

GIANFRANCO MOSCONI

THE ATHENIAN HISTORY ACCORDING TO PERICLES:
ANCESTORS, FATHERS, AND PRESENT-DAY MEN
IN THUC. II 36, 1-3

ABSTRACT

In Thuc. II 36, 1-3 Pericles structures the entire Athenian history into three phases, clearly distinguished through their respective merits: the age of the *progonoï*, that of the *pateres*, that of the present-day men. This is a great difference with the other *logoi epitaphioi*, where the Athenian past is an undifferentiated continuum; on the contrary, the tripartite *climax* in Thuc. II 36, 1-3 aims to give greater prominence to the last two phases, when Athens acquired and then developed the *arkhe*. Despite the overall clarity of the text, scholars have been puzzled by the exact identity of οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν mentioned in 36, 2 (and therefore by the definition of the chronological boundaries between the three groups).

In this paper, strong arguments are given in favor of the thesis that the age of the *pateres* includes the Persian Wars: above all, the comparison with Thuc. I 144, 4 and the need for internal coherence between Thuc. 2, 36, 1 and Thuc. II 36, 4 (with its reference to the struggle against the “barbarian enemy”). Therefore, if the sixty years between 490 and the end of 431 are divided in half, the boundary between *pateres* and ‘present-day men’ can be placed around 461 BC: an actual turning point in the fifth-century Athenian history.

Anyhow, this question is not only merely exegetical: the attribution of the Persian Wars to the *pateres* is consistent with the viewpoint (widespread in fifth-century sources) according to which the Persian Wars were the first step in the acquisition of the *arkhe*; the absence of a minimal reference to the Persian Wars (a central theme in contemporary Athenian propaganda) seems to match the Periclean Athenian foreign policy, which put an end to the wars against the Persians, focusing on the hegemony over the allies and on the confrontation with Sparta and her allies.

1. THE TRIPARTITE *CLIMAX* OF THUC. II 36, 1-3¹

The section devoted to the history of Athens in the Periclean *Epitaphios* (Thuc. II 36, 1-3) is much shorter than in the other *logoi epitaphioi*: this is a well-known

¹ All dates are BC. For the reader’s sake, in this footnote, we collect all the references to Thucydidean editions, traductions and comments which will be used in this paper: G.B. ALBERTI (ed.), *Thucydidis Historiae. I. Libri I-II*, Romae 1972; I. BEKKER (ed.), *Thucydidis De Bello Peloponnesiaco libri octo, ex recensione I. B. Accedunt scholia Graeca et Dukeri Wassique annotationes*, I, Oxonii 1821; L. CANFORA (a cura di), *Tucidide. La guerra del Peloponneso*, Torino 1996, Milano 2007²; J. CLASSEN, J. STEUP (hrsg. v.), *Thukydidés, erklärt von J. Classen, besorgt von J. Steup. Zweiter Band. Zwites Buch II*, Berlin 1889; H. DALE (ed.), *Thucydides. The History of the Peloponnesian War*, New York 1894; J.M. DENT (ed.), *Thucydides. The Peloponnesian War*, London-New York 1910; U. FANTASIA (a cura di),

fact². However, there is another important difference between the ‘historical’ section of the Periclean *Epitaphios* and the corresponding passages in the other

Tucidide. La guerra del Peloponneso. Libro II. Testo, traduzione e commento con saggio introduttivo, Pisa 2003; A.W. GOMME, *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides. The Ten Years' War, II: Books II-III*, Oxford 1956; M. HAMMOND, P.J. RHODES, *Thucydides. The Peloponnesian War. Translated by M.H., With an Introduction and Notes by P.J.R.*, Oxford-New York 2009; TH. HOBBS (ed.), *Eight Bookes of the Peloponnesian Warre written by Thucydides*, London 1634² (1628¹); S. HORNBLLOWER, *A Commentary on Thucydides. I (Books I-III)*, Oxford 1991; C. HUDE, *Scholia in Thucydides ad optimos codices collata*, edidit C.H., Lipsiae 1927 (rist. New York 1973); A. IZZO D'ACCINNI, C. MORESCHINI, F. FERRARI (a cura di), *Erodoto. Storie. Traduzione di Augusta Izzo D'Accinni. Tucidide. La guerra del Peloponneso. Traduzione di Claudio Moreschini, revisione di Franco Ferrari*, Milano 2008; B. JOWETT (ed.), *Thucydides, Translated into English, with Introduction, Marginal Analysis, Notes and Indices*, Oxford 1881; J.TH. KAKRIDIS, *Der Thukydeische Epitaphios. Ein stilistischer Kommentar*, München 1961; K.W. KRÜGER (hrsg. v.), *Θουκυδίδου Ἐργαφῆ, mit erklärenden Anmerkungen hrsg. von K.W.K.*, vol. I,1, Berlin 1860³ (= Thuc. 1-2); voll. I,2-II, Berlin 1858-1861² (rist. Hildesheim-New York 1972); O. LONGO (a cura di), *Tucidide. Epitafio di Pericle per i caduti del primo anno di guerra (II, 34-47)*, Venezia 2000; O. LUSCHNAT, *Thucydidis Historiae, post C. Hude edidit O.L.*, I: *Libri I-II*, Lipsiae 1960² (Bibliotheca Teubneriana); E.C. MARCHANT (ed.), *Thucydides. Book II*, London-New York 1961 (London 1891¹); M. MOGGI (a cura di), *Tucidide. La guerra del Peloponneso*, Milano 1984; E.F. POPPO, J.M. STAHL (ed.), *Thucydidis de bello Peloponnesiaco libri octo, explanavit E.F. Poppo; editio altera (II-IV) et tertia (I), quam auxit et emendavit J.M. Stahl*, vol. I, 1, Lipsiae 1886; P.J. RHODES (ed.), *Thucydides. History II. Edited with translation and commentary by P.J.R.*, Warminster 1988; J. DE ROMILLY (éd. par), *Thucydide. La guerre du Péloponnèse. Livre II, texte établi et traduit par J.d.R.*, Paris 1962 (Collection Budé); J.S. RUSTEN (ed.), *Thucydides. The Peloponnesian War, Book II*, Cambridge 1989 (Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics); H. STEPHANUS, L. VALLA (ed.), *Thucydidis Olori filii De bello Peloponnesiaco libro octo. Iidem Latine, ex interpretatione Laurentii Vallae, ab Henrico Stephano recognita excudebat Henricus Stephanus, illustris viri Huldrici Fuggeri typographus*, [Genevae] 1564; H. STEPHANUS (ed.), *Thucydidis, Olori filii de bello Peloponnesiaco libri octo. Iidem Latine, ex Laurentii Vallae interpretatione, ab Henrico Stephano nuper recognita, quam Aemilius Portus... passim expolitam innovavit*, Francofurti 1594; H. STUART JONES (ed.), *Thucydidis Historiae, recognovit H.S.J., apparatus criticum correxit et auxit J.E. Powell*, I-II, Oxonii 1942 (Oxford Classical Texts); J.J. TORRES ESBARRANCH (ed. por), *Tucidides. Historia de la guerra del Peloponeso. Libros I-II. Introducción general de Julio Calonge Ruiz, traducción y notas de J.J.T.E.*, Madrid 1990.

² J.TH. KAKRIDIS, *op. cit.*, pp. 11-12; J.E. ZIOLKOWSKI, *Thucydides and the Tradition of Funeral Speeches at Athens*, New York 1981, pp. 75-77, 181-182 and “Table 2” (p. 95), with a synopsis of the *topoi* of the *epainos* in the Athenian funeral speeches. Cf. A.B. BOSWORTH, *The historical context of Thucydides' Funeral Oration*, «JHS» 120 (2000), pp. 1-16 (2000), p. 4: in the Periclean *Epitaphios*, “the past is almost literally buried”. N. LORAUX, *L'invention d'Athènes. Histoire de l'oraison funèbre dans la «cité classique»*, Paris - La Haye - New York 1981, does not pay attention to this fundamental difference between the Periclean *Epitaphios* and the other *logoi epitaphioi*: see pp. 119-121. General overview on the memory of the past in the *logoi epitaphioi*: J.L. SHEAR, ‘Their Memories Will Never Grow Old’: *The Politics of Remembrance in the Athenian Funeral Orations*, «CQ» n.s. 63 (2013), pp. 511-536. As Shear (p. 513) observes, «the processes of remembering are integral to the dynamics of these orations, the purpose of which is to create memory»; therefore, the conciseness of the historical section of the Periclean *Epitaphios* is even more striking.

logoi epitaphioi: in Thuc. II 36, 1-3, the Athenian history is divided into three distinct phases: the *progonoi*, the *pateres*, and the present-day generation. This is the text:

[1] Ἄρξομαι δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν προγόνων πρῶτον· δίκαιον γὰρ αὐτοῖς καὶ πρέπον δὲ ἅμα ἐν τῷ τοιῷδε τὴν τιμὴν ταύτην τῆς μνήμης δίδοσθαι. τὴν γὰρ χώραν οἱ αὐτοὶ αἰεὶ οἰκοῦντες διαδοχῇ τῶν ἐπιγιγνομένων μέχρι τοῦδε ἐλευθέραν δι' ἀρετὴν παρέδοσαν.

[2] καὶ ἐκεῖνοί τε ἄξιοι ἐπαίνου καὶ ἔτι μᾶλλον οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν· κτησάμενοι γὰρ πρὸς οἷς ἐδέξαντο ὄσπιν ἔχομεν ἀρχὴν οὐκ ἀπόνως ἡμῖν τοῖς νῦν προσκατέλιπον.

[3] τὰ δὲ πλείω αὐτῆς αὐτοὶ ἡμεῖς οἶδε οἱ νῦν ἔτι ὄντες μάλιστα ἐν τῇ καθεστηκυῖα ἡλικίᾳ ἐπηυξήσαμεν καὶ τὴν πόλιν τοῖς πᾶσι παρεσκευάσαμεν καὶ ἐς πόλεμον καὶ ἐς εἰρήνην ἀνταρκεστάτην³ (Thuc. II 36, 1-3).

I shall begin with our ancestors first of all. It is right, and also appropriate on such an occasion, that this tribute should be paid to their memory. The same race has always occupied this land, passing it on from generation to generation until the present day, and it is to these brave men that we owe our inheritance of a land that is free. They deserve our praise. Yet more deserving are our own fathers, who added to what they themselves had received and by their pains left to us, the present generation, the further legacy of the great empire which we now possess. We ourselves, those of us still alive and now mainly in the settled age of life, have strengthened this empire yet further in most areas and furnished the city with every possible resource for self-sufficiency in war and peace (translation in HAMMOND, RHODES, *op. cit.*, p. 9).

This tripartite structure aims to two linked purposes: the first one is to cancel any reference, even indirect, to the *spatium mythicum* (because the phase of the *progonoi* includes historical events, since it extends up to the eve of the Persian Wars)⁴; the second one is to make very evident the presence of an ascending *climax*, in which each phase surpasses the previous one and in which the culmination is constituted by the Athenians of the generation to which Pericles

³ For the Greek text we follow the edition of H. STUART JONES, *op. cit.*, *ad loc.* This passage does not suffer relevant textual problems: in addition to STUART JONES, see O. LUSCHNAT, *op. cit.*, p. 145 and the even richer critical apparatus of G.B. ALBERTI, *op. cit.*, pp. 187-188.

⁴ On the chronology of the transition between the age of the *progonoi* and the age of the *pateres* see below, §§ 3.3-3.4.

himself belongs, the generation that made Athens ἐς πόλεμον καὶ ἐς εἰρήνην αὐταρκεστάτην⁵.

This clear distinction between these three phases of the Athenian history is particular to the Periclean *Epitaphios*: in the other *epitaphioi* known to us there is no distinction within the historical treatment of Athens' past exploits, or a distinction is made between *spatium mythicum* and *spatium historicum*⁶; in any case, this distinction does not imply any reference to a quantitative and/or qualitative progression, but only takes into consideration the dichotomy between 'deeds which celebrated in poetry' and 'deeds which have not (yet) celebrated in poetry' (see below, § 2).

Therefore, also in this specific aspect as in many others, the Periclean *Epitaphios* seems to move away from the rules of the literary genre to which it belongs, as we can reconstruct them through the other known *epitaphioi*, where we find «una rigida tradizionale e doverosa fissità di motivi e di *topoi*, che sfidava la capacità di ciascun oratore, anche il più grande o il più abile, di sviluppare concetti originali»⁷.

This peculiar feature of the Periclean *Epitaphios* (its attention to the chronological evolution in the Athenian history) is not always given due attention. E.g., Loraux acknowledges that «Périclès refuse délibérément toute collusion de la cité avec le temps mythique»⁸; however, when analyzing the «scansion du temps et devenir de la cité» in the *corpus* of the *logoi epitaphioi*⁹, she does not appear to

⁵ Cf. N. LORAUX, *L'invention d'Athènes...*, cit., pp. 121-122: «tout se passe comme si depuis l'origine le passé avait été attendu du présent» (121).

