Philip A. Harland

Pontic Diasporas in the Classical and Hellenistic Eras

Pontic Diasporas in the Classical and Hellenistic Eras[1]

1. Introduction

In the study of ancient peoples, the terminology of "diaspora" or "dispersion" has most often been applied to those from Judea or Israel who, for various reasons, found themselves settled elsewhere in the Mediterranean world. In the present article I use the terminology of "diasporas" playfully to indicate the importance of investigating other peoples who migrated or relocated and continued to be identified based on common geographical origins or ethnicity, although I do not aim to argue that there were necessarily ongoing connections or communications that mirror those found among some Judeans (Jews). While I have explored the Syrian diaspora with respect to the formation of associations before,[2] here I turn to neglected epigraphic evidence[3] for Pontic peoples from the Black Sea area settled elsewhere as a result of migration – more often forced than otherwise.

Pontic peoples, including those identified as "Scythians" and "Thracians", were consistently ranked very low in Greek ethnic hierarchies while particular ethnic groups enveloped by these more general categories were sometimes ranked further.[4] Such Pontic peoples appeared at or near the bottom of hegemonic ethnic hierarchies despite the fact that most were considered Europeans by Greek authors, and most Europeans were thought to be superior to most Asian and Libyan peoples in the three-fold division of the world that was common among some Greek intellectuals, including Herodotos and the Hippokratic author of *On Airs, Waters, and Lands*. However, anecdotal material from Herodotos' *Histories* regarding ethnic rivalries between Greeks and indigenous peoples near northern Greek settlements like Olbia reflect alternative ethnic hierarchies. In these alternative perspectives of indigenous Pontic peoples, Greeks such as Ionians could be positioned low on the scale as inherently "slavish", with Pontic peoples above Greeks.[5] I began to suggest that such ethnic relations and categorizations along with their legitimating ideologies would likely have social implications for actual encounters between Greeks and Pontic peoples elsewhere in Greek societies.

The current case study moves from ideologies reflected in literature to social conditions of dispersed Black Sea peoples in Greek societies as reflected in inscriptions. It does so while also highlighting the complicated relationship that exists between ideologies of the elites and social interactions on the ground. First and foremost, I seek to establish firmly the presence of Pontic peoples alongside Greeks in the classical and Hellenistic eras in Attica, in central Greece, on Aegean islands, and in parts of Asia Minor. In the process, I provide what may be the first survey of inscriptional evidence for Pontic diasporas with attention to the social and legal status of these populations. In dealing with peoples from the Black Sea region, my focus is on those from the western, northern and eastern coasts, and not on Paphlagonians or others on the southern coast (in Asia Minor).[6]

---

[2] Harland 2009, 99–122.

[3] Epigraphic abbreviations follow those outlined on the "Associations in the Greco-Roman World" website: http://www.philipharland.com/greco-roman-associations/?p=12#abbrev.

[4] Harland forthcoming. On ethnic hierarchies as a concept in the social sciences, see for instance Hagendoorn 1993. For Judean interactions with hegemonic ethnic hierarchies, see Harland 2019.

[5] For alternative ethnic hierarchies as put forward by Judean authors (Philo, Paul and Josephos), see Harland 2019.

[6] From the Athenian perspective, sometimes those in the northern Troad and in Bithynia would nonetheless be considered "Thracians", however. See Sears 2015, 308–309; cf. Sears 2013; Herodotos, *Histories* 7.75.

These materials regarding Pontic dispersions provide a window into social contexts in which ethnic ste-
reotypes and hierarchies impacted the experiences of these minorities in day-to-day life. This is where some
of these peoples, faced with ideologies that both devalued them and established a basis for their mistreat-
ment, nonetheless could also navigate a place for themselves within certain areas of social and cultural life.
On the one hand, I do not want to underestimate the negative social implications of stereotypes and ethnic
hierarchies, which would no doubt result in ongoing discrimination. At the same time, I am attentive to how
the inscriptions may provide an alternative perspective to literary sources, offering some glimpses into oth-
er areas of social or cultural adaptation by these minorities who were, often, displaced and (at some point)
enslaved peoples. So although these minority populations would be subject to negative treatment that flowed
from a low ranking in Greek ethnic hierarchies and, in many cases, from a subordinate position within local
social and legal structures, attenuating responses and alternative categorizations would also be at play.

2. Pontic peoples in Attica

There are significant materials indicating the presence of Pontic peoples within certain Greek city-states
where Greeks (including authors of the surviving literature) would encounter such peoples in daily life.
Some of the earliest indications of a Pontic or "Scythian"[7] diaspora pertain to the slave-trade and to the
"Scythian archers" that also feature regularly in Athenian art and drama beginning in the sixth century.[8]
The first clear reference to importation of enslaved "Scythians" occurs in a speech by Andokides, where
he relates (in garbled form) various actions taken by the Athenian People after the battle of Salamis (ca.
470s BCE), including the purchase of three hundred "Scythian archers" (Andokides, 3.5).[9] Characters in
roughly contemporary plays of the fifth century clarify that such "Scythians" were possessed by the People
and that some served as a sort of police force under the direction of the civic presidents (πρυτάνεις) at least
until 390 BCE.[10] In Aristophanes, for instance, such first-generation enslaved "Scythians" are the brunt of
negative jokes, where they are pictured speaking with strong or unintelligible accents, lusting after real or
apparent girls or women, or defecating themselves in a cowardly fashion.[11]

The trading source of these earliest enslaved "Scythians" is not entirely clear, but there are some hints
that markets on the island of Chios (off the coast of western Asia Minor) may have been a transition point
as early as the fifth century. According to Theopompos (writing ca. 350 BCE), his hometown of Chios was
the first slave-trading centre to focus on importing "barbarians" to sell as slaves.[12] In the late fifth century,
Thucydides claims that, with the exception of Sparta, the Chians possessed more slaves than any other city-
state, but he does not mention the source of these enslaved persons.[13] While the "barbarians" bought and
sold on Chios may have included peoples from Anatolia (e.g. Phrygians, Lydians, Carians, or Paphlagoni-
ans),[14] it is likely that a number of these "barbarians" were Pontic peoples such as Thracians, Scythians,
Maiotians, Sarmatians, Sindians, and Kolchians. This is particularly the case in light of Chios' location

---

[7] "Scythians", "Thracians" and similar generalized ethnic categories are sometimes Greek or Roman outsiders' over-
simplifications of varied peoples from certain regions, a point that certain ancient authors also recognize: Pliny the Elder,
Natural History 6.19; Ephoros cited in Strabo, *Geography* 7.3.9; Strabo, *Geography* 12.3.26; Tacitus, *Germania* 2.3 (on "Ger-
mans"). Cf. Graninger 2015 or Bingen 2007. Nonetheless, internal processes of group identification are based not only on
self-understandings but also on external categorizations (Jenkins 1994), and we will see that even the Greek generalized cat-
egorizations were adopted as self-identifications by some immigrants to Greek societies.

[8] On the Pontic slave trade, see Finley 1962; Braund and Tsetskhladze 1989; Gavriljuk 2003; Tsetskhladze 2008; Avram
2007; Braund 2008. On sources of foreign slaves generally, see D. Lewis 2011; Wrenhaven 2013. On the archers in art and
drama, see Skinner 2012, 68–78; Plassart 1913; E. Hall 2006, 225–254; Couvenhes 2012; Ivantchik 2006.

[9] Aischines (2.173) supplies the same basic information.

[10] Hunter 1994, 145–149. On Scythian archers in Greek comedy, see Long 1986, 105–107, 137, 143–148.

[11] Aristophanes, *Thesmophoriazousae* 1001–1003, 1082–90, 1164–1175, 1190–1207; *Lysistrata* 422–475. E. Hall 2006,
225–254.

[12] Theopompos, fragment 122a = Athenaios, *Deipnosophistai* 6 = 266e–f.

[13] Thucydides, *Peloponnesian War* 8.40.2. Cf. Herodotos, *Histories* 8.105.

[14] See D. Lewis 2015 on the potential flow of Anatolian slaves through Kyzikos as early as the sixth century BCE (inter-
preting *SIG*³ 4). Cf. D. Lewis 2011, 99, 104 (on Asian slaves at Chios specifically).

below the Propontis: Polybius notes that Pontic slaves flowed through Byzantion (*Histories* 4.38.4, writing about the late third century), presumably on a route that would readily lead to Aegean islands, the western coast of Asia Minor, and, especially, Attica.[15] Later on, Nikolaos of Damascus and Poseidonios of Apamea (first century BCE) are cited as stating that Mithridates enslaved the Chians and, as punishment, handed them over to their own slaves – namely Kolchian slaves – to be transported back to Kolchis on the eastern coast of the Black Sea.[16] It is noteworthy that one of the earliest Greek authors to position Pontic peoples on a low rung of the ethnic ladder – Herodotos – came from the western coast of Asia Minor, spent time on the island of Samos near Chios,[17] and also likely spent time at Athens in the 440s BCE, the final destination of a good number of these early Pontic slaves.[18] So, by the second half of the fifth century, Greeks like Herodotos would encounter such peoples from the Black Sea area in daily interactions, whether slaves of the Athenian People or, as I now show, household slaves.

Inscriptions from Attica confirm the continuing presence of people from the Pontic region, particularly slaves owned by households beginning in the late fifth century.[19] Fragmentary inscriptions pertaining to confiscation of property owned by individuals who had been judged guilty of impiety in 415 BCE are instructive here (*IG* I³ 421–430).[20] One inscription (*IG* I³ 421, lines 34–49) refers to sixteen slaves that were confiscated from Kephisodoros, a resident alien (μέτοικος) living in the Piraeus who is also in one of the lists of alleged guilty parties mentioned by Andokides (*On the Mysteries* 15). Four of these slaves are from Asia Minor (a Carian man, two Carian children, and a Lydian woman), one man from Syria, one man from Malta, and two other men from Illyria (northwest of Thrace). Yet a substantial number – six out of the fourteen (about 43%) – are identified as coming from the Pontic region: three Thracian women, one Thracian man, one Scythian man, and one Kolchian.

Regarding Kolchians specifically, I have already pointed to Kolchis as a significant source of slaves, and a study by D. C. Braund and G. R. Tsetskhladze explores this at some length.[21] A potter named Kolchos who signed his work some time in the sixth century BCE, if a Kolchian slave, would be the earliest known instance in Athens.[22] On a reused piece of pottery from the late fourth century, there is record of a slave named Kolchos, appearing alongside a value of 24 drachmas.[23] Later on, graves from the second and first centuries BCE show the continuing presence of Kolchians in Attica.[24]

Another inscription from Attica listing the sale of confiscated property in 415 BCE (*IG* I³ 422) refers to a Thracian man (column 1, line 70) alongside house-bred slaves, and also lists four slaves confiscated from Axiochos son of Alkibiades (cf. Andokides, *On the Mysteries* 16). These are a Thracian woman named Arete, a Thracian man named Grylion, a Thracian woman named Habrosyne, and a Scythian coppersmith named Dionysios (column 2, lines 195–206). A further list of confiscated slaves provides both names and identifications of the ethnic group (τὸ γένος) of origin, including Carians (Strongylion and Carion), a Lydian (Phanes), a Scythian (Simos), and two Thracians with Greek names (Antigenes and Apollonides; *IG* I³ 427, lines 2–13). If this particular group of inscriptions is any indication of the general situation in the late fifth century, then a substantial portion of the household slave population (in this situation just less than half) would derive from the Pontic region, with Thracians being most numerous.

