

On Bribing Athenian Ambassadors

S. Perlman

THE READER of Greek comedy and the Attic orators will come to the conclusion that bribing and bribe-taking were not only endemic in Greece but that they were the main motive behind decisions on interstate relations and international politics. In the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. we already find pronouncements that Persian gold may be more effective in bringing Greece into subjection than Persian arms and that Philip's successes were due to his bribing of Greek politicians.¹ Though some modern scholars have lately warned against ascribing too great importance to these accusations of bribery,² there is still the pervading feeling that there was always the possibility that politicians would take bribes and that bribery was quite common in public life.³

It is the aim of this paper to examine the cases in which ambassadors and envoys were accused of bribery against the background of the general Greek attitude toward bribery in political life. The main questions to be answered are: What is the basis of the accusations of bribery levelled against ambassadors and envoys? To what extent were these accusations based on facts, and to what extent were they part of the process of political warfare in the Greek *poleis*? Was the bribing of ambassadors and envoys customary in the Greek city-states themselves, or was it generally connected with non-Greek states?

¹ Hdt. 9.2; Dem. 19.300, 18.19, 247. It should be pointed out that already Polyb. 18.14 contradicted Demosthenes' views on the importance of bribery and disputed Demosthenes' charges that his opponents were traitors.

² G. L. Cawkwell, *CQ* 13 (1963) 204-05. G. Ramming, *Die politischen Ziele und Wege des Aeschines* (Diss. Erlangen 1965), who maintains that accusations of corruption against Aeschines were pure invention. Aeschines' political views and actions, according to Ramming, were not influenced or motivated by bribe-taking, and Aeschines is certainly not to be accused of treason to Athenian interests.

³ P. J. Rhodes, *The Athenian Boule* (Oxford 1972) 112. W. G. Forrest, *YCS* 24 (1975) 51-52; D. J. Mosley, *Envoys and Diplomacy in Ancient Greece* (*Historia Einzelschr.* 22, 1973) 39. See also F. Adcock/D. J. Mosley, *Diplomacy in Ancient Greece* (London 1975) 67, who compare Greek politicians with English politicians of the seventeenth century who "did not scruple to accept French money while they did what they thought best for their party or their country." Cf. J. A. Goldstein, *The Letters of Demosthenes* (New York 1968) 84.

I submit that the Greek attitude to bribery was different from ours; that accusations of bribery were directed against envoys to non-Greek states only, first and foremost against ambassadors to Persia and Macedon; that these accusations were possible because, on one hand, there was a prevailing custom of extending gifts of hospitality to envoys and, on the other, the tasks of ambassadors were conceived in such a broad and undefined way as to make such accusations possible. Thus the accusations of bribe-taking were not necessarily based on provable facts, but bribe-taking was considered to be possible on the basis of prevailing customs. The Greek attitude to bribery and the methods of direct diplomacy not based on permanent diplomatic representatives, which enhanced the responsibility of the politicians who served as envoys, made possible the charges of bribery against ambassadors as part of the warfare among political opponents.

I

The Greek views on bribery as evidenced by Athenian sources were different from ours. Though it is pointed out that bribery is a malpractice,⁴ the prevailing attitude was that accepting bribes is a crime only when it is connected with activity detrimental to the state.⁵ Even the wording and the interpretation of the νόμος εἰσαγγελτικός⁶ indicate that it is bribe-taking resulting in treason or activities harmful to the state which should be punished. Accusations of bribery are, therefore, always connected with accusations of treachery, thus turning into political trials in which the accusation of bribery serves to bring forward conflicting political views and to decide political conflicts between opposing political parties.⁷

II

As is well known, the pay of Athenian ambassadors was not high considering the expenses which some of them incurred during pro-

⁴ Dem. 19.7; cf. 273–75.

