

C. H. DE CARVALHO GOMES

XOUTHIAS SON OF PHILAKHAIOS  
On IG V.2 159 and its Possible Historical Placement

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 108 (1995) 103–106

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn



## XOUTHIAS SON OF PHILAKHAIOS

On IG V.2. 159 and its possible historical placement<sup>1</sup>

An inscription on a bronze plate informs us about a certain Xouthias son of Philakhaios who deposits a sum of money at Tegea (surely at the temple of Alea Athena) in the middle of the fifth century B.C.<sup>2</sup> For the convenience of the reader, I repeat the text in C.D.Buck, Greek Dialects no. 70:

- A Ξουθίαι τῷ Φιλαχαίῳ διακάτι|αι μναῖ. αἴ κ' αὐτὸς ἠίκῃ, ἀνελέσ-|  
 θῶ· αἰ δέ κ' ἀποθάνῃ, τῶν τέκνων | ἔμεν, ἐπεὶ κα πέντε Φέτεα ||  
 5 ἠἔβῳντι· αἰ δέ κα μὲ γενεὰ λ[ε]||ίπεται, τῶν ἐπιδικατῶν ἔμεν· | δια-  
 γνῶμεν δὲ τὸς Τεγεάτα[ς] | κα τὸν θεθμόν.
- B Ξουθίαι παρκαθῆκα τῷ Φιλαχα|ίῳ τετρακάτιαι μναῖ ἀργυρίῳ.  
 εἰ μ|έν κα ζῳῆ, αὐτὸς ἀνελέσθῶ· αἰ δέ κ|α μὲ ζῳῆ, τοὶ υἱοὶ ἀνελόσθῶ  
 5 τοὶ γνῆ||σιοι, ἐπεὶ κα ἔβάσῳντι πέντε Φέτε|α· εἰ δέ κα μὲ | ζῳῆντι,  
 ταὶ θυγατέρες | ἀνελόσθῶ ταὶ γνῆσ|ιοι· εἰ δέ κα μὲ | ζῳῆντι, τοὶ  
 10 νόθοι ἀνελόσθῶ· εἰ δέ κα | μὲ νόθοι ζῳῆντι, τοὶ 'ς ἄσιστα πόθικ||ες  
 ἀνελόσθῶ· εἰ δέ κ' ἀμφιλέγῳντι|(ι, τ)οὶ Τεγεᾶται διαγνόντῶ κα  
 τὸν θεθμόν.

About the identity of Xouthias it is not possible to grasp any historical or political picture from what the inscription says. If so, at a preliminary stage, one can only remark that Xouthias, the son of Philakhaios, is an individual who deposited money at Tegea in the middle of the fifth century B.C. The next question obviously concerns the possibility of placing this document in its historical and political context.

### 1 - Xouthias son of Philakhaios

Who was Xouthias?

Spartan laws against money - making practices by Spartans were an essential part of the Lykourgan system and an evident "point d'honneur" of Spartan behaviour in politics. Those activities were naturally reserved to helots and perioikoi.<sup>3</sup> Xouthias son of Philakhaios could

<sup>1</sup> I wish to thank W.G.Forrest, D.M.Lewis, K.A.Raaflaub and above all H.Taeuber for their sounding comments.

<sup>2</sup> Found at Piali, today at the Athens, National Museum no. X-8165. IG V.2, 159 = Sammlung Gr.Dial.Inschr. 4598 = Syll. 1213 = Schwyzer 57 = Solmsen-Fraenkel 35 = Buck 70; see D.Comparetti, Ann. 2 (1916) pp. 246 et sq.; (and H.Taeuber, Arkadische Inschriften rechtlichen Inhalts Diss., Vienna 1985, no. 1; see also the forthcoming comprehensive juridical commentary by G.Thür and H.Taeuber, Prozessrechtliche Inschriften der griechischen Poleis, fasc. I: Arkadien). Add. SEG XXXIX no. 395.

<sup>3</sup> See X., LP, 7.2, cf. *ibid.*, 7.6; Plu., Lyk., 24.2; Pl., Leg., 742 e; Poseidonios, FGrH 87 F 48c (= Athen., 6.233 E-F, see Kidd's comment. ad loc., Cambridge 1988); also Arist., frg. 544 Rose = 550 Gigon. On the subject see D.M.MacDowell, Spartan Law (Edinburgh 1986), pp. 116 et sq.; G.Berthiaume, Mnemosyne 29 (1976) pp. 360 et sq.; E.David, Sparta between Empire and Revolution - 404 - 243 B.C. (New York 1981) pp.

not be a helot or a perioikoi for perioikoi and helots, who were allowed to undertake such activities, obviously did not need to deposit money outside Lakonia. The fact that the script is Arkadian implies the possibility that this deposit might have been clandestine in contempt of Spartan rules. It then appears that Xouthias, son of Philakhaios, was a man from Lakonia and obviously a Spartan.

