

3

Networks: Exile and Tourism in the Roman Cyclades

REBECCA SWEETMAN

Attracted by the fame of the place, I was eager to come within sight of Delos, and seemed to traverse the deep with languid pace. How often did I chide the oars, as slow in bearing us along? How often complain that our sails were not stretched by the stunted blasts? And now I had passed Mycone, Tenos, and Andros, and bright Delos was within view; which I no sooner saw, than I cried out, Why does the island seem to fly by me?

—Ovid, *Heroides* 21.77–84

The prevailing view of the Cyclades in the Roman period comes from literary sources that assert an inaccessibility and insularity, as for example in Catullus, “Dare not deny her, insular Cyclades.”¹ The image of remoteness was further underscored by stories of piracy and Pompey’s efforts to eradicate it.² It is not surprising, then, that the islands were famed as places of exile, particularly in the imperial period.³ While the view of the islands from the ancient sources is overwhelmingly negative, the modern perspective is also problematic. In practical terms, little is known about the administrative history of the islands, and the islands are often erroneously considered a single entity rather than individual lands. The fact that it is difficult to ascertain to what province various islands belonged at different times suggests that the degree to which the concept of a Roman province can enhance analysis of the Cyclades is questionable;⁴ their shared administration did not necessarily create bonds or a collective identity among the islands. A collective identity was lacking in other jurisdictions as well, for example in the joint province of Crete and Cyrene, where there appear to have been few points of commonality and little surviving evidence of a shared visual culture.⁵ And the labels that have been used to define roles or relationships, terms such as *province* and *colony*, can be misleading in that they prompt assumptions of how places should work or relate to Rome based on categorization.⁶ A good example of this confusion occurs with Knossos, Crete’s only Roman colony, where results of excavations have been interpreted through the lens of expectations for Roman colonies.⁷ In the top-down approach of past scholarship, if there was little evidence that a region conformed to the idea of a Roman province, that area was sometimes viewed as being of little consequence—so, for example, Crete was seen as a backwater and the Cyclades as insular.⁸

The dearth of literary sources and the historical stereotyping of the Cyclades as marginal overshadowed the drive to understand the actual material evidence.

When examined without such preconceptions, however, the archaeology of the Cyclades indicates that life on the islands during the Roman period was quite dynamic. Studies of the *agorai* in Melos, Thera, and Andros, for example, all indicate an energetic and escalating economy with rebuilding and investment, particularly in the second century.⁹ There were at least eight statue bases dedicated to Hadrian, revealing the positive attempt to gain imperial attention, and the *macellum* of the Agora at Palaiopolis in Andros may even have been dedicated to Marcus Aurelius.¹⁰ An erroneous concept of the unity of a province had encouraged the analysis of the Cyclades as a single entity, a place of insularity and exile, thus neglecting the multiplicity of roles and diversity among the islands and any real evidence for active participation in the empire.¹¹ A richer and more complex picture of the Cyclades comes into focus when individual islands and their roles in the Roman network are analyzed.

I have argued elsewhere that a range of agents and motivations (local and central) were needed in order for a place to become actively part of the Roman Empire, whether through trade, the military, politics, administration, or personal connection.¹² Analysis of the Cyclades makes it clear that a range of different network connections, from personal to public, played a fundamental role in affording opportunities to diverse islands, regardless of their provincial designation. The islands were not a monolithic group; while some may have taken advantage of network connections, others may not have done so. Through an analysis of personal interaction, exile, and tourism and an examination of the archaeological data, this essay aims to assess the extent to which the Cyclades were really isolated and to consider a range of roles individual islands may have played over time in the Roman network. As Ovid wrote, once the individual islands are explored it is possible to see how dynamic many really were.

A Brief History of the Roman Cyclades

The insularity of the Roman Cyclades has become a self-sustaining trope along the lines of the supposed austerity of Classical Sparta, and in both cases past scholars were deterred from undertaking systematic studies of the “poor” periods of these areas.¹³ For the Roman period, with the exception of work on individual sites (Palaiopolis on Andros), surveys (Melos), and onomastic studies, few large-scale efforts have been attempted.¹⁴ Roman material from some individual islands, such as Keos and Melos, is reasonably well known, but considerable quantities of Roman material from other islands, such as Andros, Thera, and Kythnos, remain underused in broader studies.¹⁵ Unhelpfully, much of the work on the history and archaeology of the Cyclades in the Roman period is typified by issues of scholarly disagreement over which islands were part of which province and at what period.

R. L. N. Barber has noted that significant Classical centers of the Cyclades—such as Klima on Melos, Palaiopolis on Andros, and Thera on Santorini—were continuously occupied from the Geometric until the end of the Late Antique period (seventh century).¹⁶ The Cycladic islands were almost always controlled by overseas powers, whether by Classical Athens and Rhodes, Hellenistic Macedonia or Egypt, or finally Rome.¹⁷ During the Republican period, Sulla gave some of the islands to Rhodes as a reward for its support during the First Mithridatic War. Marcus Antonius gave Andros, Tenos, and Naxos to Rhodes, while Keos went to Athens.¹⁸ By the first century BCE,

most of the islands seem to have been in the Roman province of Asia except Keos and Delos, which belonged to Achaëa and were thus part of Achaëa.¹⁹ Under Augustus, many of the islands were given to Achaëa; others seem to have been left in the province of Asia.²⁰ The islands did not become politically unified as a single province until 294 CE, as Diocletian's *provincia insularium* under a *praeses insularum*. But even then the arrangement excepted Keos, Delos, Kythnos, Mykonos, Seriphos, and Syros, all of which remained part of Achaëa. In terms of the management of the islands, it is likely that most were relatively independent as long as dues were paid to the Roman state.²¹ Onomastic data suggest that tax collectors and merchants were regular visitors to the islands.²² While there are some political names, their presence on the islands seems to have had financial or religious purposes.²³ It is known that Marcus Aurelius sent two imperial legates, C. Vettius Sabinianus Iulius Hospes and L. Saevinius Proculus, to the Cyclades to take care of economic activities.²⁴ There were other low-ranking officials connected with cult foundations, as for Mithras on Andros (by M. Aurelius Rifinus, an *evocatus Augusti*) and for Isis on Syros (by Claudius Secundus, a *viator tribunicius*).²⁵ Similarly, the relatively higher-ranking officials in evidence on Tenos were associated primarily with the sanctuary of Poseidon and Amphitrite at Kionia.

