Panel Abstracts Booklet

Celtic Conference in Classics

Coimbra 2019

Faculty of Arts and Humanities
University of Coimbra

26th - 29th June 2019

Organization

University of Coimbra

Faculdade de Letras Universidade de Coimbra

CECH Centro de Estudos Clássicos e Humanísticos Universidade de Coimbra

FCT Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia

Funding

FCT Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia

Partners

República Portuguesa Cultura

Património Cultural Direção-Geral do Património Cultural

Conimbriga

[Panel 7] Misinformation, Disinformation, and Propaganda in Greek Historiography

[Wednesday]

Slot 3: 3:40 - 4:30pm

Rosaria Vignolo Munson, Swarthmore College [rmunson1@swarthmore.edu]
A different Persian 'debate' in Herodotus: On truth and falsehood

On the subject of truth and lying, Herodotus ascribes widely different ideologies to Persians and Greeks. While both groups traffic in falsehood to an equal degree and often in similar ways, the Persians more frequently accuse each other of lying or discuss lying and truth-telling. Most notably they alone in the *Histories* generalize about this topic, just as as they are the only ones who speak about forms of government in theoretical terms. Herodotus' knowledge of Persian culture, including his probably indirect knowledge and ironical interpretation of the Behistun inscription, have led him to put his Persian sources and historical agents in charge of questioning the appropriateness of truth-telling and falsehood. This is a discussion which, unlike the Constitutional Debate in Book Three, is not confined to a single scene but spans the entire course of the *Histories*. There Herodotus shows how, unlike the Greeks and in spite of numerous transgressions, the Persians hold truth-telling as a moral value, as self-defining as the Greeks consider freedom. As a Greek and a storyteller, Herodotus participates in his culture's casual and often admiring view of all sort of (successful) trickery. As an historian, however, that position is one he can hardly afford.

Slot 4: 4:40 - 5:30pm

Luke Madson, Rutgers University [luke.madson@rutgers.edu]
The Herophilos Hypothesis and Aristomenes of Messene

This paper seeks to make sense of the traditions on the death of Aristomenes of Messene in order to understand the flexibility of the Messenian historical tradition following the refoundation of Messene in 371 BCE. As Ogden (2004) has noted, Aristomenes is a remarkably pliable folk hero, and Figueira (1999) has characterized Aristomenes as an "invincible loser." Pausanias (4.24) states that Aristomenes died in Rhodes; however, an alternate tradition states that the Spartans captured Aristomenes, cut him open, and found his heart to be hairy (Rhianos *FGH* 265 F46; a tradition picked up by later writers).

How these two death traditions are to be reconciled is unclear. Both Luraghi (2008) and Bertelli (2010) suggest that Rhianos' *Messenika*, as a Hellenistic ethno-epic, was in agreement with Pausanias' narrative that Aristomenes died on Rhodes (following Rhianos *FGH* 265 F41). Bertelli similarly considers that the hairy heart was a rhetorical rumor which was noted only to be refuted by Rhianos, who could thereby adopt the stance of an erudite poet who distinguished genuine tradition for his audience. In this case, Rhianos' portrayal of Aristomenes would be in line with the emergence of the Hellenistic romance novel.
There are multiple interpretations of the hairy heart: a sign of martial valor, heroic guile, or trickster resurrection (see Ogden 2004; cf. Bertelli 2010). I argue that the heart

of Aristomenes is deployed in more than just a literary imaginary. Rhianos was likely influenced by human dissection at Alexandria by Herophilos of Chalcedon, the man credited for developing an understanding of the cardiovascular system under the Ptolemaic research program (von Staden 1989). Rhianos' tale can be seen as both Homeric deformation and a nod to scientific exploration much like some medical allusions in Callimachus (See Most 1981; cf. Lang 2009).
If we accept that the hairy heart as deformation of prior tradition, it suggests that Rhianos was working within a tradition which existed in Messenian myth-history before the Battle of Leuctra. Rather than seeing this narrative as invention and continuing the debate in Messenian historiography between discontinuists and continuists, we can follow Alcock's (1999) work on public remembrance and narrative multiplicity. The two death traditions should be viewed as supporting both diaspora communities as well as localized identity in opposition to Laconia. The dual tradition granted the Messenians flexibility when articulating identity in both local and broader Pan-Hellenic discourses.