⁵ Hyper. C. Dem. 25; Demades, ὑπὲρ τῆς Δωδεκαετίας 21; Dem. 19.293–95; Ep. 2.1; cf. Dem. 19.277–79, 21.113; Lys. 21.22; IG II² 223,5–6; Arist. Pol. 1309a13–20. On the connection between εἰσαγγελία and παραπρεσβείας γραφή, see Thalheim, RE 5 (1905) 2139–40.

⁶ Hyper. Pro Eux. 7–8; cf. 28–30. On γραφή δώρων see J. H. Lipsius, *Das attische Recht und Rechtsverfahren* II.1 (Leipzig 1905) 401–04.

⁷ Cf. D. J. Mosley, *Ancient Society* 3 (1972) 13.

longed embassies.⁸ On the other hand, election as member of an embassy and participation in embassies were part of a politician's career and an indication of his importance and influence in the *polis*.⁹ There was, then, no direct economic incentive to serve as an ambassador, and there was always the risk of prosecution after the embassy. This risk was enhanced by terms of reference under which the embassy was sent out, by the expectations of the ambassadors' performance, and by their public responsibility for their behaviour and achievements as ambassadors.¹⁰

But, in spite of these difficulties and dangers, there was no lack of candidates wishing to serve as ambassadors. What is perhaps even more surprising is that the accusations against ambassadors for bribery were not very frequent, and the number of those known to us who had been accused and convicted specifically for their conduct as ambassadors is not very great.¹¹ If this is true, one of the reasons for it is that accusations of bribery are restricted almost entirely to embassies to the court of the Persian king and later in the fourth century to the court of the king of Macedon. The reception of ambassadors in Greek cities which were not under monarchical or tyrannical rule was open to scrutiny, and there were no opportunities for bribery such as existed at the courts of the Persian and Macedonian kings. This can be seen from the story told by Aeschines (3.103–05, *cf.* 86–93) about a bribe received by Demosthenes from Oreos; though Demosthenes accepted at the same time bribes from Callias of Chalcis and Cleitarchus of Eretria, it was because of the

⁸ W. L. Westermann, "Notes upon the Ephodia of Greek Ambassadors," *CP* 5 (1910) 203–16. Adcock/Mosley, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.3) 155–56; D. Kienast, *s.v. Presbeia*, *RE* 13 (1973) 578–79.

⁹ Mosley, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.3) 39; Kienast, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.8) 528–31; Adcock/Mosley, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.3) 157–58; D. J. Mosley, *CR* 22 (1972) 167–69, and *op.cit.* (*supra* n.7) 12.

¹⁰ On the duties of ambassadors and their responsibility see Dem. 19.3–8; *cf.* 27–28, 82, 161, 182–86, 277–79; 1.2, 24. Athenians often defined the terms of reference of an embassy vaguely, so that the envoys could easily be charged in case of failure, see Aeschin. 2.104–05; ambassadors were often charged with responsibility for actions over which they had no control, Aeschin. 2.80; they also might become victims of the inconstancy of the Athenian people, Andoc. 3.35. It seems, therefore, that there was sometimes a difference between the reception of envoys in the Council and in the Assembly, Dem. 19.18–19. Moreover, ambassadors were often exposed to prolonged detainment abroad and even to physical danger, especially during war-time, but also in time of peace. See Thuc. 2.67; Xen. *Hell.* 1.3.13, 4.15; Tod no.96.35; *Hell.Oxy.* 2.1–2; and Strabo 17.1.19 (C 802). See also Kienast, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.8) 544, 563–66.

¹¹ Mosley, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.3) 41.

money which had to be paid by the people of Oreos that the whole story was admittedly revealed. Though this case is not connected with an embassy, it seems that the same principle was applicable to cases of bribing ambassadors. Free Greek *poleis* did not bribe ambassadors who came from other Greek states. It may be interesting that when the treaty with Thebes is brought forward against Demosthenes, it is stated that as ambassador he had concluded the treaty because he was bribed by Persia.¹²

III

Since the bribing of ambassadors is connected almost exclusively with embassies to Persia and Macedon, the foundations or the allegations on which the accusations of accepting bribes from the kings are made ought to be carefully examined.

