



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

This thesis has been submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for a postgraduate degree (e.g. PhD, MPhil, DClinPsychol) at the University of Edinburgh. Please note the following terms and conditions of use:

This work is protected by copyright and other intellectual property rights, which are retained by the thesis author, unless otherwise stated.

A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge.

This thesis cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the author.

The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the author.

When referring to this work, full bibliographic details including the author, title, awarding institution and date of the thesis must be given.

Reading ideology through myth:
Institutions, the orators and the past in democratic Athens

Matteo Barbato

PhD

The University of Edinburgh

2017

Signed declaration

I declare that this thesis has been composed solely by myself and that it has not been submitted, in whole or in part, in any previous application for a degree. Except where stated otherwise by reference or acknowledgment, the work presented is entirely my own.

Signed:



Matteo Barbato
Vasto, 31/07/2017

Acknowledgments

This research project started as a study of the use and manipulation of myth in Athenian funeral speeches. It was the natural continuation of my MA thesis, which I wrote at the University of Bologna under the supervision of Prof. Simonetta Nannini. I am grateful to her for encouraging me to start a PhD and helping me to produce my first research proposal for this project.

My biggest thanks go to my primary supervisor, Dr Mirko Canevaro, whose guidance has been most precious since the beginning of my application process. I am grateful to him for helping me through my transition from the Italian to the British academic system, supporting me in all my endeavours and encouraging me to explore new and fruitful themes and methodologies. Without him, this thesis would not look the same as it does now.

I am equally grateful to my secondary supervisor, Prof Douglas Cairns, whose insightful comments and thoughtful guidance have been fundamental to refining my methodology, strengthening my argument and exploring my sources from different perspectives, and to Prof Edward Harris, who has kindly offered me his advice on this and related projects and shared with me several forthcoming essays.

In my four years at the University of Edinburgh, I had the opportunity to meet many outstanding scholars. Among them, I thank Prof Judith Barringer, Dr Benjamin Gray, Dr John Holton, Prof David Konstan and Prof Josiah Ober, who all generously offered me feedback, advice or bibliographical suggestions. I am similarly grateful to all my friends and colleagues who contributed to this project with feedback, proofreading or bibliographical advice: Sebastiano Bertolini, Sarah Cassidy, Raphaëla Dubreuil, Alberto Esu, Alison John, Alana Newman, Jessica Robinson, Gianna Stergiou, Belinda Washington, Matteo Zaccarini and Sara Zanovello. Any remaining mistakes are of course my own.

Last but not least, I am grateful to my friends and family for supporting me through the joys and hardships of the PhD experience. To them I dedicate this thesis.

Abstract

My thesis investigates the construction of democratic ideology in classical Athens. Ideology has often provided an alternative tool to formal institutions for the study of Athenian political life. An approach that reconciles institutions and ideology can provide us with a fuller understanding of Athenian democracy. Rather than as a fixed set of ideas, values and beliefs shared by the majority of the Athenians, I argue that Athenian democratic ideology should be seen as the product of a constant process of ideological practice which took place within and was influenced by the institutions of the democracy. My thesis focuses in particular on the construction of shared ideas and beliefs about Athens' mythical past. Ch. 1 lays down the methodology of my work, which is inspired by the trend in the political sciences known as New Institutionalism. Ch. 2 explores the relationship between myth and Athenian democratic institutions. I show that the Athenians interacted with myth at all levels of their public and private lives, and were thus able to appreciate mythical variants and their potential ideological value. I also show that Athenian democratic institutions were characterised by specific discursive parameters which conditioned the behaviour of Athenian political actors. A comparison between mythical narratives produced for public and private contexts shows that the discursive parameters of Athenian democratic institutions influenced the construction of shared ideas about the mythical past in Athenian public discourse. As proven in Ch. 3-5, the Athenians emphasised different values and mythical variants depending on the institutional settings of the democracy. Ch. 3 analyses the influence of institutions on the values of *charis* and *philanthrōpia* in the myth of the Athenian war in defence of the Heraclidae. Ch. 4 explores the use or absence of *hybris* in accounts of the Attic Amazonomachy produced for public and private contexts. Ch. 5 explores how the myth of autochthony was conceptualised in terms of exclusiveness or collective *eugeneia* in different Athenian institutions. My research therefore provides a dynamic and multifaceted picture of Athenian democratic ideology, and shows that the Athenian democratic institutions enabled the Athenians to produce multiple and compatible ideas about their mythical past.

Contents

<i>Signed declaration</i>	2
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	3
<i>Abstract</i>	4
<i>Contents</i>	5
<i>List of tables</i>	7
<i>Abbreviations</i>	8
1. Introduction	9
1.1. Ideology: a brief history	10
1.2. Ideology and classical Athens: beyond <i>Mass and Elite</i>	11
1.3. Toward an institutionalist approach to Athenian ideological practice	15
1.4. Myth, memory and institutions in classical Athens	21
1.5. Outline of the work	25
2. Myth and Athenian democratic institutions	28
2.1. Myth and the polis: a survey	29
2.1.1. The dramatic festivals and the Panathenaea	29
2.1.2. The institutional settings of Athenian oratory	44
2.1.3. Myth in private contexts	54
2.1.4. Myth and variants in classical Athens	57
2.2. The discursive parameters of Athenian democratic institutions	60
2.2.1. The state funeral for the war dead	61
2.2.2. The lawcourts	67
2.2.3. The Assembly and the Council	69
2.2.4. The dramatic festivals	75
2.3. Discursive parameters and myth: the case of Adrastus	77
2.4. Conclusions	83
3. Between <i>charis</i> and <i>philanthrōpia</i> : the Heraclidae	86
3.1. Athens' help for the Heraclidae: <i>charis</i> or <i>philanthrōpia</i> ?	88
3.2. Between <i>charis</i> and <i>philanthrōpia</i>	91

3.3. Euripidean tragedy and reciprocity	97
3.4. Lysias: the Heraclidae and Athenian <i>philanthrōpia</i>	104
3.5. <i>Charis</i> and the Heraclidae in Isocrates' private rhetoric	111
3.6. Conclusions	113
4. Fading shades of <i>hybris</i> : the Attic Amazonomachy	115
4.1. <i>Hybris</i> and the causes of the Attic Amazonomachy	118
4.2. <i>Hybris</i> : an introduction	120
4.3. Lysias: the state funeral and the discourse of <i>hybris</i>	123
4.4. Amazons at the dramatic festivals: Aeschylus' <i>Eumenides</i>	132
4.5. An allusion to the abduction in a private setting?	135
4.6. The abduction of Antiope in the figurative arts	137
4.7. The abduction of Antiope in mythographers and Attidogrpahers	139
4.8. The abduction of Antiope in Isocrates' private rhetoric	143
4.9. Conclusions	146
5. Exclusiveness and <i>eugeneia</i> in the myth of autochthony	150
5.1. Autochthony and <i>eugeneia</i>	154
5.2. <i>Eugeneia</i> : from Homeric society to democratic Athens	157
5.3. Autochthony as collective <i>eugeneia</i> at the state funeral	163
5.4. Deconstructing autochthony on the tragic stage	170
5.5. Autochthony as extreme exclusiveness in Apollodorus' <i>Against Neaera</i>	174
5.6. Conclusions	178
6. Conclusions	181
<i>Bibliography</i>	188

List of Tables

Table 1: Myths in tragedy and satyr drama	34
Table 2: Myths in the extant funeral speeches	48
Table 3: Myths in the extant forensic speeches	50

Abbreviations

Ancient authors and works are abbreviated according to the fourth edition of the *Oxford Classical Dictionary*. Journal abbreviations follow those of *L'Année philologique*. When referencing the fragments of Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides, I have used the numbering of the relevant edition of *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*. All other abbreviations are listed below:

<i>BNJ</i>	I. Worthington, ed., <i>Brill's New Jacoby</i> (Leiden 2006-).
<i>DK</i>	H. Diels and W. Kranz, eds, <i>Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker</i> (Berlin 1951-52).
<i>FGrHist</i>	F. Jacoby, ed., <i>Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker</i> (Berlin and Leiden 1923-58).
<i>IG</i>	<i>Inscriptiones Graecae</i> (Berlin 1872-).
<i>LIMC</i>	<i>Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae</i> (Zürich 1981-2009).
<i>LSJ</i>	H. G. Liddell and R. Scott, <i>A Greek–English Lexicon</i> , revised and augmented by H. S. Jones (Oxford 1940 ⁹).
<i>Maehler</i>	H. Maehler, ed., <i>Pindari Carmina cum Fragmentis. Pars II: Fragmenta. Indices</i> (Leipzig 1989).
<i>OED</i>	J.A. Simpson and E.S.C. Weiner, <i>Oxford English Dictionary</i> (Oxford 1989 ²)
<i>PMG</i>	D. L. Page, ed., <i>Poetae Melici Graeci</i> (Oxford 1962)
<i>RO</i>	P. J. Rhodes and R. G. Osborne, eds, <i>Greek Historical Inscriptions 403-323 BC</i> (Oxford 2003).
<i>Smyth, GGC</i>	H. W. Smyth, <i>A Greek Grammar for Colleges</i> (New York 1920).
<i>Suda</i>	A. Adler, ed., <i>Suidae lexicon</i> (Leipzig, 1928-35)
<i>TrGF</i>	<i>Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta</i> (Göttingen 1971-2004).
<i>Voigt</i>	E.-M. Voigt, ed., <i>Sappho et Alcaeus: Fragmenta</i> (Amsterdam 1971).
<i>West</i>	M. L. West, ed., <i>Iambi et Elegi Graeci ante Alexandrum Cantati</i> (Oxford 1989-1992 ²).

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Ideology, especially after the publication of Josiah Ober's seminal book *Mass and Elite in Democratic Athens* in 1989, has become a keyword in scholarship on Athenian democracy. Ideology has often provided an alternative tool to formal institutions for the investigation of Athenian political activity.¹ Some recent trends in the political sciences, on the other hand, have successfully challenged extra-institutionalist approaches and brought the formal institutions of the state back to centre stage. The main contention of this thesis is that institutions are still a valuable tool for ancient historians, and that an approach that reconciles a focus on institutions with an interest in ideology can offer a fruitful and yet unexplored perspective for the study of Athenian democracy. In doing so, I have the additional aim of bridging the gap between ancient history and modern political sciences (and specifically the line of thought known as 'New Institutionalism'). The mythical narratives produced by orators and other political actors of Athenian democracy are the subject matter of this study. I compare a selected set of mythical variants (the Athenian help for the Heraclidae, the Attic Amazonomachy and the myth of autochthony) and analyse them within the institutional settings that produced them in order to determine what were the discursive parameters which conditioned political actors in different institutions of the Athenian democracy.

This project raises several theoretical and methodological questions, whose nature spans from the definition of ideology itself to the study of social memory and institutionalist theory. The present chapter deals with these issues, and aims to build the theoretical framework sustaining my research. In Section 1.1, I provide a brief history of the notion of ideology from its origins during the Enlightenment to its later developments in Marxism and anthropology. Section 1.2 summarises the main products of classical scholarship on ideology in ancient Greece. I focus in particular on Ober's *Mass and Elite*, whose conclusions I try to challenge and advance. In Section 1.3, I introduce the main tenets of the New Institutionalism in the political sciences and illustrate their impact upon my approach to the ancient sources. Contextually, I state the connections between my research and studies of Athenian social memory, and clarify how I intend to explore the Athenians' shared memories of their past from

¹ For a good overview of the scholarly debate between institutionalist and non-institutionalist approaches to the study of Athenian democracy, see Azoulay and Ismard (2007).

an institutionalist perspective. In Section 1.4, I defend my choice of subject matter and expose the advantages offered by the memory of Athens' mythical (as opposed to historical) past to the student of the ideological practice of Athenian democracy. Finally, Section 1.5 provides a general outline of the thesis and illustrates the structure of my case studies.

1.1. IDEOLOGY: A BRIEF HISTORY

The term ideology was coined in the eighteenth century by Enlightenment philosopher Antoine Destutt de Tracy. Ideology originally held the meaning of 'science of ideas', and was set in opposition to religion and the system of thought which sustained the *ancien régime*.² The concept of ideology has since been the object of constant debate and analysis. Taken up by Marx and Engels during the nineteenth century, the term went through a considerable shift in meaning and lost its original positive sense. In his reflection on ideology, Marx oscillated between an epistemological and a political interpretation of the notion. The epistemological interpretation is expressed in *The German Ideology*, where Marx and Engels elaborated the theory of ideology as false consciousness.³ Against German Idealism, which they considered guilty of privileging consciousness and ideas over what they perceived as real life, Marx and Engels promoted a materialistic approach. They advocated a shift of focus from ideas to the actual life-processes that produce them, and reacted against the illusion created by ideology, which they described as operating an inversion in the causal relationship between the real world and consciousness.⁴ *The German Ideology*, however, also contains the kernel of a political interpretation which Marx will further elaborate in his subsequent writings and which views ideology as the ideas of the ruling class, and therefore the ruling ideas of a given historical period. These ideas are the direct expression and legitimisation of the material relations of production within society and are not necessarily judged as true or false.⁵

In response to the evaluative, and mostly pejorative, interpretation of ideology endorsed by Marxism, a more neutral approach has been advanced by a tradition that is

² Eagleton (1991), 63-70; F. Jameson (2009), 323.

³ The interpretation of ideology as false consciousness is commonly held as the standard Marxist theory of ideology; however, as Chiapello (2003), 156 rightly points out, this interpretation is not shared by all Marxist thinkers.

⁴ Marx and Engels (1938) [1932], 13-16; Eagleton (1991), 70-9; F. Jameson (2009), 323-4.

⁵ Marx and Engels (1938) [1932], 39; Eagleton (1991), 79-80; F. Jameson (2009), 325-8. A significant development of the Marxist theory of ideology was offered by Althusser (1984) [1971], 1-60 in his essay 'Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses'. Althusser defined ideology as a representation of the 'imaginary relationship of individuals to their real conditions of existence' and envisioned it as an instrument for the reproduction of the relations of production. The latter is achieved through the Ideological State Apparatuses (ISAs), a set of institutions (cultural, religious, educational, etc.) that form the individual according to the ruling ideology and ensure the continuation of the domination of the ruling class over the subordinated classes.

sometimes referred to as “culturalist”.⁶ The culturalist tradition stems from Mannheim’s attempt to develop a non-evaluative concept of ideology in his book *Ideology and Utopia*. Building on Mannheim’s paradox that, since all thought is socially mediated, all thought about ideology must itself be ideological,⁷ anthropologist Clifford Geertz relied on semiotics to investigate the realm of ideology. Since all human thought, not unlike ideological thought, is symbolically mediated, ideology should be considered no more false or distortive than cognitive processes themselves.⁸ Geertz therefore emphasised the integrative aspect of ideology, whose function he compared to a map which orients people’s actions and makes ‘an autonomous politics possible by providing the authoritative concepts that render it meaningful’.⁹ In this line of thought, ideology neutrally denotes ‘the general material process of production of ideas, beliefs and values in social life’, and tends to be assimilated to the broader anthropological concept of culture.¹⁰

1.2. IDEOLOGY AND CLASSICAL ATHENS: BEYOND *MASS AND ELITE*

Both the Marxist and the culturalist interpretations of ideology have been taken up by ancient historians. The Marxist theory of ideology, for example, has been applied to ancient Greece by G. E. M. de Ste. Croix in his classic monograph *The Class Struggle in the Ancient Greek World: From the Archaic Age to the Arab Conquests*. In his chapter entitled ‘The Class Struggle on the Ideological Plane’, de Ste. Croix envisioned ideological class struggle as the attempt of the dominant classes (i.e. the propertied classes) to persuade, through forms of propaganda or brainwashing, the exploited classes (i.e. slaves and other providers of unfree labour) to accept their own condition of exploitation.¹¹ De Ste. Croix’s aim, however, was to recognise the exploitation of unfree labour as the source of the economic surplus enjoyed by the propertied class. Such an approach imposed a significant limit on his analysis of ideology, which as a result mainly focused on slavery and class struggle. De Ste. Croix’s discussion was based on the writings of Plato, Xenophon and other aristocratic authors and did not consider public discourse, which in classical Athens was an extremely significant site of ideological practice. De Ste. Croix similarly neglected the important role of several intermediate

⁶ The “culturalist” label is employed in Chiapello (2003), 157-9 and Meyer, Sahlin, Ventresca and Walgenbach (2009), 4-5.

⁷ Mannheim (1936) [1929], 88-90; Ricoeur (1986), 159-80.

⁸ Geertz (1973), 208-18; Ricoeur (1986), 254-66.

⁹ Geertz (1973), esp. 218-19.

¹⁰ Eagleton (1991), 28-9; Chiapello (2003), 157-9. On the concept of culture in anthropology, see Geertz (1973), 4-5; J. B. Thompson (1990), 127-35.

¹¹ Ste. Croix (1981), 409-16.

categories between slaves and propertied elite (peasants, traders, artisans, etc.) in the ideological dynamics of democratic Athens.¹²

Slavery remained an important factor in the discussion of ideology in ancient Greece also after de Ste. Croix. Finley, in particular, used the category of slave economy to come to the opposite conclusion that ‘in ancient Greece, with its open exploitation of slaves and foreign subjects, there would be little scope for ideology in the Marxist sense’.¹³ The ideological nature of public discourse, on the other hand, was a central tenet in Nicole Loraux’s analysis of the Athenian funeral oration for the war dead (*epitaphios logos*) in her influential book *L’invention d’Athènes: Histoire de l’oraison funèbre dans la cité classique*. Against the generic usage of the word ‘ideology’ with the meaning of ‘system of ideas’, Loraux endorsed the Marxist notion of ideology as the ideas of the dominant class. Arguing against Finley that such notion can indeed be applied to ancient Greece, Loraux concluded that the *epitaphios logos* was ideological in so far as it denied the internal divisions of the *polis* and concealed the Empire as a hegemony.¹⁴ Despite trying to tone down the nuance of illusion in her conception of ideology by resorting to the notion of *imaginaire*,¹⁵ Loraux did not emphasise the positive and even necessary character of the funeral oration in creating civic bonds and making up for private losses on behalf of the city.¹⁶ The *epitaphios logos* is ideological, but should more productively be read in the light of Benedict Anderson’s notion of “imagined community”, which was not yet available to Loraux. In his study *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, Anderson posited that any community whose members do not know the majority of their fellow-members is an imagined community. Such act of imagining is conceived of in positive terms as a necessary construction. Not only does it enable people to die for their country, but it also binds them together and constitutes the foundation of reciprocal obligations in relations that are no longer face-to-face.¹⁷ The notion of imagined community fits the case of classical Athens, which was not a face-to-face society to a full extent and relied on public discourse to build a community.¹⁸ The main function of the

¹² The limited scope of de Ste. Croix’s discussion of ideology for the classical period has been highlighted even by a Marxist classicist such as Rose (2006), 104, who points out how this analysis was overly dependent on Plato.

¹³ Finley (1985) [1973], 104.

¹⁴ Loraux (1981), 340-7.

¹⁵ Loraux (1981), 347-9.

¹⁶ According to Loraux (1981), esp. 206-7, the function of the *epitaphios logos* was to express the cohesion of the Athenian community; yet, according to the (loosely) Marxist framework of her study, Loraux interpreted this function mainly as a means to conceal the reality of civil strife.

¹⁷ B. Anderson (2006) [1983], 5-7. The applicability of the notion of imagined community to the case of classical Athens has been recently endorsed by G. Anderson (2003) and Shear (2011), 10-11.

¹⁸ The idea that Athens was a face-to-face society, originally endorsed by Finley (1985) [1973], 17-20, has been convincingly challenged by R. Osborne (1985), 64-5 and Ober (1989), 31-3. Some degree of face-to-face dynamics, however, is conceivable at the deme level or in the case of the Council, but not

epitaphios logos was thus to construct an imagined community. The speech turned the state funeral from a potential occasion of private resentment toward the *polis* into a source of social cohesion. By giving the Athenians a city worth dying for, the funeral oration justified the sacrifice of their relatives and inspired them to follow their example.¹⁹

The positive aspects of ideology were instead highlighted by Josiah Ober in his seminal book *Mass and Elite in Democratic Athens: Rhetoric, Ideology, and the Power of the People*. First published in 1989, Ober's study provides a culturalist definition of ideology and is still to this day the standard account of Athenian democratic ideology. My research aims to engage with and further develop Ober's insights, which will presently be the object of detailed critical analysis.²⁰ Ober addressed precisely the aspects that had been neglected in de Ste. Croix's analysis of ideology: status and public discourse. Ober posited a fundamental distinction of the Athenian population between an elite of wealth, education and birth, and the mass of ordinary citizens which constituted the Athenian *dēmos*. In doing so, he aimed to understand how the Athenian democracy managed to survive and achieve stability for almost two hundred years without *de facto* relinquishing all power in the hands of a ruling elite.²¹ Ober concluded that stability was achieved through ideological negotiation and emphasised the importance of rhetoric for the functioning of Athenian democracy. In his view, public discourse was the arena where mass and elite negotiated ideological compromises that created a balance between socio-economic inequality and political equality.²²

In his programmatic section, Ober defined ideology as the set of 'assumptions, opinions, and principles which are common to the great majority of th[e] members [of any given community]', and suggested that ideology, intended as a system of symbols, determines social and political decisions to a large extent.²³ In his final remarks, Ober pointed out how his thesis challenged not only the view of those who consider Athenian democracy ultimately as dominated by a ruling elite, but also the traditional Marxist approach that conceives ideology

at the *polis* level more widely. In the speech *Against Pancleon*, for example, Lysias claims that Pancleon had misappropriated citizen status based on the fact that his alleged fellow demesmen did not know him (Lys. 23.3). As for the Council, its 500 members (50 per tribe) met almost on a daily basis (Rhodes 1972, 1-48, 30, and Hansen 1999 [1991], 247-55). This led them to engage in constant personal interactions and face-to-face dynamics: see Ober (2008), 142-51.

¹⁹ The importance of the dead in the *epitaphios logos* was emphasised by Longo (2000), 9-27, whose view of ideology, however, was inspired by a Marxist approach.

²⁰ Ober himself has recently emphasised the relevance of *Mass and Elite* for current scholarship as well as the necessity to update and extend the picture of Athenian democracy provided by his book: see Ober (2016).

²¹ Ober (1989), 11-20.

²² Ober (1989), esp. 304-6. This view has been criticised by Harris (2006), 134-9, who argued that social stability was achieved through more material means than ideological negotiation.

²³ Ober (1989), 38-42; he is followed by Steinbock (2013a), 13-14. See also Canevaro (forthcoming a).

as the set of ideas used by the dominant class to mask its domination over the lower classes.²⁴ Ober had the merit of clearing ideology from the negative aura commonly associated with the term under the influence of much Marxist tradition, and emphasised instead the positive and integrative function of ideology.²⁵ Yet, Ober's view of ideology appears rather static and descriptive. As we shall see, Ober did not account for the actual ideological practice in classical Athens and the normative aspect it entails. My research will address these issues and advance our understanding of the ideological practice of democratic Athens as outlined in Ober's study.

The Athenians' assumptions, opinions, and principles, which Ober envisions as a fixed, monolithic set of ideas imposed on the elite, did not spring out of nowhere. They were the result of constant ideological practice, a continuous process of creating and re-creating which took place in an array of institutional settings and involved both the mass and the elite. Ober rightly noted the centrality of rhetoric and public discourse in this process, but did not fully appreciate the role played by the orators. Ober envisaged the orators as mere negotiators between the ideology of the elite, of which they were part, and that of the mass, who held supreme power and ideological hegemony in the democratic *polis*. In *Mass and Elite*, in other words, the orators passively interpreted the community's democratic ideology, in a sort of play of which the masses were the beneficiaries and ultimate judges.²⁶ Instead, I argue that the role of the orators in the ideological dynamics of democratic Athens was more active and multifaceted, and largely depended on the institutional setting in which they operated. This is especially evident in the case of the state funeral for the war dead, where the orators were themselves actively involved in creating and perpetuating the shared ideas of the community. Given Ober's focus on forensic and deliberative rhetoric, *Mass and Elite* included limited discussion of the state funeral and the insights it provides into Athenian ideological practice.

Ober's claim that public discourse was the locus of a negotiation between the opposing ideologies of mass and elite also needs to be addressed. I do not deny that the systems of beliefs of the Athenian mass and elite could sometimes differ and conflict, but I argue that oratory is not the ideal place to look for traces of elite ideology.²⁷ As my analysis will show, public discourse was instead the expression of a transversal democratic ideology which the orators

²⁴ Ober (1989), 339. Ober (1989), 38-40 emphasised how the Marxist view of ideology as a product of the ruling elite is not applicable to the Athenian democracy.

²⁵ But the conception of ideology as false consciousness is not common to all Marxist thinkers and was subject to evolution even in Marx's own thought: see p. 10 above.

²⁶ See Canevaro (2016b), 48 n. 39, who criticises this aspect of Ober's approach specifically concerning the lawcourts.

²⁷ Such traces are rather to be found in the private writings of the Athenian elite which Ober himself has analysed in a more recent monograph: see Ober (1998). Already in *Mass and Elite*, Ober noted how the failure to obtain ideological hegemony in the public sphere led the elite to elaborate and write the formal political theory that the democracy never developed: see Ober (1989), 338-9.

themselves endorsed and produced, and which invested Athenian democratic institutions according to their specific discursive parameters. I argue that the study of Athenian ideological practice will benefit from a greater attention to the institutions of Athenian democracy, which Ober's analysis relegated to the background.²⁸ My approach to the ancient evidence will be inspired by the principles of the New Institutionalism, and an additional aim of my research will be to contribute to bridging the gap between the study of ancient history and current trends in the political sciences.

1.3. TOWARD AN INSTITUTIONALIST APPROACH TO ATHENIAN IDEOLOGICAL PRACTICE

The New Institutionalism emerged in the late 1970s as a reaction to the focus on individual actions propounded by behaviouralism and rational choice theory, and advocated a return to the study of institutions as independent factors in political life.²⁹ The New Institutionalism envisions institutions as ensembles of rules, practices and narratives which largely condition the behaviour of individual political actors, at the same time empowering them and compelling them to act according to a logic of appropriateness.³⁰ Mostly ignored and even rejected by institutionalist scholars until the 1990s, ideas and discourse have recently enjoyed increasing attention as methodological tools particularly well suited to explaining institutional change. They have originated a specific variant sometimes referred to as Discursive Institutionalism (DI) and distinct from the three main traditions known as Historical Institutionalism (HI), Sociological Institutionalism (SI) and Rational Choice Institutionalism (RI). Institutionalists in the discursive tradition see ideas and discourse simultaneously as a product and as constitutive of institutions, and they insist on the importance of studying them within their institutional context.³¹ To give just some examples, Vivien Schmidt correlates a country's discourse with its institutional structure and suggests that, while single-actor polities such as Britain and France tend to develop an elaborate 'communicative discourse' to the general public, multi-actor polities such as Germany tend to develop a more elaborate 'coordinative

²⁸ The relatively minor role played by democratic institutions in *Mass and Elite* has been criticised by Hansen (1990), 351-2.

²⁹ For an example of behaviouralist approach applied to the case of democratic Athens, see Herman (2006).

³⁰ A theoretical enunciation of the principles of New Institutionalism is first found in March and Olsen (1984); see also March and Olsen (2006) and Lowndes and Roberts (2013).

³¹ On Discursive Institutionalism, see Schmidt (2006), (2008) and (2010). As noted by Schmidt (2008), 304, not all institutionalists interested in ideas posit a distinct fourth New Institutionalism, and those who do sometimes refer to it with different labels, such as 'Ideational Institutionalism', 'Constructivist Institutionalism' and 'Strategic Constructivism'. On the 'turn to ideas' in the New Institutionalism see also Hay (2006) and Blyth, Helgadottir and Kring (2016).

discourse' among policy actors.³² John Campbell investigates the impact of ideas on policy making by analysing the role of ideas and institutions in the rise of supply-side economics in the macroeconomic policy making of the United States in the late 1970s and early 1980s.³³ Colin Hay similarly uses the crisis of Keynesianism and the rise of neoliberalism in Britain during the 1970s, which culminated in the election of Margaret Thatcher in 1979, as a case study to explore how new politico-economic paradigms are institutionalised and replace old paradigms according to a logic of 'punctuated evolution'.³⁴

A renewed focus on institutions which considers these recent trends in the political sciences can provide a fruitful and yet mostly unexplored angle for the advancement of the study of Athenian democracy.³⁵ Institutionalism has been successfully employed, for example, by Edward Harris in a recent article. Harris has shown that the Athenians were aware of the etiquette of the Assembly as opposed to that of the lawcourts and consequently expected public speakers to respect it.³⁶ Mirko Canevaro has similarly applied an institutionalist approach to the realm of Athenian popular culture. He argues that, since Athenian institutions were controlled by the masses, 'authorised' cultural forms in Athens that were produced within the formal institutions of the state were an expression of the ideas of those masses, whereas 'unauthorised' cultural forms produced in informal contexts were often the expression of the ideas of the elite.³⁷ The institutionalist (and specifically discursive institutionalist) approach to classical Athens, however, still necessitates an extensive and programmatic study. The realm of Athenian democratic ideology, not yet explored with an eye on the institutions that produced it, offers an excellent test case for the interaction between ideas and institutions in Athenian democracy. I shall therefore look at Athenian ideological practice from an institutionalist perspective and make the case that Athenian democratic institutions conditioned the construction of the shared ideas of the community.

My research will focus on a specific facet of Athenian ideological practice and investigate how a shared image of the city's mythical past was constructed within Athenian democratic institutions and according to the discursive parameters of each institutional setting. My analysis will necessarily interweave with studies of Athenian social memory with a similar

³² Schmidt (2002), ch. 5-6.

³³ Campbell (1998).

³⁴ Hay (2001).

³⁵ Institutions have been the focus of a fruitful tradition of studies of Athenian democracy: see e.g. Rhodes (1972); Hansen (1974), (1978), (1983), (1987) and (1999) [1991]; Rhodes and Lewis (1997). This approach, however, was largely descriptive and is now often regarded as old-fashioned.

³⁶ Harris (2013a); more in general Harris (2013b), 3-18.

³⁷ Canevaro (2016b).

focus on the orators and the city's past.³⁸ Rosalind Thomas's *Oral Tradition and Written Record in Classical Athens*, for example, identifies various traditions about Athens' past and reveals the existence of a subterranean struggle and cooperation between different mnemonic communities. Her depiction of Athens as mainly an oral society, however, leads Thomas to underestimate the influence of writing in the processes of memory formation and negotiation, which has been convincingly argued, for example, by Maurizio Giangliulo in the case of colonial traditions in Cyrene.³⁹ Thomas concludes that in Athenian social memory, 'where contemporary written evidence either does not exist or is ignored, there is almost no check on the accumulating changes and distortions'.⁴⁰ This view seems not to grant enough credit not only to written sources, but also to the several channels available to the Athenians for the transmission of the past, such as monuments or drama.

Thomas' conclusions about oral traditions and mnemonic communities have been recently taken up by Bernd Steinbock in his book *Social Memory in Athenian Public Discourse*. Steinbock addresses the question of the role of the orators in Athenian social memory, and convincingly argues that arguments from social memory were not mere rhetorical cover-ups for considerations of *Realpolitik* but had an actual impact on Athenian

³⁸ The concept of social (or collective) memory is borrowed from the field of sociology. It was originally elaborated by Maurice Halbwachs, who highlighted the social dimension of memory. Halbwachs considered memory impossible to achieve as a purely individual effort, and pointed out that the reconstruction of the past is based on the present: see Halbwachs (1925) and (1950). For an outline of Halbwachs's thought and influence, see Giangliulo (2010) and Proietti (2012), 13-19. Fentress and Wickham (1992) appropriated the concept of social memory for historiography and insisted on its active nature, where details tend to be adapted to present social and performative contexts. Assmann (1992) emphasised the role of memory in preserving a group's identity, and introduced a distinction between communicative memory (i.e., memories of the recent past that cover a span of three or four generations and shared by individuals in informal interactions) and cultural memory (i.e., memories about mythical origins transmitted in formal and ceremonial occasions through a fixed set of symbols). Gehrke (2001), 298 has elaborated the concept of "intentional history", i.e. 'history in a group's own understanding, especially in so far as it is significant for the make-up and identity of the group'. See also Gehrke (2010), 16, where intentional history is defined as 'that part of cultivated memory which is relevant for a group's identity'. Alcock (2002) investigates the role of monuments and landscape (the so-called *cadre matériel*) in the social memory of ancient Greece; see also Ma (2009) on the same topic for the Hellenistic period.

³⁹ See Giangliulo (2001). Recent studies have shown that writing was much more central to Athenian society than acknowledged by Thomas: see Pébarthe (2006) for an extensive study on literacy and writing in Athenian society, and Faraguna (2009) specifically on the role of writing in the Athenian legal system. On the development of writing and, specifically, letter writing, see Ceccarelli (2013), 23-53. The large body of archaic rupestral graffiti inscribed by shepherds discovered by Langdon (2015) in the Attic countryside suggests that literacy might have been relatively widespread even outside the elites since an early stage. Vansina (1985), 120-3, recognises the influence of writing on oral traditions and acknowledges that, in societies where orality and literacy coexist, homeostasis (i.e. the tendency of traditions to change and be congruent with the present state of the society that produces them) is not complete.

⁴⁰ Thomas (1989), 284.

decision-making.⁴¹ Like Thomas, Steinbock envisions Athenian social memory as a sum of parallel traditions elaborated by separate mnemonic communities, and the orators as simply picking each time the tradition that best suited their needs.⁴² This view is problematic for several reasons. First, it overlooks the role of institutions in conditioning the choice of appropriate historical narratives. Second, it is risky to conceive of distinct memory communities (and specifically purely private family traditions) in a society where the past of the city was constantly recalled and discussed in public arenas.⁴³ In such a context, traditions about the city's past were unlikely to develop in complete independence from one another and without mutual interference. Finally, by viewing the orators as passively drawing memories from pre-existing mnemonic communities, Steinbock undermines their role in the memory dynamics of classical Athens. That this role was rather active and consisted in creating and not just preserving memory has been rightly suggested by Julia Shear in a recent article on the *epitaphios logos*,⁴⁴ where she also stresses the malleability of memory as 'depend[ant] very much on the particular (social) context'.⁴⁵

The notion that the orators actively created shared memories for the Athenian community is instead one of the premises of Andrew Wolpert's *Remembering Defeat: Civil War and Civic Memory in Ancient Athens*. In his study of the democratic restoration and amnesty of 403 BC, Wolpert analyses the speeches of the orators in order to investigate how they helped the Athenians to negotiate an image of their defeat in the Peloponnesian War and of the subsequent civil war which could prevent oligarchy and civil strife from arising again.⁴⁶ Wolpert, however, uses forensic and funeral speeches interchangeably and does not fully appreciate the different function of recalling the past in these two genres of rhetoric. Like Steinbock, he overlooks the institutional settings in which memory was created and preserved, their specific discursive parameters and their impact on what the orators could do with the past.

The institutionalist approach advocated in my research will advance the current state of scholarship on Athenian social memory by addressing the abovementioned issues. The institutions of Athenian democracy and their discursive parameters will form the basis of my

⁴¹ See Steinbock (2013a). Steinbock addresses similar issues in an article dealing with the memory of the ancestors in Athenian public debate: see Steinbock (2013b).

⁴² See in particular Steinbock (2013a), 96-9.

⁴³ On the relevance of the past and the importance of remembering in classical Athens, see Canevaro (forthcoming b).

⁴⁴ Shear (2013), 531.

⁴⁵ Shear (2013), 535.

⁴⁶ See Wolpert (2002). The regime of the Thirty and the democratic restoration have also been analysed from the perspective of social memory by Shear (2011), who has compared Athenian memory strategies following the fall of the Thirty to those following the democratic restoration in 411. See also Loraux (2002) [1997].

study of Athenian ideological practice and social memory. My case studies will dissect the variants of three myths which were extremely significant for the Athenian community (the Athenian help for the Heraclidae, the Attic Amazonomachy and the myth of autochthony) and place a strong focus on the institutional settings which conditioned each version of the story. This will in turn shed light on the dynamics of Athenian ideological practice and illuminate the role of the orators in different institutions of Athenian democracy.⁴⁷ By using the memory of Athens' mythical past as a case study, my research will build on Ober's conclusions on Athenian democratic ideology and consider dynamically the ideological practice of classical Athens. I will start from the premise that the assumptions, opinions and principles that Ober saw as a fixed and monolithic set were in fact constantly moulded by the ideological practice taking place within the institutions of the state.⁴⁸

Athenian democratic institutions all coherently participated in the city's democratic ideology, but each of them was characterised by specific discursive parameters.⁴⁹ The role of the orators was not simply that of passive recipients of democratic ideology and mere negotiators in the ideological dynamics between the elite, of which they were members, and the mass which held the power in the democratic city.⁵⁰ Their function depended on the institutional context in which they operated. More generally, institutions had a profound impact on how the past (both mythical and historical) was recalled. The state funeral for the war dead, where the funeral speech for the war dead (*epitaphios logos*) was delivered, was an important arena for the recollection of the city's past. The *epitaphios logos* was devoted to the praise of the Athenians who had died in war, but also to the praise of the ancestors and the city itself.⁵¹ In the funeral speeches, the orators created a version of Athenian history which did not simply adopt ideological *topoi*,⁵² but actively shaped the memory of past events to construct and validate the identity and beliefs of the community.⁵³ The *epitaphios logos* fulfilled its function towards the dead by providing the survivors with an idealised image of the city, one which could justify the self-sacrifice of their relatives and inspire them to follow their

⁴⁷ See Gehrke (2001), 286, who has highlighted the 'ideological significance of references to the past'.

⁴⁸ Sobak (2015) interestingly suggests that this process of production and dispersal of political knowledge occurred also outside the formal institutions of the state, in the net of interactions among non-elite citizens taking place in "free spaces" such as markets and workshops.

⁴⁹ The discursive parameters of Athenian democratic institutions will be discussed more in detail in Chapter 2. What follows is only a brief summary to help delineate the theoretical framework of my research.

⁵⁰ Pace Ober (1989), esp. 304-6.

⁵¹ On the *epitaphios logos* and the commemoration of the Athenian war dead in general, see Thuc. 2.34; Walters (1980); Loraux (1981); Thomas (1989), 196-237; Low (2010); Shear (2013).

⁵² Pace Loraux (1981), 340-1. See Balot (2013), 277.

⁵³ See the notion of intentional history developed by Gehrke (2001) and (2010).

example.⁵⁴ Funeral speeches thus produced shared memories and beliefs that Athens, which was not an archetypal face-to-face society, needed in order to create an imagined community and guarantee its unity and cohesion.⁵⁵

The past was also frequently recalled in the Assembly and the lawcourts. When alluding to the city's past, deliberative and forensic orators were respectful of the beliefs of their democratic audience because they needed to avoid alienating their sympathies. Yet, their prime function was not that of creating an idealised image of the city's past. According to Aristotle, the aim of the deliberative orator was the advantageous (τὸ συμφέρον) and the harmful (βλαβερόν), whereas that of the forensic orator was the just (τὸ δίκαιον) and the unjust (τὸ ἄδίκον) (Arist. *Rh.* 1358b21-8). Advantage and justice, in other words, were central in the discursive parameters of the Assembly and the lawcourts respectively.⁵⁶ Expressing his respect for this image was therefore one of the means through which the deliberative orator could persuade his fellow citizens of the advantageousness of his policy and the forensic orator could convince the judges on matters of justice and the laws. Consequently, the ways speakers used events from the past varied depending on the institutional setting.

My research will not be limited to the institutional settings of Athenian oratory. The past was extremely valuable for the Athenians and it was significant also to other institutions. The dramatic festivals, for example, were an important occasion where the (mostly but not exclusively) mythical past of the city was recalled and re-enacted.⁵⁷ Compared to the contexts of oratory, the dramatic festivals had yet another impact on mythical narratives. This institution enabled playwrights to pose questions about and reaffirm the core values and ideas of the democratic city.⁵⁸ In Euripides' *Ion*, for example, Athens' earthborn royal family (and its last surviving member, Creusa), ignored in the renditions of the myth of autochthony in the funeral speeches, coexists with the motif of the collective autochthony of the Athenians typical of the *epitaphios logos*. By focusing on Creusa's individual tragedy and Ion's concerns about his own integration into the Athenian citizen body, Euripides brings onto the stage the contradictions of the idealised image of the city developed in the funeral oration. The notion of *eugeneia*, which in the *epitaphios logos* unites the Athenian people by virtue of their autochthony, in the play becomes the private attribute of Creusa's family. Autochthony shows its dark side in the unwelcoming attitude of the Athenians towards the foreigner, Ion. By the

⁵⁴ On the importance of the dead in the economy of the *epitaphios logos*, see Longo (2000), 9-27.

⁵⁵ On the notions of imagined community and face-to-face society and their applicability to the case of classical Athens, see pp. 12-13 above.

⁵⁶ See Harris (2013a), who has convincingly shown that the Athenians were aware of the rules of the different genres of rhetoric.

⁵⁷ For a survey of the mythical subjects of Greek tragedies, see Chapter 2, Table 1.

⁵⁸ See Allan and Kelly (2013).

end of the play, however, Athena reveals Ion's autochthonous nature and successfully integrates him into Athens' citizen body. What was not appropriate at the state funeral was therefore possible at the dramatic festivals.⁵⁹

The ways Athenian political actors shaped the memory of the past were strongly conditioned by Athenian democratic institutions and their discursive parameters. This principle is illustrated by Aeschines' appeal to the ancestors in the speech *On the False Embassy*. There, Aeschines, prompted by Demosthenes' accusation that he had exhorted the Athenians to forget about the victories of their ancestors (Dem. 19.15-6), reconstructs his own address to the Assembly from three years earlier and provides an unusual interpretation of the city's historical past. Aeschines states that he had in fact invited the Athenians to imitate the good judgment (*euboulia*) of the ancestors, embodied by the Persian Wars and the generalship of Tolmides, but that he had warned them against emulating their ill-timed love for victory (*philonikia*). The latter was exemplified by the Sicilian expedition and the refusal of Sparta's peace proposal at the end of the Peloponnesian War (Aeschin. 2.74-7). Such a distinction between good and bad ancestors would have been inconceivable at the state funeral, where the deeds of the ancestors were all univocally praised and recommended for imitation.⁶⁰ In this institutional setting, the orators contributed to the creation of an idealised image of Athens' past which was functional to the construction of an imagined community. In the lawcourts and the Assembly, however, recalling the example of the ancestors performed a different function. In such contexts, the orators exploited the ancestors' ideological weight to support the argument of their speeches, and couched their appeals to the memory of the ancestors respectively in terms of justice and advantage.⁶¹ Aeschines was therefore able to provide a (partly) critical appeal to the memory of the ancestors thanks to the institutional setting of the Assembly. Uninterested in providing an idealised picture of the ancestors, Aeschines offered a set of historical examples which focused on the advantage and safety of the state and were appropriate to the discursive parameters of the Assembly.⁶²

1.4. MYTH, MEMORY AND INSTITUTIONS IN CLASSICAL ATHENS

The case of the ancestors in Athenian public debate and Aeschines' attempt at recalibrating his historical allusions according to the discursive parameters of the Assembly demonstrates

⁵⁹ For a detailed analysis of the myth of autochthony in Euripides' *Ion*, see Section 5.4.

⁶⁰ Cf. e.g. Thuc. 2.36.1-3; Lys. 2.3; Dem. 60.6.

⁶¹ For appeals to the memory of the ancestors in the lawcourts, cf. e.g. Din. 1.109-10; Dem. 23.204-6; in the Assembly, cf. e.g. Dem. 9.74; 18.66-8; 18.95-101.

⁶² For a detailed analysis of the Aeschines passage, see Steinbock (2013b), who overlooks the ideological dynamics of democratic Athens and the role of the discursive parameters of the Assembly in enabling Aeschines to reassess the traditional image of the ancestors.

the potential of an institutionalist approach to Athenian ideological practice and social memory. But what can myth tell us about the ideological dynamics of classical Athens? This is the last question that needs to be answered before setting off to explore the domain of Athenian myths, institutions and ideology, and it first requires establishing a working definition of the word ‘myth’.⁶³

The Greek word μῦθος and its derivatives appear already in the Homeric poems, where they have the neutral meaning of ‘word, speech’.⁶⁴ The word later evolves to have a more negative meaning of ‘tale, fiction’, and μῦθος (as opposed to λόγος) comes to be often associated with falseness.⁶⁵ Herodotus (Hdt. 2.23, 45) and Thucydides (Thuc. 1.21.1), for example, use μῦθος and its derivatives to refer to stories for which no evidence is available.⁶⁶ Despite this, myth was no less valuable to the Greeks, who did not seem to perceive a clear boundary between myth and history. Myth was mostly envisioned as very ancient history. The main difference between the domains of myth and history laid in the lesser amount of evidence available to reconstruct the former with sufficient confidence.⁶⁷ Herodotus, for example, when recounting the causes of the enmity between Greeks and barbarians, moves seamlessly from the mythical episodes of Io, Europa, Medea and Helen to the historical reign of Croesus, whom he pinpoints as the first barbarian to ever wrong the Greeks (Hdt. 1.1-6). Isocrates similarly establishes a chronological continuity between mythical and historical events when he narrates the Athenian achievements against the barbarians in his *Panegyricus*. The orator matches the older victories over the Amazons and the Thracians with the more recent ones against Darius and Xerxes, which he explicitly describes as akin (ἀδελφά) to the former (Isoc. 4.66-72). Even Lysias, who in his *Funeral Oration* separates Athens’ mythical exploits from his account of the Persian Wars by including a digression on the immutable character conferred to the Athenians by their autochthonous origins, does not seem to treat the two realms any differently (Lys. 2.3-47).⁶⁸

⁶³ As noted by Bremmer (1987), the nature of Greek myth is a complex and debated question, which has given rise to many unsatisfactory answers. I am not aiming at settling such an issue and I shall content myself with providing a few introductory remarks. For a survey of current and historical approaches to myth, see Vernant (1988) [1974], 226-60, Dowden (1992), 16-27 and, more at length, Csapo (2005).

⁶⁴ LSJ s.v. μῦθος, I. 1. Cf. e.g. Hom. *Il.* 6.381-2; 9.431, 443. In the *Iliad*, according to Martin (1989), 1-42, the word μῦθος, as opposed to the generic and “unmarked” ἔπος, denotes specifically an authoritative speech-act, which usually takes place in public in front of an audience.

⁶⁵ LSJ s.v. μῦθος, II.

⁶⁶ Gotteland (2001), 52-5; Dowden (1992), 3-4.

⁶⁷ On the Greeks’ understanding of the relationship between myth and history, see more in general Veyne (1988) [1983].

⁶⁸ Gotteland (2001), 89-102.

If the distinction between myth and history was not very well drawn for the ancient Greeks, the same is not true from a modern perspective. To the modern scholar, the Amazonomachy or Erichthonius' birth from the earth obviously bear no resemblance to historical facts. Their value for the ancient historian lies mostly in what these myths meant to their Athenian audience. My research will thus focus on Athenian myths. By this expression, I refer to those stories that dealt with the legendary times which the Athenians considered their remote past. Such stories were deemed culturally and historically relevant to the present, and had been transmitted for generations through several media which included poetry, prose and the visual arts.⁶⁹ The modern distinction between myth and history, however, is one worth exploring further. A focus on the memory of Athens' mythical past offers significant advantages over a study of Athenian social memory of the historical past. First, whereas the orators' historical allusions are subject to the modern interpreter's evaluation of their trustworthiness, this does not apply to the case of mythical accounts. To us, in other words, no version of a myth is more genuine than another. The same, however, is not necessarily true for an ancient audience. The Greeks were aware of the multiplicity and contradictory nature of their mythical traditions. Hecataeus, for example, criticises the stories (λόγοι) of the Greeks for being many and ridiculous (πολλοί τε καὶ γελοῖοι), and embarked on the task of writing a truthful account by rationalising some of those myths (*FGrHist* 1 F 1).⁷⁰ Isocrates, who in the *Panegyricus* had adopted the bellicose version of the myth of Adrastus (Isoc. 4.54-9), uses the peaceful version of the same myth in the *Panathenaicus* and openly admits to be contradicting his previous account (Isoc. 12.168-74).⁷¹ In Plato's *Symposium*, Phaedrus accuses Aeschylus of talking nonsense (φλοῦραεῖ) in his play *Myrmidons*, where he had made Achilles Patroclus' *erastēs*. Phaedrus recalls how, according to Homer, Achilles was in fact much younger than Patroclus, and therefore necessarily his *eromenos* (Pl. *Symp.* 180a).

One cannot expect every Greek to have the critical attitude of a Hecataeus.⁷² Yet, an Athenian audience would have been familiar with different versions of the same myths from

⁶⁹ See Gotteland (2001), 12, who defines myth as 'tout récit transmis par la tradition, mettant en scène des personnages divins ou héroïques, décrivant une suite d'actions dont le caractère historique ne peut être démontré, et inscrit dans un cadre temporel antérieur au retour des Héraclides ou contemporain de cet événement'. According to Csapo (2005), 9, myth can be defined as 'a narrative which is considered socially important, and is told in such a way as to allow the entire social collective to share a sense of this importance'. Tyrrell and Brown (1991), 6 in turn define myth as 'a tale rooted in Greek culture that recounts a sequence of events chosen by the maker of the tale to accommodate his own medium and purpose and to achieve particular effects in his audience. As narratives that both exemplify and shape that culture, myths are words in action'.

⁷⁰ See Bertelli (2001), 80-4; Fowler (2001), 101.

⁷¹ On this passage and its possible interpretations, see Nouhaud (1982), 18-19 and more at length Steinbock (2013a), 203-10.

⁷² On Greek critical approaches to myths, see Veyne (1988) [1983], 41-57.

drama, epic and lyric poetry, oratory and the visual arts. The presence of myth at all levels of Athenian society and the Athenians' familiarity with their mythical tradition constitute another notable advantage offered by an analysis that privileges Athenian myths over the city's historical past. Any variation on the part of the orator would have hardly gone unnoticed and would have probably been perceived as significant. Precisely because his variations would have been patent to his mythically informed audience, the role of the orator must be considered essential in the ideological dynamics of classical Athens. Far from merely picking a mythical variant from one or another memory community, the orators were active agents in Athenian ideological practice and the construction of the shared image of the city's past. The function of the past in turn varied according to the institutional settings of Athenian democracy. The myth of autochthony, for example, could be employed at the state funeral to create an image of Athens as a cohesive and egalitarian community. In a lawsuit over citizenship rights, in accordance with the focus on justice and the laws typical of the lawcourts, the same myth could instead provide the aetiology of an exclusive prerogative of a limited section of the citizen body which the defendant was accused of having misappropriated.⁷³ The orators had to accommodate their mythical narratives to the institutions of the democracy and create memories appropriate for the discursive parameters of each institutional setting.

Despite its significant advantages, the analysis of the mythical past has had to this day only a marginal place in studies on Athenian social memory.⁷⁴ A comparative study of mythical variants therefore offers a privileged, yet mostly unexplored perspective to the student of Athenian ideological practice and social memory. By following the ideological thread through the mythical narratives performed in different institutions of Athenian democracy, I shall reconstruct the complex interaction between social memory and ideology in fifth- and fourth-century Athens. The texts of the Attic orators will be the main (though not exclusive) focus of this investigation, but I shall also pay attention to other institutional settings and media through which memories of the mythical past were produced, such as tragedy at the dramatic festivals and the visual arts. Texts produced for private settings outside the formal institutions of the state, such as the speeches of Isocrates or the fragments of the *Atthidographers*, will also be employed as valuable sources. These will act as a foil to the ideological specificity of the institutional settings of the Athenian democracy.

My approach differs from previous approaches to mythology, and notably from structuralism, in that it does not aim at uncovering the underlying structure of a myth that

⁷³ See Chapter 5.

⁷⁴ The main exception is the chapter that Steinbock has devoted to the myth of Adrastus and the burial of the Seven: see Steinbock (2013a), 155-210.

determines its universal value. Instead, I shall focus on specific versions produced within specific Athenian institutions, in order to investigate the concrete uses of myth in the ideological dynamics of Athenian democracy in the classical age.⁷⁵ By reading myth from an ideologically minded and institutionalist perspective, I also intend to fill the gaps of the only extensive work devoted to the use of myth in the orators: Sophie Gotteland's *Mythe et Rhétorique. Les exemples mythiques dans le discours politique de l'Athènes classique*. Gotteland aims to develop a theory of the Greek mythical *exemplum*, investigating its perception by the orators and its relation to the historical *exemplum*. She offers a detailed and informative account of the orators' mythical allusions with the inclusion of relevant comparative material from other genres. Yet, her book – a sort of mythological counterpart to Michel Nouhaud's *L'utilisation de l'histoire par les orateurs attiques* –⁷⁶ does not pay sufficient attention to issues of social memory. More importantly, the institutional settings of the speeches of the Attic orators are mostly overlooked. Gotteland locates the speeches of the orators in an institutional vacuum, which does not allow her fully to appreciate the ideological specificity of – to mention just one example – Lysias' narrative of the causes of the Amazonomachy in his *Funeral Oration* (Lys. 2.4-6) as opposed to Isocrates' versions in the *Panegyricus* (Isoc. 4.66-70) and the *Panathenaicus* (Isoc. 12.193).⁷⁷

To what extent did the orators contribute to the ideological practice of Athenian democracy? How did their contrasting versions of myths reflect the discursive parameters of different Athenian institutions? I shall endeavour to answer these questions by studying a selected set of mythical variants within the institutional settings that produced them. I shall pay particular attention to the ideological specificity of each version and investigate how Athenian political actors shaped and re-shaped the Greek mythical tradition to accommodate their narrative to different institutional settings of the Athenian democracy. This will allow me to observe Athenian ideological practice in the making and explore its dynamic nature.

1.5. OUTLINE OF THE WORK

This chapter has outlined the aims of my research and defined its relation with previous scholarship on ideology, institutional theory and social memory. I have chosen Josiah Ober's approach to Athenian democratic ideology in *Mass and Elite* as the starting point of my study. I have declared my intention to advance Ober's valuable reconstruction by investigating the

⁷⁵ For the programmatic enunciation of the structuralist approach to myth, see Lévi-Strauss (1963) [1958], 206-31, and esp. 213-18 for its application to the Oedipus myth. See also Kirk (1970), 42-83; Vernant (1988) [1974], 246-53; Csapo (2005), 181-261.

⁷⁶ Nouhaud (1982).

⁷⁷ Gotteland (2001), esp. 141-9.

dynamics through which Athenian political actors actively produced shared ideas and values, which were far from a fixed set imposed on the elite. To achieve this goal, I shall adopt an institutionalist approach in my analysis of the ancient sources. An additional aim of my research is therefore that of contributing to bridging the gap between the study of ancient history and current trends in the political sciences. I have restricted the topic of my investigation to Athenian social memory of the city's mythical past and explained the advantages of such a choice. Finally, I have outlined my methodology. I shall compare a selected set of mythical variants produced by orators and other political actors and analyse them within the institutional settings that produced them in order to highlight the ideological specificity of each setting.

In Chapter 2, I provide a survey of the institutions of Athenian democracy that showed significant interaction with myth. These included the dramatic festivals, the Panathenaea, the state funeral for the war dead, the lawcourts, the Assembly and the Council. Contextually, I investigate the presence of myth in Athenian private settings, such as the family and the symposium. The aim of this chapter is twofold. On the one hand, my survey shows that the Athenians were continually engaging with myth in almost every aspect of their public and private lives. As a result, they were able to perceive the slightest changes and innovations in mythical narratives and allusion, which had the potential to carry ideological value. On the other hand, I reconstruct the discursive parameters of Athenian democratic institutions and assess their influence on mythical narratives. This allows me to establish the general framework sustaining my three case studies (Chapters 3-5), which show how the discursive parameters of Athenian democratic institutions conditioned specific mythical variants by shifting their focus on ideas and values appropriate to each institutional setting.

Each case study is centred on one myth of cultural, historical and political relevance for the Athenian community and on one or two values significant to that specific mythical narrative. These values serve as pivots to illuminate the impact of the discursive parameters of different institutional settings on how Athenian political actors recalled the city's mythical past. Chapter 3, in particular, deals with the myth of Athens' help to the Heraclidae as told in Lysias' *Funeral Oration*, Euripides' *Children of Heracles* and Isocrates' *Panegyricus*, and is constructed around the notions of *charis* and *philanthrōpia*. Chapter 4 is devoted to the myth of the Attic Amazonomachy, and specifically to the variants found in Lysias' *Funeral Oration*, Aeschylus' *Eumenides*, Isocrates' *Panegyricus* and *Panathenaicus* and in the fragments of Philochorus and Pherecydes transmitted in Plutarch's *Life of Theseus*. My analysis revolves around the notion of *hybris* and includes a discussion of relevant depictions in the visual arts. Finally, Chapter 5 deals with the myth of autochthony and the earthborn kings of Athens. The

mythical variants found in Euripides' *Ion*, the pseudo-Demosthenic *Against Neaera* and the surviving *epitaphioi* are read in connection to the theme of *eugeneia*. Each of these chapters starts with a brief history of the relevant myth in Athenian social memory, followed by an introduction of the case study. I then present the values which are the focus of my discussion and explore their significance for Athenian democracy. Separate sections are devoted to the mythical variants deployed in each institutional setting or private context.

The comparative method adopted in the case studies allows me to consider each mythical variant within the institutional context that produced it. Through the analysis of the collected sources, I highlight how Athenian political actors shaped each myth in order to fulfil the discursive parameters of different institutions of Athenian democracy. By placing institutions back at centre stage, I am able to offer new insights into the fifth- and fourth-century development and adaptation of the mythical tradition within the context of Athenian democracy and to shed new light on the dynamics of Athenian ideological practice.

CHAPTER 2

Myth and Athenian democratic institutions

The Introduction (Chapter 1) set out the aim of my research: to reconcile the study of ideology and institutions and gain a fuller understanding of Athenian democratic ideology. I argue that the “culturalist” interpretation of ideology as the set of ideas, values and beliefs shared by a community, notably applied to Athenian democracy in Ober’s *Mass and Elite*, needs to be reconceptualised in terms of ideological practice in order to account for the dynamic aspect of Athens’ democratic ideology. In other words, we need to establish how the shared ideas, values and beliefs of the Athenian community, far from being a fixed and self-imposed set, were actually produced. My proposed answer is that this process took place mostly through discourse within the institutions of the state. In accordance with the principles of the New Institutionalism, institutions are here understood as ensembles of rules, practices and narratives which condition the behaviour of the individual political actors who act within them. In a series of three case studies (Chapters 3-5), I shall focus on one particular facet of Athenian ideological practice and explore how the Athenians constructed shared ideas and beliefs about Athens and her mythical past according to the discursive parameters of the institutions of the democracy.

My approach rests on several assumptions, which I have outlined in the Introduction. First, the choice of a specific mythical variant as opposed to another can be seen as carrying a distinctive ideological value only if the Athenians were able to appreciate variations in mythical narratives. In the Introduction, I have brought some textual evidence showing that this was in fact the case,⁷⁸ but such passages need to be complemented by an assessment of the mythical knowledge of the Athenians during the classical period. Second, I have adopted the principles of the New Institutionalism, which posits that institutions have a strong and conditioning impact on the behaviour of political actors. This hypothesis needs to be checked against the evidence from classical Athens in order for us to understand the functioning of the institutions of Athenian democracy and their influence on individual behaviour. Finally, I have suggested that the discursive parameters of the Athenian democratic institutions accordingly had a profound impact on how the past, and specifically the mythical past, was recalled in

⁷⁸ See discussion above, p. 23.

public settings. Such discursive parameters need to be explored in detail in order to clarify how the Athenians were expected to talk about the mythical past in the different institutions of the *polis*.

The present chapter aims to tackle the aforementioned issues and establish a solid framework for the case studies. In Section 2.1, I therefore review the array of myths employed inside and outside the formal institutions of Athenian democracy and use some examples of mythical variants to assess the Athenians' familiarity with their own mythical tradition in all its complexity. This survey shows that myth was virtually omnipresent in the lives of the Athenians and held an important place in the political life of the community. In Section 2.2, I examine the institutions of Athenian democracy and establish how their discursive parameters influenced the behaviour of political actors, namely orators and playwrights. In Section 2.3, I investigate the impact of Athenian democratic institutions on mythical variants. I focus on the accounts of the myth of Adrastus produced for different institutional settings of Athenian democracy (and for non-Athenian contexts) and show how their form was conditioned by the discursive parameters highlighted in Section 2.2. This allows me to shed light on the processes through which the Athenians constructed shared ideas and beliefs about the city and its mythical past, and to place Athenian ideological practice directly within the institutions of the democracy.

2.1. MYTH AND THE POLIS: A SURVEY

2.1.1. The dramatic festivals and the Panathenaea

An assessment of the mythical knowledge of the Athenians cannot but start with a study of Greek drama. The dramatic festivals were key in providing the Athenians with a popular setting for the performance and re-discussion of their mythical tradition. During the course of the year, the Athenians had several occasions to watch their myths brought to the stage. In Athens, dramatic contests took place at the Great Dionysia and at the Lenaea. Drama retained a very special place in both festivals, which were held every year in honour of Dionysus. Dramatic contests are also attested for the Rural Dionysia, which provided the inhabitants of the whole Attica with further occasions to attend the theatre. The present section is thus devoted to the description of the dramatic festivals and the assessment of the myths which (based on the available evidence) were most popular on the tragic stage during the fifth and fourth centuries. Such an analysis illuminates the impact of the dramatic festivals on the Athenians' mythical knowledge, of which tragedy formed the bulk.

The Great Dionysia took place in the spring, during the month of Elaphebolion, and were the most important among Athenian dramatic festivals. The dramatic contests were held at the Theatre of Dionysus and attracted a huge audience, made of both Athenians and foreigners from all over Greece. Such contests are commonly thought to have started in the late sixth century in connection with the tyranny of Pisistratus.⁷⁹ This is based on two pieces of evidence. First, according to the *Suda* and the Parian Marble, Thespis performed at the festival at some time between 538 and 528 BC (*TrGF* 1 T 1-2). Second, the list of victors recorded in the 'Fasti' (*IG* II² 2318), whose preserved section starts from 472 BC, is assumed to have gone back to 501 BC.⁸⁰ At least during most of the fifth century, three tragedians competed, each with three tragedies and a satyr play, while five comic poets competed with one comedy each. The celebrations also included competitions for dithyrambic choruses. Each Attic tribe trained one chorus of men and one of boys for a total of twenty dithyrambic choruses. During the Peloponnesian War, however, it seems that the number of comedies was cut down to three for economic reasons. As for the fourth century, epigraphic evidence (*IG* II² 2320) seems to point to the conclusion that, starting some time before 341 BC, the tragic programme regularly included a single satyr play and a single old tragedy. The same evidence shows that each tragic contestant produced three plays, but only two tragedies per poet are attested in 340 BC. Regular performances of old comedies, on the other hand, are attested at the festivals from 311 BC (*IG* II² 2323 a), while the number of comic contestants might have returned to the same as in the period before the Peloponnesian War.⁸¹

The Lenaea were held in winter, during the month of Gamelion. They were run on a smaller scale than the Great Dionysia, since their audience was mainly constituted by Athens' population and did not include many foreigners (*Ar. Ach.* 504-6). The dramatic contests at the Lenaea, which originally took place in the Agora and were then transferred to the Theatre of Dionysus, were more oriented to comedy than to tragedy and probably originated in the second half of the fifth century.⁸² During this period and probably also during the fourth century, only two tragedians competed, with two plays each, while five comic poets produced for the

⁷⁹ See Pickard-Cambridge (1968) [1953], 57-8; Csapo and Slater (1995), 103-4; Rhodes (2003), 106. The traditional view has been challenged by Connor (1989), who dated the institution of the Great Dionysia after Cleisthenes' reforms and connected the festival with Athenian democracy.

⁸⁰ Pickard-Cambridge (1968) [1953], 71-2; Rhodes (2003), 106. But Scullion (2002), esp. 81-4, has casted doubts on the reliability of the sources about drama's early history and asserted that 'there is no longer any reason to suppose that it was in the 530s that tragic performances were first put on or some sort of tragic festival instituted at Athens'.

⁸¹ Pickard-Cambridge (1968) [1953], 52-100; Parke (1977) 125-35; Csapo and Slater (1995), 103-21; Csapo and Wilson (2014), 293-6.

⁸² On the dating of the tragic contests at the Lenaea, see Pickard-Cambridge (1968) [1953]. He pointed out (108) that there is no secure evidence for the traditional date of ca 432 BC and suggested (125) that the tragic contests were introduced around 440-30 BC, slightly later than the comic contests.

occasion one play each. It is commonly acknowledged that the Lenaea, just as the Great Dionysia, saw the number of comedies reduced to three during the Peloponnesian War. There is no secure evidence for the re-performance of old plays. As for satyr plays and dithyrambs, no performances seem to be attested for the period under analysis.⁸³

In winter, during the month of Poseideon, individual demes organized the local festivals known as Rural Dionysia. Their status and ambition varied depending on the dimensions and prosperity of the demes themselves. One such festival was held at Piraeus and featured tragedy and, from the fourth century, dithyrambic choruses (*IG II² 380; 456; 1496.70; [Plut.] X orat. 842a; Ael. VH 2.13*).⁸⁴ Dramatic contests taking place during the classical period are also attested for other Attic demes. These included Eleusis, where tragedy, comedy and dithyramb were performed (*IG II² 1186; 3100; possibly IG II² 3090*), and Acharnai, where there is evidence for comedy and dithyramb (*IG II² 3092; 3106*). Dionysian festivals of some kind are attested for Mirrhinous (*IG II² 1182; IG II² 1183.36*), while Kollytos (Aeschin. 1.157; Dem. 18.180), Thorikos (*IG I³ 258bis*) and perhaps Ikarion (*IG I² 186-7; IG II² 1178; 3094; 3095; 3099*) hosted both tragic and comic contests. Comic performances took place during the festivals at Aixone (*IG II² 1198; 1200; 1202*) and Rhamnous (*IG II² 3108; 3109*), while only dithyramb is attested for Salamis (*IG II² 3093*).⁸⁵

The vast array of dramatic festivals held every year shows that the theatre played a central role in the life of the Athenians. If one considers only the Great Dionysia and the Lenaea, at least during the second half of the fifth century and with the exclusion of the Peloponnesian War, the Athenians had the opportunity to attend twenty dithyrambic choruses, thirteen tragedies, ten comedies and three satyr plays every year. The situation was not particularly different during the fourth century. At that time, the dramatic programme included twenty dithyrambic choruses, fourteen tragedies (including one old tragedy brought on the stage by an actor), ten comedies (and, starting from 311 BC, also one regular old comedy) and one satyr play. It is difficult to determine how many plays were performed at the Rural Dionysia, but it has been reasonably argued that, since the festivals were structured as contests, their programme included at least two plays for each genre.⁸⁶ Whatever the number of plays,

⁸³ Pickard-Cambridge (1968) [1953], 25-42; Parke (1977), 104-6. Csapo and Slater (1995), 123 recall evidence for two tragic poets at the contest in 418 BC and three in 363 BC, and conclude that 'it is impossible to know which represents the norm'. Csapo and Wilson (2014), 298 cast some doubts on the inclusion of the Lenaea in the 'controversy about the reductions in comedies at the Dionysia during the Peloponnesian War'.

⁸⁴ Comic (and tragic) performances at Piraeus are attested in the Law of Evagorus, quoted in Dem. 21.10, but the document should be considered a late forgery: see Harris in Canevaro (2013a), 216-23.

⁸⁵ Pickard-Cambridge (1968) [1953], 42-54; Parke (1977), 100-3; Csapo and Slater (1995), 121-32; Csapo and Wilson (2014), 296-7.

⁸⁶ Csapo and Slater (1995), 122.

however, the Rural Dionysia, taking place almost in every corner of Attica, probably contributed to increasing the geographic and social reach of drama.

The Theatre of Dionysus itself, with its several phases of construction, reflects the immense popularity of the dramatic festivals and their potential impact on the mythical knowledge of the Athenians. The building was originally a simple structure with a wooden auditorium and a primitive stage (*skēnē*). As the interest in drama grew stronger, the Theatre of Dionysus underwent an intense reconstruction. This started during the Periclean age, when the *skēnē* was improved but the auditorium was still made of wooden seats. The theatre was then enlarged and completely rebuilt in stone during the fourth century by Lycurgus.⁸⁷ According to modern estimates, the size of the audience must have been between 3,700 and 7,000 spectators for the fifth-century building,⁸⁸ while the Lycurgan theatre is thought to have reached a capacity of even 14,000 to 17,000.⁸⁹ Such numbers are impressive and suggest a massive participation in theatre events.⁹⁰ During the fourth, and possibly already in the fifth century, the *polis* also instituted the Theoric Fund.⁹¹ This granted Athenian citizens a sum of money to attend the festivals and helped making dramatic performances accessible even to the poor.

The available data all point to the huge popularity of the dramatic festivals in classical Athens and shows that drama was deeply rooted in Athenian culture and society.⁹² If one correlates this with the fact that tragedy, satyr drama and dithyrambic poetry, unlike comedy, mainly focused on myth, one comes to the conclusion that the institution of the dramatic festivals had the potential of deeply influencing the mythical culture of the Athenians. Different accounts of the same myths are likely to have circulated thanks to the work of different playwrights, and one may guess that particularly powerful plays may have been able

⁸⁷ Pickard-Cambridge (1946), 265-8; Csapo and Slater (2005), 79-81; Csapo (2007), 98-9; Goette (2007).

⁸⁸ See Csapo (2007), 97, who also offers a summary of several alternative estimates. Roselli (2011), 72-5 argues that during the fifth century the total size of the audience was the sum of the capacity of the *theatron* (around 6,000 spectators) and a couple thousands extra viewers standing in free viewing spaces beyond the auditorium.

⁸⁹ See Pickard-Cambridge (1946), 141; Csapo (2007), 97. Roselli (2011), 64 notes that these same numbers have been wrongly applied by many scholars also to the fifth-century theatre.

⁹⁰ Pickard-Cambridge (1968) [1953], 263. See also Goldhill (1997), 58, who deems the Great Dionysia ‘the largest single body of citizens gathered together not only in the Athenian calendar but also throughout the Greek world, except perhaps for the Olympic games (for which figures are not readily available) or for certain major battles’.

⁹¹ There is no scholarly consensus on the date of introduction of the Theoric Fund: see Pickard-Cambridge (1968) [1953], 265-86; Csapo and Slater (1995), 287-8; Sommerstein (1997), 66-7; Goldhill (1997), 66-7; Csapo (2007), 100-3 and 114. Roselli (2011), 90-2 rejects the idea of a permanent Theoric Fund during the fifth century and suggests that *theōrika* at that time were ‘ad hoc payments approved by the Assembly when deemed necessary’.

⁹² On the social span of the theatre audience, see Pickard-Cambridge (1968) [1953], 263-5; Goldhill (1997), 60-6.

to impose specific versions of some myths in the collective memory of the Athenians.⁹³ It is also worth recalling that, starting from 386 BC and 339 BC, re-performances of old tragedies and old comedies respectively started to appear on an irregular basis, while this privilege had been already accorded to Aeschylus' plays sometime after the poet's death.⁹⁴ Such a habit may have helped reinforce the popularity of some stories and the Athenians' knowledge of particular versions to the detriment of others.

Having described the institutional context of Attic drama and made clear how pervasive theatre was in Athenian society, we can move on to an analysis of the myths that provided the subject for tragedies and satyr plays. The massive tragic production of the fifth and fourth centuries is mostly lost and only a small part survives to this day. Nevertheless, a brief survey of both the extant tragedies and the titles of the plays that are now lost or in a fragmentary state can help us understand what myths were most often brought on stage. In order to reconstruct as widely as possible the contribution of the dramatic festivals to the mythical knowledge of the Athenians, it is important not to limit our study to the better known works of Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides. By taking into account also their fragmentary plays as well as the titles and fragments of the minor tragedians, we can draw a general outline of the tragic production of the fifth and fourth centuries. The outcome of such a study, presented in tabular form, is necessarily tentative. The analysis of the lost tragic production rests on very shaky foundations. This is mainly due to the fact that, especially in the case of the minor tragedians, the available evidence is not always sufficient to determine the content of the plays with any certainty. Moreover, the sources are not always consistent when they mention titles of lost or fragmentary plays. This makes it sometimes difficult to discern between alternative titles of a single tragedy and titles that actually refer to different plays. For these reasons, when dividing the titles into thematic categories, I chose to round them down and listed any additional plays or possible alternative titles in the footnotes. The survey which follows is based on the titles and plots of the fragmentary plays as they have been reconstructed in the Loeb editions of the Great Tragedians, namely Sommerstein (2008) for Aeschylus, Lloyd-Jones (1996) for Sophocles, and Collard and Cropp (2008) for Euripides. As for the minor tragedians, I based my work on the titles collected in the first volume of *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, edited by Bruno Snell in 1971. The table is organised according to clusters of myths (e.g. myths about the Trojan Cycle, myths about the Argonauts, etc.), further

⁹³ On the diverse use of myth by the tragedians and their innovations, see e.g. Edmunds (2006), esp. 13-56, on Oedipus between the epic tradition and the tragedians; Cropp (1988), xliii-1, on Electra in Euripides and his predecessors.

