



<https://publications.dainst.org>

iDAI.publications

ELEKTRONISCHE PUBLIKATIONEN DES
DEUTSCHEN ARCHÄOLOGISCHEN INSTITUTS

Dies ist ein digitaler Sonderdruck des Beitrags / This is a digital offprint of the article

Alan S. Henry

The Spelling of $\chi\omicron\epsilon\nu\alpha/\xi\epsilon\nu\alpha$ in Fifth-Century Invitations to the Prytaneion

aus / from

Chiron

Ausgabe / Issue **13 • 1983**

Seite / Page **61–68**

<https://publications.dainst.org/journals/chiron/1280/5629> • urn:nbn:de:0048-chiron-1983-13-p61-68-v5629.9

Verantwortliche Redaktion / Publishing editor

Redaktion Chiron | Kommission für Alte Geschichte und Epigraphik des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Amalienstr. 73 b, 80799 München

Weitere Informationen unter / For further information see <https://publications.dainst.org/journals/chiron>

ISSN der Online-Ausgabe / ISSN of the online edition **2510-5396**

Verlag / Publisher **Verlag C. H. Beck, München**

©2017 Deutsches Archäologisches Institut

Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Zentrale, Podbielskiallee 69–71, 14195 Berlin, Tel: +49 30 187711-0

Email: info@dainst.de / Web: dainst.org

Nutzungsbedingungen: Mit dem Herunterladen erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen (<https://publications.dainst.org/terms-of-use>) von iDAI.publications an. Die Nutzung der Inhalte ist ausschließlich privaten Nutzerinnen / Nutzern für den eigenen wissenschaftlichen und sonstigen privaten Gebrauch gestattet. Sämtliche Texte, Bilder und sonstige Inhalte in diesem Dokument unterliegen dem Schutz des Urheberrechts gemäß dem Urheberrechtsgesetz der Bundesrepublik Deutschland. Die Inhalte können von Ihnen nur dann genutzt und vervielfältigt werden, wenn Ihnen dies im Einzelfall durch den Rechteinhaber oder die Schrankenregelungen des Urheberrechts gestattet ist. Jede Art der Nutzung zu gewerblichen Zwecken ist untersagt. Zu den Möglichkeiten einer Lizenzierung von Nutzungsrechten wenden Sie sich bitte direkt an die verantwortlichen Herausgeberinnen/Herausgeber der entsprechenden Publikationsorgane oder an die Online-Redaktion des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts (info@dainst.de).

Terms of use: By downloading you accept the terms of use (<https://publications.dainst.org/terms-of-use>) of iDAI.publications. All materials including texts, articles, images and other content contained in this document are subject to the German copyright. The contents are for personal use only and may only be reproduced or made accessible to third parties if you have gained permission from the copyright owner. Any form of commercial use is expressly prohibited. When seeking the granting of licenses of use or permission to reproduce any kind of material please contact the responsible editors of the publications or contact the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut (info@dainst.de).

ALAN S. HENRY

The Spelling $\chi\acute{\epsilon}\nu\iota\alpha/\xi\acute{\epsilon}\nu\iota\alpha$ in Fifth-Century Invitations to the Prytaneion¹

In 1955 W. A. McDONALD wrote as follows:² «In our series up to the year 408 B.C. the consonant combination at the beginning of the word *xenia* (entertainment for foreign guests) is consistently indicated by $\chi\sigma$. It is true that there are only eleven precisely datable examples before 408 which contain this word; but that uniformity appears to be significant. In one further case [i² 106.23–24], dated between 411 and 408, the single Ionic symbol ξ is restored. We shall see, however, that there is good reason on another count to doubt the correctness of the restoration. The Ionic symbol appears first on stone in 408 and is regularly used thereafter in writing this formula. In the case of several inscriptions dated somewhere between 446 and 405, the overwhelming likelihood should be, then, that $\chi\sigma$ was used. One of them [i² 144.11–12] seemed to controvert this, for in it the single letter ξ is restored. It was an interesting coincidence, therefore, to find that Meritt in re-publishing the text [Hesperia 8.66/67.22.27–29] has for quite different reasons changed the length of (stoichedon) line from 26 to 27 letters and now restores the word in question with $\chi\sigma$. He dates it in 416/15(?)»

