

UNDERSTANDING THE POLITICAL GEOGRAPHY AND ECONOMIC HISTORY OF THE BLACK SEA ON THE BASIS OF PROXENY DECREES*

BY
VICTOR COJOCARU*

Abstract:

In the context of publishing a monograph on proxenia in the Black Sea area, the author has begun to examine the dynamic interactions between external cultural influences and local cultural traditions. Throughout almost two centuries of historiographical debate, a number of solid works and valuable studies have explored this topic, yet none of them provides a coherent picture on the external relations of the Pontic Greek cities during the Classical, Hellenistic and Roman times on the basis of proxeny decrees. Starting with a brief introduction on the status quaestionis, this paper analyses aspects of social, economic, and religious interactions which are connected with the status of foreigners in the Greek world, and this at various levels: local (between Greeks and non-Greeks), regional (between an individual and a state in the world of the Pontus Euxinus); and in terms of macrocosms (the evolution of proxeny due to the growth of business between citizens of different city-states). The discussion is drawing on a systematic analysis of ca. 250 inscriptions, from simple tax exemptions (ateleiai) to complex honorary documents. It focuses especially on the status of foreigners as proxenoi in the city-states on the Black Sea coast, in contrast to some Pontikoi as representatives of their communities in other parts of the oikoumene. The objective of this approach is not only to obtain a holistic understanding of the Black Sea as an ancient region which was well integrated to the Mediterranean world, but also to bring attention to some modern perceptions of history "that take the nation as timeless, the state as predestined, and the region as ephemeral" (KING 2004: 239).

Keywords: Black Sea area; Greek cities; proxeny decrees; political geography; economic history; status of foreigners.

1. RESEARCH PROJECT ON PROXENIA IN THE BLACK SEA AREA

In his letter to Biagio Virgilio from the 1st of March 1970, Louis Robert seemed to be convinced that "(...) there is no place for *proxenia* other than as a chapter in a handbook on Greek institutions".¹ Robert's impression that "there is nothing new of interest to discover concerning proxeny" was influenced by an increasing scepticism of earlier scholarship concerning the functional nature of *proxenia*. Since the end of the 19th century scholars began to see a contradiction between the understanding of *proxenia* as a quasi-contractual office, involving an obligation on the side of the *proxenos* to perform particular duties, with the honorific aspect of this status which seemed prominent in the rapidly expanding epigraphic record of proxeny decrees for the Hellenistic period.² Robert signalled his own rejection of this simplistic narrative of the post-Classical decline of proxeny and repeatedly rejected the historiographic belief which implied the

* Institute of Archaeology, Romanian Academy – Iași Branch; victorinstarhia@yahoo.com.

This work was supported by a grant of the Romanian Ministry of Research and Innovation, CCCDI – UEFISCDI, project number „PN-III-P1-1.1-TE-2019-0783”. I am very grateful to Dr. Annamária-Izabella Pázsint, Dr. Ligia Ruscu (Cluj-Napoca), and Prof. Dr. Altay Coşkun (Waterloo, Ontario) for proofreading the article; all remaining shortcomings are of course my own.

¹ See the full letter translated by MACK 2015: 4: "The study? If I am not mistaken there is nothing new of interest to discover concerning proxeny. It is a question which has been solved and, thank goodness, we know what it is, we can explain it to novices. If Monceaux's monograph is out of print it can be reprinted lithographically. In my opinion there is no place for *proxenia* other than a chapter in a handbook on Greek institutions".

² Cf. MACK 2015: 5-8.

‘death’ of the post-Chaironeian *polis*.³ But his distrust of Virgilio’s planned and then abandoned project of a *corpus* with an introductory study of all extant proxy decrees did not help overcome this historiographical *aporia*.

However, since Robert’s dismissive statement and to this day, there has been a continuous stream of publications on *proxenia*; the subject being tackled both in more general terms, and through case studies.⁴ Of particular interest in this regard are the contributions of F. Gschnitzer,⁵ Chr. Marek,⁶ Ph. Gauthier,⁷ D. Knoepfler,⁸ and more recently the outstanding book by W. Mack.⁹

For my own project on *proxenia* in the Black Sea area,¹⁰ I analysed social, economic, and religious aspects connected with the status of foreigners in the Greek world, and this at various levels: local (between Greeks and non-Greeks),¹¹ regional (between an individual and a state in the world of the Pontus Euxinus);¹² and in terms of macrocosms (the evolution of proxy due to the growth of business between citizens of different city-states).¹³ The objective of this approach was to obtain a holistic understanding of the Black Sea as an ancient region in its own right, on the one hand, but also as a region integrated into the Mediterranean world on the other hand. First of all, my research is based on an exhaustive catalogue of 178¹⁴ *ateleia*, *proxenia* and *politeia* decrees, as evidence for the evolution of the proxy in the Black Sea area.

These decrees range from simple tax exemptions (*ateleiai*) to complex honorary documents, they reflect the relations of the Pontic Greeks between each other and with other regions of the Greek and Roman world. Among the more than 5600 stone inscriptions from the Black Sea region that have been published previously, the 178 grants of *ateleia*, *proxenia* and *politeia* constitute less than 3% (Tab. I), but it is beyond doubt that they convey a much higher proportion of the information relevant for the external contacts of the Ancient Black Sea area. Despite the risks inherent to statistical analysis, I will allow myself to make a few observations on the distribution of documents among the city-states. At present I am aware of the attestation of 2 documents from Apollonia, 24 from the Bosporan Kingdom,¹⁵ 4 from Byzantium, 4 from Chalcedon, 15 from Callatis, 40 from Chersonesus, 5 from Dionysopolis, 14 from Histria, 12 from Mesambria, 7 from Odessus, 41 from Olbia, 5 from Sinope, 2 each from Tomis¹⁶ and Tyras,¹⁷ and 1 from Tios.