⁹⁴ Pickard-Cambridge (1968) [1953], 99-101; Wilson (2000), 22-4; Nervegna (2007), 15-8.

divided into specific themes (e.g. Philoctetes, Medea, etc.) accompanied by references to the relative plays, and only includes clusters of myths that appear in at least five plays.

Myths (number of titles)	Themes and Plays
Cypria (22) ⁹⁵	<p>Palamedes/Nauplius: Aesch. F 180a-82; Soph. F 425-28; 429-31; 478-9; Eur. F 578-90; <i>TrGF</i> 24 ante F 1; 60 F 5; F 5a.</p> <p>Paris/Helen:⁹⁶ Soph. F. 181; 360-1; <i>TrGF</i> 72 F 3.</p> <p>Iphigenia in Aulis:⁹⁷ Soph. F 305-8; Eur. <i>IA</i>.</p> <p>Achilles/Telephus:⁹⁸ Aesch. F 238-9; Eur. F 696-727c.</p> <p>Other episodes: Soph. F. 33a-59; 176-80; 462-7; 497-521; 562-71; 618-35; Eur. F 681a-86</p>
Aethiopsis (4) ⁹⁹	<p>Memnon: Aesch. F 126a-8; F 279-80a; Soph. F 28-9.¹⁰⁰</p> <p>Achilles/Thersites: <i>TrGF</i> 71 F 1a-3.</p>
Little Iliad (21) ¹⁰¹	<p>Ajax/Teucer:¹⁰² Aesch. F 83, 84a; 174-177a; 215a, 216;¹⁰³ Soph. <i>Aj.</i>; F 576-578; <i>TrGF</i> 19 F 34-5; 52 F 1; 60 F 1a; 70 F 1; 72 F 1; 85 T 1.</p>

⁹⁵ Procl. *Chr.* 79-169.

⁹⁶ Sophocles' *Rape of Helen* (no surviving fragments) and *Eris* (F 199) might be added to the list, if they are not actually alternative titles for *Helen's Wedding* (F 181) and *The Judgment* (F 360) respectively.

⁹⁷ Sophocles' *Clytemnestra* (F 334) might have been an alternative title for his *Iphigenia* (F 305-8). Aeschylus' *Iphigenia* (F 94) may be included in this category, but it cannot be established whether it was parallel to Euripides' *Iphigenia in Tauris* or *Iphigenia in Aulis*.

⁹⁸ There is evidence for three *Telephus* plays by the fifth-century authors Iophon (*TrGF* 22 F 2c) and Agathon (*TrGF* 39 F 4) and by the fourth-century play-writer Cleophon (*TrGF* 77 T 1), but whether they belong to this category or they dealt with earlier episodes of Telephus' life is hard to tell.

⁹⁹ Procl. *Chr.* 172-204. One cannot rule out the possibility that some of the titles attesting seven *Achilles* plays by minor tragedians dealt with episodes of the *Aethiopsis*: for the references, see n. 108 below.

¹⁰⁰ One could add Sophocles' *Memnon* (no surviving fragments) to the list, but this may have been an alternative title for *Aethiopians* (F 28-9): see Lloyd-Jones (1996), 22.

¹⁰¹ Procl. *Chr.* 206-36.

¹⁰² The titles about Ajax/Teucer might be twelve if Sophocles' *Eurysaces* (F 223) and *Teucer* (F 576-8) were two different plays.

¹⁰³ Aeschylus' *Thracian Women* (F 83-4a), *Award of the Arms* (F 174-7a) and *Women of Salamis* (F 215a-16) may have constituted a trilogy: see Sommerstein (2008), 100, 175, 223.

	<p>Philoctetes: Aesch. F 249-253, 255; Soph. <i>Phil.</i>; F 697-699, 701; Eur. F 787-803; <i>TrGF</i> 20 F 37; 24 post F 1; 72 F 5b.</p> <p>Other episodes: Soph. F 206-22b; 367-9a; 553-61.</p>
Iliou Persis (12) ¹⁰⁴	<p>Soph. F 10a-18; 137; 370-1, 373-5; 522-6; 542-4; Eur. <i>Hec.</i>; <i>Tro.</i>; T 6; <i>TrGF</i> 17 T 1; 22 F 2b; 77 T 1.</p>
Nostoi (22) ¹⁰⁵	<p>Agamemnon/Orestes: Aesch. <i>Ag.</i>; <i>Cho.</i>; <i>Eum.</i>; Soph. <i>El.</i>; F 235-6; Eur. <i>El.</i>; <i>Or.</i>; <i>TrGF</i> 19 F 1-5; 24 ante F 1; 77 F (6); 17 T 1; 70 F 1g; 72 F 5; 73 F 1.</p> <p>Iphigenia in Tauris: Soph. F 726-29; Eur. <i>IT</i>; <i>TrGF</i> 78 F 1.¹⁰⁶</p> <p>Other episodes: Soph. F 202-3; 485-96; Eur. <i>Andr.</i>; <i>Hel.</i>;¹⁰⁷ <i>TrGF</i> 55 F 1</p>
<i>Total titles about the Trojan Cycle: 81</i> ¹⁰⁸	
Oedipodia (18)	<p>Aesch. F 121-2a; 173; 235-6;¹⁰⁹ Soph. <i>OT</i>; <i>OC</i>; Eur. F 539a-57; <i>TrGF</i> 20 F 30-1; 24 ante F 1; 33 F 1; 36 F (T 1); 48 F 1 (tetralogy); 70 F 1f; 72 F 4; 86 T 3; 88 F 1f.</p>
Thebaid (12)	<p>Seven vs Thebes: Aesch. <i>Sept.</i>; F16-7; *149a; Soph. F 113-21; Eur. <i>Phoen.</i>; <i>TrGF</i> 60 F 5b; 70 F 1c; 72 F 5a; 77 T 1.</p>

¹⁰⁴ Procl. *Chr.* 239-74.

¹⁰⁵ Procl. *Chr.* 277-303.

¹⁰⁶ The myth of Orestes' rescue of Iphigenia in Tauris did not feature in the *Nostoi* and may have been Euripides' own invention: see Kyriakou (2006), 21-2. Yet, the story belongs to the same timeline as the cyclic poem, and it is therefore sensible to include it in this category. Aeschylus' *Iphigenia* (F 94) may be included in this category, but it cannot be established whether it was parallel to Euripides' *Iphigenia in Tauris* or *Iphigenia in Aulis*.

¹⁰⁷ The story of Euripides' *Helen* does not feature in the *Nostoi*, but the cyclic poem did include Menelaus' arrival in Egypt, which provides the background to Euripides' play. I have therefore included the play in this category.

¹⁰⁸ Several titles which may have dealt either with the Trojan Cycle or the Homeric poems might be added to this category: e.g. three *Odysseus* plays (*TrGF* 62 T 8; 64 T 1; 71 F 13) from the fourth century and seven *Achilles* plays (*TrGF* 14 F 1a; 22 F 1a; 60 F 1f; 70 F 1d; 77 F (3); 85 T 1; 88 F 1a) from the fifth and fourth centuries.

¹⁰⁹ Aeschylus' *Laius* (F 121-2a) and *Oedipus* (F 173) and his satyr drama *Sphinx* (F 235-6) were part of the same tetralogy as the *Seven Against Thebes*: see Sommerstein (2008), 123-4, 175, 238-41.

	Antigone: Soph. <i>Ant.</i> ; Eur. F 157-76; <i>TrGF</i> 60 F 1e.
Epigoni/Alcmeonis (16)	Epigoni: Aesch. F 55. Soph. F 185-90. <i>TrGF</i> 60 F 2b. Alcmeon: Soph. F 108. Eur. F 65-73; 73a-87a. <i>TrGF</i> 20 F 12-5; 38 F (1); 39 F 2; 56 F 1; 60 F 1b-c; 72 F 1a-2; 85 T 2. Diomedes/Oeneus: Eur. F 554-70; <i>TrGF</i> 24 ante F 1; 71 F 14.
<i>Total titles about the Theban Cycle: 46¹¹⁰</i>	
Heracles (28)	Alcmena/Heracles' birth: Aesch. F 12; Eur. F 87b-104; <i>TrGF</i> 19 F 5a-8; 60 F 1d; 76 F 2. Antaeus: <i>TrGF</i> 3 F 3a; 9 F 1; 75 F 1. Other episodes and labours: Aesch. F 108-13; 123; Soph. <i>Trach.</i> ; F 122-4; 223a-b; 225-6; Eur. <i>HF</i> ; F 312b-15; 371-80; 473-9; 686a-94; <i>TrGF</i> 19 F 17a-33; 20 F 16a; 20 F 32-5; 33 F 2; 40 T 1; 43 F 1-14; 49 F (1); 60 F 4; 88 F 1c.
Dionysus (26)	Lycurgus/Orpheus/Pentheus: Aesch. F 22; 23-5; 57-67; 124-6; 146-9; 168-72b; 183; Soph. F 328-33; Eur. <i>Bacch.</i> ; <i>TrGF</i> 1 F 1c; 7 F 1 (tetralogy); 22 F 2; 33 F 1; 71 F 4-7; 77 F (4); 86 T 2. Semele: Aesch. F 221-4; <i>TrGF</i> 40 T 1; 45 F 1; 70 F 2-3. Other episodes: Aesch. F 78a-82; 246a-d; Soph. F 171-2.
Theseus/Athenian myths (23)	Heraclidae: Aesch. F 73b-7; Eur. <i>Heracl.</i> ; <i>TrGF</i> 51 T 1.

¹¹⁰ The total number of titles relating to the Theban Cycle may rise to forty-seven, if one considers Sophocles' *Epigoni* (F 185-90) and *Eriphyle* (F 201a-g) two distinct plays.

	<p>Adrastus: Aesch. F 53a-4; Eur. <i>Supp.</i>¹¹¹</p> <p>Eumolpus: Eur. F 349-70.</p> <p>Theseus' exploits: Aesch. F 102-7; Soph. F 19-25a; Eur. F 1-13; 381-90; 674a-81; <i>TrGF</i> 37 F 1.</p> <p>Phaedra: Soph. F 677-93; Eur. <i>Hipp.</i>; F 428-47; <i>TrGF</i> 20 F 18</p> <p>Alope: Eur. F 105-13; <i>TrGF</i> 2 F 1; 70 F 1b.</p> <p>Ion: Soph. F 319-22;¹¹² Eur. <i>Ion</i>.</p> <p>Other episodes: Aesch. F 281; Soph. 596-617a.</p>
Argonauts (22)	<p>Medea: Eur. <i>Med.</i>; <i>TrGF</i> 15 F 1-3; 17 T 1; 23 T 4a; 29 F 1; 52 F 1a; 70 F 1e; 78a T 1; 88 F 1e.</p> <p>Daughters of Pelias: Eur. F 601-16; <i>TrGF</i> 73 F 1.</p> <p>Hypsipyle/Lemnos: Aesch. F 95-7a; 123a-b; 247-8; Soph. F 384-8; Eur. F 752-70; <i>TrGF</i> 84 T 4.</p> <p>Other episodes: Aesch. F 20-21; Soph. F 337-46; 534-5; 546, 549; <i>TrGF</i> 55 F 1a</p>
Tantalus and his descendants (21)	<p>Tantalus: Soph. F 572-75; <i>TrGF</i> 3 F 7; 4 F 2; 14 F 1b.</p> <p>Pelops: Soph. 471-7; Eur. F. 571-7; 838a-44; <i>TrGF</i> 88 F 1g.</p> <p>Plisthenes: Eur. F 460-70a; 625-633; <i>TrGF</i> 39 F 1; 70 F 1.</p> <p>Atreus/Thyestes: Soph. F 140-1; 247-69; Eur. F 391-97b; <i>TrGF</i> 39 F 3; 64 T 1; 71 F 8; 77 F (7); 88 F 1; 88 F 1d.</p>

¹¹¹ The myth of Adrastus may have been the subject of Ion's *Argives* (*TrGF* 19 F 8a-9a), Achaeus' *Adrastus* and *Theseus* (*TrGF* 20 F 1, 18, 18a) and Apollodorus' *Suppliants* (*TrGF* 64 T 1-2): see Steinbock (2013a), 181-2.

¹¹² One may add Sophocles' *Creusa* (F 350-7) to this group, if that were not an alternative title for *Ion* (F 319-22).

Iliad (7)	Patroclus/Hector/Achilles: Aesch. F 78-78a; 131-9; 150-3; 263-7; ¹¹³ <i>TrGF</i> 60 F 1h-2a; 76 F 2a. Dolon: [Eur.] <i>Rhes.</i>
Odyssey (8)	Slaying of the Suitors: Aesch. F 179-80; 187; ¹¹⁴ <i>TrGF</i> 24 post F 1. Circe: Aesch. F 113a; 273-5. Polyphemus: Eur. <i>Cyc.</i> ; <i>TrGF</i> 9 F 4. Nausicaa: Soph. F 439-41.
<i>Total titles about the Homeric Poems: 15</i>	
Perseus (11) ¹¹⁵	Perseus' exposure: Aesch. F 46a-47c; Soph. F 61-67; Eur. F 316-30a. Medusa/Polydectes: Aesch. T 78,15b; 261-62; Eur. F 330b-48; <i>TrGF</i> 86 T 4. Andromeda: Eur. F 114-56; Soph. F 126-33. Other episodes: Soph. F 378-83; <i>TrGF</i> 4 F 2.
Athamas (10) ¹¹⁶	Phrixus/Helle: Aesch. F 1-4a; Soph. F 1-10; Eur. F 818c; 819-20b; <i>TrGF</i> 20 F 38; 86 T 3. Other episodes: Eur. F 398-423; <i>TrGF</i> 33 F 1; 60 F 1.
Danaids (8)	Aesch. <i>Supp.</i> ; F 5; 13-15; 43-46; <i>TrGF</i> 3 F 1; 3 F 4; 36 F (T 2); 72 F 3a.
Caledonian Boar Hunt (6)	Aesch. T 78,3a; Soph. F 401-6; Eur. F 515-39; <i>TrGF</i> 9 F 2; 55 F 1b; 92 F 1.
Telephus (6) ¹¹⁷	Aesch. F 143-5; Soph. F 77-91; 409-18; Eur. F 264a-81; <i>TrGF</i> 73 F 1.

¹¹³ Aeschylus' *Myrmidons* (F 131-9), *Nereids* (F 150-3) and *Phrygians/Ransoming of Hektor* (F 263-4, 266-7) may have formed an *Achilles* trilogy, possibly with *Chamber-makers* (F 78-a) as the satyr play: see Sommerstein (2008), 80-1, 134-5, 156-7, 262-5.

¹¹⁴ Sommerstein (2008), 120-1, 178-81, 192-3, 268-9 suggests that Aeschylus' *Penelope* (F 187) and *Bone-Gatherers* (F 179-80) formed a tetralogy together with *Ghost-Raisers* (F 273-5) and the satyr drama *Circe* (F 113a).

¹¹⁵ The total plays in this category may have been twelve, if Sophocles' *Danae* (F 165) was not an alternative title for his *Acrisius* (F 61-7).

¹¹⁶ According to a scholium on Aristophanes' *Clouds* (Schol. *ad Ar. Nub.* 257b), Sophocles produced two plays entitled *Athamas* (F 1-10). The plays in this category may be eleven, if Sophocles' *Phrixus* (F 721-2) was not identical with either of his *Athamas* plays.

¹¹⁷ For the involvement of Telephus in the Trojan War, see p. 34 with n. 98.

Ixion (5)	Aesch. F 90-3; 184-6a; Soph. F 296; Eur. F 424-7; <i>TrGF</i> 38 f 1
Minos (5) ¹¹⁸	Aesch. F 116-20. Soph. F 323-7; 389a-400. Eur. F 471a-72f; 634-46.
Sisyphus (5) ¹¹⁹	Aesch. T 78, 16a; T 93b3. Eur. F 282-4; 673-4. <i>TrGF</i> 43 F 19.
Prometheus (5) ¹²⁰	Aesch. <i>PV</i> ; F 190-204; 204a-8a; Soph. F 362-6; 482-6.

Table 1: Myths in tragedy and satyr drama

A quick glance through Table 1 immediately shows the sheer range of mythical themes developed in Athenian tragedies and satyr plays.¹²¹ A substantial part of Athenian tragic production was inspired by cyclic epics. The Trojan Cycle, in particular, provided at least eighty-one titles, while at least forty-six refer to the Theban Cycle. With only fifteen titles, the Homeric poems are comparatively under-represented but still feature among the popular categories. These include, for example, myths concerning Heracles (twenty-eight titles), the Argonauts (twenty-two) and the family of Tantalus (twenty-one). Many other myths, such as stories about Prometheus, Ixion or Minos, had only limited currency at the dramatic festivals but still provided the subject of at least five plays each. The list could be expanded by mentioning some of the myths which received minor attention on the tragic stage and are not included in Table 1. The story of Alcestis, for example, was the subject not only of Euripides' *Alcestis* but also of a lost play by Phrynichus (*TrGF* 3 F 1c-3). The myths of Bellerophon (Soph. F 297-299; Eur. F 285-312; 661-671; *TrGF* 60 F 1g) and Actaeon (Aesch. F 241-246; *TrGF* 3 F 1b; 22 ante F 1; 77 F 1) were the subject of only four plays each. Even smaller

¹¹⁸ These titles mostly refer to the death and resurrection of Glaucus, son of Minos. The amount of plays dealing with Minos may be larger, if one considers Sophocles' *Minos* (F 407) not to be a corruption and his *Daedalus* (F 158-62) not to be identical with *Men of Camicus* (F 323-7). Euripides' *Theseus* (F 381-90), which dealt with the slaying of the Minotaur and maybe the abandonment of Ariadne, has been included among the plays connected with Theseus and Athens.

¹¹⁹ Sisyphus' myth seems to have been particularly suitable for satyr plays, since four out of five titles are likely to have referred to satyr plays.

¹²⁰ Three of these titles (Aesch. F 204a-7a; Soph. F 362-6; 482-6) may have referred to satyr plays. The total amount of Prometheus plays might be brought to six, if Aeschylus' *Prometheus the Fire-Bearer* (F 208-a) and *Prometheus the Fire-Kindler* (F 204a-7a) were two separate plays: see Sommerstein (2008), 210-13.

¹²¹ This survey does not even consider myths which were only the object of allusions in the plays and could expand this list further. The Attic Amazonomachy, for example, does not feature in any of the extant titles of tragedies and satyr plays, but is briefly mentioned in Aesch. *Eum.* 685-90. The Chorus in Eur. *HF* 348-435 similarly describes the labours of Heracles and includes some of the exploits that do not feature in any of the surviving titles, such as Heracles' Amazonomachy or the slaying of the Lernaean Hydra. On the use of mythological *exempla* in tragedy, see Konstantinou (2015), with references.

dramatic attention was devoted to the infinite constellation of other characters of the Greek tradition, such as Tereus (Soph. F 581-595b; *TrGF* 24 post F 1; 70 F 4), Niobe (Aesch. F 154a-167b; Soph. F 441-451) or Alpheisiboea (*TrGF* 20 F 16; 56 F 1; 71 F 1).

Some myths seem to have been particularly popular on the stage during the fifth century, but this may be at least partially due to the uneven distribution of the extant sources. Philoctetes, for example, features in seven titles of plays produced by fifth-century tragedians (Aesch. F 249-253, 255; Soph. *Phil.*; F 697-699, 701; Eur. F 787-803; *TrGF* 20 F 37; 24 post F 1), while only Theodectes seems to have dramatized this story during the fourth century (*TrGF* 72 F 5b). The fortune of Dionysus similarly decreased from the fifth to the fourth century, the distribution of the plays being twenty-two (Aesch. F 22; 23-5; 57-67; 78a-82; 124-6; 146-9; 168-72b; 183; 221-4; 246a-d; Soph. F 171-2; 328-33; Eur. *Bacch.*; *TrGF* 1 F 1c; 7 F 1 tetralogy; 22 F 2; 33 F 1; 40 T 1; 45 F 1) to four (*TrGF* 70 F 2-3; 71 F 4-7; 77 F (4); 86 T 2). Some playwrights seem to have been particularly fond of some categories of myths. Out of fourteen plays dealing with Homeric themes, for example, seven are ascribed to Aeschylus alone (Aesch. F 113a; 131-9; 150-3; 179-80; 187; 263-7; 273-5), whereas Athenian myths are particularly well-represented in Euripides' production (Eur. *Heracl.*; *Hipp.*; *Supp.*; F 1-13; 105-13; 349-70; 381-90; 428-47; 674a-81).

Despite the existence of trends and tendencies in the distribution of mythical themes, my survey shows that tragedy and satyr drama virtually covered the entire Greek mythical tradition. The range of the mythical themes employed, especially if seen in conjunction with the popularity of the theatre and its centrality in Athens' cultural life, justifies the claim that the dramatic festivals provided the bulk of the Athenians' mythical knowledge.¹²² Tragedy and satyr drama, however, were not the only components of the dramatic festivals to be involved with myth. In order to assess the role of the dramatic festivals fully, it is necessary to devote a few words to the dithyramb. The name of this genre is itself a source of confusion and debate. Early sources (most notably Archilochus' fragment 120 West) use the word 'dithyramb' to allude to a song in honour of Dionysus performed in a ritual context and connected to wine consumption. Such denomination corresponded to an early system of classification of the genres of lyric poetry based on a functional criterion. During the course of the fifth century, a new system based on formal criteria started to overlap with the pre-existing one. Performances of dithyrambs began to go under the name of *kyklioi choroi*, which allowed the circular chorus of the dithyramb to be distinguished from tragedy's quadrangular chorus. The expression *kyklioi choroi* also applied to generic round choirs performed in non-Dionysiac contexts, such

¹²² Cf. Isoc. 12.168-9, where Isocrates assumes that his readers have heard the myth of Adrastus from the tragedians at the Dionysia (τῶν τραγῳδοδιδασκάλων Διονυσίαις).

as the Panathenaea, the Thargelia and the Prometheia. The overlap of the two systems is reflected in the work of the Alexandrian scholars, who eventually labelled songs performed by *kyklio choroi* in both Dionysiac and non-Dionysiac festivals as ‘dithyrambs’, thus causing the modern interpreters’ confusion.¹²³

The uncertainty surrounding the name, together with the scanty amount of surviving dithyrambs, makes it hard to delineate the characteristics of this enigmatic genre, whose history has been commonly perceived as one of rise and decline. According to many scholars, the dithyramb originated as a non-literary, anonymous composition in honour of Dionysus sung by a processional chorus lead by a leader (*exarchos*), and received its literary “codification” at the end of the seventh century thanks to Arion of Corinth (Hdt. 1.23). The dithyramb was then introduced in Athens probably under the tyrants or at the beginning of the Cleisthenic democracy, and the institution of dithyrambic contests has been attributed to the poet Lasos of Hermione. The tradition credited dithyrambs (not necessarily designed for performance at Athens) to all three great lyric poets of the fifth century. Nothing survives of Simonides’ production, while Pindar’s dithyrambs have only been preserved in fragmentary form (Pind. fr. 70-86a Maehler). Recent papyrological discoveries have brought back to light the Alexandrian edition of Bacchylides’ *Dithyrambs* (Bacchyl. 15-20), but it is hard to tell if these were the kind of dithyrambs that would have been performed at the Great Dionysia. Some innovations seem to have occurred between the end of the fifth and the beginning of the fourth century, when poets such as Melanippus, Philoxenus and Timotheus started challenging the traditional dithyramb. The ‘New Dithyramb’ was characterised by experimental music, lyric solos and obscure and innovative language. Due to Plato’s and Aristophanes’s criticism (Pl. *Leg.* 3.700a–1a; Ar. *Av.* 1377-1409), this new trend has long been perceived as an elaborated and yet superficial kind of poetry, emptied of any real religious meaning.¹²⁴

As for the themes, there is substantial agreement on the fact that the dithyramb was characterised by the presence of mythological narrative. Doubts arise about the actual Dionysiac content of the poems, and the available evidence does not provide any secure answers. On the one hand, Pindar’s fragments tend to appear as cult songs and show some connections to Dionysus even when they deal with completely different myths. Only two out of the six dithyrambs of Bacchylides, on the other hand, can be clearly assigned to a Dionysiac

¹²³ See Käppel (2000), 15-26; Fearn (2007), 165-74 and 205-12. Kowalzig and Wilson (2013), 16 state that the success of the dithyrambic contests at the Dionysia ‘encouraged the spread of similar choral contests to festivals of gods other than Dionysos’, but that such contests ‘should probably not be thought of as dithyrambs’ but as generic *kyklio choroi*.

¹²⁴ For a reconstruction of the history of the dithyramb see Pickard-Cambridge (1927), 5-75; Zimmermann (1992), 21-133. See Fearn (2007), 181-205 and Kowalzig and Wilson (2013), who both argue against the theories of decline.

context: Bacchyl. 16 and 19. The former dealt with the myth of Heracles and Deianira and belonged to the winter rituals held in Delphi in honour of Dionysus, while the latter, probably written for the Great Dionysia, was concerned with the myth of Io and included a genealogy of Dionysus. The remaining poems show a significant diversity of themes, which range from the demand of Helen's return (Bacchyl. 15) to episodes from Theseus' life (Bacchyl. 17; 18) and the story of Idas and Marpessa (Bacchyl. 20).¹²⁵

The dramatic festivals played a key role in the development of the Athenians' mythical knowledge, but they were by no means the only festival where the Athenians engaged with their mythical tradition. Another major religious festival in particular needs to be mentioned as one such context: the Panathenaea. Held in honour of Athens' patron goddess, Athena Polias, the event itself was rooted in myth. The Panathenaea celebrated Athena's birthday or the role of the goddess in the Olympians' victory over the Giants. The foundation of the festival was placed in mythical times. The Athenians attributed it to Erichthonius (*FGrHist* 323a F 2; 324 F 2; schol. *ad* Aelius Aristides 1.362) and Theseus (Plut. *Thes.* 24.3; Paus. 8.2.1; schol. *ad* Pl. *Prm.* 127a; Phot. *Lex.* s.v. Παναθήναια; *Suda* s.v. Παναθήναια). As Athena's foster child and earthborn ancestor of the Athenians, Erichthonius was well-suited to be the inventor of the Panathenaea, and was specifically associated with some of the festival's individual components, such as the procession and some of the sporting events (*JG* XII,5 444.17-18; *FGrHist* 328 F 8; [Eratosth.] *Cat.* 13). Theseus was thought to have been the festival's second founder, and ancient sources associate his reform of the Panathenaea with his synoecism. Because of their mythical *aition* and the identity of their founders, the Panathenaea had a martial flavour and celebrated Athens' greatness and special relationship with Athena.¹²⁶

Two versions of the festival can be distinguished. The Small Panathenaea were celebrated every year and were local events where only Athenians could participate. The Great Panathenaea, introduced in 566/5 BC possibly by Pisistratus, took place every four years and had an international character. The Panathenaea were held in the final part of the month of Hekatombeion, at the beginning of the Attic year.¹²⁷ The central moment in both versions of the festival was the procession, which started at the Ceramicus and followed the Panathenaic Way through the Agora and up to the Acropolis. There, the procession culminated in the sacrifices to Athena, which were followed by feasting and revelling. While in the Small

¹²⁵ See Pickard-Cambridge (1927), 5-75; Käppel (2000), 12-18 and 26; Maehler (2004), 157-222; Fearn (2007), 177-81 and 219-25; Kowalzig and Wilson (2013), 4-5; Calame (2013). Zimmermann (1992), 113-16 suggests that two tendencies existed in dithyrambic poetry: a non-Dionysiac current, represented by Bacchylides, and a Dionysiac counter-tendency, represented by Pindar, which aimed at the restoration of the original cultic character of the genre.

¹²⁶ Parke (1977), 33; Neils (1992a), 14-15; Shear (2001), 29-71; Sourvinou-Inwood (2011), 270-80.

¹²⁷ Parke (1977), 33-4; Neils (1992a), 14-15; Shear (2001), 5-8.

Panathenaea only Athenian men and women took part in these events, the Great Panathenaea saw also the participation of metics, colonists and, only for the fifth century, allies. Myth also played a role in the procession, when a robe (*peplos*) depicting the Gigantomachy was dedicated to Athena on behalf of the Athenians. This offering was one of the main components of the celebration, and during the classical period it only took place at the Great Panathenaea.¹²⁸

Competitions played a prominent role at the Panathenaea. Sporting events included gymnastic, equestrian and tribal competitions, some of which were limited to Athenian contestants.¹²⁹ More relevant to the present study are the musical and poetic contests. Tribal contests for *kyklio choroi*, or ‘dithyrambs’, are attested for both the Small and Great Panathenaea, but nothing can be said about their mythical topics. The only well-preserved dithyramb that may be associated with the festival is Bacchyl. 15, which deals with the cyclic episode of Menelaus and Odysseus’ embassy to demand Helen’s return.¹³⁰ A wider range of events was offered at the Great Panathenaea. According to Plutarch, musical contests (*mousikoi agōnes*) had been introduced by Pericles (Plut. *Per.* 13.5-6). Based on Attic vase painting, however, modern scholars agree that at least some of the events were already part of the festival’s programme in the sixth century. In the classical period, such contests included competitions for *kitharōidoi*, *aulōidoi*, *kitharistai* and *aulētai*. The Great Panathenaea also hosted rhapsodic contests. These must have been part of the programme since the sixth century. This can be inferred by the fact that Solon or Hipparchus were credited with the rule that rhapsodes at the Panathenaea had to recite the Homeric epics in sequence, each taking up where the previous contestant had left off ([Pl.] *Hipparch.* 228b4-c3; Diog. Laert. 1.57). It is not clear whether these competitions implied adherence to a fixed text of the Homeric poems, nor can it be established if the contestants recited the poems in their entirety or only performed selected episodes in their narrative order. Whatever the format of the rhapsodic contests, however, their subject certainly came from the Homeric epics and (possibly, but less likely) the Trojan Cycle.¹³¹

Myth featured conspicuously in the figurative cycles adorning the buildings of the Agora and the Acropolis, which provided the physical setting for most of the events of the

¹²⁸ Neils (1992a), 23-4; Shear (2001), 72-230; Tracy (2007). Specifically on the *peplos*, see Barber (1992); Shear (2001), 173-86; Sourvinou-Inwood (2011), 267-70.

¹²⁹ Kyle (1992); Boegehold (1996); Shear (2001), 231-350. On the prizes won at Panathenaic contests see Neils (1992b); Shear (2001), 388-413; Themelis (2007); Tiverios (2007).

¹³⁰ On Bacchyl. 15, see Maehler (2004), 157-8; Fearn (2007), 257-337.

¹³¹ Shapiro (1992); Shear (2001), 350-76; Nagy (2002), 9-35. The performance of cyclic epics at the Panathenaea has been posited by Burgess (2004-2005). Recitation of non-epic poetry is attested for other Athenian festivals: according to Plato, for example, Athenian boys performed Solon’s poetry, together with poems by other poets, at the festival of the Apatouria (Pl. *Ti.* 21b).

Panathenaea. The Gigantomachy used to appear on the east pediment of the archaic temple of Athena and later featured on the east metopes of the Parthenon, on the shield of the statue of Athena Parthenos and on the east pediment of the temple of Athena Nike. The fall of Troy was sculpted on the north metopes of the Parthenon and depicted in the Painted Stoa, whereas the Centauromachy featured on the south metopes of the Parthenon, on the sandals of the statue of Athena Parthenos and on the shield of Athena Promachos. The Amazonomachy appeared on the west metopes of the Parthenon, on the shield of Athena Parthenos, in the Painted Stoa and possibly on the west pediment of the temple of Athena Nike. Athena and her special relationship with Athens were celebrated on the pediments of the Parthenon, which depicted the birth of the goddess and the contest between Athena and Poseidon over the city.¹³²

Overall, the impact of the Panathenaea on the mythical knowledge of the Athenians seems to have been far from negligible. Several myths physically unfolded in front of the participants when once a year they marched in the procession through the Agora and up to the Acropolis. Mythical narratives were also part of the competitions for *kykloi choroi* at both Small and Great Panathenaea. The rhapsodic contests, held once every four years at the Great Panathenaea, probably contributed to the Athenians' familiarity with the mythical subject of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. The mythical themes deployed at the Panathenaea cannot be delineated completely, but they spanned from the Gigantomachy to the Homeric epics and the Trojan Cycle, from the Centauromachy to specifically Athenian myths such as the Amazonomachy and the contest between Athena and Poseidon. Such range, relatively limited when compared to the thematic flourishing of the dramatic festivals, was by no means inferior to the one employed in other public contexts, to which it is now time to turn.

2.1.2. The institutional settings of Athenian oratory

Athenian orators made abundant use of the past. Whether they provide a term of comparison with the present or are used to praise the city, episodes from the past are often recalled in the extant speeches. Most allusions refer to the historical past, but many others derive their subject

¹³² Castriota (1992), 33-89, 134-83; Shear (2001), 708-14, 724-42, 761-8, 773-8; Hurwit (2004), 123-33, 147-54, 181-91; Castriota (2005); Stansbury-O'Donnell (2005); Barringer (2008), 59-108. Brommer (1967), 191-5 rejected the identification of the west metopes of the Parthenon with the Amazonomachy and suggested scenes of Greeks fighting Persians. The sacrifice of the daughters of Erechtheus during Eumolpus' invasion of Athens may have featured on the Parthenon frieze, if one believes Connelly (1996). The scholarly consensus, however, is that the frieze portrayed the Panathenaic procession itself: see Hurwit (1999), 222-8; Shear (2001), 742-61; Hurwit (2004), 133-46; Barringer (2008), 85-91. The frieze of the temple of Athena Nike, which almost certainly featured the battle of Marathon, may also have depicted mythical battles. Proposed identifications include the recovery of the bodies of the Seven, the Athenian defence of the Heraclidae and the war against Eumolpus: see Shear (2001), 782-5 for an overview of the issue.

matter from myth.¹³³ The vast majority of the mythical allusions in the orators, however, comes from the private speeches of Isocrates.¹³⁴ Only part of the preserved mythical allusions was therefore delivered in the institutions of Athenian democracy, or at least written with an institutional setting in mind. As we shall see, myth featured almost regularly at the state funeral for the war dead in the customary funeral speech. Several mythical allusions are present in the extant forensic speeches, delivered in the lawcourts. Finally, myth played a minor role in the Assembly and, possibly, the Council. This section will focus on these institutions and explore the range of myths deployed in each of these contexts.

The state funeral for the war dead provided the Athenians with a public, emotionally charged occasion to recall and construct the city's past.¹³⁵ As a part of the burial rituals, an orator chosen by the city would deliver a funeral speech (*epitaphios logos*) to commemorate the war dead. Such speeches often included narratives about the historical and mythical exploits of the Athenian ancestors. Thucydides describes the state funeral when he introduces the funeral speech delivered by Pericles in the winter of 431/0 BC. Before the ceremony, the bones of the dead were laid out in a tent for three days and received offerings from the mourners. There followed a procession during which the bones, placed into coffins according to tribes, were transported to the public burial ground (*dēmosion sēma*),¹³⁶ while an empty bier was prepared for the dead who had not been recovered. Anyone who wished, both Athenians and foreigners, could participate in the procession, and women were there to lament the dead. The bones were then laid out and buried, and a man chosen by the city delivered a funeral speech in honour of the dead (Thuc. 2.34.2-6).

¹³³ For a general study of the use of history in the orators, see Nouhaud (1982); for a similar study of the use of myth in the orators, see Gotteland (2001).

¹³⁴ For a table describing the distribution of mythical allusions among the Attic orators, see Nouhaud (1982), 19. On the private nature of the speeches of Isocrates, see Too (1995), 74-112; Mirhady and Too (2000), 5-6.

¹³⁵ The collective burial of the war dead was a very significant Athenian practice, but it was by no means restricted to Athens: on this custom in other Greek *poleis* see Low (2003).

¹³⁶ The expression δημόσιον σῆμα is only attested in Thucydides. For other expressions used to refer to the public cemetery, see Arrington (2014), 66-7. The *dēmosion sēma* was located in the Ceramicus (schol. ABFGc₂ ad Thuc. 2.34.5), in the north-western part of Athens. The graves were distributed along the road that connected the Dipylon Gate with the Academy (Paus. 1.29.4; Cic. *Fin.* 5.1.1-5.2.5; Philostr. *V S* 2.22). According to Stupperich (1977), 22, 26 and Clairmont (1983), 32, the graves strictly lined the road, but Arrington (2014), 67-8 (further elaborating Goette 2009, 188) has convincingly argued that some of them were scattered on a series of cross-streets. The *dēmosion sēma* was not an enclosed area exclusively devoted to the Athenian war dead: see Patterson (2006), 53-6, who has criticised the idea of 'a specific area marked out as a public or citizen cemetery in the Athenian Ceramicus'; see also Low (2012), 23-32, Arrington (2010), 500, n. 4 and (2014), 73-6. Pausanias (1.29.3-15) mentions several public graves of individuals, cavalrymen and allies, and archaeological evidence reveals that the area also hosted private burials: see Clairmont (1983), 3-4, 38, 40-1, 44; Low (2012), 31-2; Arrington (2014), 86-8. From a juridical point of view, the area of the Ceramicus included both public and private lands: see Faraguna (2012), 177-80.

The place of myth at the state funeral was in the *epitaphios logos*. This genre is not very well represented in our sources, as only six funeral speeches survive. Two fragments (DK Gorg. B 5a-6) of one such speech composed by the sophist Gorgias, probably a literary exercise, are attested.¹³⁷ Pericles delivered the *epitaphios* for the dead of the first year of the Peloponnesian War. The speech is reported by Thucydides (2.34-46), and whether it was a (more or less) faithful reproduction of Pericles' real speech or Thucydides' free composition is a matter of debate.¹³⁸ Lysias' *Funeral Oration* commemorated the dead of the Corinthian War (395-386 BC), but its exact date cannot be determined with any certainty. The speech's authenticity has often been questioned because of Lysias' status as a metic, and scholars have similarly debated whether the text was meant for private circulation.¹³⁹ Whatever one's view on this issue, Lysias' speech reflects the themes and discursive parameters of a real *epitaphios logos* and is a highly valuable source. Demosthenes is known to have delivered the funeral speech for the fallen at the Battle of Chaeronea in 338 BC (Dem. 18.285; Plut. *Dem.* 21.2), but the authenticity of the preserved text of the speech has been the object of scholarly debate.¹⁴⁰ In Plato's *Menexenus*, Socrates recounts a funeral speech that he had allegedly heard from Aspasia. The dialogue is generally regarded as authentic, and the speech is usually seen as a parody of the genre of the *epitaphios logos*.¹⁴¹ Finally, Hyperides' *Funeral Speech* commemorated the dead of the Lamian War (323/2 BC) and is commonly considered unusual because of its focus on the fallen general Leosthenes.¹⁴²

The *epitaphios logos* is unique in offering a continuous, albeit selective narrative of Athenian history. Funeral speeches commemorate a relatively fixed set of myths and historical events. As Table 2 shows, four out of six funeral speeches allude to Athenian autochthony. Athens' mythical wars were also a common epitaphic *topos*. The Amazonomachy, the war

¹³⁷ Todd (2007), 151.

¹³⁸ See Kakridis (1961), 5; Flashar (1969), 28, n. 54; Ziolkowski (1981), 188-95, 202; Hornblower (1991), 294-6; Pritchard (1996), 141-4; Bosworth (2000), 1. Plutarch attests that Pericles also delivered the funeral speech for the fallen of the Samian War in 440/39 BC (Plut. *Per.* 28.3-5), and preserves the only surviving fragment of the speech (Plut. *Per.* 8.6).

¹³⁹ Todd (2007), 157-64.

¹⁴⁰ On the issue of authenticity, see Worthington (2003) and Herrman (2008).

¹⁴¹ See Coventry (1989); Loraux (1981), 321-37; Thomas (1989), 210-11; Trivigno (2009). Monoson (1998) sees Socrates' speech generically as critical towards Pericles' funeral speech. The parodic nature of Plato's *Menexenus* has been questioned by Kahn (1963) and recently by Pappas and Zelcer (2015), 77-93. Tsitsiridis (1998), 63-92 takes a middle ground between these two interpretations.

¹⁴² Loraux (1981), 132-5 explains Hyperides' focus on Leosthenes as a result of the increasing importance of exceptional individuals in Greek politics during the fourth century. Herrman (2009), 61-2 and Petruzzello (2009), 83-7 connect this feature of the speech with the development of prose encomia. Hesk (2013) rightly emphasises that praise of individuals or subgroups was not unusual in funeral speeches and downplays the uniqueness of Hyperides' *Funeral Speech*: see discussion below, at p. 63. The authenticity of the speech is generally accepted but has recently been questioned by Canfora (2011).

against Thebes for the recollection of the bodies of the Seven and the war against Eurystheus in defence of the Heraclidae, in particular, feature in all three *epitaphioi* which offer a narrative of the ancestral exploits: Lysias', Demosthenes' and Plato's funeral speeches. The Trojan War is twice mentioned as a term of comparison for the deeds of the Athenian ancestors, who surpassed the excellence of the Greek heroes who captured Troy.¹⁴³ Many other myths, including for example the sacrifice of Erechtheus' daughters, Ajax's suicide and the story of Procne and Philomela, are recalled exclusively in Demosthenes' catalogue of the eponymous heroes (Dem. 60.27-31). This catalogue prompts a discussion of the reasons that brought the Athenians of each tribe to strive for a noble death, but it is Demosthenes' own innovation and does not feature in any other extant funeral speech.¹⁴⁴ If one takes this detail into account, it is safe to conclude that the range of myths employed at the state funeral was limited to four or five episodes from the early history of the city.

The captivating power of the *epitaphios logos* over the audience is testified by Socrates in Plato's *Menexenus*. The philosopher ironically praises the orators' ability to bewitch the souls of the listeners (γοητεύουσιν ἡμῶν τὰς ψυχάς) and make them all feel ennobled (Pl. *Menex.* 234c-235c). As previous scholarship has pointed out, this may not be sufficient to support the assumption that the *epitaphios logos* always provided the dominant versions of the myths current in classical Athens.¹⁴⁵ The emotional weight of epitaphic narratives, however, together with the constant presence of a limited set of themes repeated with very few variations, probably caused the state funeral to contribute significantly to the mythical knowledge of the Athenians and to influence to some extent their ideas about specific episodes from the city's past.

¹⁴³ On the reception of the Trojan myth in classical Greece, see Erskine (2001), 61-92.

¹⁴⁴ On the issue of tradition and innovation in the funeral speeches, see Frangeskou (1998-1999).

¹⁴⁵ See Brock (1998), 229-30, who notes that the 'public funeral took place at most once a year, separated by a flood of more pragmatic oratory, not to mention dramatic performances both at festivals and in demes'; see also Hanink (2013).

Myth	Speech
Autochthony	Lys. 2.17; Pl. <i>Menex.</i> 237b1-c6, 237e, 238e5-239a7; Dem. 60.4; Hyp. 6.7.
Amazonomachy	Lys. 2.4-6; Pl. <i>Menex.</i> 239b; Dem. 60.8.
Adrastus and the bodies of the Seven	Lys. 2.7-10; Pl. <i>Menex.</i> 239b; Dem. 60.8.
Defence of the Heraclidae	Lys. 2.11-16; Pl. <i>Menex.</i> 239b; Dem. 60.8.
War against Eumolpus	Pl. <i>Menex.</i> 239b; Dem. 60.8.
Trojan War	Dem. 60.10; Hyp. 6.35-6.
Daughters of Erechtheus	Dem. 60.27.
Theseus establishes <i>isonomia</i>	Dem. 60.28.
Procne and Philomela	Dem. 60.28.
Daughters of Leo	Dem. 60.29.
Acamas at Troy	Dem. 60.29.
Birth of Oeneus from Dionysus	Dem. 60.30.
Double nature of Cecrops	Dem. 60.30.
Marriage of Alope	Dem. 60.31.
Ajax's suicide	Dem. 60.31.
Antiochus, son of Heracles	Dem. 60.31.

Table 2: Myths in the extant funeral speeches

The lawcourts (*dikastēria*), manned by ordinary Athenians without any specialist training, were an essential and defining feature of Athenian democracy (Arist. *Pol.* 1275a22-33; [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 41.2). The institution of the popular lawcourts was traditionally attributed to Solon (Arist. *Pol.* 1273b35-74a5; [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 9.1),¹⁴⁶ and their role was allegedly enhanced by Ephialtes ([Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 25.2). Several locations have been proposed as meeting places for the *dikastēria*. Five structures (Buildings A-E) excavated under the Stoa of Attalus in the east side of the Agora were built from the end of the fifth century and are identified as law courts by the remains of dicastic equipment. Around 300 BC, these structures were replaced by a single building known as Square Peristyle, which offered the advantage of concentrating all trials in one location. Other sites hosting popular lawcourts during the fifth and fourth centuries are attested from literary and epigraphic sources. Such sites included the Periclean Odeon (Ar.

¹⁴⁶ This attribution is generally accepted, but modern scholars disagree on the nature of the judicial institution created by Solon, which is usually referred to as *hēliaia*. The traditional view, shared e.g. by Rhodes (1981), 160-2, 318-19 and Ostwald (1986), 9-12, is that Solon's *hēliaia* was a judicial session of the people's Assembly. Hansen (1989), 237-49, 258-62 and Boegehold (1995), 17-20, on the other hand, argue that the Solonian *hēliaia* was not a judicial session of the Assembly but a separate institution divided into several courts.

Vesp. 1108-9; [Dem.] 59.52; Poll. 8.33) and the Painted Stoa (Dem. 45.17; *IG II²* 1641.25-33; 1670.34-5), whereas other courts such as the Parabyston (Ar. *Vesp.* 1108-9; Paus. 1.28.8; Harp. s.v. παράβυστον; *IG II²* 1646.12) and the Red and Green Courts (Paus. 1.28.8) have been associated with some of the buildings under the Stoa of Attalus.¹⁴⁷

Every Athenian over thirty years of age who was not a debtor to the Treasury or disenfranchised had the right to serve in the lawcourts ([Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 63.3). A total of 6,000 judges were selected by lot every year and had to swear the Heliastic Oath. This bound them, among other things, to cast their votes in accordance with the laws and decrees of the city.¹⁴⁸ The judges were then allocated to specific courts every morning. How this happened during the fifth century is unclear. From at least 410 BC, however, the judges were divided into ten sections and allocated to courts by lot. By the end of the fourth century this process was improved and came to include a second selection by lot that assigned judges to courts individually ([Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 63-4). The size of judging panels varied from a minimum of 201 to a maximum of 501 judges depending on the nature of the procedure, but on some occasions two or three panels of 501 judges could be brought together ([Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 53.3, 68.1). Daily pay for the judges was introduced by Pericles (Arist. *Pol.* 1274a8-9; [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 27.3-4) and its rate, which was originally two obols, was raised to three obols by Cleon (schol. *ad Ar. Vesp.* 88, 300; [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 62.2).¹⁴⁹

Five special courts require some separate remarks. The Council of the Areopagus, the Palladion, the Delphinion, the Phreatto and the Prytaneion each dealt with a specific type of homicide charge ([Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 57.3). The mechanism for the selection of judges differed from the one employed in the popular courts. Only former Archons could serve in the Areopagus (Plut. *Sol.* 19.1; Dem. 24.22; [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 60.3) and they were appointed for life (Lys. 26.11; [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 3.6). The size of the Council of the Areopagus is not known, but suggested numbers range from 150 to 250 Areopagites. The other Homicide Courts were manned by judges called *ephetai*, who had to be at least fifty years old and formed panels of 51 (*IG I³* 104.13-19; [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 57.4; Poll. *Onom.* 8.125; Phot. *Lex.* s.v. ἐφέται). Homicide charges were brought before the King Archon, who held three preliminary hearings (*prodikasiai*) in order to determine the appropriate court for the trial. At the hearing proper, the prosecutor spoke first and the defendant spoke second; both litigants were then allowed a

¹⁴⁷ On the locations proposed as meeting places for the law courts, see Boegehold (1995), 3-16, 91-113 and Townsend (1995), 24-106.

¹⁴⁸ The text of the oath quoted in Dem. 24.149-51 is a forgery, but its contents can be reconstructed thanks to the many allusions in the orators: see Harris (2013b), 101-37; Canevaro (2013a), 173-80.

¹⁴⁹ On the selection of the judges, the size of the panels and the pay for the judges, see Rhodes (1981), 697-716, 728-30, 734-5; Boegehold (1995), 21-42; Hansen (1999) [1991], 181-96.

second shorter speech. Finally, the judges voted and the King Archon, who was not allowed to vote, pronounced the verdict.¹⁵⁰

As the data shows, the Athenian judicial system was deeply rooted in Athenian society. At least 6,000 Athenians served in the lawcourts every year, not to mention the additional number of Areopagites (and possibly *ephetai*) serving in the Homicide Courts. If one also considers that the lawcourts met between 150 to 200 days per year and that forensic speeches make up the vast majority of the surviving oratorical production of classical Athens,¹⁵¹ the mythical allusions in such speeches are proportionately few. Table 3 shows that, especially compared to the state funeral, no specific myths were particularly associated with the lawcourts. Most mythical allusions in forensic speeches, however, deal with Athens' past. Some of these episodes, such as the Athenians' autochthonous origins and the war against Eumolpus, also feature in extant funeral speeches. Other Athenian myths, such as the mythical trials at the Areopagus and the death of king Codrus, are not part of typical epitaphic narratives. Episodes and characters from the Trojan War are also employed and sometimes feature together with poetic quotations. A significant example is Aeschines' use of quotations from the *Iliad* to illustrate the love between Achilles and Patroclus. Myth therefore was not a central element in the rhetoric of the lawcourts, but provided forensic orators with a useful tool for the construction of their arguments.

Myth	Speech
Autochthony	[Dem.] 59.74; Lycurg. 1.41, 47, 100
Trial of Orestes at the Areopagus	Dem. 23.66 and 74; Din. 1.87
Trial of Ares at the Areopagus	Dem. 23.66; Din. 1.87
Eumolpus/daughters of Erechtheus	Lycurg. 1.98-100; Demad. 1.37
Theseus and the synoecism	[Dem.] 59.75
Achilles and Patroclus	Aeschin. 1.144-50
Phoenix	Aeschin. 1.151-2
Acamas and Amphipolis	Aeschin. 2.31
Thersites	Aeschin. 3.231

¹⁵⁰ Rhodes (1981), 640-50; Wallace (1989), 94-127; Boegehold (1995), 43-50; Hansen (1999) [1991], 288-95; Leão (2010); Harris (2016), 76-80. The identity and method of selection of the *ephetai* is highly debated. The sources state that they were elected by lot (*λαχόντες*) ([Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 57.4) or selected according to birth (*ἀριστινῶν*) (*IG I³* 104.19, partially restored based on Poll. *Onom.* 8.125). As a result, some scholars have reasonably (*pace* Kapparis 1999, 188) conjectured that the *ephetai* were selected by lot among the Areopagites. Scholarship is similarly divided on whether the *ephetai* were replaced by regular judges at the end of the fifth century. For a survey of these and other issues connected to the *ephetai*, see Kapparis (1999), 187-9 and Canevaro (2013a), 56-7.

¹⁵¹ On the frequency of the sessions of the lawcourts, see Hansen (1979) and (1999) [1991], 186.

Trojan War	Lycurg. 1.62
Death of king Codrus	Lycurg. 1.84-7
Hector	Lycurg. 1.102-4

Table 3: Myths in the extant forensic speeches

The Council and the Assembly were the deliberative bodies of the Athenian democracy. The Council (*boulē*) of the Five Hundred was introduced by Cleisthenes ([Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 21.3), even though a previous Council of the Four Hundred was attributed to Solon ([Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 8.4; Plut. *Sol.* 19.1).¹⁵² The Council met in the Council house (*bouleutērion*) in the west side of the Agora. Its original meeting place, the Old Bouleuterion, had been built in the early fifth century. In the last quarter of the fifth century this building came to be used as the state archive, while the New Bouleuterion was constructed to host the meetings of the Council.¹⁵³ Extraordinary meeting places are also attested, including the dockyards at Piraeus, the Acropolis and even Salamis during the Persian invasion.¹⁵⁴ Another building associated with the Council was the Tholos. Circular in shape, it was built around 470 BC and hosted the members of the tribe that took turns in presiding the Council. These were called *prytaneis* and they would sleep and have their meals in the Tholos.¹⁵⁵

All Athenian citizens over the age of thirty were eligible to serve in the Council unless debarred by specific circumstances. These included practicing prostitution (Aeschin. 1.19-20) and having performed military service under the Four Hundred in 411 BC (And. 1.75), but other restrictions may have applied. It was possible for the same person to serve in the Council twice, although not two years in a row, but only a minority of Athenians seems to have exercised this right.¹⁵⁶ The Council was manned by 500 councillors who received a salary of five obols per day. Each tribe provided fifty councillors selected by lot among volunteers from Athens' 139 demes ([Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 43.2). Each deme was allotted a number of seats in proportion to its size, but this number could vary depending on whether the smaller demes were able to provide enough councillors.¹⁵⁷ The Council met around 300 times a year.¹⁵⁸ As previously mentioned, each tribe's fifty councillors had to take turns in leading the Council as *prytaneis*. Their period of office lasted one prytany, i.e. one tenth of the Attic year. Their main task was to summon the Council and the Assembly and they received an extra obol in addition

¹⁵² Rhodes (1972), 1 and 208-9; Hansen (1999) [1991], 247.

¹⁵³ Thompson and Wycherley (1972), 29-31; Rhodes (1972), 30-2; Hansen (1999) [1991], 251-2.

¹⁵⁴ Rhodes (1972), 35-6; Hansen (1999) [1991], 251.

¹⁵⁵ Thompson and Wycherley (1972), 41-6; Rhodes (1972), 16-23, 32; Hansen (1999) [1991], 250-2.

¹⁵⁶ Rhodes (1972), 1-4; Hansen (1985), 51-5; Hansen (1999) [1991], 249.

¹⁵⁷ Rhodes (1972), 8-12; Hansen (1999) [1991], 247-8.

¹⁵⁸ Rhodes (1985), 30; Ober (2008), 144.

to the councillors' normal salary. Every day a chairman (*epistatēs*) was selected by lot among the *prytaneis* to act as the head of state.¹⁵⁹

Together with the lawcourts and the magistracies, the Assembly (*ekklēsia*) was one of the cornerstones of Athenian democracy (Arist. *Pol.* 1275a22-33; [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 41.2). The Assembly might have originally met in the Agora (Plut. *Sol.* 8.2, 30.1) or in the Lyceum (*IG I³* 105.34), but its meetings were eventually moved onto the Pnyx. This hill, located south-west of the Agora, hosted the Assembly until the end of the fourth century, when the meetings were transferred to the Theatre of Dionysus (*IG II²* 389). Archaeological excavations have revealed three phases in the development of the Assembly site. Pnyx I (ca 460-400 BC) hosted about 5,000-6,000 people sitting directly on the rock in a semicircle and facing the speaker's platform (*bēma*) placed on the north side of the hill. Pnyx II (ca 400-345) hosted about 6,000 people sitting, probably on benches, in a rebuilt auditorium facing south. Pnyx III (ca 345-300) was rebuilt, possibly by Lycurgus or Eubulus, with an enlarged auditorium and might have hosted over 10,000 people.¹⁶⁰

All adult male Athenian citizens, except for those who had been disenfranchised (*atimoi*) or were public debtors, were entitled to attend, speak and vote in the Assembly, and there were no restrictions based on census or land ownership. The introduction of Assembly pay (*ekklēsiastikos misthos*) after the democratic restoration in 403 BC encouraged even the poorest citizens to take part in the meetings, and the reimbursement amounted to one drachma or a drachma and a half depending on the type of session. Based on literary and epigraphic sources, average attendance of the Assembly has been estimated at about 5,000 people during the fifth century (Thuc. 8.72; Ar. *Ach.* 1-25) and about 6,000 during the fourth, when a quorum of 6,000 voters was established for certain types of decisions to be valid (Dem. 24.45-6; [Dem.] 59.89-90; *IG II²* 103). Compared to population estimates, these numbers indicate that participation to the Assembly increased in the fourth century: while only one tenth of Athens' citizen population attended the *ekklēsia* during the fifth century, one fifth took part during the following century.¹⁶¹ There were two types of sessions of the Assembly: principal assemblies (*ekklēsiai kyriai*) and regular assemblies (*ekklēsiai nomimoi*). Principal assemblies took place once every prytany and were devoted to specific matters such as votes on the conduct of magistrates or *eisangeliai*, whereas regular assemblies were held three times per prytany. Therefore, the Assembly regularly met a total of four times per prytany and forty per year

¹⁵⁹ Rhodes (1972), 16-23; Hansen (1999) [1991], 250-1.

¹⁶⁰ H. A. Thompson (1982); Hansen (1987), 12-14; Hansen (1999) [1991], 128-9.

¹⁶¹ Hansen (1987), 14-19; Hansen (1999) [1991], 130-2.

([Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 43.3-6).¹⁶² This number, however, could be exceeded, because in case of emergency it was possible to summon extraordinary meetings called *ekklēsiai synklētoi* (Dem. 19.123; Aeschin. 2.72).¹⁶³

Both the Council and the Assembly had the potential to influence the mythical knowledge of the Athenians due to the frequency of the sessions (especially in the case of the Council) and the large number of citizens involved. It is therefore striking that no mythical allusions are attested in any of the extant Assembly speeches or in the ones recounted by Thucydides.¹⁶⁴ Myth is similarly absent from the speeches destined to the Council, but this can be partially ascribed to the small amount of preserved bouleutic speeches.¹⁶⁵ The only extant mythical allusions in deliberative oratory are found in Xenophon's account of a speech delivered by the ambassador Procles of Phlius in front of the Athenian Assembly. Procles recalls how the Athenians fought against the Thebans over the bodies of the Seven and against Eurystheus in defence of the Heraclidae (Xen. *Hell.* 6.5.46-8). Procles' use of myth in his embassy speech may not have been an isolated case, as we can infer from a passage in Thucydides. There, some Athenian envoys address the Spartan Assembly and declare that they will not mention the very ancient events (καὶ τὰ μὲν πάνυ παλαιὰ τί δεῖ λέγειν;) but rather focus on the Persian Wars (Thuc. 1.73.2).¹⁶⁶ Aeschines offers further proof in his speech *On the Embassy*, where he states that during an embassy to Macedon he once recalled how Theseus' son Acamas had acquired the area known as *Ennea Hodoi* (Aeschin. 2.31). It can then be argued that embassy speeches provided a possible occasion for the Athenians to engage with myth in the Council and the Assembly, where such speeches were normally delivered.

This survey of the institutional settings of Athenian oratory has shown that myth was certainly used at the state funeral, in the lawcourts and in the Assembly, and that it may have also been employed in the Council. The presence of myth and the range of the mythical themes deployed, however, are not comparable to those of the dramatic festivals, and they varied in

¹⁶² According to Hansen (1983), 35-72, esp. 37, the number of four meetings per prytany and forty per year constituted a fixed limit that could not be exceeded, but Harris (2006), 85-90 has shown that such a limit did not exist.

¹⁶³ Rhodes (1981), 520-31; Hansen (1987), 19-24; Hansen (1999) [1991], 133-5; Harris (2006), 81-120. *Pace* Hansen (1983), 35-72, esp. 41-2, *ekklēsiai synklētoi* were not ordinary meetings summoned at short notice within the fixed limit of four meetings per prytany.

¹⁶⁴ The myth of Athens' defence of the Heraclidae is mentioned in a decree quoted in Demosthenes' *On the Crown* (Dem. 18.187), but the document is a later forgery: see Canevaro (2013a), 310-18.

¹⁶⁵ Only five bouleutic speeches survive: Lys. 16; 24; 26; 31; Dem. 51. Most of them deal with cases of *dokimasia* and can be ascribed to the forensic genre.

¹⁶⁶ Cf. also Hdt. 9.26-7, where Tegeans and Athenians each claim the command over the left wing of the Greek army at Plataea and construct their speeches on episodes from the mythical past. As noted by Brock (1998), 228-9, these passages may well have been Thucydides' and Herodotus' free compositions, but must have employed 'the sort of arguments that contemporary Athenians were presenting to outsiders'.

each of the institutions considered. Despite the possible use of mythical exempla in embassy speeches, the available sources show that myth only played a minor role in the Council and the Assembly. Myth featured to a larger extent in the lawcourts. The mythical allusions attested in forensic oratory usually deal with Athens' past or with the Trojan War, but no specific episodes seem to have been particularly popular in this setting. Compared to forensic rhetoric, the mythical allusions in extant funeral speeches are numerically and proportionately larger. This shows how central the past, both mythical and historical, was at the state funeral for the war dead. Funeral speeches usually dealt with a fixed set of myths, which were limited to Athens' mythical wars and Athenian autochthony, but their emotional and rhetorical charge probably had a significant impact on the mythical knowledge of the Athenians.

2.1.3. Myth in private contexts

The previous sections have shown that the Athenians constantly engaged with the mythical past in virtually every aspect of their public life. Together with history, however, myth was also recalled and transmitted in private contexts outside the formal institutions of the state.¹⁶⁷ One such context was the family. Ancient sources mention older relatives passing down knowledge about the past to their descendants through casual conversation (Pl. *Lach.* 179a-180b; Aeschin. 3.191). The information remembered concerned the family itself or the history of the *polis* at large. Especially for the first type of memories, Rosalind Thomas has introduced the notion of 'family tradition', which implies an almost esoteric transmission of the past within the family.¹⁶⁸ Such a closed system of transmission is hardly conceivable in classical Athens,¹⁶⁹ but this does not detract from the importance of the family as a context for the recollection of the past. Orators, for example, often mention their own family as their source of historical information. In *On the Embassy*, for example, Aeschines attributes his knowledge of Athens' past mistakes to the testimony of his father and uncle (Aeschin. 2.74-8).¹⁷⁰ The

¹⁶⁷ Unlike much recent scholarship (Vlassopoulos 2007; Gottesman 2014; Taylor and Vlassopoulos 2015), I do not think that a dichotomy existed between Athenian democratic institutions and extra-institutional, 'free' spaces. Accordingly, I consider private contexts not to be diametrically opposed to but embedded in the structure of the democracy. I merely take such settings as additional *loci* of social interaction and transmission of memory, and claim that they were not necessarily conditioned by the discursive parameters of the democratic institutions. See also Canevaro (2017) for some criticism specifically on Gottesman's approach.

¹⁶⁸ See Thomas (1989), 95-154, esp. 98; Steinbock (2013a), 73-6.

¹⁶⁹ For a criticism of Thomas' approach, see p. 17. Thomas herself acknowledges that the anthropological notion of 'esoteric tradition' is not entirely appropriate to the Athenian context: see Thomas (1989), 98 n. 8.

¹⁷⁰ On the Aeschines passage see Steinbock (2013b). On the habit of citing family as one's source of historical information see Canevaro (forthcoming b). According to Thomas (1989), 99, 110-23, historical information preserved through family traditions were often employed in the lawcourts to

specific place of myth at the family level is hard to determine. Athenian families may have preserved the memory of their mythical ancestors. This is suggested by a passage in Plato's *Theaetetus* which mocks those people who trace their ancestry back to Heracles or other mythical forebears (Pl. *Tht.* 174e-75a).¹⁷¹ The family might also have been the context where the Athenians were first exposed to myth. If we believe Plato's *Republic*, nurses and mothers told children tales similar to those sung by the poets, such as the story of Cronus and Uranus (Pl. *Resp.* 2. 377b-83c). This information is confirmed by later sources, with Philostratus stating that nurses were very skilled at telling stories such as Theseus' abandonment of Ariadne (Philostr. *Imag.* 1.15.1-5).¹⁷²

Another important private context for the recollection of myth may have been the symposium. This social and cultural institution originated as an exclusively elite activity, but at least in Athens since the late fifth century it gradually became familiar to larger strata of society. In a typical symposium, a small group of friends would gather in a private house to enjoy wine, company and various forms of entertainment, usually after a dinner and before taking part in a revel (*kōmos*) out in the streets. The participants would recline on couches (*klinai*) placed in a circle along the walls of the room. Such an arrangement allowed the fellow drinkers to engage in conversation with each other in an intimate and egalitarian atmosphere. A symposiarch was elected to decide the strength of the wine and supervise the night's entertainment. Wine was diluted with water in a krater according to Greek custom and poured to the symposiasts by servants. The participants were adult males, sometimes accompanied by younger relatives. The only women admitted were courtesans (*hetairai*) and flute players hired to provide entertainment. Symptotic pastimes included drinking games (most notably the *kottabos*), toasts, mockeries (*skōmmata*), cultured discussions and performances of lyric poetry and drinking-songs (*skolia*), and they often had erotic implications.¹⁷³

The intimate atmosphere of the symposium and its several forms of entertainment contributed to reinforce the group identity of the participants, which at least in the case of the *hetaireiai* could be associated with anti-democratic tendencies (Thuc. 3.82.5-6; 8.54.4; Lys. 12.43; 14.25).¹⁷⁴ Performance of songs and poetry provided an opportunity to recall

provide a 'family defence', i.e. 'a plea for voters' sympathy in which a speaker asserts his democratic ancestry, the service given by his ancestors for the city and its democracy'.

¹⁷¹ See Thomas (1989), 108-9. The other examples offered by Thomas cannot be securely associated with transmission within the family (Pl. *Lysis* 205b-e), do not attribute a claim of mythical ancestry to a family tradition (Hdt. 5.57) or do not mention mythical ancestors at all (Pl. *Alcib. I* 104a-c, 112c).

¹⁷² Cf. also Pl. *Leg.* 10.887c-d. See Veyne (1988) [1983], 43.

¹⁷³ Murray (1993) [1980], 207-12 and (1990a), 5-7; Fisher (2000); Lynch (2013); Węcowski (2014), 27-55.

¹⁷⁴ Murray (1990b); Hobden (2013), 117-56, esp. 140-54; Canevaro (2016b), 61-3. But the institution of the symposium was not inherently anti-democratic, and, as shown by Fisher (2000), 356-61, in classical Athens symptotic practices were relatively widespread even outside the elite.

meaningful episodes from the past.¹⁷⁵ Some fragments of elegiac poetry, a genre traditionally associated with the symposium, show an interest in the past. Xenophanes, for example, reflects on the importance for the symposiasts to recall noble actions (ἔσθλά) and avoid invented stories (πλάσματα), such as battles against Titans, Giants and Centaurs, as well as stories about civil strife (Xenophanes fr. 1.19-24 West). Tyrtaeus recalls episodes from Spartan history (Tyrtaeus fr. 2.12-15; 5 West); Mimnermus provides a brief narrative of the colonisation of Smyrna (Mimnermus fr. 9 West), and a poem on a battle between Smyrna and the Lydian king Gyges is also attributed to him (Paus. 9.29.4). A long fragment of the ‘New Simonides’, which might have been originally destined to public performance at a festival, provides a historical narrative of the battle of Plataea and includes a comparison with Trojan myth (Simon. fr. 11 West). Athenian history was one of the themes of sympotic *skolia*. The Aristotelian *Constitution of the Athenians*, for example, quotes one such song devoted to the battle of Leipsydriion ([Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 19.3 = *PMG* 907), while several drinking-songs celebrating the Tyrannicides are attested from other sources (*PMG* 893-6).¹⁷⁶

The mythical past also had a place in the symposium. Mythical scenes were often depicted on vase shapes traditionally associated with the symposium such as kraters and kylikes. Popular subjects included Heracles’ labours, Theseus’ exploits and episodes from the Trojan War, but the thematic range was very broad.¹⁷⁷ Another medium for the recollection of myth at the symposium may have been epinician poetry. Scholars have now recognised the symposium as a possible context for the performance, or at least re-performance, of epinicia.¹⁷⁸ The re-performance of epinicia in Athenian symposia, in particular, is attested by a passage in Aristophanes’ *Clouds* where Strepsiades blames his son, Pheidippides, for refusing to sing an epinicion by Simonides during a symposium (Ar. *Nub.* 1355-8). Myth was an important component of epinician poetry, and even though we do not know which epinicia were popular in Athenian symposia it is safe to assume that they too showed some involvement with the mythical past. If one takes Pindar’s victory odes as a standard for the genre, it appears that epinician poetry used myth to several ends. These ranged from providing the victor with a heroic equivalent (Pind. *Ol.* 1.75-111; *Pyth.* 6.28-46) to illustrating a *gnōmē* with a mythical

¹⁷⁵ For an overview of poetry in the symposium, see Bowie (1986), 15-21 and (1993), 358-66; Gerber (1997), 7; Carey (2009), 30-8.

¹⁷⁶ Rösler (1990); Grethlein (2010), 54-72; Steinbock (2013a), 76-80.

¹⁷⁷ For examples of mythical scenes depicted on Greek pottery, including Attic shapes associated with the symposium, see in general Carpenter (1991) and Lissarrague (2001). A significant portion of the evidence, however, was made for the export market, and according to Lynch (2011), 103 the Athenian market tended to avoid domestic pottery with mythical themes. Even if that was the case, the fact that Athenian potters produced vases depicting some specific myths demonstrates, if not use, at least knowledge of such myths.

¹⁷⁸ Kurke (1991), 5; Currie (2004); Morrison (2007); Grethlein (2010), 41. This view has been partly challenged by Budelmann (2012).

example (Pind. *Pyth.* 1.50-7; 2.20-30).¹⁷⁹ Finally, Plato's *Symposium* attests that myth was also a possible topic of conversation among symposiasts. Upon Eryximachus' advice, the characters in the dialogue decide to each give a speech in praise of love. In his speech, Phaedrus illustrates the power of love with the help of some mythical *exempla*. He recalls the stories of Alcestis, who chose to die for her husband Admetus, and Achilles, who went to the rescue of his lover Patroclus knowing that this would ultimately lead to his own death. While Alcestis and Achilles were rewarded by the gods for their actions, Phaedrus states that Orpheus was punished because he did not have the courage to die for Eurydice (Pl. *Symp.* 179b-80b).

It can be concluded that myth was a significant presence in the private lives of many Athenians. It is plausible that the Athenians first came into contact with myth in the family thanks to nursery rhymes and stories that were passed down generations. Young and adult Athenians could also interact with myth at symposia through the scenes depicted on sympotic pottery, learned conversation among symposiasts and possibly the re-performance of epinician poetry. The impact of private contexts on the mythical knowledge of the Athenians cannot be precisely quantified, nor is it possible to identify particularly popular themes. The family and the symposium, however, along with the constant use of myth in public contexts, probably contributed to the Athenians' familiarity with the Greek mythical tradition.

2.1.4. Myths and variants in classical Athens

My analysis of the use of myth in the institutions of Athenian democracy and in private contexts has shown that myth was a constant presence in the life of the Athenians during the classical period. The dramatic festivals combined great popularity with an exceptional thematic range and provided the bulk of the Athenians' mythical knowledge. Myth was central to the Panathenaea and featured not only on the façades of the public buildings which formed the landscape of the festival but also in the rhapsodic and dithyrambic contests which were part of the programme. Orators often employed mythical allusions at the state funeral for the war dead and in the lawcourts, while myth had a rather minor role in the Assembly and possibly in the Council. Finally, the Athenians also engaged with myth in private contexts, such as the family and the symposium. To acquire a fuller understanding of the mythical knowledge of the Athenians, however, it is necessary to determine the range of mythical variants deployed in the institutions and private contexts of classical Athens. I shall therefore look at some myths which appear multiple times in fifth- and fourth-century Athenian sources

¹⁷⁹ On the functions of myth in epinician poetry, see Rutherford (2011).

in different versions. These examples will allow us to appreciate the Athenians' familiarity with the Greek mythical tradition in its whole complexity.

In the *Panathenaicus*, Isocrates defends his choice of the pacific over the bellicose version of the myth of Adrastus (Isoc. 12.168-74). In the pacific version, the Athenians sent ambassadors to Thebes and obtained the return of the bodies of the Seven through diplomacy. In the bellicose version, which Isocrates admits he used in the *Panegyricus*, the Athenians achieved the same result by going to war against the Thebans (Isoc. 4.54-9). Isocrates may have been particularly well versed in Greek mythology, but most Athenians would similarly have been familiar with both versions from the theatre.¹⁸⁰ Plutarch informs us that the pacific version, also adopted by the attidographer Philochorus, featured in Aeschylus' *Eleusinians* (Plut. *Theb.* 29.4-5). The bellicose version is instead found in Euripides' *Suppliant Women*. It is possible that fourth-century Athenians knew both plays thanks to the re-performance of old tragedies at the dramatic festivals, but the popularity of the bellicose version may have been enhanced thanks to the orators. This variant features in all the funeral speeches that mention the myth of Adrastus (Lys. 2.7-10; Pl. *Menex.* 239b; Dem. 60.8) and appears to have been the standard version at the state funeral for the war dead. The bellicose version also appears in the speech delivered by Procles of Phlius in front of the Athenian Assembly (Xen. *Hell.* 6.5.46-8) and may have been the natural choice for envoys when asking for Athenian military intervention.¹⁸¹ A third version of the myth existed, according to which the Seven received burials in Thebes. This variant appears twice in Pindar's victory odes (Pind. *Ol.* 6.12-17; *Nem.* 9.23-5), and it cannot be ruled out that it made its way into Athens thanks to the re-performance of epinician poetry during symposia.¹⁸²

The myth of Adrastus is a particularly fitting example, but it is by no means the only myth for which multiple variants are attested in classical Athens. In Plato's *Symposium*, for example, Phaedrus praises Achilles for having died to avenge the death of his lover (*erastēs*) Patroclus. As Phaedrus himself states, however, Aeschylus in the *Myrmidons* portrayed Patroclus not as Achilles' *erastēs*, but as his beloved (*eromenos*) (Pl. *Symp.* 179e-180a). To defend his own version, Phaedrus recalls how Homer stated that Achilles was the younger of the two (Hom. *Il.* 785-7), which would implicitly make him the *eromenos*. Aeschines seems

¹⁸⁰ Isocrates himself suggests that his readers will probably be familiar with the story of Adrastus for having seen it in the theatre (Isoc. 12.168-9).

