



Nauarch and Nesiarch

Author(s): W. W. Tarn

Source: *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*, Vol. 31 (1911), pp. 251-259

Published by: [The Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/624771>

Accessed: 23/12/2014 18:23

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



The Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

NAUARCH AND NESIARCH.¹

THE conclusion here reached, regarding the government of the Aegean under Ptolemy II., is as follows. The sea and all the Egyptian fleets were under the sole control of one nauarchos or admiral; he had, in addition, the powers that would have been exercised by the strategos or general of the Islands, had one existed; the two offices together made him almost a viceroy of the Sea, and he exercised a general control over the Islands. As the islands gradually passed from Egypt, it is possible that the office of nauarch remained attached to the strategia of those that remained: when this strategia finally vanished and Egypt retired from the Aegean, the office of nauarch became attached to another strategia, that of Cyprus. The nesiarch, on the other hand, had no military authority and very little power; he was the Ptolemaic Resident.

I will take the nesiarch first.

We know of three; (1) Bacchon son of Nicetas, a Boeotian, about 280, a contemporary of Philocles, king of the Sidonians; (2) Hermias, possibly of Halicarnassus,² who founded the festival at Delos in honour of Arsinoe Philadelphos, afterwards known as the Philadelphieia, the first vase of which appears under the archon Meilichides II. (267),³ and who therefore was probably Bacchon's successor; and (3) Apollodorus son of Apollonius of Cyzicus, who was a private person in 279,⁴ and was nesiarch some time later,⁵ and who probably succeeded Hermias, though it is also conceivable that he may have preceded him.

As Bacchon and Apollodorus are foreigners to the League of the Islanders, Delamarre very justly deduced that the nesiarch was appointed by Ptolemy and not by the League,⁶ a conclusion now perhaps strengthened by the nationality of Hermias. Otherwise, all that we know about the functions of the nesiarch relates to Bacchon, and (apart from the fact that the Islanders

¹ The locus classicus is J. Delamarre's commentary on the Nikouria decree, *Rev. Phil.* 20 (1896), 103. See also, on the nauarchs, P. W. Meyer, *Das Heerwesen der Ptolemäer und Römer in Ägypten* (1900), p. 20; on the nesiarchs, Werner König, *Der Bund der Nesioten* (1910), pp. 66 *seq.*

² *B.C.H.* 34 (1910), p. 363, No. 10, decree of Delos in honour of Ἑρμῖαν Δ. . . . οὐ Ἀλικαρνασσεῖα (*circa*. 260), who may perhaps be

the nesiarch. His title nesiarch from Demares B. l. 71 (Dittenb. *Syll.*² 588).

³ E. Schulhof, *B.C.H.* 32 (1908), pp. 106, 114.

⁴ Hypsocles, A. l. 31 (*B.C.H.* 14 (1890), p. 389, *seq.*, Michel 833): see Homolle, *Archives*, p. 45.

⁵ Decree of Cyzicus, Michel, 534.

⁶ *Rev. Phil.* 20, p. 112.

erected two statues to him on Delos⁷ and that he made offerings there, the earliest appearing in 279⁸) depends on the interpretation of four inscriptions: the decree of the Islanders found at Nikouria;⁹ a decree of Carthaea in Ceos;¹⁰ a decree of Naxos;¹¹ and a decree of Ios.¹²

In the Nikouria decree, the circumstances of which were entirely special, Philocles and Bacchon together write to the synhedroi of the League of the Islanders to come to Samos in order to hear the proposals of Ptolemy II. as to the festival which he was about to institute at Alexandria in honour of Ptolemy I. (The decree can be dated almost with certainty to 280; for Egypt did not possess Samos prior to Lysimachus' death in 281, and the festival referred to was probably first celebrated in 279/8.)¹³ Philocles and Bacchon both address the synhedroi, who then vote; among other things, they vote that Bacchon shall nominate the person to collect the extraordinary contributions to be made by the cities of the League to pay for the theoria and wreath that are to go to Alexandria. Note that Bacchon has no power here of any kind; Philocles and he, on Ptolemy's instructions, ask the representatives of the League to come to Samos to consider a very special matter; they both put Ptolemy's proposal before the representatives; and that is all. There seems to be no question of Bacchon convening an ordinary assembly or presiding in an ordinary assembly: the whole thing is a matter of courtesy to Ptolemy. That the synhedroi ask Bacchon to name a treasurer ad hoc is a matter of courtesy also: they could have named one themselves. The only thing this decree shews is, that Bacchon is a channel through which Ptolemy communicates with the League, and that he was less important than Philocles, who is named before him twice.