It seems that it was not only the custom of the Greek cities but also of the kings of Persia and Macedon to invite ambassadors to their courts to special dinners or banquets;¹³ but, whereas in a Greek *polis* the invitation to dinner was formally the only honour extended by the state, in the case of royal banquets it was an occasion on which the envoys received royal gifts and even made requests of the king.¹⁴ Thus, in his account of the embassy of Pelopidas to the Persian court, Plutarch tells us that Antalcidas was the most honoured of the Greek ambassadors to the Persian court because he was given by the king a wreath dipped in myrrh, whereas to Pelopidas the king granted the greatest and most splendid of the customary gifts.¹⁵

A similar custom of bestowing gifts on ambassadors during a

¹² Aeschin. 3.238–40; cf. 259; [Plut.] *X orat.* 847F, 848E. Though Aeschines in the speech *Against Ctesiphon* often accuses Demosthenes of receiving bribes (3.58, 60, 66, 69–70, 82, 85, 86–93, 103–05, 143, 156, 173; cf. 209, 81), the only accusation which may be referred to his taking bribes as envoy is 3.113–14, when he accuses Demosthenes of accepting bribes from Amphissians as *πυλαγόρας* in order to further their interests in Athens. Thus he shows that Demosthenes' unlucky hand brings misfortune on everyone whether he be *ιδιώτης*, *δυνάστης* or *πόλις δημοκρατουμένη*. The gravest charge against Demosthenes is that he had declared that he would serve as ambassador wherever he wished, whether the Athenians agreed or not (3.145–46), an offence which on Demosthenes' own testimony is punishable by death (Dem. 19.126).

¹³ Kienast, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.8) 567.

¹⁴ E.g., the story of the favours requested by the Athenian actor Satyrus at a banquet at the court of Philip, Dem. 19.192–95.

¹⁵ Plut. *Pelop.* 30.4–5. What follows in the account of Plutarch, *ταύτας ἔχων τὰς ἀποκρίσεις, τῶν δὲ δώρων οὐδὲν ὅ τι μὴ χάριτος ἦν σύμβολον καὶ φιλοφροσύνης δεξάμενος, ἀνέλευσεν*, implies that there might have also been cases when improper gifts were given and accepted.

banquet was also part of the diplomatic procedure at the Macedonian court. Philip, according to Demosthenes' report,¹⁶ attempted at a banquet to offer the Theban ambassadors gifts which included captives and precious goblets. Demosthenes recounts the behaviour of the Theban ambassadors and stresses their rejection both of the direct attempts at bribery on the part of Philip and their refusal to accept the gifts offered during the banquet. The bestowal of gifts by the king was often an expression of his esteem for the ambassadors and of his attitude to their mission. That these gifts were νομιζόμενα δῶρα can also be seen from further evidence.

It was part of the diplomatic procedure in Athens to honour ambassadors and invite them to the *prytaneion*. Similarly, it is related that the ambassadors from Athens were invited by Philip ἐπὶ ξένια.¹⁷ Moreover, in Macedon the ambassadors from Athens are sent a gift by the king which is called ξένια; Demosthenes suggested that the money thus offered should be used to obtain the release of prisoners of war held by the Macedonians. It seems that this collective gift of ξένια may have been interpreted as a deception in order to enable some of the members of the embassy to receive bribes without incurring the danger of being discovered.¹⁸ If the proposal of Aeschines as related by Demosthenes was at all possible (and Demosthenes must have counted on its acceptance by the Athenian public), there is in the story additional evidence that conferring of gifts was part of the diplomatic protocol when envoys were received at the court of the king of Macedon.¹⁹

¹⁶ Dem. 19.139. According to Theopompus (*FGrHist* 115 F 162 = Athen. 6.260B-C), Philip won most of the Thessalians by giving special parties for them, rather than by gifts; these *convocia* were specially arranged to suit the licentious and wanton customs of the Thessalians.

