

THEMATA
22

EPIGRAMMATA 5

DINAMICHE POLITICHE E ISTITUZIONALI
NELL'EPIGRAFIA DELLE CICLADI

ATTI DEL CONVEGNO DI ROMA
Roma, 31 gennaio - 1 febbraio 2019

a cura di
ALESSANDRA INGLESE

Edizioni TORED - 2020

Comitato scientifico:

ALBIO CESARE CASSIO, FEDERICA CORDANO, CARMELO DI NICUOLO,
CATHERINE DOBIAS LALOU, ALESSANDRA INGLESE,
EUGENIO LANZILLOTTA, MARIO LOMBARDO

Responsabile editoriale:

EUGENIO LANZILLOTTA - ALESSANDRA INGLESE

Responsabile grafica e stampa:

MASSIMO PASCUCCI

Comitato di redazione:

ALESSANDRA INGLESE - ALESSANDRO CAMPUS

ISBN 978-88-99846-45-9

© Copyright 2020

Edizioni TORED s.r.l.

Via Vincenzo Pacifici, 17

00019 Tivoli (Roma)

www.edizionitored.it

e-mail: info@edizionitored.it

CHRISTY CONSTANTAKOPOULOU

GOATS, SHEEP, AND DEAD BODIES.
SOME (UN)EXPECTED MANIFESTATIONS OF
ISLAND CONNECTIVITY IN THE CYCLADES.

To the memory of my aunt and uncle,
Sophia and Giorgos Zevgolis, who of-
fered me a childhood of roaming in
the agricultural terraces of mountain-
ous Naxos.

Introduction

The Aegean sea is a truly unique geographical landscape¹. The presence of so many islands created an archetypical archipelago, which was celebrated for this feature already in antiquity. The number of islands facilitated the existence of dense traffic through maritime connectivity in ancient times. Within the Aegean, the southern Aegean cluster of islands called the Cyclades famously took its name because the islands “circled” Delos. The “circling” of the islands around Delos became the inspiration for a powerful poetic image, that of the Dance of the Islands, articulated in Callimachus, but also in

¹ I want to thank Alessandra Inglese for her invitation to contribute to the conference and the volume. Unfortunately, I was unable to attend the conference itself, due to personal circumstances.

fifth-century red-figure iconography². Ideas about island connectivity (as well as about its polar opposite, island isolation) permeate our ancient sources. Indeed, much of recent work has focused on maritime connectivity as the background upon which ancient history should be seen, and on networks as a profitable way through which to explore important themes in ancient history³.

I have written extensively on the history of the Aegean islands and the concept of insularity, and the ways through which ancient insularity transformed and was consolidated as a *topos*, especially as a result of the Athenian control of the Aegean islands during the course of much of the fifth century⁴. Imperial subjugation and con-

² ARISTID. *Hymn to the Aegean* 44, 14: «as the sky is decorated with stars, the Aegean sea is decorated with islands». Heavy traffic in the Aegean: XEN. *Hell.* 5.1.23. The islands “circling” Delos in STR. X 5, 1 c. 484, PLIN., *N.h.* IV, 12, 65, and Dion. *Perieg.* 526. The dance of the islands can be found in CALL. *Del.* 16-22 and 300-301 and in a red-figure cup from the former Czartoryski collection. See C. CONSTANTAKOPOULOU, *The Dance of the Islands. Insularity, Networks, the Athenian Empire, and the Aegean World*, Oxford 2007, pp. 20-28.

³ Maritime connectivity: P. BRUN, *Les archipels égéens dans l'antiquité grecque*, Bordeaux 1996; P. HORDEN - N. PURCELL, *The Corrupting Sea*, Oxford 2000; C. CONSTANTAKOPOULOU, *Aegean Interactions. Delos and its Networks in the Third Century*, Oxford 2017; Networks (indicatively): essays in I. MALKIN - C. CONSTANTAKOPOULOU - K. PANAGOPOULOU (eds.), *Greek and Roman Networks in the Mediterranean*, London - New York 2009; D. SCHAPS, *Systems Networks Analysis and the Study of the Ancient World*, in «SCI» 29, 2010, pp. 91-97; essays in N. FENN - C. RÖMEL-STREHL (eds.), *Networks in the Hellenistic World*, Oxford 2013; essays in T. BRUGHMANS - A. COLLAR - F. COWARD (eds.), *The Connected Past. Challenges to Network Studies in Archaeology and History*, Oxford 2016; L. FOXHALL et al., *Tracing Networks: Technological Knowledge, Cultural Contact and Knowledge Exchange in the Ancient Mediterranean and Beyond*, in E. Barker - S. Bouzarovski - C. Pelling - L. Isaksen (eds.), *New Worlds from Old Texts. Revisiting Ancient Space and Place*, Oxford 2016, pp. 281-300; essays in J. LEIDWANGER - C. KNAPPETT (eds.), *Maritime Networks in the Ancient Mediterranean World*, Cambridge 2018; essays in M. DANA - I. SAVALLI-LESTRADE (eds.), *La cité interconnectée: transferts et réseaux institutionnels, religieux et culturels aux époques hellénistique et impériale*, Bordeaux 2019.

⁴ CONSTANTAKOPOULOU, *Dance of the Islands...*, cit.; C. CONSTANTAKOPOULOU, *Centrality and Peripherality: Insularity and the Appeal of the Religious Networks of Delos*

trol became dominant contexts through which ancient ideas about insularity were expressed. Above all, ancient Greek ideas about insularity associated the concept of the island with that of small islands. Ancient Greek insularity, I have argued, was understood as essentially Aegean, and specifically, Cycladic insularity, that is, small spaces, which are characterised by increased maritime mobility.

Cycladic connectivity, therefore, is a well-researched theme through which to write about the Greek landscape, or, better, seascape⁵. The Cycladic region has been at the forefront of many exciting new works in ancient history and archaeology⁶. At the same time, however, the traditional focus by modern ancient history nar-

and Samothrace in the Classical and Hellenistic Periods, in R. von Bendemann - A. Gerstenberg - N. Jaspert - S. Kolditz (eds.), *Constructions of Mediterranean Insularities*, Mittelmeerstudien, Bochum 2016, pp. 75-93; C. CONSTANTAKOPOULOU, *The Shaping of the Past: Local History and Fourth-Century Delian Reactions to Athenian Imperialism*, in A. Powell - K. Meidani (eds.), *The Eyesore of Aigina: Anti-Athenian Attitudes across the Greek, Hellenistic and Roman Worlds*, Swansea 2016, pp. 125-46.

⁵ Writing the history of a seascape: N. PURCELL, *Tide Beach, and Backwash: The Place of Maritime Histories*, in P.N. Miller (ed.) *The Sea: Thalassography and Historiography*, Ann Arbor 2013, pp. 84-108; P. CECCARELLI, *Map, Catalogue, Drama, Narrative. Representations of the Aegean Space*, in E. Barker - S. Bouzarovski - C. Pelling - L. Isaksen (eds.), *New Worlds from Old Texts. Revisiting Ancient Space and Place*, Oxford 2016, pp. 61-80; G. REGER, *Nodes of Sea and Sand: Ports, Human Geography, and Networks of Trade*, in K. Höghammar - B. Alroth - A. Lindhagen (eds.) *Ancient Ports: The Geography of Connections*, Uppsala 2016, pp. 9-36; L. RADLOFF, 'Placing' a Maritime Territory at Hellenistic Miletos, in R. Döhl - J. Jansen van Rensburg (eds) *Signs of Place. A Visual Interpretation of Landscape*, Berlin 2019, pp. 99-120.

⁶ Indicatively: BRUN, *Les archipels égéens...*, cit.; essays in M. Yeroulanou - M. Stamatopoulou (eds.), *Architecture and Archaeology in the Cyclades. Papers in Honour of J.J. Coulton*, Oxford 2005; B. RUTISHAUSER, *Athens and the Cyclades. Economic Strategies, 540-314 BC*, Oxford 2012; essays in G. BONNIN - E. LE QUERE (eds), *Pouvoirs, îles et mer. Formes et modalités de l'hégémonie dans les Cyclades antiques (VIIe s. a.C. – IIIe s. p.C.)*, Bordeaux 2014; G. BONNIN, *De Naxos à Amorgos. L'impérialisme athénien vu des Cyclades à l'époque classique*, Bordeaux 2015; essays in A. Mazarakis-Ainian (éd.), *Les sanctuaires archaïques des Cyclades. Recherches récentes*. Rennes, 2017; essays in E. ANGLIKER - J. TULLY (eds.) *Cycladic Archaeology and Research. New Approaches and Discoveries*, Oxford 2018.

ratives on literary sources and their contexts, audiences, implications, and assumptions, and by that I mean primarily Athenian literary sources, inevitably results in a skewed view of ancient Greek history. In the classical period, such a view is formed by the imperial Athenian centre; we lack the voices and narratives from the islanders themselves. And while classical (mostly Athenian) literary sources have been mined for their contribution to this new research focus on interaction and connectivity, it is extremely difficult to reconstruct the island perspective from such sources. How did the Cycladic islanders experience connectivity and interaction? What was their response to centralised efforts, such as that of Athenian imperialism? How did they earn their livelihood? What were the main challenges they faced? What was their relationship to their insular environment? For these questions, literary sources cannot help us. But inscriptions can.

What I want to do in this contribution is to look at some unexpected forms of Cycladic island connectivity. The history of ancient networks focuses on interactions and mobility of people, things, and ideas. This tri-partite subject matter is wide enough to cover many, if not all, instances of movement. But within this division, that is people, things and ideas, there are neglected episodes of connectivity. Sure, a history of the interactions between the different (male) members of the various poleis' elites is significant and interesting. Inscriptions recording the award of proxeny, for example, can tell us a lot about the regional or inter-regional catchment area that Greek city-states operated in⁷. Pottery or amphora distribution can tell an interesting story about trade, taste, and markets⁸. The diffusion of

⁷ I have discussed this in CONSTANTAKOPOULOU, *Aegean Interactions...*, cit. and C. CONSTANTAKOPOULOU, *Networks of honour in third-century Delos*, in M. Dana - I. Savalli-Lestrade (éds.), *La cité interconnectée: transferts et réseaux institutionnels, religieux et culturels aux époques hellénistique et impériale*, Bordeaux 2019, pp. 83-98. See also W. MACK, *Proxeny and Polis. Institutional Networks in the Ancient Greek World*, Oxford 2015.

⁸ See for example the excellent analysis by Paleothodoros on Attic black figure pottery distribution in the Cyclades in D. PALEOTHODOROS, *The Import of Attic*

democratic ideology and the epigraphic habit is equally important for our understanding of Greek history. Such focal points for an exploration of interactions can and should be written. Interaction and connectivity, however, affected not just the elite. Inscriptions offer us rare glimpses of episodes that do not occupy the spotlight of ancient Greek history narratives. It is to such inscriptions and their episodes of unexpected connectivity that I now turn.

The connectivity of pastoralism: Goats, sheep, and pigs

It is not only humans who inhabit the Cycladic islands; it is also animals. The Cyclades are home to a number of indigenous species of flora and fauna⁹. Animal pasturage and husbandry played a key role in the ancient economy, and provided a livelihood for many ancient communities in the Cyclades and Aegean Greece more generally. This is not the place to discuss the role of pasturage and transhumance for the ancient Greek economy¹⁰. What I want to explore is

Black Figure Vases in the Cyclades, in E. Angliker - J. Tully (eds), *Cycladic Archaeology and Research. New Approaches and Discoveries*, Oxford 2018, pp. 101-12. On amphoras see T. PANAGOÛ, *Patterns of Amphora Stamp Distribution. Tracking Down Export Tendencies*, in E.M. Harris - D.M. Lewis - M. Woolmer (eds), *The Ancient Greek Economy. Markets, Households, and City-States*, Cambridge 2016, pp. 207-29.

⁹ F. MÉDAIL, *The Specific Vulnerability of Plant Biodiversity and Vegetation on Mediterranean Islands in the Face of Global Change*, in «Regional Environmental Change» 17, 6, 2017, pp. 1175-90 [<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10113-017-1123-7>, accessed 15.12.19]; K. DEMERTZIS - L. ILIADIS, *The Impact of Climate Change on Biodiversity: The Ecological Consequences of Invasive Species in Greece*, in W. LEAL FILHO - E. MANOLAS - A.M. AZUL - U.M. AZEITEIRO - H. MCGHIE (eds.), *Handbook of Climate Change Communication*, 1. *Theory of Climate Change Communication*, Berlin - Heidelberg 2018, pp. 15-38.

¹⁰ A recent summary of the discussion is provided by E. MARGARITIS, *Agricultural Production and Domestic Activities in Rural Hellenistic Greece*, in E.M. Harris - D.M. Lewis - M. Woolmer (eds.), *The Ancient Greek Economy. Markets, Households and City-States*, Cambridge 2016, pp. 187-203. See also T. HOWE, *Pas-*

animal movement between neighbouring islands as a form of island connectivity that still remains relatively unexplored¹¹.

