

GRAIN AND MERCENARIES. A REAPPRAISAL OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ARKADIA AND BOSPOROS IN THE TIME OF LEUKON I

Liviu Mihail IANCU*

Keywords: *Arkadia, Bosporan Kingdom, inscriptions, Leukon I, Mantinea, mercenaries, Olbia, Pantias, Pantikapaion, Phanagoria, Tegea, trade, war.*

Abstract: *Four inscriptions dating from the 4th century BC, found in Pantikapaion, Phanagoria, and Olbia, represent a small corpus attesting to the existence of contacts between Arkadia and the Greek cities on the North Pontic coast. The one found in Pantikapaion in 1829 – a fragmentary honorary decree of the Arkadians for Leukon I – was amply discussed in modern literature, whereas the others were only briefly examined in relation to it. Two main conflicting interpretations were advanced: either one or more bands of Arkadian mercenaries served Leukon I and honored him by erecting the inscription from Pantikapaion, or the Arkadian League that functioned in the 360s BC developed political and commercial ties with the Bosporan Kingdom and Olbia, probably centred on obtaining better conditions for the grain trade, which might explain the enactment of the honorary decree. A few additional epigraphic and historical remarks included in the present paper support the mercenary hypothesis. However, the wider perspective on the recruitment of foreign troops in the 4th century BC shows that the military ties between Bosporos and Arkadia could have been doubled by commercial ones, too.*

In 2006, S. Gallotta published a short article on the inscription of the Arkadians honoring Leukon I, found at Pantikapaion in 1829 (CIRB 37). She joined the long-lasting debate about whether it is proof of the Arkadian involvement in the Bosporan Kingdom as mercenaries or as merchants by

* Liviu Mihail IANCU: The Institute of Advanced Studies in Levant Culture and Civilization; e-mail: liviu.iancu@drd.unibuc.ro.

I am indebted to the French School and the Romanian Archaeology Institute in Athens for facilitating the documentation for this paper. I also thank Stefania Gallotta and Inga Głuszek for their bibliographic support and Dragoş Hălmagi for his comments on the paper.

[...] *gymnasion* [...] of his fatherland Mantinea [...]

1. 2: Latyshev 1902, p. 51: [ν?]αόν; CEG 887: [ν]αόν γυμνάσιόν [τ(ε)— — — — —]

3. YAILENKO 1986, p. 222–286 (SEG 37.676)

Upper part of a white marble tombstone with a fragmentarily preserved cornice above. Traces of red paint on the stele, both on the cornice and on the front surface. *Stoichedon*.

Discovered in 1975 in the western necropolis of Phanagoria. First half of the 4th century BC.

Παντίας
Τεγέατας

Pantias the Tegean

4. *I.Olbia* 4 (= IGDOP 17)

Upper part of a white marble slab with a pediment with three *akroteria* above.

Discovered in 1955 at the bottom of a cistern in the Eastern Temenos of Olbia. First half of the 4th century BC, based on the shape of the letters, the brevity of the decree and the structure of the slab.

Ολβιοπολίται
Αριστάνδρωι
Μελισσοῦ
[Ο]ρχομενίωι
[ἐξ Ἀρ]καδίας
[ἔδωκαν] προξενίαν
[— — — — —]

The Olbiopolitans to Aristandros, son of Melissos, Orchomenian from Arkadia, gave proxenia [...]

These four inscriptions have never really been discussed together as a corpus, although they have been put in connection recently not only by Avram³. Most often, the honorary decree for Leukon I was placed in the forefront, whereas the others were cursorily mentioned. They were extensively examined against the background of the military and commercial expansion of the Spartokid realm during Leukon I's reign, when the recruitment of mercenaries and the export of grain to the Aegean seem to start developing on a large scale, and consequently, they were interpreted as proofs either of the enlistment of Arkadians in the

³ E.g. YAILENKO 1986; L. Dubois in IGDOP, p. 42.

Bosporan armies or of the commercial ties built around the food supply needed by the Arkadian League in the 360s. However, no one really tried to study them from the broader perspectives of the Arkadian politics of the first half of the 4th century BC, considered in detail, and of the military recruitment practices that connected the armies of the several mainland Greek states with rulers from the East in the same period. It is what I intend to do through this paper.

By far, the most discussed inscription is the honorary decree set by the Arkadians for Leukon, as shown even by the massive amount of contributions made up to 1960, summarized in Russian by V. F. Gaidukevich⁴. The hypothesis that Leukon was granted honors by the assembly of the Arkadian League on the ground of presumed benefactions, particularly in the field of grain trade, developed early and found quite a few supporters, ranging from A. Böckh, A. B. Ashik, and W. Dittenberger to L. Stephani, E. L. Hicks, V. V. Latyshev, and E. Minns. Their main arguments were that the Bosporan Kingdom conducted throughout the 4th century BC a constant policy of gaining popularity in the Aegean through generous shipments of grain and fiscal exemptions awarded to merchants from agreed parties, such as Athens and Mytilene, and that the mentioning of Leukon in his private capacity was a device for accommodating the democratic sensibilities of the Arkadian citizens⁵. Some of these scholars did not exclude the possibility that mercenaries were part of the relationship that developed between Bosphoros and Arkadia and even played a role in the erection of the inscription in Pantikapaion⁶. On the other hand, starting with F. Hiller von Gaertringen in 1915, a more radical mercenary explanation emerged on the basis of the marked difference between the simple enactment formula of the decree found in Pantikapaion (ἔδοξεν τοῖς Ἀρκάσιν) and that of the presumably only preserved decree issued by the Arkadian League during its ephemeral existence in the 360s, which granted proxeny to the Athenian Phylarchos and mentioned the two main deliberative bodies of the *koinōn*, the Council and the assembly, referred to as The Ten Thousand (IG V,2 1: ἔδοξεν τῇ βουλῇ τῶν Ἀρκάδων καὶ τοῖς μυρίοις, preceded by the invocation θεός. τύχη). According to this hypothesis, embraced by M. Rostovtseff, H.W. Parke⁷, S.A. Zhebelev, V.D. Blavatskii, and N.I. Sokolskii, it was a band of Arkadian mercenaries that had the initiative of honoring Leukon, their paymaster, through this inscription that they erected in Pantikapaion. There were many stated and implicit reasons for the popularity of this view: the growing importance of Greek mercenaries in the Bosporan armies at the time of protracted conflicts with the Herakleans for Theodosia and the Maiotian and Sindian tribes, as shown not only by literary sources but also by some other epigraphical evidence such as the tombstone of the Paphlagonian Drosanis, a

⁴ GAIDUKEVICH 1960, p. 106–109. A short version in German is provided in GAJDUKEVIČ 1971, p. 100, n. 13. I exclude from this summary of the scholarly debate P. Foucart's hypothesis that the document was issued by the city of Arkades in Crete, as it was briefly, but convincingly dismissed by GAIDUKEVICH 1960, p. 107–108.

⁵ A. Böckh and A.B. Ashik cited by GAIDUKEVICH 1960, p. 106.

⁶ E.L. Hicks and E. Minns cited by GAIDUKEVICH 1960, p. 106–107.

⁷ PARKE 1933, p. 15, n. 1, not cited by GAIDUKEVICH 1960.

mercenary “of Leukon”⁸, who died “fighting in the land of the Maiotians” (CIRB 180), and the dedication of Bathyllos, son of Derkios, to Hekate, “the mistress of Sparta” (CIRB 22), the fame of the Arkadian mercenaries throughout the Greek world, the mistrust in the expanse of the sea trade connections of the landlocked Arkadia, the (misleading) feeling that the reference to Leukon as a private citizen of Pantikapaion points to the informal character of the inscription, more appropriate for a band of soldiers.

At the end of his bibliographical review of 1960, V.F. Gaidukevich vigorously refuted the radical mercenary hypothesis that had turned into orthodoxy by then, mainly by attacking von Gaertringen’s conclusions on the enactment formula. He maintained that: Phylarchos’ decree should be dated during the revival of the Arkadian League after 338 and therefore is not relevant as a *comparandum*; there was a certain variability in the prescripts of 4th-century BC Greek decrees, citing the example of Olbia where precisely the honorary decrees employed the shorter enactment formula Ὀλβιοπολίται ἔδωκαν; a very fragmentary decree presumably erected by the Arkadians at Olympia during their short-lived control over the sanctuary in 365–363 BC (IvO 31) should have started with the formula [Ἀρκάδες τοιοῦδε ἐ]ἔδωκαν; there are not any known decrees whereby mercenaries honor their patrons. He then strengthened the conclusion that mentioning Leukon I as a simple citizen of Pantikapaion should have been expected from the Arkadian assembly, by invoking the similar Athenian and Mytilenean inscriptions mentioning Leukon and his sons (IG II³,1 298 = IG II² 212, respectively IG XII,2 3). In the end, he cited the then recently found Aristandros’ proxeny decree from Olbia (*I.Olbia* 4), the inscription mentioning a Mantineian at Phanagoria (CIRB 991), and even Bathyllos’ dedication to Hekate, as proofs of the trading interests of the Peloponnesians in the Northern Black Sea in the 4th and the early 3rd century BC⁹.

