CHAPTER I

Problems, models and sources

I.I THE ANOMALY OF ELITE SPORT IN DEMOCRATIC ATHENS

In classical Athens the high standing of athletics was a striking anomaly. Democracy may have opened up politics to every citizen but it had no impact on athletic participation. The involvement of Athenians in athletics depended on the extent of their schooling. Training in the standard sporting events was provided by an athletics teacher. But it was only the upper class who could afford his classes, because the democracy did not subsidise education. Everyone recognised this training as essential for a creditable performance in a race or bout. As they missed out on this teacher's classes, lower-class Athenians simply decided against entering athletic contests. In view of the fact that the athletes of democratic Athens continued to be drawn from the upper class, it comes as a surprise that athletics was still highly valued and supported by the lower class. The Athenian *dēmos* ('people') judged athletics to be an unambiguously good thing and associated it with justice and the personal virtues of courage and self-control. The power which the democracy gave lower-class citizens allowed them to turn this high evaluation into pro-sport policies. Thus they gave sportsmen who were victorious at the Olympics or one of the other international sporting festivals their highest public honours. In the democracy's first fifty years they created an unrivalled programme of local sporting festivals, on which they spent a large amount of money. In addition they carefully managed the public infrastructure for athletics. But the most anomalous aspect of the way in which the *dēmos* treated athletics was their protection of it from the public criticism which was normally otherwise directed at the upper class and its conspicuous activities.

This book attributes this anomaly to the relationship which the classical Athenians perceived between athletics and their own waging of war. Ancient historians have not yet studied the impact of this cultural overlap

on sport's public standing.[1] The Athenian *dēmos* described athletic competition and battle with a common set of words and concepts. They saw both as contests with agreed rules, which tested personal virtues and the fitness of their participants. Both types of contest involved toils and dangers. Victory was attributed to the courage of athletes, hoplites and sailors, and defeat to cowardice. Lower-class citizens believed that divine aid was also required for victory in battle or the stadium.

Democracy may not have changed the class background of athletes but it did transform war. The Athenian *dēmos* massively increased the scale and the frequency of military expeditions. Lower-class citizens valued war more highly than any other secular activity. They also extended military participation to every stratum of the citizenry. The creation of a publicly controlled army of hoplites as part of the democratic revolution, the subsequent expansion of the city's navy and the provision of military pay opened up war – like politics – to large numbers of lower-class Athenians. In the democracy it was how audiences of this social class responded which determined the outcomes not only of political and legal debates but also of dramatic competitions. Thus public speakers and playwrights were under pressure to represent the new experiences of the lower class as hoplites and sailors in terms of the traditional moral explanation of victory on the battle- and sportsfield. These transformations made sure that the cultural overlap between sport and war had a double impact on the standing of athletics. The first effect was that lower-class citizens assimilated this upper-class preserve with the mainstream and highly valued activity of war. The second effect was that they now had personal experience of something which was akin to athletics and hence could empathise more easily with what athletes actually did. Together these effects explain fully why the Athenian *dēmos* valued sport as highly as they did, protected it from public criticism and founded a large number of sporting festivals.

1.2 THE SOCIAL DIFFERENTIATION OF ATHENIAN CITIZENS

As the argument of this book divides the classical Athenians into two discrete classes, we should clarify, at its outset, the structure and the character of social differentiation under the democracy.[2] Public speakers

[1] This is not to deny the valuable recent reflections on the general relationship between athletics and war in the Greek world; see, for example, Barringer 2005: 228–9; Cornell 2002; Golden 1998: 23–8; 2004: 173–4; Lavrencic 1991; Müller 1996; Pleket 2000a: 631–2; Reed 1998; Singor 2009: 599.

[2] The model of Athenian society which I discuss here will be familiar to social historians of classical Athens and draws heavily on Fisher 1998b; Gabrielsen 1994: 43–73; Markle 1985: 266–71; Ober 1989: 194–6; Pritchard 2004: 212–13; Rosivach 1991; 2001; Vartsos 1978.

and playwrights drew distinctions between citizens on the basis of, for example, military roles, Solonian *telē* or income classes, occupation and residence in the country or the city.[3] But the distinction which they judged to be the most important for their audiences and hence introduced considerably more frequently than the others was between *hoi plousioi* ('the wealthy') and *hoi penētes* ('the poor').[4] This distinction clearly played a vital role in determining how citizens interacted socially and what public services they performed. Thus this book uses different terms for social differentiation, such as elite and non-elite citizens and the upper class and the lower class, strictly as synonyms for the wealthy and the poor. In the literature of classical Athens this dichotomy always implied much more than the greater prosperity of one group of citizens relative to another; for public speakers and dramatists clearly used it to distinguish between two social classes which, in reality, had different ways of life, pastimes, clothing and types of public service.[5]