As with so many other cases, it is Delos that provides the best evidence, mostly because of the survival of the many inscriptions from the island. During the Delian period of Independence (314-166 BC), the administrators of the sanctuary, the *hieropoioi*, continued what was previously the Athenian practice of inscribing their accounts and inventories of the Delian sanctuary onto large slabs of stone. These inscriptions, which survive today in good numbers, provide a detailed picture of the administration of a large regional sanctuary. The level of detail is incredible indeed, and almost unparalleled for the rest of the Greek world¹². The accounts of the sanctuary, in particular, record in great detail costs related to the maintenance and overall function of the sanctuary (such as building repairs costs, costs for the purchase of materials, salaries for workers etc.)¹³. They also record the income received by the sanctuary administrators through the rents of sacred land belonging to the god on Delos and elsewhere. This latter aspect of the accounts is particularly important for our reconstruction of the presence of sacred estates as well as the use of land within an insular agricultural and pastoral con-

toral Politics: Animals, Agriculture and Society in Ancient Greece, Claremont 2008, esp. pp. 1-28; A. BRESSON, *The Making of the Ancient Greek Economy. Institutions, Markets, and Growth in the City-States*, Princeton 2016, pp. 132-41. For the islands see BRUN, *Les archipels égéens...*, cit. pp. 88-103.

¹¹ Main evidence collected in C. CHANDEZON, *L'élevage en Grèce (fin Ve – fin Ier s. a.C.): l'apport des sources épigraphiques*, Bordeaux 2003, pp. 109-181.

¹² I have discussed this more extensively in C. CONSTANTAKOPOULOU, *Aegean Interactions...*, cit., especially pp. 171-81. Reger's discussion of the economy of Independent Delos on the basis of the accounts is unparalleled: G. REGER, *Regionalism and Change in the Economy of Independent Delos*, Berkeley 1994.

¹³ See for example IG XI, 2 161A, dated to 279, as an almost complete example of an account. Translation (in French) and commentary in C. PRÊTRE, *Nouveaux choix d'inscriptions de Délos. Lois, comptes, inventaires*, Athens 2002, pp. 87-124.

text¹⁴. The various entries related to costs and income of the Delian sanctuary during the third and second century BCE reveal a great deal about animal management on the island itself, but also on the neighbouring islands of Rheneia and Mykonos, where we can safely locate some of the sacred estates belonging to the Delian gods¹⁵.

There are a number of important insights about pasturage provided by the accounts and other epigraphic evidence from Delos. We see a number of references to buildings that must have housed animals, such as ‘sheep shed’ (προβατῶν) and ‘cow shed’ (βούστασις). These are included in the leases of land belonging to the gods. According to the leases, these farms often included a number of buildings; the accounts even describe whether the buildings had doors or not¹⁶. There is even a reference to a ‘pigsty’, but this is unique (καπρῶν)¹⁷. While the leases

¹⁴ For such approaches see J.H. KENT, *The Temple Estates of Delos, Rheneia and Mykonos*, in «Hesperia» 17, 1948, pp. 243-338; M. BRUNET, *Contribution à l'histoire rurale de Délos aux époques classique et hellénistique*, in «BCH» 114, 1990, pp. 669-682; REGER, *Regionalism and Change...*, cit., esp. pp. 189-247.

¹⁵ R. CHARRE - M.-T. LE DINAHET, *Sites de fermes à Rhénée*, in *Territoires des cites grecques*, «BCH» Suppl. 121, 1, 1997, pp. 103-24; CHANDEZON, *L'élevage en Grèce...*, cit., pp. 116-33; R. HARFOUCHE, *Retenir et cultiver le sol sur la longue durée: les terrasses de culture et la place du bétail dans la montagne méditerranéenne*, in «Anthropozoologica» 40, 1, 2005, pp. 45-80; V. CHANKOWSKI, *Athènes et Délos à l'époque classique. Recherches sur l'administration du sanctuaire d'Apollon délien*, Athens 2008, pp. 282-83.

¹⁶ IG XI, 2 287A 143-74, with many references to sheepfolds and cow sheds: eg. l. 149-50: ἀχυρῶνα ἄθυρον, προβατῶνα ἄθυρον, ἄλλο οἶκημα τεθυρωμένον, θύραν αὐλείαν. Κορακιάς καὶ Σολόην Φίλαρχος Θεωρύλου δραχμῶν ΗΗΗΗΔΔ· ἔγ<γ>ουι Πυθαγόρας Ἄβρωνος, Χέρσις Ἑλπίνου· καὶ παρέλαβεν θύραν αὐλείαν, κλείσιον τεθυρωμένον, θαλάμους δύο ἄθυρους, βούστασιν ἄθυρον, προβατῶνα ἄθυρον, ὑπερώδιον ἄθυρον, θάλαμον τεθυρωμένον. On the terminology of such farm buildings, with particular discussion of the Delian evidence, see R. OSBORNE, *Buildings and Residence on the Land in Classical and Hellenistic Greece: The Contribution of Epigraphy*, in «ABSA» 80, 1985, pp. 119-128, and M. BRUNET, *Contribution à l'histoire rurale...*, cit.

¹⁷ IG XI, 2 154A 41: τὸν καπρῶνα ἐπισκευάσαντι. This is not part of a lease, but included in the expenses incurred in that year. On this unique reference see REGER, *Regionalism and Change...*, cit. p. 151.

are not clear as to whether such buildings allowed permanent residence or not, the common inclusion of buildings in the farm leases in our accounts implies that many estates included such buildings and therefore were engaged, with a degree of variation in scale, in some form of pasturage activities¹⁸. We can even zoom in to specific families and individuals who appear as tenants or who owned their own farms. The epigraphic evidence certainly includes references to private estates¹⁹. Menyllos, son of Menyllos, owned an estate on Rheneia, where he seemed to have practiced pasturage in combination with viniculture²⁰. Such owners of estates, as Vial has shown, belonged to the elite of the Delian community, and they often occupied prestigious political positions. The same cannot be said for the tenants, leasing the land, few of whom are known in the extensive Delian nomenclature beyond the estate leases. The leases recorded on the accounts imply that the Delians practiced agriculture, and especially viniculture²¹, alongside relatively small-scale pasturage practices. We do not see on Delos evidence for large flocks or large-scale pasturage, mostly because the insular environment (and fauna) of the island would not make such a practice profitable or feasible. We do see one case where an estate seems to have been used for pasturage alone, rather than a combination of pasturage and agriculture: this was the Phytalia estate, which seems to have been a piece of land without any structural investment²². Such a format of an estate im-

¹⁸ In the accounts of 250, (IG XI, 2 287A), 12 out of 15 estates include a cow shed and 11 out of 15 include a sheepfold: see CHANDEZON, *L'élevage en Grèce...*, cit. p. 278.

¹⁹ See the analysis by C. VIAL, *Délos indépendante*, Paris 1984, pp. 325-328.

²⁰ VIAL, *Délos indépendante*, cit. p. 328, discussing references.

²¹ Ph. BRUNEAU - Ph. FRAISSE, *Un pressoir à vin à Délos*, in «BCH» 105, 1981, pp. 127-153, especially section *La vigne à Délos*, pp. 141-45 = in J.-C. MORETTI (ed.) *Études d'archéologie délienne par Philippe Bruneau*, Athens 2006, pp. 589-593.

²² BRUNET, *Contribution à l'histoire rurale...*, cit. 678-79, joining ID 452 with ID 467.

plies that it was used for pasturage alone for animals which were housed elsewhere²³, but it seems that this was the exception rather than the rule.

It is clear, therefore, that pasturage did take place on Delos and the neighbouring islands, and the keeping of livestock (mostly goats and sheep, which the Delian sources call *probata*, but also pigs) was an important contribution to the Delian economy²⁴.

Livestock was kept on the island itself and on estates in the neighbouring islands, such as Rheneia and Myconos. Indeed, large parts of Rheneia itself belonged to Delos and were used as land generating income for the sanctuary. Rheneia's history and trajectory was very closely associated with that of Delos²⁵. The independent polis of Rheneia was located on the northern part of the island; the southern part, however, belonged to the Delians as a cemetery or as estates²⁶. We have a number of toponyms for the Rheneian estates²⁷; these seem to have been used for agriculture and pasturage, based on the presence of cow sheds, sheep sheds and storehouses for chaff (ἀχυρώων). The gods also owned estates on the island of Myconos²⁸. We know of at least two: Dorion-Chersonesos and Thaleon²⁹. The emphasis here seems to have been primarily agriculture.

²³ BRUNET, *Contribution à l'histoire rurale...* cit. 679, followed by REGER, *Regionalism and Change...*, cit. p. 308.

²⁴ REGER, *Regionalism and Change...*, cit.

²⁵ See also Zozi Papadopoulou's contribution in this volume.

²⁶ KENT, *The Temple Estates of Delos...*, cit.; M.-T. COULLLOUD, *Les Monuments funéraires de Rhénée*, Paris 1974. Summary of the archaeological remains of Rheneia in PH. BRUNEAU - J. DUCAT, *Guide de Délos*, Athens 2005⁴, pp. 321-326.

²⁷ CHANDEZON, *L'élevage en Grèce...*, cit. pp. 125-30, building on KENT, *The Temple Estates of Delos...*, cit.

²⁸ KENT, *The Temple Estates of Delos...*, cit., pp. 286-89, and CHANDEZON, *L'élevage en Grèce...*, cit. pp. 130-131.

²⁹ ID 346A 13-14; 366A 101; 440B 21-25.

The Dorion-Chersonese estate is recorded as having 2750 vines, 47 fig trees, more than 25 wild olive trees, two myrtle trees, three nut trees, six apple trees, and a palm tree³⁰. In the account of the year 169 BCE, the same estate is described as including a cow shed, a storehouse for chaff, an upper floor room (ὑπερώδιον), what is possibly a lower-floor room (if that is indeed what ἀνδρώνιον means here)³¹, and a kitchen or bake-room (probably -ἰπνών)³². While the agricultural production of this Myconian estate must have been significant, especially in relation to viniculture, the presence of the cowshed and the storeroom for chaff implies that pasturage also took place on the land owned by the Delian gods on Myconos. We also have a number of references to *ennomion*, that is right to pasture, in the Delian accounts³³. The right to pasture was given for the area of Isthmos on Myconos, which should be located in the area of modern Ornos village³⁴. References to the right to pasture in the accounts are included in lists of other incomes generated for the sanctuary, such as the fee to have the right to use the port (τέλη τοῦ λιμένος), the right to use the *holkos* on the Island (τοῦ ὄλκου τοῦ ἐν τῇ Νήσῳ) and the *holkos* on the Isthmos of Myconos (τοῦ ὄλκου τοῦ ἐν τῇ ἰσθμῳ τῇ ἐν Μυκόνῳ), the fee for the right to fish for purple dye (τῆς

³⁰ ID 440B 22-27 and 452 26-29.

³¹ For an explanation of this term see OSBORNE, *Buildings and Residence...*, cit. pp. 121-122.

³² ID 461 Bb55-57: X[ε]ρσό[ν]ησον δέ, [οὐ καθιστάντος τοὺς ἐγγύους τοῦ δεῖνα τοῦ Με]νύλλου, ἀνεμισθώσαμεν, καὶ ἐμισθώσατο Ξένων Ξένωνος δρα. ΗΗΔ· [...] [καὶ παρέλαβεν κλείσιον?] τεθυρωμένον, βούστασιν, ἀχυράνα, ὑπερώδιον, ἀ[ν]δρώνιον, [ἰ]πνῶνα ἄθυρα.

³³ CHANDEZON, *L'élevage en Grèce...*, cit. pp. 133-137.

³⁴ ID 353A 28-36, dated to 219 BCE. Discussion of the localisation of the Myconian isthmus in KENT, *The Temple Estates of Delos...*, cit., pp. 277-278, CHANDEZON, *L'élevage en Grèce...*, cit. p. 136, and CHANKOWSKI, *Athènes et Délos...*, cit. p. 299 and 304.

πορφύρας)³⁵, the right to use what may have been a form of capstan on the port (τῶν στροφείων) etc³⁶.

Another important inscription, the so-called *Hiera Syngraphe*, dated to 300 BCE, is indicative of the importance of pasturage for the Delian community³⁷. The inscription includes regulations for the rent of the sacred estates, and is particularly concerned with livestock. The regulations produced by the *hieropoioi* deal with a number of issues: livestock (cattle and *probata* which are goats and sheep) and slaves would be seized in the occasion of tenants not paying their rent³⁸. The regulation in relation to rent are divided in two broad categories: those which deal with tenants who have sheep and goats (l. 20), and those who do not (l. 28)³⁹. Rent of the estates was therefore categorised according to the use of the land for pasturage or not. There is an additional reference to “marked, or branded, animals” (l. 25, τῶν ἐγκεκαυμένων βοσκημάτων), that is animals which were marked by

³⁵ This was an important form of fishing in the Delian archipelago, especially in the area around Rheneia: see Ph. BRUNEAU, *Documents sur l'industrie délienne de la pourpre*, in «BCH» 93, 1969, pp. 759-91 = MORETTI (ed.) *Études...*, cit., pp. 189-221; Ph. BRUNEAU, *Deliaica III: no. 30: Encore la pourpre: Δήλιος κυρτεύς (Herondas III 51) et Δήλιος κολουμβητής (Diogène Laërce, II 22 et IX 12)*, in «BCH» 103, 1979, pp. 83-88 = MORETTI (ed.) *Études...*, cit., pp. 473-478; CHANKOWSKI, *Athènes et Délos...*, cit., pp. 295-96. See also E. LYTLE, *The Delian Purple and the lex portus Asiae*, in «Phoenix» 41, 2007, pp. 249-267.

