

PREFACE

The traditional view of Greek history has long held that the *polis* was the fundamental unit and institution around which other social and political structures revolved. The Greek world was seen as a mosaic of these citizen-communities interacting with one another in war and peace, and it was the autonomous community of the *polis* that made the Greek world unique. While the importance of the *polis* to communal life in the Greek world cannot be overlooked, various research projects over the past decades have shown that it was not the only source of identity and community in Greek antiquity. The ‘ethnic turn’ that has developed since the 1990s demonstrates more and more the important role played by ethnic allegiance as a tie that suffuses *polis* structures and connects communities that were otherwise politically separate. Recent advances in the study of federalism have shown how these perceived ethnic relationships contributed to – and were in turn influenced by – the elaboration of federal structures comprising many *poleis* in a given region. The editors of this volume along with many of its contributors were involved in the recent project *Federalism in Greek Antiquity* published by Cambridge University Press in 2015, whose various systematic and case studies demonstrated in striking detail how these latent ethnic attachments produced vastly different forms of federal collaboration, though all were united by their foundation on a sense of common descent. These new avenues of inquiry have produced as many questions as they have answered regarding this fascinating interplay between ethnicity and politics, and much work remains to be done.

An aspect of this that has been relatively neglected so far, however, is an examination of the interior composition of Greek *ethne* and the ways in which they managed to relate – and often synthesize – with one another. The process of negotiation and inclusion played out in response to social and environmental factors unique to each particular region and *ethnos*, and some of these aggregative trends – but not all – gradually morphed into confederate structures. Neither did these processes occur in isolation: the influence one *ethnos* had on another and the mutual awareness of various *ethne* and the federal structures with which they organised themselves has likewise been under-explored. The world of a given community, region, or federation was never a vacuum. The interplay between and mutual consciousness of parallel developments throughout the Greek world is equal parts fascinating and underexplored.

More than perhaps anywhere else in the Greek World, Delphi embodies the overlap among these various tiers of Greek history, as it was a place of devotion to ethnic groups, cities, and federations alike. All of these quite literally met together in the sanctuary of Apollo in the hills above the village. The place thus provided the ideal location for an international colloquium aimed at filling some of the gaps

in our understanding of the relationship between *ethnos* and *koinon*. This colloquium took place at the European Cultural Centre of Delphi from 24 to 27 May 2015, and the harvest of this meeting and its findings have been collected, edited, and presented here. We hope that it will shed further light on these different corners of a Greek world that was constantly trying to overcome its narrow borders. It is amusing, if not perhaps sobering, to think of the relevance of such an avenue of inquiry to the Europe of our age, which seems to find itself torn between local and general interests, identities, and priorities. If the editors and contributors to this volume can come together in the decoding of this phenomenon, perhaps it can too. History does not repeat itself as a facsimile, but it also never fails to recall its past in its own present.

The colloquium in Delphi was sponsored by the Anneliese Maier Research Prize which the Humboldt Foundation awarded to Hans Beck. The editors wish to thank Angelos Chaniotis for his comments and for guiding us through the peer review process. Chandra Giroux offered more than one helping hand throughout the editorial process for which we are genuinely grateful. Our sincere thanks as well go to Andrew Lepke for his careful reading of the final typescript.

May 2018	Hans Beck Montreal	Kostas Buraselis Athens	Alex McAuley Cardiff
----------	-----------------------	----------------------------	-------------------------

ETHNIC ARGUMENTS

Emily Mackil

University of California, Berkeley

Just inside the entrance to the Sacred Way in the precinct of Apollo in Delphi are situated the fragmentary blocks that once comprised the base of perhaps the most ethnically charged monument in the entire sanctuary: a series of nine statues depicting Apollo, Nike, and the tribal heroes of Arkadia. The group was dedicated in the heady aftermath of the Theban-led invasion of Lakonia in the winter of 370/69, which led to the liberation of the helots, the establishment of two massive new cities, Messene and Megalopolis, and the foundation of an Arkadian *koinon*. The monument is situated directly opposite the huge Spartan nauarchs' monument, which celebrated the victory at Aigospotamoi, a location certainly chosen as a deliberate snub to their Spartan enemies.¹ The Arkadians presented themselves to Apollo and the Hellenes, in an epigram inscribed on this massive base, as ἀυτόχθων ἱερᾶς λαὸς [ἄπ' Ἀρκαδί]ας, the 'autochthonous people of holy Arkadia,' and recorded a genealogy apparently designed not so much to describe as to enact and promulgate the kinship of Azanians, Triphylians, and Arkadians, all descendants of Arkas himself.² Dedicated in the early years of the Arkadian state, the monument carefully implies a coincidence of ethnic identity and political action that might be taken as the result of a policy of ethnic exclusiveness.³

We should not find this especially surprising. Ethnic identity, even as a social construct, is widely believed to have had a powerful integrative force, driving the formation of ethnically defined regional states like those of the Phokians, Boiotians, Achaians, and Arkadians to name just a few. Self-categorization, the assertion of a claim about collective identity, has been highlighted by Hans-Joachim Gehrke as one of the major purposes of what he calls intentional history, the purposive retrojection of claims into the deep, especially the mythic, past. But the intention behind such acts of intentional history as the Arkadian monument at Delphi was not simply to assert a group identity. The intention was also to justify present arrangements or

1 On the spatial politics of the monument see Scott 2008.

2 *FD* III.1.3 l. 2. The important distinction between dedications as contributing to an identity, rather than simply displaying an existing identity, has recently been made by Giangiulio 2010, 121: 'When discussions of state dedications at Delphi take into account corporate identity, polis or group identity is often presupposed, and seen as a factual given, or an object, in a sense something one can put on display. Instead, the evidence shows that this type of dedication contributed to shaping, rather than simply to displaying the self-awareness of the relevant community...'. On the claim to autochthony in this epigram see Roy 2014, 247f.