Next, the decree of Carthaea.¹⁴ There were the usual troubles in Carthaea, probably between debtors and creditors. Bacchon, in order to do what he could for the citizens, wrote (something—the word is lost) to them so that they might be reconciled. He probably outlined a scheme, for the people voted that what he wrote should be done (*κυρίαν αὐτῆν [εἶναι]*). This shews that he was only using his good offices, and not giving an order; if he had had power to *order*, the people could not have voted that his *order* should be *κύρια*. The scheme, however, was not carried out, for some reason; and Carthaea appealed to Philocles, when he came later on to settle with Bacchon the affairs of the islands, to have the scheme carried out. Philocles thereon appointed a judicial commission, who decided the matters

⁷ Homolle, *B.C.H.* 15 (1891), p. 120, *Archives*, p. 45, No. 1; see P. Roussel, *B.C.H.* 33 (1909), p. 480.

⁸ Hypsocles B. 1, 12, a vase: mentioned again in Acridion (240), l. 33; see Homolle, *Archives*, p. 45.

⁹ Dittenb. *Syll.*² 202 = *I.G.* xii. 7, 506 (where there are references to its literature).

¹⁰ *I.G.* xii. 5 (ii), 1065.

¹¹ *B.C.H.* 1894, p. 400, with Holleaux' commentary.

¹² *I.G.* xii. 5 (ii), 1004 = Dittenb. *O.G.I.* 773.

¹³ H. von Prott, *Rhein. Mus.* 53 (1898), p. 460; see Bouché-Leclercq, *Hist. des Lagides*, vol. iv., add. to vol. i. 155. See further as to date, Werner König, *l.c.* 20: and it may be noted that offerings both of Philocles and Bacchon at Delos appear in the inventory of Hypsocles, 279.

¹⁴ See Graindor's commentary, *B.C.H.* 30 (1906), p. 92.

in dispute. Here we see Bacchon concerned to restore peace, but without power to enforce his recommendations or to appoint a commission with judicial powers; for these things appeal has to be made to Philocles.

The Naxos decree is to the same effect. Internal troubles in Naxos; the League desire arbitrators from some state outside the League; Bacchon has no power; and (Philocles not being there, or for some reason not in question) the League have to apply, presumably through Bacchon, to the ultimate Court of Appeal, Ptolemy himself, who instructs Bacchon to apply to Cos for arbitrators and conduct them to Naxos, which Bacchon does.

This is all. I find it impossible, on these facts, to agree with Delamarre, that the nesiarch convoked and presided in the assemblies of the synhedroi, or represented the League in its external relations; still less with the wide-spread view that he was governor. He seems rather to have been a kind of Egyptian Resident, concerned to watch Ptolemy's interests, give good advice, and form an easy channel of communication.

There remains the Ios decree; and here the view has been put forward that Bacchon was the naval commander of the fleet that protected the islands.¹⁵ The circumstances are as follows. Zeno and his squadron of aphracts were at Ios with Bacchon; some runaway slaves took refuge on the ships; the owners, naturally enough, seem to have applied to Bacchon, Ptolemy's representative on the spot, and he left Zeno to deal with the matter:¹⁶ to Zeno the owners' emissaries then went. It seems fairly simple. The ships were Egyptian (it was the squadron which provisioned Athens for Ptolemy in 288, and there is no trace whatever of any ships of the Islanders till the time of the Rhodian protectorate); and once on board, the slaves *were on Egyptian territory*. Bacchon had no power over Egyptian territory; Zeno, the commander of the squadron, had: Bacchon therefore naturally referred the complainants to Zeno, and went his way, leaving Zeno to settle the matter, which he did, after assembling and questioning his trierarchs. There is nothing whatever to show that Bacchon was Zeno's superior officer. He gives Zeno no *orders*.

I now turn to the nauarch. Putting aside for the moment Philocles, king of the Sidonians, whose position has to be considered, we know of three nauarchs of this period: Callicrates, son of Boiskos, of Samos; Patroclus, son of Patron, a Macedonian; and Hermaphilos (?), son of Philostratos, a Rhaukian of Crete.¹⁷ Two others, given as nauarchs by P. M. Meyer, Philothenos and Dikaïos,¹⁸ are not nauarchs at all, but *τεταγμένοι ὑπὸ τὸν βασιλέα Πτολεμαῖον*.

