


Oiantheia in Between. Cross-border Activities in Ancient Federal Greece

Elena FranchiUniversità degli Studi di Trento 

E-mail: elena.franchi@unitn.it

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3652-1935><https://dx.doi.org/10.5209/geri.98958>

Recibido: 10 de noviembre de 2024 • Aceptado: 10 de enero de 2025

Abstract: Oiantheia is a city located on the eastern border of Aitolia having an outlet to the sea and probably a harbour. Their access to the Corinthian Gulf played an essential role in their relations with neighbouring towns and ethne. The town was undoubtedly perceived as Lokrian, yet its location on the border meant there was a pervasive element of Aitolian identity present too. Unsurprisingly, many Aitolians and Lokrian towns in the eastern borderlands with the Ozolian Lokrians had converging interests with their neighbours across the political divide. They exchanged goods locally and regionally, whereas certain surplus goods were even circulated inter-regionally. They also shared a communal enemy in Naupaktos. The cross-border activities and dynamics help to account for the Aitolian-Lokrian synergic integration in the area. The Aitolian koinon set in motion top-down strategies of institutional integration. They also endeavoured to manipulate the symbolic attachment by merging Lokrian genealogies into Aitolian lore. The success of their strategy, however, most likely depended on an effective exploitation of previous political and economic cross-border cooperation, as will be argued in this article.

Keywords: Oiantheia; Aitolians; Lokrians; federalism; borders.

ESP Oiantheia en la encrucijada. Actividades transfronterizas en la antigua Grecia federal

Resumen: Oiantheia es una ciudad situada en la frontera oriental de Etolia, dotada de una salida al mar y, probablemente, de un puerto. Su acceso al golfo de Corinto desempeñó un papel esencial en sus relaciones con las ciudades vecinas y ethne. No cabe duda de que la ciudad era percibida como locria, pero su ubicación en la frontera significaba la presencia de un elemento omnipresente de identidad etolia. Como era de esperar, muchos etolios de las tierras fronterizas orientales con los locrios de Ozolia tenían intereses comunes con sus vecinos, situados al otro lado de la división política. Todos ellos intercambiaban bienes a nivel local y regional, llegando ciertos excedentes a circular interregionalmente. También compartían un enemigo común en Naupaktos. Las actividades y dinámicas transfronterizas ayudan a explicar la integración etolio-locria en la zona. El koinon etolio puso en marcha estrategias de integración institucional que pueden ser definidas top-down. También se esforzaron por manipular el vínculo simbólico mediante la fusión de genealogías locrias en la tradición etolia. El éxito de su estrategia, sin embargo, dependió muy probablemente de una explotación eficaz de la previa cooperación política y económica transfronteriza, como se argumentará en este artículo.

Palabras clave: Oiantheia; etolios; locrios; federalismo; fronteras.

Sumario: 1. Oiantheia, a city with a strong Lokrian identity. 2. Oiantheia and the Aitolians: before the Aitolians' control of Ozolian Lokrian cities. 3. Cross border cooperation and switching identities. 4. Borderising Oiantheia. 5. Conclusions. 6. Bibliography.

Cómo citar: Franchi, E. (2025): "Oiantheia in between. Cross-border Activities in Ancient Federal Greece", *Gerión* 43/1, 47-70

1. Oiantheia, a city with a strong Lokrian identity¹

Ancient Oiantheia² was first identified with modern Galaxidi, where the famous treaty between Oiantheia and Chaleion (*IG IX* 1², 3, 717)³ was found, and then, from Lucien Lerat, with the site of Mathiou in the bay of Vitrinitsa maybe (but not necessarily: I, 209) extending to encompass the territory of Kisseli (whereas Galaxidi would coincide with Chaleion)⁴ while Petros K. Themelis more

¹ This article was made possible by generous financial support from the European Union in the framework of the ERC project "FeBo: Federalism and Border Management in Greek Antiquity" (COG PR. 2021 Nr. 101043954, P.I. Elena Franchi). Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Research Council Executive Agency. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them. I am grateful to Claudio Biagetti, Luca Valle Salazar, Roy Van Wijk and Sebastian Scharff, as well as to the anonymous referees for their valuable suggestions.

² The sources citing Oiantheia (sometimes in the variant Euantheia/Euanthis: Lerat 1952 I, 43-44) and/or its inhabitants are listed and analysed by Lucien Lerat (1952 I, 41-44) and D. Rousset (2004, 396-397, nr. 166): Hekat. *FGrH* 1 F 113; Thuc. 3.101; Hellan. fr. 120 (BNJ/Ambaglio); Aristot. fr. 561 Rose (ap. Plut. *Q.gr.* 15); Pseudo Scyl. 36 (Euanthis); Polyb. 4.57.2; 5.17.8; Str. 9.4.8; Pompon. Mel. 2.55; Plin. 4.7 (and Mart. Cap. *Sat.* 6.651); Polyæn. 8.46; Ptol. *Geogr.* 3.14.3 (Euantheia); Paus. 10.38.9; Steph. Byz. s.v. Οἰάνθη (ed. Billerbeck); Ravenna Cosmograph. 4.10; 5.13 (Evanzia); Tab. Peut. VI C (Evamzia; see on <https://tp-online.ku.de/trefferanzeige.php?id=961> for some commentary). To this catalogue one has to add: *Orac. Sybill.* 3.347 Geffcken (a very dubious emendation however; manuscripts read πάνθηια). Inscriptions mentioning Oiantheia: *IG IX* 1², 4, 882 (625-600 a.C.) (= *IG IX* 1, 867=LSAG 234 no. 9=Meiggs - Lewis, *GHI* 4=Hansen, *CEG* 143=GV 42=SEG 15.356=SEG 37.436= SEG 44.441=Van Effenterre - Ruzé, *Nomima* I no. 34); *IG IX* 1² 3, 717 (475/4-450/49 BCE) (= *IG IX* 1, 333= LSAG 106-108 no. 4=Tod, *GHI* 34=SEG 18.258=SEG 24.393=SEG 26.640=SEG 30.510=SEG 32.557=SEG 33.441=SEG 34.465=SEG 36.531=SEG 39.478=SEG 43.1275=SEG 44.1735=SEG 47.2299=SEG 53.424=SEG 54.538=SEG 54.1877=SEG 55.588=SEG 58.1903=SEG 60.2051=SEG 62.1887=SEG 66.2418=SEG 67.1560=Van Effenterre - Ruzé, *Nomima* I no. 53); *IG IV* 2, 1, 95 (*IG IV* 1504=SEG 11.411=SEG 26.447=SEG 35.306=SEG 42.291=SEG 45.275=SEG 47.340=SEG 48.425=SEG 49.376bis=SEG 50.375) (mid-4th BCE); *IG IX* 1² 1, 31 A, II. 28, 33-34, 38, 40-41 (=SEG 23.397=SEG 32.1651=SEG 33.447) (end 3rd BCE-beginning 2nd BCE); Plassart 1921, 23 (col. IV, II. 69-73) (=SGDI II 2580= SEG 26.624=SEG 30.494=SEG 33.420=SEG 36.500=SEG 38.413=SEG 55.474=SEG 56.555=SEG 59.520) (230-220 BCE); SGDI II 2011 (Euantheus) (196/195 BCE); SGDI II 1984 (193/2 BCE); Syll.³ 609/610 (191/190 BCE); SGDI II 2245 (187/6 BCE); Daux 1936, 436-437 (175-174 BCE); SGDI II 1997 (170-169 BCE); SEG 54 452 (=SEG 60.436) with D. Rousset's remarks (*BE* 2005, nr. 225); SGDI II 1851 (Euantheus) (166/5); *IG IX* 1² 3, 709 (=SEG 3.431-432=SEG 12.278-279) (Euantheus) (166/65 BCE); SGDI II 1951 (Euanthis) (165/4 BCE); SGDI II 1901 (154/3 BCE); SGDI II 1954 (156/51); *IG IX* 1² 3, 681 (2nd BCE); *IG IX*, 110 (=SEG 62.1927) (2nd BCE); SGDI II 1908 (154-53); *FD III* 1, 565 (c. 150 BCE); *FD III* 3, 20 (c. 150 BCE); *FD III* 3, 50 (Euantheus) (mid-2nd BCE); *IG IX* 1² 3, 712 (but heavily restored) (mid-2nd BCE); *IG IX* 1² 3, 676 (I) (=SEG 56.571=Rousset 2006, 353-358, nr. 2) (mid-2nd BCE); SGDI II 2181 (143/2 BCE); *FD III* 2: 214 (130 BCE); *FD III* 4, 277 B, II. 5-6 (but heavily restored) (=Syll.³ 826B=SEG 26.628=SEG 28.505=SEG 52.525=CID IV 119 B, II. 19-20) (125 or 117-116 BCE); SEG 12.248 (=SEG 61.1615=Lerat 1952 I, 42) (Euanthea/Ouanthis) (end 1st BCE); *FD III* 6, 126 (Euantheus) (1st AD); *FD I* 68 (=Syll.³ 407) (undated). It is unclear where a coin presumably dating from the 2nd century BCE and bearing the ethnic "Oiantheion", that Friedrich Imhoof-Blumer (1883, 147 no. 69) saw and describes in detail (he also reproduces the design), was found and where it is preserved (as Imhoof-Blumer himself states): Head 1911 [1963], 338 (2nd BCE). This coin seems not to have been considered by Lucien Lerat.

³ =Tod *GHI* 34; cf. Lerat 1952 I, 116; Larsen 1968, 54f; Van Effenterre - Ruzé 1994, 216-221 no. 53.

⁴ But see already Cramer (1828 II, 108-109), as Lerat himself acknowledges (1952 I, 208).

strongly puts forward the site of Kisseli, a little further east.⁵ So far, it is the Vitrinitsa hypothesis that has established itself.⁶ Lerat rests on Classical and Hellenistic pottery fragments⁷ and mostly on two historiographical sources: a passage by Thukydides referring to Eurylochos' expedition supporting the Aitolians against Naupaktos supported by the Athenians (3.101; the year is 426) where the historians cites the cities in a likely geographical order;⁸ as well as a passage by Pausanias (10.38.9) stating that Oiantheia is bordering on Naupaktos (ταύτη ὁμοροῦσά ἐστι Ναύπακτος).⁹ Be that as it may, it is significant for our topic that all hypotheses (Galaxidi, Vitrinitsa, Kisseli) assume an outlet to the sea, most likely relying on indications from the historiographical tradition (Oiantheia's relationship with the sea) to which we will return.

According to myth, Oiantheia was among the first cities founded by Lokros, which underlines how important the Lokrian identity of Oiantheia was and/or how important it was to stress and enhance this identity,¹⁰ at least in the representations the Greeks and perhaps the Lokrians themselves had of this city. The story is told by a notice that, according to Valentin Rose and Olof Gigon, can be drawn back to Aristotle's *Polity of the Opuntians* (fr. 561 Rose, ll. 5-6= fr. 572 Gigon; a hypothesis that will be questioned below). The testimonium is Plutarch (Q.Gr 15):

Φύσκου τοῦ Ἀμφικτύονος υἱὸς ἦν Λοκρός, ἐκ δὲ τούτου καὶ Καβύης Ὀποῦς

Opous is son of Kabye and Lokros who is son of Physkos, who is son of Amphiktyon (transl. by the author).

Shortly below (the testimonium here is Eustathios=fr. 561 ll. 14-20 Rose, cited more lengthily by Gigon as fr. 574), Aristotle is supposed to have stated:

οἱ δὲ παλαιοὶ φασὶ καὶ ταῦτα· Ἀμφικτύονος καὶ Χθονοπάτρας ἀπόγονος Φύσκος, οὗ Λοκρός, ὧν ἀπὸ μὲν Φύσκου Φύσκοι πρῶτων, ἀπὸ δὲ Λοκροῦ Λοκροὶ οἱ αὐτοὶ ὠνομάσθησαν· Λοκροῦ δὲ Ὀποῦς, πρὸς ὃν διενεχθεὶς ὁ πατὴρ Λοκρός ἐξ ἧν ἀρχεῖν ἐκείνων, αὐτὸς δὲ οἰκεῖ τὰ πρὸς ἐσπέραν τοῦ Παρνασσοῦ ἔχων ὑφ' ἑαυτὸν τοὺς ἐκεῖ οἱ Ἑσπεριοὶ τε καὶ Ὀζόλαιοι ἐκαλοῦντο

The ancients say also these things: that Physkos is a descendant of Amphiktyon and Chthonopatra, that Lokros is son of Physkos, that from Physkos come the inhabitants of Physkeis and that they were called Lokroi after Lokros; Opous was son of Lokros; having had a quarrel with Opous, Lokros let him in command, while he himself went to colonize the western side of the Parnassos, ruling there the people who are called both Hesperioi and Ozolai (transl. by the author).

Soon next (the testimonium is Athenaios [II p. 70c], citing Didymos: fr. 561 Rose, ll. 21-27), Aristotle drives on to state that "when Lokros received an oracle commanding him to build a city wheresoever he should be bitten by a wooden dog, he founded the city in the region where he had

⁵ Themelis (2003, 33; see also 1983, 232) ascribes this identification to Lerat (1943, XIV-XV; Chamoux – Lerat 1947, 71-72), who actually swings between Kisseli and Vitrinitsa (1943, XIV-XV; Chamoux – Lerat 1947, 71-72) or Vitrinitsa and Vidavi (1946, 336) in his early articles (but inclines towards Vitrinitsa) while in the monograph he is uncertain between Glypha, even further west, and Vitrinitsa, and chooses Vitrinitsa rather decisively (1952 I, 207-209).

⁶ Philippon – Kirsten 1951, 371 n. 2; Fraser 1954, 250-251; Pritchett 1980, 278-279; Rousset 1991, 143 n. 423; Freitag 1999, 104; Talbert 2000, Oiantheia/Euantheia? (55 C4); Domínguez Monedero 2013, 431; 2015, 255; Zachos 2016, 171, map 6:3D, s.v. Oiantheia / Oiantheia / Euantheia proposes the hill of Pithas in Vitrinitsa as the location of the city and the Ereteini bay as that of the port; Zunino 2017, 129; Zachos 2023, 242.

⁷ 1947, 71. See also Leekley – Efstratiou 1980, 117-8.

⁸ *Vid. infra*. Interestingly, it is the same order as in the list of the theorodokoi of Delphi (Plassart 1921, 23, col. IV ll. 69-73 [SGDI 2580] [230-220 BCE]; Lerat 1952 I, 206-207) where, however, the order of the cities, as Lerat himself acknowledges, is not always geographical.

⁹ Cf. Lerat 1946, 329. Lerat himself admits, however, that Pausanias' passage is not decisive since even more neighbouring cities are Oineon, Eupalion, Erythrai and Polis (1952 I, 207). On the other hand, he considers that Polybios 4.57.2, which states that the Achaian Agira is in front of Oiantheia, which would force Oiantheia to be placed in Galaxidi, should not be interpreted too rigidly (206).

