

THE HISTORICAL CONTEXT OF THUCYDIDES' FUNERAL ORATION*

FOR all its celebrity, Thucydides' Funeral Speech remains an enigma. 'Unquantifiably authentic' is how one scholar describes it,¹ and the description betrays a measure of despair. We feel that the speech is authentic in some sense of the word. To some degree it corresponds to what Pericles actually said in the winter of 431/30 BC, but the degree of correspondence is a mystery. All agree that Thucydides framed the speech in his own words and integrated it with his historical narrative, so as to recall and answer Archidamus' encomium of Sparta in Book I. It also anticipates the forthcoming description of the plague with mordant, subtle allusions.² Hellmut Flashar's conclusion, formulated long ago in 1961, still commands general assent: the speech may echo the argumentation of Pericles and even echo his language, but it is in essence Thucydides' own composition, written to express the policies and thought of the city's leader at the acme of her power.³ But is the speech a message of Thucydides, a sermon on the value of democracy, or a eulogy of Athenian power and ideals? Is it so alien to the genre of funeral orations that it cannot have been delivered by the historical Pericles? These questions may help focus the discussion. What cannot be denied is that the speech is difficult and abstract, short on concrete illustration and long on florid, convoluted rhetoric. It encourages equally abstract interpretation, which removes the speech from its historical context and treats it as some kind of timeless manifesto.⁴ As a result, the military and political events of 431 tend to be disregarded, and the eulogy of the dead becomes Thucydides' vehicle for a more wide-ranging discussion of politics and patriotism. Yet the circumstances of delivery are important. It is my contention that the speech is directly influenced by the events of the past year, and its shape and direction are determined by those events and the popular reaction to them. Thucydides certainly wishes us to see the Funeral Speech in relation to the war as a whole, but I would argue that it is first and foremost a speech anchored in its immediate historical context.⁵

* Earlier versions of this paper were delivered at Oxford and Nottingham. I thank my audiences for constructive criticism, and have a particular debt to two friends at Pisa, Leone Porciani and Andrea Zambrini. I am also grateful to the Journal's referees for their critical suggestions. The errors, as always, are my own.

¹ Paul Cartledge, 'The Silent Women of Thucydides: 2.45.2 re-viewed', in R.M. Rosen and J. Farrell (eds.), *Nomodeiktēs. Greek Studies in Honor of Martin Ostwald* (Ann Arbor 1993) 125–32 at 128.

² See particularly Colin Macleod, *Collected Essays* (Oxford 1983) 149–53, emphasizing the bitter echo of *σωμα αὐταρκές* (2.41.1) at 2.51.3 (the parallel in Hdt. 1.32.9 was already noted by J.T. Kakrides, *Der Thukydideische Epitaphios. Ein stilkritischer Kommentar* (Munich 1961) 63). More recently P.A. Brunt, *Studies in Greek History and Thought* (Oxford 1993) 159–80, has argued that the pattern of thought in the *Epitaphios* 'is too redolent of Thucydides' own ideas and fits too neatly into the economy of his history to be a largely authentic report' (160).

³ H. Flashar, *Der Epitaphios des Perikles* (Sitzb. Heidelberg 1969/1) 33. There is an interesting qualification, 'möglicherweise unter Verwendung einiger perikleischer Argumentationen'. Flashar cannot quite bring himself to break the link with the historical Pericles; the speech for him is Thucydides' own, as far as content goes, but it is sprinkled with Periclean mannerisms. That essentially seems the position of Nicole Loraux, *The Invention of Athens* (Cambridge, Mass. 1986), esp. 9: 'transcribed or rather reconstituted, if not actually recomposed, by Thucydides'. But the same shift is evident in a later passage (191): 'there are many clues to suggest that Pericles did in fact deliver a speech quite similar to the literary epitaphios'.

⁴ See now the lengthy and highly abstract treatment by Karl Prinz, *Epitaphios Logos. Struktur, Funktion und Bedeutung der Bestattungsreden im Athen des 5. und 4. Jahrhunderts* (Frankfurt 1997), esp. 94–143. The best example of the generic interpretation of the *Epitaphios*, as a formative member of a literary genre, is Loraux's subtle study (n.3). Reservations have recently been expressed by C.B.R. Pelling, *Greek Tragedy and the Historian* (Oxford 1997) 229–32, and Sophie Mills, *Theseus, Tragedy and the Athenian Empire* (Oxford 1997) 47–50.

⁵ This has recently been argued by C.M.J. Sicking, 'The general purport of Pericles' Funeral Oration and last speech', *Hermes* 123 (1995) 404–25, viewing the speech as a general answer by Pericles to critics of the war, who might deride the nugatory gains of the first year of the war. I quite agree that he 'praises the dead not by celebrating their exploits (which would have been problematic anyhow), but rather by celebrating the city they died for' (413). The argument, however, can be taken much further, and the political events of 431 have many more subtle resonances in the Funeral Oration than Sicking would perhaps admit.

One point should be made at the outset. Thucydides goes out of his way to underline the importance of the occasion and the size of the audience. After describing in detail the funerary procedure, he introduces the speaker, Pericles son of Xanthippus, who takes his stand on a high rostrum specially constructed to make the speech audible over the greatest possible part of the audience (2.34.8). In other words, there were as many witnesses to the speech as to any in Thucydides. Pericles himself refers to the crowd of citizens and aliens alike (2.36.4), and stresses that what he has to say is appropriate for the occasion and the audience (ἐπί τε τῶι παρόντι οὐκ ἄν ἀπρεπῆ λεχθῆναι αὐτὰ καί....ξύμφορον εἶναι ἐπακοῦσαι αὐτῶν). Thucydides could not make it clearer that the oration is geared to a particular audience and so to the political context of the moment. He is also explicit that the audience was particularly large. On his own criteria of verification⁶ this should be one of the speeches with the most witnesses, and one at which Thucydides himself was likely to have been present, given that it was mid-winter and no campaigning was afoot. His memory could then have been supplemented by that of the maximum number of witnesses, and there can have been little doubt about the precise content of the oration. We should therefore expect this speech of all speeches to have been closest in theme and content to what was actually said.

We may begin testing the hypothesis with the famous exhortation to the women left in widowhood (2.45.2). There are in fact two statements. Glory comes if they are not inferior to their fundamental nature and if they are least talked of among men for praise and blame. Once this is taken as a general statement of principle and attitude, then we are in a minefield.⁷ The Athenians in general may be vilified for their condescension, their insistence that women be seen and not heard can be taken as typical of male attitudes. However, there have been protests against the general interpretation, notably by Pat Lacey and recently by Lorna Hardwick.⁸ Hardwick in particular interprets the admonition as directed towards predominantly upper-class women, the wives of the young cavalrymen killed in 431, who would be prime marriage-fodder and likely to protest against the war that had cost them their husbands. There was also the obligation to farewell the deceased in style. As Thucydides makes clear (2.34.4), it was the function of the female relatives of the dead to give the ritual lament, and Pericles is made to end his speech with an exhortation to begin the wailing (2.46.2).⁹ The words to the widows, it can be argued, contain a barely encoded warning not to go to excess with the laceration and self-mutilation which had been restricted by the Solonian laws.¹⁰ This funeral should be marked by self-control and

⁶ Thuc. 1.22.1. Whatever view one takes of the nuances of this endlessly discussed passage, there is no doubt about Thucydides' dilemma with the speeches: it was difficult for him and his informants to remember 'the exact tenor of what was said' (χαλεπὸν τὴν ἀκρίβειαν αὐτῆν τῶν λεχθέντων διαμνημονεῦσαι). On this celebrated passage, see the recent contributions by Thomas F. Garrity, 'Thucydides 1.22.1: content and form in the speeches', *AJP* 119 (1998) 361–84, and Leone Porciani, 'Come si scrivono i discorsi. Su Tucidide I 22,1 ἄν...μάλιστα' ἐπέειν', *QS* 49 (1999) 103–35. Though the authors approach the text from very different perspectives, they agree that Thucydides' aim is to obtain a close approximation to the speeches as they were actually delivered.

⁷ Hence Brunt's argument (n.2, 159) that the dictum is a 'slip' by Thucydides: it 'would have come ill from Aspasia's lover'. But the statement is not an observation about women in general; it is specifically directed to the families of the deceased, the war widows, and the injunction is to self-control, above all in the funerary context. That is hardly inconsistent with Pericles' relationship to Aspasia, a *hetaira* not of Athenian birth.

