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THE Xenodokoi OF Thessaly

Several Thessalian inscriptions from the Hellenistic and Roman periods contain the term ξενοδόκοι, qualified in some cases as κοινοίς or ἵδοις. The xenodokoi are found in manumission acts, in honorific decrees and in covenants, usually named at the end of the documents and sometimes side by side with eponymic magistrates (strategoi or tagoi). The fact that these xenodokoi are named in documented transactions has lead scholars to assume that they functioned as witnesses or guarantors to the transactions, and that in Hellenistic Thessaly the word xenodokos lost its original meaning of ‘one who receives foreigners’ and came to define ‘a witness’. 1 Indeed, late lexicographers explained this word both as ‘receiving foreigners’ and ‘witnessing’, 2 and Chr. Habicht even claimed to have found support for this interpretation in literary texts. 3 Furthermore, it has been argued that the usual term used elsewhere for witness, μάρτυς, was rare in Thessaly. 4

Yet, although some scholars recognize that ‘witness’ is an evolution of the original meaning, 5 no satisfactory explanation has been offered for this semantic shift, nor for the difference between koinos and idios xenodokos. 6 Two other important questions also remain unanswered: first, if the xenodokoi in Thessaly were witnesses, why was this term not used in all the extant epigraphic documents from Thessaly? and second, why is this term not found in all the extant documents originating from the same polis? Moreover, although it seems that the xenodokoi in Thessaly served as witnesses, it is not clear

---


2 E.g. Hesych., s.v. ξενοδόκος: ὑποδεχόμενος ξένους, καὶ μάρτυς.

3 Simon., Fr. 84.7 Bergk; Pind., Fr. 311 Snell. See Habicht (n. 1), 145 f.

4 See Habicht (n. 1), 145 and n. 6, who suggests that martyς, martyria, martyrleo, appear only in agreements between Thessalian and foreign communities, or in arbitration acts made by foreign judges (poleis, kings and Leagues). Such an example is the arbitration agreement in IG IX (2) 205 (= Syll. 3 546 B), dated 213/2, where the synedrion of the Aetolian League, its prostatai, the secretary, the hipparchos and three citizens of different poleis are named as martyres to a sympoliteia-agreement between Melitaia and Pereia; cf. Ager (n. 1), no. 56. Yet in IG IX (2) 521, an arbitration agreement between Kondaia and an unspecified state, dating from the 2nd century, the martyriae are testimonies given by private citizens as to their knowledge of the disputed land (lines 5, 6, 19, 20, 30). In other words, these citizens were not witnesses to the agreement (cf. Ager, no. 70). A similar case is an inscription (first published by Arvanitopoulos, AE 1913, 25 f., 43 f.) which records the arbitration given by officials of Philip V between Gnomoi and Herakleion (perhaps after 218 B.C.; Helly, Gnomoi, Vol. II, nos. 93, 98; Ager, no. 54). Although Herakleion was a Macedonian city and so were the judges, here too the witness gives testimony as to his knowledge of the disputed land; he is not a witness to the agreement. See farther n. 31.


6 Habicht (n. 1), 145–7, explained this change of meaning in terms of interstate commerce. In earlier times, he argues, the foreigners were mostly traders, and the citizens who received them were their business partners; later, these partners were also their guarantors in the law courts or in other political institutions. In the passage of time interstate treaties made the use of mediation of xenoi (guestfriends) superfluous. Yet this explains neither the absence of evidence for the same semantic change in other Greek poleis whose commercial treaties are known to us, nor the fact that xenodokoi also appear in manumission documents. Babacos (n. 1), 48–9, following Rensch (n. 1), suggested that the koinoi xenodokoi were special magistrates entrusted with taking care of manumitted slaves, and that the idioi xenodokoi were witnesses. This, however, does not explain the presence of the koinoi xenodokoi in honorific decrees and covenants, nor the fact that the idioi xenodokoi do not appear in all documents.
whether the semantic content of the word was limited to this function, or whether a xenodokos had other functions as well. A study of these questions can contribute not only to our knowledge of the semantic history of the term xenodokos, but also to our knowledge of the political, juridical and social spheres of Thessalian life in the Hellenistic period. Here I therefore propose a re-evaluation of the evidence. My arguments will be: a) that the function of the xenodokos as a witness was but one of his original functions as a ‘recipient of foreigners’; b) that the word continued to retain its original meaning of receiving foreigners; and c) that the care for foreigners was institutionalized in Thessaly in the Hellenistic period, if not earlier.

I. The Evidence for Xenodokoi

Let us first examine the manumission documents. In Larissa there seems to have been a pattern: the payment to the polis (whether a manumission or a publication fee) by the manumitted slave was made in the presence of a xenodokos – sometimes qualified as koinos, but never as idios.7 However, not all the extant manumission acts from Larissa mention xenodokoi.8 Moreover, some of the inscriptions that mention xenodokoi suggest that these people were appointed to this task at regular intervals,9 which may indicate that they were official magistrates.10

Inscriptions from Pythion show various uses. Some documents mention xenodokoi together with the strategos and the tagos,11 while in others the xenodokoi include the tagos and there are also idioi xenodokoi.12 Another document mentions a koinos xenodokos who is also the tagos,13 and in some documents the verb xenodokein is used in the genetive absolute.14 Furthermore, in one case the same man functioned as both a tagos and a koinos xenodokos, and later as an idios xenodokos,15 and it seems that members of his family used to act as idioi xenodokoi.16

In Trikka, one document refers to the payment made by a manumitted slave in the presence of the tagos and the koinos xenodokos, but in other manumission acts of the same inscription there is no

---

7 ἐναντίον κοινοῦ ξενοδόκου: IG IX (2) 302 A.a (where the payment is also made in presence of the tagos); 558 (1st century B.C.; the payment is made κρατά τὸν νόμον); Y. Béquignon, Klio 52, 1970, 17ff. (= J. Bousquet, BCH 95, 1971, 277; ca. 125 B.C.).

8 ἐναντίον κοινοῦ ξενοδόκου: SEG 29, 532 (mid 2nd century B.C.); BCH 95, 1971, 562 (1st quarter of the 2nd century B.C.); Giannopoulos, AD 11, 1927–8, 61–4, A.


A similar formula seems to have been used in an inscription from Delphi, FD III 6, 101 (138/7 B.C.), which refers to a payment and where the words κοινο... ξενοδόκου were reconstructed.

