

1 | The Funeral Oration after Loraux

DAVID M. PRITCHARD

1.1 Introduction

The French can be surprised that foreigners come to France to study ancient Greece.¹ They understand why Anglophone philosophers do so, as it is a matter of genuine national pride that ‘French theory’ conquered the world in the 1980s.² But relatively few French people realise that among English-speaking researchers of ancient Greece the so-called Paris school was no less influential.³ The leading figures of this Paris-based circle of ancient historians were Jean-Pierre Vernant and Pierre Vidal-Naquet.⁴ Reading their books as well as those of younger circle-members has profoundly shaped our historiography. It turned me and other budding foreign researchers of ancient Greece into the cultural historians that we are today.⁵ The book of the Paris school that exerted the greatest influence on my generation was *The Invention of Athens* by Nicole Loraux. It was the first book-length study of the speech that democratic Athens staged for the war dead. Before this book’s publication in 1981, ancient historians had accorded little importance to the funeral oration. For them, the genre consisted only of dubious clichés. It also endorsed a pronounced cultural militarism: funeral orators claimed that war brought only benefits and sought to deny the human costs. This was at odds with the strong anti-militarism on the French left during the 1970s. In writing a book about this genre, Loraux clearly was a trailblazer. *The Invention of Athens* established for the first time the vital importance of this almost annual speech in the formation of Athenian self-identity. Loraux showed how each staging of it helped the Athenians to maintain the same shared civic identity for over two centuries. *The Invention of Athens* was also clearly different from the other books of the Paris school. At the time, Vernant and Vidal-Naquet, for

¹ For their helpful comments on this chapter I sincerely thank R. K. Balot, G. Chadwick, P. Cartledge, D. Cairns, D. A. Curtis, R. Dowe, E. Foster, E. García Novo, S. D. Goldhill, L. Hoffman, J. Keane, D. Konstan, S. Mills, I. Papadopoulou, D. J. Phillips, M. Piekosz, G. Proietti, E. Saltis and S. C. Todd.

² E.g. Storey 2018: 116–39. ³ Murray 2019; Stocking 2020; cf. Vernant 2007: 15.

⁴ E.g. Loraux 2005: 9–29. ⁵ Pritchard 2020.

example, were researching the basic structures of Greek thought.⁶ What Loraux had discovered was more complex: a detailed narrative about who the Athenians were and a set of discursive practices for its maintenance.

The Invention of Athens truly was a remarkable achievement. Yet, in spite of its transformative impact, it was still far from a complete work. Loraux deliberately played down individual authorship as a topic of study, which helped her to prove that the surviving funeral speeches were part of a long-stable genre. But this meant that *The Invention of Athens* left unanswered important questions about each of the seven surviving examples. An even larger gap concerned intertextuality. *The Invention of Athens* rightly saw traces of the funeral oration right across Athenian literature, but it never systematically compared the funeral oration with other types of public speech or drama. Therefore, Loraux was unable to demonstrate whether the other literary genres of classical Athens were ever a counterweight to the funeral oration's cultural militarism. Without such intertextuality, her ability to prove many of her bold hypotheses was limited. The principal aim of this edited volume is to complete methodically *The Invention of Athens*. To this end, our book dedicates a chapter to each extant funeral speech in order to answer the important questions that Loraux left unanswered. It completes the vital intertextual analysis of the genre that is missing in *The Invention of Athens*. In filling such gaps, our chapters also aim to reassess numerous bold arguments and claims that Loraux made in her celebrated first book. Another aim of ours is to furnish a rich analysis of war's overall place in the culture of democratic Athens.

1.2 The Transformative Impact of Nicole Loraux

The classical Athenians claimed to be the only Greeks to honour the war dead with a funeral oration.⁷ Seven examples of what does appear to be a unique Athenian genre have survived in whole or part. The most famous of them is the *epitaphios logos* ('funeral speech') attributed to Pericles from 431/0 BC.⁸ We also have the actual speeches that Demosthenes delivered in 338/7 and Hyperides in 323/2. The other four examples were by authors who never intended to speak at a public funeral for the fallen. In the early fourth century, Lysias and Plato published long literary versions of

⁶ Schmitt Pantel and de Polignac 2007: 7. E.g. Vernant 1965; Vidal-Naquet 1981; cf. Vernant 1988a.

