Constructions of Spartan Masculinity in Classical Athenian Prose

Kendell Ashley Heydon, B.A. (Hons) & M.A.

A thesis submitted to the University of Nottingham
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

January 2018

Abstract

Employing a methodological approach informed by sociological social constructionist theories of gender, I endeavour to explore representations of Spartan masculinity in the works of Xenophon Thucydides and Plato, to gain better understanding of portrayals and usages of ideologies of Spartan masculinity in Classical Athenian philosophical and historical works. I structure my project by focusing on seven categories which constructionists believe to be important to the formation of masculinity. My aim is to demonstrate the utility of this methodological framework for exploring historical masculinities and to contend that there is no singular representation of Spartan masculinity within Classical Athenian prose. Rather, representations of Spartan masculinity are complex and multifaceted, with authors constructing and employing different ideologies of Spartan masculinity situationally and for a variety of purposes, both internal and external to the texts.

In chapter one, I examine Xenophon's *Spartan Constitution*, demonstrating the role of masculine ideals in the "Lycurgan" system and suggesting Xenophon depicts Spartan masculinity as highly competitive and performative in nature. In chapter two, I examine Plato's *Laws* and *Republic*, to demonstrate that Plato portrays Spartan masculine ideals as playing a prominent role in the imbalanced development of Spartan character. I also analyse Plato's depiction of the auxiliary guardians to suggest that problematic elements he associates with Spartan men are unresolved, even within his idealised *polis*. In chapter three, I explore Thucydides' *History*. I elucidate the role of masculine ideals in

characterisations of Spartan individuals and the Spartan *polis* and argue that characters' redefinition of Spartan masculine ideals is portrayed as politically useful in the text. Finally, in chapter four, I examine Xenophon's historical works, focusing primarily on the *Hellenica*. I explore a number of episodes to demonstrate characters' employment of masculine ideals for political purposes, to demonstrate correspondences between masculine ideals identified in the *Lac*. and Xenophon's characterisations of Spartan individuals in the *Hellenica* and argue that hegemonic masculinity is observable in depictions of of Spartan societal processes and mechanisms.

To my parents, who always encouraged me to pursue my education

(and probably regret that now)

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I would like to thank my supervisors, Stephen Hodkinson and Carl Buckland for the incredible kindness, patience, and excellent guidance they have provided me over the course of my doctoral studies.

I would also like to express my gratitude to the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council, for providing the funding with which to undertake my Ph.D.

I am also grateful to the Department of Classics and Archaeology of the University of Nottingham, for aiding me in developing my skills as a researcher, speaker and teacher, and to my many colleagues in the department who offered me encouragement and advice throughout the last four years.

Last, but not least, I must thank my parents, for being my constant encouragers, counselors, and consolers, and for believing in me, even when I didn't believe in myself.

Table of Contents

Introduction

There has been a renaissance of Spartan studies over the last generation, which has radically revised earlier understandings of Spartan society. However, the topic of masculinity has been largely neglected – in spite of the fact that we have more information about Sparta's social characteristics than those of any other state in Classical Greece, excepting Athens. This lack is especially striking when one contemplates the considerable amount of scholarly attention that has been given to topics concerned with Athenian masculinity and manhood,[1] as well as the considerable attention which has been given to the subject of Spartan women.[2] Study of Spartan masculinity is important for a number of reasons: (1) to provide better understanding of Spartan society, (2) to discern the ways specific constructions of Spartan manhood may have been employed to serve particular purposes within ancient texts; and (3) to facilitate analysis and deconstruction of modern notions of masculinity – as images of Sparta continue to be powerful symbols today.[3]

Examination of ancient sources has the potential to offer insight into how perceptions of Spartan masculinity arose, reveal trends in changing attitudes about masculinity during the Classical period, and provide a reference point to examine the extent to which modern attitudes towards masculinity have skewed scholarly interpretations of the evidence. Therefore, examination of Spartan masculinity can not only better our understanding of antiquity, it can

[1] See pp. 7-10.
[2] E.g. Cartledge 1981, Millender 1999 & 2018, Pomeroy 2002 & 2008, Figueira 2010.
[3] Cartledge 2006; Levene 2007; Hodkinson and Macgregor Morris 2012.

also provide context for reception studies of Spartan masculinity. This project began with the desire to track constructions of Classical Spartan masculinity, as they are depicted in contemporary written sources; to explore the similarities and differences in depictions; and to contextualise authors' depictions within their cultural and generic milieus.

However, a challenge arose when I encountered the first integral question in approaching the exploration of Spartan masculinity: that of methodology. The idea of masculinity as an object of study is a recent one. But despite, or perhaps because of its relatively novel status, the study of masculinity has been taken up by a number of disciplines (e.g. sociology, psychology, anthropology, and history), all of which approach the subject in a variety of ways.[4] This has proved fruitful in producing an abundance of material on the subject matter of masculinity.

However, the sheer diversity of material and approaches can make the task of deciding which methodological frameworks to apply to a historico-cultural examination of Classical Spartan constructions of masculinity a daunting one. When I surveyed approaches employed by other studies of masculinity in antiquity, it became clear that methods employed by scholars were far from unified. As the study of identities such as masculinity can be somewhat nebulous in nature, a necessary first step is the formation of a clear methodological framework which can be systematically applied to exploration of sources.

[4] Bickrell 2006, 87; Fletcher 2011, 61.

Therefore, the primary objective of my PhD project shifted to the creation of a methodological approach with which to analyse texts for elements which depict ideas of masculinity within a given culture, and the systematic application of this approach to a limited number of contemporary prose texts relating to Spartan history or society. In so doing, I aim to both test the efficacy of my chosen approach and elucidate the depictions of Spartan masculinity that can be found in a number of contemporary texts.

In this chapter, I intend first to discuss briefly how other studies of historical masculinities have approached the topic. Second, I will discuss prominent theoretical frameworks that have been applied to masculinity within the field of sociology, highlighting their theoretical merits and shortcomings. Third, I will examine specific challenges encountered when applying sociological gender theories onto a historical study. And, finally, I will suggest that the most useful approach to the study of depictions of Classical Spartan masculinity (and indeed the approach I will employ in this project) is to undertake an analysis of texts informed by ideas taken from constructionist theories of gender.

Regarding my decision to employ of a sociological approach in my project: I recognise that significant contributions have been made in masculinity research in many other fields such as psychology and anthropology as well.[5] However, as the methods employed by such fields rely heavily on accounts of personal

[5] E.g. Jacobson, Michaelson and Aaland 1976, Gutmann 1997, Lancaster 2002, Diamond 2006, Moss 2006.

experience from psychoanalysis or survey research, I feel that such approaches do not lend themselves to a historical study whose primary sources are literary works of historical, philosophical, and biographical genres. This is especially the case when one considers the fact that the majority of materials extant concerning Spartan society represent, almost exclusively, the views of the educated, non-Spartan aristocracy, and thus cannot provide the range of viewpoints that psychological and anthropological studies often seek to reveal.

Background: Historical Studies of Masculinity

When approaching the question of how to best examine constructions of masculinity in antiquity, it is useful to review the ways in which other historical studies of gender and masculinity have approached their explorations, in terms of both structure and theme. Structurally, the majority of studies tend toward being either extremely broad or extremely specific. In the case of the former, the projects' scope can somewhat obstruct critical analysis of source material. The result is that such works often read primarily as descriptive accounts, wherein source material is taken more-or-less at face value and sources are presented as unproblematic representations of societal norms.

Many such studies tend to take a broad brush to both issues of chronology and geography, taking sources from particular geographic and temporal contexts and presenting them as representative of "the Greeks", "the Romans", or "antiquity" at large. In so doing, they largely overlook analysis of the reasons why particular forms of gender expression were culturally exalted in certain

times and places, as well as how and why gender ideals may have changed over time.