³ See, for example, ROBERT 1984: 273: “Dans l’étude de l’histoire sociale de l’époque hellénistique et romaine existent au moins deux fables convenues, deux mystifications. La première est la mort de la cité grecque à Chéronée et, désormais, le rôle exclusif des rois”.

⁴ For a more comprehensive survey, with a focus on the *proxenia* in the Black Sea area, see now COJOCARU 2016A: 26-49.

⁵ GSCHNITZER 1973.

⁶ MAREK 1984.

⁷ Especially GAUTHIER 1972; 1985.

⁸ KNOEPFLER 2001.

⁹ MACK 2015; cf. COJOCARU 2016B.

¹⁰ COJOCARU 2016A.

¹¹ See, for example, the treaty of alliance between Sadalas and the Mesambrians, which was preceded by the grant of *politeia*, *proxenia* and *proedria* to the Thracian dynast and his descendants – IGBulg I² 307 (cf. COJOCARU 2016A: 149, nr. 66).

¹² This is the case for most of the proxy decrees. As a typical example, I quote IGDOP 20 (cf. COJOCARU 2016A: 73, nr. 40): Ἀγαθῆι τύχηι | Ὀλβιοπολίται ἔδωκαν | τοῖς Θεοσπόπου παισὶν | Θεοφάνει καὶ Ἀρίστῃ | Ἡρακλεώταις, αὐτοῖς | καὶ ἐγγόνοις προξενίαν, πολιτείαν, |⁸ ἀτελείαν πάντων | χρημάτων ὧν ἂν αὐτοὶ | εἰσάγωσιν ἢ ἐξάγωσιν, ἢ θεράποντες, |¹² καὶ εἰσπλουν καὶ | ἐκπλουν καὶ ἐμ πολέμῳ καὶ ἐν εἰρήνῃ | ἀσυλεῖ καὶ ἀσπονδεῖ.

¹³ COJOCARU 2016A (*passim*), especially 180-193.

¹⁴ To the 174 documents catalogued in COJOCARU 2016A: 50-152 is to be added IGBulg V 5094 (a decree from Mesambria): [---]ITI[---] | [---]ΓΝΟ[---] | [---]. INAITE[---] |⁴ [---] σιτωνί[α(?) ---] | [δεδόχθαι τᾷ βουλᾷ καὶ τῷ δάμῳ . . .] INT[---] | [--- τ]οῖς πολεμοῦσι ΠΟ[---] | [δεδόσθαι δὲ αὐτῶι κ]αὶ ἐ<κ>γόνοις προξενίαν, π[ο]⁸[λιτείαν, πάντων χρημ]άτων ἰσ[ο]τέλειαν καὶ εἰσ[π]λουν καὶ ἐκπλουν πο]λέμου καὶ εἰράνας ἀσυλεῖ | [καὶ ἀσπονδεῖ καὶ ἔφοδον] ἐπὶ τὰν βουλὰν καὶ τὸν δᾶ[μ]ον πρᾶτοις μετὰ τὰ ἱερά], τὸν δὲ ταμίαν ἀναγρά[μ]α¹²[ψαντα τὸ ψάφισμα τοῦτο] εἰς τελαμῶνα λευκοῦ λ[ι][θου ἀναθέμεν εἰς τὸ ἱερ]ὸν τοῦ Σαράπιος. I am grateful to Thibaut Castelli for drawing my attention to this document. The first proxy decree from Tyras was published by IVANTCHIK 2017: 968-970. For two other recently published documents, see the note below.

¹⁵ 20 stone inscriptions + two attestations of *ateleia* by Isoc. 17.57 (cf. COJOCARU 2016A: 91, nr. 70) and Dem. 20.31 (cf. COJOCARU 2016A: 91-92, nr. 71). In addition to the 20 stone inscriptions catalogued by COJOCARU 2016A: 92-100, nr. 72-91, we can now add two fragmentary decrees published by SHELOV-KOVEDYAEV 2018.

¹⁶ One stone inscription + one attestation of *immunitas* (= *ateleia*) by Ov. *Pont.* 4.9.101-103 (cf. COJOCARU 2016A: 104, nr. 98).

¹⁷ IVANTCHIK 2017: 968-970 + Ovinus Tertullus’ letter to the magistrates, *boule* and *demos* of Tyras (IOSPE I² 4, cf. COJOCARU 2016A: 105-106, nr. 100), with mention of tax exemption (*immunitas* = *ateleia*) and the right of citizenship.

