Lawrence A. Tritle

Athenian Friends, Macedonian Enemies[1]

The parameters of this issue may be framed by a recent observation of Brent Shaw's regarding perceptions of ethnicity:

> It has always been the case that those closest to us, our ideological and cultural brethren, are hated and feared the most. Freud called this the "narcissism of little differences", though the phenomenon is not usually so polite[2].

This statement calls to mind so many conflicts around the world both past and present; the agony of post-Yugoslavia Bosnia is just one example that comes to mind in which cultural and ethnic identity is not just an issue of academic interest but one of life and death proportions. Yet the preceding quotation may also illuminate a much older issue, one that differs little from what we read in the newspapers today: namely, the conflict over the identity of the ancient Macedonians and how they were perceived and recognized by their Greek contemporaries. This may seem as yet another example of what Shaw, in the essay referred to above, calls the "contemporary obsession with the study of sameness and difference"[3]. But if there is any truth to the view that each generation writes history from its own particular vantage point, then there may be some usefulness in both Freud's observation and the contem-

1. This paper and that of W. L. Adams, "The Rest of Greece: Greek and Macedonian Ethnicity in the Hellenistic Age", comprised a panel discussion on ideas of classical Greek ethnicity at the annual meeting of the Pacific Coast Branch of the American Historical Association in Maui, Hawaii, August 5, 1995. I wish to thank W. L. Adams for some useful suggestions in revising this essay.

2. B. Shaw, "The Devil in the Details", *The New Republic*, July 10, 1995, p. 30 (= a rev. of E. Pagels, *The Origin of Satan*, New York, 1995, cited with minor editorial changes).

3. *Ibid.*

porary concern with the "other". Let us now turn to the situation in Greece at the end of the Lamian War in 322 BC.

After his defeat of the allied Greek army at Crannon, Antipater —one time advisor to Philip and Alexander of Macedon, and would-be regent to Olympias— stood on the Athenian-Boeotian border, poised for an invasion of Attica. The scene surely evoked memory of a similar situation seventeen years earlier after Chaeronea. The critical difference this time was that the once-mighty Athenian fleet was no more and the city possessed no reserves. A ravaging of the land such as had not been seen since the Spartan invasions of a century before seemed imminent. An Athenian embassy consisting of Demades, Phocion, and other dignitaries (such as Xenocrates, the head of the Academy) traveled to the Macedonian camp to negotiate a settlement. The envoys had no leverage and Antipater was obdurate. While hemmed in at Lamia early in the war, his own overtures to Leosthenes, the Athenian general commanding the allied Greek army, were answered only with a call for "unconditional surrender". Now with the tables turned, Antipater responded likewise. Yet these men, the Athenians Demades and Phocion, the Macedonian Antipater, were hardly strangers. Antipater had visited Athens on several occasions and during these had become friendly with most of the Athenians now present in his camp. Thanks, I think, mostly to the stature of Phocion, Antipater softened somewhat his stance. Rather than unconditional surrender, he offered peace to Athens, and assurances that he would not let loose his army on the Attic countryside, if they accepted his terms. These were stiff: an indemnity, surrender of Demosthenes and other advocates of resistance to Macedon, a garrison in the Piraeus, and revision of the constitution that amounted to a loss of franchise for thousands of Athenians[4]. The "Peace of Antipater" was harsh. But it must be seen as Antipater's work and not that of the Athenian delegation that accepted his terms. In fact it seems most likely that Antipater's settlement was the result of his knowledge and familiarity with Athens, an experience that dated back a quarter of a century to the negotiations leading to the Peace of Philocrates in the spring of

4. Plut. *Phoc.* 26.3-27.5, Diod. 18.18.3-5. See also L. A. Tritle, *Phocion the Good*, London, 1988, pp. 129-31; P. J. Rhodes, "On labelling fourth century politicians", *Liverpool Classical Monthly*, 3, 1978, p. 208.

347/6 BC. These visits, repeated over the years, provided Antipater with a working knowledge of Athens and its democracy. Antipater, Demades, and Phocion, then, were Athenian friends and Macedonian enemies.