For example, McDonnell's work on ideas of Roman manhood is impressive both in its scope and range of source material, as it explores Roman manhood depicted by a variety of textual and material sources, from a range of perspectives, throughout a significant period of time.[6] To its credit, this work does make efforts to place sources into generic contexts, as well as track temporal changes in Roman understanding of manhood. But due to its scope, the contextualisation of sources is limited, and investigation of changing ideals is often relegated to a single case study.[7]

Another example is Dover's *Greek Homosexuality* – which is still influential in informing understandings of the ideology of "Greek" same-sexual relations,[8] in spite of the fact that it presents primarily an analysis of Athenian ideology, with only brief attention given to non-Athenian mores. And while this book is not specifically a study of gender it is nevertheless relevant, as sexual behaviour features prominently in most scholarly work on masculinity in antiquity.

Finally, Rhubarth's *Competing Constructions of Masculinity in Ancient Greece* employs an approach informed by ancient women's studies to argue that

[6] McDonnell 2006.
[7] See especially chapters 7 and 8.
[8] Dover 1978. However, Dover's ideas have been challenged. See e.g. Davidson 1998; 2001; 2007.

ancient Greek masculinity was not a uniform construction.[9] He argues that the "Athenian civic model", the "Spartan martial model", and the "Stoic philosophical model" each constructed masculinity in unique ways; and explores these constructions as they relate to the spheres of courage, patriarchy, political participation, and sexuality. However, while Rhubarth seeks to dispel the notion that Ancient Greek masculinity was a singular construction, he nevertheless treats the three constructions he employs as case studies as monoliths in and of themselves, thus overlooking many of the many nuances and complexities involved in the formation of Athenian, Spartan and Stoic masculine identities.

On the other end of the spectrum, studies of gender that take on a specialised focus tend to provide more detailed analysis and historical contextualisation of their source material. These studies focus closely on the texts, seeking to establish how the gendered subject is constituted by the material, and how images of masculinity or femininity presented by sources relate to the wider historical situation. However, such studies are not without their own vulnerabilities. Due to their focused nature, they often present – at most – a partial picture of culturally constituted gender expression at a given time. Despite this, some of these studies tend to give the impression that their specific area of focus, be it a particular gender archetype or a particular genre (or sometimes even author), has a universal application. While these examinations contextualise their studies within their historical settings, they do not always to make an equivalent effort to situate their sources within the

[9] Rhubarth 2014.

history of ideas, or to examine the ways in which the representations of gender presented by the genres they are exploring interrelate with complementary or competing images put forth by other genres within the same cultural milieu. The result of this is that the representation of gender promoted by a particular branch of thought is presented as representing the whole of thought for a given society, and thus given a cultural significance which is perhaps unwarranted.

For example, there have been a number of studies on the ways in which the male subject was created within New Comedy and several scholars have considered this genre to be greatly beneficial towards illuminating the social history of Athens in the fourth century BCE.[10] Heap suggests that, as ancient historians were primarily concerned with the roles of men in the political and economic spheres, social comedies – primarily concerned with the *oikos* – provide a valuable piece in the puzzle of what it meant to be a man within the context of Athenian society.[11] New Comedy has been deemed illuminative of the inequality and relations between sexes, as well as qualifications for manhood at various stages throughout the lifespan.[12] Scholars of New Comedy have provided detailed treatments of masculine ideals found within this genre. However, their examinations of Athenian masculinity do not tend to compare the image of masculinity in New Comedy with different images, such as those presented by historians. The picture of Athenian masculinity created by New Comedy is further limited by the fact that the plays of Menander are often the sole focus of these explorations.[13]

---

[10] Heap 1998; Pierce 1998; Sommerstein 1998.
[11] Heap 1998, 115-6.
[12] Pierce 1998, 130.
[13] Heap 1998, 121; Pierce 1998, 130.

The issues that can arise with extremely close studies are not restricted to explorations of New Comedy. For instance, Graziosi and Haubold's *Homeric Masculinity: ΝΟΡΕΗ and ΑΓΗΝΟΡΙΗ* [14] provides a detailed exploration of language associated with manhood, as it was understood relationally between men in Homer. But their focus is extremely narrow – primarily centred on the usage of two terms within the Homeric works. Likewise, Gleason's *Making Men*, which adeptly explores the self-presentation associated with Roman manhood,[15] is restricted to the ideology of the Second Sophistic, and primarily to two specific figures within that movement. Rademaker's analysis of manhood in Aristophanes[16] is an exception to many close studies' tendency to give exclusive treatment to a single author or genre, as it compares the ideology of manhood presented by Aristophanic comedy with law-speeches in order to assess the veracity of these ideas. However, this generic comparison is still quite limited in scope.

Structurally, material in examinations of gender in antiquity is often arranged thematically. In the discussion of themes, it is relevant to highlight the diversity of approaches taken by examinations of masculinity in Classical Athens, a topic that has received considerable attention in recent years. A few key areas have been highlighted. Scholars have argued that one of the fundamental ways in which masculinity was developed in antiquity was by defining it in terms of the opposition of men and women.[17] This can be seen in

[14] Graziosi and Haubold 2003.
[15] Gleason 2005.
[16] Rademaker 2003, 115-25
[17] Carson 1990, 137; Harries 1998, 185.

the structure of male-female relations manifest within Athenian society. Areas of interest have included: the ideological and physical separation between the spheres of males and females, the need for males to play dominating sexual roles and father male offspring to avoid being viewed as effeminate, and the need for men to publicly display manliness through feats and competition.[18]

Another theme – and perhaps the one most discussed in investigations of masculinity in Athens (and indeed in antiquity more broadly) – is sexual experience. Several researchers have argued that sexual behaviour comprised a significant component of public life[19] – itself seen as a gendered arena in which performance of manhood had political and social implications.[20]

Discourse employed when talking about men and manhood constitutes another significant theme in several explorations of Athenian masculinity. For instance, the concept of σωφροσύνη or self-control has been thought by some to be the central feature of manhood in Classical Athens.[21] One particularly good example of exploration of discourse is Roisman's *The Rhetoric of Manhood*, which deals mainly with ideas of discourse and performativity in its discussion of how orators could employ discourse to shape and reshape the ideals of masculine courage to accord with their purposes.[22]

---

[18] Winkler 1990, 178-82; Gleason 1995 77-81; Fisher 1998, 69-70; Roisman 2005, 67.
[19] Dover 1978; 68, 83, 103-4; Foucault 1985, 83-5, 207-9, 218-20; Halperin 1990a, 5, 11; 1990b, 23-5, 29-33, 36; 1990d 93-4; Hubbard 1998, 49-67; Winkler 1998, 174, 177, 182, 203; Roisman 2005, 85-90. However, scholars debate the particular significance of various forms of sexual expression. Additionally, Davidson 2001 and 2007, Cohen 2003 and Halperin 2003, discuss at length the relationship of sexual behaviour and understandings of gender in Greek antiquity as well.
[20] Winkler 1998, 177.
[21] Foucault 1985, 21, 30-1; Carson 1990, 138, 142; Fox 1998, 13-5; Harries 1998, 186; Van Wees 1998, 16-18; Roisman 2005, 76-9, 163-85.
[22] Roisman 2003.

Institutions are another area highlighted by some scholars. Examples include the importance placed on the *gymnasia* and *symposia* (with their emphasis on the performative aspects of gender which required men to prove and re-prove their status through adherence to societally approved standards of masculinity), rites of initiation such as enrolment into the phratries, and competitions designed to display manly excellence, especially the *euandreia* competition at the *Panathenaea*.[23] Finally, institutional democracy, and democratic ideology is prominent in a number of discussions of concepts of Classical Athenian masculinity.[24]

Moving beyond Classical Athens to look at studies of historical masculinity more broadly, themes chosen by scholars also vary greatly in these works. To list a few examples of themes that have featured prominently in explorations of historical masculinities: Carrigan, Connell and Lee (1985) identify relations between men and women or other men, gender's institutional nature, and the significance of sexuality as key themes when approaching examinations of masculinity.[25] Scott (1986) focuses on the idea that gender has been used to discuss the relations between the sexes and sexuality, and provides a definition of gender comprising symbolic representation, binary opposition of masculine and feminine, social institutions and organisations, and subjective identity. He views gender as characterised by its primacy in signifying power relations.[26]

---

[23] Cartledge 1998, 61; Fisher 1998, 69-71. Additionally, the exploration of how relational ideals of masculinity between men factored into Athenian economics and labour, undertaken by Cohen 2003, is related to the idea of institutions.
[24] Loraux 1993, 11, 19, 50-51; Cartledge 1998, 54-5; Lape 2001, 98-9, 108; Balot 2001; 2005; Roisman 2005 106-13, 131-5.
[25] Carrigan, Connell and Lee 1985, 50-5.
[26] Scott 1986, 1056, 1067-8.