Gaidukevich’s article became the new radical trade orthodoxy, unquestionably followed by some scholars, sometimes with confident statements such as this: „In 1960 V.F. Gaidukevich for all practical purposes closed the discussion in a particularly convincing manner”¹⁰. Similarly, others still adhered to the older radical mercenary orthodoxy¹¹. When the researchers did not just proclaim their faith in one of the two hypotheses, they brought only minor additions to older arguments and lines of thought, such as Gallotta did most recently by adding more flesh to the already cited solid body of references to the fame of the

⁸ As shown by VINOGRADOV 1997b, p. 124, n. 160, when discussing his curious designation Δρόσανις Παφλαγῶν Λεύκωνο[ς].

⁹ GAIDUKEVICH 1960, p. 109–111.

¹⁰ MIELCZAREK 1999, p. 23–24. See also the historical commentary of CIRB 37, p. 44–45; BURSTEIN 1974, p. 413, n. 51; YAILENKO 1986, p. 224–225; ZAVOIKIN 2004, p. 66. The same interpretation is implicitly or explicitly stated by SAPRYKIN 2003, p. 27; BRESSON 2005, p. 105; BRAUND 2007, p. 65, n. 13; D. Chistov in KUZNETSOV & TOLSTIKOV 2017, cat. no. 152, p. 281, without reference to GAIDUKEVICH 1960.

¹¹ FIELDS 1994, p. 71; FIELDS 2001, p. 124; TRUNDLE 2004, p. 53; A. A. Zavoikin and V.P. Tolstikov in KUZNETSOV & TOLSTIKOV 2017, p. 55, n. 124.

Arkadian mercenaries. Understandably, sometimes scholars prefer to mention both hypotheses without showing any preference for either¹².

The other inscriptions received far less attention and were mostly discussed against the background offered by the decree discovered at Pantikapaion. It is first and foremost the case of the highly fragmentary CIRB 991, always explored as a minute complement to CIRB 37. The discovery of Aristandros's proxeny decree in 1955 engendered a short discussion about the commercial connections of Olbia, in the context of other Olbian proxeny decrees, made by E.I. Levi¹³, who later included the inscription in the corpus *Inscriptiones Olbiae* without significant changes. As aforementioned, Gaidukevich briefly discussed the evidence of these two inscriptions to support his commercial interpretation of the Arkadian honorary decree for Leukon I. The more recent discussions on the Olbian proxeny decrees usually repeat Levi's assumption that they are mainly or even exclusively indicative of its commercial ties¹⁴ and thus Aristandros's decree is conjecturally interpreted as proof of the grain trade between Olbia and Arkadia¹⁵, although L. Dubois advanced as well the mercenary hypothesis with regard to Aristandros¹⁶.

The latest discovered document in the series was the simple tombstone of Pantias from Tegea. As a supporter of Gaidukevich's stance on CIRB 37, V.P. Yailenko proposed that Pantias was a merchant. To maintain his point of view, he added a historical commentary about the grain trade of Bosporos and how Arkadia could fit into this background. He particularly stressed the role of Athens as an intermediary, given the connections of certain influential Athenians both with the Bosporan leadership and some members of the Arkadian elite, particularly the Mantineian democratic exiles after the Spartan imposed *dioikismos* of 385 BC¹⁷. Yu. G. Vinogradov advocated instead for the view that Pantias was a mercenary on account of the lack of the patronymic on the tombstone. He also refuted Yailenko's claim that the slab was imported from Arkadia¹⁸.

If we were to discuss solely the inscriptions, not many additional matters could be adduced. Their low number and fragmentary state will always hamper reaching a consensus about their interpretation before new evidence will become available. Nonetheless, I would point out to several epigraphic issues.

On the matter of who issued the honorary decree for Leukon I, Gaidukevich's arguments for rejecting the evidence of the only surviving complete decree of the Arkadian League (IG V,2 1) are not as pervasive as previ-

¹² VINOGRADOV 1997a, p. 31; VINOGRADOV 1997b, p. 124, n. 160; VINOGRADOV & GORONCHAROVSKII 2008, p. 118; MÜLLER 2010, p. 225, 346.

¹³ LEVI 1958, p. 241–243, pl. II.3.

¹⁴ L. Dubois in IGDOP, p. 39; MÜLLER 2010, p. 225.

¹⁵ MÜLLER 2010, p. 225.

¹⁶ L. Dubois in IGDOP, p. 42.

¹⁷ YAILENKO 1986, p. 224–226.

¹⁸ VINOGRADOV 1990, cat. no. 596, p. 556–557; VINOGRADOV 1994, cat. no. 7, p. 68–69. Cf. ZAVOIKIN 2004, p. 91; TRUNDLE 2004, p. 53; A.A. Zavoikin, V.P. Tolstikov in KUZNETSOV & TOLSTIKOV 2017, p. 55, n. 124.

ously thought. Even if Phylarchos's decree were issued in 342 or 338–335 BC¹⁹, it should safely be assumed that the revived League would have emulated the institutions of the glorious 360s and employed similar, if not identical prescripts for its decrees. The fragmentary bronze inscription from Olympia cited by Gaidukevich as evidence for a simpler enactment formula used by the Arkadian League (IvO 31) could be reconstituted differently, for example as a decree issued by the Pisatans²⁰. On the other hand, an utterly fragmentary inscription discharged in a well at Olympia in the mid-4th century BC – not known to Gaidukevich – is certainly an Arkadian decree sanctioning an alliance treaty struck with the Pisatans and the Akroreians in 365/364 BC, presumably erected at Olympia and destroyed by the Eleans when they put an end to the short-lived independence of their two small neighbors. Its first line preserves a reference to the *myrioi*²¹ and can reliably be reconstituted as [θεός. ἔδοξεν τῆι βουλήι καὶ τοῖς] μυριοῖς since the inscription is *stoichedon*.

Certainly, Gaidukevich's assumption that the Arkadian League issued a honorary decree for Leukon I employing a shorter enactment formula should not be outright rejected based on these remarks, especially as the existence of abbreviated and semi-abbreviated decrees granting proxeny (and other honors) is well attested²² and, as D. Hälmagi kindly indicated to me, there is a handful of such documents issued both by some Arkadian *poleis*²³ and by later Hellenic leagues (the Aitolians, the Epirotes)²⁴ that employ, among other simpler enactment formulae, specifically the *ethnikon* (or a replacement) in the dative after ἔδοξε. Moreover, pointing out to some traces preserved from the third line of the decree which are visible in the new and much better photograph of the decree published in the CIRB-album, Hälmagi thinks that the inscription may be restored as a non-probouleumatic award of proxeny by the Arkadian League to Leukon I,

¹⁹ On the date of IG V,2 1, see DUŠANIĆ 1970, p. 336–337, with former bibliography; ROY 1971, p. 571; ROY 2001, p. 312, n. 17.

²⁰ KONDIS 1958, p. 93–98, who proposes the restoration [θεός. τύχα. ἐπεὶ προθύμῳς ἔ]δοκάν. J. and L. Robert (BE 1959, 173), show reluctance towards the new lecture overall, but their criticism is concentrated on other issues.

²¹ SEG 29.405, first published in KUNZE 1961, with significant improvements in DUŠANIĆ 1979, p. 117–122, and RINGEL *et alii* 1999, p. 413–417, the latter based on additions from a new fragment discovered in 1979. See also RHODES & LEWIS 1997, p. 91.

²² See SWOBODA 1890, p. 47–50, and LARFELD 1914, p. 329–331, with surveys of the areas with the most numerous decrees of this type and GRZESIK 2013, on the largest corpus of them, found at Delphi. See as well RHODES & LEWIS 1997, *passim*, esp. 5–6.

²³ Orchomenos (PLASSART & BLUM 1914, cat. no. 14, p. 471, probably 3rd century BC): [ἔδοξε Ἐρ]χομε[νίοις] ?; Lousoi (IG V,2 394, 3rd/2nd century BC): ἔδοξε το[ῖς] π[ο]λείταις. See however RHODES & LEWIS 1997, p. 92. The potential addition to these two inscriptions signalled by Hälmagi of IvO 30 (ca. 425 BC, ἔδοξεν Αλείοισι), as emanating from Alea (e.g. RHODES & LEWIS 1997, p. 87), should be rejected given the careful remarks made in MINON 2007, p. 173–174.