⁸ W.K. Lacey, 'Thucydides, II, 45, 2', *PCPS* n.s. 10 (1964) 47–9; Lorna Hardwick, 'Philomel and Pericles: silence in the Funeral Speech', *G&R* 40 (1993) 147–62.

⁹ So Lys. 2.81; Plat. *Menex.* 249C; Dem. 40.37. Euripides' *Supplikes* (1114 ff.) also ends with the funeral lament by the mothers and children of the dead (A.M. Bowie, 'Tragic filters for history', in Pelling (n.4) 39–62, esp. 51).

¹⁰ Plut. *Sol.* 21.5–6 (ἀπεύργοντα τὸ ἄτακτον), 12.8; [Dem.] 43.62; Cic. *De leg.* 2.64 (*mulierum genas ne radunto*). Cf. Plat. *Leg.* 960a.

moderation. Individual mourners were not to make a spectacle of themselves.¹¹

To place this injunction in context we must go back eight years to the other recorded funeral speech of Thucydides, for those who fell while crushing the Samian Revolt. That was a celebrated oration, commemorated somewhat critically by Ion of Chios and Stesimbrotus of Thasos.¹² Exultant and triumphal, Pericles so eulogized the fallen that when he left the rostrum, he was mobbed by the women present, who showered him with garlands and ribbons, for all the world like a victorious athlete.¹³ It was a display of excess which Pericles did not discourage. Yet, if we may trust the tradition, the enthusiasm was not universal. Elpinice, the formidable sister of Cimon, confronted Pericles in his glory and remarked sourly that the dead had not fallen in combat with the Mede, as they would have done under her brother's command, but in the subjugation of an allied, kindred city.¹⁴ It was a barbed comment, and Pericles responded with an insult; Elpinice was too near the truth for comfort. However, in 439 the one woman who got herself talked about did not spoil the triumphal occasion, and Pericles preened himself in the limelight. There was no injunction to moderation. The tone of Pericles' warning in 431 suggests that this was to be a rather different occasion. This time excessive displays of mourning were to be avoided, and no woman, if he could help it, was to take on the role of Elpinice. We have a clear indication that the funeral was a sombre event, staged against a background of dissatisfaction which Pericles needed to neutralize in his oration.

As far as we can tell, the speech of 439 was the polar opposite of Thucydides' Funeral Oration. It revelled in the glory of the occasion and the achievements of the campaign. While Agamemnon had taken ten years to capture a single barbarian city, Pericles himself had overcome the most powerful Ionian state in a mere nine months.¹⁵ The Trojan War is used as a measure of comparison, to exalt the achievement of the victors and those who had fallen in the victory. The theme is treated in much the same way in the greatest extant funeral oration, Hyperides' tribute to the dead of the Lamian War. Leosthenes, the general who fell in the autumn campaign of 323, could be made to surpass the heroes of Troy in that they destroyed a single city with the help of a panhellenic alliance, whereas he humiliated the ruling power of Europe and Asia. While they avenged the violence done to a single woman, he and his fellow dead turned aside the outrages that were directed against the whole of Greece.¹⁶ This was a theme attuned to victory. Pericles had overcome a major revolt, while Leosthenes was responsible for the first significant victories against Macedonian armies on Greek soil: Antipater had been defeated and

¹¹ Such appears to have been the general sentiment. The apocryphal laws of Charondas (Stob. 4.2.24, lines 73–9) clearly echo the *Epitaphios*, emphasizing that it is better to die honourably for one's country than to live in disgrace and shame (Thuc. 2.43.6). It adds that the dead should be honoured in memory (Thuc. 2.43.3) and through the annual offerings (2.35.1), not by tears and lamentation, 'for immoderate grief is an affront to the chthonic powers' (ὡς ἀχαριστίας οὐσης πρὸς δαίμονας χθονίους λύπης ὑπὲρ τὸ μέτρον γιγνομένης).

¹² Both authors cite extreme examples of rhetorical exaggeration (Plut. *Per.* 8.9 = Stesimbrotus, *FGrH* 107 F 9; Plut. *Per.* 28.9; *De glor. Ath.* 350E = Ion, *FGrH* 392 F 16). The striking metaphor reported by Aristotle (*Rhet.* 1.1365a 31–3, 3.1411a 2–4) probably comes from this oration. Cf. L. Weber, 'Perikles' Samische Leichenrede', *Hermes* 57 (1922) 375–95; Max Pohlenz, 'Zu den attischen Reden auf die Gefallenen', *SO* 26 (1948) 46–74, esp. 46–50, 65–6.

¹³ Plut. *Per.* 29.5. Compare Thuc. 4.121.1, where Brasidas is showered with ribbons by the people of Scione, who approach him as though he were an athlete (on the interpretation, see Simon Hornblower, *A Commentary on Thucydides* (Oxford 1991) 2.380–5). The practice is also attested for the Alexander period (Arr. 6.13.3; *Ind.* 36.3, 42.8—all passages derived from Nearchus).

¹⁴ Plut. *Per.* 28.6 (cf. Hardwick (n.8) 153–4). Elpinice is in the same camp as Gorgias, who declared in his own *Epitaphios* that trophies raised over barbarians called for hymns, those over Greeks for dirges (Philostr. *VS* 1.9 = Gorgias B 5b Diels/Kranz).

¹⁵ Plut. *Per.* 28.8 = Ion, *FGrH* 392 F 16. The comparison recurs in the Demosthenaic *Epitaphios* (Dem. 60.10—the contrast is with the Athenian victories of 490 and 480); by that time Isocrates had made it a virtual commonplace (Isocr. 4.83, 5.111, 9.65).

¹⁶ Hyp. *Epitaph.* col. 12.

forced to undergo siege in Lamia, and Leonnatus, the Bodyguard of Alexander, had been killed in battle when he brought forces to relieve the siege.¹⁷ On any reckoning this was a significant achievement, and Hyperides shamelessly eulogizes it, using the Trojan War as a yardstick. In Thucydides' oration (as has been often remarked) there is nothing comparable. Homer makes a passing appearance, at the climax of Pericles' praise of Athens (2.41.4), only to be dismissed as the author of a superficially attractive but factually unreliable story (an ἀγώνισμα ἐς τὸ παραχρήμα). Athens does not need such help to win immortality; her achievements speak for themselves. This is indeed hyperbole, but it is expressed in the most general terms to glorify the total imperial achievement of Athens. Thucydides virtually omits the dead.¹⁸ So Pericles himself admits (2.36.4): he places the city first and then passes on to the fallen. It is the collective, the city, which he makes the centre of his eulogy; her achievements make it a worthy object of sacrifice both for the dead and the living.

Another comparison will give a sharper focus. In a celebrated chapter (2.36) Thucydides begins his speech with the Athenian forefathers, praising their preservation of freedom from earliest times to the present day.¹⁹ Then comes encomium of the previous generation who bequeathed the existing empire, and still more those Athenians of mature age who have expanded the city's possessions and given it its preeminent self-sufficiency in war and peace. Once more the dead are not mentioned. The eulogy is directed to the audience and above all to the speaker himself. Finally, Pericles refuses to dilate upon the successes of the past, the repelling of barbarian or Greek invaders, because he is reluctant to speak at length before an audience familiar with the facts (μακρηγορεῖν ἐν εἰδόσιν), and turns instead to praise of the city. The passage is blatantly imitated by Hyperides, who protests that he has neither time nor ability to do justice to the achievements of the past, and contents himself with an elaborate analogy, comparing Athens with the sun as the universal provider of Greece.²⁰ But then he turns explicitly to the dead and devotes himself to a eulogy in which the standard comparisons are made: Leosthenes and his men outshone Miltiades and Themistocles because he did not simply defeat the barbarians—he kept them at a distance, far away from the boundaries of Attica. Even Harmodius and Aristogeiton play second fiddle; they killed the tyrants (*sic*) of their country, but Leosthenes discomfited the tyrants who oppressed the whole of Hellas. Hyperides may have eschewed a full catalogue of Athenian achievements, but he did select particular examples to highlight the merits of the dead. In Thucydides the past is almost literally buried. It is the city of the present which is eulogized.²¹

¹⁷ On the events of the so-called Lamian War, see N.G.L. Hammond and F.W. Walbank, *A History of Macedonia* (Oxford 1988) 3.109–13; O. Schmitt, *Der Lamische Krieg* (Bonn 1992), esp. 73–84; Chr. Habicht, *Athen* (Munich 1995) 47–53. On the patriotic fervour in Athens on the outbreak of this 'Hellenic' war, see N.G. Ashton, 'The Lamian War—*stat magni nominis umbra*', *JHS* 104 (1984) 152–7.