West and Zimmerman (1987) examine performative constructions of gender. Kimmel (1994) is concerned with male homosociality and the performance of masculine ideals. Tosh (1994) discusses the relational nature of masculinity and ideas of hegemonic masculinity. Richlin (2003) discusses performativity and self-representation in Roman declamation, discussing how gendered identities (masculine/feminine) come into being relationally between men in spheres of life devoid of actual women. Masterson (2005) touches on ideas of discourse, representation and performativity, and relations between men in Flavian Rome. Baron (2006) focuses on the bodily discourse and performative/representative aspects of working-class masculinity, as well as the contribution of homosociality and power relations between men to the construction of workers' masculinity.[27] And Holmes (2012) discusses the areas of masculine-feminine opposition, gendered relations between males, gendered practices (which can be seen as denoting ideas of performativity), sexual expression, and appearance and physical representation in an exploration of gender in antiquity.

Despite considerable variation in approach to their topics, many of the abovementioned studies display a certain degree of thematic overlap in their treatment of subject material. However, individual explorations often to give particular focus to only some of these themes, suggesting that they present a partial picture of gender constructions. The great diversity in approaches scholars have taken in their analyses of gender, as well as the pervasive nature of gender in culture, suggests the need for solid methodological frameworks to

[27] Baron 2006, esp. 144-9.

employ in examinations of source material, if the enquiry is to avoid accusations of arbitrariness.[28] The question then becomes: what is the best way to structure an examination of a particular construction of masculinity (i.e. Classical Spartan masculinity) in antiquity? In response to that question I turned my attention to modern theories concerning the construction of gender.

Methodological Background:

Taking a broad view of the theories concerning the formulation of gender, the two most distinct – and oppositional – perspectives are those of essentialists and of constructionists.[29] The core of essentialism lies in the belief that gender arises from a fundamental essence – usually believed to proceed from biological sex – and that, therefore, there exists significant and innate discrepancy of experience between the two biological sexes. Conversely, adherents of constructionist theories believe that gender has no inherent essence, but rather that it is constructed through societal structures and discourse, often with political aims.

Modern essentialist theories of gender can trace their origins to developments in the Western world which began in the 16th century, and came to prominence in nineteenth-century ideology.[30] This generated significant interest in the idea of sex-difference, spawning, in turn, much research – especially within the

[28] See Harvey; Shepherd 2005, 275 for discussion of the vastly disparate and often incommensurable areas of enquiry that have arisen as a result of the differing approaches scholars have taken to the historical study of masculinity. See also Alberti 2002, 123-4 for discussion of the relatively recent phenomenon of historical study of men in terms of gender-relations.
[29] Higate 2003, 28; Howson 2006, 55.
[30] Connell 2002, 246-9, 252-3.

field of psychology – which continues into present times.[31] Beginning with Freud, the idea that "anatomy is destiny"[32] was espoused by proponents of the belief that innate disparity between the sexes accounts for not only biological differences, but also social differences in men and women's roles.[33] While Freud's theories of gender formation involved complex and lengthy processes,[34] his successors (such as Jung) assumed masculinity and femininity to be core essences natural to human beings; it is from this line of thinking that essentialist theory stems.[35]

Within essentialist views, role theory attempts to explain how the creation of different social roles for men and women arises as a result of their different natures, and asserts that roles which society places upon men and women are outward expressions of intrinsic natures.[36] Essentialists view adherence to traditional sex roles as being both advantageous and natural, because such adherants acts in congruence with the natural biological essence of men and women.[37] In accordance with the biological focus of its ideas, essentialist theory often employs sociobiological methodology in its arguments. Sociobiology is the systematic study of the biological/evolutionary basis of social behaviour,[38] and is widely employed in discussions of role theory in an attempt to demonstrate a biological and evolutionary basis for separate social spheres of activity, divided along the line of biological sex.[39] The

[31] Connell 2005, 21; Howson 2006, 56.
[32] Adams and Savran 2002, 338.
[33] Jackson 1991, 201.
[34] Connell 2005, 7-11.
[35] Reeser 2009, 22.
[36] Clatterbaugh 1990, 100-2; Connell 2005, 22; Hausman 2011, 35.
[37]Clatterbaugh 1990, 100-18; Howson 2006, 56; Atkinson 2011, 5.
[38] Clatterbaugh 1990, 102; Howson 2006, 58.
[39]Clatterbaugh 1990, 102; Howson 2006, 56; Atkinson 2011, 5.

sociobiological school of thought asserts that masculinity is a force natural to men's bodies which has arisen from evolutionary forces.[40]

Essentialist applications of sociobiology and role theory have historically been used to advocate the separation of social roles along gendered lines, defend the structures of hegemonic masculinity and the traditional family, and oppose recent feminist movements.[41] Essentialist views were particularly popular during the nineteenth century. Not only did essentialist ideas of separate male and female spheres of action fit with bourgeois capitalist ideology, they were also agreeable to feminists of that period. This new idea of the female as a separate, rather than an inferior, category of human aided the women's emancipation movement.[42] The ideological separation of spheres of action also enabled women to have a greater degree of freedom and authority within those spheres considered to be feminine.[43] However, in recent years, essentialist ideas – particularly those within the frameworks of sociobiology and role theory – have met with considerable criticism, and have fallen from popularity within academia.

Firstly, doubt has been thrown on their scientific claims. Although considerable research has been conducted in the area of sex-difference, some argue that the actual psychological disparity between the sexes is so slight as to render it non-existent, were we not culturally cued to exaggerate the

[40] Connell 2005, 46; Howson 2006, 56; Reeser 2009, 33.
[41] Clatterbaugh 1990, 100-19; Jackson 1991, 201; Atkinson 2011, 5; Jackson and Balaji 2011, 20.
[42] Connell 2005, 21.
[43] Connell 2002, 252; 2005, 68.

significance of sex-difference.[44] Role theory is therefore understood to distort the view of social realities by exaggerating the biological difference between males and females, thereby justifying a level of social disparity between the sexes which the empirical data does not support.[45]

A second criticism is that essentialism's common-sense appeal is also illusionary. While descriptions of natural masculinity or femininity may resonate with certain individuals' experiences of being a man or woman, it does not do so with all individuals: i.e. role theory does not account for the difference between what is expected of people and what they actually do – the result being that any deviation from normative performance of biological sex is counted simply as a failure in socialisation.[46] Critics of essentialism suggest that perception of one's masculinity or femininity as an essential trait is perhaps not the result of natural inclination, but rather of cultural conditioning.[47] Thus, masculinity only seems natural because the cultural processes by which it is constructed work in such a way as to make it appear natural, eternal, and unchanging.[48] Moreover, they assert that, when essentialist views are subjected to scrutiny, it becomes apparent that there is no "true" or "essential" masculinity because the "essences" chosen by advocates of essentialism are arbitrary and differ from scholar to scholar.[49] There are also situations in which ideas of an ingrained and unchanging masculinity fall apart. This occurs when masculinity is viewed in the context of different cultures

[44] Connell 2005, 21.
[45] Connell 2005, 21, 26.
[46] Carrigan, Connell and Lee 1985, 39.
[47] Tolson 1977, 121-9; Reeser 2009 51-2.
[48] Reeser 2009 51-2.
[49] Connell 2005, 69; Reeser 2009, 2, 75.

