

Saviors of Greece

William C. West III

FEW TEXTS have been so problematic as the so-called Marathon Epigrams (IG I² 763). In their recent edition in the collection of Meiggs and Lewis one can follow succinctly the progress of nearly four decades of controversy regarding the interrelated questions of the restorations of individual lines, the nature of the monument, and the battles commemorated.¹ The last line of Epigram I is, in fact, the only line of that poem whose suppletion has not been seriously questioned or modified since Kirchhoff proposed it in 1869,² and it is perhaps ironic that this line suggests a point of historical interest which has been neglected.

Meritt's latest restoration of the epigram, which combines the fifth-century fragments and the alleged fourth-century copy, will serve to introduce the problem:

Ἄνδρῶν τῶνδ' ἀρετῇ [λάμψει φά]ος ἄφθι[τον] αἰεί,
[οἷς κἂν εἶ]ν ἔργ[οις ἐςθλὰ] νέμωσι θεοί·
ἔσχον γὰρ πεζοί τε [καὶ] ὠκυπόρων ἐπὶ νηῶν
'Ελλά[δα μ]ῆ πάσαν δούλιον ἡμαρ ἰδεῖν.³

The final couplet expresses the idea that the victory commemorated was responsible for the saving of Greece. The belief that this epigram, as well as its companion, referred to the battle of Marathon held the

¹ *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the End of the Fifth Century B.C.*, ed. R. Meiggs and D. Lewis (Oxford 1969) no.26.

² A. Kirchhoff, *MonatsberBerl* (1869) 412–16. A slightly different version was printed in IG I 333, but the original suggestion was followed in *Epigrammata Graeca ex lapidibus conlecta*, ed. G. Kaibel (Berlin 1878) no.749, and confirmed by the Agora find of 1932.

³ I cite a convenient recent version published in *Inscriptions from the Athenian Agora* Excavations of the Athenian Agora, Picture Book No.10, Princeton 1966) nos. 2–3. For full discussion of the epigraphical details see “The Marathon Epigrams Again,” *AJP* 83 (1962) 294–98, and “Epigrams from the Battle of Marathon,” *The Aegean and the Near East. Studies presented to Hetty Goldman* (Locust Valley, N.Y. 1956) 268–80. Disagreement with Meritt as to whether the fourth-century inscription is actually a copy of the fifth-century text is voiced by W. K. Pritchett, *AJP* 85 (1964) 50ff, but the standard view is otherwise. See Meiggs and Lewis, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.1) 55.

field for almost a hundred years and has only been weakened, if not altogether dispelled, by relatively recent developments.⁴ Would such praise for Marathon be consistent, however, with our understanding of the direction of Athenian propaganda in the decades following the war with Xerxes?

Ever since the discovery of the new fragment in 1932 in the Athenian Agora some critics maintained that the first poem actually referred to Salamis, or Salamis and Plataea. Hiller first objected to its attribution to Marathon on the grounds that *ἠκυπόρων ἐπὶ νηῶν* (cf. the Eurymedon epigram, *AP* 7.258) should be restored in line 3 and that it could not have been asserted that Marathon saved all Greece from slavery.⁵ Jacoby summarily dismissed this suggestion with a contemptuous reference to "... the frequent confusion between the historical views held by us with those held by the contemporaries of the event."⁶ The feeling that the Athenians utilized Marathon in pushing themselves as saviors of Greece was quite strong and, therefore, criticism of the implications of line 4 was not forthcoming. Gomme, citing the prominent reference to a city by the sea, *ἀγχιάλον*, in line 2 of Epigram II, argued that both epigrams should be referred to Salamis.⁷ Nevertheless Marathon at first remained the orthodox attribution.

In 1956, however, Meritt published the copy of Epigram I which upheld Hiller's restoration and confirmed the reference to land and sea warfare in lines 3 and 4, and because of the attested reference to ships Salamis quickly won adherents. Although Meritt had attempted to rationalize the meaning of *ἐπὶ νηῶν* as 'by the ships' rather than 'upon' them,⁸ Amandry formally proposed Salamis as the battle logically commemorated in the phrase.⁹ Pritchett countered that *ἐπί* with the genitive must mean 'on' (hence the impossibility of referring

⁴ The bibliography of the epigrams is voluminous. See F. Jacoby, *Kleine philologische Schriften* I (Berlin 1961) 461–62 nn.19, 20; *SEG* 10.404; 12.68; 13.34, 35; 14.18; 16.22, 139; 19.38; 21.117; 22.63; and Meiggs and Lewis, *loc.cit.* (*supra* n.1).

