



<https://publications.dainst.org>

iDAI.publications

ELEKTRONISCHE PUBLIKATIONEN DES
DEUTSCHEN ARCHÄOLOGISCHEN INSTITUTS

Dies ist ein digitaler Sonderdruck des Beitrags / This is a digital offprint of the article

Christopher P. Jones Kinship (συγγένεια) in Two Cities of the Troad

aus / from

Chiron

Ausgabe / Issue **40 • 2010**

Seite / Page **29–40**

<https://publications.dainst.org/journals/chiron/503/5111> • urn:nbn:de:0048-chiron-2010-40-p29-40-v5111.3

Verantwortliche Redaktion / Publishing editor

Redaktion Chiron | Kommission für Alte Geschichte und Epigraphik des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Amalienstr. 73 b, 80799 München

Weitere Informationen unter / For further information see <https://publications.dainst.org/journals/chiron>

ISSN der Online-Ausgabe / ISSN of the online edition **2510-5396**

Verlag / Publisher **Walter de Gruyter GmbH, Berlin**

©2017 Deutsches Archäologisches Institut

Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Zentrale, Podbielskiallee 69–71, 14195 Berlin, Tel: +49 30 187711-0

Email: info@dainst.de / Web: dainst.org

Nutzungsbedingungen: Mit dem Herunterladen erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen (<https://publications.dainst.org/terms-of-use>) von iDAI.publications an. Die Nutzung der Inhalte ist ausschließlich privaten Nutzerinnen / Nutzern für den eigenen wissenschaftlichen und sonstigen privaten Gebrauch gestattet. Sämtliche Texte, Bilder und sonstige Inhalte in diesem Dokument unterliegen dem Schutz des Urheberrechts gemäß dem Urheberrechtsgesetz der Bundesrepublik Deutschland. Die Inhalte können von Ihnen nur dann genutzt und vervielfältigt werden, wenn Ihnen dies im Einzelfall durch den Rechteinhaber oder die Schrankenregelungen des Urheberrechts gestattet ist. Jede Art der Nutzung zu gewerblichen Zwecken ist untersagt. Zu den Möglichkeiten einer Lizenzierung von Nutzungsrechten wenden Sie sich bitte direkt an die verantwortlichen Herausgeberinnen/Herausgeber der entsprechenden Publikationsorgane oder an die Online-Redaktion des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts (info@dainst.de).

Terms of use: By downloading you accept the terms of use (<https://publications.dainst.org/terms-of-use>) of iDAI.publications. All materials including texts, articles, images and other content contained in this document are subject to the German copyright. The contents are for personal use only and may only be reproduced or made accessible to third parties if you have gained permission from the copyright owner. Any form of commercial use is expressly prohibited. When seeking the granting of licenses of use or permission to reproduce any kind of material please contact the responsible editors of the publications or contact the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut (info@dainst.de).

CHRISTOPHER P. JONES

Kinship (συγγένεια) in Two Cities of the Troad

Greek cities of antiquity had a strong sense of their own earliest past, the time when gods and heroes walked the earth, the heroes often leading whole populations to new lands. Especially in the Hellenistic period, such cities studied and used this past not only for self-affirmation but to assert or renew links of «kinship» (συγγένεια) or «intimacy» (οικειότης) with other political entities, whether cities, kings, or leagues. The subject of such links and their exploitation has received much attention in recent years, after pioneering studies by ELIAS BICKERMANN, DOMENICO MUSTI, and especially LOUIS ROBERT, who promised a monograph on the topic. In 1995 OLIVIER CURTY published a corpus of epigraphical texts relating to such «legendary» links, and has defended his positions in two later articles.¹

While the interpretation of οικειότης is disputed, whether it means a weakened form of kinship, or rather a familiarity or intimacy that need not depend on any supposed blood- or family-ties, by contrast the general meaning of συγγένεια has seemed reasonably clear. In the words of ÉDOUARD WILL, «Des cités se disent «parentes» lorsqu'elles se tiennent pour issues d'un commun ancêtre mythique, même s'il est parfois difficile, voire impossible de démêler et même de percevoir les pedigrees sous-tendant ces «parentés», que les rédacteurs des textes n'éprouvent que rarement le besoin de rap-peler. Il s'agit là de traditions orales ou de constructions érudites.»²

I have used the following abbreviations: CURTY, Parentés = O. CURTY, Les parentés légendaires entre cités grecques, 1995; HELLY, Décret = BR. HELLY, Décret de Larisa pour Bombos, fils d'Alkaios, et pour Leukios, fils de Nikasias, citoyens d'Alexandrie de Troade (ca 150 av. J.-C.), Chiron 36, 2006, 171–203; JONES, Kinship Diplomacy = C. P. JONES, Kinship Diplomacy in the Ancient World, 1999; ROBERT, Ét. num. gr. = L. ROBERT, Études de numismatique grecque, 1951. I am grateful, as always, to GLEN BOWERSOCK for his advice and criticism, and also to RUDOLF HAENSCH and the anonymous referee for Chiron.

