
Sport, war and democracy in classical Athens

David M. Pritchard

School of History, Philosophy, Religion and Classics, University of Queensland, Brisbane, QLD 4072, Australia. Email: d.pritchard@uq.edu.au

Abstract

This article concerns the paradox of athletics in classical Athens. Democracy may have opened up politics to every class of Athenian but it had little impact on sporting participation. The city’s athletes continued to drawn predominantly from the upper class. It comes as a surprise then that lower-class Athenians actually esteemed athletes above every other group in the public eye, honoured them very generously when they won, and directed a great deal of public and private money to sporting competitions and facilities. In addition athletics escaped the otherwise persistent criticism of upper-class activities in the popular culture of the democracy. The research of social scientists on sport and aggression suggests this paradox may have been due to the cultural overlap between athletics and war under the Athenian democracy. The article concludes that the practical and ideological democratization of war by classical Athens legitimized and supported upper-class sport.

The sporting passions of classical Athens

The classical Athenians lavished time and money on sporting contests and facilities, esteemed athletes above other public figures, and handed international victors the metaphorical keys to the city. Classical Athens had an extensive programme of festival-based agônes or contests (Th. 2.38.1), apparently celebrating more festivals than any other Greek city (Isoc. 12.45-6; Ps.-X. 3.2; cf. Ar. Nu. 307-10). [1] Many of these agônes were established in the democracy’s first fifty years. [2] The most extensive program of contests was staged at the Great Panathenaia, which was the large-scale version of the city’s annual festival for its patron deity. [3] This did not mark the birthday of Athena (a misinterpretation going back to the nineteenth century) but celebrated the Gigantomachy and her prominent role in this military victory of the Olympians over the Giants (e.g. Arist. fragment 637 Rose). [4] In the 380s BC this four-yearly festival had agônes for individuals in 27 distinct athletic, equestrian and musical events (IG II² 2311.1-82). [5] In addition contests for groups were staged for pyrrhic and dithyrambic choruses and for tribal teams of
torch racers, sailors and handsome young men (83-93). [6] These events were easily as numerous as those of the Olympic Games, which explains why the Great Panathenaia ran for 10 days, lasting longer than any other of the city’s festivals. [7] Although this celebration for Athena only took place every four years and several of the festivals the city sponsored did not have athletic or equestrian events, eight other festivals also supported sporting contests. In particular the annual games for the war dead, the Eleusinia, which was staged in three out of four years, and the quadrennial Herakleia at Marathon each had a reasonably large set of athletic, equestrian and musical events. [8] Five other festivals, which were staged every year, also featured a solitary athletic or equestrian contest. [9]

For these festivals the Athenian dēmos (‘people’) not only spent public money but co-opted the private resources of individual citizens. Upper-class Athenians were encouraged or, if necessary, conscripted to pay for the training of choruses and sporting teams and for other festival-related activities. [10] By funding these liturgies generously elite citizens won the gratitude of the people, which often translated into political support (e.g. Plu. Nic. 3.1-3) or leniency if ever they had to face a popular jury (e.g. Lys. 18.23, 20.31, 25.12-13). [11] By the 350s the city’s elite undertook around one hundred festival liturgies each year. [12] However, ancient complaints about the Athenians spending more on their major festivals than the armed forces are wild exaggerations (D. 4.35-7; Plu. Moralia 348f-9a); for warfare clearly used up more money than all other public activities, usually costing several hundred talents or even more than a thousand talents each year. But such complaints could be made, because the Athenians did fund their festivals generously: the Great Panathenaia of the early fourth century alone cost 25 talents 1725 drachmas, while the total figure for public and private spending on the entire program of city-sponsored festivals was one hundred talents. [13] This last figure was comparable to the running costs of the democracy and fully justifies Aristophanes’ association of wealth with the ‘holding of musical and athletic contests’ (Pl. 1161-3). [14]

The democracy of classical Athens put great store in the upkeep of the city’s sporting fields. Leading politicians clearly got ahead in their contests for pre-eminence by helping to develop these publicly owned assets. For example, in the fifth century Kimon, following the precedent of the tyrants (Ath. 609d; Paus. 1.30.1), spent private money renovating the Akademy (Plu. Cim. 13.7), while Perikles used public funds to do the same to the Lykeion (Harp. s.v. ‘Lykeion’) and Alkibiades proposed a law and modified another concerning Kynosarges (Ath. 234e; IG I3 134). [15] In the later fourth century Lykourgos not only completed the
construction of the theatre of Dionysos in stone but also oversaw the building of the Panathenaic stadium and a further renovation of the Lykeion (e.g. IG II² 457b5-9). Athenian treasurers also kept a close watch on the finances of these athletics fields (e.g. IG I³ 369), while the dēmos introduced an annual tax on the city’s horsemen, hoplites and archers for the upkeep of the Lykeion (IG I³ 138). [16]

By the late 430s the Athenian democracy awarded sitēsis (free dining in the Prytaneion) and ‘other gifts in addition’ for life to those citizens who had won an athletic or equestrian event at one of the recognized Panhellenic or international games, staged every two or four years at Isthmia, Nemea, Delphi and of course Olympia. [17] Since the Athenians never gave sitēsis without proedria before the Roman period, these ‘other gifts’ for successful sportsmen presumably included front-row seating at the city’s dramatic, musical and sporting competitions. [18] These two awards were among ‘the highest honours paid by a Greek city to an individual’ and in classical Athens were also given to descendants of the tyrant-slayers (e.g. IG I³ 131.5-7; Is. 5.47), victorious generals (e.g. Aeschin. 2.80; D. 23.107) and politicians who had performed an extraordinary service for the city (e.g. Ar. Eq. 281-4, 709, 766, 1404; Din. 1.101). [19] That sporting victors were included in such an esteemed group underlines the extraordinarily high estimation of athletic success in classical Athens.

This high standing and public support of athletes and athletics was reflected in the irreverent comedies of the Athenian democracy. The plays of old comedy give the impression that ‘anyone and everyone in the public eye’ was subject to comic ridicule’. [20] However, the comprehensive study of known kōmoidoumenoi (‘targets of comic ridicule’) by Alan Sommerstein shows that one group of conspicuous Athenians escaped the personal abuse of old comedy: the city’s athletes. [21] Admittedly comic poets recognized the wrestling school as ‘the prime arena of pederastic courtship’ and occasionally poked fun at the homosexual predilections of athletes and their hearty eating habits. [22] In contrast to their general treatment of other upper-class activities, however, they did not subject athletics to sustained parody or direct criticism and clearly assumed this pursuit to be an overwhelming good thing. For example, in Clouds Aristophanes couples the ‘old education’ (961), of which athletics is the main component (e.g. 972-84, 1002-32), with norms of citizenship and manliness. Better Argument suggests that traditional education flourished at the same time as two of the cardinal virtues of the Greek city, justice and sōphrosunē or moderation (960-2), and nurtured ‘the men who fought at Marathon’ (985-6). This education – according to Better Argument – ensures a boy will have ‘a shining breast, a bright skin, big shoulders, a minute
tongue, a big rump and a small prick’ (1009-14; cf. 1002). [23] Depictions of athletes on red-figure pots reveal most of these to be the physical attributes of the ‘beautiful’ meirakion or youth. [24] By contrast the ‘new education’ (937-8) of the sophists, Better Argument complains, results in ‘pale skin’ (1017) and other undesirable physical features (1015-19), has emptied the wrestling schools of students (915-8, 1054), and encourages them to reject traditional morality (1019-23).