8 E.g. IG IX (2) 539–550. In the document published by Giannopoulos (n. 7), the xenodokoi appear only in part A, although a payment is also mentioned in part B.

9 In SEG 29, 532, the name of the xenodokos in the first and second documents is the same. In BCH 95, 1971, 277, the same xenodokos is named in the first five documents. Documents nos. 6–10 of the same inscription, which belong to the month Hippodromion, mention a different xenodokos in no. 6 and yet another one in nos. 7–10, which may imply that the xenodokos appointed for this month had died or was replaced for other reasons. Documents nos. 11 and 12, belonging to another month, have yet a different xenodokos (see p. 280 for Bousquet’s table). In BCH, 95, 1971, 562, the xenodokos in the first four documents is probably the same person (the patronymic was not preserved). In the inscription published by Giannopoulos (n. 7), the same private name is mentioned in documents 1–6 (in nos. 7–8 only the patronymic was preserved).

10 Babacos (n. 1) argued that the koinoi xenodokoi in manumission documents were official magistrates.

11 IG IX (2) 1282, II (1st century B.C.); Arch. Eph. 1924, 166, no. 404 B, C; no. 406 A, B.

12 IG IX (2) 1282, III (3 idioi xenodokoi), IV (5 idioi xenodokoi); Arch. Eph. 1924, 155, no. 400 (1st century B.C.; 3 idioi xenodokoi).

13 Arch. Eph. 1924, 188, no. 418 a B (= IG IX (2) 1282); SEG 26, 689 (although Arvanitopoulos reads: xenodokoi).

14 Arch. Eph. 1924, 166, no. 404 D, E; no. 405 A.

15 IG IX (2) 1282, lines 19, 32.

16 Ibid., lines 11, 19.
mention of a xenodokos.\footnote{17} An inscription from Doliche, however, mentions both koinoi xenodokoi, of which one was the tagos, and idioi xenodokoi.\footnote{18}

What can we make of this inconsistency? First, the extant evidence strongly suggests that the use of xenodokoi was not a rule in Thessaly, even in poleis which occasionally made use of them. Second, in some cases the (koinos) xenodokos performed the function of witnessing the payment made by the manumitted slaves. Third, the tagos was in some cases included among the xenodokoi and in other cases acted as a koinos xenodokos; in such cases it seems that the rule was to use idioi xenodokoi as well. Fourth, at least in Larissa the koinos xenodokos was either an official magistrate who was appointed regularly, or perhaps responsible for performing a liturgy, and in Python the members of at least one family used to act regularly as idioi xenodokoi. It seems safe to conclude that some Thessalian poleis at times saw fit to use the tagos, or private citizens who were appointed to this task ad hoc, as official guarantors or witnesses to manumission acts (koinoi xenodokoi). In such cases they may have also used private witnesses (idioi xenodokoi), probably chosen by the manumitted slaves.

Xenodokoi also appear in honorific decrees. In an inscription from Phayttos (\textit{IG IX} (2) 489 a; mid 3\textsuperscript{rd} century B.C.), the koinos xenodokos mentioned in line 28 was probably a guarantor to the decision, since the words κοινός ξενοδόκος τοῦτο κυρίσθη (καί τῶν νόμων) appear in the previous line. In a grant of proxenia from Atrax (\textit{SEG} 29, 500; 1\textsuperscript{st} half of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century B.C.), a xenodokos is mentioned in the genitive absolute together with συνεξεξοδοκοί.\footnote{19} Another such grant from the same poleis (\textit{SEG} 29, 502; late 3\textsuperscript{rd} century B.C.) has the same formula, except that in this case there are at least two xenodokoi who are koinoi.\footnote{20} In a decision of Kranon (or Atrax) in honor of a citizen of Trikka (\textit{SEG} 33, 449), the use of a xenodokos (perhaps koinos) is indicated by the verb xenodokein in the genitive absolute, and there are also synxenodokoi.\footnote{21} A grant of citizenship by Metropolis (Habicht, \textit{Klio} 52, 1970, 139; 3\textsuperscript{rd} or early 2\textsuperscript{nd} century B.C.) mentions koinoi xenodokoi. None of these inscriptions mention idioi xenodokoi, but three inscriptions mention synxenodokoi who, together with the (koinos) xenodokos, may have constituted a collegium.

Lastly, xenodokoi appear in two covenants of Thessalian poleis. The first is an agreement of the συνγένεα of the Basaidai to exclude from the ταγία and the ἵστριμα non-members of the four families who comprised this syngeneia (\textit{SEG} 36, 548; ca. 2\textsuperscript{nd} half of the 3\textsuperscript{rd} century B.C.).\footnote{22} At the end of this agreement two priests of Apollo Hekatombaioi are mentioned as xenodokoi. The other document is an agreement of Phthiotic Thebes and Halos to refer their territorial dispute to the arbitration of Macon of Larissa (\textit{IG IX} (2), Add. pp. X–XI, no. 205 I a; 140–137 B.C.). Four citizens of the poleis Melitaia are named in line 23 as xenodokoi.\footnote{23}

It should also be noted, that the private name Xenodokos was common in Thessaly, as in other Greek poleis, and that in at least two cases the word xenodokos was the private name of the strategos.\footnote{24}

