

XENELASIA AND SOCIAL CONTROL IN CLASSICAL SPARTA

The Spartan custom of *xenēlasia*, or expulsion of aliens, makes a most dramatic entry onto the stage of history, appearing in a manner that can be rivalled by few ancient institutions. On the eve of the Peloponnesian War, the turning point in the life of the classical *polis*, none other than Pericles introduces *xenēlasia* at a crucial moment in the movement toward hostilities.¹ He alludes to it in his response to a Spartan ultimatum, in terms that are not only aimed at the Spartans, the ostensible recipients, who are still only potential adversaries of the Athenians, but also at his critics among fellow Attic politicians (Thuc. 1.144.2).²

νῦν δὲ τούτοις ἀποκρινάμενοι ἀποπέμψωμεν, Μεγαρέας μὲν ὅτι ἐάσομεν ἀγορᾷ καὶ λιμέσι χρῆσθαι, ἣν καὶ Λακεδαιμόνιοι ξενηλασίας μὴ ποιῶσι μήτε ἡμῶν μήτε τῶν ἡμετέρων ξυμμάχων (οὔτε γὰρ ἐκείνο κωλύει ἐν ταῖς σπονδαῖς οὔτε τόδε) . . .

Let us dismiss them [the Spartan envoys], now answering with these [proposals] that we shall allow the Megarians to use the *agora* and harbours, if the Lakedaimonians do not make *xenēlasiai* [expulsions of aliens], neither of ourselves nor of our allies (for neither the former nor the latter is prevented in the *spondai* [armistice]) . . .

Here Pericles is actually harking back in his remarks to the penultimate stage in the demands from the Spartans. More recently, they had insisted quite brazenly that the Athenians concede *autonomia* to their allies, by which they seem to have meant independence from Attic directives (1.139.3, 140.3).

Yet, the Spartans had earlier demanded three concessions: that the Athenians rescind the Megarian Decree, barring the Megarians from the Athenian marketplace and from the harbours of the Attic alliance; that they withdraw from Potidaea on the Pallene peninsula of the Chalcidice in northern Greece, an allied city they had under siege; and that they grant their Aeginetan subjects, their neighbours in the Saronic Gulf, their autonomy, as was supposedly required by treaty (1.139.1, 140.3–4; cf. 1.67.2). Pericles considered yielding to such ultimatums to constitute appeasement that would elicit further demands, while weakening Athens (140.5–141.1). For him, the Spartan refusal to accept arbitration, as specified by the Thirty Years Peace, exposed the unjust nature of their proposals and militated in favour of firmness in response (140.2, 144.2).

None the less, Pericles was confronted by political opponents who had pointed to

¹ For further discussion of this reconstruction, see T. J. Figueira, *Excursions in Epichoric History* (Savage, MD, 1993), 268–71 ~ ‘*Autonomoi kata tas spondas* (Thucydides 1.67.2)’, *BICS* 37 (1990), 63–88, see 73–6.

² K. M. T. Chrimes, *Ancient Sparta: A Re-examination of the Evidence* (Manchester, 1949), 310 misconstrues the nature of *xenēlasia* by supposing that Pericles refers to an actual expulsion upon which the Spartans had decided for military reasons, after they determined that Athens had broken the *spondai*. See also S. Rebenich, ‘Fremdfeindlichkeit in Sparta? Überlegungen zur Tradition der spartanischen Xenelasiae’, *Klio* 80 (1998), 336–59, see 352. Clearly, had war been averted by Attic concessions, such a merely deterrent measure could be expected to be rescinded. See also nn. 57, 59 below.

the Megarian Decree as a minor element of policy that the Athenians could nullify without experiencing any significant risks (139.1–2, 140.4–5). Why not make this modest concession—his adversaries argued—and see how the Spartans might react? Nullification was something quite different either from releasing the stranglehold on Poteidaia, a respite that would presumably have had negative military ramifications in the Chalcidice and encouraged dissidents throughout the Thraceward region, or allowing ancient enemies like the Aeginetans dangerous latitude for further agitation or even for military preparations. Hence, Pericles was careful to craft a response that asserted Athenian rights without appearing to close the door on further negotiations. If the Spartans paused to consider counter-proposals, the objectionable peremptory style of their demands might be disarmed.³ Thus, he offered finely calibrated counter-terms. Athens would concede autonomy to any state autonomous at the time of the Thirty Years Peace (144.2). Thus, Sparta would have to argue a better case regarding Poteidaia and Aegina in order to win meaningful concessions. Or the Athenians might grant a more sweeping variant of autonomy to all their allies, provided that the Spartans would do the same. That approach was another invitation to negotiations on reciprocal terms.

As has been noted, a relinquishment of *xenēlasia*, at least as it affected the Athenians and their allies, is presented as the reciprocation for cancellation of the Megarian Decree. Why this juxtaposition seemed appropriate to Pericles and, one assumes, to other contemporary Athenians is an important question that has received too little attention.⁴ In fact, *xenēlasia* has until recently been a little-studied Spartan institution.⁵ This paper aspires to synthesize the surviving evidence in order to understand *xenēlasia* as a social mechanism in structural terms. This exercise will yield some surprising results, because our sources make some seemingly unanticipated, institutional connections about *xenēlasia*.⁶

³ Note that unlikelihood of a diplomatic success is not equivalent to unfeasibility (E. J. Bickerman, 'AUTONOMIA. Sur un passage de Thucydide (I, 144, 2)', *RIDA* 5 [1958] 313–44, see 320); cf. *Σ* Thuc. 1.144.2: ἦν καὶ Λακεδαιμόνιοι ξενηλασίας μὴ ποιῶσι: ἀδύνατον αὐτοῖς ἀντέθῃκεν, ὅπερ ἐκείνοι ποιεῖν οὐκ ἠμέσχοιτο.

⁴ Reflected by the three lines in A. R. W. Gomme, A. Andrewes, and K. J. Dover, *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides* (Oxford, 1945–81), 1.462, and by the lack of allusion in S. Hornblower, *A Commentary on Thucydides*, I: *Books I–III* (Oxford, 1991), 230–1. Contrast G. E. M. de Ste. Croix, *The Origins of the Peloponnesian War* (Ithaca, 1972), 289.

⁵ See A. Krebs, *Daremberg-Saglio* (1912–17), s.v. 'Xénélasia', 5.1006–8; H. Schaefer, *RE* 2 18 (1967), s.v. 'xenelasia', 1436–8. I pass over issues involving the scholarly tradition that are well treated in Rebenich (n. 2). Another recent treatment is M. Nafissi, *La nascita del kosmos: Studi sulla storia e la società di Sparta* (Naples, 1991), 267–70.

⁶ The following is a conspectus of the sources. For contemporary allusions: Thuc. 1.144.2, 2.39.1 with scholia including *Σ* Thuc. 1.77.6; Ar. *Birds* 1010–20 with scholia; Xen. *RL* 14.4; Plato *Protag.* 342c, cf. *Laws* 950b, 953e; Arist. *Pol.* 1272b17; Theopomp. *FGrH* 115 F 178. Retrospective references: Dion. Hal. *Antiq. Rom.* 2.17.1; Plut. *Lyc.* 9.3–4, 27.3–4; *Agis* 10.2–4; *Mor.* 226d, 237a, 238e; Ael. *VH* 13.16; *Σ* Ar. *Peace* 623a–c; *Σ* Ael. Arist. *Panegy.* 166.9–10; *Suda* s.v. διερωνόξενοι δ 997 Adler; s.v. ξενηλατεῖν, ξ 25; also Joseph. *Ap.* 2.259; Olympiod. *In Platonis Gorg.* 44.2; Hesych. s.v. ξενηλασία, ξ 41 Latte, ξενηλατοῦνται, ξ 42; Phot. s.v. ξενηλατεῖν; Philostrat. *VA* 6.20, *Dial.* 1.28; Apsines, *Ars Rhet.* 356 Stengel; Ael. Arist. 46.292; Sext. Emp. *Adv. Math.* 2.20; *Σ* Hermog., *Rhetores Graeci* 4.72.9–14 Walz; Sopater, *Scholia ad Hermog., Rhetores Graeci* 5.27.19–26, 30.14–21 Walz; Theodoret, *Cur.* 9.18, 10.34. Terminological reflection: Hecat. *FGrH* 264 F 6; *Σ* Ar. *Wasps* 718b; *Σ* Isoc. *Hypoth.* 11; Polyb. 9.29.4; Plut. *Mor.* 527c, 727e; Philo, *Spec.* 2.27.146; Diod. 40.3.2, 4; Strabo 17.1.19 C802; Philostrat. *VA* 8.7.13; *Martyrium Pionii* 4.18; J. Chrys. *MPG* 50.531.22, 60.267.5, 9–10; *SC* 188.389; [J. Chrys.] *In Synaxim Incorporalium* 6.35; Themist. *Or.* 18.222a; Libanius, *Or.* 16.43; Theophylact Simocatta, *Hist.* 2.18.11, 3.2.7, 4.16.21; Nicephoras Grigoras, *Hist.* 19.2.4, 2.937; 29.10, 3.229; 33.16, 3.411.

I. THE CONCEPT OF XENELASIA

The image of Sparta has been a compelling lure for commentators, ancient and modern, who have been prompted to blame, to praise, and even to urge imitation. Much of our evidence on the institutional structure of Sparta has its deepest roots in late fifth- and early fourth-century appreciations by observers like Critias and Xenophon, interested parties who reacted directly to Spartan participation in hegemonic politics. In time such appraisals came to be incorporated into Peripatetic syntheses, such as the 'constitution' attributed to Aristotle, another constitutional work by Dicaearchus and his *Tripolitikos*, and perhaps the compilations of Theophrastus.⁷ Naturally, these writers also combed then extant historical or literary texts for any relevant material. It is also evident that fourth-century treatises on Spartan institutions, whether pamphlets or constitutional works, were sufficiently detailed and programmatic to indicate considerable input from Spartan informants. Moreover, from the late fourth century, there existed a whole derivative sub-genre devoted to the Spartan *politeia*, as broadly construed (*FGrH* 584–6, 588–91, 595, 703, cf. 587).

These authorities did not speak with one voice. Not only did they bring their own partisanship to the transmission of received evidence, but their reactions to their own contemporary Sparta also conditioned their historiography. Yet, despite ideological influences, anachronisms, and synchronic descriptions that distorted historical evolution, it is inappropriate to dismiss this material as a Spartan 'mirage', unless we are prepared to attack particulars of the 'constitutional' synthesis with better contemporary evidence. When any Laconian institution is treated, it will be incumbent upon us to sketch the portrait embodied in such synthetic works, even if that image will later require 'corrective optics' to compensate for various causes of distortion.

Unlike Spartan messes or iron money, where the 'constitutional' tradition predominates almost absolutely in surviving citations, *xenēlasia* may also be viewed from another perspective. The practice was fundamentally alien to late fifth-century Athenians and was viewed by them with considerable *animus*. Thus, *xenēlasia* had its place in a partisan bill of indictment against the Spartans. Much contemporary documentation of this criticism has been lost, but its traces may be discerned in later allusions and references of a summary nature, such as lexical glosses and scholia.

The noun *ξενηλασία* and its related verb *ξενηλατέω* are compounds built from *ξένος*, meaning 'stranger', 'foreigner', or 'guest-friend' and the verbal root present in *ἐλαύνω* 'drive'. As illustrated by the above-cited passage from Thucydides, most attestations refer to *xenēlasiai* in the plural.⁸ *xenēlasia* was a procedure that was implemented periodically, and so usually envisaged as an aggregate of its applications. The practice of *xenēlasia* was not much imitated by the other Greeks.⁹ *xenēlasia* was sometimes viewed as an aspect of xenophobia, a usage perhaps derived from Athenian polemics. Thus, the terminology of *xenēlasia* was applied in situations only distantly

⁷ Aristotle frs. 539–51 Gigon; Dicaearchus: *FHG* frs. 21–2, 2.241–2; frs. 67–72 Wehrli; Theophrastos fr. 512A Fortenbaugh. Cf. T. J. Figueira, 'Iron money and the ideology of consumption in Laconia', in S. Hodkinson and A. Powell (edd.), *Sparta: Beyond the Mirage* (London and Swansea, forthcoming).

⁸ Rebenich (n. 2), 352.

⁹ Ael. *VH* 13.16 on *xenēlasia* at Apollonia in the Adriatic: ὅτι Ἀπολλωνιάται ξενηλασίας ποιοῦν κατὰ τὸν Λακεδαιμόνιον νόμον, Ἐπιδάμνιοι δὲ ἐπιδημεῖν καὶ μετοικεῖν παρείχον τῷ βουλομένῳ. Its appearance at Lyttos in Crete (*SEG* 39 [1989], 974) is very speculative. Cf. M. van Effenterre, 'Ein neues Gesetz aus dem archaischen Kreta', in G. Thür (ed.), *Symposium 1985. Vorträge zur griechischen und hellenistischen Rechtsgeschichte* (Cologne and Vienna, 1989), 23–7.

comparable to Spartan circumstances, and referred to expulsion as a tool to exclude foreign influences.¹⁰ Since the practice achieved some prominence in classical texts, *ξηνηλασία* and *ξεναλατέω* could be used in the sense of ‘banishment’ and ‘to banish’ when those expelled were foreign.¹¹ These allusions do not, however, imply special procedures dealing with foreigners, but merely describe an outcome affecting them. Occasionally in late antiquity, this terminology becomes a picturesque way of denoting exile.¹² For example, Aelius Aristides could emphasize by using *xenēlasia* the danger of exiling an unprecedented number of sophists and rhetoricians from the Platonic *polis*, while alluding to the Spartan procedure.¹³

To get a preliminary feeling for the institution, let us start by citing several glosses. A scholion to Thucydides offers a brief definition: τὸ τοὺς ξένους ἐλαύνειν ‘the act of driving out foreigners’ (ΣThuc. 1.144.2). Hesychius offers two entries in his lexicon (ξ 41, 42 Latte).

s.v. *ξηνηλασία*: τὸ μὴ ἔαν ξένους ἐπιμίγνυσθαι.

xenēlasia: the act of not allowing *xenoi* to intermingle.

s.v. *ξηνηλατοῦνται*: τύπτεσθαι τοὺς ξένους ἐλαυνομένους.

xenēlatountai: to strike *xenoi* being driven out [or: *xenoi* being driven out are struck].

The first gloss touches on the conventional openness of *poleis* to visitors in *epimeixia* ‘social intercourse’ in times of peace. The idea of beating *xenoi* as a part of *xenēlasia* is owed to Aristophanes, *Birds* 1013. A gloss from the lexicon of Photius is similar (ξ 308 Porson).

s.v. *ξηνηλατεῖν*: Λακεδαιμόνιοι μετὰ πληγῶν ἐξήλυνον τοὺς ξένους.

xenēlatein: the Lacedaimonians used to expel *xenoi* with blows.

It is important here to reject an unprofitable line of analysis before proceeding. The *xenoi* subject to *xenēlasia* are not to be construed as ‘guest-friends’, as it is quite clear that the archaic and classical Spartans shared in the culture-wide practice of welcoming aliens into their midst for visits, when those persons arrived under the patronage of

¹⁰ Using *xenēlasia* anthropologically, Strabo (citing Eratosthenes) alludes to the xenophobia of non-Greek cultures *vis-à-vis* the Heracles/Bousiris myth (17.1.19 C802): φησὶ δ’ Ἐρατοσθένης κοινὸν μὲν εἶναι τοῖς βαρβάροις πᾶσιν ἔθος τὴν ξενηλασίαν. Σ Isoc. *Hypoth.* 11 describes Bousiris as a *ξηνηλάτης*. In addition, the departure of the Jews (in the exodus!) and other aliens from Egypt can be seen as *xenēlasia*, according to Diodorus Siculus, drawing on Hecataeus of Abdera (FGrH 264 F 6). Note Diod. 40.3.2: εὐθὺς οὖν ξενηλατομένων τῶν ἀλλοεθνῶν; Diod. 40.3.4: διὰ γὰρ τὴν ἰδίαν ξενηλασίαν; [J. Chrysostomus], *In Synaxim Incorporalium* 6.35 (*Subsidia hagiographica* 38). Similar also is Philo Alex. *Spec.* 2.27.146: ἀπολελοιπότες χώραν γέμουσαν ἀπανθρωπίας καὶ ξενηλασίας ἐπιτηδεύουσιν...