Denis Correa, Universidade de Coimbra, dniscorrea@gmail.com
Agonistic intertextuality and authorial rivalry in Hdt. II. 143 and Thuc. I. 97

This research is a work in progress that investigates controversies between historians in Fifth-century historiography. The term "agonistic intertextuality" was first applied to this subject by L. Bertelli (2001, 68–78) when debating Hecataeus' critical approach of earlier genealogical tradition. Bertelli ascribed the term to J. Assmann (1992, 286–87), although Assmann's work stressed rather his notion of "hypoleptic discourse" in which agonistic intertextuality is just a way to designate the competitive aspect of Greek scribal culture. Recently, C. Condilo (2017) termed Herodotus's engagement with Hecataeus in *Hdt.* II. 143 (the famous conversation with Egyptian priests) as agonistic intertextuality and suggested (2017, 254) a similar competitive setting for the reference to Hellanicus in *Thuc.* I. 97. Condilo, however, does not mention Assmann's concept of hypoleptic discourse.
Bertelli and Condillo approached the creation of historical chronology from the genealogical system that preceded it, and doing so they emphasized the methodological aspects of these historical controversies. However, is Herodotus' account of Hecataeus being humiliated by Egyptian Priests motivated strictly by methodological concerns? Can we trust that this event actually took place and that it was not some sort of misrepresentation that intended to undermine Hecataeus' reputation (HEIDEL 1935, 123–26; WEST 1991, 147–49; FOWLER 2007, 35–36)? And Thucydides really offers a more accurate chronological system than that of Hellanicus (HORNBLOWER 1996, 490–93; CLARKE 2008, 91–95)? And what is the role of authorial rivalry in these polemics? I intend to answer these questions regarding *Hdt.* II. 143 and *Thuc.* I. 97, using the notions of hypoleptic discourse and agonistic intertextuality (ASSMANN 1992, 2011), while approaching the controversies as authorial self-definition within the tradition (MARINCOLA 1997, 218–36). I will focus on the rhetorical and persuasive aspects, in order to understand how Fifth-century historians drained the reputation of predecessors by criticizing their work.

Bibliography
ASSMANN, Jan. 1992. *Das kulterelle Gedächtnis: Schrift, Erinnerung und politische Identität in frühen Hochkulturen*. München: Beck.
———. 2011. *Cultural Memory and Early Civilization: Writing, Remembrance, and Political*

Imagination. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
BERTELLI, Lucio. 2001. «Hecataeus: from Genealogy to historiography». In *The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus*, edited by Nino LURAGHI, 57–94. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
CLARKE, Katherine. 2008. *Making Time for the Past: Local Histories and the Polis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
CONDILO, Camila. 2017. «Agonistic intertextuality: Herodotus' engagement with Hecataeus on genealogies». *JAH* 5 (2): 228–79.
FOWLER, R. 2007. «Herodotus and his prose predecessors». In *The Cambridge Companion to Herodotus*, edited by C. DEWALD and John MARINCOLA. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
HEIDEL, W. A. 1935. «Hecataeus and the Egyptian Priests in Herodotus, Book II». *Memoirs of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences* 18 (2): 53–134.
HORNBLOWER, Simon. 1991, 1996. *A Commentary on Thucydides - Vol. I-II*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
MARINCOLA, John. 1997. *Authority and Tradition in Ancient Historiography*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
WEST, Stephanie. 1991. «Herodotus' portrait of Hecataeus». *JHS*, n. 111: 144–60.

