Transactions of the American Philological Association 134 (2004) 55–105

Ponêroi vs. *Chrêstoi*: The Ostracism of Hyperbolos and the Struggle for Hegemony in Athens after the Death of Perikles, Part I

DAVID ROSENBLOOM
Victoria University of Wellington and Princeton University

SUMMARY: This paper is divided into two parts. Part I explains the last ostrakophoria as a struggle between leaders who enjoy cultural validation, labeled *chrêstoi* ("good," "noble," "useful," "genuine"), and those who lack such legitimation, labeled *ponêroi* ("bad," "vile," "useless," "inauthentic"). The ostrakophoria took place in 415 and its catalyst was Alkibiades' Olympic victory in 416, which prompted Hyperbolos, the quintessential *ponêros*, to move an ostrakophoria as "protector/leader of the people" to ostracize a symbolic tyrant, to cast suspicion upon *chrêstoi* as inimical to the demos, and to legitimate his own leadership and that of his faction. This ostrakophoria pit *ponêroi* against *chrêstoi* in the formers' bid to become a hegemonic class in Athenian society. Part II will appear in *TAPA* 134.2.

INTRODUCTION

NEARLY TWO DECADES AGO Patrice Brun declined to discuss the ostracism of Hyperbolos on the grounds that "il ne servirait guère d'allonger une bibliographie dans ce domaine, tant elle est déjà vaste" (183).[1] Despite the size of

[1] Unless otherwise noted, comic fragments are cited from Kassel and Austin [henceforth K-A]; authors include Alexis, Antiphanes, Apollodoros Karystios, Archedikos, Aristophanes, Demetrios II, Diphilos, Ekphantides, Euboulos, Eupolis, Hermippos, Kratinos, Leukon, Menander, Nikophon, Nikostratos, Pherekrates, Philemon, Phrynichos, Plato Comicus, Telekleides, Theophilos, and Theopompos Comicus, as well as the Adespota. Fragments of historical works are cited from Jacoby; authors include Androtion (324), Kratippos (64), Philochoros (328), and Theopompos (115). The scholia to Aristophanes are cited from Koster/Holwerda unless otherwise noted. Ostraka from the agora are cited according to the inventory and catalogue numbers of Lang. The inventory numbers for the Kerameikos ostraka are available in Siewert 2002 and Brenne 2001. A catalogue of names on the Kerameikos ostraka can be found in Willemsen/Brenne. Translations are my own.

the bibliography, questions remain unanswered.[2] Why and when did the demos hold an ostrakophoria? What factions developed and what were their motives and aims? Why was Hyperbolos ostracized and why was his ostracism perceived as a travesty of the institution? Why was Hyperbolos the last *ostracisé*? What were the underlying causes of this ostrakophoria and how were they eventually resolved?

Part I of this paper identifies the underlying cause of this ostrakophoria as *stasis* between two types of leaders: those branded *ponêroi* ("bad," "vile," "useless," "inauthentic") and those termed *chrêstoi* ("good," "noble," "useful," "genuine").[3] The exemplary *ponêros* derives from an oikos that produces goods and services for the market, but the label clings to leadership that consists exclusively in speech acts.[4] The label *chrêstos* attaches to men whose status derives from some combination of prestigious birth, landed wealth, military prominence, conspicuous expenditure, education, and aristocratic culture.[5] *Ponêroi*

[2] Studies of Hyperbolos' ostracism since Brun include Lehmann esp. 41–52; Rhodes 1994; Siewert 1999, 2002; Heftner 2000, 2000a. Cf. Martin esp. 142–43; Ellis 45–49; Mattingly 1991: 23–25.

[3] Both terms are allied with a range of antithetical labels (*kalos k'agathos, gennaios, eugenês, dikaios, sôphrôn, kosmios, metrios*, *dexios*, *mousikos*, *eusebês*, vs. *kakos, aischros, dysgenês, agennês*, *adikos, anaidês, amathês*, *agoraios*, *thrasus*, *bdelyros*, *miaros*, *panourgos*, *asebês, atheos*), but the antithesis between *chrêstos* and *ponêros*, which summarizes the entire range of oppositions, is the most frequent and politicized.

[4] For *ponêroi*/*mochthêroi* as leaders see Ar. *Eq.* 181–86, 336–37, 858 (Kleon; cf. 821); *Th.* 830–39; *Lys.* 576; *Ra.* 419–21 (Archedemos), 706–17 (Kleigenes); 717–37, 1454–56; *Ek.* 174–84, 184–88 (Agyrrhios); *Pl.* 30–31; Kratin. fr. 223 (Androkles); Pl.Com. fr. 202; E. *Supp.* 240–43, 423–25; fr. 53.28–32 Austin. Other political actors said to have been mocked as *ponêroi* or for *ponêria* in comedy include: Dieitrephes (Σ*Av.* 798b, f); Drakontides (Pl.Com. fr. 148; Kirchner, *Prosopographia attica* [henceforth *PA*] 4546?); Hierokleides (Hesych. κ 3309; *PA* 7472?); Lykourgos (Σ*Av.* 1296a; *PA* 9249); Meidias (Σ*Av.* 1297–99; *PA* 9714); Myrmex (Σ*Ra.* 1506b); Nikomachos (ibid.; *PA* 10934; Souda α 453 adds Kleon, Archemoros, Adeimantos); Teleas (Σ*Av.* 167a, 168; *PA* 13500); Theoros (Σ*Eq.* 608a–b; *V.* 42a, 43; *PA* 7223). For the meaning of the epithet see Neil 206–9; Connor 1992: esp. 88–89; de Ste. Croix 358–59; Dover 1974: 52–53, 64–65; Rosenbloom 300–312.

[5] "Leadership of the demos (ἡ δημαγωγία) is no longer the province of an educated man nor of a man noble in his ways (χρηστοῦ τοὺς τρόπους)" (Ar. *Eq.* 191–92). *Chrêstoi* comprise farmer-hoplites (Ar. *Ach.* 595–97; *Pax* 910–21), naval personnel, taxiarchs, generals, trierarchs (*Th.* 830–39), men of prestigious birth, aristocratic education and culture, and high moral value, who can offer direction to the polis (*Ra.* 718–35, 1454–59; E. *Or.* 772–73). The *chrêstos* benefits the polis as a hoplite, hippeus, *eisphora*-payer, or liturgist (Is. 4.27; 7.37–42). See Seager 1973: 20–25; cf. Wilson 135–36; Whitehead 55–74. In general, see Donlan 1973; 1978; 1980: esp. 127–53. A citizen's contribution of *chrêsta* to the assembly can define democratic freedom and yield public recognition (E. *Supp.* 438–41). In the fifth century the comic chorus' contribution of *chrêsta* to the polis is a *topos* (Ar. *Lys.* 637–67; *Ra.* 686–705; cf. 1034–36, 1053–56, 1418–23).

exercise leadership legally but lack the symbolic validation of their culture. *Chrêstoi* have a traditional, culturally valid entitlement to lead. Hyperbolos son of Antiphanes, who bore the mark *ponêros* as a fixed epithet and was humiliated annually on the comic stage as a barbarian, slave, lamp-seller, and sykophant, challenged *chrêstoi* to an ordeal. His objectives were to defend the demos through the ostracism of a *chrêstos*, preferably Alkibiades, who was poised to subvert it; to emerge as the dominant survivor of the ordeal and consolidate a power-base across the major divisions of Athenian society; to win symbolic validation for his leadership through an ancestral democratic practice. Surviving an ostrakophoria was a rite of passage into the highest level of leadership in the fifth-century democracy. Themistokles, Kimon, and Perikles faced and survived ostrakophoriai at turning-points in their careers and used their positions as dominant survivors to exercise leadership across class and faction. Hyperbolos' ostracism enabled Alkibiades to consolidate and to exercise extraordinary power as the dominant survivor. This ostrakophoria sought to resolve *stasis* between two types of leaders to be the authorized heirs of Perikles' leadership.

The above summary contradicts Plutarch's explanation of this ostrakophoria as an attempt to resolve *stasis* between Nikias and Alkibiades, which divided the polis into age-classes, the old favoring Nikias and peace, the young Alkibiades and war. I argue that Plutarch anachronistically uses Thucydides' debate on the Sicilian expedition to explain this ostrakophoria. Rather, the catalyst for the ostrakophoria was Alkibiades' magnificent but controversial victory in the four-horse chariot race at Olympia in 416. No democratic leader had won an event on the circuit prior to this, let alone the four-horse chariot race, in which Alkibiades had seven entrants and was accused of having stolen the winning team. Such a victor could be depicted as possessing a mystique so powerful, and a character so debased, that he threatened to monopolize power in the polis. From the perspective of Hyperbolos and his allies, ostracism could prevent Alkibiades from converting the prestige of his victory into unrivaled political leadership.

An ostrakophoria is not simply a political procedure; it is the manifestation of a political culture, a symbol-laden activity and decisive act of communal self-definition. It is not precise enough to guarantee the exile of a target. Alkibiades' aristocratic pedigree, hippotrophy, flamboyant sexuality, prodigious consumption, and *paranomia* offered a pretext to target *chrêstoi*, including Nikias and Phaiax, as "hating the people" (μισόδημοι): their leadership would subvert the demos or curtail its power.[6] The report that the

[6] Rosivach 163–64 suggests that Hyperbolos used "the symbolic value of an ὀστρακοφορία ... to intensify popular resentment against Alkibiades' undemocratic manner." I argue that Alkibiades was the exemplary member of the class targeted in this ostrakophoria.

ostrakon was destined to fall upon Alkibiades, Nikias, or Phaiax, until two of them, usually Alkibiades and Nikias, joined factions to ostracize Hyperbolos, is not credible.[7] These men united from the start; their lifestyle and leadership were the implied targets of this ostrakophoria.[8] Six years earlier, Aristophanes' Hermes disparaged the demos for enrolling itself under Hyperbolos, a *ponêros prostatês*, "a rotten representative, leader, and protector" (*Pax* 683–84). The title *prostatês tou dêmou* is first attested for Hyperbolos; building on the leadership of Perikles and Kleon, he made this role part of the vocabulary of Athenian politics. The object of this ostrakophoria was the *prostasia tou dêmou* in its broadest sense, generalized and symbolically valid leadership of the demos across classes.[9]

Part II, which will appear in *TAPA* 134.2 (fall 2004), argues that the ostracism of Hyperbolos realizes a comic plot and exacerbates the *stasis* it was meant to resolve, partly because a challenge to the *chrêstoi* galvanized the political clubs (*hetaireiai*), which helped engineer Hyperbolos' ostracism. The *stasis* begun in this ostrakophoria persists through the *zêtêsis* on the mutilation of the Hermai and performance of the Mysteries in private homes and the oligarchic takeovers of 411 and 404. The *stasis* concludes when men of Hyperbolos' socio-economic profile and leadership type win symbolic validation as *chrêstoi* and attain hegemony in Athenian society. This entails the cultural validation of the market and the dikasterion as hegemonic institutions in society, which spells the obsolescence of ostracism as a political practice.

[7] For Phaiax (*PA* 13921) see Fuqua 172–73; Davies, *Athenian Propertied Families* (henceforth *APF*) 521–24; Ostwald 233. Phaiax' role in this ostrakophoria is a problem for Plutarch. He notes that "some say" Alkibiades negotiated and united with Phaiax and not with Nikias (*Alk.* 13.8). In the *Life of Nikias* he rejects as a minority view Theophrastos' statement that Phaiax and Alkibiades were the primary rivals and the likely victims of this ostrakophoria (*Nik.* 11.10). Mattingly 1991: 24 accepts Theophrastos. Majority opinion continues to favor Nikias and Alkibiades as rivals. See Gomme 1945–81, *Historical Commentary on Thucydides* (henceforth *HCT*) 5.263; Kagan 1981: 146; Rosivach 162 n. 3; Rhodes 1994: 92–93. For speculation about Phaiax' role in this ostrakophoria see Carcopino 320–22; Hatzfeld 112–18; Camon 145–51.

[8] Cf. Heftner 2000: 59 for the suggestion of unity on different grounds.

[9] Harding 158 argues that this ostrakophoria was a contest to be "top demagogue." This is accurate at some level, but assumes that Nikias was not involved and that Alkibiades and Phaiax were leaders in the same sense as Hyperbolos, Kleophon, Philinos, Androkles, Kleonymos, and Peisandros, who I argue below formed a faction in this ostrakophoria.

THE LABEL *PONÊROS/MOCHTHÊROS*

Hyperbolos was the exemplary *ponêros*, *mochthêros*, and *phaulos* among the leaders of late fifth-century Athens.[10] He was the most savagely abused of the industrial slave-holders—men whose slaves produced commodities for the market and who held their wealth in liquid form—to cross the invisible line dividing economic success from political and moral leadership in society.[11] The label *ponêros/mochthêros* derives from its bearers' relation to the means of production. Their origin in a particular type of oikos determines their standing in Athenian culture. That they held their wealth in slaves and money rather than in land made them indistinguishable from slaves and metics, whose wealth had to take these forms.[12] *Ponêroi* raise slaves in their households or buy barbarian slaves and "force them to produce goods," presiding over oikoi that are in effect slave organizations (X. *Mem.* 2.7.3–6). As leaders they import their domestic economies into the city's political economy, transforming the demos into wage-earners and degrading its self-sufficiency and autonomy. Hence they are represented as slave-dealers (Ar. *Eq.* 1030) and leaders of a "city of slaves" (Kratin. fr. 223; Eup. fr. 212; cf. Ar. *V.* 515–20, 602–4).[13]

[10] Ar. *Eq.* 1304; *Nu.* 1065–66; *Pax* 684; *Th.* 836–37; Pl.Com. fr. 182; Th. 8.73.3; Philochoros F30; Androtion F42; Plut. *Arist.* 7.3; *Nik.* 11.5, 6; *Alk.* 13.4; *Mor.* 855C9–10; ΣAr. *Pax* 681b; Σ*V.* 1007b; ΣLuk. *Tim.* 30 Rabe. Cf. And. fr. 5 Blass.

[11] For their socio-economic profiles see Connor 1992: 151–75; Davies 1981: esp. 41–49. Hyperbolos was called a lamp-seller (λυχνοπώλης, *Eq.* 739 with Σ; cf. *Nu.* 1065–66 with Σ; Σ*Eq.* 1315b; Σ*Pax* 681b; Kratin. fr. 209) or a lamp-maker (λυχνοποιός, *Pax* 690; Σ*Eq.* 739a–b, 1304a, b; Σ*Nu.* 1065a; λυχνοποιεῖ, And. fr. 5 Blass). Later scholiasts linked Hyperbolos' *ponêria* and his business practice. Σ(Rec.) *Nu.* 1064a alleges that he took oil and wax from the public stock; Σ(Tr.) *Nu.* 1065a says he added lead to bronze when making his lamps to give the false impression of heft. We do not know whether he made metal or clay lamps, or both. The scholiasts' references to Hyperbolos as a potter (Σ*Eq.* 1304a–c) misinterpret the epithet ὀξίνης, which means "bitter" or "spoiled." The epithet πικρός is central to the portrait of the *ponêros* and the sykophant (D. 25.45, 83–84, 96; [Demades] fr. 79 de Falco; cf. Alexis fr. 187, Philemon fr. 113.4). Demosthenes' charge (18.50) that Aischines "sprinkled, as it were, some stale wine (ἐωλοκρασίαν τινά) of his own *ponêria* and injustices over me" expresses the idea. We cannot infer from the scholia that Hyperbolos made ceramic lamps as Carcopino 242–43 and others do.

[12] Slaves and metics could own land in the polis only by special grant. See Finley 1973: 35–61 esp. 48. Liquid wealth is suspect: it can be hidden and squandered (Ar. *Ra.* 1065–68; *Ek.* 601–2; Is. 6.28–30, 33–36; Aischin. 1.105). See Kurke 1991: 225–39; Davidson esp. 206–8.

[13] For the "city of slaves" see Edwards 98–99 n. 35. The receipt of a monetary payment, whether as a gift (E. *Supp.* 871–80) or for a service (X. *Mem.* 1.2.6), is figured as slavery. Likewise, the power of *kerdos* to override the dictates of justice is a kind of slavery (Diphilos fr. 94; cf. fr. 67). Cf. Telekleides fr. 3. For the problem of *misthophora* see Part II.

The extreme social distance associated with commodity exchange subtends claims that *ponêroi* are non-Greek slaves barely able to speak the Attic dialect.[14] They have the unpleasantly screeching voices of *agoraioi*, "men of the marketplace."[15] They lack the birth, education, and moral worth required to direct society. The comic stage links *ponêroi*/*mochthêroi* and the agora. Aristophanes' Sausage-Seller has everything it takes for democratic leadership (πολιτεία): "a disgusting voice, you're low born, and you're from the marketplace" (*Eq.* 218 φωνὴ μιαρά, γέγονας κακῶς, ἀγοραῖος εἶ). The general Demosthenes tells him he will be great, "because you are vile and from the market place and insolent" (181 ὁτιὴ πονηρὸς κἀξ ἀγορᾶς εἶ καὶ θρασύς). The *Knights* treats the hemp-seller Eukrates, the cattle-dealer Lysikles, the hide-seller Paphlagon, and the Sausage-Seller, who will defeat and succeed him, as a group unified by market culture, low social status, and inadequate education (129–45). The lamp-seller Hyperbolos waits in the wing; the Sausage-Seller initially resembles him but displaces him from the succession (1300–15, 1356–64; cf. 736–40).[16] Comedy imagines their leadership as private economic enterprise: *ponêroi* produce language as a commodity, "selling" fictions that mask their profit motives, treating their right to speak as a profitable commodity.[17]

By extension the label *ponêros* applies to men whose leadership consists in speech acts—the *rhêtôr* who "controls" and "deceives" the demos with his "tongue" (γλώσσῃ, E. *Supp.* 240–43, 424–25; *Or.* 902–13).[18] *Ponêroi* by defi-

[14] For "social distance," the proximity or distance in kinship or affinity that structures norms of reciprocity, see Sahlins 185–272; Millett 10–11. Rosenbloom 308–9 applies the concept to the portrait of political leaders as *agoraioi*, *douloi*, and *xenoi*.

[15] Ar. *Eq.* 214–19, 292–93, 296–97, 634–38, 1257–58; cf. *Nu.* 990–91, 1002–4, 1055–57; *Ra.* 1013–17; frr. 402, 488; X. *Kyr.* 1.2.3–4; Pl. *Prt.* 347b7–48a9; *Rp.* 425c10–e2; Arist. *Pol.* 1319a19–b1, 1328b33–29a2; *EN* 1158a16–22; Thphr. *Char.* 6.2; Phot. *Lex.* s.v. ἀγοραῖος νοῦς (α 233); Souda α 308; Connor 1992: 154–55; Ostwald 214–15; Rosenbloom 304–12, esp. 306 n. 93 for their voices.

[16] ΣAr. *Eq.* 149a lists men the Sausage-Seller may represent: Kleonymos, Hyperbolos, or Euboulos. Euboulos is an anachronism, perhaps derived from Theopompos, who treated him last in *On Demagogues*. See Connor 1968: esp. 64–65.

[17] See Ar. *Eq.* 1084–89; *V.* 512–749; they traffic in the peasantry (*Ach.* 370–74; *Pax* 632–33) and in all the institutions of the polis (*Eq.* 168–76; cf. fr. 699). See Rosenbloom 292–96, 307). In the fourth century, "selling" the right to address the demos defines the "vilest (πονηρότατον) of all classes in the polis" (D. 23.146–47; 51.21–22). See Part II.

[18] The tongue as an organ of communication and of community is central to the figure of the *ponêros*. The man who surpasses the meaning of the word *ponêros*, Ariphrades, "defiles his tongue with shameful pleasures" (Ar. *Eq.* 1284); not only is he excluded from the community, but anyone not disgusted by him "will never drink from the same cup with us" (1288–89). See Napolitano; cf. D. 25.59–62.

nition have a "fluency" (εὐγλωσσία) that *chrêstoi* lack (E. fr. 156 Austin). The label *ponêros*/*mochthêros* clings to citizens who exercise leadership in the dikasteria. The sykophant is the label's principal bearer.[19] The sykophant makes justice a commodity, exacting payment through the threat of litigation and using jurors as a labor force paid to convict a defendant.[20] Leaders marked *ponêros* perform speaking roles that require knowledge of political and legal procedure, but they lack traditional elite attributes; they serve as un-elected *rhêtores* and allotted *bouleutai*.[21] They intensify political competition by representing the demos when they prosecute *graphai* and charges arising from *euthynai*, styling themselves "friends of the people" (φιλόδημοι) and defenders of democracy.[22] They construct the demos' hegemony: the demos is supreme in Athenian society not simply because it constitutes the military force of the city and of the empire, a proposition nobody would challenge ([X.] *Ath.*1.2), but because it forms the majority and can impose its interests through institutions.[23]

The label *ponêros*/*mochthêros* censures the private appropriation of resources that insure the long-term prosperity of the community, marking its

[19] For prosecutors and sykophants as *ponêroi* see Ar. *Ach.* 517, 700; *Pl.* 862, 869, 920, 939, 957; fr. 424 (Euathlos); E. *Supp.* 243. It is impossible to tell whether Pyrrandros (Σ*Eq.* 901a), Opountios (Σ*Av.* 153c; Souda o 478), and Exekestides (Hesych. ε 3838) were actually mocked as *ponêroi*/*mochthêroi* sykophants. See Christ esp. 48–117; Harvey 109 "Above all the sykophant is *poneros*, plain bad, a word associated with him at least fifty times."

