

RACHEL ZELNICK-ABRAMOVITZ

THE *XENODOKOI* OF THESSALY

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 130 (2000) 109–120

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

THE *XENODOKOI* OF THESSALY

Several Thessalian inscriptions from the Hellenistic and Roman periods contain the term *ξενοδόκος*, qualified in some cases as *κοινός* or *ἴδιος*. 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 (*stratego*i or *tagoi*). The fact that these *xenodokoi* are named in documented transactions has led 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

¹ See R. Dareste, B. Haussoullier, Th. Reinach (eds.), *Recueil des inscriptions juridiques grecques*, Paris 1898, 311–12, no. 45; G. de Sanctis, *Monumenta Anticha* VII, 1898, 20–21; A. Calderini, *La manomissione e la condizione dei liberti in Grecia*, Roma 1965, 155; Chr. Habicht, Eine Bürgerrechtsverleihung von Metropolis, *Klio* 52, 1970, 145–147; B. Helly, La convention des Basaidai, *BCH* 94, 1970; idem, *ZPE* 51, 1983, 157–168; Sh. Ager, *Interstate Arbitrations in the Greek World, 337–90 B.C.*, Berkeley–Los Angeles–London 1996, 418, no. 153. W. Rensch, *De manumissionum titulis apud Thesalios*, Diss. Phil. Halenses 1908, 120–123, argued that the *xenodokos* witnessed the transition of the manumitted slave to the status of a *xenos*. On the other hand, M. Todd, *International Arbitration*, Oxford 1913, 77, 83, and A. Babacos, *Πράξεις κοινῆς διαθέσεως καὶ ἄλλα συγγενῆ φαινόμενα κατὰ τὸ δίκαιον τῆς ἀρχαίας Θεσσαλίας*, Thessaloniki 1961, claimed that the *koinoi xenodokoi* were magistrates.

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 *martyr*, *martyria*, *martyreo*, 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 *martyriai* 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 Gonnoi and Herakleion (perhaps after 218 B.C.; Helly, *Gonnoi*, 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.

⁵ E.g., Rensch (n. 1); Habicht (n. 1); O. Hiltbrunner, *RE IX*, 2 (1967), “ξενοδοχεῖον”, coll. 1487–1488; Fr. Gschnitzer, *RE Suppl. XII* (1974), “Proxenos”, col. 634.

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 Triikka, 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 κατὰ τὸν νόμον); Y. Béquignon, *Klio* 52, 1970, 17ff. (= J. Bousquet, *BCH* 95, 1971, 277; ca. 125 B.C.).

ἐνώπιον 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.

ἐνώπιον ξενοδόκου: *SEG* 35, 593 (ca. 200 B.C.; Helly reads: ἐνώπιον κοινοῦ ξενοδόκου).

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... ξενοδόκος 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 read: *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*.¹⁷ An inscription from Doliche, however, mentions both *koinoi xenodokoi*, of which one was the *tagos*, and *idioi xenodokoi*.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 Pythion 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 *tagoi*, 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 (*IG IX (2) 489 a*; mid 3rd century B.C.), the *koinos xenodokos* mentioned in line 28 was probably a guarantor to the decision, since the words καὶ τὸ ψήφισμα τοῦτο κυρῶσα[ι κα]τὰ τὸ[ν νόμον] appear in the previous line. In a grant of *proxenia* from Atrax (*SEG 29, 500*; 1st half of the 2nd century B.C.), a *xenodokos* is mentioned in the *genetive absolute* together with συνξενოდόκοι.¹⁹ Another such grant from the same *polis* (*SEG 29, 502*; late 3rd century B.C.) has the same formula, except that in this case there are at least two *xenodokoi* who are *koinoi*.²⁰ In a decision of Krannon (or Atrax) in honor of a citizen of Triikka (*SEG 33, 449*), the use of a *xenodokos* (perhaps *koinos*) is indicated by the verb *xenodokein* in the *genetive absolute*, and there are also *synxenodokoi*.²¹ A grant of citizenship by Metropolis (Habicht, *Klio 52, 1970, 139*; 3rd or early 2nd 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 συγγένεια of the Basaidai to exclude from the ταγία and the ἰσοτιμία non-members of the four families who comprised this *syngeneia* (*SEG 36, 548*; ca. 2nd half of the 3rd century B.C.).²² At the end of this agreement two priests of Apollo Hekatombaios 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 (*IG IX (2), Add. pp. X–XI, no. 205 I a*; 140–137 B.C.). Four citizens of the *polis* Melitaia are named in line 23 as *xenodokoi*.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*.²⁴