The rarity, by contrast, of references to Solon's *telē* in classical texts or inscriptions indicates how the Athenian people considered these income classes to be less important than the dichotomy between the wealthy and the poor.[6] The part which Solon's classes played in the running of the democracy was also more limited.[7] The Athenians of the fifth century employed them to restrict to a particular stratum of citizens a recurring magistracy or, for example, land grants in a colony or compulsory service in the navy by tying such a public benefit or obligation to membership of one or more *telē* ([Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 26.2; Thuc. 3.16.1; *IG* I^3 46.44–6). In the course of the next century, however, they appear even to have stopped using them in this way, as, towards its close, candidates for magistracies simply ignored the requirement to belong to one or another *telos* and no one was sure any longer what the qualifications were for membership of each income class ([Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 7.4, 8.1, 47.1; cf. Isae. 7.39).[8] At no point, finally, did Solon's *telē* play a part in the determining of who

[3] For the drawing of distinctions between citizens on the basis of military roles, see, for example, Aesch. *Pers.* 435–71; Ar. *Ach.* 162–3; Lys. 14.7, 11–12; 14–15; 16.12–13; on occupation, see, for example, Ehrenberg 1951: 113–46; Roselli 2011: 111 – both with references; and on residence, see, for example, Ar. *Nub.* 628; *Pax* 254, 508–11, 582–600, 1172–90; Eur. *Or.* 917–22; Dover 1974: 112–14; Vartsos 1978: 242.

[4] See, for example, Ar. *Eccl.* 197–8; *Eq.* 222–4; *Ran.* 1006–7; *Plut.* 29–30, 149–52, 500–3, 1003–5; *Vesp.* 463–8; Dem. 22.53; [Dem.] 51.11; Eur. *Supp.* 238–43; Isoc. 20.19; Lys. 24.16–17; 26.9–10; 28.102; Hansen 1991: 115–16; Rosivach 2001: 127.

[5] Gabrielsen 1994: 43–4, 238 n. 1 *pace* Rosivach 1991: 196 n. 4.

[6] Vartsos 1978: 231. For these references, see Rosivach 2002: 42–5.

[7] Hansen 1991: 106–9; Gabrielsen 2002b: 212–14.

[8] With Gabrielsen 2002b: 213; Rosivach 2002: 38–9.

should pay for liturgies and the extraordinary war tax or in the assigning of different types of military service to individual citizens.[9]

The way of life and physical appearance of wealthy Athenians and their significant contributions to public life made them conspicuous among the city's residents.[10] They probably numbered close to 5 per cent of the citizen body.[11] Wealth relieved them of the necessity of work and so gave them a life of *skholē* or leisure (e.g. Ar. *Plut.* 281; *Vesp.* 552–7; Men. *Dys.* 293–5). It also allowed the wealthy to pursue pastimes which were simply too expensive and time-consuming for the poor. Groups of wealthy friends regularly came together for a *sumposion* or drinking party, which was normally preceded by a *deipnon* or dinner party (e.g. Ar. *Vesp.* 1216–17, 1219–22, 1250).[12] Symposiasts may have begun with educated conversations but, as they became more intoxicated, regularly took up drinking games, had sex with hired entertainers and stumbled onto the city's streets as part of a *kōmos* or drunken revel in honour of Dionysus. We can easily see why public speakers and comic poets thought the upper class to be overly fond of alcohol, prostitutes and gourmandising.[13] In the *Frogs* of Aristophanes, for example, a slave agrees that his master is indeed a gentleman because he knows how – to put it politely – to soak and poke (739–40). Wealthy citizens were constantly criticised for wasting their private resources on such conspicuous conviviality instead of liturgies and *eisphorai* or extraordinary war taxes.[14] They also set themselves apart by taking part in hunts, conducting public love-affairs with boys and young men of citizen status, joining the cavalry corps, and pursuing horse racing and chariot racing.[15] This book adds athletics to this list of upper-class pursuits.

[9] Scholarship of the last decade has put beyond doubt that Solon's income classes had no bearing on the type of military service which citizens chose; see Pritchard 2010: 23–7 with bibliography.

