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This dissertation examines the phenomenon of interstate arbitration in the northeast Peloponnese between the years 250-150 B.C. Following 250 B.C. a number of Peloponnesian city-states joined the recently reformed Achaian League, changing its composition dramatically since none of these new members were ethnically Achaians.

Of these new Achaian League members Corinth, Epidauros, Hermion, and Troizen were all at some time involved in territorial disputes with their neighbors. On two separate occasions Epidauros and Troizen each became involved in a dispute with the Ptolemaic colony of Arsinoë (Methana).

Our sources for these territorial disputes is almost exclusively epigraphic and it is with the inscriptions that this study begins. The majority of the inscriptions studied here were set up originally in the Asklepieion of Epidauros (IG IV².1.70+59, 71, 72, 74, 75+, and 76+77) while one was found in Hermion (SEG XI 377) and another in Troizen (IG IV 752).

Presented first in each chapter is a new edition of each inscription followed by a detailed epigraphical commentary on each stone. After this a commentary on the date and historical circumstances of each dispute is presented. Finally each chapter
concludes with a topographical commentary on the disputed territory with conclusions suggested as to what the land was used for and why the land was contested.

This examination of interstate arbitration also allows us to make some conclusions concerning the relationships between Achaian League members as well as the relations between the League and the Ptolemies. The argument is made here that Achaian members submitted their disputes for arbitration with the hope of territorial aggrandizement, as well as for the control of land that was more productive than previous scholars have believed. Ptolemaic Arsinoē, on the other hand, enjoyed cordial relations with its Achaian neighbors while the League and the Ptolemies were allied and it was during these times that outstanding disputes were settled by arbitration.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION AND METHODOLOGY

This study is a thorough examination of a number of boundary disputes in the northeastern Peloponnese during the late Hellenistic period for which our evidence is almost exclusively epigraphic. It is not, however, limited to the republication of the stones with extensive epigraphical commentaries. Wherever possible, an attempt has been made to extract as much information from the texts as possible. More often than not this has meant leaving the museums in which they are stored and spending time investigating the countrysides to which they refer. This study, therefore, is an epigraphical, historical, and topographical analysis of these disputes.

The disputes studied here comprise a unified group in two ways: both geographically and historically/chronologically. They are linked together both historically and chronologically in that the Achaian League played some role in each of the arbitrations. This study then, can also be seen as an investigation of the Achaian League’s use of international arbitration as a process by which it settled disputes between several of its members as well as one non-League neighbor. By examining this legal process employed by the Achaians it is possible to gain new insight into the League, its position within the Hellenistic world and the status of these cities within it. Previous studies of the Achaian League have been concerned with broad issues,
such as the organization of its assemblies, its prominent statesmen, and its relations with the Hellenistic monarchies or Rome. While such studies have their own value, this study is an examination of the Achaian League from a different viewpoint. It focuses on only a few of its member states and concentrates on their relations with one another and how they, through the Achaian League, settled their differences.

The second unifying factor is the geographical proximity of the states involved in the disputes discussed here (Map 1.1). These cities include Corinth and those of the Akte, or southern Argolid: Epidauros, Troizen, and Hermion. Another city, located close to these is Arsinoë, a Ptolemaic outpost on the Methana peninsula, which is included within this study as a means of determining how the Achaians and the Ptolemies conducted international relations with one another. These relations between the Achaian League and Ptolemaic Arsinoë were not carried out on a large international stage, but they still supply us with enough evidence to explain how Arsinoë was able to survive independently while surrounded by Achaian League members.

Another reason for choosing these few cities is that they all became League members (with the obvious exception of Arsinoë) at an early stage of its expansion, between 243-229 B.C. Furthermore, these cities, at one time or another resorted to the process of arbitration to settle disputes over their boundaries. The few cases studied here provide a unique glimpse of the arbitration process as a widely used practice within the Hellenistic world. Within this collection are examples of arbitration between Achaian League members settled by another League member,

1 For the League assemblies, see Aymard 1938a and Larsen 1968, pp. 215-241. For Achaian relations with Rome, see Aymard 1939b and more recently Bastini 1987 and Nottmeyer 1995. For Achaian relations in the Hellenistic world, see Urban 1979. Bibliographies of the two well known Achaian statesmen Aratos and Philopoimen include Walbank 1933 and Errington 1969 respectively.
several League members. Also, we have two examples of arbitration between an Achaian member and the Ptolemaic colony of Arsinoë on Methana. These two examples are both unique in that the first, with Epidauros, it seems that as many as eleven Achaian cities made up the arbitration board while the second, with Troizen, king Ptolemy was apparently involved by sending ambassadors. Thus, within this collection of a few disputes from a small geographical area, we can study a number of different phenomena concerning the arbitration process itself. Although physical examination of the stones has been conducted only on the inscriptions concerning the cities mentioned above, I have also tried to place these within the larger body of all arbitration disputes between League members.

One inscription studied here (IG IV.1.74), while it involved two states that became Achaian League members, probably predates to their entrance into it. We also have epigraphical evidence (IG IV 791) that apparently reveals another dispute between two cities of the Akte after the League's dissolution in 146 B.C. These two disputes, which are both discussed below, shed light on our subject in that they may help us learn why the cities of the Akte seemingly disputed amongst one another so frequently. It may also help explain why border disputes were a common occurrence both before and after they were League members.

The Achaian League was refounded in 281/0 B.C. and for its first thirty years it existed within the boundaries of Achaia itself. In 251/0 B.C. its composition changed when Aratos of Sikyon overthrew the tyranny in his native city-state and added it to the League. It is at this moment that the focus of this dissertation begins. The League's major period of expansion began several years after Sikyon joined when Aratos, while League strategos, launched a night attack on Corinth expelling its
Macedonian garrison. At this point (243/2 B.C.) Corinth, Epidauros and Troizen also became members. By 229 B.C. the tyrant Aristomachos relinquished his hold on Argos and joined it to the League: Xenon the tyrant of Hermion and most of Arkadia immediately followed suit.

Many cities that joined the League after Sikyon were in similar positions: either held by a tyrant who was supported by the Macedonians, or in Corinth’s case a Macedonian garrison on Acrocorinth. There were no other options for these cities to defend themselves and maintain freedom from Macedonian influence than to join a group of states that was also opposed to Macedonian presence within the Peloponnesos. At other times the threat to these cities came from Aetolia and within the Peloponnesos itself from Sparta. This was undoubtedly one of the primary reasons for which these cities joined themselves to the League, but it was certainly not the only one.

The choice of these cities, for the reasons outlined above, provides a unique insight into the Achaian League on levels not limited to its prominent statesmen and its relations with the Hellenistic monarchies or Rome. The questions asked here are: Why did cities outside Achaia proper join the League? What, if anything, did they hope to gain from membership? How did the Ptolemaic presence on Methana affect the Achaian cities of the Akte? And what steps were taken to make their presence there amicable to both sides? These questions pertain to traditional topics concerning international relations and the organization of a Hellenistic federal state but regarding the Achaian League, they have never been approached in this way before.

One concern mentioned above is to determine, if possible, what the reasons were for individual cities to join the Achaian League. Certainly they hoped to gain
some protection through the League from Sparta or extra-Peloponnesian influence, but the frequency with which non-Achaian members disputed their boundaries suggests that other factors may have been involved. At least one dispute studied here took place shortly after the two cities became League members, while the others involving League members occurred well after their membership had been approved. Regarding cases in which arbitration was carried out immediately after membership was granted it seems that the League may have played an active role in making sure its new members had all outstanding conflicts resolved. This does not explain, however, why such disputes occurred long after states had become members. Why then, we should ask, were members of a federal state, commonly united in this respect so prone to dispute amongst themselves as the evidence suggests? This question is interesting when we consider it with Polybios' famous statement on the Achaian League:

Πολλών γὰρ ἐπιβαλλόμενων ἐν τοῖς παρεληλυθόσι χρόνοις ἐπὶ ταύτῳ συμφέρον ἀγαγείν Πελοποννησίους, οὐδὲνός δὲ καθικέσθαι δυνηθέντος, διὰ τὸ μὴ τῆς κοινῆς ἐλευθερίας ἐνεκεν, ἀλλὰ τῆς σφετέρας δυναστείας χάριν ἐκάστους ποιεῖσθαι τὴν σπουδὴν, τιμαύτην καὶ τηλικαύτην ἐν τοῖς καθ ἡμᾶς καιροῖς ἔσχε προκοπὴν καὶ συντέλειαν τούτῳ τὸ μέρος ὡστε μὴ μονὸν συμμαχικὴν καὶ φιλικὴν κοινωνίαν γεγονέναι πραγμάτων περὶ αὑτῶς, ἀλλὰ καὶ νόμοις χρῆσαι τοῖς αὐτοῖς καὶ σταθμοῖς καὶ μέτροις καὶ νομίσμασι, πρὸς δὲ τούτοις ἀρχοὺσι βουλευταῖς. δικασταῖς τοῖς αὐτοῖς. καθόλου δὲ τούτῳ μόνῳ διαλλάττειν τοῦ μὴ μιᾶς πόλεως διαθέσαι ἔχειν σχεδόν τὴν σύμπασαν Πελοπόννησον τῷ μὴ τὸν αὐτὸν περίβολον ὑπάρχειν τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν αὐτὴν. τάλλα δὲ εἶναι καὶ κοινὴ καὶ κατὰ πόλεις ἐκάστοις ταύτα καὶ παραπλήσια.
(Polybios 2.37.9-11)

In previous times, many have tried to bring the Peloponnnesians together in a manner beneficial for them, but no one has been able to do this. for it was not on account of a common freedom, but for the sake of their own power that each one made the attempt. It has had so great an advance and been nearly completed in our time that not only is there a common and friendly alliance amongst each other, but they also use the same weights, measures, and coinage, in addition to their rulers, councillors and judges. in this one thing nearly the whole Peloponnnesos differs from a single city in that no single wall exists around it, and all other things with regard to the whole and each individual city are very nearly equal.
Polybios clearly implies here that the unification of the Peloponnesos under the Achaian League was beneficial to all states within it. His comparison of the League with a single city seems quite contrary, on the other hand, to the picture that we have from these numerous border disputes. Polybios was a native of Megalopolis, a member state that also was involved in several disputes over its borders. He was undoubtedly aware of this practice and its frequent use: in fact he himself took part in a dispute between Megalopolis and Messene. How, therefore, can his statement be reconciled with the evidence and can it be used, if at all, to understand this process? The most plausible explanation is that Polybios is referring to the cities themselves and is not concerned with events in the countryside in his evaluation of relations amongst the member states. These countrysides would not have been heavily populated and any disputes over them would not have altered Polybios' interpretation of the League, which was primarily concerned with international events.

An investigation of the Greek countryside by nature relates most closely with these small farmers and shepherds living outside of the cities and whose lives were generally not recorded by ancient authors. While very little information about these people is recoverable, the study of the countryside is perhaps the most useful means by which to reconstruct their lives and to learn how they utilized the land. It is these people who, in some manner, were most affected by the border disputes. We can no longer determine how individuals living on the fringe of a city’s territory would have reacted or what they thought, if they one day found themselves living within the territory of another city-state. How this would have affected these people, mentally

---

² Ἀρ. 46, line 6.
and or financially is a question we will never be able to answer, but it must have affected them in some manner.

Where possible in the study of the individual arbitration disputes, a topographical commentary on both the boundaries themselves and the importance of the borderlands to the economies of the disputants is included. This method of approaching a history of the northeast Peloponnesos is the best possible way to shed some light on the lesser-known regions and the countless unknowns who were citizens of League member states. While we cannot avoid studying the well-known strategoi of the League and its other politicians to gain some insight into these disputes, particularly to determine their dates, this investigation into the border regions will hopefully provide information previously unknown about these nameless segments of Hellenistic society in the northeastern Peloponnesos.

INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION

Arbitration between Greek cities has received new interest in recent years. The current world trend to settle the seemingly endless number of border disputes through arbitration and “shuttle diplomacy” undoubtedly has provided the stimulus for this renaissance.

M. N. Tod first collected the evidence for arbitration disputes in his *International Arbitration amongst the Greeks* (1913). His work is now long out of date, as a large body of evidence has come to light since its publication. This gap has been filled recently by two works one in English and the other in Italian: Sheila Ager’s publication in 1996 of her volume, *Interstate Arbitration in the Greek World, 337-90 B.C.* and A. Magnetto’s *Gli Arbitrati Interstatali Greci* (1997). These two collections
will be the starting point for all future scholars working on this or related topics. Collections of such a large body of material are resources that have made my task much easier. Both works, however, are not without their problems, which were understandably unavoidable in compilations of such books. Ager’s collection of epigraphical and literary references to interstate arbitration, which numbers 171, could not have been made with autopsy of every stone mentioned, especially if one considers how widely the stones themselves have now been dispersed. Magnetto’s collection only consists of disputes that occurred between the years 337-197 B.C. Such arbitrary time limits are not without foundation, but for an examination of a federal state’s use of this practice all evidence must be considered. Nor is a detailed analysis into all aspects of each dispute a possibility with such a large body of material. In my collection below, which is made up of four cases studied by Ager, all the stones have been examined personally. By studying such a limited number of disputes, I have also had the time and opportunity to address the topographical problems related to each one. Future investigations into Hellenistic arbitration should follow a similar methodology, for no individual scholar can study the practice of arbitration completely without autopsy of the stones and the countrysides.

Other studies dealing with international arbitration and especially cities’ frontiers have appeared in recent years, mostly from the French speaking world. This is largely the result of Louis Robert’s preliminary work, who was unfortunately never able to complete a study of Greek borders that he at one time promised.

A thorough study of a border dispute is a multi-faceted undertaking as indicated above. In the case of the disputes discussed below strict adherence to this
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model has been applied. New editions, based on my personal examination of the inscriptions, form the basis of each chapter.

The most important aspects in the study of an arbitration dispute are autopsy of the stone and a topographical survey of the borderland itself, not only to identify the physical boundary, but also to gain an understanding of why the land was disputed and how it was used. What the cities' reasons were for submitting their disputes for arbitration and what they hoped to gain from expanding their territory is another critical question when we consider the disputes between Achaian League members. Equally important is an examination of all relevant primary sources relevant to the disputes for the purpose of putting them in their historical contexts.

The inscriptions studied and re-edited here according to the method outlined below include: IG IV^2.1.70+59. IG IV^2.1.71. IG IV^2.1.72. IG IV^2.1.74. IG IV^2.1.75+. IG IV^2.1.76+77. IG IV 752. and SEG XI 377. With the exception of the last two, all were found in the Epidaurian Asklepieion, which on account of its status as an international sanctuary, was a natural place to set up these records; they would have been clearly visible to the visitor.

Of those found there, Epidauros itself is one of the two litigants in at most four out of five recorded disputes and not less than three. The two stones not set up in the Asklepieion were found in the city of one of the two litigants and are duplicates of copies also found in the Epidaurian Asklepieion.

Interestingly, both of these disputes resulted in the creation of a common territory between the disputants, thus possibly explaining why the decisions were inscribed on stelai and set up in both litigants' cities and not just in the city of the

---

4 One other Epidaurian inscription, IG IV^2.1.78, may record part of an arbitration, but the fragment is too small to recover the names of the litigants, or any other information about the dispute. I have seen the stone itself in the Epidauros Museum and I have examined a squeeze of it in the Center for Epigraphical and Paleographical Studies at the Ohio State University but I could make no advancements in the text.
victor. This theory holds true for disputes in which the arbitrators did not decide upon a common territory. Thus, when dealing with a fragmentary text, such as IG IV.1.72, from which we cannot determine either the exact nature of the dispute or its result, we could suggest hesitantly that Epidauros was the beneficiary of the judgment since the inscription was found there. This is a dangerous argument only because no other copy has been found. Another copy may have existed at one time and is now destroyed or is waiting to be uncovered in future excavation.

The process by which these disputes were judged also provides insight into the Achaian League's legal history. In all but one of the disputes discussed below, the League itself was in some way involved in the settlement. Normally, it seems that the parties involved submitted their differences to the League, who assigned judges from one or more member states to carry out the decision. Evidence from the dispute between Corinth and Epidauros makes it clear that an appeal process also existed, for the Corinthians appealed the first decision. What is unclear, however, is how the judges themselves, whether Achaian members or non-Achaians, were chosen. The dispute between Troizen and Arsinoë is a unique case, for it is almost certain that both Ptolemaic representatives as well as Achaians were involved in the judgment. Arsinoë was also involved in an earlier dispute with Epidauros that was settled by judges selected from Achaian member states. These two cases involving Ptolemaic Arsinoë are unique in that it was not a member state, therefore they supply a great deal of evidence concerning both Achaian-Ptolemaic relations and how disputes were settled between a member of a federal state and a non-member. Epidauros and Hermion, both League members, had a dispute settled by two panels of judges, one from Miletos and the other from Rhodes. Nowhere in the record of the dispute is the
Achaian League mentioned and it appears that it played no role in its settlement. This case is one of the latest chronologically studied here and it may reflect a change in Achaian policy. During its early stages of expansion in the Peloponnesos, the League appears to have been involved closely in the resolution of outstanding disputes between its new members. Later, however, members seem to have a greater degree of freedom to settle disputes amongst themselves, as is illustrated in the case between Hermion and Epidauros.

EPIGRAPHICAL METHODOLOGY

In editing the inscriptions that follow all previous editions and the secondary literature associated with them have been consulted. These editions have been prepared according to the conventions laid out by Sterling Dow that are based on the Leiden Convention.\(^5\)

In the heading of each inscription reference is made only to the editio princeps and subsequent re-editions of them. The secondary literature relating to several of them is quite large and would be too cumbersome to compile here.\(^6\) Included within each heading are the measurements of all pertinent aspects of the stones, some of which have never been recorded previously. Drawings and photographs are supplied to show the exact state of each stone (with the exception of IG IV\(^2\).1.71, for which no drawing is presented here).

Following each drawing is a detailed epigraphical commentary where all letters difficult to read are described. Included in the epigraphical commentaries, where

\(^5\) Dow 1969. For the sigla used here, see pp. 5-12.

\(^6\) For more complete bibliographies of the literature on these stones, see Pikoulas 1992-1998; Ager 1995; Magnetto 1997.
appropriate, are also brief discussions of readings made by previous editors that require additional explanation beyond that found in an *apparatus criticus*.

In the preparation of the texts, supplements are included only where parallels can be produced in support of them. By following this principle of limited restoration, several editions here are quite different from those that are regularly cited. Previous restorations are frequently omitted where they are without parallels, or seem highly unlikely. These omissions, and other variant readings, are all noted in the *apparatus criticus* following each text. Where my editions are so markedly different from a previous one, I have reproduced the earlier edition to facilitate a comparative reading between the two.

Translations of the inscriptions have also been provided. At times, this has proven a difficult task, as some of the stones do not preserve any connected sentences. Nevertheless, translations of as much of these texts as possible are supplied so as to give the reader an understanding both of the nature of the preserved text and its fragmentary state of preservation. Preparing the English translations has also constituted a number of difficult problems. No method for presenting a translation of an inscription is at present agreed upon by epigraphists, but a number of admirable models can be found. Any translation, however, must indicate in some manner where the text is secure and where it is based on restoration. Thus, all supplements are placed within brackets, both within the Greek and English texts.

Detailed discussions of the inscriptions' dates follow each text. In several cases, the dates proposed below are quite different from those suggested by previous
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1 This is especially the case with *IG IV²* 1.74. See my comments and discussion below. Chapter 4.

2 For a recent presentations of translated inscriptions, see Aleshire 1989 and Burstein 1985. pp. xiv-xv.
editors and that have been widely accepted in the secondary literature. These new dates are the result of both new readings from the stones and a thorough examination of the primary literature concerning the Achaian League's internal relations as well as its foreign affairs, primarily with the Ptolemaic kingdom.

Prosopography has also played a significant role in the discussions of date. A very common characteristic of all inscribed records of arbitration disputes is the inclusion of a list of the judges who made the decision. This often provides the only evidence by which we are able to venture a guess concerning the dates of the disputes. In several cases below, prosopographical arguments either made from new epigraphical readings or new interpretations of old ones have led to very different conclusions about the dates of three disputes. Even in cases where the date of the dispute is relatively secure, all relevant prosopographical evidence is examined thoroughly.

The primary literature is of the utmost importance in the study of these disputes, especially concerning their dates. The most valuable of these sources is Polybios' *Histories*. Polybios himself was an Achaian statesman until he was sent to Rome as a hostage after the conclusion of the Third Macedonian War: his first hand experience in Achaian affairs make him an invaluable source.° Plutarch's biographies of Aratos, Philopoimen, and Agis and Cleomenes also provide useful information on the activities of the League as well as its relations with the Ptolemaic dynasty. Evidence from these sources is used to supplement the historical commentary of each dispute.

° Walbank 1972, pp. 6-8.
Following each historical commentary is a topographical commentary, which is in some cases more detailed than in others, depending on the inscription’s preservation and what we know about the boundaries from them. One exception to this is *IG IV².1.71*, the dispute between Corinth and Epidaurus: the topography of this dispute is the subject of Chapter 3. The topographical commentaries, while concerned with the identification of the borders themselves and the toponyms found on the stones, is not limited to that alone. Within these sections my conclusions on how the land was used in antiquity and why the territory was disputed are presented.

**SURVEY METHODOLOGY**

The value of surface survey in Greece is an indisputable one, due largely to the recent, final publications of several survey results, two of which involve areas under study here.¹⁰ My topographical study has by no means constituted an intensive or diachronic survey, one which tries to extract as much about the use of a landscape over an extended period of time, but has had a specific purpose, the study of several states’ borders in the late Hellenistic period. In this regard, the scope of my project has more in common with the work of individual topographers rather than with the work of large-scale survey projects.¹¹ My work, therefore, falls into the category defined by Susan Alcock, as

explorations that are relatively systematic, but conducted on a very small scale, sometimes even single-handedly.... and comprises projects which, rather than attempting high-intensity coverage, were designed to cover a specific, usually quite large, region in a more extensive fashion: not surprisingly, a tendency to discover only the bigger sites within the study area is often demonstrable. as

¹⁰ For the area around Hermion, see Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994 and for the Methana peninsula, see Mee and Forbes 1997.

¹¹ The more prominent of the individual topographers include E. Vanderpool, W. K. Pritchett, and N. G. L. Hammond. More recent publications of a similar nature include Pikoulas 1995 and Lolos 1998.
well as a concentration on specific categories of site location (e.g. hilltops, coastal promontories). In some cases, the investigations were not fully diachronic in intent.12

Discovery of larger sites, while certainly valuable in itself, was not the only goal of this project. Advances in survey methodology over the past two decades have influenced this work. The bibliography and the issues involved concerning survey methodology in Greece has become quite vast in recent years.13

One of the more important conclusions drawn from survey results in Greece over the past twenty years is that during the late Hellenistic period there was a significant decline in rural populations represented by a decrease in site numbers from previous periods.14 Such a decline has long been suspected from several of our literary sources that also seem to indicate as much. Most important among these is Polybios' statement (36.17.5-9) in which he discusses the decrease in population, and abandonment of the countryside. This passage, and others may be exaggerations on the authors' parts, making it nearly impossible to determine the extent to which the literary record reflects an actual truth. This inescapable conclusion supplied by the literary and archaeological records, however, that population declined in the Hellenistic period has a direct impact on this study, in particular when we try to determine why the city-states contested their boundaries. The undeniable evidence


for this population decline suggests that the countrysides in question would not have been as extensively used or inhabited as in previous periods. If this assumption is correct, then why were these countrysides more hotly contested than they appear to have been previously? It would seem that a decline in the rural population indicates that the land here was less intensely used, but the degree to which it was disputed clearly shows that it held some value to the states that contested it. What was their motivation behind this?\textsuperscript{15} Certainly maintaining their territorial integrity cannot be ruled out, but it should not be considered the only explanation for this phenomenon. Topographical survey of the borders is the only method to answer these questions.

The most detailed topographical studies included here concern the borders of Corinth and Epidauros, Hermion and Epidauros, and Arsinoë with Troizen. These disputes provide the best possible case studies because the inscriptions are well enough preserved and supply sufficient topographical information to conduct such a study. The dispute between Hermion and Epidauros, which is known from two duplicate inscriptions as well as reference to it by Pausanias, has been the object of extensive topographical research. As a result of my predecessors' efforts, my commentary should be seen more as a discussion of their work than the results of my own detailed research in the field.

The Corinthian-Epidaurian boundary also provides ample evidence, both literary and epigraphical to conduct a detailed topographical study. Attempts to identify this boundary have been few and they are discussed in more detail below in Chapter 3. Although my predecessors’ work in this area was limited, it has formed the starting point of my study. Without these previous investigations, which are primarily

\textsuperscript{15} On this question, see Alcock 1993, pp. 118-128.
the record of known antiquities, one would be at a great disadvantage when starting field examination. The known sites and the numerous Byzantine chapels along the Corinthian-Epidaurian border were my starting points. Once familiar with the disputed territory, the survey area, which is defined in detail in Chapter 3, was more narrowly focused. Considerable evidence has come to light during the course of my survey suggesting that land use in the southeastern Corinthia was more extensive than previously believed. This conclusion seems to contradict the theories about rural populations in the late Hellenistic period.

The countryside of the southern Corinthia itself is considerably more fertile than that of the northern Epidauria, as one entering it from the southern Corinthia can clearly see. The ancient Corinthian-Epidaurian boundary cannot have been far from the modern Argolid-Corinthia boundary. The much more productive lands of the southeastern Corinthia must have long inspired the envy of the inhabitants of the northern Epidauria.

Arsinoë’s border with its neighbors is both more difficult to define than the others and rather easy. The outpost, which is located on a peninsula and attached to the mainland by a small, narrow isthmus means that the only adjacent territory is that of Troizen. A fragmentary inscription concerning a dispute between Arsinoë and Epidauros is the only testimony we have for a common boundary between the two. Its border with Epidauros, if it indeed had one, is now difficult to determine, primarily due to the inscription’s preserved state recording the arbitration between the two states. The border of Arsinoë and Troizen, however, presents a much more straightforward case study. The border is quite clear and the inscription itself actually
defines a territory to be held in common by the two states, which is defined by a number of landmarks and by economic concerns.

Recording newly discovered sites and those previously known has formed a major part of this study. In Appendix 1, all sites along the Corinthian-Epidaurian frontier are recorded and described. Each site is numbered and has a separate entry within Appendix 1. The modern toponym and the location of each site is given. All important visible features, namely traces of walls, and where relevant, whether or not sherds or tiles were seen in the area, are also recorded. In many cases sherds were not found, ruling out dating by this criterion, thus we are forced to rely on other less-reliable criteria, such as masonry styles. Since I did not have permission to collect ceramic evidence at these sites, careful study of this evidence was not possible. Due to these constraints, all dates given below are intended to represent a wide, possible range of use or habitation. Thus, it has been impossible to prove beyond a doubt if any of these sites were occupied or in use at the time the disputes occurred. These constraints have also made it impossible to determine to what degree this countryside witnessed a change in the number of sites from previous and subsequent periods. These questions can only be answered by an intensive survey on a scale much larger than my own. Descriptions of the sites related to the Hermion-Epidauros border and that of Arsinoë-Troizen, are included within the topographical commentaries of the relevant chapters.
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16 This is of the utmost importance for future topographers working in this area. I have, on several occasions, had great difficulty or no success at all in trying to locate some previously reported sites based on earlier descriptions due to new roads and changes in the modern topography.
ANCIENT METHODS USED TO MARK BORDERS

A number of different methods for demarcating the boundaries of city-states are attested in the literary sources as well as the archaeological record. These can be either natural features of the landscape or man-made objects such as inscribed boundary stones, fortifications or sanctuaries. A prominent feature of the landscape demarcated Corinth’s border with the Sikyonia, which both Strabo (8.6.25) and Livy (33.15.1) tell us was the Nema river.

Borders in antiquity, especially within Attica, were also often marked with horoi or inscribed boundary markers. Such boundary markers are not as common in the Peloponnnesos as in Attica, but they are not unknown. According to Xenophon (Hell. 4.4.6 and 4.8.34) the Corinthian-Argive border was at one time demarcated with boundary markers, for he tells us that they were removed in 392 B.C. when the two states underwent the process of isopolity.17 A rupestral horos inscription of the classical period, similar to those common in Attica, has recently been discovered along the boundary of Hermion and Philanoreia.18 Inscribed boundary markers are known from Corinth itself, but they seem to define tribal boundaries, and not the territory of the city itself.19

What seems to have been a more common practice in the Peloponnnesos was the use of stone piles or cairns to mark boundaries. Our best evidence for this phenomenon is found along the border of Hermion and Epidauros. The stone piles marking this boundary are referred to as boleoi lithoi both in the inscriptions (IG
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17 For more on the isopolity of Corinth and Argos, see Griffith 1950, pp. 236-256 and Salmon 1984, pp. 354-362.
18 This inscription has been published by Jameson, Runnells, and van Andel 1994, pp. 531-532, fig. F.5. see also pp. 602-603.
19 These inscriptions are discussed in more detail in Appendix 3.
IV.1.75+ and SEG XI 377) recording a dispute between these two states and by Pausanias (2.36.3). Other examples of stone piles that mark borders have also been found in the Peloponnesos. Among these are the 'Ερμοί λίθου that marked the borders of Tegea, Argos, and Lakonia. Pausanias (2.38.7) first reported their existence and they have been subsequently excavated. Another series of stone cairns has been identified along Sikyon’s western boundary. Below (Chapter 3) I will present what appears to be a newly discovered series of stone cairns that demarcate the Corinthian-Epidaurian border.

Also common throughout the Greek world, but best known along the Attic-Boiotian border, are systems of forts defending the boundaries. In order to locate the borders of the states studied here, any such fort has been sought that might be placed within a border defense system, where disputes might have been more likely to occur. My study has not been limited to the identification of fortifications along the border, but I have also been concerned to learn why the territory was disputed. To understand this, close attention has been paid to the land as it is used today, and for evidence of how it was used in antiquity.

---

20 For a discussion of the term Boleoi, see Robert 1963, pp. 33-34.


23 For a discussion of border forts, primarily those in Attica, and ancient references to defenses along borders, see Hanson 1983, pp. 74-85. For the border defenses of Attica in the 4th century B.C., see Ober 1985, pp. 191-207; Camp 1991, pp. 193-202; Munn 1993, pp. 3-33.
Recently the importance of sanctuaries and their position along the borders of city-states have received much attention. This theory, developed by François de Polignac, was used to illustrate how city-states in the Archaic period defined their territories. His theories and those of others have focused on the larger sanctuaries, for example the sanctuary of Poseidon at Isthmia and the sanctuary of Hera at Perachora for the definition of the early Corinthia. There is sufficient evidence to support these conclusions concerning rural sanctuaries, but recent work has focused on those larger sanctuaries that also have been excavated. If sanctuaries were in fact used to define the territory of a city-state in the Archaic period, then it is reasonable to assume that as territories expanded in the Classical and Hellenistic periods, rural sanctuaries were also used in a similar fashion. The possible identification of several rural sanctuaries that may in fact mark territorial limits are described in more detail in the topographical commentaries.

Identification of a site as a sanctuary can be a highly subjective one without architectural remains, votive, or epigraphical evidence. In several cases discussed below, where this evidence is lacking, the possibility is merely raised that location and surface remains suggest that a site may have been a sanctuary. Confirmation of these hypotheses without excavation remains impossible.

Another important feature, but also highly controversial to identify are ancient roads. In places where these are discussed or theorized, it is true that no wheel ruts, the indisputable sign of an ancient roadway, have been discovered to support their identification. Recent work on roads has demonstrated the need and the ability to
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discover wheel ruts in the most obscure places. This standard in identifying ancient roads is a difficult one to live up to, and the identification of wheel ruts in the area under study here has remained elusive. Therefore, reference to roads that seem to be ancient, or follow the courses of ancient roads is based on criteria other than wheel ruts. These include their grade, the presence of ancient remains, retaining walls, their course and destination.

MODERN MAPS AND EARLY TRAVELERS' ACCOUNTS

Within the topographical commentaries, all references to modern toponyms are based on those found on the 1:50,000 maps of the Greek Army Geographical Service [Γ.Υ.Σ.], unless otherwise noted. The modern Greek place name of each site is given where it is first mentioned in the text. Site plans, and other detailed work are based on the Γ.Υ.Σ. 1:5,000 maps. Aerial photographs have also been an invaluable source in showing recent development in these countrysides, as well as the roads in use prior to their modern successors. Especially helpful were those taken by the Royal Air Force during the Second World War that are now located in the archives of the British School at Athens. More recent photographs taken by the Greek Ministry of the Environment have been excellent sources in determining the approximate dates of dramatic changes in these landscapes.


28 As far as I know, only three sets of wheel ruts have been identified in the entire area under study here, and not one of these plays a role in any of the disputes. For these rutted roads, see Archontidou-Argyri 1984, p. 49. Tausent 1992-1993, pp. 93-96, and Jameson, Runnels and van Andel 1994, pp. 49-50.

29 I have tried to be as consistent as possible with the transliteration of all modern Greek place names, but due to the difficulty of this task some discrepancies may still remain.
Wherever available, early travelers' accounts relevant to the areas under study have been consulted. Unfortunately, the southeastern Corinthia has long been ignored by those interested in antiquity for a variety of reasons. Nevertheless, this in many ways has helped to preserve the area, although this situation is rapidly changing making a full scale intensive survey a necessary project. The early travelers do provide, however, a valuable resource for a topographical study in the Akte, but they fail us in the region north of Epidauros. In the area of Methana and Troizen the accounts of Sir William Gell, Edward Dodwell, and William Leake are among the best. Another source of information is Andonios Miliarakis' work on the geography of the Corinthia and Argolid written in 1886, which preserves an invaluable record of the region. Miliarakis' volume includes not only a record of the ancient remains, but he also records population figures and information about the agriculture of these areas.

Since the countrysides studied here are usually rural, it is difficult to retrieve much information about them, especially if their primary function was for pasturage. Hopefully it will become clear below that Corinthian-Epidaurian frontier, at least, was not as desolate as has been thought previously. It has long been recognized that, after pasturage, the countryside's primary function was agricultural. Work on ancient farming and farmsteads, as a result of the growing number of publications from survey results throughout Greece, in recent years has expanded greatly our current understanding of these most common remains of the Greek countryside.

The recent developments in survey methodology, its widespread use in Greece and their results have greatly influenced my interpretation of these countrysides.

---

29 For brief accounts of these men, see Eisner 1991, pp. 102-105.
More traditional topographical studies have had an impact here as well. Many advocates of survey have criticized these traditional studies as simply attempts at identifying places mentioned by ancient sources.\textsuperscript{31} Such complaints cannot be dismissed simply, for they represent a new method of understanding and studying the Greek countryside. It would be irresponsible, however, if all evidence was not considered. If the evidence suggests that a newly discovered ancient site played some role in an event recorded by an ancient author it is essential to discuss fully this possibility. Such identifications should also not represent the end goal of topographical research, for survey has clearly demonstrated that much more can be extrapolated from a site. Neither extreme is represented here exclusively: both the understanding of a countryside and its position within the historical record are equally important.


\textsuperscript{31} For this opinion, see Snodgrass (1987, pp. 36-43) with an emphasis on excavated sites: Morris 1994, p. 15. For a defense of this methodology, see Munn 1993, pp. 32-33.
Map 1.1: Cities involved in the disputes
INTRODUCTION

In 243/2 B.C. Corinth and Epidauros became Achaian League members and shortly thereafter they submitted a dispute over their common boundary to the Achaian court for arbitration. 151 Megarian judges settled the dispute which is preserved on an intact stele, \textit{IG IV^2\cdot1.71}, found in the Asklepieion at Epidauros. In addition to the record of the settlement this stele records that the Epidaurians won an initial dispute, and that the Corinthians appealed this decision. Thirty-one Megarians returned to the disputed area and made a second ruling which is preserved on this stele.

A second stele, \textit{IG IV^2\cdot1.70} also found in the Epidaurian Asklepieion, was interpreted originally as a record of the first Megarian decision, but it has since been shown to record the conditions of Epidauros' entrance into the Achaian League. Nevertheless, some scholars have continued to believe that it contains the results of the first arbitration, prior to the Corinthian appeal recorded on \textit{IG IV^2\cdot1.71}. It is
unquestionable that Corinth is mentioned in *IG IV*².1.70+59, but exactly in what context and why are two of the questions I will attempt to answer here. Additional matters under discussion include the entrance of cities into the Achaian League, the selection of Megarians as judges, and the settlement itself as recorded on the second stele.

*IG IV*².1.70+59. **The Entrance of Epidaurus into the Achaian League.**

Fragment a

*ed. pr.:* F. Hiller von Gaertringen, *IG IV*².1.70
M. Mitsos 1937. pp. 708-714
W. Peek 1969. no. 25. pp. 23-25. pl. IV. fig. 7

Two fragments of a hard gray limestone stele, broken on the right and bottom. A molding is preserved at the top of the stele. The left edge of the stone has been dressed with a light pick. There is an uninscribed margin on the left of ca. 0.01 (lines 1-5) and 0.003 (lines 6-23). The stele is preserved to its original thickness. The inscribed face is heavily worn on the right side. The two fragments were first associated by Werner Peek in 1969.¹

H 0.31 m; W 0.357 m; Th 0.115 m, 0.163 m (at top of molding); LH 0.006 m
Interlinear Spacing: *ca.* 0.005 m
checker: 0.0089 m (vertical), 0.0091 m (horizontal)

Photo: Figure 2.3

¹ Magnetto 1997, no. 36 I. pp. 212-213 only prints a text of *IG IV*².1.70 and omits *IG IV*².1.59.
Figure 21. IGIV.1.70, Drawing
NOTES ON READINGS

Line 5: The nineteenth letter is definitely an iota. Mitsos read an iota here, but Peek read an upsilon.

Line 10: The cutter forgot to inscribe the sigma of γένεος. This was noted correctly by Mitsos. Peek claims that above the kappa “ist ein kleines Sigma nachgetragen.” There appears to be a small chip in the stone here, but it can hardly be a kappa.

Line 13: A circular letter occupies the thirteenth stoichos. this letter must be an omicron.

Line 14: The letter in the fifteenth stoichos is clearly an upsilon.

Line 18: Within the second stoichos two parallel vertical strokes are legible. There appears to be a slight trace of a diagonal stroke indicating that this letter is a nu, but this letter may also be an eta. The final letter trace consists only of the upper half of a vertical stroke. There are no traces of an omicron and iota, which Peek read after it.

Line 19: The first visible letter trace, in the fourth stoichos, is the upper right part of a circular letter. Peek read a tau in the third stoichos, but there is no trace of this letter on the stone.

Fragment b
ed. pr.: P. Kavvadias 1918, no. 4, pp. 149-150, fig. 7
F. Hiller von Gaertringen, IG IV².1.59
W. Peek 1969, no. 25, pp. 23-25

A small fragment of hard gray limestone found in the 1916-1918 excavations of the Greek Archaeological Society in the Epidaurian Asklepieion. It is broken on the top, right and bottom. The left edge is preserved and dressed with a light pick. The two fragments do not join physically. The lacuna between the two fragments is uncertain but it was probably not much.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Δ E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
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</tr>
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<td>3</td>
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<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ΛΚΑΙΑΓΕΝΕΑΑΥ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ΑΤΤΑΥΤΑΠΟΙΕΙΤΩ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>ΕΠΙΔΑΥΡΟΝΓΑΜΗΤΑΙΔ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>ΤΟΝΕΝΑΧΑΙΙΑΙΣΥΝΑΛ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>ΤΟΥΣΤΑΣΠΟΛΙΟΣΝΟΜΟ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>ΣΥΝΑΛΑΑΓΜΑΤΩΝΑΚΑΤΤ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>ΚΗΣΕΕΝΕΠΙΔΑΥΡΟΙΤΥΣΤΕ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>ΕΝΤΑΙΒΟΥΛΑΙΤΟΝΕΠΙΔ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>ΜΕΝΣΥΜΠΟΛΙΤΕΥΣΙΝΜΗΣΙ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>ΠΟΛΙΤΕΥΣΗΤΑΙΚΑΤΑΧΡΕΟΣ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>ΣΤΕΚΑΠΑΙΣΗΤΑΙ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Στοιχ. ca.90-100

Figure 2.2: IG IV².1.59, Drawing
NOTES ON READINGS

Line 1: Only the bottom right angle of the delta is preserved.

Line 2: After the second nu Peek read Ἐπιδώτων. This reading is not possible as a single left vertical stroke of the pi, only the lower half of which survives, is the last preserved letter trace in this line.

Line 3: Only a trace of a lower horizontal stroke remains in the fourth stoichos. The lower half of a vertical stroke is preserved in the following stoichos. The final letter trace consists of the lower half of a vertical stroke and the right hand side of an upper horizontal stroke. This letter must be a tau.

Line 4: Half of the lower right diagonal and a slight trace of the left diagonal stroke of an alpha are preserved in the third stoichos. Peek unnecessarily dotted the upsilon in the fourteenth stoichos which is clearly visible.

Line 5: Peek read a kappa in the first stoichos. I cannot make out any trace of this letter.

Line 6: The lower horizontal stroke of what must be an epsilon is preserved in the first stoichos. The right diagonal, part of the horizontal and a slight trace of the top of the left diagonal are preserved of the final delta.

Line 8: I cannot make out any trace of the final upsilon and sigma read by Peek.

Line 10: Only the vertical stroke and a slight trace of the lower horizontal of the final epsilon are preserved.

Line 11: The final delta is heavily worn, but still legible. I cannot make out any trace of the alpha in the following stoichos which Peek read.

Line 12: The lower half of a vertical stroke is preserved after the final sigma.

Line 14: The final alpha is heavily worn, but part of the right diagonal and the crossbar are legible. The lower half of a vertical stroke is visible in the next stoichos.

TEXT

243/2 B.C. Στοιχ. 4

ἀγαθαὶ τῆς ἑπὶ [...]ος ἔχει ὁμολογία; τοῖς Ἐπιδώτων·
ρίοις καὶ τοῖς Ἀχαιοῖς ἐξαισθανόμεθα· καὶ·
θὰ ποτηρὶδον ποτὶ τῶν Ἀχαιῶν σὺνοδον· αὐτῶν· ὁνί·
τες καὶ ἀφούρατοι καὶ πολλεῖς [χρωμεῖν τοῖς πατέροις· ὁνί·
πλον παραπομενον εἰς τῶν· νόμοι·
vacat 0.019 m
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APPARATUS CRITICUS

Fragment a:
TRANSLATION OF OPENING LINES

Good Fortune. In the .... an agreement between the Epidaurians and the Achaians was voted.... Ambassadors go to the synod of the Achaians.... (4) The Epidaurians be autonomous and free of garrisons and be allowed to keep their ancestral constitution.

DATE

The date of the inscription has been secure since Mitsos demonstrated that it records Epidauros' entrance into the Achaian League. Fortunately we know from the literary sources that Epidauros joined the League in 243/2 B.C., shortly after Aratos of Sikyon expelled the Macedonian garrison from Acrocorinth and made Corinth an Achaian League member.²

COMMENTARY

While this inscription does not record an actual arbitration I have decided to include it here because of its possible connections with *IG* IV².1.71 and the dispute over the boundary between Epidauros and Corinth. Hiller von Gaertingen, the original editor of the inscription, argued that it recorded the initial arbitration

² For Epidauros' admission into the Achaian League, see Plutarch *Arat*. 24.3. For the taking of Acrocorinth by Aratos and the joining of Corinth to the League, see Polybios 2.43.4: Plutarch *Arat*. 16.2-23.4: Strabo 8.7.3.
mentioned in *IG IV²*.1.71, lines 7-10. His text in the corpus was inadequate at best as Markellos Mitsos, who later re-edited the text, has shown. Mitsos determined that the stone recorded not the initial arbitration, but the conditions of Epidauros’ entrance into the Achaian League. This has been accepted generally, however, some commentators have continued to argue that this extremely fragmentary inscription may still preserve a record of the initial decision. Sheila Ager has cited this text and the possible record of the initial decision within it as evidence for a practice carried out by the Achaian League in which cities joining the League were required to submit outstanding disputes with their neighbors for arbitration. Since Mitsos’ improved reading and interpretation of the text the only careful study of the stone and new edition of it has been prepared by Werner Peek, who demonstrated that another fragment, *IG IV²*.1.59, should be associated with this stele. No one has examined this stone or commented on Peek’s association since he first proposed it. My personal examination of the stone has shown that Peek’s association of the two fragments is indeed correct, but that some of his readings and supplements are far from certain.

Peek was incorrect in some of his readings that had been read accurately by Mitsos. Peek also was able to read several letters on the extremely worn right side of fragment A that I was unable to read. Peek used many of these readings as the basis for some of his supplements, which I believe must now be used with extreme caution, if at all.

---

1 Hiller (1925-1926, p. 71, note 2) first reported the inscription’s discovery and theorized that it recorded the initial decision of the Megarian judges.

4 Mitsos 1937, pp. 708-714. See also the comments of Robert, *BullEp* 1940, no. 53.

It is beyond doubt that Mitsos was correct when he proposed that the inscription recorded Epidauros’ entrance into the Achaian League. Furthermore, I do not believe there is any reason to suppose that the original decision of the Megarian judges was included on IG IV².1.70+59. If this original decision was recorded on this stele, then one must explain why the names and patronymics of the 151 judges who made the first decision are recorded on IG IV².1.71. It would be more likely that they would have been recorded at the bottom of IG IV².1.70+59, which is now lost. It seems improbable that 182 names would have been inscribed on IG IV².1.71 if the original 151 already existed on another stele. Moreover, it seems unlikely that the Epidaurians would have recorded the first decision on stone while the dispute was still under litigation, as a result of the Corinthian appeal.

The association of these two fragments has been supported recently by Sheila Ager who seems to argue that IG IV².1.70 included the first arbitration as well as Epidauros’ entrance into the Achaian League.⁷ Her thesis concerning the Achaian League is that measures were put in place for new members to submit their outstanding disputes to the Achaian court as a prerequisite of membership.⁷ Quite possibly such a requirement may have existed, but there is not enough evidence to support this conclusion. Furthermore, the presence of Corinthians in IG IV².1.70 (line 17) does not necessarily indicate that this stele recorded the initial arbitration, nor does it prove beyond a doubt that the Achaian League required Epidauros to submit an outstanding dispute with Corinth for arbitration as a prerequisite for membership. All we can say is that the Achaian League may have encouraged its new members to

---


settle outstanding disputes and that if this was not successful within a reasonable amount of time then the dispute should be submitted to the Achaian court.

THE ADMISSION OF CITIES INTO THE ACHAIAN LEAGUE

We know very little about the conditions and circumstances surrounding the entrance of other cities into the Achaian League. Only one other parallel inscription, which records Arcadian Orchomenos' entrance into the Achaian League, has been found. This inscription may also have contained a requirement that Orchomenos settle a dispute with its neighbor Megalopolis, but this is not entirely clear.