3 Although not applied directly to the Delphic monument, the principle is upheld by Nielsen 2002, 23f; Ruggeri 2009, 61.

to argue for recent changes by situating them in the deep past. The Arkadians claimed a kinship bond that enveloped the communities that were then members of the new Arkadian *koinon*, and in so doing they simultaneously justified the boundaries of their new state and imposed on its members an obligation to future loyalty, for kinship in Greek thought, as Gehrke has emphasized, entails reciprocal obligation.⁴

This perspective takes us a long way from the old explanations of Greek federal states as mere elaborations of a primordial tribal belonging, and it also helps us to avoid the value judgment implicit in terms like ‘forgery’ or ‘fiction,’ which are often used by those who ascribe to an instrumentalist view of ethnicity to describe ethnic heroes like the ones depicted on the Arkadians’ monument.⁵ In what follows I would like to explore the specific contexts in which ethnic identity was deployed as an argument for political purposes among the *ethnos* states of mainland Greece in the Classical period, the ways in which those arguments were resisted, and some of the places where we might have expected to find ethnic arguments being deployed but instead find non-ethnic contestations of disputes. Limitations of both space and expertise prohibit me from attempting a comprehensive analysis, but I have tried to draw on a wide enough array of cases as to provide at least a basic typology of ethnic arguments, which might serve as a point of reference for future discussions of the relationship between ethnic identity and political cooperation. In analyzing ancient ethnic arguments, I hope to build a bridge between the two sides of a modern ethnic argument; that is, between those who have been emphasizing identity and integration as the foremost issues to be addressed in current studies of Greek federal states and those, like myself, who have placed the spotlight on interactions and institutions as the distinctive constituents of regional identities and regional states.⁶

I will first consider ethnic arguments marshalled to encourage participation in an *ethnos* state, and then look at several cases in which ethnic identities were patently constructed or redefined in order to justify political change; this will bring us back, of course, to the Arkadian monument, which deserves much more attention than I have just given it. I will then turn to rejections of these ethnic arguments, both by individual *poleis* subjected to them as well as by *ethnos* states themselves,

4 Gehrke 2001; cf. Gehrke 2003, 2005; Gehrke 2010.

5 Primordialist explanations: Gschnitzer 1955; Larsen 1968. Ethnic identity as fiction: McInerney 1999, 148; Beck 2003, 181; V. Parker in *BNJ* 70 F 122a commentary. Cf. Gehrke 2001, 298.

6 Emphasis on identity and integration: Beck 2003, 179–183; Beck and Funke 2015, 9 (describing ‘studies that disclosed the mechanics of ethnic identity formation at the regional level’ as ‘[t]he great thematic shockwave’ in studies of Greek federalism); Funke 2013. Emphasis on interactions and institutions: Mackil 2013. In a paper dedicated to the relationship between ethnic identity and federation, Hall 2015, 48 suggests that ethnic identity was ‘not simply a prerequisite for federalization, but rather one of the means by which it was accomplished.’ His suggestion that identity could have established trust networks that supported federative political and economic developments is very useful, but it is only a beginning.

before considering conflicts within an *ethnos* to fully expose the rift between identity and political behavior. In pursuit of a more positive argument I will consider briefly some non-ethnic arguments made in favor of a politics of cooperation.

I. ETHNIC IDENTITY AS AN ARGUMENT FOR PARTICIPATION

The most obvious purpose behind the deployment of an ethnic argument by advocates of an *ethnos* state was to persuade communities to join. In 519 the Plataians were, according to Herodotus, “being pressed by the Thebans” (πιαζέμενοι ὑπὸ Θηβαίων οἱ Πλαταιεῖς) but were not willing ἐς Βοιωτοῦς τελέειν (Hdt. 6.108.2–5). The precise meaning of this phrase is difficult to understand. It is usually translated “become members of the Boiotian League” but there is no independent evidence for anything like a developed Boiotian *koinon* at this early date, and I have suggested that *teleein* here has a fiscal connotation.⁷ But whether the Thebans were asking the Plataians simply to contribute to a joint fund by which they might make war on common enemies, or whether they were pressuring them to join a state with more elaborate formal institutions, they were pressing them in the name of the Boiotians, and in so doing they were implicitly making an ethnic argument – one that the Plataians rejected out of hand, sitting as suppliants at Athenian altars and seeing the protection of their closest non-Boiotian neighbor to ensure their ongoing autonomy.

The dispute, of course, continued, and although it is possible that Plataia had joined the Boiotian *koinon* in the years after 446, if it did so the city withdrew again and in 431 was attacked by the Thebans, being encouraged, according to Thucydides, by some Plataians who wished to align their city with the *koinon* ‘for the sake of personal power’ (Thuc. 2.2.2–3). A herald announced that any Plataian who wished “to join the alliance in accordance with the ancestral customs (κατὰ τὰ πάτρια) of all the Boiotians” should lay down his arms.⁸ The Plataians, with some Athenian support, resisted for three years, until the last defenders surrendered. In the sham trial of Plataians that followed before a Spartan jury, the Thebans first claimed responsibility for the settlement of all Boiotia, conceding that they had settled “Plataia together with some other places later than the rest of Boiotia,” after “having driven out a mixed population.” They implicitly claimed that the region widely recognized as Boiotia was ethnically unified, a territory occupied by a group of people of common descent. They then accused the Plataians of “contravening the ancestral customs of the other Boiotians” by making an alliance with the Athenians, and defend the Plataian citizens who had opened the gates to them as men who

7 Mackil 2013, 27, 295; Mackil 2014, 272. For the traditional view, e.g., How and Wells 1912, II.110; Waanders 1983, 111; Scott 2005, 375–377.

8 Thuc. 2.2.4. Hornblower 1991, 241 glosses this phrase as ‘to become their ally and return to the ancestral constitution of Boiotia’ and remarks that although the meaning of *ta patria* here is ‘very vague indeed, [it is] apparently ... no more than a reference to membership of the Boiotian confederacy.’

wished that the *polis* would no longer be estranged but would again live in kinship (*ξυγγένεια*).⁹ These claims amount to a robust argument that the Boiotians, a shared descent group with a common territory, had a custom of political cooperation that should not be contravened.