¹¹ Athenian police measures against those improperly claiming citizenship in a distribution of Egyptian grain in ΣAr. *Wasps* 718b Koster; cf. 718a ~ Philochorus FGrH 328 F 119: τῆς δὲ διανομῆς γενομένης [γινομένης] τοῦ σίτου ξενηλασίαν ἐποίησαν Ἀθηναῖοι, καὶ ἐν τῷ διακρίνειν τοὺς αὐθιγενεῖς εὐρον καὶ ἐτέρους, δψξ’ ξένους παρεγγεγραμμένους. Polyb. 9.29.4 reports a speech of the Aetolian Chlaeneas before the Spartans aptly describing Macedonian banishments under Antipater with the verb *ξηνηλατέω*. At fourth-century Antioch, note *xenēlasia* in Libanius, *Or.* 16.43, and for its non-use at Constantinople: Themist. *Or.* 18.222a.

¹² Plut. *Mor.* 527c (n = nominal), 727e (v = verbal); Athenag. *Legat.* 24.1 (v); Philostrat. *VA* 8.7.13 (v.), *Dial.* 1.28 (n); *Martyrium Pionii* 4.18, p. 140 Musurillo (v.); J. Chrysostomus, *De Sancto Hieromartyre Babyla* (2), *MPG* 50.531.22 9 (n); *In Acta Apostolorum*, *Hom.* 37.3, *MPG* 60.267.5, 9–10 (n); *De Inani Gloria et de Educandis Liberis* 28, *SC* 188.389 (n); Theophylact Simocatta, *Hist.* 2.18.11, 3.2.7, 4.16.21 (v). See also Nicephoras Grigoras, *Hist.* 19.2.4, 2.937; 29.10, 3.229; 33.16, 3.411 Bekker.

¹³ *Or.* 46.292: καὶ ξενηλασίαν τοσαύτην τῶν Ἑλλήνων ποιησόμεθα, ὅσην οὐδ’ ἐν Λακεδαίμονι πω συμβάσαν ἀκούομεν.

élite Spartiates.¹⁴ Naturally, religious festivals gave non-Spartans many opportunities to visit Lakōnikē.¹⁵ In good time, the Spartan community, like other archaic societies, assumed such friendships on its own behalf. Sparta possessed *proxenoi* in other cities, and prominent Spartans were *proxenoi* of others.¹⁶ A great many artists, poets, mythographers, historians, and sophists visited and worked in Sparta.¹⁷ However questionable the tradition that made Tyrtaeus an Athenian, poets and probably other prominent *dēmiourgoi* could stay for long periods (or perhaps even indefinitely) in archaic Laconia on the basis of such élite connections (cf. [Plut.] *Mor.* 1134b–e). The sojourns of Terpander, Thaletas, and Pherecydes in Laconia would have been of this nature (Plut. *Agis* 10.3). In addition, Sparta welcomed political or military ‘guests’ such as the Athenian Isagoras, who probably lived at Sparta after his exile from Athens under the protection of Cleomenes (Hdt. 5.70.1, 72.2; *Ath. Pol.* 20.2–4).

We are not justified, moreover, in positing a xenophobic, ‘austere’ Sparta of the late sixth and early fifth centuries in contrast to an archaic Sparta receptive to visits by cultural figures. Despite the spottiness of our evidence, almost every quarter-century between 650 and 400 provides an example of a prestigious visitor.¹⁸ Furthermore, the traditions about receptivity of archaic Sparta—including those about Attic Tyrtaeus and Lydian Alcman—were either preserved or fabricated during the fifth century, the very period when *xenēlasiai* became an issue.

II. XENELASIA IN THE ‘CONSTITUTIONAL’ TRADITION

As to the historical existence of the procedure of *xenēlasia*, Xenophon stands alongside Thucydides as an important early witness to use of the process. In chapter 14 of his *Respublica Lacadaemoniorum*, he is at pains to contrast traditional Spartan behaviour with negative trends manifested by the contemporary Spartans.

Xen. *RL* 14.4: ἐπίσταμαι δὲ καὶ πρόσθεν τούτου ἔνεκα ξενηλασίας γιγνομένης καὶ ἀποδημεῖν οὐκ ἐξόν, ὅπως μὴ ῥαδιουργίας οἱ πολῖται ἀπὸ τῶν ξένων ἐμπύμπλαιντο· νῦν δ’ ἐπίσταμαι τοὺς δοκοῦντας πρῶτους εἶναι ἐσπουδακότες ὡς μηδέποτε παύωνται ἀρμόζοντες ἐπὶ ξένης.¹⁹

¹⁴ Some attestations of élite *xenoi* as ‘guest-friends’: the Spartans collectively and the Peisistratids (Hdt. 5.91.2); Demaratos and Xerxes (Hdt. 7.237.3); Archidamus II and Pericles (Thuc. 2.13.1; Plut. *Per.* 33.2); Endios and Alcibiades (Thuc. 8.6.3); Agesilaus and the son of Pharnabazus (Xen. *HG* 4.1.39–40); Podanemus and Procles of Phleious and Agesilaus and Archidamus III (Xen. *HG* 5.3.13–14); Agesilaus and Mausolus (Xen. *Ages.* 2.27). See the valuable tables in G. Herman, *Ritualized Friendship and the Greek City* (Cambridge, 1987), 166–84; S. Hodkinson, *Property and Wealth in Classical Sparta* (London and Swansea, 2000), 337–52.

¹⁵ See Chrimmes (n. 2), 310, n. 2, which collects the evidence. Note Plut. *Ages.* 29.2: ἔτυχε μὲν γὰρ ἡ πόλις ἑορτὴν ἀγοῦσα καὶ ξένων οὐσα μεστή· γυμνοπαιδία γὰρ ἦσαν ἀγωνιζομένων χορῶν ἐν τῷ θεάτρῳ· παρήσαν δ’ ἀπὸ Λεύκτρων οἱ τὴν συμφορὰν ἀπαγγέλλοντες. The Gymnopaediai was also the scene for the memorable entertainments of *xenoi* by the Spartan Lichas (Xen. *Mem.* 1.2.61; Plut. *Cim.* 10.6). The people of Attic Decelia had *prohedria* at Spartan festivals (as well as *ateleia*: Hdt. 9.73.3). See also M. Aurelius, *Med.* 11.24.

¹⁶ For *proxenoi*, note Cimon (e.g. Plut. *Cim.* 14.4); Alcibiades (ancestral status: Thuc. 5.43.2, 6.89.2, 8.8.3); Callias (Xen. *HG* 5.4.22, 6.3.4; *Sym.* 8.39). In general, note Hdt. 6.57.3; Plato *Laws* 642b; with D. J. Mosley, ‘Spartan kings and proxeny’, *Athenaeum* 49 (1971), 433–5. For full citations, see Rebenich (n. 2), 343–6; Hodkinson (n. 14), 340.

¹⁷ The entire list of culturally prominent visitors or immigrants is extensive. See Rebenich (n. 2), 344–5.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁹ ‘I understand that previously *xenēlasiai* had occurred and it was not permitted to live abroad

Xenophon makes an important link, observing that *xenēlasiai* in principle guarded against contamination through interaction with non-Spartans. This theme of cultural isolation is prominent in the treatments of *xenēlasia*. Another technique ostensibly employed for the same purpose was a prohibition on citizens (or on citizens of military age) travelling or residing outside of Lakōnikē without permission of the ephors.²⁰ Linking that ban and *xenēlasia* is attested elsewhere (Plut. *Lyc.* 27.3–4; Nic. Dam. *FGrH* 90 F 103z.144.5; Joseph. *Ap.* 2.259).

For *xenēlasia*, as for other aspects of Spartan life, Plutarch is a valuable intermediary for the ‘constitutional’ tradition. In his *Lycurgus*, *xenēlasia* is treated right after Lycurgus’ inauguration of iron money (9.3–4).

μετὰ δὲ τοῦτο τῶν ἀχρήστων καὶ περισσῶν ἐποιεῖτο τεχνῶν ξενηλασίαν. ἔμελλον δέ που καὶ μηδενὸς ἑξελαιύνοντος αἱ πολλαὶ τῷ κοινῷ νομίσματι συνεκπεσεῖσθαι, διάθεσιν τῶν ἔργων οὐκ ἐχόντων. τὸ γὰρ σιδηροῦν ἀγώγιμον οὐκ ἦν πρὸς τοὺς ἄλλους Ἑλληνας οὐδ’ εἶχε τιμὴν καταγελῶμενον, ὥστε οὐδὲ πρίασθαι τι τῶν ξενικῶν καὶ ῥωπικῶν ὑπῆρχεν, οὐδ’ εἰσέπλει φόρτος ἐμπορικὸς εἰς τοὺς λιμένας, οὐδὲ ἐπέβαινε τῆς Λακωνικῆς οὐ σοφιστῆς λόγων, οὐ μάντις ἀγυρτικός, οὐχ ἑταίρων τροφεύς, οὐ χρυσῶν τις, οὐκ ἀργυρῶν καλλωπισμάτων δημιουργός, ἅτε δὴ νομίματος οὐκ ὄντος.²¹

A similar adaptation of the same source on this ‘Lycurgan’ legislation appears in Plutarch’s *Apophthegmata Laconica* (*Mor.* 226d).²² The phrase τῶν ἀχρήστων καὶ περισσῶν ἐποιεῖτο τεχνῶν ξενηλασίαν ‘he made a *xenēlasia* of the useless and superfluous crafts’ is figurative, because only craftsmen, not crafts, could be expelled in a *xenēlasia*. None the less, this appreciation should not obscure recognition that the ‘constitutional tradition’ portrayed Lycurgus as legislating sumptuary measures that included the procedure of *xenēlasia* and a monopoly for iron money.

The identity of this source as a Peripatetic constitutional work is substantiated by the similar treatment in Olympiodorus (*In Platonis Gorgiam* 44.2.27–34).²³ Olympio-

on account of this, namely that the citizens not become imbued with self-indulgence [*rhaidiourgia*] from the *xenoi*, but I understand now that those Spartiates who are held to be leaders have taken pains in order that they never cease to act as *harmosts* [governors] on foreign territory.’

²⁰ Cf. Harpocration s.v. καὶ γὰρ τὸ μηδένα τῶν μαχίμων . . . , p. 166 Dindorf, citing Arist. fr. 549 Gigon ~ Plut. *Mor.* 238e and Isoc. *Busiris* (11) 18; Plut. *Agis* 11.2, cf. 10.2. For a similarity in Spartan and Cretan practice, note Plato, *Protag.* 342c–d.

²¹ ‘After this, he [Lycurgus] made a *xenēlasia* of the useless and superfluous crafts. The majority would have tended at any event (even had no one made an expulsion) to have vanished because of the common money [*nomisma*], since products had no means of disposition through sale [*diathesis*]. The iron money was not transferable [*agōgimos*] for the rest of the Greeks, and such a subject of mockery had no value [*timē*], so that it lacked the ability to buy anything of foreign goods, however petty, and commercial cargo did not enter the harbours. No sophist specializing in speaking landed in Lakōnikē, no vagabond prophet, no raiser of *hetairai* [sexual companions], no craftsman of gold or silver ornaments, since there was no money [*nomisma*].’

²² Plut. *Mor.* 226d: πρὸς δὲ τοῦτοις καὶ ἀπάντων τῶν περισσῶν ξενηλασίαν ἐποιήσατο· δίο οὐτ’ ἐμπορος οὔτε σοφιστῆς οὔτε μάντις ἢ ἀγύρτης οὔτε τῶν κατασκευασμάτων δημιουργός εἰσῆι εἰς τὴν Σπάρτην. οὐδὲ γὰρ νόμισμα παρ’ αὐτοῖς εὐχρηστον εἶασε, μόνον δὲ τὸ σιδηροῦν εἰσηγήσατο, ὃ ἐστι μᾶ ὀλκῇ Αἰγιναιά, δυνάμει δὲ χαλκοῖ τέσσαρες. Plutarch uses similar language metaphorically when he prescribes making *xenēlasia* of useless things before serious discussion (*Mor.* 527c).

²³ καὶ ἄλλο δὲ ἐποίησεν, ἐμχανήσατο γὰρ τὸν πλοῦτον ἀχρηστον εἶναι, ὥς μηδένα θέλειν πλουτεῖν· ἐκέλευσε γὰρ χρυσοῦν καὶ ἀργυροῦν νόμισμα μὴ πολιτεύεσθαι, ἀλλὰ χαλκοῦν, καὶ τοῦτο ὅξει βρεχόμενον, ἵνα σήποιτο. λοιπὸν οὖν καὶ ξενηλασίαι ἐγίνοντο·

dorus substantiates the linkage of iron money and *xenēlasia* by specifying that λοιπὸν οὖν καὶ ξεινηλασίαι ἐγίνοντο ‘in the future *xenēlasiai* were to occur’. Nicolaus of Damascus offered a slightly different structuring of similar material in his *Ethōn Synagōgē* (FGrH 90 F 103, cf. T 13, 15), as indicated by a series of excerpts in Stobaeus, *Florilegium* 4.2.25. A long excerpt provides 18 observations (following the division of Jacoby) about Spartan society and politics (F 103z [144]). Most can be otherwise documented from the ‘constitutional’ tradition and, specifically, have analogues in Plutarch.²⁴ His item 5 presents a combination of the provisions on residency: ξένοις δ’ ἐμβιοῦν οὐκ ἔξεστιν ἐν Σπάρτῃ οὐδὲ Σπαρτιάταις ξενιτεύειν ‘it is not permitted for *xenoi* to become settled in Sparta nor for Spartiates to live abroad’.

Theodoret of Cyrrihus in his *Graecarum Affectionum Curatio* has consulted an authority in the same tradition, albeit with a much more distant filiation. He explicitly derives his comments from authors who had written *politeiai* of the Lacedaemonians (9.19). In a context describing the desuetude of Greek laws in the face of Roman law, Theodoret supplies some examples from Sparta. In one short catalogue (9.18), *xenēlasia* finds its place with the *douleia* of the Helots, the *Neodamōdeis*, immunity for pederasty, and unconventional marriages (τὰς ἐννόμους εἰς τοὺς γάμους παρανομίας). Another set of examples is appended to an attack on the Delphic oracle. In this list, headed by *xenēlasia*, are found ‘impunity for love affairs with boys’, ‘unconventional liaisons with women’, and confounded marriage laws (10.34).

In a passage later in the *Lycurgus*, Plutarch reintroduces expulsion of aliens when he notes the Lycurgan prohibition on dwelling abroad (27.3–4).

‘Ὅθεν οὐδ’ ἀποδημεῖν ἔδωκε τοῖς βουλομένοις καὶ πλανᾶσθαι, ξενικὰ συνάγοντας ἦθη καὶ μιμήματα βίων ἀπαιδεύτων καὶ πολιτευμάτων διαφόρων. ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς ἀθροιζομένους ἐπ’ οὐδενὶ χρησίμῳ καὶ παρεισρέοντας εἰς τὴν πόλιν ἀπήλυνεν, οὐχ, ὥς Θουκυδίδης φησί, δεδιὼς μὴ τῆς πολιτείας μιμηταὶ γένωνται καὶ πρὸς ἀρετὴν τι χρήσιμον ἐκμάθωσιν, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον ὅπως μὴ διδάσκαλοι κακοῦ τινος ὑπάρξωσιν. ἅμα γὰρ ξένοις σώμασιν ἀνάγκη λόγους ἐπεισιέναι ξένους· λόγοι δὲ καινοὶ κρίσεις καινὰς ἐπιφέρουσιν. ἐξ ὧν ἀνάγκη πάθη πολλὰ φύεσθαι καὶ προαιρέσεις ἀπαδούσας πρὸς τὴν καθεστῶσαν πολιτείαν, ὥσπερ ἁρμονίαν. διὸ μᾶλλον ὥστεο χρῆναι φυλάττειν τὴν πόλιν ὅπως ἡθῶν οὐκ ἀναπλησθήσεται πονηρῶν ἢ σωμάτων νοσερῶν ἔξωθεν ἐπεισιόντων.’²⁵

ἕκαστος γὰρ ἐνεθυμείτο ὅτι “εἰ ἐνταῦθα μέινω καὶ ἐργάζωμαι καὶ λάβω νομίσματα τοιαῦτα, ἐν τῇ ἐμῇ πόλει οὐ δύναμαι αὐτοῖς χρῆσασθαι. I punctuate somewhat differently from the standard editions, which offer καὶ λάβω νομίσματα τοιαῦτα ἐν τῇ ἐμῇ πόλει, οὐ δύναμαι αὐτοῖς χρῆσασθαι. The reference to bronze rather than iron money seems a pure mistake, not a variant tradition.

