

## Co-living (共生 *kyousei*) with *barbaroi*: from archaic to classical Greece

Sumio TAKABATAKE

### Preface: What is *kyousei*?

共生 *kyousei* is now a very popular word in Japan. People who are using *Kanji* (Chinese characters) may easily suppose its literal meaning; since *kyou* (共) means ‘with, together’ and *sei* (生) ‘to live, to be alive’, the whole word represents the concept of ‘living together’. It is usually translated into English as ‘coexistence’ but the wise object that this leaves something untranslated. According to Professor TAKEMURA Makio in my university (Indian philosophy) it is a peculiar word, created in Japan as a slogan of a social movement by a Buddhist monk, SHIHO Benkyo (1876-1971), and based on a sentence in the classics of the *Joudo* sect of Buddhism. Having developed from this slogan, the word *kyousei* is now widely used. It is used not only in relation to human society but also for the natural world and many other areas, such as 「環境との共生」 *kyousei* with environment or 「男女の共生」 *kyousei* of men and women. With its wide extension the concept of *kyousei* is believed to be valuable and the word sometimes appears even in academic contexts. For example the graduate school of Kyoto university has a Department of Human Coexistence (共生人間学専攻), that of Kyushu university has a Department of Human Coexistence System (人間共生システム専攻), and many other universities including mine have such names of departments or lecture courses. My university, Toyo university, has the Center for Sustainable Development Studies (国際共生社会センター, literally the Center for International Coexistence of Societies) and is now promoting an academic project of the Study of *kyousei*, to which this study also owes its origin.

Since the word originated from a Buddhist slogan, in the usages cited above a Buddhism-derived notion is said to be preserved, namely that living beings should live with each other by recognizing each other’s existence. In other words *kyousei* is coexistence between different living beings on mutual

acknowledgement and on respect for mutual differences. Thus we can find it at various levels, from relations between husband and wife or parents and children to those between state and state or nation and nation. Also in ancient Greece many types of *kyousei* may be found and can be studied, but in this paper I want to confine myself to that with foreigners, especially with *barbaroi*, in archaic and classical Greece. I shall first examine the conditions in which such *kyousei* operated; this will lead to an analysis of the peculiarity of Greek society during these periods.

### **The *kyousei* in archaic Greece**

At first we have to look at the concept of foreigners, because it was not so simple at this period as nowadays. There existed no clear nationality legally defined as nowadays, accordingly the concept of the citizen was ambiguous itself, while its counter-concept of the foreigner was not so clear-cut. According to my older study in Japanese the word *xeinos* in Homer could show a foreigner in general but its range of meaning was not the same as the 'foreigner' in our days (S. Takabatake, "On ξένος: Foreigners in Archaic Period," *Journal of Classical Studies* 32, 1984, 16-27). And the word itself must have reflected the real life, so we can expect to find some reality of the *kyousei* with foreigners at this period in trying to understand the sphere of meanings of the words corresponding to the 'foreigner' today.

Let us begin with *barbaroi*. In Homer only the form of *barbarophonoi* appears as an epithet of the Carians (*Il.* II 867), the exact meaning and nuance of which we cannot grasp fully. It is quite difficult to answer convincingly from only one usage to some basic questions, such as why the word was applied only to the Carians among many non-Greek speaking peoples, and then whether it meant 'non-Greek speaking' or 'bad Greek speaking'. But by analyzing whole epics of Homer we can draw three conclusions; (1) there exists a view differentiating non-Greek speaking peoples from Greek speaking ones, as the word *allothroi* shows (*Od.* I 183, III 302, XIV 43, XV 453). (2) There is, however, no epithet (except *barbarophonoi* if we take one of the options) modifying the groups or community of foreigners which defines their characters from a

non-Greek speaking's point of view. (3) Although the Trojan war can be taken as a war between the Greeks and the barbarians, as Agamemnon in the *Iphigenia in Aulis* (1271-1275) by Euripides declares, there are no such kinds of depiction. From these conclusions it can be said that Homer was aware of the difference between Greek-speaking and non-Greek-speaking peoples but that he did not need to emphasize it particularly. For the Greeks in those days the difference between communities, *poleis*, was much more significant than that between languages. The *kyousei* with *barbaroi* in those days, if possible, therefore, took place in a similar way as that with foreigners in general, *xeinos/xenos*. And the situation must have continued till the first half of the 5th century BC, because it was not until this time that the use of the word *barbaroi* began and expand explosively.