¹⁰ See below, par. 4 and Conclusions.

scratched his leg on a dog-thorn" (transl. by Olson 2006). Plutarch recounts the same episode in more detail (*Q.gr.* 15 in fr. 561 Rose=fr. 572 Gigon): Lokros, greatly troubled by the wound, spent several days in that region

ἐν αἷς καταμαθὼν τὸ χωρίον ἔκτισε πόλεις Φυσκεῖς καὶ Ὑάντειαν καὶ τὰς ἄλλας ὅσας οἱ κληθέντες Ὀζόλαι Λοκροὶ κατώκησαν

during which time he explored the country and founded the cities Physkos and Oiantheia and the other cities which the so-called Ozolian Lokrians inhabited¹¹ (transl. by Cole Babbitt 1936).

Caution is required with regard to some of these notices about the kinship of Lokros assembled by Rose and Gigon. A large part of the scholars maintains that at least some of these pieces of evidence (reported by Plutarch and Eustathios) can be attributed to Aristotle, on the basis of *schol.* Pind. *Ol.* 9.86e, clearly stating him as his source.¹² Albeit not certain, this connection seems very likely.¹³ So, if the above is correct, we can assume that the news about Oiantheia as one of the most important cities founded by Lokros, the eponymous hero of the Lokrians, goes back as far as the school of Aristotle, thus to the 4th (and maybe even earlier).

If, then, Oiantheia is to be identified with modern Vitrititsa, as it is commonly assumed, we cannot forget that it is precisely at Vitrititsa where the inscription of the Lokrian Maidens was found (*IG IX 12, 3, 706*).¹⁴ The inscription notoriously refers to the girls the Aiantioi and the city of

¹¹ Here is the whole fr. 561, as reconstructed by Rose:
 Schol. in Pindar. *Ol.* 9.86 ἀπὸ γὰς Ἑπειῶν: Ἑπειῶν
 τῶν Ἥλειων ... Ὅποῦντος ἦν θυγάτηρ (ἡ Πρωτογένεια)
 Ἥλειων βασιλέως, ἦν Ἀριστοτέλης Καμβύσῃν καλεῖ.
 Plutarch. *qu. Gr.* 15: Τίς ἡ ξυλίνη κύων παρὰ Λοκροῖς;
 Φύσκου τοῦ Ἀμφικτύονος υἱὸς ἦν Λοκρός, ἐκ δὲ τούτου
 καὶ Καβύης Ὅπου. πρὸς ὃν ὁ πατὴρ διενεχθεὶς καὶ συχνοῦς
 τῶν πολιτῶν ἀναλαβὼν περὶ ἀποικίας ἐμαντεύετο· τοῦ δὲ
 θεοῦ φήσαντος κτίζειν πόλιν ὅπου περ ἂν τύχῃ δηχθεὶς ὑπὸ
 κυνὸς ξυλίνης, ὑπερβαίνων εἰς τὴν ἐτέραν θάλασσαν ἐπά-
 τῃσε κυνὸσβατον, ἐνοχληθεὶς δὲ τῇ πληγῇ διέτριψεν ἡμέρας
 αὐτόθι πλείονας, ἐν αἷς καταμαθὼν τὸ χωρίον ἔκτισε πόλεις
 Φυσκεῖς καὶ Ὑάντειαν καὶ τὰς ἄλλας ὅσας οἱ κληθέντες
 Ὀζόλαι Λοκροὶ κατώκησαν.
 Eustathios in *Il.* p. 277 Van der Valk: οἱ δὲ παλαιοὶ φασὶ καὶ ταῦτα·
 Ἀμφικτύονος καὶ Χθονοπάτρας ἀπὸγονος Φύσκος, οὗ Λο-
 κρός, ὦν ἀπὸ μὲν Φύσκου Φύσκοι πρῶην, ἀπὸ δὲ Λοκροῦ
 Λοκροὶ οἱ αὐτοὶ ὠνομάσθησαν· Λοκροῦ δὲ Ὅπου, πρὸς ὃν
 διενεχθεὶς ὁ πατὴρ Λοκρός ἐξ ἂν μὲν ἄρχειν ἐκείνῳ, αὐτὸς δὲ
 οἰκεῖ τὰ πρὸς ἐσπέραν τοῦ Παρνασσοῦ ἔχων ὑφ' ἑαυτὸν τοὺς
 ἐκεῖ οἱ Ἑσπέραιοι τε καὶ Ὀζόλαι ἐκαλοῦντο.
 Athen. *II* p. 70c: Δίδυμος δ' ὁ γραμματικὸς ἐξηγου-
 μενος παρὰ τῷ Σοφοκλεῖ τὸ κύναρος ἄκανθα, μήποτε,
 φησί, τὴν κυνὸσβατον λέγει διὰ τὸ ἀκανθῶδες καὶ τραχὺ
 εἶναι τὸ φυτόν· καὶ γὰρ ἡ Πυθία ξυλίνην κύνα αὐτὸ εἶπε
 καὶ ὁ Λοκρός χρησμὸν λαβὼν ἐκεῖ πόλιν οἰκίζειν ὅπου ἂν
 ὑπὸ ξυλίνης κυνὸς δηχθῇ, καταμυχθεὶς τὴν κνήμην ὑπὸ
 κυνοσβάτου, ἔκτισε τὴν πόλιν.
 Hesych. s. κύναρος: φυτόν τι, καὶ μήποτε ἡ κυνὸσβα-
 τος, διὰ τὸ τραχὺ καὶ ἀκανθῶδες· κύνα γὰρ ξυλίνην τὴν
 κυνὸσβατον ὁ θεὸς λέγει.

¹² See Giesen 1901, 466-468; Oldfather 1908, 426, n. 47; Fowler 2013, 142, n. 70.

¹³ Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Möllendorff (1922, 359) and Martin Hose are more prudent. According to Hose (2002, 216) Lokros' kinship with Opous cannot be harmonised with his alleged kinship with Physkos: this implies that Aristotle was contradicting himself. However, it is important to consider that Pindar (vv. 62-65, see above) claims that Lokros called his son after the father of his wife, Opous, i.e. there are an Opous I and an Opous II.

¹⁴ Momigliano 1945; Wilhelm 1911; Jacoby 1954 *ad Timaios FGtH* 566 F 146; Hughes 1991, 168-169; Ragone 1996; Mari 1997; Redfield 2003, 85-150; Morris 2007; Domínguez Monedero 2008, 326; 2015, 251-252; Champion 2010 *ad BNJ* 566 F 146a; F 146b; Biffis 2014.

Naryx had to send as a tribute to Athena Ilios in Ilios in order to atone for their ancestor Ajax the Lesser's rape of Cassandra.¹⁵ Curiously enough, this tribute was paid by the Lokrians of eastern Lokris, seemingly chiefly by the Opuntians (more precisely, by the family of the Hundred houses) but openly in the name of all the Lokrians, including the Ozolians. In light of this, the fact that the inscription was found in Vitrinitsa makes us realise how important Oiantheia was considered not only from an Ozolian perspective, but also from a Panlokrian one,¹⁶ assuming that the identification of Oiantheia with Vitrinitsa is correct. Beyond the intermittencies that we will analyse below,¹⁷ this also relates to the *longue durée*. Oiantheia is listed among the Lokrian cities by Pseudo-Scylax; and Strabo also considers it as such.¹⁸

2. Oiantheia and the Aitolians: before the Aitolians' control of Ozolian Lokrian cities

Thus, Oiantheia is a city to which the Greeks recognize a strong Lokrian identity. It became Aitolian in the 3rd century BCE.¹⁹ For now, we are not interested in seeing what happens after the expansion of the Aitolians' control of Oiantheia (as of other Ozolian Lokrian cities), nor are we interested in trying to pinpoint the exact moment of this expansion, issues we will deal with later (par. 3 and 4). Instead, we would like to draw attention to the relations between the Aitolians and Oiantheia in the period before this expansion, that is, in the phase that we would call "Lokrian" in Oiantheia. The collaboration with the Aitolians is, in fact, earlier than this expansion, as already Emily Mackil suggested:²⁰ that is, Oiantheia already collaborated with the Aitolians in its Lokrian phase, both politically and economically.

Regarding the political aspect, Thukydides 3.101, i.e. the passage on the so-called "Peloponnesian invasion of Lokris Ozolia" (to put it with Gomme's words)²¹ is significant in this respect. In 426 the Aitolians had asked the Spartans for help against Naupaktos which is in turn supported by the Athenians and this brings the Spartans in Ozolian Lokris. To better assess the Spartan action in Ozolian Lokris and Aitolia as a whole, we must first set it in the broader context of the alliances of the Peloponnesian War: were the Ozolians on the side of the Athenians or on the side of the Spartans? As we will see later, the answer to this question has an impact on their positioning in relation to the Aitolians. However, this question requires in turn the clarification of another problem: at what point do the Ozolian Lokrians join together as a *koinon*? Let's start with the last issue. The terminus *ante quem* of the *koinon* of the Ozolian Lokrians is known to be given by the formula [ἐ]δοξε τῷ κοινῷ τῶν Λοκρῶν τῶν Ἐσ[περι]-[ων] mentioned in an inscription (IG IX 1² 3:665) which was found at Malandrino (ancient Physkeis) and which is dated to the years 360-357 BCE.²² There can be no doubt that earlier joint military actions, such as the participation of the Lokrians (X. *Hell.* 6.5.23; 30) in Epaminondas' first Peloponnesian campaign and in earlier enterprises to be mentioned in the following paragraphs, suggest a capacity for joint military actions prior to 360-357 BCE. Obviously, these examples do not testify to the existence of a *koinon*, but certainly to a certain habit of joint ventures, which seems to have already been established at the beginning of the 4th century.

A look at the previous decades seems to confirm this picture, which we will now analyse in order to answer the question of the Ozolian alliances in the Peloponnesian War and the

¹⁵ Aen. Tact. 31.24; Timaios *FGrH* 566 F 146 (=BNJ 566 F 146a; F 146b) (*ap. schol.* Alex. 1141); Lyk. *Al.* 1141-71; Polyb. 12.5; Kallimachos F 35 Pfeiffer; Apoll. *Bib. Epit.* 6.20-22; Str. 13.1.40 (C600); Plut. *Mor.* 557d; Ael. F. 47 H.

¹⁶ More generally on this Panlokrian perspective: Daverio Rocchi 2013; 2015, 180-182.

¹⁷ *Vid. infra.*

¹⁸ Pseudo-Scyl. 36 Shipley (Μετὰ δὲ Αἰτωλοῦς Λοκροὶ εἰσιν ἔθνος, ἐν οἷς εἰσὶν <οἱ> Ὀζόλαιοι καλούμενοι, καὶ πόλεις αἰδὲ· Εὐάνθεις, Ἀμφισσα); Str. 9.4.8 (Οἰάνθεια δὲ καὶ Εὐπάλιον Λοκρῶν εἰσὶν). See also Steph. Byz. s.v. Οἰάνθη.

¹⁹ More on this expansion: *Vid. infra.*

²⁰ Mackil 2013, 287-88. See also Bonnier 2016, 111.

²¹ Gomme 1962 [1998], 408 *ad* Thuc. 3.101.

²² See Daverio Rocchi 2013, 146; 2015, 191-192. For a different view: Rzepka 2017, chapter I: the mention of the term "koinon", which can have different meanings, should not be overestimated.

above-mentioned Spartan action against Naupaktos. In the famous passage in which Thukydides lists the allies of the two warring powers (2.9), the Lokrians are mentioned on the side of the Spartans. The problem is precisely that there is the generic term “Lokrians”, so it is not clear whether it refers to all Lokrians, only to the eastern, or only to the western (i.e., the Ozolians). Some clue comes to us from Diodoros (12.42.4), who refers to the Lokrian allies of the Spartans as those in front of Euboea and “the Amphissians of the rest” (Λοκροὶ τῶν μὲν πρὸς Εὐβοίαν ἐστραμμένων οἱ πλείους, τῶν δ’ ἄλλων Ἀμφισσεῖς, transl. by C. H. Oldfather) –Amphissa stands, notably, in Ozolian Lokris. And yet this Diodorean information is not decisive because Amphissa famously occupies what has been called a “Sonderstellung”, a special position, in tension between the Phokians, Delphians and Lokrians.²³ According to Lerat, the most plausible picture is that at this stage, i.e. at the outbreak of the conflict, the Ozolian Lokrians are not sided as a whole, while from 425 they are sided collectively with the Athenians.²⁴ This can be inferred from a passage by Thukydides describing Demosthenes the Athenian general’s plan to march “against the Boeotians by way of Ozolian Lokris to Kytinium in Doris, keeping Parnassus on his right until he descended to the Phokians, whom he could force to join him if their ancient friendship for Athens did not, as he anticipated, at once decide them to do so” (Thuc. 3.95):²⁵ Demosthenes could not have thought of passing through Ozolian Lokris if the Ozolians had not been allied or at least well-disposed towards the Athenians, i.e. for reasons similar to those that Thukydides specifies regarding his intention to pass through Phokis as well: their friendship for Athens.²⁶

Before this time, it seems not appropriate to imagine a united front by all the Ozolians, given that the sources report so many peculiar situations (as e.g. Amphissa and Naupaktos).²⁷ Indeed, the very passage from Thukydides on the Peloponnesian invasion of Ozolian Lokris (3.101), seems to suggest that the Ozolian cities at this stage were autonomous in foreign policy:

The army having assembled at Delphi, Eurylochus sent a herald to the Ozolian Lokrians; the road to Naupaktus lying through their territory, and he having besides conceived the idea of detaching them from Athens. [2] His chief abettors in Lokris were the Amphissians, who were alarmed at the hostility of the Phokians. These first gave hostages themselves, and induced the rest to do the same for fear of the invading army; first, their neighbors the Myonians, who held the most difficult of the passes, and after them the Ionians,

²³ Bauer 1907, 41 (using the word “Sonderstellung”); Lerat 1952 II, 57; Daverio Rocchi 2013, 141; 2015, 195.

²⁴ While the Eastern Lokrians may still have been allies of Sparta: see Hornblower 1991, 511 ad Thuc. 3.96.1.

