

ANGELOS CHANIOTIS

MOBILITY OF PERSONS DURING THE HELLENISTIC WARS

STATE CONTROL AND PERSONAL RELATIONS

War mobility : a general characterization

Around 220 B.C. the Knossians attacked the city of Lyttos, which had been left defenceless, since the armed men were participating in a campaign. As Polybios reports (4.54) the city was taken and destroyed completely, women and children were captured. When the Lyttians returned to their city and saw what had happened, they lamented the fate of their country, turned their backs on it and retired to Lappa, more than 300 km to the west as the crow flies. The Lappaeanes received them with kindness and cordiality¹.

A roughly contemporary inscription from Aigiale contains an honorary decree for two courageous citizens² : «During the night pirates landed in our territory and virgins and (married) women and other persons, both free and slaves, were captured – a total of more than thirty persons; and (the pirates) destroyed the ships in the harbour and captured the ship of Dorieus, with which they departed carrying away both the persons and the rest of the booty; when this occurred, Hegesippos and Antipappos, the sons of Hegesistratos, who were among the captives, jointly persuaded the leader of the pirates, Sokleidas, who was sailing along with them, to release the free persons, also some of the freedmen and the slaves, while they offered themselves as hostages.»

A third document, this time a treaty between the dynast Eupolemos, the besieged city of Theangela and its mercenaries (c. 310 B.C.) concerns itself, among other thing, with various groups of persons that were given immunity (*adeia*) by the victorious

¹ For epigraphic publications I use the abbreviations used in *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum* ; all dates are BC, if not otherwise indicated.

² A. Bielman, *Retour à la liberté. Libération et sauvetage des prisonniers en Grèce ancienne*, Paris, 1994, n° 38.

dynast³ : they included the Ereinaieis (probably allies of Theangela that were in the city on the moment of its capitulation), the deserted soldiers of Eupolemos who had sought refuge in the city, and runaway slaves. In addition to this Eupolemos promised to pay the wages of the mercenaries, which Theangela had hired for this war, and offered them the option either to serve in his army and settle in Pentachora or to leave, marching through the territory of Eupolemos without having to pay any taxes for their movables.

Several questions arise from these narratives. What happened to the captive women and children of Lyttos? When arriving at Lappa did the Lyttians claim the right of refuge on the basis of an already existing treaty (e.g., a treaty of isopolity or alliance) or was a decree of Lappa moved to this effect? When the pirates released the captives they had made in Aigiale, keeping the citizens and a few hostages, how could they be sure that they would receive a substantial ransom and would not just loose a potential profit? How did they distinguish between citizens, freedmen and slaves among their captives⁴? What had been the status of the deserters from Eupolemos' army while resident in Theangela? And how could the authorities at Theangela distinguish between deserters and runaway slaves, between the slaves who run away at peace time and those who run away during the war?

We are familiar with similar problems from our own days. The fate of thousands of Cypriotes thirty years after the war of 1974 is equally unknown as that of the Lyttian women; refugees cross the borders of states, often intentionally destroying any documentation of their identity; and even in a period in which every passenger in an airplane has a passport or an other form of identification, hijackers might still have difficulties in sorting out which of their victims, e.g., with an American passport, really belongs to a hostile or friendly nation.

When references to refugees and the administrative, economic, and other problems – imaginary or not – connected with their presence abound in newspapers and headline news in a world with a developed international law, we should expect that, in a world which knew only brief periods of peace and lacked the modern instruments of international law, our sources would continually be referring to the chaotic conditions caused by the uncontrolled presence of persons relocated from their fatherlands because of wars. This is not the case. The new comedy often refers to a child of

³ *Staatsverträge* 429.

⁴ For the differentiated treatment of captives according to status see P. Ducrey, *Le traitement des prisonniers de guerre dans la Grèce antique des origines à la conquête romaine*, Paris, 1999 (second edition), p. 283-288.

citizen status that was captured by pirates, enemies, or runaway slaves, but we are dealing with individuals not with masses and there is always a reassuring happy end (e.g., Plautus, *Captivi*, *Curulio*, *Menaechmi*, *Persa*, and *Rudens*). Aeneas Tacticus' alludes to the dangers originating in the presence of uncontrolled persons in a besieged city, but his brief comments are no compensation for the lack of detailed regulations⁵.

What are we to make of the silence of our Hellenistic sources about the problems of control connected with war mobility? Did the problems not exist? We may observe a similar silence in the case of other problems caused by Hellenistic wars, e.g., in the case of invalidity and orphans. Were the Hellenistic Greeks indifferent? Or were the mechanisms of solving these problems of such a nature that they are not reflected in the predominantly public record? In this paper I will suggest that the latter is the case, stressing the fact that, with the exception of mercenary soldiers who represented a controlled mobility, the fate of the other major categories of persons depended on personal relations and initiatives. But first let us have a look at the diversity and the dimensions of war mobility.

In the three sources I summarised above – as in the majority of our literary and documentary sources – the mobility of persons caused by Hellenistic wars appears as sharing several general features :

- it is involuntary (with the notable exception of the mercenary service);
- it is massive;
- it is anonymous and impersonal;
- it is «gendered» and socially relevant, since its specific form depends on gender (e.g.; fugitive men, captured women), age (children versus adults), and status (citizen versus non-citizen, free vs. non free, wealthy versus poor);
- it is not certain whether it will be temporary or permanent.

Polybius' narrative refers to two aspects of mobility caused by a war : the carrying away of prisoners of war (in this case women and children) and the migration of the population of destroyed cities; the honorary decree for the two brave men from Aigiale and the treaty of Theangela add further groups : captives of pirates, hostages⁶, deserters, runaway slaves, mercenaries. In addition to

⁵ See especially Aen. 10.12-13 with the comments by D. Whitehead, *Aineias the Tactician, How to Survive under Siege. Translated with Introduction and Commentary*, Oxford, 1990.

⁶ For hostages see M. Amit, *Hostages in Ancient Greece*, in *RFIC*, 98, 1970, p. 129-147; see, e.g., *Staatsverträge*, 472; *Syll.*³ 519; Welles, *RC* 54.

this specific 'war mobility', various itinerant groups of persons (envoys, entertainers, artists, athletes, physicians, traders, sacred envoys etc.), that were on the move both during wars and at peace time, faced serious problems of security in times of war.