Philocles is fixed to *circ.* 280 by the Nikouria decree: Patroclus, of course, belongs to the Chremonidean war. Callicrates is generally placed at the

¹⁵ Werner König, *l.c.* p. 70. See also W. S. Ferguson, *Klio*, 5, p. 178, n. 1.

¹⁶ *Καταλειφθεὶς ὑπὸ Βάκχωνος* means just 'left,' and not 'the delegate of'; see Dittenberger, *ad loc.* Unnecessary difficulty has been caused by the introduction of the

idea of delegation.

¹⁷ Known from a decree of Thera, *I.G.* xii. 3, 1291. The name is not certain.

¹⁸ *Heerwesen*, p. 20.—Philothenos is *I.G.* xii. 5 (ii), 1066; Dikaïos, *C.I.G.* 2267.

end of the reign of Ptolemy II. and the beginning of that of Ptolemy III.; but there can be no doubt whatever that he really comes between Philocles and Patroclus. It may be as well to get the order right first.

It seems probable that at some period in the the lifetime of Arsinoe Philadelphos, subsequent to her marriage in 274/3, Callicrates was not yet nauarch; for he does not use the title in the inscriptions on the bases of the statues of Ptolemy II. and Arsinoe II., which he set up at Olympia.¹⁹ I say 'probable,' for the conclusion is by no means imperative: he was not bound to use his own title himself. On the other hand, he *was* nauarch in the lifetime of a queen Arsinoe, as is shewn by his dedication at Maamourah of a temple to Isis and Anubis on behalf of 'king Ptolemy and queen Arsinoe.'²⁰ On the face of it, the queen, who has no distinguishing words of any kind, should be Arsinoe I., the first wife of Ptolemy II., as Breccia supposed; but this cannot be regarded as certain. If the dedication from Samos on behalf of Ptolemy and Arsinoe and Callicrates²¹ were complete, the matter would probably be settled; but Dittenberger's restoration 'Ἀρσινόη[ς βασιλίσσης] has been challenged by Wilcken, who would read 'Ἀρσινόη[ς Φιλαδέλφου];²² and it is not possible to be sure which of the two queens is intended. The fact, however, that, in the Samos dedication, Ptolemy is called son of Ptolemy and Berenice the Saviours, *while Arsinoe is not*, seems to me to point strongly to Arsinoe I. The conclusion seems to be, that Callicrates certainly became nauarch some time prior to the death of Arsinoe II. in 270, and *may* have become nauarch prior to the repudiation of Arsinoe I., though this cannot, on present materials, be decided. He must have died, or ceased to be nauarch, prior to the outbreak of the Chremonidean war in 266/5, when Patroclus held the office.²³ We know, however, from other sources that Patroclus was not yet nauarch in 270, for in that year he was eponymous priest of Alexander and the Θεοὶ Ἀδελφοί:²⁴ and with this agrees the fact that Callicrates was certainly still nauarch at some time after July 270, the date of Arsinoe's death; for he was nauarch when he built to her memory the temple of Arsinoe Zephyritis, as the two epigrams of Poseidippos shew: both call Callicrates nauarch.²⁵

¹⁹ Dittenb. *O.G.I.* 26, 27.

²⁰ Discovered at Maamourah by Prince Omar Pacha Toussom, and published by E. Breccia, *Bull. de la Soc. archéologique d'Alexandrie*, 1905, p. 107: ὑπὲρ βασιλέως Πτολεμαίου | καὶ βασιλίσσης Ἀρσινόης | τὸ ἱερόν Ἴσει Ἀνούβει Καλλικράτης | Βοΐσκου Σάμιος ναυαρχῶν | ἔδωκεν Πασινῆ(ι) ἱερεῖ. I can see no distinction between ναυαρχῶν and ναύαρχος, and Breccia admits that his attempt to distinguish them is over-subtle.

²¹ Dittenb. *O.G.I.* 29.

²² *Ib.* Add. et Corr. ii. p. 539.

²³ Paus. i, 1, 1.