¹⁸¹ The bellicose version features also in Isocrates' *Plataicus*, where the Plataeans ask Athens' help in restoring their city after it had been destroyed by the Thebans (Isoc. 14.53-5). On the nature and destination of Isocrates' *Plataicus*, which was not probably composed for actual delivery by the Plataeans in front of the Athenian Assembly, see Papillon (2004), 228-9 and Steinbock (2013a), 198-200.

¹⁸² For an analysis of the variants of the myth of Adrastus, see Gotteland (2001), 198-213, Steinbock (2013a), 155-210 and Hanink (2013), 302-8.

to follow Aeschylus in making Achilles the *erastēs* in the speech *Against Timarchus*. There, the orator insists that Menoetius had entrusted (*παρακαταθείτο*) Patroclus to Achilles and that Achilles had accepted to take care of him out of love (Aeschin. 1.143).¹⁸³ Phaedrus' version seems to be confirmed by an Attic red-figure cup, dated ca 500 BC. In the interior of the cup, which an Athenian would have used in a sympotic context, a hairless Achilles mends a wound of a bearded Patroclus.¹⁸⁴

Several variants about the myth of Philoctetes circulated in Athens thanks to the theatre. The theme had been dramatized by all Great Tragedians. In Sophocles' *Philoctetes*, for example, Odysseus goes to Lemnus together with Neoptolemus to fetch Philoctetes' bow. According to Dio Chrysostom, Aeschylus portrayed Odysseus as acting alone, whereas Euripides showed him accompanied by Diomedes (Dio Chrys. 52.14).¹⁸⁵ Euripides' version came closest to the one told in the cyclic *Little Iliad*, which the Athenians may have heard from the rhapsodes at the Panathenaea.¹⁸⁶ If we believe Proclus, in the poem Philoctetes was brought back to Troy by Diomedes (Procl. *Chr.* 211-13). Another version, found in Pindar, may have been transmitted in the context of the symposium. The poet vaguely states that the godlike heroes brought Philoctetes back from Lemnos (Pind. *Pyth.* 1.50-3). A fragmentary Attic red-figure cup dated to ca 460 BC also exemplifies a version of the myth destined to a sympotic context, and shows Philoctetes seated together with Odysseus and another character, possibly Diomedes or Neoptolemus.¹⁸⁷ Finally, if we believe Pausanias, a painting which showed Diomedes bringing back Philoctetes' bow could be admired in a building on the left of the Propylaea (Paus. 1.22.6).

The myth of Oedipus, which provided the subject for the epic *Oedipodia*, was a popular theme on the tragic stage. The Athenians knew the story in several variants. For example, Oedipus famously blinds himself in Sophocles' *Oedipus the King* after he discovers Jocasta's dead body (Soph. *OT* 1265-79). The self-blinding must have also featured in Aeschylus' *Oedipus*, as one can assume based on a passage in the *Seven against Thebes*, which followed *Oedipus* in the trilogy (Aesch. *Sept.* 778-84). A different version featured in Euripides' *Oedipus*, where Laius' servants blinded Oedipus while still unaware of the hero's real identity (Eur. F 541). The Great Tragedians similarly disagreed about the fate of Jocasta.

¹⁸³ See Fisher (2001), 290.

¹⁸⁴ Berlin, Antikensammlung, F2278; *LIMC* s.v. Achilleus 468.

¹⁸⁵ At least three more *Philoctetes* tragedies are known to have been produced by minor tragedians (*TrGF* 20 F 37; 24 post F 1; 72 F 5b), but not enough survives to determine what version of the myth they dramatized.

¹⁸⁶ But performances of cyclic epics at the Panathenaea are unattested in the sources and merely hypothetical: see Burgess (2004-2005).

¹⁸⁷ Basel, H. A. Cahn Collection, HC 1738; *LIMC* s.v. Philoktetes 55a.

The story of her suicide goes back at least to the *Odyssey*, where she is called Epicasta and hangs herself (Hom. *Od.* 11.271-80). The Athenians probably already knew the Homeric version from the rhapsodes at the Panathenaea, but they certainly encountered it on the tragic stage in the Messenger's speech in Sophocles' *Oedipus the King* (Soph. *OT* 1237-64). Euripides, on the other hand, provided a different version. In the *Phoenician Women*, Jocasta is still alive during the war between Eteocles and Polynices and only commits suicide after the death of her two sons (Eur. *Phoen.* 1427-59). In one of the surviving fragments of Euripides' *Oedipus*, Jocasta is similarly alive after Oedipus' blinding and the two share their guilt and sorrows (Eur. F 545a.9-12).¹⁸⁸

The study of this small selection of mythical variants has deepened our understanding of the mythical knowledge of the Athenians. Not only did the Athenians interact with myth at almost every level of their daily life, but they also had the opportunity to learn multiple versions through several media and institutional settings. The performance and re-performance of tragedies at the dramatic festivals, the mythical allusions of the orators in several institutional settings and the presence of myth in private contexts all contributed to the mythical knowledge of the Athenians and often provided them with diverging variants of the same stories. It is safe to assume that, as a result of their broad mythical knowledge, the Athenians could appreciate mythical variants when these were deployed. This was probably even truer for those myths that tended to assume an almost fixed form in a specific institutional context, as in the case of the catalogue of the exploits in the *epitaphios logos*. But what were the criteria which influenced the choice of one mythical version over another in public contexts? The next two sections of this chapter address this issue. In Section 2.2, I define the discursive parameters of Athenian democratic institutions and determine how they influenced the behaviour of political actors.¹⁸⁹ In Section 2.3, I use the myth of Adrastus to explore the impact of such discursive parameters on mythical narratives and allusions performed within the institutions of the democracy.

2.2. THE DISCURSIVE PARAMETERS OF ATHENIAN DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTIONS

¹⁸⁸ Gantz (1993), 499-501.

¹⁸⁹ My analysis will be limited to those institutions whose discursive parameters can be reconstructed with some degree of confidence. The Panathenaea, in particular, will not be included in the discussion because the available evidence does not provide a sufficiently clear picture of the impact of this institution on, for example, the compositional choices of dithyrambic poets or the criteria of selection of Homeric materials by rhapsodes. Private context will not be the subject of specific discussion but will sometimes provide a term of comparison with formal democratic institutions in both the present chapter and the case studies.

2.2.1. The state funeral for the war dead

The ideological and political relevance of the state funeral for the war dead and of the *epitaphios logos* has been long emphasised.¹⁹⁰ Nicole Loraux, in particular, interpreted the funeral oration as ideological in the sense that it concealed Athens' internal divisions and imperial vocation.¹⁹¹ As I have argued in the Introduction (Section 1.2), the *epitaphios logos* and the state funeral should be read in the light of the notion of “imagined community” elaborated by Benedict Anderson. According to Anderson, any community larger than face-to-face is an imagined community. The act of imagining is what keeps the members together and enables them to die for their country and to act as a community.¹⁹² This does not mean to deny that the state funeral performed further honorific and consolatory functions – they were integrated within the main purpose of the ceremony, and were constitutive of it. The casualty lists that accompanied the graves of the war dead, for example, resembled other Athenian lists in that they honoured the fallen for their service to the city and implicitly urged other people to imitate them.¹⁹³ Funeral speeches usually included a consolation (*paramythia*) directed to the relatives of the dead.¹⁹⁴ However, by considering the extant funeral speeches in conjunction with their physical setting, which included casualty lists as well as funerary epigrams and reliefs, I will show that the state funeral's main purpose was the creation of an imagined community, and that such a function informed the discursive parameters of this institution.

The practice of the public burial of the war dead is itself revealing of a desire to build an imagined community. Attending to the bodies of the dead was traditionally a private matter that pertained to the sphere of the family, and private grave markers for wealthy Athenians who fell in battle, including for example the famous Anavysos Kouros, are attested during the sixth century. It is significant that at some point between the sixth and the fifth century the *polis* started to bury the war dead collectively and at public expense,¹⁹⁵ replacing the family

¹⁹⁰ See notably Loraux (1981). The cultic function of the *epitaphios logos*, whose importance alongside the political function has been pointed out e.g. by Prinz (1997), 48-53, is not relevant to my discussion and will not be addressed. Major studies of the state funeral and the *epitaphios logos* include Walters (1980), Loraux (1981), Thomas (1989), 196-237, Prinz (1997), Low (2010), Shear (2013) and Arrington (2014).

¹⁹¹ Loraux (1981), 340-9.

¹⁹² B. Anderson (2006) [1983], 5-7. On classical Athens as an imagined community, see e.g. G. Anderson (2003) and Shear (2011), 10-11.

¹⁹³ Low (2010), 344-5; Petrovic (2016), 366. On the honorific function of Athenian lists, see Liddel (2007), 196-8.

¹⁹⁴ Frangeskou (1998-1999), 326-8. On the typical subdivision of a funeral speech into exordium, praise, exhortation and consolation see Frangeskou (1998-1999), 319.

¹⁹⁵ The time of the institution of the state funeral for the war dead has attracted great scholarly interest, and proposed dates range from the age of Solon to the 460s: see Jacoby (1944); Gomme (1956), 94-8;

and supplanting traditional burial practices.¹⁹⁶ Through a complex discursive strategy, a painful and potentially divisive occasion such as the death of one's relatives for the sake of the community was turned into a public event and source of social cohesion. An important component of this strategy was the erection of casualty lists, which shows a concern for the creation of a community of the dead.¹⁹⁷ Inscribed on tall marble slabs, casualty lists usually open with the heading 'these men died' or similar phrasings (*IG I³ 1147; 1148; 1162; 1166; 1183; 1191; 1193 bis; II² 5221; 5222*), and they often indicate the location where the fallen lost their lives (*IG I³ 1147; 1162; 1183; II² 5221; 5222*). The names of the dead are listed without patronymics or demotics and organised by tribes. Military functions, such as 'general' (*IG I³ 1147.5; 1162.4*) or 'trierarch' (*IG I³ 1166.2; 1186.108*), are sometimes stated, and foreigners (*IG I³ 1144.34 and 118, 1162.96; 1172.26-7*) and even slaves (*IG I³ 1144.139*) are occasionally included.¹⁹⁸ The inclusion of military titles on the casualty lists shows that individuality, far from being repressed, was publicly acknowledged.¹⁹⁹ This impression is confirmed by Pausanias, who attests the presence of separate monuments for the cavalry in the *dēmosion sēma* (Paus. 1.29.3-15).²⁰⁰ The absence of demotics and patronymics from the casualty lists, however, reveals a concern for egalitarianism. The differences between the citizens were levelled by their death for the democratic city.²⁰¹ At the same time, the arrangement of the names by tribe framed the individual contribution of the fallen into the institutional structure of the democracy and invited the survivors to perceive the dead as members of the Athenian community.²⁰²

Stupperich (1977); Loraux (1981), 49-52; Clairmont (1983), 7-15; Pritchett (1985), 112-24; Hornblower (1991), 292-3; Prinz (1997), 38-48; Arrington (2014), 39-49.

¹⁹⁶ See Arrington (2014), 66-7. For a possible mass burial (*polyandrion*) dating from the late fifth century recently discovered in the Ceramicus, see Stoupa (1997). Archaeological research shows that lavish private burials in Athens disappeared around 500 BC and reappeared around 420 BC: see Morris (1992), 128-55 and (1994). For a comprehensive study of Attic private grave reliefs, see Bergemann (1997).

¹⁹⁷ For the idea of a community of the dead, see Arrington (2014), 96. For a detailed analysis of the functions of casualty lists, see also Arrington (2011). Outside Athens, one can mention the stele of the Marathonomachoi originally set up in Marathon and found in the villa of Herodes Atticus at Eua-Loukou, whose authenticity is debated: see Proietti (2013) and Tentori Montalto (2014) for two opposing views on the subject.

¹⁹⁸ Low (2012), 14-15; Arrington (2011), 183-4.

¹⁹⁹ Liddel (2007), 288-9; Low (2012), 16-23.

²⁰⁰ Clairmont (1983), 3-4, 38, 40-1, 44; Low (2012), 31-2; Arrington (2014), 86-8. According to Barringer (2014), the *dēmosion sēma* may have also hosted freestanding equestrian monuments for fallen knights.

²⁰¹ Loraux (1981), 44. But patronymics are similarly absent from a casualty list from Thespieae (*IG VII 1888*), which shows that the use of the war dead to create an imagined community may not have been limited to Athens and the democracy: see Low (2003).

²⁰² This process may have been achieved also through the oral performance of the casualty lists at the state funeral, as recently suggested by Petrovic (2016).

Casualty lists were not the only medium which enabled the Athenians to channel individual losses into the construction of an imagined community. The same dynamics between individual and collective can be detected in the *epitaphios logos*. The role of individuality in the funeral oration has been traditionally considered a minor one.²⁰³ Extant funeral speeches, however, mention several named individuals. Themistocles features in two preserved speeches (Lys. 2.42; Hyp. 6.37-8), Miltiades is mentioned in Hyperides' speech (Hyp. 6.37-8) and Myronides is recalled by Lysias (Lys. 2.52). Hyperides' entire speech is dedicated to the fallen general Leosthenes. When one considers that Thucydides and Gorgias' fragments do not include historical narratives and that Demosthenes compresses Athens' historical exploits in two paragraphs (Dem. 60.10-11), the instances of named individuals in funeral speeches are proportionately not as rare as has previously been suggested. Yet, if some of the speeches acknowledge the contribution of named individuals to the common cause, it remains true that the *epitaphios logos* usually provides a version of Athenian history whose protagonists are the Athenians as a whole.

By acknowledging the individual sacrifice of the fallen through a collective form of commemoration, casualty lists and funeral speeches attempted to create a sense of community among the survivors. Death for the city, however, remained a potentially problematic issue. The crude reality of war and its dangers appear, for example, in the epigrams and reliefs that were sometimes attached to the casualty lists. Funerary epigrams commemorated the fallen by lamenting their death in battle and celebrating their *aretē* and the glory they conferred upon the city (*IG I³* 503/504; 1162.45-8; 1163.34-41; 1179.10-3; *II²* 5225). Such epigrams are usually vague about the outcome of the battle, whether a victory or a defeat,²⁰⁴ but focus on the struggle and death of the warriors and sometimes state the location where the battle took place.²⁰⁵ The few figural reliefs securely attributed to casualty lists similarly depict battles whose outcome is undecided. These scenes focus on the ongoing struggle and its violence and highlight the dangers the fallen warriors undertook for the safety of the city.²⁰⁶ Such sacrifices on behalf of the city needed to be justified to the relatives of the dead. To do so, it was necessary to create an image of the city with which most citizens would identify and for which they would be willing (and proud) to fight and even die.

²⁰³ See notably Loraux (1981). Hesk (2013) has rightly argued for a reevaluation of individuality in the *epitaphios logos*.

²⁰⁴ The only exception is the inscribed base for the Marathon cenotaph (*IG I³* 503/504), which alludes to the dead having 'kept all Greece from seeing the day of slavery' (transl. Bowie).

²⁰⁵ Low (2010), 346-7; Arrington (2014), 99, 105-7.

²⁰⁶ Cf. Oxford, Ashmolean Museum, Michaelis no. 85; Athens, Third Ephoreia M 4551; Athens, National Archaeological Museum 2744. See Arrington (2011), 196-202.

The creation of an image of the city functional to the construction of an imagined community was the task of the orator chosen to perform the funeral oration. An important aspect of this process was the idealisation of Athenian democracy. By providing an ideal picture of the Athenian constitution and its advantages, orators of funeral speeches gave the Athenians a reason to fight for the city. Pericles, for example, praises the democracy for attributing deliberative power to the many instead of the few, establishing equality before the laws and granting access to the magistracies according to merit (Thuc. 2.37.1). Pericles then lists other advantages of Athenian democracy, such as the citizens' respect for the magistrates and the laws and the celebration of several games and sacrifices throughout the year (Thuc. 37.3-38.1). Lysias explains that the ancestors established the democracy because they thought that the freedom of all was the greatest form of concord (Lys. 2.18). Demosthenes states that democracy has many noble features and focuses in particular on freedom of speech (Dem. 60.26). Socrates ironically praises the democracy as a form of aristocracy because the magistracies are assigned to those who appear to be the best, and he commends the Athenians' equality of birth (Pl. *Menex.* 238b-239a).

The construction of an idealised picture of the democracy was coupled with the production of shared memories about Athens' past. This process served to build an imagined community because it exemplified what it meant to be an Athenian and the values that informed Athenian actions. Most funeral speeches include a narrative of Athenian mythical and historical exploits. These mostly consist of catalogues of Athenian victories. Defeats, when acknowledged, are addressed in a justificatory tone. Lysias thus attributes the defeat at Aegospotami to the incompetence of a general or the design of the gods and portrays it as further evidence of the valour of the ancestors (Lys. 2.58-60). Plato justifies the defeat in the Sicilian expedition, which he imputes to the lack of reinforcements due to the long distance from Athens (Pl. *Menex.* 242e6-43a7),²⁰⁷ and goes as far as to claiming the Peloponnesian War as an Athenian victory (Pl. *Menex.* 243c-d).²⁰⁸ Funeral speeches often invite the Athenians to imitate the great deeds of their ancestors or the sacrifice of the dead of the day.²⁰⁹ Pericles exhorts the survivors to have an attitude as brave as that of their relatives against the enemy (Thuc. 2.43.1). Lysias states that everyone should remember the actions of the ancestors and educate the living in the deeds of the dead (Lys. 2.3). The orator then praises the men of the Piraeus (Lys. 2.61) and the present dead (Lys. 2.69) for having imitated the virtue of the

²⁰⁷ See Nouhaud (1982), 272-3.

²⁰⁸ Demosthenes adopts a similar justificatory tone toward the present dead, as he blames their defeat at Chaeronea on the Theban commanders (Dem. 60.22).

²⁰⁹ The educational function of the *epitaphios logos* has been highlighted by Grethlein (2010), 119-21, Shear (2013), 518-21 and Steinbock (2013b), 77.

ancestors. Demosthenes praises each Athenian tribe for having emulated their respective eponymous heroes (Dem. 60.27-31). Socrates highlights the paradigmatic value of the Marathonomachoi (Pl. *Menex.* 240d-e) and invites the Athenians to remember and imitate the actions of their fathers and ancestors (Pl. *Menex.* 246b-c; 248e). Hyperides praises Leosthenes and his companions because they did not dishonour the acts of valour of their ancestors (Hyp. 6.32), and he then states that the general even surpassed those who fought alongside Miltiades and Themistocles (Hyp. 6.37-8).

The ancestral exploits symbolised the values that an Athenian was expected to possess. Orators of funeral speeches constructed an idealised image of Athens, which was presented as supremely just and devoted to the cause of *philanthrōpia* and Greek freedom. These features are summarised at the beginning of Hyperides' speech. The orator states that Athens 'continuously punishes the wicked, [gives aid] to the just (τοῖς δὲ δίκαιοις βοηθοῦσα), [dispenses] equality instead of injustice (τὸ δὲ ἴσον ἀντὶ τῆς ἀδικίας) to all, and provides [universal safety] (κοινήν ἄδειαν) to the Greeks at its own [risk] and expense (τοῖς δὲ ἰδίοις κινδύνοις καὶ δαπάναις)' (Hyp. 6.5, transl. Herrman). Gorgias states that the Athenians are helpers of those who unjustly suffer misfortunes and punishers of those who are unjustly fortunate (θεράποντες μὲν τῶν ἀδίκως δυστυχοῦντων, κολασταὶ δὲ τῶν ἀδίκως εὐτυχοῦντων) (DK Gorg. B 6). Demosthenes, when introducing his brief section on the Athenian exploits, maintains that the ancestors never wronged anyone (ἠδίκησαν μὲν οὐδένα) and were extremely just (δικαιοτάτοις εἶναι) (Dem. 60.7). Lysias similarly insists on justice as the driving force of Athenian actions. This is especially evident in the case of the mythical exploits,²¹⁰ but it also appears in relation to the historical exploits. When during the Persian Wars the Peloponnesians built a wall on the Isthmus of Corinth, the Athenians admonished them against abandoning the rest of the Greeks. The Peloponnesians therefore went to their aid in Plataea, because they realised that their own actions were unjust (ἄδικά τε ποιεῖν) and what the Athenians were saying was right (δίκαιά τε λέγειν) (Lys. 2.45-6). Lysias similarly praises those Athenians who in 403, fighting for the right (περὶ τοῦ δίκαιου μαχόμενοι), returned to the Piraeus and restored the democracy (Lys. 2.61).

The Athenians' devotion to justice is a component of their traditional *philanthrōpia*, which leads them to act as selfless champions of the weak and injured. Lysias, for instance, explains that the Persians attacked Athens before any other city because they knew that the Athenians would have gone to the rescue of anyone who suffered injustice (τοῖς ἀδικουμένοις ἥξουσι βοηθήσοντες) (Lys. 2.22). By the same token, Lysias praises the dead of the day for

²¹⁰ On which see pp. 104-10 below, specifically on Lysias' treatment of the Athenian intervention in defence of the Heraclidae.

having helped their previous enemies, the Corinthians, when they had been injured (βοηθήσαντες Κορινθίους ἀδικουμένους) by the Spartans (Lys. 2.67-8). Plato makes the paradoxical statement that Athens, being ‘compassionate to excess and the handmaid of the weak (τοῦ ἥττονος θεραπίς)’ (Pl. *Menex.* 244e-245a; transl. Lamb), even went to the rescue of her worst enemy, the King of Persia. Connected with Athenian *philanthrōpia* is Athens’ role as bulwark of Greek freedom. This image is central to epitaphic narratives about the Persian Wars. Lysias for example introduces his account of the historical exploits with praise of the Athenian ancestors, who ‘were the only ones to undergo dangers (μόνοι διεκινδύνευσαν) against countless myriads of barbarians, on behalf of the whole of Greece (ὑπὲρ ἀπάσης τῆς Ἑλλάδος)’ (Lys. 2.20; transl. Todd).²¹¹ Plato praises the Marathonomachoi as the fathers of the freedom of all the inhabitants of the continent (τοὺς ἄνδρας φημι οὐ μόνον τῶν σωμάτων τῶν ἡμετέρων πατέρας εἶναι, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς ἐλευθερίας τῆς τε ἡμετέρας καὶ συμπάντων τῶν ἐν τῆδε τῇ ἡπείρῳ) (Pl. *Menex.* 240e). Demosthenes similarly glorifies the Athenians who fought against the Persians for having achieved the common safety of the Greeks (κοινῆς σωτηρίας πᾶσι τοῖς Ἑλλησιν) through their own individual dangers (διὰ τῶν ἰδίων κινδύνων) (Dem. 60.10).

The narrative of the exploits in the *epitaphios logos* constructed an idealised image of Athens and her past. This image was expected to console the survivors for the loss of their relatives, persuading them that they had given their lives for a good cause. The catalogue of the exploits underscored the achievements of the ancestors as the supreme example of Athenian virtue and civic values, and the orators explicitly exhorted the living to remember and imitate the deeds of the fallen. In accordance with the discursive parameters of the state funeral, the orators produced an image of the city that was functional to the construction of Athens’ imagined community. The criterion for the selection of mythical and historical materials was the creation of a model community with which the citizens could identify. By exalting the qualities of the democracy and providing an idealised image of Athenian history, funeral speeches gave the Athenians a city worth dying for. In the emotionally charged context of the state funeral, the orators actively shaped the memory of past events in order to construct and validate the identity and beliefs of the community.²¹² In its etymological sense of speech upon the grave, the *epitaphios logos* fulfilled its function towards the dead by constructing an image of Athens that justified the sacrifice of the fallen and inspired their relatives to follow their example. The speeches complemented the funerary monuments in honouring the fallen soldiers. Thanks to the catalogue of the exploits, the dead of the day ceased to be simply names

²¹¹ Cf. also Lys. 2.33, 42, 44, 55-7, 60.

²¹² See the notion of ‘Intentional History’ elaborated by Gehrke (2001) and (2010).

inscribed on a casualty list and were assimilated into the larger Athenian tradition of death for the city commemorated by the monuments of the previous years. In conjunction with the physical environment of the *dēmosion sēma*, the *epitaphios logos* thus produced the shared memories and beliefs that Athens needed in order to create an imagined community and secure its unity and cohesion.

2.2.2. The lawcourts

The discursive parameters of the lawcourts are delineated in Aristotle's *Rhetoric*. According to the philosopher, the aim (τέλος) of the forensic orator was the just (τὸ δίκαιον) and the unjust (τὸ ἄδίκον), while all other considerations could be added as accessory (Arist. *Rh.* 1358b21-8). Aristotle's definition can be further qualified. Athenian judges were bound by the Heliastic Oath to vote in accordance with the laws and decrees of the Athenian people (Aeschin. 3.6; And. 1.2; Dem. 18.121; Lys. 15.9).²¹³ The Heliastic Oath also compelled the judges to vote only about issues included in the written plaint that the plaintiff had to produce in order to initiate a lawsuit (Aeschin. 1.154; Dem. 45.50).²¹⁴ At the court hearing, the litigants similarly swore an oath which bound them to keep to the point and not to speak outside the subject (*exō tou pragmatos*) ([Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 67.1).²¹⁵ These oaths indicate that in the lawcourts orators were expected to deal not simply with issues of justice but more specifically with whether the defendant had broken a specific law, and recent studies have demonstrated that extant forensic speeches accordingly show a very high degree of relevance to the legal issues at stake.²¹⁶

The available evidence shows that litigants and judges were expected to abide by their oaths. Forensic orators often mention the Heliastic Oath and the necessity to put it into practice.²¹⁷ Demosthenes, for example, opens his speech *On the False Embassy* with an exhortation to the judges to 'hold no obligation nor any man to be of greater importance than justice and the oath' (Dem. 19.1, transl. Yunis). The speaker of Lysias' *Against the Corn Dealers* states that his accusation should be sufficient to condemn the defendants because they

²¹³ The Heliastic Oath also prescribed that judges should vote according with their fairest judgment in cases where there are no laws or the laws are not clear, but such cases were in fact very rare: see Harris (2013b), 104-14.

²¹⁴ On the jurisdiction of magistrates, see A. R. W. Harrison (1971), 7-36. On the plaint, see Harris (2013c). On the summons, the *anakrasis* and the structure of court hearings, see A. R. W. Harrison (1971), 85-199; Boegehold (1995), 21-42; Hansen (1999) [1991], 196-203; Thür (2008).

²¹⁵ A similar oath was sworn by the litigants in the Council of the Areopagus (Arist. *Rh.* 1354a22-3): see Rhodes (2004), 137.

²¹⁶ Rhodes (2004); Harris (2013b), 101-37 and (2013c). Pace Lanni (2006), who argues that Athenian law courts adopted a broader notion of relevance which encompassed both legal and extra-legal arguments; see more recently Lanni (2016), 1-14.

²¹⁷ See Harris (2013b), 101-2, 353-6.

broke the laws and the judges swore to vote in accordance with the laws (Lys. 22.7). The speaker of Isaeus' *On the Estate of Menecles* closes his speech with an appeal to the judges to remember the law and their oath and give their verdict accordingly (Is. 2.47). It was also common for forensic orators to accuse their opponents of speaking outside the subject. In the *Against Timarchus*, for example, Aeschines anticipates Demosthenes' irrelevant arguments and invites the judges not to accept them in view of the oath they have sworn (Aeschin. 1.166-70). The speaker of Lysias' *For the Soldier* complains that his opponents have disregarded the plaintiff and made accusations on his character instead (Lys. 9.1). In *Against Eratosthenes*, Lysias refers to the bad habit of many speakers who pay no attention to the terms of the accusation and deceive the judges by boasting about their public service (Lys. 12.38).²¹⁸

In accordance with the oaths sworn by litigants and judges, the discursive parameters of the lawcourts compelled forensic orators to deal with matters of justice and specific legal charges.²¹⁹ Arguments which relied on character evidence or public service, for example, were usually couched in terms of justice and lawfulness. In the speech *Against Meidias*, for example, Demosthenes recalls the defendant's insignificant amount of public service as well as his private luxury and display in order to prove his charge of *hybris* (Dem. 21.154-9). The speaker of Isocrates' *Against Callimachus* invites the judges not to trust the defendant, whose dishonesty is proved by the fact that he once provided false testimony in court (Isoc. 18.52-7). This claim is relevant to the legal issue of the speech, since Callimachus is accused of violating the Amnesty by bringing false charges against the speaker (Isoc. 18.4). The speaker then rebuts the accusation that he had confiscated Callimachus' money by recalling how generously he spent his wealth for the city in times of crisis and therefore was unlikely to strive for other people's money, and asks to be treated justly in view of his public service (Isoc. 18.58-67).²²⁰

The use of history in forensic speeches was similarly conditioned by the focus on justice and legal charges expected in the lawcourts.²²¹ In his speech *Against Leocrates*, Lycurgus reinforces his accusation of treason against Leocrates by comparing the attitude of the defendant to a series of mythical and historical *exempla* which show the importance of the attachment to one's land (Lycurg. 1.83-130). The speaker of Dinarchus' *Against Demosthenes* recalls how the Athenians had punished Timotheus for taking bribes from the Chians and Rhodians despite his public service and invites the judges to do the same against Demosthenes,

²¹⁸ On these and other passages where the orators accuse their opponents of speaking *exō tou pragmatos*, see Harris (2013b), 126-8.

²¹⁹ See Harris (2013a), who has shown that the Athenians were aware of what kind of arguments were appropriate to the lawcourts as opposed to the Assembly.

²²⁰ On the allusion to liturgies in the orators, see Harris (2013b), 129-36, *pace* Millet (1998) and Lanni (2006), 59-64. See also Johnstone (1999), 93-100.

²²¹ On the functions of history in the orators, see Nouhaud (1982), 55-72.

who is guilty of accepting money from Harpalus (Din. 1.14-15). In his *graphē paranomon* against Ctesiphon's decree which crowned Demosthenes for his service to the city, Aeschines criticises Athens' current generosity in granting honours and compares it with the ancestors' honorary policy. The latter is shown to have been sensible, as even greater benefactors than Demosthenes, such as Themistocles, Miltiades and Aristides, were never honoured with a crown (Aeschin. 3.177-82).²²² In *Against Neaera*, Apollodorus recalls how the Athenians rightfully granted citizenship to the Plataean exiles because of their service to Athens and Greece during the Persian Wars and compares their situation with that of Neaera, who is illegally behaving as a citizen ([Dem.] 59.94-107).

This brief analysis has shown that the discursive parameters of the lawcourts largely influenced the arguments employed by forensic orators. These needed to focus on justice and the legal issues under discussion. The discursive parameters of the lawcourts also had an impact on how forensic orators referred to the past of the city. While at the state funeral orators created an idealised image of the city's past in order to build an imagined community, this process was only coincidental in the lawcourts. The Athenians' reverence for the glorious deeds of their ancestors, fuelled by the idealised narrative of the *epitaphios logos*, was often exploited in court to reinforce specific arguments within the context of litigation. Forensic orators therefore recalled the past in order to convince the judges on legal matters and couched their historical allusions in terms of justice and lawfulness.

2.2.3. The Assembly and the Council

The Assembly was the fundamental deliberative body of Athenian democracy. During the fifth century, the Assembly had jurisdiction over foreign and domestic affairs. It enacted both general and short-term provisions, which at the time were not formally differentiated, and was in charge of running procedures for the prosecution of public officials (*eisangeliai*) and electing those magistrates and officials (such as generals and envoys) who were not selected by lot.²²³ After the restoration of the democracy in 403 BC, the Athenians introduced some major reforms to their legislative procedure which changed the prerogatives of the Assembly to some extent. A clear-cut distinction between laws (*nomoi*) and decrees (*psēphismata*) was established. Laws were general and universally valid regulations; decrees were temporary provisions applying to individual cases and included honorific decrees, citizenship grants and decisions in matters of foreign policies, cult and, to some extent, finances. While the Assembly

²²² Cf. Dem. 23.196-203 for a similar argument in another case of *graphē paranomon*.

²²³ Hansen (1987), 94-124; Hansen (1999) [1991], 150-60; Canevaro (2013b), 139 and (forthcoming a); Harris (forthcoming).

remained directly responsible for the enactment of decrees, laws were now enacted through a complex procedure of *nomothesia*.²²⁴ In the course of the fourth century, the Assembly lost its power to judge cases of *eisangelia*, which became the exclusive prerogative of the lawcourts,²²⁵ whereas its elective function came to include the appointment of new financial magistracies such as the treasurer of the military fund and the theoric board.

In accordance with its functions and powers, the Assembly had its own specific discursive parameters. No formal rule comparable to the oaths sworn by judges and litigants in the lawcourts existed for the Assembly. However, Aristotle's formulations on deliberative rhetoric and an analysis of Athenian deliberative practice show that an analogous criterion of appropriateness was in place. In the *Rhetoric*, Aristotle states that the aim of the deliberative orator was the expedient (τὸ συμφέρον) and the harmful (βλαβερὸν), whereas all other aspects, such as the just and the unjust, or the noble and the shameful, could be used as additional (Arist. *Rh.* 1358b21-8). Aristotle's theorisation appears to have been firmly grounded on Athenian deliberative practice. The Athenians were well aware of the arguments which were appropriate to deliberative rhetoric as opposed to the other genres of rhetoric. This is shown very clearly by Thucydides' Mytilenean debate (Thuc. 3.36-49).²²⁶ The Athenians had decreed to punish the Mytilenean revolt with the execution of all male adults and the enslavement of all women and children in Mytilene. On the next day, however, they called another Assembly to re-discuss their decision. Thucydides reports Cleon's and Diodotus' opposing speeches. Cleon starts by criticising his opponents for behaving as sophists speaking in contests of epideictic rhetoric. Cleon himself, however, delivers a speech which closely resembles a forensic speech. He focuses on issues of corrective justice and obedience to the laws, and exhorts the Athenians to punish the Mytileneans as they deserve.²²⁷ These arguments are denounced by Diodotus as irrelevant and inappropriate to the deliberative process of the Assembly (Thuc. 3.44.4). Diodotus does not deny that the Mytileneans are guilty, but focuses instead on what policy would be advantageous for Athens. He proposes to spare those Mytileneans who had not rebelled, and his motion is eventually carried out by the Athenians.

As Aristotle's theorisation and Thucydides' Mytilenean debate show, the discursive parameters of the Assembly compelled deliberative orators to focus mainly on issues of advantage. This is clearly stated in the opening of several deliberative speeches. In the *Second*

²²⁴ Hansen (1987), 98. On *nomothesia*, see Canevaro (2013b) and (forthcoming a).

²²⁵ But see Harris (2016), who challenges the idea of a constitutional change which limited the powers of the Assembly from the fifth to the fourth century.

²²⁶ See Harris (2013a). On the passage, see also Macleod (1978).

²²⁷ On the difference between corrective justice (διορθωτικόν), which was appropriate to the lawcourts, and distributive justice (διανεμετικόν), which was appropriate to the Assembly, see Arist. *Eth. Nic.* 1130b-31a with Harris (2013a), 106-8.

Philippic, for example, Demosthenes wishes for the Athenians to choose the best and safest policy (τὰ βέλτιστα καὶ τὰ σώσοντα) instead of the easiest and most pleasant (Dem. 6.5). In the speech *On the Chersonese*, Demosthenes opens with an exhortation for the Athenians to vote what they think would be advantageous for the city (ἅ τῇ πόλει νομίζετε συμφέρειν, ταῦτα καὶ ψηφίζεσθαι καὶ πράττειν) (Dem. 8.1). At the beginning of his speech *For the Megalopolitans*, Demosthenes similarly declares that the task of the speakers in the Assembly is to consider what is best for the community (τὸ δὲ κοινῶς ὑπὲρ τῶν πραγμάτων λέγειν καὶ τὰ βέλτισθ' ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν σκοπεῖν), without siding either with Megalopolis or Sparta (Dem. 16.1-3). Public interest was therefore a recurrent argument in the rhetorical arsenal of deliberative orators. The Corcyrean envoys who address the Athenian Assembly in Thucydides' Book 1 close their speech with a pragmatic analysis of the advantages which an alliance with Corcyra would grant to Athens (Thuc. 1.35.5-36.3). In the *First Olynthiac*, Demosthenes urges the Athenians to help Olynthus against Philip in order to keep the war far from Attica and avoid risking their own land (Dem. 1.14-15). In the speech *For the Megalopolitans*, Demosthenes argues that it is in the Athenians' interest to maintain a balance of power between Sparta and Thebes (Dem. 4-5).²²⁸

The discursive parameters of the Assembly conditioned the orators to focus on matters of advantage also when they recalled the past. Deliberative orators often exploited the idealised image of the past created at the state funeral in order to persuade the Athenians of the expediency of a policy and urge them to act on their advice. In an Assembly reported by Thucydides, Pericles encourages the Athenians not to be inferior to their fathers, who with lesser resources defeated the Persians, and face war against Sparta in order to hand down their possessions to their descendants without any losses (Thuc. 1.144.4). In Book 6, Alcibiades similarly reminds the Assembly that their fathers acquired the Empire despite the opposition of domestic and foreign enemies. He therefore persuades the Athenians to invade Sicily without fearing their enemies back in Greece (Thuc. 6.17.7), on the grounds that the Athenians' interventionist policy is what gained them their Empire and will keep their possessions safe (Thuc. 6.18.2). In the *Second Olynthiac*, Demosthenes is astonished to see that the Athenians, who opposed the Spartans for the sake of all Greeks and ran great risks for the rights of others, are now refraining from fighting Philip for their own good (Dem. 2.24). In other instances, deliberative orators provide the Assembly with negative examples from the

²²⁸ On the references to public interest in deliberative oratory, see Harris (forthcoming), who also reviews other types of argument employed by speakers in the Assembly, such as issues of reciprocity or references to international treaties.

past.²²⁹ In the *First Olynthiac*, Demosthenes urges the Athenians to help Olynthus against Philip and recalls several instances when they had missed precious opportunities to oppose the Macedonian king (Dem. 1.8-9). In his speech *On the Embassy*, Aeschines recalls an address he had delivered in front of the Assembly three years earlier. On that occasion, he had urged the Athenians not to repeat the mistakes that led them to disaster during the Peloponnesian War, and invited them to choose peace over war for the safety of the state (Aeschin. 2.74-8).

These examples show that in the Assembly the past was not recalled in order to construct an imagined community, but it was part of a pragmatic discourse to support policies presented as advantageous for Athens. If the discursive parameters of the Assembly appear clear, it is not as easy to determine the discursive parameters of the other deliberative body of Athenian democracy: the Council. One problem is represented by the composition of the Council. As Hansen has calculated, over one third of the Athenian citizens over eighteen years old and about two thirds of the citizen population over forty served in the Council at least once in their lives.²³⁰ This means that a large portion of the Athenian citizen body participated in the Council at some point during their lives. On the other hand, since every Athenian could be elected as a councillor twice ([Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 62.3), but few of them actually served in the Council more than once, it appears that each year the Athenians had to find about 375 to 400 new councillors.²³¹ The membership of the Council was therefore substantially different from one year to the next, and one might wonder whether the ideology and discursive parameters of the institution could be preserved through time. The frequency of the sessions, however, led current councillors to grow familiar with the discursive parameters of the Council. Furthermore, as Ober has pointed out, the demotic and tribal structure of the Council, together with the almost face-to-face reality of Athenian demes,²³² probably facilitated the distribution of knowledge among councillors belonging to the same deme and tribe. The fact that each councillor was part of a broader network of contacts further spread his knowledge to larger sections of the Athenian population.²³³ Moreover, the fact that each year around 100-125 councillors had served before helped to preserve and reproduce the institutional memory of the Council.

It can be inferred that the dynamics of knowledge distribution highlighted by Ober made it possible for former, current and prospective councillors to be familiar with and

²²⁹ See Grethlein (2010), 126-45. Grethlein, however, bases his argument mostly on Andocides' *On the Peace* (And. 3), which has been shown to be a forgery by Harris (2000).

²³⁰ Hansen (1999) [1991], 249.

²³¹ Hansen (1985), 51-5, and (1999) [1991], 249.

²³² On the possibility that the deme was close to a face-to-face society, see p. 12 n. 18 above; Ober (2008), 134-42.

²³³ Ober (2008), 142-51, esp. 150.

preserve the discursive parameters of the Council. This is shown very clearly in Lysias' *For the Invalid*, a *dokimasia* speech for a subsidy holder.²³⁴ The speaker, an old man who belonged to the poorest echelons of Athenian society, seems very familiar with arguments commonly employed in the Council. He opens with an ironic vote of thanks to his opponent for giving him the opportunity to give an account of his own life (Lys. 24.1). The speaker then mockingly defends himself from the accusation of having been a supporter of the Thirty and boasts his own participation in the democratic restoration (Lys. 24.25). The speech has of course been composed by Lysias, but it needed to be credible when delivered by the speaker. It appears therefore that a common Athenian of advanced age – and possibly a former councillor himself, if we believe Hansen's estimates – was expected to be familiar with the discursive parameters of the Council.²³⁵

If it can be assumed that the Athenians succeeded in preserving the discursive parameters of the Council through time, it is not easy to delineate the nature of such parameters. This is partly due to the wide range of tasks performed by the Council, which held significant legislative, administrative and judicial powers. The Council's legislative power mainly consisted of the ability to propose preliminary decrees (*probouleumata*) to the Assembly. To these must be added a number of decrees enacted by the Council alone, mostly on honorific matters.²³⁶ The Council's administrative tasks were manifold. Notable ones included control of all sanctuaries in Attica, equipping of the navy, supervision of public works, management of many aspects of the public finances and dealing with foreign envoys.²³⁷ The Council's judicial functions included the faculty to impose fines up to 500 drachmae, the jurisdiction over its own members, and the power to try magistrates through the procedure of *eisangelia* and to hold several types of scrutiny (*dokimasia*).²³⁸

The fact that the Council performed both deliberative and judicial functions seems to suggest that issues of justice and advantage coexisted in the discursive parameters of this institution. This is confirmed by the content of the Bouleutic Oath that the councillors had to swear before taking office. The Bouleutic Oath required councillors to deliberate in accordance with the laws (Xen. *Mem.* 1.1.18) and to decide what was best for the city and people of Athens (Lys. 31.1; [Dem.] 59.4).²³⁹ The few surviving bouleutic speeches tend to

²³⁴ The speech's attribution to Lysias has sometimes been doubted, but most scholars are now in favour of authenticity: see Canevaro (2016b), 44-5, with references.

²³⁵ Account of one's life: cf. Lys. 16.1. Behaviour under the Thirty: cf. Lys. 16.3-5; 26.5, 9-10, 16-18. See Canevaro (2016b), 46-8.

²³⁶ Rhodes (1972), 49-87; Hansen (1999) [1991], 255-7.

²³⁷ Rhodes (1972), 88-143; Hansen (1999) [1991], 259-65.

²³⁸ Rhodes (1972), 144-78; Hansen (1999) [1991], 257-9.

²³⁹ Rhodes (1972), 194-9; Hansen (1999) [1991], 227.

conform to these criteria.²⁴⁰ The deliberative element is particularly evident in Lysias' *Against Philon*, the *dokimasia* of a prospective councillor. The speech opens with an appeal to the Bouleutic Oath, which bound councillors to advise the best decisions for the city (τὰ βέλτιστα βουλευέσθαι τῆ πόλει) (Lys. 31.1-2), and closes with the hope that the Council will take advantageous decisions for the city (τὰ συμφέροντα τῆ πόλει γνώσεσθαι) (Lys. 31.34). In between these sections, the speaker insists that councillors should strive for the good of the city and not, like Philon, put their private gain before the communal good (Lys. 31.5-7). The speaker, however, also appeals to corrective justice, a feature typical of the lawcourts, as an alternative to distributive justice, which was typical of the Assembly.²⁴¹ *Against Philon's* expectation to be honoured by the Athenians, the speaker protests that the defendant should justly (δικαίως) suffer the greatest punishment (τῆς μεγίστης τιμωρίας) for having betrayed the city (Lys. 31.26). Deliberative features coexist with forensic features even more clearly in another *dokimasia* speech: Lysias' *On the Scrutiny of Evandrus*. The speaker points out that the men who have been wronged (τῶν ἡδικημένων) by Evandrus are the same who are going to vote about him (Lys. 26.1) and insists on Evandrus' unlawful way of conducting his political life (εἴλετο παρὰ νόμῳ πολιτευθῆναι) (Lys. 26.5). The speech also raises the issue of advantage several times. The speaker reminds the councillors of the importance of the *dokimasia* for the safety of the state (Lys. 26.9), evokes the many evils Evandrus had caused to the city (Lys. 26.13) and explains that it is in the Athenians' interests (συμφέρει) to reject the defendant (Lys. 26.15).

This brief analysis has shown that the discursive parameters of the Council were constructed around notions of justice and lawfulness as well as advantage. The impact of the discursive parameters of the Council can also be observed in the historical allusions in the surviving bouleutic speeches. In Lysias' *For Mantisheus*, yet another case of *dokimasia*, recent Athenian military campaigns provide the context of the defendant's service to the city in time of war. Mantisheus reminds the Athenians that they all have derived advantage (ὠφελείσθε) from the dangers he had personally faced in fighting the Spartans (Lys. 16.13-18). The speaker of Lysias' *For the Invalid* reminds the councillors of his participation in the restoration of the democracy and asks them not to mete out the same treatment as for those who have committed many injustices (τοῖς πολλὰ ἡδικηκόσιν), despite him having done no wrong (μηδὲν

²⁴⁰ Most extant bouleutic speeches relate to cases of *dokimasia*. It is therefore possible that their characteristics have to be ascribed to this specific procedure rather than to the institutional setting of the Council. Given the poor amount of available evidence, the rest of this section will only provide a tentative reconstruction of the discursive parameters of the Council. A significant part of this section originated from fruitful discussion with my colleague Alberto Esu, to whom I am very grateful. Any mistakes or inaccuracies are of course my own.

²⁴¹ See p. 70 n. 227 above.

ἡμαρτηκώς) (Lys. 24.25-6). The speaker of Lysias' *Against Philon* compares the dangers faced by the men of Phyle against the Thirty with Philon's choice of abandoning the city to prove the defendant's negligence for the safety of the state (Lys. 31.7-9). Demosthenes' *On the Trierarchic Crown*, the only surviving bouleutic speech which does not deal with a case of *dokimasia*, also includes an historical allusion. Demosthenes reminds the Athenians that, when they had been defeated by Alexander of Pherae in a naval battle, they punished the trierarchs who had let out their trierarchies. He therefore invites them to punish his opponents for the same behaviour in view of what is just (σκοπεῖν τὸ δίκαιον) (Dem. 51.7-10).

It can therefore be concluded that the discursive parameters of the Council, in conformity with the Bouleutic Oath, conditioned the behaviour of the orators acting within this institution to focus on issues of justice and advantage. This also applied when orators recalled the past in their speeches. As in the case of the lawcourts and the Assembly, in the Council the past was not used to construct an imagined community. Allusions to the past needed to be couched in terms of justice and advantage. They had to fit the orator's arguments, helping him to make his case and guide the deliberative process of the Council.

2.2.4. The dramatic festivals

Defining the discursive parameters of the dramatic festivals is not simple. This task requires an analysis of the debated issue of the political significance of Attic tragedy. The present section does not aim to provide a full and comprehensive study of such a complex matter, but it will briefly review the main scholarly trends and highlight the issues that are relevant to my enquiry. While some scholars prefer to emphasise the aesthetic and poetic aspect of Greek tragedy over its political element,²⁴² another popular trend sees this genre as inherently political.²⁴³ Simon Goldhill, in particular, in an influential article later included in Winkler and Zeitlin's *Nothing to Do with Dionysos? Athenian Drama and its Social Context*, has argued that tragedy and the Great Dionysia had a deep connection with the democracy. According to Goldhill, the pre-play ceremonies performed at the Great Dionysia, such as the announcement of public benefactors or the parade of the ephebes, were an expression of Athenian civic ideology. Tragedy, on the other hand, was a transgressive genre which subverted and questioned that same ideology.²⁴⁴ Goldhill's approach has received much criticism. Griffin, for example, has pointed out that there is no evidence that the Athenians regularly questioned their own values or believed that engaging in such an activity was something desirable in the

²⁴² See e.g. Schwinge (1992); Griffin (1998) and (1999); Rhodes (2003); Garvie (2009), xvi-xxii.

²⁴³ See e.g. Seaford (1994); Griffith (1995); Wilson (2000) and (2007); Csapo (2007).

²⁴⁴ Goldhill (1987) and (1990).

first place. According to Griffin, the Dionysia were not a specifically democratic event, because they were first celebrated under the tyrants during the sixth century and continued to be celebrated after the Macedonian conquest.²⁴⁵ Rhodes has analysed the institutional framework of Attic theatre and has come to the similar conclusion that Attic drama was not an expression of Athenian democracy but of the Greek *polis* more broadly.²⁴⁶

William Allan and Adrian Kelly have recently put these scholarly trends under scrutiny and proposed a more sophisticated take on tragedy and its political function. Allan and Kelly point out that the idea that tragedy questioned mainstream values is anachronistic and based on a modern conception of art. They argue that there is no evidence that the Athenians perceived tragedy as a subversive genre. Tragedy did sometimes pose questions about Athenian society, but it also tried to provide reassuring answers. In Euripides' *Suppliant Women*, for example, the democracy is strongly contested by the unsympathetic Theban Herald (Eur. *Supp.* 409-25), but his criticism is finally put to rest by the Athenian victory over Thebes.²⁴⁷ Allan and Kelly also stress the competitive nature of the dramatic festivals and the status of drama as a form of mass entertainment. To win first prize, playwrights had to gratify a large and socially diverse audience and ten randomly selected judges.²⁴⁸ Tragedians were therefore unlikely to attack the shared values of the broadest part of the community. Not only did playwrights need to appeal to the core values and beliefs of the Athenians, but they also had to offer something to every social group in their audience. According to Allan and Kelly, tragedy was therefore a polyphonic genre. On the one hand, tragedians respected the values of the *dēmos*. This is shown, for example, by the sympathetic depiction of proto-democratic kings such as Pelasgus in Aeschylus' *Suppliant Women* or Theseus in Sophocles' *Oedipus at Colonus*, or the positive representation of lower-class figures such as Electra's farmer husband in Euripides' *Electra*.²⁴⁹ On the other hand, tragedy acknowledged the greatness of the aristocratic heroes of the mythical tradition, and in doing so gratified the elite portion of the audience and the wealthy *chorēgoi* who funded the plays.²⁵⁰

The multivocality of Attic tragedy is revealing of the discursive parameters of the dramatic festivals. The institutional context led playwrights to endorse values potentially

²⁴⁵ Griffin (1998), 46-50. But it is far from certain that the Great Dionysia were instituted under Pisistratus: see Connor (1989); West (1989); Scullion (2002).

²⁴⁶ Rhodes (2003).

²⁴⁷ Allan and Kelly (2013), 83-7.

²⁴⁸ On the estimates of theatre attendance in fifth- and fourth-century Athens, see p. 32 above. On the mechanism of selection of the judges at the Dramatic festivals, see Pickard-Cambridge (1968) [1953], 95-9; Pope (1986); Csapo and Slater (1995), 157-65; Wilson (2000), 98-102.

²⁴⁹ Allan and Kelly (2013), 91-2.

²⁵⁰ Allan and Kelly (2013), 93-5. On the institution of the *chorēgia*, see Pickard-Cambridge (1968) [1953], 86-91; Csapo and Slater (1995), 139-57; Wilson (2000).

shared by both mass and elite. Tragedies, for example, often provide a negative picture of one-man rule in accordance with democrats' and aristocrats' aversion for this form of government. The most obvious case is Sophocles' depiction of Creon in *Antigone*. Despite his initial profession of devotion to the good of the city (Soph. *Ant.* 175-91), Creon eventually reveals a tyrannical personality (Soph. *Ant.* 567-81, 640-80, 734-9) that brings doom upon him and his family.²⁵¹ Finally, if the institutional setting of the dramatic festivals did not invite playwrights to directly challenge Athens' democratic ideology, it did enable them to stimulate constructive reflection about the *polis*. In doing so, tragedians could engage with the audience's experience with the institutions of the democracy and their discourse. In Euripides' *Children of Heracles*, for example, Iolaus asks the Athenian king, Demophon, to reciprocate the benefits his father Theseus received from Heracles and help the Heraclidae against Eurystheus (Eur. *Heracl.* 215-22). Iolaus' appeal is consistent with the discourse of reciprocity typically employed in Athenian honorific and deliberative practice, with which many members of the audience would have been familiar thanks to their service in the Council and their participation in the Assembly.²⁵² Orestes similarly employs legal language in Aeschylus' *Libation Bearers*. After killing his mother Clytemnestra, he wishes for Zeus to be his witness in court (μάρτυς ἐν δίκῃ) and defends the legitimacy of his murder of Aegisthus, who has been punished as an adulterer, as the law prescribes (ἔχει γὰρ αἰσχυντήρος, ὡς νόμος, δίκην) (Aesch. *Cho.* 984-90)²⁵³

In conclusion, the discursive parameters of the dramatic festivals caused playwrights to endorse values that could be shared by the majority of their audience. In order to win first prize, tragedians tried to offer something to both the elite and the mass attending the dramatic contests. Tragedy was in some sense a meta-ideological genre. The dramatic festivals enabled tragedians to play with the discourse developed in other Athenian institutions. Playwrights could therefore pose questions about the core ideas of the democratic *polis* and reaffirm the validity of those values through mechanisms of heroic distance and heroic difference or through the decisive intervention of a *deus ex machina*.²⁵⁴

2.3. DISCURSIVE PARAMETERS AND MYTH: THE CASE OF ADRASTUS

In Section 2.1, I explored the myths deployed inside and outside Athenian institutions and established that myth was virtually omnipresent in the lives of the Athenians. In Section 2.2, I

²⁵¹ Allan and Kelly (2013), 92, 99. Specifically on Sophocles' unsympathetic characterisation of Creon as a tyrant, see Harris (2006), 41-80 and Cairns (2016a), 42-56.

²⁵² See discussion below, at pp. 97-104.

²⁵³ For this and other examples of legal language in Attic drama, see Harris (2010); more in general on the relationship between Attic drama and Athenian law, see the essays in Harris, Leão and Rhodes (2010).

²⁵⁴ On the concepts of heroic distance and heroic difference, see Allan and Kelly (2013), 99-101.

delineated the discursive parameters of the main institutions of Athenian democracy. It is now time to combine the results of both sections and determine the impact of the discursive parameters of Athenian institutions on mythical narratives and allusions. This will help to set up the framework for my three case studies (Chapters 3-5), which will provide a detailed analysis of the myths of the Heraclidae, the Attic Amazonomachy and autochthony. In the present section, I shall therefore analyse different accounts of the myth of Adrastus produced for different institutional settings of Athenian democracy and highlight how each version was influenced by the discursive parameters of Athenian democratic institutions.

I have already mentioned the existence in Athens of at least two versions of the myth of Adrastus. In one, the Athenians went to war against the Thebans to recover the bodies of the Seven. In the other, the Athenians obtained the return of the fallen through diplomacy. The bellicose version was the standard choice at the state funeral. In accordance with the discursive parameters of this institutional setting, orators of funeral speeches used the myth of Adrastus to provide an idealised image of Athens functional to the construction of an imagined community. In his *Funeral Oration*, Lysias uses the episode to emphasise the Athenians' *philanthrōpia* and role as righteous punishers of *hybris*.²⁵⁵ According to the orator, the Athenians believed that, if the Argives had done wrong, they had paid the price with death (ἐκείνους μὲν, εἴ τι ἠδίκουν, ἀποθανόντας δίκην ἔχειν τὴν μεγίστην), and that the Thebans were causing the gods to be treated with impiety (τοὺς δὲ κάτω τὰ αὐτῶν οὐ κομίζεσθαι, ἱερῶν δὲ μαινομένων τοὺς ἄνω θεοὺς ἀσεβεῖσθαι). The orator then points out that the Athenians went to war against the Thebans despite the fact that they had no previous quarrel with them and were not gratifying the Argives who were still alive (οὐδεμιᾶς διαφορᾶς πρότερον πρὸς Καδμείους ὑπαρχούσης, οὐδὲ τοῖς ζῶσιν Ἀργείων χαριζόμενοι). In doing so, the Athenians benefited both the Thebans, who ceased to commit *hybris* against the gods (τοὺς θεοὺς ἐξυβρίσωσιν), and the Argives, who were not deprived of ancestral honour and Greek custom.²⁵⁶ The Athenians won the war with justice as their ally (τὸ δὲ δίκαιον ἔχοντες σύμμαχον) and were not roused by their fortune into exacting an excessive vengeance on the Thebans (Lys. 2.7-10). Demosthenes similarly states that the Athenians did not permit funerary rights to suffer *hybris* (τὰ τῶν κατοικομένων νόμιμ' οὐ περιεῖδον ὑβριζόμενα) when Creon forbade the burial of the Seven (Dem. 60.8). In Plato's *Menexenus* Socrates simply lists

²⁵⁵ The attitude of the Thebans in this episode is explicitly characterised as *hybris* against the gods, but *hybris* was not necessarily a religious offence: see discussion in Section 4.2. According to Steinbock (2013a), 189-90, funeral speeches emphasised Theban *hybris* to present the episode of Adrastus as a mythical prefiguration of Athens' defeat of the hubristic Thebans during the Persian Wars. This may well be the case, but Steinbock does not consider that the myth of Adrastus was not the only one where the Athenians acted as punishers of *hybris* in epitaphic narratives: see Chapter 4.

²⁵⁶ Gotteland (2001), 205.

the war against the Thebans on behalf of the Argives among the wars Athens fought for the freedom of the Greeks (Pl. *Menex.* 239a-b).

The bellicose version of the myth of Adrastus also features in Xenophon's account of the speech delivered by Procles of Phlius in front of the Athenian Assembly in 369 BC.²⁵⁷ Procles' account shows slight but significant differences compared to epitaphic narratives. Procles needs to persuade the Athenians to intervene in defence of the Spartans and their allies against the Thebans. In accordance with the discursive parameters of the Assembly, he explains that, if they help the Spartans now, the Athenians will have the advantage of securing them as their allies in the future (Xen. *Hell.* 6.5.38-44). Procles then stirs the Athenians' pride in their tradition of helping the victims of injustice, but immediately introduces considerations of reciprocity. He states that the Athenians are now considering whether to help Sparta or Thebes, despite the fact that the Thebans once tried to persuade the Spartans to destroy Athens. The speaker exhorts the Athenians not to let the Spartans who are still alive suffer *hybris* or be destroyed, just as they once did not let the dead bodies of the Seven go unburied (Xen. *Hell.* 6.5.45-6).²⁵⁸ The Athenians' religious piety, central in Lysias' and Demosthenes' epitaphic narratives, is downplayed in Procles' mythical allusion in front of the Assembly. Procles does mention the risk that the Spartans will suffer *hybris* (ὕβρισθῆναι) from the Thebans, but such *hybris* is not specifically characterised as religious. Plato's boast of Athens' role as champion of Greek freedom is similarly absent. The myth of Adrastus is tailored to the present situation, as Athens is again called to make war against Thebes. More importantly, the allusion is incorporated into a discourse of reciprocity which would have been inconceivable at the state funeral, where the point was the character of the Athenians as a community, not the nature of their reciprocal dealings with other communities. Procles make this even clearer when he alludes to the myth of the Heraclidae. The Athenians performed a noble deed when they saved the Heraclidae, the founders of Sparta, from Eurystheus. The speaker exhorts them to do something even nobler by saving the whole city, especially given that the Spartans themselves saved Athens from destruction in 404 BC. Procles then closes his speech with an appeal to the Athenians to reciprocate the favours received from the Spartans on behalf of all Greece (Xen. *Hell.* 6.5.47-8).

The impact of the Dramatic Festival on the myth of Adrastus can be observed in Aeschylus' *Eleusinians* and Euripides' *Suppliant Women*. Not much can be said about

²⁵⁷ Cf. Hdt. 9.27.3, where the Athenians use the myth of Adrastus in their debate with the Tegaeans over the leadership of the left wing of the Greek army in Plataea: see Steinbock (2013a), 196-8. Cf. also Isoc. 14.53-5, where the (real or imaginary) Plataeans employ the myth of Adrastus to persuade the Athenians to help them against the Thebans: see Steinbock (2013a), 198-200.

²⁵⁸ Steinbock (2013a), 200-1.

Aeschylus' play, of which only two very short fragments survive (Aesch. F 53a-54). As Plutarch testifies, the play deployed the pacific version of the myth (Plut. *Thes.* 29.4-5). Such a choice would have been obviously inappropriate in the military context of the state funeral, but was clearly possible on the tragic stage. More can be said about Euripides' *Suppliant Women*.²⁵⁹ Enabled by the institutional setting of the dramatic festivals, Euripides at first seems to question the epitaphic image of the Athenians as selfless champions of the weak. Despite the pitiful sight of the mothers and children of the Argive dead, Theseus initially rejects Adrastus' supplication (Eur. *Supp.* 219-49). Theseus reproaches Adrastus for his decision to give his own daughters in marriage to Tydeus and Polynices and in doing so mixing the just with the unjust (χρῆν γὰρ οὐδὲ σώματα ἄδικα δικάοις τὸν σοφὸν συμμιγνύναι). He then blames the Argive king for attacking Thebes against the advice of the seers.²⁶⁰ Euripides provides Theseus with sensible reasons for denying help to Adrastus. Theseus' concern that Adrastus associated himself with unjust individuals, in particular, reflects the Athenians' belief in their ancestors' devotion to justice. At the same time, the playwright problematizes the choice between justice, religious piety and help for the weak in a manner inconceivable for orators of funeral speeches. The anomaly is eventually fixed when Theseus' mother, Aethra, persuades her son to help the Argives (Eur. *Supp.* 297-364).²⁶¹ Aethra exhorts Theseus to consider the will of the gods in order not to dishonour it and err (τὰ τῶν θεῶν σκοπεῖν κελεύω μὴ σφαλῆς ἀτιμάσας).²⁶² Not only does she insist on the consequences of Theseus' choice for his own reputation, but she also displays the same preoccupation with burial rights and Greek custom (νόμιμά τε πάσης συγγέοντας Ἑλλάδος) that characterises Lysias' and Plato's accounts of the episode. The Athenians are finally able to recover the bodies of the Argive dead. Euripides, however, not bound by the discursive parameters of the state funeral, once again departs from the epitaphic version and acknowledges the creation of a bond of *charis* between Theseus and Adrastus (Eur. *Supp.* 1166-95). While funeral speeches ignore or deny any relationship of reciprocity between Athens and Argos, at the end of the play Theseus asks the Argives to remember the favour they have received (ὕμᾱς δὲ τῶνδε χρὴ χάριν μεμνημένους σῶζειν). Adrastus promises timeless gratitude (χάριν τ' ἀγήρων), and Athena closes the play with an exhortation for Theseus to sanction the newly established bond with an oath.

The versions of the myth of Adrastus produced for the state funeral, the Assembly and the dramatic festivals can be compared with those produced outside the formal institutions of

²⁵⁹ The play has often been seen as a reaction to Thebes' refusal to return the Athenian dead of the battle of Delium in 424 BC: see Gotteland (2001), 209-10; Morwood (2007), 28-30; Steinbock (2013a), 192-3.

²⁶⁰ Gotteland (2001), 201-2.

²⁶¹ See Morwood (2007), 6-7, who emphasises Aethra's role in educating Theseus.

²⁶² Gotteland (2001), 205-7.

the democracy. In Isocrates' *Panegyricus* (4.54-9), for example, the bellicose version illustrates Athens' character and power (τὸν τρόπον καὶ τὴν ῥώμην). The orator stresses Adrastus' failure in recovering the bodies of the fallen (τοὺς ὑπὸ τῇ Καδμείᾳ τελευτήσαντας αὐτὸς μὲν οὐ δυνάμενος ἀνελέσθαι) and his expectation that Athens would provide help in the communal misfortunes (ταῖς κοιναῖς τύχαις) out of respect for ancestral custom (πάτριον νόμον) and the burial rights of the war dead. According to Isocrates, the episode proves that Athens has always been in a position of leadership, because it is natural for the weak to seek the help of the powerful, especially in matters which are not private but communal (περὶ πραγμάτων οὐκ ἰδίων ἀλλὰ κοινῶν). Isocrates therefore shares with the speakers of the funeral speeches not only the use of the bellicose version but also the interest for Athens' religious piety. At the same time, while funeral speeches stress Athenian *philanthrōpia*, Isocrates focuses on Athens' power and position of leadership.

Isocrates' rendering of the myth of Adrastus in *Panathenaicus* openly departs from the epitaphic version (Isoc. 12.168-74). The speech praises Athens and its benefactions to Greece through a comparison with Sparta. Despite a theme reminiscent of a funeral speech, Isocrates' *Panathenaicus* is a speech for private circulation and is clearly unaffected by the discursive parameters of the state funeral.²⁶³ First, Isocrates employs the pacific version of the myth, where the Athenians obtain the return of the bodies of the Seven through diplomacy. The orator even stresses the Thebans' moderation in handling the situation (μετρίως περὶ αὐτῶν τε διαλεχθέντες καὶ τῶν ἐπιστρατευσάντων κατηγορήσαντες) and states that their decision contrasted with the opinions that some people hold about them (οὐχ ὁμοίως ἔγνωσαν οὔτε ταῖς δόξαις αἷς ἔχουσί τινες περὶ αὐτῶν). Isocrates' justificatory tone towards the Thebans, commonly ascribed to his desire to safeguard the relations between Athens and Thebes,²⁶⁴ would have been out of place at the state funeral and is not featured in any of the extant funeral speeches.²⁶⁵ By substituting Theban *hybris* with a more moderate (μετρίως)

²⁶³ On the nature of Isocrates' *Panathenaicus*, see V. J. Gray (1994b); Roth (2003); Papillon (2004), 167-8.

²⁶⁴ See Steinbock (2013a), 201-9, with references; for an alternative explanation, see V. J. Gray (1994a), 96-100. Isocrates explicitly justifies his choice of the pacific version over the bellicose version employed in *Panegyricus*. He claims to have written well and expediently (καλῶς γέγραφα καὶ συμφερόντως) and expects to be praised by '[every]one who can understand these things' (τῶν ταῦτα συνιδεῖν ἂν δυναθέντων) (Isoc. 12.172-3, transl. Papillon). On the difficult interpretation of the expression τῶν ταῦτα συνιδεῖν ἂν δυναθέντων, see Steinbock (2013a), 202 n. 208.

²⁶⁵ Cf. Demosthenes' attitude towards the Thebans in his *Funeral Speech*. When describing the disastrous outcome of the battle of Chaeronea, Demosthenes blames the Greek defeat not on the Athenian and Theban ranks, but on the Theban commanders (τοῖς ἐπὶ τούτῳ ταχθεῖσιν Θηβαίων, οὐχὶ τοῖς πολλοῖς οὔτ' ἐκείνων οὔθ' ἡμῶν ἐγκαλέσειεν ἂν τις εικότως) (Dem. 60.22). In the context of the state funeral, therefore, Demosthenes does not refrain from making a veiled attack on the Thebans despite the fact that Athens and Thebes were then allies!

behaviour,²⁶⁶ Isocrates abandons the epitaphic image of the Athenians as the punishers of *hybris*. Moreover, the orator once again downplays Athenian *philanthrōpia* and focuses on Adrastus' inability to recover the dead and on his appeal to ancestral custom to secure Athenian intervention. Such custom is respected by all, not because it has been established by human nature, but because it has been prescribed by divine power (οὐχ ὡς ὑπ' ἀνθρωπίνης κειμένῳ φύσεως, ἀλλ' ὡς ὑπὸ δαιμονίας προστεταγμένῳ δυνάμεως). According to the orator, however, the Thebans felt compelled to return the dead by the words of the Athenians more than by divine laws (ἐλέσθαι μᾶλλον αὐτοὺς ἐμμεῖναι τοῖς λόγοις τοῖς ὑπὸ τῆς πόλεως πεμφθεῖσιν ἢ τοῖς νόμοις τοῖς ὑπὸ τοῦ δαιμονίου κατασταθεῖσιν). Isocrates' account therefore emphasises Athens' power rather than the qualities usually highlighted by orators at the state funeral.

Pindar refers to the myth of Adrastus in *Olympian Six* and *Nemean Nine*. Neither poem was composed for an Athenian audience, nor can it be determined whether any of them was ever performed in Athens. Pindar's rendition of the story is thus an interesting example of a development of the myth of Adrastus outside of Athenian democratic institutions.²⁶⁷ Both poems are dedicated to Sicilian victors at athletic games and they never mention Athenian intervention or a dispute over the return of the dead. In *Olympian Six*, Pindar reports Adrastus' praise of the dead Amphiaras. The speech takes place in Thebes after the pyres of the Seven have been consumed (ἐπτα δ' ἔπειτα πυρᾶν νεκρῶν τελεσθεισᾶν Ταλαϊονίδας εἶπεν ἐν Θήβασι τοιοῦτόν τι ἔπος) (Pind. *Ol.* 6.12-17). Pindar describes the funeral rites of the Seven again in *Nemean Nine*. According to the poet, the Argives fattened the smoke with the corpses of the Seven on the banks of the Ismenus (Ἴσμηνοῦ δ' ἐπ' ὄχθασι), and their pyres feasted on their bodies (Pind. *Nem.* 9.23-5). It has been suggested that Pindar reproduced a pre-existing Theban tradition or invented a new version in response to the Athenian account of the burial of the Seven.²⁶⁸ Whatever the origin of Pindar's version, his account of the myth of Adrastus lacks the elements highlighted in the versions produced for Athenian democratic institutions. Athens has no role in the story, and the poet rather focuses on the heroism and death of the Argives.

This analysis of the myth of Adrastus shows that the discursive parameters of Athenian democratic institutions had a significant impact on mythical narratives. At the state funeral for the war dead, myth served to construct an idealised image of Athens that was functional to the creation of an imagined community. Orators of funeral speeches therefore focused on aspects that would have made the Athenians proud of dying for their city, such as the Athenians' *philanthrōpia* or their role as champions of Greek freedom and religious customs. In the

²⁶⁶ Gotteland (2001), 209.

²⁶⁷ Cf. Paus. 1.39.2: 'The Thebans, however, say that they voluntarily gave up the dead for burial and deny that they engaged in battle' (transl. Jones and Ormerod).

²⁶⁸ See Steinbock (2013a), 165-9, with references.

Assembly, the mythical past was used to persuade the Athenians on matters of public policy. In accordance with the discursive parameters of this setting, mythical narratives and allusions were couched in terms of advantage and could include appeals to reciprocity that would have been inappropriate at the state funeral. The dramatic festivals enabled tragedians to play with the discourse developed in other institutions. As a result, playwrights enjoyed greater freedom than public orators in handling mythical material but still acted within the ideological horizon of the larger part of their audience.

2.4. CONCLUSIONS

This chapter has addressed some of the issues raised in the Introduction and established a framework for the case studies that will be the subject of the next three chapters. First, I have offered an assessment of the mythical knowledge of the Athenians and showed that the Athenians during the classical period engaged with myth in virtually every aspect of their public and private lives. The dramatic festivals and (to a lesser extent) the Panathenaea reached broad sections of Athens' population and touched an extremely wide range of mythical themes. As a result, both institutions had a great potential to influence the mythical knowledge of the Athenians. The state funeral covered a relatively limited range of mythical themes. The emotional power of funeral speeches, however, probably caused the state funeral to contribute significantly to the Athenians' familiarity with specific episodes from the city's mythical past. The lawcourts and, to a lesser degree, the Assembly and possibly the Council provided further arenas for the discussion of the mythical past in Athens' public life. The Athenians also interacted with myth in their private sphere, especially within the contexts of the family and the symposium. Not only did the Athenians deploy a wide range of mythical themes in both public and private contexts, but they also often used multiple versions of the same myths. It is therefore safe to assume that, thanks to their familiarity with the Greek mythical tradition, the Athenians were capable of appreciating variations in mythical narratives, and that choosing one mythical version over another could carry ideological value.

Second, I have explored the nature and discursive parameters of the main institutions of Athenian democracy. At the state funeral for the war dead, the Athenians produced an image of the city that was functional to the construction of an imagined community. The *epitaphios logos*, in particular, provided an image of Athens that justified the sacrifice of the fallen and inspired their relatives to follow their example. In the lawcourts, orators were bound by oath to deal with issues of justice and specific legal charges. No such formal rules existed in the Assembly, but the evidence shows that speakers in this setting were expected to address issues of advantage and discuss the best policy for the city. In the Council, the focus on justice and

advantage seemed to coexist in accordance with the Bouleutic Oath sworn by the councillors. Finally, at the dramatic festivals, the values and beliefs of the Athenian community could be put to question and reaffirmed by tragedians. My study of the discursive parameters of Athenian democratic institutions has thus shown that the new institutionalist idea that institutions influence the behaviour of political actors is appropriate to the case of classical Athens.