It is impossible to know whether the Thebans in fact made these ethnic arguments either in 431 or in 427. What matters is that Thucydides seems to have known that ethnic identity could at least be viewed as a strong inducement to a politics of cooperation; this may, in fact, have been one of the Thebans' favorite lines, and Thucydides may have known that. It appears again, in more positive terms, in the speech he puts in the mouth of Pagondas of Thebes, one of the eleven boiotarchs in office in 424, when the Boiotian army mustered at Tanagra to drive the Athenians out of Delion. The only boiotarch to favor pursuit of the Athenian army after it had crossed into Attic territory, Pagondas exhorted his colleagues to engage, telling them that "it is your ancestral custom to oppose a foreign army (*πάτριόν τε ὑμῖν στρατὸν ἀλλόφυλον ἐπελθόντα*) regardless of whether he is in your country or not."¹⁰ Pagondas' harangue placed equal emphasis on territory and common descent. For the Thebans, arguments made in terms of 'ancestral custom' were expected to be compelling, charged as they were in both an ethnic and political sense. Pagondas' fellow boiotarchs, and the army assembled by them, were more receptive to Theban ethnic arguments than the Plataians had been: having been persuaded by Pagondas, the Boiotian army pursued and routed the Athenians at Delion, winning an important victory in the Peloponnesian War.

While we have to read Herodotus and Thucydides at an angle in order to perceive the ethnic arguments being advanced by the Thebans in the late sixth and fifth centuries, evidence for a parallel argument being made in fourth-century Arkadia is much clearer. As Xenophon tells it, the movement for Arkadian political unification began in Tegea in 370, where two leaders, Kallibios and Proxenos, "were urging that all of Arkadia should unite and that the *poleis* should agree to abide by whatever was decided in common."¹¹ Despite gaining the upper hand in an armed conflict with fellow citizens committed to the ongoing autonomy of the *polis*, a position justified by appeal to Tegea's 'ancestral laws,' further steps were taken toward political unification only after the Boiotian invasion of Lakonia.¹² According to Xenophon, the Arkadians were encouraged in 369 to stop following the Thebans and assume a leadership of their own. In a speech that has justifiably received a great deal of attention, one Lykomedes of Mantinea makes a series of ethnic arguments in favor of this proposal: the Arkadians alone of the Peloponnesians were autochthonous as well as being the most numerous of all the Greek *ethnē*, not to mention

9 Thuc. 3.61.2, with a paraphrase of Thuc. 3.65.3. Larson 2007, 181 remarks that 'Thebes is now using older ethnic ties to emphasize further the newer federal obligations.'

10 Thuc. 4.92.

11 Xen. *Hell.* 6.5.6. Cf. Diod. Sic. 15.59.1, who attributes the innovation to Lykomedes of Tegea and gives a more purely institutional account. As Beck 2000, 340–343 notes, the fact that this proposal was advanced prior to the Theban invasion suggests that we should not chalk the innovation of Arkadian federalism up to Theban policy.

12 Xen. *Hell.* 6.5.7–10 with Gehrke 1985, 154f.

their physical and military prowess, proven simply by appeal to the excellent reputation of Arkadian mercenaries.¹³ The claim of autochthony is simultaneously a claim about shared territory and consanguinity; these are the terms with which Lykomedes justifies the new politics of cooperation in Arkadia. But the ethnic claims themselves are not new: the myth of Arkadian autochthony almost certainly goes back to the Archaic period.¹⁴ To our knowledge, the opposition at Tegea in the previous year was the only significant opposition faced by the authors of political unification in Arkadia. In fact, the new state was so attractive that it immediately attracted non-Arkadians as members.

I am alluding, of course, to the Triphylians, who were in the early 360's, according to Xenophon, "held ... in high regard because they claimed to be Arkadians."¹⁵ Thomas Heine Nielsen has shown that the Triphylians, erstwhile *perioikoi* of Elis, only forged an ethnic identity of their own after their liberation by the Lakonians in 400.¹⁶ Now, chameleon-like, they have changed their identity again in the interest of safety, saying that they too are Arkadian. Both Nielsen and Claudia Ruggeri have suggested that the Triphylians adopted an Arkadian identity because it was the only way for them to participate in a *koinon* predicated on 'ethnic exclusiveness.'¹⁷ This reading of the evidence is too literal. The Triphylians heard the ethnic arguments being made in favor of participation, like those put in the mouth of Lykomedes, and responded in the same idiom. It was surely as a result of both Arkadian argument and Triphylian response that Triphylos himself, eponymous hero of the recently-defined group known as *Triphylioi*, appears on the Arkadian monument at Delphi with which I began, one of the sons of Arkas to be sure, but born to a different mother – not Erato but Laodameia, the daughter of the Spartan king Amyklas.¹⁸

13 Xen. *Hell.* 7.1.23–26.

14 The earliest probable reference to it is in a fragment of Asios quoted by Paus. 8.1.4. On Asios see West 1985, 4. Hdt. 8.73.1 includes the Arkadians in a list of the seven *ethnē* that inhabit the Peloponnese; of those seven, the Arkadians and Kynourians (a 'tribe' on a par with the Mainaians, both of which become part of the Arkadian *koinon*) are autochthonous. Nielsen 2000, 32–35 discusses the Arkadian origin myth and the claim of autochthony. On the speech of Lykomedes, see the detailed examination of Bearzot in this volume.

15 Xen. *Hell.* 7.1.26.

16 Nielsen 1997; cf. Ruggeri 2009.

17 Nielsen 2002, 23f; Ruggeri 2009, 61: 'the Arcadian federal state was 'ethnically exclusive', which means that no-one [*sic*] who did not share the same ethnic identity could become a member of the federation.' But Nielsen (2000, 54f) notes that '[t]he Arkadian *ethnos* was not a closed unit: it was, on the contrary, capable of expansion' and cites the inclusion of the Triphylians and the independent *polis* Lasion as evidence. Yet he concedes, a page later, that '[t]here is no doubt that the fourth-century Confederacy was to a large extent built upon Arkadian ethnicity. All communities that were allowed to join the Confederacy were considered to be Arkadian. True, some of the members, such as the Triphylians and Lasion, may have been 'new' Arkadians, but they were, nevertheless, considered Arkadians by 370. The basis upon which the Confederacy was built was thus at least in part a common feeling of Arkadian ethnicity.'