⁶ This distinction is already conceptualized in the fifth century: see Hdt. II 122, 2, who speaks of *anthropeie genee* to which Minos does not belong. However, just as Herodotus does not at all doubt the historicity of Minos (see Asheri 1988, pp. 37 ff.), so the distinction between the two periods in the exposition of the *logoi epitaphioi* (especially in the Lysian *Epitaphios* and in the *epitaphios* from the Platonic *Menexenos*) does not imply a different judgment on the historical reality of the characters of the heroic age: see below, § 2; L. PORCIANI, *Prime forme della storiografia greca. Prospettiva locale e generale nella narrazione storica*, Stuttgart 2001, p. 84 note 59. On the other hand, in the Periclean *Epitaphios*, this question does not even arise, because no enterprise of the *spatium mythicum* is recalled, and the 'progonoi age' might belong fully to the post-mythical age and extend within the *anthropeie genee* mentioned by Herodotus. Likewise, the only reference to a theme that can be seen as 'mythical', the Athenian autochthony in Thuc. II 36, 1, occurs in 'secular' and rationalistic forms: in the expression τὴν γὰρ χώραν οἱ αὐτοὶ αἰεὶ οἰκοῦντες διαδοχῆ τῶν ἐπιτηγνομένων there is no reference to the 'birth from the earth' or to the 'mother earth' which the other epitaphs dwell in (Lys. II 17; Plat. *Menex.* 237e-238b + 238e-239a; Demosth. LX 4-6).

⁷ L. CANFORA, *Il corpusculum degli epitafti ateniesi*, in G. URSO (a cura di), *Dicere laudes: elogio, comunicazione, creazione del consenso: atti del convegno internazionale, Cividale del Friuli, 23-25 settembre 2010*, Pisa, pp. 69-82 (also in «QS» 37, 2011, pp. 5-25): p. 70.

⁸ N. LORAUX, *L'invention d'Athènes...*, cit., p. 119.

⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 119-131.

be aware that the «scansion du temps» in the Periclean *Épitaphios* is by far more pronounced than in the other *épitaphioi*. On the contrary, according to Loraux, «l'oraison funèbre semble hantée par un modèle d'intemporalité que tous [!] *épitaphios*, même le plus résolument novateur, présente, en dépit de efforts de l'orateur»¹⁰.

2. THE ATHENIAN PAST IN THE OTHER *LOGOI EPITAPHIOI*: AN UNDIFFERENTIATED *CONTINUUM*

Therefore, it is useful to see how the Athenian history is articulated in the other *logoi épitaphioi*.

2.1. In the *Épitaphios* attributed to Lysias¹¹ the only category of *progonoi* is mentioned again and again¹². In one passage only (Lys. II 20), after the exposition

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 129. The same goes for J.L. SHEAR, *op. cit.*, *passim*, who pays no attention to this peculiar feature of the Periclean *Épitaphios*. There is only a hint in J.E. ZIOLKOWSKI, *Thucydides and the Tradition of Funeral Speeches...*, cit., p. 76, who just speaks of a «threefold division of a *topos*, which may conveniently be called *genos*».

¹¹ As is well known, as for, doubts have been raised about the authorship of both Lys. II and Demosth. LX, and about the fact that they were actual official speeches; such doubts are stronger as for the Lysian *Épitaphios*, because it appears problematic that a metic was called to deliver an official speech where the speaker presents himself as part of the community of citizens (see for example Lys. II 17 and 23). As for authorship and nature of Lys. II see K.J. DOVER, *Lysias and the corpus Lysiacum*, Berkeley 1968, p. 193 and L. CANFORA, *Il corpusculum...*, cit., p. 75; as for Demosth. 60 see I. WORTHINGTON, *The Authorship of the Demosthenic Épitaphios*, «MH» 60 (2003), pp. 152-157; L. PETRUZZIELLO, *Iperide. Epitafio per i caduti del primo anno della guerra lamiaca, Introduzione, testo critico, traduzione e commento*, Pisa-Roma 2005, pp. 213-215; J.S. HERRMAN, *The Authenticity of the Demosthenic Funeral Oration*, «AAntHung» 48 (2008), pp. 171-178 (in favor of the attribution to Demosthenes); L. CANFORA, *Il corpusculum...*, cit., pp. 77-82 («forse prodotto di scuola retorica meno probabilmente di provenienza storiografica»: p. 79). This problem is not relevant here: if we are dealing with discourses really pronounced on a specific occasion, they are in any case examples of the genre of the *logos épitaphios*, whatever their authorship; if instead they were fictitious texts (written by an orator as a display of his rhetorical skills), they are conceived to adapt to the genre to which they belong. See K.J. DOVER, *op. cit.*, p. 193: «A funeral speech, like any enkomion or panegyric, belongs to a genre naturally attractive to anyone interested and skilled in oratory, and a rhetorician must often have composed such a speech without even entertaining the possibility that he himself or anyone else would deliver it at a real state funeral [...]. Consequently, I see no reason why Lysias should not have composed the *Épitaphios*»; see L. CANFORA, *Il corpusculum...*, cit., p. 82, which denies Demosthenic authorship of Demosth. 60 precisely because it exhibits «formule [...] che trasmigrano dall'uno all'altro epitafio», which would make it unlikely that Demosthenes had felt the need to write a text of this kind.

¹² Lys. II 3, 6, 17, 20, 23, 26, 32, 61, 69. The *progonoi* mentioned in § 60 are those of the Great King Darius II.

of the mythical exploits and the establishment of democracy¹³, and before the start of the narrative of the Persian Wars, a vague distinction is made between the *progonoι* of the fallen and the descendants of the *progonoι* themselves (οἱ πρόγονοι τῶν ἐνθάδε κειμένων vs. οἱ ἐξ ἐκείνων γεγονότες)¹⁴. We could therefore infer that the author of the text uses πρόγονοι only for the Athenians who lived before the Persian Wars, but in reality, he attributes to the *progonoι*, indifferently, the mythical deeds narrated in §§ 4-16 (see §§ 3 and 6), the autochthony and the establishment of democracy narrated in 17-19 (see § 17), the Persian Wars and the subsequent ones up to the present time set forth in §§ 20-66 (see the mention of the *progonoι* in §§ 23 and 26 for the *Maratonomakhoi* and in § 32 for the Athenians in 480)¹⁵. The account of the mythical enterprises and that of the enterprises of the period between the Persian Wars, and the Corinthian War are separated by the mention of autochthony and the birth of the democratic regime (§§ 17-19); but there is by no means any progression in the development of Athenian power and/or valor. On the contrary, in his narrative about the battle of Salamis (§§ 32-44), Lysias creates an intentional “slide between the Athenians in 480 and the Athenian audience of the early fourth century”¹⁶.

The only hint to such a progression is given in § 20, where the *progonoι* are remembered as authors of πολλὰ μὲν καλὰ καὶ θαυμαστὰ, while their descendants, οἱ ἐξ ἐκείνων γεγονότες, are instead praised with a more precise wording, i.e., because ἀείμνηστα δὲ καὶ μεγάλα καὶ πανταχοῦ [...] τρόπαια διὰ τὴν αὐτῶν ἀρετὴν κατέλιπον. The mention of the τρόπαια makes it clear that we are talking about specific victories on the battlefield; the category of πανταχοῦ...τρόπαια encompasses the events of 490-480, but also the subsequent Athenian victories during the *Pentekontaetia*, which took place in a vast geographical area (unlike the mythical deeds, by which the Athenians win on their own territory or in areas immediately nearby, reacting to external aggressions: see Lys. II 4-16)¹⁷. The phrasing in Lys. II 20 could echo Thuc. II

¹³ The collocation of the ‘constitution’ between the exploits of the mythical age and those of the historical age is a feature both of Lys. II and *Menexenos*. This position has a structural function: cf. L. PORCIANI, *op. cit.*, p. 84 note 59.

¹⁴ Lys. II 20: πολλὰ μὲν καλὰ καὶ θαυμαστὰ οἱ πρόγονοι τῶν ἐνθάδε κειμένων ἠργάσαντο, ἀείμνηστα δὲ καὶ μεγάλα καὶ πανταχοῦ οἱ ἐξ ἐκείνων γεγονότες τρόπαια διὰ τὴν αὐτῶν ἀρετὴν κατέλιπον.

¹⁵ In the section 20-66, the category of the *Athenaioi* is used again and again (§§ 30, 31, 45, 46, 48-52, etc.), *et pour cause*: because events are narrated in which the Athenian behavior was different from that of other Greeks, or in which the Athenians were at war with other Greeks.

¹⁶ J.L. SHEAR, *The politics of remembrance...*, cit., p. 525. She observes that ἡμέτεροι πρόγονοι in § 32 is «an isolated usage and the rest of the narrative will be carried out with verbs in the third person plural and pronouns».

¹⁷ Relying on Lys. II 20, L. PORCIANI *op. cit.*, pp. 78-79, sees in the Lysian *Epitaphios* the

41, 4¹⁸, where Pericles alludes to the Athenian military enterprises in the *Pentekontaetia* and exalts the extension of the Athenian *tolme* on every land and on every sea.

2.2. In the dialogical introduction of the Platonic *Menexenos*¹⁹, Socrates takes into consideration only two categories as the object of *epainos* of a *logos epitaphios*, i.e., the men of the present (the men dead in war and the living ones) and their ancestors, considered as a unitary group (an aspect which Socrates himself underlines: see ἅπαντας τοὺς ἔμπροσθεν)²⁰; it is noteworthy that Socrates is representing the *logos epitaphios* in its general characteristics, typical of the literary genre.

We may consider the actual epitaph attributed to Aspasia within the dialogue. In 236e the distinction between the *pateres* of the fallen and the *progonoi* of the fallen has no ideological significance (the *progonoi* are simply grandparents or great-grandparents)²¹; in 237b the *progonoi* are mentioned for their autochthony; in 238b οἱ τῶνδε πρόγονοι are the founders of the Athenian *politeia*, whose institution is placed in an indeterminate past (and projected in the *spatium mythicum*: see 237b-238b). The only criterion of distinction over time is the difference between deeds which have been celebrated by poets (events of the mythical time) and deeds which have not yet been the subject of poetic celebration (239c-d): the first of the latter is the battle of Marathon. In a way consistent with this approach, the category of *pateres* can assume a very generic meaning. In 239a οἱ τῶνδ' γε πατέρες καὶ οἱ ἡμέτεροι καὶ αὐτοὶ οὗτοι are all grouped together as authors of “many noble enterprises to advantage of all human

same tripartition shown in Thuc. II 36, 1-3. However, the only reference in § 20 to the difference between *progonoi* and ‘descendants of the *progonoi*’ cannot counterbalance the generic use of *progonoi* in Lys. II. In short, unlike the Thucydidean Pericles, Lysias is much less interested in an exact division of three different phases: because, unlike the Thucydidean Pericles, he is not even interested in assigning a well-defined merit to each period.

¹⁸ πᾶσαν μὲν θάλασσαν καὶ γῆν ἐσβατὸν τῇ ἡμετέρᾳ τόλμῃ καταναγκάσαντες γενέσθαι, πανταχοῦ δὲ μνημεῖα κακῶν τε κάγαθῶν αἰδία ζυγκατοικίσαντες.

¹⁹ As is well known, the Platonic authorship of *Menexenos* has also been contested by some scholars: in favor of authorship see S. TSITSIRIDIS, *Platons Menexenos: Einleitung, Text und Kommentar*, Stuttgart-Leipzig 1998, pp. 34-41; against it see TH. KOENTGES, *The Un-Platonic Menexenus: A Stylometric Analysis with More Data*, «GRBS» 60 (2020), pp. 211-241. For a summary of the *status quaestionis* see TH. KOENTGES, *op. cit.*, pp. 225-229. As for Lys. II and Demosth. LX, this issue is not relevant to the investigation carried out here: see above, note 7.

²⁰ Plat. *Menex.* 235a: τοὺς τετελευτηκότας ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ καὶ τοὺς προγόνους ἡμῶν ἅπαντας τοὺς ἔμπροσθεν καὶ αὐτοὺς ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἔτι ζῶντας.

²¹ In fact, the speaker is referring to the *progonoi* still alive at the time of the public funeral of the fallen: πατέρας δὲ καὶ μητέρας καὶ εἴ τινας τῶν ἄνωθεν ἔτι προγόνων λείπονται.

beings²², and the first mentioned deeds belong to the mythical age²³; here the category of *pateres* has no precise chronological collocation and is equivalent to *progonoι*²⁴. Conversely, in 246c-d, the *pateres* are not the generation prior to the current one, but precisely the fallen who are the object of praise, in relation to the children present in the audience.