¹⁷ *IG IX (2) 302, A.a.*

¹⁸ *SEG 23, 462* (= Babacos, *BCH 86, 1962, 499–500*; 2nd half of the 2nd century B.C.). Cf. Helly, *Phoenix 30, 1976, 147–149*; *SEG 26, 670*.

¹⁹ See Helly, *ZPE 35, 1979, 246–247*, who thinks that these *synxenodokoi* were the colleagues of the *xenodokos*.

²⁰ Cf. Gallis, *AD 29, 1973/4 (1979), B. 583–584*; *BCH 104, 1980, 643*; Marek, *ZPE 48, 1982, 112–116*.

²¹ Habicht (n. 1), 146, thinks that these *synxenodokoi* have the same function as the *idioi xenodokoi*.

²² Cf. Helly (n. 1), 161 ff.

²³ I follow the reading of Pouilloux, *FD III, 4, 1976, no. 355*. See also Ager (n. 1), 415 ff., no. 153. According to the reading of Kern and Hiller in *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 *polis*. See also Habicht (n. 1), 146, who reads two *xenodokoi* from Thebes and two from Halos, and *Deltion 19, 1964, 265.19*.

²⁴ E.g., in Thessaly: *IG IX (2) 18, line 4*; 520, line 1 (see Habicht (n. 1), 145 f., contra Fougères, *BCH 13, 1889, 380*); *SEG 32, 604, line 6* (a *strategos*); Y. Béquignon, *Sur des inscriptions de la Thessalie du nord, Mélanges helléniques offerts à George Daux*, Paris 1974, 3, nos. 1 and 10 (probably *strategoi*); in Delos: *ID face A 95; 96*; in Cos: *IdiCos 530*; in Delphi: *FD III 2, 172, line 57*; 6, 101, line 7; *SGDI 1995, line 7*.

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 manumitters 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 μαρτυρ]ίου) 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 δικασταγωγός and with the δικαστοφύλακες, mentioned in inscriptions, mainly from Asia Minor.³⁰ 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.³¹ 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.³²

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

The decision recorded in this inscription states that this covenant (συνθείκα) is intended for those who belong to the four families (γενίουν) of the Basaidai and also take part in the *taga* (lines 1–4).³³ The

³⁰ Tod (n. 1), 83. For the *dikastagogos*, see L. Robert, *Opera Minora Selecta*, Vol. V: Les juges étrangers dans la cité grecque, 143; Ph. Gauthier, *Symbola. Les étrangers et la justice dans les cités grecques*, Nancy 1971, 313. For references, see Ch. V. Crowther, Chr. Habicht, L. & K. Hallof, Aus der Arbeit der 'Inscriptiones Graecae' I. Drei Dekrete aus Kos für δικασταγωγοί, *Chiron* 28, 1998, 87, n. 4. For *dikastophylakes*: *Insc. Magn.* 93 a. 23; cf. Crowther, Habicht, Hallof, 93, nn. 12, 13.

³¹ E.g., *IG IX (2) 205*: the whole Aetolian League (who had appointed arbiters from Calydon) as witnesses (*martyres*) to the *sympoliteia*-agreement between Melitaia and Pereia (213/2 B.C.); *IG IX (2)*, Add. p. XI, no. 205 II: citizens of Thebes and Demetrias are witnesses (*martyroi*) to a judgement given by judges from Cassandreia in a dispute between Melitaia, Chalai, and Peuma (lines 1–16), and between Pereia, Phylladon, and Peuma (lines 16–30); *IG IX (2)*, Add. 205 III A: Thermioi and Eidaioi as witnesses (*martyres*) to a judgement given by arbitrators, chosen by the Aetolian League.