This important embassy and settlement provides in itself information relating to knowledge of the other, but also to the issue of ethnicity and how the Greeks and Macedonians perceived each other. This topic has been addressed previously by such scholars as E. Badian and E. N. Borza, both of whom have made numerous contributions to the study of classical Greek history and whom I respect greatly[5]. Yet there remains reason to examine the issue of Macedonian ethnicity and Greek-Macedonian interaction and gain a fresh perspective by looking at this issue as one of "sameness", not "otherness".

A foreign visitor to Athens in the years following the dissolution of Yugoslavia would have noted quickly the staunch Greek defense of Macedonia, something that undoubtedly would have brought a smile to Philip of Macedon after the many sneers of Demosthenes. In the airport, in shop windows, signs and posters proclaimed, "Macedonia is Greek: Always was, always will be! Know your History!". This assertion stemmed from the disputes between Greece and FYROM (i.e., the "Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia") over numerous issues, including the proper place of ancient Macedonia, its history and cultural heritage, in the new Balkan state. Though ancient Macedonian identity figures in this controversy, it lies beyond the scope of this paper. Yet Demosthenes and other Athenians might well (or might not as will be argued below) have been as astonished, or mystified, by these signs and proclamations as King Philip. But back to the matter at hand: were the ancient Macedonians "Greek"?

The opinion of E. N. Borza on this vexed question is that the Macedonians were not, and that Macedon was but an "adjunct" to Greek history. This view is based on an analysis of the famous appearance of the Macedonian king Alexander I at the Olympic games, where he was accepted as a Greek; a similar analysis of the establishment of a

5. E. Badian, "Greeks and Macedonians", in *Studies in the History of Art*, Vol. 10: *Macedonia and Greece in Late Classical and Early Hellenistic Times*, ed. by B. Barr-Sharrar and E. N. Borza, Washington D.C., 1982, pp. 33-51; E. N. Borza, *In the Shadow of Olympus. The Emergence of Macedon*, Princeton, 1989.

Macedonian "Olympia" at Dion by King Archelaus I; and the view that "Macedonian" was somehow a different language from Greek. Curiously, however, this position begins with an admission that the Macedonians began with "Greek" origins[6]. Contrary views, however, are argued by N. G. L. Hammond and R. M. Errington. They contend that the Macedonians spoke a dialect of Greek, worshiped Greek deities, bore Greek names, and as Errington notes acutely, were similar in customs and culture to the Aetolians and Acarnanians, whose "Greekness is never doubted"[7].

Of these conflicting assessments the latter seems most plausible: the evidence, both linguistic and cultural, seems strong enough to maintain the view that the Macedonians were essentially Greek. It is this position that will be sustained in the remainder of this paper. In the matter of language, it might be helpful to keep in mind the various forms in which languages exist. This is possibly difficult to see when one looks at the issue from a modern American perspective, where multiple dialects are seldom encountered (the only candidates that come to mind are Black English [including Gullah spoken on the islands off the Georgia coast] and Cajun). But consider for a moment Germany. Even today dialects such as Bavarian and Swabian are spoken which, in the eyes of northern Germans speaking perfect *hoch Deutsch*, are regarded as not being German. A speaker of these dialects is looked down upon as uncultured at best or as a peasant at worst and would find it difficult to become a news reader on either RAD or ZDF, the national television news ser-

6. E. N. Borza, pp. 19, 112-13, 174-77, 277. The Macedonian Olympics at Dion is itself a complex issue; it would appear, however, that it is one in which political factors, particularly the emergence of the Macedonian state, are as critical if not more so than cultural.

7. N. G. L. Hammond, "The Traditions and the Language of Early Macedonia", in N. G. L. Hammond and G. T. Griffith, *A History of Macedonia*, Vol. 2, *550-336 B.C.*, Oxford, 1979, pp. 45-54; R. M. Errington, *A History of Macedonia*, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1990, pp. 3-4. On the Hellenic roots of Macedonian names, note the comments of M. Andronicos, "The Royal Tombs at Aigai (Vergina)", in *Philip of Macedon*, ed. by M. B. Hatzopoulos and L. D. Loukopoulos, Athens, 1980, p. 204, with plates 109-110, that the names inscribed on grave inscriptions of "common" Macedonians (i.e., recovered from the tumulus that covered the royal cemetary at Vergina) from the classical era are Greek. While it is easy to argue for a "Hellenic" ruling elite over a "Macedonian", i.e., non-Greek population, these funeral *stelai* demonstrate that such a view is skewed, that the Macedonians were essentially Hellenic in their origins.

vices. As one who has traveled widely and lived in Germany, whose roots are Swabian, I have experienced this firsthand. It may be a similar relationship with Greek and Macedonian, a point that will be resumed below.