City	Proxeny decrees (<i>ateleia, proxenia, politeia</i>)	Total (estimated) of the stone inscriptions
Apollonia	2	ca. 100
Bosporan Kingdom (cities of)	24	ca. 1600
Byzantium	4	ca. 400
Chalcedon	4	ca. 150
Callatis	15	ca. 270
Chersonesus	40	ca. 600
Dionysopolis	5	ca. 80
Histria	14	ca. 500
Mesambria	12	ca. 50
Odessus	7	ca. 300
Olbia	41	ca. 600
Sinope	5	ca. 230
Tios	1	ca. 100
Tomis	2	ca. 600
Tyras	2	ca. 70

Tab. I. Proxeny decrees (*ateleia, proxenia, politeia*) in the Black Sea region. Statistics.¹⁸

Century	Apollonia	Bosporan Kingdom	Dionysopolis	Histria	Odessus	Olbia	Sinope	Tios	Tomis	Tyras
5 th BC		Athens				Heraclea, Sinope				
4 th BC		Amisus - Piraeus Apollonia?-2 Athens Chalcedon Chios? Kromna (in Paphlagonia) Mytilene uncertain-12	Odessus	uncertain-1		Athens, Byzantium Chalcedon, Chersonesus Heraclea, Heraclea ? Histria, Mesambria Miletus Orchomenus (in Arcadia) Sinope/ Heraclea ? Thesalia ? uncertain-8	Callatis Kos uncertain-2			
3 rd BC	uncertain - 1	Histria?	Callatis	Apollonia-2 Callatis, Chios uncertain-3	Chersonesus uncertain-3	Byzantium ? Callatis, Histria Rhodes-2 uncertain-8	Kos			uncertain-1
2 nd BC			Mesambria uncertain-1	Callatis Samothrace Tomis uncertain-3	Antiohia Callatis	Amisus Chersonesus Smyrna Tomis, Tyras			Tyras	
1 st BC	Tarsos	uncertain-1			Heraion Teichos					
1 st AD						uncertain-2			Ovid	
2 nd AD						Prousa ad Hypium		Chersonesus		

Tab. II. *Proxenoï* in the Ionian city-states on the Black Sea coast¹⁹

¹⁸ Revised version of COJOCARU 2016A: 155, Tab. I.

¹⁹ Revised version of COJOCARU 2016A: 234, Tab. VIII.

City \ Century	Byzantium	Chalcedon	Callatis	Chersonesus	Mesambria
4 th BC			uncertain-1	uncertain-1?	
3 rd BC			Apollonia Chersonesus-2 Dionysopolis Elea, Mytilene Paros, Tyras uncertain-3	Olbia Rhodes uncertain-1	Apollonia Callatis Neapolis Sadalas Thessalia uncertain-3
2 nd BC	Miletus Seleukeia (Cilicia)	Byzantium Seleukeia (Cilicia)	uncertain-1	Amisus Sinope	De[- -], son of Dezas, ast uncertain-1
1 st BC				Heraclea? uncertain-2	
Hellen. time		Olbia? uncertain-1	uncertain-1		uncertain-1
1 st AD	Olbia		uncertain-1	Heraclea uncertain-1	
2 nd AD				Amastris-2 Amastris? Heraclea-3 Sinope-3 T. Aurelius Calpurnianus Aurelia Paulina uncertain-11	
Roman time				uncertain-7	

Tab. III. *Proxenoï* in the Dorian city-states on the Black Sea coast.²⁰

This division by itself seems to underline the outstanding role of Olbia as the most important trading centre of the region from the Archaic to the Hellenistic age.²¹ In contrast, the status of Tomis appears to have been insignificant in the pre-Roman period. Actually, it was still an *emporion* depending on Histria and Callatis up to the middle of the 3rd century BC.²² As the metropolis of the western Pontus (μητρόπολις τοῦ Εὐωνύμου Πόντου²³), the city reached its historical heyday and became a popular residence choice for many foreigners only in the first century AD. Nevertheless, the Tomitans – as well as other Greek communities of the western and southern Black Sea coast under Roman rule – stopped awarding proxeny by that time. On the northern Black Sea coast, the lack of evidence from Tyras²⁴ indicates quite clearly, in my opinion, that this settlement functioned mainly as a transit centre for trade with other Pontic and non-Pontic *poleis*,²⁵ thus acting just as a ‘rest stop’ for ‘les étrangers de passage’. In fact, for the pre-Roman period we do not have more than three honorary decrees from this *polis*.²⁶

Furthermore, one might mention the absence of documentary evidence from Heraclea and the insignificant number of items from Byzantium, Chalcedon and Sinope. However, many of their own citizens were honoured as *proxenoï* abroad (Tab. IV-V). As for the other city-states on the Black Sea coast – whether Ionian, such as Olbia and Histria, or Dorian, such as Callatis and Chersonesus – their situation is quite different. Since these emerged due to trade routes on

²⁰ Revised version of COJOCARU 2016A: 235, Tab. IX.

²¹ Relevant in this respect seems to be the testimony of Herodotus, who sees the city as ‘the centre of Scythia’ (Hdt. 4.17): ἀπὸ τοῦ Βορυσθενείτων ἐμπορίου (τοῦτο γὰρ παραθαλασσίων μεσαιτατὸν ἐστὶ πάσης τῆς Σκυθίας) (...). I have pointed out the outstanding role of Olbia as the most important trading centre of the region elsewhere, see COJOCARU 2013: 94-95, with n. 35.

²² Regarding the status of *emporion* of Tomis, see esp. ROBU 2014, with references to primary sources and scholarship.

²³ So, for example, ISM II 92, l. 9-12 (ca. 222-235 AD): (...) βουλή δήμος τῆς λαμ|προτάτης μητροπόλεως | καὶ α' τοῦ Εὐωνύμου Πόντου |¹² Τόμειος. Cf. ISM II 54 (ca. 139-144 AD), ISM II 70 (ca. 161-169 AD), ISM II 82 (under Septimius Severus), ISM II 97 (the Severan era).