²⁴ IG IX,1² 1:201 (end of 3rd century BC): ἔδοξε τοῖς Αἰτωλοῖς; SEG 24.448 (end of 3rd century BC): ἔδοξε τοῖς Απειρώταις.

written in the Arkadian dialect, except for the name of the honorand, that was preserved in its original Ionic form²⁵.

Even though we should be fully aware that decisions of a political community could have been inscribed with “differing degrees of fullness” and thus “not even an inscribed decree of standard type can be relied on to be absolutely complete”²⁶, it is still surprising that a foreign leader and benefactor of such importance as Leukon I would have been honored by the Arkadian League through a presumably largely abbreviated decree. The surprise arises in particular when comparing this inscription with the roughly contemporary Phylarchos’s proxy decree and the Athenian honorary decree of 347/346 BC for Leukon’s sons (IG II³,1 298 = IG II² 212), that renewed similar provisions previously made for Satyros and Leukon and employed the same formulae found in general in Athenian decrees, being publicly displayed in Piraeus, along the preceding documents issued for Leukon, whose copies were erected by the Athenians and by him in the Bosporan Kingdom and at Hieron, on the Asiatic side of the Thracian Bosporos²⁷.

Definitely, the epigraphic peculiarities of the Athenian democracy²⁸, presumable conservative Arkadian epigraphic habits and potential lesser benefactions awarded by the Bosporan ruler to the Arkadians than to the Athenians (e.g. a one-time shipment of grain, instead of the long term tax exemption granted to the Athenian traders), could explain such a major difference between the aforementioned decrees and this one, whose only surviving copy would be the one found at Pantikapaion, cut by a local lapicide, as attested by the shape of the letters²⁹.

On the other hand, alternative explanations could account for this marked difference, revolving around the assumption that the resolution to honor the Bosporan ruler was not adopted by the entire Arkadian *koinōn*. Thus, the inscription could have just as well been set up by a corps of mercenaries or by another group of Arkadians³⁰.

In any case, Gaidukevich’s argument stating the absence of honorary decrees erected by mercenaries for their patrons is tenuous. Just like other soldiers, mercenaries bestowed honors on their leaders and employers that could have been written down in stone. For example, in 357 BC, Dion’s mercenaries crowned

²⁵ An expanded version of Hälmagi’s hypothesis and arguments will be published in a future paper.

²⁶ RHODES & LEWIS 1997, p. 6.

²⁷ LAMBERT 2017, p. 35–36, with special references to ll. 20–23, 25–29, 44–47 of the inscription and Dem. *Lept.* 35–37.

²⁸ RHODES & LEWIS 1997, p. 2, 550–557; MEYER 2013.

²⁹ The letters are largely similar to those employed in the Semibratnee epigram (SEG 43.515) and CIRB 4 (small fragment of a proxy decree). See also other 4th century BC inscriptions: CIRB 1 (proxy decree issued by Pairisades I and his sons for a Peiraeen); CIRB 3 (proxy decree issued by Pairisades I for a Chian?); CIRB 18 (dedication to Demeter Thesmophoros); CIRB 973 (epitaph of Agias of Heraklea, from Phanagoria) etc.

³⁰ Like the League of the northern Arkadians, rallied around Mantinea, which apparently functioned between 362 and 342 BC, see DUŠANIĆ 1970, p. 164–166, 307, 334–335.

him with a golden wreath for the victory over Dionysios II's troops at Syracuse³¹. There are some preserved inscriptions of this kind. Thus, in the late 4th and 3rd centuries BC, the garrisons of Sounion, Rhamnous, and Eleusis, composed of Athenian citizen soldiers and foreigners alike, honored several generals and magistrates who, in most cases, took good care of their supplies, by awarding them golden crowns, their decisions being recorded through decrees whose structure and language resemble those of the Athenian assembly³². A garrison decree from Rhamnous granting a golden wreath for the honorand, probably dating from 256/5 BC, was issued by a contingent of Macedonian mercenaries for an Athenian general who had acted diligently so that they had promptly received *isoteleia*, according to the order of Antigonos Gonatas³³. After Athens regained its independence in 229 BC, mercenaries stationed at Sounion and Rhamnous were awarded the political status of *paroikoi*, and issued honorary decrees for their military leaders³⁴. Similarly, the mercenaries stationed by the Lagids in Cyprus, sometimes grouped in ethnic associations (Akhaians, Cretans, Ionians etc.), honored their commanders through numerous dedications probably made on the basis of decrees that had been lost to us, with one notable exception³⁵.

In addition, auxiliary forces sent by Aegean *koina* (the Cretans, the Akhaians) to Hellenistic monarchs (Ptolemaios VI Philomētōr, the future Attalos II) in a manner not so different to the presumable support dispatched by the Arkadians to Leukon I (see below) issued honorary decrees for these leaders and their officers³⁶.

Nonetheless, the mercenary hypothesis is fraught with a similar problem as the Arkadian League assumption: to my knowledge, there are no surviving decrees (or, as a matter of fact, dedications made on the basis of decrees) where the body of soldiers passing the resolution is designated in the enactment formula

³¹ Plut. *Dio.* 31.1: γενομένης δὲ λαμπρᾶς τῆς νίκης οἱ μὲν Συρακούσιοι τοὺς ξένους ἑκατὸν μναῖς ἔστεφάνωσαν, οἱ δὲ ξένοι Δίωνα χρυσῷ στεφάνῳ. It seems plausible that Plutarch relied here on a source that used the original decrees recording these grants. Most of the 800 mercenaries were Peloponnesians (Plut. *Dio.* 42.2 and 7.43.2; see also 22.4–8; 23.2; 57.2–4).

³² Sounion: IG II² 1260, 1270, 1308; Rhamnous: IG II² 1286, 1310–1313 (cf. the dedication IG II² 2968); Eleusis (sometimes together with the soldiers from Panakton and Phyle or with the Eleusinians): IG II² 1272, 1279, 1280, 1285, 1287, 1288, 1299, 1303–1307 (cf. the dedication IG II² 1958). Similar decrees were issued by the Athenian cavalry (IG II² 1264; SEG 21.435; SEG 21.525). An illustrative example is IG II² 1270 of 298/7 BC, whereby the *exetastēs* Kephisodotos is crowned with a gold wreath on account of the services he rendered to the Athenians *demos*, the citizens garrisoning Sounion (τοὺς [στρ]ατευομένους ἐπὶ Σουνίῳ τῶν πολ[ιτῶ]ν) and the mercenaries (τοὺς ξένους), the enactors being “the soldiers” (δεδόχθαι τοῖ[ς] στρατιώταις). On the meaning of *στρατιῶται* in the Attic garrison inscriptions, see KENT 1941, p. 344; LAUNEY 1949–1950, p. 1038–1064; POUILLOUX 1954, p. 124–125. The honors bestowed by soldiers on their military commanders were frequent, although the language of the inscriptions that recorded them is not always that employed in decrees, cf. LAUNEY 1949–1950, p. 1006–1007; SOKOLSKII 1958, p. 300.

³³ SEG 3.122, with POUILLOUX 1954, p. 118–120 and ISE I 22, p. 45–47.

³⁴ POUILLOUX 1954, p. 69–75 and ISE I 32, p. 71–74, where all the inscriptions are mentioned and discussed, starting from SEG 15.113.

³⁵ LAUNEY 1949–1950, p. 1031–1035, 1061–1063.

³⁶ ID 1517, ID 1518, IvP I 64, with LAUNEY 1949–1950, II, p. 1059, 1060–1061.

simply by the *ethnikon*. All the preserved inscriptions recording or emanating from decisions taken by military troops, whether mercenary or not, where *ethnika* are mentioned, contain additional details identifying these particular groups of soldiers. Thus, besides the more general δεδόχθαι τοῖς στρατιώταις (IG II² 1270, IG II² 1287) or ἔδοξε τοῖς στρατιώταις³⁷, the documents attest formulae such as: [τοῦ] δήμου τοῦ [Ἀθηναίων δεδόχθαι τοῖς] στρατιώ[ταις]³⁸, δεδόχθαι Ἀθηναίων [τ]ο[ῖ]ς στρα[τε]υομέν[ο]ις Π[α]μνοῦντι (IG II² 1311), δεδόχθαι Ἀθηναίους τ[οῖς] τε[ταγμέν]οις Ἐλευσίνοι (IG II² 1272), δ[ε]δόχθ[αι] Ἐλ[ε]υσινίοις καὶ Ἀθηναίων τοῖς Ἐ[λευσ]ίνι τεταγμένοις (IG II² 1280), ἔδοξεν Ἀθηναίων τοῖς τεταγμένοις Ἐλευσίνοι καὶ Πανάκτωι καὶ Φυλῆι (IG II² 1303–1307, cf. IG II² 1299), [ἔδοξεν τῶν ἰσο]τελῶν τοῖς τεταγμένοις Παμνοῦντι (SEG 3.122), ἔδοξεν τῶν παροίκων τοῖς τεταγμένοις Παμνοῦντι (SEG 15.113), [δεδόχθαι Ἀθηναίων] τοῖς στρατευομένοις ἐπὶ Σουν[ίου] (IG II² 1281), ἔδοξε τοῖς ἔξαπε[σταλ]μένοις εἰς Ἀλεξάνδρειαν ὑπὸ τοῦ κοινοῦ τῶ[ν] Κρητ[α]ίων συμμαχοῖς (ID 1517), Ἀχαιῶν οἱ διαβάντες κατὰ συμμαχίαν πρὸς βασιλέα Εὐμένην τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ (InvP I 64), οἱ ἐν Κύπρω[ι] στρατευόμενοι Ἀχαιοὶ καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι Ἕλληνες (InvO 301), τὸ κοινὸν τῶν ἐν τῇ νήσῳι τασσομένων Κρητῶν (OGIS 153)³⁹ etc.