[25] The play itself supports these complaints of Better Argument: the students of the ‘new education’ are indeed pale skinned (103, 119-20, 186, 718, 1017, 1112, 1171) and physically weak (986-8) and avoid athletics (407), while Pheidippides turns conventional morality upside down once fully trained by Sokrates (1321-492).

These complaints exemplify a well-known commonplace of old comedy, which sees a poet praise the values and practices of the ‘good old days’, while accusing contemporaries of abandoning them for the sake of questionable alternatives. [26] Clouds also helps explain why poets who aimed for as many laughs as possible subjected theatregoers to this kind of abuse. Contrary to the impression Better Argument gives, a wide range of literary evidence shows that the ‘old education’ had not been abandoned: although the sophists were offering new courses of study, contemporary Athenian boys still pursued the three of traditional education: letters, athletics and music. [27] Moreover, theatregoers – like the play’s chorus-leader (959-60) – would have agreed with Better Argument that education plays a critical part in imparting morality to the young; for they believed the solitary goal of education was to turn paides (‘boys’) into agathoi andres or virtuous men (e.g. E. Supp. 912-17; Hyp. Epit. 8-9). [28] Therefore, the audience laughed at this charge against them of having abandoned the athletically centred education of their ancestors, because they knew it to be completely untrue and another of the anticipated slanders of old comedy.

Aristophanes levels similar charges concerning athletics in Frogs, first staged at the Lenaia festival of 406/5. The first occurs in the play’s famous parabasis where Aristophanes draws an analogy between the city’s debasement of its once celebrated coinage and its current embrace of scallywags as political leaders (718-37). In particular the chorus complain (727-33; cf. Eq. 180-3):

Of the citizens those we know to be well born, moderate (sōphronas) and just gentlemen who have been raised in wrestling schools, choruses and music we maltreat. We employ instead the copper coins that are foreigners, red-headed Thracian slaves, wicked men sprung from men wicked in everything, whom the city formerly would not even have willingly used as scapegoats.
This is another false complaint of decline from the ‘good old days’, since, throughout the classical period, the Athenians consistently believed that politicians had to be wealthy and well-educated if they were to advise and protect the city effectively (e.g. Ar. Eq. 147-224; Lys. 16.20-1; Dem. 18.256-67). [29] Despite initial impressions, these lines bear out the perceptions that athletics is closely associated with justice and moderation and an important component in the normative education of the young. Later in the play Aeschylus suggests that by teaching adolescents to be chatterboxes Euripides has emptied the wrestling school (1068-71). ‘Because of a lack of athletic training (hup’ agumnasias)’, he continues, ‘nobody can carry a torch anymore’ (1087-8). Dionysos fully concurs, having recently witnessed a very poor performance by a ‘pale and fat’ torch-racer at the Great Panathenaia (1089-98). These particular complaints are part of a comically absurd attack by one dead tragedian against another in Hades and as such cannot be taken at face value. [30] To do otherwise, we must accept that Euripides has also turned good citizens into villains (1010-11, 1013-17), encouraged the wealthy to dress as beggars to avoid trierarchies (1063-6), and made the city’s politicians thieving and deceiving charlatans (1077-86). Thus here we have another slanderous joke turning around the ‘axis’ or underlying assumption that sport is normal and good. [31]

Comedians and tragedians were of course members of the Athenian upper class. Nonetheless their plays were performed as part of the dramatic agōnes of Athenian festivals for Dionysos. Formally the judging of these contests was in the hands of ten magistrates. [32] But victory ultimately depended on the vocal responses of the predominantly lower-class audience (e.g. And. 4.20-1; Ar. Av. 444-5, Ra. 778-9; Pl. Lg. 700c-2b). [33] Poets then were compelled to tailor their plays to the dramaturgical expectations, morality and politics of non-elite citizens. Under the democracy litigants and politicians faced a comparable performance dynamic: their agōnes or debates were decided by the votes of lower-class jurors, assembly-goers or councillors. As a result wealthy contenders also sought to negotiate the perceptions of poor citizens. Significantly these debates and plays were the main forums for developing and perpetuating the agreed communal identities and shared culture of classical Athens. As non-elite citizens had the greatest input into the content of this civic ideology, we might call it ‘popular culture’ and Athenian plays and oratory ‘popular literature’. [34] Therefore the overwhelmingly positive treatment of athletics in old comedy, which also occurs in satyric drama and tragedy, reflects an important aspect of Athenian popular culture: poor Athenians held athletics in very high regard, which helps explain why comic criticism of known
athletes was not tolerated, Panhellenic victors were rewarded lavishly, and public resources devoted to athletic competitions and facilities. [35]

The paradox of sport under the democracy

For the youths of classical Athens technical instruction and training in athletics were given in the regular school classes of the paidotribēs (‘athletics teacher’). [36] Isocrates explains how athletics teachers instruct their pupils in ‘the moves devised for competition’ (ta skhēmata ta pros tēn agōnian eurēmena – 15.183). They then train them in athletics, accustom them to toil (ponein) and compel them to combine each of the lessons they have learnt (184). According to Isocrates, this teaching and training turns pupils into competent athletic competitors as long as they have sufficient natural talent (185). The picture drawn here of the paidotribēs teaching groups of students competitive athletics and overseeing their training is confirmed by other classical Athenian authors. A few, for example, have pupils learning athletics under a paidotribēs (Ar. Eq. 1238-9; Pl. Grg. 456c-e; cf. 460d), several have him supervising those in athletic training and one, like Isocrates, puts the teaching (paideuō) and training (askeō) of an athlete into his hands (Pl. La. 184e). [37]

Athletics teachers are most frequently represented in classical texts or on red-figure pots giving lessons in wrestling or in the other ‘heavy’ events of boxing and the pankration. [38] This is not unexpected, as many of these teachers owned a palaistra or wrestling school and some of them had been victors in such events in their youth (e.g. Pl. Men. 94c). [39] What is surprising is that we also find them teaching and training their charges in the standard ‘track and field’ events of ancient Greek athletics. In his Statesmen Plato, for example, outlines how there are in Athens, as in other cities, ‘very many’ supervised ‘training sessions for groups’ where instructions are given and ponoi (‘painful toils bringing honour’) expended not just for wrestling but also ‘for the sake of competition in the foot race or some other event’ (294d-e; cf. Grg. 520c-d). Likewise, Antiphon has an athletics teacher conducting a class in javelin-throwing for a group of Athenian boys in a gymasion (3.1.1; 3.2.3, 7; 3.3.6; 3.4.4, etc). Red-figure pots, by contrast, show athletics teachers supervising discus-throwing and the long jump as well as javelin-throwing and running. [40] All of these events are of course the standard ones of local and international games. Thus we can see that athletics in classical Athens consisted of two closely related activities: festival-based agōnes and the physical education classes of traditional education (e.g. Pl. Lg. 764c-d). [41]
Athletics was one of three subjects of traditional *male* education in classical Athens. [42] The other widely-agreed disciplines were *mousikē* (‘music’) and *grammata* (‘letters’), to which was occasionally added choral lessons in singing and dancing dithyrambs (e.g. Aeschin. 1.9-11; Ar. *Ra.* 727-30; Pl. *Lg.* 654a-b, 672c). [43] The discipline of music was the preserve of the *kitharistēs* or lyre teacher, who taught students how to play the *kithara* and sing lyric poems (e.g. Ar. *Av.* 962-72; Pl. *Prt.* 326a-b), while that of letters was overseen by the *grammatistēs* or letter teacher. [44] He instructed students in literacy and numeracy and made them memorize and recite edifying passages of epic poetry, principally Homer (e.g. Pl. *Prt.* 325e-26a). As classes in each of the three main disciplines were taken concurrently, students travelled from one educational establishment to another throughout the day (e.g. Ar. *Av.* 963-4). [45]