The erection of stelai to record the entrance of new members may have been official League practice, for Polybios states (2.41.12) that none were set up recording the entrance of Patrai, Dymai, Tritaia and Pharai into the League because they were the first cities to join, with the implication being that many other such stelai existed at one time. In fact Polybios supplies us with the necessary evidence to support this conclusion. He tells us (23.18.1) that the Achaians drew up an inscription on stone recording Sparta's entrance into the League. Another example may be found (Polybios 24.2.1-3) regarding Messene's entrance into the League at which time the Achaians granted them three years tax exemption upon joining the League and that this was to be recorded on stone. We can only hope that further excavation will uncover additional examples of this type. F. W. Walbank has argued that the Polybian references to stelai recording the entrance of new members would have been set up in

---

¹ IG V.2.344. see also Staatsverträge III, no. 499, pp. 190-193 and Ager 1996, no. 43, pp. 129-131.
² For Messene's first entrance into the League, see Staatsverträge III, no. 513, pp. 227-228.
Aiglon at the Hamarion. The evidence of the stelai from Epidauros and Orchomenos make it clear that they were set up in the individual poleis themselves. This does not exclude the possibility that duplicate stelai would have been set up at the Hamarion, but to date the site itself has not been identified.

*IG IV².1.71 - Megarian arbitration on the Corinthian-Epidaurian boundary.*

*Ed. pr.:* Staës 1887, pp. 9-24
Bechtel. *SGDI*, no. 3025
P. Kavvadias. *Épidaure* I, no. 234, pp. 74-75
M. Fraenkel, *IG IV* 926
F. Hiller von Gaertringen. *IG IV².1.71*
*SIG*, no. 471

Found in June 1886 in the Roman bath at the Epidaurian Asklepieion. The inscription is now located in the foyer of the Epidauros Museum. The stone is a hard gray limestone and excluding a few minor chips at the edges it is preserved intact. I present here the text of F. Hiller von Gaertringen.

H. 1.43 m; W. 0.69 m; Th. 0.18 m; LH 0.007 m
Interlinear Spacing: 0.006-0.007 m
checker 0.0118 m (vertical): 0.012 m (horizontal)

Photo: Figure 2.4

Epidauros Inv. No. 8.

---

10 Walbank 1957, p. 233; Walbank 1979, pp. 252 and 255.

11 Others have erroneously recorded that the stele is white marble, see Wiseman 1978, p. 136.
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éît'i CTTpataY[oû tcôv] ’ Axcticôv AiyiaXeijc. év 6' ' ETtiôaijpcüi én ' iap eû ç
TOÛ ' AcncÂ,a;tio[û A ijovuoiou. tcatà zâôe ËKpivav toi M eyapeîç lolq
f E jr]i6aupioi.; ica'i KopivGioiç itepi tâ ç %o)paç â ç â p o é /Jx y o v icci'i
[îtE]p'i TOÛ ZeÀÂâvToç icai to û iTTipaiou icoTà tôv alvov tôv tcüv A[xcti]cüv ôitcaaTqpiov ciTrooTeiÀavTEÇ àvûpaç évaTÔv jrevTiiKovTa
[Ëv]a ica'i éJCEXOôvTCüv én aÛTÔv tôv xcôpav tcüv ôiKacrtâv ical icpivciv[tcüJv ’ EjTiÔavipicüv EÎpEv Tciv xcüpav civTiÀEyôvTcov 6è tcüv KopivBi[0)V T]cüI TEppOVCOpCül TTCiÀlV (ïTtÉOTElXaV TOI MEyopElC TOÛÇ TEppOv[iç]oûvTaç ÊK TCÜV aÛTCüv ôncacnâv âvôpaç TpicÎKOVTa tca'i ë v a tca[to ] TOV alv o v TÔV TCÜV ‘ Axaicüv. oÛTOi 6è énE^.ôôvTEÇ ètt'i tô v x<ûpav
ÊTEppôvtqav K'aTcc zâSe- ‘ cijtô zàq KopiX)âç to û KopûoÂEÎoo ém
[t]àv icopvoctv TOÛ ' AÀiEiovi' ' (iitô toû ' A /.ieîou ém tccv icopooâv toû
[K]Epa\)viow ‘ (ijTÔ toû KEpaoviou ÊJTi tôv Kopooàv toû KopviaTa
ÔTTÔ TÔç Kopuoâç TOÛ KopviaTa ém tôv ô5ôv ètt'i tôv p ax iv tôv toû
KopviaTa- ciitô toû p dxioç toû KopviaTa én'i tôv pcixiv tôv ètt'i toî ç ÂvEiaiç ÛTTÈp tôv Z ko^Jæ iô v ' âicô toû pdxtoç toû ûirÈp tôv Z koà./^ id v [û]itô Tdç ' A vEiaiç ètc'i tôv Kopuoôv tôv ÛTcèp Tdç ôôoû Tdç d p a çiTo[û Td]ç KüTayoûcraç ètt'i tô STtipaîov ‘ ditô toû Kop\r0oû toû ûttep TÔÇ [ô]ôoû Tdç dpaçiT oû ètt'i tôv tcopuoôv tôv ètt'i toû «bdyaç- ' ôttô
TOÛ Kopoooû TOÛ ètt'i toû O dyaç ètt'i tôv tcopooôv tôv ètt'i toû A iyiTTÛpaÇ- ‘ dTTÔ toû ICOpOCXTÛ TOÛ ÈTTl TÔÇ AiyiTTÛpüÇ êit'i tôv ICOpUOÔV
tôv t[oû ] A p aiaç. ' ôttô toû A paiaç ètti tôv icopvioôv tôv ûttô flÈTpa r ‘ dTTÔ TOÛ ûttô tôi flETpai ètt'i tôv vopuoôv tôv ètt'i toû ZxoivoûvTOÇ- ÛTTÔ TOÛ ICOpUOOÛ TOÛ ÛTTÈp TOÛ ZxOlVOÛVTOÇ ÈTTl TÔV ICOpOOÔ[v]
TÔV KaTÔ TÔV Eûôpyav ‘ ûttô toû tcopoooû toû ûiTÈp Tdç Eûôpyaç È[r'i]
TÔV pdx[iv] TÔV ÛTTÈp Tdç Zutfooaiaç- ‘ ôttô toû pdxioç toû ÛTiép Tdç
Sutcooaiaç ètt'i tôv icopuoôv tôv ÛTiÈp Tdç ÜE/dÆpiTioç- ‘ diTÔ toû
[tc]opU0OÛ TOÛ ÛTTÈp Tdç riE>J.EpiTlOÇ ÈTTl TÔV tfOpUOÔV TÔV TOÛ Flav[io]l)- dTTÔ TOÛ ria v io u ètt'i tôv pdxiv tôv ÛJTÈp to û OÀKOÛ ' dTTÔ TOÛ pdîxiojç TOÛ ÛTTÈp TOÛ 'O/.tCOÛ ÈTTl TÔV pdxiV TÔV TOÛ ' A7TO>d.CÜvioiJ- ÛTTÔ
[rijTTOKÀEÛç. ' ' Hpdiccüv A apéa. ‘ ' Av5potc/w£i8aç AE^iicpdTEOÇ. ' ApoïKÀûç ' ATTo/iXcüviôa. ' Oéôcüpoç ' ApOiviicoo. ' ' ApicrTCüv Kiictccüvoç. ' E evcüv
Alicdvôpoo. ' EûyEiTCüv ©EoaaÀoû. ‘ KaÀXiTÈXiiç ZEOçiûcopoo. Ti
p éa ç riaaicüvoç. ‘ Zaviw v <l>uÀAéa, ' AEçi/.aç ' Hpo5o)poi». Mvaoicov M aTpéa, ' ZcüvaÛTüç K a )J.ia . ' Ka/J.iTCüv 'Avtioîàoit. ' <bi/-cüviôaç Avaçicüvoç. ‘ 'HpdK'ÀEiTOç NiKCüvoç ' ndpouÂoi ' EÛTTaÀlvoç ' AvaxiXa,
A ûoütv 0EOÇÉVOO. ‘ ' ATToXÀôôcüpoç nûGcüvoç. ' AioK)vEi8aç E ûayôpa.
Epaoiopcüv Lipû/.ou. ' <l>iÀcüv Adpcüvoç. Eûavgpoç EûpnSicüvoç. A apéaç Kakkicüvoç. ' M e /. iootcüv ' AvTixdpEoç. Aiovooôôcüpoç A iovoci-
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TRANSLATION (lines 1-32)

When Aigialeos was the strategos of the Achaians, when Dionysios was the priest of Asklepios in Epidauros, the Megarians made the following decision for the Epidaurians and the Corinthians about the land which they were disputing and (4) the area of Sellas and Spiraion. They sent 151 men to decide the following by a resolution of the Achaian court. The arbitrators went to the territory itself and judged that it belonged to Epidauros, but the Corinthians disputed (8) the line of the boundary and so the Megarians sent, from the same judges, 31 men to draw up the boundary according to the resolution of the Achaians. These went to the land and decided on the following boundary: from the peak of Korduleion to (12) the peak Halieion; from Halieion to the peak Keraunion; from Keraunion to the peak Korniatas; from Korniatas to the road on the ridge of Korniatas; from the ridge of Korniatas to the ridge on (16) Aneia above Skolleia; from the ridge above Skolleia under Aneia to the peak over the wagon road leading to Spiraion; from the peak over the wagon road to the peak at Phaga; from (20) the peak at Phaga to the peak at Aigipura; from the peak at Aigipura to the peak of Araia; from Araia to the peak under Petra; (24) from the peak under Petra to the peak by Euorga; from the peak over Euorga to the ridge over Sukousia; from the ridge over Sukousia to the peak over Pelleritis; from the (28) peak over Pelleritis to the peak of Panion; from Panion to the ridge over Holkos; from the ridge over Holkos to the ridge of Apollonion; from the ridge of the Apollonion to the Apollonion.

[the following sixty-four lines of the inscription preserve the names of the 151 judges who made up the first board followed by the thirty-one members of the second board].

DATE

The date of the inscription cannot be determined precisely, but it can be placed within a very narrow time frame. It is dated both by Achaian strategos (Aigialeos) and priest of Asklepios at Epidauros (Dionysios), but unfortunately neither name is know securely elsewhere thus preventing us from assigning an accurate date. An Aigialeos son of Kritoboulos from Aigion, however, is known from another inscription dated between 230-200 B.C., but the two cannot otherwise be identified as the same
Nevertheless, we do know enough about the list of strategoi from this period of the Achaian League’s history to date the inscription with some accuracy. In 243/2 B.C. Aratos of Sikyon freed Corinth from its Macedonian garrison at which time Corinth became an Achaian League member. Shortly after this Megara, Epidauros, and most of the southern Argolid, also joined the League. Furthermore, Plutarch tells us that Aratos of Sikyon was elected strategos for the first time in 245/4 B.C. and after this he was elected every other year for the remainder of his life. This gives us a list of the years that Aratos was strategos and another list of the alternate years in which a strategos name does not survive. In addition to the list of strategoi we know that Megara left the League in 224 and did not rejoin until 192 B.C. (Polybios 20.6.7-9). We also know that the strategos of the year 236/5 B.C. was most likely Dioetas, thus eliminating this year from consideration. The list of strategoi following the year 235 B.C. is also known. Therefore the arbitration must have taken place at some time between 242 and 235 B.C. Since we know the dates of Aratos’ generalships, the arbitration and Aigialeos’ generalship must have taken place in one of the following years: 242/1. 240/39. or 238/7 B.C.

COMMENTARY

The inscription records a great deal of information, both about the procedure for carrying out arbitration between League members and the topography of the

---

12 The inscription is a list of theorodokoi, see Plassart 1921, II, line 59 = Rizakis 1995, no. 688. I would like to thank Professor John Morgan for calling this inscription to my attention. The two are listed separately in LGPN III.A. s.v. Αἰγιάλεως, nos. 1 and 2, p. 17.

13 Polybios 2.43.4; Plutarch Arat. 16.2-23.4; Strabo 8.7.3.

14 Plutarch Arat. 24.4, see also Walbank 1933, pp. 174-75.

15 Walbank 1933, p. 169.
disputed area. We know that the stone records the second decision that was carried out after the Corinthians appealed the first, one which they undoubtedly had lost. This first decision was conducted by a group of 151 Megarian judges. After the appeal, thirty-one of the original 151 were selected to return to the territory in dispute and make another ruling. This is the decision recorded on IG IV².1.71. No other evidence, epigraphical or literary, mentions the right of a disputant to appeal a decision arrived at by arbitration. Since this is its only attestation it may be a unique case and not a regular means of recourse for a city disappointed with the outcome of an arbitration. Perhaps there was something unique about the way in which this dispute was settled that allowed the Corinthians the right to appeal the decision.

THE SELECTION OF MEGARIAN JUDGES

It has been noted that the selection of judges from Megara was a logical one considering its proximity to the disputed area.¹⁶ Megara is indeed close to Corinth, but the choice of Megarian judges raises an interesting question that must be examined. As we shall see below, Epidauros frequently disputed its boundaries with neighboring cities. We are unfortunately without the same evidence for Corinth, but there is no reason to believe that Corinth was not open to such litigation with its other neighbors.¹⁷ The selection of Megarian judges, therefore, calls to mind the numerous border conflicts between Corinth and Megara dating from the late 8th century to at

¹⁶ Ager 1996, p. 117.

¹⁷ Although we have no evidence for other arbitration disputes in which Corinth was involved as a litigant several have been discovered in which Corinthians served as members of arbitration boards, see Corinth VIII. i. nos. 4 and 6; Corinth VIII. iii. nos. 46a and 46b; Stroud 1972, no. 3, pp. 201-203; Robertson 1976, pp. 253-266 (SEG XXVI 392).
least the mid-5th century B.C.\textsuperscript{18} A brief overview of Corinthian-Megarian border conflicts, for which the ancient sources are clear, will illustrate this point. Our earliest evidence for conflict over the border here dates possibly as far back as the 8th century B.C. from a Megarian inscription in honor of an Olympic victor in 720 B.C.. Orsippos, who "pushed the borders of his country to their greatest extent, when his enemies tried to lop off much territory." (\textit{IG VII} 52). Whether or not this inscription does indeed refer to a historical event in the late 8th century B.C. is not clear, but it certainly is evidence enough that border conflicts between these two states were believed, by contemporaries to have a long history. Archaeological evidence, primarily from the sanctuary of Hera at Perachora, has been the center of discussion concerning the border of Corinth and Megara from the Geometric to the Archaic periods.\textsuperscript{19} Literary evidence also supports the conclusion that the sanctuary was only one of several areas under dispute. Both Diodoros Siculos (11.79: 12.65.7) and Strabo (8.6.22: 9.1.6. 11) mention that Perachora and Crommyon were once part of Megarian territory.\textsuperscript{20}

We are on somewhat more solid ground with the literary evidence from the 5th century B.C. Thucydides (1.103.4) makes explicit reference to a Corinthian-Megarian dispute over their boundary, perhaps in 455 B.C. Only a few years prior to this, according to Plutarch (\textit{Cim.} 17.2), the Corinthians were acting aggressively towards

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{18} For general treatments of the Corinthian-Megarian boundary and earlier conflicts over it, see \textit{Corinth} I. i. p. 18; Hammond 1954a. pp. 93-102; Wiseman 1974. pp. 535-543 and Wiseman 1978. pp. 17-43; Legon 1981. pp. 59-85; Salmon 1984. pp. 1. 3 and 70-71; Polignac 1995. p. 51-52. See also Pausanias 1.44.6-10 and Plutarch (\textit{Mor.} 295B), who states that the Corinthians were always trying to subject Megara to their rule.
  
  \item \textsuperscript{19} For discussions of the Perachora sanctuary and its status as Corinthian or Megarian, see Morgan 1994. pp. 129-135.
  
  \item \textsuperscript{20} For Crommyon, which is identified with modern Agioi Theodoroi, see Wiseman 1978. pp. 18-19.
\end{itemize}
the Megarians along their border, perhaps in 462 B.C. Some years later, in 446 B.C.,
the Corinthians and Epidaurians, supplied assistance to the Megarians, who were in
revolt from Athens.\(^{21}\)

With such a long standing history of border troubles it certainly comes as a
surprise that the Achaians selected Megarian judges for this responsibility and it
should not be seen as a logical choice. This is, as far as I know, the only case of a
third party arbiter who also shared a common boundary with one of the two litigants.

PROSOPOGRAPHY

We also possess prosopographical evidence from the 151 names preserved on
the inscription, some of which also appear on a Megarian inscription (\(IG\) VII 42)
recording contributions for the construction of a temple dedicated to Apollo.\(^{22}\) At least
three names appear on both stelai, and possibly a fourth: Τιμέας Πολυχάρεος (\(IG\)
I\(V\)^{2}.1.71, line 34 and \(IG\) VII 42, line 28), Ηράκλειτος Ασκλήπιωνος (\(IG\) IV\(^{2}.1.71,\) line
41 and \(IG\) VII 42, line 6). Ζώππος Πίστου (\(IG\) IV\(^{2}.1.71,\) line 57 and \(IG\) VII 42, line
26): and possibly Πανέας Νίκωνος (\(IG\) IV\(^{2}.1.71,\) line 64). [Πανέας] Νίκωνος (\(IG\) VII
42, line 32). A fifth name may record the name of a father on the Epidaurian
inscription and his son on the Megarian inscription: Ηράκλειτος Απολλοδώρο[υ]
(\(IG\) IV\(^{2}.1.71,\) line 81) and Απολλόδωρος Ηρακλείτου (\(IG\) VII 42, line 30). This
prosopographical evidence supports a date within the second half of the 3rd century
B.C. for the dispute.

\(^{21}\) Thucydides 1.114.1. For more on this passage, see below “Corinthian-Epidaurian Relations Prior to
the Dispute.”

\(^{22}\) See the comments of Staës 1887, p. 21: \(IG\) IV 926, p. 202: \(SGDI\) 3025: Ager 1996, p. 117.
CORINTHIAN-EPIDAURIAN RELATIONS PRIOR TO THE DISPUTE

The earliest evidence for diplomatic relations between Corinth and Epidauros comes from the period of the Cypselid tyranny at Corinth. Herodotos (3.50.1, 5.92.1-4), our best source for the tyranny, records that Periander, son and successor of the first Corinthian tyrant Cypselos, was married to the daughter of Prokles the Epidaurian tyrant. This marriage was possibly a means of solidifying some arrangement between the two tyrants, but it soon resulted in disaster for Epidauros. According to Herodotos, Periander had his Epidaurian wife murdered and that he soon afterwards had a falling out with his youngest son over this. Periander believed it was his father-in-law who was to blame for the rift with his son, so he sent an army against Epidauros taking both Prokles and the city itself.

The 5th century B.C. represents a period in which both Corinth and Epidauros were always members of the same alliance, unified against a common foe and one in which they displayed consistent cooperation. During the Persian wars, both contributed to the Greek cause. The Corinthians sent 400 men to Thermopylae (Herodotos 7.202), forty ships to Artemision (Herodotos 8.1.1), 40 ships to Salamis (Herodotos 8.43) and 5,000 men to Plataia (Herodotos 9.28.3). Epidauros’ contributions, while not as numerous as the Corinthian, included eight ships at Artemision (Herodotos 8.1.2), ten ships at Salamis (Herodotos 8.43), and 800 men at Plataia (Herodotos 9.28.4). The Corinthians and Epidaurians both appear on the Serpent Column (ML 27, coils 2 and 4 respectively). Both Corinthians and Epidaurians supplied assistance to the Megarians when they revolted against the

---

23 See also Diogenes Laertius 1.94-95; Pythainetos of Aigina, FGrH 299, F3 and Salmon 1984, pp. 217-218.
Athenians in 446 B.C. (Thucydides 1.114.1). The Epidaurians also undoubtedly worked in close cooperation with the Corinthians when they sent five ships to Corcyra to complement the Corinthian fleet (Thucydides 1.27.2). According to Thucydides (5.53), the Corinthians expressed great concern for the Epidaurians after they were attacked by the Argives during the Peloponnesian War.

A similar fate fell on both Corinth and Epidauros during the 4th century B.C. Both Corinth and Epidauros were ravaged by Epaminondas. Following the battle of Chaironeia in 338 B.C., Philip II established the Hellenic League at Corinth: Epidauros too joined the re-founded league. When Demetrios Poliorketes revived the Hellenic League, of which both Corinth and Epidauros became members, one of the stelai recording it was set up in the Asklepieion at Epidauros.

Construction of the monuments in the Epidaurian Asklepieion also marks another area in which the Corinthians and Epidaurians had extensive dealings with one another. Building accounts from the Asklepieion provide extensive records for the purchase of Corinthian limestone, timber and possibly terra-cotta roof tiles as well as the use of Corinthian craftsmen. Although not evidence of formal relations between the two, it certainly reflects both the skill and quality of Corinthian work and an Epidaurian willingness to employ it.

---

24 Xenophon Hell. 6.5.37 (Corinth) and 7.1.18 (Epidauros).

25 For the revival of the Hellenic League, see Plutarch Dem. 25 and for the stelai recording it, see IG IV².1.68.

26 For Corinthian stone, which is referred to as either <<Kopiroteria>> (IG IV².1.103, line 11) or <<Lithoi eγ λασμίας ενς Κέραμέςς Κορινθίου>> (IG IV².1.103, lines 40-41). For the quarystone used at Epidauros in general, see Burford 1969, pp. 168-175. Corinthian timber (silver fir, ἐλάττ) is well attested in the Epidaurian building accounts, for example see IG IV².1.102, lines 24-25. For the use of Corinthian timber at the Asklepieion, see Burford 1969, pp. 176-179. For the possibility that Corinthian terracotta roof tiles were imported for the use on the temples, see Burford 1969, p. 182.
Throughout their histories, the Corinthians and Epidaurians enjoyed cordial relations for two neighbors, with the exception of the Archaic period. During times when we cannot trace their relations closely it is at least clear that they normally had the same allies and were commonly united in the same causes. Nothing, however, indicates that the Corinthians had a long-standing border dispute with the Epidaurians, as they certainly did with the Megarians.

CONCLUSIONS

Both Epidauros and Corinth became members of the Achaian League shortly after Aratos of Sikyon’s liberation of Acrocorinth from its Macedonian garrison. At some time shortly after they joined the Achaian League Corinth and Epidauros submitted a dispute over their boundary to the Achaian court for arbitration. A fragmentary inscription found in the Epidaurian Asklepieion that records Epidauros’ entry into the League may also contain a stipulation for the two states to settle an outstanding dispute amongst themselves. If this interpretation is correct then we must conclude that these efforts met with failure for within a few years after their admission to the League the two states submitted their dispute to the League court for arbitration. The Achaian court selected Megara, also a League member at this time, to provide the arbitration board which consisted of 151 judges. Their decision is recorded on a separate stele, also found in the Asklepieion. According to the inscription the Epidaurians won this dispute, but the Corinthians appealed it and 31 Megarian judges returned to the disputed territory to make another ruling. It is this boundary demarcation that is recorded on the stele from the Asklepieion. The Achaian court’s decision to select Megarian judges is a surprising one since the two
are known to have had a number of conflicts over their own border possibly dating as far back as the 8th century B.C. Nevertheless, the Corinthians apparently consented to the court's selection for we have no evidence for an appeal. We do not know which state benefited from the second Megarian decision based on the inscription itself; only the topography of the border holds the key to this answer. The following chapter represents an in depth examination of the Corinthian-Epidaurian border.
Figure 2. 3: *IG IV².1.70+59.*
Figure 2.4: IG IV².1.71.
CHAPTER 3

THE DISPUTE BETWEEN CORINTH AND EPIDAUROS II:
THE TOPOGRAPHY OF THE BOUNDARY

INTRODUCTION

Between fall 1997 and summer 1999 an extensive topographical survey of the Corinthian-Epidaurian border was carried out with the hope of identifying the location of the boundary decided by the Megarian judges and understanding why it was disputed. Positive identification of all the landmarks named in the inscription has never been the final goal of this project. My methodology has been to walk the countryside in question with the hope of identifying anything that may shed light on the dispute. The types of things I have looked for include forts that may have guarded the border, temple sites, roads, as well as evidence of occupation and land use. This chapter is a presentation of the results of visits to known sites, sites unknown prior to this topographical survey, and my conclusions on the location of the boundary. Locating and recording these unknown antiquities represents a major contribution of this chapter for during the last twenty to thirty years much of the southeastern Corinthia has been built up rapidly. This makes it all the more necessary to identify
and catalogue the ancient remains in the areas that are still as yet untouched by modern development. Detailed descriptions of architectural remains are limited here, so as not to take away from the topographical commentary of the inscription. A more complete description of the finds is included in Appendices 1 and 2. Appendix 3 is a brief discussion on the political organization of the Corinthia. In it a fragment from Polybios’s *Histories* that may shed new light on this much discussed topic is considered.

**MODERN MAPS AND THE ANCIENT SOURCES**

While one should not make an attempt at identifying an ancient boundary without autopsy of the area, any such investigation must begin with modern maps and the ancient sources from which valuable information can be learned. Nineteen toponyms are mentioned in *IG* IV\(^2\).1.71, and Spiraion (lines 4 and 18) is the only one still preserved on modern maps ("Ax. Σπαιώνι"). although its location in antiquity remains controversial. No other toponym is known today with the possible exception of the genitive Sellantos (line 4). Some commentators have suggested that the modern Selondas riverbed (Σελόνντα), which empties into the Bay of Sophiko south of Korphos, may preserve the ancient toponym Sellantos recorded on *IG* IV\(^2\).1.71.\(^1\)

Sellantos also occurs on another contemporary boundary dispute between Epidauros and Hermione (*IG* IV\(^2\).1.75+, lines 17, 23, 31, and 34-35: *SEG* XI 377, line 14).\(^2\) In this dispute the name also refers to a river, but certainly not the same one. Michael

---

\(^1\) Those who have made the suggestion include Jameson 1953, pp. 161 and 165-6 note 47; Jameson, Runnels and van Andel 1994, p. 599. Hiller, in *IG* IV\(^2\).1, does not discuss this identification but he has marked the modern Selontas river as Sellas on the map at the end of the volume. Tabula 1. Wiseman (1978) curiously neither comments on this suggestion nor mentions it as a possibility.

\(^2\) For a text of this inscription, see below Chapter 4.
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Jameson, in his commentary on this inscription restores the nominative of this name as Sellas. Parallels are also found in ancient literature of other rivers in the Greek world with the name Sellas. The assumption appears strong that the form in the genitive Sellantos, as recorded on IG IV².1.71, has been preserved in the modern name of the river discussed above and that its ancient name in the nominative was Sellas.

Interestingly the name Sellas only appears once in the inscription, in the preamble where the dispute is said to concern "the area around Spiraion and Sellas" (line 4). Spiraion occurs again in the inscription, seventh in the list of eighteen toponyms that delineate the boundary. Sellas does not. A similar description is used in IG IV².1.75+ (lines 13 and 30-31) to differentiate the disputed territory from the entire boundary. Just as in the case of that decision, the territory disputed by the Corinthians and Epidaurians dealt with a small area and not the entire boundary. We may, therefore, conclude that the Sellas river in the Hellenistic period fell either within Epidaurian or Corinthian territory and that the border was located to the north or south of it depending on who controlled it. Taking this as fact, we must discuss next the location of Spiraion.

Spiraion is mentioned elsewhere in ancient literature. Any attempt to identify the border described in IG IV².1.71 must also address the problems associated with its location in these sources. In his account of an important naval encounter

---

3 The ancient parallels include: *Iliad* 2.659, 839; Strabo 8.3.5. 13.1.20.

4 Fowler in *Corinth* I, i. p. 20 calls it Sellanyum. Wiseman (1978, p. 138) has the nominative as "Selanys (Sellas)." Austin (1982, no. 136, p. 233) restores the nominative as Sellanyon and Osborne (1987, p. 163) restores Sellanus.

5 Thucydides 8.10-11; Ptolemy 3.16.12; Pliny *NH* 4.5.
Thucydides states:

παραπλέοντας αὐτοὺς καταδιώκουσιν ἐς Σπειραιόν τῆς Κορινθίας· ἔστι δὲ λιμὴν ἐρήμος καὶ ἔσχατος πρὸς τὰ μεθόρια τῆς Ἑπιδαιρίας. (Thucydides 8.10)

[The Athenians] pursued [the Peloponnesians] sailing along the coast to Speiraion in the Corinthia, a deserted harbor and the last before the Epidaurian boundary.

The Peloponnesian fleet was defeated and they sought refuge in Speiraion harbor. The Athenians regrouped their fleet at a small island near this harbor. The passage, however, remains controversial for Thucydides' Σπειραιόν also occurs in the manuscript tradition as Πειραιόν. The reading Σπειραιόν appears to have been confirmed by its presence in the Oxyrhynchus Papyrus (1247). Thucydides clearly refers to Speiraion as a harbor, but our two other sources call it a promontory.

Two other ancient authors, Ptolemy and Pliny, mention a Spiraion promontory in their descriptions of the Argolic peninsula between Epidauros and Kenchriae. Ptolemy lists: "Ἐπίδαυρος. Σπείραιον ἀκρον. Ἀθηναίων λιμήν. Βουκέφαλος λιμήν. Κεγχρεαί." (3.16.12) "Epidauros. Speiraion promontory, the harbor of the Athenians. Boukephalos harbor. Kenchriae." Pliny has a similar description of this coast, the only difference with his account is the absence of the harbor of the Athenians and the inclusion of the harbor Anthedus. He writes: "Επιδαιρι oppidum Aesculapi delubro celebre, Spiraeum promunturium, portus Anthedus et Bucephalus et

Throughout this Chapter I have chosen to spell the name of the harbor as Spiraion as it is recorded on the inscription. Where I refer to Thucydides' account explicitly I have retained his spelling Speiraion.

For Thucydides' account of this engagement, see Salmon 1984, pp. 336-338 and Stroud 1994, pp. 297-299.

Σπειραιόν is printed in the Oxford Classical Text, Thucydidis Historiae, vol. 2. For a discussion of the emendation, see Gomme, Andrewes, and Dover (1981, pp. 25-26) who reject it. See also Wiseman 1978, p. 141 note 38.
quas supra dixeramus Cenchreae." (N. H. 4.57) "the town of Epidauros with the famous sanctuary of Asklepios, Spiraeum promontory, the harbor Anthedus and the harbor Bucephalus and beyond those, the harbor of Kenchriae." Clearly there was considerable confusion concerning not only the names, but also Spiraion's location at an early date.

It was first proposed that Thucydides' Speiraion should be identified with the harbor known today as Frangolimani. This identification was made on account of Evraionisi, an island directly opposite the harbor, which has been associated with the island to which the Athenians moved their ships after the battle. The problem is not easy to solve as a number of islands exist along this coast all of which could be identified as the island on which the Athenians landed.

If Spiraion of our inscription refers to a cape and not a harbor, then at least two candidates exist for its location: modern Cape Speiri and Cape Trachyli (\(\alpha\kappa.\ \tau\rho\varepsilon\alpha\chi\tilde{n}l\)). Recently Cape Trachyli has been proposed as the most logical candidate for the boundary between the Corinthia and the Epidauria in 412 B.C., the time of the engagement described by Thucydides. If Sellas (IG IV^2.1.71, line 4) can be equated with the Selondas river then either of these two candidates could be correct. The area between modern Cape Speiri and the Selondas river is not great, nor is that between Cape Trachyli and the river. These must be our two options for the location of the territory disputed between the Corinthians and the Epidaurians.

---

7 Leake 1830b, p. 312-313, see also RE IIIA. 1929, cols. 1596-1598, s.v. Speiraion (F. Bölte).
9 Corinth I. i, pp. 22-23 and following Fowler, Wiseman 1978, p. 140.
If a harbor is meant in both Thucydides and IG IV².1.71 then the most logical candidate must be Korphos, which Thucydides described as deserted (ἐρήμως). As we shall see below an ancient road most certainly led down to Korphos, but whether or not it was deserted remains disputable; it may have been at the time when Thucydides was writing, but by the late 3rd century B.C. there is strong evidence to suggest that it was not.

Additional clues can be gleaned from the other toponyms in the inscription. The terminus of the boundary is the Apollonion (Ἀπόλλωνιον, lines 30-31), which seems to indicate a temple or a place sacred to Apollo.¹² A possible candidate for the Apollonion will be discussed below. Petra (lines 22-23) is also known as the town in which the Corinthian tyrant Cypselos' father was born (Herodotos 5.92.1). Identification of our Petra with the Petra of Cypselos' father is, however, unlikely for the border passes over the "peak below Petra." If it was a major Corinthian town it would not be likely to find it above a peak. Also of considerable interest is the Panion (Πανιον, lines 28-29). Curiously no commentators on the topography of this inscription have ventured any guesses as to the meaning of this term.¹³ The most recent edition of LSJ, however, lists this term as meaning a temple of Pan, citing our inscription for its meaning.¹⁴ Such a meaning may be possible, and a candidate for it is discussed below.¹⁵

---

¹² For the use of sanctuaries to mark boundaries, see Sartre 1979, pp. 213-224; Polignac 1995, pp. 32-41; Alcock 1993, pp. 202-210; and with special attention to the Corinthia, see Morgan 1994, pp. 105-142.

¹³ Wiseman (1979, p. 537) refers to it as a mountain.

¹⁴ LSJ, s.v. Πανιον.

¹⁵ The only evidence for the worship of Pan in the southern Corinthia that I am aware of is a fragmentary marble statue of the god found at Solygeia, see Stroud 1971a, p. 238 and plate 5, no. 4 and a marble relief of the god found at Kenchriae, see Wiseman 1978, p. 52 and fig. 48.
Several other place names reveal some clues as to their possible location, either by the sea or in the mountains. Reference to two roads in the inscription is perhaps the most important landmark for identification of the boundary. In particular the wagon road which leads down to Spriaion (lines 17-19) should have left some physical remains in the form of wheel ruts.

My topographical fieldwork in this area began with the hypothesis that the Sellas river of the inscription should be identified with the modern Selonda riverbed and that Spiraion of the inscription should be identified with Korphos harbor.

PREVIOUS SCHOLARSHIP ON THE CORINTHIAN-EPIDAURIAN BOUNDARY

Before discussing my proposed identification of the boundary, the previous scholarship must be reviewed. The southeastern Corinthia has not been visited extensively by topographers, ancient or modern: neither Pausanias nor any of the early travelers have left us with a description of the visible remains or the roads. This is presumably the result of two factors: the belief that this area was not inhabited extensively in antiquity and the lack of good roads until the very recent past.

Nearly all discussions of IG IV².1.71 and the topographical problems associated with it started with a number of assumptions, some of which are not necessarily factual and cannot be proven as such. The first is that Epidauros won the dispute. No internal textual evidence can be cited to support this conclusion. Undoubtedly Epidauros won the first decision, but we also know that the Corinthians appealed it. Only after determining the physical border itself can we make any conclusions

---

16 For a discussion of some of these, see Wiseman 1978, p. 138.
17 *Corinth* I, i, p. 20; Salmon 1984, p. 5.
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concerning the second Megarian decision. One factor, however, that may indicate an Epidaurian victory in the appeal is the inscription's findspot in the Epidaurian Asklepieion, for it seems unlikely that the Corinthians would have set up a stele in Corinth recording a territorial loss.\(^1\) Secondly, commentators have generally believed that the border described in IG IV\(^2\).1.71 was relatively small and that it probably did not concern the entire Corinthian-Epidaurian boundary.\(^2\) Again, no textual evidence supports this, although it does seem a logical conclusion considering the clause in the inscription which defines the area under dispute as the area concerning Sellas and Spiraion, presumably to differentiate it from the entire boundary. Perhaps the most misleading assumption made by topographers is that the boundary demarcation preserved in the inscription begins at the sea and proceeds westwards from there, or that it proceeded eastwards and terminated at a point above the sea.\(^3\) Once again, however, nothing within the text indicates this or should lead us to this conclusion.

The first attempt to understand the topography of the boundary was made by F. Bölte in the preparation of his article on Spiraion for the *RealEncyclopädie*. He concluded that the Speiraion harbor mentioned by Thucydides and in the inscription should be identified with Frangolimani (Φραγολιμανο) harbor. Bölte's most important observation concerns the road leading down to Spiraion. He rightly commented that the boundary must cross this road as it is below one of the peaks that

---

\(^1\) For the probability that states who lost a dispute would not set up an inscription to record it, see Ager 1996, p. 18.

\(^2\) *Corinth* I. i, p. 22; Wiseman 1978, p. 138.

\(^3\) Wiseman (1978, pp. 138 and 140) makes the assumption that the demarcation began at the sea: Fowler (*Corinth* I. i, p. 22) concludes that the terminus was at the sea.
demarcate it. Other than this, Bölte also made numerous valuable observations during his visit to the area, for example, he was apparently the first to discover the medieval site on Mt. Tsalikas.

H. N. Fowler, who prepared the section on the Corinthian topography in *Corinth* I. i. first proposed the identification of Korphos as Thucydides’ Speiraion but he did not associate it with Spiraion of the inscription.\(^{21}\) In his reconstruction, the Corinthian-Epidaurian boundary in the late 5th century B.C. was at cape Trachyli.\(^{22}\) Fowler’s commentary on the boundary remains important for he too visited many of the sites in question and discovered some that had been previously unknown.

James Wiseman has made by far the most detailed attempt to trace the line of the boundary described in the inscription, but problems exist in his thesis concerning its location. He, too, identifies Korphos with both the Speiraion of Thucydides and the inscription, but his line of the boundary cannot be correct. Wiseman argued that it began at the Trachyli promontory and proceeded west along it. Without any evidence he places the terminus “at a sanctuary of Apollo on a ridge above the bay, west of Sellóndas and doubtless well below the peak of Xéstí.”\(^{23}\) Earlier he states that if Spiraion is the last Corinthian harbor before the Epidauria, then it must be identified with the Spiraion of the inscription. He, therefore, solves the problem by placing Spiraion of the inscription in two places, Korphos and Trachyli. Thus, he avoids the problem of Thucydides mentioning a harbor and Ptolemy and Pliny a promontory. He

---

\(^{21}\) *Corinth* I. i. p. 22.

\(^{22}\) *Corinth* I. i. p. 23.

\(^{23}\) Wiseman 1978, p. 140.
dismisses the third possibility, modern cape Speiri, by saying there could never have been a road going down to it.

The boundaries of the Corinthia are discussed briefly by J. T. Salmon, who argued that the Spiraion of both Thucydides and the inscription should be identified with the modern harbor of Korphos. This is an attractive proposal, but Salmon did not pursue this conclusion as far as he could have. He remained worried about two issues, the first that Thucydides calls Spiraion deserted and the second that Korphos looks away from the Corinthia. Neither of these issues need cause concern with such an identification.

The consensus among modern commentators is that Korphos most likely should be identified with the Spiraion harbor of Thucydides and most likely that of the inscription. These identifications, however, were almost all made with the use of modern maps and the literary sources and not on extensive personal autopsy of the region. My fieldwork concentrated on the territory between modern Sophiko to the north and Korphos harbor to the south (Map 3.1). The eastern limit of my study area was modern Cape Speiri and to the west as far as Angelokastro. The area east of the modern Isthmos-Epidauros national road, which parallels the Selonda riverbed, was explored much more intensively than that west of it. Considering the previous studies and the modern toponyms, the territory around Sophiko and Korphos seemed the most logical place to begin a topographical investigation of the border dispute. No commentators mentioned above conducted extensive work in the area around Korphos. The results of my work in this area have been extremely fruitful and they

Salmon 1984, pp. 6-7, 32.
show conclusively that the line of the boundary was very close to Korphos, which should be identified with Spiraion of both Thucydides and the inscription. My study has also shown that the area around Sophiko was a much larger settlement in antiquity than has generally been thought, and that its size may have been the impetus for the dispute itself. Therefore, the topographical commentary must begin with the ancient settlement at Ag. Paraskevi, near modern Sophiko, and proceed geographically to the south terminating at Korphos. This approach will illustrate most clearly the region’s wealth and why the Corinthians and Epidaurians disputed it. Following this, the status of Angelokastro and the western Corinthian-Epidaurian border are discussed. Finally, the ancient routes between the Corinthia and the Epidauria will be examined.


The settlement at Ag. Paraskevi was undoubtedly one of the more important locations within the Corinthia and it is unfortunate that we know neither its place name nor do we understand its relationship within the Corinthia as a whole. The site itself has been known to travelers and archaeologists since at least the mid-19th century, but it has received very little attention.

Access to the site from Corinth itself was relatively simple as the road (Road 1) proceeded eastwards through modern Hexamilia (Ἐξαμιλία) and Xylokeriza (Ξυλοκέριζα) to the Isthmos-Epidauros highway near Kenchriae and Loutro Elenis. Travel along this road would have been well checked by the fort at Stanotopi on the

---

25 The organization of the Corinthia still remains a controversial topic. For the relevant discussions on the matter, see Dow 1942, pp. 90-106; Stroud 1968, pp. 233-242; Jones 1980, pp. 43-46; Salmon 1984, pp. 413-419; Stanton 1986, pp. 139-153; Jones 1998, pp. 49-56. For a more detailed discussion of this topic, see below Appendix 3.
eastern extent of the Oneion range. From there the road turned to the southwest at Almyri towards the modern village of Ryto, following roughly the old road to Sophiko. Turning to the southeast around the southern face of Mt. Tsalikas the road would have entered the Sophiko plain at the site of Ag. Paraskevi, not far to the northeast of the modern village.

The site is located on a small hill approximately 2 km to the northeast of Sophiko, southeast of the monastery of Ag. Panaghia (‘Αγ. Παναγία) near the small chapel of Ag. Paraskevi (Figure 3.1). No excavation has been conducted here nor has there been any extensive survey of the visible remains. The most detailed study of the site was conducted by James Wiseman in 1968, who drew a plan of it with Joseph Shaw (Figure 3.2). Its fortification wall is constructed in polygonal masonry, with as many as eight square towers. In addition to the fortification wall, the foundation of the Ag. Paraskevi chapel, located at the northeast corner of the circuit, is comprised of very large, worked poros blocks, which are almost certainly ancient. Wiseman dated the fortification wall and the site from the 4th century B.C. to the Hellenistic period based on sherds and other finds.

---

26 For the fort at Stanotopi, see Stroud 1971b, pp. 127-145. For the route from Corinth through Hexamilia and Xylokheriza to the area of Loutro Elenis, see Stroud 1971a, p. 239 and Pritchett 1980, p. 242.

27 In December 1998 I walked this route from Corinth to the Sophiko plain. The journey took just over five hours. This route is described briefly by Wiseman 1978, p. 127 and Salmon 1984, p. 37. Neither author offers physical evidence for its existence.

28 For the monastery, see Orlandos 1935, pp. 59-67.

29 For the chapel, see Orlandos 1935, pp. 67-69.

30 Wiseman 1978, pp. 127-128, figs. 188-197. For a plan of the site, see fig. 189.

31 For the finds at the site and the date, see Wiseman 1978, pp. 128-129 and figs. 193-197. He also notes that some sherds may date to as early as the 5th century B.C.
Three inscriptions have reportedly been found in the area of Sophiko. One of these, *IG* IV 1559, a small votive to Apollo, is of great interest to us for the identification of the Corinthian-Epidaurian border fixed by the Megarian judges. François Lenormant, the original editor of this inscription, described its findspot as "Sophici, in ecclesia beatae virginis." No date was offered for the inscription by Lenormant or any subsequent commentator, nor is its current location known. I present here (for Lenormant's transcription, see Figure 3.10) a text of the inscription:

\[\text{Αρτεμίδωρος Απόλλωνι εύχην.}\]

James Wiseman believes that this inscription must have been found in the monastery of the Panaghia at the site of Ag. Paraskevi and that it is tempting to associate the Apollonion of the boundary inscription with this dedication. This association and the existence of a temple at a site the size of Ag. Paraskevi are both attractive suggestions. The theory, however, must remain speculation since no conclusive temple or sanctuary remains are extant.

The inscription may, however, still play an important role in the identification of the Apollonion and the border itself. Not far to the southeast of Sophiko is another Ag. Panaghia chapel at Cape Stiri, close to the village of Korphos (Appendix 1, Site 11). We shall see below that there was almost certainly a sanctuary located there.

\[\text{[Footnotes:}\]

32 See Lenormant 1866, p. 394, nos. 243-245 = *IG* IV 1558-1560. Fraenkel, the editor of *IG* IV, included these inscriptions within the "Tituli Spurii vel Suspecti." See also the comments of Le Bas and Foucart (1877, no. 156a, p. 68) on both the inscriptions and the site itself.

33 The other two inscriptions, *IG* IV 1558 and 1560, are funerary.

34 LGP.VIII.A. s.v. 'Αρτεμίδωρος, no. 20, p. 72 date him to "Hell?" but also note that the name may be "fals."'

35 Wiseman 1978, pp. 127 and 140 note 8. see also SEG XXVIII 389.

36 Wiseman (1978, p.128) suggests that a temple may lie under the threshing floor which was constructed in the center of the fortification.
Furthermore, the Ag. Panaghia chapel near Korphos has until recently been under the administration of the village of Sophiko. Since we do not know specifically where Lenormant saw the inscription it remains a possibility that its original location was at the Ag. Panaghia chapel near Korphos and not at the site of Ag. Paraskevi. We must also admit the possibility that Lenormant did not actually see this inscription and that it is a fabrication. Within the church of the Panaghia at the site of Ag. Paraskevi are also some ancient remains, including classical millstones, two ionic capitals and several marble blocks.

Not far to the north of Ag. Paraskevi is another small hill at a slightly higher elevation (elv. 473 m) which is separated from the hill with the chapel and Classical settlement by a low saddle (Figure 3.3). On this higher hill are two or three ruined windmills of uncertain date. James Wiseman visited this hilltop and rightly commented upon its strategic location. He went so far as to state that “the hill affords too fine a view in all directions to have been totally neglected by the inhabitants of the hill of Ag. Paraskevi....One would have expected at least a watchtower to have been located here: its ruins could be hidden by the mills and the debris from their collapse.” During one of my visits to this hilltop, the remains of two square towers (Map 3.2: Figures 3.4-7) and the sparse remains of a circuit wall

---

17 For a recent discussion on Lenormant and the authenticity of some of his reported inscriptions, see Masson 1993, pp. 44-60. The rediscovery of the inscription and proper study of it could shed valuable light on its date and possible find spot. I have checked thoroughly both the Panaghia chapel near Sophiko and near Korphos. The inscription is not built into either chapel today. It is interesting to note, however, that Lenormant had no knowledge of this boundary dispute or the evidence for an Apollonion in the region.

18 Orlandos 1935, p. 62. These are all still visible today.

19 Wiseman 1978, p. 128. Wiseman did report seeing “some small pieces of Melian obsidian and a few coarse sherds on the lower slope” of this hill.
(Figures 3.8-9) surrounding the summit were discovered. They are approachable from
the lower fortified site by the chapel and following the clear footpath that gently rises
up the southwest face of the hill, eventually terminating at the westernmost of the two
polygonal towers that must have guarded the access road between it and the lower
site. The two towers are constructed in polygonal masonry and their dimensions are
very similar to those of the towers at the lower site. A wall between the two towers,
running east-west, linked the two together. Although not preserved completely, its
line is easily traceable. The circuit wall is not so clearly defined, but it can be traced
easily by following stones slightly exposed above the ground. The windmills are
roughly in the center of the circuit wall itself, which is best preserved on the north
side of the hilltop.

Unfortunately no sherds were found in the area of these two new towers, or
within the circuit wall. Similarities in the masonry, however, may suggest that its
construction was contemporaneous with the site below. This newly discovered site
should be taken with the site known since the 19th century, and the two together
probably made up part of a Corinthian kome, whose name is lost to us. Unfortunately, very few place names from the Corinthia as a whole have been
preserved.

40 On Wiseman's plan of the site (1978, p. 129, fig. 189, see also his comments on p. 129) he places an
"entrance?" at the spot by the chapel where the road leads from the site across the saddle. I believe that
there was certainly an entrance here.