Third, I have shown that the discursive parameters of democratic institutions conditioned the use of the past in Athenian public discourse. My analysis of the myth of Adrastus has proven that such parameters also applied to the realm of the mythical past. Compared to private or even non-democratic contexts, Athenian democratic institutions imposed specific constraints on how political actors handled mythical materials. At the state funeral, myth was recalled to create an idealised image of Athens that could construct an imagined community. Through myth, orators of funeral speeches emphasised values that the Athenians would identify as typical of their community, such as their *philanthrōpia* and their role as the bulwark of Greek freedom. In the lawcourts, orators recalled myths to convince the judges on legal matters and couched their allusions in terms of justice and lawfulness.²⁶⁹ In the Assembly, myth was used to persuade the Athenians on matters of public policy, and deliberative orators were expected to embed their mythical allusions in their discussion of advantage.²⁷⁰ Myth was central in Attic tragedy. In accordance with the discursive parameters of the dramatic festivals, tragedians could use myth to play with and reaffirm the values and discourse developed in other institutions. I have therefore shown that the Athenians were expected to talk about myth differently in the different institutions of the democracy.

The outcomes of the present chapter will be put into practice in three case studies. In Chapter 3, I explore the use of the notions of *charis* and *philanthrōpia* in the versions of myth of the Athenian defence of the Heraclidae produced for the state funeral, the dramatic festivals and private oratory. Chapter 4 is devoted to the Attic Amazonomachy and analyses how the notion of *hybris* shaped the story in different ways in democratic institutions and private contexts. In Chapter 5, I analyse the myth of autochthony and Athens' earthborn kings. Variations produced for the state funeral, the dramatic festivals and the lawcourts are read in connection to the theme of *eugeneia*. These three cases studies allow me to explore the dynamic process through which the Athenians constructed shared ideas about Athens and her

²⁶⁹ I have not discussed the lawcourts in Section 3 because none of the preserved forensic speeches alludes to the myth of Adrastus. As Chapter 5 will show, the focus on justice and the laws, highlighted in Section 2 with regard to historical allusion, also applied to mythical allusions.

²⁷⁰ Since no mythical allusions are attested in the extant bouleutic speeches, I have not included the Council in the discussion.

past within the institutions of the democracy and according to the specific discursive parameters of each institutional setting. As a result, I shed new light on the role of political actors and institutions in the ideological practice of Athenian democracy.

CHAPTER 3

Between *charis* and *philanthrōpia*: the Heraclidae

The story of Athens' intervention in defence of the Heraclidae held a special place in Athenian social memory. This is to some extent surprising, given the strong Peloponnesian connotations of Heracles and his children. The return of the Heraclidae was at the core of Sparta's foundation narrative. In particular, the belief that the Spartan kings were the descendants of the Heraclidae can be traced back at least to the seventh century, when it featured in the poems of Tyrtaeus (Tyrtaeus fr. 2.12-15; 11.1; 19.8 West).²⁷¹ Heracles, however, figured prominently also in Attic pottery of the sixth century. Heracles' fight against Nereus and his introduction to Olympus were particularly popular scenes, and the hero's incidence in Athenian architectural sculpture of the same period is remarkable compared with the rest of Greece.²⁷² The vases depicting Heracles' introduction to Olympus, which usually show Athena riding a chariot together with the hero, are especially interesting. The scene has been linked with Pisistratus' second rise to power. On that occasion, if we believe Herodotus and the Aristotelean *Constitution of the Athenians*, the future tyrant entered Athens on a golden chariot accompanied by a woman who posed as Athena (Hdt. 1.60; [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 14.4). This similarity led John Boardman to postulate that the vases reflect the political use of Heracles on the part of Pisistratus, who fostered the idea of his own identification with the hero.²⁷³

The Spartans' claim to descend from Heracles, which stems from the myth of the return of the Heraclidae, made its first appearance in Athens at the end of the sixth century in the aftermath of the fall of the Pisistratids. Herodotus recounts how the Spartan king Cleomenes, when trying to impose Isagoras as Athens' ruler, had not been allowed in the temple of Athena on the Acropolis. To the priestess of Athena who accused him of being a Dorian, Cleomenes protested his Achaean ancestry (Hdt. 5.72.3). Cleomenes therefore tried to gain access to the shrine by downplaying the Dorian and emphasising the Heraclid ancestry, if not of the Spartans as a whole, at least of their royal families.²⁷⁴ Herodotus continues that

²⁷¹ For ancient accounts of the return of the Heraclidae cf. Diod. 57-8; Apollod. 2.8; Paus. 2.18.7-8; 3.1.5; 4.3.3-8; see Malkin (1994), 15-45; Hall (1997), 56-65; Fowler (2013), 334-42.

²⁷² Boardman (1975), 1-3. For the Nereus scenes, see *LIMC* s.v. Nereus 16-20; 34-48. For the Introduction scenes, see *LIMC* s.v. Herakles 2847-2860; 2881-2906.

²⁷³ See Boardman (1972) and (1975). But Boardman (1989), 159 stresses that the vases were not 'the medium for any deliberate political propaganda'.

²⁷⁴ Parker (1998), 4-5.

the king, ignoring the omen, insisted in occupying the Acropolis and was then forced to abandon the city (Hdt. 5.72.4). The historian says nothing about the priestess' reply to Cleomenes, but the fact that she was unaware of the king's Achaean roots is in itself significant. Her ignorance of Cleomenes' pedigree may indicate that sixth-century Athenians were unfamiliar with the return of the Heraclidae, or at least with its implications for the Spartans and their control over the Peloponnese.²⁷⁵ This may be connected with the fact that Athens was at the time still a minor player in the international arena, whose interests probably did not extend much outside Attica.²⁷⁶ Alternatively, one might read the words of the priestess as implicitly questioning the Spartans' alleged kinship to Heracles. If one credits Boardman's theory, it may be even suggested that, in the instability following the fall of the Pisistratids, the Athenians tried to appropriate the tyrants' Heracleian imagery. Whatever its interpretation, the episode of Cleomenes and the priestess shows that, at the end of the sixth century, the myth of the return of the Heraclidae was starting to be employed in an Athenian context. This, in conjunction with Heracles' popularity in early Athenian visual arts, led the Athenians to elaborate on an episode in the myth of the Heraclidae where their city played the main role.²⁷⁷

The earliest explicit mention of Athens' involvement with the Heraclidae dates to the 470s. Pherecydes tells the story of how, after Heracles' death, Eurystheus expelled the hero's children from their land and became king. The Heraclidae found shelter in Athens, but Eurystheus invaded the city when the Athenians refused to hand them over and was eventually killed in battle (*FGrHist* 3 F 84).²⁷⁸ Herodotus' account of the dispute between the Athenians and the Tegeans before the battle of Plataea suggests that the Athenian stage in the return of

²⁷⁵ Bremmer (1997), 13-17. The Spartans' claim of descending from the Heraclidae must have been well-known in fourth-century Athens, if Procles of Phlius could invite the Athenians to help the Spartans as they once helped their ancestors, the Heraclidae (Xen. *Hell.* 6.5.47). The return of the Heraclidae must have been a familiar myth in Athens already during the fifth century, when Euripides produced four Heraclid plays: *Archelaus* (Eur. F 228-46), *Cresphontes* (Eur. F 448a-59), *Temenidae* (Eur. F 728-40) and *Temenus* (Eur. F 741a-51a). *Archelaus*, however, had been originally produced in Macedonia and may have never been performed in Athens: see Collard and Cropp (2008), 229-33. On the importance of the return of the Heraclidae for the geopolitical order of the Peloponnese, see Luraghi (2014), 139-46.

²⁷⁶ See Frost (1984a) and G. Anderson (2003), 147-51, who both connect the Clisthenic reforms with the introduction of a proper citizen army in Athens and the consequent increase in Athens' military activity. But this view has been recently questioned by van Wees (2013), 63-75.

²⁷⁷ See Allan (2001), 24-5, who highlights the prestige the Athenians derived from their assimilation of the Heraclid myth and their association with Heracles.

²⁷⁸ Pindar's *Ninth Pythian* seems to transmit a version that did not feature Athenian intervention. The poet states that Iolaus was buried in Thebes after killing Eurystheus (Pind. *Pyth.* 9.79-83). However, both this detail and a scholion which mentions Eurystheus' burial in Thebes (schol. *ad Pind. Pyth.* 9.82) do not necessarily imply that the battle occurred in Thebes (*pace* Allan 2001, 29-30 and Fowler 2013, 343): the bodies may have been transferred to Thebes, and Pindar may have overlooked the Attic setting and Athens' involvement in order not to obscure Iolaus and Thebes. On the dating of Pherecydes' activity see p. 139 with n. 479 below. The detail of Eurystheus' death in Attica will later appear in Thucydides (Thuc. 1.9.2).

the Heraclidae may have been already well established at the time of the Persian Wars. In the passage, the Athenians use their intervention in defence of the Heraclidae as an argument to claim the command of the left wing of the Greek army (Hdt. 9.27).²⁷⁹ A possible, even earlier allusion to Athens' assistance to the Heraclidae can be found in a fragment of Hecataeus. There Ceyx, king of Trachis, sends the Heraclidae away and suggests them to go to some other country (ἐς ἄλλον τινὰ δῆμον ἀποίχεσθε) (*FGrHist* 1 F 30). Ceyx's advice to the Heraclidae to find refuge somewhere else has been interpreted as a reference to their stay in Athens and may push the invention of the episode before the end of the sixth century.²⁸⁰

The Athenian intervention on behalf of the Heraclidae was a perfect illustration of Athens' military excellence and commitment to the protection of the weak. It is then not surprising that the episode achieved popularity on the tragic stage and in oratory. Only five fragments survive of Aeschylus' *Children of Heracles* (Aesch. fr. 73b-75a, 77 Radt), which may have dealt with Athens' help to the Heraclidae or with a theme similar to Sophocles' *Women of Trachis*.²⁸¹ Another *Children of Heracles* play was produced by Pamphilus in the fourth century and certainly included a supplication scene (*TrGF* 51 T 1). The only surviving tragedy which relates the story of the Heraclidae in Attica is Euripides' *Children of Heracles*. The play has often been deemed a poetic failure, and modern interpreters have offered diverging interpretations on its meaning and possible political allusions.²⁸² The Athenian help to the Heraclidae was a standard element in the catalogue of Athens' mythical exploits in the *epitaphios logos* (Lys. 2.11-16; Dem. 60.8-9; Pl. *Menex.* 239b). The fortune of the episode in Attic oratory was not limited to funeral speeches, and the story was employed more generally to praise Athens (Isoc. 4.54-60; 5.33-4; 10.31; 12.194) or her king Theseus (Isoc. 10.31).

3.1. ATHENS' HELP FOR THE HERACLIDAE: *CHARIS* OR *PHILANTHRŌPIA*?

The war against Eurystheus on behalf of the Heraclidae was a typical example of Athens' past glorious deeds.²⁸³ Many elements of the story were subjected to variation in the ancient

²⁷⁹ Herodotus, however, wrote many years after the Persian Wars and may have attributed these words to the Athenians under the influence of the catalogue of exploits in the funeral speeches.

²⁸⁰ Fowler (2013), 342. An even earlier date may be suggested by an Attic inscription from ca 550 BC (*IG* I³ 972), which has been recently read as a dedication of an altar or precinct to the Heraclidae: see M. Jameson (2005), 19, but his interpretation is far from secure, given the poor state of the inscription.

²⁸¹ Wilkins (1993), xviii-xix.

²⁸² See, among others, Zuntz (1955), 26-54; Garzya (1956); Avery (1971); Burian (1977); Allan (2001); Tzanetou (2012), 73-104.

²⁸³ The term 'Heraclidae' can either refer to the children of Heracles or to Heracles' descendants in general. In the rest of the chapter, I will use 'Heraclidae' only to refer to the children of Heracles.

sources,²⁸⁴ but one such element is particularly significant for the study of the ideological dynamics of Athenian democracy: the reason that led Athens to intervene in defence of the Heraclidae. In Euripides' *Children of Heracles*, in particular, Iolaus reminds the Athenian king, Demophon, of how Heracles had once rescued Theseus, Demophon's father, from the underworld. Iolaus therefore asks Demophon to repay the favour (ἀντιδοῦναί ... χάριν) and succour the Heraclidae against Eurystheus (Eur. *Heracl.* 215-22). Such an acknowledgment of a private obligation is unparalleled in Lysias' *Funeral Oration*. The orator is instead keen to stress that the Athenians helped the Heraclidae despite the fact that they did not personally (ἰδίᾳ) receive any benefactions from Heracles and did not know what kind of men the Heraclidae would turn out to be. Lysias implies that Athens, far from having any personal interests at stake, decided to defend the Heraclidae entirely out of altruism and love for justice (Lys. 2.11-16). In other words, Lysias implicitly attributes Athens' intervention to the Athenians' traditional humanness (*philanthrōpia*).

Strictly speaking, there is no formal contradiction between Euripides' and Lysias' versions. To deny the existence of a collective debt of the Athenians toward Heracles does not necessarily mean to deny Theseus' private obligation towards the hero. Lysias may have simply omitted an aspect of the story without openly arguing against it. There is, however, a significant difference of emphasis between the two accounts: while Euripides focuses on reciprocity (*charis*), Lysias ignores, if not even denies the same notion in favour of Athenian *philanthrōpia*. One possible explanation for such an opposite use of the concept of *charis* might be found in the disappearance of Theseus, Athens' "national" hero, from the narrative horizon of the *epitaphios logos*.²⁸⁵ This striking absence has been interpreted by Nicole Loraux as a sign of a democratic re-elaboration of Athens' mythical past, with the Athenian *dēmos* replacing Theseus as the real hero.²⁸⁶ Moreover, Loraux exploited this feature of funeral speeches to connect the origins of the *epitaphios logos* with the new political environment of

²⁸⁴ Several sources, for example, state that the Heraclidae sought the help of other cities before arriving in Athens (*FGrHist* 1 F 30; Eur. *Heracl.* 15-25; Apollod. 2.8.1; Diod. 4.57.2-5; Paus. 1.32.6), while according to Isocrates' *Panegyricus* the Heraclidae only looked for Athens' help (Isoc. 4.56). Ancient sources similarly disagree on the participation of the Heraclidae to the battle. Lysias states that the Athenians fought against Eurystheus with their sole forces (Lys. 2.16), but Euripides and several others attest Hyllus' (and sometimes Iolaus') participation in the battle (Eur. *Heracl.* 799-866; Apollod. 2.8.1; Diod. 4.57.6). Thucydides even states that the Heraclidae killed Eurystheus in Attica (Thuc. 1.9.2), and Pindar ascribes the killing of Eurystheus to Iolaus (Pind. *Pyth.* 9.79-83). For a full survey of the mythical variants of the Heraclidae episode, see Gotteland (2001), 169.

²⁸⁵ On the adoption of Theseus as Athens' "national" hero, see Walker (1995), 35-81; Calame (1996) [1990], 398-419; Mills (1997), 1-41; G. Anderson (2003), 134-45; Steinbock (2013a), 169-72.

²⁸⁶ See Loraux (1981), 65-6.

the radical democracy. She therefore interpreted the disappearance of Theseus as a repudiation of Cimon, who according to several scholars used Theseus in his political propaganda.²⁸⁷

Loraux's interpretation of the absence of Theseus from the extant funeral speeches is problematic. Loraux uses the contingent (and hypothetical) desire of the newly born radical democracy to banish Cimon from Athenian social memory to explain a long-lasting feature of the epitaphic genre. In this respect, her theory is reminiscent of the controversial tendency to identify hidden (and often forced) allusions to contemporary political figures in Attic tragedy.²⁸⁸ Moreover, while it is true that Theseus does not feature in epitaphic narratives of Athenian exploits, the hero does appear in Demosthenes' catalogue of Athenian tribes, where he is praised as the founder of political equality (*isēgoria*) in Athens (Dem. 60.28). Similarly, if a bias against Cimon really existed in the *epitaphios logos*, it would have been inappropriate for Hyperides to mention Cimon's father, Miltiades, among the great Athenians of the past (Hyp. 6.37). Finally, the belief that Theseus was strictly connected to Cimonian propaganda is itself the result of a modern reconstruction based on Cimon's alleged recovery of Theseus' bones in 479 BC. Yet, a recent study has shown that the story of the recovery of Theseus' bones was a tradition elaborated during the fourth century and possibly later, and has raised reasonable doubts against the existence of a Cimonian propaganda based on the figure of Theseus.²⁸⁹ Even if one assumes that such propaganda did exist and present Cimon as the new Theseus, Loraux's theory is based on a circular argument. Loraux employs the absence of Theseus as proof of the origin of the *epitaphios logos* in the aftermath of Cimon's ostracism, but the existence of an equivalence between Theseus and Cimon in funeral speeches can only be postulated if one accepts Loraux's dating of the birth of the epitaphic genre.

Not only is Loraux's explanation of the absence of Theseus from the *epitaphios logos* unsatisfactory; it is also unhelpful for explaining the rationale of Euripides' and Lysias' narratives of the Heraclidae episode. I shall argue that the two accounts of the reasons for Athens' intervention (and the subsequent role of Theseus) were influenced by their respective institutional settings. In accordance with the discursive parameters of the dramatic festivals, Euripides played with his audience's familiarity (acquired through their participation in the Assembly and the Council) with Athenian deliberative and honorific practice, where *charis* played a significant part. Lysias, on the other hand, was conditioned by the discursive parameters of the state funeral for the war dead. By focusing on Athenian justice and

²⁸⁷ See Loraux (1981), 66. On Theseus and Cimonian propaganda, see Podlecki (1971); Calame (1996) [1990], 416-17; Parker (1996), 168-70.

²⁸⁸ For a recent (and unsatisfactory) attempt, see Vickers (2008), who identifies allusions to Alcibiades in the works of Sophocles and Euripides.

²⁸⁹ See Zaccarini (2015).

selflessness, Lysias provided an idealised image of the Athenians as champions of *philanthrōpia*, and contributed to the construction of Athens' imagined community. In this light, it appears clear that the role of Theseus was not problematic because of the hero's alleged Cimonian connotations. Instead, Theseus' debt towards Heracles was obscured because inappropriate to the altruistic picture of the Athenians expected at the state funeral.

The discursive parameters of the state funeral for the war dead are even more evident if one compares Lysias' narrative of the Heraclidae episode to Isocrates' account of the same myth in his *Panegyricus*. The speech was produced for a private setting and exemplifies a praise of Athens which did not respond to the discursive parameters of the state funeral.²⁹⁰ Free from the task of constructing an imagined community, Isocrates never stresses Athenian *philanthrōpia*. Instead, he reintroduces *charis* in the relationship between Athens and the Heraclidae. Isocrates states that the Heraclidae sought the help of the Athenians alone, because they considered them the only ones capable of reciprocating (ἀποδοῦναι χάριν) Heracles' benefactions to humanity (Isoc. 4.56). The orator does not mention Theseus and his private debt of *charis* towards Heracles, but rather highlights the fact that, while all mankind was indebted to Heracles, only Athens was strong enough to return the favour. The argument of reciprocity emphasises Athens' power and serves the argument of the speech, which praises Athens and proposes a Panhellenic expedition against Persia under Athenian (or joint Spartan and Athenian) leadership.

3.2. BETWEEN CHARIS AND PHILANTHRŌPIA

My discussion of the myth of the Heraclidae will move between the two poles of reciprocity (*charis*) and humaneness (*philanthrōpia*). These notions may at first glance appear irreconcilable, but should not be seen as completely separate and opposed to one another. The altruistic disposition of *philanthrōpia* cannot be understood outside of the reciprocal dynamics regulating Greek life and society. As we shall see, *charis* and *philanthrōpia* were two interconnected sides of the same cultural framework.

The concept of reciprocity has entered the domain of classical studies from anthropological research, where it is taken as a central factor in the economic processes of primitive societies.²⁹¹ The theories of Marshall Sahlins, in particular, have enjoyed considerable popularity among ancient historians. Sahlins identified three distinct and

²⁹⁰ Gotteland (2001), 176-85 rightly notes the differences between Euripides', Lysias' and Isocrates' accounts of the reasons for Athens' intervention in defence of the Heraclidae, but does not highlight their institutional and ideological implications.

²⁹¹ For a survey on anthropological research about reciprocity, see Van Wees (1998).

progressive degrees of reciprocity: generalised, balanced and negative.²⁹² Generalised reciprocity refers to an altruistic form of exchange, where the expectation of requital exists but is indefinite and might even be disappointed. Balanced reciprocity refers to a direct, *quid pro quo* exchange where the return is immediate and equivalent to the good received. Negative reciprocity is described as ‘the attempt to get something for nothing with impunity’ and can manifest itself in the economic shape of the barter or in more cunning or violent forms. Reciprocity can incline toward either of these three degrees depending on kinship distance, with members of the same kinship or social group tending towards the generalised type. Moreover, Sahlins noted how generosity and thus generalised reciprocity can create rank through indebtedness, and (conversely) how a dominant position implies a certain amount of generosity as a sort of *noblesse oblige*.

Reciprocity has been found to affect many aspects of the Greek world.²⁹³ In Homeric society, for example, reciprocity (*charis*) operated in the practice of gift giving and hospitality, and has been used to explain the relations between individuals and those between leader and subjects.²⁹⁴ In the classical period, dynamics based on reciprocity have been identified in Spartan diplomatic rhetoric and in Athenian forensic language.²⁹⁵ Some degree of reciprocity was also involved in Greek notions of justice. In Plato’s *Republic*, for example, Polemarchus re-elaborates Simonides’ saying that ‘it is just to give back (*ἀποδιδόναι*) to everyone what he is owed’, and states that justice is the art ‘which renders (*ἀποδιδούσα*) benefit to friends and harm to our enemies’ (Pl. *Resp.* 331d-332d, transl. Emlyn-Jones and Preddy).²⁹⁶ One can see this principle in action in Thucydides’ Mytilenean debate (Thuc. 3.36-50). There, Cleon exhorts the Athenians to persevere in their decision to execute the entire adult male population of Mytilene despite the fact that only the wealthy had rebelled against Athens. Cleon stresses the injustice of the Mytileneans, who turned against the same Athenians who had granted them many honours (Thuc. 3.39.2-3). Cleon, in other words, accuses the Mytileneans of giving harm in return for benefits, and clearly conceives justice in terms of reciprocity. Punishing the Mytileneans is exactly what justice requires (Thuc. 3.40.4), and even Cleon’s opponent, Diodotus, does not deny this principle. Even though he advocates a milder treatment for the

²⁹² Sahlins (1972), 193-210. For a recent attempt to challenge the traditional views of anthropologists on reciprocity, see Graeber (2011).

²⁹³ See Seaford (1998).

²⁹⁴ See Donlan (1998); Postlethwaite (1998).

²⁹⁵ On reciprocity in Spartan diplomatic rhetoric, see Missiou (1998), who on the other hand downplays the role of the *charis* argument in Athenian diplomatic rhetoric. On forensic *charis* in Athens, see Harris (2013b), 129-36, *pace* Millet (1998).

²⁹⁶ See Dover (1974), 180-1, who provides further passages where this notion is employed; see also Havelock (1978), 309-11.

sake of advantage, Diodotus agrees on the intrinsic justice of Cleon's speech (Thuc. 3.44.4; 47.5), thus acknowledging the reciprocal nature of justice itself.²⁹⁷

If the Athenians were keen to reciprocate harm to their enemies, at least in their own self-perception they were even more concerned with requiting benefits to their friends. In particular, their zeal in reciprocating favours to public benefactors was a quality that they proudly considered as their specific prerogative. This is well exemplified in Demosthenes' *Against Leptines*. There, the orator repeatedly accuses Leptines' law of being shameful for Athens because it would abolish the honours the Athenians have always granted to public benefactors as a due reward for their good actions towards the city (Dem. 20.43-4, 64, 81, 141, 156). Demosthenes insists that Leptines' law should be repealed in order to protect the good reputation of the Athenians, who would otherwise appear as ungrateful (ἀχάριστοι) in the eyes of the Greeks (Dem. 20.10).²⁹⁸ The epigraphic record proves that the Athenian community shared Demosthenes' concern for public *charis*. As several scholars have pointed out,²⁹⁹ fourth-century honorific decrees stressed the eagerness of the Athenian *dēmos* (or sometimes both the *dēmos* and the *boulē*) to reciprocate the *charis* due to those who had benefited the city.³⁰⁰ In this sense, reciprocating public *charis* was itself a matter of justice, and one in which the Athenians believed to excel.

The other pole of my discussion of the Heraclid myth is the notion of humaneness (*philanthrōpia*).³⁰¹ With this term, I refer to the righteous and altruistic attitude which the Athenians typically associated with themselves.³⁰² According to Isocrates' *Panegyricus*, for example, the Athenians have shown their *philanthrōpia* since their origins, when they choose to share with the rest of humanity the gifts they had received from Demeter (Isoc. 4.29). In the speech *Against Meidias*, Demosthenes asserts that the Athenians' *philanthrōpia* and mildness are well known to all mankind thanks to the Athenian law on *hybris*. This law punishes even the outrages perpetrated against slaves, even though the Athenians have suffered many wrongs from the barbarian countries where the slaves are purchased (Dem. 21.48-9). The

²⁹⁷ Diodotus' argument is that (corrective) justice is not the province of the Assembly, and that Cleon delivered a forensic speech instead of a deliberative speech: see Harris (2013a).

²⁹⁸ See Canevaro (2016a), 89-91.

²⁹⁹ See Whitehead (1983), 62-4; Liddel (2007), 167-70; Luraghi (2010), 250-2.

³⁰⁰ Cf. *IG* II² 196.11-14; 222.11-15; 223 a 13-14; 391.10-12; 392.1-3; 425.9-14; 448.16-19.

³⁰¹ On the notion of *philanthrōpia* see Dover (1974), 201-5; De Romilly (1979), 43-52; Christ (2013); B. D. Gray (2013). In the *Poetics*, Aristotle describes *to philanthrōpon* as the possible response to the view of a bad person who passes from good to bad fortune (Arist. *Poet.* 1453a2-6). As a sympathetic response to one's misfortune regardless of desert, *to philanthrōpon* thus differs from pity (*eleos*), which consists in a sympathetic response to one's undeserved misfortune: see Konstan (2001), 46-7 and (2006), 214-18.

³⁰² Christ (2013) has recently suggested that *philanthrōpia* was transformed into a democratic virtue by Demosthenes. Even if one accepts Christ's conclusions, the values of justice and altruism associated with the notion of *philanthrōpia* were already predicated of the Athenians prior to Demosthenes.

philanthrōpia of Athenian law is once more the object of praise in Demosthenes' *Against Timocrates*. There, the orator states that the Athenian procedures to enact new laws impose to the citizens to act humanely and kindly (φιλανθρώπως καὶ δημοτικῶς) (Dem. 24.24). Athens has such a reputation for *philanthrōpia* that some people may even take advantage of it, as Demosthenes accuses Charidemus of doing in the speech *Against Aristocrates* (Dem. 23.156).

But is it possible to reconcile the altruistic character of *philanthrōpia* with the importance of reciprocity in Athenian society? If one interprets altruism as an inclination to help others regardless of the possibility of receiving any form of compensation, the concept of *philanthrōpia* can be accommodated in the discourse of reciprocity, and specifically with generalised reciprocity.³⁰³ Their eagerness to honour public benefactors is itself an indicator of the value the Athenians attached to public acts which, even though rewarded, one can safely define as altruistic.³⁰⁴ The compatibility between *charis* and *philanthrōpia* is particularly evident in Demosthenes' *Against Leptines*. There, Demosthenes calls the Athenians *philanthrōpoi* because they rewarded the Corinthians who had been exiled for allowing into Corinth the Athenian soldiers defeated in the battle of Nemea in 394 BC. Demosthenes then warns his fellow citizens against cancelling these rewards and proving to be ungrateful (ἀχάριστοι) (Dem. 20.55).³⁰⁵ In the Demosthenic passage, therefore, the Athenian generosity in granting rewards to the Corinthians is labelled an act of *philanthrōpia*, and its opposite is seen as a denial of the *charis* due to benefactors. Not only was altruism compatible with reciprocity, but it was even a significant factor in the generalised reciprocity which regulated the relationship between the *polis* and its citizens. Traces of such a complementarity can be found already in archaic thought. In the *Works and Days*, Hesiod stresses the importance of paying back one's own debts in fair measure (εὖ δ' ἀποδοῦναι, αὐτῷ τῷ μέτρῳ), but invites his audience to render even more (καὶ λώϊον) than what is due (Hes. *WD* 349-50). The anticipation of an eventual return (ὡς ἂν χρηρίζων καὶ ἐς ὕστερον ἄρκιον εὕρης) (Hes. *WD* 351) does not undermine the other-concern of the action. In fact, it confirms that forms of generosity which can be ascribed to altruism were embedded in dynamics of reciprocity.

The altruistic disposition of *philanthrōpia* held an important place in the Athenians' self-perception of their international relations.³⁰⁶ In this specific context, *philanthrōpia* was

³⁰³ Zanker (1998), 76. On the issue of applying the modern conception of altruism to the ancient world, see Christ (2012), 4-6.

³⁰⁴ See Liddel (2007), 168-70, who highlights the altruism displayed by the *dēmos* in reciprocating public benefactors with honours.

³⁰⁵ Christ (2013), 208-9.

³⁰⁶ Athenian altruism has been the subject of scholarly debate in recent years. Herman (2006), esp. 373, holds an almost utopian idea of Athenian altruism and argues in favour of a 'strategy of generosity' that regulated Athenian foreign policy. Christ (2012) argues instead that the Athenians often refrained from helping people outside their family circle and held very pragmatic foreign policies. Despite their

translated into the Athenian helping paradigm. This consisted in the idealised image of the Athenians as altruistic champions of justice and helpers of the weak, which was traditionally evocated in the funeral speeches.³⁰⁷ Produced at the state funeral for the war dead, this image was often employed in other settings. This is exemplified in Demosthenes' *For the Megalopolitans*. The orator warns the Athenians that the Spartans, soon after capturing Megalopolis, will attack Messene. Demosthenes exhorts the Assembly to vote a pre-emptive intervention in defence of Megalopolis, which would be a nobler and more humane way (καλλίονα καὶ φιλανθρωποτέραν) to prevent Sparta from committing injustices (Dem. 16.9). This decision would be consistent with Athens' traditional policies, which always aim to save the victims of injustices (τοὺς ἀδικουμένους σώζειν) (Dem. 16.14-15), and Demosthenes will conclude his speech accordingly by inviting his fellow citizens always to side with the weak against the powerful (Dem. 16.32). The orator insists that an alliance with Megalopolis would be both just and advantageous. A later intervention in defence of Messene, on the contrary, would damage the reputation of the Athenians, who would appear to act not out of concern for justice but out of fear of the Lacedaemonians (Dem. 16.10).

If the Athenians were keen to ascribe to themselves the role of champions of the weak, they were equally eager to deny that such *philanthrōpia* might also characterise other Greeks. In the *Against Leptines*, for example, Demosthenes compares the Thebans' cruelty and baseness (ὠμότητι καὶ πονηρία), exemplified by their treatment of Orchomenus, to the Athenians' *philanthrōpia* and desire for justice (φιλανθρωπία καὶ τῷ τὰ δίκαια βούλεσθαι) (Dem. 20.109).³⁰⁸ Philip's false *philanthrōpia* (τῆς δὲ φιλανθρωπίας, ἦν ... ἐκεῖνος ... ἐπλάττετο) is the object of Demosthenes' criticism in the speech *On the Crown* (Dem. 18.231). Another passage from Demosthenes' *For the Megalopolitans* deserves even more attention. The orator questions the Spartans' support for the territorial claims of the other Greeks. The Spartans have not suddenly become *philanthrōpoi* (ὄψε γὰρ ἄν φιλάνθρωποι γεγονότες εἶεν); they are merely obliging the Greeks to help them against Messene and avoid appearing unjust for not reciprocating the favour (μὴ τὴν ὁμοίαν αὐτοῖς χάριν ἀποδιδόντες) (Dem. 16.16-17). Demosthenes therefore contrasts the Spartans' selfish use of *charis* with Athens' traditional *philanthrōpia*, which the Spartans can only pretend to embody.

opposite conclusions, both scholars share a similar, unsatisfactory approach. Instead of focusing on altruism as an element of Athenian ideology and self-image, they try to assess the actual participation of the Athenians in the practice of altruism. See also Low (2007), 175-211, who argues that Greek interstate relations included a norm of intervention based on the principle of 'helping the wronged'. This norm, not necessarily limited to the Athenians, 'not only functions as an ideal, but can even sometimes be argued to involve some obligation'.

³⁰⁷ For some examples, see discussion below, at pp. 109-110.

³⁰⁸ See Canevaro (2016a), 370-1.

Athenian *philanthrōpia* and the helping paradigm were deeply rooted in the Athenians' self-image. Any challenge to these ideas was doomed to meet with suspicion and disapproval in Athenian public discourse. This appears clearly in Demosthenes' *On the False Embassy*. According to Demosthenes, Aeschines once invited the Athenians in the Assembly not to remember the achievements of the ancestors. Aeschines reached such a level of shamelessness that he even advocated a law forbidding the Athenians from helping any Greek city that had not previously helped them (μηδενὶ τῶν Ἑλλήνων ὑμᾶς βοηθεῖν, ὃς ἂν μὴ πρότερος βεβοηθηκῶς ὑμῖν ᾗ) (Dem. 19.17). In other words, Demosthenes accuses Aeschines of exhorting the Athenians to reject their traditional *philanthrōpia* in favour of a form of balanced reciprocity incompatible with the idealised picture of Athenian interstate relations. Demosthenes introduces Aeschines' supposed assertions as 'words deserving many deaths' (πολλῶν ἀξίους ... θανάτων λόγους) (Dem. 19.16), and they would have certainly sounded outrageous to his audience as well. This is especially evident from Aeschines' account of the same event in his speech *On the False Embassy*. In what sounds as an indirect reply to Demosthenes' accusations, Aeschines is keen to show that he had never directly challenged the Athenian helping paradigm. The orator makes no mention of his alleged law proposal; far from arguing against helping the weak *per se*, Aeschines states that he had simply warned the Athenians against giving aid to Leontini while Athens itself was in greater danger. According to Aeschines, the Athenians should keep emulating the exploits performed by their ancestors during the Persian Wars, but at the same time avoid repeating the mistakes made during the Peloponnesian War (Aeschin. 2.75-6).³⁰⁹ Demosthenes' eagerness to depict Aeschines as an opponent of the Athenian helping paradigm and Aeschines' defensive reply attest how dangerous it was for one's reputation to question the idealised image of Athens' *philanthrōpia*.³¹⁰

We can now finally turn to the last problematic point: the relationship between *philanthrōpia* and justice. The two concepts have been sometimes seen as incompatible,³¹¹ but ancient sources do not support this view. In the *Against Timocrates*, for example, Demosthenes mentions a law that forbade citizens convicted in court from resorting to supplication. The orator praises the law, whose purpose is to prevent any public losses deriving from the Athenians' *philanthrōpia*. Such *philanthrōpia* is not contrasted with justice, but with advantage (διὰ ταύτην [= τὴν φιλανθρωπίαν] ἑώρα περὶ πολλῶν ὑμᾶς ἐκόντας ἤδη ποτὲ

³⁰⁹ See MacDowell (2000), 212-13, who stresses that Demosthenes decontextualized Aeschines' assertions and placed them in the discussion about the inclusion of non-allies in the peace with Philip. Aeschines, on the other hand, contextualized his own words in the debate about whether Athens should sign a peace with Philip in the first place.

³¹⁰ See Canevaro (forthcoming b). See Steinbock (2013b) for a detailed analysis of the passage.

³¹¹ See De Romilly (1979), 116-25, and B. D. Gray (2013), 141.

μεγάλα ζημιωθέντας) (Dem. 24.51-2). In the same speech, the orator draws a distinction between laws concerning private affairs, which should be characterised by kindness and humanity (ἠπίως καὶ φιλανθρώπως), and those concerning public matters, which need to be strict and severe (Dem. 24.192-3). The fact itself that the orator admits *philanthrōpia* in the sphere of private law proves that *philanthrōpia* was not in principle incompatible with justice.³¹² Demosthenes' *Against Meidias* does seem to include a direct attack against *philanthrōpia*. The orator states that it would not be righteous (θεμιτόν) to deem Meidias worthy of benevolence (φιλανθρωπίας). Demosthenes does not oppose *philanthrōpia* to justice as such. He merely warns the judges against showing *philanthrōpia* towards an unworthy individual such as Meidias, one who has never stood out for words, deeds or noble birth (Dem. 21.148-50). Justice and *philanthrōpia* could thus coexist in Athenian public discourse. Devotion to justice was in fact a central feature of Athenian traditional *philanthrōpia* in international relations. As we will see, the Athenians saw themselves as eager to sustain massive efforts and personal risks to fight in defence of the weak and correct or prevent injustices committed between third parties.

3.3. EURIPIDEAN TRAGEDY AND RECIPROCITY

The story of the Athenian war on behalf of the Heraclidae provides the subject for Euripides' *Children of Heracles*. The play opens with the Heraclidae sitting as suppliants at the Temple of Zeus in Marathon, where they are seeking help against the Argive king Eurystheus. The Heraclidae are all young and helpless, and they are accompanied by Heracles' mother, Alcmena, and Heracles' old friend, Iolaus.³¹³ An Argive Herald arrives to demand the restitution of the Heraclidae, but Demophon, son of Theseus and king of Athens, decides to accept the children's supplication and grant them help. The Athenians now have to face a war against the Argives, but the oracles state that only through the sacrifice of a maiden will Athens emerge victorious. One of Heracles' daughters volunteers to be the victim, and the battle can finally start. The Athenians, together with a rejuvenated Iolaus and Heracles' older son, Hyllus, are able to defeat the Argives and take Eurystheus as a prisoner. At the end of the play, Alcmena obtains the execution of Eurystheus despite the opposition of the Athenians, to whom

³¹² See also Harris (2013b), 274-301, who analyses cases where the principle of fairness (*epieikeia*) was applied and suggests that mildness was built in the Athenian legal system.

³¹³ The detail of Iolaus' old age is Euripides' own innovation, which was probably meant to emphasise the hopelessness of the Heraclidae: see Allan (2001), 27-8.

Eurystheus promises his protection after his death as a reward for their attempt to save his life.³¹⁴

Euripides' *Children of Heracles* can be ascribed to the category of suppliant drama, which includes several plays which all share a similar structure of their storyline.³¹⁵ Such plays usually start with the suppliants' description of their situation, their plea to the local king and the success of their supplication. The action then proceeds with the arrival of an enemy herald threatening to carry the suppliants away, his clash with the king, the preparation and report of the battle and finally (but not necessarily) the suppliants' rejoicing for their victory and their demonstration of gratitude.³¹⁶ Each suppliant play, however, exploits and develops this broad pattern in its own particular way, and one of the peculiar traits of Euripides' *Children of Heracles* is the large role played by rhetoric.³¹⁷ Early on in the play, Euripides introduces a contest of speeches (*agōn logōn*) between the Herald and Iolaus, who debate over the fate of the Heraclidae. The two characters each deliver a speech (*rhēsis*) in front of Demophon, who is eventually persuaded by Iolaus to grant help to the Heraclidae (Eur. *Heracl.* 134-252). As part of his argument, Iolaus recalls how Heracles once saved Theseus from the underworld and asks Demophon to repay his father's debt of *charis* towards Heracles (Eur. *Heracl.* 215-22).

Euripides' choice to focus on reciprocity reflects the discursive parameters of the dramatic festivals. First, it employs a value, *charis*, which was not exclusively democratic and could appeal to any Greek in the audience. Second, the *agōn logōn* between the Herald and Iolaus plays with the audience's familiarity with Athenian deliberative practice (and specifically diplomacy) and the language of honorific decrees, which the Athenians experienced thanks to their participation in the Assembly and the Council. Seen in this light, Iolaus' reference to Theseus' debt of *charis* is reminiscent of the language of reciprocity typical of the Assembly and the Council.³¹⁸ Significantly, Iolaus' *rhēsis* contrasts with the speech of the Herald, which programmatically reverses Athenian diplomatic etiquette. By

³¹⁴ Ancient sources disagree on the position of the burial place of Eurystheus, which Euripides locates in Pallene (Eur. *Heracl.* 849-50; 1030-1). According to Pausanias, Eurystheus was buried at the Scironian rocks, near Megara (Paus. 1.44.10), while Strabo states that he was buried at Gargettus (Strabo 8.6.19). Pindar even locates Eurystheus' burial place in Thebes (Pind. *Pyth.* 9.79-83). On the issue see Kearns (1989), 49 and Allan (2001), 30. The role of Alcmena in the death of Eurystheus may have been Euripides' innovation: see Allan (2001), 28-9 and Mendelsohn (2002), 119-26.

³¹⁵ See Burian (1971), 1, who includes in this category Aeschylus' *Suppliants*, Sophocles' *Oedipus at Colonus*, and Euripides' *Suppliants* and *Children of Heracles*. For a general study on supplication, see Naiden (2006).

³¹⁶ Burian (1971), 16-29.

³¹⁷ Burian (1971), 95; Collard (1975), 62-4; Lloyd (1992), 72-6; Allan (2001), 143-55.

³¹⁸ One should also note that in Athens (at least during the fourth century) supplications by metics, public slaves and foreigners (such as Iolaus) were heard in the Council and the Assembly: see Hansen (1987), 27; Naiden (2006), 173-7.

juxtaposing a positive and a negative example of deliberative language, Euripides therefore showed how to conduct a diplomatic exchange properly and guided his audience towards the natural outcome of the *agōn logōn* between Iolaus and the Herald.

The *agōn logōn* starts with the Herald's *rhēsis*, which opens with an appeal to a principle of international law: Iolaus and the Heraclidae are Argives and therefore subjected to the authority of Eurystheus (Eur. *Heracl.* 134-43).³¹⁹ Issues of international law were a common argument employed in front of the Assembly.³²⁰ In Book 1 of Thucydides, for example, the Corcyrean envoys urge the Athenians to accept them as allies and reassure them that this would not violate their treaty with the Spartans (Thuc. 1.35). The Corinthian envoys protest that an alliance between Athens and Corcyra would indeed break the existing treaty, and appeal to their right to deal with their colony Corcyra as they please (Thuc. 1.38-40). However, the way Euripides' Herald develops this legitimate argument is striking. While apparently insisting on the justice of his claim (δίκαι' ... δίκαιοι ... δίκας), the Herald actually threatens Demophon with the danger of Argive violence.³²¹ He states that every other city gave in to Eurystheus' demands because they did not dare suffering any personal evils (κοῦδεις ἐτόλμησ' ἴδια προσθέσθαι κακά) (Eur. *Heracl.* 144-6). The Herald adds that it would be foolish to take pity on the Heraclidae (Eur. *Heracl.* 147-52). This statement, coupled with the Herald's final exhortation to Demophon not to indulge in the Athenian habit of always siding with the weak (Eur. *Heracl.* 175-8), clearly challenges the principle of Athenian *philanthrōpia*. Not only does it emphasise the Herald's reliance on force rather than justice, but it would have also been inappropriate in Athenian public discourse.

The Herald then draws a comparison between the benefits the Athenians would get if they sided with Eurystheus and the harm they would suffer if they refused to give up the children (Eur. *Heracl.* 153-78). This pragmatic evaluation of pros and cons is in line with the nature of deliberative oratory, which tended to focus on the advantageous (*to sympheron*) and the harmful (*to blaberon*) (Arist. *Rhet.* 1358b22).³²² Once again, however, the Herald deviates from Athenian deliberative practice while developing a legitimate argument. He asks Demophon: 'what will you gain (τί κερδανεῖς) by admitting these people into your country or by allowing us to take them away?' (Eur. *Heracl.* 154, transl. Allan). The Herald's insistence on gain (*kerdos*) is controversial. The theme of *kerdos* is frequently attested in Athenian

³¹⁹ But see Allan (2001), 143-4, who highlights the inaccuracy of the Herald's legal argument. Pace Gastaldi (2007), 44-5, on this occasion the Herald does not employ the language of kinship typical of Greek diplomacy.

³²⁰ See Harris (forthcoming).

³²¹ Allan (2001), 143-5.

³²² See Carey (2000), 196-203; Harris (2013a).

rhetorical practice, but usually holds a negative value.³²³ Forensic orators often attributed love of gain to their opponents to portray them in a negative light.³²⁴ Deliberative orators similarly expressed concern over *kerdos* and tended to advise their audience against pursuing it. In Thucydides' Mytilenean debate, for example, Cleon warns the Athenians against orators who deceive the people for profit (κέρδει) (Thuc. 3.38.2). In Xenophon's *Hellenica*, Thrasybulus addresses the men of the city in the Assembly and blames them for the crimes they committed for the sake of gain (ἔνεκα κερδέων) (Xen. *Hell.* 2.4.40). Demosthenes, in the *Third Philippic*, complains that the Greek cities are eager to gain (κερδᾶναι) from each other's ruin instead of uniting against Philip for the salvation of Greece (Dem. 9.29). In the speech *On the Navy*, he asks the Athenians who would want to sacrifice their own ancestors, graves and land for the sake of gain (ἔνεκα κέρδους) (Dem. 14.32).

Euripides intentionally attributed a cynical and inappropriate appeal to *kerdos* to the Herald, whose unsympathetic nature has been noted by several commentators.³²⁵ The Herald's rhetoric is reminiscent of the Athenian envoys in Thucydides' Melian Dialogue. The diplomatic exchange between Melians and Athenians does not take place before the people (οὐ πρὸς τὸ πλῆθος) but before the few (ἐς τοὺς ὀλίγους), and the Athenians openly reject the arguments they would normally use in a democratic deliberative setting (Thuc. 5.85, 89). The dialogue is thus a perversion of Athenian diplomatic practice, and the similarities with the *rhēsis* of the Herald are significant. The Athenian envoys refuse to comply with justice, and state that between non-equals there is no question of right, but only of force (Thuc. 5.89). Their rejection of justice in favour of force parallels the Herald's overconfidence in the power of Eurystheus. The Athenian envoys also share the Herald's positive attitude toward *kerdos*. They argue that Melos' surrender would benefit both Melians and Athenians. The Athenians would gain (κερδαίνουμεν) from not destroying the Melians, while the Melians would submit and avoid suffering worse consequences (Thuc. 5.93).³²⁶ The Herald's speech shows Euripides' familiarity with the deliberative practice of diplomacy, which in Athens took place before the Assembly and the Council. The poet programmatically reversed such practice and shaped the Herald as an anti-orator.³²⁷ In accordance with the discursive parameters of the dramatic festivals, Euripides played with the audience's familiarity with Athenian democratic

³²³ Cozzo (1988), 37-71; Balot (2001), 1. *Kerdos* already holds a negative value in Hesiod: cf. Hes. *WD* 321-4 with Balot (2001), 33.

³²⁴ Cf. e.g. Lys. 18.16; Dem. 24.65, 201; 52.26; Isaeus 9.26. Gain hold a negative meaning also in Lysias' *Funeral Oration*, where *kerdos* features among Xerxes' motivations for invading Greece (Lys. 2.29-30).

³²⁵ See Avery (1971), 558 n. 41; Burian (1977), 5; Allan (2001), 35.

³²⁶ See Allan (2001), 145, who draws a parallel with Thucydides' Mytilenean debate (Thuc. 3.36-50) and describes the Herald's argument as an example of *Realpolitik*.

³²⁷ Pace Gastaldi (2007).

institutions (and specifically the Assembly and the Council), and presented the Herald as the natural loser of the *agōn logōn*.

The Herald's speech contrasts with Iolaus' reply, which closely reflects the audience's knowledge of Greek diplomatic practice. Iolaus rebuts the Herald's legal argument by stating that the children and himself are exiles and thus Eurystheus holds no legal power upon them (Eur. *Heracl.* 184-90). After praising Athens and the freedom of her people (Eur. *Heracl.* 191-201), Iolaus stresses Demophon's kinship with the Heraclidae, pointing out that both Theseus and Heracles descended from Pelops (Eur. *Heracl.* 207-13). Appealing to kinship was a common strategy in Greek diplomacy and international relations.³²⁸ Herodotus, for example, recalls how a Persian herald appealed to the kinship between the Argives and the Persians to persuade the formers not to join the Greeks in the war against Xerxes (Hdt. 7.150). In Book 1 of Thucydides, the Corinthians urge the Spartans to help Potidaea, a Corinthian colony, against Athens and invite them not to abandon their own friends and kinsmen (ἄνδρας τε φίλους καὶ συγγενεῖς) (Thuc. 1.71.4). In Aristophanes' *Lysistrata*, the protagonist addresses the ambassadors from Athens and Sparta and blames both Athenians and Spartans for going to war against each other despite the rituals which they share as kinsmen (ὅσπερ συγγενεῖς) (Ar. *Lys.* 1128-32). Iolaus therefore imitates a typical diplomatic argument, which the audience would have probably recognised and found effective.

It is at this stage that Iolaus, before performing the traditional gestures of a suppliant (Eur. *Heracl.* 226-31),³²⁹ appeals to Theseus' debt of *charis* towards Heracles. Iolaus recalls how he sailed with Theseus as part of Heracles' campaign against the Amazons, and reminds Demophon that Heracles once rescued Theseus from the underworld.³³⁰ Demophon is then requested to return the favour (ὄν ἀντιδοῦναί σ' οἷδ' ἀπαιτοῦσιν χάριν) by not handing the Heraclidae to Eurystheus (Eur. *Heracl.* 215-20).³³¹ As we have seen in the previous section, reciprocity was a fundamental Greek value, which could appeal to Euripides' audience at large. It was therefore natural for the poet to include the argument of *charis* in Iolaus' plea to Demophon. The Athenian king himself later admits that his father's debt (τὸ προουφείλειν) to Heracles is one of the reasons compelling him to take the Heraclidae under his protection (Eur. *Heracl.* 240-1). At the same time, the value of *charis* was embedded and institutionalised in

³²⁸ Jones (1999), 27-35; Low (2007), 48-51.

³²⁹ See Naiden (2006), 44-62 on the gestures usually performed by suppliants.

³³⁰ Because of the alleged weakness of the argument and the irregular syntax of the passage, which moves from the first to the third person singular, some scholars have inserted a lacuna after l. 217. It has therefore been suggested that Iolaus' appeal also included an allusion to Heracles' gift of Antiope to Theseus: see Wilkins (1993), 79-80; Kovacs (1995), 4-5 and 31; Allan (2001), 149-50.

³³¹ As noticed by Allan (2001), 150, obligations of *charis* could be inherited from previous generations, as in the case of Eur. *Orest.* 244 and 453.

Athenian deliberative and honorific practice.³³² Iolaus' argument reflected the inescapable sense of obligation towards benefactors that the Athenian community had elevated to the status of a fundamental civic value.³³³ His appeal to *charis* was designed to strike a chord in particular with Euripides' democratic audience and their institutional expertise. Accordingly, Iolaus' wording resembles the vocabulary of reciprocity attested in the rhetorical practice and honorific decrees of the fourth century, and aims to create in Demophon the same feeling of obligation.

One might start with an analysis of the verb ἀπαιτέω ('to demand back'), which Iolaus employs to request for Demophon's protection on behalf of the Heraclidae. The word implies that the speaker is demanding back something that rightfully belongs to him.³³⁴ Orators often use the verb in connection with the *charis* due to benefactors. In the speech *Against Leptines*, for example, Demosthenes uses ἀπαιτέω three times to refer to the benefactors whom Leptines' law would unjustly punish if they claimed the reward they rightfully earned (Dem. 20.156-8).³³⁵ The speaker of Isocrates' *Against Callimachus*, accused of confiscating a sum of money belonging to Callimachus, recalls the honours he received from the city in return for his services and asks back the *charis* which the community owes him (ἡμῖν τε παρὰ τῷ πλήθει τῶν πολιτῶν χάρις ὀφείλοιο: ἦν ὑμᾶς νῦν ἀπαιτοῦμεν). The speaker reinforces the verb ἀπαιτέω with the verb ὀφείλω, which relates to the idea of debt.³³⁶ Far from requesting to be accorded more than is just, he states that such *charis* will serve as proof of his innocence (Isoc. 18.67).³³⁷ The verb ἀπαιτέω was also a technical term of Greek diplomacy. Thucydides, for example, recalls how a herald from Ambracia found out that the reinforcements sent by his city had been annihilated and gave up demanding the return of the dead (οὐκέτι ἀπῆτει τοὺς νεκρούς) out of despair (Thuc. 3.113.5). In Book 5 of Thucydides, the Spartans send an embassy to Athens to ask back (ἀπαιτήσοντες) Pylos in exchange for Panactum (Thuc. 5.44.3). The author of the speech *On Halonnesus* attributed to Demosthenes reminds the Athenians of an embassy they had sent to Philip to demand back (ἀπαιτοῦντες) a prisoner ([Dem.] 7.38).

Iolaus' phrasing ἀντιδοῦναι ... χάριν also requires discussion. The wording resembles the expression χάριν ἀποδίδωμι, which orators typically employ when they rely on the language of reciprocity. A striking parallel is found in Isocrates' account of the Heraclidae

³³² On reciprocity as an argument in deliberative rhetoric, see Harris (forthcoming).

³³³ See Monoson (1994), 267-8, who identifies in Pericles' funeral speech a celebration of the reciprocal relationship between *polis* and citizens. In particular, she points out that 'citizens understand that if they act to cultivate the city's virtue they can expect to receive, in turn, the gratitude or favor (*charis*) of the city'.

³³⁴ LSJ s.v. ἀπαιτέω, I. 1.

³³⁵ See Canevaro (2016a), 417-22 on the rationale of the passage.

³³⁶ Cf. Hdt. 6.59; Ar. *Clouds* 1135; Dem. 45.33; 36.41.

³³⁷ On 'forensic *charis*' see Harris (2013b), 129-36, *pace* Millett (1998).

episode in his *Panegyricus*, where the orator describes Athens as the only city powerful enough to return the favour owed (ἀποδοῦναι χάριν) to Heracles for his benefactions to mankind (Isoc. 4.56).³³⁸ The same expression features in deliberative oratory and (specifically) diplomacy. In Xenophon's *Hellenica*, for example, a Theban ambassador reminds the Athenians of Thebes' refusal to join the Spartans against the Athenian democrats during the civil war, and requests Athens' assistance against Sparta. In his reply, Thrasybulus acknowledges Thebes' benefaction and promises to return the favour in greater measure (χάρिता ... ἀποδοῦναι μείζονα) (Xen. *Hell.* 3.5.16). Demosthenes, in the speech *For the Megalopolitans*, warns the Athenians against Sparta's benefactions, which are only meant to oblige the Greeks to make an equal return to the Spartans (τὴν ὁμοίαν αὐτοῖς χάριν ἀποδιδόντες) (Dem. 16.17). The verb ἀποδίδωμι is usually matched with *charis* also in Athenian honorific decrees. An inscription dating from 344/3 BC, for instance, states that the stele stands as a memorial of the fact that the Athenian *dēmos* rewards his benefactors with great favours (ἀποδίδωσιν χάριτας μ[εγ]άλας) (*IG II²* 222). Similar formulae appear in several other honorific decrees,³³⁹ and the Athenians would have been familiar with them thanks to their service in the Council and the Assembly.

Instead of ἀποδίδωμι, Iolaus uses the verb ἀντιδίδωμι. Compared to the more compelling ἀποδίδωμι, which means 'to render what is due',³⁴⁰ ἀντιδίδωμι has the more neutral meaning of 'to give something in return'.³⁴¹ Despite the different nuances, the two verbs were practically synonymous. This appears from a passage in Book 3 of Thucydides. There, the Thebans criticise the behaviour of the Plataeans, who reciprocated the benefactions they had received from the Athenians by helping them to enslave the Greeks. The Thebans add that the real shame lies in not returning favours in equal measure (τὰς ὁμοίας χάριτας μὴ ἀντιδιδόναι), rather than in refusing to return favours which are justly due but lead to injustice when they are paid back (ἐς ἀδικίαν δὲ ἀποδιδομένας) (Thuc. 3.63.4). Euripides' audience would have thus recognised the language of reciprocity typical of Athenian rhetorical and honorific practice. Moreover, the presence of the verb ἀπαιτέω compensates for the absence of ἀποδίδωμι and gives a compelling sense of obligation to Iolaus' plea. This is especially evident if one compares Iolaus' wording with a parallel passage from Euripides' *Heracles*. In that play, Theseus promises Heracles shelter and heroic honours in Athens as a return for having been rescued from the underworld (χάριν σοι τῆς ἐμῆς σωτηρίας τήνδ' ἀντιδώσω) (Eur. *Her.* 1336-7). The verb ἀντιδίδωμι confers a gentle tone on Theseus' friendly plea, which is

³³⁸ See discussion below, at pp. 111-13.

³³⁹ See references at p. 93, n. 300 above.

³⁴⁰ See LSJ s.v. ἀποδίδωμι, I. 1.

³⁴¹ LSJ s.v. ἀντιδίδωμι, I.

meant kindly to lead Heracles to accept help. Iolaus, on the other hand, employs ἀντιδίδωμι together with ἀπαιτέω in order to stress Demophon's debt toward Heracles. Iolaus' purpose is to put pressure on the Athenian king and oblige him to intervene in defence of the Heraclidae. His rhetorical strategy proves to be successful. Not only does Demophon accept Iolaus' request, but he also employs the verb προὔφειλω ('to owe') to emphasise his debt towards the Heraclidae as a reason for his intervention in their defence (Eur. *Heracl.* 240-1).

As my analysis has shown, Iolaus' language is reminiscent of the vocabulary of reciprocity typical of Athenian deliberative and honorific practice. It shares with such contexts the same compelling sense of obligation to return benefits received. It is also worth noting, as others have done, that *charis* is a major theme in Euripides' *Children of Heracles*, and is evoked by several characters throughout the play.³⁴² Demophon, for example, is ready to repay his debt toward the Heraclidae, but is also equally keen to rebound this *charis* back at them and assert the credit he has now acquired (Eur. *Heracl.* 333-4).³⁴³ In this sense, Euripides provides us with a fairly realistic and non-idealised description of how a relationship based on *charis* worked. In accordance with the discursive parameters of the dramatic festivals, the playwright played with his audience's familiarity with Athenian deliberative oratory (and specifically diplomacy) and honorific practice. The rhetoric of Iolaus and the Herald was meant respectively to reflect and reverse the language typical of such contexts, which the Athenians knew thanks to their service in the Assembly and the Council, and guide the audience towards Iolaus' victory in the *agōn logōn*.

3.4. LYSIAS: THE HERACLIDAE AND ATHENIAN *PHILANTHRŌPIA*

Lysias includes the story of the Heraclidae in the narrative of Athens' mythical exploits at the beginning of his *Funeral Oration*. According to the orator, after Heracles' death, the children of the hero arrived to Athens as suppliants to escape the persecution of Eurystheus. Unlike the rest of the Greeks, the Athenians refused to hand the Heraclidae to Eurystheus. Out of respect for Heracles and indifferent to the upcoming dangers, the Athenians choose not to gratify (χαρίζομενοι) the powerful and went to war for the weaker on the side of justice (ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀσθενεστέρων μετὰ τοῦ δικαίου διαμάχεσθαι). They faced Eurystheus in battle despite the fact that they had not received any personal benefit from Heracles (ἀγαθὸν μὲν οὐδὲν ἰδίᾳ ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτῶν πεπονθότες) and did not know what sort of men the Heraclidae would have become. Lysias stresses that the Athenians had no previous quarrel with Eurystheus, nor any

³⁴² See Scully (1973), 331-42.

³⁴³ On these and other grounds, Garzya (1956), 22-3 rejected the traditionally positive interpretation of the character of Demophon, whom he described as 'tortuoso calculatore e sostanzialmente meschino'.

prospect of gain (κέρδους) except for good reputation. They thus fought alone against all Peloponnesian forces and freed the Heraclidae from fear (Lys. 2.11-16).

Lysias' account of the Heraclidae episode never mentions Theseus and his debt of *charis* towards Heracles. As I have previously shown, this striking absence cannot be ascribed to a politically motivated desire to banish Cimon through the omission of Theseus, his (alleged) mythical counter figure. The exclusion of the Athenian hero from Lysias' narrative is better explained if we read the passage from an institutionalist perspective. The discursive parameters of the state funeral for the war dead compelled Lysias to provide an idealised image of Athens which was functional to the construction of an imagined community. Through the myth of the Athenian help for the Heraclidae, Lysias therefore painted a picture of Athenian international relations as guided by principles of *philanthrōpia*. Focusing on Theseus' debt of *charis* towards Heracles risked endangering this picture, because it implied that the Athenians may have supported the Heraclidae for reasons other than pure altruism. This detail of the story was inappropriate to the state funeral, and Lysias needed to downplay it in favour of more suitable motivations.

In accordance with the discursive parameters of the state funeral, Lysias downplayed Athens' personal obligations towards the Heraclidae. This is consistent with the treatment of the episode in the other extant funeral speeches. In Plato's *Menexenus*, Socrates simply lists the Athenian war on behalf of the Heraclidae among Athens' noble deeds for the freedom of the Greeks (Pl. *Menex.* 239b). Demosthenes states that the Athenians saved the children of Heracles, who himself had saved the other Greeks (ὄς τοὺς ἄλλους ἔσωζεν).³⁴⁴ Demosthenes therefore acknowledges a reciprocal relation between Heracles' actions and Athens' help for his children, but implies that the Athenian intervention was meant to reciprocate benefactions conferred on other cities and not on Athens specifically (Dem. 60.8). Lysias raises this point more explicitly and shifts the focus from *charis* onto Athenian *philanthrōpia*. He states that the Athenians remained determined in the face of the imminent danger, even though they had not personally received any benefit from Heracles (ἀγαθὸν μὲν οὐδὲν ἰδίᾳ ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτῶν πεπονθότες) and did not know what kind of men the Heraclidae would turn out to be (Lys. 2.13).

Lysias denies the possibility that the Athenians expected anything in return from the Heraclidae. The latter were still young and the Athenians could not know whether they would grow up as base or valiant men.³⁴⁵ The Heraclidae, in other words, may have never been able

³⁴⁴ That the expression refers to other Greeks can be inferred from the previous sentence, where Demosthenes states that the Athenians drove the army of Eumolpus not only out of their own land but also those of the other Greeks (ἐκ τῆς τῶν ἄλλων Ἑλλήνων χώρας).

³⁴⁵ Todd (2007), 224-5.

or willing to reciprocate Athens' benefaction. At the same time, through the expression ἀγαθὸν μὲν οὐδὲν ἰδίᾳ ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτῶν πεπονθότες, Lysias stresses that the Athenians had no obligation to fulfil toward Heracles. The adjective ἴδιος has the main meaning of 'private, personal',³⁴⁶ and here is employed in its adverbial function (ἰδίᾳ). In this form, it is usually paired with δημοσίᾳ or κοινῇ to create an opposition between the private and the public sphere, between the individual and the collective dimension.³⁴⁷ A parallel independent use of ἰδίᾳ in the Lysianic corpus can be found in the first speech *Against Alcibiades*. There, the speaker maintains that Alcibiades has to be considered an enemy even if nobody has personally suffered any injustices from him (εἰ μὴ τις ἰδίᾳ ἀδικούμενος ὑπ' αὐτοῦ τυγχάνει) (Lys. 14.1). In Lysias' *Funeral Oration*, the adjective ἴδιος is sometimes used to qualify something that sets the Athenians apart from the other Greeks. Thus the Athenians, trusting only on their own forces, fought against the army which Eurystheus gathered from the whole Peloponnese (παραταξάμενοι δ' ἰδίᾳ δυνάμει τὴν ἐξ ἀπάσης Πελοποννήσου στρατιάν) (Lys. 2.15). In the battle of Salamis, the Athenians similarly won freedom for the whole of Greece by relying on their own valour alone (τῇ ἰδίᾳ ἀρετῇ κοινὴν τὴν ἐλευθερίαν καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἐκτήσαντο) (Lys. 2.44). Through the adverbial form ἰδίᾳ, Lysias isolates the Athenians from the rest of the Greek world benefited by Heracles. Far from denying Heracles' merits towards humanity, Lysias stressed that the hero did not benefit Athens in particular.³⁴⁸

Heracles' benefactions towards mankind are openly acknowledged by Lysias. The orator recalls how the hero had been responsible for many benefits to all humanity (ἀγαθῶν πολλῶν αἴτιος ἅπασιν ἀνθρώποις), but could not punish his own enemy, Eurystheus (Lys. 2.16). The orator also stresses that the Athenians respected (ἠδοῦντο) Heracles' virtue more than they feared for their own dangers (μᾶλλον ... ἢ τὸν κίνδυνον τὸν ἑαυτῶν ἐφοβοῦντο) (Lys. 2.12). This reference to the Athenians' *aidōs* for Heracles does not imply any obligation on their part. When intended as respect, *aidōs* entails an acknowledgement of someone's honour.³⁴⁹ The notion can express obligation to other people,³⁵⁰ but this is not the case in Lysias' passage, where the vocabulary of reciprocity is completely absent. Lysias does not focus on *aidōs* as such. He merely mentions the Athenians' respect for Heracles to mirror their altruistic disregard for their own danger.³⁵¹ Reciprocity is explicitly denied, sacrificed on the altar of Athenian *philanthrōpia*, when Lysias states that the Athenians choose to fight on

³⁴⁶ LSJ s.v. ἴδιος, I. 1.

³⁴⁷ Cf. e.g. Lys. 2.61; 6.47; 13.2, 69.

³⁴⁸ Todd (2007), 224.

³⁴⁹ Cairns (1993), 13-14.

³⁵⁰ Cairns (1993), 183-8 and (2011), 30.

³⁵¹ See Todd (2007), 223, who notes how Lysias takes particular care 'not to use the language of personal benefit'.

behalf of the weak for the sake of justice instead of gratifying the powerful (τοῖς δυναμένοις χαριζόμενοι) by giving up those who had been wronged (Lys. 2.12).

Lysias' attitude toward *charis* in the Heraclidae episode is consistent with his treatment of the notion throughout the speech. The clearest parallel is Lysias' narrative of the myth of Adrastus. There, the orator states that the Athenians fought against Thebes over the bodies of the Seven despite the fact that they had no previous enmity with the Thebans or intention to gratify the Argives who were still alive (οὐδὲ τοῖς ζῶσιν Ἀργείων χαριζόμενοι) (Lys. 2.8).³⁵² When it is not openly denied, *charis* is at least ignored as a motivation for Athenian action. The word χάρις only occurs three times in Lysias' *Funeral Oration*. In one such occurrence, the term is used in a prepositional function to describe the Amazons' invasion of Attica as motivated by excessive glory and high ambition (πολλῆς δόξης καὶ μεγάλης ἐλπίδος χάριν) (Lys. 2.5). The word χάρις appears again in Lysias' account of the battle of Marathon. On that occasion, the Athenians chose to fight alone at Marathon because they did not want to owe their own safety to anyone else (οὐδ' ᾠήθησαν δεῖν ἑτέροις τῆς σωτηρίας χάριν εἰδέναι) (Lys. 2.23). Only on one instance does Lysias' *Funeral Oration* employ and endorse the traditional vocabulary of reciprocity. There, the orator invites the Athenians to repay their war dead with the gratitude owed to them (μόνην δ' ἄν μοι δοκοῦμεν ταύτην τοῖς ἐνθάδε κειμένοις ἀποδοῦναι χάριν) (Lys. 2.75).³⁵³

The fact that Lys. 2.75 is the only instance in the entire speech where Lysias acknowledges a debt of *charis* on the part of the Athenians is significant. According to the orator, the Athenians can only be indebted and grateful to the Athenians themselves. Such a notion would have been inconceivable in the Assembly and the Council. As we have seen, Athenian honorific decrees commonly insisted on the Athenian eagerness to reciprocate benefactions, and reciprocal obligations were often acknowledged in the deliberative practice of diplomacy. At the state funeral, on the other hand, orators were reluctant to admit any sort of obligations on Athens' part. In Pericles' funeral speech, the Athenians are described as unique because they make friends not by receiving favours but by granting them. As a result, they avoid being in the inconvenient position of having to reciprocate benefactions not as simple favours but as proper debts (οὐκ ἐς χάριν, ἀλλ' ἐς ὀφείλημα τὴν ἀρετὴν ἀποδώσω) (Thuc. 2.40.4).³⁵⁴ The Athenians appear as the natural recipients of *charis* from the other

³⁵² See Todd (2007), 220, who stresses how this sentence was meant to 'make the Athenian action more the disinterested product of a desire for justice'. Cf. Eur. *Supp.* 1167-79, where Theseus and Adrastus stipulate a bond of *charis* which obligates the Argives to remember and honour the help they have received from the Athenians.

³⁵³ See Todd (2007), 271.

³⁵⁴ According to Loraux (1981), 81-2, Pericles' words are an expression of aristocratic spirit and relegate Athens' friends in the subordinate rank of debtors who cannot participate in the city's glory. But see

Greeks, a role which Socrates (not without irony) emphasises several times in Plato's *Menexenus*. Socrates states that the Athenians who fought at the Eurymedon, in Cyprus and in Egypt should be remembered and rendered thanks (ὄν χρῆ μὲμνησθαι καὶ χάριν αὐτοῖς εἰδέναι) because they put an end to the Persian threat to Greece (Pl. *Menex.* 241e). The Athenians' entitlement to *charis* is even more evident when Socrates alludes to the ungrateful behaviour of the other Greeks. The latter invaded Attica and thus repaid the Athenians with an unworthy *charis* (ἀναξίαν χάριν ἐκτινόντων) (Pl. *Menex.* 242c). Socrates insists that the Greeks, despite the benefactions received from the Athenians, paid them back with such a *charis* (εὖ παθόντες ὑπ' αὐτῆς οἷαν χάριν ἀπέδοσαν) that they deprived Athens of her ships and walls (Pl. *Menex.* 244b-c).³⁵⁵ According to Hyperides' *Funeral Oration*, Leosthenes deserves eternal gratitude (δίκαιον δ' ἐστὶν ... Λεωσθένην ἀεὶ χάριν ἔχειν) not only for his deeds but also for the Greek victory against the Macedonians which followed his death and for the benefits deriving from his campaign (Hyp. 6.14).³⁵⁶

If *charis* is clearly not a keyword of Lysias' *Funeral Oration*, the speech constantly emphasises Athenian *philanthrōpia*. In his narrative about the Heraclidae, Lysias makes every effort to stress Athens' altruism, devotion to justice and role as champion of the weak. As we have seen, the orator states that the Athenians' respect for the virtue of Heracles was stronger than their fear for their own dangers. He adds that the Athenians were more concerned with fighting in defence of the weak on the side of justice (ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀσθενεστέρων μετὰ τοῦ δικαίου διαμάχεσθαι) than with gratifying the powerful (Lys. 2.12). Lysias insists that the Athenians went to war on behalf of the Heraclidae because they thought this was the right thing to do (δίκαιον δὲ νομίζοντες εἶναι) (Lys. 2.13). He then devotes a long clause to delineate Athens' other noble reasons for fighting Eurystheus. The Athenians had no previous quarrel with the Argive king (οὐ προτέρας ἔχθρας ὑπαρχούσης πρὸς Εὐρυσθέα), nor were they pursuing any gain other than good reputation (οὐδὲ κέρδους προκειμένου πλὴν δόξης ἀγαθῆς).

Missiou (1998), 190-1, who rightly reads the passage in connection with the following paragraph. There, Thucydides emphasises the generosity of the Athenians, who confer favours without considering their own advantage (τοῦ συμφέροντος) (Thuc. 2.40.5). Yet, Missiou wrongly suggests that the Athenians rejected reciprocity not only in the idealised image of their foreign policy, but also in the practice of diplomatic rhetoric. Cf. Arist. *NE* 1167b17-1168a27, according to which benefactors seem to love their beneficiaries more than their beneficiaries love them. Aristotle rejects the creditor-debtor analogy because it involves personal interest, and emphasises the nobility (*to kalon*) of the act.

³⁵⁵ Pace Walters (1980), 6-8, such accusations need not be attributed to an Athenian 'deep anxiety over their isolation from the rest of Greece'.

³⁵⁶ Among the passages mentioned, only Plato's may tend towards the balanced pole of reciprocity, but this can be ascribed to the parodic and critical nature of *Menexenus*. Funeral speeches generally avoid the idea of *quid pro quo* exchanges in Athenian interstate relations. Although such speeches sometimes stress how the actions of the Athenians deserve gratitude, they do not in fact fall outside the altruistic pattern of generalised reciprocity. To acknowledge the *charis* that the Athenians deserve for their benefactions does not mean to imply that they performed such benefactions to win credit and favours from the Greeks.

They were acting out of pity for the victims of injustices (τοὺς μὲν ἀδικουμένους ἐλεοῦντες) and hatred for those guilty of *hybris*. Finally, they obeyed to the principles of freedom (ἐλευθερίας), justice (δικαιοσύνης) and courage (εὐψυχίας) (Lys. 2.14). Many of these themes are reminiscent of the *agōn logōn* of Euripides' *Children of Heracles*. Both the Herald (Eur. *Heracl.* 137-8; 142-3; 253) and Iolaus (Eur. *Heracl.* 187-90; 194-5) maintain that they have justice on their side. Demophon himself defends against the Herald his rightful decision to protect suppliant people (Eur. *Heracl.* 253-4). The *kerdos* that the Herald offers to Athens in vain (Eur. *Heracl.* 153-7) is the same which Lysias' Athenians refuse to pursue. Just as Demophon wants to avoid dishonour (Eur. *Heracl.* 242), Lysias' Athenians have good reputation as their only goal. Finally, Iolaus (Eur. *Heracl.* 197-8) and Demophon (Eur. *Heracl.* 243-6; 286-7) stress Athenian freedom, a sentiment that is echoed in Lysias.