Since the democracy did not finance nor administer education, each family made its own decisions about how long their boys would be at school and whether they would take each of the three traditional disciplines: athletics, music and letters. The Athenians understood very well that the number of educational disciplines a boy could pursue and the length of his schooling depended on the resources of his family. [46] This inequality of opportunity is succinctly captured by the Platonic Protagoras, who explains that the three subjects of the ‘old education’ are taken by those ‘...who are most able; and the most able are the wealthiest (hoi plousiōtatoi). Their sons begin school at the earliest stage, and are freed from it at the latest’ (Pl. *Prt.* 326c; cf. Ap. 23c). [47]

Money determined not only whether a family could pay school fees (e.g. Ath. 584c), but also whether they could give their sons the *skholē* or leisure they needed to pursue disciplines that were taught concurrently. Contemporary writers make clear that most poor citizens were unable to afford enough household slaves (e.g. Arist. *Pol.* 1323a5-7; cf. Hdt. 6.137). As a result they required their wives and children to help run family farming or business concerns. [48] They were aware too how this child labour markedly restricted the educational opportunities of boys. [49]

In *Sport and Festival in the Ancient Greek World* I collect the evidence which shows how, as a result of such barriers, poor Athenian families passed over music and athletics and sent their sons only to the lessons of the letter teacher, which they believed to be the most useful for moral and practical instruction. [50] In addition this chapter refutes the recent argument of Nick Fisher that athletics reached down to sub-hoplite Athenians and his interpretations of the literary testimonia he makes in its support and demonstrates that the vast majority of the city’s torch racers were also upper-class young men. [51] It was only wealthy boys, then, who received
instruction in each of the three disciplines of education. As the Athenian people clearly believed training in athletics was indispensible for creditable performance (let along victory) in a race or bout, lower-class boys and youths would have been dissuaded from entering sporting competitions in the first place. [52] Thus in the world’s first fully developed democracy athletes continued to be drawn predominantly (and possibly even exclusively) from the city’s upper class. [53]

There were other activities in classical Athens, such as the drinking party, horsemanship, pederastic homosexuality and political leadership, which were also preserves of the wealthy. [54] However these upper-class pursuits – in contrast to athletics – were regularly criticized in old comedy and the other genres of popular literature. Poor Athenians may have hoped to enjoy, one day, the lifestyle of the rich, but they still had problems with their exclusive pursuits, frequently associating them with stereotypical misdeeds of this social class. [55] Wealthy citizens, for example, were criticized for their excessive enjoyment of two staples of the symposion or drinking party: alcohol (e.g. Ar. Eq. 92-4; V. 79-80; Av. 285-6; Ra. 715, 739-40) and prostitutes (e.g. Ec. 242-4). As far as the Athenian dēmos were concerned, intoxicated symposiasts were prone to commit hubris or physical or verbal assault (e.g. V. 1251-67, 1299-1303) – a crime considered typical of wealthy citizens (e.g. Pl. 563-4; Lys. 24.16-17; D. 21.98, 158). They also believed expenditure on a drinking party – along with the fancy dinner before it – came at the expense of a wealthy citizen’s ability to pay for festival and military liturgies, such as the chorus sponsorship and trierarchy. [56]

Popular culture also entertained mixed views of the elite’s chariot-racing and their military service as members of the cavalry corps. We have already seen how the Athenian dēmos gave two of the city’s highest honours to citizens who had been victorious in an equestrian event at the Olympics or one of the other international games (see above). But they also criticized chariot-racing as a waste of a practitioner’s private resources (e.g. Ar. Nu. 12-24; Th. 6.6.1-3, 12.2, 15.3) and viewed even the ownership of a chariot as an indulgence which brought no benefit to the city (e.g. D. 21.158-9, 42.24; cf. 18.320, 22.5-7). [57] Likewise, the city’s horsemen may have been judged as something of real military benefit to the democracy (e.g. Ar. Eq. 1369-72; S. OC 706-19). [58] Contradictorily, however, poor Athenians took a wealthy citizen’s preference for cavalry over hoplite service as a sign of his cowardice (e.g. Ar. Eq. 1369-72; D. 9.49; Lys. 14.7, 11-12, 14-15; 16.13). [59] Pederasty too may sometimes have been viewed in a positive light by lower-class Athenians (e.g. Aeschin. 1.135-57; Th. 2.43.1), but it was normally linked with the stereotypical misdeeds of the wealthy and, at times, considered akin
to male prostitution. [60] Finally, while expecting political leaders to be wealthy and well-educated, poor Athenians actually suspected them of taking bribes and embezzling state funds (e.g. Ar. Eq. 716-18, 779-80, 801-4; Lys. 27.6-8; 21.12-13) and of trying to deceive the dēmos through manipulative oratory (e.g. Ar. Eq. 650-724; D. 35.40-2; Lys.27.6).

Athletics then was highly valued and practically supported by the Athenian democracy and escaped the often highly critical assessment that other upper-class activities met in the city’s popular culture. Why this was the case remains an open question. This article argues that a major reason for this unusual treatment is the close relationship between athletics and the new democratic style of warfare that classical Athens developed and waged.

**Popular ideas and modern theories about sport and war**

There have long been competing popular ideas about the impact of sport on war, which have spawned a range of modern theories on this relationship and helped provoke heated debates within the social sciences. [61] Admittedly the use of theory is not yet standard practice in our discipline, occasionally raising the ire of some of our more traditional practitioners. However, reviewing social-science literature is of clear utility for this study of the anomaly of Athenian athletics. [62] Doing so ensures the discipline-based and apparently common-sense assumptions we bring to this topic are widely accepted and scientifically valid. Social-science models can also help us to make better sense of the evidence and to develop explanations of phenomena which go well beyond those of ancient writers.