¹⁸ Even Lysias (2.67–8) supplies details about the achievements of the fallen. It is dangerous to characterize Hypereides' *Epitaphios* as 'the least conformist' of the genre (Loroux (n.3) 110), given that so few examples survive. Lysias and Plato's *Menexenus*, with their imbalance towards the glories of the past, may have been more atypical. As, in fairness, Loroux recognizes, the circumstances of delivery must always have affected the choice and arrangement of material.

¹⁹ Significantly, Thucydides dwells on the permanence of the Athenians in Attica (τὴν γὰρ χώραν οἱ αὐτοὶ αἰεὶ οἰκοῦντες), echoing his description at the very start of his *History* (1.2.5: ἀστασίαστον οὖσαν ἄνθρωποι ὤικουν οἱ αὐτοὶ αἰεὶ). The Athenians were uniquely associated with their land (*cf.* Hornblower (n.13) 1.12–13 for discussion and bibliography), and the burial ceremony restored the dead to the earth from which the people had sprung. It was a highly appropriate theme for a funeral oration.

²⁰ Hyp. *Epitaph.* col. 2, lines 19 ff. There is an echo in Demosthenes' comparison (Dem. 60.24) of the loss of the fallen with the failure of the light of day, in its turn a somewhat frigid exaggeration of Pericles' celebrated analogy of spring going out of the year (Arist. *Rhet.* 1.1365a 31–3, 3.1411a 2–4; see above, n.12).

²¹ Sicking (n.5) 406–10 even argues that the *captatio benevolentiae* at 2.35.2 is directed against Pericles' critics, implying that they were 'motivated by jealousy and self-interest'. Quite the contrary. The reference to envy actually

What alternative was there? If we review the standard encomia of the men of Marathon and Salamis, the themes that Thucydides places in the mouths of the Athenian ambassadors at Sparta and Euphemus at Syracuse, what we find is a stress on the risks taken: at Marathon the Athenians left their city and fought unaided against the barbarians, while at Salamis they sacrificed their land and city but still manoeuvred the enemy into a sea battle which preserved the freedom of Hellas.²² In 431 it was a very different story. The Athenians had sacrificed their land—unwillingly, but there was no glorious victory against the odds. They had avoided battle, kept the cavalry engagements down to the bare minimum necessary to protect the land near the city (2.22.2), and allowed the Spartans to ravage the peripheries of Attica at will. Nor could it be said that there were achievements abroad to compensate for the inactivity at home. The sea-borne retaliation against the Peloponnese was on a large scale, involving one hundred Athenian warships and fifty from Corcyra, the product of the new alliance. The results, however, were minimal. An attack on the deserted fort of Methone was frustrated by the enterprise of Brasidas (2.25.2). There were desultory skirmishes around Elis in which the harbour of Pheia was captured but promptly abandoned when the full levy of Elis was mobilized. The year's hostilities ended in the north-west with the capture of the Corinthian dependency of Sollium and the expulsion of the tyrant of Astacus. The island of Cephallenia also came over without a fight (2.30). These were gains to be sure, but it might be argued that Corcyra profited most from the acquisition of Cephallenia, and it was the Acarnanians of Palaerus who were given the lands of Sollium. As for Astacus, its tyrant was restored soon after by a Corinthian expeditionary force (2.33.1), and the news may have reached Athens by the time of the Funeral Oration. A second force was rather more successful in the north, but on a very small scale. It occupied the fortress of Thronium just below Thermopylae, and placed a guard post on the tiny deserted island of Atalante to protect Euboea from piratical raids from Locris (2.26, 32). These were not achievements to be named alongside Marathon, Salamis and the Eurymedon. Nor indeed was the great invasion of the Megarid, which Thucydides categorically states was the largest expedition to be mounted by Athens while her power was at its height, unaffected by the plague.²³ 13,000 hoplites and an unspecified but large force of light armed were joined by the hundred ships returning from Acarnania. They ravaged Megarian land while the Megarians looked on from their fortifications, for all the world like the Athenians at the start of the season. For all the damage they caused, there was no conclusive result, no victory in the field, no strong point captured—and, in all probability, no Athenian dead.²⁴

The most substantial result of the year was diplomatic, and it was not secured by an Athenian. Their newly acquired *proxenos*, Nymphodorus of Abdera, was able to negotiate alliances with Sitalces, king of the Odrysian Thracians, and Perdiccas of Macedon, who now gave support to the Athenian campaign in Chalcidice.²⁵ Even so, there are no events of note recorded. The siege

elevates the dead. Their achievement is such that his hearers might think it beyond belief, or beyond their capacity. The dead (that is, the collective dead over the years) have performed something almost superhuman, and the cohort of 431 belongs in that august company. With superb skill Pericles insinuates that the deeds of the fallen are quite outstanding, consistent with the city's glorious heritage, but he wisely refrains from spelling out what those deeds actually were.

²² 1.73.4–74.4, 6.82.3.

²³ 2.31.2. Later (6.31.2) Thucydides reinforces the point, emphasizing that the armament was larger than the force operating at Poteidaea and the Sicilian expedition itself.

²⁴ Despite the two invasions they suffered each year, the Megarians held out until late 424 before making overtures to Athens. Even then it was pressure from dissident exiles as much as the Athenian devastation of their land that broke their resistance (4.66.1–2).

²⁵ 2.29.7. The alliance was predictably of short duration. It did not prevent Perdiccas sending troops to the polyglot army which invaded Acarnania two summers later, in 429 (2.80.7).

of Poteidaea continued remorselessly. The defenders slowly starved, but without giving the Athenians a chance of battle and victory. A far cry even from the previous year, when the Athenian expeditionary force fought a successful battle outside the walls of Poteidaea, killed three hundred of the enemy for the loss of 150 of their own men, and forced them back inside their own city walls (1.63.3). That is duly commemorated in the extant epitaph for the Athenian dead. It commemorates their sacrifice in language reminiscent of Thucydides, but it also gives precise details about the circumstances of their demise: their lives were lost by the gates of Poteidaea, and their enemies have their own portion of burial or fled and entrusted their hope of survival to their walls.²⁶ There was a victory, a trophy had been erected, and the epitaph describes the event briefly but vividly. By contrast, 431 had been a year without trophies. The only such monument recorded by Thucydides was one erected by the Peloponnesians close to the walls of Athens (2.22.2), a striking illustration of the impotence of the imperial city when her soil was invaded. The dead of 431 had perished in a series of skirmishes, most of them inconclusive, and the major event had been a practically uncontested invasion. Against that background the heroic Athenian forefathers were a downright embarrassment, and it is easy to see why Pericles avoided dwelling on their achievement. The contrast with the present was too uncomfortable.²⁷

We can see why Pericles avoided specific encomium and direct comparison with the past. Can we go further and explain why he chose the emphasis he did, praising the political and social institutions of the Athenian *polis* before an audience which one would have thought was only too aware of them? There is, I think, a clear answer, an answer rooted firmly in the momentous events of the last campaigning year. What Pericles says about Athenian institutions (2.37) is indeed familiar, almost trite, but it is given a particular 'spin', a stress on the collective values of the democracy. The message is that the *polis* through its political structure and material wealth gives its citizens, rich and poor, unique opportunities for self-fulfilment and it deserves the passionate devotion of each individual, a passion which makes death in military service almost a desirable contribution to the collective. Voluntary death in battle is proof that the individual has seen the worth of the community and constitutes the highest form of *arete*. The possibility of losing such a society justifies the sacrifice of one's life, and the current batch of dead are seen as consciously embracing death for the community. Their death is a voluntary subscription (*ἐράνος*), giving entry into an élite society that enjoys immortality through the collective memory of its virtue. This is a hymn²⁸ to the corporate virtues of Athens, which satisfy the aspirations of its citizens and justify their death in battle as the most desirable communal service. What relevance does such a hymn have to the circumstances of 431?

The answer, I believe, is given in Thucydides' famous chapters on the evacuation of Attica, which precede the Funeral Speech and have a bearing on Pericles' encomium of the collective. In these chapters he gives a justly famous explanation of the regional attachment of many of the communities of Attica. Before Theseus, the region had been split into self-governing *poleis*, and even after the synoecism most of the rural population remained static in their demes. It was therefore difficult for them to transplant themselves to the city proper for the duration of the invasion. They chafed at the necessity to leave their homes and shrines which had been

²⁶ IG I³ 1179 = Tod, *GHI* no. 59: ἐχθρὸν δ' οἱ μὲν ἔχουσι τάφο μέρος, Ἡοῖ δὲ φυγόντες] τεῖχος πιστοτάτεν Ἑλιπιδ' ἔθεντο [β'ο].