Slot 5: 9:00 - 9:50am

Deborah Boedeker, Brown University [deborah_boedeker@brown.edu]

Attitudes and actions: Non-Greeks on Greeks in Herodotus

Attitudes and Actions: Non-Greeks on Greeks in Herodotus

Readers of Herodotus have long noted that the *Histories* include a good deal of national stereotyping. For example, Greeks are poor but politically free; Persia is wealthy but enslaved to its autocratic ruler; the Egyptians' civilization is especially ancient, idiosyncratic, and marked by wisdom. Scholarship on this broad topic has been both prolific and enlightening.

This paper focuses on a narrative device that Herodotus often uses to highlight such fixed ideas. Characters in the *Histories*, both groups and individuals, are given voice to express their attitudes (usually negative) about the habits, beliefs, or predilections of foreign peoples. Herodotus calls attention to this tendency to typify and criticize the ways of others, and occasionally makes his own generalizations about a group's attitude toward different nations, as when he declares that Egyptians and Scythians alike eschew foreign practices, believing their own to be superior (2.91, 4.76.2). As narrator, he not only calls attention to the common practice of judging the customs and characters of other cultures, but gives his own view (in perhaps our earliest statement of cultural relativism), concluding that all groups prefer their native ways, and citing a dictum of Pindar, *nomos pantôn basileus* 'custom is king of all' (3.38.4).

Especially interesting in this matter are passages where Persians (or their allies) are said to believe or say something about Greeks that is demonstrated to be false by "real" occurrences, i.e. events that are described in the narrative of the *Histories*. Such discrepancies serve to complicate the audience's reception of cross-cultural generalizations.

Slot 6: 10:00 - 10:50am

Donald Lateiner, Ohio Wesleyan University [dglatein@owu.edu]

"Bad News" in Herodotos and Thoukydides: Unwelcome, deceptive, or untrue

Historians, contemporary and subsequent to their events, confront problems such as the accuracy and adequacy of assembled data/facts and the biases of their informants. Written and oral errors produce intended *disinformation,* mass-distributed *propaganda,* and unintentional *misinformation*. Such inconvenient "facts" were generated in the period under study and promoted for personal, family, polis or patriotic pride or exculpation. Further, historians excavate prior and subsequent distortions that interested parties produce from similar motives. Foreground, background, and reception material--when false, concocted, or inadequate--constitutes our first species of "bad news."

Herodotos, the belated investigator, flags perceived errors (1.91, 2.16, 7.139), bias and superstition (2.123, 160), and malice (8.94). He knows that his capacities to discover or reconstruct the fragile truth have limits (Preface, 4.11, 7.152), however dogged and impressive his investigations (2.99, 5.66, 9.84). Sifting through the past's cold detritus, he hears conflicting and mutually exclusive, non-investigable narratives (6.14, 124). Peisistratos, Histiaios, and Aristagoras exemplify *disinformants* duping audiences (5.97). Autocrats excel in concealing and suppressing truths, both Deiökes in his palace and Xerxes hiding his corpses at Thermopylai. Oracle-monger Onomakritos was a fraud and a forger for hire (7.6). Herodotos judges the Aiginetan cenotaph memorial erected after the victory at Plataiai to be patriotic, communal *disinformation* and propaganda for future visitors (9.85). The essential flipside of deceit is gullibility, and the Athenians surprisingly illustrate it (1.60, 5.97).

Ethnic prejudice supplies a ready ingredient for jingo *propaganda* in both fifth-century historians. The Persians despise the Hellenes (1.153, 7.9*, 103*, 147), and all their own subjects (1.134, 8.68g*); the Egyptians scorn foreigners likewise (2.41). The Skyths and Dorians despise the Ionians (4.142, 9.106; cf. Thouk. 8.25), and the Hellenes scorn the "barbarians" (7.135, 9.79*). Both Herodotos and Thoukydides repeat ethnic *propaganda* perhaps sharing these prejudices. The Persians regard their unstopped progress towards world domination as justifying their disdain (7.8g1*).