[20] See, e.g., Ar. *Eq.* 255–65, 773–76, 797–809, 1359–60; *V.* 604–19, 655–759; Lys. 27.1; 30.22; cf. Hyp. 3.32–37.

[21] Ar. *Ach.* 38; *Eq.* 1350–54; *Th.* 292–93, 381–82; *Ra.* 367–68; *Ek.* 194–96, 243–44; E. *Hek.* 122–29 imply that *rhêtores* make speeches and proposals in the assembly; cf. Meiggs and Lewis (henceforth ML[2]) 49.21 (ca. 445). Krates produced a *Rhêtores*, perhaps around the same time (Athen. 9.369C; see K-A 4.101). At some point *rhêtôr* becomes a title for those who lead by speaking in the assembly, dikasteria, or Boule (Ar. fr. 205 [*Daitaleis*, 428/7]; *Ach.* 680; *Eq.* 58–71, 324–25, 358, 878–81; *Th.* 529–31; *Pl.* 31–32, 377–79; 567–70; Eup. frr. 102–3; Pl.Com. fr. 202; E. fr. 597.4 Nauck = Com. Ades. fr. 1208.4 Kock = Kritias fr. 22.4 Diels/Kranz [henceforth D-K]). See Hansen 1983: esp. 41–42; Ober 1989: 105–8; Arthurs.

[22] See Reverdin; Finley 1985: 38–75; Connor 1992: esp. 89–198; Ostwald 199–229; Henderson 1990: 275–84; Ober 1989: 91–93.

[23] For the hegemony of the demos see Ober 1989: esp. 332–39. The demos is monarch or tyrant: Ar. *Eq.* 1111–14, 1330; E. *Supp.* 352; cf. [X.] *Ath.* 1.4, 6–7, 13–18; Isok. 7.26; Aischin. 3.233; cf. D. 13.31; Raaflaub. Jury service is the highest form of demotic power: *V.* 518, 548–58, 560–76, 586–87, 619–30. Control of the dikasteria makes the demos master of the *politeia*: *Ath.Pol.* 9.1; cf. 35.2, 41.2. For the hegemony of the jurors see Lys. 1.36; D. 19.297; 21.223; cf. 13.16–17; Dein. 1.106; Arist. *Pol.* 1274a3–21; 1292a11–17; Hansen 1974: 15–18; cf. Allen 179–83.

bearers as lower-class rogues whose speech acts are forms of slander and flattery for profit.[24] The labels apply to actors on the civic stage, denying them elite status and the moral worth required for directing society and forming alliances across class and status groups. They function in an intra-elite struggle for hegemony that rages after the death of Perikles. The ostrakophoria examined in this paper is a critical moment in that struggle.

An ostrakon assignable to this ostrakophoria calls Krates Athmoneus "the son of Phrynondas."[25] Phrynondas is proverbial for *ponêria* and the namesake of *ponêroi* in classical Athens.[26] Krates may have attracted the slur because of his association with Hyperbolos; or it may be a counter-label—an explicit application of the epithet *ponêros* to someone with traditional elite qualities.[27] In any case, the ostrakon, if correctly dated, shows that the label *ponêros* featured in this ostrakophoria. It is perhaps significant that the *Birds*, performed at the City Dionysia of 414 while the ostrakophoria and its sequel, the *zêtêsis*, were still divisive issues, is unique among Aristophanes' extant comedies for declining to ridicule anyone as *ponêros* or *mochthêros* and for failing to problematize *ponêria* by name (see *Av.* 3, 493, 1648). Was the label

[24] For the connection between *ponêria* and profit (*kerdos*) see Demetrios II fr. 2; Diphilos fr. 94 "if there were no taking, there would not even be one *ponêros*"); Ar. *Nu.* 1064–66. Cf. E. *Supp.* 236–45, 411–25; [X.] *Ath.* 1.5; X. *HG* 1.4.13; Rosenbloom 300–305. For the connection between *ponêria* and *ponos*, the labor value of prestige—precisely what *ponêroi* lack—see Part II.

[25] Agora P 30190 = 660 Lang. I follow Schröder 1991 and 1993, reading Φρυνονδ⟨ου⟩ | Κρατες | Ἀθμο⟨νευς⟩. Krates is the son of Phrynondas and hence πονηρὸς ἐκ πονηροῦ (cf. Ar. *Eq.* 186, 337; *Ra.* 731; E. fr. 1068 Nauck; also next note). Not all scholars agree. Lang 100 prefers "Phrynondas son of Kratesios, Kratesippos, Kratesilaos or such." Mattingly 1991: 24 n. 123 considers the reading uncertain and dates the ostrakon to an ostrakophoria in 461; Masson 115 adopts Lang's reading and dates the ostrakon to the time of Themistokles or earlier; Brenne 2002: 94 considers these proposals "hypothetical." Phillips 1990: 129–33 tentatively identifies Krates with the grammateus of the Boule for 407/6 (ML^2 88.2) and links him with Alkibiades.

[26] Souda s.v. Φρυνώνδας (φ 770), τῶν ἐπὶ πονηρίᾳ διαβεβοημένων; Hesych. Φρυνώνδας: πονηρούς (φ 938); *EM* s.v. Φρυνώνδας; Ar. *Th.* 861 (with Σ Rutherford), fr. 484; Eup. frr. 45, 139. He is paired with Eurybatos (Pl. *Prt.* 327d6–e1; Aischin. 3.137; Luk. *Alex.* 4), a *ponêros*, *prodotês*, *kleptês*, and *panourgos* (Ar. fr. 198; D. 18.24; Souda ε 3717–18). Cf. Isok. 18.57.

[27] Fifth-century counter-labeling is rare and indirect (Ar. *V.* 466; *Ra.* 921; cf. *Eq.* 265; *Th.* 837; E. fr. 407 Nauck; [And.] 4.12 [purports to be fifth-century]). The ability to distinguish a *ponêros* from a *chrêstos* is a fifth-century certainty ([X.] *Ath.* 2.19; Ar. *Ra.* 726–33). See further Part II.

too controversial for use before a Panhellenic audience?[28] The Lenaia of 414, by contrast, was an appropriate venue for airing it. Aristophanes' *Amphiaraos* echoes the message on the ostrakon: "O you scum and Phrynondas and *ponêros*, you!" (fr. 26 ὦ μιαρὲ καὶ Φρυνῶνδα καὶ πονηρὲ σύ).

CHRÊSTOI, *PONÊROI*, AND THE STRUGGLE FOR HEGEMONY

The tradition that Hyperbolos "was ostracized ... because of his *ponêria*" (Th. 8.73.3) not only highlights the obstacles that he and members of his socio-economic group faced in winning validation of their legally-held positions as leaders, it points to the underlying issue of this ostrakophoria: "hegemony," the moral direction a dominant social class, in alliance with other classes, imparts to culture, society, and politics.[29] The validating characteristic of a hegemonic class is its perceived transcendence of private economic motives.[30] This ideological positioning legitimates its moral leadership (*aretê*) and elicits the consent, honor (*timê*), and gratitude (*charis*) of all classes.[31] In Athenian society *chrêstoi* constitute the hegemonic group. There is unanimity that leadership and its rewards belong to them, in carefully formulated antithesis to *ponêroi*.[32] Those who envision the social and political structure of the polis

[28] Phrynichos' *Monotropos* placed third at the City Dionysia in 414 and dealt with a Timon figure (fr. 19)—a *misoponêros* (Ar. *Lys.* 805–20)—but the word is not attested in the fragments.

[29] Gramsci esp. 12, 57, 181–82. See Williams 105–14; Bocock esp. 21–39; Eagleton 112–23; Rose 29–30; Wohl 1996: 25–88. Cf. Finley 1973: 38 "Ideology never divides neatly along class lines; on the contrary, its function, if it is to be of any use, is precisely to cross those lines."

[30] Being *chrêstos* and valuing money and profit over civic values are a basic opposition: Ar. *Ach.* 595–97; *Pl.* 155–59 (probably ironic); E. *Supp.* 872–80; cf. Perikles' self-description at Th. 2.60.5; X. *Mem.* 2.9.4; Isok. 3.50; D. 20.10, 13, 25; 24.160, 210 (ironic mislabels); 36.52 "being *chrêstos* is more profitable than much money"; 58.29 "he is *chrêstos* and trustworthy and stronger than money," ironic mislabel of Theokrines); Dein. 3.7 (ironic).

[31] *Chrêstoi* deserve *timê* and *charis* (Ar. *Eq.* 1274–75; *Th.* 832–45; Lys. 20.30–32; Isok. 9.43; D. 20.39–40, 116; 23.205; 25.97; 50.64; cf. D. 18.269), recognition (Isok. 9.16), and a greater share of goods (D. 20.7).

[32] See Ar. *Ra.* 716–37; Isok. 8.122–33; D. *Prooim.* 55. Pseudo-Xenophon refuses to praise democracy because it allocates more goods to *ponêroi* than to *chrêstoi* (1.1, 4, 14; 2.19; cf. 3.1). The moral/ancestral order of the polis requires that *chrêstoi* have a greater share of political, social, and economic goods than *ponêroi* (Lys. 31.25–26; Isok. 2.28; 3.14; 7.20–23; D. 19.339–40; 20.154, 164–65; 25.24–25, 75, 97; Aischin. 3.177–85; cf. Isok. 1.22; D. 24.215–17; *Ep.* 3.16–28; S. *Ant.* 520, 661–62; *Ph.* 456–58; E. *Hek.* 306–8). The argument of

attribute to the *chrêstoi* what Pierre Bourdieu calls "symbolic capital"—a combination of *aretê*, *timê*, *kleos*, and *charis*.[33] *Chrêstoi* have the highest value in the moral economy of the polis—they are "useful to the polis" (χρήσιμοι τῇ πόλει).[34] Because hegemony is a moral position, the hegemonic group is not the rich; *chrêstoi* can be poor.[35] Hegemony is figured as an alliance of large and small landholders—*chrêstoi*, *metrioi*, and *autourgoi*—and constructed around the exclusion of producers and sellers of non-food commodities.[36] The critical determinants are source of wealth, its conversion to the public sphere, and the devotion of private resources to the long-term benefit of the polis.[37] The form of value underlying the antithesis between *ponêros* and *chrêstos* is that of food. This is connected to the idea that *chrêstoi* produce food for the citizen body.[38] It is also a function of the linkage of status to food in Greek culture.[39]

Ar. *Ploutos* is that *chrêstoi* rather than *ponêroi* deserve prosperity, though in fact the latter are rich and the former poor (28–31, 386–88, 489–506, 627–30, 825–26; cf. E. *Hek.* 902–4; Men. *Mon.* 420 Jaekel: "when a *chrêstos* prospers, this is a common good."

[33] Symbolic capital is economic capital "misrecognized" and converted into socially acceptable form as a moral relation (Bourdieu 1990: 112–21, esp. 118) and "recognition from the group" (Bourdieu 1991: 72–76). *Chrêstoi* have *aretê*: X. *Mem.* 1.2.19–20; [X.] *Ath.* 1.8, 2.19; cf. Pl. *Cra.* 386d3–6; Arist. *EN* 1129b25–30a13; *Pol.* 1303b15–17. For *aretê* and *charis* see Th. 2.40.4–5; Isok. 15.95; Aischin. 3.42. For *aretê* as a kind of currency see E. frr. 542, 1029 Nauck. *Aretê* cannot be bought or attained with money or wealth (E. frr. 527, 960); wealth is its false sign (Ades. Trag. fr. 103a Snell/Kannicht). For generosity and *aretê* see MacDowell 1963. For trust/credit (πίστις) as the "greatest capital (ἀφορμή) of all for money-making" see D. 36.44. The "most beautiful *kleos*" is to be *chrêstos ek chrêstou* (E. *Hel.* 941–43; cf. 917–18; S. *Ph.* 475–77).

[34] See, e.g., Eup. fr. 129; E. *Or.* 909–13; D. 18.257; 19.277; 36.56–60; 38.25; [D.] 50.2–3; 58.63–65; Alexis fr. 249. *Ponêroi* are not *chrêsimoi*: D. 19.281–82; 23.191; 25.31, 42.

[35] E. *And.* 639–41; *Supp.* 871–79; *HF* 669–72; *El.* 34–38, 253, 365–90; *Ion* 834–35; fr. 53.27 Austin; frr. 739, 953.19 Nauck; Ar. *Pl.* 503–4, 975–77; Lys. 16.14; D. 21.83, 95; cf. [D.] 59.72; [Arist.] *Prob.* 950b9–22. As Athens becomes increasingly market- and money-oriented, *chrêstoi* are more likely to be represented as poor.

[36] See esp. E. *Supp.* 238–45; *Or.* 920–30; Ar. *Pl.* 245–47; cf. Lys. 21.16–17; Rosenbloom 319–29.

[37] For the concept of "conversion," the movement of an object into a higher or lower sphere of value, see Bohannan and Dalton 8–9; Bloch and Parry 23–28; von Reden 96–97.

[38] *Ponêros*/*mochthêros* and *chrêstos* often qualify food and drink. The former describes them as rotten, unpalatable, not worth their price, or producing bad effects: Eup. fr. 365; Pl.Com. fr. 28; Theopompos Comicus fr. 9; Nikophon fr. 1; Euboulos fr. 68; Alexis fr. 133; Philemon frr. 104, 113, 162; Apollodoros Karystios fr. 30. For *chrêstos* food see Ar. *Pax* 563; Alexis fr. 15; cf. 133.4, 153; Antiphanes frr. 36, 126, 143, 238; Archedikos fr. 3; Philemon fr. 32; Theophilos fr. 4. For *chrêstoi* as able to feed others see Part II.

[39] See, e.g., Ar. *Eq.* 411–16; Makarios 7.14 von Leutsch.

The *Frogs* represents *chrêstoi* as silver or gold coinage that no longer functions as a medium of exchange; *ponêroi*, silver-plated bronze coins, have driven them out of circulation (Ar. *Ra.* 718–26). *Chrêstoi* have authentic and enduring value; they represent the ethos and honor of the community, measuring and storing its non-monetary worth, constituting the symbolic capital of the polis, and embodying the ancestral order that both Hellenes and barbarians acknowledge as supreme.[40] *Ponêroi* are counterfeit or poorly stamped and recently minted coins (cf. Ar. *Pl.* 861–62, 957). They look like silver coins but have no intrinsic and enduring value; they function only as a medium of exchange, spent to acquire something else. They embody negative reciprocity, like the inedible parts of animals devoted to the gods in sacrifice (cf. *Eq.* 1121–30), ritual scapegoats (*Ra.* 732–33), or the interest on money (*Th.* 839–45). "There's little to the obol when it comes to *ponêroi*" (Eup. fr. 185).[41] Their exchange value exceeds their use value.[42]

As *ponêroi*, Hyperbolos and his faction exercised leadership against a steep ideological gradient, unlike Alkibiades, Nikias, and Phaiax. Yet major and minor discourses of late fifth-century Athens—the theater and pseudo-Xenophon, for example—depict Athenian society as the domination of *ponêroi* rather than as the hegemony of *chrêstoi*.[43] The ostrakophoria considered here sought to resolve this contradiction; a class of men legally exercised leadership in the democracy but lacked the ideological validation of their culture and sought to achieve it through the ostracism of a *chrêstos*. This ostrakophoria challenged widely held definitions of power and prestige at

[40] See Kurke 1999: esp. 301–27 for the language of coinage and construction of the self.

[41] Cf. X. *HG* 2.3.14; Apostol. 11.70 von Leutsch "little is the value of an obol, said of *ponêroi*."

[42] In English rhyming slang, "rogue and villain" means "shilling" (*OED*[2] s.v. "rogue" 2.d). In Athens the value of a *ponêros* consists in exchanging him for something else. A *pharmakos* has an exchange value but is useless (ΣAr. *Eq.* 1136c; cf. Σ(Rec.) *Ra.* 733a). The use value of a sykophant consists in exchange (i.e., he has no use value; Ar. *Ach.* 929–58). For the superiority of use to exchange value see Arist. *Pol.* 1256b40–58b9. Use value is "proper" or "native" (οἰκεία) to an object, exchange value is not. The latter is unlimited, the former limited by nature and by living well in the polis. Food and coin are opposed to one another as useful and useless components of wealth; cf. Achaios fr. 25 Kannicht and Snell; Balot 34–44. In Hesiod's myth of the origin of exchange value, the sacrificial offering to Zeus, the parts devoted to the god are useless but disguised as sumptuous (*Th.* 535–41).

[43] Ar. *Eq.* 128–222, 734–40 (καλοί τε κἀγαθοί); *Ra.* 727–36, 1454–59; *Ek.* 175–79; *Pl.* 900–20; [X.] *Ath.* 1.1, 1.4–9; 2.19; cf. E. *Ion* 595–601, D. 25.1–9.

Athens.[44] A procedure that vested the power of naming in the people—the man whose name appeared on the most of six-thousand sherds had to leave the city for a ten-year period—this ostrakophoria contested the prevailing modes of classification and of class in the cultural production of the city.[45]

STASIS: ALKIBIADES VS. NIKIAS, WAR VS. PEACE, YOUNG VS. OLD

To substantiate the above analysis of this ostrakophoria requires an assessment of Plutarch's three accounts of the event, which form the basis for most contemporary interpretations.[46] According to Plutarch, the two most powerful citizens of the day, Alkibiades and Nikias, were in *stasis* (*Arist.* 7.3–4). Nikias represented a policy of peace, Alkibiades a policy of war. The division polarized the demos along generational lines; the old supported Nikias, the young attached themselves to Alkibiades (*Nik.* 11.3). *Stasis* between them was replicated in the citizen body (ibid.). The "disagreement" (διαφορᾶς) between Alkibiades and Nikias culminated in an ostrakophoria (*Nik.* 11.1).

Although we cannot deny personal and political differences between these two men, Plutarch's reading of the *diaphora* derives from Thucydides' description of Alkibiades' motives in his reply to Nikias: "wishing to oppose Nikias, being in fact at variance (διάφορος) with him in the rest of his policies" (6.15.2; cf. 5.43.1–2; 6.89.2–3). Likewise, the *topos* of generational conflict represents division between mass and elite, past and present, military and litigious cultures.[47] It does not describe real factions. Plutarch interprets Nikias' appeals to the elders in his bid to thwart the invasion of Sicily as an appeal to his constituency. Accordingly, he reads this ostrakophoria as a precursor to the second debate on the Sicilian expedition (cf. Th. 6.13.1, 18.6). Nikias could

[44] I agree with Connor 1992: 79–84, 134–36, in rejecting Plutarch's conceptualization of this ostrakophoria as a struggle between two powerful men, but I do not consider Alkibiades, Nikias, Phaiax, Charias, Hyperbolos, Kleophon, Philinos, and the other known targets to be powerful and prestigious in the same senses. Connor explains Hyperbolos' ostracism by his lack of a power-base: as a "new politician" he did not have organized support. This begs the question: why would he move an ostrakophoria if he was vulnerable at the outset? Plutarch's answer (*Nik.* 11.4, quoted below) is an implausible internalization of Hyperbolos' blame tradition. Cf. Harding 154–58.

[45] For the relationship between class, classification, the power of naming, and symbolic production see Bourdieu 1991a: esp. 234–51.

[46] *Nik.* 11; *Alk.* 13; *Arist.* 7.2–4. Carcopino 229–31; Hignett 395–96; Fuqua 176–77; *HCT* 5.261–63; Kagan 1981: 142–43; Ostwald 302; Ellis 45, 47; Rhodes 1994: 94–95.

[47] For different views of this problem see Connor 1992: 147–69; Ostwald 229–50; Strauss esp. 130–78; Rosenbloom 295–96, 325–29.

either prevent a disastrous invasion by ostracizing Alkibiades or preserve his reputation as "the best general" by risking his own ostracism (*Nik.* 11.9). This is anachronistic. Nikias' problem, I would argue, was whether to betray the class that accepted him as one of its own by openly supporting Hyperbolos' faction, or to exhibit class solidarity as Alkibiades' and Phaiax' ally. The answer was axiomatic: *chrêstoi* support one another. The existence of a "peace party" centered on Nikias and a "war party" with Alkibiades at its head after 420 is a scholarly fiction.

Plutarch does not implicate Hyperbolos in the origin of the *stasis* between the two great men. Hyperbolos persuades the demos to hold an ostrakophoria to resolve it (*Alk.* 13.6).[48] Alternatively, he plays the sykophant. Such a role accords with the tradition about him and with Plutarch's principle that "in conditions of *stasis*, even the complete villain (πάγκακος) gets a share of honor" (*Nik.* 11.3; *Alex.* 53.5; *Comp. Sull. Lys.* 1.2). Hyperbolos "clearly took pleasure in their disagreement and aroused the demos against both men," hoping to remove one of the protagonists from the city and to oppose the survivor, considering himself "a long shot for ostracism because he was a better candidate for the stockade" (*Nik.* 11.4).

