DORIANS AND IONIANS

IN his 'Essay on the value of applying the ethnic criterion to the study of Greek history and civilisation', Edouard Will examined the two most numerous and politically important ethnic divisions of the Greek race in Classical times, the Dorians and the Ionians, and came to the conclusion that they inspired no true ethnic feeling amongst the Greeks.[1] Other historians have tended towards a similar view.[2] Although some writers have felt unconvinced of the thesis,[3] no one has analysed the sources used by Will and his supporters to suggest why they may not after all imply the conclusions which Will drew. This article will attempt to do so. In particular I shall try to show first that there is good evidence for the importance of ethnic feeling at the time of the Peloponnesian war, and, secondly, that we should not regard Peloponnesian war propaganda as the sole cause of this feeling. The article will concentrate upon the treatment of this subject by Thucydides and Herodotus, the interpretation of which is, I think, most in need of revaluation. Their evidence seems to me most important because they frequently document and in some cases give their own analysis of occasions where ethnic feeling seems to play a part, many of which are either contemporaneous with them or lie in the fairly recent past. I shall, however, also consider to what extent their evidence is supported by other sources.

Let us first clarify the problem. What I shall mean by 'ethnic feeling' is feelings (or opinions) arising from someone's membership of one of the two ethnic groups with which we are concerned. These could be feelings felt by the member of the group himself—e.g. of solidarity with other members; or they could be feelings felt by those outside a group towards those within it—e.g. contempt for a member of a supposedly inferior group. The questions with which we shall essentially be dealing are whether such feelings were indeed inspired by the Dorian and Ionian groups and if so what influence they had on decisions and events in Greek history. In the absence of a clear response to these questions from explicit statements in our sources,[4] I shall approach them through an examination of the extent to which ethnic feeling offers the best explanation for why men behaved as they sometimes did. This is not only because it is the role of ethnic feeling as an active influence which is most controversial, but also because to show a consistent role for ethnic feeling as an explanatory factor is perhaps the only valid way to demonstrate its existence, given the private nature of men's feelings. In order to assess this role, we must have an idea of the circumstances in which we could expect ethnic feeling to show itself and the way it might affect them. We must therefore have an idea of its scope and its nature. Both of these will become clearer, I hope, through the detailed analysis of the evidence later in this article, which I do not intend to anticipate now. However, it will be useful to set the scene with a few observations.

Clearly, the scope of feelings inspired by a group depends upon the scope of the group's membership. Defining the membership of the two groups in which we are interested is not without difficulties.[5] But perhaps the most important thing to bear in mind is that throughout we are interested primarily in how the Greeks themselves saw the composition of and dividing line between these groups—how it affected *their* thoughts and actions. In Greek eyes the Dorians and Ionians were generally seen as two different ἔθνη, each of whose members were related to

[1] E. Will, *Doriens et Ioniens* (Strasbourg 1956): henceforth 'Will'.

[2] E.g. E. N. Tigerstedt, *The Legend of Sparta in Classical Antiquity* i (Stockholm 1965) 130, 153. Tigerstedt's notes summarise the views of older works on pp. 431–3, 448: cf. esp. A. Jardé, *The Formation of the Greek People* (London 1926) 76, and J. de Romilly, *Thucydides and Athenian Imperialism* (Oxford 1963) 82–4.

[3] E.g. L. H. Jeffery, *Archaic Greece* (London 1976) 44: cf. A. W. Gomme, *HCT* iii (1956) 514–15, 520; A.

Andrewes and K. J. Dover, *HCT* iv (1970) 146, 220, 351, 433; Dover, *Greek Popular Morality* (Oxford 1975) 84.

[4] There are some firm sounding statements in the sources (e.g. Thuc. vii 57.1; viii 25.3; Hdt. i 143.2), but one of the aims of this article is to show how dangerous it is to take statements on this subject automatically at face value.

[5] See n. 9.

one another.[6] The origins of these ἔθνη were placed by Classical authors in the sequence of events accompanying the 'return of the Heraclidae' to the Peloponnese: the Dorians came with the Heraclidae from Doris.[7] The peoples they displaced by their invasion gathered as refugees in Attica and later crossed to the coast of Asia Minor: these were the Ionians, although they only became known as such when named after Ion, an Athenian leader.[8] The fifth-century Dorians and Ionians were thus held to be the descendants of those who had come in the 'Dorian' invasion and of their defeated opponents respectively.

The development and detail of these stories is much debated.[9] But there seems to have been widespread acceptance in fifth-century Greece of the outline sketched above. It is worth bearing this in mind in considering not only the scope, but also the nature of feelings which may have been generated by group membership: the 'foundation' stories tell us that within each group the members are related to one another through their common origin, and they set the two ἔθνη in opposition to each other, with victory going to the Dorians. When we examine references to the Dorians and Ionians of the fifth century with a view to establishing the nature of the impact, if any, the groupings created, the possibilities narrow themselves down to three main elements which reflect remarkably, but perhaps deceptively, the foundation story. First, there are references to common kinship made by the members of each ἔθνος, usually to claim special consideration from their fellows; secondly, statements of a supposed natural enmity between the ἔθνη; and thirdly, slighting comments by Dorians about Ionians' bravery.[10] All these elements, whatever their cause, have an obvious potential for influencing events if there is a genuine feeling behind them; they are therefore the characteristics I shall use to explore the existence and importance of ethnic feeling. It may be, as some have argued, that the references in which they appear are the fruit merely of artificial rhetoric or scholarly classification. I shall, however, argue that they represent a feeling which actually counted when decisions were made and action taken.[11]

[6] See Hdt. i 56.2. Appeals to fellow members of one's ἔθνος are made κατὰ τὸ ξυγγενές: see n. 20.

[7] E.g. Thuc. i 12.3, iii 92.

[8] E.g. Hdt. vii 94, viii 44. Some historians believe the inclusion of Athens in the migration story is a fifth-century Athenian creation: but see n. 46.

[9] For the development of the story of the Dorians, see Tigerstedt (n. 2) 28–36; and 322–3, n. 100, for references to other works. However complex this development may have been, for our purposes of assessing the importance of ethnic feeling in Classical times it is not the Dorians but the Ionians who cause the major problems. Classical authors generally use the term 'Dorian' fairly consistently to refer to an agreed set of people, who have in common their supposed ultimate descent from those who took part in the Dorian invasion (see the lists at Thuc. vii 57–8 and Hdt. viii 43). In the case of the Ionians the ethnic term is not applied consistently either to an agreed set of people nor, it seems, according to an agreed criterion. Indeed M. B. Sakellariou, La migration grecque en Ionie (Athens 1958) 249–50 despairs of finding any real ethnic criterion for its application in our literary evidence. Authors, he says, describe people as Ionian or non-Ionian merely according to fifth-century Athenian political propaganda. If this were true and reflected an essential rootlessness of the concept in the Greek world at large, it would seem to argue against a strong feeling inspired by membership of the Ionian ἔθνος. But I do not believe Sakellariou's despair is justified: the term Ionian is used in two distinct though connected ways—first as a name for a group of people who shared

common customs, cults, tribal names and dating systems (see Thuc. i 6; ii 15.4; iii 104; Hdt. i 147–8; G. L. Huxley, The Early Ionians [London 1966] ch. 2): people whose kinship was believed in Classical times to have dated from before the Ionian migration to Asia Minor (see further n. 46). The second sense in which the word is used is geographical, meaning broadly 'the Greeks of Asia Minor'. It is so used frequently by Hdt. (e.g. iv 136–42), though he is also at times careful to distinguish the Asiatics (e.g. i 141–51): cf. ML 36.3. Just as all inhabitants of the British Isles are often loosely called English after the most numerous element of the population, so no doubt the fact that the Ionians were the dominant element of the Asiatic Greeks led to the shorthand use of Ionian for the whole lot. Nevertheless, the Greeks clearly recognised the term 'Ionian' in abstract as an ethnic term like Dorian, and unless otherwise stated, that is how it is treated in this article. But the dual use does raise the question whether feelings about Ionians were based upon a truly ethnic rather than a geographic distinction. This point assumes a more than theoretic interest when we come to consider to what extent feelings about Asiatic Greeks also apply to Athens (see pp. 7–11 and n. 40).