³² As noted above, n. 4 and 31, the nouns *martys*, *martyrion*, and the verb *martyrein* were also in use. In *IG IX (2) 107* from Halos, an ἔγγυος to a *proxenia*-grant is mentioned (line 3).

³³ This is the most common interpretation of lines 2–4 (συνθείκα Βασαίδουν τεῖς εἵντεσσι τοῦν πετταροῦν γενίουν καὶ τᾶς ταγάς κοιναείντων). A. Bresson & P. Debord, Συγγένεια, *REA* 87, 1985, 200, have rightly argued that taking Βασαίδουν as a partitive genitive (thus Helly, 1970; L. Moretti, *Iscrizione storiche ellenistiche*, II, Florence 1976, n. 97)

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* (ἀπόλαος ἔστω) 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 [συγγ]ενίου, 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 ἐπί) 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 φράτριά.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 πάτρια.³⁸ A more convincing evidence for Thessaly is perhaps the names ending in -αδαί and -ίδαί, which may indicate the existence of social groups with defined territories, which were subdivisions of the φυλαί and themselves comprised of smaller divisions – the γένεαι, or πάτρια.³⁹ In this respect the *syngeneia* resembles the more recognized φράτριά, 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: . . . ξενδόκοι τύτο[υν πὰρ τὲν Ἰαπλουνα] Ἐκατόμβιεν ὁ λείτορας ὁ ἐν [Ματροπόλει ὁ λείτορας ὁ ἐπὶ Ττυλίχνας. On 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. Eitrem, Die Labyaden und die Buzyga, *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* 1911, 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 -αδαί and -ίδαί, 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. φράτορας; 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.⁴¹ The activity of most documented *syngeneiai* centered on the administration of a shrine and its territory, and elected magistrates were entrusted with different duties.⁴² Most of these *syngeneiai* were subdivisions of the tribes in the *poleis*, but there is some evidence that indicates their earlier politically independent character.⁴³

Generally, membership in the *syngeneiai* was based on kinship.⁴⁴ Kinship, however, was not essential, as indicated by several inscriptions that record the grants of privileges and membership to non-members,⁴⁵ and the incorporation of new members by way of adoption.⁴⁶ 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 ἀδελφοὶ αἰρετοί ('elected brothers'; line 20), and the process is termed ἀδελφοθετία ('adoption of a brother'; line 33). This process, so it seems, was an artificial creation of *phratriai*.⁴⁷ 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*.⁴⁸ 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.⁴⁹

⁴¹ In Caria: the *syngeneia* which administered the shrine of Sinuri in Mylasa (L. Robert, *Le sanctuaire de Sinuri près de Mylasa*, Paris 1945); the *syngeneiai* of Mylasa (W. Blümel, *Die Inschriften von Mylasa*, Vol. I, Bonn 1987); the *syngeneia* which administered the shrine of Zeus in Labraunda (J. Crampa, *Labraunda*, Vol. III, part 1: The Greek Inscriptions 1–12, Lund 1969); the *syngeneiai* of Olymos (W. Blümel, *Die Inschriften von Mylasa*, Vol. II, Bonn 1988, no. 861); the *syngeneiai* in Alabanda (Ch. Diehl & G. Cousin, *BCH* 10, 1886, 309–310). Other *syngeneiai* are recorded in Calydon (*IG* IX (1) 138), and in Kedesh in Upper Galilee (M. Fischer, A. Ovadia & I. Roll, *The Roman Temple at Kedesh, Upper Galilee: A Preliminary Study*, *Tel Aviv* 11, 1984, 146–172).