³⁶ See for example ID 353A, ll. 28-35, dated to 219 BCE. For the terms see discussion in CHANKOWSKI, *Athènes et Délos...*, cit. pp. 299-300.

³⁷ ID 503 = CHANDEZON, *L'élevage en Grèce...*, cit., pp. 109-114. Discussion about the date, and the implications of the date for the Delian community, its social hierarchies and the impact on rents in REGER, *Regionalism and Change...*, cit., pp. 220-230. The impact of Athenian practices in the development of regulations in relation to the leasing of Delian sacred estates during the Independence discussed in N. PAPAZARKADAS, *Sacred and Public Land in Ancient Athens*, Oxford 2011, pp. 59-60. On the Athenian administration of the sanctuary, CHANKOWSKI, *Athènes et Délos...*, cit. is unparalleled.

³⁸ ID 503 l. 34: τοὺς βούς καὶ πρόβατα καὶ τὰ ἀνδράποδα.

³⁹ ID 503 l. 20: ἐὰν τ[ὰ] πρόβατα τρέφωσιν, l. 28: ὅσοι ἄμ μὴ τρέφωσι πρόβατα.

fire, perhaps to make visible their state of ownership (in the sense that they acted as guarantee for the tenancy⁴⁰). The regulations tighten payment procedures and show considerable lack of lenience towards tenants who did not pay their rent. The reference to seizure of slaves, as Kent observed, must imply that pasturage work in these estates was done by slaves⁴¹. The fact that the sanctuary administrators produced this document with its very precise regulations about the time of year in which payment was due according to each category of tenants (those with *probata* and those without) implies that not only this was a particularly profitable activity for the sanctuary, but also that it was relatively widespread. This seems to agree with our previous observation about the widespread distribution of buildings related to pasturage in the estates owned by the Delian gods.

We have therefore established that pasturage was an important part of the Delian agricultural system. Both private properties and the sacred estates belonging to the gods may have been used for pasturage, often alongside agricultural production. I should also mention here the suitability of littoral spaces for pasturage. The existence of salt in such areas, which had nutritional value and had a positive impact on the taste of the milk and cheese products of sheep and goats, made them good areas for pasture⁴². The insular space of the Delian archipelago, despite its many challenges, offered some real advantages for small-scale pastoralism.

Where did these animals end up? Animals bred on the neighbouring islands of Rheneia and Myconos on the temple estates (for which our evidence is better because of the accounts of the *hieropoioi*)

⁴⁰ This interpretation was put forward by J. TRÉHEUX, *Sur la "Hiéra Syngraphè" de l'Indépendance à Délos*, in «Museum Helveticum» 48, 1991, pp. 248-251, and accepted by CHANDEZON, *L'élevage en Grèce...*, cit. pp. 113-14.

⁴¹ KENT, *The Temple Estates of Delos...*, cit. p. 280.

⁴² See PAPAZARKADAS, *Sacred and Public Land...*, cit., p. 121-22 with n. 104, discussing the nomenclature of lease areas in Attica, such as Schoinous ("rushy area"), Paralia ("coast"), and Halmyris ("salt land").

would end up in the Delian market, as this was the biggest market demanding meat, but also milk, cheese, leather and other products. The use of the Rheneia and Myconos estates for pasturage is another indication for the existence of constant and frequent travel between these islands for pastoral purposes.

One important demand for the supply of animals on Delos was of course the needs for sacrifice in the sanctuary. The sanctuary administered hundreds of festivals each year, many of which required sacrifice. The accounts do not mention often prices for livestock purchased for sacrifices, with one exception, that of pigs. We have a relatively detailed description of costs and animals sacrificed at the festival of Posideia⁴³: an account of the early second century lists an ox for 72 dr, an unspecified number of goats for 83 dr, two he-goats for 27 dr, one *delphakion* (possibly a castrated pig)⁴⁴ for 28 dr and one boar or (more likely) a male pig for 15 dr. From this and other references in the epigraphic corpus of Delos we can get an idea of the animals used for sacrifice in the sanctuary⁴⁵.

On the whole, references to goats are few⁴⁶. We know goats were sacrificed in the festivals for Artemis and in the Posideia⁴⁷, but they

⁴³ ID 440 l. 60-61: λόγος τῶν εἰς τὰ Ποσίδεα· βοὸς (72 dr)· τροφή (12 dr)· ἱερείων· αἰγῶν (83 dr)· τροφή (3 dr)· [κ]ριῶν δύο Ποσειδῶνι Ἀσφαλείῳ καὶ Ὀρθωσίῳ (27 dr)· δελφάκιον (28 dr)· κάπρος (15 dr). See also ID 464 1-3, but with different prices: an ox for 85 dr, goats for 30 dr, two he-goats (*krioi*) for (possibly) 25 dr. IG XI, 2 287A 89 (dated to 250 BCE) has a total cost for the festival of Posideia of 600 dr.

⁴⁴ D. SCHAPS, *When is a Piglet Not a Piglet?*, in «JHS» 111, 1991, pp. 208-209.

⁴⁵ References collected in Bruneau's monumental work: Ph. BRUNEAU, *Recherches sur les cultes de Délos à l'époque hellénistique*, Paris 1970.

⁴⁶ For example, IG XI, 2 287A 17-19 mentions the sale of one small goat (αἰγίσκος) for 7 dr, 4 obols and one half-obol, and the sale of another small goat for 4 dr, 4 obols, and one half-obol. ID 372 30 mentions a small goat (αἰγίδιον).

⁴⁷ BRUNEAU, *Recherches...*, cit. pp. 194-195 for Artemis and pp. 260-264 for the Posideia, discussing the evidence.

were also excluded from sacrifices from other cults⁴⁸. *Probata* (which means both sheep and goats) were sacrificed in the Eileithyia festival⁴⁹, and also for Anios, the local hero-cult of Delos⁵⁰. Cattle were sacrificed in the Apollonia festival⁵¹, in the festival for Asclepius⁵², and, as we have seen, in the Posideia festival⁵³.

Most references, however, in our epigraphic corpus are to pigs. Pig sacrifice was an important element of the Delian Thesmophoria⁵⁴, and the Nyktophylaxia⁵⁵, while pigs and a boar were sacrificed in the Posideia⁵⁶. As sacrificial victims primarily used for purification,

⁴⁸ ID 2305, a truly spectacular dedication which reveals that the dedicant Damon, son of Demetrios from Ascalon pays his respects because he was saved from pirates (through the agency of Zeus Ourios and Palestinian Astarte), prohibits the sacrifice of goats, pigs and female bovines: Δὺ Οὐρίῳ καὶ Ἀσάρτη Παλαιστίνῃ, Ἀφροδίτῃ Οὐρανίαι, θεοῖς ἐπηκόοις, Δάμων Δημητρίου Ἀσκαλωνίτης, σωθεὶς ἀπὸ πειρατῶν, εὐχὴν. οὐ θεμιτὸν δὲ προσάγειν αἴγειον, ὑκόν, βοῶς θηλείας. ID 2308 allows the sacrifice of all animals except goats: θύειν πάντα πλὴν αἰγείου. SEG XXIII, 507 prohibits the sacrifice of goats and pigs: ὑκὰ μὴ θύειν μηδ[ε] αἴ[γ]ει[α].

⁴⁹ ID 401 22, one *probaton* for 14 dr 1 obol for Eileithyia.

⁵⁰ BRUNEAU, *Recherches...*, cit., pp. 217-218 for the Eileithyia festival, pp. 428 for Anios.

⁵¹ IG XI.2 203A 64 lists the income received from the sale of an ox hide, sacrificed in the Apollonia, 22 dr. Callimachus *Aitia* F 67 (Pfeiffer) mentions a *bouphonia* which may be linked with the Apollonia festival: Κύνθειε, τὴν Δήλῳ σὴν ἐπὶ βουφονίην. See BRUNEAU, *Recherches...*, cit., p. 65 and 76.

⁵² ID 399A 19 mentions the sale of a hide, possibly connected with a sacrifice for Asclepius: see BRUNEAU, *Recherches...*, cit., p. 373 for the identification.

⁵³ See also IG XI, 2 287A 24: τοῦ βοῶς τοῦ θυθέντος τοῖς Ποσιδείοις ἡ βύρσα ἐπράθη δραχμῶν 8.

⁵⁴ References in BRUNEAU, *Recherches...*, cit., pp. 286-288. The Thesmophoria festival seems to have required the sacrifice of various types of pigs: a pregnant sow to Demeter, two castrated pigs to Kore and Zeus Euboulos and a piglet for purification: IG XI, 2 287A 68-69.

⁵⁵ ID 440A 40 with BRUNEAU, *Recherches...*, cit., pp. 290-91.

⁵⁶ See note 43 above.

their role was integral for the proper function of the sanctuary. The accounts mention a monthly sacrifice of a pig for the purification of the sanctuary, which probably took place on the first day of each month⁵⁷. In addition, pigs were sacrificed in order to purify the sanctuary in the occasion that anyone died on Delos, as Delos was considered a sacred island and therefore no death or birth could take place on the island itself⁵⁸. In one account, in the year 274, we read that a pig was sacrificed «when Stephanos died»⁵⁹. Another account refers to dead bodies being removed from Rheneia and a pig sacrificed in order to purify the island⁶⁰. We shall discuss the cases of the removal of bodies as another form of unexpected insular interaction in the next section, but for the time being, I want to stress the importance of having pigs for purification purposes that were not necessarily scheduled in advance, as was the case in the monthly sacrifice for general purification purposes⁶¹. Death could occur unexpectedly in the sanctuary, as could birth, which was equally prohibited. A fresh and immediate supply of pigs for purification purposes was therefore absolutely necessary.

In fact, the importance of pigs is reflected in the accounts itself. As Reger observed, pigs are one of the few commodities, along with olive oil and firewood, where we can observe fluctuations of market

⁵⁷ Pig sacrifice for monthly purification in IG XI, 2 203A 32-57: there is a list of months, followed by expenses. The first expense in all cases was the sacrifice of a pig: χοῖρος τὸ ἱερὸν καθάρασθαι. This for Bruneau (*Recherches...*, cit. p. 93) implies that the purification sacrifice of the pig took place on the first day of each month. See also IG XI, 2 163Aa 23 and 40, IG XI, 2 165 16 etc.

⁵⁸ Prohibition of death and birth in THUC. III, 104, discussing the Athenian purification, DIOD. XII, 58, 6, and STRAB. X, 5, 5 c486. with R. PARKER, *Miasma*, Oxford 1983, pp. 33, 163, and 276-77, and CHANKOWSKI, *Athènes et Délos...*, cit., pp. 53-56. See also following section for a fuller discussion.

⁵⁹ IG XI.2 199A 50: ὅτε ἐτελεύτησε Στέφανος χοῖρος.

⁶⁰ IG XI.2 145 8-9, dated to 302: τῶν νεκρῶν [ἔξα]γαγοῦσιν ἐκ τῆς ἱερᾶς νήσου καὶ κατορύξασι μισθωτοῖς ἄ· χοῖρος καθάρασθαι.

⁶¹ BRUNEAU, *Recherches...*, cit. pp. 50-51.

prices, and therefore write an economic history of demand and supply⁶². Indeed, we can go further than that. Reger showed that pig prices did not show fluctuation in relation to the sailing season, which implies that “the local demand was satisfied not from imports but out of local production”⁶³. This has important implications for the kind of constant interaction between islands I have been discussing. I understand Reger’s “local production” to include production on estates in Rheneia and Myconos. We may only find one reference to a pig-sty (καπρών), as opposed to many references to cowsheds and sheep-sheds⁶⁴, but the demands of the sanctuary for pig sacrifices imply the ability to supply all kinds of pigs, including piglets, pregnant sows (used for the Thesmophoria)⁶⁵, and even castrated pigs (δελφάκιον), at all times of year.

Pigs and other animals were also bred on Delos itself. Recent work has shown that the north and south ends of the island were used for agricultural and pastoral purposes. Indeed, one should not necessarily exclude the other. We have already mentioned the positioning of a number of buildings that implied pastoral activities in the estates owned by the gods. The creation of terraces was another way of maximising agricultural capacity⁶⁶; through the erection of walls and the creation of enclosed spaces, the farmers may have been in a position to practice mixed farming, through a combination of pastoral and agricultural activities. It is possible that some areas on the island, which were unsuitable for cultivation, were used exclusively as pas-

⁶² REGER, *Regionalism and Change...*, cit. esp. 150-151.

⁶³ Ibid.

⁶⁴ See notes 16 and 17 above.

⁶⁵ See note 54 above.

⁶⁶ Delian terraces: M. BRUNET, *Terrasses de culture antiques: L'exemple de Délos*, in «Méditerranée» 71, 1990-1993, pp. 5-11; M. BRUNET - P. POUPET, *Territoire délien*, in «BCH» 121, 1997, pp. 776-782; HARFOUCHE, *Retenir et cultiver le sol...*, cit.; terraces in general: BRUN, *Les archipels égéens...*, cit., pp. 64-71; S. PRICE - L. NIXON, *Ancient Greek Agricultural Terraces: Evidence from Texts and Archaeological Survey*, in «AJA» 109, 2005, pp. 665-694.

ture land⁶⁷. Agricultural strategies for specialisation do not necessarily imply exclusivity⁶⁸.