41 The complete circuit is clearly visible on aerial photographs taken in 1974 by the Greek Ministry of
the Environment.

42 Ancient testimony refers to Corinthian towns as komai, thus this term best suits the settlement at Ag.
Paraskevi. For the references to Corinthian komai, see Thucydides 4.42.2; Theopompos (FGrH 115 F
173-174) and Strabo 8.25. Herodotos (5.92), on the other hand, refers to Petra as a Corinthian deme.
Other antiquities have been reported in the area around Sophiko and the site at Ag. Paraskevi. James Wiseman, for example, reported two poros sarcophagoi just north of the site, and that he was told of others nearby. Perhaps the most interesting of these has been recorded by Andonios Miliarakis, who wrote, "beyond the monastery to the north rises Mt. Tsalika, on the foothills of which exists a small spring of water and the traces of an aqueduct and a spring of ancient Roman times." No extant remains of this structure were noticed during many walks around the site at Ag. Paraskevi and Mt. Tsalikas. Sophiko's recent expansion and the construction of the Isthmos-Epidauros national road may have obliterated any remains that once existed of this aqueduct.

AG. MARINA-MT. TOURLA. Appendix 1. Site 2.

At least three separate sites have been reported in the area of Ag. Marina monastery and Mt. Tourla, to the east and north of the settlement at Ag. Paraskevi respectively. I too have noticed extensive roof tiles and sherds in the area between the modern Ag. Marina monastery and the southern slopes of Mt Tourla (Τούρλα, 519 m). In addition to ceramics, several worked blocks can be noticed built into one of the two small chapels on the slope of the hill. Also, many worked ancient blocks of a reddish-orange conglomerate can be seen in the ruins of a house near this chapel. No remains of foundations or evidence of any other structures could be made out here.

---

43 Wiseman 1978, p. 128.
44 Miliarakis 1886, p. 142.
45 For reported remains on Mt. Tourla, see Gebauer 1939, p. 270 and AGC 3, Appendix II, pp. 29-30 who identify three sites: Tourla A with MH sherds. Tourla B on the summit with EH. MH. and some Roman sherds, and Hagios Tryphon with "sherds from Prehistoric times and perhaps from ancient Greek times". I have noticed Classical-Hellenistic tiles in the area of the westernmost chapel on the south slope of Mt. Tourla as well as many worked blocks built into the chapel and the remains of a nearby house.
The evidence of habitation in this area must be interpreted as the part of the larger settlement at Ag. Paraskevi.

Although not discussed with the settlement at Ag. Paraskevi, the remains between Ag. Marina and Mt. Tourla are certainly part of the same site. The settlement at Ag. Paraskevi's importance has long been suspected and these new finds not only confirm this, but they must also change our opinions about it. Obviously it was not just a small fortified site on the low hill, but a significant settlement, perhaps the most important in the southeastern Corinthia.

MT. TSALIKAS

The approaches to the Sophiko plain from the north are dominated by the summit of Mt. Tsalikas (Τσαλικας, Ψηλοκορφή elv. 780 m), on whose summit are the remains of a large medieval fortress that date to the Frankish period. Several scholars who have studied the topography of the southeastern Corinthia have visited these remains. Ancient remains have been postulated underneath the medieval ruins but have never been securely identified. Only Bölte claimed to have located what he called an ancient cairn on the summit, but this has not been seen by any traveler since he visited the site in July, 1909. From its summit one can see Sophiko Bay and the Saronic Gulf to the southeast, Acrocorinth, the Corinthian Gulf, Perachora and beyond to the north. From here signals could have been sent and received from almost anywhere in the Corinthia. There is, however, one extant foundation within the

---


47 RE IIIA. 1929. col. 1598, s.v. Speiraion (F. Bölte).
medieval fortification wall that is puzzling. Timothy Gregory commented on this foundation, which is preserved only to a single course of masonry, stating only that its date and function are uncertain. Undoubtedly there are signs of later construction within it, but some blocks do appear similar to those used at the fortified site of Ag. Paraskevi just to the east, a little more than an hours walk away. This may have been a signal tower from which communications were conducted. This is, however, highly speculative as neither I nor any other visitor to the summit has noticed ancient sherds, roof tiles or any other positive sign of ancient occupation on the summit.

OTHER ROUTES TO AND FROM THE SITE AT AG. PARASKEVI

Access to the settlement at Ag. Paraskevi was achieved from one of several routes. The existence of such routes would have given the inhabitants of this site ready access to the bays of both Sophiko and Kenchraie. These routes would have made the inhabitants of the settlement at Ag. Paraskevi, who undoubtedly exploited the rich farm land and timber resources of the Sophiko plain and the surrounding hills, a rather wealthy and important community. This conclusion is all the more important when we shift our focus back to the border dispute and the boundary drawn by the Megarian judges.

A second important route (Road 2) from the site at Ag. Paraskevi to the north would have followed the modern Isthmos-Epidauros national road for a short distance, passing Mt. Tourla on the east and Mt. Tsalikas an the west. Traveling north from Ag. Paraskevi this road would have terminated on the southern shores of the bay of

---

Kenchriae at either Frangolimani harbor, Ammoni harbor, or possibly both. The existence of this road and those described below combined with the ample physical remains at the site itself support the conclusion that the settlement at Ag. Paraskevi was of central importance to the organization and communications of the southeastern Corinthia. From this well-fortified site access to Corinth and destinations in the southwestern Corinthia would have been relatively simple.

A third, and most important road (Road 3b), for our discussion of the boundary dispute follows the course of the Xerias river bed to the southeast and terminates at the village of Korphos. The ancient route from Sophiko to Korphos cannot have changed much since antiquity until the construction of the modern road. Andonios Miliarakis, writing in 1886, has left us with a description of this route: “the road from Sophiko to the [Korphos] harbor crosses the adjoining Larisi plain towards the valley of Sophiko, to the north of this rises the ruined church of the Taxiarchai of an excellent Byzantine construction.” Incorporated into the chapel are large worked blocks that may be ancient, as well as two marble columns with ionic capitals. These reused architectural members may come from an earlier construction phase of the chapel, but it may still be a site of some ancient activity. On another occasion, Miliarakis described the route as “the cart road (όδος ὁμοίας ρόδως) from Korphos until

---

49 Wiseman (1978, p. 127) discusses the pass. For the ancient remains in the area of these harbors, see Wiseman 1978, pp. 132 and 134; Peppas 1990, pp. 239-240 and Peppas 1993, p. 136.

50 Wiseman 1978, p. 127. No physical evidence cited. Salmon (1984, p. 38) says that “a track or path provided access from here [Ag. Paraskevi] to the isolated harbour at Korphos; but it was rarely used.” A road following the river bed is marked on the British Admiralty Chart of Aigina and Methan (1839).

51 Miliarakis 1886, p. 142.

52 For the church, see Orlandos 1935, pp. 70-74.
Sophiko and from there until Corinth. His choice of words for the cart road echo strongly IG IV².1.71 (lines 17-18) where we have reference to the cart road leading down to Spiraion (ὁδός τᾶς ὀμοίως τοῦ). If we are to identify the harbor village of Korphos with the Spiraion of the inscription then a cart road leading down to it would be certain. and here we have additional testimony to such a road from the late 19th century. Along the course of this road are extensive remains of ancient activity. each of which deserves to be described in some detail.

James Wiseman also theorized a fourth route from the site at Ag. Paraskevi, which he believes followed the Selonda river from the site to the small Selonda Bay. The riverbed is now full of stones blasted and dumped into the riverbed during construction of the Isthmos-Epidauros national road. If a road did exist here at one time, and there is no reason to suppose it could not have. any trace of it is almost certainly buried under the construction debris.

QUARRY SITE. Appendix 1. Site 3.

Approximately 2.5 km from the settlement at Ag. Paraskevi, the road approaches a small hill where today is located an abandoned modern quarry. Near this spot the road splits in two directions with one branch continuing south (Road 3b) and the other to the southeast (Road 3a). At the modern quarry, which is on the south face of an unnamed hill (elv. ca. 360 m), I discovered two very well preserved niches carved into the rock face (Figures 3.11-13). The niches may have been for some cult purpose, but unfortunately this cannot be confirmed, as no ceramic or other votive

---

53 Miliarakis 1886, p. 143.
evidence was noticed. Both niches do, however, look directly towards the peak of Pr. Elias hill where there may have been an ancient sanctuary. These niches, then, may have some connection with the deity to whom the sanctuary there was dedicated or may simply be a sanctuary site to some other deity. One possibility that immediately comes to mind is Pan, for there is reference to a Panion in our inscription (lines 28-29). This may be highly speculative, but the presence of these two niches, along this same rock face, makes this suggestion highly attractive. Their location on either side of the modern quarry also raises the possibility that the quarrying destroyed others and any evidence by which we could have determined the site’s function. In addition to the niches, a roughly oval circuit wall is preserved on the hill’s summit. It is constructed entirely of unworked local gray stones and is probably medieval in date.


Where the road (Road 3a) branches near the quarry site to the southeast it passes over a low saddle between Pr. Elias hill on the west and a small hillock on the east. On the peak of the western hill (elv. 414 m), which rises high above the west bank of the Selonda riverbed, is a small chapel dedicated to Pr. Elias (Figure 3.14). Beneath it are discernible the foundations of what may have been a small hilltop sanctuary in the Classical and Hellenistic periods and possibly into the Roman period.55 In the area surrounding the chapel are many fragmentary Classical-Hellenistic roof tiles in addition to several joining fragments of a fine black-glazed Classical skyphos and other sherds. Later architectural members are also present including the lintel of the chapel door, which is a sawn-in-half monolithic marble

column. About 10 m southwest of the chapel another broken marble column is lying on the ground. The two appear to be the same diameter and probably from the same construction phase. The chapel itself is built on a level clearing, the hill’s highest point. A retaining wall south of the chapel, constructed of large unworked stones, was apparently constructed to create an artificial terrace at the peak (Figure 3.14). Several thick walls of unworked stones also encircle the summit. These cannot be dated with precision but may be medieval or later.\textsuperscript{56}

PR. ELIAS TOWER. Appendix 1, Site 5.

As the road (Road 3a) continue past Pr. Elias hill, an isolated tower was discovered on its southeastern foothills (Figures 3.55-16). It is rectangular in plan and its masonry is polygonal, making a late Classical-Hellenistic date highly probable. Within and around this tower I noticed several fragmentary Classical-Hellenistic roof tiles of the same type found on the summit, but no sherds. This isolated tower undoubtedly served as a farm tower. The tower is best preserved on its south and east sides and is extremely grown over in the center. It has also been partially incorporated into a retaining wall that extends for some distance to the south.

This isolated tower along an ancient roadway suggests that as early as the Classical period, the inhabitants of the settlement at Ag. Paraskevi controlled this small sanctuary. If the identification of the Selonda riverbed with Sellas mentioned in IG IV\textsuperscript{2}.1.71 proposed above is correct, then a hilltop sanctuary along its eastern bank

\textsuperscript{56} Peppas (1990, pp. 241-242, fig. 40) and Peppas (1993, p. 136, fig. 3) believes that they are in fact medieval.
must be considered a potential candidate for the Apollonion, the terminus of the Corinthian-Epidaurian border.

The sanctuary on Pr. Elias hill must have been one of major importance for the inhabitants of the settlement at Ag. Paraskevi. It is located approximately half-way between the site and its harbor at modern Korphos. It also lies between the Xerias and Selonda riverbeds. Roads to and from the settlement at Ag. Paraskevi, following either riverbed would have passed close by this sanctuary, possibly explaining both the small watchtower along Road 3a and the choice of this site for the later fortification.


This branch of the road (3a) that passes by the site of Pr. Elias continues along in a southeasterly direction, eventually paralleling the western bank of the Xerias riverbed. It terminates on a small triangular clearing where the Xerias is joined by a small tributary. Located on this clearing is a large ancient fortification (Figure 3.18). It has been reported briefly by Ioannis Peppas who calls it "Αρε Μπάρτζε>>, a name I too have heard used in the kapheneia of Sophiko.57 The local toponym apparently derives from a Turkish word meaning cart-driver, which may conceal some reference to the cart road that led to the fortification.

The fortification must have been Corinthian, as it is accessible only from the northwest and is situated on the steep cliffs above the ravine. It commands the road network from the interior to Korphos harbor and offers a view of it, as well as the entire Sophiko bay and beyond into the Saronic gulf. From here a garrison, which was
probably not more than ten men, could have watched over traffic to and from Korphos as well as any naval activity within the harbor. Today the clearing is covered with olive trees and also has a natural water source. Inhabitants of the fortification would have been virtually self-sufficient in this otherwise rough terrain.

The masonry of the fortification is an amalgamation of polygonal, trapezoidal, and some ashlar blocks (Figures 3.20-23): the corners of which are not drafted. The stones are of two types: both local gray limestone and a reddish-orange conglomerate.

The fortification's plan is straightforward (Figure 3.19): it consists of a rectangular wall with four separate elements within it: a central tower or πύργος, one room or οίκια on either side of it and a large courtyard or αὐλή to the west of these three elements. An entrance (Figure 3.25) is preserved on its southwest side. Adjacent to the tower's west wall is a worked millstone (Figure 3.24) that is partially set into the ground. In most places only one course of the outer wall remains. The central tower is preserved to a height of nearly 2 m and as there is no apparent entrance to it, we must conclude that its original height was greater than it is preserved today and that its interior was accessible by ladder or wooden steps.

This arrangement immediately calls to mind a fortified farmstead and ceramic evidence from the site makes the likelihood strong that this was the structure's


56 For the ashlar-trapezoidal style of masonry see the comments of McNicoll 1997, p. 3.

57 This reddish-orange conglomerate is the same as that noticed in the ruined house on the southern slope of Mt. Tourla, see above and Appendix 1, Site 2.
original function.\textsuperscript{60} There is, however, simply not enough arable land on the clearing to justify this interpretation. Furthermore, the topography makes it clear that we are in fact dealing with a watchtower, overlooking Korphos harbor that guarded the road between it and the settlement at Ag. Paraskevi (Figure 3.26).

A high density of fragmentary roof tiles and sherds is scattered throughout the fortification and the area immediately around it. Among the assemblage was a late 5th century B.C lamp nozzle, as well as a 4th century B.C skyphos base. Sherds of large pithoi, datable between the 4th-3rd centuries B.C., comprise the highest percentage. Most noteworthy of these were two body sherds, each with a decorative band of three parallel lines and a wavy band either above or below it. These relatively small sherds are remarkable for their decoration that is paralleled on a pithos excavated at Corinth. Elizabeth Bogess published this pithos and dated it between the early 4th and the end of the 3rd century B.C.\textsuperscript{61} Ceramic evidence, therefore, suggests that the fortification was in use between the late 5th and late 3rd centuries B.C. Its masonry is also consistent with this date.

The layout of our fort and its position on the steep cliffs and overlooking a harbor is paralleled closely with a Corinthian fortification at Asprokampos near Perachora.\textsuperscript{62} It too has a central tower flanked by two rooms and a central courtyard. This fortification, therefore, is identical with ours in plan (Figure 3.27) and the dimensions of the two are different by less than one half meter. Today a small chapel

\textsuperscript{60} For the arrangement of farmsteads with towers, see Young 1956, pp. 122-146.

\textsuperscript{61} Bogess 1970, pp. 73-78. I would like to thank C. K. Williams and N. Bookidis for their help in identifying this pottery.

\textsuperscript{62} Perachora I, pp. 7: Wiseman (1978, p. 34 and fig 31) interprets the fortification as “a rectangular watchtower with outworks.” and N. Faraklas (AGC 3, appendix II, p. 3) believes that it may have “served as a temple.” No date for the fortification was proposed by any of those who have commented on it.
dedicated to Pr. Elias lies upon the remains of the central tower. The masonry of the two are, however, slightly different as the Pr. Elias fortification is comprised entirely of ashlar masonry. This need not imply that the two are not contemporary with one another. Roof tiles, similar to those seen at the Ἄρες Μπάρτζε site are also abundant at Pr. Elias. Although previous commentators offered no date for the Pr. Elias fortification, Classical remains are plentiful and well known from the Asprokampos plain. The fortification's location on the steep cliffs above the plain provides an unobstructed view of it and the pass to the northwest and its harbor at Kaki Skala. As the plain lies between the harbor and the fortification it is difficult to see how it functioned as a military watchtower that guarded it. More likely it functioned here as a fortified farmstead.

The similarities between these two fortifications, on opposites ends of the Corinthia, are extraordinary and may imply either that the same architect designed them, or that a set plan for such fortifications existed at one time.

Another Corinthian fortification at Oenoe, east of Asprokampos and along the Megarian border better parallels ours in function, but not in size or scale. It is also positioned on steep cliffs with natural access from only one direction and it overlooks the Corinthian harbor of Skoinos. Its size is greater than that of the Ἄρες Μπάρτζε fortification, but the two are undoubtedly phrouria designed to guard sensitive border areas.

---

53 For the Archaic inscriptions from Asprokampos, see IG IV 414-423: Perachora I, pp. 7-8 (SEG XI 239-241); Wiseman 1979, pp. 34-36 (SEG XXVIII 377-378). Most were inscribed on sarcophagus lids.

64 For this fort, see Corinth I, i, pp. 36-40; Wiseman 1978, pp. 28-30; Lawrence 1979, pp. 204-205.
Although the "Ape Mπάρτζε" fortification is not attested specifically in the ancient literature, it may have played a role in an encounter Thucydides described between the Peloponnesian and Athenian fleets in 412 B.C. According to Thucydides (8.10.2-11.2) the Peloponnesians left Kenchreai (and):

καὶ αὐτοῖς Ἀθηναίοι τὸ πρῶτον ἑσαίας ναυσὶ προσπλεύσαντες ὑπῆγον ἐς τὸ πέλαγος. ώς δὲ ἐπὶ πολὺ οὐκ ἐπηκολούθησαν οἱ Πελοποννήσιοι. ἀλλ' ἀπετράποντο. ἐπανεχώρησαν καὶ οἱ Ἀθηναίοι... ἀλλ' ὕστερον ἄλλας προσπληρώσαντες ἐς ἑπτὰ καὶ τριάκοντα παραπλέοντας αὐτοὺς καταδιώκουσιν ἐς Σπείραιον τῆς Κορίνθιας ἔστι δὲ λιμὴν ἔρημος καὶ ἔσχατος πρὸς τὰ μεθόρια τῆς Ἐπιδαύριας... καὶ προσβαλόντων τῶν Ἀθηναίων καὶ κατὰ θάλασσαν ταῖς ναυσὶ καὶ ἐς τὴν γῆν ἀποβάντων θόρυβος τε ἐγένετο πολὺς καὶ ἀτακτος. καὶ τῶν τε νεὼν τὰς πλείους κατατραμματίζουσιν ἐν τῇ γῇ οἱ Ἀθηναίοι καὶ τὸν ἁρχοντα Ἀλκαμένη ἀποκτείνουσιν καὶ αὐτῶν πινὲς ἀπέθαναν. διακριθέντες δὲ πρὸς μὲν τὰς πολεμίας ναύς ἐπέταξαν ἐφορμεῖν ἰκανάς. ταῖς δὲ λοιπαῖς ἐς τὸ νησίδων ὀρμίζονταί ἐν ὧν ὅποι ἀπέχοντο ἐστρατοπεδεύοντο. καὶ ἐς τὰς Ἀθηναίας ἐπὶ βοήθειαν ἐπεμπον. παρῆσαν γὰρ καὶ τοῖς Πελοποννήσιοι τῇ ύστεραιᾳ οἱ τε Κορίνθιοι βοηθοῦντες ἐπὶ τὰς ναύς καὶ ὅ πολλῶς ύστερον καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι πρόσχωροι.

The Athenians at first sailed up to them with an equal number of ships. and tried to draw them out into the open sea. But when the Peloponnesians did not follow them very far but turned back. the Athenians also withdrew.... But they afterwards manned additional ships. bringing their number up to thirty-seven. and then pursued the enemy. as they sailed along the coast. to Speiraion in Corinthian territory. This is a deserted port. the last toward the borders of Epidauria.... And now. when the Athenians attacked them. both by sea with their fleet and on land. having put men ashore. there was great confusion and disorder: and most of the Peloponnesian ships were disabled by the Athenians on the beach and their commander Alcamenes was slain. And some Athenians were also killed. After drawing off. the Athenians posted a sufficient number of ships to keep watch upon those of the enemy. but with the rest cast anchor at an islet not far distant. on which they proceeded to make their camp: and they also sent to Athens for reinforcements. For the Corinthians had joined the Peloponnesians the next day. bringing reinforcements to the fleet. and not long afterward the people of the neighborhood also came.

\footnote{For a brief account of the engagement and Thucydides' treatment of it. see Stroud 1994. pp. 297-299. For the battle itself. see Salmon 1984. pp. 336-338.}
If this engagement did take place in Korphos harbor then the Corinthian reinforcements mentioned by Thucydides quite possibly reached the fleet from the Ἀπε Μπάρτζε fortification, and it is probable that those from the surrounding area came from the settlement at Ag. Paraskevi. Furthermore, the small island Ag. Petros (Ἀγ. Πέτρος) may be proposed as a candidate for the islet on which the Athenians made their camp. Late 5th century B.C. pottery from both sites confirms that they were inhabited at the time of the battle described by Thucydides.

Ceramic and terra-cotta evidence at the site, in addition to the masonry, also support an occupation date for the fortification within the second half of the 3rd century B.C., or contemporary with the Corinthian-Epidaurian border dispute. Its size and strategic location make the conclusion a likely one that this fortification played a major role in the Corinthian defense along its southern frontier, and was probably located very close to the boundary drawn by the Megarian judges.

Road 3a

Along this road (Road 3a) from the site at Ag. Paraskevi, past the Pr. Elias sanctuary site to the Ἀπε Μπάρτζε fortification, no wheel-ruts were seen, but other evidence was noted suggesting its antiquity. For nearly the entire distance from the Pr. Elias hill to the site of the fortification the west bank of the road is supported by a retaining wall. Also, at a location approximately between the quarry site and the tower below Pr. Elias, Ronald Stroud noticed a small outcropping of bedrock along the

---

66 Gomme, Andrewes, and Dover (1981, p. 25) commenting on these reinforcements state that “in this very broken country it would take time for even neighbors to collect, and there were not many of them. Since Corinth has been mentioned already and Argos is excluded, these men can only be Epidaurians.”

67 I was accompanied by R. Stroud along the entire course of this road in summer 1998. His suggestions and comments were invaluable.
east side of the road that has been cut away and leveled off, possibly to facilitate traffic along it. For some distance past the site of Pr. Elias the road has a low grade, making traffic easy for any vehicle. At some distance further along, however, the gradient becomes considerably steeper and the road makes several fairly sharp switchbacks, to lessen it. At each corner, the retaining wall does not follow the natural curve of the road, but swings out forming roughly right angles creating a turnout. This additional space at these locations can only have been for vehicles to pull over if oncoming traffic were approaching. Furthermore, the uniformly packed surface along the road cannot have been formed entirely by modern automobile traffic, but is indicative of cart and foot use. Perhaps the most important piece of evidence attesting to the road's antiquity is its function. As noted above, the road terminates at the Αρε Μπάρτζε fortification. Its construction, therefore, must have been to gain access to the fort and must be contemporary with it.

Evidence is present, however, that does not testify to its antiquity. At a few isolated spots drill holes for dynamite can be seen, clearly indicating modern construction activity along this roadway. They are, nevertheless, so sporadic that the blasting may only have been needed in certain sections of the existing ancient road in order to facilitate automobile traffic. Modern telephone wires closely follow the road's course, and this may be one explanation for the blasting. Transportation of the equipment required for the installation of the telephone wires would have been

---

95 For ancient roads with steep gradients and switch-backs, see Pritchett 1980, pp. 193-194.
96 I have only ever seen an automobile on this road twice in many walks along it.
97 That the course of ancient roads are often followed by the line of telephone wires, see Pritchett 1980, p. 196.
impossible along a steep and narrow ancient road. Another explanation for the modern blasting, and one which may be a direct result of it, is to provide automobile access to the clearing for the collection and transport of the olives harvested there.

Road 3b

Following the route (Road 3) south from the settlement at Ag. Paraskevi, Road 3b continued in a southerly direction beyond the point where Road 3a branched off to the southeast. Not far beyond the Pr. Elias hill (ca. 1 km) Road 3b turned almost due east to a point where it eventually entered the Xerias river bed from where travelers could make an easy end of the journey to the harbor town. For some distance after turning east, Road 3b is now a fairly broad dirt road and its antiquity is impossible to prove as it too was apparently bulldozed. However, for a short stretch a footpath is preserved approximately 1 m immediately above the southern bank of the dirt road. As with Road 3a that led to the Αρε Μπατζέ fortification, what was undoubtedly the first telephone line to Korphos followed this road. The bulldozer may very well have been employed to widen the existing foot path, or cart road, to allow trucks through for their installation. Modern telephone lines, as has been noted, very often follow ancient roads and this may be the case here. Unfortunately, modern construction along Road 3b may have destroyed any trace of its antiquity. The road itself is visible from the Αρε Μπατζέ fortification, but the modern tree-line obscures the view of the fort from the road. At a point, almost opposite the Αρε Μπατζέ fortification itself, the fairly broad dirt road comes to an abrupt end and it becomes footpath.

---

1 Along the entire course of this road, almost to Korphos itself, remains of the old telephone poles and ceramic coverings marked with OTE (Greek Telephone Service) can be seen.

Undoubtedly this is the same path that paralleled the dirt road along its southern bank. From this point onwards, all that remains is the footpath and it terminates at a small rema that is a tributary of the Xerias. At this rema, however, are the substantial remains of a well constructed bridge. It is much better preserved on its east bank (Figure 3.29) where it is preserved to a height of ca. 5.35 m and has a width of ca. 4.15 m. The bridge is constructed primarily of loose, unworked stones mortared together. On its corners, however, are well worked blocks. The west bank (Figure 3.30) is almost entirely in ruins now, but the construction technique is somewhat different as mortar does not appear to have been used here. Although the bridge is not ancient, its existence here confirms that this was once the primary route between the Sophiko plain and Korphos harbor. The footpath continues on the opposite bank of the rema and it is significantly broader. It is also supported by a substantial retaining wall along the relatively steep slope of the rema. It continues along the west bank of the Xerias for some distance while it gradually descends into the riverbed from where the village is only minutes away. Unless wheel-ruts are discovered elsewhere within the Xerias riverbed, Road 3b should be considered the most likely candidate for the “wagon road leading down to Spiraion.”

73 I have shown several photographs of the bridge to Dr. Yannis Pikoulas, who has told me that the construction of eastern pier is typical of the early 19th century.

74 As the road drops gradually, it eventually enters private property and is not traceable any further. I spoke with the resident there, who knew of the bridge, but he could offer me no toponym for it other than η γέουπα. He confirmed that this was the “old foot path” to Sophiko, but he was unaware of any wheel-ruts along its course or anywhere else within the rema.
The Field of the Greek

Just south of Road 3b, and not far from the modern road to Korphos is a small level plain which is known today as Χωράφι τοῦ Ἑλληνα or the Field of the Greek.\(^5\) The ruins of a modern house (Figure 3.28) constructed out of mortared, unworked stones lie in this plain. A large cistern, still functioning, is connected to the house on its northwest side. To the northwest of the house, on the other side of the dirt road leading to it is a threshing floor.\(^6\) Within the collapsed debris of the house I noticed several fragmentary Classical-Hellenistic roof tiles and several large pithos fragments, similar to those found at the Ἀρε Μπάρτζε fortification. The small plain around the house is today full of olive trees and an occasional fig tree. A few minutes walk to the east from this ruined house is another threshing floor, which is also in the midst of a large olive grove. Throughout this area there are also many pine trees that are still being exploited for their resin. This site must represent an isolated farmstead in antiquity as it apparently still functioned until recently. The olive groves around the ruined house, however, are still being maintained.

TOWER SYSTEM AROUND KORPHOS (Κόρφος) Appendix 1. Sites 8-10.

The modern village of Korphos, located within the bay of Sophiko and with its own fantastic harbor, is cut off from the interior by a ridge of five distinct peaks surrounding the village. This effectively has landlocked the small village until the construction of the modern road that now leads down to it after turning off from the

\(^5\) For the frequency of ancient sites that are now known by names such as this, see Kakridis 1989.

\(^6\) Threshing floors are notoriously difficult to date. For two threshing floors found that are apparently related to ancient farmsteads in south Attica, see Young 1956, pp. 122-126. See also the comments of Isager and Skysgaard 1992, pp. 53-55.
Epidauros-Isthmos national road and circling around the peaks of Stavrostos (Σταυροστός, elv. 280 m) and Loutsa Tsingkou (Λούτσα Τσίγκου, elv. 349 m). From antiquity until the very recent past there can only have been two routes to and from of the village: 1. the sea, from the Bay of Sophiko and 2. a road following the Xerias river to the Sophiko plain.

Along the ridge, which is comprised of five distinct peaks, north of the village that surround it is a system of towers that may have been used for both communication and the defense of the border. From west to east the five peaks around the village are: Loutsa Tsingkou, Prosili Togia (Προσήλι Τόγια, elv. ca. 320 m), Spati (Σπάτη, elv. 400 m), Koryphi (Κορυφή, elv. 441 m), and Monastiri (Μοναστήρι, elv. 386 m). The first peak is separated from the rest by the Xerias river bed.

The first tower (Appendix 1, Site 8), also from west to east along the ridge, is located near the summit of Prosili Togia (elv. ca. 320 m). It is round and between two and three courses of masonry are preserved in places. It is constructed exclusively out of unworked local gray limestone found throughout the area and no mortar is present. Its wall, which is roughly 1 m thick, is partially collapsed into the center, the diameter of which is ca. 2.2 m. No tiles or pottery were seen in or around this tower. The view from it is today partially obscured by the tree-line, but to the south and southeast Korphos harbor and the Sophiko Bay are visible. Mt. Tsalikas dominates the near horizon to the northeast. Directly to the north, the peak of Prixea (Πριξεα, elv. +400 m) is clearly visible and is separated from this peak by a small tributary of the Xerias river.
The summit of Spati (elv. 400 m) was apparently not used in the system of defense and communication around Korphos. It was not used in the system of defense and communication around Korphos. The next structure along the ridge is a round tower, which is apparently incorporated into a larger circuit wall, the diameter of which is approximately 20 m (Appendix 1, Site 9). The stones, mostly small, are again constructed of unworked local gray limestone. The inner diameter of the tower is ca. 3.3 m. There are also sparse remains of a larger circuit wall, of the same construction, into which the round tower is incorporated on its southeastern side. This fort is unique in that it is the only site along this ridge at which indisputable evidence of antiquity was noticed: one small Corinthian pan tile fragment within the remains of the round tower. It is dangerous to conclude that the structure is ancient from such scanty evidence. However, the site is so isolated that explanation for the presence of this single tile here is needed to contradict it. Without further investigation the antiquity of this structure and the others near it should remain a tentative conclusion. The view from the site is also partially obscured by the modern tree-line, but the view of Sophiko bay and Cape Trachyli to the south is stunning. Mt. Tsalikas and the Sophiko plain are visible to the northwest.

On the peak of Monastiri (elv. 386 m) is the third and final tower within this network. It is almost identical in plan with the fort near the peak of Koryphi: a larger oval circuit wall with a small tower on its southeast side (Appendix 1, Site 10). The survey column is within the middle of the circuit wall. The construction is also identical with the others: local gray, unworked stones and no mortar. Many stones

---

77 I have visited this summit on only one occasion and saw no ancient remains or walls there. As the entire ridge is heavily grown over I could easily have missed some remains.

78 It took me approximately eight minutes to reach the survey column from the tower.
within the circuit wall are quite large, and it is best preserved along its northeast side. No ancient ceramic remains were seen within or around the site, but the similarities in construction and plan between this fort and the one to the west on Koryphi make its antiquity probable, but again this remains only a tentative conclusion.  

These towers around Korphos all show similar characteristics indicating that their construction was contemporaneous. Some further tentative conclusions can be suggested from their masonry. The use of unworked stones is dramatic in comparison to the other fortifications discussed above, possibly suggesting hasty construction. It is tempting, therefore, to associate these towers and their construction with the Corinthian-Epidaurian border dispute. One possible theory is that they were constructed shortly after the Megarians made their second decision concerning the boundary. These towers may have been built at that time to serve as a Corinthian defense network along the newly created frontier. The Xerias fort, although constructed in a much different style should also be included in this network, as it guarded the land route from the harbor to the interior. While it may be a theory built upon little evidence, it remains a possibility and one that deserves consideration.


Near Cape Stiri (Ak. Sīrip), which is some 5-6 km to the northeast of Korphos and immediately below the summit of Monastiri, lies the chapel of the Panaghia.  

It is built on a low ridge on the either side of which are two small clearings. Kurt

---

89 I was accompanied to see this fort in summer 1998 by R. and H. C. Stroud, who supported my identification of this fortification as ancient.

80 For the church of the Panaghia, see Orlando 1935, pp. 81-85.
Gebauer claimed to have located early Helladic sherds in the area, but no other finds have been reported. My visits to this area have revealed more extensive occupation in this area than has been reported previously. In addition to a Late Roman inscription built into the chapel (see Appendix 2), which is certainly evidence of occupation nearby in the Roman period several other blocks appear to have been reused from ancient structures. These cannot be dated with precision but several fine black-glazed Classical-Hellenistic sherds along with numerous Classical-Hellenistic tiles were found on the slope of the small hill immediately south of the chapel. North of it is a well, thus making this a logical position for a site in antiquity. The extant remains strongly point to the identification of this as a sanctuary. Its identification as such is strengthened further if we consider IG IV 1559, the small votive inscription to Apollo discussed above. If the suggestion proposed there, that the inscription originated from this site, and not the monastery of Ag. Panaghia near the settlement at Ag. Paraskevi is correct, then we may even plausibly identify this sanctuary with the Apollonion mentioned on IG IV 3.1.71. Such a conclusion is highly speculative for the reasons outlined earlier, namely that we simply do not know where the inscription was found and that no one other than Lenormant has seen it. The site is very close to the sea, however, which is not inconsistent with where we might expect the terminus of the boundary to be. The evidence at the site clearly indicates that it was an important site in antiquity with habitation in several different periods, including the

---

1 Gebauer (1939, p. 271) located the sherds at a site he calls Pr. Elias which is not far from the Panaghia church. AGC 3, appendix II, p. 30 also cite EH and possibly LH sherds from the same location.

2 As with the site at Pr. Elias, see Verdelis (1962, pp. 184-192) for an excavated sanctuary in the southern Corinthia.
Mycenaean, Classical-Hellenistic, late Roman, the Byzantine, and into the modern period.

The site at the Panaghia chapel was inaccessible from the village of Korphos until recently when a dirt road was blasted up to the church. The site was approachable only by a small road that can still be followed to it from Sophiko. An ancient route also must have followed a similar route. Access to the forts above Korphos is more difficult to determine. Approach from the village of Korphos itself, up the south slopes of these hills is extremely steep and very difficult. The forts are much more easily accessible from Sophiko than they are from Korphos. Following the same route to the site at Ag. Panaghia one can easily reach the peak of Monastiri and the three other peaks along the ridge north of the harbor. Certainly access to the forts is from the north, and they must have been Corinthian.

Their location above Korphos harbor and overlooking the bay of Sophiko is suggestive, as indicated above, of a border defense network. Furthermore, the location of a hilltop sanctuary here, very close to the sea, and along the same ridge on which three hastily constructed forts are positioned, makes the identification of this sanctuary site at the Panaghia chapel with the Apollonion very attractive. This may also help to explain the next problem.

STONE CAIRNS NEAR KORPHOS (Appendix 1, Site 13)

Korphos harbor is protected on its southeast by a small promontory extending westwards, partially closing off the harbor from the bay of Sophiko. Along the ridge of this promontory are located at least five stone cairns, which may be boleoi lithoi, or

---

87  I am unaware when exactly the road was constructed, but aerial photographs of the area taken in 1974 show that it was not in existence then.
heaped up stone piles that mark a boundary. The first cairn (Figure 3.38) is located ca. 15 m southeast of the survey column (elv. 63 m). Around it are several modern terrace walls, and there is a conspicuous lack of any ancient pottery or roof tiles. The cairn itself is approximately 8 m in diameter, and ca. 1.5 m high. It is constructed of the loose, gray field stones that are omnipresent in the southeastern Corinthia. At the cairn's center is a small circular depression ca. 1 m deep and with a diameter of 1.35 m. The second cairn is located only ca. 100 m to the east of the first and the two are visible from one another (Figure 3.40). Their dimensions and that of the third are approximately the same. The third is located at some distance from the second and the two are not visible from one another. All three cairns are distinctive for the small circular depressions in their centers. Their purpose was possibly to hold something within it, perhaps a herm which is commonly associated with boundary markers. The fourth lies further along the ridge to the east. It is somewhat smaller than the first three, but it does have the characteristic small depression. The fifth cairn is approximately the same size as the first three, but it lacks the depression. Remains of what may be two other cairns can also be noticed, but they are so disturbed as to make their positive identification ambiguous. Modern terracing walls in this area must also be taken into consideration for these cairns would have provided ample

---

84 I originally found only the first of the cairns in April 1998 and thought that it may have been a signal tower, possibly for ships entering the harbor. In fact, the modern name of the promontory is Φαναρούμι or "Lighthouse island." The conclusion that these must be boundary markers of some type became inevitable in July 1998 when I was accompanied to see the first cairn by R. S. Stroud and H. C. Stroud, who located both the second and the third on our visit to the site.

building material for them. Thus, while only five or six have been identified, others may have existed at one time. The complete lack of any ceramic remains along this ridge must rule out the possibility that the cairns served some other function.

These cairns, positioned in an east-west line along the promontory, would undoubtedly have been visible from the sea by any ships approaching Korphos harbor. If they do mark the boundary drawn by the Megarian judges it is not easy to understand their position on this small promontory. A possible solution is that the border was above Korphos, along the ridge where the forts are located and that these cairns were used as markers along the promontory to let those approaching by sea know that this harbor was either Corinthian or Epidaurian. Modern fishing in the area is primarily conducted at a large fish farm off the island of Ag. Petros ("Ag. Πετρος"). The numerous fishing boats returning to the harbor still sail parallel to the promontory’s coast. As one of only two routes to the harbor, some form of boundary marker would not come as a surprise along this promontory.

The absence of any other stone cairns along the boundary proposed here requires explanation. Their presence at Korphos harbor, however, may provide the answer to the question. Their prominence along this promontory suggests that control of the harbor and its resources was the central issue of the dispute. If Korphos can be identified as ancient Speiraion this suggestion is not surprising, as it received a prominent place in the definition of the area under dispute which was “between Sellas and Spiraion.”
THE FIND OF SOPHIKO

If the identification of Spiraion in Thucydides and IG IV² 1.71 with modern Korphos is correct, then we must explain why Thucydides tells us it was deserted in 412 B.C. It is very possible that by the second half of the 3rd century the harbor’s true value was realized and it was both utilized and inhabited. That the harbor was not deserted in the second half of the 3rd century B.C. is well established. Remains have been reported in the area of the modern village. This view is even more likely when we consider the so-called “find of Sophiko,” a hoard of 945 coins dating between the late 4th and the late 3rd centuries B.C. and found in Korphos harbor in 1893 by sponge divers. The coins, which are now located in the Numismatic Museum at Athens, were in a silver vase that was found among the debris of a shipwreck. I. N. Svoronos first dated the hoard to 240-200 B.C. This date has since undergone revision with the accepted date now being around 220 B.C. The date of the shipwreck in Korphos harbor at any date between 240-200 puts it in very close proximity to the time of the Corinthian-Epidaurian dispute. It also tells us that the harbor was in use at this time, but not necessarily that it was inhabited. Also possible is that the harbor was inhabited only after it changed hands from Corinthian to Epidaurian.

---

86 Wiseman (1978, p. 134) noticed coarse sherds along the beach, and poros blocks in the water. See also AGC 3, appendix II, p. 30. On my visits to Korphos, I too have noticed coarse sherds along the shore, but local fishermen have told me that they know of no worked blocks within the harbor. The British Admiralty Chart of Aigina and Methana (1839) also has “ruin” marked at the eastern edge of the modern town. I have not noticed any trace of these remains.

87 Interestingly, there were no Corinthian, Epidaurian or Achaian coins in the hoard.

88 Svoronos 1899, pp. 289-296. Both Fowler (Corinth I, i. p.102 note 1) and Wiseman (1978, p. 134) cite the hoard.

89 Svoronos 1899, pp. 289-296. See also Svoronos 1905, pp. 115-120 and Svoronos 1907, pp. 35-46. For bibliography on the hoard, see IGCH. no. 179, p. 29; Hackens 1968, pp. 71-72 and CH III 49: CH VII 81.
CAPE SPEIRI (Ἄκ. Σπερί).

Although it is suggested here that the border crossed the peaks and ridges above the harbor of Korphos which should be identified with ancient Spiraion, modern Cape Speiri, since it retains the ancient name, also requires some discussion. An unpaved road of undetermined date leads from the area around the chapel of the Panaghia in a northeasterly direction to the sea at Cape Speiri. Along this road are the remains of at least three distinct settlements, perhaps dating from the Turkokratia. No antiquities were seen along this road, nor at the settlements. In places, however, the land is fairly level and cultivated with olive trees. It would not be surprising if these lands were occupied by several farmsteads.

CAPE TRACHYLI. Appendix I, Site 14.

As discussed above, Thucydides’ statement that Speiraion was the last harbor before the Epidauria seems to indicate that their boundary in the late 5th century B.C. was at Cape Trachyli. I have walked in this area on several occasions looking for anything which may help to support this theory. On the northern side of the promontory itself I discovered two small round towers; both are constructed of unworked stones. The first tower measures roughly 3.0 m in diameter and is located below the summit of Asprovouni. The second is located further to the east along the promontory itself, on its northern slope. This tower is also roughly 3.0 m in diameter and its masonry is the same as the first. The most striking feature of this circular tower is its floor level, which is an exposed flat patch of bedrock. Unfortunately no tiles or sherds were found at either location, thus it cannot be proven conclusively that they are ancient structures. The two towers do, however, communicate with one
another and both provide excellent views of the whole Sophiko Bay and across to Korphos harbor.

PALATI or PERIVOLI AT ANGELOKASTRO (Ἀγγελόκαστρο). Appendix 1, Site 15.

The status of Angelokastro, whether it was Corinthian or Epidaurian, has long been the subject of much contention. It may very well have been a matter of discussion in the original arbitration between Corinth and Epidauros. but as we have seen, the decision recorded on IG IV.1.71 almost certainly concerned a small part of the boundary, the area around Sellas and Spiraion, modern Korphos. Angelokastro is today dominated by the sizable remains of a Frankish kastro that rises above the village. Some ancient remains have been reported in the area of Angelokastro, and as we shall see below a major route between the Corinthia and the Epidauria passed through here. The most substantial of the known remains near Angelokastro is a small structure constructed in polygonal masonry (Figure 3.41). We have little evidence by which any conclusions about Angelokastro's status can be made.

THE SITE AT POLITIS (Πολίτης). Appendix 1, Site 12.

Northeast of Angelokastro, near a peak called Xesti where there is a good well, Arthur Parsons reported finding the remains of an ancient structure. Parsons' notes

---
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Leake 1846, p. 279 called it Epidaurian and identified it with ancient Μωλύχιον. Hesychios (s.v. ἔνθα λυκούργος (Θησεύς) τῶν Κορυνήτων ἄνειλε, τόπως. On the question of whether Angelokastro was Corinthian or Epidaurian, see Corinth I. i. pp. 103-105: Wiseman 1978, pp. 130 and 140; Salmon 1984, pp. 7 note 18.

The site was first located by A. Parsons (1935, unpublished notes). Wiseman (1978, p. 130, figs. 201-204) discusses the site and has drawn a plan. I was unable to relocate this site during a walk in the area of Angelokastro.

Parsons 1935 (unpublished notes) refers to this as Site I. Wiseman (1978, p. 128) refers to this site, but he did not visit it.
are both brief and vague and he did not offer a possible interpretation of the remains. No remains on the peak of Xesti were seen on my visit to it. On the peak of Politis, however, which is north of Xesti, are the remains of an ancient structure that may be the one Parsons described. According to Parsons it consisted of one corner of a building, with either an east-west or north-south orientation. He also noted that there were many sherds in the area. This site on the eastern peak of Politis, as well as the surrounding hills were damaged extensively in July 1998 by the fires that swept through this area. As Parsons noted, the remains are best preserved at the southwest corner, but other traces of walls were visible. Parsons, however, reported many sherds in the area, I noticed only several roof tiles. Neither its dimensions, nor its orientation were ascertained during my visit to the site. It would be dangerous both to propose any interpretation of this structure here and to place it within the context of the border dispute. The structure is, however, undoubtedly ancient and it requires further attention before any conclusions about it can be made.

ROADS FROM THE SOUTHEASTERN CORINTHIA TO THE EPIDAURIA

Ancient roads from the Corinthia to the Epidauria, via the southeastern Corinthia, are not well known, nor are they attested in the literature. The more common route, which is known from the literature, proceeded south from Corinth towards Argos and then eastwards towards the Asklepieion and the city of Epidauros. Pausanias and the early travelers used this route. This is the result of the imposing range of Mt. Arachnaion, which at times must have served as the

---

93 The literature on the roads from Corinth towards Argos, both ancient and modern, is vast. For the most recent and thorough treatment of this topic, see Pikoulas 1995.
northern frontier of the Epidauria. Direct routes south from the Corinthia would have had to take Arachnaion into account, either skirting it to the west, or the east following the coast. Travel along either route must have been slow. I am aware of only two references to travel in antiquity from the Corinthia to the Epidauria. The first is epigraphical and comes from the building accounts of the Epidaurian Asclepieion. We learn from these inscriptions that Corinthian quarry-stone was transported to Epidauros by sea.\textsuperscript{94} The second reference occurred during the Cleomenean war when Aratos was called to Argos to assist in the city’s revolt from Cleomenes. Aratos did not take a land route, but instead sailed from the Isthmos to Epidauros. (Plutarch \textit{Arat.} 44.2 and \textit{Cleom.} 20.3) and from there by land to Argos. If the settlement at Ag. Paraskevi was indeed as wealthy as its extensive fortifications and natural resources suggest then any further expansion to the south by this southeastern Corinthian center would have been most unwelcome by the inhabitants of the northern Epidauria. One route from the Epidauria to the Corinthia is briefly mentioned by W. M. Leake who wrote: “At the back of the hills which border this entire coast, rising either immediately from the shore, or at no great distance from it, there is a succession of small elevated valleys, through which passes a road from Dhamalá to Piádha, near Pidhavro, and thence by similar valleys almost as far as Corinth.”\textsuperscript{95}

An ancient road from Angelokastro to Epidauros has been identified recently by Klaus Tausent, who has located wheel-ruts confirming its existence.\textsuperscript{96} The road

\textsuperscript{94} See \textit{IG IV\textsuperscript{2}}.1.103, face B, lines 40–41 and Burford 1969, p. 169.

\textsuperscript{95} Leake 1830a, p. 456.