These problems are not at all negligible given the almost endemic nature of Hellenistic wars, the legal consequences of which are clearly illustrated by the aforementioned episode in Cretan history : the destruction of Lyttos. The entire population of Lyttos was relocated, part of it only temporarily. As already mentioned, we do not know what happened to the captive women and children, but their fate is easily predictable : they were either sold as slaves or kept as hostages. The reaction of their husbands and fathers is also predictable : to try to find where they were kept and to try to ransom them. The legal issues in the relocation of the Lyttian men are no less complex. In order to get to Lappa (certainly by land), where they were given refuge, the Lyttians had to cross the borders of at least three states – depending on the route they followed, they marched either through the territory of Knossos, Tylisos, Axos and Eleutherna or through that of the Arkadians, Gortyn, and Sybrita. When arriving at Lappa they may have claimed the right of refuge on the basis of an already existing treaty (e.g., a treaty of isopolity or alliance); otherwise a decree of Lappa must have been moved to this effect, in the latter case initiated by the proxenos of Lyttos in Lappa.

The Hellenistic wars continually confronted the Greek communities with similar problems. Many of the relevant issues (e.g., the protection of envoys and fugitives) had long been the subject of customary, unwritten norms and were not addressed in written documents. Literary sources refer to these norms primarily to criticize their violation⁷.

The rules that applied to the treatment of individuals or larger groups are sometimes explicitly mentioned in bilateral treaties, e.g., in treaties concerning the employment of mercenaries, the mobility of transhumant shepherds, or the liberation of the victims of pirates⁸. In many cases they may be inferred from clauses in

⁷ See, e.g., P. Ducrey, *Le traitement ...* (cit. n. 4), p. 313-332 (with regard to the treatment of prisoners of war).

⁸ Treaties concerning mercenary service : e.g., P. Ducrey, *Nouvelles remarques sur deux traités aitalides avec des cités crétoises*, in *BCH* 94, 1970, p. 637-659; *Staatsverträge*, 551. Mobility of transhumant shepherds : L. Robert, *Les chèvres d'Héracléia*, in *Hellenica*, 7, 1949, p. 161-170; A. Chaniotis, *Milking the Mountain : Economic activities on the Cretan uplands in the Classical and Hellenistic period*, in A. Chaniotis (ed.), *From Minoan Farmers to Roman Traders. Sidelights on the Economy of Ancient Crete*, Stuttgart, 1999, p. 192-205. Treaties concerning the liberation of captives of pirates : J. Herrmann, *Zum Rechtshilfevertrag zwischen Milet und Gortyn*, in *ZPE*, 17, 1975, p. 127-139. In general, see Ph. Gauthier, *Sym-*

honorific decrees or other public documents. One of the most common clauses in both honorary decrees of individuals and in bilateral treaties is, e.g., the guarantee of the safety of the travellers and their property both in peace time and during wars (*asphaleia kai autois kai chremasin kai kata gen kai kata thalassan kai polemou kai eirenes*; e.g. in *Staatsverträge* 542 and 564). But in most cases the control of the mobility of persons relied on the initiative not so much of authorities, but rather of private persons. This difference becomes clear if we study the distinct categories of war mobility separately, contrasting the controlled mobility of mercenaries to the uncontrolled mobility of deserters, refugees, runaway slaves, and prisoners.

Mercenaries

The service of mercenary soldiers is a form of massive, but usually temporary mobility. The treaties determine the number of the mercenaries and their conditions of service (payment, transportation, etc.), only rarely making provisions about a potential stay in the area of service⁹. Of course, we may presuppose the existence of arrangements for the settlement of mercenaries in new foundations and military colonies, as the ones mentioned in Antiochos' III letter concerning the relocation of Jews¹⁰.

Mercenary soldiers moved in organised groups, in controlled numbers and, often, under the command of their own officers or of *condottieri*¹¹. When they were sent by their native city in accordance with an agreement between the city and the potential employer (e.g., from Hierapytna to Rhodes), their native city had the responsibility for determining the persons that would participate in a particular campaign and usually kept lists with the names of the soldiers (*katagraphe, katalogismos*)¹²; catalogues were certainly also kept by

bola. Les étrangers et la justice dans les cités grecques, Nancy, 1972; for Crete see also G. Capdeville, *Le migrazioni interne nell'isola di Creta. Aspetti giuridici, economici e demografici*, in M. Sordi (ed.), *Emigrazione e immigrazione nel mondo antico*, Milano, 1994, p. 187-222.

⁹ E.g., the treaty between Eupolemos and the mercenaries in Theangela (c. 310 BC): *Staatsverträge*, 429.

¹⁰ Joseph., *Jewish Ant.* 12.149-53. Cf. G. M. Cohen, *The Seleucid Colonies. Studies in Founding, Administration, and Organization*, Wiesbaden, 1978, p. 5-9. For the Seleucid settlements, in general, see G. M. Cohen, *Hellenistic Settlements in Europe, the Islands, and Asia Minor*, Berkeley-Los Angeles-Oxford, 1995; cf. R. A. Billows, *Kings and Colonists: Aspects of Macedonian Imperialism*, Leiden, 1995.

¹¹ W. K. Pritchett, *The Greek State at War. Part II*, Berkeley-Los Angeles-Oxford, 1974, p. 59-116.

¹² See e.g. SEG, XXIII 305 II 15f; A. Chaniotis, *Die Verträge zwischen kre-*

the recruiters of mercenaries (*xenologoi*)¹³ and the *condottieri*. The fact that in garrisoned cities we often find foreign women exactly from the areas from which the soldiers of the garrisons were recruited suggests that these women were dependents (wives, daughters, or sisters) of members of the garrison¹⁴. It is reasonable to assume that mercenaries who spent a longer service abroad brought members of their family to their place of service.