If any politician might hope to lead a "war party," it was Hyperbolos.[49] His name is synonymous with opposition to peace. Aristophanes' Eirene turns away in disgust when she learns that he controls the Pnyx (*Pax* 683–84; cf. 918–21, 1319). As early as 424 Hyperbolos was associated with fantastically aggressive naval imperialism. The *Knights* describes the scope of Athenian imperial desire as extending from Karia to Carthage (173–74; cf. Th. 6.15.2, 34.2, 90.2; Eup. fr. 207). At the end of the play the triremes protest that Hyperbolos is about to ask for one hundred of them for an expedition to

[48] Did Hyperbolos propose the ostrakophoria? Many scholars interpret *Ath.Pol.* 43.5 to mean that the matter went to a vote without proposer or discussion. See Bonner and Smith 194–95; Phillips 1982: 34 n. 7. I agree with Rhodes 1994: 89 n. 25 that an ἐπιχειροντία does not preclude a debate and vote. The question, however, is moot: even if the matter went directly to a vote, Hyperbolos was the force behind the ostrakophoria. Most scholars accept this. Grote 5.504 considered Nikias the most likely proponent, Whibley 57 Alkibiades. Cf. Baldwin 1971: 154; Ellis 47–48. Heftner 2000: 48 doubts Hyperbolos' proposal of an ostrakophoria, pointing to the tradition that the founders of democracy and ostracism, Theseus and Kleisthenes, were also its first victims.

[49] Hyperbolos' bellicosity was typical of the leaders who may have allied with him, such as Kleophon, Peisandros, and Kleonymos. Androkles tempered his desire to punish Alkibiades with a concern for the military requirements of the Sicilian campaign (Th. 6.29.3, 61.5; cf. Com. Ades. fr. 951.1). Although not associated with this ostrakophoria, Demostratos supported the invasion of Sicily (Ar. *Lys* 390–94; cf. Th. 6.25.1; Plut. *Nik.* 12.6; *Alk.* 18.3).

Carthage; they declare this "terrible and unendurable" and threaten to take refuge at the Theseion or at the altar of the Semnai Theai (Ar. *Eq.* 1300–15).

Moreover, Nikias ceased to be a political force after 420. He was blindsided by Alkibiades' abuse of the democratic process—his tricking the Spartans into denying their full powers to negotiate before the demos, and then denouncing them in the assembly to prevent a settlement over Panakton, Pylos, and Sparta's separate alliance with Boiotia—a move that turned Athens toward an alliance with Argos, Elis, and Mantinea.[50] Nikias' failure to settle these matters as an envoy to Sparta provoked the demos' wrath, doomed his peace efforts, and damaged his political leadership in 420 (Th. 5.45.3, 46.4; Plut. *Alk.* 14.4–6; *Nik.* 10.8–9).[51] In 419 when Alkibiades moved that "the Lakedaimonians did not abide by their oaths" be added as a subscript to the stele containing the terms of the peace (Th. 5.56.3; cf. Ar. *Lys.* 512–14), Athens was on a collision course with Sparta and Nikias' political leadership had reached a dead-end. From this point the demos and its leadership are united in exploiting the quadruple alliance to break Sparta's grip on the Peloponnese and to isolate Korinth, while also operating in the Thraceward region (ML^2 77; cf. Th. 5.26.2–4).

A "peace party" has no room to maneuver. The Spartan-Argive truce of 418 provided an opening for its supposed members—Laches, who proposed the truce of 423 (Th. 4.118.11) and signed the peace of Nikias in 421 (5.43.2), and Nikostratos, a signatory to the truce (4.119.2)—to avoid confrontation with Sparta.[52] But they joined Alkibiades in persuading the Argives to break their truce with Sparta, arguing that it was invalid because it was not ratified by the alliance and that "it was necessary to engage in war" (5.61.2; cf. D.S. 12.79.1).[53] The generals could not have faced the demos after failing to engage the Spartans in the field.

Historians sometimes argue that the Athenians' late arrival for the encounter on the Argive plain (Th. 5.59.3) and Alkibiades' service as envoy rather than as general at Mantinea in 418 (5.61.2) are signs of conflict between war and peace factions.[54] There may have been tensions involving Mantinea.

[50] Th. 5.45; Plut. *Alk.* 14.6–12; *Nik.* 10.4–7; Hatzfeld 89–90; *HCT* 4.51–53; Ellis 37–40. Cf. Plut. *Alk.* 15.2; *Comp. Alk. Cor.* 2–3.

[51] Cf. Seager 1976: 261. Some interpret Plut. *Nik.* 10.9 to mean that "Nikias ceded the *stratêgia* to Alkibiades" in 420. See Fornara 62.

[52] *HCT* 4.87–88 denies that Nikostratos and Laches belonged to a "peace party." Cf. Gomme 1962: 104 n. 18.

[53] See Seager 1976: 266.

[54] Kagan 1981: 103; Ellis 43–45. Cf. Westlake 1989: 90. Andrewes in *HCT* 4.83 attributes lateness to the fact that they traveled by sea. *HCT* 4.78–79 denies a temporary victory of

Eupolis describes a scene of strife set at either Athens or Mantinea: amid thunder and lightning a *rhêtôr* traduced the generals, threatening to throw them in the stocks (fr. 99.30–32).[55] We do not know the issue. Such evidence is a weak basis for positing a rift between war and peace factions. Certainly the defeat at Mantinea reversed two years of activity. Yet Alkibiades could claim that he saved the Argive democracy (Th. 5.84.1; D.S. 12.81.2; Plut. *Alk.* 15.3–4). Three years later he depicted Mantinea as a successful challenge to Spartan confidence and authority and used it as a credential for leadership against Sicily (Th. 6.16.6; contrast 5.75.3).

A commitment to war continues unabated after Mantinea. The Melian expedition realizes the strategy begun in 420 of co-opting or attacking Sparta's allies; there is no evidence that a "peace party" opposed it (Th. 5.84.1). The tactics used at Melos suggest a deliberate avoidance of Nikias' failure there a decade earlier (Th. 3.91.1–3). Thucydides depicts the Athenian decision to send 60 triremes to conquer Sicily as the expression of a communal desire (6.1, 6.6.1, 6.8, 6.24.3), not as the work of a war faction struggling against a peace faction of comparable power. Young and old, rich and poor unite in the desire to invade (6.24.4, 31.3). Even as grave an omen as the mutilation of the Hermai does not weaken Athenian resolve to launch the invasion (6.27.3; Plut. *Nik.* 13.3; *Alk.* 18.7).

We find no effective advocates of peace in 415; none had existed since 420. Plutarch describes Nikias' support as reduced to a few powerless men on the eve of the Sicilian expedition (Plut. *Nik.* 12.3). Nikias does not voice opposition to the invasion until after the demos voted to send 60 ships (Th. 6.9–15, 20–23; Plut. *Nik.* 12.4; *Alk.* 18.2). A few responded to his pleas, but they were so outnumbered that they chose to remain silent, "afraid to seem ill-disposed (κακόνους) to the city" (Th. 6.24.4; cf. Plut. *Nik.* 12.3).[56] We are not dealing with a powerful faction but with a silent minority. The ostracism of Hyperbolos would have left Plutarch's two factions intact and the *stasis*

the "peace party," but the suggestion that "some lawless prank" was behind Alkibiades' failure to secure a generalship in 418 is not appealing; cf. Seager 1976: 265–66; McGregor 31. Diodoros' description of Alkibiades' role at Mantinea is a guess (12.79.1). The issue of Alkibiades' generalship in 418 is insoluble. Merrit 160 and Fornara 63 argue that he was elected general in 418. Wade-Gery 34 n. 2 offers the plausible hypothesis that he assumed the generalship after the deaths of Laches and Nikostratos at Mantinea (Th. 5.74.3). His name fits into a missing portion of *IG* 1^3.370.17 (=ML^2 77.17).

[55] Storey 2000: 181–84 considers Hyperbolos the most likely *rhêtôr*, and dates the play to 417.

[56] See Ober 1994; 1998: 104–21.

prompting the ostrakophoria would have continued in the deliberations on the invasion of Sicily.[57] But it does not.

One might object that the *stasis* continues in the mutilations of the Hermai: these were the acts of a peace faction that had failed to achieve its aims during the ostrakophoria and the debate on Sicily.[58] Perhaps the perpetrators even rallied around Nikias; one brother, Diognetos, was indicted for profaning the Mysteries (And. 1.15) and another, Eukrates, for mutilating the Hermai (1.47).[59] An objector might continue: *hetaireiai* engineer Hyperbolos' ostracism and then seek peace through vandalism and sabotage of the invasion. This position has little to recommend it. Although *hetairoi* united in the ostracism of Hyperbolos, they were divided over the issue of war. Alkibiades' *hetaireia* favored war (Th. 6.13.1). Even so, indictments, threats, and punishments for the mutilations and profanations fell heavily upon it.[60] The *hetaireiai* did not openly challenge the demos' consensus on the war. That the demos would authorize an ostrakophoria to decide between war and peace is unlikely, for it was not divided on the issue of war and peace.

The understanding of ostracism as involving "conflicts of policy between parties whose strength was dangerously equal ... to resolve a deadlock" may explain the ostracisms of Aristeides, Kimon, and Thucydides son of Melesias.[61] To impose such a model on this ostrakophoria is Procrustean. The divisive issue is simply not there. Nikias' peace policy and stewardship were moribund in 420, and in any case he never had the capacity to dominate the demos. Kleon, Hyperbolos, and Alkibiades overshadowed him in rapid succession. Setbacks in the Thraceward region and at Delion coupled with Kleon's and Brasidas' deaths and the return of Pleistoanax to Sparta offered a chance for

[57] Ostwald 304–5 suggests that "in external politics, Hyperbolos' ostracism led to an eclipse of Nicias' policy and a victory for Alcibiades'." Nikias' policy, as I see it, was eclipsed in 420/19. If Hyperbolos' ostracism settled anything, it was the question of leadership: Alkibiades was chosen to lead the city to the limits of its power, even though this vision is first associated with Kleon and Hyperbolos.

[58] One tradition makes the Korinthians responsible: Plut. *Alk.* 18.7; Philochoros F133; Kratippos F3; Phot. *Lex.* s.v. Ἑρμοκοπίδαι. For the mutilations of the Hermai as internal resistance to the invasion of Sicily see MacDowell 1962: 192–93; Osborne 1985a: 65–66; Furley 1996: 30; McGlew 16–20.

[59] For identification of this Diognetos with Nikias' brother see MacDowell 1962: 74–75; *APF* 404–5 (possible, based on his exile, Lys. 18.9); Ostwald 544. For a different view see Storey 1990: 26–27.

[60] *HCT* 4.283. See Part II.

[61] The quotation is from *HCT* 5.258. See further Plut. *Per.* 14.3; Stanton 180–81; Ostwald 27; Stockton 39–40; Mattingly 1991: 5, 25.

peace in 421 (Th. 5.15–16), but Hyperbolos quickly filled the void Kleon left, and, if we can trust Aristophanes, virtually wrote Alkibiades' script for the expansion of empire to Carthage. Hyperbolos' aim, as a partisan of war, would not have been to force an issue between war and peace, for Nikias' ostracism would not assure him of leadership, while Alkibiades' ostracism, which was preferable from his perspective, would jeopardize his own imperialist ambitions.

In the next section I argue that Alkibiades' Olympic victory was the catalyst for this ostrakophoria: it symbolized the menace of tyranny in the city and formed the basis for a campaign against *chrêstoi* as inimical to democracy and poised to subvert it.

ALKIBIADES *HIPPOTROPHOS*: THE OLYMPIC VICTOR AS TYRANT

In Plutarch's formulation, ostracism is not punishment (κόλασις) but a way of checking (κόλουσις) the power of well-born, celebrated, wealthy, and talented citizens.[62] Ostracism enacts the fall of the best men (*Nik.* 11.6 ἀρίστοις; cf. [And.] 4.5 τὸν βέλτιστον) partly out of envy, partly to curb the arrogance of wealth, birth, and power that could jeopardize democratic equality and freedom.[63] An excess of virtue makes the ideal *ostracisé* a threat to monopolize power (cf. Arist. *Pol.* 1284a9–10).[64] Plutarch's analysis of ostracism reads the "fear of tyranny" as a coded expression for mass envy toward outstanding members of society.[65] The ordeal of ostracism, however, culminates in the

[62] Plut. *Them.* 22.4–5; *Nik.* 11.6; *Arist.* 7.2; cf. Arist. *Pol.* 1284a3–b3; Plut. *Alk.* 13.6. Ostracism is also punishment: Ar. *Eq.* 850–51; Hesych. κ 2266; Plut. *Alk.* 13.9; [And.] 4.4 (τιμωρία), 35 (δημοσία τιμωρία); 40 (δίκην διδῶσιν, κολάσαντες). See Rosivach 164–66.

[63] For the qualities of an *ostracisé* see Th. 8.73.3 (power and prestige); Philochoros F30 (suspicion of tyranny); Arist. *Pol.* 1284a18–22 (power, wealth, friendships, political assets); *Ath.Pol.* 22.6 (men who seem better than the rest); Demetrios of Phaleron *apud* Plut. *Arist.* 1.2–3 (prestige of great houses and genos); D.S. 11.55.2, 87.1 (ability to be tyrant and to subvert the demos); Plut. *Arist.* 1.7 (superior reputation, genos, power of speech); *Nik.* 6.1 (power of speech and understanding); 11.1 (reputation or wealth); *Alk.* 13.6 (reputation and power); *Them.* 22.4–5 (prestige, superiority). Graffiti on ostraka depict targets as adulterers, traitors, medizers, foreigners, accursed, sorcerers, cheats, and criminals. See Siewert 1991; Brenne 1994; 2002: 155–66.

[64] Aristotle views ostracism as a measure designed to ensure democratic equality (*Pol.* 1284a3–22; cf. Plut. *Them.* 22.4), curbing superior members of society (1284a36–37), and culling potential tyrants (1302b15–19).

[65] *Arist.* 7.2, cf. 1.2; *Them* 22.5; *Nik.* 11.1; *Alk.* 13.7. For envy in Greek culture see Gouldner 55–60; Walcot 52–66.

expulsion of a symbolic tyrant (D.S. 11.87.1).[66] The tradition that views the *ostracisé* in terms of ill-will (κακόνοια) toward the demos or a capacity to subvert democracy is linked to the symbolic function of ostracism (D.S. 11.55.2; Plut. *Per.* 9.5; Phot. *Lex.* s.v. ὀστρακισμός).

Alkibiades' unprecedented entry of seven chariots, the controversy over a team of horses stolen from a fellow citizen, his victory celebrations, and his commissioning of a praise poem, could all be used to orchestrate envy against his aristocratic success, to cast suspicion on his ability to live within the confines of democratic equality, and to charge that he would claim tyranny as compensation.[67] Alkibiades had probably won victories in the four-horse chariot race at the Pythian and Nemean games and at the Panathenaia of 418.[68] But his Olympic victory in 416 enabled Hyperbolos and his faction to enact democratic ideology in an ostrakophoria.

The names of victors on the circuit appear on ostraka.[69] The link between hippotrophy and ostracism was ingrained in the political imagination of the city. Alkibiades' maternal grandfather, Megakles son of Hippokrates, is called ἱπποτρόφος on two ostraka, sketched as a knight on a third, and associated on six ostraka with Koisyra, by-word for the arrogance of the horse-loving

[66] *Ath.Pol.* 22.3 sees ostracism as an attempt to prevent another Peisistratos and insists on friendship and kinship between the first three *ostracisés* and the Peisistratidai (*Ath.Pol.* 22.6; cf. Philochoros F30; Androtion F6): they are remnants of the tyrannical regime. A symbolic transformation takes place when *ostracisés* "seem greater than the rest": "the first man to be ostracized of those distant from the tyranny was Xanthippos son of Ariphron" (22.6). Scholars often neglect ostracism as symbolic action, viewing it exclusively as a legal and political tool: e.g., Raubitschek 1991: 75; Vanderpool 3. For ostracism as the exile of a symbolic tyrant see Plut. *Per.* 4.4, 7.1–4, 16.1; *Arist.* 7.1; Finley 1985: 72; Rosivach 164–65. For the ostraka see Brenne 2002: 160–61: "Die Ostraka enthalten mithin mögliche Hinweise, aber keinen konkreten oder eindeutigen Vorwurf gegen Tyrannisbestrebungen."

[67] Seven teams: Th. 6.16.2; Plut. *Alk.* 11.1–2; cf. Isok. 16.43. Theft of a citizen's team: [And.] 4.26–29 (Diomedes); Isok. 16.1 (Teisias); D.S. 13.74.3–4 (Diomedes); Plut. *Alk.* 12.2–5 (Diomedes). Celebrations: [And.] 4.29–31; cf. Plut. *Alk.* 12.1–2, 13.3; Ath. 1.3E, 12.534D; Isok. 16.34. Praise poem: Plut. *Alk.* 11.2–3; *D.* 1.1. See Moretti no. 345; Kyle A4, 195–96.

[68] Alkibiades dedicated two pinakes after his Olympic victory: one depicted the Olympic and Pythian festivals crowning him, the other showed him in the lap of Nemea (Ath. 12.534D; cf. Paus. 1.22.7). Amyx 183–84 suggests that the 100 Panathenaic vases on the "Attic Stelai" are Alkibiades' and posits a chariot-race victory at the Panathenaia of 418.

[69] See Kyle 161; Golden 166 observes that no known ostraka label their targets as athletes. The labels symbolize a range of deviant social roles that merit exclusion from the community.

aristocracy.[70] The political efficacy of chariot racing is a matter for debate.[71] But no democratic leader before Alkibiades could boast of victory on the circuit.[72] Panhellenic athletic victory and democratic leadership were an unprecedented mixture.[73] Alkibiades' use of his victories in chariot racing to consolidate his political leadership could recall Kylon's bid to parlay his Olympic victory into tyranny at Athens.[74] His arrogation of Diomedes' or Teisias' Olympic victory in the four-horse chariot race duplicated the conduct of Peisistratos, who took credit for Kimon son of Stesagoras' Olympic victory in

[70] For the sketch of Megakles son of Hippokrates as a knight see Brenne 1992: 162–64; 2002: 143. For ostraka calling Megakles ἱπποτρόφος see Mattingly 1971: 283; Brenne 1994: 16; 2002: 112–14, 152, 161–62. Two ostraka call Megakles ἱππότης and one is addressed to Megakles and his horse; see Brenne 2002: 112–14. Megakles is called "the son of Hippokrates and Koisyra": see *APF* 380–81; Lavelle; Brenne 1994: 15–16; 2002: 108–12. The connection between Megakles, Koisyra, and hippotrophy still resonates in the period 423–18 (Ar. *Nu.* 46–48, 68–69, 124–25; cf. 815). "Koisyra" is a stereotype for the female arrogance of birth and wealth that nurtures tyrants. The stereotype descends from Semonides' horse-woman fr. 7.57–71 West: her luxurious ways would appeal only to "a tyrant or a king, who delights in his heart at such things" (68–70). She fits into the symbolic matrix of ostracism as the mother or wife of a tyrant.

[71] Davies 1981: 102 dates the political ineffectiveness of the four-horse chariot competition at Athens to 400–366, but this is misleading. He lists 12 entrants for 433–400. Alkibiades accounts for 10 of them, and he prevented a potential rival, Teisias or Diomedes, from entering. This leaves one anonymous entrant, who competed some time before 390 (cf. 168); whether he was politically active is unknown. Alkibiades is the only known entrant in the period. Golden 169–75 dates the decline to after Kleisthenes' reforms. Rhodes 1986: 138 suggests that chariot racing was a social phenomenon that "had never paid political dividends."

[72] Megakles son of Hippokrates won the chariot race at the Pythian Games of 486 (Pi. *P.* 7), just after his ostracism (*Ath.Pol.* 22.5; Pi. *P.* 7.15; Kyle 157; *APF* 379). His son Megakles won a chariot victory at Olympia in 436. He was secretary to the treasurers of Athene but not a political leader (Kyle A 44).

[73] For a different view see Ober 1989: 85. Alkibiades is unique in this. Private citizens might use ancestral victories on the circuit as tokens of their value to the city (Lys. 19.63; cf. [And.] 4.26). Preeminent democratic leaders patronize gymnasia: Kimon son of Miltiades was impresario of games at the Theseia and patron of the gymnasion at the Academy (Kyle 40–41, 54–55, 73–74, 99–100). Perikles patronized the Lykeion (Kyle 79–80, 163). Isok 16.35 and Plut. *Nik.* 3.2 include gymnasiarchies among Alkibiades' and Nikias' liturgies; cf. [And.] 4.42. [X.] *Ath.* 2.10 notes the importance of "demotic" gymnasia. See Fisher.