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
\item\footnote{17} \textit{IG IX} (2) 302, A.a.
\item\footnote{18} \textit{SEG} 23, 462 (= Babacos, \textit{BCH} 86, 1962, 499–500; 2\textsuperscript{nd} half of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century B.C.). Cf. Helly, \textit{Phoenix} 30, 1976, 147–149; SEG 26, 670.
\item\footnote{19} See Helly, \textit{ZPE} 35, 1979, 246–247, who thinks that these synxenodokoi were the collegues of the xenodokoi.
\item\footnote{21} Habicht (n. 1), 146, thinks that these synxenodokoi have the same function as the idioi xenodokoi.
\item\footnote{22} Cf. Helly (n. 1), 161 ff.
\item\footnote{23} I follow the reading of Pousilloux, \textit{FD III} 4, 1976, no. 355. See also Ager (n. 1), 415 ff., no. 153. According to the reading of Kern and Hiller in \textit{IG IX} (2), the first two names are citizens of Halos, which was party to the agreement, and the other two were from Melitaia. Yet it seems strange that witnesses represented only one party to the agreement, while the other two witnesses were from a third poleis. See also Habicht (n. 1), 146, who reads two xenodokoi from Thebes and two from Halos, and \textit{Deltion} 19, 1964, 265.19.
\item\footnote{24} E.g., in Thessaly: \textit{IG IX} (2) 18, line 4; 520, line 1 (see Habicht (n. 1), 145 f., contra Fougeres, \textit{BCH} 13, 1889, 380); \textit{SEG} 32, 604, line 6 (a strategos); Y. Béguignon, Sur des inscriptions de la Thessalie du nord, \textit{Mélanges helléniques offerts à George Daux}, Paris 1974, 3, nos. 1 and 10 (probably strategoi); in Delos: \textit{ID} face A 95; 96; in Cos: \textit{IdiCos} 530; in Delphi: \textit{FD III} 2, 172, line 57; 6, 101, line 7; \textit{SGDI} 1995, line 7.
\end{itemize}
The lack of uniformity in the use of the term xenodokos could be the result of particular needs of different poleis, yet it should also warn us against the sweeping conclusion that in Thessaly this term came to mean ‘a witness’. In reading the epigraphic evidence, however, we can discern a common feature that sheds light on the use of the term. The manumission documents and the honorific decrees containing a reference to xenodokoi were all transactions between citizens of a given polis and foreigners. The manumitted slaves were xenoi in relation to their manumittors and the polis;25 the beneficiaries in honorific decrees were xenoi in relation to the granting polis, and this was also true in cases of grants of citizenship since the beneficiaries remained xenoi until they implemented the grant. It can therefore be assumed that xenodokoi were citizens who witnessed only transactions made by their polis with foreigners, and in this respect the term used to define them accords with its original meaning.26 In other words, these witnesses were called xenodokoi not because this word came to mean ‘a witness’, but because one of the functions of receiving foreigners and taking care of them was to mediate between them and the polis and to guarantee any transaction between the two parties.

Babacos is therefore probably right in assuming that the koinoi xenodokoi were citizens entrusted by their polis with taking care of foreigners; their duty, however, was not confined to manumitted slaves. As for the idioi xenodokoi, these were probably added where the tagos fulfilled the task of a koinos xenodokos, or perhaps when specifically demanded by the foreigners. It must be noted though, that idioi xenodokoi are found only in manumission documents, a fact that may imply that the manumitted slave needed the mediation and the protection of a private citizen, perhaps something in the line of the prostates known from other poleis and also from Thessaly.27 Xenodokoi without any qualification may be considered as koinoi, while the term synxenodokoi may indicate a collegium of xenodokoi entrusted with the task of caring for foreigners. The two instances that do not seem to fit this assumption are the agreement between Phthiotic Thebes and Halos (IG IX (2), Add. pp. X–XI, no. 205 I a) and the agreement of the Basaidai (SEG 36, 548), since neither document seems to concern xenoi. It is therefore important to examine these two inscriptions in detail.

II. The Agreement Between Phthiotic Thebes and Halos: IG IX (2), Add. pp. X–XI, no. 205 I

The first part of the inscription (a, lines 1–23) records the agreement between Phthiotic Thebes and Halos to refer their land dispute to arbitration. This agreement was made by representatives from both poleis: the tagoi and private citizens (lines 1–10). The representatives agreed to submit their dispute to the arbitration of Macon of Larissa and to accept his judgement as binding (lines 10–12).28 The agreement is then dated by the federal calendar and the federal strategos (lines 12–13), and provision is made for its inscription and publication in both Delphi and Larissa (lines 13–17). A penalty clause follows, imposing fines on whoever does not adhere to Macon’s decision (lines 17–19), and another provision for the publication of the decision in both the disputing poleis (lines 20–22). The word xenodokoi appears at the end of line 22, followed by a list of four citizens of Melitaia (line 23).29

25 Cf. Rensch (n. 1), 122–123.
26 See also Rensch (n. 1), 123; Hiltbrunner (n. 5); Gschnitzer (n. 5).
27 On the prostates of the freedmen, see Calderini (n. 1), 272, 331; H. Rädle, Untersuchungen zu griechischen Freilassungen, Diss. München 1969, 138–139. On the prostates in Thessaly see A. Babacos, La mention du prostates dans les affranchissements thessaliens, BCH 86, 1962, 494–503; K.-D. Albrecht, Rechtsprobleme in den Freilassungen der Böoter, Phoker, Dorier, Ost- und Westlokrer, Paderborn 1978, 213–215. The existence of prostatai in Thessaly does not necessarily exclude the possibility that the idioi xenodokoi acted in the same capacity, since these xenodokoi are found in inscriptions which do not mention prostatai.
28 The decision to call a particular person as an arbiter is unusual; generally the disputing poleis decided upon a third polis, which then appointed the arbiters. See Ager (n. 1), 418–419, who assumes some involvement on the side of the Thessalian koinon.
29 See above, n. 23.
The second part of the inscription (b, lines 24–50) contains the judgement of Macon, given after an inspection tour of the disputed land (lines 26–27) and after hearing the testimonies (τοῦ... ῥηθέν[τος ἡμῶν]... ἐσετείνου) of both sides (lines 27–28). This part of the inscription is very fragmentary, but it seems that the dispute involved a shrine and sacred land (line 29). Macon seems to have decided that the disputing poleis had joint possession of the shrine and the sacred land (lines 40–45). Macon then instructed the parties to inscribe his decision and publish it in Delphi, Larissa, Thebes, and Halos (lines 45–50).

In 1913, Marcus N. Tod suggested that the xenodokoi in part a of the agreement were persons appointed by the disputing poleis to the task of taking care of foreign arbiters. Tod compared them with the δικαστασκωγός and with the δικαστοσφώλακες, mentioned in inscriptions, mainly from Asia Minor. According to these inscriptions, the dikastagogos was elected by the Assembly and entrusted with the task of going to another polis and asking its authorities to send judges; he then escorted the foreign judges to his polis, protected them and saw to all their needs, usually at his own expense. Tod’s argument, however, is marred by two flaws. First, it is based on a mistaken reading of line 23: Tod thought that the four persons named were citizens of the disputing poleis Thebes and Halos, who thus can be likened to the dikastagogoi. But according to the new reading, we know that they were all citizens of Melitaia. Second, all the inscriptions in which dikastagogoi are mentioned refer to foreign judges and not to arbitrators. Hence, unless dikastagogoi were appointed in cases of arbitration too, we must abandon Tod’s solution.