The movement of family members was not uncontrolled either. The best documented case is that of Miletos, which had to man numerous forts in Hybandis (on the former territory of Myous) and on the islands Patmos, Leros and Lepsia¹⁵. In the late third century (234/33 and 229/28) Miletos enfranchised more than 1,000 Cretan mercenaries, who settled with their families (c. 3,000-4,000 people) in the newly acquired territory of Hybandis, which was contested by Magnesia on the Maeander¹⁶. These persons were given citizenship and land in Miletos. The enfranchisement documents give the names of the men and their dependants. It seems probable that this massive exodus of Cretans was not the result of civil wars or wars, but the result of a planned effort of Miletos to recruit potential defenders of the new territory. Whether Miletos negotiated with the cities or the settlers first is not known, but seems to me plausible; at least some of the new settlers came under the leadership of *condottieri*¹⁷.

Some time later (ten years later according to one dating of the relevant documents, forty years later according to another) these Cretans attempted to return to Crete, probably after Miletos had lost the territory assigned to them. Their countrymen tried to prevent their return, and this became the subject of negotiations between

tischen Städten in der hellenistischen Zeit, Stuttgart, 1996, no. 59 l. 26. *Katalochismoi : I. Magnesia/Sipylos* 1 lines 45-46 (cf. *grammateis ton tagmaton*). For the military catalogues of Boiotian cities see R. Étienne and D. Knoepfler, *Hyettos de Béotie et la chronologie des archontes fédéraux entre 250 et 171 av. J.-C.*, Paris, 1976, p. 67-112, 202-212.

¹³ On *xenologoi* see M. Launey, *Recherches sur les armées hellénistiques. Réimpression avec addenda et mise à jour*, en postface par Y. Garlan, Ph. Gauthier and Cl. Orrieux, Paris 1987, p. 30-32.

¹⁴ A. Chaniotis, *Foreign Soldiers - Native Girls? Constructing and Crossing Boundaries in Hellenistic Cities with Foreign Garrisons*, in A. Chaniotis and P. Ducrey (ed.), *Army and Power in the Ancient World*, Stuttgart, 2002, p. 111.

¹⁵ I. Pimouguet, *Défense et territoire : l'exemple Milésien*, in *DHA*, 21.1, 1995, p. 89-109.

¹⁶ *Milet* I.3, 33-38; P. Brulé, *Enquête démographique sur la famille grecque antique. Étude de listes de politographie d'Asie mineure d'époque hellénistique (Milet et Ilios)*, in *REA*, 92, 1990, p. 238-242; P. Herrmann, *Inschriften von Milet. Teil 1*, Berlin, 1997, p. 160-164.

¹⁷ Philanor and Sof[---] in *Milet* I.3 33 g.

Miletos and the Cretan cities, the outcome of which is, unfortunately, unknown¹⁸.

A review of the evidence concerning the mercenaries shows a very particular case of a controlled movement of population: the numbers and the conditions of service were usually described in detail in bilateral treaties; the formulaic language and the standard content of the relevant clauses show the existence of generally applied norms; and the very nature of this mobility (military engagement) made it necessary that lists of the soldiers were kept (personal names, ethnics, reference to status or rank). This safeguarded the control of the foreigners during their temporary stay.

Even in the case of this controlled and regulated mobility we may observe the importance of personal relations when we study the marriage patterns of mercenaries. Soldiers were interested in producing legitimate heirs. This required a legitimate marriage. One expects mixed marriages in garrisoned sites, especially when the duration of the soldiers' service was long. In many Hellenistic cities the legitimacy of a marriage (and consequently the legitimacy of the offspring) required citizenship from both man and wife or was allowed on the basis of an interstate agreement (*epigamia*)¹⁹. We can observe the effect of this restriction on the marriage patterns of particular ethnic groups abroad. The Cretans present a good case. Their island was one of the main sources of mercenaries in the Hellenistic period, and consequently the Cretans attested in inscriptions of garrisoned areas can easily be recognized as soldiers. We find Cretan women present in places with Cretan garrisons, such as in the Antigonid garrisons of Attika, Euboia, and Thessaly, obviously the dependants of soldiers²⁰. Dryton, a descendant of Cretan mercenaries, was born around 195 BC as a citizen of the Greek city of Ptolemais in Egypt; as we can infer from the name of his father-in-law (Esthladas), his first wife, Sarapias, was also of Cretan descent and member of a citizen family; in this respect Dryton represents the pattern of marriage within the same ethnic

¹⁸ M. Launey, *Recherches ...* (cit. n. 13), p. 680f.; A. Chaniotis, *Die Verträge ...* (cit. n. 12), p. 284f.; A. Magonetto, *Gli arbitrati interstatali greci. Introduzione, testo critico, traduzione, commento e indici. Volume II. Dal 337 al 196 a.C.*, Pisa, 1997, p. 262-271.

¹⁹ On *epigamia* see e.g. W. Gawantka, *Isopolitie. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der zwischenstaatlichen Beziehungen in der griechischen Antike*, Munich, 1975, p. 34 with note 72; A. Chaniotis, *Die Verträge...* (cit. n. 12), p. 103-104. For the relaxation of these strict regulations in the Hellenistic period, see D. Ogden, *Greek Bastardy in the Classical and Hellenistic Periods*, Oxford, 1996, p. 289-316.

²⁰ A. Chaniotis, *Die Verträge ...* (cit. n. 12), p. 27 note 118.

group and of persons of the same legal status²¹. His next marriage shows how this pattern was abandoned sometime later: after Sarapias' death or divorce Dryton married a second time (around 150 BC); his second wife, Apollonia, also called Senmouthis, was much younger, did not have citizen status, and she was not Cretan. Her family had probably immigrated to Egypt in the mid-third century (or earlier) from Kyrene and had to a great extent adopted Egyptian culture and Egyptian names.

More interesting are the examples of mixed marriages of Cretans with representatives of other ethnic groups in garrisoned places. In two cases we can determine the origin of the non-Cretan partner; in both cases it is a citizen of the Aitolian Koinon, which had relations of isopoliteia (i.e., mutual grant of citizenship) with Cretan cities²². A long funerary epigram from Palestine (late third or early second century) narrates the adventurous life of Charmadas from Anopolis on Crete²³. After the defeat of his native city he joined the Ptolemaic army and served in a garrison somewhere in Koile Syria; there his daughter Archagatha married his fellow soldier Machaios, an Aitolian. In another Ptolemaic garrison, at Kition on Cyprus, Aristo, the daughter of the Cretan Dion, married Melankomas – again a man from Aitolia. Both her husband and his homonymous father were highly-ranked officers of the Ptolemaic garrisons (c. 146-116 B.C.)²⁴. An explanation for the striking preference for Aitolia may be the fact that it was with the Aitolian koinon that Cretan cities had treaties isopolity.