²⁷ The discomfort emerges even in the most elevated passages of rhetoric. For instance, at 2.43.3, the immortal tribute of memory is paid to the resolution (*γνώμη*) of the fallen, rather than their actual achievement (*ἔργον*). There is, I think, no possibility that *ἔργον* here refers to the physical monument (as suggested by Stahl, Steup and others). Pericles is placing the morale of the fallen above their accomplishment, and it is a clear indication that in 431 their accomplishment was not outstanding. I am grateful to Dr. Leone Porciani for pointing this out to me.

²⁸ 2.42.2: Sicking (n.5) 415 gives a metrical analysis of a short passage of the speech.

theirs for generations, and felt that the move was nothing less than deserting their own *polis* (οὐδέν ἄλλο ἢ πόλιν τῆν αὐτοῦ ἀπολείπων ἕκαστος).²⁹ If that is correct (and we have no reason to doubt it), the evacuees had little experience of the central, fortified city, and, when they withdrew to Athens, they presumably felt that they were leaving their true home for an alien entity.³⁰ The feeling of alienation will have been exacerbated by the conditions they found in Athens. Again Thucydides is explicit that few had homes of their own or friends to provide shelter. The majority occupied vacant shrines which were at least roofed, or camped out in the open between the Long Walls, sometimes in wretched makeshift hovels which were stifling in the heat and breeding grounds for the plague the following year (2.52.1–2). For them the city was unwelcoming, profoundly uncomfortable, and a constant reminder that they were suffering out of all proportion if compared with the population normally resident in or around Athens.

The depredations of the Peloponnesian army can only have sharpened these feelings. The devastation it caused in Attica was selective. After the siege of Oenoe, when they refrained from ravaging the land, the Spartans turned their attention to Eleusis and the Thriasian plain. They then veered northwards to Acharnae. There they based themselves, hoping to provoke the Athenians into a pitched battle in defence of their land, and Thucydides adds that Archidamus was well aware of the size of the deme of Acharnae and the voting strength of its hoplites. He was deliberately playing on the strength of local feeling, for the Acharnians, so he calculated, would not be willing to sacrifice themselves for the city as a whole if their own land was left to be devastated (2.20.4).³¹ Whether or not his judgment was correct, Thucydides thought it credible that he was playing upon local patriotism and encouraging faction within the *polis* as a whole (στάσις δ' ἐνέσσεσθαι τῆι γνώμηι). In this Archidamus may have been more successful than is usually thought. There was considerable pressure in Athens to take the field, and it is notorious that Pericles ensured that no public meeting was held to vote on the matter. As the invasion proceeded, the Peloponnesian army ravaged the area north of Athens around Acharnae, confining its attentions to a very localized area, the gap between Mt. Parnes and Mt. Pentelicon. This was different from the next year's invasion, which affected the entire *paralia* from Athens to Sunium, and is unlikely to have inflicted systematic devastation.³² The invasion of 431 was selective, and in the weeks that the Peloponnesian army was encamped around Acharnae it could have made havoc of the agricultural areas, not merely digging out the vines but making a serious start on the more arduous business of wrecking the olive industry.³³ It then

²⁹ 2.16.2.

³⁰ It is noteworthy that the decision to evacuate the countryside was made by an assembly dominated by the voters of the central city, and the event probably inspired Xenophon's observation (*Oec.* 6.6–7) that in the face of an invasion of the countryside the landowners would vote to protect their property, while the urban *technitai* would refuse to fight for the land and stay within their walls. Cf. David Whitehead, *The Demes of Attica* (Princeton 1986) 351 n.6, citing J.A.O. Larsen, *CPh* 44 (1949) 175 ('the policy of Pericles...probably would have been voted down if the assembly had met out in the country and been attended chiefly by farmers').

³¹ See particularly C.B.R. Pelling, 'Thucydides' Archidamus and Herodotus' Artabanus', in *Georgica: Greek Studies in Honour of George Cawkwell* (*BICS* Suppl. 58, 1991) 120–42, esp. 126–8; pointing out the irony in Thucydides' presentation of Archidamus' strategy; the Spartan king was entrapped in the very policy he had considered least desirable.

³² Thuc. 2.47.2, 55, 57. The sheer area covered by the Spartans in this, the longest of the invasions, would have undermined Athenian morale. It demonstrated that no area of Attica could be safely left unevacuated.

³³ The effectiveness of the Spartan strategy has come under serious questioning in recent years (see the survey by Lin Foxhall, 'Farming and fighting', in J. Rich and G. Shipley (eds.), *War and Society in the Greek World* (London 1993) 134–45). In general it may be said that the author of the *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia* (17.5 Bartoletti) was right to maintain that Attica suffered relatively little during the invasions of the Archidamian War; however, there were areas of special concentration, like Acharnae, which would have been seriously damaged, and probably suffered further devastation in 427, when land previously ravaged was cleared of any new growth (Thuc. 3.26.3).

departed via the north-east of Attica. The Peloponnesians emerged at Oropus, and had presumably damaged the areas of Marathon and Tetrapolis as they went.³⁴ Once again it was the more distant areas that suffered.

By contrast, the plain around Athens itself was largely intact. It had been deliberate policy to spare it, and in Athens it seems to have been deliberate policy to defend it. Pericles had used cavalry harassment once in the Thriasian plain, but thereafter he sent out his squadrons only to deter the invaders from ravaging close to the city.³⁵ Acharnae was left to burn, and the closest the enemy cavalry came was the locality of Phrygia in the deme of Athmonon, at the northern fringe of the city plain.³⁶ That cannot have sweetened the mood of the communities which had borne the brunt of the invasion. The city and its hinterland was receiving privileged treatment. So, it may have seemed, was Pericles himself. Admittedly he had made a gesture of sacrifice, offering to give to the public any of his estates spared by the Peloponnesian army. But, even if he did make good his promise, it affected only the property which happened to be in the path of the invading army. The bulk of his assets were presumably in the parts of Attica untouched by the invasion, notably in the Alcmaeonid heartland in the south-east, well outside the path of the Peloponnesian army.³⁷ That area was to be marked for devastation in 430, but for the moment it was untouched, and Pericles might be thought to have been spared the suffering his policies had inflicted on others.

The invasion lasted a month at most,³⁸ but the bitterness it created was more long-lasting. Rich and poor alike, according to Thucydides (2.65.2), were discontented, the former because their expensively equipped properties were ruined, the latter because they were deprived of what little they had. Although there was as yet no pressure to end the war, the enthusiasm for it must have waned. In particular the inhabitants of Eleusis and Acharnae (and possibly Rhamnus too) will have looked sourly at the privileged splendour of the centre, its public and private buildings protected by the Long Walls, its agricultural land carefully preserved from devastation. Was it for this that their lands had been ravaged and they themselves plunged into destitution? The war had demanded unequal sacrifices, and the victims of 431 may have felt little love for the political structure that had brought them their misery while the ἀστυ, the fortified centre, was spared any damage. That, I suggest, was the social atmosphere Pericles confronted in his Funeral Oration. The first year of the war had been militarily unproductive and politically divisive. The lack of success could be glossed over by avoiding the standard comparisons with the past and stressing the overwhelming importance of the city as a whole. The theme of Athenian unity was

³⁴ 2.23.3. Thucydides states that the Athenian subject territory of Oropus was ravaged, and *a fortiori* Athenian land would have suffered the same fate. There was no time to inflict the systematic devastation that Acharnae had experienced, but farmsteads could be burned and vines, if not uprooted, at least slashed. On the road to Oropus, see J. Ober, *Fortress Attica: Defense of the Athenian Land Frontier* (Leiden 1985) 112–14.

³⁵ 2.19.2, 22.2–3; cf. 3.1. On this strategy of ‘mobile defence’, see I.G. Spence, ‘Perikles and the defence of Attika during the Peloponnesian War’, *JHS* 110 (1990) 91–109, esp. 102–4, noting that the plain around Athens was a relatively secure area. That contrasted with the area around Acharnae, where the Peloponnesian army had free range. The light troops who presumably did most of the ravaging (V.D. Hanson, *Warfare and Agriculture in Classical Greece* (Pisa 1983) 21–5; Spence 97–102) were not subject to the cavalry harassment that was to prevent their ravaging the city plain in 428 (Thuc. 3.1.2).

³⁶ 2.22.2. The deme location is given by the scholiast.