\textsuperscript{96} Tausent 1992-1993, pp. 93-96.
proceeded south from Angelokastro, over the saddle to the east of Trapezona, to the village of Arachnaion. It was, according to Tausent, guarded by a kastro and two towers, one of which is located at the thesi Maleviti. This Hellenistic fort, with wheel-ruts close by, has only been briefly mentioned in a preliminary notice. Guards at the Epidauros Museum informed me of the location of thesi Maleviti: this fort does not lie along the course of the road as reconstructed by Tausent.

During one of my visits to the Epidauros Museum the guards there informed me of the existence of traces of another ancient road that also must have conducted traffic between the Corinthia and the Epidauria. The remains are in the form of a leveled off surface of bedrock near the church of Ag. Andreas ("Αγ. Ανδρέας) a few kilometers northeast of the Asklepieion.

It is difficult to determine if these two sections both belong to the same ancient roadway. If they are, these may be the physical remains of the roadway described by Leake.

CONCLUSIONS ON THE TOPOGRAPHY OF THE BOUNDARY

In summing up my conclusions on the Corinthian-Epidaurian border it will be useful to return to the beginning of the discussion, the conclusions of a previous commentator of it. Robin Osborne, in his description of the disputed land states:

The dispute between Epidauros and Corinth clearly did not involve much territory. What land was involved was rough terrain, not prime land. Prime land had long since ceased to be the subject of dispute in neighborly conflicts. The countryside was not important for itself, but for the political charge that it carried. Local pride was at stake. Macedonian overlordship reduced the

---

97 Archontidou-Argyri 1984, p. 49. The author of the notice was informed of the location of the site by Th. Giannoulis who had been a guard at the Epidauros Museum at the time. See also Catling 1985-1986, p. 25.
Greek cities to playing at politics, and it was the politics of territory and of the borders that they played.88

The results of my topographical field work have shown clearly that his statement is exaggerated. The land involved was indeed prime land, and land that was certainly inhabited by a large number of people.

The purpose of my topographical survey has not been solely to identify the location of a line separating Corinthian and Epidaurian territory. Submitting the dispute to the Achaian court, having 151 arbitrators investigate the area and going through the process of appeal raises the question of why? Travelers ever since Pausanias first passed over the southeastern Corinthia on his way to the southern Argolid have ignored this land. Because of this and the rough nature of the terrain little attention has been paid to the area. Nevertheless, Corinth and Epidaurus thought it important enough to dispute and there must have been a legitimate reason. In the preceding discussion, little attention has been given to land use but what needs to be stressed here is the wealth that exists in this area. Today this countryside is heavily cultivated with olives and pine trees, with their valuable resin. Further wealth is added to the area if we consider the resources of the sea at Korphos, whose main industry today is its fish tavernas and must have been in antiquity too.

These economic concerns together: forests for timber and resin, farm land, olives and fishing are reminiscent of another arbitration dispute that will be discussed below (Chapter 5), between Troizen and Arsinoë. In this dispute all of these issues were also under debate. As with the dispute between Corinth and Epidaurus valuable land was at stake and additional economic gain if Epidaurus was indeed awarded Korphos harbor from the Corinthians. In this reconstruction we could imagine the

88 Osborne 1987, p. 164.
Corinthian inhabitants of the settlement at Ag. Paraskevi still having access to Korphos harbor, but possibly having to pay a tax or toll of some type. Similar taxation is paralleled in the dispute between Troizen and Arsinoē.

At this time it is my opinion that the territory disputed lies between the modern Cape Speiri and the Sellondas river and that the Spiraion of the inscription should be identified with modern Korphos. This conclusion allows us to answer a question raised above. The new boundary crossed the cart road within the Xerias riverbed, which we should identify with the “wagon road leading down to Spiraion.” From there it followed the peaks above Korphos and terminated at the Ag. Panaghia chapel or the Apollonion. Thus Spiraion was awarded to the Epidaurians following the Corinthian appeal. This is a very fertile area and one that was populated in antiquity by more than shepherds alone. It was not only the availability of these rich lands that was at issue, but also access to the bay of Sophiko and from there points throughout the Saronic Gulf and beyond that was at stake.
Map 3.1: The Topography of the Corinthian-Epidaurian Border Dispute.
Figure 3.1: The lower fortified site from the Hill of the Ruined Windmills.

Figure 3.2: The Settlement at Ag. Paraskevi, lower Site plan (after Wiseman 1978, fig. 189).
Figure 3.3: Hill of the Ruined Windmills from the lower fortified site.

Figure 3.4: Hill of the Ruined Windmills, western tower from north.
Figure 3.5: Hill of the Ruined Windmills, eastern tower from south.

Figure 3.6: Hill of the Ruined Windmills, western tower detail of west wall (1 m scale).
Figure 3.7: Hill of the Ruined Windmills, eastern tower, from northwest.

Figure 3.8: Hill of the Ruined Windmills, remains of circuit wall from east with Mt. Tsalikas in the background.
Figure 3.9: Hill of the Ruined Windmills, circuit wall, detail of polygonal block.

Figure 3.10: IG IV 1559, Lenormant’s 1866 transcription.
Figure 3.11: The Quarry Site, Niche 1.

Figure 3.12: The Quarry Site, Niche 2.
Figure 3.13: The Quarry Site from Pr. Elias hill, showing the location of niches 1 and 2.

Figure 3.14: Pr. Elias site, showing the chapel and the medieval fortification walls.
Figure 3.15: Tower below Pr. Elias from northeast.

Figure 3.16: Tower below Pr. Elias from southeast.
Figure 3.17: Location of the Αρε Μπαρτς fortification.
Figure 3.18: *Ape Μπαρτζε* topographical plan.
Figure 3.19: Αρε Μπαρτζέ site plan.

Figure 3.20: Αρε Μπαρτζέ tower south wall, detail of masonry.
Figure 3.21: Αρχαίας Μπαμπεντζέ tower west wall, from west (4 m scale).

Figure 3.22: Αρχαίας Μπαμπεντζέ tower south wall, from southwest.
Figure 3.23: Ape Μπαρτζε tower north wall (1 m scale).

Figure 3.24: Ape Μπαρτζε fortification, millstone (1 m scale).
Figure 3.25: Aρε Μπαρτζε fortification, entrance from south.

Figure 3.26: View to Korhos harbor from Aρε Μπαρτζε fortification.
Figure 3.27: Pr. Elias fortification near Asprokampos, Corinthia. Site plan (after Wiseman 1978, fig. 31).

Figure 3.28: Farmstead at the Field of the Greek.
Figure 3.29: Remains of bridge, east bank along Road 3b.

Figure 3.30: Remains of bridge, west bank along Road 3b.
Figure 3.31: Korphos harbor from the southwest, showing 1. Spati; 2. Koryphi; 3. Monastiri; 4. Ridge of the Stone Cairns; 5. Ag. Petros island.
Figure 3.32: Ag. Panaghia near Korphos, block on which the funerary epitaph is inscribed.
Figure 3.33: Funerary epitaph at Ag. Panaghia, detail left edge.

Figure 3.34: Funerary epitaph at Ag. Panaghia, detail center.
Figure 3.35: Funerary epitaph at Ag. Panaghia, detail end of inscription.

Figure 3.36: Funerary epitaph at Ag. Panaghia, detail of chip in the stone, line 4.
Figure 3.37: Funerary epitaph at Ag. Panaghia, detail center.

Figure 3.38: Stone cairn (No. 1) near Korphos from southwest with the peak of Monastiri in the background.
Figure 3.39: Stone cairn (No. 2) near Korphos from southeast.

Figure 3.40: View to Cairn 1, looking west from Cairn 2.
Figure 3.41: Palati or Perivoli near Angelokastro (after Wiseman 1978, fig. 202).
INTRODUCTION

The inscriptions discussed in this chapter preserve the record of two separate settlements, both probably between Hermion and Epidauros. The first inscription (IG IV^2.1.74) is interesting in that it may provide our only evidence for a settlement between two cities of the Akte, or the southern Argolid, prior to their admission into the Achaian League. There is no evidence within the preserved text to indicate that it was settled by an arbitration board, nor is it entirely clear who Hermione's, the only name preserved in the text, antagonist was. The second dispute is a settlement concerning the boundary of Hermion and Epidauros and the creation of a common territory that an arbitration board composed of Milesian and Rhodian judges decided. It is known from two copies, one found in the Epidaurian Asklepieion (IG IV^2.1.75+) and the other in Hermion (SEG XI 377). The dates of the two disputes have not been identified securely as we have little evidence by which to date them other than the criteria of their letter-forms and prosopography. New readings based on my personal
autopsy of one of these stones (IG IV\(^2\).1.75+). provide the basis for my proposed date of the dispute.

If both disputes discussed here do involve Hermion and Epidauros, then we can be fairly certain that it was a long-standing one. It is possible then, that the second dispute may give us some insight into the outcome of the first dispute. If the two disputes were over the same part of their boundary, then at least one of the two parties must have been disappointed with its outcome. Whichever side this was waited for some time, perhaps until a new opportunity presented itself, namely the Achaian League's desire to settle disputes between members by arbitration. If this is the case, then Epidauros must have won the first dispute for we know that Hermion initiated the second settlement (SEG XI 377. lines 12-14). Hermion itself did not join the Achaian League until 229 B.C., some fourteen years after Epidauros joined. Furthermore, Hermion was captured during the Cleomenean war, only four years after its entry and most likely did not rejoin the League until after 195 B.C., when the Achaian League was able to defeat the Spartan king Nabis who had been harassing the Saronic coast.\(^1\) The second dispute is also of interest in that it was decided by Milesian and Rhodian judges and is the only dispute studied here between Achaian League members that was not decided by Achaian judges. Whether or not the League was involved at all in this decision is also explored here.

\(^1\) For the suggestion that Hermion was under the control of Nabis between 197-195 B.C., see Jameson 1959, p. 111 (BullEp 1960, no. 163).
IG IV².1.74. Arbitration between Hermion and [Epidauros?]

Stele of hard bluish-gray limestone with the right edge preserved. Broken at the back, top, bottom and left. The inscription is cut in the stoichedon style. Found at the Asklepieion of Epidauros. Hiller reported neither the findspot, nor its date of discovery. Because my text is so radically different from Hiller’s I have found it useful to reproduce his text here.

[IG IV².1.74]

ed. pr.: F. Hiller von Gaertringen, IG IV².1.74

H 0.29 m; W 0.26 m; Th 0.130 m; LH 0.009 m
Interlinear Spacing: 0.005 - 0.006 m
Checker: 0.0127 m (horizontal), 0.0143 m (vertical)

Photo: Figure 4.10

Epidauros Inv. No. 402
ca. first half 3rd century B.C.

Στοιχ.

Figure 4.1: IG IV².1.74, Drawing
NOTES ON READINGS

Line 1: Before the nu traces of two letters are preserved. Both are traces of right diagonal strokes. The reading of nu in the seventeenth stoichos is certain, two vertical strokes and part of the diagonal are preserved. The second to last letter consists only of the lower half of a vertical stroke. This letter may be an iota, a tau, or a gamma.

Line 2: The first preserved letter consists of the lower part of a vertical stroke and a lower horizontal. This trace is certainly an epsilon. The next preserved trace on this line consists of the lower part of two diagonal strokes. This letter can be only an alpha or a lambda. Two parallel vertical strokes occupy the next stoichos, indicating either an eta or possibly a pi. A single vertical stroke is preserved in the final stoichos.

Line 3: The first letter consists of a single right diagonal stroke. This letter may be either an alpha or a lambda. The lower half of a vertical stroke occupies the next stoichos. After this stroke the lower half of two diagonal strokes and possibly the inner crossbar survive. This letter is probably an alpha. Within the next stoichos are preserved two parallel horizontal strokes. This letter may be either an eta or possibly a pi. The following stoichos is occupied by the lower half of a vertical stroke.

Line 4: The lower horizontal of the epsilon is preserved in the second stoichos.

Line 6: There is clearly space for one more letter after the final omega. Hiller restored a rho after this at the beginning of line 7. The rho must be restored at the end of this line.

Line 7: The left vertical of the eta is preserved in the final stoichos.

Line 9: The edge of the right serif of an omega can be read before the nu in the first preserved stoichos. Hiller read an omega after the final nu. I can see no trace of this letter. The final nu also occupies the last stoichos. Hiller restored [ωτ] after the final nu of this line. The nu occupies the final stoichos therefore the -[ωτ] must be restored at the left margin of line 10. In no line on this stone did the cutter extend past the position of the final stoichos.²

Line 11: Only the apex of the delta survives in the second stoichos.

Line 15: Hiller read a dotted iota at the end of the line. No trace of this letter survives, moreover, the tau occupies the final stoichos.

Line 17: The upper right trace of a horizontal stroke survives before the nu. This letter could possibly be a gamma, epsilon or a tau. The third and fourth letters are not fully preserved. Both letters could be an alpha, delta, or lambda. Only the tip of the

² See the comments of Peek (1969. no. 29. p.26).
apex of the fourth letter survives, thus making it impossible to determine which of the three options is most probable.

TEXT

ca. first half 3rd century B.C. Στοίχ:

APPARATUS CRITICUS

The translation is provided as follows:

the man from Hermion .... (4) to each of the cities.... a war over properties .... from all of the land... the collected moneys... (8) of the money in common... of the country in whatever manner it seems.... each city seized.... (12) these seats of honor (proedroi).... each city half....
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EPIGRAPHICAL COMMENTARY

It is impossible to determine the length of the lines here. Hiller, in his supplements, restored lines that range from 34-40 letters in length. This inconsistency is further evidence that we should abandon outright or use Hiller’s supplements with extreme caution.

DATE

Previous editors have dated this inscription to the first half of the 3rd century B.C. based both on the use of the stoichedon style and its letter-forms. An approximate date for this inscription can be determined based on the stoichedon style alone. All other inscriptions from the Asklepieion studied here and cut in the stoichedon style can be dated independently to some point in the second half of the 3rd century. This inscription, therefore, could reasonably be placed at any time within the 3rd century. Lacking reference to the Achaian League, or any dating formula within the text we cannot use either the date of Epidauros’ or Hermion’s entrance into the Achaian League to assist in the dating of the inscription.

HISTORICAL COMMENTARY

Since Hiller’s edition of this inscription, with the name of Epidauros restored in line 4, it has been interpreted as either an agreement or possibly an arbitration between these two cities. Hiller undoubtedly restored Epidauros as the other litigant because the stele was found in the Sanctuary of Asklepios at Epidauros. While this

---

1 Hiller, IG IV².1.74; Austin 1938, p. 67; Staatsverträge III. no. 559, p. 346; Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, p. 598.

4 See Staatsverträge III. no. 559, pp. 346-347, however, for warnings about Hiller’s restorations. Supported by Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, p. 598.
may be likely, it is by no means certain as we have at least one other stele (IG IV².1.76+77) preserved from the Asklepieion recording an arbitration between two cities other than Epidauros. Despite the absence of the Achaian League on the stone the dispute does not necessarily have to predate the entrance of these two cities into it. In fact, without the upper part of the stele it is impossible to know if the League was involved in the dispute's settlement. However, if the dispute does predate their entrances into the Achaian League then it represents our only epigraphical evidence for a settlement in the Argolic peninsula prior to the League's advent there.

Michael Jameson has proposed a possible solution for explaining the circumstances surrounding the dispute. His suggestion is that the text concerns Halieis, another city-state in the southern Argolid, which was abandoned in the early 3rd century. Jameson has proposed that the inscription records a division of Halieis' territory by Epidauros and Hermion. The explanation is an attractive solution to the problem as it reconciles the archaeological record with the letter-forms on the stone. Halieis was no longer inhabited: thus its territory was no longer controlled by the city. This would have left a large area of land, much of which was along the coast, wide open. As Epidauros and Hermion were Halieis' two contiguous neighbors it seems a highly plausible conjecture that the two would have liked to control the more prosperous lands within Halieis' territory. While this is a very likely solution to the problems concerning both the date and the circumstances surrounding the dispute we have no corroborating evidence to support it. thus it must remain just one possibility in explaining this dispute.

Adolph Wilhelm offered another interpretation of this inscription by theorizing a connection between it and IG IV².1.75. Wilhelm’s suggestion is that this agreement, which he dated within the early 3rd century B.C., possibly required a renewal that he believed was the impetus for the second settlement between Hermion and Epidauros.⁶ Like Jameson’s suggestion, however, Wilhelm’s too is only speculation, as it cannot be proven independently.

Historical circumstances in the Akte during the first quarter of the 3rd century B.C. may also allow us to propose another interpretation of this settlement. By 275 B.C. the Macedonian garrison at Troizen had left the town (Polyaenus 2.29.1; Frontinus 3.6-7) and this may be true of Epidauros as well.⁷ We have no evidence of a garrison at Hermion, but there is enough evidence to suggest that the power vacuum left by the Macedonian presence here may have been the impetus for any settlement in the Akte. Macedonian departure from the region taken with the nearly contemporaneous abandonment of Halieis may have compounded the situation first proposed in A Greek Countryside regarding its territory. This theory, as with the two others proposed, without any additional evidence must remain speculation.

CONCLUSIONS

The text is clearly too fragmentary to make any certain conclusions about the settlement recorded on it, but at least one point should be clear. The supplements that Hiller proposed in his edition of this stone do not conform to the observable stoichedon order preserved on the inscription and must be rejected. Nor is it certain

---

⁶ Wilhelm 1948, p. 71.

⁷ For the suggestion that Epidauros may have had a Macedonian garrison until this time, see Burford 1969, p. 31.
that Epidauros was the other disputant here, although it is the most logical candidate for restoration. With so many important issues still unresolved it is next to impossible to reach any conclusions concerning the settlement itself or the territory that was disputed.

*IG IV².1.75+ and SEG XI 377. Arbitration between Epidauros and Hermion.*

Two separate stelai record the result of this arbitration. one found in the Asklepieion at Epidauros and the other at Hermion. The Epidauros copy is preserved in seven non-joining fragments while the Hermion copy preserves almost completely the first twenty-seven lines of the decision. Since the discovery of the Hermion copy, the Epidauros copy has been restored fully based on it. A recent edition of this inscription has attempted to use underlining to indicate the restorations based on the Hermion copy. This has not always been done accurately and the use of underlining causes a great deal of confusion regarding the preserved state of the inscription. Presented below is a detailed edition of the Epidauros copy, with a discussion of each individual fragment and notes on readings. This is followed by a text of the Epidauros copy as it is preserved with lines 1-25 restored based on the Hermion copy. Following this is a new edition of the Hermion copy. Several new readings on the Epidaurian copy will be used in a discussion of prosopography and the date of the inscription, which I argue should now be placed between 175-172 B.C. Finally, the discussion of this dispute is concluded with a detailed Topographical Commentary. The topography

---

of this dispute has been well studied, especially in recent years. My commentary is based heavily on the work of my predecessors in this area, but is also the result of my personal observations.

**Epidauros Copy:**

Stele of hard, creamy gray-white limestone, preserved in seven non-joining fragments. Various fragments preserve the left and right edges and the bottom of the stele. Fragments a and f preserve the first line of the inscription and fragment e preserves the last line. Traces of guidelines are still visible on some fragments. The interlinear spacing on all fragments ranges between ca. 0.006-0.009 m. Since nearly the entire stele can be restored based on the duplicate copy from Hermion, we can also determine the approximate original dimensions of the Epidaurian stele. Its restored width is ca. 0.53 m. The restored height is more difficult to determine, since we do not know how many lines are lost between lines 28-29. As this number was probably not more than two, we can estimate the restored height to have been not less than ca. 0.82 m. A pedimental molding, like that on the Hermion copy, almost certainly capped the stele, thus, its height was slightly greater than the figure just proposed. The original thickness of the stele is 0.17 m, as preserved on Fragment e, the only fragment with its back intact.

**Epidauros Inv. Nos.:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fragment</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>471</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Fragments a-g are currently located in the Epigraphikon of the Epidauros Museum. The fragments are stored together in a wooden crate.
NOTES ON READINGS

Fragment a:

A small fragment, broken on all four sides. The back is not preserved to its original thickness. This fragment has nicely preserved guidelines. There is a trace of a molding above the first inscribed line (H 0.015 m), which may have been a similar to the one preserved on SEG XI 377, the Hermion copy. The molding is raised ca. 0.002 m above the inscribed surface.¹¹

Photo: Figure 4.11

H 0.151 m; W 0.15 m; Th 0.0.155 m; LH 0.012 m

¹⁰ For no apparent reason, Magnetto has changed the consistently used lettering of the fragments.

¹¹ Numbers in parentheses refer to the line numbers in the restored text.
Figure 4.2: IG IV^2.1.75+ Fragment a. Drawing

Line 1: Only the lower horizontal and a trace of the lower diagonal joining it of the sigma remain.

Line 2: The tip of the bottom horizontal is all that is preserved of the first epsilon.

Line 3: The first letter in this line is a kappa. Baunack, in the editio princeps of this fragment read an omicron before this letter, which was read later by both Fraenkel and Hiller. Since Hiller's edition in IG IV^2.1 this letter has disappeared. With the discovery of the Hermion copy it is certain that an omicron belongs here, so I have underlined it in my text below. Hiller read the second to last letter as a dotted rho. Peek read the same letter as an iota. Clearly all that survives of this letter is a vertical stroke. There is no room between this stroke and the following letter trace to finish out the rho read by Hiller. The bottom left corner of the final letter preserves a diagonal stroke with a horizontal stroke joining it. Hiller read this letter as a dotted alpha and Peek read it as a delta. The traces clearly show that this letter can only be a delta.

Line 4: As with the omicron in line 3, Baunack, Fraenkel and Hiller all read an alpha at the left edge of this line before the iota. No trace of this letter still remains on the stone, therefore this letter is also underlined in the text below.

Line 5: The tip of a vertical stroke survives at the break on the right.

Line 7: Only the horizontal stroke of the first tau survives. Part of the vertical and the top part of the curving stroke of the rho are preserved. Only a small trace of the apex of the alpha remains.

Fragment b:

This fragment preserves the left edge only, which is lightly picked. It is broken on the top, right, and bottom; the back of the stele is not preserved to its original thickness. There is an uninscribed margin along the left side of 0.011 m.
Photo: Figure 4.12

H 0.18 m; W 0.106 m; Th 0.124 m; LH 0.012 m

1 (19) ΩΕ
2 (20) ΕΠΙΙ
3 (21) ΚΛΗΜΑ
4 (22) ΓΝΠΡΟΣ
   vacat (0.018 m)
5 (23) ΚΑΤΑΣΔΕ
6 (24) ΠΑΡΕΚΑΤΕ
7 (25) ΔΙΟΠΕΙΘΗ
8 (26) ΚΑΡΠΙΝΝ
9 (27) ΣΥΣΙΓΓ
10 (28) ΑΝΘΕ

Figure 4.3: IG IV 1.75+ Fragment b. Drawing

Line 1: The bottom trace of an arc is visible at the left break: the lower half of the vertical and the lower horizontal of the epsilon are preserved at the right break. Hiller read this letter as a theta, but it could also be an omicron. The bottom horizontal and the bottom half of the vertical of the epsilon are preserved. Hiller also read another line above this one consisting of one letter, Π. As only the lower half of my line 1 is visible I do not know how Hiller was able to read another line above these traces unless part of the stone has broken away since he examined it.

Line 2: The left vertical is all that survives of the final letter.

Line 4: Only the lower horizontal and diagonal of the sigma are preserved.

Line 7: The final letter of the line was read by Fraenkel, et al. as an epsilon, but it must be an eta. The left vertical and a central horizontal remain. No traces of an upper or lower horizontal are visible. For the name Διοπειθης and those in lines 8 and 9, see more below “Prosopography and the Date of the Inscription.”

Line 8: Hiller read an ο after the nu. No trace of this letter is visible.

Line 9: At the break on the right, only the upper left angle of the horizontal and vertical strokes survive of the final letter which must be read as a dotted epsilon. The gamma before this trace has been read by all since Fraenkel as a pi, but the traces on the stone do not bear out this reading; it is undoubtedly a gamma. Therefore, the name Sosippos can no longer be maintained and the name is undoubtedly Sosigenes.

Fragment c:
Small fragment broken on all four sides and the back is not preserved to its maximum thickness.

Photo: Figure 4.13

H 0.14 m; W 0.217 m; Th 0.161 m; LH 0.012 m

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>1 (9)</th>
<th>2 (10)</th>
<th>3 (11)</th>
<th>4 (12)</th>
<th>5 (13)</th>
<th>6 (14)</th>
<th>7 (15)</th>
<th>8 (16)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ΣΔΙΑΜΙ</td>
<td>ΓΕΝΟΜΕΝΗΝΠΕ</td>
<td>ΣΥΝΑΛΥΣΕΙΠΕΡΙΗΠΡ.</td>
<td>ΟΝΕΝΤΗΝΠΟΛΙΝΤΥ</td>
<td>ΚΑΙΑΓΡΙΟΥΣΛΙΜΕΝ</td>
<td>ΙΝΝΗΝΠΙΟΝΕ</td>
<td>ΟΥΣΟΡΟΥ</td>
<td>ΙΛΛ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.4: IG IV².1.75+ Fragment c. Drawing

Line 1: Only the bottom half of a vertical stroke survives after the mu. Hiller read this letter as a Φ, but it could also be an iota, therefore I have dotted the letter in my text.

Line 2: After the final epsilon only the bottom of a vertical stroke is preserved.

Line 3: Only the top of a curving stroke survives after the final rho at the break on the right.

Line 5: The right diagonal stroke of the first alpha is preserved.

Line 6: Hiller read the first letter as an omicron. I can only make out the upper right trace of an arc. The final epsilon consists only of the upper half of the vertical and the upper horizontal.

Line 8: Only the top of a vertical stroke followed by two apices are legible.

Fragment d:

Small fragment broken on all four sides. The back is almost entirely broken away. There is an uninscribed space ca. 0.069 m below line 9 (45).

Photo: Figure 4.14
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H 0.225 m; W 0.12 m; Th 0.08 m; LH 0.012 m

1 (37) NT
2 (38) ΠΙΑΣΔ
3 (39) ΙΑΠΟΤΑ
4 (40) ΕΠΑΝΕΨ
5 (41) ΤΑΠΟΤΙΝ
6 (42) ΥΘΕΙΤΑΙΣΓ
7 (43) ΝΟΜΑΝΤΑ
8 (44) ΑΛΛΑΛΛΝΙ
9 (45) ΑΙΓΙΝΝΠΟΙ
vacat (ca. 0.069 m)

Figure 4.5: IG IV¹.1.75+ Fragment d. Drawing

Line 2: The bottom of two vertical strokes are visible before the alpha.

Line 3: The bottom of a vertical stroke is legible before the alpha. Following this trace is a left diagonal stroke and a trace of the crossbar of an alpha.

Line 4: The right tips of the two lower horizontals only are legible of the epsilon.

Line 5: The bottom of a vertical stroke and the right side of a horizontal stroke of what can only be a tau are visible before the alpha.

Line 6: The left vertical and part of the horizontal of the pi are legible at the break on the right.

Line 8: The right diagonal and part of the crossbar of the first alpha are preserved. A vertical stroke and a trace of a diagonal stroke, both consistent with a mu, are legible after the nu. Hiller read this letter as K.

Line 9: The right diagonal and a trace of the crossbar of the alpha are legible. After the omicron the tip of an upper horizontal stroke is preserved.

Fragment e:

Left and bottom edges are preserved, broken on the top and right. The back of the stele is preserved to its maximum thickness. The left edge is lightly picked just as Fragment b. The left side of a tenon is also preserved at the bottom of the fragment. The inscribed face is smoothly polished, but the tenon is lightly picked. There is an
uninscribed space, ca. 0.085 m, below line 12 (46) to the bottom of the stele and an uninscribed space of ca. 0.153 m from the bottom of line 11 (45) (right side) to the bottom of the tenon, which is preserved to a width of ca. 0.12 m. The fragment was found in 1900.

Photo: Figure 4.15

H 0.33 m; W 0.304 m; Th 0.17 m; LH 0.012 m

Figure 4.6: IG IV*.1.75+ Fragment e. Drawing

Line 1: The first preserved letter traces are the lower halves of two vertical strokes. After these strokes a lower horizontal and the lower vertical of what must be an epsilon is legible. After a lacuna of ca. 5 letter spaces the bottom right angle of a vertical and diagonal stroke of what can only be nu are preserved. This is followed by a lacuna of one letter space, after which is the lower half of a vertical stroke. In the next letter space is preserved the lower horizontal and the lower diagonal of a sigma. The right half of a lower horizontal joined with the lower half of a vertical stroke follow this.

Line 2: The first visible letter trace consists of the bottom of a right diagonal stroke. After this trace the lower half of a vertical is preserved. Hiller read ΛΙΣ before the diagonal stroke. These traces are not visible.

Line 3: Only a small trace of the lower horizontal of the initial sigma is preserved as well as the lower half of the epsilon following it. A small trace of the bottom left of the final sigma is still legible.

Line 4: Only the bottom of a vertical stroke is preserved at the break on the right. The context, however, makes a nu inevitable, thus I have not dotted this letter.

Line 6: A vertical stroke is preserved along the break at the right after the final nu.
Line 8: Hiller unnecessarily dotted the nu in the center of this line, it is clearly legible. Hiller read the final letter as a dotted pi. An upper horizontal stroke and the upper half of the left hand vertical are clearly visible after the final epsilon.

Line 9: The left part of the horizontal and the upper part of the vertical stroke of the final tau are legible before the break on the right.

Line 12: The cutter left one letter space uninscribed between theomicron and tau of πρότερον. There is no apparent explanation for this vacat.

Fragment f:

Small fragment preserving only the right edge, which is also lightly picked. The left, top, and bottom are all broken. The back of the stele is not preserved to its original thickness. On the right side of the fragment, at the top, a small trace of the molding, which is 0.02 m in height and 0.055 wide is preserved. It is raised above the surface ca. 0.002 m. As with Fragment a, the traces of the molding here seem to confirm that it was identical to the one on the Hermion copy.

Photo: Figure 4.16

H 0.242 m; W 0.154 m; Th 0.15 m; LH 0.012 m

1 (1) TAI
2 (2) ΠΟΣ
3 (3) ΜΑΙΑΝΔΡΙΟΥ
4 (4) ΟΣΝΑΝΘΙΑΔΗΣ
5 (5) ΤΥΝΕΖΑΠΙΟΥ
6 (6) ΝΟΣΤΟΥ νννν
7 (7) ΑΤΟΥΣνΕΓΔΕ ννν
8 (8) ΤΙΜΑΙΝΕΤΟΥΤΟΥ
9 (9) ΙΕΝΟΥΣΤΟΠΟΥΣν
10 (10) ΣΙΝΥΦΕΚΑΤΕΡΝ
11 (11) ΕΣΑΤΟΧΥΡΑΣν
12 (12) ΝΤΗΣΤΕν
13 (13) ΥΝΤΟΣ

Figure 4.7: IG IV^{2}.1.75+ Fragment f, Drawing

Line 3: Only the a small trace of the lower horizontal of the sigma survives.
Line 6: The bottom right diagonal of the first letter is preserved.

Line 7: Only the right side of the alpha is preserved.

Line 8: Traces of the tops of the two diagonal strokes of the second upsilon are preserved at the break on the right.

Line 9: Only the right vertical of the mu is still legible.

Line 11: A trace of the upper horizontal of the epsilon is preserved; Peek did not read this letter in his edition of this fragment.

Line 12: Peek read an omega before the first nu. I cannot see any trace of this letter. The right vertical of the nu is preserved as is part of the diagonal along the break on the left.

Line 13: Only the upper half of the upsilon and the nu are preserved. Part of the upper horizontal of the sigma is also legible.

Fragment g:

The stone is broken on all four sides and the back is not preserved. The fragment was found ca. 25 m north-east of the Palaestra in a dump of the old excavations. Ager, in her recent edition of this text, did not include this fragment within it, but included it in her *apparatus criticus*. I have examined the fragment in the Apotheke and it certainly belongs to our stele.

Photo: Figure 4.17

H 0.05 m; W 0.1 m; Th 0.055 m; LH 0.012 m

\[
\begin{align*}
1 (29) & \text{ IAI}/ \\
2 (30) & \text{ VNĐIKAΣT} \\
3 (31) & \text{ OY,MENE}
\end{align*}
\]

Figure 4.8: *IG IV*.1.75+ Fragment g, Drawing

Line 1: Mitsos did not dot the rho here, but only the lower half of the vertical is visible, thus it should be dotted.
Only the right side of an upper horizontal is preserved before the omicron. This letter which must be a tau, should be dotted.
APPARATUS CRITICUS


EPGRAPHICAL COMMENTARY

As indicated above nearly the entire Epidaurian stele can be restored confidently based on the more complete Hermion copy first published by Werner Peek in 1934. The only lacuna that remains in the text is between lines 28-29 where the names of the Rhodian dikasts were recorded. Since the publication of the Hermion copy, one additional fragment (Frag. g) has been found that should be placed within this lacuna, which Markellos Mitsos, the editor of the fragment, argued that it should be placed above Fragment e. line 35. No effort has been made by any editor, including Mitsos, to determine the number of missing lines between Fragments b and g. In the text above, the lacuna is indicated as ca. 2 lines, but there is no way to determine this precisely. In fact, the four letters in line 28 could possibly be placed in the vacat on the left of line 29. This would make ´Ανθε[-] a patronymic and the last Rhodian name on the stele. The discovery of Fragment g raises several questions as it provides us with only the second textual difference between the Milesian and Rhodian decisions. Line 6 preserves the word [ἀνδρ]ῶν while in the corresponding position of the Rhodian decision, Fragment g clearly preserved the word.

12 Magnetto (1997, no. 69 II. pp. 407-409), the only editor to include this fragment in a complete text, does not indicate the lacuna.
The other distinct difference between the two decisions is the terminology used for the Milesians and Rhodians. In line 1, the Milesians are clearly referred to as δικασταί. Neither the Epidaurian nor the Hermion copy preserves fully the first line of the Rhodian decision, and no editor has not supplemented the word δικασταί here. The Rhodians were certainly judges as were the Milesians, therefore the term should possibly be supplemented in line 23 of the Epidaurian copy and line 24 of the Hermion copy.

The only other line that deserves some attention is 28, where only four letters of a name are preserved. The letters have been interpreted both as the end of a name and as the initial letters of one. Considering that lines 25-27 all preserved the beginnings of names, it seems that the cutter made a conscious effort to start each line with a name. Therefore, Wilhelm's suggestion that the name in line 28 should be taken as something beginning in Ἀνθ[-], seems the most reasonable way to construe the line. Many restorations for this name are possible, but no Rhodian names in Ἀνθ[-] are attested from the first half of the 2nd century B.C. Each line of the stele contains approximately forty-six letter spaces, which is the basis for the estimated number of missing letters per line.

**Hermion Copy:**

The stone was found on the property of the Papabasileios family in Hermion. Michael Jameson, however, argued that the stone may have been found by Alexandros

---

13 Compare also lines 3-5, 7 and 9 which all start with the beginning of a name. No line on the stone starts with a broken name. This is also true on the Hermion copy.

14 Peek 1934, no. 9, p. 47.
Philadelpheus in his 1908 excavations on the Bisti, or the promontory on which the remains of ancient Hermion are located.\textsuperscript{15} The stone is now located in the apotheke of the Halieis excavations in Porto Cheli.\textsuperscript{16}

A stele of hard, creamy, gray-white limestone that is probably the same stone as used for the Epidauros copy. The stone was originally capped with a pedimental molding, the apex of which is now broken. The preserved traces appear to confirm that the Epidaurian stele had an identical molding atop it. Its right and left sides, which are lightly picked, are intact, but it is broken on the bottom. The back is preserved to its maximum thickness and is roughly picked. There is significant damage on parts of the inscribed face, making readings difficult in some places (especially lines 6 and 7). At some time between 1996 (when the stone was moved from Hermion to Porto Cheli) and June 1998 the stone itself was broken into three pieces. A small piece from the upper left corner is broken away; the main break runs diagonally from the upper left to the bottom of the stone. The text below is based on my examination of the stone in April 1999 and a squeeze made before it was broken that was kindly supplied to me by Michael Jameson.

\textit{ed. pr.}: W. Peek 1934, no. 9, pp. 48-52 (\textit{SEG} XI 377).

Photo: Figure 4.19

H ca. 0.66 m; W ca. 0.59 m; Th 0.13 m; LH 0.007-0.011 m
Interlinear Spacing: ca. 0.005 m

\textsuperscript{15} Jameson 1953, no. 15, p. 160 with the references to Philadelpheus' reports.

\textsuperscript{16} Piteros 1996, p. 107 (\textit{SEG} XLIV 328).
NOTES ON READINGS

Line 2: Peek did not read the tau of ἐκατέρων, but both the horizontal and the vertical are clearly legible.

Line 6: I can no longer make out any letter traces after the τῶν at the right of the line.

Line 10: No traces remain visible of the last seven letters read by Peek at the right of the line.

Line 11: Again, damage to the inscribed surface at the right make any reading of the last eight letters read by Peek unrecoverable.

Line 25: An upper left horizontal and part of an upper right curving stroke are preserved of the last letter, i.e., beta or rho.

Line 27: Peek read the traces of five letters here, but I cannot make out any.
TEXT

175-172 B.C. non-Στοίχ.

[kai] tà tâde épêkrivn kan kai svndlùsan ois Mileiôi dika-
[oi] tai laðôntes par' ékatèrôn tîn épi'tîpîn
Zênippos 'Gongylîs ' Povôkôphìs ' Povôstîdïa]

4 Dêmîtrios 'Maiandriôu 'Dêmîtrios 'Istaiôu
'Heîlôchoi 'Thêmîstôkklèôs ' Anôïôdôs 'Sîmôu
paralòdèntes ek Klîtôrâs upô tûn [èxasostalèn]-
tôn anôdron, êg mèn 'Ermîônôs ' [Fîlîonôs] tûn

8 Kallîstîrôu 'Menekràtôu ' tûn Menekràtouk ' êg dê
Èpîdaûróu Dâm[i]kklèôs ' tûn Kallîmênéos ' [T]mâiûnu tû
Kallîkôntos ' kai êpi tûs diaûmôsîbthoudêmous tû-
tûs épêlôntes, káta tûn gênomènên periû[ghi]n uò 'ê]
káteârôn épêkriñan evn êpi svndîse peri hê proekalèç[a]-
tû chôra ò plôs tûn 'Ermîmênoù tûn plîn tûn 'Èpîdâur<î>-
on tê te kátâ Sêllânta kai 'Agrîôu [Lîmênas] âxhî tû
Sîrrouùntos' evnai taûtûn koiýn Òrmîmênoù kai Òepîdâurîm-
uôn tês [liûmìas] káta tûs òrôn, ois evin boleôi líthoi keîmê-
noi apò tûs kalouvêmêns Filanôrîas kai káta âkra òs òkolô-
uous ès tû Sîrrouùntos kai enûmôrìkan èsîs ès thalâsan,
tûs próû tônòn ùs õdâta katarê. Êi dê tîn epiûmìa eî[pi]akol[ou]-
thèi taûs plûsaîn, ûrðhâi taûta. Peri dê tûs karplêi kai tûs
épîmûnoû tûs pró tûs kriûsei mhê evnai mhêdêtôrâs ègklê-
muû mhêhn. Tô dê gêgônûs próûtêroû krima peri tûn aîgôn pró-
ûs tûs telônas kûròun èstw. vacat
vacat (0.03 m)

24 Katà tâde épêkrivn ois 'Rôdoi kai su[vôlûsan laðôntes]
pâ' ékatèrôn tûn êpi[trôpâv] Oîb[-]-------------------[-]
Tîmôsîkrâtou 'Ôô[-----------------------]
[-----------------------] traces? [-----------------------]

APPARATUS CRITICUS


TRANSLATION OF COMBINED FRAGMENTS

The following is the decision and settlement of the Milesian judges who received the
commission from both sides. The judges were Zenippos son of Gongylös, Phanokles
son of Polystides, (4) Demetrios son of Maiandrios, Demetrios son of Histiaios,
Hegelochos son of Themistokles, Anthiades son of Simos.
We were conducted from Kleitor by the men sent - from Hermion. Philon (8) son of
Kallistratos, Menekrates son of Menekrates; from Epidaurus Damokles son of
Kallimenes, Timainetos son of Kallikon - and we proceeded to the disputed places. On
the basis of this inspection, on which we were conducted by (12) both sides, we made
our decision for the solution [of the dispute] concerning the territory over which the
city of Hermion lodged a complaint against the city of Epidaurus: [this territory is] in

17 The translation is based on Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, pp. 596-597 with some minor
alterations. The line numbers are from the Hermion copy (SEG XI 377).
the area of the Sellas [a stream] and the Agrioi Limenes ["Wild Harbors"] up to the Strouthous. This is to be common territory for the Hermionians and the Epidaurians. (16) It is in the Didymia and is defined by the following boundaries: the boleoi set up on the border of the Philanoreia, as it is called, and along the dock-tailed heights straight down to the sea - the south side of the watershed. Any fine pending against (20) the cities is to be canceled. No claim is to be made concerning cropping or pasturage [which occurred] before this decision. The previous decision concerning the payment of fees to tax collectors for the pasturage of goats is to remain in force.

(24) The following is the decision and settlement of the Rhodians who received the commission from both sides. Oib[-], Diopeithe[s - ], son of Timasikrates. Thr[- -], Karpon [- -], Sosigenes[- -], Anthe[- -].

We were conducted from Kleitor by the men sent - from Hermion Philon son of Kallistratos, Menekrates son of Menekrates...

we made our decision for the solution [of the dispute] concerning the territory over which the city of Hermion lodged a complaint against the city of Epidauros...

SIMILARITIES BETWEEN THE TWO STELAI

As noted above it seems that the two stelai were both cut on the same stone and they were both capped with identical pedimental moldings. Additionally, Werner Peek proposed that both stones were inscribed by the same cutter.18 If true, this is a significant observation, for all these similarities would imply that the two copies were cut at the same place, time and by the same individual. Where this was done, and the source for the stone remain unknown. My own personal observations concerning the lettering of the two stelai favor Peek’s theory.

PROSOPOGRAPHY AND THE DATE OF THE INSCRIPTION

These two inscriptions are unique among those studied here in that no dating formula was used within either text. Without such means we are forced to rely on the criteria of prosopography and letter-forms to determine a date for this dispute. Previous commentators have placed the dispute from as early as the late 3rd century to as late as the first half of the 2nd century B.C. based both on prosopographical

18 Peek 1934, p. 48. See also Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel (1994, p. 597) who seem to support Peek.
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considerations and the letter-forms. The only attempt to date the inscriptions more accurately within the first half of the 2nd century B.C. was made by Michael Jameson, who suggests that the dispute may have occurred shortly after 195 B.C. when the cities of the Akte returned to the Achaian League following the disturbances caused there by the Spartan king Nabis.

The date of the dispute depends on the new readings I have made in lines 25 and 27 of the Epidauros copy, where we have preserved the names of two Rhodian judges restored in the genitive case and understood as patronymics since M. Fraenkel's edition in IG IV. I have demonstrated above, in the "Notes on Readings" of Fragment b (IG IV\textsuperscript{2}.1.75+), that the surviving traces on the stone do not support Fraenkel's readings. The names in lines 25 and 27, at least, should be restored in the nominative case and are in fact the names of the judges themselves. Furthermore, these readings show clearly that Hiller's reading of the name in line 27 Sosippos (Σωσίππος) cannot be correct; the name must be Sosigenes (Σωσίγενης). It cannot be determined if the name Karpon (Κάρπων), preserved in line 26, should be taken as a nominative or genitive since the nu is the last letter at the break on the right, thus the patronymic is still a possibility, although an unlikely one. The name Κάρπων itself is attested from Rhodes in both the 3rd and 2nd centuries B.C.

\footnote{Fraenkel (IG IV 927), the first editor to propose a date, placed the inscription in "saeculo a. Chr. n. altero," Hiller, IG IV\textsuperscript{2}.1.75; Wilhelm 1948, pp. 69-70; Jameson 1953, p. 160; Moretti 1967, no. 43, pp. 100-105; Daverio Rocchi 1988, p. 159; Uibopuu 1995, p. 63 all argue for a date in the first half of the 2nd century B.C. Mitsos (1981, p. 215 note 2) proposed a date in the late 3rd century B.C., which is generally supported by Ager (1991, p. 22) who presents a case for placing the dispute in the year 201/0 B.C. See also Ager 1996, no. 63, pp. 170-173. Magnetto (1997, no. 69, p. 409) argues for a late 3rd-early 2nd century B.C. date. Suto (1995-1996, p. 4) merely reviews the arguments of others and does not take a side in the discussion.}

\footnote{Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, pp. 598.}

\footnote{LGPN I. s.v. Κάρπων, nos. 4 and 5, p. 252.}
Considering these new readings we must look carefully at the names Diopeithes and Sosigenes (lines 25 and 27) and a controversial passage from Polybios’ *Histories* concerning the Achaian League’s removal of honors decreed upon King Eumenes II of Pergamon. In the year 170/69 B.C. the League assembly debated whether or not to restore the king’s honors that they had overturned some years earlier. The historian Polybios himself, who was League hipparch at the time, played an active role in this debate and we must believe that his account of these events is highly accurate. In his speech before the assembly, Polybios explained how the honors had been overturned by two men whom the League chose to rule on the issue. The historian writes:

τοὺς δὲ περὶ Ὀσιγένη καὶ Διοπείθη, δικαστὰς Ἄρδιους ὑπάρχοντας κατ’ ἐκείνον τὸν καυρόν καὶ διαφερομένους ἐκ τινῶν ἰδιῶν πρὸς τὸν Εὔμενη.... (Polybios 28.7.9).

Sosigenes and Diopeithes and their followers, Rhodian judges, at that time and being at odds with Eumenes for private reasons....

That two Rhodian judges by the names Sosigenes and Diopeithes, who were at an Achaian assembly, also appear in a list of Rhodian judges who took part in the arbitration dispute cannot be merely coincidental. These two must be the same men who served as judges on the arbitration board that settled the dispute between Hermion and Epidauros.

---

22 See also the discussions of this passage in Larsen 1968, p. 236 and Ager 1996, no. 119, pp. 319-320. For Diopeithes, see *LGPN* I, s.v. Διοπείθης, no. 17, p. 139. The Diopeithes mentioned in the Polybian passage is not included in *LGPN* I. For Sosigenes, see *LGPN* I, s.v. Σωσίγενης, no. 24, p. 421 with reference to the Polybian account. Compare also, *LGPN* I, s.v. Σωσίγενης, no. 28 and *LGPN* I, s.v. Κάρπος, no. 4, who are dated to 175-150 B.C. and 2nd century B.C. respectively. Both are attested on stamped Rhodian amphora handles and references are given to Agora Inventory numbers for both men. The numbers actually refer to those in the catalogue compiled by Virginia Grace which is located in the Stoa of Attalos. I would like to thank Mark Lawall for helping me find these references in the Stoa.
The exact date when these two Rhodians were invited by the Achaian assembly to rule on the honors that the League bestowed on king Eumenes is not known, but it cannot have been later than 172 and most likely not earlier than 175 B.C. The *terminus ante quem* is supplied by Livy (42.12.7), who, while describing the events of 172 B.C., made reference to the Achaian withdrawal of honors for Eumenes.\(^{24}\) The *terminus post quem* is more difficult to establish, but it cannot have been many years earlier than 172, and a date after 175 B.C. is commonly accepted.\(^{25}\)

The controversy surrounding the Polybian passage is centered on the historian’s statement that the two men were Rhodians.\(^{26}\) Those who omit the word Rhodians from the text have argued that the Achaian League would not use Rhodian judges for such a decision. Clearly, the Epidaurian inscription shows that the Polybian passage should stand as it is and the reading can no longer be questioned. With the date of the dispute established it will also be useful to review the additional prosopographical evidence that has been used to date the inscription variously between the late 3rd century and the middle of the 2nd century B.C.