In the case of mercenaries the legal status and citizenship of a person was of crucial importance, but it was also easy to control. Although the engagement of the mercenaries was usually of a temporary nature, the stay in a foreign country could be long or permanent. And yet, the study of individual cases shows that the ties with the city of origin could remain strong for many years and the original civic identity was not forgotten (cf. below § 4).

The next three categories of persons differ from that of the mercenaries in an essential way, since their relocation took place in an uncontrolled manner.

²¹ On Dryton's family see J. K. Winnicki, *Ein ptolemäischer Offizier in Thebais*, in *Eos*, 60, 1972, p. 343-53; S.B. Pomeroy, *Women in Hellenistic Egypt from Alexander to Cleopatra*, New York, 1984, p. 103-124; J. Mélèze-Modrzejewski, *Dryton le Crétois et sa famille, ou Les mariages mixtes dans l'Égypte hellénistique*, in *Aux origines de l'Hellénisme. La Crète et la Grèce. Hommage à Henri van Effenterre*, Paris, 1984, p. 353-376. On mixed marriages cf. D. Ogden, *Greek Bastardy ...* (cit. n. 19), p. 343-347.

²² A. Chaniotis, *Foreign Soldiers ...* (cit. n. 14), p. 111f.

²³ *SEG*, VII 269.

²⁴ *OGIS*, 134.

Deserters

In the case of deserters the relevant problems are revealed by a still unpublished treaty between Knossos, Gortyn and their allies that concerns itself with the problem of the deserters (*automoloi*) during the 'Lyttian War' (c. 220 B.C.)²⁵. It seems that a great number of these persons had sought refuge in other cities, where they were being hidden, thus escaping control. We recognize references to the persons who hide them (*toi kryponti = to kryptonti*). From the better preserved last 17 lines of the first side we are informed that the *ereutai* (investigators) fined not the deserters themselves, but those who offered them shelter. The fine was sent to the city of the deserter. If the magistrates could not exact the fine from the property of the convict, they seized him and delivered him to the city, which had been wronged. If the convict escaped seizure, the fine was paid by the city where the deserter had found refuge, under the responsibility of the local magistrates, who were liable to punishment if they failed to pay. This strange procedure can be explained by the fact that the city of the deserter was regarded as the wronged party and, consequently, should receive the fine. The convict/wrongdoer was not the deserter, but the person who harboured him in the foreign city, then the foreign city if it failed to punish the wrongdoer. Any *ereutes*, but also any private person (*idiotes*) had the right to proceed to a seizure, i.e. to exact the duplum, give half of it (i.e. the original fine) to the wronged city and keep the rest. A still unpublished official registry of deserters (*automoloi*) from Argos (c. 303?) may also concern itself with the control and/or the rights of such persons²⁶.

These texts, as well as the treaty between Eupolemos and Thenagela (§ 1), show the complexity of the issues connected with the presence of deserters. Under certain conditions a welcome addition to the manpower of a city, they could also be a factor of disorder. In Crete, where during the Lyttian war the illegal and uncontrolled presence of deserters became a problem, the involvement of private persons as prosecutors suggests that the identification and control of deserters was very much a subject of private prosecution and report to the authorities (cf. § 4).

²⁵ A. Chaniotis, *The Epigraphy of Hellenistic Crete. The Cretan Koinon: New and Old Evidence*, in *Atti del XI Congresso Internazionale di Epigrafia Greca e Latina*, Rome, 1999, I, p. 287-300.

²⁶ *SEG*, XXXVII 280. The dangers caused by deserters are occasionally mentioned by Aeneas Tacticus (22.14, 23.1, 24.16, 28.2, 40.5.)

Refugees

The refugees are the third major group of relocated persons as a result of war or civil war. Sometimes we only know of their existence, not of their numbers, but they must have been a substantial factor of mobility. If their situation is not directly addressed in treaties, it is probably because it was subject to the more general rules of supplication and *asylia* that the Hellenistic age had inherited from earlier periods. With regard to the legal issues connected with refugees, it is reasonable to assume the refugees would seek refuge in cities with which their polis already had a treaty, e.g. a treaty of alliance or a treaty of *isopoliteia*.

The difficulties to control the movement of persons and movable is best exemplified by several Hellenistic treaties that concern themselves with a particular aspect of insecurity caused by wars : with the mobility of goods. Several texts include a clause that allows the citizens of one partner to deposit their goods (animals, movable) in the other city, i.e. to bring them to safety during a war and to export them without paying any customs²⁷. This phenomenon is indirectly addressed to in a treaty between Hierapytna and Priansos : «If a Hierapyrnian deposits something in Priansos or a Priansian in Hierapytna, let him import and export these pieces of property and their offspring by land and by sea; of the goods they have deposited, for those that they export by sea they should pay the customs according to the laws of each city»²⁸. This regulation allowed the citizens of the two cities to bring their movables to the other city in case of war, without having to pay customs when they returned home.

What the treaties do not explain, is how the persons made themselves known as citizens of the city privileged by the treaty. While citizens that travelled at peace-time could always acquire a letter of identification by the magistrates of their city and professionals often possessed letters of recommendation (*martyriai*) sealed with the official seal of a city²⁹, the refugees and captives usually did not have such a possibility. What other possibilities remained? In some cases investigations were necessary, as, e.g., in the case of slaves from Ios : when some ships under the command of the Ptolemaic naval commander Zenon visited Ios, a number of

²⁷ H. Müller, *Phyges heneken*, in *Chiron*, 5, 1975, p. 129-156.

²⁸ A. Chaniotis, *Die Verträge ...* (cit. n. 12), no. 28 l. 21-27. For a different interpretation see F. Guizzi, *Private economic activities in Hellenistic Crete : the evidence of the isopoliteia treaties*, in A. Chaniotis (ed.), *From Minoan Farmers to Roman Traders. Sidelights on the Economy of Ancient Crete*, Stuttgart, 1999, p. 241-242.