That said, the co-existence, sometimes in the same estate, of agricultural and pastoral activities needed careful management. Goats, as it is well known already from antiquity, would eat everything if left unsupervised⁶⁹. Survival on the limited insular agricultural space of the Cyclades meant that pasture animals needed to be carefully supervised and managed. Such management would be provided by the construction of terraces and enclosed spaces. We also have a number of regulations that seem to address the problem of unsupervised or excessive grazing. We can find such regulations on a number of islands, including Delos; as we shall see, however, not all such regulations reflect exactly the same concerns⁷⁰. I shall discuss the cases from the Cycladic islands only, but we should note that this was a general concern, beyond the geographic constraints of insularity.

Delos provides a very good example. A decree dated to the first third of the second century regulates that pigs and other animals (the elusive *βοσκήματα*) are not allowed to enter the area of the sanctuary, which is defined here by the presence of *perirrhantaria*, with the exception of animals that are destined for sacrifice. If animals do enter, then the owners are to pay a fine⁷¹. Part of the problem targeted

⁶⁷ M. BRUNET, *Le paysage agraire de Délos dans l'antiquité*, in «Journal des Savants», 1999, pp. 1-50; M. LEGUILLOUX, *The Delian Chora in Classical and Hellenistic Times: An Island Landscape Planned for Pastoralism*, in E. Kotjabopoulou - Y. Hamilakis - P. Halstead - C. Gamble - P. Elefanti (eds.), *Zooarchaeology in Greece. Recent Advances*, London 2003, pp. 251-256.

⁶⁸ BRESSON, *The Making of the Ancient Greek Economy...*, cit., p. 134. See also CHANDEZON, *L'élevage en Grèce...*, cit. pp. 128-30.

⁶⁹ Eupolis, *Goats* F13 K-A = Plutarch, *Moralia* 662d; Plato, *Laws* 639a; Varro, *On Agriculture* 2.3.7.

⁷⁰ Collection of inscriptions in CHANDEZON, *L'élevage en Grèce...*, cit. pp. 137-66. See also discussion in M.P. DILLON, *The Ecology of the Greek Sanctuary*, in "ZPE" 118, 1997, pp. 113-27.

⁷¹ SEG 48.1037, first published in C. FEYEL - F. PROST, *Un règlement délien*, in

here may have been the general cleanliness of the sanctuary, which was the target of a decree proposed by a prolific Delian proposer, Telemnestos, son of Aristeides⁷². This decree regulates that the area around the sanctuary of Dionysus and the temenos of Leto should be ‘clean’ (καθαρός), and that no one should throw dung (κόπρος) or ashes (σποδός) in these areas⁷³. Along the same lines, a fifth-century regulation is concerned about the state of the Minoa spring: if indeed the restoration of the word ‘dung’ (κόπρος) is correct, as I think it is, then the regulation targets, among other things, the throwing of dung in the spring⁷⁴. The cleanliness of water was a constant concern for the Delian authorities, as the recently published inscription regulating the water of Inopos river reveals, which included clauses of prohibition of washing (both πλύνειν and λοσθαί) and throwing stones (λίθος ἐσβάλλειν)⁷⁵. Dung (κόπρος) appears to have been an issue in the area of the Sarapieion A on the slopes of Mt Kynthos⁷⁶. The story of the foundation of this Sarapieion is recounted in magnificent detail in an inscription on a column⁷⁷. The inscription narrates in prose and then in hymn the story of the introduction of the cult of Sarapis to Delos and the construction of the Sarapieion. According

“BCH” 122, 1998, 455-68, and discussed in CHANDEZON, *L' élevage en Grèce...*, cit. pp. 137-39.

⁷² SEG 23.498, dated to the end of the third century. On the decrees proposed by Telemnestos see CONSTANTAKOPOULOU, *Aegean Interactions...*, cit. pp. 132-35.

⁷³ SEG 23.498 3-9: ὅπως εἰς τὸ λοιπὸν διαμέ[ν]ε[ι] ὁ τόπος καθαρὸς ὦν ὁ π[ρὸ]ς τῷ [Διο]νύσῳ καὶ μηθεὶς ἐμ[β]άλλει εἰς τὸν [ἀ]νακαθαρθέντα τόπον μηδ' εἰς τὸ τ[έ]μενος τὸ τῆς Λητοῦς [μή]τ[ε] κόπρον μῆτε σποδὸν μῆτε [ἄ]λλο μηθέ[ν].

⁷⁴ ID 69 with SEG 23.497: τὴν κρήν[εν] κόπρον μηδέ τι ἄλλ[ο].

⁷⁵ Published in H. SIARD, *Un règlement trouvé dans le Réservoir de l'Inopos à Délos*, in “BCH” 2006, pp. 329-48.

⁷⁶ Sarapieion A in BRUNEAU - DUCAT, *Guide de Délos*, GD 91, pp. 267-69. I have discussed this in CONSTANTAKOPOULOU, *Aegean Interactions...*, cit. pp. 81-86.

⁷⁷ IG XI.4 1299, for which see BRUNEAU, *Recherches...*, cit., 459-61, and I. MOYER, *Egypt and the Limits of Hellenism*, Cambridge 2011.

to the story, the grandfather of the prose narrator, Apollonios, the priest of Sarapis, brought the cult to Delos. After the god visited him in a dream to tell him that he should find an appropriate location for the erection of the sanctuary, Apollonios found a plot of land for sale on a poster on the way to the Agora. The plot of land that Apollonios purchased was ‘full of dung’ (κόπρου μεστός). Rather than understanding this as a rubbish tip, as previous scholarship has done, I read the reference to dung as a literal reference⁷⁸. The reference to dung here may be an attempt to show how the grace of the god transformed an otherwise marginal, inappropriate space, into a proper sanctuary, worthy of admiration; but whatever literary or religious aims the reference served, it is another indication that dung was a constant presence on the island.

What we see in the above references, then, is not just a concern about sacred space, but an attempt to control pastoral activities. The regulations about animals entering the sanctuary, the regulations about dung in the temenos, as well as the ones about the cleanliness of water, all imply that unregulated pastoralism was indeed a problem for the Delian community. A similar concern is included in the accounts of 157/6 BCE, where we read ‘not to allow *probata* (ie. sheep and goats) to enter vineyards; if they do, payment of 200dr per year should be paid’⁷⁹. This regulation included a hefty fine, and it showed that while pasturage could take place alongside agriculture, unsupervised grazing was specifically targeted.

Three further Cycladic islands issued similar regulations targeting pasturage. The island of Ios produced at least two regulations re-

⁷⁸ See CONSTANTAKOPOULOU, *Aegean Interactions...*, cit. p. 83 with n. 165. H. SIARD, *La crypte du Sarapieion A de Délos et le procès d’Apollônios*, “BCH” 122, 1998, pp. 469-86, interpreted the prosecution brought against Apollonios by the city of Delos, described in the inscription, as related to the water supply of the Sarapieion.

⁷⁹ ID 1416B I 47-51: μή ἐξέστω δὲ πρόβατα εἰς τὰς ἀμπέλους ἐμβαλεῖν· εἰ δὲ μή, ἀποτεισάτω [δρ]αχμᾶς ΗΗ κατ’ ἐνιαυτόν. Discussed in CHANDEZON, *L’ élevage en Grèce...*, cit. p. 116. See BRUNEAU - FRAISSE, *Un pressoir à vin à Délos...*, cit., pp. 144-45.

lated to pastoral activity. The earliest one, dated to the fifth or early fourth century, limited the right to pasture to foreigners to only five days; any pasture beyond that time period resulted in the payment of a fine⁸⁰. As the inscription itself is very fragmentary, it is very difficult to establish what this particular regulation was targeting: the main concern may have been similar to the regulations from Delos and therefore targeting sacred space. I am less inclined to accept this possibility, however, as there is nothing in the text itself that points to any concern related to a sacred temenos. Rather, we should read this, along with the inscription from Heracleia, discussed below, as a regulation targeting unsupervised pasturage on the island itself by foreigners who treated Ios as a 'goat' island, and therefore suitable for the pasture of large flocks of animals. The second inscription does imply that there is a concern about pasture in sacred spaces⁸¹. The decree, dated to the third century, states that the *hieropoioi* will proclaim who is to be allowed the right to pasture, and those who are allowed should mark their animals as 'sacred' with fire. We have already seen how branding with fire was used on Delian estates to mark which animals were allowed to graze in specific territories⁸². The decree displays similar concerns about limited pastureland and careful management of the animal grazing.

Our next Cycladic inscription, from Arcesine, on the island of Amorgos, provides us with a fascinating insight as to the complementarity between pasture and agriculture, despite the fact that the decree itself includes, among other things, the prohibition of goats

⁸⁰ IG XII.5 1: [...a]κοσίας δ[ραχμὰς] ὀφελέτω· ξένο[ς πρό]βατα μὴ νεμέτ[ω πλέ]ον πένθ' ἡμερ[έων· ἢν δ]ὲ νέμηι, ὀφε[λέτω ἡμέρη]ν ἐκάστ[τ]ην προβάτο] ἐκάστ[ο] [δραχμὰς], discussed in CHANDEZON, *L'élevage en Grèce...*, cit. pp. 141-42.

⁸¹ IG XII.5 2(A) = LSCG 105: ὀπόσων νέμει [ἐ]κασ[τος, κηρῦξαι] δὲ τοὺς ἱεροποι[ὸς] ἅ[παντας το]ὺς νέμοντας ἱερά καθσαι [πάντα ἢ] [μὴ] νέμειν, ὁμόσα[ι δὲ καὶ ἄλλ]ο μὴ νεμέειν, discussed in CHANDEZON, *L'élevage en Grèce...*, cit. pp. 139-41.

⁸² ID 503 l. 25, and note 40 above.

and sheep (*probata*) entering a leased estate⁸³. The level of detail in this decree is remarkable. The decree regulates the lease of a sacred estate. The responsibilities of the tenant are given in great detail: the tenant needed to plough half of the land each year, dig around the vines twice in a year, and around the figs once in a year. He should also re-build all the now fallen walls, which here must include terrace walls and walls around the estate⁸⁴. He should also keep the roofs (we assume of agricultural buildings in the estate itself) watertight and give them over in that condition at the end of the tenancy⁸⁵. Furthermore, he should apply every year 150 heaps of manure (*κοπροφορά*), with penalties for non-compliance⁸⁶. The lease regulations include the prohibition of *probata* in the *temenos*, with the exception of the sacred *probata* of Zeus *Temenites*, or in other words, if flocks do enter the estate, then they become sacred to the god⁸⁷. This set of regulations follows similar lines in relation to the prohibition of pasture in agricultural estates that we have seen on Delos⁸⁸. What I would like to underline, however, is the inclusion of the statement about manure. Indeed, the word ‘manure heap’ (*κοπροφορά*) is only

⁸³ IG XII.7 62 = RO 59, dated to the middle of the fourth century, discussed in Chandezon, *L' élevage en Grèce...*, cit. pp. 143-47.

⁸⁴ IG XII.7 62 = RO 59 l.17 for terrace walls: *τειχία τὰ πίπτον[τα] ἀφ' αὐτοῦ ἀνορθώσ[ει]*, and ll. 19-20 for enclosure walls: *φράξει τὰ ἐφ' ὁδοῦ τειχία ἅπαντα καὶ πέφρ[α]γμ[έν]α [κα]τ[α]λείψει ἀπιών.*

⁸⁵ IG XII.7 62 = RO 59 ll. 25-26: *τέγη στεγνὰ παρέξει κ[αὶ κα]ταλείψας παραδώσει.*

⁸⁶ IG XII.7 62 = RO 59 ll. 20-25: *κοπροφορὰς ἐμβαλεῖ ἐκ[άσ]του ἐνιαυτοῦ πεντήκοντά τε καὶ ἑκατὸν με[τ]ρητίδα[s] ἀρσίχ[ω]ι χ[ω]ρούσηι μέδ[ι]μνον τέσσαρα ἡμίεκτα· ἐὰν δὲ μὴ ἐμβάλῃ, ἀποτείσει ἐκάστης ἀρσίχου τριώβολο[ν]· πίστιν δὲ ποιήσει πρὸς τοὺς νεωποίας, ἢ μὴν ἐμβεβληκέναι τῆ[ν κό]προν κατὰ τὴν συγγραφὴν.*

⁸⁷ IG XII.7 62 = RO 59 ll. 35-37: *πρόβατα [δὲ μὴ] ἐξέστω ἐμβιβάσκειν εἰς τὸ τέμενος μηδενί· εἰὰν δ' [ἐμβιβά]σκη, ἔστω [τὰ] πρόβατα ἱερὰ τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ Τεμενίου.*

⁸⁸ See note 79 above.

attested here⁸⁹. Manure was an essential fertilizer for the agriculture, as it provided nitrogen to the soil and plants. Substantial quantities of manure, as this inscription shows, were a necessary feature for any successful crop, especially in the Cycladic landscape, where soil is not generally rich in nutrients. Manure could be produced by composting, but the main source of manure in antiquity (as indeed in modern times) was animal dung. The presence of manure, therefore, shows clearly that agriculture depended, to a considerable degree, on at least small-scale pasturage. Amorgos is a steep and rocky island, whose territory was divided among three poleis, Minoa, Arcesine, and Aigiale. It is unlikely that in the limited agricultural landscape of Arcesine there would be enough bovine animals to provide manure. Rather, we are looking mostly at sheep and goats (but also poultry and a small number of mules, horses, and donkeys) for the primary production of manure. The use of manure in the estate, carefully regulated in this inscription, implied the co-existence of agriculture and pastoral activities. The inclusion of the construction of walls in the tenancy agreement also points to a careful demarcation of the land, through the repair and construction of terraces and enclosure walls. If animals did succeed in entering the space of the estate, then they became sacred property. This inscription, therefore, is an example of an integrated economy, promoted by the sanctuary's administration⁹⁰.