¹ BICKERMANN, *Origines Gentium*, CPh 47, 1952, 65–81 = *Religion and Politics in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods*, 1985, 399–417; D. MUSTI, *Sull' idea di συγγένεια in iscrizioni greche*, ANSP 2nd ser., 32, 1963, 225–239; for ROBERT's planned *Origines légendaires de Synnada*, see OMS 4, 90–91 (Cours 1944–1945, Collège de France) and other references collected by CURTY, Parentés 261 n. 12; id., *La parenté légendaire à l'époque hellénistique: Précisions méthodologiques*, Kernos 12, 1999, 167–194; id., *Un usage fort controversé: La parenté dans le langage diplomatique de l'époque hellénistique*, AncSoc 35, 2005, 101–117.

² E. WILL, RPh 69, 1995, 300.

STEPHAN LÜCKE has now argued that συγγένεια, so far from referring to a literal kinship, however distant or mythical, is often used in a metaphorical sense, as when modern cities are «twinned»; in such cases it indicates only «an association not resulting from true blood-relationship» («eine Verbundenheit, die nicht aus echter Blutsverwandtschaft resultierte»)³. On the other side, it must be remembered that modern knowledge of such traditions is very defective. The stele of Xanthos recording an embassy of the Cytenians of Doris to various cities and kingdoms of the late third century, published by J. BOUSQUET in 1988, showed how large a store of myth cities could draw upon, even when they did not elaborate such links to suit the occasion; they themselves did not regard such traditions as myth, but as early history.⁴ Once it is granted, in WILL'S words, that «the pedigrees underlying these «kinships» are sometimes difficult, even impossible, to untangle», by the same token it becomes very difficult or even impossible to declare with assurance that they do not exist at all, but are only «metaphorical.» In the following I consider two inscriptions concerning cities of the Troad, one long since known, the other only recently published. In connection with the first, I hope to show that the text shows the exact opposite of what LÜCKE infers from it, while the second similarly makes sense only when «kinship» is taken to mean something literal rather than metaphorical for those who refer to it.

I. Lampsacos and Rome

A famous decree of Lampsacos honors its son, Hegesias, for his mission to Lucius Quinctius Flaminius in Greece and to Rome via Massilia in 196.⁵ The Lampsacenes declare that Hegesias met with «Lucius» and urged him that the Romans had a duty to protect them διὰ τε [τὴν ὑπάρχουσαν] ἡμῖν πρὸς αὐτοὺς συγγένειαν, ἦν καὶ ΑΠΟ[---/ --- κ]αὶ διὰ τὸ Μασσαλήτας εἶναι ἡμῖν ἀδελφ[ούς, οἱ εἰσι φίλ]οι καὶ σύμμαχοι τοῦ δήμου τῶν Ῥωμαίων (lines 24–27). For LÜCKE, «this συγγένεια resulted in all probability (*aller Wahrscheinlichkeit nach*) from the fact that Lampsacos had been a member of the Ilian koinon, a union of several communities of the Troas that observed the cult of Athena Ilias in Ilion (Troy).»⁶

LÜCKE appears to rely on an old assumption that MAURICE HOLLEAUX already refuted in 1921: «On a coutume de répéter, à la suite de H. G. LOLLING, que les

³ S. LÜCKE, *Syngeneia: Epigraphisch-historische Studien zu einem Phänomen der antiken griechischen Diplomatie*, 2000, 17.

⁴ J. BOUSQUET, REG 101, 1988, 12–53 (SEG 38, 1988, 1476; CURTY, Parentés 183–191, no. 75).

⁵ *Editio princeps* by H. G. LOLLING, MDAI(A) 6, 1881, 95–103 (IGR IV 179; Syll.³ 591; I.Lampsakos 4); CURTY, Parentés 78–82 no. 39; cf. JONES, *Kinship Diplomacy* 95–96.

⁶ LÜCKE (n. 3) 17; CURTY has already criticised LÜCKE's interpretation in *AncSoc* 35, 2005, 112.

Lampsakéniens se qualifient de συγγενεῖς des Romains parce qu'ils sont membres de la fédération ilienne et participent au culte d'Athéna Ilios. Cela ne paraît point exact. L'admission de Lampsaque au nombre des πόλεις αἱ κοινωνούσαι τοῦ ἱεροῦ καὶ τῆς πανηγύρεως τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς τῆς Ἰλιαδός⁷ n'a pu créer une συγγένεια entre elle et Ilion (ni, partant, entre elle et Rome) mais, au contraire, la présuppose. C'est parce que les Lampsakéniens passent pour «parents» des Iliens qu'ils célèbrent avec eux le culte d'Athéna Ilios: et s'ils passent pour leurs parents, c'est qu'ils sont censés, comme eux, descendre des anciens habitants de la Troade. La même raison en fait naturellement les συγγενεῖς des Romains.»⁸