Although the Duke of Wellington in fact never said that the Battle of Waterloo was won on the playing fields of Eton, from the later nineteenth century generations of boys at English ‘public’ schools were made to play organized sport for the sake of their moral fortification. [63] In particular sports such as rugby, cricket and athletics were widely thought to teach boys of the aristocracy and haute bourgeoisie the dispositions they needed to run joint stock companies, administer the British Empire, and fight for the country. [64] Elite contemporaries in Europe and North America saw these school sports as one of the secrets of Britain’s economic success and worldwide empire and sought to establish amateur clubs for playing them in the hope of raising the fortunes of their own countries. [65] These clubs quickly formed national organizations, out of which were fashioned international sporting bodies. [66] Most notable of these was the International Olympic Committee (IOC), which constituted itself in 1894. [67] As the leading proponent of its establishment Baron Pierre de Coubertin believed revived Olympic Games would bring hostile countries
together and encourage world peace. [68] This represented a real change of mind on the part of de Coubertin, as, immediately after the Franco-Prussian War of 1871, he had first been attracted to English school-boy sports as a way to ready France for a war of revenge against Germany. [69]

Drawing explicitly on his own experience of a ‘public’ school and the Indian Imperial Police, George Orwell came to somewhat different conclusions about war and sport in a newspaper column published in December 1945. The Soviet Union had recently sent over one of its premier soccer teams to play local British clubs ostensibly for the sake of maintaining cordial relations between the two wartime allies. [70] However, things did not go according to plan: after controversies over team-selection and refereeing, violent confrontations on the playing field, and unsporting behaviour from the spectators, the Soviet team left England prematurely after only two games. For Orwell this debacle of the Moscow Dynamos was due to aggressive nationalism and vindicated the widely held scepticism about the supposed potential of international sport to foster peaceful co-existence. [71] Although he was not the first columnist to express the view that international sport increases ill-will between nations and hence the likelihood of war, his column has certainly become its most memorable rehearsal. ‘Even if’, he wrote, ‘one didn’t know from concrete examples (the 1936 Olympic Games, for instance) that international sporting contests lead to orgies of hatred, one could deduce it from the general principles.’ Orwell suggests that the linking of a sporting team and its performance to ‘some larger unit’ inevitably arouses ‘the most combative instincts’. At the international level this encourages spectators – along with entire nations – to believe that ‘running, jumping and kicking a ball are tests of national virtue’ and to countenance winning at any cost. [72] As a result, Orwell concludes, ‘Serious sport has nothing to do with fair play. It is bound up with hatred, jealousy, boastfulness, disregard of all rules and sadistic pleasure in witnessing violence: in other words it is war minus the shooting.’ [73]

Needless to say the International Olympic Committee has never heeded any such criticism of the ‘Olympic ideology’ about international sport and peace. [74] Its successive presidents have held to de Coubertin’s view that the promoting of world peace and the reconciling of warring nations are the chief purpose of the games. [75] Likewise, the organizing committee of the Athens 2004 Olympic Games claimed: ‘In the ancient Olympic Games, a truce was declared so that what is good and ennobling in humankind would prevail. The Games today are the greatest celebration of humanity, an event of joy and optimism to which the whole world is invited to compete peacefully.’[76] Thus ‘…what matters most is to share the
common vision of promoting peace and friendship among all the people of the world, through the noble competition in sport.’

Although continuing to present the games as a hallowed means of promoting world peace, the Olympic movement has not explained how ‘noble competition in sport’ might achieve this pacifying end. By contrast, coherent ideas about the impact of sport on individual aggression and a nation’s propensity to wage war have long had currency in the popular cultures of the western world. For example, US coaches of basketball and American football believe that playing sport is a safe way to reduce aggression, reinforces socially constructive values and hence reduces the likelihood of war, while sports journalists cherish the idea that the watching of sport alone can dissipate aggression. [77] Like sports writers, players of aggressive sports also believe more strongly than others that spectators of such games enjoy a ‘symbolic catharsis’ of their aggression. [78] Nor are such ideas confined to sports insiders. A recent social-psychology study of Canadians, for example, suggests that a majority of the general public think playing or even watching aggressive sport reduces an individual’s aggressiveness. [79] Moreover, Hollywood movies, self-help books and other media of US popular culture consistently endorse the closely related popular idea that ‘blowing off steam’ by means of playing an aggressive sport or, for example, punching a pillow is a safe way to reduce one’s anger. [80]

Within the social sciences this popular view of sport as a ‘safety valve’ for aggression has been integrated into different theories of catharsis, which can be traced back to Freud and Aristotle. [81] One of the most influential (and certainly the only one to be the subject of a best-selling book) is the so-called drive-discharge model of catharsis, which was promulgated by Konrad Lorenz from the early 1960s. [82] As a pioneer of ethology Lorenz argued that aggression is an innate drive, which constantly accumulates in animals or humans as aggressive tension. For Lorenz this accumulation is similar to the operation of a steam boiler: aggressive tension builds up to a point where it must be released either as a spontaneous explosion or in a series of controlled discharges. Thus aggression can be safely vented through socially acceptable activities, such as sport. Notwithstanding the teaching of self-control and fair play, Lorenz explains, ‘the main function of sport today lies in the cathartic discharge of the aggressive urge’. [83] In general, his model predicts an inverse relationship of sport with aggression and warfare. [84]

This drive-discharge model of catharsis may still be drawn on favourably by historians of ancient Greek sport, but it is now thoroughly discredited within the social sciences. [85] As Brian Ferguson explains, at the conceptual level it has come ‘under intense criticism from psychologists and physiologists for oversimplifying
the complex phenomenon of aggression, from physical anthropologists and biologists for fallaciously extrapolating from animals to humans, and from cultural anthropologists for ignoring observed cultural variation in responses to threat and stress and confusing the individual and social levels’. [86] The model has also been repeatedly challenged on empirical grounds. In particular, for the last thirty-five years social psychologists have shown that what Lorenz’s model predicts about competitive sport and aggression – along with comparable popular ideas – are entirely unfounded: far from an inverse relationship, sport manifestly increases aggressiveness. [87] For example, an empirical study of students at Indiana University in the early 1970s found that the everyday level of unprovoked aggression among those playing contact sports was much higher than those who played no sport whatsoever. [88] Sport seems to have a similar impact on spectators. Interviews at the 1969 Army–Navy gridiron game in Philadelphia showed that male spectators were much more aggressive after the event, regardless of whether their preferred team won or lost. [89] A similar study achieved the same results with Canadian spectators of ice-hockey and professional wrestling: watching either event not only significantly raised the general aggressiveness of males and females but diminished their ability to interact cooperatively with others. [90] These results, the study concludes, ‘call into question an assumption that sports events are necessarily rich social occasions where goodwill and warm interpersonal relations are fostered’. [91]

Successive social psychologists have also cast doubt on the related popular idea that ‘blowing off steam’ can safely reduce anger. [92] One to have done so recently is Brad Bushman, whose study tests how three different ‘safe’ activities moderate the anger and aggression undergraduates feel, after receiving harsh and demonstrably unfair comments on a piece of written work. [93] In response to this unjust provocation, his first group of students pounded a punching bag, while ruminating about the professor who had enraged them; the second also punched the bag but thought instead of getting physically fit; and the third simply sat quietly. Bushman’s results again confound popular thinking. The angriest and most aggressive group were the first, while the second were less angry but no less aggressive. Those with the lowest levels of anger and aggression were the ones who had not ‘blown off steam’. For social psychologists such results lend strong support to alternate models of human aggression, which postulate that aggressive stimuli reinforce comparable actions and thoughts, such as the social-learning theory or the cognitive-neoassociation theory. [94] This last theory – the culmination of three decades of research by Leonard Berkowitz – proposes that aggression-related
experiences form an associative network in a person’s memory, with similar connections existing between potential emotional and behavioural responses to aggression. [95] Thus an aggression-related thought activates memories of earlier aversive events and primes aggressive feelings and potential responses, thus increasing the likelihood of actual violent behaviour.