Just as nuances of language must be considered, so too those defining culture. The Macedonians practiced a number of customs that have often been described as "Homeric", and these along with their kingship and the primitive nature of their political ways, struck the Greeks as being certainly backward, possibly even "barbaric"; the fact that similar customs had once been practiced by the Greeks was perhaps not widely recognized, hardly remembered[8]. A common cultural practice, one that reveals that the cultural gap between Greeks and Macedonians was not so wide was the practice of *xenia*, or guest friendship[9]. This point too will be taken up below. What all of this adds up to, however, is the existence of valid reasons for thinking that the Macedonians were certainly Greek.

One final argument that requires consideration before examining some of the available evidence is a methodological consideration. If some Greeks, as suggested by the rhetoric of Demosthenes for example, took the view that the Macedonians were "barbarians" and not Greeks, should that evidence be accepted at face value[10]? Let us for the moment take this as the initial point in our investigation. The modern researcher should then begin by saying, all right, so what? The next step should be to examine the evidence and attempt to go beyond what it states and so recover the past and its true reality: to ask, well some Greeks thought the Macedonians were not Greek but rather barbarians, but why, and were they right? This view will inform the analysis offered here.

First, let us consider some Macedonian "enemies" of Athens, figures who in fact had extensive Athenian contacts:

8. See especially N. G. L. Hammond, 2: 45-54, on this.

9. For discussion see G. Herman, *Ritualised Friendship & the Greek City*, Cambridge, 1987, and below.

10. Demosthenes' *Third Olynthiac* (3.16) is a famous example of Demosthenes' "macedonian baiting" oratory in which he contemptuously dismisses Philip as a "barbarian". But cf. Isocrates' *Philippus* (12.129, 154) which refers in the one place to the "ravings of orators" and contrasts Philip with the "barbarians" (i.e., Persians) on the other.

1. *Antipater:* Antipater traveled to Athens (for the first time?) in 347/6 BC as a representative of Philip in the discussions that led to the Peace of Philocrates; while in Athens it is known that he attended the dramatic festivals and attended private parties hosted by prominent Athenians including Demosthenes. This suggests that he had opportunities to become familiar with Greek customs and Athenians, in turn, with Macedonian ways. Antipater returned to Athens in 338/7 BC, after Chaeronea, escorting the ashes of the Athenian dead. It is likely too that he would have visited the city ca. 330 BC during his suppression of the Spartan King Agis' revolt. Antipater's dealings with an Athenian businessman, mentioned by Theophrastus in his *Characters*, also demonstrates that Antipater was quite familiar with Athens, its people and ways[11].
2. *Harpalus:* A boyhood friend of Alexander's, Harpalus traveled to Athens for the first time in 338/7 BC in the company of Alexander and Antipater (again after Chaeronea). He later returned to Athens in 324 BC as a fugitive from Alexander, loaded down with lots of money and a large retinue including mercenaries. His "visit" to Athens touched off a political scandal involving charges of bribery that is now known as the "Harpalus affair". His money and connections brought him into the circles of many prominent Athenians including Demosthenes, Phocion, and Charicles' (Phocion's son-in law). Again this suggests great familarity in both directions[12].
3. *Hephaestion:* Friend and possibly lover of Alexander, Hephaestion became a friend of Demosthenes' as a result of the latter's contact through his associate Aristion. Not much is known of this relationship, but it at least suggests that Demosthenes' remarks concern-

11. See the sources cited in H. Berve, *Das Alexanderreich auf prosopographischer Grundlage*, 2 vols., Munich, 1926, 2: no. 94 and M. J. Osborne, *Naturalization in Athens*, 4 vols., Brussels, 1981-82, 3: 70-71. Theophr. *Char.* 23 relates Antipater's efforts to encourage an Athenian businessman into the timber exporting trade in Macedonia. This suggests a sophisticated understanding on Antipater's part in regard to commercial activities. See also P. Greece, *Alexander to Actium. The Historical Evolution of the Hellenistic Age*, Berkeley, 1990, p. 70, who dates this passage historically to c. 320/19 BC.