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 ἔγδικοι (who represented the community in law suits), ταμίαι, priests, and ἐργοδόται who conducted public works (Robert, inscriptions no. 9, 14). The *syngeneiai* in Olymos (*Inscr. v. Mylasa*, II, no. 861), had particular rites, προστάται, and sacral magistrates. The *syngeneia* of the Aganites in Mylasa elected κτηματῶναι for the purchase of lands, and *tamiai* (*Inscr. v. Mylasa*, I, no. 121, 220, 222). The *syngeneia* in Kedesh (Fischer, Ovadia & Roll, n. 41) worshipped θεοῦ ἁγίου οὐρανόου, identified as Baalshamin. Cf. the decree of the *phratia* Demotionidai in Athens (*IG* II (2) 1237; 396/5 B.C.), and the decree of the *phratia* 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 *syngeneiai* 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 *Inscr. 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, no. 11); but in ca. 220 B.C., after the *synoikismos* of Labraunda with Mylasa, this *syngeneia* is defined as *patra* (*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 *Inscr. 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 αὐτὸν τῆς Πορμουνοῦ συγγενείας καὶ αὐτὸν καὶ ἐγγόνους καὶ μετέχειν αὐτὸν πάντων ὧν περὶ καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ συγγενεῖς. So did the *syngeneia* of Pelekos, which preceded that of Pormounos in administering the shrine of Sinuri (*ibid.*, no. 73, mid 4th century B.C.). See also Diehl & Cousin (n. 41) on Alabanda; *Inscr. v. Mylasa*, II, no. 861 and 868 from Olymos.

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

⁴⁷ See D. Asheri, Osservazioni storiche sul decreto di Nakone, *ASNP* 12, 1982, 1033–1045.

⁴⁸ Robert (n. 41), no. 73, lines 7–8.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, no. 14, where an *egdikos* is elected [κατὰ τῶν ἀδί]κως μετεχόν[των τῆς συγγενείας (lines 10–11)]. Cf. *Inscr.*

The *syngeneiai* 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 *syngeneiai* of Olymos after the *synoikismos* (or *sympoliteia*) with Mylasa.⁵⁰ Since most of the activity of these *syngeneiai* concerned the shrines of their gods, it is probable that privileges granted by them – such as *ateleia*, equal rights,⁵¹ 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).⁵² 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 Ὀρχομενίων, 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.⁵³

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),⁵⁴ what was its and Polichne's status in relation to the *polis*?

Several places bearing the name Polichne are known,⁵⁵ 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,⁵⁶ 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

v. Mylasa, II, no. 861; *Syll.*³ 1023 (from Cos).

⁵⁰ In the inscription from Olymos, *Inscr. v. Mylasa*, II, no. 861, this process is called *sympoliteia* (lines 3–4), and the decision is made by the *demoi* of Olymos (line 1), but the fact that the ancient *phylai* of Olymos became *syngeneiai* (lines 8–9; cf. *Inscr. 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'Amyzon en Carie*, Vol. I, Paris 1983, 188–191.

⁵¹ Robert (n. 41), no. 44, lines 8–10: καὶ μετέχειν αὐτὸν πάντων ὧν περ καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ συγγενεῖς.

⁵² The inscription from Olymos (*Inscr. v. Mylasa*, II, no. 861) regulates participation in ceremonies, and different categories of those entitled or not entitled to it are mentioned.

⁵³ See L. Piccirilli, *Gli arbitrati interstatali greci*, Pisa 1973, Vol. I, 200–204, no. 52. A similar case is *IG IX² (1) 718*, which records the regulations for the ἐπιφοῖκοι 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.

⁵⁴ See above, n. 40.

⁵⁵ In the Troad (Strabo, 13, 603 C.); near Chios or on the mainland (Her., 6, 26.2; Thuc., 8, 14, 23); in Crete (Her., 7, 170.1; Thuc., 2, 85.5); near Syracusae (Thuc., 7, 4; Diod., 13, 7; 14; 72).

⁵⁶ The word πολίχνη, or πολίχνα, usually denoted a small town, a fort; cf. Thuc., 7, 4; Plut., *Tim.*, 11.