(and time periods) whose social organisation differs from that of modern Western societies,[50] or when one observes that changes occur in the presentation of masculinity throughout the lifespan.[51]

Thirdly, arguments have been made asserting that essentialist frameworks are logically vague, oversimplified, and rely on a superficial analysis of human personality without leaving room for social structure;[52] that they exaggerate biological sex-difference while ignoring other contributing factors such as race, class and sexuality;[53] that they are historically static; and they are ultimately conceptually, practically, and empirically inadequate because the "male sex role" does not exist."[54] So while some still adhere to essentialist beliefs concerning gender, prevalent approaches to the subject have shifted towards constructionist frameworks.[55]

Constructionism, like essentialism, can also trace its ideas back to Freud.[56] But while essentialist ideology presents the development of normative internalised gender roles (and heterosexuality) from biological gender as a natural unproblematic process,[57] constructionists view the construction of normative heterosexual masculinity (and by extension femininity) as socially and culturally instituted over the entire course of a life.[58] Constructionist theories began to truly take root out of the feminist movements in the 1960s through

[50] Reis and Grossmark 2009, 1-2.
[51] Ellis 2011, 264.
[52] Connell 1993, 124; Connell 2005, 26.
[53] Connell 2005, 26.
[54] Carrigan, Connell and Lee 1985, 40-1.
[55] Hausman 2011, 135; Pleck 1995, 37.
[56] Anderson 2009, 35.
[57] Connell 2005, 10-1.
[58] Tolson 1977, 129.

1980s,[59] beginning with the rejection of role theory.[60] Two constructionist views which came to be especially prominent from this time onwards are those of social constructionism and post-structuralism.

Constructionist theories reject the idea that masculinity is a naturally occurring emanation from biological essence. Instead, they see masculinity as a cultural construction fashioned outside the body.[61] It is seen as a configuration of social practice contributing to the structure of power within a given culture at a particular moment in time.[62] Social constructionists view masculinities as relational above all else, as they believe that masculinity cannot exist except in relation,[63] both between men and women as well as between men.[64]

However, gender relations are not seen as the only factor in the construction of masculinity. Masculinity is viewed as one of a number of subjectivities which intersect both in individual lives and in the fabric of society. Therefore, constructionists argue that gender must be examined in relation to a number of other subjectivities including race, class, sexuality and age.[65] Since masculinity is taken to be part of societal ideology, social constructionist theories shift focus from the individual to the societal, and from experience to representations; the result is that masculinity is viewed as a cultural project.[66]

---

[59] Catano and Novak 2011, 2-5.
[60] Connell 2005, 23.
[61] Howson 2006, 56.
[62]Jackson 1991, 210; Howson 2006, 57; Reeser 2009, 12, 51-2; Alexander 2011, 55-6; Jackson and Balaji, 2011, 17.
[63] Roper and Tosh 1991, 90; Connell 1993, 126; Adams and Savran 2002, 155; Connell 2005, 29, 35, 43-4, 67-8; Reeser 2009, 12; Reis and Grossmark 2009, 1-2; Arnold and Brady 2011, 3-4; Tosh 2011, 22-3.
[64] Howson 2006, 57; Alexander 2011, 55-6; Arnold and Brady 2011, 3-4.
[65] Adams and Savran 2002, 155; Reeser 2009, 12; Arnold Brady 2011, 3-4; Tosh 2011, 22-3.
[66] Arnold and Brady 2011, 3-4; Tosh, 22-3.

As a relational construct, masculinity is seen as primarily constructed through interaction, having three prominent sites of interactional construction: discourse, representation, and institutions. The contribution of discourse to imbuing constructions of masculinity with meaning will be discussed below – as it is a point that social constructionism shares with post-structuralism (though the significance of language in the construction of masculinity, in fact, factors more heavily in post-structuralist theory). Social constructionists believe that societies create representations of idealised masculinity which comprise visible traits. These representations are culturally exalted and intentionally propagated through any number of channels, from politics to mass media. Thus, not only individuals, but corporations, institutions, and even nations can be seen as taking on particular representations of masculinity.[67] Culturally approved forms of masculinity are thus seen to be institutionalised, and institutions are viewed as the primary site of gender construction (wherein idealised expressions of masculinity are developed and then disseminated, by means of discourse and representation). Institutions which social constructionists highlight as being key to the construction of masculinity include the traditional family, school, athletics, the state, and the military.[68]

Further, social constructionist theories do not view culturally promoted masculinity as an arbitrary construction, rather they view it as "hegemonic masculinity"; a form deliberately framed and propagated by power regimes to

[67] Reeser 2009, 180; Alexander 2011, 52-5; Atkinson 2011, 158-9.
[68] Tolson 1977, 121-9; Morgan 1994, 445-8; May 1998, 117-8; Connell 2005, 73; Anderson 2009, 54, 56-7.

produce a dominant gender hierarchy within society.[69] To bring this about, a hegemonic archetype of masculinity is created and culturally exalted as the ideal.[70] Hegemonic masculinities are then placed in relation and contrast to complementary femininities.[71] The idealised, or hegemonic, type of masculinity is not the only masculinity thought to exist within a culture. Nor is it a universal archetype. Hegemonic masculinity is both historically and culturally rooted. As it is merely the form of masculine expression that occupies the hegemonic position in the gender-relations of a given culture, at a particular moment in time, the hegemonic ideal is always subject to change, as well as challenge from other masculine forms.[72] It has also been noted that hegemonic masculinity is usually not even the most prevalent form of masculinity within a society, but that it is merely an exemplar in relation to which other forms position themselves.[73] This stratification occurs on all levels, involving cultural persuasion on the part of mass media, the division of labour, and enforcement by the state.[74]

While the primary purpose of hegemonic masculinity is seen to be the continuation of patriarchy (making women the main subjugated group),[75] the functioning of hegemonic masculinity is also reliant on the subordination of other forms of masculinity.[76] Understanding hegemonic relationships between

---

[69] Carrigan, Connell and Lee 1985, 51-3; Connell 2005, 77; Howson 2006, 60; Whitehead 2006, 10; Anderson 2009, 36; Reeser 2009, 22; Atkinson 2011, 29.
[70] Atkinson 2011, 32.
[71] Jackson 1991, 201-2; Anderson 2009, 34-6.
[72] Anderson 2009, 30-2.
[73] Carrigan, Connell & Lee 1985, 51; Connell 1993, 133; Connell 2005, 77.
[74] Carrigan, Connell & Lee 1985, 53; Connell 2005, 72.
[75] Adams and Savran 2002, 2; Bickrell 2006, 97-8; Anderson 2009, 34-5.
[76] Carrigan, Connell & Lee 1985, 51; Roper and Tosh 1991, 90; Connell 2005, 78; Howson 2006, 60-1, 63-4.

men is seen as important to understanding not only the diversity of masculine expression, but also the relations between them: the ability to impose definitions on other masculinities is what defines hegemony in gender.[77] Privilege is gained by occupying favourable positions on the hegemonic ladder, accomplished by emulation of the idealised forms and active marginalisation of subordinate masculine forms.[78] Therefore, the dominant forms of masculinity do not seek the annihilation of subaltern masculinities, as their subordination is one of the main sources of hegemonic power.[79]

Perhaps the largest identity group responsible for supporting hegemonic masculinity is those who possess "complicit" masculinities. These are men who are exhibit many traits of hegemonic masculinity but fall short of the idealised form.[80] The majority of men in Western society are seen as falling under this heading. By acting out the culturally approved masculine behaviours, they are seen as possessing "orthodox masculinity". However, since the hegemonic masculine ideal also demands that one possess a number of characteristics, such as race, class and physical appearance, that one often cannot assume but must be born into, most men never embody full hegemonic masculinity.[81] These men emulate the hegemonic form and benefit from positioning themselves in relation to it, thus becoming complicit in their presentation.[82] Constructionists argue that it is the acceptance of hegemony by complicit masculinities which allows the hegemonic form to maintain an

[77] Carrigan, Connell & Lee 1985, 51; Connell 2005, 37.
[78] Anderson 2009, 32, 42; Atkinson 2011, 46-7.
[79] Howson 2006, 63-4.
[80] Connell 2005, 79; Howson 2006, 65; Atkinson 2011, 33.
[81] Anderson 2009, 41-3.
[82] Connell 2005, 79; Howson 2006, 65; Atkinson 2011, 33.