12. See the sources cited in H. Berve, 2: no 143 and M. J. Osborne, 3: 79; for discussion, L. A. Tritle, pp. 119-22.

ing the Macedonians as barbarians may be mostly rhetoric for popular consumption rather than as an accurate guide to his views on the subject[13].

4. *Menelaus:* Perhaps the most fascinating of all these Macedonian friends of Athens is Menelaus. His precise identity is contested, but it remains clear that he became an Athenian citizen and served as a commander of Athenian cavalry ca. 350 BC, perhaps a little earlier. For the purposes of this paper that is all that is really necessary. His service with Athenian soldiers suggests that the perceived language barrier between Greeks and Macedonians is exaggerated, that it would have been possible for individuals on both sides to understand each other[14].
5. *Parmenio:* It is known that he traveled to Athens with Antipater in 347 BC and participated in the discussions leading to the Peace of Philocrates. He would presumably have attended the same functions and activities as Antipater[15].

Let us now turn the question around and take a look at some Athenian "friends" of Macedon, individuals who had contacts and relationships there:

1. *Aeschines:* "Bought" by Philip of Macedon if Demosthenes is to be believed (probably not a good idea!), Aeschines continued to maintain Macedonian contacts during his career[16].
2. *Demosthenes:* His association with Hephaestion has been pre-

13. See the sources cited in Berve, 2: no. 357, Aeschin. 3.162, and A. B. Bosworth, *Conquest and Empire. The Reign of Alexander the Great*, Cambridge, 1988, pp. 212-13. See also W. Heckel, "Hephaistion 'the Athenian'", *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, 87, 1991, pp. 39-41.

14. See Dem. 4.27, and other sources cited and discussed in M. J. Osborne, 3: 60-63. See also N. G. L. Hammond - G. T. Griffith, 2: 19-20 and G. Bugh, *The Horsemen of Athens*, Princeton, 1988, p. 160. Menelaus' ties came about as a result of his friendship with the Athenian general Timotheus.

15. See the sources cited in H. Berve, 2: no. 606. One other Macedonian who had an Athenian connection was Alcimachus, also honored by the Athenians as Antipater, Alexander, and Harpalus. See M. J. Osborne, 3: 70-71.

16. On Aeschines see Dem. 19. 166-68 and E. M. Harris, *Aeschines and Athenian Politics*, New York and Oxford, 1995, pp. 85-86.

viously noted. It is known too that he kept company with Antipater and Parmenio during the negotiations of 347 BC[17].

3. *Iphicrates:* Some of the earliest evidence attesting Athenian and Macedonian associations comes from the career of Iphicrates. While serving in the northern Aegean in the 370s BC, Iphicrates came into close contact with the Macedonian queen Eurydice and her sons, and emerged as not only a friend but also a protector of the dynasty[18]. In her plea for Iphicrates' aid, the queen addressed the Athenian general as both *adelphos* and *philos*, i.e., as both a family member and a political ally.
4. *Phocion:* It appears that Philip had made Phocion his *xenos*, and that this relationship had been inherited by Alexander. This placed Phocion into close contact with all the prominent Macedonians of the era, including Antipater, Harpalus, and most importantly, Alexander the Great. Phocion, however, was affluent and self-respecting enough that he could, somewhat haughtily perhaps, refuse any gift or would-be bribe[19].

These Athenian and Macedonian associations are better documented than those from the fifth century BC and earlier. As such they are revealing as to the extent of interaction and knowledge of the two groups as regards the other; they also suggest some nuances as to the dimensions of language and culture, and the Greek institution of *xenia*, or guest friendship, a social relationship that dates back to Homeric times.

Language and culture are closely related and in his essay "Greeks and Macedonians", E. Badian argues that neither Greeks nor Macedonians were able to understand the other and that this linguistic gap created a

17. Din. 1.28 and I. Worthington, *A Historical Commentary on Dinarchus. Rhetoric and Conspiracy in Later Fourth Century Athens*, Ann Arbor, 1992, pp. 176-77.