²⁴ Hibeh Pap. 1 (1906), No. 99: B.C., 270 (269). That the Patroclus, son of Patron, here

mentioned is the future nauarch seems certain. Patroclus is not a common name at this time; and though there are several other instances of Patron, the conjunction of the two is most unlikely to be a coincidence. This priesthood was held by persons of importance, even by members of the royal house; Menelaos, son of Lagos, brother of Ptolemy I. and his general in Cyprus in 306, held it for 5 years; Hibeh Pap. 84 a, Elephantine Papyri (1907) No. 2 (p. 24), with O. Rubensohn's commentary.

²⁵ The first, given Ath. 7, 318 b, is well known. The other, from a papyrus, is not so often quoted; I therefore give the material lines. (Published by H. Weil in *Monuments Grecs* for 1879, p. 31). The temple speaks:—

The offerings at Delos do not add much. One Callicrates dedicated a wreath some time before 279 (Hypsocles l. 54 = Charilas B. l. 76 = Sosisthenes l. 6) and the inventory of Charilas gives the important information that he called himself *Καλλικράτης Μακεδών*.²⁶ If we were sure that it was the nauarch we should have here a very valuable instance of *Μακεδών* taken as a title of honour. But though probable, it cannot be called certain.

The inscriptional evidence, however, is complete. Callicrates son of Boiskos of Samos was nauarch from some date between 280 and 270 to some date between 270 and 265. If, as is probable, he be the Callicrates, *τῶν φίλων*, sent to Cyprus by Ptolemy I., in 310,²⁷ he was not a young man; the Boiskos who appears as a Ptolemaic official in Cyprus somewhere *circ.* 295–290 is as likely to be his brother as his father.²⁸

The grounds on which Callicrates has been put later seem to be mere mistakes. Dittenberger's note says that the lettering of *Syll.*² 223—the base of the statue of Callicrates dedicated by the League of the Islanders—points to a later date, to the reign of Euergetes. But it appears that the lettering is even later: the stone has been recut,²⁹ like some others commemorative of the Lagid domination in the Aegean. Again, Dittenberger³⁰ refers to the building of the Zephyrion temple as interrupted by the death of Ptolemy II., citing Wilamowitz, *Antigonos von Karystos*, p. 338, and deduces that Callicrates lived to Euergetes' reign. But the temple that was incomplete at Philadelphos' death, and to which Wilamowitz alludes was not the Zephyrion temple at all, but the famous Arsinoeion in Alexandria, the temple which is said to have been planned to contain a magnetic room with an iron statue of Arsinoe floating in mid air.³¹

Lastly, Euphantos ap. *Ath.* 6, 251 d, refers to a Callicrates as a flatterer of Ptolemy III. Either this is not the admiral, or *τρίτου* is a mistake: in any case, it cannot be set up as evidence for a moment against the inscriptions. That Euphantos of Olynthos, pupil of Eubulides of Megara and teacher of Antigonos Gonatas, survived till the reign of Ptolemy III. is, other things apart, almost

1. 4. *Ενθα με Καλλικράτης ιδρύσατο και βασιλίσσης
 ἱερὸν Ἀρσινόης Κύπριδος ἀνώμασεν.
 Ἄλλ' ἐπὶ τὴν Ζεφυρίτιν ἀκουσομένην
 Ἀφροδίτην
 Ἑλλήνων ἀγναί βαίνετε θυγατέρες,
 οἱ θ' ἄλδς ἐργάται ἄνδρες ὁ γὰρ ναύαρχος
 ἔθηκεν
 τοῦθ' ἱερὸν παντὸς κύματος εὐλίμενον.*

Poseidippos was a contemporary of Zeno and Cleanthes, living at Alexandria. What *πρώτος δὲ ναύαρχος θήκατο Καλλικράτης* (in No. 1) means is obscure. It cannot mean that Callicrates only began the temple, seeing that he named it (No. 2, l. 5). Perhaps it means that it was the first temple erected to the worship of Arsinoe.

²⁶ Cited by Homolle, *Archives*, p. 38, n. 5.—Hypsocles (279), Michel 833 = *B.C.H.* 1890,

p. 389. Sosisthenes (250), *B.C.H.* 1903, p. 62. Charilas (269), unpublished; will be *I.G.* xi. 203, as Professor F. Dürnbach kindly informs me.

²⁷ Diod. xx. 21, 1.