The only hint of a tripartition of the history of Athens is given by the mention of the γονῆς δὲ ἡμέτεροι in 239d, distinct from the *progonoι* mentioned in 237b and 238b; however, this hint serves above all to show the difference between the distant past and the near past (which coincides with the distinction between events celebrated by poets and events not yet the subject of poetry, in 239b-c). Except for this passage, there is never an explicit reference to the current generation as a ‘historical subject’; the first-person plural refers generically to the Athenians and does not create a temporal opposition. Therefore, like the *Epitaphios* of Lysias also the ‘*epitaphios* of Aspasia’ distinguishes a distant past and a more recent one, but does not contrast it with the generation of the present; the eulogies to the fallen, in Lys. II 67-70 and in Plat. *Menex.* 246a-b, are not intended to highlight a distinct generation²⁵.

2.3. The Demosthenic *Epitaphios* speaks generically of “*progonoι* of the current generation”, and this category includes “both their *pateres* and those before them who had names by which they are recognized by members of their family”²⁶ (i.e., grandparents, great-grandparents, great-great-grandparents, etc.). Both the

²² *Menex.* 239a: οἱ τῶνδὲ γε πατέρες καὶ οἱ ἡμέτεροι καὶ αὐτοὶ οὗτοι [...] ἔργα ἀπεφάναντο εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους; τῶνδὲ are the fallen, as elsewhere (e.g., 237; 238b), and in the Periclean *Epitaphios* (e.g., Thuc. II 36, 4; 41, 5; 42, 2, etc.).

²³ *Menex.* 239b recalls the defense war against Eumolpus and against Amazons, the war in defense of Argives against Cadmeans and the war in defense of Heraclides against Argives.

²⁴ Likewise, other mentions of the *progonoι* are generic: 237e (τοὺς τῶνδὲ τε καὶ ἡμετέρους προγόνους); 246b; 247b.

²⁵ For the reasons explained in the text, I do not see the similarity highlighted by L. PORCIANI (*op. cit.*, pp. 78-79) between the (clear) temporal scansion in Thuc. II 36, 1-3 and the slight one in the Lysian and Platonic *epitaphioi*. In these two epitaphs the present has no real ‘historical’ role (in Thuc. II 36, 3 the present-day Athenians are part of the glorious history of Athens), and the occasional distinction between the remote past and the near past is devoid of ideological role; on the contrary, Thuc. II 36, 1-3 is fully built on the distinction between three different ages (not two), whose difference concerns their value, not the criterion of temporal distance and/or the form of transmission (in poetry *vs.* in prose or orally). On the distinction between the remote past and the recent past both in the fifth- and fourth-century rhetoric and historiography see L. PORCIANI, *op. cit.*, pp. 81-85.

²⁶ Demosth. LX 7: οἱ γὰρ τῆς κατὰ τὸν παρόντα χρόνον γενεᾶς πρόγονοι, καὶ πατέρες καὶ τούτων ἐπάνω τὰς προσηγορίας ἔχοντες, αἷς ὑπὸ τῶν ἐν γένει γνωρίζονται, κτλ.

mythical enterprises listed in § 8 and the more recent ones are attributed to them; among these latter deeds, only the Persian Wars are mentioned (§ 9) and then, generically, the wars against other Greeks in defense of justice up to the present time (§ 11). The only internal articulation is between mythical events and events of recent times (§ 9)²⁷.

2.4. Finally, even in the *Epitaphios* of Hyperides, in which the space of past events is minimized by conscious choice (§§ 4-6), the *progonoi* are an all-encompassing category, used in an equivalent way to *polis* and *Athenaioi* when the speaker talks about the Athenian past²⁸.

3. WHO ARE “OUR FATHERS” IN THUC. II 36, 2? A COMPARISON WITH THUC. I 144, 4 AND II 36, 4

3.1. After highlighting the peculiar nature of the triplet made up of *progonoi*, *pateres*, and ‘present-day men’, we can return to analysis of Thuc. II 36, 1-3. In fact, despite the overall clarity of the text, two major exegetical problems have been raised by scholars: the exact identity of οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν mentioned in 36, 2 (and therefore the definition of the chronological boundaries between the three groups); the interpretation of τὰ δὲ πλείω αὐτῆς ... ἐπηυξήσαμεν, especially in relation to the previous ὄσσην ἔχομεν ἀρχὴν (but this second problem will be dealt with elsewhere)²⁹. The present paper investigates the first of these two problems. However, the question is not only merely exegetical: as will be seen, the identity of the *pateres* of Thuc. II 36, 2 reflects an articulation of the Athenian fifth-century history which shows many points of contact with other sources of the fifth century, and this fact is even more interesting considering the different articulation of the history of Athens shown in the other *logoi epitaphioi*.

So: who are the *pateres*, exactly? And, therefore, which are the chronological boundaries of the three different groups (*progonoi*, *pateres*, ‘we, the present generation’)? Indeed, there are two different interpretations.

3.2. According to the first interpretation, already supported by Steup, then by Kakridis, Loraux, and other scholars³⁰, «poiché l’età dei padri si segnala per

²⁷ Demosth. LX 9: τῶν μὲν οὖν εἰς μύθους ἀνενηνεγμένων ἔργων; τῶ δ’ ὑπογυώτερ’ εἶναι τοῖς χρόνοις οὕτω μεμυθολόγηται, οὐδ’ εἰς τὴν ἡρωϊκὴν ἐπανήκται τάξιιν.

²⁸ *Progonoi*: Hyper. VI 3; *polis*: VI 4-6; *Athenaioi*: VI 7.

²⁹ See G. MOSCONI, «We ourselves have conquered most of the empire»: A (Grammatical and Ideological) Interpretation of Thuc. 2, 36, 2-3, «RCCM» 66 (2024), c.s.

³⁰ See J. CLASSEN, J. STEUP, *op. cit.*, p. 62, note *ad loc.*; J. TH. KAKRIDIS, *op. cit.*, p. 11; N. LORAUX, *L’invention d’Athènes...*, cit., p. 121 («La première [generation] mène de la discrète

l'edificazione dell'impero, lo spazio coperto dagli antenati dovrebbe in teoria comprendere la storia di Atene dalle origini fino alle guerre persiane» (*scilicet*, to the end of the Persian Wars)³¹. The supporters of this interpretation observe that 'having kept the homeland free' seems to fit perfectly with the events of the Persian Wars: e.g., according to Kakridis, the boundary between *progonoï* and *pateres* must be placed around 478 precisely «als der defensive Krieg gegen die Perser zu Ende war und Athen die Führung des Delischen Bundes übernahm und somit den Grund für seine spätere Machtenfaltung legte»³². This reasoning may seem convincing, but overlooks the fact that, also after 478, the anti-Persian enterprises could be seen as part of a defensive fight against the Persian menace (this issue will be dealt with later). As a further element of proof, the passages of Thucydides are cited in which the expressions τὰ παλαιά or τὰ πρότερον ἔργα indicate events up to the 70s of the fifth century³³.

Therefore, if the age of the *pateres* begins after 480 (ca. 478), the watershed moment between the fathers and the current generation would be around 446, i.e., in correspondence with the thirty-year peace with Sparta, «als Perikles mit der Organisierung der attischen ἀρχή fertig war»³⁴ or “bis etwa zur Schlacht von Koronea»³⁵.

However, as Fantasia himself observes, this interpretation «provoca un indubbio schiacciamento temporale delle due generazioni più recenti», which are

évocation de l'autochtonie à celle, encore plus allusive, des guerres médiques») and p. 396 note 194 («La première époque semble bien comprendre les guerres médiques»: there is no argumentation about this statement); U. FANTASIA, *op. cit.*, p. 371; L. PORCIANI, *op. cit.*, p. 66 note 2.

³¹ U. FANTASIA, *op. cit.*, p. 371. Likewise, L. PORCIANI, *op. cit.*, p. 66 note 2, writes: «I padri, come è chiaro da Th. II 36, 2-3, sono quelli che hanno fondato e portato a un certo livello l'impero: è la generazione degli Ateniesi attivi fra gli inizi degli anni settanta e grosso modo la metà degli anni quaranta», cioè «ca. 478 e 446 a.C.».

³² J. TH. KAKRIDIS, *op. cit.*, p. 11. He follows J. CLASSEN, J. STEUP, *op. cit.*, p. 62: «Diese Worte [...] ohne Zweifel noch die Abwendung der Gefahr von der Persern einschliessen». Cf. L. PORCIANI, *op. cit.*, p. 66 note 2: «i πατέρες non sono [...] la generazione delle guerre persiane; sono i πρόγονοι, dice Pericle, ad aver salvaguardato la libertà dell'Attica».

³³ See U. FANTASIA, *op. cit.*, p. 371. He recalls three passages: Thuc. I 20, 1 (here τὰ παλαιά includes the birth and evolution of the Delian League, mentioned in I, 19); Thuc. I 73, 2 (here πάνυ παλαιά are the events prior to the Persian Wars; from the speech of the Athenians in Sparta); Thuc. I 23, 1 (here τὰ πρότερον ἔργα also includes the Persian Wars; in this case, however, the reference appears less pertinent, because τὰ πρότερον ἔργα are all the events prior to the war Thucydides deals with).

³⁴ J. TH. KAKRIDIS, *op. cit.*, p. 11.

³⁵ J. CLASSEN, J. STEUP, *op. cit.*, p. 62, *ad loc.* The reference to the battle of Coronea is perplexing: Pericles could hardly consider this serious Athenian defeat as a noteworthy turning point.

confined to the period after 480; moreover, only the last fifteen years of Athenian history (446–431 BC) are attributed to the last generation, in comparison with the nearly thirty-five years of the generation of the *pateres*³⁶. Moreover, if we consider the territorial losses suffered by the Athenian *arkhe* precisely in 447³⁷ (the boundary between *pateres* and *hemeis* according to Classen, Steup, Kakridis and so on), the affirmation that the fathers acquired the *arkhe* and left it as an inheritance would be inopportune, recalling a moment of crisis and decrease for the Athenian *arkhe* (this is more striking if we consider the clarification ὄσην ἔχομεν ἀρχήν).

On the other hand, it is not even justified to apply the Thucydidean concept of τὰ παλαιά (and even less that of τὰ πρότερον ἔργα, which is totally generic) to the temporal articulation in Thuc. II 36, 1-3. Indeed, the expression τὰ παλαιά in Thuc. I 20, 1, it summarizes all the previous events (explained in I 2-19), ranging from the origins of the Greek world up to a significant part of the *Pentekontaetia*, i.e., up to the outbreak of the open conflict between Spartans and Athenians with their allies³⁸ and then it also includes events reaching at least about 460 BC. Therefore, a chronological equivalence between the category of *progonoi* in Thuc. II 36, 1 and *ta palaiia* in Thuc. I 20, 1 is impossible – in fact, no one would claim that the *progonoi* reach up to 460! It is worth noting that this circumstance shows us a Thucydidean Pericles whose ideas do not coincide with

³⁶ This was admitted by J.TH.KAKRIDIS, *op. cit.*, p. 11.

³⁷ In 447, after the Athenian defeat at Coronea (which was the outcome of a military initiative which Pericles had opposed: Plut. *Per.* 18, 2), Athens lost control of Boeotia and the neighboring regions (cf. Thuc. I 108, 2 and 113, 2-3). In the following year Euboea rebelled; this revolt was repressed but allowed the defection of the strategic Megarid and therefore a further territorial reduction of the Athenian *arkhe*, perhaps compensated by the harsher submission of Euboea: cf. Thuc. I 114. On these events cf. M. BETTALLI, *Tra guerre persiane e guerra del Peloponneso: la Grecia durante la Pentecostetia*, in A. BARBERO (dir.), *Storia d'Europa e del Mediterraneo*, Parte I, Vol. IV, Roma 2008, pp. 249-288: pp. 270-271.

³⁸ Thuc. I 18, 3: καὶ ὀλίγον μὲν χρόνον ξυνέμεινεν ἡ ὁμαιχμία, ἔπειτα διενεχθέντες οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι καὶ Ἀθηναῖοι ἐπολέμησαν μετὰ τῶν ξυμμάχων πρὸς ἀλλήλους. The phrase καὶ ὀλίγον μὲν χρόνον ξυνέμεινεν ἡ ὁμαιχμία means the period 478/477 (= birth of the Delian League, i.e., creation of an Athenian alliance, mentioned at the end of I 18, 2) to 461, when the alliance anti-Persian relationship between Sparta and Athens was broken (Thuc. I 102, 4). According to L. PORCIANI, *op. cit.*, p. 66 and note 1, the concept of τὰ παλαιά in Thucydides' *Arkhaiologia* includes the events from Thuc. I 1 to I 18, 2 «fino alle guerre persiane incluse», excluding the events of the *Pentekontaetia*, because «nella *archaiologia*, la ricostruzione degli eventi politico-militari, pur scheletrica, finisce propriamente con le guerre persiane; invece del cinquantennio (18, 2-19) è data una sorta di sintesi strutturale». However, this difference seems irrelevant, because even in the *Arkhaiologia* there are numerous passages which are devoted to 'structural syntheses', not only for remote ages, but also for fully historical periods: e.g., 12, 4-13, 1; 15, 1-2; 17-18, 1.

those of the historian³⁹: this element reinforces the idea that the concepts expressed in Thuc. II 36 go back to Pericles as historical figure⁴⁰.