When faced with these claims of «kinship», it is always good method to look for a basis in a city's previous history, even though such a search may prove fruitless. «History» must of course be understood to include much of what would nowadays be considered myth, since for the Greeks and Romans the beginnings of recorded history stretched at least as far back as the Trojan War, and usually some generations before that. The question therefore must be: is anything known about the history of Lampsacos that would justify its calling itself «kin» to the Romans? Now a fertile source of such civic «myths», even though it survives only in a sadly truncated state, is the onomastic lexicon of Stephanus of Byzantium, who wrote under Justinian. Like the somewhat earlier Nonnus, Stephanus preserves many traditions developed in prior centuries by local scholars and poets, sometimes on the basis of local lore, sometimes by their own ingenuity. After correctly noting that Lampsacos had been founded by Phocaea, Stephanus gives two earlier names, «Pityoussa», in which he agrees with a number of ancient sources, and «Laomedonteia», for which he cites Epaphroditus, a celebrated scholar of the first century CE.⁹ This name immediately suggests the mythic king of Troy, son of Ilos and father of Priam, who refused to pay Apollo and Poseidon for building the walls of Troy, and thereafter refused to reward Heracles for killing a sea-monster sent by the angry Poseidon; in revenge, Heracles sacked Troy and killed all the king's sons except Priam.¹⁰ Because of the Romans' Trojan connection, Vergil can say *satis iam pridem sanguine nostro Laomedontae luimus periuria Troiae*, and Silius Italicus can use *Laomedonteia urbs* as a periphrasis for Rome. A scholiast on Lycophron says that Laomedon extended the boundaries of Troy across the later Thrace and Macedonia as far as the river Peneios in Thessaly, «for previously Troy was

⁷ Syll.³ 330, 25–26; I.Ilion 1; cf. L. ROBERT, *Monnaies antiques en Troade*, 1966, 23.

⁸ M. HOLLEAUX, *Rome, la Grèce et les monarchies hellénistiques au III^e siècle avant J.-C.* (273–205), BEFAR 124, 1921, 54 n. 2. The reference to LOLLING is MDAI(A) 6, 1881, 102.

⁹ Stephanus s.v. Λάμψακος (p. 410 M.): πόλις κατὰ τὴν Προποντίδα, ἀπὸ Λαμψάκης ἐπιχωρίας τινὸς κόρης, ἔστι δὲ Φωκαίων κτίσμα, πάλαι Πιτυούσσα λεγομένη, ὡς Δηίοχος ὁ Κυζικηνός (FGrHist 471 F 3). Ἐπαφρόδιτος δὲ (fr. 24 BRASWELL-BILLERBECK) Πιτύειαν ὑφ' Ὀμήρου (Il. 2, 829) ταύτην κληθῆναι διὰ τὸ πιτύων ἔχειν πλῆθος, Λαομεδόντειαν καλουμένην. BRASWELL-BILLERBECK mistakenly translate Φωκαίων as «Phocian».

¹⁰ J. BOARDMAN, LIMC 6, 1, 1992, 201–203.

merely a little city».¹¹ Hence it is no stretch to suppose that he could have founded Lampsacos, situated just opposite the Thracian Chersonese where the Propontis narrows into the Hellespont. This surely is the chief reason for Lampsacos' membership of the League of Athena Ilias, and by extension for its kinship with Rome, a city that could be called «Laomedontean» because of Aeneas and his Trojan followers.

A subsidiary reason probably lies in the fact that, like many cities of the Troad, Lampsacos could also claim to have been settled by Aeolian-speaking Greeks. While not directly attested, this emerges from that fact that another Lampsacene inscription, a decree of an Aeolic-speaking city, probably Eresos or Methymna on Lesbos, honors a certain Damocreon son of Zeno whom the city had sent for in order to settle internal lawsuits, and this decree calls the Lampsacenes «kin» (συγγέ[νεες]). The use of «summoned judges» (μετάπεμπτοι δικασται) was common in the Hellenistic period, and a link of kinship often appears as a motive for such requests.¹²

Such superimposed layers of settlement, often imagined in the form of «subsidiary foundations» (ἐπικτίσεις), were common in reality, and were especially useful as a device for those cities that lacked the prestige of mythical antiquity. Hence it was not inconsistent for the Lampsacenes simultaneously to claim Aeolian settlement, foundation by Laomedon, and foundation by Phocaea in the seventh century. This last claim made them «brothers» of the Massaliotes, model allies of the Romans, and hence gave them a further claim on the senate in their request to be protected against Antiochus III. The classic literary text for such overlapping layers of foundation is the Antiochene Oration (XI) of Libanius, but many others are known, for some of which the decisive clue again comes from Stephanus: one such, recently discussed by PETER WEISS, is Eumeneia in Phrygia.¹³

As already observed, the decree in honor of Hegesias says that he claimed the Romans' protection for his city διὰ τε [τὴν ὑπάρχουσαν] ἡμῖν πρὸς αὐτοὺς συγγένειαν, ἦν καὶ ΑΠΟ[---/--- κ]αὶ διὰ τὸ Μασσαλήτας εἶναι ἡμῖν ἀδελφ[οὺς, οἱ εἰσι φίλ]οι καὶ σύμμαχοι τοῦ δήμου τῶν Ῥωμαίων. At this part of the text, the decree uses indirect speech in reporting Hegesias' plea, and since relative clauses in indirect statements may be attracted into the infinitive of the principal clause, LOLLING supplemented the lacuna with the words ἀπὸ [προγόνων ὑπάρξαι], DITTENBERGER with ἀπο[δέξασθαι αὐτοῦς].¹⁴ DITTENBERGER's suggestion is weak, «because of the kin-