association with the majority of men, thus legitimising the continuation of the hegemonic gender order.[83]

Post-structuralism shares many ideas with social constructionism, so much so that they have, at times, been taken to be virtually synonymous.[84] However, post-structuralist frameworks go one step further in the abstraction of gender, by viewing discourse and representations, rather than institutions, as most significant to gender construction. For instance, Reeser, who employs a humanities-based methodology focused around post-structuralist theory, makes "language and signs" the focus of his analysis of masculinity.[85] He asserts that one cannot view institutions as the primary creator of masculinity because masculinity also helps to create institutions. Moreover, he argues that ideology cannot be taken as simply the tool of institutions, because ideologies can take on lives of their own; therefore, institutionally-created ideas concerning masculinity can move beyond the framework of institutions – even in unintended ways. Instead, Reeser encourages the view of masculinity as an ideology aligned with structures of power – and in which various institutions have a vested interest – but which cannot be said to be created by any single group. Viewed in this way, ideologies of masculinity are seen to be created and propagated in a number of ways, such as through images, myths, discourse, and practices.[86]

[83] Howson 2006, 65.
[84] Bickrell 2006, 89.
[85] Reeser 2009, 9.
[86] Reeser 2009, 9-10, 20-31.

The idea of "performativity" is also prominent in post-structuralist theory, as a method by which masculinity is constructed. Following the ideas of Judith Butler,[87] post-structuralists argue that since masculinity has no essence, it is accomplished through performance. Men daily perform their masculinity, choosing from a body of masculine behaviours which are made available to them relationally through discourse and prior performances.[88] The influences of discourse, representations, and performativity are considered to be so crucial to the construction of gender that post-structuralist theory argues that they can even be seen to create biological sex. In this framework, the body is seen as a *tabula rasa*, whose only significance is that which is culturally afforded to it.[89] Post-structuralists thus reject the notion that while gender is socially constructed, sex is a stable distinction of biological origin.[90] They argue that maleness is as performative as masculinity, and that physical traits associated with the male sex have no meaning except that which is imposed upon them by discourse.[91]

There are many advantages to constructionist approaches, whether social constructionist or post-structuralist. For example, they are useful frameworks to employ when analysing the ways in which a culture forms its ideal gender archetypes. Further, constructionist frameworks are preferable to essentialist frameworks in the examination of inconsistencies in performances of gender, as the existence of diverse expressions of masculinity in different cultures and

---

[87] Adams and Savran 2002, 4; Higate 2003, 28; Bickrell 2006, 93; Reeser 2009, 81-3.
[88] Adams and Savran 2002, 4; Whitehead 2002, 67; Higate 2003, 28; Bickrell 2006, 93; Reeser 2009, 81-6; Alexander 2011, 52.
[89] Butler 1999, 9-13; Connell 2005, 51; Reeser 2009, 91.
[90] Bickrell 2006, 93; Reeser 2009, 72-5, 78, 85-6, 91, 93-4.
[91] Reeser 2009, 72-5, 78, 85-6, 91, 93-4.

time periods is poorly explained by the idea of a core essence of gender. Constructionism also provides a method for understanding and explaining the mechanisms of stratification and subordination, characteristic of gender relations, which cannot be accounted for by biology.

Despite the current dominance of constructionist frameworks in academic theories of masculinity, they too have met with a number of criticisms. It has been suggested that their heavy reliance on representation may not express the realities of lived experience.[92] Other criticisms include: that constructionist theory does not place enough emphasis on the individual, does not take psychoanalytical approaches to gender into consideration,[93] and views masculinity as voluntary – inasmuch as the subject chooses their behaviours from available options.[94] Some think that constructionism goes too far in rejecting biological influence.[95] Finally, perhaps the harshest criticism is that, because of their view that nothing has any inherent meaning, constructionist theories have become divorced from any sense of reality (a view particularly directed at post-structuralists, even by adherents of social constructionism).[96]

In addition to the abovementioned weaknesses of constructionist frameworks, there are additional challenges when attempting to apply such frameworks to historical study. Modern theoretical frameworks present themselves as existing in the realm of pure ideas. However, they are rooted both historically and

[92] Arnold and Brady 2011, 4-5.
[93] Higate 2003, 28.
[94] Connell 2005, xix.
[95] Higate 2003, 28; Reeser 2009, 78; Hausman 2011, 135.
[96] Connell 1993, 65, 124-5; Anderson 2009, 33.

culturally within Western intellectual thought and society. European presentations of an "ideal type" of man and woman came to be employed in the processes of colonialism.[97] Scholars have noted that modern masculinity studies have grown out of this tradition, which has resulted in an ethnocentric Western masculinity being *the* masculinity which has informed theoretical frameworks – even though it only reflects a recent form, practised by a small segment of the world's population, in a single cultural milieu.[98] This privileging of modern Western masculinity in theoretical frameworks of gender construction creates difficulties when one attempts to study the construction of gender within the context of a different culture or historical period.

One common issue stems from the fact that the construction of gender is fundamentally relative to the cultures and time periods in which it occurs, and as such understandings of gender in different cultures and time periods will often differ considerably from our own.[99] While this may seem obvious, many gender theorists still impose modern Euro-American models of gender on cultures and time periods for which they are ill-fitting,[100] dismissing any masculinities which do not correspond with these models rather than examining them within their own historical and cultural contexts.[101] Therefore, studies of historical masculinities must be careful to attempt to define

---

[97] Connell 2005, 68; Jackson and Balaji, 2011, 18-9, 22-3. This "globalisation' of Western ideals of masculinity has served to strengthen the mistaken view that the type of masculinity studied in contemporary Western societies is a sort of universal, trans-historical masculinity.
[98] Connell 1993, 125; Connell 2005, 68; Jackson and Balaji 2011, 21-3.
[99]Jackson 1991, 201; Connell 2002, 245; Connell 2005, 81; Reeser 2009, 2, 75, 194, 217-8; Berg 2011, 97; Fletcher 2011, 59; Hubbard 2011, 189; Jackson and Balaji, 2011, 53.
[100] Connell 1993, 127-8; Fletcher 2011, 61; Hubbard 2011, 189.
[101] Jackson and Balaji 2011, 17.

constructions of masculinity within the specific historical and cultural context concerned.[102]

Another difficulty arises from the fact that modern gender models are also developed within the context of particular fields and political movements. Thus, theoretical frameworks reflect the preoccupations of the fields from which they originated.[103] Constructionist theories, in particular, are often politically-charged, as they stem from second-wave feminist and gay liberation movements.[104] With this awareness, the historian must be careful to avoid taking on the political agendas associated with many of the general models along with the models themselves. Additionally, scholars must take care to avoid insensitivity towards how the experience of being male was perceived in the past. Modern western conceptions of masculinity did not exist before the eighteenth century, yet historians often treat masculinity and historical concepts like "manhood" as though they were synonymous.[105] Scholars of medieval and early modern periods argue that this displays a gross insensitivity, as concepts referred to in sources – such as manhood and manliness – are complex constructions, distinct from contemporary understandings of masculinity. In treating these categories as though they were equivalent to modern conceptions of masculinity, scholars are guilty of overlooking how these ideas were historically constructed.[106]

---

[102] Jackson and Balaji 2011, 17, 22-4.
[103] Connell 2005, 6; Bickrell 2006, 87.
[104] Connell 2005, 6, 39; Ellis 2011, 263; Tosh 2011, 17.
[105] Fletcher 2011, 60-1; Jeleniewski Seidler 2011, 436.
[106] Ellis 2011, 264-5; Jeleniewski Seidler 2011, 436.