⁵ F. Hiller von Gaertringen, "Perserepigramme von der athenischen Agora," *Hermes* 69 (1934) 204–06.

⁶ F. Jacoby, "Some Athenian Epigrams from the Persian Wars," *Hesperia* 14 (1945) 165. Hiller's view was also criticized by W. Peek, *Hermes* 69 (1934) 339–43, but even Meritt (*Studies Goldman* [*supra* n.3] 272) felt that the Panhellenic character of the text was not suitable for a date before 480.

⁷ A. W. Gomme, *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides* II (Oxford 1956) 98–100.

⁸ *Studies Goldman* (*supra* n.3) 271–72.

⁹ P. Amandry, "Sur les epigrammes de Marathon," *Θεωρία. Festschrift für W.-H. Schuchhardt* (Baden-Baden 1960) 1–8.

the epigram to Marathon) and noted that the sentiment of the poem reflected that expressed in regard to Salamis in the *Persae* of Aeschylus, with its emphasis on the hoplite action on Psyttaleia as well as the naval battle.¹⁰ Peek, preferring to associate another fragmentary epigram, *SEG* 13.34, with Salamis and Plataea, argued that Epigram I referred to all operations of 480–79,¹¹ but Meritt, on the assumption that the demonstratives τῶνδ' of Epigram I and τοῦτ' of Epigram II must refer to the same men, has stoutly defended the reference of both poems to Marathon.¹² Meiggs and Lewis now state definitely that the first epigram, and the monument, concerned Salamis and, at any rate, it must now be admitted that Marathon is the unorthodox position.

In view of this development it should be noted that Kirchhoff had originally proposed Marathon, in 1869, in the belief that both epigrams had been inscribed on the base of the Athena Promachus statue, said by Pausanias (1.28.2) to be a tithe ἀπὸ Μήδων τῶν ἐκ Μαραθῶνα ἀποβάντων.¹³ It would appear that, since in his opinion both epigrams commemorated Marathon, they could be used to account for Pausanias' clear statement as to the origin of the famous statue. Oliver, in his publication in 1933 of the new fragment, followed Kirchhoff in his attribution but did not investigate his motives in making it, speaking merely of an epigram commemorating "a battle which saved all Hellas" as being "correctly" referred to Marathon.¹⁴

The much discussed problems of dating and restoration, however, have obscured the fact that line 4 (*Ἑλλάδα μὴ πᾶσαν δούλιον ἦμαρ ἰδεῖν*), the one certain complete line in Epigram I, is the only solid epigraphical evidence that Athens, in the early years of the Pentecontaetia, promoted herself as the savior of Panhellenic interests. Consequently, if the epigram now refers to Salamis, as the trend of scholarship suggests, one may feel justified in asking if there is any other evidence from the fifth century that Athens in its propaganda associated the saving of Greece with their victory at Marathon. I hope to show that there is none at all from early in the century for such an idea and that it stems from a tradition primarily of the fourth century.

¹⁰ W. K. Pritchett, *Marathon* (CalifPCLArch 4.2, Berkeley and Los Angeles 1960) 160–68.

¹¹ *Hermes* 88 (1960) 494–98.

¹² *AJP* 83 (*supra* n.3) 297–98.

¹³ Kirchhoff, *loc.cit.* (*supra* n.2).

¹⁴ J. H. Oliver, *Hesperia* 2 (1933) 485–86.

The idea appears distinctly in *epitaphia* of the fourth century, the earliest of which (*ca.* 394) is Lysias, *Epit.* 20: *μόνοι γὰρ ὑπὲρ ἀπάσης τῆς Ἑλλάδος πρὸς μυριάδας τῶν βαρβάρων διεκινδύνευσαν.* Other appearances of the *topos* in this tradition include Plato, *Menex.* 240D–E, Demosthenes 60.10, and Hyperides, *Epit.* 37. It occurs also in other orations of different formal types: Andocides, *De Myst.* 107, Isocrates, *Panath.* 195, and Demosthenes, *De Cor.* 208, and Marathon is indicated by implication in Lysias 18.27 and Isocrates, *Paneg.* 75. As an example of the latter group the reference of Andocides bears quoting because of its close resemblance to that of Lysias, suggesting a common source for the *topos*: . . . ἡξίουσαν φᾶς αὐτοὺς προτάξαντες πρὸ τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἀπάντων τοῖς βαρβάρους Μαραθῶνάδε . . . μαχεσάμενοι τε ἐνίκων καὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα ἡλευθέρωσαν καὶ τὴν πατρίδα ἔσωσαν. The earliest of all these orations is *De Mysteriis*, dated in 400 or 399 B.C.;¹⁵ the Lysian speeches are dated a few years later.