²⁵ Here is the whole passage (3.95.1 Jones-Powell): ὁ δὲ τῶν Μεσσηνίων χάριτι πεισθεὶς καὶ μάλιστα νομίσας ἄνευ τῆς τῶν Ἀθηναίων δυνάμεως τοῖς ἡπειρώταις ξυμμάχοις μετὰ τῶν Αἰτωλῶν δύνασθαι ἂν κατὰ γῆν ἐλθεῖν ἐπὶ Βοιωτοῦς διὰ Λοκρῶν τῶν Ὀζολῶν ἐς Κυτίνιον τὸ Δωρικόν, ἐν δεξιᾷ ἔχων τὸν Παρνασσόν, ἕως καταβαῖναι ἐς Φωκέας, οἱ προθύμως ἐδόκουν κατὰ τὴν Ἀθηναίων αἰεὶ ποτε φιλίαν ξυστρατεύειν ἢ κἂν βία προσαχθῆναι (καὶ Φωκεῦσιν ἦδη ὁμορος ἡ Βοιωτία ἐστίν), ἄρας οὖν ξύμπαντι τῷ στρατεύματι ἀπὸ τῆς Λευκάδος ἀκόντων τῶν Ἀκαρνάνων παρέπλευσεν ἐς Σόλλιον (To this plan Demosthenes consented, not only to please the Messenians, but also in the belief that by adding the Aetolians to his other continental allies he would be able, without aid from home, to march against the Boeotians by way of Ozolian Lokris to Kytinium in Doris, keeping Parnassus on his right until he descended to the Phocians, whom he could force to join him if their ancient friendship for Athens did not, as he anticipated, at once decide them to do so. Arrived in Phocis he was already upon the frontier of Boeotia., transl. by Crawley 1910).

²⁶ Lerat 1952 I, 117; Fragoulaki 2013, 202; 204. It must be admitted, however, that the two cases are analogous but only to a certain extent, since in the case of the Phokians Thukydides refers to a friendship he labels as ancient (whose antiquity, however, does not date back that far: Franchi 2022; 2023), whereas in the case of the Ozolian Lokrians this friendship is quite recent “and not very staunch” (see Gomme 1962 [1998], 403-404 ad Thuc. 3.95.1 [quotation from p. 403]; Hornblower 1991, 511 ad Thuc. 3.96.1). It should also be noted that the fact that both Phokians and Lokrians are allied with Athens does not necessarily imply that they are allied with each other and therefore does not contradict the hostilities between the two witnessed by both Thukydides (5.32.2) and Diodoros (12.80.4) and dated to 421/420. Cf. also Thuc. 3.101.2 (*vid. infra.*) on the fear the Amphissians had of the Phokians in 426, although this information must be assessed in relation to the already mentioned Sonderstellung of Amphissa. See also Gomme 1970 [1998], p. 30 ad Thuc. 5.32.2; Hornblower 2008, p. 76 ad Thuc. 5.32.2 (with further references on the tensions between Phokians and Lokrians); Fragoulaki 2013, 204 with n. 390.

²⁷ See already Lerat 1952 I, 39.

Messapians, Tritaeans, Chalaeanes, Tolophonians, Hessians, and Oeanthians, all of whom joined in the expedition; the Olpaeans contenting themselves with giving hostages, without accompanying the invasion; and the Hyaeans refusing to do either, until the capture of Polis, one of their villages (Crawley 1910).²⁸

Eurylochos is going to intervene at the head of the Spartans and also obtains the support of some Lokrian poleis, and among them Oiantheia is mentioned. The Thukydidean passage is important to our inquiry, especially with regard to the issue of the relations between the Aitolians and the Lokrians, since it implies that some Ozolian cities, including Oiantheia, were closer to the Spartans than to the Athenians (who supported Naupaktos):²⁹ one has to bear in mind that at this stage being close to the Spartans implies being (or at least becoming) close to the Aitolians, who had asked the Spartans for help against the Naupaktians.³⁰ The Spartan-Aitolian-Lokrian collaboration is not surprising, nor is it surprising that the Aitolians who inhabited that part of eastern Aitolia, bordering the Lokrian cities, evidently had a strong common interest with the Lokrians themselves: containing Naupaktos. In fact, this constellation would not be new, both as a whole (i.e. including all three subjects, Spartans, Aitolians and Ozolian Lokrians) and in its possible narrower binary configurations. If Diodoros (14.34.2)³¹ is right in reporting the return of Naupaktos to the Ozolian Lokrians by the Lakedaimonians after the end of the Peloponnesian War,³² this convergence is also attested for the end of the 5th century, and at a significant historical turning point: the redefinition of interstate balance following the Peloponnesian War. What's more, this holds true also for other periods preceding the Aitolian annexation of the territory of the Ozolian Lokrians (end of the 3rd BCE: see below). More generally speaking, whether or not they were responsible for the dispute with the Thebans, then allies of the Athenians in the War of Korinth,³³ the Ozolian Lokrians are mentioned by Xenophon (*Hell.* 4.2.17) as allies of the Spartans in the Battle of Nemea (394 BCE) and probably included among the Lokrians named by Diodoros (15.31.2) as members of the Peloponnesian coalition led by Sparta in an anti-Theban function in the years following the Peace of Antalkidas,³⁴ while we are aware that together with the Aitolians (and with the Phokians) they are allies of Thebes after the Battle of Leuktra (Diod. 15.75 with Daverio Rocchi 2013, 146, cf. also X. *Hell.* 6.5.23). Add to this the fact that the Lokrians (probably both eastern and western) were, like the other peoples of central Greece, allied with the Aitolians in the revolt led by

²⁸ συλλεγέντος δὲ τοῦ στρατεύματος ἐς Δελφοῦς ἐπεκηρυκεύετο Εὐρύλοχος Λοκροῖς τοῖς Ὀζόλαις· διὰ τούτων γὰρ ἡ ὁδὸς ἦν ἐς Ναύπακτον, καὶ ἅμα τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἐβούλετο ἀποστήσai αὐτούς. [2] ξυνέπρασαν δὲ μάλιστα αὐτῶν τῶν Λοκρῶν Ἀμφισσῆς διὰ τὸ τῶν Φωκέων ἔχθος δεδιότες· καὶ αὐτοὶ πρῶτοι δόντες ὁμήρους καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους ἐπεισαν δοῦναι φοβουμένους τὸν ἐπιόντα στρατὸν, πρῶτον μὲν οὖν τοὺς ὁμόρους αὐτοῖς Μυονέας (ταύτη γὰρ δυσσεβολώτατος ἡ Λοκρίς), ἔπειτα Ἰπνέας καὶ Μεσσαπίους καὶ Τριταιέας καὶ Χαλαίους καὶ Τολοφωνίους καὶ Ἰασίους καὶ Οἰανθέας· οὗτοι καὶ ξυνεστράτευον πάντες. Ὀλπαιοὶ δὲ ὁμήρους μὲν ἔδωσαν, ἠκολούθουν δὲ οὐ· καὶ Ὑαῖοι οὐκ ἔδωσαν ὁμήρους πρὶν αὐτῶν εἶλον κώμην Πόλιν ὀνομα ἔχουσαν (ed. Jones-Powell).

²⁹ Lerat 1952 I, 117. Freitag 1999, 102, 108.

³⁰ On the Spartan-Aitolian axis more generally, think also of the inscription first published and edited by Peek 1974, unfortunately difficult to date. Cf. Cartledge 1976; 1978; Kelly 1978; Cozzoli 1985; Sordi 1991; Landucci Gattinoni 2004, 109-110. As I discuss in a forthcoming article, Naupaktos has a similar but different role with regard to the stabilising potential of cross-border activities.

³¹ Λακεδαιμόνιοι δὲ καταλελυκότες τοὺς πολέμους καὶ σχολὴν ἔχοντες ἐστράτευσαν ἐπὶ Μεσσηνίου, ὧν οἱ μὲν ἐν Κεφαλληνίᾳ φρουρίον τι κατέωκον, οἱ δὲ Ναύπακτον ἐν τοῖς προσησπερίοις λεγομένοις Λοκροῖς, δόντων Ἀθηναίων. ἐκβαλόντες δ' αὐτούς ἐκ τῶν τόπων ἀπέδωκαν τὰ φρούρια, τὸ μὲν τοῖς τὴν Κεφαλληνίαν οἰκοῦσι, τὸ δὲ τοῖς Λοκροῖς (And the Lacedaemonians, now that they had brought their wars to an end and were no longer concerned with them, advanced with their army against the Messenians, of whom some were settled in an outpost on Cephallenia and others in Naupactus, which the Athenians had given them, among the western Locrians. Driving the Messenians from these regions, they returned the one outpost to the inhabitants of Cephallenia and the other to the Locrians, transl by Oldfather 1989).

³² It is not easy to reconstruct the chronology of these restitutions, not least because in another passage (15.75) Diodoros relates that Epaminondas also returned Naupaktos to the Lokrians, which at this stage was however held by a garrison of the Achaians; see Franchi forthcoming.

³³ Which caused the latter to break out (as it is well known, *Hell.* Oxy. 21.3 makes one think of the Ozolians, X. *Hell.* 3.5.3-4 of the Opuntians).

³⁴ See already Oldfather 1926, 1202 and Lerat 1952 I, 45.

Leosthenes after the death of Alexander (Diod. 18.9.5 and 11.2; Paus. 1.25.4, both with commentary by Lerat 1952 I, 63).

Regarding the economic aspect, we need to consider the results of the Strouza Region project, a survey of eastern Aitolia by a team of Dutch scholars undertaken in the 1980s. Simon C. Bakhuizen undertook the survey of Velouchovo (Kallipolis, modern Steno)³⁵ in 1976, which in 1981 was transformed, with the collaboration of Sebastiaan Bommelje, into the Strouza Studies Project (1985-1991), extending its interest to the entire eastern part of Aitolia.³⁶ In 1985, the Aitolian Studies Project (1985-1990) was then created by Bommelje himself together with Peter K. Doorn and Joanita A.C. Vroom.³⁷ Attempting to build a picture of the economic pattern of the region as it appeared in the ancient times, the team searched for information about the local economy prior to World War II, when the larger part of the current eparchy of Doris, comprising eastern Aitolia,³⁸ was still almost entirely preindustrial.³⁹ Many of the changes, as e.g. the beginnings of industrialization, left this territory almost unstirred.⁴⁰ The Aitolian cities Kallipolis (= modern Steno), and Aigion (= modern Strouza)⁴¹ acted as an interconnecting hub between the Aitolian hinterland and the Lokrian coastline; Steno was the most important node of the network. They had highly localized economic resources and depended upon exchange with one another.⁴² Communications to the north of Kallipolis were more difficult than southward, also (but not only: see below) because in the north the mountains are higher, the villages lie further apart and less land was cultivated.⁴³ Southward, however, a number of rivers flow together at the Steno Pass acting as connectors and valleys punctuating the mountains environment acted as physical routes.⁴⁴ As a consequence, cities as Kallipolis and Aigion had more exchange with some Lokrian settlements,⁴⁵ esp. with those on the coast like Kallithea, Tol(o)phon, and Panormos. These last ones produced sufficient or surplus quantities of grain and were the only source of surplus olives for the region. The harbours at the coast must have played an especially important role in this respect, both in connection with sailing routes and with the settlements in the hinterland, acting “as recipients and as initiators of communication”.⁴⁶ On the other hand, it is precisely the exchanges with the north, which, however more difficult they may be, still take place (on mountains that can unite rather than divide),⁴⁷ that make this same network make sense from an Aitolian point of view. It should come as no surprise that the Aitolians of the hinterland were encouraged to maintain connections with the Aitolians closer to the coast, who in turn maintained close links with the Lokrian harbours.

Naupaktos is clearly one of the most vital ones, esp. for its closeness to Antirrhium, from where one soon reaches the Peloponnese;⁴⁸ however, its ties with Athens and more generally its history may make an alliance or intense cooperation with it less attractive at certain historical stages. Add to this the fact that from Kallipolis to Naupaktos is about 50 km, i.e. a 12 to 14 h journey and that to

³⁵ On the localisation of ancient Kallipolis in Velovouchos see esp. W. Dittenberger *ad Syll.*³ 919 (cf. *Syll.*³ 369); Sotiriadis 1907, 310; Klaffenbach 1932 (*JG IX* 1², fasc. 1), p. 68; Bakhuizen 1977, 115-7; Herbert – Kase 1977, 114-5; Laffineur 1977, 118; 1978, 845 (=SEG 38.504); 1979, 633-34; 1980, 742-7; Themelis 1979, 249; 1983, 237-44 (and 1998); Zapheirou 1982, 1; Bommelje – Doorn 1984, 277; Funke 1987, 95; Antonetti 1988, 15 n. 6; Themelis 1999, 427-440; Antonetti – Baldassarra 2004, 12-14; D. Rousset in Rousset – Laroche 2006, 282; 2006 (vs. Lerat 1952 I, 77 n.5; Walbank 1979, 84-5).

³⁶ Bommelje – Doorn 1981; 1984; 1985; Doorn 1985.

³⁷ Summary of archaeological campaigns and projects in Antonetti – Baldassarra 2004, esp. 11.

³⁸ Doorn 1985, 276 and fig. 1.

³⁹ Cf. Doorn *et alii* 2016 (DANS).

⁴⁰ Doorn 1985, 278.

⁴¹ Cf. esp. Antonetti 1988, 17.

⁴² See also Kirsten 1983, 361 focusing esp. on the Belesitsa valley, and Bonnier 2016, 34, 44, 277 (fig. 36).

⁴³ Doorn 1985, 290.

⁴⁴ Bonnier 2016, 44.

⁴⁵ The Aitolian-Lokrian border (area) probably ran in the Belesitsa valley, north of the Lokrian villages of Skaloula and Pentapolis: see Bommelje – Doorn 1984; 28 and the remarks by Antonetti 1988, 18.

⁴⁶ Bonnier 2016, 112, 124.

⁴⁷ Horden – Purcell 2000, 82.

⁴⁸ Philippson – Kirsten 1958 II.2, 320-23; Lerat 1952 I, 38-41; Daverio Rocchi 2006, 752; Domínguez Mone-dero 2015, 255; Zachos 2023, 238-239.

reach Naupaktos, one had to cross the Mornos river, which in the absence of bridges is anything but easy to ford (not surprisingly, the river was also called a man-eater).

More attractive could have been four harbours mentioned by the sources further east: (from east to west) Oiantheia itself (on which more below), Phaistinos (Plin. *NH* 4.7, modern Erateini or Kisseli?),⁴⁹ Tol(o)phon (Dion. Per. 66, maybe in the small bay of Hag. Pandes),⁵⁰ and Chaleion (which has two natural harbours divided by a peninsula).⁵¹ It is not negligible that from Kallipolis to Oiantheia, on the other hand, it just takes 30 to 35 km (depending on the identification of the site), so 7-8 h, in contrast to the 14 h from Kallipolis to Naupaktos.⁵² Admittedly, there is no sign of a port (i.e. an artificial harbour provided with infrastructure, according to the recent classification applied by Chiara Maria Mauro to ancient harbours)⁵³ at Oiantheia which was probably located to the east of the ancient settlement in a zone that has been much resettled (modern paralia Tolophonos, between Cape Psaromyta and Erateini)⁵⁴. However, the potential relevance of Oiantheia as a harbour or its maritime activities is supported by at least three arguments, one of a more geographical order, the others of a more evidence-based order. First, the harbour is situated at a break of the maritime façade implying control over a potential entry point.⁵⁵ Second, Oiantheia seems to provide a plausible background of some pieces of literary evidence⁵⁶ as well as of two well-known inscriptions. One of them, found in Kerkyra, was part of the cenotaph of a certain Menekrates of Oiantheia, built by his brother Praximenes.⁵⁷ It is dated between the last quarter of the 7th century and mid-6th century. Menekrates is depicted as proxenos, and despite the arguments that the text and the monument have prompted, the existence of relations of proxenia between Oiantheia and Kerkyra may hint to the fact that the Lokrian city had maritime contacts with the outside worlds (Kerkyra was key to communications with the Adriatic Sea and Magna Grecia).