18. Aeschin. 2.28 and the discussion in G. Herman, p. 23.

19. Plut. *Phoc.* 17.6-10, and L. A. Tritle, p. 118. On the nature of the gifts offered Phocion (and other Greeks as well) see the discussion below. Another Athenian family that might have a Macedonian connection is that of Leocrates, the man prosecuted by Lycurgus after the defeat at Chaeronea for abandoning Athens (which might in fact explain his flight, i.e., generated by fear of his known Macedonian links). Leocrates' brother's name was Amyntas —a name uncommon in Attic prosopography, but well attested in Macedon.

cultural chasm[20]. This led, for example, a Macedonian force under the general Pithon to massacre a force of rebellious Greek mercenaries in 321 BC[21]. Several other instances of Greek and Macedonian incompatibility and conflict are also advanced to prove ostensibly that Greeks and Macedonians could not get along. First, during the nasty confrontation that led "Black" Clitus to his death, Alexander called out orders to his guards "in Macedonian"[22]. He used, Badian argues, the language in which his guards could be addressed, as presumably, they would not have understood Greek. A few years later, after Alexander's death, his former secretary Eumenes engaged an opposing force made up of Macedonians; to parlay with this force, Eumenes dispatched one Xennias —whose speech was Macedonian— to rely a message to these soldiers[23]. Badian sees this as necessary, as Eumenes had no command of Macedonian and the Macedonians themselves had learnt no Greek.

All of this adds up, Badian argues, as evidence to a language barrier between Greek and Macedonian. But does it? A few counterarguments may be offered. Our accounts of the drunken brawl that cost Clitus his life suggests that Alexander might well have called out in Macedonian because of his inebriated state and such words would be the first to come to mind. As for Eumenes' need for Xennias' meditation and linguistic talents: the point that this was necessary on account of Greek-Macedonian incapacity for language is not compelling. These were men who had soldiered together for a decade (if not longer) and it seems reasonable to assume that both sides would have learned some of the others' speech. During the Vietnam War, for example, many American soldiers were able to learn a working command of Vietnamese within a year, and Vietnamese is not nearly as close to English as Macedonian is to Greek. In fact, Athenaeus states that he knows many Attic writers who used Macedonian idioms in their works, which suggests that the two

20. E. Badian, pp. 41-43. Cf., however, N. G. L. Hammond, *The Macedonian State. The Origins, Institutions and History*, Oxford, 1989, p. 13, n. 29.

21. Diod. 18.7.5.

22. The text is a papyrus fragment of Arrian's *Successors*. See E. Badian, p. 50, n. 65, and A. B. Bosworth, "Eumenes, Neoptolemus, and *PSI* XII 1284", *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies*, 19, 1978, pp. 227-37.

23. Plut. *Alex.* 51.6.

"languages" were not that far different[24]. Unfortunately Athenaeus does not identify any of these authors, which complicates a proper understanding of his remarks. It seems most likely, however, that he is referring to authors of the classical era, i.e., the fourth century BC, rather than to later writers when the Greek language had assimilated the Macedonian dialect into its hellenistic *Koine* form. Finally, Badian's argument that a linguistic barrier aggravated by cultural antagonisms would produce sufficent animosity to lead the Macedonians to massacre a group of Greeks is overwrought. Waldemar Heckel has noted that the number of Greeks purportedly killed on this occasion is exaggerated[25]. More to the point, however, Badian's argument that it was "Macedonian irrational hatred" that led to the massacre overlooks the simpler explanation of greed, the desire to take the possessions and women of the now defenseless Greeks, as well as the simple animosity of soldiers. Rivalries and conflicts can exist within any military force that on occasion can and will erupt into violence. The animosities common to soldiers, when exacerbated by anger and greed, will only make such clashes more fearsome.

Against these points too may be placed the case of the naturalized Athenian Menelaus. His exact identity remains unclear; he may have belonged to the royal house of Pelagonia in Upper Macedonia, but this is by no means certain. Menelaus became an Athenian, received honors from Ilion, and served as an Athenian cavalry commander. This demonstrates with little doubt that a Macedonian from the highlands could not only prosper in the Greek world, but be received amicably as well. The case of Menelaus casts further doubt on Badian's thesis of Greek-Macedonian mutual ignorance and hostility. Again the issue seems to be one of sameness, not otherness.