The name and patronymic of one of the Epidaurians, Damokles the son of Kallimenos (*IG IV*.1.75+, line 8; *SEG XI* 377, line 9), also appears on *IG IV*.1.28 line

---

\(^{24}\) *At hercule suos honores, cuius merita in eam gentem privatim an publice sint maiora vix dici possit, partim desertos per incultum ac neglentiam, partim hostiliter sublatos esse.* (But, by Hercules, his honors of whose deeds for that people, whether the private or the public were greater, it is scarcely possible to say, they were partly abandoned through disuse and neglect, and partly annull ed in hostility).


\(^{26}\) For the most convincing argument in support of retaining the word ‘Poôiouç, see Holleaux 1938, pp. 441-443. See also the comments of Walbank (1979, pp. 335-336) who supports its retention in the text. The word itself is not printed in the Loeb Classical Library (*Polybius, The Histories*, vol. VI), but “Rhodians” is bracketed in the translation. The Teubner edition (*Polybius: Historiae*, vol. IV) also has <<Poôiouç>> in brackets.
56. an inscribed casualty list from the battle at the Isthmos in 146 B.C.\textsuperscript{27} Werner Peek first noticed this and it has since become the central issue concerning the date of the dispute.\textsuperscript{28} Markellos Mitsos, who dated the dispute to the late 3rd century B.C., discussed the problems involved in associating Damokles with the Epidaurian known from the casualty list, arguing that he would have been too young to take part in the arbitration if he was still of military age in 146 B.C.\textsuperscript{29} This argument would be a plausible one if the circumstances were normal, but we know that they were not. Polybios (38.15.5-7) records that the Achaian strategos Diaeos freed twelve thousand slaves and armed all citizens capable of fighting and ordered them to gather at Corinth for the imminent encounter with the Romans.\textsuperscript{30} Mitsos cited this passage concerning the arming of slaves, but he overlooked the reference to arming all citizens capable of fighting. As one of the Epidaurians responsible for guiding the judges between 175-172 B.C., Damokles undoubtedly would not have been too old to fight at the Isthmos in 146 B.C., even under normal circumstances. He, therefore, should certainly be identified as the Epidaurian who fell in the Achaian League's final encounter with Rome.

Peek also noted that another name preserved on the Epidaurian casualty list, Philokles son of Timainetos (\textit{IG IV}\textsuperscript{2}.1.28, line 43), may be identified as the son of Timainetos son of Kallikon (\textit{IG IV}\textsuperscript{2}.1.75+, lines 8-9, \textit{SEG} XI 377, lines 9-10).\textsuperscript{31} This

\begin{footnotes}
\item[27] \textit{LGPN} III.A, s.v. Δαμοκλῆς, no. 23, p. 111. The editors identify the Damokles of both the arbitration and the casualty list as the same individual.
\item[28] Peek 1934, p. 49.
\item[30] On this passage, see the comments of Fuks 1970, pp. 78-89.
\item[31] Peek 1934, p. 49; Wilhelm 1948, p. 66; Uibopuu 1995, p. 63.
\end{footnotes}
suggestion cannot be ruled out and must remain a possibility. Michael Jameson has also proposed that this Timainetos son of Kallikon (SEG XI 377, line 9) should be identified as a possible descendant of another Timainetos who appears as the dedicant of an altar to the Anakes or Dioskouroi. As he notes, this Timainetos dedicated "a tithe of the goats" which may indicate that he was a shepherd. Since this countryside was certainly used heavily for pasturage, one of Timainetos' descendants who may also have been a shepherd would have been a logical selection for the Epidaurians to serve as a guide for the arbiters through the disputed territory.

The name of one of the Milesian judges, Phainokles son of Polystides (Φαίνωκλῆς Πολυστίδα. IG IV².1.75+, line 3; SEG XI 377, line 3), is known from a Milesian inscription that was dated originally to the 2nd century B.C. Christian Habicht, however, has shown recently that it should be dated more accurately between the years 190-180 B.C. If we can identify this Phainokles with the man from our inscription then his presence on an arbitration board between 175-172 B.C. is very likely. Further prosopographical evidence to defend this proposed date can be gained from another Milesian inscription. The name Zenippos son of Gongylos (Ζηνίππος Γονγύλου. IG IV².1.75+, lines 2-3; SEG XI 377, line 3), is preserved on a Milesian inscription that is dated by its letter forms to the second half of the 2nd century B.C. In a recent discussion of this inscription it has been argued that he

---

12 Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, p. 604. The inscription, SEG XXVI 451, was found in Old Epidaurus near the ancient theater and is dated by the ed. pr. to ca. 350 B.C. The Timainetos of this dedication may probably be the same man who is attested on another dedicatory inscription found near the theater at Old Epidaurus that is dated to the 4th century B.C. (IG IV².1.2).

13 First noted by Peek 1934, p. 49. The Milesian inscription is Milet. i. iii, no. 151, line 14.

14 Habicht 1991, p. 328 (SEG XLI 58) and Milet VI. i. p. 189. See also, Magnetto 1997, p. 413 note 2.
should be identified with the Zenippos of our inscription. Another Rhodian, Timasikrates, which appears as a patronymic on our stone (SEG XI 377, line 26), may also be identified with a Timasikrates mentioned by Livy (37.14.3) in his account of the year 190 B.C. The date I have proposed based on the new readings of lines 25 and 27 of the Epidauros copy and Polybios 28.7.9 certainly accords well with the other prosopographical evidence within the inscription.

THE SETTLEMENT OF THE DISPUTE

Since the Achaian League is not explicitly mentioned in the inscription, we are left to wonder whether or not it was involved in the settlement at all. Both Epidauros and Hermion were certainly Achaian League members when the decision was made. The fact that Milesian and Rhodian judges were used in the settlement, however, marks a difference from the earlier disputes between Epidauros-Arsinoë and Corinth-Epidauros, in which the League played an active role in the settlement of disputes and was responsible for the selection of the arbitration board.

With the inscription now dated securely, it is possible to make a conjecture concerning the Achaian League's direct involvement in this settlement. Sosigenes and Diopeithes, the two Rhodian judges who were involved in the Achaian decision to

---

15 The inscription is Milet I, ii, no. 13, line 12. For his possible identification with the member of the arbitration board, see Milet VI, i, no. 13, pp. 158-159.

16 Compare also, IG V.2.344 = Staatsverträge III, no. 499, pp. 190-193 from Orchomenos, where the League seems to have made possible the conditions for a future arbitration between Orchomenos and Megalopolis. Another inscription from Nemea, SEG XXIII 178, may record an arbitration between Argos and Kleonai shortly after Argos became a League member in 229 B.C. Unfortunately the stone is broken away at the top and we cannot be sure if the Achaian League was involved in this decision or not. For a full commentary on this inscription, see Bradeen 1966, no. 6, pp. 323-326. Interestingly, the differences between Argos and Kleonai remained an issue after the dissolution of the Achaian League for in 145 B.C. the they called on L. Mummius to settle a dispute between them, see Bradeen 1966, no. 7, pp. 326-329 (=SEG XXIII 180).
overturn the honors to King Eumenes, may hold the key to our understanding of this question. Only two possibilities exist concerning the sequence of events for the two cases in which they served as judges: either they were present for the decision concerning Eumenes and then were asked to sit on the arbitration board, or they were asked to decide on Eumenes' honors after serving as judges in the dispute between Hermion and Epidauros. There is no way of knowing which of these two events happened first. We do not know where the League assembly met when the Rhodians overturned Eumenes' honors, but since the judges in the dispute were conducted to the disputed territory from Kleitor it cannot be ruled out that this is where it was held. We are, in fact, fortunate to have evidence for at least one meeting of the League assembly held at Kleitor in 185/4 B.C., thus it is not unreasonable to assume that the Milesians and Rhodians were at the assembly prior to judging the border dispute.\(^7\) Other than this conjecture, we have no evidence to determine the sequence of these events.

The dispute calls to mind another settlement, but not an arbitration dispute, between two other League members, Aigeira and Stymphalos. This settlement is preserved on an inscription found in Kionia, near Stymphalos.\(^8\) J.A.O. Larsen has argued convincingly that this settlement is evidence that cities within the Achaian League possessed a certain degree of freedom to negotiate disputes with one another and between their citizens.\(^9\) If Larsen's theory concerning the agreement between

---

\(^7\) For the meeting at Kleitor in 185/4 B.C., see Polybios 22.2.1 and Livy 39.35.5-37.21.

\(^8\) *IG V.2.357 = Staatsverträge* III. no. 567. pp. 359-371. The stone is now in the Epigraphical Museum at Athens.

\(^9\) Larsen 1971. pp. 81-84. See also the comments of Ager 1996, no. 63. pp. 172-173. *IG VII 188* also is of interest here as it contains the result of an arbitration between and Achaian city, Pagai and a Boiotian city, Aigosthena. The Achaian League appears to have been involved in some capacity of the dispute's settlement, which is dated to *ca.* 192 B.C. The Achaian League, however, does not appear to have played
Aigeira and Stymphalos is correct, then this arbitration over the boundary between Hermion and Epidauros may also provide additional evidence to support it. All we know about the selection of the arbiters is that they were guided by citizens of Hermion and Epidauros from Kleitor (SEG XI 377, line 7), where they may have been involved in a meeting of the League assembly or conducting another investigation. The two states possibly agreed to call in arbitrators without consulting the Achaian court as Epidauros and Corinth had done. The disputes, of which we have a record, and that were conducted in the early phases of the League’s expansion all seem to have taken place under the auspices of the League itself and shortly after the cities joined it. We may, then, theorize either a change in policy, sometime in the late 3rd or early 2nd century B.C. that allowed members to conduct this business on their own, or that the League only involved itself in the affairs of its members upon their admission to the League.

Explanation is also required when we consider the number of judges involved in the dispute’s settlement. There is no doubt concerning the number of Milesian judges who were members of the arbitration board. The complete Hermion copy preserves a total of six names, all with their patronymics. This number raises interesting questions when we turn to the Rhodian judges, where we have no less than seven names preserved; the lacunae in lines 24-28 and the missing lines between 28 and 29 would certainly add several more names.

There has been considerable discussion concerning the nature of the arbitration board itself, and how the Milesians and Rhodians worked together, if indeed they did

an active role in a number of other disputes between its members. In a few cases the stones on which the decisions are preserved are too fragmentary to say this is indisputable, but it is worth noting that in all examples the disputes were conducted well after the cities had joined the League. See IRO no. 46 (Ager 1996, no. 116); Ager 1996, no. 145.
at all. It has been noted previously that if the two boards comprised a single commission, then it is strange to see the decision recorded twice almost verbatim. Others have suggested that the two groups may have served as a check on one another or that one served as an appeal board. Further complicating the matter of its composition is the total number of judges. We should expect an odd number, but six Milesian judges is an even number and we are without the Rhodian total, which must have been several more than seven. How did this disparity in the size of each group affect the overall settlement of the dispute? Any argument assessing the relationship between these two boards must address this question, which has never been adequately answered. Little, unfortunately, can be said by way of analogy with other disputes. The meticulous detail, however, recorded on the stone - from where the judges were conducted and by whom, would seem to suggest that they both worked together. The fact that they both came from Kleitor and were taken to the disputed territory by the same representatives of Epidauros and Hermion, indicates that both were in Kleitor at the same time and were shown the territory together. While other options are possible, the conclusion that both the Milesians and Rhodians together agreed upon the decision recorded on these stelai seems the most plausible.

TOPOGRAPHICAL COMMENTARY

The creation of this common territory and its demarcation is unique in that we also possess literary testimony for several of the toponyms mentioned in the inscription. Pausanias (2.36.3), in his travels through the southern Argolid almost
certainly saw one of the two copies of this inscription. His description of the route he took north from Hermion is crucial for any reconstruction of the border. He writes:

\[
\text{\textit{άπο Μάσητος δὲ ὁδὸς ἐν δεξιὰ ἐστὶν ἐπὶ ἀκραν καλουμένην Στρουθούντα.}}
\text{\textit{στάδιοι δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς ἄκρας ταύτης κατὰ τῶν ὀρῶν τὰς κορυφὰς πεντήκοντά}}
\text{\textit{εἰσὶ καὶ διακόσιοι ἐχὶ Φιλανορίον τέ καλούμενον καὶ ἐπὶ Βολεοῦς ὁ ὀἰ δὲ}}
\text{\textit{Βολεοὶ οὗτοι λίθων εἰσὶ σωροὶ λογάδων. χωρὶς δὲ ἐπεροῦν ὁ Διδύμους ὀνομάζουσι. στάδια ἐκοσὶν αὐτόθεν ἀφέστηκεν ἐνταῦθα ἐστὶ μὲν ἱερὸν Ἀπολλώνας. ἐστὶ δὲ Ποσειδάνας. ἐπὶ δὲ αὐτοῖς Δήμητρος. ἀγάλματα δὲ ὀρθὰ λίθου λευκοῦ.}}
\]

From Mases there is a road on the right to the promontory called Strouthous. It is two hundred and fifty stades from this promontory across the mountain peaks to Philanorion and the so-called Boleoi. The Boleoi are heaps of gathered stones. Another place, called Didymoi, is twenty stades from there, where there is located a temple of Apollo, one of Poseidon, and another of Demeter. their sculptures are standing upright and of white stone.

As a result of Pausanias’ references to the boleoi, the Strouthous promontory, Philanorion and Didymoi, which are also named in the inscription, topographers have sought their locations since its discovery.

Adolf Wilhelm made the most detailed commentary prior to Peek’s publication of the Hermion copy in 1934. All serious commentaries on the problems associated with Pausanias’ description of the territory and the inscription itself have been made since the publication of the more complete Hermion copy. Peek first noted that the problem would be solved beyond doubt with the discovery of the boleoi lithoi, but no candidate had been found for nearly fifty years after he published the Hermion copy.

Since 1990 two different locations have been proposed for the boleoi lithoi: first in 1990 by Adonis Kyrou and four years later in the 1994 publication of A Greek Countryside, the results of the Argolid Exploration Project. To understand the

---

41 Wilhelm 1911, pp. 26-32.
42 Peek 1934, p. 52.
topography of the common territory and draw conclusions on the line marking it. A
review of the discussions of it prior to the identification of the boleoi lithoi and those
made since they have been located is necessary.

Wild Harbors (Ἄγριοι λιμένες)

Within the inscription itself, the dispute is said to concern the area of Sellas
and the Wild Harbors up to Strouthous (SEG XI 377. lines 13-15) and this is where any
topographical commentary must begin. Nearly all commentators on the dispute agree
that the ancient "Wild Harbors" (Ἅγριοι λιμένες) can only be the Vourlia Bay ( "Ὀμοῖος Βουρλίας"). The only other proposed location for the "Wild Harbors" has
been made recently by Adonis Kyrou who associates this toponym with the Iria
plain. Recently, Suto (1995-1996). who believes that the "Wild Harbors" and
Vourlia Bay are the same, has proposed that the name may also refer to a site that
was first identified and interpreted by Kyrou as Mycenaean. Suto challenged
Kyrou's conclusions and argued that it is a Classical-Hellenistic acropolis. possibly
called "Agrioi Limenes" and that its position suggests that it played a central role in
the dispute. The site is too small to be interpreted as a significant settlement and in
fact there is hardly conclusive evidence that the site was a large settlement in
antiquity. While there are traces of walls here that are almost certainly ancient in

43 First proposed by Wilhelm 1911. p. 30-31; see also IG IV2.1.75 and Tabula 1: Peek 1934. p. 51;
45 Kyrou 1990. pp. 85 and 222.
addition to some sherds, it most likely should be seen as nothing more than an isolated farmstead, or possibly a watchtower.\footnote{I visited the site in May 1999 with Michael Jameson, who will publish a more detailed discussion of this site and its relation to the border dispute. Suto claims to have discovered a mortarium at the site, which would suggest a farmstead. Jameson and I were not able to relocate this. We did, however, find one that looks similar to the one photographed by Suto (1995-1996, p. 11, pl. 4e) and another worked block that may have been a trough at a place called Pigadi Avgou, ca. 2.5 km to the northeast of the site.} Suto’s reconstruction, therefore, seems to overstretch the evidence and should not be taken seriously. Nevertheless, if the site was inhabited in the early 2nd century B.C. it does show that there was a rural population in this region and it was thus used for more than pasturage alone. It does not exclude the possibility that it may have functioned as possibly a seasonal dwelling for shepherds.

Strouthous

Closely associated with the identification of the “Wild Harbors” is Strouthous, which scholars have placed at one of the two capes on either side of the Vourlia Bay: Cape Iria on its west side or Cape Vourlia on the east. Jameson has made a strong case for the identification of Strouthous with Cape Iria.\footnote{Jameson 1953, p. 165. see also Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994. Moretti 1967, p. 103: Kyrou 1990, pp. 21 and 212: Uibopuu 1995, p. 64: Magnetto 1997, p. 412.} Other commentators have argued for its identification with Cape Vourlia.\footnote{Peek 1934, p. 51: Wilhelm 1948, p. 58.} Jameson’s candidate seems the more logical for two reasons. The first is that Cape Iria is a very prominent ridge, one that seems to accord much better with the topographical description preserved within the inscription. Secondly, and more importantly, by placing the boundary at Cape Iria, the Milesian and Rhodian judges made all of the Agrioi Limenes, or Wild Harbors, a
part of the common territory. Thus, they avoided what would have been a delicate issue, awarding it outright to Epidauros or Hermion.

Sellas

The location of Sellas is much more controversial, but only two serious options may be considered as possible. The only agreement, however, amongst scholars who support either of the two options is that it must be a riverbed or stream. The first of the two is the Bedheni valley (Figure 4.20) which is located to the north of Vourlia Bay and to the north of the of the Avgo mountain range. Identification of Sellas with the Bedheni valley must take into account a small inscription found in the village of Karnezeïka (Καρνεζεϊκα), which is located on the north side of the valley, but the stone may have originally come from the Iria plain. The small, three line inscription (IG IV 1.701) is a boundary marker which reads ὄρος | Ἀσκλα - | πιοῦ. It has been interpreted as a marker of a sacred land (ager sacrus) belonging to the sanctuary of Asklepios with the territory thus being Epidaurian.

The second candidate is to the south of Vourlia Bay, the modern Salandi valley, which is the only other riverbed suitable for consideration. Etymological considerations provide the basis by which it is associated with the Sellas of the

---

50 The evidence for identifying Sellas with a stream or riverbed is discussed above in the topographical commentary of IG IV 2.1.71 (Chapter 3. p. 47), where the name Sellas is also used in the boundary demarcation between Corinth and Epidauros. Evidence points to its identification with a riverbed in that dispute also.


52 IG IV 2.1.701, see Jameson and Jameson 1950, pp. 89-90.

inscription. This and the fact that the Iria plain must lie to the north of the border and thus in Epidaurian territory, make the Salandi an almost certain identification.

Philanoreia and the Boleoi Lithoi

A great deal of controversy also surrounds the location of Philanoreia (SEG XI 377. line 17), which is of the utmost importance for the identification of the boleoi lithoi that were to be set up on its border with the Didymia. Philanoreia's location is central to the candidates suggested by Jameson and Kyrou for the boleoi lithoi. According to Jameson's reconstruction of the boundary Philanorion should be identified with the modern village of Phournoi (Φουρνοί), which is located approximately 3.5 km south of Didyma. Jameson's candidate has been met with stern resistance by scholars who believe that Philanorion must be to the north of the Avgo range and the Bedheni river. Kyrou, for example, places Philanorion north of modern Vothiki (Βοθίκη). The site at Vothiki certainly was a significant one, traces of which are visible on two separate hill-tops north of the modern village. On the western of the two is a small square tower, known locally as τοῦ Ἀντρεμένου τὸ μνῆμα, that undoubtedly served as a watchpost over the route through the Bedheni

---

54 For the linguistic arguments for this identification, see Jameson 1953, pp. 165-166.

55 Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, p. 602 and for the remains in the area of Phournoi, see site F60, pp. 518-519. Jameson (1953, p. 166) first identified Philanorion with Lambagiana, where the remains of an ancient tower are located. This tower is now interpreted as a fortified farmstead. see Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, appendix A, site F3, pp. 506-508, figs. A.34 and A.35.

56 Kyrou (1990, pp. 21 and 213-216) discusses the remains in the area of Vothiki. Also of great importance is a bronze votive bull that was apparently seen at Vothiki in 1966. For a photograph of it, see Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, p. 286, fig. 5.13.
valley.\textsuperscript{57} To the east of this hilltop is another site, where several worked blocks can still be seen \textit{in situ}. Perhaps the most significant remain found here is a small 4th century B.C. dedicatory inscription to the Hero Klaikophoros.\textsuperscript{58} He is known from two other identical inscriptions, one found at Troizen (\textit{IG IV} 768) and the other at the Epidaurian Asklepieion (\textit{IG IV}\textsuperscript{2} 1.297). The function of the site itself is unclear, but it may have been a shrine to the Hero Klaikophoros, as Kyrou has proposed. Its identification as ancient Philanoreia, however, seems unlikely, as it is virtually impossible to reconcile its location here with Pausanias' account of the area. His figure of twenty stades, or roughly four kilometers, distance between Didyma and the Boleoi certainly implies that they must be located very close to one another and apparently not far from Didyma.

Much discussion has focused on the distances recorded by Pausanias.\textsuperscript{59} With regard to this figure, it seems that the location for the Boleoi proposed in \textit{A Greek Countryside} is slightly too close to Didyma, while Kyrou's candidate at Vothiki is somewhat further than Pausanias' twenty stades. It is difficult, however, to use this figure with any precision, for if the Boleoi do indeed lie along a ridge, from where did Pausanias' source measure their distance to Didyma? Michael Jameson's candidate of nine stone piles along a ridge displays a difference between \textit{ca.} 2.5 and 3 km from Didyma to the furthest and nearest of them respectively. Unless further evidence

\textsuperscript{57} For a plan of the tower, see \textit{AGC} 12, fig. 56. According to Kyrou (1990, p. 215) the name of the fortification is taken from a local tale that it marks the grave of a hero (Andreioemenos) who defended the pass through the Bedheni valley against an invading enemy.

\textsuperscript{58} \textit{ed. pr.} Charitonides 1955, pp. 251-251 = \textit{SEG} XV 210, see now \textit{SEG} XLIV 339. When I visited the site in May 1999 Kostas Stephanopoulos, a local informant, told me that someone from the Epidauros Museum had removed the stone the previous year. For a good photograph of the inscription, see Kyrou 1990, p. 215.

\textsuperscript{59} For a full discussion of the problems with Pausanias' numbers, see Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, Appendix F, p. 602 note 5. Their reconstruction is supported by Pritchett 1999, p. 33.
sheds new light on its location, controversy will continue to surround Philanoreia’s identification. Until that time, however, the site at Phournoi seems to accord best with the identified remains and Pausanias’ account.

Didymia

Several other toponyms mentioned within the inscription may be identified with some certainty. Among these is the Didymia, which all scholars agree should be identified as the territory of Didymoi which can only be modern Didyma (Διδυμα). Identification of the modern town with its ancient namesake has not been made on purely linguistic grounds, for in Pausanias’ discussion quoted above he mentions a temple of Demeter at Didymoi. Although no remains of this temple have been located an inscribed dedication to Demeter has been found built into the church of Ag. Marina, ca. 1.5 km southeast of the modern town. The evidence, therefore, while not entirely conclusive is strong enough to support this identification without serious reservations.

Many recent discussions of this dispute have unfortunately not taken the recent work of Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel (1994) and Kyrou (1990) into account and thus they have little value since they do not confront the problems now associated with the identification of Philanoreia and the boleoi lithoi. Only one commentary on

---

the dispute has been published since the work of Kyrou and the southern Argolid survey. Unfortunately, this work is also not without its problems.

Any solution to the problem of the border rests on the identification not only of the boleoi, but also that of Philanoreia. As discussed above, two candidates have been proposed for the site, Phournoi (Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994) and Vothiki (Kyrou 1990). Kyrou has located a heap of stones he identifies with the Boleoi, on a small hilltop called locally Kastro, and the region around it is known as Sese. This heap of stones (Figure 4.21) is certainly not natural and must be considered as a potential candidate for the marker referred to in the inscriptions and by Pausanias. Unfortunately for the purposes of the boundary described in these inscriptions, the location of the stone pile identified by Kyrou cannot be reconciled with the other securely identified toponyms nor Pausanias’ description. One possibility that has not been proposed previously is that it may in fact mark some other boundary. The area in which this stone pile is located must be close to a point where the territories of Epidauros, Hermion, and Troizen came together and it could possibly mark that point.

The locations of these two proposed candidates clearly demonstrates how difficult it can be to determine the line defining the common territory. Kyrou’s site is far to the north from Jameson’s creating problems if we try to see territory this far north as being common.
LAND USE IN THE COMMON TERRITORY

Both the mountainous terrain of the area defined as common and the provision within the decision “concerning the payment of fees to tax collectors for the pasturage of goats” clearly indicate that the primary use of this land was for shepherding. The inscription also records another provision, however, “concerning cropping or pasturage [which occurred] before this decision.” From this we can be sure that farming within the common territory was also an issue the arbiters had to address. At least one site that may be contemporary with the dispute and that may be agricultural has been located within the boundaries of the common territory.

CONCLUSIONS

The dispute between Hermion and Epidauros was certainly one of long standing. If Epidauros was indeed the other disputant in IG IV² 1.74 then that settlement must not have resolved all the differences between the two states. for approximately one hundred years later the dispute again reached proportions requiring international arbitration. Unfortunately we are at a loss concerning much of this dispute, making our understanding of it extremely limited. What we do learn from it is that two states in the southern Argolid did have a dispute settled in some manner during the first half of the 3rd century B.C. My examination of the stone has added little to our overall understanding of it, but it has shown that the previously published text in IG should be abandoned for the supplements proposed there are highly improbable. With regards to the second settlement, recorded on two separate stelai from Hermion and Epidauros, we can now be certain that it was conducted at some

\(^{2}\) Kyrou (1990, p. 219) tries to associate the modern toponym with the Italian “sassi,” meaning “rocks.” Suto (1995-1996, p. 20 note 39) points out that it may also be derived from the Albanian “shesh-i”
point between 175-172 B.C. based on the new readings of the Rhodian judges in lines 25 and 27 of the Epidaurian copy.

New discoveries over the last ten years have also rekindled interest among scholars concerning the topography of the common territory and the causes of the dispute itself. The new sites have greatly increased our knowledge of the countryside here, but they have not answered all of our questions beyond a reasonable doubt. Nevertheless, with the evidence available at this time, the common territory seems to have been marked by the nine boleoi lithoi that Jameson has identified. As set out in the Introduction (Chapter 1), proper study of an arbitration dispute requires autopsy of both stone and the disputed territory. I have adhered to this model and have tried to take all recent work into account. The countryside between Hermion and Epidauros is rough and it is large. More work needs to be done in this area and hopefully this will shed new light on both the dispute and the borders of the two states.

meaning flat land.
Map 4.1: Sites discussed in Chapter 4.
Figure 4.10: *IG* IV$^2$.1.74.

Figure 4.11: *IG* IV$^2$.1.75+, Fragment a.
Figure 4.12: *IG IV².1.75*, Fragment b.

Figure 4.13: *IG IV².1.75*, Fragment c.
Figure 4.14: $IG IV^2.1.75^+, $Fragment d.

Figure 4.15: $IG IV^2.1.75^+, $Fragment e.
Figure 4.16: IG IV².1.75+, Fragment f.

Figure 4.17: IG IV².1.75+, Fragment g.
Figure 4.18: *IG IV²,1.75+:* Position of fragments.
Figure 4.19: *SEG* XI 377 (after Jameson 1953, pl. 51, no. 15).

Figure 4.20: The Bedheni valley from the east (Ag. Demetrios monastery).
Figure 4.21: Stone cairn at Kastro (Sese).
CHAPTER 5

THE ACHAIAN LEAGUE AND PTOLEMAIC ARSINOE

INTRODUCTION

The arbitration disputes discussed in this chapter are quite different from those discussed above which were settled between Achaian League members. These two cases involve Achaian League members and Ptolemaic Arsinoë, which was founded on the Methana peninsula around the time of the Chremonidean war (268/7-263/2 B.C.) and remained in Ptolemaic hands probably until 146 B.C.\(^1\) During its lifetime Arsinoë never joined the Achaian league and was perhaps the only Peloponnesian state not to do so.

The two disputes are known from three separate inscriptions, two found in the Epidaurian Asklepieion and the third in Troizen. The first dispute involved Epidauros and Arsinoë, the second Troizen and Arsinoë. Our evidence for the first case comes from a fragmentary opisthographic inscription found in the Asklepieion at Epidauros. The second dispute is known from two duplicate inscriptions, three fragments of one

\(^1\) Parts of this chapter were read at the First International Conference on the History and Archaeology of the Argo-Saronic Gulf held on Poros, Greece June 26-29, 1998.
stèle found in the Epidaurian Asklepieion and a second copy found at Troizen. These stones provide valuable information about the relations between the Achaian League and its Ptolemaic neighbor as well as information about how arbitrations were carried out between a member of a federal state and a non-member.

The literary sources for Achaian-Ptolemaic relations in conjunction with the epigraphical evidence can be used to shed valuable new light on these two disputes, both regarding their dates and the manner in which they were settled. It has generally been assumed that the disputes must have occurred while the Achaians and the Ptolemies were at odds with one another, but I intend to show here that, while they may have arisen at these times, they were almost certainly settled at times when the two were allied. I will first present new editions of these three important inscriptions based on my personal examination of the stones, followed by detailed epigraphical commentaries on each of them. Discussions on the dates of each dispute and the historical circumstances behind them follow the texts. A topographical commentary of the boundaries and the economic considerations central to them is also included here.

*IG IV².1.72. Arbitration between Epidauros and Arsinoë.*

*Ed. pr.:* P. Kavvadas 1918, nos. 5 and 5a, pp. 151-154
F. Hiller von Gaertringen, *IG IV².1.72*
J. Bingen 1953, pp. 624-625 (*SEG* XIII 251)

A stèle of hard gray limestone found in the 1916-1918 excavations of the Greek Archaeological Society in the Epidaurian Asklepieion.² The stèle is broken on the right, left and bottom, the top is preserved and lightly picked. The stone is inscribed

² Kavvadas 1918, p. 115.
on both faces with the letters more heavily worn on Face A than Face B. The stone is
now in the Epigraphikon at the Epidaurian Asklepieion.

Photo Face A: Figure 5.5
Photo Face B: Figure 5.6

H 0.278 m; W 0.215 m; Th 0.142 m; LH 0.007-0.008 m (Face A), 0.006-0.007 m
(Face B), 0.017 m (line 1, Face B)
Interlinear Spacing: 0.008 m (Face A), 0.01 m (Face B)
Checker: Face A 0.011 m (horizontal), 0.014 m (vertical); Face B 0.0087 m
(horizontal), 0.015 m (vertical)

cia. 236-228 B.C.

Face A:

\[\Sigma\tau\omicron\iota\chi\ 50-55\]

1 \[\Theta\ E\ O\ \Sigma\]

2 \[\begin{array}{cccccccccccc}
A & T & A & \Gamma & O & Y & T & O & I & \Sigma & A & X & A & I & O & I & \Sigma
\end{array}\]

3 \[\begin{array}{cccccccccccc}
O & \Sigma & E & N & \Delta & E & E & P & I & \Delta & A & Y & R & V & I & I
\end{array}\]

4 \[\begin{array}{cccccccccccc}
P & I & O & I & \Sigma & K & A & I & A & R & \Sigma & I & N & O & E
\end{array}\]

5 \[\begin{array}{cccccccccccc}
E & N & \Pi & E & P & I & T & A & \Sigma & X & V & R & A
\end{array}\]

6 \[\begin{array}{cccccccccccc}
E & \Sigma & T & V & E & \Pi & I & T & A & \Sigma & X & V & I
\end{array}\]

7 \[\begin{array}{cccccccccccc}
E & N & \Delta & E & K & A & \Pi & R & O & B & \Lambda & H & \Theta
\end{array}\]

8 \[\begin{array}{cccccccccccc}
\nu & \Pi & E & \Lambda & \Lambda & A & \Lambda & v & A & \Gamma
\end{array}\]

9 \[\begin{array}{cccccccccccc}
\Sigma & \Sigma & A & \nu & O & I & \Delta & E & \Lambda & A & X & O
\end{array}\]

10 \[\begin{array}{cccccccccccc}
\Sigma & A & X & P & I & K & A & T & P & E & I & \Sigma
\end{array}\]

11 \[\begin{array}{cccccccccccc}
\Pi & O & I & H & \Sigma & O & N & T & A & I & E
\end{array}\]

12 \[\begin{array}{cccccccccccc}
I & T & R & I & T & V & I & M & H & N
\end{array}\]

13 \[\begin{array}{cccccccccccc}
R & A & G & I & N & E & \Sigma & \Theta & V & \Sigma
\end{array}\]

14 \[\begin{array}{cccccccccccc}
V & N & H & \Theta & E & V & N & T & I
\end{array}\]

15 \[\begin{array}{cccccccccccc}
E & I & \Sigma & T & A & \Sigma & \Pi & O
\end{array}\]

16 \[\begin{array}{cccccccccccc}
I & A & I & P & R & I & \Lambda
\end{array}\]

17 \[\begin{array}{cccccccccccc}
N & T & A & \Gamma
\end{array}\]

Face B:

18 \[\begin{array}{cccccccccccc}
N & T & O & I
\end{array}\]

19 \[\begin{array}{cccccccccccc}
\nu & \nu & \nu & \nu & \nu & \Theta & E & \Lambda & \Phi & O & Y & \Sigma & \Sigma
\end{array}\]

\(^{3}\) Kavvadias (1918, p. 151) restored a line of about 43 letters on Face A with a number slightly less than
43 for Face B. Kavvadias also restores the original width of the stele to about 0.54 m. Bingen (1953, p.
624 note 3) restored a line of +/- 50-55 letters.
NOTES ON READINGS

Face A

Line 2: The upper stroke of the sigma is visible at the break on the right.

Line 3: The last letter consists of a single vertical stroke, which is located in the center of the stoichos. No horizontal strokes are visible making the reading of this letter as an epsilon impossible.

Line 6: Only the bottom half of the vertical is preserved of the final rho.

Line 8: The lower part of a possible right diagonal stroke exists before the vacat at the beginning of the line. If this truly is a letter trace it is partially cut in the empty space and thus violates the stoichedon style.

Line 10: The upper and lower horizontals of the final sigma are legible as well as a small trace of the upper diagonal.

Line 11: The last letter is certainly an epsilon. It has been read as a gamma by all editors except Bingen who read it as an epsilon. Both the top and bottom horizontals, as well as part of the central horizontal are all legible.

Line 16: Only a slight trace of an upper diagonal or possibly a horizontal is preserved on the left. This letter could be gamma, epsilon, tau, or possibly sigma. After the rho a vertical stroke is visible. This letter is not an iota. All other iotas on this face are centered in their stoichos. This vertical stroke is located in the left of the stoichos, thus indicating any number of different letters, i.e., epsilon, eta, rho, etc. After this trace an apex of an alpha, delta, or lambda is preserved.

Line 17: The last letter consists of the upper half of a left vertical stroke and an upper horizontal stroke. This letter could be either a gamma or pi.
Face B

This face was arranged in columns with the names of the judges inscribed below the names of their cities. It is not possible to determine if all eleven cities who sent judges were responsible for the decision and represented on the stone. The names preserved in the column under Thelphoussioi begin immediately underneath the right vertical of the nu in line 1. Considering that this column occupied the same space as five letters in the heading, it may be possible to assume that Face B consisted of four columns of names as fifteen letters are missing to the left of the nu. This does not imply that only four cities were represented on Face B, for more than one city may have been listed in each column.

Line 18: Kavvadas in the editio princeps was correct in reading only NTOI. Hiller claimed to read NANTOIAE.

Line 19: The letters of this line are non-Στιοχ. The theta and the epsilon are clearly legible. The lambda and the phi are very worn, but they can be read with some difficulty. Only a slight trace of the lambda is preserved. The phi is clearer, with the circular part of the letter visible as well as part of the vertical stroke, both above and below the circular stroke. Knoepfler argued in favor of this reading without Apparently being aware of Bingen’s reading.

Line 23: There is a trace of a letter before the first sigma. It may be an upsilon. The final letter is definitely a rho. Its left vertical is preserved and part of a curving stroke.

Line 24: The final letter is certainly a nu. Its left vertical and part of the diagonal are preserved.

Line 27: There is a slight trace of a letter before the vacat. Only the right diagonal stroke is preserved, as well as what appears to be part of an inner diagonal stroke. This letter is almost certainly an alpha. At the break on the right, the left tip of a horizontal stroke is preserved. This is most probably a tau.

Line 30: Only the right tip of the upper horizontal of the first letter is preserved. This stroke must be of an epsilon.

---

1 Ager 1996, p. 136 note 3.

2 Knoepfler 1983, p. 54 note 27 (SEG XXXIII 299 and 447). His argument is based on a parallel toponym, Argoussa.
### TEXT

**Face A**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ca. 236-228 B.C.</th>
<th>Στοιχ. ca. 50-55</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>vacat</strong> Θεός <strong>vacat</strong> [túxa úgathá]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ἐπὶ στραταγού τοῖς Ἀχαιοῖς [-]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[.......]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Ἐπιδαυρίων καὶ Ἀρσινοῦ[ις] -]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[.......]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Παλλὰνα]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Θελουθοῦσα]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[.......]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ἐν τῷ Τριτών μην[ι] -]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[.......]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ΠΑΙΡΕΙ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[.......]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Face B**

| [δικασταὶ ἐκριναὶ τοῖς[δὲ] |                   |
| [.......] |                   |
| 20 |                   |
| [Ἐξηπτών Δυτιλ[ου]] |                   |
| [.......] |                   |
| 24 |                   |
| [Στρατηγὸς Αἰ[ν] -] |                   |
| [.......] |                   |
| 28 |                   |
| [Εμαυπτὼν Άτα[θ] -] |                   |
| [.......] |                   |
| 32 |                   |
| [.......] |                   |

### APPARATUS CRITICUS

**Face A**

1: Θεός [túxa úgathá] (Kavvadias, Bingen); 2: Ἀχαιοῖς [μ. .... γραμματέος δὲ] (Kavvadias), Ἀχαιοῖς (Hiller) Ἀχαιοῖς (Bingen); 3: Ἑπιδαύρων ἐπὶ [ιπτεύς .... ἐκριναὶ] (Kavvadias). Ἐπιδαυρίων ἐπὶ [ιπτεύς Ἀσκληπιοῦ τοῦ δείκτα] (Bingen); 6: [κρίσις] (Hiller). χώρ[ίς] (Bingen); 7: [πόλεις] (Kavvadias); 8: Αἰγί[ον] (Kavvadias, Hiller, Bingen). Αἰγί[ειρα] (Rizakis); 10: ἄχρι Κατρείς (Kavvadias). κα τρεῖς (Hiller); 11: ποίησον τὰ [-] (Kavvadias, Hiller). ποίησον τὰ [-] (Bingen); 13: [πα]ραγενέσθωσαν] (Kavvadias, Hiller). παραγενεσθώσαν (Peek); 14: οὐ ἢ θεῶν τι[ζ -] (Kavvadias). τοῖς ἢρῶ[ι] οὐ θεῶν τι[μ -] (Hiller); 16: 181
EPIGRAPHICAL COMMENTARY

Line 1: Kavvadas (followed by Bingen) first proposed the supplement [τύχα ἀγαθά] to fill out the right side of the stele. The supplement must be correct, for as it is preserved the heading would be too far to the left of the stele and not evenly centered. Θεός followed by τύχα ἀγαθά is paralleled in several other inscriptions from the Epidaurian Asklepieion. See IG IV².1 nos. 47, 65, 66, 73, 121. Contrast this with IG IV².1.55 where [Θεός] appears alone in the first line and seems to be spaced evenly across the top of the stele.

Line 2: This dating formula is paralleled in IG IV².1.71, lines 1-2 and IG V.2.293, line 1 where Achaian is in the genitive plural and not the dative: ἐπὶ στρατηγοῦ τῶν Ἀχαιῶν. See also, IG IV².1.70, line 1 (see above pp. 28-30), where a similar dating formula may have been used. The genitive plural is most often used with the secretary, see IG IV².1.60, line 1: [ἐπὶ] γραμματέως τοῖς Ἀχαιοῖς. Compare also, IG IV².1.61, line 2; IG VII 188, line 3; and SEG XL 394, line 4. Since twenty-three letter spaces are used for the dating formula by Achaian strategos, ca. thirty letter spaces must be missing to the right. Clearly the name of the strategos would follow immediately, but this could not fill out the entire line. Kavvadas
suggested that the inscription was also dated by the Achaian secretary, but there does not appear to be enough space for this either.

Line 3: As indicated in the "Notes on Readings" the letter following Ἑπιδαυρωτι can only be an iota and not an epsilon, thus ruling out ἐπὶ as the next word. Bingen read the line correctly and supplemented ἰ[ερεὺς Ἀσκλαπιοῦ τοῦ δείνα]. A dating formula here by priest of Asklepios is inevitable, but its use without the preposition ἐπὶ is unparalleled at Epidauros. Although ἰ[ερεὺς] is preceeded at Epidauros, it is probably better restored in its Doric form ἰ[απεὔ] followed by the article τοῦ.⁹ Considering that the names of both litigants follow immediately at the beginning of line 4, we should expect a noun. A very probable supplement would be ἀ ὁμολογία as found in IG IV².1.76+77, line 3 the record of an agreement between Troizen and Arsinoë. The only difference here is that the two cities on IG IV².1.72 are in the dative case while on the other example they are in the genitive.

Line 4: Again, based on the parallels between this inscription and IG IV².1.76+77 we might expect something after Ἀρσινοε[ὗσιν] such as [εἰς ἀπαντα τὸν χρόνον].

Line 5: For the restoration here compare IG IV².1.71, line 3.

Line 8: A. D. Rizakis (1995, no. 695, p. 376) proposes Αἰγ[ειρα], based on its geographical proximity to Pellana, as a more probable supplement than Αἰγ[ιον] restored by Kavvadias and Hiller. Either is equally possible.

Line 9: For οἱ δὲ λαχόντες, compare SEG XXXII 86, line 12 and I.Eph. 4A, line 10.

⁹ For ιερεύς in its Ionic form, see IG IV².1.60, line 3; 83, line 6 and other examples. For its Doric form, compare IG IV².1.71, line 1.
Line 18: For this supplement, compare IG IV^2.1.71, lines 31-32.

Line 22: I have retained the proposed supplement of Κλεισ[θένεψ?] only as a possibility. The name, however, is not attested in Arkadia. Another possibility might be Κλεισ[κω?], which is known from 3rd century B.C. Mantinea.

Line 23: I have restored the name Δωρ[οθέου?] based on a known philosopher Δωροθέος from Thelphoussa of the 3rd century B.C.\textsuperscript{7}

Line 25: Several names beginning in Φι- are known from 3rd century B.C. Thelphoussa, these include: Φιλων (suggested by Kavvadias). Φιλέας, Φιλίσκος, and Φιλόμπροτος. The first three would seem possible options considering the space available to the right, while Φιλόμπροτος is probably too long.

Line 28: Kavvadias first proposed reading the name after Ἐμαυτίων as σταδ[εύς], based on Pausanias' reference (6.17.4) to an Arkadian named Emaution who was an Olympic victor in the stade race. His supplement has not been followed by subsequent editors. The name Σταδεύς is paralleled from another passage in Pausanias (6.4.5) and from a Theran inscription (IG XII(3) 336). The editors of LGPN III.A (s.v. Ἐμαυτίων nos. 1 and 2, p. 141) note the possibility that the man from our inscription and the Olympic victor may be the same individual.

Line 30: Λάκ[ονος] has been supplemented by all previous editors and is included in LGPN III.A based solely on this attestation. Again, however, as with other supplemented names in this list additional possibilities can be offered. Λακράτης and Λακριτος are both attested in Arkadia from the 3rd century as is Λάκων. Any of these options must be considered a possibility.
Line 31: Suggestions for this fragmentary name include [X]ερις as Kavvadias proposed and [Φ]ερις, Hiller’s supplement. Another possibility may be [ˇ]ερις a name known from Elis which has been dated to ca. 230-200 B.C.6

Line 32: [Λε]ωνίδας has been restored by all previous editors, and it certainly must be considered a possibility. There are, however, no other attestations of this name in Arkadia from the 3rd century B.C. Σαωνίδας is known from Tegea in this century. Other possibilities might include Οιωνίδας (Peloponnese) or Βιωνίδας (Sparta), both of which are known in the 3rd century B.C.

Line 33: Considering that four letters are missing from the judge’s name before -ων, many possible names could be restored. Within LGPN III.A, however, there are only fourteen names from Arkadia datable within the 3rd century B.C. that fit these requirements. Of these only two are attested at Thelphoussa. The first, Οζυτιων, is known from our inscription, line 20. The second appears as a patronymic on a 3rd-2nd century B.C. proxeny decree from Megalopolis (IG V.2.511, lines 1 and 5-6) in honor of Θύμων Πανθιων[ο]ς from Thelphoussa. Πανθιων fits the letter spaces available nicely and thus may be offered as a possible suggestion for the judge’s name.

TRANSLATION

Face A:

God [Good Fortune]
When -?- was the strategos of the Achaians
When -?- [was the priest of Asklepios] in Epidauros
4 [between the Epidau]rians and the residents of Arsinoë
[- - -] concerning the land, which was being disputed
4 to be a [judgment] on the country

6 For the references to him, see LGPN III.A. s.v. Ἀρτεμίζιος, no. 12, p. 136.

5 LGPN III.A. s.v. Ἐρις, no. 1, p. 216.
eleven [cities] put forth

Pellana, Aigion?; -eira?

Thelphoussa. Those on whose lot it fell
[- -]s until and three
they made

in the third month
they were present
of the heroes or of the gods
to the cities

Face B:
The following were the judges:
From Thelphoussa -

20 Oxution son of Diullos
Pausanias son of Tro-
Theoitas son of Kleisthenes
Philoxenos son of Dor[oteos?]

24 Stratippos son of An-
Melankomas son of Phi-
Polystratos son of
Sostratos son of An-

28 Emuotion (son of?) Stad-
Aristodamos son of D-
Euthumenes son of Lak[on?]
[.eris son of Kritho[n]

32 [?Le]onidas son of Peith-
[- - ?Paus]ion son of Kle-

DATE
Any attempt to understand this settlement between Epidauros and Arsinoë
must begin with its date. The inscription is dated by both the Achaian strategos and
the priest of Asklepios at Epidauros, but unfortunately the stone preserves neither
name. That this dating formula was used, however, confirms that the arbitration was
carried out after 243/2 B.C., the year Epidauros joined the Achaian League. Two
additional factors can be used to assign a date to the inscription. The first is the
participation of judges from Thelphoussa, which must also have been a League

---

9 For a text of the inscription recording Epidauros’s entry into the Achaian league and the literary
references to this, see above pp. 28-30.
member at the time of the arbitration. The second and less-reliable criterion for
dating the inscription is the use of the stoichedon style and the letter-forms, which
may indicate a date no later than the end of the 3rd century B.C.  