¹⁷ Aeschin. 2.39; cf. 162. Cf. the νόμιμον ἔθος (Dem. 19.234) by which Demosthenes describes his vote of thanks and invitation to the *prytaneion* which he extended to the Athenian ambassadors returned to Athens. He also (19.235; cf. 18.27–28) defends his entertainment of the Macedonian ambassadors as something naturally understandable. On the other hand, no reception is extended to Hegesippus and his fellow ambassadors, and Demosthenes (19.331) reports that Philip banished Xenocleides for offering hospitality to Hegesippus and his colleagues.

¹⁸ Dem. 19.166–67. The wealth which, according to Demosthenes, Aeschines and his collaborators acquired and attributed to their activity as ambassadors is actually linked to their political activity in Athens in connection with the ratification of the peace of Philocrates, Dem. 19.144–46.

¹⁹ Plut. *Dem.* 16.1–2 distinguishes between the attention Philip paid to Demosthenes' political views and the ἄλλαι τιμαὶ καὶ φιλοφροσύναι which the king conferred upon Aeschines and Philocrates. For the conferring of ξένια see Kienast, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.8) 568–69.

There is also additional proof that the conferring of gifts on ambassadors was part of the diplomatic usage at the court of the Persian king. Together with the embassy of Pelopidas, embassies from other Greek states, among them Athens and the Arcadian League, were despatched to Persia. Xenophon, who recounts the negotiations and their results, also tells of the behaviour of Antiochos, the envoy of the Arcadian League: Antiochos refused the royal gifts because the Persian king preferred Elis to the Arcadian League.²⁰ The refusal to accept gifts is the expression of a basic difference of opinion between the Arcadian envoy and the Persian king. The Arcadian registers his dissatisfaction by refusing to participate in the customary proceedings.

There is, then, ample evidence that the offering of gifts to ambassadors was part of the reception of embassies at the courts of the kings of Persia and Macedon. The acceptance of these customary gifts was also a sign of proper diplomatic relations. The type of gift probably depended on the attitude of the king towards the ambassadors, their country and the negotiations being conducted at that time. Though there may have been general consensus that there was no harm in accepting customary gifts, this may have served as an excuse for accusations of accepting bribes by ambassadors. It is, therefore, of importance to examine cases in which such accusations were made.

IV

The best documented case of charges of taking bribes by an ambassador to the Persian court is that of Timagoras. Timagoras and Leon were sent to Persia in 367 during the embassy of Pelopidas. Athens of course was not the only Greek state to send ambassadors to Persia to safeguard its interests and to counteract the Theban influence. The negotiations ended in the acceptance of the Theban proposals by the King, and though a clause was added at the demand of Leon allowing presentation to the king of demands by Athens, it was a recognition of Theban hegemony in Greece.²¹ As we have already seen, Xenophon was well aware of the diplomatic proceedings

²⁰ Xen. *Hell.* 7.1.38. See D. J. Mosley, *GRBS* 11 (1970) 40–41. The refusal of the Theban ambassadors to accept gifts at the court of Philip (Dem. 19.139–41) may have been an expression of similar sentiments, though it was not such a harsh rejection as that by Antiochos. D. E. Queller, *The Office of Ambassador in the Middle Ages* (Princeton 1967) 204–06, points out that it was difficult to distinguish between gifts bestowed on ambassadors *bona fide* and those which were an attempt to bribe them; he also lists Venetian legislation to prevent the acceptance of gifts by the ambassadors of the Republic.