A similar conclusion emerges from an appraisal of the social interaction of Athenians and Macedonians as revealed in their guest friendships. There are many attested examples of such Macedonian-Athenian relationships, stretching from the late sixth century BC to the fourth. The well known visit of Euripides to the court of Archelaus I, as

24. Athen. *Deiph.* 3. 122A.

25. W. Heckel, *The Marshals of Alexander's Empire*, London, 1993, p. 277, with discussion and additional references.

well as the Platonic disciple and advisor to Perdiccas III, Euphraeus, attest intellectual aspirations if not attainment in high politics[26]. The level to which these influences penetrated Macedonian society may be debated, though cannot similar arguments be made for elsewhere in Greece itself? But it appears that the friendships and connections of Athenians and Macedonians remained constant from the sixth century BC onwards: Alexander I with the tyrant Peisistratus (and/or Hippias), Archelaus I with Andocides, Menelaus with Timotheus, and Philip II with Aeschines and Phocion[27]. The practice of *xenia* represented a kind of super-friendship, nearly kinship, that was expressed by the mutual exchange of gifts, favors, and ties. In Homeric times such links crisscrossed Greece and tied people together; upon the emergence of the polis, such ties increasingly came into conflict with one's allegiance to the polis[28]. In Greece below Macedon, *xenia* continued to be practiced, as seen in the relationship between the tyrant Plutarch of Eretria and the influential Athenian Meidias[29]. The customs or practices of *xenia*, however, seem gradually to have transformed. A good example of this is *adorodoketos*, i.e., the refusal to accept gifts from a *xenos* so as not to be compromised. In the Homeric era such behavior would have been regarded as either insulting or at least a display of bad manners[30]. Yet the nuances of gift-giving practiced by *xenoi*, and the complications these raised, are depicted clearly in the figure of Phocion. This includes the well known offer made by Alexander to give Phocion four Asian cities. The historicity of this incident has been contested since W. W. Tarn, but put into the context of *xenia* and the ancient practice of the

26. For Euripides' residence in Macedonia see Ael. *VH.* 2.21, 13.4, and R. M. Errington, p. 26, for Euphraeus', Dem. 9.59-62.

27. See G. Herman, pp. 167-74, for a convenient list. Other examples include Philip II with the Persian Artabazus and the Greeks Philon (of Thebes) and Demaratus (of Corinth), Hephaestion with two unamed Sidonians, and Polyperchon (friends unknown). Herman suggests that Phocion's friendship was with Alexander; the details of Phocion's introduction to Alexander, who then declared him his *xenos* suggests instead that Alexander was continuing a relationship that began with Philip. See L. A. Tritle, p. 118 for discussion.

28. See G. Herman, pp. 162-65, for discussion.

29. See Dem. 21.110 and L. A. Tritle, "A Missing Athenian General: Meidias Kephisodorou Anagyrasios", *Athenaeum*, 80, 1992, pp. 487-94; for other fourth century examples, see the list in G. Herman, pp. 167-74.

30. See G. Herman, pp. 77-78. This might in part explain the reasons for Phocion's refusal of gifts from his Macedonian friends.

giving of estates or lands, Alexander's extravagant offer makes sense[31].

In Macedon, however, the relative absence of the polis meant the transformation of *xenia* did not occur and that attitudes toward gifts and social relationships would remain much as they had earlier in "Homeric" times. We may close with two points: first, the practice of gift-giving observed by Philip and Alexander and so roundly condemned by Demosthenes for example, conforms to Homeric ways and reflects on the "Greekness" of the Macedonians. At issue here is not a clash of cultures, but rather a conflict provoked by degrees of sophistication. Second, the social interaction of Athenians and other Greeks with the Macedonians demonstrates that they recognized and understood these antique ways of the Macedonians and attempted to cope with them as best they could. The differences, however, were surely a degree of sameness rather than one of otherness.

Loyola Marymount University
Los Angeles California

31. W. W. Tarn, *Alexander the Great*, 2 vols., Cambridge, 1948, 2: 222-27, commenting on Plut. *Phoc.* 18.1,6 (for other incidents of gifts offered Phocion see *Phoc.* 30.1 [the Macedonian general Menyllus] and 30.3-4 [Antipater]). The latest discussion is T. Corsten, "Zum Angebot einer Schenkung Alexanders an Phokion", *Historia*, 43, 1994, pp. 112-18, who concludes that Alexander's offer may be neither confirmed nor denied. The gift-giving of *xenoi*, however, does not enter into Corsten's analysis. See G. Herman, p. 108, who refers to this ritualized practice.