Since the inscription was first published, several dates have been proposed for
the dispute. The editio princeps was prepared by Panayiotis Kavvadias, who argued
based on the stoichedon style and letter-forms, that the inscription should be dated to
the second half of the 3rd century B.C.  

Hiller von Gaertringen, also proposed a 3rd
century B.C. date citing the letter-forms, but he later revised this to a post 228 B.C.
date without explanation.  

Almost all commentators on this arbitration since Hiller
have accepted as fact his post 228 B.C. date. I believe a date after 228 B.C. is
impossible and that a more precise date can be assigned to this inscription.

To do this we must begin with the internal textual evidence of the inscription.
The participation of judges from the Arkadian city of Thelphoussa provides us with a
terminus post quern for the inscription’s date. We do not have an exact date for
Thelphoussa’s admission into the League, but evidence points to the year 236 or
perhaps as late as 234 B.C. In 236 B.C. the Achaian strategos Dioetas launched a
successful campaign against Heraia, Thelphoussa’s neighbor, and brought it into the
League.  

For this campaign to have been successful Thelphoussa must already have

---

10 Austin 1938, pp. 66-67 and 113.

11 Kavvadias 1918, p. 151.

12 For the 3rd century B.C. date, see Hiller 1925-1926, p. 71. For the post 228 date, see Hiller IG
IV2.1.72.

The inscription is dated to “s. III.A. p. post” in SEG XIII 251 and “late 3rd century” in SEG XXXIII 299.
Magnetto (1997, no. 42, p. 260) dates the dispute to the second half of the 3rd century B.C.

14 Polyaeus 2.36. For the date of Dioetas’ strategia, see Walbank 1933, p. 169.
been a League member or became one very soon after Heraia.\textsuperscript{15} The fates of Thelphoussa and Heraia were linked closely on at least two other occasions, possibly in 227 B.C. as we shall see and again in 223 B.C. when they both surrendered to Antigonos Doson.\textsuperscript{16} Other Arkadian cities are known to have joined the Achaian League between 235-234 B.C., most notably Megalopolis and Orchomenos.\textsuperscript{17} The evidence thus points strongly to a date between 236 and 234 for Thelphoussa’s admission, but it may not have occurred until as late as 229 B.C. when, according to Plutarch, the greater part of Arkadia joined the League.\textsuperscript{18}

The start of the Cleomenean War (228-222 B.C.) between the Achaian League and Sparta supplies a \textit{terminus ante quem} of 228 B.C. It is unlikely that the League would have had time for arbitration during a long and dangerous war that threatened its existence. The narrative accounts of Polybios and Plutarch, as we shall see, confirm this hypothesis.

If one will not accept 228 B.C. as the \textit{terminus ante quem} then it cannot be many years later. During the Cleomenean war the Spartans captured Thelphoussa, at what date we are not sure, but it must have been early in the war. The hostilities began in 229/8 B.C. when Cleomenes took the Arkadian cities Tegea, Mantinea, and

\textsuperscript{15} For the possibility that Thelphoussa joined the League in 235 or a few years earlier, see \textit{RE} VA. 1934. col. 1620. \textit{s.v.} “Thelphusa;” (E. Meyer). That the Achaians must have held Thelphoussa to take Heraia, see Walbank 1957. p. 257; Walbank 1984. p. 449.

\textsuperscript{16} For the surrender of Thelphoussa and Heraia to Doson, see Polybios 2.54.12-13 and Walbank 1957. p. 257.

\textsuperscript{17} For Megalopolis’ entry into the League, see Polybios 2.44.5: Plutarch \textit{Arat}. 30.2. For the possibility that Thelphoussa joined the League about the same time as Megalopolis, see \textit{IG} V.2, p. 101. For Orchomenos’ admission, see \textit{IG} V.2.344 = \textit{Staatsverträge} III. no. 499. pp. 190-193: Walbank 1957. pp. 242-243.

\textsuperscript{18} Plutarch \textit{Arat}. 34.5. see also Urban (1979, p. 174) who argues that Thelphoussa was not a member until 229 B.C. Meyer (\textit{RE} Suppl. IX. 1962, col. 1392, \textit{s.v.} “Thelphusa,;”) only says that Thelphoussa was a member of the Achaian League in the 2nd century B.C.
Orchomenos after which he began to construct fortifications in the area of
Megalopolis.\textsuperscript{10} Furthermore, Heraia was taken by Cleomenes in 227 B.C.;
Thelphoussa could not have held out for much longer than this.\textsuperscript{20} Finally, the
arbitration cannot have taken place after 225 B.C., when during that year’s campaign
Cleomenes captured Pellene, one of the cities that supplied judges for the arbitration
board, and Epidauros, a litigant in the dispute.\textsuperscript{21} The evidence is conclusive that the
arbitration cannot have been conducted after 225 B.C. when Epidauros, Thelphoussa,
and Pellene were no longer League members. Therefore, the arbitration recorded on
\textit{IG IV}\textsuperscript{2}.1.72 almost certainly occurred between 236-228 B.C. and on no account later
than 225 B.C.\textsuperscript{22}

\textbf{COMMENTARY}

Arsinoë was never a member of the Achaian League, but a Ptolemaic outpost
founded on the Methana peninsula around the time of the Chremonidean War (268/7-
263/2).\textsuperscript{23} This raises the question why Achaian judges were selected for the

\textsuperscript{10} Polybios 2.46.2-5; Plutarch \textit{Cleom.} 12.2, 14.1. For the earlier history of these cities, see Walbank
1957, p. 242 who dates their annexation by Cleomenes to 229 B.C.

\textsuperscript{20} For Cleomenes’ capture of Heraia, see Plutarch \textit{Cleom.} 7.3. See also Briscoe (1973, pp. 174-175) on
Livy 32.4-5.

\textsuperscript{21} Polybios 2.52.2: Plutarch \textit{Cleom.} 19.3.

\textsuperscript{22} Another inscription from the Asklepieion of Epidauros, \textit{IG IV}\textsuperscript{2}.1.73 an Achaian law on the cult of
Hygeia, was also dated between the years 229/8-225/4 B.C. by Hiller, see also Lehmann 1983, pp. 245-
246 (\textit{SEG} XXXIII 300). A recent examination of this inscription has shown that it can only be dated
between the years 210-207 B.C. based on the list of cities on the stone and when they all could have been
members, see Gschnitzer 1985, pp. 103-116 (\textit{SEG} XXXV 303). This confirms that another League action
which was dated by Hiller to the years during the Cleomenean war in fact was carried out some years
after its completion.

\textsuperscript{23} For the date of the foundation of Arsinoë, see \textit{RE XV.} 1932, col. 1378, s.v. Methana (E. Meyer);
Bagnall 1976, pp. 135-136; Mee and Forbes 1997, pp. 73-75. That Arsinoë was never a member of the
Achaian League, see Aymard 1938b, p. 13 note 4; Walbank 1957, p. 218. This fact is missed by Ager
(1996, p. 136) who writes about this inscription “it seems that the Achaian League was again involved in
arbitration. If a date between 236-228 B.C. for the arbitration is correct then we may have a solution. Any answer to this question must be sought from the literary sources which indicate that the Achaians and the Ptolemies enjoyed close relations for some time prior to the war with Cleomenes. As early as 268/7 B.C. the Achaians were allied with Sparta, Athens and Ptolemy II Philadelphos against Macedon during the Chremonidean war. We hear of no contact between the League and the Ptolemaic kingdom following the war’s end until 251/0 B.C. when Aratos of Sikyon and Ptolemy III Euergetes forged a personal relationship.

This relationship began when the Ptolemaic monarch made a gift of twenty-five talents to Aratos after he freed Sikyon from its tyrant and joined it to the Achaian League (Plutarch Arat. 11.2). This money was to be used by Aratos to lessen the civil unrest in Sikyon after the fall of the tyranny; but the sum was not sufficient to quell the disturbance and Aratos was forced to make a journey to Egypt to request more money from the king (Plutarch Arat. 12.1-5: Cicero de off. 2.82). After this visit Aratos secured an annual gift of six talents from the king (Plutarch Arat. 41.5: Cleom. 19.4).

Ptolemy’s policy of ingratiating himself with the Achaian League may be seen as part of the larger Ptolemaic strategy of maintaining friendly relations with states on the Greek mainland in order to keep a closer eye on the Macedonians. Two further possibilities for this relationship may be simply that Ptolemy had the foresight to see that the Achaians would soon be expanding into the Akte, and would possibly pose a

settling a dispute between its members.” For the Hellenistic polis on Methana, see Mee and Forbes 1997, pp. 122-127, site MS 10.

24 This alliance was recorded on the Chremonides Decree which marked the start of the Chremonidean War, see IG II² 686 + 687 = Staatsverträge III, no. 476, pp. 129-133 (lines 21-24 and 35-38).
threat to his colony on Methana and he wished to prevent any conflict over the
Ptolemaic presence in the Peloponnese. Another possibility is that Ptolemy saw the
Achaians as a long term ally and one that could help him rid Athens of its Macedonian
garrison.\textsuperscript{26}

Shortly after 243 B.C. an alliance was struck when Aratos made Ptolemy an
Achaian σύμμαχος and gave him ἡγεμονία in war both on land and sea:

Πτολεμαῖον δὲ σύμμαχον ἐποίησε τῶν Ἀχαιῶν ἡγεμονίαν ἔχοντα πολέμου
καὶ κατὰ γῆν καὶ θάλατταν. (Plutarch\textit{ Arat.} 24.4).

He made Ptolemy an ally of the Achaians, holding hegemony in war on both
land and sea.

While this did not make Arsinoë a League member, it would have provided an ideal
opportunity for the Ptolemaic outpost and Epidauros to resolve any outstanding
disputes through arbitration. As both an ally and the League’s hegemon in war,
Ptolemy may have been more than willing to entrust this responsibility to the
Achaians.

As we have seen it is unlikely that the arbitration was carried out in the early
stages of the Cleomenean War and certainly not after 225 B.C. At the start of the war
the Achaians, according to Polybios (2.47.2-3), were making every effort to maintain
their friendship with Ptolemy. Military assistance from the League’s ally and
hegemon in war, however, was non-existent and we know of no financial support
other than an annual payment of six talents to Aratos.\textsuperscript{27} Loss of territory to the
Spartans combined with the panic caused by the war forced Aratos to abandon the

\textsuperscript{26} Griffin 1982, p. 81.

\textsuperscript{27} Habicht 1992, pp. 73-74. For the Achaian attempts to bring Athens into the League in the 230’s B.C.,
see Habicht 1997, pp. 164-166 and for the years after 229 B.C., pp. 173-178.

\textsuperscript{27} Plutarch\textit{ Arat.} 41.3; Cleom. 19.4.
alliance with Ptolemy and approach Antigonos Doson for aid against Cleomenes. The price for Doson’s assistance was high, the return of Acrocorinth to Macedonian control, but it was necessary to save the League. After Ptolemy learned of the Achaian-Macedonian alliance he too changed allies and began to supply Cleomenes with financial assistance, probably in winter 226/5 B.C. This marked the end of the Achaian-Ptolemaic alliance that had existed for almost twenty years. In the years following the Cleomenean war we are without direct evidence for Achaian-Ptolemaic contact until the 180’s B.C. This evidence makes the likelihood strong that the dispute between Epidauros and Arsinoē was submitted for arbitration at a time when the Achaians and the Ptolemies were in alliance. Our lack of evidence for another alliance between the two until the 180’s provides further evidence that the arbitration between Epidauros and Arsinoē was not conducted after the conclusion of the Cleomenean war.

THE NATURE OF THE DISPUTE

It is difficult to understand from this fragmentary inscription what Epidauros and Arsinoē were disputing. The two do not share a common boundary today and it is unclear if they did in antiquity. That the dispute was primarily economic in nature is certainly a logical solution to this problem, but we must explore the possibility that at some time the two did share a boundary on the mainland. If they shared one it must

---


29 Polybios 2.51.2; Plutarch Cleom, 22.3-7 and Staatsverträge, III, no. 505, pp. 208-209. See also Walbank 1957, p. 250 and Walbank 1984, pp. 463-64.

30 As Walbank (1979, p. 178) has pointed out we are completely unaware of when the alliance was renewed.
have been somewhere opposite Methana’s western coast, perhaps in the area of Ano Phanari ("Ανώ Φανάρι") or south of it in the agriculturally rich Lessia plain. Evidence will be discussed below suggesting that Arsinoë did hold territory on the mainland in the first half of the 2nd century B.C. If the dispute was primarily economic, then it may have concerned the fishing rights that the citizens of Arsinoë later disputed with the Troizenians. This dispute between Troizen and Arsinoë, which undoubtedly involved both the sea and possessions on the mainland, may have resulted from some unknown conflict between Epidauros and Troizen. If the area of the Lessia plain was disputed by these two cities and it changed hands at some point from Epidaurian to Troizenian it might help to explain both disputes and the sequence in which they occurred.

It is not until the first half of the 2nd century that we have additional epigraphical evidence concerning the relations between Ptolemaic Arsinoë and the Achaian League. The inscribed record of this dispute between Troizen and Arsinoë will be considered next.

*IG IV² 1.76+77 and IG IV 752. Arbitration between Troizen and Arsinoë.*

Our evidence for this dispute between Troizen and Arsinoë comes from two separate inscriptions, one found at the Asklepieion of Epidauros and the other from

---

31 For the site at Ano Phanari, see *AGC XII*, fig. 58 and appendix 3, p. 9 and Foley 1988, p. 172.
Troizen. A third copy was to be inscribed and set up on the Athenian Acropolis. This stone has not been found.\footnote{I have searched extensively through published Athenian inscriptions attempting to identify any fragment that might be part of this stele. Unfortunately none has been located.}

**The Epidaurian Stele:**

*IG IV².1.76:*

*ed. pr.:* F. Hiller von Gaertringen 1925-1926, no. VIII, pp. 71-75  
F. Hiller von Gaertringen, *IG IV².1.76*  
W. Peek 1969, no. 31, pp. 27-28, pl. VI, fig. 9

*IG IV².1.77 (Fragments a and b):*

*ed. pr.:* M. Fraenkel, *IG IV 941*  
F. Hiller von Gaertringen, *IG IV².1.77*  
Nikitsky 1902, pp. 445-467 (non vidi); Nikitsky 1903, pp. 406-413  
W. Peek 1969, no. 31, pp. 27-28, pl. VI, fig. 9

Three fragments of white marble. Two joining fragments (*IG IV².1.76+77 Frag. a*) preserve the top and right edge of the stele. A third non-joining fragment (*IG IV².1.77 Frag. b*) preserves its left edge. All three fragments are now located in the Epigraphikon of Epidaurus. *IG IV².1.76+77* Fragment a have been re-joined and the restored stele is now set up against a wall in the Epigraphikon. The third fragment (*IG IV².1.77 Frag. b*) has not been incorporated in the restored stele. Neither the dates of discovery nor their find spots in the Asklepieion are recorded in any of the publications.

Louis Robert first suggested in 1960 that the two inscriptions might be from the same stele, but it was not until 1969 that Werner Peek demonstrated this beyond doubt.\footnote{Robert 1960, pp. 159-60 note 2, see also SEG XXII 278; Peek 1969, no. 31, pp. 27-28.} Unfortunately Peek produced a text of lines 30-46 only and thus did not
confront the problem posed by Hiller’s supplements to *IG* IV².1.76, the lines of which are clearly too short for the stele. Sheila Ager recently presented the first complete text of *IG* IV².1.76+77, producing a composite based on Hiller’s *IG* IV².1.76 text and Peek’s lines 30-46 with an additional 11 lines restored based on *IG* IV 752, the second copy from Troizen. The presentation of this text, in which underlining is used to indicate supplements from *IG* IV 752, is inadequate and the lack of an up-to-date edition of the whole has resulted in considerable confusion surrounding these inscriptions. Peek’s join itself has not been noticed by several scholars and has been mistakenly noted by others. To clear up these misunderstandings I reproduce first the text prepared by Ager followed by new editions of both inscriptions with epigraphical commentary and discussion of the arbitration based on my personal autopsy of the stones.

AGER 1996. NO. 138:

vacat

See especially the comments of L. Robert (*BE* 1961, no. 318) who first pointed out this fact.

Bravo (1980, pp. 745 note 64, 805-806, 865-868 = *SEG* XXX 385, 388) was unaware of the join writing eleven years after it was published by Peek. Mee and Forbes (1997, nos. 9 and 10, pp. 270-271) conclude that both *IG* IV².1.76 and *IG* IV².1.77 are related based on the erroneous assumption that 77 is inscribed on the reverse of 76. Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel (1994, pp. 598, 606 note 9) and Baladié 1980, p. 216 accept the association without comment. Habicht (1997, p. 233 note 54) has correctly noted that the two fragments are part of the same inscription. See also the comments of Pikoulas 1992-1998, p. 319 note 9.
[νοις· ἀναγωγάς δὲ κ]αι καταγωγάς καὶ παραγωγάς
[μὴ καλλίων τούς ἀγ]οντας, μηδὲ ἄλλο μηθέν πρᾶς-
[σειν τούς καὶ τὸν ἔρ]γασαν μηδὲ τὸν τὸν χάρακα
[οἰκέωντα· εἰ δὲ μ. ἀ μ]ὲν πόλις μυρίας δραχμάς καὶ
[ὁ ἱδιώτας δὲ] χιλίας δραχμάς καὶ ὁ. τι βασιλιδί "
[χρή τε]λείπων. δικ]άξεθαι μετά τὰς Χερσονήσου
[καὶ τὸν καλουμέ]ναν Διοσπέτην ἀπὸ τοῦ κατό τοῦ
[ἐν τῷ] καὶ τὸν χάρακα τοῦ ἐπι τοῦ Στεντία. τὸν δὲ "
[Στεντίαν καὶ] τὸν ἐκτὸς τοῦ χάρακος χώραν "
[τὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ χάρακος κεῖ] τὸν λευκὸν Ἑρμᾶν τὸν ποτῖ]
[τοῦ χώραν] κοίνων εἰμιν στάλας ὁρισθείσαν.

[τὰ τε τὸν Πραξι]νεῶν καὶ τὰς κοινὰς χώρας κοινά.
[τὸν Πραξι]νεῶν καὶ τὰς κοινὰς χώρας κοινά.
[ὁ ἱδιώτας δὲ] χιλίας δραχμάς εἰμιν.
[ὁ] ρούς δὲ χέμιν ἀπὸ τοῦ χάρακος κεῖ τὸν λευκὸν "
[Ἐρμᾶν τὸν δὲ χωρ]αν καὶ τὰς ἀλὰς καὶ τὸ λιμένιον'

[διδ]οσθαι δὲ ἑξαγαγόν κατ’ ἑναυ-
[τὸν] ἀ]τελέους ἔργαζομεν τὸν ἀλὸν

[καὶ] ἔλθαι ὁ ἐγδεξαμένος τὰς ἀλὰς

[ὅλος τις ἀπὸ κοινοῦ] εἰτε εκ τὰς χώρας εἰτε εν ταὶ πο-
[λεῖ ἀποτέπραγε] ἐντὸς καὶ ἀποτεσσάρων.

[ὁ] δὲ δικάξασθαι μηθέναι περὶ τοῦ τῶν χρημάτων ἐγί
[τὰ δικαία] ἀτελῆς ἐντὸς καὶ ἀποτεσσάρων.

[μὴ] δικάζασθαι μηθέναι περὶ τοῦ τῶν χρημάτων ἐγί
[ἐν τοῖς ἑμποροῦν] χρόνοις μή δικαζάσθαι μηθέναι εἰ δὲ δικαίατο ἀποτεσσάρων.

[ἐν τοῖς] ἑμποροῦν χρόνοις μή δικαζάσθαι μηθέναι εἰ δὲ δικαίατο ἀποτεσσάρων.

[ἐν τοῖς] χρόνοις μή δικαζάσθαι μηθέναι εἰ δὲ δικαίατο ἀποτεσσάρων.

[ὅ] τοὺς ἑμποροῦν χρόνοις μή δικαζάσθαι μηθέναι εἰ δὲ δικαίατο ἀποτεσσάρων.

[ὅ] τοὺς ἑμποροῦν χρόνοις μή δικαζάσθαι μηθέναι εἰ δὲ δικαίατο ἀποτεσσάρων.

[ὅ] τοὺς ἑμποροῦν χρόνοις μή δικαζάσθαι μηθέναι εἰ δὲ δικαίατο ἀποτεσσάρων.

[ὅ] τοὺς ἑμποροῦν χρόνοις μή δικαζάσθαι μηθέναι εἰ δὲ δικαίατο ἀποτεσσάρων.

[ὅ] τοὺς ἑμποροῦν χρόνοις μή δικαζάσθαι μηθέναι εἰ δὲ δικαίατο ἀποτεσσάρων.

[ὅ] τοὺς ἑμποροῦν χρόνοις μή δικαζάσθαι μηθέναι εἰ δὲ δικαίατο ἀποτεσσάρων.

[ὅ] τοὺς ἑμποροῦν χρόνοις μή δικαζάσθαι μηθέναι εἰ δὲ δικαίατο ἀποτεσσάρων.

[ὅ] τοὺς ἑμποροῦν χρόνοις μή δικαζάσθαι μηθέναι εἰ δὲ δικαίατο ἀποτεσσάρων.

[ὅ] τοὺς ἑμποροῦν χρόνοις μή δικαζάσθαι μηθέναι εἰ δὲ δικαίατο ἀποτεσσάρων.
NOTES ON AGER'S TEXT

A strong word of caution must be issued against the supplements in lines 1-29, which are based on Hiller's edition of IG IV.1.76 that he prepared unaware of the join. These supplements consist of approximately thirty-eight words per line. Lines 38-52, which can be restored based on the Troizen copy, are comprised of up to sixty-four words per line. A simple calculation tells us that Hiller's supplements in lines 1-29 are slightly less than twenty-six letters too short and, therefore, should be abandoned. Additional problems with Ager's text include the use of underlining to indicate the restorations based on the Troizenian stele, IG IV 752. This creates unnecessary confusion, for underlining should be used only to indicate letters once read on a stone and no longer legible. Furthermore, Ager claimed to use underlining to indicate the parts that correspond to the Troizenian stele, but her text is not accurate in this respect. The underlining begins in line 46 of her Epidaurian text, which corresponds to IG IV 752, line 7. If underlining is to be used properly in the manner she described it should have begun in line 37 of the Epidaurian text with χελίς δραγμάς (IG IV 752 line 1). An additional problem with Ager's text, which others are guilty of as well, is the omission of the final twelve fragmentary lines of IG IV 752. Although these are extremely fragmentary and add little to our understanding of the dispute, they do provide us with the final line of the stele, which we enables us to determine how much of the text is lost.

16 Dow 1969, p. 10.
17 Both Legrand and Fraenkel read this line of IG IV 752 incorrectly: Nikitsky first read it accurately.
These two joining fragments preserve the top and right edges of the stele. A molding originally existed at the top of the stele, but is now broken to level off the inscribed face for later reuse; a trace of it is also visible on the right side of the stele. Along the right, the fragment is preserved to its original thickness, but the back is broken away on the left side. The stele also displays a slight taper. Since it is nowhere preserved to its original width, the exact degree at which it tapers cannot be determined precisely, although several calculations taken from both the stone and squeezes show it to be between 1.5-3 degrees. Nevertheless, that the stele displays this feature casts further doubt on the restorations proposed by previous editors who neither noted it nor took it into consideration in their editions.

Photo: Figure 5.7

H 0.73 m; W 0.23 m; Th 0.125 m; LH 0.005-0.008 m
Interlinear Spacing: 0.002-0.003 m

non-Στοιχ.

vacat (0.111 m)  [IG IV².1.76]

1  ΟΥΓΝΙΚΥΝΟΣΕΝΑΡΣΙ
2  ΑΘΑΝΑΙΦΕΙΔΟΣΤΡΑΤΟΥ
3  ΟΜΟΛΟΓΙΑΤΡΟΖΑΝΙΝ
4  ΕΙΣΑΙΠΑΝΤΑΝΩΝΧΡΟΝΟΝ;
5  ΠΠΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΥΠΡΕΣ
6  ΕΡΙΤΑΣΧΥΡΑΣΤΑΣΚΑΛΟΥΜΕ
7  ΝΑΣΟΥΚΛΑΠΡΑΣΩΝΙΟΥΚ
8  ΝΚΑΙΣΤΕΝΙΑΝΚΟΙΝΑΙΕΙΜΕ
9  ΛΙΘΙΝΑΣΚΑΙΤΑΣΣΥΛΙΝΑΣ;
10  ΚΑΙΤΑΣΚΑΤΑΓΓΑΣΚΑΙΠΑ
11  ΟΕΙΣΚΥΛΥΕΤΝΟΥΣΤΡΙΑΜΕ
12  ΚΑΤΑΓΓΑΣΚΑΙΠΑΡΑΓΓΑΣ

34 Because the two fragments are now attached to a wall in the epigraphikon, I was unable to examine the back of these two joining fragments thoroughly.
NOTES ON READINGS

Figure 5.2: IG IV^2.1.76+77 Frag. a. Drawing

Line 4: Only the right ends of the horizontals of the epsilon are preserved.

Line 11: Only a small trace of a curving stroke is preserved at the beginning of the line.
Line 12: There is no room before the break at the left edge for Peek’s alpha and iota to be read.

Line 14: After the mu a slight trace of the right vertical stroke is still visible.

Line 16: The bottom right diagonal stroke is all that is preserved of the first letter.

Line 18: The third to last letter is certainly an alpha, but only traces of the two diagonal strokes are still legible.

Line 22: Only the bottom half of the vertical stroke is preserved of the final tau.

Line 23: The lower diagonal stroke of the first letter is all that is visible.

Line 24: Only the right vertical of the first letter is legible.

Line 27: The apex of the first letter is preserved.

Line 34: The trace of what appears to be an epsilon is preserved at the left. It could possibly be a sigma.

Line 35: The first extant letter trace consists only of a curving stroke.

Line 36: The right hasta of the mu is all that remains. The right part of an upper horizontal of the tau is preserved.

Line 39: The break between the two fragments cuts right through the center of this line making reading extremely difficult.

Line 42: This line is virtually impossible to read. Peek claimed to read several more letters than any other editor, but I cannot confirm any of his readings here. At times I have been able to make out what look like letter traces, but these could just as well be damage on the stone’s surface. It is also quite possible that there was a significant vacat here. For now, this is how I construe the line. See the additional comments on this line in the “Notes on Supplements.”

IG IV².1.77 Frag. b:

This fragment preserves only the left edge; the back is preserved to its original thickness and is roughly picked. There is an uninscribed margin of ca. 0.015 m along the left edge of the stone.39

39 The numbers in parentheses after the line numbers refer to the corresponding line number in the restored text.
Epidauros Inv. No. 290

Photo: Figure 5.8

H 0.26 m; W 0.16 m; Th 0.126 m; Lh 0.005-0.008 m.
Interlinear Spacing: ca. 0.002-0.003 m.

non-Στοιχ.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (31)</td>
<td>/ 1 EKATAP'A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (32)</td>
<td>\ / I \</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (33)</td>
<td>IΑΝΚΟΙΝΑΝΧΡΑΝ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (34)</td>
<td>ΗΑΛΛΟΣΤΙΣΑΠΟΚΟΙΝ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (35)</td>
<td>ΛΕΙΑΠΟΠΕΠΡΑΓΕΚΕ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 (36)</td>
<td>ΜΗΔΙΚΑΣΣΑΣΘΑΙΝΗΘΕΝ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 (37)</td>
<td>ΑΤΕΔΙΚΑΣΣΑΛΗΣΕ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 (38)</td>
<td>ΕΙΔΕΠΟΛΙΣΜΥΡ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 (39)</td>
<td>ΤΑΝΕΚΤΑΣΧΩΡ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 (40)</td>
<td>ΕΝΤΟΙΣΕΜΠΡΟΣΘΕ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 (41)</td>
<td>ΣΑΤΝΕΙΜΕΝΙΩΝΤΑ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 (42)</td>
<td>ΕΣΤΤΠΕΡΙΔΕΣΤΝ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 (43)</td>
<td>ΝΝΑΠΟΤΑΣΣΧΑΡ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 (44)</td>
<td>ΕΚΙΤΝΘΟΝΝΕΙ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 (45)</td>
<td>ΡΗΙΟΛΟΓΟΣΟ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 (46)</td>
<td>ΥΠΟΤΥΝΠΟΛ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 (47)</td>
<td>ΔΡΑΧΜΑΣΔΙ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 (48)</td>
<td>ΩΣΑΕΣΤΙΕ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 (49)</td>
<td>ΕΠΙΛΥΣΑΝΤ /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 (50)</td>
<td>ΣΙΑΣΜΕΝ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 (51)</td>
<td>ΕΚΑΤΕΙ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5.3: IG IV 2.1.77 Frag. b, Drawing

NOTES ON READINGS

Line 1: The traces of two letters can be read. The first consists of the lower half of a vertical stroke. Only the lower half of the left vertical survives of the second letter. This letter could be alpha or lambda.

Line 2: Only the lower half of a left vertical survives of the first preserved letter. The second consists of the lower half of a vertical. Only the top of the apex of the final letter is preserved.

Line 3: The first letter consists of only the bottom half of a vertical stroke.

Line 4: Peek read ΟΥ after the final nu. I am unable to see any traces of these letters.
Line 6: A superfluous sigma was accidentally inscribed by the cutter. He also erred by inscribing a nu instead of a mu after the second iota.

Line 7: Part of the left side of the upper horizontal stroke and the upper part of the upper diagonal of the final sigma is legible.

Line 9: Part of the right diagonal of the final alpha is legible.

Line 11: Only the apex remains of the final alpha.

Line 14: The cutter left one letter space uninscribed between the second and third letters.

Line 17: Only the upper half of the final iota is preserved.

Line 18: Hiller unnecessarily dotted the final epsilons. The upper horizontal stroke, the vertical and part of the lower horizontal are all clearly legible.

Line 19: The final tau is clearly visible and part of the left diagonal of the final alpha is also preserved.

Line 21: Only the vertical stroke of the final rho is legible.

TEXT OF COMBINED FRAGMENTS

*ca. 200-150 B.C.*

\*\*non-Στοιχ.\*\*

\*vacat (0.111 m)\*
[24] — ἀπὸ τοῦ χάρακος ἐπὶ τὸν λευκὸν 
[24] — χώραν καὶ τὰς ἀλὰς καὶ τὸ λιμένιον /
[28] [διδοθεὶ] δὲ ἐξαγαγόν καὶ ἔνισθα 
[28] — ἀτελών εργαζομενὸν τὰν ἀλὰν

[77 b] [ce.14....] Μ[ca. 8... ἐν τῶι] καλουμένων Στενίται καὶ τοὺς " 

32 [IΛ][..]α κατὰ πα[......ca.13... στάλασις ὀρισθέντα] ἐξουσία δ' ἔστω 
[32] τὰν κοινὰν χώραν [....ca.15.....] όσα ἐν π[ο]λεμαρχοί ἡ δαμιργοι 
[32] ή ἄλλος τις ἀπὸ κοιν[ου].....ca. 12...Ε εἶτε εκ τὰς χώρας εἶτε ἐν τὰ δολ 
[32] λεί αποπέραγε κε[....ca. 15.....] Ε̄] ον κοινὰς χώρας καὶ περὶ] τὸν ἐπικαρπι 
[32] τὸν χώρας καὶ περὶ τὸν ποθὸν τὰν ἐκ τὸν θυνδείον τὸν γένομε[ν] 

52 [τὰ κυρία ἡ] ἀποστειλαντὸς πρεσβείας εκάτεροι εἰς Ἁθάνας καὶ ἀξίζουν[ω] 
[52] [δόμεν αὐτοῖς ἀνδρᾶς τρεῖς, οἰτ σα] παραχεόμενοι τὰ γεγονότα αὐτοῖς ὁμ[ο] 
[52] — λογα ἑπικρίναντες ἀναθεσοῦνται ἐν στάλαις εἰς τὰ ιερὰ τὸ τε ἐν Καλαυρε[ι]αί 

56 [Ποσειδάνος καὶ τὸ ἐν Ἐπιδαύρω τοῦ Ἀσκληπιοῦ καὶ τὸ ἐν Ἁθάνας ἐν ἀκροπό 
[56] — λει τὰς Ἁθάνας, ὅπως δὲ καὶ τὸ λοιπὸν ἐννόμως εκάτεροι αἱ πόλεις ἀμοστε] 

APPARATUS CRITICUS

NOTES ON SUPPLEMENTS

As noted above nearly all of Hiller's supplements in lines 1-35 have been abandoned here since the stele was much wider than he assumed. Its original width can be calculated now that the taper has been observed (Figure 5.9), but the number of lost letters per line can only be approximated due to the uninscribed margin along the left hand side and the size of several letters. The significant margin preserved on the small left hand fragment, common to tapered stelai, most likely indicates that the letters in the first several lines were cut very close to the left edge of the stele. Furthermore, the letters iota, theta, and omicron occupy significantly less space than all other letters. As a result of these factors, the line lengths in the upper part of the stele were most likely not much shorter than those in the lower half. The supplements in lines 36-40 are highly likely and those in lines 41-57 are certain as they are based on IG IV 752, the duplicate copy from Troizen. I have not proposed drastic new supplements in the text above, but several are suggested in the notes below. Any attempt to do so in the first 35 lines would be highly speculative as we are dealing primarily with a territory delineated by a very specific set of toponyms.

Line 1: The Troizenian eponym has been interpreted by all commentators since Hiller as the numeral γ' followed by the name Νίκων. This surely cannot be correct and the simplest way to construe the line is to take the name as Γνίκων, which is paralleled at Troizen from the well-known diateichisma inscription, IG IV 757, face B, lines 28-29, that is dated to around 146 B.C. I know of no other attestation of this name. For the implications it has on the inscription's date, see below.

40 For an example of a tapered stele on which the letters along the left margin are inscribed in a straight column, see Agora XIX. no. L4b.
"Prosopography." Unfortunately we have no evidence for the dating formula used in Troizenian decrees, thus we do not know what their eponymous official was.

Line 2: In Hiller’s supplement of this line Pheidostratos is interpreted as a priest of Athena and eponymous official of Arsinoë. Once again, however, his miscalculation of the line length must rule out this reconstruction. The eponymous official of Arsinoë is lost and Pheidostratos must be interpreted as something else. For more on this, see below “Prosopography.”

Line 4: A possible supplement here might be [καί Ἀρσινοέων ὑπάρχειν ἕκατέροις] εἰς ἅπαντα χρόνον as is paralleled in the Troizenian copy at lines 50-51. Any other similar formula is also possible, such as [ὑπάρχειν δὲ αὐτοῖς], compare Milet I. iii no. 150, lines 34-35. The first supplement would yield a line of forty-seven letters followed by a vacat of one space, a figure very close to what we would expect in the upper part of the stele.

Line 9: I can find no parallels for the presence of [τὰς δὲ τομὰς τὰς] before the break on at the left, but it is a reasonable supplement and I have retained it in the text. For the use of ξυλίνας, compare IG IV^2^.1.106, face B, line 136, which Burford (1969, p. 177) takes to mean small timbers, specifically for the “battens on which the roof tiles were laid.”

Line 10: Both here and in line 12, Hiller added ἀναγωγὰς in this sequence of nouns. While a possible supplement, it should not be seen as more than that.

Line 12: Based on the presence of the article τὰς following καί and preceding καταγωγὰς in line 10, I have altered slightly Hiller’s supplement.
Line 15: Hiller's supplement of οἰκεόντα is considered very doubtful by Robert (1960, p. 158 note 3).

Line 18: The proposed supplement at the left is based on the sequence of toponyms in line 7, where the Praxoneion immediately follows the Chersonasos. In support of this, compare lines 22 and 26-27 where the sequence of toponyms ἀπὸ τοῦ χάρακος ἐπὶ τὸν λευκὸν Ἀρμῖαν is repeated. I have also retained Hiller's [τὰν καλομέ]ναν Διαστενίταν as a likely possibility as it is closely paralleled in line 31: καλομένων Στενίται. This supplement yields a line of 52 letters, which is also consistent with the available number of letter spaces.

Line 24: Hiller first proposed [Προξε]νεῖον at the break on the left. Robert (1960, p. 159 note 2) pointed out the possibility of supplementing [Θυν]νεῖον instead. Either is epigraphically possible, but I have chosen to retain Hiller's suggestion in my text as a toponym appears more likely at this point in the text rather than a reference to tuna fishing, which does not occur in the preserved text until line 39 and for a second time in line 44. The Praxoneion, on the other hand, was already referred to in line 7. By analogy, the charax is mentioned four times in the first 26 lines and the Stenita twice in the first twenty. For more on this, see below "The Settlement of the Dispute."

Line 31: Approximately 14 letter spaces precede the first two preserved letters at the left. Following the parallel wording in line 27, it may be possible to restore [καὶ τὸ λιμένιον], which occupies thirteen letter spaces at the left of this line.

Line 39: In IG IV, 752, line 3, the article τὰγ is present between θυννείον and γενομενὰν. Hiller supplemented τὰγ on the Epidaurian copy following the Troizenian.
example, and Peek omitted the article, which should be present. Its correct form, however, should be ταύ, as I have restored it in the text above, for the Epidaurian copy does not employ consonant assimilation, which is used on the Troizenian stele.

Line 42: Peek (1969, p. 28) supplemented an additional three words in this line that do not appear on the Troizenian stele. Peek’s reasoning for this is that the line, as it should appear based on the duplicate copy, would be far too short. His supplement adds an additional fifteen letters to the line giving it a total length of 58 letters, a figure consistent with the width of the stele. Unfortunately this line is the most heavily worn on the stele and it is unclear if there are any inscribed letters (Fraenkel printed the line as a vacat, and Hiller supplemented the line entirely in brackets).

Line 45: For the koine use of σῶμα here meaning “person,” see Buck 1955, pp. 288-289.

Line 49: Hiller printed the article ταῦ before κοινάν, which is how it appears in the Troizenian copy (line 12), but surely on the Epidaurian stele it would have been ταύ as paralleled, for example, in line 39.

Line 52: Hiller first restored πρεσβείαν here, but the correct form πρεσβείας is confirmed by IG IV 752, line 15. Fraenkel was the first to propose the singular form on the Troizenian stele.

Line 54: All other editors have printed the preposition [ἐγ] before [Καλαυρεία]. As with the other examples of consonant assimilation found on the Troizenian copy they are not duplicated on the Epidaurian stele, therefore [ἐν Καλαυρεία] is a preferable supplement.
IG IV 752, The Troizenian Stele:

ed. pr.: P. Legrand 1900, no. 5, pp. 190-199
A. Nikitsky 1902, pp. 445-467; Nikitsky 1903, pp. 406-413
M. Fraenkel, IG IV 752 and Addenda et Corrigenda, p. 381
Schwyzer 1923, no. 104, p. 50
EM 3529

The inscription was found by Legrand built into the facade of the Ag. Nikolaos chapel in Troizen. Although found there, the stone was most likely set up in the sanctuary of Poseidon at Calaureia, as stipulated in line 18, and moved from there for the construction of the chapel. At some time in its past the stone was also used as a paving or threshold block. The stele is gray marble and is broken at the top and bottom; the right and left edges are preserved, both are lightly picked. The stone is preserved to its original thickness, the back of the stele is roughly picked. The letters on the bottom half of the stone are extremely worn as a result of its later reuse. A few letters from the last line are preserved, followed by an uninscribed surface of ca. 0.13 m. A margin of ca. 0.01 m is preserved along the left edge of the stone and a margin of ca. 0.005 m is preserved along the right edge. The stele tapers towards the top, with a difference in width of 0.017 m between lines 1 and the bottom of the stele. Nikitsky first recognized that IG IV 752 was a copy of IG IV'.1.77, preserving a second copy of lines 38-54 of the Epidaurian stele. Only Legrand and Fraenkel have published (in

---

41 Chandler (1776, p. 262) noted that when he visited the temple of Poseidon he saw blocks “cut to the size which is a load for a mule” and that his guide on the island was a stone mason “long employed in destroying these remnants of antiquity.” According to Chandler these blocks he saw were being shipped to Hydra for the construction of a monastery. Strangely no other commentator has tried to explain why a copy of the inscription was found in Troizen.

42 Legrand 1900, p. 190.

43 First published by Nikitsky (1902, pp. 445-467) in Russian with a shortened version of the original article in German (Nikitsky 1903, pp. 406-413).
majuscule) lines 21-32. In his commentary Fraenkel alone has attempted to make any sense of these lines. The stone is now located in the Epigraphical Museum at Athens, inv. no. 3529.

Photo: Figure 5.10

H 0.51 m; W 0.433 m (top) - 0.45 m (bottom); Th 0.11 m; LH 0.05-0.07 m.
Interlinear Spacing: 0.003 m.

non-Στοιχ.,

Figure 5.4: IG IV 752, Drawing
NOTES ON READINGS

Line 1: Based on the number of letters preserved in line 5 (the first completely preserved line on the stele), which is fifty-five, an estimate of ca. 44 letters have been lost from this line. Line 1 of this stele corresponds with lines 37-38 of the Epidaurian stele. The preserved number of letters on the left of the Epidaurian stele and the supplements in line 38 yield a number of 38 letter spaces, which is six short of what might be expected. As indicated above (p. 000), the supplement in line 38 of the Epidaurian copy is not certain, but likely. This discrepancy in the number of letters per line may cast some doubt on that supplement.

Line 2: The fifth letter has been read by previous editors as a sigma, but we should expect a nu, based both on grammatical considerations and that a nu is found at this point on the Epidaurian stele. I can make out the traces of two parallel strokes which seem to confirm the presence of nu.

Line 3: The bottom of a left diagonal stroke is preserved at the break.

Line 4: The lower half of the X and a trace of the bottom of the left vertical stroke of the mu are preserved after the final alpha.

Line 11: The last letter consists of the bottom left of an arc.

Line 13: The upper stroke of a sigma is preserved on the right at the break.

Line 14: Only a left vertical stroke remains of what was most likely a gamma.

Line 17: On the left a trace of a vertical stroke is preserved before the final epsilon.

Line 18: The right hasta and a trace of a diagonal stroke of the first letter on the left remains. This letter can only be a nu.

Line 20: The last preserved letter consists only of the tip of a vertical stroke. Fraenkel's IG IV 752, line 20 does not correspond to his majuscule text in the Addenda et Corrigenda, IG IV, p. 381.

TEXT

non-Στοιχ. 

[λίθας δραχμας] 38

[περὶ τὰν ἔρικαπταν τὰν ἕκ τὰς χώρας καὶ περὶ τῶν ποθόδων τῶν ἐκ τῶν θυν]-

4  

[μυρίας καὶ ὁ δίκα ἀτελῆς ἔστω. Περὶ δὲ τῶν ἐρμητικοῦ ἐκ τῶν πό-

8  

[λόγος ὁ ταῦτα Φιλόκλεος, καὶ τοῖς συμμαχοῖς τοῖς ἀποπραγχεῖσιν ἦπο τῶν πολεμάρχων Ἀρτεμιδώροι, Πύρροι. Θεο-
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While it is indisputable that the two stelai are records of the same dispute, there are several differences between the two. For example, IG IV².1.76+77, line 42 does not duplicate the *vacat* found in IG IV 752, line 5, nor does IG IV 752, line 7 duplicate the *vacat* found in IG IV².1.76+77, line 44. Several distinct differences in
spelling also occur in the two texts. Line 40 of the Epidaurian stele we find δικάζωντο and on the Troizenian stele, line 4, we have the same word spelled slightly differently δικάζοντο with a sigma. The only significant textual difference with the two preserved texts is found in line 42 of the Epidaurian copy = lines 5-6 of the Troizenian copy. It seems that the phrase χωρίων καὶ οἰκίῶν was omitted from the Troizenian stele.

TRANSLATION OF THE COMBINED FRAGMENTS

When -?- son of Gnikon [was -?- in Troizen], in Arsinoë ... when Pheidostratos was [the priest] of Athena ... the following agreement was made between Troizen and Arsinoë (4) [which is to exist between them?] for all time. When ambassadors of King Ptolemy came ... concerning the so-called common territory ... (it was decided?) that the Chersonasos, the Praxoneion (8) and ... and the Stenita would be held in common. (It was also decided that there shall be no hindering at all by tolls) of the quarrying of stone and the cutting of wood ... the putting out to sea and harboring and the moving of troops. There shall not be any hindering of putting out to sea, harboring or moving of troops by ... nor shall there be any further occupation of the fortified camp (charax).... If it is the city (who violates this agreement the fine is) ten thousand drachmas. (16) if it is a private individual (who violates this agreement the fine is) one thousand drachmas and [it is necessary the fine be paid?] to the king.... It is decided that between the Chersonasos and [the Praxoneion?] and the so-called Diastenitis from the low country ... they will mark out (the boundary) as they consented (20) ... and the fortified camp (charax) to the Stenita ... [the Stenita] ... and the land outside the fortified camp (charax),... from the fortified camp (charax) to the White Herm ... to the Stenita let it be common territory and to mark the boundary with stelai ... that things are (to be held) in common from the (24) [Praxoneion and the common territory.... In the common territory let there be security of property.... from the fortified camp (charax) to the White Herm ... the land and the salt harbor ... (28) to give yearly drawing out rights ... to work the salt harbor without taxation as many as they have charge of.... in the so-called Stenita and the ... (32) being marked with stelai. Let the authority be to the common territory .... How much the polemarchoi or the damiorgoi or any other from the common ... or if it is from the land or if it is in the city from ... it is to be indivisible outside the land and (36) there shall be no judgment concerning the money: if it is... if it is a private individual, (who violates this agreement the fine is) one thousand drachmas, if it is the city, (who violates this agreement the fine is) ten thousand drachmas.

\[44\] For more on the dialectical differences between the two copies, see Buck 1955, no. 88, pp. 288-289.

212
Concerning the common territory and the harvest rights from the land and concerning the revenues of the tunny-fishing (40) from previous times let there be no judgment. If there has been a judgment, let it be extended. If it is private individual, (who violates this agreement the fine is) one thousand drachmas, if it is the city, (who violates this agreement the fine is) ten thousand drachmas and let the decision be without end. Concerning the seizure of territory by the city or concerning the agmenon from the lands in which there has been seizure of the common proceeds (44) from the tunny fishing those who have had property seized shall be recompensated by payment? as the treasurer Philokles has accounted, and to those who have been sold out? by the polemarchoi Artemidoros, Pyrros, Theodotos to each one shall be given two hundred drachmas in Troizenian coinage and the lands and as many houses (48) as have been seized by the city, to give back to those who have had (property) seized, releasing from the common proceeds to those who have cultivated any of the lands seized by the city. There shall exist to each other for all time the right of intermarriage and the right to possess country in each other's territory (enktesis). When they are in agreement let it be ratified, (52) let each city dispatch an ambassador to Athens and if it is consented to give to them three men who will make and additional agreement and set it up on stelai in the temple of Poseidon in Calaureia, and in the temple of Asklepios in Epidauros, and in the temple of Athena on the (56) Athenian Acropolis. Each city shall ... each other lawfully for the rest of time.

DATE

Hiller proposed two separate dates for the Epidaurian fragments that Robert and Peek have demonstrated belong to the same stele. He assigned dates between 163-146 B.C. for IG IV2.1.76 and the first half of the 2nd century for IG IV2.1.77. Scholars who have commented on this inscription since Peek's joining of the fragments have accepted a date between 163-146 B.C., which Hiller proposed for IG IV2.1.76. Such a date may be possible, but I believe it can no longer be supported. To understand the problem we must look at the dates proposed for the fragments of the Epidaurian inscription before Peek joined the two.