There is then the treaty between Oiantheia and Chaleion (*IG IX* 1², 3, 717),⁵⁸ dating back to the first half of the 5th century, which regulates the right of reprisal between the inhabitants of the two cities and the judicial procedures to be followed to obtain compensation.⁵⁹ Notoriously, the agreement seeks to prevent looting by the citizens of the two cities while declaring the harbours safe places.⁶⁰

This led some scholars to suggest that it is the very harbour at Oiantheia that must have been valuable for the export of regional surpluses and the import of other commodities discussed

⁴⁹ Lerat 1952 I, 121; Freitag 1999, 105; Zachos 2023, 242.

⁵⁰ Lerat 1952 I, 50; Freitag 1999, 107. See Marcotte 1990, 120. On the Tolphon/Tolophon alternation in the sources see Marek 1984, 186 n. 87.

⁵¹ Domínguez Monedero 2015, 256-7; Petrochilos 2019b, 6, fig. 8 and n. 18 reminding that the inscription on the treaty between Chaleion and Oiantheia “bears an explicit reference to a harbour situated outside the city τὰ ξενικά ἐθαλάσσας ἡγάγεν ἐλπίμενος ἐκτὸς τοῦ κατὰ πόλιν”.

⁵² Leake 1835 II, 594; 598-608; 624.

⁵³ Mauro 2019, esp. 23 (and nr. 125 in the Appendix). She also stresses that in Archaic and Classical Greece artificial structures were far from ubiquitous.

⁵⁴ Doorn 1985, 285. In the absence of thorough excavations, it is difficult to support the hypothesis that the port was in the Gulf of Hagios Nikolaos. See Freitag 1999, 104; Domínguez Monedero 2015, 257; Zachos 2016, 171, map 6:3D, s.v. Oianthea / Oiantheia / Euantheia (the bay of Erateini).

⁵⁵ Bonnier 2016, 47, 112.

⁵⁶ See e.g. Pseudo-Scylax, 36: Μετὰ δὲ Αἰτωλοῦς Λοκροὶ εἰσιν ἔθνος, ἐν οἷς εἰσιν Ὀζόλαι καλούμενοι, καὶ πόλεις αἰδεῖ. Εὐάνθις, Ἀμφισσα. Εἰσὶ δὲ καὶ τοῦτοις πόλεις ἐν μεσογείαι. Παράπλους δ' ἐστὶ τῆς Λοκρῶν χώρας τὸ ἡμισυ ἡμέρας.

⁵⁷ *IG IX* 1² 4, 882 (= *IG IX* 1, 867) (= *LSAG* p. 234 no. 9; Hansen, *CEG* 143; *SEG* 46.615=SEG 44.441). Cf. Lerat 1952 I, 116; Wallace 1970, 190; Bourriot 1976, 246-50; Ecker 1990, 88-110; Mataranga 1994; Van Effenterre – Ruzé 1994, 216-221; Baillard 1995-1996; Freitag 1999, 101; Moggi 2007; Struffolino 2010, 277-79 (with literature); Daverio Rocchi 2015, 183; Domínguez Monedero 2015, 256; Tribulato 2017; D'Amore 2017; Petrochilos 2019a, 54.

⁵⁸ =Tod *GHI* 34= Buck, *Dialects* nr. 58=LSAG² 106, 108 nr. 4a-b, 403 e tav. 15 fig.4=Staatsverträge II nr. 146 (only A)] =Cataldi, *Symbolai* nr. 3 with tabl. II-III=Nomima I nr. 53. See Daverio Rocchi 2015, 193-194.

⁵⁹ Lerat 1952 I, 31-32; Buck 1955, 253-55; Larsen 1968, 54-55; Gauthier 1972, 288-289; Austin – Vidal-Naquet 1977, 146-148; Bravo 1980, 904-907; Domínguez Monedero 2008, 325-26; Papakonstantinou 2012, 96-98, esp. 97; Domínguez Monedero 2015, 326; Zunino 2017; Petrochilos 2019b, 5.

⁶⁰ Freitag 1999, 102.

above, whether they are produced by Aitolian or Lokrian centres. The distinction between the Aitolian and Lokrian regions here is blurred; an economic network that ignores the political border zone has more strength.

Does this economic network play a role in subsequent political events, including the penetration of the Aitolians into Lokris? Does this network have the power to condition the effectiveness of Aitolian actions and more generally of Lokrian-Aitolian integration in the region?⁶¹

3. Cross border cooperation and switching identities

First we have to answer a different question: When does Oiantheia join the Aitolian League?

One might think that the problem should be put in more general terms, namely: when were the Ozolians (or when was the Ozolian koinon) annexed to the Aitolian koinon? Indeed, the Aitolian koinon has existed since the beginning of the 4th century (at the latest).⁶² Yet, the federal perspective should be avoided because the evidence suggests a slow penetration of the Aitolians and a differentiated accession. We know that Philip assigned Naupaktos to the Aitolians in 338.⁶³ This annexation acted as a catalyst for the Aitolian expansion and other Lokrian cities were annexed between 321 and 290.⁶⁴ Three deeds of enfranchisement dating from the first half of the 2nd century (*SGDI* 2070, from Delphi, and *IG IX I* 2 3, 618 and 625, from Naupaktos) mention the Lokrikon telos, i.e. the Lokrian district that includes the Ozolians in a subunit of the Aitolian koinon.⁶⁵ There is then the case of Amphissa which is peculiar. According to Pausanias (10.23.1) at the time of the Celtic invasion at Delphi (279), the inhabitants of Amphissa were independent of both the Phokians and the Aitolians, as Lerat rightly stresses.⁶⁶ In 273 or in nearby years the

⁶¹ The same issues will be addressed with regard to Naupaktos in a forthcoming article.

⁶² The earliest mention of an Aitolian koinon dates back to the year 367 (Rhodes – Osborne, *GHI* 35, ll. 8 and 16-7; below, n. 84): see Funke 2015, 89 with literature. Earlier common political enterprises are well attested: Rzepka 1999 [and, more generally, 2017, chapter I: the term koinon is not unambiguous and therefore its mention should not be overestimated]; Antonetti 2012).

⁶³ See Str. 9.4.7 (C 427); see also Philoch. *FGrH* 328 F 56a-b; Dem. *Or.* 9, 34. Cf. Momigliano 1934, 144, 158 and 162; Schäfer 1859, 483 (= 1886², 559 n. 2); Jacoby 1926-1930 *ad* Theopomp. *FGrH* 115 F 235 a (=Sud. s.v. Φρουρήσεις ἐν Ναυπάκτῳ [φ 742 Adler]) and b; Flacelière 1937, 42; Lerat 1952 II, 54-55; Fabre 1965, 360; Ellis 1976, 196-197; Hammond – Griffith 1979, 508-509; Corsten 1999, 150-151; Marcotte 1986, 170; Bommeleje 1988, 310; Merker 1989, 308-9; Freitag 1999, 87; Grainger 1999, 30-31, 42-44, 87; Landucci Gattinoni 2004, 11-12; Rousset 2004; Shipley 2011, 121 *ad* Pseudo-Scyl. 35; Shipley 2017 *ad* Pseudo-Scyl. 35. Some modern scholars find confirmation of this assignment of Naupaktos by Philip to the Aetolians also in a fragment of Theopompus *FGrH* 115 F 235 a (*ap.* Sud. s.v. Φρουρήσεις ἐν Ναυπάκτῳ [φ 742 Adler]) and b (*ap.* Zenob. 6.33), which came in two different variants, see however the remarks of Bosworth 1976 (followed by Gullath 1982, 131-133 and Mendels 1984, 135-136 as well as Grainger 1999, 41-53) and the general discussion in Landucci Gattinoni 2004, 111-120. See also Merker 1989, 308-311; Sordi 1997, 103, n. 61; Scholten 2000, 13-14.

⁶⁴ Lerat 1952 II, 61-94; Bosworth 1976, 164-81; Grainger 1999, 42-45.

⁶⁵ Sordi 1953, 442-445; Larsen 1968, 197; Corsten 1999, 133-159; Rzepka 2006, 33-45; Mackil 2013, 380-384; Funke 2015, 95-96; Lasagni 2019, 148-59, which is the most recent discussion of the hypothesis of the organisation into tele of the territories annexed to the Aitolian League at a later date (among them, in Ozolian Lokris). *Vid. infra*.

⁶⁶ Less valuable are Lerat's assertions where he infers the unrelatedness of specific Ozolian cities to the Aitolian koinon from the fact that individuals from the aforementioned cities are granted proxenia (e.g. to Aristion Androkleos of Chaleion, cf. *IG IX* 12 1, 5; cfr. Lerat 1952 I, 65; Freitag 1999, 108, n. 570): as we now know, "both the Aitolian League and individual member-states honoured not only citizens of foreign states but also Aitolian citizens with proxenia" (Funke 2015, 104). See also Funke 2015, 104, n. 48: "Until recently, only proxy and citizenship decrees from members of the Aitolian League for recipients outside the league were known. It was therefore questionable if an Aitolian member-state was able to award proxenies to individuals in another Aitolian member-state. But the proxy decrees of the Aitolian city Kallipolis for citizens of various member-states of the Aitolian League published by Rousset 2006: no. 2; 3; 6 (?); 7; 8; 12; 13 (= *SEG* 56.581; 582; 586 (?); 587; 588; 592; 593) indicate that the award of proxenies within the Aitolian League was possible. The awards of *proxenia* and *politeia* by the Aitolian League to citizens of Aitolian member-states on the coast of the Corinthian Gulf (*IG IX* 12 1, 30a; 31d, lines 26-27; 31-32, lines 40-44) need to be re-evaluated in this light. Since Klaffenbach wanted to rule out in principle the award of *proxenia* and *politeia* within the Aitolian League, he posited, in his commentaries to the named inscriptions, a

Aitolians grant the isopoliteia (and enktesis) to Kallia of Amphissa and her three sons (*IG IX 12, 12*): this seems to confirm that Amphissa in that year was still not a member of the Aitolian koinon. In the later part of the 3rd century, on the other hand, Amphissa seems to be Aitolian: it is significant that some coins minted in Amphissa with Aitolian-type symbols date back to those decades.⁶⁷

And Oiantheia? There is one fact that is significant; an inscription from the last quarter of the 3rd century BCE (c. 225–200) mentions inhabitants of Oiantheia acting as guarantors of proxeny decrees to Thermos (*IG IX 1² 31 A ll. 28, 34–38, 40–41*).⁶⁸ Even more important, in these very same decades Oiantheia struck bronze coins displaying Aitolian emblems.⁶⁹ From this time on (at the latest) Oiantheia is Aitolian, as also confirmed by a passage by Polybios (4.57.2: εἰς Οἰάνθειαν τῆς Αἰτωλίας, with reference to the Social War).⁷⁰

What happens after Oiantheia joins the Aitolian koinon confirms the strategic importance of the area. In fact the control of Oiantheia by the Aitolians facilitated military expeditions on and beyond the Corinthian gulf. Think of what Polyb. 4.57.2 tells:

[2] Ἀλέξανδρος δὲ καὶ Δωρίμαχος κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν τοῦτον ἔχοντες πρᾶξιν κατὰ τῆς τῶν Αἰγειρατῶν πόλεως, ἀθροίσαντες τῶν Αἰτωλῶν περὶ χιλίους καὶ διακοσίους εἰς Οἰάνθειαν τῆς Αἰτωλίας, ἥ κεῖται καταντικρὺ τῆς προειρημένης πόλεως,⁷¹ καὶ πορθμεῖα τοῦτοις ἐτοιμάσαντες, πλοῦν ἐτήρουν πρὸς τὴν ἐπιβολήν.

Alexander and Dorimachus at this time having formed a project for surprising Aegeira, had collected about twelve hundred Aitolians at Oiantheia in Aitolia, which is situated just opposite Aegeira, and having provided transports for this force were waiting for favorable weather to cross and make the attack (transl. by Paton 1922).

The framework is the Social War, fought between the Hellenic League and the Aitolians (and Sparta and Elis). To put it with Grainger, “the most powerful enemy of the Aitolian was Macedon, but the key political opponent was Achaia. So the Aitolian plans for the military defence of their lands involved conducting raids into Achaia in which the political object seems to have been to promote the breakup of the league”.⁷² Two attacks were launched and in this passage Polybius describes the second one, by Dorimachos, who traversed from Oiantheia and attacked Aegeira (northern Achaia) while Philipp is about to invade Aitolia. In this case –the year is 219– Oiantheia is the “mustering point of the Aitolian troops headed across the Gulf of Corinth to Aegeira”.⁷³ its strategic function for the Aitolians is quite evident.

temporary independence of these cities from the Aitolian League in the late 3rd and early 3rd centuries BCE. In light of the new inscriptions from Kallipolis, this assumption no longer appears valid”.

⁶⁷ Head *BMC* 8, 13, 1–2; Liampi 1995–1996, 86 with n. 18 and 105 with comments of Rzepka 2006, 109 and Funke 2015, 106–107 (n. 56).

⁶⁸ Cf. Lerat 1952 I, 86.

⁶⁹ Head 1911 [1963], 338; Imhoof-Blumer 1883, 147 no. 69; Liampi 1995–1996, 86; 105 with comments of Rzepka 2006, 109 and Funke 2015, 106–107 (n. 56) (but see above, n. 2).

⁷⁰ See below.

⁷¹ This statement has in some cases (Dodwell 1819 I, 130, e.g.) been used to locate Oiantheia in today's Galaxidi, however, it should be noted with Lerat (1952 I, 206) that Polybius' information in this passage should not be over-emphasised in topographical terms.

⁷² Grainger 1999, 272.