---

[15] On slave trade from the Pontic region, see Braund and Tsetskhladze 1989, 124; Strabo, *Geography* 11.2.3.

[16] Athenaios, *Deipnosophistai* 6 = 266e–f, writing ca. 200 CE; cf. Appian, *Mithridatic Wars* 7.

[17] Mitchell 1975, 75. Cf. Suda s.v. Herodotus.

[18] Ostwald 1991.

[19] On foreigners or metics and their status at Athens, see the recent works of M. J. Osborne 1996; Bäbler 1998; Niku 2007; Lape 2010; Wijma 2010; Kamen 2013 (with corrections in Sosin 2016).

[20] Pritchett 1953; Pritchett and Pippin 1956; D. M. Lewis 1997.

[21] Braund and Tsetskhladze 1989.

[22] Braund and Tsetskhladze 1989, 121–122.

[23] *SEG* 35:134, line 18. One of the four citizens of Byzantion who were honoured by the Athenian People for contributions in some naval expedition was Hekataios son of Kolchos (a captain of the trireme; *IG* II² 884 = *IG* II³ 1238, ca. 200 BCE).

[24] *IG* II² 9049 (Euphrosyne daughter, wife or slave of Chairemon), 9050 (Kerdon son or slave of Hermon). One manumission from Delphi involves Kallo, a slave identified as a Kolchian (*SGDI* II 2218; 139/138 BCE).

There is more contemporary evidence regarding Thracian settlers specifically, yet this evidence shows that not all Thracians in Attica would be enslaved in this era. Thracians began to form groups based on common ethnic identification quite early, as early as 429 or 413 BCE when a festival in honour of the foreign goddess Bendis was introduced at Athens. By the second half of the fourth century or earlier, such associations began to designate themselves "sacrificing-associates" (ὀργεῶνες).[25] The key inscription here (*IG* II² 1283) dates to 240/239 BCE but refers to earlier events. Christopher Planeaux studies this document in detail in relation to all the related epigraphic material (mainly *IG* II² 1283 and *IG* II² 337) and literary evidence (the opening passage of Plato's *Republic*), and the details need not be recounted here.[26] For our purposes, what is significant is that by around 429 BCE or, less likely, 413 BCE, Thracians were involved in a procession and festival for Bendis at Athens alongside Athenians who likewise participated in their own procession for Bendis.

After consulting Zeus at the oracle at Dodona (as early as 437 BCE on Ilias Arnaoutoglou's chronology but after 429 BCE on Planeaux's),[27] the Thracians at the Piraeus followed the god's advice in gaining permission (ἔγκτησις) from the Athenian authorities to purchase property on which to build a sanctuary to engage in their ancestral rites for Bendis (some time between 429 BCE and 333 BCE).[28] Since, in this period, the right to own land in Athenian territory was restricted to freeborn citizens and to immigrants with the status of registered resident aliens or metics (μέτοικοι) who gained a special right (ἔγκτησις), this points to the status of the Thracian representatives who gained this permission as freeborn or freed metics.[29]

By 239 BCE a second association of Thracians consisting in part of resident aliens – these ones living at Athens rather than the Piraeus – built their own sanctuary and arranged to be involved with the group at the Piraeus in the processions that had existed since the late fifth century. Once again, this situation clearly points to the freeborn or freed status of those who engaged in diplomacy with the civic authorities in order to gain permission for the group to hold land. So there were associations of Thracians at both the Piraeus (likely by 429 BCE) and at Athens (before 239 BCE) and each group came to participate in the officially recognized festival for Bendis supported by the civic institutions of Athens. This points to some degree of integration within certain dimensions of cultural life at Athens and the Piraeus rather than a completely marginalized status.

It is worth noting that more than thirty-four graves of Thracians (involving at least 15 men and 19 women) also attest to the continued presence of Thracians in Attica from the fourth century and on through the Hellenistic era.[30] The majority though not all of these graves identify their occupants only by personal

---

[25] It is true that surviving evidence only confirms the existence of groups labelled "sacrificing-associates" (ὀργεῶνες) by the second half of the fourth century. Some such as W. S. Ferguson, Chr. Planeaux and S. Lambert nonetheless propose that they existed earlier, perhaps beginning in the mid-fifth century (Ferguson 1944, 104; Lambert 2010). Arnaoutoglou thinks they first came into existence in the second half of the fourth century (Arnaoutoglou 2015, 39–49). Even if the term was not used earlier, it does seem likely that Thracians nonetheless formed groups of some type in the earlier period (by 429 or 413 BCE at least), regardless of what group designation (perhaps merely ἔθνος) would be used.

[26] Planeaux 2000. Cf. Deoudi 2009; Stavrianopoulou 2006; Janouchová 2013; Arnaoutoglou 2015. Arnaoutoglou (p. 38) proposes a slightly different chronology relating to Bendis, which would not change the relevance of this material to the present discussion. See also the discussion in *GRA* I 23 (= Kloppenborg and Ascough 2011). On ἔγκτησις, see the classic, careful work by Pečírka 1966, which argues that there was no clear scheme in the varying formula associated with this grant (besides giving resident aliens the right to purchase a plot of land on which to build). Cf. Woodhead 1969.

[27] Arnaoutoglou 2015, 38.

[28] The Thracians claim they were the first of all ethnic groups to be granted this right. It was in 333 BCE that Kitian merchants sought and gained permission to purchase property on which to build a meeting-place to engage in ancestral customs, and the Kitians refer to an earlier grant to Egyptians (see *IG* II² 337).

[29] Kamen 2013.

[30] Those identified as "Thracian" on Attic tombs in *IG* II²: 8896–97 (Agathon; 4th BCE), 8898 (Anthrakion [f.]; post-317 BCE), 8899 (Arkesis [f.]), 8900 (Aphrodisia daughter of Sadalas; imperial period), 8901 (Bithys; 1st CE), 8902 (Bithys; 2nd–1st BCE), 8902a (Gymnasion; 2nd BCE), 8903 (Demetria daughter or wife of Sergion; 1st BCE), 8904 (Diokeleia; late-2nd BCE), 8905 (Dionysis [m.], also known as Thraix; 2nd–1st BCE), 8906 (Dorkion; after 300 BCE), 8907 (Doution daughter or wife of Alexandros; 3rd BCE), 8908 (Driallia daughter or wife of Apollodoros), 8908a (Epiktesis; 1st BCE), 8909 (Euion [f.]; 2nd BCE), 8910 (Euporia wife of Aisopos; 1st BCE), 8911 (Eutychis [f.]; imperial era), 8912 (Kleo [f.]; 1st BCE),

names and ethnicity which, as I explain shortly, likely points to low social standing or servile origins.[31] Certain personal names on these graves point clearly to servile status, such as Monimos whose name means "Staying-in-place" (*IG* II² 8916). Two graves where the father of the deceased is identified using a Thracian name suggest that some of these immigrants were not enslaved, however (*IG* II² 8924, 8927).

Further evidence for a Pontic presence in Attica, in this case more slaves owned by individual Athenians, comes from a list of naval crew members serving on eight triremes around 400 BCE (*IG* I³ 1032 = *IG* II² 1951). The 169 slaves mentioned on this important list amount to almost half of all known slave names from classical sources, as Kostas Vlassopoulos clarifies.[32] Since none of the names are accompanied by an explicit identification of ethnicity (but only mention owners), here we are left to rely on the portion that possesses non-Greek names with indications of geographic origin. In doing so, it is worth noting the following points: Athenian evidence suggests that only 20–27% of slaves would have ethnic-geographic names; fourth century funerary evidence from the Laureion mines indicates that 31% would have such names; and, Delphic manumissions (dating ca. 200 BCE–100 CE) suggest that only about 11% would have such names.[33] So we are glimpsing only part of the picture even with this important naval inscription. I am of the opinion that ethnic slave names in the classical and Hellenistic eras, at least, are in many cases likely to have some relation to actual geographic origins or ethnic identifications, a view that David Lewis also holds (see Strabo, *Geography* 7.3.12).[34] In the Roman imperial period, when ethnic identifications of slaves became a factor in pricing, such identifications are less trustworthy.[35]

Twenty-one of these 169 slaves serving on Athenian naval vessels (12.42%) possess names that provide geographic indicators or ethnic identifications. These are Assyrios (line 109), Syros (120, 256, 399, 449, 469, 475), Phoinix (107, 274), Lakon (232), Carion (119, 140, 366, 403), Thraix (248, 383, 390, 391, 395, 406), and Skythes (128). Slaves named after Syria and Phoenicia represent nine out of these twenty-one (ca. 43%). There are four named after Caria (19%). Once again, those from areas around the Black Sea feature significantly (ca. 38%), with Thracians predominating in six of the twenty-one slave names (ca. 29%) alongside one Getian and one Scythian named Skythes. The personal name Skythes, which is attested as early as the late sixth century BCE in connection with a vase-painter at Athens who may have been a Scythian slave, is subsequently attested in epigraphy both in Attica and elsewhere, as I discuss below.[36] The feminine equivalent, Skythaina, appears as a slave character in Aristophanes' *Lysistrata* (184), and in variant spellings is also attested later on Samos (*IG* XII,6,2 781) and on Rhodes (*IG* XII,1 527). While many individuals named

---

8913 (Kteson; 4th–3rd BCE), 8914 (Logos of Alexandros; 2nd–1st BCE), 8915 (Menophila daughter or wife of Athenion; imperial era), 8916 (Monimos; 2nd BCE), 8917 (Zopyrion son of Morphe; 3rd BCE), 8918 (Nepos; 3rd CE), 8919 (Niko [f.]; 3rd BCE), 8920 (Pangaion [f.]; after 300 BCE), 8921 (Pyrrhias; 3rd BCE), 8922 (Rhodion [f.]; after 300 BCE), 8923 (Seleukos; 1st BCE), 8924 (Skopas son of Tarousinos; 2nd–1st BCE), 8925 (Sosicha; after 300 BCE), 8926 (Taloura daughter of Talouros; after 300 BCE), 8927 (Philonikos son of Bithys; 4th BCE), 8928 (Ophelion; after 300 BCE), 9287 (Thraix from Maroneia; 3rd BCE), 9288 (Thraitta daughter or wife of Andrabys from Maroneia).

[31] In a few cases there is further identification (using the genitive) of the name of either the husband (e.g. *IG* II² 8910), mother (e.g. *IG* II² 8917), father (e.g. *IG* II² 8926, 8927, since the names in the genitive are also Thracian), or father / master (e.g. *IG* II² 8914, *IG* II² 8924). Some who identify the father's name may therefore be free or freed. There are also some cases of civic identification (e.g. those from Maroneia) which may point to citizenship abroad and, therefore, free status (*IG* II² 9287; see previous note).

[32] Vlassopoulos 2010, 127. See also Robertson 2008; D. Lewis 2011, 102–103. Cf. Bakewell 2008; Laing 1965.