²⁴ Ovinus Tertullus' letter from AD 201 (cf. above n. 18) is only an indirect piece of evidence for the previous functioning of the proxeny.

²⁵ Interesting to note that Nilos from Tyras, honoured as *proxenos* at Tomis (ISM II 5, cf. COJOCARU 2016A: 103-104, Nr. 97) is mentioned as a contact person between *Tomitai* and *Olbiopolitai* and not between *Tomitai* and *Tyritai*.

²⁶ SEG 49, 1051 and BE 1964, 309 (cf. COJOCARU 2013: 110, Nr. 24 and 25). To this we now add IVANTCHIK 2017.

the fringes of the Mediterranean, they benefited extensively from the institution of proxeny when establishing commercial, political, cultural and religious relations with other *poleis* in the Black Sea region, with other non-Pontic Greek communities, as well as with the 'barbarians' from the hinterland (Tab. II-III).

Besides the statistical data, the existing database allowed me to elaborate a more or less extensive commentary, structured according to several categories: the concept of *proxenos* and *proxenia*,²⁷ proxeny decrees as a source type and research task,²⁸ methodological problems,²⁹ history of research,³⁰ evolution of formulas,³¹ issuing authorities for the proxeny decrees,³² recipients (*proxenoi*),³³ awarded privileges,³⁴ places where the decrees were pronounced and exhibited,³⁵ and lastly the geographical distribution of the *proxenoi* based on ethnics.³⁶ A separate chapter is dedicated to the foreigners of Pontic origin as *proxenoi* in other regions of the *oikoumene*.³⁷ Given the limits of this paper, in the following section I confine myself to the status of foreigners as *proxenoi* in the Pontic city-states, comparing the evidence with some *Pontikoi* as representatives of their communities in other parts of the *oikoumene*.

2. BIFOCAL PERSPECTIVE: PROXENOI IN THE PONTUS EUXINUS VERSUS PONTIKOI AS PROXENOI ABROAD

Proposals for grants of *ateleia* and later of *proxenia* were the most common means through which the civic community collectively expressed links with the outside world. Such customs should be seen more broadly in the context of a typically Greek desire of networking and building ties with other *poleis*.³⁸ Athens' trade and diplomatic network in the Black Sea area in the 6th century BC³⁹ was seminal for the export of the proxeny institution. From then on, its further development depended on the complexity of the external relations of each *polis*.

The early documentary evidence, the so-called *ateleia* decrees from Olbia, seems to reveal that the institution was initially rooted exclusively in trade connections. The trade-community of Borysthene was interested in having strong business partners in other important centres, such as with Ietrokles, son of Hekataios, from Sinope,⁴⁰ or someone from Heraclea Pontica.⁴¹ Protecting people and goods was of high importance since the Archaic period.⁴² The next stage involved entire communities, for grants such as the right of sailing in and out of the harbour without threat of seizure (and without the need for a treaty, both in war and peace time) required legislation binding the whole *polis*.⁴³

On the northern Black Sea coast, only the Bosphoran Kingdom seems to have enjoyed a similar importance as Olbia as of the 4th century BC, especially for the south-Pontic and non-Pontic *poleis*. Hence, a relatively high number of

²⁷ COJOCARU 2016A: 16-21.

²⁸ COJOCARU 2016A: 21-23.

²⁹ COJOCARU 2016A: 23-25.

³⁰ COJOCARU 2016A: 26-49.

³¹ COJOCARU 2016A: 158-169.

³² COJOCARU 2016A: 169-180.

³³ COJOCARU 2016A: 180-193.

³⁴ COJOCARU 2016A: 194-223.

³⁵ COJOCARU 2016A: 224-230.

³⁶ COJOCARU 2016A: 231-235.

³⁷ COJOCARU 2016A: 236-248.

³⁸ Cf. MACK 2015: 207.

³⁹ PANITSCHKE 1988 (with bibliography). Cf. BRASHINSKIY 1963; 1967; BOUZEK 1989.

⁴⁰ IGDOP 1 (cf. COJOCARU 2016A: 66, Nr. 29).

⁴¹ NO 2 (cf. COJOCARU 2016A: 67-68, Nr. 30).

⁴² As evidenced very clearly by an inscription on lead, mentioning Achillodoros, around 550-500 BC (IGDOP 23): "Protagoras, your father sends instructions to you. He is being wronged by Matasys, for he is enslaving him and has deprived him of his cargo-carrier [or: of the shipment]. Go to Anaxagoras and tell him the story, for he [Matasys] asserts that he [Achillodoros] is the slave of Anaxagoras, claiming: 'Anaxagoras has my property, slaves, both female and male, and houses.' But he [Achillodoros] disputes it and denies that there is anything between him and Matasys and says that he is free and that there is nothing between him and Matasys. But what there is between him and Anaxagoras, they alone know. Tell this to Anaxagoras and the (his?) wife. Beside, he sends you these other instructions: take the (your?) mother and the (your?) brothers, who are among the Arbinatai, to the city. The ship-guard himself, having come to him, will go directly down [or: down to Thyora]" (transl. by CECCARELLI 2013: 335-336).