Our final inscription from the Cyclades regulating access to pasture land comes from the small island of Heracleia, to the south of

⁸⁹ LSJ s.v. κοπροφορά: load of dung. κοπροφορέω, cover with dung or dirt, can be found in Aristophanes *Knights* 295, while κοπροφόρος, carrying dung, can be found in Poll. 7.134. Xenophon *Mem.* 3.8.6 has a reference to a κοπροφόρος κόφινος, dung basket.

⁹⁰ Sanctuary land as example of integrated economies in J. McINERNEY, *On the Border: Sacred land and the Margins of the Community*, in R.M. Rosen - I. Sluiter (eds), *City, Countryside, and the Spatial Organisation of Value in Classical Antiquity*, Leiden 2006, pp. 33-59.

Naxos⁹¹. The decree regulates the judicial procedures for crimes committed during the illegal entrance of goats onto the island⁹². The decree itself reveals a situation of acute crisis for the local community. It presupposes a previous decree which forbade the import and feeding of goats on the island. What we have here is a community taking measure to protect itself against the bitter struggle that has arisen in relation to the exploitation of the land on the island. I have argued previously that this specific prohibition would not have been aimed at farmers owning a few animals in order to have access to cheese, milk, meat, leather, and manure⁹³. These animals could graze the land under supervision in such a way as not to harm the cultivated areas, and could be housed in similar buildings as the one we have seen on Delos (such as *προβατῶν*)⁹⁴. In other words, the prohibition does not seem to aim to end the practice of mixed pastoralism that must have taken place on the Cyclades, and we have witnessed on Delos and Amorgos. The problem which led to the legislation must be related to large herds of goats grazing the land without supervision. The problem, in other words, was that the herdsmen against whom the decree is primarily aimed wanted to treat Heracleia, an inhabited island, as a goat island⁹⁵, releasing large numbers of goats and following the practice of specialised pastoralism. In that sense, survival for the farmers meant the prohibition of the introduction of goats on their island. This measure must have provoked reactions, to the extent that someone used force to import goats on the island; the struggle then

⁹¹ IG XII.7 509, discussed in CHANDEZON, *L' élevage en Grèce...*, cit. pp.147-49.

⁹² IG XII.7 509 ll. 5-10: ἐὰν δέ τις βιασόμενος αἴγας εἰσάγ[ειν ἢ] τρέφειν ἐν τῆι νήσῳ παρὰ τὸδε τὸ ψήφι[σ]μα καὶ τὸν ὄρκον τῶν κωλυόντων τινὰς κτείνει, ἐπεξιόντων αὐτὸν οἷ τε προσήκοντες τοῦ παθόντος καὶ τὸ κοινὸν τῶν νησιωτῶν ἅπαν.

⁹³ See CONSTANTAKOPOULOU, *Dance of the Islands...* cit., pp. 205-11.

⁹⁴ See note 16 above.

⁹⁵ L. ROBERT, *Îles à chèvres*, in *Hellenica* 11-12, Paris 1960, pp. 173-75. See also CONSTANTAKOPOULOU, *Dance of the Islands...* cit., pp. 200-14, for a fuller discussion.

took a violent turn involving deaths and revenge to the extent that the community had to take measure for the protection of the inhabitants. The herdsmen of these large flocks seem to be outsiders⁹⁶, possibly from the neighbouring islands of Naxos, Amorgos, or Ios. Could this decree be the result of the owners of flocks having to pay a fee for grazing on the island of Ios, that we examined above? Such a hypothesis is entirely possible, but of course any answer will remain hypothetical. Another important feature of the decree is that it is not produced by the polis or the demos of Heracleia, but by an elusive *koinon* of the islanders. I have argued elsewhere how this reference shows that the crisis facing the community on the island was so substantial that the deciding body was not just the citizens of Heracleia but the citizens and foreign residents of the island; this is an example of communal decision-making that transcended the strictly defined citizen body⁹⁷. Indeed the final line of the decree states that ‘all this is for the protection and the salvation of all the Heracleians and the inhabitants [of the island]’⁹⁸.

The Heracleia decree, therefore, shows the real threat that unsupervised grazing by a large number of animals, particularly goats, could pose to a community of a small island, controlling a limited territory suitable for agricultural production. In that sense, the evidence from Heracleia puts forward slightly different concerns than the evidence we examined from Amorgos, Ios and Delos. While all cases discussed here reveal a community concern about the careful supervision of grazing animals, the Heracleia decree implies a much bigger problem; this, I would argue, makes the case of Heracleia the ex-

⁹⁶ Argued by L. ROBERT, *Les chèvres d’Héracléia*, *Hellenica* 7, Paris 1949, pp. 161-70.

⁹⁷ C. CONSTANTAKOPOULOU, *Beyond the Polis: Island Koina and Other Non-Polis Entities in the Aegean*, in C. Taylor - K. Vlassopoulos (eds), *Communities and Networks in the Ancient Greek World*, Oxford 2015, pp. 213-36.

⁹⁸ IG XII.7 509, ll. 17-19: ταῦτα δ’ εἶναι εἷς τε φυλακῆγ καὶ σωτηρίαν Ἡρακλειωτῶν πάντων καὶ τῶν οἰκούντων ἐν τῇ νήσῳ.

ception, rather than the norm. If we can indeed witness an insular agricultural economy based on a combination of pastoralism with agriculture, as the evidence particularly from Delos and Amorgos seems to imply, this balance of different uses of landscape has all but been destroyed on Heracleia, which forced the community to produce the only inscription we have from the island. The background is one of struggle, as I have mentioned. But the other important parameter shaping the background to the production of this decree is the fragile biodiversity of small islands.

A careful balancing of human activities in their relation to the environment lies at the heart of all successful agricultural systems. It is the geographic constraints of insularity, I would argue, that create an additional layer of urgency and the need for careful planning. Indeed, the decree from Heracleia is not the only evidence we have from the ancient world about how fragile island ecosystems were. A story preserved in Hegesandros' *Hypomnemata* is a wonderful attestation of this aspect of insular life. The story says that

“during the reign of Antigonos Gonatas there were so many hares on Astypalaia that the Astypalaians consulted the oracle. And Pythia said to breed (hunting) dogs and to hunt them. And they killed in a year more than six thousand. This is how they had become so many: a person from Anaphe had introduced two hares on the island; earlier, a person from Astypalaia had released two partridges onto Anaphe and there were so many of them on Anaphe that the inhabitants almost had to abandoned the place. Originally, Astypalaia had no hares but did have partridges”⁹⁹.

⁹⁹ Hegesandros F42 in Mueller *FGH* vol. 4 p. 421: ‘Ηγήσανδρος δ’ ὁ Δελφὸς ἐν Ὑπομνήμασι, κατὰ τὴν Ἀντιγόνου τοῦ Γονατᾶ φησι βασιλείαν τοσοῦτον πλήθος γενέσθαι λαγῶν ἐν Ἀστυπαλαίᾳ, ὡς τοὺς Ἀστυπαλαίεις περὶ αὐτῶν μαντεύσασθαι. Καὶ τὴν Πυθίαν εἰπεῖν, κύνας τρέφειν καὶ κυνηγετεῖν· ἀλώναί τε ἐν ἐνιαυτῷ πλείους τῶν ἑξακισχιλίων. Ἐγένετο δὲ τὸ πλήθος τοῦτο, Ἀναφαίου τινὸς ἐμβαλόντος δύο λαγῶους εἰς τὴν νῆσον· ὡς καὶ πρότερον, Ἀστυπαλαίεως τινὸς ἀφέντος δύο πέρδικας εἰς τὴν Ἀνάφη, τοσοῦτον πλήθος ἐγένετο περδίκων ἐν· τῇ Ἀνάφῃ, ὡς κινδυνεῦσαι

The story is one of competition between neighbouring islands, Anaphe and Astypalaia. Astypalaia had no hares, but it had partridges¹⁰⁰. The release of a pair of partridges by an Astypalaian on Anaphe created an ecological disaster, where the island was overtaken by the birds. For revenge, the people of Anaphe released two hares onto Astypalaia, creating an equivalent (if not worse) threat for the Astypalaian ecosystem. The Astypalaians' response to this ecological disaster was to consult the oracle of Delphi, which suggested the hunting of hares with dogs. We have similar stories for other islands too: hares were introduced with similar disastrous effects on the island of Carpathos, according to the entry in *Suida*, which in fact stresses that this took place on an island (Καρπάθιοι νήσον οἰκοῦντες)¹⁰¹, while Hyginus reports the large number of hares on the island of Leros¹⁰². Xenophon, in his discussion of hunting of hares, reports that hares are more numerous in the islands, both inhabited and uninhabited¹⁰³. The reason for this, according to him, is that islanders are less likely to hunt (by which he means hunt with dogs, which is the elite form of hunting that he is interested in), and that on the islands there are no natural predators for hares, such as foxes and eagles. The insular biodiversity, therefore, explains partly the large number of hare. It is most likely that these stories are not true. What the stories do reveal, however, whether true or not, is that the ancient islanders were acutely aware that their survival depended on the care-

ἀναστάτους γενέσθαι τοὺς κατοικοῦντας. Κατ' ἀρχὰς δὲ ἡ μὲν Ἀστυπάλαια οὐκ εἶχε λαγῶς, ἀλλὰ πέρδικας.

¹⁰⁰ Partridge (πέρδικη): see W. G. ARNOTT, *Birds in the Ancient World*, London 2007, pp. 174-76. Hunting of partridges in J. MYNOTT, *Birds in the Ancient World*, Oxford 2018, pp. 83-85.

¹⁰¹ *Suida* s.v. ὁ Καρπάθιος τὸν λαγῶν. οἱ Καρπάθιοι νήσον οἰκοῦντες καὶ λαγωὺς οὐκ ἔχοντας ἐπηγάγοντο. Οἱ δὲ πολλοὶ γενόμενοι τὰ γεωργία αὐτῶν ἐλυμαίνοντο. Εἴρηται οὖν ἡ παροιμία ἐπὶ τῶν καθ' ἑαυτῶν τι ἐπινοουμένων.

¹⁰² Hyginus, *Astronomica* 2.33.2. On these stories see BRUN, *Les archipels égéens...*, cit.; pp. 55-56.

¹⁰³ Xenophon, *Cynegetica* 5.24-5.

ful management of their limited insular space. Such threat to the biodiversity of an environment and consequently to the survival of a community by the introduction of a foreign species would not have the same impact in a non-insular environment. The other important underlying assumption is also the implied scale of insularity in these sources: for the ancient Greeks, an island was essentially synonymous with a *small* island. Islands such as Crete, Lesbos or Chios, were not really understood as proper islands. Insularity, therefore, was closely aligned with an understanding of a small insular space¹⁰⁴.

How is all this related to connectivity, which was our starting point? All the evidence we have examined so far relate to some form of movement, often between neighbouring islands. I have argued that the demands of the sanctuary and the Delian population could not have been met by animals bred on Delos itself; rather, there must have been considerable traffic between Delos and Rheneia or Myconos (as well as other islands in the region). The accounts recording the income of the Delian sanctuary from estates on Rheneia and Myconos contribute to this interpretation. In addition, the regulations controlling pasturage that we have examined on Delos, Ios, Amorgos, and Heracleia are not simply articulations of concern about the appropriate degree of supervision for grazing animals. They are also the result of concern about movement of animals between neighbouring islands. This is certainly the case for Ios, where the pasture of 'foreign *probata*' is limited to five days only. I have also interpreted the evidence from Heracleia as essentially the result of forceful import onto the island of large flocks of goats from neighbouring islands. The overall image, therefore, is one of constant connectivity, perhaps linked to occasional transhumance (the case of Ios and the failed case of Heracleia) but also for the purposes of consumption and the market (the case of movement between Rheneia, Myconos and Delos). The underlying reality of the pastoral strategies adopted in the cases we have examined is one of constant maritime connectivity.

¹⁰⁴ I have discussed this in CONSTANTAKOPOULOU, *The Dance of the Islands...*, cit., pp. 13-15.

The transfer of livestock was just one part of the ferrying traffic between islands. In addition to animals, animal products also travelled between islands. The Delian accounts mention costs and income related to cheese (τυρός)¹⁰⁵, wool (ἔριον)¹⁰⁶, and hides (δέρμα, βύρση)¹⁰⁷. The sale of hides, frequently mentioned in the accounts, seems to have been one of the duties of the board of *boonai*¹⁰⁸. Similarly, there are references to a *psykter* (cooling vessel) in the inventories, purchased through the sale of the wool of the sacred sheep¹⁰⁹. Such products did not necessarily come just from the Delian estates on Myconos and Rheneia (in addition to any production on Delos itself), but could have come from further away, from islands such as Syros, Cythnos, Ceos, Naxos etc¹¹⁰. Indeed, island cheese acquired a fame in antiquity, especially that from Cythnos and Ceos¹¹¹. Aelian, quoting Aeschylides, described the cheese from Ceos as excellent (κάλλιστον) because of the thin soil (λεπτόγειον) of the island and the diet fed to the goats¹¹². The presence

¹⁰⁵ Cheese in *ID* 401 19 and 22; *ID* 440A 69; *ID* 445 14.

