

Foreign Soldiers - Native girls? Constructing and Crossing Boundaries in Hellenistic Cities with Foreign Garrisons

Angelos Chaniotis

1 INTRODUCTION

The maintenance of a garrison in a city or a region was for many a Hellenistic power a comfortable alternative to conquest and direct administration. Every major power held garrisons in dependent settlements of various legal statuses, usually in dependent poleis or dependent communities.¹ To give but a few examples from mainland Greece, the Aegean islands and Asia Minor, Ptolemaic garrisons were placed in and around the major cities of Cyprus, in several cities of Asia Minor (e.g., Ephesos and Xanthos), in Cretan Itanos, in Thera, in Thrace, and probably on Lesbos;² the Antigonid control of southern Greece relied on their garrisons (esp. in Akrokorinthos, Chalkis, and Eretria);³ Athens had to endure the presence of a Macedonian garrison for the most part of the period between the death of Alexander and 229 B.C.⁴ Even relatively small poleis guaranteed their control over subordinate (or incorporated) communities by establishing troops there — e.g., Teos at Kyrbissos, Miletos at Pidasas, and Gortyn on the island of Kaudos.⁵ That garrisons were a major political factor in the Hellenistic world cannot escape the notice of any reader of the histories of Polybios or Diodoros. The documentary evidence, — the treaties in particular, — shows that the issue of the garrisons, the duration of their presence, and their removal was a major topic in negotiations between poleis and kings or military leaders.⁶ However, when we raise the question about the ways in which officers and members of foreign garrisons interacted with the native population, our sources often let us down. Equally scanty is the evidence for the everyday life of the soldiers. The bulk

¹ M. LAUNEY, *Recherches sur les armées hellénistiques. Réimpression avec addenda et mise à jour, en postface par Y. Garlan, Ph. Gauthier, Cl. Orrieux* (Paris 1987), 633-675 (= LAUNEY, *Recherches*).

² R.S. BAGNALL, *The Administration of the Ptolemaic Possessions outside Egypt* (Leiden 1976), 220-224 (= BAGNALL, *Administration*).

³ Cf. M.B. HATZOPOULOS, *L'organisation de l'armée macédonienne sous les Antigonides. Problèmes anciens et documents nouveaux* (Athens 2001), 29-32.

⁴ LAUNEY, *Recherches*, 636-641; Chr. HABICHT, *Athens from Alexander to Antony* (Cambridge Mass.-London 1997), 36-172; M.C. TAYLOR, 'When the Peiraeus and the City are Reunited', *ZPE* 123 (1998), 207-222; B. DREYER, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des spätclassischen Athen (322-ca. 230 v. Chr.)* (Stuttgart 1999).

⁵ Kyrbissos: L. ROBERT, 'Une inscription grecque de Téos en Ionie. L'union de Téos et de Kyrbissos', *Journal des Savants* (1976), 153-235 (= *Opera Minora Selecta* VII, Amsterdam 1990, 297-379). Pidasas: *Milet* 1.3, 149 LL. 15-18; ROBERT, *art. cit.*, 193f. Kaudos: A. CHANIOTIS, *Die Verträge zwischen kretischen Poleis in der hellenistischen Zeit (HABES, 24)*, Stuttgart 1996, 418-420.

⁶ E.g., *Staatsverträge* 405, 415, 421, 422, 429, 446, 492, 507; *Sardis* VII.1 2 = *SEG XXXVII* 1003; cf. *IG XII* 9, 212 = *SEG XLIII* 591; POLYBIOS 15.24.2.

of the evidence comes from the Ptolemaic garrisons, in particular those of Cyprus and Thera.⁷

The intentionally provocative title of this paper points to the most intimate of all possible relations between foreign soldiers and natives; however, I will not limit myself to the questions of intermarriage (§6) but will explore various aspects of the interaction between foreign soldiers and natives. Naturally, I will not consider the evidence for native soldiers serving in garrisons in the territory of their polis,⁸ unless these garrisons were established in areas inhabited by a non-citizen population or in newly acquired lands. Foreign mercenaries hired by a civic community to man its own forts are also irrelevant for the issues discussed here, although they may be instructive for the integration of foreign soldiers; it should be added that many inscriptions which concern foreign troops do not allow us to recognize whether we are dealing with hired mercenaries or a garrison imposed by a foreign power.

When considering foreign garrisons in the Hellenistic world, one should bear in mind several common features. (i) There is an important difference between the Classical and the Hellenistic period. In the Hellenistic period the garrison established by a king in a dependent polis would usually be manned with mercenaries of many different origins. Unlike the garrisons of *Athenian* soldiers established by the Athenians in their subject cities, the Ptolemaic, Antigonid, Seleucid, and Attalid garrisons brought together men from the most distant regions of the Hellenistic world. To give but three examples, the Ptolemaic garrison at Paphos on Cyprus in 224/23 included men from Mytilene, Kadyanda, Limyra, Myra, Patara, Xanthos, and Tlos; in roughly the same period we encounter men from Pamphylia, Thessaly, Euboia, and Thrace in the garrison at Kition; the Attalid garrison at Lilaia (208 B.C.) brought together soldiers from the Peloponnese (Sikyon, Sparta, Arkadia, Achaia), Eretria, Lokris, Phokis, the ethnos of the Ainianes, Aitolia, Thessaly, Kalymnos, Crete, Macedonia, Thrace, various regions of Asia Minor (esp. Mysia), Sicily, and Massalia.⁹ Although the minor powers which maintained garrisons in dependent areas (e.g., Rhodos in the Cretan city of Olous, Gortyn on the dependent island of Kaudos) usually recruited the soldiers from among their own citizens, sometimes they too had to hire foreign mercenaries in order to man the garrisons. The best documented case is that of Miletos, which had to man numerous forts in Hybandis (on the former territory of Myous) and on the islands Patmos, Leros and Lepsia.¹⁰ In the late third century (234/33 and 229/28) Miletos enfranchised more than 1,000 Cretan mercenaries, who settled with their families (c. 3,000-4,000 people) in the newly acquired territory of Hybandis, which was contested by Magnesia on the Maeander.¹¹ (ii) There is also a substantial difference between persons hired by a foreign power to serve in

⁷ BAGNALL, *Administration*, 38-79, 123-134.

⁸ E.g., *I.Priene* 4, 19, 21, 22, 37, 251, 252; *I.Smyrna* 609-612.

⁹ Paphos and Kition: BAGNALL, *Administration*, 264f. Lilaia: LAUNEY, *Recherches*, 71-73.