Much of the evidence cited above originates in later Hellenistic times and it is likely that in the 4th century BC, when the political sentiment of soldiers may have been more vigorous, the instances where military groups acted as true polities were still more pronounced, even among mercenaries, as shown by Xenophon's *Anabasis* and Aineias Taktikos' *Poliorketika*⁴⁰. Moreover, just like in the case of decrees issued by cities and political *koina*, the formulae of any honorary decrees that may have been recorded on stone by soldiers could have been more concise and less specific. When one reads Book VI of Xenophon's *Anabasis* – where the decisions of the Ten Thousand convened in assembly are introduced with expressions such as ἔδοξε τοῖς στρατιώταις (6.1.14), ἡ δὲ στρατιὰ συνῆλθε ... καὶ ἐπεὶ τοῦτο ἔδοξε (6.1.25) and the foundation decision of the seceding corps of Arkadians and Akhaians with ταῦτ' ἔδοξε (6.2.12), while the secessionists are simply called afterwards οἱ Ἀρκάδες (e.g. 6.3.1) – there is a deep temptation to assume that in the first half of the 4th century BC an ethnically homogenous band of Arkadian mercenaries could have issued honorary decrees for a generous

³⁷ Xen. *An.* 6.1.14.

³⁸ KLAFFENBACH 1926, cat. no. 4, p. 34.

³⁹ On the ethnically or pseudo-ethnically based *koina* and *politeumata* of soldiers serving the Ptolemaic dynasty, such as the Cypriote *koinōn* of Cretans mentioned in OGIS 153, and their epigraphic activity, see LAUNEY 1949–1950, p. 1031–1035, 1064–1084.

⁴⁰ GARLAN 1975, p. 91–93, esp. p. 92. It is no surprise that campaigning together engendered a strong solidarity and a certain sense of belonging and common identity among mercenaries; however, it is interesting to note that the specific forms of manifestation of these feelings were closely replicating the institutional and procedural framework of the *polis*. On the solidarity built among groups of στρατευσάμενοι – participants in the same campaign – who make together dedications for their leaders or along their leaders, see LAUNEY 1949–1950, p. 1005–1008, esp. 1006–1007.

patron employing them for a long time far from the Peloponnesos, using the enactment formula ἔδοξεν τοῖς Ἀρκάσιν⁴¹.

The inscription SEG 37.676 is a simple funerary inscription and nothing more can be added to the arguments made by Yailenko and Vinogradov. On the other hand, the inscription CIRB 991, although the most fragmentary of all, may conjecturally be connected with a certain category of individuals, respectively that of soldiers, especially if, following the suggestion of Latyshev, we accept that it is a metrical text⁴². It would be then most probably a verse epitaph⁴³ or less likely a verse votive inscription⁴⁴. Funerary epigrams are a common occurrence in the military milieu: soldiers are the best-represented professional category in verse epitaphs from Hellenistic Peloponnesos, Attika, Boiotia, and Thessaly⁴⁵. Naming the *patris* of the deceased soldier is also frequent, especially when he is buried abroad, as it seems to be the case for this Mantineian⁴⁶. Last, but not least, the mention of the *gymnasion*, although could fit a votive inscription, too, alluding, for example, to the place where the dedication was made, is more likely a reference to the athletic and martial prowess of the deceased⁴⁷. It is rather

⁴¹ Such military bands composed of Arkadians might have already been operating in Western Anatolia starting from the last third of the 5th century BC, see the evidence listed below in n. 60 and 61.

⁴² LATYSHEV 1902, p. 51, accepted in CIRB 991, VINOGRADOV 1997a, p. 32, CEG 887.

⁴³ YAILENKO 1986 interprets the inscription as an epitaph, too.

⁴⁴ CEG 887.

⁴⁵ CAIRON 2009, p. 13. Cf. BARBANTANI 2014, p. 305–306. Comrades frequently associated themselves to bury their fallen fellows in foreign lands and place tombstones with telling epitaphs over their graves. Cf. Xen. *An.* 6.4.9; LAUNEY 1949–1950, p. 1002–1004.

⁴⁶ BARBANTANI 2014, p. 306–310. Cf. IG V,1 724, the 2nd century BC epitaph of Botrichos, Arkadian mercenary buried in Lakonia: νῦν δέ νιν Ἀρκαδίας ἀπὸ πατρίδος ὧδε θανόντα („but now, far from Arkadia, his fatherland, he is thus dead“); IG V,1 723, the epitaph of a Cretan mercenary from Oreia, presumably fallen in battle at Corinth in 265 BC and buried at Sparta: [πατ]ρίδες δέ μοί ἐστιν Ὀρειοὶ („my fatherland is Oreia“); SEG 42.329, the epitaph of the 3rd century BC Illyrian mercenary Plator, married to a Spartan woman: Οὔτε πάτρα Θρινκαία τὸν ἔξοχον, οὔθ’ ὁ Λακόνων[ν] („neither your fatherland Trinkaia, nor that of the Lakonians etc.“). IG IX,2 430, the 3rd century BC epitaph of Kallias, buried at Pherai, in Thessaly, but πατρίδος ἐκ Τεγέας, might also belong to an Arkadian soldier. Otherwise, the word πατρίς is recurrent in the epigraphs of soldiers fallen in battle, but in connection to the *topos* of their noble sacrifice in defence of the fatherland (e.g. IG IX,2 466).

⁴⁷ On the military importance of the *gymnasia*, used not only for the general training of citizens for war in times of peace but also for physical training during operational pauses in times of war, as muster places, fields for military drills, camps, and fortifications, see FORBES 1945, p. 37–39. From all the instances cited there, I would like to highlight how Agesilaos, during his Asiatic campaign of 396–394 BC, thoroughly trained his army, which comprised numerous Arkadian allies and mercenaries (Xen. *An.* 7.8.24; Xen. *Hell.* 3.1.4–6, 2.7, 4.2–3, 4.20; Paus. 8.6.2), in the Ephesian *gymnasia* (Xen. *Hell.* 3.4.16 and Ages. 1.25). Similarly, ca. 375 BC, Jason of Pherai trained his mercenaries in *gymnasia* (Xen. *Hell.* 6.1.6.) On the more general connection between *gymnasia* and military training, see also LAUNEY 1949–1950, p. 813–835; KAH 2004 and HATZOPOULOS 2004. Some verse epitaphs of soldiers mention *gymnasia* with reference to the athletic and military prowess of the deceased and their presumable premature death: SEG 23.233, the 2nd century BC epitaph of the Arkadians Kallias and Epiteles (... ἐν λιπαραῖς παστάσι γυμνασίου, “... in the shiny gates of the *gymnasion*”), with CAIRON 2009, cat. no. 39, p. 125–128, esp. p. 128; IG VII

surprising then that Yailenko rejected the mercenary explanation for both Pantias and the Mantineian from Phanagoria when he advocated for it in the case of other foreigners from Chios, Syracuse, and Cyprus, buried in the Bosporean Kingdom in the reign of Leukon I's son, Pairisades I⁴⁸.