Another social-science discipline to challenge the drive-discharge theory of catharsis is anthropology. Its practitioners have habitually assumed that human aggression is not an innate quality but something that is learnt or, at the very least, entirely shaped by socio-cultural factors. [96] Some have also assumed that common values inform disparate social activities and that large patterns of a culture tend to support each other. Claude Lévi-Strauss for one assumes that different structures of signification in a culture tend to ‘overlap, intersect and reinforce one another’. [97] Interestingly, evidentiary support for such assumptions has long come from the cultural history of ancient Greece by Jean-Pierre Vernant, who coopted some of the structuralist methods of Lévi-Strauss and Dumézil. [98] Vernant’s research on the ‘historical psychology’ of the Greeks, while sensitive to cultural contradiction and dissonance, has time and again shown how mythology’s structures of meaning are implicit in political, religious and social practices and how symmetries and reciprocal interactions exist between large patterns of thought. [99] Finally Günther Lüschen has inferred from anthropological case studies and sociological research on modern societies that ‘sport is indeed an expression of that socio-cultural system in which it occurs’. [100] For Lüschen sport not only bears out a society’s values and norms but also ‘socializes’ towards them and helps articulate and legitimize its social structures. [101]

In a widely acclaimed study Richard Sipes draws these assumptions and findings together in a new theory concerning sport and war, which he calls the ‘cultural pattern model’. [102] His model views the ‘intensity and configuration’ of aggression as ‘predominantly cultural characteristics’. It also assumes ‘…a strain toward consistency in each culture, with similar values and behaviour patterns, such as aggressiveness, tending to manifest in more than one area of culture.’ As a result, behaviours and cultural patterns ‘relative to war and warlike sports tend to overlap and support each other’s presence’. [103] His model predicts a direct relationship between combative sports and war: such sports are more likely to occur in warlike societies than peaceful ones. In order to test the validity of his cultural pattern model as opposed to that of the drive-discharge theory of catharsis, Sipes conducts a quantitative analysis of twenty premodern societies, including the Aztecs, Kung Bushmen and Copper Eskimos. [104] His results are decisive: of the ten ‘warlike’
societies nine have ‘combative sports’, whereas eight of the ten ‘non-warlike’ societies lack such sports. [105] Therefore, his cross-cultural analysis confirms that ‘war and combative type sports’ are not ‘alternative channels for the discharge of accumulable aggressive tensions’. [106] Rather, in any one society they ‘appear to be components of a broader cultural pattern’.

The cultural overlap between sport and war

Classical Athenians described and thought of athletics and war with a common set of words and concepts. [107] Although no ancient writer comments explicitly on this cultural overlap or provides concepts for its analysis, the cultural-pattern model of sport and war highlights its significance for the standing of sport in classical Athens. Indeed this proven explanation provides a very plausible hypothesis for explaining the anomaly of Athenian athletics. What is more, this relationship between social science and ancient history need not be a one-way street; for, if this hypothesis is proven as well for classical Athens, the wealth of evidence which is available for this city means we can do what has not been attempted for any other historical case study. We can detail the so-called causal mechanisms which brought about this mutually supporting relationship between sport and war. [108]

Athens of the fifth century intensified and transformed the waging of war and killed tens of thousands of fellow Greeks. [109] By the time its democracy was fully consolidated, in the 450s, war had come to dominate the politics and popular culture of the city and the lives of its citizens. War consumed more money than any other public activity (see above), was waged more frequently than ever before, and was the main topic of debate in the democratic council and assembly. [110] The city’s military power and frequent victories were constantly glorified and legitimized in the city’s public art and architecture, public discourse and civic ceremony. [111] War then was a prominent and highly esteemed subject of Athenian popular culture. As such, its ideological affinity with sport would have impacted positively on the general standing of athletics and athletes.

The most fundamental aspect of this cultural overlap was that battle and an athletic or equestrian competition were considered an agōn or a contest decided by mutually agreed rules. [112] Today liberal democracies, sometimes, wage war contrary to international law and break the Geneva Convention in the course of their occupation of captured territory and open-ended incarceration of ‘militants’ or ‘unlawful combatants’. In such circumstances it is easy to forget that war in the western world was once regulated by widely discussed conventions and customs, limited in its scale and impact on civilian populations, and viewed as a legitimate
way to settle outstanding disputes between nation-states. [113] The regular hoplite battle of classical Greece was no exception, being as it was ‘a test as rule-bound as a tournament’. [114]

Thus a Greek city informed another of its intention to attack by sending a herald (cf. Th. 1.29.1). By agreement their phalanxes met in an agricultural plain – the best topography for Greek land warfare (e.g. Hdt. 7.9.2; Pl. *Moralia* 193e). [115] After hours of hand-to-hand fighting, the decisive moment was the *tropē* (‘turning’), when the hoplites of one side broke up and ran for their lives (e.g. E. *Heracl. 841-2*). The victors pursued them only for a short distance, as they had much left to do on the field of battle. There they collected the bodies of their dead comrades, stripped the bodies of the enemy, and used some of the weapons and armour so acquired to set up a *tropaion* (‘trophy’) on the exact spot where the *tropē* had occurred (e.g. 786-7; Th. 4.44.2-3). When the defeated had time to regroup, they sent a herald to those controlling the battlefield for a truce to collect their dead (e.g. Th. 4.97.2). Custom dictated that the victors could not honourably refuse this request (e.g. Lysias 2.9-10). But asking for such a truce was recognized as the decisive proof of a concession of defeat (e.g. Hdt. 1.82; Th. 4.44.5-6).

For classical Athenians the *agônes* of athletics and war also tested the moral fibre and physical capacities of individual sportsmen and soldiers. The best evidence for the ideology of athletics comes of course from Pindar, whose poems for victorious sportsmen were usually performed immediately after their victory at a sporting festival or upon their triumphal return home. [116] This sporting ideology remained relatively unchanged from the fifth century until the later Roman empire, while literary and archaeological evidence confirm its currency in Athens during the classical period. [117] In the songs of Pindar victory in a ‘heavy’ or ‘track and field’ event depends on, and confirms, the *aretē* or manly excellence of the sportsman (e.g. *I.* 1.15-28, 42-5; *O.* 6.9-10; *N.* 6.23-4), which is frequently presented as a moral quality inherited from ancestors (e.g. *I.* 3.13-14; *O.* 10.20-1, 12). [118] Pindar believed that victory also depended on the support of a ‘divine being’, ‘god’ or a named Olympian deity (e.g. *O.* 13.104-6; *P.* 10.10) and sang of the prayers for victory that sportsmen made (e.g. *O.* 4.12-14). [119] Athletic victors of fifth-century Athens made dedications to Athena on the Akropolis (e.g. *IG I 3* 826, 893) and at Sounion, presumably as thanks-offerings for her answering of their prayers, while fellow citizens clearly believed in divine intervention at sporting contests (e.g. S. *El.* 697-9). [120] For Pindar few athletes gained victory without *ponoi* or painful toils bringing honour (*O.* 10.22). [121] A sporting *agôn* involves many toils (e.g. *I.* 5.22-5; *O.* 6.9-11, 10.22-3; *N.* 6.23-4) and can even be described as a *ponos* itself (e.g. *I.*
Pindar also made much of the *ponoi* and expense of athletic education (e.g. 1.42-5, 6.10-11; *O.* 5.7-8) and the expertise of the athletics teacher, which he considered another precondition for sporting success (e.g. *I.* 4.70-2; *N.* 4.93-6, 6.66-9; *O.* 8.54-66). Classical Athenians also acknowledged the toils athletes endured in competition (e.g. *E.* *Alc.* 1025-6) and in the classes of the athletics teacher, which, along with Pindar, they saw as a prerequisite for competent sporting performance and victory (see above). [122]