Misinformation, as everywhere always, abounds and persists. The Persians "quoted" in Herodotos expect the Hellenes to collapse on Persian approach (7.8g*, 7.210, 8.68b*). Greeks mistake the nature of the Nile river (2.20) and Africa (2.16, 4.42). Thoukydides, the ferocious revisionist, corrects both popular accounts about the Athenian tyrannicides' sordid motives and colleagues' research inadequacies, such as Hellanikos' too brief survey and inaccurate chronology of the Fifty Years (1.20, 97; 6.54). Nikias' misplaced faith in celestial divination costs Athens an army and navy (7.50).

Both Herodotos and Thoukydides identify "pretexts," that is, conscious disinformation, often mass-directed and so, *propaganda*. Ponder Peisistratos' Athene, Histiaios' nearly comical pretenses (5.35, 106-7), Xerxes' professed aim for his expedition (7.8, 138), Themistokles' self-justifying tricks to persuade Greeks and Persians. Thoukydides emphasizes his war's "truest cause," but he treats at greater length the Spartan *prophases* for starting the Peloponnesian War (1.23). In Sicily, Athenians and Syrakousans concoct political propaganda to mislead neutrals and aggregate allies to themselves.

Thoukydides' contemporary history criticizes supernal disinformation or *un-information,* such as curses, oracles, seers, and omens (2.8, 47, & 54, 5.103.2*, 8.1). He flags popular delusions (misinformation) about "quick 'n' easy" wars and invasions deemed unlikely,

"incredible" (2.8, 4.17, 6.36-40*, 7.18, 8.2). Themistokles, Brasidas, and Alkibiades--masters of political deceits--bluff with promises of liberation in Thrace or of Persian aid delivered to Spartans or Athenians. Absence of information allows disinformation from foes (7.48), produces rumors (2.48: poison) and dubious gossip. Thoukydides had to "guestimate," and he complains about data insufficient to answer questions, despite having "tortured" it (1.20, 4.80, 5.68, 7.87). Thoukydides' eighth book constitutes a treasure-house of all sides' propagandistic lies, suppression of facts ("un-information"), and treachery. False promises and secret negotiations pervade internal Athenian negotiations and externally engineered Aegean revolutions.
"Bad news" of a different kind—not inaccurate but panic-provoking--threatens and verifies invasions, borders penetrated, cities captured or burned, citizens exiled. Other catastrophes record the death of multitudes experiencing plague or battle, dearth of warships, loss of allies, and exhaustion of materiel, cash, and food (Hdt. 1.79, 6.19, 8.50, 9.3; Thouk. 1.23, 2.50, 3.112, 8.1). Both historians report stunning catastrophes and public responses to "bad news" for their dramatic and historical value, as they should.

Slot 7: 11:10 - 12:00am

Robert Wallace, Northwestern University [rwallace@northwestern.edu]

Thucydides on the causes of the Peloponnesian War. A case of misdirection

From Aristophanes *Acharnians* down through Plutarch, "all Greece said that Perikles started the [Peloponnesian] War" (Plut. *Alc.* 14). Thucydides systematically suppresses Perikles' responsibility for this war, and (since 449) the Athenians' and also the Spartans' wish not to fight more wars, until long after he has the Spartans declare war under pressure from their allies. Only then, when modern scholarship proves the brilliant success of his misdirection, does he have Perikles admit that "he would have no concessions, and ever urged the Athenians on to war" (1.127): "no concessions to the Peloponnesians… war is a necessity" (1.140), "I persuaded you to go to war" (2.60).

Slot 8: 12:10am - 1:00pm

Paula Debnar, Mount Holyoke College [pdebnar@mtholyoke.edu]

Lies and liars in Thucydides

Although treating truth creatively has a distinguished pedigree in Greek literature, attitudes toward lies and deceit can change over time, as can the lines drawn between lying and other kinds of deception. Focusing on utterances by historical actors in the History, I try to 1) determine whether (and how) Thucydides distinguishes lies from other kinds of deception; 2) tease out the historian's views of lies and liars, and of those who are (or are not) taken in by them; and 3) identify the historical consequences of lies.
Having identified seven individual and two collective liars, I will discuss examples of lies from across the History—by Athenians and others; by individuals and collectives. Analysis reveals that Thucydides does draw attention to blatant lies, although his techniques change over the eight books, as do the ways in which he expresses his attitude toward them. The effects of mendacity turn out to be contingent on the audiences' relationship to the liars, their access to information, and their emotional states. The paper concludes with a brief overview of the historical consequences of lies.