[74] Kylon's attempt to convert an Olympic victory in the diaulos into tyranny at Athens was notorious (Hdt. 5.71; Th. 1.126.3–12; Paus. 1.28.1). Megakles son of Hippokrates was called κυλόνεος ("Kylonian") on an ostrakon (Kerameikos O 2741). I agree with Brenne 2002: 104: Megakles is Kylon's successor.

532.[75] Olympic victory conferred a dangerous mystique upon the victor.[76] Tyranny was a reward for victories so great that they exceeded society's ordinary capacity for compensation. Pausanias son of Kleombrotos, winner of "the most beautiful victory of all we know" (Hdt. 9.64.1; cf. 78.2), is a case in point: he "had the desire to become tyrant of Hellas" (Hdt. 5.32) and sought compensation from the Great King (Th. 1.128).

Sources connect Alkibiades' Olympic victory and this ostrakophoria. Plutarch places the ostrakophoria immediately after his narrative of Alkibiades' Olympic victory and *theôria* at the festival (*Alk.* 11–12).[77] Pseudo-Andokides devotes more space to the Olympic victory and its implications than to any other incident ([And.] 4.25–33). He treats this event last; it recapitulates his case for Alkibiades' ostracism. Rhetorically this is a difficult task, for Alkibiades will use the victory to avoid confronting the charges against him; it is his best and only line of defense (4.25; cf. Th. 6.16–17.1). The Olympic victory and its aftermath form the core of the speech's argument. They demonstrate how the citizen Alkibiades personified the city and the empire, subordinating the collective good to his personal desire, appropriating the property of a fellow-citizen and the city itself to finance and to embellish a private victory, transgressing the limits of democratic freedom, equality, and accountability. Conspicuous expenditure was a traditional entitlement to lead; it could also be a form of self-aggrandizement incompatible with democratic equality.[78] Pseudo-Andokides indicts Alkibiades for committing "hybris against the whole polis" and for appearing "more powerful than the entire polis" at the Olympic festival ([And.] 4.29). His Alkibiades personifies the empire: the Ephesians gave him a Persian tent twice the size of the city's and the Chians provided sacrificial animals and feed for his horses. Alkibiades "commanded (προσέταξε) the Lesbians [to supply] wine and other expenses," as if assessing tribute (30). For pseudo-Andokides, these are bribes, and Alkibiades should be held accountable and be liable to prosecution (30–31). Instead, "he got *sitêsis* in the prytaneion and still makes much use of his victory, as if he didn't dishonor the city much more than he crowned it" (31). Thucydides' Alkibiades responds to such a charge: his enrollment of seven

[75] Kimon son of Stesagoras won consecutive Olympic chariot victories from 536 to 528 (Hdt. 6.103). He transferred his second victory to Peisistratos in exchange for return from exile. He was murdered after (or perhaps because of) his third victory. See Kyle 158.

[76] For the *kudos* of a victor in the crown games see Kurke 1993.

[77] *Nik.* 11 places this ostrakophoria after Nikias' failure to save the peace in 420 and before the appeals of the Egesta and Leontini in 416/5.

[78] Cf. Davies 1981: 98. Pseudo-Andokides questions *megaloprepeia* as a political virtue (4.32); cf. Gorg. fr. 11a.88–95 D-K.

chariots, victory, and lavish entertainments benefited the polis. The Hellenes expected Athens to be weakened by years of war; instead, Alkibiades' performances made them consider the city's power to be greater than it actually was (Th. 6.16.1–3). As Thucydides' Alkibiades puts it, "such lavish displays are an honor by custom, but power is also assumed at the same time from their accomplishment" (6.16.2–3).

Thucydides weaves the themes of hippotrophy, risky and expensive pursuit of private glory, and the envy of success into his account of the second debate on the Sicilian expedition. This suggests that the Olympic victory, the ostrakophoria, and the debates on the invasion belong to the same nexus of events. Thucydides' Nikias uses Alkibiades' hippotrophy to disqualify him from leadership: it is an expensive risk to win personal glory and to replenish a fortune wasted on horses and "other expenditures" (Th. 6.12.2). Thucydides himself confirms the invective (6.15.2–3). His Alkibiades justifies his refusal to consider himself equal to his fellow citizens (Th. 6.16.3–5; [And.] 4.27, cf. 16).

The refusal to palliate the envy of the citizens and to respect the limits of democratic equality is a form of *paranomia*.[79] Sexual deviancy is a figure for *paranomia*.[80] As a crime against the polis that corrupts its foundations, *moicheia* has a prominent place in the symbolism of ostracism.[81] Megakles son of Hippokrates is a *moichos* or has "new hair" (as if a convicted adulterer) in graffiti found on three ostraka.[82] Hypereides, whose client Lykophron was prosecuted for *moicheia* under the *eisangeltikos nomos*, clarifies the meaning of the charge: "subverting the democracy by transgressing the laws" (2.12).[83] Pseudo-Andokides begins his account of Alkibiades' life with his *moicheia* and *paranomia*, though he avoids treating these topics in detail (10). *Moicheia*, like

[79] For παράνομος/παρανομία in the portrayal of Alkibiades see Ostwald 116–18; Wohl 1999: 353–55, 366–75.

[80] These images played a role in civic discourse of all kinds. See, e.g., Hunter 96–119. Forsdyke 254 n. 87 claims that "the comments made on ostraca ... are ... general terms of abuse and not indicative of the purpose of ostracism." I take them as expressions of ostracism's symbolic functions: the labeling and expulsion of a citizen unfit for life in the polis, the epitome of whom is the tyrant. For sexual ridicule on ostraka see Brenne 2002: 163–64.

[81] See Lys. 1.4, 17, 25, 33, 49; 13.66. For the law see Lys. 1.31–32, 49; 13.66: a *kyrios* can treat a man caught in the act "in whatever way he wishes" (Lys. 1.49; cf. [D.] 59.66) and kill him (Lys. 1.30; 13.66; D. 23.53; Aischin. 1.91; X. *Hier.* 3.3–4). See Cohen.

[82] Kerameikos O 2513–14, 3168; Brenne 2002: 114–16; cf. Ar. *Nu.* 1079–84; *Pl.* 168.

[83] Lysias depicts Agoratos, whose sykophancy enabled the Thirty tyrants to take power, as a *moichos* (13.66).

incest, figures the desire for tyranny as transgressive sexuality.[84] An ostrakon commands Kimon to leave and to take Elpinike with him.[85] *Paranomia* alone explains Kimon's ostracism: "they ostracized Kimon because of his *paranomia*, seeing that he lived as the husband of his own sister" ([And.] 4.33; cf. Ath. 13.589E).

Images of Alkibiades' perverse sexuality accumulate a decade before this ostrakophoria.[86] Thucydides claims that the masses feared the magnitude of his *paranomia* toward his body—it defined his way of life—and became his enemies because he desired tyranny (Th. 6.15.4). Other texts attribute the suspicion of tyranny to his unparalleled status and arrogance ([And.] 4.24, 27) or to the fact that tyranny is a universal object of desire, but only Alkibiades was capable of achieving it (Isok. 16.38).[87]

Thucydides remarks that Alkibiades would have been considered too young to participate in the politics of other cities, but "was honored because of the prestige of his ancestors" (Th. 5.43.2; cf. 6.16.1). Alkibiades exploited his noble lineage for political gain; hippotrophy is part of his politics.[88] It expresses an aristocratic superiority incompatible with democratic political culture. Hippotrophy distinguishes him from *phauloi* and excuses him from competing with athletes of low birth and inferior education; it marks his class and status (Isok. 16.33).[89] Alkibiades' upbringing as a ward of Perikles and his standing as a grandchild of the *ostracisés* Megakles and Alkibiades (Lys. 14.39–40; [And.] 4.34) made him a target for ostracism from birth. His prodigious

[84] See Vernant; Wohl 1999: 360–61.

[85] Kerameikos O 6874; Mattingly 1971: 284 and n. 9; Brenne 1994: 14; 2002: 92–93. For whether Kimon was Elpinike's half or full brother see Ostwald 118 n. 100. For the "inbreeding" of the aristocracy see Gribble 76.

[86] Eupolis' Alkibiades is a *moichos* of monstrous proportions (fr. 171), as is Pherekrates' (fr. 164; cf. X. *Mem.* 1.2.24; Com. Ades. fr. 123; Antisthenes frr. 29a–b, 32a Decleva Caizzi). Aristophanes' Alkibiades is born in the archonship of Phalenios (fr. 244), "ridiculing him as from Phales, for he was a creature of unnatural lust" (Hesych. ε 5373; cf. Hermippos fr. 57; Antiphon fr. 67 Thalheim; Lys. frr. 30–31 Gernet and Bizos). For a Kerameikos ostrakon inscribed ΚΑΛΙΑΣ ΦΑΛΕΝΙΟ see Schröder 1993: 43–44. Alkibiades is εὐρύπρωκτος (Ar. *Ach.* 715–16) and invents πολλὴ λακκοπρωκτία (Eup. fr. 385.4). Such mockery suits a *kinaidos*, *moichos*, or *akolastos*. See Ar. *Nu.* 1083–84; Dover 1989: 106, 140; *contra* Henderson 1991: 210. Gribble 74 and Wohl 1999: 366–75 stress Alkibiades' passivity and lack of control.

[87] See Seager 1967: 6–18; Gribble esp. 140–41.

[88] For Alkibiades' nobility see Isok. 16.25; D. 21.144; [Pl.] *Alk.* I 121a1–2; Plut. *Alk.* 1.1; *APF* 9–18; de Romilly 20–22.

[89] Contrast [D.] 61.23: the *apobatês* competition distinguishes citizens from slaves and metics, rather than *phauloi* from *eudaimonestatoi*.

sexuality, especially charges of *moicheia* and *paranomia*, combined with his hippotrophy and Olympic victory to make his tyrannical aims palpable and to mark him as an ideal candidate for ostracism.[90]

If the Olympic victory provided a pretext for this ostrakophoria, it took place in the eighth prytany of 416/5 (Philochoros F30).[91] An ostrakophoria in 415 explains the initial uncertainties about the number of generals for the invasion of Sicily (ML^2 78*b*.2–4), the late launch of the expedition, and the remarkable unity of Alkibiades' support (Th. 6.24).[92] The portrait of Alkibiades as *hippotrophos*, Olympic victor, and tyrant makes intelligible the pervasive fear of anti-democratic conspiracy that gripped Athens after the mutilation of the Hermai and reports of the performance of the Mysteries in private homes (Th. 6.27.3, 28.2, 53.3, 60.1; And. 1.36).

I develop the hypothesis that the *stasis* of this ostrakophoria continued into the affairs of the Hermai and the Mysteries in Part II. Here, I examine how Alkibiades' Olympic victory divided leaders into two factions labeled *chrêstoi*

[90] That ΣAr. *Eq.* 855b includes Alkibiades as an *ostracisé* with Aristeides, Kimon, Themistokles, and Thucydides indicates his status as an ideal *ostracisé*. Phillips 1982: 32, 41 n. 71 suggests the name refers to Alkibiades' homonymous paternal grandfather, but the scholiast lists the names in chronological order (he transposes Kimon and Themistokles).

[91] Raubitschek 1991: 117–18; 1955: 122–26; Rhodes 1994: 91 argue for 415 on different grounds. Since Woodhead 1949: 78–83, 417 has been thought the earliest date possible for this ostrakophoria. A date of 416 has been made to conform with Theopompos F96b ἐξωστράκισαν τὸν Ὑπέρβολον ἓξ ἔτη. Many therefore consider 416 the most likely date: McGregor 31–32; Fuqua esp. 175–79; *HCT* 5.261, "416 as most likely and 415 just possible"; Ostwald 302 n. 39; Ellis 45–49; Furley 1989: 149–50; Mattingly 1991: 23; Harding 156–57; Heftner 2000a: 27–45; Scheidel 392–95. Carcopino 191–96; Hatzfeld 109; Bianchetti 224–33; Lehmann 43–49 argue for 417. Theopompos provides little support for a date. He claims that the city ostracized Hyperbolos for six years, not that he was in exile for six years when he was murdered, or, as Raubitschek 1955: 125–26 has re-written it, that Hyperbolos had been a demagogue for 6 years before his ostracism (i.e., 421–15). Theopompos is not a good source for Hyperbolos: he names his father Chremes (F95).

[92] ML^2 pp. 239–40 considers the number of generals unresolved after this assembly; *HCT* 4.225 thinks it was resolved. If Th. 6.8.2 describes the assembly from which ML^2 78*b* derives, then *HCT* must be right; but ML^2 78*b*.2–4 may derive from an earlier assembly. The chronological relationship between an ostrakophoria and the election of generals in the fifth century is not known for certain. If the *Ath.Pol.*'s account holds true, then they transpire more or less simultaneously: generals can be elected after the sixth prytany if the signs are favorable (44.4). See Rhodes 1981: 536–37. Would an ostrakophoria, which the demos authorizes in the sixth prytany, be an unfavorable sign? Merrit 171 places the launch in Prytany X, 21 = June 20; *HCT* 4.276 dates it to early June, assuming that the Hermai were mutilated under a full moon.

and *ponêroi*. First I discuss the division in leadership style that develops after Perikles' death, as *chrêstoi* reinvent the aristocratic style for the democratic polis and *ponêroi* declare its exponents anti-democratic, defining themselves as the defenders of the demos. Then I read pseudo-Xenophon's treatment of *chrêstoi* and *ponêroi* at Athens as an index to the issues and factional alignment of this ostrakophoria. Finally, I analyze the primary objective of this ostrakophoria, the role of "leader/protector/representative" of the demos, the *prostatês tou dêmou*.

CLASS, STATUS, AND FACTION

Scholars note the emergence of a new political elite as a central feature of Athenian politics after Perikles' death. Less often noted is the development of a new aristocratic style in politics.[93] Alkibiades' Olympic victory directed critical scrutiny to the culture behind this style. Nikias and Phaiax (Plut. *Alk.* 13.1 Φαίακα ... γνωρίμων ὄντα πατέρων) belonged to this group; perhaps Hippokles and Charias (*PA* 15324, the archon of 415/4) did as well.[94] *Chrêstoi* define and differentiate themselves from *ponêroi* though conspicuous expenditure. Alkibiades' spending on private pleasure and public spectacles is a hallmark of his political style.[95] Nikias adopted a comparable, if more restrained, style.[96] Together they re-invented *megaloprepeia* as a form of political leadership. Their expenditure at Panhellenic festivals and competitions

[93] But Morris 1994: 74 argues that ca. 420 the "aristocracy muscled in on ... polis iconography" using grave imagery to depict itself as leaders of the polis.

[94] Hippokles son of Menippos (*PA* 7620) was general in 413/2 (Th. 8.13.1). He may be the Hippokles (*PA* 7619) who, along with Pheidon and Epichares, succeeded Kritias (Lys. 12.55). Thirty ostraka survive from this ostrakophoria: 8 for Kleophon, 5 each for Alkibiades and Phaiax, 3 against Hyperbolos and Hippokles, and 1 each for Nikias, Philinos, Charias, Krates, Myrrhinik(h)os, and Phileriphos. See Phillips 1990: 127–29; Lang 6, 42, 50, 64, 90–91, 96–97, 99–100; Mattingly 1991: 24–25; Masson 114–15; Rhodes 1994: 85–86; Heftner 2001: 49–53; Brenne 2001; 2002: passim.

[95] Alkibiades' expenditures: Plut. *Alk.* 16.4; Isok. 16.34–35; cf. Th. 6.16.3; *APF* 20–21. Plut. *Alk.* 10.1 is an allegory of Alkibiades' persona (noble generosity and inordinate desire that infects the citizen body) and is probably not evidence for an *epidosis*, *pace APF* 20. Pseudo-Andokides' "Phaiax" claims to be a victorious liturgist in *euandria*, the torch-race, and tragedies (4.42). For Alkibiades' expenditure as the cause of *aischrokerdeia*—he needs a generalship in 415 to replenish his wealth—see Th. 6.12.2, 15.2–3; cf. [And.] 4.32. [And.] 4.11, 13, 25–26, 29, 30, 42 detail his theft of public wealth and extortions from individuals.

[96] Plut. *Nik.* 3–4; Pl. *Grg.* 472a5–7; *APF* 403–4.

evoked Kimonian *megalophrosynê* and a "politics of largesse."[97] Tradition dictates that *rhêtores* of the time—Kleon, Hyperbolos, Androkles, and Kleophon—did not convert their wealth to the public sphere; they diverted public and private wealth and redistributed it to the demos.[98] The culture opposed to their leadership blocked memory of their benefactions; *ponêroi* have money but not symbolic capital.[99] The liabilities of conspicuous expenditure are envy and suspicion of aiming to monopolize power.[100]

Nikias' wealth generated envy (Plut. *Nik.* 11.2), despite his projections of aristocratic magnanimity.[101] As *chorêgos* he dressed one of his tall, young slaves as Dionysos to the audience's delight, proclaiming it "not holy" for him to remain a slave; the slave's manumission was the climax of the masquerade

[97] For Kimon see Kritias fr. 8.1 West; Gorgias fr. 20 D-K. For the "politics of largesse" see Connor 1992: 18–22; cf. Davies 1981: 96–99; Ober 1989: 85–86. For the social fiction that *chrêstoi* gives gifts with no strings attached ("generalized reciprocity") see Rosenbloom 312–18. Arist. *EN* 1122b19–23a6 defines the expenditure of a *megaloprepês* εἰς τὰ κοινά as sacred. Cf. Morris 1996: 25 "Spending on the gods was ambiguous, creating both a sense of community and a hierarchical structure of honor within it."

[98] Davies 1981: 117 thinks that their money gave them the leisure for political leadership but served no other function; cf. Plut. *Comp. Nik. Crass.* 1.4. Kleon's father was *chorêgos* (*IG* 2^2.2318). Hyperbolos may have been trierarch, but the evidence is poor (Eup. frr. 207, 210; Ar. *Th.* 837; *APF* 517). Ostwald 214; Henderson 1990: 280 suggest they affected lower class origins.

[99] Diversion of wealth from the rich and from the demos and its redistribution to the demos *vs.* gift of private wealth is basic to the *ponêros*/*chrêstos* divide. See, e.g., Ar. *Eq.* 773–76, 868–74; *V.* 914–16; Isok. 8.13; cf. And. 2.17; D. 21.189. The classic distinction is *Ath.Pol.* 27.3–5: Perikles introduces pay for jury service, "giving to the many their own property" to compete with the private wealth of Kimon, the brilliant liturgist (see n. below) and benefactor. This "makes the *politeia* worse" and enables the development of *ponêroi* (i.e., those who are not *epieikeis*) to join the ranks of leadership after his death (27.4–28.2).

[100] Kurke 1991: 176–82; Wilson 145. Kimon used his "tyrannical wealth" to perform liturgies "brilliantly," explicitly relating the enormous wealth, conspicuous expenditure, and tyranny (*Ath.Pol.* 27.3; cf. Theopompos F98; Plut. *Kim.* 10.1–5). Cf. Lys. 26.4. For liturgical spending as a cause of envy see Th. 6.16.3; Lys. 27.10–11; Is. 6.61; Walcot 59; Ober 1989: 226–33, esp. 232.

[101] Kallet's 363 n. 102 claim that "Nikias' lavish liturgical spending caused no problems" omits this ostrakophoria. Nikias' lineage was not impressive. His wealth derived from slaves who mined the soil and not from manufacture for exchange. This is a critical difference; cf. Ehrenberg 121 n. 3. He led as *stratêgos* and not as a *prostatês.* Finally, the *kaloi k'agathoi* accepted him as their own (cf. *Ath.Pol.* 28.3, 5); cf. Ostwald 294–95. Connor 1992: 151–73, esp. 172–73 argues that "class bias" fails to explain the comic treatment of demagogues because Nikias' socio-economic profile was identical. But it was not identical, nor was it perceived as such.

(Plut. *Nik.* 3.4). But his culture was not clearly democratic. He lacked the personal charm of a populist aristocrat and cut an odd figure, liable to be described both as hostile to the demos (Plut. *Nik.* 11.2; X. *HG* 2.3.39) and as its benefactor (Lys. 18.2–4).

This ostrakophoria is a reaction to the reinvention of the aristocratic style in politics. Ostracism was perhaps the only democratic institution that was anti-aristocratic. Whatever the political or social tension that prompted an ostrakophoria, the exile of an elite citizen was its solution.[102] The spectacle of a sherd-wielding demos filing through makeshift entrances in the agora according to tribe signified to every aristocrat that his residence in Attika depended upon the will of the demos.[103] An ostrakophoria subjected members of the elite to wide-ranging ridicule.[104] It appealed to the envy of the demos against leaders with some combination of birth, landed wealth, social power and privilege, foreign friendships, exceptional education, and high-status celebrity of the sort lavished on Alkibiades (E. fr. 755 Page; Kritias fr. 4 West; Pl. *Smp.*) and perhaps on Phaiax (Dionys. Eleg. fr. 4 West). It questioned the loyalites of the rich and well-born: Nikias had guest friendships in Sparta; Alkibiades was his rival for Spartan influence who could muster a private mercenary army from Argos and Mantinea.[105] Unlike a trial before a jury, an ostrakophoria makes high status itself a liability. From the perspective of Hyperbolos and his faction, ostracism's lack of a platform for speech was an advantage.[106]

The comedians likened ostracism to the children's game ostrakinda (Ar. *Eq.* 855; Pl.Com. fr. 168), a form of tag in which two teams occupy opposite sides of a line, a neutral throws a shell (ostrakon) into the air above the line, and the team ranged on the side where it falls flees, while the other pursues.[107]

[102] Kerameikos O 5886 styles its target, hunger, "of noble fathers" (εὐπ{ρ}ατρίδες); Brenne 2002: 97, 161–62.