Pindar presented defeat as a source of shame: the sportsman who does not win must travel home down back streets, avoiding the taunts of enemies and even the company of friends (Pi. *O.* 8.69; *P.* 8.83-7; fragment 229 Race). [123] What for us is an exceedingly unsportsmanlike attitude is, as Bowra writes, the logical outcome of Pindar’s general explanation for sporting victory: ‘If men win in the Games because they have a natural talent, work hard and enjoy the support of the gods, it follows that, if they fail, they must be lacking in one or more of these qualifications. The defeated are those who, when put to the test, fail, and Pindar feels justified in deriding them.’ [124] This moral reasoning was partially explicated by Xenophon: the capable athlete who chooses not to compete in Panhellenic games is *deilos* or cowardly (*Mem.* 3.7.1; cf. Paus. 5.21.18).

Pindar assumed that sporting contests entailed *kindunoi* or dangers (e.g. *O.* 5.7-8; 6.9-11) – something which was clearly the case for the ‘heavy’ events of Greek athletics. [125] For example, the *himantes* or hand- and arm-bindings of the boxer were designed (like knuckledusters) to protect his hands and to injure his opponent, while the winner of a boxing bout emerged only when one boxer gave up or was bashed unconscious. [126] Unsurprisingly boxers were occasionally killed (e.g. Paus. 8.40.1-5; *SEG* 22.354), and depictions of them on black- and red-figure pots frequently show blood streaming from their faces. [127] Wrestling and the *pankration* were no less violent (e.g. 6.4.2, 8.40.3-5). There are eight documented examples of deaths during such ‘heavy’ events at the international games. [128] ‘Track and field’ events were also perceived as potentially dangerous: for example, Antiphon assumed a boy might be transfixed by a javelin during an athletics class (e.g. 3.1.2, 2.3, 3.6), while mythology had Hyakinthos accidentally killed by a discus (e.g. *E.* *Hel.* 1469-74). [129]

Classical Athenians accounted for military success in the same moral and religious terms as sporting victory. In the speeches delivered at the public funeral for the city’s war dead victory depended, not on tactics or strategy, but on the *aretē* of Athenian soldiers (e.g. D. 60.21; Lys. 2.4-6, 20, 64-5; *Pl. Mx.* 240d), which it was also said to confirm (e.g. Lys. 2.24; *Pl. Mx.* 243c; cf. Hdt. 9.71). [130] For example,
Hyperides explains (*Epit.* 17): ‘...the general is responsible for good counsel but those willing to run risks (*kindunein*) with their bodies for victory.’ Courage in battle required a hoplite to remain steadfast in the battle line, with a secondary requirement being the performance of martial deeds. [131] In doing so a soldier was without fear (Lys. 14.15) and voluntarily accepted the possibility of ‘a sudden wound of the spear’ (E. *HF* 159-64) or death (e.g. *Ph.* 999-1002; Lys. 2.14-15; Th. 2.42.4). For classical Athenians such possibilities had to be faced, as battle was full of *kindunoi* or dangers. [132] Classical Athenians boasted of course that they did not have to practise ‘toils’, like the Spartans, to be courageous, since theirs was a natural *aretē* (Th. 2.34.4), which they had inherited from their mythical and historical ancestors. [133] Nonetheless they firmly believed that battle – like a sporting contest – involved *ponoi* and that their toils were responsible for the empire, military power and greatness of fifth-century Athens. [134] In this moral accounting of military outcomes defeat was due only to the cowardice of the enemy (e.g. D. 60.25, E. *Or.* 1475-88; Lys. 2.64-5) and *aiskhunē* (‘sense/fear of shame’) had an important part to play. [135] Cowardice was considered *aiskhros* (‘shameful’), while the fear of shame encouraged Athenian soldiers to be brave. [136]

The Greeks believed the gods lent a hand in battlefield victory. [137] Thus classical Athenians prayed for divine aid before and during battle (e.g. Lys. 2.39; Th. 6.32.1), and felt obliged to thank those who had answered their prayers (e.g. S. *Aj.* 175-7). Indeed Aeschylus has the Theban leader Eteokles, before a battle, promise trophies, sacrifices and dedications to his city-protecting deities, if they now save the city (*Th.* 271-80). [138] In victory Athenian soldiers did use captured arms and armour to set up a trophy (e.g. Th. 2.92.4; 4.44.3), which they understood as a thanks-offering to Zeus (e.g. E. *Ph.* 1250-1). Likewise, their generals made sacrifices to city-protecting gods and demi-gods who had also helped them win (e.g. Paus. 10.11.6). [139] Along with other Greeks, the Athenians also used a tenth of their booty to make dedications in local or Panhellenic sanctuaries (e.g. Hdt. 5.55; *IG* I3 501), thus helping to turn temples into ‘virtual war-museums’. [140]

**The democratization of war**

Athens of the fifth century not only revolutionized the waging of war but significantly broadened military participation. With the emergence of democracy war quickly became the preserve of every strata of the citizen-body, attracting thousands upon thousands of lower-class soldiers. Their new experiences of battle were represented in terms of the traditional moral explanation of victory on the battle- and sports field. Athenian democracy may not have changed the monopoly of
the upper class on active sporting participation, the practical and ideological opening up of war profoundly altered the way lower-class Athenians perceived of athletes and athletics. Poor citizens now had personal experience of an activity which was thought to be very similar to elite sport. As such they could identify more easily with the goals, exertions and achievements of wealthy sportsmen. Certainly the cultural overlap of sport and war in its own right had a positive impact on the standing of sport and sportsmen. But it was this new non-elite affinity with athletics, made possible by the democratization of war, which explains more than any other factor the paradoxically high standing of athletics under the Athenian democracy.