⁷ Dem. 20.141; Loraux 1986b: 1; Ziolkowski 1981: 23.

⁸ Loraux 1986b: 5; Shear 2013: 511; Todd 2007: 153.

a funeral oration, while Isocrates, in his first major publication, drew extensively on the genre. Several decades earlier, Gorgias, soon after arriving in Athens from Sicily, had written his own *epitaphios logos*. Today, there is broad agreement that the official speech was a vitally important institution for articulating how the classical Athenians thought of themselves.⁹ Therefore, when they study Athenian public discourse, cultural historians now invariably put this genre on a par with forensic and deliberative oratory as well as old comedy and tragedy.¹⁰

Such a clear consensus makes it easy to forget how the funeral oration was viewed completely differently forty or more years ago. Indeed, before 1981, ancient historians considered the genre to be of little importance.¹¹ As funeral orators always repeated ‘the same banalities’, theirs was ‘an untruthful genre’ that shed no light on Athenian politics.¹² Instead, the funeral oration was taken only as an example of what Aristotle came to call epideictic oratory: a display speech with no serious purpose.¹³ Admittedly, the *epitaphios logos* of 431/0 was still regularly studied because Pericles, many ancient historians thought, had brilliantly succeeded in escaping the funeral oration’s deadening constraints.¹⁴ But no one ever saw the need for a dedicated study of this genre as a whole.¹⁵

Therefore, a veritable paradigm shift has occurred in our understanding of the Athenian funeral oration. In the 1970s, Nicole Loraux, against the tide, decided to study the genre. Her *The Invention of Athens*, published in French in 1981 and in English five years later, is almost entirely responsible for this shift. One of its most important findings concerned Pericles’ funeral speech. Loraux put beyond doubt that it was part of an oral tradition that remained stable for over a century. The *epitaphios logos* of Pericles had the same structure as the others and touched on the same topics.¹⁶ It included 31 of the 38 *topoi* (‘commonplaces’) that the fourth-century funeral speeches shared.¹⁷ *The Invention of Athens* also found that

⁹ E.g. Barbato 2020: 15; Mills 1997: 48, 52; Pernot 2005: 26–7; Pritchard 2013: 18; Steinbock 2013b: 50–1, 54, 57; Thomas 1989: 196–7, 200, 206, 213.

¹⁰ E.g. Barbato 2020: 57–81; Pritchard 2013: 9–19; Steinbock 2013b: 48–99.

¹¹ Loraux 1986b: 15, 78, 221, 229.

¹² E.g. Gernet and Bizon 1955: 44–5, from where the quotations come; Kennedy 1963: 154–5; Nilsson 1951: 87.

¹³ Arist. *Rh.* 1358a7–b2; Loraux 1986b: 78, 223–4. E.g. Kennedy 1963: 152–3; Nilsson 1951: 87.

¹⁴ Loraux 1986b: 221–2, 289, 347 n. 1. E.g. Kennedy 1963: 155–7, 164; Nilsson 1951: 85; cf. Castoriadis 2011: 228.

¹⁵ Loraux 1986b: 9–10; Ziolkowski 1981: 10–11.

¹⁶ Loraux 1986b: 8–12, 289; cf. Pritchard 1996: 142–3; Thomas 1989: 209–10; Ziolkowski 1981: 180–1.

¹⁷ Ziolkowski 1981: 183. E.g. Thuc. 2.35.2–Dem. 60.2 and Pl. *Menex.* 236d–e; Thuc. 2.35.3–Dem. 60.1, Hyper. 6.2, Lys. 2.1–3 and Pl. *Menex.* 236e–7a; Thuc. 2.40.4–Dem. 60.4–5 and Lys. 2.17–18; Thuc. 2.41.3–Lys. 2.2 and Pl. *Menex.* 243a; Thuc. 2.41.4–Dem. 60.10–12 and Hyper. 6.35–6.

the genre had a surprising focus. As a speech in honour of combatants who had fallen in a particular year, it, predictably, praised them,¹⁸ exhorted the living to show as much courage as they had,¹⁹ and consoled their bereaved relatives.²⁰ Surprisingly, however, it directed most of its praise to the Athenians as a people.²¹ Consequently, every citizen who listened to an *epitaphios logos* felt ‘greater, nobler and finer’ (Pl. *Menex.* 235b). Loraux confirmed that this praise usually consisted of a positive narrative about Athenian military history,²² in which the Athenians were almost always victorious.²³ In fighting for the freedom or safety of others, they always waged just wars. Funeral orators characterised the Athenians in the same way for 130 years. They did so, according to Loraux, because this was how the *dēmos* (‘people’) continued to think of themselves.²⁴ Loraux really was the first ancient historian to identify such complex collective thinking. Therefore, the final important finding of *The Invention of Athens* was the existence itself of Athenian self-identity.