[10] Christ 2007: 54, 68; Ehrenberg 1951: 99; Vartsos 1978: 239.

[11] This estimate is based primarily on the number of *eisphora*-payers in fourth-century Athens; see, for example, Hansen 1991: 90–4, 109–15; Pritchard 2004: 212, 212–13 n. 23; Rhodes 1982; Taylor 2007: 89 *pace* Davies 1981: 24–7.

[12] For the drinking party as an elite activity in classical Athens, see Cooper and Morris 1990: 77–8; Murray 1990: 149–50; cf. 1993: 207–13.

[13] E.g. Ar. *Av.* 285–6; *Eccl.* 242–4; *Eq.* 92–4; *Nub.* 1072–3; *Ran.* 715, 1068; *Vesp.* 79–80, 493–5; Aeschin. 1.42; Dem. 19.229; Lys. 19.11.

[14] E.g. Ar. *Plut.* 242–4; *Ran.* 431–3, 1065–8; Dem. 36.39; Lys. 14.23–9; 19.9–11; 28.13.

[15] For hunting as an upper-class activity, see Chapter 2. For pederastic homosexuality and equestrian pursuits as the same, see Chapter 3.

This distinctiveness of wealthy citizens extended to their physical appearance. This is clearly reflected in the final scene of Aristophanes' *Wasps* where a rich son finds it difficult to convince his poor father to give up his *tribōn* ('coarse cloak') and *embades* ('cheap slippers'), which were the standard attire of the poor in the poet's other plays, for a *khlaina* or upper-class cloak and a pair of shoes called 'Laconians', which were evidently something of a luxury (1331–58).[16] It is no easier for him to get his father to walk in the manner of the wealthy (1168–73).[17] In other plays Aristophanes noted how the upper class wore signet rings and could afford warmer clothing (e.g. *Eccl.* 632; *Nub.* 332; *Ran.* 1065–8), while its younger members styled themselves as Spartans by wearing clothes with wool-tassels and keeping their beards untrimmed and their hair long.[18] In the same vein public speakers associated the *tribōn* and *embades* with poor citizens and recognised the distinctive attire of the wealthy (e.g. Isae. 15.11; Lys. 16.19). Elite Athenians of the fifth century may have spent much less on clothing and tombs than their sixth-century forebears (Ar. *Eq.* 1325; Thuc. 1.6.3–6), but clearly they could still be recognised visually as a distinct stratum of the citizen body.[19]

The wealthy also stood out for providing the democracy with its political leaders, as only they were capable of bearing the demands and the dangers of *hē dēmagōgia* or the leadership of the people (e.g. Ar. *Eq.* 191–3).[20] Athenian politicians had to develop domestic and foreign policies, manage public finances, propose decrees and amendments, argue for their proposals in public forums and carry political contests into the law-courts. Only the well-educated could undertake such complex tasks.[21] But this book confirms that education in classical Athens depended on the private wealth of individual families.[22] Thus it was only the sons of wealthy citizens who could purse the three traditional disciplines of education and take lessons with the sophists in public speaking, which clearly was a vital skill for anyone aspiring to political leadership.[23] As politics took up a great deal of time, politicians also required *skholē*, which was – as we have seen – a

[16] Aristophanes frequently associates these two items of dress with poor citizens; see, for example, *Eccl.* 633, 847–50; *Plut.* 842–3; *Vesp.* 33, 115–17. For the different clothing of the two social classes, see, for example, Geddes 1987: 311–15; M. C. Miller 2010: 317–21; Rosivach 2001: 127–8.
[17] Bremmer 1993: 18–20.
[18] E.g. Ar. *Eq.* 579–80; *Nub.* 14; *Vesp.* 467–8, 474–6.
[19] For this restraint of conspicuous consumption in the fifth century, see Fisher 1998b: 90–1; Morris 1992: 128–55.
[20] Heath 1987: 37; Ober 1989: 112; Pelling 2000: 13–14.
[21] Ober 1989: 115, 182–91; Robb 1994: 125–56, 183.
[22] Chapter 2. [23] Chapter 3.

preserve of the upper class. Political leaders, finally, were expected to pursue each other in the law-courts on the charges of unconstitutional proposals or acts of treason (e.g. Din. 1.100–1; Dem. 22.66–7; 24.173–4). As a consequence, they faced the constant threat of prosecution for crimes whose punishments were fines of thousands of drachmas, exile or death.[24] This danger made *hē dēmagōgia* unattractive to everyone except the extremely confident, the legally powerful and those who were able to withstand the imposition of heavy monetary penalties.[25] It was only wealthy individuals who could brave such risks (e.g. Dem. 10.70).