²⁹ e.g., *I. Perge* 12.

slaves escaped on his ships. The envoys of Ios informed him about the situation, Zenon summoned his trierarchs and ordered an investigation, which apparently revealed the truth³⁰. The refugees could take an oath, they could try to find an old acquaintance or a friend³¹, or they would go to a *proxenos*. In most cases the authorities had to rely to the testimony the person gave, threatening him with sanctions in case his testimony was false and, thus, the treaty was violated.

Captives

Captivity is the most extreme form of involuntary mobility caused by war. In addition to the prisoners of war after battles and the enslaved populations of captured and destroyed cities³², a particular group of captives are the victims of pirates³³. The numbers of captives are rarely known and can range from a single person³⁴ to several thousands. Even when the absolute numbers seem small, they may represent a substantial part of the population of small communities – e.g., the 280 persons captured by Aetolian pirates in Aulon on Naxos³⁵. Countless men, women, and children lost their freedom in the Hellenistic period, most of them during the wars against the Romans.

The women and children that were carried away from sacked and destroyed cities in order to be sold in distant places were for ever lost for their families. This anonymity of captivity is opposed to the eponymous captives, e.g., envoys captured by bandits or enemies³⁶ and prisoners of war who were captured after a battle, and whose identity could be established on the basis of military catalogues (see n. 11).

Also the victims of pirates had the hope of being ransomed, especially when they were kept in places where they could be

³⁰ OGIS, 773 with the comments of M. Launey, *Recherches ...* (cit. n. 13), p. 648, H. Heinen, *Zur Sklaverei in der hellenistischen Welt I*, in *AncSoc*, 7, 1976, p. 145-146 and R. S. Bagnall, *The Administration of the Ptolemaic Possessions outside Egypt*, Leiden, 1976, p. 147.

³¹ Cf. the function of the *synkritas* (mediator) in Crete; see A. Chaniotis, *Die Verträge...* (cit. n. 12), p. 112.

³² G. Volkmann, *Die Massenversklavung der Einwohner erobert Städte in der hellenistisch-römischen Zeit*, Stuttgart, 1990 (second edition by G. Horsmann); P. Ducrey, *Le traitement...* (note 4); see, e.g. A. Bielman, *Retour à la liberté...* (cit. n. 2), nos. 1-3, 7-9, 14-17, 20, 42-44, 48.

³³ e.g. A. Bielman, *op. cit.*, nos. 26, 32, 38, 40, 51, 52, 54; possibly 4-6, 24, 25, 28, 29, 31, 33, 34, 39, 45, 47, 57.

³⁴ e.g. A. Bielman, *op. cit.*, no. 25.

³⁵ A. Bielman, *op. cit.*, no. 26.

³⁶ A. A. Bielman, *op. cit.*, no. 55.

recognized (or make themselves recognized) by private individuals. The realistic expectation of a ransom for persons with wealth and high social status could improve the chances that someone would care for their safe return³⁷. The reference to negotiations for the ransom³⁸ suggests that the cities of the captives received lists with the numbers and certainly the names of the persons that had to be ransomed. Several Hellenistic cities were eager to sign treaties (again, in particular with Cretan cities) in order to forbid the selling of their citizens and to define the modalities for a safe return (see n. 7).

Private initiative was extremely important for the safe return of captives, as the honorary decrees show. The foreigners who are honoured by a city for saving their citizens who have been captured after a battle or by pirates are usually persons that already had close contacts with the city and its citizens, were engaged in trade, or even had inherited the specific relations from their forefathers³⁹. The honorary decrees often inform us that these persons took care of the captives, paid the ransom and the expenses for their return, took care of the education of young prisoners and treated respectfully the women. All this meant substantial expenses, which make sense only when those who took upon them this financial burden had the realistic perspective to get their money back or expected honours; both expectations presuppose existing relationships. Also personal relationships with kings were instrumental for the liberation of captives⁴⁰. An instructive example (c. 170-160 B.C.) concerns two men from Chalkis who were captured (*aichmaloton genomenon*) under unknown circumstances and were brought to the slave market in Anthedon in Boiotia (*poloumenon*). There, a man from Anthedon, who already had contacts to Chalkis, bought them free (*exegorasen ek ton idion*) and returned them safely to their city, where he and his descendants were honoured with proxeny⁴¹. The hortatory formula («so that the other persons that have the ability to make benefactions follow their example») indicates how important private initiatives were in this issue. The services of Philippides of Athens, a renowned comic poet and friend of king Lysimachos (283/2 BC), illustrate all these aspects: personal initiative, relations to kings, and identification of prisoners of war possibly on the basis

³⁷ e.g., A. Bielman, *op. cit.*, nos. 32 and 38.

³⁸ e.g. A. Bielman, *op. cit.*, no. 31; cf. no. 55 : *edokamen auton hoson eitoun oi katechontes*.

³⁹ e.g., A. Bielman, *op. cit.*, nos. 8-12, 16, 34, 40, and 51.

⁴⁰ A. Bielman, *op. cit.*, no. 20.

⁴¹ A. Bielman, *op. cit.*, no. 46.

of military catalogues : «When king Lysimachos won the battle which was fought at Ipsos against Antigonos and Demetrios, he (Philippides) had those of the citizens who were killed in this danger buried at his own expenses; as for those who were taken prisoners, he presented their case to the king and achieved their release; he also arranged for the enrolment in military units of those of them who wanted to serve in the army, and to those who preferred to leave he gave clothes and supplies from his own resources and sent them to whichever place each of them wished, more than three hundred men altogether. He also requested the release of those of our citizens who were found in Asia placed in custody by Demetrios and Antigonos»⁴².