Military affairs did not dominate the public life of Athens in the sixth century as it did in the next century. [141] Wars were waged very infrequently and initiated privately by clan leaders (e.g. Plu. Sol. 9.1). The hoplites of each campaign numbered in the hundreds rather than thousands and came predominantly from the city’s upper class. How they represented their soldiering can be seen on archaic black- and red-figure pottery. [142] Its imagery suggests that upper-class Athenians drew on the values and ideas of epic poetry to represent and glorify their own martial deeds. [143] A good example of this epic influence concerns the scenes of a hoplite killed in action or his corpse being carried back to the city. [144] Homeric heroes explicate how they will gain everlasting renown and memory of their youthfulness if they die bravely in battle (e.g. Hom. Il. 12.318-28, 22.71-3, 304-5; cf. 22.362-4). [145] By this ‘beautiful death’ a hero gains a categorical confirmation of his aretē, which is reflected in the beauty of his corpse (e.g. 22.71-3, 369-71). [146] Painters sometimes represent this aretē of the hoplite killed in action by painting in a lion – one of the animals Homer uses as a symbol of a hero’s martial excellence (e.g. Hom. Il. 5.782; Od. 18.161, 11.611). [147] They also evoke his attaining of the ‘beautiful death’ of the heroes by giving him alone of the painted figures long hair and – along with his bearer – a Boiotian shield. Homer repeatedly draws attention to the long hair of his warrior heroes (e.g. Hom. Il. 3.43; 2.443, 472; 18.359), with the Boiotian shield is given to a named hero in Attic imagery. [148]

Fifth-century Athens opened soldiering – like politics – to every strata of the citizen-body. [149] This marked expansion of military participation began with the reforms Kleisthenes introduced after 508/7 (Ath. Pol. 20-1; Hdt. 5.66-73). [150] These not only made the dēmos the final arbiters of public policy but formally unified Athens and its countryside for the first time. [151] Each free male of Attike was now registered as a citizen of Athens in his local deme and clusters of these villages and suburbs were linked together in ten tribes. These new registers were used to conscript hoplites for each tribal corps for most of the classical period (e.g.
Ar. *Pax* 1173, 1179-86; *IG I³* 138.1-2, 5-6). [152] This was the city’s first-ever mechanism for mass mobilization, helping it to raise thousands of hoplites in future campaigns (e.g. Th. 2.13.6-7). Soldiering was made possible for the majority of citizens who were too poor to be hoplites by the decision of the Athenian dēmos, in 483/2, to build a large navy and their ongoing commitment to its maintenance. [153] A changing proportion of sailors in the fleet may have been resident aliens (e.g. Th. 1.143.1, 7.63.3-4), allies (e.g. 1.121.3, 7.13.2) and slaves (e.g. 7.13.2). [154] But the largest portion (numbering thousands per expedition) was clearly Athenian (e.g. Th. 1.142.6, 8.74-7; Ps.-X. 1.2).

The common performance dynamic of the democracy gave non-elite Athenians real power to shape civic ideology according to their morality and perspective. As a consequence, the traditional moral explanation of victory, which had once been the preserve of epic heroes and the city’s elite, was now applied to their own military activities. [155] This ideological democratization of war can be observed best in the collective funeral for the war dead, held each year when Athenians were killed in action (Th. 2.34.1, 7-8). [156] Their ashes were placed in ten caskets (one for each tribe) and displayed for three days in the city’s marketplace (2). On the day of the funeral they were carried to the public cemetery (4-5) where they were placed in ‘a beautiful and grandiose tomb’ (Pl. *Mx.* 234c; cf. X. *HG* 2.4.7). Such tombs were adorned with statues of lions and friezes of hoplites killing opponents that signified the aretē of those being buried. [157] They also had epigrams explaining that the dead had put their aretē beyond doubt, leaving behind an eternal memory of gallantry (e.g. *IG I³* 1179.3, 8-9; 1162.48). Finally, each tomb displayed a complete list of the year’s casualties, including citizen sailors, which was organized by tribes (1142-93). [158] The funeral oration traditionally delivered after the burial always outlined how the war dead had met ‘the most beautiful’ death: by falling in battle for the city they had gained ageless praise and renown and a deathless remembrance not only of their aretē but also of their youthfulness. [159]

Under the democracy non-elite Athenians killed in action were not the only soldiers to be favourably discussed in the traditional language and concepts of military performance. The funeral orators themselves were bountiful in this regard. [160] As Sokrates explains to a young companion (Pl. *Mx.* 234c-235b), ‘They laud the city by all means, those who died in war and our ancestors, all men who went before, and praise us too who are still alive. Being so praised by them, I for my part, Menexenos, am made to feel very noble.’ Thus most battles funeral speeches describe reveal ‘the Athenians’ (not just the war dead) to be ‘courageous men’ (e.g. Lys. 2.27, 52, 70; Pl. *Mx.* 245e-46a), who surpass all other Greeks in aretē. [161]
Alternatively they make flattering generalizations about decades of Athenian warfare (e.g. D. 60.11). A good example is the summary of the Athenian empire by Lysias: as a result of their ‘very many toils (ponōn), conspicuous contests (agonōn) and outstanding dangers (kindunōn)’, the Athenians made Greece free, ruled the sea for seventy years and brought political equality to their allies (2.55-6). Critically funeral orators make no distinction between hoplites and sailors: victory at sea reveals Athenian aretē no less than on land. [162] Nor was this extension of traditional martial values to sailors confined to the collective funeral. For example, in his tragedy The Persians Aeschylus acknowledges the bravery of the Athenian sailors at the battle of Salamis (Pers. 394; cf. IG I3 503/4.1-4) and draws heavily on epic phraseology to describe their efforts. [163] Aristophanes sees ‘hard toil’ in fighting land battles, besieging cities and rowing (V. 684-5), while the Athenian general Phormio, apart from describing a sea battle as an agōn (Th. 2.89.8, 10; cf. A. Pers. 405), thinks it involves ‘dangers’ (11) and bravery (3; cf. 2.86.4, 8-9) on the part of sailors.

Conclusion

The Athenian people authorized the spending of public money on sport, discouraged attacks on sportsmen by the poets of old comedy, and awarded sporting victors lavishly. Such public support and high estimation occurred in spite of athletics remaining a predominantly upper-class pursuit under the democracy. Sport of course was not the only preserve of elite Athenians. But in contrast to the mannered drinking-party, pederasty, horsemanship and political leadership, it escaped the otherwise persistent criticism of upper-class activities in Athenian popular culture. A major reason for this paradoxical situation is the close relationship between athletics and the new democratic style of warfare classical Athens developed and waged. Classical Athenians conceived of athletic contests and battles in identical terms: they were agōnes involving ponoi, with victory in both depending on the aretē of the competitors. Although Athenian warfare, in the sixth century, was a predominantly elite activity, in the next it was subject to a profound democratization practically and ideologically. With the creation of a city-based army of hoplites and a huge navy and the introduction of military pay, soldiering – like politics – was opened to every class of Athenian. Under the democracy the power non-elite citizens had to shape the city’s culture ensured every hoplite or sailor was now recognized for his aretē and ponoi in battle and considered equally responsible for victory. As a result, lower-class citizens came to believe that upper-class athletes exhibited the same moral qualities and experienced the same ordeals as they did.
when fighting battles. This non-elite affinity with the values of sport ruled out public criticism of athletes and underwrote the exceptionally high standing of athletics under the democracy. Thus the democratic style of warfare in classical Athens legitimized and supported elite sport.
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Notes

[3] This so-called Small Panathenaia did not have a program of agônes (Tracy, ‘Games at the Lesser Panathenaia?’).
[5] These figures are based on the restoration of this inscribed list of prizes by Julia Shear (‘Prizes from Athens’, especially 103-5).
[6] Kyle, *Athletics in Ancient Athens*, 190-4; ‘The Panathenaic Games’, 94-7; Shear, *Polis and Panathenaia*, 322-49. While the surviving portion of the prize-list does not mentioned dithyrambic contests, they were probably part of the Great Panathenaia as they certainly were of the festival’s annual version (Lys. 21.2; Ps.-X. 3.4; Davies, ‘Demosthenes on Liturgies’, 37; Shear, *Polis and Panathenaia*, 323-31; Wilson, *The Athenian Institution of the Khoregia*, 40).