¹⁰ *Milet I.3*, 33-38, 148, 150; cf. L. ROBERT, 'Philologie et géographie II', *Anatolia* 4 (1959), 17-24 (= *Opera Minora Selecta* III, Amsterdam 1969, 1439-1446) and *Journal des Savants* (1976), 198; I. PIMOUGUET, 'Défense et territoire: L'exemple Milésien', *Dialogues d'Histoire Ancienne* 21.1 (1995), 89-109.

¹¹ *Milet I.3*, 33-38; LAUNEY, *Administration*, 660-664; P. BRULÉ, 'Enquête démographique sur la famille grecque antique. Étude de listes de politographie d'Asie mineure d'époque hellénistique (Milet et Ilion)', *Revue des Études Anciennes* 92 (1990), 238-242; P. HERRMANN, *Inschriften von Milet. Teil 1* (Berlin 1997), 160-164.

a foreign place for money and representatives of a polis in a controlled or subordinated area. The form of the interaction between native population and foreign troops could easily be influenced by this distinction, as indeed it was (iii) by the exact conditions under which a garrison was established (capitulation, negotiations, defeat in a war, or invitation by the entire community or by a particular group). (iv) A fourth important factor is the duration of the service of the foreign troops and their commanders. A man who served for 42 years in a garrison in a relatively peaceful area (an anonymous commander at Philai)¹² has little in common with a soldier sent by a Macedonian king to his garrison in Athens and facing an Athenian revolt a few months after his transfer.

2 FOREIGN GARRISONS AND THE AMPUTATION OF AUTONOMY

An Athenian decree proposed by Aristoteles in the year 378/77 B.C. for the conclusion of an alliance between Athens and other Greek cities — the so-called ‘Second Athenian League’ — gives a very clear definition of autonomy: the members of this League should be “free and autonomous, living under whatever constitution they choose, *admitting no garrison*, submitting to no governor and paying no tribute.”¹³ If the freedom from foreign troops appears here as one of the fundamentals of autonomy, this can be easily explained by what the Greeks had experienced under the Athenian and the Spartan Empire. From 378/77 onwards the term *aphrouretos*, i.e., ‘ungarrisoned’, is almost a synonym for *autonomos* in the diplomatic language of the Greeks. The words *autonomos* and *aphrouretos* appear next to one another in several treaties which aimed at guaranteeing the independence of a polis.¹⁴ *Aphrouresia* was a privilege no less eagerly desired than exemption from the payment of tribute.¹⁵

The presence of foreign troops in a Hellenistic polis that wished to remain autonomous was not viewed much more favourably than the occupation of the citadel by a tyrant, the presence of Soviet troops in Prague or Warsaw or the stationing of the 6th U.S. Fleet in Piraeus during the Greek military dictatorship. The violent or peaceful removal of a foreign garrison was one of the most common occasions for the establishment of a commemorative anniversary dedicated to the celebration of freedom and autonomy.¹⁶ When a foreign (Macedonian or Ptolemaic?) garrison left Eretria (in 313, 308, or c. 196-194 B.C.) during the celebration of a procession for Dionysos, the Eretrians re-organised the festival as a commemorative anniversary of the liberation of the city, “because on the occasion of the procession for Dionysos the garrison departed, the people were liberated during the singing of the hymns (?) and regained the democratic constitution.”¹⁷ Hellenistic orators and historians never tire of emphasising the slavish

¹² SEG XXVIII 1479.

¹³ *Staatsverträge* 257.

¹⁴ E.g., in the peace treaty between king Antigonos Monophthalmos and Rhodes (*Staatsverträge* 442, 304 B.C.), in the treaty with which Epidauros joined the Achaian League (*Staatsverträge* 489, 243 B.C.), and in the treaty between king Antiochos (III?) and Lysimacheia (*I.Illion* 45 = SEG XXXVIII 1252).

¹⁵ E.g., POLYBIOS 15.24.2; *I.Iasos* 2; *Sardis* VII.1 2 = SEG XXXVII 1003.

¹⁶ A. CHANIOTIS, ‘Gedenktage der Griechen: Ihre Bedeutung für das Geschichtsbewußtsein griechischer Poleis’, in J. ASSMANN (ed.), *Das Fest und das Heilige. Religiöse Kontrapunkte zur Alltagswelt* (Gütersloh 1991), 125.

¹⁷ IG XII 9, 192 (SEG XL 758; LSCG 46); see also A.F. JACCOTTET, ‘La pierre de la liberté’, *ZPE* 80 (1990), 150-156; N. LEWIS, ‘The “Ivy of Liberation” Inscription’, *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine*

element inherent in the presence of a garrison.¹⁸ For Plutarch (i.e., for his Hellenistic source) the Achaeans were “bridled like a horse” (*hosper chalinoumenous*), when they accepted a Macedonian garrison and delivered hostages to king Antigonos Doson.¹⁹ An Athenian honorific decree honoring Euphron of Sikyon for the expulsion of the Macedonian garrison from Sikyon in 322 B.C. gives us a vivid impression of how people thought and talked about foreign garrisons (LL. 43-56):²⁰ “during the Greek War, which the people of Athens started for the sake of the Greeks, Euphron returned from exile, expelled the garrison from the citadel with the concurrence of the Sikyonians, liberated the city and made it — first among all the Peloponnesian cities — a friend and an ally of the Athenians; as long as the people continued the war, he participated in it and he contributed soldiers and whatever is necessary in a war; when, however, Greece was befallen by misfortune, and garrisons were sent to those cities which had previously expelled them, he chose to be killed by the enemies, fighting for the democracy, so that he might not see his own country and the rest of Greece enslaved.”²¹ Neither Hellenistic historiography nor contemporary decrees passed over the opportunity for dramatic narratives provided by the violent expulsion of foreign troops.²²

The Greeks were conscious of the incompatibility of autonomy and the presence of foreign troops in a polis. Foreign troops were then as they are now an instrument of subordination; they implemented a more or less direct control over the political institutions of a civic community; and they occupied its military facilities (e.g., forts, citadels, and harbors). To some extent they controlled or exploited its economic resources, e.g., through the control of harbors or through the confiscation of land; the Ptolemaic garrisons in particular were also an economic factor inasmuch as they contributed to the creation of a Ptolemaic monetary zone.²³

Naturally, our information on exactly how a foreign garrison served as an instrument of control and subordination is limited to reports concerning the most violent (and effective) aspect of its presence: its establishment and its direct confrontation with rebellious citizens. We thus have numerous narratives of how a garrison was established — especially after the capitulation of a city or after the conclusion of an unfavorable peace treaty;²⁴ we also have reports on the efforts of citizens (often with foreign aid) to expel a foreign garrison violently from the citadel or another important fortress (e.g., the Mouseion and Mounichia in Athens, Akrokorinthos, the citadel of Iasos). But what happened between the violent beginning and the bloody end? That a foreign garrison had a deterrent effect on the population can easily be assumed and is sometimes explicitly stated, particularly in connection with a political regime imposed by exogenous factors. After the capitulation of Athens to Antipatros in 322 the Athenians had to accept a

Studies 31 (1990), 197-202; CHANIOTIS, *art. cit.* (note 16), 125; for similar cases see *IG II²* 834; *Syll.*³ 361.