A Delphic inscription which contains a letter sent by the Cretan city of Axos to the Aitolians (early second century B.C.) exemplifies the variety of possibilities of war mobility⁴³. The citizens of Axos had citizen rights in Aitolia on the basis of a treaty; the Axians wanted to make sure that a certain Epikles, whom they regarded as their own citizen, was given these rights in Aitolia. To justify this claim they narrate the adventures of his family. Eraton, a citizen of Axos, had come as a mercenary to Cyprus; there he married a woman of unknown name and origin. This woman gave birth to two sons, Epikles and Euagoras. After Eraton's death in Cyprus, his widow and his older son, Epikles, were captured (by pirates?). Epikles was sold as a slave in the Aitolian city of Amphissa – his mother's fate is not mentioned. In Amphissa he was somehow able to pay the necessary ransom. He settled in Amphissa and took a wife (again of unknown name and origin), who gave birth to two sons (Erasiphon and Timonax) and one daughter (Melita). The letter of the Axians, obviously written more than thirty years after Eraton's departure for Cyprus, shows how strong the legal ties of Epikles were to his father's city, which he himself possibly had never visited. This text also attests the impact war had on migration in the life of two generations of the same family : first the voluntary migration of Eraton, as a mercenary, to Cyprus, then the involuntary transfer of his son Epikles, as a slave, to Amphissa. This text also shows the importance of letters as a form of control and recommendation of foreigners⁴⁴. Such letters are only seldom inscribed on non-

⁴² IG II² 657 lines 16-29; M. M. Austin, *The Hellenistic World from Alexander to the Roman Conquest. A Selection of Ancient Sources in Translation*, Cambridge, 1981, no. 43; A. Bielman, *op. cit.*, no. 20.

⁴³ *Syll.*³ 622 B = *I.Cret.* II,v 19. Cf. M. Launey, *Recherches ...* (cit. n. 13), p. 679f.; A. Chaniotis, *Foreign Soldiers ...* (cit. n. 14), p. 112.

⁴⁴ Cf. Ph. Gauthier, *Symbola...* (cit. n. 8), p. 76-85; A. Bresson, *La cité marchande*, Brussels, 2000, p. 141-149.

perishable material, but the hundreds of seals of foreign communities at Kallipolis in Aitolia⁴⁵ gives an idea of the quantity of official correspondence, at least some of the letters that have perished for ever must have concerned private persons, such as Epikles.

General remarks : the importance of personal relations

The mobility of persons caused directly or indirectly by the Hellenistic wars is quantitatively and qualitatively one of the most important factors of migration, resettlement, and colonisation, but also an important phenomenon of Hellenistic social, legal and cultural history. The cultural koine of the Hellenistic period was to a significant extent the result of mobility caused by wars.

From the viewpoint of a modern historian who observes processes that have come to an end in the past, many cases of 'war mobility' mean the final, permanent, irreversible uprooting of persons from their native city. For the contemporaries, who were the subjects of this movement, the voluntary or involuntary migration (as mercenaries, captives or refugees) was in most cases regarded as a temporary situation. The Lyttians who sought refuge in 221 B.C. in Lappa remained throughout the period of their exile a community of citizens, which continued to use the ethnic name Lyttioi and to conclude treaties (e.g., treaties of alliance) regardless of the fact that they were a community without a city. For the Lyttians the exile lasted only a few years, for the Samians it had lasted for 45 years (366-322 BC). The Lyttians did not lose the hope of a return – not unlike the Palestinians or the Greek Cypriotes of today.

One should remark in this context that we cannot always determine whether an ethnic designation really indicates contacts with the place of origin. In Egypt, the families of military settlers kept the original designation of ethnic origin or citizenship generations after the original settlement, even though they did not retain any contact with their city of origin, in fact even though their city of origin had ceased to exist⁴⁶. Philippos, a high officer in the Ptolemaic army, was still called 'the Korinthian' in 70 BC, 76 years after the destruction of his ancestral city⁴⁷. An unauthorised change of this ethnic designation was punished with death⁴⁸. Had Hypergenes, son of Eurymedes, «a Cretan from Detonnion» who

⁴⁵ P. A. Pantos, *Tà σφραγίσματα τῆς αἰτόλικῆς Καλλιπολέως*, Athens, 1985.

⁴⁶ M. Launey, *Recherches ...* (cit. n. 13), p. 676-678.

⁴⁷ *SB*, 6236.

⁴⁸ *BGU*, 1250.

died in Ptolemais in the 2nd cent. BC – probably as a mercenary in the service of the Ptolemies – any contacts with his city which was conquered by Lyttos in the early 2nd century⁴⁹?

In addition to this strong attachment to the original citizenship, the study of individual cases shows that in the study of «war mobility» in the Hellenistic period one needs to make a sharp distinction between controlled mobility (mercenaries) and uncontrolled mobility (captives etc.). In the first case the control of the persons (identity, numbers etc.) could be established on the basis of registers (e.g., military catalogues) and was the subject of treaties. The control and the establishment of the identity of other foreigners who were present in a city, temporarily or for a longer period, because of a war (captives, refugees, deserters) depended primarily on the information they provided themselves. In many cases this information was supported by tokens⁵⁰, letters of recommendation, earlier honorary decrees for themselves or for ancestors. These documents were authenticated by means of official seals. The great number of sealings that have been found e.g. in Kallion or on Delos indicate the amount of Hellenistic correspondence, some of which must have been correspondence concerning the status of relocated persons. The identity of a person relied very much on the private initiative of the citizens of the foreign city in which he had come, especially on the initiative of *proxenoi*. Despite the existence of legal regulations, one expected that private persons would report to the authorities about the presence of deserters or would prosecute those who offered them shelter; that they would recognize captives as citizens of neighbouring cities or cities with which friendly relationships existed; that they would inform the foreign city about captives. This significant role of private persons explains the part played by honorary decrees : with their hortatory formula they invited other persons to contribute to the recognition and safe return of captives and refugees.

The importance of private initiatives may be seem to us rather surprising, but it was the most efficient means of control not only with regard to the mobility during war, but also with regard to the protection of graves, the control of the persons who attended the assembly, and to any other violation of norms in face-to-face societies.

Angelos CHANIOTIS

⁴⁹ SEG, XXVI 1679.

⁵⁰ For identity tokens (*symbola*) see Aen. Tact. 10.8; cf. Ph. Gauthier, *Symbola...* (cit. n. 8), p. 75-76.