[10] For references to claims to common kinship see n. 20; natural enmity between the ἔθνη, n. 58; contemptuous comments by Dorians about Ionians, n. 19. The relation between these manifestations of ethnic feeling and its ultimate causes is touched upon in n. 40.

[11] Besides being the names of ἔθνη, the adjectives 'Dorian' and 'Ionian' describe different types of music, architecture and dress. It is not with these usages that we

THUCYDIDES AND ETHNIC FEELING DURING THE LATTER PART OF THE FIFTH CENTURY

Thucydides has many references to kinship arguments and ethnic antipathy on both sides in the Peloponnesian war.[12] Will, however, argues that Thucydides quashes the idea that kinship feeling was important, both by his explicit narrative statements and by showing in his speeches how the orators of the time exploited the kinship argument as an oratorical trick (σόφισμα) giving specious reasons for interference and without any appeal to real feeling.[13] But not all the references to the power of ethnic feeling in Thucydides occur as sophistical arguments in speeches: for instance, when narrating the course of a battle around Miletus between the Athenians and their Argive allies on the one hand and on the other the Milesians with some Peloponnesian troops,[14] Thucydides tells us that the Argives arrogantly rushed forward in disorder on the grounds that they were attacking Ionians, who were men who wouldn't stand up to them. He adds that they were bloodily defeated by the Milesians, and makes a point of telling us a little later that in this battle the Ionians on both sides (i.e. Athenians and Milesians) defeated their Dorian opponents. Here, apparently, the 'myth' of Dorian superiority commanded sufficient belief to cause careless over-confidence and help to send a number of Argives to their deaths; and the importance of the belief has been picked up by Thucydides.

As for the speeches, there is one fundamental problem in assuming that the distinction drawn and the antipathy expressed is merely an 'opposition oratoire': the speaker's overriding purpose is often to persuade people to adopt the course he wishes.[15] He must therefore use the arguments he believes his audience finds most compelling. It may be appropriate to talk of formal distinctions or merely rhetorical arguments in types of rhetoric which do not need to play on deep feelings, but there is no similarity between such cases and those in which an argument forms one of the bases of a speech delivered before the mass of the people by a competent orator for whom success in persuading his listeners is essential. In the speech of the Sicilian Hermocrates before the assembly at Camarina, Thucydides portrays the ethnic argument in this very role.[16] At issue is the question of whether Camarina is to join the Athenians against Syracuse. The men of Camarina are Dorians, and it is this kinship with Syracuse as well as Dorian pride to which Hermocrates repeatedly appeals: 'Will we not stand together and show them (i.e. the Athenians) that it is not Ionians or Hellespontines and islanders with whom they have to deal, who live in a state of continuous subjection to the Mede or some other of their everchanging masters, but free Dorians who have settled in Sicily from the Peloponnese, which acknowledges no master?' Later in the speech Hermocrates speaks of the help to be expected from the Peloponnese, 'where men are altogether superior to these in war'. He ends his speech with an impassioned plea: 'We beseech you, and if we do not persuade you, we protest that we are being plotted against by Ionians, our perpetual foes, and we are being betrayed by you—Dorians by Dorians.'

To argue that these references are 'merely rhetorical' is to convict Hermocrates of an

shall be directly concerned, but it is worth noting that the associations noted in the words' ethnic use occur to varying degrees in these areas also: they are most marked in the case of music (see Plato *Rep.* 398d–399a; Arist. *Pol.* 1340b, 1342b). It is not certain whether the use of 'Doric' and 'Ionic' to describe different types of architecture was common in Classical times, but M. Robertson, *A History of Greek Art* i (Cambridge 1975) 347–8 suggests that the gradual exclusion of the Doric order in favour of the Ionic in Attic temples may have been connected with Athens' wish to associate herself with Ionia for propaganda purposes. We do find the words 'Dorian' and 'Ionian' used to describe styles of dress (see e.g. Aesch. *Pers.* 183, Hdt. v 87): Ionian dress could be considered more sumptuous and less manly (Thuc. i 6).

[12] See *HCT* v (1981) index s.v. 'race', and add to the references there i 418.

[13] Will 68.

[14] Thuc. viii 25.3. For other narrative passages where Thucydides seems ready to allow for the influence of ethnic feeling, see n. 26. Dover, *HCT* v 60–1, argues that Thucydides emphasises this incident for patriotic reasons. I am sceptical that Thucydides would express this type of patriotism, and think he was trying to bring out the truth of one of his own theories about ethnic difference: see p. 5 below.

[15] This is brought out by C. W. Macleod, *Quaderni di storia* ii (1975) 40.

[16] Thuc. vi 76–80.

incompetence absent from the rest of his dealings.[17] It is interesting to note that Hermocrates' opponent Euphemus begins his reply with a defence of Athenian rule on ethnic grounds: 'We Ionians had to protect ourselves from the Dorians.' But as the men of Camarina are Dorians, Euphemus would have been unwise to stress kinship arguments. There are no further references to race in his speech.[18] The above examples show that we cannot lightly dismiss arguments based on kinship as 'merely rhetorical'. Thucydides' work abounds with the theme—Brasidas and Gylippus also encourage their audiences with the thought that there are only Ionians to face.[19] The Ionians after the Persian war, the Corinthians at Sparta, the Melians, the men of both Leontini and Egesta at Athens and the Athenians themselves at Rhegium all use kinship arguments in an attempt to win help.[20] Both Euphemus and Hermocrates refer to the 'natural' enmity between the ἔθνη. We have already considered an example in which the beliefs to which such arguments appeal helped to cause the believers' defeat in battle.[21]

There is an immediate objection to this conclusion: how can we be sure that what we find in Thucydides' speeches is what was said by the original speaker at the time? It is true that the speeches are not verbatim reports. But our purpose does not require this. Our conclusions depend on the assumption that Thucydides' arguments are representative of the types of arguments used by contemporary speakers when they needed to persuade, not that they were used on a particular occasion. Thucydides sets himself in his speech-writing the task of reflecting how each speaker in his opinion would have said what was necessary about the circumstances obtaining at the time. These needs, as conceived by Thucydides, will have included not only the need for advice but also, and probably primarily, the need for successful persuasion. If then Thucydides followed his criteria, he must have given his speakers arguments intended to persuade.[22]

But even if we agree that an argument is inserted to persuade, we might argue that it is not used because the original audience would have found it persuasive, but because Thucydides himself found it so; or that it is one which Thucydides thought would have persuaded the

---

[17] Thucydides' own opinion of him is high (Thuc. vi 72.2); cf. Thucydides' comments on Brasidas, another speaker to make use of the racial argument: Thuc. iv 84 and v 9.1.

[18] Thuc. vi 82.2. Will 66 thinks that the implausibility of racial arguments is further demonstrated by the fact that Euphemus does not use them. In fact, as my text makes clear, the opposite is the case. Nor is it an argument against the wide appeal of racial arguments that Hermocrates in several places (Thuc. iv 61.2; 64.3; vi 76) attacks as fraudulent the Athenian claim that they are intervening in Sicily on kinship grounds (cf. Will 66). Such attacks may reveal Hermocrates' own sophistry; but one does not labour the exposure of arguments which are not expected to convince anyone. In any case, we can hardly assert that Athenian kinship appeals were artificial because Thucydides puts the claim into a 'tour de force' by one of their enemies!