In classical Athens elite membership and tax obligations were closely associated: elite citizens were obliged to pay particular taxes, which, in turn, helped them to prove their membership of the elite.[26] Public speakers emphasised that it was the wealthy who undertook liturgies, such as the *khorēgia* or chorus-sponsorship and the trierarchy, and paid the *eisphora* whenever it was levied.[27] Aristophanes subjected the same observation to comic exaggeration. In his *Knights*, for example, the caricature of the politician Cleon threatens a poor retailer with liability for this tax (923–6): 'You will be truly punished by me, when you are weighed down by *eisphorai*; for I am going to register you among the wealthy.' In his *Frogs* the dead Euripides is accused of teaching rich citizens how to evade the trierarchy by dressing in rags and claiming to be poor men (1062–5). Like archaic aristocrats, wealthy Athenians were under enormous social pressure to perform *agatha* or benefactions for poor neighbours and the city as a whole.[28] Liturgies were widely thought to be a duty of the upper class.[29] As individuals who performed liturgies gained political and legal advantages, many regularly volunteered to do so.[30] Those who did not could be forced to perform one by a magistrate or the legal procedure of the *antidosis* or exchange of properties.[31] If a citizen who had been assigned a liturgy believed that there was another who was better qualified to do it because of his greater prosperity, he could use the *antidosis*-procedure

[24] Fisher 1998b: 93. [25] Sinclair 1988: 138.
[26] Davies 1981: 13; Gabrielsen 1994: 43–4; Hansen 1991: 110; Vartsos 1978: 241–2.
[27] For the wealthy as liturgists in Athenian speeches, see Davies 1971: xx–xxi; 1981: 9–14. As *eisphora*-payers, see, for example, Antiph. 2.3.8; Dem. 4.7; 10.37; 27.66; Lys. 22.13; 27.9–10; Christ 2007, 54.
[28] Gabrielsen 1994: 48–9. For the private acts of charity of the wealthy, see, for example, Dem. 18.268; 19.170; 59.72; Lys. 16.4; 19.59; 31.15; Rosivach 1991: 193–4.
[29] E.g. Ar. *Lys.* 653–4; Dem. 42.22; Lys. 27.10; Christ 2006: 171–84.
[30] For these advantages, see Chapter 3.
[31] For this procedure, see Christ 1990.

to challenge that person either to take over his liturgy or to exchange properties with him (e.g. Lys. 24.9).

The Athenian democracy may have made elite citizens liable for liturgies and extraordinary taxes for war but it never set an income or property qualification for elite membership. 'Despite the importance of the contribution the rich made to the state, the state did very little to assess accurately or even record who owned what.'[32] It simply lacked the means of independently assessing the personal wealth of its citizens.[33] Instead, citizens who volunteered to perform such *agatha* saw themselves as wealthy and hence morally obliged to do so. Citizens who were compelled to be liturgists were seen by others to be wealthy, because they clearly did what the wealthy normally did or were the sons of citizens who had been liturgists.[34] The identification of the wealthy on such subjective grounds made membership of this social class 'to an appreciable degree optional'.[35] As long as the son of a rich citizen was prepared to wear the charge of having wasted his inheritance, he could decide to drop out of this social class and back it up by refusing to perform liturgies and avoiding – as Aristophanes joked – the trappings of the rich. By the same token the son of a non-elite citizen could, after amassing a personal fortune, claim elite membership by being the first in his family to perform liturgies, pay *eisphorai* and, more generally, take up the elite's way of life.[36] In light of the appreciable turnover of elite members in classical Athens there would have been a steady stream of individual citizens making such a decision to move themselves and their families from one social class to another.[37]

Although it contrasts with how we regularly subdivide contemporary society into fractions of the upper, middle and lower or working classes, the classical Athenians classified everybody who did not belong to the wealthy as the poor.[38] Some ancient historians have argued for an underclass of *ptōkhoi* or beggars below the poor on the strength of *Wealth* by Aristophanes.[39] In this comedy the goddess of poverty is criticised for leaving men short of food and with rags to wear (535–47). Her defence is that this is actually the life of a beggar, whereas the *penēs* or poor man 'lives thriftily, devoting himself to his work and, while nothing is left over, he