18 E.g., DIODOROS 20.19.3.

19 PLUTARCHOS, *Aratos* 38.10.

20 *IG II²* 448 (318/17).

21 Cf. *IG II²* 469; *IG II²* 657 LL. 34-36; *IG II²* 834; *IG VII* 2406.

22 E.g., DIODOROS 20.45-56; PAUSANIAS 1.26.1-2; *SEG XXVIII* 60 LL. 11ff.; *IG II²* 666-667.

23 Confiscation of land: BAGNALL, *Administration*, 130 and 166. Ptolemaic monetary zone: *ibid.*, 176-212.

24 *Staatsverträge* 415, 421, 477.

garrison, as Diodoros reports, so that they would not revolt (*neoterizein*);²⁵ and if there is some truth in Apollodoros' report, Antigonos Gonatas' measures in Athens after 260 B.C. combined the establishment of a garrison with infringement upon the constitutional order.²⁶ But as will become clear from the following examples, there are several other possibilities which range between the extremes of the blind terror mentioned so far and the love pleasures promised by the title of my paper.

3 FEARS AND EXPECTATIONS

The mention of foreign garrisons in our sources is usually impersonal: they refer to a garrison as a whole and not to its individual members — and if so, only to the commander. There are some notable exceptions, such as the honorific inscriptions for the commanders of garrisons (*phourarchoi*) decreed by the communities, in which the garrisons served.²⁷ Despite their formulaic language these inscriptions do indicate — rather vaguely — some kind of interaction, as for example in the honorific decree of Xanthos in Lykia for Pandaros, commander of the garrison sent by Ptolemy II:²⁸ “Pandaros, son of Nikias from Herakleia, was sent by king Ptolemy as commander of the garrison at Xanthos; he has shown good and meritorious behaviour, worthy of the king, providing no reasons for complaint to the polis of the Xanthians and doing many and great services both to the entire community and to each one individually.” One need not (necessarily) praise a doctor for not murdering his patients, and similarly to say that a commander had not given reasons for complaints (*anenkletos*, a formulaic expression often attested in such decrees)²⁹ can be understood as praise only if garrison commanders often *did* behave in a way that provoked negative reactions. Of course it lies in the nature of the honorific decrees that we only hear of commanders who have been righteous and disciplined;³⁰ but even these sources with their trivial phraseology reveal that some commanders were better than others; otherwise it would be difficult to understand why the Aiginetans repeatedly sent envoys to the Attalid kings asking them to maintain Kleon of Pergamon as the commander of their island — obviously with some success, since he remained in this office for 16 years.³¹ Some historians would be inclined to see in the phrase “services, both to the entire community and to each one individually” in the aforementioned decree of Xanthos a stereotypical formula which does not imply any kind of relations between the phourarchos and individual Xanthians. However, the fact that the formulaic language of Hellenistic decrees displays many individual variants³² makes it probable that Pandaros — and other phourarchoi — did in fact interact with individual citizens. This is directly attested in the case of Hieron of Syracuse, commander of the Ptolemaic troops in Arsinoe (Koresia) on Keos. After some vague and formulaic phrases

25 DIODOROS 18.18.3 = *Staatsveträge* 415.

26 *FGrHist* 244 F 44; cf. DREYER, *op. cit.* (note 4), 167 note 224.

27 LAUNEY, *Recherches*, 642-651.

28 *SEG* XXXV 1183.

29 E.g., *Amyzon* 4.

30 Cf. LAUNEY, *Recherches*, 642.

31 *OGIS* 329.

32 A. CHANIOTIS, ‘Empfängerformular und Urkundenfälschung: Bemerkungen zum Inschriftendossier von Magnesia am Mäander’, in R.G. KHOURY (ed.), *Urkunden und Urkundenformulare im Klassischen Altertum und in den orientalischen Kulturen* (Heidelberg 1999), 51-69.

(LL. 5-7) in a decree of Karthaia in his honor,³³ we find a very concrete narrative of his zealous intervention to save the property of a citizen (LL. 8-11): “and now, when Epiteles was deprived of movables from his house on the field, he has shown every zeal and care; he has recovered them, returning to Epiteles whatever items he had received personally and giving the price for the rest, wishing to do the city a favor”.

Such allusions to the possibility of complaints in this and in other decrees remind us that foreign soldiers are a burden on a community.³⁴ Garrisons established more or less permanently, in a citadel or a fort, did not cause problems with respect to billeting,³⁵ but their soldiers could still be an element of disorder, or even of insecurity. The treaty between the city of Iasos, Ptolemy I, and the commanders of his (?) garrison at Iasos (c. 309 B.C.) includes an amnesty clause for legal disputes between the foreign troops and the *laseis* (LL. 21-24);³⁶ the charter of the shopkeepers in the Heraion of Samos (c. 245 B.C.) refers constantly to four potential violators of order: *stratiotai* (obviously soldiers of the Ptolemaic garrison), unemployed mercenaries (*apergoi*), suppliants (*hiketai*) and runaway slaves (*hoi kathizontes oiketai*).³⁷ A great (and justified) preoccupation with discipline, order, and good behavior (*eutaxia*) is clear in the few surviving Hellenistic military regulations,³⁸ as it is in the honorific decrees for troops and their commanders.³⁹ Despite these ideals of conduct, foreign soldiers caused many problems for local inhabitants, e.g., by damaging the agricultural production.⁴⁰

A treaty of *sympoliteia* between Teos and Kyrbissos points to further problems.⁴¹ In the third century the Teos absorbed Kyrbissos and granted its inhabitants Teian citizenship. The treaty stipulates that Kyrbissos was to be retained as a fort under the command of a *phourarchos* sent by Teos every four months. A certain maturity was required for this office, since its holder should be older than thirty (LL. 8-11); one of his first duties was to establish discipline and *eutaxia* (LL. 31-33). But the real fears are revealed by the treaty oath. The “citizens in the polis” (L. 2, cf. LL. 41 and 55) swore an oath that they would not destroy the dependent settlement at Kyrbissos; and “the citizens who inhabit Kyrbissos” (LL. 4, 43, and 58) swore that they would not abandon the *phourarchos*, that they would follow whatever he commands (*parangeilei*), and that they would defend the fort and reveal any plans against the fort or the garrison. These mutual oaths suggest that one could not exclude (or that one even anticipated) tensions between the two groups. The Teians were also concerned that the garrison might revolt against the polis; this fear was not only felt in Teos but was typical of concerns over Hellenistic garrisons in general.⁴² For instance, it is generally assumed that the troops in Magnesia

33 *IG XII 5*, 1061.