²⁴ O. Gigon treats the passage as his item 143.4 F 25.5, noting its Aristotelian pedigree (p. 573). See also F. Jacoby, FGrH 2C, 255–7.

²⁵ ‘Wherefore he did not give permission to those wishing to live abroad and to travel about, integrating foreign [*xenika*] customs [*ēthē*] and imitations of non-acculturated lifestyles and variant political systems. But he expelled both those crowding in for no useful purpose and filtering into the city, not as Thucydides says, afraid lest they become mimickers of the [Spartan] polity and discover something contributory to excellence [*aretē*], but rather in order that they not serve as teachers [*didaskaloi*] of some evil, because it is necessary that alien [*xenoi*] modes of thought and discourse [*logoi*] enter with alien bodies and new modes of thought and discourse [*logoi*] introduce new judgments, from which it is necessary that many misadventures [or emotional conditions: *pathē*] come into being and preferences discordant to the prevailing polity, just as to a harmony. Therefore he thought it more necessary to guard the city in order that it not become filled with base habits [*ēthē*] than to guard against it being filled with diseased bodies entering from outside.’

This is one of the strongest enunciations of the contention that *xenēlasia* was begun to prevent cultural and political taint. The citation of Thucydides does not accurately represent his text. In Thucydides 2.39.1, Pericles states that the Spartans sought to protect military secrets. The assertion that *xenēlasia* intended to forestall political or moral emulation is an extrapolation that implies a much more favourable view of Spartan behaviour than either Pericles or Thucydides is likely to have endorsed.

A final Plutarchean treatment implies that the 'constitutional' tradition on *xenēlasia* was sufficiently valid at Sparta itself that it could shape the appreciation of this custom by King Agis IV himself (*Agis* 10.1–6).²⁶

[Leonidas] ἡρώτα τὸν Ἄγιν εἰ δίκαιον ἄνδρα καὶ σπουδαῖον ἡγεῖται γεγονέναι Λυκούργον. ὁμολογήσαντος δ' ἐκείνου, "ποῦ τοῖνυν" ἔφη, "Λυκούργος ἢ χρεῶν ἀποκοπὰς ἔδωκεν ἢ ξένους κατέταξεν εἰς τὴν πολιτείαν, ὃς οὐδ' ὅλως ἐνόμιζεν ὑγιαίνειν τὴν πόλιν μὴ χρωμένην ξενηλασίαις;" ὁ δ' Ἄγισ ἀπεκρίνατο μὴ θαυμάζειν τὸν Λεωνίδα, εἰ τεθραμμένος ἐν ξένῃ καὶ πεπαιδοποιημένος ἐκ γάμων σατραπικῶν ἀγνοεῖ τὸν Λυκούργον, ὅτι τὸ μὲν ὀφείλειν καὶ δανείζειν ἅμα τῷ νομίσματι συνεξέβαλεν ἐκ τῆς πόλεως, τῶν δ' ἐν ταῖς πόλεσι ξένων τοὺς τοῖς ἐπιτηδεύμασι καὶ ταῖς διαίταις ἀσυμφύλους μᾶλλον ἐδυσχέραινε· καὶ γὰρ ἐκείνους ἤλαυνεν οὐ τοῖς σώμασι πολεμῶν, ἀλλὰ τοὺς βίους αὐτῶν καὶ τοὺς τρόπους δειδώς, μὴ συναναχρωννύμενοι τοῖς πολίταις τρυφῆς καὶ μαλακίας καὶ πλεονεξίας ἐντέκωσι ζῆλον· ἐπεὶ Τέρπανδρόν γε καὶ Θάλητα καὶ Φερεκύδην ξένους ὄντας, ὅτι τὰ αὐτὰ τῷ Λυκούργῳ διετέλουν ἄδοντες καὶ φιλοσοφούντες, ἐν Σπάρτῃ τιμηθῆναι διαφερόντως.²⁷

If Plutarch were dependent on Phylarchus or Sphaerus here, that would account for some Hellenistic touches.²⁸ This passage couples the monetary legislation of Lycurgus with a cancellation of debt, reflecting a Hellenistic preoccupation with indebtedness at Sparta and elsewhere. Such debt legislation is absent in the *Lycurgus*. Furthermore, the *Agis* is more defensive about *xenēlasia* than the authorities used in the *Lycurgus* and *Apophthegmata*. So the source for this interchange was anxious to separate Lycurgus from the application of physical abuse in *xenēlasia*. Note his care in specifying καὶ γὰρ ἐκείνους ἤλαυνεν οὐ τοῖς σώμασι πολεμῶν 'accordingly he sought to drive them out, not making war on their persons'.

These, then, are basic facets of the 'constitutional' tradition on *xenēlasia*.

²⁶ G. Marasco, *Commento alle biografie plutarchee di Agide e di Cleomene* (Rome, 1981), 268–70.

²⁷ '[Leonidas] asked Agis if he believed that Lycurgus had been a just and serious [*spoudaios*] man. When Agis agreed, he said, 'where indeed did he either grant a curtailment of debts or classify *xenoi* in the citizen body, this man who truly considered that city that did not use *xenēlasiai* could not be healthy?' Agis answered that he was not surprised that Leonidas, who had been reared abroad and sired children out of a satrapal marriage, was ignorant that Lycurgus had expelled borrowing and lending from the city together with money [*nomisma*], and that he [Lycurgus] was more aggrieved over those of the *xenoi* in the cities who could not be assimilated in their habits and behaviours [*or less preferably*: was more aggrieved over those unassimilated in their habits and behaviours than *xenoi* in the cities]. Accordingly he sought to drive them out, not making war on their persons, but fearing their lifestyles and their mores lest they, spending much time with the citizens, engender in them an appetite for luxury [*truphē*], softness, and arrogance [*pleonexia*], while Terpander, Thales, and Phercydes, although *xenoi*, because they, performing poetry and philosophizing, were achieving the same goals as Lycurgus, were honoured exceedingly in Sparta.'

²⁸ Marasco (n. 26), 24–6, 41–2.

1. *Xenēlasia* is characteristically Spartan. Many of the scattered citations mention *xenēlasia* as an institution typical of Sparta. Therefore, it can be used in metaphor for any distinctive provision of Spartan law, separating Spartans from customs prevailing elsewhere. This idea appears in Plutarch's *Instituta Laconica*, where Spartan pragmatic literacy is highlighted by saying that they had made a *xenēlasia* of other *paideumata* 'educational programmes'.²⁹ At Sparta, when the Aetolian delegate Chlaeneas wishes to dramatize Macedonian expulsions from Greece, he naturally terms them *xenēlasiai* (Polyb. 9.29.4). Thus, *xenēlasia* was not merely a procedure for dealing with individual criminals or deviants of foreign derivation.³⁰ All Greek cities had magistrates to whose charge fell supervision of non-citizens, including the authority to constrain and expel objectionable aliens.³¹ As we shall see in the case of Maeandrius, such authority at Sparta paralleled the process by which a *xenēlasia* was proclaimed. Yet Spartan *xenēlasiai* were still perceived as unique by Greek observers because of their pervasive impact.

2. *Xenēlasia* is a practice inaugurated by Lycurgus, according to the *Lycurgus*, *Apophthegmata*, and *Agis*. Other testimonia concur.³² The *Suda* includes this attribution in its biography, which is Peripatetic in derivation: ξένους δὲ ἀπῆλασε, τὴν ἐκ τῆς ἐπιμιξίας διαφθορὰν ὑφορώμενος 'he expelled foreigners [*xenoi*], suspecting corruption through interaction with them' (s.v. Λυκούργος, λ 824.22–3 Adler). Furthermore, *xenēlasia* is characteristically Lycurgan in that it is never discussed historically, but only as an institution springing full grown from the mind of the *nomothetēs*. From the foregoing discussion in the *Lycurgus* we learn that it belonged to a second legislative phase, along with the creation of the system of *klēroi* (*Lyc.* 8.1).

3. In that second phase also appears the inception of Spartan iron money. Hence, *xenēlasia* is correlated with the Lycurgan monetary ordinances.³³ Lycurgus had demonetized gold and silver coinage and prohibited its use (as well as any possession of precious metals). In the *Apophthegmata*, there is a forced exchange of coinage in precious metal. In *Lycurgus* 9.1–2 an account is given of the iron money of the Spartans. It weighed a great deal for a low value per unit and had been treated with acetic acid to render it less useful for practical purposes. The monetary reform seems to have laid the groundwork for the first *xenēlasia* implied in *Lycurgus* 9.3. Olympiodorus presented the same connection, except for his mistaken reference to bronze money.

4. *Xenēlasia* is treated as part of an effort to isolate Spartan society from conventional Greek purveying of goods and providing of services. As such, it served a wider policy of suppressing inequality. The use of iron money struck at conspicuous

²⁹ Plut. *Mor.* 237a: γράμματα ἔνεκα τῆς χρείας ἐμάνθανον· τῶν δ' ἄλλων παιδευμάτων ξηνηλασίαν ἐποιούντο, οὐ μᾶλλον ἀνθρώπων ἢ λόγων.

³⁰ Cf. Krebs (n. 5), 1007; Rebenich (n. 2), 353.

³¹ E. Berneker, *RE* ² 18 (1967), s.v. 'ξενίας γραφή', 1441–79, see 1462–71; P. Gauthier, *Symbola: les étrangers et la justice dans les cités grecques* (Paris, 1972), 149–59.

³² Philostrat. *VA* 6.20; Apsines, *Ars Rhet.* 356 Stengel; Theodoret, *Cur.* 9.18. Sextus Empiricus has a Lycurgan law of *xenēlasia* borrowed from Crete through Thales (Thaletas), with specific reference to rhetoricians (*Adv. Math.* 2.20).

³³ Figueira (n. 7).

consumption (*pleonexia* in *Lyc.* 9.1). The victims of *xenēlasia* were the practitioners of ‘useless’ crafts. Thus, *xenēlasia* parallels sumptuary legislation. While ordinary sumptuary legislation addresses the consumers’ end of the derogated transactions by dictating prohibitions and limits, *xenēlasia* attacks the ‘supply-side’ of exhibitionism by removing the very persons who would satisfy the demand for inappropriate consumption.

5. As noted above, Xenophon explains *xenēlasia* as a means for excluding assimilation by the Spartans of ‘alien’ moral and cultural behaviour.³⁴ Even earlier, Thucydides had placed a comment about the separation of Spartan mores from common practices into the mouths of the Attic envoys at the pre-war conference at Sparta (1.77.6).

ἄμεικτα γὰρ τά τε καθ’ ὑμᾶς αὐτοὺς νόμιμα τοῖς ἄλλοις ἔχετε καὶ προσέτι εἰς ἕκαστος ἐξιὼν οὔτε τούτοις χρήται οὔθ’ οἷς ἡ ἄλλη Ἑλλάς νομίζει.³⁵

This is a critical ideological juncture in Thucydides’ history. It is the only effort by the Athenians to discover common conceptual ground with the Spartans over the nature of international affairs and the dictates of power politics, although, as is seen in this passage, that attempt is intensely cognizant of the varying ‘national’ characters of the two peoples. The manifest failure of this endeavour at rapprochement will condition Athenian readiness to undertake policies to win the ‘hearts and minds’ of the Peloponnesians and other pro-Spartan Greeks during the Peloponnesian War. Strikingly, the scholiast found here a reference to *xenēlasia* in the term ἄμεικτα.

ἄμεικτα γὰρ κτέ.: οὐδενὶ γὰρ ξένῳ μετεδίδουσιν τῶν παρ’ αὐτοῖς νομίμων οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐξενηλάτουν.³⁶

The theme of ‘cultural isolation’ receives great stress in later allusions to *xenēlasia*.³⁷ Plutarch is again helpful. In both the *Lycurgus* and *Instituta Laconica*, the target of *xenēlasiai* is people ‘filtering in’ or ‘slipping in’ who might become corrupting *didascaloi* ‘teachers’ of the citizens (*Lyc.* 27.3–4; *Mor.* 238e).³⁸ The *Agis* too brings out

³⁴ Cf. Plut. *Lyc.* 27.3–4; Nic. Dam. *FGrH* 90 F 103z.144.5; Joseph. *Ap.* 2.259; Sext. Emp. *Adv. Math.* 2.20; J. Chrys. *MPG* 60.267.5–10; SC 188.389. Hdt. 3.148.2–149.1 implies a deployment of the theme as early as c. 499, but vouches for its currency (at least in embryonic form) in the mid-fifth century, when Herodotus was collecting his evidence.

³⁵ ‘For incompatible with the other [Greeks] are the customs [*nomima*] you use among yourselves and moreover each one of you going abroad neither uses these customs nor those in which the rest of Greece believes.’

³⁶ ‘For unmixed and following: for the Lacedaemonians give a share of the *nomima* [laws and customs] among themselves to no *xenos*, but they even subject them to *xenēlasia*.’

³⁷ See n. 34 just above. Note these formulations: Arist. fr. 549 Gigon: οὐκ ἐξείναι φησιν ἀποδημεῖν τοῖς Λακεδαιμονίοις ὅπως μὴ ἐθίζωνται ἄλλων νόμων εἶναι φίλοι; Joseph. *Ap.* 2.259 Λακεδαιμόνιοι δὲ καὶ ξενηλασίας ποιούμενοι διετέλουν καὶ τοῖς αὐτῶν ἀποδημεῖν πολίταις οὐκ ἐπέτρεπον διαφθορὰν ἐξ ἁμφοῖν ὑφορώμενοι γενήσεσθαι περὶ τοὺς νόμους. Note the similarity to the citation of the *Suda* s.v. Λυκούργος, λ 824 Adler, which contains the same idea: τὴν ἐκ τῆς ἐπιμικσίας διαφθορὰν ὑφορώμενος.

³⁸ *Lyc.* 27.3–4: ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς ἀθροισζομένους ἐπ’ οὐδενὶ χρησίμῳ καὶ παρεισρέοντας εἰς τὴν πόλιν ἀπήλυνεν, . . . ἀλλὰ μάλλον ὅπως μὴ διδάσκαλοι κακοῦ τινος ὑπάρχωσιν. *Mor.* 238e: καὶ ξενηλασίας δ’ εἰσηγήσατο, ὅπως οἱ παρεισρέοντες μὴ διδάσκαλοι κακοῦ τινος τοῖς πολίταις ὑπάρχωσι.

most particularly the theme of contamination from foreign mores. Its sources were reacting more strongly to criticism of *xenēlasia* as anti-social. A reference to *xenēlasia* by Aristotle shows his awareness of its role as a mechanism for cultural separation. In the *Politics*, he discusses the indifferent quality of Cretan institutions, with particular emphasis on the role of extra-constitutional measures of relief from arbitrary authority (of the *cosmoi*). These would create risk except that geography has the same protective effect as *xenēlasiai*: *Pol.* 1272b16–18: ἀλλά, καθάπερ εἴρηται, σώζεται διὰ τὸν τόπον· ξενηλασίας γὰρ τὸ πόρρω πεποίηκεν ‘but, as has been said, the situation is saved through geography, for distance has accomplished *xenēlasiai*’.

The debate over the propriety of such means of isolation could transcend a tight focus on *xenēlasia*. In his *Laws*, Plato was sensitive to this question of the appropriate degree of intermixture a society was to allow with representatives of foreign social orders, and his terminology gives a peculiarly Spartan cast to his prescriptions.³⁹ Interaction between cities (ἡ πόλεων ἐπιμειξία) creates a blending of their characteristics and customs (*Laws* 949e–950a).⁴⁰ The people who live in a superior polity risk harm through such contaminating contact. Yet, the alternative of total isolation is unacceptable as ultimately self-subversive through its surrender of the superior state’s fair repute (*Laws* 950a–b).