¹¹ Vergil: Georg. 1, 512 (cf. Callim. fr. 698 PF.). Silius: 17, 4. Scholiast: Schol. Lyc. 1341 (p. 375 SCHEER), ὁ γὰρ Λαομέδων κρατήσας τῶν πόλεων, ἃς ὁ Λυκόφρων ἀπαριθμεῖται, ἔκτισε τὴν Τροίαν ἄχρι τοῦ Πηνειοῦ. πρῶην γὰρ ἡ Τροία μικρὸν τι πολίχνηον ἦν.

¹² I.Lampsakos 34, 8; CURTY, Parentés 77–78 no. 38. On Aeolian settlement in the Troad, see below.

¹³ Libanius: JONES, Kinship Diplomacy 126–127. Eumeneia: P. WEISS, Eumeneia und das Panhellenion, Chiron 30, 2000, 617–637, citing Stephanus 286 M. s.v. Εὐμένηα, πόλις Φρυγίας, Ἀττάλου καλέσαντος ἀπὸ Εὐμενοῦς τοῦ Φιλαδέλφου· ἡ Ὑλλος καλῶς μεῖνας ὠνόμασεν οὕτω.

¹⁴ LOLLING (n. 5); DITTENBERGER in Syll.² 276, retained by HILLER in Syll.³ 591. On this construction, H. W. SMYTH, Greek Grammar, revised ed., 1956, 593–594, section 2631.

ship, which they accepted», and LOLLING's is undesirably vague, even though better than DITTENBERGER's. Hence there is much to be said for PETER FRISCH's proposal that the name of a mythical ancestor is lurking here. He proposes ἀπό [Τρωὸς / ἔχ-ομεν], since Tros was the common ancestor of the royal line of Troy through his son Ilos, and of the Aeneadae through his son Assarakos, but a more idiomatic verb, and one that better fits the lacuna, might be κατάγομεν. STEPHANUS-DINDORF have a number of examples of κατάγειν in this sense, largely drawn from Christian authors, and even the more classical LIDDELL and SCOTT cite Nicolaus of Damascus, Μύρων ὁ Σικυωνίων βασιλεὺς ἀπὸ Ὀρθαγόρου κατάγων τὸ γένος, and Pseudo-Plutarch, κατήγον τὸ γένος ... ἀπὸ Ἐρεχθῆος τοῦ Γῆς καὶ Ἡφαίστου.¹⁵ I have not found an instance in which κατάγειν governs συγγένειαν, but this does not appear an implausible conjunction. Whatever the correct supplement, it would be odd of the Lampsacenes to cite a «metaphorical» kinship at the same time as the literal «brotherhood» that they shared with the Massaliotes as colonies of Phocaea.

II. *The Decree of Thessalian Larisa for Bombos of Alexandria Troas*

An inscription first published by YVES BÉQUIGNON in 1935 was partly indecipherable and little noticed until BRUNO HELLY produced an improved version, dating it between 160 and 150 BCE.¹⁶ It contains two decrees, of which the first honors a certain Bombos son of Alkaios, «Aeolian from Alexandria», that is, from Alexandria Troas, while the second, much shorter, honors Leukios son of Nikasias, also an «Aeolian from Alexandria». Whereas Leukios had shown his goodwill by kind treatment of Larisians visiting Alexandria, Bombos had visited Larisa and given lectures that, among other things, illustrated the «kinship and friendship» between the city and Alexandria. In the following I will argue that this «kinship» rested on complex and ancient legendary connections between the two cities, and not, as HELLY argues, on a religious procession sent annually by the Thessalians to Ilion.

I begin by discussing the text of the essential lines (12–18), which HELLY gives as follows:

ὀπειδεῖ (13) [B]όμβος Ἀλκαίοι Αἰολεὺς [ἀπ' Ἀλεξαν]δρείας παρεπιδαμεί(14)σας ἐν τᾷ πόλει [καὶ ποιεισάμε]νος ἐπιδειξίς ἐν τοῦ γ[υ(15)μ]νασίου [συνεμναμονεύσατο ἔ]ν τε τοῖς πεπραγματευμένοις (16) αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀκροάσεσιν τοῦν γεγενημένον ἐνδόξουν Λα(17)ρισαίοις, καὶ τάν τε συγγενείαν καὶ φιλίαν ταῖς πολιέσσι π[ό](17)θ'

¹⁵ STEPHANUS-DINDORF, *Thesaurus Graecae Linguae* 4, 1048 D – 1049 A; Nicolaus, *FGrHist* 61, ll. 24–25; [Plut.] *Vitae X Orat.* 843E.