Similarly, sites of gender construction perceived as important to modern masculinities do not necessarily hold the same significance in historical masculine identities. For instance, many scholars assert that modern gender models over-privilege the dichotomy between male and female.[107] This has arisen partially from Marxist and feminist concerns with hegemony, and patriarchy's perceived oppression of one part of humanity by the other,[108] as well as from a conceptual shift whereby modern society has come to give binary oppositions primacy over graduated distinctions such as age and class which held greater sway in the past. Similarly, masculinity theories have also placed substantial emphasis on issues of sexuality.[109] The idea that sexuality had a relation to masculinity began when Jung and his followers took Freud's discussion of the complicated and fragile process of attaining adult heterosexuality, and re-presented it as a natural and simple process emerging from one's biological sex.[110] Therefore, while sexuality may be an important factor in modern constructions of masculinity, scholars should not assume that it had the same weight or implications for historical constructions.[111] In view of such examples, it is important that when scholars of historical masculinity employ sites of gender construction emphasised in modern theories of gender in their analyses, they avoid imposing false or exaggerated ideological significance on the sources' depictions of those areas.

---

[107] Reis and Grossmark 2009, 2; Ellis 2011, 264-6; Jeleniewski Seidler 2011, 436. Ellis makes the poignant remark that, even when distinctions of race or sexuality are taken into account, they are often described in gendered terms, "using the language of effeminacy or femininity".
[108] Ellis 2011, 265; Hubbard 2011, 189.
[109] Carrigan, Connell and Lee 1985, 49; Adams and Savran 2002, 9; Petersen 2003, 55; Connell 2005, 78; Bickrell 2006, 100; Anderson 2009, 39, 67; Jackson and Balaji 2011, 19, 23.
[110] Connell 2005, 8-11; Reeser 2009, 73.
[111] Halperin 1990a 7-9; 1990b, 15-16, 38, 40; Fox 1998, 10-11; Bickrell 2006, 91.

Another issue with constructionist approaches is their tendency towards over-estimating the extent to which the "history of ideas", expressed in philosophical or moralising works, reflects the reality of social norms. The gap between representation and lived experience is important to consider, as the "real" is often precisely what cannot be symbolised by discourse.[112] Halperin notes that if manly conduct described in philosophical works can be seen as the society's ideal mode of behaviour in any given situation, it would be dangerous to assume that societal norms always lived up such ideals.[113] Moreover, several scholars note that philosophical works are often not expressive of the norms of the society from which they originate. Rather, they represent the ideas of a small intellectual elite, whose work was often antipathetic towards the ideology of their culture and was often disregarded – or explicitly derided – by society at large.[114] Furthermore, scholars examining constructions of masculinity in antiquity face the same issues as those examining non-Western constructions but on a greater scale, since the period is so distant. Not only are cultural and social aspects of the period less understood, the further back in history one goes, incomplete source material often creates additional difficulties in interpretation.[115] The dependence of historians on written materials and archival records also presents a challenge since it makes it difficult, if not impossible, to examine those aspects of society which are unspoken or have been suppressed.[116]

---

[112] Fox 1998, 7-9, 12, 16-9.
[113] Halperin 1990c, 58-9 contends that some works stress ideals precisely because contemporary society was viewed by the authors as falling short in their adherence to them.
[114] Winkler 1990, 172-4; Fox 1998, 11-2.
[115] Berg 2011, 97.
[116] Jeleniewski Seidler 2011, 437-8.

Methodological Framework of this Project

In spite of these issues (which are inescapable when one deals with any sort of theoretical framework), there are many reasons for considering constructionist frameworks to be well-suited to the exploration of depictions of Classical Spartan masculinity. To begin, constructionism's move away from looking at individual lives to examining societally instituted stereotypes and norms is advantageous. Much of the primary source material concerning Sparta is of a philosophical or moralising nature and focuses on Sparta's societal structure,[117] presenting readers not so much with information of an experiential nature, as the presentation of normative ideals. Therefore, constructionism's favouring of representation over experience is compatible with the source-material available.

The stress constructionist theories place upon the importance of literary analysis is also appealing.[118] Since authors' chief concerns were not discussions of masculinity (and indeed, the authors would not have even held modern conceptions of masculinity), this emphasis lends itself to a level of textual analysis which may prove beneficial in delving deeper into the ideological images presented by authors in cases where masculine ideology is implicit rather than apparent.

Finally, perhaps the best reason to employ a constructionist framework to a historical examination is that such an application has been employed

[117] Philosophical discussion of Spartan society can be seen in works such as Xenophon's *Lacedaemoniorum Politeia*, Plato's *Republic* and *Laws*, and Aristotle's *Politics*. The later biographies of Spartans written by Plutarch are heavily moralising in tone.
[118] Reeser 2009, 10-1; Arnold and Brady 2011, 4-5.

effectively before. For example, Berg employed such frameworks from gender theory to his examination of masculinities in early Hellenistic Athens, and found that doing so allowed greater insights than one would discover from historical methods alone.[119]

After considering the benefits and limitations of sociological constructionist methodology in general, and approaches taken by other scholars' examinations of gender in antiquity, I determined that this project's subject of enquiry would be an exploration of representations of Spartan masculinity in Classical Athenian prose, employing methodology informed primarily by social constructionist theories of the construction of masculinity. Social constructionism situates its analysis primarily on the cultural level. It places stress on analysis of cultural institutions and norms. This is advantageous for my study, which seeks to examine authors' depictions of the cultural construction of Spartan masculinity. While post-structuralism shares many features, the post-structuralist emphasis on discourse as the primary site of gender construction, involves a further level of abstraction, which is less conducive to the examination authors' depictions of culturally constructed manhood. Therefore, while I will employ some ideas informed by post-structural approaches, the proceeding exploration will be informed mainly by social constructionist theories of gender.

To provide some limits for the scope of my study, I have restricted my examination to depictions of Spartan masculinity found in Classical Athenian

[119] Berg 2011, 97.

prose. Limiting my selection of authors to Classical Athenians, will allow me to explore similarities and differences in representations of Spartan masculinity presented by authors who share a common cultural context. And focusing on prose will allow me to compare different genres, which share common features and concerns. My project comprises analysis of works from three authors (Thucydides, Xenophon, and Plato) writing in two genres (history and philosophy). The methodological aspect of my exploration will be structured by focusing on a number of areas which constructionist frameworks highlight as being important sites for the cultural construction and maintenance of gender.[120] While employing these categories as signposts for gender ideology contains certain risks (as mentioned above), I believe that the categories I have chosen to explore as the primary sites for the construction of masculinity provide a reasonably sound basis for examining depictions of Spartan masculinity, since some or all of these areas factor into previous examinations of historical gender.[121] While not all scholars list these sites of gender construction as those categories which they intend to subject to analysis (nor, it must be said, do these themes necessarily appear in scholarly works using the same terminology through which I have chosen to express them), these are nevertheless themes which can be seen to repeatedly factor into examinations

[120] It is likely that each source examined will highlight some of these areas but not others, and therefore discussion will vary with the source and examine those areas which the source in question brought forth as significant.

[121] See pp. 3-12. It should be noted that these categories are far from the only themes which have been prominent in works on ancient masculinity, however they are themes that I found to have common utility for examinations of gender in antiquity. A particularly good testament to the applicability of my approach is that, in his lengthy treatment of Roman manhood, McDonnell 2006 touches on nearly every category which I will suggest as being important to the construction of masculinity. The book discusses ideas of discourse (chapters 1-3), visual representation (chapter 4, esp. pp.142-3), the relation/opposition of men and women (chapter 5, esp. pp. 161-5), relations between men and hegemonic masculinity (chapter 5, esp. pp. 159-61, 166-8), sexual behaviour (chapter 5, esp. pp. 165-6), and institutions such as the education systems and the military (chapter 6).

of gender construction. Therefore, I am reasonably convinced that – provided proper attention is maintained to avoid potential pitfalls – these categories should provide a relevant and comprehensive foundation for a search for depictions of masculinity.

The categories are as follows:

1) Men and women: This category comprises both authors' depictions of relational practice between men and women, and comparisons of men and women, as they relate to ideological and social norms. These are thought to be perhaps the most fundamental areas in which constructions of gender are formed. It will be important to look for Spartan ideology surrounding such notions as the opposition and separation of men and women, the similar or differing qualities possessed by the sexes, and the values placed on those qualities.