The intense net of similarities between Lysias' account about the Heraclidae and the *agōn logōn* in Euripides' *Children of Heracles* makes the absence of *charis* from Lysias' narrative even more striking. The orator's focus on Athenian *philanthrōpia*, on the other hand, is particularly evident if one concentrates on Lysias' treatment of the theme of justice. There are twenty-four instances of words relating to justice throughout the *Funeral Oration*, and seven of them are in the section about the Heraclidae.³⁵⁷ In many of the occurrences, the Athenians are portrayed as fighting for the right in defence of the victims of injustice.³⁵⁸ It is no coincidence that the orator, immediately after the Heraclidae episode, devotes a paragraph to describing the autochthonous origins of the Athenians as the root of their commitment to justice. According to Lysias, to fight for the right was typical of the Athenian ancestors (πολλὰ μὲν ὑπῆρχε τοῖς ἡμετέροις προγόνους ... περὶ τοῦ δικαίου διαμάχεσθαι). Because they were born from the soil and did not inhabit a land stolen from another nation, the Athenians were righteous since the origins of their life (ἦ τε γὰρ ἀρχὴ τοῦ βίου δικαία) (Lys. 2.17).³⁵⁹

Lysias' focus on Athenian *philanthrōpia* is not unique. It reflects the discursive parameters of the state funeral and creates an idealised image of Athens with which the Athenians could identify.³⁶⁰ The same focus on *philanthrōpia* can be detected in the other extant funeral speeches. Pericles, for example, stresses how the Athenians in their public life are respectful of the laws, and particularly those concerning the help to the victims of injustices (Thuc. 2.37.3); he then praises the Athenians for their eagerness to help other people without

³⁵⁷ Lys. 2.12 (twice), 14 (four times), 16.

³⁵⁸ Lys. 2.10, 12, 14, 22, 61, 67.

³⁵⁹ Pace Frangeskou (1998-1999), 319-20, Lysias, despite being a metic, does not avoid emphasising the theme of autochthony.

³⁶⁰ The idealized image of Athens' *philanthrōpia* constructed at the state funeral was often reproduced in other settings: cf. e.g. Eur. *Heracl.* 329-32 and Eur. *Supp.* 377-80, where the Chorus praise Athens' role as champion of the weak.

pursuing any personal interest (Thuc. 2.40.5). Demosthenes recalls the ancestors' extreme justice as one of their many virtues, and states that they never wronged any man (Dem. 60.7). Demosthenes also stresses Athenian altruism. According to the orator, the Athenians privately undertook great risks for the common good of the Greeks in order to punish the injustices committed by the Persians, and they were always ready to fight on the side of justice (Dem. 60.10-11). Hyperides summarises all these ideas in one paragraph, where he states that Athens punishes the evil and helps the just, and grants the Greeks common safety at her individual risk (Hyp. 6.5). In Plato's *Menexenus*, the idealisation of Athenian *philanthrōpia* at the state funeral emerges very clearly through the distorting filter of parody. According to Socrates, the Athenians are so compassionate and eager to help the weak that they went to the rescue not only of the same Greeks who had previously wronged them, but even of their own historical enemy, the king of Persia (Pl. *Menex.* 244e-245a).

Once we have analysed Lysias' narrative about the Heraclidae from an institutionalist perspective, we can safely conclude that Theseus' absence was not motivated by a desire to obliterate Cimon's alleged mythical counter figure. Theseus' debt of *charis* towards Heracles was a central part of Iolaus' rhetorical strategy in Euripides' *Children of Heracles*. This was partly due the nature of the tragic genre, which was based on individual interactions between mythical characters on the stage. More importantly, Euripides was conditioned by the discursive parameters of the dramatic festivals. He therefore relied on *charis* as a value universally recognised by the entire Athenian community. At the same time, the institutional setting enabled him to manipulate his audience's familiarity with Athenian deliberative and honorific practice, where reciprocity played a central part. For the same reasons, Theseus' debt of *charis* was not appropriate to the state funeral for the war dead. In accordance with the discursive parameters of this institution, Lysias omitted Theseus' debt to Heracles from the myth of the Heraclidae and focused on Athenian *philanthrōpia*.³⁶¹ Only the Athenians were so righteous and selfless to face the power of Eurystheus for the sake of the Heraclidae, despite having no personal enmity toward the former or obligations toward the latter. To place emphasis on their debt of *charis* with Heracles would have prevented the Athenians from performing their traditional role as *philanthrōpoi* and Lysias from achieving his task of constructing an imagined community.

³⁶¹ The Athenian intervention in defence of the Heraclidae is explicitly called an act of *philanthrōpia* in a decree quoted in Demosthenes' *On the Crown* (Dem. 18.187). The text of the decree, however, is probably a forgery: see Yunis (2001), 29-31 and Canevaro (2013a), 310-18.

3.5. CHARIS AND THE HERACLIDAE IN ISOCRATES' PRIVATE RHETORIC

The relationship of reciprocity between Athens and the Heraclidae resurfaces in Isocrates' *Panegyricus*. The speech, purportedly composed for a panegyric festival, was most probably a literary exercise for written circulation.³⁶² It therefore exemplifies how the myth of the Heraclidae could be developed in a private context, independently from the discursive parameters of Athenian democratic institutions. The *Panegyricus* mixes epideictic and deliberative features,³⁶³ and can help to highlight by contrast how the Heraclidae could be used to construct a praise of the Athenians which did not abide by the discursive parameters of the state funeral. According to Isocrates, the Heraclidae sought Athens' help because they deemed it the only city capable of returning Heracles' benefits towards mankind (τὴν δ' ἡμετέραν ἰκανὴν νομίζοντες εἶναι μόνην ἀποδοῦναι χάριν ὑπὲρ ὧν ὁ πατήρ αὐτῶν ἅπαντας ἀνθρώπους εὐεργέτησεν) (Isoc. 4.56). Unlike Lysias, Isocrates restores the argument based on *charis*. At the same time, he is reminiscent of Lysias in that he does not imply that the Athenians received any personal benefit from Heracles. Isocrates' phrasing does not focus on reciprocity *per se*. It uses the concept of *charis* only to prove that Athens was the only city worthy of Heracles. The ideal of selflessness so cherished by the Athenians remains on the background, while Isocrates focuses on Athens' power.

Not bound by the discursive parameters of the state funeral, Isocrates was able to describe the relationship between the Athenians and the Heraclidae through the typical vocabulary of reciprocity. The orator acknowledges the fact that the Athenians paid back the *charis* (ἀποδοῦναι χάριν) due to Heracles by helping his children. At the same time, Isocrates does not mention Theseus and stresses that Athens merely repaid a debt owed to Heracles on behalf of the whole humanity (ὁ πατήρ αὐτῶν ἅπαντας ἀνθρώπους εὐεργέτησεν). Isocrates' concern with reciprocity is restated shortly afterwards, when the orator describes Athens' help for the Heraclidae as one of the city's many benefactions (εὐεργεσιῶν) to the Spartans. Mindful of Athens' rescue of their ancestors, the Spartans should have avoided invading Attica and endangering their own saviours. Isocrates concludes that, even if one leaves issues of gratitude (τὰς χάριτας) aside, it is not natural for the benefited to lead the benefactors (ἡγεῖσθαι ... τοὺς εὖ παθόντας τῶν εὖ ποιησάντων) (Isoc. 4.61-3). Isocrates' insistence on reciprocity would have been inappropriate at the state funeral. In that institutional setting, acknowledging that Athens helped the Heraclidae because of a debt of *charis* towards Heracles would have

³⁶² Usher (1990), 19-21; Too (1995), 79-80; Papillon (2004), 23-5, 27.

³⁶³ Buchner (1958), 7-15; Papillon (2004), 25-6.

compromised the idealised image of the Athenians as *philanthrōpoi*. Isocrates, however, had no interest in emphasising such image. Justice does not feature in Isocrates' account of the myth of the Heraclidae. Isocrates does mention Athenian altruism, but only as a mirror of the ingratitude of the Spartans, who have endangered the city which once ran risks (προκινδυνεύσασαν) to defend Sparta's ancestors, the Heraclidae (Isoc. 4.62).

Isocrates did not aim to construct an imagined community. His purpose was to prove that Athens was the most powerful city in Greece and naturally disposed to a role of leadership. This is openly declared at the beginning of the speech, where Isocrates addresses Sparta's alleged ancestral right to lead the Greeks and ascribes this honour to the Athenians instead (Isoc. 4.18). The argument is consistent with the overall purpose of the *Panegyricus*, which invokes a Panhellenic campaign against Persia under the joint leadership of Athens and Sparta.³⁶⁴ Isocrates' insistence on reciprocity is functional to this rhetorical strategy. The orator avoids mentioning Theseus' private debt of *charis* with Heracles and stresses Heracles' benefactions to all Greeks. This allows him to show that the Heraclidae did not deem the other Greeks able to offer them any help (τὰς μὲν ἄλλας πόλεις ὑπερορῶντες ὡς οὐκ ἂν δυναμένας βοηθῆσαι ταῖς ἑαυτῶν συμφοραῖς), despite the fact that they all owed favours to Heracles. The Heraclidae asked the help of the Athenians alone, because they considered them the only ones capable of reciprocating Heracles' benefactions (Isoc. 4.56).

Isocrates uses the war against Eurystheus to prove that Athens held a hegemonic position already in mythical times (κατ' ἐκεῖνον τὸν χρόνον ἡ πόλις ἡμῶν ἡγεμονικῶς εἶχε) (Isoc. 4.57). He then recalls how the Athenians subdued Eurystheus, who had been able to impose his yoke upon the mighty and semi-divine Heracles, and implies that they thus proved to be even stronger than Heracles himself (Isoc. 4.60). Isocrates concludes that their victories over Argos, Thebes and Sparta in mythical times earned the Athenians the right to be considered the prime power in Greece (Isoc. 4.64-5). Isocrates' praise of Athens, therefore, differed from those commonly produced for the state funeral for the war dead. Lysias' *Funeral Oration* suppressed Theseus' private debt of *charis* towards Heracles in order to emphasise the *philanthrōpia* of the Athenians, who went to the rescue of the Heraclidae out of altruism and devotion to justice. Isocrates, writing in a private context, also downplayed Theseus' involvement, but acknowledged Athens' relationship of reciprocity with Heracles. By stating that the Heraclidae sought the help of the Athenians alone because they were the only ones

³⁶⁴ Isocrates alternates a claim for Athenian leadership to a call for joint leadership of Athens and Sparta. The second option was more realistic in the historical context of ca 380 BC, when the speech was completed, because Greece was at the time under Spartan hegemony: see Papillon (2004), 26-7.

able to reciprocate Heracles' favours to humanity, Isocrates could highlight Athens' power and recommend the city as the leader of the Greeks.

3.6. CONCLUSIONS

The Heraclidae, whose return and conquest of the Peloponnese was a keystone of Sparta's foundation narrative, entered Athenian social memory by the beginning of the fifth century. The Athenians prided themselves with the intervention in defence of the young and helpless children of Heracles against Eurystheus. This myth was popular on the tragic stage as well as in the speeches of the orators, but accounts of the story diverged over the reasons that had led to Athens' military intervention. This chapter has shown that Athenian democratic institutions conditioned political actors who recalled the Heraclidae episode (specifically Euripides and Lysias) and compelled them to emphasize either the Athenians' *philanthrōpia* or their solicitude in reciprocating the *charis* due to their benefactors. Isocrates' *Panegyricus*, produced for a private setting, has served as a term of comparison with Lysias' *Funeral Oration* and exemplified how an orator could use the Heraclid myth to construct Athens' praise independently from the discursive parameters of the state funeral for the war dead.

Euripides dramatized the Heraclidae episode in the *Children of Heracles*. In the play, Iolaus and the Argive Herald are the protagonists of an *agōn logōn* in front of the Athenian king, Demophon. Because of the discursive parameters of the dramatic festivals, Euripides constructed their speeches using the language of Athenian deliberative and honorific practice. While the rhetoric of the Herald programmatically reversed the discourse typical of such contexts, Iolaus' speech was made to reflect such discourse. Euripides played with his audience's familiarity with Athenian deliberative and honorific practice, which they acquired thanks to their service in the Assembly and the Council. In doing so, he anticipated the outcome of the *agōn logōn*, with Iolaus emerging as the natural winner. As a part of this strategy, Euripides made Iolaus emphasise Theseus' debt of *charis* towards Heracles and Athens' obligation to repay it, and used Demophon's reply to restate Athens' eagerness to reciprocate benefactions.

If Theseus' private obligation towards Heracles was an important motivation for Athens' intervention in defence of the Heraclidae in Euripides' *Children of Heracles*, the opposite can be said about Lysias' *Funeral Oration*. Not only did Lysias omit Theseus' debt of *charis*, but he also denied the existence of any reciprocal ties between Athens and the Heraclidae. In accordance with the discursive parameters of the state funeral, Lysias emphasised Athenian *philanthrōpia* by stressing Athens' altruism, devotion to justice and role as champion of the weak. Lysias, therefore, produced an idealised image of Athens that would

stir the Athenians' pride in their national character and contribute to the construction of an imagined community. This is even more evident if one compares Lysias' account of the myth of the Heraclidae with Isocrates' narrative of the same myth in the *Panegyricus*. Writing Athens' praise in a private setting, Isocrates was not bound by the discursive parameters of the state funeral. Instead of stressing Athenian *philanthrōpia*, Isocrates emphasised the bond of *charis* between Athens and the Heraclidae. The orator replaced Theseus' private obligation with mankind's collective debt towards Heracles, and stressed that Athens was the only city powerful enough to reciprocate the hero's favours. Isocrates' version of the Heraclid myth did not aim to construct an imagined community, but used reciprocity to praise Athens' power and advocate a Panhellenic expedition against Persia under Athenian leadership.

The myth of the Heraclidae is instructive in two respects. First, my analysis has shown that Theseus' absence from the narrative horizon of the *epitaphios logos* was not motivated by a desire to obliterate the memory of Cimon, who allegedly used Theseus as his mythical counter figure. Theseus could simply not figure in epitaphic narratives about the Heraclidae because his private debt of *charis* towards Heracles endangered the idealised image of Athenian *philanthrōpia*. Second, I have shown that Euripides emphasised the Athenians' zeal to reciprocate the *charis* due to benefactors, while Lysias focused on Athenian *philanthrōpia*. These two images of the city coexisted in Athenian ideological practice. The Athenians portrayed themselves both as eager to repay their debts of *charis* and as ready to grant gratuitous help to the weak and undertake personal risks for the sake of justice. Both images were of course idealised to some extent: the Athenians *always* repaid their benefactors (at least according to honorific decrees), and they *always* helped the weak. More importantly, each image was suitable for a different institutional setting. Considerations of reciprocity were appropriate to the Assembly and the Council. They featured in the language of deliberative (and diplomatic) rhetoric and honorific practice, which Euripides could borrow thanks to the discursive parameters of the dramatic festivals. Athenian honorific decrees, in particular, emphasised Athens' eagerness to reciprocate the *charis* due to benefactors and thus fostered the continuous flow of benefactions towards the city.³⁶⁵ Athenian *philanthrōpia* was instead the trademark of the *epitaphios logos* at the state funeral of the war dead. Lysias and the other orators of funeral speeches emphasised the Athenians' role as righteous and altruistic champions of the weak and constructed an image of the city that was functional to the creation of an imagined community.

³⁶⁵ See Liddel (2007), 163-4; Lambert (2011), 193-5, 198 and (2012), 96; Canevaro (2016a), 77-97.

CHAPTER 4

Fading shades of *hybris*: the Attic Amazonomachy

The Amazons have always fascinated both the ancient and the modern imagination.³⁶⁶ Greek myths about Amazons, with particular attention for their gender implications, have been investigated by several generations of scholars.³⁶⁷ Archaeological and osteological findings in the Eurasian steppes have revealed that women in those areas commonly practiced horse-riding and warfare.³⁶⁸ Contact with this very different civilisation probably prompted the Greeks to elaborate stories about a nation of Amazon warriors. In Athens, in particular, the Amazon myth held a significant place in the remote and idealised history of the city, which credited the Athenians with the successful repulsion of an Amazon invasion. Yet stories about the Amazons were not the exclusive domain of the Athenians, but were popular and widespread in Greek mythology more widely.

The Amazon myth, which bore possible connections with ritual,³⁶⁹ went through many changes in its setting and protagonists. Amazonomachies were attributed to the most important Greek heroes. The Amazons made their earliest literary appearance in Homeric and cyclic epics. In the *Iliad*, Priam recalls his military encounter with the Amazons on the river Sangarius (Hom. *Il.* 3.182-90), and Glaucus mentions his ancestor Bellerophon's victory against the Amazons in Lycia (Hom. *Il.* 6.171-86). The epithet ἀντιάνθρωποι – whether it is to be interpreted as 'opposite to men' or 'equal to men' – qualifies the Amazons in both passages and implicitly emphasises their atypical gender status.³⁷⁰ The Amazons played a significant part in the cyclic *Aethiopis*, where they joined the war as allies of the Trojans. In the poem, Achilles slayed the Amazon queen Penthesilea and then killed the Greek Thersites, who had accused him of being in love with the woman (Procl. *Chr.* 175-81; Schol. T *ad* Hom. *Il.* 24.804).³⁷¹ The poetic tradition also attributed Amazonomachies to Heracles and Theseus. Heracles went to the Amazons' capital Themiscyra to fetch the girdle of their queen, Hippolyta

³⁶⁶ On traditions about Amazons outside the Greek world, see Mayor (2014), 357-429.

³⁶⁷ See Stewart (1995), 572-6 and Blok (1995), 21-143 for a detailed outline of the long tradition of studies on the topic.

³⁶⁸ Davis-Kimball, Yablonsky and Bashilov (1995); Mayor (2014), 63-83.

³⁶⁹ Dowden (1997), 124-8.

³⁷⁰ On the expression Ἀμαζόνες ἀντιάνθρωποι, see Blok (1995), 145-93.

³⁷¹ Stewart (1995), 576-7; Blok (1995), 195-288; Dowden (1997), 98-9. For the motif of Achilles and Penthesilea in Attic vase painting, see Bothmer (1957), 4, 70-3, 143, 148; *LIMC* s.v. Amazonas 175-80.

(Pind. fr. 172 Maehler; Eur. *HF* 408-18; *Ion* 1144-45; cf. Apollodoros 2.5.9; Diodoros 4.16).³⁷² The motif appears on Attic vase painting starting from ca. 575 BC.³⁷³ Theseus was also given an expedition to Themiscyra, probably for him to compete with Heracles' exploit. Whether he participated in Heracles' campaign (Hegias *ap.* Paus. 1.2.1; Plut. *Thes.* 26.1 = *FGrHist* 328 F 110; Eur. *Heracl.* 215-7) or went on his own expedition (Plut. *Thes.* 26.1 = *FGrHist* 3 F 151, *FGrHist* 4 F 166, *FGrHist* 31 F 25a), it is on this occasion that Theseus acquired his Amazon wife, whom the tradition calls either Antiope or Hippolyta (Pind. fr. 175 Maehler; Isoc. 12.193; Plut. *Thes.* 26).³⁷⁴ Theseus and Heracles were even represented fighting Amazons on two metopes of the Athenian Treasury in Delphi, while the entire east side of the building was dedicated to an Amazonomachy, the identification of which is disputed.³⁷⁵

The Amazons acquired particular importance in Athenian collective memory. Probably in connection with the Greek victories against the Persians, the successful repulsion of the Amazon invasion of Attica acquired great popularity in Athenian literary and artistic production. The story, already attested outside Athens in Pindar (Pind. fr. 174 Maehler), might have featured in the epic *Theseis*, whose content is a matter of speculation.³⁷⁶ In Book 9 of Herodotus, the Athenians recall the episode in a speech before the battle of Plataea (Hdt. 9.27.4). The allusion may well be a retrospection of a later rhetorical topos and thus one cannot take it as proof that the Attic Amazonomachy was already current in Athens in 479 BC.³⁷⁷ Aeschylus alludes to the myth in the *Eumenides*, where the Amazon invasion provides the aetiology of the name of the Areopagus (Aesch. *Eum.* 685-90). Hellanicus adds that the Amazons crossed the frozen Cimmerian Bosphorus in order to reach Athens (Plut. *Thes.* 27.2 = *FGrHist* 4 F 167). A painting of the Amazonomachy by Micon featured in the Cimonian

³⁷² In addition to Themiscyra, the tradition knew of another place associated with the Amazons: Dowden (1997), 103-16 distinguishes the epic site of Themiscyra from an ethnographic site in the Caucasus. Both sites feature in Hdt. 4.110-16: the Amazons, defeated and captured by the Greeks at Themiscyra, killed their captors and ended up on the shores of Lake Maiotis; there, they eventually married Scythian youths, thus explaining the origins of the untraditional customs of Sauromatian women.

³⁷³ Bothmer (1957), 6-29; Boardman (1982), 7; Tyrrell (1984), 2-3; Stewart (1995), 577; Dowden (1997), 100-1.

³⁷⁴ Bothmer (1957), 124-30; Boardman (1982), 8-10; Tyrrell (1984), 3-5; Stewart (1995), 577; Dowden (1997), 101-2; Fowler (2013), 485-6.

³⁷⁵ Bothmer (1957), 125-6; Culasso Gastaldi (1977), 291-2; Boardman (1982). On the dating of the Athenian Treasury in Delphi, see Gensheimer (2017), 1-3 and Neer (2004), 67, with references. The identification of the Amazonomachy on the east side of the Treasury is debated. Bothmer (1957), 118, Boardman (1982), 14 and Barringer (2008) 118-21 propend for Heracles and Theseus' joint expedition to Themiscyra, while Devambez (1976), 273-4 favours the Attic Amazonomachy. Based on recent hypotheses about the thematic arrangement of the metopes, Gensheimer (2017), 9-14 suggests that both the east and west sides of the Treasury featured Amazonomachies: each side would have been devoted to Heracles' and Theseus' Amazonomachies respectively.

³⁷⁶ Tyrrell (1984), 3-4; Dowden (1997), 102.

³⁷⁷ Boardman (1982), 6.

iconographic programme of the Theseion (Paus.1.17.2).³⁷⁸ The motif appeared also in the Painted Stoa. In this building, which was also connected to Cimon, an Amazonomachy painted by Micon appeared alongside paintings depicting the fall of Troy, the battle of Oenoe and the battle of Marathon (Paus. 1.15.2).³⁷⁹ The Amazonomachy was part of the Periclean building programme as well. The theme featured on the west metopes of the Parthenon and on the shield of Athena Parthenos.³⁸⁰

The presence of the Amazonomachy on public buildings attests the ideological potential of this episode, which was exploited at its best at the state funeral for the war dead. The successful repulsion of the invasion was a recurring element of the historical narrative of the *epitaphios logos*. The story usually opened the account of Athens' mythical exploits and provided a precedent for Athens' victories against Persian imperialism (Lys. 2.4-6; Dem. 60.8; Pl. *Menex.* 239b).³⁸¹ While Athens' official rhetoric usually presented a skeletal account of the story, a particularly detailed description of the campaign was offered by the fourth-century Attidographer Cleidemus, who even recalled the extension of the wings of the Amazon army (Plut. *Thes.* 27.3-4 = *FGrHist* 323 F 18).³⁸² The role of Antiope/Hippolyta in the war varied according to the sources.³⁸³ A version preserved by Diodorus and found in Attic vase painting presented Antiope fighting on Theseus' side against the invading Amazons (Diod. 4.28).³⁸⁴ Another version, if we believe Plutarch, was told by the poet of the *Theseid* in a lost *Insurrection of the Amazons*. In the poem, Antiope attacked Athens together with her fellow Amazons after Theseus had replaced her with Phaedra, and was eventually killed by Heracles. Plutarch does not give the story much credit (Plut. *Thes.* 28.1), but scenes where Antiope fought alongside the Amazons against Theseus do appear in Attic vase painting.³⁸⁵ Connected

³⁷⁸ Tyrrell (1984), 10-1; Castriota (1992), 43-57. The exact location of the Theseion is still uncertain: see Thompson and Wycherley (1972), 125. The temple should not be confused with the building on Kolonos Agoraios, formerly known as Theseion and now generally identified with the Hephaisteion: see Thompson and Wycherley (1972), 140-2.

³⁷⁹ Tyrrell (1984), 11-2; Castriota (1992), 76-89. Culasso Gastaldi (1977), 294-5 highlighted how the simultaneous presence of the Amazonomachy and the battle of Marathon contributes to the Amazons/Persians parallel; see also Castriota (1992), 82-5 and (2005). But the identification of the west metopes of the Parthenon with the Amazonomachy has been doubted by Brommer (1967), 192-5. The identification of the Oenoe painting is debated: for an outline of the issue, see Stansbury-O'Donnell (2005), 78-81.

³⁸⁰ Bothmer (1957), 208-14; Tyrrell (1984), 19-21; Castriota (1992), 143-51.

³⁸¹ Tyrrell (1984), 13-19.

³⁸² According to Pelling (2002), 176-7, Plutarch's remark that Cleidemus, in describing the Amazonomachy, wanted 'to be accurate (ἐξᾠκριβοῦν) about the details' (Plut. *Thes.* 27.3) has to be taken as ironic.

³⁸³ Mayor (2014), 275-6. As a rule, I will refer to Theseus' Amazon wife as Antiope, except when discussing the sources where she is explicitly called Hippolyta.

³⁸⁴ For the motif of Antiope fighting on Theseus' side in Attic vase painting see *LIMC* s.v. Antiope II 16-19; Bothmer (1957), 165-7, 169-70.

³⁸⁵ For Antiope fighting on the Amazon side in Attic vase painting see *LIMC* s.v. Amazones 232, 236; Bothmer (1957), 170, 183; Mayor (2014), 275.

to Theseus and Antiope was a myth concerning their son, Hippolytus. The story of Phaedra's tragic love for him was brought on the stage by Euripides in the extant *Hippolytus Wearing a Crown* and in its previous version, the lost *Hippolytus Veiled*.

4.1. *HYBRIS* AND THE CAUSES OF THE ATTIC AMAZONOMACHY

The Attic Amazonomachy was a key event in Athenian social memory. The successful repulsion of the invasion was a popular theme from the city's history and a source of pride for the Athenians. Theseus' role in the events, however, posed a potential problem to political actors who recalled the episode in Athenian public discourse. Was Theseus' abduction of Antiope, a popular theme in Attic vase painting, the reason behind the Amazons' invasion of Athens? Acknowledging Athenian responsibilities for the outbreak of the conflict could have a significant impact on the image of the city. Athenian sources accordingly each find their own way to resolve the embarrassment deriving from Theseus' involvement. I shall argue that the degree of ambiguity about Athens' responsibility for the Amazon invasion was conditioned by the discursive parameters of Athenian democratic institutions. Alternative accounts of the Attic Amazonomachy produced for private contexts, where the same institutional constraints did not apply, will provide a term of comparison with the accounts destined for public settings.

Lysias' *Funeral Oration* illustrates well the impact of the state funeral on the narrative of the Attic Amazonomachy. According to Lysias, the Amazons heard about Athens' greatness and gathered an army of many nations to invade Attica. The orator explains that their invasion was motivated 'by excessive glory (πολλῆς δόξης) and high ambition (μεγάλης ἐλπίδος)' (Lys. 2.5, transl. Lamb, adapted). Even though Lysias never speaks of *hybris* explicitly, his narrative constantly hints at the hubristic nature of the Amazons.³⁸⁶ They are portrayed as overstepping the limits of the traditional role of women, excessive in their pursuit of glory (*doxa*) and completely disinterested in justice. In their constant drive for conquest, the Amazons are disrespectful of the honour (*timē*) of other nations. Lysias makes this even clearer in the conclusion of his narrative, where he proclaims that the Amazons suffered a just punishment for their madness (ἀνοΐα) and unjust greed (Lys. 2.6). Lysias completely ignores Theseus' role and provides a straightforward and monochromatic account of the invasion. He employs the colour of *hybris* to paint a completely negative picture of the Amazons and clear Athens of any responsibility for the outbreak of the war. In doing so, Lysias creates a positive image of Athens which was functional to the creation of an imagined community.

³⁸⁶ Castriota (1992), 51.

The ambiguity connected to Theseus' involvement in the Attic Amazonomachy, which Lysias tried to defuse, could be played out at the dramatic festivals. This is exemplified in Aeschylus' brief allusion to the episode in the *Eumenides*. In the play, there is no mention of the Amazons' *hybris* and the invasion is motivated by their *phthonos* against Theseus (Aesch. *Eum.* 685-90).³⁸⁷ The Greek concept of *phthonos*, however, does not have a precise and univocal equivalent in English.³⁸⁸ Since Aeschylus does not provide any further information about the context, the meaning of the word φθόνον in the passage is far from clear. Is the Amazons' *phthonos* to be understood in its negative value of envy,³⁸⁹ as from the point of view of the Athenians? Or do we need to understand it from the point of view of the Amazons as a justified resentment for a wrong suffered,³⁹⁰ and therefore as a subtle allusion to Theseus' abduction of Antiope? In accordance with the discursive parameters of the dramatic festivals, Aeschylus adopted a version that was open to interpretation and could appeal to different strata of his audience.

Accounts of the Attic Amazonomachy produced for private contexts do not obey to the discursive parameters of any of the institutions of the democracy. Isocrates' narrative of the episode in the *Panegyricus* retains some degree of ambiguity regarding the causes of the invasion. In this speech, the myth is recalled as an example of Athens' achievements against imperialistic powers. Neither Theseus, Antiope or the abduction are mentioned explicitly, but Isocrates' reference to the accusations (ἐγκλήματα) that the Amazons raised against the Athenians to justify the attack may well be an allusion to the abduction of Antiope (Isoc. 4.66-70). Other sources are explicit in mentioning Theseus' involvement in the events. Plutarch, for example, recalls Philochorus' and Pherecydes' accounts of the episode. According to Philochorus, Theseus participated in Heracles' expedition against the Amazons and received Antiope as a prize (γέρας). In Pherecydes' account, on the other hand, the Athenian hero took Antiope captive (αἰχμάλωτον) during an independent expedition (Plut. *Theseus* 26.1 = *FGrHist* 328 F 110 = *FGrHist* 3 F 151).³⁹¹ These versions attribute some role to Theseus in causing the attack of the Amazons and risk casting a shadow of illegitimacy over the

³⁸⁷ Pindar too, according to Paus. 7.2.7, knew of an attack brought by the Amazons against Athens and Theseus.

³⁸⁸ Sanders (2014), 33-46, in his recent book on envy, identifies twelve different values of the Greek word *phthonos*.

³⁸⁹ See Fisher (2003), 185-8; Cairns (2003), 242-4; Sanders (2014), 38-9. See also Ober (1989), 205-14.

³⁹⁰ See Sanders (2014), 43-4; Cairns (2003), 246-8; Fisher (2003) 185 n. 16, 198-202.

³⁹¹ In the same passage, Plutarch ascribes Pherecydes' version also to Hellanicus of Lesbos (*FGrHist* 4 F 166) and Herodorus of Pontus (*FGrHist* 31 F 25a). Plutarch's testimony is partially contradicted by a Pindaric scholion which states that according to Pherecydes Theseus and his charioteer Phorbos abducted (ἀρπάξει) Antiope (schol. *ad Pind. Nem.* 5.89 = *FGrHist* 3 F 152).

invasion.³⁹² A similar version appears in Isocrates' *Panathenaicus*, with the significant difference that Theseus' Amazon wife, here called Hippolyta, falls in love (ἐρασθεῖσαν) with the hero and follows him to Athens willingly (Isoc. 12.193).³⁹³ Isocrates blames the war on Hippolyta,³⁹⁴ but his narrative remains problematic because from a legal point of view one might consider Theseus guilty of seduction (*moicheia*).³⁹⁵ These accounts all acknowledge Athens' responsibilities in the outbreak of the war and do not usually mention the Amazons' *hybris*.³⁹⁶ They are especially far from the idealised image of Athens' past conveyed at the state funeral and show a degree of freedom in handling mythical materials which is not comparable to the versions produced for public settings.

4.2. *HYBRIS*: AN INTRODUCTION

Hybris is one of the most widely studied concepts of Greek morality, and one that enjoys great popularity even in the common modern language. Yet its meaning has long been (and sometimes still is) misunderstood. It took decades of scholarly debate to clarify how exactly the Greeks understood *hybris*. The word is commonly translated as 'pride' and (especially in everyday language) interpreted in religious terms.³⁹⁷ *Hybris* therefore would constitute a religious offence consisting in one's overstepping of his own mortal limits and resulting in the outraged reaction of the gods.³⁹⁸ In the past few decades, however, much effort has been made to reassess the traditional view, and we now possess a clearer understanding of the Greek notion of *hybris*.³⁹⁹ The connection with the divine as an intrinsic feature of *hybris* has been questioned and rejected by most scholars, who are now more interested in the moral and legal aspects of the notion.⁴⁰⁰

³⁹² Cf. Pind. fr. 175 Maehler *apud* Paus. 1.2.1 for a (non-Athenian) less generous attitude toward Theseus.

³⁹³ Isocrates' account is very similar to that of Hegias of Troezen found in Paus. 1.2.1: here Antiope falls in love (ἐρασθεῖσαν) with Theseus, who is aiding Heracles in his campaign against Themiscyra, and betrays her country.

³⁹⁴ Isocrates' treatment of Hippolyta reminds of Hecuba's accusations to Helen in Eur. *Tro.* 987-1001: see discussion below, p. 145.

³⁹⁵ On the relevance of legal concepts in Greek tragedy, and consequently in extra-legal contexts, see in general Harris, Leão and Rhodes (2010), and in particular Harris (2010) on the familiarity of the Athenian audience with legal terminology and practice.

³⁹⁶ The only exception is Isocrates' *Panathenaicus* (Isoc. 12.196).

³⁹⁷ For the notion of *hybris* in everyday language, see *OED* s.v. *hybris*: 'Presumption, orig. towards the gods; pride, excessive self-confidence'.

³⁹⁸ See e.g. Dodds (1951), 31, 48 and Bowra (1964), 81.

³⁹⁹ The history of the scholarly debate on *hybris* is summarised by Fisher (1992), 2-5.

⁴⁰⁰ The main studies on the subject are MacDowell (1976), Dickie (1984), Fisher (1992) and Cairns (1996). See also Dover (1974), 54, who briefly touches upon the theme of *hybris* and defines it as a 'behaviour in which a citizen treats a fellow-citizen as if he were dealing with a slave or a foreigner'.

MacDowell, after examining the evidence from fifth- and fourth-century Athens, defined *hybris* as the act of ‘having energy or power and misusing it self-indulgently’ and argued against the idea that *hybris* was an inherently religious offence.⁴⁰¹ MacDowell also discussed the Athenian law about *hybris*, which he dated to the sixth century,⁴⁰² and noted that it covered offences which were regulated by other laws as long as they were committed with a hubristic state of mind.⁴⁰³ Dickie, on the other hand, provided a fairly traditional definition of *hybris* as ‘unchecked arrogance, engendered by good fortune, and manifesting itself in transgressing the boundaries that divide men from the gods’, and pointed out that *hybris* is often opposed to quietness (*hēsychia*) in archaic poetry.⁴⁰⁴

Nick Fisher, in a series of articles and in his groundbreaking book *Hybris: A Study in the Values of Honour and Shame in Ancient Greece*, has convincingly argued that *hybris* was not intrinsically related to religion but was connected with the notion of honour. Fisher builds his thesis on Aristotle’s discussion of *hybris* in the *Rhetoric* (Arist. *Rhet.* 1378b23-35). On these grounds, Fisher defines *hybris* as ‘the committing of acts of intentional insult, of acts which deliberately inflict shame and dishonour on others’⁴⁰⁵, and points to the pleasure of insulting as the cause for committing hubristic acts.⁴⁰⁶ Accordingly, *hybris* as such does not constitute a religious offence, but only when the act of intentional insult is directed towards a god’s honour.⁴⁰⁷

Particularly interesting for the case of the Amazons is Fisher’s analysis of Herodotus’ account of the Persian debate concerning the invasion of Greece (Hdt. 7.5-16). Xerxes is persuaded by Mardonius to start an expedition against Greece and declares his plans to the Council. Xerxes brings several arguments to his cause: the Persian custom which imposes every king to extend the Empire’s territories; the glory and fertile lands the Persians would acquire if they conquered Greece; and the opportunity to take vengeance on the Athenians for their past offences (Hdt. 7.8a-8b). Xerxes then wishes to extend the borders of the Persian Empire up to the sky of Zeus and to submit both the guilty and the innocent under the joke of slavery (Hdt. 7.8c). The view of the king is supported by Mardonius. The latter shows no respect for the strength of the Greeks and acknowledges that the Persians’ drive for conquest led them to attack nations who did them no wrong (Hdt. 7.9-9c). Xerxes’ uncle Artabanus, on

⁴⁰¹ MacDowell (1976), 21-2.

⁴⁰² But MacDowell bases his argument on the text of the *graphē hybreōs* transmitted in Dem. 21.94, which is very likely to be a forgery: see Canevaro (2013a), 224-31.

⁴⁰³ MacDowell (1976), 24-9.

⁴⁰⁴ Dickie (1984), esp. 85.

⁴⁰⁵ Fisher (1992), 148.

⁴⁰⁶ Fisher (1992), 11.

⁴⁰⁷ Fisher (1992), 142-8.

the other hand, speaks against the expedition. He highlights the risks deriving from Xerxes' plan to bridge the Hellespont and recalls Darius' failed invasion of Scythia. He then warns the king that the god strikes with his thunderbolt those who make a display (φαντάζεσθαι) because he does not allow anyone but himself to think big (φρονέειν μέγα) (Hdt. 7.10e).

Xerxes is angered by Artabanus' words at first, but he then changes his mind and decides to cancel the expedition. The king, however, is led by a dream to reconsider his position again, and consults his uncle on the matter. Artabanus will finally be persuaded by the same dream to approve the invasion. Before this happens, he explains the reason for his previous disappointment towards the behaviour of the king. 'When there were two motions for action placed before the Persians,' he says, 'one of which was tending to increase *hybris*, the other to diminish it, by saying that it is a bad thing to teach the soul always to seek to have more than what is in front of one, when these two motions were placed before us you chose the one that would be worse both for you and for the Persians' (Hdt. 7.16a.2, transl. Fisher). In Fisher's opinion, the *hybris* against which Artabanus warns Xerxes is not simply an individual characteristic of the king, but an expression of the traditional imperialistic policy of the Persians and their acquisitiveness (*pleonexia*).⁴⁰⁸ Fisher also argues that the concept of 'thinking big' (*mega phronein*) can be one of the factors inducing *hybris*, with which it is often associated, but the two notions need not be equated. Fisher suggests that this distinction applies to the Herodotus passage as well, and that Artabanus is here using the milder language of *mega phronein* in order not to attack the king openly with an accusation of *hybris*.⁴⁰⁹

Douglas Cairns has been able to reconcile Fisher's ideas on *hybris* with those of his critics and has provided a more advanced synthesis of their respective positions. Cairns has further developed Fisher's conclusions, questioning his fundamentally (although not completely) behaviourist approach and advocating a reevaluation of the dispositional aspect of *hybris*. After considering Arist. *Rhet.* 1378b23-35 within the broader context of Aristotle's ethical theory, Cairns has come to the conclusion that *hybris* is not limited to the act of insulting others with the specific intention of dishonouring them. *Hybris* is rather a disposition to overvalue one's own worth and honour, which can result in specific attacks on the honour of others.⁴¹⁰ Moreover, Cairns argues against Fisher that the concept of pride, or 'thinking big' (*mega phronein*), coincides with the dispositional aspect of *hybris*, of which it is a 'regular feature'.⁴¹¹ This is well exemplified by the Herodotean passage just discussed, which is an

⁴⁰⁸ Fisher (1992), 371.

⁴⁰⁹ Fisher (1992), 372-4.

⁴¹⁰ Cairns (1996), 2-8.

⁴¹¹ Cairns (1996), 10-17.

expression not so much of Persian national imperialistic character, but of the individual personalities of the kings who are responsible for Persia's imperialistic policy.⁴¹²

4.3. LYSIAS: THE STATE FUNERAL AND THE DISCOURSE OF *HYBRIS*

It was common for orators to recall the Attic Amazonomachy at the state funeral for the war dead. Demosthenes' *Funeral Speech* lists the repulsion of the Amazon invasion among the noble deeds performed by the Athenians in self-defence (Dem. 60.7-8). Socrates, in Plato's *Menexenus*, similarly mentions the victory over the invading Amazons as an example of Athenian battles for the freedom of the Greeks (Pl. *Menex.* 239a-b). While Demosthenes and Plato discuss the Attic Amazonomachy very briefly, Lysias devotes a detailed narrative to the episode in his *Funeral Oration* (Lys. 2.4-6). In accordance with the discursive parameters of the state funeral, Lysias' account is functional to the construction of an imagined community. The orator provides a version of the Amazonomachy which could make the Athenians proud of their city and motivate them to give their lives for the community. To achieve this goal, Lysias ignores Theseus' role in the events. Instead, he focuses on the Amazons' *hybris* and produces an ideal image of the Athenians as the righteous punishers of *hybris*.⁴¹³

Lysias never uses the word ὑβρις or its derivatives to describe the Amazons. Yet his narrative clearly portrays the Amazons as guilty of *hybris*. The first element of this characterisation lies in the Amazons' unusual gender status. Lysias notes that the Amazons were the daughters of Ares and locates them in the area of the river Thermodon.⁴¹⁴ He then describes the Amazons' innovative fighting style, based on the use of iron weapons and horse-riding, which gave them a considerable advantage over their enemies.⁴¹⁵ Lysias also highlights the contrast between the Amazons' female nature and their courage, which made them appear similar, if not superior, to men (Lys. 2.4).⁴¹⁶ Because of their unnatural inclination for warfare, the Amazons represent a distortion of traditional gender roles, and this idea does come out in

⁴¹² Cairns (1996), 13-15.

⁴¹³ The image of Athens as the punisher of *hybris* is a common feature of funeral speeches: cf. Dem. 60.8, 28; Lys. 2.14; Hyp. 6.20.

⁴¹⁴ For the Amazons' descent from Ares, cf. *FGrHist* 3 F 15; Todd (2007), 215 links this detail to Amazon militarism. For the location of the Amazons' homeland, see Tyrrell (1984), 55-9; Dowden (1997), 100-1, 103-16.

⁴¹⁵ See Todd (2007), 215-16, who follows Tyrrell (1984), 17 in considering these details as 'designed to represent the Amazons as the moral inferiors of Greek hoplites'. On Amazons and horse-riding, see Mayor (2014), 170-90.

⁴¹⁶ See Tyrrell (1984), 18, who defines the Amazons as 'sexual hybrid[s]' because they are given the 'male prerogatives of ruling lands, enslaving neighbours, and pursuing a reputation'. However, one should note that enslaving neighbours is not so much a male prerogative, but an imperialistic attitude which the Athenians considered alien to their nature.

Lysias' text.⁴¹⁷ However, the role of women in society was not central in the discursive parameters of the state funeral.⁴¹⁸ At no point does Lysias suggest that the Amazons were trying to impose a different, female-centric order, which the Athenians had to prevent. The orator does not focus on the Amazons' reversal of gender roles as such.⁴¹⁹ Instead, he makes clear that the Amazons, despite their female nature, were a very powerful enemy and posed a real threat to Athens, which made their defeat all the more impressive. More importantly, by describing the Amazons as overstepping the limits of the legitimate role of women, Lysias implicitly depicts them as guilty of *hybris*.

In classical Athens, respectable women were expected to live indoors and avoid contact with non-related men. A woman's role in Athenian society was to run her household and give her husband legitimate heirs, and her main occupations included weaving and taking care of their children.⁴²⁰ The Amazons' practice of horsemanship and warfare is therefore an appropriation of features that are alien to the female domain. One can take a famous line spoken by Euripides' Medea as evidence of the traditional Athenian view on women and warfare. Medea opposes the condition of women inside the household to that of men fighting on the battlefield and declares that she would rather 'stand three times with a shield in battle than give birth once' (Eur. *Med.* 248-51, transl. Kovacs). The Amazons themselves, in Herodotus' account of their encounter with the Scythians (Hdt. 4.110-6), stress their unconventional lifestyle in comparison to the customs of Scythian women. The Amazons point out how their own habits, which include archery, throwing the javelin and riding horses, are incompatible with traditional female occupations (ἔργα δὲ γυναικίῃα), which Scythian women regularly perform (Hdt. 4.114.3).⁴²¹ That women who exceeded the limits of their traditional role and *timē* could be perceived as guilty of *hybris* appears from some passages in Aristophanes' *Lysistrata*. As scholars have pointed out,⁴²² on several occasions the attitude of the women in the play, with their rebellious intrusion into the male domain of war and foreign

⁴¹⁷ See Tyrrell (1984), 18, whose analysis, however, overestimates the importance of gender roles in Lysias' account.

⁴¹⁸ Only Pericles' funeral speech in Thucydides devotes a brief section to the role of women in Athenian society. Pericles exhorts Athenian women to pursue female excellence, which consists in being 'least talked of among the men' (Thuc. 2.45.2). No other funeral speech stresses the unusual gender status of the Amazons: *pace* Loraux (1981), 170-1, the *epitaphios logos* did not portray the Amazonomachy mainly in terms of a struggle between sexes.

⁴¹⁹ See Barringer (2008), 59-108 for a reading of the Amazonomachy (and specifically the Amazonomachy on the west metopes of the Parthenon) which emphasises these kinds of anxieties about the role of women in society.

⁴²⁰ Fantham, Foley, Kampen, Pomeroy and Shapiro (1994), 101-6; Pritchard (2014), 182-3. But see Brock (1994), who suggests that, despite the existence of an ideology of seclusion, work outside the *oikos* was often necessary for women from the poorest strata of Athenian society.

⁴²¹ Hardwick (1990), 17; Fantham, Foley, Kampen, Pomeroy and Shapiro (1994), 133-4; Dowden (1997), 107.

⁴²² Castriota (1992), 51-3; Stewart (1995), 591-4; see also Pritchard (2014), 177.

policy (Ar. *Lys.* 507-20),⁴²³ is labelled as *hybris* by male characters (Ar. *Lys.* 399-401, 425, 658-9). In a passage that bears clear sexual overtones, the leader of the men's Chorus even worries about the possibility that the women will follow the example of the Amazons depicted in the Painted Stoa and turn to horse-riding (Ar. *Lys.* 676-9). It can therefore be concluded that the Amazons' anomalous gender status is only a component of a broader discourse of *hybris* that characterises the entire passage in Lysias' *Funeral Oration*.

Another indication of the Amazons' *hybris* is their characterisation as excessive in their desire for conquest and glory. Lysias' Amazons embody the image of the imperialistic power, who submit weaker nations and rule over a vast empire. The orator describes them as 'ruling over many nations' (ἄρχουσαι δὲ πολλῶν ἔθνῶν) and states that they had enslaved (καταδεδουλωμένα) the peoples around them. The Amazons' greed and desire for conquest seem to have no limits. They became attracted to Athens' great fame (κλέος μέγα) and decided to make war against the city. The motivations which Lysias attributes to the Amazons are particularly interesting. The orator states that the Amazons 'were moved by excessive glory (πολλῆς δόξης) and high ambition (μεγάλης ἐλπίδος)' to gather a powerful army and organise an expedition against Athens (*Lys.* 2.5, transl. Lamb, adapted). As I shall prove, the orator's insistence on glory (*doxa*) and ambition (*elpis*) as the reasons leading the Amazons to start their campaign convey the idea of their *hybris* and disposition to *mega phronein*.

The notion of *doxa* could of course hold a positive value and be achieved through honourable means. In Demosthenes' *Against Leptines*, for example, the Athenians are encouraged to pursue a good reputation (*doxa chrēstē*). This derives from reciprocating favours to benefactors and following in the footsteps of the ancestors (Dem. 20.10, 25). Lysias himself, in the *Funeral Oration*, speaks of the Athenian ancestors as pursuing good reputation (δόξης ἀγαθῆς), which they attained not by depriving other nations of their honour and land but by saving the Heraclidae from Eurystheus (*Lys.* 2.14). The Amazons, however, are described as excessive in their pursuit of glory. They were not motivated by good *doxa* or even simply by *doxa*, but acted for the sake of excessive glory (πολλῆς δόξης χάριν). Unlike the Athenians, the Amazons did not achieve their *doxa* through acts of *philanthrōpia*, but by conquering the lands of other nations and imposing slavery on their own enemies.

The Amazons' great *elpis*, which can be translated as 'hope' or 'ambition', also deserves some discussion. In Greek thought, *elpis*, especially if further qualified, can have a negative meaning, because it often presupposes a gap between excessive expectations and

⁴²³ Cf. Hom. *Il.* 6.490-3.

negative or even disastrous outcomes.⁴²⁴ Pindar, for example, points out how men perform bold acts (μεγαλανορίας) because they are driven by shameless hope (ἀναιδεῖ ἐλπίδι). The poet then advocates a measured life in order to avoid the acts of madness (μανία) which derive from unattainable desires (Pind. *Nem.* 11.44-8).⁴²⁵ Similarly, the Chorus in Sophocles' *Antigone* notes that *elpis* can be a source of profit, but can also lead to deception, especially when the god drives one's mind toward *atē* (Soph. *Ant.* 615-624).⁴²⁶ *Elpis* is explicitly associated with *hybris* in an oracle reported by Herodotus before the account of the battle of Salamis. There, it is foreseen that, after the Persians have sacked Athens in mad hope (ἐλπίδι μαινομένη), 'divine Justice will extinguish mighty *Koros* the son of *Hybris*' (Hdt. 8.77, transl. Godley, adapted).⁴²⁷

The bad consequences of excessive hope and imperialism are emphasised in Isocrates' *To Philip*. In a passage that bears many resemblances with Lysias' Amazon narrative, Isocrates recalls how the Thebans made bad use of their hegemony. They engaged in an expansionistic policy, undertaking the enslavement (καταδουλοῦσθαι) of the Thessalians, and brought war against the Phocians. However, instead of conquering the cities of the Phocians, the Thebans have lost (ἀπολωλέκασιν) their own. Isocrates significantly concludes that the Thebans 'have reached the point where, although they once hoped (ἐλπίσαντες) to have all Greece in their control, now their hopes (τὰς ἐλπίδας) for their own safety lie with you [Philip]' (Isoc. 5.53-5, transl. Papillon). One can observe the same ideas in Lysias' characterisation of the Amazons. There, the combination of excessive desire for *doxa* and great *elpis* conveys the idea of the Amazons' *hybris* and tendency to *mega phronein*. The actions of the Amazons will be later labelled as acts of folly (*anoia*), and their hopes will result in the complete annihilation of their nation and reputation.

The general impression of *hybris* attached to the Amazons is reinforced by Lysias' description of the disastrous outcome of the invasion. When they had to fight against brave men (ἀγαθῶν ἀνδρῶν), the Amazons proved to be women and their *doxa* became the opposite of the one they had previously achieved (ἐναντίαν τὴν δόξαν τῆς προτέρας λαβοῦσαι μᾶλλον ἐκ τῶν κινδύνων ἢ ἐκ τῶν σωμάτων ἔδοξαν εἶναι γυναῖκες) (Lys. 2.5). They all died in Athens, and their massive defeat was punishment for their folly (δοῦσαι δίκην τῆς ἀνοίας). The orator concludes that, because they had desired unjustly (ἀδίκως ἐπιθυμήσασαι) the land of another

⁴²⁴ See Cairns (2016b), who has recently shown that the meaning of the Greek word ἐλπίς ranges from the neutral 'expectation' to the desiderative 'hope', and that the notion could be employed in both a positive and a negative sense. The negative aspect of *elpis*, due to the uncertainty and unpredictability of the future, has been already noted by Cornford (1907), 167-72.

⁴²⁵ See Cairns (2016b), 35-7. On the theme of *elpis* in Pindar, see Theunissen (2000).

⁴²⁶ See Cairns (2016b), 39-42.

⁴²⁷ Fisher (1992), 375-6.

people, the Amazons justly (δικαίως) lost their own (Lys. 2.6). Lysias states that the Amazons' defeat occurred when they had to face brave men (ἀγαθῶν ἀνδρῶν), but does not stress the clash between two genders. Instead, he points to the superiority of the Athenians over the nations which the Amazons had been able to submit. The orator's insistence on *doxa* (πολλῆς δόξης ... ἐναντίαν τὴν δόξαν ... ἔδοξαν εἶναι γυναικες) suggests once again that the gender issue is merely a component of the discourse of *hybris* which is central to the economy of the passage. The Amazons tended to overvalue their own *timē* and were excessive in their pursuit of *doxa*. This led them not only to fail in achieving a greater reputation, but also to lose the one they already had. When they had to fight against stronger enemies, they experienced a reversal of their former *doxa*. Moreover, the Amazons' course of action is labelled a case of *anoia*, reminiscent of both the deception deriving from *elpis* and the failing of rationality sometimes associated with *hybris*.⁴²⁸

Finally, in the conclusion of his narrative of the Amazonomachy, Lysias describes the Amazons' fate in terms of justice and punishment of *hybris*. The Amazons' greed and their desire for a land that did not belong to them are labelled as unjust.⁴²⁹ As a result, the Amazons rightfully lost their own land. The orator implicitly opposes the Amazons' unjust imperialistic recourse to war not only to the Athenians' traditional role as champions of justice, but also to their status as an autochthonous people who have never deprived other nations of their lands (Lys. 2.17).⁴³⁰ Moreover, the opposition between justice and excessive behaviour reflects Solonian views of justice. In one of the surviving fragments of his poetry, Solon warns the Athenians that their city will perish because of the greed of its citizens, and anticipates the doom which awaits the leaders of the people. These leaders have an unjust mind (ἄδικος νόος) and they will suffer great pains because of their great *hybris* (ὑβριος ἐκ μεγάλης). The poet adds *koros* to the picture, and describes the excesses in the conduct of the leaders as well as their acquisitive behaviour (Solon fr. 4.5-16 West).⁴³¹ Solon therefore establishes a link between *hybris*, excessive behaviour and injustice, and foresees the inevitable punishment which derives from this combination. Lysias' Amazons, with their excessive ambition and pursuit of glory, as well as their unjust desire for the lands of other nations, fit perfectly into

⁴²⁸ Cf. Aesch. *Pers.* 749-50, on which see discussion below, p. 131.

⁴²⁹ See MacDowell (1976), 19, who notes how one of the possible manifestations of *hybris* is the 'act of taking from someone else a thing which belongs to him, or preventing him from receiving what should be his'.

⁴³⁰ On this opposition see Tyrrell (1984), 114-6; on autochthony in general see Leão (2012), 137-41, with bibliography; see also discussion below, in Chapter 5.

⁴³¹ Fisher (1992), 70-3. Canevaro (forthcoming c), stresses how the connection *hybris-koros-injustice-retribution* was typical of archaic Greek thought.

Solon's pattern: their invasion of Attica and its disastrous outcome are a clear case of deservedly and justly punished *hybris*.

Lysias' description of the Amazons' defeat as the just punishment of their *hybris* is coherent with the absence of justice among the reasons for the invasion. Other versions of the Attic Amazonomachy created grounds for possible complaints on the part of the Amazons.⁴³² Theseus' abduction of Antiope in particular risked shedding a negative light on the Athenians and making them appear as the aggressors. One reason to pass over this detail was the necessity to present the Athenians as the wronged party and blame the conflict on the Amazons. At the same time, by obliterating any Athenian responsibilities for the outbreak of the war, Lysias manages to exclude justice from the moral horizon of the Amazons. Not only is justice replaced by excessive *doxa* and *elpis* in the account of the reasons for the invasion; it is also explicitly denied at the end of the narrative, when Lysias describes the Amazons' desire for the lands of other nations as contrary to justice (Lys. 2.6). This description contributes to the creation of a moral opposition between Amazons and Athenians. The Amazons ignored the norms of intervention that regulated Athens' foreign policy and made the Athenians champions of justice and defenders of the weak.⁴³³ Focusing on the *hybris* of the Amazons had therefore the further advantage of highlighting by contrast the justice and good character of the Athenians.

Lysias' depiction of the Amazons as hubristic finds a significant parallel in the depiction of the other traditional invaders of Attica in Athenian social memory: the Persians. In the aftermath of the Greek victory in the Persian Wars, the Attic Amazonomachy became a popular subject of monumental art. This episode was placed side by side with the Battle of Marathon in the Painted Stoa and was included in the programme of the Parthenon, the victory monument for the Persian Wars *par excellence*. It also featured in the Theseion and on the Shield of Athena Parthenos.⁴³⁴ These depictions, probably reflected in Attic vase painting,⁴³⁵ have led many scholars to assume that the Amazons symbolised (and feminised) the Persians

⁴³² On the abduction of Antiope and its implications for the legitimacy of the Amazons' invasion of Attica, see discussion below, at pp. 139-46.

⁴³³ See Low (2007), 175-211 on the norm of intervention based on the principle of 'helping the wronged'. For further discussion of the helping paradigm and the image of the Athenians as champions of justice, see pp. 94-6 above.

⁴³⁴ For Attic red-figure vase painting which possibly reflects monumental Cimonian Amazonomachies, see Bothmer (1957), 161-92; for the Amazonomachies on the west metopes of the Parthenon and the Shield of Athena Parthenos, see Bothmer (1957), 208-14; E. B. Harrison (1966).

⁴³⁵ Bothmer (1957), 161-92.

in Athenian official art.⁴³⁶ Recent scholarship has raised doubts over this view,⁴³⁷ and suggested that the Athenian victory against the Amazons simply provided a mythical precedent for their glorious victory over the Persian invaders.⁴³⁸ Lysias' narrative participates in this trend. His account of the Amazonomachy closely resembles the description of Darius' and Xerxes' campaigns against Greece in fifth- and fourth-century Athenian sources, which portray the Persian invasions as motivated by *hybris* and imperialism.

The very fact that Lysias claims that the Amazons dominated over a multi-ethnic empire mirrors the reality of the Persian Empire.⁴³⁹ The Amazons' propensity to the enslavement of other nations resembles Persian hubristic and imperialistic attitudes.⁴⁴⁰ Later in the speech, Lysias states that Darius, not content with his Asian dominions, invaded Greece in the hope of enslaving Europe (ἐλπίζων καὶ τὴν Εὐρώπην δουλώσασθαι). Darius' frustrated *elpis* in the passage shows a further parallel with the Amazons (Lys. 2.21).⁴⁴¹ Similarly, in Herodotus' account of Xerxes' decision to attack Greece, the Persian king immediately abandons his rightful complaints against the unprovoked injustices that his father Darius had suffered at the hands of the Greeks (Hdt. 7.8b), and expresses his hubristic desire to enslave both the guilty and the innocent (οὐτῶ οἱ τε ἡμῖν αἴτιοι ἔξουσι δούλιον ζυγὸν οἱ τε ἀναίτιοι) (Hdt. 7.8c.3).⁴⁴²

The Amazons' motivations to go to war against Athens (πολλῆς δόξης καὶ μεγάλης ἐλπίδος χάριν) also recall those of the Persians. Darius' *elpis* in Lysias' account has already been stressed; as for Xerxes, Lysias mentions his frustrated hope (ἐψευσμένος δὲ τῆς ἐλπίδος) as one of the reasons which led him to war (Lys. 2.27). In Book 7 of Herodotus, Xerxes plans to use the campaign against Greece to defeat his predecessors in a competition for gaining more power for the Empire and winning the most *timē*. From his victory against the Greeks,

⁴³⁶ See e.g. Devambez (1976), 273-4; Culasso Gastaldi (1977), 294-6; Boardman (1982), 13-15; Castriota (1992), *infra* and (2005). Athenian art started to portray Amazons in oriental (specifically Scythian and Thracian) outfit since the half of the sixth century, while Amazons dressed as Persians started to appear since the beginning of the fifth century: see Shapiro (1983); Veness (2002), 98-9; Cohen (2012), 462-3.

⁴³⁷ Veness (2002), 99-104; Mayor (2014), 280-3.

⁴³⁸ As Mayor (2014), 280-3 suggests, in the fifth century the Amazons did not symbolise or stand for Persians but were merely ancient precursors of the Persians as first eastern invaders of Greece.

⁴³⁹ See Todd (2007), 216, who stresses that the extent of the Amazon Empire was a new detail, 'serving primarily to highlight their fall from power and the scale of the Athenians' victory'.

⁴⁴⁰ See Todd (2007), 217, who stresses that such an attack on the Amazons' imperialism was at odds with the imperial reputation of Athens herself, which was accused of having enslaved the Greeks. But this contradiction does not really apply to the *epitaphios logos*, where Athenian imperialism was not admitted. In this respect, Pericles' funeral speech, with its open mention of the Empire (Thuc. 2.36.2), represents the exception, not the norm, and should be considered as unmasking, rather than being evidence of, the official rhetoric of Athens (*pace* Loraux 1981).

⁴⁴¹ See Todd (2007), 231, who rightly stresses that the motif of enslavement portrays the Persian invasion as an act of 'gratuitous expansionisms rather than revenge for Athens' activities at Sardis'.

⁴⁴² Fisher (1992), 367-8.

the Persian king expects to obtain both glory (*kydos*) and fertile land (Hdt. 7.8a.2). Not only does Xerxes fail to recognise the Greeks' honour, but he also proves to be excessive in his pursuit of *timē* and *kydos*, as he plans to yoke the Hellespont (Hdt. 7.8b.1) and make the Persian Empire border on the dominions of Zeus (Hdt. 7.8c.1-2).⁴⁴³ The ghost of Darius in Aeschylus' *Persians* condemns Xerxes' expedition against Greece. In particular, Darius disapproves of his son's impious *elpis* of holding the sacred Hellespont as a slave (Ἐλλήσποντον ἱρὸν δοῦλον ὧς δεσμώμασιν ἤλπισε σχήσειν) (Aesch. *Pers.* 745-6). If this only amounts to an implicit accusation of *hybris*,⁴⁴⁴ Darius does label the expedition explicitly as an act of *hybris* shortly afterwards in his speech (Aesch. *Pers.* 803-8). On that occasion, the former king insists again on the vain hopes (κεναῖσιν ἐλπίσιν) that persuaded Xerxes to leave chosen troops in Greece awaiting disaster. Darius then defines *hybris* as having excessive thoughts (ὑπέρφρεν ... φρονεῖν) and portrays *atē* as its natural consequence (Aesch. *Pers.* 820-2).⁴⁴⁵ Xerxes' excessive behaviour is thus very similar to that of Lysias' Amazons.⁴⁴⁶

Another important similarity between the hubristic portrayal of Amazons and Persians lies in the absence of justice from the motivations of the Persian invasion. If the Amazons are not at all concerned with justice, and Lysias explicitly describes their expansionistic policy as a form of injustice, in Herodotus' account Xerxes at first includes justice among the reasons for his campaign. The Persian king declares his desire to punish the Athenians for the wrongs (ἄδικα) they inflicted on his father (Hdt. 7.8b.2). Xerxes, however, fallen victim to his hubristic desires, immediately forgets his initial motivations and declares his plan to enslave both the guilty and the innocent (Hdt. 7.8c.3). Similarly, the Athenians' help for the Milesian Revolt, which could be seen as their original wrong against the Persians, is expounded in Lysias' narrative of the Persian Wars in the *Funeral Oration* (Lys. 2.21). Just as with the Amazons, Lysias removes any possible Athenian responsibilities for the war and presents the Persians as driven only by expansionistic desires and uninterested in justice.⁴⁴⁷

The Persians' expansionistic desires eventually clashed with Athens' opposition. Just as he highlighted how the fortunes of the Amazons came to an end when they encountered *agathoi andres* in the persons of the Athenians, Lysias later describes Xerxes as unexperienced with brave men (ἄπειρος ἀνδρῶν ἀγαθῶν) prior to his invasion of Greece (Lys. 2.27). The

⁴⁴³ Cairns (1996), 13.

⁴⁴⁴ Pace Garvie (2009), 295, who argues that in this particular passage Aeschylus portrays the bridging of the Hellespont as a foolish but not hubristic act.

⁴⁴⁵ Garvie (2009), 314-15; Cairns (1996), 16 n. 68. But Garvie (2009), xxii-xxxii downplays the importance of *hybris* in the general economy of Aeschylus' *Persians*.

⁴⁴⁶ A significant difference is Aeschylus' portrayal of Xerxes as impious and sacrilegious (Aesch. *Pers.* 809-12), which is unparalleled in Lysias' characterisation of the Amazons, but both passages represent clear cases of *hybris*.

⁴⁴⁷ Todd (2007), 230-2.

orator points to the Athenians' superiority over the nations that Amazons and Persians had been able to subdue. In both cases, he implies that the hubristic ambitions of imperialistic powers, although successful against other nations, were doomed to fail against the Athenians, *agathoi andres* and enemies of the powerful *par excellence*.

Finally, in Aeschylus' *Persians*, Darius describes Xerxes as lacking good judgment (οὐκ εὐβουλίᾳ) because of his hubristic act of yoking the Hellespont, and he ascribes his son's dreadful choices to a disease of the mind (νόσος φρενῶν) (Aesch. *Pers.* 749-50).⁴⁴⁸ The Amazons, even though their *hybris* was not directed towards the gods, were similarly affected by *anoia* according to Lysias' *Funeral Oration*. Both Amazons and Persians experienced a failing of their intellectual faculties (and therefore of their abilities to determine their appropriate *timē* and that of others) which derived from their hubristic attitude and drive for conquest. In both cases, the result is *atē*: Lysias' Amazons are completely annihilated, while Aeschylus' Chorus of Persian elders lament their tragic defeat together with a prostrate Xerxes (Aesch. *Pers.* 908-1076).

I have shown that Lysias' account of the Attic Amazonomachy was conditioned by the discursive parameters of the state funeral for the war dead. In this context, the orators provided a positive image of Athens which justified her military actions as motivated by altruism or self-defence.⁴⁴⁹ Lysias accordingly puts all the blame for the war on the Amazons. Theseus' abduction of Antiope is never mentioned, and there is no hint at any possible Athenian fault. More importantly, Lysias paints a very clear picture of the Amazons as guilty of *hybris*, clearing Athens of any responsibilities for the conflict or embarrassment for the role played by Theseus. The *hybris* of the Amazons is not a fixed element of this myth and is a further sign of the influence of the institution of the state funeral on Lysias' account. Just as other orators of funeral speeches, Lysias presents the Athenians as the righteous punishers of *hybris*. To achieve this goal, the orator portrays the Amazons as unjust, excessive in their desire for conquest and glory, and disrespectful of other peoples' *timē*. Even the Amazons' reversal of traditional gender roles contributes towards their overall characterisation as hubristic, which is reinforced by the parallel with the Persian invasion of Greece. From a moral point of view, the Amazons appear as the anti-Athenians. This picture contributes to the idealised image of the Athenians as the righteous punishers of *hybris*, which was functional to the construction of an imagined community in accordance with the discursive parameters of the state funeral.

⁴⁴⁸ Garvie (2009), 297.

⁴⁴⁹ This is perfectly exemplified in Demosthenes' introduction of the Athenian exploits in his *Funeral Speech* (Dem. 60.7). There the orator states that the Athenian ancestors were noble and just, and in defending themselves (ἀμυνόμενοι) they performed great deeds.

4.4. AMAZONS AT THE DRAMATIC FESTIVALS: AESCHYLUS'

EUMENIDES

Lysias' insistence on portraying the Amazons' *hybris* as the only cause of the war is itself a sign that alternative versions where the invasion resulted from Theseus' abduction of Antiope were current and well known in Athens. The involvement of Theseus was a potential source of embarrassment that was not appropriate to the institutional setting of the state funeral. Any allusion to the abduction of Antiope would have endangered the image of Athens as the righteous punisher of the *hybris* of imperialistic powers that is central to Lysias' epitaphic narrative. In other institutional settings, however, alluding (even if vaguely) to the abduction episode was not as problematic and could provide a picture not as unilateral and straightforward as the one painted by Lysias. This is the case of a brief allusion to the Attic Amazonomachy featured in Aeschylus' *Eumenides*. Unlike Lysias, Aeschylus was free from the task of constructing an imagined community and was not compelled to adopt an idealised version of Athenian history. The poet was conditioned by the discursive parameters of the dramatic festivals, which led playwrights to appeal to the whole social span of their audience in order to win first prize.

Aeschylus' allusion to the Amazonomachy appears halfway through the play. To solve the dispute between Orestes and the Erinyes over the murder of Clytemnestra, Athena institutes the Council of the Areopagus and grants it jurisdiction over homicide cases. The goddess alludes to the Attic Amazonomachy to provide an aetiology of the name of the location. Athena recalls how the Amazons had once invaded Athens because of their *phthonos* towards Theseus (Θησέως κατὰ φθόνον), and how the hill where they established their camp and performed sacrifices to Ares had been hence known as the Areopagus (Aesch. *Eum.* 685-90). Unlike Lysias, Aeschylus mentions Theseus in connection with the Amazonomachy, but does not clarify the hero's involvement in the events. Even though the playwright does not describe the grounds of the invasion clearly, one needs to consider the possibility that the ambiguous *phthonos* of the Amazons may have concealed an allusion to Theseus' abduction of Antiope.

The Greek word φθόνος does not have a precise and univocal equivalent in English. The notion encompassed many different values, both negative and positive.⁴⁵⁰ One of its possible meanings was the negative value of 'envy'.⁴⁵¹ Aristotle, for example, discusses *phthonos* in his analysis of virtue and vices in the *Nicomachean Ethics*. The philosopher

⁴⁵⁰ See Sanders (2014), 33-46, who identifies twelve different "scripts" of the notion of *phthonos*.

⁴⁵¹ LSJ s.v. φθόνος, I. 1.

includes *phthonos* among those emotions which are regarded as intrinsically evil (Arist. *NE* 1107a8-12). Aristotle defines the envious man (ὁ φθονερός) as he who suffers at any good fortune of others. To this he opposes the rightly resentful man (ὁ νεμεσητικός), who suffers only at the undeserved good fortune of others (Arist. *NE* 1108a35-b6).⁴⁵² As with other negative notions such as *kerdos*,⁴⁵³ *phthonos* was something that one rarely claimed for oneself.⁴⁵⁴ On the contrary, *phthonos* was often predicated on others. Pindar's *Seventh Pythian*, for example, accuses the Athenians of feeling *phthonos* towards their fellow citizen Megacles because of his athletic victories and good fortune (Pind. *Pyth.* 7.17-8). In the *Antidosis*, Isocrates on several occasions accuses his own enemies of acting against him out of *phthonos* (Isoc. 15.4, 13, 142-3).⁴⁵⁵ The *phthonos* Aeschylus attributes to the Amazons as the reason for their invasion of Attica may therefore be simply a sign of their negative character. The poet may be presenting them as envious of the good fortune, power and wealth of Theseus and (implicitly) Athens. If one credits this interpretation, Aeschylus' Amazons, though not characterised by *hybris*, would not be particularly different from Lysias' Amazons, who decided to invade Attica when they heard of Athens' *kleos* (Lys. 2.5).

The meaning of envy was not the only value that the Greeks attached to the word φθόνος. On several instances, *phthonos* was felt as justified and even invoked as a rightful reaction to injustices. In this sense, the word can be considered equivalent to the English 'indignation'. A classic case is the resentment of the gods towards successful mortals (*phthonos theōn*).⁴⁵⁶ Pindar, for example, prays that the gods' favour for Xenarces, father of the addressee of the *Eight Pythian*, may be without *phthonos* (θεῶν δ' ὄπιν ἄφθονον) (Pind. *Pyth.* 8.71-2). The Messenger in Aeschylus' *Persians* states that Xerxes did not perceive the *phthonos* of the gods towards him (Aesch. *Pers.* 362). In Book 7 of Thucydides, Nicias encourages the Athenian troops in Sicily and says that, if their expedition caused the *phthonos* of a god (εἴ τῳ θεῶν ἐπίφθονοι ἐστρατεύσαμεν), the Athenians have already been punished for it (Thuc. 7.77.3). The idea of a rightful form of *phthonos* was not limited to the gods and can be observed in Athenian oratory in several instances.⁴⁵⁷ Isocrates, for example, invokes justified *phthonos* against the Persians, who have undeservedly acquired a power too great for

⁴⁵² Cf. Arist. *Rhet.* 1386b11-12, where Aristotle opposes *phthonos* to *nemesis*. The former is the pain felt at the good fortune of those who are equal and like, while the latter is the pain felt at the good fortune of those who do not deserve it. See Fisher (2003), 183; Cairns (2003), 247 n. 42.

⁴⁵³ On *kerdos* see discussion above, with bibliography, at pp. 99-100.

⁴⁵⁴ See Sanders (2014), 36, who points out that in only three instances in the classical corpus (Eur. *Bacch.* 820; Eur. fr. 334.1-2; Xen. *Cyr.* 3.1.39.8) does someone explicitly attribute *phthonos* to himself.

⁴⁵⁵ Fisher (2003), 185-8; Cairns (2003), 242-4; see also Sanders (2014), 38-9 for other examples.

⁴⁵⁶ Walcot (1978), 22-51; Cairns (2003), 249-50; Sanders (2014), 42.

