

# Tekmeria

Vol 17 (2023)

γεγενῆσθαι. μνηνέται οὖν ἀπὸ μετοίκων τέ τινων καὶ ἀκο-  
 λούθων περὶ μὲν τῶν Ἑρμῶν οὐδέν, ἄλλων δὲ ἀγαλμάτων  
 περικοπαί τινες πρότερον ὑπὸ νεωτέρων μετὰ παιδιᾶς καὶ  
 οἴνου γεγενῆσθαι. ΕΘΝΙΚΟ ΙΔΡΥΜΑ ΕΡΕΥΝΩΝ • ΙΝΣΤΙΤΟΥΤΟ ΙΣΤΟΡΙΚΩΝ ΕΡΕΥΝΩΝ  
 NATIONAL HELLENIC RESEARCH FOUNDATION • INSTITUTE OF HISTORICAL RESEARCH  
 SECTION OF GREEK AND ROMAN ANTIQUITY καὶ  
 αὐτὰ ὑπολαμβάνοντες οἱ μάλιστα τῷ Ἀλκιβιάδῃ ἀχθόμενοι  
 ἐμποδὼν ὄντι σφίσι μὴ αὐτοῖς τοῦ δήμου βεβαίως προεστάναι,  
 καὶ νομίσαντες, εἰ αὐτὸν ἐξελάσειαν, πρῶτοι ἂν εἶναι, ἔμεγά-  
 λυνον καὶ ἐβόων. **Τεκμήρια** ἐπὶ δὲ τὸν δήμον καταλύσει τὰ τε μυστικά καὶ  
 ἡ τῶν Ἑρμῶν περικοπή γένοιτο καὶ οὐδὲν εἴη αὐτῶν ὅτι οὐ  
 μετ' ἐκείνου ἐπράχθη, ἐπιλέγοντες τεκμήρια τὴν ἄλλην αὐτοῦ  
 ἐς τὰ ἐπιτηδεύματα οὐ δημοτικὴν παρανομίαν. ὁ δ' ἐν τε  
 τῷ παρόντι πρό- ΣΥΜΒΟΛΕΣ ΣΤΗΝ ΙΣΤΟΡΙΑ ΤΟΥ ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΟΥ ΚΑΙ ΡΩΜΑΙΚΟΥ  
 ΚΟΣΜΟΥ • CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE HISTORY OF THE GREEK  
 AND ROMAN WORLD • CONTRIBUTIONS A L'HISTOIRE DU  
 MONDE GREC ET ROMAIN • BEITRÄGE ZUR GESCHICHTE  
 DER GRIECHISCHEN UND RÖMISCHEN WELT • CONTRIBUTI  
 PER LA STORIA DEL MONDO GRECO E ROMANO καὶ ἐτοῖμος ἦν  
 πρὶν ἐκπλεῖν κρῖναι τὸν ἀποδεδειγμένον ἦν (ἤδη  
 γὰρ καὶ τὰ τῆς παρασκευῆς ἐπεκτερίσθη, καὶ εἰ μὲν τούτων  
 τι εἴργαστο, δίκην δοῦναι, εἰ δ' ἀπολυθείη, ἄρχειν. καὶ  
 ἐπεμαρτύρετο μὴ ἀπόντος πέρι αὐτοῦ διαβολὰς ἀποδέχεσθαι,  
 ἀλλ' ἤδη ἀποκτείνειν, εἰ ἀδίκει. **17** καὶ ὅτι σωφρονέστερον εἴη  
 μὴ μετὰ τοιαύτης αἰτίας, πρὶν διαγνώσι, πέμπειν αὐτὸν ἐπὶ  
 τοσοῦτ' στρατεύματι. οἱ δ' ἔχοντο δεδιότες τό τε στράτευμα  
 μὴ εὖνουν ἔχρη, ἦν ἤδη ἀγωνίζηται, ὃ τε δήμος μὴ μαλα-  
 κίζεται θεραπεύων ὅτι δι' ἐκείνου οἱ τ' Ἀργεῖοι ξυνεστράτευον  
 καὶ τῶν Μαντινέων τινές, ἀπέτρεπον καὶ ἀπέσπενδον, ἄλλους  
 ῥήτορας ἐνιέντες οἱ ἔλεγον νῦν μὲν πλεῖν αὐτὸν καὶ μὴ  
 κατασχεῖν τὴν ἀναγωγὴν, ἐλθόντα δὲ κρῖνεσθαι ἐν ἡμέραις  
 ῥηταῖς, βουλόμενοι ἐκ μείζονος διαβολῆς, ἦν ἔμελλον ῥῶον  
 αὐτοῦ ἀπόντος ποριεῖν, μετάπεμπον κομισθέντα αὐτὸν ἀγω-  
 νίσασθαι. καὶ ἔδοξε πλεῖν τὸν Ἀλκιβιάδην.  
 Μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα θέρους μεσοῦντος ἤδη ἡ ἀναγωγὴ ἐγίγνετο

## The Ozolian Locris in Roman Times: A Lost People in a Fragmented Land

George Zachos

doi: [10.12681/tekmeria.35450](https://doi.org/10.12681/tekmeria.35450)

Copyright © 2023



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/).

### To cite this article:

Zachos, G. (2023). The Ozolian Locris in Roman Times: A Lost People in a Fragmented Land. *Tekmeria*, 17, 233–260. <https://doi.org/10.12681/tekmeria.35450>

GEORGE ZACHOS

## **The Ozolian Locris in Roman Times: A Lost People in a Fragmented Land\***

West Locris is a narrow strip of land stretching halfway up the Corinthian Gulf's northern coast [from Molykrion Akron (modern Cape Antirrio) to the Gulf of Kirra (modern Gulf of Itea)]. Its hinterland reaches down to the southern bank of the Mornos R. (ancient Daphnos) and the mountainous zone of Naupactos (Mt. Trikorpho), while the eastern part of it extends as far as the western foothills of Mt. Parnassos and Mt. Ghiona.<sup>1</sup>

The sources on the region are limited for the Roman period. Strabo offers a good overview of the cities attributed to Aitolia Epictetos, and the legendary tradition of the area. Pliny includes in his narrative two quite problematic passages. And although Pausanias passed through West Locris shortly after AD 170, his account of West Locris is rather disappointing, compared to his detailed descriptions of Boeotia and Phokis. For our purposes, it is Pausanias' two passages relating to the geopolitical situation of West Locris, namely a) his reference to the Aitolians settling in Amphissa and b) the Achaean control over the rest of Locris, that are important.

The historical topography of the Late Hellenistic to Late Roman period is not corroborated by archaeological evidence, due to the lack of excavations in the region, with the exception of Amphissa and Naupactos. This results, in part, from limited modern building activity in the rest of the Ozolian territory,

---

\* This paper is dedicated to Prof. Panos Valavanis who followed in Lucien Lerat's footsteps in West Locris.

I am grateful to Anthi Tsaroucha, archaeologist in the Ephorate of Antiquities of Phokis, who shared with me her immense experience and knowledge from the excavations in Amphissa, and clarified some crucial points about West Locris in Late Antiquity. I also thank Sofia Zoumbaki for the discussion we had on the "Achaean control" of Locris and Denis Rousset who offered his advice on parts of the paper. Thanks, also, to Christy Constantakopoulou who carefully proofread the final manuscript.

1. Lerat 1952; Rousset 2004, 391.

along with the absence of major public projects. Despite the copious efforts of the Greek Archaeological Service, the last systematic archaeological survey to be conducted in the area was by L. Lerat, during the Greek Civil War.

The collection of archaeological data for this period in West Locris, as part of the Academy of Athens *Tabula Imperii Romani* project (**fig. 1**),<sup>2</sup> necessitated a re-evaluation of our textual sources, with the aim of suggesting answers to some questions on the history of the region: how did the intervention of Rome in Old Aitolia and in Aitolia Epictetos affect the settlement pattern and the status of the Ozolian cities in the Roman era? Why did Aitolian immigrants choose Amphissa as their new homeland? Can we draw a connection between the new population and an honorary inscription erected by an Aitolarch in the sanctuary of Athena Kranaia in the Phokian Elateia some decades after the visit of Pausanias to West Locris?

### Sources: from Strabo to Pausanias

#### *Strabo*

Strabo's passages about West Locris<sup>3</sup> are informative for events of the period.<sup>4</sup> Although he was aware of the events of the Augustan era concerning the fate of Aitolia ("The cities of the Aitolians are Calydon and Pleuron, which are now indeed reduced"), he does not refer to the control of a large part of Locris by the Achaeans of Patras. The reason for this might be that he focuses on the geographical boundaries and geomorphological features of the area, as well as on the myths, while historical references are only incidentally inserted into the text. It is also worth noting that he cites the legend about the decaying body of Nessos and the other centaurs on Mt. Taphiassos as an explanation for the Ozolians' name,<sup>5</sup> omitting Pausanias' interpretation that links the name to the animal skins the Locrians wore. This may indicate that the primitive bucolic element of the Ozolians was not a dominant theme in accounts of the region in Strabo's time.