As no witnesses or guarantors are mentioned in the second part of the inscription, I suggest that the Melitaian xenodokoi named in the first part acted as both witnesses to the agreement to go to arbitration and guarantors to the judgement given by Macon. In other words, they were appointed by the disputing poleis as a third party to the agreement, a practice for which we have other examples. In this capacity they functioned as ‘recipients of foreigners’, whenever representatives of the disputing poleis came to Melitaia to complain of non-adherence to the judgment. In Melitaia these representatives would be xenoi, and the role of the Melitaian xenodokoi would be to receive them and settle their disputes. In any case, the use of the word martyrion in our inscription (line 28) seems to rule out the possibility that the word for ‘witness’ in Hellenistic Thessaly was xenodokos; it is hardly conceivable that the Thessalians used the word martyrion to denote evidence given by a witness, and the word xenodokos to denote the witness.

III. The Covenant of the Basaidai: SEG 36, 548

The decision recorded in this inscription states that this covenant (συνθέσεια) is intended for those who belong to the four families (γενεάιοι) of the Basaidai and also take part in the taga (lines 1–4). The
covenant stipulates that the *taga* and the *isotimia* are not to be granted to anyone outside the *syngeneia* (lines 5–7); anyone who fails to abide by these stipulations will be banned by the *syngeneia* (ἁπόλλοις ἔστοι) and will pay a fine of one silver talent to the *syngeneis* (lines 7–10). What were the *taga* and *isotimia*? Against Moretti, who argued that the *taga* was the supreme magistracy of the *polis* Metropolis, and hence only those belonging to the four families were entitled to elect the *tagoi*, the more common view is that the *taga* was a magistracy of the *syngeneia*, and that the *isotimia* were the equal rights of the *syngeneis*.34 I tend to agree with this last view for reasons specified below. In lines 10–19 fifteen names are listed, defined as ὀνόματα τοῦν [συγγενείον], whose nature has also raised a controversy.35 At the end of the covenant, as noted above, two priests (ὁ λείτορας) of Apollon Hecatombaion are mentioned, one in Metropolis and the other for (ὁ ἐπι) Polichne, and defined as *xenodokoi* (lines 19–21).36

This inscription is the sole evidence for the existence of *syngeneia* as a familial-social unit in Thessaly, although there is some evidence for φράτρας.37 Scholars assume the existence of such social units in Thessaly, especially on the basis of an inscription from Delphi from the first half of the 4th century B.C., which contains regulations of the *syngeneia* of the Labyades. According to this inscription, the magistrates of the *syngeneia*, the *tagoi*, were instructed to fulfill their task according to the laws of the *polis* and those of the Labyades, and were the representatives of the subdivisions of the *syngeneia* – the πάτραι.38 A more convincing evidence for Thessaly is perhaps the names ending in -αδαι and -δαι, which may indicate the existence of social groups with defined territories, which were subdivisions of the φυλαί and themselves comprised of smaller divisions – the γένεια, or πάτραι.39 In this respect the *syngeneia* resembles the more recognized φράτρας, and indeed is identified with it.40

What was the nature of the *syngeneia* of the Basaidai, its relation to the *polis*, and the reason for this covenant? In seeking an answer to these questions, it is useful to review other examples of such *syngeneiai*, most of which come from Asia Minor in the Hellenistic period and attest to the social and

contradicts this translation. Fr. Gschnitzer, *Griechische Sozialgeschichte*, 1981, 66–67, argued that the four families were only a part of the *syngeneia*.

34 Moretti (n. 33); contra Helly (n. 1), 184–185; cf. idem, *L’Etat thessalien*, 1995, 27–29, 320–321; Bresson & Debord (n. 33), 201. The *isotimia* is explained as the right to be active (rule) and passive (be ruled); in other words: to elect and be elected.

35 According to Moretti (n. 33), these were the *syngeneis* entitled to be elected as *tagoi*. Gschnitzer (n. 33) argued that this list comprises the whole *syngeneia*; Helly (n. 1), 183, and Bresson & Debord (n. 33), 202, argue that the 15 are representatives of the *syngeneia*.

36 Lines 19–21 read: . . . ἔξωδοκι τύποιν πάρ τεν "Ἀπλοῦσαν ἑκατομβίμην ὁ λείτορας ὁ ἐν [Ματροπόλει] ὁ λείτορας ἐπὶ Τυλίξας. ὂν ὁ λείτορας, see the discussion of Helly (n. 1), 179–180, and O. Masson, *Variétés thessaliennes, RPh* 54, 1980, 227–228; for the identification of the god, Helly, 185–186, and S. Estrem, *Die Labyaden und die Buzya*, *Eranos* 20, 1921–22, 106–108, who suggests that this cult was analogous to the Apatouria, when children were introduced to the *phratriai*.

37 In an inscription from Homolion, published by A. S. Arvanitopoulos, *RPh* 111, 134, no. 36 (cf. L. Robert, *Hellenica I* 1940, 68–69), and in an inscription from Larissa, *SEG* 13, 394. Helly (n. 34), 319–320, has doubts as to the weight of this evidence.

38 See G. Rougemont, *Corpus des inscriptions de Delphes*, I, 1977, 26–85, no. 9, who argues for a Thessalian influence. Cf. Helly (n. 34), 27–29, who rejects a connection between the Thessalian *tagoi* and those of the Labyades, and refers to another inscription of the Labyades from the 6th century B.C. (Rougemont, 86–88, no. 9bis), where these magistrates are called ‘the fifteen’. Is it a mere coincidence that the inscription of the Basaidai also has 15 names?

39 For names in -αδαι and -δαι, see Arvanitopoulos, *BCH* 1923, 524, from Krannon; A. Tziafalias, *Thessaliko Himerologio* 7, 1984, 200, no. 37 (late 4th century B.C.), and *IG* IX (2) 524 (4th or 3rd century B.C.) from Larissa. Cf. Helly (n. 34), 321–323.