Most of the Cycladic islands were fairly self-sufficient in terms of agricultural and wine production, and some expanded their remit to other industries. For many of the islands the first century BCE was a watershed, with some islands emerging as more successful than others. During the Hellenistic period, islands such as Delos were well integrated, and many of the nearby islands (Tenos and Andros) benefited from their proximity to this network hub. Others, such as Paros and Seriphos, did well economically because of their natural resources and were tied into the trade network. Significant alterations to the islands' established contacts came in the first century BCE with attacks like those by Mithridates on Delos and by the Romans on Seriphos (in 84 BCE). Delos never recovered from this period of crisis, and afterward even some of the islands with natural resources, such as Kythnos, Keos, Siphnos, and Seriphos, appear not to have been exploited as fully in the Roman period.²⁶

During the second century CE, the Cyclades, like other areas of Greece, seem to have prospered. Strabo mentions Andros, Naxos, and Paros as important and implies the same for Melos by comparison to its neighbors.²⁷ Unsettling events in the third century may have contributed to the abandonment of some islands such as Delos.²⁸ Recent data indicate that the Cyclades were Christianized somewhat earlier in the Late Antique period (fourth century) than areas such as the Peloponnese and Crete.²⁹ Paros, Siphnos, and Amorgos were also episcopal seats, and the islands appear to have been as prosperous as other areas around the eastern Mediterranean until at least the seventh century, when many of the islands were raided by the Slavs.³⁰

Networks

Network analysis measures levels of diversity and connectivity over a diachronic period. Networks, which can be static or dynamic,³¹ are defined as the means through which information is shared; there are multiple types, including social, infrastructural, and biological. Networks can be created through personal connections (such as exile, tourism, religious experience) and/or may be organizational (such as trade or information exchange). Networks can be controlled or mediated by different groups or individuals, and they can be generated organically or manipulated.³² As already indicated, networks may be scale-free, such as the Roman Empire, or small-world (local

ones).³³ An examination of networks provides a better understanding of the individual places and overall organization, and assesses diversity of relationships over time and space in accordance with varying contacts created by different means and people.

Underpinning a network analysis is the idea of phase transition—the idea that wide-scale communication between locations (hubs or nodes) will create further nodes.³⁴ Hubs are highly connected loci that are not necessarily significant cities, while nodes are locations that connect small-world and scale-free networks. Evidence of phase transition clarifies the level of participation in the wider Roman network.

Application of network analysis to archaeological evidence has developed significantly in the last few years, particularly through the work of Tom Brughmans and Carl Knappett.³⁵ Both social networks of people (particularly craftspeople), and nonsocial/material networks (artifacts) have been the subjects of analysis.³⁶ In the case of Middle Bronze Age pottery in the Cyclades, for example, the evolving networked relationships between artifacts, people, and space have been examined with a focus on economic evidence for cultural transmission and the organization of individuals.³⁷ Evidence of economic exchange might be measurable by the existence of a product in demand as well as by imported goods. The use of locations as stopover points is more difficult to ascertain, although the presence of luxury or imported items in an otherwise subsistence-level economy might indicate a transfer.

Defining the type of network allows for more complex interactions to be recognized (and not merely as simple linear connections) in the Cyclades. As networks can be relational and not necessarily categorical (that is, they do not have to be grouped according to common characteristics), they allow for fluctuation in interactions among island communities.³⁸ Communication hubs such as Melos may have connected the small-world network of the islands with the larger scale-free network of the Roman Empire. This nodal relationship would have enabled less-structured communication links for islands that may not have exploited their connections to make them more active or regular players in the larger Roman network.

Levels of isolation changed over time and degrees of insularity might have increased or decreased even on a seasonal basis, as certain weather conditions may have made it necessary to keep the sailing times shorter with more stops at islands.³⁹ Travel across the Mediterranean from west to east and from north to south was straightforward, but prevailing winds made the return journeys far less predictable.⁴⁰ Thus a range of network connections might have been made through casual visits, location on trade routes, or even nebulous weather. It is arguable that many of the Cycladic islands were actually quite well connected to each other (small-world network) and the center through personal interactions. Because only a small number of islands exploited connections to become part of the larger Roman network society (scale-free network), news of the majority of the islands stayed largely local or personal, thereby promulgating the idea, though not the experience, of static seclusion.

Network analysis enables the recognition of connections on a macro (town) and micro (individual) scale. The study of the Egyptian trade focuses on Red Sea coastal sites like Berenike, where the evidence of being a hub and part of the scale-free network is seen in the variety of offerings in the sanctuaries within the towns, while the evidence for the small-world network is seen in the spread of imported objects in satellite villages.⁴¹ On the other side of the empire, in the northwest, evidence for network connections can be found in imagery on coinage, although the exact details of the functioning of the networks are opaque.⁴² In this essay I examine similar network connections to rethink the nature of the Cyclades in the Roman period. The focus will be on the

personal networks and on whether or not they contributed to empire-wide structuring principles that allowed access to a local rather than imperial perspective.⁴³ Personal or emotional exchange is not easy to measure in archaeological contexts, but in the case of the Cyclades, epigraphic data and characterizations of exile can contribute to such analysis. This essay stands alongside others in this volume that chart elements of material culture, with a focus here on the evidence for the interconnectedness that impacted these islands, particularly in the contexts of political exile and religious tourism.⁴⁴

Exile and Tourism

According to Mary Braginton, 150 people are known to have been exiled in the imperial period, but the actual number is likely to have been much higher.⁴⁵ The nature of Roman exile changed over time; in some cases remoteness was key (Augustus restricted those exiled to islands that were “not less than 50 miles from the mainland,” and travel was forbidden); in others it was preferable to send an outcasts to well-populated places (like cities) so that they could be monitored—for example, when Cicero went into exile to Thessaloniki, or Helvidius Priscus to Nicopolis. Despite the view that the remoteness of the Cyclades made them suitable places of exile, not all islands used for deportation were small and remote. And there were different levels of severity of exile. Dio Chrysostom, for example, who was exiled from Rome, was able to travel widely. Others were restricted to one location. The evidence suggests that execution while in exile—as in the case of Flaccus, sentenced to execution while in exile on Andros in 39 CE—was uncommon. Although in most cases exile meant loss of citizenship, there were different levels of property appropriation. In exile Ovid and Seneca kept their property, for example, and Lollia Pavlenia had a large allowance.