---

2. Zachos 2016, s.v. West Locris.

3. Strabo 9.4.7; 9.4.8; 10.2.3.

4. He is drawing from Homer and Ephorus in this passage.

5. It is obvious that Mt. Taphiassos (Maurovouna, turk. Klokova) derives meaning both as a geomorphological and mythological boundary between Aitolia and Ozolian Locris.

In addition, some scholars have argued that Amphissa hardly existed in the time of Strabo,<sup>6</sup> on the basis of a misleading English translation of Strabo's passage in 9.4.7 (πόλεις δ' ἔσχον Ἀμφισσάν τε καὶ Ναύπακτον, ὧν ἡ Ναύπακτος συμμένει τοῦ Ἀντιρρίου πλησίον, ὠνόμασται δ' ἀπὸ τῆς ναυπηγίας τῆς ἐκεῖ γενομένης...: "The cities they held were Amphissa and Naupactus; of these, Naupactus survives, near Antirrhium, and it was named from the shipbuilding that was once carried on there...").<sup>7</sup> Here, Strabo comments on Naupactus and its mythological past, which in his time was still located (it had not been destroyed, like others) near Antirrio (συμμένει πλησίον). The pronoun ὧν is added here, not to indicate which city did in fact exist in his time (Amphissa or Naupactus), but which of the two was situated close to Antirrio (we must not forget that Strabo's work is entitled *Geography*). Amphissa was probably affected by the events of the first century BC, as we will see below. Evidence for a settlement with the status of a city during this period is suggested by the list of the eponyms of the city from 167 BC to the early first century BC, as well as the grant of the privileges of *enktesis* and *epinomia* to the freedman of a Roman owner, who possibly managed his owner's business in Amphissa in the late second century or early first century BC.<sup>8</sup>

### *Pliny the Elder*

Pliny follows a Hellenistic geopolitical division, according to which the western part of Locris is attributed to Aitolia (Epictetos): "The towns of Aitolia are Calydon... and then Macynia and Molycria, behind which are Mount Chalcis and Taphiassus... Aitolian towns on the Gulf of Corinth are Naupactus, Eupalimna, and inland Pleuron and Halicarna".<sup>9</sup> Therefore, although it has been argued that Pliny had in mind Agrippa's atlas,<sup>10</sup> we must admit that either that atlas depicted the pre-Augustan topography, or in this passage about Locris Pliny based his account on earlier sources.

There is also complete confusion in his text regarding the borders between Phokis and West Locris, given that Chaleion is recorded as part of the former: "Next to the Aitolians are the Locrians, surnamed Ozolae, who are exempt

6. Cf. Roller 2018, ad. loc.

7. Translation by H. L. Jones, ed. Loeb, 1927.

8. Rousset 2002b, 92-96.

9. Plin. *HN* 4.4 (7).

10. Dilke 1987, 207-209.

from tribute. Here are the town of Oeanthe, the harbour of Apollo Phaestius and the Chrisaeon Gulf; and inland the towns of Argyna, Eupalia, Phaestum and Calamistus. Beyond are the Cirrhaean Plains of Phokis, the town of Cirrha and the port of Chalaëon, seven miles inland from which is Delphi...There was also formerly the town of Crisa, and together with the people of Bulis there are Anticyra, Naulochus, Pyrrha, the tax-free town of Amphissa, Tithrone, Tithorea, Ambrysos and Mirana, the district also called Daulis".<sup>11</sup> This confusion may be due to the fact that he follows an *Itinerarium Maritimum*<sup>12</sup> and, for this reason, his reference to cities is geographical rather than ethnological. The inclusion of totally unknown cities (such as Argyna, Calamistus) raises serious doubts about accuracy. More problematic is the last part of the passage, where Amphissa features as a tax-free town along with Phokian cities or cities of unknown origin (Pyrrha, Mirana).<sup>13</sup> Leaving aside these two problems, the Ozolian settlements mentioned in the texts are three coastal settlements (Oianthia, Phaistinos port, Chaleion) and two inland ones (Eupalion and Amphissa). The absence of Myania is notable.

#### *Pausanias*

Pausanias describes Amphissa as the largest and most renowned Locrian city. He also mentions that "the people hold that they are Aitolians, being ashamed of the name of Ozolians...When the Roman emperor drove the Aitolians from their homes in order to found the new city of Nicopolis, the greater part of the people went away to Amphissa. Originally, however, they came of Locrian race".<sup>14</sup> He offers evidence about the legendary tradition of the city (Amphissa is daughter of Macar) and the sights (tomb of Adraimon, Athena's temple with the bronze statue brought from Troy by Thoas).<sup>15</sup> He then goes on to describe Myania and Oiantheia. The other Ozolians, he says, but not Amphissa, "are under the government of the Achaeans of Patrae, the emperor Augustus

---

11. Plin. *HN* 4.5 (7-8); Translation by H. Rackham, ed. Loeb, 1952.

12. Axioti 1980.

13. This problem may have arisen from the two quotations about Phokis having been split and then re-joined by the medieval copyist (Fossey 1986, 158-159 and Addendum).

14. Paus. 10.38.4; Translation by W. H. S. Jones, ed. Loeb, 1961.

15. Paus. 10.38.4-5.

having granted them this privilege".<sup>16</sup> He ends his narrative with the description of Naupactos.<sup>17</sup>

Archaeological research has brought to light additional settlements that existed in Locris during the time of Pausanias (Chaleion, Physkos). A possible explanation for Pausanias' omissions would be that, after visiting Myania, Pausanias boarded a ship in the port of Kirrha and moved on to Oiantheia and Naupactos.<sup>18</sup>

Pausanias is interested in providing mythological links between the population and the Locrian past (death of Nessos in the Evinos River, i.e. on the western border of Locris; link to the Trojan War; etymological traditions about the name "Ozolian", which associate it with the primitive or bucolic element of its origin or with viticulture).<sup>19</sup> Locrian sanctuaries too are worthy of mention.

Pausanias in his account provides a number of explanations for the name Ozolian, which includes three versions of stories that link the region with a stinking smell. These are: a story about a "stinking" river, the flower asphodel which produces an unpleasant smell, and finally, the first inhabitants of the region, who were "aboriginal children of the soil", wearing hides which produced a nasty smell. All these stories, which include primitive elements related to a nasty smell, may reflect an attempt to justify the renunciation of the Locrian identity by the population of Amphissa in his time. The other meanings of "Ozo", assembled by Lerat, support this supposition.<sup>20</sup>

Pausanias includes elements of an Aitolian tradition in his narrative. Locros appears as the son of Physkos and grandson of Aitolos,<sup>21</sup> while Thoas, son

---

16. Paus. 10.38.8-9.

17. Paus. 10.38.9-13.

18. Papachatzis 1981, 452-465, esp. 457 n. 3.

19. Paus. 10.38.1-3. More or less the same traditions about the Ozolian's name are mentioned by Plutarch (*Mor. Quaest. Graec.* 15). The bad smell of centaurs is a common "topos" (Paus. 5.5.10).

20. Lerat 1952, II, 3-5, 7.

21. Although Lerat (1952, II, 4) refers to Hecataeus the Milesian for the genealogy of Locros (FGrH I, 341-342), the connection of Locros with Aitolos appears for the first time in Ps.-Scymnos (2nd cent. BC) and is repeated slightly altered in Plutarch (*Mor. Gr. Quest.*, 15). The intrusion of the Amphiktyon is maybe an attempt of the Locrians or the Aitolians to clear the Locrians, and especially the Amphissans, of the accusation of

of Andraimon, founder of Amphissa, leads the Aitolians<sup>22</sup> and not the Locrians to Troy. On the other hand, Thoas brings the bronze statue of Athena to Amphissa and not to an Aitolian city.<sup>23</sup>

### Topography: Old and New Evidence

As revealed by the archaeological evidence collected for the *Tabula Imperii Romani* programme, 40 sites were situated in West Locris (including Aitolia Epictetos),<sup>24</sup> of which 14 are locations of urban centres that survived after the end of the Late Hellenistic period or represent traces of human activity in former urban centres.<sup>25</sup> There, also, are seven villas or farmsteads, all located in the territory of Naupactos or in the neighbouring region of Makyneia.<sup>26</sup> Nine more sites, most of them mountainous settlements (eight on Mt. Vardousia-Lidoriki<sup>27</sup> and one on Mt. Ghiona)<sup>28</sup> are to be added to the site corpus. For the sake of comparison, it should be mentioned that in neighbouring Phokis the corresponding numbers are 21 urban centres and 40 farmhouses or rural sites.<sup>29</sup> I believe that the clustering of archaeological evidence for farms in the area of Naupactos should not be necessarily attributed to the increased modern building activity of the area, but rather it is related to historical developments.