Loraux closely analysed how this epitaphic narrative operated. It basically was a series of disconnected *erga*, or exploits.²⁵ In discussing this catalogue of exploits, funeral orators always distinguished between mythical and historical *erga*.²⁶ *The Invention of Athens* demonstrated how each historical exploit revealed standard characteristics of the Athenians. Such exploits always showed them to be *agathoi andres* (‘courageous men’),²⁷ who surpassed all others in *aretē* (‘courage’).²⁸ Historical Athenians regularly fought for the freedom of other Greeks or for justice.²⁹ Several of their *erga* concerned the protection of persecuted weak states.³⁰ This recital of

¹⁸ E.g. Dem. 60.12–24; Gorg. fr. 4 Herrman; Hyper. 6.10–35; Lys. 2.67–70; Pl. *Menex.* 245d–6a; Thuc. 2.42.

¹⁹ E.g. Pl. *Menex.* 246d–7c; Thuc. 2.43; cf. Barbato 2020: 63.

²⁰ E.g. Dem. 60.32–7; Hyper. 6.41–3; Lys. 2.71–6; Pl. *Menex.* 247c–8d; Thuc. 2.44.

²¹ Loraux 1986b: 77–131, 322; cf. Pl. *Menex.* 236e; Thuc. 2.35.6; Carey 2007a: 243; Ziolkowski 1981: 100.

²² Loraux 1986b: 132–71; cf. Grethlein 2010: 122–3.

²³ E.g. Loraux 1986b: 67–8, 81–2; cf. Coventry 1989: 3–4; Ziolkowski 1981: 176.

²⁴ E.g. Loraux 1986b: 263–4.

²⁵ Loraux 1986b: 134; cf. Grethlein 2010: 109; Proietti 2015: 517.

²⁶ E.g. Dem. 60.9; Lys. 2.3, 20; Pl. *Menex.* 236b–c; cf. Hdt. 9.26–7; Thuc. 2.36.1–2.

²⁷ E.g. Lys. 2.27, 52, 70; Pl. *Menex.* 245e–6a. The classical Greeks could employ *aretē* (‘excellence’) to describe a range of virtues and *agathos* (‘good’) the man who was commendable in different ways. In funeral speeches, however, these words were almost always used to describe courage and the courageous man, which is reflected in the translation of these terms throughout this volume.

²⁸ E.g. Dem. 60.6, 17–18, 21–3; Lys. 2.24, 33, 40, 44, 48–53, 57–8, 61–2, 67–8; Pl. *Menex.* 239d, 240e–1a, 243a, 243c–d.

²⁹ For the sake of freedom see e.g. Hyper. 6.10, 16, 19, 37; Lys. 2.26, 33, 35, 41, 47, 68; Pl. *Menex.* 242a–b, 242e–3a. For justice see e.g. Dem. 60.11; Hyper. 6.5; cf. Gorg. fr. 4; Lys. 2.17.

³⁰ E.g. Lys. 2.67–8; Pl. *Menex.* 242a–b, 244d–5a.

erga gave pride of place to the Persian Wars of 490 and 480–79.³¹ These wars, after all, included several great victories, in which the Athenians had demonstrated all their ‘national’ characteristics.