²¹ Xen. *Hell.* 7.1.33–37. H. Bengtson, *Die Staatsverträge des Altertums* II (Munich/Berlin 1962) no.282.

at the Persian court when he reported Antiochos' refusal to accept royal gifts. Xenophon also gives an account of the charges preferred against Timagoras at Athens after the envoys returned home: Timagoras was accused by Leon and condemned to death because he refused to share quarters with his colleague and consulted on everything with Pelopidas. No mention is made by Xenophon of bribe-taking by Timagoras.²²

The first mention of bribe-taking by Timagoras is made by Demosthenes (19.136–37), though even he recounts it as a rumour. The example of Timagoras is brought forward again when Demosthenes mentions the refusal of the council to invite the members of the third embassy to Philip to the *prytaneion*²³ and again when he lists other instances of charges and convictions of ambassadors and other officials by their colleagues in office.²⁴ In Plutarch the story of bribe-taking by Timagoras becomes centrally prominent.²⁵ But though Plutarch gives a long list of valuable gifts which were bestowed on Timagoras by the king, he also adds a remark that bribe-taking was not the main cause of the wrath of the Athenians.²⁶

The case of Timagoras shows how an accusation of accepting bribes by an ambassador is added to serve as an additional example and argument in a trial *παραπρεβείας*. It seems that the charge of bribe-taking was not part of the original indictment against Timagoras. Moreover, it is very doubtful whether in this case specific bribe-taking during the embassy could be proved; but, because of the custom of bestowing gifts and because politicians often profited economically, it was not difficult to add an accusation of bribe-taking to purely political charges. In many cases the charges of bribe-taking were late and served only as an additional accusation to strengthen the arguments of the political opponent.

²² Xen. *Hell.* 7.1.38. See Mosley, *loc.cit.* (*supra* n.20).

²³ Dem. 19.31; see also Ramming, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.2) 85.

²⁴ Dem. 19.191. It should be noted that Demosthenes alludes only in a very general way to charges which appear in the account of Xenophon. He, of course, adds *δωροδοκία* to the account. As is well known, Aeschines tells the story that his colleagues refused to room or dine with Demosthenes during the second embassy in 346; Aeschin. 2.97, and see also Kienast, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.8) 541. Demosthenes' statement in the above passage that Leon and Timagoras had been together envoys for four years is a rhetorical exaggeration and has no basis in historical tradition. See D. J. Mosley, "Leon and Timagoras: Co-envoys for four years," *GRBS* 9 (1968) 157–60.

²⁵ Plut. *Artax.* 22; *Pelop.* 30.6.

²⁶ Plut. *Pelop.* 30.6, ἀλλ' ἔοικεν οὐχ ἢ δωροδοκία μάλιστα παροξύνει τοὺς Ἀθηναίους, and see also Athen. 6. 251B: καὶ Τιμαγόραν δ' ἀπέκτειναν ὅτι πρεσβέων ὡς βασιλέα προσεκύνησεν αὐτόν.

The Peace of Callias and the behaviour of the leading Athenian ambassador are a more difficult problem because of doubts as to the authenticity of the Peace and because the evidence for it comes from the fourth century. But whereas the sources for the terms of the Peace as presented by the orators can be traced (the existence of a stele, the allusion in Thucydides), there is no source and no confirming evidence for Demosthenes' allegation that Callias was fined fifty talents at the *εὔθυνα* because he received bribes from the Persian king.²⁷ The attempt of Demosthenes to dissociate the political achievements of the embassy from the charges of bribe-taking and to create the impression that Callias was convicted of bribe-taking, though the embassy was successful, is, to say the least, suspicious. Demosthenes' account is most general, and the fine only is mentioned.²⁸ The argument in which Demosthenes is interested is that bribe-taking is a crime in itself, even if not connected with political controversy. This is the reason why the example of Callias is chosen: the embassy to Persia made it conceivable that the ambassador was bribed.