---

being the sacrilegious cultivators of the Delphic sanctuary's Sacred Land during the Fourth Sacred War; this attempt occurred at a time (2nd cent. BC) when the issue of borders between Amphissa and Delphi had been raised twice (in the time of Acilius Manius and in ca. 117 BC). Another genealogical line associating Locris to Boeotia was clearly formed during the Third Sacred War.

22. Hom. *Il.* 638-644.

23. Paus. 10.38.5; Lerat 1952, II, 157.

24. i.e. the areas of Naupactos, Eupalion, Molykreion, Makyneia (Rousset 2004).

25. Zachos 2016, 157-175.

26. Zachos 2016, s.v. Makyneia (Kipia, Loutro, Paralia, Rizo), Naupactos (Elaiostasi, Gipedo, Palaiofanagia, Vareias, Xeropigado / Megalomata); Saranti 2018, 359-370.

27. Zachos 2016, s.v. Amygdalia, Bouchouri, Kallithea-Palaiokastro, Karyes, Pentapolis-Ag. Ioannis, Skaloula, Vrila.

28. Zachos 2016, s.v. Prosilio-Viniani. Another stronghold of the Late Antiquity was found in the small hill Leona in Viniani area (Raptopoulos 2011a, 506, εικ. 8.14).

29. Zachos 2016, 101-129.

Naupactos is the main port and hub opposite the colony of Patras; it was economically controlled by the Achaeans of Patras.<sup>30</sup> It lies close to the Kalydon area, which was controlled economically by the Roman colonists of Patras, and has access to the resources of Lake Trichonis. Moreover, the mountain road down to Kallipolis connects the coast of Locris to Eurytania (where a flourishing centre of the Late Roman–Early Christian period came to light at Klaphsi) and to the Spercheios valley, ending at the port of Naupactos. For all these reasons, it was included among the ports of *Itinerarium Maritimum*. The plain of Naupactos, along with the plain of Amphissa, is the only area on the north coast of the Corinthian Gulf that could accommodate a network of agricultural sites. We do not know to what extent the farms in that plain were related to each other, but their number and location around the city (they are sub-urban villas) must be directly related to the supply line of Naupactos and the use of its port. Furthermore, the owners of the villas, in addition to selling the surplus of their production (there was a constant demand for wine and olive oil in the urban centres), could take advantage of the city's amenities.<sup>31</sup> On the other hand, the fact that Naupactos was economically exploited by the Achaeans but never annexed to the territory of the *Colonia Patrensis*, facilitated the survival of the urban centre and secured some kind of independence for the city.<sup>32</sup> Naupactos continued to be inhabited in Roman times and progressively flourished.<sup>33</sup> The prominence of Early Christian basilicas and public buildings and amenities (sewage system, bath facilities)<sup>34</sup> indicates that quite

---

30. Rizakis, 1995, no. 364. The grave stele of P. Maedio, son of Publius from the tribe of Quirina and veteran of XII Fulminata legio, was found in secondary usage in an Early Christian church in the district of Ovryolakka and provides evidence that some Italian veterans stayed in the city (Vokotopoulos 1973, 395; *ILGR* 255; Rizakis, 1995, no. 748; Rizakis 1998, no. 369).

31. Antoniadis, Zachos 2021; Zachos (in press). For a list of minor urban centers with villas in their periphery, see Rizakis 2018, 139, 141.

32. Rizakis 1996, 295.

33. Saranti 2018, 196, 306–319, 375–376, 488. Kahrstedt (1954, 34) argues that the city had declined in the time of Pausanias, based on the latter's reference to the Sanctuary of Asclepius as in ruins. However, he does not take into consideration Pausanias' remarks on the rest of the sanctuaries in West Locris (Paus. 10.34.9–13).

34. Papageorgiou 2004; Saranti 2018, 196, 256–260, 266–267.



early, a significant part of the city elite embraced the new religion and promoted it in the public domain. The same phenomenon, as we shall see, occurs in Amphissa.

One problem for those studying Naupactian topography is whether or not the sanctuary of Asclepius at Krounoi in Logga, NW of Naupactos, existed in the Roman period. The sanctuary is assigned to the *kome* of Vouttos, a dependency of Naupactos located at Marmara, where Roman pottery was found.<sup>35</sup> At the same time, the bulk of manumission records dedicated to the god cannot be dated after the second century BC, which creates problems for confirming its Roman phase.<sup>36</sup>

The adversities of the end of the second century BC led West Locris into decline, triggered essentially by the decline and gradual disintegration of the Aitolian Confederation. In contrast to areas like Aenis, which pulled out of the Confederation for other reasons (perhaps not immediately, but after a short period of time) and eventually enjoyed prosperity, the archaeological evidence from West Locris of the second - first century BC does not bear witness to a similar situation. The adversities in Amphissa,<sup>37</sup> the land lost to the sacred land of Delphi,<sup>38</sup> the extensive modification of private and public buildings in Naupactos,<sup>39</sup> and the lack of finds in inland settlements,<sup>40</sup> all outline a picture of decline. Although Locris was declared independent after the events of 168 BC, its western part remained “epictetos” of Aitolia (Makyneia, Molykrion, Naupactos, Vouttos, Eupalion, Oineon, Polis), whereas the central part (Phaistinos, Tolphon, Tritea, Myania, Physkos and minor settlements in its territory like Dymanes, Kyraeis) formed the League of the Hesperian Locrians, with Amphissa and Chaleion remaining independent.<sup>41</sup> We are not in a position to

35. Zachos 2016, s.v. Vomvokou-Marmaria-Spilia, Vouttos.

36. IG IX.1<sup>2</sup> 631-635, 638-641, 649.

37. Petrocheilos 2017, 48.

38. Grainger 1999, 475; Rousset 2002a, 72-74, 80-91, 128-143.

39. Saranti 2018, 374.

40. Erythrai, Eupalion, Laphron. Oineon, Alpa/Alope, Hyaia, Hpnia, Issioi, Messapi-oi, Tritea (cf. Rousset 2004 with Zachos 2016, s.v.). Some of them have not been located as yet. In other cases, recent chronological evidence does not go beyond the 2nd cent. BC. Also, names of Locrian cities or “ethnica” appear in manumissions in the sanctuary of Delphi during the Hellenistic period but disappear in the 1st cent. BC (cf. Petrocheilos 2017, 51-52).

41. Lerat 1952, II, 97-99; Rousset 2002a, 392, s.v. Physkeis. On the importance of

know to what extent the compulsory participation of the Ozolians in the war between Caesar and Pompey contributed to the impoverishment of the area, but it most surely did not benefit the region.<sup>42</sup>

However, despite the troubles of the period, we have evidence that some cities were not abandoned.<sup>43</sup> These are mainly sites in the coastal zone whose harbours were either landing places for ships coming from Italy, or ports of loading and unloading for ships from the opposite shore. It is surely no coincidence that Ptolemy in his “Geography” mentions Amphissa alone in the inland area. All of the other cities are located along the coastal zone (Molykria, Euantheia, Chaleos).<sup>44</sup>

Chaleion (modern Galaxeidi), for instance, may not have yielded significant evidence for the settlement pattern of the period under consideration (being a listed heritage settlement with restricted building activity),<sup>45</sup> but it is known that it bestowed honours on Pompey for returning items –presumably dedications– removed from a sanctuary or sanctuaries of the city, in the period when he was pro-praetor for the war against pirates and Mithridates (67-62 BC).<sup>46</sup> The so-called “Galaxidi treasure”, which included a significant number of bronze artefacts (probably dedications in a sanctuary) dated from the Archaic period to the first century BC, may be related to this episode of Pompey returning items.<sup>47</sup> Furthermore, if we combine the epigraphically attested cult of Jupiter Optimus Maximus<sup>48</sup> with the mention of Poplius Licinius,<sup>49</sup> citizen of Chaleion, in a manumission text from Delphi, there is sufficient evidence

---

Physkeis and about the sanctuary of Athena Ilias as federal religious center of the League, cf. Daverio-Rocchi 2015, 192-193.

42. Pompeian garrisons are mentioned in Kalydon and Naupactos and troops from Amphissa were included in his army (Caes. *BCiv.* 3.35; Lucanus 3.172; cf. Flor. 2.15.2). Later, Caesarian troops under the command of Cn Calvisius Sabinus and L. Cassius Longinus drove out the Pompeians (Caes. *BCiv.* 3.34-35). Locrians enlisted in the army of Caesar in Pharsalos (Cass. Dio 41.51.3).

43. Cf. Karabinis 2018, 279.

44. Ptol. *Geog.* III.14.3; 14.14.

45. Zachos 2016, s.v. Chaleion; Baziotopoulou, Valavanis 2003.

46. *IG IX.1*<sup>2</sup> 719.