18 *FD* III.1.3 l. 7: Λαοδάμεια δ' ἔτικτε Τρίφυλον, παῖς Ἀμύκλαντος; cf. Paus. 10.9.5 for Laodameia as daughter of Amyklas. Stesichoros (Σ Aesch. *Cho.* 733) knows Laodameia as the nurse of Orestes.

As exciting as this dedication is for those interested in the relationship between ethnic identity and political practice, a note of caution is in order. We know very little about the political position of Triphylia or its member *poleis* within the Arkadian *koinon*. Only one decree of the Arkadian *koinon* survives in a tolerably complete state: a proxeny decree for an Athenian, belonging to the 360s.¹⁹ It includes an apparently complete list of 50 *damiorgoi*, officials who clearly served as representatives of member communities to the *koinon*. These officials are clustered by their representative units, which include *poleis* large and small—Megalopolis and Kleitor, for example—as well as smaller ethnic groups, Nielsen’s Arkadian ‘tribes,’ like the Mainalians and Kynourians. The Triphylians do not appear as a group, and the only hint that they may be represented at all is the presence of two *damiorgoi* under the heading *Lepreatai*. Nielsen regards it as possible that this signifies a hegemonic role for Lepreon over all the other Triphylian *poleis*, whereby they controlled the group’s representation to the *koinon*, or that Lepreon was not considered a Triphylian community for the purposes of the Arkadian *koinon*.²⁰ Neither possibility, however, sheds a particularly favorable light on the way in which the Arkadian *koinon* integrated ethnic outsiders.²¹ But with a sample size of precisely *one* decree from the *koinon* in this period, it would be rash to draw any firm conclusions on the matter. It remains possible, however, that the Arkadian monument at Delphi, a brash display of the rewards of political unification for an *ethnos*, occludes practical inequalities that existed within that new state.

Let me return, however, to the broader issue I am pursuing. The Thebans on several occasions in the late sixth and fifth centuries, and some Arkadians in 370 and 369, were advancing the claim that ethnic identity ought to be politicized, that members of an ethnic group were well poised, perhaps in some sense morally obligated, to participate in a regional state governed by and for the *ethnos*. Yet none of the speakers on these occasions spells out exactly why they suppose that a common ethnic identity ought to be enough to justify a politics of cooperation, even though an answer to this question seems to me imperative. In two speeches imputed by Thucydides to Athenian leaders during the Peloponnesian War, I think we can find a more explicit articulation of *the logic of political ethnicity*, although in both cases it is expressed in negative terms.

On the eve of the Peloponnesian War, Thucydides (1.141.6) has Perikles exhort the Athenians by describing the weaknesses of their Peloponnesian opponents.

19 Rhodes and Osborne 2003 no.32 (*JG* V.2.1) from Tegea, topped with a relief depicting Tyche holding a helmet and touching a trophy. On the date see Roy 1971, 571 (368–361) and Rhodes and Osborne 2003, 160 (‘c. 367 or slightly earlier’).

20 If Lepreon is supposed to represent all the Triphylian cities, they seem rather under-represented, given that for example the small city of Kleitor on its own has five *damiorgoi*. See Roy 2000, 312f; Nielsen 1997, 153–155 for a full discussion of the difficulty of understanding the implications of the Leprean *damiorgoi* in this text.

21 A third, more neutral, possibility is that the Triphylian communities rotated the responsibility for sending *damiorgoi* each year, but we would still have expected the heading to read *Triphylion* in that case.

μάχη μὲν γὰρ μιᾷ πρὸς ἅπαντας Ἕλληνας δυνατοὶ Πελοποννήσιοι καὶ οἱ ζύμμαχοι ἀντισχεῖν, πολεμεῖν δὲ μὴ πρὸς ὁμοίαν ἀντιπαρασκευὴν ἀδύνατοι, ὅταν μῆτε βουλευτηρίῳ ἐνὶ χρόμειοι παραχρημά τι ὀξέως ἐπιτελώσι πάντες τε ἰσόνηφοι ὄντες καὶ οὐχ ὁμόφυλοι τὸ ἐφ' ἑαυτὸν ἕκαστος σπεύδῃ.

In a single battle against all the Hellenes the Peloponnesians and their allies might be able to prevail, but they are not capable of waging war against a different kind of opponent, for they lack a single council in which to resolve on swift and vigorous action, but they all have an equal vote and yet are not *homophyloi*, with each one devoted to his own interest.

And in 415, as the Athenians debated whether or not to embark on an expedition to Sicily with rather unclear goals, Thucydides (6.17.2–4) has Alkibiades encourage them, again by describing the weakness of their opponents. The cities of Sicily, he tells them, have “large populations comprised of motley rabblés” (ὄχλοις τε γὰρ ζυμμεῖκτοις πολυανδροῦσιν αἱ πόλεις); citizenship is highly unstable. As a result, they are not equipped with arms nor do they have landed property. *Stasis* is rife. And from such a mob, Alkibiades reassures the Athenians, unanimity and cooperative action are not to be expected. There is, in the Sicilian cities, no common interest.

On this Thucydidean view, ethnic diversity – being *allophyloi* or *xummeiktoi* – correlates strongly to a failure of cooperative political behavior and to military defeat. The underlying assumption is that kinship makes political cooperation possible by creating “a basis for mutual identification that supports social cohesion and collective action.”²² The same idea is implicit in Aristotle’s remark that “*stasis* also arises among those who are not *homophyloi*, until they accomplish unity of spirit.”²³ But these critical passages imply other reasons for supposing that an ethnically homogeneous state will be most successful: it leads to stability in the citizen body, and a strong sense of commitment fostered by the receipt of arms from the state and possession of landed property in its territory. Having been given a personal stake in the flourishing and independence of the community, individual and communal interests are successfully aligned.