[103] Cf. Forsdyke 255.

[104] Siewert 1991; Brenne 1994; 2002: 155–66.

[105] For Alkibiades' *xenoi* see Herman 116–18, 148–50, 180–81. For Nikias' friends in Sparta see Th. 5.16.1, 43.2, 46; 6.89.2; 7.86.2; Plut. *Nik.* 9–10. Phaiax would have *xenoi* to call on during his embassy to Sicily and Italy in 422 (Th. 5.4–5).

[106] *Pace* Connor 1992: 136.

[107] See K-A 7.500; Pl. *Phdr.* 241b with Σ Greene, which offers a slightly different description; Forbes 1673. Siewert 2002a: 223–26 interprets Pl.Com. fr. 168 (*Symmachia*) as a criticism of the arbitrariness of ostracism and relates it to this ostracism because Hyperbolos was an arbitrary *ostracisé*. I read the comparison as stressing that an ostrakophoria divides the city into factions (Ar. *Eq.* 852–57). The comparison may predate comedy; see Bicknell 183–84, on Kerameikos O 5547. For ostracism in factional politics see Arist. *Pol.* 1284b21–22.

The pun indicates that the decisive and politically effective component of an ostrakophoria (as opposed to the scatter vote) pit two factions against one another. Who formed Hyperbolos' faction?

Kleippides' sons, Kleophon and Philinos, are likely allies of their tribesman Hyperbolos.[108] Their father had been general in 429/8, a target for ostracism in the previous generation, and was presumably Perikles' ally and associate.[109] They were scions of the Periklean legacy whose socio-economic and leadership profiles matched those of Hyperbolos.[110] Kleophon faced ideological obstacles to his political leadership similar to Hyperbolos'. The comic stage and writers reliant upon it depict him as a poorly-educated foreigner who uses political leadership to flatter, to corrupt, and to deceive the demos, profiting from war against external enemies and from abuse of the law courts against internal rivals.[111] Plato staged a demagogue-comedy entitled *Kleophon*

[108] Kleophon and Philinos were from Acharnai, in the inland trittys of the tribe Oineis. Perithoidai, Hyperbolos' deme, was in the city trittys. Camon 145–51 argues that Nikias and Phaiax united, then Phaiax acted as a go-between to effect a merger with Alkibiades; Hyperbolos then united with Kleophon against this coalition.

[109] General: Th. 3.3.2; D.S. 12.55.3; target of ostracism: Brenne 2002: 59 (112 ostraka). One ostrakon calls him βυζάντιο[ς]. Brenne 2002: 93–94 takes this as a reference to the revolt of Byzantion in 441, making Kleippides a *prodotês*. But the label may associate him with a nexus of ideas linking Byzantion with the culture of the market: iron currency (Ar. *Nu.* 249; Pl.Com. fr. 103), wealthy traders (Men. *Sam.* 98–101), the base pleasures of a trading center (Diphilos fr. 42.18–25; Men. fr. 66), and above all, fish (Diphilos fr. 17.11–15; Antiphanes frr. 78, 179; Nikostratos fr. 5). The label may suggest the debauched pleasures preferred by moneyed elites as opposed to high-status *tryphê*. For the former see Davidson esp. 186–90, 226–27, 288–92, 309–12; for the latter cf. the ostrakon calling Megakles *Trophonos*, with Brenne 2002: 118–19.

[110] Kleophon is λυροποιός (And. 1.146–47; Aischin. 2.76; *Ath.Pol.* 28.3; ΣAr. *Th.* 805 Rutherford; ΣAischin. 3.333a–b *ad* 150 Dilts); cf. τυροποιός (*sic*) Σ*Ra.* 681c; Σ(Tze.) Ar. *Ra.* 676a; Souda φ 433. Baldwin 1974 denies he made lyres. The first extant reference to him in comedy is in 411 (Ar. *Th.* 805 with Σ Rutherford). It is likely that the Philinos of Antiphon 6 (*PA* 14300) is his older brother; see Raubitschek 1954. He is a figure for the corruption, bribery, abuse of the dikasteria, and rapacious imperialism associated with Kleon, Hyperbolos, and Kleophon (Antiphon 6.12, 21, 34–38; cf. frr. 61–64 Thalheim, from a *Kata Philinou*). He is told to stop ogling an unnamed imperial city and to "slink off" (lit. "drip off") to a colony (Eup. fr. 223). Sommerstein 347 n. 142 suggests he was *prohedros* at Eupolis' *Poleis*, dated 426–20. See Rosen 158–60; Storey 2000: 184.

[111] Kleophon is mocked as the son of a Thracian mother (ξένος, βάρβαρος, δυσγενής), as an illegitimate citizen (νόθος πολίτης), as uneducated (ἀμαθής, ἀπαιδευτός), and as a babbler (φλυαρός): Ar. *Ra.* 674–86; 1532–33; Pl.Com. fr. 60; Aischin. 1.76; ΣAr. *Ra.* 679c–d, 681a, b, d, 1504b, 1532c,d, 1532a; (Rec.) 678b, 1504b, 1532c; (Tze.) 676a, 678b, 681a, b, 682, 683a; ΣE. *Or.* 903, 904 Schwartz vol. 1; Souda φ 433. He was accused of flattery,

(406/5) just as he had produced a *Hyperbolos*. Like Hyperbolos, Kleophon bore the labels *ponêros* (Lys. 30.13) and *prostatês tou dêmou* (Lys. 13.7–12; 30.10–14). The comic stage threatened both with death.[112] Both were murdered in oligarchic coups (see below), and each is branded the first of a line of "bad" leaders in democratic Athens (*Ath.Pol.* 28.4; ΣAr. *Pax* 681b for Hyperbolos). The later tradition links the two: as corrupters of the *politeia* of Aristeides, Themistokles, and Miltiades (Isok. 8.75), as leaders whose fathers could not be named (Ael. *VH* 12.43), as prosecutors of Nikias and Alkibiades (Him. *Or.* 36.63–64), and as practitioners of a figment of oratory whose aim is the sykophantic appropriation of property (Aristeid. *On the Four* 176.9–15). Both blindly led the city into danger (Lib. *Decl.* 15.49). They shared a tribal and socio-economic identity; they shared a leadership style and ideological impediments to elite status. Each played the same deadly role of *prostatês tou dêmou*. It is a fair suggestion that Hyperbolos and Kleophon collaborated in the performance of this role in this ostrakophoria and that Philinos supported them.

The leaders who intensified the inquiry after the mutilation of the Hermai and profanations of the Mysteries that led to Alkibiades' flight to Sparta may have allied with Hyperbolos, although no ostraka survive to confirm that they were targets for ostracism. Androkles, one of the "newly rich rogues" (Kratin. fr. 223 νεοπλουτοπονήρων), is a likely member of Hyperbolos' faction. He was treated nearly as harshly as Hyperbolos on the comic stage and killed four years later as *prostatês tou dêmou* and as responsible for Alkibiades' exile (Th. 8.65.2). Comic mockery of him focuses on his poverty and his degrading and criminal attempts at enrichment.[113] If Androkles and Kleophon allied with Hyperbolos, then the *stasis* that prompted this ostrakophoria united three

deception, and corruption of the demos (Aischin. 1.76; *Ath.Pol.* 28.3–4, 34.1; D.S. 13.53; Demetr. *Eloc.* 294), and of profiting from war and prosecution (Pl.Com. frr. 58–59; D.S. 13.53). Lys. 19.49 claims that Kleophon died poor and that everyone knew his heirs and relatives were poor.

[112] Death threats are rare on the comic stage. For Hyperbolos see *Eq.* 1358–63; cf. *Pax* 685–87; *Th.* 839–45). For Kleophon see Ar. *Ra.* 684–85, 1504–14, with Σ 1504a, 1506d; Souda π 1799; ΣE. *Or.* 772 Schwartz, citing Philochoros, claims E. *Or.* 772 threatens Kleophon with death.

[113] Androkles is from Pitthos, possibly in the inland trittys of the Kekropis tribe. He is Ἀνδροκολωνοκλῆς (Kratin. fr. 281). Meineke was right to correct a lexicographer's gloss of "stupid" (ἠλίθιος) to "hired" (μίσθιος). Kratinos ridiculed Androkles as waiting on Kolonos hill for day labor. This fits with Kratinos' mockery of him as a prostitute (ἡταιρηκότα, fr. 281), a slave and a beggar (fr. 223), and with the claims of Telekleides (fr. 16) and Ekphantides (fr. 5) that he was a cut-purse (βαλλαντιοτόμον; cf. Kleon in Ar. *Eq.* 1196–98). Com. Ades. fr. 278 calls him "Androkles the guy from the black poplars." Hesychios, who quotes the fragment, glosses the line as "instead of sykophant": "the

leaders marked as *prostatai tou dêmou* in the period 421–404, and the ostrakophoria itself can be readily interpreted as an effort to protect the demos from impending subversion in the aftermath of Alkibiades' Olympic victory.

Other leaders may have joined this faction. Kleonymos, the first to offer monetary rewards for informants during the *zêtêsis* of 415 (And. 1.27), was also a notorious butt of the comic stage. Not ridiculed strictly according to the pattern of the industrial/litigious elite, he has some characteristics of the group: he is a rapacious *dêmêgoros* (Ar. *Eq.* 953–58 λάρος), a flattering prosecutor (*V.* 589–93), a sykophant (*Av.* 1479), an oath-breaker (*Nu.* 398–400), and the sort of villain that forces others to swerve out of his way in the agora (*Ach.* 844). Unlike the men considered so far, however, he is mocked as a fat, gluttonous parasite (*Eq.* 1290–99; μέγας, *V.* 592; *Av.* 1477; cf. *Ach.* 88–89; *Av.* 288 κατωφαγᾶς) and as a hoplite. Kleonymos is the stock *ripsaspis* of the comic stage, a *miles gloriosus* and a coward.[114] His abrupt disappearance from comedy after the *Birds* suggests that he died shortly after; he may have fallen in the oligarchic takeover of 411 (cf. Th. 8.66.2). The type of ridicule he attracts implies a military connection (taxiarch?) and landed wealth, though he is accused of using political leadership to enter the money economy.

Peisandros son of Glauketes is mocked along similar lines in comedy—as a *miles gloriosus*, a coward, an ass, and a glutton—and his wealth is definitely landed (Lys. 7.4).[115] A demesman of Kleophon and Philinos and a tribesman of Hyperbolos (*IG* I^3.472.3), he may have joined the faction. Plato Comicus

basest men (ἔσχατοι) hung tablets from a black poplar in the agora." Kolb 34–36 defends this interpretation, arguing that Androkles is mocked as a "man from the black poplar market" (i.e., he makes his living from sykophancy), and that the *pinakia* contain indictments. The lines could also ridicule Androkles as the antithesis of a *prohedros*: "the view from the black poplar" was proverbial for seats farthest from the orchestra. See Wycherley nos. 721–28.

[114] *Eq.* 1372; *Nu.* 353–54; *V.* 16–27, 592, 820–23; *Pax* 444–46, 670–78, 1295–1304; *Av.* 287–90, 1470–81; Eup. fr. 352. He is also mocked as masculine in form but feminine in gender, like ἡ κάρδοπος (*Nu.* 670–80). The final joke in this series is not clear. The scholia read it as a jibe at his poverty. He is a φέναξ (*Ach.* 89), δειλότατος (*Nu.* 354; cf. *Av.* 1477), οὐδὲν χρήσιμον (*Av.* 1476, functionally equivalent to *ponêros*, and relates to sykophancy). For Kleonymos' decrees ca. 426 see ML^2 65.34; 68.5.

[115] *Miles gloriosus*: Ar. *Pax* 395; coward: Ar. *Av.* 1553–64; Phryn. fr. 21 (one of the "great apes"); Eup. fr. 35; X. *Smp.* 2.14; Souda δ 319; π 1467. He uses war to steal and to profit: Ar. *Lys.* 488–92; fr. 84; Souda π 1467; ει 335; cf. Pl.Com. fr. 103. Girth (he was called "ass" and "donkey driver" to mock him as a farm hand) and gluttony: Eup. frr. 99.1–4, 195; Herm. fr. 7; Pl.Com. fr. 102; Pl.Com. frr. 106–7 may refer to his *talaipôria*, for which see Th. 8.48.1, 64.1. Thucydides classes him among the *dynatôtatoi* (8.90.1). *Ath.Pol.* 32.2 calls Peisandros, Antiphon, and Theramenes "men well-born and seeming to be outstanding in intelligence and judgment."

lampooned him (in a *Peisandros*), as he had done to Hyperbolos and would later do to Kleophon. Eupolis' *Marikas* prophesies Peisandros' downfall (fr. 195), though it is unclear whether this is good or bad news for Marikas (= Hyperbolos). Peisandros added a 10,000 dr. reward for information on the Hermai and Mysteries (And. 1.27), and as *zêtêtês* announced that both affairs were a conspiracy to subvert the demos (1.36). He also proposed to the Boule that the decree prohibiting the torture of citizens be rescinded to expedite information-gathering (1.43).[116] A combination of tribal affiliation, socio-economic background, ideological resistance to their leadership expressed through a kind of comic ridicule specific to them, and shared political aims as protectors of the demos against subversion and as rivals of Alkibiades united Hyperbolos, Kleophon, Philinos, Androkles, Kleonymos, Peisandros, and perhaps Charikles (see n. 116) into a faction.

Nikias, Phaiax, and Alkibiades were also mocked in comedy, but not in these terms. The comic stage did not challenge their elite status or fitness for leadership, accuse them of crimes of private profit detrimental to the long-term interests of the polis, or treat them as ritual scapegoats.[117] There is no evidence that they were ridiculed as *ponêroi*, *mochthêroi*, or *phauloi*. Their ridicule takes

[116] This may be reflected in Eup. fr. 99.1–4; so Beta 25–26, but Storey 2000: 174 offers convincing counter-arguments. Woodhead 1954: 135–37 has Peisandros supporting Alkibiades and opposing Androkles in 416/5, but this is difficult to reconcile with his actions during the *zêtêsis*. Certainly he changed sides in 412/1. That he could arrange Alkibiades' recall, dissolve the demos, and organize the *hetaireiai* in 412/1 after his role in the *zêtêsis* is astonishing, but in keeping with the fluidity of Athenian factional alignments. Charikles, another tribesman of Hyperbolos, was *zêtêtês* with Peisandros in 415 and shared the view that the mutilations and profanations were a plot to subvert the demos (And. 1.36). He is mentioned once in comedy along with Nikias as a sykophantic target, though not offered the same courtesy of silence on the reason: he paid a mna to prevent a blackmailer from saying that his mother bought him (Telekleides fr. 44.1–2). His profile matched that of the *chrêstoi*, and he joined them, perhaps as a member of the Four Hundred (Lys. 13.74, of doubtful value, but see *APF* 502), and as a member of the Thirty (X. *HG* 2.3.2) in Kritias' *hetaireia* (Lys. 12.55; X. *Mem.* 1.2.31), where he functioned as a demagogue (Arist. *Pol.* 1305b26). In the early fourth century he is used as a foil for the populist aristocrats, Andokides and Alkibiades, to imply a moral equivalence between demagogic democracy and oligarchy (And. 1.101; Isok. 16.42–43). His interests coincided with those of Hyperbolos' faction in 416/5: Alkibiades purportedly stole his brother-in-law Teisias' money, team of horses, and the glory of his Olympic victory. See Isok. 16.42–43; *APF* 502–3.

[117] Rosenbloom 283–346 argues that the comic stage branded the industrial elite *doulos*, *xenos*, *agoraios*, *ponêros*, *sykophantês*, *kobalos*, *bômolochos*, *miaros*, and *pharmakos* to block their bid for hegemony.

a form appropriate to, and formulates, their status in the polis. Nikias wins sympathy as a victim of sykophants and schemers, who include Hyperbolos (Eup. fr. 193; Telekleides fr. 44; cf. Ar. fr. 102). Even though the speaker of Telekleides fr. 44 knows why Nikias paid a blackmailer a mna he refuses to divulge the reason: "for the man is a friend, and I think he is just and good" (44.5 φίλος γὰρ ἀνήρ, σωφρονεῖν δέ μοι δοκεῖ). Even on the comic stage Nikias retains a heroic mystique. The *Marikas*' semi-chorus of wealthy citizens expresses outrage at the semi-chorus of poor citizens for trying to ensnare Nikias: "you crazy fools, you would catch an *aristos anêr* in a crime?" (Eup. fr. 193.7–8).[118]

The comedians located Nikias' weaknesses. They mock his feeble presence in the assembly, his religious superstition (Ar. *Eq.* esp. 30–34, 358), and his overly cautious generalship (Ar. *Av.* 639). Phrynichos is harshest, claiming that Nikias falls short of the measure of a "good citizen" (fr. 62 πολίτης ἀγαθός; cf. Th. 6.14). Yet Nikias sets a standard for strategic cleverness that the comic hero surpasses (Ar. *Av.* 363; Phryn. fr. 23). Plutarch remarks that Nikias' fear of the tumult of politics and of litigation—a source of comic mockery—endeared him to the demos and won him its goodwill (*Nik.* 2.6). The comic stage tended to lampoon and to reinforce the very features that made Nikias popular.

Comedians ridicule Phaiax for his rhetorical style: it epitomizes the "chatter" of democratic oratory (λαλία; Ar. *Eq.* 1377–81; Eup. fr. 116). He is a technically impressive speaker, a sort of Sisyphos, who can talk his way out of death; his oratory appeals to educated youths who flock to the perfume-market to analyze it according to sophistic categories and to praise him as *sophos* (Ar. *Eq.* 1375–80). If Dionysios Chalkos refers to this Phaiax (son of Erasistratos), then the power of his speech provides magical inspiration in the communication of a sympotic praise poem: "And Phaiax' cleverness of speech (δεξιότης τε λόγου) sends rowers upon the rowing benches of the Muses" (fr. 4.4–5 West). Praiseworthy in the touchstone of the symposion, Phaiax runs the kind of upper-class household at which a parasite might be served prawns (Eup. fr. 2).

Alkibiades is a special case; he is a figure of insatiable and transgressive sexual and bodily appetite (see above).[119] Nonetheless, the comic stage does not depict him as a lower-class scoundrel who embeds the polis in the agora

[118] To an extent, comedy shares Thucydides' evaluation of Nikias: "his entire way of life was practiced for *aretê*" (7.86.5). See *HCT* 4.461–64; cf. *Ath.Pol.* 28.5; Plut. *Nik.* 1.5.

[119] For Alkibiades in comedy see Carriere 56; Moorton. We do not know how Eupolis mocked him in the *Baptai*, but the tradition that he drowned the comedian for the insult reflects his status (K-A 5.331–33). Contrast *ponêroi*'s legislative and litigious interventions in the theater; see Carriere 41–50; Halliwell.

or lampoon him as a protector of the demos who professes his love for it while stealing from it and corrupting it; Alkibiades does not function as a *pharmakos* whose expulsion rids the city of pollution and restores the prestigious past. On the contrary, Aristophanes opposes Alkibiades to *ponêroi*, teasing his lambdacism to permit him to insult Kleon's associate Theoros as a rapacious flatterer (κόραξ and κόλαξ, *V.* 42–53), allowing "the chattering *euryprôktos* son of Kleinias" to play the role of *synêgoros*, so long as he prosecutes men his own age, while disdaining the *ponêros synêgoros* and Skythian archer Euathlos and his ancestry (*Ach.* 703–18; fr. 424) and the *bômolochos synêgoros* Hyperbolos (*Eq.* 1358). Alkibiades is central to the group of *chrêstoi* the *Frogs* pleads to restore to leadership (686–737); his return is linked, however ambiguously, to the salvation of the city (1418–533). Could the comic stage imagine such a role for Kleon, Kleonymos, Hyperbolos, Androkles, or Kleophon?