Loraux was clear-eyed about how the catalogue of exploits distorted history. Because the *dēmos* believed that a defeat was usually due to *deilia* (‘cowardice’),³² funeral orators avoided mentioning defeats because they would call into question the *aretē* that the *dēmos* claimed.³³ When this was not possible, they turned a defeat into a temporary setback.³⁴ Alternatively, they attributed it to, for example, the will of the gods or the mistakes of other people.³⁵ A second distortion was the catalogue’s Athenocentrism.³⁶ Like the other Greeks, the Athenians fought as part of a military coalition most of the time.³⁷ Funeral orators often twisted such joint military efforts into purely Athenian ones.³⁸ When such a distortion would be too far-fetched, they made Athens the undisputed military leader.³⁹

The classical Greeks often used myth to justify a claim about themselves.⁴⁰ Loraux rightly saw that the mythical *erga* had this function in the epitaphic narrative. The extant *epitaphioi logoi* (‘funeral speeches’) had in common three standard myths. In the first, the Athenians repelled the invasion of Greece by the Amazons (e.g. Dem. 60.8; Lys. 2.4–6; Pl. *Menex.* 239b). Loraux recognised the parallels between this ‘barbarian’ people and the funeral oration’s Persians.⁴¹ This myth clearly supported what the genre claimed about Athens in the Persian Wars. The second myth concerned the Thebans’ refusal to let their defeated enemy, the Argives, bury their war dead (e.g. Dem. 60.8–9; Lys. 2.7–10; Pl. *Menex.* 239b). Because the classical Greeks believed such a burial to be a divine *nomos* (‘custom’ or ‘unwritten law’),⁴² this myth helped to justify the claim that Athens always fought for justice. The final myth had the Athenians protecting the children of Heracles, who had come to Athens as refugees (e.g. Dem. 60.8; Lys. 2.11–16; Pl. *Menex.* 239b). In order to do so, they had to defeat an enormous coalition army from the Peloponnese. This myth

³¹ E.g. Isoc. 8.74; Loraux 1986b: 155; cf. Arist. *Rh.* 1396a12–14; Carey 2007a: 243.

³² E.g. Andoc. 3.18; Dem. 60.21; Eur. *Or.* 475–88; Lys. 2.64–5; *IG* i³ 1179.8–9; Pritchard 2019a: 72.

³³ Loraux 1986b: 137–41; cf. Pritchard 1996: 147; Thomas 1989: 227–31.

³⁴ E.g. Pl. *Menex.* 241e–2a, 242c–e; cf. Thuc. 1.108.1–4.

³⁵ E.g. Dem. 60.21–2; Lys. 2.58; Pl. *Menex.* 243a. ³⁶ Loraux 1986b: 133, 139.

³⁷ Nielsen and Schwartz 2013; Pritchard 2019a: 35–6.

³⁸ E.g. Lys. 2.20–6; Loraux 1986b: 81–2. ³⁹ E.g. Lys. 2.29–34, 44–6.

⁴⁰ E.g. Buxton 1994: 195; Castriota 1992: 49; Connor 1970: 152, 165, 170; Mills 1997: 35.

⁴¹ Loraux 1986b: 67, 120; cf. Grethlein 2010: 113; Mills 1997: 58; Proietti 2015: 521–2; Ziolkowski 1981: 176.

⁴² E.g. Eur. *Supp.* 19; Lys. 2.9; Soph. *Ant.* 450–5; Pritchard 2013: 168–9; cf. Kucewicz 2021: 74–5.

lent support to, among other things, the epitaphic characterisation of the Athenians as the protectors of the persecuted and weak.

The Invention of Athens put beyond doubt the genre's vital importance in maintaining Athenian self-identity. The premature death of fellow citizens in battle had the potential to call into question core beliefs that the *dēmos* held.⁴³ It could lead to dangerous political opposition during a war. Loraux plausibly suggested that a major function of the funeral oration was to affirm what the *dēmos* believed in the face of such potential negative responses.⁴⁴ What made it more effective for this discursive maintenance was its frequency.⁴⁵ Athens staged a public funeral for the war dead each year when there were Athenian casualties.⁴⁶ Because it went to war in two out of three years in the fifth century and even more frequently in the fourth century,⁴⁷ an *epitaphios logos* would have regularly been an annual event. The genre also furnished the most detailed account of Athenian history to which the *dēmos* had access.⁴⁸ The other genres of public oratory and drama focussed much less on self-identity and the past. This was due to their different primary functions. Politicians and litigants wanted to win a political debate or a legal case.⁴⁹ They mentioned a core belief or a military campaign only if it helped them to do so.⁵⁰ Since the poets of old comedy had to raise as many laughs as possible, their comedies were rarely lessons in civic education. The tragic poets set the majority of their plays outside Athens,⁵¹ which meant that it was less common for them to focus explicitly on Athenian self-identity.