¹⁶ Y. BÉQUIGNON, *Études thessaliennes VII* (1), *BCH* 59, 1935, 55–64, no. 2; HELLY, *Décree*; HELLY briefly discusses the same text in *Inscriptions and History of Thessaly: New Evidence*, *Proceedings of the International Symposium in honor of Professor Christian Habicht*, 2006, 24–25; cf. *Bull. ép.* 2007, 357. See now also A. CHANIOTIS, in: R. HUNTER – I. RUTHERFORD (eds.), *Wandering Poets in Ancient Greek Culture: Travel, Locality and Pan-Hellenism*, 2009, 261.

εὐτὰς ὄνευε[ούσατο] καὶ τὰ φιλάνθρωπα τὰ ὑπάρχοντα (18) Αἰολεῖοισι πὸτ τὰν πόλιν τὰν Λαρισαίων, κτλ.

HELLY translates: «Attendu que Bombos, f. d'Alkaios, Éolien d'Alexandrie de Troade, est venu séjourner dans notre cité et y a fait des présentations au gymnase en faisant mémoire dans ses ouvrages et dans ses conférences des personnages qui ont été fameux chez les Larisiens, et qu'il a renouvelé la parenté et l'amitié mutuelles qui existent entre les deux cités comme aussi les dispositions privilégiées que les Éoliens ont envers les Larisiens, ...»

I take first some minor points of the text and the translation. In line 15, HELLY (p. 197) justifies the supplement *συνεμναμονεύσατο* from a decree of Acraiphia in Boeotia for judges from Larisa, *συνμημονεῦον(τες) τῆς ὑπαρχούσης ἐξ ἀρχῆς συγγενείας πρὸς τοὺς Ἀκρηφείας καὶ πρὸς πάντας Βοιωτο(ύ)ς*. LIDDELL and SCOTT, who do not cite this inscription, give very few attestations of the verb *συνμημονεῦω*: twice in the active from Plutarch and Marcus Aurelius, once in the passive from Galen, and never in the middle. *Συνεμναμονεύσατο* is therefore suspect, and ΒΕΨΙΓΝΩΝ restored *ἐπεμνάσθη* from the much better-attested *ἐπιμνήσχομαι*; another possibility is *ἀναμνήσχομαι*, as in the celebrated inscription of the delegation of Cytention at Xanthos or, if considerations of space require a longer supplement, *μνάμαν ἐποιείσατο* (*μνήμην ποιείσθαι* is a favorite expression of the contemporary Polybius). ΒΕΨΙΓΝΩΝ also understood *τοῦν γεγενημένων ἐνδόξων Λαρισαίοις* (in *koine*, *τῶν γεγενημένων ἐνδόξων Λαρισαίοις*) as a neuter plural, «achievements», «glorious deeds», citing an inscription from Magnesia on the Maeander, *μνημῆμος τε τῶν διὰ προγόνων ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρχῆς γεγενημένων ὑφ' ἑαυτοῦ ... καλῶν καὶ ἐνδόξων*. J. and L. ROBERT understood the text in the same way, adding a decree of Thasos for a citizen who, while visiting a city whose name is now lost, had read a work of his own composition «about the glories of the city» ([*περὶ τῶν*] *τῆς πόλεως ἐνδόξων*). This interpretation is also preferable in the decree of Larisa, since it makes better sense of the participle *γεγενημένων*. *Τὰ γενόμενα* and *τὰ γεγονότα* frequently mean «things done in the past», «past events» and the dative *Λαρισαίοις* is best understood as one of agency, «glorious things done by the Larisaeans». ¹⁷

To clarify the following discussion, it will be best to give a rapid sketch of the mythic past connecting Larisa of Thessaly with north-western Asia Minor. The ethnic «Aeolian», which the text uses both of Bombos, «Aeolian from Alexandria», and of the Larisians themselves, has a very specific meaning in myth and history. According to a tradition already known to Herodotus, Thessaly had once been called «Aeolis», but in historical times the term was usually applied to a region of north-western Asia Minor, including Lesbos and Tenedos, which colonists from the Aeolic-speaking regions of

¹⁷ Akraiphia: IG VII 4130, 10–11. Magnesia: I.Magnesia 105, 23–24 (Syll.³ 685; I.Cret. III, IV 9). Thasos: I.Thasos 166, 5; Bull. ép. 1959, 330; similarly J. and L. ROBERT, Fouilles d'Amymon, 1983, 163, «des hauts faits des Larisiens»; CHANIOTIS (n. 16) 261 n. 24. γίγνομαι: LSJ s.v. I 3.