The word *xeinoi/xenoi* in Homer surely denoted foreigners in general, but a person who kept being recognized as *xeinos* was limited. Only a highly estimated person could continue to be *xeinos*. If we take the time (which passes since he reaches a community) as X-axis and the estimation as Y-axis (which the people at that community make for him), the concept of *xeinos* can be drawn in a certain diagram. A *xeinos* who continued to be *xeinos* long was one who had been estimated highly, while lowly-estimated *xeinos* became to be recognized as other titles such as *therapon*, *ptochos*, *thes*, etc in a short time. He could not stay as *xeinos* for a long time and the *kyousei* with him must have been harsh to him. Because, as the expression *atimetos metanastes* (a unhonored migrant) suggests (*Il.* IX 648, XVI 59), he was not allowed any rights and honor. *xeinos*, on the other hand, was always a highly-estimated foreigner and then the *kyousei* with him must have been always in a happy condition. Because *xeinos* was thought to be protected by Zeus *xenios* and hospitality to him was common custom or morals justified on this thinking of Zeus, to which even *xeinos* on his side could have recourse in order to get some help from those who received him.

The arguments so far are based mainly on analysis of words themselves. We should turn now to the real world. Herodotus and some inscriptions will lead us. In Herodotus we can find many examples of contact between the Greeks and

the barbarians. We will examine them by dividing into two cases; (1) the Greeks contact the barbarians outside of their homeland, (2) the Greeks contact the barbarians in their homeland.

(1): Why did the Greeks go to the barbarian lands? Herodotus reports, “when Cambyses, son of Cyrus, invaded Egypt, many Greeks came, some to trade, as was natural, some to be soldiers, and some to see the country itself” (III 139.1). Seemingly mercantile, military, and sightseeing was their main aims of going abroad. As for mercantile aim, Herodotus relates some stories concerning Naukratis in Egypt. Firstly, Egyptian pharaoh Amasis was a philhellene and gave the Greeks coming to Egypt the city Naukratis to live in, and to those who traveled to the country without wanting to settle there, he gave lands where they might set up altars and make holy places for their gods (II. 178.1). Here, a peaceful *kyousei* was established by an Egyptian king. Secondly, Herodotus reports about the holy places which the Greeks founded unitedly; “Of these the greatest and most famous and most visited precinct is that which is called the Hellenion, founded jointly by the Ionian cities of Chios, Teos, Phocaea, and Clazomenae, the Dorian cities of Rhodes, Cnidus, Halicarnassus, and Phaselis, and one Aeolian city, Mytilene” (II 178.2). Thus another *kyousei* seems to have been established among the Greeks there. We may consider the similar situation occurred in Cyrene (IV 159.2) and Cyprus (VII 7.90), where many Greeks from many Greek regions came to settle. Since mercantile acts could not be flourishing without peace, peaceful *kyousei* must have been achieved to some extent between the Greeks and the barbarians as well as between the Greeks themselves in the places where trade was realized. But these episodes of Herodotus also suggests that not only the awareness of the Greeks but also that of the Chians, Teans, etc must have existed, so the conflicts of interests should have occurred along this line, too.

As for military acts we can find many Greeks participate in the armies of the barbarian leaders. A Persian king Cambyses “considered the Ionians and Aeolians as slaves inherited from his father, and prepared an expedition against

Egypt, taking with him some of these Greek subjects besides others whom he ruled.” (II 1.2) But also in the Egyptian army there existed the Greeks and Carians from the time of Psammetichos according to Herodotus’ report (II 2.154, and other kings: 163<Apries>, III 11<Amasis>). The reason why the Greeks went to such places to be soldiers might be various, such as their curiosity or as a diplomatic means. But for considering *kyousei* their weakness and poverty which made them inevitable to be mercenaries is significant. A kind of *kyousei* must have been established between employers and employees, and it may have varied according to employers’ characters and employees’ royalty and usefulness. For example, Psammetichos made friends with the Ionians and Carians promising them great rewards, who became the first men of alien speech to settle in Egypt (II 152.5, 154.4), or the Mytileneans in Persian army seem to have been respected, as the episode shows that for every Mytileneans who had perished with his boat at Memphis ten noble Egyptians were judged by the royal judges to be killed (III 14.5). Then the various types of *kyousei* could be supposed between the Greeks and the barbarians, but among the Greek soldiers themselves there must have been some types of *kyousei*. It was not always a happy one as the case of Halicarnassian Phanes, one of Amasis’ mercenaries, typically shows. He took flight from Amasis and escaped to Persia, where he advised Cambyses how to march into Egypt. The Egyptian mercenaries, Greeks and Carians, angered at him for leading a foreign army into Egypt, slaughtered his sons left in Egypt in their father’s sight and then gave battle drinking their blood with wine and water (III 4, 11).