Hindsight of course presents a direct challenge to these arguments, and Thucydides certainly knew it. The mixed rabble of Sicilians inflicted on the Athenians their worst defeat in the war until that time, acting with both *homonoia* and common resolve, and the Peloponnesians finally defeated the Athenians and their allies despite not being *homophyloi*. Does this mean that ethnic arguments in favor of a politics of cooperation in the ancient Greek world were purely specious? Perhaps not, given that they seem in some cases to have contributed to cooperative outcomes, as in fifth-century Boiotia, a case Thucydides knew very well, and fourth-century Arkadia, which of course he did not. However, I will suggest that such arguments were largely instrumental, that they could easily be dismissed by those

22 Lape 2010, 169.

23 Arist. *Pol.* 1303a 25–26: στασιωτικὸν δὲ καὶ τὸ μὴ ὁμόφυλον, ἕως ἂν συμπνεύσῃ. He gives as examples of ethnic *stasis* colonies founded by multiple groups, who later fight, with one group expelling the other(s). The only non-colonial example is Antissa on Lesbos, which accepted a group of Chian exiles; they later fought with these Chians and expelled them. See Hansen and Nielsen 2004, 129.

toward whom they were directed or simply rejected if other enabling conditions were not met, and that other arguments – mutual advantage and shared mistrust among them – were at least as persuasive among the *ethnos* states of the Classical Greek world.

II. CONSTRUCTING AND REDEFINING ETHNIC IDENTITY IN TANDEM WITH POLITICAL CHANGE

In his exhortation to the Athenians Alkibiades associated ethnic diversity with political instability; the implicit contrast is with the steady course steered by an ethnically homogeneous crew at the helm of the ship of state. Resting as it does on notions of shared descent and common territory, ethnicity is, in the Greek imaginary, as stable and unchanging a social force as one could hope for. Yet the ease with which new claims about the past were made and readily accepted made ethnic identity a valuable instrument for those undergoing political change. Its capacity to create an appearance of long-standing solidarity is precisely what made it so useful in the constantly changing political landscape of the Greek world.

In other words, ethnic arguments evolved in tandem with political change. The best illustration of this dynamic comes, of course, from the case of Triphylia, mentioned briefly above. But their protean ethnic identity can only be fully appreciated by considering their earlier commitments. Herodotus lists six cities in the region that was later called Triphylia – Lepreon, Makiston, Phrixa, Pyrgos, Epeion, and Noudion – and tells us that they were settled by Minyans, descendants of the crew of the Argo who had for a time resided in Sparta but were later expelled when they ‘became arrogant,’ asking for a share of the kingship and doing other things that were ‘not sacred.’²⁴ It was at this juncture, according to Herodotus, that they went to the northwestern Peloponnese. But Herodotus (4.148.4) hastens to add what was certainly the most salient fact about these cities in his time: “Most of these in my time the Eleians have sacked.” They had, in other words, been subjugated by the Eleians who counted them among their *perioikoi*. Whether these communities actively nurtured a Minyan or some other group in the early Classical period is unclear. In the fifth century Pherekydes identified Phrixa as an Arkadian *polis*; insofar as the others are attested in Classical sources other than Herodotus, they appear as perioikic *poleis* of Elis.²⁵ Strabo mentions a sanctuary of Poseidon Samios, administered by the Makistioi, where all Triphylians worshipped, and though a cult like that could serve as a center for the articulation and performance of group identity,

24 Hdt. 4.148.3–4.

25 Phrixa: Pherekydes, *FGrH* 3 fr. 161 (Steph.Byz. s.v. Φρίξα: πόλις: Φερεκύδης δὲ Ἀρκαδίας αὐτὴν γράφει). For these cities as perioikic *poleis* of Elis: Thuc. 5.31.4 and Xen. *Hell.* 3.2.25 with Roy 1997.

there is no certainty that Strabo's report addresses a period before the fourth century.²⁶ When these communities were freed from Eleian rule by the Spartans around 400 they, along with other communities in the area not listed by Herodotus, protected themselves by creating a regional state with a name that was patently new: the *Triphylioi*.²⁷ Initially loyal to their Spartan benefactors, the Triphylians seem to have advertised their ethnic hybridity to create a new identity that would embrace all members of the new state.²⁸

It is intriguing that the only public documents we have from this Triphylian state (*SEG* 35.389, 40.392) are records of the bestowal of citizenship on outsiders, and it is tempting to infer that they integrated foreigners in a way that was rather atypical for the early fourth century. The fact that these two inscriptions also reflect significant dialectal variations attests to the construction of this new state from a group of people who were clearly, to borrow a phrase from Thucydides, not *homophyloi*.²⁹ The appearance of the eponymous ancestor Triphylos on the Delphic monument is the only evidence we have for an expression of this identity in ancestral terms, but as we have already seen, that appearance was embedded in an attempt to integrate the Triphylians into the new Arkadian *koinon*. As Thomas Nielsen has shown so clearly, the Triphylian identity did not disappear, persisting at least into the second century, but was expertly grafted onto the Arkadian one.³⁰ The apparently sudden articulation of a group identity in the early fourth century reflects an attempt by the Triphylians not so much to find a place of belonging as to become part of a state that would protect them from Eleian encroachments, for we know that immediately after Leuktra, the Eleians refused to sign a renewal of the common peace because they would not recognize the autonomy of Marganeis, Skillous, or the Triphylians.³¹ The Triphylians, then, illustrate the way in which ethnic identity could be crafted and changed in very short periods of time. What I wish to empha-

26 Str. 8.3.13. Ruggeri 2004, 96–102 (see also Ruggeri 2001, 173–175; Ruggeri 2009, 54f) and Tausend 1992, 19–21 believe this amphiktyony of Poseidon Samikos, attested only by Strabo, was Archaic. It is thought that Strabo is relying here on Artemidorus of Ephesos (late second/early first century BCE), but *his* source is unclear. Nielsen 1997, 147 n.115 exercises prudent caution: 'It seems ... safe to assume that the cult must have existed in the Classical period, if it was administered by Makiston, a city which presumably did not survive into the Hellenistic period. But it may ... have existed *earlier* as well.'