The proxeny decree for the Orchomenian Aristandros is the only such inscription erected by the Olbiopolitans whose recipient is a Peloponnesian: in the 5th and 4th centuries BC, outside Pontos, proxeny was granted only to two Athenians and potentially one Theban, whereas other Aegean connections are certified only by the votive inscription of a citizen from Keos found at Olbia and a document from Amphipolis mentioning an Olbiopolitan⁴⁹. Moreover, the proxeny decree seems to be contemporary with another inscription recording both an honorary decree for Satyros I, the father of Leukon I, and an alliance treaty between Leukon himself and the Olbiopolitans: the documents were tentatively dated around 390–385 BC and interpreted as evidence for the creation of a block by Bosporos and Olbia against the rivals from Theodosia, Chersonesos and Heraklea⁵⁰. A connection of Aristandros's proxeny decree with the political and military cooperation between Olbia and Bosporos, where three other interactions with Arkadia are attested very close in time, seems to me more acceptable than admitting an active trade relationship between Olbia and the small and landlocked Arkadian Orchomenos⁵¹, the only city from the entire Peloponnesos that would have left epigraphical traces in the city of the Borysthenites⁵². In addition, the award of proxeny – and other rights, including citizenship – to mercenaries is attested in Hellenistic Greece. The most famous example is of course the *en masse* grant of *proxenia* and *isopoliteia* to the Pergamenian citizen-soldiers and mercenaries garrisoning the small city of Lilaia in Phokis, around 208 BC⁵³, but there are quite a few other documented instances involving both individuals and groups of soldiers⁵⁴.

2537, the epitaph of the Boiotian Euanoridas, dated in 279 BC (ἐγ γυμνασίου σύντροφος ἄ[Λικί]ας, “companion of the youth from the *gymnasion*”), with CAIRON 2009, cat. no. 47, p. 158–161, esp. 160.

⁴⁸ YAILENKO 1990, p. 293, referring to the tombstones CIRB 1233, CIRB 203, CIRB 236.

⁴⁹ VINOGRADOV 1997a, p. 30–31. See also MÜLLER 2010, p. 224–225.

⁵⁰ VINOGRADOV 1997c.

⁵¹ Even in later times, the network of foreign relations of this small city seems to be mostly restricted to Arkadia and the close neighboring regions in the northern Peloponnesos, with some exceptional ties in Central Greece, see PLASSART & BLUM 1914, p. 459.

⁵² The evidence cited in BRESSON 2005, p. 105 (Paus. 8.5.8, Hdt. 7.147, IGCyr 010900), shows that Pontic grain could have indeed reached Arkadia, including Orchomenos, but it is likely that the trade was conducted by merchants from maritime cities, such as Aigina or Helike (cf. SEG 36.718, the epitaph of Philoxenos, son of Kelon, from Helike, dated ca. 490–480 BC, found at Gorgippia; see BOLTUNOVA 1986, p. 59–61). On Hdt. 7.147, see also MORENO 2007, p. 161; BRAUND 2007, p. 43–44.

⁵³ FD III.4 132–5, with LAUNEY 1949–1950, p. 654–655, and ISE II 81, p. 28–31

⁵⁴ For a possible similar contemporary case at Tralles, see MAREK 1984, p. 308–309. See also SEG 17.639, with LAUNEY 1949–1950, p. 656–657, for the *politeia* granted by the Aspendians to the mercenaries of Ptolemaios I, ca. 301–298 BC. The individual cases are numerous: IG II² 666, 287 BC, with LAUNEY 1949–1950, p. 637, and ROSE & WALLACE

The above notes tip the scales for associating the four inscriptions or at least part of them with a surmised Arkadian mercenary activity on behalf of Leukon I. At the same time, they extend the potential chronological span of the events in which the Arkadian mercenaries were involved far beyond the 360s. The potential rejection of the Arkadian League that functioned between 371 and 363/362 BC as the state that issued the honorary decree for Leukon I would allow for placing his use of Arkadian mercenaries anytime during his long reign marked in the beginning by the war against Theodosia and afterward by the conflicts against the Maiotians and other tribes of the Taman Peninsula. If indeed Aristandros's decree is contemporary with the honors awarded to Satyros I by the Olbiopolitans and the treaty alliance between them and Leukon I, then the start of the enlistment of Arkadian mercenaries in the Bosporos could be significantly raised and placed even at the end of Satyros I's reign, in the 390s. It would not be surprising in the light of the march of the Ten Thousand along the southern shores of the Euxine and their display of power when serving Seuthes in Thrace: both areas were connected with the Cimmerian Bosporos and Pantikapaion at that time⁵⁵. Moreover, the case of Drosanis of Paphlagonia shows that these areas were recruiting grounds for Leukon I in the second part of his rule. On the other hand, it also points to the likelihood that the Arkadian mercenaries, just like the Paphlagonian, were used later, in the Maiotian campaigns of Leukon. The chronological issue rests open until new data emerge.

It is futile to point out why Leukon I (and possibly Satyros I) resorted to the use of Arkadian mercenaries, given their huge renown as heavily armed hoplites, echoed in proverbs, comedies, and political speeches⁵⁶. There are numerous comprehensive modern accounts of their employment in the greatest part of the 5th and the first half of the 4th century BC, not least in relation to the present matter⁵⁷, and it would be superfluous to repeat the data here. I would like only to emphasize their receptiveness toward offers made by Greek and barbarian

2002 for the date of the events: the Athenians grant citizenship to the mercenary Strobichos for his cooperation in expelling Demetrios's Poliorketes troops from the Mouseion hill; CIG 2676, with SEG 4.219, ca. 300–280 BC: the city of Iasos grants proxeny to the mercenary captain Aristodemos, who served the Macedonian general Eupolemos in Caria; SEG 29.502, ca. 220–200 BC: the city of Atrax in Thessalia grants proxeny and citizenship to the Cretan mercenary Orthotimos from Tylesios, who served under Philip V of Macedon, etc. For a general treatment of the matter, see LAUNEY 1949–1950, p. 642–675.

⁵⁵ Cf. the assumption of L. Dubois in his commentary of the inscription in IGDOP, p. 42. See also Paus. 8.27.5–6 for Arkadian emigrants in Trapezous, ca. 370 BC.

⁵⁶ Comedy and proverbs: Hermippos fr. 63 PCG, in a list of commodities praised at Athens: "from Arkadia mercenaries" (ἀπὸ δ' Ἀρκαδίας ἐπικούρους); Plato Comicus fr. 106 PCG: "imitating Arkadians" (Ἀρκάδας μιμούμενος). Speeches: Lykomedes of Mantinea, according to Xen. *Hell.* 7.1.23: "whenever men needed mercenaries, there was none whom they chose in preference to Arkadians" (ἐπικούρων ὅποτε δεηθείεν τινες, οὐδένας ἤροῦντο ἀντ' Ἀρκαδῶν).

⁵⁷ PARKE 1933, p. 11, n. 3, p. 14–15, n. 1; COOPER 1978, p. 21–26; COOPER 1996, p. 77–79; FIELDS 1994, p. 62–73; ROY 1999, p. 347–349; FIELDS 2001, p. 116–125; GALLOTTA 2006, p. 363–365; BETTALLI 2013, p. 406–409.

potentates, from Sicily⁵⁸ and Thrace⁵⁹ to Sardis⁶⁰, Lykia⁶¹, and possibly Phoenicia⁶². It is not far-fetched then to admit their employment in Bosporos at this date, particularly as the Bosporan Kingdom relied on mercenary Greek heavily armed infantrymen in the 4th and 3rd centuries BC⁶³.

⁵⁸ Some Arkadians fought under the Deinomenids and the Anaxilaidis in the first half of the 5th century BC, as shown by a few inscriptions and literary sources mentioning certain conspicuous individuals who even got the citizenship of the Sicilian cities or became intimately connected with the houses of the tyrants: Praxiteles of Mantinea (IvO 266); Phormis of Mainalos and possibly his friend or son Lykortas (Paus. 5.27); the seer Hagesias of Elis, whose mother was from Stymphalos (Pind. *Ol.* 6); Mikythos, son of Choiros, probably from Tegea (IvO 267–269; Hdt. 7.170.4; Diod. Sic. 11.48.2, 11.66.1–3; Paus. 5.26.2–5, etc.). Thus, although there are no explicit references to Arkadians as an ethnic group in the historical accounts of the wars fought by the Deinomenids, it is likely that there were Arkadians among their Peloponnesian mercenaries (Hdt. 7.155; Diod. Sic. 11.49, 72–73, 76). Alexias, who dedicated a column or a statue in the sanctuary of Demeter Malophoros at Selinous (IG XIV 270 = IGL Palermo 53), should be excluded from the dossier: the initial explanation in GUARDUCCI 1953, p. 210–211, that he was an Arkadian mercenary serving at Gela was later replaced with a much more convincing restitution and interpretation in MANNI–PIRAINO 1963, p. 150–151, n. 30, and rejected as well in GUARDUCCI 1966, p. 190. Unfortunately, he is still regarded as an Arkadian mercenary by some authors who refer only to GUARDUCCI 1953, p. 210–211; COOPER 1996, p. 78, n. 305; YAILENKO 1986, p. 224; BETTALLI 2013, p. 323.

⁵⁹ Xen. *An.* 7.3.23, 6.8–9: Arkadian mercenaries served Seuthes along with other survivors of the expedition of the Ten Thousand.