⁴³ For example, see above, n. 13.

ateleia and *proxenia* grants have been found – at least 22 documents have survived. The king with his sons is always named as the issuing authority.⁴⁴ The low level of autonomy among the Bosporean cities prevented them from developing external relations through proxy grants. Yet, at least one of these cities seems to have enjoyed, for a short period, real autonomy, as seems to be reflected in an undated fragment of a citizenship grant: “The Council and the People of Phanagoria included soldiers from abroad in the lists of citizens, because they had been campaigning for a long time with citizens”.⁴⁵ Interestingly, this *politeia* decree ends somewhat abruptly with a formula which seems to be borrowed from the earlier *ateleia* documents – “they shall have the right to exit and enter (the port)”.⁴⁶ This may imply the lack of a proxy tradition in an important Bosporean city such as Phanagoria.

During the first stage of existence of the proxy institution, Olbia, Dionysopolis and the Bosporean dynasts granted privileges and warranties to foreigners who were useful as reliable partners in brokering imports and exports on their domestic markets. But already the grant from Sinope to Kallipidas, son of Emmenidas, from Cos,⁴⁷ or to Sat[uros, son of such], from Callatis,⁴⁸ shows that some *poleis* in the area of Pontus Euxinus in the early fourth century became interested in configuring *proxenoi* networks to support their commercial interests (not only) in their home cities. It is true that a motivation like “[he] is full of zeal towards the (our) city / the people of Sinope”⁴⁹ does not tell us yet much about the service provided, but it shows the full maturity of an institution which worked for more than six hundred years in the Pontic world. In the 3rd – 2nd centuries BC, a *proxenos* is defined most often as a well-disposed and zealous man towards the *polis* issuing the proxy decree and providing services to those of the citizens who come to him whether on private or public business.⁵⁰ After the prescript and enactment formula, but before the award of *proxenia* and various honours, most typical documents comprise a vague clause indicating the reasons for which a specific motion was proposed. According to W. Mack, this paradigmatic language “reflected and reinforced citizens’ expectations of their city’s *proxenoi*, but it also shaped their understanding of the relationship they had with any cities which had named them *proxenoi* and, indeed, informed them of the attitude and actions appropriate if they had any ambitions to become *proxenoi* of another community”.⁵¹

On the northern shore of the Black Sea, at Olbia and especially at Chersonesus, citizenship on the basis of *proxenia* along with other privileges, including the right of sailing in and out of the harbour without threat of seizure and without the need for a treaty, both in war and peace time, was still granted in the 2nd century AD. Evidence for the survival of this institution attests, at the same time, the continuing autonomy of these *poleis* as regards their external relations. If we adopt a diachronic perspective, the first document – an *ateleia* grant from Olbia for a Sinopean⁵² – dates to the second quarter of the 5th century BC. The later documents include the proxy decrees from Chersonesus, dated to AD 174, for T. Aurelius Calpurnianus Apollonides, financial procurator of Moesia Inferior, and for his wife Aurelia Paulina.⁵³ On this basis, one may well assume a large degree of continuity over seven centuries of the proxy practice, as a special institution

⁴⁴ E. g. CIRB 1 (cf. COJOCARU 2016A: 95, Nr. 78) l. 2-9: Παιρισάδης και παίδε[ς – – – ωι] | Διονυσίου Πειραεῖ και [ἐκγόνοις] | ἔδοσαν προξενίαν κ[αὶ ἀτέλει] | ἀν πάντων χρημάτων [ν ἐν παν] | τι Βοσπόρωι, αὐτοῖς κα[ὶ θεράπου]σι | ν τοῖς τούτων και ε[ἰσπλοῦν] |⁸ και ε[κ]πλοῦν και πολέ[μου και εἰρήνης] ἀσπλει και [ἰ ἀσπονδεῖ].

⁴⁵ SEG 41, 625 (cf. COJOCARU 2016A: 100, Nr. 91) l. 2-4: (...) Φαναγοριτῶν ἢ βουλή και ὁ δήμος τοὺς ἀπὸ ξέ[νης] στρατιώτας ἐπολιτογράφησαν διὰ τὸ ἐκ χρο[ν]ῶν ἰκανῶν συνστρατεύσασθαι (...).

⁴⁶ *Ibidem*, l. 11-12: (...) ἔστω δὲ αὐτοῖς ἔκρ[λους] |¹² και εἰσπλοῦς.

⁴⁷ I.Sinope 5 (cf. COJOCARU 2016A: 101, Nr. 94).

⁴⁸ I.Sinope 3 (cf. COJOCARU 2016A: 101, Nr. 95).

⁴⁹ Πρόθυμός ἐστι περὶ τὴν πόλιν (I.Sinope 5, l. 4-5) / τὸν Σινωπέων δήμον (I.Sinope 3, l. 4-5).

⁵⁰ See, for example, IGBulg I² 13 ter (Dionysopolis), l. 3-10: (...) [ἐπει]δὴ Διονύσιος Διο[νυσίου Κ]αλλατιανὸς εὐνο[υ]ς | ὦν και πρό]θυμος διατελεῖ | [κοινή τε] τῶι δήμωι και ἰδ[ί]αι τοῖς ἐν]τυγχάνουσι τῶν |⁸ [πολιτῶν ε]ὔχρηστον ἑαυτὸν | [ἐν παντὶ και] ρῶι παρασκευ[ά]ζει (...).

⁵¹ MACK 2015: 29. Cf. 36-37: „Utility was central to the *proxenos*-paradigm, and this aspect was stressed when, as frequently, recipients of *proxenia* were described as *chrēsimos* or *euchrēstos*, or, indeed, more commonly, as *prothumos* – which was roughly equivalent, meaning ‘eager to perform services for the *polis*’, as we can see in the ways in which it was sometimes expanded with the infinitive and used in relation to the other terms”.