⁷³ Mackil 2013, 288. See Lerat 1952 I, 70. Emily Mackil notes that controlling Oiantheia and generally the other Lokrian settlements on the coast has not only military advantages for the Aitolians as in the case illustrated by Polybius, but also economic advantages. Noting this is certainly important if the focus is the Aitolians' motivation for expanding their control of this area (vs. Scholten 2000, 29–58). It seems quite likely that the passage from Oiantheia to the Achaian coast was a widespread experience, whether hostile or friendly, as is testified to by some two-handled black-painted cups and an oinochoe found on the Lokrian coast (more precisely at Galaxidi) which have some parallels in Achaia (and in Elis) (Themelis 1983, 232–37). Contacts may have existed before, as might be attested by some serpentinite fragments “that are entirely foreign to the local geolithology. The closest area with outcrops of these rocks is found in eastern Aitolia, about 15 km inland from the coast on the opposite side of the Corinthian Gulf (Pe-Piper – Hatzipanagiotou 1993) where some contemporaneous sites are reported (Saranti 2017)”: Xanthopoulou et al. 2022, 19. It should also be noted, however, that there are other plausible provenances of these

It is equally evident that the forms of economic and political cooperation that preceded the Aitolians' effective control of the area enhanced the effectiveness of the Aitolians' exploitation of Oiantheia's strategic position. The collective identity of the inhabitants of Oiantheia was not predominantly an oppositional identity constructed in opposition to the Aitolians, and indeed in certain periods the boundaries between the Aitolian and Lokrian collective identities were not to be perceived as clear-cut, divisive, non-negotiable. Rather, they were unstable. Similar dynamics seem to underpin an epigraph from a period when Oiantheia was no longer controlled by the Aitolians. In a manumission decree of Physkeis (*IG IX* 1², 3, 681 [= Cahen 1898, 357, nr. 2], mid-2nd BCE) the inhabitants of Oiantheia are set against the inhabitants of Oineon, Aitolian, as Lokrians, probably as an outcome of the rearrangements following the battle of Pydna.⁷⁴ To become Lokrian again and be recognized as such, even as opposed to the Aitolians, was possible because the sense of Lokrian identity had most likely remained active during the Aitolian phase. Why? Maybe because it was not necessary to choose once and for all between a Lokrian and an Aitolian identity. Instability and flexibility of identity made it possible, on the one hand, to reinforce more cooperative than oppositional attitudes towards the Aitolians and, on the other hand, to emphasize one ethnic identity to the detriment of the other in specific historical phases when this was necessary.

It is perhaps difficult for our modern sensibilities shaped by nation-states and the borders that divide them to think that an ethnic identity in a borderland could temporarily fade in favour of the conqueror's ethnic identity. One of many possible examples is the identity of the German-speaking population living in South Tyrol, a territory annexed to Italy after the First World War by the Treaty of St. Germain. In South Tyrol, public discourse has always been dominated by discourses on ethnic identity: in fact, two of the three most represented language groups in the territory, Italians and Germans, are often referred to as the Italian ethnic group and the German ethnic group. More than a century after annexation (which had dramatic consequences, especially during the fascist era), integration is still far off.⁷⁵ Germans and Italians attend different schools, where teaching is in Italian or German, respectively; public employment posts are allocated by competitive examination but on the basis of an ethnic proportional principle based on periodic ethnic censuses; even the world of associations (sporting, cultural, recreational) tends to be separated by language groups

very fragments: serpentinite is present in Sousaki, in the Korinthian region (Antoniadis – Kabbadas 2017). On the other hand, these contacts might have been alluded to, albeit rather indirectly and for a later period, by a passage from Polyainos (8.46), who in his *Strategemata* tells of a certain Phrikodemos, tyrant of Oiantheia, who around the middle of the 4th century (in 373, when Helike was engulfed in the sea after an earthquake as a punishment for their impiety: cf. Str. 8.7.1-2 [κατεκλύσθη δ' ἡ Ἐλίκη δυσὶν ἔτεσι πρὸ τῶν Λευκτικῶν]; Paus. 7.7.2; see Katsonopoulou 2002, 176; 2005; Soter – Katsonopoulou 2011, 584 with further sources; Katsonopoulou – Katsarou 2017), allegedly persecuted a girl named Themistho, daughter of Crithon of Oiantheia, "guilty" of refusing the hand of one of the tyrant's sons. Themistho is said to have fled by sea to the Achaian Helike from Oiantheia, in whose sanctuary of Poseidon she is said to have found refuge. Subsequently, another son of the tyrant would have gone to Helike to demand the surrender of Themistho. The inhabitants of Helike would deliver her- and this is the impious act that would have triggered the earthquake according to Strabo- but on the way back the ship would be stranded by a storm. We cannot exclude (nor go so far as to suggest) that Helike represents the Achaians, and thus presupposes a precise feature of the relations between the Achaians and Oiantheia. In this regard, it is worth remembering, perhaps, that for the sources, before it was destroyed by the earthquake Helike was most probably the seat of the Achaian assemblies (Aymard 1938, 277-293; Morgan – Hall 1996, 196; Walbank 2000, 26; Redfield 2003, 243-5; Hall 2015, 42) and on the other hand it is equally worth bearing in mind that it is also as a consequence of a refusal to obey the Achaians, who suggested to Helike that it should give the statue of Poseidon or at least the plan of the temple to the Ionians who requested it, that the impious Helike is punished (Str. 8.7.2; Diod. 15.48.3; 49.1-4; Paus. 7.7.2; 24.6). See also Anderson 1954, 81 and, more generally, Lerat 1952 I, 45-6 and Freitag 1999, 102-3.

⁷⁴ Wilhelm 1909, nr. 124; Daux *ad FD III* 3 p. 40 n. 2; Daux 1932, 319-320; Lerat 1952 I, 97 and 99.

⁷⁵ Just to cite a recent case, according to an Ansa report later confirmed in Brixen on 16 January 2024, an Italian boy was beaten up by some German youths who allegedly addressed him with the term "Dreckwalscher", i.e. "dirty Italian": https://www.ansa.it/sito/notizie/topnews/2025/01/15/bastardo-italiano18enne-picchiato-da-sudtirolesi-a-bressanone_20d28ec5-2e9e-4ae2-856f-a1878b49b88e.html. On the other hand, sometimes nostalgic claims of the fascist era by Italians under the slogan 'But here we are in Italy' are not uncommon.

(or ethnic groups, to use the emic term). The local German-language press devotes one space to events that took place in South Tyrol and another to those that took place in Italy (as if South Tyrol were not part of it); in the German-language news, the term “Italiener” recurs to designate those who live south of Salorno, where the border between South Tyrol and Trentino runs. The South Tyrolean identity, it could be said, was strengthened after annexation, and its markers were cultivated and emphasised, first and foremost the South Tyrolean dialect, not infrequently spoken on public occasions and even in schools.

This does not seem to have been the case of Ozolian Lokrians, esp. of Oiantheians, for whom identities are more flexible and switching them was easier. What makes it easier are a complex of strategies and dynamics in which cross-border activities play a primary role.

4. Borderising Oiantheia

Indeed, in addition to the forms of political and economic cooperation prior to the Aitolian control of the area highlighted by Emily Mackil, other strategies are recognisable. As we shall see, integration and cooperation between the Aitolians and Lokrians is fostered in particular (but, it is to be expected, not only) by two strategies that could be described as top down and by a bottom up factor. It is by looking at them as a whole that we are able to grasp the effectiveness of potentially stabilising integration mechanisms in areas close to the border.

Regarding the first strategy, it is a top-down institutional mechanism put in place by the Aitolians to structure the new territories and integrate them into the system, thus facilitating their management in administrative terms. I am referring to the so-called Lokrikon telos, a Lokrian district whose characteristics are still being debated.⁷⁶ As is well known, we have evidence of Aitolian districts (telos): the Stratikon telos⁷⁷ and the Lokrikon Telos.⁷⁸ In the current state of knowledge, it is not easy to determine whether the organisation into tele covered the whole of Aitolia, as Larsen and Corsten⁷⁹ thought, or only the later annexation territories (as in the case of the only two attested tele),⁸⁰ nor is this decisive for our argument. In both hypotheses, the Aitolians' ability and pragmatism in favouring integration and facilitating the organisation of the new territories is evident. It appears that the tele had military and fiscal functions, and it is not ruled out, though far from certain, that they expressed one or more councillors for the central council. If this were true, it would be a particularly concrete way of involving local structures in central government. But beyond this, the districts could certainly have been a way adopted by the Aitolians to meet the local identity needs of the new ethnic groups that came into the Aitolian sphere of control on a more symbolic level.⁸¹

This leads us to the second strategy, whose symbolic core is far more pronounced. We must return to an issue we addressed at the beginning of this article: the genealogies of Lokros, the eponymous hero of the Lokrians. At some point, at the latest in the 4th century, and certainly also in the 4th century, the Lokrians or Aitolians or both imagined Lokros to be related to the eponymous hero of the Aitolians, Aitolos.

Indeed, according to Plutarch (*Q.Gr.* 15) Lokros is son of Physkos (who is in turn son of Amphiktyon);⁸² this very Physkos is, according to a lemma by Stephanos of Byzantium (s.v. Φύσκος),

⁷⁶ Flacelière 1937, 120; Lerat 1952 II, 66, 117; Scholten 2000, 63-66; Moreno Hernández – Pascual Valderrama 2013, 531-2; Funke 2015, 96, 115.

⁷⁷ *IG IX* 1² 1, 3B, I. 2 (235-232 BCE c.): Στρατικού τέλεος.

⁷⁸ *SGDI* II, 2070, II. 1-3 and *SGDI* II, 2139, II. 1-2 (both 189/8 BCE). Cf. also *IG IX* 1² 3, 618, II. 1-2 (200-180 BCE): τ[οῦ Λο]κ[ρικου] τέλεος and *IG IX* 1² 3, 625a, I. 1 (c. 200-180 BCE [a]): [τοῦ Λοκρικου] τέλεος if the integrations are right. The existence of a dorikon telos is more debated: see Funke 1997, 180-181 n. 53; 2015, 96 n. 25 (vs. Lasagni 2019, 154-9) discussing Bousquet 1988, 12-53 (ed. pr.) = *SEG* 38.1476.

⁷⁹ Larsen 1968, 197-198; Sordi 2002 (= 1953), 53-55 (more cautious); Corsten 1999, 133-159; Mackil 2013, 380-384 and 488-489 (more cautious).

⁸⁰ Grainger 1999, 180-181; Funke 2015, 96 and 115; Lasagni 2019, 147-59.

⁸¹ See more generally Scholten 2000, 64.

⁸² Plutarch. *q.Gr.* 15: Φύσκου τοῦ Ἀμφικτύωνος υἱὸς ἦν Λοκρός, ἐκ δὲ τούτου καὶ Καβύης Ὀπποῦς Ὀπου is son of Kabye and Lokros who is son of Physkos, who is son of Amphiktyon (transl by the author). See esp. Anto-

son of Aitolos (who is in turn son of Amphiktyon).⁸³ Both passages, the one by Plutarch and the one by Stephanos, are to be traced back to Aristotle (respectively, fr. 561 Rose, ll. 5-6= fr. 572 Gigon and fr. 560 by Rose, under fr. 571 by Gigon; Stephanos' passage maybe through a *Mittelquelle*, the *Periodos ghes* by Ps. Skymnos, as Marcotte assumes).⁸⁴ This gives reason to believe that in the second half of the 4th century, the belief circulated that Lokros and Aitolos were related; indeed, that Aitolos was Lokros' father, as I have argued in an article about Lokros' genealogies.⁸⁵

But there is more: on the one hand, the two passages contradict each other; on the other, they lend themselves to a joint reading. They contradict each other because in Plutarch's passage Physkos, the father of Lokros, is the son of Amphiktyon, while in Stephanos' passage Physkos is the grandson of Amphiktyon, who is the father of Aitolos, who is the father of Physkos.

However, they lend themselves to a conjoint reading insofar as they are both traceable to the intention of making Lokros and Aitolos relatives, who in turn are made relatives of Amphiktyon. At stake is the desire to integrate the Lokrians among the Aitolians under the aegis of Delphi⁸⁶ and this is consistent with well-known dynamics happening in Central Greece in these very decades:

netti 1994; Antonetti 2012, 181 and n. 49; Daverio Rocchi 2013, 142-143; 2015, 179-180; Funke 2015, 91.

⁸³ Steph. Byz. s.v. Φύσκος ed. Billerbeck-Neumann-Hartmann: πόλις Λοκρίδος, ἀπὸ Φύσκου τοῦ Αἰτωλοῦ Ἀμφικτύωνος τοῦ Δευκαλίωνος (...) Φύσκος δὲ <...> ἀφ' οὗ οἱ Λέλεγες οἱ νῦν Λοκροὶ (...): "Physkos: polis in Lokris, from the name of Physkos, son of Aitolos, son of Amphiktyon, son of Deukalion (...) Physkos (...) from whom came the Leleges who are now called Lokroi" (transl. by the author). For a more detailed discussion, see Franchi 2020, 148-151 with sources and literature.

⁸⁴ In his comment on F 13 by Hekataios and by dealing with the Deukalionidai stemmata, Jacoby argues that both Stephanos and the Lokrian verses of the *Periodos ges* go back to Ephoros, without stating the arguments for this attribution. In her recent comment on this Frances Pownall (*BNJ* 1 F 13) does not address this issue.

⁸⁵ Franchi 2020 with literature. However, it should not be overlooked that the issue is very complex. I discussed it in my article on the genealogies of Lokros (2020, 148-151), here I simply summarise it. Αἰτωλοῦ in Stephanos of Byzantium's text, which is embraced by Rose and Gigon in their edition of Aristotle's fragments as well as by Meineke in his edition of Stephanos, is questioned by Didier Marcotte (2000 I, cxxix-cxxx, 91, 127, 219-220), who deals with this passage in his edition of Pseudo-Skymnos, whose *Periodos ges* is often drawn on by Stephanos (Marcotte 2000, cxxvii-cxxxix). Indeed, in the only known codex where this part of the *Periodos ges* is given (i.e. D = Parisinus suppl. gr. 443, a corpus of writings dating back to the 13th century collected by the author of one of them, Marcian of Heraclea, writing in the 2nd BCE: see Marcotte 2000, xix-xliv), it reads that father (or "foregoer", depending on the meaning of εἴρα) of Physkos (and son of Amphiktyon) is a Ἰτωλος (v. 590): a vox *nihili* which was always amended as Αἰτωλός based on Stephanos' lemma (Meineke 1849; Müller GGM I ([1855, ad I; Wilamowitz-Möllendorff 1922, 359; Daux 1957, 98; Uhl 1963, 42; in his editio princeps of Stephanos David Höschel suggested to correct Αἰτωλός even before D was discovered (he read v, an apocryph reading Ἰτωλος]). Didier Marcotte, followed by Martin Korenjak (2017 ad I.), amends instead as Ἰτωνός. Itonos is the father (Pausanias 9.1.1; 9.34.1) or the son (Diod. 4.67) of Boiotos, and also the son of Amphiktyon (Paus. 5.1.4). Given that also according to Stephanos (s.v. Boiotia ed. Billerbeck) Itonos is the son of Amphiktyon, Marcotte infers that Stephanos, too, must have written Ἰτωλος instead of Αἰτωλός, probably because he directly accessed the archetype of D, i.e. μ, where there was already this mistake. As I argued elsewhere (2020, 149) Itonos is an attractive correction, since he is cited by Simonides the genealogist (*BNJ* 8 F 1, 5th BCE? See Paradiso 2017 and Fowler 2013: 729-30); and by Armenidas (*FGrH* 378 F 1), one of the authors of *Thebaika*, also dating back to the 5th century BCE as well as by Alexander Polyhistor (*BNJ* 273 F 97, 1st BCE) and by Pausanias (Paus. 5.1.4; 9.1.1; 34.1). Since Armenidas seems to have only written about Theban issues, we can assume that his reference to Itonos is also related to Boiotia, maybe with an event mentioned in Theban legend. There is one more strong argument supporting Marcotte's emendation: the internal consistency in the *Ethnika*. Stephanos would have written that Aitolos is the son of Amphiktyon s.v. Boiotia, and that he is the father of Physkos s.v. Physkos; yet this last lemma most probably depends on vv. 587-90 of the *Periodos ges*, where Aitolos is the son of Endymion (473-7), and not of Amphiktyon, a contradiction that Stephanos should have noticed. On the other hand, one cannot neglect that all the three major manuscripts of Stephanos (Rehdigeranus, Vossianus, and Parisiensis) do actually read Αἰτωλοῦ. What's more, one cannot neglect that the Aitolians' conquest of part of Central Greece, which was gradual, especially in Ozolian Lokris (Lerat 1952 II, chap. VI), began precisely in the second half of the 4th century, when they came to control some Ozolian Lokrian cities after many decades of pressure (Oldfather 1926, 128-19; t.a.q. for the Aitolian koinon is 367, when an Athenian inscription cites it [Rhodes – Osborne, *GHI* 35, ll. 8 and 16-7]: see Funke 2015, 89; previous common politics of the Aitolians should not be dismissed: Rzepka 1999; Antonetti 2012).