⁶⁰ Thuc. 3.34.2: in 427 BC, Arkadian mercenaries are sent to Notion by Pissouthnes, the satrap of Sardis, to support the oligarchic faction in the civil strife from Kolophon (cf. Thuc. 1.115.4: in 440 BC, the same satrap help the Samian fugitives to raise an army of 700 mercenaries); Xen. *An.* 1.1.2: in 404 BC, Xenias the Parrhasian was in command of the 300–strong bodyguard of Cyrus the Younger, satrap of Lydia and Phrygia, and escorted him to Babylon; Xen. *An.* 1.1.6, 1.2.1, 3, 10: in 401 BC, the same Xenias was commander of all the 4000 Greeks, mostly Peloponnesians, garrisoning the cities in Cyrus's satrapies, and led them to Sardis, afterward celebrating the Arkadian religious festival of Lykaia.

⁶¹ A funerary epigram on the Obelisk of Xanthos (TAM I 44 = MEIGGS & LEWIS 1969 93), mentioning that the Lykian dynast Gergis (Kheriga) “slew seven heavily-armed Arkadian men in a day” (ἐπτά δὲ ὀπλίτας κτείνειν ἐν ἡμέραι Ἀρκάδας ἀνδρας), presumably serving under another Lykian lord, Wakhsspepddimi, or the Persian satrap of Lydia, Amorges. Cf. KEEN 1998, p. 131–137, esp. 133, 137; GYGAX & TIETZ 2005, esp. 93–94; THONEMANN 2009, esp. p. 187, n. 63, p. 188, n. 69. The specific mention of Arkadian hoplites is particularly telling about their widespread use by the potentates of Western Asia at the end of the 5th century BC.

⁶² Xen. *An.* 1.4.3, with PARKE 1933, p. 26 and ROY 1967, p. 301–302, n. 67: 400 Hellenic soldiers under Abrokomas, governor of Phoenicia, ca. 400 BC. At least part of them should have been Arkadians, given the large number of these soldiers in the Persian garrisons of that time, remarked by PARKE 1933, p. 45, n. 2, p. 57, n. 3.

⁶³ PARKE 1933, p. 15, n. 1; BLAVATSKII 1954, p. 70–72; BLAVATSKII 1958, p. 100; SOKOLSKII 1958, *passim*; FIELDS 1994, p. 71–72; VINOGRADOV 1997b, p. 124; MIELCZAREK 1999, p. 34–38; GALLOTTA 2006, p. 362–363; VINOGRADOV & GORONCHAROVSKII 2008, p. 82, 117–118, 121; KOZAK & FEDORUK 2019. One of the ancient literary sources cited in this respect could provide indirect evidence that Arkadian mercenaries were employed by Leukon I. Aineias Taktikos, a 4th century BC military writer frequently (and probably rightly) identified with Aineias the Stymphalian, the *stratēgos* of the Arkadian *koinōn* in 367 BC (Xen. *Hell.* 7.3.1), wrote that: “Leukon the tyrant of Bosporos used to discharge even members of his bodyguard who got into debt as the result of

Nonetheless, it would be unwise to exclude other types of connection between the Bosporan Kingdom and Arkadia, as the recruitment of Greek mercenaries was most often a matter of intricate political, economic, and even private ties between employers and the areas that furnished the mercenaries⁶⁴. It would not be surprising if the leaders of the short-lived Arkadian League caught between the diverging interest of Athens, Sparta, and Thebes nurtured better ties with the affluent rising power in the extreme north that might have provided the *koinōn* with grain and even money. The need for additional food in Arkadia was always actual⁶⁵, whereas the sources of payment for the 5000 *eparitōi* of the League proved to be a crux that eventually led to the split of 363/362 BC⁶⁶. Not too much later, both Thebes and Sparta, states with larger resources than the Arkadian League, had to “sell” their armies and generals to raise money from powerful satraps and monarchs⁶⁷. On the other hand, the Spartokids’ largesse with the grain shipments and fiscal exemptions for the Athenians seems to have been triggered, among others, by their plans for manning their fleet with experienced Athenian *hypēresiai* (either naval officers or oarsmen)⁶⁸, whom the government in Athens could have convinced more easily to embark for the Black Sea region⁶⁹. It is tempting to envisage that Leukon did the same to strengthen his land forces too

gambling or other excesses” (Aen. Tact. 5.2). This piece of information could have reached Aineias from fellow Arkadians serving under Leukon I, cf. FIELDS 1994, p. 71.

⁶⁴ ROP 2019 makes a good argument for the 4th century BC. In my unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, I make the same case for earlier periods.

⁶⁵ Cf. FIELDS 1994, p. 59–61; ROY 1999, p. 328–329, with emphasis though that there were also surplus years, particularly for the communities living on the plains of eastern Arkadia, such as Mantinea.

⁶⁶ On the actual number of the *eparitōi* and the context of the crisis, see DUŠANIĆ 1970, p. 83–90, 303–304; PRITCHETT 1971–1991, II, p. 223; AMIT 1973, p. 180–181; ROY 2001, p. 316–321; BETTALLI 2013, p. 185–186; NIELSEN 2015, p. 264, 267–268.

⁶⁷ The best-known cases are that of Agesilaos and Pammenes. Agesilaos in Egypt: Xen. *Ages.* 2.28–31; Plut. *Ages.* 36–40; Diod. Sic. 15.92–93, with PARKE 1933, p. 111–112; PRITCHETT 1971–1991, II, p. 89–90; TRUNDLE 2004, p. 156–157; ROP 2019, p. 107–115. Pammenes employed by Artabazos: Dem. 23.183; Diod. Sic. 16.34; Polyainos 5.16.2 = Frontin. *Str.* 2.3.3; Polyainos 7.33.2, with PARKE 1933, p. 124; PRITCHETT 1971–1991, II, p. 90–92; TRUNDLE 2004, p. 52, 137, 157; ROP 2019, p. 21, n. 55, p. 126–128. W. K. Pritchett aptly demonstrates that the citizen and mercenary troops led by the two generals were “lent” by their own states in exchange for money that they badly needed. See PRITCHETT 1971–1991, II, p. 97–99, with further historical examples (including *schol.* on Ar. *Plut.* 187, grain vs. military aid) and FIELDS 1994, p. 5, who calls them “official soldiers-of-fortune”.

⁶⁸ The first meaning is defended in MORRISON 1984, the second in JORDAN 2000, p. 89–101, with previous literature. Irrespective of the precise meaning, the service in the *hypēresia* could have been of mercenary nature and both authors agree that this was the case of the Athenian *hypēresiai* requested for the Bosporan fleet (MORRISON 1984, p. 54; JORDAN 2000, p. 93).

⁶⁹ PRITCHETT 1971–1991, II, p. 99 hypothesizes that the enlistment of Athenian *hypēresiai* by Leukon’s sons (IG II³,1 298 = IG II² 212 l. 59–65) in exchange for grain falls under the same category of recruitment evidenced in the cases of Agesilaos and Pammenes. BLAVATSKII 1958, p. 100 rightly emphasizes that similar enlistments were conducted in the time of Leukon I since the solid relationship between Pantikapaion and Athens had been already forged during the reign of Satyros I (see the list of sources in MORENO 2007, p. 337–338, and their brief discussion in BRAUND 2007, p. 51–62).

with some of the finest hoplites available in the Aegean at that time⁷⁰. The tight connections of some Arkadian leaders – particularly the democratic Mantineian exiles who fled to Athens after the *dioikismos* imposed on their city by Sparta in 385 BC – with certain influential Athenians, already mentioned by Yailenko⁷¹, could have certainly helped in replicating the model of the Bosporan-Athenian relationship with regard to Arkadia. This could have happened even after the demise of the greater Arkadian *koinōn* in 363/362 BC, given the apparent survival of a smaller league of northern Arkadian cities centered around Mantinea⁷².

On the other hand, picturing the Bosporan-Arkadian relationship in the first half of the 4th century BC as driven exclusively by commercial interests seems to me not only implausible in the light of the extant evidence⁷³ but also an anachronism, given the overall image of the interstate relations in Classical Greece⁷⁴.

There is of course much conjecture in the epigraphic notes and the historical comments that I made above, so I do not expect that someone will consider that I “closed the discussion in a particularly convincing manner”. However, I hope I was able to demonstrate that, in fact no one succeeded to have done that either way.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

AMIT 1973 – M. Amit, *Great and Small Poleis. A Study in the Relations between the Great Powers and the Small Cities in Ancient Greece*, Bruxelles, 1973.

AVRAM 2009 – A. Avram, *Pont*, in: L. Dubois et alii, *Bulletin épigraphique*, REG 122 (2009), 2, p. 496–512.