47. Zymi, Sideris 2003, 40-41, 52-55.

48. *CIL III*, 569; *IG IX.1*<sup>2</sup> 722; Schörner 2003, 512 no. 1101.

49. *F.Delphes III* 6, 130.

to indicate the existence of an Italian population in the city. The Aitolian and Patran bronze coins from the graves in Manoussakia district, dated to the second - early first century BC, can be seen as testament to a change in influence over the city.<sup>50</sup>

Traces of habitation, dated to the Roman period, were found in Vitrinitsa (hill of Pithas) and in the coastal town of Erateini. These are associated with the settlement<sup>51</sup> and the port of Oiantheia, depicted in Tabula Peutinger (or in Itinerarium Maritimum).<sup>52</sup> Albeit scarce, the epigraphic evidence provides proof for continuous habitation until the end of the first century BC.<sup>53</sup> However, when Pausanias visited Oiantheia one and a half century later, he described a city (or maybe merely its sanctuaries) in decay. The sanctuary of Apollo Phaistinos, mentioned by Pliny, must have been located on the coast (in the bay of Kiseli or the bay of Erateini).<sup>54</sup>

Furthermore, the traces of habitation in Marmara-Vidavi may be attributed to Tolophon, whose citizens are mentioned in manumission records at Delphi until the mid-first century AD.<sup>55</sup>

Archaeological evidence from the inland area is much more problematic. There is little significant building activity in the modern villages, most of which were founded during the middle or late Ottoman period. Thus, it is quite difficult to correlate the ruins found in these locations, or in their vicinity, with the small ancient Locrian settlements and even more so to determine their longevity.

It is worth discussing in detail the case of the city of Physkos, in modern Malandrino. On the one hand, Roman pottery came to light during clearance works in the fortification wall around the hill of Agios Nikolaos. On the other hand, the sanctuary of Athena Ilias, known by manumission texts of the second century BC, was abandoned and used as a cemetery in the Roman period.<sup>56</sup>

---

50. Tsaroucha 2019, 697.

51. Zachos 2016, s.v. Oianthea/Oiantheia/Euantheia.

52. Tabula Peutinger VIC; Axioti 1980, 204, fig. 2.

53. *F.Delphes* III 2, 214; *CID* 4, 119B; *SGDI* II, 2181.

54. Zachos 2016, s.v. Phaistinos. A manumission dedicated to the sanctuary of Apollo was found in the place-name Kameni Michani in the municipal community of Panormos in Tolophon municipality (Tsaroucha 2009).

55. Zachos 2016, s.v. Tolophon.

56. Zachos 2016, s.v. Physkos; Raptopoulos 2001-2004, 456 no. 50.

Nonetheless, the occurrence of funerary inscriptions of the Imperial period, an architrave of the second/third century AD,<sup>57</sup> and especially an epigraphic text about a “thiasos” of maenads and herdsmen participating in a Dionysian rite on the mountains in the mid-second century AD,<sup>58</sup> attest to a lively city in Roman times.

Although Eupalion appears in Strabo and Pliny, no activity of Roman date is documented in the area of the modern settlement (turk. Sule).<sup>59</sup> The same is true for Myania (Agia Euthymia).<sup>60</sup> The description of Pausanias, however, and the city’s involvement in the arbitration of the sacred land of Delphi in the early second century AD<sup>61</sup> leave no doubt about the existence of a settlement and the status of the city in the Roman period.

Let us now turn our attention to Amphissa. The migration of the Aitolians to the city in the Augustan period was not an uninformed decision. It could be argued that it was, in fact, to a certain degree inevitable. Nicopolis was a symbol of Roman power, a power that, a century earlier, had deeply humiliated the Aitolians, and now transferred parts of their ancient (“patroa”) homeland (Kalydon, Pleuron) to the Roman colonists of Patras. Epictetos, under Aitolian control for centuries, was now economically controlled by their most hated enemies, the Achaeans. Even Hypata, which successfully resisted the siege of Manius in 191 BC, became part of the Thessalian League along with Herakleia.<sup>62</sup> That left only Amphissa as an available refuge from the old

---

57. IG IX.1<sup>2</sup> 699, 703.

58. IG IX.1<sup>2</sup> 670; *LSCG Suppl.*, 318-320 no. 181; Beard, North, Price 2003, 291-292 no. 12.1c; Jaccottet 2003, II no. 153 (erroneously enlisted with Asian inscriptions); Kloppenborg, Ascough 2011, I no. 61; Heinrich 1978, 155-156.

59. Zachos 2016, s.v. Eupalion.

60. Zachos 2016, s.v. Myania.

61. It is worth noting that the delineation of the borderline between Delphi and Amphissa-Myania in the arbitration of the early 2nd cent. AD is mentioned without distinction between the two Locrian cities, which has been interpreted by Lerat (II, 101-102) as indicating a kind of commonalty between the two cities (cf. Rousset 2002a, 152-154, 167). Based on Lerat, Petrocheilos (2017, 53) suggests that the territory of Amphissa extended from the Sacred Land of Delphi to the east, to Chaleion to the west and to Vounichora to the north.

62. Zachos 2016, 57-59 and s.v. Hypata, 67-68 and s.v. Herakleia; Sekunda 1997, 208; Helly 2001; Rousset 2015, 228-229; Rousset 2020, 393-394.

Aitolian protectorate; the city remained outside the post-167 BC League of the Hesperians, and it had no obvious commitments to Rome or to their old enemies.<sup>63</sup> Furthermore, it is possible that the Aitolians, who lived in the city until the beginning of the second century BC and had lost their land, as it got incorporated to the Sacred Land of Delphi in 190 BC,<sup>64</sup> did not abandon the city. Moreover, from the Locrian point of view, it seems that the Locrians had welcomed the arrival of the Aitolians. After the abstraction or non-restoration of Epictetos, the rest of Locris would hardly have survived in the new era. At least the countryside of Amphissa must have suffered a great deal,<sup>65</sup> if we take into account the invasion of the Boeotians in 148 BC,<sup>66</sup> the raid of Scordisci, Maedi and Dardani across Delphi in 84/83 and 81/80 BC,<sup>67</sup> and Cicero's account (even though we do not know to what extent it is accurate) of the destruction of the area by the Eurytians and the Agrianes in the time of Calpurnius Piso.<sup>68</sup> Perhaps not unrelated to all this, at the beginning of the second century AD, the Amphissians again raised the issue of the borders of the Delphic land.<sup>69</sup> After three generations, the needs of the settlers for land would surely have increased, as well as their self-confidence. This may be why the land dispute between Amphissa and Delphi continued throughout the second century AD, lasting up until the beginning of the next century.<sup>70</sup>

At the same time, the rest of Locris was under "the government of the Achaeans of Patras, the emperor Augustus having granted them this

---

63. Ljung (2012, 195) dates the migration of the Aitolians to Amphissa in the mid-1st cent. AD when the last remnants of Kalydon's population left Aitolia.

64. Lerat 1952, II, 74; Ljung 2012, 138; Grainger 1999, 475.

65. It is worth noting that proconsul L. Junius Gallio informed the emperor Claudius about the lack of citizens in Delphi and the emperor ordered him to invite people from other cities (Rousset 2002a, 245-247 no. 40; *Choix Delphes*, 221). This evidence may not be irrelevant to the Aitolians having settled in Amphissa some years previously.

66. Paus. 7.14.7; Morgan, 1969; Ager 1996, 410-411 no. 149.

67. App. Ill. 5.

68. Cic. Pis. 91, 96. On the problems of Cicero's reference, see Zachos (in press).

69. *F. Delphes* III 4, 290-299; *CIL* III, 567; Lerat 1952, II, 110-111; Rousset 2002a, 91-111, 143-145 nos. 7-20; *Choix Delphes*, 428-432 no. 246.

70. Rousset 2002a, 111-114, 150, 280-282 nos. 21-23.

privilege”, according to Pausanias.<sup>71</sup> If he refers to financial control that began in the reign of Augustus (or this is what he was told) and continued into his days, it should be related to the provision of some income. We do not know what these revenues were. However, judging from the concession of the lagoon of Kalydon to the roman colony of Patras during the same period,<sup>72</sup> it is possible that the exploitation of the plain of Naupactos, and the presence of farmhouses that have been unearthed in the last two decades around the city, may be related to this agreement.<sup>73</sup> What is certain is that, in the case of Naupactos, the Achaian control did not hinder the flourishing of the city. It is likely, however, that this was not the case for the other smaller cities of Locris, which may have been affected.