James Scott notes that negative elements of being in exile can change (even while still in exile) to a positive experience of diaspora.⁴⁶ In some cases of Cycladic exile certain deportees seem to have flourished. Glitius Gallus and Egnatia Maximilla, for example, after being banished to Andros by Nero, settled into their new residence with great flair, invested in their new homes, and were held in high esteem by the local Andrians, who erected honorific monuments to them.⁴⁷ In contrast, Cassius Severus died in squalor after having spent fourteen of his twenty-five years in exile on Seriphos, and when Vibius Serenus was recalled to Rome from exile in Amorgos he arrived in rags.⁴⁸ It is unclear whether there were multiple deportees occupying the same islands at the same time and whether particular islands were favored at different periods.

The main islands used for exile were Amorgos, Andros, Gyaros, Kythnos, and Seriphos. There are also occurrences of exile at Naxos and Syros—for example, in 65 CE Lucius Silanus chose to be exiled to Naxos, and a false prophet was banished to Syros by Marcus Aurelius after the attempted usurpation of Avidius Cassius in 175 CE—but these are less frequent.⁴⁹ Juvenal likened imprisonment to being between Seriphos and Gyaros and described Gyaros as a vile place,⁵⁰ which indicates that certain islands were considered particularly dreadful places for banishment. Some families petitioned for more lenient sentences for individuals banished to Gyaros;⁵¹ for example, although they were originally sentenced to exile in Gyaros, Caius Iunius Silanus was ultimately banished to Kythnos by Tiberius (23 CE) and Avillius Flaccus to Andros by Caius (39 CE).⁵² Seriphos, considered poor and insignificant, hosted the outcasts Vistilia (19 CE) and Cassius Severus (24–33 CE). Kythnos, which was relatively close to the mainland and had pleasant

features such as hot springs and, according to Pliny, good cheese,⁵³ may not have been so dreadful for an exile. C. Iuncus Silanus, proconsul of Asia, was banished there in 23 CE.

Paul Allatson and Jo McCormack suggest that while exile is often seen as “a disturbed physical and psychic relation to space and home,” it is also now used figuratively to refer to senses of dislocation or unease.⁵⁴ Analyses of exile in the Roman period focus on the impact of exile on an individual’s psyche and how that experience is articulated rather than on the place of exile.⁵⁵ Although elements of exile in terms of the *patria* have been studied, particularly when there may be negative qualities associated with the homeland, the effects of exiled individuals on the new place are not so commonly discussed.⁵⁶ The phenomenon of mass exile in more recent times has turned attention to the effects of the diaspora on the new place as well as the effects of the loss of the exiles on the old place and cultures.⁵⁷ Depending on the individuals exiled, their presence on the island could contribute to a change in its welfare either through direct investment or through expenditure by visitors to the exiles, each circumstance providing different network opportunities. This is particularly the case with those islands that harbored some of the more renowned exiles, where not just family members but also supporters or clients may have visited. An astrologer exiled to Seriphos did particularly well financially after his business followed him to the island,⁵⁸ and even an exile to the dreaded Gyaros, the teacher Musonius Rufus, was visited by many while there.⁵⁹ Although there is little to suggest that these islands became significant players in the Roman network, they were not cut off from wider experiences in the empire.

Epigraphic evidence indicates that there were opportunities to be had on fertile islands such as Andros and Amorgos. On Andros, for example, two honorific inscriptions were set up to the exiles Glitius Gallus and Egnatia Maximilla (65 CE).⁶⁰ Even on less promising islands, the exiles made a difference; Philostratus indicated that the presence of Musonius on Gyaros improved the island because people came to see him there. Apparently he uncovered a fountain and also worked on digging through the isthmus.⁶¹

Although life cannot have been easy on many of the islands, it was by no means as remote and barren as the generalizations of exile would imply. In *De exilio* 8 Plutarch discusses the happiness of life in exile, even on small islands, and says that the exiled are mistaken if they think they are being punished. Every island has a “house, a walk, a bath, fish and hares for hunting and sport,” he notes. The presence of exiles on some of the Cycladic islands would have changed the connectedness of an island, in some cases temporarily and in other cases—through investment in buildings or cult—more permanently.⁶²

One prompt for more permanent investment was cult practice in connection with tourism. Clive Gamble and Carl Knappett argue that connections are not limited to those with “face-to-face interaction.”⁶³ Reasons of religious or cultural interest also come into consideration in the form of pilgrimage and tourism practices. Evidence for tourism to the islands in the Roman period is limited to a small number of elite references from Cicero, Mucianus, and the like. These sources do at least make it known to us that there were several island tourist attractions: for example, on Naxos, the Tomb of the nurse of Ariadne and Ariadne herself; on Ios, the Tomb of Homer; and on Paros, the Tomb of Archilochos.⁶⁴ In 51 BCE Cicero toured the Cycladic islands on his way to take up his governorship in Cilicia, visiting Keos, Gyaros, Syros, and Delos before heading over to Samos.⁶⁵ Some suggest that the visits were due to weather conditions rather than being planned events.⁶⁶ Hadrian certainly sailed through the Cycladic islands on the way from Ephesus to the Peloponnese in 124 CE and seems to have stopped off at Astypalaia.⁶⁷ Sextus Pompeius holidayed

on Keos on his way to take up the governorship of Asia in about 27 CE, and the historian Florus (ca. 70–140 CE) also visited the Cyclades.⁶⁸