[33] D. Lewis 2017a. On slaves at the Laurion mines, see Morris 2011, 184–185; Morris 1998, 207.

[34] On ethnic names generally and difficulties in assessing their significance, see Fraser 2000.

[35] See *POxy* LI 3617; *Digest* 21.1.31.21. On the debate regarding the value of ethnic identifications of slaves, see D. Lewis 2011, 92–96. Cf. D. Lewis 2017a. For the classical era, at least, Lewis challenges the view of Braund and Tsetskhladze 1989 (that ethnic names are not reliable indicators of geographic origins or ethnic identifications, but their evidence for this is from the Roman era). It is true that, later, Varro (*On the Latin Language* 8.21) suggests that *Romans* specifically might name slaves not after where they came from but after the locale of the market at which they were bought. And the identification of origin or market could of course be falsified to increase the value of a slave.

[36] See *LGPN* II. On Skythes the vase-painter, see Hedreen 2014, 55–56; cf. Frolov 2000. Individuals named Skythes: *IG* I³ 658 (ca. 500 BCE); *IG* II² 2352, line 6 (ca. 200 BCE); *IG* II² 2391, line 19 (ca. 350 BCE); *IG* II² 12623/4, line 1. For the related name Skythinos, see the "manumission-bowl" inscription *IG* II² 1569, line 67 (330–320 BCE).

Skythes or Skythaina or Skythainis (or Kimmerios for that matter) are likely connected with the Pontic region, instances when Greeks (including citizens) seem to be so named mean that we need to take caution.[37]

Before delving further into funerary evidence of Pontic peoples, it is important to note common principles in identifying social and ethnic status with respect to graves. Although not fool-proof, P. M. Fraser's principle for the late classical and Hellenistic periods is generally valid for Attica and Rhodes (but not necessarily anywhere else): namely, if a person on a grave is identified only with a single personal name and a foreign ethnic (and no civic identification), it is highly likely that this is a foreign slave.[38] Further identifiers, such as reference to a foreign city or mention of a father's name, likely point away from servile status (i.e. freed or freeborn persons). It is important to clarify that Kostas Vlassopoulos' recent study firmly establishes that, contrary to previous views, the majority of foreign slaves shared names in common with Athenian citizens, so Greek names are no guarantee that the person in question had not been enslaved.[39] There are anecdotal indications that approximately one-tenth to one-third of foreign slaves would have personal names derived from ethnicity, as I mentioned above. Those designated on graves with just a name and no ethnic would likewise be slaves or others of low social status. This contrasts to both registered resident aliens (μέτοικοι), who (if not freedpersons) would have a name along with identification of a foreign city of which they were citizens; and, citizens, who would most often be further identified by father's name and civic subdivision (δῆμος).[40]

With these factors in mind, we can now turn to the evidence of graves involving Pontic peoples settled in Attica. Beginning in the fourth century BCE (e.g. *IG* II² 9253) and continuing on into the Roman era (e.g. *IG* II² 9255), there are a number of people identified as "Maiotians", namely immigrants or displaced people from an area around Lake Maiotis, or what is now the Sea of Azov in southern Russia.[41] Maiotians were among the ethnic groups ruled (by the 380s BCE) by the Thracian, Spartokid kingdom in the Bosporan region, along with Sindians, Toretians, Doskians, Tarpeitians, Dandarians, and Psessians.[42] From Strabo's perspective, Sindians and some of the other peoples just mentioned would be sub-groups within the broader category of "Maiotians" (*Geography* 11.2.11). There are Attic graves of nine people identified as Maiotians (seven men and two women), most only mentioning personal name and ethnicity, suggesting past or present servile status.[43] In some cases, personal names clearly confirm servile origins, as with Parmenon ("Remaining"), Pistos ("Loyal"), and Monimos ("Staying-in-place") (*IG* II² 9256, 9257; *SEG* 23:144). Furthermore, the descriptive term "good", "noble", or "useful" (χρηστός / χρηστή), which at both Athens and on Rhodes was used primarily on graves of foreigners and people of low social standing (but very rarely on citizens' graves), appears on three of these nine graves.[44] The servile origins of a Maiotian man (Agathon) and woman (Eutaxia) are also clear in two Delphic manumission inscriptions from the second century BCE, for instance.[45] Two other Maiotians in coastal cities somewhat near Athens – at Troizen and Rhamnous – should also be mentioned.[46]

---

[37] See, for instance, Demosthenes, *Apollodoros against Stephanos* 45.8 where one of the witnesses is Skythes son of Harmateus of Kydathenaion subdivision. If Scythian, this would be a rare case of one who somehow gained citizenship (on which see Agasikles further below). At both Eretria on Euboia and on Thasos, for instance, there are civic leaders named Skythes or with fathers by that name: *SEG* 34:898 = Petrakos 1963 (dated 510–500 BCE, on which see Leone 2017; cf. *IG* XII,9 183); Pouilloux and Dunant 1954, 266–268 (no. 29) and 279–280 (no. 36) (430–390 BCE). On these names, also see Ivantchik 2006, 222–224.

[38] Fraser 1977, 46–49; Fraser 1995. Cf. Fraser and Rönne 1957; Bresson 1997.

[39] Vlassopoulos 2010.

[40] Fraser 1977, 46–47. Cf. Fraser and Rönne 1957, 92–98; Nielsen et al. 1989.

[41] Cf. Avram 2007, 243–244; Strabo, *Geography* 11.2.1. On graves of foreigners generally, see Bäbler 1998.

[42] *CIRB* 9–11, 25, 39–40, 971–972, 1039–1040. For a brief summary of the possible location and origin of these peoples, see Ustinova 1999, 13–17. Rostovtzeff 1922 is still helpful on some points. On difficulties in sorting out the migration of peoples designated as "Maiotians", "Sarmatians", "Sauromatians", and "Iaxamatians" in ancient times, see Gardiner-Garden 1986 and, especially, Dan 2017.

[43] *IG* II² 9252 (2nd BCE), 9253 (4th BCE), 9254 (2nd BCE), 9255 (1st-2nd CE), 9256 (1st BCE), 9257 (undated); *SEG* 19:285 (4th–3rd BCE); *SEG* 23:144 (3rd–2nd BCE); *SEG* 29:229 (undated).

[44] *IG* II² 9253; *SEG* 19:285; *SEG* 29:229. On χρηστός / χρηστή see Fraser 1977, 71–72.

[45] *SGDI* II 1992 (182 BCE) and 2163 (150–140 BCE).

[46] *IG* IV 866; *SEG* 49:254 (2nd BCE).

There are signs that some Sarmatians and Sindians, Pontic peoples often associated with Maiotians and likely originating from northeast and southeast of lake Maiotis, would be settled in Attica at least by the second century BCE.[47] In that century, two men (Neon and Hygylinon) and two women (Soteris and Sarmatis) identified as Sarmatians are found on individual epitaphs, and once again servile status is likely as only the name and ethnicity is given.[48] In the mid-second century, a list of new members in an association (σύνοδος) devoted to Herakles in the Athenian subdivision of Kydathenaion includes free citizens, foreigners (e.g. from Antioch and Rhamnous), and at least one slave (*SEG* 36:228 = *GRA* I 38, line 11; 159/158 BCE). One of the newly listed members, whose name appears without mention of subdivision (unlike some others), is known merely as Sindes, likely suggesting a Sindian slave or ex-slave.[49]

That many Sarmatians living in Greece were slaves becomes clear in the Delphic manumission inscriptions, where there are ten manumissions (8 women and 2 men) with the kinship group (τὸ γένος) of the slave identified as Sarmatian (all second century BCE).[50] This number amounts to 5.6% of all manumitted slaves identified by ethnicity in the Delphic manumissions, a significant portion.[51] The names in these cases are sometimes typical Greek names and seldom ethnic identifiers themselves, including Phila, Aphrodisia, Rhoda, Eirene, Philokrateia, and Sopolis. Note should be taken of two further manumitted Sarmatians identified by ethnicity (τὸ γένος) in the region of Lokris, at Naupaktos (named Phrynea) and Physkeis (named Soso [?]; *IG* IX,1²,3 638,3 and 679; both mid-second c. BCE). As the discussion so far shows, the majority of Pontic peoples attested in funerary evidence from Attica and elsewhere in Greece were likely of servile origin – they were slaves or ex-slaves.

3. Pontic peoples elsewhere in the Aegean and Asia Minor

This brings us to Pontic peoples settled outside of Attica. Although, as usual, most of our evidence comes from well-excavated Athens, there are some indications that migrants or displaced people from the Pontic region would be found in other Greek cities, at least from the second century BCE and on. In light of Chios' early reputation for importing slaves from the Pontic region, it is not surprising to find such peoples on Aegean islands and on the western coast of Asia Minor. This evidence shows that encounters between Greeks, on the one hand, and immigrants or displaced people from the Black Sea area, on the other, was a realistic scenario for some locales outside of Attica, especially by the late Hellenistic era.

A striking example is provided by a single collective grave on the island of Rheneia, neighbouring Delos. Around 100 BCE, a man named Protarchos buried twenty-two enslaved persons, who likely died together in an accident of some sort (*SEG* 23:381 = *IG* IX,1²,4 1778).[52] With one exception, these people possess Greek names and are identified by geographic or ethnic origin (either ethnicity or, perhaps less likely, city of purchase in some cases).[53] Four male slaves are from Maiotis and three male slaves are from Thracian coastal sites (Istros and Odessos), so one-third (7 of the 21 with ethnic identifications) are from

[47] Cf. Strabo, *Geography* 11.2.11, 11.6.2: Strabo places the Sindian people on the Taman peninsula near Hermonassa and Phanagoreia and as far south as Gorgippia; he places Sarmatians between the Caspian Sea and the Tanais (Don) river. On the difficulties in sorting out Sauromatians, Sarmatians and others, see Dan 2017.

[48] *IG* II² 8430: "Sarmatian of the Bosporos"; *IG* II² 10243; *IG* II² 10244; *SEG* 28:338 = *IG* II² 12061, lines 1–2.

[49] Cf. Arnaoutoglou 2011, 39; *SEG* 21:1069; *IMilet* 798 = *GRA* II 132 (discussed in Harland 2014, 285). Variants the Bosporan region itself include Sindeas (e.g. *CIRB* 1094), Sindax (e.g. *CIRB* 709), and Sindos and Sindokos (e.g. *CIRB* 1137; see *LGPN* IV).

[50] *SGDI* 1724 (168 BCE), 2108 (ca. 150–140 BCE), 2110 (ca. 113–100 BCE), 2142 (142 BCE), 2274 (ca. 153–144 BCE); *FD* III 2, 228 (ca. 153–144 BCE); *FD* III 3/1, 24 (ca. 153–144 BCE); Amandry 1942, 71–72 (no. 2, ca. 153–144 BCE), 73–75 (no. 4, ca. 153–144 BCE).

[51] On the ethnicity of slaves in the Delphic material, see D. Lewis 2017a (discussed further below).

[52] See also Couilloud 1974, 192–193, no. 418. Cf. D. Lewis 2017a; Avram 2007, 243–244.