Pliny, on the other hand, calls the Ozolians *immunes* and includes Amphissa in a catalogue of “immune” cities of Phokis (the only Locrian city in the catalogue). Both passages have been associated with Pausanias’ comment about the control of Ozolian Locris (except Amphissa)<sup>74</sup> by the Achaeans of Patras, mentioned above. Specifically, it has been proposed that Pausanias’ reference is related to financial obligations imposed on the Locrians, as compensation to the Greeks of Patras for the land taken from them and given to the Roman colonists of the city. These obligations, however, were temporary; shortly afterward, the cities of Ozolian Locris regained their independence.<sup>75</sup> This view may reconcile the *immunitas* of Pliny with the “Achaian control” of Pausanias. However, it contains an anachronism, since Pausanias is referring to a process that started in the reign of Augustus but was in force in his time (“ἄρχονται”).

Pliny’s references are quite problematic, as we have already seen; what Pliny does imply is that there was a different status between the other Ozolian cities and Amphissa in the Early Roman period, and some of Ozolian cities

---

71. Paus. 10.38.9.

72. Strabo 10.2.21; Zachos (in press).

73. Cf. the revenues of the Capuans from the Knossian land in the form of wine, as a compensation for their land in Italy having been rewarded to veterans from Sicily by Augustus (España-Chamorro, Gregori 2021) and the exploitation of various natural sources by Athens in the Roman period (cf. Zoumbaki, 2022).

74. Rizakis (1996, 278-285) suggests that Myaneia may also have been excluded from the new settlement.

75. Rizakis 1997, 25-26; Karabinis 2018, 279.

–possibly in a different period– were exempted from tribute. What kind of status the cities had is more difficult to ascertain.

We can be certain that at the beginning of the Late Roman period the Aitolian Amphissa was a prosperous city, with inhabitants who could afford to decorate their homes with expensive mosaics.<sup>76</sup> There are also trade connections with Patras, since lamps of a Patraic workshop were found there.<sup>77</sup> The wealth of some of its citizens is confirmed by the donation of a *balaneum* to the city by a wealthy citizen in honour of his son Aristopeithus in the third century AD.<sup>78</sup> A later epigraphic text from the city mentions that the proconsul Decimus Secundinus, curator and defender of the people of Amphissa, ordered the local officers to clean drains and channel water back into public cisterns, after a wealthy inhabitant had diverted it to his property. All this evidence substantiates the existence of an elite in the city, as well as the operation of the body of the Demos in Amphissa of the fourth century AD (probably after the reign of Constantine I).<sup>79</sup>

Amphissa was destroyed by the invading Goths led by Alaric, as indicated by the destruction layers dating to the end of the fourth century AD uncovered in local excavations.<sup>80</sup> The evidence of luxurious buildings (*villae urbanae*) dated to the fifth–sixth century AD (Frourio hill, Labour Centre, Papadimitriou plot, Poseidonos street) attest to its revival.<sup>81</sup> In addition, the buildings associated with the new religion are quite important (Early Christian church and baptistery or *Balaneum*).<sup>82</sup> Naupactos and Amphissa are the only cities of West Locris mentioned in Hierocles' *Synekdemos*.<sup>83</sup>

---

76. Zachos 2016, 159–160; Themelis 1977; Skorda 2008, 353. A masterpiece depicting a terrified pygmy being chased by a crane was found in Gerolymatos' plot, a theme well known from the myth of Antoninus Liberalis (Kokkini 2012, I, 236–237, 256–257, II, 97–98, Pygm. 3, pl. 59).

77. Tsaroucha 2019, 703.

78. *IG IX.1*<sup>2</sup>, 759.

79. *CIL III*, 578, cf. *CIL III*, p. 1317; *ILS 5794*; Lerat 1952, II, 111–112; Manino 1984, 107, 124.

80. Raptopoulos 2006.

81. Zachos 2016, 159; Petrou 2001–2004a; Asimakopoulou–Atzaka 1987, 190–194.

82. Ristow 1998 no. 233; Asimakopoulou–Atzaka 1987, 188–190; Petrocheilos 2017, 56–57; Petrou 2001–2004b.

83. Lerat 1952, II, 112.

In addition, numerous farms in the Hylaithos valley indicate that the countryside was not deserted, and cultivation (olive and viticulture) was intense in the Late Roman–Early Byzantine period, continuing till the Ottoman period.<sup>84</sup>

The region must have suffered during the time of the barbarian invasions.<sup>85</sup> Amphissa is located on the Isthmus Corridor Route that was used, according to Koder and Rosser, as the main route for the transportation of Slavic groups to Peloponnese.<sup>86</sup>

The inclusion of Amphissa in the catalogue of *De Thematibus* cannot be used as evidence to draw safe conclusions regarding its survival as a city, since this treatise is a mix of imperial propaganda, historical geography and historical evidence compiled from pre-Hellenistic, Hellenistic, Roman and Late Roman sources. The author, himself, mentions that he copied *Synekdemos*, which explains why the list of the cities of (supposedly Medieval) Central Greece starts with Skarpheia, the administrative centre of the region in Late Roman times,<sup>87</sup> and continues with the other cities of the region, among them the city of Delphi (a. μὲν Σκάρφειαν/Skarpheian, b. Ἐλατίνα/Elatina, c. Δαύλιον/Daulion, d. Χαιρώνειαν/Chaeronea, e. Ναύπακτον/Naupaktus, f. Δελφοῦς/Delphi, g. Ἀμφισσαν/Amphissa).<sup>88</sup>

### The Locrian ethnos: to be Ozolian (or Aitolian?) in Roman times

The League of the Hesperians appeared in 167 BC. Although it had presumably disintegrated along with the other Greek leagues in 146 BC, it is certain that

---

84. Vasileiou, Tsoumari 2017.

85. The islets opposite Galaxidi in the gulf of Itea have been identified as refuge places associated with the barbarian raids (Hood 1970; Valavanis 2015); Gregory 1981 points out that although much of the ceramic finds are dated to the late 6th and 7th cent. AD, there is also material of the 4th and 5th cent. (cf. also, Rosser 1996; Vasileiou, Tsoumari 2017, 75–76 n. 40). According to a new survey conducted by Th. Mailis, there is evidence for a diachronic use of the islands (LR, Byz, Mediev., Turk, Mod. times) and not only as refuge places (Mailis 2007).

86. Koder 1978, 315–332; Rosser 1991, 147; cf. also, the Mariolata case, Mailis 2011, 314–321. A peddle road attributed to the “East Branch” of the Corridor was found close to the chapel of Ai-Voristis to the north of Amphissa (Raptopoulos 2011b, 507 εικ. 15–16).

87. Zachos 2013b, 545.

88. *Constantinus Porphyrogenitus. De thematibus et de administrando imperio* (ed. I. Bekker) (Bonn 1840), pp. 51, II, P. 24; cf. Haldon 2021.



it was re-established in the 130s BC.<sup>89</sup> As we have seen, only the cities of the central part belonged to this league. The cities of the Epictetos, as well as Amphissa and Chaleion,<sup>90</sup> were not included. This is important as these two cities were the most significant cities with the most fertile land (Amphissa, Naupactos), which had functioned as administrative centres of Aitolia and Locris, and the most important ports (Naupactos and Chaleion), as well. In essence, it was a deficient league, without many chances of survival. Shortly before the battle of Actium, the League of Boeotians, Euboeans, Locrians, Phokians and Dorians bestowed honours on M. Junius Silanus, Marc Antony's *proquaestor*.<sup>91</sup> The Locrians are cited, along with the Achaeans, Boeotians, Phokians, Euboeans and Dorians, as members of the "Panachaeans", in an honorific decree erected in the Asklepieion of Epidauros for the "grammateas" of the League, T. Stateilius Timocrates, between the reign of Tiberius and that of Nero.<sup>92</sup> In addition, the Locrians are mentioned as members of the "Panhellenes" in a decree dated to ca. AD 37,<sup>93</sup> as well as in a dedication to the emperor Claudius in the sanctuary of Athena Itonia in Boeotia,<sup>94</sup> but without specifying by whom (the Hesperians, who were under Achaean financial control, or the Opountians and the Epicnemidians, or both?). This is the last reference to representatives of a Locrian league. The only evidence we have after these general references to some Locrians derives from a letter of Hadrian to the people of the city of Naryx; according to the emperor, the city of East Locris provided a "Boiotarch", chose a "Panhellene" and sent a "theêkolos".<sup>95</sup> The absence of any reference in the letter to a Locrian league cannot be accidental.<sup>96</sup>

All the same, even if we assume that this absence is not sufficient evidence to rule out the existence of a Locrian *koinon* in which cities from East or West

---

89. Lerat 1952, II, 100.

90. Lerat 1952, II, 99.

91. *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 767; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 4114; cf. *Plut. Ant.* 59; *Tod* 1922, 175; *Larsen* 1938, 450-451; *Deininger* 1965, 89; *Martin* 1975, 600.