40 See Hesych., s.v. φράτρας; and cf. Helly (n. 1), 183. For ‘kinship’, real or artificial, as the meaning of the term *syngeneia*, see E. des Places, *Syngeneia: La parenté de l’homme avec dieu, d’Homère à la patristique*, Paris 1964; Bresson & Debord (n. 33), 194–196.
familial character of such groups. The activity of most documented syngeneiai centered on the administration of a shrine and its territory, and elected magistrates were entrusted with different duties. Most of these syngeneiai were subdivisions of the tribes in the poleis, but there is some evidence that indicates their earlier politically independent character.

Generally, membership in the syngeneiai was based on kinship. Kinship, however, was not essential, as indicated by several inscriptions that record the grants of privileges and membership to non-members, and the incorporation of new members by way of adoption. An interesting inscription from Nacone in Sicily (SEG 32, 914; late 4th or early 3rd century B.C.) contains regulations for the reestablishment of civil order in the polis after a period of discord. The opponent factions are instructed to choose 30 persons each; two political opponents and three neutrals are then to be drawn by lot and to form a group of five. The other citizens are also divided into groups of five, which are called ἄδελφοι αἰχμετοι (‘elected brothers’; line 20), and the process is termed ἄδελφοθεία (‘adoption of a brother’; line 33). This process, so it seems, was an artificial creation of phratria. A similar term is found in an inscription of the syngeneia of Pelekos, which administered the shrine of Sinuri in Mylasa in the 4th century B.C.: the syngeneia grants to a foreigner ateleia and the right to be adelphos of the syngeneis. It seems then that membership in the syngeneia was determined by descent, by way of adoption, or by granting membership and making the grantee an artificial kin (adelphos). Granting membership indicates openness in some such groups, although steps were taken to prevent illegal penetration by non-members.

---


42 See Robert (n. 41), 25–29. The syngeneia of Pormounos in Mylasa, for example, administered the shrine of Sinuri and its lands, collected taxes, elected ἐγόδικοι (who represented the community in law suits), τομίται, priests, and ἔργοδοτηι who conducted public works (Robert, inscriptions no. 9, 14). The syngeneiai in Olymos (Inscr. v. Mylasa, II, no. 861), had particular rites, προσπέτες, and sacral magistrates. The syngeneia of the Aganites in Mylasa elected κτηματοῦντα for the purchase of lands, and τανιαί (Inscr. v. Mylasa, I, no. 121, 220, 222). The syngeneia in Kedesh (Fischer, Ovodiah & Roll, n. 41) worshipped θεᾶς ήγου σωφρίνου, identified as Baalshamin. Cf. the decree of the phratria Demotionidai in Athens (IG II (2) 1237; 396/5 B.C.), and the decree of the phratria of the Aristaioi in Naples (L. Dubois, Inscriptions grecques dialectales de la Grande Grèce, Genève 1995, 81–90, no. 29; 1st century B.C., or 1st century A.D.).

43 In Robert’s view (n. 41), 93, the syngeneia used to be independent cellules of the political life in Caria, as is shown by the decisions of these groups in Alabanda (BCH 10, 1886, 309), which do not mention the city, but only the confederacy of the Carians. See Inschr. v. Mylasa, I, no. 176, 521 (from Mylasa); II, no. 863, 876 (from Olymos). The three syngeneiai, mentioned in the inscription from Olymos (n. 41), were, prior to its synoikismos with Mylasa, three tribes of Olymos, and the resolution mentioned in the inscription is reached by ‘the demos of Olymos’. In mid 3rd century B.C. the syngeneia of Corris in Labraunda granted citizenship and registration in a phyle to a foreigner (Crampa, n. 41, mid 1st century B.C.), but in ca. 220 B.C., after the synoikismos of Labraunda with Mylasa, this syngeneia is defined as paтра (ibid., no. 4), a subdivision of a tribe in Mylasa; see Bresson & Debord (n. 33), 205–206.

44 As indicated by the names of the syngeneiai (Aganites, Ogondeis, Kendebeis, etc.). See also Inschr. v. Mylasa, I, no. 521, lines 1–3; II, no. 861, line 3.

45 Thus, the syngeneia of Pormounos in Mylasa granted privileges, equal rights and membership (Robert, n. 41, nos. 29, 30, 44, 75); in no. 44, lines 7–10, the wording is: εἶναι αὐτῶν τῆς Πορμούνου συγγενείας καὶ αὐτῶν καὶ εὐγόνως καὶ μετέχειν αὐτῶν πάνων ὄψιν καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ συγγενεῖς. So did the syngeneia of Pelekos, which preceded that of Pormounos in administrating the shrine of Sinuri (ibid., no. 73, mid 4th century B.C.). See also Diehl & Cousin (n. 41) on Alabanda; Inschr. v. Mylasa, II, no. 861 and 868 from Olymos.

46 E.g., Robert (n. 41), 12–13 (= Inschr. v. Mylasa, I, no. 217, line 7); Inschr. v. Mylasa, II, no. 861, line 4.


48 Robert (n. 41), no. 73, lines 7–8.

49 Ibid., no. 14, where an ἐγόδικος is elected ἀκάτω τῶν ἀδελφῶν μετεχόντων τῆς συγγενείας (lines 10–11). Cf. Inschr.
The *syngeneia* in Asia Minor emerge from this review as autonomic communities, which controlled shrines and lands, had an Assembly and elected magistrates, and granted privileges, membership, and even citizenship to foreigners. This seems to have been their status whether as subdivisions of the whole *polis*, as in Olymos and Labraunda in the 4th century B.C., or as subdivisions of the *phylai*, like the *syngeneia* of Olymos after the *synoikismos* (or *sympoliteia*) with Mylasa. Since most of the activity of these *syngeneia* concerned the shrines of their gods, it is probable that privileges granted by them – such as *ateleia*, equal rights, and membership – also concerned the shrine, i.e., the right to participate in the ceremonies, to sacrifice, to be elected and to elect the various magistrates (priests, judges, commissioners), and sometimes the privilege not to pay dues (mostly, it seems, sacrifices to the shrine). The autonomic religious life of communities unified by *synoikismos* is also exemplified by an inscription from Orchomenos, recording an agreement of *synoikismos* with Euaimon (*IG V* (2) 343; 360–350 B.C.). According to lines 6 ff., the inhabitants of Euaimon were to continue to perform their customary rites in their city every month. Thus, although Euaimon was the smaller and less important *polis* and is not mentioned again, except by Stephanus of Byzantium as πόλις Ὄρχομενίων, and although a part of the *chora* of Orchomenos was to be divided between citizens of both *poleis* (lines 11 ff.), the inhabitants of Euaimon were not compelled to move to Orchomenos, and it seems that the two communities continued their separated lives.

