

The Bosphoran Kings and Classical Athens: Imagined Breaches in a Cordial Relationship (Aisch. 3.171-172; [Dem.] 34.36)

David Braund



Our knowledge of the relationship between the Athenian democratic state and the rulers of the Bosphoros depends on very different kinds of evidence. At one extreme we have inscribed decrees: their contents provide unimpeachable data about the relationship, though neither singly nor collectively can they offer much more than a series of momentary insights. Moreover, even if we had every decree passed on the relationship (and we may be sure enough that we do not), the formal outcomes which these decrees present tell us very little about the broader social, economic and political context which caused them.

By contrast, at the other extreme we have the orators, especially Aischines and Demosthenes. There can hardly be more slippery sources of information. That fact is well-known as a general principle: it is well understood, by and large, that the orators distort, deliberately misrepresent and deploy every trick they have at their disposal to win the argument. Limitations to their artful deception are provided only by the general plausibility of their statements in the minds of their audiences at the time of delivery: what they say need not be simply true, but it must appear plausible. And, the orators offer the modern historian excellent insight into what was deemed plausible at the time of speaking. Accordingly, their speeches (the work of orators of a standard beyond basic competence) may be taken to offer what an audience was expected to want to hear, to respond to with warmth, belief and even pleasure. But they may well not (though they may) describe events, persons and relationships in a way that would satisfy modern standards of historical truth. After all, these are not histories, but speeches in direct contest with each other, often with major matters at stake (and usually we only have one side of the argument). It is worth insisting on this simple point because, however much it may be understood as a general phenomenon, that understanding has not always been brought to bear on the particular relationship between Athens and the Bosphoros.

Any interpretation of Athens' dealings with the Bosphoran rulers requires the reconciliation of these extremely different kinds of evidence. That can

only be a very delicate procedure, especially in view of the enormous gaps in our evidence of any sort. All the more so when we bear in mind (as we must) that democratic Athens created and maintained its relations with the Bosporos and other states and rulers through public debate. Open discussion and argument was characteristic of all aspects of Athenian public life: such was typical of democracy and recognised as such by the many ancient critics of the system (e.g. Hdt. 3.80-82). Accordingly, the internal political struggles and rivalries of the Athenians were readily caught up with and expressed in the foreign relations of the Athenian democracy as a whole. So much is obvious enough, for example, in the hostility between Demosthenes and Aischines, which we find played out in the context of the Athenian state's complex dealings with Philip II of Macedon. It would be naïve to expect that it was otherwise in Athens' dealings with other powers about whom we know less, including the rulers of the Bosporos. Rather, it is to be expected that the Athenian democracy's relations with the Bosporan rulers were caught up not only in the conflict between Aischines and Demosthenes, but also in the plurality of other rivalries which formed the sinews of the democracy at work.

In view of all that, there is in fact a remarkable consistency in the direct statements in our sources of all types about the political relationship between the Athenian democratic state and the rulers of the Bosporos. Our sources offer a consistent picture of friendship and cooperation which may seem all the more surprising when traced across more than a century from the early years of the Spartokids down to the time of Alexander and indeed well beyond. Since those years involved changing circumstances, not least changes of ruler in the Bosporos, it is easy enough to understand why some modern scholars have tried to find dissonances in the extended harmony. By making subtle inferences from our very different sources, scholars have claimed to find at least two periods of disharmony, indeed even outright hostility, between Athens and the Bosporos. In what follows I shall review the evidence and attempt to demonstrate that it does not permit such inferences. Remarkable as it is, the political relationship between the Athenian democracy and the rulers of the Bosporos does indeed seem to have remained harmonious, as far as we can form any judgment at all.