Leadership at Athens grows increasingly polarized after the death of Perikles, as members of moneyed households join its ranks, refashioning the verbal expression of political power, and seeking in particular to use democratic institutions to reinforce the demos' control over society and politics. In this respect, the culture (as opposed to economy, politics, and society) of late fifth-century Athens is reactionary, for it refuses to validate their leadership. The predominant modes of defining *chrêstoi*—comic mockery bordering on praise, sympotic celebrity, conspicuous expenditure, elite education and rhetorical craft, military command and use of guest-friendships in diplomacy, the reinvention of the aristocratic life-style—culminate in Alkibiades' Olympic victory. This perfect realization of the *chrêstos* as a democratic leader united those labeled *ponêroi* to realize their self-definition as protectors of the demos from elite conspirators. At the core of those labeled *ponêroi* were *rhêtores* from industrial households in the tribe Oineis: Hyperbolos, Kleophon, Philinos. Androkles from Pitthos in the tribe Kekropis, whose source of wealth is unknown, also formed part of the inner circle, as did landed leaders from less well-known families, Peisandros, a tribesman of Hyperbolos, and Kleonymos. All led from the dikasterion, assembly, and Boule; their associations with the military were a cause for public humiliation. They sought to drive the Olympic victor Alkibiades from the polis as a symbolic tyrant and to cast suspicion upon his entire class as opposed to the democratic order. This ostrakophoria, as perhaps all ostrakophoriai, enacted conflicting ideological positions clearly delineated throughout Athenian society. Its motivating force—that *chrêstoi* operate to subvert the demos while *ponêroi* work to preserve it—appears in the most unlikely place: pseudo-Xenophon's *Constitution of the Athenians.*

PONÊROI VS. *CHRÊSTOI*: FRIENDS AND ENEMIES OF THE DEMOS

Pseudo-Xenophon's *Constitution of the Athenians* probably circulated in the period 424–15.[120] It divides leadership into *chrêstoi* and *ponêroi* in ways that prefigure the factions and aims of this ostrakophoria. The text is certain that the demos can distinguish *ponêroi* and *chrêstoi* leaders but prefers *ponêroi* ([X.] *Ath.* 2.19):

> And so I think that the demos at Athens recognizes who are the *chrêstoi* and who are the *ponêroi* citizens. But recognizing those who are serviceable and advantageous to themselves, they love them, even if they are *ponêroi*, but they rather hate the *chrêstoi*, for they do not think that their excellence (*aretê*) is for their benefit, but rather, for their detriment.

Pseudo-Xenophon's democratic society is an alliance of *ponêroi* that redistributes wealth, power, and social goods from *chrêstoi* to *ponêroi* (*Ath.* 1.1, 4, 8; 3.1) both at home and abroad (3.10–11; cf. 1.14–18). Democratic institutions ensure that the interests of *ponêroi* dominate: a *ponêros* who speaks in the Boule and assembly discovers "what is good for himself and those like himself" (1.6). The demos prefers his "ignorance" (ἀμαθία) and "villainy" (πονηρία) to the "excellence" (ἀρετή) and "wisdom" (σοφία) of *chrêstoi* (ibid.), for *ponêroi* have the demos' best interests at heart (εὔνοια, 1.7). Their leadership enables the demos "to be free and to rule" (1.8). Democratic leadership is not a form of moral direction or hegemony; it the inversion of moral order which represses *chrêstoi* in the name of self-preservation. Hence it is not blameworthy, but neither does it merit the author's praise (1.1; 3.1).

Pseudo-Xenophon declares the alliance between *ponêroi* and the demos necessary for the survival of democracy. Old Comedy, by contrast, treats it as a disease (Ar. *V.* 650–52). Old comic *ponêroi* represent their bond with the demos as reciprocal *eunoia* and *philia*.[121] But the genre unmasks this claim as a rhetorical stance calculated to conceal their private profit motives: *ponêroi*

[120] For the date see Gomme 1962: 38–69 (420–15); Frisch 47–62 (432); de Ste. Croix 307–10 (post 431, perhaps 424); Ostwald 182 n. 23 (431–24); Mattingly 1997: 352–57 (414); Ober 1998: 14 (450–413); Balot 185 n. 24 (420s).

[121] Ar. *Eq.* 732–48, 763–96, 820–21, 848–49, 860–63, 873–74, 946; 1340–57. *Ponêroi* want *philia* between themselves and the demos to be positively reciprocal (*Eq.* 1051–53), but the reciprocity is negative: the *ponêros*' theft and deception wins the demos' sacrificial/legal justice (*Eq.* 1111–50). Aristophanes ridicules the bond between leaders and followers as that between *erastai* and *erômenoi*, in which boys prefer men with money to those with nobility, education, and aristocratic culture (*Eq.* 732–40, 1162–63, 1341–49). See Connor 1992: 99–108; Ober 1989: 316; Rosenbloom 303–5, 312–18.

enslave, corrupt, and impoverish the demos, while also inuring it to suspicion and hatred of *chrêstoi*, casting themselves as "dogs" who "fight for the people."[122] They assert that they are an indispensable defense against "conspirators."[123] In contrast to comedy, which plots to sever the bond between *ponêroi* and demos and to restore the ancestral/moral order of *chrêstoi* to hegemony, pseudo-Xenophon endorses the truth of *ponêroi*'s rhetoric and the authenticity of their roles: without them, the demos will fall into slavery.

Pseudo-Xenophon states as a principle what I argue is the basis for Hyperbolos' action in this ostrakophoria: "in no city is the best element *eunous* toward the demos" (3.10; cf. 1.5). If they gain control of the polis, *chrêstoi* will subvert the demos ([X.] *Ath.* 1.9):

> If it is good order (εὐνομίαν) you seek, first you will see the most intelligent men (δεξιώτατοι) making the laws for them. Then the *chrêstoi* will punish the *ponêroi* and the *chrêstoi* will deliberate about the city and will not allow crazy men to deliberate and to speak and to attend the assembly. From these good things the demos would most quickly fall into slavery.

Pseudo-Xenophon envisions a revolutionary scenario similar to those enacted in 411 and 404 at Athens.[124] In both cases, self-selected *chrêstoi* took over the Boule, killing and excluding *ponêroi* from citizenship and leadership; they made a show of researching laws, called *patrioi nomoi* or *patrios politeia*, and of committing them to writing.[125] Pseudo-Xenophon's *ponêroi* function as

[122] Dogs: Ar. *Eq.* 1015–24; *V.* 914–16, cf. 894–902; *Pax* 313–15. Fighting for the people: Ar. *Eq.* 767, 1038, cf. 1341–42; *V.* 593, 667. The trial in the *Wasps* imagines two types of leaders/dogs, Labes, an *aristos* who guards the flock and the door, steals to feed his men, undergoes the hardships of battle, and deserves pity (= *stratêgos*, 954–69), and the dog of Kydathenaion, an *oikouros*, who demands a share of all public money, a fraction of which he redistributes to the demos; he bites if he is stinted (= sykophant, 970–72).

[123] Paphlagon defines his enemies as "conspirators" (ξυνωμόται, *Eq.* 235–36, 255–57, 452, 461–64, 475–79, 626–29, 860–63), as does the chorus of the *Wasps* (341–45, 482–83; cf. 953). See Ostwald 224.

[124] Cf. Balot 191–93. See Ober 1998: 25 for a different view.

[125] Self-selected *chrêstoi*, designated *kaloi k'agathoi* (X. *HG* 2.3.12, 15, 19, 49, 53); *spoudaioi* (X. *HG* 2.3.19); *beltistoi* (X. *HG* 2.3.22, 25; *Ath.Pol.* 36.1); *epieikeis* (*Ath.Pol.*36.2); "not *ponêroi*" (X. *HG* 2.3.19); "men with *aretê*" (*Ath.Pol.* 36.2); hippeis and hoplites (X. *HG* 2.3.48–49); "those particularly able to provide benefit with their money and persons" (Th. 8.65.3–66.1); "those most capable of performing liturgies with their persons or money" (*Ath.Pol.* 29.5, 30.1; cf. 32.2). Killing and excluding *ponêroi*, sykophants, demagogues (X. *HG* 2.3.12–14, 19, 27, 28 [the mark of death for Theramenes], 38, cf. 51; *Ath.Pol.* 35.3; D.S. 14.4.2; cf. Lys. 18.11; 25.19). Researching and writing ancestral laws (Th. 8.67.1; *Ath.Pol.* 29.1–3, 30–31; X. *HG* 2.3.2, 11; D.S. 14.4.1–2). See Ostwald esp. 367–85, 475–80.

defenders of the demos from *chrêstoi*, whose domination of society entails the imposition of *eunomia*, the end of democracy, and the enslavement of the demos. His text uniquely justifies *ponêroi* as leaders in a democratic society.

As we have seen, those labeled *ponêroi* performed this protective role in times of *stasis*: Androkles was murdered as *prostatês* in 411 (Th. 8.65.2); Kleophon was killed in this role in 404 (Lys. 13.7–12; 30.10–14). Hyperbolos, I suggest, fashioned the role in the *stasis* of 416/5 and was ostracized; later he was murdered in Samos by Charminos and oligarchic conspirators as proof of their loyalty to one another (Th. 8.73.3). Whether Hyperbolos knew pseudo-Xenophon's text is unknowable. Nonetheless, the text justifies and explains his faction's aim, for it states that *chrêstoi* will enslave the demos if they gain control, and it predicts a successful outcome of an ordeal between the two groups: the demos loves *ponêroi* and hates *chrêstoi*.

Pseudo-Andokides' *Against Alkibiades* describes this ostrakophoria in terms of hatred and goodwill toward the demos.[126] The speaker refuses to defend himself against charges of "hating the people" (μισοδημία) and "involvement in civil discord" (στασιωτεία). Such issues, he claims, arose in the four cases in which he was a defendant, and the jurors' vindication of him on those occasions must stand as definitive (8–9). He accuses Alkibiades of speaking "as if he were *eunous* toward the demos" (16), and of alleging that "the others are oligarchs and haters of the demos" (μισοδήμους, ibid.), claiming to be "a guardian of the constitution" (ibid.); but he does not desire democracy (13) and shows that it is worthless (27; cf. 17, 24).

Pseudo-Xenophon's sociological terms have three distinct variables: economic class, social status (including education), and moral worth. The basic terms are *ponêros* and *chrêstos*; they represent the fusion of the three variables.[127] Technically they are status terms, but they imply poverty and wealth, ignorance and knowledge, badness and goodness. If this ostrakophoria divided political leadership along the lines of *chrêstoi* and *ponêroi*, it challenged the power of class to determine status and moral worth, and contested the line of demarcation between economic success and leadership in society. The exile of a *chrêstos* on the grounds of his hostility to the demos, a typical pat-

[126] [And.] 4 is not Andokides', nor is it a genuine product of this ostrakophoria. It is useful for my purposes because it uses themes that are integral to the political culture of Athens in the period 429–404, and because it contrasts and reconciles ostracism and legal justice (see Part II). Most scholars date the speech to after 403/2 and consider it a rhetorical exercise or a pamphlet that expresses a political position through historical fiction. See most recently Heftner 1995 and 2001. For the suggestion that Andokides' *Pros hetairous* circulated during this ostrakophoria see Part II.

[127] For a different view, see Gomme 1962: 49.

tern of ostracism, could provide the conditions for altering the determinants of the labels. *Eunoia* and *philia* toward the demos, rather than source of wealth, leadership role, and culture, would become definitive criteria for the labels. The ostracism of Hyperbolos rather than of Alkibiades, Nikias, or Phaiax proves—if proof is needed—that pseudo-Xenophon's analysis is flawed. He neglects the contradiction between practice and ideology, politics and culture in Athenian society—*ponêroi* led legally but *chrêstoi* legitimately—and minimizes ideology's dual function: creating solidarity both within and across class boundaries. In this regard, pseudo-Xenophon agrees with his contemporaries, who also stress the exclusive solidarity of *ponêroi* and of *chrêstoi* (E. fr. 296 Nauck; X. *Mem.* 2.6.15–20).

This ostrakophoria not only enacts social and cultural ideology as political action, but also seeks to transform that ideology. And the prize for the dominant survivor is the *prostasia tou dêmou.*

PROSTASIA TOU DÊMOU AND THE LEGACY OF PERIKLES

The title *prostatês tou dêmou* summarizes the ambiguities, perils, and promise of late fifth-century democratic leadership.[128] The title describes the role of *ponêroi* in the democracy and marks their constituency as *déclassé*; the figure is comparable to the patron of a metic.[129] The goddess Peace is mortified to learn that Hyperbolos controls the rock of the Pnyx: "the demos enrolled a *ponêros prostatês* for itself" (Ar. *Pax* 683–84).[130] A *prostatês* uses the dikasterion as a tool of class warfare, exploiting the envy of the poor for the rich: the poor are "cheated by the tongues of vile leaders (πονηρῶν προστατῶν)" (E. *Supp.* 243; cf. 423–25).[131] A *prostatês* represents the demos' power as supreme and establishes himself as its protector; democracy depends upon his leadership for its survival (cf. Ar. *V.* 417–19).

Does "demos" in the title *prostatês tou dêmou* refer to the entire citizen body or to its poorest element?[132] W. R. Connor suggests that *prostatai tou dêmou* tried "to represent themselves as protectors of the whole city or of the

[128] Reverdin 203–8; Connor 1992: 110–15; Ober 1989: 316 n. 38; Rosenbloom 292–93.

[129] Ar. *Ra.* 569–70; Isok. 8.53; cf. Arist. *Rh.* 1408b24–26.

[130] πονηρὸς προστάτης is a rare phrase: E. *Supp.* 243; Ar. *Ek.* 176–77, *Pl.* 920; [And.] 4.12; *Hypothesis 2 ad Aves* 3–4; cf. Isok. 12.133; 8.53–55. Its emergence in the period 424–21 suggests that it was coined to describe Hyperbolos as leader.

[131] For the date of the *Suppliants* see de Ste. Croix 356–57 n. 1 (421); Zuntz 88–94 (424); Collard 8–14 (close to 424). For the *prostatês* as a prosecutor see Rosenbloom 292–300.

[132] See Hansen 1978; Ober 1996: 117–20; 1998: 16–20, 71–72, 331–32.

demos."[133] O. Reverdin interprets "demos" in this connection as the urban poor.[134] Each reading is partially valid. A *prostatês tou dêmou* is a factional leader, the representative of the demos' interests against its enemies in a period of *stasis*.[135] Hyperbolos moved the ostrakophoria in this role.

As Connor has seen, the title also promises leadership across classes and factions, which Hyperbolos could claim if he emerged as the dominant survivor of this ostrakophoria.[136] The actual dominant survivor, Alkibiades, claims a version of this title, substituting *plêthos* and *xympan* for *dêmos* to avoid the hint of factional leadership (Th. 6.89.4 ξυμπαρέμεινεν ἡ προστασία ἡμῖν τοῦ πλήθους, 6.89.6 ἡμεῖς δὲ τοῦ ξύμπαντος προέστημεν; cf. 6.28.2). Ideologically, ostracism was a check on the power of a high-status individual; in practice, however, it was also a way of consolidating power: the demos expelled a prominent individual and enacted its own self-definition by vesting the power to lead in the dominant survivor. Ostracism fits Victor Turner's model of "social drama": it features the breach of a norm (*paranomia*), crisis and dissolution into factions (assembly in the agora, breakdown into tribes; etching names on sherds); redressive process (exile of individual); and reintegration (rallying around the dominant survivor) or recognition of permanent schism.[137]

The power of a *prostatês* consists in representation.[138] As a "champion" who stands before a group as its defender (A. *Th.* 798), as the "patron" of a metic (A. *Supp.* 963; D. 25.58, 30.30), as a voluntary prosecutor of a *graphê* (Ar. *V.* 417–19; *Pl.* 907–20), or as a leader of a faction, a *prostatês* represents others in his person. To harm him is to damage what he represents. In the *Knights* Paphlagon treats the plot against him as plot against the demos (235–39; 255–57, 626–31; cf. 730–31). Kleon's *eisangelia* of Aristophanes for *hybris* against

[133] Connor 1992: 112–13; cf. Ober 1989: 316–17.

[134] Reverdin 207–8.

[135] A *prostatês* is a factional leader, whether in terms of geography (Hdt. 1.59.3), ethnos (1.127.1), or class (3.82.4). The term describes leaders of democratic factions: Th. 3.75.2, 82.3; 4.46.4, 66.3; 8.65.2, 81.1, 89.4; Lys. 13.7; X. *HG* 3.2.27; 5.2.4, 6; 7.4.33; Aischin. 2.176; *Ath.Pol.* 36.1, 38.3. But other factions have *prostatai*: Th. 8.90.1; X. *HG* 2.3.51; 3.3.6; Isok. 12.148; D.S. 13.34.2; 14.4.5.

[136] The vocabulary applies to non-factional leadership: E. *Herakl.* 206, 964; Th. 2.65.11; 6.28.2, 89.4, 6; X. *HG* 3.2.27–29; D. 19.295–97. Xenophon terms such leadership προστατεία τῆς πόλεως (*Mem.* 1.1.8, 2.32, 40; 2.8.4–5; 3.4.6–7, 6.1–2, 10).

[137] Turner 1974: esp. 33–50; 1982: esp. 72–73, 103–4.

[138] Wolin 1996: esp. 67–87 warns that dramaturgical models for political action require an elite actor and distort the nature of the demos as a collective agent. The *prostatês tou dêmou* arises at a time when the elite status of the agent is contested.

the demos assumes this synecdoche.[139] As we have seen, oligarchs subvert the demos by murdering its *prostatai*.

The *prostatês* embodies and performs the communal identity, personifying the "imagined community."[140] This trope assumes many forms. Its simplest expression is the opening of the *Poroi*: "I am always of this opinion: whatever kinds of men the *prostatai* are, of such kinds too are political communities" (X. *Vect.* 1.1). Demosthenes offers a more complex model: "The one who does anything on behalf of the polis must imitate the character of the polis ... whatever kinds of people you appear to welcome and preserve, you will seem to be like these" (22.64).[141] Leaders mirror the character of the polis and the identity of the demos.

Several individuals may be *prostatai*, but simplification of the relationship between leaders and followers is an ideological imperative. Aeschylus, Sophokles, and Euripides represent democracy as a relationship between the demos and a single leader.[142] Aristophanes' Demos describes the practice as sacrificial ritual: "I want to rear one *prostatês* who steals; and when he is glutted, I lift him up and I strike the blow" (*Eq.* 1127–30). Aristophanic demagogues wield total power in Athens (*Eq.* 159, 164–67, 178, 180, 720), trafficking in the islands and territory from Karia to Carthage (*Eq.* 168–74; cf. 303–13, 837–40). They succeed one another as if they were kings (*Eq.* 125–45). A single leader "controls the affairs of the city" (*Eq.* 130), or "the rock of the Pnyx" (*Pax* 679–81), or "the reins of the Pnyx" (*Eq.* 1107–9). Demos "entrusts" himself and his treasure (*Eq.* 941–59) to an *epitropos* (1098–99, 1259; cf. Th. 2.65.4).[143] Herodotos' Dareios claims that "whoever represents/protects the

[139] *Ach.* 377–82, 502–3, 630–31; cf. *V.* 1284–91. See D. 21.7; cf. 126–27, 134, 219–20.

[140] For "imagined communities" see Anderson esp. 15–16; Ober 1996: 117–20. In the late fifth century there is tension within the demos as an imagined community: on the one hand, it is made up of an "urban peasantry" or "poor" dependent upon *ponêroi prostatai* for wages and food, oppressing *chrêstoi* and the rich in the courts; on the other, it is a self-sufficient community of farmers that preserves the *patrioi nomoi* and allies with *chrêstoi*. The difference between Aristophanes' Demos before (old, urban, juror, poor, ugly, *erômenos* of its leaders, acting for private interest, client of Kleon and Hyperbolos) and after restoration (youthful, rural, soldier/farmer, aristocratic, handsome, *erastês*, messmate of Aristeides and Miltiades) recapitulates the division. The tension culminates in the fictions of the 5,000 and the 3,000 that destroy the demos as an imagined community.

[141] See D. 20.13,15; cf. Isok. 2.31, 8.53. For the alternative see D. 13.36.

[142] A. *Supp.*; S. *OK*; E. *Herakl.*; *Supp.* Aeschylus' Danaids may betray barbarian ideas about political leadership when they tell Pelasgos, "You are the city, you are the public" (A. *Supp.* 370), but their literal understanding of Pelasgos converges with the symbolic function of a *prostatês*. Cf. Connor 1992: 110–15. See Mills 103 for a different view.

[143] For ἐπίτροπος and its forms as terms for democratic leadership see Ar. *Eq.* 211–12, 425–26; *Pax* 685–87 (Hyperbolos); cf. *Ek.* 179, 212, 455; fr. 305.

demos (ἂν προστάς τις τοῦ δήμου) ... seems to be a monarch because of the awe in which he is held after he defeats the demos' enemies (3.82.4). Such *thauma* constitutes the stakes for which Hyperbolos risked his residency in Attika.

A single *prostatês* is the dominant figure for the democratic leader in fifth-century Athens, whatever the reality of democratic leadership. Ostracism is an institutional expression of this mentality and a means of realizing the two-fold function of a *prostatês*: protection of the demos as a faction and leadership of the demos across class and faction. Thucydides' description of Periklean democracy as a "democracy in name, but in reality rule by the first man" (Th. 2.65.9; cf. 1.139.4) conforms to this pattern. Thucydides views this model of leadership as continuing after Perikles' death, and claims that each of his successors "yearn[ed] to be the first man" (2.65.10; cf. 2.65.11; 6.28.2; 8.89.3). Their inability to achieve their desire is the result of their relative equality (ibid.). Thucydides' analysis of post-Periklean leadership explains this ostrakophoria: it expressed the yearning "to be the first man" and to consolidate a power-base of the magnitude of Perikles'. In effect, it sought to determine Perikles' political heir. A. W. Gomme notes that Perikles' legacy "fell into the hands of Kleon and Alkibiades."[144] This ostrakophoria sought to determine which branch, *ponêroi* or *chrêstoi*, would claim that legacy.