The Cycladic islands also had a number of prominent sanctuaries and sites of miracles. Especially famed were the temple of Apollo and Artemis on Keos, which was excavated in the early nineteenth century, and the sanctuary of Delian Apollo at Paros.⁶⁹ The sanctuary of Dionysos at Andros was known for its miracles.⁷⁰ Anna Collar, Hugh Bowden, and Ian Rutherford have successfully shown how network analysis can be applied to the spread of religious ideas and practices of different periods in the Graeco-Roman world,⁷¹ but more remains to be done in this vein for the Cyclades in the Roman period. Although it is difficult to assess the extent of everyday occurrences of religious tourism, it is known, for example, that Mucianus visited the Cycladic sanctuaries of Dionysos on Andros and Apollo on Delos.⁷² Andros was primarily an agricultural island, as well as being used for exile, but there was a high volume of traffic because of the sanctuary.⁷³ As discussed above, there was external investment in cult sites such as Mithras on Andros, Isis on Syros, and Poseidon and Amphitrite on Tenos. Although the temples of Mithras at Palaiopolis on Andros and of Isis on Syros have been identified only through epigraphic evidence, foundations of the temple of Poseidon and Amphitrite on Tenos were revealed in the twentieth century by excavations undertaken by the French School of Archaeology.⁷⁴ Founded in the fourth century BCE, the sanctuary was lavishly constructed of a variety of marbles. It reached its zenith in the Hellenistic period; both Augustus and Tiberius took an interest in it, particularly Tiberius, who gave it *asylia*. Later investment is also evidenced through epigraphic data as well as Roman sculpture including Hadrian and Trajan.⁷⁵ Elsewhere, personal connections of other kinds may be shown through investment and patronage. Islands such as Paros, Thera, and Andros benefited from donations from wealthy individuals.⁷⁶

The Cycladic Islands and Networks

One of the hindrances to understanding the Roman Cyclades was a relative lack of archaeological data from this period. In the last few decades, however, this lack has been addressed, and in addition to the evidence from the larger islands of Andros, Melos, and Tenos more attention has been paid to the Roman material from smaller islands such as Amorgos and Kythnos.⁷⁷ Although a full analysis is not possible here, a brief look at the archaeology of the islands in relation to economic issues, exile, and tourism will make clear the impact of networks on a reconsideration of the Cyclades in the Roman period.

Melos went out of its way to attract trade by exploiting its location and its resources, which included hot springs, and it seems to have done exceptionally well in the Roman period.⁷⁸ Recent work has been undertaken on the Roman minerals used for industry and medicine and on mining in the area of Agia Kyriaki; it appears that the mines were well exploited.⁷⁹ Additionally, the Melians engineered good connections to the networks through the establishment of a number of small ports around the island to maximize trade in many kinds of weather, although not all ports were in constant use—for example, the main harbor silted up in the early Roman period.⁸⁰ Harbor installations were excavated at Klima, and it is likely that substantial data will be recovered at Palaiochori (ancient Zephiri).⁸¹ The significant amounts of archaeological material already excavated on Melos (at Klima, Agios Elias, and Tramythia)—from public places such as gymnasia, baths, and theaters (fig. 3.1) to private buildings, industry, and mortuary evidence—have provided

Permission to use this image was granted for publication in *Beyond Boundaries* only. To see the final published chapter complete with images, please consult the published book: <http://shop.getty.edu/products/beyond-boundaries-connecting-visual-cultures-in-the-provinces-of-ancient-rome-978-1606064719>

FIGURE 3.1 The theater on Melos

a broad view of the Roman occupation.⁸² Close to the catacombs near Trypiti is a small Christian church, and a Late Antique church is located in the modern town of Plaka. Melos's comparatively extensive networks are reflected in onomastic data that show a Melian, Ti. Claudius Frontonianus, becoming a Roman *eques*.⁸³ Furthermore, it is clear from an inscription thanking the Romans for their investment that there was external spending on the island.⁸⁴ The extensive architectural remains, mosaics, and sculpture hint at the return the Melians got on their investment in being part of the network society. There may also have been a minor ripple effect on Kimolos, enabling the exploitation of Kimolian chalk. More recently, a Hellenistic and Roman settlement has been identified in the south of the island.⁸⁵ The sites of Ellenika and Palaeokastro were occupied until the Late Antique and Byzantine periods, respectively, and it is hoped that the recent survey will provide more data.⁸⁶

While Melos may have had a positive impact on nearby islands in the imperial period, it is likely that only in the Hellenistic period did Tenos benefit from being in Delos's wake. There is evidence of Roman bankers, *proxenoi*, and a Roman community on Tenos in the first century BCE. Despite the decline of Delos in the Roman period, however, Tenos continued to do well. There was some patronage on the island, but it was by families unconnected with the imperial elite,⁸⁷ and in turn a number of patrons and Roman officers are known to have received honors on the island.⁸⁸ Strabo noted that the famous Poseidia festival attracted significant numbers of visitors, and he also noted that the island did not have a major city.⁸⁹

The main town on the island, Xobourgo, seems to have been replaced by the town closer to the modern capital sometime in the fifth or fourth century BCE.⁹⁰ Although the sanctuary of Poseidon and Amphirrite at Kioni has been excavated,⁹¹ little of the Hellenistic and Roman occupation of the town of Tenos has been investigated, and there are hints of Roman occupation at

Permission to use this image was granted for publication in Beyond Boundaries only. To see the final published chapter complete with images, please consult the published book: <http://shop.getty.edu/products/beyond-boundaries-connecting-visual-cultures-in-the-provinces-of-ancient-rome-978-1606064719>

Sparto and Akroterio Ourion. Tenos was largely self-sufficient, but it had few significant resources other than some marble quarries. In spite of the small urban space and limited trade, epigraphic evidence suggests that Tenos did well throughout the imperial period, which may have been in part through its agriculture and religious tourism and perhaps even through its use as a place of exile.⁹²