³⁷ He presumably had property in his home deme of Cholargus, which was located outside the city walls, to the north-east of Mt. Aegaleos (J.S. Traill, *The Political Organization of Attica* (*Hesperia* Suppl. 14, Princeton 1975) 47). That was some 12 km south-east of Athmonon, unlikely to have been affected by the Peloponnesian ravages.

³⁸ Of the invasions of Attica the second, in 430, was the longest, at 40 days (Thuc. 2.57.3), and the last, in 425, was the shortest, at 15 days (Thuc. 4.6.2), drastically curtailed by the Athenian occupation of Pylos. The invasion of 431 lost time at Oenoe, on the borders of Attica, and there is no way of calculating how long the army stayed at Eleusis and Acharnae.

also relevant to the social situation. Refugees from the ravaged land could be read a sermon on the value of the collective *polis*, be convinced of the advantages they enjoy through their citizenship, and come to recognize the power of the city which guaranteed those advantages.

Pericles duly begins by emphasizing the power of the city, the empire founded by their fathers and expanded by the current generation, and proceeds to outline the political and social practices that are responsible for its present greatness. First comes a brief characterization of the unique Athenian political system, which is all-inclusive. Rich and poor alike can participate, since men of distinction can be recognized by election to the *strategia* and other high office, and nobody is prevented by poverty from involvement in public life.³⁹ Sortition and payment for office, so we are led to believe, make public service accessible to every citizen with political aspirations.⁴⁰ Involvement in the public life of the city is accompanied by personal freedom. Universal access to office gives freedom, freedom that is manifested by a relaxed style of living which allows personal idiosyncrasies, and is implicitly contrasted with the intolerance of deviation from the social norm which is the mark of authoritarian states like Sparta. Athens' political structure encourages diversity, and the diversity gives her strength. It also means that all citizens, whatever their financial and social status, whatever their personal predilections, can be effective members of the body politic. If the political and legal structure encourages individuality, the quality of life is enhanced by the city's wealth and power. It enables sacrifices and games to be held throughout the year to relieve the everyday toils of living, while the wealthy enjoy their elaborate private installations.⁴¹ The goods of the world are also open for Athens to enjoy because of the city's greatness. Accordingly, the means for sophisticated and luxurious living are here at hand, for all who can to enjoy. The message to the victims of the devastation was clear enough. You may have suffered personally, but that is necessary for the survival of the city as a whole. You have

³⁹ 2.37.1. Peter Rhodes, *Thucydides History II* (Warminster 1988) 220, has argued that Pericles' statement is deliberate misrepresentation, since the vast majority of offices were selected by lot, and even offices determined by sortition were denied to the thetic class. But, as he admits, Thucydides (or Pericles) would be guilty of an obvious lie. We should beware of taking the passage as a blanket statement. Thucydides does not state that all the poor are eligible for office, merely that poverty (a relative term) and lack of personal distinction are not barriers to office. Similarly, the man of outstanding ability can have his qualities recognized by election (so Hornblower (n.13) 1.300–1). This is a true enough generalization, the mirror image of which we find in the Old Oligarch ([Xen.] *Ath. Pol.* 1.3; cf. Loraux (n.3) 213).

⁴⁰ See, however, E.M. Harris, 'Pericles' praise of Athenian democracy: Thucydides 2.37.1', *HSCP* 94 (1992) 157–67, esp. 165, where it is maintained that there is no reference to sortition: Pericles simply contrasts democracy and its unrestricted access to office with the exclusiveness of oligarchies (so, already, Loraux (n.3) 175, maintaining that 'misthophoria and the drawing of lots...are totally ignored in the Epitaphioi'). If so, the passage is somewhat pleonastic, adding little to ἐς πλείονας οἰκεῖν. Nor can we argue from the small sample of Thucydidean parallels that ἀπὸ μέρους cannot mean 'in rotation'. The phrase does not recur elsewhere in Thucydides, and it is rash to assume that it cannot have a meaning similar to ἐν μέρει (8.86.3, 93.2; cf. κατὰ μέρος at 3.49.3 and 4.26.4), as it certainly does at Diod. 13.108.1. On my interpretation the passage echoes Theseus' proud boast in Eur. *Suppl.* 404–8 (cited by de Romilly, Gomme and by Harris himself, who concedes that Thucydides' reference to poverty does not exclude sortition; *contra* Loraux 215). It is true, as Harris claims, that sortition and rotation are not the same thing. However, the prohibition on iteration, given the large number of political offices in Athens, had much the same effect as sortition: it demanded a large pool of applicants for office.

⁴¹ 2.38.1. The Old Oligarch again provides a significant counterpoint: in the case of sacrifices and games it is not possible for the poor to fund them out of their resources, so the city provides for all, and the poor have the enjoyment of the sacrificial meat; similarly, some few rich individuals have private gymnasia and baths, whereas the *demos* makes such facilities the preserve of the poor ([Xen.] *Ath. Pol.* 2.9–10). For this writer, democracy is the great leveller, giving the poor the social advantages of the rich, whereas Pericles insists that the *polis* allows rich and poor to enjoy their own distinct lifestyles; the poor are not elevated but compensated for their poverty in a way unthinkable in other states. There is a distinctly hedonistic tinge to the passage, which is surely deliberate. The refugees are subtly reminded of the festivals which they had attended and presumably enjoyed—notably the Thargelia and Plynteria, which fell in the period of the invasion (cf. J.K. Mikalson, *The Sacred and Civil Calendar of the Athenian Year* (Princeton 1975) 151–64).

the advantages of personal freedom. If you are rich you can make the political impact your station demands and have unparalleled resources for the enjoyment of life. On the other hand, however poor you are, you can still play a role in public affairs, live your life as you think fit and have access to the public entertainment provided by the city.⁴²

At this point Pericles deals with an implicit objection. Do not the cultural and political blessings enjoyed by the Athenians make them softer, less competitive in the military sphere? Quite the reverse, argues Pericles, they give us a resilience and esprit which more than matches our enemies' unrelenting discipline (2.39). This is a paradox, and he is on somewhat dangerous ground. He addresses the ticklish theme of the Peloponnesian invasion; the Spartans invade our land with their entire complement of allies, while we are successful elsewhere by ourselves, even when fighting against people defending their home territory.⁴³ This could provoke the bitter reflection that the Athenians themselves had done nothing to defend their land during the past year, which would have been a better use of their fighting qualities than attacking others. However, the passage is very skilfully framed in terms flattering to Athenian patriotism. The Spartans were too frightened to face us by themselves. They needed a complete levy of the Peloponnesian League to invade Attica, whereas we tend to be victorious with a fraction of our forces against men who have everything to lose. It is an encomium of the Athenian soldier and so, by implication, the Athenian dead. I do not see it, as some have, as an ideology of non-professionalism.⁴⁴ There is no suggestion that the Athenians do not train for military service. Pericles' point is that they do not spend their life training. Their involvement simultaneously in public and private concerns gives them a versatility and morale which more than matches the continuous training and unrelenting hardship endured by the Spartan hoplite.

Pericles now moves to more general themes, but he does not lose sight of the central issue, the social and political organization of Athens which gives her citizens unique advantages. He keeps firmly to practicalities, despite the high-flown rhetoric in which he expresses his ideas. The famous sentence φιλοκαλοῦμέν τε γὰρ μετ' εὐτελείας καὶ φιλοσοφούμεν ἄνευ μαλακίας should certainly not be taken as a reference to different styles of life, contemplative, active or acquisitive. It is a transitional connective, bound to the previous phrase by the explanatory γὰρ and looking ahead to the next clauses which are closely bound by asyndeton and linked by a sequence of the correlatives τε...καί.⁴⁵ The boast that love of the beautiful is combined

⁴² That was indeed cold comfort (as a referee reminds me) for humble folk from remote areas like Anaphlystus or Thoricus, who would rarely, if ever, have the leisure to participate in the public life of central Athens. However, the people most affected by the invasion of 431, and most embittered, came from Acharnae and neighbouring areas north-west of the fortified city. With some effort even the poorest could derive some advantage from the amenities of the centre—and while they were refugees they could (in theory) participate fully in the polity.

⁴³ 2.39.2. That citizen soldiers fight best in defence of their own becomes almost commonplace. Aristotle (*NE* 3.1116b 15–19) contrasts the cowardly behaviour of the mercenaries in Boeotian service with the heroic resistance of the citizen troops at Coronea (cf. J. Buckler, *Philip II and the Sacred War* (Leiden 1989) 72). See also the remarks of Aen. Tact. Praef. 2. In general, Aristotle's view of courage mirrors the sentiments of the *Epitaphios*, compare *NE* 3.1117^b8–21 and Thuc. 2.42.4, 43.5–6.