(Syll.³ 239 E) mentions the *Ματροπολίται Θεσσαλοί*.⁵⁷ 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.⁵⁸ Another such *polichne*, according to Strabo, that also brought the cult of Aphrodite Kastnietis to Metropolis, was *Ὀνθούριον*,⁵⁹ a name rendered by Stephanus of Byzantium as *Ὀνθύριον* 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 Onthyriion 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.).⁶⁰ 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 *Ὀνθυρέων* (line 7), a name which no doubt points to the *polichne* Onthourion/Onthyriion, which participated in the *synoikismos* of Metropolis. It seems, therefore, that the *polis* Onthyriion 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.⁶¹ 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: [τ]ῆς Πολιχνάϊων χώρας (line 9) and τὰμ πόλιν τὸν Ὀθορνέων (line 13). Axenides proposed that the second name was a variation of the name Onthyriion, mentioned by Rhianus, and concluded that both Onthyriion and Polichne lay in south Hestiaiotes.⁶² How could two disputing tribes of Metropolis go to arbitration to another *polis*? Axenides suggested that by the time of the dispute Onthyriion no longer belonged to Metropolis, or that the *synoikismos* had dissolved in the first year of the Roman rule.⁶³ 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 Onthyriion was already integrated into Metropolis and had lost its independence.⁶⁴ 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* Onthyriion, previously an independent community, from disputing land with another *phyle*. It could even reverse to its previous status in case the *synoikismos* was dissolved.⁶⁵

It seems plausible then, that both Polichne and Onthyriion 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 Demetrius by little *polichniai* 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 Onthyriion 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 Thamiéis of Thamiái – the later name of Ithome.

⁶² Th. D. Axenides, *Hellenika* 11, 1939, 263–271.

⁶³ Axenides also suggests that the arbiter was a Roman commander, perhaps Flamininus himself, because of the verb φημί in line 9, and the adjective φιλάνθρωπον in line 11.

⁶⁴ E. Kirsten, *RE* XXI 2, 1952, “Polichne”, col. 1372. Cf. A. Philippson, *Die griechischen Landschaften*, Frankfurt am Main, 1950, Vol. I, 291 and n. 1.

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.⁶⁶ 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.⁶⁷ 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.⁶⁸ 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.⁶⁹ The priests of Apollo Hecatombaios 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 *proxenoi* in Olympia and Delphi (and maybe also Sparta), attested by several sources.⁷⁰ 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 *ξενοδοκεῖν* 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'.⁷¹ In Homer (*Il.*, 3.354; *Od.*, 8.210) and in Hesiod (*Op.*, 183) *xenodokos* means 'one who receives foreigners'.⁷² The word *xenodochia* in the sense of 'receiving foreigners' is found in Xenophon (*Oec.*, 9.10).⁷³

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.⁷⁴ Thus Apollonius (*Lex. Hom.*, 117.25 B) says: *ξενοδόκος ξενοδόχος, ὁ τοὺς ξένους*

⁶⁶ See above, nn. 51, 52, and n. 53 on the status of ex-Locrians from Naupactos in their native country.

⁶⁷ Helly (n. 1), 188–89; cf. Bresson & Debord (n. 32), 201–3.

⁶⁸ Such as to persons from Krannon, in the inscription published by Habicht (n. 1). See also Moretti (n. 33), 67. One example of this political change and the resistance it aroused is *IG IX (2) 517 (= Syll.³ 543)*: the letters of Philip V to Larissa, ordering it to grant citizenship to foreigners.

⁶⁹ Cf. Pl., *Leg.*, 729 c–e, where foreigners are defined as those who do not belong to a *syngeneia*.

⁷⁰ Olympia: *Inscr. v. Olymp.*, no. 10, 11, 13; Delphi: F. Sokolowski, *Lois sacrées des cités grecques*, Paris 1969, no. 40 A & C; *Syll.³ 548*; Eur., *Andr.*, 1103; *Ion*, 551, 1039, 1253–1255; Sparta: Her., 6, 57. See Gauthier (n. 30), 42–52. Habicht (n. 1), 147, suggests that the term *proxenos* in the archaic times, as the term *xenodokos* in Hellenistic and Roman Thessaly, denoted 'a witness, a guarantor'. This seems to be the case in some inscriptions from western Greece and literary texts. I hope to study this subject elsewhere.