BARBANTANI 2014 – S. Barbantani, “*Déjà la pierre pense où votre nom s’inscrit*”. *Identity in context in verse epitaphs for Hellenistic soldiers*, in: R. Hunter, A. Rengakos,

⁷⁰ If indeed Arkadian troops served in Bosporos under the official approval of the Arkadian League, possibly led by a legitimately chosen general, like Agesilaos in Egypt, then we might envisage the inscription CIRB 37 as the result of the joint agency of the *koinōn* and the soldiers in the field (cf. the commentary of HICKS & HILL 1901, no. 136). It should also be noted that in the mid-4th century BC, the Athenians enacted certain honorary decrees for foreign rulers and citizens based on letters sent by the generals in service overseas (IG II² 110, dated 363/2 BC, honorand: Menelaos the Pelagonian, adviser: Timotheos the general; IG II² 187, dated ante 353/2 BC, honorand: satrap of Phrygia, adviser: ?; IG II² 408, dated ca. 330 BC, honorands: Mnemon and Kallias of Herakleia, advisers: Diotimos, the general, and Olympiodoros, probably an officer, with PRITCHETT 1971–1991, II, p. 47).

⁷¹ YAILENKO 1986, p. 225. On the Mantineian exiles at Athens and the tight relations between certain Arkadians (mostly Mantineians) and some conspicuous Athenians, such as Plato, Isokrates, Timotheos, and Leochares, see DUŠANIĆ 1970, p. 284–290, 300–301; DUŠANIĆ 1979, p. 128–135; LODDO 2020, p. 208–209. Members of the Bosporan upper classes, too, maintained good connections with the Athenian elites, particularly with the circle of Isokrates, see the comprehensive picture drawn in MORENO 2007, p. 174–177, table IV.

⁷² DUŠANIĆ 1970, p. 164–166, 307, 334–335.

⁷³ The implausibility of a significant trade connection between Bosporos and Arkadia results too from the fact that the latter did not have economic products that could have paid for the grain imported from the Pontic region, cf. ROY 1999, p. 340.

⁷⁴ Cf. VINOGRADOV 1997c, p. 521–525, about Satyros I’s and Leukon I’s dynastic and strategic interests, sometimes obscured in modern literature by economic considerations.

E. Sistakou (eds.), *Hellenistic Studies at a Crossroads. Exploring Texts, Contexts and Metatexts*, Berlin, 2014, p. 301–334.

BETTALLI 2013 – M. Bettalli, *Mercenari. Il mestiere delle armi nel mondo greco antico*, Roma, 2013.

BLAVATSKII 1954 – V.D. Blavatskii, *Ocherki voennogo dela v antichnykh gosudarstvakh Severnogo Prichernomor'ya*, Moscow, 1954.

BLAVATSKII 1958 – V.D. Blavatskii, *Ob etnicheskom sostave naseleniya Pantikapeya v IV–III vv. do n. e.*, SA 28 (1958), p. 97–106.

BOLTUNOVA 1986 – A.I. Boltunova, *Nadpisi Gorgippii (Iz nakhodok 1971–1981 gg.)*, VDI 1 (1986), p. 43–61.

BRAUND 2007 – D. Braund, *Black Sea Grain for Athens? From Herodotus to Demosthenes*, in: V. Gabrielsen, J. Lund (eds.), *The Black Sea in Antiquity: Regional and Interregional Economic Exchanges*, Black Sea Studies 6, Aarhus, 2007, p. 39–68.

BRESSON 2005 – A. Bresson, *Ecology and Beyond: the Mediterranean Paradigm*, in W. V. Harris (ed.), *Rethinking the Mediterranean*, Oxford, 2005, p. 94–114.

BURSTEIN 1974 – S. Burstein, *The War between Heraclea Pontica and Leucon I of Bosphorus*, *Historia* 23 (1974) 4, p. 401–416.

CAIRON 2009 – É. Cairon, *Les épitaphes métriques hellénistiques du Péloponnèse à la Thessalie*, Budapest – Debrecen, 2009.

COOPER 1978 – F.A. Cooper, *The Temple of Apollo at Bassai: A Preliminary Study*, New York – London, 1978.

COOPER 1996 – F.A. Cooper, *The Temple of Apollo Bassitas. I. The Architecture*, Princeton, 1996.

DUŠANIĆ 1970 – S. Dušanić, *Arkadski savez IV veka. The Arcadian league of the Fourth century*, Belgrade, 1970.

DUŠANIĆ 1979 – S. Dušanić, *Arkadika*, MDAI(A) 94 (1979), p. 117–135.

FIELDS 1994 – N. Fields, *The Anatomy of a Mercenary: from Archilochos to Alexander*, PhD diss., University of Newcastle upon Tyne, 1994.

FIELDS 2001 – N. Fields, *Et ex Arcadia ego*, AHB 15 (2001), p. 102–130.

FORBES 1945 – C.A. Forbes, *Expanded Uses of the Greek Gymnasium*, CPh 40, p. 32–42.

GAIDUKEVICH 1960 – V.F. Gaidukevich, *Bospor i Arkadiya (Po povodu nadpisi IPE, II, 4)*, ZOAO 1 (34) (1960), p. 105–111.

GAJDUKEVIČ 1971 – V.F. Gajdukevič, *Das Bosporanische Reich*, Berlin – Amsterdam, 1971.

GALLOTTA 2006 – S. Gallotta, *I mercenari arcadi: dal'Occidente al Mar Nero*, in: M.G. Angeli Bertinelli, Angela Donati (eds.), *Le vie della storia. Migrazioni di popoli, viaggi di individui, circolazione di idee nel Mediterraneo antico, Atti del II Incontro Internazionale di Storia Antica (Genova, 6–8 ottobre 2004)*, Roma, 2006, p. 361–365.

GARLAN 1975 – Y. Garlan, *War in the Ancient World. A Social History*, transl. by J. Lloyd, London, 1975.

GRZESIK 2013 – D. Grzesik, *Abbreviated Decrees of Delphi*, ZPE 186 (2013), p. 157–162.

GUARDUCCI 1953 – M. Guarducci, *Arcadi in Sicilia*, PP 8 (1953), p. 209–211.

GUARDUCCI 1966 – M. Guarducci, *Note di epigrafia selinuntina arcaica*, *Kokalos* 12 (1966), p. 179–199.

GYGAX & TIETZ 2005 – M.D. Gygax, W. Tietz, *'He who of all mankind set up the most numerous trophies to Zeus'. The Inscribed Pillar of Xanthos reconsidered*, AS 55 (2005), p. 89–98.

HATZOPOULOS 2004 – M. Hatzopoulos, *La formation militaire dans les gymnases hellénistiques*, in D. Kah, P. Scholz (eds.), *Das hellenistische Gymnasium*, Berlin, 2004, p. 91–96.

HICKS & HILL 1901 – E.L. Hicks, G.F. Hill (eds.), *A Manual of Greek Historical Inscriptions*, 2nd ed., Oxford, 1901.

JORDAN 2000 – B. Jordan, *The Crews of Athenian Triremes*, AC 69 (2000), p. 81–101.

KAH 2004 – D. Kah, *Militärische Ausbildung im hellenistischen Gymnasium*, in D. Kah, P. Scholz (eds.), *Das hellenistische Gymnasium*, Berlin, 2004, p. 47–90.

KEEN 1998 – A. Keen, *Dynastic Lycia: a political history of the Lycians and their relations with foreign powers, c. 545–362 B.C.*, Leiden – Boston, 1998.

KENT 1941 – J.H. Kent, *A Garrison Inscription from Rhamnous*, *Hesperia* 10 (1941) 4, p. 342–350.

KLaffenBACH 1926 – G. Klaffenbach, *Samische Inschriften*, *MDAI(A)* 51 (1926), p. 26–40.

KONDIS 1958 – I.D. Kondis, *Το ιερό της Ολυμπίας κατά τον Δ.π.Χ. αιώνα*, Athens, 1958.

KOZAK & FEDORUK 2019 – A.I. Kozak, A.V. Fedoruk, *Inostrannye komandiry na sluzhbe v Bosporskome tsarstve (konets IV – seredina III vv. do n. e.)*, *Stratum Plus* 3 (2019), p. 407–424.

KUNZE 1961 – E. Kunze, *Zwei Marmorstele des Arkadischen Bundes*, in E. Kunze (ed.), *VII. Bericht über die Ausgrabungen in Olympia*, Berlin, 1961, p. 211–217.

KUZNETSOV & TOLSTIKOV 2017 – V.D. Kuznetsov, V.P. Tolstikov (eds.), *Pantikapei i Fanagoriya. Dve stolitsy Bosporskogo tsarstva*, Moscow, 2017.