⁵² See above n. 41.

⁵³ SEG 45, 985 (cf. COJOCARU 2016A: 139-142, nr. 49-50). Cf., e.g., VINOGRADOV 1996; HAENSCH 2005; 2009; PUECH 2012, esp. 211. Cf. JAJLENKO 2017, with a reprint of the document and an extended commentary.

of interstate-relations in the Black Sea region. And while its origin⁵⁴ is to be sought in the Greek mainland, hundreds of documents from the Pontic Greek cities contributed to the long-term existence of the proxeny in all its complexity at the periphery of the *oikoumene*.

Towards the end of my paper, I would like to say a few words on the *ethnika* of the foreign *proxenoi* in the Pontic city-states (Tab. IV-V), in contrast to other *Pontikoi* as representatives of their communities in other parts of the *oikoumene* (Tab. II-III).

City \ Century	Amisus	Apollonia	Bosporan Kingdom	Olbia	Sinope
4 th BC		Athens	Athens Chios		Chios Kos
3 rd BC	Oropos	Delos	Delos Delphi	Delphi	Delphi-2, Histiaia Kletor (in Arcadia) Kolophon Oropos, Thermos
2 nd BC	Knosos			Delos-2	

Tab. IV. Citizens of Ionian Pontic communities attested as *proxenoi* outside the Pontus Euxinus (cf. COJOCARU 2016A, 246 Tab. X).

The earliest attestations point to the existence of trade links between Olbia and Sinope and Heraclea, and between the Bosporan Kingdom and Athens respectively.⁵⁵ With the 4th century BC, the contacts became more intense and varied. The network actually involved all of the first-tier *poleis* in the Black Sea area. In addition, it comprised centres from outside the Pontus Euxinus, such as Athens, Chios, Cos, Miletus, Mytilene, Orchomenus in Arcadia, Rhodes, Samothrace, Smyrna, Tarsus, Thasos, possibly also Antioch and Heraion Teichos.⁵⁶ However, we must bear in mind that in many cases the fragmentary nature of the epigraphic sources diminishes our certainty regarding the place of origin of *proxenoi*.

City \ Century	Byzantium	Chalcedon	Callatis	Chersonesus	Heraclea	Mesambria
5 th BC					Athens	
4 th BC	Athens-2, Chios Delos, Delphi Heraion (island Samos), Kos Oenoe (island Icaria), Theba	Carthaea (island Cea)			Athens-3	
3 rd BC	Athens, Carthaea (island Cea) Delos-4, Delphi-4 Eresos (island Lesbos) Oropos-3 Tenos (island) Termos	Athens Delos Histiaia (island Euboea) Samothrace Thermos (Aetolia)	Delphi-2	Delphi Eresos (island Lesbos) Oropos-2	Delphi Heraion (island Samos) Histiaia (island Euboea) ? Oropos-2 Thermos (Aetolia)	Oropos
2 nd BC	Delos Mylasa	Lindos Maronea		Delphi	Delos	
2 nd AD	Delphi					

Tab. V. Citizens of Dorian Pontic communities attested as *proxenoi* outside the Pontus Euxinus (cf. COJOCARU 2016A, 247 Tab. XII).

⁵⁴ Cf. already Hom. *Il.* 6.212-231, with a commentary of this passage by MITCHELL 1997: 12-13 and SANTIAGO ÁLVAREZ 2013: 34.

⁵⁵ The earliest evidence consists of two literary *testimonia*, see above n. 16.

⁵⁶ The latter two cities are mentioned as the place of origin of two councillors of the dynasts Sadalas and Kanitas – IGBulg I² 307 and 41 (cf. COJOCARU 2016A: 173-174, nr. 66 and 63, nr. 26).

In the case of the Dorian city-states (Tab. V),⁵⁷ aside from Byzantium and Chalcedon (where the institution is known only through a few late inscriptions), we see that Callatis, Chersonesus, and Mesambria appear, almost exclusively, as the 'adoptive homeland' of citizens from other Pontic city-states. There is a greater openness of Mesambria to the Thracian hinterland, and one may also mention the intense and long-lasting relations maintained by Chersonesus with the south-Pontic *poleis*, especially the *metropolis* Heraclea. Only Callatis seems to have extended its network beyond the Pontus Euxinus. Thus, in the 3rd century BC, the city had some interest at least in Elea, Mytilene and Paros. The pre-eminent position that the city held in the Hellenistic period is confirmed by the presence of Callatians as *proxenoi* in the most important *poleis* of the Black Sea area – Chersonesus, Dionysopolis, Histria, Mesambria, Odessus, Olbia, Sinope (Tab. II-III).

Regarding the citizens of Pontic communities attested as *proxenoi* outside the Pontus Euxinus (Tab. IV-V), we encountered almost exclusively natives of Byzantium, Chalcedon, Heraclea, and Sinope until the 4th century BC. In the 3rd – 2nd centuries, the list of endorsements is completed by some Callatians, Chersonesitans, Mesambrians and Olbians, but actually only at Delos, Delphi and Oropos (as evidence for cultic ties).