92. *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 796; *IG* IV<sup>2</sup>,1 80-81; *IEpidauros Asklepieion*, 28-29 no. 34. On the date, see *Rizakis, Zoumbaki* 2001, 233-235, no. 252.

93. *IG* VII 2711; *Martin* 1975, 219-228, 613 no. 2; *Oliver* 1971.

94. *IG* VII 2878.

95. *SEG* 51, 641; *Jones* 2006, 151-162; *Knoepfler* 2006; *Knoepfler, Pasquier* 2006.

96. Cf. *Zachos* 2013b, 540.

Locris (or from both regions) were members, it is somewhat difficult to view the Aitolians of Amphissa participating in it.

Another possibility is suggested by an honorary inscription erected in the sanctuary of Athena Kranaia in Phokian Elateia at the end of the second century or the beginning of the third century AD, that is, a generation after Pausanias' visit to Locris (fig. 2). According to the text, an "Aitolarch" from Hypata honoured a lifetime "Xystarch" of the Great Pythian Games at Delphi in response to an honorary inscription for him by the latter at Delphi.<sup>97</sup> This appearance of an office related to the Aitolian ethnos two and half centuries after the last appearance of their league (84 BC) is quite bizarre. Although these offices were often no more than a title in this period, an echo of the glorious days, it is difficult not to distinguish a population behind them, namely some people claiming to be Aitolians. But, how could this population live in the abandoned Kalydon or in the deserted Pleuron,<sup>98</sup> or in Thermon where the porticoes for the Assembly of the League were used as graveyard?<sup>99</sup> There can be no definite answer, unless we assume that the small settlements around Lake Trichonis that survived into Roman times, or the long forgotten Kallipolis, could have fulfilled this role.<sup>100</sup> Of course, these people could have lived in various cities, in other ethnological regions, citing their ancient origins. But in that case, it would be the only league of Central Greece without an ethnic city-centre, or even a settlement. So, could the residents of Amphissa who did not want to be named Ozolians but Aitolians, be the population we are looking for? Did the origin that Pausanias invokes also have an "ethnological status" for the descendants of those who settled in Amphissa? Pausanias' silence on this matter, while not helpful, cannot be taken as definitive. Especially if we consider his analogous silence on a Boiotarch-Phokarch, the existence of which is confirmed by epigraphical texts. Furthermore, in Pausanias' narrative, the Amphissans/Aitolian citizens of Amphissa fought in Troy under the command of Thoas and not under the command of Ajax, son of Oileas; they did not rape the priestess of Athena like the ancestor of the Locrians did,<sup>101</sup>

97. Zachos 2013a, 296-298, pl. 68b; Rousset, Strasser 2017.

98. Zachos 2016, s.v. Kalydon, (Nea) Pleuron.

99. Zachos 2016, s.v. Thermon.

100. Zachos (in press); cf. Grainger 1999, 543-544.

101. Eur. *Tro.* 70; Verg. *Aen.* 2.403; Hyg. *Fab.* 116; Quint. Smyrn. 13.422; Lycoph. *Alex.* 1141-1173: τοῦπιλώβητον γένος (1173). On the inscription from Oiantheia and

but instead they brought the statue of Athena and worshipped it in the temple of their citadel; and above all ...they did not smell badly anymore.<sup>102</sup> During Antiquity, bad smell was associated with poor personal hygiene and a dirty body was seen as an indication of a sullied or sick mental state.<sup>103</sup> To be physically filthy was also understood as being filthy in the soul (like the rapists of Cassandra), and this could have been applied to those sacrilegious enough to cultivate sacred land.<sup>104</sup> It is reasonable for the Aitolians, who defended the sanctuary of Delphi against the Gauls in 279 BC, not to want to be associated with such impurities.

The granting of the title of Aitolarch to an Hypatian should not come as a surprise, especially when considering the close link between Aenis and Aitolia and the offices the Hypatians had undertaken in Delphi and beyond.<sup>105</sup>

It is amazing that West Locris has had the same fate in modern times. East Locris was a province (“eparchia”) of the Greek state since 1833, even occupying a much wider area than the ancient province, as it included a large part of ancient East Phokis. In contrast, West Locris was divided into the provinces of Doris, Parnassis and Naupactia of the prefectures of Phthiotis-Phokis and Aitoloakarnania.<sup>106</sup> Finally, after the abolition of the province administrative system, it was divided up between the prefectures of Aitoloakarnania and Phokis. Even though the modern province of Locris was integrated into the prefecture of Phthiotis, the Locrian identity in the eastern part remained alive, something that did not happen in the western part. The people of Amphissa, for instance, felt like Aitolians in the time of Pausanias, and nowadays promote

---

the mythical tradition, see *IG IX.1*<sup>2</sup> 706, *SEG* 28, 503; 32, 558, Wilhelm 1911; Graf 1978; Hughes 1991, 166-184. For a fresh look on the Locrian Maidens, cf. Redfield 2003. On its association to the Locrian ethnos, Giovannini 2007, 293, 326-328. On the sacrilege of Ajax, see Parker 1983, 185, 202-203.

102. There is a constant concern (or even fear) of the Greeks related to foul body odours (Lee 2015, 65-66).

103. Osborne 2011, 158-184.

104. For an association between impurity, sexual crime and sacrilege in Greek thought, see Parker 1983 (on the people living close to nature as potential sources of impurity, cf. p. 32), in Latin literature, see Fantham 2012, 59-60.

105. Sekunda 1997. Cf. also, Rousset, Strasser 2017, 21-22.

106. Official Greek Government Gazette (ΦΕΚ 12Α/6.04.1833).

their modern Phokian identity. What Philomelos, Onomarchos and Phayllos did not achieve during the Third Sacred War, was accomplished by the modern Greek State.

### Conclusion

Ozolian Locris operated for a very long time as a direct extension of Aitolia and therefore failed to regain its residential and ethnic integrity in the years following the battle of Pydna. Its fragmentation, as well as the control of its economy by outside forces, became attestations of its decline (with the exception of Amphissa and Naupactos), as in the case of Aitolia.<sup>107</sup> The paradox is that Aitolia's dissolution reconnected it with Locris in a rather bizarre way. The Aitolians refused to move to Nicopolis, the colonia-symbol of the Augustan power, and immigrated to Amphissa, which became, like the Gauls of René Goscinný, the "Aitolian village" in the middle of the Augustan settlement of the Achaëa Province. But what kind of resistance could one put up in the Roman Empire? The only form of "resistance" the Aitolians could provide were the narratives about Aitolian identity and the imposition of Aitolian identity on those deemed weak and unlucky, such as the Ozolians of Amphissa.

George Zachos  
Research Center for Antiquity  
Academy of Athens  
gzachos@academyofathens.gr

---

107. Ljung 2012.

## Περίληψη

### Η Οζόλια Λοκρίδα στους Ρωμαϊκούς χρόνους. Ένα «χαμένο» έθνος σε μία κατακερματισμένη γη

Ο Πausanías φτάνοντας στην Άμφισσα λίγο μετά το 170 μ.Χ. θα συναντήσει κατοίκους Αιτωλούς, αντί για Λοκρούς, οι οποίοι ήθελαν να αποποιηθούν το λοκρικό παρελθόν της πόλης. Οι Αιτωλοί αυτοί, σύμφωνα με τον ίδιον, είχαν αρνηθεί να μετοικήσουν στην Πάτρα ή την Νικόπολη όταν ο Αύγουστος μοίρασε την Αιτωλία στις δύο νέες αποικίες. Θα επισκεφθεί επίσης την Μυανία, το Χάλειον και την Ναύπακτο και θα μας πληροφορήσει ότι το υπόλοιπο της Δυτικής Λοκρίδας, πλην της Άμφισσας, ήταν υπό τον «έλεγχο» των Ελλήνων της Πάτρας. Ο συνδυασμός των αρχαίων πηγών (Πausanías, Στράβων, Πλίνιος, επιγραφικές μαρτυρίες) με αρχαιολογικά ευρήματα από την περιοχή μας παρέχουν πληροφορίες για το status των πόλεων της Οζόλιας Λοκρίδας στους Ρωμαϊκούς χρόνους. Το νέο *status quo* που επιβλήθηκε από την Ρώμη στην Αιτωλία και την Επίκτητο Αιτωλία «ακρωτηρίασε» τους Εσπέριους Λοκρούς και επηρέασε σε μεγάλο βαθμό το μοτίβο κατοίκησης της περιοχής. Όσο για την «Αιτωλική» Άμφισσα μία τιμητική επιγραφή από το ιερό της Αθηνάς Κραναίας θα μπορούσε να «φωτίσει» το θέμα του νέου πληθυσμού της.