²⁸ Dittenb. *O.G.I.* 20. This inscription cannot fall before 306, as Ptolemy is *βασιλεύς*. From 306 to 295 Cyprus belonged to Demetrius; it is therefore later than 295. At the same time Berenice is not yet *βασίλισσα*; as she must have got the title when her son was recognised as heir, it cannot be very long after 295.

²⁹ P. Roussel and J. Hatzfeld, *B.C.H.* 1909, p. 480.

³⁰ Notes to *Syll.*² 223 and *O.G.I.* 26–27.

³¹ Plin., *N.H.* 34, 138; 36, 68; 37, 108. See Beloch, *Griech. Gesch.* iii. 1, 374, n. 1.

incredible.³² It is worth noting that we know of another Callicrates of Samos, son of Isitheos, who may have been of some importance at the time, as he received the proxeny of Oloos in Crete at the same time as the nauarch Patroclus.³³

Having got the succession fixed, it remains to consider the powers and functions of the nauarch.

The Egyptian method of governing *conquered* provinces, as is well known, was through *στρατηγοί*.³⁴ We have as instances the strategos of Cyprus,³⁵ of Cilicia,³⁶ of 'the elephant-hunts,' who developed into the strategos of the Indian and the Red Sea,³⁷ and of 'the Hellespont and the parts about Thrace,'³⁸ after the conquests of Ptolemy III. in that region. There is *some* slight evidence that the strategos, like a Roman proconsul, had authority over the sea bordering his province; the strategos of the Red Sea has ships and marines under his orders,³⁹ the strategos of the Hellespont is found taking measures for the defence of Samothrace against pirates.⁴⁰

The League of the Islanders, however, was not in the position of a conquered province. It was, nominally, an autonomous state, which had been 'freed' by Ptolemy from the tyranny of Demetrius. There were difficulties about a strategos of the Islands; and in fact such a strategos was missing from the Ptolemaic system. It appears in another guise.

To take Patroclus first. He was nauarch⁴¹ and commanded the fleet in the Chremonidean war. He was also 'sent as strategos to Crete';⁴² this does not mean that he was strategos of Crete, which was not Egyptian, but that it was his business to superintend the growing interests of Egypt in that island.⁴³ He was strategos so far as regarded the town of Carthaea;⁴⁴ and if the Carthaeans called him strategos, then he must have also been strategos in relation to the other towns of the League of the Islanders. The literary

³² Wilamowitz defended it; *Antigonos von Karystos*, 87, n. 3. E. Schwartz (*Hermes*, 35, pp. 106, 128) cannot believe it, and would read *πρώτου* for *πρίτου*, with Mallet (*Hist. de l'école de Mégare*, 1845, 96). Natorp (*Euphantos* in Pauly-Wissowa, vi. (i), 1907) inclines to follow Schwartz and Mallet, saying that it is hardly possible, as a matter of chronology, that Euphantos could mention anyone at the court of Ptolemy III. With this last I agree; but I note that Schwartz' argument, that Euphantos ought to have been born before 348, being called an Olynthian, will hardly do; Olynthus was in existence again by 300, see P. Perdrizet in *B.C.H.* 1897, p. 118 (= *S.G.D. I.* 2768), citing *I.G.* ii. 611 (300/299 B.C.). References to Olynthians become common in the 3rd century. See, too, *I.G.* ii. 963, a list of mercenaries which includes 'Ολύνθιοι, somewhere about 300. The real point seems to be, that Euphantos was Eubulides' pupil.

³³ *B.C.H.* 24 (1900), p. 225, No. 5, 1.

³⁴ P. M. Meyer, *Heerwesen*, p. 17; Bouché-

Leclercq, *Hist. des Lagides*, iv. pp. 11 *seq.*

³⁵ *B.C.H.* 15, 136; Diod. 19, 79; (under Ptolemy I.). Dittenb. *O.G.I.* 84, under Ptolemy IV. Often later.

³⁶ The 'amicus Antiochus' of Jerome on Dan. xi. 8.

³⁷ Refs. in Meyer, *l.c.*

³⁸ Dittenb. *Syll.*² 221.

³⁹ Elephant-transport, *ἐλεφαντηγοί*, Petr. Pap. ii. n. 40 (a). Grenfell, Pap. i. n. 9 (239/8) *μισθοφόροις πληρώματα[τος ἐπ'] Ἐρ[υθρῆ] θαλάσσει*. Bouché-Leclercq, *l.c.* iv. p. 63, n. 1, has some doubt if these really belonged to the navy; but if they were a gang of 'galériens' working on land, why the phrase 'on the Red Sea'?