[19] Brasidas at Thuc. v 9.1; Gylippus at vii 5.4; cf. also i 124.1.

[20] The Ionians at Thuc. i 95.1; Corinthians i 71.4, 124.1; Melians v 104; Egestaioi vi 6.2; men of Leontini iii 86.3; Athenians vi 44.3. These instances include cases where we have a colony appealing to its mother city κατὰ τὸ ξυγγενές (the Ionians and Melians). The question arises as to whether the kinship bond in this sort of case is wholly different from that between people merely of the same ἔθνος. The relationship between colony and mother city is explored in detail in A. J. Graham, *Colony and Mother City in Ancient Greece* (Manchester 1964), but I do not find that Graham

addresses this particular problem. One might suppose that where there had been a lack of continuity in the tradition of a link between colony and mother city (as in perhaps Ionia) feelings of ethnic kinship were likely to play a larger role in underpinning appeals to the mother city: but the men of Leontini, even when talking about the Dorian colonies in Sicily and their mother states, where the foundation traditions were well catalogued, do identify a feeling of ethnic kinship at work (Thuc. vi 6.2: Δωριῆς τε Δωριεῦσι κατὰ τὸ ξυγγενὲς καὶ ἅμα ἄποικοι τοῖς ἐκπέμψασι . . . βοηθήσαντες). Nonetheless, the relationship between Athens and Ionia was probably unique, as the fifth-century tradition ascribed the origin of the whole Ionian ἔθνος to Athens: it thus becomes particularly difficult to talk of separating ethnic feelings from the feelings of a colony for its mother city. But it does seem that to justify her ἀρχή Athens saw scope for introducing a larger 'mother city' element into the relationship through Delian league propaganda —cf. J. P. Barron, *JHS* lxxxii (1962) 1–6; R. Meiggs, *The Athenian Empire* (Oxford 1972) 293–4, 562–5—which *perhaps* argues that when the Ionians appealed to Athens after the Persian wars, the predominant feeling was one of common Ionian unease in the face of Dorian arrogance.

[21] Thuc. viii 25.3: see n. 14.

[22] Cf. Macleod (n. 15). He is absolutely right to stress that the orator's need is not only (nor primarily?) for accurate analysis but also for success in persuasion; and that this is reflected in τὰ δέοντα by Thucydides.

audience, which the original speakers would not have thought of using. Both possibilities seem to me to consort unhappily with Thucydides i 22. But in the case of this argument founded on ethnic feeling, there is another powerful answer. Thucydides himself, it is argued and I agree, was not susceptible to it. He would not have included it as something which convinced him (it didn't), nor was he likely to invent it for himself as something appealing to man's innermost feelings (he suspected that, ultimately, it didn't).[23] He could have over-emphasised its use by those not susceptible to it to show up the cynical and sophistical character of some speakers: this suits Macleod's understanding of the speeches. But again, he could not have gone far down this road without abandoning the principles of i 22.

It may still be felt that there is an inconsistency in using Thucydides' speeches as evidence for the existence of ethnic feeling when those who have doubted its existence have continually turned to Thucydides as the author who, by his narrative comments, showed ethnic differences to be unimportant. There is no doubt that Thucydides was at times concerned to point out the shortcomings of explanation by reference to ἔθνος. How, it may be asked, could he do this whilst at the same time composing speeches which do not make sense unless ethnic feeling is presumed to exist?

To deny that ethnic feeling was responsible for certain events is not to assert that it was never responsible for anything. Thus when Thucydides says the Athenians sent their first expedition to Sicily on the declared ground of kinship, but really to prevent corn coming into the Peloponnese and to reconnoitre to see if they could reduce Sicily (and makes a similar charge in his account of the main expedition)[24], we must not automatically extend the analysis beyond its immediate circumstances. And as an analysis of those circumstances, the emphasis is probably right though we may be suspicious of so neat an antithesis.

Moreover, it is easy to confuse two different reasons for rejecting the importance of ethnic differences. We must distinguish between believing (i) that people were wrong to see ethnic differences as important in the sense that (as the Greeks expressed it) they betokened a real difference of φύσις,[25] and foolish to rely on such assumptions when acting; and (ii) that people were wrong to see ethnic differences as important in the sense of causing men to act in certain ways. Indeed, the two points of view are not consistent with one another: by pointing out the folly of belief in and reliance upon a difference of φύσις between ἔθνη, one accepts that at least for those people who do hold such a belief ethnic difference is important as an influence upon action. Thucydides was certainly concerned to point out the folly of believing in such a difference of φύσις. This emerges clearly in his treatment of the incident already refered to in the Ionian war where the overconfident Argives were defeated by Milesians and Peloponnesians by Athenians, and where he pushes home the Argives' folly by remarking 'so it happened in this battle that on both sides the Ionians defeated the Dorians'.[26]

Nevertheless, historians have taken Thucydides to be hostile to explanation by reference to the importance of ethnic difference in the second sense, as an influence upon men's actions. And there are one or two passages which support this view. For instance, at the beginning of his catalogue of allies who fought at Syracuse, Thucydides mentions that those who joined the two

---

[23] Below, p. 6.

[24] Thuc. iii 86.4, vi 6.1.

[25] For evidence that the Greeks did so regard the Dorian/Ionian distinction, see p. 10 f. and n. 56. But the point made here is not dependent upon the terminology of the νόμος/φύσις antithesis.

[26] Thucydides seems to me to be touching upon the same point in the mismatch between the Peloponnesians' claims to 'natural' superiority before the second battle against Phormio (ii 87) and the facts as presented by the narrative. Cf. i 121.4, and the contrast between the frequent statements about how easy victory in the

war would be for the Peloponnesians and the reality of iv 55 (discussed below). This attitude, as the main text argues, implies Thucydides' belief in the reality of ethnic feeling. For other narrative passages with the same implication, see i 102.3 (Spartans make Athenians leave Ithome); iii 2.3 (Spartans and Boeotians helping Mytilene); iii 92 (foundation of Heracleia); v 80.2 (Perdiccas swayed by Argive links). Cf. iii 86.2–3 (men of Rhegium and also Athenians, though Thucydides seems sceptical in the latter case: cf. 86.4). At i 95.1 Thucydides does not deny that the Ionians did turn to Athens κατὰ τὸ ξυγγενές.

opposing sides did so not κατὰ ξυγγένειαν, but through chance, self interest, or compulsion.[27] Again, the statement refers to a specific situation. As with so many of Thucydides' denials of ethnic influence it is concerned with the Sicilian expedition alone.[28] But it does claim to cover all the participants in the war in Sicily. One might argue that the breadth of this generalisation points to a general feeling in Thucydides' mind that explanations for action on grounds of ethnic feeling were bogus—as though he were able to assert so confidently that no one joined sides κατὰ ξυγγένειαν because he believed in the still more general premiss that no one did act κατὰ ξυγγένειαν; after all, he could hardly have spoken to everyone involved in the Sicilian war. And this general premiss could of course also have been responsible for other more specific judgements about ethnic motives (e.g. about Athenian intervention in Sicily). Thucydides does to this extent seem to be contradicting evidence found elsewhere in the History, especially in the speeches.