The status of the *Pontikoi* attested as *proxenoi* in other parts of the *oikoumene* could be the matter of another research. On this occasion, I only recall the well-known story of Lykon, a citizen of Heraclea, as attested in Apollodorus' speech against the *proxenos* Kallippos: „No sooner had Lykon set out, and was sailing around the Argolian gulf, than his ship was captured by pirate vessels and his goods taken to Argos, while he himself was shot down by an arrow, and met his death. Immediately after this mischance this man Kallippos came to the bank, and asked whether they knew Lykon, the Herakleian. Phormion, who is here present, answered that they knew him. «Was he a customer of yours?» Phormion replied that he was, «but why do you ask?» «Why? I will tell you. He is dead and, as it happens, I am *proxenos* of the Herakleiotai. I demand therefore that you show me your books, that I may know whether he has left any money; for I must of necessity look after the affairs of all the men of Herakleia.»⁵⁸

In contrast with all this evidence, we have no information on who managed the business of men from Athens at Heraclea. One of the most important trade centres of the Classical and Hellenistic world has so far remained without any documented proxeny decree. Bitter irony, indeed.

⁵⁷ Cf. COJOCARU 2016C.

⁵⁸ Dem. 52.5: τύχης δὲ συμβάσης τοιαύτης τῷ Λύκωνι τούτῳ ὥστε εὐθὺς ἐκπλέοντα αὐτὸν περὶ τὸν Ἀργολικὸν κόλπον ὑπὸ ληστρίδων νεῶν τὰ τε χρήματα καταχθῆναι εἰς Ἄργος καὶ αὐτὸν τοξευθέντα ἀποθανεῖν, ἔρχεται ἐπὶ τὴν τράπεζαν Κάλλιππος οὕτωσι εὐθὺς ἐρωτῶν, Λύκωνα Ἡρακλεώτην εἰ γινώσκουσιν. ἀποκριναμένου δὲ Φορμίωνος τουτουὶ ὅτι γινώσκουσιν, ἄρα καὶ ἐχρήτο ὑμῖν; ἔφη ὁ Φορμίων: ἄλλα πρὸς τί ἐρωτᾷς; πρὸς τί; ἔφη: ἐγὼ σοὶ ἐρῶ. ἐκεῖνος μὲν τετελεύτηκεν, ἐγὼ δὲ προξενῶν τυγχάνω τῶν Ἡρακλεωτῶν. ἀξιώ δὴ σε δεῖξαι μοι τὰ γράμματα, ἵν' εἰδῶ εἴ τι καταλείπειν ἀργύριον: ἐξ ἀνάγκης γάρ μοι ἐστὶν ἀπάντων Ἡρακλεωτῶν ἐπιμελίσθαι.' (Trans. by Norman W. & J. DeWitt, adapted). For a recent discussion of this passage, see MACK 2015: 77-81.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- BRAŠINSKIJ 1967 Brašinskij, I. B., *Die Beziehungen Athens zu den Griechenstädten des nördlichen Schwarzmeergebietes zur Zeit der Perserkriege*, in: *Klio*, 49, 53-61.
- BRASHINSKIY 1963 Brashinskiy, I. B., *Afiny i Severnoe Pričernomor'e v VII-II vv. do n.e.* (Athens and the Northern Black Sea Region in the 7th-2nd Centuries BC), Ed. Nauka, Moscow.
- BOUZEK 1989 Bouzek, J., *Athènes et la Mer Noire*, in: *BCH*, 113, 249-259.
- CECCARELLI 2013 Ceccarelli, P., *Ancient Greek Letter Writing. A Cultural History (600 BC-150 BC)*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- COJOCARU 2013 Cojocaru, V., *Relațiile interpontice ale orașelor grecești de la nordul Mării Negre și contactele acestora cu barbarii din hinterland pe baza izvoarelor epigrafice* (The Inter-Pontic Relations of the Greek Cities of the Northern Black Sea Area and Their Contacts with the Hinterland Barbarians According to the Epigraphic Sources), in: Panait-Bîrzescu, F. et al. (eds.), *Poleis în Marea Neagră: relații interpontice și producții locale* (Poleis in the Black Sea Area: Inter-Pontic Relations and Local Productions), Ed. Humanitas, Bucharest (in col. "Pontica et Mediterranea", I), 87-142.
- COJOCARU 2016A Cojocaru, V., *Instituția proxeniei în spațiul pontic / Die Proxenie im Schwarzmeerraum*, Ed. Mega, Cluj-Napoca 2016 (in col. "Pontica et Mediterranea", V).
- COJOCARU 2016B Cojocaru, V., *Review to Mack 2015*, in: *ArhMold*, 39, 384-388.
- COJOCARU 2016C Cojocaru, V., *Un espace dorien pontique d'après les décrets de proxénie*, in: Robu, A., Bîrzescu, I. (eds.), *Mégarika. Nouvelles recherches sur Mégare et les cités de la Propontide et du Pont-Euxin. Archéologie, épigraphie, histoire*, Ed. de Boccard, Paris, 165-189.
- GAUTHIER 1985 Gauthier, Ph., *Les cités grecques et leurs bienfaiteurs*, Ed. de Boccard, Paris.
- GAUTHIER 1972 Gauthier, Ph., *Symbola. Les étrangers et la justice dans les cités grecques*, Ed. Université de Nancy II, Nancy.
- GSCHNITZER 1973 Gschntzer, F., s.v. *Proxenos*, in: *Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Suppl. XIII, Munich, 629-730.
- HAENSCH 2009 Haensch, R., *Not Official, but Permanent: Roman Presence in Allied States. The Examples of Chersonesus Taurica, the Bosporan Kingdom and Sumatar Harabesi*, in: Eilers, C. (ed.), *Diplomats and Diplomacy in the Roman World*, Ed. Brill, Leiden and Boston, 209-225.
- HAENSCH 2005 Haensch, R., *Rom und Chersonesus Taurica. Die Beziehungen beider Staaten im Lichte der Ehrung des T. Aurelius Calpurnianus Apollonides*, in: Cojocaru, V. (ed.), *Ethnic Contacts and Cultural Exchanges North and West of the Black Sea from the Greek Colonization to the Ottoman Conquest*, Ed. Trinitas, Iași, 255-268.
- IVANTCHIK 2017 Ivantchik, A. I., *Novye dekrety iz Tiry* (New Decrees from Tyras), in: *Vestnik Drevney Istorii*, 77.4, 967-977.
- JAJLENKO 2017 Jajlenko, V. P., *Chersones, Severnoe Pričernomor'e i Markomanskije vojny po dannym chersoneskogo dekreta 174 g. n.e. v čest' Tita Avrelija Kal'purniana Apollonida* (Chersonesus, the Northern Black Sea Coast and the Marcomannic Wars According to the Data of the Chersonesian Decree of 174 AD in Honour of Titus Aurelius Calpurnianus Apollonides), in: Jajlenko, V. P., *Istoriya i epigrafika Ol'vii, Khersonesa i Bospora VII v. do n. e. – VII v. n. e.* (History and Epigraphy of Olbia, Chersonesus and the Bosphorus from the 7th Century BC to the 7th Century AD), Ed. Nestor, St. Petersburg, 694-754.
- KING 2004 King, C., *The Black Sea. A History*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- KNOEPFLER 2001 Knoepfler, D., *Décrets érétriens de proxénie et de citoyenneté*, Ed. Payot, Lausanne.
- MACK 2015 Mack, W., *Proxeny and Polis. Institutional Networks in the Ancient Greek World*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- MAREK 1984 Marek, Chr., *Die Proxenie*, Ed. Peter Lang, Frankfurt am Main et al.
- MITCHELL 1997 Mitchell, L. G., *Greeks Bearing Gifts: The Public Use of Private Relationships in the Greek World*. 435-323, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- PANITSCHKEK 1988 Panitschkek, P., *Zur Entstehung des athenischen Handels mit dem Schwarzmeerraum im 6. Jahrhundert*, in: *Münstersche Beiträge zur antiken Handelsgeschichte*, 7.2, 27-44.