In spite of their different functions, these literary genres are still all good evidence for how non-elite Athenians viewed themselves and their world more generally. Although dramatists, politicians and litigants belonged almost always to the elite, their audiences were predominantly non-elite.⁵² In dramatic *agōnes* ('contests'), state-appointed judges might have formally voted on who the winner would be,⁵³ but they clearly took their lead from how the non-elite theatregoers had responded to each play (e.g. Dem. 18.265, 19.33, 21.226). The result was that comic and tragic poets needed to reproduce the non-elite viewpoint (e.g. Pl. *Leg.* 659a–c, 700a–1b). Politicians and litigants had to do this even more because the outcomes of their *agōnes* depended on the actual votes of their audiences

⁴³ Barbato 2020: 8, 15, 61–2; Shear 2013: 527. ⁴⁴ E.g. Loraux 1986b: 118, 131–2.

⁴⁵ Steinbock 2013b: 50–1. ⁴⁶ Thuc. 2.34.1, 7–8; Pritchett 1985: 112.

⁴⁷ Pritchard 2019a: 5, 18.

⁴⁸ E.g. Loraux 1986b: 3–4, 145; cf. Kapach 2020: 331; Mills 1997: 50, 52; Steinbock 2013b: 50–1; Thomas 1989: 198–202, 206, 236.

⁴⁹ E.g. Arist. *Rh.* 1358b21–8; Barbato 2020: 66–76. ⁵⁰ Loraux 1986b: 32; cf. Mills 1997: 48.

⁵¹ See pp. 302–4. ⁵² E.g. Pritchard 2013: 9–18. ⁵³ Csapo and Slater 1994: 157–64.

(e.g. Pl. *Resp.* 493d). By contrast, funeral orators were not competing for votes in a formal *agōn* ('contest').⁵⁴ Nevertheless, Loraux was absolutely right to assume that they articulated no less how the *dēmos* generally thought. After all, the democratic council chose a funeral orator from among the leading politicians.⁵⁵ Such orators knew that they had to meet the expectations of a large crowd of mourners.⁵⁶

The Invention of Athens played a major role in the cultural turn in Classical Studies. As a result, it can be forgotten that Loraux lacked the theoretical tools that contemporary cultural historians take for granted.⁵⁷ Today, discourse analysis and the studies of oral tradition and social memory are well established. This was not the case when Loraux wrote *The Invention of Athens*. Consequently, her discovery, in the funeral oration, of a complex narrative of self-identity was a remarkable achievement. Vincent Azoulay and Paulin Ismard (Chapter 3) remind us that Marxism was one of the few tools that Loraux had at her disposal. In capitalism, Karl Marx argued, the bourgeoisie had created an ideology to obscure their economic exploitation of the working class.⁵⁸ In his eyes, ideology lacked any independence from economics.⁵⁹ Because it was only an illusory reflection of this reality, studying it was of little importance.⁶⁰ Instead, for Marx, the economic base was the key for understanding capitalist society. Azoulay and Ismard rightly point out that *The Invention of Athens* explicitly rejected Marx's traditional argument.⁶¹ In its conclusion, Loraux argued that 'an institutional illusion is still a fact'.⁶² Athenian self-identity, according to her, was thus 'an integral part of Athenian political practice'. It mediated the relations that the Athenians had with reality and was independent of the economic base. Loraux reinforced this rejection by choosing, not ideology, but *l'imaginaire* ('the imaginary') for describing 'all figures in which a society apprehends its identity'. Loraux made abundantly clear that she had borrowed this term from the exiled Greek, Cornelius Castoriadis,⁶³ who, with Claude Lefort, had founded a left-wing anti-Stalinist intellectual circle (Figure 1.1).⁶⁴ Among their criticisms of Marx was his unwarranted devaluing of culture.⁶⁵

⁵⁴ Blanshard 2010: 205–7.

⁵⁵ E.g. Dem. 18.285; Isoc. 4.74; Pl. *Menex.* 234b, 235c; Thuc. 2.34.6; Hesk 2013: 61; Loraux 1986b: 244.