2) Attitudes towards sex: It is debatable whether or not scholars have overvalued the influence of sexual activity on historical perceptions of manhood.[122] However, the considerable attention that has been given to the subject with regards to masculinity in Athens, and the Greek world at large, means that it ought to be included in an examination of Spartan masculinity. Moreover, the fact that sources from antiquity often frame questions concerning *andreia* and *sophrosyne* within the context of discussion of sexual behaviours necessitates that questions of sexual experience occupy a place in this examination.

3) Institutions: Institutions will feature prominently in analysing depictions of

[122] See pp. 24-6.

Spartan masculinity, both because a great deal of attention was paid to Spartan institutions by the authors with which this study is concerned, and because constructionist frameworks cite institutions as one of three key sites of interactional gender construction.[123]

4) Discourse: The idea of the importance of discourse to gender construction has a place in social constructionist frameworks. This study will analyse features of the ideology of masculinity as they can be perceived from the words employed in discussions relating to manhood. Analysis of the words and concepts which occupied primacy in discourse surrounding masculinity in Sparta, as well as how the ideology of Spartan masculinity as a whole was used discursively, will prove illuminating both of the character of Spartan masculinity and of Athenian authors' appraisal of it.

5) Representation and performativity: The view of gender as a deliberate social construction, rather than an innate element of being, suggests that masculinity is not something which can be established once and then forgotten. Rather, constructionist views argue that gender is repeatedly affirmed and reaffirmed via the creation of a rhetoric of behaviour and appearance, which individuals must continually perform in the public arena. This paper will examine this rhetoric as it applies to representations of Spartan masculinity.

6) Relations between men and hegemonic masculinity: Discussions of power relations and hierarchical masculinity between groups of men has always played a prevalent role in the examination of masculinities. This is especially evident when one examines the masculinity of a culture at large. It will be useful to attempt to identify the culturally institutionalised archetypes of

[123] The other two sites are discourse and representation, which will also be examined.

idealised Spartan masculinity and to examine how these ideals factored into relations not only between men of Spartiate standing and "others" such as the various subordinate groups (*perioikoi*, helots, *hypomeiones*, *mothakes*, etc.), and non-Spartan allies, but also between Spartiates. This will encompass relations between adult members, as well as differing expressions and perceptions of masculinity discernible at various stages of the lifespan. As hegemony has been of special concern to social constructionist inquiries, any specific examples present in the sources of hegemonic masculine hierarchies operating within Spartan society will be emphasised, to explore how hegemonic mechanisms can be seen operating in the sources' depictions of events, and to what ideological or political ends they were put.

7) Competition: In constructionist theories, the category of masculine competition does not receive special mention in its own right and could be subsumed under either the category of relations between men or under representation and performativity. However, when dealing with Classical texts, I have found that masculine competition seems to be a highly specialised and important site for the construction of masculinity that does not fit neatly within analysis of general relations between men. To this end, I suggest that masculine competition should properly be viewed as a feature of masculinity in its own right, as a number of studies of both modern and historical masculinities have viewed it.[124]

[124] E.g. Kimmel 1994, 128-9; Bird 1996, 121; Masterson 2005, 289; McDonnell 2006, 166; Meuser 2007.

In terms of structure, each chapter will focus on a particular author within the context of his work in a particular genre. I will begin by discussing philosophical works in chapters 1 and 2, since authors' philosophical perspectives will have bearing on the interpretation of historical works, followed by historical works in chapters 3 and 4.[125] Within the genres, authors' works will be examined in chronological order. Chapter 1 will explore Xenophon's *Respublica Lacedaemoniorum*, read as a philosophical work. Chapter 2 will examine Plato's *Republic* and *Laws*. Chapter 3 will examine Thucydides' *History*. Finally, Chapter 4 will analyse Xenophon's historical works, primarily focusing on the *Hellenica*.

The above-mentioned categories will thus be addressed in the context of both author and genre. However, chapters will not be organised according to the categories, as to do so would restrict the possibility for analysing the intersections between categories. Instead, the manner of exploration will vary from chapter to chapter, given that each work highlights different aspects of masculine construction in different ways. Chapters concerning historical works will analyse representations of Spartan masculinity in a range of episodes in which they feature prominently. Chapters concerning philosophical works will comprise more thematic analysis. However, common to all chapters will be attention to the above-mentioned categories or sites of the construction of masculinity. These categories provide important reference points for consideration when exploring how Spartan masculinity is depicted within the

[125] This decision was made primarily for facilitating analysis of Xenophon's works, as he is the only author who will be examined under both genres in this study.

source material, as they will inform the selection of episodes or sections of the work for analysis, as well as serving as guide-posts to explore the construction and function of masculinity ideology within individual instances.

The primary aim of this project has shifted, from the time of its conceptualisation, to the analysis predominantly of authors' representations of Spartan masculinity (with reference to the seven categories of gender construction). That is, the ways in which authors depict Spartan masculinity being constructed and operating within the world of the texts themselves, rather than in historical actuality. Before being able to reliably approach questions of historical actuality regarding texts' depictions of Spartan masculinity, it is necessary to analyse comprehensively the depictions in their own right. This is the level of analysis with which this study is primarily concerned. It is my hope that, with further development, my approach to the examination of Spartan masculinity will be a useful starting-point for exploring questions both of historical actuality, and of how constructions of masculinity fit into authors' overall styles and aims more broadly. Indeed, the specifications of the present study were designed with a mind to provide a stepping-stone to doing just that. The focus on a particular historical and cultural standpoint (Classical Athenian prose writers) from which to analyse depictions of Spartan masculinity, while at the same time exploring depictions from a number of genres within that cultural standpoint, should form a good basis for future work on "authentic" Spartan masculinity. This survey structure can also aid literary analysis by facilitating a future examination of representations of Spartan masculinity within their larger intellectual and

cultural context. In addition, cross-genre assessment will help to maintain the understanding that the ideas presented concerning Spartan masculinity by any particular genre of writing were not presented in a void, but must be assessed in relation to other contemporary depictions.[126] This structure will reveal the various consistencies and discrepancies in the picture of Spartan masculinity provided by the literary culture of Classical Athens across genres (which, in turn, will be useful for future assessment of the accuracy of Classical Athenian depictions of Spartan masculinity overall). And while the scope of my project has narrowed, some of my initial broader aims remain reflected in my analysis. Exploration of sources' depictions will contain some partial contextualisation of said depictions, with reference to authors' cultural standpoints or authorial aims, inasmuch as a full analysis of how Spartan masculinity is depicted within a particular episode necessitates such contextualisation.

As full contextualisation, and discussion of the relationship between authors' depictions and the likelihoods of historical actuality lie beyond the scope of my current project, it is important to give one final caveat regarding language I employ in my analysis. Namely, while – for stylistic purposes – the language employed in this study may appear to slip into the realm of historical actuality, my analysis will remain firmly rooted within the context of events as they are represented by authors. For example, in order to avoid overly laborious turns of phrase, I may discuss what the actions or speech of a certain individual within the narrative might imply regarding their motivations or use of ideology

[126] See Foxhall 2013, 16-7 on the importance of understanding the generic context of literary depictions of gender issues and archetypes.

without making explicit reference to the fact that this is simply the manner in which the author of the text depicts that character, and does not necessarily truly reflect the unfolding of events in historical actuality. In such instances, this knowledge is assumed.

1. Xenophon's Philosophical Writing

Xenophon's philosophical works provide an abundance of material for the examination of Spartan masculinity. This section will focus mainly on Xenophon's *Respublica Lacedaemoniorum* (henceforward abbreviated *Lac.*),[127] as it is the work in which Xenophon focuses most exclusively and comprehensively on Spartan ideology and practices. I will draw support from Xenophon's other philosophical works, such as the *Memorabilia*, *Symposium*, and *Cyropaedeia*, as supplementary texts where appropriate. Admittedly, the *Lac*. has not been universally viewed as a philosophical work. There has been, in fact, a great deal of diversity in scholarly opinion as to what exactly Xenophon intended the work to express. Some view the *Lac.* as being an encomiast work of praise for the Spartan system and its lawgiver;[128] some view it as a work which reflects an author who admired Sparta's traditional system, but had become embittered with contemporary Spartans' failure to live up to its precepts;[129] and some view the work as a cohesive description of a paradoxical system, which allowed for Sparta's rise to pre-eminence yet contained within it the seeds of its own destruction.[130] The purpose of chapter XIV – with its significant change in tone, and sharp contrast between Spartan behaviour "then and now" – has proven especially interesting to many.[131] As Xenophon represents the so-called Lycurgan system as operating within a historical framework, and observations have been made linking the *Lac.* to the

[127] Unless otherwise stated, all text references in this chapter will be to the *Lac*.
[128] Lipka 2002, 17; Gray 2007, 217-9.
[129] Weathers 1954, 717-21; Rahn 1971, 507-8; Moore 1975, 69-73, 121; Whitby 1994, 103, 139.
[130] Humble 2004, 227 & 2007, 295; Gish 2009, 365-6.
[131] Dillery 2017, 200-201.