⁷¹ Cf. Pl., *Resp.*, 4, 419 a; *Anth. Pal.*, 10.16.

⁷² Cf. *Od.*, 8.543; 15.55, 70; 18.64; Men., *Mon.*, 402; Theocr., 16.27; *Anth. Pal.*, 10.15.

⁷³ Cf. Theophr., *Char.*, 23.9.

⁷⁴ Pindaros, *Pyth.*, 10 was written for one of the Thessalian Aleuadae in 498 B.C. Simonides went to Thessaly in ca.

ὑποδεχόμενος· ὁ δὲ Πίνδαρος ξεινοδόκησέν τε δαίμων: (Fr. 311 Snell) ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐμαρτύρησε. καὶ ἐν τῇ Ὀδυσσεΐα ξεινοδόκος μὲν ἐγώ (18. 64) ἔδοξέ τισι λέγειν < > φησὶν οὖν Σιμωνίδης· ξεινοδόκων δ' ἄριστος ὁ χρυσὸς ἐν αἰθέρι λάμπων: (Fr. 84.7 Bergk) ἀντὶ τοῦ μαρτύρων.

A slightly different version is given by *Et. Magn.*, 610.43: ξεινοδόκος· ὁ μὲν Ὀμηρος τὸν ξένους δεχόμενον . . . Σιμωνίδης δὲ καὶ Πίνδαρος καὶ ἄλλοι τινὲς τὸν ἐπιμάρτυρα ἐξεδέξαντο· Σιμωνίδης, ξεινοδόκησεν Τελάμων, ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐμαρτύρησε· καὶ Πίνδαρος, ξεινοδόκων – λάμπων, ἀντὶ τοῦ μαρτύρων (cf. Zonaras, 1415; *Et. Gud.*, 414.35, which nonetheless defines ξεινοδόχος [414.25] as ὁ τοὺς ξένους φιλοφρονῶν).

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 (ξεινοδόκων . . . λάμπων) 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:

οἳ τε πόλιν Γλαύκοιο Κορίνθιον ἄστῳ νέμοντες
[οἷ] κάλλιστον μάρτυν ἔθεντο πόνων,
χρύσου τιμήεντος ἐν αἰθέρι· καὶ σφιν ἀέξει
αὐτῶν τ' εὐρεΐαν κληδόνα 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 . . . ἐν 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 ξεινοδόκων . . . λάμπων 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: ὑποδεχόμενος ξένους, καὶ μάρτυς, and ξεινοδοκῶν· ξεινοδοχῶν, μαρτυρῶν, 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, ἱκεταδόκος is a person who receives suppliants (*A., Supp.*, 713),⁷⁷ ἱεροδόκος 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 Graeca*, Loeb, 1931, Fr. 92, accepts the connection and adds the line: ξείνος δ' ἦλθε κακὸς τοῖς χερὶ δεξαμένοις, 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.

⁷⁷ See Eust., 1807.9; Soph., *OC*, 258; T.G. Tucker, *The 'Suppliants' of Aeschylus*, London 1889, 140; H. Friis Johansen & E. W. Whittle, *Aeschylus, The Suppliants*, Vol. III, Copenhagen 1980, ad loc.

who receives sacrifices (A., *Supp.*, 363),⁷⁸ and δωροδόκος is a person who receives bribes (Pl., *Resp.* 390 d; Dem., 18.61). Moreover, θεωροδόκοι, ‘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 *theorodokos*’ descendants.⁷⁹ 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*.⁸⁰

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 *prostatai* 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 *martys* and *martyrein*, and in one case, at least, their use occurs along with the use of *xenodokoi*.⁸¹

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.⁸² Hence my interpretation of the *xenodokoi* in the covenant of the Basaidai: the priests of the god of the *syngeneia* 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 φιλόξενός τε καὶ μεγαλοπρεπῆς τὸν Θετταλικὸν τρόπον (fond of foreigners and generous according to the Thessalian habitude).

Tel Aviv

Rachel Zelnick-Abramovitz

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.