34 LAUNEY, *Recherches*, 690f.

35 For the problems connected with billeting see, e.g., *I.Labraunda 46*; LAUNEY, *Recherches*, 695-713.

36 *I.Iasos 2*.

37 *IG XII 6.1*, 169. For similar problems cf. *I.Labraunda 46*.

38 F.J. FERNANDEZ NIETO, ‘Los reglamentos militares griegos y la justicia castrense en época helenística’, in G. THÜR and J. VÉLISSAROPOULOS-KARAKOSTAS (eds.), *Symposion 1995. Vorträge zur griechischen und hellenistischen Rechtsgeschichte (Korfu, 1.-5. September 1995)* (Cologne-Weimar-Vienna 1997), 213-244. Cf. more recently HATZOPOULOS, *op. cit.* (note 3), 29-32, 152f. nos. 1 *III*.

39 E.g., *IG VII 1*; LAUNEY, *Recherches*, 692f.

40 FERNÁNDEZ NIETO, *art. cit.* (note 38), 226f.

41 *SEG XXVI 1306*; ROBERT, *art. cit.* (note 5), 188-228; FERNÁNDEZ NIETO, *art. cit.* (note 38), 244.

42 ROBERT, *art. cit.*, 199 and 210-214.

-by-Sipylos, which concluded a treaty of *sympoliteia* with Smyrna (c. 243 B.C.), constituted the Seleucid garrison in that city which had betrayed Seleukos II during the War of Laodike and taken over Magnesia. A mutiny of the Attalid garrisons at Philetaireia and Attaleia could only be settled after hard negotiations between Eumenes I and his troops (c. 263-241 B.C.).⁴³ The Cretans enfranchised in Miletos swore to defend the city and its forts, but the limited faith the Milesians had in the trustworthiness of the Cretans can be seen in the fact that they allowed them to occupy the office of the *phourarchos* only twenty years after their naturalisation in Miletos.⁴⁴

More rare, but nonetheless attested, is the co-operation between the natives and a foreign garrison against the power that had established it;⁴⁵ such a co-operation presupposes intensive interaction between the foreign soldiers and the inhabitants of the garrisoned settlement. Strombichos, an officer in the service of Demetrios Poliorketes in Athens when the Athenians revolted against the Macedonian garrison in 282/81 B.C., took the side of the Athenians:⁴⁶ “when the people took up the weapons to fight for freedom and asked the (garrison) soldiers to take the part of the polis, he accepted the call of the demos for freedom and he placed his arms in the service of the polis, in the belief that he should not oppose the polis’ benefit, but that he should contribute to its rescue” (LL. 8-14). If Strombichos had been just one of the many opportunists who served as mercenaries in the Hellenistic armies and changed fronts to save his life, the gratitude of the Athenians would probably have been less eloquently expressed. A new epigraphic find — a dossier of letters of Eumenes II concerning the grant of a polis constitution to the inhabitants of Tyriaion (c. 187 B.C.) — may present an example of such a co-operation between soldiers and natives.⁴⁷ Tyriaion did not have polis status or any recognized form of self administration; its population consisted both of natives (*enchorioi*) and settlers, probably military settlers or soldiers serving in a garrison.⁴⁸ The efforts of Tyriaion’s inhabitants to organize themselves as a *demos* with its own laws, a council, and a gymnasium were successful, although king Eumenes II accepted this request very unwillingly. One of the envoys of the Tyriaieis (in two separate embassies) had the characteristic Gaulish name Brennos; the editors of the inscription plausibly assume that he was a mercenary soldier.⁴⁹ The names of two other envoys (Antigenes and Orestes) are also untypical for this region of Phrygia. We may assume that the contribution of the foreign soldiers (whether retired military settlers or active troops) in this development was crucial.

⁴³ Magnesia on the Sipylos: *Staatsverträge* 492; cf. LAUNEY, *Recherches*, 671-674. Philetaireia and Attaleia: *Staatsverträge* 481.

⁴⁴ *Milet* I.3, 37 d 65f. and 82ff. Cf. similar clauses in *Milet* I.3, 146 LL. 39f. and 150 LL. 50-52.

⁴⁵ Cf. LAUNEY, *Recherches*, 650.

⁴⁶ *IG* II² 666.

⁴⁷ L. JONNES and M. RICL, ‘A New Royal Inscription from Phrygian Paroreios: Eumenes II Grants Tyriaion the Status of a Polis’, *Epigraphica Anatolica* 29, 1997, 1-29 (*SEG* XLVII 1745). See also the comments of Ph. GAUTHIER, ‘Bulletin épigraphique’, *Revue des Études Grecques* 112 (1999), 680-682 no. 509; C. SCHULER, ‘Kolonisten und Einheimische in einer attalidischen Polisgründung’ *ZPE* 128 (1999) 124-132.

⁴⁸ GAUTHIER, *ibid.*, 681 and SCHULER, *ibid.*, 128f., have corrected the reading ἐν χωρίοις in L. 27 (“in fortified places”) to ἐνχωρίοις (“indigènes”). Even though the text does not explicitly refer to forts (*choria*), it is still very probable that the inhabitants of Tyriaion were either active or retired soldiers.

⁴⁹ JONNES and RICL, *art. cit.*, 12. SCHULER, *art. cit.*, 127, has, however, suggested that the envoys were civilians, the descendants of the original (military?) settlers.