The *epitaphios* tradition, however, goes well back into the fifth century, and recent scholarship has stressed once again its influence in establishing the repeated claims of Athenian propaganda.¹⁶ Common opinion holds that orations became part of the ceremony of burial shortly after the war with Xerxes and continued year after year with essentially the same laudatory *topoi*.¹⁷ Fifth-century speeches which have been interpreted as reproducing the commonplaces of funeral oratory are the speech of Athens against Tegea concerning

¹⁵ For the date see R. Sealey, *Historia* 5 (1956) 181–82, and *Andokides. On the Mysteries*, ed. D. MacDowell (Oxford 1962) 204–05.

¹⁶ The idea had been suggested and argued extensively by E. Meyer, *Forschungen zur alten Geschichte* II (Halle 1899) 219ff. See now W. Kierdorf, *Erlebnis und Darstellung der Perserkriege (Hypomnemata* 16, Göttingen 1966) 83–110, and C. Starr, *ParPass* 17 (1962) 330ff. Cf. H. Strasburger, *Hermes* 86 (1958) 20–22; H. Diller, *Entretiens Hardt* 8 (Vandœuvres-Genève 1961) 55; and J. H. Oliver, *TrAmPhilosSoc* 58.1 (Philadelphia 1968) 9ff.

¹⁷ The oration was added to an existing ceremony of public burial (Thuc. 2.35.1; Dion. Hal. *Ant.Rom.* 5.17.4; Diod.Sic. 11.33.3). Kierdorf, *loc.cit.* (*supra* n.16), concludes that the *epitaphios logos* became traditional shortly after 478. See A. Westermann, *Geschichte der Beredsamkeit in Griechenland und Rom* (Leipzig 1833) 35, and H. Caffiaux, *De l'oraison funèbre dans la Grèce païenne* (Valenciennes 1860) 21–27, who assert from the literary evidence that the custom of public oration was established after the Persian wars. Cf. also A. Hauvette, *Mélanges Henri Weil* (Paris 1889) 159ff; T. C. Burgess, "Epideictic Literature," *Studies in Classical Philology* 3 (Chicago 1902) 146ff; O. Schroeder, *De laudibus Athenarum a poetis tragicis et ab oratoribus exultis* (Diss. Göttingen 1914); and G. Kennedy, *The Art of Persuasion in Greece* (London 1963) 154. Jacoby's celebrated thesis that the *patrios nomos* was established in 464 after the disaster at Drabescus (*JHS* 64 [1944] 37–66) has been effectively criticized by Gomme, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.7) 94–101, and D. W. Bradeen, *Hesperia* 36 (1967) 321–28 and *CQ* 19 (1969) 154–55.

position in the battle line at Plataea (Hdt. 9.27),¹⁸ the Athenian ambassador's speech in reply to the Corinthians in the conference at Sparta in 432 B.C. (Thuc. 1.73ff), and, in part, the speech of Euphemus at Camarina in 415 (Thuc. 6.83ff).¹⁹ None of these speeches is itself an *epitaphion*. They were probably creations of Herodotus and Thucydides, but in their use of the *topoi* they reflect the tradition of *epitaphia* which incorporated praise of Athens and, therefore, are indicative of what was standard in the fifth century concerning the praise of Marathon.

In Herodotus emphasis is placed on Athenian uniqueness. In 9.26–27, before the battle of Plataea, the Athenians and the Tegeans quarrel for the privilege of occupying one wing of the battle line, each speaker basing his city's claims on past achievements. The Tegean speaker cites the duel between the Heraclid Hyllus and their king Echemus, acting as champion for all the Peloponnesus, by virtue of which the Tegeans were granted the right to lead the army's second wing in campaigns which involved a united Peloponnesian force. The Athenian response, although noting suitable *exempla* from Athens' mythological heritage (restoration of the Heraclidae to the Peloponnesus, burial of the seven against Thebes, victory over the Amazons who attacked Attica), downgrades mythology (. . . οὐ γὰρ τι προέχει τούτων ἐπιμεμνήσθαι . . . παλαιῶν μὲν νυν ἔργων ἄλις ἔστω 27.4–5). The Athenians state proudly that all past events were eclipsed by their one achievement at Marathon, emphasizing that *only* they fought there (μοῦνοι Ἑλλήνων δὴ μονομαχίκαντες τῷ Πέρσῃ 27.5) and that they conquered forty-six nations. The point is made to undercut the one-to-one confrontation between Echemus and Hyllus.