Tenos may actually have benefited from the decline of its neighbor Delos, as might Andros. At Andros, epigraphic data indicate trade and banking activity, but the level of patronage found in Tenos has not been shown here.⁹³ Since the island has seen some concentrated archaeological work, however, this assessment may change in the future. As the second largest of the Cycladic islands, Andros had well-watered and fertile land in addition to wood and some marble resources. The renowned first-century BCE copies of the *Matron of Herculaneum* and *Hermes Psychopompos* were found at Palaiopolis (fig. 3.2). Zagora was deserted in favor of a new foundation at Palaiopolis, and excavations have revealed vast quantities of Hellenistic and Roman material including the walls and the Agora, mosaics and a cistern and a Late Antique church with mosaics.⁹⁴ Furthermore, recent excavations at sites such as Virokastro, Peristerionas, and Kolymbos have revealed Roman occupation, and at Sotera (near Palaiopolis) a Late Antique building was excavated.⁹⁵ Quarries at Kato Phello and the nearby Roman settlement have been investigated.⁹⁶ At Tourlos a Roman grave and sarcophagus have been excavated.⁹⁷ There is also ongoing work at the harbor.⁹⁸ A Mithraeum was established on the island and attracted a great deal of external investment.⁹⁹ Pliny discussed the miracles of the river flowing wine at the sanctuary of Dionysos; it may be that this was another reason to visit the island.¹⁰⁰ Andros clearly made use of its varied connections—those of economic resources, of religious tourism, and of banishment to exile—and as a result, the island attracted a wide range of visitors, from the *evocatus Augusti* M. Aurelius Rifinus and three praetorian soldiers to the exiled Glitius Gallus and Egnatia Maximilla and, consequently, various members of their family.¹⁰¹

Evidence for personal connections like tourism and exile is found primarily in epigraphic data; economic connections may be more readily seen in archaeological remains, from pottery to harbor installations. But one cannot assume that personal connections always made an impact. Keos, for example, had longstanding connections through its associations with the family of Herodes Atticus, but there is little evidence as yet to indicate any personal investment on the island, which in turn encourages theories about lack of Roman involvement there.¹⁰² Neither the celebrated sanctuary nor the eminent tourists seem to have had any long-term impact on the island, perhaps because of the one-directional nature of traffic. Keos did not have good clays, so nearly all its pottery was imported. G. A. Zachos's study of the ceramic data from Late Antique Keos suggests that the normal African red slip and local table wares (Attiko pottery) were imported and that specialist wares such as beehives were imported along with oil and wine amphorae.¹⁰³ Zachos suggests that ships often stopped in Keos before going to Piraeus from Constantinople and Asia Minor. In this case we see evidence for local networks (with the use of Attiko pottery, produced in the Cyclades) as well as one-way traffic from the east.

Assessing participation in the broader network of the empire brings a further tension to the fore. Because the Cyclades today form part of the modern Greek state, the default perspective is to look for connections with Greece rather than Asia Minor.¹⁰⁴ Some of the islands, however, had

FIGURE 3.2 *Hermes Psychopompos* from Palaiopolis, Andros, 1st century BCE. Marble. Andros, Archaeological Museum

closer connections with Asia Minor than with mainland Greece. Epigraphic data show that families from Thera, Santorini, were active in Ephesus, a connection supported by Enora Le Quéré's suggestion that the agora in Thera is stylistically similar to that of Ephesus; Thera's basilica hall, too, shares architectural features with the one at Ephesus.¹⁰⁵ On Santorini, the focus of work in more recent years has been on Bronze Age material, but the acropolis city of Thera was extensively occupied in the Hellenistic and Roman periods. It was in the Roman period that baths were constructed and the theater rebuilt (fig. 3.3).

To date, most of the evidence for Roman-period material on the larger islands of Mykonos, Naxos, and Paros has been identified through rescue excavations.¹⁰⁶ Some long-term occupied settlements have Roman levels at Divouni (Mykonos), Rizokastelia (Naxos), and Paroikia (Paros). Given their size and resources, it is surprising that these islands show little evidence for significant exploitation of their assets.¹⁰⁷ In the case of Paros, however, new work is changing the picture, and the same may be true for the other islands. On Paros, recent studies by Sophia Detoratu indicate that, contrary to earlier assessments, marble continued to be quarried, but it stayed a little more local than it had in the past.¹⁰⁸ The recent survey undertaken on the island has also identified some new quarries, including one at Karavos.¹⁰⁹ Otherwise, although many of the islands would have been on key routes, particularly the northern ones, efforts to exploit the position were not made.

Lina Mendoni and Sophia Zoumbaki indicate a dearth of Roman names found in the Cyclades (certainly in comparison to the mainland), and the number of complete Roman



FIGURE 3.3 The agora on Thera

names indicating citizenship is even more limited.¹¹⁰ Andros, Melos, Syros, and Tenos have the richest onomastic evidence, and all except Melos have famous religious sanctuaries. It is likely that Andros, Melos, and Tenos were well connected in part because of their resources and the efforts they made to be connected. There is an archaeological bias in that all but Syros, which has been developed for industry, have seen extensive archaeological work. Still, there are indications of occupation at locations such as Ermoupolis, as well as tantalizing remains such as theater seats and a statue base with a dedication to Hadrian.¹¹¹ It is worth noting that a dearth of resources or agriculture—as in Syros—did not automatically mean an island was less well connected. The epigraphic data from Syros indicates significant conspicuous consumption (in the form of public banquets) along with an Italian and foreign presence.¹¹² Syros was on a number of routes, and it may be that the island was well connected, but with the lack of archaeological investigation it has remained on the sidelines. The lack of information affects other islands too. Tiny islands such as Tsimindiri and Rheneia seem to have been occupied in some way, perhaps just as cemeteries,¹¹³ yet many of the small islands, including Anafi,¹¹⁴ Antimilos, Danousa, Despotiko, Foleganros, and Gyaros Heraklea, along with some of the larger ones, such as Ios, Seriphos, Siphnos, and Sikinos,¹¹⁵ are still relatively unknown in terms of archaeological evidence pertaining to the Roman period.¹¹⁶ The bias is being corrected, and islands such as Keros, Kouphonisi, and Schniousea have been the focus of recent work, with Roman material coming to light through survey and excavation.¹¹⁷ Furthermore, increasingly systematized underwater surveys are shedding light on the nature of trade—at Polyaigos, for example, where Carystos marble and amphorae were found off the coast.¹¹⁸