4 GARRISONS AND THE IDEOLOGY OF HELLENISTIC MONARCHY

Besides the honorific inscriptions, dedications are one of the best sources for the activities of foreign garrisons sent by kings to cities; they usually concern their commanders. The picture we get from this kind of evidence is, again, not representative. Nonetheless it allows us to recognize how several elements of monarchical self-representation could reach the population of a dependent polis through this medium. Hellenistic kings founded the legitimacy of their rule not only on dynastic principles, but also to a great extent on military victories, on a privileged relationship with the divine (usually in the form of the royal cult), and on their role as benefactors.⁵⁰ Garrisons were obviously suitable for the propagation of these elements.

That the beneficent nature of Hellenistic kingship could be propagated through its most hated instrument of control should not sound as paradoxical as it might at first, if one considers the fact that the sending of a garrison by a king was often explained as an act of benefaction which aimed at protecting the place in question. The aversion of the Greeks to garrisons could then be compensated through rhetorical and lexicographical devices, i.e., through the replacement of the discredited word *phroura* with a derivative of the verb *phylatto* ('to protect'). When king Philip V, notorious for his cunning, was asked by the Aitolian statesman Alexandros why he kept a garrison at Lysimacheia in Thrace (198 B.C.) thus undermining the city's freedom, he made sure to point to the distinction between *phrourein* and *phylattein*: his troops were present there not as a garrison (*ou tous phrourountas*), but as protectors of the city (*alla tous paraphylattontas*) against the Thracians.⁵¹ A fragment of a contemporary treaty between Philip and Lysimacheia (c. 202-197 B.C.) seems in fact to refer to the restoration of the forts (A 11).⁵² Similarly, the Ptolemaic garrison at Itanos on Crete, possibly established at the initiative of the Itanians but certainly very advantageous for the control of the sea routes in the Southern Aegean, was officially represented as helping and protecting the Itanians (L. 40: *charin boetheias kai phylakes*; L. 97: *eis prostasian kai phylaken*).⁵³ Garrisons on islands and in coastal sites are known to have defended the local population from marauding pirates.⁵⁴ The Ptolemaic troops in Thrace protected, upon request, the mainland possessions of Samothrake; and the garrison sent by Attalos I to Lilaia in Phokis during the First Macedonian War (208 B.C.) was so warmly accepted that some

50 E.g., H.-J. GEHRKE, 'Der siegreiche König. Überlegungen zur hellenistischen Monarchie', *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte* 64 (1982) 247ff.; L. KOENEN, 'The Ptolemaic King as a Religious Figure', in A. BULLOCH et alii (eds.), *Images and Ideologies: Self-Definition in the Hellenistic World* (Berkeley 1993), 25-115; K. BRINGMANN, 'Die Ehre des Königs und der Ruhm der Stadt. Bemerkungen zu königlichen Bau- und Feststiftungen', in M. WÖRRLE and P. ZANKER (eds.), *Stadt und Bürgerbild im Hellenismus* (Munich 1995), 93-102.

51 POLYBIOS 18.4.5.

52 *Staatsverträge* 549; but cf. *SEG* XXXI 628; XXXVIII 603.

53 *I. Cret.* III iv 9. For the Ptolemaic interests in Itanos see S. KREUTER, *Außenbeziehungen kretischer Gemeinden zu den hellenistischen Staaten im 3. und 2. Jh. v. Chr.* (Munich 1992), 18-34; D. VIVIERS, 'Economy and Territorial Dynamics in Crete from the Archaic to the Hellenistic Period', in A. CHANIOTIS (ed.), *From Minoan Farmers to Roman Traders. Sidelights on the Economy of Ancient Crete* (Stuttgart 1999), 222-224.

54 E.g., *IG* II² 1225; *IG* XII 3, 328; *OGIS* 9; LAUNNEY, *Recherches*, 644f.; BAGNALL, *Administration*, 128 and 132f.

of its members were later awarded citizenship.⁵⁵ By rendering such services, a Hellenistic monarch could justify his claim to the title of *Soter* ('Savior').

Kings were not the only ones who were intelligent enough to justify the presence of their troops by pointing to the protection they offered. A treaty between Smyrna and Magnesia on Sipylos describes the commander of the garrison at Magnesia not as a phourarchos but rather euphemistically as 'the official sent by the city to take hold of the keys and be in charge of the protection of the city' (LL. 55f.: *epi tes phylakes tes poleos*).⁵⁶ The ideological implications of the expression *epi tes phylakes tes poleos* become clear when we consider the fact that it is this precise expression that is consistently used in Hellenistic and later decrees to characterize decisions of extreme importance which were given a higher priority over other legal norms.⁵⁷ So, it should not come as a great surprise to us that the word *phylake* appears in a fragmentary clause of a treaty which undoubtedly concerns the presence of a Gortynian garrison on the dependent island of Kaudos.⁵⁸

The phourarchoi became bearers of the dynastic ideology primarily through their dedications which were addressed to their kings and members of the royal house or were made in their honor and for their welfare. In Thera all dedications addressed to the deified Ptolemaic kings, in which the names of the dedicators are known to us, were initiated by members of the garrison.⁵⁹ The Thereans readily accepted this practice.⁶⁰ Gymnastic contests were also held on behalf of the king in the local gymnasium; interestingly enough, these contests are attested only in the year in which Baton, a member of the garrison, served as a gymnasiarchos (153 B.C.).⁶¹ The role of garrisons in the promulgation of the royal cult can be seen best in Itanos on Crete, precisely because the dynastic cult is a peripheral phenomenon on this island. A Ptolemaic garrison was established there during the reign of Ptolemy III at the latest.⁶² During his reign the Itanians dedicated a temenos to the king and to queen Berenike and established annual sacrifices (c. 246? B.C.); in the relevant document Ptolemy is praised for protecting the city and its laws.⁶³ Once established, the dynastic cult could be continued, obviously under the care of the phourarchoi. It is the commander of the garrison, a Roman, who made a dedication to Ptolemy IV Philopator and queen Arsinoe (c. 217-209 B.C.).⁶⁴ It is less certain that the

55 Thrace: *IG XII 8*, 156 A; BAGNALL, *Administration*, 160 and 221. Lilaia: LAUNEY, *Recherches*, 654f.

56 *Staatsverträge* 492.

57 F. GSCHNIZER, 'Zur Normenhierarchie im öffentlichen Recht der Griechen', in P. DIMAKIS (ed.), *Symposion 1979. Actes du IVe colloque international de droit grec et hellénistique* (Athens 1981), 157 and 163.

58 CHANIOTIS, *op. cit.* (note 5), 418-420; cf. the decree of *sympoliteia* between Miletos and Pidasia: *Milet 1.3*, 149 LL. 15-18.