27 Xen. *Hell.* 3.2.30–31 for the negotiations between Sparta and Elis that leave the cities in the region autonomous.

28 Initial loyalty to Spartans: Xen. *Hell.* 4.2.16, contributing troops to the Spartan side at Nemea in 394.

29 Ruggeri 2000, 120 n. 22; Ruggeri 2004, 134–137. *SEG* 35.389 was found in the temple of Athena at Mazi; *SEG* 40.392 may be from Krestena (Hallos 1990, on the basis of letters in the *IG* archive from Hans von Prott, who saw the piece in 1897 and 1898 in the hands of a 'sehr verdächtig' Athenian art dealer), a mere 6 km west of Mazi. Both date to the period c. 400–369.

30 Polyb. 4.77.8 knows the *Triphylioi* as descendants of Triphylos, one of the sons of Arkas. In 219 they were again subordinated to Elis, which at the time was an ally of the Aitolian *koinon* (Polyb. 4.77.10).

31 Xen. *Hell.* 6.5.2–3.

size is the fact that in each stage of this development we see the change being effected in the service of political and strategic concerns. The perioikic communities of Elis were aware of the ethnic idiom in which regional states were speaking, and readily adopted it for their own in order to secure protection from their erstwhile overlords.

The Eleians were, of course, not oblivious to any of this, and they provide us with a second illustration of the advancement of ethnic claims in shifting political circumstances. In the early fourth century the Eleians and Aitolians seem to have been vigorously re-activating and elaborating upon a claim of kinship that certainly goes back to the first quarter of the fifth century, if not earlier. Scholars of both Elis and Aitolia have written about this interesting dynamic, but they have tended to focus on one side or the other in the kinship claim, whereas both sides seem to have been actively interested in promulgating the relationship. This means that in order to understand what was happening we need to take a broader perspective.

In *Olympian* 3, composed in 476 for Theron of Akragas, Pindar, in a characteristically elusive fashion, describes one of the *Hellanodikai*, the Eleian judges of the Olympic Games, as an Αἰτωλὸς ἀνὴρ (*Ol.* 3.12). And a bit later, Herodotus (8.73.2–3) says that Elis is the only city in the Peloponnese that is part of the Aitolian *ethnos*. But explicating these hints would be virtually impossible if we did not have fragments of several fourth-century historians who dilate on the theme of kinship between Aitolians and Eleians. And that pattern may be significant: the sudden interest in the theme in the early fourth century suggests that it received elaboration because it was suddenly powerful – not just to Eleians but also to Aitolians.

Ephoros, writing in the mid-fourth century, describes what must be regarded as a pair of statues, one at the sanctuary of Apollo at Thermon and one in the agora of Elis. Both sat on bases inscribed with dedicatory epigrams, which Ephoros appears to quote *verbatim*.

παρατίθησι δὲ τούτων μαρτύρια τὰ ἐπιγράμματα, τὸ μὲν ἐν Θέρμοις τῆς Αἰτωλίας, ὅπου τὰς ἀρχαιρεσίας ποιῆσθαι πάτριον αὐτοῖς ἔστιν, ἐγκεχαραγμένον τῇ βάσει τῆς Αἰτωλοῦ εἰκόνας· Χώρης οἰκιστῆρα, παρ' Ἀλφειοῦ ποτε δίναις θρεφθέντα, σταδίων γείτον' Ὀλυμπιάδος, Ἐνδυμίωνος παῖδ' Αἰτωλοὶ τόνδ' ἀνέθηκαν Αἰτωλόν, σφετέρως μνημ' ἀρετῆς ἔσορᾶν. τὸ δ' ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ τῶν Ἡλείων ἐπὶ τῷ Ὀξύλου ἀνδριάντι· Αἰτωλὸς ποτε τόνδε λιπὼν αὐτόχθονα δῆμον κτήσατο Κουρήτιν γῆν, δορὶ πολλὰ καμῶν· τῆς δ' αὐτῆς γενεᾶς δεκατόσπορος Αἴμιονος υἱὸς Ὀξύλος ἀρχαίην ἔκτισε τήνδε πόλιν.

As evidence for this he (i.e. Ephoros) quotes inscriptions, one of which is at Thermon in Aitolia, where the Aitolians by custom conduct the elections of their officials. The inscription is engraved on the base of the statue of Aitolos: 'The Aitolians dedicated this statue of Aitolos, son of Endymion, the founder of this land, who as a neighbour of Olympia's track once grew up beside Alpheios' eddies, as a monument of their valour for all to see.' But the other inscription stands on the statue of Oxylos in the marketplace of Elis: 'Aitolos once left this autochthonous people and in war with many hardships won the land of Kouretis. Oxylos, the son of Haimon, the tenth seed of the same lineage, founded this ancient city.'³²

32 Ephoros *BNJ* 70 F 122a 1–2 (trans. V. Parker).

The two statues and their epigrams together attest a vigorous assertion by both Aitolians and Eleians of their kinship with one another: the Aitolian epigram focuses on the founding hero represented by the statue, proudly asserting his Eleian origin, while the Eleian statue nods at the same tradition but describes the Eleians as autochthonous and adds the local detail that Elis was founded by Oxylos, a tenth-generation descendant of Aitolos. This is our only evidence for an Eleian claim to autochthony.³³ The Eleians must have been engaging in an act of intentional history with the aim of providing a basis for their claim to their territory. And as Gehrke has noted, the Greeks' intentional histories were most successful when they reached "as far back into the past as possible."³⁴ On this logic, the claim of autochthony trumps all other claims intended to demonstrate the right to a territory.