⁴⁵⁷ Sanders (2014), 43-4.

men (Isoc. 4.184).⁴⁵⁸ In *Against Meidias*, Demosthenes claims that *phthonos*, and not pity, is the appropriate reaction to Meidias' wealth and hubristic behaviour (Dem. 21.196). In his second speech *Against Aphobus*, Demosthenes similarly invites the judges to be justly indignant (φθονήσειε δικάίως) towards the defendant, his former guardian Aphobus, because he robbed him of his inheritance and tried to prevent him from reacquiring it (Dem. 28.18).⁴⁵⁹ The *phthonos* of the Amazons in Aeschylus' *Eumenides* may therefore be their (more or less) justified resentment for Theseus' abduction of Antiope.⁴⁶⁰

Because of the multivalence of the notion of *phthonos* and the ambiguity of Aeschylus' phrasing, it is hard to determine the version of the myth which is alluded to in the play. Aeschylus may have chosen the Amazonomachy over other possible aetiologies of the name of the Areopagus because the Amazons provided a significant parallel with Clytemnestra and her monstrous, non-feminine behaviour.⁴⁶¹ The dual interpretation of the Amazons' motivations may even reflect the ambivalent portrayal of Clytemnestra's motivations in the first play of the trilogy, *Agamemnon*. There, the queen shows both a rightful indignation for the sacrifice of Iphigeneia (Aesch. Ag. 1377-8; 1432-3) and an envy of (and tendency to misappropriate) Agamemnon's male status and power (Aesch. Ag. 10-11; 1069-71).⁴⁶² Aeschylus may have thus been deliberately ambiguous, leaving the audience free to choose either version of the Amazonomachy. This was in line with the discursive parameters of the dramatic festivals, which invited playwrights to appeal to every social group in their audience. Aeschylus' vague mention of Theseus may have triggered in part of the audience the memory of the abduction of Antiope, whose currency is testified by the popularity of the motif in Attic

⁴⁵⁸ In this usage, *phthonos* is reminiscent of *nemesis* (cf. Arist. *Rhet.* 1386b11-12), as noted by Cairns (2003), 247.

⁴⁵⁹ Cairns (2003), 246-8; Fisher (2003), 185 n. 16, 198-202; Sanders (2014), 43-4.

⁴⁶⁰ Whether or not this resentment should be considered justified depends on the different versions of the myth, as in some accounts Antiope is portrayed as Theseus' legitimate acquisition: see discussion below, at pp. 139-43.

⁴⁶¹ *Suda* s.v. Ἄρειος πάγος gives two possible explanations for the name of the Areopagus. The name either depends from the fact that the Council of the Areopagus judged in matters of homicides, which were the domain of the god Ares, or it derives from the myth of Halirrhothius, son of Poseidon, whose death at the hands of Ares had been the first case of homicide judged by the Areopagus (cf. Eur. *El.* 1258-62; Dem. 23.66; Apollod. 3.180; Paus. 1.21.4): see Wallace (1989), 9-10 and Fowler (2013), 454-5. Wallace (1989), 88 rightly notes that Aeschylus' new aetiology was meant to support the idea that Orestes, and not Ares, was the first defendant tried for homicide by the Council of the Areopagus. Modern scholarship has often seen Aeschylus' *Eumenides* as a reaction to Ephialtes' reform of the Areopagus (see e.g. Podlecki 1966, 74-100; Sommerstein 2010, 281-8; Leão 2010, 42), but the historicity of such reform as we know it has been convincingly questioned by Zaccarini (forthcoming). See Harding (2007), 33-6 for a survey and commentary of the testimonies of the Attidographers about the Areopagus. On the parallels between Clytemnestra and the Amazons cf. Aesch. *Eum.* 625-30; see Zeitlin (1978), 155; Tyrrell (1984), 93-122.

⁴⁶² See Winnington-Ingram (1948), 130-7.

vase painting.⁴⁶³ This version blamed the war on the Athenians. Because they were presented as the recipients of the Amazons' rightful *phthonos*, the Athenians may have even appeared to some as guilty of *hybris*. Such an image contrasted with the idealised picture produced at the state funeral and was probably appealing for those members of the audience who did not identify with the official rhetoric and ideology of the democracy. Part of the audience, on the other hand, would have interpreted Aeschylus' vague phrasing as an allusion to the self-congratulatory Amazonomachies of funeral speeches. This interpretation certainly resonated with the majority of the *dēmos*, who could perceive their ideas about the city being restated on the tragic stage.

4.5. AN ALLUSION TO THE ABDUCTION IN A PRIVATE SETTING?

Another possible allusion to Theseus' abduction of Antiope in connection with the Attic Amazonomachy can be found in Isocrates' *Panegyricus*. The speech was composed for private circulation and exemplifies a case where an orator was not conditioned by the discursive parameters of Athenian democratic institutions. The *Panegyricus* mixes epideictic and deliberative features,⁴⁶⁴ but it does not reflect clearly the discursive parameters of the state funeral nor to those of the Assembly. The object of the speech is the proposal of a Panhellenic campaign against Persia under Athenian leadership. To support Athens' entitlement to lead the expedition, Isocrates recalls a series of Athenian exploits against barbaric imperialistic nations (Scythians, Thracians and Persians) that tried to extend their dominions at the expense of the Greeks. Among such exploits was the Amazonomachy (Isoc. 4.66-7). According to the orator, the Amazons and their Scythian allies raised accusations (*ἐγκλήματα*) against Athens and invaded Attica (Isoc. 4.68).⁴⁶⁵ Isocrates' vague reference to the accusations put forward by the Amazons may well be an allusion to the events regarding Antiope. As in Aeschylus' *Eumenides*, the phrasing is ambiguous but could have been enough to make an Athenian think of Theseus' abduction of Antiope.

Isocrates seems to admit (though vaguely) the existence of possible grounds for complaints on the part of the Amazons, but does not speak of Athenian responsibilities explicitly and does not even mention Theseus or Antiope. Rather than as well-founded accusations, the *ἐγκλήματα* sound as pretexts fabricated by the Amazons and their Scythian

⁴⁶³ Cf. Apollod. *Epit.* 1.16-7 for a late account of the Amazonomachy as the direct consequence of the abduction of Antiope. On the abduction of Antiope in vase painting, see pp. 137-9 below.

⁴⁶⁴ On the nature, destination and themes of Isocrates' *Panegyricus*, see Usher (1990), 19-21; Too (1995), 79-80; Papillon (2004), 24-7.

⁴⁶⁵ Cf. Diod. 28, where the Amazons lead an army that they gathered together with the Scythians, since they wanted to punish the Athenians for Theseus' enslavement of Antiope (*διὰ τὸ τὸν Θησέα καταδεδουλώσθαι τὴν ἡγεμόνα τῶν Ἀμαζόνων Ἀντιόπην*).

allies to initiate a war against Athens. Not unlike Lysias, Isocrates is keen to describe the Amazons as an imperialistic power and their military campaign as moved by their desire for conquest. Since their first mention in the *Panegyricus*, the Amazons are associated with imperialism. They invaded Attica together with the Scythians, and their attempt is introduced as one of the wars moved against Greece by the nations who were the most suited for command (ἀρχικώτατα μὲν τῶν γενῶν) and possessed the greatest dominions (μεγίσταξ δυναστείας ἔχοντα). These were the Scythians, the Thracians and the Persians (Isoc. 4.67). Isocrates stresses their imperialism further when he states that Scythians and Amazons were trying to rule (ἐπιῆρχον) over Europe. The orator adds that, although they hated the whole race of the Greeks (μισοῦντες μὲν ἅπαν τὸ τῶν Ἑλλήνων γένος), the Amazons raised accusations against the Athenians in particular (ιδίᾳ) because they knew that if they attacked Athens they would have conquered the entirety of Greece (Isoc. 4.68).⁴⁶⁶ It is clear, then, that the ἐγκλήματα and the possible allusion to Theseus' abduction of Antiope are only the alleged reason for the Amazons' invasion, and their importance is notably diminished by the description of the war as an expansionistic campaign.

The passage has to be read in the light of the rhetorical purpose of the speech. Isocrates needs to stress Athens' power in order to endorse the city's leadership in the prospective campaign against Persia. Unlike Lysias, Isocrates is not influenced by the discursive parameters of the state funeral. Accordingly, he does not focus on the image of the Athenians as the righteous punishers of *hybris*. Isocrates' possible allusion to Theseus' abduction of Antiope as one of the causes of the war does not challenge explicitly the idealised image of Athens constructed at the state funeral. While indirectly triggering the memory of a well-known version of the myth, Isocrates shows not only that the Amazons' real aim was the complete conquest of Greece, but also that to achieve this aim they needed a pretext for attacking the Athenians, and the Athenians alone. Athens therefore emerges as the prime power of Greece, the only city powerful enough to lead the Greeks against the Persians. At the same time, the instrumental use of the past in support of a policy is reminiscent of deliberative rhetoric. Isocrates twice states that recalling Athens' wars against the barbarians is appropriate when discussing the leadership of a campaign against Persia (Isoc. 4.66, 71). Yet the speech explicitly questions the principle of advantage (*to sympheron*) which was central to the discursive parameters of the Assembly. Before relating the myths of Athens' help for Adrastus and the Heraclidae, Isocrates defends the Athenian custom of defending the weak against the powerful. The orator claims that the Athenians deserve praise because they willingly side with the weak against their own advantage (παρὰ τὸ συμφέρον) instead of favouring the powerful

⁴⁶⁶ Cf. Aesch. *Pers.* 234; Lys. 2.22.

for their own profit (τοῦ λυσιτελοῦντος ἔνεκα) (Isoc. 4.53). As a private speech, Isocrates' *Panegyricus* therefore did not reflect the discursive parameters of any of the institutions of Athenian democracy where it could have belonged.

4.6. THE ABDUCTION OF ANTIOPE IN THE FIGURATIVE ARTS

Theseus' acquisition of Antiope was mentioned explicitly as the cause of the Attic Amazonomachy by Philochorus and Pherecydes, as well as by Isocrates in the *Panathenaicus*. These sources all belonged to private contexts, not conditioned by the discursive parameters of the formal institutions of Athenian democracy. Their accounts of the causes of the Amazonomachy show small but significant differences, to the extent that it is even questionable whether they all portray the episode of Antiope as an abduction. At the same time, they all agree in attributing to Theseus some kind of responsibility for the outbreak of the war. Before turning to the analysis of Philochorus, Pherecydes and Isocrates and their different portrayals of the story, it is necessary to consider how Theseus' acquisition of Antiope was depicted in the figurative arts. This can help clarify what fifth- and fourth-century Athenians knew about the episode.

The abduction of Antiope appeared in Athenian art between the end of the sixth and the beginning of the fifth century. The motif first occurs on the west pediment of the temple of Apollo in Eretria, which was built during the last decades of the sixth century and then destroyed by the Persians in 490 BC. Similarities in style, as well as the subject of the sculptures, have suggested a connection with Athens, if not even a form of patronage.⁴⁶⁷ For these reasons, the pediment probably reflects mythical traditions which were current in Athens at the time. The pediment shows Theseus holding Antiope with his left arm while placing her on his chariot in the act of carrying her off. Athena features in the centre of the scene, which might have also included Theseus' companions fighting against Amazons.⁴⁶⁸

The abduction scene was relatively popular in Attic vase painting of roughly the same period. Ten such depictions survive, dating from the end of the sixth century to around 450 BC.⁴⁶⁹ This suggests that Athenians in the classical period had long been familiar with the motif, although nothing is implied about a possible retaliation by the Amazons. Most vases show Antiope gesturing to her companions or looking back in search for help, which suggests

⁴⁶⁷ Bothmer (1957), 126; Boardman (1991), 156.

⁴⁶⁸ See Bothmer (1957), 125-6; Boardman (1991), 156; *LIMC* s.v. Antiope II 2.

⁴⁶⁹ See *LIMC* s.v. Antiope II 4-13. According to Bothmer (1957), 126-7, the vases depicting the episode were not later than 490 BC and the vase painters might have been partly influenced by the abduction scene on the temple of Apollo in Eretria.

that she is being carried off by force.⁴⁷⁰ An Attic black-figure amphora from Cumae stored in Naples, for example, portrays Theseus running towards his chariot with Antiope in his arms. The woman, in hoplitic dress, looks back helplessly.⁴⁷¹ In an Attic red-figure cup in London found in Vulci, Theseus, accompanied by Pirithous and Phorbas, carries off Antiope and steps on his chariot. The Amazon is dressed in oriental attire and extends her left arm in the opposite direction while still carrying her bow.⁴⁷² An Attic red-figure amphora from Vulci displayed in the Louvre shows Theseus and Pirithous running away. Theseus carries Antiope in his arms; the woman, who wears a richly decorated oriental dress, stretches her right arm towards her pursuing companions (who are not represented).⁴⁷³ A very similar scene is depicted on a red-figure cup in Oxford. Theseus is stepping on his chariot with Antiope in his arms; the Amazon, dressed as an oriental archer, looks back and extends both hands.⁴⁷⁴ An interesting exception to the established pattern can be found on an Attic black-figure amphora from Vulci, now in Munich. There, Theseus is again stepping on his chariot with Antiope in his arms. The Amazon, however, does not look back in search for help but keeps hold of the chariot rail with her right hand, a detail which has been interpreted as a sign of her willingness to follow Theseus.⁴⁷⁵

The artistic evidence shows that, at least at the dawn of the fifth century, the Athenians knew that Theseus seizes Antiope with the help of his Athenian companions. Heracles, who according to Philochorus was involved in the episode, never appears in the iconography of the abduction. In the west pediment of the temple of Apollo in Eretria, as well as in most of the vase depictions, Theseus carries off Antiope by force. The scene never features an actual battle, which suggests an abduction rather than a legitimate acquisition as a result of a military enterprise.⁴⁷⁶ On the Munich amphora, on the other hand, Antiope does not show signs of resistance, and the direction of her gaze suggests that she may be following Theseus willingly. If that were the case, the vase would provide a precedent for Isocrates' account in the *Panathenaicus*.⁴⁷⁷

⁴⁷⁰ See Bothmer (1957), 127-30, who analyses these vases, together with several other instances of the abduction in Attic vase painting.

⁴⁷¹ Napoli, Museo Archeologico Nazionale, 128333; *LIMC* s.v. Antiope II 5.

⁴⁷² London, British Museum, E 41; *LIMC* s.v. Antiope II 8.

⁴⁷³ Paris, Musée du Louvre, G 197; *LIMC* s.v. Antiope II 10.

⁴⁷⁴ Oxford, Ashmolean Museum, 1927.4065; *LIMC* s.v. Antiope II 9.

⁴⁷⁵ München, Staatliche Antikensammlungen und Glyptothek, 1414; *LIMC* s.v. Antiope II 4. See Bothmer (1957), 127.

⁴⁷⁶ See Culasso Gastaldi (1977), 290-1; Fowler (2013), 485-6. Some Attic vases depicting Theseus' abduction of Helen similarly show the armed hero lifting up the girl without implying a military context: see *LIMC* s.v. Helene 31-4.

⁴⁷⁷ Antiope's consent would not have made Theseus any less guilty from a legal point of view: on the Athenians' perception of sexual offence, see Harris (2006); against the traditional view that the Athenians regarded seduction as a worse crime than rape see Harris (1990), *pace* Carey (1995).

4.7. THE ABDUCTION OF ANTIOPE IN MYTHOGRAPHERS AND ATTIDOGRAPHERS

Theseus' encounter with Antiope, unanimously portrayed as an abduction (or an elopement) in the visual arts, gave origins to slightly diverging versions in the works of mythographers and Attidographers. Their accounts are unfortunately lost, but Plutarch summarises them in his *Life of Theseus*, where he uses the work of Philochorus and Pherecydes to illustrate the causes of the Attic Amazonomachy (Plut. *Thes.* 26-8).⁴⁷⁸ Pherecydes of Athens, author of a reference work on Greek mythology, was active during the 470s,⁴⁷⁹ while Philochorus wrote his *Atthis* during the late fourth or early third century.⁴⁸⁰ Both authors illustrate how the episode of Theseus and Antiope could be discussed explicitly in an Athenian private context, not influenced by the discursive parameters of democratic institutions. The nature of the evidence, however, invites caution. Plutarch provides us with information on otherwise lost sources. His testimony is highly valuable, if not indispensable, but Plutarch was not an historian. Plutarch's biographies had a moral and paradigmatic purpose, and this could influence the way he handled his sources. In other words, Plutarch may have filtered the information according to his moral and narrative aims. Moreover, Plutarch introduces Philochorus' and Pherecydes' accounts about Theseus' acquisition of Antiope to explain the causes of the Attic Amazonomachy, but we cannot safely assume based on his testimony that those authors considered the two episodes connected, or that they discussed the Amazon invasion of Attica in the first place.

Plutarch mentions Philochorus' account first. According to the Attidographer and other authors, Theseus joined Heracles' expedition to the Euxine Sea to fight the Amazons and received Antiope as a war prize (γέρας Ἀντιόπην ἔλαβεν) (Plut. *Thes.* 26.1).⁴⁸¹ Unlike the iconographic evidence, Philochorus does not envisage Theseus' encounter with Antiope as an abduction, but portrays Antiope as Theseus' legitimate acquisition through military endeavour. Plutarch, however, immediately rejects Philochorus' version and recalls another variant. According to the Athenian mythographer Pherecydes and the majority of writers (including Hellanicus and Herodorus), Theseus went on his own expedition to the Euxine Sea, independently and after Heracles, and on this occasion took Antiope as a spear-captive (τὴν

⁴⁷⁸ On Plutarch's use of sources in the *Life of Theseus* see Frost (1984b), esp. 68-9; Pelling (2002), 177-8; Cooper (2007), esp. 228-31.

⁴⁷⁹ Dolcetti (2004), 12-15; Pàmias i Massana (2008), 19; Fowler (2013), 708-9; Dolcetti, in particular, connects Pherecydes' activity to the political circle of Cimon. On the issue of the identity of Pherecydes of Athens and his possible identification with Pherecydes of Syrus, see Fowler (1999) with references.

⁴⁸⁰ Harding (2007), 8-9; Jones' Biographical Essay in *BNJ* 328.

⁴⁸¹ Theseus' participation in Heracles' campaign against the Amazons is mentioned by Iolaus in Eur. *Heracl.* 215-7; cf. also Diod. 4.16.4: [Ἡρακλῆς] τῶν δ' αἰχμαλωτῶν Ἀντιόπην μὲν ἐδωρήσατο Θησεΐ.

Ἀμαζόνα λαβεῖν αἰχμάλωτον).⁴⁸² Plutarch explicitly declares his preference for this version, on the grounds that none of those sharing in the expedition took an Amazon captive (Plut. *Thes.* 26.1).

The adjective αἰχμάλωτος and its derivatives are used in tragedy and historiography specifically to indicate war prisoners or spoils. Aeschylus uses αἰχμάλωτος for Cassandra in *Agamemnon* (Aesch. *Ag.* 1440) and Sophocles employs it for Iole in *Women of Trachis* (Soph. *Trach.* 417), while Euripides uses the noun αἰχμαλωτίς for the captive women of Troy in *Trojan Women* (Eur. *Tro.* 28-9). Spear-won terminology is similarly frequent in Thucydides. At the end of Book 2, for example, the Athenians sail home from Naupactus with the freemen among the prisoners they had captured in the sea battles (τούς τε ἐλευθέρους τῶν αἰχμαλώτων ἐκ τῶν ναυμαχιῶν ἄγοντες) (Thuc. 2.103.1). In Book 4, an ally of the Athenians teases one of the Spartans who had been taken captive in Sphacteria (ἓνα τῶν ἐκ τῆς νήσου αἰχμαλώτων) (Thuc. 4.40.2). In Book 9 of Herodotus, a woman from Cos, concubine of the Persian Pharandates and taken prisoner by the Greeks at Plataea, supplicates Pausanias to spare her from captive slavery (αἰχμαλώτου δουλοσύνης). She then explains that Pharandates had taken her by force (βίη λαβών) in Cos (Hdt. 9.76.1-2). The use of the adjective αἰχμάλωτος to refer to her future captivity clearly distinguishes the woman's prospective status as a war prisoner from her former status as a concubine acquired by force and sexual violence.⁴⁸³

As in the case of γέρας in Philochorus' version, αἰχμάλωτος in Pherecydes' account characterises Antiope not as a victim of abduction, but as a war prisoner and therefore Theseus' legitimate possession.⁴⁸⁴ When recalling his sources on the episode, Plutarch seems to make an effort not to use expressions that would clearly indicate sexual violence.⁴⁸⁵ This is particularly evident from a comparison with Plutarch's treatment of other abductions performed by Theseus. In those cases, the biographer regularly uses the verb ἄρπάζω or the noun ἄρπαγή. Plutarch states that one of the features that Theseus shared with Romulus, his Roman counterpart in the *Lives*, was the fact that they both abducted women (ἄρπαγή δὲ γυναικῶν ἑκατέρω πρόσεστιν) (Plut. *Thes.* 2.1). Theseus is then said to have abducted (ἄρπάσαι) the Troezenian Anaxo and committed sexual violence (συγγενέσθαι βίῃ) on the daughters of Sinis and Cercyon (Plut. *Thes.* 29.1). Plutarch repeatedly refers to Theseus'

⁴⁸² This was, according to Fowler (2013), 485-6, the original version of this myth, while the Heracles version was first attested around 430 BC.

⁴⁸³ Cf. Plut. *Thes.* 34.1, where Theseus' mother Aethra is taken captive (αἰχμάλωτον) by the Dioscuri when they moved war against Aphidnae to recover Helen.

⁴⁸⁴ As Harris (2016), 84 has recently noticed, ancient sources (Pl. *Resp.* 468a-b; Arist. *Pol.* 1255a6-7; Xen. *Cyr.* 7.5.73) show that 'the universal rule among the Greeks was that persons captured in battle belonged to the victors by right of conquest'.

⁴⁸⁵ Cf. Pind. fr. 175 Maehler *apud* Paus. 1.2.1, where Antiope is carried off (ἄρπασθῆναι) by Theseus and Pirithous.

encounter with the young Helen as an abduction (Plut. *Thes.* 29.2: τὴν Ἑλένης ἀρπαγὴν; 31.1: ἀρπάσαι; 31.2: ἀρπάσαντες). Aedoneus, king of the Molossians, is said to have seized Theseus and Pirithous, who intended to abduct (ἀρπασομένουσ) his daughter Cora (Plut. *Thes.* 31.4). Whether or not any distinction of this sort existed in his sources, Plutarch seems to separate Antiope from Theseus' other love interests. While the cases of Anaxo, Helen and Cora are clearly treated as abductions, and those of the daughters of Sinis and Cercyon seem to be described as cases of rape, Antiope on the other hand is acquired by Theseus as the result of military victory and treated as a war prisoner.⁴⁸⁶

Portraying Antiope as the victim of an abduction or as a war prisoner had different implications on Theseus' image and on the legitimacy of the Amazons' reaction. Scholars usually think that seduction and sexual violence were not punished as offences against women *per se*, or as violations of their right to choose their sexual partners, but rather as offences against the woman's *kyrios*.⁴⁸⁷ Whether or not that was the case, these acts were liable to heavy punishment. In Athens, men caught in the act of having (consensual or non-consensual) sexual intercourse with another's wife, daughter, mother, sister or concubine could be subjected to justifiable homicide.⁴⁸⁸ Men guilty of sexual violence could also be prosecuted under a *graphē hybreōs*. This procedure seems to have been rarely used, but it could result in the death penalty.⁴⁸⁹ Moreover, Herodotus' famous narrative on the origins of the enmity between Greeks and barbarians shows that war could be a reasonable reaction to an abduction. The historian recalls how Io, daughter of the king of Argos, had been carried off (ἀρπασθῆναι) by the Phoenicians. The Greeks replied by abducting (ἀρπάσαι) Europa, daughter of the king of Tyre, and later abducted (ἀρπάσαι) Medea, daughter of the king of Colchis. Two generations later, Paris, son of the Trojan king Priam, carried off (ἀρπάσαντος) Helen. When the Greeks sent messengers to Troy and were refused Helen's return, they reacted with war (Hdt. 1.1-4).⁴⁹⁰ Plutarch similarly recalls how the Dioscuri, when Theseus abducted their sister Helen, went to Athens to ask for her restitution. The Athenians replied that they ignored Helen's

⁴⁸⁶ Plutarch does mention a version where Theseus' encounter with Antiope was treated as an abduction. According to this story, attributed to Bion, Theseus abducted Antiope through deceit (ταύτην παρακρουσάμενον οἴχεσθαι λαβόντα) (Plut. *Thes.* 26.2). Plutarch gives no clear indication about Bion's identity. Jacoby ascribed the fragment to Bion of Proconnesus (*FGrHist* 332 F 2), who was the author of two books in Ionic dialect (*FGrHist* 332 T 1) and lived before the Peloponnesian War (*FGrHist* 332 T 2). It is hard to tell if Bion operated in Athens, or if his work was directed to an Athenian audience at all (see Jones in *BNJ* 332 F 2): it is therefore sensible to exclude his account from the scope of this research.

⁴⁸⁷ See T. Harrison (1997), 190, 193; Harris (2006), 307-20.

⁴⁸⁸ Harris (1990), 371-2; Carey (1995), 409-10. The text of the law on lawful homicide is preserved in Dem. 23.53, but see Canevaro (2013a), 64-70 on the issue of its authenticity.

⁴⁸⁹ Harris (1990), 373-4; Carey (1995), 410; Harris (2006), 316-20.

⁴⁹⁰ Harris (2006), 309-11.

location, and the Dioscuri went to war against them (Plut. *Thes.* 32.2). War prisoners, on the other hand, were usually released by means of diplomacy.⁴⁹¹ In Book 1 of the *Iliad*, Chryses, priest of Apollo, offers ransom to Agamemnon to obtain the restitution of his daughter Chryseis (Hom. *Il.* 1.12-21). Apollo punishes the Achaeans with the plague only after Chryses' offer had been rejected and because of Agamemnon's disrespectful behaviour towards the priest (Hom. *Il.* 1.92-100). Thucydides tells how the Corinthians released Corcyraean prisoners of war (αἰχμάλωτοι) in exchange for 800 talents – but with the secret intent of causing *stasis* in Corcyra (Thuc. 3.70.1). In Book 5, the Boeotians return some war prisoners to the Athenians (Thuc. 5.42.1) as a result of previous negotiations between Athenians, Spartans and Boeotians (Thuc. 5.39.2-3).⁴⁹² Philochorus and Pherecydes, therefore, by portraying Antiope as a war prisoner and Theseus' legitimate acquisition, preserved Theseus' good name and made the Amazons' reaction appear unjustified.

The malleability of the myth of Theseus' acquisition of Antiope is even more striking if we consider that our sources do not even agree in recounting Pherecydes' version of the myth. According to a scholion to Pindar's *Fifth Nemean*, Pherecydes stated that Phorbas was Theseus' charioteer when the hero abducted (ἀρπάζει) Antiope (schol. *ad* Pind. *Nem.* 5.89 = *FGrHist* 3 F 152). Unlike Plutarch, the scholiast uses the verb ἀρπάζω and attributes the abduction version to Pherecydes.⁴⁹³ The scholiast probably transmits valuable information, as the Pindaric scholia are thought to derive from the works of the Alexandrian scholars.⁴⁹⁴ Moreover, his testimony is not influenced by rhetorical or narrative purposes, while Plutarch may have had his own agenda when presenting the evidence.⁴⁹⁵ Plutarch himself, as if forgetful of his own treatment of the story in the *Life of Theseus*, seems to agree with Pindar's scholiast in the *Comparison of Theseus and Romulus*. There, he enumerates Antiope among the women who had been abducted by Theseus (ἤρπασε γὰρ Ἀριάδνην καὶ Ἀντιόπην καὶ Ἀναξὼ τὴν Τροιζηνίαν, ἐπὶ πάσαις δὲ τὴν Ἑλένην) (Plut. *Comp. Thes. Rom.* 6.1). On these grounds, we

⁴⁹¹ See Canevaro and Rutter (2015), 14-18 specifically on the Athenians taken captive by the Syracusans during the Sicilian expedition.

⁴⁹² But cf. Thuc. 8.107.2, where the Spartans rescued (ἐκομίσαντο) some of their ships which were held as war spoils (αἰχμαλώτων).

⁴⁹³ Something similar happens in the case of Herodorus. According to Plutarch, Herodorus followed Pherecydes in making Antiope a war prisoner (Plut. *Thes.* 26.1-2 = *FGrHist* 31 F 25a), but Tzetzes testifies that the author generically said that Theseus took (λαβεῖν) Antiope (Tzetz. *ad* Lycoph. *Alex.* 1332 = *FGrHist* 31 F 25b).

⁴⁹⁴ See Dickey (2007), 39.

⁴⁹⁵ The repulsion of the (illegitimate) invasion of the Amazons may be taken as part of a narrative progression leading from Theseus' glorious achievements to his decadence and death. Plutarch may have tried to portray Theseus' involvement in the Attic Amazonomachy in a good light, as opposed to the expedition of the Dioscuri for the recollection of Helen, which increased the internal opposition against Theseus (Plut. *Thes.* 32.2) and contributed to his downfall: see Leão and do Céu Fialho (2008), 13 and 28-9.

should be inclined to prefer the scholiast's opinion over Plutarch's, or at least to cast some doubts on the trustworthiness of Plutarch's testimony.

Whether we want to trust Plutarch or Pindar's scholiast, in both cases Pherecydes' version implies some sort of responsibility on Theseus' part. If Antiope had been the victim of an abduction, as Pindar's scholiast implies, the Amazons' reaction would have been justifiable. This version implicitly transferred the accusations of *hybris* from the Amazons to Theseus.⁴⁹⁶ If, on the other hand, Theseus had acquired Antiope as a spear-captive (or according to Philochorus received her as a war prize from Heracles), the Amazons' retaliation would have been illegitimate and unjustified. Yet, even in this version, Theseus was portrayed as leading (or participating in) a military expedition against the Amazons in the first place. Both versions would have been incompatible with the discursive parameters of the state funeral. The abduction version made the Athenians not the punishers, but the supporters of those guilty of *hybris*. The *γέρας/αίχμάλωτος* version, on the other hand, portrayed Theseus as the original aggressor, which contradicted the idealised image of Athenian foreign policy produced in funeral speeches. A comparison with Aeschylus' allusion to the Amazonomachy in the *Eumenides* shows that Philochorus' and Pherecydes' accounts would have been inappropriate also at the dramatic festivals. Aeschylus' vague reference to the Amazons' *phthonos* towards Theseus could have been interpreted either as a tribute or a challenge to the idealised image of Athens constructed at the state funeral. An explicit allusion to Theseus' abduction of Antiope or to his legitimate acquisition of the woman through military endeavour would have probably encountered the resistance of the majority of the audience and limited the playwright's chances of winning the contest.⁴⁹⁷

4.8. THE ABDUCTION OF ANTIOPE IN ISOCRATES' PRIVATE RHETORIC

Isocrates had already touched upon the causes of the Amazonomachy in the *Panegyricus*. There the orator did not mention Theseus or Antiope directly, but referred to unspecified accusations that the Amazons had moved against the Athenians, possibly alluding to the episode of the abduction. In his *Panathenaicus*, Isocrates includes a more detailed discussion of the origins of the invasion. In the speech, Theseus' abduction of Hippolyta (as Isocrates

⁴⁹⁶ Cf. Isoc. 10.19, where Theseus' abduction of Helen is described in hubristic terms. According to the orator, Theseus was unable to obtain Helen from her guardians. Despising (*ὑπεριδόν*) the power of Tyndareus and disdainning (*καταφρονήσας*) the strength of Castor and Pollux, Theseus therefore took Helen by force (*βίᾳ λαβόν*). Isocrates then feels the need to justify Theseus and re-affirm his virtue in spite of this dishonourable episode (Isoc. 10.21).

⁴⁹⁷ An allusion to Heracles' gift of Antiope to Theseus has been included in the text of Euripides' *Children of Heracles* by some modern editors (Eur. *Heracl.* 218-19), but the conjecture is far from certain: see p. 101, n. 330 above.

calls Theseus' Amazon wife) is explicitly mentioned as the cause of the war (Isoc. 12.193). Writing in a private context, Isocrates chooses to follow a specific version of the myth which notably diverged from the picture produced at the state funeral. Yet a degree of ambiguity survives, if not in the portrayal of the story, at least in its implications.

Isocrates immediately declares the purpose of the *Panathenaicus* at the beginning of the speech. After explaining the reasons that induced him to write the speech, the orator explains that his aim is to extol Athens by discussing the city's benefactions towards Greece (Isoc. 12.35). Isocrates then states his intention to achieve this goal through a comparison between Athens and Sparta (Isoc. 12.39-41). The orator recalls the Amazonomachy later in the speech when dealing with a specific aspect of this comparison, namely the different nature of Athens' and Sparta's military achievements. While the Spartans only care about acquiring the possessions of other peoples, the Athenians' only interest has always been to be highly esteemed (εὐδοκιμεῖν) by the whole Greek world (Isoc. 12.188). This is exemplified by Athens' prominent role in all the wars that the Greeks fought against the barbarians (Isoc. 12.189). These include the Attic Amazonomachy, which is listed together with the wars against the Thracian Eumolpus, the Persians led by Darius and – oddly – the Peloponnesians led by Eurystheus (Isoc. 12.193-5).

When relating the causes of the Amazonomachy, Isocrates chooses the abduction version. To preserve the Athenians' reputation in accordance with the purpose of the passage, however, the orator needs to present the episode in a fashion favourable to the Athenians. Isocrates states that the Amazons, together with the Scythians, organised the expedition against Hippolyta (τὴν στρατείαν ἐφ' Ἴππολύτην ἐποιήσαντο). The woman had transgressed the laws of her country (τὴν τοὺς τε νόμους παραβᾶσαν τοὺς παρ' αὐταῖς κειμένους) when out of love (ἐρασθεῖσαν) she followed Theseus and went to live with him in Athens (Isoc. 12.193). The detail of Hippolyta's willingness to follow Theseus may have featured in Attic vase painting, as shown by the already mentioned Munich amphora.⁴⁹⁸ The elopement version was thus an already attested, though probably minor variant of the abduction. This version allowed Isocrates to shift the focus from Theseus' actions to Hippolyta's own choice. Hippolyta is

⁴⁹⁸ A similar version, if we believe Pausanias, was told by Hegias of Troezen. Hegias, a citizen of Theseus' very hometown, stated that Antiope fell in love (ἐρασθεῖσαν) with Theseus, who was besieging Themiscyra together with Heracles, and betrayed her own country (Paus. 1.2.1). The identity of Hegias is far from certain. If he was the same person as the Agias of Troezen mentioned by Proclus as the author of the cyclic *Nostoi* (Procl. *Chr.* 277-303), he could then have influenced Isocrates. The identification, however, is rejected by most scholars: see Fowler (2013), 486. Fowler's objection that the Attic Amazonomachy could not feature in the *Nostoi* because of geographical and chronological reasons is inconclusive, as the episode could have been quoted as an historical example: see Willcock (1964) on the use of historical examples in the Homeric epics. Stronk's Biographical Essay in *BNJ* 606 suggests that Hegias was not a poet, but the Hellenistic author of a Τροϊζηνιακόν.

always the subject of the action, while Theseus passively participates in her initiative. It is Hippolyta who falls in love (ἐρασθεῖσάν) with the Athenian hero; it is she who follows him (συνακολουθήσασαν) out of her land and lives with him (συνουκήσασαν) in Athens; it is she who transgressed the laws of her country (τοὺς νόμους παραβᾶσαν). The Amazon invasion itself is not described as a campaign against Theseus, but as an expedition against Hippolyta (ἐφ' Ἴππολύτην). The orator therefore managed to put the blame for the war on Hippolyta and preserve Athens' reputation for justice as opposed to the Sparta's acquisitiveness.

Isocrates probably relied on the fact that Athenian laws recognised a difference between women who had been victims of rape and those who were guilty of adultery, for only the latter were subjected to punishment.⁴⁹⁹ Moreover, it was not unusual to insist on the woman's consent in order to downplay the man's responsibility. In Herodotus, for example, the Persians blame the Greeks for having reacted with war to Helen's abduction and point out that, if a woman does not want to be carried off, she would not be carried off (Hdt. 1.4.1-2). The Phoenicians similarly object to the Persians' account of the abduction of Io and claim that she left willingly because of the shame of being pregnant out of wedlock (Hdt. 1.5.2). In Euripides' *Trojan Women* Hecuba and the Trojan captives blame Helen for the destruction of their city (Eur. *Tro.* 130-7; 766-73). Hecuba also discusses Helen's guilt in an *agōn* in front of Menelaus. The captive queen denies that Paris had taken Helen by force and states that Helen followed him willingly (Eur. *Tro.* 987-1001). Even Menelaus acknowledges Helen's guilt in leaving with Paris voluntarily, as well as her agency in dishonouring him, and announces his decision to stone her to death as a requital for the sufferings she caused to the Achaeans (Eur. *Tro.* 1036-1041). Menelaus, however, also protests that he had not come to Troy for the sake of a woman but to punish Paris, who had betrayed his hospitality and carried off (ἐλήσατο) his wife (Eur. *Tro.* 864-8). Menelaus might be downplaying the importance of Helen in order not to lose face, but he also makes clear that Helen's consent did not make Paris any less guilty. Not only did Paris disrespect the customs of hospitality, but he also seduced and appropriated a woman who was under the authority of another guardian (*kyrios*), her husband Menelaus. In other words, Paris could be considered guilty of seduction (*moicheia*).⁵⁰⁰

⁴⁹⁹ The laws prescribed that women caught in adultery should not be allowed to adorn themselves and should not be admitted to public sacrifices; if anybody caught them not abiding by these prescriptions, he was allowed to inflict upon them any punishment he wanted with the exception of death and mutilation: cf. Dem. 59.86; Aeschin. 1.183; see Fisher (2001), 336-7; also Carey (1995), 414.

⁵⁰⁰ Cf. Hdt. 2.113-15 with Harris (2006), 310-11. A common scholarly trend assumes that the Athenians considered seduction a worse crime than rape: this view has been refused by Harris (1990) and partly defended by Carey (1995).

Isocrates' account of the Attic Amazonomachy in the *Panathenaicus* is highly malleable.⁵⁰¹ On the one hand, it allows the orator to shift the focus on Hippolyta's transgression of the laws of her country. The episode is phrased in such a way that serves the rhetorical purpose of the passage, namely that the wars fought against the barbarians demonstrate that the Athenians' only interest has always been their good reputation. Isocrates preserves Athens' innocence, to the extent that he can even include the Amazons among the enemies who were punished by the Athenians for their *hybris* (Isoc. 12.196). From this point of view, Isocrates' account is not very distant from the discursive parameters of the state funeral for the war dead. Yet, Isocrates' version does not acquit Theseus completely. The hero's responsibility has only been moved on the background. An Athenian would have probably perceived the episode as a case of *moicheia*.⁵⁰² This would have not been conceivable at the state funeral. The Athenians' support for Theseus despite his status as a seducer would have endangered their image as the champions of justice.

4.9. CONCLUSIONS

The Attic Amazonomachy was an important episode in Athens' remote history. In public rhetoric and art, the Athenians proudly claimed to have defeated the invading horde of the Amazons. Theseus' role in the events, however, was potentially problematic. Attic vase painting shows that the Athenians had been familiar with Theseus' abduction of Antiope at least since the end of the sixth century.⁵⁰³ The abduction version and its variants implied some sort of Athenian responsibility for the outbreak of the war, an issue that needed to be tackled when using the Amazonomachy in Athenian public discourse. This chapter has shown that the discursive parameters of Athenian democratic institutions had a strong impact on how the Athenians conceptualised the causes of the Amazon invasion. Accounts of the episode produced for private contexts, which were not subjected to the same institutional constraints, have provided a useful tool for highlighting the ideological specificity of the accounts produced for the public settings of the democracy.

⁵⁰¹ It is significant that the internal audience of the speech detects a degree of ambiguity in the arguments employed by Isocrates. The orator recalls how one of his pupils argued that the *Panathenaicus*, while overtly criticising the Spartans, covertly praised them instead (Isoc. 12.239-40). Isocrates then states that he neither confirmed or denied his pupil's interpretation (Isoc. 12.265). Scholars also considered the possibility that Isocrates wanted the interpretation of the *Panathenaicus* to be open: see V. J. Gray (1994b) for an outline of the issue.

⁵⁰² One might question, however, whether it is possible to speak of a woman's *kyrios* in a completely female society as that of the Amazons.

⁵⁰³ Cf. Pind. fr. 175 Maehler *apud* Paus. 1.2.1.

At the state funeral for the war dead, the orators could not admit Theseus' involvement in the Attic Amazonomachy. Whether he forcibly abducted Antiope, seduced her or legitimately acquired her through military endeavour, Theseus made the Athenians at least partly responsible for the Amazon invasion. This would have contradicted the idealised image of the city which funeral speeches were expected to produce.⁵⁰⁴ Lysias' *Funeral Oration* accordingly makes no mention of Theseus, Antiope or the abduction. The orator provides a monochromatic account of the Amazons as an imperialistic power moved by excessive *elpis* and desire for *doxa*. Lysias' narrative of the causes of the Amazonomachy participates in his general characterisation of the Amazons as guilty of *hybris*. Not only does this depiction provide a mythical precedent for Athens' struggle against Persian imperialism, but it also opposes the Athenians to their moral counterpart. The Amazons are the embodiment of *hybris* as much as the Athenians are the embodiment of justice: the Amazons are, in other words, the anti-Athenians. The Amazons' excessive desire for *doxa* fulfilled through military conquest contrasts with the Athenians' pursuit of *doxa* through *philanthrōpia*; their indifference to justice with the Athenians' mission as champions of justice; their unjust desire for the lands of other nations with Athenian autochthony. This image was functional to the construction of an imagined community and therefore reflected the discursive parameters of the state funeral.

The Amazons' *hybris* was central to Lysias' narrative of the Amazonomachy, but was by no means a fixed element of the myth. Aeschylus, for example, alluded to the Amazon invasion in the *Eumenides* but did not characterise the invaders as hubristic. In the context of the dramatic festivals, the playwright offered a brief and ambiguous account of the causes of the war. Athena's reference to the Amazons' *phthonos* against Theseus as the reason for their attack could be interpreted as an allusion to their rightful indignation for the abduction of Antiope. The goddess' vague phrasing, however, may as well have referred to the Amazons' envy for Theseus' power and good fortune, a reading compatible with the ideal image of Athens produced at the state funeral. Aeschylus may have been deliberately vague, allowing the audience to choose either version. In accordance with the discursive parameters of the dramatic festivals, the playwright's allusion to the Amazonomachy appealed to those Athenians who were not enthusiastic about the city's official rhetoric, and at the same time reaffirmed that same rhetoric and the beliefs of the majority of the audience.

⁵⁰⁴ The surviving funeral speeches, when dealing with the Amazonomachy, never mention Theseus and do not usually provide many details on the war: cf. Dem. 60.8; Pl. *Menex.* 239b. The same is true, however, also of the other mythical exploits, which are usually recalled in a very vague and generic manner. On Theseus' absence from the *epitaphios logos*, see pp. 89-90 above, *pace* Loraux (1981), 65-6.

The abduction of Antiope featured, both implicitly and explicitly, in several texts produced for private contexts, which did not reflect the discursive parameters of Athenian democratic institutions. Isocrates' vague mention of the Amazons' accusations (ἐγκλήματα) against the Athenians in the *Panegyricus* may have triggered the memory of the abduction in his readers. At the same time, the orator's insistence on the Amazons' imperialism as the true reason of the invasion assimilates these accusations to mere pretexts. Thematically, the speech resembles both epideictic and deliberative rhetoric, but does not obey the discursive parameters of the state funeral nor those of the Assembly. Isocrates does not challenge explicitly the epitaphic image of the Athenians as punishers of *hybris*, but does not emphasise it either. He uses the past to support his proposal of a Panhellenic campaign against Persia, but does not insist on (and at times questions) the deliberative principle of advantage (*to sympheron*). Isocrates' presentation of the Attic Amazonomachy is functional to his rhetorical needs. According to the orator, the Amazons had to fabricate accusations against the Athenians in order to attack Athens (and Athens alone) and conquer the whole of Greece. Isocrates therefore emphasises Athens' power and primacy among the Greeks, and reinforces his claim for Athenian leadership in the expedition against the Persians.

Unlike in public settings, Theseus' abduction of Antiope (and its variants) could be mentioned explicitly among the causes of the Attic Amazonomachy in private contexts. Philochorus made Antiope a war prize (γέρας) which Theseus won when he took part in Heracles' expedition against the Amazons. According to Pherecydes, if we believe Plutarch, Theseus obtained Antiope as a spear-captive (αἰχμάλωτος) during his independent expedition to the Euxine Sea. Both versions portray Antiope as Theseus' legitimate acquisition. In doing so, they implicitly question the legitimacy of the Amazons' invasion of Attica, but they also make Theseus the original aggressor. If we believe Pindar's scholiast, on the other hand, Pherecydes had Theseus and his charioteer Phorbas abduct (ἀρπάζει) Antiope. This version, as the one commonly depicted in Attic vase painting, implicitly justifies the Amazons' violent reaction and acknowledges the responsibility, if not of the Athenians, at least of their mythical king. Isocrates' *Panathenaicus* states that Hippolyta fell in love (ἐρασθεῖσαν) with Theseus and followed him to Athens willingly. Hippolyta transgressed the laws of her country, and the Amazons reacted with a military expedition against her (ἐφ' Ἴππολύτην). By focusing on Hippolyta's misconduct, the orator preserves Athens' good reputation, but at the same time keeps Theseus' act of *moicheia* in the background. All these versions can act as a foil to the discursive parameters of the state funeral for the war dead. The γέρας/αἰχμάλωτος version portrayed Theseus as the original aggressor of the Amazons and contrasted the idealised image of Athenian foreign policy produced in funeral speeches. The abduction version risked

portraying the Athenians as participating in their king's *hybris*. Finally, Isocrates' elopement version explicitly accused the Amazons of *hybris*, but the Athenians' support to Theseus despite his status as a seducer would have endangered their epitaphic image as the champions of justice.

CHAPTER 5

Exclusiveness and *eugeneia* in the myth of autochthony

Among all Athenian civic myths, autochthony is probably the most representative of Athenian identity. By claiming to be indigenous inhabitants of Attica, born from the very soil of their own land, the Athenians could reinforce their identity and civic cohesion, and at the same time mark their difference from and superiority over the rest of the Greeks.⁵⁰⁵ It has been traditionally assumed that the Athenians developed this view at an early stage, when they pictured themselves collectively as indigenous and born from the earth. A fruitful scholarly trend inaugurated by Vincent Rosivach has convincingly shown that this was not in fact the case. The complete notion of autochthony only came about around the middle of the fifth century from the combination of two separate traditions: the early myth of Erechtheus/Erichthonius' birth from the earth and the Athenians' belief that they had inhabited Attica from time immemorial.⁵⁰⁶

The earliest mention of the earthborn Erechtheus is in the 'Catalogue of Ships' in the *Iliad*. There, the poet defines Athens as 'the land of great-hearted Erechtheus' (δῆμον Ἐρεχθῆος μεγάλητορος), and recalls how Erechtheus had been engendered by the earth (τέκε δὲ ζεῖδωρος ἄρουρα) and entrusted to the care of Athena. The goddess then placed him in her sanctuary, where the Athenians honoured him with yearly sacrifices (Hom. *Il.* 2.546-51).⁵⁰⁷ A further Homeric reference to Erechtheus can be found in Book 7 of the *Odyssey*, where Athena leaves Scheria for Marathon and Athens and enters the palace of Erechtheus (Hom. *Od.* 7.77-81). The Homeric epics therefore clearly establish a special connection between the earthborn Erechtheus and the goddess Athena. The designation of Athens as the land of Erechtheus,

⁵⁰⁵ According to Gotteland (2001), 319, autochthony has two distinct functions: it legitimises Athens' power and affirms her supremacy over other cities.

⁵⁰⁶ See Rosivach (1987); Bearzot (2007), 9; Blok (2009); Leão (2012). Among the proponents of the traditional view, see e.g. Loraux (1979); Parker (1987), 194-5. I am not fully convinced by Shapiro (1998), who accepts most of Rosivach's argument but dates the full notion of autochthony to the period of the Persian Wars. The question of whether Erechtheus and Erichthonius were regarded as two distinct individuals does not affect my argument: on the topic see Kron (1976), 37-9, Parker (1987), 200-1, Shear (2001), 55-60 and Fowler (2013), 449. I will use the name 'Erechtheus' to refer to the adult earthborn king of Athens and 'Erichthonius' to refer to the earthborn baby.

⁵⁰⁷ Cf. also Hdt. 8.55.1, where the historian mentions the shrine of Erechtheus, called the earthborn (τοῦ γηγενέος λεγομένου), on the Acropolis.

however, does not necessarily imply the Athenians' direct descent from the hero or their participation in his earthborn quality, as much as the importance of Erechtheus in Athenian cult from an early date.⁵⁰⁸

Scenes depicting Erichthonius' birth start to appear on Attic vase painting in the early fifth century. The theme soon becomes very popular and tends to follow a fixed pattern, with Gaia arising from the earth and handing the baby Erichthonius to Athena, usually in the presence of significant others such as the other famous earthborn king Cecrops or Erichthonius' putative father Hephaestus.⁵⁰⁹ Fifth-century vases usually characterise the birth of Erichthonius as an Olympian event by depicting Zeus and other deities attending the handing over of the child,⁵¹⁰ or highlight the myth's cultic implication by showing the Cecropids taking part in the action.⁵¹¹ The only case where the myth seems to have a political meaning is a red-figure cup by the Codros Painter now in Berlin (ca 440/30 BC). There, the 'handing over' scene takes place at the presence not only of the Cecropids, who play an important part in the myth of Erichthonius, but also of the Athenian kings Cecrops, Erechtheus – apparently distinct from Erichthonius in this depiction – and Aegeus.⁵¹² This chronologically odd parade of Athenian kings might be a sign of the growing importance of the earthborn Erichthonius for the Athenian community during the second half of the fifth century.⁵¹³

Pindar is the first to refer to the Athenians as Erechthidae. In the *Seventh Pythian* the poet refers to the Alcmaeonidae as citizens of Erechtheus (Ἐρεχθέος ἀστῶν) and praises them for building the temple of Apollo in Delphi (Pind. *Pyth.* 7.9-12). In the *Second Isthmian* Pindar recalls Xenocrates' victory at the Panathenaea, 'when he gained the glorious favor of Erechtheus' descendants (Ἐρεχθειδῶν) in shining Athens' (Pind. *Isthm.* 2.19-20; transl. Race).

⁵⁰⁸ Rosivach (1987), 294-5. The iliadic reference to Erechtheus belongs to a problematic section of the Homeric text. Lines 553-5 were athetised by Zenodotus (schol. A *ad* Hom. *Il.* 553-5), probably because of the unusual attention devoted to Menestheus: see Kirk (1985), 207. Suspicions of inauthenticity were raised in antiquity also on the Salaminian entry (Hom. *Il.* 557-8) which follows the Athenian entry in the 'Catalogue of Ships' and places the Salaminian contingent right next to the Athenian one. In the sixth century, the lines were at the centre of a controversy between the Athenians and the Megarians over the possession of Salamis. The Megarians accused the Athenians of having interpolated the passage and proposed an alternative reading that connected the Salaminian contingent with Megara (Arist. *Rh.* 1375b30; Strabo 9.1.10): see Kirk (1985), 207-9. No ancient authority expressed doubts about the lines dealing with Erechtheus (Hom. *Il.* 546-51), but their authenticity has been questioned in modern times, in particular by Wilamowitz: see Kron (1976), 32-7 for a review of the issue. However, even if one takes the Athenian entry in the 'Catalogue of Ships' to be a later Athenian interpolation, the passage suggests that the Athenian cult of Erechtheus went back at least to the sixth century.

⁵⁰⁹ See Kron in *LIMC* s.v. Erechtheus, p. 943; Shapiro (1998), 133-9.

⁵¹⁰ Cf. e.g. a red-figure hydria by the Oeanthe Painter dating from ca 470/60 BC (London, British Museum, E 182), or a red-figure stamnos from Vulci dating from ca 460/50 BC (Munich, Antikensammlungen, 2413). See Kron in *LIMC* s.v. Erechtheus, p. 943; Shapiro (1998), 138-9.

⁵¹¹ Cf. e.g. a fragmentary red-figure pelike dating from ca 470/60 BC (Leipzig, Antikemuseum, T 654). See Kron in *LIMC* s.v. Erechtheus, pp. 943-4.

⁵¹² Berlin, Antikemuseum, F 2537.

⁵¹³ See Kron in *LIMC* s.v. Erechtheus, p. 943.

The patronymic implies a descent that is symbolic rather than literal;⁵¹⁴ yet it probably contributed to extending the chthonic origin of Erechtheus to the Athenians as a whole.⁵¹⁵ The Athenians are explicitly called earthborn for the first time in Sophocles' *Ajax*. In the play Tecmessa addresses the Chorus of Salaminian sailors as 'members of the race descended from the earthborn Erechthidae (γενεᾶς χθονίων ἀπ' Ἐρεχθειδῶν)' (Soph. *Aj.* 202, transl. Finglass). As Rosivach rightly noted, however, the phrasing is probably the result of a hypallage and the patronymic Erechthidae is to be taken as a poetic usage, rather than a common way to address the Athenians.⁵¹⁶

As for the word αὐτόχθων, Rosivach has pointed out that its etymological structure has nothing to do with the idea of birth from the earth. Rosivach suggested that its original meaning was rather 'always living in the same land, indigenous', as opposed to 'immigrant' (ἔπιλυς).⁵¹⁷ In this sense, autochthony was not a uniquely Athenian attribute but a common claim made by several Greek communities.⁵¹⁸ The word αὐτόχθων is first attested with the meaning of 'indigenous' in Herodotus.⁵¹⁹ The historian uses the term when discussing the indigenous nature of the Carians and the Caunians (Hdt. 1.171-2), or when pointing to Arcadians and Cynurians as the only indigenous nations of the Peloponnese (Hdt. 8.73.1).⁵²⁰ Similarly, Thucydides only uses the word αὐτόχθων once and with the meaning of 'indigenous', when he rejects the Sicani's claim that they had been the first settlers of Sicily (Thuc. 6.2.2).⁵²¹

The tradition of the Athenians' long-standing habitation of Attica probably emerged in the late 470s in connection with Athens' growing rivalry with the Dorian Spartans and can be seen as a reaction to the latter's immigrant origins and their claims of descending from the Heraclidae.⁵²² The earliest occurrences of this belief are in Herodotus. The historian does not

⁵¹⁴ See Blok (2009), 260.

⁵¹⁵ See Rosivach (1987), 295

⁵¹⁶ See Rosivach (1987), 295-6.

⁵¹⁷ See Rosivach (1987), 297-301.

⁵¹⁸ See Bearzot (2007), 13-19; Blok (2009), 251-2.

⁵¹⁹ The word is first attested (in the unusual form αὐτόχθονος) in Aeschylus' *Agamemnon*, but it has a different meaning. The passage refers to Paris, who as a punishment for his abduction of Helen 'has both lost his booty and caused his father's house to be mown down to the very ground in utter destruction (πανώλεθρον αὐτόχθονον πατρῶον ἔθρισεν δόμον)' (Aesch. *Ag.* 535-6; transl. Sommerstein): see Blok (2009), 253; Pelling (2009), 473-4.

⁵²⁰ See Pelling (2009), 479-80. The Arcadians, together with the Aeginetans and the Thebans, figured as autochthonous also in Hellanicus. It is not clear, however, in what sense Hellanicus interpreted the word αὐτόχθονες (*FGrHist* 4 F 161 = Harp. s.v. αὐτόχθονες).

⁵²¹ See Pelling (2009), 478-9.

⁵²² See Rosivach (1987), 296-7.

use the word *αὐτόχθων* explicitly,⁵²³ but he recalls the Athenians' Pelasgian origins as opposed to the Hellenic and immigrant nature of the Dorians, and stresses that the Pelasgians had never migrated (*ἐξεχώρησε*) anywhere (Hdt. 1.56.2).⁵²⁴ In Book 7, an Athenian envoy replies to Gelon's demand of commanding the united Greek fleet by stressing that the Athenians were the most ancient nation (*ἀρχαιότατον μὲν ἔθνος*) and the only Greeks who had never migrated (*μοῦνοι δὲ ἐόντες οὐ μετανάσται Ἑλλήνων*) (Hdt. 7.161.3).⁵²⁵ Thucydides also touches on the indigenous nature of the Athenians without using the word *αὐτόχθων*. In Pericles' funeral oration, the ancestors are praised because they have always inhabited Attica (*τὴν γὰρ χώραν οἱ αὐτοὶ αἰεὶ οἰκοῦντες*) and transmitted it free until the present day (Thuc. 2.36.1). When dealing with the primitive conditions of Greek cities in the 'Archaeology', Thucydides attributes the relative growth of Athens to autochthony. According to the historian, because of the poverty of its soil Attica had always been inhabited by the same people (*ἄνθρωποι ὄκουν οἱ αὐτοὶ αἰεὶ*). As a result, Athens became a safe haven for powerful men escaping from other Greek cities, which were subjected to *staseis* and invasions because of the fertility of their lands (Thuc. 1.2.5-6).⁵²⁶

The fact that Thucydides offers a politico-economic explanation for the indigenous nature of the Athenians may be a sign that autochthony was already a well-established component of Athenian identity at the time the historian was writing. It was probably in connection with Pericles' citizenship law in 451/0 BC that the Athenians blended the tradition of their continuous habitation of Attica with the myth of the earthborn Erechtheus/Erichthonius and adopted the complete notion of autochthony.⁵²⁷ The mutual implications of the ideology of autochthony and Pericles' citizenship law are central for example in Euripides' *Ion*. In the play, the autochthony of the Athenians (Eur. *Ion* 15-20, 267-74, 542, 999-1000, 1465-7) and the earthborn nature of their royal line (Eur. *Ion* 29-30, 589-90, 673-5) are constantly recalled and act as a foil to Ion's difficult process of integration.⁵²⁸ In Euripides' *Erechtheus*, now preserved in fragmentary form, the autochthonous origins of the Athenians (*αὐτόχθονες δ'*

⁵²³ But cf. Hdt. 9.73.2, where the historian recalls how, when Helen had been abducted by Theseus and the Dioscuri invaded Attica to recover her, the autochthonous Titacus (*Τιτακὸς ἐὼν αὐτόχθων*) betrayed the deme of Aphidnae to them.

⁵²⁴ See Pelling (2009), 480-1.

⁵²⁵ Cf. Isoc. 4.23-4, who similarly claims that Athens was the oldest (*ἀρχαιότατην*) city in Greece and praises the Athenians' continued possession of Attica.

⁵²⁶ See Pelling (2009), 476; also Hornblower (1991), 12-13. The passage expresses the Athenian claim of autochthony and at the same time acknowledges the naturalisation (*πολιταὶ γιγνόμενοι*) of the refugees, anticipating the somewhat contradictory tendency of funeral speeches to praise the Athenians for both their autochthony and nobility of birth and their welcoming attitude towards suppliants (e.g. the Heraclidae).

⁵²⁷ See Rosivach (1987), 303 n. 34; Bearzot (2007), 12-13; Blok (2009), 261-3; Leão (2012), 137-41.

⁵²⁸ These mutual implications are analysed at length by Leão (2012).

ἔφουμεν) are recalled by Praxithea, wife of Erechtheus, as a reason for her willingness to sacrifice her own daughter for her land (πρὸ γαίας) (Eur. F. 360). The manner of Erechtheus' death, sunk down the earth by Poseidon (κατὰ χθονὸς κρύψας Ἐρεχθέα), is also a possible allusion to the king's chthonic connotations (Eur. F. 370).⁵²⁹ Praxithea's speech is quoted in Lycurgus' *Against Leocrates*. The Euripidean passage reinforces the charge of treason against Leocrates, depicted as lacking the devotion to his country and the spirit of sacrifice expected from an autochthonous Athenian (Lycurg. 1.98-101). The orator also laments the condition of the city after Chaeronea, when the Athenians, once proud of their autochthony, proposed to extend citizen rights to foreigners (Lycurg. 1.41).⁵³⁰ Autochthony features prominently in the extant fourth-century funeral speeches, where it is central in the construction of an idealised image of the city (Lys. 2.17; Dem. 60.4; Pl. *Menex.* 237b1-c6, 237e, 238e5-239a7, 245c6-d6; Hyp. 6.7). The discourse of autochthony developed in this context is based on the notion of nobility of birth (*eugeneia*) and on the metaphor of the Athenian community as a family born from their motherland.⁵³¹ Such images can be adapted to different uses outside the formal institutions of the state. Isocrates, for example, exploits the discourse of autochthony to claim Athenian leadership for the Pan-Hellenic campaign against Persia he endorses in the *Panegyricus*. The orator recalls the noble origins (καλῶς καὶ γνησίως γεγόναμεν) of the Athenians, who are autochthonous (ἀυτόχθονες ὄντες) and have always lived in the land from which they were born (ἐξ ἧσπερ ἔφουμεν) (Isoc. 4.23-5). Isocrates' *Panathenaicus* praises the Athenians by alluding to their autochthony. The motif is developed in terms very similar to those used in the *Panegyricus*, but the orator adds the detail of the Athenians' descent from Hephaestus through Erichthonius. The earthborn is even mentioned explicitly and extolled for having inherited Cecrops' possessions and handed them over to his descendants down to Theseus (Isoc. 12.124-6).

5.1. AUTOCHTHONY AND *EUGENEIA*

The conflation of the double tradition of the earthborn kings and the indigenous Athenians into the complete notion of autochthony implied a potential disruption of the unity of the Athenian citizen body. Were the mythical kings of Attica more autochthonous than the rest of the Athenians? Did the inclusion of immigrants into the citizen body in ancient times,

⁵²⁹ See Blok (2009), 261-2; Calame (2011).

⁵³⁰ See Azoulay (2009), 171-3.

⁵³¹ See discussion below, at pp. 163-70.

acknowledged for example by Thucydides,⁵³² imply the existence of different degrees of autochthony among the Athenian citizenry?⁵³³ The complex history and extreme malleability of the notion of autochthony enabled political actors to focus on and develop different aspects of this myth, as they crafted their narratives in accordance with the specific discursive parameters of different institutional settings of Athenian democracy.

At the state funeral, orators prevented any contradictions from arising by devoting themselves entirely to the complete notion of autochthony and avoiding any mention of the earthborn kings.⁵³⁴ Funeral speeches usually insist on the collective nobility of birth (*eugeneia*) of the Athenians. According to Demosthenes, the Athenians' *eugeneia* has its roots in their autochthony. Their birth can be traced back not only to their fathers but also collectively (κοινῆ) to their entire land. The orator then claims that only the Athenians, who live in the same land from which they were born (ἐξ ἧσπερ ἔφυσαν), can be called legitimate citizens (γενεσίους ... πολίτας) of their *polis*. On the other hand, those who migrated into their cities can only be compared to adopted (εἰσποιητοῖς) children (Dem. 60.4).⁵³⁵ Hyperides similarly states that it is useless to trace the Athenians' individual (ἰδίᾳ) genealogy, because their common origin (ἡ κοινὴ γένεσις) due to their autochthony (αὐτόχθοσιν οὖσιν) grants them all unsurpassed *eugeneia* (Hyp. 6.7). In Plato's *Menexenus* the autochthonous origins of the Athenians are again recalled as the reason of their *eugeneia*, and Socrates stresses that their ancestors had been reared by their mother-land (τρεφομένους ... ὑπὸ μητρὸς τῆς χώρας) (Pl. *Menex.* 237b1-c6).⁵³⁶ Socrates also evokes autochthony in order to explain the superiority of the Athenian constitution, which depends on the citizens' equality of birth (ἡ ἐξ ἴσου γένεσις). The Athenians are all brothers born of one single mother (μιας μητρὸς πάντες ἀδελφοὶ φύντες), and this natural condition translates into the legal condition of *isonomia* (Pl. *Menex.* 238e5-239a7).⁵³⁷

⁵³² Cf. Thuc. 1.2.6: the most powerful people from the rest of Greece arrived in Athens to escape from war and *stasis* and, becoming citizens (πολίται γινόμενοι), made the population of the city even larger. See Hornblower (1991), 14-15.

⁵³³ Similar issues are raised by Blok (2009), 263-4 and Azoulay (2009), 171-2.

⁵³⁴ As Gotteland (2001), 325-6 observes, orators generally prefer the collective autochthony of the Athenians over the myth of Erichthonius. Gotteland rightly points out that Isoc. 12.126 is the only passage in the orators evoking Erichthonius (320-1), but she does not note that the *Panathenaicus*, although exploiting a similar set of motifs, does not belong to the same institutional setting of the *epitaphios logos* and does not respond to its same discursive parameters. See also Loraux (1993) [1984], 49.

⁵³⁵ Demosthenes recalls how the fruits of the earth had first appeared in Attica as a proof for the belief that the ancestors were born from their very land (μητέρα τὴν χώραν εἶναι τῶν ἡμετέρων προγόνων) (Dem. 60.5).

⁵³⁶ Socrates envisions the ancestors as literally born from the earth. He states that the proof that the earth has generated the Athenians lies in the fact that the Attic land was the first to produce food for humans (Pl. *Menex.* 237e).

⁵³⁷ Cf. also Pl. *Menex.* 245c6-d6: the Athenians, being pure Greeks, are naturally haters of barbarians.

In Lysias' *Funeral Oration*, set in the aftermath of the democratic restoration, the theme of *eugeneia* coexists with that of concord (*homonoia*), which takes first place in the treatment of autochthony. The orator makes no mention of Erichthonius or any of the Athenian earthborn kings; he clearly takes autochthony as a communal attribute of the ancestors and the entire Athenian community. Lysias recalls autochthony as the reason of the ancestors' *philanthrōpia*,⁵³⁸ stating that their life had been just since the beginning. Unlike most nations, the Athenians had not conquered their land by driving other people out, but were autochthonous (αὐτόχθονες) and had the same mother and fatherland (τὴν αὐτὴν ἐκέκτηντο μητέρα καὶ πατρίδα). Adopting one single resolve (μᾶ ἡ γνώμη χρωμένοις), the ancestors always had the habit to fight for justice (Lys. 2.17). Lysias thus uses autochthony as aetiology of the *homonoia* that characterises the Athenians throughout the whole speech and makes them always ready to fight for justice.⁵³⁹

Despite Lysias' innovative account, which is evidence of the dynamic nature of Athenian ideological practice, all funeral speeches show a similar approach to the myth of autochthony and reflect the same discursive parameters. At the state funeral for the war dead, the orators produced a shared image of the city and its past in order to create an "imagined community" for the Athenians and justify the sacrifice of their relatives for the common good. In this institutional setting autochthony was the glue that held the entire Athenian community together and made it unique, superior to the rest of humanity, and worth dying for.⁵⁴⁰ Not only do all the surviving funeral speeches ignore the earthborn kings of Athens,⁵⁴¹ but they also share the same language and a common set of images. These speeches all express autochthony through the opposition of individual versus collective, the metaphor of the community as a family and the language of legitimate birth. In doing so, they provide an ideal picture of the Athenians as politically cohesive and equal in their communal claim for nobility of birth.

The motifs employed in funeral speeches to describe Athenian autochthony are reversed in Euripides' *Ion*. This was possible thanks to the discursive parameters of the

⁵³⁸ On the connection between autochthony and *philanthrōpia* see p. 109 above.

⁵³⁹ Cf. Lys. 2.18, 20, 24, 43, 63; see Todd (2007), 229, who connects Lysias' insistence on *homonoia* throughout this speech with the amnesty that followed the restoration of democracy in 403 BC.

⁵⁴⁰ On autochthony and unity, see Bearzot (2007), 9-10 and Forsdyke (2012), 136-7. The only exception is Thucydides' Pericles, who does not elaborate on the theme of autochthony and simply points out that the ancestors 'dwelt in the country without break in the succession from generation to generation, and handed it down free to the present time by their valor' (Thuc. 2.36.1, transl. Dent).

⁵⁴¹ An allusion to Erichtheus can be found in Demosthenes' *Funeral Speech*, but it does not belong to the section about Athenian autochthony. Demosthenes recalls Erichtheus' divine origins (τὸν μὲν ἄπ' ἀθανάτων πεφυκότα) when praising the tribe of the Erechthidae (Dem. 60.27). The orator does not mention Erichtheus' earthborn nature but focuses on the king's sacrifice of his own daughters for the salvation of Athens. Given the context of the allusion, the orator points not so much to Erichtheus the king of the autochthonous Athenians, as to Erichtheus the tribal hero: on the cult of Erichtheus as tribal hero see Kron (1976), 52-55.

dramatic festivals, where tragedians had the opportunity to put the ideal image of the city under discussion. In the play, the potential ambiguities inherent in the myth of autochthony are acknowledged and enacted on the stage, only to be resolved by the intervention of Athena. The earthborn nature of the kings of Attica and the collective autochthony of the Athenians apparently coexist without any issues,⁵⁴² but they allow the poet to highlight the potential dangers and excesses of the ideology of autochthony. Euripides treats *eugeneia* as an individual feature, which he constantly attributes to Creusa and her family but never to the Athenians as a whole. The image of the Athenian community as a family disappears, absorbed in the private drama of the Erechthid house. Legitimacy of birth, used only metaphorically in the extant funeral speeches, becomes a concrete problem for Ion, the bastard and foreigner who is about to move to Athens as Xuthus' son and heir.

On the opposite end of the ideological spectrum from the *epitaphios logos* stands Apollodorus' brief allusion to autochthony in the pseudo-Demosthenic *Against Neaera*. According to the orator, in ancient times, when Athens was still a monarchy, the kingship belonged to those who were each time superior because of their autochthony (ἡ βασιλεία τῶν ἀεὶ ὑπερέχόντων διὰ τὸ αὐτόχθονας εἶναι) ([Dem.] 59.74). Apollodorus resolves the potential contradiction implied in the complete notion of autochthony by attributing the prestigious status of autochthonous exclusively to the Athenian royal line. This is consistent with the discursive parameters of the lawcourts, which implied a focus on justice and the laws. Free from the task of creating an "imagined community", the orator develops an aspect of autochthony that would be completely inappropriate in a funeral speech but fits his case perfectly. Apollodorus wants to prove that the non-Athenian Neaera has broken the laws by passing her daughter Phano as an Athenian citizen and marrying her to the King Archon. To further his accusations, the orator suggests that Phano was not worthy of performing the ritual tasks of the wife of the King Archon as they were once the prerogative of Athens' autochthonous kings, and he crafts his mythical allusion accordingly so as to make autochthony appear even more exclusive.

5.2. *EUGENEIA*: FROM HOMERIC SOCIETY TO DEMOCRATIC ATHENS

Good birth was highly valued by the Greeks. The earliest examples come from Homeric society. As already noted by Calhoun, the semantic range of *eugeneia*, including synonyms

⁵⁴² For the earthborn nature of the Athenian royal house, cf. Eur. *Ion* 267-74, 999-1000, 1463-7; the concept of birth from the earth is challenged by Xuthus at Eur. *Ion* 542. For the autochthony of the Athenians as a whole, cf. Eur. *Ion* 589-90, 673-5, 735-7.

such as γενναῖος, εὐπατρίδης or γεννητής, is mostly absent from the Homeric poems.⁵⁴³ This does not mean that the poems did not place importance on ancestry and descent, which were among the qualities that heroes were expected to possess. The term διογενής (‘sprung from Zeus, divine’), for example, occurs twenty-three times in the *Iliad* and twenty-three in the *Odyssey*, and it is used to praise some of the greatest heroes of the epics, including Achilles, Odysseus and Ajax.⁵⁴⁴ Homeric heroes often inquire about each other’s ancestry, which sometimes stems from a divine figure.⁵⁴⁵ Glaucus proudly traces his lineage (γενεήν) back to Sisiphus and ultimately Aeolus, and recalls the deeds of his grandfather, the hero Bellerophon, noble offspring of a god (θεοῦ γόνον ἦϋν) (Hom. *Il.* 6.145-211).⁵⁴⁶ Nestor recalls how Peleus once rejoiced in asking him about the ancestry and offspring (γενεήν τε τόκον τε) of all the Argives (Hom. *Il.* 7.123-8).⁵⁴⁷ Diomedes balances his young age with his descent from a valiant father (Hom. *Il.* 14.112-4).

A richer vocabulary of *eugeneia* developed during the archaic period. The term εὐγενής appears for the first time in the Homeric *Hymn to Aphrodite* to describe the goddess Themis (Hom. *Hymn Ven.* 94). The synonym γενναῖος is first attested with the meaning of ‘highborn’ in a one-line fragment of Archilochus (Archil. fr. 225 West).⁵⁴⁸ The adjective εὐπατρίδης occurs for the first time in a late archaic Attic *scholion* where the exiles who died in Leipsydrion fighting against Pisistratus are celebrated as brave in battle and born from noble fathers (μάχεσθαι ἀγαθούς τε καὶ εὐπατρίδας) (PMG 907).⁵⁴⁹ The wealth of synonyms to express good birth goes alongside the importance of *eugeneia* in the political struggle, where appealing to the poor origins of one’s opponents constituted a powerful argument.⁵⁵⁰ Alceus, for example, complains that Mytilene is now ruled by the baseborn (κακοπατρίδαν) Pittacus (Alc. fr. 348 Voigt). Herodotus recalls the opposition faced by Maeandrius when he succeeded to Polycrates as tyrant of Samos. Instead of ruling over his equals, Maeandrius decided to grant them freedom and *isonomia*, but one of the Samians protested that, because of his low birth

⁵⁴³ Calhoun (1934). A notable exception is the noun εὐπατέρεια, which appears three times (Hom. *Il.* 6.292; *Od.* 11.235; 22.227).

⁵⁴⁴ Duplouy (2006), 40-1.

⁵⁴⁵ On the vocabulary of good birth in the Homeric poems, see Duplouy (2006), 38-43.