In this confessedly preliminary discussion,³ however, there are many points at which McDONALD is less than illuminating:

- (i) what is «the year 408 B. C.»? Presumably the archon year 408/7, to which belongs the incomparable decree in favour of Oiniades of Palaiskiathos (i³ 110), with its clear-cut $\xi\acute{\epsilon}\nu\iota\alpha$ in v. 25. The *terminus post quem non* for $\chi\acute{\epsilon}\nu\iota\alpha$ is then, on McDONALD's reasoning, 409/8.

¹ In addition to the standard abbreviations I shall use the following in this paper:

ML = R. MEIGGS and D. M. LEWIS, *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the End of the Fifth Century B.C.* (Oxford, 1969)

Miller = Stephen G. Miller, *The Prytaneion: Its Function and Architectural Form* (Univ. of California Press, 1978)

Walbank = Michael B. Walbank, *Athenian Proxeny of the Fifth Century B.C.* (Samuel Stevens, Toronto and Sarasota, 1978)

In referring to inscriptions in the Corpus I omit the letters I.G.: thus i³ 11 = *Inscriptiones Graecae*, vol. I³ no. 11.

² AJA 59 (1955) 151.

³ McDONALD (*ibid.*) stresses that his conclusions are tentative and merely intended as prolegomena.

- (ii) what are «the eleven precisely datable examples before 408» – McDONALD nowhere lists them – and what does he mean by «precisely datable»? Presumably – given the uncertain chronology of most decrees of the fifth century⁴ – these are texts which can safely be assigned to a date before 408/7, but not texts which can necessarily be placed in a particular year.
- (iii) what does «contain this word» mean? If «contain» implies actually on the stone, or sufficiently so as to leave no doubt about the restoration, then the number eleven is too high. If it includes all examples of the *καλέσαι* formula in which, *ipso facto*, the word *xenia* must be restored, eleven is too few.⁵
- (iv) are the «several inscriptions dated somewhere between 446 and 405» included in McDONALD's eleven?

Against this background of uncertainty and in view of the refinements of reading and dating as evidenced in the recent third edition of volume I of the *Corpus* and elsewhere, it may be as well to set out in tabular form the evidence as it now stands a quarter of a century after McDONALD wrote.⁶ This will allow us to test his theory of the year 408/7 as a significant dividing-line in the transition from the spelling *χθένια* to the spelling *ξένια* in the formula. From the evidence of Table 1 (see p. 66–67) we may draw the following conclusions about the incidence of *χθένια*/*ξένια*:

χθένια:

- (i) There are 7 instances where *χθένια* may be regarded as certain: *i*³ 11; 66; 101 I; 101 II; 163; 165 and 173. Of these *i*³ 11; 66; 101 I and 165 all fall clearly before McDONALD's lower terminus (409/8). Some doubt may be felt about *i*³ 163 and 173, but with regard to the former, it is only the Ionicism *βουλεῖ* in v.4. which encourages WALBANK to entertain the possibility of a date in the 410s rather than in the 420s to which the letter-forms point,⁷ and on the latter WALBANK comments: «The neatness and regularity of both script and chequer are characteristic of inscriptions of the 430s and 420s».⁸ *i*³ 101 II, however, seems certainly to be located c. 407/6: although the *first* decree on this stone is firmly placed in 410/9, the second decree (moved by Axiochos) is generally regarded to have followed the recapture of Thasos: «Thasos was recovered

⁴ See my paper, «The Dating of Fifth Century Attic Inscriptions», *CSCA* 11 (1978) 75–108, especially pp. 77–83.

⁵ See my detailed argument below.

⁶ The reader should note that I have disregarded WALBANK's rather sanguine restoration of a *καλέσαι* formula amidst the pathetic remnants of *i*³ 169 (see WALBANK, no. 58). This fragment was previously unpublished, and would not therefore have been known to McDONALD. WALBANK reads *χθένια* (totally restored), and dates the text c. 430–415.

⁷ See WALBANK, pp. 306–307.

⁸ See WALBANK, p. 158.

by Thrasymboulos in 407 . . . , and it was probably in this year that Axiochos . . . moved the second decree».⁹

- (ii) There are a further 8 instances where χρένια is restored, but in contexts whose lettering and/or stoichedon cutting makes the restoration likely: these are i³ 43; 63; 91; 113; 123; 149; 172 and 180. Of these i³ 43; 63; 91; 113 and 149 do no violence to McDONALD's thesis, and both i³ 172 and 180 may squeeze inside the required limit: of i³ 172 WALBANK notes: «The letter-forms suggest a date in the late 420's or early 410's»,¹⁰ and LEWIS would reject any dating lower than 411 for i³ 180 «in quo [anno] colacretas (v. 4) cessisse creditur». Once again, however, we have an example which would seem to defy attempts to date it in 409/8 or before viz. i³ 123, on which MEIGGS and LEWIS comment: «It seems clear that Hannibal and Himilkon were both referred to in a context which has to do with Sicily. This seems to point clearly to the first half of 406, when they were together in Sicily».¹¹
- (iii) There are 3 other possible examples of χρένια, all of which involve problems of one sort or another:

i³ 106:

