

EARLY GREEK *PROXENOI*

M. B. WALLACE

WE MAY LOOSELY DEFINE a *proxenos* as one city's official friend in another city.¹ Students of Hellenistic life know the institution of proxeny from quantities of inscriptions, but there is little evidence for its origins. Yet few aspects of Greek inter-state relations can be so clearly isolated, and few so graphically illustrate the detailed workings of the slowly widening archaic political consciousness. This note aims to collect and analyse the currently available testimony for proxeny down to ca. 460 B.C., by which time the institution was widely and firmly established in the Greek world.²

¹This paper was originally intended to be an appendix to my "Notes on Early Greek Grave Epigrams," *Phoenix* 24 (1970) 95-105, and appears here separately at the suggestion of the editor. I should like to thank Prof. M. E. White and Prof. J. W. Cole for criticizing earlier drafts; also Miss H. Dawson, Prof. H. J. Mason, and Mr. K. Rigsby for discussion of points in it. The following abbreviations are used:

Bengtson = H. Bengtson, *Die Staatsverträge des Altertums* 2 (Munich and Berlin 1962)

Miss Guarducci = M. Guarducci, *Epigrafia Greca* 1 (Rome 1967)

Miss Jeffery = L. H. Jeffery, *Local Scripts of Archaic Greece* (Oxford 1961)

Meiggs and Lewis = R. Meiggs and D. Lewis, *Greek Historical Inscriptions* (Oxford 1969)

Pfohl = G. Pfohl, *Greek Poems on Stone* 1. *Epitaphs* (Leyden 1967 = *Textus Minores* 36)

²460 is a comparatively arbitrary date chosen to allow the inclusion of early material from as many places as possible while excluding the mass of developed Attic material. For that see A. Lambrechts, *Tekst en vitzicht van de Atheense proxeniedecreten tot 323 v. c.* (Brussels 1958), with D. M. Lewis, *Gnomon* 32 (1960) 166-167. For the last third of the century the epigraphical evidence is supplemented by eleven references to *proxenoi* in Thucydides (2.29, 2.85, 3.2, 3.52, 3.70, 4.78, 5.43, 5.59, 5.76, 6.89, 8.92) and some elsewhere: for instance, Diodoros 13.27.3 adds the important information that Nikias was *proxenos* of Syracuse, and Aristoph. *Av.* 1021 shows that the natural first question of an Athenian *episkopos* visiting a city was "Where are the *proxenoi*?" For the importance which proxeny came to have see also R. Meiggs, "A Note on Athenian Imperialism," *CR* 63 (1949) 9-12, and S. Perlman, "A Note on the Political Implications of Proxenia in the Fourth Century B.C.," *CQ* 8 (1958) 185-191.

As we are not discussing the developed institution, we need neither enter the long controversy over the degree to which proxeny was or might be or become purely honorary, nor distinguish among diplomatic, religious, and commercial sub-types of proxeny. An institution that developed out of Homeric *xenia* was potentially as inclusive as friendship itself, an all-purpose reciprocal relationship, which cannot be further qualified except by reference to the particular condition and interest of particular friends and types of friend. An illuminating if polemical set of analyses of individual cases may be found in A. Wilhelm, *Attische Urkunden* 5 (Vienna and Leipzig 1942 = *SBWien Ph.-Hist. Klasse* 220.5) 42: "Proxenie und Euergesie," 11-86.

References are given to *IG*, *SEG*, and the standard works listed in note 1; otherwise discussion and bibliography of individual items have been kept to a minimum. Some texts mentioned briefly in notes have only a reference to Meiggs and Lewis.

The word *proxenos* and its cognates first appear in the sixth century, with a variety of senses. The etymological meaning is not clear, for there are difficulties with both parts of the compound. The prefix *pro* may mean "on behalf of" or "instead of," *xenos* may mean "guest friend" or, more generally, "foreigner." At Sparta the kings appointed Spartans *proxenoi*, to act "on behalf of foreigners" (Catalogue, item 12 below), and in Magna Graecia *proxenos* meant the witness and guarantor of a will or treaty on behalf of foreigners or a foreign state (items 31 and 32). In the normal case, however, the citizens of state A appointed a man of state B as *proxenos* for A's citizens in B, apparently "instead of guest-friends," whom not all travellers would have in a given place.³ He was to be their friend abroad, with all that that implied, high honours for him when he came to them, and the expectation of every form of aid when they went to him.

The earliest document to employ the term is the Korkyrean grave epigram on the cenotaph of Menekrates of Oianthea in Western Lokris:

Ηνιὺ Τλασίαφο Μενεκράτεος τόδε σᾶμα
 Οϊανθέος γενεάν, τόδε δ' αὐτῷ δᾶμος ἐποίει
 ἔς γὰρ πρόξενος δάμου φίλος. ἀλλ' ἐνὶ πόντοι
 ὄλετο, δαμόσιον δὲ καρὸν .ο — — —
 Πραξιμένους δ' αὐτῷ γ[αί]α ἀπὸ πατρίδος ἐνθὼν
 σὺν δάμ[ο]ι τόδε σᾶμα κασιγνέτοιου πονέθει

I have discussed this well-known text in its literary and social context elsewhere; here its more specifically political implications must concern us.⁴ What kind of *proxenos* was Menekrates? Obviously he stood in some kind of enduring relationship to the Korkyreans, was not merely the guarantor, for example, of certain contracts. Prof. Lattimore has sug-

³It is awkward to suppose that the word developed separately in each of these two ways, and that the Spartans in the fifth century used it in both senses (Catalogue items 7-12). Possibly in item 12 about the Spartan kings Herodotos is using a familiar word to describe a somewhat unfamiliar variant practice for which the Spartans themselves had some other technical term. In that case *proxenos* in Magna Graecia could perhaps be re-interpreted as "acting instead of guest friends" (though in itself the translation "on behalf of foreigners" seems to fit the legal contexts better), and only that sense would exist. That sense is surely required for the normal practice; from the point of view of the man appointed he is acting on behalf of foreigners, but those who appointed him would presumably not think of themselves thus. Admittedly, though, *pro* "instead of," as in *proponeo*, is uncommon, and one would rather expect a noun of the requisite sense to be compounded with *anti*. If the legal sense of *proxenos* is the older, and the diplomatic sense is derived from it, it is possible that the true meaning is "on behalf of foreigners" (the sense "foreigner" of *xenos* is as old as the *Odyssey*) and that the use of the word was simply extended without regard to etymological logic. In short, one may argue that *proxenos* had both meanings, or one, or the other.

⁴See my "Notes on Early Greek Grave Epigrams," *Phoenix* 24 (1970) 95-105.

gested, however, that his *proxenia* was not an official grant, and certainly the root seems to have a less than officially precise sense elsewhere in poetry (items 21, 27, 34).⁵ If Winston Churchill, say, had died on the Atlantic and had received a cenotaph in America, might not the monument have recorded that he had been a friend of America, dear to the people, whose death had brought them a common sorrow, whom they had honoured with public burial? Surely it might. Only the phrase *πρόξενος δάμου φίλος* seems redundant on that view, and the emphasis on the *damos* persuades me, at least, that the epitaph is a propaganda document, part of whose intent is to stress the independence and authority of the people. If so, it seems best to suppose that they are burying their chosen and appointed friend.

When would one expect *proxenoi* of such an official kind to appear? The need may have come early, with the great increase in international activity which, beginning already in the eighth century, revolutionized Greek life in the seventh. But the formal grant of rights, honours, and responsibilities by a state surely cannot antedate the seventh century when constitutions were for the first time established. Tyrants, like the aristocracies that they supplanted, tended to function through private ties of blood, marriage, and friendship—Periander is an excellent example. When a state got its constitution, the first matters to be dealt with seem usually and naturally to have been the defining of political and of legal rights and obligations at home, and one might expect a comparatively sophisticated device for international relations to develop somewhat after constitutional government in a given case. Evidently, however, a late seventh-century date for the beginnings of proxeny at, say, Athens and Sparta would be possible within this theoretical framework. It is the absence of any indication that men like Solon and Cheilon, or indeed any political figures before the fifth century, were anyone's *proxenoi* that makes a date in the second half of the sixth century seem preferable.