¹⁰⁶ ἔριον in *IG* XI.2 156A 17.

¹⁰⁷ δέρμα in the accounts: *IG* XI.2 161D 10: 2dr 3 obols; *ID* 440A 68: 6 dr; *ID* 442A 169: 56dr 3 obols; *ID* 464 10: 5dr; we also have references to phialai in the inventories, purchased from the profit of the sale of leather: eg. *ID* 1417B 112. Βύρση: *IG* XI.2 203A 64; *IG* XI.2 274 24; *IG* XI.2 287A 11 and 24 etc.

¹⁰⁸ REGER, *Regionalism and Change...*, cit. p. 148 with n. 41.

¹⁰⁹ ψυκτήρ ἀπὸ τῶν ἐρίων τῶν ἱερῶν προβάτων in *ID* 104(10) 14 and 16 (earlier reference, dated to 335/4 BCE); following references in *ID* 104(12) 111, *IG* XI.2 219A 3.

¹¹⁰ See REGER, *Regionalism and Change...*, cit. p. 63 with n. 55.

¹¹¹ See the references in BRUN, *Les archipels égéens...*, cit. pp. 93-94, esp. n. 140. On the Cythnian cheese see also P. BRUN, *Du fromage de Kythnos au marbre de Paros: La question des appellations contrôlées (?) dans l'Antiquité Grecque*, in "REA" 99, 1997, pp. 401-09.

¹¹² Aelian, *On the nature of animals*, 16.32: Αἰσχυλίδης ἐν τοῖς περὶ γεωργίας κατὰ τὴν Κείων γῆν πρόβατα γίνεσθαι ὀλίγα ἐκάστω τῶν γεωργῶν φησι. τὸ δὲ αἴτιον, λεπτόγειόν τε εἶναι τὴν Κέω ἰσχυρῶς καὶ νομὰς οὐκ ἔχειν: κύτισον δὲ καὶ θρία

of the sanctuary on Delos and its needs, as well as the existence of a regional market on the island, must have increased the traffic of such products to Delos. In other words, the sanctuary was an important element in the regional economy and generated significant wealth, partly through the redistribution of products¹¹³.

Certainly, the needs for sacrificial animals in the Delian sanctuary resulted to the transfer of live animals. Indeed, as we shall see in the following section, a fragment of Hypereides' speech in defence of the Athenian control of Delos implies that the sale of sacrificial victims would take place on Delos itself¹¹⁴. How did the animals move? Transport of livestock over long distances overseas was not necessarily easy¹¹⁵. But the kind of maritime interaction envisaged here was not one that depended on long distances. Rather, live animals, meat products, and other animal products could be shipped to Delos from neighbouring islands. Rather than long journeys involving large cargoes and vessels, the kind of interaction implied by the references in the Delian accounts must have involved small boats, engaged in the act of ferrying, *porthmeutike*¹¹⁶. We know of at least two *porthmeia* op-

ἐμβάλλειν, καὶ τῆς ἐλαίας τὰ ρεύσαντα φύλλα, καὶ μέντοι καὶ ὄσπριων ἄχυρα ποικίλων, παρασπείρειν δὲ καὶ ἀκάνθας, καὶ ἐκείνοις ἀγαθὸν εἶναι ταῦτα δεῖπνον. γίνεσθαι δὲ ἐξ αὐτῶν γάλα, καὶ τοῦτο τρεφόμενον τυρὸν ἐργάζεσθαι κάλλιστον: καλεῖσθαι δὲ αὐτὸν Κύθιον ὁ αὐτὸς λέγει, καὶ μέντοι καὶ τὸ τάλαντον αὐτοῦ πιπράσκεσθαι δραχμῶν καὶ ἐνενήκοντα.

¹¹³ REGER, *Regionalism and Change...*, cit., pp. 51-53.

¹¹⁴ See next section and note 137 below.

¹¹⁵ See discussion in J. BLANCOU - I. PARSONSON, *Historical Perspectives on Long Distance Transport of Animals*, in "Veterinaria Italiana" 44.1, 2008, pp. 19-30. For modern concerns see C.J.C. PHILLIPS - E. SANTURTUN, *The Welfare of Livestock Transported by Ship*, in "Veterinary Journal" 196.3, 2013, pp. 309-14. I was not able to consult H. GRASSL, *Zur Geschichte des Viehhandels im klassische Griechenland*, in "MBAH" 4.2, 1985, pp. 77-88.

¹¹⁶ I have discussed island ferrying in CONSTANTAKOPOULOU, *The Dance of the Islands...*, cit., pp. 222-26.

erating around Delos from the accounts of the sanctuary¹¹⁷: one facilitated the ferrying between Delos and Rheneia and the other between Myconos and Delos¹¹⁸. The references to the *porthmeia* in the Delian accounts are related to money received by the sanctuary through the operation of such ferries. The first reference to such income comes from the accounts of 398 BCE, in the period of Athenian control of the sanctuary¹¹⁹. In the period of Independence, we can safely say that such income was not negligible: in the listed revenues from the *porthmeia* in the year 269, the ferry to Rheneia produced an income of 200dr¹²⁰, while in 250, it was 440dr¹²¹. There has been some debate about the role of these *porthmeia*, which is linked with their localisation, especially on the island of Rheneia; in other words, can we see these ferries as essentially operating on ‘sacred’ business or did they include non-religious journeys?¹²² Given the current

¹¹⁷ See KENT, *The Temple Estates of Delos...*, cit. p. 249 with n. 11, and CHANKOWSKI, *Athènes et Délos...*, cit. pp. 297-98.

¹¹⁸ Ferry to Rheneia: IG XI.2 138 5, IG XI.2 153 19, IG XI.2 199B 96, IG XI.2 203A 30 and D 59, IG XI.2 224A 23, IG XI.2 274 13, IG XI.2 287A 40, ID 290 31, ID 316 65, ID 346A 4, ID 354 28, ID 396A 22, ID 399A 89, ID 442A 153, ID 457 42. Ferry to Myconos: IG XI.2 138 9, IG XI.2 199B 97, IG XI.2 287A 39, ID 368 41. There are also references to a *πορθμεῖον τὸ εἰς Ἀπόλλωνιον*, but this seems to be the same as the *porthmeion* to Myconos: IG XI.2 203A 29, ID 290 19, ID 354 27, ID 372A 27, ID 399A 90, ID 403 62, ID 442A 153, ID 449B 24-5, ID 460u 8.

¹¹⁹ ID 95 14, through the new reading of CHANKOWSKI, *Athènes et Délos...*, cit. pp. 409-11 (her no. 9), who reads [τῶν πορθ?]μείων.

¹²⁰ IG XI.2 203A 30.

¹²¹ IG XI.2 274 13.

¹²² T. HOMOLLE, *Comptes des Hiéropes du temple d'Apollon délien*, in “BCH” 6, 1882, p. 68, sees the ferrying between Rheneia and Myconos as a monopoly, owned by the sanctuary. The main purpose may have been the restriction of funerary rites on Delos itself. Contra KENT, *The Temple Estates of Delos...*, cit.; p. 249, who argues that the ferry to Rheneia in the accounts was simply the ferry from Delos to the city of Rheneia (and therefore not linked with funerary business necessarily). CHANKOWSKI, *Athènes et Délos...*, cit. pp. 298-99, who summarises the debate, argues that the *porthmeion* to Rheneia was partly linked with sacred business, and

state of evidence, I am not sure we can resolve this debate in a satisfactory manner. Certainly, entries in the Delian accounts reflect money belonging to the sacred treasury; it is therefore entirely possible that the income recorded in the accounts does reflect ferrying linked with religious activities, such as the transfer of the dead to Rheneia (for which see the following section). That said, however, the same argument cannot stand for the ferry to Mykonos (also appearing as the ferry to the Apollonion)¹²³. Furthermore, can we really assume that the ferries recorded in the accounts were the only ferries operating in the region? We cannot assume a monopoly, controlled by the sanctuary, of the kind envisaged by Homolle, for ferrying journeys between the neighbouring islands and Delos¹²⁴. I envisage heavy traffic taking place for a very wide range of purposes. We should also consider that the ferrying practices that I have been describing, based on the entries in the accounts to ‘ferries’, reflect the low end of distance range. Delos attracted many visitors for a variety of purposes from a great range of geographic distance¹²⁵. On the whole, ferrying practices involved close-distance sailing, in small vessels, which would require very minimal port installations¹²⁶. To this heavy traffic, we should therefore add the contributions of pastoral economy. The transfer of live animals for sacrifice from the Delian estates of Rheneia and Mykonos (but also from other islands as part of individual or community offerings to the gods), the transfer of meat

therefore situated on the necropolis of Rheneia on the south of the island (which belonged to Delos).

¹²³ See note 118 above.

¹²⁴ In this I agree with CHANKOWSKI, *Athènes et Délos...*, cit. p. 299.

¹²⁵ I have explored this more fully in relation to the place of origin of dedicants to the Delian gods, as they are recorded in the Delian inventories of the period of Independence, in CONSTANTAKOPOULOU, *Aegean Interactions...*, cit, esp. pp. 204-24.

¹²⁶ What Kolodny observed for port installations in the Greek islands, when travelling in the 1960s: E. KOLODNY, *La population des îles de la Grèce: essai de géographie insulaire en Méditerranée orientale*, Aix en Provence 1974, p. 99.

products, as well as cheese, hides, wool from the estates and elsewhere, all contributed to an active network of communication, and enhanced the operation of Delos as a regional economic market of exchange.

Dead bodies¹²⁷

As I have already mentioned, Rheneia functioned as the extensive necropolis of the Delians, as death and birth were not allowed on the island¹²⁸. It was certainly not unusual to see such prohibitions in relation to sacred space. What was unusual was the extension of such a prohibition to the entire island. Delos' insularity was inescapably linked with the sanctity of the sanctuary; a consequence of this identification was that the whole island was understood to have elements of a sacred territory¹²⁹. Such an extension of the prohibition of burial and death took place within the context of the Athenian empire: in 426/5, Thucydides tells us, the Athenians decided to re-purify Delos by removing all existing graves to Rheneia¹³⁰. Such an act can be understood as a testament of piety, but it was also an imperialist statement about control of the sanctuary, the island and its resources by the Athenians. It was certainly understood as a contin-

¹²⁷ I wrote this section before becoming aware of Cl. Prêtre's article on the subject: see Cl. PRÊTRE, *Voir Délos et mourir: La gestion de la mort interdite dans un sanctuaire grec à travers les sources épigraphiques et les données archéologiques*, in "Revista M." 3.6, 2018, pp. 303-17.

¹²⁸ See note 58 above.

¹²⁹ I have argued in CONSTANTAKOPOULOU, *Aegean Interactions...*, cit. pp. 119-20 that Delian insularity also affected the ways in which the award of honours was articulated in honorific (especially proxeny) decrees in the period of Independence.

¹³⁰ R. PARKER, *Athenian Religion: A History*, Oxford 1996, pp. 149-51. I have discussed this in CONSTANTAKOPOULOU, *The Dance of the Islands...*, cit. pp. 71-75. See also CHANKOWSKI, *Athènes et Délos...*, cit., pp. 63-65.

uation of Peisistratus' previous act of purification, when he removed the burials from the part of Delos which was visible from the sanctuary and moved them to Rheneia¹³¹. Peisistratus was certainly not the only tyrant interested in displaying power and piety over the archaic regional audience of the sanctuary on Delos. Polycrates, the tyrant of Samos, also performed a similar act when he 'dedicated' Rheneia to Delos, connecting them with a chain¹³². The incident with a chain is remarkable indeed. Chaining an island onto another had strong symbolic overtones of subjugation. It could also be perceived as an act of transgression against the divine order of things. Herodotus, who does not discuss this episode, has many stories about *hybris* and subsequent *nemesis* when men attempted to alter the geographical setting of their environment¹³³. It is therefore particularly poignant that Thucydides places the reference to Polycrates' chaining of Rheneia within the context of the Athenian imperialistic intervention in 426/5.

Dead bodies, Athenian control of Delos and its sanctuary, and Athenian imperialistic policies, all come together in our next story. In the 340s, the Delians appealed to an external body, most likely Delphi, in order to question Athenian authority over the administration of their sanctuary¹³⁴. We have some of the fragments of Hypereides' speech, who was appointed to present the Athenian defence. The speech must have been successful, as the Delian appeal was rejected

¹³¹ Herodotus 1.64.2, Thucydides 3.104.1-2. PARKER, *Athenian Religion...*, cit. pp. 87-89 and, CHANKOWSKI, *Athènes et Délos...*, cit., pp. 10-14.

¹³² Thucydides 1.13.6 and 3.104.2. CHANKOWSKI, *Athènes et Délos...*, cit., pp. 14-15.

¹³³ A few examples: Xerxes digging a canal on Mt Athos (and turning a peninsula into an island) in 7.22.3; Xerxes yoking the Hellespont in 7.33-5 and 7.54-6; the Cnidians attempting to cut off their peninsula in order to gain a defensive advantage against the invading Persian army (and as a result, suffering accidents): in 1.174.3.