Slot 9: 2:30 - 3:20pm
Anton Powell, Classical Press of Wales [powellanton@btopenworld.com]
Spin and grand silences: wringing history from Xenophon's texts concerning Sparta

Xenophon's notorious silences are more lamented than analysed. We shall look at his pattern of omissions (and of notorious distortions) constructively, across his three longest works and the `Agesilaos', to trace patterns which may prove revealing of something far more purposeful than some general `pro-Spartan bias'. The author's special relation with king Agesilaos may then emerge with more precision, raising hypotheses concerning the unity of the Xenophontic oeuvre and its author's practical ambitions.

Slot 10: 3:30 - 4:20pm
Matthew Christ, University of Indiana [mrchrist@indiana.edu]
Xenophon on the Thirty: Deception and disinformation in politics and historiography

This paper examines two aspects of Xenophon's account of the Thirty in his *Hellenika*: 1) how Xenophon represents and critiques the Thirty's use of disinformation and propaganda to achieve their ends; and 2) how Xenophon's narrative itself seeks to exculpate the "moderate" supporters of the Thirty and in so doing could be said to engage in its own form of disinformation. Xenophon presents a scathing picture of deception and distortion on the part of the Thirty under the leadership of Critias. The new regime, according to Xenophon, never carried through on its promise to establish new laws and an inclusive and moderate oligarchy. Although Xenophon approves of its initial measures to purge the city of democratic "sykophants," he abhors how the Thirty executed an ever-widening circle of citizens and metics under the guise of cleansing the city of its enemies, including ultimately one of their own number, the moderate Theramenes. While Xenophon's critique of the Thirty's lies and deceptions may be well grounded, there is something misleading in his defense of the "moderates" who had supported the Thirty because they believed this would lead to the establishment of a lawful and inclusive oligarchy and in his scapegoating of Critias for the misdeeds of the Thirty. If, as is commonly thought, Xenophon served in the cavalry under the Thirty, his slanted account can be taken as an attempt to justify his involvement and that of men like him in the overthrow of the democracy in collaboration with Sparta. Although Xenophon may have believed fully in the veracity of his account, his version of this historical episode attests to the subjectivity of historical narrative and the partisan purposes that it can serve.

[Friday]

Slot 11: 9:00 - 9:50am
Ellen Millender, Reed College [millende@reed.edu]
The (im)morality of verbal deception in Xenophon's Anabasis

As many fifth-century Athenian-based works attest, Sparta long enjoyed a reputation for treachery and guile. In his account of the battle of Plataea, Herodotus provides a clear reference to Spartan perfidy in his claims that the Athenians refused to leave their position, "knowing the Lacedaemonians penchant for thinking one thing and saying

another" (9.54.1). Thucydides furnishes a far more sinister portrait of fork-tongued Spartans in his account of the lies that lured thousands of helots to their deaths (4.80.3-4). Euripides' Andromache goes even further in her characterization of the Spartans as liars and schemers (*Andr.* 445-52). Aristophanic Athenians likewise demonstrate constant fear of Spartan perfidy (cf., e.g. *Pax* 622-3, 1065-8, 1083-7).
It is perhaps, then, not surprising to meet Spartan liars and cheats in fourth-century texts, even in the works of the supposed Laconophile Xenophon. His *Anabasis*, in fact, features a particularly striking *exemplum* of Spartan treachery in the form of Clearchus, whose constant engagement in stratagems proves beneficial until it leads to his own execution and stranding of the Cyreians in the heart of the Persian Empire. Despite his focus on Clearchus' deception, Xenophon never explicitly critiques this aspect of Clearchus' leadership. While some scholars have taken Xenophon's silence on this issue as tacit approval of Clearchan perfidy (cf., e.g., Danzig 2007), Xenophon's detailed depiction of Clearchus' almost constant engagement in verbal deception invites closer inspection. This paper suggests that Xenophon's treatment of Clearchus' perfidy is far more negative than previous scholarship has argued and points to Xenophon's concerns about the Spartans' – especially Clearchus' – obsession with warfare and inability to differentiate between friends and enemies.