59 *IG XII 3*, 464, 1390, and 1391; cf. BAGNALL, *Administration*, 124-126; other evidence for the cult of the Ptolemies in Thera: *IG XII 3*, 462 and 465; cf. *IG IV 854*: a dedication for Ptolemaios VI at Methana by the local garrison.

60 Cf. the dedication for the well-being of Ptolemy VI and his family: *IG XII 3*, 468.

61 *IG XII 3*, 331; BAGNALL, *Administration*, 129.

62 KREUTER, *op. cit.* (note 53), 18-34 (with the earlier bibliography).

63 *I.Cret. III iv 4*; Chr. HABICHT, *Gottmenschen und griechische Städte* (Munich 1970; 2nd edition), 120-122.

64 *I.Cret. III iv 18*.

dynastic cult of the Ptolemies in Cyprus was established by the garrisons,⁶⁵ but it was certainly promoted by them. Poseidippos, phrourarchos of Kition and Idalion on Cyprus, erected a statue of queen Berenike at Kition (c. 246-221 B.C.).⁶⁶ In Athens, in the latest period of the Antigonid garrison, the Athenian general Aristophanes, commander of the garrison, offered a sacrifice for the well-being of king Demetrios and queen Phthia at his own expenses.⁶⁷ With such actions — whether guided by the royal administration or not — the garrisons reminded the local population that there was a divine element inherent in kingship and made the presence of the king felt in the city.

5 LOCI OF INTERACTION: SANCTUARY AND GYMNASION

When one studies the epigraphic material concerning occupation forces in cities, two civic areas — i.e., outside the fort — play a prominent role: sanctuaries and gymnasia. Foreigners were not, however, automatically allowed to take part in either area; access to cults was occasionally denied to non-citizens, and the participation in the gymnasium was also subject to restrictions. For these reasons the participation of foreign soldiers in the world of both religion and the gymnasium should be seen as an important indication of their integration in the community. The limits of the integration become obvious when one takes a closer look at the evidence.

Foreign soldiers occasionally made dedications in important sanctuaries near their garrison.⁶⁸ But the overall impression is that they preferred to worship deities other than those indigenous to their place of service. Their dedications are addressed to deities of their native land or of the kingdom which had recruited them (e.g., Egyptian deities in the case of the Ptolemaic soldiers), or to deities particularly popular among military personnel.⁶⁹ In this way the soldiers undoubtedly became an important factor in the diffusion of cults. Of particular interest is the introduction into dependent communities of cults of the kingdom that had established the occupation forces. Thera, whose Ptolemaic garrison is one of the best documented, provides the clearest example.⁷⁰ The cult of the Egyptian deities is attested in numerous dedications from the early third century onwards; the earliest was made by a member of the garrison, Diokles, and by the association of the Basilistai (early third century) which was interestingly enough devoted to the Ptolemaic dynastic cult.⁷¹ The sanctuary of the Egyptian deities in Thera was restored by a former Ptolemaic officer (Artemidoros of Perge who was granted citizenship in Thera) on behalf of king Ptolemy III and his deified ancestors, who were probably worshipped in the same temenos.⁷² Another member of the garrison — a man from Myndos — made a dedication

⁶⁵ BAGNALL, *Administration*, 68-73.

⁶⁶ *OGIS* 20 = *SEG XXXI* 1348; cf. BAGNALL, *Administration*, 49.

⁶⁷ *IG II*² 1299.

⁶⁸ See, e.g., dedications of *phrourarchoi* and *phrouroi* at Troizen and Epidauros: *IG IV* 769, 852, and 1352. For the *proskynemata* of soldiers in Egyptian sanctuaries: LAUNEY, *Recherches*, 979-992.

⁶⁹ Cf. LAUNEY, *Recherches*, 890f.

⁷⁰ L. VIDMAN, *Sylloge Inscriptionum religionis Isiacae et Sarapiacae* (Berlin 1969), 88-91.

⁷¹ *IG XII* 3, 443 = VIDMAN, *op. cit.*, 88f. no. 137. Cf. LAUNEY, *Recherches*, 1026-1031; BAGNALL, *Administration*, 129.

⁷² *IG XII* 3, 463 = VIDMAN, *op. cit.*, 89 no. 139. For Artemidoros see now also F. GRAF, 'Bemerkungen zur bürgerlichen Religiosität im Zeitalter des Hellenismus', in M. WÖRRLE and P. ZANKER (eds.), *Stadtbild und Bürgerbild im Hellenismus* (Munich 1995), 107-112 and *SEG XLVII* 490.

there for the well-being of Ptolemy IV and queen Arsinoe.⁷³ Some soldiers in Thera (and elsewhere) were organised in religious associations. One of the soldiers at Thera served as priest (*leitoreusas*) of Dionysos Thrax; the verb *archeuo* in the same text, which designates the office of another soldier, makes clear that we are dealing with a religious association. It is tempting to assume that the choice of this particular god is connected with the fact that he was the patron god of the Ptolemies.⁷⁴ Similarly, the Attalid garrisons in Aigina and in Panion in Thrace worshipped deities particularly associated with Pergamon, i.e., Zeus Soter and Athena Nikephoros.⁷⁵

It is not necessary to assume that the promotion of these cults was guided by the royal administration. The dedicant's own religious beliefs were often the decisive factor, as in the case of Philotas on Epidamnos, who served in the Ptolemaic garrisons in Itanos (Crete) and Philai (Egypt). During his service as the commander of the Ptolemaic garrison at Itanos, sometime during the reign of Ptolemy VI Philometor (c. 145 B.C.), he made a dedication to Zeus Soter and Tyche Protogeneia Aienaos. For a long time it was believed that Philotas' dedication should be dated to the reign of Epiphanes (c. 205-181 B.C.); although one was tempted to associate Tyche Protogeneia with Fortuna Primigenia and Isis, there was a serious chronological problem: the cult of Fortuna Primigenia was introduced in Rome in 194, and the earliest evidence for the identification of Isis with Tyche Protogeneia can be found in the mid second century. The later dating of the inscription frees us from these problems and makes an association of Tyche Protogeneia with these deities very plausible. Some puzzles remain: We still cannot tell whether Philotas introduced these cults in Itanos or just showed his reverence towards deities already established there; but it seems that Philotas was a man of deep religious feelings, since we know him also as a dedicant to Isis at Philai a few years later (after 139 B.C.). It is also certain that the cult of Tyche Protogeneia was not native to Itanos but introduced by foreign soldiers — either by Philotas or one of his predecessors.⁷⁶

The social barriers facing foreign soldiers were not insurmountable. Evidence for their interaction with the native population is particularly clear in the case of commanders or soldiers who are honored for their benefactions, e.g., for the erecting or restoration of buildings in sanctuaries.⁷⁷ An honorific inscription for the Cretan commander of Kition Agias refers to his *euergesia* towards the city (c. 181-146 B.C.).⁷⁸ The Ptolemaic commander at Thera Ladamos of Alexandria was honored together with his wife by the association of the Bakchistai and was granted membership.⁷⁹ The vague formulations of

⁷³ IG XII 3, 1389 = VIDMAN, *op. cit.*, 89f. no. 140.