## Summary

### The Ozolian Locris in Roman Times: A Lost People in a Fragmented Land

Pausanias, arriving at Amphissa shortly after AD 170, met with Aitolian residents - instead of Locrians- who wanted to renounce the Locrian past of the city. These Aitolians, according to him, had refused to move to Patras or Nicopolis, when Augustus divided Aitolia between the two new colonies. Pausanias also visited Myania, Chaleion and Naupactos and mentions that the rest of the Ozolian Locris, except Amphissa, was "under the control" of the Greeks of Patras. The combination of the ancient sources (Pausanias, Strabo, Pliny and the epigraphic record of West Locris) with the archaeological finds from

the region provides some information on the status of the Ozolian cities in the Roman period. The new status quo imposed by Rome in Aitolia and in Epictetos Aitolia fragmented the Hesperians and strongly affected the settlement pattern of the region. As far as Amphissa is concerned, an honorary inscription from the sanctuary of Athena Kranaia in Elateia may shed light on the matter of its new Aitolian population.

### Abbreviations-Bibliography

- Ager, S. 1996. *Interstate Arbitrations in the Greek World, 337–90 B.C.*, Berkeley.
- Antoniadis, V., Zachos, G. 2021. “From Map to Gazetteer and Back Again”, in *Proceedings of the 1<sup>st</sup> TIR-FOR Symposium: From Territory Studies to Digital Cartography, Barcelona 26-27/10/2020*. Barcelona, 61-71.
- Asimakopoulou-Atzaka, P. 1987. *Σύνταγμα των Παλαιοχριστιανικών ψηφιδωτών δαπέδων της Ελλάδος*, vol. II: Πελοπόννησος-Στερεά Ελλάδα. Thessaloniki.
- Axioti, K., 1980. “Ρωμαϊκοί δρόμοι της Αιτωλοακαρνανίας”, *ArchDelt* 35A, 186-205.
- Baziotopoulou, H., Valavanis, P. 2003. “ ‘Μετακινήσεις’ του Γαλαξειδίου στην Αρχαιότητα”, in P. Themelis, R. Stathaki-Koumari (eds.), *Το Γαλαξείδι από την αρχαιότητα έως σήμερα. Πρακτικά Πρώτου Επιστημονικού συνεδρίου, Γαλαξείδι 29-30 Σεπτεμβρίου 2000*. Athens, 11-26.
- Beard, M., North, J., Price, S. 2003. *Religions of Rome: A Sourcebook*. Cambridge.
- Daverio Rocchi, G. 2015. “The Lokrians and their Federal Leagues”, in H. Beck, P. Funke (eds.), *Federalism in Greek Antiquity*. Cambridge, 179-198.
- Deininger, J. 1965. *Die Provinziallandtage der römischen Kaiserzeit von Augustus bis zum Ende des dritten Jahrhunderts n. Chr.* Munich – Berlin.
- Dilke, O. 1987, “Maps in the Service of the State: Roman Cartography to the End of the Augustan Era”, in J.B. Harley, D. Woodward (eds.), *The History of Cartography* vol. I. Chicago, 201-211.
- España-Chamorro, S., Gregori, G.-L. 2021. “Campani a Creta: nuove riflessioni sui termini positi inter coloniam Flaviam Augustam Felicem Capuam et Plotium Plebeium (AE 1969/70, 635)”, in S. Antolini, S.M. Marengo (eds.), *Pro merito laborum. Miscellanea epigrafica per Gianfranco Paci*. Tivoli, 277-293.
- Fantham, E. 2012. “Purification in Ancient Rome”, in M. Bradley (ed.), *Rome, Pollution and Propriety: Dirt, Disease and Hygiene in the Eternal City from Antiquity to Modernity*. Cambridge – New York, 59-66.
- Fossey, J. 1986. *The Ancient Topography of Eastern Phokis*. Amsterdam.
- Giovannini, A. 2007. *Les relations entre États dans la Grèce antique du temps d’Hommère à l’intervention romaine (ca. 700-200 av. J.-C.)*. Stuttgart.
- Graf, F. 1978. “Die lokrischen Mädchen”, *Studi storici-religiosi* 2, 61-79.
- Grainger, J. 1999. *The League of the Aitolians*. Leiden – Boston – Cologne.
- Gregory, T. 1981. “Byzantine ‘Isles of Refuge’ ”, *AJA* 85, 195.
- Haldon, J. (ed.) 2021. *The De Thematribus (‘on the themes’) of Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus*. Liverpool.

- Heinrich, A. 1978. "Greek Maenadism from Olympias to Messalina", *HSCP* 82, 121-160.
- Helly, B. 2001. "Un décret fédéral des Thessaliens méconnu dans une cité d'Achaïe Phthiotide (IG IX 2, 103)", *BCH* 125, 239-287.
- Hood, S. 1970. "Isles of Refuge in the Early Byzantine Period", *BSA* 65, 37-45.
- Hughes, D. 1991. *Human Sacrifice in Ancient Greece*. London – New York.
- Jaccottet, A.-F. 2003. *Choisir Dionysos. Les associations dionysiaques ou la face cachée du dionysisme*. Zürich.
- Jones, Chr. 2006. "A letter of Hadrian to Naryka (Eastern Locris)", *JRA* 19, 151-162.
- Kahrstedt, U. 1954. *Das wirtschaftliche Gesicht Griechenlands in der Kaiserzeit: Kleinstadt, Villa und Domäne*. Berne.
- Karabinis, M. 2018. "Urban Networks in the Roman Province of Achaia (Peloponnese, Central Greece, Epirus and Thessaly)", *Journal of Greek Archaeology* 3, 269-339.
- Kloppenborg, J., Ascough, R. 2011. *Greco-Roman Associations: Texts, Translations, and Commentary*. Vol. I. Attica, Central Greece, Macedonia, Thrace. Göttingen.
- Knoepfler, D. 2006. "L'inscription de Naryka (Locride) au musée du Louvre: la dernière lettre publique de l'empereur Hadrien ? (première partie)", *REG* 119, 1-34.
- Knoepfler, D., Pasquier, A. 2006. "Un don des Amis du Louvre au Département des Antiquités grecques, étrusques et romaines: la lettre d'Hadrien aux gens de Naryka (Locride)", *CRAI* 150B, 1281-1313.
- Koder, J. 1978. "Zur Frage der slavischen Siedlungsgebiete im mittelalterlichen Griechenland", *ByzZ* 71, 315-332.
- Kokkini, Ph. 2012. "Η απεικόνιση του καθημερινού βίου στα ψηφιδωτά δάπεδα του ελληνικού χώρου κατά τη ρωμαϊκή αυτοκρατορική περίοδο" (Diss. Univ. of Athens).
- Larsen, J. 1938. "Roman Greece", in T. Frank (ed.), *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome*, vol. IV. Baltimore, 259-498.
- Lee, M. 2015. *Body, Dress, and Identity in Ancient Greece*. Cambridge.
- Lerat, L. 1952. *Les Locriens de l'Ouest*, vols I and II. Paris.
- Ljung, E. 2012. "From Indemnity to Integration: Economic Decline in Late Hellenistic Aitolia" (Diss. Univ. of Princeton).
- Mailis, Th. 2007. "Νομός Φωκίδας", *ArchDelt* 62, B1, 664-665.
- Mailis, A. 2011. "The Early Christian Basilica and the Later Cemetery at Mariollata (Phocide): Transformations of a Site beside the Great Isthmus Corridor Route", *Antiquité tardive* 19, 303-321.
- Mannino, V. 1984. *Ricerca sul 'Defensor Civitatis'*. Milan.