τὸ δ’ αὖ μήτε ἄλλους δέχεσθαι μήτε αὐτοὺς ἄλλοσε ἀποδημεῖν ἅμα μὲν οὐκ ἐγχωρεῖ τό γε παράπαν, ἔτι δὲ ἄγριον καὶ ἀπηνὲς φαίνοιτ’ ἂν τοῖς ἄλλοις ἀνθρώποις, ὀνόμασιν τε χαλεποῖς ταῖσι λεγομέναις ξενηλασίαις χρωμένους καὶ τρόποις αὐθάδεσι καὶ χαλεποῖς, ὥς δοκοῖεν ἂν· χρηὴ δὲ οὐποτε περὶ σμικροῦ ποιεῖσθαι τὸ δοκεῖν ἀγαθοὺς εἶναι τοῖς ἄλλοις ἢ μὴ δοκεῖν.⁴¹

The perception that so troubles Plato is precisely the image of Spartan insularity and misanthropy that was associated with the *xenēlasiai*, the very characterization disseminated by Athenian democrats.

Plato designs rules for his new ‘Cretan’ city that restrict travel abroad to men over forty on matters of public business (*Laws* 950d–951d), including legal/philosophical research (951b–952d). His limitations on visits by *xenoi* include isolation and supervision of seasonal, commercial visitors (952d–953a), accommodation of limited duration for *theōroi* in temples under priestly supervision (953a–b), public reception for official visitors solely by high state officers (953b–c), and carefully monitored and rare stays by cultural dignitaries (953c–d). These provisions will engineer an appropriate outcome (953d–e).

τούτοις δὴ τοῖς νόμοις ὑποδέχεσθαι τε χρηὴ πάντας ξένους τε καὶ ξένας ἐξ ἄλλης χώρας καὶ τοὺς αὐτῶν ἐκπέμπειν, τιμῶντας ξένιον Δία, μὴ βρώμασι καὶ θύμασι

³⁹ The dubiously Platonic *Hippias Maior* also shows awareness of the cultural contamination motif when Socrates teases Hippias over whether the Spartans believed that Hippias could teach their children to be better men (283c–284d).

⁴⁰ *Laws* 949e: πέφυκε δὲ ἡ πόλεων ἐπιμειξία πόλεσιν ἡθῇ κεραννῆναι παντοδαπά, καινοτομίας ἀλλήλοισι ἐμποιοῦντων ξένων ξένοισι . . .

⁴¹ ‘Neither for them to receive others nor themselves to go abroad anywhere is not at all a feasible option and it would (moreover) appear to the rest of mankind savage and perverse as though having recourse to that grievous terminology of the so-called *xenēlasiai* and to practices obstinate and grievous as they would appear. But the issue whether or not they seem to be good to others or not ought never to receive a slight estimation.’

τὰς ξενηλασίας ποιουμένους, καθάπερ ποιούσι νῦν θρέμματα Νείλου, μηδὲ κηρύγμασιν ἀγρίοις.⁴²

The example of the Egyptians is to be shunned, as they expel foreigners by refusing them participation in local religious activity (see note 10 above). Especially interesting for our purposes are the *kērugmata agria* 'savage proclamations' because they presumably evoke contemporary feelings toward Spartan *xenēlasiai*.

This picture is reasonably consistent when polemical emphases and rhetorical elaborations are discounted, save for a single testimonium that does indeed come from an important, early witness, Herodotus.⁴³ In giving the background to Croesus' approach to the Spartans for an alliance, Herodotus recounts Spartan successes against Tegea. He then speaks of a time of disorder at early Sparta before the legislation of Lycurgus (1.65.2).

τὸ δὲ ἔτι πρότερον τούτων καὶ κακονομώτατοι ἦσαν σχεδὸν πάντων Ἑλλήνων κατὰ τε σφέας αὐτοὺς καὶ ξείνοισι ἀπρόσμεικτοι. μετέβαλον δὲ ᾧδε ἐς εὐνομίην· Λυκούργου τῶν Σπαρτιητέων δοκίμου ἀνδρὸς ἐλθόντος ἐς Δελφοὺς ἐπὶ τὸ χρηστήριον . . .⁴⁴

After our saturation with the traditions on *xenēlasia*, Herodotus' comment seems almost counterintuitive. Lycurgan Sparta maintained its *eunomia* through cultural isolation that was enforced by *xenēlasiai*. By implication any disordered pre-Lycurgan Sparta ought to have been awash with the presence and influence of *xenoi*. Thereafter, the Lycurgan 'revolution' initiated a return to a truer tradition. One explanation for this incongruity is that the theme of cultural isolation became prominent between the time of Herodotus' interrogation of his informants and the composition of Thucydides' first book. This resolution, however, overlooks the appearance of a fear of contamination in the Maeandrius and Aristagoras episodes in Herodotus himself (3.148.2, 5.51.2).

The term *ἀπρόσμεικτος* is rare.⁴⁵ It can be entirely excluded that an obscure (and now unknown) Laconian 'term of art' ('not-opposing-admixture') was misunderstood and transformed into an improper Ionic equivalent. The better alternative is to believe that the account in Herodotus, which manifestly rests on Spartan informants, is already defensive in the face of criticism of Spartan insularity by the Athenians and their Ionian allies. Herodotus' Spartan informants asserted that 'Lycurgan' Sparta established principles for reciprocal visitation with other Greeks, the very sort of diplomatic and cultural interaction corroborated in the substance of the *logoi* of Herodotus and perhaps too in the conduct itself of his *historiē*, for he visited Sparta.

⁴² 'It is necessary under these laws [*nomoi*] to receive all male foreigners [*xenoi*] and female foreigners [*xenai*] from another land and send abroad their own people, honoring Zeus the patron of guests [Zeus *Xeinios*] while not making *xenēlasiai* for [sacrificial] meats and ceremonies, as now the offspring of the Nile do, nor by savage proclamations.'

⁴³ Note E. Lévy, 'La Sparta d'Hérodote', *Ktema* 24 (1999), 123–34, see 131–4.

⁴⁴ 'During the time even earlier than these events, they were both the most evilly endowed with laws of nearly all the Greeks among themselves and without social intercourse [*aprosmeiktoi*] with *xenoi*. They were transformed to a sound constitution [*eunomiē*] in this way: when Lycurgus a leading man of the Spartiates came to Delphi for the oracle . . .'

⁴⁵ Cf. Arr. *FGrH* 156 F 177; Helioid. *Aeth.* 3.19.3; but it is also attested in the sense 'unapproachable' (e.g. Eustath. *Il.* 4.982). Dio Cass. 38.49.6 has the connotation 'unassailable in close combat' (cf. Thuc. 5.72.1; Dio Cass. 40.2.4; Arr. *Anab.* 2.2.5 for *πρόσμε(ε)ίξις*).

In their turn, the Athenians portrayed a policy of cultural isolation achieved through *xenēlasia* as a lack of affinity for their fellow Greeks on the part of the Spartans. Thus, implementation of *xenēlasiai* became a subject for ideological controversy during the second half of the fifth century.

III. XENELASIA IN ATTIC EYES

Let us commence our investigation of Athenian attitudes toward *xenēlasia* by citing an entry in the *Suda*. It incorporates a gloss to the *Peace* of Aristophanes that it supplements with a series of negative characterizations of the Spartan treatment of *xenoi*.

Suda s.v. Διειρωνόξενοι, δ 997 Adler: ἐξαπατώντες τοὺς ξένους καὶ ψευδόμενοι δι' εἰρωνείας καὶ ὑποκρίσεως. οἱ Λάκωνες· παρ' οἷς καὶ ὁ τῆς ξενηλασίας ἔκειτο νόμος. ὅτι δὲ αἰσχροκερδεῖς καὶ μικρολόγοι οἱ Λάκωνες, δηλοῖ ὁ χρησμός· ἂ φιλοχρηματία Σπάρταν ὀλεῖ, ἄλλο δὲ οὐδέν. ἦσαν δὲ καὶ περὶ τοὺς ξένους ἀπάνθρωποι, καὶ οὐκ ἐξὸν ξένῳ τινὶ ἀεὶ τῆς Σπάρτης ἐπιβαίνειν, ἀλλ' ὠρισμέναις ἡμέραις.⁴⁶

The scholia to the *Peace* contain the same material nearly word for word.⁴⁷ The theme of Spartan greediness was prominent in wartime Attic polemics, some of which are transmitted through Aristophanes. That *philokhrēmatia* would destroy the Spartans was emphasized by an oracle retrospectively associated with Lycurgus himself. Fourth-century historiography used this response so assiduously in explanations of Sparta's decline that it achieved proverbial status.⁴⁸ The passage annotated here is a speech of Hermes in the *Peace* about the causation of the Peloponnesian War that condemns both the Spartans and certain Attic allies (verses 619–27).⁴⁹

Another entry in the *Suda* also cites Aristophanes on Spartan behaviour toward *xenoi*. It explains the verb *ξενηλατέω*.

⁴⁶ 'Dieirōnoxenoi 'dissembling with guests/foreigners [*xenoi*]: deceiving *xenoi* and being deceitful with dissembling [*eirōneia*] and hypocrisy. The Spartans [*Lakōnes*] among whom there was even established a law of *xenēlasia*. That the Spartans are greedy [*aiskhrokerdeis*] and conniving after trifles [*mikrologoi*] the oracle reveals: money-lust [*philokhrēmatia*] will destroy Sparta, and nothing else. And they were also inhumane [*apanthrōpoi*] about *xenoi* and it was not allowed for any *xenos* to enter Sparta all the time, but only on limited days.'

⁴⁷ Σ*Peace* 623a Holwerda: αἰσχροκερδεῖς· ὅτι αἰσχροκερδεῖς καὶ μικρολόγοι . . . ἀλλ' ὠρισμέναις ἡμέραις. Σ*Peace* 623b: διειρωνόξενοι· ἐξαπατώντες τοὺς ξένους καὶ ψευδόμενοι δι' εἰρωνείας καὶ ὑποκρίσεως. καὶ οὐδὲν θαυμαστὸν ἐνταῦθα ἐποιοῦν, παρ' οἷς καὶ ὁ τῆς ξενηλασίας κεῖται νόμος. Σ*Peace* 623c: διειρωνόξενοι· εἰρωνεύόμενοι τοὺς ξένους.

⁴⁸ Figueira (n. 7).

⁴⁹ κατ' ἐπειδὴ γινώσαν ὑμᾶς αἱ πόλεις ὧν ἤρχεσθε | ἡγριωμένους ἐπ' ἀλλήλοισι καὶ σεσηρότας, | πάντ' ἐμχανῶντ' ἐφ' ὑμῖν τοὺς φόρους φοβούμεναι, | κἀνέπειθον τῶν Λακωνῶν τοὺς μεγίστους χρήμασιν. | οἱ δ' ἅτ' ὄντες αἰσχροκερδεῖς καὶ διειρωνόξενοι | τήνδ' ἀπορρύπαντες αἰσχροῦ τὸν Πόλεμον ἀνέρπασαν· | κατὰ τὰ κείνων γε κέρδη τοῖς γεωργοῖς ἦν κακά· | αἱ γὰρ ἐνθένδ' αὖ τριήρεις ἀντιτιμωρούμεναι | οὐδὲν αἰτίων ἂν ἀνδρῶν τὰς κράδας κατήσθιον. (And then when the cities over whom you rule saw you grown savage and | snarling at each other, they began to contrive everything against you, | fearing tributary payments, and they induced the greatest men of the | Laconians by money. Since they are greedy [*aiskhrokerdeis*] and | dissemblers [*dieirōnoxenoi*], casting away this one [Peace] shamefully, | they snatched up War. And then their profits were evils for the farmers. | Triremes from here then that were deemed an appropriate counter-action | ate up the figs of men not guilty at all.)

Suda s.v. ξενηλατεῖν, ξ 25 Adler: Λακεδαιμόνιοι μετὰ πληγῶν ἐξήλαυνον τοὺς ξένους. Ἀριστοφάνης: τί δ' ἔστι δεινόν; ὥσπερ ἐν Λακεδαίμονι ξενηλατοῦνται καὶ κεκίνηνται τινες πληγαὶ συχναὶ κατ' ἄστυ. ποτὲ γὰρ ἐκεῖσε σποδιᾶς γενομένης ξενηλασία γέγονε.⁵⁰

The quotation is from Aristophanes, *Birds* 1012–14, where Meton among other nuisances has arrived in Clouduckooland. He is threatened by Peisetaerus in the manner that has been annotated in the citation above. The last sentence in the gloss attempts to paraphrase *Birds* 1015–16: . . . ὁμοθυμαδὸν | σποδεῖν ἅπαντας τοὺς ἀλαζόνας δοκεῖ ‘with one accord it’s been decided to pound all quacks’. Yet the scholion to the *Birds* indicates that something has become distorted in the transmission of this explanation. It cites Theopompus, who speaks of a *sitodeia* ‘food shortage’ at Sparta, and not of *spodia* ‘pounding’ (*FGH* 115 F 178 ~ *SBirds* 1013a–b Holwerda; see below pp. 66–8).⁵¹ Although a specific attribution cannot be ascertained, it is likely that the lexicographers and scholiasts drew their treatment from an Attidographer, one of the local historians of Attica.

The whole context in the *Birds* is even more helpful about contemporary Athenian attitudes. Let us then consider *Birds* 1010–20.

ΠΕΙΣΕΤΑΙΡΟΣ. Ἴσθ' ὅτιν' φιλῶ σ' ἐγώ,
κᾶμοι πιθόμενος ὑπαποκίνει τῆς ὁδοῦ.

ΜΕΤΩΝ. Τί δ' ἔστι δεινόν;

ΠΕ. Ὅσπερ ἐν Λακεδαίμονι
ξενηλατοῦνται καὶ κεκίνηνται τινες.

Πληγαὶ συχναὶ κατ' ἄστυ.

ΜΕ. Μῶν στασιάζετε;

ΠΕ. Μὰ τὸν Δί' οὐ δῆτ'.

ΜΕ. Ἀλλὰ πῶς;

ΠΕ. Ὅμοθυμαδὸν
σποδεῖν ἅπαντας τοὺς ἀλαζόνας δοκεῖ.

ΜΕ. Ὑπάγοιμι τᾶρ' ἄν.

ΠΕ. Νῆ Δί', ὥς οὐκ οἶδ' ἂν εἰ
φθαίης ἄν' ἐπικεῖνται γὰρ ἐγγὺς αὐταί.

ΜΕ. Οἴμοι κακοδαίμων.

ΠΕ. Οὐκ ἔλεγον ἐγὼ πάλοι;

Οὐκ ἀναμετρήσει σαυτὸν ἀπιῶν ἀλλαχῇ;⁵²

⁵⁰ ‘To expel foreigners: the Lacedaemonians used to expel *xenoi* with lashes. Aristophanes: [Meton] ‘What is awful?’ [Peisetairus] ‘Just as in Lacedaimon some continuous lashes expel aliens [verb: ξενηλατέω] and get them moving out of town.’ Once when there was a pounding there, a *xenēlasia* took place.’

⁵¹ *SBirds* 1013a: ξενηλατοῦνται: περὶ τῆς ἐν Λακεδαίμονι ξενηλασίας Θεόπομπός φησιν ἐν τῇ τρίτῃ καὶ τριακοστῇ. 1013b: ποτὲ γὰρ ἐκεῖσε σιτοδείας γενομένης, ξενηλασία γέγονεν, ὡς Θεόπομπος ἐν τῇ λζ' φησίν.

⁵² ‘Pe.: You know how fond I am of you, | [so] take my advice, and sneak out of the street. | Me.: What’s the worry? | Pe.: Just as in Lacedaemon | they drive away *xenoi* [*xenēlatountai*] and some folks get stirred up. | Blows are common around town. | Me.: Are you involved in factional conflict then? | Pe.: By Zeus, that’s not it! | Me.: Why then? | Pe.: With one accord | it’s been decided to pound all quacks. | Me.: I should indeed be slipping away. | Pe.: By Zeus, I don’t really know if | you’ll beat the deadline since those blows are right here. | Me.: Alas! Wretched me! | Pe.: Wasn’t I telling you a while back? | Won’t you measure yourself, going off elsewhere?’