⁴⁰ Dittenb. *Syll.*² 221.

⁴¹ Paus. i, 1, 1.

⁴² Dittenb. *O.G.I.* 45.

⁴³ Cf. the proxenia conferred on him by Oloos, *B.C.H.* 24 (1900), p. 225, No. 5, 1.

⁴⁴ Decree of Carthaea for Hieron son of Timokrates of Syracuse, *I.G.* XII. 5, ii. 1061.

texts, for what they are worth, generally refer to him as strategos.⁴⁵ He exercised absolute authority over Thera,⁴⁶ and must therefore have been strategos of that island. Patroclus then is nauarch, admiral commanding the fleet in war, with the authority of a strategos over the Islands of the League and Thera, and with a commission as strategos to watch Egyptian interests in Crete. Here we seem to have the missing strategia of the Island world,⁴⁷ conjoined in one hand with the office of nauarch.

To turn now to Philocles, whom some have considered to be nauarch, others to hold an exceptional position as a kind of Egyptian viceroy. We have seen that he had power to appoint a judicial commission in a city of the League;⁴⁸ and the same decree of Carthaea which shews this also implies clearly that he could enforce obedience to the verdict, if it came to that. We find, that when he requests the representatives of the League to come to him he summons them to Samos;⁴⁹ his headquarters then are the headquarters of the fleet. No document expressly calls him nauarch; but this has really no bearing either way, for he had a higher title, that of king of the Sidonians, and the documents always use his higher title. He has power to compel the islands to pay their debts to Delos, and he uses that power.⁵⁰ The decree of Carthaea before mentioned also shews that he had a general power to regulate the affairs of the Islands, and came from time to time for that purpose. A literary text also calls him strategos.⁵¹

He had then very extensive powers; but a comparison seems to shew that those of Patroclus were just as extensive. If Philocles could compel the islands to pay their debts to Delos, Patroclus can appoint, of his own motion, a governor (*ἐπιστάτης*) in this or that town, in Arsinoe of the League equally with Thera.⁵² These governors were as a rule appointed by the king, and derived their power from him; Patroclus then is pretty nearly viceroy. We find that Patroclus can also, of his own authority, appoint a judicial commission to go to Thera,⁵³ just as Philocles had done

⁴⁵ Phylarchos ap. *Ath.* 8, 334 a; Hege-
sander, ap. *Ath.* 14, 621 a.

⁴⁶ Dittenb. *O.G.I.* 44.

⁴⁷ Though we are not actually told that Patroclus commanded any land forces, this must follow from his being strategos of Thera: for the later nauarch Hermaphilos, as strategos of Thera, disposed of the troops in that island, *I.G.* XII. 3, 1291.

⁴⁸ Decree of Carthaea, *I.G.* XII. 5, ii. 1065.

⁴⁹ Nikouria decree.

⁵⁰ Dittenb. *Syll.*² 209.

⁵¹ Polyæn. III. 16.

⁵² In Arsinoe; *I.G.* XII. 5, 2, 1061. In Thera; Dittenb. *O.G.* I. 44. Arsinoe must be in Ceos; Graindor thought Koresia (*B.C.H.* 30, 1906, pp. 95 *seq.*), Wilamowitz Poiea (note in *I.G. ad loc.*); anyhow it was in the League. Mentioned again, Dittenb. *Syll.*². 261. It has

nothing to do with Arsinoe-Methana.—Hieron, the epistates of Arsinoe, came to Ceos with Patroclus, having been *τεταγμένος ὑπὸ τῷ βασι[λέα] Πτολεμαῖου*, i.e. he was a 'royal official,' generally speaking (Graindor, *ad loc.*), but with his sphere not marked out; thereupon Patroclus appoints him epistates. Apollodotos the epistates of Thera (Dittenb. *O.G.I.* 44) seems to have been chosen entirely by Patroclus; he may, like the arbitrators, have been from Iulis in Ceos; the text leaves it uncertain.—On the office of epistates in the Macedonian kingdoms, see Holleaux in *B.C.H.* 1893, p. 52: the appointment of these magistrates or governors by the king, to represent him, was the regular method in the Macedonian monarchies of administering newly acquired territory, autonomous or otherwise.