ANNEXES

1. The destruction of Lyttos and the captivity of women and children (220 B.C.), Polyb. 4.54.

While the Lyttians were campaigning with their entire armed forces against enemy territory, the Knossians noticed it and seized Lyttos which had been left without defenders; having sent off the women and children to Knossos, they burned, demolished and wrecked the city in every way and then returned home. When the Lyttians came back to their city from their campaign and saw what had happened, they were so much affected that none of them had the heart even to enter the native city, but after walking round it many times bewailing and lamenting the fate of their country and themselves, turned their backs on it and retreated to Lappa. The Lappaians received them with the greatest kindness and cordiality. The Lyttians, having become in one day from citizens cityless and foreigners fought against the Knossians together with their allies.

2. Decree of Amorgos concerning two men who contributed to the liberation of victims of pirates, *IG XII 7 286*

Cf. M. M. Austin, *The Hellenistic World from Alexander to the Roman Conquest. A Selection of Ancient Sources in Translation*, Cambridge, 1981, no. 87; A. Bielman, *Retour à la liberté. Libération et sauvetage des prisonniers en Grèce ancienne*, Paris, 1994, no. 38

Resolved by the council and the people. Soterides, son of Phidias of Kosyllos was president, Philoxenos, son of Philothemis of Alsos, moved. Since during the night pirates landed in our territory and virgins and (married) women and other persons, both free and slaves, were captured – a total of more than thirty persons; and (the pirates) destroyed the ships in the harbour and captured the ship of Dorieus, with which they sailed off carrying away both the persons and the rest of the booty; when this occurred, Hegesippos and Antipappos, the sons of Hegesistratos, who were among the captives, jointly persuaded the leader of the pirates, Sokleidas, who was sailing along with them, to release the free persons, also some of the freedmen and the slaves, while they offered themselves as hostages, and showed great concern that none of the women of citizen status or men should be carried off as booty and be sold, nor suffer torture or hardship, and that no free person should perish. Thanks to these men the captives were saved and returned home without suffering harm [...]

3. Treaty between the ruler of Karia Eupolemos and the besieged city of Theangela, c. 310 B.C.; *Staatsverträge* 429; M. M. Austin, *op.cit.* no. 33.

[...] and there shall also be an amnesty for the people of Erinaia [...] to Philippos, Demagathos, and Aristodemos and the soldiers under their command shall be paid the four months salary that is due to them as well as a donative of two months' salary to Aristodemos and all the soldiers under his command who decide to remain in the service of Eupolemos. For all the soldiers who came over to the city from the army of Eupolemos in peace or

in war there shall be an amnesty. For all the slaves who came over in peace the conditions shall be as laid down in the treaties with Eupolemos and with Peukestas. For those who came over in war there shall be an amnesty; to the artillerymen shall also be paid four months' salary. All the soldiers who wish to depart shall be allowed to do so taking their chattels with them and shall be exempt from custom dues on their goods on passing through the territory of Eupolemos. And when Eupolemos has sworn to the people of Theangela and the troops in the city that he will abide by the agreement, and when he has paid the salary to the soldiers, let him take control of the city and the citadels. Any soldiers from Theangela who take up service with Eupolemos shall be allowed to settle at Pentachora [...]

4. Treaty between Hierapytna and Priansos, c. 200 B.C., *I.Cret.* III,iii 4; A. Chaniotis, *Die Verträge zwischen kretischen Städten in der hellenistischen Zeit*, Stuttgart 1996, no. 28 lines 21-26. Clause concerning the bringing of possessions in safety into the territory of the partner city during war.

If a Hierapyrnan deposits something in Priansos or a Priansian in Hierapytna, let him import and export these pieces of property and their offspring by land and by sea; of the goods they have deposited, for those that they export by sea they should pay the customs according to the laws of each city.

5. Honorary decree for the actor Philippides, 283/282 B.C., *IG II²* 657 lines 16-29; cf. M. M. Austin, *op. cit.* no. 43 :

When king Lysimachos won the battle which was fought at Ipsos against Antigonos and Demetrios, he (Philippides) had those of the citizens who were killed in this danger buried at his own expenses; as for those who were taken prisoners, he presented their case to the king and achieved their release; he also arranged for the enrolment in military units of those of them who wanted to serve in the army, and to those who preferred to leave he gave clothes and supplies from his own resources and sent them to whichever place each of them wished, more than three hundred men altogether. He also requested the release of those of our citizens who were found in Asia placed in custody by Demetrios and Antigonos.

6. Letter of the magistrates of Axos to the Aitolian League, 2nd cent. BC, *I.Cret.* II,v 19.

Greetings of the kosmoi (magistrates) and the city (citizens) of the Axians to the councillors, the general, and the commander of the cavalry of the Aitolians. You should know (be aware of the fact) that Eraton, who was our citizen, sailed off to Cyprus for a campaign, and after he had taken a wife he begot two sons, Epikles and Euagoras. It occurred that after Eraton had died in Cyprus, those around Epikles (under the guardianship of Epikles?) and their mother were captured, and Epikles was sold in Amphissa. Epikles has paid the ransom and lives among you in Amphissa, being our citizen, both he and his children Erasiphon and Timonax and his daughter Melita. It will be a good thing if you should see to it that if

somoene does them wrong, he shall be hindered by you, both publicly and privately, and that our joint citizenship (*koinopoliteia*) remains for ever inscribed.