This Attic picture of *xenēlasia* is characterized by certain themes.

1. Spartan cultural and social isolation were the concomitant of hostile attitudes toward other human beings. They were *dieirōnoxenoi*, that is, dissemblers and hypocrites in their dealings with foreigners. This was quite different from the *philoxenia* exhibited by the Athenians, who welcomed persons from other *poleis* and *ethnē* into Attica.⁵³ By implication, the Athenian vision of *xenēlasia* holds the Attic institution of the *metic* class as the essential alternative. Sparta was ‘peculiar’, Athens was ‘universal’.⁵⁴

2. *Xenēlasia* was associated in Attic eyes with greed and economic exploitation. Our sources are not explicit about the mechanisms involved, but *xenēlasia* was seen as a means to garner some financial advantage unfairly. The Athenians rejected the image of an egalitarian Sparta free from luxury (*truphē*) and self-aggrandizement (*pleonexia*). They took no cognizance of the system of iron money. To them, Lyncurgan norms were irrelevant, inasmuch as the Spartans were clearly obsessed with accumulating money in the form of silver coinage. They took it as axiomatic that the utilization of *xenēlasia* assisted Spartan greediness.

3. The process of *xenēlasia* involved physical abuse in the form of blows aimed at those being expelled. Again there is a contrast with Athens, where it was not appropriate to subject persons, even foreigners or slaves, to casual molestation (cf. [Xen.] *Ath. Pol.* 1.10).

4. A final item of the Attic indictment luckily comes to us through Thucydides himself, as he presents Pericles in the *Epitaphius* making a hostile reference to *xenēlasia* (Thuc. 2.39.1).⁵⁵ Spartan *xenēlasia* could be advantageous because it shielded military activities from the scrutiny of outsiders. His tone is understandably much less diplomatic than that of the Attic envoys at Sparta before hostilities. These comments are placed between his extolling Athenian religious activity and ‘consumerism’ (2.38.1–2) and contrasting the laborious courage attained by the Spartan *agōgē* with the less studied valour of the Athenians (2.39.2).

⁵³ Thuc. 2.39.1; Eur. *Heracl.* 107–8; Soph. *OC* 260–2; Ar. *Frogs* 455–9; Isoc. *Panegy.* [4] 41, cf. 2.22; Strabo 10.3.18 C471; Paus. 1.17.1; *Suda* s.v. *Περιθοῖδαι*, π 1168 Adler. Cf. Thuc. 1.2.6 with scholia; Diod. 11.43.3; Paus. 7.1.8–9. See M. Clerc, *Les métèques athéniens* (Paris, 1893), 318–20; D. Whitehead, *The Ideology of the Athenian Metic*, PCPS Suppl. 4 (1977), 69, 141–42. Note that the Athenians centred their protests on *xenēlasia*, not on incorporation of aliens as citizens. Their Periclean citizenship law represented a typical exclusivity (*Ath. Pol.* 26.4; Plut *Per.* 37.3), which in Athens, as elsewhere, was punctuated in practice by an inclusivism imposed by military and political exigencies. Cf. Rebenich (n. 2), 339–43.

⁵⁴ Note the cross-cultural prevalence of institutions like the Attic *metoikia*. See D. Whitehead, ‘Immigrant communities in the classical polis: some principles for a synoptic treatment’, *AC* 53 (1984), 47–59; P. Gauthier, ‘Meteques, perieques et *paroikoi*: bilan et points d’interrogation’, in R. Lonis (ed.), *L’étranger dans le monde grec* (Nancy, 1988), 23–46.

⁵⁵ The scholia confirm the implied reference to the Spartans, and amplify on Spartan deceitfulness (ΣThuc. 2.39.1 Hude). The presence of the term *ξενηλασίαις* there suggests that its absence in ΣAel. Aristid. 46.163.16–18, quoting this passage, does not militate for its deletion in the text of Thucydides. Cf. D. M. Lewis, ‘Toward a historian’s text of Thucydides’ (Diss. Princeton, 1952), 104, 195; Hornblower (n. 4), 304.

Thuc. 2.39.1: διαφέρομεν δὲ καὶ ταῖς τῶν πολεμικῶν μελέταις τῶν ἐναντίων τοῖσδε. τήν τε γὰρ πόλιν κοινὴν παρέχομεν, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ὅτε ξενηλασίαις ἀπείργομέν τινα ἢ μαθήματος ἢ θεάματος, ὃ μὴ κρυφθὲν ἂν τις τῶν πολεμίων ἰδὼν ὠφελῇ, πιστεύοντες οὐ ταῖς παρασκευαῖς τὸ πλεόν καὶ ἀπάταις ἢ τῷ ἄφ' ἡμῶν αὐτῶν ἐς τὰ ἔργα εὐψύχω.⁵⁶

That the Spartans sought to hide their military preparations from others was a truism in the late fifth century that, as Thucydides notes elsewhere, also made historical investigation difficult (5.68.2). The theme of the Spartans as practitioners of deceit has here a military valence, whereas in other negative comments on *xenēlasia* it has an economic sense.⁵⁷ Thucydides' Pericles stresses the status of Athens as an 'open society' that is part and parcel of his claim that the city represents a *paradeigma* 'example' in political life (2.37.1) and a *paideusis* 'means of education' of Greece (2.41.1). By implication, insular and self-doubting Sparta constitutes in this view an institutional dead end.⁵⁸ None the less, Pericles may be stretching to make his point: Spartan measures to protect the confidentiality of policy-making (such as barring visitors on days of deliberation) did not require *xenēlasia*, and Greek *poleis* took security measures in wartime.⁵⁹ By his allusion here, Pericles reminds the Athenians of his earlier proposal to trade the Megarian Decree for a Spartan surrender of *xenēlasia*. Their refusal to countenance his offer shows how high a value the Spartans placed on *xenēlasia*, which further heightens the opprobrium connected with the practice. That evil reputation could help in further stigmatizing Spartan secrecy measures.

IV. CULTURAL ISOLATION

Xenophon contrasted earlier Sparta, with its *xenēlasiai*, and contemporary decadent Sparta. We have seen how the 'constitutional' tradition, transmitted through Plutarch and others, praised *xenēlasia* as a weapon in the arsenal of cultural segregation. The Hellenistic historiography lying behind Plutarch's *Agis* shows defensiveness regarding the issue. Attic political commentary is condemnatory. The care that Plato takes in the *Laws* over his own rules for social separation indicates the negative atmosphere surrounding *xenēlasiai*.

Plato also deftly undermined positive claims about *xenēlasia* in his *Protagoras*. In

⁵⁶ 'We differ from our adversaries also in military training practices in this manner. We offer an open city, and there is no time when we exclude through *xenēlasiai* anyone either from learning or viewing regarding any matter which as unhidden someone of our enemies might profit from seeing, since we do not place our trust more in preparations or in deceits [*apatē*] than in our innate good character for military affairs.'

⁵⁷ One ought not privilege this aspect of the Attic critique in order to suggest that the military function of *xenēlasia* was prior or fundamental in terms of Spartan social structure. In point of fact, this reference is coeval with our Aristophanic evidence. The earlier *xenēlasiai*, implied in Thuc. 1.144.2, cannot have been military measures, for it makes no sense that Pericles would require the Spartans to relinquish a wartime policy in a proposal itself intended to avoid war. See n. 2 above.

⁵⁸ Plutarch or a Laconizing source in Plut. *Lyc.* 27.3–4 distorts Thucydides to imply that he was charging the Spartans with a refusal to share their *aretē*.

⁵⁹ For ordinary 'police' measures when *epimeixia* 'international interrelations' terminated, note Aen. Tact. 10.8–10 with D. Whitehead, *Aineias the Tactician: How to Survive under Siege* (Oxford, 1990), 117; cf. Hdt. 1.68.1; Thuc. 5.35.2, 78.1; Xen. *HG* 5.1.1. See also Whitehead, 'The Laconian key', *CQ* 40 (1990), 268.

the relevant passage (342c), Socrates is expounding the view that Sparta is pre-eminent because of the cultivation there of philosophy and wisdom as well as their sophistical practitioners. He ironically portrays this commitment as a sort of state secret, in the protection of which the Spartans conduct *xenēlasiai*.⁶⁰ These expulsions not only encompass various resident aliens, but also specifically include any visiting Laconizers. Their purpose is to maintain the secret of Spartan interaction with the sophists even from their admirers, who have only imitated the outward signs of the Laconian lifestyle (such as dress and physical culture). Interestingly, Socrates then attributes the ban on Spartan foreign residence to the same concern. The idea of the Spartans hiding their devotion to *sophia* through *xenēlasiai* is delightfully subversive of any defence of the institution along the moral segregation tack. By implication, Spartan wisdom ought only be prized to the extent that they preserved pan-Hellenic archaic moral teachings.

This argument over the evaluation of Spartan cultural isolation was not only fought out contemporaneously, but also replayed in later Greek thought. A series of passages illustrates the conflict between the ostensible purpose of *xenēlasia* in keeping Spartan *nomoi* safe from external contamination and the accusation that the Spartans lacked generosity of temperament by their curtailing so dramatically interaction with other Greeks. This dichotomy could even lie ready to hand for Jewish apologetics. Josephus defends Jewish separatism as approximating the measures adopted against corruption of their mores by the *eudokimōtatoi* 'most renowned' of the Greeks, such as the Spartans with their *xenēlasiai* and prohibitions against citizens living abroad (Joseph. *Ap.* 2.259–61). Alluding to the negative appreciation of *xenēlasia*, Josephus asserts that the Spartans might be taxed with *ducolia* 'perversity', unlike the Jews, whose willingness to assimilate 'converts' testifies to their philanthropy and magnanimity.

A similar thematic juxtaposition is posed by Philostratus in his life of Apollonius of Tyana. His extraordinary setting for a discussion of *xenēlasia* is a meeting between Apollonius and a group of Egyptian sages (*VA* 6.20). With his customary spirit of wilfulness regarding tradition, Philostratus calls these wise men Gymnosophists, the usual Greek denomination for the *gurus* of various Indian sects. The particular context is a debate between Apollonius and an Egyptian savant called Thespesion. Their point of departure for discussing *xenēlasia* is the Spartan custom of venerating Artemis (Orthia) by shedding blood through flogging. That was a usage supposedly patterned on the human sacrifice of the Taurian Scythians, although with the significant mitigation of wounding instead of killing. Thespesion questions the spirit of this mitigation, implying that one or two human sacrifices of foreign visitors might not be worse than a general use of *xenēlasia* (*ξηνηλασίᾳ χρώμενοι ἐς πάντας*). Apollonius defends Lycurgus, since the legislator's intention was not to foster *amixia* 'alienation', but to keep Spartan mores sound (*τοῦ ὑγιαίνειν τὰς ἐπιτηδεύσεις*; thus invoking the cultural contamination theme). Thespesion counters that by being exposed to *xenoi* at home the Spartans would have better learnt to preserve their traditional attitudes and acquire virtues. He amplifies by noting that the Spartans had not only destroyed their

⁶⁰ *Protag.* 342c: οἱ δὲ Λακεδαιμόνιοι, ἐπειδὴν βούλωνται ἀνέδην τοῖς παρ' αὐτοῖς συγγενέσθαι σοφισταῖς καὶ ἤδη ἄχθονται λάθρα συγγιγνόμενοι, ξηνηλασίας ποιούμενοι τῶν τε λακωνιζόντων τούτων καὶ εἴαν τις ἄλλος ξένος ὦν ἐπιδημήσῃ, συγγίγνονται τοῖς σοφισταῖς λανθάνοντες τοὺς ξένους . . . (Whenever the Spartans wish to spend time with the sophists among them without restraint, and they get aggrieved at meeting in secret, implementing *xenēlasiai* both of the Laconizers and any other *xenoi* in residence, they spend time with the sophists, while avoiding the cognizance of the *xenoi* . . .)

traditional behaviour patterns while using *xenēlasiai*, but had also become hated by the Greeks for their adoption of Attic hegemonic behaviours (including the levying of *phoros*).⁶¹ So Thespesion melds the traditional criticism of *xenēlasia* with a position on Spartan greed and imperialism in the spirit of fourth-century historiography.⁶²

The exotic setting here cannot disguise a rhetorical set-piece. Therefore, the debate over the character of *xenēlasia* was sufficiently well known that rhetoricians imagined school exercises in which arguments might be marshalled for or against. Accordingly, Valerius Apsines prescribed the correct manner to approach a denunciation of Lycurgus for the creation of the procedure (*Ars Rhetorica* 356 Stengel). Sopater in his scholia to the rhetorical treatises attributed to Hermogenes uses *xenēlasia* as an example in his treatment of *amphisbētēsis* ‘disputation’. The *rhetōr* must be able to speak on behalf of the status of metic at Athens, but in favour of *xenēlasia* at Sparta, accommodating himself to the prevailing legal system (5.27.19–26, 30.14–21 Walz). Other scholia to Hermogenes repeat the same advice (*Scholia ad Hermogenis status* 4.72.9–14 Walz).

The scholia to the *Panathenaicus* of Aelius Aristides offer a striking collocation of motifs from this retrospective debate. The text of Aelius Aristides extols the faithfulness with which the Athenians discharged the terms of the amnesty of 404, including paying the Spartans back the loan taken out by the Thirty against the *dēmos* itself. He delicately observes that he cannot compare Spartan *homonoia* because they keep their domestic interrelations secret (*Panath.* 166: καὶ μὴν Λακεδαιμόνιοι μὲν ὅπως ὠμίλουν ἀλλήλοις οὐκ ἂν ἔχοιμεν εἰπεῖν· ἔκρυπτον γάρ). The scholiast explains by noting that *xenoi* could not attend meetings of the assembly and council for reasons of maintaining the confidentiality of these proceedings (*ΣPanath.* 166.8). These observations echo Pericles in the Funeral Oration in his contrast of Attic openness with Laconian secrecy (Thuc. 2.39.1). The next two entries in the scholia explicitly refer to *xenēlasia* as an outgrowth of Spartan concerns with secrecy (*ΣPanath.* 166.9).

The most analytically sophisticated observation generated by this debate comes from Dionysius of Halicarnassus. Insightfully, he saw *xenēlasia* from the perspective of the debate on Spartan *oliganthropia* ‘dearth of manpower’ (Arist. *Pol.* 1270a32–4). He sets his comments in a discussion of the demographic advantage accruing to the Romans through their policy of *philoxenia*, inaugurated in the regal period, the ultimate token of which was enfranchisement of freedmen (*AR* 2.17.1–2). He cites as motivation for Greek avoidance of such measures a cross-cultural eugenic preoccupation.

τὰ δὲ Ἑλλήνων ἔθνη παρὰ ταῦτα ἐξετάζων οὐκ ἔχω πῶς ἐπαινέσω τὰ τε Λακεδαιμονίων καὶ τὰ τῶν Θηβαίων καὶ τῶν μέγιστον ἐπὶ σοφία φρονούντων Ἀθηναίων, οἱ φυλάττοντες τὸ εὐγενές καὶ μηδενὶ μεταδιδόντες εἰ μὴ σπανίοις τῆς παρ’ ἑαυτοῖς πολιτείας (ἐγὼ γὰρ λέγειν ὅτι καὶ ξενηλατοῦντες ἔνιοι) πρὸς τῷ μηδὲν ἀπολαῦσαι ταύτης τῆς μεγαληγορίας ἀγαθὸν καὶ τὰ μέγιστα δι’ αὐτῇν

⁶¹ οἱ δὲ καίτοι ξενηλασίαις χρώμενοι διεφθάρσαν τὰς ἐπιτηδεύσεις καὶ οἷς μάλιστα τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἀπήχθοντο, τούτοις ὅμοια πράττειν ἔδοξαν. τὰ γοῦν περὶ τὴν θάλατταν καὶ αἱ μετὰ ταῦτα ἐπιτάξεις τῶν φόρων ἀττικώτερον αὐτοῖς ἐβουλεύθη, καὶ ὑπὲρ ὧν πολεμητέα πρὸς Ἀθηναίους ὦντο αὐτοῖς εἶναι, ταῦτ’ ἐς τὸ καὶ αὐτοὶ δρᾶν κατέστησαν τὰ μὲν πολέμια τοὺς Ἀθηναίους νικῶντες, ὧν δὲ ἐκείνοις ἐπιτηδεύειν ἔδοξεν ἡττώμενοι.