As for sightseeing, the episode of Syloson at Memphis is symbolic. He was Polycrates’ brother and in exile from Samos. He met Darius, who was, at that time, one of Cambyses’ guard and as yet a man of no great importance, in the market and gave him his cloak. Several years later, finding the man to whom he had given the cloak now a Persian king, Syloson went up to Susa and asked a king to give him back his own country Samos, which was now under his former slaves. And Darius ordered it to be done (III 139-141). Here a *kyousei* between the Greeks and the barbarians at personal level was achieved. Since sightseeing

is basically a personal act and the number of Greeks who went abroad for sightseeing or other personal reasons may not have been a few (for example, to Sardes all wise Greek men went, I 29.1), many types of *kyousei* must have been established at personal level (for example, the case of Rhodopis, II 134.3-135; Democedes, III 125, 129-134; Mandrocles, IV 87-88; Histiaios and Coes, V. 11).

(2): Why did the barbarians come to Greece? As the case of the Greeks, mercantile, military, and sightseeing may be their main aims. But what we can find in Herodotus' *Histories* is military expeditions and those who came to Greece because of diplomatic or some personal purposes instead of mercantile and sightseeing examples. We will examine, therefore, dividing their coming into collective and individual aims.

As for coming by collective aims, military expedition was most typical. For *kyousei* study the response of the Greeks is important. Herodotus said, "Those of them who had paid the tribute of earth and water to the Persian were of good courage, thinking that the foreigner would do them no harm, but they who had refused tribute were afraid, since there were not enough ships in Hellas to do battle with their invader; furthermore, the greater part of them had no stomach for grappling with the war, but were making haste to side with the Persian" (VII 138.2). If the Greek attitude to the Persian army was not alike, as he reported, there must have been found various types of *kyousei*. As a matter of fact, "the farther into Hellas the Persian advanced, the more nations followed him" (VIII 66.2; even after the retreat of Xerxes the situation did not change so much, IX 9.1), and for example Artemisia of Halicarnassos, Herodotus' native city, took part in the Persian army (VII 99) and she, who "neither was most cowardly in the sea battles off Euboea nor performed the least feats of arms" (words of herself, VIII 68a1), made the best advice to Xerxes (VIII 68-69). Also "those Thebans who were on the Persian side had great enthusiasm in the battle, and did not want to fight in a cowardly manner. As a result of this, three hundred of their first and best were killed there by the Athenians" (IX 67). The Greeks did not fight against the Persian unanimously, so the possibility of *kyousei* was not

unanimous for all Greeks, either. Or rather the possibility was various, so diplomatic measures could pay. We can find some examples of the diplomatic devices of the barbarians from Croisus onwards as well as those of the Greeks, both of which we have no time to mention now.

As for coming by personal aims, we can find Anacharsis, who had seen much of the world in his travels and given many examples of his wisdom (IV 76), on the one hand, and an unnamed eunuch of Sataspes, who as soon as he heard of his master's death escaped to Samos with a great hoard of wealth, of which a man of Samos got possession, on the other hand (IV 43.7). They could be received in various manners according to their own and receivers' characters, which made many types of *kyousei* possible.

