

three groups, citizens, metics and ξένοι as at Dem. 23.23: *τίνι τάξει... πότερα ξένος ἢ μέτοικος ἢ πολίτης ἐστίν*. But, as A. R. W. Harrison writes, 'It would perhaps be safe to say that in a legal context the word ξένοι will be held to include metics unless they are specifically excluded.'<sup>8</sup>

The words can even be used, in effect, as synonyms as in Dem. 46.22: *τὸν τοίνυν νόμον ἐπὶ τούτους ἀνάγνωθι, ὃς κελεύει ἐπιδικασίαν εἶναι τῶν ἐπικλήρων ἀπασῶν, καὶ ξένων καὶ ἀστών, καὶ περὶ μὲν τῶν πολιτῶν τὸν ἄρχοντα εἰσάγειν καὶ ἐπιμελεῖσθαι, περὶ δὲ τῶν μετοίκων τὸν πολέμαρχον*. Most important is the fact that frequently the entire citizen body is divided precisely between citizens and ξένοι, with metics clearly included under the latter appellation. For instance this is the case in Dem. 20.123, *ὁ γὰρ ἄξια τῆς ἀτελείας εὐ πεποιηκέναι δόξας καὶ ταύτην παρ' ὑμῶν λαβὼν τὴν τιμὴν μόνην, ἢ ξένος ἢ καὶ τις πολίτης...*; and Dem. 57.24, *ἐξ ὧν ἔστιν εἰδέναι, πότερόν ποτ' ἀστὸς ἢ ξένος ἦν ὧ ταῦθ' ὑπήρχεν*; and, finally, at Dem. 23.47, *πάλιν οἴσθ', ἐκῶν ἢ ἄκων, καὶ ξένος ἢ πολίτης ὁ τοῦτο ποιήσων ἔσται*. The upshot of all of this is that it would be normal later fourth-century parlance to refer to the mass of non-citizens as ξένοι. Rather than being an 'archaism', ξένος was the word most likely to have come to the mind of a fourth-century forger looking to label non-citizens.

In conclusion, it is clear that the alleged 'archaisms', supposed indications of authenticity, are nothing of the sort. Both *μεθίστημι* and ξένοι are employed in the decree in a manner standard to the fourth century. This does not, however, by any means prove that the Themistocles decree is a forgery. B. D. Meritt has argued that anachronisms indicate only that the text has been recopied with changes occurring in language rather than in content.<sup>9</sup> However that may be, it is important to be aware that we are not in any instance dealing with a text containing 'archaisms'.

Brown University

JAMES J. KENNELLY

<sup>8</sup> A. R. W. Harrison, *The Law of Athens* (Oxford, 1968), p. 188.

<sup>9</sup> *Lectures in Memory of Louise Taft Semple*, 1st Series (Princeton, 1967), pp. 119–32.

## LYSANDER AND LIBYS

To convince the Spartans of his suggested reform of the kingship, Lysander tried to get the sanction of the oracle of Zeus Ammon at the oasis of Siwa in Libya, and even attempted to bribe the priests there.<sup>1</sup> The priests reported him to the Spartans. Only after his death, upon the discovery of a speech he had ordered concerning the reform, was the full scale of his plans revealed.<sup>2</sup>

Why did Lysander expect Zeus Ammon to be favourable? Why did he expect his bribery to succeed? The way a Spartan went about bribing an oracle may be understood by a parallel: the attempt by the Spartan Kleomenes to bribe the Pythia at Delphoi.<sup>3</sup> At Delphoi this bribery was effected through a local magnate, someone

<sup>1</sup> Ephorus, F. Jacoby, *FGrHist* 70 F 206 = Plut. *Lys.* 25; Nepos, *Lys.* 3.2–4; Diod. 14.13.5–8.

<sup>2</sup> Ephorus, F. Jacoby, *FGrHist* 70 F 207 = Plut. *Lys.* 30; Plut. *Ages.* 20.3; *Apophthegmata Laconica* 212c, 229f. For discussions of chronology and credibility see R. E. Smith, 'Lysander and the Spartan Empire', *CP* 43 (1948), 148–9; H. W. Parke, *The Oracles of Zeus* (Oxford, 1967), pp. 219–21; C. D. Hamilton, *Sparta's Bitter Victories* (Cornell, 1979), pp. 89–94; J. F. Bommelaer, *Lysandre de Sparte* (Paris, 1981), pp. 134–8.