Chronologically the first case in the fourth century of allegations of bribe-taking is that of Epicrates, one of the leaders of the restored democracy and, together with Phormisios, envoy to Persia shortly after the battle of Cnidus.²⁹ Though accusations of bribe-taking from the Persian king by Epicrates were apparently quite frequent in Athens and he was one of the standard examples,³⁰ it seems that he had never been tried on this charge.³¹ The treatment of the case of Epicrates is most interesting.³² Demosthenes brings forth the example

²⁷ Dem. 19.273–75, and see J. K. Davies, *Athenian Propertied Families 600–300 B.C.* (Oxford 1971) 261. The attempts to explain the Demosthenic passage as relating to an earlier or a later embassy (Mosley, *op.cit.* [*supra* n.3] 41 and 42 n.37, and K. Kraft, *Hermes* 92 [1964] 167–69) are not based on any real evidence.

²⁸ The fine of fifty talents was not usual and would certainly have been well known. Though the peace itself is referred to also by others, the fine is never mentioned.

²⁹ Davies, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.27) 181, no. 4859.

³⁰ Plato Comicus, frgg. 119–127 (Edmonds); and K. J. Dover, *CR* 64 (1950) 5–7; Plut. *Pelop.* 30.7; Athen. 6.251A–B. For a detailed examination of the problems connected with the activities of Epicrates as ambassador, see I. A. F. Bruce, "Athenian Embassies in the Early Fourth Century B.C.," *Historia* 15 (1966) 272–81.

³¹ The anecdote in Athenaeus is interesting as far as charges of bribe-taking are concerned. Epicrates is compared with Demades and Timagoras; Demades and Timagoras were condemned for what seems to have been very clear and unequivocal expressions of their pro-Macedonian or pro-Persian attitudes. Though Epicrates' views are described as not less pro-Persian, the difference is that they were politically acceptable at that time.

³² Dem. 19.277, 280; cf. Bruce, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.30) 274–75.

of Epicrates as the prominent man who marched from the Peiraeus and restored the democracy but was condemned to death because he exploited his office for profit and was virtuous only by halves. Demosthenes does not give any details and does not mention the occasion on which Epicrates was condemned, and the connection with an embassy is only implied.³³ The condemnation of Epicrates was connected with the embassy to Sparta in 392/1 in which Andocides also took part; it was, perhaps, only remotely connected with any previous pro-Persian policy advocated by Epicrates. It was not the bribe-taking when Epicrates was ambassador to Persia but the ambassadors' actions at Sparta which were regarded as contrary to the interests of Athens and could be brought to court to decide this political issue. But on the basis of popular knowledge about the gifts which Epicrates received in Persia and the rumours of his having enriched himself in politics,³⁴ Demosthenes, in order to strengthen his own argument, creates the impression that bribe-taking by Epicrates as ambassador was the cardinal crime, the source of his actions and the reason for his conviction.³⁵

V

The number of cases in which charges were made against ambassadors because of bribe-taking is quite small. This clearly confirms the view that bribing ambassadors was not a very widespread custom. Moreover, charges of bribe-taking by ambassadors were restricted to embassies to Persia and Macedon. In these cases the

³³ In Demosthenes' account, 19.277–79, the offences relating to the *παρὰπρεβεία* of Epicrates are listed: (1) the ambassadors disobeyed their instructions; (2) they made false reports to the Council and Assembly; (3) they bore false witness against allies; only then, at last, the offence of (4) taking bribes. Clearly, Demosthenes knew that the condemnation of Epicrates was, at best, only very remotely connected with the accusations of bribe-taking.

³⁴ See Lys. Or. 27, which in spite of its title (*κατὰ Ἐπικράτους καὶ τῶν συμπρεβούντων, ἐπίλογος ὡς Θεόδωρος*), does not contain any reference to an embassy. See Bruce, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.30) 275; he rightly points out that Theodoros probably concluded, on the basis of Demosthenes, that the accusation of bribe-taking was connected with an embassy. That the trial for which the speech was written was not connected with an embassy, see *FGrHist* IIIb, II p.417 n.28.