Yet the Menekrates epigram looks much older. It used to be assigned more or less indifferently to the seventh or the sixth century, but recent opinion has hardened on the formula 625–600.⁶ With due respect, that

⁵R. Lattimore, *CP* 47 (1952) 101–104.

⁶Meiggs and Lewis 4 and Pfohl 10 follow Miss Jeffery's date, 232–234, no. 9. Miss Jeffery stresses the difficulties in dating this particular text, besides which there are formidable general uncertainties. In the absence of a public epigraphic tradition exercising an influence toward uniformity and supplying us with fixed points for dating we cannot hope for accuracy within a generation. Miss Jeffery herself accepts a divergence in the practice of different masons in late archaic Athens sufficient to make the Piesistratos altar dedication look thirty years younger than it is, p. 75. Outside Attica the scarcity of material imposes even greater caution, cf. the recent controversies over the date of Nestor's cup from Ischia (Meiggs and Lewis 1; dates from later eighth to middle sixth century) and over that of the Corinthian epigram on Salamis (Meiggs and

seems to pay too much attention to archaeological pointers that are far in themselves from being conclusive. The political precocity that would be implied by such a date seems a virtually decisive reason for lowering it. The people are much more likely to appear as a political unit exercising independent power in a document after the fall of the Kypselids than before Periander's recovery of the island, and 582 (on the traditional chronology of the Corinthian tyranny) is a plausible *terminus post quem*.⁷ Certainly, the later the date adopted the less anomalous it will appear beside those of other early pieces of evidence for proxeny, none of which is certainly earlier than the late sixth century.

The suggestion cannot be fully supported here. The *damos*, admittedly, had some sort of existence and influence much earlier.⁸ My point is that

Lewis 24; date ca. 600 or 480). Items 2, 5, and 22 below are also the subjects of current differences of opinion involving more than fifty years. It is noteworthy that Meiggs and Lewis prefer to date the Menekrates epigram by the pottery. But the two proto-Corinthian aryballoi found in the cenotaph are "heirlooms" also on their dates, unless they are relying on the argument that local Korkyrean imitations of Corinthian pottery will have lagged behind in style, cf. G. Dontas, "Local Imitation of Corinthian Vases of the Later Seventh Century B.C. Found in Corfu," *Hesperia* 37 (1968) 331-337. If so, the dating would seem rather uncertain. Among older scholars who accepted a sixth-century date G. Rodenwaldt, *Korkyra* (Berlin 1939) 2.171 should have special mention. The above considerations at best only re-open the question of date, and it has been put to me that I support a late date only through a highly subjective reconstruction of the political ambience of the epigram. The opinion of someone who has at least no proxeny axe to grind should be more reliable. W. Peek, *Griechische Grab-Gedichte* (Berlin 1960) 9-10 writes: "Nur dass sich dieses nun ganz im Bereich des Bürgerlichen abgespielt hat, in der neuen demokratischen Ordnung, die sich die griechische Polis des 6. Jahrhunderts gegeben hatte: nicht zufällig wird das Wort δᾶμος 'Volk' (Gemeinde) dreimal wiederholt." There is one small positive consideration favouring the late date: namely, that there are otherwise no grave epigrams of more than one couplet known from before the mid-sixth century. Admittedly, very few really early poems survive, and Pfohl 22 = Miss Jeffery 322, 324, no. 27 may be an exception, though its restoration is dubious, the two and a half lines are not wholly metrical, and earlier scholars assigned it to the later sixth century. *A priori*, however, the change from one to many couplets seems likely to have been a definite development, if one may use the marked nature of the change from one to many poems on the same stone as a parallel.

⁷For the date of the fall of the Kypselid tyranny in Corinth see J. Ducat, "Note sur la Chronologie des Kypselids," *BCH* 85 (1961) 418-425, with references, to which should be added R. Sealey, "From Phemius to Ion," *REG* 70 (1957) 312-355, esp. 318-325, arguing for the low dates independently of E. Will's monumental case in *Korinthiaka* (Paris 1955). M. Ducat's defence of the traditional dates has been elaborated by M. Catandella, "Erodote e la Cronologia dei Cipselidi," *Maia* 16 (1964) 204-225, cf. W. den Boer, "Herodot und die Systeme der Chronologie," *Mnem.*⁴ 20 (1967), 7th Exkurs, 58-60. About Korkyra after the death of Periander there seems to be nothing at all known.

⁸The term *demos* for the mass of the people is found in Homer, Archilochos, Alkman, and Tyrtaos, and implied in such passages as τὰ χρήματα ἔστω αὐτοῦ δαμόσσια in the oath of the founders at Cyrene, Meiggs and Lewis 5.38. The Spartan *damos* was

the Korkyra epigram does not merely show a *damos* which has been given a constitutional position, a junior partnership, as it were, in the state; the Korkyrean *damos* is itself apparently the final authority, and itself conducts comparatively advanced international diplomatic activity. The fourfold repetition of the root *dam-* strikes an emphatic note. Obviously the membership of the *damos* may have been restricted, and inevitably it will have been guided by men of privilege and position. What is exciting is the rhetoric of the situation as much as its reality. A wide body of citizens wields the basic political power. Their spokesmen emphasize that power to the exclusion of any other authority in the state. No tyrant currying favour or aristocratic clique seeking to project a liberal image could have adopted such a tone. Solon gave the Athenian *demos* considerable political power, and on Chios there was a *δημοσὶν βουλῇ* before 550, but can one see either *demos* successfully asserting that it *was* the state?⁹ Surely it was not before Periander got control of the island, but after Psammetichos' death, that the Korkyrean manifesto was issued.

Even a date as low as 550 would probably leave Menekrates of Oianthea as our first known *proxenos*, but he would fit more intelligibly into the pattern formed by the rest of the material. At least five late archaic or early classical inscriptions refer to an official status of *proxenos*, items 2, 4, 11, 22, 30, cf. 5 and 6. Pindar, Bacchylides, and Aeschylus are the earliest literary sources for the root *proxen-*, and it is first in Herodotos that the sense is certainly formal, items 13, 21, 24–27, 34. The name *Proxenos* may occur once at the end of the sixth century; it becomes common only from the middle of the fifth, item 33. It is in the last third of the fifth century that we meet second and third generation *proxenoi* in Athenian decrees and in Thucydides, items 7, 15, 16, 17, cf. 18 and 19, and toward the beginning of the fourth century that there appear fourth-generation *proxenoi*, items 8 and 9. Though argument from silence at this period is clearly dangerous, the positive evidence

given a share in the state by the Great Rhetra; for its date and significance see especially W. G. Forrest, "The date of the Lykourgan Reforms in Sparta," *Phoenix* 17 (1963) 157–179, "Legislation in Sparta," *Phoenix* 21 (1967) 11–19, *Sparta* (London 1968) ch. 5 and Excursus 1, and G. Huxley, *Early Sparta* (London 1962) ch. 3, who argue for a date close to 676. Pausanias 6.19.1 reports a dedication at Olympia by Myron I and the *demos* of the Sikyonians, but Miss M. E. White, "The Dates of the Orthagorids," *Phoenix* 12 (1958) 10, suggests on several grounds that Pausanias has confused Myron I and Myron II, and that the dedication will have been just before 600.