The consensus view now seems to hold that these statues with their epigrams must have been dedicated in the early fourth century: the Eleians had suffered significant territorial losses with the liberation of their *perioikoi* — including the Triphylians — in the war with Sparta around 400, and a robust assertion of the right to control that territory makes sense in the aftermath of that conflict.³⁵ It also makes sense from the Aitolian perspective, but this has not been much discussed. When the Eleians were being attacked by the Spartans in 400, they received help from the Aitolians, "their allies, who sent a force of 1,000 picked men" deployed to guard an area of the city.³⁶ Shortly before 389, the Aitolians had lost control of their ancient *polis* Kalydon when it was taken by the Achaians, who had also by this time gained control of Lokrian Naupaktos, long a Messenian-Athenian stronghold. The Aitolians and Eleians, both suffering significant territorial losses and being faced with the rising efficacy of regional states on their borders, fell into one another's arms, distant relatives who needed now to become reacquainted. It seems to me that it is possible to understand the pair of statues described by Ephoros — and we must see them as a deliberate pair — only as an act of reacquaintance.

In this act of reacquaintance, the bond appears to have been strengthened not by simply repeating old stories but by improving on them. Here Strabo's coda to Ephoros' description of the statues is quite interesting:

τὴν μὲν οὖν συγγένειαν τὴν πρὸς ἀλλήλους τῶν τε Ἡλείων καὶ τῶν Αἰτωλῶν ὀρθῶς ἐπισημαίνεται διὰ τῶν ἐπιγραμμάτων, ἐξομολογουμένων ἀμφοῖν οὐ τὴν συγγένειαν μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ ἀρχηγέτας ἀλλήλων εἶναι· δι' οὗ καλῶς ἐξελέγχει ψευδομένους τοὺς φάσκοντας τῶν μὲν Αἰτωλῶν ἀποίκους εἶναι τοὺς Ἡλείους, μὴ μέντοι τῶν Ἡλείων τοὺς Αἰτωλοῦς.

With these inscriptions Ephoros rightly attests the Eleians' and the Aitolians' kinship with each other since both inscriptions agree not only in the matter of kinship, but also in regard to each people's being the other's founders. In this way he skilfully refutes as liars those who say that the Eleians are colonists [*apoikoi*] of the Aitolians, but that the Aitolians are not colonists of the Eleians.

33 Roy 2014, 248f.

34 Gehrke 2001, 304.

35 Antonetti 1990, 60; Sordi 1994; Roy 2014, 249.

36 Diod. Sic. 14.79.9–10.

The liars to whom Ephoros and Strabo allude here must be those, like Herodotus, who ascribed to the view that the Aitolians had settled Elis and believed that was the end of the matter.³⁷ We can, I think, glimpse here a vigorous ethnic argument, a claim that the Aitolians and Eleians were not related to one another merely as *metropolis* to *apoikia*, as was claimed in the fifth century, but were more closely bound together by both kinship and reciprocal settlement. This elaboration of the Eleian-Aitolian tie is perhaps in part a response to the deterioration of the simple tie between *metropolis* and *apoikia* that was so fully exposed at the start of the Peloponnesian War; in the early fourth century, that bond was no longer particularly robust.

There are several other hints that this ethnic argument was being made in precisely the first half of the fourth century. Ephoros, once again, in a long fragment devoted to the history of Elis, recounts the reciprocal settlement of Aitolia by the Eleian Aitolos and of Elis by his Aitolian descendant Oxylos, and then adds that when Oxylos and his men achieved their victory, “they also took over the management of the sanctuary at Olympia, which the Achaians had been governing.”³⁸ A strange claim from a purely Eleian perspective, it perfectly integrates the concerns of their Aitolian kin in the early fourth century and draws the battle lines clearly, asserting the ancient pre-eminence of the Aitolians and Eleians while diminishing any Achaian claims or presumptions to Peloponnesian leadership.³⁹ The vigor of this new argument in the first half of the fourth century, and Aitolian interest in it, is further attested by its appearance in a fragment of the fourth-century historian Daimachos of Plataia.⁴⁰ The other reason to date this development to the early fourth century is a purely negative one, which could of course be chalked up to the choices made by our extant sources. But for what it is worth, Thucydides twice describes major Athenian attacks on Aitolian territory — once in 456 and again in 426 — and though he goes into great detail about the latter invasion, on neither occasion do we hear about Aitolian appeals to Eleian kin. Indeed, at this time it is likely that the Aitolians, or at least some group of Aitolians, had made an alliance with the Spartans.⁴¹ In short, in the early fourth century, surrounded by neighbors

37 Parmeggiani 2011, 651f.

38 Ephoros *BNJ* 70 F 115 (trans. V. Parker).

39 The only surviving trace of an Achaian provocation to which the Eleians could have been responding is the early fifth-century dedication by the *Achaiaoi* of a statue group depicting Nestor and the Homeric Achaian heroes drawing lots for a duel with Hektor (Paus. 5.25.6–8). The bases survive *in situ*: Eckstein 1969, 27–32; Dörig 1977, 20f. There is otherwise no surviving evidence for Achaian claims to Olympia or to Peloponnesian leadership, but there is much that we do not know.

40 Daimachos *BNJ* 65 F 1 reports that Aitolos, son of Endymion, the Elean, fled across the gulf after having committed involuntary manslaughter, became eponymous ancestor of Aitolia, and had three sons, after whom cities in Aitolia were named: Pleuron, Koures, and Kalydon. Jacoby (*FGrH* 65 F 1) associated Daimachos of Plataia with the period of the Theban hegemony; he is largely followed by Zecchini 1997, 193 and, cautiously, by Engels in *BNJ*.

41 Invasion of 456: Thuc. 1.108.5 and *SEG* 32.550; invasion of 426: 3.94.1–98.5. Spartan alliance depends on the date of the inscribed treaty *SEG* 51.449 with Mackil 2013, 483–488. These invasions are discussed by Mackil 2013, 52–57.

whose regional states were growing in power at their expense, the Eleians and Aitolians invigorated an old tradition of kinship, elaborated upon it, and promulgated their new, intertwined ethnic identity in their respective political centers. As with the Triphylians, so too with the Eleians and Aitolians: ethnic identity was very much in the service of political need.