Philakhaios was Xouthias' father. It is important to point out that the study of personal Greek names may give us some hints to why someone is so named. Sometimes that reason can be related to the political inclinations of the progenitor, e.g.: the fact that Kimon's son was named Lakedaimonios cannot be entirely separated from Kimon's pro - Spartan feelings.<sup>4</sup> Then the possibility that the motivation that makes someone call his child or children can be related to personal political feelings should be further explored.

The inscription can be dated to period not before the second half of the fifth century, c. 450 - 445 B.C.<sup>5</sup> Xouthias would probably not be younger than to say thirty; if so, his birth would fall c. 480 - 475, Philakhaios' c. 505 - 500 (certainly not after), Philakhaios' father's (Xouthias' grandfather) c. 530 - 525 B.C., at the lowest.

Xouthias' grandfather consequently lived in a period of good relations with Tegea. In c. 556 - 555 B.C. a treaty between Sparta and Tegea had been celebrated.<sup>6</sup> It is thus perfectly reasonable to conclude that the years 530 - 525 were a complement to this political cooperation between the two poleis. Philakhaios' father certainly was a contemporary with Kleomenes. The famous episode when Kleomenes, at Athens, declares that he is not a Dorian but an Akhaian is well known ("ᾠ γύναϊ, ἀλλ' οὐ Δωρτεύς εἰμι ἀλλ' Ἀχαιός"<sup>7</sup>). He also tried to raise the Arkadians in revolt against Sparta. To be an "Akhaian" was the essential requirement Kleomenes needed for complete political fulfilment when declaring himself the leader of the Arkadians (and it does appear that he was acting on legitimate grounds - after all was not Kleomenes King of Sparta and so the "guardian" of the bones of Orestes?).<sup>8</sup> Had not Philakhaios' father all the reasons to name his son Philakhaios - Friend of the Akhaians (i.e.: Friend of the Arkadians, conceivably of the Tegeans)? It is evident that he had.

---

5 et sq. (on the date of the law mentioned by Plutarch, *Lys.*, 17.6, concerning the public possession of money with exclusion of private ownership); for a full juridical analysis see H.Tauber, *Praktika Γ' Διεθνοῦς συνεδρίου Πελοποννησιακῶν σπουδῶν Καλαμάτα*, Αθήναι 1987-88 pp. 353 et sq., esp. pp. 355 et sq.; and G.Thür, *Festschrift A.Kränzlein* (Graz 1986) pp. 123 et sq. Finally see also the following ancient evidence: *Pl. Alk.*, 122 e; *Plu., Lys.*, 19.7 (cf. *ibid.*, *laud. sup.*); also *Hdt.*, 6.60 and 7.134.1 (on legislation concerning certain professions).

<sup>4</sup> See *Plu., Kim.*, 16.1, *id.*, *Per.*, 29.1; *Th.*, 1.45.2.

<sup>5</sup> A.Johnston, in new ed. of *LSAG* (Oxford 1990), p. 449, suggests 450- 425 B.C. However 450 - 445 B.C. is still correct.

<sup>6</sup> See *Arist.*, *frg.* 592 Rose (*Plu., Mor.*, 277 C and 292 B). *Staatsverträge II*, no. 112. See our *Arkadian Politics Foreign and Domestic 715 - 404 B.C.*, thesis (Oxford 1991), Part. I, ch. II.2 and App. 1.

<sup>7</sup> *Hdt.*, 5.72.3-4.

<sup>8</sup> *Hdt.* 1.67. On the subject see Part I, ch. II.1, of our *Arkadian Politics Foreign and Domestic*, *cit.sup.*, and also C.M.Bowra, *Greek Lyric Poetry* 2nd ed. (Oxford 1961), p. 113.

In conclusion - Xouthias' grandfather named his son Philakhaïos possibly because of his pro - Arkadian (i.e.: pro - Tegean) political feelings;<sup>9</sup> in the same way this could also be an indicator that Philakhaïos called his son a non Dorian name.<sup>10</sup>

The possibility that Philakhaïos' political conduct would have not differed very much from his father's is plausible; if so, the implicit association of his son Xouthias with Tegea may be a testimony of the political commitments of Xouthias' family with the Arkadians, that is to say the Tegeans.

The possibility that Xouthias' grandfather and Philakhaïos were involved in a pro - Tegean policy has relevant historical implications for there is the possibility that the deposit made by Xouthias in the middle of the century might have not been so isolated as thought and one may suggest that the historical evidence we have brings our discussion to Kleandridas (surely Xouthias' contemporary) and his political activities.

## 2 - Kleandridas

In the first decade of the second half of the fifth century Sparta was shaken by internal political dissension due to the Pleistoanax and Kleandridas affairs.