<sup>3</sup> Hdt. 6.66.

called Kobon, the son of Aristophantos. Lysander too, we are told, tried bribing both Delphoi and Dodona; Ephorus even provides the name of his agent at Dodona, a certain Pherekrates of Apollonia.<sup>4</sup> It would seem that Lysander had even better personal connections at Siwa with someone of high position.

There were reasons why Lysander expected his fellow Spartans to be impressed by the Libyan oracle (which I will only mention here): the cult of Zeus Ammon was of particular importance at Sparta, compared with other Greek states.<sup>5</sup> At some time, too, it came to be associated with prophecies used apparently by Dorieus around 514 B.C. concerning prospective Spartan colonization in North Africa.<sup>6</sup> The Spartans, for example, were supposed one day to settle an island called Phla in lake Tritonis.<sup>7</sup> These prophecies, however, were never realized and therefore may be authentic; it is at least probable that this is not a case of a *vaticinium post eventum*.

My concern here is with the brother of Lysander, Libys, the nauarch of 403,<sup>8</sup> who may offer an important clue to Lysander's special links with Siwa. Understanding why Libys was thus named may help clarify certain ambiguities and even mistakes in modern scholarship. It may also prove important to the question of Lysander's own background as well as remove from history a king of Cyrene. Finally, it will be suggested that the Lysander–Ammon episode should be viewed in the context of Sparta's policy and diplomacy *vis-à-vis* Egypt.

Why 'Libys'? All agree that Lysander's brother was so named because of *xenia* relations and the custom of naming one's son after one's *xenos*. Much later, in the days of Agis, we even hear of a 'Lysander son of Libys'.<sup>9</sup> But *xenia*-relations with whom? Beginning when? Too many scholars seem to follow Obst's article in the *Realencyclopädie* s.v. 'Libys: König in Kyrene (403) [B.C.]'.<sup>10</sup> Obst quotes in support Diodorus: ... ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν περὶ ἐκείνους τοὺς τόπους Λίβυς... ἦν.<sup>11</sup> The clue, as we shall see immediately, lies in the missing words represented here by the three dots. According to Obst, for example, a certain Libys, a 'King of Cyrene' (still a king in 403?), had once struck *xenia* relations (this too from the passage in Diodorus) with Lysander's father Aristokritos, unless these relations go back even further (see below). This interpretation is often followed by specialists of Sparta such as C. D. Hamilton, or of Lysander (e.g. J. F. Bommelaer), or of *xenia* (e.g. G. Herman).<sup>12</sup>

But surely this is impossible: when could such a king Libys, attested nowhere in our

<sup>4</sup> Diod. 14.13.4; Plut. *Lys.* 20.6–9. F. Jacoby, *FGrHist* 70 F 206; F 207.5.

<sup>5</sup> See above, n. 1; other sources: Plut. *Alc.* 149b; Paus. 3.18.3; Cic. *de Div.* 1.96. See for discussion and some further references C. J. Classen, 'The Libyan God Ammon in Greece before 331 B.C.', *Historia* 8 (1959), 352 with n. 22; Parke, pp. 209–11.

<sup>6</sup> Plut. *Lys.* 25. See Hdt. 5.42.2 with 4.178–9. I. Malkin, *Religion and Colonization in Ancient Greece* (Leiden, 1987), pp. 78–81. Cf. B. Niese, *Hermes* 42 (1907), 450–7, esp. pp. 454ff.; H. H. Rohrbach, *Kolonie und Orakel* (Diss. Heidelberg, 1960), pp. 111–12; A. Schenk von Stauffenberg, 'Dorieus', *Historia* 9 (1960), 181–215, esp. p. 185.

<sup>7</sup> Hdt. 4.177–8. The role of Ammon in the context of Greek ideas concerning the colonial chain Sparta–Thera–Cyrene is discussed in a forthcoming book by this author.

<sup>8</sup> Xen. *Hell.* 2.4.28.

<sup>9</sup> Plut. *Agis* 6.3; cf. *IG* v.1.210: Libys, son of Eubalkes, a member of the cult of Poseidon at Tainaron.

<sup>10</sup> *RE* xiii. col. 202.

<sup>11</sup> Diod. 14.13.5–6.