Elsewhere in Herodotus the singularity of Athens' effort at Marathon is cited by Artabanus, in the first council scene before Xerxes' invasion (. . . στρατιὴν γε τοσαύτην σὺν Δάτι καὶ Ἀρταφρένει ἔλθοῦσαν ἐς τὴν Ἀττικὴν χώραν μόνου Ἀθηναῖοι διέφθειραν 7.10β1–2). In Miltiades' speech to Callimachus before the battle (6.109), the decision to fight at Marathon is represented as one that will enslave or free Athens and make her the leading city in Greece. The orators of Herodotus do not represent the *Marathonomachae* as the saviors of

¹⁸ E. Maass, *Hermes* 22 (1887) 589 n.1; Meyer, *loc.cit.* (*supra* n.16); L. Solmsen, *CP* 39 (1944) 248–50; Kierdorf, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.16) 97–100.

¹⁹ Meyer, *loc.cit.* (*supra* n.16); Strasburger, *loc.cit.* (*supra* n.16).

Greece,²⁰ an honor clearly reserved for the combatants at Salamis (cf. 7.139.5).

The Athenian orators in Thucydides also emphasize the fact that only the Athenians fought at Marathon, rather than call it a battle in behalf of Greece. In the speech of the Athenian ambassador at Sparta in 432, before the outbreak of war, Marathon and Salamis are both promoted as examples of Athenian contributions. Whereas Salamis is dealt with in detail, Marathon is accorded only a brief sentence: *φαιμὲν γὰρ Μαραθῶνι τε μόνοι προκινδυνεύσαι τῷ βαρβάρῳ . . .* (1.73.4). The phrase occurs in the section on the praise of Athens which has been interpreted as incorporating the commonplaces of funeral oratory.²¹ An apparent parallel would be Lysias' *μόνοι γὰρ ὑπὲρ ἀπάσης τῆς Ἑλλάδος . . . διεκινδύνευσαν* (*Epit.* 20), but the parallelism is deceptive. The phrase *ὑπὲρ ἀπάσης τῆς Ἑλλάδος* has been added in Lysias specifying the beneficiaries of the Athenian effort (cf. *πρὸ τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἀπάντων*, *Andoc. De Myst.* 107). The emphasis is upon *μόνοι* in Thucydides as in Herodotus.

The word *προκινδυνεύσαι* requires special comment. Derivative from the two meanings of *προ-* ('before', temporal, and 'in front of', spatial, i.e., 'in defense of'), the lexical meaning of *προκινδυνεύσαι* is 'brave the first danger' or 'bear the brunt in battle' (so *LSJ*). The connotation is of troops fighting in the front line and, therefore, meeting the first shock of battle. A cognate genitive is required for the object defended. The philological question is: Which meaning is present in 1.73.4? The scholiast's explanation (*πρὸ τῆς Ἑλλάδος κινδυνεύσαι*) was generally followed by most commentators of the nineteenth century, who took the sense to be 'in behalf of' (sc. of Greece).²² More recent interpretations have preferred the temporal meaning ('we ran the risk first' or 'we alone were at the front', i.e., before anyone else).²³ The scholiast's

²⁰ On the absence of such praise of Marathon in Herodotus see H. R. Immerwahr, *Form and Thought in Herodotus* (APA Mon. 23, Cleveland 1966) 250 n.38.

²¹ Strasburger, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.16) 20–25; Kierdorf, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.16) 100–10.

²² See, e.g., *ad loc.*: Thucydides, 5th ed. G. Boehme/S. Widmann (Leipzig 1882); A. Croiset ed., *Thucydide, livres I–II* (Paris 1886); *Thucydides*, 3rd ed. E. F. Poppo/J. M. Stahl (Leipzig 1886). But *contra*, for the temporal sense, see *The History of the Peloponnesian War by Thucydides*, ed. J. J. Owen (New York 1857), and *Thucydides, Book I*, ed. C. D. Morris (Boston 1887).