I think we may explain the difficulty by reference to the combination of two traits prominent in Thucydides' approach to his history,[29] whilst bearing in mind that the actual scope of the difficulty within Thucydides' history is limited. The first element of the combination is Thucydides' rigorous determination to reach down to the *real* causes of events, and not to be satisfied with the superficial. This often manifests itself as a reaction against popular beliefs and explanations, as for instance in his exposition of the 'true story' of the fall of the Peisistratids (ἀποφανῶ οὔτε τοὺς ἄλλους οὔτε αὐτοὺς 'Αθηναίους περὶ τῶν σφετέρων τυράννων . . . ἀκριβὲς οὐδὲν λέγοντας).[30] The idea that popular explanations tended to make Thucydides suspicious, that they gave him something to challenge is not new.[31] From what we have seen we may readily understand that popular feeling might often use ethnic feeling as an explanation for action.[32] The second element of the combination comprises Thucydides' views about motivation. Frequently, when Thucydides gives his view of the motive for an action, he stresses the importance of the agent's perception of his own self interest.[33] In doing so, he is making specific statements about particular events. Even so, he more than once seems more definite in his ascription of this motive than he has a right to be.[34] We may suspect that he was deriving his explanation from general ideas about what motivated men. In the age of the Old Oligarch, the sophists and the rest of the generation depicted vividly by Forrest in his article on an 'Athenian generation gap', Thucydides would have been in tune with one of the prominent intellectual movements of the time in believing in the force of τὸ ξυμφέρον as a motive.[35] Even if he regretted its primacy, it seems that he felt bound to regard it as prevalent: there may well have been characters in his own circle amongst the politicians and the educated aristocracy who would have confirmed his suspicions. However, sympathetic feelings of kinship as a cause of action—the manifestation of ethnic feeling whose existence is most frequently derided by Thucydides—cannot be provided for under this scheme. If it is man's nature to act for his self-advantage, he will not put himself out simply because a kinsman asks him to. To a man with

[27] Thuc. vii 57.1.

[28] Thucydides may have found the Sicilian campaign a paradigm case in proving the correctness and perspicacity of his views about motivation and lost no opportunity to push home the message. See the further analysis of the catalogue on p. 7.

[29] R. H. S. Crossman, in his introduction to Bagehot, *The English Constitution* (Fontana 1963) 30–1, analyses that writer's approach to his work in a way very similar to what follows.

[30] Thuc. vi 54.1; cf. i 20 (οὔτως ἀταλαίπωρος τοῖς πολλοῖς ἡ ζήτησις τῆς ἀληθείας, καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ ἑτοῖμα μᾶλλον τρέπονται); ii 17.2.

[31] On his playing down of the Megarian decree, cf. Gomme, *HCT* i (1959) 447. Whatever motive we impute to the passing of the 'Megarian decree' referred

to, we must acknowledge that it was 'in the news' at the outbreak of the war: cf. Thuc. i 139.1.

[32] Cf. also Thuc. ii 54.2, where the reference to Δωριακὸς πόλεμος as a commonplace is illuminating.

[33] E.g. Thuc. i 87.2; viii 89.3, as well as the examples in Thucydides' treatment of the Sicilian expeditions referred to in n. 24.

[34] In addition to the example from Thuc. vii 57.1 quoted in my text, see P. J. Rhodes' comments in *JHS* xcii (1972) 115–16.

[35] W. G. Forrest, *YCS* xxiv (1975) 37–52. Cf. G. E. M. de Ste Croix, *The Origins of the Peloponnesian War* (London 1972) 12–23. The sophist Democritus makes a similar point to Thucydides in his claim that τὸ ξυμφέρον, not ξυγγένεια unites men (fr. 107 DK).

Thucydides' views, the idea of kinship feeling as an important reason for action must at least have been embarrassing.

Combined, these elements suggest that Thucydides could have fallen into the trap of thinking that in reacting against the popularly used principle of ethnic explanation, he was penetrating the superficial, which was all that most people saw, and at the same time confirming the correctness of his views about motivation. His reasoning is, however, self-contradictory. It is one thing to claim that the popular view of an historical event such as the deposition of the tyrants is wrong, and that the truth lies elsewhere. It is quite different to suggest that people who see events in general in terms of their own belief in and susceptibility to ethnic reasons as reasons for action are wrong, and that the real causes inevitably lie elsewhere. Provided only that ethnic reasons for action have established themselves as good reasons (that is, good both as explanations and as an influence on action) in the minds of sufficient people, then ethnic differences will, by that very fact, exert an influence on the way people act. Perhaps those people will not be of Thucydides' or his circle's type. More likely they will be the mass in the assembly or the men on the battlefield. Nevertheless, their feelings and susceptibilities (particularly in a democracy such as Athens) will have played a part in determining the course of events. Thucydides' treatment of the catalogue of allies in the Sicilian war perhaps demonstrates most clearly his tendency to this error. Despite appearing to concede that the Athenians and even Ionian subjects went, as Ionians, willingly against the Dorian Syracusans, he denies kinship feeling any influence. His points against kinship feeling at vii 57.7 are good, but they only prove that kinship did not always override all other motives. The polemical style and arrangement suggest a reaction against other people's views.

CONTEMPORARY ATHENIAN ATTITUDES

Thucydides' ample evidence of the influence of ethnic feeling is not therefore to be discounted because of his own occasional scepticism. The questions remain, however, to what extent we see Thucydides' preoccupations reflected in other writing of the time, and whether we are justified in considering ethnic feeling as more than a product of Peloponnesian war propaganda, in which it obviously found a most suitable vehicle.

I should like initially to tackle these questions together by examining the general attitude amongst the Athenians to one of the best documented and apparently most influential aspects of the contrast between Dorian and Ionian, the supposed effeminacy or lack of resolution of the Ionians. References to this occur from the seventh century onwards.[36] Learned ancient authors rationalised this attitude by ascribing the Ionians' effeminacy to the kindly climate of Asia Minor or contact with the βάρβαροι.[37] Modern writers have suggested the Ionians' defeat at the hands of the Lydians and the Persians, compared with the mainland's successful resistance, was responsible.[38] What is common to both these types of explanation is that their base is fundamentally geographical, rather than ethnic. Yet we have seen that in Thucydides it is just as often the Athenians who are being written off as Ionians as any Asiatics.[39] This, together with the use of an ethnic term rather than a geographical one, suggests that though both the above explanations may have had some currency we should not consider statements of contempt for the Ionians as wholly based on a feeling against Asiatics by the rest of the Greek world, but as due in some measure to the Ionians' low standing as an ethnic group, particularly compared with the Dorians.[40]

[36] See esp. Athen. xii 524–6 for a list, and cf. the comments by C. J. Emlyn-Jones, The Ionians and Hellenism (London 1980) 1–2, 170.

[37] For the effects of climate on Asia Minor's inhabitants, see Hippoc. Aer. 12; cf. Hdt. i 142, where the reference is to Ionia; and Arist. Pol. 1327b. For contact with βάρβαροι, see Xenophanes, fr. B3 West.

[38] E.g. E. Rawson, The Spartan Tradition in European Thought (Oxford 1969) 15–16.

[39] Thuc. i 124; vi 76–80; viii 25.3.

[40] As n. 9 makes clear 'Ionian' is used in both an ethnic and a geographical sense. At issue here is whether the denigratory sense in which the word was used attaches to the former or latter usage. I argue that, because the fifth-century Athenians (i.e. non-Asiatics)

However, it could be argued that the inclusion of the Athenians as proper targets of Dorian contempt, and thus the truly ethnic basis for that contempt, is a later extension of an originally geographically based attitude; and an extension which is not of antique origin, but a mere product of Peloponnesian war propaganda. Even so, it seems to have had some effect amongst its immediate, Peloponnesian, audience.[41] On our interpretation of Thucydides' speeches we should have expected this frequently used argument to have been persuasive in someone's ears. But the attitude of the Athenians themselves will be critical in determining whether we should acknowledge the existence of a feeling based upon ethnic criteria before the propaganda of the mid fifth century. For if these slights against Athens are no more than a recent attempt to extend a long standing criticism of Asiatic Greeks, we should not expect the Athenians to feel defensive about them. The Athenians, particularly in view of Athens' very swift rise to prosperity and power, would have no good reason to accept the Dorian view of things, even supposing they knew much about it. However, an examination of the evidence for Athenian views suggests that consciousness of their own Ionianism was sufficient to make them uneasy, and uncertain in the face of their Dorian enemies.