<sup>12</sup> P. Poralla, *Prosopographie der Lakedaimonier*, (Rome, [1913] 1966), s.v. 'Aristokritos': '...sein Geschlecht war mit dem Königshause von Kyrene eng befreundet'; similarly, P. M. Fraser and E. Matthews, *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names* i (Oxford, 1987), s.v. 'Libys'. H. Volkman in *Der kleine Pauly* s.v., follows Obst (above, n. 10). See Hamilton, p. 92; Bommelaer, pp. 36; 133; 'le roi' in p. 133 is ambiguous, but his statement in p. 35 'un Cyrénéen'

sources, have ruled Cyrene? Cyrene's last king, Arkesilas IV, ended his rule in 456. Since he belonged to the ruling house of the Battiads where the names alternated between Battos and Arkesilas, there could not have been a Libys, king of Cyrene, prior to 456. What about later? Lysander's brother, the Spartan nauarch of 403, could not have been born much later than 440 B.C. Yet between 456 and, say, 440 there was no other king of Cyrene after whom he could have been named. So who was the original Libys?

The only relevant source is Diodorus.

[Lysander] made a journey to Cyrene, offering as his reason payment of vows to Ammon, but actually for the purpose of bribing the oracle; and he brought with him a great sum of money with which he tried to win over the attendants of the shrine. And in fact, Libys, the king of those regions, was a guestfriend of his father [or 'a hereditary guest-friend'] and it so happened that Lysander's brother had been named Libys by reason of the friendship with the king.

(Diod. 14.13.5–6 [trans. Loeb ed.])

...καὶ γὰρ ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν περὶ ἐκείνους τοὺς τόπους Λίβυς ξένος ἦν αὐτῷ πατρικός, καὶ τὸν ἀδελφὸν τοῦ Λυσάνδρου συνέβαινεν ὀνομάζεσθαι Λίβυν ἀπὸ τῆς πρὸς ἐκείνον φιλίας.

The context, as well as the Greek, is straightforward (without Obst's omissions):<sup>13</sup> Libys was not a king of Cyrene, but king of 'those regions' Lysander went to visit. In other words – he was the king of the Ammonians residing at Siwa, probably one of the successors of Etearchos, another 'king of the Ammonians', attested by Herodotus.<sup>14</sup>

Etearchos himself is not without interest. the name is Greek and is common in Cyrene, perhaps because of connections with Crete: king Etearchos of Cretan Oaxos was the grandfather of Battos I and a *xenos* of the Theran Themison.<sup>15</sup> It probably reached the Oracle via *xenia* relations with Cyrene, and it is unnecessary to assume that 'Etearchos' was a corruption of a Libyan name,<sup>16</sup> or that he was half Greek, half Libyan.<sup>17</sup> Greek (Cyrenaian) influence had been strong at the oracle of Siwa and we are told that by Alexander's day at the latest the high priest there spoke Greek.<sup>18</sup>

Perhaps one of his line came to be called Libys, 'the Libyan': an external 'ethnic' appellation which may have been favoured by non-Libyans, whether Egyptians at Siwa or Greeks at Cyrene, or was some sort of self-assertion like the Greek parallel 'Dorieus', 'the Dorian'. Somehow it stuck. Perhaps a local boy made it to the highest echelons at Siwa, possibly by marriage or even '*xenia*' between Egyptians and Libyans. Herman is probably wrong to regard the name as a Greek appellation after a geographical area (like Thessalos, Boiotikos, Lakedaimonios, etc.).<sup>19</sup>

clarifies his position. G. Herman, *Ritualized Friendship and the Greek City* (Cambridge, 1987), p. 21: 'ruler of Cyrene'. I understand from personal communication that this is to be corrected in the reprinting of the book. Cf. D. Kagan, *The Fall of the Athenian Empire* (Cornell, 1987), p. 298. More to the point is G. Busolt, *Griechische Geschichte*, iii.2 (Gotha, 1904), p. 1570n: 'Gastfreundschaft mit einem Libyerfürsten'; cf. Parke, p. 210: '[Libys] king of the Ammonians'; S. Hornblower, *The Greek World 479–323 BC* (London and New York, 1983), p. 190 is less committed, but not wrong: 'family ties with Africa'.

<sup>13</sup> I am grateful to Ms. Iris Sapir for first drawing my attention to this straightforward reading of Diodorus.

<sup>14</sup> 2.32.1.

<sup>15</sup> Fraser/Matthews, s.v.; Hdt. 4.154.1. I owe thanks to G. Herman for pointing out this possibility.