⁹Solon speaks with irritation of the leaders of the *demos*, fr. 3.7 Diels³; that is perhaps the first appearance of the word to represent a partisan political force. In fr. 24.1–2 Solon speaks of an assembly of the *demos*, and in fr. 22 of restraining it. He appears to have given the rights of sitting in the assembly, electing magistrates, and serving judicially in the Heliaia, to all citizens. The air of orderly compromise is absent from our Korkyrean text. For Chios see Meiggs and Lewis 8.

coheres well to suggest a late sixth-century date for the first appearances of the institution.

Nothing certain can be deduced about the origins of proxeny from the geographical distribution of the early examples, though the complete absence of the Aegean islands and the Ionian East is a notable feature. Proxeny was conferred before the Persian Wars by Korkyra (Menekrates), Elis (item 2, cf. 4) Sparta (items 7, 8, and 9), Athens (items 13 and 14, cf. 16), and Thessaly (item 22). Korkyra conferred it on a West Lokrian, Thessaly on an East Lokrian. If the diplomatic institution was an off-shoot of *proxenia* in private law, it might have been developed by the Lokrians to meet their special need for close ties between their two sovereign parts, or by the Eleans to facilitate the operation of an international sanctuary, or by the Spartans to smooth the working of the most important early multilateral confederacy in Old Greece, the Peloponnesian League. The Lokrians probably had *proxenoi* early in private law (items 1 and 32), the Eleans or Spartans will have taken the idea from the Lokrians or various Magna Graecia states (cf. the treaty of the Sybarites and the Serdaioi deposited at Olympia, item 31). It should be remembered, however, that the native Spartan institution of proxeny was somewhat different, item 12. Diplomatic and legal *proxeniai* may well have developed separately, and whatever hypothesis we propose for the origin of diplomatic proxeny, several states must have borrowed the idea for different reasons almost immediately. The circumstances and date of the first naming of a *proxenos* cannot be established from geographical inspection. We are left, then, with the somewhat vague conclusion that official diplomatic proxeny began in mainland Greece ca. 550 B.C.

CATALOGUE OF EVIDENCE FOR EARLY PROXENY

LOKRIS

No record survives of any grant of proxeny made by Lokrians during our period. However, the earliest known *proxenos* in Greece was Menekrates of Oianthea in Ozolian Lokris, as we have seen, above p. 190, from the grave epigram on his cenotaph on Korkyra. Also in the archaic period Arisstomachos of Opountian Lokris was made *proxenos* of Pherai in Thessaly, item 22 below. Pindar reveals that Lampromachos of Opountian Lokris was a *proxenos* of the Thebans, item 24 below.

(1) IG 9.1.333 from Oianthea from the middle of the fifth century or somewhat later, Miss Jeffery 106, 108, no. 4b, provides that when a *xenos* is selecting a body of men to try his suit, which he may do if the *xenodikai* disagree, he must not choose either *proxenos* or *widioxenos*,

obviously lest they be prejudiced in his favour. The meaning of *proxenos* is unclear. The previous sentence is Τὸν πρόξενον, αἱ ψευδέα προξενεῖ, διπλεῖ οἱ θάμι' ἔστω which suggests that to be a *proxenos* is to be an official witness or guarantor, as in items 31 and 32; on the other hand the contrast with *widioxenos* suggests a more permanent relationship.

Lokrian forms, then, were clearly sophisticated, and yet remain unknown apart from a few scraps of chance discovery. It is a frustrating situation. The problem to which proxeny is intended as a partial solution, how to give foreigners standing in a state, must certainly have been especially acute between the two sovereign halves of the Lokrian people, so that it is tantalizing to find the first recorded *proxenos* a Lokrian.

ELIS

There is one certainly early proxeny conferred by the Eleans, upon a Spartan:

(2) *SEG* 11 (1954) 1180a: Γόργος Λακεδαιμόνιος πρόξενος Φαλείων appears on a marble seat in the Olympia stadium. Miss Guarducci 281, no. 3 follows Miss Jeffery 190, 199, no. 15 in dating the text to the first half of the sixth century. The original editor, E. Kunze, "Ein Monument aus den Stadion," *Olympiabericht* 4 (1944) 164-166 and Tafel 67, proposed the second half of the sixth or the early fifth century, which was accepted by *SEG ad loc.* and by F. Hasbreeks, "Over de Proxenie in Lakonie," *RBPhil* 37 (1959) 5-30, p. 5.

(3) The scholiast on Aelius Aristides 3.515Dind., who says that Kimon was a *proxenos* at Elis, seems only to be making a deduction from the false tradition that Kimon had a son named Elaios; there is no need to accept his unsupported statement (see item 23).

(4) *Olympia* 5 (Berlin 1896 = Amsterdam 1966) 11 is an agreement between the Chaladrioi, who control land in Pisa, and a foreigner named Deukalion, giving him the status of Chaladrian, *proxenos*, and *demiourgos*; no return is specified on his part although the honours are cast in the form of a bilateral contract. Miss Guarducci 203-205, no. 2 follows Miss Jeffery 220, no. 8 in suggesting an early fifth-century date. We must suppose that the Chaladrioi form a constituent township of the Elean state. This is the earliest example by over a century of the grant of combined citizenship and proxeny.¹⁰

¹⁰The lack of an ethnic for Deukalion is odd, the only early parallel being in item 30. It is possible that he is an Elean of another deme, but then one would perhaps not expect him to get *wisoproxenia* as well as *wisodamiourgia*. It seems unlikely to be a higher honour, and so should be included here for some practical reason connected with the legal representation of foreigners. It would follow that Deukalion was a foreigner, and one would suppose that he received *wisoproxenia* rather than *proxenia* because it

There is some evidence that toward the end of the archaic period a good many states had appointed Eleans their *proxenoi*:

(5) *SEG* 22 (1967) 338, a treaty between the Anaitioi and the Metapioi found at Olympia, provides that if either party defaults, he shall be prevented by the *proxenoi* and the *manteis* from sharing in the sacrifices. Bengtson 111 dates it ca. 550, Miss Jeffery 220, no. 12, ca. 475–450.

(6) *Olympia* 5.13 provides, in penalizing a certain Timokrates, that he should under certain circumstances be kept away from the altar by the *proxenoi* and the priest. The date suggested is "archaic."

It seems more probable to me that the Elean *proxenoi* in these texts are representatives of the states involved rather than, say, guarantors, but no certainty is possible. G. Busolt, *Griechische Staatskunde* (Munich 1920) 229, n. 1, would assimilate them to the type of Spartan *proxenoi* mentioned in item 12.

The evidence for proxeny at Elis, then, depends largely upon the dating of Elean inscriptions which seems far from precise (cf. n. 6). The institution was probably familiar by the late archaic period, and an important international sanctuary had every reason to pioneer in diplomacy.

SPARTA

(7) In Thucydides 5.43.2 we hear for the first time of a proxeny which has actually already extended over several generations, cf. Plut. *Alc.* 14. Alkibiades' grandfather had been *proxenos* of Sparta, but renounced the connection; Alkibiades claimed to resume it.¹¹ In Thuc. 6.89.3 Alkibiades

was felt inappropriate to call a citizen *proxenos* even if he remained also a citizen of his native state. As a deme seems unlikely to have its own *proxenoi*, *wisoproxenia* probably means privileges in the deme equivalent to those of *proxenoi* of Elis. Doubtless the deme is making effective a preliminary resolution of Elis to make Deukalion citizen and *proxenos*; it enrolls him and affirms his rights and privileges. One might question speaking of the relation between the Chaladrioi and the Eleans in terms of deme and *polis*, especially as Elis was not synoikized until after the Persian Wars, Diod. 11.54.1, Strabo 336–337. "The Eleans," however, make alliances (Meiggs and Lewis 17) and war (Meiggs and Lewis 27, the "Serpent column") and criminal law (*Olympia* 5.2) as a unit before the synoikism, and, of course, appoint a *proxenos*, item 2. There is no trace of comparable activity on the part of Elean villages.