Connections and Networks

Positive evidence for Roman investment and connections in the Cycladic islands has been muted by the tropes of exile and isolation. Network analysis of the archaeological, epigraphic, and literary data, however, indicates a more vibrant view, even of the very smallest of the islands. Mendoni and Zoumbaki found that the Cyclades did not make a significant impact on high imperial policy in terms of individuals, particularly as significant amounts of land were required in order to join the senatorial order.¹¹⁹ The islands were not the focus of imperial attention except to fulfill specific aims; for example, Tiberius took some artwork by Skopas, and Nero took material from Andros and Mykonos. The islands' onomastic evidence may not indicate much of an impact on the political life of the empire, but there is good evidence for sustained relationships through merchants, exiles, and tourists.

In this discussion I have focused on the personal network connections that survive in the contexts of exile and tourism, and highlighted some of the parallel economic conditions revealed by the archaeological data. There is a great deal of work still to be done on the Cyclades and other network connections between the islands and between the center and individual islands. Work focusing on groups of specific artifacts such as mosaics and on sites such as sanctuaries might help to identify specific small-world networks that may have existed between the islands without necessarily having direct connections to Rome. Although Mendoni and Zoumbaki argue that there is little evidence for movement of people between the islands and certainly no evidence for seeing the islands as a political unit,¹²⁰ there may have been movement of artifacts and craftspeople, which may have created levels of “glocalization,” which can be understood in terms of the

local reworking of global products.¹²¹ Melos seems to have been involved in the Roman network, but there is little evidence of phase transition, as few of the nearby islands appear to have become nodes as a consequence.

The islands of the Cyclades had different types of contact with the main centers of the Roman Empire—personal or business, direct or indirect, planned or accidental. In earlier scholarship, the top-down approach to an analysis of the islands resulted in negative views of isolation. However, the islands do not have to be viewed in relation to Rome.¹²² They had their own decision-making processes irrespective of Rome or indeed other regions.¹²³ Although life on the islands may have been in parallel to what was going on in the broader empire, there was still individual choice. For example, some islands or simply cities or individuals may have openly courted imperial attention, as can be seen in Palaiopolis on Andros with the eight statue bases dedicated to Hadrian. In other cases, involvement in the empire may have been imposed on certain islands for financial or strategic reasons, or as a result of an island being selected as an internment site, each circumstance producing different dynamics. For many islands, day-to-day life may have continued unchanged, particularly if people had little contact with other areas of the Roman Empire.¹²⁴ In other cases, such as Paros, it is difficult to see why the island had little success in becoming part of the imperial network, particularly since it had resources to exploit and had already been central to regional communication links. The evidence indicates the fluctuating nature of the networks in the Cyclades. The islands that had the means and motivation to participate, such as Melos, seem to have been more successfully incorporated into the Roman network. It had resources, and it used its multiple ports to make those resources accessible. It is suggested here that, rather than being a negative, the use of the islands as places of exile provided certain levels of integration and opportunities to be part of a network, even if those opportunities were not commonly exploited. From the local perspective it seems that those living on the islands may have had a choice to participate in the Roman network. If they did not participate, it reflects not passive segregation but active judgment.

The analysis of the Cyclades in the Roman period highlights the importance of local networks that may not have included Rome as well as those that did.¹²⁵ While being part of a province may have made it easier to take advantage of imperial network connections, it did not automatically mean that connections would be sustainable or successful. Ironically, being considered peripheral to the empire and used as a place of exile may have stimulated temporary network connections that left lasting effects of investment. Few of the islands were truly insular—there was plenty of contact with different parts of the empire, and on a range of levels—but few had multiple connections. Furthermore, while Melos may have been a network hub, the current data do not allow identification of other islands as nodes or even bridges in the scale-free network. As Brughmans has noted, it wasn't enough just to create links through the presence of people or patronage of the island; something had to be actively engineered to make the connections work.¹²⁶ In this respect, although an island like Gyaros had large numbers of visitors because of its noteworthy exiles, there was no motivation for the island to be plugged into the network, nor were there resources significant enough for the center to be interested.¹²⁷ This is hardly surprising, given the island's small size of 23 square kilometers. According to Knappett, nodes of a network may be identifiable in relational terms, and the situation on Melos in comparison to many of the other Cycladic islands is a good case in point.¹²⁸ Unlike those on Gyaros, Melians did all they could to exploit their island's contacts and ports.

It is clear from the archaeological and epigraphic evidence that many of the Cycladic islands were far from isolated places suitable only for exile. The application of network theory to these data allows the diversity of relationships to be highlighted. It gives us a means for looking at individual islands as well as groups without preconceptions about how they should relate to each other or to Rome based on provincial categorization. While individual islands may have had sustained network links with Rome, others may have had only temporary links with Rome but prolonged links with other islands within a small-world network. Preliminary analysis of material such as marble and amphorae suggests small-world networks were in operation involving Paros, Naxos, Andros, and Tenos. The multitude of visitors Strabo mentioned adds weight to this possibility. It is also possible to see Melos as a key link between the Cycladic small-world network and the larger Roman scale-free network. Furthermore, some islands may have had connections with other provinces (as in the case of Santorini and Asia Minor), which have been overshadowed by research approaches. The increasing archaeological data from survey, research, and rescue excavations in the Cyclades is helping to provide a better understanding of life on individual islands in the Roman period. Network connections help to explain diverse relationships and reveal active engagements otherwise not seen. The study of this material is only deepened by new questioning of our old ideas of how provinces should behave.