While keeping the 478 as the starting point of the second generation (cf. *supra*, note 26), Loraux proposed a different solution about the turning point between the second generation and the third one: according to her, the current generation begins «au plus tard avec la venue au pouvoir de Périclès» (ca. 462)⁴¹; hence the age of the *pateres* is given only “une quinzaine d’années” (i.e., ca. 478/477 to ca. 462)⁴². Loraux acknowledges that «la seconde période en serait singulièrement raccourcie» and «une quinzaine d’années ne suffit pas à faire une génération» (this problem is analogous to the «schiacciamento temporale» about which Fantasia speaks arguing for the chronological articulation 478-446-431), but she denies this problem simply stating that «Périclès se préoccupe peu de donner des dates précises»⁴³. However, this last objection is a *petitio principii*: the vagueness of the chronological articulation proposed by Pericles in Thuc. II 36, 1-3 must be demonstrated, and must not be the logical basis of a hypothesis precisely about this chronological articulation. Furthermore, admittedly, the Thucydidean Pericles might not to give «des dates précises» for the transitions between one period and another, but it is a very different thing to maintain that Pericles can attribute a duration time to a generation (the *pateres*) so different from the duration of the

³⁹ Conversely, according to L. PORCIANI, *op. cit.*, p. 66, the group of *progonoi* and the group made up of ‘*pateres* and present-day men’ «compongono una bipartizione cronologica del tutto parallela» to that created by Thucydides for “il racconto della storia greca fino alla guerra del Peloponneso» (divided between *Arkhaiologia* and *Pentekontaetia*, to which Thucydides dedicates two separate sections). However, as we will show, the *progonoi* do not reach 478 and therefore the parallel breaks down. Moreover, it should be remembered that the *Arkhaiologia* includes an essential synthesis of the ‘fifty years’ (Thuc. I 18, 2-19) and that the choice to narrate the *Pentekontaetia* as an autonomous section is motivated, by Thucydides, through contingent reasons (the absence of other accounts of the period; the need of showing how the Athenian *arkhe* arose for a better understanding of the Peloponnesian war): see Thuc. I 97, 2.

⁴⁰ On the relationship between Pericles’ ideas (as they can be seen through the speeches of Pericles in Thucydides) and those of Thucydides, and on the fact that the numerous common elements do not at all imply to consider Pericles’ speeches in Thucydides a substantial invention of the historian, cf. the persuasive arguments in L. PORCIANI, *op. cit.*, pp. 68-80 and U. FANTASIA, *op. cit.*, pp. 358-363, p. 360: the similarities can be interpreted as an effect of ideas circulating in Athens in the second half of the fifth century BC. For a similar methodological approach about the contacts between Thucydides and the Old Oligarch see G. MOSCONI, *Chi “pratica la musica” e chi “non sa suonare la lira”. A proposito di [Xen.] Ath. resp. 1, 13, «RFIC» 130 (2002)*, pp. 299-335: pp. 333-334.

⁴¹ N. LORAUX, *op. cit.*, p. 121; however, Loraux gives no clear chronological reference point for that (she hints to a period between 462 and 454: *op. cit.*, p. 396 note 194).

⁴² N. LORAUX, *op. cit.*, p. 396 note 194.

⁴³ N. LORAUX, *ibid.*

next generation (the present-day men), since Pericles needed to be understood by his audience (it is not a question of an abstract love of symmetry). Anyway, as will be shown (§ 4), even this problem can be solved by accepting a different chronological articulation, which is also ideologically meaningful.

3.3. A different articulation has been proposed by numerous other scholars (including Gomme)⁴⁴: according to them, the age of the *progonoi* reaches up to the eve of the Persian Wars, the *pateres* fought in the Persian Wars and in the first period of the *Pentekontaetia*. Gomme has translated this articulation into chronology: the *pateres* were active between 490 and 465, and the current generation are Athenians who were fully active from 465 onwards. This partition is more convincing but still imperfect, as will later be explained. Anyhow, its strong point is the attribution of the decade of the Persian Wars, 490-480, to the *pateres*. Despite the doubts raised by some scholars ('since the *progonoi* are praised because they kept Attica free and the Persian Wars kept Athens free from Persians, then the Persian Wars were fought by the *progonoi*')⁴⁵, the Persian Wars are a merit of the *pateres*, not of the *progonoi*.

3.4. This interpretation has often been presented as self-evident; however, since there are different interpretations (see *supra*, § 3.2), it is appropriate to provide the evidence in support of it, which has not been done. There are three pieces of evidence that have not yet been proposed: two are drawn from internal analysis of Thuc. II 36, 2-4; the third on a parallel passage.

The first proof is the fact that, in Thuc. II 36, 4, the clash with the "attacking

⁴⁴ A.W. GOMME, *op. cit.*, pp. 104-105. Likewise, E.C. MARCHANT, *op. cit.*, p. 169; M. MOGGI, *op. cit.*, p. 299, note 1; RUSTEN, *op. cit.*, p. 141 (*progonoi* = «the ancestors [...] who lived before the Persian war»; *pateres* = «the preceding generation [...] who won the Persian war and established the empire»); J.J. TORRES ESBARRANCH, *op. cit.*, p. 449 n. 277 (*pateres* = «generación de la época de las Guerras Médicas, del 490 al 465 a. C.») and n. 279 (*hemeis* = «generación de Pericles, que estaba en su madurez (de los 40 a los 60 ó 65 años) entre el 465 y el 440 a. C.»). See also H. FLASHAR, *Der Epitaphios des Perikles. Seine Funktion im Geschichtswerk des Thukydides*, in H. FLASHAR, *Eidola. Ausgewählte kleine Schriften*, hrsg. v. M. Kraus, Amsterdam 1989, pp. 435-481, p. 445 no. 23 (= «Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, phil-hist. Kl.», Jg. 1969, n. 1, Heidelberg 1969, p. 15 note 23); K. PRINZ, *Epitaphios Logos. Struktur, Funktion und Bedeutung der Bestattungsreden im Athen des 5. und 4. Jahrhunderts*, Frankfurt a.M.-Berlin-Bern-New York-Paris-Wien 1997, pp. 103ff.

No mention of this problem in P.J. RHODES, *op. cit.*, p. 218 (where the fathers are credited only with the foundation of the Delian League, without any reference to the Persian Wars) and in S. HORNBLLOWER, *op. cit.*, p. 297 *ad loc.*, who just observes that «the Greek word for 'fathers' can be used in the wider sense in this kind of context» (on this see below, in the text).

⁴⁵ See above, notes 25-26.

barbarian enemy” is linked to the generation of the *pateres* and to that of Pericles but not to the *progonoí*⁴⁶: αὐτοὶ ἢ οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν βάρβαρον ἢ Ἑλληνα πολέμιον ἐπιόντα προθύμως ἡμυνάμεθα. This is consistent with an interpretation according to which the time of the *progonoí* reaches 490 but does not include the Persian Wars: after all, in Thuc. II 36, 1-4, the *progonoí* are the only ones in which no ‘clash with the barbarian’ is explicitly mentioned!

At the same time, the same sentence in Thuc. II 36, 4 offers a strong argument against reducing the time space of the present-day men to the fifteen years 446-431: the reference to wars supported also by the ‘present-day men’ against the “barbarian aggressor” (βάρβαρον [...] πολέμιον ἐπιόντα προθύμως ἡμυνάμεθα) requires starting the age of the ‘present-day men’ before 449⁴⁷. In fact, from 449 onward, every Athenian military activity against the Persians ends (no matter whether there was an actual agreement such as the debated ‘peace of Callias’ or an informal appeasement)⁴⁸: therefore, the age of the ‘present-day men’ cannot begin after 449. On the contrary, if the age of ‘present-day men’ begins in about 460, it includes an intense anti-Persian activity. And if the campaign in Egypt may seem inconsistent with the image of the ‘barbarian aggressor’ (but until the reconstruction of the temples of the Acropolis, all the clashes with the Persians can be presented as a defense against possible Persian attacks), in the 50s some phases of the confrontation with the Persians could have appeared properly defensive: the transfer of the treasure of the League from Delos to Athens, “because of fear of barbarians” (Plut. *Per.* 12, 1); the campaign led by Cimon in 451/0 for the liberation of Cyprus, a partly Hellenized territory that had been trying to escape from Persian rule since the time of the Ionian revolt (Hdt. VI 104, 1 + 109, 3).

The third proof in favor of attributing the Persian wars to the generation of the *pateres* comes from the comparison with a passage that has been ignored or undervalued⁴⁹ so far when explaining Thuc. 2, 36, 2 (this is surprising, because

⁴⁶ Thuc. II 36, 4. On the historical events to which the expression βάρβαρον...πολέμιον ἐπιόντα refers cf. *infra*. H. FLASHAR, *op. cit.*, p. 445 note 23 (= «Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie»..., cit., p. 15 n. 23) observes that βάρβαρον...πολέμιον ἐπιόντα refers «ganz natürlich auf die Perserkriege» and is right; however, this expression can refer also to the following period and, *per se*, cannot be a decisive proof.

⁴⁷ J. TH. KAKRIDIS, *op. cit.*, p. 16 is aware of this problem in its analysis of 36, 4 (in particular, on the relative pronoun ὧν which opens § 4), but neglects it when he discusses the chronological scansion of the three groups of §§ 1-3.

⁴⁸ On that see below, note 51.

⁴⁹ There is no reference to Thuc. I 144, 4 in the comments on II 36, 2 of the various editions of the second book of Thucydides considered here, i.e., STEPHANUS, VALLA (1564); STEPHANUS (1594); KRÜGER; POPPO, STAHL; CLASSEN, STEUP; GOMME; KAKRIDIS; DE ROMILLY (which

it mentions the *πατέρες ἡμῶν* and comes from a speech by Pericles in Thucydides). This passage is Thuc. I 144, 4:

οἱ γοῦν πατέρες ἡμῶν ὑποστάντες Μήδους καὶ οὐκ ἀπὸ τοσῶνδε ὀρμώμενοι, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ ὑπάρχοντα ἐκλιπόντες, γνώμη τε πλεονίη ἢ τύχη καὶ τόλμη μείζονι ἢ δυνάμει τὸν τε βάρβαρον ἀπεώσαντο καὶ ἐς τὰδε προήγαγον αὐτά.

Did not our fathers resist the Medes not only with resources far different from ours, but even when those resources had been abandoned; and more by wisdom than by fortune, more by daring than by strength, did not they beat off the barbarian and advance their affairs to their present height?⁵⁰

Without doubt, here the *pateres* are the generation that fought the two Persian Wars of 490-480: *ὑποστάντες Μήδους* could refer to either the events of 490 or 480/479, while *τὰ ὑπάρχοντα ἐκλιπόντες* refers exclusively to 480, when the Athenians abandoned their possessions⁵¹, i.e., the whole of Attica, in the face of the Persian invasion⁵².

Tellingly, Thuc. I 144, 4 attributes two distinct merits to the *pateres* (connected to each other: cf. *infra*)⁵³: ‘having rejected the barbarian’ (*τὸν τε βάρβαρον ἀπεώσαντο*) and ‘having brought the resources of Athens to the present situation’

however does not deal with II 36); RHODES; RUSTEN; HORNBLLOWER; FANTASIA. The same goes for translations, when they have synthetic commentary notes (see above, note 1). I find a cursory mention of Thuc. I 144, 4 only in O. LONGO, *op. cit.*, p. 58, *ad loc.*, but only as an example of the *topos* of ‘not being inferior to the fathers’ (together with Thuc. I 71, 7; I 122, 3; II 11, 2; IV 92, 7, and, from the speeches of Pericles, I 144, 4 and II 62, 4). According to L. PORCIANI, *op. cit.*, p. 80, in Thuc. I 144, 4 there is the same «linea di sviluppo storico dell’epitafio», but Porciani attributes the age of the Persian wars to the *progonoï* (as we have seen).

⁵⁰ Translation in J.M. DENT, *op. cit.*, *ad loc.*

⁵¹ According to K.W. KRÜGER, *op. cit.*, p. 162, *τὰ ὑπάρχοντα* is «ihre Macht»; this is a wrong and unnecessary interpretation. See the use of *ἐκλιπεῖν* Thuc. I 18, 2: upon the arrival of the Persians the Athenians decided to *ἐκλιπεῖν τὴν πόλιν*.