²³ See, e.g., *ad loc.*: Thucydides, 5th ed. J. Classen/J. Steup (Berlin 1919); *Thucydides I*, ed. A. Maddalena (Florence 1951–52). Cf. also the translations by R. Crawley (Everyman, London and New York 1910), C. F. Smith (LCL³, London and Cambridge 1928), and J. de Romilly (Budé, Paris 1958), which take the phrase in this sense, and de Romilly, *Thucydide*

note, however ancient it might be, could well have been influenced by the tradition of fourth-century oratory. In the Thucydidean context the temporal meaning does seem preferable because of the development of the argument in chronological terms, in which Marathon and Salamis are clearly seen as two phases of the same war (cf. . . . καὶ ὅτε τὸ ὕστερον ἦλθεν . . .), and because of the strong emphasis on *μόνοι* for Marathon, which contrasts sharply with *ἐν Σαλαμῖνι ξυμμαχῆσαι* following shortly.

The emphasis on uniqueness is repeated or strongly implied, without reference to fighting in behalf of Greece, in other references in Thucydides to the Persian wars, namely, in the speech of Euphemus at Camarina (6.83.2: τὸν βάρβαρον *μόνοι* καθελόντες εἰκότως ἄρχομεν) and in the Melian dialogue (5.89: δικαίως τὸν Μῆδον καταλύσαντες ἄρχομεν).

Although parallel expressions in fourth-century orators are careful to specify the beneficiary of defense (Lys. *Epit.* 20, 18.27; Andoc. *De Myst.* 107; Isoc. *Paneg.* 75, *Panath.* 195; Dem. *De Cor.* 208), the emphasis on uniqueness is seldom retained (cf. *De Cor.* 208: τοὺς Μαραθῶνι προκινδυνεύσαντας τῶν προγόνων). The shift of emphasis from uniqueness to Panhellenism in this *topos* provides a typical contrast between the respective attitudes of the fifth and fourth centuries. Since in the speech of Euphemus (Thuc. 6.83ff) the emphasis is still on *μόνοι*, it would seem that Panhellenism was not added to the praise of Marathon until after, or during the later years of, the Peloponnesian war. The glory of old Athens, not Panhellenism, highlights the passages praising Marathon in Aristophanes.²⁴ In extant literature it makes its first appearance in *De Mysteriis* 107 and then is regular throughout the fourth century. Consequently, if Epigram I of IG I² 763 is construed as referring to Salamis, there is no precedent to suggest that Panhellenism was part of the *topos* in the earliest funeral orations. Significantly enough, the funeral speech of Pericles (Thuc. 2.35ff) does not specifically mention the *Marathonomachae* at all.

Two further pieces of possible fifth-century evidence must be considered. In the Callimachus dedication, IG I² 609, Shefton, carefully restudying the inscription in 1950, conjectured in lines 3 and 4 τὸν ἀγῶνα|τὸν Μα[ραθῶνι πρὸς ἡ]ελ(λ)έρον . . . (“the struggle at Marathon in

et l'impérialisme athénien (Paris 1947) 207–09, on Athens' claim as to her own uniqueness in the Persian wars.

²⁴ Ach. 180ff, 692ff; Eq. 781ff, 1333ff; Nub. 984ff; Vesp. 711, 1081–85; Av. 242ff; Thesm. 806ff; Ran. 1296ff; fr. 413 K. (Ath. 3.111A).

behalf of the Greeks”) as a phrase suitably designating the battle of Marathon. Since at the time Marathon was still the prevailing view for both epigrams of *IG I² 763*, there seemed to be no objection to this on historical grounds. But as Salamis now seems more likely for Epigram I, the conjecture becomes more awkward. One should note that Fraenkel’s τὸν Μα[ραθόνοθεν ἠ]έλεν. . . (i.e., “won the contest at Marathon,” cf. *Hdt.* 5.102.3) is also possible and, in fact, received Shefton’s approval.²⁵

Finally, there is the epigram quoted by Lycurgus (*Leoc.* 109) which Suidas (*s.v.* Ποικίλη) quotes also, with the implication that it stood beneath the painting of the battle of Marathon in the Stoa Poecile:

Ἑλλήνων προμαχοῦντες Ἀθηναῖοι Μαραθῶνι
χρυσοφόρων Μήδων ἐστόρεσαν δύναμιν.