We examined Herodotus so far. Before going to a conclusion of this period we should see some inscriptions briefly. In *Nomima I* (ed. by H.V. Effenterre & F. Ruzé, Roma, 1994) the inscriptions concerning foreigners are collected (esp. nos.1-9, and nos.10-14). The expression “εἶτε ἀστός τις ἀνὲρ εἶτε χσένος ἄλοθεν ἐλθόν” in no. 2 <Epitaphe de Tettikhos, vers 560> shows the distinction between *astos* and *xenos*, and the expression “κσενείαι δίκαι” (no.7 l 8) <Pacte Gortyn-Rhitten, début Vème s.> and “Φαστίαν δίκαν” (no.8 l 4) <Concession de privileges à Dionysios, Début Vème s.> shows that they had distinctive rights. The expression in no.2 means clearly “all people who come here now” but the regulations in no.7 or no.8 show that *xenoi* were not equal in themselves and the word *dromeus* in no.3 (though very fragmentary) <Fragment concernant les citoyens, Fin VIème s.> and the regulation about Salamians in no.6 <Decret relatif aux Salaminiens, 510-500> show that even in *astoi* some distinction existed. Further the word *allopoliatai* in nos.10-13 shows the distinction in *xenoi* more clearly. This word is found only in Crete and means foreigners originated from the Crete island. The distinction between foreigners from other cities in Crete and from out of the island led to (or rather was made out of ) the distinction of the rights among foreigners.

What can we say from these observations? That there was no tendency to regulate or arrange affairs by the concept of barbarians may be pointed out. There might have been the concept of *barbaroi* as the word *barbarophonoi* in Homer suggests, but, as many examples of the contacts between the Greeks and the barbarians in Herodotus and the expressions and regulations in some inscriptions indicate, there was no evidence of the attitude towards barbarians which was determined by thinking whether he/she was barbarian or not. So talking about the *kyousei* with barbarians generally is not useful in this period. It takes various types according to a barbarian him/herself or his/her master as the *kyousei* with a Greek takes according to his/herself or his/her polis.

### **The *kyousei* in classical Greece**

The situation changed in the classical period. The word *xenos* was legally defined as opposed to citizen (at least in Athens since 451 BC) and the word *barbaroi* came to include a derogatory sense, and there appeared a way of thinking to grasp all the nations other than the Greeks as one word *barbaroi*. An Elean stranger in the *Politicus* by Plato criticizes this thinking when young Socrates asked, “What is it, then, that you say we did wrongly in making our division just now?”: he replied, “it was very much as if, in undertaking to divide the human race into two parts, one should make the division as most people in this country (ἐνθάδε, Athens) do; they separate the Hellenic race from all the rest as one, and to all the other races, which are countless in number and have no relation in blood or language to one another, they give the single name ‘barbarian’; then, because of this single name, they think it is a single species” (262c-d). This shows that such a kind of thinking spread widely in Athens. Even one Athenian, Antiphon the sophist, seems to have criticized this thinking (Fr. 144(b)). Then the *kyousei* with *barbaroi* in Athens must have been influenced by this thinking. We may find some such examples especially in the treatment of slaves, but we should ask at first whether this situation was common to all Greeks or just peculiar to the Athenians, because almost all sources are from Athens (, one of several exceptions of which may be the Halicarnassian law concerning disputed property, Meiggs-Lewis, 32, but we have no time to

consider it now). Fortunately we can find many examples of the behaviours of the people other than the Athenians in Thucydides' History. Although the author was an Athenian, we can approach the problem by analyzing such behaviours themselves. Today we want to consider a conflict around Ambracian gulf from 430/29 to 426/5 BC, which will cast some lights not only upon this problem but also upon the situation of the Greek world in those days.

The details of the events were as follows;

1. In the end of the summer of 430/29 BC people of Ambracia, one of Corinthian colonial poleis, made an expedition against Amphilochian Argos and the rest of Amphilochia with themselves and the *barbaroi* whom they had summoned (Chaonians and others). But not able to take the city, they returned home and disbanded into their respective tribes. (II 68.1-2)
2. Next summer, the Ambraciots and Chaonians persuaded Spartans to give help. Spartans gathered a force from her allies and made an expedition. The Corinthians were especially eager to support this enterprise of the Ambraciots, who were colonists of theirs. The Greeks who were with Spartans were Ambraciots, Leucadians, and Anactorians, the barbarians were Chaonians, Thesprotians, Molossians, Atintanians, Paravaeans and Orestians. And also came Macedonians. They passed through the territory of Amphilochian Argos and arrived at Stratus, the largest *polis* of Acarnania. (II 80)
3. The Acarnanians perceived that a large army had invaded much of their land but did not join in a common defense of Stratus. Instead, each region set up its own defense and sent word to Phormio, an Athenian general in Naupaktus, urging him to aid them, but he refused it. (II 81.1)
4. The Stratians, noticing that the Chaonians were advancing alone, set ambushes around the city and closed in upon them from the city and from the ambushes and destroyed them. Owing to this victory the expedition retreated to each country through Oeniadae, a *polis* of Acarnania, which took sides with the expedition. (II 81.2-83.1)
5. In the winter the Athenian army under Phormio made an expedition