⁶² Thespesion finally offers a series of *reductiones ad absurdum*, including a rule by which old men are executed at sixty as a proof of superior courage, only to reject his whole line of analysis as a subjecting of received traditions to destructive scrutiny. Apollonius agrees to the change in topic, while asserting that Spartans had many arguments in favour of their institutions.

ἐβλάβησαν. Σπαρτιᾶται μὲν γε πταίσαντες μάχῃ τῇ περὶ Λεῦκτρα, ἐν ᾗ χιλίους καὶ ἑπτακοσίους ἄνδρας ἀπέβαλον, οὐκέτι τὴν πόλιν ἡδυνήθησαν ἐκ τῆς συμφορᾶς ταύτης ἀναλαβεῖν, ἀλλ' ἀπέστησαν τῆς ἡγεμονίας σὺν αἰσχύνῃ.⁶³

Dionysius deserves our praise for transcending both Laconizing commendation of *xenēlasia* for its *prophylaxis* against foreign contamination and Atticizing criticism of its exploitation and inhumanity.

V. THE FUNCTION OF *XENELASIA*

We must now consider whether it is possible to offer an interpretation of *xenēlasia* as Spartan policy that will build on this framework of the ancient appreciations of the institution that have just been described. To do so, it is first necessary to note that the existence of *xenēlasia* had an ideological purpose even when there was no recourse to it in practice. By consensus, *xenēlasia* was the capstone of a pattern of behaviours motivated by an impetus toward cultural or social isolation. This complex emphasized to the Spartans that Sparta was a special place, with rules for daily life distinct from and superior to other *poleis*. Through institutions such as *klēroi*, messes, iron money, prohibition of the public ownership of precious metals, and other sumptuary restrictions, the Spartans could claim to have suppressed *hubris*, *pleonexia*, and *truphē*, the primary, cross-cultural social transgressions of aristocrats in archaic Greece. Moreover, the same social structures ostensibly ensured that full civic status could not be jeopardized through the vicissitudes of life experiences save for those entailing divergence from behavioural norms. The Spartan pursuit of *aretē* could be recognized as meritocratic in its own light, in that a single *agōgē* 'upbringing' was open to all Spartiates. Civic *sōphrosynē* expressed through an austerity of lifestyle was a foundation of Spartan solidarity from which flowed the military power of the community.

Xenēlasia reaffirmed this cohesion by 'othering' the rest of the Greeks, emphasizing the bonds linking Spartans exclusively and stigmatizing certain stimuli toward finding common ground with non-Spartans. If each possible interaction with a non-Spartan was suspect for its risk of tainting, the impulse toward cultural segregation lying behind *xenēlasia* converted all such occasions into opportunities to reinforce indigenous behavioural norms. Even an eight- or nine-year old girl like Gorgo, the daughter of king Cleomenes I, could be expected to be acutely sensitive to the dangers of contagion. When Aristagoras, the erstwhile tyrant of Miletus, was attempting to bribe Cleomenes in 498 on behalf of Spartan intervention in the Ionian revolt, Gorgo warned *πάτερ, διαφθερέει σε ὁ ξένος, ἣν μὴ ἀποστὰς ἔῃς* 'father, the *xenos* will corrupt you, unless you get up and leave' (Hdt. 5.51.2, cf. 5.48). And this point was

⁶³ 'When I review the practices [*ethē*] of the Greeks alongside these [Roman assimilation methods], I do not know how I might praise the practices of the Lacedaimonians and those of the Thebans and those of the Athenians who pride themselves greatly for wisdom, people, who while they kept guarding their ethnic excellence and were not sharing their own citizenship with anyone except for rare cases (for I omit to mention that some were even practicing *xenēlasiai*), in addition to enjoying nothing good from their haughtiness, they did a great deal of harm through this. Indeed the Spartiates, stumbling in the battle at Leuktra in which they lost seventeen hundred men, were no longer able to restore their city after this misfortune, but fell from their hegemony in humiliation.' [The example of the Thebans and Athenians at Khaironeia is next noted.]

driven home again every time such a story, whether true or apocryphal, was retold (cf. Plut. *Mor.* 240d).

Nevertheless, *xenēlasia* was not merely a piece of legal symbolism; rather there were actual instances of the procedure being used during the fifth century. One must assume that Pericles' reference to the procedure in his counter-offer guarantees a use of *xenēlasia* in the living memories of many participants that day in the assembly. The same conclusion is valid for the audience of the *Birds*, and probably also for those who saw the *Peace* of Aristophanes. That *xenēlasiai* actually occurred during the fifth century is also supported by the reference of Xenophon in *Respublica Lacedaemoniorum* to earlier recourse to the procedure (14.4). Plato imagined that *xenēlasiai* took place in the period leading up to the dramatic date of the *Protagoras* in the late 430s. The implementation of *xenēlasiai* implies the presence of *xenoi* to be expelled, including those derived from Athens and its allies. Pericles would not have demanded that the Spartans refrain from doing something that they were not doing in the first place.

The economy of fifth-century Sparta was an unusual amalgam of archaic social structures with the behaviours and conceptual apparatus of contemporary Aegean Greece. As I have outlined elsewhere,⁶⁴ Sparta achieved considerable communal solidarity and thereby military strength from its articulation of much of the intra-communal circulation of goods into formulas such as those enshrined in the amount of rent from the *klēroi* and the terms of the dues for the *syssitia*. The regularity of such transactions fostered egalitarian feeling, by reducing opportunities for and anxieties over economic competition. Other non-politically mediated material transactions were mainly accomplished through barter. The barter economy was ostensibly buttressed both by a prohibition against the usage and public possession of ordinary silver coinage and by the establishment of an iron token currency, itself an adaptation of an archaic quasi-monetary medium.⁶⁵ The status of the *pelanors*, the iron ingots comprising the only authorized money, may have been dramatized by their occasional, but conspicuous use in paying fines to the state. Otherwise, the *pelanors* were virtually unusable because of their heavy weight and low value.

This economic dispensation had been thoroughly compromised by the late fifth century. By then the Spartan government conducted all sorts of dealings in its foreign policy and military activities in terms of coinage.⁶⁶ Élite Spartiates not only avidly sought monetary enrichment through political activity and dealt in terms of coined money abroad, but they maintained stocks of precious metals (in coins and bullion) hidden within their *oikoi*.⁶⁷ By the early fourth century, the Spartiates seem to have conceptualized all economic phenomena in monetary units. Monetary calculations would eventually infiltrate the evaluation of mess dues by the mid-fourth century at the latest.⁶⁸ As we shall note shortly, a market in grain seems to have existed by the late 340s, and difficulties in that market triggered the only specifiable *xenēlasia*. The final citadel of the traditional economy was under assault in the Hellenistic period when

⁶⁴ T. J. Figueira, 'Mess contributions and subsistence at Sparta', *TAPA* 114 (1984), 84–109; id. (n. 7).

⁶⁵ Cf. e.g. Xen. *RL* 7.5–6; Plut. *Lyc.* 9.1–5; [Plato], *Eryxias* 400a–b; Polyb. 6.49.8–10.

⁶⁶ K. L. Noethlichs, 'Bestechung, Bestechlichkeit und die Rolle des Geldes in der Spartanischen Aussen- und Innenpolitik vom 7.-2. JH. V. Chr.', *Historia* 36 (1987), 129–70; Hodgkinson (n. 14), 167–76.

⁶⁷ Cf. Posidonios *FGrH* 87 F 48; [Plato], *Alcib.* 1.122D–123B.

⁶⁸ Plut. *Lyc.* 12.3; Dicaearchus *FGH* 2.242, fr. 23 = fr. 72 Wehrli; cf. Athen. 4.19, 141C; ΣPlato *Laws* 633a.

even the Helots began to accumulate assets from monetary income (Plut. *Cleom.* 23.1; Macrobian *Sat.* 1.11.34).

Notwithstanding differences in the degree of differentiation of labour, in technological circumstances, and in levels of productivity, late fifth- and fourth-century Sparta was analogous to modern command economies. The latter allocate the majority of productive inputs and resultant output through bureaucratic decision, while, at Sparta, custom and legal formula dominated economic activity. Against the artificially valued money of the command regime, one may place the artificially valued quasi-monetary iron *pelanors* of Sparta. In both cases barter thereby became disproportionately prominent and resistant to supersession by more advanced market forms. That was because the mandated transactional media inefficiently transmitted needed information about the status of markets. Both the modern command economy and the Spartan economy could experience an infiltration of more credible monetary instruments, whether hard currencies like dollars, Deutschmarks, and yen for the former, or, for the latter, Aeginetan 'turtles' and Attic 'owls'.⁶⁹

Individuals with affiliations with external economies are valuable in each setting, both for their role as intermediaries with more efficient markets and for the mental and behavioural apparatus they might import and 'naturalize' from abroad. Immigrants were drawn to Sparta to conduct craft or commercial activities exploiting pre-existing skills and connections, and were less inhibited by local custom in doing so.⁷⁰ Their presence was not necessarily opposed by the Spartiates, acting individually. As the controllers of most assets in the local economy, the Spartiates had the most to gain from greater efficiency among their sources for goods and services. We have few data on practicalities amid growing illicit monetization. Accumulations of assets in the form of coins were probably remedying various imbalances in the traditional system of political redistribution of output. Most significantly, money may have eventually been used for hiring labour to offset shortages in the Helot workforce and supplementing deficient production from the allotments in order to pay mess dues.⁷¹ Immigration into Lakōnikē may not have been a phenomenon of great magnitude, but, by the same token, not many immigrants were needed to affect the non-traditional sectors of the Laconian economy.

Naturally, foreigners dwelt in the shadows of the old political economy.⁷² Some of the evidence on *xenēlasia* reveals the disabilities under which they laboured, although these limitations were permanent, while *xenēlasia* itself was applied intermittently. The Attic source tradition associated *xenēlasia* with a restriction concerning which days *xenoi* could enter Sparta (*Suda* s.v. *διειρωνόξενοι*, d 997 Adler; *ΣPeace* 623a).⁷³ The implication garnered from Thucydides 2.39.1 is that no foreigners could enter Sparta itself when the assembly was in session and perhaps during the days when the *gerousia* conducted regular meetings. That conclusion might be clinched if *ΣAel. Arist. Panath.* 166.8, with its explicit testimony to that effect, could be trusted. It is possible that this restriction was also intended to seal off the *agora*. Unfortunately, our only evidence derives from Xenophon's account of the denunciation of the insurrectionist Cinadon

⁶⁹ Cf. G. Grossman, 'Gold and the sword: money in the Soviet command economy', in H. Rosovsky (ed.), *Industrialization in Two Systems: Essays in Honor of Alexander Gerschenkron* (New York, 1966), 204–36; S. Pozo, *Price Behavior in Illegal Markets* (Aldershot, 1996), 51–68.

⁷⁰ Nafissi (n. 5), 269–71.

⁷¹ Cf. Figueira (n. 64), 104–9; id., 'Population patterns in late archaic and classical Sparta', *TAPA* 116 (1986), 165–213, see esp. 193–97, 203–4, 209–10.

⁷² Cf. B. Dallago, *The Irregular Economy* (Aldershot, 1990), 61–88.

⁷³ The days certainly included the days of public festivals. See Krebs (n. 5), 1007.

in 399. Cinadon was quoted as enumerating the participants in the *agora* without mentioning *xenoi* as possible participants in his uprising (Xen. *HG* 3.3.5). That occasion may have been a special market day, because a king, the ephors, and the *gerontes* were all present. As for the duration of licit residence for *xenoi*, a scholion to Hermogenes implies one lunar month (*Scholia ad Hermogenis status* 4.72.13–14 Walz). Had such a rule been enforced stringently in individual cases, Sparta would have had no need for *xenēlasiai*. In contrast, Athens did not need to use mass expulsions to force immigrants to register as metics and pay the required tax.

It was inevitable, however, at Sparta that a significant discontinuity would exist between the economic behaviour promoted by individual choice and the imperatives of the traditional normative order of their society. In our Spartan evidence, *xenēlasia* is correlated with austerity, sumptuary restrictions, and exclusion of conventional money. Daily life created niches for immigrant *xenoi* to make a living. Yet their presence provided a spontaneous challenge to the social order because they had no defined status within it, and no naturalization process for incorporating them had ‘Lycurgan’ authority. Furthermore, *xenoi* were carriers of deviant economic consciousness as persons acculturated within a monetary economy. Traditionalists could interpret their presence as threatening a form of behavioural contagion. That would explain the emphasis on cultural isolation in ‘constitutional’ tradition on *xenēlasia*. The effect of *xenēlasiai* was to impede periodically any advance toward the emergence of a more typical Greek monetary and commercial economy at Sparta. In a manner of speaking, implementation of a *xenēlasia* sought to reset the ‘Lycurgan’ social order back to its default settings.

None the less, recourse to *xenēlasia* sacrificed the demographic contribution that might be made by immigrants. In the state of contemporary technology, exporting population negatively affected economic output and military capacity. At Sparta, civic, economic, and social status boundaries coincided to a greater degree than in most other archaic and classical *poleis*. The highest, fully civic class of the Spartiates faced particular challenges in its exposure to military casualties, in experiencing stimuli toward family limitation, and in its pursuit of familial status. Infiltration of *xenoi* into Laconia was not only a symptom of the demographic crisis, but also a manifestation of spontaneous or autonomous self-correction. Along with the relatively impermeable boundaries between classes, *xenēlasiai* contributed to *oliganthropia* ‘dearth of manpower’ (Arist. *Pol.* 1270a32–4) through abnegation of mechanisms for the external recruitment of Spartans or Spartiates. The defeat of Athens should not obscure that the Athenians—despite crushing battlefield losses—weathered the Peloponnesian War demographically better than the Spartans because of the availability of naturalization to supplement natural increase.⁷⁴

Rather than signifying a re-establishment of ‘Lycurgan’ disdain for a money economy, the Athenians contended that *xenēlasiai* illustrated Spartan *philokhrēmatia*. That is a subtext in Aristophanes and direct statement in Attidography, as reflected in the *Suda* and the Aristophanic scholia. Discounting exaggeration, we can readily understand the other elements of the Attic indictment, for instance why they thought *xenēlasia* reeked of hypocrisy, inhumanity, abusiveness, and anxious secrecy. But what is the reason for their insistence that *xenēlasiai* demonstrated greed?

An episode in Herodotus may help us understand how a *xenēlasia* was initiated. The

⁷⁴ Figueira (n. 71, 1986), 199–206.

Samian Maeandrius came to Sparta and attempted to bribe Cleomenes I. After the king rebuffed him, Cleomenes then went before the ephors (Hdt. 3.148.2; cf. Plut. *Mor.* 224a–b).

βὰς ἐπὶ τοὺς ἐφόρους ἄμεινον εἶναι ἔφη τῇ Σπάρτῃ τὸν ξεῖνον τὸν Σάμιον ἀπαλλάσσεσθαι ἐκ τῆς Πελοποννήσου, ἵνα μὴ ἀναπέιση ἢ αὐτὸν ἢ ἄλλον τινὰ Σπαρτιητέων κακὸν γενέσθαι. οἱ δ' ὑπακούσαντες ἐξεκέρυξαν Μαιάνδριον.⁷⁵

This action ought not to be envisaged as constituting a *xenēlasia*, as only Maeandrius, a specific and identifiable individual, was affected as far as we know. Nevertheless, it is striking that Cleomenes' request to the ephors plays on the fear of contamination by an alien corruptor using monetary means. The ephors responded by banning Maeandrius through a *kērux* 'herald'. Accordingly, it is probable that the ephors had the power to initiate *xenēlasiai* and also that the first stage in the expulsion was a herald's public announcement.⁷⁶

The expulsion was probably implemented by the Spartans themselves. That is precisely the predicament of Meton in the *Birds*, when Peisetairus announces that a *xenēlasia* has been ordered in Cloudecockooland. Therefore, *xenēlasiai* would have caught many immigrant *xenoi* by surprise, forcing them to leave with only the property that they could arrange to be carried at short notice or be held in safekeeping. All the Spartans to whom the *xenoi* had any obligation would presumably levy compensation on the spot. As for what was coming to them, the *xenoi* would be grossly disadvantaged in receiving their due. So individual Spartans might profit from an ability to settle debts and discharge transactional responsibilities more favourably. Therefore, to hostile eyes, the implementation of a *xenēlasia* provided an opportunity for petty cheating and gouging. The grievances of the expelled were disseminated by the very act of forcing them out.