King Pleistoanax was accused of having accepted bribes from Perikles and took refuge at Lykaion, in Parrhasia, in Arkadia.<sup>11</sup> That both Pleistoanax and Kleandridas,<sup>12</sup> his adviser, were implicated in the bribes affair is a fact attested by Ephoros<sup>13</sup> and Plutarch.<sup>14</sup> Polyainos, 2.10.3, informs us that the pro / Spartan aristocrats of Tegea became extremely suspicious about Kleandridas' intentions. Kleandridas had then to make use of a stratagem to convince the pro - Spartans to open the city gates. It does seem that such an unwillingness can only be understood within a political context where Kleandridas has become a *persona non grata* at least at the eyes of the Tegean lakonizers. That the Tegeans were prepared to take action against the pro - Spartan aristocrats is a fact that Polyainos also mentions. The most interesting point is that Kleandridas seems to have benefited from this situation at a time

---

<sup>9</sup> One should point out that this historical argument is sufficient to demonstrate that Philakhaïos was a Spartan and his son Xouthias as well. Philakhaïos was certainly a contemporary of the Persian Wars and with Themistokles.

<sup>10</sup> It is clear that this name is related to Xouthos, see W.Pape & G.Benseler, *Wörterbuch der griechischen Eigennamen* 3rd ed. (Braunschweig 1911) s.v.; F.Bechtel, *Die historischen Personennamen des Griechischen bis zur Kaiserzeit* (Halle 1917) p. 575; P.M.Fraser and E.Matthews, *Greek Personal Names vol. I* (Oxford 1987) s.v. Xouthos.

<sup>11</sup> See Th., 5.16.3, Plu., Per., 22.3, Schol. in Ar., Nub., 85 = Ephoros, FGrH 70 F 193, Suidas, s.v. deon.

<sup>12</sup> P.Poralla, *Prosopographie der Lakedaimonier*, 2nd ed. A.Bradford (Chicago 1985) s.v. Kleandridas gives him as Ephor in 446 B.C. (based on Suidas s.v. ephoroi, see also *ibid.* p. 168, see also G.Hill, *Sources for Greek History*, 2nd. ed., Oxford 1951, ad loc.). This is obviously wrong since there is no such reference under this entry. Poralla was followed by G.M. De Ste Croix, *The Origins of the Peloponnesian War* (London 1972), p. 197 n. 95, however he changes his mind at the end in a Corrigendum, p. 444. On Kleandridas see G.Busolt, GG, III.1, pp. 428-9, Busolt-Swoboda, *Griechische Staatskunde*, p. 1399, K.J.Beloch, GG 2nd ed., II.1, pp. 182 and 184, also A.W.Gomme, *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides I* (Oxford 1945) pp. 341 and 366.

<sup>13</sup> See loc. laud. sup.

<sup>14</sup> See loc. laud. sup.

when the pro - Spartan aristocrats appear to be in a weak position and conceivably looking for Spartan support.

Thus, Polyainos, at 2.10.3, refers to Kleandridas' flight to Tegea due to his political activities in connection with Pleistoanax and not to his political activities in the sixties as the editors of Polyainos, E.Woelfflin and S.Melber,<sup>15</sup> have thought. This does not necessarily imply that the lakonizing party in Tegea is only a fact in the forties; on the contrary, Polyainos' information strongly implies that the pro - Spartan party was a reality before Kleandridas' contacts with the Tegeans.<sup>16</sup>

The most important aspect of this is that Kleandridas took refuge at Tegea when the pro - Spartan party was not in charge of the government there and Tegea was not on good terms with Sparta.

Because of his association with Pleistoanax Kleandridas' flight would then take place in 445.

### 3 - Xouthias and Kleandridas

The fact that Xouthias' deposit of money at Tegea happened at a time more or less contemporary with Kleandridas' Tegean connection coupled with the possibility of him having fled to Tegea may not be pure coincidence. Both Xouthias and Kleandridas appear in highly compromising acts in manifest contempt of the Spartan authorities, both are involved with Tegea - and Tegea was certainly involved with both. This inter - relationship suggests the possibility that Xouthias and Kleandridas showed the same political sympathies around 445 B.C. If so, this would be the most probable date for IG V.2.159.

Setúbal

C. H. de Carvalho Gomes

---

<sup>15</sup> See their edition of Polyaeus. *Strategemata* (Leipzig 1887) ad loc. P.Poralla, op.cit. sup., s.v. Kleandridas, suggests 446 B.C.

<sup>16</sup> This is sufficient to invalidate any attempt to date the passage to the sixties. On the other hand, as we have pointed out, the pro - Spartan party a Tegea was a reality before Kleandridas going back to the middle of the sixth century B.C., c. 556 - 555 (see Arist., frg. 592 Rose). For a different view see e.g. D.M.Lewis, *CAH V* 2nd ed. (Cambridge 1992) p. 105 n. 5.