Gylon and the "tyrants" of the Bosporos

The case of Gylon has been taken to show an early breach between Athens and the Bosporans. For Aischines claims that Gylon had betrayed the city of Nymphaion to Athens' enemies and had subsequently been granted the town of Kepoi ("Gardens") by the rulers of the Bosporos:

"There was a certain Gylon of Kerameis. He, having betrayed to the enemy Nymphaion in the Black Sea (a place which the city

then held), became an exile from the city to escape impeachment, and was condemned to death.¹ He reached the Bosporos where he received as a gift from the tyrants so-called Gardens. And he married a woman who was wealthy, for sure, and brought him much gold, but who was a Scythian by blood. From her he had two daughters, whom he sent here with substantial wealth... Demosthenes of Paiania took to wife the second of these, ignoring the laws of the city; it was she that bore you this busybody and informer. So by inheritance from his grandfather he would be an enemy of the people (for you condemned his forbears to death), while by inheritance from his mother he would be a Scythian, a barbarian playing the Greek in his speech. Therefore, with regard to his misconduct he is not a native of the city" (Aisch. 3.171-172. Author's translation)

This kind of vitriol is typical enough of the orators. And it is entirely in place among the insults and denunciations traded back and forth between Aischines and Demosthenes. That is enough to warn us that caution is needed: Aischines' whole interest in the story of Gylon is that it can be used to discredit Demosthenes. What, then, can be made of the story?

First, we should observe the chronology. Aischines delivered his speech in 330 BC. The date of Gylon's activities cannot be fixed with any precision, but is usually and reasonably located in the closing stages of the Peloponnesian War. In other words, more than 70 years had elapsed between Gylon's alleged treachery and Aischines' speech. That is important because it means that Aischines could be confident that his audience would have no direct knowledge of events at Nymphaion. He knew that he could make allegations which might be believed. Gylon had died by the later 380s, so that few in 330 would have much memory of him at all.²

Secondly, Athenian law. Condemnation to death would be appropriate enough for treason, which no doubt leads Aischines to claim that Gylon was so condemned. It also helps his further claim to the effect that Demosthenes hated the Athenian people. However, the disputes after Gylon's death have not a word to say about any such condemnation. Rather, Gylon seems to have been fined, and not necessarily for events at Nymphaion: the issue after his death was whether or not he had paid the fine, which he seems in fact to have done.³ A fine sits less well with a major act of treachery, though it cannot be ruled out *a priori*.⁴ Meanwhile, the good marriages made by Gylon's daughters (named Kleoboule and Philia) surely establish beyond much doubt that any crime he had committed had left no great stain on his family. Both daughters married men of considerable social standing at Athens within a couple of decades of the supposed treason: while Kleoboule married Demosthenes' father, Philia married the prominent Demochares.⁵ There

can have been no question-mark against their Athenian citizenship. Gylon's marriage had presumably taken place by 403/2 BC when the Athenian law on citizenship was re-asserted after the upheavals of the Peloponnesian War and its aftermath.⁶ After all Gylon had many choices: he did not need to find husbands for his daughters at Athens. That he did so is a further indication of Aischines' misrepresentation: Gylon retained and valued his links with Athens and may well have returned there in person, if only to arrange his daughters' marriages. But Aischines could be sure enough that his audience in 330 would have known little or nothing of all these details.

We do not know the identity of the "Scythian" lady whom Gylon married: she was hardly a nomad, as Aischines alleges elsewhere (2.78; cf. 180). Most probably she was a member of the Bosphoran elite, even the ruling Spartokid dynasty, for such a wife would have been appropriate to the master of Kepoi. As such she would more usually have been considered a Greek. There is no reason to query Aischines' claim that she was wealthy, but Gylon would have had enough opportunity to amass wealth for himself anyway at Kepoi. Presumably Aischines depicts her as a Scythian because he can thereby direct at Demosthenes all the negative stereotypes that might be evoked by such ethnicity, in particular bloodthirstiness, stupidity and idiosyncratic (at best) oratory. Typically enough the vitriol of the orator plays also with the humour more familiar on the comic stage: Aischines' attack involves mockery as well as insult. Both in the courts and on the comic stage it was quite usual to offer (and receive) insults and allegations about matters of citizenship and ethnic identity, however preposterous they might be.⁷ To that extent, in suggesting that Demosthenes was really a Scythian, Aischines is indulging in an accepted ploy of rhetoric and abuse. At the same time, latent also in his rhetoric is an auxiliary explanation for Demosthenes' hostility to Philip, which Aischines may mean also to insinuate. For earlier in the speech he had noted Philip's expedition against the Scythians (3.128-129, stressing bribery): small wonder, Aischines may imply, that the Scythian Demosthenes did not like him.