[53] Avram (2007, 244, followed by Lewis 2017a; cf. Braund and Tsetskhladze 1989) thinks that the ethnics in this inscription designate slave markets rather than having value as indicators of the slaves' actual ethnic or geographic origins. While the coastal cities of Istros, Odessos, and Side may fit this line of thinking regarding markets, others are clearly not coastal (e.g. Mazaka) and still others, such as Nabataia, would be even more problematic for that view.

the Pontic region. The remainder include eight from Syria, Israel, or Nabataia (Apamea, Rhosos, Marathos, Joppa, Marisa, Nabataia), three from Asia Minor (Myndos in Caria, Mazaka in Cappadocia, and Side in Pamphylia), and two from Cyrene (a mother and her daughter).

Beyond Attica and the Delphic manumissions, the island of Rhodes supplies the most extensive evidence for Pontic peoples abroad, particularly in the second and first centuries BCE. This is not at all surprising in light of the fact that Rhodes is second only to Attica in the number of published grave inscriptions. [54] Funerary evidence from the island attests to at least three Scythians (two men and one woman); three Kolchians, again with Greek names; six Maiotians (four men and two women), one of which was married to a man who was likely a citizen of Bargylia on the mainland in Caria; two Sarmatian women, one married to a man who was likely a citizen of Nikomedia in Bithynia; one Sindian man; and, six Thracians (four women and two men).[55] With two exceptions (the women married to the Bargylian and the Nikomedian, respectively) the deceased is identified only by personal name and ethnicity, suggesting servile origins. One of these outstanding cases of the first century BCE at Rhodos involves funerary honours granted by an association (κοινόν) devoted to Saviour Zeus to Chysippos of Bargylia and his wife Akakias of Maiotis (*ILindos* 683). So in this case a Maiotian woman is (at least as wife of a benefactor) involved in networks of benefaction at Rhodos and not marginalized from interactions with local associations that were endemic on the island. It is not clear whether she was a former slave of her now husband.[56]

Something can be said about the number of Pontic slaves within the overall slave population on Rhodes in the second and first centuries BCE. Leaving aside the Maiotian and Sarmatian women who were married to men who were probably citizens from other Greek cities (and therefore may or may not be of servile background), there are a total of 19 Pontic slaves attested in excavated evidence from Rhodes. On Donato Morelli's count, there are a total of 140 attested slaves with ethnic identifications (beyond the Pontic ones above), which gives us a total of 159 enslaved persons whose ethnicity is mentioned.[57] If one were to take this anecdotal material as at least an indication of the possibilities, Pontic slaves would account for one in ten slaves identified by ethnicity in surviving inscriptions. Slaves deriving from regions of Asia Minor, including Armenia, total 111 individuals, which amounts to almost 70% of the total slave population on Rhodes in this era.[58] From further east there are 14 Syrians (almost 9%), 6 Medes (almost 4%), and 2 Persians. Furthermore, there are 4 Egyptians (just over 2.5%), 1 Libyan, and 1 Celt.

The island of Kos provides further instances of Pontic settlers in the late Hellenistic period and into the Roman era. Graves of two women named Thraissa have been found, and one man is identified as a Thracian on his grave.[59] Furthermore, a number of Thracians who also identify themselves as coming from the city of Herakleia formed a society (θίασος) at least by the first century CE. Like many other such associations on Kos, the members purchased a common burial plot together, which (along with the identification

---

[54] Fraser and Rönne 1957, 94–98; Fraser 1977, 46.

[55] Scythians: *IG* XII, 1, 526 = (?) *IRhodM* 233 (Aphrodisias); *IG* XII, 1, 527 (Kalliope); *IRhodM* 421 (Philon; 1st BCE). Kolchians: *SEG* 51:1015; Hatzfeld 1910, 243, no. 8 (Eunoia). Maiotians: *IRhodM* 229 (Dionysodoros); *IG* XII,1 514 (Timon; undated); Jacopi 1932, 232, no. 122 (Lysimachos and Sapis; undated); *ILindos* 683 (Akakia, married to a Bargylian; 1st BCE); *MDAI(A)* 23 (1898) 394, no. 64 (Eirena; undated). Sarmatians: *IG* XII,1 525 (Athano); Jacopi 1932, no. 95 (Hesychia, married to Menophilos of Nikomedia). Sindian: *IG* XII,1 1385 (Artamitios; at Ialysos); cf. Pugliese Carratelli 1955, 159, no. 4 (Rhodes; 100–70 BCE); Couilloud 1974, no. 315 (Rheneia). Thracians: *IRhodM* 217 (Graphe), 218 (Agathanassa); *ILindos* 695 (Asia; probably 2nd BCE); *IG* XII,1 545 (Parthenios, who may be buried with her son, Philon, identified as "born within the household", ἐγγενής); *IG* XII,1 877 (Antaios); *ASAA* 2 (1916) 176, no. 166 (Hellas). Cf. PH295262 = *Historia* [Milan] 7 (1933) 581, no. 3, grave of Thraissa, a daughter or slave of Isias at Aperi on the island of Karpathos.

[56] It is noteworthy that the city of Rhodos happens to supply one of the earliest epigraphic instances of the personal name Kimmerios (ca. 380/379 BCE). This involves Kleiton son of Kimmerios who is one among the priests of Helios and is not likely of servile origins; this may or may not be an early immigrant from the Cimmerian Bosporos (*SEG* 12:360, line 39). Cf. *IDelphi* (FD III) 1:53 (424 BCE); *IG* XII Suppl. 312, from Tenos island (ca. 200 BCE). See also Ivantchik 2006, 223, although he seems overly confident in discounting the possibility that some named Kimmerios would be acculturated Cimmerian immigrants.

[57] Morelli 1956, esp. 137–139 and 178–184. Cf. Sacco 1980.

[58] Most well represented from Asia Minor were those identified as coming from Phrygia (21 slaves), Cilicia (14 slaves), Lycia (12 slaves), Galatia (12), Lydia (9), and Lykaonia (9), and Cappadocia (8).

[59] *IKosPH* 224, 301 (= *IKosS* EF 84); *IKosS* EF 566 (1st BCE).

as Herakleians) suggests that these Thracians were freeborn citizens of a foreign city and metics at Kos, not enslaved persons.[60] Once again, the fact that these Thracians formed groups and proudly identified their origins points to some degree of ethnic pride, rather than complete marginalization.

Beyond Thracians, surviving evidence for "Scythians" or Pontic peoples on mainland Asia Minor is minimal. The name Skythes is attested and may in some cases involve descendants of those from the Pontic region, but we cannot be certain based solely on the use of this personal name in these cases, and many of these people apparently identify their father's names, pointing to non-servile status.[61] The dearth of other material from Asia Minor may be due, in part, to the partial nature of epigraphic finds, as well as a lack of ethnic identifications in the inscriptions. Many of the Pontic peoples or slaves we did encounter in Attica and on Rhodes used Greek names, which in other cases could make them largely indistinguishable in the epigraphic record.[62] Yet this situation may also suggest that many Pontic slaves went on to Attica or elsewhere, rather than to Greek cities of Asia Minor, where Carians, Lykaonians, Cilicians, Phrygians, or Paphlagonians would offer local supplies.

Regarding Thracians in Asia Minor, some would of course be settled near Thrace in northwestern cities, such as Miletopolis near Kyzikos (e.g. *IMT* 2291 = *IKyzikos* II 7 with its Thracian names in the third century BCE). Yet further away, too, there were settlements by Seleucid or Attalid rulers of Thracian mercenaries in the Hellenistic era, and this offers a glance of freeborn Thracians abroad. Such settlers continued to form groups and to identify themselves as Thracians into the Roman era. So, for instance, the Thracian populations at Antioch in Pisidia and at both Apollonia and Neapolis in Phrygia show some signs of integration into civic life there.[63] Likewise in the Milyas region, at the convergence of Lycia, Pisidia and Phrygia, the Thracian settlers (Θρᾳκες οἱ κατοικοῦντες) formed an ongoing group, which on one occasion joined with the Milyadians and the guild of Roman businessmen to make a dedication to both the goddess Roma and Augustus.[64] Jean Bingen has challenged the notion that descendants of Thracian mercenaries settled in Egypt were extremely low on the status scale, that they were merely in third place above slaves and Egyptian farmers (as previously suggested by V. Velkov and A. Fol).[65] As our focus here is on Greek cities, the Egyptian material cannot be dealt with at length, but I would suggest a similar situation may hold for long-established Thracians descended from mercenaries in Asia Minor.

Although the surviving evidence for Pontic peoples on the western coast of Asia Minor is meager, there are notable cases near Rhodes in the Hellenistic and Roman imperial eras. At Knidos (south of Chios and opposite Rhodes), an inscription mentions a Thracian named Philetairos, who is listed as a member and contributor of a society (θίασος) in the second century BCE (*IKnidos* 23 = *GIBM* IV 795). Eleven of the thirteen legible members are immigrants, including those from Libya, Phrygia, Arados, Soloi, Myndos (two individuals), Selge, Kaunos, Seleukeia, and Samos island. So this Thracian was in this sense integrated within immigrant populations at Knidos, where at least some of the members were likely free or freed citizens of other cities. Just inland, at Kaunos, there is a Thracian with resident alien status (μέτοικος) – therefore likely freeborn or freed – among donors in a fragmentary list dating to the mid–late second century BCE (*IKaunos* 38, line 32). Furthermore, there is a grave of the classical or Hellenistic period that belonged to a Thracian named Hekataios son of Sadalos, likely of freeborn status in light of the Thracian patronym (*IKaunos* 148a).

This survey of Pontic peoples abroad clearly shows that although some were freeborn or freed, the majority of our evidence pertains to those who were likely of servile origin, some of whom were manumitted. So many Pontic people had a low social position that paralleled a low ranking in commonly shared

---

[60] *IKosB* 276 = *SEG* 58:879.

[61] See *LGPN* 5a: E.g. *IG* IX,1,2,1 17, line 60 (Elaia; 263 BCE); *IEph* 901, line 6 (2nd–1st BCE); *IEph* 1390 (Hellenistic); *SEG* 43:713 A, line 5 (Halikarnassos; 5th–4th BCE); *Illion* 51, line 16 (3rd BCE); *Illion* 58, line 6 (3rd–2nd BCE); *SEG* 19:698, line 423 (Kolophon; 311–306 BCE); *IMagn* 110a, line 12 (1st BCE); *IMilet* 122, line 73 (451 BCE); *IG* XII,6,1 180, line 9 (Samos; ca. 200 BCE).

[62] On this tendency for foreign slaves to possess Greek names, see Vlassopoulos 2010.

[63] For debates on the Thracian settlements (whether under Seleucids or Attalids), see Cohen 1995, 279, 285, 288–289, 348.

[64] *SEG* 36:1207 = *AGRW* 208 (5–4 BCE). See A. S. Hall 1986, 137–139, 152–154.

[65] Bingen 2007; Velkov and Fol 1977.

Greek ethnic hierarchies. Thracians seem to provide a somewhat consistent exception in some regards, as there were clearly Thracians of free or freed status in the Piraeus, at Athens (where they gained the right to build), on Kos (where they purchased a burial plot), and in Asia Minor (where descendants of mercenaries of the Hellenistic era continued to live their lives into the Roman period). On the other hand, there is a dearth of epigraphic evidence for clearly freeborn Scythians, Maiotians or others abroad. In the fourth century, Demosthenes states that the majority of Athens' grain came from the northern Pontos, so it is likely that there were indeed traders from the Bosporan region who were resident aliens in Attica (and therefore free), namely traders responsible for coordinating importation of grain.[66] Yet evidence for these immigrants has been largely lost, though I consider the unusual though important case of the "Scythian" Agasikles shortly.