κα]λέαια δὲ Πολ[υ]κλέα καὶ Πειραιᾶ καὶ τὸς μετ' αὐτῶν καὶ ἐπὶ CTOIX. 50
[χρένια εἰς] τὸ πρυτανεῖον ἐς αὔριον. *vacat*

McDONALD rejected HILLER's [ξένια εἰς] on the grounds that we have no parallel for the «double sigma on stone in these formulas [and] the εἰ looks out of place 20 years before the earliest authentic instance. Furthermore, the second occurrence of the preposition . . . is on the stone and it is spelled ἐς».¹² He is clearly aware of the weakness of his argumentation here,¹³ but he is unable to suggest a revised restoration which would account for the [χρένια ἐς] – one letter too short – implied in his remarks.

WILHELM's [χρένια εἰς] gets round this latter problem, but does not meet McDONALD's objection to εἰς, nor, more importantly, does it square with the Ionic ξ's found immediately above in vv.18 (συμπράξοντ[α]) and 19 (ξυμβουλεύοντ[α]). One should perhaps, therefore, consider the possibility of reading [δεῖπνον ἐς], a possibility mentioned by WALBANK, only to be rejected by him since «this formula seems to apply more to citizens than to foreigners».¹⁴ Certainly, δεῖπνον is the strictly appropriate form of entertainment for citizens, and ξένια for foreigners, but, as I hope to have shown in a forthcoming

⁹ ML, p. 274.

¹⁰ P. 309.

¹¹ ML p. 281.

¹² Art. cit., p. 152.

¹³ See his footnote 12 *ibid.*

¹⁴ WALBANK, p. 430.

ing paper, the Athenians could, and did, exercise their discretion in awarding δειπνον even to those not strictly eligible for it.¹⁵

i³ 118:

τὸς δὲ πρέσβ[ε]ς καὶ Ἴ Απολ CTOIX. c. 36

[λῶδορον κ]αλέσαι ἐς πρυτανεῖον ἐπ[ὶ χ]έν[ι]α ἐ
[c αὔριον] *vacat*

The main problems here are a) that the stoichedon pattern is not faithfully adhered to throughout;¹⁶ and b) that, although the writing is predominantly Attic, there are «frequent lapses into Ionic».¹⁷ Given, however, the space that appears to be available on the stone – plus, perhaps, the fact that Ionic ξ appears nowhere else – it is perhaps not unreasonable to accept the restoration ἐπ[ὶ χ]έν[ι]α. That being so, we now have another example of χένια later than 409/8, since it is now generally agreed that Selymbria was recaptured by Alcibiades in 408, and that the settlement then made was ratified by the Athenians on the motion of Alcibiades in 407.¹⁸

i³ 167:

The problem here is quite unique: in brief, we are asked to believe in a text in which the *first* provision of the decree is an invitation to the prytaneion. I find this totally unacceptable, for reasons which I have given in detail elsewhere.¹⁹ Suffice it to say here that the restoration depends solely on the letters]ΣΤΟΠΡ[in v.6, without which it would never have occurred to anyone to attempt to foist an invitation upon this part of an honorary decree. Indeed, the text is so fragmentary that we can base nothing on what it *may* have contained. I suggest, therefore, that we leave it out of consideration here.

ξένια:

- (i) Of the 2 certain examples of ξένια, i³ 110 is securely located in 408/7, and i³ 107 is probably not far from the same date.²⁰
- (ii) As restored examples we have cited i³ 57 and 182 *bis*. On the latter WALBANK notes that «the hand in which this decree is inscribed is very close to, and per-

¹⁵ See Antichthon 15 (1981), 100–110.

¹⁶ Cf. R. P. AUSTIN, *The Stoichedon Style in Greek Inscriptions* (Oxford, 1938), p. 51: «it [i³ 118] actually begins in fairly good stoichedon script, which is maintained for about twenty-five lines; then irregularities become frequent and the stoichedon sequence finally breaks down altogether».

¹⁷ ML, p. 267.

¹⁸ See ML, p. 269.