SYMBOLIC LEGITIMATION OF *PONÊROI*

Hyperbolos did not prosecute Alkibiades, even though his frequent use of litigation was a proverbial black-mark on democracy; "beyond Hyperbolos" meant the *ne plus ultra* of litigiousness.[145] Ostracism alone could give Hyperbolos and his faction the symbolic legitimation to exercise leadership across class and faction. An aura of venerability surrounded the institution, making it a vehicle for cultural validation.[146] The practice had been dormant for a generation; Thucydides son of Melesias was its last victim (Plut. *Per.*

[144] Gomme 1962: 101–11.

[145] Apostol. 17.68 von Leutsch. See Ar. *Ach.* 845–47 with Σ846; *Eq.* 1355–65; *Nu.* 874–76; Eup. frr. 193–94; Plut. *Alk.* 13.6; Souda υ 245. For the *synêgoros* see Rubinstein esp. 121–223. Alkibiades was difficult to take to court because of his money, friends, prestige, and potential for reprisal ([And.] 4.15, 20–21, 30, 35–37).

[146] Most scholars consider ostracism obsolete by 417–15: Hignett 267; Connor and Keaney 313; Connor 1992: 136; Rosivach 163 with n. 6; Harding 155–56. Rhodes 1994: 92 cites Ar. *Eq.* 855 as proof that ostracism is a serious possibility in 424; Carcopino 242 n. 2; Hatzfeld 108 make similar inferences from the passage. It is fair to say that it was in the process of becoming obsolete.

16.3).[147] Perikles' dominance in the period 443–29 explains its abeyance, as does his successor's use of the dikasteria as a power-base.[148] Litigation was a contested form of leadership in fifth-century Athens; it did not offer the symbolic capital required for leadership across class and faction. Ostracism remained the sole test of this form of leadership.

Nikias, Phaiax, and Alkibiades supplemented traditional entitlements to lead with eloquence, sophistic education, and shrewd publicity, such as the appearance of distance from personal friendships and of total absorption in the duties of the city.[149] Their leadership accorded with the *patrios dêmokratia* as the comic stage imagined it and as Aristotle theorized it: "the best of the citizens are in the front rank (ἐν προεδρίᾳ)" (*Pol.* 1292a9; cf. Ar. *Ra.* 718–37; Eup. fr. 384).[150] Nearly a decade before this ostrakophoria Aristophanes restored Demos to his ideal state as a messmate of Miltiades and Aristeides (*Eq.* 1325) and returned him to his "old" form as an inhabitant of Athens in the aftermath of the Persian Wars, ridding the polis of Kleon and humiliating Hyperbolos.[151] The demos of Marathon and Salamis defined the imagined community in comedy. An ostrakophoria could recreate this community and associate Hyperbolos and his faction with the leadership of it.

The Athenians considered ostracism an original institution of the democracy.[152] It could be a means of restoring the *illud tempus*, the time of presti-

[147] Krentz 499–504 argues that Thucydides was not ostracized until 437/6: he was general in 440/39 (Th. 1.117.2). The expense and brutality of the war with Samos were the issues prompting his ostracism. Mattingly 1991: 18 accepts this, but prefers 438 as the date. Brenne 2002: 93–94 uses Kerameikos O 74 to suggest a date after 440. Phillips 1991 defends the traditional date (443/2). A critical unknown is the date of Damon's ostracism, if he was ostracized. Carcopino 125–42 rejects the ostracism; Mattingly 1991: 22 considers it "not proved"; Wallace 139–42 argues for a date in the mid-440s.

[148] See Pritchett 2.4–33; Ostwald 211–13; Hamel 122–47; Rosenbloom 292–300.

[149] Nikias posed as a man devoted to *ta dêmosia* and *ta koina* to the exclusion of private pleasures and pursuits, and may have used Hieron as a sort of spin-doctor (Plut. *Nik.* 4–5). For Phaiax' oratory see above; for Alkibiades' see Ar. *Ach.* 716; fr. 205.5–6; Plut. *Alk.* 10.4.

[150] For the ideological basis of the *patrios dêmokratia* see Rosenbloom 316–18.

[151] Cf. Isok. 8.75, which restates the end of the *Knights*.

[152] *Ath.Pol.* 22 makes ostracism part of Kleisthenes' reforms in 508/7, but claims it was devised specifically to remove Hipparchos son of Charmos, who was not ostracized until 488/7, and cannot precisely define its original function. The best explanation of this is the necessary fiction that democracy and ostracism share a common origin. Scholars save this fiction, inventing explanations for its institution in 508/7 but first use in 488/7: Carcopino 15–36; Kagan 1961; Knight 21–23; Stanton; Thomsen 109–42; Forsdyke 253–57; cf. Keaney 1970; 1993: 262–66. A minority considers ostracism instituted in 488/7:

gious origins whose return heals and purifies the present.[153] Like the end of the *Knights*, an ostrakophoria would literally renew the time of the fathers and establish a definitive leader according to ancestral practice. It would evoke the heroic leaders of the democracy, Themistokles and Perikles, who survived ostracism to increase the power of the people and of the city. Survival of the ordeal would allow Hyperbolos and his faction to represent themselves as the successors of Perikles, who was the last man to emerge as the dominant survivor of an ostrakophoria. Aristophanes ridicules Kleon for comparing himself to Themistokles and Perikles (*Eq.* 810–19; cf. 1036–43).[154] Eupolis chastises contemporary leaders for failing to measure up to Miltiades (fr. 106; cf. fr. 233), and Leukon invokes Megakles to witness Hyperbolos' theft (fr. 1).[155] The entire polis yearns for leaders of previous generations (Eup. fr. 118 ἅπασα γὰρ ποθοῦμεν ἡ κλεινὴ πόλις). *Rhêtores* depicted themselves in terms of these figures and an ostrakophoria would evoke them.[156]

Moreover, Hyperbolos and his faction could win whatever the outcome. Hyperbolos would either emerge as the dominant survivor or his ostracism would confirm his elite status. The definition of an *ostracisé* as a superlative citizen is an ideological formula that the graffiti on ostraka undermine. Nevertheless, it accurately represents ostracism as a transaction between the demos and a single citizen that confirms his elite status in exchange for a decade-long exile.[157] By the time of this ostrakophoria the belief was firm: "almost all men of the highest nobility and education (οἱ χαριέστατοι) were ostracized" (ΣAr. *Eq.* 855b).[158] Praise traditions form around *ostracisés*, partly as criticism of the demos, partly as compensation.[159]

Raubitschek 1991: 65–72; Hignett 159–66; Schreiner. Keaney and Raubitschek 79–80 accept the late Byzantine account that makes ostracism an ancient practice of the Boule taken over by the demos after Kleisthenes' reforms; see Hall 91–100; Forsdyke 253 n. 84. Rhodes 1981: 268; Lang 3 offer skeptical appraisals of the evidence.

[153] For the *illud tempus* see Eliade esp. 84–85.

[154] For *Eq.* 810–19 see Marr.

[155] For Eup. fr. 233 see Storey 1994: 112.

[156] Com. Ades. fr. 1177–78 Kock Ὑπερθεμιστοκλῆς, Ὑπερπερικλῆς may mock Hyperbolos for rivaling Themistokles and Perikles. Cf. ΣAr. *Eq.* 1304a for this kind of wordplay.

[157] Kerameikos O 8500, destined for Themistokles [τ]ιμ|ες *h*ένε|κα; Brenne 2002: 130–31, 160. Knox 152–56 argues that ostracism had "dishonorable connotations." In certain contexts this is true (e.g., Lys. 14.39–40 and graffiti on ostraka), but it was a form of dishonor that had this consolation: it was only available to high-status individuals.

[158] Cf. Pl.Com. fr. 203 and Part II.

[159] Pi. *P.* 7 (Megakles); Hdt. 8.79.1 (Aristeides); Kratin. fr. 1.2–4 (Kimon); cf. Ar. *Ach.* 676–718 (Thucydides); *Eq.* 819 (Themistokles).

In order to win validation as *prostatês* of the entire demos, Hyperbolos needed to be an avowed target for ostracism and to survive it, for in the fifth-century polis an ostrakophoria is the only referendum conducted by the entire demos, attracting the rural population to the city (Plut. *Arist.* 7.2; cf. 7.7). The interval of two prytanies between the vote for an ostrakophoria and its performance enables "as many as possible to vote, including those from the furthest demes."[160] The degree of regular attendance in the assembly among the rural population of fifth-century Athens is unknown, but the predominance of participants from the city and suburbs is likely.[161] That farmers constitute a minority on the Pnyx is axiomatic in the *Ekklesiazousai*: Chremes believes that the white-faced majority, which supports the motion to hand the city over to women, is a "shoe-making crowd"; it outnumbers and outvotes the farmers who reject it (431–34, cf. 383–86, i.e., the *agoraios dêmos* are women). Mogens Hansen argues that 6,000 citizens normally attended the assembly in the fourth century—when there was greater urbanization and payment for attendance (*Ath.Pol.* 41.3). He admits that fewer citizens attended in the fifth century and that they constituted a smaller percentage of the citizen body.[162] The Pnyx could accommodate 6,000 citizens in the fifth century.[163] An ostrakophoria summoned a larger turnout than the Pnyx could hold and for this reason was held in the agora; it assembled the entire demos. A leader seeking its support had to survive its collective wrath.

CONCLUSION TO PART I

In the aftermath of Alkibiades' Olympic victory, Hyperbolos emerged to defend the demos as *prostatês tou dêmou*. Alkibiades' ancestry, wealth, conspicuous expenditure, sexual and appetitive rapacity, hippotrophy, and *paranomia* made him an ideal candidate for ostracism. The mystique of his Olympic victory carried the danger that he would demand tyranny as compensation.

[160] Hands 72.

[161] Arist. *Pol.* 1318b7–38; Finley 1985: 52; Osborne 1985: 69 sees a "local bias" operating against elite participation outside a 15-mile radius, and more restrictively among ordinary citizens. See Carter 81–82; cf. Hanson 212–13. The evidence used to argue for a balance between rural and urban assembly attendance (Ar. *Ek.* 816–22; X. *Mem.* 3.7.6; Thphr. *Char.* 4.3) proves only that rural citizens attended—which no one contests. Hansen 1987: 8–12; 1991: 126–27; cf. Ober 1989: 136–37 consider geographical restrictions less relevant to the make-up of the assembly, but concede urban bias.

[162] Hansen 1976.

[163] Hansen 1976: 130–34. I agree with *HCT* 5.183–84 that the figure 5,000 at Th. 8.72.1 is roughly correct; Hansen 1976: 123 rejects it as tendentious, but agrees that fewer than 6,000 attended the assembly in the fifth century (124, 133).

Ostracism could prevent Alkibiades from unrivaled political leadership. An ostrakophoria would challenge the class whose *aretê* he exemplifed, termed *chrêstoi*, to an ordeal. Self-defined by a reinterpretation of the aristocratic style in politics, *chrêstoi* enjoy the symbolic validation of the city's culture. They have the symbolic capital and moral worth required for hegemony. An ostrakophoria would make their status and culture targets of envy and suspicion as inimical to the demos. The idea is in the air. Around this time, pseudo-Xenophon envisions *chrêstoi* punishing *ponêroi* and enslaving the demos if they attain control; he contends that an alliance among *ponêroi* is essential to the survival of democratic society. Factions form: *chrêstoi* ally with Alkibiades to defend their culture; *ponêroi*, apparently clustered in the tribe Oeneis, join Hyperbolos to discredit *chrêstoi* and to win symbolic validation for their leadership. At stake is the title *prostatês tou dêmou* and with it, a definitive claim to Perikles' legacy. Hyperbolos could view an ostrakophoria as a win-win proposition. The practice was linked to the prestigious origins of democracy and the *illud tempus* of the Persian Wars; Hyperbolos could orchestrate the return of this prestigious time and emerge as a leader tested by ancestral ordeal. Ridiculed as a patron of the poor, a sykophant, lamp-seller, barbarian, slave, and *ponêros*, the first member of his family to hold a position of leadership, and one of the first generation of industrial slave-holders to seek hegemony in Athenian society, Hyperbolos had so far been unable to build a power base that included all classes or to win cultural validation. Avoidance of ostracism would provide the symbolic legitimacy for leadership of the kind Themistokles, Kimon, and Perikles exercised. Even if he failed, his name would be in the company of Xanthippos, Aristeides, Themistokles, and Kimon. Ostracism is a bad thing; but it only happens to the best men.

Hyperbolos did not win the label *chrêstos* as an *ostracisé*; on the contrary, he was ostracized "because of his *ponêria*" (Th. 8.73.3) and ridiculed for debasing the institution (Pl.Com. fr. 203). Part II analyzes the failure of his enterprise. Nor does Hyperbolos' ostracism resolve *stasis* between *chrêstoi* and *ponêroi*. It persists through the affairs of the mutilations of the Herms and the profanations of the Mysteries, the oligarchic takeovers of 411 and 404, and the restoration of democracy in 403. The comic stage subjects *ponêroi* to symbolic violence and the demos ostracizes Hyperbolos as a *ponêros*; but the Thirty's realization of this symbolic pattern as mass murder establishes an unsurpassable upper limit for *ponêria*. The labels *chrêstos* and *ponêros* are nonnegotiable and class-based throughout the fifth century. They become negotiable and generally applicable in the aftermath of the Thirty's *ponêria*. The legal definition of the *ponêros* and the institutionalization of violence toward *ponêroi* in the democratic law court (as opposed to its realizations on the comic

stage and in the oligarchic takeovers), the cultural acceptance of the agora as hegemonic, and the transformation of theater, gradually make it possible for members of moneyed oikoi and *rhêtores* to claim the label *chrêstos* and to share in hegemony. If my reading of this ostrakophoria and its aftermath is correct, Hyperbolos and his faction lost this battle, but their class won the war.

WORKS CITED

Allen, D. S. 2000. *The World of Prometheus: The Politics of Punishing in Democratic Athens*. Princeton.

Amyx, D. A. 1958. "The Attic Stelai, Part III. Vases and Other Containers." *Hesperia* 27: 163–254.

Anderson, B. 1991 (original edition 1983). *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. Rev. ed. London.

Arthurs, J. 1993. "The Term Rhetor in Fifth- and Fourth-Century B.C.E. Texts." *RSQ* 23: 1–10.

Austin, C., ed. 1968. *Nova fragmenta euripidea in papyris reperta*. Berlin.

Baldwin, B. 1971. "Notes on Hyperbolus." *Acta classica* 14: 151–56.

———. 1974. "Notes on Kleophon." *Acta classica* 17: 35–47.

Balot, R. K. 2001. *Greed and Injustice in Classical Athens*. Princeton.

Beta, S. 1994. "Pisandro et la tortura: Il verbo διαστρέφειν in Eupolis fr. 99 K.-A." *ZPE* 101: 25–26.

Bianchetti, S. 1979. "L'ostracismo di Iperbolo e la secunda redazione delle *Nuvole* di Aristophane." *SIFC* 51: 221–48.

Bicknell, P. J. 1986. "Agasias the Donkey." *ZPE* 62: 183–84.

Blass, F., ed. 1906 (original edition 1871). *Andocidis orationes*. Leipzig.

Bloch, M., and J. Parry. 1989. "Money and the Morality of Exchange." In J. Parry and M. Bloch, eds., *Money and the Morality of Exchange*. Cambridge. 1–32.

Bocock, R. 1986. *Hegemony*. London.

Boegehold, A., and A. Scafuro, eds. 1994. *Athenian Identity and Civic Ideology*. Baltimore.

Bohannan, P., and G. Dalton. 1965. *Markets in Africa*. Garden City.

Bonner, R. J., and G. Smith. 1930. *The Administration of Justice from Homer to Aristotle. Vol. 1*. Chicago.

Bourdieu, P. 1990 (French original 1980). *The Logic of Practice*. Trans. R. Nice. Stanford.

———. 1991 (French original 1982). *Language and Symbolic Power*. Trans. G. Raymond and M. Adamson. Cambridge, Mass.

———. 1991a (French original 1984). "Social Space and the Genesis of 'Classes'." In J. B. Thompson, ed., *Language and Symbolic Power*. Trans. G. Raymond and M. Adamson. Cambridge, Mass. 229–51.

Brenne, S. 1992. "'Portraits' auf Ostraka." *AM* 107: 161–85.

———. 1994. "Ostraka and the Process of Ostrakophoria." In W. D. E. Coulson, O. Palagia, et al., eds., *The Archaeology of Athens and Attica under the Democracy*. Oxbow Monograph 37. Oxford. 13–24.

———. 2001. *Ostrakismos und Prominenz in Athen: Attische Bürger des 5. Jhs. v. Chr. auf den Ostraka*. Tyche Supplementband 3. Wien.

———. 2002. "Die Ostraka (487–ca. 416 v. Chr.) als Testimonien (T1)." In Siewert 2002. 36–166.
———. 2002a. "T 16: Thukydides 8, 73, 3." In Siewert 2002. 258–70.
Brun, P. 1987. "Hyperbolos, la creation d'une 'legende noire'." *DHA* 13: 183–97.
Camon, F. 1963. "L'ostracismo di Iperbolo." *Giornale italiano di filologia* 16: 142–62.
Carcopino, J. 1935 (original edition 1908). *L'ostracisme athénien*. 2nd ed. Paris.
Carrière, J. C. 1979. *Le carnaval et la politique: Une introduction à la comédie grecque*. Annales Litteraires de l'Université de Besançon, vol. 212. Paris.
Carter, L. B. 1986. *The Quiet Athenian*. Oxford.
Cartledge, P., P. Millett, and S. Todd, eds. 1990. *Nomos: Essays in Athenian Law, Politics and Society*. Cambridge.
Cartledge, P., P. Millett, and S. von Reden, eds. 1998. *Kosmos: Essays in Order, Conflict, and Community in Classical Athens*. Cambridge.
Christ, M. R. 1998. *The Litigious Athenian*. Baltimore.
Cohen, D. 1990. "The Social Context of Adultery at Athens." In Cartledge/Millett/Todd. 147–65.
Collard, C. 1975. *Euripides*. Suppliants. 2 vols. Groningen.
Connor, W. R. 1968. *Theopompus and Fifth-Century Athens*. Washington, D. C.
———. 1992 (original publication 1971). *The New Politicians of Fifth-Century Athens*. Indianapolis.
———, and J. J. Keaney. 1969. "Theophrastus on the End of Ostracism." *AJP* 90: 313–19.
Davidson, J. 1997. *Courtesans and Fishcakes: The Consuming Passions of Classical Athens*. London.
Davies, J. K. 1971. *Athenian Propertied Families*. Oxford.
———. 1981. *Wealth and the Power of Wealth in Classical Athens*. New York.
Decleva Caizzi, F., ed. 1966. *Antisthenis fragmenta*. Milan.
Diels, H. 1956–59. *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*. 8th ed. by W. Kranz. 3 vols. Berlin.
Dilts, M., ed. 1992. *Scholia in Aeschinem*. Stuttgart.
Dobrov, G., ed. 1997. *The City As Comedy*. Chapel Hill.
Donlan, W. 1973. "The Origins of καλὸς κἀγαθός." *AJP* 94: 365–74.
———. 1978. "Social Vocabulary and Its Relationship to Political Propaganda in Fifth-Century Athens." *QUCC* 27: 95–111.
———. 1980. *The Aristocratic Ideal in Ancient Greece*. Lawrence.
Dover, K. J. 1974. *Greek Popular Morality in the Time of Plato and Aristotle*. Oxford.
———. 1989 (original publication 1978). *Greek Homosexuality*. Updated with a new postscript. New York.
Eagleton, T. 1991. *Ideology: An Introduction*. London.
Edwards, A. T. 1993. "Historicizing the Popular Grotesque: Bakhtin's *Rabelais* and Attic Old Comedy." In R. Scodel, ed., *Theater and Society in the Classical World*. Ann Arbor. 89–117.
Ehrenberg, V. 1951 (original edition 1943). *The People of Aristophanes*. 2nd ed. Oxford.
Eliade, M. 1954. *The Myth of the Eternal Return*. Princeton.
Ellis, W. 1989. *Alcibiades*. London.
de Falco, V., ed. 1954 (original edition 1932). *Demade oratore: Testimonianze e frammenti*. Naples.