It is well known that there was an official Athenian policy promoting the story that Athens' subjects in Asia and the islands were kinsmen who had originated from Athens.[42] But despite this propaganda, Aristophanes and other Athenian comic poets make fun of the Ionians' luxuriousness and even play on the disagreeable connotations of the word 'Ionian' itself.[43] There is thus an ambivalence in Athenian attitudes which suggests that official propaganda may not have accorded with the views of the ordinary Athenian, who found much to laugh at in his Ionian kinsmen. It is to this contrast that I think Herodotus refers in a curiously phrased passage (i 143.3) where he says that in the past Athenians and some other Ionians used to avoid the name Ionian: he continues '... ἀλλὰ καὶ νῦν φαίνονταί μοι οἱ πολλοὶ αὐτῶν ἐπαισχύνεσθαι τῷ οὐνόματι'. Though Herodotus' evidence for the status of the Ionians must be dealt with carefully, it is the contrast within the sentence which is relevant here. The emphatic ἀλλὰ καὶ νῦν of the final clause implies that the second statement is more contentious or surprising than its predecessor, yet Herodotus is committed to it, as φαίνονταί μοι makes clear. Granted that Herodotus' evidence was accumulated and his History written during the period when 'Ionian' propaganda was being disseminated, it makes sense to suppose that a number of people, particularly outside the ἀρχή, might think that Athens now exulted in common Ionianism even though she had not before. In this deliberate aside from his main narrative Herodotus corrects their mistake.[44]

felt a lack of confidence in themselves as Ionians, in the period we are considering a fairly well established feeling of inferiority did indeed attach to the Ionian ἔθνος. No doubt this feeling was reinforced by contempt for the Asiatic 'Ionians'' subjection to Persia (see e.g. Thuc. vi 82.4) or their 'effeminate' ways. In particular, much of Herodotus' bile seems directed at an Asiatic target (this is discussed further below). For the purposes of this article—the examination of the existence and effect of ethnic feeling in the Classical period—it is sufficient to demonstrate that the feeling was not then wholly based on geography. But in determining ethnic feeling's origin, it becomes a matter of great importance whether geographical consider-ations are the primary basis for the connotations of inferiority of the word 'Ionian'. If not, and there is an ethnic basis, then the foundation stories of the Dorian and Ionian ἔθνη are indeed strikingly reflected in the later connotations of the two terms. But if it is geographical, the suspicion arises that the feeling may itself have helped create the foundation story. Although

well beyond the scope of this article such implications are worth following up.

[41] Judging by Thucydides' comments at viii 25.5, he saw no distinction in the attitude of Dorians facing Milesians and those facing Athens.

[42] Certainly during the fifth century: see Meiggs (n. 20) 293–8; A. J. Podlecki, The Political Background of Aeschylean Tragedy (Michigan 1966) 17–21. The propa-ganda may go back to Solon and Peisistratus, but see Sakellariou (n. 9) 25. See further n. 46.

[43] Ar. Thesm. 163; Pax 932; Eccl. 918; fr. 543 Kock; Callias/Diocles fr. 5 Kock: see also Hermippus fr. 58 Kock. Cf. the Athenian attitude at Thuc. vi 82.4 and Emlyn-Jones (n. 36) 1–2 on Hippocrates.

[44] It has been suggested to me that the source for this statement is the anti-Ionian Alcmaeonidae. Whether we can accept this depends to a large extent on whether we can accept that Herodotus would make a statement such as φαίνονταί μοι οἱ πολλοί on the basis of what the Alcmaeonidae told him. Unlike what is superficially a similar case at Hdt. v 69, when Herodotus tells us that in

The Athenians, it seems, liked to distance themselves from other Ionians. Only once in Thucydides do they refer to their Ionian identity, and then, unlike the use of Dorianism as a rallying cry, it is almost a device to attract pity.[45] If this feeling were one of simple rejection of other Ionians as completely alien to themselves, we might suppose that it was a product of their lack of sympathy for 'effete Orientals', with whom they and other Greeks were equating the Ionians. But it is more complex than that. There *are* occasions where fellow feeling may play a part.[46] More important, when we investigate the Athenians' assessment of their own powers of endurance and bravery we find that they agree with their Dorian enemies in applying to themselves belittling (and unrealistic) judgements. It seems that their reason for differentiating themselves from other Ionians was that in so far as they acknowledged their Ionian identity they accepted the unpleasant consequences that flowed from the ethnic criterion itself. It is in the context of the Peloponnesian war, against predominantly Dorian enemies, that we see the Athenians' lack of confidence most clearly.

For instance, in the first set of sea battles of the war, the Peloponnesian leaders encourage their men with the thought that their bravery will more than make up for the enemies' technical skill—no use, they say, without valour. Phormio, the Athenian general, accepts that the Peloponnesians' belief that courage is *naturally* their own (προσῆκον σφίσιν) is their chief source of confidence. His attempts to explain away the basis for that confidence, and the defensive way in which he begs his men 'not to fear their [the Peloponnesian] daring' would be extraordinary if we did not assume some feeling of inferiority amongst them, given the reputation of Athens' fleet at that time.[47] Later in the war, Nicias' speech during the Sicilian debate confirms that the Athenians did not, when the war began, expect to emerge successfully and had been very frightened of the Spartans and their allies.[48] They apparently shared the rest of Greece's assessment of their chances: an assessment which, in so far as it was rationalised, was based on the belief that the Athenians would surrender rather than endure the ravaging of their land for a couple of years.[49]

his opinion Cleisthenes renamed the Athenian tribes in contempt of the Ionians, no one could in this case regard the Alcmaeonidae as the sole relevant and obtainable source. In this interpretation I am attaching more importance to Herodotus' form of words than for instance D. Fehling, *Die Quellenangaben bei Herodot* (Berlin 1971), but I am not convinced that we should ignore his phraseology to the extent that Fehling is.

[45] Thuc. vi 82.2.

[46] Thuc. iii 32.3; vii 82.1; *cf.* Hdt. v 97. We might suppose that the very existence of Athens' Ionian propaganda presupposes some pull for kinship feeling, and some pride in Ionian ancestry. But there are dangers in reading too much real feeling into the Delian league propaganda: first it was primarily directed only at Asiatic Ionians. Propaganda aimed at the people of Athens generally dwelt not upon their Ionianism, but their autochthonous status as a reason for pride in their ancestry (*cf.* Thuc. ii 36.1 and Plato *Menex.* 237b; see also Eur. *Ion* 29, 589, 737; Arist. *Vesp.* 1076; Thuc. i 2). Athenian politicians had a clear motive for using this theme at home as it provided a story of valour to counter that of the Dorian invasion, and thus a genuine reason for self-pride amongst the people. The two themes—Athens' link with Ionia and the autochthonous nature of her people—are both emphasised in Euripides' *Ion*, whose hero turns out to be one of the autochthonous Athenians and founder of the Ionian ἔθνος. But the stress on Athens' Ionian nature in this material for Athenian consumption seems exceptional (see further n. 55). What Athenians wished to be

reminded of was their autochthony. Whilst it is thus dangerous to read too much into the showpieces of Delian league propaganda, it is also dangerous to suppose that the whole edifice was built upon nothing. It has been suggested that there was no mother city role for Athens before the Delian league propaganda (see e.g. F. Jacoby, *FGrH* iiib [Leiden 1950] 323a F 11 and 23 with comm.). Even if the origin story of the Ionian ἔθνος did alter over the years, common Ionianism could be used to justify political claims apparently at least as far back as Solon (see Plut. *Solon* 10): in fact I think that story of origin from Athens was probably well established amongst all Ionians by at least the beginning of the fifth century (*cf.* Meiggs [n. 20] 294) and thus did help give substance to a feeling of common Ionianism along with such factors as the shared customs, etc., identified in n. 9.