Notes

- 1 Catullus, *Carmina*, translated by Sir Richard Francis Burton (London, 1894), poem 4.
- 2 Strabo 7.7.5.
- 3 A number of inscriptions also refer to piracy in the Cyclades, for example, one from Tenos (*IG XII* 5.860), which mentions that the island was constantly being attacked by pirates, and another from Syros (*IG XII* 5.653), honoring Onesandros from Siphnos, who helped a victim of a pirate raid (de Souza 1999, 63, 85).
- 4 As Jiménez in the previous essay.
- 5 Sweetman 2013, 8–9.
- 6 Revell (in this volume) notes the dichotomy created in contemporary scholarship between what is Roman and what is native.
- 7 Sweetman 2007.
- 8 The negative view of provinces is discussed in detail by Jiménez in this volume.
- 9 Le Quéré 2011.
- 10 Palaiokrassa-Kopitsa 2012, 34; Le Quéré 2011, n. 9.
- 11 For the Bronze Age and Classical periods, counter-analysis for the broad-brush approach has been provided by Broodbank 2000 and Constantakopoulou 2007, respectively.
- 12 Sweetman 2007; see also Papaioannou in this volume.
- 13 See Papaioannou in this volume.
- 14 For an onomastic study see Mendoni and Zoumbaki 2008.
- 15 Sneeringer 2011 is a promising master's thesis on the economy of the Roman Cyclades with potential for future development; Leekley and Noyes 1975 focuses on recent archaeological work, while Freely 2006 provides an overview of Cycladic history and archaeology.
- 16 Barber 2005; Leekley and Noyes 1975; Freely 2006.
- 17 Livy 31.15.5–11.
- 18 Mendoni and Zoumbaki 2008, 24.
- 19 Mendoni and Zoumbaki 2008, 24.
- 20 Mendoni and Zoumbaki 2008, E350.
- 21 Papageorgiadou-Banis 1997, 8.
- 22 For example, M. Cosconius M. F. Poll. Fronto, *procurator ad vectig(al) XX her(editatium) per Asiam, Lyciam, Phrygiam, Galatiam, insulas Cycladas*, a second-century inheritance tax collector (Mendonni and Zoumbaki 2008, 27–28).
- 23 Mendoni and Zoumbaki 2008, 27.
- 24 Mendoni and Zoumbaki 2008, 27.
- 25 Mendoni and Zoumbaki 2008, 27.
- 26 Mendoni and Zoumbaki, 2008, 32–33.
- 27 Strabo 10.5.7, 10.5.1.
- 28 For example, Gothic raids in 268 CE had an impact on a number of islands like Paros (Kulikowski 2007, 19–20). See also Freely 2006, 14–15.
- 29 It is known that there was a bishopric established on Santorini in 342 CE (Freely 2006, 15), but there were of course Christians present on the islands much earlier than the fourth century, as indicated most prominently by the first-century catacombs on Melos.

- 30 Curta 2004, 520–21. Curta notes (n. 23) that the evidence for Slavic raids on the Cyclades has been disputed.
- 31 Brughmans 2010.
- 32 Van Dijk 2005; D’Souza et al. 2007.
- 33 Brughmans 2010, 278–80.
- 34 Chen and D’Souza 2011, 1.
- 35 Brughmans 2010; Knappett 2011, 2013.
- 36 Brughmans 2010, 282.
- 37 Nikolakopoulou and Knappett 2005; Knappett 2011, 7–9.
- 38 Knappett 2011, 57.
- 39 Constantakopoulou 2007, 3.
- 40 Rauh 2003.
- 41 See Gates-Foster in this volume. For comparable examples, see also Moser and Revell in this volume.
- 42 Cassibry and Wicker in this volume.
- 43 Knappett 2011, 9. Many studies of Cycladic networks focus on spatial distribution of material and on human connections rather than on social space.
- 44 The contributions by Cassibry, Gates-Foster, Revell, and Wicker in this volume all discuss different elements of material culture to analyze network connections and their ramifications for understanding the provinces.
- 45 All details (and the quotation) in this paragraph are from Braginton 1944, 391–97.
- 46 J. M. Scott 1997a, 173.
- 47 Mendoni and Zoumbaki 2008, 30.
- 48 Braginton 1944, 399.
- 49 Mendoni and Zoumbaki 2008, 30.
- 50 Juvenal 10.170, 1.73.
- 51 Braginton 1944, 401.
- 52 Tacitus, *Annales* 3.68–69; Mendoni and Zoumbaki 2008, 29.
- 53 *Naturalis Historia* 13.134.
- 54 Allatson and McCormack 2008, 9.
- 55 Said 1984; Rossbach 2007. Neil and Allen (2011) examine evidence for responses to exile in the Late Antique.
- 56 Cohen 2006.
- 57 Scott 1997b; Sanders 1997; Kilduff and Corley 1999.
- 58 Juvenal 6.562–64; Braginton 1944, 394. Another astrologer, Pammenes, was exiled under Nero. While the place of exile is not known according to Tacitus (*Annales* 16.14), he had a steady number of visitors continuing to visit him for consultations (Rudich 1993, 145).
- 59 Braginton 1944, 401.
- 60 Other examples include Avillus Flaccus (39 CE) on Andros and Vibius Serenus on Amorgos (23 CE): Mendoni and Zoumbaki 2008, 29–30.
- 61 Philostratus, *Vita Apollonii* 7.16. Mendoni and Zoumbaki 2008, 29.
- 62 This is particularly pertinent in terms of temporal connections (as discussed by Knappett 2011 and Gamble 2007 and discussed in the conclusions here).
- 63 Gamble 2007; Knappett 2011, 11.
- 64 Stumpf 2003, 438.
- 65 Stark 2006, 90.
- 66 Mendoni and Zoumbaki 2008, 26.
- 67 Stumpf 2003, 453.
- 68 Mendoni and Zoumbaki 2008, 26.
- 69 Strabo mentions the Keos temple (10.5.6). At Paros, various religious sites have been identified, such as those to Asklepius and Delian Apollo near Paroikia (Freely 2006, 147–54).
- 70 Pliny, *Naturalis Historia* 2.106. The sanctuary of Dionysos has not yet been identified on Andros; however, Freely (2006, 86) suggests that it may be located at the monastery of Panagia Zoodochos Pigi near Agios Petros, which has a holy well.
- 71 Collar 2009; Bowden 2009; Rutherford 2009.
- 72 Stark 2006, 95–96.
- 73 Mendoni and Zoumbaki 2008, 35.
- 74 Dumoulin 1902.
- 75 Dumoulin 1902, 411.
- 76 Mendoni and Zoumbaki 2008, 35.
- 77 On Amorgos, the site of Minoa and buildings such as the temple of Serapis and the gymnasium were in continuous use until the third century CE (AR 2001–2, 100; AR 1989–90, 69–70; AR 1999, 46). Roman imperial seals have also been found, in addition to houses endowed with mosaics (AR 2006–7, 90), which were also excavated at the site of Katapola (AR 2009–10, 164; AR ID 555). An ongoing project at Kythnos by the University of Volos has helped highlight the extensive archaeological evidence particularly at the sanctuary to Apollo and Artemis (AR 2007–8, 93). Furthermore, the harbor at Mandraki with its various extensions has also been studied both on land and under water (AR ID 840; AR 2008–9, 55; AR ID 1307).
- 78 Mendoni and Zoumbaki 2008, 40.
- 79 Photos-Jones et al. 1999.
- 80 Sneeringer 2011, 44.
- 81 C. Smith 1895–96.
- 82 Renfrew and Wagstaff 1982.
- 83 Mendoni and Zoumbaki 2008, 3. Only one other example is known from the Cyclades, T. Flavius Cleitosthenes from Thera.
- 84 IG XII 3.1097.
- 85 AR 2001–2, 99.
- 86 AR 2003–4, 71.
- 87 For example, P. Serveilius P. f. Isauricus, proconsul of Asia 46–44 BCE, restored some sculpture that had been dedicated earlier by C. Pandusinus Cn. f. in about 100 BCE (Mendonni and Zoumbaki 2008, 36).