Greece, notably Thessaly and Boeotia, settled between the twelfth and the eighth centuries. European and Asiatic Aeolis were united by a shared dialect, Aeolic, though this had several regional variations, and within Thessaly itself there were variations between the northern district, Pelasgiotis, of which Larisa was the center, and Thessaliotis to the south.¹⁸ Geographically, Asiatic Aeolis had two main groupings, a northern one including Lesbos, Tenedos, and the Troad, and a southern one forming a league of twelve cities that stretched from Cyme in the north to Smyrna in the south: the term «Aiolis» tended to refer to this southern one.¹⁹

On the coast of the northern Aeolis, and in the southern Troad, Antigonos Monophthalmos founded the city later known as Alexandria. He called it «Antigoneia,» but after his death at Ipsos in 301 Lysimachos renamed it in memory of Alexander, though in the imperial period the usual name was «Troas». The fact that the city was founded in a region originally Aeolic explains the unusual designation «Aeolian from Alexandria». This is found only in the present inscription and another from Larisa, in a proxy decree of Orchomenos about 250, and in a list of winners at the Coan Asclepieia about 200. According to Pausanias, at the 145th holding of the Olympics the prize for boys in the pancratium was won by Phaedimus «an Aeolian from the city of Troas» (Αἰολεὺς ἐκ πόλεως Τρωάδος). The author may well have copied a contemporary record, changing the name of the city to that current in his own day.²⁰

There were several cities named «Larisa» in antiquity, three of them in western Asia Minor, of which only two are important for the present purpose. Antigonos incorporated the most northerly of these, Larisa of the Troad, into his new foundation. It is securely located at Liman Tepe about 22 kilometers south of Alexandria.²¹ The second is Larisa in Aeolis proper, sometimes known as «Larisa Phriconis» from Mount Phricion in Locris (since some of the migrating Aeolians had passed through Locris); this is usually identified with the modern site of Buruncuk on the river Hermos, excavated

¹⁸ C. D. BUCK, *The Greek Dialects*, 1955, 147–151, especially 150–151 on differences between the two regions of Thessaly.

¹⁹ General extension of term «Aeolis»: FR. GSCHNITZER, *Aioleis 1*, DNP 1, 1996, 336–339. Thessaly once called Aeolis: Hdt. 7, 176, 4; cf. Diod. Sic. 4, 67, 2. Aeolis of Asia Minor: Strab. 13, 1, 3–4 (C. 582–583); E. SCHWERTHEIM, *Aioleis 2*, DNP 1, 339–341.

²⁰ Foundation of Antigoneia-Alexandria: Strab. 13, 1, 33 (C. 597). 47 (C. 604). 52 (C. 607); G. M. COHEN, *The Hellenistic Settlements in Europe, the Islands, and Asia Minor*, 1995, 145–148. Ethnic designations of Alexandrians: ROBERT, *Ét. num. gr.* 96–97; M. RICL, in: *I. Alexandria Troas p. 4. Larisa*: SEG 35, 1985, 594, 21. Orchomenos: IG VII 3167; *I. Alexandria Troas 209, T 91*. Cos: TH. KLEE, *Zur Geschichte der gymnischen Agone an griechischen Festen*, 1918, 12, no. II B 84 (*I. Alexandria Troas 241, T 148*: the dating of these lists is disputed, SEG 50, 2000, 752). Phaedimus: Paus. 5, 8, 11 (*I. Alexandria Troas 258 T 172*).

²¹ On all three Larisas: Strab. 13, 3, 2 (C. 620). On the site of this Larisa, ROBERT, *Ét. num. gr.* 57–63; J. M. COOK, *The Troad: An Archaeological and Topographical Study*, 1973, 219–221; ROBERT, *BCH 106*, 1982, 319–333 = *Documents d'Asie Mineure 281–295*, showing that Larisa was detached from Alexandria by Ptolemy III and renamed «Ptolemais»; *Barrington Atlas of the Greek and Roman world*, 2000, 56 C 2.

by a Swedish team between 1902 and 1933.²² By Strabo's day, the third Larisa had become a village on the territory of Ephesos, and very little is known about it, though an observation that the geographer makes in discussing this Larisa is notable: «Something special about the Larisaeans, those of the Cayster, the Phriconian ones, and thirdly those in Thessaly, is that all had territories formed by alluviation, the first by the Cayster, the second by the Hermos, the third by the Peneios.»²³

One of the two more northerly Larisas, either that of the Troad or that of Aeolis, had the honor of appearing in the Iliad. The «Trojan Catalog» in Book II names, as one of the allies of Troy, «Hippotheus [who] led the tribes of the Pelasgi, who rage with the spear, them who lived in deep-soiled Larisa.» «Hippotheus, the glorious son of Pelasgian Lethus», returns in Book XVII when he drags the corpse of Patroclus and is killed by Telamonian Ajax, and so dies «far from deep-soiled Larisa». It was debated in antiquity and the Middle Ages which Larisa was meant: Strabo, following Demetrius of Scepsis, thought that Larisa of the Troad was too close to Troy to be the one meant, and preferred «Phriconian» Larisa. Stephanus of Byzantium, certainly following an ancient tradition, considered Homer's Larisa to be the one in the Troad, not Larisa of Aeolis, while modern opinion is divided. One of the scholiasts observes that Homer's Larisa was not the Thessalian one, which suggests that some commentators thought that it was, and this view also has found modern adherents.²⁴