⁷⁴ SEG VIII 714; BAGNALL, *Administration*, 129, for the term *leitoreuo* cf. SEG XLIII 311 A 1; for *archeuo* cf. L. HALLOF - K. HALLOF - C. HABICHT, 'Aus der Arbeit der "Inscriptiones Graecae" II. Ehrendekrete aus dem Asklepieion von Kos', *Chiron* 28 (1998), 123 with note 84.

⁷⁵ LAUNEY, *Recherches*, 956.

⁷⁶ Philotas' dedication in Itanos: *I. Cret.* III iv 14; his dedication at Philai: SEG XXXI 1521. For the date see: P. CABANES et alii, *Corpus des inscriptions grecques d'Illyrie méridionale et d'Épire. I. Inscriptions d'Épidamne-Dyrrhachion et d'Apollonia. I. Inscriptions d'Épidamne-Dyrrhachion* (Athens 1995), 155. For the association of Tyche Protogeneia with Fortuna Primigenia and Isis see St. V. SPYRIDAKIS, 'The Itanian Cult of Tyche Protogeneia', *Historia* 18 (1969), 44. For the introduction of this cult by mercenaries see *ibid.*, 46f.

⁷⁷ I. Nicolaou, 'Inscriptiones Cypricae alphabeticae III', *Report of the Department of Antiquities of Cyprus* (1964), 199-201 no. 12.

⁷⁸ OGIS 113.

⁷⁹ IG XII 3, 1296.

the decree do not reveal the exact nature of his services, but it is tempting to assume that he was particularly interested in an association devoted to the cult of Dionysos, the patron of the Ptolemies. There are references to the kings only in the decree's fragmentary ending, and we cannot make out the context. The officers of garrisons themselves seem to have distinguished themselves through benefactions. It goes without saying that a phourarchos' position and means provided him with many opportunities to distinguish himself as a benefactor, especially when he was stationed in a poorer and less prominent city. This explains why Delphi appointed as its theorodokoi (those responsible for receiving the sacred envoys) in three rather small poleis of Cyprus — Lapethos, Karpasia, and Tamassos — the local garrison commanders from Gortyn, Chios, and Aspendos (late third century B.C.).⁸⁰

Another area suitable for interaction was the gymnasium, not only one of the most characteristic features of civic life but also a place of great importance for military training. In Tyrhiaeon, where soldiers seem to have played a crucial role for the establishment of a self-administered civic community in co-operation with the local population (see above § 3), one of the major concerns was the foundation of a gymnasium and the means for its supply of olive oil.⁸¹ The integration of the soldiers of the garrison in the life of a local gymnasium is best attested for Thera and Cyprus. Even common soldiers contributed from their pay to help ensure the supply of oil for the gymnasium at Paphos on Cyprus and at Thera;⁸² one of the soldiers of the garrison at Thera, Baton, even served as gymnasiarchos.⁸³ Generalisations from the Cypriote and the Theran cases are not permissible, since these regions were under continual Ptolemaic control for very long periods of time; long-term service there was common, and, consequently, the establishment of more permanent relations with the natives was more probable than elsewhere. For this reason it is most likely to find the most intimate relations between occupation troops and natives in these areas.

6 FOREIGN SOLDIERS AND NATIVE GIRLS: LEGAL BOUNDARIES AND MIXED MARRIAGES

The title of this section (and of the entire paper) brings to mind a cliché familiar not only from the musical *Miss Saigon* and from headline news, but also from ancient fiction. Soldiers, like Pyrgopolinikes in Plautus' *Miles Gloriosus* (act IV), must have been often attracted either by the beauty or the dowry of women living in the garrison town. The occupation troops consisted of men who had left behind their native city but not their sexual desires or their hope of marital life. The sexual desires could be satisfied through visits to the local brothel — and perhaps, occasionally, through the rape of a native girl. Many comedies introduce into their plot the intimate relations of a (mercenary) soldier with a prostitute (e.g., Plautus' *Bacchides*, *Curculio*, *Epidicus*, *Pseudolus*, and *Truculentus*, as well as Terence's *Eunuchus*), and this stereotype must have been inspired by reality. On the other hand, the obligation to produce legitimate heirs required a legitimate marriage. One expects mixed marriages in garrisoned sites, especially when the

⁸⁰ BAGNALL, *Administration*, 65f.

⁸¹ Cf. GAUTHIER, *art. cit.* (note 47), 682 no. 509.

⁸² BAGNALL, *Administration*, 68 and 128f.

⁸³ BAGNALL, *Administration*, 129.

duration of the soldiers' service was long. This is in fact what one observes in Egypt.⁸⁴ Things were not that simple in the world of the Greek cities, where legal barriers were often stronger than the wish to create a family. In many Hellenistic cities (e.g., on Crete) the legitimacy of a marriage (and consequently the legitimacy of the offspring) required citizenship from both man and wife or was allowed on the basis of an interstate agreement (*epigamia*). In some cities (and in the world of comedy) the legal restrictions were loosened in the course of the Hellenistic period,⁸⁵ but in many others (e.g., in Crete) they remain valid. We can observe their effect on marriage patterns, if we concentrate on particular ethnic groups. The Cretans present a good case. Their island was one of the main sources of mercenaries in the Hellenistic period,⁸⁶ and consequently the Cretans attested in inscriptions of garrisoned areas can easily be recognized as soldiers. The inscriptions from Miletos which concern the mass recruitment and settlement of Cretans in parts of the Milesian territory (see above p. 100) show that these soldiers immigrated with their families (wives, sons, and daughters). Although they were naturalized in Miletos, they undoubtedly retained their original civic identity — as a matter of fact they attempted to return to their native cities sometime later; if the unmarried Cretan mercenaries wanted to marry women from Crete, this was possible. Admittedly, the Cretans in Miletos are a particular case, but we similarly find Cretan women present in other places with Cretan garrisons such as in the Antigonid garrisons of Attika, Euboia, and Thessaly.⁸⁷ This kind of evidence is not, however, limited to Cretan women. In many garrisoned sites we find evidence for women from areas which supplied the Hellenistic armies with mercenaries; it is reasonable to assume that they were dependents (wives, daughters, or sisters) of members of the garrison. Bagnall's list of foreign women in Cypriote cities with Ptolemaic garrisons includes women from Aspendos, Euboia, Byzantion, Crete, and Arabia.⁸⁸ With the exception of Arabia, these are the very areas, where the male soldiers of the garrisons were recruited; in fact, in Roger Bagnall's list of members of the garrisons we find six men from Aspendos, one from Euboia, two from Crete, and one from Byzantion.