While statistics often elude us, there are signs that Pontic slaves constituted a significant portion of the entire slave population in Greece and the Aegean, particularly if the Delphic manumission inscriptions can be taken as representative in certain respects. (These manumissions date between 200 BCE and 100 CE and number over 1000 in total.) David Lewis calculates the numbers for the 179 Delphic manumissions where ethnicity is stated explicitly (with the use of τὸ γένος), the majority of which come from the second century BCE. At Delphi, 60 manumitted slaves (33.5%) are identified as coming from parts of Greece; 38 (21.2%) from parts of Asia Minor; 16 (8.9%) from Macedonia and the Balkans (*excluding* Thrace); 60 (33.5%) from the Near East, including Syria, Phoenicia, Judea and Arabia; 6 (3.3%) from Libya or Egypt; and 6 (3.3%) from Italy. Most important for us here are the numbers from the Pontic region, where 34 (19%) are identified as Thracians and 15 (8.4%) as Maiotians, Bastarnians (sometimes considered "Germans" as in Tacitus, *Germania* 46), Kolchians, or Sarmatians. So approximately *one-third* of slaves manumitted at Delphi stating their ethnicity were identified as coming from areas bordering on the west, north and east shores of the Black Sea. This is a portion that exceeds that for Delphic manumissions of persons originating in Asia Minor and roughly matches the portion from the Near East. That roughly one in three enslaved persons would be from these regions aligns with anecdotal evidence for Attica encountered throughout this paper, though the anecdotal numbers for Rhodes suggested a lower rate of just over one in ten. So, based on the numbers of slaves alone, there was a high likelihood that the Pontic peoples that Greeks would encounter were more likely than not to have servile origins.

Of course, we lack the quantitative data necessary to estimate accurately the total number of Pontic slaves in relation to the total population of any particular city. If, however, we were tentatively to take the educated guesses on Athenian demographics offered by the likes of Robin Osborne, and these are guesses as good and unconfirmable as any, there would have been about 21,000 adult male citizens and 80,000 citizens, about 20,000 foreigners, and 50,000 slaves, for a total population of 150,000 in fourth century Athens and surrounding area.[67] In this scenario, one in ten to one in three slaves deriving from the Black Sea area would amount to a servile Pontic population of between 5,000 and 16,666 in fourth century Athens and vicinity. Such demographic guesses must remain impressionistic only.

3. Experiences of dispersed Pontic peoples: Social status, discrimination, and integration

In my previous study I explored how Greek elite authors positioned particular peoples, including Pontic peoples, within commonly shared ethnic hierarchies, usually with Greeks above all other ethnic groups and with northern peoples very low on the scale. There was also a concern on the part of such Greeks to further distinguish amongst specific ethnic groups. I investigated the ideologies that were developed either to bolster or, less often, to counter common rankings of such peoples. The present survey, which shows the plausibility of daily interactions between Greeks and Pontic peoples, provides a framework in which

---

[66] Cf. E. Hall 2006, 213; Noonan 1973; Xenophon, *Ways and Means* 2.3. On the import of grain from the Bosporan region, see Demosthenes, 20.31–33 (ca. 355 BCE); *IG* II³,1 298 = *IG* II² 211 (347/346 BCE), which mentions the flow of grain to Attica under the Spartokid dynasty in earlier times as well; and, *IG* II³,1 870 = *IG* II² 653 (285/284 BCE).

[67] R. Osborne 1985, 42–46. See also Hansen 2006, where he observes that Osborne's estimate of the total population is conservative on many methods of calculation, and so I have chosen a conservative number here, erring on the side of low numbers. Hansen's own estimates for fourth century Attica are 133–186,000 freepersons and 66–93,000 slaves, for a total population of 200–250,000. See also the discussion by Scheidel in Garnsey 1998, 196–197.

to broach the somewhat elusive question of how such stereotypes and categorizations reflected in literature impacted diasporic experience and influenced how these people navigated their environments. As usual, the social historian is better not presuming an exact correspondence between Greek elite ideologies and actual experiences on the ground as represented in other archeological or epigraphic evidence. So there may be indications of integration in specific cases even though elite ideologies would often translate into discrimination in other situations.

First of all, it is important to recognize that Pontic peoples made up approximately one-third of all slaves in places like Attica and perhaps a lesser portion at Rhodes. So the evidence we have for the treatment of enslaved persons generally provides insights into the negative experiences of a significant contingent of people from the Black Sea region.[68] The fact that Pontic peoples that a Greek would potentially encounter in cities like Athens were, in many cases, likely to be slaves or ex-slaves may suggest further reasons why these peoples were placed low in Greek ethnic hierarchies in the first place. However, this is not directly stated by ancient authors I surveyed in my earlier study, where Asians (not Europeans) are more frequently considered inherently servile.[69] Many of these people would have been forcibly removed from their home-lands and families, having been captured by pirates, enslaved through conquest, or sold into slavery by indigenous elites.[70] Pontic slaves of subsequent generations would be housebred slaves whose identification with that region might continue, whether in their own eyes, in the eyes of their owners, or both.

It seems that negativity towards Pontic peoples flowing from ethnic categorizations would often con-verge with negativity towards the servile population, magnifying the potential for discrimination and increasing mistreatment of these peoples in particular. This is not the place to engage debates regarding whether ancient Greek concepts of the slave are better understood primarily in terms of property ownership, on the one hand, or domination and "social death", on the other.[71] What matters more to the question of dis-crimination against Pontic peoples, at least as enslaved individuals, are materials that point to the negative conditions and experiences of slaves, though my discussion must remain brief. There is ample evidence that what a modern person would label abuse was extremely common in relation to those who were enslaved in Athens, who were most often foreigners from places like the Black Sea region. Slave-holders were entitled to treat their own slaves as they wished, and so there are signs that enslavers could readily humiliate the enslaved, torture them for information (Lysias, 1.18–22), beat and starve them in order to ensure obedience (Xenophon, *Memorabilia* 2.1.15–16), punish them physically with whipping or other means (Demosthenes, 22.54–55, 24.166–167; *IG* II² 333.6–7 and 1013.5, 45–49), use them for sexual purposes (Xenophon, *Oeco-nomicus* 10.12), and even kill their own slaves (Antiphon, 6.4; Isocrates, 12.181).[72]

---

[68] On the convergence of ideologies of slavery and ideologies concerning the more general category of "barbarians", see Rosivach 1999: "when Athenians thought about slaves they habitually thought about *barbaroi*, and when they thought about *barbaroi* they habitually thought about slaves" (p. 39). In this and the previous study, I am more concerned with approaches to specific peoples sometimes enveloped within that broader category of "barbarians", however, and Rosivach does not focus on such distinctions.

[69] The irony here is that many legitimizing ideologies emphasized that warm climates create people who are ideally suited for subjugation and slavery. Such stereotypes or categorizations were quite fluid and, at times, even arbitrary, as the combined use of astrology, climate, and humours as a theoretical basis (for assessing level of spirit or heart) allows a consider-able range of interpretations of a particular people's relative inferiority or superiority (cf. Aristotle, *Politics* 1338b). The fourth century Peripatetic author of *Household Management* (*Oikonomika* 1.5.5 = 1344b) advises that slaves be chosen, in part, based on what we would call ethnicity, stating that the "best laborers will be furnished by those kinship groups (γένη) which are neither cowardly (δειλά) nor extremely manly (ἀνδρεῖα). For both are problematic, for the extremely cowardly cannot endure hard labor, and those with high spirit (οἱ θυμοειδεῖς) are not easily controlled."

[70] On piracy as a likely source of slaves from the Black Sea, see Strabo's discussion of pirates on the eastern coast below Sindian territory, around Kolchis (*Geography* 11.2.12). On local elites' enslavement of nearby peoples, see Herodotos' descrip-tion of the so-called "Royal Scythians" who "think that other Scythians are their slaves" (*Histories* 4.20).

[71] On slavery as "social death" and violent domination, see Patterson 1982, and qualifications in Bodel and Scheidel 2017. For a challenge to that approach with regard to Attica (and a reaffirmation of "property"), see D. Lewis 2017b. For the important theor-izing of Aristotle, see *Politics* 1253b–1255b. On Greek slavery as primarily a power relation of domination, see Vlassopoulos 2011.

[72] On this, see Hunter 1994, 70–95, 154–184; D. Lewis 2017b, 39.

Beyond the general situation regarding the treatment of Pontic peoples as enslaved "barbarians" and the tendency to assume those from that region would be servile, there are only a few hints regarding how such stereotypes might have been translated into negative treatment of northern peoples generally. The fact that ancestral connections with peoples from the Pontic region did have direct implications regarding both status and treatment seems clear in oratory strategies. These can be witnessed in rivalries with Demosthenes in the mid–late fourth century BCE. Deinarchos mentions and Aischines sustains the insult that Demosthenes' grandmother had "Scythian" blood (though no servile origins are expressly claimed), and that this ethnic origin explains Demosthenes' "wickedness" (πονηρία), a supposed characteristic of nomads.[73] Aischines' point is, in part, that Demosthenes' citizenship was illegitimate (in relation to Periklean law) due to this supposed mixed blood. In making this accusation, Aischines anticipates that his audience (around 330 BCE) would believe this claim about "the rhetorician and the Scythian" and that the insult (whether having some measure of truth or not) would facilitate his audience's negative treatment of Demosthenes.[74]

Unfortunately, due to their nature, inscriptions rarely preserve evidence of discriminatory treatment of Pontic peoples (or others) on the ground. This is despite the fact that negative stereotypes in literature would suggest that mistreatment would be common in daily life at least sporadically, if not commonly. What the inscriptions do provide, though, are momentary glimpses into certain diasporic peoples' integration despite negative stereotypes, mainly but not solely in connection with Thracians.

As I explore in some detail in another book regarding Syrian and Judean immigrants in Greek societies, anthropologists, sociologists, and social psychologists interested in assessing diasporic experience often explain processes of negotiation in the place of settlement using theories of acculturation and assimilation.[75] Studies in this area by Milton Yinger and others suggest that assimilation in this theoretical sense does not assume a one-way process towards the disappearance of the cultural distinctiveness of a particular ethnic group. Rather, immigrants as individuals and communities navigate areas of participation in the place of settlement while also maintaining cultural and social customs of the homeland in other respects, including associating with others who share a common ethnic identification. The formation of associations based on common ethnicity is itself an important means by which people could assert this sense of belonging with others of an ostensibly common origin.[76] At the same time, what seems very clear in the case of ancient Greek societies is that, when immigrants did form associations, they often modelled such groups on local, *Greek*, social forms (e.g. ὀργεῶνες, θίασος, σύνοδος, κοινόν). So the formation of ethnic associations could be both an expression of ethnic identification and an indicator of assimilation to local cultural forms. Most importantly regarding integration within local society, forming such groups facilitated opportunities for diasporic populations to interact within local social networks, entailing connections with those who would identify as Greeks (or more specific civic descriptors under this rubric) in that context.