[47] Phormio and the Peloponnesians: Thuc. ii 87.4 (*cf.* i 121.4); 89.2. Phormio perhaps concentrates on removing this prejudice to turn his men's thoughts away from the enemy's numbers. But the prejudice was there to be removed.

[48] Thuc. vi 11.5. Thucydides' language describing Spartan reaction after Pylos emphasises the complete unexpectedness, not just of the Pylos affair, but of the way the war had gone in general, and the grave effect on Spartan confidence (Thuc. iv 55).

[49] See Thuc. iv 85.2; v. 14.3; vii 28.3 (a narrative judgment by Thucydides). P. A. Brunt, *Phoenix* xix (1965) 264–5, believes that the Greeks' past experience of border warfare would have been sufficient to instil so

The farsighted on both sides had to remind their listeners that war is a matter of resources, not just victory on the battlefield—Pericles to justify his claim that Athens is no *weaker* than her enemies, Archidamus that the war will not be an immediate Peloponnesian victory.[50] Pericles' funeral speech provides a justification of Athenian values, but also reassurance to an uncertain Athens that the Athenians are a match for their opponents: Pericles, like Phormio, wished to counteract the Athenians' instinctive fear of their adversaries' 'natural' daring. In a brilliant piece of argument he stands the traditional view on its head: it is, he asserts, the Athenians who are intrinsically brave, while the Spartans achieve their bravery only through 'laboured preparation'.[51]

The themes of Pericles' funeral speech—Athens' protection of the weak, the uniqueness of her democracy—are echoed in some of the contemporary works of Athenian tragedy, such as Euripides' *Heraclidae* and *Supplices*.[52] In the elements common to the plots of these two plays I also find a structure offering its audience reassurances of the same type as in Pericles' and Phormio's speeches. The plays use two of the most famous traditions of Athenian benefaction to other Greeks in a way which emphasises the uniqueness of Athens' moral courage and fearlessness, and (particularly in *Supplices*) her right to recognition as a military power.[53] Christopher Collard's argument that the *Supplices* would have heartened Athenians downcast by Delium seems to me nearer to the psychology of the play than Zuntz's interpretation of it as a celebration after Pylos.[54] The tone of *Heraclidae* is less partisan: the poet had not then lived through seven years of war. But the similarities of treatment point towards a similar, reassuring, intention around the beginning of the Peloponnesian war: at that time also, Athens felt unsure of herself.

None of these Athenian speeches or plays uses the language of Dorians or Ionians.[55] But both the Athenians and their enemies refer to a supposed difference of φύσις between them, which allowed the Spartans and their allies to regard themselves as superior.[56] If we ask what lay

---

wild a miscalculation (*cf.* de Ste Croix [n. 35] 207–8), but in my view the presence of these ethnic feelings in the background explains much more convincingly the universal prevalence of the mistake. After all, the Athenians never tired of reminding people how they had abandoned their city altogether during the Persian invasion without surrendering. The speech of the Corinthians at Sparta in 432 (Thuc. i 68–71) is often taken as a panegyric of Athens: the Corinthians certainly praise certain qualities in the Athenians. But there also seems to be the assumption that Sparta has only to act and a natural order of things will reassert itself. See also Ps.-Xen. *Ath. Pol.* ii 1 (Athenian hoplites worse than their enemies').

[50] Pericles, Thuc. i 141.2; Archidamus, i 80–1, though de Ste Croix (n. 35) 207–8 feels that even Archidamus doesn't fully convince himself.

[51] Thuc. ii 39.1.

[52] *Cf.* Thuc. ii 37.3 and Eur. *Her.* 303–6, 329–30; *Suppl.* 184–90, 304. Also Thuc. ii 37.1 and *Suppl.* 349–53, 403–8. For a detailed analysis of the themes of patriotic oratory found in these plays, see G. Zuntz, *The Political Plays of Euripides* (Manchester 1955) 16–18, 40–1.

[53] The stories on which these two plays are based are two of the three mentioned in the mock funeral speech in Plato *Menex.* 239b; *cf.* Hdt. ix 27. Athens' courage in standing up to powerful enemies is emphasised in both plays (e.g. *Suppl.* 518–20, 584–94; *Her.* 191–219, 236–52, 284–7). Her enemies arrogantly and mistakenly look down upon her (e.g. *Suppl.* 568; *Her.* 134–78), though the reality of their strength is acknowledged, to give Athens greater glory in defeating them (e.g. *Her.*

759–62). There are frequent references to Athens' military might, especially in *Supplices* (e.g. 163, 184–90): both plays describe the moment of Athenian victory (*Suppl.* 654–723; *Her.* 824–42).

[54] *Cf.* C. Collard, *Euripides Supplices* i (Groningen 1975) 13–14 and Zuntz (n. 52) 89–90.

[55] Euripides' *Ion*, produced at a later date, deals with the supposed founder of the Ionian ἔθνος and does refer to Ionians and Dorians. It contains a few lines referring to the Athenian origin of the Ionians, apparently much in line with current Delian league propaganda (1580–8). But I do not find that the emphasis of Euripides' play quite fits the propaganda put out by contemporary politicians for an Athenian audience, which played to Athenian autochthony but excluded the Ionian connection (see n. 46). Euripides' play seems an attempt to take the legend of Ion and turn it into a genuine cause for unity of purpose and goodwill between Athenians and their subjects (no doubt both in his audience): the version of the legend at Paus. vii 1 is quite different and much less suitable for this purpose. Euripides' notion did not seem to catch on—possibly partly because he was arguing against feelings of shame and contempt for Ionians to which most politicians preferred to bow and pander. It has been thought (e.g. by Wilamowitz, *Euripides Herakles* [Berlin 1933] 129) that Euripides' *Hercules Furens* should be seen as pointing out the insufficiency of Dorian values. If any political undercurrent is to be read into this play, however, I should say it was demonstrating the mutual dependence of Athens and Sparta (Theseus and Heracles).

[56] Thuc. i 121.4 and ii 89.2, where προσῆκον σφίσιν seems to carry the same meaning.

behind this difference of φύσις, and examine the passages where the Peloponnesians' superiority is explained in more concrete terms, we find that on the Peloponnesian side it is the Dorian/Ionian distinction which is most frequently invoked.[57] I suggest that when both sides argue about natural superiority, they have at the back of their minds the superiority arising from a natural difference between Dorians and Ionians. In Greek thought, a corollary of natural difference could be natural opposition: it is therefore not surprising that we find that Dorian and Ionian are said to be 'natural' enemies.[58] The question remains as to why Athenian leaders did not attempt to meet the argument head on by arguing that Ionians were not inferior: this is after all what Thucydides seems to have wished to point out at viii 25.3. The answer, I feel, is that by talking of Dorians and Ionians, and putting the argument in their opponents' terms, they feared they would exacerbate their problem: the traditional concept of Ionian weakness was so engrained that it could not be shifted. Indeed, how could Ionians be as good when they had lost to Persia? And how could Athenian leaders single out Athens as different when they were trying to promote unity in the ἀρχή? For Athenians to disprove Dorian superiority in a way which emphasised their own Ionianism was to enter a minefield. No wonder they used different arguments, which apparently varied according to the speaker and the circumstances.[59]

The primary conclusion I draw in this section is that their ethnic beliefs caused Athenians in certain circumstances to suffer a lack of self-confidence. This conclusion has two important consequences: first, it tends to confirm the view that these ethnic beliefs were deeply embedded before the Peloponnesian war. Secondly, it helps explain the miscalculations made by the Peloponnesians in the early part of the war: the Peloponnesians entered the war with an overconfident estimate of their chances—but it was an estimate which was always unlikely to be challenged, as the feelings on which it was based were shared by the rest of Greece including Athens.