⁵⁶ E.g. Dem. 60.1; Thuc. 2.34.6–7, 35.2–3, 36.1, 46.1; Grethlein 2010: 226; Loraux 1986b: 236.

⁵⁷ E.g. Kapach 2020: 330; Pritchard 2020. ⁵⁸ E.g. Marx and Engels 1982.

⁵⁹ Barbato 2020: 3–4; Storey 2018: 61–4. ⁶⁰ Marx and Engels 1982: 78.

⁶¹ Loraux 1986b: 330. ⁶² Loraux 1986b: 336–7. ⁶³ E.g. Loraux 1986b: 338.

⁶⁴ E.g. Gottraux 1997; Thompson 1984: 16–41.

⁶⁵ E.g. Castoriadis 1975: 159, 206; Lefort 1978: 281; cf. Arnason 2014: 25–9.



Figure 1.1 Nicole Loraux speaks at a conference in Montrouge (Paris) in 1987, along with, from left to right, Claude Lefort, Louis Dumont and François Furet. Paris © École des hautes études en sciences sociales, photograph of a session of the EHESS conference held on 12 and 13 June 1987, Grig Pop collection, photo no.152 EHE 520.

The surprise of Azoulay and Ismard's chapter is that Loraux's relationship to Marxism was more nuanced than her conclusion suggests. Indeed, in a later abridged edition of *The Invention of Athens* for French readers, Loraux exchanged the imaginary for the Marxist concept of ideology that she had first encountered in the 1970s.⁶⁶ It is tempting to interpret this exchange simply as her combative response to Castoriadis' public criticism of her use of his new term.⁶⁷ Yet, the chapter of Azoulay and Ismard puts beyond doubt that a version of Marxism was always a critical tool for her. The famous re-reading of Marx by Louis Althusser clearly echoes throughout *The Invention of Athens*.⁶⁸ Certainly, Althusser, as a longstanding Marxist, held that ideology was more or less about the economic base because it articulated for individuals what economic roles they were

⁶⁶ Loraux 2006: 23–4.

⁶⁷ He did so in a seminar that he delivered at l'École des hautes études en sciences sociales in 1985 (Castoriadis 2011: 225–41).

⁶⁸ E.g. Althusser 1976: 67–125.

supposed to perform. Nevertheless, he also went beyond Marx by seeing ideology as largely independent from economics and as a key phenomenon for understanding any society.⁶⁹ Loraux, of course, extended Althusser's re-reading by disconnecting ideology entirely from the economic base and making it a product, not of an economic class, but of the political community as a whole.⁷⁰ Even here, however, Azoulay and Ismard conclude, there were still echoes of Marx, for Loraux had taken over both extensions from the many Marxism-inspired studies of classical Greece in the 1970s.⁷¹ Cultural historians today do not always acknowledge their debts to Marxism.⁷² *The Invention of Athens* shows us how important it was as a tool for their pioneering figures.

1.3 The Public Honours for the War Dead

Thucydides set the scene for Pericles' famous funeral speech of 431/0 by describing the public funeral for the war dead (2.34). Rich as his description was, it actually failed to mention three *timai* ('honours') that classical Athens granted them.⁷³ His chapter 2.34 also did not provide sufficient background for measuring how exceptional these honours were. *The Invention of Athens* was strong on filling this chapter's gaps.⁷⁴ By the late 430s, the Athenians had for a long time brought home the bones of their war dead, whom they had cremated on or near the battlefield.⁷⁵ The first stage of the public burial was the *prothesis* ('display') of these bones for two days in cypress-wood coffins.⁷⁶ Here there was one coffin for each of the ten Cleisthenic *phulai*, or tribes (Thuc. 2.34.2–3). The bereaved deposited offerings next to the coffin that contained, supposedly, the bones of their loved one.⁷⁷ On the third day, an *ekphora* ('funeral procession') escorted these ten coffins to the vicinity of the public tombs. These tombs were located in the Ceramicus – the potters' district, which was, according to Thucydides, 'the most beautiful suburb of the city' (5; cf. Ar. Av. 395–9). That the Athenians used wagons for this *ekphora* points to it covering a reasonable distance, which suggests that the *prothesis* probably took place

⁶⁹ Storey 2018: 74–6. ⁷⁰ Pritchard 1998: 38–9. ⁷¹ E.g. Lanza and Vegetti 1975.