¹¹Plutarch actually calls Alkibiades *proxenos*, and G. Daux argues that he (and Alkibiades) were right in supposing that the grandfather's unilateral act could not change the legal position, G. Daux, "Alcibiade, Proxène de Lacédémone," *Mélanges offerts à A. M. Desrousseaux* (Paris 1937) 117–122. The Spartans had decreed the proxeny whatever he chose to say, and are unlikely to have voted a formal revocation. M. Daux assumes that the grant would have been hereditary, as certainly proxeny tended to be. Items 8 and 9 are early Spartan parallels, cf. Plato *Laws* 642b, where the Spartan Megakles says that his "hearth" (*hestia*) was *proxenos* of Athens, that he was brought up to consider himself a *proxenos* of Athens, and that he was teased by the

speaks of his ancestors in the plural as having had the honour cf. *schol.* 5.43.2. The evidence for his family tree is incomplete and controverted. E. Vanderpool proposes a birth date as late as 535 B.C. for Alkibiades' great grandfather, Kleinias I, in which case two generations of proxeny by Alkibiades' ancestors would fit into the fifth century. I should prefer ca. 560, in which case the proxeny might begin in the Peisistratid period, or, perhaps more probably, at its end in 510.¹²

other children as being an Athenian, also items 4, 15, 16, 17. Proxeny was not always hereditary, however, cf. items 11, 22, 30. One should not, for instance, suppose that all five sons of Alexander I of Macedon, including Perdikkas, were *proxenoi* of the Athenians throughout their lives. If proxeny is seen as the formalization of friendship between a state and an individual, it is evident that it takes two to be friends. The arrangement is bilateral, even if it is executed in a unilateral decree, cf. item 4, beginning "the *rhetra* of the Chaladrioi and Deukalion...". The public party could terminate it, as the Thirty terminated the proxenies of friends of the Athenian *demoi*, cf. *IG* 2/3¹ 6 = *Syll.*³ 119, *IG* 2/3¹ 17 = *Syll.*³ 127, by cancelling their decree, cf. Perlman, *op. cit.* (above, n. 2) 188, n. 9 and notes 6 and 7. Equally the private party must have been able to refuse to befriend the state involved and its citizens, and such a refusal would surely be held to void the arrangement. One would expect that a state of war, at least when the individual was prominent in the war party, and indeed any serious unfriendly act, would also dissolve the partnership, even in the absence of formal declarations on either side.

¹²See E. Vanderpool, "The ostracism of the Elder Alkibiades," *Hesperia* 21 (1952) 1-8, revised in "New Ostraca from the Athenian Agora," *Hesperia* 37 (1968) 117-120, 118, n. 1, and defended in "Alkibiades," *Hesperia* 37 (1968) 398. The ostraca show that the famous Alkibiades' father's father's father was called Kleinias. Isokrates 16. 26 names a grandfather of Alkibiades' father Alkibiades. A. E. Raubitschek, "Zur Attischen Genealogie," *RM* 98 (1955) 258-262, made the obvious proposal that Isokrates was speaking of Alkibiades' father's *mother's* father. But as Alkibiades is a rare name we should not postulate the coincidence that there was an unknown Alkibiades unrelated to the main family, whose daughter our Alkibiades' grandfather happened to marry. The easiest solution is that Alkibiades' grandfather's father Kleinias (from the ostraca) and Alkibiades' grandfather's wife's father, Alkibiades (from Isokrates) were brothers. The first-cousin marriage would not be surprising, cf. W. E. Thompson, "The Marriage of First Cousins in Athenian Society," *Phoenix* 21 (1967) 273-282. Vanderpool, however, finds it less tortuous to suppose that Isokrates' "great-grandfather Alkibiades" was an inaccurately termed great grandfather.

There seem to me to be five slight indications that the more complex hypothesis should be accepted. (1) Isokrates wrote his speech for the famous Alkibiades' son, whose first cousin he was, so his credit on this issue is higher than usual. (2) Even Vanderpool's revised stemma postulates three thirty-year and two twenty-five year generations in the family of Alkibiades, which seems unlikely in a period of late marriages and high infant mortality, cf. M. E. White, "Some Agiad Dates: Pausanias and his Sons," *JHS* 84 (1964) 140-152, notes 11, 18. (3) The naming of a pair of brothers Alkibiades and Kleinias is found also in the case of the famous Alkibiades. (4) Vanderpool is obliged to assume that the Kleinias son of Alkibiades who furnished a trireme at Artemision (Her. 8.17) was the famous Alkibiades' great grandfather, who would be rather old; I would make him that Kleinias' nephew, the son of Isokrates' "great grandfather Alkibiades," also called Kleinias. (5) Vanderpool admits that 'Αλκιβιάδης

(8) Xenophon, *Hell.* 6.3.4., makes Kallias III tell the Spartans that he is not the first of his line to be their *proxenos*, for his father's father inherited their grant as a paternal honour. Kallias' sister was Isokrates' mother; he was born in 436, so she was born by 455, and their father, Hipponikos II, ca. 490–485. His father, then, was born ca. 520, and his grandfather in the 550's. This man's proxeny must fall between ca. 530 and 480, and a very suitable occasion would have been the expulsion of the Peisistratids.

(9) Xenophon, *Hell.* 6.1.4, also has Polydamas of Pharsalos tell the Spartans in 374 that all his ancestors as far back as can be remembered have been *πρόξενοι καὶ ἐνεργέται* of Sparta. In the mouth of an aristocrat that form of boast would seem likely to fail of its effect unless the honour went back behind his grandfather, at least to a great grandfather, who would be active about the time of the Persian Wars.

(10) Plutarch, *Kimōn* 14, makes Kimon refer to his Spartan proxeny in 463 or 462. The grant cannot be before Miltiades' death ca. 489, and should be the occasion of Kimon's naming his son Lakedaimonios ca. 476 (the boy was hipparch ca. 446, cf. *IG* 1² 400).

Only one Laconian is known to have received the gift of proxeny from another state during the early period apart from Gorgos, for whom see item 2, and he is described, by the Argives, only with his deme name. One may wonder if the honour was intended as recognizing a Spartan. (11) *SEG* 13 (1956) 239, dated by Miss Jeffery 162, 169, no. 22 ca. 475, is a bronze plaque containing a proxeny decree for Gnosstas of Woinous (in Lakonia).

An idiosyncratic form of proxeny seems to have existed at Sparta from an early date:

(12) Herodotos 6.57 says that the Spartan kings had the right of appointment of *proxeinoi* from among the *astoi*. I cannot believe, with Hasbreeks, *op. cit.* (above, p. 195) item 2, that *astoi* is here equivalent to *metoikoi*; Monceaux was surely right that the kings placed a kind of liturgic obligation on prominent Spartans to look after certain foreigners. There are some traces of similar practices elsewhere, as a supplement to the normal system of *proxenoi*, cf. P. Monceaux, *Les Proxénies Grécques* (Paris 1886) ch. 2, and the proposals in Plato *Laws* 12.953. The kings' right seems likely to have become formalized very early, and the seventh century would not be surprising.

'Αλκιβιά[δο] is a more natural restoration than 'Αλκιβιά[δες Κλεινίο]|'Αλκιβιά[δες Κλεινίο] of the ostrakon he published in *Hesperia* 37 (1968) 117–120, no. 2. I suggest that it is right, and refers to a son of the famous Alkibiades' grandfather Alkibiades, and brother of Alkibiades' father Kleinias. If so, we have another pair of brothers named Alkibiades and Kleinias, and the complexity of nomenclature which at first sight looks like a weakness of my hypothesis begins to look like an authentic pattern.

Sparta seems to have been granting proxenies before the end of the sixth century, and at least one of her citizens seems to have been receiving proxeny earlier. She is also one of the Greek states most internationally active during the period. Yet it seems impossible to attribute the invention of the institution to her because her own native conception of proxeny was untypical. She is slightly more likely to have adopted what became the normal form from Elis than from anywhere else.