In the politicized economy of the Spartans, collective and individual evaluations of interests were (I repeat) unusually discrepant. However, group interest and personal opportunism dovetailed in *xenēlasiai*. The Spartiates could perform in public their adherence to 'Lycurgan' contempt for money-making and their resistance to social deviance, while reaping an advantage from the *xenoi*. Hence they probably co-operated in the pragmatic details of a mass expulsion. Hypocritical to their Athenian contemporaries, their behaviour might more neutrally be described as characterized by cognitive dissonance.

VI. A *XENELASIA* IN PRACTICE

Theopompus gives us our only actual attestation of the conduct of a *xenēlasia*, which is dated to the period covered by his thirty-third book (*FGrH* 115 F 178 *apud* ΣAr. *Birds* 1013a–b; see Jacoby, 2B 359⁷⁷).

⁷⁵ 'Going before the ephors, he said that it would be better for Sparta that the Samian *xenos* depart from the *Peloponnesus* [my emphasis] in order that he not persuade himself or any of the other Spartiates to become *kakos* [bad]. They listened to him and expelled Maeandrius from Sparta through a herald's proclamation.' Cf. Rebenich (n. 2), 348–9.

⁷⁶ N. Richer, *Les éphores: études sur l'histoire et sur l'image de Sparte* (Paris, 1998), 464–5.

⁷⁷ See also G. S. Shrimpton, *Theopompus the Historian* (Montreal and Kingston, 1991), 61–2, 243.

περὶ τῆς ἐν Λακεδαιμονίᾳ ξενηλασίας Θεόπομπός φησιν ἐν τῇ τρίτῃ καὶ τριακοστῇ. -ποτὲ γὰρ ἐκέισε σιτοδείας γενομένης ξενηλασία γέγονεν, ὡς Θεόπομπος ἐν τῇ τριακοστῇ ᾧ φησίν.⁷⁸

The thirty-first book and following of Theopompus' *Philippica* dealt with the period after the Peace of Philocrates of 346, so that this *xenēlasia* might have occurred during the late 340s.⁷⁹ In that case, this *xenēlasia* comes late in the sequence attested by earlier authorities such as Thucydides, Aristophanes, Xenophon, and Plato.

The precipitating factor for the *xenēlasia* was a *sitodeia* 'dearth of grain'. Except for this instance, no other evidence associates Spartan *xenēlasiai* with food shortages, although expulsions of immigrants were an obvious way to lessen the number of consumers.⁸⁰ It is likely that the decision to attempt a restoration of the 'Lycurgan' order might often be triggered by some episode of stress such as this. A consideration of food production in Lakōnikē shows that such a reaction to a *sitodeia* is congruent with our hypothesis about the interaction of *xenoi* with the traditional politicized Spartan economy. In principle, the agricultural economy of Lakōnikē operated without recourse to a money market in foodstuffs. The Spartiates were supported from the *klēroi* from which the rents were designed to be sufficient to underwrite their families' subsistence and a payment of their mess dues. The remaining production of the *klēroi* supported the Helot labourers. I have previously postulated the existence of a mechanism for the recirculation of food to the Helots through the messes.⁸¹ The Perioikoi were *autourgoi* whose communities were supposedly self-supporting (cf. Thuc. 1.141.3–5).

Such a system should have confronted bad harvests in an autarkic manner. Lakōnikē was relatively fertile, so the Spartiates had an appreciable ability to accumulate grain from good years, storing it either in individual *oikoi* or in the messes. Besides tapping the reserves of their local community, the Perioikoi could probably draw upon the Spartan surplus either through barter or by the channels of reciprocity or patronage (mainly with the élite). The main burden of a natural shortfall should perforce have fallen entirely on the Helots, but a maximum levy of 50 per cent on the *klēroi* may also have been a protection for them (cf. fr. 6 West; Paus. 4.14.4–5; Ael. *VH* 6.1). The Helots would normally store grain, and, because of ordinary self-interest as well as in anticipation of shortfalls, they were strongly motivated to divert some of their production as a reserve. In any event, Spartans, either singly or collectively, could never have casually contemplated the risk of starvation among the Helots. Really dire conditions might stimulate the flight of young male Helots, the very workers that the Spartans could least afford to lose.⁸² In my hypothesis, the messes were employed to fine-tune the mechanism for recirculation of foodstuffs to the Helots in order to maximize social control.

The recourse to a *xenēlasia* during a *sitodeia* reveals a different picture. By expelling

⁷⁸ 'Concerning *xenēlasia* in Sparta, Theopompus says in the 33rd book: for once when there was a dearth [*sitodeia*] there, a *xenēlasia* occurred as Theopompus says in the 33rd.'

⁷⁹ The date of the famine, however, is not certainly established, because Theopompus may have digressed on the earlier history of Sparta and Messenia (cf. F 171 from book 32), when discussing Philip's rapprochement with the Messenians. The following analysis renders a deep foray into the past unlikely.

⁸⁰ Hence Themistius, *Or.* 18.222a envisages the cure of a *xenēlasia* as more damaging than the underlying food shortage. That explains its absence from Constantinople. Cf. Suet. *Aug.* 42.3; Dio Cass. 55.26.1–3.

⁸¹ Figueira (n. 64), 96–8, 107–9.

⁸² *Ibid.*, 104–6.

xenoi, the Spartans attempted to reduce the persons consuming grain in Lakōnikē, thus making a larger amount available for consumption by the indigenous population. This intention betrays the existence of a single market for grain. That market probably encompassed all the less privileged classes of resident (Perioikoi, Hypomeiones, and Helots), because their inferior access to the grain supply made them more vulnerable to a shortage in the first place. Moreover, they hugely outnumbered the Spartiates at this time. Of these, the *xenoi* (at the least) were probably using coined money to acquire food. The traditional partitions had broken down, those separating the Laconian economy into different, politically defined compartments interconnected by stereotypical transfers of goods. By removing the *xenoi* from the pool of customers for grain through a *xenēlasia*, the Spartans engineered less demand for the available stock of grain and probably lowered its price.

The choice of this remedy points up the peculiarities of the Spartan economy. Other *poleis* at this time had developed an arsenal of techniques in *sitōnia* 'grain procurement', such as compulsory purchases, accumulating public reserves, price controls, and incentives to merchants.⁸³ But all these devices were the tools of a monetary marketplace in foodstuffs. Merely to expel foreigners was not only a crude administrative ploy, but destructive, for it sacrificed the contribution to production of the persons expelled. In Sparta's ideological and politicized economy, the natural 'reaction' was 'reactionary' (to use a loaded term deliberately), an attempt to reset the demography of Lakōnikē to its 'Lycurgan' state. Furthermore, choosing *xenēlasia* over more subtle measures may well have been motivated by a willingness to exploit the *xenoi*, the most vulnerable participants in the economy.

Thus, the actions of the Spartans in the *xenēlasiai* are not dissimilar to those of certain African governments over the last thirty years in expelling 'foreign residents', often of very long standing, at moments of economic hardship or social tension. One thinks particularly of the mass expulsion (two to three million in two weeks) by the government of Nigeria of Ghanaians and other west Africans in 1983.⁸⁴ At that time, the Nigerian authorities also encouraged private individuals to coerce the targeted group into departing amid great hardships that included property seizures.

VII. THE ORIGIN OF *XENELASIA*

It is fairly certain that the custom of *xenēlasiai* can make no particular claim to great antiquity when viewed from the standpoint of Pericles in 431, despite the claims of the 'constitutional' tradition. We have already seen how international visitors could have been accommodated in archaic Sparta through the mechanism of *xenia*. Most immigrants to archaic Lakōnikē arrived in groups, such as the fugitives from Argolic Asine and Nauplia who were welcomed by the Spartans and settled in Messenia in the eighth and seventh centuries.⁸⁵ Mythological forerunners for groups

⁸³ Cf. P. Garnsey, *Famine and Food Supply in the Graeco-Roman World* (Cambridge, 1988), 70–86, 137–49; L. Migeotte, 'Le pain quotidien dans les cites hellénistiques. À propos des fonds permanents pour l'approvisionnement en grain', *Cahiers du Centre G. Glotz* 2 (1991), 19–41.

⁸⁴ O. Aluko, 'The expulsion of illegal aliens from Nigeria: a study in Nigeria's decision-making', in G. O. Olusanya and R. A. Akindele (edd.), *The Structure and Processes of Foreign Policy Making and Implementation in Nigeria, 1960–1990* (Ibadan, 1990), 421–45; E. E. Osaghae, *Crippled Giant: Nigeria since Independence* (London, 1998), 155–62.

⁸⁵ Paus. 2.36.4–5, 3.7.4, 4.14.3, 4.24.4, 4.27.8, 4.35.2. See J. Christien, 'L'étranger à Sparte', in R. Lonis (ed.), *L'étranger dans le monde grec* (Nancy, 1992), 147–67, see 148–54 for incorporations of immigrants on Cape Taenarum.

of immigrants existed in the Aegeidai from Boeotia who were supposedly assimilated during the Return of the Heraclids.⁸⁶ The continued viability of this line of policy is indicated by the fate of the Aeginetans, who were established by the Spartans in the Thyreatis after their expulsion from their island by the Athenians in 431.⁸⁷

In early Laconia, a few individual immigrants might be suppliants, in which case Spartan authorities would decide whether to accept them and to what status they might be assigned.⁸⁸ The two alternatives were presumably rank as a *Homoios* or as a *Perioikos*, both of which presumptively immunized them against *xenēlasia*. Some other élite sojourners may also have been protected through relationships of *xenia* with the kings, *gerontes*, and other influential Spartans (above pp. 47–8). Yet the class of similarly situated persons must always have been tiny. Significantly different was an infiltration of Lakōnikē by individual immigrants without élite sponsorship in numbers sufficient to warrant a procedural response. Dating this development is difficult.

One approach is to ask when more settled conditions in the Aegean were accompanied by the emergence of a larger pool of displaced or transient persons. A threshold in classical demography was crossed with the creation of the fifth-century Attic *arkhē*. This huge political entity was more integrated economically than any large segment of the Greek world previously. Attenuation of political compartmentalization and Athenian economic vitality, coupled with safety of the seas, attracted free immigrants to Attica. Greater affluence, fuelled by silver mining and the profits of empire, produced an influx of slaves, many of whom would eventually be manumitted. In contrast, Lakōnikē appears lower on a hierarchy of places attractive to mid-fifth-century immigrants. Hence the number of transients drawn to Sparta was perhaps not that great, at least compared with an ascending number of Attic metics or with the total complement of settlers enlisted for Athenian colonies.⁸⁹ Yet so many people in movement are likely to have generated a spillover effect even in economically peripheral areas, and some chattel slaves in Laconia had no better alternative than to stay after manumission. Crystallization of the status of metic at Athens (465–50) perhaps represents a *terminus ante quem* for *xenēlasia*. This same *terminus*, however, could also be intuited from Pericles' remarks in 431, since an occasional recourse to the practice over several decades was needed to familiarize an Athenian audience to *xenēlasia*. To set an upper boundary for this period of inauguration of *xenēlasia*, one possibility is 495–90, inasmuch as the suppression of the Ionian revolt displaced numbers of eastern Greeks.⁹⁰

A little more help can be drawn from the debate over the establishment of a public treasury at Sparta after the defeat of Athens in the Peloponnesian War. We pick up the story after Gylippus, who had been acting as an aide to Lysander in conveying surplus funds back to Sparta, was caught with embezzled coins, tried, and convicted. Our fullest account is contained in Plutarch's *Lysander* 17.1.

⁸⁶ Hdt. 4.147, 149; Pind. *Isth.* 7.14–15 with scholia 7.18a–c, *Pyth.* 5.101; Arist. fr. 539 Gigon; Ephorus *FGrH* 70 F 16; cf. Androtion *FGrH* 324 F 60.

⁸⁷ Thuc. 2.27.2, 4.56.2; Diod. 12.44.3; Paus. 2.29.5, 38.5–6. See Figueira (n. 1), 293–9; Christien (n. 85), 163–7.

⁸⁸ The Spartans accepted the conventional host/guest protocols, as indicated by their cults of Zeus Xenius and Athena Xenia (Paus. 3.11.11).

⁸⁹ T. J. Figueira, *Athens and Aigina in the Age of Imperial Colonization* (Baltimore, 1991), 201–17.

⁹⁰ Rebenich sees *xenēlasia* as fifth-century: (n. 2), 355–6, 358–9; id., *Xenophon. Die Verfassung der Spartener* (Darmstadt, 1998), 138.

οἱ δὲ φρονιμώτατοι τῶν Σπαρτιατῶν οὐχ ἥκιστα καὶ διὰ τοῦτο τὴν τοῦ νομίσματος ἰσχὺν φοβηθέντες, ὥς οὐχὶ τῶν τυχόντων ἀπομένην πολιτῶν, τὸν τε Λύσανδρον ἐλοιδόρουν καὶ διεμαρτύραντο τοῖς ἐφόροις ἀποδιοπομπεῖσθαι πᾶν τὸ ἀργύριον καὶ τὸ χρυσίον ὥσπερ κῆρας ἐπαγωγίμους.⁹¹

Note that this request for the removal of coinage from the city is lodged with the ephors. The ephors then brought the issue before the *gerousia* or assembly. It is unclear whether this specific outcome was not owed to the intensity of the disagreement over policy more than to limits on the ephors' discretion. The opponents of Lysander were proposing 'to banish ritually all gold and silver [money] as though imported curses', in what may be accounted a ritual purification of Sparta aimed at removing gold and silver money. The infinitive ἀποδιοπομπεῖσθαι clearly denotes such an act of religious cleansing.⁹² Moreover, the term is appropriate tonally to a heraldic pronouncement. It is an attractive hypothesis that this language reflects the legal formula for initiating a *xenēlasia*.⁹³ *Xenēlasia* and the prohibition on the use of money are strongly correlated in the 'constitutional' tradition.

Plutarch quotes both Ephorus and Theopompus here, since they differed over the identity of the leader of the anti-Lysandrian forces (*FGrH* 70 F 205, 115 F 332). Therefore, he may derive the details of the language used in this setting from one or both of these good contemporary sources. The visualization of threats to economic equality as κῆρας may well be traditional diction. In the speech in which Cleomenes III announces his programme to a Spartan assembly, he describes τὰς ἐπεισάκτους τῆς Λακεδαιμόνος κῆρας 'the imported curses of Lakedaimon', as *truphai* 'luxuries', *poluteleai* 'extravagances', *khrea* 'debts', and *daneismoι* 'loans' (Plut. *Cleom.* 10.4). He goes on to mention 'older evils than these', that is, *penia* 'poverty' and *ploutos* 'wealth'.⁹⁴

It would have been legally feasible for the anti-Lysandrians to demand that the ephors propose legislation ordering complete disposition of funds in the treasury (through dedication, allocation as booty, civic expenditure, or return to their grantors). They could even have insisted that the ephors rigorously enforce the traditional rules against possession of precious metals. Taken in isolation, these would have been difficult demands, not withstanding the 'Lycurgan' prejudices against money. Manifestly, Sparta owed its victory over Athens to the adoption of a conventional fiscal administration for its forces. Hence, returning unconditionally to the *status quo ante bellum* in which Sparta had no permanent treasury would jeopardize the city's hegemonic status. Therefore, the anti-Lysandrians chose instead to facilitate their 'hard sell' by appealing as well to another 'Lycurgan' preoccupation, fear of alien

⁹¹ 'The most sensible of the Spartiates frightened not least by this case over the power of money on the grounds that it was not affecting just ordinary citizens, both reproached Lysander and lodged requests with the ephors to banish ritually all gold and silver [money] as though imported curses.'