⁷² E.g. Dirks, Eley and Ortner 1994: 16–17.

⁷³ For the description of what they gave the fallen as *timai* see e.g. Dem. 60.10, 36; Lys. 2.75; Pl. *Menex.* 249b; Thuc. 2.35.1; Pritchard 1996: 137; Ziolkowski 1981: 109.

⁷⁴ Loraux 1986b: 15–42.

⁷⁵ Thuc. 2.34.1–2; 6.71; cf. Aesch. Ag. 435–6, 443–4; Eur. *Supp.* 949, 114, 1123, 1185.

⁷⁶ Thuc. 2.34.2; Loraux 1986b: 19.

⁷⁷ Rees 2018 rightly raises doubts about the fallen being cremated in tribal groups.

in the Athenian *agora* ('civic centre').⁷⁸ Loraux brought to the fore what was exceptional in these first stages of the public funeral. In classical Athens, it was illegal for a family to stage a *prothesis* of more than a day.⁷⁹ The longer one for the war dead helped to make the public funeral itself a substantial *timē* ('honour'). Loraux plausibly proposed that the armed forces played a large part in this *ekphora*.⁸⁰ She was the first to appreciate the significance of the cypress wood of the coffins.⁸¹ The palaces of epic poetry were built out of this timber (e.g. Hom *Od.* 17.340), while the classical Greeks considered cypress to be precious, like silver and gold, and a guarantor of deathless memory (e.g. Pind. *Pyth.* 5.39; Plut. *Vit. Per.* 12.6).

The first *timē* that Thucydides failed to mention was the public tomb before which the funeral orator spoke. Such a burial place took the form of a tumulus or a walled rectangular enclosure.⁸² The most conspicuous constituent of it was a list of the year's casualties that was organised by tribe.⁸³ This list could be a line of ten individual slabs or a continuous wall with recesses between the *phulai* (Figure 1.2). A casualty list was often two metres in height and several metres in length.⁸⁴ Plato's Socrates understandably described this burial as 'beautiful and magnificent' (*Menex.* 234c). In the early years of Athenian democracy, rich Athenians abandoned the archaic practice of building lavish private tombs.⁸⁵ As a group, they began to provide such tombs for their relatives again only in the 430s. Because the rectangular ones that they now built cost thousands of drachmas,⁸⁶ Plato's Socrates was right to assert that a *penēs* ('poor man') who had died in battle gained a tomb for which his family could never have paid (*Menex.* 234c). But a public tomb for the fallen was also always grander than elite private ones (*Xen. Hell.* 2.4.17), as it had to accommodate ten tribal coffins and a long list of casualties.

Such a tomb could also include a figural relief. Loraux was not alone in overestimating the commonness of these reliefs.⁸⁷ Indeed, only two of the many casualty lists that survive from the fifth century had such decoration.⁸⁸ The earliest known one was the list of the war dead from

⁷⁸ Arrington 2015: 36; Loraux 1986b: 20. ⁷⁹ E.g. Dem. 43.62; Garland 1985: 26.

⁸⁰ Loraux 1986b: 20. An Athenian *loutrophoros* from c. 430 puts a horseman and a hoplite next to what appears to be a public tomb for the war dead (Athens, National Archaeological Museum, inv. no. 1700; Arrington 2015: 82–3, 210–11). Thuc. 5.11.1 and Pl. *Leg.* 947b–c have combatants in comparable funeral processions.

⁸¹ Loraux 1986b: 349 n. 26. ⁸² Arrington 2015: 79–82.

⁸³ Bradeen 1969: 146–8; Low 2012: 21. ⁸⁴ Arrington 2015: 95–6.

⁸⁵ E.g. Morris 1992: 128–55; Parker 1996a: 133–5; cf. Kuczewicz 2021: 102–4.

⁸⁶ E.g. Dem. 40.52; 45.79; Lys. 31.21; 32.21; Morris 1992: 117–18; Pritchard 2019a: 25.

⁸⁷ E.g. Loraux 1986b: 22; Osborne 2010: 251; cf. Low 2012: 21–2.

⁸⁸ Arrington 2015: 99–104; Low 2012: 28.