ATHENS

(13) Herodotos 8.136, cf. 8.143, calls Alexander I of Macedon *πρόξενός τε . . . καὶ εὐεργέτης* of Athens. The occasion is Mardonios' dispatch of Alexander to Athens in winter 480/479 to treat for a separate peace. Herodotos is well informed about Alexander, so that we should take it seriously that he employs language which suggests an official decree. The Peisistratids had ties with Alexander's father, Amyntas, but they would surely have honoured Amyntas himself. Alexander can hardly have been born before 530. Some proxenies were hereditary, to be sure, but any friendship between the Macedonian and the Athenian authorities must have ended in 510. Amyntas backed Hippias in exile, no doubt as part of a policy of accommodation with Persia, and on Alexander's accession there was probably no open breach with the Great King; otherwise Herodotos would recount it among the stories of Alexander's philhellenism. Dealings with Athens might have been resumed either between 496 and 493 or between 486 and 483 without direct offence to Persia, and Amyntas' proxeny revived for the occasion, but the simpler explanation is surely that during one of these two periods Alexander became Athens' benefactor and was honoured accordingly. A proxeny relation under Amyntas, interrupted and renewed, is possible but unsupported.¹³

¹³The relevant material is almost all in Herodotos, 5.17–22, 94, 6.44–45, 7.9, 173, 8.34, 121, 136–143, 9.44–45. Cf. Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 15.2. Alexander's age also depends on the disputed regnal dates of his successors. Dem. 23.200 says that the Macedonian king who helped the Greeks in the Persian Wars was rewarded with Athenian citizenship, ps.-Dem. 13.24 says not with citizenship but with *ateleia* (both wrongly have the name as Perdikkas). F. Geyer, *Makedonien bis zur Thronbesteigung Philipps II* (Munich and Berlin 1930) 44, suggested that Alexander was probably given *proxenia* and *ateleia* after the Persian Wars when he was officially philhellene (cf. the gold statue he dedicated at Delphi from Persian spoils, ps.-Dem. 12.21 with Her. 8.121), and that Herodotos has antedated the grant. Geyer may have had in mind that later *proxenia* is usually accompanied by *ateleia*; that, however, does not seem to have been the case in our period, cf. items 5, 11, 17, 26, 27. His is a bold way to treat a well-informed contemporary source (it is followed by N. G. L. Hammond, *OCD*, s.v. "Alexander"). A fuller study is needed of the accompanying claim that all Herodotos' evidence for Alexander's philhellenism before 479 is derived from false Macedonian (and Peloponnesian?) propaganda, G. Lombardo, "Alessandro Filelleno," *RFIC* 59 (1931) 480–484, and

(14) Aischines 3.258 says that Arthmios of Zeleia, near Kyzikos, was a *proxenos* of Athens, apparently before Xerxes' invasion of Greece. He distributed Persian gold in the Peloponnesos, and was proclaimed an enemy of the Athenians and their allies on the motion of Kimon, Dem. 9.42, 19.271; Deinarchos 2.24–26; Krateros, *FGrHist* 342 F 14; Plut. *Them.* 6.2; Aelius Aristides 1.310 and 2.392 Dind., cf. 3.327; Harpokration s. "Ἀρθμιος, ἀτιμία. These sources do not mention Arthmios' proxyeny, but the repeated statement that he was punished with ἀτιμία shows that he had some civic rights at Athens, and thus confirms Aischines.¹⁴ The tradition conceives of Arthmios' offence as connected with Xerxes' expedition, but since Grote the phrase "the Athenians and their allies" has been taken to indicate a date for the condemnation during the Delian Confederacy.¹⁵ Indeed as Athens seems to be legislating

A. Momigliano, *Filippo il Macedone* (Florence, 1934). I would only say that (1) unless Herodotos is grossly mistaken about Alexander's very *age*, his admission to competition at Olympia, Her. 5.21, and with it his interest in proving himself Greek, must have been before 490. (2) As Geyer and Lombardo agree, the language used of Mardonios' conquest in 492, Her. 6.44, shows some break in the dependence of Macedon on Persia between 513 and 492, though probably not an overt break, or Herodotos would have reported and stressed it. Might Alexander, though a Persian client king, have entered into relations with Athens when she repented of helping the Ionian revolt, and been indiscreet enough to become her *proxenos*, for which he was curbed?

Alternatively one might ask what happened on the death of Darius. Alexander probably had no personal obligation to Xerxes, and every reason after 492–490 to regard Athens as a welcome counterforce to Persia, a state to which he might look for help in reasserting his comparative autonomy. As late as 483 and 482 vast quantities of ship timber was arriving in Athens to enable the building of the Themistoklean navy which saved Greece and Macedonia; Macedonia was a major source of that scarce strategic material, *IG* 1³. 71.22/3, 105.30, Aristoph. *Lys.* 421 with Andok. 2.11, Dem. 19.265, ps.-Dem. 49.26, 36 Ditt., *Syll.*³ 248 N 7, *Syll.*³ 587.66, 304, *Syll.*³ 135, from which passages it appears that the export of wood for ships and oars was kept under the personal control of the king of Macedon, at least in the period ca. 440–380, and no doubt earlier and later as well.

¹⁴ Ἀτιμία is mentioned by Dem. 9.42, cf. Harpokration s.v. ἀτιμία; Plut. *Them.* 6.2; Aelius Aristides 1.310 Dind. and scholia (3.327 Dind.; cf. *ap.* Krateros, *FGrHist* 342 F 14). Demosthenes and Harpokration are surely wrong in claiming that ἀτιμία in this decree has the older sense of "outlaw," cf. G. Colin, "La Déformation d'un Document . . .," *RevPhil* 7 (1933) 237–260, 256. It would weaken Demosthenes' case about the vigilance of the Athenians to mention that the man they punished had spent time in Athens and was, indeed, their *proxenos*, so that he needed an *ad hoc* explanation for ἀτιμία.

¹⁵ The following points in the sources indicate the Persian War date:

(a) Aischines appeals to the probable indignation of the victims of Marathon and Plataia at pro-Persian activity, and specifically names Themistokles as a man whose shade will be outraged by failure to treat Demosthenes like Arthmios. Themistokles is a very odd choice, in view of his later career, and why is one man named at all? The most obvious answer is that Aischines meant to single out the mover of the decree against Arthmios, which he had just mentioned. So Plutarch or his source seems to have taken the passage, for it is hard to see where else the wrong attribution of the decree to Themis-

unilaterally for the whole alliance, many scholars assign Kimon's motion to an advanced stage of the Confederacy, and accordingly reject the idea that Arthmios' offence could date back to 480. The only attested Persian mission of intrigue sent to Greece between 479 and the death of Kimon ca. 450 is that of Megabazos to Sparta about 457 or 456, and those who believe that Kimon was recalled from ostracism after the battle of Tanagra have sometimes dated his attack on Arthmios between 457 and 455. Others have argued for 451/0, 462/1, or the later 470's, and the real date for Arthmios' offence, the *terminus ante quem* for his proxyeny, is correspondingly doubtful.¹⁶

tokles in *Them.* 6.2 can have come from (Aelius Aristeides follows it). Thus Aischines (if it is not a mere uncorrected slip) and his readers throughout antiquity thought that the decree belonged to the time before Themistokles' ostracism.

(b) Demosthenes 9.43 stresses that Arthmios was a subject of the Great King, owing to Zeleia's being in Asia. After 479 the route to the Black Sea was as everyone knew in Greek hands.

(c) The scholiast on Aristeides who quotes Krateros says that the stele bearing the Arthmios decree was set up after the Persian occupation of Athens in 480/79, in short, in connection with Xerxes' expedition.