Slot 12: 10:00 - 10:50am

Cinzia Bearzot, Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, Milano [cinzia.bearzot@unicatt.it]

Les sources sur le meurtre d'Ephialte entre réticence et désinformation

La tradition sur le meurtre d'Éphialtès comprend cinq sources appartenant à des genres littéraires différents (Antiphon, Aristote, Idoménée de Lampsaque, Diodore, Plutarque). Aristote et Plutarque donnent le nom du meurtrier, Aristodicos de Tanagra ; Plutarque (qui cite Aristote) parle d'un complot oligarchique, dont Éphialtès serait tombé victime à cause de son inflexibilité envers les adversaires du peuple.
Idoménée porte contre Périclès l'accusation d'avoir fait tuer son ami et allié par jalousie ; Plutarque, qui nous a transmis le fragment d'Idoménée, ne croit pas à cette version, qui trouve son origine dans l'opposition à Périclès et qui appartient sans doute à la catégorie des fake news.
Antiphon (qui est la source la plus ancienne) et Diodore (qui est le seul vrai « historien ») sont évidemment réticents : à leur avis, le cas resta non résolu. La réticence de ces sources, dont la tendance est anti-démocratique, semble confirmer la version du complot oligarchique.
Réticence et désinformation caractérisent donc la tradition sur le meurtre d'Éphialtès ; cependant, la comparaison avec les sources plus fiables nous permet de proposer une reconstruction convaincante de l'affaire.

Slot 13: 11:10 - 12:00am

Carolyn Dewald, Bard College [dewald@bard.edu]

Was Plutarch right about Herodotus, after all?

Beginning with Plutarch's *De Herodoti malignitate,* I want to consider once more Plutarch's most basic question: what exactly did Herodotus have in mind when he wrote his

Histories? What did Herodotus intend us to take away from reading his account of the *erga megala te kai thômasta* of the human past? How does his text further our understanding of that past? I accept the argument that Plutarch's attack on Herodotus' character was historiographically a serious answer to that question, as he in effect accused Herodotus of deliberately being a purveyor of 'fake news'; here I want to go on to explore some underlying features of the text of Herodotus' *Histories*, in form, in content, and in Herodotus' rhetorical construction of his own persona, that made Plutarch's answer seem, to himself at least, more plausible, since these features do seem designed systematically to plunge us, the *Histories*' readers, not just into questioning the motives, character, and actions of important actors in the account, but into a more thoroughgoing interpretive uncertainty as well, about what happened and what it meant.
I will explore individual *logoi* that seem suddenly to reverse their interpretive valence, problematic juxtapositions of *logoi* that seem to argue for the author's use of a rather dark irony, and also larger, over-arching threads that, when put together, seem to contradict or at least problematize the apparent interpretation of meaning that the individual *logoi*, taken individually, contain. I cannot supply an answer to the question of Herodotus' meaning or claim completely to understand myself the pervasiveness of ambiguity and paradox in his *Histories*, but I hope that lively discussion will follow.