[32] J. N. Davidson 1997: 242.
[33] Christ 2007: 57; Gabrielsen 1994: 44–53; Hansen 1991: 111.
[34] For the inheritance of liturgical obligations, see Gabrielsen 1994: 60–7.
[35] Gabrielsen 1994: 49.
[36] Gabrielsen 1994: 60; Vartsos 1978: 234.
[37] Fisher 1998b: 92–3; Pritchard 2003: 302.
[38] Christ 2007: 55; Hansen 1991: 115.
[39] E.g. Fisher 1998b: 96; Heath 1987: 32; Markle 1985: 270.

does not go short' (548, 550–4). In other passages Aristophanes did sometimes characterise the poor along the same lines: while working for a living, they had adequate stores of food and owned their own farming plots and even slaves (e.g. *Pax* 632–8; *Plut.* 26–9; cf. Lys. 5.5). But he could also associate a lack of enough food or proper clothes with this social class (e.g. *Eccl.* 422–5, 565–7; *Ran.* 1062–5), while public speakers employed *ptōkhos* as an exaggerated synonym for *penēs* (e.g. Dem. 18.131; 19.310; 21.185, 198, 211; Lys. 30.27). Thus Poverty's distinction between the two in *Wealth* seems to be another of her falsehoods, like the one that Zeus is poor (*Plut.* 582), which this goddess introduces in the hope of winning an *agōn* or debate.[40] In classical Athens *hoi penētes* included everyone from the truly destitute to those who sat just below the elite.

In public speeches and on stage what the varied members of this social class had in common was a lack of *skholē* and hence a need to work and an inability to act decisively as individuals in politics or in a law-court. They also had a way of life which was frugal and moderate and fewer opportunities than the rich to perform *agatha* for the city. Poor citizens were marked out primarily by their need to work for a living.[41] This was reflected in social terminology, as *penēs*, which was the most commonly used word for a poor man, was derived from the verb *penomai*, whose primary meaning was to work or toil. It was taken for granted that the poor as individuals were less powerful than the wealthy (e.g. Dem. 44.28; Eur. *El.* 35–42). In Aristophanes' *Wealth*, for example, the god of wealth complains that the poor men who are willing to aid him in his contest with Zeus will be *ponēroi summakhoi* or poor-quality allies (218–20). His interlocutor assures him that they will be of value, once, that is, this god has made them wealthy (220). Speakers in legal *agōnes* understandably emphasised the legal weakness of poor citizens (e.g. Dem. 21.123–4, 219; Lys. 24.16–17).[42] For his part Demosthenes saw poverty as the main reason why earlier victims of Meidias had failed to prosecute him (21.141): 'You all know why a man recoils from defending himself. What is responsible is a lack of leisure, a desire for a quiet life, an inability to speak in public, poverty and many other reasons.' One of the reasons which he gives here is poverty, while two others are direct consequences of it. Because poor citizens – out of fear of litigation – avoided giving offence to others or causing trouble and generally lacked the spare time and cash for the

[40] Rosivach 1991: 189–90, 196–7 n. 5; Sommerstein 1984: 329.
[41] E.g. Ar. *Pax* 632; *Vesp.* 611; *Plut.* 281; Lys. 24.16; Rosivach 2001: 127, 133.
[42] Ober 1989: 217–19.

rich's conspicuous consumption, they lived lives which were characterised by *sōphrosunē* or moderation (e.g. Ar. *Plut.* 563–5; Eur. *El.* 50–3; Lys. 24.16–17). The wealthy, by contrast, were thought to get away with *hubris*, that is, the violent disrespecting of other citizens, because they were legally powerful and could even pay off those whom they had thoughtlessly wronged (e.g. Ar. *Plut.* 563–4; Dem. 21.123–4; Lys. 24.16–17). The poor, finally, simply could not afford to perform the same public services as the wealthy. Thus their recognised benefactions for the city were restricted to their fighting of land and sea battles.[43]