- 88 *Praefectus classis* Q. Calpurnius Q. f. along with his family was honored with proxeny and local citizenship. P. Quintilius Varus was a *quaestor* and was honored on Tenos as a patron.
- 89 Strabo 10.5.11.
- 90 AR 1955, 28.
- 91 AR 1973–74, 30; AR 1974–75, 22.
- 92 Palaiokrassa-Kopitsa has published extensive accounts of the archaeology of Tenos; see Palaiokrassa-Kopitsa 2007.
- 93 Mendoni and Zoumbaki (2008, 35) point out various official roles (such as *stephanephoros*) that had to be repeated by the same citizens, as there were not enough to hold the public functions.
- 94 Respectively, AR 2003–4, 68; AR 2003–4, 68; AR 2006–7, 82.
- 95 AR 2006–7, 82, and AR 1999–2000, 114 (for the Late Antique church).
- 96 AR 1999–2000, 115.
- 97 AR 2001–2, 95, 116.
- 98 AR 2007–8, 88.
- 99 Mendoni and Zoumbaki 2008, 31.
- 100 *Naturalis Historia* 2.106.
- 101 Mendoni and Zoumbaki 2008, 28–31; Braginton 1944, 398.
- 102 Papageordiou-Dias 1997, 8–9. Strabo mentions the two major towns, Ioulis and Karthaia, and also the temples of Apollo and Artemis, which were excavated in the early nineteenth century (Strabo 10.5.6). Work undertaken on the site and pottery at Karthaia (AR ID 2046) and on the harbour of Poiessa on the west side of the island indicate more activity during the Roman period than previously assumed (AR ID 2071).
- 103 G. A. Zachos 2010.
- 104 See Jiménez in this volume for further details.
- 105 Le Quéré 2011, 341; Stinson 2007, n. 21. For another case of a basilica's design suggesting overseas links, see Morton in this volume.
- 106 For example, the Roman kilns at Chora on Naxos, AR 1999–2000.
- 107 The marble quarries were taken out of the hands of the locals and run by the Romans.
- 108 <http://phdtheses.ekt.gr/eadd/handle/10442/28675>.
- 109 Bruno 2010; Bruno, Lazzarini, et al. 2010.
- 110 Mendoni and Zoumbaki 2008, 43.
- 111 AR 2003–4, 68, and Freely 2006, 141.
- 112 Mendoni and Zoumbaki 2008, 37–39.
- 113 AR 2006–7, 85.
- 114 There is likely to have been murex production at Anafi (AR ID 560), however.
- 115 On Ios, Hellenistic and Roman remains have been identified at Pounta, Managari, and Mylopotamos (AR 1981–82, 46). On Seriphos, a Roman bathhouse with mosaics has been excavated on the eastern slope below the modern village of Chora (Pantou 2001–4, 13). Sikinos may have evidence for a tomb of an exile at Episkopi (Frantz, Thompson, and Travlos 1969).
- 116 Many of these—Danousa, Foleangaros, Sikinos, Gyaros, Seriphos—are known as places of exile.
- 117 AR 2007–08, 92; AR ID 1978.
- 118 AR ID 544 and AR ID 1350.
- 119 Mendoni and Zoumbaki 2008, 24.
- 120 Mendoni and Zoumbaki 2008, 24.
- 121 Knappett 2011, 9.
- 122 See Jiménez in this volume.
- 123 The concept of free choice is also highlighted by Papaioannou in this volume.
- 124 See Sweetman 2007 on how Knossos seems to have remained largely unchanged despite the foundation of the Roman colony there.
- 125 Revell in this volume.
- 126 Brughmans 2010, 282.
- 127 In the case of Gyaros, it was murex, as noted by Larsen (1938, 485).
- 128 Knappett 2011, 38.