But there is no direct evidence that this was an epigram of the fifth century.²⁶

In summary, then, there is no evidence from unequivocal fifth-century sources that the Athenians emphasized Panhellenism in their early propaganda concerning Marathon. It is readily evident that such an attitude was associated with Salamis (*IG I² 763*; *Hdt.* 7.138.2–144, 8.60; *Thuc.* 1.73.4ff), although the outspoken smugness of the Athenian ambassador at Sparta in Book I of Thucydides (*ξυνεχώσαμεν ὑμᾶς τε τὸ μέρος καὶ ἡμᾶς αὐτούς . . .* 74.3–4) belies altruism. Regarding both battles the Athenians essentially emphasize themselves: “At Marathon we alone fought. In the Xerxes war we were responsible for the decisive victory.” These nationalistic arguments developed into fully Panhellenic ones, perhaps, very late in the fifth century and were widely used in the fourth.

The fifth-century claims of the other Greek cities for their own contingents in the Persian wars are quite similar to those of Athens. The evidence of the historians suggests that the minor cities set great store by representation at the sites of Panhellenic memorials. The lists on the serpent column at Delphi and the base of the colossal

²⁵ See B. B. Shefton, “The Dedication of Callimachus, *IG I² 609*,” *BSA* 45 (1950) 140–64, and E. Fraenkel, “A Marathon Epigram,” *Eranos* 49 (1951) 63–64. Approval of Fraenkel’s restoration: Shefton, *BSA* 47 (1952) 278.

²⁶ The suggestion that the epigram did stand beneath the painting was made by C. W. Goettling, *Gesammelte Abhandlungen II* (Munich 1863) 139–40. For doubt as to its fifth-century authorship, see Jacoby, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.6) 160.

statue of Zeus at Olympia provided the basis for this, and the smaller cities singled out such monuments as representative of their own efforts. Plataea used the serpent column in her defense in the trial of 427 (Thuc. 3.57.2). Herodotus comments sarcastically on the large number of cities erecting tombs and cenotaphs at Plataea so as to share in the glory of its fame (9.85).

Apart from the Athenian ones, there are some twenty separate poetical epigrams, public and private, on the war with Xerxes which are attested primarily in the literary tradition. An exception preserved on stone is IG I² 927, the epigram for the Corinthians at Salamis. Four others beside this—the three cited by Herodotus (7.228) as inscribed on stelae at Thermopylae and Pausanias' original epigram for the serpent column (Thuc. 1.132.2)—were definitely early poems, but the remaining fifteen are attested only in late sources.²⁷ Although fifth-century authorship is possible and even likely for some, it cannot be demonstrated absolutely for any. The phrase *ρύόμεθα τὴν Ἑλλάδα*, however, a feature of some of the epigrams, can be taken to mean in the fifth century the same thing as *ἐκώζομεν τὴν Ἑλλάδα* with a subtle distinction. The verb *ρύομαι* is the Homeric *ἔρυμαι* ('guard, protect, defend'), cognate with Sanskrit *varū-tár-* ('protector'), *várū-tha-* ('protection') and Latin *servare*.²⁸ The meaning 'rescue' is therefore explicit only in the aorist ('protect once and for all'), but the idea of defense is present in all tenses. *Κώζω* is the stronger word, but the two are similar in their popular implications.

Nine of the twenty proclaim the freeing of Greece, or at least action in her behalf, in such phrases as 'rescuing Greece', 'freeing Greece', 'confirming the freedom of Greece', and so forth (e.g., the full version of the Corinthian epitaph at Salamis; the epigrams on the cenotaphs at the Isthmus and at Megara; the inscription on the altar of Zeus Eleutherius at Plataea).²⁹ Of these nine, two are Panhellenic, three

²⁷ Theopomp. *ap. schol. Pind. Ol.* 13.33; Chamael. *ap. Ath.* 13.573c–e; Strab. 9.650c; Diod.Sic. 11.14.4, 33; Plut. *Arist.* 19.7, *De Hdt.Mal.* 869c, 870e–f, 871b, 873b; Favorin. *ap. Dio Chrys.* 37.18; *Aristid.* 28.66 Keil; *schol. Aristid.* 1.126.4 (3 p.136 Dindorf); *AP* 6.50, 215; 7.250, 301, 344, 347, 442, 512; *IG VII* 53; *Steph.Byz. s.v. Θέσπεια*.