Hiller also published the editio princeps of IG IV2.1.76 where he explained the reasons for his proposed date. This inscription was dated by the reference in line 5 to king Ptolemaios, who Hiller identified as Ptolemy VI. Citing parallels in the letter-
forms between IG IV².1.76 and inscriptions from the Ptolemaic outpost on Thera datable to Ptolemy VI’s reign, Hiller concluded that the Ptolemy in the inscription could only be Ptolemy VI Philometor. Using parallel letter-forms on inscriptions from Thera to date an Epidaurian inscription is questionable methodology. Moreover, Hiller did not notice that the three fragments all belonged to the same stele. Furthermore, the letter-forms on IG IV 752 have no similarity to those found on IG IV².1.76+77, further weakening arguments for the dating of this inscription by this criterion. Hiller’s date, therefore, should be used with extreme caution.

To assign a more accurate date to the inscriptions let us begin with Hiller’s first half of the 2nd century B.C. date which he proposed for IG IV².1.77 and look for a time when the Achaian League and the Ptolemies were again allied.

Following the breakdown in the alliance between the Achaeans and the Ptolemies during the Cleomenean war we are without literary testimonia for contact between the two until the early 180’s. A thorough examination of the evidence for contact between them from this point until 146 B.C. may help us to determine a possible date for the arbitration between Troizen and Arsinoë. In particular it is references to Ptolemaic ambassadors (προσβευταί) sent to the Peloponnesian who are of interest to us, for IG IV².1.76+77, lines 5-6 records that προσ[βευταν] were sent by the king presumably to assist in the settlement of the dispute. To determine possible candidates for the date of the arbitration between Troizen and Arsinoë the literary evidence for Ptolemaic embassies to the Achaian League must be reviewed thoroughly. By examining each Ptolemaic embassy to the Achaeans and those sent by

---

10 Hiller von Gaertringen 1925-1926. pp. 71-75. The Theran inscriptions are IG XII (3) 331 and Suppl. 1296.
the Achaians to Egypt, we may be able to find a possible circumstance for the dispute's settlement.

The first recorded Ptolemaic embassy to the Achaian League, after their alliance was terminated during the Cleomenean war, occurred some time between 188-186 B.C. when Demetrios of Athens came before the Achaian assembly as King Ptolemy V's ambassador in order to renew the existing alliance.47

At about the same time, Demetrios the Athenian came as an ambassador on behalf of Ptolemy to renew the existing alliance between the king and the Achaians. The Achaians, being willing to receive the renewal, sent as ambassadors to the king Lykortas my father, Theodoridas, and Rhositeles, both Sikyonians, to swear the oaths on behalf of the Achaians and to receive them from the king.

This Demetrios is otherwise unknown from the literary and epigraphic sources.48

When these Achaian ambassadors returned from Egypt they announced to the League assembly that the existing agreement with Ptolemy had been renewed and that a gift of six thousand bronze shields and two hundred talents of coined bronze had been accepted (Polybios 22.9.2-3). This reference to the existing alliance is as ambiguous to us today as it was to several members of the assembly then, most especially the strategos Aristainos who asked the ambassadors which alliance between the Achaians

---

47 For Ptolemaic-Athenian contact in the 2nd century, see Habicht 1997, pp. 220-222 and pp. 232-233 for a brief discussion of the two inscriptions.

48 Willrich RE IV. 1901. col. 2802 (Demetrios, no. 45); P.A. no. 3338, p. 220; Peremans and Van't Dack 1968, no. 14754, p. 48; Walbank 1979, p. 178; LGPN II, s.v. Δημήτριος, no. 33, p. 104; Traill 1996, no. 308365, p. 120.
and the Ptolemy they had renewed. Neither the Achaian, nor the Ptolemaic ambassadors could answer the question. Polybios explicitly describes this event in the following passage.

The Achaian strategos Aristainos got up before them and asked Ptolemy’s ambassador and those dispatched by the Achaians for the renewal, which alliance had been renewed. No one replied and they all began talking to one another; the bouleuterion was full of questions. This was the reason why. Since there was more than one alliance between the Achaians and king Ptolemy and these had many differences according to the circumstances of the situations, the ambassador of Ptolemy made no distinction when it was renewed and he spoke generally about the matter, nor did the Achaian ambassadors, but they swore the oaths and received them from the king as if there only ever existed one alliance. When the strategos brought forth all the alliances and successively determined that in each there were great differences, the assembly sought to know what alliance they would renew.... Finally, he (Aristainos) did not allow the resolution to be ratified, but he concluded the debate, on account of the confusion stated above.

This passage clearly indicates that there had been a number of different alliances between the Achaians and the Ptolemies and that they had been concerned with several distinct matters. Unfortunately we do not know the exact meaning of

---

Errington 1969, pp. 163-165.
συμμαχία here, but Aristainos may have read a text of the Chremonides decree, and possibly from the alliance discussed above which took place after 243/2 B.C. when Aratos made Ptolemy III an Achaian ally and League hegemon. That their terms and circumstances varied widely may possibly conceal both a reference to the settlement between Epidauros and Arsinoē and possible conditions of these alliances.\(^{50}\) If true, this would provide further evidence that the arbitrations under discussion here were conducted when relations between the Ptolemies and the Achaians were friendly. We must also admit that the Achaian ambassadors are said by Polybios to have renewed the “existing alliance” between the king and the Achaians, and not between the Ptolemaic dynasty as a whole. As we have seen, there is no evidence for a prior alliance between the Achaians and Ptolemy V and we must assume, as Aristainos apparently did, that all alliances between the Achaians and the Ptolemies were referred to here.

Within a few years after this diplomatic embarrassment we have additional evidence for renewed contact between the Achaians and the Ptolemies. In 181/0 B.C. king Ptolemy sent another ambassador offering gifts to the Achaians.

"Οτι περὶ τούς αὐτούς καιροὺς Πτολεμαῖος ὁ βασιλεὺς, βουλόμενος ἐμπλέκεσθαι τῷ τῶν Ἀχαιῶν ἐθνεῖ, διεπέμψα ὑπερβευτὴν ἐπαγγελλόμενον δεκαναίαν δώσειν ἐντελὴ πεντηκοντηρίκων πλοίων. οί δ᾽ Ἀχαιοὶ καὶ διὰ τὸ δοκεῖν τὴν διάφορα ἀξίαν εἶναι χάριτος ἀσμένως ἀπεδέξαντο τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν. δοκεῖ γὰρ ἡ διαπάνη ὅποι λείπειν τῶν δέκα ταλάντων. ταύτα δὲ βουλευσάμενοι προεχερίσαντο πρεσβευτάς Λυκόρταν καὶ Πολύβιον καὶ σὺν τούτοις Ἀρατον, ὑιὸν Ἀράτου τοῦ Σικυωνίου, τοὺς ἀμὰ μὲν εὐχαριστήσαντος τῷ βασιλεὶ περὶ τε τῶν ὀπλῶν ὃν πρότερον ἀπέστειλε καὶ τοῦ νομίσματος, ἀμὰ δὲ παραληψιμένους τά

"Larsen (1968, pp. 460-461), in a discussion of this passage, argues that the treaties were a means by which the Ptolemies were able to raise mercenaries in the Peloponnese. He goes so far as to call the Ptolemaic garrison of Arsinoē "something like a permanent armed legation and recruiting station nor is there any sign that the Achaians raised the same objection to the control of Methana by the Ptolemies as they did to that of Aigina by Eumenes." Apparently Larsen was unaware of the two arbitration disputes discussed in this chapter and his comments concerning Arsinoē should be regarded as highly doubtful.
At about the same time king Ptolemy, wishing to become involved with the Achaian League, sent an ambassador announcing that he would give them a full squadron of ten pentekonters. The Achaians since it seemed that the gift was worthy of thanks, readily received the announcement. The cost seemed to be not more than ten talents. Having determined these things they appointed as ambassadors Lykortas and Polybios and with them Aratos, the son of Aratos of Sikyon, that they would both give thanks to the king for the weapons which he had sent earlier and for the coins, and to receive the ships and make preparations concerning their being sent out.... It did not happen that the embassy was sent, for around this time Ptolemy passed away.

Although a Ptolemaic embassy to the Achaians is explicitly referred to here there is nothing in the passage to indicate that any alliance was discussed or sworn. It is clear that the king was trying to improve relations with the Achaians by offering the gifts and this may be interpreted as the precursor to such a step, which is one that both the Achaians and Ptolemy may have envisioned. One responsibility of the Achaian embassy described above was to offer thanks to the king for the weapons and coins sent earlier. These were the gifts Lykortas and the two Sikyonians brought back from Egypt after exchanging oaths with the king and renewing the alliance, which the Achaian assembly did not ratify. That the Achaians were only now sending thanks for these gifts, accepted eight or nine years earlier, is suggestive that the alliance was being renewed at that time. The earlier embassy did, however, exchange oaths with Ptolemy and it is unclear what force, if any, this had after Aristainos suspended debate on its ratification. Perhaps it was still honored as an actual alliance by the Achaians, despite the ambiguity of its terms.
Several other references to embassies exist in Polybios’ narrative. Another
records an Achaian decision to send an embassy to the king in order to renew the
philanthropia between them.

At about the same time they learned that the Anacleteria, the festival usually
celebrated on the king’s coming of age, had been celebrated in honor of King
Ptolemy, thinking it behooved them to note the event, they voted to send
ambassadors to renew the existing friendship with the king, and im mediately
they appointed Alkithos and Pasiadas.

This “renewal” of the philanthropia between the king and the Achaians clearly
indicates that it had already been in existence prior to this embassy. When this
relationship was established and what its conditions were, we have no idea.

We next learn of two separate Achaian embassies who happened to be in
Egypt at the same time. The date of these embassies must be 169/8 B.C. for the
Ptolemaic synedrion voted to send them and other Greek embassies also present there
to discuss terms of peace with Antiochos IV after the battle of Pelusion in that year.
The two Achaians mentioned in this passage are also the same as those in the passage
cited previously, so the renewal of friendship in these two passages refer to the same
event.
First it was resolved by the synedrion to send those ambassadors from Greece to discuss peace with Antiochos. There were then two embassies on behalf of the Achaian League, one for the renewal of their friendship for which Alkithos the son of Xenophon from Aigion and Pasiadas were sent, and the second about the games of Antigonos.

Once again we hear of the “renewal” of the philanthropia between the Achaians and the Ptolemies, which may have been a condition of an unknown alliance. If such an alliance did exist, then it must have been negotiated some time prior to 169/8 B.C.

The final literary reference concerns an embassy from the two Ptolemaic kings to the Achaians who were seeking assistance according to the existing alliance. This embassy occurred not long after the one just discussed in 169/8 B.C. and apparently prior to the battle of Pydna in 167 B.C.

That winter when ambassadors of both kings [Ptolemy and Ptolemy] came to the Peloponnese for assistance, there was a heated debate. The members of Kallikrates, Diophanes and Hyperbatos' party did not approve of giving assistance, the party of Archon, Lykortas and Polybios approved of giving help according the existing alliance....

This is the first unambiguous testimony of an alliance (συμμαχία) that existed prior to this embassy. This could very well be a reference to the alliance postulated above, a condition of which may have been an annual renewal of philanthropia between the Achaians and the Ptolemies.

\[\text{\textsuperscript{51}}\] A similar provision may have been included in the alliance between the Achaians and the Macedonians made during the Cleomenean War. Livy (32.5.4) states that as part of this alliance the Achaians had to renew the oaths annually. For the evidence of the Achaian-Macedonian alliance, see Staatsverträge III. no. 507, pp. 212-217.
Of these few known embassies between the Ptolemies and the Achaians during the first half of the 2nd century B.C. the most striking for our purposes is the first discussed. This embassy to the Achaians by Demetrios the Athenian raises the possible connection between it and the settlement of the dispute between Troizen and Arsinoë. The connection with Athens in this dispute is certain from the Troizenian copy *IG IV 752*, lines 15-19, where it is recorded that both sides send representatives to Athens to have the decision ratified. There is also the provision that one of the three stelai on which the decision was to be recorded was to be set up in the temple of Athena on the Athenian acropolis.

This lengthy discussion on Achaian-Ptolemaic relations in the first half of the 2nd century B.C. has not answered the question of the dispute’s date beyond a doubt, but it has raised a number of interesting possibilities. It must be admitted that Hiller’s proposed date still may be correct, but that his methodology for arriving at it is questionable. This review of the literary evidence has shown that during this period there was extensive contact between the Achaians and the Ptolemies and the evidence of Aristaios’ speech is proof of several alliances between the two prior to 188 B.C. If we can use these references to help assign a date to the inscription it is the contact in the 180’s and more specifically the Ptolemaic embassy headed by Demetrios of Athens that emerges as a possible candidate for the date of the arbitration. An Athenian ambassador’s presence before the Achaian assembly on king Ptolemy’s behalf is highly suggestive of the dispute under discussion which was to be ratified by Athenians. Although the evidence is not conclusive, it is enough to suggest that the arbitration may have been carried out in the 180’s and not as late as 163-146 B.C.
Seven names are preserved in the inscription, but only two shed any light on the date of the dispute or our understanding of it. In fact regarding the five remaining names we are at a complete loss as to their ethnics. The first two names, Gnikon and Pheidostratos, certainly were used as part of a dating formula within the inscription. Hiller read the first name as Nikon and interpreted it as a Troizenian eponymous. The reading Gnikon, as opposed to Nikon, has a profound impact on the date of the dispute. A Gnikon son of Nikokles is known from a Troizenian inscription that is dated to around 146 B.C. and if we are dealing with the same individual this would give us an approximate date for the dispute. The position of Gnikon in the line, however, makes it almost inevitable that it is a patronymic and that Gnikon himself was not the Troizenian eponymous official by which the dispute was dated. Nevertheless, the rarity of the name makes it all but certain that the man on our inscription should be identified with the man on IG IV 757, thus making the unknown eponymous official the son of Gnikon. Another possibility that must be mentioned is that Gnikon son of Nikokles of IG IV 757 is the grandson of our Gnikon, thus generating a hypothetical stemma of [Gnikon]-Nikokles-Gnikon.

A date of around 146 B.C. for IG IV 757, if correct, most likely would exclude a date in the 180’s for our dispute, but does not entirely rule it out. Another possibility

---

52 He is considered Troizenian by the editors of LGPN III.A, s.v. Nikoµ, no. 33. p. 328.

53 See LGPN III.A, s.v. Γvikoµ, no. 1. p. 100. The inscription, with letter forms of the 2nd century B.C. (Maier 1959, no. 32, p. 144), is dated exclusively on the construction of the diateichisma for the safety of the city. The most logical occasion to associate this with is the Achaian War which ended at the Isthmos of Corinth in 146 B.C. Another event, now unknown to us, could certainly have provided such an occasion and we could even associate it with the dispute between Troizen and Arsinoë, which we know included hostilities.
that can be proposed is that *IG* IV 757 should be dated earlier than the years prior to 146 B.C. The inscription has also been dated to just prior to 225 B.C. in association with Cleomenes' attack on Troizen, the only other known critical situation in which the wall might have been built.\(^5^4\) Clearly, however, some unknown event in the first half of the 2nd century B.C. might also have provided such an occasion. If so, we could possibly even associate it with the dispute between Troizen and Arsinoë for it reached drastic proportions, including the seizure of property. Frustratingly, however, this association does little to provide a secure date for the dispute and casts doubt on a date of around 146 B.C. for the diateichisma. Both may be very close in date to one another and a possible association between the two can not be ruled out entirely.

As indicated in the "Epigraphical Commentary" Hiller considered Pheidotroatos to be a priest of Athena and the eponymous official of Arsinoë.\(^5^5\) We have no evidence for this official at Arsinoë and it is doubtful considering the length of the line that he should be identified as such. Athena is known as an important deity at Troizen, but a dating formula by priests of Athena is not paralleled elsewhere at Troizen.\(^5^6\) We have no evidence for a cult of Athena at Arsinoë during the Hellenistic or any other period.

King Ptolemy, who is also mentioned in the text, was clearly involved in the dispute, at least by sending ambassadors, but we do not know which king this was. Hiller tried to identify him with Ptolemy VI Philometor, but substantial doubt is cast on this identification regarding the method by which he arrived at it.

\(^5^4\) Mylonas (1886, p. 136) was the first to propose this date for the inscription.

\(^5^5\) Another Pheidotroatos appears as a patronymic on a 3rd century B.C. grave stele from Methana-Arsinoë, see *LGPN* III.A, s.v. Φείδοστρατος, no. 1, p. 445 (*SEG* XXXVII 320).
Far more problematic to understand is the role played by the last four individuals named in the settlement of the dispute. All we know of the first individual, Philokles, is that he was treasurer (ὁ ταμία) and that the final three, Artemidoros, Pyrrros, and Theodotos, were all polemarchoi. Whether these were magistrates of Troizen, Arsinoë, or possibly the Achaian League is not clear. Two of these four names are paralleled elsewhere as Troizenians, and although they cannot be identified as the same men the possibility does exist. A Pyrrros of Troizen is known from a grave stele found in Athens that is dated to the 2nd century B.C. A Philokles of Troizen is known from around 200 B.C. If these men were magistrates of the Achaian League then there is no reason that they should be associated with one another, as they could be from any member state within the Peloponnese.

THE SETTLEMENT OF THE DISPUTE

These two inscriptions record the second of two known arbitration settlements between an Achaian League member and Ptolemaic Arsinoë. The manner in which the decision was reached in this case is quite different from that recorded on IG IV².1.72, when the Achaian League sent judges from eleven cities who made up the arbitration board. Here we are unfortunate that the stone is broken away in a critical spot, but it seems certain enough that King Ptolemy sent ambassador(s) (lines 5-6).

---

56 According to Pausanias (2.30.6) Athena shared Troizen with Poseidon and was represented on their coinage. For the shrine of Athena of Strength on the acropolis, see Pausanias 2.32.4.

57 All four men are listed in LGPN III.A as Troizenians.

58 LGPN III.A, s.v. Πύρρος, no. 6. p. 383. The Athenian inscription is IG II² 10463.

59 LGPN III.A, s.v. Φιλοκλῆς, no. 22. p. 456 = PP 4126.
Whether or not judges (κρίται) were also sent, as Hiller supplemented, is not at all certain.

An understanding of how this dispute was settled cannot, however, be limited to this for the presence on the stone of πολέμαρχοι (lines 33 and 46) and δαμιοργοί (line 33) must also be explained. Both are known magistrates within the Achaian League, thus we must consider the possibility that it too played a role in the settlement of the dispute, possibly sharing this responsibility with the Ptolemaic ambassadors. Before proceeding to this question the evidence for these two boards must be reviewed, as our knowledge of them both is very limited. The damiorgoi were a board of ten men who held great power within the League and among their responsibilities was conducting foreign affairs and receiving ambassadors, which may explain their presence on our stele.60 If not Achaian magistrates, the damiorgoi could possibly be Troizenian for the institution is attested there, prior to their entrance into the Achaian League.61 For the institution of the polemarchoi we are on even less secure ground, but often they do appear with the damiorgoi, as in our inscription.62

Another official mentioned in our inscription is the tamia (IG IV2.1.76+77, line 45; IG IV 752, line 8), for whom we are also without direct evidence concerning his involvement in the dispute. The tamiai are known officials from Troizen during the Hellenistic period, but it is not clear if Philokles in our inscription is a Troizenian

60 For the damiorgoi in general, see Aymard 1938a. pp. 173-175; Larsen 1968, pp. 221-223; Veligianna-Terzi 1977.

61 See IG IV 746, which is dated there to the 4th century B.C.

62 The polemarchoi seem to have had some role in the settlement of a dispute between Argos and Kleonai, see SEG XXIII 178. line 3.
official. Another interpretation concerning the tamia can be proposed if we understand him to be an official from Calaureia, where this official is also attested. The presence of a Calaureian official on our stone would not be entirely surprising, for the inscription records that one of the three stelai was to be set up at Poseidon’s sanctuary there.

Perhaps the way this dispute should be interpreted is to see it settled by two separate arbitration boards, each with slightly different responsibilities than the other. The first board was most likely a Ptolemaic one, with the ambassadors sent by the king acting as one commission. The second board seems to have been made up of representatives of the Achaian League, possibly the damiorgoi, polemarchoi or both. Each board may have reached their decisions that were then sent to Athens for ratification. Placing a break in line 32 may illuminate the text. Prior to this point only the Ptolemaic ambassadors are attested, whereas it is not until line 33 that the polemarchoi and damiorgoi are mentioned. The text up to line 32 is also somewhat different in its content, for in these lines we are dealing almost exclusively with toponyms that delineate the common territory. Following the introduction of the polemarchoi and damiorgoi in line 33, the content of the decision is slightly different as it focuses more on issues such as the seizure of property, the right of intermarriage and enktesis. The absence of the polemarchoi and damiorgoi in the first 32 lines does not exclude the possibility that they were involved in this part of the decision as the stele is not complete. Furthermore, the lack of reference to the Ptolemaic ambassadors in the second part of the ruling indicates that they were not involved

---

63 See IG IV 757, face A, line 3.

64 For example, see IG IV 839, line 3 and IG IV 841, line 11.
here, although we do not know what was recorded within the last twelve lines of the stele. This second ruling concludes in line 51 and is followed by the provision calling on representatives to be sent to Athens for the ratification of the decision and the clause calling for the setting up of the three stelai.

Evidence within the text also seems to indicate that hostilities between the two cities had existed for some time. This is consistent with a gap of at least forty years between the end of the Achaian-Ptolemaic alliance during the Cleomenean war and Demetrios of Athens' embassy. Unfortunately no direct literary evidence can be cited to support this thesis, but Polybios mentions two events during the Social War that may shed some light on the situation around the Akte in the late 3rd century B.C. The first occurred in 217 B.C. when as part of an Achaian resolution, it was decided to man three ships to sail around the Akte and the Argolic gulf (Polybios 5.91.8). The second incident took place at the time of the harvest, also in 217 B.C., when Aratos remained in the Argolis to watch over the collection of grain (Polybios 5.95.5). While neither of these events supplies conclusive evidence for hostilities in the southern Argolid involving the Ptolemaic colony on Methana, they do tell us of the area's importance for the Achaians, and that they believed it deserved special attention on these two occasions.

TOPOGRAPHICAL COMMENTARY

A few attempts have been made to identify the toponyms mentioned in the inscription. To understand the area between the two states and why they disputed it
each toponym must be discussed separately, mentioning previously proposed identifications for them as well as my personal observations.65

Χερσόνασος (IG IV².1.76+77. lines 7 and 17).

This may be the easiest toponym within the inscription to identify. The word, which means a peninsula, may refer to Methana itself, as others have proposed.66 More probable, however, is that it should be identified with the small peninsula that extends eastwards towards the island of Poros and to the north of Troizen’s harbor, Pogon (Figure 5.16). That this toponym is followed immediately by Praxoneion in line 7 and possibly line 17 may indicate that the two are at least close to one another.

Πραξονείων (IG IV².1.76+77. lines 7, 18? and 24?).

Welter and Faraklas have identified this with the area just north of Troizen and on the south side of the Methana isthmus.67 Neither gives an explanation for their identification. As just indicated it should probably be looked for either within the Chersonasos or near it.

---

65 I owe a great debt of gratitude to Eleni Konsolaki of the Second Ephoreia of Prehistoric and Classical antiquities for sharing with me her knowledge of the Methana peninsula and the topography of the Troizenia. She also kindly introduced me to Giorgios Oikonomou, resident and archaeological guard of Methana, who was also invaluable for his knowledge of the peninsula.

66 Those who have commented on this include Hiller 1925-1926, p. 73 and Welter 1941, p. 7. See also Thucydides 4.45.2 and his description of an Athenian campaign in the Akte: ἀπολαμβάνεις τῶν τῆς χερσονήσου ἱσθμῶν ἔτειχεν ἐν ᾳ Μέθανα ἐστίν. καὶ ὁρόσυνον καταστήσαμεν ἐλήστευον τῶν ἐπείτα χρόνων τε τῷ Τροζηνίαν γῆν καὶ Ἀλίαδα καὶ Ἑπίδαυρον. (Cutting off the isthmus on which is Methana, they walled it off. They established a garrison which spent its time plundering the territory of Troizen, Halies and Epidaurus). Several walls, datable between the late Classical and Hellenistic periods, have been identified along the Methana isthmus. For these remains, see Mee and Forbes 1996, pp. 162-168, sites MS200 A and D and MS202 B. The authors (1996, p. 65) also discuss this passage briefly and comment that “the wall itself was probably hastily constructed and is likely to have left little trace detectable from field survey.” We also know (Thucydides 5.18.7) that the garrison was withdrawn from Methana in 421, some four years after it was founded. While the wall may have been “hastily constructed” when the Athenians first landed on Methana, a four year occupation is plenty of time to build a substantial wall that would leave a more permanent trace.

67 Welter 1941, p. 7; Faraklas. AGC. 10, appendix II, p. 6.
This topographical reference only appears in Hiller's supplement. As most other toponyms recorded in the inscription are located near the isthmus it would not be surprising to find mention of it within the text, but since it is not preserved it should not be considered with the other topographical points. If reference to an isthmus did appear on the inscription then it would certainly have to be identified with the Methana isthmus itself.

Στενίτας (IG IV².1.76+77, lines 8, 20, [23], and 33).

This must certainly be identified with the Methana Isthmos, which is still called Στενό today. It could also have some connection with the bay to the east of the Methana isthmus, known today as Steno bay ("Ορμος Στενό). If Στενίτας here means the isthmus itself, then it is even more difficult to defend Hiller's restored [ 'Ισθμός] in line 8.

χάραζ (IG IV².1.76+77, lines 14, 20?, 21, 22, and 26).

The term charax literally means a pointed stake, and by extension, a palisaded camp. If this meaning is correct, such a camp, or small fort probably would not have left much in the way of physical remains. On the other hand, the χάραζ may refer to a fortified site constructed of a rubble wall. The use of a fortified camp as a boundary marker is an unlikely possibility and this is confirmed by the stipulation within the settlement that it is to be abandoned. No identification has been proposed for its

---

68 Weller (1941, p. 7) remarks that the isthmus is also called Stenitas, but he does not comment on the fact that the reference to the isthmus is based only on Hiller's supplement.

69 McCredie (1966, pp. 97-99) discusses the meaning of the term χάραζ and argues strongly that here as on Patroklos' Island, off the coast of southern Attica, we are dealing with rubble walls and not a palisaded camp. Mee and Forbes (1997, pp. 74-75) support McCredie's theory, but they do not attempt to identify it with any of the rubble walls found on the isthmus.
location, but the only ancient rubble walls known in this area are from the Isthmos itself.

Διαστενίτις (IG IV².1.76+77, line 18).

This undoubtedly has some connection with the Methana isthmus and the Στενίτας, but their relationship is unclear. The term διάστενος means a very narrow strip of land and could thus be a reference to the narrowest part of the isthmus, which is at its southernmost end.

ό λευκός Ἔρμας (IG IV².1.76+77, lines 22, 26-27).

Undoubtedly a topographical marker used to delineate the territory referred to in the inscriptions. Its precise location is unknown, but it must have been close to the Charax since it immediately follows it in the list of toponyms. The use of herms to mark boundaries in antiquity was a common practice. Welter has proposed the only possible candidate for its location, claiming it cannot be a marble herm, but a projecting white rock, which he identified on the “nördlichen Ende von Hügle I,” the southernmost on the Isthmos. I have not been able to identify any prominent candidates for the White Herm along the Isthmos. Furthermore, if one is to be found there it is unlikely that it would be on the north side of a hill making it unobservable to one approaching Methana from Troizen.

On a small hill east of Ag. Nikolaos harbor above the road from Vidi (Βοῖότι) to Methana, I noticed a large, prominent rock which may possibly be identified with the White Herm (Figure 5.11). The rock appears to be a gray limestone from a distance, but upon closer examination it is streaked with veins of white marble. It is located on

the south slope of the hill, approximately half way up it, below the summit. On its south face, which is visible to one traveling towards Methana, are four man-made cuttings. Two of these are on a level surface (Figures 5.13-14) and must have been used to place something upright, the other two are on the side of the rock face (Figure 5.12) and may have been used to hang something from them. Those on the flat surface of the rock measure *ca.* 0.15 m and *ca.* 0.22 m. No other cuttings or sherds were noticed around this rock, but since it lies along one of the two routes towards Methana from the mainland its prominence, coupled with the cuttings on the face visible from the road make this a likely candidate for the White Herm.

Another possible explanation for these cuttings is to understand them as quarrying marks. This is a highly unlikely solution, however, for there is no other rock source near the proposed White Herm. Furthermore, it would be difficult to understand why someone went through the trouble of making the cuttings, but did not bother extracting the block. Quarrying, therefore, seems an unlikely explanation for the cuttings.

Identification of this rock with the White Herm is certainly subjective and cannot be proved conclusively. Some literary evidence, however, can be cited to support the identification of a rock with as a boundary marker or herm. As far back as Homer (*Iliad* 21.403-405) large rocks were called boundary markers, “Drawing back she (Athene) took the stone in her strong hands, it was lying on the ground - black, rough, and great, men of the past set it up there as the boundary stone of the field.”²

---

¹ Welter 1941, p. 7.
² ἤ δ' ἀναγχασσαμένη λίθον ἐίλετο χειρὶ παχεὶν
κείμενον ἐν πεδίῳ, μέλανα, τρητῶν τε μέγαν τε,
tὸν ρ' ἄνδρες πρῶτοι θέσαν εὑμεναι οὐρὸν ἄροφρης.
Furthermore, there is sufficient ancient testimonia that a herm need not be a sculpted stone monument of the familiar type. According to Pausanias (2.38.7), the boundary of Argos, Tegea, and Sparta was marked by stone herms. Both Hesychios (s.v. Ἐρμαίος λόφος; s.v. ἔρμας) and the Suda (s.v. Ἐρμαιόν) tell us that herms can be piles of stones, which are often placed the roads. Although no evidence of an ancient road has been found in the area of my candidate for the White Herm, it is along one of only two natural routes from the area of Troizen to the Methana peninsula. If a pile of stones can be called a herm then a single large and prominent stone, also by a road could conceivably be called a herm as well. Perhaps even something anthropomorphic, or similar in shape to a normal herm could easily be proposed, or itself called a herm.

Although it is more an economic issue than a toponym, the reference here to tuna fishing allows us to identify a probable location. The small bay on the west side of the Methana isthmus is today known by the name of Ὄρμος θυλλή, for the tuna fish which were once caught here. It has even been remarked that within this harbor may be seen the remains of tuna traps (Figure 5.15), whose date is uncertain. These remains are still visible to the west of the isthmus itself and I have been told that this is the old method of fishing around Methana. Tuna and other fish swim in the Bay of Epidauros in a counter-clockwise direction and it is at this point near the

---

7 Hesychios s.v. Ἐρμαίος λόφος: τοὺς σωροὺς λίθων ἔρμας, τοὺς ἐν ταῖς ὁδοῖς γινομένους εἰς τιμὴν τοῦ θεοῦ. Suda s.v. Ἐρμαιόν: εὖρημα. ἔπειδὴ λίθων σωροὺς ὁσιέρουν τῷ Ἐρμῆ ἐν ταῖς ὁδοῖς ταῖς ὀδήλοις.

7 For tunny traps in general, see Galant 1985, pp. 21-23 and pls. 12-14. For a discussion of fishing around the Argolid, see Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, pp. 311-316.

isthmos that the traps are set. Nets positioned in the line that the fish swim divert them off their course into a holding tank. When the fish are securely within the tank a door is shut, trapping them. Although this method of catching tuna was not employed in antiquity, it is possible that the location disputed in the inscription is the same.

λιθίνας καὶ ξύλινας. (IG IV².1.76+77, line 9).

This reference to the cutting of stone and wood is also economic in nature, but these stipulations may shed light on the topography of the dispute. Eugene Vanderpool in an unpublished paper on the antiquities of Methana reported the existence of a quarry “which may date from ancient times” located “near the summit of the limestone hill above the isthmus.” Vanderpool was apparently referring to the hill known today as Asprovouni (Ἀσπροβούνι, elv. 355 m). In November 1998 I located what must be the site mentioned by Vanderpool, but I was unable to determine if it is indeed an ancient quarry. Nevertheless, this is the only possible quarry site in the area, thus it is tempting to associate it with the quarrying of stone referred to in the inscription. If, however, Asprovouni was exploited for its limestone in antiquity it is hard to understand how it fits with the other toponyms, as it is located within the Methana peninsula, north of the isthmus. Eleni Konsolaki and Giorgos Oikonomou have also suggested to me that ancient quarrying may have occurred on the small southernmost hill along the isthmos. There has been modern

---

* Vanderpool 1930, p. 20. No ancient quarries were recorded in Mee and Forbes 1997.

** Miliarakis’ (1886) map indicates ancient ruins near the summit of Asprovouni, but he does not describe them. I have not seen any traces of antiquities there that may be identified with them.

*** The site certainly looks like an ancient quarry to me, but an indisputable identification would require a trained geologist. No abandoned blocks, or impressions left by blocks removed from the quarry were noticed. It should be mentioned, however, that at least three modern quarries exist on the lower slopes of this hill.
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quarrying at this site which may have destroyed traces of ancient exploitation.\(^7\) This site fits the location better for the quarrying of stone as described in the inscription than the hill of Asprovouni. N. Faraklas suggested another possibility by placing an ancient quarry at his proposed Praxoneion, on the east side of the hill south of the isthmos.\(^8\) Although I have not located any activity of ancient quarrying in this area, the location suggested by Faraklas is not far from the site proposed above for the White Herm. As mentioned in the discussion above, marble is present in that area which may be suggestive of a quarry site nearby. This does not imply that the quarry mentioned in our inscription was for marble.

\[\alpha\lambda\alpha\ (IG IV^2.1.76+77, \text{lines 27, 29, and 30}).\]

The mining of salt is another economic concern, but one that can be used to understand the territory and why it was disputed.\(^9\) Salt has been mined outside the Methana peninsula, primarily along the coast to the west of the isthmos (Figure 5.17) in the area near Psiphta (\[\Psi\phi\tau\alpha\]) and Valariou harbor ("\[\Omega\mu. \\beta\alpha\lambda\alpha\rho\iota\omicron\upsilon\]).\(^2\)

Interestingly, two early travelers to the area of Troizen and Methana report the existence of a salt lake. Gell described the view from the citadel of Troizen,

\(^7\) I have walked extensively around this hill and the modern quarry, but again I located no evidence of ancient activity here.

\(^8\) \textit{AGC} 10, appendix 2, p. 6. Faraklas does not report any remains to support this identification, which he made based solely on the evidence of this inscription.


\(^2\) Hiller von Gaertingen (1925-1926, p. 75) placed the salt works on the coast between the Isthmos and Vathy harbor. Robert (1960, p. 159 note 2) proposed that they should be identified with Valariou harbor, which he also identifies with the \[\alpha\lambda\iota\alpha\ \lambda\iota\mu\eta\] of \[\text{Euripides, Hippolytos}, \text{lines 228 and 1133}\.\] Frazer (1913, p. 279), writing before the discovery of the inscription, mentions a lagoon near the village of Valaria which is salt.
mentioning the “Limne, or salt lake, near the gulph of Methana.” Dodwell noted that on his route from Methana to Phanari he passed a small salt lake on his left, which can only be Psiphta. Another possible location for salt mining is the small Ag. Nikolaos harbor on the northeast of the small peninsula, southeast of the Methana isthmos, which I have proposed as the location of the Chersonasos of the inscription. This may be a highly likely candidate, as it is also located very close to the proposed White Herm and possibly the charax. The most likely place, however, for the salt mining mentioned in the dispute must be along the coast most likely at Psiphta and possibly at Valariou harbor.

The decision to let the citizens of both states work the salt harbor without taxation provides us with some insight into the dispute. Not much is known about salt mining in antiquity, but it is clear that the Ptolemies held a state monopoly over the production and taxation of salt that was valid even in Ptolemaic possessions outside Egypt. This was a practice unparalleled in antiquity before the Roman Empire. Since Arsinoë was a Ptolemaic colony we can assume that this was one of the more delicate issues involved in the settlement and that the Ptolemaic garrison on Methana attempted to tax the use of these salt mines with the revenues from these taxes being sent to the king in Egypt. The freedom from taxation concerning salt mining certainly suggests that this point, at least, is one the citizens of Arsinoë lost as a result of the dispute’s settlement.

---

83 Gell 1810. p. 122.
84 Dodwell 1819. p. 285. The British Admiralty Chart (Aegina and Methana 1839) has Psiphta marked as “Salt Lake.” The name is preserved from the ancient Psi, which is mentioned by Pausanias (2.32.9, θάλασσαν δὲ τὴν Ψίσσαν) and in IG IV 823, line 35, an inscription from Troizen, which records private contributions for work on the road from Psipha (ὀδοὺ ἐργασίας ἀπὸ Ψίσσας Θεσσαλίων). The Psiphean Sea is discussed by Frazer 1913, pp. 283-284.
If this identification of the salt harbor at either Psiphta or Valariou harbor and my theory concerning the Ptolemaic control of salt production are correct, then we must admit that Arsinoë held territory on the mainland. The use of the salt harbor and salt-panning in it should perhaps be seen in close connection with the dispute over tuna fishing rights. If catches within the harbor were significant, then a large amount of salt would have been required for the preservation and storage of the tuna.

It comes as no surprise that the landmarks mentioned in the inscription, and identifiable with some certainty, are located close to the sea and around the Methana isthmus. This is the most logical area for a dispute between these two cities, as the citizens of Arsinoë would have had little or no access to the mainland beyond the isthmus. Clearly land alone was not at stake, but also certain rights on the sea which were common to both.

OTHER ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL ISSUES

The thrust of the dispute seems to have been economic rather than territorial. This is certain from the points mentioned above dealing with tuna fishing, cutting of stone and wood, and salt mining. Analysis, therefore, of land use within the common territory is straightforward. A vivid picture of an economically diverse landscape can be constructed from the inscription. Other than the toponyms discussed above, several other aspects of this countryside are illuminated throughout the ruling.

The arbitrators also ruled on other issues, including taxes on the entering and leaving of port, both of which must have affected the import and export of goods. What is of particular interest here is what ports were subject to this ruling. The
ancient harbor of Troizen, Pogon (Πόγον), has been identified with the modern harbor Vidi (Figure 5.16).\textsuperscript{86} Arsinoë itself most likely had two harbors, on the east of the peninsula there must have been a harbor at the modern harbor of Loutra as evidenced by the fortifications at Nissaki and on the west coast of the peninsula there was again certainly a harbor at the modern town of Vathy, which would have served the main town on the peninsula.\textsuperscript{87} It seems highly unlikely that the harbors mentioned in the settlement should be associated with any of these three harbors, but if this assumption is correct then another candidate must be identified.

Social issues also played a central role in the dispute with the rights of land ownership in the common territory (line 26) and intermarriage (ἐπιταγμαὶ IG IV\textsuperscript{2}.1.76+77, line 50; IG IV 752, line 13) at stake. A ruling on these issues by the arbitrators undoubtedly means that they were the causes of problems for a segment of society, most especially those living close to the border and those living across it.

A grant of enktesis, or the right for citizens of one state to hold land in the territory of the other was also granted by the arbiters.\textsuperscript{88} This ruling too, must have been the result of some controversy concerning this issue. Nevertheless, in the context of the first half of the 2nd century B.C. it is interesting to learn that land was at such a premium, so that the inhabitants of this small corner of the Akte possessed land in each other’s territory.

\textsuperscript{86} No excavation has been carried out here nor has a plan of the remains been made. The testimonia include Herodotos 8.42 and Strabo 8.6.14. For the identification, see \textit{AGC} 10. Appendix 2, p. 1.

\textsuperscript{87} For the fortifications at Nissaki, see Mee and Forbes 1997, site MS103, pp. 152-153 with earlier bibliography. For the main Hellenistic settlement on the west coast, see Mee and Forbes 1997, site MS 10, pp. 122-127.

\textsuperscript{88} For grants of enktesis in Attica, see Perçika 1966.
The dispute between the two neighbors even reached a point that lands and houses were seized and people taken captive. Undoubtedly, there had been several instances in which one side or the other (or both) tried to impose taxes on the use of the natural resources of the disputed territory. We can be fairly certain of this when we consider that the arbitrators made many of these issues untaxable, such as extracting salt from the harbors.

CONCLUSIONS

Relations between the Achaian League and the Ptolemaic kingdom were often very good, but this was not always the case depending on the problems each faced closer to home. This fluctuation in relations is reflected in the interaction of the Ptolemaic colony of Arsinoē and the Achaian League members Epidauros and Troizen. The inscribed records of two arbitration disputes between these Achaian League members and Arsinoē have been seen as taking place during times when relations between the two were not good. I have shown that in the case of *IG IV²*.1.72, which has been dated to the years after 228 B.C., should now be placed prior to that date. It was during this time that the Achaians and the Ptolemies were in a formal alliance, which would explain the use of Achaian judges in a dispute with a city that was not a member of the League. A date before 228 B.C. is also more plausible after examining all of the evidence for the cities mentioned in the inscription, both the litigants and those who sent judges. Of the three certain Achaian League members mentioned on the stele, all were no longer members by 225 B.C. as a result of the Cleomenean war.

The second dispute studied in this chapter has been dated consistently by scholars between the years 163 and 146 B.C. following Hiller von Gaertringen, who
arrived at this date by comparing the letter-forms with Ptolemaic inscriptions from Thera. I have tried to show that this method of dating the inscription is suspect and that the dispute may have occurred as early as the 180’s based on a study of Ptolemaic ambassadors to the Achaian League. Such a date cannot be proven beyond a doubt, nor can we rule out Hiller’s entirely. I believe that a date within the first half of the 2nd century is the safest possibility, but that the evidence is suggestive of a date no earlier than the 180’s B.C.

Both disputes were concerned primarily with economic issues and the arbitration between Troizen and Arsinoē certainly dealt with the definition of the two states’ border near the isthmos and the establishment of a common territory. The inscription recording the dispute between Epidauros and Arsinoē is unfortunately much more fragmentary and it is unclear at best if there was any dispute over a border or territory. It is hard to see how Epidauros and Arsinoē could share a common boundary, as the Troizenia lies between the two. It is the sea to the west of Methana where their dispute most likely was focused. Access to the shore of the mainland in territory that was Epidaurian may have provided the impetus for the arbitration between the two states.

The existence of a Ptolemaic outpost on the Methana peninsula and so close to the territory of the Achaian League could potentially have created problems for both, and at times it undoubtedly did. The practice of diplomacy through arbitration proved to be the logical solution on at least two occasions. This practice proved easiest to conduct during times when the Achaians and the Ptolemies were allied, at least nominally.
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Figure 5.15: Remains of tuna trap in Thunni Bay.
Figure 5.16: View from southeast of Troizen, showing 1. Pogon harbor; 2. The Chersonasos?; 3. Calaureia (Poros).

Figure 5.17: Methana Isthmos from northeast (Asprovouni), showing 1. Thunni Bay; 2. Psiphta; 3. Valariou harbor.
CHAPTER 6

THE BORDERS OF HELLENISTIC TROIZEN

INTRODUCTION

Other than the dispute discussed in the previous chapter, between Arsinoē and Troizen (IG IV².1.76+77). we have no other firm evidence that Troizen disputed its borders with its two other contiguous neighbors. Epidauros and Hermion. The text of IG IV 791B will be presented and discussed in this chapter since its is suggestive of a border dispute between Troizen and Hermion that occurred shortly after the dissolution of the Achaian League. The inscription itself is fragmentary. and preserves no topographical information concerning the border. We are without any evidence for a dispute between Epidauros and Troizen.

This chapter provides an analysis of Troizen’s border to the north with Epidauros and to the southwest with Hermion. It is quite different from the previous chapters since we have no epigraphical information by which we might determine the line of these boundaries. Nevertheless, Pausanias has provided a detailed account of the area which can be supplemented with accounts of Strabo, Livy and the early travelers. Furthermore much of this area has been widely surveyed and with the
publication of these results a very detailed picture of these borders can be reconstructed.

**IG IV 791B. Arbitration? between Hermion and Troizen.**

*Ed. pr.:* Legrand 1900, no. 6, pp. 200-201  
Fraenkel, *IG IV* 791B  
Hiller, *IG IV* 2.1, p. xxvii  
Wilhelm 1911, p. 28-29  
Ager 1996, no. 151, p. 413  
Gruen. p. 738

The inscription was found in 1899 by Legrand, built into the church of Ag. Sotiria in the agora of Troizen. The inscribed block was not moved from the site and it has not been moved to any museum. Eleni Konsolaki has informed me that it is still on the site of ancient Troizen. During a search of the site in June 1999 I could see what appeared to be the block within the overgrown ruins, but it remains inaccessible. The stone itself, which may have been a statue base, is inscribed on two faces, that Fraenkel designated A and B (see Figures 6.1-2). Traces of only four letters survive on Fraenkel’s transcription of Face A and little can be made out. Since I have not seen the stone, the text below is not based on personal autopsy, but on Fraenkel’s text of Face B.

```
[Γ]ơ[πρή]τππνν Ἐξ[.....]ονα
εὐερεῖταν ἄ πολις[ζ] ἀνέθη[κε]
ἀγορανομήσαντα καὶ πρε[σβευ]-
σαντα εἰς Ἑρμαν ὑπὲρ θηλίας καὶ
συμμαχίας καὶ ὑπὲρ τὰς [είρανας]
ποθ Ἐρμιονεῖς ἐπτάκις[ζ]
```

**APPARATUS CRITICUS**

Line 1: ΞΩ...ΠΙΟΝΕΧ (Legrand) [Γ]Ơ[πρή]τππνν (Fraenkel, Hiller); Line 5: [είρανας] (Fraenkel), [είρανας] or [συλλύστους] (Wilhelm), [ὀμολογίας] (Hiller)
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EPIGRAPHICAL COMMENTARY

Line 1: Fraenkel's text has been reproduced above, and for lines 2-6 his readings are the same as other editors. Line 1, however, presents some problems. As will be clear from the *Apparatus Criticus*, Legrand's reading of this line is quite different. Since we are dealing with a name that might shed light on the dispute, autopsy of the stone is essential to check the readings. As noted above, the stone is now inaccessible and I was unable to do this. Without personally examining the line I am hesitant to make any conclusions about it.

TRANSLATION
The city set up (this statue?)
of Gorgippos, son of Ex[.....]on their benefactor,
since he served agoranomos and also as ambassador
to Rome seven times for the [friendship? and]
the alliance and the [peace?] with the citizens of Hermion.

DATE

The presence of Rome and the absence of the Achaian League within this small inscription has caused commentators to date it most likely to the period after the absolution of the League in 146 B.C.¹ This need not necessarily be the case, however, as Rome is not unknown as an arbitrator between Achaian League members in the first half of the 2nd century B.C.² The only other criterion by which we might be able to make an approximation for the date is the letter forms. Unfortunately no

¹ Gruen 1984, p. 738 (*SEG* XXXIV 1723); Ager 1994, no. 151, p. 413. Others have dated the inscription to post 196 B.C., see Hiller, *IG* IV², 1, p. xxvii.