Thirdly, Nymphaion and the Bosphoros. Nymphaion lies only some 15 km from Pantikapaion, the key city of the Crimean part of Bosphoros. Its good harbour was a notable feature. We are told by a fragment of Krateros's *Decrees* (quoted by Harpokration) that it paid tribute of one talent to Athens.⁸ How the Bosphoran rulers viewed this arrangement is simply beyond our knowledge. It is easy enough to suppose that they resented Athenian interference in their own area. Yet it is as easy to suppose that they welcomed a friendly force which could support and perhaps even extend their dominions over their many neighbours.⁹ The appointment of Gylon at Kepoi might (though it need not) be interpreted as an indication of such an attitude. After all, scholars have often observed that the emergence in c. 437 BC of the Spartokids is more-or-less contemporary with Perikles' expedition into the

Black Sea, which left an Athenian presence at Sinope and perhaps Amisos. The coincidence has encouraged the thought that Perikles may have played some part in the creation of the Spartokid kingdom. However, that intriguing and suggestive coincidence has recently been disturbed by the publication of an Athenian casualty-list, which seems to show Athenian losses around Sinope in the later 430s. It has been taken, therefore, to offer a date for Perikles' expedition a few years after the emergence of the Spartokids in c. 437. But the new list cannot do that much. No doubt the process of Athenian settlement at Sinope took some time and the process may have entailed significant resistance and Athenian casualties. Accordingly, the casualty-list can do no more than suggest a *terminus ante quem* for Perikles' expedition.¹⁰

Further, it has often been thought that Gylon was in command of an Athenian garrison there, though even Aischines does not say that. In fact Aischines has nothing to say about Gylon's official position at the time of his alleged treason at Nymphaion; it is even possible that he did not have one. But what did Gylon actually do? The crucial observation is that even Aischines does not say that Gylon betrayed Nymphaion to the Bosporans, though he has often been taken to do so.¹¹ In fact, he suggests quite the opposite. We should not be surprised that he does not clarify the matter, for it was of no particular concern to him and his argument: the treason itself was enough, while the precise identity of the enemy did not much matter. Indeed, if the treason is itself Aischines' exaggeration (or even, to take an extreme position which cannot be wholly excluded, his invention), the orator may well have found it difficult to identify the enemy to whom Gylon betrayed Nymphaion. In any event, it was not the Bosporans, for then Aischines would have said so, and perhaps made some further remark about Kepoi and perhaps the "Scythian" wife as Gylon's reward for his treachery. He does not. On the contrary, he first speaks of "the enemy" and then shifts to talking of the Bosporans, with no sign that they are the enemy of whom he was speaking. He could not suppose that his audience would identify the two, even if the Bosporans had been the enemy in question: his expression is against it, while, as we have seen, the chronology is against much memory of these events in Athens of the 330s. Indeed, it is symptomatic that he mentions the Bosporans as "the tyrants": that was a possible usage at Athens when speaking of the rulers of Bosporos in 330, but it was hardly appropriate to the Bosporan regime of the late fifth century BC, where Satyros seems to have presided alone.¹²

Where in all this can one find a breach in the friendship between Athens and the Bosporos? They are not "the enemy", who (if they are a reality) are best understood as anti-Athenian forces within Nymphaion itself, though it is likely enough that the Spartan harmost at Byzantion, Klearchos, probed into the Black Sea too. However, if we wish to press details in Aischines'

account (and we have seen how risky that must be), we might still take the Bosporan reception of fugitive Gylon as sufficient sign of a breach. However, that is hardly persuasive either. Even if we go so far as to accept Aischines' details, it remains to consider the context of all this: the closing years of the Peloponnesian War, as far as we can tell.

These were difficult and unstable years, especially under the Thirty at Athens. We know that Satyros took in Athenians at this time. The young aristocrat of Lysias 16, one Mantitheos, actually rebutted the suggestion of his complicity in the deeds of the Thirty by claiming to have spent these years at the court of Satyros (Lys. 16.4). The fact that he did so, shortly after the event establishes beyond reasonable doubt that not only was such a refuge acceptable in the minds of a contemporary Athenian audience, but Satyros was no enemy of the Athenian democracy in these years. If he had been, Mantitheos' defence would have been immediately self-defeating. No doubt Satyros had some difficulty in keeping up with the swiftly changing situation at Athens through defeat and violent oligarchy and back by force of arms to democracy. However, it is absolutely clear that once democracy was restored at Athens the Athenians looked upon Satyros without rancour and with active goodwill. Accordingly, the speaker of Isokrates' *Trapezitikos* of the 390s, after many indications of the cooperation of Athens and Satyros, concludes his case by urging the Athenians to remember all that Satyros has done for them in the past. Of course, he has in mind especially favours in grain-export, but the conclusion would be so clumsy as to be hardly thinkable if Satyros had been Athens' enemy only a few years earlier.