More interesting are the examples of mixed marriages of Cretans with representatives of other ethnic groups in garrisoned places. In the two cases where we can determine the origin of the non-Cretan partner it is Aitolia, a region for which treaties of alliance — and more importantly — treaties of *isopoliteia* (i.e., of mutual grant of citizenship) with Crete are attested.⁸⁹ A long funerary epigram from Palestine (late third or early second century) narrates the adventurous life of Charmadas from Anopolis on Crete. After the defeat of his native city he joined the Ptolemaic army and served in a garrison somewhere in Koile Syria; there his daughter Archagatha married his fellow soldier Machaios, an Aitolian.⁹⁰

84 E.g., J. MÉLÈZE-MODRZEJEWSKI, 'Dryton le Crétois et sa famille, ou Les mariages mixtes dans l'Égypte hellénistique', in *Aux origines de l'Hellénisme. La Crète et la Grèce. Hommage à Henri van Effenterre* (Paris 1984), 353-376.; LAUNEY, *Recherches*, 714.

85 D. OGDEN, *Greek Bastardy in the Classical and Hellenistic Periods* (Oxford 1996), 291; on mixed marriages cf. more differentiated A.-M. VÉRILHAC - C. VIAL, *Le mariage grec du VI^e siècle av. J.-C. à l'époque d'Auguste* (Paris 1998), 76f.

86 A. PETROPOULOU, *Beiträge zur Wirtschafts- und Gesellschaftsgeschichte Kretas in hellenistischer Zeit* (Frankfurt 1985) 15-31.

87 CHANIOTIS, *op. cit.* (note 5) 27 note 118.

88 BAGNALL, *Administration*, 263-266.

89 CHANIOTIS, *op. cit.* (note 5) 16f. and 36f.

90 SEG VIII 269.

In another Ptolemaic garrison, at Kition on Cyprus, Aristo, the daughter of the Cretan Dion, married Melankomas — again a man from Aitolia. Both her husband and his homonymous father were highly-ranked officers of the Ptolemaic garrisons (c. 146-116 B.C.); Dion of Crete had presumably served there.⁹¹ This testimony is of particular interest, because it comes from a period in which the military units were organised by ethnic associations (*koina*).⁹² The crossing of these ethnic boundaries was possible, but the preference for Aitolia is striking. It seems hard to believe that the legal relationships of Cretan cities with Aitolia might have influenced the marriage patterns of Cretan women in Cyprus (especially as late as the mid second century), but one cannot exclude this possibility. Even in Plautus' *Miles Gloriosus* Pyrgopolynices asks more questions about the legal status of a woman (LL. 961-964: *ingenuan an festuca facta e serva liberast?... Nuptan est an vidua?*) than about her looks.

The importance of legal factors can be also observed in a Delphic inscription which contains a letter sent by the Cretan city of Axos to the Aitolians (early second century B.C.). The citizens of Axos had citizen rights in Aitolia on the basis of a treaty; the Axians wanted to make sure that a certain Epikles, whom they regarded as their own citizen, was given these rights in Aitolia. To justify this claim they narrate the adventures of his family. Eraton, a citizen of Axos, had come as a mercenary to Cyprus; there he married a woman of unknown name and origin.⁹³ D. Ogden, perhaps under the influence of the stereotype that a foreign soldier ought to have a relationship with a native girl, concluded hastily that this woman "was surely Cypriot."⁹⁴ The examples presented above demonstrate that this was not necessarily the case. This woman gave birth to two sons, Epikles and Euagoras. After Eraton's death in Cyprus, his widow and his older son, Epikles, were captured (by pirates?). Epikles was sold as a slave in the Aitolian city Amphissa, but was able to pay the necessary ransom. He settled in Amphissa and took a wife (again of unknown name and origin), who gave birth to two sons (Erasiphon and Timonax) and one daughter (Melita). The letter of the Axians, obviously written more than 30 years after Eraton's departure for Cyprus, shows how strong the legal ties of Epikles were to his father's city, which he himself possibly had never visited.

7 HELLENISTIC GARRISONS: CREATING AND CROSSING BOUNDARIES

Occupation forces and garrisons are unanimously condemned by in historiographical and documentary sources of the Hellenistic period. And yet garrisons were ubiquitous. When considering foreign troops, ancient and modern historians are naturally preoccupied with the motives of the power which established the garrison and the reaction of the communities which had to accept it; the life of the foreign soldiers and the individual interaction with the natives are not of primary importance. Although the relevant evidence is not abundant, it still allows us to recognize how multifaceted this phenomenon is. On the one hand, political motives, legal factors (citizenship), and to some extent religious practices (cult associations, the worship of particular deities) separated the foreign soldiers from the native population they were sent to subordinate. They were a burden on the society and the economy and a factor of disorder; their departure could only be greeted

⁹¹ OGIS 134; cf. BAGNALL, *Administration*, 52.

⁹² BAGNALL, *Administration*, 54-57.

⁹³ Syll.³ 622 B = *I. Cret.* II v 19.

⁹⁴ D. OGDEN, *Greek Bastardy in the Classical and Hellenistic Periods* (Oxford 1996), 291.

with joy; and very often they remained within their own group, socialised with other soldiers, and avoided marriages with the natives. On the other hand, through the real or imaginary protection they offered to the garrisoned community and through the promotion of the dynastic cult they familiarised the native population with elements of the Hellenistic monarchical ideology. Depending on the place, the conditions, and the duration of their service, solidarity between the occupation army and the natives was possible. Individual members of the garrison could distinguish themselves as benefactors of the foreign community, and occasionally the garrison could even initiate the creation of a new civic community together with the native population.

Angelos CHANIOTIS

University of Heidelberg