Slot 14: 12:10am - 1:00pm

Francesco Mari, Freie Universität Berlin [francesco.mari@fu-berlin.de]

Marcellinus' genealogy of the Philaids and the role of Cimon Coalemos reconsidered

This paper deals with purposeful misinformation about the history of the Athenian family of the Philaids arguably circulated by Cimon via the work of Pherecydes in 5th-century Athens. Despite several textual difficulties, Marcellinus' narrative in the first paragraphs of his *Vita Thucydidis* represents a valuable source not only for assessing the extent of such deliberate distortions, but also for investigating their underlying causes. Both at the beginning and at the end of his opening section (§ 3–14), Marcellinus claims to be reading Didymus, whose explicit source would in turn be Pherecydes. It is surely from Pherecydes that Didymos takes the genealogy of the Philaids from the mythical age up to Miltiades the Elder (§ 3), which (after an excursus whose source is clearly Herodotus: § 4–8) continues down to Miltiades the Younger, Cimon's father (§ 9-14).
After long debates, scholars now seem to acknowledge Pherecydes to have been Cimon's contemporary and to have actively taken part with his work in the cultural activities that the latter sponsored [1]. Pherecydes' highly simplified genealogy of the Philaids would then have been elaborated and purposefully diffused to provide Cimon with autochthonous mythical ancestors as well as with a more straightforward historical pedigree, one that hides his father Miltiades' belonging to an acquired and rather obscure branch of the family and links him more directly to prestigious 6th-century Athenians, such the conqueror of the Chersonese (Miltiades the Elder) or the archon under whom the Panathenaic Games were introduced (Hippocleides).
This paper claims that such assumptions might be partially inaccurate, since (despite a textual corruption at § 9) Marcellinus' text does account for Miltiades the Younger only being related to Miltiades the Elder on his mother's side. What the text does not account for, and no textual emendation can possibly provide, is the name nor the very existence of Cimon's grandfather: Cimon son of Stesagoras, the uterine brother of Miltiades the

Elder, who was later to be referred to as Coalemos ("the Foolish"). From Herodotus' more accurate genealogical narrative (VI 38, 103), we know that, having been exiled from Athens by Pisistratus, Cimon had to pay a high price to secure his readmission into the town. Shortly afterwards, he was killed in dubious circumstances. As for his younger son Miltiades, we know that he took a Pisistratid wife and became the Athenian archon for 524/3 BC (Dion. Hal. VII 3,1). The lack of further details in Herodotus' narrative makes it difficult to ascertain how these events were related. Together with his diminishing epithet, however, the fact that Cimon was ruled out of the Philaid genealogy produced within his own grandchild's entourage hints at the latter's attempt to clear his ancestry of uncomfortable relationships with the tyrants. In turn, this path of enquiry leads to a thorough reappraisal of the role played by Cimon Coalemos under Pisistratus, and as a consequence of the relationship between the tyrant and Cimon's brother, Miltiades the Elder.

[1] Cf. P. Dolcetti, *Ferecide di Atene. Testimonianze e frammenti*, Alessandria 2004, p. 30–31.

Slot 15: 2:30 - 3:20pm

William S. Morison, Grand Valley State University, morisonw@gvsu.edu

Kritias of Athens and oligarchic propaganda in late fifth-century Athens

Kritias of Athens is infamous as a leader in the oligarchy of the Thirty in 404/3 BCE, but I argue that he was also a leading antidemocratic propagandist. Among the fragments of Kritias' works, for example, an elegiac poem on Sparta and his "constitutions" of Thessaly, Athens, and Sparta may be read as promoting oligarchy. In these works, Kritias illustrates the superiority of the Spartan constitution and the corrupt and dissolute nature of Athenian democracy, in order to influence his fellow Athenian aristocrats as well as to flatter the Spartans. The content and poetic genre of these works are suggestive of performance at the oligarchic *hetaireiai* of Athens. He also composed similar works in prose. Kritias' role as propagandist, I also argue, is reflected in the character Kritias' appearance Plato's *Timaeus-Kritias* as the narrator of an allegedly historical Primeval Athens with its separate warrior-caste, focused on a regimented agricultural and artisanal economy that roughly approximates the historical Kritias' own view of an idealized, oligarchic Sparta. An indication of Kritias' antidemocratic attitude may be seen in Plutarch's anecdote that Kritias warned Lysander that as long as Athens remained a democracy, Spartan rule in Greece would not be safe (*Alk.* 38).