- PUECH 2012 Puech, B., *Derniers affichages de l'octroi du droit de cité à l'époque impériale*, in: Heller, A., Pont, A.-V. (eds.), *Patrie d'origine et patrie électives: les citoyennetés multiples dans le monde grec d'époque romaine. Actes du colloque international de Tours, 6-7 novembre 2009*, Ed. Ausonius, Bordeaux, 196-212 & 347-371.
- ROBERT 1984 Robert, L., *Les concours grecs. Discours d'ouverture du VIII^e Congrès international d'épigraphie grecque et latine*, in: *Praktika tou H' diethnous synedriou ellinikis kai latinikis epigraphikis Athina* 3-9 Okt. 1982, Athens, 35-45 (= L. Robert, *Choix d'écrits*, éd. par D. Rousset, Ed. Les Belles Lettres, Paris, 2007, 267-278).
- ROBU 2014 Robu, A., *Les relations de Byzance avec les cités du Pont Gauche à l'époque hellénistique: la guerre pour l'emporion de Tomis*, in: Cojocaru, V., Schuler, Chr. (eds.), *Die Außenbeziehungen pontischer und kleinasiatischer Städte in hellenistischer und römischer Zeit. Akten einer deutsch-rumänischen Tagung in Constanța, 20.-24. September 2010*, Ed. Franz Steiner, Stuttgart, 19-36.
- SANTIAGO ÁLVAREZ 2013 Santiago Álvarez, R.-A., *La polaridad 'huésped' / 'extranjero' en los Poemas Homéricos*, in: Santiago Álvarez, R.-A., Oller Guzmán, M. (eds.), *Contacto de poblaciones y extranjería en el mundo griego antiguo. Estudio de fuentes*, Ed. Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Barcelona, 29-45.
- SHELOV-KOVEDYAEV 2018 Shelov-Kovedyaev, F. V., *Dekrety, naydennye v Pantikapee v 2015 godu* (Decrees Found in Panticapeum in 2015), in: Zuev, V. Yu., Khrshanovskiy, V. A. (eds.), *Bosporskiy fenomen. Obshchee i osobennoe v istoriko-kul'turnom prostranstve antichnogo mira. Materialy mezhdunarodnoy nauchnoy konferentsii. Chast' 2* (The Bosporan Phenomenon. General and Peculiar Features of Historical and Cultural Space in the World of Classical Antiquity. Proceedings of the International Conference. Part 2), St. Petersburg, 275-281.
- VINOGRADOV 1996 Vinogradov, Ju. G., *Novoe dokumental'noe dos'e imperatorskoy epokhi iz Khersonesa (O prevratnosti sudeb khersonesitov i ikh lapidarnogo arkhiva)* (A New Documentary Dossier of the Imperial Epoch from Chersonesus [The Vicissitudes of Life of the Chersonesians and Their Lapidary Archives]), in: *Vestnik Drevney Istorii*, 216.1, 48-60.