⁵⁴⁶ See Donlan (1999) [1980], 15; Mann (2007), 124. According to Kirk (1990), 185, there is no need to interpret Hom. *Il.* 6.191 as a reference to the variant that made Poseidon the father of Bellerophon.

⁵⁴⁷ See Fowler (1998), 1.

⁵⁴⁸ That Archilochus used γενναῖος as a synonym of εὐγενής is attested by Athenaeus, who preserves the fragment (Ath. 14.653d). The adjective γενναῖος first appears in Hom. *Il.* 5.253, but not with the meaning of ‘high-born’. In the passage, Diomedes states that it is not true to his birth (γενναῖον) to run away in battle or cower down.

⁵⁴⁹ The context of the song is provided at [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 19.3. Whether an aristocratic class known as Eupatrids existed and monopolised political and religious offices in pre-Solonian Athens is a matter of contention: for an outline of the issue see Pierrot (2015), with bibliography.

⁵⁵⁰ See van Veas (2000); Duplouy (2006), 43-8; Mann (2007), 125.

(γεγονώς τε κακῶς), Maeandrius was not worthy to rule in the first place (Hdt. 3.142).⁵⁵¹ Theognis, troubled by the social mobility in Megara due to acquisition of wealth, complains that wealth has corrupted race (πλοῦτος ἔμειξε γένος). According to the poet, people seek for purebred (εὐγενέας) horses but do not follow the same criterion when they seek marriage. The noble man (ἔσθλος ἀνὴρ) now wants the daughter of the lowborn man (κακοῦ) in exchange for a rich dowry, and women choose the wealthy over the noble (ἀγαθοῦ) man (Thgn. 183-92).⁵⁵²

The concept of noble birth, however, was not uncontroversial, and in the archaic period one can already observe tendencies later attested in democratic Athens. In Theognis, for example, the notions of good birth and nobility start to assume a moral value alongside their class value. The poet expresses doubt about the possibility to acquire nobility through education. He states that ‘if good sense could be made and placed in a man, there would never be a base son of a noble father (ἐξ ἀγαθοῦ πατρὸς ἔγεντο κακός), since he would heed words of wisdom. But you will never make the base man noble (οὔποτε ποιήσει τὸν κακὸν ἄνδρ’ ἀγαθόν) through teaching’ (Thgn. 429-38, transl. Gerber).⁵⁵³ Moreover, the ideal of good birth was sometimes contested. Callinus, inviting the young to fight for their land, wives and children, remarks that nobody can escape death, not even if he descends from immortal ancestors (προγόνων ἢ γένος ἀθανάτων) (Callinus fr. 1.12-13 West). Phocylides similarly asks ‘what advantage is noble birth (γένος εὐγενές) to those who have nothing attractive in what they say or plan?’ (Phocylides fr. 3 West, transl. Gerber).⁵⁵⁴

If nobility of birth was already at least partly problematic in the archaic period, the situation was more complex in classical Athens, where democracy had the potential to threaten the notion of *eugeneia*. Aristocratic families still traced their origins back to heroic or divine ancestors. Pherecydes, for example, reports the full genealogy of the Philaid family, which stemmed from Ajax’s son Philaeus (*FGrHist* 3 F 2).⁵⁵⁵ The importance of ancestry was also evident in court, where litigants sometime mentioned the liturgies performed by their ancestors as well as their military achievements at the service of democracy.⁵⁵⁶ In this context, speakers could highlight their loyalty to the democracy in connection to and despite their *eugeneia*. In Isocrates’ *On the team of horses*, the speaker Alcibiades the Younger states that his father

⁵⁵¹ See Donlan (1999) [1980], 132-3.

⁵⁵² See van Wees (2000), 61-3; Mann (2007), 125-6.

⁵⁵³ Donlan (1999) [1980], 77-80; van Wees (2000), 64-6.

⁵⁵⁴ Duploux (2006), 44-6.

⁵⁵⁵ See Thomas (1989), 159; Duploux (2006), 56-64.

⁵⁵⁶ See Thomas (1989), 108-23; Mann (2007), 138. Such appeals have sometimes been interpreted as implying a request to reciprocate public service with a positive verdict (see e.g. Millet 1998), but Harris (2013b), 129-36 has shown that Athenian litigants tended to refer to public service only if it was directly relevant to the charge and mostly during the *timēsis* part of the trial.

belonged to the Eupatrids on the male side, which testifies to his nobility of birth (εὐγένειαν), and on the female side to the Alcmeonids, who proved their devotion to democracy when they refused to share into the tyranny of Pisistratus (Isoc. 16.25). The speaker of Lysias' *Against the Subversion of the Ancestral Constitution of Athens* mentions his good birth when arguing against Phormisius' proposal to restrict citizenship only to landowners. Even though his wealth and birth (γένει) would prevent him being disenfranchised and would even make him superior (πρότερος ὄν) to his opponents, the speaker believes that the safety of the city is only possible if all Athenians participate in their citizenship rights (Lys. 34.3).⁵⁵⁷

The examples mentioned show that nobility of birth was not necessarily incompatible with democracy, and members of the elite could claim to be both *eugeneis* and good citizens. Drama, however, shows that some ideological tensions did exist. As in the archaic period, the ideal of good birth was open to debate, and moral and class connotations often remained intertwined in the notion of *eugeneia*. In Sophocles' *Ajax*, Menelaus tells Teucer that it is typical of a base man (κακοῦ ἀνδρός) to refuse to obey those who are in power (Soph. *Aj.* 1069-72). Teucer replies that it is not surprising that people of insignificant birth commit some wrongs, when those who are considered wellborn (οἱ δοκοῦντες εὐγενεῖς πεφυκέναι) speak as wrongly as Menelaus (Soph. *Aj.* 1093-6).⁵⁵⁸ In a fragment of Euripides' *Alexander*, the Chorus states that it is superfluous to praise human nobility of birth (εὐγένειαν ... βρότειον), as the wellborn and the lowborn are one single offspring (μία δὲ γονὰ τό τ' εὐγενὲς καὶ δυσγενές) generated by the earth (Eur. fr. 61b).⁵⁵⁹ In Sophocles' *Antigone*, the heroine challenges the nobility of her sister Ismene, who will have to prove whether she is noble (εὐγενής) or the base daughter of noble parents (ἐσθλῶν κακή) (Soph. *Ant.* 37-8). Euripides sometimes attributes *eugeneia* to characters of low status. In a fragment of *Melanippe*, for example, a messenger asks how one is supposed to judge nobility of birth (τὴν εὐγένειαν) and states that 'those who are brave and just by nature, though they are born from slaves (κἂν ὧσι δούλων), are more nobly-born (εὐγενεστέρους) than those who are mere empty appearances' (Eur. fr. 495.40-3, transl. Collard and Cropp, adapted). The characters of *Electra* similarly discuss about the nobility of Electra's peasant husband. The peasant himself recalls his Mycenaean ancestors, eminent for birth (λαμπροὶ γὰρ ἐς γένος) but poor, which he considers the ruin of nobility of birth (ἠὺγένει' ἀπόλλυται) (Eur. *El.* 35-8).⁵⁶⁰ He later declares his intention not to show a lowborn character (τό γ' ἦθος δυσγενές) despite his poverty (Eur. *El.* 362-3). Electra defines

⁵⁵⁷ Ober (1989), 254 mentions these passages as examples of positive allusions to *eugeneia* but does not fully appreciate their rhetorical context and purpose.

⁵⁵⁸ See Donlan (1999) [1980], 131-2.

⁵⁵⁹ See Donlan (1999) [1980], 138.

⁵⁶⁰ Cropp (1988), 102.

her husband a poor but noble man (πένης ἀνὴρ γενναῖος) (Eur. *El.* 253). Orestes states that worthless men are often born from a noble father (γενναίου πατρός) and good children from bad parents (ἐκ κακῶν). He concludes that Electra's husband, despite his low status, has proved to be most noble (ἄριστος), and men should be considered nobly born (εὐγενεῖς) based on their company and customs (Eur. *El.* 367-90).⁵⁶¹ Comedy, on the other hand, shows the possible counterclaims of the supporters of nobility of birth. In a fragment by Eupolis, the Chorus regrets the good old days when the generals came from the greatest families, eminent for wealth and birth (πλούτῳ γένει τε πρῶτοι) (Eup. fr. 384 K.-A.). Aristophanes, addressing the audience in the *Frogs*, shows similar concerns for the current state of Athenian politics. He complains that, while the citizens who are wellborn (εὐγενεῖς) and possess many virtues are despised, those who are brazen, foreigners and knavish are entrusted with every public affair (Ar. *Ran.* 727-33).⁵⁶²

Forensic orators sometimes exploited the ideological tension associated with *eugeneia*. In *Against Meidias*, Demosthenes asserts that there is nothing, even birth (γένος), wealth or power, which the Athenians should tolerate in a person if *hybris* is present (Dem. 21.143). To reinforce his accusation against Meidias, the orator recalls how even Alcibiades, who was certainly a man of a different stamp from the plaintiff, had been punished by the Athenians for his *hybris* even though he was an Alcmeonid (Dem. 21.144-7). Nobility of birth is valued to the extent that Demosthenes can use it as the measure of the gravity of the crime of *hybris*, considered so serious that not even good birth can compensate for it.⁵⁶³ By hinting at Alcibiades' excessive behaviour, the passage also testifies the negative aspects and suspicions often associated with high birth and aristocratic lifestyle in democratic Athens. In Demosthenes' *Against Conon*, for example, the speaker Ariston anticipates that Conon will minimise his accusation of battery. The defendant will claim that the episode was simply one of the many fights over some courtesans in which many sons of *kaloi kagathoi*, who playfully call themselves *ithyphalloi* or *autolēkythoi*, often get involved (Dem. 54.13-4). Ariston, who since the beginning of the speech has depicted Conon and his sons as excessive and hubristic,⁵⁶⁴ states that the so-called *ithyphalloi* indulge in acts that respectable people would be ashamed to mention or do (Dem. 54.17).⁵⁶⁵ What is under attack here is not so much

⁵⁶¹ Cf. Eur. *El.* 551: 'many who are noble (εὐγενεῖς) are no good (κακοί)' (transl. Cropp).

⁵⁶² See Mann (2007), 138-40.

⁵⁶³ See Ober (1989), 254-5, with further examples of what Ober calls 'the "convicted, though high born" topos'.

⁵⁶⁴ Cf. Dem. 54.3-9.

⁵⁶⁵ See Ober (1989), 255-9.

aristocratic status as such, but the most excessive and despicable manifestations of aristocratic lifestyle.⁵⁶⁶

As Aristotle states in the *Politics*, *eugeneia*, together with *ploutos*, *aretē* and *paideia*, was one of the marks of elite status (Arist. *Pol.* 1291b14-30).⁵⁶⁷ As such, nobility of birth could carry some negative weight due to the excesses that the democratic *polis* sometimes associated with aristocratic status. However, even under the democracy, *eugeneia* was at the same time a desirable attribute and, somewhat paradoxically, not an exclusively aristocratic one. Aristotle in the *Rhetoric* significantly treats *eugeneia* as both an individual and a collective feature. Nobility of birth is one of the components of happiness, which according to the philosopher is always the object of discussion of speeches of exhortation and dissuasion. Aristotle states that, for nations and cities (ἔθνει μὲν καὶ πόλει), *eugeneia* consists in being autochthonous or of ancient origins (τὸ αὐτόχθονας ἢ ἀρχαίους εἶναι) and having great ancestors. For individuals (ιδίᾳ), on the other hand, nobility of birth is a quality acquired from either the father or the mother and it depends on one's legitimacy of birth and on the renown of one's family (Arist. *Rh.* 1360b). Aristotle therefore provides a definition of *eugeneia* that grants equal value to individual and collective claims of nobility. The philosopher's statement reflects the usage of his time, when the notion of Athenian collective *eugeneia* had been firmly established by the *epitaphios logos* thanks to the myth of autochthony.

The application of nobility of birth to the Athenian *dēmos* through the myth of autochthony has notably been interpreted as a democratization of a specifically aristocratic value.⁵⁶⁸ The evidence discussed shows that this was not in fact the case. The ideal of *eugeneia* had been an object of criticism even in the pre-democratic society of the archaic period, where it provided an argument in the political struggle rather than the absolute domain of a hereditary aristocracy. The absence of a clear line dividing a class and a moral connotation of nobility, already witnessed in Theognis, similarly suggests that *eugeneia* was not necessarily connected to aristocracy. Rather than as a prerogative of aristocratic ideology that the *dēmos* communalised and claimed for itself,⁵⁶⁹ *eugeneia* should be seen as an attribute that, although partly frowned upon in democratic Athens, was generally highly valued and could be applied

⁵⁶⁶ On democratic suspicions towards aristocratic lifestyle, see Cairns (2003), 244-7 and Fisher (2003).

⁵⁶⁷ See Ober (1989), 11-12.

⁵⁶⁸ See Ober (1989), 259-66; Loraux (2000) [1996], 21-3; Lape (2010), 26-7; more generally, see Loraux (1981) for the idea that the Athenian democracy appropriated aristocratic values for itself.

⁵⁶⁹ See van Wees and Fisher (2015), 33: 'in classical Athenian ideology [the concept of good birth] played much the same role as in Homer, i.e. the particular achievements, reputation and wealth of one's family and forebears were a factor that affected one's personal status but did not form the basis for any categorical claim to hereditary privilege. [...] There is therefore no reason to regard allusions to good birth and collective autochthony in Athenian political discourse as evidence that "aristocratic values" had become "democratized"'. The very existence in ancient Greece of an aristocracy in the modern sense of the term has been questioned by van Wees and Fisher (2015).

indifferently to collectives and individuals that were made object of praise.⁵⁷⁰ Good birth enjoyed considerable prestige since the Homeric epics and the notion of *eugeneia* had always been employed in claims of excellence. It was therefore naturally suitable to express the exclusive status of Athenian autochthony.

5.3. AUTOCHTHONY AS COLLECTIVE *EUGENEIA* AT THE STATE FUNERAL

Autochthony was a paramount component of the rhetoric of the *epitaphios logos*. At the state funeral for the war dead, orators created a shared image of Athens and its past that contributed to build an imagined community and to justify the prospect of dying for the city. Funeral speeches therefore used autochthony to claim nobility of birth (*εὐγένεια*) for the Athenian community. In doing so they deployed a common set of images. These included the metaphor of the Athenian community as a family, the contrast of individual versus collective, and the language of legitimacy of birth. Through these images, orators of funeral speeches were able to paint a picture of Athens as an equal and socially cohesive society.

Demosthenes elects *eugeneia* as a topic of praise at the beginning of his *Funeral Speech*. He states that Athenians deserve praise not only for their courage, but also because ‘it was their lot to have been nobly born (*γεγενῆσθαι καλῶς*) and rigorously educated to acquire wisdom, and to have dedicated their lives to the highest goals’ (Dem. 60.3, transl. Worthington). The orator recalls autochthony as the proof of the Athenians’ nobility of birth (*ἡ γὰρ εὐγένεια τῶνδε τῶν ἀνδρῶν*), which is envisioned as a collective quality levelling all social differences between citizens. The passage is constructed on the opposition between individual and collective. According to Demosthenes, not only is it possible to trace back the war dead and each of their ancestors individually (*κατ’ ἀνδρα*) to a father, but also collectively (*κοινῆ*) to their entire fatherland, of which they are recognised to be autochthonous (*ἧς αὐτόχθονες ὁμολογοῦνται εἶναι*).⁵⁷¹ The coexistence of individual and collective ancestry poses no problem to the orator, and autochthony is used in order to portray the Athenian community as a family.⁵⁷² Demosthenes further exploits the connection between *eugeneia* and the image of the family as he highlights that the Athenians are the only people who have been living in the same land from which they were born (*ἐξ ἧσπερ ἔφυσαν*). Consequently, while those who arrive in their cities as immigrants (*ἐπήλυδας*) can be compared to adopted children

⁵⁷⁰ See Duploux (2006), 49-56.

⁵⁷¹ Loraux (2000) [1996], 24-5 interpreted the passage as excluding Athenian women from the generation of citizens. Such gender issues, however, are not raised explicitly by the orator, if at all present.

⁵⁷² As noted by Loraux (1993) [1984], 51.

(ὁμοίους εἶναι τοῖς εἰσποιητοῖς τῶν παίδων), the Athenians are legitimate (γενεσίους) citizens of their fatherland by birth (Dem. 60.4). The orator develops the image of the family by exploiting the similarities between the language of naturalisation and that of adoption and family law:⁵⁷³ the Athenians are the only ones who can be regarded as legitimate children (*gnēsiōi*), as opposed to the other nations, who are made up of immigrants and can be compared to adopted children (*eispoiētoi*).⁵⁷⁴

In Demosthenes' *Funeral Speech*, autochthony is thus intertwined with the themes of nobility and legitimacy of birth; not only does it supply the foundation of Athens' harmony and social cohesion, but it also provides a prestigious claim of superiority over the rest of the nations. Hyperides adopts a similar strategy in his *Funeral Speech*. Like Demosthenes, Hyperides constructs the praise of Athenian autochthony on the opposition of individual versus collective, and contrasts the pure and noble origins of the Athenians with the mixed origins of other nations. According to the orator, to trace the individual (κατ' ἄνδρα) genealogy of the war dead would be necessary in the case of other nations, who have gathered in one city from many places (πολλαχόθεν) and brought their individual lineage (γένος ἴδιον) to the common stock. To relate the ancestry of the Athenians individually (ιδίᾳ), on the other hand, would be superfluous, because their common origin (ἡ κοινὴ γένεσις) due to their autochthony (αὐτόχθοσιν οὖσιν) grants them unsurpassed *eugeneia* (Hyp. 6.7). Hyperides therefore downplays the importance of the individual *genos* and extends *eugeneia* to the entire Athenian community, adopting at the same time an oppositional strategy in defining Athenian purity against the composite nature of other nations.⁵⁷⁵

The theme of *eugeneia* opens the praise of the Athenians also in Plato's *Menexenus*, where Socrates elects the Athenians' nobility of birth as the first topic of his speech (Pl. *Menex.* 237a). In his parody of the *epitaphios logos*, Plato abandons the dialectic between individual and collective and gives a very literal interpretation of the metaphor of the Athenian community as a family. Socrates states that their ancestors' non-immigrant origin (ἡ τῶν

⁵⁷³ Naturalised citizens could be referred to as ποιητοὶ πολῖται (cf. Arist. *Pol.* 1275a6; [Dem.] 45.78) or δημοποίητοι (cf. Plut. *Sol.* 24.2); see M. J. Osborne (1983), 139. Adopted children could be referred to as εἰσποιητοὶ υἱοί (cf. [Dem.] 44.34; Is. 3.61) or ποιητοὶ υἱοί (cf. [Dem.] 44.39; Is. 5.6). On adoption in classical Athens, see Rubinstein (1993).

⁵⁷⁴ See Ogden (1996), 168. Demosthenes then reinforces the image by giving a literal twist to the metaphor of the family. For the orator, the fact that the fruits of the earth first arose in Attica is the proof that the land itself was the mother of the Athenian ancestors (μητέρα τὴν χώραν εἶναι τῶν ἡμετέρων προγόνων) (Dem. 60.5).

⁵⁷⁵ The concept of an oppositional strategy of self-definition, applied here to Athenian identity, is borrowed from Hall (1997), 44-51. Investigating the construction of Greek ethnic identity, Hall distinguishes between an aggregative mechanism of self-definition, typical of archaic Greece and based on the claim of common descent from Hellen, and an oppositional mechanism that came about after the Persian Wars and defined the Greeks through comparison and opposition with the barbarians.

προγόνων γένεσις οὐκ ἔπηλυσ ὄσσα) is the prime cause of the nobility (εὐγενείας) of the war dead and, implicitly, of the Athenians as a whole. The Athenians are characterised as indigenous (αὐτόχθονας) inhabitants of their fatherland as opposed to foreign residents (μετοικοῦντας) (Pl. *Menex.* 237b). More importantly, they are represented literally as children of their land.⁵⁷⁶ According to Socrates, the Athenians are the only ones who have not been raised (τρεφομένους) by a stepmother (μητρειᾶς), but by their very mother-land (μητρὸς τῆς χώρας). Their land itself gave birth to them (τεκούσης), reared them and received them at the moment of their death (Pl. *Menex.* 237c). The status of children of the land is not limited to the first earthborn Athenian ancestors,⁵⁷⁷ but is extended to the whole citizen body through the war dead, whose noble birth (ἡ τῶνδε εὐγένεια) is restated at the end of the passage (Pl. *Menex.* 237c). The idea of collective *eugeneia* is again exploited as a distinctive quality of the Athenians in comparison with non-Athenians. The same oppositional strategy deployed by Demosthenes and Hyperides is carried out in Socrates' speech through the contrast between mother and stepmother and the corresponding dichotomy between αὐτόχθονας and μετοικοῦντας.⁵⁷⁸

To provide the grounds for the Athenian claim to *eugeneia* is the main but not the only function of autochthony in Plato's *Menexenus*. When praising the constitution of the Athenians, Socrates recalls autochthony as an aetiology of their *isonomia*. Socrates, not without a hint of irony, defines Athens' constitution an ἀριστοκρατία, understood in the etymological sense of 'rule of the best'.⁵⁷⁹ He then states that nobody is excluded from the city's political life 'by his weakness or poverty or by the obscurity of his parentage' (Pl. *Menex.* 238d; transl. Lamb).⁵⁸⁰ Socrates in turn traces the root (αἰτία) of Athens' constitution back to the Athenians' equality of birth (ἡ ἐξ ἴσου γένεσις). He states that the other cities are inhabited by people of diverse origins; this results in their tyrannical and oligarchic regimes, where the citizens regard each other as slaves or masters. The Athenians, on the other hand, are all brothers born of the same mother (μῆδ' ἀδελφοὶ φύντες) and politically equal. Their equality of birth (ἡ ἰσογονία) according to nature (κατὰ φύσιν) results in their equality of rights (ἰσονομίαν) according to law (κατὰ νόμον) (Pl. *Menex.* 238e-239a). Plato thus carries on with the opposition between Athens and the other *poleis*. He insists on the superiority of the Athenian constitution, which grants all citizens equality of rights as a

⁵⁷⁶ Cf. also Pl. *Menex.* 237e. See Tsitsiridis (1998), 201-2.

⁵⁷⁷ Pace Tsitsiridis (1998), 198.

⁵⁷⁸ See Tsitsiridis (1998), 201. Cf. also Pl. *Menex.* 245c6-d6, where the Athenians are the only pure Greeks who did not mix up with barbarians (αὐτοὶ Ἕλληνας, οὐ μίξοβαρβαροὶ) and are by nature haters of the barbarians (φύσει μισοβάρβαρον).

⁵⁷⁹ See Tsitsiridis (1998), 225.

⁵⁸⁰ Cf. Thuc. 2.37.1.

consequence of their equality of birth deriving from autochthony. The political cohesion of the Athenian community is once again expressed through the metaphor of the family, as the Athenians are now literally envisioned as brothers born from one mother, the Attic land.

The notion of *eugeneia* and the metaphor of the family are less prominent in Lysias, who nevertheless insists on social cohesion as the natural result of Athenian autochthony and introduces the notion of *homonoia* otherwise unattested in the surviving funeral speeches.⁵⁸¹ After a long narrative on the mythical exploits of the ancestors, Lysias goes on to explain these deeds by referring to the autochthonous origins of the Athenians.⁵⁸² The orator states that the ancestors, having one single mind (μῆ γνῶμη χρωμένοις), used to fight for justice, because the origin of their life was itself just. Unlike most nations (οἱ πολλοί), they did not gather from multiple places, nor did they drive other people out and inhabit a land that did not belong to them (τὴν ἀλλοτρίαν). Because of their autochthony (αὐτόχθονες ὄντες), the Athenian ancestors had the same land as their mother and fatherland (τὴν αὐτὴν ἐκέκτηντο μητέρα καὶ πατρίδα) (Lys. 2.17).

The passage is constructed on the usual oppositional strategy, which here contrasts the autochthonous and righteous Athenians with the unjust and ethnically diverse majority of nations. Lysias, however, does not fully develop the motif of *eugeneia* and legitimate birth. Nobility of birth is mentioned only in passing at the beginning of the historical narrative on the Persian Wars. There, the orator states that, because they were nobly born (φύντες καλῶς), the ancestors accomplished many admirable deeds (Lys. 2.20). The metaphor of legitimacy of birth only appears later in the speech, when Lysias comments that at Salamis the Athenians ‘taught the barbarians of Asia that their own valour was of legitimate birth and native to their soil (γνησίαν δὲ καὶ αὐτόχθονα)’ (Lys. 2.43, transl. Lamb, adapted). At the same time, the orator expands the traditional opposition between autochthonous and immigrants. He characterises the other nations as illegitimate inhabitants of lands that belong to others, and turns autochthony into an aetiology of the Athenians’ commitment to the cause of justice and *philanthrōpia*.⁵⁸³ The metaphor of the Athenian community as a family is present, but Lysias exploits it very briefly. The orator simply states that the Athenians, because of their

⁵⁸¹ But see Bearzot (2015), 104-7, who notes that Pericles’ funeral speech, without relying on the vocabulary of *homonoia*, conveys a picture of Athens that emphasises the peaceful coexistence of its citizens and establishes it a connection between democracy and concord (Thuc. 2.37.2-3). It cannot be ruled out, as suggested by Frangeskou (1998-1999), 320, that Lysias’ status as a metic (and the fact that he was granted Athenian citizenship for having supported the democratic restoration, only to be then disenfranchised again: see Todd 2007, 6 n. 20) had an impact on his unusual rendition of the myth of autochthony. This, however, does not affect my overall argument that Lysias’ treatment of Athenian autochthony reflects the discursive parameters of the state funeral for the war dead.

⁵⁸² Todd (2007), 227 rightly notes that Lysias’ *Funeral Oration* is distinctive in its use of autochthony as a summary to ease the transition from the mythical to the historical exploits.

⁵⁸³ For a detailed discussion of Athenian *philanthrōpia*, see pp. 93-7 above.

autochthony, had the same land (τὴν αὐτήν) as mother (μητέρα) and fatherland (πατρίδα). The structure of the passage, based on the correlation between τὴν ἄλλοτρίαν and τὴν αὐτήν, makes it clear that the metaphor is here a component of the broader oppositional strategy; rather than focusing on the motif of pure descent and nobility of birth, it furthers the argument of the Athenians' natural devotion to justice due to their autochthonous origins.

Even though he does not fully exploit the set of motifs which orators of funeral speeches traditionally use to conceptualise autochthony, Lysias shares their purpose in recalling this myth. In accordance with the discursive parameters of the state funeral for the war dead, autochthony contributes to building an ideal image of Athens as socially and politically cohesive. Set during the long aftermath of the democratic restoration,⁵⁸⁴ Lysias' *Funeral Oration* achieves this goal by relying on the concept of *homonoia*. This notion emerged during the civil unrest affecting Athens in the last decade of the fifth century and quickly became a key word in Athenian public discourse.⁵⁸⁵ *Homonoia* is introduced for the first time in the speech when Lysias establishes it as an ancestral quality of the Athenians, whose unity of intent (μῆ ἰσότης χρωμένοις) in fighting for justice is made to derive from their autochthonous origins.⁵⁸⁶ The centrality of *homonoia* in Lysias' account of Athenian autochthony is even more evident if one reads the passage together with the following paragraph, as the Greek itself suggests by linking them through the correlative μέν ... δέ. The passage introduces the topic of Attica's synoecism. The orator states that the Athenians had been the first and only ones to expel the oligarchies (δυναστείας) in power among them and to establish a democracy,⁵⁸⁷ as they believed that the freedom of all was the greatest form of concord (ὁμόνοια). Lysias goes on to add that the Athenians made the hopes deriving from their perils common (κοινά) to one another and administered the state with free souls (Lys. 2.18). Not only does the passage reprise the traditional contrast between individual and communal, but it also restates the theme of *homonoia* just alluded to in the paragraph on

⁵⁸⁴ Todd (2007), 163-4, who sees the speech as a display piece written for private circulation, places the dramatic date in the late 390s. Piovan (2011), 291-4 defends the possibility that Lysias actually delivered the speech, but similarly dates it to the period between 393 and 391/0 BC.

⁵⁸⁵ On the notion of *homonoia* and its history, see Romilly (1972); Thériault (1996), 6-13; Cuniberti (2007); Daverio Rocchi (2007); Cobetto Ghiggia (2012); Bearzot (2015). The verb ὁμοιοῦμαι is first attested in Thuc. 8.75.2, while the noun ὁμόνοια occurs for the first time in Thuc. 8.93.3. Both passages deal with events connected to the oligarchic coup in 411 BC. For the theme of *homonoia* in the orators, cf. e.g. Lys. 25.20, 27; 18.17-19; Andoc. 1.73, 76; Dem. 20.110; 22.77; 24.185; Isoc. 12.178. Cuniberti (2007), 51-2 posits that *homonoia* originated as a philosophical (and sophistic) concept and later passed into the political realm, thus explaining its use by both democrats and sympathisers of oligarchy.

⁵⁸⁶ See Todd (2007), 229 for this connection.

⁵⁸⁷ Todd (2007), 228 notes the implicit connection between autochthony and the institution of the democracy in Lysias' treatment, and argues that the link 'presumably relies on the idea that autochthony is something in which all true-born Athenians share equally'. For a survey of the values of the word δυναστεία, see Bearzot (2003), 24-35.

autochthony. By making this notion one of the guiding principles of the founders of the democracy, Lysias therefore grounds Athenian democracy itself in *homonoia*.

Lysias' interest in *homonoia* does not just affect his view of autochthony. Due to the historical context of the speech, which is set about ten years after the democratic restoration and reflects the political climate of the Amnesty,⁵⁸⁸ the notion occurs multiple times in the *Funeral Oration*.⁵⁸⁹ After appearing in the account of the founding of democracy, *homonoia* is again recalled at the beginning of the narrative on Athens' historical exploits. Lysias states that the ancestors performed noble and marvellous deeds 'because of the nobility of their nature and the harmony of their thoughts' (γνόντες ὅμοια),⁵⁹⁰ thus summarising the main themes of the sections on autochthony and the synoecism (Lys. 2.20; transl. Todd). Lysias alludes to *homonoia* again when describing the mental disposition of the Athenians in facing the Persian threat at Marathon, where they marched against the enemy all of one accord (ταῦτα μᾶ ἡ γνώμη πάντες γνόντες) (Lys. 2.24). Finally, the orator praises those who fought against the Thirty and restored the democracy because they made it clear that the city was in harmony (ὁμονοῦσαν) and not divided in factions (στασιαζούσης) (Lys. 2.63).⁵⁹¹ The successful return of the *demos* in spite of the ongoing *stasis* (στασιάσαντες πρὸς ἀλλήλους) is taken as evidence that, if the Athenians had been of one mind (ὁμονοῦντες), they would have easily won the war against the Peloponnesians (Lys. 2.65). Lysias' insistence on *homonoia* is not surprising. In the political climate in which the speech – if not actually delivered – is imagined to take place, the state funeral for the war dead offered a valuable occasion for rekindling Athens' imagined community, and appealing to *homonoia* was an appropriate way to achieve this goal.

Given the prominence of the theme throughout the speech, *homonoia* becomes the natural focus of Lysias' section on autochthony together with and even more than *eugeneia*. In attributing autochthonous origins to the ancestors as a whole, the orator establishes not only their unique propensity to fight for justice but also their social cohesion and unity of intent as innate attributes of the Athenians. Lysias adopts some sort of cyclic composition starting from the autochthonous origins of the ancestors and culminating in the democratic restoration. In

⁵⁸⁸ On the date of the speech, see p. 167 n. 584 above. On the democratic restoration and the Amnesty, see Loraux (2002) [1997], Wolpert (2002) and Shear (2011).

⁵⁸⁹ See Todd (2007), 229. The importance of *homonoia* in the aftermath of the democratic restoration (and as one of the values on which Lysias founds his picture of democracy) is rightly highlighted by Piovan (2011), 302-4. See also B. D. Gray (2015), 37-41, who stresses how reconciliation agreements within divided communities could be based on *homonoia*, as in the case of the reconciliation in Nakone after a *stasis* in the late fourth/early third century BC.

⁵⁹⁰ See Todd (2007), 230, who rightly rejects Lamb's translation of the passage as 'being of noble stock and having minds as noble' and interprets γνόντες ὅμοια as 'thinking in the same way as each other', and thus as a reference to *homonoia*.

⁵⁹¹ A further occurrence can be found in Lys. 2.43, but here the verb ὁμονοέω is used metaphorically to characterise the prosperity the Athenians derived from their victory at Salamis as equal to their dangers.

doing so, he stresses the importance of *homonoia* throughout the whole of Athenian history. If concord had seemingly been lost during the dramatic events connected with the rule of the Thirty, the men of the Piraeus proved this to be contrary to the Athenian nature. Together with the democracy, they restored that *homonoia* that (at least in Lysias' narrative) had always been a distinctive feature of their community.

This section has shown that, whether they focus on the Athenians' collective *eugeneia* or praise their natural *homonoia*, the extant funeral speeches all share the same rhetorical strategy and a common set of motifs when dealing with the topic of autochthony. At the state funeral, orators tended not to pay attention to the earthborn kings of Attica. In doing so, they resolved the potential ambiguities inherent in the complete notion of autochthony by unequivocally attributing autochthony to the ancestors and (by extension) to the Athenians as a whole. This collective focus was achieved through a rhetoric based on the contrast between individual and collective and the metaphor of the Athenian community as a family. Autochthony was also taken as a sign of Athenian uniqueness. It was part of a strategy of identity-making that opposed Athens to all other cities and contrasted the autochthonous to the immigrants. This view of Athenian autochthony, which in most surviving funeral speeches is summarised under the rubric of collective *eugeneia*, in Lysias' *Funeral Oration* is conceptualised mainly (though not exclusively) in terms of *homonoia*. Lysias' account of autochthony is instructive in two respects. First, the inclusion of the notion of *homonoia*, a relative newcomer in Athenian public discourse, attests to the dynamic nature of the ideological practice of Athenian democracy. The ideas and values of the Athenian *dēmos*, in other words, were not a fixed monolith; they were constantly discussed and re-discussed inside and outside the formal institutions of the state, and the role of the orators in these dynamics was far from negligible.⁵⁹² Second, despite his variations on the epitaphic script of Athenian autochthony, Lysias shares with the other orators of funeral speeches the same image of Athens as a cohesive community where social and political inequalities are levelled by the common autochthonous origins of its inhabitants.⁵⁹³ This in turn illustrates the discursive parameters which operated at the state funeral for the war dead. Such parameters required the orators to provide the mourners with an image of Athens that could console them for the sacrifice of their relatives and inspire them to follow their example. By appealing to the Athenians' collective *eugeneia* and to their natural *homonoia*, the *epitaphios logos* was not ideological in the sense that it concealed the internal divisions of the Athenian citizen body,⁵⁹⁴ but rather in

⁵⁹² Pace Ober (1989), esp. 304-6.

⁵⁹³ The Athenian model of autochthony as a source of social cohesion contrasted with Thebes' divisive model of autochthony: see Montanari (1981), 151-5.

⁵⁹⁴ Pace Loraux (1981), esp. 206-7.

the sense that it focused on the positive and cohesive side of autochthony in order to create an imagined community.

5.4. DECONSTRUCTING AUTOCHTHONY ON THE TRAGIC STAGE

The traditions of the Athenians' collective autochthony and the earthborn kings of Attica coexist on the tragic stage in Euripides' *Ion*.⁵⁹⁵ The play tells the story of Creusa, daughter of Erechtheus and only surviving member of Athens' earthborn royal family. Creusa arrives in Delphi with her non-Athenian husband Xuthus to consult the oracle about their own childlessness. Her secret purpose, however, is to inquire about the fate of the son she had begotten after being raped by Apollo and whom she had then exposed. The boy is now a servant in the temple of Apollo in Delphi, where mother and son, unaware of the respective identities, meet and engage in conversation. Xuthus is advised by the oracle that the first person he will meet outside the temple will be his son. Having run into the young servant, Xuthus mistakes him for a son he may have had from some Delphian girl. He therefore names him Ion and persuades him to follow him to Athens to become the future king of the city. Feeling betrayed by her husband and Apollo, Creusa follows the advice of the Old Man and makes an attempt on Ion's life. When her plan is discovered, the woman flees to the altar of the god to avoid Ion's revenge. There, however, the recognition between mother and son takes place, and Ion and Creusa are finally reunited. The play ends with the arrival of Athena, who invites Creusa to set Ion on Athens' royal throne as Xuthus' son. As the goddess reveals, Ion will be the progenitor of the Ionians, while Xuthus and Creusa's future sons, Dorus and Achaeus, will originate the Dorians and the Achaeans.⁵⁹⁶

Creusa's personal tragedy runs parallel with her political tragedy. Not only is she ignorant of the fate of the son she once exposed, but she also feels the pressure of having to perpetuate the earthborn line of the Erechthidae and grant a suitable king to the autochthonous people of Athens.⁵⁹⁷ The theme of autochthony is thus omnipresent throughout the play, as Euripides explores the ideal picture of Athenian autochthony traditionally produced at the state funeral.⁵⁹⁸ The poet reinterprets and reverses the images that funeral speeches associate with

⁵⁹⁵ See Loraux (1993) [1984], 200.

⁵⁹⁶ For a survey of the themes of the play, which are not limited to autochthony, see Lee (1997), 30-8.

⁵⁹⁷ Most scholars now agree in interpreting Euripides' *Ion* not as a nationalistic and enthusiastic endorsement of the ideology of autochthony, but rather as somewhat critical of it: see e.g. Walsh (1978); Saxonhouse (1986); Loraux (1993) [1984], 184-236; Lape (2010), 95-136; Leão (2012); Kasimis (2013). Lee (1997), 36 rightly notes that Euripides' treatment of autochthony is ambiguous and states that 'if *Ion* cannot be treated simply as a vehicle for national pride, subversive readings too need to take account of the complexity of the play and of Euripides' work generally'.

⁵⁹⁸ As noted by Saxonhouse (1986), 254, it is Xuthus, not Euripides, who denies the notion of autochthony as birth from the earth (Eur. *Ion* 542), but the poet nevertheless 'forces the citizens of

autochthony. In doing so, he subtly highlights the ambiguities of the Athenians' claim of autochthony and the limits of their restrictive citizenship policies.⁵⁹⁹ This operation would have been inappropriate in the institutional setting of the state funeral for the war dead. The context of the dramatic festivals, however, empowered Euripides to pose questions about the Athenian ideology of autochthony, which is finally restated at the end of the play thanks to the *ex machina* intervention of Athena.

While the surviving funeral speeches all ignore the earthborn kings in their discussion of autochthony, Euripides puts Creusa and the Erechthid family right at the centre of it. This of course is partly due to the nature of the tragic genre, where the individual stories of the protagonists play the main role. Hermes therefore introduces Creusa as a direct descendant of the earthborn Erichthonius (γηγενοῦς Ἐριχθονίου) (Eur. *Ion* 20-1), and Ion is curious to know whether Erichthonius had really been born from the earth (ἐκ γῆς πατρός σου πρόγονος ἔβλασταν πατήρ;) (Eur. *Ion* 267-74). The earthborn origin of the Erechthid family is also evoked in a dialogue between Creusa and the Old Man (Eur. *Ion* 999-1000), and again by Creusa, who rejoices for the luminous future of the earthborn house (γηγενέτας δόμος) after her recognition with Ion (Eur. *Ion* 1466-7). Yet, since the play's prologue, Creusa's earthborn legacy coexists with the broader claim of Athenian autochthony, as Hermes recalls how he once had to go to the autochthonous people of famous Athens (λαὸν εἰς αὐτόχθονα κλεινῶν Ἀθηνῶν) to save the baby of Apollo and Creusa (Eur. *Ion* 29-30).

By focusing on Creusa's individual tragedy, Euripides reverses the treatment of one of the main components of the discourse of autochthony in the *epitaphios logos*: the theme of *eugeneia*. Nobility of birth is constantly recalled throughout the play and is highly valued by the characters, but is always employed as an individual feature.⁶⁰⁰ During his first encounter with Creusa, Ion immediately recognises her noble status (γενναιότης) and states that it is usually possible to tell from one's appearance whether one is nobly born (εὐγενής) (Eur. *Ion* 237-40). After inquiring about Creusa's earthborn pedigree, Ion asks her about her husband and assumes that he must also be nobly born (εὐγενῆ) (Eur. *Ion* 289-92). The theme of *eugeneia* is picked up again by Xuthus. When trying to persuade Ion to follow him to Athens, he promises him that instead of ill-born (δυσγενής) and poor he will be called well-born (εὐγενής) and rich (Eur. *Ion* 579-80). The Chorus, praying Persephone for the success of Creusa's plot against Ion, wishes that nobody from another family would ever rule the city in

Athens to look critically at the Athenian myth of autochthony [...] to make them reflect on the implications of such a myth'.

⁵⁹⁹ See Leão (2012), 150-1. But see Lape (2010), 135, who rightly rejects the view that 'Ion's bastardy should be read as ironic or critical of Athenian ideology'.

⁶⁰⁰ See Walsh (1978), 301.

place of the noble Erechthidae (τῶν εὐγενετῶν Ἐρεχθειδῶν) (Eur. *Ion* 1058-60).⁶⁰¹ Finally, Creusa praises Apollo because he gave Ion to Xuthus as his son despite being the boy's real father and established him in a noble house (εὐγενῆ δόμον) (Eur. *Ion* 1540-1). Apollo's benefaction to Ion is later confirmed by Athena, who states that the god gave Ion to the noblest house (οἶκον εὐγενέστατον) (Eur. *Ion* 1561-2).

In contrast with the quasi-obsession of the characters in the play with nobility of birth, Euripides never uses the vocabulary of *eugeneia* to refer to the Athenians as a whole.⁶⁰² This is significant, if one considers that the Athenians' collective *eugeneia* is constantly associated with autochthony in the extant funeral speeches, where it is the main marker of the social and political cohesion of the Athenian community. Euripides chooses to focus on nobility of birth as an individual feature, and particularly as a characteristic of Creusa and her earthborn family. In doing so, he reveals the ambiguity of appealing to autochthony – as Socrates, for example, does in the *Menexenus* – as the source of the Athenians' equality of birth and *isonomia*. More importantly, the absence of the rhetoric of collective *eugeneia* shows that in Euripides' *Ion* the myth of autochthony is not recalled to build the Athenian identity and construct an imagined community. On the tragic stage, the image of social cohesion that funeral speeches convey through the notion of collective *eugeneia* is downplayed in favour of more controversial aspects of the ideology of autochthony.

The metaphor of the Athenian community as a family, cherished by the orators at the state funeral, disappears on the background of the private drama of Creusa and her *oikos*. The Athenian claim of autochthony is briefly introduced by Hermes in the prologue, and during the rest of the play is only seen through the eyes of foreign characters. These either highlight autochthony's negative and intolerant aspects or challenge the very concept of birth from the land that was a corollary of the complete notion of autochthony. When Ion, still unaware of his mother's identity, wonders whether he may have been born from the earth (γῆς ἄρ' ἐκπέφυκα μητρός;), Xuthus, the non-Athenian married to the *über*-autochthonous Creusa, mockingly replies that the ground does not produce children (οὐ πέδον τίκτει τέκνα) (Eur. *Ion*

⁶⁰¹ Lee (1997) at Eur. *Ion* 1058-9 accepts Murray's emendation ἄλλος ἥκων instead of the transmitted text ἄλλος ἄλλων ἀπ' οἴκων and renders the passage as 'never may a newcomer rule my city in place of the Erechtheidai of noble birth'. This may lead one to interpret τῶν εὐγενετῶν Ἐρεχθειδῶν as referring not literally to the Erechthid family but figuratively to the Athenians as a whole. Yet, the context of the passage, where the Chorus wishes for the poison to reach 'the one making an attack on the house of the Erechtheidai (τῶν Ἐρεχθειδῶν δόμων)' (Eur. *Ion* 1056-7; transl. Lee), suggests that the expression is likelier to refer to the Erechthid family.

⁶⁰² Pace Walsh (1978), 313, who argues that 'against the conflict of class loyalty and patriotism, the *Ion* depicts the Athenians as sharing a common εὐγένεια'. See also Loraux (1993) [1984], 203, and Lape (2010), 108, who suggests that 'aristocratic *eugeneia* was not the measure of worth in the democratic polis; it was rather the democratically revised conception of *eugeneia* as birth from two natives'.

542).⁶⁰³ Ion later expresses doubts over following Xuthus to Athens because he is aware that he would be treated as an outsider.⁶⁰⁴ He knows that arriving among the autochthonous (αὐτόχθονας) people of Athens, who are said not to be an immigrant race (οὐκ ἐπέισακτον γένος), he will be regarded as suffering from two plagues (δύο νόσω): having a foreign father (πατρός τ' ἐπακτοῦ) and being of bastard birth (νοθαγενής) (Eur. *Ion* 589-92).⁶⁰⁵ The theme of legitimacy of birth, which orators of funeral speeches employ metaphorically in order to praise the superiority of the Athenians over the other Greeks as legitimate children of their land, takes a very concrete twist for Ion.⁶⁰⁶ The boy then reinforces his concerns by stating that one who joins a pure (καθαράν) city, even if he is a citizen by name, has the mouth of a slave (τό γε στόμα δοῦλον πέπαται) and does not enjoy freedom of speech (παρρησίαν) (Eur. *Ion* 670-75).

Rather than as a united family, Athens risks to appear as a close community jealous of its own privileges and which refrains from welcoming foreigners into its social fabric.⁶⁰⁷ The recognition between Ion and Creusa and the appearance of Athena at the end of the play resolve this potential conflict and implicitly restate the ideology of autochthony. Creusa rejoices at the thought that her newly found son will restore the earthborn house of Erechtheus (Eur. *Ion* 1463-7). The issue of Ion's bastardy is circumvented thanks to Xuthus' unaware adoption of the boy (Eur. *Ion* 1601-3). This deception, sanctioned by and perpetrated upon Athena's advice, would have probably been more acceptable to an Athenian audience than the solution planned by Xuthus, who wanted to introduce his supposed son Ion into the Athenian citizen body gradually and make him the next king. Ion is proven to be a member of the earthborn family of Erechtheus and a suitable citizen of Athens' autochthonous community, even though only on his mother's side.⁶⁰⁸

If in the *epitaphios logos* the oppositional strategy which highlights the uniqueness of the Athenians compared to the other Greeks is part of a wider discourse that portrays Athens

⁶⁰³ Loraux (1993) [1984], 206-7.

⁶⁰⁴ See Walsh (1978), 301-2; Loraux (1993) [1984], 205-6.

⁶⁰⁵ On the question of Ion's bastardy, see Loraux (1993) [1984], 204; Lape (2010), 128-36; Leão (2012), 148-9.

⁶⁰⁶ This is even more evident if one considers that, according to a version that goes back to Hesiod's *Catalogue of Women*, Ion was the legitimate son of Xuthus and Creusa (Hes. fr. 10(a).20-4; cf. Hdt. 7.94, 8.44; Eur. fr. 481.9-11; Paus. 7.1.2-5). Whether Apollo's paternity of Ion was Euripides' own invention cannot be securely established: see Lee (1998), 39.

⁶⁰⁷ Cf. Lyc. 1.41, who in the lawcourts exploits the oppositional aspect of autochthony to further his accusation of treason against Leocrates: 'anyone would have shared their pain and would have wept to see the people who prided themselves on their freedom and racial purity (ἐπὶ τῷ αὐτόχθον εἶναι) voting to grant slaves their freedom, give citizenship to foreigners, and restore privileges to the disenfranchised' (transl. Harris).

⁶⁰⁸ It is interesting to note that Ion would not have qualified as an Athenian citizen according to Pericles' citizenship law.

as a cohesive, equal and democratic society, Euripides' *Ion* shows the extreme consequences that this rhetoric risks to engender when put into practice.⁶⁰⁹ The poet downplays the Athenians' collective *eugeneia* in favour of individual nobility, absorbs the image of the city as a family into Creusa's private *oikos*, and provides a realistic interpretation of the metaphor of legitimacy of birth. Enabled by the context of the dramatic festivals, Euripides reflects on the image of Athens produced at the state funeral. He plays with the themes that funeral speeches commonly associate with the myth of autochthony. The coexistence of the collective notion of Athenian autochthony with the myth of the earthborn kings of Attica is functional to this process. It is revealing of the discursive parameters of the dramatic festivals, where playwrights were free from the task of constructing an imagined community and could invite the audience to reflect upon the ideal image of the city and its past.

5.5. AUTOCHTHONY AS EXTREME EXCLUSIVENESS IN APOLLODORUS' *AGAINST NEAERA*

Autochthony is the subject of a brief account in the pseudo-Demosthenic *Against Neaera*. The passage, which resolves the ambiguity inherent in the complete notion of autochthony by moving the focus onto the earthborn kings, is indicative of the discursive parameters of the lawcourts, where justice and the laws played a central role. In the speech, Apollodorus prosecutes the former courtesan Neaera, non-Athenian concubine of Stephanus, an Athenian citizen.⁶¹⁰ Stephanus and Neaera are accused of living as a married couple in violation of a law forbidding marriages between Athenian citizens and non-Athenians.⁶¹¹ In what is ultimately an attack against Stephanus, Apollodorus has to show that Neaera is an alien and has been living with Stephanus as a wife. To address the second point, Apollodorus questions the citizen status of Stephanus' children. The orator makes the case that these were in fact Neaera's children, and not Stephanus'. Stephanus allegedly enrolled them as citizens and passed them off as his own children from a previous marriage with an Athenian woman. Apollodorus focuses in particular on Phano, allegedly Neaera's daughter and therefore a non-Athenian

⁶⁰⁹ See Walsh (1978), 313, who suggests that, by choosing a servile and unsympathetic character such as the Old Man as the main mouthpiece of 'an extreme doctrine of racial purity, the poet invites his audience to reject it'. See also Saxonhouse (1986), 273.

⁶¹⁰ Scholars now agree in attributing *Against Neaera* to Apollodorus, who delivers most of it: see Trevett (1992), 50-76; Carey (1992), 17; Kapparis (1999), 48-51; MacDowell (2009), 99-100, 121-6. The first part of the speech ([Dem.] 59.1-15) is delivered by Apollodorus' brother-in-law, Theomnestus, who had formally brought the charge against Neaera. On Apollodorus' enmity with Stephanus and on the circumstances leading to Neaera's prosecution, see Carey (1992), 4-8 and Kapparis (1999), 29-31.

⁶¹¹ The text of the law, quoted in [Dem.] 59.16, is considered authentic by Carey (1992), 92, Kapparis (1999), 198 and MacDowell (2009), 122. Canevaro (2013a), 183-7, however, has brought reasonable arguments against its authenticity.

herself. Stephanus had given her in marriage first to Phrastor and then to Theogenes, both Athenian citizens and unaware of Phano's real identity.⁶¹²

Apollodorus' narrative of Phano's marriage with Theogenes is especially interesting. The orator makes the case that Stephanus and Neaera, not content with having passed Phano as a citizen, had dared giving her in marriage to Theogenes. The latter was an Athenian of noble birth (εὐγενῆ), but poor and politically inexperienced, who had just been elected King Archon ([Dem.] 59.72). The last detail is of utmost importance. Giving an alien woman in marriage to an Athenian citizen was itself a crime,⁶¹³ but the fact that the Athenian citizen in question was the King Archon made the issue appear even more serious. Apollodorus insists on the gravity of this marriage. He points out that Phano, an alien and a prostitute, as wife of the King Archon had performed the rites connected to the festival of the Anthesteria. Such rituals, which included the secret sacrifices (τὰ ἄρρητα ιερά) and the Marriage of Dionysus, were precluded even to the average Athenian citizen.⁶¹⁴ Apollodorus constantly hints at the exclusivity of these rites, which he characterises as 'many and sacred and not to be spoken of' (πολλὰ καὶ ἄγια καὶ ἀπόρρητα). He stresses that Phano had seen what was not proper for a foreigner such as herself to see, and that despite her wicked nature she had entered where only the wife of the King Archon out of all Athenians can enter ([Dem.] 59.73). Even the stele preserving the law which established the criteria that the Basilinna was expected to fulfil was stored in an exclusive location. This was 'the most ancient (ἀρχαιοτάτω) and holy (ἁγιωτάτω) shrine of Dionysos in the Marshes', and Apollodorus states that it was open only once a year so that only a few people would be able to read the inscription (ἵνα μὴ πολλοὶ εἰδῶσιν τὰ γεγραμμένα) ([Dem.] 59.76; transl. Carey).

To reinforce his allegations against Phano, Apollodorus introduces a digression explaining how the magistracy of the King Archon had come to be instituted. The orator states that in antiquity Athens was a monarchy (δυναστεία) and the kingship belonged to those who each time were prominent because they were autochthonous (ἢ βασιλεία τῶν ἀει ὑπερεχόντων διὰ τὸ αὐτόχθονας εἶναι). At that time, the King used to make all the sacrifices, while his wife, the Basilinna, used to perform the holiest and secret ones ([Dem.] 59.74). After Theseus

⁶¹² For an outline of the case, see Kapparis (1999), 31-43, who rightly argues that Apollodorus' allegations rested on very weak grounds. Kapparis deconstructs Apollodorus' arguments to show that Phano and her brothers were not in fact Neaera's children and Neaera herself did not misappropriate the role of an Athenian wife.

⁶¹³ The law forbidding alien women to be given in marriage to Athenian men is quoted at [Dem.] 59.52-3. Apollodorus recalls how Phrastor, Neaera's first husband, had brought a public charge against Stephanus in accordance with this law, but had later dropped it when Stephanus decided to settle their dispute through an arbitration. The text of the law, however, has been shown to be a later forgery by Canevaro (2013a), 187-90, *pace* Carey (1992), 113 and Kapparis (1999), 198-9.

⁶¹⁴ On the Anthesteria and the relative rites, see Parke (1977), 107-20; Kapparis (1999), 324-31; Parker (2005), 290-326.

completed the synoecism and founded the democracy and the city became populous, the ritual functions of the King and his wife passed on to the King Archon, now a magistrate elected by the *dēmos*, and his wife. The Athenians also enacted a law establishing that the Basilinna should be a citizen (ἄστυν) and a virgin at the moment of her wedding ([Dem.] 59.75).⁶¹⁵

Given the insistence on the exclusivity of the rites illicitly performed by Phano and the centrality of citizenship rights to the trial under discussion, an allusion to autochthony does not strike as surprising. What is unusual in this account is the fact that the orator implicitly presents autochthony as a factor of inequality within the citizen body. The phrasing of Apollodorus' statement implies a tradition of hereditary kingship that was transmitted by virtue of the unique autochthonous nature of the royal family. The genitive τῶν ἀεὶ ὑπερεχόντων, attached to the nominative ἡ βασιλεία in the predicative position, indicates that the orator is not simply stating that the city was then the kingdom of the autochthonous people of the Athenians, superior to the rest of humanity.⁶¹⁶ Apollodorus is rather stating that the ancient kings of Athens were the exclusive detainers of autochthony and were thus distinguished from the majority of the population.⁶¹⁷ In other words, the orator is subtly alluding to the myth of the earthborn kings of Attica, which at the time of the trial was already intertwined with the notion of Athenian autochthony.

If one reads the passage in conjunction with the following paragraph, however, an alternative interpretation might be possible. Apollodorus states that after Theseus instituted the democracy and the city became populous (πολύανθρωπος), the Athenians nonetheless kept electing the king, which they choose via *cheirotomia* among preselected candidates on the basis of valour (κατ' ἀνδραγαθίαν) ([Dem.] 59.75). The passage from a hereditary system based on autochthony to an elective system based on worth is made to coincide not only with the birth of democracy but also with the enlargement of Athens' citizen population following the synoecism.⁶¹⁸ Is thus πολύανθρωπος to be understood not simply as indicating an increase in the amount of Athens' inhabitants but also an inflow of population of disparate origins? A passage in Aristotle's *Politics* seems to support this hypothesis. The philosopher maintains

⁶¹⁵ Apollodorus reinforces this argument by adding that, according to the law on seduction, Phano should have been excluded from all the rituals of the city in the first place ([Dem.] 59.85-7). The orator is here alluding to Phano's alleged affair with a man named Epainetus: cf. [Dem.] 59.64-71. The document preserving the text of the law, quoted at [Dem.] 59.87, is likely to be a later forgery: see Canevaro (2013a), 190-6, *pace* Kapparis (1999), 354-7. As Kapparis (1999), 353 has rightly pointed out, Apollodorus' argument is faulty and contradictory: if Phano were a prostitute, as the orator portrays her at [Dem.] 59.64-71, then the law on seduction did not apply to her and she would have been free to participate in any rituals.

⁶¹⁶ Smyth, *GGC*, p. 315, par. 1302.

⁶¹⁷ This is how Carey (1992), 123 interprets the passage in his commentary; both Kapparis and Bers share the same view in their translations.

⁶¹⁸ See Trevett (1990), 418.

that a great state is not the same as a populous (πολύανθρωπος) state, and correlates the adjective πολύανθρωπος with the multitude (πλήθος) inhabiting a city, which includes slaves, metics and aliens (Arist. *Pol.* 1326a17-25). A passage in Thucydides confirms this interpretation. The historian, discussing the foundation of Epidamnus by Corcyra, mentions the participation of Corinthian colonists and other Dorians and states that the city ended up becoming a great and populous (πολύανθρωπος) power (Thuc. 1.24.3). Although Corinth was Corcyra's mother city and they were both part of the Dorian *ethnos*, the passage nonetheless presents the foundation and demographic growth of Epidamnus as the result of the contribution of people coming from disparate places. Apollodorus may therefore imply that, while under the monarchy Athens was a community of autochthonous people and the King was an expression of such a community, after the synoecism Athens' citizen body became ethnically heterogeneous and the city started to elect the King Archon on the basis of valour. This hypothesis, however, does not match the logic of Apollodorus' argument, which rather highlights the continuity between the Basilinna and the wife of the King Archon and the seriousness of Phano's usurpation of this title.⁶¹⁹ Moreover, by restricting autochthony to the royal family and not to an original core of the Athenian population, the orator would make the role of the wife of the King Archon even more exclusive.

Whether one interprets Apollodorus' passage as an allusion to the earthborn nature of the kings or to their membership of an original autochthonous core of Athens' population as opposed to the ethnically diverse population of the democratic city, the orator depicts autochthony as a distinctive feature of a limited part of the citizen body. This is a significant change from the picture traditionally provided at the state funeral, where autochthony is envisaged as the unifying quality of the entire Athenian community. Having to persuade the judges of the enormity of Stephanus and Neaera's offence, Apollodorus exploits the contradictions inherent in the myth of autochthony. He makes the case that, by illegally giving Phano in marriage to the King Archon, the defendants had caused a foreigner and a prostitute to misappropriate a role that was originally meant for the more authentically autochthonous part of the Athenian community. The comparison between Apollodorus' allusion to autochthony in the lawcourts and the treatment of the same myth at the state funeral illuminates the different discursive parameters of the two institutional settings. Orators of funeral speeches focused on those aspects of autochthony that claimed Athens' superiority over the rest of the Greeks and at the same time attested the social and political cohesion of the Athenian citizen body. This was consistent with the discursive parameters of the state funeral for the war dead,

⁶¹⁹ For the same reason, as Kapparis (1999), 334-5 points out, Apollodorus compressed the progressive transition from a hereditary to an elected *basileus* in two stages.

where the orator had to provide the Athenians with the image of a city worth dying for and create an imagined community. Already a mark of exclusivity in funeral speeches, where it isolated the Athenians from the rest of the Greeks, autochthony was made even more exclusive in the forensic speech *Against Neaera*. Apollodorus set an autochthonous subgroup apart from the rest of the Athenian community in order to further his argument against Phano and her mother. Such a claim, which would have been inappropriate at the state funeral, was instead suitable to the lawcourts. This institutional setting enabled orators to diverge from the ideal image of the city provided at the state funeral. On the other hand, it compelled them to craft their historical and mythical allusions according to the discursive parameters of the lawcourts, which placed importance on the relevance to issues of justice and to the legal charges under discussion.

5.6. CONCLUSIONS

Autochthony was a very significant myth for the Athenians, who rehearsed it on countless public occasions. In its final form, which resulted from the combination of the independent traditions of the earthborn kings of Attica and the indigenous Athenians, autochthony was a potentially ambiguous notion. In particular, the mythical figures of the earthborn kings could be perceived as more autochthonous than the rest of the Athenians and imply a disruption of the ideal unity of the citizen body. Political actors resolved this ambiguity by moving the focus away from or onto the earthborn kings, or preferred to play the myth out in all its contradictory aspects. This chapter has argued that their choices were largely conditioned by the different institutional settings of Athenian democracy, and that their mythical variants can be used to illuminate the discursive parameters of those settings.

When approaching the subject of autochthony, orators of funeral speeches adopted a common set of motifs designed to provide an image of Athens as socially and politically cohesive which could justify the prospect of dying for the city and contribute to creating an imagined community. In other words, these speeches all reflected the same discursive parameters, those of the state funeral for the war dead. In the extant funeral speeches, autochthony is therefore often couched in terms of opposition and superiority to the rest of the Greeks. At the same time, orators of funeral speeches resolve the inherent ambiguity of the myth of autochthony by avoiding any mention of the earthborn kings and portraying autochthony as a common trait of the whole Athenian community. This image is constructed mainly through the praise of the Athenians' collective *eugeneia*. To formulate such praise, orators rely (not without individual variations) on a common rhetorical strategy. Through the opposition between collective and individual, they downplay the importance of individual

genealogy in favour of a sense of belonging to Athens' collective noble family. The metaphor of the family is also commonly employed to characterise the Athenian community, with the citizens portrayed as legitimate children of their land and their land in turn as a nurturing mother. Lysias' *Funeral Oration*, set in the aftermath of the democratic restoration, shows a certain degree of innovation compared to the other funeral speeches. Lysias keeps nobility of birth in the background and focuses instead on the relatively new notion of *homonoia*. The latter, presented as an innate feature of the Athenians due to their autochthonous origins and finally reinstated after the defeat of the Thirty, reprises the role of *eugeneia* in expressing the social and political cohesion of the Athenian community. Lysias' treatment of autochthony reinforces the conclusion that, even when introducing variations on the typical rhetorical strategy, orators of funeral speeches all responded to the same discursive parameters. At the same time, Lysias' account of autochthony attests to the dynamic nature of Athenian ideological practice, showing that democratic ideology could come to include new ideas and values that reflected contemporary debates within the *polis*.

If the extant funeral speeches defuse the potential ambiguities of autochthony by moving the focus away from the earthborn kings of Athens, Euripides' *Ion* exploits these contradictions to the full and lets the collective autochthony of the Athenians coexist with the individual earthborn nature of the Erechthid family. The institutional setting of the dramatic festivals releases the playwright from the task of constructing an imagined community and enables him to raise questions about the idealised image of Athens produced at the state funeral. The poet plays with the motifs usually associated with autochthony in the funeral speeches and does not shy away from the controversial aspects of the ideology of autochthony. Euripides downplays the Athenians' collective *eugeneia* in favour of Creusa's individual nobility of birth. Political and social cohesion, at least from the point of view of the outsiders Xuthus and Ion, are replaced by the intolerant side of Athenian autochthony. The metaphor of the Athenians as legitimate children of their land becomes painfully real in the personal experience of Ion, the foreigner and bastard whom Xuthus plans to establish on Athens' throne. The epitaphic image of the Athenian community as a family seems shattered as a result of the individual drama of the Erechthid family, until the poet finally reinstates it thanks to Athena's intervention and Ion's successful integration into the Athenian citizen body.

The reality of Athens' debate over citizenship is central to the pseudo-Demosthenic *Against Neaera*. In this speech, autochthony ceases to be a common feature of the Athenian community as a whole and becomes the exclusive domain of the mythical kings of Attica. The institutional setting of the lawcourts enables Apollodorus to stretch the commonly accepted picture of Athenian autochthony and adapt it to the forensic focus on justice and the laws. The

orator exploits the ambiguity inherent in the Athenian traditions on autochthony. He concentrates on the earthborn kings in order to support his prosecution of the foreign prostitute Neaera, accused of illicitly living with the Athenian Stephanus as a wife. With Stephanus' help, Neaera has allegedly given her daughter Phano in marriage to the King Archon. Apollodorus insists on this detail to strengthen his accusation and complains that Phano, herself an alien and a prostitute, as wife of the King Archon had performed the rituals of the Anthesteria, once the exclusive prerogative of the wife of the autochthonous King. The claim of autochthony, sign of Athenian superiority over the rest of the Greeks in the *epitaphios logos*, is made even more exclusive in Apollodorus' forensic speech. From a reason of social and political cohesion, autochthony has become an implicit factor of disparity among the citizen body. Apollodorus' treatment of autochthony, out of place at the state funeral, is instead appropriate to the context of the lawcourts. In accordance with the discursive parameters of the lawcourts, the orator pushes the exclusiveness of autochthony to an extreme to make Neaera's infringement of Athens' citizenship laws plain and clear to the judges.

CHAPTER 6

Conclusions

This study has explored the construction of democratic ideology in classical Athens. I have argued that research on Athenian democratic ideology would benefit from an increased attention to the formal institutions of the state. My approach has been inspired by the New Institutionalism, which interprets institutions as ensembles of rules, practices and narratives that condition the behaviour of political actors. In particular, I have adopted the principles of Discursive Institutionalism, according to which ideas and discourse are at the same time a product and constitutive of institutions. By reconciling the study of institutions and ideology, which have traditionally been seen as separate and alternative tools for the investigation of Athenian political life, I have advanced a new interpretation of Athenian democratic ideology. Rather than as a fixed set of ideas, values and beliefs shared by the majority of the Athenian community, Athenian democratic ideology should be seen as the product of a constant process of ideological practice which took place within and was influenced by the institutions of the democracy. My thesis has focused on a specific facet of Athenian ideological practice, and has explored the construction of shared ideas about Athens' mythical past. I have shown that Athenian democratic institutions were characterised by distinctive discursive parameters that conditioned the construction of the past in Athenian public discourse. Athenian political actors therefore tended to emphasise different elements of each myth and different values depending on the institutional settings of the democracy.

Chapter 2 has established a framework for my case studies by investigating the relationship between myth and Athenian democratic institutions. First, I have assessed the Athenians' mythical knowledge and showed that fifth- and fourth-century Athenians engaged with myth in virtually every aspect of their public and private lives. The Athenians were familiar with a wide range of mythical themes, and often knew multiple version of the same myths. As a result, they were likely to appreciate variations in mythical narratives and their ideological implications in Athenian public discourse. I have thus shown that the social memory of Athens' mythical (as opposed to historical) past is a valuable field of investigation for the student of Athenian ideological practice.

Second, I have reconstructed the discursive parameters of the institutions of Athenian democracy where the Athenians interacted with myth, and shown that they were an important

factor that conditioned the behaviour of political actors. At the state funeral for the war dead, the Athenians tended to produce an idealised image of the city which was functional to the construction of an imagined community. In the lawcourts, orators were bound by oath to deal with issues of justice and specific legal charges. No such formal rules existed in the Assembly, but the speeches show that deliberative orators were expected to address issues of advantage and discuss the best policy for the city. In the Council, the focus on justice and advantage seemed to coexist, as shown by the Bouleutic Oath and the extant bouleutic speeches. At the dramatic festivals, tragedians needed to appeal to their audience at large in order to win first prize. Playwrights thus tended to endorse values that could be shared by most of the Athenians. The dramatic festivals even enabled them to manipulate the discourse developed in other institutions and allowed them to pose questions about and reaffirm the core ideas of the democratic city.

Finally, through an analysis of several versions of the myth of Adrastus, I have shown that the discursive parameters of democratic institutions had a significant influence on the use of myth in Athenian public discourse. At the state funeral, myth allowed the orators to emphasise the positive values that the Athenians would identify as typical of their community. In the lawcourts, the orators often recalled myths to convince the judges in legal matters, and usually couched their allusions in terms of justice and lawfulness. The speakers in the Assembly could use myth to persuade the Athenians on matters of public policy, and tended to adapt allusions to the past to the deliberative focus on advantage. Myth provided the subject matter for the tragedies at the dramatic festivals, and one of its possible functions was to help playwrights to manipulate and reaffirm the values and discourse developed in Athenian democratic institutions.

Chapter 3 analyses the role of *charis* and *philanthrōpia* in the versions of the myth of the Athenian defence of the Heraclidae produced for the dramatic festivals and the state funeral. In Euripides' *Children of Heracles*, Iolaus obtains Athens' help as a return for the favours that Theseus had received from Heracles. Euripides relied on the value of *charis*, which was shared by most of the Athenians. At the same time, *charis* was important in the language of Athenian deliberative and honorific practice, which the playwright manipulated in the *agōn logōn* between Iolaus and the Herald in order to guide his audience towards Iolaus' success in the debate. In Lysias' *Funeral Oration*, on the other hand, Theseus' private obligation towards Heracles disappears. The orator denied the existence of any reciprocal ties between Athens and the Heraclidae, and described the Athenian intervention as a righteous and altruistic act of *philanthrōpia*. Lysias, therefore, produced an idealised image of Athens that would contribute to the construction of an imagined community. The influence of the state

funeral on Lysias' account of the Heraclidae episode is even more evident from a comparison with Isocrates' narrative of the same myth in his *Panegyricus*. Writing Athens' praise in a private setting, Isocrates did not stress Athenian *philanthrōpia* but emphasised the bond of *charis* between Athens and the Heraclidae. At the same time, he did not mention Theseus' private obligation, but praised Athens' power by stressing that the city had been the only one capable of reciprocating mankind's collective debt towards Heracles.

I have shown that the focus on *charis* or *philanthrōpia* in the myth of the Athenian intervention in defence of the Heraclidae, as well as the presence or absence of Theseus from the episode, were conditioned by the discursive parameters of Athenian democratic institutions. Euripides and Lysias produced two different but compatible images of Athens: on the one hand, the Athenian eagerness to repay the *charis* due to benefactors, which was prominent especially in the language of Athenian honorific decrees; on the other, the Athenian *philanthrōpia* traditionally praised at the state funeral, where the Athenians were portrayed as the righteous and altruistic champions of the weak. Both images coexisted in Athenian ideological practice, but political actors tended to emphasise one or the other depending on the institutional settings of the democracy.

Chapter 4 deals with the myth of the Attic Amazonomachy and the notion of *hybris*. The Athenians were proud of their successful repulsion of the Amazon invasion of Attica, but Theseus' involvement in the events was potentially problematic for Athens' image. Whether he forcibly abducted Antiope, seduced her or legitimately acquired her through military endeavour, Theseus made the Athenians at least partly responsible for the Amazon invasion. I have therefore shown that the discursive parameters of Athenian democratic institutions had a strong impact on how the Athenians conceptualised the causes of the Attic Amazonomachy.

In his *Funeral Oration*, Lysias never mentioned Theseus or Antiope, and emphasised the Amazons' *hybris* as the only cause of the war. Under the influence of the discursive parameters of the state funeral, the orator provided an idealised image of the Athenians as the just punishers of *hybris*. Theseus' involvement, however, could be the object of allusions in institutional settings other than the state funeral as well as in private contexts. In Aeschylus' *Eumenides*, for example, Athena alludes to the Amazon invasion and mentions the Amazons' *phthonos* against Theseus as the reason for their attack. Aeschylus could refer either to the Amazons' envy for Theseus' power or to their rightful indignation for his abduction of Antiope. In accordance with the discursive parameters of the dramatic festivals, Aeschylus' version of the story appealed both to the majority of Athens' democratic audience and to those Athenians who did not share the idealised image of the city provided at the state funeral. In the *Panegyricus*, which was produced for a private setting, Isocrates may have similarly

alluded to Theseus' abduction of Antiope. The orator hinted at the fact that the Amazons fabricated accusations against Athens to be able to attack the Athenians alone and conquer the whole of Greece. Unaffected by the discursive parameters of Athenian democratic institutions, Isocrates produced an image of Athens that emphasised the city's power and supported his proposal of an expedition against the Persians under Athenian leadership.

Other accounts of the Attic Amazonomachy produced for private settings explicitly mentioned Theseus' abduction of Antiope or some variants of the story, and openly contrasted with the idealised image of Athens produced at the state funeral. The abduction version, which was a popular theme in Attic vase painting, risked portraying the Athenians not as the punishers but as the accomplices of those guilty of *hybris*. Philochorus and Pherecydes, who stated that Theseus acquired Antiope either as a war prize from Heracles or as a spear-captive during an independent military campaign, portrayed Theseus as the Amazons' original aggressor in contradiction to the epitaphic picture of Athenian international relations. Isocrates' *Panathenaicus* blamed the war on Hippolyta, who followed Theseus to Athens out of love, and explicitly accused the Amazons of *hybris*, but characterised Theseus as guilty of seduction and risked endangering the Athenians' image as the champions of justice.

Chapter 5 explores the myth of autochthony and its relation to the notion of *eugeneia* at the state funeral, the dramatic festivals and the lawcourts. The myth of autochthony derived from the combination of the independent traditions of the earthborn kings of Attica and the indigenous Athenians. Because of the special status of the earthborn kings compared to the rest of the Athenians, autochthony was an ambiguous notion and implied a potential disruption of the unity of Athens' citizen body. I have argued that Athenian democratic institutions conditioned the way political actors resolved the inherent ambiguity of the myth of autochthony, prompting them to shift the focus away from or onto the earthborn kings.