In this way the broadly contemporary evidence of Lysias and Isocrates amply confirms the case against any suggestion of a breach between the Bosporans and the Athenian democracy in the late fifth century BC. After all, even Aischines had not claimed that there was one, as we have seen. As for Gylon's alleged treason, the fact that neither Aischines nor, as far as we know, Demosthenes' other detractors choose elsewhere to harp on it must surely encourage us to think that this particular line of attack was not even very successful in 330. All the more so when we find those detractors casting other aspersions on Demosthenes' relationship with the Bosporans.¹³ Finally, it is surely telling against the veracity of Aischines' claims that even Plutarch voices his doubt about them and seems to have known them only from the speech of Aischines itself (Plut. *Dem.* 4).

Pairisades, Lampis and grain-privileges for Athens

The very fact that Athenian orators like Aischines and Deinarchos can be critical of Demosthenes' relations with the Bosporans has been taken to suggest a breach between the Athenian state and the rulers of the Bosporos.¹⁴ However, we should remember that the Athenian democracy was typified by disputes and contestation: it would be remarkable if there were no criti-

cal statements about the Bosporans, or about any of Athens' other friends and allies. Yet the fact is that in the works of Aischines and even Deinarchos we find scant criticism of the Bosporans: these orators' primary target is Demosthenes, through whom the Bosporans come into play only a little. It is true that in an attack upon Demosthenes Deinarchos calls the rulers of the Bosporos "tyrants", but not in a speech directed at them. Moreover, in contexts of this kind the term "tyrants" need not be critical: it was more likely to be neutral or even positive.¹⁵ Deinarchos' specific claim – that they send grain to Demosthenes – is about as harsh as his critique of the Bosporans gets: by the standards of Athenian oratory that hardly counts as criticism at all. It seems safer to argue that the rather delicate treatment of the Bosporans by Demosthenes' enemies suggests that the Athenian state remained on good terms with them. That Demosthenes' enemies did not wish to alienate the Bosporans is illustrated well enough by Androtion's sponsorship of honours for them. Demosthenes' enemies and rivals might well wish to supplant or challenge his particular links with the Bosporans, founded not least in his family ties, but there was not much to be gained from attacking the Bosporans themselves.¹⁶

However, it is a speech in the Demosthenic corpus which has given rise to the notion of a breach in cordial relations between Athens and the Bosporos in the fourth century BC, namely a passage in the *Against Phormio*:

"So if, gentlemen of the jury, it were only me that Lampis despised it would be nothing remarkable. But, as it is, he has done much worse than him (sc. Phormion) to you all. For when Pairisades made a proclamation in Bosporos that anyone taking grain to Athens, to the Attic emporion, would not pay tax on its export, Lampis, who was visiting the Bosporos, took on a load of grain for export and paid no tax by giving the name of Athens. When he had filled a large vessel with grain he carried it to Acanthos and there unloaded it..." ([Dem.] 34.36. Author's translation).

The argument for a breach rests on the interpretation of Pairisades' proclamation. The speech can be dated on internal evidence to summer 327.¹⁷ Since Pairisades attained sole rule in 344 or thereabouts, his proclamation at the time of Lampis' visit to the Bosporos shortly before the court-case of 327 is taken to show the absence of special privileges for grain-export to Athens in the first decade and more of his reign. Pairisades, it is argued, had chosen not to renew the privileges which Athens had enjoyed under his predecessors. That is the essence of the argument for a breach in cordial relations between Athens and the Bosporos.