In his sociological study, Yinger distinguishes further between cultural assimilation and structural assimilation. Structural assimilation, which is more pertinent here, entails both informal and formal levels.[77] At the *informal* level, individuals can interact with persons from other ethnic groups through personal, social network connections, including memberships in neighbourhoods, clubs, and associations.[78] The *formal* level of structural assimilation involves members of a specific group engaging with or having access to formal institutions of society, including political, legal, social, or economic institutions.

Particularly noteworthy here, then, are at least six instances witnessed above where Pontic peoples – either as individuals or as groups – interact in local social networks in connection with associations or

---

[73] Deinarchos, 1.15; Aischines, 2.78, 180 and 3.172; cf. Plutarch, *Life of Demosthenes* 4.

[74] See Braund 2003.

[75] See Harland 2009, esp. pp. 99–142. Cf. Berry 1980; Berry 1997, 5–34; Yinger 1981, 249–264; Phinney 1990; Marger 1991, 117–120; Yinger 1994.

[76] On associations and immigrant groups in the ancient Mediterranean, see the bibliographies in Harland 2003 = Harland 2013; Harland 2009. For relevant sources in translation, see Harland, Ascough, and Kloppenborg 2012; Kloppenborg and Ascough 2011; Harland 2014, 20; and, the expanding collection at: http://www.philipharland.com/greco-roman-associations.

[77] Yinger 1981; Yinger 1994. Cf. Marger 1991, 117–120.

[78] Cf. Yinger 1981, 254; Marger 1991, 118.

clubs specifically.[79] There are at least three types of activity pertaining to informal and formal structural assimilation evident in these instances. First, there are cases where Thracians express identification with one another and a concern to engage in ancestral customs together by forming associations while also interacting with other non-Thracian groups and institutions. Material concerning associations of Thracians at both the Piraeus and Athens point to integration within the Athenian cultural sphere, on the one hand, and identification with the homeland and its distinctive customs and deities, on the other. The inscription from the third century (*IG* II² 1283) expresses significant ethnic pride and identification between the two Thracian associations in the Piraeus and at Athens while also indicating participation in celebrations for the goddess Bendis that were sponsored by Athenian authorities: when these things take place and the entire people (ἔθνος; i.e. the Thracians) lives in concord, the sacrifices and other rites will be done for the gods in accordance with both the ancestral customs of the Thracians and the laws of the city. As a result, it will turn out well in a way that reflects piety for the entire people (ἔθνος) in matters concerning the gods.

Both the Piraean and the Athenian associations of Thracians, which included at least some members of free or freed status (since they are treated as metics seeking permission to own land), also engaged in diplomatic relations with civic authorities. This is a rare glimpse into formal structural assimilation as defined by Yinger.

Comparable forms of structural assimilation are offered by two other inscriptions, one from Kos (*IKosB* 276) and the other from southern Asia Minor (*SEG* 36:1207). These once again attest to Thracians (in this case certainly including at least some freeborn or freedpersons) forming ongoing associations based on a sense of shared geographic origins. The inscription from Milyas has these descendants of Thracian mercenaries joining with another important immigrant group (Roman businessmen) and regional formal institutions (the body of Milyadians) in honouring Roman imperial figures.

A second type of structural assimilation pertains to individual settlers interacting with others within the society of settlement. In second century Athens (*SEG* 36:228) and Knidos (*IKnidos* 23) there are examples of an individual Sindian (likely a slave) and an individual Thracian joining mixed associations that consisted of a variety of citizens and/or foreigners, pointing towards everyday interactions between these Pontic peoples and others. As social network analysis emphasizes, contacts with others in this way expands one's sets of social connections and considerably increase access to social capital within local society.[80]

A third area of structural assimilation pertains to participation in networks of benefaction that entailed contacts with local associations. There is the Maiotian woman who, admittedly in connection with her husband, was posthumously honoured by an association on Rhodes in the first century BCE. This points to the sorts of connections that could exist between Pontic immigrants as benefactors, on the one hand, and local associations, on the other, which in this Rhodian case may have consisted of citizen or non-citizen members, or both (*ILindos* 683).

Beyond these glimpses into relative integration by Pontic peoples, there are further anecodotal hints that certain Scythians, even those with a servile past, might find a place for themselves within a local Greek society in certain ways. Even though there are some interpretative quandaries, the unusual case of the "Scythian" Agasikles gaining or claiming Athenian citizenship in the fourth century BCE is instructive and important. Regardless of how one solves the quandaries, this is a very clear case in which a person most likely from the Pontic region was to some degree integrated within local networks and social structures, in this case involving an official Athenian subdivision (δῆμος).[81]

We only know about Agasikles from a fragmentary speech by Deinarchos in the 330s BCE, from a mention by Hypereides in the same era, and from two subsequent lexical works that make reference to the content of the largely lost speech of Deinarchos.[82] In the speech, Deinarchos apparently characterizes the

---

[79] On associations in classical and Hellenistic Athens, see for instance: Jones 1999; Arnaoutoglou 2003.

[80] Lin 1999.

[81] On this see Whitehead 1986, 292–301; Vlassopoulos 2009, 354; Wijma 2010, 27–29, 55–56, 64, 74.

[82] Harpokration (2nd CE): Dindorf 1853 = http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:2013.01.0002. Suda online (ed. David Whitehead): http://www.stoa.org/sol/.

opponent (identified as Agasikles in the lexical evidence) as the "son of a Scythian (or: son of Skythes) pre-measurer (προμετρητοῦ) who was born among slaves of the People (ἐν δημοσίοις γέγονε) and has himself been a pre-measurer up till now in the market, and you regularly receive wheat from him".[83]

Regarding Agasikles' socio-economic status within Athenian society, Deinarchos identifies Agasikles as a "pre-measurer" (προμετρητής) and it seems the intention is to emphasize Agasikles' low status due to involvement in the grain trade. The role of the pre-measurer is mentioned in only one published inscription, where it is clear that "wages" (μισθός) were involved (*IG* II² 1672, lines 291 and 299; 329/328 BCE), something confirmed by lexical sources which also specify that measurement of grains in the market was the focus (Harpokration and Suda: s.v. προμετρητής). If the entry in the lexicon on *Rhetorical expressions* (in Lexica Segueriana) can be taken as accurate, pre-measurers were not merely manual labourers; rather they were "officials" (ἄρχοντες) who held the position on a yearly basis, which would suggest that Deinarchos is downplaying Agasikles' actual status in the speech.[84] As Craig Cooper clarifies, prejudice against or ambivalence towards metics involved in trade as merchants or shippers was very common, so much so that in the 340s BCE a new Athenian decree was passed that helped to protect such foreign traders by offering ready access to the courts in cases of baseless accusations.[85]

There seems to be no reason here to doubt Deinarchos' claim that Agasikles was in fact a descendant of someone from the northern Pontic area. Yet there is ambiguity regarding Agasikles' legal status within Athens or the Piraeus itself before the citizenship controversy, whether merely a foreign slave from the Pontic region or a freedperson with registered resident alien (μέτοικος) status. I would suggest the latter – that he had already been recognized as a resident alien – is more likely here for several reasons.[86] It was common practice within legal speeches to slander opponents by exaggerating (or inventing) servile connections, and so in many cases a freedperson might be characterized as a slave or a relative of a slave for the purposes of undermining that person's reputation.[87] Furthermore, the language that Deinarchos uses, speaking of Agasikles "having been born among slaves of the People (ἐν δημοσίοις γέγονε)" clearly leaves open the scenario that Agasikles had since been manumitted, despite his continued involvement in the grain trade. Additionally, Deinarchos complains that some relatives of Agasikles (presumably his sons) had participated in the Panathenaia festival in going up to the Acropolis "as ephebes [i.e. citizens] rather than as bowl-bearers [i.e. metics]". Here Deinarchos seems to assume that Agasikles is a freedperson with metic status, and so his sons would be limited to carrying the bowls in the Panathenaic procession (rather than still a slave of the People and therefore further restricted from participation). This participation in the procession (if it is descriptive rather than merely rhetorically evocative) also provides an instance of Scythian involvement in a very important Athenian festival.

More details regarding the controversy that led to the trial become clear in Hypereides' contemporary mention that "Agasikles of Piraeus" faced charges of denunciation or impeachment (τῷ εἰσαγγελτικῷ νόμῳ) "because he was registered (ἐνεγράφη) in Halimous", the Athenian subdivision (δῆμος). Hypereides cites this as a further case of *improper* application of the law of denunciation. Harpokration, writing in the second century CE but presumably with access to Deinarchos' full speech, adds that the reason for the charge against Agasikles was corruption or bribery: Deinarchos "demonstrated that [Agasikles] bribed the Halimousians and, for that reason, although he was a foreigner, he was registered for citizenship (δεδήλωται ὅτι Ἁλιμουσίους συνεδέκασε καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ξένος ὢν τῇ πολιτείᾳ ἐνεγράφη)".[88] The Halimous subdivision would have consisted of more than 73 members in this era (see Demosthenes, 57.9). There are other *alle-*

---

[83] Stroud 1998, 60, interprets Skythes as the personal name of the father, which would nonetheless also point to a Scythian connection.

[84] Bekker 1814, 290–291 (Λέξεις ῥητορικαί, *Rhetorical expressions*, s.v. προμετρητής): Προμετρηταί· ἄρχοντές τινες ἐνιαύσιοι ἦσαν, οἱ τῷ δικαίῳ μέτρῳ διαμετροῦντες τὰ ὄσπρια καὶ τοὺς πυροὺς ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ. See Stroud 1998, 60. Cf. *POxy* XV 1804 (3rd CE), and the introduction to that papyrus. I am grateful to Jeremy Trevett for pointing me to this material.

[85] Cooper 2003, 69–71. Demosthenes, 58.10–11 and 53.

[86] On metics during the Panathenaia festival, see Wijma 2010, 29–84, who assumes that Agasikles was a metic.

[87] Whitehead 1977, 114–116; Whitehead 1986, 81–85; Kamen 2013, 54; Isaios, *On the Estate of Philoktemon* 6.49; Demosthenes, 20.131–135; Rotstein 2007.

[88] Harpokration, *Lexicon of the Ten Orators*, s.v. Ἀγασικλῆς (Dindorf 1853; cf. Suda).

gations of corruption through bribery related to this district, including removal of names from the registers and enrolment of foreigners as citizens in the subdivision (Anaximenes and Nikostratos).[89]

Complicating assessment of allegations of bribery against Agasikles is the fact that accusations of bribery were very common in Athenian legal contexts and often initiated in connection with personal vendettas by rivals, as Aischines' and Demosthenes' mutual allegations show (Aischines, 2.23). There are signs that such accusations could be based on very slim evidence or be completely unfounded, as Claire Taylor's research indicates.[90] It is noteworthy that, in another speech, Deinarchos (ca. 323 BCE) accuses Demosthenes himself of bribery in all sorts of situations, including six cases where metics or freedpersons were granted Athenian citizenship (Deinarchos, 1.41–45). So even the charge of bribery as the ostensible basis for Agasikles' acceptance within, and enrolment into, the Halimous subdivision is questionable.