- against Acarnania. They expelled from Stratus, Coronta, and other places such men as were regarded as untrustworthy and returned. (II 102.1-2)
6. In the winter of 426/5 BC the Ambraciots made an expedition against Amphiloichian Argos under a promise with the Spartans and captured a fort Olpae. Some of the Acarnanians went to the aid of Argos, while the rest went to the other place to kept guard to prevent the Peloponnesians from joining the Ambraciots, and also they asked an Athenian Demosthenes to come and be their leader. Meanwhile, the Ambraciots at Olpae sent a message to Ambracia ordering them to come to their aid in full strength. (III 105)
  7. The allied troops of the Acarnanians and Athenians defeated those of Ambraciots and Peloponnesians. Demosthenes and his fellow generals from Acarnania secretly agreed to allow the Mantineans and Menedaius (a Spartan general who assumed sole command), with other Peloponnesian commanders and notables among them, to withdraw quickly. The Ambraciots noticed this and an affray occurred. The Acarnanians decided to kill only the Ambraciots but there was much dispute and uncertainty as to whether a man was an Ambraciot or a Peloponnesian. (III 108-109. 111)
  8. The troops from the city of Ambracia reached without knowing what had previously happened. They thought the attackers were their own men, for Demosthenes had purposely put the Messenians in front and directed them to accost the enemy in the Doric dialect. Many Ambraciots were slain and some of them ran to the sea and seeing Athenian ships, swam toward them, thinking in the panic of the moment that if they had to die, it would be better for them to be killed by the men on the ships than by the detested barbarian Amphiloichians. (III 112)
  9. Demosthenes and the Athenians insisted to capture Ambracia, but the Acarnanians and Amphiloichians did not hear of it. The fact is, they were afraid that if the Athenians had Ambracia, they would be more troublesome neighbors than the Ambraciots. (III 113.6) (We can draw an interesting idea about the Athenians from this, but I will omit today because of a time's reason).

These details suggest many significant facts about the political and social situations under the Peloponnesian war. At first we can see the mechanism how a minor conflict between small countries grew a major war containing big countries. When they could not achieve the aim of expedition, the Ambraciots asked the Spartans to help them (1, 2). Sparta was an allied country of Corinth, which was a mother country of Ambracia, and now under the war with Athens. If the Spartans found any profit in helping the city for the current war, they would willingly come to aid. And the profit would be easily found because to make any country allies meant to strengthen her power and weaken the opponent's in this narrow and resourceless world. And if the Spartans came, the Acarnanians could not face them alone, so they went naturally to the opposite side of Sparta, Athens (3, 6). And the Athenians could easily find a profit in aiding them because to prevent the Spartans from expanding their power is a big profit for them. This is the mechanism how minor conflicts grew bigger wars and a reason why the rivalry between big countries made conflicts or wars easily happen everywhere in Greece. There was a tendency to originate wars, revolts and *staseis* in this period of Greece. And wars were waged by a *polis*, or rather a *polis* was considered as a political unit which would wage wars. Then the identity of a *polis* raised more highly than ever, although a *polis* was not always an unanimous group, as clearly shows the fact that Phormio expelled someone who were regarded untrustworthy by him or from the Athenians' point of view (5) or many examples of *stasis*. In Acarnania, an *ethnos* country which consisted of several *poleis*, when they noticed the large army was invading their land, each *polis* rushed to defend her own region at first and then worried about Stratus (3). A *polis* was thought more important than *ethnos*. As a matter of fact, one of the *poleis* Oeniadae acted in their own way as opposed to other Acarnanians (4) and as for the winners' side they determined how to deal the defeated persons by *polis*, even though they could not distinguish physically who belonged to what *polis* (7, 8). Generally speaking, the distinction between *polites* and *xenos* became clearer not only legally but psychologically in this situation, and the *kyousei* with *xenoi* must have become harsh. The usefulness for a *polis*

became a main norm to judge *xenoi* and in Athens even some *strategoí* were known to be elected from *xenoi* who were proved useful (Pl. *Ion* 541c-d). The type of *kyousei* with foreigners was determined according to this norm.