³⁵ F. Jacoby, *FGrHist* IIb, I p.519, in his commentary on 328 (Philochoros) F 149 says, "Also the question about the embassies of Epikrates is solved; we are informed of two: Demosthenes, when talking of the condemnation, has in mind the embassy to Sparta in winter 392/1 B.C.; all the remaining information refers to an embassy to the court of the Persian king together with Phormisios." But this is too facile; Demosthenes did include the accusation of bribe-taking, which is in no way connected with the embassy to Sparta in winter 392/1 B.C.

prevailing custom of bestowing gifts as a sign of hospitality and an expression of political and diplomatic relations with the Greek states made it possible to cast suspicion of bribery. Thus, the charges of *παραπρεβεία* against Aeschines were an occasion on which cases of alleged bribing of ambassadors were exaggerated or even invented by Demosthenes in order to strengthen his argumentative examples. The case of Callias seems to be such an invention.³⁶ Moreover, Demosthenes brought forward the example of Epicrates, though his condemnation was not directly connected with his embassy to the Persian court. Even the example of Timagoras is presented in such a way as to create the impression that bribery and not differences of political views is the main issue. It was Demosthenes, then, who made bribing ambassadors more prominent than it really was and thus created the impression that it was all pervading.³⁷

Demosthenes wanted to overcome the common view and prove that bribe-taking is a crime and should be absolutely condemned, even if it is not directly injurious to the state.³⁸ In his view (19.268) bribe-taking is the forerunner of treason, and a man taking bribes is a traitor. Aeschines' change of mind from his pro-Macedonian to his anti-Macedonian policy is described as the direct result of his having sold himself.³⁹

³⁶ Callias is the only ambassador in the fifth century who is said to have accepted bribes as ambassador. In the case of Arynias, who was sent as ambassador to Pharsalus in 423, no details about charge or accusation of bribe-taking are known (see Mosley, *op.cit.* [*supra* n.3] 40, and D. M. MacDowell, *Aristophanes Wasps* [Oxford 1971] 296–97). Neither do we know why Philo of Coele was accused of *παραπρεβεία* (see Mosley, *loc.cit.*, and Isocr. 18.22). Androtion, Melanopos and Glaucetes, who were sent as ambassadors to Caria in 355/4, were not accused of bribe-taking but were charged because they captured a ship and did not turn the proceeds in to the state treasury after it was declared a prize by Athenian courts (see Dem. 24.127). It may be interesting to note that no accusation is preferred by Demosthenes against Aphobetos, the brother of Aeschines, who served as envoy to the Persian king (Aeschin. 2.149), see Dem. 19.237.

³⁷ In the list which Kienast, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.8) 577–78, brings under *παραπρεβεία* the only clear instance of accusation because of bribe-taking is that against Callias. See also E. Berneker, *παραπρεβείας γραφή*, *RE* 18 (1949) 1374–75. The other two examples adduced by Berneker for accusation of *παραπρεβεία* because of bribery are, of course, Timagoras and Epicrates.

³⁸ Dem. 19.7; the examples of Callias (Dem. 19.273–75) and Epicrates (Dem. 19.277) serve to prove that bribery is an absolute wrong.

³⁹ Dem. 19.9, 12–13; *cf.* 106–10, 118–19. Demosthenes (19.50–52; *cf.* Aeschin. 3.66) maintains that Aeschines' claim to *φιλία καὶ ξενία* with Philip and Alexander has no basis in reality; the gifts which Aeschines received are simply a payment for his support of Macedon.

Demosthenes was interested to show that bribe-taking is the cardinal sin which an ambassador can commit and that once the ambassador committed this crime he was to be convicted, because his actions automatically become detrimental to the state. He therefore stressed bribe-taking even in cases in which no charges were made and there was no conviction, and in cases in which acceptance of gifts was not the main or only cause for a change of political views. Demosthenes thus contributed to the impression that bribe-taking was very wide-spread among ambassadors. It was not as wide-spread as is generally assumed. Moreover, in general it was not of decisive influence on the ambassador's political views. Accusations of bribe-taking against ambassadors were fabricated in order to strengthen arguments in a controversy on foreign policy.

TEL-AVIV UNIVERSITY
April, 1976