We may now return to the covenant of the Basaidai. This *syngeneia*, it seems, resembled the Carian model. It was an organization based on kinship, it had an Assembly, elected magistrates, and – if the two priests specified as *xenodokoi* were the priests of the *syngeneia*’s god – conducted rites to Apollo Hecatombaios in two shrines: one in Metropolis and the other in Polichne. Assuming that this *syngeneia* was a subdivision of a tribe in Metropolis, and itself comprised of *gene* (line 2), what was its and Polichne’s status in relation to the *polis*?

Several places bearing the name Polichne are known, but its existence in Thessaly is recorded for the first time in our inscription. If the name can serve as an indicator for the size and importance of such places, it may be significant that according to Strabo (9, 438 b–c) Metropolis was first established by a *synoikismos* of three insignificant *polichniai*; later, other such communities were added. The *synoikismos* took place sometime before 360 B.C., since an inscription from Delphi from that year.

---

50 In the inscription from Olymos, *Inschr. v. Mylasa*, II, no. 861, this process is called *sympoliteia* (lines 3–4), and the decision is made by the *demos* of Olymos (line 1), but the fact that the ancient *phylai* of Olymos became *syngeneia* (lines 8–9; cf. *Inschr. v. Mylasa*, II, no. 806, line 11) in a social structure of *phylai*, *syngeneiai*, and *patrai* in Mylasa indicates a greater integration. Similarly, the *syngeneia* of Corris in Labraunda became a *patra* after its absorption by Mylasa; see above, n. 43. On *sympoliteia* and *synoikismos*, see L. Robert, *Villes d’Asie Mineure*, Paris 1962, 55 ff.; J. & L. Robert, *Fouilles d’Amynon en Carie*, Vol. I, Paris 1983, 188–191.

51 See L. Piccirilli, *Gli arbitrati internazionali greci*, Pisa 1973, Vol. I, 200–204, no. 52. A similar case is *IG IX²* (1) 718, which records the regulations for the *epoikoi* sent to Naupactos by the Hypocnamidian Locrians, apparently before the capture of Naupactos by the Athenians (460–455 B.C.). These colonists, although becoming Naupactians, have several rights that preserve their link with the Hypocnamidian: they can still participate in the ceremonies and sacrifices of their native country, but as *xenoi* (lines 1–3); they have the right to return (lines 6–10), and for some of them the right of ownership over property among the Hypocnamidian is guaranteed (lines 22–27); they maintain their rights of succession in their original community (lines 28–30); and they have their own deliberative institution (line 40). Although it seems that these *epoikoi* were reinforcing colonists sent to an already existing *polis* and not participants in a *synoikismos*, their status versus Naupactos is similar.

52 The word *polichνη*, or *polichνον*, usually denoted a small town, a fort; cf. *Thuc.*, 7, 4; *Plut.*, *Tim.*, 11.
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(Syll. 239 E) mentions the Ματροπολίται Θεσσαλοί. According to the Basaidai inscription, Polichne was in the neighborhood of Metropolis, perhaps a village in its territory, or maybe one of the polichnai participating in the synoikismos, which retained the name because of its small size. Another such polichne, according to Strabo, that also brought the cult of Aphrodite Kastnietis to Metropolis, was 'Όνθυριον, a name rendered by Stephanus of Byzantium as 'Όνθυριον on the authority of Rhianus of Bene, in book 8 of his Thessalika (who places the city near Arne – later Kierion, a neighbor polis of Metropolis). Since Rhianus defines Onthyrion as a polis, it has been suggested that the synoikismos took place not before his time (the first quarter or third of the 3rd century B.C.). In the 3rd or early 2nd century B.C. honorific decree of Metropolis, published by Chr. Habicht, the grantees of the citizenship of Metropolis registered in the phyle of 'Όνθυριον (line 7), a name which no doubt points to the polichne Onthourion/Onthyrion, which participated in the synoikismos of Metropolis. It seems, therefore, that the polis Onthyrion became, after the synoikismos with Metropolis, a tribe in the polis, a change in status that other communities participating in a synoikismos may also have undergone. It should be remembered that it was through a similar process that the phylai of Olymos in Caria became syngeneiai in Mylasa, and the syngeneiai of Labraunda became patrai.

In 1939 Th. D. Axenides published a fragment of an inscription found at Larissa (Hellenika 11, 1939, 263–271). This is an arbitration agreement, dated by Axenides to the year 186/5 by the name of the Thessalian strategos mentioned in line 3. The names of the disputing parties are: τῶν Πολιχνίων (line 9) and τῶν Πόλεων τῶν 'Όνθυρεων (line 13). Axenides proposed that the second name was a variation of the name Onthyrion, mentioned by Rhianus, and concluded that both Onthyrion and Polichne lay in south Hestiaiotis. How could two disputing tribes of Metropolis go to arbitration to another polis? Axenides suggested that by the time of the dispute Onthyrion no longer belonged to Metropolis, or that the synoikismos had dissolved in the first year of the Roman rule. If we accept this theory, and if Polichne too was a tribe in Metropolis, as seems to be the case, we have to assume that either the synoikismos was indeed dissolved, or that Metropolis followed the new trend of referring internal disputes to the Romans. Axenides’ theory has been questioned by E. Kirsten, on the ground that by the time of the land dispute Onthyrion was already integrated into Metropolis and had lost its independence. Yet if the communities that participated in the synoikismos of Metropolis retained their autonomy in religious and municipal life, as did, e.g., Olymos in Caria, there was nothing to prevent the phyle Onthyrion, previously an independent community, from disputing land with another phyle. It could even reverse to its previous status in case the synoikismos was dissolved.