¹³⁴ I have discussed this more extensively in CONSTANTAKOPOULOU, *The Shaping of the Past...*, cit.

and the Athenians retained control of the sanctuary until the Delian Independence in 314 BCE¹³⁵. In the longest fragment of Hypereides' speech, we come across a truly sensational incidence¹³⁶. Some rich Aeolian men, Hypereides recounts,

“arrived at Delos, carrying a lot of gold, being away from their homeland in a pilgrimage of Greece; they were discovered cast up on Rheneia dead. As the affair became notorious, the Delians brought as a charge against the people of Rheneia that they had done this, and indicted their polis for impiety. The Rheneians were outraged with the affair and they summoned into court the Delians with the same charge. When the trial took place in order to find out which party was the one who had done the act, the Rheneians asked the Delians why the men had come to them; for they had no harbours, nor market nor anything else worth a visit. Everyone, they said, went to Delos, and they themselves often stayed there. When the Delians replied to them that the men crossed over to Rheneia to buy sacred victims, “if they came to buy sacred victims, as you claim”, the Rheneians said, “why did they not bring the slaves who attended to them to take back the victims, instead of leaving them in Delos and crossing alone? Besides, why, when it is thirty stades from the landing place to the city of Rheneia, and the road is rough, through which they had to walk for the purchase, did they cross without shoes, when in Delos in the sanctuary they walked with shoes on?”¹³⁷

¹³⁵ BNJ (FGrH) 401b. See my commentary on the fragments in C. CONSTANTAKOPOULOU, *Critical edition, translation and commentary of Anonymous Authors on Delos (BNJ 401b)*, in I. Worthington (ed.), *BNJ (Brill New Jacoby) 401a*.

¹³⁶ Hypereides F70 Jensen = BNJ 401b F5a.

¹³⁷ Hypereides F70 Jensen = BNJ 401b F5a: παρά Ὑπερίδῃ ἐν τῷ Δηλιακῷ· “ἐκθησόμεθα δὲ τὰ εἰρημένα ὑπὲρ τοῦ γενέσθαι σαφὲς τὸ λεγόμενον. ἀφίκοντό τινες εἰς Δῆλον ἄνθρωποι Αἰολεῖς πλούσιοι, χρυσίον ἔχοντες πολὺ, κατὰ θεωρίαν τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἀποδημοῦντες ἐκ τῆς αὐτῶν· οὗτοι ἐφάνησαν ἐν Ῥηνεῖαι ἐκβεβλημένοι τετελευτηκότες. τοῦ δὲ πράγματος περιβοήτου ὄντος, ἐπιφέρουσι Δῆλιοι τοῖς

Hypereides includes this remarkable incident in order to show the Delians in a negative light. The murder of the rich Aeolian pilgrims may have been used as the background for the Athenian accusation of the Delians for *asebeia*, which, perhaps, led to their expulsion by the Athenians in 422¹³⁸. This episode, in other words, was not only crucial for the Athenian arguments in the 340s about the Delian unsuitability in managing the Delian sanctuary (and by implication, the Athenian suitability), but may have also been used as justification for the imperialist act of the expulsion of the Delian population from the island in 422. How could the Delians be trusted in taking care of the cult of Apollo and Artemis, when they have been engaged in such a gross act of impiety?

There are a number of fascinating details in the fragment. First of all, this is unique in giving a voice to the people of Rheneia, who are on the whole entirely elusive in our sources. Rheneia, according to Hypereides, had no harbour, no market, nor anything else worth a visit. The Delian counter-claim that the Aeolians went there to buy sacrificial victims is met with incredulity. While, as we have seen in

Ῥηνεῦσιν αἰτίαν ὡς αὐτῶν ταῦτα πεποιηκότων, καὶ γράφονται τὴν πόλιν αὐτῶν ἀσεβείας, οἱ δὲ Ῥηνεῖς ἠγανάκτῃται τε τῷ πράγματι, καὶ προσκαλοῦνται Δηλίου τὴν αὐτὴν δίκην. οὕσης δὲ τῆς διαδικασίας, ὁπότεροί εἰσιν οἱ τὸ ἔργον πεποιηκότες, ἠρώτων οἱ Ῥηνεῖς τοὺς Δηλίους, δι' ἣν αἰτίαν πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἀφίκοντο· οὔτε γὰρ λιμένας εἶναι παρ' αὐτοῖς οὔτε ἐμπόριον οὔτε ἄλλην διατριβὴν οὐδεμίαν· πάντας δὲ ἀνθρώπους ἀφικνεῖσθαι πρὸς τὴν Δῆλον ἔλεγον, καὶ αὐτοὶ τὰ πολλὰ ἐν Δῆλῳ διατρίβειν. τῶν δὲ Δηλίων ἀποκρινομένων αὐτοῖς, ὅτι ἱερεῖα ἀγοράσαντες οἱ ἀνθρωποὶ διέβησαν εἰς τὴν Ῥηνεῖαν, 'διὰ τί οὖν' ἔφασαν οἱ Ῥηνεῖς 'εἰ ἱερεῖα ἦκον ὠνησάμενοι, ὡς φατε, τοὺς παῖδας τοὺς ἀκολούθους οὐκ ἤγαγον τοὺς ἄξοντας τὰ ἱερεῖα, ἀλλὰ παρ' ὑμῖν ἐν Δῆλῳ κατέλιπον, αὐτοὶ δὲ μόνοι διέβησαν, πρὸς δὲ τούτοις τριάκοντα σταδίων ὄντων ἀπὸ τῆς διαβάσεως πρὸς τὴν πόλιν τὴν Ῥηνεῖαν, τραχείας οὕσης ὁδοῦ, δι' ἧς ἔδει αὐτοὺς πορευθῆναι ἐπὶ τὴν ἀγοράσιαν, ἄνευ ὑποδημάτων διέβησαν, ἐν Δῆλῳ δ' ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ ὑποδεδεμένοι περιεπάτουν''.

¹³⁸ Expulsion of the Delians in Thucydides 5.1 and Diodorus 12.73.1. Link between this incident of *asebeia* and the expulsion in 422 argued by S. HORNBLOWER, *A Historical Commentary to Thucydides*, vol. II, Oxford 1996, p. 522 and R. PARKER, *Athenian Religion...*, cit. p. 225. The Delians were allowed to return a year later, in 421: Thucydides 5.32.1.

the previous section, there is ample evidence for the presence of animals on Rheneia, which may have ended as sacrificial victims on Delos, the assumption here is that such purchase would take place on Delos itself, not on Rheneia. The forensic detail of the absence of shoes on the dead bodies seems to have consolidated the argument that the murder could not have taken place on Rheneia. What kind of scenario can we envisage that would explain the narrative of this fragment? In order to do that, we need to turn our attention to references of bodies cast out, or washed ashore, in the Delian inscriptions.

The Delian accounts of the early second century BCE record the salaries paid to at least five individuals for the recovery of dead bodies around Delos and Rheneia¹³⁹. Some of the names and locations where the bodies were found are not legible, but we can safely read that there was a body by the shore (πρὸς τὸν αἰγιαλόν) close to the Asclepieion (GD 125), a body by the Artemision on Rheneia¹⁴⁰, a body by the stoa next to the Posideion¹⁴¹, a body which had fallen in a ditch next to the Heracleion¹⁴², and a body by the shore close to the

¹³⁹ ID 440A 49-55: τοῖς ἄρασι τὸ σῶμα τὸ προσπεσὸν εἰς τὸ ΕΛΥΚΕΙΟΝ 3dr· καὶ Ἀλκίμωι? ἄραντι τὸ σῶμα τὸ προ[σπε]σὸν πρὸς τὸν αἰγιαλὸν τὸν πρὸς τῷ Ἀσκληπιεῖω 3dr 2 obols· ΚΛΕΦΟΛΛΙΩΙ ἄραντι τὸ σῶμα [τὸ] προσπεσὸν πρὸς τὴν νῆσον τὴν ἱερὰν 3dr· καὶ Εὐπόρωι ἄραντι τὸ σῶμα τὸ ἐκ τῆς στοᾶς τῆ[ς] [π]ρὸς τῷ Ποσιδεῖω 2 dr· Σωτηρίχωι ἀνακολυμβήσαντι τὸ σῶμα τὸ ἐμπεσὸν εἰς τὸ ὄρυγμα τὸ [π]ρὸς τῷ Ἡρακλέωι 5 dr· καὶ Σώσωι ἄραντι τὸ σῶμα τὸ προσπεσὸν πρὸς τὸν αἰγιαλὸν τὸν πρὸς τῷ Θεσμοφορίωι 3dr, κοφίνων 2dr, σφόγγων 1dr.

¹⁴⁰ The inscription describes this as πρὸς τὴν νῆσον τὴν ἱερὰν; J. TRÉHEUX, *Archéologie Délienne: L' Artemision ἐν Νήσῳ, localisation et histoire*, in "Journal des Savants" 1995, 187-207, identified this as the area on Rheneia where the Artemision ἐν Νήσῳ was located.

¹⁴¹ The Posideion is located on the north side of the Agora of Theophrastos (GD 49): BRUNEAU - DUCAT, *Guide de Délos*, cit., p. 213. It is therefore located by the west coast of the island, close to the littoral.

¹⁴² The Heracleion is not safely identified: it was certainly located in the area of Inopos: see BRUNEAU - DUCAT, *Guide de Délos*, cit., p. 271, following BRUNEAU, *Recherches...*, cit. pp. 389-90 and 400-01.

Thesmophorion¹⁴³. The accounts do not record any information about who the deceased were; such details would be beyond the scope of the inscription, which was to record expenses incurred in that year that were linked with the sacred treasury. Instead of information about the dead, we have the names of those who recovered the bodies (Alkimos, possibly, Euporos, Soterichos, and Sosos) and their payment. Payments range from two drachmas for the recovery of the body by the stoa next to the Posideion, to five drachmas to Soterichos for the recovery of the body from a ditch next to the Heraclion, while Sosos, who recovered the body from the shore by the Thesmophorion received three drachmas, two drachmas worth of baskets and one drachma worth of sponges. The payments are not excessive, but not negligible either¹⁴⁴. During roughly the same period, an architect would receive an annual salary of 720dr, while a female helper (the truly bizarre τῆ ἀνθρώπῳ εἰς τὰ ἐπιτήδεια) would receive 120dr, and a male servant (ὑπηρέτης) 156dr¹⁴⁵. The five drachmas, therefore, paid to Soterichos represent a very good daily wage; this can partly be explained by the difficulty of the task. Soterichos had to recover a body which had fallen from under water (ἀνακολυμβήσαντι τὸ σῶμα τὸ ἐμπεσὸν εἰς τὸ ὄρυγμα). We do not know the status of the men paid to recover the bodies. Soterichos is included in the index of names from Delos, in the volume on foreigners¹⁴⁶. Soterichos ap-

¹⁴³ The Thesmophorion is not safely identified. BRUNEAU - DUCAT, *Guide de Délos*, cit., p. 313 tentatively suggest GD 123, following BRUNEAU, *Cultes...*, cit. pp. 281-82.

¹⁴⁴ REGER, *Regionalism and Change...*, cit., p. 9 on the difficulty of establishing wages.

¹⁴⁵ IG XI.2 161A 83.

¹⁴⁶ J. TRÉHEUX, *Index des inscriptions de Délos I. Les étrangers à l'exclusion des Athéniens de la clérarchie et des Romains*, Paris 1992, p. 80, s.v. Σωτήριχος, where he comments that this cannot be the same as the metic Soterichos, known for his *choregia* at the Dionysia in IG XI.2 133 12; in other words, it would be very unlikely that a rich metic would risk his life to recover a dead body for 5dr.

pears as a servant (ὑπηρέτης) elsewhere in the same account¹⁴⁷. Would this make him a slave? This is possible, but not certain.

Similarly, the more fragmentary account of 179 BCE records the payments made to the workers (ἐργάται) who recovered a body by the stoa next to the Leukothion (possibly GD 126), as well as other bodies, whose details are not preserved¹⁴⁸. We get more references to dead bodies in other years' accounts, but these are far less descriptive. The accounts of 280 BC record the payment of ten drachmas made to Sosipolis who took out the body which had fallen in the lake¹⁴⁹. Finally, the accounts of 302 BCE mention the payment of ten drachmas made to salaried men (μισθωτοί) who took the dead (νεκροί) from the 'sacred island' (Rheneia) and buried them¹⁵⁰.

The location of the dead bodies, when this is identified, reveals a common feature: that of the presence of water. First, in two instances, the dead bodies are found 'by the shore' (πρὸς τὸν αἰγιαλόν), one by the Asclepieion, the other by the Thesmophorion¹⁵¹. It is also likely that the Leukothion, close to which another body was recovered, was also situated on the littoral. Bruneau, while accepting that no secure identification for Leukothion can take place, did not object to a location south of the Asclepieion on the coast¹⁵². Even if the Leukothion was not situated by the coast (which the nature of the de-

¹⁴⁷ ID 440A 26.