⁴⁴ See Hornblower's note on the matter (1.303–4), quoting P. Vidal-Naquet, *The Black Hunter* (Baltimore 1986) 89–90: 'nowhere else is the ideology of non-professionalism pushed so far'. So Hardwick (n.8) 158–9.

⁴⁵ For all its sophistication I cannot accept the main thesis of Jeffrey S. Rusten, 'Two lives or three? Pericles on the Athenian character (Thucydides 2.40.1–2)', *CQ* 35 (1985) 14–19. Rusten interprets the triple occurrence of τε as a device to mark off three separate styles of life. However, the first segment seems curiously bald: there is no attempt to enlarge on the striking combination, philosophy without softness, and these three words are the only allusion in the whole speech to speculative contemplation. It is surely better to read the passage as a series of antitheses, marked by the copulatives τε and καί. φιλοκαλοῦμεν and φιλοσοφούμεν mark different and contrasting occupations, both of which involve the whole community, rich and poor alike. The antithesis is continued in the following sentences, which refer first to the financial activity of the community and then to its political involvement; the separate but complementary roles of rich and poor are briefly defined and illustrated.

with economy is enlarged by a statement that the Athenians use their wealth not for ostentation but as a resource for action,⁴⁶ while the poor see it as a duty to escape poverty and bend all their efforts to doing so. Frugality (εὐτέλεια) takes the emphasis.⁴⁷ The Athenians might have a love of beauty, expressed above all in the buildings of the Acropolis and the public festivals of the city, but it takes place against a background of industry. Few looking at the system of public liturgies and above all the trierarchy would deny that wealth was poured into the city's military effort. The city had the resources to act appropriately at the right moment. On the other hand, the poor, unashamed of their condition, are not content to live on public largesse (if that were possible), but bend their efforts to becoming productive members of the community. This is a thinly concealed defence against criticisms of the democracy. Athens' love of the beautiful could be construed as extravagance, the temples of the Acropolis an unfair imposition upon the resources of the allies, while the poor could idle their time away on a constant diet of shows and festivals. That might have been one of the genuine grievances of the evacuees of 431. They were living in misery under the shadow of the Acropolis, witnessing the *dikastai* collecting their payment for their day's service, service which, given the remoteness of their domicile, they themselves rarely had the chance to give, experiencing some of the extravagance of state festivals which normally they could not attend. Pericles' reply to the implied criticism is brief but effective. We may have a taste for the beautiful, but we are not slaves to luxury; the rich give their resources to promote the war effort, while the poor feel a moral obligation to achieve self-sufficiency and contribute to the collective.

The second claim Pericles makes is that the Athenian predilection for *sophia* does not entail that they are effete. It is fatally easy to translate φιλοσοφοῦμεν as 'philosophize' and to conclude that the text refers to the passion for theoretical speculation that made the sophists the social centre of cultured young Athenians. On the contrary, Pericles enlarges on the sentiment by emphasizing the Athenians' involvement in the political life of their city, and it is the public deliberation of state business that he particularly addresses. It is against that background that we should understand Thucydides' reference to love of *sophia*. This is his sole use of the word φιλοσοφείν, and he may well be using it in the wider sense of 'love of cleverness', *sophia* in terms of practical wisdom such as Herodotus ascribes to Themistocles and the Athenians at large. That kind of *sophia* was manifested above all in public debate, in persuasive argument and appreciation of rhetorical technique. So it is in Aristophanes' *Ecclesiazusae* where Praxagora is urged by the chorus to show her subtlety and sophistry (φιλόσοφος φροντίς) in debate.⁴⁸ The best comment, I think, comes in Cleon's Mytilenean oration, which so often echoes and inverts sentiments earlier expressed by Pericles. There, in a wonderful exhibition of Satan rebuking sin, Cleon excoriates the Athenians' passion for rhetoric and novel expression, which he maintains seduces them into unwise decisions (such as reprieving the Mytileneans). You are absolutely under the spell of the charm of listening and resemble the audiences of sophists rather than people deliberating on the issues concerning their *polis* (σοφιστῶν θεαταῖς εἰκότες καθημένοις μάλλον ἢ περὶ πόλεως βουλευομένοις: 3.38.7). To suit his purposes Cleon

⁴⁶ For the connection between wealth and the love of beauty, see *Xen.Mem.* 3.11.9; *Cyrop.* 1.3.3; *Isocr.* 1 (*ad Demonicum*).10. Note particularly *Isocr.* 1.27, where the φιλόκαλος is defined as munificent (μεγαλοπρεπής), as opposed to the exhibitionist (καλλωπιστής). The latter corresponds to the κόμπος λόγου at *Thuc.* 2.40.2 and 41.2.

⁴⁷ I fail to see how Gomme (2.119–20) can argue that εὐτέλεια has a pejorative force, given the high praise Alcibiades (and presumably Thucydides) showers upon the economies which the Athenians imposed after 413 (*Thuc.* 8.86.8; *cf.* 8.1.3).

⁴⁸ *Ar. Eccl.* 571: νῦν δὴ δεῖ σε πικρὴν φρένα καὶ φιλόσοφον ἐγείρειν φροντίδ' ἐπισταμένην. As Ussher points out in his commentary *ad loc.*, the demand is not for 'a harangue on philosophy, political or other (and they do not get it): the words merely mean "a bright idea"'.

represents Athenian public debate as an exercise in rhetorical technique, with the audience so heavily involved that they ignore the evidence of their own experience and are prone to disaster because of their infatuation with novel technique. This is caricature, brilliantly over the top, but it must represent contemporary views of the Athenian *demos*. In particular the refugees of 431, witnessing public deliberations for the first time, might have been horrified by what they heard. Admittedly, Pericles was able to avoid summoning the assembly while the Acharnians' land was being ravaged (2.22.1), but it is difficult to believe that there was no meeting during the entire period of the invasion. Many of the refugees remained by necessity—those whose property had been irreparably damaged. These were people like Aristophanes' Dicaeopolis, who is represented attending the Assembly some five years after the first invasion,⁴⁹ looking north from the Pnyx with deep nostalgia for his farm, in full view near Acharnae.⁵⁰ Significantly, all he witnesses in the public debate is greed, corruption and futility. The refugees also had ample opportunity to witness forensic rhetoric at work, and the immigrants might well have felt their city cousins excessively addicted to the pleasures of argumentation and persuasive oratory. Once again Pericles can reply that the public taste for rhetoric does not inculcate softness. He emphasizes that all Athenians are involved to some degree with the public life of their city. Some are involved in politics as much as their private estates, while others⁵¹ are committed to their livelihood but still have adequate knowledge of public affairs. Nobody can avoid some involvement without incurring censure. For Pericles the collective political involvement of the Athenians is a source of strength, giving them accurate knowledge of the situation they will face. The ideal hinted at here is his own speech before the evacuation of Attica, which presented a balance sheet of Athenian assets sufficiently detailed to persuade the citizen body that it would not face defeat.⁵² The calculation of the city's strength gave the confidence to leave the countryside and submit to invasion. It was perhaps the ultimate illustration that appreciation of oratory was no sign of weakness. Pericles could rightly stress the importance of putting the citizen body in the picture, and maintain that the collective involvement was a major ingredient in Athens' military strength. It allows him to associate the living with the dead who are the ostensible subject of the laudation. Both achieve the height of courage in that they are fully briefed about their situation, have the most profound knowledge of the perils facing them and the pleasures of communal life, but still confront action without flinching.⁵³

That allowed Pericles one of his most daring and superficially puzzling transitions. He turns to Athens' record in acquiring friends, through altruistic benefaction and confidence in the city's freedom (2.40.4). In the light of Athens' record towards her allies, which Thucydides famously characterizes as tyranny, that seems a bizarre claim. For Hermann Strasburger this was something the historical Pericles could not have said; it is a piece of deliberate propaganda inserted

⁴⁹ Ar. *Ach.* 32–3; cf. 302. There are also references to long-term refugees in later plays: *Eq.* 805–7, 1394–5; *Pax* 551–2, 562–3, 569–70. Cf. Lowell Edmunds, 'Aristophanes' "Acharnians"', *YCS* 26 (1980) 1–41, esp. 26–32.

⁵⁰ Dicaeopolis would have been looking north-north-east, outwards over the *bema*. On the alignment of the Pnyx in the fifth century, see H. A. Thompson, 'The Pnyx in models', *Hesperia* Suppl. 19 (1982) 133–47, esp. 134–6; M. H. Hansen, *The Athenian Assembly in the Age of Demosthenes* (Oxford 1987) 12, 131.