To explain the relations between Thessalian Larisa and Alexandria Troas, HELLY does not invoke any link of kinship, but instead cites a ritual practice known from two works of Philostratus of Athens in the third century CE. In his *Heroikos* (53, 8–17) the author relates how an oracle of Dodona, at an unspecified early date, ordered the Thessalians to send a sacred embassy to Troy every year and to sacrifice at the tomb of Achilles. After a while they neglected the rite, then resumed it at the time of Alexander's invasion of Asia Minor, but thereafter neglected it again until, four years before the dramatic date of the dialog, Achilles had threatened them with a punishment issuing from the sea. This threat was realized when they received a heavy fine in connection with the local purple-industry. Since the dialog seems to be set about the time

²² Larisa «Phrikonis»: Strab. 13, 1, 3 ad fin. (C. 582); ROBERT, *Ét. num. gr.* 51–52, 65–68; J. BOEHLAU – K. SCHEFFOLD, *Larisa am Hermos I–III, 1940–1943*; Barrington Atlas 56 E 4.

²³ Ephesian Larisa: ROBERT, *Ét. num. gr.* 42–44; Barrington Atlas 61 F 2. Strabo's observation: 13, 3, 4 (C. 631), Ἴδιον δέ τι τοῖς Λαρισαίοις συνέβη τοῖς τε Καύστριανοῖς καὶ τοῖς Φρικωνεῦσι καὶ τρίτοις τοῖς ἐν Θετταλίᾳ: ἅπαντες γὰρ ποταμόχωστον τὴν χώραν ἔσχον οἱ μὲν ὑπὸ τοῦ Καύστρου, οἱ δ' ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἑρμου, οἱ δ' ὑπὸ τοῦ Πηνειοῦ.

²⁴ Larisa in Homer: Il. 2, 840–841; 17, 288, 301, tr. A. T. MURRAY, Loeb Classical Library. Strabo: 13, 3, 2 (C. 620), followed by scholiast T on Il. 17, 301 (4, 384 ed. ERBSE). Stephanus: s. v. Λάρισαι πόλεις ἰ' ... τετάρτη τῆς Τρωάδος, ἣν φησιν Ὅμηρος «τῶν οἱ Λάρισαν ἐριβόλακα», πέμπτη Αἰολίδος περὶ Κύμην τὴν Φρικωνίδα (412 M.). In favor of the northern Larisa, A. J. B. WACE – F. H. STUBBINGS, *A Companion to Homer*, 1962, 302; in favor of the southern one, E. SCHWERTHEIM, *Larisa 6*, DNP 6, 1999, 1154. Not Thessalian Larisa: scholiast A^a on Il. 17, 301 (4, 384 ed. ERBSE), ἑτέρα ἐστὶν αὐτῆ παρὰ τὴν Θεσσαλικήν; but in favor of this view, E. MEYER, *RE Suppl.* 14, 1974, 1188–1189.

of writing, roughly in the second quarter of the third century, the author may refer to some measure taken by a Roman emperor, perhaps Alexander Severus.²⁵

Philostratus reverts to the same subject in the *Life of Apollonius*. Traveling westwards after his journey to India, Apollonius arrived in Ionia, and then decided to visit Greece, going by way of Pergamon and Ilion. In Ilion he visited the tomb of Achilles and conferred with the hero's ghost. The ghost complained to Apollonius about the Thessalians' negligence, which had now lasted for many years, and threatened them with punishment. Once in Greece, Apollonius «went as Achilles' emissary to the Thessalians at the time of the meetings in Pylaea, at which the Thessalians do business with the Amphictyony, and he frightened them into voting to resume the due rites for the tomb».²⁶

It is this ritual pilgrimage to which HELLY supposes the decree for Bombos to refer.²⁷ «Ce ne sont donc pas des contacts purement occasionnels qui ont amenés les Lariséens à honorer des citoyens de cette Alexandrie de Troade qui devait être pour eux bien lointaine. On peut en rendre compte en rappelant que les Thessaliens envoyaient une procession annuelle à *Alexandrie de Troade*, comme on apprend de Philostrate, pour honorer le héros Achille ... Apollonios vint à *Alexandrie et* à Ilion pour interroger les mânes d'Achille: il recueillait alors les plaintes du héros contre les Thessaliens ... Il ne fait pas de doute, à mes yeux, que les décrets des Lariséens pour ces citoyens d'Alexandrie de Troade trouvent leur justification dans la participation de théores de Larisa à la procession que les Thessaliens envoyaient sur le tombeau d'Achille, et que le séjour de Bombos à Larisa a eu aussi pour objet de rappeler cette histoire et de renouveler l'ardeur des Thessaliens pour qu'ils assurent le maintien de ce culte héroïque.» Yet the inscription mentions only the «kinship and friendship» between Alexandria and Larisa, and says nothing about a religious procession or a sacrifice. There is no comparison, for example, with the celebrated inscription of Locris concerning the Aianteioi and the sending of the Locrian Maidens to Ilion.²⁸ What is more important, HELLY has mis-read Philostratus' account of Apollonius at the tomb of Achilles. The author makes no mention of Alexandria, but only of Ilion, and it was this city, not Alexandria, whose territory contained the tomb of Achilles. Ilion, the successor of the ancient Troy, was no less prosperous than Alexandria in the Hellenistic period. It had received favors from Alexander, but Lysimachus built it up by a synoecism when, according to Strabo, «he had already devoted attention to Alexandria». As already mentioned, it was the ritual center of a League of Athena that included many cities of the Troad and issued its own coinage. Famously excavated by

²⁵ On the reference in this passage, P. GROSSARDT, *Einführung, Übersetzung und Kommentar zum Heroikos von Flavius Philostrate*, 2006, 733–734.