- Martin, D. 1975. "Greek Leagues in the Late Second and First Centuries B.C." (Diss. Univ. of Princeton).
- Morgan, G. 1969. "Metellus Macedonicus and the Province Macedonia", *Historia* 18, 422-446.
- Niebur, B. 1840. *Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae*. Bonn.
- Oliver, J. 1971. "Epaminondas of Acraephia", *GRBS* 12, 221-237.
- Osborne, R. 2011. *The History Written on the Classical Greek Body*. Cambridge.
- Papachatzis, N. 1981. *Πανσανίου Περιήγησις 5: Βοιωτικά-Φωκικά*. Athens.
- Papageorgiou, V. 2004. "Παλαιοχριστιανική Ναύπακτος: Όψεις της πόλης μέσα από τις ανασκαφικές μαρτυρίες", in *Β' Διεθνές Ιστορικό και αρχαιολογικό Συνέδριο Αιτωλοακαρνανίας, Αγρίνιο 29-31 Οκτωβρίου 2002*, vol. II. Agrinio, 459-471.
- Parker, R. 1983. *Miasma: Pollution and Purification in Early Greek Religion*. Oxford.
- Petrocheilos, N. 2017. "Από τους Δελφούς στο Κάλλιο. Διαδρομή στο τοπίο κατά τους αυτοκρατορικούς χρόνους", in *Αρχαιολογικές Συμβολές 4: Φωκίδα, Μουσείο Κυκλαδικής Τέχνης*. Athens, 47-68.
- Petrou, D. 2001-2004a. "Αμφισσα. Οδός Ποσειδώνος (αποχετευτικό δίκτυο)", *ArchDelt* 56-59, B2, 61-62.
- Petrou, D. 2001-2004b. "Αμφισσα. Οδοί Παπαχρήστου, Παπούλια και Αθ. Διάκου (οικόπεδα Π. Μπούτσικου και Π. Μέρμηγκα - Ευ. Γρίβα)", *ArchDelt* 56-59, B2, 62-64.
- Raptopoulos, S. 2006. "Some Late Roman – Early Byzantine Tombs from an Amfissa – in – Fokis Cemetery (Delfi Region) Greece", in *IVe colloque international d'archéologie funéraire*. Tulcea, 229-234.
- Raptopoulos, S. 2001-2004. "Επιφανειακή έρευνα. Φωκίδα – Δυτική Λοκρίδα – Οίτη", *ArchDelt* 56-59, B2, 448-458.
- Raptopoulos, S. 2011a. "Λεονά Βίνιανης", *ArchDelt* 66, B1, 506-507.
- Raptopoulos, S. 2011b. "Αϊ Βορίστης", *ArchDelt* 66, B1, 507.
- Redfield, J. 2003. *The Locrian Maidens. Love and Death in Greek Italy*. Princeton.
- Ristow, S. 1998. *Frühchristliche Baptisterien*. Münster.
- Rizakis, A. 1995. *Achaïe I. Sources textuelles et histoire régionale* (Μελετήματα 20). Athens.
- Rizakis, A. 1996. "Les colonies Romaines des côtes occidentales grecques : Population et territoires", *Dialogues d'histoire ancienne* 22, 255-324.
- Rizakis, A. 1997. "Roman Colonies in the Province of Achaia: Territories, Land and Population", in S. Alcock (ed.), *The Early Roman empire in the East*. Oxford, 15-36.
- Rizakis, A. 1998. *Achaïe II. La cité de Patras : Épigraphie et histoire* (Μελετήματα 25). Athens.

- Rizakis, A. 2018. “Η αγροτική οικονομία των ελληνικών πόλεων κατά την αυτοκρατορική εποχή: παράδοση και νεωτερισμοί”, in V. Di Napoli, F. Camia, V. Evangelidis, D. Grigoropoulos, D. Rogers, S. Vlizon (eds.), *What’s New in Roman Greece? Recent Work on the Greek Mainland and the Islands in the Roman Period. Proceedings of a Conference held in Athens, 8-10 October 2015* (Μελετήματα 80). Athens, 137-156.
- Rizakis, A., Zoumbaki, S. 2001. *Roman Peloponnese* vol. I: *Roman Personal Names in their Social Context* (Μελετήματα 31). Athens.
- Roller, D. 2018. *A Historical and Topographical Guide to the Geography of Strabo*. Cambridge.
- Rosser, J. 1991. “The Dark Ages”, in E.W. Kase, G.J. Szemler, N.C. Wilkie, P.W. Wallace (eds.), *The Great Isthmus Corridor Route: Explorations of the Phokis-Doris Expedition*, vol. I. Minneapolis, 145-155.
- Rosser, J. 1996. “Byzantine Isles of Refuge in the Chronicle of Galaxeidi”, in P. Lock, G.D.R. Sanders (eds.), *The Archaeology of Medieval Greece*. Oxford, 139-146.
- Rousset, D. 2002a. *Le territoire de Delphes et la terre d’Apollon*. Paris.
- Rousset, D. 2002b. “Inscriptions hellénistiques d’Amphissa”, *BCH* 126, 83-96.
- Rousset, D. 2004. “West Locris”, in M.H. Hansen, Th.H. Nielsen, *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis*. Oxford, 391-398.
- Rousset, D. 2015. “Microfederalism in Central Greece: the Dorians and Oitaians”, in H. Beck, P. Funke (eds.), *Federalism in Greek Antiquity*. Cambridge, 222-230.
- Rousset, D. 2020. “L’emprunt de Drymos de Phocide à la confédération des Oitaiens”, *JSav*, 369-428.
- Rousset, D., Strasser, J.-Y. 2017. “D’Élatée à Delphes: Un Étolarque et un Xystarque”, *REG* 130, 1-22.
- Saranti, P. 2018. “Ναύπακτος: Τοπογραφική εξέλιξη του άστεως και της χώρας, από τους προϊστορικούς χρόνους μέχρι την Ύστερη Αρχαιότητα” (Diss. Univ. of Ioannina).
- Schörner, G. 2003. *Votive im römischen Griechenland: Untersuchungen zur späthellenistischen und kaiserzeitlichen Kunst – und Religionsgeschichte*. Stuttgart.
- Sekunda, N. 1997. “The Kylooi and Eubiotoi of Hypata during the Imperial Period”, *ZPE* 118, 207-226.
- Skorda, D. 2008. “Φωκίδα: Ιστορικό και αρχαιολογικό περίγραμμα, Αρχαία Δυτική Λοκρίδα. Εσπέραιοι Λοκροί”, in A. Vlachopoulos (ed.), *Εύβοια και Στερεά Ελλάδα*. Athens, 346-353.
- Themelis, P. 1977. “Ψηφιδωτά στην Άμφισσα”, *AAA* 10, 242-258.
- Tod, M. 1922. “Greek Inscriptions from Macedonia”, *JHS* 42, 167-183.

- Tsaroucha, A. 2009. “Περυσυλλογή”, *ArchDelt* 64, B1, 538.
- Tsaroucha, A. 2017. “Η λατρεία στην Εσπερία Λοκρίδα μέσα από τους μύθους, τις γραπτές πηγές και τις ανασκαφικές μαρτυρίες”, in *Αρχαιολογικές Συμβολές*. Vol. 4: Φωκίδα, Μουσείο Κυκλαδικής Τέχνης. Athens, 35-46.
- Tsaroucha, A. 2019. “Η πορεία της Φωκίδας μέσα από τα νεκροταφεία των ιστορικών χρόνων”, in H. Koundouri, A. Gadolou (eds.), *Τα νεκροταφεία: Χωροταξική οργάνωση, ταφικά έθιμα, τελετουργίες*. Vol.1. Athens, 685-709.
- Valavanis, P. 2015. “Αρχαία ναυτική βάση στη βραχονησίδα Άγιος Δημήτριος του Κρισσαίου κόλπου”, *AEphem* 154, 111-122.
- Vasileiou, M., Tsoumari, V. 2017. “Η αγροτική ζωή στην κοιλάδα του Υλαίου από τους πρώιμους βυζαντινούς έως τους νεότερους χρόνους”, in *Αρχαιολογικές Συμβολές*. Vol. 4: Φωκίδα, Μουσείο Κυκλαδικής Τέχνης. Athens, 69-90.
- Vokotopoulos, P. 1973. “Παλαιοχριστιανική βασιλική Ναυπάκτου”, *ArchDelt* 28, B2, 394-395.
- Wilhelm, A. 1911. “Die lokrische Mädcheninschrift”, *ÖJh* 14, 163-256.
- Zachos, G. 2013a. *Ελάτεια: Ελληνιστική και Ρωμαϊκή περίοδος*. Volos.
- Zachos, G. 2013b. “The Roman Period: from 146 BC to Justinian”, in J. Pascual, M.-F. Papakonstantinou (eds.), *Topography and History of Ancient Epicnemidian Locris (Mnemosyne Suppl. 362)*. Leiden, 537-548.
- Zachos, G. 2016. *Tabula Imperii Romani J34-Athens: Achaia Phthiotis, Malis, Aenis, Oitaia, Doris, Eurytania, East & West Locris, Phokis, Aitolia-Akarnania*. Athens.
- Zachos, G. (in press). “Roman Aitolia: The Wind of Change”, in C. Papageorgiadou, S. Zoumbaki, V. Antoniadis (eds.), *Epirus under the Romans: Economic Dynamics and Countryside*. IHR/NHRF (in press).
- Zoumbaki, S. 2022. “New Epigraphic Evidence from Melos and New Insights in the Economic Affairs of two Melian Ladies in Puteoli on the Basis of the Sulpicii Archive”, *ZPE* 222, 259-271.
- Zymi, H., Sideris, A. 2003. “Χάλκινα σκεύη από το Γαλαξείδι: πρώτη προσέγγιση”, in P. Themelis, R. Stathaki-Koumari (eds.), *Πρακτικά Πρώτου Επισημονικού συνεδρίου. Γαλαξείδι 29-30 Σεπτεμβρίου 2000*. Athens, 35-60.




Fig. 1. Map of West Locri in Roman Times: Zachos 2016, map 6 (© Academy of Athens).




Fig. 2. The Inscription of Aitolarch: Zachos 2013a, pl. 68b (© G. Zachos).