Furthermore, according to Apollodoros (ca. 340s BCE), the most common scenario for a resident alien to be naturalized as a citizen (δημοποίητος) was to demonstrate the conduct of a good man (ἀνδραγαθία) in the form of services rendered to Athens as benefactor, something that his father, Pasion the foreign bank-er and ex-slave (perhaps from Syria), had evidently done (cf. *Apollodoros Against Neaira*, [Dem.] 59.88–92, esp. 89).[91] In Pasion's case, his financial contributions at least included shields (produced in his own facto-ry) and five naval ships (*Apollodoros Against Stephanos*, [Dem.] 45.85), so the outlay would be prohibitive for most metics wishing to be citizens. There were also stipulations for a full (born) citizen subsequently to contest a resident alien's claim to citizenship in court, with the charge of being a foreigner (ξενίας γραφή) and, if found guilty, the penalty of enslavement.[92] So one could imagine cases where citizenship was grant-ed as a gift due to financial service to Athens, but was later contested as a case of "bribery", as Deinarchos' speech against Demosthenes illustrates.

Irrespective of whether Agasikles was still a slave of the People or was an ex-slave with metic status before the citizenship controversy and irrespective of what procedures led to his claim of citizenship, this episode clearly points to this (likely) Scythian's relative integration within local society in at least some sig-nificant respects. The fact that he could successfully broker or arrange the acquisition of citizenship by any means (legal or not) suggests that something more than just a "bribe" underlies his success. With or without a "bribe", the whole scenario points to Agasikles' clout with local officials (such as the δήμαρχος) and at least connections with a substantial number of citizens who were members in the Halimous subdivision.[93] As Jeremy Trevett argues in relation to Pasion's case, "connections between wealthy metics and important citizens were by no means uncommon in this period".[94] Presumably, Agasikles was already a well-known figure within social networks of this neighbourhood in Athens long before this controversy. Moreover, the portion of Deinarchos' speech which has survived presumes that the audience at the trial would also know who Agasikles was based on encounters in the marketplace.

It is difficult to evaluate how representative or anomalous this level of positive interaction between a certain Scythian and local Greeks was, but Agasikles' case does have affinities with the sort of interactions between Pontic peoples and local social networks and associations I have outlined earlier in this section of the paper. Yet in this case involving Agasikles, the association in question also constitutes an official civic structure. The case of Agasikles along with other situations involving informal associations at least cautions against any assumption that all Pontic people, even those with a servile history, were completely marginalized within local social and cultural life in places like Athens.

---

[89] On alleged corruption within Halimous specifically (ca. 346 BCE), see also Demosthenes, 57.26, 49, 58–61: "You will not find anything more outrageous done in other subdivisions (demes) than what you find done in ours." Cf. Whitehead 1986, 292–301.

[90] Taylor 2001a (esp. pp. 55–64); Taylor 2001b. Cf. Harvey 1985.

[91] On Pasion and Apollodoros, see Trevett 1992 (see pp. 24–25 on Pasion's contributions). Most known individual grants of citizenship at Athens in this period involve bankers, most likely because they were among the few metics who could afford the outlay: Pasion, Phormion, Epigenes and Konon (Deinarchos, 1.43), as well as the possible cases of Aristolochos (Demos-thenes, 45.63) and Timodemos (Demosthenes, 36.29, 50).

[92] Cooper 2003, 69–70.

[93] On the face-to-face and communal nature of the demes, see Whitehead 1986, 223–252.

[94] Trevett 1992, 159.

Bibliography

Amandry, Pierre. 1942. Actes d'affranchissement delphiques. *BCH* 66: 68–83.

Arnaoutoglou, Ilias. 2003. *Thusias heneka kai sunousias: Private Religious Associations in Hellenistic Athens*. Athens.

– 2011. 'Ils Étaient dans la ville, mais tout à fait en dehors de la cité': Status and Identity in Private Religious Associations in Hellenistic Athens. In Onno van Nijf and Richard Alston, eds. *Political Culture in the Greek City after the Classical Age*. Groningen-Royal Holloway Studies on the Greek City after the Classical Age 2. Leuven, 27–48.

– 2015. Cult Associations and Politics: Worshipping Bendis in Classical and Hellenistic Athens. In Vincent Gabrielsen and Christian A. Thomsen, eds. *Private Associations and the Public Sphere: Proceedings of a Symposium Held at the Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters, 9–11 September 2010*. Copenhagen, 25–56.

Avram, Alexandru. 2007. Some Thoughts about the Black Sea and the Slave Trade before the Roman Domination (6th–1st Centuries BC). In Vincent Gabrielsen and John Lund, eds. *The Black Sea in Antiquity. Regional and Interregional Economic Exchanges*. Black Sea Studies 6. Aarhus, 239–251.

Bäbler, Balbina. 1998. *Fleissige Thrakerinnen und wehrhafte Skythen: Nichtgriechen im klassischen Athen und ihre archäologische Hinterlassenschaft*. Berlin.

Bakewell, Geoffrey. 2008. Trierarchs' Records And The Athenian Naval Catalogue (IG I³ 1032). *Orality, Literacy, Memory in the Ancient Greek and Roman World*. Mnemosyne Supplements 298. Leiden, 143–162.

Bekker, Immanuel. 1814. *Anecdota Graeca: Lexica Segueriana*. Berlin.

Berry, John W. 1980. Acculturation: Theory, Models and Some New Findings. In Amado M. Padilla, ed. *Acculturation as Varieties of Adaptation*. AAAS Selected Symposium 39. Boulder, Colorado, 9–25.

– 1997. Immigration, Acculturation, and Adaptation. *Applied Psychology* 46: 5–34.

Bingen, Jean. 2007. The Thracians in Ptolemaic Egypt. In Roger S. Bagnall and Jean Bingen, eds. *Hellenistic Egypt: Monarchy, Society, Economy, Culture*. Edinburgh, 83–93.

Bodel, John, and Walter Scheidel, eds. 2017. *On Human Bondage: After Slavery and Social Death*. Chichester.

Braund, David. 2003. The Bosporan Kings and Classical Athens: Imagined Breaches in a Cordial Relationship (Aisch. 3.171–172; [Dem.] 34.36). In P. Guldager Bilde, J. M. Hojte, and V. F. Stolba, eds. *The Cauldron of Ariantas: Studies Presented to A. N. Sceglov on the Occasion of His 70th Birthday*. Black Sea Studies 1. Aarhus, 197–208.

– 2008. Royal Scythians and the Slave-Trade in Herodotus' Scythia. *Antichthon* 42: 1–19.

Braund, David, and G. R. Tsetskhladze. 1989. The Export of Slaves from Colchis. *CQ* 39: 114–125.

Bresson, Alain. 1997. Remarques préliminaires sur l'onomastique des esclaves dans la Rhodes antique. In Giuseppe Cordiano, Mauro Moggi, and Maria Pettinato, eds. *Schiavi e dipendenti nell'ambito dell' "oikos" e della "familia" atti del XXII Colloquio GIREA, Pontignano (Siena), 19–20 novembre 1995*. Studi e testi di storia antica 8. Pisa, 117–126.

Cohen, Getzel M. 1995. *The Hellenistic Settlements in Europe, the Islands, and Asia Minor*. Berkley.

Cooper, Craig. 2003. Worst of All He's an Egyptian. *Syllecta Classica* 14: 59–81.

Couilloud, Marie-Thérèse. 1974. *Les monuments funéraires de Rhénée*. Paris.

Couvenhes, Jean-Christophe. 2012. L'introduction des archers scythes, esclaves publics, à Athènes: La date et l'agent d'un transfert culturel. In B. Legras, ed. *Transferts culturels et droits dans le monde grec et hellénistique*. Paris, 99–118.

Dan, Anca. 2017. The Sarmatians: Some Thoughts on the Historiographical Invention of a West Iranian Migration. *Vom Wandern Der Völker: Migrationserzählungen in Den Altertumswissenschaften*. Berlin Studies of the Ancient World 41. Berlin, 97–134.

Deoudi, Maria. 2009. Bendis' neue Heimat in der Fremde. *Ancient West and East* 8: 223–233.

Dindorf, Wilhelm. 1853. *Harpocrationis lexicon in decem oratores Atticos*. Oxford.

Ferguson, W. S. 1944. The Attic Orgeones. *HTR* 37: 61–140.

Finley, M. I. 1962. The Black Sea and Danubian Regions and the Slave Trade in Antiquity. *Klio* 40: 51–59.

Fraser, P. M. 1977. *Rhodian Funerary Monuments*. Oxford.

– 1995. Citizens, Demesmen and Metics in Athens and Elsewhere. In Mogens Herman Hansen, ed. *Sources for the Ancient Greek City-State: Symposium August, 24–27 1994*. Acts of the Copenhagen Polis Centre 2. Copenhagen, 64–90.

– 2000. Ethnics as Personal Names. *Proceedings of the British Academy* 104: 149–158.

Fraser, P. M., and Tullia Rönne. 1957. *Boeotian and West Greek Tombstones*. Lund.

Frolov, E. D. 2000. Die Skythen in Athen. *Hyperboreus* 6: 3–30.

Gardiner-Garden, John R. 1986. Fourth Century Conceptions of Maiotian Ethnography. *Historia* 35: 192–225.

Garnsey, Peter. 1998. *Cities, Peasants and Food in Classical Antiquity: Essays in Social and Economic History*. Edited by Walter Scheidel Cambridge.

Gavriljuk, Nadežda A. 2003. The Graeco-Scythian Slave-Trade in the 6th and 5th Centuries BC. In P. Guldager Bilde, J. M. Hojte, and V. F. Stolba, eds. *The Cauldron of Ariantas: Studies Presented to A. N. Sceglov on the Occasion of His 70th Birthday*. Black Sea Studies 1. Aarhus, 75–85.

Graninger, Denver. 2015. Ethnicity and Ethne. In Julia Valeva, Emil Nankov, and Denver Graninger, eds. *A Companion to Ancient Thrace*. London, 22–32.

Hagendoorn, Louk. 1993. Ethnic Categorization and Outgroup Exclusion: Cultural Values and Social Stereotypes in the Construction of Ethnic Hierarchies. *ERS* 16: 26–51.

Hall, Alan S. 1986. R.E.C.A.M. Notes and Studies No. 9: The Milyadeis and Their Territory. *AS* 36: 137–157.

Hall, Edith. 2006. *The Theatrical Cast of Athens: Interactions Between Ancient Greek Drama and Society*. Oxford.

Hansen, Mogens Herman. 2006. *The Shotgun Method: The Demography of the Ancient Greek City-State Culture*. The Fordyce W. Mitchel Memorial Lecture Series. Columbia.

Harland, Philip A. 2003. *Associations, Synagogues, and Congregations: Claiming a Place in Ancient Mediterranean Society*. Minneapolis.

– 2009. *Dynamics of Identity in the World of the Early Christians: Associations, Judeans, and Cultural Minorities*. New York.

– 2013. *Associations, Synagogues, and Congregations: Claiming a Place in Ancient Mediterranean Society*. Second edition Kitchener: Philip A. Harland. At http://philipharland.com.