²⁸ See *ἔρυμαι* in H. Frisk, *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch I* (Heidelberg 1960) 568–69, and F. Solmsen, *Untersuchungen zur griechischen Laut- und Verslehre* (Strassburg 1901) 245ff.

²⁹ *ὦ ξένε εὐνδρον IG I² 927*, Plut. *De Hdt.Mal.* 870e, Favorin. *ap. Dio Chrys.* 37.18; *ἀκμᾶς ἐστακυῖαν De Hdt.Mal.* 870e–f, *Aristid.* 28.66 Keil, *schol. Aristid.* 1.126.4 (3 p.136 Dindorf), *AP* 7.250; *Ἑλλάδι καὶ Μεγαρεῦσιν IG VII 53*; *τόνδε ποθ' Ἑλληνες Plut. Arist.* 19.7, *De Hdt.Mal.* 873b, *AP* 6.50; *Ἑλλάδος εὐρυχοροῦ Diod.Sic.* 11.33; *εὐθυμάχων ἀνδρῶν AP* 7.442; *αἴδ' ὑπὲρ Ἑλλάνων Theopomp. ap. schol. Pind. Ol.* 13.33, *De Hdt.Mal.* 871b, Chamael. *ap. Ath.*

represent Corinth, one Megara, one Opuntian Locris, one Tegea, and one is for an individual, Adimantus of Corinth. Although not a single one of the epigrams can be shown to be a fifth-century poem beyond shadow of doubt, some are probably genuine, as the etymological argument suggests, together with the explicit testimony of Herodotus and Thucydides. If Boegehold's recent arguments for not rejecting the last two lines of ᾠ ξένε εὐδρον are valid,³⁰ this conclusion would be confirmed from an early source.

Literary evidence suggests that Sparta made use of similar propaganda. Thucydides represents the Corinthian ambassador as sharply rebuking the Spartans, at the conference before the Archidamian war, for the claim that their city was the liberator of Greece, while they allowed by inactivity the growth of Athenian power (1.69.1). Sparta could look upon herself as liberator of Greece both for her opposition to tyrannies in the sixth century and for her leadership against Persia in 480–79.³¹ The Corinthian argument sets forcefully the contrast between Athenian activity and Spartan indifference after the Persian wars and presses the incongruity of the claim during that period.

From the early sixth century Sparta had been the *προστάτης τῆς Ἑλλάδος*. In this rôle she held the position of *ἡγεμών* in the Hellenic League and thereby pledged opposition to the enemies of Greek independence. In Herodotus this leadership is acknowledged by foreign powers and Greek states alike (Croesus, 1.69.1; Aristagoras of Miletus, 5.49.2; Socles of Corinth, 5.92; the Greek embassy to Gelon, 7.157ff; the Athenians and other allies, 8.3; Athens and Tegea, 9.26–27). It would seem that Sparta's original rôle as *προστάτης* for the championship of Greek freedom was reaffirmed in the League of 481. This league continued to exist after the war with Xerxes, since Sparta appealed to it in 462 when seeking help from Athens against the helots. Yet relations had become strained between the cities and in 446, with the ratification of the thirty years' peace between Athens and Sparta, a formal dualism was recognized in the Greek world and the old league was allowed unconsciously to lapse. It was kept in existence formally, however, since in 427 the Plataeans appealed to it in their

13.573c; *τούδε ποθεῖ φθιμένους* (ποθεῖ Meineke, ποτέ mss.) Strab. 9.650c; *οἶτος Ἀδειμάντου* *De Hdt. Mal.* 870f, Favorin. *ap.* Dio Chrys. 37.18.

³⁰ A. L. Boegehold, "The Salamis Epigram," *GRBS* 6 (1965) 179–86.

³¹ For Sparta's opposition to tyranny see *Hdt.* 5.92 and *Thuc.* 1.18.2. *Cf.* Gomme, *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides I* (Oxford 1944) 228.

defense. The league's principles remained valid also for Sparta, as indicated by her repeated use of 'freedom' as a slogan against Athens during the Peloponnesian War.³² The Corinthian criticism discussed above is therefore directed at the fact that Sparta upheld such principles nobly at the time of Xerxes' invasion, then neglected them during the Pentecontaetia as Athens 'enslaved' her allies.