¹⁹ See my forthcoming book, *Honours and Privileges in Athenian Decrees* (chap. IX).

²⁰ WALBANK (p. 483) comments: «The closeness of the hand of #93 to that of IG, I², 110 a [= i³ 103, of the year 410/9] suggests to me that it belongs at the same point in this series, in the last decade of the fifth century.»

haps the same as that of #93 [i³ 107]». It thus probably belongs also in the last decade of the fifth century, and not in the first half of the *fourth* century, where McDONALD would have found it under ii² 202. i³ 57 has also taken a considerable upward leap since its placement in the first half of the fourth century by SCHWEIGERT in his original publication.²¹ WILHELM²² had wished to join it with i² 55 (= i³ 55), but this suggestion was correctly dismissed by MERITT.²³ Nevertheless, it is generally agreed that i³ 57 was cut by the same hand as i³ 55 (dated c.431), and this and the letter-forms both suggest «a date in the 430's or early 420's».²⁴ If then we can accept the restoration

καλέσαι δὲ ἀὐτὸν καὶ [ἐπὶ ξένια ἐς τὸ] CTOIX. 31(?)
[πρυτανεῖον ἐς] αὔριον·

this may be considered evidence for a much earlier occurrence of the spelling ξένια than McDONALD would admit.

Conclusion

Our review of the available evidence would seem to indicate, therefore, that McDONALD's dividing-line of the year 409/8 is not quite so clear-cut as he would have us believe.²⁵ Certainly, there does appear to be a fairly firm *lower* limit for the spelling χθένια, but this is no more than one would expect shortly before the official adoption of the Ionic alphabet in 403 B.C. On the other hand the evidence of i³ 57 could be taken to suggest that the form ξένια may well have appeared much earlier than McDONALD would have it.²⁶ There seems no good reason therefore to reject MEISTERHANS' placing of this phenomenon simply as one of several Ionisms which occur in the half century 450–400 B.C.²⁷

²¹ Hesp. 7 (1938) 275/7.10.

²² AU 4.37/8 (cf. SEG 10.50).

²³ Hesp. 10 (1941) 336–337.

²⁴ WALBANK, p. 173.

²⁵ McDONALD does, of course, take pains to defend himself against any charge of naively assuming «that the year 408 saw this particular change in the Attic alphabet begun and completed». At the same time, however, he sees the «transition as a very swift one, occurring a few years before the archonship of Eukleides». (art. cit., p. 152).

²⁶ i³ 57 *may* be an isolated occurrence, but the evidence for the fifth century is too scanty for us to be sure of that.

²⁷ See MEISTERHANS-SCHWYZER, *Grammatik der attischen Inschriften*³, (Berlin, 1900), 3–5. The reader may also note that LESLIE THREATTE, *The Grammar of Attic Inscriptions*, vol. 1 (Berlin, 1980) pp. 26 ff. makes no particular reference to the χθένια/ξένια dichotomy.

TABLE 1

i ³	Spelling	Overall lettering ²⁸	i ² (or other)	MILLER ²⁹ (Appendix A)	WALBANK
11 v. 14 (ante med. s. v.)	χcéνια	Attic	19 (453)	19 (453)	—
43 v. 22 (c. 435–427)	[χcéνια]	Attic	35 (post 445)	23 (post 445)	—
57 v. 12 (c. 430)	[ξένια]	Ionic	(Hesp. 7.275/7.10 [400–375])	85 (400–375)	31 (c. 435–400)
63 v. 8 (c. 426)	[χcéνια]	Attic (non-stoichedon)	58 (c. 428)	29 (c. 428)	—
66 v. 24 (427/6)	χ[céνια]	Attic	60 (427/6)	30 (427/6)	—
91 v. 28 (c. 416/15)	[χcéνια]	Attic (but Ξ appears in v. 1, and Λ = λ and perhaps Η = η in v. 2)	144 (act. incert.)	43 (416/15) ³⁰	64 (c. 430–415)
101.I v. 46 (410/9)	χcéνια	Generally Attic, but Η = η, and in v. 44 Λ = λ (non-stoichedon)	108 (410/9)	47 (410/9)	—
101.II v. 62 (407/6)	χ[céνια]	Attic	108 (410/9)	47 (410/9) ³¹	—
106 v. 24 (409/8)	[χcéνια etc] WILHELM	Generally Attic, but Ξ in vv. 18–19	106 (411–408), reading [ξένια εicc] with HILLER	46 (411–408) ³²	85 (c. 410–405)
107 v. 10 (c. 409)	ξένια	Ionic	106 a (= ii ² 48) (ante 403/2)	57 (ante 404/3)	93 (c. 420–400)
110 v. 25 (408/7)	ξένια	Ionic	118 (408/7)	49 (408/7)	87 (408/7)
113 v. 32 (c. 410)	[χcéνια]	Attic	113 (c. 410)	—	—
118 v. 46 (408/7)	[χcév]α	«Attic writing, with frequent lapses into Ionic» (ML n. 87). (inaccurate stoichedon)	116 (409/8)	48 (409/8)	86 (c. 408/7)