[8] For the games of the war dead, see *Ath. Pol.* 58.1; D. 60.1; Lys. 2.80; Pl. *Mx.* 249b; Kyle, *Athletics in Ancient Athens*, 44-5; Parker, *Athenian Religion*, 132; *Polytheism and Society at Athens*, 469-70. For the Eleusinia, see *Pl.* I. 1.57; O. 9.99; 13.110; *IG I* 3 988; *II* 2 1672.258-61; Kyle, *Athletics in Ancient Athens*, 47; Parker, *Polytheism and Society at Athens*, 201-2, 468-9. For the Herakleia, see *Ath. Pol.* 54.7; D. 19.125; *Pl. O.* 9.84-94; *P.* 8.78-9; *IG I* 3 3; Kyle, *Athletics in Ancient Athens*, 46-7; Parker, *Polytheism and Society at Athens*, 473. For the scale of their programs, see Pritchard, ‘Comparing the Costs of Festivals and War in Classical Athens’. The staging of contests at the Olympicia and Theseia is far from certain: there is no evidence their programs of Hellenistic times date back to the classical period (Parker, *Polytheism and Society at Athens*, 477, 483-4 pace Kyle, *Athletics in Ancient Athens*, 40-1, 46).

[9] The festivals for Hephaistos, Pan and Prometheus each had a torch race (Hdt. 6.105; *IG I* 3 82.3-5; Davies, ‘Demosthenes on Liturgies’, 35-7; Kyle, *Athletics in Ancient Athens*, 90-3). In addition there was a torch race on horseback at the Bendideia (*Pl. R.* 327a-8b) and probably also a footrace for youths carrying vine-branches at the Oskhophoria (Kyle, *Athletics in Ancient Athens*, 47-8).


[14] Hansen costs the democracy’s honorary decrees and its payment of assembly goers, councillors and jurors at 92 to 112 talents per year in the 330s (*The Athenian Democracy in the Age of Democracy*, 98, 150, 189, 241, 254-5, 315-6). The salary bill for the democracy would have been slightly lower a century early (Kallet, ‘Accounting for Culture in Fifth-Century Athens’, 46).


[17] *IG I* 3 131.11-18; cf. *Ath. 237f; Ar. Eq.* 535; *Pl. Ap.* 36d-e. That these honours were introduced well before the late 430s is suggested by the so-called Prytaneion Decree (*IG I* 3 131), which confirmed grants of public dining for sportsmen and others that were considered traditional (5) or had already been mentioned in an earlier decree (14-15, 18). The letter-forms of *IG I* 3 131 date to the 440s. For the restoration of this fragmentary inscription, see now Kyle, *Athletics in Ancient Athens*, 145-7; Morrisey, ‘Victors in the Prytaneion Decree’; Thompson, ‘More on the Prytaneion Decree’.


[22] Quotation from Hubbard, ‘Pindar’s Tenth Olympian and Athlete–Trainer Pederasty’, 142. Bilinski, L’agonistica sportive nella grecia antica, 50-7. For the association of athletics and pederasty, see Ar. Av. 136-42; Nu. 177-9, 972-8, 989, 1014; Pax 762-3; V. 1025; Eup. fragment 65 Kassel and Austin. A fragment of new comedy has an athlete speak in comically-inflated terms about his eating habits (Theophil. fragment 8 Kassel and Austin).
[23] Translated by Sommerstein.
[26] Heath, Political Comedy in Aristophanes, 23-4; Pelling, Literary Texts and the Greek Historian, 135; Pritchard, The Fractured Imaginary, 50; Redfield, ‘Drama and Community’, 331.
[29] For such expectations about political leaders, see Pelling, Literary Texts and the Greek Historian, 13-14; Pritchard, The Fractured Imaginary, 67-70 with references.
[31] Pelling explains (Literary Texts and the Greek Historian, 126): ‘All fantasy, it is increasingly realised, is historically situated: not just in the sense that one cannot fantasise or dream about telephones or planes of one has never seen one, but much more substantially in terms of underlying thought patterns and aspirations. These may form part of the ‘axis’ around which any upside-down turnings take place…’
[34] For these terms and this performance dynamic of elite performers and mass spectators, see Pritchard, ‘The Fractured Imaginary’, 40; The Fractured Imaginary, 2-12; ‘Athletics, Education and Participation in Classical Athens’, 308; cf. Pelling, Literary Texts and the Greek Historian, 5-9; Roisman, The Rhetoric of Manhood, 3-6.
[35] Kyle, Sport and Spectacle in the Ancient World, 173, 176-9. My forthcoming War minus the Shooting: Sport, War and Democracy in Classical Athens analyzes the functions of athletics in each of these genres of Athenian drama. In brief, tragedy treated athletics as a regular pastime of its heroes, crafted sporting metaphors to simplify its agônes, which involved challenging contradictions in civic ideology or morality, and employed athletics as an unambiguous norm, against which the immortality and madness of its malefactors could be more easily appreciated (e.g. E. El. 367-400, 528, 614, 761-2, 781-2, 854-90, 1273). Likewise, satyr-drama used athletics as a foil to reveal the moral flaws and anti-social habits of its satyrs, which was a revelation Athenian audiences found very funny and expected of the genre (e.g. A. fragments 78a, 78c Radt). In addition satyr-plays regularly dramatized a hero’s slaying of a villain who had been killing travellers as part of a perverse boxing or wrestling bout (e.g. S. fragment 122 Radt; Apollod. 1.9.20). The popularity of this type of play lay in its black-and-white morality: the villain’s end was just, because of his breaking not only of the customs of xenia or guest-friendship but also those of sport, which did not mandate the killing of the defeated. The most recent studies of athletics in old comedy, tragedy and satyr-drama are Thiéry, ‘Sport et comédie au Vᵉ siècle’; Larmour, Stage and Stadium, especially 92-133; and Sutton, ‘Athletics in the Greek Satyr Play’ respectively.
[37] For athletics teachers supervising training, see, for example, Arist. Pol. 1279a1-10, 1287b1-2; Pl. Cry. 47b; R. 389c; Thg 123e; cf. Plt. 295c; Lg. 720e.

[38] E.g. Ar. Eq. 490-2, 1238-9; P. Alc. 1.107e-8e; Grg. 456d-e. For examples of athletes practising ‘heavy’ events in the presence of an athletics teacher on red-figure pots, see F.A.G. Beck, Album of Greek Education, nos. 193-5, 196, 197b-c, 204, 210-11.
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