It seems plausible then, that both Polichne and Onthyrion became phylai in Metropolis and that they retained their original territory and social stratification. Now, if the syngeneia of the Basaidai had a shrine both in Metropolis and in Polichne, it is only logical to conclude that it was a subdivision of the

---

57 See Moretti (n. 33), 67. Cf. Plut., Demetr., 53.3, on the synoikismos of Demetrias by little polichnai in the neighborhood of Iolkos.
58 On a possible identification of the site of Polichne, see Helly (n. 1), 187.
59 A correction of Meineke of the Mss. ONOURION, OMOURION, etc.
60 Habicht (n. 1), 143. Moretti (n. 33), 67, argues that Rhianus describes a mythic period and therefore Onthyrion is mentioned as an independent polis, just as Arne is mentioned by its ancient name and not by the name Kierion, which already existed in Rhianus’ time.
61 See Habicht (n. 1), 142–143; Helly (n. 34), 318–319; Id., La sympolitie entre Gomphoi et Ithômé, Thessaliko Himerologio 10, 1986, 145–162, on the Thamieis of Thamiai – the later name of Ithome.
63 Axenides also suggests that the arbiter was a Roman commander, perhaps Flamininus himself, because of the verb φημι in line 9, and the adjective φιλάνθρωπος in line 11.
65 According to Liv., 32, 13.11, the citizens usually lived in villages, and flocked to the city only in times of emergency.
phyle Polichne (and may have previously been a phyle in the independent community Polichne). This syngeneia, as noted above, had its Assembly, elected magistrates and priests, and accordingly also privileges reserved for its members. And since it had its particular god and shrines, is it not possible that the isotimia mentioned in the inscription refer to privileges in sacrificing to that god and in introducing new members to the syngeneia (a situation known from the syngeneiai and phratriai of other places)? From the inscription of Olymos and of the syngeneia of Pormounos in Mylasa we learn that it was the concern of the syngeneis to prevent non-members from false registration and from taking part in the rites and magistracies. The covenant of the Basaidai seems to have had the same purpose, and the duty of preventing non-members from the timia seems to have fallen to the priests of the syngeneia’s god.

It remains to clarify the reason for that covenant and for the term xenodokoi. Through the synoikismos of Metropolis, proposes Helly, many foreigners were admitted into the civic body, a process that may have threatened the composition of political and religious groups in the city. This change, however, may have occurred later, when other polichnai were added to the synoikismos (e.g., Ithome), or when Metropolis started to grant citizenship to foreigners. In such a case, the Basaidai would strive to guard their rights against members of the other communities and newly enfranchised citizens of Metropolis. They would think of non-members as xenoi who were debarred from the taga, from the cult of the syngeneia, and from registration in the syngeneia or introducing their infant sons to it. The priests of Apollo Hecatombaioi were to prevent such intrusion, and to mediate between foreigners, who wished to sacrifice to this god, and the shrine. In this respect they had a similar role to that of the proxenoι in Olympia and Delphi (and maybe also Sparta), attested by several sources. In other words, one of their duties was to take care of foreigners in the religious sphere as mediators, which seems to be the reason why they were defined as xenodokoi.

IV. The Literary Evidence

No literary text from Thessaly has survived, and we have to rely on writers from other parts of the Greek world. According to the extant evidence, the word xenodokos and the verb ἐκεινοδοκεῖν retained their original meaning of taking care of foreigners. Thus in Herodotus (6, 127.3) and Euripides (Alc., 552) the verb has the clear meaning of ‘receiving foreigners’. In Homer (Il., 3.354; Od., 8.210) and in Hesiod (Op., 183) xenodokos means ‘one who receives foreigners’. The word xenodochia in the sense of ‘receiving foreigners’ is found in Xenophon (Oec., 9.10). Yet fragments of Pindaros and Simonides are quoted by later lexicographers as evidence for the use of the noun and the verb in the sense of ‘a witness, witnessing’, and both these poets are known to have visited Thessaly. Thus Apollonius (Lex. Hom., 117.25 B) says: ἐκεινοδόκοις ἐκεινοδόχοις, ὁ τοὺς ἔξωνυς...
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ÍpodexÒmenow: į d° P¤ndarow jeinodÒkhs°n te da¤mvn: (Fr. 311 Snell)

έντ‹ toË §martÊrhse. ka‹ §n

tª ÉOdus¤& jeinodÒkow m¢n §g≈ (18. 64) ¶doj° tisi l°gein < > fhs‹n oÔn Simvn¤dhw: jeinodÒkvn d'
êristow ı xrusÚw §n afiy°ri lãmpvn

(Fr. 84.7 Bergk)

έντ‹ toË martÊrvn

A slightly different version is given by Et. Magn., 610.43:

jeinodÒkow: ı m¢n ÜOmhrow tÚn j°nouw

d¢ ka‹ P¤ndarow ka‹ êlloi tin¢w tÚn §pimãrtura §jed°janto: Simvn¤dhw, jeinodÒkhsen Telãmvn, ént‹ toË §martÊrhse: ka‹ P¤ndarow, jeinodÒkvn

–

lãmpvn, ént‹ toË martÊrvn

(cf. Zonaras, 1415; Et. Gud., 414.35, which nonetheless defines jeinodÒxow [414.25] as ı toÁw j°nouw filofron«n [189]).

It should first be noted that xenodokos is defined as one who receives and takes care of foreigners, and that the quotations from Pindaros and Simonides are given as exceptions. The poem of Pindaros has not survived, except for those three words (of which we have two readings), and hence does not provide a firm basis for inferring Pindaros’ meaning or Apollonius’ reason for equating xenodokos with martys.

As for the Odyssey, 18. 64, these words are said by Telemachus to Odysseus when he promises him protection against Iros and the suitors, and he clearly means: ‘I am the host’. Apollonius says that these words were read by some as meaning ‘I am the witness’, but obviously this interpretation is wrong.

The line quoted from Simonides (ξεινοδοκόν . . . λάμπον) was appended by Bergk to a fragment of an elegy written by Simonides about the battle of Plataea and quoted by Plutarch (de Mal. Her., 42 = Fr. 84.1–6 Bergk). The lines relevant to our case (Fr. 84.3–6 Bergk) are the following:

ο· te pÒlin GlaÊkoio Kor¤nyion êstu n°montew [o"] kãlliston mãrtun ¶yento pÒnvn,

χρύσου τιμήντος εν αἰθέρι· καὶ σφιν ἄεξει

αὐτών τ’ εὐφέρειν κληρόνα καὶ πατέρων.75

If the line quoted by Apollonius indeed belongs to the same poem, it is clear that Simonides is playing on the metaphor gold-sun and on the related words xenodokos, xenos. The ‘gold in the sky’, which the Corinthians took as a witness (martys) to their deeds in the battle of Plataea, is the sun. So long as the gold/sun stays in the sky it is the best xenodokos – recipient of guests (foreigners), for it warms, lightens and welcomes men. If we accept the addition of Edmonds (see n. 75), the notion is complete: if gold (substantially, not metaphorically) is accepted by men, it comes as an evil xenos – guest (foreigner). It is clear that the word xenodokos stands here as apposition to χρύσου . . . εν αἰθέρι, and is not a synonym of martys.76 The metaphor gold = host/guest would make no sense if we understood xenodokos to mean ‘witness’. The last two lines expand the theme of gold/sun and are not an explanation of martys. Taken alone, the line ξεινοδοκόν . . . λάμπον does not necessarily indicate that ‘witnesses’ are meant, and as in the case of Pindaros it is difficult to draw any clear conclusion from it.