ABREVIATIONS

- BGU*: *Ägyptische Urkunden aus den königlichen Museen zu Berlin. Griechische Urkunden*, Berlin, 1863-.
- I.Cret.*: M. Guarducci, *Inscriptiones Creticae*, Vol. I-IV, Rome, 1935-1950.
- IG*: *Inscriptiones Graecae*, Berlin, 1873-.
- I. Perge*: S. Sahin, *Die Inschriften von Perge*. Teil I (vorrömische Zeit, frühe und hohe Kaiserzeit), Bonn, 1999.
- Milet I.3*: A. Rehm, *Die Inschriften*, in G. Kawerau – A. Rehm, *Das Delphinion in Milet (Milet I 3)*, Berlin, 1914, 162-406.
- OGIS*: W. Dittenberger, *Orientalis Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae*, Leipzig, 1903-1905.
- SB*: *Sammelbuch griechischer Urkunden aus Ägypten*.
- SEG*: *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum*, Leiden 1923-
- Staatsverträge*: H. H. Schmitt, *Die Staatsverträge des Altertums*. Dritter, Band. *Die Verträge der griechisch-römischen Welt von 338 bis 200 v. Chr.*, Munich 1969.
- Syll.*³: W. Dittenberger, *Sylloge inscriptionum Graecarum*, Leipzig 1915-1924 (third edition).
- Welles, RC*: C. B. Welles, *Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period*, New Haven 1934.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- M. Amit, *Hostages in Ancient Greece*, in *RFIC*, 98, 1970, p. 129-147.
- M. M. Austin, *The Hellenistic World from Alexander to the Roman Conquest. A Selection of Ancient Sources in Translation*, Cambridge, 1981.
- R. S. Bagnall, *The Administration of the Ptolemaic Possessions outside Egypt*, Leiden, 1976.
- A. Bielman, *Retour à la liberté. Libération et sauvetage des prisonniers en Grèce ancienne*, Paris, 1994.
- R. A. Billows, *Kings and Colonists: Aspects of Macedonian Imperialism*, Leiden, 1995.
- A. Bresson, *La cité marchande*, Brussels, 2000.
- P. Brulé, *Enquête démographique sur la famille grecque antique. Étude de listes de politographie d'Asie mineure d'époque hellénistique (Milet et Ilion)*, in *REA*, 92, 1990, p. 233-258.
- G. Capdeville, *Le migrazioni interne nell'isola di Creta. Aspetti giuridici, economici e demografici*, in M. Sordi (ed.), *Emigrazione e immigrazione nel mondo antico*, Milano, 1994, p. 187-222.

- A. Chaniotis, *Die Verträge zwischen kretischen Städten in der hellenistischen Zeit*, Stuttgart, 1996.
- Id., *Milking the Mountain : Economic activities on the Cretan uplands in the Classical and Hellenistic period*, in A. Chaniotis (ed.), *From Minoan Farmers to Roman Traders. Sidelights on the Economy of Ancient Crete*, Stuttgart, 1999, p. 192-205.
- Id., *The Epigraphy of Hellenistic Crete. The Cretan Koinon : New and Old Evidence*, in *Atti del XI Congresso Internazionale di Epigrafia Greca e Latina*, Rome, 1999, I, p. 287-300.
- Id., *Foreign Soldiers – Native Girls? Constructing and Crossing Boundaries in Hellenistic Cities with Foreign Garrisons*, in A. Chaniotis – P. Ducrey (eds.), *Army and Power in the Ancient World*, Stuttgart, 2002, p. 99-113.
- G. M. Cohen, *The Seleucid Colonies. Studies in Founding, Administration, and Organization*, Wiesbaden, 1978.
- Id., *Hellenistic Settlements in Europe, the Islands, and Asia Minor*, Berkeley-Los Angeles-Oxford, 1995.
- P. Ducrey, *Nouvelles remarques sur deux traités attalides avec des cités crétoises*, in *BCH* 94, 1970, p. 637-659.
- Id., *Le traitement des prisonniers de guerre dans la Grèce antique des origines à la conquête romaine*, Paris, 1999 (second edition).
- R. Étienne – D. Knoepfler, *Hyettos de Béotie et la chronologie des archontes fédéraux entre 250 et 171 av. J.-C.*, Paris, 1976.
- Ph. Gauthier, *Symbola. Les étrangers et la justice dans les cités grecques*, Nancy, 1972.
- W. Gawantka, *Isopolitie. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der zwischenstaatlichen Beziehungen in der griechischen Antike*, Munich, 1975.
- F. Guizzi, *Private economic activities in Hellenistic Crete : the evidence of the isopoliteia treaties*, in A. Chaniotis (ed.), *From Minoan Farmers to Roman Traders. Sidelights on the Economy of Ancient Crete*, Stuttgart, 1999, p. 235-245.
- H. Heinen, *Zur Sklaverei in der hellenistischen Welt I*, in *AncSoc*, 7, 1976, p. 145-146.
- J. Herrmann, *Zum Rechtshilfevertrag zwischen Milet und Gortyn*, in *ZPE*, 17, 1975, p. 127-139.
- P. Herrmann, *Inschriften von Milet. Teil 1*, Berlin, 1997.
- M. Launey, *Recherches sur les armées hellénistiques. Réimpression avec addenda et mise à jour*, en postface par Y. Garlan, Ph. Gauthier et Cl. Orrieux, Paris 1987.
- A. Magnetto, *Gli arbitrati interstatali greci. Introduzione, testo critico, traduzione, commento e indici. Volume II. Dal 337 al 196 a.C.*, Pisa, 1997.
- J. Mélèze-Modrzejewski, *Dryton le Crétois et sa famille, ou Les mariages mixtes dans l'Égypte hellénistique*, in *Aux origines de l'Hellénisme. La Crète et la Grèce. Hommage à Henri van Effenterre*, Paris, 1984, p. 353-376.
- D. Ogden, *Greek Bastardy in the Classical and Hellenistic Periods*, Oxford, 1996.
- P. A. Pantos, *Τὰ σφραγισμάτα τῆς αἰτολικῆς Καλλιπολέως*, Athens, 1985.
- I. Pimouquet, *Défense et territoire : l'exemple Milésien*, in *DHA*, 21.1, 1995, p. 89-109.

- S. B. Pomeroy, *Women in Hellenistic Egypt from Alexander to Cleopatra*, New York, 1984.
- W. K. Pritchett, *The Greek State at War. Part II*, Berkeley-Los Angeles-Oxford, 1974.
- L. Robert, *Les chèvres d'Héracléia*, in *Hellenica*, 7, 1949, 161-170.
- G. Volkmann, *Die Massenversklavung der Einwohner eroberter Städte in der hellenistisch-römischen Zeit*, Stuttgart, 1990 (second edition by G. Horsmann).
- D. Whitehead, *Aineias the Tactician, How to Survive under Siege*. Translated with Introduction and Commentary, Oxford, 1990.
- J. K. Winnicki, *Ein ptolemäischer Offizier in Thebais*, in *Eos*, 60, 1972, p. 343-53.