1.3 THE EVIDENCE FOR ATHENIAN POPULAR CULTURE

This book is largely a work of cultural history: its explanation of the anomaly of elite sport in democratic Athens focuses on the perceptions which non-elite Athenians had of athletics, other elite pursuits and the waging of war, and the view which they had of themselves as hoplites and sailors. In light of this cultural focus we should also clarify, as part of the book's introduction, the evidence which we possess for the viewpoints, morality and self-identity which the classical Athenians by and large shared. These have been described variously as, among other terms, 'civic ideology', 'Athenian identity and civic ideology', 'conventional Athenian ideology' and 'a civic ideology … defined in public discourse' or 'public conversations'.[44] Nicole Loraux famously avoided such terminology, because of ideology's deceptive meaning in Marxist theory, and invented in its place 'the Athenian imaginary'.[45] For my part I have described this cultural melange as 'popular thinking' or 'popular culture' and its surviving evidence as 'popular literature' on the grounds that non-elite citizens had the greatest power to determine its content.[46]

The medium for the communicating of this popular culture was the spoken word. Classical Athens remained a predominantly oral society. The decision-making of its legal and political venues was conducted orally, with relevant documents read aloud by public servants (e.g. *Ath. Pol.* 54.5; Isae. 5.2).[47] The small number of books in existence circulated

[43] Ar. *Ach.* 595–7; Eur. *Supp.* 886–7; Lys. 16.14; Soph. *Aj.* 410; cf. Ar. *Eq.* 943–5.
[44] These descriptions are by, respectively, Goldhill (1986a: 57, 70), Boegehold and Scafuro (1994), Mills (1997: 48, 75, 83), Ober (1994: 102) and Balot (2004: 406).
[45] Loraux 1986: 335–7; Pritchard 1998a: 38–9 with bibliography.
[46] E.g. Pritchard 1998a: 40; 1999a: 2–12; 2009: 216; 2010: 32.
[47] Lewis 1996: 433; Phillips 1990: 139; Thomas 1989: 61–4.

amongst the wealthy (e.g. Ar. *Av.* 1288–9; *Ran.* 52). Poor citizens showed little interest in them.[48] Indeed most members of this social class would have struggled to read them, because as boys they had not stayed long enough in the classes of a *grammatistēs* or letter teacher to learn how to read fluently or had never taken such classes.[49] They were, by contrast, very good talkers.[50] Poor citizens habitually came together in small groups around the *agora* or marketplace (e.g. Ar. *Eccl.* 301–3; *Thesm.* 578; *Vesp.* 488–99) and, among other locations (e.g. Pl. *Resp.* 492b), in barbers' shops (e.g. Ar. *Av.* 1440–1; *Plut.* 337–8; Lys. 24.19–20).[51] In such informal gatherings elements of popular culture were no doubt rehearsed. The most important forums, however, for the representing and communicating of this common identity and shared set of norms and viewpoints were the political venues of the democracy, its law-courts and the dramatic competitions which it staged; for public speakers and playwrights were more capable than others of articulating such cultural material clearly and fulsomely, were regularly required to do so, and addressed audiences of hundreds and, more frequently, thousands of citizens.[52]

The cultural history of classical Athens has been written largely on the basis of speeches which were drafted for meetings of its assembly or council of five hundred or for its law-courts and were subsequently published. The orations of this kind which we possess have been used in the historiography of subjects as diverse as, for example, the religious and military viewpoints of the *dēmos*, its construction of masculinity, and its perceptions of morality, political leadership and social class.[53] Cultural historians have so privileged these orations because of a particular dynamic of their performance: although politicians and litigants came from the upper class, those whom they addressed and whose votes determined the outcome of their *agōnes* were predominantly lower-class citizens.[54] Such assembly-goers, councillors and jurors were notoriously difficult to win over (e.g. Aesch. *Supp.* 483; Ar. *Pax* 607; Pl. *Resp.* 492b–c). We have already seen how the lower class had a decidedly mixed view of upper-class morality

[48] Finley 1986: 29. [49] Chapter 2.
[50] Carter 2011a: 63; Griffith and Carter 2011: 14. [51] Lewis 1996.
[52] Henderson 1990: 277–8; Ober 1989: 45; Thomas 1989: 198.
[53] For the use of such speeches in the study of military attitudes, see, for example, Burckhardt 1996: 154–261; Ober 1978; Roisman 2005: 105–29; religious attitudes, Mikalson 1983; masculinity, Roisman 2005; morality, Dover 1974; and political leadership and social class, Ober 1989.
[54] For the class position of politicians and litigants, see section 1.1 above. For jurors and assembly-goers as predominantly lower class, see Hansen 1991: 125–78, 183–6; Markle 1985: 281–92; Ober 1989: 132–8; 141–7; Todd 2007. For this use of *agōn*, see Chapter 4.