– 2014. *Greco-Roman Associations: Texts, Translations, and Commentary. II. North Coast of the Black Sea, Asia Minor*. BZNW 204. Berlin.

– 2019. Climbing the Ethnic Ladder: Ethnic Hierarchies and Judean Responses. *Journal of Biblical Literature* 138: 665–686.

– forthcoming. 'The Most Ignorant Peoples of All': Ancient Ethnic Hierarchies and Pontic Peoples. *Ethnicity, Historical Geography and Politics on the Shores of the Black Sea*. Stuttgart.

Harland, Philip A., Richard S. Ascough, and John S. Kloppenborg, eds. 2012. *Associations in the Greco-Roman World: A Sourcebook*. Waco, Texas.

Harvey, F. D. 1985. Dona Ferentes: Apects of Bribery in Greek Politics. *History of Political Thought* 6: 76–117.

Hatzfeld, Jean. 1910. Inscriptions de Rhodes. *BCH* 34: 242–248.

Hedreen, Guy. 2014. Smikros and Epilykos: Two Comic Inventions in Athenian Vase-Painting. In John Oakley, ed. *Athenian Potters and Painters III*. London, 49–62.

Hunter, Virginia J. 1994. *Policing Athens: Social Control in the Attic Lawsuits, 420–320 B.C.* Princeton.

Ivantchik, Askold I. 2006. 'Scythian' Archers on Archaic Attic Vases: Problems of Interpretation. *Ancient Civilizations from Scythia to Siberia* 12: 197–271.

Jacopi, Giulio. 1932. Nuove epigrafi dalle Sporadi meridionali. *Clara Rhodos* 2: 165–256.

Janouchová, Petra. 2013. The Cult of Bendis in Athens and Thrace. *Graeco-Latina Brunensia* 18: 95–106.

Jenkins, Richard. 1994. Rethinking Ethnicity: Identity, Categorization and Power. *ERS* 17: 197–223.

Jones, Nicholas F. 1999. *The Associations of Classical Athens: The Response to Democracy*. Oxford.

Kamen, Deborah. 2013. *Status in Classical Athens*. Princeton.

Kloppenborg, John S., and Richard S. Ascough. 2011. *Greco-Roman Associations: Texts, Translations, and Commentary. I. Attica, Central Greece, Macedonia, Thrace*. Berlin.

Laing, Donald Rankin. 1965. *A New Interpretation of the Athenian Naval Catalogue IG II² 19*. Ph.D. University of Cincinnati.

Lambert, Stephen D. 2010. A Polis and Its Priests: Athenian Priesthoods before and after Pericles' Citizenship Law. *Historia* 59: 143–175.

Lape, Susan. 2010. *Race and Citizen Identity in the Classical Athenian Democracy*. Cambridge.

Leone, Barbara. 2017. Dedica degli Aeinautai di Eretria. *Axon* 1: 97–103.

Lewis, David. 2011. Near Eastern Slaves in Classical Attica and the Slave Trade with Persian Territories. *CQ* 61: 91–113.

– 2015. The Market for Slaves in the Fifth- and Fourth-Century Aegean: Achaemanid Anatolia as a Case Study. In Edward M. Harris, David Lewis, and Mark Woolmer, eds. *The Ancient Greek Economy*. Cambridge, 316–336.

– 2017a. Notes on Slave Names, Ethnicity, and Identity in Classical and Hellenistic Greece. *U Schyłku Starożytności: Studia Źródłoznawcze* 16: 183–213.

– 2017b. Orlando Patterson, Property, and Ancient Slavery: The Definitional Problem Revisited. In John Bodel and Walter Scheidel, eds. *On Human Bondage: After Slavery and Social Death*. Chichester, 31–54.

Lewis, David M. 1997. After the Profanation of the Mysteries. *Selected Papers in Greek and Near Eastern History*. Cambridge, 158–172.

Lin, Nan. 1999. Building a Network Theory of Social Capital. *Connections* 22: 28–51.

Long, Timothy. 1986. *Barbarians in Greek Comedy*. Carbondale.

Marger, Martin N. 1991. *Race and Ethnic Relations: American and Global Perspectives*. Belmont, CA.

Mitchell, B. M. 1975. Herodotus and Samos. *JHS* 95: 75–91.

Morelli, Donato. 1956. Gli stranieri in Rodi. *SCO* 5: 126–190.

Morris, Ian. 1998. Remaining Invisible: The Archaeology of the Excluded in Classical Athens. In Sandra Rae Joshel and Sheila Murnaghan, eds. *Women and Slaves in Greco-Roman Culture: Differential Equations*. London, 199–226.

– 2011. Archaeology and Greek Slavery. In Keith Bradley and Paul Cartledge, eds. *The Cambridge World History of Slavery: Volume 1: The Ancient Mediterranean World*. Cambridge, 176–193.

Nielsen, Thomas Heine, Lars Bjertrup, Mogens Herman Hansen, Lene Rubinstein, and Torben Vestergaard. 1989. Athenian Grave Monuments and Social Class. *GRBS* 30: 411–420.

Niku, Maria. 2007. *The Official Status of the Foreign Residents in Athens, 322-120 B.C.* Papers and Monographs of the Finnish Institute at Athens 12. Helsinki.

Noonan, Thomas S. 1973. The Grain Trade of the Northern Black Sea in Antiquity. *AJPh* 94: 231–242.

Osborne, Michael J. 1996. *The Foreign Residents of Athens: An Annex to the Lexicon of Greek Personal Names: Attica*. Studia Hellenistica 33. Leuven.

Osborne, Robin. 1985. *Demos: The Discovery of Classical Attika*. Cambridge.

Ostwald, M. 1991. Herodotus and Athens. *Illinois Classical Studies* 16: 137–148.

Patterson, Orlando. 1982. *Slavery and Social Death: A Comparative Study*. Cambridge, MA.

Pečírka, Jan. 1966. *The Formula for the Grant of Enktesis in Attic Inscriptions*. Acta Universitatis Carolinae. Philosophica et Historica. Monographia 15. Prague.

Petrakos, Basile. 1963. Dédicace des AEINAYTAI d'Érétrie. *BCH* 87: 545–547.

Phinney, Jean S. 1990. Ethnic Identity in Adolescents and Adults: Review of Research. *Psychological Bulletin* 108: 499–514.

Planeaux, Christopher. 2000. The Date of Bendis' Entry into Attica. *CJ* 96: 165–192.

Plassart, Agnès. 1913. Les archers d'Athènes. *REG* 26, no. 117: 151–213.

Pouilloux, Jean, and C. Dunant. 1954. *Recherches sur l'histoire et les cultes de Thasos*. Études thasiennes 3. Paris.

Pritchett, W. Kendrick. 1953. The Attic Stelai, Part I. *Hesperia* 22: 225–299.

Pritchett, W. Kendrick, and Anne Pippin. 1956. The Attic Stelai: Part II. *Hesperia* 25: 178–328.

Pugliese Carratelli, G. 1955. Nuovo supplemento epigrafico rodio. *ASAA* 33–34: 157–181.

Robertson, Bruce. 2008. The Slave-Names of *IG* I³ 1032 and the Ideology of Slavery at Athens. In Craig Cooper, ed. *Epigraphy and the Greek Historian*. Phoenix Supplementary Volumes. Toronto, 79–116.

Rosivach, Vincent J. 1999. Enslaving 'Barbaroi' and the Athenian Ideology of Slavery. *Historia* 48: 129–157.

Rostovtzeff, Michael Ivanovitch. 1922. *Iranians and Greeks in South Russia*. Oxford.

Rotstein, Andrea. 2007. Critias' Invective against Archilochus. *CPh* 102: 139–154.

Sacco, G. 1980. Sul alcuni etnici di stranieri in Rodi. *RAL* 25: 517–528.

Sears, Matthew A. 2013. *Athens, Thrace, and the Shaping of Athenian Leadership*. Cambridge.

– 2015. Athens. In Julia Valeva, Emil Nankov, and Denver Graninger, eds. *A Companion to Ancient Thrace*. London. 308–319.

Skinner, Joseph. 2012. *The Invention of Greek Ethnography: From Homer to Herodotus*. Oxford.

Sosin, Joshua D. 2016. A Metic Was a Metic. *Historia* 65: 2–13.

Stavrianopoulou, Eftychia. 2006. Gemeinsam feiern, getrennt verehren: Zum Kult der thrakischen Göttin Bendis in Attika. In Stefan Weinfurter, Gerald Schwedler, Claus Ambos, and Stephan Hotz, eds. *Die Welt der Rituale: Von der Antike bis heute*. Darmstadt, 144–155.

Stroud, Ronald S. 1998. *The Athenian Grain-Tax Law of 374/3 B.C.* Hesperia Supplements 29. Princeton, NJ.

Taylor, Claire. 2001a. Bribery in Athenian Politics Part I: Accusations, Allegations, and Slander. *Greece & Rome* 48: 53–66.

– 2001b. Bribery in Athenian Politics Part II: Ancient Reaction and Perceptions. *Greece & Rome* 48: 154–172.

Trevett, Jeremy. 1992. *Apollodoros, the Son of Pasion*. Oxford.

Tsetskhladze, Gocha. 2008. Pontic Slaves in Athens: Orthodoxy and Reality. In Peter Mauritsch, ed. *Antike Lebenswelten: Konstanz, Wandel, Wirkungsmacht. Festschrift für Ingomar Weiler zum 70. Geburtstag*. Philippika. Marburger altertumskundliche Abhandlungen. Wiesbaden, 309–320.

Ustinova, Yulia. 1999. *The Supreme Gods of the Bosporan Kingdom*. RGRW 135. Leiden.

Velkov, Velizar, and Aleksandre Fol. 1977. *Les Thraces en Égypte gréco-romaine*. Studia Thracica 4. Sofia.

Vlassopoulos, Kostas. 2009. Slavery, Freedom and Citizenship in Classical Athens: Beyond a Legalistic Approach. *European Review of History / Revue Européenne d'histoire* 16: 347–363.

– 2010. Athenian Slave Names and Athenian Social History. *ZPE* 175: 113–144.

– 2011. Greek Slavery: From Domination to Property and Back Again. *JHS* 131: 115–130.

Whitehead, David. 1977. *The Ideology of the Athenian Metic*. Cambridge Philological Society Supplement 4. Cambridge.

– 1986. *The Demes of Attica 508/7 – ca. 250 B.C.: A Political and Social Study.* Princeton.

Wijma, Sara. 2010. Joining the Athenian Community: The Participation of Metics in Athenian Polis Religion in the Fifth and Fourth Centuries B.C. Ph.D. Utrecht University.

Woodhead, A. G. 1969. Review of: The Formula for the Grant of Enktesis in Attic Inscriptions by J. Pečírka. *JHS* 89: 161–162.

Wrenhaven, Kelly. 2013. Barbarians at the Gate: Foreign Slaves in Greek City-States. *Electryone* 1: 1–17.

Yinger, J. Milton. 1981. Toward a Theory of Assimilation and Dissimilation. *ERS* 4: 249–264.

– 1994. *Ethnicity: Source of Strength? Source of Conflict?* Albany.

Philip A. Harland, Humanities and History, York University, Vanier 248, 4700 Keele St, Toronto, ON M3J 1P3, Canada

pharland@yorku.ca