<sup>16</sup> Parke, p. 205.

<sup>17</sup> A. B. Lloyd, *Herodotus Book II* (Leiden, 1976), ad 2.32.1.

<sup>18</sup> Plut. *Alex.* 27.5. Cf. Eratosthenes ap. Strabo 49–50 with Classen's article cited above, n. 4.

<sup>19</sup> Herman, p. 21. He may have been black: Hdt. 2.42.4. Cf. Paus. 6.13.7; 18.1.

It remains to ask when this *xenia* was struck between the king of the Ammonians and a Spartan, an ancestor of Lysander. It is possible that it was begun by Aristokritos, the father of Lysander. However, since Libys was king at the time when a fully grown Lysander went to Siwa, that would perhaps be stretching Libys' lifetime too far back. It is more likely that the *xenia* was much older. Diodorus refers to (the Libyan) Libys as *ξένος ἢν αὐτῷ πατρικός*, i.e. he speaks of a hereditary *xenos* and not literally 'of his father'. There is something else to consider: Herodotus says 'I heard (*ἤκουσα*) these things from men of Cyrene who said they went to the oracle of Ammon and spoke with Etearchos, the king of the Ammonians...' Herodotus seems to be saying that those Cyrenaians themselves went to Siwa, and so Etearchos may have been Herodotus' own contemporary. This would make Etearchos contemporary with Herodotus' visit to Egypt (and probably Cyrene), i.e. around 450–440.<sup>20</sup> Now, Libys the Spartan nauarch of 403 B.C. was born about then; so his father Aristokritos could not have named him after a Libyan Libys, king of the Ammonians of about 450, since at that time the king was probably Etearchos. Unless Etearchos was very old or already dead when Herodotus heard this story and a new (and young) king Libys took his place (alas, always a possibility when comparing generations) – the Libyan-Spartan *xenia* may have been even older than Etearchos.

Lysander went to Siwa expecting to use his special *xenia* relations to influence the oracle. Even bribery needs its agents, like Kobon at Delphoi or Pherekrates at Dodona. The oracle had already been favourable to him when he besieged Aphytis.<sup>21</sup> But now Lysander failed, and we shall never know why; perhaps the explanation is simply that the old *xenia* relations at Siwa were weakened by death or loss of clout. Possibly a more general 'Spartan' policy, transcending the personal *xenia* relations was now advocated at the oracle of Zeus-Ammon, which may be implied by Siwa's disappointment (at the outcome of Lysander's trial) and expectations, expressed in its prophecy that one day Spartans would settle Libya.<sup>22</sup>

The need for Siwa to advocate a more general Spartan policy – i.e. not to support Lysander's revolutionary scheme – may be inferred from the political situation of Egypt at this time. Artaxerxes II became king of Persia in 405/4; in the same year Amyrtaeus rebelled against the Persian Empire and founded an independent Egyptian dynasty.<sup>23</sup> Egypt was apparently in turmoil: in 402/1, the Jewish colony at Elephantine still insisted on recognizing Artaxerxes as the sovereign.<sup>24</sup> Amyrtaeus was deposed in 400/399 and his successor, Nephertites (399/8–395/4) had sent supplies to the Spartan fleet at Rhodes.<sup>25</sup> His successor Achoris was acknowledged by the ruler of Siwa, (if the reading and dating of a certain inscription is correct).<sup>26</sup>

<sup>20</sup> S. Gsell, *Hérodote* (Alger, 1915; reprinted: 'L'Erma' (Rome, 1971), *Studia Historica*, 85), pp. 62–4; Lloyd, pp. 61–8.

<sup>21</sup> Plut. *Lys.* 20; Paus. 3.18.3.

<sup>22</sup> Plut. *Lys.* 25. That Lysander's foreign policy, in spite of personal eclipse, was apparently kept up by Sparta to some degree matters little for the way things may have seemed from Siwa where a revolutionary Lysander was consulting the oracle. Hence the distinction, in terms of Siwa, between 'Lysandrian' and 'Spartan' policies seems justified.

<sup>23</sup> E. Bresciani, 'The Persian Control of Egypt', *The Cambridge History of Iran ii* (Cambridge, 1985), pp. 522ff.

<sup>24</sup> E. G. Kraeling, *The Brooklyn Museum Aramaic Papyri* (New Haven, 1953), pp. 9–13; nos. 10, 11, 12. Cf. Bresciani, p. 512.