⁵¹ I take καὶ ἐτέροις at 2.40.2 to refer to a subsection of the Athenian *demos*; in the case of the rich, attention to public and personal affairs can be combined in the same individuals (ἐνι τε τοῖς αὐτοῖς οἰκείων ἄμα καὶ πολιτικῶν ἐπιμέλεια), while the rest have necessarily to concentrate on day to day labour, which does not prevent their acquiring some knowledge of public affairs (καὶ ἐτέροις πρὸς ἔργα τετραμμένοις τὰ πολιτικὰ μὴ ἐνδεῶς γινῶναι)—even if they are not directly involved in office. There is definitely no need for emendation (such as Richards' ἐτέροις ἔτερα), which destroys the contrast between the politically active and the rest of the population (so Rusten (n.45) 18; Hornblower (n.13) 1.305; *contra* Gomme 2.121).

⁵² 2.13.3–9 (indirect speech); cf. 62.1.

⁵³ 2.40.2–3. The message is progressively reinforced at 2.42.4 and 43.4–6, where Thucydides moves from encomium of the dead to exhortation of the survivors.

by Thucydides, propaganda which any reader would recognize as such and which provides a motif for Cleon to answer at length in his Mytilenean Oration.⁵⁴ But how bizarre is this passage? If challenged, the historical Pericles might have represented the original foundation of the Delian League as an act of altruism, when Athens accepted the hegemony at the request of the allied Ionian states, and other actions such as the aid to Sparta in 462 or even the subsequent alliance with Argos might be seen as Athenian benefactions. In any case, the issue is not the empire but the acquisition of allies as partners, not subjects. There was one recent, celebrated instance. This was the famous alliance with Corcyra, which Thucydides treats as the episode directly instrumental in bringing the war.⁵⁵ It was an intensely debated issue, the Athenians opting first against and then for alliance, and the open Corinthian threats of war were clearly a deterrent.⁵⁶ Under those circumstances it was possible for the treaty to be represented as an altruistic act. Indeed, in the speech Thucydides gives them, the Corcyrean delegates admit that they have no prior services to Athens to call upon, and claim that they will be enduringly grateful.⁵⁷ The assistance given to them in their resistance to oppression will give their benefactors a general reputation for virtue (φέρουσα ἐς μὲν τοὺς πολλοὺς ἀρετήν) as well as lasting gratitude and military strength. The language echoes that of the Funeral Speech, and has the same thought pattern. Admittedly, the Corcyreans spend most of their speech stressing the expediency of the alliance, but those arguments are explicitly addressed by the Corinthian delegation. The advantages are illusory, and will bring the Athenians the certainty of war, not a remote possibility (1.42.2–3).

Those words would have seemed prophetic in 431. Then the alliance with Corcyra might have been seen as a catastrophe, or at best one-sided. The Athenian ships saved the day at Sybota—at the price of alienating the Corinthians and provoking war. During the past summer the Corcyrean fleet had done little to turn the balance of the war, and the Athenian involvement in the north-west was certainly in the interest of Corcyra. What had the Athenians gained from their investment in the alliance? Pericles answers indirectly. The most efficacious political friendships are those where the main actor is altruistic. What is more, that actor will do what the Athenians are now doing: following up the initial benefaction with more, so as to cement the original compact. The Corcyreans may seem less committed, but they have less inspiration, given that they are repaying a favour. But they *are* indebted, and in the long run they will discharge their debt.

At this point the orator recapitulates. The city in its entirety forms an education for Greece (2.41.1); everything so far expounded explains why Athens is the paramount and paradigm state. Its civic and social institutions give it its overwhelming strength, and that strength mainly depends on the involvement of its citizens. And there may be an underlying pun. Education (παίδευσις) involves correction and chastening,⁵⁸ and part of the education Athens instilled was military. By defeating her enemies she showed them most vividly the qualities that made

⁵⁴ H. Strasburger, 'Thukydides und die politische Selbstdarstellung der Athener', in H. Herter (ed.), *Thukydides* (Darmstadt 1968) 498–530, esp. 517–19 = W. Schmitthenner and R. Zoepffel (eds.), *Studien zur Alten Geschichte* (Hildesheim 1982) 2.676–708, esp. 695–7.

⁵⁵ So H.-P. Stahl, *Thukydides. Die Stellung des Menschen im geschichtlichen Prozeß* (Munich 1966) 53: 'Der Autor darf von seinem Leser erwarten, daß er diesen Fall nicht vergessen hat.'

⁵⁶ Thuc. 1.44.1; cf. 1.40.2–3. The Corcyreans attempt to anticipate and counter the threat (1.36.1), but their arguments are weak, inviting the Athenians to place their fears of an indefinite, general war above the immediate danger of a clash with Corinth (contrast the Corinthian riposte at 1.42.2).

⁵⁷ 1.32.1, 33.1–2. The later speech of Euphemus addresses the phenomenon from a different perspective: the islands of the west are left as free allies precisely because they are vulnerable to attack from the Peloponnese (6.85.2). Similarly, the cities of Sicily can rely on keeping their autonomy, because it is in Athens' interest that they remain so.

⁵⁸ The term recurs in the same sense in Archidamus' speech in Sparta: 1.84.3 (quoted below, n.67), 84.6 (ἐν τοῖς ἀναγκαϊοτάτοις παιδεύεται). It is taken up by Pericles at 2.39.1, where the hallmark of Spartan παιδεία is said

her great, and because of her power she was able to give the appropriate education; learning through pain is often the most effective. Once more it is Athens' power that matters, and the power comes from the citizen body. And not merely citizen numbers, Pericles hastens to add. What matters is the quality of the citizens, and the individual Athenian is superlatively versatile, sophisticated and self-reliant. Now Pericles builds up to a powerful rhetorical climax, praising the power of the city which has made every part of the world accessible to it and left undying memorials of its successes and reverses. Once more the specific examples are carefully omitted. There is to be no comparison of present and past, which could only open recent events to unwelcome scrutiny. Instead, past and present are blended together in a timeless encomium of Athens, supremely wealthy, powerful and fortunate through the involvement of its citizens in its government, deliberative processes and armies. The conclusion is unavoidable. This is a city worth dying for.

From this point onwards Pericles can repeat his theme, steadily increasing the rhetorical tempo. The dead are praised against the common values of the city. Because Athens is such a complex and tolerant city, it is possible for the rich to gain the maximum enjoyment out of their wealth and the poor have the opportunity to escape poverty. Despite these advantages the fallen did not shirk their duty but died in battle. And death is skilfully presented as something almost desirable. Those who fell did so at the height of their aspiration, in the briefest of moments when their fortune was undecided, and what they experienced was glory rather than fear.⁵⁹ The living are invited to join the collective of the glorious dead, out of passionate love for the power of the city, the power that was only guaranteed by the involvement of all its citizens. Their deaths are not seen as a loss to the city, but as a kind of subscription entitling them to public burial and eternal commemoration in the public memory (2.43.2–3). We can once again make a comparison with Pericles' speech on the dead at Samos. There the dead are said to be immortal, and they are compared with the gods; their immortality is an inference from their achievements and the honours they receive. If Stesimbrotus reported it aright, the speech anticipated Euhemerus and the hellenistic ruler cult in representing divinity as the reward for beneficent and outstanding achievements.⁶⁰ Mortals could achieve immortality through outstanding merit, and Pericles insinuated that the dead at Samos might belong to this category.⁶¹ He claimed that the honours paid to the fallen attest their immortality, just as do the honours paid to the gods.

to be 'painful training'. These are the only instances of *παιδεία* and *παίδευσις* in Thucydides, and the passages are clearly contrived to mirror each other. Elsewhere Thucydides uses *ἀπαιδευσία* once, in the mouth of Diodotus, in the sense of indiscipline, the characteristic of unreasoning anger (3.42.1)—so in the spurious interpolation at 3.84.2 (*ἀπαιδευσαί ὀργῆς*).