However, although impressive at first sight, the argument is hardly strong. First, there is the general problem that we cannot press the details of

a lawcourt-speech like the *Against Phormio*. The fact that the prosecutor claims that events took a certain course in the Bosporos does not make it so, or so in precisely the way which the speaker leads us to think. In this case we should be especially on our guard because the speaker is using the proclamation to suggest that Lampis' behaviour is a slight not only against him but against the Athenian state itself. Moreover, there is an alternative interpretation which deserves serious attention. It has been observed that Pairisades was engaged in a war with the Scythians which, according to the speaker of the *Against Phormio*, had affected the Bosporan market to the extent that Phormion could not sell his imported wares (34.8). Here again, we need not believe him. However, if we do give him any credence on the point, it is not impossible to think that Pairisades' difficulties had caused some hiatus in his favours for Athens. We need not be surprised if, as the speaker claims, Phormion did not anticipate market-disruption until he reached the Bosporos (34.8), or indeed that goods could still be found to export, including grain (34.36).¹⁸

Moreover, there is a refinement to that explanation which needs to be considered before we go so far as to infer a breach between Athens and the Bosporans. We must begin by observing that the speaker does not say that Pairisades proclaimed tax-exemption for the first time in his reign when Lampis was in Bosporos, but only that he made a proclamation (or better had a proclamation made) that there was an exemption. What kind of proclamation? There is every reason to take this proclamation as a regular event, for that was one way in which the exemption could be kept a current matter of general knowledge.¹⁹ That was all the more important in view of the fact that the exporters might well be new to the Bosporos and its regulations. Even with civic honours the regular proclamation of a one-off decision was usual enough. For example in Hellenistic Chersonesos the award of a crown to an honoured citizen was proclaimed each year: this too, like the proclamation of Pairisades, is termed a *kerugma*, a proclamation.²⁰

However, the speaker talks of the *making* of a proclamation, which is paralleled in monarchical contexts of various kinds – both in the literary tradition and in epigraphy.²¹ His choice of expression better suits the issuing of a decision than the announcement of an established regulation. Once again our interpretation comes to depend on the precise and literal truth of the speaker's claim. We cannot be sure. However, we may proceed, at least provisionally, by taking the speaker's words to be a precise enough presentation of what happened, because his audience may well have included men who would have known about established practices in the Bosporos. Even if Pairisades really did make a proclamation of a new decision, as the speaker's language suggests, there is still no strong case for inferring a previous breach between him and Athens. For it is much easier to suppose that he (and perhaps previous rulers of the Bosporos) made a fresh proclamation

each year, having taken thought for the available harvest, the military situation, Athens' and Athenians' conduct and much else besides. What we hear from inscriptions and the orators about Bosphoran favours for Athens tends to suggest that Athens regularly benefited from such proclamations, but there is nothing in our sources to indicate that there was only one such proclamation per reign, as some scholars seem to have assumed.

If the proclamation is seen as a regular event in the Bosphoros (for example, an annual one) and if the statements of Deinarchos and Aischines are understood to be as restrained as they indeed are, we can dispense with the revisionist view that "Pairisades' policies, far from being beneficial to Athens, were for many years actually detrimental to her interests".²² There is no sign of that in *Against Phormio* or any of our other evidence. And once that step has been taken, there are no grounds for further hypotheses, for example, about the date at which Demosthenes had Pairisades' statue erected at Athens, which could as well be before 327 as after it. If, as is entirely possible, the statue was erected before 327, the limited significance of the proclamation (beyond the story of Phormion and Lampis) would be all the more apparent, for a statue seems unlikely if indeed Pairisades was at odds with Athens.²³

As we have seen, there is no reason to suppose that Pairisades was ever at odds with Athens, rather as there is also no sign of breach between Athens and Satyros decades earlier. Inevitably perhaps the conclusion is negative. However, it also has a positive side, for we may be confident enough in the remarkable continuity of good relations between the Athenian state and the rulers of the Bosphoros, for all the *lacunae* in our knowledge. Further, we have also acquired a methodological case-study: we should be slow to insist on the literal truth of the details of the claims made by orators in debate. Finally, those who choose to press hard the language of *Against Phormio* 36 can and probably should infer that Pairisades, and probably other Bosphoran rulers too, made a proclamation every year, usually but not inevitably to the benefit of those shipping grain to Athens. That this proclamation was a regular (presumably annual) event offers some further encouragement to the contemporary tendency among scholars to move away from once-popular notions of a bustling, vital and uninterrupted flow of grain from the Bosphoros to Athens.²⁴ However, while the export of Bosphoran grain to Athens may have always been a matter of uncertainty (despite the overblown claims of Demosthenes, in particular), there is no sign of a political rift between classical Athens and the Bosphoros, under Satyros I, Pairisades I or others.