Then what can be said about the attitude towards *barbaroi*? The Ambraciots jointed with the Chaonians and many barbarians could be seen in the Spartan expedition (1, 2). We do not know how their relationship was because Thucydides told nothing about that. But the fact that the Chaonians could march alone under their own judgment (4) suggests that they were dealt not as slaves but as cooperators like other Greeks. Although we cannot imagine how they felt about the barbarians, the Ambraciots and Spartans did not hesitate to connect themselves with barbarians. Under their connection a thought that it was useful for their *poleis* to connect with the barbarians must have existed. And on the barbarians' side they found some profit in taking part in the war. The intensions of the both sides fitted together and a kind of happy *kyousei* was achieved. There was no room for derogatory sense to work in this perilous situation. As for the thinking of the Ambraciots when they swam to the Athenian ships (8), it should be interpreted as hatred not to the barbarians in general but to the old neighbour enemies, which could be seen in other places, too (such as in Megara, IV 66.3; in Corcyra IV 48.1), considering their connection with the Chaonians. The barbarians were judged by the same norm as other foreigners, *xenoi*. Even the Athenians planned to use the Thracians in the Sicilian expedition as light-armed troops though not fulfilled, as Thucydides reported (VII 27, 29), and also Thucydides narrates that an expectation of making an alliance with Persia through Alcibiades consisted of Peisander's persuasion to change the democracy, which no one could resist (VIII 53). Then there could be various types of *kyousei* with *barbaroi* according to this norm. So talking about the *kyousei* with barbarians generally is no more useful in this period than in the previous period.

### **Epilogue: What can be said through this study?**

If we came to a conclusion that there is no use in talking about the *kyousei* with barbarians generally neither in the archaic nor in the classical period, then

what is the difference between two periods? The norm to judge foreigners might be pointed out. As we mentioned above it can be said that a *xenos* was judged from the usefulness for a *polis* in a society where the strong tendency to war made a *polis* consolidated. The emphasis of that norm might be a new phenomenon, although the idea of usefulness for a *polis* was not so simple because the rivalry of two *poleis* also led a *polis* to divide into two parts which ended in *stasis*.

The derogatory sense in *barbaroi* can be also pointed out as a new phenomenon. This sense increased explosively after the last quarter of the 5th century BC, accompanying an idea of superior Greeks and inferior barbarians. This idea was available for insisting that the superior should rule the inferior so that the Greeks should unite under the most excellent Athenians. This was also available for praising the Athenians by reminding people of her great exploits against the barbarians in the Persian war as the case of their famous answer to the Spartans fearing their betrayal (“the kinship of all Greeks in blood and speech, and the shrines of gods and the sacrifices that we have in common, and the likeness of our way of life, to all of which it would not befit the Athenians to be false,” Hdt. VIII 144.2). At the background of the explosion of the idea we should grasp Athenian expectations. The idea may not have been so popular as the details we examined shows and even the Athenians disregarded it in the perilous condition.

A concept of *barbaroi* corresponds to that of *Hellenes*, which is based on the self-recognition of the Greeks. But the Greeks could recognize themselves variously, such as Greeks, Athenians, or *Eumolpidae*, etc. Their identities went to nation, *polis*, *genos*, family or some others, and nation-identity did not have any bigger meaning than polis-identity neither in archaic nor in classical period. Because their conflicts generally took place among the aristocrats or between the aristocrats and the people in archaic period, and between *poleis* in classical period except in the time of the Persian war. Even in the Persian war the *polis*-identity was strong and every Greek *polis* did not behave in the same way. In such a situation that there existed stronger identities than nation a concept

of *barbaroi* was used as a tool to take an advantage in conflicts between *poleis* or others. Therefore no hesitaion could be seen to seek a cooperation with *barbaroi* in a real life, although there were many evidences to show the derogatory sense for them.