² Rome arbitrated between Sparta and Megalopolis, see Polybios 31.1.6-7; Pausanias 7.11.1-2 and Ager 1996, no. 135, pp. 374-376. Another dispute between Sparta and possibly Argos was also arbitrated by Rome, see Pausanias 7.11.1-2 and Ager 1996, no. 136, pp. 376-377. Both of these cases are datable to 163 B.C.
photographs of the stone have been published, thus nothing can be said with certainty regarding this.

LITERARY AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL EVIDENCE FOR THE BORDERS OF THE TROIZENIA

The fact that Troizen and Hermion seem to have had a border dispute resolved after the absolution of the Achaian League, or possibly earlier, suggests that there had been a long standing dispute between the two. Such a dispute may have been settled at some point during their membership within the League, but no epigraphical or literary record of one survives. Within these literary sources, however, we have evidence that is suggestive of a border conflict between the two city-states.

Several ancient authors specifically refer either to Troizen's border with Hermion, or to specific places within their territories. This information is highly suggestive that a conflict between the two occurred, on at least one occasion along the southern coast of the Akte, specifically between the areas of Thermisia in the Hermionid and Cape Skyllaion which our sources place in both the Troizenia and the Hermionid. Each piece of evidence and the date for it can be used to reconstruct a boundary in this region which undoubtedly shifted over time.

The earliest chronological reference to the southern coast of the Akte and its status is provided by the Roman historian Livy, who while describing the events of the year 200 B.C., places the boundary between Troizen and Hermion at Skyllaion. He writes

\[\textit{classis a Corcyra eiusdem principio aestatis cum L. Apustio legato profecta Maleo superato circa Scyllaeum agri Hermionici Attalo regi coniuncta est.} \]

(Livy 31.44.1)
In the beginning of the same summer a fleet with L. Apustius as legate, left Corcyra and rounding Malea joined King Attalos near Skyllaion which is in the territory of Hermion.

Roughly contemporary with Livy, the geographer Strabo also makes two references to the same Cape Skyllaion. He too specifically refers to it as a place in the territory of Hermion: τό δὲ Σκύλλαιον τὸ ἐν Ἕρμιόνῃ (Strabo 8.6.13). Skyllaion, which is in the Hermionid. On another occasion, Strabo (10.5.1) writes:

ἡ Μῆλος, ἀξιολογώτερα τούτων, διέχουσα τοῦ Ἕρμιονικοῦ ἀκρωτηρίου, τοῦ Σκυλλαιου, σταδίους ἐπτακοσίους.

Melos, which is more worthy of mention than these, is seven hundred stades from the Skyllaion peninsula in the Hermionid.

In the mid 2nd century after Christ, Pausanias twice mentions the Troizenian-Hermionid boundary and its association with a sanctuary of Demeter that he places within the borders of the Hermionid:

"Εστι δὲ ὁ δόξας ἐς Ἕρμιόνα ἐκ Τροιζῆνος κατὰ τὴν πέτραν ἢ πρότερον μὲν ἐκαλεῖτο Σθενίου Διὸς Βομός, μετὰ δὲ Θησέα άνελόμενον τὰ γνωρίσματα ὅνομαζουσιν οἱ νῦν Θησέας αὐτῆν. κατὰ ταῦταν ο뇜 τὴν πέτραν ιοὐσιν ὄρεινήν ὄδὸν. ἔστι μὲν Ἀπόλλωνος ἐπίκλησιν Πλατανιστίου ναός. ἔστι δὲ Εἰλεοὶ χωρίων, ἐν δὲ αὐτῷ Δήμητρος καὶ Κόρης τῆς Δήμητρος ἱερὰ. τὰ δὲ πρὸς θάλασσαν ἐν ὅροις τῆς Ἕρμιονίδος ἱερῶν Δήμητρος ἐστὶν ἐπίκλησιν Θερμασίας. (Pausanias 2.34.6).

There is a road to Hermion from Troizen by the rock which used to be called the altar of Zeus of Strength, but nowadays since Theseus took away the tokens they call it Theseus’ Rock. Along the mountain road that passes this rock is a shrine of Apollo of the Plane Tree, there is also the territory of Eileoi, in which there are sanctuaries of Demeter and Kore. Towards the sea on the Hermionid boundary there is a sanctuary of Demeter Thermasia.
Leake, during his journey supports the conclusion that the sanctuary of Demeter Thermasia was in the Hermionid, on its border with the Troizenia. Later, discussing the cults of Hermion he again mentions the sanctuary of Demeter Thermasia:

Δήμητρος δὲ ἱερὰ πεποίηται Θερμασίας, τὸ μὲν ἐπὶ τοῖς πρὸς τὴν Ῥώμην ὅροις, ὡς ἐστὶν εἰρημένον ἢ ὡς μοι. τὸ δὲ καὶ ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ πόλει. (Pausanias 2.34.11).

There are sanctuaries of Demeter Thermasia, one on the Troizenian border as I have already said, the other in the city [of Hermion] itself.

Less importantly for our purposes, he also states that, “Methana is a peninsula of the Peloponnese: but inside it Troizenian territory borders on Hermion.” (Pausanias 2.34.5).

Clearly this evidence is contradictory and indicates that the border between the two states had shifted between the early 1st and the mid 2nd centuries after Christ. The evidence of Livy could be used to place the terminus post quem as far back as 200 B.C., but displaying caution here is the better choice as the Roman historian may have placed Skyllaion in the Hermionid because it was there when he wrote (1st century after Christ). Hesitation here is further confirmed if we consider IG IV 757, found in Troizen on which are recorded a list of contributors for the construction of a diateichisma. One group recorded on the stele for their

---

1 Leake (1830a. p. 462) states that the temple of Demeter at Thermisia appers “to have been just within the boundary line of the Hermionis, which was marked probably by the course of a river falling into the sea a little eastward of Thermis.”

2 Briscoe (1973. p. 150) believes that the location of Skyllaion need not be changed, but that the boundary must have shifted over time.

3 For the inscription (IG IV 757), see now Maier (1959. no. 32. pp. 139-145) who dates it to ca. 146. For more on this inscription and doubts about this date, see above pp. 000. Regardless of any controversy surrounding the date it must be prior to 146 B.C.
contributions is the Skyllaieis, which has been identified as a district of the Troizenia.⁶

Although it has been argued above that the literary record reflects a border conflict between Troizen and Hermion, some have been suggested that the Cape Skyllaion referred to in the passages above, actually is another cape of the same name, and not the Troizenian district.⁷

Turning to the archaeological record, we are still not on solid ground with relation to the southern boundary of Troizen and Hermion. One known site in the vicinity of modern Thermisi that may have played a role in the definition of the Hermionid is a quarry, possibly of Roman date.⁸ As with the case of IG IV².1.76+77, where stone quarrying was one of the issues involved in the dispute, the same may be true here if the quarry is contemporary with a later dispute. It is not surprising when we consider this site and its location near the Hermionid boundary with Troizen, that a Demeter sanctuary marked it.⁹

Along the northern boundary we are without any direct evidence, but several suggestions can be made concerning this stretch of the boundary. The main road from Troizen, which Pausanias took and described in some detail, undoubtedly followed the

---


⁷ This argument was first proposed by Frost (1980, p. 100).

⁸ Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, site E8, p. 305 and fig. 5.19.

⁹ For the use of Demeter sanctuaries along Hermion's boundary, see Guettel Cole 1994, p. 206. By her count Hermion had seven sanctuaries of Demeter, located both in town and countryside. The seventh in her numbering was brought to the territory of Hermion after the "synoecism with Haliets in the Hellenistic period." Clearly there is no evidence for such a synoikism between these two states, but Haliets' territory, which was abandoned around 280 B.C., may have been the subject of the dispute between Hermion and Epidauron recorded on IG IV².1.74, see above Chapter 4.
ridge of the Adheres range to Eileoi and then to Hermion. Along this route are two interesting features which at some time may have played a role in marking this boundary.

The first of these, proceeding from Troizen to Hermion, is known today as Anathema (Ἀναθήμα), a toponym used apparently since at least the early 19th century according to Gell’s (1810, p. 123) account: “At one hour 14 minutes [from Damala (Troizen)] another top whence Hydra and several islands are visible both in the gulph of Aegina and that of Argos. At one hour 20 minutes pass an anathema or heap of stones in the road.” During my one visit to the site only one black glazed sherd (classical?) was noticed. Around the peak itself are the remains of a modern structure as well as a large number of loose stones strewn about. At its highest point, on which the survey column is located, is what also appears to be an artificial mound of some type (Figures 6.3-4), but it was impossible to determine this beyond doubt. The likelihood is strong that this marked the boundary between Troizen and Hermion. The view from this location is extensive in all directions with Methana, Hydra, Iliokastro, and Hermion all visible.

The second is a watch tower that has recently been discovered along the route from Troizen to Hermionid, built apparently to guard the border. The fortification itself is built atop an artificial mound of earth that the editors of A Greek Countryside suggest may have functioned originally as a boundary marker between the territory of

---

10 For a map of Pausanias’ route, see Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, fig. D.1 and appendix D: Pausanias on the Southern Argolid, pp. 575-577. In April 1999 I walked this route from Troizen to Hermion in just under six hours.

11 This possibility was first suggested to me by M. Jameson (per ep.), but my personal observations support this theory.

the two states. Locally the site is known as Soros (Σωρός), a word roughly meaning a heap or pile. The editors of *A Greek Countryside* note that the view from the Soros is “better in the direction of Troizen” and conclude that it “may have been built to watch over Troizenian frontiers and grazing lands.”

Interestingly, the modern boundary between the Nomos of Attika and the Nomos of the Argolid follows the Adheres range, passing exactly along the peak of both Soros and Anathema.

Further along the route taken by Pausanias and the early travelers is the site of ancient Elioi. The ancient site has been located with some certainty *ca.* 2.5 km northeast of the modern village of Iliokastro.

**TROIZEN, HERMION AND HYDRA**

With regard to the island of Hydra, which lies off the coast of the southern Trozenia and the Hermionid roughly covering the coast from Cape Skyllaion to just east of Thermisia, we are fortunately with solid evidence for its status in the Archaic period. The historian Herodotos (3.59.1-3) records that the island once belonged to Hermion who sold it in the late 6th century B.C. to exiles from Samos. These new inhabitants of the island soon abandoned it, resettling in Crete, and handed it over to the Troizenians in whose hands it apparently remained for some time. We have no

---

13 Compare Hesychios, s.v. "Ερμιοίς λόφος τους σωρούς λίθων. For the word Soros, see also Kakridis 1989, p. 38.

14 For the site of ancient Elioi, see Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel, site G2, pp. 519-512 and Foley 1988, p. 178. In the 19th century, Leake (1830a, p. 462) remarked that the village was known as Ilio when he visited it. One inscription (IG IV 747) was said to have been found in the area of "τα "Ηλιαρα, which can only be Iliokastro. For another recently discovered in modern Iliokastro, see Tzifopoulos 1992-1998, pp. 251-258.

15 For more on this, see Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, p. 28.
evidence for a Troizenian loss of the island, but recently a case has been made that
points to a conclusion that is quite relevant for our purposes of defining the extent of
Troizen's territory in the Hellenistic period.

Christian Habicht has recently argued, based on an Athenian honorary decree,
that the Ptolemies may also have had a garrison on the island of Hydra (Ὑδρέα),
located off the southeastern coast of the Argolid and opposite both the territory of
Troizen and Hermion.16 If such a base existed there then it is fair to assume that
some of the problems between Troizen and Arsinoē also affected the southern
Troizenia. The theory for the existence of a Ptolemaic base on Hydra may be
strengthened if we consider a small Hellenistic fort along the coast of the mainland at
Phourkaria, which looks across the bay towards Hydra.17 This small fort is discussed
elsewhere and is securely dated to the Hellenistic period.18 Undoubtedly, the fort
must have guarded a coastal road between Troizen and Hermion, but it may also have
served as a watchpost along the coast against any border infractions by the Ptolemaic
garrison on Hydra. It has also been argued recently that the Ptolemies may have held
another garrison on the Islands of Pelops (Πέλοπος νῆσοι) off the coast of Methana,
which would have added to the precarious position of the Troizenia.19 We have no

16 Habicht 1992, pp. 88-90 (SEG XXIII 103). The Athenian inscription is IG II² 1024. Habicht discusses
the text and gives the references.

17 I would like the thank Eleni Konsolaki for calling my attention to this fort and for allowing me to see and
advanced copy of an article in preparation on the fortifications of the Troizenia which is to appear in the
Δελτίον.

18 For the fort, see Wrede 1927, p. 365; Faraklas AGC 10, appendix II, pp. 2-3 and fig. 32. See also the
comments of Kyrour 1990, p. 255. For the identification of Phourkaria with ancient
Skyllaiēis, see Frost 1980, pp. 186-188. For the late Roman villa there, see Frost 1977, pp. 233-238. For
ancient remains on Hydra, see RE Suppl. III, 1918, cols. 1159-1161. s.v. Hydrea (F. Bolte). For
inscriptions from Hydra, see Jameson 1959, pp. 116-119; Stamires 1960, pp. 87-89 and SEG XXXIII 265.

19 For the evidence in support of a Ptolemaic presence on the Islands of Pelops, see Peremans and van't
Dack 1959, p. 171-172; Habicht 1992, pp. 89-90 and Bagnall 1976, p. 84. Pausanias (2.34.4) mentions
these nine islands by this name.
literary references to this fort but the passage cited above (Polybios 5.91.8) concerning the Achaian resolution to have ships patrolling the Akte and the Argolic gulf may have been a result of a Ptolemaic presence here as much as on Methana.

A Ptolemaic garrison on Hydra still remains a conjecture, but taken in connection with the fort at Phourkaria it seems a likely one. This excursus adds little to our understanding of the arbitration between Troizen and Arsinoë, but it does confirm the tenuous position that Troizen, above all other cities of the Akte, was in vis à vis the Ptolemaic presence around the Akte.

CONCLUSIONS

Although we can say little with certainty about Troizen’s borders with Hermion and Epidauros, there is sufficient evidence to support the conclusion that its border with Hermion was disputed. The literary record shows that this dispute undoubtedly occurred along the southern coast of the Akte, opposite Hydra and between the sites of Thermisia and Skyllaion. The archaeological record, on the other hand, suggests that the actual border may have been marked along the Adheres range at the sites Anathema and Soros.
Map 6.1: Sites discussed in Chapter 6.
Figure 6.1: IG IV 791, Fraenkel’s transcription.

Figure 6.2: IG IV 791, Fraenkel’s drawing of the stone.
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Figure 6.3: Stone heap at Anathema, from east.

Figure 6.4: Stone heap at Anathema, from southwest.
CHAPTER 7

CONCLUSIONS

In the preceding chapters a number of individual arbitration disputes have been examined in detail. Each chapter has as its foundation the presentation of firsthand examination of the stones on which the results of the disputes were inscribed. Commentaries on date and the historical circumstances surrounding the disputes follow this. Finally a presentation of my conclusions concerning the topography of the borders and the use of the land completes each chapter. Several important conclusions on specific epigraphical and topographical points are presented throughout the work as a whole, but within this final chapter I will attempt to synthesize the preceding discussions into preliminary conclusions concerning the use of arbitration in the northeast Peloponnesos from ca. 250-150 B.C.

As stated in the Introduction (Chapter 1), the cases of arbitration in this region present a unique group from which such conclusions can be drawn. For they involve a small number of cities, they occurred over a relatively short period of time, and they all involve in some way the Achaian League or one of its members. Furthermore, the Ptolemaic colony Arsinöe, which was never a League member, was involved in two of these disputes thus providing us with evidence from which we can gain some insight
into how a member of a federal state and a non-member solved a territorial dispute. These two disputes involving Arsinoë also shed valuable light on Achaian-Ptolemaic relations in the Hellenistic period, a subject that has largely been overlooked by previous scholars.

Following its refoundation in 281/0 B.C. members of the Achaian League were limited to those city-states within the boundaries of Achaia itself, but its composition changed dramatically after 251/0 B.C. In this year, Aratos of Sikyon abolished the tyranny in his native city-state and joined it to the League, making Sikyon its first non-Achaian member. From this point onwards, the League undertook an aggressive policy of expansion within the Peloponnesos marked first by the expulsion of the Macedonian garrison on Acrocorinth (243/2 B.C.), after which Corinth too joined the League. Following Corinth’s admission several other city-states from the Northeast Peloponnesos and Arkadia joined the League.

We have substantial epigraphical evidence that attests to what may have been an official League practice compelling new members to submit outstanding border disputes to the League court for arbitration. Among the cases studied here, our best evidence for this is the dispute between Corinth and Epidauros (IG IV².1.71) that took place shortly after the two became League members. Fortunately the stele recording Epidauros’ entry into the League has been discovered in the excavations of the Sanctuary of Asklepios at Epidauros. On this badly damaged stele (IG IV².1.70+59) is a tantalizing reference to Corinth that is not at all clear. It has been suggested that this stele records a first decision concerning the boundary that was subsequently appealed by the Corinthians and that this case provides our best evidence for an Achaian provision requiring arbitration of outstanding disputes between new
members. A second decision, following the appeal, appears on a second stele (IG IV².1.71). It is certainly beyond doubt that several states did submit to arbitration shortly after their entry into the League, but there is no evidence that proves beyond a doubt that it was an official requirement of membership. In fact, one could propose the equally valid hypothesis that the possibility of territorial aggrandizement through League arbitration was one of the motivating factors for non-Achaian cities to join the League itself. Other factors certainly influenced these cities to join the Achaian League, namely protection against Macedonian influence within the Peloponnesos, or Spartan, or Aetolian incursions into their territories. The most important conclusion we can draw from the Corinthian-Epidaurian dispute concerning the League's use of arbitration is that it was willing to serve as the venue by which the dispute was settled. The reference to Corinth on the stele recording Epidauros' admission to the League may be seen as an Achaian provision promising to serve as arbitrator if the two could not work out the dispute themselves.

The other disputes studied above that certainly occurred some time after the states involved became members also appear to contradict the conclusion that the League had a provision to settle disputes soon after membership was granted. It is, in particular, the case between Hermion and Epidauros (IG IV².1.75+, SEG XI 377) that is of interest here. As I have shown in the Epigraphical Commentary and the discussion of Prosopography this dispute took place between 175-172 B.C., some time after these two states first became members. It was also undoubtedly a dispute of long standing as is made clear by certain provisions within the text itself. Further complicating the matter is the fact that the Achaian League does not appear to have played an explicit role in its settlement, although there is evidence to suggest that it
may have played a minor one. What is certain is that the dispute was settled by Milesian and Rhodian judges. That the League played no direct role in its settlement may be evidence to suggest that the League, in the 2nd century, had abandoned its attempts to involve itself in its members’ disputes as it had in the previous century. Additional evidence for this conclusion can be cited from several other contemporary border conflicts and settlements among League members.

Two other disputes were recorded and set up in the Asklepieion that involved the Ptolemaic colony of Arsinoë on the Methana peninsula. These two, one with Epidauros the other with Troizen, are separated chronologically by a significant time period. The dispute between Epidauros and Arsinoë almost certainly took place not long after Epidauros became a League member (243/2 B.C.), while the one with Troizen took place at some point in the first half of the 2nd century B.C. The manner in which they were settled cannot be determined beyond a doubt, as the stelai recording them are not intact. Nevertheless, it appears that the first dispute (IG IV.1.72) was settled by Achaian judges from as many as eleven member cities. There is no indication on the stele recording the settlement that the Ptolemies were involved in it in any way. I have argued above (Chapter 5) that this was almost certainly due to the fact that the settlement was reached shortly after the Achaians made Ptolemy League hegemon on both land and sea. This would have provided a perfect opportunity for the member cities within the Akte to settle outstanding differences with their Ptolemaic neighbor, in a manner similar to that in which new member states settled their differences soon after membership was granted.

Shortly after this settlement was carried out the Achaians and Ptolemies ended their alliance during the course of the Cleomenean war (228-222 B.C.) and we have no
indication of any diplomatic contact between the two until the 180's. It was, I believe, sometime after Achaian-Ptolemaic diplomatic relations were reestablished that the second settlement occurred. The manner in which the dispute between Troizen and Arsinoë was settled is difficult to determine on account of the stele's state of preservation. Fortunately, however, two duplicate stele are preserved (IG IV².1.76+77 from Epidauros and IG IV 752 from Troizen) that record the settlement making a plausible reconstruction of it possible. In this case it seems that both the League and the Ptolemies were involved directly in the settlement of the dispute. The arrangement of the decision on the stele indicates that it was divided in two separate parts, the first dealing with the establishment of a common territory, the second with economic and social concerns involving citizens of Troizen and Arsinoë. A case has been presented above for interpreting the first settlement as carried out by Ptolemaic ambassadors, while Achaian officials judged the second. A third element of this decision is unique among all those studied here; a provision was recorded that ambassadors be sent to Athens where the settlement was to be ratified. It is clear from the inscription that the dispute was one of long-standing and the lack of diplomatic contact between the Achaians and Ptolemies supports this conclusion. The breakdown in communication between the two during the Cleomenean war and the different circumstances under which they were reestablished may be explanation enough to understand the differences between this settlement and that between Epidauros and Arsinoë.

Two additional inscriptions have been included in the discussions above. The first of these two (IG IV².1.74) most likely concerned Epidauros and Hermion and quite possibly predates their entrance into the Achaian League. The second involved
Hermion and possibly Troizen and almost certainly occurred after the dissolution of the Achaian League in 146 B.C. (*IG IV* 791). These two disputes have been included in this analysis as a means to illustrate that territorial tensions existed both prior to and following the Achaian League’s involvement in the Akte. They, on the one hand, illustrate the long-standing nature of the disputes and on the other show that the League itself did not put to rest the tensions within this region.

How the arbitrators were selected remains another problem concerning which the evidence available does not allow us to make any secure conclusions. Some general observations, however, can be stated. In cases where the Achaian League was directly involved in the settlement of a dispute, judges from member states only were employed. In the case between Epidauros and Arsinoë (*IG IV* 2.1.72) several cities served on the arbitration board, while only one city settled the dispute between Epidauros and Corinth (*IG IV* 2.1.71). When the non-member Arsinoë was involved in its disputes with Achaian members two different methods of settlement may have been used. The most unique case, however, remains the selection of Megarian judges to settle the dispute between Epidauros and Corinth. This is the only case that I am aware of in which a third party arbiter also shared a common boundary with one of the disputants. Furthermore, Corinth and Megara had a long history of border conflict and this may have been the grounds on which the Corinthians were able to appeal their first decision, for an appeal process is otherwise unknown among disputes in which the League was involved.

For each individual dispute discussed above, a topographical commentary is provided. In each commentary I have presented my conclusions on the boundary drawn by the judges in each individual dispute, as well as the use of the land in
question. At this point it will be useful to look at these commentaries in order to make some general conclusions about land use and population within the territories studied.

The ancient literature is clear about population decline and an abandonment of the rural countryside during the Hellenistic period, and recent surveys in Greece have seemingly supported this conclusion. Considering this, the question arises why city-states disputed their boundaries so often in the Hellenistic period. Certainly the obvious answer is that this land was used primarily for pasturage and that there was little permanent settlement in these countrysides. There is evidence in at least one of our disputes that attests to pasturage on the land in question, but other textual and topographical information leads us to the conclusion that these countrysides had a much greater value than this alone. From the text that records the dispute between Troizen and Arsinöe (IG IV².1.76+77, IG IV 752) it is stated explicitly that important economic resources, such as the cutting of stone and timber and tuna fishing, were at the heart of the dispute. My topographical work along the Corinthian-Epidaurian frontier has revealed more extensive settlement than previously known as well as a fortification system and no less than two sanctuary sites. Whether or not all these sites were in use at the time of the dispute cannot be determined conclusively, but their existence in this countryside reveals that it was more densely inhabited than has previously been thought.

DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Prior to the inception of this project much of the southern Argolid and the Methana peninsula had been intensively surveyed. As it reaches completion an
intensive survey in the eastern Corinthia is currently underway. Nonetheless, many other areas of the Corinthia, Epidauria and the Akte remain in desperate need of similar attention. As outlined in the Introduction, my topographical field work was carried out alone: the area is too large for one person to cover completely. Certainly the countrysides I have investigated still hold many clues that would increase our knowledge of these territories, their boundaries and settlement patterns within them. Hopefully the results of the eastern Corinthia survey will shed both new light on the topography of the southeastern Corinthia and support the conclusions reached herein.

At present, no survey, intensive or extensive, is underway in either the Epidauria or the Troizenia. As I have only scratched the surface of these archaeologically rich countrysides, we can only hope that new projects will commence there in the near future.

My study has also focused on the borders of these cities from only the Hellenistic period. Earlier disputes are attested in the literature and a study of these would also be welcome as it would give us a much clearer picture of land use and territorial divisions over a longer period of time. Our literary sources and the extensive excavations carried out in the twentieth century have given us a very clear picture of the larger and well-known cities of the Greek world. It is time that our focus shifts to their countrysides for there remains much to be learned about the relationship between polis and chora.

It has been the goal of this project to shed new light on this relationship, and hopefully that has been achieved. Since our sources for the rural countrysides are so few, historians cannot afford to eschew any evidence available to them. The epigraphical sources at the heart of this work do indeed provide information about the
internal workings of the Achaian League, but they also tell us so much more. By examining the topography and the archaeological remains along with the epigraphical and literary sources I hope to have drawn a picture of a relatively vibrant countryside in the Hellenistic period that is still in need of more attention.
APPENDIX 1:

CATALOGUE OF SITES MENTIONED IN CHAPTER 3

1. The Settlement at Ag. Paraskevi

Figures: 3.1-3.10.

Location:

ca. 2 km northeast of Sophiko. The primary remains are located on two separate summits. The small chapel of Ag. Paraskevi is located within the remains on the lower site (elv. 420 m). The other remains are located ca. 0.5 km to the northeast on a hill with the remains of two or three ruined windmills (elv. 473 m).

Bibliography (lower site only):

Lenormant 1866, p. 243-245; Le Bas and Foucart 1877, p. 68; Miliarakis 1886, pp. 142-143; Frickenhaus and Müller 1911, pp. 149-150; RE IIIA. 1929, col. 1593, s.v. Speiraion (F. Bolte); Corinth I, i. p. 99; Gebauer 1939, p. 270; AGC 3, appendix II. p. 29; Wiseman 1978, pp. 127-128; Salmon 1984, p. 28; Peppas 1990, pp. 136-137; Peppas 1993, pp. 236-237.
Description:

The lower fortified site consists of a circuit wall with eight towers. Sherds (primarily 4th century B.C. and some as early as the 5th century) were noted by Wiseman. At the monastery of Ag. Panaghia, just to the west of this site are numerous reused blocks, including several ancient millstones.

On the hill to its north are the remains of a roughly oval-shaped circuit wall and two square towers linked together by a cross wall (Map 3.2). The towers are on the north side of the hill, just below the circuit wall. Each of the towers is approximately 6.5 m x 6.5 m and they are separated by a partially preserved wall at a distance of ca. 23 m. From the towers and the summit itself there is a clear view to the north and the pass between Mt. Tourla and Mt. Tsalikas that leads to the harbors of Frangolimani and/or Ammoni. No sherds or tiles were noticed in the area of the circuit wall or the two towers.

Three inscriptions (IG IV 1558-1560) may have come from this site.

Interpretation:

These remains must represent a significant settlement, perhaps a fortified acropolis on the hill to the north and part of the lower town below. Many sherds and reused blocks are scattered in the area around the hill of the ruined windmills. Wiseman reported seeing sarcophagi in the area, which provides evidence for a cemetery. Taken together this evidence points to the identification of this site as a large settlement or a Corinthian kome.
2. **Mt. Tourla - Ag. Marina**

Location:

Hill. 2 km to the north-northeast of the site at Ag. Paraskevi (elv. 519 m). The monastery of Ag. Marina is located due south of Mt. Tourla and east of the hill with the ruined windmills and circuit wall.

Bibliography:


Description:

On the southern slope of Mt. Tourla are many sherds and roof tiles. Two small chapels are also located here and in the area around them are the remains of several modern houses that are constructed of stone. Within them are several worked blocks that appear to be from a nearby ancient structure. Three different sites were reported here by Sakellariou and Faklaras (*AGC* 3). These include what they call Tourla A (MH sherds), Tourla B (EH, MH. and Roman sherds), and Hagios Tryphon (prehistoric to "ancient Greek times").

Almost due south of the easternmost chapel, very close to the modern monastery of Ag. Marina are many sherds and tiles.

Interpretation:

The significant settlement just to the south and southwest of Mt. Tourla would indicate possible habitation in the plain separating it with the large circuit wall and towers.
2a. Mt. Tsalikas

Location:
southernmost summit of the Tsalika ridge (elv. +780 m).

Bibliography:

Description:
Large medieval settlement, most likely of the Frankish period (Gregory 1996, pp. 64-65). The site may have been utilized in antiquity, but there is no hard evidence to support this theory.

3. The Quarry Site

Figures: 3.11-3.13.

Location:
ca. 4 km south of the site at Ag. Paraskevi (elv. ca. 360 m).

Bibliography:

Description:
Two separate rock-cut niches, each is located on either side of a modern quarry. The quarry itself was opened sometime prior to 1974, for it is visible on an aerial photograph taken in that year. On the summit of the hill is a rubble fortification wall that is roughly oval in plan.

Niche 1: This niche is located ca. 20 m to the east of the modern quarry. The height of the niche is 1.66 m and it is 1.28 m wide. It is recessed into the quarry face to a
maximum of 0.85 m, at its lowest point. The distance from bottom of niche to ground level is 0.6 m.

Niche 2: Located immediately to the west of the quarry. H: 0.46 m; W: 0.50 m (at bottom); H from bottom of the niche to the ground: ca. 0.90 m; recessed ca. 0.26 m into the rock face.

On the summit, above the modern quarry, is an oval fortification wall. It is constructed of loose field stones that are not mortared. The wall appears to be medieval or later.

Interpretation:
Possible cult site. Although nothing was found to support the identification, it is tempting to associate this site with the Panion of our inscription.

4. Pr. Elias Site

Figure: 3.14.

Location:
hilltop (elv. 414 m), immediately south of the quarry site.

Bibliography:
Peppas 1990, pp. 241-242, fig. 40; Peppas 1993, p. 136, fig. 3.

Description:
Small Byzantine chapel built on a clearing at the summit. Large walls of loose field stones, not mortared, enclose the summit forming several terraces. Peppas claims that some of the larger stones within these walls may have come from the fortification Αρέ Μπάρτζε (Site 6). It seems highly unlikely that any stones would have been transported uphill to this site, when there are so many loose stones at the site itself.
Large numbers of Classical-Hellenistic roof tiles were noticed on the surface as well as several sherds of a black glazed skyphos.

Interpretation:

Almost certainly the site of an ancient sanctuary with the Byzantine chapel built on top of it. The site may also have been used as a fortification in the medieval period.

5. Tower below Pr. Elias

Figures: 3.15-3.16.

Location:

southeastern slope of the Pr. Elias hill (elv. ca. 366 m).

Bibliography:

Description:

Isolated tower in polygonal masonry. The south and west walls of the tower have been dismantled, making any determination of its orientation or restored dimensions hypothetical. The east wall has been incorporated into a modern retaining wall that extends off to the south of the tower. Its preserved height at the northeast corner is 1.4 m and the east wall is ca. 6.1 m in length. The north wall is preserved to a length of ca. 10.8 m. thus it seems that the tower was rectangular in plan. The center of the tower is heavily overgrown and there is much rock fall, making it impossible to determine if there are any walls within the tower itself. Several Classical-Hellenistic Corinthian pan tiles were found in and around the tower.

Interpretation:

Most likely a tower associated with a nearby farmstead on the rich Larisi plain to the south of it where many olives are grown today. Another possibility is to interpret this
tower as a guard post controlling traffic along the road and access to the sanctuary on the summit. This theory, however, seems somewhat less likely than the first.

6. "Αρε Μπάρτζε (Xerias Fort)

Figures: 3.17-3.27.

Location:

small clearing above the west bank of the Xerias river. ca. 2 km north of Korphos. (elv. ca. 126 m).

Bibliography:


Description:

Located on a large clearing above the Xerias riverbed, where it is joined by a smaller tributary. The site is constructed in polygonal-trapezoidal masonry and consists of four distinct elements: a courtyard, a central tower, and two small rooms on either side of it. The central tower is approximately 7 x 7 m and is preserved to a height of ca. 2.2 m. One block seems to have toppled off the top preserved course and fallen into the tower. With this block, the height of the tower may be restored to at least 3 m. Along the west wall of the tower, and nearly abutting it is a millstone that is 0.96 m (external diameter). The dimensions of the outer wall are approximately 21 x 16.5 m. Although unexcavated, there is evidence to suggest that there were at least two phases of construction. Many sherds and tiles are located all around the surface. Many olives are grown on this clearing today and there is a water source there.
Interpretation:
Undoubtedly a Corinthian fortification used to guard the road from the Settlement at Ag. Paraskevi to Korphos harbor, as well as to watch over activity within the harbor itself. After the Megarians made their ruling concerning the boundary, its function must have changed slightly and it became an important guardpost along the Epidaurian border. Ceramic evidence indicates that it was in use from the late 5th-late 3rd centuries B.C. and possibly later than that.

7. Χωράματος τοῦ Ἑλλήνα (The Field of the Greek)

Figure: 3.28.

Location:
A small clearing not far to the east of the modern road to Korphos. (elv. ca. 325 m).

Bibliography:

Description:
The site is centered around a ruined modern house which has a large cistern attached to it. The house is constructed of loose stones, mortared together. Many Classical-Hellenistic roof tiles and some pithos body sherds are used as chinking stones. A large threshing floor is located immediately to the north-east of the house, as is another a short distance to the south. There are many olive and a few fig trees in the immediate area of the ruined house.

Interpretation:
Farmstead.
8. Προσήλι Τόγια

Location:
Along the ridge of the Prosili Togia summit (ca. 300 m).

Bibliography:

Description:
Round tower of unworked loose field stones. It is preserved to 2-3 courses. No sherds or roof tiles were found in or around these remains.

Interpretation:
The similarities between this fortification wall and those on Koryphi and Monastiri suggest that they are contemporary. The presence of one ancient tile at the Koryphi site may be slim evidence to suggest that these are all ancient fortifications, but further work at these sites may reveal further evidence. If they are indeed ancient structures they appear to have been hastily constructed and thus may be interpreted as a system of watchtowers along the ridge above Korphos harbor.

9. Κορυφή

Location:
Just below the summit of Koryphi, on a small level clearing on its western slopes (elv. ca. 400 m).

Bibliography:

Description:
Oval circuit wall of loose gray field stones that are not mortared together. Within the remains of the round tower was one Classical-Hellenistic Corinthian pan tile.
Interpretation:
Possibly the second in a system of watchtowers along the ridge above Korphos harbor.

10. Monastirí

Location:
Easternmost peak in the ridge to the north of the modern village of Korphos. (elv. 386 m)

Bibliography:

Description:
At the summit is an oval circuit wall with one round tower on its east side. The walls are constructed of loose gray fieldstones that are not mortared together. Some of the stones are large, approximately .5 m in diameter. From this fortification all of the Bay of Sophiko is visible to the south.

Interpretation:
Possibly the third tower in a system of watchtowers along the ridge above Korphos harbor.

11. Ag. Panaghia (Stiri)

Figures: 3.32-3.37.

Location:
To the east of the peak of Monastiri, and to the northeast of Korphos. (elv. ca. 230 m)

Bibliography:
Description:
Byzantine monastery with many traces of antiquity in its vicinity. Among these is the funerary epitaph discussed below (Appendix 2) and many Classical-Hellenistic roof tiles and sherds, including fine black-glazed pieces. Immediately south of the chapel is a threshing floor. The chapel itself may be built on ancient foundations, but whitewash makes this difficult to determine conclusively.
Interpretation:
Possible religious site.

12. Politis
Location:
Just below the eastern summit of Politis on its northern face, ca. 2.5 km to the west of the Isthmos-Epidauros national road. (elv. 800 m)
Bibliography:
Autopsy:
January 1999
Description:
The site near the summit of Politis undoubtedly suffered some damage as a result of the forest fires in this area in July 1998. Four walls of a structure can be made out clearly, with the southern and western walls best preserved.
Interpretation:
13. **Stone Cairns near Korphos**

Figures: 3.38-3.40.

Location:

Ridge southeast of Korphos village. The westernmost point along the ridge is marked as Phanaronisi on Γ.Υ.Σ. 1:5,000 maps. (elv. 63 m - ca. 80 m).

Bibliography:

Description:

Along this ridge are five conspicuous stone piles made of heaped up loose field stones. Each pile, with the exception of one, has a characteristic central depression.

Interpretation:

Possible boundary markers defining the boundary decided upon by the Megarian arbiters.

14. **Cape Trachyli**

Location:

Promontory on the southern limit of the Bay of Sophiko.

Bibliography:

*Corinth* i.i, pp. 22-23; Wiseman 1979, p. 140; Salmon, p. 6

Description:

Interpretation:

Possibly the point that marked the Corinthian-Epidaurian boundary prior to the decision made by the Megarian judges.
15. Palati or Perivoli (Angelokastro)

Figure: 3.41.

Location:

c. 2 km south of the summit on which the Frankish kastro is located and c. 150 km south of the road at this point (Wiseman 1979. p. 130).

Autopsy: none

Bibliography:

Leake 1846, p. 279; Corinth I. i, pp. 102-104, figs. 68-71; Wiseman 1979, pp. 130 and 133, figs. 202-204.

Description:

Rectangular building, oriented northwest-southeast. 12.7 m long x 8 m wide. The masonry is polygonal, preserved to a maximum of two courses. Thickness of walls is approximately 0.7 m. According to Wiseman’s description and plan, the structure consists of three rooms: one large room on the northwest side and two smaller contiguous rooms on the northeastern side. Wiseman saw sherds, mostly of the 4th-5th centuries after Christ, and some possibly as early as the Hellenistic period. He also reported that the local inhabitants often found coins and lamps in the surrounding fields.

At another place called Patima (2 km) from the village of Angelokastro Fowler (Corinth I. i) reported other traces that is possibly ancient or later. These include ruined house walls and a broken column (of uncertain date) and a cement lined cistern nearby it.
Interpretation:

The location of this tower in the plain below the summit on which the Frankish kastro is located is strong evidence that it is not a fortification tower. Its form and location, on the other hand, are suggestive of a fortified farmstead. As Wiseman noted, Col. Leake apparently saw more extensive ancient remains than exist today. Leake suggested identifying the site here with Molychion.
APPENDIX 2

A FUNERARY EPITAPH FROM AG. PANAGHIA NEAR KORPHOS

The inscription is incorporated into the eastern window frame on the eastern side of the chapel of the Panaghia at Cape Stiri, near Korphos.¹ The stone is bluish-grey marble, which has been white-washed, some of which is now partially rubbed away.

Photos: Figures: 3.32-37

H 0.12 m: W 1.1 m: Th 0.35 m
LH 0.02 m (lines 1 and 4): 0.015 m (lines 2-3)

saec. II-III p.

Δημητρία χαῖρε: πῶς δύν<α>μαι χαίρειν προλιπούσα φῶς
καὶ γλυκυτάτους γονίς τετραέτην ζήσαςα χρόνον:
folium
καὶ ἐνθάδε νέα οὖσα πρωτὴ τε ἐγὼ κατοικῶ

ἀλλὰ ὑμεῖς τὸ γλυκ///ὕ φῶς μέχρι που τόμαρμένον ἐλθῃ.

¹ For the church and the ancient remains in the vicinity of the chapel, see above Chapter 3 and Appendix I. Site 000.
TRANSLATION

Demetria greetings! How am I able to rejoice having left the light and my dearest parents, having lived only four years time? I dwell here, in this tomb, being young in years but you are able to enjoy the sweet light until your fated time comes.

LETTER FORMS

The letters are all very carefully and neatly cut. Several show distinctive qualities which I discuss individually.

alpha: the cross bar is usually vertical beginning at the bottom of the left vertical stroke. In several instances the left stroke of the letter is horizontal and the right often has a tail similar to the lambda.

epsilon: is identical in shape to the sigma with a horizontal stroke in the center that extends to the right edge of the letter.

lambda: the lamda is similar in shape to the alpha and often has a tail at the bottom of its right vertical.

pi: the two horizontals are of equal height and the vertical extends slightly beyond each horizontal.

rho, phi, upsilon: all three of these letters are similar in that their verticals always extend well below the line. The third upsilon in line 4 is the only exception to this.

sigma: lunate.

omega: two lunate sigmas, joined together by a single vertical stroke in the center.

EPIGRAPHICAL COMMENTARY

Line 1: lapis ΔΥΝΟΜΑΙ. For the formula προλιπούσα φῶς compare IG IV 623, line 4: προλιπούσα φῶς, and GV no. 383: προλιπών φῶς. For a discussion of "leaving the light" as a metaphor for death, see Lattimore 1942, pp. 161-164. It is also closely paralleled in IG V. 1 1222 where the deceased is said to have ἥλιον προλιπούσα. See also IG IX, 2 651 (Larisa), lines 1-2: τεταρτῆς ὡν ἐλιπον | ἥλιον τὸ γλυκὺ φένγος.

Line 2: This formula for the age is paralleled in IG V. 1 1222, line 5 where the number of years is followed by δὲ χρόνον ζήσασα.

Line 4: The small break in the stone, which could accommodate no more than two letters, apparently existed before the inscription was cut. Neither letter on either side of the break is damaged thus indicating that the cutter simply continued the word he was inscribing on the other side of the break. τὸ μαρμένον represents a crasis for τὸ εἰμαρμένον. The phrase τὸ γλυκῷ φῶς is paralleled elsewhere, see GV nos. 953, 1054, 1158, 1681. φέγγος can also be supplied for φῶς, see GV nos. 258 and 1554.

COMMENTARY

The presence at Cape Stiri of an inscribed funerary epigram of this quality raises a number of questions concerning its place of origin. No Roman period settlement is known from this area nor have I discovered any traces of one nearby that one would expect from such a monument. We could speculate that it originated elsewhere, but its size and access to the site of the Panaghia chapel would seem to contradict this hypothesis. That an ancient site existed around the chapel at least since the late Classical period is without doubt and it would not be surprising to know that it persisted through the Roman period.

DATE

The absence of any Christian symbol on this completely preserved stone is evidence enough to rule out an early Christian date for the inscription. Thus, we are left with the letter forms alone to assign it an approximate date.

METER

The epitaph is not unified in its use of meter. The fourth line is unique in its use of both elision and crasis. examples of this are not found in the first three lines, although it could have been used in several places.
APPENDIX 3

THE SETTLEMENT AT AG. PARASKEVI AND THE ORGANIZATION OF THE CORINTHIA

The political organization of the Corinthia has remained an elusive topic for many years, although much progress in understanding it has been made recently, primarily as the result of epigraphical finds at Corinth. Some literary evidence also has been used in support of various theories, none of which has been universally accepted. Within this Appendix the theories of Corinthian political organization will be examined briefly along with the epigraphical and literary evidence. A previously overlooked passage of Polybios that may shed some light on the topic will be cited to support my tentative conclusions on this issue, with a special emphasis placed on how the settlement at Ag. Paraskevi functioned within the Corinthia.

As noted above, the primary evidence for our understanding of the organization of the Corinthia is epigraphic. Further evidence, upon which the epigraphical arguments have been made, is supplied by the Suda (s.v. πάντα ὀκτώ) which has been interpreted as evidence for a Corinthian division into eight tribes or phylai. Only one reference to a Corinthian tribe is preserved by Hesychios (s.v. Κυνόφυλλαί). Hiller von Gaertringen first recognized that an inscribed casualty list from Corinth that listed the
deceased under various three letter headings, which he interpreted as tribal abbreviations.\(^1\) Since this was noted, several other inscriptions have come to light at Corinth that have added to our understanding of its tribal organization. Two of these inscriptions, first published by Ronald Stroud, were the basis for his interpretation of the Corinthian tribal system.\(^2\) He argued that it was organized on a model similar to the trittyes system at Athens that was introduced by Cleisthenes, and that each tribe was divided into three units within the Corinthia: these being the city itself, the area outside the Isthmos, and the other within it. The divisions are represented on the inscriptions by three different letters: F, Π, and E. In support of this arrangement, Stroud also cited Thucydides' statement (4.42.3) concerning the battle of Solygeia that it was defended by all available, with the exception of those outside the Isthmos.\(^3\) J. Salmon, citing a suggestion of Robert Jordan, construed this arrangement as: Ε(ντος τοῦ Ἰσθμοῦ), Π(ἐρα(ν) τοῦ Ἰσθμοῦ), and Φ(στυ).\(^4\) Stanton, too, supported Stroud's theory concerning a trittyes arrangement in the Corinthia, but his interpretation of the abbreviations was slightly different than Salmon's. His reconstruction is as follows: Φ(αστικοῦ), Π(ἄραλοι) and E possibly an abbreviation for ἐνδοθεν.\(^5\) Nicholas Jones, however, rejected these interpretations, with his identification of a Delian

\(^{1}\) The inscription is *Corinth* VIII, i, no. 11. For the reference to Hiller and a further discussion of the inscription and its importance for understanding the organization of the Corinthia, see Dow 1942. pp. 90-106.


\(^{3}\) Stroud 1971a. pp. 239-241. This relevance of this passage to the debate is explored somewhat more fully by Salmon, p. 417.


\(^{5}\) Stanton 1986. pp. 139-153.
inscription as a Corinthian decree.' Within it. Jones cites evidence he believes refutes the hypothesis first proposed by Stroud and later advanced by Salmon and Stanton. The identification of the Delian inscription as Corinthian remains speculative and without additional evidence a Corinthian trittyes division seems the most reasonable conclusion that the evidence allows.

In support of this theory concerning the division of the Corinthia into trittyes must be added a fragment from Polybios which has hitherto been overlooked. In his description of Aemilius Paullus' march through Greece Polybios (30.10.3) states that:

ό δὲ θαυμάσας τὴν τῆς πόλεως θέσιν καὶ τὴν τῆς ἀκροπόλεως εὐκαρίαν πρὸς τε τοὺς ἑντὸς Ἰσθμοῦ καὶ πρὸς τοὺς ἑκτὸς ἀπολαμβανομένους τόπους.

He (Aemilius Paullus) was in admiration about the position of the city and its acropolis concerning its position towards the area inside the Isthmos and that outside it.

While this remark recorded by Polybios does not exactly reproduce the terminology used in Stroud's, Salmon's, or Stanton's reconstruction, it clearly adds further weight to the argument that the division of the Corinthia was in three areas: the city, the area inside the Isthmos, and the area outside the Isthmos. This final category has been construed reasonably as Π(εραν τοῦ Ἰσθμοῦ) which we do not have here. While this difference does pose some difficulty in citing this passage in support of a Corinthian trittyes division, it cannot be denied that Polybios explicitly has Paullus admire these three distinct parts of the Corinthia. Polybios, it is fairly reasonable to assume, may have had first hand knowledge of the Corinthian system of organization and this my be reflected here. This heretofore overlooked Polybian passage,

"For Jones' argument and his critique of Stroud, Salmon and Stanton, see Jones 1980, pp. 43-46 and Jones 1998, pp. 49-56."
therefore, does not add any conclusive evidence in support of the theory first proposed by Stroud but it is highly suggestive of it.

What can be said with certainty about the settlement at Ag. Paraskevi is that it must have fallen under the organizational rubric of those who live outside of the Isthmos. This adds little to our understanding of that settlement, but if my theory concerning it is correct future epigraphical discoveries may shed light on its tribe name, and possibly the settlement's name itself, which is unfortunately lost to us.
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