⁵² This passage from the ‘first discourse’ aims to demonstrate that the strategy proposed by Pericles shortly before in I, 143, 5 (the abandonment of the *khora* outside the Long Walls to stake everything on the fleet) is not a betrayal of the Athenian tradition (as a large part of Athenian public opinion thought, according to the testimony of Thuc. II 21-22 and other sources) but it has an illustrious precedent, i.e., the Athenian strategy in 480: here the *pateres* are recalled as a model to get something new accepted! It matters little, for the purposes of argumentative effectiveness, that the parallel established by Pericles is unjustified: on this cf. G. MOSCONI, *Pericle, la guerra, la democrazia e il buon uso del corpo del cittadino*, «MediterrAnt» 17 (2014), pp. 51-86, pp. 53-54.

⁵³ See below, § 6.1.

(ἐς τὰδε προήγαγον αὐτά; αὐτά = τὰ ὑπάρχοντα). This second element corresponds perfectly to what the *pateres* did according to Thuc. II 36, 2: ἐς τὰδε is equivalent to the *arkhe* possessed by ‘men of the present’ but which they have received from the *pateres*. This further contact between Thuc. I 144, 4 and Thuc. II 36, 2 confirms that in this latter passage the *pateres* are those who fought in the Persian Wars.

Besides, comparison with Thuc. I 144, 4 allows to exclude, in II 36, 2 and in the conceptually analogous II 62, 3 (again from a Periclean discourse)⁵⁴, that *πατέρες* may be interpreted *lato sensu* (= ‘ancestors’), as some translators and commentators do⁵⁵ (and as indeed occurs in Plat. *Menex.* 239a, where οἱ τῶνδὲ γε πατέρες καὶ οἱ ἡμέτεροι are all of the ancient Athenians *vs.* the generation of the fallen)⁵⁶. The same goes for the expression οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν in Thuc. II 36, 4; however, in this case, the expression βάρβαρον...πολέμιον ἐπιόντα (which presents the barbarian as an aggressor and not simply as an ‘enemy’)⁵⁷ does not refer only to the Persian Wars of 490-479, but to all those subsequent clashes with the Persians which could be seen and/or presented as an assault on the freedom of Athens, until the cessation of hostilities in 449⁵⁸. This is consistent

⁵⁴ Thuc. II 62, 3: Athenians are exhorted not to appear inferior to the *pateres*, οἱ μετὰ πόνων καὶ οὐ παρ’ ἄλλων δεξάμενοι κατέσχον τε καὶ προσέτι διασώσαντες παρέδωσαν ὑμῖν αὐτά. As in Thuc. II 36, 2, the *pateres* acquired, “with hard work”, something they did not receive from previous generations, they preserved it and then transmitted it to the generation of men of the present (the relationship between the two passages was widely noted: see, e.g., O. LONGO, *op. cit.*, p. 58; U. FANTASIA, *op. cit.*, pp. 467-468). The pronoun αὐτά is very vague: it includes, in a generic way, the various elements mentioned in the previous sentences, i.e., the *dynamis* mentioned at the beginning of § 3 (see FANTASIA, *op. cit.*, p. 149, who translates “power”; cf. the translation “domain”, chosen by Mariella Cagnetta in L. CANFORA, *Tucidide...*, cit., p. 265), but also *eleutheria* (understood as “libertà assoluta [...] inclusiva del diritto al dominio”) and again material prosperity, mentioned during the § 3. About the “nesso tipicamente greco fra libertà ed autorità, fra indipendenza e dominio” see U. FANTASIA, *op. cit.*, p. 474, hence the previous quotation; cf. J. DE ROMILLY, *op. cit.*, pp. 69-72 and Lanza 1977, pp. 236-239). Perhaps the best translation might be the generic “that”. An equally vague use of the pronoun is in the conceptually similar Thuc. 2, 36, 4: ἤλθομεν ἐπ’ αὐτά.

⁵⁵ B. JOWETT, *op. cit.*, p. 133, translates *pateres* with “ancestors” in II 62, 3; S. HORNBLOWER, *op. cit.*, p. 297, *ad* II 36, 2 (*pateres* is «opposed to the remote ancestors» of 36, 1 «though – as in English – the Greek word for ‘fathers’ can be used in the wider sense in this kind of context») and p. 336, *ad* II 62, 3 (here H. translates with «the more literally correct ‘fathers’» but adds that «‘ancestors’ is obviously the general sense»; see p. 297: *προγόνων* is connected to *πατέρων* of II 62, 3). Similarly, also in II 36, 4 οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν cannot mean «die früheren Generationen in allgemeinen», as J.T.H. KAKRIDIS, *op. cit.*, p. 15 rightly observes.

⁵⁶ See above, § 2.2.

⁵⁷ See the *Greek English Lexicon* (GEL = Liddell-Scott-Jones), *s.v.* ἔπειμι: «mostly in hostile sense, come against, attack», with numerous examples from Thucydides.

⁵⁸ J.T.H. KAKRIDIS, *op. cit.*, p. 15, argues that βάρβαρον...πολέμιον ἐπιόντα...ἡμυνάμεθα

with the attribution of the wars against the barbarian aggressor both to the *pateres* and to the 'present-day men' (therefore much later than 478).

We are conditioned by the Thucydidean perspective (according to which the Persian Wars were resolved rapidly and the siege of Sestos in 479/478 is the breakthrough from the *Medika* to the *Pentekontaetia* marked by the Athens-Sparta competition)⁵⁹; therefore, we run the risk of forgetting that the Persians was perceived as a real threat up to the actual turning point of 449 BC⁶⁰. In short, Kakridis was wrong when he stated that «nach 478 keine Abwehrkriege gegen die Barbaren stattgefunden haben» (thus finding himself in difficulty in the face of Thuc. II 36, 4, where it speaks of wars of defense against the barbarian aggressor fought by the *pateres* and by the present-day men)⁶¹. Rather, we may say that after 478 and up to 449 the war of Athens against the Persians was strictly defensive only on some occasions: this could explain why in Thuc. II 36, 4, the Thucydidean Pericles uses a hypothetical formulation (εἴ τι ... ἤμυνάμεθα) for the defensive wars, and the peremptory ἕκαστα ἐκτήθη when speaking about the Athenian conquests.

A final remark should be made about the thesis according to which, since in Thuc. II 36, 1 it is said that the *progonoι* kept Attica free, the age of the *pateres*

hints «unmittelbar» at the Persian Wars: this hypothesis is contradicted by the fact that, in this passage, the wars against the Persian aggressors (ἐπιόντα) are attributed both to the *pateres* and to the 'present-day men'. Moreover, Kakridis himself must admit that this interpretation is in contrast with his idea that the *progonoι* of II 36, 1 include the combatants of 490 and 480/79. Unfortunately, both interpretations are wrong.

⁵⁹ Thuc. I 23, 1 (the war with the Medes ended in two land battles and two sea battles); I 89, 2-3 about the siege of Sestos seen as the beginning of the *Pentekontaetia*.

⁶⁰ See M. ZACCARINI, *The Lame Hegemony. Cimon of Athens and the Failure of Panhellenism, ca. 478-450 BC*, Bologna 2017, pp. 139-143: «A significant part of the tradition underscores the persistence of the menace posed by the Persians forces after the retreat from Greece» (142). Zaccarini attributes this tradition above all to the fourth century BC and finds its traces in Diodorus Siculus and in Plutarch's *Vita Cimonis* (*ibid.*, 142). But the mere fact that the reconstruction of the Acropolis was started only after the turning point of 449 BC (apart from the controversial question of the historicity of the 'peace of Callias' and the 'Panhellenic Congress' whose only source is Plut. *Per.* 17) shows that this conception was shared by Athenian public opinion at least until the 40s of the fifth century: on this cf. G. MOSCONI, *Il consigliere segreto di Pericle. Damone e i meccanismi della democrazia ateniese*, Pisa 2023, pp. 101-103 (*ibid.*, p. 101 n. 42 on the so-called 'Panhellenic Congress'; p. 102 n. 43 on the 'peace of Callias' and n. 45 for another Thucydidean passage which refers to a long perspective of the Persian Wars). Therefore, we may notice that the perspective of the Thucydidean Pericles in Thuc. II 36, 4 is different from that of the historian Thucydides: another case that adds to the one already seen (i.e., the discrepancy between the category of *progonoι* in Thuc. II 36, 1 and that of *ta palaia* in Thuc. I 20, 1: above, § 3.2).

⁶¹ J.TH. KAKRIDIS, *op. cit.*, p. 17.

cannot include the Persian Wars (see above, § 3.2)⁶². On the contrary, even though the merit of having kept Attica free is certainly the specific merit of the *progonoi*, the statement in 2, 36, 1 does not exclude *pateres* and ‘present-day men’ from the task of keeping Attica free.

We may say this not only relying on factual logic (only by continuing to keep Attica free the *pateres* could found the *arkhe* and the present-day men could expand it), and on other affirmations of Thucydidean Pericles in the first and third discourse, which connect the possession of the *arkhe* to the defense of the freedom of Athens⁶³, and above all finally on an element internal to the text under examination, namely the μέχρι τοῦδε in Thuc. II 36, 1. This clarification, apparently contradictory with the rest of the sentence (how may the *progonoi* have transmitted Attica free “until now”?)⁶⁴, is valuable: μέχρι τοῦδε allows Pericles to attribute the defense of freedom and the *arete* assigned to the *progonoi* also to the generations of *pateres* and ‘present-day men’, albeit indirectly; in this way, attention is also drawn to the specific merits of the last two generations, compared to the generic virtue of the *arete*⁶⁵.

In other words, the text itself of Thuc. II 36, 1 shows that the defense of the freedom of Attica is a merit of the *progonoi*, but not only theirs: the *pateres* (and the ‘present-day men’) also have this merit, and the absence of a reference to the Persian Wars does not matter, since there is no such specification even for the *progonoi* and the whole discourse is deliberately devoid of references to specific events. To the defense of Attica, however, *pateres* and present-day men add their specific merits: each generation, in fact, adds something to the received ‘heritage’ (see also the clarification πρὸς οἷς ἐδέξαντο in Thuc. II 36, 2). On the other

⁶² See U. FANTASIA, *op. cit.*, p. 372, *ad loc.*: «ciò che i padri avevano ereditato dagli antenati era un’Atene libera e vittoriosa contro i Persiani».

⁶³ Thuc. I 140, 3-141, 1: yielding even to the least Spartan demand (= partial or total renunciation of the *arkhe*) means *doulosis*; Thuc. II 63, 2: maintaining the *arkhe* against the Peloponnesians means «to fight for *eleutheria* instead of *doubleia*».

⁶⁴ See U. FANTASIA, *op. cit.*, p. 372, *ad loc.*

⁶⁵ See J.TH. KAKRIDIS, *op. cit.*, p. 15. Cf. J. CLASSEN, J. STEUP, *op. cit.*, p. 61 note *ad loc.*: μέχρι τοῦδε gives more weight to ἐλευθέραν. On a strictly material level, no doubt Attica is what the *pateres* inherited from the *progonoi*: cf. K.W. KRÜGER, *op. cit.*, p. 194 (“fast nur Attika”), E.F. POPPO, J.M. STAHL, *op. cit.*, p. 73. However, the most precious good which has been transmitted intact by the *progonoi* to the *pateres* and from the *pateres* to the ‘present-day men’ is *eleutheria*. According to N. LORAUX, *op. cit.*, pp. 121-122, ‘μέχρι τοῦδε ἐλευθέραν...παρέδοσαν’ creates «une sorte de mise entre parenthèses de la génération des *patères*» because «c’est aux contemporains de Périclès de quel es ancêtres ont transmis la terre de l’Attique»: this seems to be a strained interpretation; Pericles wants to highlight that the freedom of Attica has been a common task of all the Athenian generations (in fact, the possession of the *arkhe* is useful to the defense of the freedom of Athens: see *supra*, note 59).

hand, the acquisition of the *arkhe* attributed to the *pateres* includes both Persian Wars: this issue will be examined later (see below, § 6).

When referring to the *eleutheria* the *progonoi* guaranteed to Attica, Pericles could allude to the many mythical episodes in which Attica appeared victorious against external aggressions (these episodes are a *topos* of the other *logoi epitaphioi*: see above, § 2), but we may think that, above all, his words refer to situations and events much closer in time, events extraneous to that mythical and poetic-literary tradition that Pericles condemns as unreliable in the course of the *logos epitaphios* itself⁶⁶. When Pericles was delivering his speech, there were areas of the Greek world which had completely lost their freedom (Messenia; Cynuria) or which were subject to external conditioning, already before the Persian Wars (many members of the Peloponnesian League subordinated to the Spartan will). Athens herself had undergone an attempt at submission: the Spartans and the Peloponnesians had tried to control Athens with two military interventions (Hdt. V 70-74) and, in the same context, Boeotians and Chalcidians had occupied parts of her *khora* (Hdt. V 74-77); in both cases the Athenians had kept Attica free, forcing the Spartans and Peloponnesians to give up the fight and defeating Boeotians and Chalcidians (Hdt. V 74, 1; V 77, 1-2). In this case the specification δι' ἀρετήν applies in full⁶⁷.