⁸⁶ The stemma Amphiktyon-(A)itolos-Physkos-Lokros seems consistent with the Aitolians' control of the Amphiktyony after the Galatian invasion (see Lerat 1952 II, 64).

the Aitolians' control of Delphi after the defeat of the invading Galatians, and their control of Ozolian Lokris starting from the reign of Demetrius II.⁸⁷

This desire for integration is not simply reflected in genealogical manipulation, it is instead constructed through genealogical manipulation, which proves to be a useful tool for cross-border integration. That the Ozolian Lokrians (and not just the Lokrians, or the Opuntian) are thought of above all is confirmed by this very passage of Plutarch, who after describing the genealogy of Physkos tells that Lokros is said to have founded some cities located in Ozolian Lokris on the orders of the oracle: τὰς ἄλλας [i.e. πόλεις] ὅσας οἱ κληθέντες Ὀζόλαι Λοκροὶ κατώκησαν. Two cities are mentioned explicitly, and the choice is not random: they are Physkeis, one of the most important cities for the Ozolians,⁸⁸ and, what interests us most, Oiantheia itself. One of the sources that establishes a kinship between Lokros and Aitolos emphasises, in the story, Oiantheia, a city whose Lokrian identity was itself emphasised by being mentioned, in the same passage, as the foundation by Lokros. Oiantheia is proposed, together with Physkeis, simultaneously as a symbol of Lokrian identity and as a symbol of Aitolian integration. And perhaps this is no coincidence: precisely because Oiantheia has been made and thus was considered particularly representative of Lokrian identity, it lends itself, when put in relation to the Aitolians (with Aitolos), to becoming a vector of Lokrian integration.

To these two strategies must be added a factor that can potentially be turned into an element of a strategy: the factor at issue is precisely the phenomena of informal cross-border cooperation highlighted in the previous paragraph. Cross-border cooperation has attracted increasing attention from scholars focusing on dynamics of territorialisation and management of political communities that are members of supra-state organisations. Central to these studies is often the analysis of the phenomena of territorial convergence between the two sides of borders,⁸⁹ which are triggered by more or less informal forms of cross border cooperation and are of crucial importance in the investigations on contemporary supranational spatial planning processes. Territorial convergence is understood as the reduction of differences between integrating interconnected but separate spatial entities. It seems to me that territorial convergence can also be considered operative for classical studies for at least two reasons. Firstly, the fact that territorial convergence is considered to build on the mostly functional dimension of cross-border flows and interactions initiated by individuals having diverse roles and various collective actors as well as on more institutionalised forms of cross-border cooperation;⁹⁰ secondly, that it can be both structural (in terms of urbanisation, economic activity and social composition) as well as ideational. This ideational dimension is connected to the collective perceptions and representations that border societies have of the neighbouring foreign societies as well as of themselves in relations to these neighbouring societies; these representations sometimes lead to the construction of a common sense of belonging which is transborder.⁹¹

⁸⁷ Lerat 1952 II, 75-77 and 95-96 (to the point that the names Lokris and Lokrians are no longer to be found in the sources and the manumission decrees were dated using the name of the Aitolian *strategos* until 166/5, cf. e.g. *FD* III 3, 54, while until the end of the 2nd century BCE, some cities of Ozolian Lokris were still considered Aitolian, see also Franchi 2020, 159-60).

⁸⁸ Given that Physkeis is not mentioned in the famous list of cities of Ozolian Lokris by Thukydides (3.101), that the first inscriptions mentioning Physkeis/Physkos date back to the first half of the 2nd BCE (see e.g. *I. Magnesia* 31; *IG* IX 1³: 671; 678; *SGDI* 1842; 1851; 1854, with Lerat 1952 II, 49 and Rousset 2006 for further inscriptions) and that the oldest datable remains of Malandrino, the modern settlement on the site of the ancient Physkeis/Physkos (see e.g. *IG* IX 1¹ 349-50 = *IG* IX 1² 672 with Lerat 1952 I, 77), date back to the Classical Period (it has to be admitted, however, that some fortifications are still undated: Lerat 1952 I, 123-37; Rousset 2004), it is safe to assume that Physkeis became important in the Classical Period (at the latest). Its importance grows in the centuries to follow, as seem to be testified by the fact that it was considered the most important city of the Ozolian Lokrian federation after 167 BCE (*IG* IX 1² 3: 667) as well as by the very passage by Plutarch (*Q.gr.* 15).

⁸⁹ De Boe – Grasland – Healy 1999.

⁹⁰ Engl – Mitterhofer 2016, 25-28.

⁹¹ Durand – Decoville 2020, 107.

It is no coincidence that the European Union has, for some years now, begun to value these phenomena of territorial convergence. The latter is in fact recognised as a powerful tool for cross-border cooperation and thus for cohesion between EU members, and cohesion has been among the EU's objectives since its foundation.⁹² Territorial convergence is valorised to the point of being institutionalised through the creation of a legal instrument, the European Groupings of Territorial Cooperation (EGTCs).⁹³ EGCTs were set up in 2006 in order "to enable cross-border cooperation approaches to reach a new level, by creating supranational institutional structures with legal personality and their own financial and human resources".⁹⁴ They are meant both to institutionalise existing cross-border cooperation phenomena⁹⁵ and to foster the emergence of new forms of cross-border territoriality, that is EGCT are at the same time a result and a means of cross border cooperation.⁹⁶ The latter is seen as an opportunity for border territories: it can "aim to find win-win partnerships between regions, in particular to transform a border into a possibility of development".⁹⁷ The border position of neighbouring regions is no more a weakness since they are transformed in interfaces,⁹⁸ that is they are cross-borderised. To achieve this effect previous social or economic relationships are reactivated. It is these relationships, therefore, that, beyond any form of contemporary institutionalisation that can enhance and further incentivise them, are the real heart of the matter. They can become a means of cohesion between members of a supra-state body.

Exactly this is, it seems to me, the dynamic that we record with regard to the relations between the south-eastern Aitolians and the Lokrians of Oiantheia.

5. Conclusions

As seen above, Oiantheia is a city with an outlet to the sea and most probably a harbour that played a primary role in Oiantheia's relations with neighbouring towns and ethne. One cannot fail to notice that the ancient Greeks and probably the Lokrians themselves and the Oiantheis in particular perceived the strong Lokrian identity of the city: it is among the few foundations of the eponymous hero Lokros that the sources on Lokros make explicit. On the other hand, the very fact that it is necessary to emphasise the Lokrian identity of Oiantheia raises the suspicion that it was not so strong or at least not so stable in the 4th century, the period to which the above-mentioned traditions date, and indeed needed to be stabilised through genealogical and foundation stories. It had to be stabilised because by its very nature it was negotiable in both Lokrian and Aitolian terms. An analysis of the city's political and economic relations indicates, not surprisingly, that the ties with the Aitolian cities located in eastern Aitolia, close to the "border" with the Ozolian Lokrians, were very important. The Aitolian and Lokrian cities in that area had converging interests, and on several levels. On the political level, in certain historical phases the need to unite against

⁹² Engl – Mitterhofer 2016, 28.

⁹³ Engl 2013; Engl – Mitterhofer 2016, 13 and n. 13, 14-16 (see esp. Regulation 1082/2006 and subsequent amendments [1302/2013]).

⁹⁴ Durand – Decoville 2020, 104. See also De Sousa 2013.

⁹⁵ The institutional setup of an EGCT must be composed at least by an assembly made up of representatives of the EGTC members and a director representing the EGTC and acting on its behalf. Just to give an example, the specific EGCT "European Region Tyrol-South Tyrol-Trentino is made by an assembly consisting of 12 members (main tasks: establish the EGTC's guidelines and monitor the achievement of its objectives; adopt internal rules of procedure; decide on resolution, inclusion of new members or amendments on the convention and the statute), a 3-members-board (main tasks: decide on the annual work programme of the EGTC; adopt the annual and multiannual budget; define the annual financial contribution by the EGTC), a president (main tasks: chairing board and assembly; setting the agenda of their meetings; external representation of the EGTC; preparing the annual work programme; proposing annual and multiannual budget), a general secretary (main tasks: organizing meetings of the board and of the assembly; proposing their agenda; ensuring their decisions are carried out) and a council of auditors (whose main task concerns economic and financial control). See Engl – Mitterhofer 2016, 23-25.

⁹⁶ Decoville – Durand – Sohn – Walther 2013.

⁹⁷ Durand – Decoville 2020, 105. See also Stubb 2011.

⁹⁸ Decoville – Durand – Feltgen 2015.

Naupaktos emerges from the sources; on the economic level, the need to exchange locally and regionally as well as to circulate surplus goods interregionally.

The scarcity of sources on Oiantheia and in general on the centres involved in this network of political and economic cooperation does not allow us to grasp the intensity of these cross-border activities. Its relevance can, however, at least partly be reconstructed indirectly from the flexibility of local and regional identities and the possibility of switching from one regional identity to another over time, as evidenced by the alternation of ethnonyms combined with 'of Oiantheia' in epigraphs. These cross-border activities seem to be part of a broader framework of integration strategies and dynamics that can account for the Aitolian-Lokrian integration in the area. On the one hand, the Aitolian koinon set in motion top-down strategies of institutional integration through the creation of tele for the territories of subsequent acquisition; on the other hand, it contributed to manipulating (again in a top-down form, probably through co-construction mechanisms elaborated in Aitolian and Lokrian erudite and elite circles) the symbolic plane by contributing to the adaptation of Aitolian and Lokrian genealogies, which became kin (a kinship that is declined in an Ozolian key). The success of these strategies most likely depended on an effective exploitation of political cross border cooperation and economic interdependencies. In the case of the latter this exploitation was probably much more market-driven, rather than policy-driven, but may nevertheless have also been used ex post in a broader context of the expansion and integration policies that are one of the keys to the success of the Aitolian koinon.

6. Bibliography

- Anderson, John K. (1954): "A Topographical and Historical Study of Achaea", *The Annual of the British School of Athens* 49, 72-92.
- Antonetti, Claudia
 (1988) "Problemi di geografia storica del territorio etolo-acarnano: appunti sulla base di nuove testimonianze epigrafiche", [in] Pietro Janni – Eugenio Lanzillotta (eds.), *ΓΕΟΓΡΑΦΙΑ. Atti del secondo Convegno maceratese su geografia e cartografia antica (Macerata, 16-17 aprile 1985)* (=Atti di convegni 7; Pubblicazioni della Facoltà di lettere e filosofia dell'Università degli studi di Macerata 45), Roma, 11-38.
 (1994): "Strabone e il popolamento originario dell'Etolia", [in] Anna Maria Biraschi (ed.), *Strabone e la Grecia*, Napoli, 119-136.
 (2012): "Aitolos and Aitolia: Ethnic Identity per imagines", [in] Margit Offenmüller (ed.), *Identitätsbildung und Identitätsstiftung in griechischen Gesellschaften (Vorträge gehalten im Rahmen eines Symposiums von 28-29. Jänner 2010, Graz: Grazer Universitätsverlag)*, Graz, 183-200.
- Antonetti, Claudia – Baldassarra, Damiana (2004): "Aggiornamento archeologico-epigrafico e nuove prospettive di ricerca per l'Etolia e l'Acarnania", *Epigraphica* 66, 9-35.
- Antoniadis, Demetrios – Kabbadas, Iason (2017): *Ορυκτολογική Μελέτη των πετρωμάτων στην περιοχή Σουσάκι*, Athens.
- Austin, Michel – Vidal-Naquet, Pierre (1977): *Economic and Social History of Ancient Greece*, Berkeley.
- Aymard, André (1938): *Les assemblées de la Confédération achainne. Étude critique d'institutions et d'histoire* (=Bibliothèque des universités du Midi 21), Bordeaux.
- Baillard, Michel (1995-1996): "Le tombeau de Ménékratès: ombres et lumières", *Verbum* 18, 227-237.
- Bakhuizen, Simon C. (1977): "Veloukhovo-Kallipolis 1988: a Fieldwork report", *Newsletter of the Netherlands Institute at Athens* 2, 3-6.
- Bauer, Edmund (1907): *Untersuchungen zur Geographie und Geschichte der nordwestlichen Landschaften Griechenlands*, Halle.
- Beck, Hans – Funke, Peter (eds.) (2015): *Federalism in Greek Antiquity*, Cambridge.