Orators of funeral speeches never mentioned the earthborn kings and treated autochthony as a common quality of the entire Athenian community. They tended to conceptualise autochthony in terms of collective *eugeneia*, relying on a standard set of images which included the opposition between collective and individual, and the metaphor of the Athenian community as a family. Compared to the other extant funeral speeches, Lysias' *Funeral Oration* shows some degree of innovation. Besides *eugeneia*, Lysias introduced the relatively new notion of *homonoia*, which he characterised as an innate feature of the Athenians due to their autochthonous origins. By focusing on *eugeneia* or *homonoia*, orators of funeral speeches provided an idealised image of Athens as socially and politically cohesive. This picture was coherent with the discursive parameters of the state funeral because it contributed to creating an imagined community. At the same time, Lysias' introduction of the

notion of *homonoia* into the epitaphic script of Athenian autochthony reveals the dynamic nature of Athenian ideological practice, which could come to include new ideas and values that reflected contemporary debates within the *polis*.

The discursive parameters of the dramatic festivals enabled Euripides to exploit and resolve (at least on the tragic stage) the potential contradictions of the myth of autochthony. In *Ion*, the Athenians' collective autochthony coexist with the individual earthborn nature of the Erechthid family. Euripides manipulated the epitaphic image of Athenian autochthony and its controversial aspects. The poet downplayed the Athenians' collective *eugeneia* in favour of Creusa's individual nobility. To the metaphor of the family, he substituted the private drama of Creusa's *oikos* and Ion's painful experience of the intolerant side of Athenian autochthony. The positive image of Athenian autochthony, however, is finally restored by Athena's *ex machina* intervention, when the goddess grants Ion a successful integration into the Athenian citizen body.

The earthborn kings of Attica take centre stage in Apollodorus' allusion to autochthony in the speech *Against Neaera*. Apollodorus couched the myth of autochthony in terms of justice and adapted it to the legal issue of the speech. The orator recalled the myth of autochthony to highlight the seriousness of Neaera's illegal choice to give her daughter Phano, a foreigner, in marriage to Theogenes, an Athenian who had been appointed King Archon. The orator made the case that Phano, as wife of the King Archon, performed the rituals of the Anthesteria. These were once the prerogative of the wives of the Attic kings, who ruled by virtue of their autochthony. Apollodorus treated autochthony as an exclusive characteristic of Athens' mythical kings and an implicit factor of disparity within the Athenian citizen body. He therefore pushed the exclusiveness of autochthony to an extreme in order to emphasise Neaera's infringement of Athens' citizenship laws.

My institutionalist approach to myth and Athenian ideological practice offers significant advantages. First, I have advanced the standard account of Athenian democratic ideology provided by Josiah Ober in *Mass and Elite in Democratic Athens*. Ober envisioned Athenian democratic ideology as a fixed set of ideas and beliefs held by the *dēmos*, which the orators passively endorsed in order to negotiate their place within the democracy as members of the elite. I have provided a more dynamic picture of Athenian ideological practice and shown that the orators (and Athenian political actors in general) actively participated in the construction of the shared ideas, values and beliefs of the community. This process of ideological construction was enabled by the institutions of the *polis*, whose discursive parameters deeply influenced the values and memories that were each time emphasised. Not only does my research stress the complex and multifaceted role of the orators in Athenian

ideological practice, but it also allows us to look at the production of ideas and values *in fieri*, as in the case of *homonoia* highlighted in Chapter 5. A future research perspective offered by my synergic approach to institutions and ideology is therefore the development and possible institutionalisation of new ideas and values in Athenian political debate.⁶²⁰ Moreover, my study offers a balanced synthesis between culturalist and Marxist interpretations of ideology. It combines the descriptive aspect and positive notion of ideology held by the culturalist tradition (and shared by Ober) with the normative aspect and evolving nature of ideology typical of the Marxist tradition.⁶²¹ In other words, I have argued that ideology should not be seen as either true or false, nor mainly as a means for the legitimization of the ruling class within class struggle, but as a necessary element in the political life of the community. Accordingly, I have shown that Athenian ideological practice was an ongoing process through which both the mass and the elite contributed to the creation of shared values and ideas.

Second, my study has added a further dimension to the traditional institutional analysis of Athenian democracy. While previous scholarship focused on the description of the formal aspects of Athenian democratic institutions, I have offered an analysis of the relationship between those institutions and the Athenians acting within them. I have thus shown how the institutions of the democracy tended to condition the way Athenian political actors spoke and participated in the community's ideological practice, and how the same institutional constraints did not apply in private settings. Research on Athenian social memory has similarly benefited from a new layer of investigation as a result of my study. Not only have I explored what the Athenians remembered, but I have also analysed the reasons why specific memories were significant to the Athenians in specific contexts. Moreover, I have shown that Athenian social memory should not be conceived as the sum of separate mnemonic communities, but rather as a collective process of production of different memories appropriate to different settings. The orators accordingly did not simply pick versions of the past produced in pre-existing traditions, but actively participated in the creation and dispersion of social memory. My study has also contributed to our understanding of Aristotle's classification of rhetoric. The nature of such classification (and of Aristotle's *Rhetoric* in general) was at the same time

⁶²⁰ Christ (2013) has recently analysed the development of the notion of *philanthrōpia* in Athenian public discourse, but his discussion does not consider the role of institutions in this process.

⁶²¹ The evolving nature of ideology according to Marxist theory is well exemplified by Althusser (1984) [1971], esp. 58-9, who stressed that 'the ideology of the ruling class does not become the ruling ideology by the grace of God, nor even by virtue of the seizure of state power alone. It is by the installation of the ISAs [Ideological State Apparatuses] in which this ideology is realised and realizes itself that it becomes the ruling ideology. But this installation [...] is the stake in a very bitter and continuous class struggle'. See also Rose (2012), 42-7.

descriptive and normative.⁶²² Viewed from an institutionalist perspective, the descriptive aspect acquires a further level of meaning. My analysis corroborates the view that Aristotle's subdivision of the discipline into three genres was based on the observation of actual oratorical practice,⁶²³ and the presence of clear correspondences between Aristotle's speculation on rhetoric and the institutional structure of the Athenian democracy suggests that the philosopher's classification had an (at least intuitive) institutional rationale.⁶²⁴

Finally, my thesis has contributed to bridging the gap between ancient history and modern political sciences. By adopting the principles of the New Institutionalism, I have shown that institutions are still a valuable tool for the study of Athenian democracy. This methodological realignment can allow Greek historians to ask new and contemporary questions to the ancient sources. A potential field of investigation would be the study of the influence of ideas on Athenian democratic institutions. We are now witnessing to the rise and gradual institutionalisation of an anti-establishment ideology. Some elements of such an ideology existed also in classical Athens, where orators conceptualised their opponents as an elite of professional rhetors whom the *dēmos* was invited to distrust. An institutionalist approach would allow us to understand whether, when and how an anti-establishment ideology managed to influence the formal institutions of Athenian democracy, and would provide a fresh perspective not only on Athenian political life but also on a contemporary phenomenon. In conclusion, a renewed and dynamic focus on institutions can help ancient historians to pose topical questions that can attract the general interests of social and political scientists, broadening our understanding of Athenian democracy and contributing to a larger debate on human political interaction.

⁶²² See Pepe (2013), 125-6. Garver (2009), 13 has similarly noted that the three genres allowed Aristotle to avoid providing either a purely descriptive or a completely idealised account of rhetorical practice.

⁶²³ Pepe (2013), 134, *pace* Kennedy (2007) [1991], 22-3, who argued that Aristotle only had limited knowledge of Attic oratory and based his *Rhetoric* not on the analysis of actual speeches but rather on his understanding of politics and ethics.

⁶²⁴ The necessity to connect Aristotle's three genres of rhetoric with the institutions of the Greek *polis* has been recently highlighted by Depew (2013), esp. 319. See also Garver (1994), 52-73.

Bibliography

- Alcock, S. (2002), *Archaeologies of the Greek Past: Landscapes, Monuments and Memories*, Cambridge.
- Allan, W. (2001), *Euripides: Children of Heracles*, Warminster.
- Allan, W. and Kelly, A. (2013), 'Listening to Many Voices: Greek Tragedy as Popular Art', in A. Marmoraro and J. Hill (eds), *The Author's Voice in Classical and Late Antiquity*, Oxford, 77-122.
- Anderson, B. (2006) [1983], *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, London.
- Anderson, G. (2003), *The Athenian Experiment: Building an Imagined Political Community in Ancient Attica, 508-490 BC*, Ann Arbor (Mich).
- Althusser, L. (1984) [1971], *Essays on Ideology*, London.
- Arrington, N. T. (2010), 'The Location of the Athenian Public Cemetery and Its Significance for the Nascent Democracy', *Hesperia* 79/4, 499-539.
- Arrington, N. T. (2011), 'Inscribing Defeat: The Commemorative Dynamics of the Athenian Casualty Lists', *ClAnt* 30/2, 179-212.
- Arrington, N. T. (2014), *Ashes, Images, and Memories: The Presence of the War Dead in Fifth-Century Athens*, Oxford.
- Assmann, J. (1992), *Das kulturelle Gedächtnis: Schrift, Erinnerung und politische Identität in frühen Hochkulturen*, Munich.
- Avery, H. C. (1971), 'Euripides' Heracleidai', *AJPh* 92, 539-65.
- Azoulay, V. (2009), 'Lycurgue d'Athènes et le passé de la cité : entre neutralisation et instrumentalisation', *CEA* 46, 149-80.
- Azoulay, V. and Ismard, P. (2007), 'Les lieux du politique dans l'Athènes classique. Entre structures institutionnelles, idéologie civique et pratiques sociales', in P. Schmitt Pantel and F. de Polignac (eds), *Athènes et le politique. Dans le sillage de Claude Mossé*, Paris, 271-309.
- Balot, R. K. (2001), *Greed and Injustice in Classical Athens*, Princeton (NJ).
- Balot, R. K. (2013), 'Epideictic Rhetoric and the Foundations of Politics', *Polis (Exeter)* 30/2, 274-304.
- Barber, E. J. W. (1992), 'The Peplos of Athena', in J. Neils (ed.), *Goddess and Polis. The Panathenaic Festival in Ancient Athens*, Hanover (NH) and Princeton (NJ), 103-17.

- Barringer, J. M. (2008), *Art, Myth, and Ritual in Classical Greece*, Cambridge and New York.
- Barringer, J. M. (2014), 'Athenian State Monuments for the War Dead: Evidence from a Loutrophoros', in A. Avramidou and D. Demetriou (eds), *Approaching the Ancient Artifact. Representation, Narrative, and Function: A Festschrift in Honor of H. Alan Shapiro*, Berlin and Boston (MA), 153-60.
- Bearzot, C. S. (2003), 'Il concetto di «dynasteia» e lo stato ellenistico', in C. Bearzot, F. Landucci Gattinoni, G. Zecchini (eds), *Gli stati territoriali nel mondo antico*, Milano, 21-44.
- Bearzot, C. S. (2007), 'Autoctonia, rifiuto della mescolanza, civilizzazione: da Isocrate a Megastene', in T. Gnoli and F. Muccioli (eds), *Incontri tra culture nell'oriente ellenistico e romano*, Milano, 7-28.
- Bearzot, C. S. (2015), 'Il tema dell'*homonoia* nell'azione politica di Trasibulo', *Rationes Rerum* 5, 99-116.
- Bergemann, J. (1997), *Demos und Thanatos. Untersuchungen zum Wertsystem der Polis im Spiegel der attischen Grabreliefs des 4. Jahrhunderts v .Chr. und der Funktion der gleichzeitigen Grabbauten*, München.
- Bers, V. (2003), *The Oratory of Classical Greece: Demosthenes, Speeches 50 – 59*, Austin (TX).
- Bertelli, L. (2001), 'Hecataeus: from Genealogy to Historiography', in N. Luraghi (ed.), *The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus*, Oxford, 67-94.
- Blok, J. H. (1995), *The Early Amazons. Modern and Ancient Perspectives on a Persistent Myth*, Leiden.
- Blok, J. H. (2009), 'Gentrifying Genealogy: On the Genesis of the Athenian Autochthony Myth', in U. Dill and C. Walde (eds), *Antike Mythen. Medien, Transformationen und Konstruktionen*, Berlin and New York, 251-75.
- Blyth, M., Helgadottir, O. and Kring, W. (2016), 'Ideas and Historical Institutionalism', in O. Fioretos, T. G. Falletti and A. Sheingate (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Historical Institutionalism*, Oxford, 142-62.
- Boardman, J. (1972), 'Herakles, Peisistratos and Sons', *RA* 1972/1, 57-72.
- Boardman, J. (1975), 'Herakles, Peisistratos and Eleusis', *JHS* 95, 1-12.
- Boardman, J. (1982), 'Herakles, Theseus and Amazons', in D. C. Kurtz and B. A. Sparkes (eds), *The Eye of Greece. Studies in the Art of Athens*, Cambridge, 1-28.
- Boardman, J. (1989), 'Herakles, Peisistratos and the Unconvinced', *JHS* 109, 158-9.
- Boardman, J. (1991), *Greek Sculpture: the Archaic Period; a Handbook*, London.
- Boegehold, A. L. (1995), *The Lawcourts at Athens: Sites, Buildings, Equipment, Procedure and Testimonia (The Athenian Agora: Results of Excavations Conducted by the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, Vol. XXVIII)*, Princeton (NJ).

- Boegehold, A. L. (1996), 'Group and Single Competitions at the Panathenaia', in J. Neils (ed.), *Worshipping Athena: Panathenaia and Parthenon*, Madison (WI), 95-105.
- Bosworth, A. B. (2000), 'The Historical Context of Thucydides' Funeral Oration', *JHS* 120, 1-16.
- von Bothmer, D. (1957), *Amazons in Greek Art*, Oxford.
- Bowie, E. L. (1986) 'Early Greek Elegy, Symposium and Public Festival', *JHS* 106, 13-35.
- Bowie, E. L. (1993), 'Greek Table-Talk before Plato', *Rhetorica* 11/4, 355-71.
- Bowie, E. L. (2010), 'Epigram as Narration', in M. Baumbach, A. Petrovic, and I. Petrovic (eds), *Archaic and Classical Greek Epigram*, Cambridge, 313-84.
- Bowra, C. M. (1964), *Pindar*, Oxford.
- Bremmer, J. M. (1987), 'What is a Greek Myth?', in J. M. Bremmer (ed.), *Interpretations of Greek Mythology*, London, 1-9.
- Bremmer, J. M. (1997), 'Myth as Propaganda: Athens and Sparta', *ZPE* 117, 9-17.
- Brommer, F. (1967), *Die Metopen des Parthenon: Katalog und Untersuchung*, Mainz.
- Brock, R. (1994), 'The Labour of Women in Classical Athens', *CQ* 44, 336-46.
- Brock, R. (1998), 'Mythical Polypragmosyne in Athenian Drama and Rhetoric', *BICS Suppl.* 71, 227-38.
- Buchner, E. (1958), *Der Panegyrikos des Isokrates: eine historisch-philologische Untersuchung*, Wiesbaden.
- Budelmann, F. (2012), 'Epinician and the *Symposion*: A Comparison with the *Enkomion*', in C. Carey, R. Rawles and P. Agocs (eds), *Reading the Victory Ode*, London, 173-90.
- Burgess, J. S. (2004-2005), 'Performance and the Epic Cycle', *CJ* 100/1, 1-23.
- Burian, P. H. (1971), *Suppliant Drama: Studies in the Form and Interpretation of Five Greek Tragedies*, Princeton (NJ).
- Burian, P. H. (1977), 'Euripides' Heraclidae. An interpretation', *CPh* 72, 1-21.
- Cairns, D. L. (1993), *Aidôs: The Psychology and Ethics of Honour and Shame in Ancient Greek Literature*, Oxford.
- Cairns, D. L. (1996), 'Hybris, Dishonour, and Thinking Big', *JHS* 116, 1-32.
- Cairns, D. L. (2003), 'The Politics of Envy: Envy and Equality in Ancient Greece', in D. Konstan and K. Rutter (eds), *Envy, Spite, and Jealousy: The Rivalrous Emotions in Ancient Greece*, Edinburgh, 235-52.
- Cairns, D. L. (2011), 'Honour and Shame: Modern Controversies and Ancient Values', *Critical Quarterly* 53, 23-41.
- Cairns, D. L. (2016a), *Sophocles: Antigone*, London.

- Cairns, D. L. (2016b), 'Metaphors for Hope in Archaic and Classical Greek Poetry', in R. R. Caston and R. A. Kaster (eds), *Hope, Joy, and Affection in the Classical World (Festschrift for David Konstan)*, Oxford, 13-44.
- Calame, C. (1996) [1990], *Thésée et l'imaginaire athénien: légende et culte en Grèce antique*, Lausanne.
- Calame, C. (2011), 'Myth and Performance on the Athenian Stage: Praxithea, Erechtheus, their Daughters, and the Etiology of Autochthony', *CPh* 106/1, 1-19.
- Calame, C. (2013), 'The Dithyramb, a Dionysiac Poetic Form: Genre Rules and Cultic Contexts', in B. Kowalzig and P. Wilson (eds), *Dythiramb in Context*, Oxford, 332-52.
- Campbell, J. L. (1998), 'Institutional Analysis and the Role of Ideas in Political Economy', *Theory and Society* 27/3, 377-409.
- Canevaro, M. (2013a), *The Documents in the Attic Orators: Laws and Decrees in the Public Speeches of the Demosthenic Corpus*, Oxford.
- Canevaro, M. (2013b), 'Nomothesia in Classical Athens: What Sources Should We Believe?', *CQ* 63/1, 1-22.
- Canevaro, M. (2016a), *Demostene, Contro Leptine. Introduzione, Traduzione e Commento Storico*, Berlin.
- Canevaro, M. (2016b), 'The Popular Culture of the Athenian Institutions: "Authorized" Popular Culture and "Unauthorized" Elite Culture in Classical Athens', in L. Grig (ed.), *Locating Popular Culture in the Ancient World*, Cambridge, 39-65.
- Canevaro, M. (2017), 'Review of A. Gottesman, *Politics and the Street in Democratic Athens*', *CR* 67/2, 1-3.
- Canevaro, M. (forthcoming a), 'Making and Changing Laws in Ancient Athens', in E. M. Harris and M. Canevaro (eds), *Oxford Handbook of Ancient Greek Law*, Oxford.
- Canevaro, M. (forthcoming b), 'Memory, the Rhetors and the Public in Attic Oratory', in L. Castagnoli and P. Ceccarelli (eds), *Greek Memories: Theories and Practices*.
- Canevaro, M. (forthcoming c), 'Social Mobility vs. Societal Stability: Once Again on the Aims and Meaning of Solon's Reforms', in J. Bernhardt and M. Canevaro (eds), *From Homer to Solon: Continuity and Change in Archaic Greek Society*, Leiden.
- Canevaro, M., and Rutter, N. K. (2015), 'Silver for Syracuse: the Athenian Defeat and the Period of the "Signing Artists"', *Schweizerische Numismatische Rundschau* 93, 5-20.
- Canfora, L. (2011), 'L'epitafio in morte di Leostene e la "guerra lamiaca"', *QS* 37, 5-28.
- Carey, C. (1992), *Apollodoros, Against Neaira [Demosthenes] 59*, Warminster.
- Carey, C. (1995), 'Rape and Adultery in Athenian Law', *CQ* 45/2, 407-17.

- Carey, C. (2000), 'Observers of Speeches and Hearers of Action: The Athenian Orators', in O. Taplin (ed.), *Literature in the Greek and Roman Worlds*, Oxford, New York, 192-216.
- Carey, C. (2009), 'Genre, Occasion and Performance', in F. Budelmann (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Lyric*, Cambridge and New York, 21-38.
- Carpenter, T. H. (1991), *Art and Myth in Ancient Greece*, London.
- Castriota, D. (1992), *Myth, Ethos and Actuality: Official Art in Fifth-Century B.C. Athens*, Madison (WI).
- Castriota, D. (2005), 'Feminizing the Barbarian and Barbarizing the Feminine. Amazons, Trojans, and Persians in the Stoa Poikile', in J. M. Barringer and J. M. Hurwit (eds), *Periklean Athens and its Legacy. Problems and Perspectives*, Austin (TX), 89-102.
- Ceccarelli, P. (2013), *Ancient Greek Letter Writing: A Cultural History (600 BC-150 BC)*, Oxford.
- Chiapello, E. (2003), 'Reconciling the Two Principal Meanings of the Notion of Ideology. The Example of the Concept of the Spirit of Capitalism', *European Journal of Social Theory* 6/2, 155-71.
- Christ, M. R. (2012), *The Limits of Altruism in Democratic Athens*, Cambridge.
- Christ, M. R. (2013), 'Demosthenes on *Philanthropia* as a Democratic Virtue', *CPh* 108/3, 202-22.
- Clairmont C. W. (1983), *Patrios Nomos. Public Burial in Athens During the Fifth and Fourth Centuries B.C. The Archaeological, Epigraphic-literary and Historical Evidence, I & II*, Oxford
- Cobetto Ghiggia, P. (2012), '*Homonoia e demokratia* nell'Atene fra V e IV sec. a.C.: un approccio lessicale', in S. Cataldi, E. Bianco and G. Cuniberti (eds), *Salvare le poleis, costruire la concordia, progettare la pace*, Alessandria, 267-79.
- Cohen, B. (2012), 'The Non-Greek in Greek Art', in T. J. Smith and D. Plantzos (eds), *A Companion to Greek Art*, Oxford and Malden (MA), 456-79.
- Collard, C. (1975), 'Formal Debates in Euripides' Drama', *G&R* 22, 58-71.
- Collard, C. and Cropp, M. J. (2008), *Euripides: Fragments*, Cambridge (MA), London.
- Connelly, J. B. (1996), 'Parthenon and *Parthenoi*: A Mythological Interpretation of the Parthenon Frieze', *AJA* 100/1, 53-80.
- Connor, W. R. (1989), 'City Dionysia and Athenian Democracy', *C&M* 40, 7-32.
- Cooper, C. (2007), 'Making Irrational Myth Plausible History: Polybian Intertextuality in Plutarch's *Theseus*', *Phoenix* 61/3-4, 212-33.
- Coventry, L. (1989), 'Philosophy and Rhetoric in the *Menexenus*', *JHS* 109, 1-15.
- Cropp, M. J. (1988), *Euripides: Electra*, Warminster.
- Csapo, E. (2005), *Theories of Mythology*, Oxford and Malden (MA).

- Csapo, E. (2007), 'The Men Who Built the Theatres: *Theatropolai*, *Theatronai*, and *Arkhitektones*', in P.J. Wilson (ed.), *The Greek Theatre and Festivals: Documentary Studies*, Oxford, New York, 87-121.
- Csapo, E. and Slater, W. J. (1995), *The Context of Ancient Drama*, Ann Arbor (Mich.).
- Csapo, E. and Wilson, P. J. (2014), 'Dramatic Festivals', in H. M. Roisman (ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Greek Tragedy*, Chichester, 292-9.
- Culasso Gastaldi, E. (1977), 'L'Amazzonomachia teseica nell'elaborazione propagandistica ateniese', *AAT* 111, 283-96.
- Cuniberti, G. (2007), 'Giurare e decretare la *homonoia*: nota a Thuc. VIII 75, 2 e 93, 3', in G. Daverio Rocchi (ed.), *Tra concordia e pace: parole e valori della Grecia antica. Atti della giornata di studio (Milano, 21 ottobre 2005)*, Milano, 39-54.
- Currie, B. (2004), 'Reperformance Scenarios for Pindar's Odes', in C. J. Mackie (ed.), *Oral Performance and Its Context*, Leiden, 49-69.
- Daverio Rocchi, G. (2007), 'La concordia: tema culturale, obiettivo politico e virtù civica', in G. Daverio Rocchi (ed.), *Tra concordia e pace: parole e valori della Grecia antica. Atti della giornata di studio (Milano, 21 ottobre 2005)*, Milano, 3-38.
- Davis-Kimball, J., Yablonsky, L. T., and Bashilov, V. (1995), eds., *Nomads of the Eurasian Steppes in the Early Iron Age*, Berkeley (CA).
- Dent, J. M. (1910), *Thucydides. The Peloponnesian War*, New York.
- Depew, D. J. (2013), 'Why Aristotle Says That Artful Rhetoric Can Happen in Only a Few Venues - and Why We Should Too', *Polis (Exeter)* 30/2, 305-21.
- Devambez, P. (1976), 'Les Amazones et l'Orient', *RA* 1976/2, 265-80.
- Dickey, E. (2007), *Ancient Greek Scholarship. A Guide to Finding, Reading, and Understanding Scholia, Commentaries, Lexica, and Grammatical Treatises, from Their Beginnings to the Byzantine Period*, Oxford.
- Dickie, M. W. (1984), 'Hesychia and Hybris in Pindar', in D. E. Gerber (ed.), *Greek Poetry and Philosophy: Studies in Honour of Leonard Woodbury*, Chico (CA), 83-109.
- Dodds, E. R. (1951), *The Greeks and the Irrational*, Berkeley and Los Angeles (CA).
- Dolcetti, P. (2004), *Ferecide di Atene. Testimonianze e frammenti. Introduzione, testo, traduzione e commento*, Alessandria.
- Donlan, W. (1998), 'Political Reciprocity in Dark Age Greece: Odysseus and His *Hetairoi*', in C. Gill, N. Postlethwaite and R. Seaford (1998), 51-71.
- Donlan, W. (1999) [1980], *The Aristocratic Ideal and Selected Papers*, Wauconda (IL).
- Dover, K. J. (1974), *Greek Popular Morality in the Time of Plato and Aristotle*, Berkeley (CA).
- Dowden, K. (1992), *The Uses of Greek Mythology*, London and New York.

- Dowden, K. (1997), 'The Amazons: Development and Functions', *RhM* 140, 97-128.
- Duplouy, A. (2006), *Le prestige des élites: recherches sur les modes de reconnaissance sociale en Grèce entre les Xe et Ve siècles avant J.-C.*, Paris.
- Eagleton, T. (1991), *Ideology: an Introduction*, London and New York.
- Edmunds, L. (2006), *Oedipus*, London.
- Emlyn-Jones, C. and Preddy, W. (2013), *Plato. Republic, Volume I: Books 1-5*, Cambridge (MA).
- Erskine, A. (2001), *Troy between Greece and Rome. Local Tradition and Imperial Power*, Oxford.
- Fantham, E., Foley, H. P., Kampen, N. B., Pomeroy, S. B., and Shapiro, H. A. (1994), *Women in the Classical World. Image and Text*, Oxford.
- Faraguna, M. (2009), 'Oralità e scrittura nella prassi giudiziaria ateniese tra V e IV sec. a.C.', in E. M. Harris and G. Thür (eds), *Symposion 2007. Vorträge zur griechischen und hellenistischen Rechtsgeschichte*, Wien, 63-82.
- Faraguna, M. (2012), 'Società, amministrazione, diritto: lo statuto giuridico di tombe e *periboloi* nell'Atene classica', in B. Legras and G. Thür (eds), *Symposion 2011. Vorträge zur griechischen und hellenistischen Rechtsgeschichte*, Wien, 165-85.
- Fearn, D. (2007), *Bacchylides: Politics, Performance, Poetic Tradition*, Oxford and New York.
- Fentress, J., and Wickham, C. (1992), *Social Memory*, Oxford.
- Finglass, P. J. (2011), *Sophocles. Ajax*, Cambridge and New York.
- Finley, M. I. (1985) [1973], *Democracy Ancient and Modern*, New Brunswick (NJ).
- Fisher, N. R. E. (1992), *Hybris: A Study in the Values of Honour and Shame in Ancient Greece*, Warminster.
- Fisher, N. R. E. (2000), 'Symposiasts, Fish-Eaters and Flatterers: Social Mobility and Moral Concerns in Old Comedy', in D. Harvey and J. Wilkins (eds), *The Rivals of Aristophanes: Studies in Athenian Old Comedy*, Swansea, 355-96.
- Fisher, N. R. E. (2001), *Aeschines. Against Timarchos*, Oxford.
- Fisher, N. R. E. (2003), "'Let Envy be Absent": Envy, Liturgies and Reciprocity in Athens', in D. Konstan and K. Rutter (eds), *Envy, Spite and Jealousy: The Rivalrous Emotions in Ancient Greece*, Edinburgh, 181-215.
- Flashar, H. (1969), *Der Epitaphios des Perikles: seine Funktion im Geschichtswerk des Thukydides*, Heidelberg.
- Forsdyke, S. L. (2012), "'Born from the Earth": The Political Uses of an Athenian Myth', *Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Religions* 12, 119-41.
- Fowler, R. L. (1998), 'Genealogical Thinking, Hesiod's *Catalogue*, and the Creation of the Hellenes', *PCPhS* 44, 1-19.
- Fowler, R. L. (1999), 'The Authors Named Pherecydes', *Mnemosyne* 52/1, 1-15.

- Fowler, R. L. (2001), 'Early *Historie* and Literacy', in N. Luraghi (ed.), *The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus*, Oxford, 95-115.
- Fowler, R. L. (2013), *Early Greek Mythography. Vol. II: Commentary*, Oxford.
- Frangeskou, V. (1998-1999), 'Tradition and Originality in Some Attic Funeral Orations', *CW* 92/4, 315-36.
- Frost, F. J. (1984a), 'The Athenian Military before Cleisthenes', *Historia* 33, 283-94.
- Frost, F. J. (1984b), 'Plutarch and Theseus', *CB* 60/4, 65-73.
- Gantz, T. (1993), *Early Greek myth: a Guide to Literary and Artistic Sources*, Baltimore (MD).
- Garver, E. (1994), *Aristotle's Rhetoric: an Art of Character*, Chicago (IL).
- Garver, E. (2009), 'Aristotle on the Kinds of Rhetoric', *Rhetorica* 27/1, 1-18.
- Garvie, A. F. (2009), *Aeschylus. Persae, with Introduction and Commentary*, Oxford.
- Garzya, A. (1956), 'Studi sugli *Eraclidi* di Euripide, I: Il dramma', *Dioniso* 19, 17-40.
- Gastaldi, V. (2007), 'Embajadores trágicos: la retórica del κῆρυξ en Heraclidas de Eurípides', *AC* 76, 39-50.
- Geertz, C. (1973), *The Interpretation of Cultures*, New York.
- Gehrke, H.-J. (2001), 'Mythos, History, and Collective Identity: Uses of the Past in Ancient Greece and Beyond', in N. Luraghi (ed.), *The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus*, Oxford, 286-313.
- Gehrke, H.-J. (2010), 'Greek Representations of the Past', in L. Foxhall, H.-J. Gehrke, N. Luraghi (eds), *Intentional History: Spinning Time in Ancient Greece*, Stuttgart, 15-33.
- Gensheimer, M. B. (2017), 'Metaphors for Marathon in the Sculptural Program of the Athenian Treasury at Delphi', *Hesperia* 86/1, 1-42.
- Gerber, D. E. (1997), 'General Introduction', in D. E. Gerber (ed.), *A Companion to the Greek Lyric Poets*, Leiden, 1-9.
- Gerber, D. E. (1999), *Greek Elegiac Poetry: From the Seventh to the Fifth Centuries BC*, Cambridge (Mass.).
- Giangiulio, M. (2001), 'Constructing the Past: Colonial Traditions and the Writing of History. The Case of Cyrene', in N. Luraghi (ed.), *The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus*, Oxford, 116-37.
- Giangiulio, M., (2010), 'Le società ricordano? Paradigmi e problemi della 'memoria collettiva' (a partire da Maurice Halbwachs)', in M. Giangiulio (ed.), *Memorie coloniali*, Roma, 29-43.
- Gill, C., Postlethwaite, N., and Seaford, R. (1998), eds, *Reciprocity in Ancient Greece*, Oxford.
- Godley, A. D. (1920), *Herodotus. The Persian Wars, Volume IV: Books 8-9*, Cambridge (MA).
- Goette, H. R. (2007), 'An Archaeological Appendix', in P.J. Wilson (ed.), *The Greek Theatre and Festivals: Documentary Studies*, Oxford and New York, 116-21.

- Goette, H. R. (2009), 'Images in the 'Demotion Sema'', in O. Palagia (ed.), *Art in Athens during the Peloponnesian War*, Cambridge, 188-206.
- Goldhill, S. (1987), 'The Great Dionysia and Civic Ideology', *JHS* 107, 58-76.
- Goldhill, S. (1990), 'The Great Dionysia and Civic Ideology', in J. J. Winkler and F. I. Zeitlin (eds), *Nothing to Do with Dionysos?: Athenian Drama in Its Social Context*, Princeton (NJ), 97-129.
- Goldhill, S. (1997), 'The Audience of the Athenian Tragedy', in P. E. Easterling (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Tragedy*, Cambridge, New York, 54-68.
- Gomme, A. W. (1956), *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides 2: Books II–III*, Oxford.
- Gotteland, S. (2001), *Mythe et Rhétorique. Les exemples mythiques dans le discours politique de l'Athènes classique*, Paris.
- Gottesman, A. (2014), *Politics and the Street in Democratic Athens*, Cambridge and New York.
- Graeber, D. (2011), *Debt: The First 5,000 Years*, New York.
- Gray, B. D. (2013), 'The Polis Becomes Humane? *Philanthropia* as a Cardinal Civic Virtue in later Hellenistic Honorific Epigraphy and Historiography', *Studi Ellenistici* 27, 137-62.
- Gray, B. D. (2015), *Stasis and Stability: Exile, the Polis, and Political Thought, c. 404-146 BC*, Oxford.
- Gray, V. J. (1994a), 'Isocrates' Manipulation of Myth and the Image of Athens, *Panegyricus* 54ff., *Panathenaicus* 168ff.', *Prudentia* 26/1, 83-104.
- Gray, V. J. (1994b), 'Images of Sparta: Writer and Audience in Isocrates' *Panathenaicus*', in A. Powell and S. Hodkinson (eds), *The Shadow of Sparta*, London, 223-71.
- Griffith, M. (1995), 'Brilliant Dynasts: Power and Politics in the *Oresteia*', *ClAnt* 14/1, 62-129.
- Griffin, J. (1998), 'The Social Function of Attic Tragedy', *CQ* 48/1, 39-61.
- Griffin, J. (1999), 'Sophocles and the Democratic City', in J. Griffin (ed.), *Sophocles Revisited: Essays Presented to Sir Hugh Lloyd-Jones*, Oxford and New York, 73-94
- Grethlein, J. (2010), *The Greeks and Their Past: Poetry, Oratory and History in the Fifth Century BCE*, Cambridge.
- Halbwachs, M. (1925), *Les cadres sociaux de la mémoire*, Paris.
- Halbwachs, M. (1950), *La mémoire collective*, Paris.
- Hall, J. M. (1997), *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity*, Cambridge.
- Hanink, J. (2013), 'Epitaphioi Mythoi and Tragedy as Encomium of Athens', *TiC* 5, 289-317.
- Hansen, M. H. (1974), *The Sovereignty of the People's Court in Athens in the fourth century B.C. and the public action against unconstitutional proposals*, Odense.
- Hansen, M. H. (1978), 'Nomos and Psephisma in Fourth-Century Athens', *GRBS* 19/4, 315-30.
- Hansen, M. H. (1979), 'How often did the Athenian *Dicasteria* Meet?', *GRBS* 20/3, 243-6.
- Hansen, M. H. (1983), *The Athenian Ecclesia. A Collection of Articles 1976–1983*, Copenhagen.

- Hansen, M. H. (1985), *Demography and Democracy: The Number of Athenian Citizens in the Fourth Century B.C.*, Herning.
- Hansen, M. H. (1987), *The Athenian Assembly in the Age of Demosthenes*, Oxford.
- Hansen, M. H. (1989), *The Athenian Ecclesia II. A Collection of Articles 1983-89*, Copenhagen.
- Hansen, M. H. (1990), 'Review of J. Ober, *Mass and Elite in Democratic Athens*', *CR* 40, 348-56.
- Hansen, M. H. (1999) [1991], *Athenian Democracy in the Age of Demosthenes: Structure, Principles and Ideology*, Oxford.
- Harding, P. (2007), *The Story of Athens. The Fragments of the Local Chronicles of Attika*, London and New York.
- Hardwick, L. (1990), 'Ancient Amazons - Heroes, Outsiders or Women?', *G&R* 37/1, 14-36.
- Harris, E. M. (1990), 'Did the Athenians Regard Seduction as a Worse Crime Than Rape?', *CQ* 40/2, 370-7.
- Harris, E. M. (1992), 'Pericles' Praise of Athenian Democracy: Thucydides 2.37.1', *HSPH* 94, 157-67.
- Harris, E. M. (2000), 'The Authenticity of Andocides' *De Pace*. A Subversive Essay', in P. Flensted-Jensen, T. H. Nielsen and L. Rubinstein (eds), *Polis & Politics: Studies in Ancient Greek History Presented to Mogens Herman Hansen on his Sixtieth Birthday*, Copenhagen, 479-506
- Harris, E. M. (2006), *Democracy and the Rule of Law in Classical Athens. Essays on Law, Society, and Politics*, Cambridge.
- Harris, E. M. (2010), 'Introduction', in E. M. Harris, D. F. Leão and P. J. Rhodes (2010), 1-24.
- Harris, E. M. (2013a), 'How to Address the Athenian Assembly: Rhetoric and Political Tactics in the Debate about Mytilene (Thuc. 3.37-50)', *CQ* 63, 94-109.
- Harris, E. M. (2013b), *The Rule of Law in Action*, Oxford.
- Harris, E. M. (2013c), 'The Plaint in Athenian Law and Legal Procedure', in M. Faraguna (ed.), *Archives and Archival Documents in Ancient Societies*, Trieste, 143-62.
- Harris, E. M. (2016), 'From Democracy to the Rule of Law? Constitutional Change in Athens during the Fifth and Fourth Centuries BCE', in C. Tiersch (ed.), *Die athenische Demokratie im 4. Jahrhundert zwischen Modernisierung und Tradition*, Stuttgart, 73-88.
- Harris, E. M. (forthcoming), 'Rhetoric and Politics in Ancient Greece', in M. MacDonald (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Rhetorical Studies*, Oxford.
- Harris, E. M., Leão, D. F., and Rhodes, P. J. (2010), eds, *Law and Drama in Ancient Greece*, London.
- Harrison, A. R. W. (1971), *The Law of Athens. Vol. II: Procedure*, Oxford.
- Harrison, E. B. (1966), 'The Composition of the Amazonomachy on the Shield of Athena Parthenos', *Hesperia* 35, 107-33.
- Harrison, T. (1997), 'Herodotus and the Ancient Greek Idea of Rape', in S. Deacy and K. Pearce (eds), *Rape in Antiquity*, London, 185-208.

- Havelock, E. A. (1978), *The Greek Concept of Justice: From its Shadow in Homer to its Substance in Plato*, Cambridge (MA).
- Hay, C. (2001), 'The "Crisis" of Keynesianism and the Rise of Neoliberalism in Britain: an Ideational Institutional Approach', in J.L. Campbell and O. Pedersen (eds), *The Rise of Neoliberalism and Institutional Analysis*, Princeton (NJ), 193-218.
- Hay, C. (2006), 'Constructivist Institutionalism', in R.A.W. Rhodes, S. Binder and B. Rockman (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Political Institutions*, Oxford, 56-74.
- Herman, G. (2006), *Morality and Behaviour in Democratic Athens: A Social History*, Cambridge.
- Herrman, J. S. (2008), 'The Authenticity of the Demosthenic *Funeral Oration*', *AAntHung* 48, 171-8.
- Herrman, J. S. (2009), *Hyperides. Funeral Oration*, Oxford.
- Hesk, J. (2013), 'Leadership and Individuality in the Athenian Funeral Orations', *BICS* 56/1, 49-65.
- Hobden, F. (2013), *The Symposium in Ancient Greek Society and Thought*, Cambridge.
- Hornblower S. (1991), *A Commentary on Thucydides. Vol. I: Books I-III*, Oxford.
- Hurwit, J. M. (1999), *The Athenian Acropolis. History, Mythology, and Archaeology from the Neolithic Era to the Present*, Cambridge.
- Hurwit, J. M. (2004), *The Acropolis in the Age of Pericles*, Cambridge.
- Jacoby, F. (1944), '*Patrios Nomos*. State Burial in Athens and the Public Cemetery in the Kerameikos', *JHS* 64, 37-66.
- Jameson, F. (2009), *Valences of the Dialectic*, London and New York.
- Jameson, M. (2005), 'The Family of Herakles in Attica', in L. Rowlings and H. Bowden (eds), *Herakles and Hercules. Exploring a Graeco-Roman Divinity*, Swansea, 15-36.
- Jones, C. P. (1999), *Kinship Diplomacy in the Ancient World*, Cambridge (MA).
- Jones, W. H. S., and Ormerod, H. A. (1918), *Pausanias. Description of Greece*, Cambridge (MA) and London.
- Käppel, L. (2000), 'Bakchylides und das System der schorlyrischen Gattungen im 5. Jh. v. Chr.', in A. Bagordo und B. Zimmermann (eds), *Bakchylides: 100 Jahre nach seiner Wiederentdeckung*, München, 11-27.
- Kahn, C. H. (1963), 'Plato's Funeral Oration: The Motive of the *Menexenus*', *CPh* 58, 220-34.
- Kakridis, J. T. (1961), *Der Thukydeische Epitaphios: ein stilistischer Kommentar*, München.
- Kapparis, K. (1999), *Apollodoros "Against Neaira" [D 59]*, Berlin.
- Kasimis, D. (2013), 'The Tragedy of Blood-Based Membership: Secrecy and the Politics of Immigration in Euripides' *Ion*', *Political Theory* 41, 231-56.
- Kennedy, G. A. (2007) [1991], *Aristotle. On Rhetoric: a Theory of Civic Discourse*, Oxford and New York.

- Kirk, G. S. (1970), *Myth, its Meaning and Functions in Ancient and Other Cultures*, Berkeley (CA) and Cambridge.
- Kirk, G. S. (1985), *The Iliad: A Commentary. Volume 1, Books 1-4*, Cambridge.
- Kirk, G. S. (1990), *The Iliad: A Commentary. Volume 2, Books 5-8*, Cambridge.
- Konstan, D. (2001), *Pity Transformed*, London.
- Konstan, D. (2006), *The Emotions of the Ancient Greeks: Studies in Aristotle and Classical Literature*, Toronto.
- Konstantinou, A. (2015), 'Tradition and Innovation in Greek Tragedy's Mythological *Exempla*', *CQ* 65/2, 476-88.
- Kovacs, D. (1994), *Euripides. Cyclops; Alcestis; Medea*, Cambridge (MA).
- Kovacs, D. (1995), *Euripides. Children of Heracles; Hippolytus; Andromache; Hecuba*, Cambridge (MA).
- Kowalzig, B. and Wilson, P. (2013), 'Introduction: The World of Dithyramb', in B. Kowalzig and P. Wilson (eds), *Dithyramb in Context*, Oxford, 1-28.
- Kron, U. (1976), *Die zehn attischen Phylenheroen: Geschichte, Mythos, Kult und Darstellungen*, Berlin.
- Kurke, L. (1991), *The Traffic in Praise. Pindar and the Poetics of Social Economy*, Ithaca (NY).
- Kyle, D. G. (1992), 'The Panathenaic Games: Sacred and Civic Athletics', in J. Neils (ed.), *Goddess and Polis. The Panathenaic Festival in Ancient Athens*, Hanover (NH) and Princeton (NJ), 77-101.
- Kyriakou, P. (2006), *A Commentary on Euripides' Iphigenia in Tauris*, Berlin.
- Lamb, W. R. M. (1930), *Lysias*, Cambridge (MA).
- Lambert, S. D. (2011), 'What Was the Point of Inscribed Honorific Decrees in Classical Athens', in S. D. Lambert (ed.), *Sociable Man. Essays in Ancient Greek Social Behaviour, in Honour of Nick Fisher*, Cardiff, 193-214.
- Lambert, S. D. (2012), *Inscribed Athenian Laws and Decrees 352/1-322/1 BC. Epigraphical Essays*, Leiden.
- Langdon, M. K. (2015), 'Herders' Graffiti', in A. P. Matthaiou and N. Papazarkadas (edd.), *ΑΞΩΝ: Studies in Honor of Ronald S. Stroud*, Athens, 49-58.
- Lanni, A. M. (2006), *Law and Justice in the Courts of Classical Athens*, Cambridge and New York.
- Lanni, A. M. (2016), *Law and Order in Ancient Athens*, Cambridge and New York.
- Lape, S. (2010), *Race and Citizen Identity in the Classical Athenian Democracy*, Cambridge.
- Leão, D. F. (2010), 'The Legal Horizon of the *Oresteia*: the Crime of Homicide and the Founding of the Areopagus', in E. M. Harris, D. F. Leão and P. J. Rhodes (eds), *Law and Drama in Ancient Greece*, London, 39-60.

- Leão, D. F. (2012), 'The Myth of Autochthony, Athenian Citizenship and the Right of *Enktesis*: a Legal Approach to Euripides' *Ion*', in B. Legras and G. Thür (eds), *Symposion 2011. Vorträge zur griechischen und hellenistischen Rechtsgeschichte*, Wien, 135-52.
- Leão, D. F., and do Céu Fialho, M. (2008), *Plutarco. Vidas Paralelas - Teseu e Rómulo*, Coimbra.
- Lee, K. H. (1997), *Euripides. Ion*, Warminster.
- Lévi-Strauss, C. (1963) [1958], *Structural Anthropology*, translated by C. Jacobson, New York and London.
- Liddel, P. (2007), *Civic Obligation and Individual Liberty in Ancient Athens*, Oxford and New York.
- Lissarrague, F. (2001), *Greek Vases: the Athenians and Their Images*, New York.
- Lloyd, M. (1992), *The Agon in Euripides*, Oxford.
- Lloyd-Jones (1996), *Sophocles: Fragments*, Cambridge (MA) and London.
- Longo, O. (2000), *Tucidide. Epitafio di Pericle per i caduti del primo anno di guerra*, Venezia.
- Loraux, N. (1979), 'L'autochtonie: Une topique athénienne: le mythe dans l'espace civique', *Annales E.S.C.* 34, 3-26.
- Loraux, N. (1981), *L'invention d'Athènes: Histoire de l'oraison funèbre dans la cité classique*, Paris.
- Loraux, N. (1993) [1984], *The Children of Athena. Athenian Ideas about Citizenship and the Division between the Sexes*, translated by C. Levine, Princeton (NJ).
- Loraux, N. (2000) [1996], *Born of the Earth : Myth and Politics in Athens*, translated by S. Stewart, Ithaca (NY)
- Loraux, N. (2002) [1997], *The Divided City : on Memory and Forgetting in Ancient Athens*, translated by C. Pache with J. Fort, New York.
- Low, P. (2003), 'Remembering War in Fifth-Century Greece: Ideologies, Societies, and Commemoration beyond Democratic Athens', *World Archaeology* 35/1, 98-111.
- Low, P. (2007), *Interstate Relations in Classical Greece. Morality and Power*, Cambridge.
- Low, P. (2010), 'Commemoration of the War Dead in Classical Athens: Remembering Defeat and Victory', in D. M. Pritchard (ed.), *War, Democracy and Culture in Classical Athens*, Cambridge, 341-58.
- Low, P. (2012), 'The Monuments to the War Dead in Classical Athens: Form, Contexts, Meanings', in P. Low, G. J. Oliver and P. J. Rhodes (eds), *Cultures of Commemoration: War Memorials, Ancient and Modern*, Oxford and New York, 13-39.
- Lowndes, V. and Roberts, M. (2013), *Why Institutions Matter. The New Institutionalism in Political Science*, Basingstoke.
- Luraghi, N. (2010), 'The Demos as Narrator: Public Honors and the Construction of Future and Past', in L. Foxhall, H.-J. Gehrke, and N. Luraghi (eds), *Intentional History: Spinning Time*, Stuttgart, 247-63.

- Luraghi, N. (2014), 'Ephorus in Context: The Return of the Heraclidae and Fourth-century Peloponnesian Politics', in G. Parmeggiani (ed.), *Between Thucydides and Polybius: The Golden Age of Greek Historiography*, Cambridge (MA), London.
- Lynch, K. M. (2011), *The Symposium in Context: Pottery from a Late Archaic House near the Athenian Agora*, Athens.
- Lynch, K. M. (2013), 'Drinking and Dining', in T. J. Smith and D. Plantzos (eds), *A Companion to Greek Art*, Oxford and Malden (MA), 531-41.
- Ma, J. (2009), 'The City as Memory,' in G. Boys-Stones, B. Graziosi and P. Vasunia (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Hellenic Studies*, Oxford, 248-59.
- MacDowell, D. M. (1976), 'Hybris in Athens', *G&R* 23/1, 14-31.
- MacDowell, D. M. (2000), *Demosthenes: On the False Embassy (Oration 19)*, Oxford and New York.
- MacDowell, D. M. (2009), *Demosthenes the Orator*, Oxford and New York.
- Macleod, C. W. (1978), 'Reason and Necessity. Thucydides III 9-14, 37-48', *JHS* 98, 64-78.
- Maehler, H. (2004), *Bacchylides: a Selection*, Cambridge.
- Malkin, I. (1994), *Myth and Territory in the Spartan Mediterranean*, Cambridge and New York.
- Mann, C. (2007), *Die Demagogen und das Volk. Zur politischen Kommunikation im Athen des 5. Jahrhunderts v. Chr. (Klio, Beiträge zur Alten Geschichte, Beihefte, Neue Folge Band 13)*, Berlin.
- Mannheim, K. (1936) [1929], *Ideology and Utopia: An Introduction to the Sociology of Knowledge*, translated by L. Wirth and E. Shils, London.
- March, J. G. and Olsen, J. P. (1984), 'The New Institutionalism: Organizational Factors in Political Life', *The American Political Science Review* 78/3, 734-49.
- March, J. G. and Olsen, J. P. (2006), 'Elaborating the "New Institutionalism"', in R. A. W. Rhodes, S. A. Binder and B. A. Rockman (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Political Institutions*, Oxford, 3-20.
- Martin, R. P. (1989), *The Language of Heroes: Speech and Performance in the Iliad*, Ithaca (NY).
- Marx, K. and Engels, F. (1938) [1932], *The German Ideology*, edited with an introduction by R. Pascal, London.
- Mayor, A. (2014), *The Amazons: Lives and Legends of Warrior Women across the Ancient World*, Princeton (NJ).
- Mendelsohn, D. (2002), *Gender and the City in Euripides' Political Plays*, Oxford.
- Meyer, R. E., Sahlin, K., Ventresca, M. J. and Walgenbach P. (2009), 'Ideology and Institutions: Introduction', in R. E. Meyer, K. Sahlin, M. J. Ventresca and P. Walgenbach (eds), *Institutions and Ideology*, Bingley, 1-15.

- Millett, P. (1998), 'The Rhetoric of Reciprocity in Classical Athens', in C. Gill, N. Postlethwaite and R. Seaford (1998), 227-53.
- Mills, S. (1997), *Theseus, Tragedy, and the Athenian Empire*, Oxford and New York.
- Mirhady, D. C. and Too, Y. L. (2000), *The Oratory of Classical Greece: Isocrates. I*, Austin (TX).
- Missiou, A. (1998), 'Reciprocal Generosity in the Foreign Affairs of Fifth-Century Athens and Sparta', in C. Gill, N. Postlethwaite and R. Seaford (1998), 181-97.
- Monoson, S. S. (1994), 'Citizen as Erastes: Erotic Imagery and the Idea of Reciprocity in the Periclean Funeral Oration', *Political Theory* 22/2, 253-76.
- Monoson, S. S. (1998), 'Remembering Pericles: The Political and Theoretical Import of Plato's *Menexenus*', *Political Theory* 26/4, 489-513.
- Morris, I. (1992), *Death-Ritual and Social Structure in Classical Antiquity*, Cambridge and New York.
- Morris, I. (1994), 'Everyman's Grave', in A. L. Boegehold and A. D. Scafuro (eds), *Athenian Identity and Civic Ideology*, Baltimore (MD), 67-101.
- Morrison, A. D. (2007), *Performances and Audiences in Pindar's Victory Odes*, London.
- Morwood, J. (2007), *Euripides. Suppliant Women*, Oxford.
- Murray, O. (1990a), 'Symptotic History', in O. Murray (ed.), *Sympotica: a Symposium on the Symposion*, Oxford, 3-13.
- Murray, O. (1990b), 'The Affair of the Mysteries: Democracy and the Drinking Group', in O. Murray (ed.), *Sympotica: a Symposium on the Symposion*, Oxford, 149-61
- Murray, O. (1993) [1980], *Early Greece*, Cambridge (MA).
- Nagy, G. (2002), *Plato's Rhapsody and Homer's Music: the Poetics of the Panathenaic Festival in Classical Athens*, Washington (DC).
- Naiden, F. S. (2006), *Ancient Supplication*, Oxford and New York.
- Neer, R. (2004), 'The Athenian Treasury at Delphi and the Material of Politics', *ClAnt* 23/1, 63-93.
- Neils, J. (1992a), 'The Panathenaia: An Introduction', in J. Neils (ed.), *Goddess and Polis. The Panathenaic Festival in Ancient Athens*, Hanover (NH) and Princeton (NJ), 13-27.
- Neils, J. (1992b), 'Panathenaic Amphoras: Their Meaning, Makers, and Markets', in J. Neils (ed.), *Goddess and Polis. The Panathenaic Festival in Ancient Athens*, Hanover (NH) and Princeton (NJ), 29-51.
- Nervegna, S. (2007), 'Staging Scenes or Plays? Theatrical Revivals of "Old" Greek Drama in Antiquity', *ZPE* 162, 14-42.
- Nouhaud, M. (1982), *L'utilisation de l'histoire par les orateurs attiques*, Paris.
- Ober, J. (1989), *Mass and Elite in Democratic Athens. Rhetoric, Ideology, and the Power of the People*, Princeton (NJ).

- Ober, J. (1998), *Political Dissent in Democratic Athens: Intellectual Critics of Popular Rule*, Princeton (NJ).
- Ober, J. (2008), *Democracy and Knowledge: Innovation and Learning in Classical Athens*, Princeton (NJ).
- Ober, J. (2016), 'Mass and Elite Revisited', in R. Evans (ed.), *Mass and Elite in the Greek and Roman World. From Sparta to Late Antiquity*, London, 1-10.
- Ogden, D. (1996), *Greek Bastardy in the Classical and Hellenistic Periods*, Oxford.
- Osborne, M. J. (1983), *Naturalization in Athens. Volumes III and IV (Verhandelingen van de koninklijke Academie voor Wetenschappen, Letteren en Schone Kunsten van België)*, Bruxelles.
- Osborne, R. (1985), *Demos: The Discovery of Classical Attika*, Cambridge.
- Ostwald, M. (1986), *From Popular Sovereignty to the Sovereignty of the Law. Law, Society and Politics in Fifth-Century Athens*, Berkeley (CA).
- Pàmias I Massana, J. (2008), *Ferècides d'Atenes, Històries. Vol. I-II. Introducció, edició crítica, traducció i notes*, Barcelona.
- Papillon, T. L. (2004), *The Oratory of Classical Greece: Isocrates II*, Austin (TX).
- Pappas, N., and Zelcer, M. (2015), *Politics and Philosophy in Plato's Menexenus: Education and Rhetoric, Myth and History*, London and New York.
- Parke, H. W. (1977), *Festivals of the Athenians*, London.
- Parker, R. C. T. (1987), 'Myths of Early Athens', in J. Bremmer (ed.), *Interpretations of Greek Mythology*, London, 187-214.
- Parker, R. C. T. (1996), *Athenian Religion*, Oxford.
- Parker, R. C. T. (1998), *Cleomenes on the Acropolis: An Inaugural Lecture Delivered before the University of Oxford on 12 May 1997*, Oxford.
- Parker, R. C. T. (2005), *Polytheism and Society at Athens*, Oxford.
- Patterson, C. (2006), "'Citizen Cemeteries' in Classical Athens?", *CQ* 56, 48-56.
- Pébarthe, C. (2006), *Cité, démocratie et écriture. Histoire de l'alphabétisation d'Athènes à l'époque classique*, Paris.
- Pelling, C. (2002), *Plutarch and History*, London.
- Pelling, C. (2009), 'Bringing Autochthony Up-to-Date: Herodotus and Thucydides', *CW* 102, 471-83.
- Pepe, C. (2013), *The Genres of Rhetorical Speeches in Greek and Roman Antiquity*, Leiden.
- Petrovic, A. (2016), 'Casualty Lists in Performance. Name Catalogues and Greek Verse-Inscriptions', in E. Sistakou and A. Rengakos (eds), *Dialect, Diction, and Style in Greek Literary and Inscribed Epigram*, Berlin, 361-90.
- Petruzzello, L. (2009), *Epitafio per i caduti del primo anno della guerra lamiaca: PLit. Lond. 133v. Iperide; introd., testo critico, trad. e commento*, Pisa.

- Pickard-Cambridge, A. W. (1927), *Dithyramb, Tragedy and Comedy*, Oxford.
- Pickard-Cambridge, A. W. (1946), *The Theatre of Dionysus in Athens*, Oxford.
- Pickard-Cambridge, A. W. (1968) [1953], *The Dramatic Festivals at Athens*, 2nd edition revised by J. Gould and D. M. Lewis, Oxford.
- Pierrot, A. (2015), 'Who were the *Eupatrids* in Archaic Athens?', in N. R. E. Fisher and H. van Wees (eds), *'Aristocracy' in Antiquity. Redefining Greek and Roman Elites*, Swansea, 147-68.
- Piovan, D. (2011), *Memoria e oblio della Guerra civile. Strategie giudiziarie e racconto del passato in Lisia*, Pisa.
- Podlecki, A. J. (1966), *The Political Background of Aeschylean Tragedy*, Ann Arbor.
- Podlecki, A. J. (1971), 'Cimon, Skyros and "Theseus' Bones"', *JHS* 91, 141-3.
- Pope, M. (1986), 'Athenian Festival Judges. Seven, Five, or However Many', *CQ* 36, 322-6.
- Postlethwaite, N. (1998), 'Akhilleus and Agamemnon: Generalized Reciprocity', in C. Gill, N. Postlethwaite and R. Seaford (1998), 93-104.
- Prinz, K. (1997), *Epitaphios Logos. Struktur, Funktion und Bedeutung der Bestattungsreden im Athen des 5. Und 4. Jahrhunderts*, Frankfurt am Main.
- Pritchard, D. M. (1996), 'Thucydides and the Tradition of the Athenian Funeral Oration', *AH* 26/2, 137-50.
- Pritchard, D. M. (2014), 'The Position of Attic Women in Democratic Athens', *G&R* 61/2, 174-93.
- Pritchett, W. K. (1985), *The Greek State at War, IV*, Berkeley and Los Angeles (CA).
- Proietti, G. (2012), 'Memoria collettiva e identità etnica: nuovi paradigmi teorico-metodologici nella ricerca storica', in E. Franchi and G. Proietti (eds), *Forme della memoria e dinamiche identitarie dell'antichità greco-romana*, Trento, 13-41.
- Proietti, G. (2013), 'The Marathon Epitaph from Eua-Loukou: Some Notes about Its Text and Historical Context', *ZPE* 185, 24-30.
- Race, W. H. (1997), *Pindar. Nemean Odes. Isthmian Odes. Fragments*, Cambridge (MA).
- Rhodes, P. J. (1972), *The Athenian Boule*, Oxford.
- Rhodes, P. J. (1981), *A Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaion Politeia*, Oxford.
- Rhodes, P. J. (2003), 'Nothing to Do with Democracy: Athenian Drama and the *Polis*', *JHS* 123, 104-19.
- Rhodes, P. J. (2004), 'Keeping to the Point', in E. M. Harris and L. Rubinstein (eds), *The Law and the Courts in Ancient Greece*, London, 137-58.
- Rhodes, P. J., and Lewis, D. M. (1997), *The Decrees of Greek City-States*, Oxford.
- Ricoeur, P. (1986), *Lectures on Ideology and Utopia*, New York.

- de Romilly, J. (1972), 'Vocabulaire et propagande ou les premiers emplois du mot ὁμόνοια', in A. Ernout (éd.), *Mélanges de linguistique et de philologie grecques offerts à P. Chantraine*, Paris, 199-209.
- de Romilly, J. (1979), *La douceur dans la pensée grecque*, Paris.
- Rose, P. W. (2006), 'Divorcing Ideology from Marxism and Marxism from Ideology: Some Problems', *Arethusa* 39/1, 101-36.
- Rose, P. W. (2012), *Class in Archaic Greece*, Cambridge.
- Roselli, D. K. (2011), *Theater of the People. Spectators and Society in Ancient Athens*, Austin (TX).
- Rösler, W. (1980), 'Mnemosyne in the Symposium', in O. Murray (ed.), *Symptica: a Symposium on the Symposium*, Oxford, 230-7.
- Rosivach, V. J. (1987), 'Autochthony and the Athenians', *CQ* 37, 294-306.
- Roth, P. (2003), *Der Panathenaios des Isokrates: Übersetzung und Kommentar*, München.
- Rubinstein, L. (1993), *Adoption in IV. Century Athens*, Copenhagen.
- Rutherford, I. (2011), 'Singing Myth: Pindar', in K. Dowden and N. Livingstone (eds), *A Companion to Greek Mythology*, Oxford, 107-23.
- Sahlins, M. D (1972), *Stone Age Economics*, London.
- Sanders, E. (2014), *Envy and Jealousy in Classical Athens: A Socio-Psychological Approach*, Oxford and New York.
- Saxonhouse, A. W. (1986), 'Myths and the Origins of Cities: Reflections on the Autochthony Theme in Euripides' *Ion*', in J. P. Euben (ed.), *Greek Tragedy and Political Theory*, Berkeley and Los Angeles (CA), 252-73.
- Schmidt, V. A. (2002), *The Futures of European Capitalism*, Oxford.
- Schmidt, V. A. (2006), 'Give Peace a Chance: Reconciling the Four (not Three) New Institutionalisms in Political Science', presented at *Annu. Meet. Am. Polit. Sci. Assoc.*, Philadelphia.
- Schmidt, V. A. (2008), 'Discursive Institutionalism: The Explanatory Power of Ideas and Discourse', *Annual Review of Political Science* 11, 303-26.
- Schmidt, V. A. (2010), 'Taking Ideas and Discourse Seriously: Explaining Change Through Discursive Institutionalism as the Fourth 'New Institutionalism'', *European Political Science Review* 2/1, 1-25.
- Schwinge, E.-R. (1992), 'Griechische Tragödie: das Problem ihrer Zeitlichkeit', *A&A* 38, 48-66.
- Scullion, S. (2002), 'Tragic Dates', *CQ* 52/1, 81-101.
- Scully, S. E. (1973), *Philia and Charis in Euripidean Tragedy*, Toronto.
- Seaford, R. (1994), *Reciprocity and Ritual: Homer and Tragedy in the Developing City-State*, Oxford and New York.
- Seaford, R. (1998), 'Introduction', in C. Gill, N. Postlethwaite and R. Seaford (1998), 1-11.

- Shapiro, H. A. (1983), 'Amazons, Thracians, and Scythians', *GRBS* 24/2, 105-14.
- Shapiro, H. A. (1992), 'Mousikoi Agones: Music and Poetry at the Panathenaia', in J. Neils (ed.), *Goddess and Polis. The Panathenaic Festival in Ancient Athens*, Hanover (NH) and Princeton (NJ), 53-75.
- Shapiro, H. A. (1998), 'Autochthony and the Visual Arts in Fifth-Century Athens', in D. Boedeker and K. A. Raaflaub (eds), *Democracy, Empire and the Arts in Fifth-Century Athens*, Cambridge (MA) and London, 127-52.
- Shear, J. L. (2001), *Polis and Panathenaia: The History and Development of Athena's Festival (PhD Thesis)*, Philadelphia (PA).
- Shear, J. L. (2011), *Polis and Revolution: Responding to Oligarchy in Classical Athens*, Cambridge.
- Shear, J. L. (2013), 'Their Memories Will Never Grow Old: The Politics of Remembrance in the Athenian Funeral Orations', *CQ* 63/2, 511-36.
- Sobak, R. (2015), 'Sokrates among the Shoemakers', *Hesperia* 84/4, 669-712.
- Sommerstein, A. H. (1997), 'The Theatre Audience, the *Demos*, and the *Suppliants* of Aeschylus', in C. Pelling (ed.), *Greek Tragedy and the Historian*, Oxford and New York, 63-80.
- Sommerstein, A. H. (2008), *Aeschylus: Fragments*, Cambridge (MA) and London.
- Sommerstein, A. H. (2009), *Aeschylus. Oresteia: Agamemnon. Libation-Bearers*, Cambridge (MA).
- Sommerstein, A. H. (2010), *Aeschylean Tragedy*, London.
- Sourvinou-Inwood, C. (2011), *Athenian Myths and Festivals: Erechtheus, Plynteria, Panathenaia, Dionysia* (ed. by R. C. T. Parker), Oxford.
- Stansbury-O'Donnell, M. D. (2005), 'The Painting Program in the *Stoa Poikile*', in J. M. Barringer and J. M. Hurwit (eds), *Periklean Athens and its Legacy. Problems and Perspectives*, Austin (TX), 73-87.
- de Ste. Croix, G. E. M. (1981), *The Class Struggle in the Ancient Greek World from the Archaic Age to the Arab Conquest*, London.
- Steinbock, B. (2013a), *Social Memory in Athenian Public Discourse*, Ann Arbor (Mich.).
- Steinbock, B. (2013b), 'Contesting the Lessons from the Past: Aeschines' Use of Social Memory', *TAPhA* 143, 65-103.
- Stewart, A. (1995), 'Imag(in)ing the Other: Amazons and Ethnicity in Fifth-Century Athens', *Poetics Today* 16/4, 571-97.
- Stoupa, C. (1997), 'Ὀδός Σαλαμίνος 35', *AD* 52/B1, 52-6.
- Stupperich R. (1977), *Staatsbegräbnis und Privatgrabmal im klassischen Athen*, Münster.
- Taylor, C. and Vlassopoulos, K. (2015), eds., *Communities and Networks in the Ancient Greek World*, Oxford.

- Tentori Montalto, M. (2014), 'La stele dei caduti della tribù Erechtheis dalla villa di Erode Attico a Loukou – Eva Kynourias (*SEG LVI 430*)', *ZPE* 192, 34-44.
- Themelis, P. G. (2007), 'Panathenaic Prizes and Dedications', in O. Palagia and A. Choremi-Spetsieri (eds), *The Panathenaic Games: Proceedings of an International Conference held at the University of Athens, May 11-12, 2004*, Oxford, 21-32.
- Thériault, G. (1996), *Le culte d'Homonoia dans les cités grecques*, Québec.
- Theunissen, M. (2000), *Pindar: Menschenlos und Wende der Zeit*, München.
- Thomas, R. (1989), *Oral Tradition and Written Record in Classical Athens*, Cambridge and New York.
- Thompson, H. A. (1982), 'The Pnyx in Models', *Hesperia Supplements* 19, 133-47 and 224-7.
- Thompson, H. A., and Wycherley, R. E. (1972), *The Agora of Athens: The History, Shape and Uses of an Ancient City Center (The Athenian Agora: Results of Excavations Conducted by the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, Vol. XIV)*, Princeton (NJ).
- Thompson, J. B. (1990), *Ideology and Modern Culture: Critical Social Theory in the Era of Mass Communication*, Malden (MA).
- Thür, G. (2008), 'The Principle of Fairness in Athenian Legal Procedure: Thoughts on the *Echinos* and *Enklema*', *Dike* 11, 51-74.
- Tiverios, M. A. (2007), 'Panathenaic Amphoras', in O. Palagia and A. Choremi-Spetsieri (eds), *The Panathenaic Games: Proceedings of an International Conference held at the University of Athens, May 11-12, 2004*, Oxford, 1-19.
- Todd, S. C. (2007), *A Commentary on Lysias*, Oxford and New York.
- Too, Y. L. (1995), *The Rhetoric of Identity in Isocrates*, Cambridge.
- Townsend, R. F. (1995), *The East Side of the Agora: The Remains Beneath the Stoa of Attalos (The Athenian Agora: Results of Excavations Conducted by the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, Vol. XXVII)*, Princeton (NJ).
- Tracy, S. V. (2007), 'Games at the lesser Panathenaia?', in O. Palagia and A. Choremi-Spetsieri (eds), *The Panathenaic Games: Proceedings of an International Conference held at the University of Athens, May 11-12, 2004*, Oxford, 53-7.
- Trevett, J. (1990), 'History in [Demosthenes] 59', *CQ* 40, 407-20.
- Trevett, J. (1992), *Apollodoros, the Son of Pasion*, Oxford.
- Trivigno, F. V. (2009), 'The Rhetoric of Parody in Plato's *Menexenus*', *Ph&Rh* 42, 29-58.
- Tsitsiridis, S. (1998), *Platons Menexenos: Einleitung, Text und Kommentar*, Stuttgart.
- Tyrrell, W. B. (1984), *Amazons. A Study in Athenian Mythmaking*, Baltimore (MD).
- Tyrrell, W. B., and Brown, F. S. (1991), *Athenian Myths and Institutions. Words in Action*, Oxford and New York.
- Tzanetou, A. (2012), *City of Suppliants: Tragedy and the Athenian Empire*, Austin (TX).

- Usher, S. (1990), *Isocrates: Panegyricus and To Nicocles*, Warminster.
- Vansina, J. (1985), *Oral Tradition as History*, Madison (WI).
- Veness, R. (2002), 'Investing the Barbarian? The Dress of Amazons in Athenian Art', in L. Llewellyn-Jones (ed.), *Women's Dress in the Ancient Greek World*, London, 95-110.
- Vernant, J.-P. (1988) [1974], *Myth and Society in Ancient Greece*, translated by J. Lloyd, New York.
- Veyne, P. (1988) [1983], *Did the Greeks Believe in their Myths? An Essay on the Constitutive Imagination*, translated by P. Wissing, Chicago.
- Vickers, M. J. (2008), *Sophocles and Alcibiades: Athenian Politics in Ancient Greek Literature*, Stocksfield.
- Vlassopoulos, K. (2007), 'Free Spaces: Identity, Experience and Democracy in Classical Athens', *CQ* 57/1, 33-52.
- Walcot, P. (1978), *Envy and the Greeks: A Study of Human Behaviour*, Warminster.
- Walker, H. J. (1995), *Theseus and Athens*, Oxford and New York.
- Wallace, R. W. (1989), *The Areopagus Council to 307 B.C.*, Baltimore (MD) and London.
- Walsh, G. B. (1978), 'The Rhetoric of Birthright and Race in Euripides' *Ion*', *Hermes* 106, 301-15.
- Walters, K. R. (1980), 'Rhetoric as Ritual: The Semiotics of the Attic Funeral Oration', *Florilegium* 2, 1-27.
- Węcowski, M. (2014), *The Rise of the Greek Aristocratic Banquet*, Oxford.
- van Wees, H. (1998), 'The Law of Gratitude: Reciprocity in Anthropological Theory', in C. Gill, N. Postlethwaite and R. Seaford (1998), 13-49.
- van Wees, H. (2000), 'Megara's Mafiosi. Timocracy and Violence in Theognis', in R. Brock and S. Hodkinson (eds), *Alternatives to Athens. Varieties of Political Organisation and Community in Ancient Greece*, Oxford, 52-67.
- van Wees, H. (2013), *Ships and Silver, Taxes and Tribute: A Fiscal History of Archaic Athens*, London and New York.
- van Wees, H., and Fisher, N. R. E. (2015), 'The Trouble with "Aristocracy"', in N. R. E. Fisher and H. van Wees (eds), *'Aristocracy' in Antiquity. Redefining Greek and Roman Elites*, Swansea, 1-57.
- West, M. L. (1989), 'The Early Chronology of Attic Tragedy', *CQ* 39, 251-4.
- Whitehead, D. (1983), 'Competitive Outlay and Community Profit: ΦΙΛΟΤΙΜΙΑ in Democratic Athens', *C&M* 34, 55-74.
- Wilkins, J. (1993), *Euripides: Heraclidae*, Oxford.
- Wilson, P. J. (2000), *The Athenian Institution of the Khoregia*, Cambridge.
- Winnington-Ingram, R. P. (1948), 'Clytemnestra and the Vote of Athena', *JHS* 68, 130-47.

- Wolpert, A. (2002), *Remembering Defeat: Civil War and Civic Memory in Ancient Athens*, Baltimore (MD).
- Worthington, I. (2003), 'The Authorship of the Demosthenic *Epitaphios*', *MH* 60, 152-7.
- Worthington, I., Cooper, C. and Harris, E. M. (2001), *The Oratory of Classical Greece: Dinarchus, Hyperides, and Lycurgus*, Austin (TX).
- Yunis, H. (2001), *Demosthenes: On the Crown*, Cambridge.
- Zaccarini, M. (2015), 'The Return of Theseus to Athens: A Case Study in Layered Tradition and Reception', *Histos* 9, 174-98.
- Zaccarini, M. (forthcoming), 'The Fate of the Lawgiver: The Invention of the Reforms of Ephialtes and the *Patrios Politeia*', *Historia* 67/4.
- Zeitlin, F. I. (1978), 'The Dynamics of Misogyny: Myth and Mythmaking in the *Oresteia*', *Arethusa* 11/1, 149-84.
- Zimmermann, B. (1992), *Dithyrambos: Geschichte einer Gattung*, Göttingen.
- Ziolkowski, J. E. (1981), *Thucydides and the Tradition of Funeral Speeches at Athens*, New York.
- Zuntz, G. (1955), *The Political Plays of Euripides*, Manchester.