EARLIER ETHNIC FEELING

Although this lack of confidence suggests a fairly deeply embedded ethnic consciousness, we would also expect, or hope, to find more direct evidence for the influence of ethnic feeling before Peloponnesian war propaganda. And there are indeed references to the earlier existence of this feeling. Much of this evidence is to be found in stories of past history told by Herodotus. However, we cannot take these stories at their face value: Herodotus' work seems to be pervaded by a systematic bias against the Ionians.[60] Given his own Dorian background we might of course expect such a bias: that it does not apply to Athens could be a result of his admiration of the city based on long personal experience.[61] However, I fear the explanation is not so simple. In assessing his evidence we must consider three things which would make it unrepresentative of wider feelings: the influence of personal prejudices, immediate source bias, or simply the change

---

[57] See e.g. Thuc. i 124.1, v 9.1, vi 77.1, vii 5.4. A geographical contrast between Peloponnesians and islanders is also sometimes drawn where appropriate, but it is the Dorian/Ionian contrast to which references occur most consistently.

[58] See Thuc. iv 60.1, 61.3, vi 82.2; and cf. the interesting parallel in Plato Rep. 470c, where different races are also being discussed and the argument from difference to hostility is fully expressed.

[59] For instance, Pericles' rhetorical tour de force at Thuc. ii 39, which argues that the Athenians are actually braver by nature than their enemies, is not used by Phormio at Thuc. ii 89.2, where the Peloponnesians' reputation is argued to depend upon their success on land, and thus not to be valid at sea. Perhaps Pericles'

argument would have seemed a little abstract and theoretical on the battlefield.

[60] J. Neville, CQ xxix (1979) 268–75, believes Herodotus' narrative gives an accurate portrayal of Ionian weakness. This seems to me inconsistent with the extreme language which is continually used. O. Murray, Early Greece (Fontana 1980) 244, accepts that Herodotus' narrative unjustifiably devalues Ionians, but ascribes all bias to Herodotus' sources. I do not agree: the narrative's attitude is too uniformly contemptuous to be the product of any particular source influence (see e.g. i 153.3, v 105 and refs in n. 63; cf. the comments by Emlyn-Jones [n. 36] ch. 7).

[61] Which also caused vii 139.

in men's attitudes created by the passage of time since what he narrates took place; we must also be certain that the wider feeling is one based upon ethnic, rather than geographical criteria.

Most of Herodotus' aspersions against the Ionians are open to challenge under the first and second heads, not to mention the others. Some writers have considered that he had a personal grudge against the Ionians of the twelve towns.[62] This seems to me unlikely to be the sole reason for his remarks, because many of his defamatory comments have a far wider scope.[63] A more important personal consideration probably arises from his moral views and artistic aims. His charge against the Ionians is that they prefer the safe drudgery of slavery to the risks of defending freedom.[64] They are the counterpoise to the heroes of the mainland who fought to retain their freedom under the law—and particularly the Athenians who were prepared to fight on without a city. This could explain why we find most of his criticisms aimed at the Asiatics. Some of his sources could have helped reinforce such intentions: the Samians, for instance, may have encouraged him to play down the importance of the Ionian revolt.[65] The Alcmeonid family may have been responsible for other statements which do not show the Ionians to their credit, such as the tale about Cleisthenes' motives for renaming the Athenian tribes.[66] However, the occasional example of anti-Ionian bias seems to come unexplained even through all these considerations—for instance, the conversation between Demaretus and Xerxes at the Hellespont (vii 102): 'I praise all the Greeks who live in Dorian lands,' says Demaretus, 'although I shall speak now only about the Spartans.' Demaretus confines his praises to Dorians. Ionians (and others) are implicitly slighted, at least in comparison. The first thing to note is that the scope of the implied slight does not correspond to Herodotus' suggested biases against the twelve towns or Asiatic Greeks. It applies equally, for instance, to Athens. The slight does seem genuinely to be based on ethnic rather than geographical criteria: though Demaretus talks of 'lands', he thinks in terms of the ethnic groups occupying them. There is no good reason to suspect source bias unrepresentative of any interest except its own. Thus the comment, which is intended by Herodotus to reflect Demaretus' views, does not seem to have been caused by purely personal or source bias. It may be challenged as anachronistic (perhaps representing Herodotus' own ethnic prejudice as a Dorian). As such it would still of course be evidence for ethnic feeling in later times. One can only say that Herodotus seems to be doing his best throughout this conversation to recreate Demaretus' thoughts.[67]

But it must be admitted that the anti-Ionian references are not easy to interpret. We are on more solid ground when we look at episodes set in the period before Peloponnesian war propaganda in which mere consciousness of ethnic difference forms part of the incident's point. Considerations of anti-Ionian or -Asiatic bias are not relevant here. But we must still decide to what extent the original facts may have been distorted by subsequent generations' views, whether these views were deliberately encouraged or simply evolved in response to changed circumstances: for instance, Herodotus' account of the quarrels between those states which comprised the resistance to the Persian invasion has been held to be influenced by later rifts between Sparta and Athens. These stories fall into two main types: those in which the ethnic element seems essential to the whole incident, and those where it seems possible that an original

---

[62] Will 64. Cf. F. Jacoby, RE Suppl. ii (1913) 211.

[63] Especially Hdt. iv 142, where the Scythians' disparaging comments refer to tyrants of whom Herodotus says four are from Ionia, six from the Hellespont and one from Aeolis. Cf. Hdt. vi 12.2, where the men of Lesbos are counted as Ionians.

[64] See Hdt. vi 12.3 (even slavery preferable to the agony of training); iv 142 (Ionians slaves who love their master) and viii 10.2 (which captures the difference between the Ionians and mainland Greeks). The Ionians could have escaped (Hdt. i 170.2 and i 164) or combined (i 170.3). That is what Athens would have done (Hdt. vii 144.2; cf. vii 139).

[65] For Samian bias, see B. M. Mitchell, JHS xcv (1975) 75–91. As argued above, Herodotus might have been receptive to sources playing down Ionian achievement.

[66] Hdt. v 69. This hypothesis rests on the assumption of anti-Ionian feeling amongst the family caused by their friendship with Persia at the time of the Ionian revolt, which subsequently caused them political embarrassment, and their reaction against Peisistratus, who had been interested in encouraging Ionian unity (subject of course to Athens' leadership); cf. Hdt. i 64 and Thuc. iii 104.

[67] See e.g. vii 104.1–2.

incident has been overlaid with a later ethnic element. Stories in the first category must be questioned as a whole, if we wish to deny the influence of ethnic difference at the time in which they are set, whereas it is possible to be more selective about what we cut out of those in the second category. These different types of approach lend themselves, in turn, to different types of defence. Let us turn to some examples.