- Biffis, Giulia (2014): "Licofrone: tra parola poetica e realtà storica come memoria di guerra", [in] Elena Franchi – Giorgia Proietti (eds.), *Guerra e memoria nel mondo antico* (=Quaderni 6), Trento, 211-226.
- Bommeljé, Sebastiaan – Doorn, Peter K. (eds.)
 (1981): *Strouza Region Project. An Historical-Topographical Fieldwork. First*, Utrecht.
 (1984): *Strouza Region Project. An Historical-Topographical Fieldwork. Second*, Utrecht.
 (1985): *Strouza Region Project. An Historical-Topographical Fieldwork. Third*, Utrecht.
 (1987): *Aetolia and the Aetolians. Towards the Interdisciplinary Study of a Greek Region* (=Studia Aetolica 1), Utrecht.
 (1988): "Aeolis in Aetolia", *Historia* 37, 297-316.
- Bosworth, Albert B. (1976): "Early Relations between Aetolia and Macedon", *American Journal of Ancient History* 1, 164-181.
- Bourriot, Felix (1976): *Recherches sur la nature du genos. Études d'histoire sociale athénienne. Période archaïque et classique*, Paris.
- Bousquet, Jean (1988): "La stèle des Kyténiens à Xanthos de Lycie", *Revue des études grecques* 101, 12-53.
- Bravo, Benedetto (1980): "Sulân. Représailles et justice privée contre des étrangers dans les cités grecques", *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa*, ser. 3, 10/3, 675-987.
- Buck, Carl D. (1955): *The Greek Dialects. Grammar, Selected Inscriptions, Glossary*, Chicago.
- Cahen, Émile (1898): "Inscription de Locride et d'Étolie", *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique* 22, 354-361.
- Cartledge, Paul
 (1976): "A New 5th Century Spartan Treaty", *Liverpool Classical Monthly* 1, 87-92.
 (1978): "The New 5th century Spartan Treaty again", *Liverpool Classical Monthly* 3, 189-190.
- Cataldi, Silvio (1983): *Symbolai e relazioni tra le città greche nel V secolo a.C. Introduzione, edizione critica, traduzione, commento e indici* (=Relazioni interstatali nel mondo antico 4), Pisa.
- Chamoux, François – Lerat, Lucien (1947): "Voyage en Locride occidentale", *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique* 71-72, 47-80.
- Champion, Craig B. (2010): "Timaios (566)", [in] Ian Worthington (ed.), *Jacoby Online. Brill's New Jacoby. Part III*, Leiden (http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1873-5363_bnj_a566).
- Corsten, Thomas (1999): *Vom Stamm zum Bund: Gründung und territoriale Organisation griechischer Bundesstaaten* (=Studien zur Geschichte Nordwest-Griechenlands 4), München.
- Cozzoli, Ugo (1985): "Sul nuovo documento di alleanza tra Sparta e gli Etolì", [in] Fulvio Mario Broilo (ed.), Xenia. *Scritti in onore di Piero Treves* (=La fenice 3), Roma, 67-76.
- Cramer, John A. (1828): *A Geographical and Historical Description of Ancient Greece*, II, Oxford.
- Crawley, Richard (1910): *Thucydides. History of the Peloponnesian War*, London.
- D'Amore, Lucia (2017): "Lesteia e nauagia: le paure dell'uomo greco sui mari", [in] Laura Chioffi – Mika Kajava – Simo Örmä (eds.), *Il Mediterraneo e la storia II. Naviganti, popoli e culture ad Ischia e in altri luoghi della costa tirrenica* (=Acta Instituti Romani Finlandiae 45), Roma, 193-211.
- Daux, Georges
 (1932): "Notes Étoliennes", *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique* 56, 313-330.
 (1936): *Pausanias à Delphes*, Paris.
 (1957): "Remarques sur la composition du Conseil amphictionique", *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique* 81, 95-120.
- Daverio Rocchi, Giovanna
 (2006): "Oianthea", [in] Hubert Cancik – Helmuth Schneider – Manfred Landfester (eds.), *Der Neue Pauly* (http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1574-9347_dnp_e828860).
 (2013): "Ethnic Identity, Cults and Territorial Settlement: East and West Lokrians", [in] Peter Funke – Matthias Haake (eds.), *Greek Federal States and Their Sanctuaries. Identity and Integration*, Stuttgart, 139-161.
 (2015): "The Lokrians and Their Federal Leagues", [in] Beck – Funke (eds.) 2015, 179-98.

- De Boe, Philippe – Grasland, Claude – Healy, Adrian (1999): *Spatial Integration. Study Programme on European Spatial Planning Strand 1.4, Final Report*, Stockholm.
- De Sousa, Luis (2013): "Understanding European Cross-border Cooperation: a Framework for Analysis", *Journal of European Integration* 35/6, 669-87.
- Decoville, Antoine – Durand, Frédéric – Feltgen, Valérie (2015): *Opportunities of Cross-border Cooperation between Small and Medium Cities in Europe*, Luxembourg.
- Decoville, Antoine – Durand, Frédéric – Sohn, Christophe – Walther, Olivier (2013): "Comparing Cross-border Metropolitan Integration in Europe: Towards a Functional Typology", *Journal of Borderlands Studies* 28/2, 221-237.
- Dodwell, Edward (1819): *A Classical and Topographical Tour through Greece during the Years 1801, 1805 and 1806*, I, London.
- Domínguez Monedero, Adolfo
 (2006): "Locrios y mesenios: de su cohabitación en Naupacto a la fundación de Mesene. Una aproximación al estudio de la Diáspora y el 'retorno' de los Mesenios", *Polis. Revista de ideas y formas políticas de la antigüedad clásica* 18, 39-74.
 (2008): "Ethnos, koinon and polis among the Locrians", [in] Mario Lombardo (ed.), *Forme sovrapoleiche e interpoleiche di organizzazione nel mondo greco antico. Atti del Convegno Internazionale. Lecce, 17-20 settembre 2008*, Galatina, 322-34.
 (2010): "La organización simbólica del espacio en el mundo griego: el caso locrio", [in] Jesús Carruesco (ed.), *Topos-Chôra. L'espai a Grècia I: perspectives interdisciplinàries*, Tarragona, 75-83.
 (2013): "Early Settlement and Configuration of the Archaic Poleis", [in] José Pascual – Maria-Foteini Papakonstantinou (eds.), *Topography and History of Ancient Epicnemidian Locris* (=Mnemosyne Supplements 362), Leiden-Boston, 405-445
 (2014): "Eubeos y locrios entre el Jonico y el Adriático", [in] Luisa Breglia – Alda Moleti (eds.), *Hesperia. Tradizioni, rotte, paesaggi* (= Tekmeria 16), Paestum, 189-210.
 (2015): "The Locrians and the Sea", *Historiká* 5, 249-262.
- Doorn, Peter K. (1985): "Geographical Analysis of Early Modern Data in Ancient Historical Research: The Example of the Strouza Region Project in Central Greece", *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 10/3, 275-291.
- Doorn, Peter K. – Bommeljé, L. Sebastiaan – Vroom, Joanita A. C. – Wijngaarden, Henk van – Bommeljé, Yvette B. (2016): "The Aetolian Studies Project Village Interviews", *Dans-Easy* 2/2, https://b2find.eudat.eu/dataset?tags=physical+geography&author=Bommelj%C3%A9%2C+Y.B.&extras_Discipline=Geography (last accessed: 27.01.2024).
- Durand, Frédéric – Decoville, Antoine (2020): "The EGTC as a tool for cross-border integration", [in] Gyula Ocskay (ed.), *15 years of the EGTCs. Lessons Learnt and Future Perspective*, Budapest, 103-122.
- Ecker, Ute (1990): *Grabmal und Epigramm. Studien zur frühgriechischen Sepulkraldichtung* (=Paltingenesia 29), Stuttgart.
- Ellis, John R. (1976): *Philip II and Macedonian Imperialism*, London.
- Engl, Alice (2013): "Ein Instrument zwischen Gemeinschaftspolitik und nationalem Recht: Die Durchführung der Verordnung über den Europäischen Verbund für Territoriale Zusammenarbeit in ausgewählten EU-Mitgliedstaaten", *Europarecht* 48/3, 285-306.
- Engl, Alice – Mitterhofer, Johanna (2016): "Bridging National and Ethnic Borders: The European Grouping of Territorial Cooperation as a Space for Minorities", *European Yearbook of Minority Issues Online* 12/1, 1-32.
- Fabre, Paul (1965): "La date de la rédaction du Périples de Scylax", *Les études grecques* 33, 353-366.
- Flacelière, Robert (1937): *Les Aitoliens à Delphes. Contribution à l'histoire de la Grèce centrale au IIIe siècle av. J.-C.* (= Bibliothèque des Écoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome 143), Paris.
- Fowler, Robert L. (2013): *Early Greek Mythography. Vol. 2: Commentary*, Oxford.
- Fragoulaki, Maria. (2013): *Kinship in Thucydides. Intercommunal Ties and Historical Narrative*, Oxford.

Franchi, Elena

(2020): "Genealogies and Violence. Central Greece in the Making", [in] Fabienne Marchand – Hans Beck (eds), *The Dancing Floor of Ares. Local Conflict and Regional Violence in Central Greece*, *Ancient History Bulletin*, Suppl. 1, 138-167.

(in preparation) "Bridging the Gulf: Naupaktos Cross-borderised".

Fraser, Peter M. (1954): "Rezension von L. Lerat, *Les Locriens de l'Ouest*, I-II Paris", *Gnomon* 26, 250-251.

Freitag, Klaus (1999): *Der Golf von Korinth. Historisch-topographische Untersuchungen von der Archaik bis in das 1. Jh. v. Chr.* (=Quellen und Forschungen zur antiken Welt 34), München.

Funke, Peter

(1987): "Zur Datierung befestigter Stadtanlagen in Aitolien. Historisch-philologische Anmerkungen zu einem Wechselverhältnis zwischen Siedlungsstruktur und politischer Organisation", *Boreas* 10, 87-96.

(1997): "Polisgenese und Urbanisierung in Aitolien im 5. und 4. Jh. v. Chr.", [in] Mogen H. Hansen (ed.), *The Polis as an Urban Centre and as Political Community* (=Acts of the Copenhagen Polis Centre 4 / Historisk-filosofiske meddelelser 75), Copenhagen, 145-188.

(2015): "Aitolia and the Aitolian League", [in] Beck – Funke (eds.) 2015, 86-117.

Gauthier, Philippe (1972): *Symbola. Les étrangers et la justice dans les cités grecques* (=Annales de l'Est publiés par l'Université de Nancy II – Mémoire 42), Nancy.

Giesen, Karl (1901): "Plutarch's Quaestiones graecae und Aristoteles' Politien", *Philologus* 60, 446-471.

Gomme, Arnold W.

(1962): *An Historical Commentary on Thucydides: Volume 2. Books II-III*, Oxford (repr. 1998).

(1970): *An Historical Commentary on Thucydides: Volume 4. Books V 25-VII*, Oxford (repr. 1998).

Grainger, John D. (1999): *The League of the Aitolians* (=Mnemosyne. Supplements 200), Leiden-Boston-Köln.

Gullath, Brigitte (1982): *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte Boiotiens in der Zeit Alexanders und der Diadochen* (=Europäische Hochschulschriften, Reihe 3, Geschichte und ihre Hilfswissenschaften 169), Frankfurt am Main.

Hall, Jonathan M. (2015): "Federalism and Ethnicity", [in] Beck – Funke (eds.) 2015, 30-48.

Hammond, Nicholas G. L. – Griffith, Guy T. (1979): *A History of Macedonia*, II, Oxford.

Head, Barclay V.

(1884): *BMC- British Museum Catalogues of Coins Vol. 8: Central Greece (Locris, Phocis, Boeotia, and Euboea)*, London.

(1911): *Historia Nummorum. A Manual of Greek Numismatics New and Enlarged Edition*, London (repr. 1963).

Herbert, Sharon – Kase, Edward W. (1977): "Kallion", *Archaiologikon Deltion* 32, *Chronika*, 114.

Horden, Peregrine – Purcell, Nicholas (2000): *The Corrupting Sea. A Study of Mediterranean History*, Oxford.

Hornblower, Simon

(1991): *A Commentary on Thucydides, Vol. 1: Books I-III*, Oxford.

(2008): *A Commentary on Thucydides, Vol. 3: Books V 25-VIII 109*, Oxford.

Hose, Martin (2002): *Aristosouths. Fragmente III. Die historischen Fragmente*, Berlin.

Hughes, Dennis D. (1991): *Human Sacrifice in Ancient Greece*, London-New York.

Imhoof-Blumer, Friedrich (1883): *Monnaies grecques*, Paris.

Jacoby, Felix

(1923): *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker. Teil 1, Genealogie und Mythographie. A. Vorrede, Text, Addenda, Konkordanz [Nr. 1-63]*, Berlin.

(1926-1930): *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker. Teil 2, Zeitgeschichte. B. Spezialgeschichten, Autobiographien und Memoiren, Zeittafeln [Nr. 106-261]*, Berlin.

(1954): *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker. Teil 3, Geschichte von Staedten und Voelkern (Horographie und Ethnographie). B. Autoren ueber einzelne Staedte (Laender) [Nr. 297-607]*, Leiden.

Katsonopoulou, Dora

(2002): "Helike and Her Territory in the Light of New Discoveries", [in] Emanuele Greco (ed.), *Gli Achei e l'identità etnica degli Achei d'Occidente. Atti del Convegno Internazionale di Studi* (=Tekmeria 3), Paestum, 205-216.

(2005): "The Earthquake of 373 BC: Literary and Archaeological Evidence", [in] Dora Katsonopoulou – Steven Soter – Ioannis K. Koukouvelas (eds.), *Ancient Helike and Aigialeia. Archaeological Sites in Geologically Active Regions. Proceedings of the Third International Conference. Nikolaiika, Diakopton, 6-9 October 2000*, Athens, 15-32.

(2011): "A Proto-urban Early Helladic Settlement Found on the Helike Delta", [in] Dora Katsonopoulou (ed.), *Helike IV. Ancient Helike and Aigialeia. Protohelladika: The Southern and Central Greek Mainland*, Athens, 63-88.

(2016): "Natural Catastrophes in the Gulf of Corinth, Northwestern Peloponnese, from Prehistory to Late Antiquity: the Example of Helike", [in] Jonas Borsch – Laura Carrara (eds.), *Erdbeben in der Antike: Deutungen, Folgen, Repräsentationen* (=Bedrohte Ordnungen 4), Tübingen, 137-152.

Katsonopoulou, Dora – Katsarou, Stella (2017): "Mainland Cosmopolitanism and the Rise of Personal Prestige: New Evidence from the Coastal Early Helladic Town of Helike, North-west Peloponnese, Greece", *Annual of the British School at Athens* 112, 1-32.

Kelly, Douglas H. (1978): "The New Spartan Treaty", *Liverpool Classical Monthly* 3, 133-141.

Kirsten, Ernst (1983): "Gebirgshirten und Sesshaftigkeit – Die Bedeutung der Dark Ages für die griechische Staatenwelt: Doris und Sparta", [in] Sigrid Deger-Jalkotzy (ed.) *Griechenland, die Ägäis und die Levante während der Dark Ages vom 12. bis zum 9. Jh. v.Chr.*, Wien, 358-370.

Klaffenbach, Günther (1932): *Inscriptiones Graecae IX². Fasc. 1, Inscriptiones Aetoliae*, Berlin.

Korenjak, Martin (2011): "Pseudo-Skymnos (2048)", [in] Hans-Joachim Gehrke – Felix K. Maier (eds.), *Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker Continued. Part V*, Leiden (http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1873-5363_jcv_a2048).

LSAG² = Jeffery, Lilian H. (1990). *The Local Scripts of Archaic Greece. Revised ed. with a Supplement by A.W. Johnston*, Oxford.

Laffineur, Robert

(1977): "Kallion", *Archaiologikon Deltion* 32, *Chronika*, 118.