⁹² Plato, *Laws* 854b (ἀποδιοπόμῃσις) with scholia, 877e, 900b; Epic. *Diss.* 2.18.20. *Suda* s.v. ἀποδιοπομπεῖσθαι, α 3297 Adler: αἰτιατικῇ. ἀποπέμπεσθαι πρὸς τὸν προστρόπαιον Δία καὶ οἰόνει καθαίρεσθαι ἢ ἱλάσκεσθαι (cf. διοπομπεῖσθαι, δ 1189). See also ΣPlato, *Crat.* 342e; Hesych. s.v. ἀποδιοπομπεῖσθαι, α 6304 Latte; s.v. Λέρνη θεατῶν, λ 691; Phot. s.v. ἀποδιοπομπεῖσθαι, α 2483). Hence its use for Sulla's order to remove a satyr his forces encountered in Macedonia (Plut. *Sulla* 27.2). For metaphorical usages, cf. Plato, *Crat.* 346e; Athen. 9.64; Plut *Mor.* 730d; ΣPind. *Nem.* 10.132c; ΣAr. *Ran.* 1340; ΣTheocr. 7.127a.

⁹³ Schaefer (n. 5), 1437.

⁹⁴ The paean of Isyllus of Epidaurus has Asclepius describe himself as τοῖς Λακεδαιμονίοις χαλεπὰς ἀπὸ κῆρας ἐρύξας (v. 74 Powell ~ *IG* IV².1.128).

contamination. They activated the potent conceptual complex associated with cultural isolation and *xenēlasia*. That they chose to personify to some degree the source of the cultural contamination is also striking.

The Attic tradition insisted that a *xenēlasia* was accompanied by targeting those being expelled for physical abuse. The scene between Meton and Peisetairus in the *Birds* treats this feature as common knowledge. The defensiveness of the remark attributed to Agis in Plutarch that Lycurgus was not warring on the bodies of the *xenoi* was probably intended as mitigation for an accepted belief that blows were meted out in a *xenēlasia*.⁹⁵ That would not be surprising if *xenēlasia* is to be envisaged as a ritual procedure in origin, the very thing that the proposal made after the conviction of Gylippus implies. Greek rituals for expelling a scapegoat (in Greek a *pharmakos* or *katharmos*) are well attested.⁹⁶ They involved expelling the person who had been made the repository of pollution, often with physical abuse. Attested rites involve 'beggars', slaves, criminals, and, in an interesting fictional composite, foreigners (Diod. 2.55.3). Several passages in Aristophanes also imply that some *pharmakoi* at Athens were characterized as foreign (Ar. *Knights* 1404–5; *Frogs* 732–3). At Abdera, the *pharmakos* seems to have been purchased from abroad.

Just like scapegoats, the *xenoi* in Lakōnikē, as receptacles of contaminating alien attitudes, were stigmatized with physical expressions of the community's rejection of their presence and of any assimilation of what they might embody. Strikingly, the term *ἀποδιοπομπεῖσθαι* can denote the removal of a tainted person as scapegoat.⁹⁷ They could be rightfully treated so, for they were *κῆρας ἐπαγωγίμους* 'imported curses', like the coins that aroused the ire of the anti-Lysandrians. That phrase also seems to be related to scapegoat ritual.⁹⁸ Thus the physical abuse included in a *xenēlasia* was not just violence that was added gratuitously to legal coercion, but a fully symbolic gesture. The herald's proclamation called on the Spartans to assist in escorting away—if the verb *ἀποδιοπομπεῖσθαι* is the relevant term—resident *xenoi*. In assisting, they enacted their adherence to the Spartan normative order by demonstrably rejecting alien mores with acts of ritualized abuse.⁹⁹

⁹⁵ Agis 10.3: . . . οὐ τοῖς σώμασι πολεμῶν, ἀλλὰ τοὺς βίους αὐτῶν καὶ τοὺς τρόπους δεδιώς . . .

⁹⁶ See C. Bérard, 'Pénalité et religion à Athènes: un témoignage de l'imagerie', *RA* (1982), 137–50; J. Bremmer, 'Scapegoat rituals in ancient Greece', *HSCP* 87 (1983), 299–320; W. Burkert, *Greek Religion* (Cambridge, MA, 1985), 82–4; D. D. Hughes, *Human Sacrifice in Ancient Greece* (London and New York, 1991), 139–65. The documentation is rich: e.g. Hipponax frs. 5–10 West (Colophon?); Ar. *Frogs* 732–3; ΣAr. *Eq.* 1136a–c; *Suda* s.v. *Κάθαρμα*, κ 36 Adler; *Φαρμακός*, φ 104; *Φαρμακός*, φ 106; (Athens); Helladius *apud* Phot. *Bibl.* 279.534a; Harpoc. s.v. *Φαρμακός*, cf. Lys. 6.53 (Thargelia); Callim. *Aetia* fr. 90 Pf. with *Dieg.* 2.29–40; Ovid, *Ibis* 467–8 with scholia (Abdera); Strabo 10.2.9 C452 (Leukas); Serv. *In Verg. Aen.* 3.57 with Petron. fr. 1; Lactantius Placidus, ΣStat. *Theb.* 10.793 (Massilia); also Diod. 2.55.3; Plut. *Mor.* 693e–f; Hesych. s.v. *φαρμακοί*, φ 181 Latte; Phot. s.v. *Περίφημα*, cf. *Suda* π 1355.

⁹⁷ An excellent contemporary parallel in Lys. 6.53: νῦν οὖν χρὴ νομίζειν τιμωρομένους καὶ ἀπαλλαττομένους Ἀνδοκίδου τὴν πόλιν καθαίρειν καὶ ἀποδιοπομπεῖσθαι καὶ φαρμακὸν ἀποπέμπειν καὶ ἀλιτηρίου ἀπαλλάττεσθαι, ὡς ἐν τούτων οὗτός ἐστι. See also Dio Cass. 37.46.1; Plut. *Mor.* 73d.

⁹⁸ *Suda* s.v. *Βάλλων*, β 86 Adler; *Κῆρας*, κ 1531; Hesych. s.v. *κῆρας*, κ 2536 Latte. Plut. *Mor.* 860e says in criticism of Herodotus' treatment of Isagoras, apropos of the contention that his family worshipped Carian Zeus (Hdt. 5.66.1): εὐρυθμός γε καὶ πολιτικός ὁ μυκτὴρ τοῦ συγγραφέως, εἰς *Κῆρας* ὥσπερ εἰς κόρακας ἀποδιοπομπευμένου τὸν Ἰσαγόραν. Cf. the expression *θύραζε Κῆρες/κῆρες* (*Suda* θ, 598 Adler; Photius s.v.; Zenobius 4.33, *CPG* 1.93; Diogen. 5.24, *CPG* 1.255; Apostol. 8.94, *CPG* 2.459; Paus. Attic. Θ 20 Erbse).

⁹⁹ The extension of the terminology of ritual purification to describe a cultural purge can also

As far as we know, scapegoat rituals did not target whole groups of victims. The relation between human scapegoat and those expelling him often encompassed a considerable degree of complicity.¹⁰⁰ For the criminal, the religious offender, or the slave, expulsion as a *pharmakos* might be preferable to the alternative. In a fine example of what Finley called reinstitutionalization, a Spartan practice that evolved in a religious or symbolic sphere was adapted to a different mode of operation to meet a new problem, that is, the greater presence of immigrants in Lakōnikē. For such an evolution to have occurred, our conjectured scapegoat ritual would have been temporally unattached to a specific festival. Rather it had been a procedure to be implemented at any moment of communal stress, just as attested at Massilia and for one Attic tradition (ΣAr. Eq. 1136c). Hence, it is again understandable that our sources often refer to the plural *xenēlasiai*.¹⁰¹ Moreover, it is now difficult to determine whether any complicit element of the underlying ritual was then discarded. Did the hard-headed personal interest of the victim of *xenēlasia* in his previous business activities replace the survival instinct of the archaic *pharmakos*?

For Pericles, Spartan limitation of *xenēlasia* was reciprocation for rescinding the Megarian Decree.¹⁰² The Megarian Decree(s) had an origin in the judgment that the Megarians had sacrilegiously cultivated the *Hiera Orgas*, land sacred to the Eleusinian goddesses along their boundary with the Athenians.¹⁰³ Thus, the Athenian reaction, barring the Megarians from the harbours in the *arkhē* and the Attic agora, was grounded in religious scruple, but also levied grave secular harms upon the Megarians.¹⁰⁴ In general, the tendency toward sacralization of border-lands fuses pious sentiment and political calculation as a means of provoking hostility toward a potential enemy. While it would be unfair to dismiss Attic policy toward Megara in 432 as mere manipulation, the Megarian Decree(s) in context transcended levying punishment for Megarian *asebeia* in manner parallel to the way in which *xenēlasia* had passed beyond its origin in scapegoat ritual to serve policy goals.

VIII. CONCLUSION

Let us return in conclusion to Pericles' usage of *xenēlasia* in crafting his response to the Spartan ultimatums in 431. In the first instance, both the Megarian Decree and *xenēlasia* had a religious dimension. More prominently, Pericles' gambit made good sense as propaganda. He was targeting an institution that was quintessentially Spartan and 'Lycurgan'. Thus he reminded the Athenians and their allies that the Spartans were not only imminent military adversaries, but also cultural opponents, who exploited *xenoi* in times of peace. Athens headed an alliance of which the origins in large part lay in Ionian alienation from Pausanias, the Spartan commander of the

be documented by Plutarch's description of M. Porcius Cato's reaction to the acclaim received at Rome by the embassy of the philosophers in 155 (*Cato Maior* 22.5–6): ἔγνω μετ' εὐπρεπείας ἀποδιοπομπήσασθαι τοὺς φιλοσόφους πάντας ἐκ τῆς πόλεως. Notice the concern for public and international opinion expressed by the word *euprepeia*. Compare also the rhetoric of the Thirty in deciding on a purge of rich Attic metics (Lys. 12.5).

¹⁰⁰ Bremmer (n. 96), 307–8; Bérard (n. 96), 146–9.

¹⁰¹ Cf. Rebenich (n. 2), 352.

¹⁰² Thuc. 1.144.2, cf. 139.2, 140.3–4; Diod. 12.39.4 ~ Ephorus *FGrH* 70 F 196; Ar. *Ach.* 536–38; ΣAr. *Pax* 605a; *Suda* s.v. Ἀσπασία π 4202 Adler; Plut. *Per.* 29.4.

¹⁰³ Thuc. 1.139.1; ΣAr. *Ach.* 532; *Pax* 605a, 606a; Plut. *Per.* 30.2. Also see de Ste. Croix (n. 4), 254–6.

¹⁰⁴ Pace de Ste. Croix (n. 4), 259–89. Thuc. 1.67.4, 139.1; Diod. 12.39.4 ~ Ephorus *FGrH* 70 F 196; ΣAr. *Ach.* 532, *Pax* 605a; *Suda* s.v. Ἀσπασία π 4202 Adler; Plut. *Per.* 29.4.

Hellenic League in 478, whose arrogant behaviour toward the Ionians was conditioned by his ethnic prejudices toward the eastern Greeks (cf. Thuc. 1.95.1–2). Whatever the deficiencies of the Athenians as *hēgemones*, they had at least created mechanisms like *sumbolai* for regular social intercourse with other Greeks, in which each player knew the rules (cf. Thuc. 1.77.1–3). Although the champion of classical oligarchy, Sparta refused to play by the rules of oligarchy, for *xenēlasia* heaped uncertainty, unpredictability, and petty exploitation on those who had already ‘voted’ by their presence to accept a role of submission and marginality.

Sparta was dangerous to Periclean Athens because its fear of Attic dynamism could not be quenched through normal diplomacy. Thus, Spartan sensitivity to Corinthian and allied agitation transcended the specific issues that might be addressed either in arbitration or through the give and take of reciprocal concessions. In 431, a majority of the Spartans seemed incapable of visualizing any measures of deterrence or pre-emption, short of total war, that could assuage their perception of the Athenian menace. Hence they rejected overwhelmingly the suggestions of their king Archidamus to prepare cautiously for a war that they might still endeavour to avoid (Thuc. 1.79.2–86.5). That decision to fight actualized the Lyncurgan ideology, and it was entered upon with wholehearted confidence in a quick victory.

Crude historical analysis on the causation of the Peloponnesian War has tended to emphasize Attic ‘imperialism’; subtler exploration has examined Athenian activism or *polypragmosunē* and its exploitation by (among others) the Corinthians. It is worth considering whether the introduction by Pericles of *xenēlasia* does not challenge us to invert this investigation, so that Spartan fear becomes our main focus for the outbreak of war: it cries out for analysis because of its deviance from contemporary norms of behaviour. Whether any Athenian appeasement at this time could have defused Spartan anxiety is unknown. Pericles and the Athenian majority evidently concluded that it could not. The offer to rescind the Megarian Decree was probably not taken with any great confidence that it would be accepted. Pericles concedes that neither party had the right to demand such a concession from the other. The immediate value of the Athenian concession was surely greater. It brought considerable direct economic relief to the Megarians and settled the only outstanding grievance provoking their agitation before the Spartans and the other Peloponnesians. On the surface, all the Spartans were asked to do in return was to promise to refrain from an act in an indeterminate future that they might or might not have taken otherwise.

Sparta would have been relatively far down anyone’s list of ‘magnets’ for emigrants during the mid-fifth century. Pericles sought immunity from *xenēlasia* only for Athenians and their allies. There is no evidence about the number of such residents in Lakōnikē who would be subject to a *xenēlasia*. Not covered by his stipulation would have been the foreigners of Peloponnesian, Cretan, western Greek, and heterogeneous extraction. The Spartans also held some chattel slaves. Many of them were in due course manumitted, and some probably tried to stay on as freedmen. It is indeed difficult to believe that there were many Athenian citizens living in Lakōnikē. Some allied citizens, perhaps from the Dorian islands, the Hexapolis, or the Megarian colonies, might have come to Sparta to practice a craft or to trade. With so many chattel slaves bought, worked, and manumitted in the Aegean basin, a certain proportion of arguably allied freedmen might have been willing to search for a means of subsistence almost anywhere. Even in default of real data, however, the onus of proof must lie with anyone trying to argue that the persons covered by Pericles’ waiver

for *xenēlasia* encompassed more than a few hundred at the very most, even counting in dependants.

Consequently, Pericles was most restrained in formulating his counter-offer, considering that his Attic opponents had assured the *dēmos* that a rescinding of the Megarian Decree might be enough to avoid war. Pericles did not match the Spartans in hyperbole by demanding unrealistically a change as radical as their demand that the Athenians give *autonomia* to their allies. His approach was consistent with a generation of Athenian forbearance from a direct insistence that both the Greeks in general *and* even the Spartans would be better served if Sparta copied Athenian-style democracy. Rather, in asking for an amendment in the application of *xenēlasia*, he merely required of Sparta that it evolve toward a more ordinary oligarchy. It is even arguable that this new Spartan oligarchy might be a more powerful adversary than contemporary Sparta. That more conventional oligarchy, however, might also feel less threatened in the face of Athenian dynamism, and that trade-off was something most earnestly to be desired in 431.

None the less, *xenēlasia* was profoundly integrated not only into a complex of ideological tenets that justified Spartan life, but also functioned as a pragmatic device in the management of the atypical Spartan economy. Relinquishing *xenēlasia* (if only in part) was a first, significant step in 'normalizing' economic interaction in Lakōnikē. That the Spartans were unprepared to take it consciously will surprise no one who has considered their fitful efforts at developing a strategy to combat the Athenians and their later incapacity to counteract their manpower dilemma.¹⁰⁵

Rutgers University

THOMAS J. FIGUEIRA
figueira@rci.rutgers.edu

¹⁰⁵ In December 2000, a version of this article was presented before the faculty and students of the programme in classics of the Graduate Center, City University of New York. The author would like to thank the audience for their stimulating discussion and helpful comments, and especially Professors Sarah B. Pomeroy and Dee L. Clayman for their invitation and hospitality. Thanks too are owed to Professor Nicolas Richer of Strasbourg for his useful comments. I should also like to note my gratitude for the insightful commentary of the anonymous referee for this journal.