III. DIVISIONS AMONG *HOMOPHYLOI*

But when ethnic arguments had to be made, if their claims were not self-evident, they cannot have been seen as either inevitable or binding. However much Perikles and Alkibiades wanted to claim that ethnic diversity severely inhibited collective action, the Greeks — and Thucydides himself — knew that ethnic unity was no guarantor of political cooperation. Let me be clear: I do not wish to assert that the Greeks themselves dismissed such claims out of hand as ‘fictions’ or ‘forgeries,’ but rather that the narratives of these intentional histories, precisely because they were so deeply embedded in presentist concerns, were subject to intense debate.

We have already seen that the Plataians twice rejected the Thebans’ ethnic argument for participation in the Boiotian *koinon*, and though our sources never make explicit the reasons they gave for their refusal to participate, it is fairly clear that in practice they hated the Thebans and feared being subordinated to them.⁴² The Thebans appear to have been drawing on a widespread view that Plataia was a Boiotian community; so at least it appears in the Homeric catalogue of ships.⁴³ At some point — and one would dearly love to know when — they rejected this view and the Thebans’ ethnic argument for political cooperation with a countervailing claim: according to Pausanias (9.1.1–3), who is certainly reporting a local claim, the Plataians were autochthonous and were named after Plataia herself, who was either a nymph, the daughter of the River Asopos that roughly delimited the border between Theban and Plataian territory, or the daughter of a King Asopos after whom the river was named.⁴⁴ By the third century, when the Plataians had actually become members of the Boiotian *koinon*, they had forged a hybrid identity that was a product of historical experience rather than mythologizing: Herakleides Kritikos, writing in the second quarter of the third century, reports that “the citizens themselves say that they are colonists (*apoikoi*) of the Athenians, and that they are ‘Athenian Boiotians.’”⁴⁵ The claim of autochthony was cast in the teeth of the Thebans and other Boiotians, who at least by the fifth century claimed to have migrated into their territory from Thessalian Arne. With the assertion that they were *apoikoi* of the

42 Oddly, the Plataian speech focuses on the Plataians’ own services to the Hellenes (Persian Wars) and to the Spartans (sending citizens to assist at Ithome); reminding the Spartans that it was they who advised the Plataians to make an alliance with Athens; and reminding the Spartans of Theban medism. They call the Thebans ἐχθιστοί (Thuc. 3.59.2).

43 Hom. *Il.* 2.494–510 (Boiotian contingent) at 504 (Plataia).

44 Paus. 9.1.3. Prandi 1988, 16 mentions the passage but makes nothing of it.

45 Evidence for membership in the *koinon* in the third century: *IG VII.2723 inter alia*. Herakleides Kritikos *BNJ* 369A F 1.11. For the date see Arenz 2006.

Athenians, the Plataians implicitly rejected the claim that ethnic identity is inherited, not made, and that it should control one's political destiny. The Plataians argued instead that they had crafted their own identity by a series of active political choices. This is, perhaps, what gave them the ideological room to become full members of the *koinon* in the Hellenistic period despite a long history of opposition to it. They participated by choice, in response to the radically changed political circumstances of Boiotia in the Hellenistic period, rather than by succumbing to some purported ethnic destiny.

Achaia affords us another set of illustrations of the limited power of ethnic arguments for political cooperation. Despite an Achaian identity that may, in the view of Catherine Morgan and Jonathan Hall, go back to the Iron Age, and the gradual establishment of a territory that was perhaps complete by the fifth century, the emergence of a regional state occurred only in the early fourth century, and even as that state emerged it failed to capture the participation of all ethnically Achaian *poleis*. Two detailed accounts of the Boiotian invasions of the Peloponnese in 370 and 369, from Xenophon and Diodorus, make it clear that Pellene, the easternmost of the Achaian *poleis*, was allied with Sparta and had not joined the Achaian *koinon*.⁴⁶ In 367, we learn that the Achaian *polis* Dyme was held by an Achaian garrison, and that it was 'liberated' by the Boiotians after they failed to secure a lasting alliance with the Achaian *koinon* in that year.⁴⁷ Dyme was, of course, the westernmost of the Achaian *poleis* and the garrison may have been stationed there not so much to hold the *polis* down as to protect the border with Elis; the other possibility, recently suggested by Klaus Freitag, is that Dyme was fortified only in anticipation of the Boiotian attack and that the language of liberation is a product of Theban propaganda.⁴⁸ But the other way to read this incident is to infer that Dyme was resisting the political integration of Achaia. We know that in these years there was *stasis* that affected not just one *polis* but the entire region, and in that context it is reasonable to suppose that Dyme had been garrisoned for resistance.⁴⁹

We do not know whether the Pelleneans or the Dymaians had articulated their separatist positions in ethnic terms, but it is clear that they did not view their shared Achaian identity as a powerful inducement to participate in an Achaian politics of cooperation. But we may be justified in concluding that not even the Achaians who were most eagerly promoting the political integration of the region in these years thought about it in ethnic terms, for the first incontrovertible evidence we have for the existence of an Achaian *koinon* is its annexation of two decidedly non-Achaian *poleis* — Lokrian Naupaktos and Aitolian Kalydon — and its bestowal of Achaian citizenship on their inhabitants sometime before 389. I leave aside as self-evident the rapid growth of the Achaian *koinon* in the Hellenistic period beyond its ethnic borders, while readily acknowledging that the Hellenistic state, at least on Polybios' telling, did emerge within the boundaries of the *ethnos*. The same is true, of course,

46 Xen. *Hell.* 7.1.15–18; Diod. Sic. 15.68.2.

47 Diod. Sic. 15.75.2 with Mackil 2013, 75.

48 Freitag 2009, 105.

49 Xen. *Hell.* 7.1.42.