3.5. A further argument to attribute the Persian Wars to the *pateres* of Thuc. II 36, 2 can be drawn from the epitaph of the Platonic *Menexenos*. As is well known, Plato imagines the '*logos epitaphios* of Aspasia' as a text constructed from material prepared for "the *logos epitaphios* pronounced by Pericles" (*Menex.* 236b) and from elements improvised by Aspasia herself (who is said to be the actual author of the Periclean *logos epitaphios*): overall, Plato wants to suggest that the *epitaphios* by Aspasia, reported by Socrates, takes up Periclean themes and concepts. It is not known to what extent and with what intention this happens: these issues are the subject of a long debate, which cannot be addressed here⁶⁸. In this alleged 'Periclean' text, the *Marathonomakhoi* are called *pateres*, and the wording underlines the proper 'biographic' meaning of this term (the use of goes in the same direction for the fighters of the Persian Wars, in *Menex* 239d, because this term emphasizes their nature of 'parents')⁶⁹:

⁶⁶ Thuc. II 41, 4, with comm. *ad loc.* in U. FANTASIA, *op. cit.*, p. 402.

⁶⁷ Cf. Hdt. V 78: the Athenian victory is proof of military valor born from political freedom.

⁶⁸ Extensive discussions in S. TSITSIRIDIS, *op. cit.*, pp. 63-92 and N. PAPPAS, M. ZELCER, *Politics and Philosophy in Plato's Menexenus: Education and Rhetoric, Myth and History*, London - New York 2015, pp. 77-93.

⁶⁹ Plat. *Menex.* 239d: Πέρσας [...] δουλουμένους τὴν Εὐρώπην ἔσχον οἱ τῆσδε τῆς χώρας

ἐγὼ μὲν οὖν ἐκείνους τοὺς ἄνδρας φημι οὐ μόνον τῶν σωμάτων τῶν ἡμετέρων πατέρας εἶναι, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς ἐλευθερίας κτλ.

Therefore, I say that those men were fathers not only of our bodies, but also of freedom, etc. (*Menex.* 240e)

Plato insists on this equation between ‘Athenian fighters in the Persian Wars’ and ‘fathers of the generation of Pericles’; therefore, it can be supposed that this was perceived as a typical element of the way in which Pericles had portrayed the Athenian history during the Persian Wars, either in a *logos epitaphios* (the one pronounced in the autumn of 431 or also the *epitaphios* for the fallen of Samos⁷⁰), or on other public occasions (see Thuc. I 144, 4, delivered before the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War). Anyhow, since the dialogic fiction places the drafting of the *epitaphios* in the period of the relationship between Pericles and Aspasia, the *Marathonomakhoi* are the actual fathers of Pericles’ generation (= ‘we,’ which is implied in ἡμετέρων).

3.6. This remark leads to a further argument for attributing the Persian Wars to the *pateres* Thuc. II 36, 2, keeping in mind that they are *pateres* in relation to Pericles’ coeval, i.e., individuals born around 490-480 BC above all (II 36, 3: αὐτοὶ ἡμεῖς οἶδε οἱ νῦν ἔτι ὄντες μάλιστα ἐν τῇ καθεστηκυῖα ἡλικίᾳ; ἡμεῖς must be noticed: «Die Generationsfolge ist also aus der Sicht des Perikles, nicht seiner jungen Zuhörer dargestellt»⁷¹).

ἔκγονοι, γονῆς δὲ ἡμέτεροι. Although γονεύς can also have the generic value of ‘progenitor’, ‘ancestor’, this is a rare use, generally clarified by other elements (cf. *GEL*, *s.v.*); in any case, the comparison between *Menex.* 239d and 240e shows that γονῆς...ἡμέτεροι means ‘parents’; note also the conceptual and etymological interplay between ἔκγονοι and γονῆς.

⁷⁰ Some passages of the *logos epitaphios* delivered by Pericles in 439 BC for the fallen in the siege of Samos remained etched in the memory of the listeners: see Stesimbrotus of Thasos, *FGrHist* 107 F 9, *apud* Plut. *Per.* 8, 9; cf. E. FEDERICO, ΑΣΕΒΗΣ ΛΟΓΟΣ. *Spietata retorica di guerra nel discorso di Pericle per i morti di Samo*, «IncidAntico» 5 (2007), pp. 95-116, and G. MOSCONI, *Pericle e il buon uso del corpo del cittadino: l’assedio di Samo*, «MediterrAnt» 17 (2014), pp. 573-608.

⁷¹ H. FLASHAR, *op. cit.*, p. 445 note 23 (= «Sitzungsberichte...», p. 15 note 23); cf. P.J. RHODES, *op. cit.*, p. 218 («his father’s generation»). As is known, the birth date of Pericles is around 494 BC: see *APF* 11811; *PAA* 772645 (*APF* = J.K. DAVIES, *Athenian Propertied Families 600-300 B.C.*, Oxford 1971; *PAA* = J.S. TRAILL, *Persons of Ancient Athens*, Toronto, voll. 1-20, 1994-2011). As for ἐν τῇ καθεστηκυῖα ἡλικίᾳ, cf. U. FANTASIA, *op. cit.*, p. 373 *ad loc.*, according to which the time span of the *kathestekyia helikia* could be 42 to 63 years (Fantasia recalls Solon, fr. 27 West²): therefore, ἐν τῇ καθεστηκυῖα ἡλικίᾳ could include also Pericles, albeit ca. 65 years old. Of course, we do not deny that ‘ἡμεῖς οἶδε οἱ νῦν’ includes younger Athenians, but we must think that Pericles is thinking of his actual coevals above all.

An elementary chronological calculation shows that the fathers of Pericles' generation were therefore the individuals who had reached or slightly exceeded the age of thirty between 490 and 480 at the latest, and who therefore had fought in the Persian Wars and then contributed to the building of the *arkhe*: individuals such as Cimon, Themistocles, and Aristides, all born between about ca. 520 and 510⁷², who had laid the foundations of the *arkhe* (like the *pateres* in Thuc. II 36, 2) but also fought in the Persian Wars or in any case in the second⁷³. Very rarely⁷⁴ it has been noted that the father of Pericles himself, Xanthippos, belongs to this group: he was politically active already in 489, he played a leading role both in the second Persian War and in the initial phase of acquisition of the *arkhe*, which is attributed to the *pateres* of 36, 2⁷⁵. In short, when the Thucydidean Pericles speaks of 'our fathers', how can he not refer to his own father too? And, therefore, to individuals active as early as around 490-480?

4. TWO THIRTY-YEAR GENERATIONS: 490-461 AND 461-431

After proving that the age of the *pateres* begins around 490, it is possible to propose an improvement to the chronological partition proposed by Gomme

⁷² Themistocles was born 525 (*APF* 6669; *PAA* 502610), Aristides around 520 (*APF* 1695; *PAA* 165170). On the presence of an erroneous 'low' dating for the two statesmen see L. PICCIRILLI, *Efiakte*, Genova 1988, p. 56. Cimon was a little younger, since he was born around 510 BC (cf. M. ZACCARINI, *Lame Hegemony...*, cit., p. 27; *APF* 8429; *PAA* 569795). For an overall catalog of Athenian officials belonging to the *pateres* generation (490 to ca. 460) see R. DEVELIN, *Athenian Officials 684-321 B.C.*, Cambridge 1989, pp. 55-60 (490 to 480) and 63-73 (480 to 460): among them the main names are those indicated in the text, to which Myronides may perhaps be added, if the *strategos* of 479/8 engaged in the battle of Plataea he is the same *strategos* of the Athenian victories against the Corinthians in 458/7 and in Boeotia in 457/6 (see *PAA* 663260 and 663265; cf. DEVELIN, *Athenian Officials...*, cit., pp. 65 and 75).

⁷³ Even the youngest among them, Cimon, could fight at Salamis (Plut. *Cim.* 5, 4); later, he was a *strategos* already in 478/477 (Plut. *Cim.* 6, 1).

⁷⁴ Among the comments considered in this paper, cf. only O. LONGO, *op. cit.*, p. 58, *ad loc.*

⁷⁵ Xanthippos was born probably around 520, «though a date ten or even fifteen years earlier is perfectly possible»: Davies in *APF*, nr. 11811 (I) p. 456. Xanthippos is the accuser of Miltiades after the failure of the campaign against Paros (Hdt. VI 136, 1); he commands the Athenian fleet in 479 BC (Hdt. VIII 131, 3) and leads the siege of Sestos (Hdt. IX 114-120) which is the first step in the Athenians' hegemony and is accomplished without the Peloponnesians (Hdt. IX 114, 2): summary of our data in *APF* 18111 (I) and *PAA* 730505. Precisely the siege of Sestos is at the beginning of the Thucydidean account of *Pentekontaetia* (i.e., the account of «those enterprises by which the Athenians became powerful»: Thuc. I 89, 1-2. The story of Xanthippos' dog (narrated in Plut. *Them.* 10, 10), may have been remembered or invented as evidence of Xanthippos' support for the Themistoclean strategy of evacuating Attica.

(*pateres*: 490 to 465; ‘present-day men’: 465 to 431), by simply dividing the sixty years between 490 and the end of 431 in half, and thus placing the boundary between *pateres* and ‘present-day men’ around 461 BC. This solution allows us to attribute to the *pateres* and the ‘generation of Pericles’ an equal time span of thirty years for both of them; and this is almost a third of a century, i.e., the ‘canonical’ duration of a generation⁷⁶. Thus, even the «inextricables difficultés» seen by Loraux «si l’on recherche un découpage arithmétique rigoureux»⁷⁷ are solved (without resorting to a ‘fifteen-years generation’ as Loraux did as for the *pateres*: see *supra*, § 3.2 *sub fine*). Of course, there is no need of «un découpage arithmétique rigoureux», but there is also no obligation to deny its possibility.

However, note that the question is not trivially numerical: differently from ca. 465 BC (a year devoid of particular importance)⁷⁸, the year 461 BC marks a real turning point in the evolution of Athens, both in the internal and international politics: in the second part of 462/1 Cimon was ostracized by Cimon; in the same year Ephialtes’s reforms were approved; in the same period (461?) the alliance between Athens and Sparta, born at the time of the expedition of Xerxes, officially ended, an event which was followed by the start of the first conflict against Peloponnesians. The turning point around 461 was significant, for Pericles, also on a strictly personal level⁷⁹: probably in 461 Ephialtes is assassinated (a few

⁷⁶ Thirty years for one generation constitutes an obvious rounding of 33 1/3 years (a third of a century), which is the span of generation according to a contemporary of Pericles, namely Herodotus (II 142, 3). An example of similar rounding is given by Herodotus himself, who also uses generations of 40 years for the list of the Spartan kings, probably following Hecataeus: see D.W. PRAKKEN, *Herodotus and the Spartan King Lists*, «TAPhA» 71 (1940), pp. 460-472, pp. 460-461 and 469-470.

⁷⁷ N. LORAUX, *op. cit.*, p. 396 note 194. Of course, a chronological equivalence can involve only the *pateres* and the present-day men.

⁷⁸ The only significant event (known to us) was the outbreak of the conflict between Athens and Thasos (which ended only in 463); in the following year, there was the great revolt of the Helots and Messenians against the Spartans, after the earthquake that struck Sparta in 464 BC (here we follow the ‘orthodox’ chronology: see M. BETTALLI, *Tra guerre persiane e guerra del Peloponneso...*, cit., pp. 285-286; for the dating of these events, within the tormented chronology of *Pentekontaetia*, see M. ZACCARINI, *Lame Hegemony...*, cit., pp. 158-159 and 191-13). Both of these events, *per se*, did not constitute turning points. Even if some scholars place the battle of Eurymedon in 465 (see M. ZACCARINI, *ivi*, pp. 119-120), this victory was certainly important, but did not put an end to the Persian-Athenian hostilities and did not change the Athenian foreign or internal policy.

⁷⁹ Cf. H. FLASHAR, *op. cit.*, p. 445 note 23 (= «Sitzungsberichte...», p. 15 note 23): «Die gegenwärtige Generation beginnt dann folgerichtig mit dem Eintritt des Perikles in die Politik»; however, Flashar follows Gomme and places the boundary between *pateres* and ‘present-day men’ in 465.

months after the approval of his reforms) and this event allowed Pericles to acquire a prominent role on the Athenian political scene⁸⁰.