Notes

1. As Hansen (1975, 84) implies, the full Greek text here is not always printed in modern editions, thanks to the predilections of its various editors. Here I trans-

- late Blass' Teubner edition, which refrains from editorial intervention at this point.
2. Gylon is referred to as dead in Dem. 28, occasioned by the famous property disputes in the aftermath of the death of Gylon's son-in-law, the father of Demosthenes the orator.
 3. Dem. 28.1-4. We may cautiously infer that he had paid the fine from the fact that Demosthenes won the dispute of which Dem. 28 forms part. Demosthenes accepts that Gylon had once had an outstanding fine.
 4. We are not told that the fine (as opposed to the alleged condemnation) was connected with events at Nymphaion. The notion that condemnation was commuted to a fine has found favour (e.g. Davies 1971, 121), but we need a plausible reason why that should have been done. Hansen (1975, 84) contends that the fine related to events after 403 BC; the evidence is thin.
 5. Badian (2000, 13-14) suspects that these prominent Athenians were attracted by the wealth of their brides, but that hardly affects the basic point: the daughters of a traitor, even wealthy, were an unlikely match for two such men. The name Philia is inferred from *IG II², 6737a*, cf. Davies 1971, 141-142 on her and the rest of Demochares' family.
 6. Marriage by 403/2 fits well enough with what we may infer about the age of Gylon's daughters, see Davies 1971, 121.
 7. On comedy in the law-courts, see Hall 1995; cf., on law and the courts on the comic stage, Carey 2000. On allegations about citizenship and ethnicity, see MacDowell 1993.
 8. Cf. also its possible mention in a fragment of the quota-lists, which has been put in doubt, perhaps irresponsibly.
 9. Gajdukevič (1971, 191) tends to the latter view.
 10. Burstein (1993, 82) seizes upon the inscription as evidence to show that Perikles' expedition had no part in the emergence of the Spartokids, after Clairmont 1979. On continuing issues there, cf. Thuc. 4.75; Justin 16.3.10.
 11. As by an ancient scholiast on the passage, properly castigated by Žhebelev 1953, 189-190; among recent examples, see Burstein 1993, esp. 82, while rightly observing how little we know about the earliest dealings between Athens and the Spartokids. A less than critical approach to Aischines' claims can still be taken: e.g. Skrzinska 1998, 172-173.
 12. For the usage, compare Deinarchos 1.43. Satyros is spoken of quite differently in Lysias 16 and Isokrates 17, though uncertainty about his regime must also be acknowledged: e.g. Werner 1955; Tuplin 1982.
 13. Cf. Deinarchos 1.15 on his "Scythian" blood and 1.43 on his receipt of grain from the Bosporean tyrants of his own day: Gylon's supposed treason is conspicuously absent. Plut. *Dem.* 4 shows that Theopompos did not have much to say about it all.
 14. Burstein 1978, esp. 430.
 15. Worthington (1992, 206) considers the term "tyrants" here to be insulting, citing Burstein's arguments. But see, for the opposite view, Kallet 1998, 52-53 and the literature she cites.
 16. *IG II², 653*; Davies (1971, 514) notes also the role of Polyeuktos, inheriting his father's link with Androtion. On Athenians' competition for Bosporean favours, see Košelenko 2002 and the Russian literature he cites.
 17. Isager & Hansen 1975, 169.
 18. *Pace* Burstein (1978, 431, esp. n. 16), where he also supposes that Pairisades was at Pantikapaion, which is beyond our evidence: certainly he did not need to be there for a proclamation to be made there in his name.