(d) Another scholiast on Aristeides (3.327 Dind.) specifically says that Arthmios was forced by Xerxes to offer the Spartans a bribe to fight with him against the Athenians at the time of his expedition. He adds that Arthmios had been living at Athens but had fallen by chance into the hands of the Persians. I do not see why all this should be dismissed as invention, less so why Cary chooses to disregard it as muddled, cf. M. Cary, "Arthmios of Zeleia," *CQ* 29 (1935) 177–180.

George Grote, *A History of Greece* (new ed., London 1907) 4. 357, n. 3 recognized that the decree could not be earlier than 477, and concluded that the offence came after 479.

¹⁶The Arthmios affair raises several disputed points in the chronology of the years 480–450 which cannot be adequately discussed here. I should like to thank Mr. Peter Derow, Mr. Philip Deane, and Mr. John Smart for the opportunity to read unpublished discussions. The sources for Megabazos' mission are Thuc. 1.109.2 and Diod. 11.74.5, and for Kimon's recall Andok. 3.3, Theopompos, *FGrHist* 115 F 88, Aisch. 2.172, Nepos *Cimon* 3.2, Plut. *Cimon* 17.6, *Pericles* 10.5. For a summary of modern views on Arthmios see A. W. Gomme, *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides* 1 (Oxford 1945) 327, n. 1, who inclines to follow Colin and Kolbe and accept ca. 456. The authors of *The Athenian Tribute Lists* (Princeton 1950) reject a return after Tanagra, 3.171, n. 42 (H. T. Wade-Gery, "The Question of Tribute in 449/8," *Hesperia* 14 [1945] 212–229, had argued for recall, but in 451) and accordingly date the Arthmios Decree to 451, though considering it a response to the activity of ca. 456. W. R. Connor, "Two Notes on Cimon," *TAPA* 98 (1967) 67–75 makes a good case that two or three children were born to Cimon by Isodike in a second marriage contracted after his return to Athens; as Isodike predeceased her husband, a return before 451 seems likely.

The most extreme view is that of C. Habicht, "Falsche Urkunden zur Geschichte Athens im Zeitalter der Perserkriege," *Hermes* 89 (1961) 1–35, who considers the Arthmios decree, along with much of the rest of the documentary record of the Persian Wars, a patriotic propagandist invention of the mid-fourth century. It seems somewhat unlikely, despite the partial parallels of the Plataia Oath and the Themistokles Decree, that the Arthmios decree was inscribed on a bronze stele and erected on the Acropolis, where Dem. 9.41 says it is, at that late date, nor is the precision of detail in the reports suggestive of uninformed creation.

Is there any real need to divorce Arthmios' offence from Xerxes' expedition? We hear of only four people against whom official proceedings for medism were launched after 479. Three were Pausanias, Themistokles, and Gongylos, an Eretrian. Gongylos, like Themistokles, was implicated in Pausanias' misdeeds. He was the only Eretrian exiled for medism, Xenophon says. His punishment will have followed the exposure of Pausanias. Athens readily co-operated with Sparta in proceeding against Themistokles, and her good offices will have been instrumental in persuading Eretria to condemn Pausanias' lesser accomplice. It seems very likely that the Arthmios decree should be placed in this immediate context, and dated to 466 or 465.¹⁷ Kimonian conservatism, friendship for Sparta, and undying opposition to Persia seem to have produced what in contemporary terms we may call the first attested judicial witch-hunt in western history. What the charge against Arthmios was we can only guess, but in the context an envoy to the Peloponnesos sounds like a link between Persia and Themistokles with the *douloi* at Argos. If Arthmios was that, it is very likely that he was also the Persian agent chiefly involved in securing Argive neutrality in 480; if so it is natural that later Athenian oratory should have preferred to animadvert upon this activity.

For the present purpose I would only say that on such a reconstruction Arthmios' proxeny would be dated definitely before 480. An early proxeny relation between Athens and Zeleia is perfectly acceptable. The Black Sea route was one of Athens' oldest international concerns, and she seems also to have had a *proxenos* in Selymbria before the Persian Wars, cf. item 16. It is interesting that so small a town as Zeleia produced so early a *proxenos*; Athens' diplomatic network, at least in the Black Sea area, must have been quite extensive.

(15) Two Athenian decrees record the hereditary proxeny of a fifth-century family from Orchomenos. *IG* 1² 70 = *SEG* 10 (1949) 84, of 423 B.C., honours Potamodoros and Eurytion and confers various privileges upon them, but it is quite fragmentary, and does not mention proxeny in the surviving part. Since it honours Eurytion, he can hardly

¹⁷For Gongylos see Thuc. 1.128.6, Xen. *Hell.* 3.1.6. The date of Pausanias' death and Themistokles' flight is accepted from M. E. White, "Some Agiad Dates: Pausanias and His Sons," *JHS* 84 (1964) 140-152. If we believe Stesimbrotos, *FGrHist* 107 F 3 = Plut. *Them.* 24, Kimon also arranged the condemnation of a certain Epikrates to death for helping Themistokles' family escape to him. W. G. Forrest, "Themistokles and Argos," *CQ* n.s.10 (1960) 229, reasonably proposes associating Kimon's two measures of condemnation. This is not the place to attempt a historical interpretation of his activity. If the Hellenic League received a new lease of life ca. 465, the cause may lie in the internal politics of Athens and Sparta, or in the renewed and formidable Persian threat that was broken at the Eurymedon, either by way of preparation beforehand or consolidation afterward.

have been born later than 440. *IG* 1² 103 = *SEG* 21 (1966) 53, of 412/1 B.C., reads: "Whereas Eurytion and his father Potamodoros and their ancestors (*progonoi*) are *proxenoi* of the Athenians and *euergetai* . . ." (lines 5-7). If the indefinite *progonoi* is used because two generations previous to Potamodoros are in question, Eurytion's great grandfather will have been made a *proxenos* of Athens in the generation before the Persian Wars.

(16) The verse epitaph for Pythagoras of Selymbria, *IG* 1² 1034 = *SEG* 10 (1949) 408, dated to mid-fifth century (Pfohl 88 following Miss Jeffery 366, 371, no. 38) says that the Athenians gave him public burial *Προξενίας ἀρετῆς τε χάριμ προγόνων τε καὶ αὐτῷ*. The verse would read more naturally and the public burial become more intelligible if at least the father had been *proxenos* as well as Pythagoras. The father's appointment would date to the Persian War period; if the plural in *progonon* is taken literally of the proxeny we should have to go back at least to a grandfather honoured a generation before 480.

(17) *IG* 1² 144 + 155 = *SEG* 21 (1966) 50, tentatively assigned to 416/5, makes Proxenos the son of Proxenos the Knidian himself a *proxenos* of Athens. It is hard not to believe that his father's name was an advertisement of his grandfather's proxeny also conferred by the mistress of the Aegean; if so the honour will belong to the 470's or the 460's.

(18) *IG* 1² 36 = *SEG* 10 (1949) 33, of ca. 447/6, makes a Thespian called Athenaios a *proxenos* of Athens. Obviously, Athenaios' father had some public political connection with Athens a generation previously, and proxeny is the most likely, though not the only, cause of the name.¹⁸

(19) *IG* 1² 23 + 30 = *SEG* 10 (1949) 20 of 450/49 makes another Athenaios *proxenos* of Athens. The same considerations apply as in item 18.

(20) Isokrates 15.166 says that Pindar was made an Athenian *proxenos* at Thebes because he called Athens the bulwark of Greece. The statement is unsupported and such traditions are somewhat suspect.