⁵³ Dittenb. *O.G.I.* 44.

in Carthaea: that is to say, he is the fount of judicial, as well as the repository of military, authority: he is vice-king.

There seems no room for doubt (save in one point)⁵⁴ that the two men occupied similar positions, with co-extensive powers. Patroclus' appointment of an epistates seems to be as clear an exercise of the royal authority as is Philocles' letter to the representatives of the autonomous League asking them to come to himself at his headquarters. Practically, then, both were viceroys of the sea-province; and Philocles' position was only exceptional *when created*. It was at the time a new thing. But the powers conferred on Philocles were continued in the line of Egyptian nauarchs; and the immense importance of these viceroys of the sea may be illustrated by the dedication made by a Samian on behalf of three persons jointly, Ptolemy II., and his queen, and the nauarch Callicrates.⁵⁵ It is quite clear that, with such powers vested in the nauarch, there was no room for another official who should either be governor of the League-province or independent commander of its protecting fleet; hence the position of the nauarch appears to bear out what I have already said about the nesiarch.

It remains to consider the decay of the office of nauarch. Egypt finally withdrew from the Aegean in 146, when her last garrisons quitted Arsinoe-Methana, Thera, and Itanos in Crete;⁵⁶ after this, no *strategia* of any Aegean islands can have existed, and there was nothing to carry with it the office of nauarch. *One* island, however, remained elsewhere; and we know for certain that after this date the office of nauarch became attached to the *strategia* of Cyprus.⁵⁷ We can also trace an intermediate period in an inscription from Thera,⁵⁸ probably of the time of Ptolemy Philometor. Every military commander had a *γραμματεὺς*,⁵⁹ and we find here one *γραμματεὺς* for the 'soldiers in Crete, Thera, and Arsinoe of the Peloponnese,' and one *οἰκονόμος* for the same places; these were all that remained to Egypt in the Aegean, and were in one military hand. It is difficult to avoid seeing here the remains of the extensive *strategia* exercised by Patroclus; and this must still have carried the office of nauarch, seeing that it had not yet shifted to the *strategia* of Cyprus.

Hermaphilos, the Rhaukian, is difficult to place, save that he must be later than Patroclus. The decree of Thera which mentions him calls him 'nauarch and strategos of our city.' There cannot of course have

⁵⁴ It is a question whether the words *τῶι ναυάρχῳ* in the broken part of the decree of Delos for Philocles, Dittenb. *Syll.*² 209, refer to Philocles or not; that is, whether he was in *actual* command of the fleet, as was Patroclus, or not. His headquarters at Samos, and the fact that he seems to have power to enforce his awards (the Carthaea decree), incline one to take the common view that he was himself the nauarch; but the evidence would be consistent with the name not yet being attached to Philocles' new office, and with Philocles (not a

young man) having under him an actual fleet-leader or praefectus classis. It is a matter of names rather than of things.

⁵⁵ Dittenb. *O.G.I.* 29.

⁵⁶ Hiller von Gaertringen, *Thera*, 1, 169.

⁵⁷ Dittenb. *O.G.I.* 140, 143, 145, 151, 152, 153, 155 to 162.

⁵⁸ Dittenb. *O.G.I.* 102. (The Aristippos here mentioned as *ὁ τεταγμένος ἐπὶ Θήρας* is not necessarily the strategos of this *strategia*.)

⁵⁹ P. M. Meyer, *Heerwesen*, 65; Dittenberger *ad loc.*

been a separate strategia for the little island of Thera so long as Egypt retained the Cyclades ; but the above words can be explained in two ways, and I see no means of deciding. Though we do not know Patroclus' military title, we have concluded that he was in fact strategos of the Cyclades, Thera, and Egyptian interests in Crete, doubtless too of other islands, *e.g.* Samos : his title may have been something like 'strategos of the Cyclades and Thera (and of the other islands).' After the loss of the Cyclades, it is possible that the name of the strategia would be 'of Thera (and of the other islands).' The loose reference in the decree of Thera to Hermaphilos as 'strategos of our city,' would fit, whether his date be the end of the reign of Ptolemy II., before the loss of the Cyclades, or later, after their loss. Till his date can be ascertained, this decree is of no use for drawing deductions as to the intermediate period, during which I suppose that the office of nauarch remained attached to a mutilated strategia of the island world before finally shifting into the keeping of the strategos of Cyprus.

W. W. TARN.