In the early books of Thucydides Sparta is characterized as the champion of Greek freedom (e.g., Brasidas' speech to the Acanthians, 4.85ff). In assessing the mood of the cities in 431 the historian had remarked: "The good will of men made a great deal of the Spartans, especially since they claimed to be liberating Greece" (2.8.4). Speeches by representatives of Corinth (1.69.1; 122.3, 124.3) and Plataea (2.71.2; 3.58.4, 59.4) put the expression in perspective by holding before the Spartans their common effort in the Persian wars, under Spartan leadership. For the Spartans Plataea was the final and decisive battle. Their dedication of the tripod and serpent column at Delphi marked the conclusion of the war with Xerxes.³³ The Plataeans themselves understandably felt in 427 that the oaths of Pausanias in their agora (2.71.2), in addition to their name on the serpent column (3.57.2), would have an effect on the Spartan judges.

It is significant that Herodotus represents Spartan generals before Plataea and Mycale encouraging their forces in the name of freedom (9.60.1, 98.3). After the battle of Plataea, moreover, Lampon of

³² Sparta as *προστάτης τῆς Ἑλλάδος*: J. H. Oliver, *Demokratia, the Gods, and the Free World* (Baltimore 1960) 124, 129–30. For evidence that the Hellenic League did not end in 478 see J. A. O. Larsen, *HSCP* 51 (1940) 204ff. On its continuance after the war with Xerxes see P. A. Brunt, *Historia* 2 (1953–54) 135–63; F. R. Wüst, *Historia* 3 (1954–55) 143–49; and H. D. Meyer, *Historia* 12 (1963) 436ff. Meyer thinks that, although the league of 481 was not formally abrogated, it was at least rendered ineffective by the return of the Peloponnesian contingent from the Hellespont in 479 and the joining of the Delian League by the islanders. See now N. G. L. Hammond, "The Origins and the Nature of the Athenian Alliance of 478/7 B.C.," *JHS* 87 (1967) 41–61, and D. Kagan, *The Outbreak of the Peloponnesian War* (Ithaca 1969) 9–74. Hdt. 8.3 has been variously interpreted as foreshadowing a change in the hegemony (from the point of view of Athens and the islands), but there can be no question that Herodotus represents Athens as recognizing Sparta's leadership against Xerxes. For a recent discussion of the problem, with bibliography, see Immerwahr, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.20) 220–22.

³³ Gomme's comment, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.31), on Thuc. 1.132.2 makes this point succinctly. The Spartan ephors substitute the names of the cities for that of Pausanias (erased in the epigram) as dedicators of the monument. If the Athenians dedicated, in their stoa at Delphi, the cables of Xerxes' bridge across the Hellespont (*cf.* Hdt. 9.121), this would seem to indicate that they looked upon the Sestus campaign, not the battle of Plataea (or even Mycale), as marking the final victory over Xerxes. See P. Amandry, *La Colonne des Naxiens et le Portique des Athéniens. Fouilles de Delphes* II.i.5 (Paris 1952) 91–121.

Aegina calls Pausanias the man 'who has rescued Greece' (*ῥυάμενον τὴν Ἑλλάδα* 9.78.2). A similar claim is made for Leonidas at Thermopylae by Spartan messengers who appear before Xerxes on his retreat through Thessaly after Salamis. They charge him with killing the king who defended Greece (*ῥυόμενον τὴν Ἑλλάδα* 8.114.2).

Panhellenic claims as to their service to Hellas were made by all cities after the war with Xerxes. In this widespread practice of common propaganda Athens attempted to establish her own uniqueness by basing claims on a similar, and more subtle, conception of Marathon and Salamis. She did not emphasize Panhellenism for both battles but promoted one as a single-handed victory and the other as a victory for which she was chiefly responsible. The other cities resented this as a distortion of glory common to all, and it contributed significantly to the ill feeling against Athens which grew steadily during the Pentecontaetia. After the Peloponnesian War, with the defeat of Athens, a new perspective developed, and Panhellenism was incorporated into the praise of Marathon, as Athenian orators attempted to inspire their listeners of the fourth century to reproduce the glories of the fifth.³⁴

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA, CHAPEL HILL

August, 1970

³⁴ I should like to express my thanks to Professor Henry R. Immerwahr for kindly reading a preliminary draft of this paper and offering pertinent criticisms. Naturally, he is not responsible for the views presented nor for any errors which may remain.