What of Athenians acting as the *proxenoi* of other states? Apart from Kimon's dubious proxenies of Elis and Thessaly (items 3 and 23), we hear only of the three great families that represented Sparta, those of Alkibiades, Kallias, and Kimon (items 7, 8, and 10). Proxeny was certainly very familiar and common by the 460's, for Kimon is repre-

¹⁸Cf. C. P. Loughran and A. E. Raubitschek, "Three Attic Proxeny Decrees," *Hesperia* 16 (1947) 78: "One of the four Thespians, Athenaios, may have received his name as homage to the glorious deeds of the Athenians in which the Thespians participated at Plataia." One might also mention Athens' interference in the internal affairs of Thespiiai after Plataia, as a result of which Themistokles was able to make Sikinnos a Thespian, *Her.* 8.75; Plataia was a Greek rather than an Athenian victory. Some Thespians must have welcomed Themistokles; it would be tidy if Athenaios' father were one and the reward was proxeny.

sented as saying at his trial in 463 or 462 that he was a *proxenos* of the frugal and honest Spartans, not of wealthy and dubious Thessalians and Ionians like some other men, Plut., *Cim.* 14. The word is also found in Aeschylus:

(21) The root *proxen-* occurs in Aeschylus *Supp.* 419, 491, 919, 920, *P. Oxy.* 2161 = *Fr.* 474Mette. The reference seems to be in each case to the official institution of proxeny, though the Danaids speak of constituting the King of Argos their *proxenos* themselves. In 919 the King objects to the Egyptian herald's acting directly and not through a *proxenos*; as Rose says, "the King, like the legalist he is, goes straight to the point of law."¹⁹

We may comment in general that there is no reason to suppose that Athens either gave or received any proxenies before the expulsion of the Peisistratidai, and some slight suggestion that that expulsion was the occasion of the grants from Sparta to the families of Alkibiades and Kallias.²⁰ It is tempting, then, to conjecture that the institution spread from Sparta to Athens. That three of Athens' earliest grants should link themselves with the name of Themistokles (items 13, 14, and 18) is no more than we might expect of that active statesman. It must be emphasized that such remarks can only be offered *exempli gratia*. Any picture of Themistokles as the apt pupil of the Spartans in diplomatic innovation is meant only as a vivid alternative to the assumption that proxeny was a familiar and permanent element in the background of archaic Greek history.

THESSALY

(22) Arisstomachos of Opountian Lokris is appointed a *proxenos* of Pherai in Thessaly by the oldest of a series of eighteen bronze proxeny decrees, published by Y. Béquignon, "Études Thessaliens, XI," *BCH* 88 (1964) 395-412, with plate. Béquignon dates it to the archaic period; while *SEG* 23 (1968) 415 proposes "ca. 450-425," the early sigma, in particular, seems to support the earlier dating.

¹⁹The date of the *Suppliants* must notoriously be later than 468, possibly 463, cf. recently A. Podlecki, *The Political Background of Aeschylean Tragedy* (Ann Arbor 1966) 42-45. The fragment is from the *Diktyoulokoï*, whose date is uncertain; Prof. Lloyd-Jones favours a late date to allow there to be three actors, *ap.* H. Smyth, *Aeschylus* (London 1957) 2.535. For the use of *proxen-* in the *Suppliants* see H. J. Rose, *A Commentary on the Surviving Plays of Aeschylus* (Amsterdam 1957) *ad loc.*

²⁰Cf. item 33 and note 13. One would not expect to find that the most elegant nobles were Peisistratos' lieutenants, and an Alkibiades took part in Hippias' expulsion. As it might be felt that I am pressing too hard for low dates, it is worth mentioning that R. Sealey, "The Entry of Pericles into History," *Hermes* 84 (1956) 238, n.3, says of the proxenies of Kallias and Alkibiades, "Perhaps on some occasion in the time of Cleisthenes the city-families had been anxious for Spartan support."

(23) A scholiast on Aelius Aristides, 3.515 Dind., says that Kimon was *proxenos* of the Thessalians. His similar statement about Kimon and Elis seems mistaken (item 3), but Prof. Connor, "Two Notes on Cimon," *TAPA* 98 (1967) 67-75 wishes to accept the Thessalian proxeny—after all Cimon did call a son Thettalos—and offers an ingenious account of how it can be reconciled with Kimon's slighting remark about *proxenoi* of Thessaly (above, p. 204). The date would be between 457 and 450, but judgment is perhaps best suspended. Who would appoint *proxenoi* of all Thessaly?

The only Thessalian known to have received an early grant of proxeny is Polydamas, item 9, from Sparta. The spread of the institution from Lokris or from Sparta is in accordance with the pattern we have come to postulate, and not particularly informative.

ΒΟΙΩΤΙΑ

(24) Pindar, *Ol.* 9.83, says that he comes to honour the Isthmian victory of Lampromachos *προξενίαι δ' ἀρεταί τ'*. Presumably the *arete* and therefore the *proxenia* are Lampromachos', and the scholiast duly informs us that he was a *proxenos* of the Thebans, and a kinsman of Epharmostos of Opountian Lokris whose Olympic victory in 468 is the occasion of the poem.²¹

(25) Pindar, *Isth.* 4.7-8, celebrating the victory of Melissos of Thebes ca. 476, says that the family are spoken of as honoured in Thebes *πρόξενοι τ' ἀμφικτιόνων*. Wilamowitz appears to be alone in taking this and the next item as evidence for proxeny of the Amphiktyonic League at Delphi.²² Surely Melissos' family have been honoured by various Boiotian towns, neighbours of Thebes.

(26) Pindar, *fr.* 94 b 41, says that he has come to the dance as a faithful witness for Agasikles *ἀμφὶ προξενίαισι· τίμαθεν γὰρ . . . ἀμφικτιόνεσσιν . . .*. Cf. the preceding item.

There is evidence also for various proxenies received by Pindar:

(27) In *Nemean* 7.65, for Sogenes of Aigina perhaps in 467, Pindar says that an Achaian dwelling by the Ionian sea will not blame him for his treatment of the myth; *προξενία πέποιθα*, and the passage is regularly taken to show that Pindar had somehow secured the proxeny of the Molossians. The story of the flight of Themistokles, however, shows that the Molossians had at the time a rather undeveloped monarchy, and on the analogy of Aesch. *Supp.* 419 (see item 21) it seems possible that

²¹The dates assigned in this and the succeeding items are those of C. M. Bowra, *Pindar* (Oxford 1964). For items 24 and 25, cf. L. R. Farnell, *A Critical Commentary to the Works of Pindar* (London 1932; Amsterdam 1965).

²²U. von Wilamowitz-Möllendorf, *Pindaros* (Berlin 1922) 337, with n. 2.

Pindar is putting his trust merely in having been befriended by the royal family.²³

We have already mentioned Isokrates' story about Pindar's proxeny of Athens (item 20); I do not know why Wilamowitz said that Pindar had received proxeny at Delphi.²⁴ Items 15, 18, and 29 refer to proxenies conferred on Orchomenians, Thespians, and Plataians, two by Athens and one by Aigina. None of the evidence for Boiotia is early enough to throw light on the origins of proxeny.

OTHER

(28) *SEG* 12 (1955) 407, a fragmentary bronze tablet found at what is probably ancient Kasmenai in Sicily, confers *ateleia* and perhaps γῆς ἐγκτησις on an undetermined group. Miss Jeffery 268, 276, 411, no. 15, cf. Plate 51, restores *proxenwia* among the privileges, which seems a little unlikely if the inscription records a block grant of rights to a sizable group of refugees, as Miss Jeffery and Miss Guarducci think, but without strong reason. The date will be late in the archaic period.²⁵

(29) Herodotos 9.85 says that the tomb of the Aiginetans at Plataia was erected ten years after the battle by Kleades son of Autodikos, a Plataian *proxenos* of Aigina.