19. Brashinsky (1971, 120-121) sees the proclamation as Pairisades' confirmation, but he seems not to envisage a regular announcement.
20. *IOSPE F*, 353, in Doric as *karugma*, of course. The term seems not to occur at all in Bosporan epigraphy. Burstein's objection, that Lampis sought the privilege only after the proclamation, is not cogent, for not only does it press very hard the details of the speech, but it also assumes that Lampis must have known the arrangement in the Bosphorus before (Burstein 1978, 431, n. 13).
21. For a royal proclamation, e.g. *Syll.*³, 741, line 20; cf. [Arist.] *Oec.* 1349b, 1351b. In fourth century BC oratory, compare especially Hyperides, *Dem.* 34 (sadly fragmentary).
22. Burstein 1978, 433. *Pace* Burstein, the rate of imports of Athenian goods is hardly traceable archaeologically without significant reservations, but is in any event irrelevant. As [Dem.] 34 and 35 both seem to show, ships might trade to the Bosphorus from Athens in goods from elsewhere, e.g. the wine of Chalkidike. See further, Kuznecov 2000.
23. Burstein (1978, 433) tries to group events around what he takes to be the key proclamation of 327 BC, but without sufficient reason. For example, even his attempt to place the erection of the statue between 330 and 324 rests on inferences from the rhetorical choices of Aischines and Deinarchos. As he fairly states, the date is not attested: we cannot proceed beyond that.
24. Kuznecov 2000 offers a valuable and critical review of the scholarly literature.

Bibliography

- Badian, E. 2000. The road to prominence, in: I. Worthington (ed.), *Demosthenes, statesman and orator*. London, 9-44.
- Brashinsky, I.B. 1971. Epigraphical evidence on Athens's relations with the North Pontic Greek states, in: *Acta of the fifth international congress of Greek and Latin epigraphy, Cambridge 1967*. Oxford, 119-124.
- Burstein, S.M. 1978. IG II² 653, Demosthenes and Athenian relations with Bosphorus in the fourth century BC, *Historia* 27, 428-436.
- Burstein, S.M. 1993. The origin of the Athenian privileges at Bosphorus: a reconsideration, *American History Bulletin* 7, 81-83.
- Carey, C. 2000. Comic law, *Annali dell' Università di Ferrara* n.s.1, 65-85.
- Clairmont, C.W. 1979. New light on some public Athenian documents of the 5th and 4th century, *ZPE* 36, 123-126.
- Davies, J.K. 1971. *Athenian propertied families*. Oxford.
- Gajdukevič, V.F. 1971 (revd. German edn.). *Das Bosporanische Reich*. Berlin.
- Hall, E. 1995. Lawcourt dramas, *BICS* 40, 39-58.
- Hansen, M.H. 1975. *Eisangelia*. Odense.
- Isager, S. & M.H. Hansen 1975. *Aspects of Athenian society in the fourth century BC*. Odense.
- Kallet, L. 1998. Accounting for culture in fifth century Athens, in: D. Boedeker & K. Raaflaub (eds.), *Democracy, empire and the arts in fifth century Athens*. Cambridge, Mass., 43-58.
- Košelenko, G.A. 2002. Ešče odin predstavitel' Bosporskogo lobbi v Afinach?, *Drevnosti Bospora* 5, 133-138.

- Kuznecov, V.D. 2000. Afiny i Bospor: chlebnaja trgovlja, *RossA* 1, 107-119.
- MacDowell, D.M. 1993. Foreign birth and Athenian citizenship, in: A. Sommerstein et al. (eds.), *Tragedy, comedy and the polis*. Bari, 359-371.
- Skržinskaja, M.V. 1998. *Skifija glazami ellinov*. St Peterburg.
- Tuplin, C. 1982. Satyros and Athens: IG II² 212 and Isokrates 17.5, *ZPE* 49, 121-128.
- Werner, R. 1955. Die Dynastie der Spartokiden, *Historia* 4, 412-444.
- Worthington, I 1992. *A historical commentary on Dinarchus*. Ann Arbor.
- Žebelev, S.A. 1953. *Severnoe Pričernomor'e*. Moskva-Leningrad.

Abbreviations

- IOSPE* B. Latyshev, *Inscriptiones antiquae orae septentrionalis Ponti Euxini Graecae et Latinae*. Petropolis 1885-1916.
- Syll.*³ W. Dittenberger, *Sylloge inscriptionum Graecarum*, vols. I-IV. Leipzig 1915-1924 (3rd ed.).