(1978): "Kallion", *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique* 102/2, 840-847.

(1979): "Kallion", *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique* 103/2, 631-634.

(1980): "Kallion", *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique* 104/2, 742-747.

Landucci Gattinoni, Franca (2004): "L'Etolia nel protoellenismo: la progressiva centralità di una periferia 'semibarbara'", [in] Gabriella Vanotti – Claudia Perassi (eds.), *In limine. Ricerche su marginalità e periferia nel mondo antico*, Milano, 105-130.

Larsen, Jacob A. O. (1968): *Greek Federal States. Their Institutions and History*, Oxford.

Lasagni, Chiara (2019): *Le realtà locali nel mondo greco. Ricerche su poleis ed ethne della Grecia occidentale* (=Studi e testi di epigrafia 1), Alessandria.

Leake, William M. (1835), *Travels in Northern Greece*, II, London.

Leekley, Dorothy – Efstratiou, Nicholas (1980), *Archaeological Excavations in Central and Northern Greece*, New Jersey.

Lerat, Lucien

(1943): "Le site du port locrien de Chaleion", *Revue des études grecques* 56, XIII-XV.

(1946): "La liste des peuples locriens dans Thucydide, III, 101", *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique* 70, 329-336.

(1952): *Les Locriens de l'Ouest*, I-II Paris.

Liampi, Katerini (1998): "On the Chronology of the Bronze Coinages of the Aetolian League and Its Members (Spearhead and Jawbone Types)." *Archaiognōsia* 9, 83-109.

- Mackil, Emily (2013): *Creating a Common Polity. Religion, Economy, and Politics in the Making of the Greek Koinon* (=Hellenistic Culture and Society 55), Berkeley-Los Angeles-London.
- Marcotte, Didier
 (1986): "Le Périple de Scylax. Esquisse d'un commentaire épigraphique et archéologique", *Bollettino dei Classici* 7, 166-182.
 (1990): *Le poème géographique de Dionysios, fils de Calliphon. Édition, traduction et commentaire* (=Fonds René Draguet 6), Louvain.
 (2000): *Géographes Grecs. Introduction générale. Pseudo-Scymnos. Circuit de la terre* (=Collection des universités de France / Série grecque 403), Paris.
- Marek, Christian (1984): *Die Proxenie* (= Europäische Hochschulschriften, Reihe 3, Geschichte und ihre Hilfswissenschaften 213), Frankfurt am Main.
- Mari, Manuela (1997): "Tributo a Ilio e prostituzione sacra: storia e riflessi sociali di due riti femminili locresi", *Rivista di Cultura Classica e Medioevale* 39/2, 131-177.
- Mataranga, Kalomira (1994): "Un étranger 'proxène' à Corcyre" *Revue Archéologique* 1, 111-118.
- Mauro, Chiara Maria (2019): *Archaic and Classical Harbours of the Greek World. The Aegean and Eastern Ionian Contexts*, Oxford.
- Meineke, August (1849): *Ethnika. Stephani Byzantii ethnicorum quae supersunt*, Leipzig.
- Mendels, Doron (1984): "Aetolia 331-301: Frustration, Political Power and Survival", *Historia* 33, 129-180.
- Merker, Irwin L. (1989): "The Achaians in Naupaktos and Kalydon in the Fourth Century", *Hesperia* 58, 303-311.
- Moggi, Mauro (2007): "I proxenoi come testimoni", [in] Paolo Desideri – Mauro Moggi – Mario Pani (eds.), *Antidoron. Studi in onore di Barbara Scardigli Forster* (=Studi e testi di storia antica 17), Pisa, 305-316.
- Momigliano, Arnaldo
 (1934): *Filippo il Macedone, Saggio sulla storia greca del IV secolo a. C.*, Firenze.
 (1945): "The Locrian Maidens and the Date of Lycophron's *Alexandra*", *Classical Quarterly* 39, 49-53.
- Moreno Hernández, Jorge J. – Pascual Valderrama, Ignacio M. (2013): "The Hellenistic Period (323-146)", [in] José Pascual – Maria-Foteini Papakonstantinou (eds.), *Topography and History of Ancient Epicnemidian Locris* (=Mnemosyne Supplements 362), Leiden-Boston, 507-535.
- Morgan, Catherine – Hall, Jonathan M. (1996): "Achaian Poleis and Achaian Colonisation", [in] Mogen H. Hansen (ed.), *Introduction to an Inventory of Poleis* (=Acts of the Copenhagen Polis Centre 3 / Historisk-filosofiske meddelelser 74), Copenhagen, 164-231.
- Morris, Sarah P. (2007): "Troy between Bronze and Iron Ages: Myth, Cult and Memory in a Sacred Landscape", [in] Sarah P. Morris – Robert Laffineur (eds.), *Epos: Reconsidering Greek Epic and Aegean Bronze Age Archaeology. Proceedings of the 11th International Aegean Conference = 11e Rencontre égéenne internationale: Los Angeles, UCLA, The J. Paul Getty Villa, 20-23 April 2006* (=Aegaeum 28), Liège, 59-68.
- Müller, Karl O. (1855): *Geographi Graeci Minores*, I, Paris.
- Oldfather, William A.
 (1908): "Lokrika: Sagensgeschichtliche Untersuchungen", *Philologus* 67, 411-73.
 (1926): "Lokris", [in] *Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* XIII.1, 1135-1288.
- Olson S. Douglas (2006): *Athenaeus I: The Learned Banqueters. Books I-III*.106e (=Loeb Classical Library 204), Cambridge (MA)-London.
- Papakonstantinou, Zinon (2012): *Lawmaking and Adjudication in Archaic Greece*, London.
- Paradiso, Annalisa (2017): "Simonides (8)", [in] Ian Worthington (ed.), *Jacoby Online. Brill's New Jacoby – Second Edition. Part I*, Leiden (http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1873-5363_bnj2_a8).
- Peek, Werner (1974): "Ein neuer spartanischer Staatsvertrag", *Abhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig* 65, 3-15.
- Pe-Piper, Georgia – Hatzipanagiotou, Konstantin (1993): "Ophiolitic Rocks of the Kerassies-Milia Belt, Continental Greece" *Ofioliti* 18/2, 157-169.

Petrochilos, Nikolaos

(2019a): "The Archaeological and Epigraphic Testimonies for the Ethnos of the Western Lokrians", [in] Hans Beck – Kostas Buraselis – Alex McAuley (eds.), *Ethnos and Koinon. Studies in Ancient Ethnicity and Federalism (=HABES 61)*, Stuttgart, 45-64.

(2019b): "The Fortification Wall of Chaleion", *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique* 143/1, 289-320.

Philippson, Alfred – Kirsten, Ernst

(1951): *Die griechischen Landschaften, Band I, Teil II: Das östliche Mittelgriechenland und die Insel Euboea*, Frankfurt-am-Main.

(1958): *Die griechischen Landschaften. Band II, Teil II: Das westliche Mittelgriechenland und die westgriechischen Inseln*, Frankfurt-am-Main.

Plassart, André (1921): "Inscriptions de Delphes. La liste des théorodokes", *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique* 45/1, 1-85.

Pownall, Frances (2013): "Hekataios of Miletos (I)", [in] Ian Worthington (ed.), *Jacoby Online. Brill's New Jacoby – Second Edition. Part I*, Leiden (http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1873-5363_bnj_a1).

Pritchett, W. Kendrick (1980): *Studies in Ancient Greek Topography. Part III (Roads)* (=University of California Publications in Classical Studies 22), Berkeley-Los Angeles-London.

Ragone, Giuseppe (1996): "Il millennio delle vergini locresi", *Studi ellenistici* 8, 7-95.

Redfield, James M. (2003): *The Locrian Maidens. Love and Death in Greek Italy*, Princeton.

Rhodes, Peter J. – Osborne, Robin (2003). *Greek Historical Inscriptions, 404-323 B.C.*, Oxford.

Rousset, Denis

(1991): *Territoires et frontières en Locride et en Phocide*, Paris (Diss.).

(2004): "West Lokris", [in] Mogen H. Hansen – Thomas H. Nielsen (eds.), *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis. An Investigation Conducted by The Copenhagen Polis Centre for the Danish National Research Foundation*, Oxford-New York, 391-398.

(2006): "Affranchissements de Physkeis en Locride occidentale", *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique* 130/1, 349-379.

Rousset, Denis – Laroche, Didier (2006): "Les inscriptions de Kallipolis d'Étolie", *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique* 130/1, 381-434.

Rzepka, Jacek

(1999): "The Aetolian Elite Warriors and Fifth Century Roots of the Hellenistic Confederacy", *Akme. Studia Historica* 4, 5-34.

(2006): *The Rights of Cities within the Aitolian Confederacy*, Valencia.

(2017): *Greek Federal Terminology* (Monograph Series Akanthina no. 12), Gdansk.

Saranti, Fotini (2017): "Prehistoric Naupaktos: a Missing Link on the Northern Shore of the Corinthian Gulf", [in] Michael Fotiadis – Robert Laffineur – Yannis Lolos – Andreas Vlachopoulos (eds.), *ΕΣΠΕΡΟΣ / Hesperos. The Aegean seen from the West. Proceedings of the 16th International Aegean Conference, University of Ioannina, Department of History and Archaeology, 18-21 May 2016 (=Aegaeum 41)*, Leuven-Liège, 443-451.

Schäfer, Arnold (1859): "Zu den Fragmenten von Theopompos", *Jahrbücher für Klassische Philologie* 79, 483.

Scholten, Joseph (2000): *The Politics of Plunder. Aitolians and their Koinon in the Early Hellenistic Era, 279-217 B.C.* (=Hellenistic Culture and Society 24), Berkeley-Los Angeles-London.

Shipley, Graham D.

(2011): *Pseudo-Skylax's Periplous. The Circumnavigation of the Inhabited World. Text, Translation and Commentary*, Liverpool.

(2017): "Pseudo-Skylax (2046)", [in] Hans-Joachim Gehrke – Felix K. Maier (eds.), *Jacoby Online. Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker Continued, Part V*, Leiden (http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1873-5363_jcv_a2046).

Sordi, Marta

(1953): "Le origini del Koinon Etolico", *Acme* 6, 419-445 (now in *Scritti di Storia Greca*, Milano 2002, 31-55).

(1991): "Il trattato tra Sparta e gli Etoli e la guerra d'Elide", *Aevum* 65, 35-38.

- (1997): "La Grecia degli ethne: genti e regioni settentrionali e centrali", [in] Salvatore Settis (ed.), *I Greci. Storia Cultura Arte Società*, II.2, Torino, 87-108.
- Soter, Steven – Katsonopoulou, Dora (2011): "Submergence and Uplift of Settlements in the Area of Helike, Greece, from the Early Bronze Age to Late Antiquity", *Geoarchaeology: An International Journal* 26/4, 584-610.
- Sotiriadis, Georgios (1907): "Zitimata aitolikis istorias kai topographias", *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique* 31, 270-320.
- Struffolino, Stefano (2010): "La poetica del naufragio nell'epigrafia sepolcrale greca", [in] Alessandra Inglese (ed.), *Epigrammata. Iscrizioni greche e comunicazione letteraria. In ricordo di Giancarlo Susini = Atti del Convegno di Roma (Roma 1-2 ottobre 2009)* (=Themata 7), Tivoli, 345-375.
- Stubb, Alexander (2011): "Foreword", [in] Pekka Järviö, *Cross-border Cooperation – Benefiting from Borders*, Helsinki, 1.
- Talbert, Richard J. A. (2000): *Barrington Atlas of the Greek and Roman World*, Princeton.
- Themelis, Petros
 (1979): "Ausgrabungen in Kallipolis 1977-1978", *Αρχαιολογικά ανάλεκτα εξ Αθηνών* 12, 245-279.
 (1983): "Δέλφοι καὶ περιοχή του 8^ο καὶ 7^ο π. Χ. αἰῶνα (Φωκίδα – Δυτική Λοκρίδα)", *Annuario della Scuola Archeologica Italiana di Atene* 61, 213-255.
 (1998): "Attic Sculpture from Kallipolis (Aitolia): A Cult Group of Demeter and Kore", [in] Olga Palagia – William Coulson (eds.), *Regional Schools in Hellenistic Sculpture*, Oxford, 47-59.
 (1999): "Die Epoche der Griechen: Ausgrabungen in Kallipolis (Ost-Aetolien) ", [in] Wolfram Hoepfner (ed.), *Geschichte des Wohnens I*, Ludwigsburg/Stuttgart, 427-440.
 (2003): "Ο Δαμοφών στην Οιάνθεια", [in] Petros Themelis – Roudoula Stathaki-Koumari (eds.), *Το Γαλαξίδι απο την αρχαιότητα εως σήμερα*, Athens, 27-33.
- Tribulato, Olga (2017): "Cenotafio di un prosseno corcirese", *Axon* 1/1, 45-52.
- Uhl, Alfons (1963): *Pherekydes von Athen: Grundriss und Einheit des Werkes*, München (Diss.).
- Van Effenterre, Henri – Ruzé, Françoise (1994): *Nomima. Recueil d'inscriptions politiques et juridiques de l'archaïsme grec* (=Bibliothèque des Écoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome 188), I, Rome.
- Walbank, Frank W.
 (1979): *A Historical Commentary on Polybius III*, Oxford.
 (2000): "Hellenes and Achaians: 'Greek Nationality' Revisited", [in] Pernille Flensted-Jensen (ed.), *Further Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis* (=Historia. Einzelschriften 138 / Papers from the Copenhagen Polis Centre 5), Stuttgart, 19-33.
- Wallace, Malcom B. (1970): "Early Greek Proxenoí" *Phoenix* 24, 189-208.
- Wilamowitz-Möllendorff, Ulrich v. (1922): *Pindaros*, Berlin.
- Wilhelm, Adolf
 (1909): *Beiträge zur griechischen Inschriftenkunde*, Wien.
 (1911): "Die lokrische Mädcheninschrift", *Jahreshefte des Österreichischen Archäologischen Instituts* 14, 163-256.
- Xanthopoulou, Vayia – Iliopoulos, Ioannis – Katsonopoulou, Dora – Katsarou, Stella (2022): "Standardized Patterns in the Ceramic Craft at Early Bronze Age Helike, Achaea, Greece", *Archaeological and Anthropological Sciences* 14, 1-29.
- Zachos, George (2016): *Tabula Imperii Romani, J 34 - Athens: Achaia Phthiotis-Malis-Aenis-Oitaia-Doris-Eurytania-East & West Locris-Phokis-Aitolia-Akarnania*, Athens.
- Zapheirou, Photeini (1982): "Το Κάλλιο στην ύπερη αρχαιότητα", *Archaeologiki Ephemeris*, 1-13.
- Zunino, Maddalena (2017): "Convenzione giudiziaria tra Eantea e Chaleion", *Axon* 1/1, 125-144.