LAMBERT 2017 – S.D. Lambert, *Inscribed Athenian Laws and Decrees in the Age of Demosthenes. Historical Essays*, Leiden – Boston, 2017.

LARFELD 1914 – W. Larfeld, *Griechische Epigraphik*, 3rd edition, Munich, 1914.

LATYSHEV 1902 – V.V. Latyshev, *Grecheskie i latinskie nadpisi, naidennnye v Yujnoi Rosii* [Greek and Latin inscriptions discovered in Southern Russia], *IIAK* 3 (1902), p. 21–57.

LAUNEY 1949–1950 – M. Launey, *Recherches sur les armées hellénistiques*, 2 vols., Paris, 1949–1950.

LEVI 1958 – E. I. Levi, *K istorii torgovli Ol'vii v IV–III vv. do n. e. (po epigraficheskim pamyatnikam agory)*, *SA* 28 (1958), p. 234–247.

LODDO 2020 – L. Loddo, *Έως ἄν κατέλθωσιν εἰς τὴν αὐτῶν: Did the Athenians Reduce their Reception of Refugees in the Fourth Century BC?*, *Pallas* 112 (2020), p. 199–230.

MANNI PIRAINO 1963 – M. T. Manni Piraino, *Iscrizioni inedite e revisioni selinuntine*, *Kokalos* 9 (1963), p. 137–156.

MAREK 1984 – C. Marek, *Die Proxenie*, Frankfurt am Main – Bern – New York, 1984.

MEIGGS & LEWIS 1969 – R. Meiggs, D.M. Lewis (eds.), *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the end of the Fifth Century B.C.* Oxford, 1969.

MEYER 2013 – E. Meyer, *Inscriptions as honors and the Athenian epigraphic habit*, *Historia* 62 (2013), p. 453–505.

MIELCZAREK 1999 – M. Mielczarek, *The Army of the Bosporan Kingdom*, Łódź, 1999.

MINON 2007 – S. Minon, *Les inscriptions éléennes dialectales (VI^e–II^e siècle avant J.-C.)*, Geneva, 2007.

MORENO 2007 – A. Moreno, *Feeding the Democracy. The Athenian Grain Supply in the Fifth and Fourth Centuries BC*, Oxford, 2007.

MORRISON 1984 – J.S. Morrison, *Hyperesia in Naval Contexts in the Fifth and Fourth Centuries BC*, *JHS* 104 (1984), p. 48–59.

MÜLLER 2010 – C. Müller, *D'Olbia à Tanais. Territoires et réseaux d'échanges dans la mer Noire septentrionale aux époques classique et hellénistique*, Bordeaux, 2010.

NIELSEN 2015 – T.H. Nielsen, *The Arkadian Confederacy*, in H. Beck, P. Funke (eds.), *Federalism in Greek Antiquity*, Cambridge, 2015, p. 250–268.

PARKE 1933 – H.W. Parke, *Greek Mercenary Soldiers from the Earliest Times to the Battle of Ipsus*, Oxford, 1933.

PLASSART & BLUM 1914 – A. Plassart, G. Blum, *Orchomène d'Arcadie. Fouilles de 1913. Inscriptions*, *BCH* 38 (1914), p. 447–478.

POUILLOUX 1954 – J. Pouilloux, *La forteresse de Rhamnonte : étude de topographie et d'histoire*, Paris, 1954.

PRITCHETT 1971–1991 – W.K. Pritchett, *The Greek State at War*, 5 vols., Berkeley – Los Angeles – London, 1971–1991.

RHODES & LEWIS 1997 – P. J. Rhodes, D. M. Lewis, *The Decrees of the Greek States*, Oxford, 1997.

RINGEL *et alii* 1999 – E. Ringel, P. Siewert, H. Taeuber, *Die Symmachien Pisas mit den Arkadern, Akroreia, Messenien und Sikyon. Ein neues Fragment der 'Arkadischen Bündnisstele' von 365 v. Chr.*, in: A. Mallwitz (ed.), *XI. Bericht über die Ausgrabungen in Olympia*, Berlin – New York, 1999, p. 413–420.

ROP 2019 – J. Rop, *Greek military service in the ancient Near East, 401–330 BCE*, Cambridge, 2019.

ROSE & WALLACE 2022 – T. Rose, S. Wallace, *The Athenian Revolt from Demetrios Poliorketes: New Evidence from Rhamnous (I.Rhamnous 404)*, *AHB* 36 (2022), 3–4, p. 166–178.

ROY 1967 – J. Roy, *The Mercenaries of Cyrus*, *Historia* 16 (1967), p. 287–323.

ROY 1971 – J. Roy, *Arcadia and Boeotia in Peloponnesian Affairs, 370–62 B.C.*, *Historia* 20 (1971), p. 569–599.

ROY 1999 – J. Roy, *The Economies of Arkadia*, in: T.H. Nielsen, J. Roy (eds.), *Defining Ancient Arkadia, Symposium, April, 1–4 1998*, Copenhagen, 1999, p. 320–381.

ROY 2001 – J. Roy, *Problems of Democracy in the Arcadian Confederacy 370–362 BC*, in: R. Brock, S. Hodkinson (eds.), *Alternatives to Athens. Varieties of Political Organization and Community in Ancient Greece*, Oxford, 2001, p. 308–326.

SAPRYKIN 2003 – S.Yu. Saprykin, *Bosporskoe tsarstvo: ot tiranii k ellinisticheskoi monarkhii*, *VDI* 1 (2003), p. 11–35.

SHELOV-KOBEDYAEV 1985 – F.B. Shelov-Kobedyayev, *Novye bosporskie dekreti*, *VDI* 1 (1985), p. 57–72.

SOKOLSKII 1958 – N.I. Sokolskii, *K voprosu o naemnikakh v Bospore v IV–III vv. do n. e.*, *SA* 28 (1958), p. 298–307.

SWOBODA 1890 – H. Swoboda, *Die griechischen Volksbeschlüsse: Epigraphische Untersuchungen*. Leipzig, 1890.

THONEMANN 2009 – P. Thonemann, *Lycia, Athens and Amorges*, in: J. Ma *et alii* (eds.), *Interpreting the Athenian Empire*, London, 2009, p. 167–194.

TRUNDLE 2004 – M. Trundle, *Greek Mercenaries. from the Late Archaic Period to Alexander*, London – New York, 2004.

VINOGRADOV 1990 – Yu.G. Vinogradov, *Côte septentrionale du Pont, Caucase, Asie Centrale*, in: Ph. Gauthier *et alii*, *Bulletin épigraphique*, *REG* 103 (1990), 2, p. 531–560.

VINOGRADOV 1994 – Yu.G. Vinogradov, *Greek Epigraphy of the North Black Sea Coast, The Caucasus and Central Asia (1985–1990)*, *ACSS* 1 (1994), 1, p. 63–74.

VINOGRADOV 1997a – Yu.G. Vinogradov, *Der Pontos Euxeinos als politische, ökonomische und kulturelle Einheit und die Epigraphik*, in *id.*, *Pontische Studien. Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte und Epigraphik des Schwarzmeerraumes*, Mainz, 1997, p. 1–73.

VINOGRADOV 1997b – Yu.G. Vinogradov, *Die historische Entwicklung der Poleis des nördlichen Schwarzmeergebietes im 5. Jahrhundert v.Chr.*, in *id.*, *Pontische Studien. Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte und Epigraphik des Schwarzmeerraumes*, Mainz, 1997, p. 100–132.

VINOGRADOV 1997c – Yu.G. Vinogradov, *Olbia und Bosporos im frühen 4. Jh. v.Chr. im Lichte eines neugefundenen Aktendossiers*, in *id.*, *Pontische Studien. Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte und Epigraphik des Schwarzmeerraumes*, Mainz, 1997, p. 515–525.

VINOGRADOV & GORONCHAROVSKII 2008 – Yu.A. Vinogradov & V.A. Goroncharovskii, *Voennaya istoriya i voennoe delo Bospora Kimmeriiskogo (VI v. do n. e. – seredina III v. n. e.)*, St. Petersburg, 2008.

YAILENKO 1986 – V.P. Yailenko, *Odna bosporskaia epitafiya*, in: G.A. Koshelenko (ed.), *Problemy antichnoi kul'tury*, Moscow, 1986, p. 222–226.

YAILENKO 1990 – V.P. Yailenko, *Ol'viya i Bospor v ellinisticheskuiu epochu*, in: E.S. Golubtsova (ed.), *Ellinizm: ekonomika, politika, kul'tura*, Moscow, 1990, p. 249–309.

ZAVOIKIN 2004 – A.A. Zavoikin, *Kratkii ocherk istorii Bospora VI – pervoi chetverti III vv. do n. e.*, *PIFK* 14 (2004), p. 58–94.