First the incident in which King Cleomenes is warned by the priestess of Athene not to enter the Acropolis, because 'it is not permitted for Dorians to go there'.[68] This seems to me a tale which must be attacked as a whole, if we wish to remove the ethnic reference; that is, the point of the story depends upon Cleomenes' being known as a Dorian. As such it must be presumed to be a creation after the event, rather than a story whose emphasis has been changed by later attitudes. We may begin by asking why the story should have been created later. Is this the sort of story which would be fabricated as a result of later 'propaganda'? I do not feel that it is. The overall point of the story is not to stress Dorian–Ionian antipathy, or to provide propaganda holding together the Athenian ἀρχή through kinship bonds. The point of the story is to demonstrate the reality of religious warning; ἐπετελέετο . . . ἡ φήμη. The ethnic point is the vehicle by which that point is made. We may also ask whether details of the story itself (granted that it is the story itself that we must eliminate) tend to vouch for its authenticity. Here Cleomenes' reply is interesting: 'I am not a Dorian but an Achaean.' The claim by Sparta to be of Achaean rather than Dorian ancestry is one generally agreed to have been created in and to belong to the sixth century rather than to the fifth.[69] It was not a policy emphasised at the time of the Peloponnesian war. Cleomenes' words fit very well a sixth-century Spartan king. That they do not let him off the religious hook is consistent with the artificial and temporary character of this piece of Spartan propaganda! These are the type of considerations which may be brought to bear on cases of this 'anecdotal' type. There is also some independent evidence corroborating the idea around which this story is built: an inscription has been found at Paros forbidding the presence of Dorians and slaves at certain religious rites.[70]

In stories of the second type we cannot so easily use internal details as a guarantee that references to ἔθνος are original. If we think that they are, we must examine how easily the story really fits together without the influence provided by ethnic feeling. One example is Aristagoras' request for aid at Athens at the beginning of the Ionian revolt: Herodotus says that one of the arguments he used was the claim that the Milesians were colonists of Athens.[71] Here we may see a motive for invention or later misunderstanding. But it remains true that Athens did send help whereas Sparta did not. Should we rule out kinship feeling as not even in part responsible for the assembly's decision? Certainly not on the interpretation of the story of the playwright Phrynichus' fine which makes the Athenians weep for Miletus' fall because their kinsmen were suffering.[72] Other incidents, such as the debate on Samos after the repulse of the Persians about what to do with the Ionians, may not provide similar opportunities for using the sequence of

[68] Hdt. v 72.3. Exclusion of foreigners from participating in certain rites was quite common in the Greek world (see e.g. F. Bömer, *Untersuchungen über die Religion der Sklaven in Griechenland und Rom* iv [Wiesbaden 1963] 955 n. 2), though we have fewer references to the exclusion of those of a particular race from a sanctuary: see, however, Plut. *Mor.* 267d and F. Sokolowski, *Lois sacrées des cités grecques* (Paris 1969) no. 110. Sokolowski cites this instance as an example of a political exclusion. The exclusion may have a 'political' origin in the sense of springing from a non-religious antagonism, though it is unlikely that the priestess thought up the exclusion on the spur of the moment, because the form of the exclusion is relatively unusual: *cf.* Hdt. vi 81 where Cleomenes meets the more usual objection. But the essential point for us is that those creating the exclusion, whoever they were, thought in

terms of Dorians, not of, say, Spartans or simply foreigners. The distinction was a live one.

[69] See W. G. Forrest, *History of Sparta* (London 1968) chs 6–7; D. M. Leahy, *Historia* iv (1955) 26–38.

[70] Sokolowski (n. 68).

[71] Hdt. v 97.2. The feeling of colony for mother city might be thought a different type from ethnic feeling alone. But see n. 20.

[72] For Phrynichus' fine, see Hdt. vi 21.2 and Sakellariou (n. 9) 39–40: Sakellariou's arguments here strike me as very artificial. And even if we suspect political manoeuvring behind the charge against Phrynichus, *cf.* W. G. Forrest, *CQ* x (1960) 235, we must reckon both with the fact that Herodotus says that the theatre did burst into tears and (if we do not accept the tears story) that even a merely ostensible charge must have had some plausibility.

generally accepted events to justify the writer's reference to the influence of ethnic feeling (there must have been a debate on policy towards the Asiatic and island Greeks; but later history does not compel us to accept that the Athenians told the Spartans not to involve themselves in debate about the Ionians, who belonged to Athens as her colonies). Nevertheless, I believe we have evidence sufficient to allow us to believe that what is depicted at Samos was at least possible at the time in which the story is placed.[73]

Even if, therefore, we reject as not authentic contempt for Ionians expressed by his characters, there is good evidence in Herodotus for a consciousness of ethnic differences before the time of Peloponnesian war propaganda. Moreover, there is support in contemporary literature (i.e. of the early fifth century) for his evidence, particularly in the poetry of Pindar. Pindar wrote most of his surviving odes for victors from Dorian states, for which aristocratic friendships and political sympathies must be largely responsible, though belief in superior Dorian manliness may have helped create and confirm these. What is more important is that he frequently refers in these odes to the fact that the victor's state is Dorian.[74] Pindar was writing to honour the victor, and he quite clearly believed that the Dorian ancestry of, for instance, Aeginetans or Syracusans was a source of pride to them. There is no similar reference to Ionianism in the odes written for Athens victors. Thus we do not have to regard Pindar as an independent champion of Dorianism to deduce from his poems confirmation that the Dorians of his time took a pride in their Dorianism similar to that found in Herodotus' stories and portrayed later in Thucydides.[75]

CONCLUSION

To focus on a particular factor as an influence upon events always risks appearing to put forward a one-sided analysis. The separation of this factor from others may also at times seem artificial: for instance, could an Argive have told you whether he despised a Milesian because Dorians had always been superior to Ionians or because Asiatics were effete and slavish? Where was the boundary between loyalty to ἔθνος and loyalty to mother state? Nevertheless, it is by separating the strands which are often muddled and twisted in real life that one can explain their different combinations. Our review of the evidence from the fifth and sixth centuries allows us, I hope, to recognise that it is after all pretty consistent in pointing to a role for ethnic feeling.[76] This feeling may have been ridiculed by the intelligentsia and exploited for their own ends by politicians. But its potential for creating sympathy, hostility or misunderstanding amongst the populace at large was ignored by both groups at their peril.[77]

JOHN ALTY

62 Enfield Cloisters,
Fanshaw Street,
London N1

[73] Hdt. ix 106. Racial feeling may have helped cause tension throughout the Persian war, e.g. about the Isthmus wall (Hdt. vii 207; viii 40), reluctance to aid Athens (Hdt. ix 6 and 7), the worth of the largely Athenian fleet (Hdt vii 183.1; viii 11; 70; 74.1). For an incident during the Πεντηκονταετία see Thuc. i 102.3. Ephorus seems to have repeated these views: see Diod. Sic. xi 34–7, 41. But it is doubtful whether his evidence has any independent value.

[74] Pindar O. viii 30; P. i 61–5; N. iii 3; I. vii 12; fr. i 3.

[75] See Tigerstedt (n. 2) 152. Aeschylus refers to the 'Dorian' spear which won the battle of Plataea (Pers. 817): whether or not we take the word literally, it implies an affinity between Dorians and warlikeness. Other writers contrast the Peloponnesian spirit with the Attic or Asian (see Stesimbrotus FGrH 107 F 4, Ion of Chios fr. 24 Nauck).

[76] To explore its earlier and later development falls outside the scope of this article; but I do not find it too surprising if it seems less prominent in our sources: combatants in later wars were not split on similar ethnic lines (see e.g. Xen. Hell. iv 3.15); as for the Archaic period, difficulties with the existence and reliability of suitable sources hamper the efforts to trace so intangible a thing back further. If we did, we might find that other ethnic differences had more impact on the generally more parochial politics of the times: see A. Andrewes, The Greek Tyrants (London 1956) ch. 5.

[77] I should like to express my gratitude to Professor W. G. Forrest and the late Mr C. W. Macleod for their comments on earlier versions of this article; and in particular to mark my debt to the late Mr M. W. Frederiksen, without whose support I should never have begun it.