Finley, M. I. 1973. *The Ancient Economy*. Sather Classical Lectures, vol. 43. Berkeley.
———. 1985 (original publication 1962). "Athenian Demagogues." In *Democracy, Ancient and Modern*. Rev. ed. New Brunswick.
Fisher, N. 1998. "Gymnasia and the Democratic Values of Leisure." In Cartledge/Millett/von Reden. 84–104.
Forbes, C. A. 1949. "Ostrakinda." *RE* 18.2 col. 1673.
Fornara, C. W. 1971. *The Athenian Board of Generals from 501 to 404*. Hermes Einzelschriften Heft 16. Wiesbaden.
Forsdyke, S. 2000. "Exile, Ostracism and the Athenian Democracy." *CA* 19: 232–63.
Frisch, H., ed., trans. 1942. *The Constitution of the Athenians*. Classica et mediaevalia Dissertationes II. Copenhagen.
Fuqua, C. 1965. "Possible Implications of the Ostracism of Hyperbolus." *TAPA* 96: 165–79.
Furley, W. D. 1989. "Andokides IV *Against Alcibiades*: Fact or Fiction?" *Hermes* 117: 138–56.
———. 1996. *Andokides and the Herms: A Study in Fifth-Century Athenian Religion*. BICS Supplement 65. London.
Gernet, L., and M. Bizos, eds. 1955–59. *Lysias discours*. 2 vols. Paris.
Golden, M. 1998. *Sport and Society in Ancient Greece*. Cambridge.
Gomme, A. W. 1940. "The Old Oligarch." In Gomme 1962. 38–69. Originally published in *Athenian Studies Presented to W. S. Ferguson*. HSCP Supplement 1: 211–45.
———. 1945–81. *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides*. 5 vols. (vols. 4–5 by A. W. Gomme, A. Andrewes, and K. J. Dover). Oxford.
———. 1951. "Four Passages in Thucydides." In Gomme 1962. 92–111. Originally published in *JHS* 71: 70–80.
———. 1962. *More Essays in Greek History and Literature*. Oxford.
Gouldner, A. W. 1965. *Enter Plato: Classical Greece and the Origins of Social Theory*. London.
Gramsci, A. 1971. *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci*. Trans. Q. Hoare and G. Nowell Smith. New York.
Greene, W. C., ed. 1981 (original publication 1938). *Scholia platonica*. Chico, Calif.
Gribble, D. 1999. *Alcibiades and Athens*. Oxford.
Grote, G. 1869 (original edition 1846–56). *A History of Greece*. 12 vols. New ed. London.
Hall, L. G. H. 1989. "Remarks on the Law of Ostracism." *Tyche* 4: 91–100.
Halliwell, S. 1991. "Comic Satire and Freedom of Speech in Classical Athens." *JHS* 111: 48–70.
Hamel, D. 1998. *Athenian Generals: Military Authority in the Classical Period*. Leiden.
Hands, A. R. 1959. "Ostraka and the Law on Ostracism: Some Possibilities and Assumptions." *JHS* 79: 69–79.
Hansen, M. H. 1974. *The Sovereignty of the People's Court in Athens in the Fourth Century B.C. and the Public Action against Unconstitutional Proposals*. Odense University Classical Studies, vol. 4. Trans. J. Raphaelsen and S. Holbøll. Odense.
———. 1976. "How Many Athenians Attended the *Ecclesia*?" *GRBS* 17: 115–34.
———. 1978. "*Demos*, *Ecclesia*, and *Dicasterion* in Classical Athens." *GRBS* 19: 127–46.
———. 1983. "The Athenian 'Politicians', 403–322 B.C." *GRBS* 24: 33–55.

———. 1987. *The Athenian Assembly in the Age of Demosthenes*. Oxford.
———. 1991. *The Athenian Democracy in the Age of Demosthenes: Structure, Principles and Ideology*. Cambridge, Mass.
Hanson, V. D. 1995. *The Other Greeks: The Family Farm and the Agrarian Roots of Western Civilization*. New York.
Harding, P. 1994. *Androtion and the Atthis*. Oxford.
Harvey, D. 1990. "The Sykophant and Sykophancy: Vexatious Redefinition?" In Cartledge/Millett/Todd. 103–21.
Harvey, D., and J. Wilkins, eds. 2000. *The Rivals of Aristophanes: Studies in Athenian Old Comedy*. London.
Hatzfeld, J. 1951 (original edition 1940). *Alcibiade: Étude sur l'histoire d'Athènes à la fin du Ve siècle*. 2nd ed. Paris.
Heftner, H. 1995. "Ps.-Andokides' Rede gegen Alkibiades [And.] 4 und die politische Diskussion nach dem Sturz der 'Dreisig' in Athen." *Klio* 77: 75–104.
———. 2000. "Der Ostrakismos des Hyperbolos: Plutarch, Pseudo-Andokides und die Ostraka." *RhM* 143: 32–59.
———. 2000a. "Zur Datierung der Ostrakisierung des Hyperbolos." *RSA* 30: 27–35.
———. 2001. "Die pseudo-andokideische Rede "Gegen Alkibiades"([And.] 4): Ein authentischer Beitrag zu einer Ostrakophoriedebatte des Jahres 415 v. Chr.?" *Philologus* 145: 39–56.
Henderson, J. 1990. "The Demos and Comic Competition." In Winkler and Zeitlin. 271–314.
———. 1991 (original edition 1975). *The Maculate Muse: Obscene Language in Attic Comedy*. 2nd ed. New York.
Herman, G. 1987. *Ritualised Friendship and the Greek City*. Cambridge.
Hignett, C. A. 1952. *A History of the Athenian Constitution to the End of the Fifth Century* B.C. Oxford.
Holwerda, D., ed. 1982–. *Scholia in Aristophanem*. Groningen.
Hunter, V. 1994. *Policing Athens: Social Control in the Attic Lawsuits, 420–320* B.C. Princeton.
Jacoby, F. 1923–. *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*. Berlin.
Jaekel, S. 1964., ed. *Menandri sententiae*. Leipzig.
Kagan, D. 1961. "The Origin and Purpose of Ostracism." *Hesperia* 30: 393–401.
———. 1981. *The Peace of Nicias and the Sicilian Expedition*. Ithaca.
Kallet, L. 1998. "Accounting for Culture in Fifth-Century Athens." In D. Boedeker and K. Raaflaub, eds., *Democracy, Empire, and the Arts in Fifth-Century Athens*. Cambridge, Mass. 43–58.
Kannicht, R., and B. Snell, eds. 1981. *Tragicorum graecorum fragmenta. Vol. 2: Fragmenta adespota*. Göttingen.
Kassel, R., and C. Austin, eds. 1983–. *Poetae comici graeci*. Berlin.
Keaney, J. J. 1970. "The Text of Androtion F6 and the Origin of Ostracism." *Historia* 19: 1–11.
———. 1993. "Theophrastos on Ostracism and the Character of his NOMOI." In M. Piérart, ed., *Aristote et Athènes*. Fribourg. 262–77.
———, and A. Raubitschek. 1972. "A Late Byzantine Account of Ostracism." In Raubitschek 1991. 77–80. Originally published in *AJP* 93: 87–91.

Kirchner, J. 1901–3. *Prosopographia attica*. 2 vols. Berlin.
Knight, D. W. 1970. *Some Studies in Athenian Politics in the Fifth Century* B.C. Historia Einzelschriften, Heft 13. Wiesbaden.
Knox, R. A. 1985. "'So Mischievous a Beaste'? The Athenian Demos and Its Treatment of Its Politicians." *G&R* 32: 132–61.
Kock, T., ed. 1880–88. *Comicorum atticorum fragmenta*. 3 vols. Leipzig.
Kolb, F. 1981. *Agora und Theater, Volks- und Festversammlung*. Berlin.
Koster, W. J. W., ed. 1960–78. *Scholia in Aristophanem*. Groningen.
Krentz, P. 1984. "The Ostracism of Thoukydides, Son of Melesias." *Historia* 33: 499–504.
Kurke, L. 1991. *The Traffic in Praise: Pindar and the Poetics of Social Economy*. Ithaca.
———. 1993. "The Economy of *Kudos*." In C. Dougherty and L. Kurke, eds., *Cultural Poetics in Archaic Greece: Cult, Performance, Politics*. Cambridge. 131–63.
———. 1999. *Coins, Bodies, Games, and Gold: The Politics of Meaning in Archaic Greece*. Princeton.
Kyle, D. G. 1987. *Athletics in Ancient Athens*. Mnemosyne Supplement 95. Leiden.
Lang, M. 1990. *The Athenian Agora. Vol. XXV: Ostraka*. Princeton.
Lavelle, B. 1989. "Koisyra and Megakles, Son of Hippokrates." *GRBS* 30: 503–13.
Lehmann, G. A. 1987. "Überlegungen zur Krise der attischen Demokratie im Peloponnesischen Krieg: Vom Ostrakismos des Hyperbolos zum Thargalion 411 v. Chr." *ZPE* 69: 33–73.
von Leutsch, E. L., ed. 1839–51. *Corpus paroemiographorum graecorum*. 2 vols. Göttingen.
MacDowell, D. M. 1962. *Andokides on the Mysteries*. Oxford.
———. 1963. "APETH and Generosity." *Mnemosyne* 16: 127–34.
Marr, J. 1996. "History As Lunch: Aristophanes' *Knights* 810–19." *CQ* 46: 561–64.
Martin, A. 1989. "L'ostracisme athénien: Un demi-siècle de découvertes et de recherches." *REG* 102: 124–45.
Masson. O. 1992. "Nouvelles notes de anthroponymie grecque." *ZPE* 91: 107–20.
Mattingly, H. B. 1971. "Facts and Artifacts: The Researcher and His Tools." *University of Leeds Review* 14: 277–97.
———. 1991. "The Practice of Ostracism at Athens." *Antichthon* 25: 1–26.
———. 1997. "The Date and Purpose of the Pseudo-Xenophon *Constitution of Athens*." *CQ* 47: 352–57.
McGlew, J. F. 1998. "Politics on the Margins: The Athenian *Hetaireiai* in 415 B.C." *Historia* 48: 1–22.
McGregor, M. 1965. "The Genius of Alkibiades." *Phoenix* 19: 27–46.
Meiggs, R., and D. Lewis, eds. 1988 (original edition 1969). *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the End of the Fifth Century* B.C. 2nd ed. Oxford.
Meineke, A., ed. 1839–57. *Fragmenta comicorum graecorum*. 5 vols. Berlin.
Merrit, B. D. 1932. *Athenian Financial Documents of the Fifth Century*. Ann Arbor.
Millett, P. 1991. *Lending and Borrowing in Ancient Athens*. Cambridge.
Mills, S. 1997. *Theseus, Tragedy, and the Athenian Empire*. Oxford.
Moorton, R. F. 1988. "Aristophanes on Alcibiades." *GRBS* 29: 345–59.
Moretti, L. 1957. *Olympionikai, i vincitori negli antichi agoni olimpici*. Atti della Accademia Nazionale dei Linceo. Memorie Classe di Scienze morali, storiche e filologiche, serie 8, vol. 8. Rome.

Morris, I. 1994. "Everyman's Grave." In Boegehold/Scafuro. 67–101.
———. 1996. "The Strong Principle of Equality and the Archaic Origins of Greek Democracy." In Ober/Hedrick. 19–48.
Napolitano, M. 1994. "'Αριφράδης πονηρός: Una riconsiderazione (Ar. *Eq.* 1274–89)." *QUCC* 48: 67–92.
Nauck, A., ed. 1964 (original edition 1889). *Tragicorum graecorum fragmenta.* 2nd ed., supplemented by B. Snell. Hildesheim.
Neil, R. A. 1901. *The Knights of Aristophanes.* Cambridge.
Ober, J. 1989. *Mass and Elite in Democratic Athens: Rhetoric, Ideology, and the Power of the People.* Princeton.
———. 1989. "The Nature of Athenian Democracy." In Ober 1996. 105–22. Originally published in *CP* 84: 322–34.
———. 1994. "Civic Ideology and Counterhegemonic Discourse: Thucydides on the Sicilian Debate." In Boegehold/Scafuro. 102–26.
———. 1996. *The Athenian Revolution: Essays on Ancient Greek Democracy and Political Theory.* Princeton.
———. 1998. *Political Dissent in Democratic Athens.* Princeton.
———, and C. Hedrick, eds. 1996. *Dêmokratia: A Conversation on Democracies, Ancient and Modern.* Princeton.
Osborne, R. 1985. *Demos: The Discovery of Classical Attika.* Cambridge.
———. 1985a. "The Erection and Mutilation of the Hermai." *PCPS* 31: 47–73.
———, and S. Hornblower, eds. 1994. *Ritual, Finance, Politics: Athenian Democratic Accounts Presented to David Lewis.* Oxford.
Ostwald, M. 1986. *From Popular Sovereignty to the Sovereignty of Law.* Berkeley.
Page, D. L. 1962. *Poetae melici graeci.* Oxford.
Phillips, D. J. 1982. "Athenian Ostracism." In G. H. R. Horsley, ed., *Hellenika. Essays on Greek Politics and History.* North Ryde. 21–43.
———. 1990. "Some Ostraka from the Athenian Agora." *ZPE* 83: 123–48.
———. 1991. "Men Named Thoukydides and the General of 440/39 B.C. (Thuc. 1.117.2)." *Historia* 40: 385–95.
Pritchett, W. K. 1974. *The Greek State at War. Vol. 2.* Berkeley.
Raaflaub, K. 2003. "Stick and Glue: The Function of Tyranny in Fifth-Century Athenian Democracy." In K. Morgan, ed., *Popular Tyranny.* Austin. 59–93.
Rabe, H., ed. 1906. *Scholia in Lucianum.* Leipzig.
Raubitschek, A. 1948. "The Case Against Alcibiades (Andokides IV)." In Raubitschek 1991. 116–31. Originally published in *TAPA* 79: 191–210.
———. 1951. "The Origin of Ostracism." In Raubitschek 1991. 65–76. Originally published in *AJA* 55: 221–29.
———. 1954. "Philinos." *Hesperia* 23: 68–71.
———. 1955. "Theopompos on Hyperbolos." *Phoenix* 9: 122–26.
———. 1991. *The School of Hellas: Essays on Greek History, Archaeology, and Literature.* Edited by D. Obbink and P. A. van der Waerdt. Oxford.
von Reden, S. 1995. *Exchange in Ancient Greece.* London.
Reverdin, O. 1945. "Remarques sur la vie politique d'Athènes au Ve siècle." *MH* 2: 201–12.

Rhodes, P. J. 1981. *A Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaion Politeia*. Oxford.
———. 1986. "Political Activity in Classical Athens." *JHS* 106: 132–44.
———. 1994. "The Ostracism of Hyperbolos." In Osborne/Hornblower. 85–98.
de Romilly, J. 1995. *Alcibiade*. Paris.
Rose, P. W. 1992. *Sons of the Gods, Children of the Earth: Ideology and Literary Form in Ancient Greece*. Ithaca.
Rosen, R. 1997. "The Gendered Polis in Eupolis' *Cities*." In Dobrov. 149–76.
Rosenbloom, D. 2002. "From *Ponêros* to *Pharmakos*: Theater, Social Drama, and Revolution in Athens, 428–404 B.C.E." *CA* 21: 283–346.
Rosivach, V. J. 1987. "Some Fifth- and Fourth-Century Views on the Purpose of Ostracism." *Tyche* 2: 161–70.
Rubinstein, L. 2000. *Litigation and Cooperation: Supporting Speakers in the Courts of Classical Athens.* Historia Einzelschriften, Heft 147. Stuttgart.
Rutherford, W. G., ed. 1896–1905. *Scholia aristophanica*. 3 vols. London.
Sahlins, M. 1972. *Stone Age Economics*. New York.
Scheidel, W. 2002. "T30: Theopomp *FGrHist* 155 F96B." In Siewert 2002. 391–400.
Schreiner, J. H. 1970. "The Origins of Ostracism Again." *C&M* 31: 84–97.
Schröder, S. 1991. "Das Neue Ostrakon gegen einen Κράτης Ἀθμονεύς." *ZPE* 86: 45–46.
———. 1993. "Nochmals zum Ostrakon gegen Krates Athmoneus." *ZPE* 96: 37–45.
Schwartz, E., ed. 1887–91. *Scholia in Euripidem*. 2 vols. Berlin
Seager, R. 1967. "Alcibiades and the Charge of Aiming at Tyranny." *Historia* 16: 6–18.
———. 1973. "Elitism and Democracy in Classical Athens." In F. C. Jaher, ed., *The Rich, the Well Born, and the Powerful: Elites and Upper Classes in History.* Urbana. 7–26.
———. 1976. "After the Peace of Nicias: Diplomacy and Policy, 421–16 B.C." *CQ* 26: 249–69.
Siewert, P. 1991. "Accuse contro i 'candidati' all'ostracismo per la loro condotta politica e morale." In M. Sordi, ed., *L'immagine dell'uomo politico: Vita pubblica e morale nell'antichità*. Milan. 3–14.
———. 1999. "Il ruolo di Alcibiade nell'ostracismo di Iperbolo." In E. Luppino-Manes, ed., *Aspirazione al consenso e azione politica in alcuni contest di fine V sec. a.C.* Alexandria. 19–27.
———., ed. 2002. *Ostrakismos-Testimonien I*. Historia Einzelschriften, Heft 155. Stuttgart.
———. 2002a. "T(?)11: Plato Comicus fr. 168 *PCG* VII." In Siewert 2002. 223–26.
Sommerstein, A. 1996. "How to Avoid Being a *Komodoumenos*." *CQ* 46: 327–56.
Snell, B., ed. 1986. *Tragicorum graecorum fragmenta. Vol. 1: Didascaliae tragicae, catalogi tragicorum et tragoediarum, testimonia et fragmenta tragicorum minorum*. Ed. corr. R. Kannicht. Göttingen.
Stanton, G. R. 1970. "The Introduction of Ostracism and Alcmeonid Propaganda." *JHS* 90: 180–83.
de Ste. Croix, G. E. M. 1972. *The Origins of the Peloponnesian War*. London.
Stockton, D. L. 1990. *The Classical Athenian Democracy*. Oxford.
Storey, I. C. 1990. "Dating and Re-Dating Eupolis." *Phoenix* 44: 1–30.
———. 1994. "The Politics of 'Angry Eupolis'." *AHB* 8: 107–20.
———. 2000. "Some Problems in Eupolis' *Demoi*." In Harvey/Wilkins. 173–90.

Strauss, B. S. 1993. *Fathers and Sons in Athens: Ideology and Society in the Era of the Peloponnesian War*. Princeton.
Thalheim, T., ed. 1914. *Antiphontis orationes et fragmenta*. Leipzig.
Thomsen, R. 1972. *The Origin of Ostracism. A Synthesis*. Gyldendal.
Turner, V. 1974. *Dramas, Fields, and Metaphors: Symbolic Action in Human Society*. Ithaca.
———. 1982. *From Ritual to Theatre: The Human Seriousness of Play*. New York.
Vanderpool, E. 1970. *Ostracism at Athens*. Lectures in Memory of Louise Taft Semple, 2nd ser. Cincinnati.
Vernant, J.-P. 1982. "From Oedipus to Periander: Lameness, Tyranny, Incest in Legend and History." *Arethusa* 15: 19–38.
Wade-Gery, H. T. 1930. "The Year of the Armistice, 423 B.C." *CQ* 24: 33–39.
Walcot, P. 1978. *Envy and the Greeks: A Study of Human Behaviour*. Warminster.
Wallace, R. W. 1994. "Private Lives and Public Enemies." In Boegehold/Scafuro. 127–55.
West, M. L., ed. 1989–92 (original edition 1971–72). *Iambi et elegi graeci ante Alexandrum cantati*. 2nd ed. 2 vols. Oxford.
Westlake, H. D. 1971. "Thucydides and the Uneasy Peace: A Study in Political Incompetence." In Westlake 1989. 84–96. Originally published in *CQ* 21: 315–25.
———. 1989. *Studies in Thucydides and Greek History*. Bristol.
Whibley, L. 1889. *Political Parties in Athens during the Peloponnesian War*. Cambridge.
Whitehead, D. 1973. "Competitive Outlay and Community Profit: φιλοτιμία in Democratic Athens." *C&M* 34: 55–74.
Willemsen, F., and S. Brenne. 1991. "Verzeichnis der Kerameikos-Ostraka." *AM* 106: 147–56.
Williams, J. 1977. *Marxism and Literature*. Oxford
Wilson, P. 2000. *The Athenian Institution of the Khoregeia: The Chorus, the City and the Stage*. Cambridge.
Winkler, J., and F. I. Zeitlin, eds. 1990. *Nothing to Do with Dionysos? Athenian Drama in Its Social Context*. Princeton.
Wohl, V. 1996. "Hegemony and Democracy at the Panathenaia." *C&M* 47: 25–88.
———. 1999. "The Eros of Alcibiades." *CA* 18: 340–85.
Wolin, S. 1996. "Transgression, Equality, and Voice." In Ober/Hedrick. 63–90.
Woodhead, A. G. 1949. "*IG* II^2 95 and the Ostracism of Hyperbolos." *Hesperia* 18: 78–83.
———. 1954. "Peisander." *AJP* 75: 131–46.
Wycherley, R. E. 1957. *The Athenian Agora. Vol. III: Literary and Epigraphical Testimonia*. Princeton.
Zuntz, G. 1963 (original edition 1955). *The Political Plays of Euripides*. Manchester.