123 v. 20 (407/6)	[χρένια]	Attic	47 (446/5–432/1)	50 (407/6)	–
149 v. 14 (432–412)	[χρένια]	Attic	49 a, b (from 442/1)	24 (442/1)	–
163 v. 7 (440–415)	χρέν[ι][α]	Attic	157 (c. 446/5–405/4)	52 (446–404)	56 (c. 425–405)
165 v. 15 (ante 420?)	χρένια	Attic	85 (ante 420)	–	35 (c. 430–420)
167 v. 6 (430–415)	[χρένια]	Attic	149 (c. 446/5–405/4)	31 (429/8 or 421/0) ³³	43 (c. 430–415)
172 v. 4 (435–405)	[χρένια]	Attic	(SEG 10.129 [c. 410]) ³⁴	54 (446–404)	57 (c. 425–405)
173 v. 1 (430–405)	χρένια	Attic	148 (c. 446/5–405/4)	51 (446–404)	28 (c. 435–420)
180 v. 5 (c. 415–410)	χ[έ]νια	Attic	67 (424?)	33 (424?)	88 (c. 425–405)
182 bis v. 5 (410–403)	[ξένια]	Ionic, but H = h in v. 6	ii ² 202 (ante 353/2)	–	94 (c. 410–400)

²⁸ All but two of the texts listed here are cut stoichedon. (The exceptions are i³ 63 and i³ 101 I). But one should beware of placing too much confidence in restorations dependent on a stoichedon pattern: quite apart from the notorious irregularities of the style, there are simply too many variables in a formula as long as the invitation to the prytaneion e.g. possible elision where the connective δέ is employed; the nature of the object (pronoun, noun, proper name); the spelling of εic/έc and πρυτανέιον/πρυτανέων. Admittedly, a stoichedon text may help to support one form as against another, but perhaps more significant where restoration is required is the overall lettering of a given document: there appears to be a 100% correlation between the spelling of *xenia* and the overall lettering (Attic or Ionic) in each text on this list.

²⁹ MICHAEL OSBORNE (ZPE 41 [1981] 154 note 4) purports to add certain items to MILLER's list of testimonia. Of the texts relevant to this paper he is correct in noticing the absence of i² 113 (= i³ 113), but Hesp. 4 (1935) 161 (= i³ 57) does appear in MILLER as no. 85 (Hesp. 10 [1941] 336/7 is the later reference); i² 144 (= SEG 10.108) as no. 43; and ii² 48 (= i² 106 a) as no. 57. (As I have noted above [note 6], I too would disregard WALBANK no. 58 = i³ 169.)

³⁰ Incorrectly cited as ξένια by MILLER. The correct reading is καλέ-
σαι] δέ αὐτόν κ[αί ἐπὶ χρένια ἐc τὸ πρυτ] ἀνεῖον ἐ[c αὐρίον.

³¹ This instance occurs in v. 62 (not 63, as MILLER) of SEG 12.37.

³² MILLER is aware of the disputed reading here, but has wrongly cited the alternatives. In both cases where he writes χρένια ἐc read χρέ-
νια εic, and for ξένια εic read ξένια εicc.

³³ The text which MILLER cites (incorrectly) is actually that of SEG 12.29. It should read as follows: κα][λάσαι μὲν . . .] αἰών [τὸν . . .] [. . . ἐπὶ χρένια ἐc τὸ πρυτανέιο] [v. For a discussion of this text, see above.

³⁴ Neither McDONALD (art.cit., p. 154, with note 29) nor MILLER seems to have been aware of Wilhelm's revision reported in SEG 10.129 of SCHWEIGERT's original publication in Hesp. 7 (1938) 274.8. WILHELM (AU 4.70/1) restored as follows: κα][λάσαι δέ αὐτόν καί ἐπὶ χρένια ἐc τ][ὸ πρυτανέιο]ν ἐc ἡ[αὐρίον vacat]. This is the text MILLER should have recorded.