<sup>25</sup> Diod. 14.79.4.

<sup>26</sup> The original reading of 'Achoris' by G. Steindorf (see *Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 69 (1933), 19–21) which has been revised to 'Amasis' (see A. Fakhry, *Siwa Oasis* (Cairo, 1944), pp. 90ff.; cf. Parke, p. 197), is now supported by a more secure dating of the

Egypt had been fighting for its independence since 405 and was probably looking for allies.<sup>27</sup> By 403 it was not unreasonable to expect Sparta to wish to undermine Artaxerxes. Is it not likely that Siwa, under the influence of Amyrtaeus, did not wish to support a blow against the Spartan regime?

Some further implications seem to emerge: when assessing Lysander's own origins (mothax?) and career, P. Cartledge mentions the *xenia* relations of Aristokritos as significant: Aristokritos, 'was able to maintain his hereditary *xenia* with a Libyan princeling'.<sup>28</sup> Such relationships, Cartledge correctly assumes, needed royal approval and hence the putative connections with Archidamos. Cartledge is therefore right to call the *xenia* 'hereditary' and to say that it was 'maintained' (i.e. not begun) by Aristokritos. Moreover, Libys, to my mind, was no 'princeling' but the ruler of Siwa, probably a man with great influence at the oracle of Zeus Ammon.

When was the *xenia* relationship started? We do not know. It may have been started between Aristokritos and a very young king Libys who was still king when Lysander *floruit*. It would be interesting to take it back to the days before Etearchos, perhaps even to the time of Dorieus. But here we can do no better than guess.

Finally, lest a new king of Cyrene (Libys) be elevated from a lowly existence in lexical items and footnotes, to be enthroned in the pages of works of history, let him be eliminated at once.

Tel Aviv University

IRAD MALKIN

building where it was found: S. Stucchi, *Architettura Cirenaica* (Rome, 1975), pp. 568; 571. Cf. A. M. Bisi, 'Origine e diffusione del culto cirenaico di Zeus Ammon', *Cyrenaica in Antiquity*, eds. G. Barker, J. Lloyd and J. Reynolds (BAR International Series 236, 1985), p. 308.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. Hornblower, p. 190 who draws an analogy between the rebels in Egypt, Dionysos in Sicily and Cyrus in Anatolia.

<sup>28</sup> P. Cartledge, *Agasilaos and the Crisis of Sparta* (London, 1987), pp. 28–9; cf. p. 81 'a minor north African ruler'.

I would like to thank David Asheri and Paul Cartledge for their helpful comments and suggestions. Responsibility for erroneous views or faults, of course, remains mine.

#### A MEANING OF ΠΡΕΣΒΕΥΕΣΘΑΙ

LSJ s.v. *πρεσβεύω* II.3.b recorded, on the strength of Thuc. 5.39.2, the meaning 'go as ambassador' for the middle voice, in addition to the well-attested 'send ambassadors'. The passage, however, does not on inspection support the meaning (see K. J. Dover, *HCT* 4.376 on Thuc. 6.104.2); it was deleted from the *Supplement* to LSJ.

Pseudo-Plutarch, *Life of Antiphon*, reproduces an Athenian decree of 411 B.C. ordering the arrest and trial for treason of Antiphon, Archeptolemus, and Onomacles (Plut. *Mor.* 833e–f). The decree is said to have been in Caecilius' *Life of Antiphon* and in all probability derives from Craterus' collection of decrees (see Harpocration s.v. *Ἀνδρων*; cf. F. Jacoby, *FGrHist* 342 F 5). After the prescript the text reads: *Ἀνδρων εἶπε: περὶ τῶν ἀνδρῶν οὓς ἀποφαίνουσιν οἱ στρατηγοὶ πρεσβευομένους εἰς Λακεδαιμόνα ἐπὶ κακῇ τῆς πόλεως τῆς Ἀθηναίων καὶ [ἐκ] τοῦ στρατοπέδου πλεῖν ἐπὶ πολέμιας νεώς καὶ πεζεύσαι διὰ Δεκελείας...*<sup>1</sup> The meaning of *πρεσβευομένους*

<sup>1</sup> Reiske's deletion of *ἐκ* seems necessary; see M. H. Jameson, 'Sophocles and the Four Hundred', *Historia* 20 (1971), 541–68, p. 551 n. 30.