¹⁴⁸ ID 442A 204-6: ἐργάταις τοῖς ἄρασι τὸ σῶμα τὸ [προσπεσὸν πρὸς — · τοῖς ἄρα]σι τὸ σῶμα τὸ ἐκ τῆς στοᾶς τῆς παρὰ τὸ Λευκόθιον ὄδρ 2 obols· τοῖς ἄρασι τὰ σώματα τὰ προσπεσόντα [πρὸς...

¹⁴⁹ IG XI.2 159A 11: Σ[ωσ]ιπόλι<δι> τὸν εἰς τὴν λίμνην ἐμπεσόντα ἐξελόντι δραχμαὶ ·10dr. According to Cl. VIAL, *Inscriptions de Délos, II. Les Déliens*, Paris 2008, p. 126, s.v. Σ[ω]ίπολις or [Δεξί]πολις or [Ἀναξί]πολις, he is 'probably Delian'.

¹⁵⁰ IG XI.2 145 8: τῶν νεκρῶν [ἐξα]γαγοῦσιν ἐκ τῆς ἱερᾶς νήσου καὶ κατορύξασι μισθωτοῖς ·10dr· χοῖρος καθάρασθαι ·5 dr.

¹⁵¹ ID 440A 50 and 53.

¹⁵² BRUNEAU, *Recherches...*, cit., pp. 451-52, tentatively followed by BRUNEAU - DUCAT, *Guide de Délos*, cit., p. 317, GD 126.

ity, Leukothea, protector of sailors, seems to imply), the existence of a river close to the Leukothion makes the presence of water prominent¹⁵³. Second, there is one occasion where a dead body had to be recovered from the lake; this retrieval also represents the highest payment for a single body recorded in our accounts (10 dr)¹⁵⁴. Third, the body found in the ditch (ὄρυγμα) by the Heracleion, as we have seen, had to be recovered by someone diving and bringing it up. The Heracleion is not safely identified, but its location was in the area of the river Inopos¹⁵⁵. The presence of a ditch full of water (so that Soterichos had to dive to recover the body) implies that it was very close to the river itself. Perhaps a winter storm filled the ditch with water from the river and that caused the fatal accident. Finally, most cases recorded in the accounts deal with the move of bodies from the ‘sacred island’¹⁵⁶. This, as we have seen, is the territory of Rheneia belonging to the Delian gods, and perhaps close to the Artemision on the Island. It is not clear from these attestations where the bodies were located, other than that they were ‘on the island’, but in any case the workers had to be transported there over the strait in order to recover the bodies and bury them.

Indeed, the payment of Sosos, who recovered a dead body from the shore next to the Thesmophorion highlights the role of water: Sosos, as we have seen, was paid three drachmas, two drachmas worth of baskets (κοφίνων) and one drachma worth of sponges (σφόγγων)¹⁵⁷.

¹⁵³ River next to the Leukothion: IG XI.2 203A 37-8 and 53: τὸν ποταμὸν ἀνακαθάραντι τὸν ἐν τῷ Λευκοθίῳ.

¹⁵⁴ See note 149 above. We have 10dr paid in IG XI.2 145 8, but this relates to cost of the recovery of bodies (plural) and their burial: see note 150. ID 372A 106 mentions 30 dr, but again it refers to dead bodies plural (νεκρούς).

¹⁵⁵ See note 142 above.

¹⁵⁶ IG XI, 2, 145 8: τῶν νεκρῶν [ἐξα]γαγοῦσιν ἐκ τῆς ἱερᾶς νήσου; ID 372A 106: τοῖς τοῦς νεκροῦς ἄρασιν τοὺς προσπεσόντας πρὸς τὴν Νήσο[ν] 30 dr; ID 440A 51: ἄραντι τὸ σῶμα [τὸ] προσπεσὸν πρὸς τὴν νήσον τὴν ἱερὰν 3 dr.

¹⁵⁷ See note 139 above.

Sponges (σπόγγοι or σφόγγοι) appear often in the Delian epigraphic corpus, as payments (as in this case), expenses, and used for the cleaning of buildings¹⁵⁸. Sponges and purple dye were harvested in the sea around Delos¹⁵⁹. The term ‘Delian fisherman’ (Δήλιος ἀλιεύς), in fact, may have signified a certain type of fisherman (and not necessarily one from Delos) who may have been involved in the fishing of purple shell¹⁶⁰. Delian swimmers (Δήλιος κολυμβητής) were famous in antiquity¹⁶¹. Such swimmers were able to dive deep and were probably engaged in the purple diving activity; for this they became proverbial, much like twentieth-century sponge divers from Calymnos¹⁶². While the ancient sources do not say so, it is very likely that such Delian ‘swimmers’ were engaged in sponge diving as well. Could it be that Sosipolis who recovered the body from the lake and Soterichos who dived in the ditch were such swimmers?

Swimming was not necessarily widespread in antiquity, and it seems to have been linked with ancient constructions of manliness¹⁶³. Slaves could swim too, as we know from a late Hellenistic inscription from the island of Syros, which honoured Onesandros, son

¹⁵⁸ Indicatively as expenses IG XI, 2, 144 A37; used in the cleaning of buildings: IG XI, 2, 219A 33.

¹⁵⁹ For purple dye see note 35 above.

¹⁶⁰ Ph. BRUNEAU, *Delos V: 39: Pythagore, ci-devant*, “pêcheur délien, in “BCH” 109, 1985, pp. 545-46 = J.-C. MORETTI (ed.) *Études d’archéologie délienne par Philippe Bruneau*, Athens 2006, pp. 557-68.

¹⁶¹ Diog. Laert. 2.22 and 9.12, and Suda s.v. Δηλίου κολυμβητοῦ. (ἐπὶ τῶν πάνυ ἐμπείρων νήχεσθαι).

¹⁶² BRUNEAU, *Documents sur l’industrie...*, cit.; BRUNEAU, *Encore la pourpre...*, cit. BRUN, *Les archipels égéens...*, cit. 134.

¹⁶³ Argument, discussing examples, put forward by E. HALL, *Drowning by Names. The Greeks, Swimming, and Timotheus’ Persians*, in H.A. Khan (ed.), *The Birth of European Identity: The Europe-Asia Contrast in Greek Thought*, 490-322, Nottingham 1994, pp. 44-80

of Boulon, from Siphnos¹⁶⁴. The body of the decree reveals the background for the award of honours, which involved the rescue of a number of Syrians from pirates. The pirates had abducted a number of people from Syros. When they put into port on the island across Siphnos (possibly the islet Citriane), one of the slaves, Noumenios, swam across away from the pirates and reached Onesandros on Siphnos, who fed him and dressed him and sent him to Syros, paying all expenses¹⁶⁵. This Noumenios must have been a very strong swimmer if he was able to swim from Citriane to the south coast of Siphnos onto Siphnos itself.

The careful inclusion in the Delian accounts of the costs incurred in the process of the recovery of the dead bodies on the littoral of Delos and in the south of Rheneia (the 'sacred' part of the island) reveal the sanctuary's preoccupation with pollution caused by death. We have already seen how pigs and piglets were a common sacrificial animal for purification purposes for pollution caused, among other things, by death. The administrators of the sanctuary would go into great lengths to employ people, often servants, in order to recover bodies, often from very difficult locations, such as in the lake, or down a deep trench full of water. The dead bodies of the rich Aeolian pilgrims, washed up on Rheneia must have been the cause of serious concern. The story, as narrated by Hypereides, who records the point of view of the Rheneians, accused by the Delians for impiety, implies

¹⁶⁴ IG XII.5 653 = Bielman 52. See discussion in C. CONSTANTAKOPOULOU, *Cycladic History and Archaeology: Some Thoughts*, in E. Angliker - J. Tully (eds), *Cycladic Archaeology and Research. New Approaches and Discoveries*, Oxford 2018, pp. v-xii, with references.

¹⁶⁵ The key passage is in ll. 25-32: ὁμοίω[ς] δὲ ἀφαρπαγέντων καὶ οἰκετικῶν σωματίων ὑπὸ πειρατῶν παρὰ Σωσίλου τοῦ Ξενοπέιθου Νουμηνίου καὶ Βότρυος ἀπὸ τῆς καλουμένης Ἑσχατίας συνέβη κατὰραι ἐπὶ τὴν ἐπικειμένην ἀπέναντι νῆσον τῆς χώρας τῆς Σιφνίων· ἓνα δὲ αὐτῶν Νουμήνιον διακολυμβήσαντα ἀπὸ τῶν πειρατῶν Ὀνήσανδρος ὑπεδέξατο, πυθόμενος ὅτι ἔστιν ἐξύρου, καὶ ἔθρεψεν ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων χρόνον καὶ πλείονα, καὶ ἀνφιέσας ἐξαπέστειλεν εἰς τὴν ἡμετέραν πόλιν τοῖς ἰδίοις δαπανήμασιν.

that these bodies were washed up in the northern part of Rheneia, and therefore not on the 'sacred' territory of the island, where Delos had responsibility. Whether the Aeolians were killed on the island, or on Delos, or indeed between Delos and Rheneia, we will never be able to tell. But what we can say from the story and the references in the accounts is that concerns about purification and pollution was another important parameter in the traffic between Delos and Rheneia, and perhaps one that massively increased the income from the ferry that operated between the two islands.

Conclusions

I have looked at some forms of connectivity between islands that are not normally discussed as such in scholarship. My main case study has been the interaction between Delos and the neighbouring islands, particularly Rheneia and Mykonos. This choice was mostly the result of the existing evidence. The production and survival of hundreds of inscriptions from Delos, especially in the period of Independence, allows us to reconstruct maritime traffic in great detail and in unexpected areas. The Delians, as the people of Ios or Arcesine on Amorgos, practiced mixed pastoralism. The presence of a great regional sanctuary on the small insular space of Delos created an increased demand for animals for sacrifice, but also animal products. These were supplied by the estates that Delos owned on Rheneia and Mykonos, as well as other islands; but the case of the sale and provision of animals from other islands is less clear, as it is not the subject matter of the accounts and inventories produced by the administration of the sanctuary. I have also explored the few, but I would argue fascinating, references to dead bodies found around Delos and Rheneia as a form of maritime connectivity.

Certainly, Delos was an exceptional island. It was small, but supported a substantial population through the income and traffic generated by the sanctuary. Not all Cycladic islands would experience the

amount of traffic that Delos experienced in the period of Independence or after 166 BCE, when Delos returned to Athenian control. The strategies, however, that the Delians employed for the management of their territory, the practice of mixed pastoralism, the construction of terraces and enclosures, the careful management of pastoral activities, through the control of unsupervised grazing, all that can also be found on the other islands of the Aegean. The goats, sheep, pigs and dead bodies in the Delian epigraphic corpus allows us to get closer to the actual Delian experience of connectivity in that part of the Aegean world.

Abbreviations

- BIELMAN A. BIELMAN, *Retour à la liberté. Libération et sauvetage en Grèce ancienne. Recueil d'inscriptions honorant des sauveurs et analyse critique*, Paris 1994.
- FGrH F. JACOBY, *Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker*, Berlin - Leiden 1923-1958.
- GD PH. BRUNEAU - J. DUCAT, *Guide de Délos*, Athens 2005⁴.
- ID *Inscriptions de Délos*, Paris 1926-37
- IG *Inscriptiones Graecae*, Berlin, 1873 -
- LSCG F. SOKOLOWSKI, *Lois sacrées des cites grecques*, Paris 1969
- RO P.J. RHODES - R. OSBORNE, *Greek Historical Inscriptions, 404-323 BC*, Oxford 2003

INDICE

EUGENIO LANZILLOTTA, <i>Introduzione</i>	pag. VII
DEMETRIOS ATHANASOULIS, <i>Ricerche nelle Cicladi</i>	» XIX
CHRISTY CONSTANTAKOPOULOU, <i>Goats, sheep, and dead bodies. Some (un)expected manifestations of island connectivity in the Cyclades</i>	» 1
ZOZI PAPADOPOULOU, <i>Ethnic identity and territorial and political control in Rheneia: the epigraphical and topographical evidence</i>	» 45
ANAÏS MICHEL, <i>Délos et les îles invisibles. Les insulaires originaires des Cyclades dans le sanctuaire d'Apollon à travers le témoignage de l'épigraphie hellénistique</i>	» 69
FEDERICA CORDANO, <i>Theoì Múchioi. I penati delle isole</i>	» 109
FRANCESCO CAMIA, <i>La stefaneforia nelle Cicladi. Considerazioni sul dossier epigrafico degli arconti eponimi di Siro (IG XII 5, 659-667)</i>	» 117
VALERIA FODERÀ, <i>Decreti onorari di Andros per cittadini stranieri</i> ..	» 149
DONATELLA ERDAS, <i>Terre e proprietà nelle Cicladi: il caso di Amorgos</i>	» 163
ALESSANDRA INGLESE, <i>Aspetti istituzionali e culturali nelle feste per Athena Itonia ad Amorgos</i>	» 185

PAOLA CECCARELLI, <i>Sul linguaggio di alcune iscrizioni di Io</i>	»	201
CARMELO DI NICUOLO, <i>Disiecta cimolia alla periferia occidentale della polinesia cicladica</i>	»	239
STEFANO STRUFFOLINO, <i>L'insularità estrema: i casi di Sikinos e Pholegandros</i>	»	271
MARIO LOMBARDO, <i>Dinamiche politiche e istituzionali nell'epigrafia delle Cicladi: Conclusioni</i>	»	303

Edizioni TORED s.r.l.
Stampato nel mese di giugno 2020