²⁶ Visit to Greece: *Vit. Apoll.* 4, 11, 1. Achilles' complaint: 4, 16, 2. Pylaea: 4, 23.

²⁷ HELLY, *Décret 195–196* (the italics are mine), thanking R. BOUCHON for this explanation. One wonders if there is a confusion between «Troy» and Alexandria Troas.

²⁸ IG IX 1, 3, 706.

SCHLIEMANN, DÖRPFELD, and others, its remains have illuminated the history of the city from the earliest times to the Byzantine era.²⁹

There is therefore no basis for the idea that the «kinship and friendship» between Larisa and Alexandria rests on the annual pilgrimage of the cities of Thessaly to the tomb of Achilles on the territory of Ilion. By contrast, the decree fits well in a series of inscriptions that celebrate men of letters who travel and give lectures illustrating the kinship between their native cities and the city to which they have come. A close parallel is the rhetor Themistocles of Ilion, honored at Xanthos for his lectures illustrating the kinship between his city and Xanthos; an instance from the imperial period is the decree for the sophist Antiochos of Aegaei, who similarly lectured at Argos on the ties that linked it with his home city.³⁰

LOUIS ROBERT knew the inscription in honor of Bombos only from the incomplete publication of BÉQUIGNON, but he made a pertinent observation, which he would doubtless have amplified in his projected monograph on «légendes originaires»: «Ces liens n'étaient point fictifs, mais de parenté réelle, et Bombos avait beaucoup à raconter d'histoires et de légendes de voyages et de fondations pour évoquer les liens entre les Thessaliens et les Éoliens d'Asie».³¹ Some at least of these links are not beyond recovery. As already observed, Alexandria Troas could be counted as lying in «Aeolis», a region settled from that part of central Greece that in historical times was called Thessaly, though once it too had been «Aeolis». Hence Alexandria and the cities it had absorbed, such as Neandria and Larisa of the Troad, were Aeolian, for when such synoecisms took place, the larger city absorbed the traditions of the smaller. ROBERT used just such a secondary kinship to explain how Amastris in Paphlagonia claimed to be the birthplace of Homer: it had absorbed the smaller Cromna, which had made the original claim, and «naturellement, la nouvelle ville Amastris, avec le territoire des petites villes qu'elle absorbait, prenait à son compte les traditions et les légendes de ces villes».³² Hence the Thessalians, whom Homer had omitted to mention, could claim Homeric status through their putative settlement of Larisa in the Troad. Even if Bombos followed the view of Demetrios that Larisa Phriconis was the Homeric Larisa, he would certainly have entered into the question of Aeolian settle-

²⁹ On Hellenistic Ilion, A. BRÜCKNER, in: W. DÖRPFELD, *Troja und Ilion*, 1902, 576–585; a brief summary of the history of the city by E. MEYER, *RE Suppl.* 14, 1974, 816–817. On the prosperity of Hellenistic Ilion, especially in the late third and the second centuries, K. J. RIGSBY, *Studia Troica* 12, 2002, 277; note also RIGSBY, *Studia Troica* 17, 2007, 43–45, Ilion absorbing Kokkylion. Site of the Achilleion: COOK (n. 21) 159–165, with sketch-map, p. 104.

³⁰ Themistocles: L. and J. ROBERT, *Fouilles d'Amizon*, 1983, 154–155, 161–163; JONES, *Kinship Diplomacy* 70. Antiochos: ROBERT, *BCH* 101, 1977, 120–129 = *Documents d'Asie Mineure* 78–87; JONES, *Kinship Diplomacy* 115–116.

³¹ *Monnaies antiques en Troade*, 1966, 61–62.

³² Alexandria: ROBERT, *Ét. num.* gr. 97: «Alexandrie, comme les villes dont elle avait absorbé le territoire, ... était considérée comme une ville d'Éolide.» Amastris: ROBERT, *A travers l'Asie Mineure*, 1980, 418.

ment in the Troad and of an Aeolian element in the population of his native city, and would probably have exploited Homer's description of the Larisans as Pelasgoi, linking them to Pelasgiotis, the region of Thessaly of which Larisa was the capital. He might also have noted, as did Strabo, the geographical similarity of the three Larissas, those of the Troad, the Aeolid, and of Thessaly. It is these links of history and geography, not the sacrifice of the Thessalians at the tomb of Achilles, that lie behind the decree for Bombos, «Aeolian from Alexandria».

Department of the Classics
Harvard University
Cambridge MA 02138
U.S.A.