As is known, the dating of all these events is subject to discordant reconstructions: here we follow the most widespread chronology (summary of the scientific debate in M. BETTALLI, *Tra guerre persiane e guerra del Peloponneso...*, cit., pp. 285-286). For the dating of Ephialtes's reforms see Arist. *Ath. resp.* 25, 1, which leads to 462/461; Cimon's ostracism took place immediately before or immediately after these reforms (as is known, the sources provide conflicting reconstructions but, in any case, they closely connect the two events: see L. PICCIRILLI, *Efialte*, cit., pp. 35-37; cf. M. ZACCARINI, *Lame Hegemony...*, cit., p. 197); the breaking of the alliance with Sparta is a consequence of the choice of the Spartans to send away the Athenian troops led by Cimon to help the Spartans (Thuc. I 101), and Cimon's expedition must take place after the end of the Thasos campaign, therefore after 463/2 (the traditionally accepted date is 462: see M. BETTALLI, *ibid.*); the breaking of the alliance with Sparta, on the other hand, can be well explained in close connection with the ostracism of the philo-Spartan Cimon. The assassination of Ephialtes took place in the same year of the reforms (see L. PICCIRILLI, *Efialte*, cit., p. 71), but after the ostracism of Cimon and therefore probably in the first part of 461.

5. "NOT WITHOUT EFFORT": A THEME OF ATHENIAN PROPAGANDA, FROM THE PERSIAN WARS ONWARD

A remark should be dedicated to οὐκ ἀπόνως, "not without effort", in which the litote put *ponos* in evidence⁸¹. The emphasis of the *ponos* through which the Athenian *arkhe* was acquired⁸² is a typical theme of the fifth-century Athenian

⁸⁰ On the relationship between Pericles and Ephialtes cf. L. PICCIRILLI, *Efialte*, cit., pp. 72-73. The fact that the elimination of Ephialtes gave more space political to Pericles may underlie the tradition according to which Pericles commissioned the murder of Ephialtes (Idomeneus of Lampsacus *FGrHist* 338 F 8, *apud* Plut. *Per.* 10, 7).

⁸¹ Cf. J. TH. KAKRIDIS, *op. cit.*, p. 12, who also draws attention to the position of οὐκ ἀπόνως and κτησάμενοι at the end and the beginning of the sentence. See J. RUSTEN, *op. cit.*, p. 141: "with great effort".

⁸² οὐκ ἀπόνως must be connected to κτησάμενοι: cf. K.W. KRÜGER, *op. cit.*, p. 194. According to Krüger himself (*ibid.*), punctuation in I. BEKKER, *op. cit.*, p. 269, shows that Bekker interpreted κτησάμενοι in an absolute sense, and linked οὐκ ἀπόνως to προσκατέλιπον, on which he made depend ὅσῃν ἔχομεν ἀρχὴν; but it seems likely that *ponos* is associated with the stage of acquiring the *arkhe*, not of bequeathing it. A confirmation comes from Eur. *suppl.* 323, which states that Athens «grows [αὔξεται] thanks to the *ponoi*» (obviously, the *auxesis* is a

propaganda⁸³ and recurs in other passages in which Thucydidean Pericles recalls the creation or conservation of the Athenian *arkhe* (in Thuc. II 62, 3, precisely in association with the *pateres*)⁸⁴: in these passages, the insistence on *ponos* highlights the merit of the Athenians, and the fact that, conversely, the Spartans and most of the members of the Delian League did not take on the fatigue of the anti-Persian struggle, and preferred to delegate these *ponoi* to the Athenians. Thus, the mention of the Athenian *ponoi* in Thuc. II 36, 2 is not trivially laudatory: these *ponoi* explain and justify the *arkhe* and the exploitation of the empire⁸⁵. Thucydides expresses the same viewpoint in one of his famous authorial comments: the Athenian allies had to submit to the Athenians, one after the other, because they did not want to face those *ponoi* which the Athenians took on instead⁸⁶.

But οὐκ ἀπόνως is even more significant if the Persian Wars are considered part of the process of acquiring the *arkhe*, as they are indeed. The words οὐκ ἀπόνως can allude to all phases of the Athenian behavior in the decade 490-480⁸⁷: the decision to face the Persians at Marathon (Aristophanes states this explicitly)⁸⁸; then the choice to allocate the resources of the Laurion to the construction of triremes instead of the distribution among the citizens; finally, the abandonment of the *khora* in the face of the invasion of Xerxes and the transfer of women, elderly, and children to Salamis and elsewhere⁸⁹.

consequence of the *ktesis*: this idea is implicit in Thuc. II 36, 3). On προσκατέλιπον see K.W. KRÜGER, *op. cit.*, p. 194: «sie haben sie uns in dieser Erweiterung hinterlassen». E.F. POPPO, J.M. STAHL, *op. cit.*, p. 73 make οὐκ ἀπόνως and ὄσπην ἔχομεν ἀρχὴν depend on both κτησάμενοι and προσκατέλιπον.

⁸³ See Eur. *suppl.* 323 cited in the previous note, and the other passages cited in the following notes. If we give credit to Thuc. I 70, 8 (where the Corinthian ambassadors address the assembly of the Peloponnesian League), this representation of the Athenians, willing to struggle for their own power, was also shared by external observers. On the link between *ponos* and *doxa*, Eur. *suppl.* 576-577 (in Theseus' Athens).

⁸⁴ In addition to Thuc. II 62, 3, see II 63, 1; 64, 3 and 6, generically referring to the Athenians. On the *ponos* in the Athenian political debate, a typical element of Periclean propaganda and later the object of dispute in 424-421 BC (Aristophanes, Nicias), see A.L. BOEGEHOLD, *A Dissent in Athens, ca 424-421 B.C.*, «GRBS» 23 (1982), pp. 147-156.

⁸⁵ See Aristoph. *vesp.* 684-685 and Plut. *Per.* 12, 3; cf. G. MOSCONI, *Il consigliere segreto di Pericle...*, *cit.*, pp. 76-80 and 96-99, respectively.

⁸⁶ Thuc. I 99, 1 and 3: the allies are «people neither accustomed nor eager to ταλαιπωρεῖν»; they prefer to pay the *phoros* διὰ γὰρ τὴν ἀπόκνησιν ταύτην τῶν στρατειῶν. And the *phoros* is the basis of the Athenian power (cf. below, note 90): therefore, the Athenians' *ponos* is the basis of their *arkhe*.

⁸⁷ H. FLASHAR, *op. cit.*, 445 note 23 (= «Sitzungsberichte...», p. 15 note 23) hints at this fact.

⁸⁸ In Aristoph. *Ach.* 694-696 the *Maratonomachoi* are remembered for their *xymponlein* and 'hot sweat' while fighting.

⁸⁹ See Thuc. I 74, 1-2: the Athenian ambassadors define προθυμίαν ἀοκνοτάτην the abandonment of Attica and the choice to fight by using only the fleet.

Moreover, the Athenian *ponoi* include the hard naval training that had allowed the Athenian victory at Salamis, i.e., the victory that had saved Greece and from which the foundation of the *arkhe* had started⁹⁰. The idea that the defense of freedom, and particularly the clash with the Persians, implies the acceptance of *ponos* is central to the episode narrated in Hdt. VI 12: Ionians gathered at Lade to face the Persian fleet but, after only seven days of hard training under the command of Dionysius of Phocaea, refused to continue in *ponein*, explicitly declaring that they preferred “future slavery, whatever it may be” (VI 12, 3); before starting the training, Dionysius himself had warned that the only means of obtaining freedom would be the acceptance of the *ponos* (VI 11, 2)⁹¹. In short, the *pateres* of Thuc. II 36, 2 have fully accepted the *ponoi* which the Ionians rejected, and this acceptance justifies their every *ktesis*.

6. WHY DOES THE THUCYDIDEAN PERICLES NOT MENTION THE PERSIAN WARS?

One problem apparently remains: when speaking of the merits of the *pateres* in II 36, 2, Pericles mentions only the acquisition of the *arkhe* and fails to mention the Persian Wars at all⁹². Why? Since the mention of the *pateres* undoubtedly includes the period of the Persian Wars (above, § 3.4), we must think that what Pericles says of the *pateres* implicitly also includes their behavior in 490- 479 BC. For some scholars, this has been a problem, in the belief that until 479/8 BC we may not speak of any Athenian *ktesis* (this idea is linked to the chronological collocation of the *pateres* in the period after 479/8)⁹³.

6.1. Because the Persian Wars are part of the acquisition of the *arkhe*. On the contrary, Pericles’ words about the “fathers who acquired the *arkhe* not without difficulty” can and must also include the period of the Persian Wars, without exegetical problems but rather in agreement with other coeval sources.

⁹⁰ The battle of Salamis seen as salvation for Greece: Hdt. VII 139; seen as the basis of the construction of the *arkhe*: VIII 111-112.

⁹¹ On Hdt. VI 11-12 cf. K.A. RAAFLAUB, *Herodotus, political thought, and the meaning of history*, «*Arethusa*» 20 (1987), pp. 221-248: pp. 226-227.

⁹² N. LORAUX, *op. cit.*, p. 121, sees an “évocation [...] allusive des guerres médiques” in Thuc. II 36, 1-2, since she ascribes *ta Medika* to the *progonoi* (see *supra*, § 3.1). However, if *ta Medika* belong to the age of the *pateres*, one could say that there is no actual ‘évocation’ at all.

⁹³ See J.TH. KAKRIDIS, *op. cit.*, p. 16, while discussing at the beginning of § 4: the work of the *progonoi* (which lasts until to ca. 478), can have nothing to do deal with the wars of acquisition mentioned in 36, 4 (= τὰ μὲν κατὰ πολέμους ἔργα, οἷς ἕκαστα ἐκτίθη). Therefore, according to him, the age of the Persian wars cannot be considered part of the *ktesis*: which is not true.

Actually, the acquisition of the *arkhe* does not begin after the foundation of the League of Delos and not even after 479/8, but is a process which starts precisely in the period of the Persian Wars⁹⁴: with the creation of the great Athenian fleet in 483/2, and indeed already with the new ‘international’ prestige gained by Athens after the victory at Marathon (while the intervention alongside the Ionian rebels was reduced in terms of commitment and time and had less weight, also because the Athenian contribution did not avoid their final defeat in 494)⁹⁵.

This long-term perspective of the development of the Athenian *arkhe* is not only the point of view of a 21st century historian, but is well-attested in fifth-century sources. The words attributed to Miltiades by Herodotus on the eve of the battle of Marathon are explicit: ἦν δὲ περιγένηται αὕτη ἡ πόλις, οἷη τέ ἐστι πρώτη τῶν Ἑλληνίδων πόλιων γενέσθαι⁹⁶; these words are even more significant because, just nine years earlier, in 499, Aristagoras of Miletus considered the Spartans and not the Athenians (who were also the *metropolis* of his Miletus)⁹⁷ ‘*prostatai* of Greece’⁹⁸. The same view is implicit in various passages of the Herodotean account: the expedition against Paros (a first Athenian imperialistic attempt) is described as an immediate consequence of the exaltation of the victorious Athenians at Marathon⁹⁹; the immediate consequence of the victory of Salamis is that Themistocles begins to demand monetary contributions for the Athenian fleet¹⁰⁰, and this is the first draft of the *phoros* system on which the Athenian *arkhe* will be based from then on (of the *phoros-arkhe* nexus Pericles is fully aware)¹⁰¹.

⁹⁴ A hint at this fact also in M. MOGGI, *op. cit.*, p. 299, note 1.

⁹⁵ Athens gave only twenty ships, only for a few months: see Hdt. V 99, 1 and 103, 1.

⁹⁶ Hdt. VI 109, 109: Miltiades is trying to persuade the *polemarkhos* Kallimachos of Aphidna to support his proposal to attack the Persian army.

⁹⁷ Hdt. V 49, 1. Athenagoras himself, after arriving at Athens, does not fail to recall that the Milesii were *apoikoi* of the Athenians (Hdt. V 97); notwithstanding, he goes to Sparta first (V 38).

⁹⁸ Hdt. V 49, 2.

⁹⁹ Hdt. VI 132-133, 1. According to Herodotus, the expedition against Paros was justified as aimed to punish its *medismos*, but the actual motivation would have been the desire to seize its riches. Even if that were not true, nonetheless Herodotus’ statement reveals us a widespread point of view (in the same historical context of the Periclean *Epitaphios*): around 431 BC, the battle of Marathon was seen as the (chronological and genetic) starting point of Athenian imperialism. Again, the Aristotelian *Constitution of the Athenians* (22, 1) considers the victory at Marathon as the beginning of a new phase of the Athenian history (in internal politics): νικήσαντες τὴν ἐν Μαραθῶνι μάχην, ἐπὶ Φαινίππου ἄρχοντος, [...], θαρροῦντος ἤδη τοῦ δήμου, κτλ. That *tharrein* is the same psychological feature Corinthians attributed to the Athenian imperialistic frenzy in foreign policy: see Thuc. I 70, 3 on Athenians *tolmetai* and *kindyneutai*.