⁵⁹ 2.42.4. This difficult passage has been variously interpreted (see particularly J.S. Rusten, 'Structure, style and sense in interpreting Thucydides: the soldier's choice (Thucydides 2.42.4)', *HSCP* 90 (1986) 49–76). The variations make little difference to the sense. What seems clear is that in antiquity the passage was understood with the verb *ἀπαλλάγησαν* used absolutely, and the two genitives were taken with the preceding dative (*ἄμα ἀκμῆ τῆς δόξης μάλλον ἢ τοῦ δέους*). So Arr. *Anab.* 7.16.7; Dio 66.18.5. Otherwise the phrasing seems to imply that the dead were quit of their glory rather than their fear, i.e. died sordidly and in fear (see the shifts to which Gomme's interpretation takes him, and also the recent essay by I. R. Alfageme, 'Thucydides II 42,4: the soldiers as a paradigm of the democratic ARETH', in U. Criscuolo and R. Maisano (eds.), *Synodia: studia humanitatis Antonio Garzya...dedicata* (Naples 1997) 37–52). I would translate the sentence roughly thus: 'in the most transitory moment of fortune, at the height of glory not of fear, they took their departure'.

⁶⁰ Euhemerus represented Zeus himself as originally a mortal, who established himself as a god through world conquest and euergetism. The key texts are Diod. 6.1.10 (T 61 Winiarczyk) and Lactant. *Div. inst.* 1.22.22 (T 64A Winiarczyk). See now Bosworth, 'Augustus, the *Res Gestae* and Hellenistic theories of apotheosis', *JRS* 89 (1999) 1–18, esp. 10–12.

⁶¹ Plut. *Per.* 8.9 = Stesimbrotus, *FGrH* 107 F 9: *ἀθανάτους ἔλεγε γεγονέναι καθάπερ τοὺς θεοὺς· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐκείνους αὐτοὺς ὀρώμεν, ἀλλὰ ταῖς τιμαῖς ἃς ἔχουσι καὶ τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς ἀπαρέχουσιν ἀθανάτους εἶναι τεκμαιρόμεθα· ταῦτ' οὖν ὑπάρχειν καὶ τοῖς ὑπὲρ τῆς πατρίδος ἀποθανοῦσιν.*

He did not go so far as to claim that the fallen *were* divine, but he certainly suggested the parallel. It was in keeping with the boastful, almost hybriatic tone of the oration. In the speech of 431 Pericles is much more restrained. There is no implicit comparison with the gods. The immortality is only the immortality of memory which Simonides attributes to the dead at Thermopylae and seems promised to the casualties at Poteidaea.⁶² In Gorgias' *Epitaphios* it becomes a vacuous commonplace.⁶³ That cannot be said for the Thucydidean speech. The motif of the immortality of the fallen makes its appearance, but it is not confined to the dead of a single glorious encounter. All citizens who give their lives for their city, whatever the circumstances, join the company of the glorious dead, commemorated in the memory of Hellas. The community of the living is paralleled by a community of the dead,⁶⁴ and in that sense the citizen is perpetually integrated with the *polis*. The *polis* also provides the negative stimulus. If a person enjoys felicity or has hopes of it, then the public censure that would be incurred by cowardice is a much worse fate than death which comes virtually unfelt in the exaltation of battle and common aspiration.⁶⁵ This is almost the ultimate paradox, death in a hoplite battle so instantaneous as to be painless, but it is the logical culmination of the rhetoric. If one is truly involved in the collective life of the *polis*, then its defence becomes a kind of love affair and one feels intoxicated by the corporate involvement in battle, to the degree that one is anaesthetized against death itself. The old lie it may be, but it is singularly effective as the climax of the eulogy of the *polis* and the advantages of the collective.

The speech fits its context admirably, and Thucydides' comment on the size of the audience, his testimony that the speech was widely witnessed, must suggest that what he has given us is a close approximation to what was said. For a complete contrast we should examine the speech of Archidamus at Sparta.⁶⁶ Thucydides (1.79.1) insists that it was delivered in a closed assembly, after non-Spartans had been excluded. The witnesses were comparatively few, and Thucydides was in no position to ascertain what was said until his exile eight years later. By that time Archidamus himself was dead, and the memories of his audience would have faded. In this case the overall thrust of the speech, the ξύμπασα γνώμη, was all the historian could hope to glean. It was, no doubt, remembered that the Spartan king warned against the dangers of war with Athens, recommended a postponement of hostilities, and defended the Spartan virtues of caution and deliberation. That gave Thucydides an opportunity to dress the message in terms which could be echoed and answered by Pericles. The discipline of Sparta, inculcated by harsh schooling, makes its citizens dependable.⁶⁷ They are not so sophisticated as to disregard the

⁶² Simonides F 26 = *PMG* 531; *IG* I³ 1179 = Tod, *GHI* no. 59: the epigram begins with an emphatic δ θάνατομ, alluding to the perpetuity of the memorial.

⁶³ Planud. *ad Hermogen.* 5.548 = Gorgias B6 (Diels/Kranz): memory remains immortal despite the mortal bodies of the fallen.

⁶⁴ Felix Jacoby drew attention to the *Genesia*, a festival of the dead apparently unique to Attica, which was held on 5 Boedromion (late August) and suggested that the burial of the fallen took place then ('*Patrios nomos*: state burial in Athens and the public ceremony in the Kerameikos', *JHS* 64 (1944) 37–66, esp. 59–64 = *Abhandlungen zur griechischen Geschichtsschreibung* (Leiden 1956) 260–315). The suggestion is implausible, for the date is too early in the year; one would expect hostilities to continue and the count of the dead to be incomplete at that point. The funeral ceremony is best left in winter, where Thucydides (2.34.1) places it. But there is probably an emotional linkage. The city first paid homage to the dead collectively, and then, a few months later, honoured the new contingent of the fallen.

⁶⁵ 2.43.6: ὁ μετὰ ῥώμης καὶ κοινῆς ἐλπίδος ἄμα γιγνόμενος ἀναίσθητος θάνατος. The best commentary on ἀναίσθητος θάνατος is Arist. *De resp.* 479a21, where it is applied to death from old age without pain or sickness.

⁶⁶ This is well analysed by Pelling (n.31) 122–30, with a useful footnote (n.7) on the historicity of the speech.

⁶⁷ 1.84.3: ἀμαθέστερον τῶν νόμων τῆς ὑπεροψίας παιδευόμενοι καὶ ξὺν χαλεπότητι σωφρονέστερον ἢ ὥστε αὐτῶν ἀνηκουστῆν. The echo of 2.37.3 is palpable, and one thinks forward to such passages as 2.39.4 and 41.1, where Pericles commends the Athenian preparation for war and represents the entire city as the educative force of Hellas (see above, n.58).

laws, and their training gives them an edge over their enemies. The claims are of course eloquently rebutted in Pericles' *Epitaphios*, in terminology which deliberately recalls Archidamus.⁶⁸ The Athenians have a uniquely free public and private life, but they still fear and respect their magistrates and laws, and their very sophistication gives them a versatility which makes them more effective in the field than their regimented opponents. It is indisputable that the two speeches are linked, but I would argue that the linkage is not altogether Thucydides' creation. The material in the *Epitaphios* comes closer to what Pericles actually said, while the earlier passage is carefully constructed to prefigure it, and to create echoes in the reader's mind which would add richness and pungency to Pericles' message. The better attested speech was the primary inspiration; the less attested could be shaped to anticipate it.

The speech, then, adheres carefully to Thucydides' compositional principles. Its generalities are not timeless platitudes but sentiments totally appropriate to the contemporary political climate. Some of the vocabulary could well be Periclean. The figurative use of ἐραστής and ἔρανος, both unique in Thucydides, could be the verbal echo of a recognized master of metaphor, as could the equally unique use of φιλοσοφεῖν. On a larger canvas we have a masterful exhibition of evasive rhetoric, an implicit answer to criticism, which is expressed with arrogant self-confidence and suffused with rhetoric that simultaneously flatters and elevates its audience. There is nothing that Pericles could *not* have uttered in his *Epitaphios*, and there is much in the historical record of 431 that gives real bite to the rhetoric. Thucydides has no doubt made the most of these linkages, but at the very least we are dealing with a selective concentration of reportage. The events that he describes are subtly and allusively echoed in the reported speech, but the echoes are what we should expect in the mouth of a skilful, politically astute statesman who had decades of experience in the Assembly. The Pericles of the *Epitaphios* might of course be Thucydides' creation, but it is more economical to accept that his art is taken from life, and that what he has given us is a potent distillation of the speech Pericles actually delivered. The burden of proof, in my opinion, remains with the sceptics.

A.B. BOSWORTH
University of Western Australia

⁶⁸ Both regard their citizens as unique (μόνοι), Archidamus for their σωφροσύνη, which gives them stability in war (1.84.2), Pericles for their self-reliance based on ἐλευθερία (2.40.5). For Archidamus (84.3) Spartan εὐψυχία is based on discipline and restraint; for Pericles (43.4) it is the product of freedom and felicity.