²³The Molossian proxeny is accepted by Wilamowitz, *ibid.* 163, 167, Farnell, *op. cit.* (above, n. 21) 1.106, n. 1, N. G. L. Hammond, *Epirus* (Oxford 1967) 384 (who says "Pindar held the position of *proxenos* then in regard to the Molossian royal house and so to the Molossian state"). For Themistokles' flight see Thuc. 1.135–136. One can easily envisage Admetos, or his predecessor, expansively saying to Pindar, "I myself shall be your *proxenos* here," and Pindar would be right to "trust in his proxeny." This is offered as an extreme view to set against the other extreme picture of the elders (or even the people) of the Molossians solemnly voting to entrust their Boiotian interests to Pindar, and it is possible to invent more than one middle way.

²⁴Wilamowitz, *op. cit.* (above, n. 22) 66. He also accepts the Athenian proxeny, 273.

²⁵The fragment (a) mentions *gamoroi*, (b) has a script other than that of its find-place. It has been thought that refugees brought it there who had (1) been given refuge at a city of appropriate script, (2) been driven thence to Kasmenai with their now useless grant of rights from the previous city. Miss Guarducci once proposed that they had come from Megara Hyblaea, but now thinks that they were themselves the Syracusan *gamoroi*, fled first to Selinos and thence to Kasmenai, see her "Nuove Note di Epigrafia Siceliota Arcaica," *ASA Athena* n.s. 21/2 (1959/60) 249–278, no. 2. But the tablet reads *ῥομα?* [λικά γαμύρον; if this is accepted (*ῥομαλικός* is unknown to *LSJ* and *Supp.*), the subject of the decree cannot be the *gamoroi*, for the treatment prescribed is to be like that already given to them. Need a group be involved? Cannot one man be put on the same footing as the *gamoroi*? And need these *gamoroi* be Syracusan? Kasmenai is a colony of Syracuse, which might plausibly duplicate her institutions. The tablet may absorb an individual into the privileged class at Kasmenai and the anomalous *chi* will be in the stranger's or the bronze worker's alphabet. Such a man might naturally be made a *proxenos*. Obviously, however, the inscription *might* refer to a group of refugees, but then it is unlikely to confer proxeny; unfunctional proxeny seems to be a much later development.

(30) *IG 12 Supp.* 549, a marble block from Eretria, contains a proxeny decree practically unique in not giving the ethnic of the man honoured (see item 4 and note 10), Aristoteles the son of Chelonios. Miss Jeffery, 86, 88, no. 15, dates it to the first quarter of the fifth century.

Several early inscriptions of Magna Graecia use the term *proxenos* to mean guarantor.

(31) *SEG* 22 (1967) 336, the treaty between the Sybarites and the Serdaioi recently found at Olympia, invokes Zeus, Apollo, the other gods, and, of cities, Poseidonia, as *proxenoi*. The letter forms suggest the generation before the destruction of Sybaris in 510, Meiggs and Lewis 10, Bengtson 120.²⁶

(32) Various early records of transfer of property survive on bronze tablets from Magna Graecia, of which *IG* 14.636 from Petelia and *SEG* 4 (1929) 71 from the area of Rhegion specifically mention *proxenwoi*. Miss Jeffery 259, 261, nos. 28, 29, Plate 50, would date them ca. 475?, though they have been put earlier. With them she associates an extremely fragmentary bronze plaque from Epizephyrian Lokris which mentions *proxe[nwoi?]*; her date is 500–480? (285, 286, no. 3, Plate 54).

(33) *Proxenos* is not a name which occurs in F. Bechtel, *Die Historischen Personnamen des Griechischen* (Halle 1917), though he reports *Proxeinos* from fifth-century Miletos. This in turn does not appear in *RE*² 23.1 (1957), where, however, under the name “Proxenos,” coll. 1029–1034, K. Ziegler and others give a selection of sixteen occurrences of that name. Where dates are available the men seem to have been born about 460 or later; four of them will have been born before 430, namely no. 1, descendant of Harmodios and Hellenotamias in 410/9, no. 3, Xenophon’s friend, who lived from 431 to 401, no. 5, a Lokrian officer in 426/5, no. 6, a brother of Hermokrates of Syracuse.

There is one worrying entry, no. 16, a *kalos*-name on a vase of the end of the sixth century, which reads ΠΡΟΧ — —. Πρόχ[σενος is not the only restoration, but it is the only restoration of a name attested in *IG* 1², Bechtel, or J. Kirchner, *Prosopographia Attica* (Berlin 1901).²⁷ It seems unlikely that the name would be given except by a father who had achieved and was proud of this status, so the question is whether to restore, say, Procharmides, or to believe that an Athenian gentleman in the last years of Peisistratos or the earlier years of Hippias would have been permitted to receive this important award from a foreign state, at

²⁶S. Calderone, “Sybaris e i Serdaioi,” *Helikon* 3 (1963) 217–258 discusses the early meaning of *proxenos* here and in items 4, 5, and 32 and concludes that here it means little more than “friend,” in the other three it refers to a magistrate much on the lines of the Spartan institution, item 12.

²⁷See D. M. Robinson and E. J. Fluck, *A Study of the Greek Love-Names* (Baltimore 1937) no. 233 for Πρόχ[— —. In no. 232, 510–500 B.C., other restorations than Πρ[οχσενίδε[ς κα]λ[ός, e.g., Φιλ[οχσενίδε[ς, are at least equally possible.

a time when such grants were not common, to say the least, and the tyrant's family was doing an active and successful job of maintaining foreign relations through ties to themselves. I should prefer the unattested name.

Not only *Proxenos* but geographical names such as "Lakedaimonios (item 10) and Athenaios (items 18 and 19) can indicate that the father has received a proxeny, but need not, cf. Connor, *op. cit.* (above, p. 205, item 23). Connor points to the names of Themistokles' daughters, Italia, Sybaris, and Asia, Plut. *Them.* 32. One might add the Spartan Samios, so called because he was the son of a man who died fighting valiantly at Samos, Her. 3.55, cf. Karystonikos in *IG* 1² 943.27. One would like to know more of the Eretrian Samios of *Syll.*³ 115; the father of Lysander's admiral Autonomos (named in 446 B.C.?), he will have been born by 475. The Samian Karystion of Schol. Aristoph. *Wasps* 283 was adult in 440; if his father fought at the reduction of Karystos in the early 460's or late 470's, that would be the first attested use of Athens' allies to subdue fellow Greeks.²⁸ The only such name from the sixth century seems to be Thettalos of Peisistratos' son, and of a Spartan Her. 5.46; this does not prove that there were no fathers who were *proxenoi*, but it is another straw pointing in that direction.

(34) In Bacchylides 8.20 Jebb, we read that Adrastus was sent to Thebes as *proxenos* of Polyneikes, which would be an extended use of the word, as Adrastus was an Argive and Polyneikes the Theban. However, the word, though known to have been used by Bacchylides, is only a conjecture in this context, and nothing should be built upon it.

(35) Late writers sometimes speak as if proxeny had always existed. When commentators on the *Iliad* discuss the proxeny relationships of various heroes before Troy, their anachronism is sufficiently shown by the absence of the term from Homer and all other literature before the fifth century (R. Schlunk, "Vergil and the Homeric Scholia," *AJP* 88 [1967] 37 presents an instructive example). When Pausanias 4.14 speaks of the Messenians as seeking refuge with their *proxenoi* after their defeat in the First Messenian War at the end of the eighth century, one cannot be so definite, but he may be accused of giving isolated and suspicious testimony. Accordingly I have made no search for such references.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, TORONTO

²⁸Is "Asopios," the name of Phormion's father (Thuc. 1.64.2), another such "war-name"? Phormion's son Asopios was general in 429/8 (Thuc. 3.7.1), and so presumably thirty. If he was born ca. 460, his father might have been born ca. 490 (not earlier, as he was still general in 430/29) and his grandfather ca. 520. It is tempting to connect the giving of the name "Asopios" with Athenian help to Plataia in 519 (Thuc. 3.68.5) which established the Asopos river as the southern limit of Theban territory (Her. 6.108).