¹⁰⁰ Hdt. VIII 111, 2-112.

¹⁰¹ See Thuc. I 143, 5 (τὰ τῶν ζυμμάχων, ὅθεν ἰσχύομεν, προσαπόλλυται) and II 13, 2.

An identical viewpoint is shared by Thucydides: the retreat of the Persian army from Greece and the battle of Cape Mycale are the immediate antecedent of the narration of the *auxesis* of Athens (Thuc. I 89, 1-2); Sparta's allies begin to fear the Athenian power immediately after the capture of Sestos but even before the reconstruction of the walls of Athens, because they fear the "strength of the fleet, which did not exist before, and the audacity shown in the Persian war"¹⁰²; the Thucydidean Pericles states that the Athenians acquired seafaring skills "starting from the wars against the Medes"¹⁰³, and since he considers the dominion of the sea to be the basis of the Athenian *arkhe*¹⁰⁴, this shows that, in the statesman's view, the deeds accomplished *during* the Persian Wars are the starting point of the Athenian *arkhe*; Thucydides himself connects the birth of the Athenian fleet to the events of 490-480¹⁰⁵. Similarly, according to the Athenian ambassadors to the assembly of the Peloponnesian League, the behavior of the Athenians in 480 (due to *prothymia* and to *xynesis*) is the actual origin (and moral justification) of the *arkhe* later acquired by Athens¹⁰⁶.

Also in Thuc. I 144, 4 (§ 3.4) the Athenian victories against Persians in 480/479 appear to be the grounds of the Athenian *arkhe*: thanks to the construction of the sentence itself, the two participles with causal value describing the Athenian behavior during the Persian Wars (ὑποστάντες Μήδους; τὰ ὑπάρχοντα ἐκλιπόντες) are connected to both main verbs (ἀπεώσαντο; προήγαγον); indeed, the link ... gives greater evidence to the second element (precisely because it is the least obvious). In other words: thanks to the victory in the Persian Wars, Athenians not only rejected the barbarian, but also gained the power they enjoyed in 431.

6.2. Because the Persian Wars are unimportant or... too important. There is a further aspect to consider: the absence of a minimal reference to the Persian wars in Thuc. II 36, 1-4 contrasts with the centrality that the Persian Wars had in contemporary Athenian propaganda (precisely in 431!), as a moral justification of the *arkhe* exalted by Pericles¹⁰⁷. What is more, "la lutte contro le Perse est, dans

¹⁰² Thuc. I 90, 1: τοῦ τε ναυτικοῦ αὐτῶν τὸ πλῆθος, ὃ πρὶν οὐχ ὑπῆρχε, καὶ τὴν ἐς τὸν Μηδικὸν πόλεμον τόλμαν γενομένην.

¹⁰³ Thuc. I 142, 7: εὐθὺς ἀπὸ τῶν Μηδικῶν.

¹⁰⁴ Thuc. I 143, 5.

¹⁰⁵ Thuc. I 14, 3 and above all 18, 2 (Athenians ἐπιόντων τῶν Μήδων διανοηθέντες ἐκλιπεῖν τὴν πόλιν καὶ ἀνασκευάμενοι ἐς τὰς ναῦς ἐσβάντες ναυτικοὶ ἐγένοντο).

¹⁰⁶ Thuc. I 74-75; 1, 75, 1: ἀρχῆς γε ἧς ἔχομεν.

¹⁰⁷ In addition to Thuc. I 74-75, cited in the previous note, see Thuc. V 89 (416 BC). As is known from Paus. I 15, 1-3, the battle of Marathon had been already celebrated in the *Stoa Poikile*, in the 460s-450s (cf. F. DE ANGELIS, *La battaglia di Maratona nella Stoa Poikile*, «ASNSP» s. IV, 1 (1996), pp. 119-171: pp. 134-141 about the dating).

son ensemble, un thème essentiel de l'oraison funèbre"¹⁰⁸, as it can be seen in the extant *logoi epitaphioi* and in other fourth-century sources¹⁰⁹. In fact, the absence of any explicit mention of the Persian Wars is another peculiar feature of the Periclean *Epitaphios* in comparison with the other *epitaphioi*; as will be shown, this absence can be seen as a conscious choice of politics of remembrance (and 'politics of remembrance' is an important feature of the genre of the *logoi epitaphioi*)¹¹⁰.

We may not explain this omission as a choice by Thucydides in order to avoid repeating arguments already treated by Herodotus¹¹¹ or by Thucydides himself¹¹², because here we miss not only an extended narration, but any minimal hint: after all, this glorious period of Athenian history could have been recalled just using the word Μῆδοι in the text (e.g., writing a sentence like 'fighting against the Medes') as well as, in II 36, 4, there is the very generic mention of the "barbarian or Greek enemy". Of course, we may think that this absence is due to the extreme synthesis of the account of Athenian history in Thuc. II 36, 1-4, although a few words would allow a reference to this central theme in the fifth-century propaganda (and in the other *epitaphioi*)¹¹³.

However, could actual reasons advise against an explicit reference to the Persian Wars when Pericles was delivering his *logos epitaphios* in 431? Yes, they could.

The first is that the Periclean Athenian foreign policy (from the beginning of the 440s onward) put an end to the wars against the Persians, focusing on maintaining hegemony over the allies and in preparing for the clash with Sparta and her allies. This direction of the Periclean foreign policy had been made explicit

¹⁰⁸ N. LORAUX, *op. cit.*, 157-173: 157.

¹⁰⁹ See Isocr. *Phil.* 147; *paneg.* 74; Aristot. *rhet.* II 1396a12-14.

¹¹⁰ About the "politics of remembrance" in the Athenian funeral orations see J.L. SHEAR, *The politics of remembrance...*, *cit.*; see *ibid.*, pp. 513-515, for a general overview of the scientific literature about the dynamics of the collective or social memory.

¹¹¹ See P.J. RHODES, *op. cit.*, pp. 218-219 («Whether or not Pericles did pass this topic over, the omission suits Thucydides»); L. PORCIANI, *op. cit.*, p. 68.

¹¹² See J.L. SHEAR, *op. cit.*, p. 529: "If we believe that the [Periclean] funeral oration is largely a literary creation of Thucydides, then the (expected) historical narrative may well have been truncated in order not to repeat material already presented in the previous book", i.e., Thuc. I 73,2-74,4 (Persian wars) and I 89, 1-117,3 (*Pentekontaetia*).

¹¹³ According to LORAUX, *op. cit.*, p. 154, the Periclean *Epitaphios* omits the Athenian deeds because «tout acte n'est qu'une conséquence du caractère athénien, toute guerre une simple réalisation du principe fondamental» (cf. *epitedeusis* and *tropoi* in Thuc. II 36, 4 and 41, 2). This interpretation does not take into account a fondamentale fact: in Thuc. II 36, 1-3, even though Pericles does not recall specific events, he does list three different Athenian achievements, i.e., a) the defence of freedom, b) the *ktesis* of the Athenian *arkhe*, c) the accomplishment of the Athenian *autarkeia* through the completion of her *arkhe*.

by initiatives such as the so-called ‘Panhellenic Congress’ and the reconstruction of the Acropolis; contemporary and later sources appear fully aware of this trend¹¹⁴. In Pericles’ viewpoint, in short, the struggle against the Persians is a solved problem, unimportant compared with the supremacy within the Greek world, and for this reason Pericles insist on the *arkhe* and the *autarkeia* achieved by Athens in Thuc. II 36, 2-4 (see τὰ δὲ πλείω αὐτῆς αὐτοὶ ἡμεῖς οἶδε οἱ νῦν ἔτι ὄντες κτλ. in 36, 3, which emphasizes the exploits of the present-day men)¹¹⁵.

The second element to be considered is linked with the first: this Periclean foreign policy had also received violent criticism. A clear testimony is given by the words that Cimon’s sister, Elpinice, had pronounced in public once Pericles himself had concluded the *logos epitaphios* for the fallen in the siege of Samos: she accuses Pericles of sending Athenians to death “not in a war against Phoenicians and Medes, like my brother Cimon, but to subjugate a consanguineous and allied *polis*”¹¹⁶. It is a fact that the memory of the Persian Wars was important in Cimonian political propaganda, as shown by the presence of the battle of Marathon in the painting program of the *Stoa Poikile*¹¹⁷.

When, few years after Elpinice’s harsh words, Pericles was delivering his new *logos epitaphios* precisely for a war which he strongly had supported¹¹⁸ against

¹¹⁴ About the ‘Panhellenic Congress’ and the reconstruction of the temples of the Acropolis as sign of victory over the Persians see G. MOSCONI, *Il consigliere segreto di Pericle...*, cit., pp. 100-103. For contemporary testimonies on the foreign policy of the Periclean Athens see Thuc. III 10, 4 (the ambassadors of Mytilene explicitly link the reduction of hostilities against the Medes and the increased exploitation of the allies) and the sources cited below, note 116. For later sources, see Plut. *Per.* 20, 3 and 21, 1. In these passages, Plutarch provides the reasons for Pericles’ foreign policy, but we cannot know which sources he uses or whether this is «his own interpretation of Pericles’ policy», as Stadter claims: PH.A. STADTER, *A Commentary on Plutarch’s Pericles*, Chapel Hill - London 1989, p. 222.

¹¹⁵ Cf. G. MOSCONI, «*We ourselves have conquered most of the empire*»: *A (Grammatical and Ideological) Interpretation of Thuc. 2, 36, 2-3*, cit.

¹¹⁶ Plut. *Per.* 28, 6 (the whole episode in Plut. *Per.* 28, 4-7: cf. MOSCONI, *Pericle e il buon uso del corpo del cittadino: l’assedio di Samo*, cit., pp. 600-604). Its source is almost certainly Ion of Chios: see *FGrHist* 392 F 16. See also Plut. *Per.* 12, 1-2 (where statements attributed to contemporaries of Pericles are reported, probably drawn from fifth-century sources: cf. G. MOSCONI, *Il consigliere segreto di Pericle...*, cit., pp. 103-135). Conversely, the devaluation of the fathers’ accomplishments in Thuc. II 36, 3 could be a way to diminish the still cumbersome memory of Cimon: see MOSCONI, «*We ourselves have conquered most of the empire*»: *A (Grammatical and Ideological) Interpretation of Thuc. 2, 36, 2-3*, cit., § 6.

¹¹⁷ Paus. I 15, 1-3. Cf. M.D. STANSBURY-O’DONNELL, *The painting program in the Stoa Poikile*, in J.M. Barringer and J.M. Hurwit (eds.), *Periclean Athens and its Legacy: Problems and Perspectives*, Austin 2005, pp. 73-87. About the relationship between the Stoa Poikile and Cimon see F. DE ANGELIS, *La battaglia di Maratona nella Stoa Poikile*, cit., pp. 130-134.

¹¹⁸ See Thuc. I 140, 1; 141, 1; 144, 3.

Sparta and her allies, any minimal hint to the Persian wars (the period of maximum unity between Athens and Sparta) would certainly have created a striking contrast with the opposite foreign policy pursued by Pericles (appeasement with Persia + conflict with the rest of the Greek world). Tellingly, on the only occasion when the Thucydidean Pericles recalls the Persian wars as a model for present-day Athens (Thuc. I 144, 4), he merely wants to justify the highly controversial choice of abandoning the *khora* in the face of the Spartan invaders.

Of course, in light of the possibility to find these connections between the Periclean *Epitaphios* and some problems of the Athenian politics in the fifth century, the overall historical reliability of the Periclean *Epitaphios* in Thuc. II 36-46¹¹⁹ comes stronger¹²⁰.

Università degli Studi di Cassino e del Lazio Meridionale
 gianfranco.mosconi@unicas.it

¹¹⁹ About this much-debated topic (and in support of the historical reliability of Pericles' speeches in Thucydides) see J.E. ZIOLKOWSKI, *Thucydides and the Tradition of Funeral Speeches...*, cit., pp. 1-12 and 174-207, especially 201-202; C.M.J. SICKING, *The general purport of Pericles' funeral oration and last speech*, «Hermes» 123 (1995), pp. 404-25; A.B. BOSWORTH, *The historical context of Thucydides' Funeral Oration*, cit., *passim*; U. FANTASIA, *op. cit.*, pp. 358-363. Cf. G. MOSCONI, *Periclean Buildings, Eternal Fame, and Well-being in the Present: the Pericles of Plutarch and the Pericles of Thucydides*, «SemRom» n.s. 12 (2023), pp. 239-282: pp. 276-277.

¹²⁰ I would like to thank the anonymous referees for their invaluable remarks and Tessa McClinton for promptly and carefully reviewing the English text of this paper before final publication.