In view of the predominant meaning ‘receiving foreigners’ in the literary sources, it seems that the ancient grammarians and lexicographers inferred the meaning martys from texts which referred to one of the functions of the xenodokos – that of a witness, or a guarantor to foreigners – and wrongly applied it to other texts, such as that of Simonides. Thus, when Hesychius defines xenodokos as: ύποδεχόμενος ξένους. καὶ μάρτυς, and xenodoków· ξεινοδόχων, μάρτυρων, it is clear that the original and predominant meaning is ‘receiving foreigners’, and that ‘witnessing’ is only an appended meaning.

Since xenodokos is a compound of -dokos, it has the basic meaning of ‘one who receives . . . ’ Thus, for example, ικετοδόκος is a person who receives suppliants (A., Supp., 713),77 ἵπεροδόκος is a person

514 as a guest of the Scopadai (Theocr., 16.42–7).

75 M.L. West, Iambi et Elegi Graeci, Vol. II, Oxford 1972, 116, Fr. 12, doubts that these passages belong to the same poem. J. M. Edmonds, Lyra Graecæ, Loeb, 1931, Fr. 92, accepts the connection and adds the line: ἡξίνος δ’ ἣλθε κοικός τοῖς χερὶ δεξιομένοις, which gives the poem a sense of clearing the Corinthians from the blame of taking bribes from the Persians.

76 As claimed by Habicht (n. 1), 145.

who receives sacrifices (A., Supp., 363), and δοοροδόκος is a person who receives bribes (Pl., Resp. 390 d; Dem., 18.61). Moreover, θεοροδόκοι, ‘recipients of theoroi’, were persons appointed by foreign poleis to the task of entertaining the theoroi sent by these poleis to announce a religious celebration, and this designation was sometimes extended to the theorodokoi’s descendants. In this respect, therefore, the theorodokoi resembled the koinoi xenodokoi and the proxenoi, who performed an official role as mediators, protectors and entertainers of foreigners. Further evidence for the continuity of the original meaning of xenodokos is the fact that a hostel, or inn, was called in later times xenodochion, and the head of such an establishment was called xenodokos.

V. Conclusions

In view of the above it may now be concluded that the term xenodokos retained its original meaning throughout the history of ancient Greece. The use of xenodokoi as witnesses in Thessaly was in line with the basic duties of a person who took upon himself to entertain and protect foreigners, and to mediate between them and the authorities. In this respect, the xenodokoi played a role similar to that of the proxenoi and the prostatai of metics. In Thessaly this role was sometimes assigned by the poleis to one or several citizens; hence the koinos xenodokos, who was occasionally the tagos himself, and sometimes assisted by synxenodokoi. In manumission documents we also find the idios xenodokos, apparently chosen by the manumitted slave and probably a person with whom he had established reciprocal relations. Indeed, there is no evidence for xenodokoi in this role outside Thessaly; but the same can be said about the prostates of the metics, known especially from Athens and rarely from other places. Nor is there evidence that all Thessalian poleis used the xenodokoi, or that the same polis used them all the time. However, there is some evidence for the use of martyis and martyrein, and in one case, at least, their use occurs along with the use of xenodokoi.

Despite liberality in granting citizenship and despite interstate treaties, which facilitated the movement of citizens and traders from one polis to another, a non-citizen was still conceived of as a foreigner. Any transaction between the polis and foreigners – whether the grant of privileges and citizenship, manumission of slaves, or arbitrating between foreign poleis – had to be witnessed and guaranteed. Hence my interpretation of the xenodokoi in the covenant of the Basaidai: the priests of the god of the syngeneis were not only mediators between the syngeneis and the god, but also between foreigners and the syngeneis. The evidence for the use of xenodokos implies the importance attached by some Thessalian poleis to the regulation of dealings with foreigners. This attitude is perhaps best expressed by Xenophon (Hell., 6, 1.3), when he writes that Polydamas of Pharsalus was φιλόξενος τε και μεγαλωτερής τόν θεταλικών τρόπων (fond of foreigners and generous according to the Thessalian habitue).

Tel Aviv
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---

78 See Tucker (n. 77), 82.
79 In IG IV 727 from Hermione (ca. 4th century B.C.) theorodokoi from different poleis are listed, probably so that the theoroi of Hermione would know where to find hospitality; cf. P. Jamot, Inscriptions d’Argolide, BCH 13, 1889, 194 ff. See also IG IV(2) 94 from Epidaurus (360/59 B.C.), and P. Flensted-Jensen, The Bottiaians and their Poleis, in M. H. Hansen and K. Raaflaub (eds.), Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis, Historia Einzelschriften 95, Stuttgart 1995, 112. The inscription IG V(2) 389 from Lysis (4th or 3rd century B.C.) is a grant of theorodokia, proxenia, epinomia and other privileges to a person from Charadrea – according to what other proxenoi and theorodokoi are entitled to (cf. BCH 49, 1925, 91, no. 20 from Delphi, mid 3rd century B.C.).
80 See IdiCos 350 (5th century A.D.); IK Apam./Pylai 101.1 (8th century A.D.); MAMA 2; 3. Cf. Pollux, Onom., 1. 74; Hiltbrunner (n. 5), coll. 1487 ff.
81 In the arbitration agreement between Phthiotic Thebes and Halos (IG IX, 2, Add. pp. X–XI, no. 205 I b, line 28).
82 In this I agree with Habicht (n. 1), 147, that the xenodokoi may have first been the business partners and witnesses of foreign traders, but I argue that the need for witnesses and mediators had not been made superfluous by interstate treaties.