Hellenica, it has been suggested that the *Lac.* should be viewed as written partially in conjunction with Xenophon's longer historical narrative.[132] But, despite disparity in scholarly opinion, most agree that the *Lac.* was not intended as a straightforward recording of historical fact and that Xenophon had other purposes for its composition. Humble has argued persuasively that the *Lac.* should be viewed as a philosophical inquiry into a political system, which places this work in the milieu of Platonic and Aristotelian investigation.[133] Recent commentaries by Lipka and Gray also take note of philosophical elements in the work.[134] Therefore, I believe it is reasonable to consider Xenophon's *Lac.* under the heading of philosophical works.

In Xenophon's *Lac.* all seven categories of gender construction which this study seeks to examine are represented, to a greater or lesser extent, making it an excellent source for inquiry into contemporary philosophical perceptions of Classical Spartan masculinity. While constructionist categories will be important to the following analysis, I will not structure this chapter around them. Instead, I will break my discussion into a number of topics/aspects of Spartan life, discussed by Xenophon in the *Lac*., analysing each (as much as possible) in the order Xenophon addresses them in the work. This chapter will comprise 8 sections examining the following topics: men and women; education as socialisation; pederasty; all-male institutions of hunting and the *syssitia*; competitions between men; military visual self-presentation;

---

[132] Prioetti 1987, xii, xv.
[133] Humble 2004 & 2007.
[134] Lipka 2002, 32; Gray 2007, 43-4. I am more in agreement with Humble 2004 & 2007 regarding Xenophon's purpose in writing. I do not think that the *Lac.* is necessarily as encomiastic regarding the laws of Lycurgus as Lipka and Gray take it to be (see Lipka 2002, esp. 17, 32; Gray 2007, esp. 39, 152, 218).

Sanctions on Cowards; and Masculine Ideals and Xenophon's Overall Portrayal of Spartan Society.

1.1. Men and Women

Xenophon's treatment of women in the *Lac.* is rather limited. Most discussion regarding practices concerning women, and women's contribution to Spartan society, is contained within chapter I (1.4-10) and is situated within his depiction of the production of offspring (τεκνοποιίας). A few additional references to women are scattered throughout the remainder of the text – usually in comparisons to men or in instances in which women contribute to the promotion of male behavioural ideals. Analysis of references to women, limited though they are, will be useful to our examination of Spartan masculinity, as they relate to the constructionist categories of men and women, and attitudes towards sex. In what follows, I will first explore Xenophon's treatment of men and women in the context of procreation. Then, I will examine other female ideological in the *Lac.*

1.1.1. Procreation and Marital Arrangements

Xenophon portrays the Spartan practices concerning women he details in the *Lac.* as designed for eugenic purposes.[135] Several marital regulations and arrangements are also framed largely within this context.[136] Xenophon's discussion of practices aimed towards effective child-production encompasses measures to ensure physically healthy parents, regulations governing marriage intended to ensure superior offspring, and additional marital arrangements to

[135] Rebenich 1998, 90, n. 7; Lipka 2002, 109 on 1.7-10; Gray 2007, 147-8 on 1.3-4.
[136] Rebenich 1998, 91, n. 12; Lipka 2002, 109; Gray 2007, 150-2, on 1.5, 7.

maximise procreative potential in special scenarios which do not follow ideal practices. These practices have a number of implications for the ideology of masculinity (relating to the categories of men and women, and attitudes towards sex) which will be discussed in what follows.

To begin, Xenophon describes practices concerning women aimed at encouraging female health, and thus the production of vigorous offspring (1.3-4):[137]

> So, to begin at the beginning, I will start with the production of offspring. In other places girls who are destined to bear children, and are thought to be well brought up, subsist on the most modest food possible, and with the smallest measure of delicacies; and they are either kept from wine entirely, or allowed only that which is greatly diluted with water. And the other Greeks think it fit to for the girls to live quietly working wool, having a sedentary life, like that of most craftsmen. How then can women raised in this way be expected to bear magnificent offspring? But Lycurgus believed slave women to be sufficient to produce clothing, and he thought the production of children to be the greatest occupation for free women. So first he appointed exercise for the female no less than for the male sex. Furthermore, he made contests of speed and strength for the females to compete with one another, just as those for males, believing that the children produced by parents who were both strong would be in better health.

In this passage, the treatment and physical condition of Spartan females is brought into a double comparison: they are compared both with women elsewhere and with Spartan males. The effect of the comparison distances Spartan women from those elsewhere and likens them to their countrymen. In terms of physical education, women are represented as on par with their male counterpoints. Male and female partners are also represented as providing equal contributions to the process of producing vigorous offspring and are held equally accountable for the results. The sole point of difference in terms of male and female physical fitness, presented in the text, is that of scope. Female

[137] Unless otherwise stated, all translations in this thesis are my own.

physical condition is depicted as important only in the realm of child-production, whereas male physical condition is significant in other spheres as well. As a result, ideology relating to Lycurgan provisions for women in the text centres exclusively around procreation. However, Xenophon's presentation of ideological concerns may again have been influenced by his stated aim to examine those aspects of Spartan society which allowed Sparta to rise to a position of pre-eminence. Thus, it is possible that ideological measures aimed at Spartan women were elided by Xenophon because he believed they contributed less directly to Sparta's rise to power. For example, Christesen has argued that the view of practices concerning women outlined in the *Lac*. as intended solely for eugenic purposes is overly simplistic, and that female athletic participation also had ideological utility. He asserts that the sort of athletics in which Spartan women engaged (especially those which incorporated ritualistic elements) would have been useful, not only in the creation of ideal female bodies, but also in the promotion of adherence to prevailing social norms by fostering an attitude of habitual compliance.[138] Thus, what Xenophon presents in this account does not necessarily reflect the entirety of Spartan provisions for women, but merely those which most reflect Xenophon's authorial concerns. In contrast, in the case of men, procreation is not the only end Xenophon represents physical fitness as serving. Rather, the ideological and practical importance of male physical fitness is expressed in relation to a number of spheres. These will be discussed in greater detail later.[139]

[138] Christesen 2012, 198, 211-25.
[139] See pp. 80, 111-21.

Xenophon continues by discussing regulations governing marriage. He recounts that, at the onset of married life, Lycurgus restricted couples' access to sexual relations (1.5):

> Seeing that, during the period after the onset of marriage, others have boundless intercourse with their wives; he [Lycurgus] established that it should be shameful to be seen entering or leaving [the wife's room]. Thus, with this constraint on intercourse, they would have greater yearning for one another; and [the child] would be stronger, if begotten in this way, than if they were surfeited with one another.

As with the practices concerning diet and bodily fitness, Xenophon represents the motivation behind this restriction as practical: it promoted the production of more vigorous offspring. However, sexual practice is also placed within an ideological context. On the one hand, the text suggests a certain parity of attitude between male and female newlyweds. Xenophon relates that the practice of sexual restraint increases both sexual partners' yearning for one another – suggesting that both partners could be expected to experience equivalent levels of enthusiasm for intercourse. However, we are told that Lycurgus established limitations on sexual contact by proclaiming that a man should be ashamed (αἰδεῖσθαι) to be seen going in to his wife or coming out from having relations with her. Thus, while relations involve participation of both males and females – depicted as displaying similar attitudes towards sex – the ideology of sexual restraint was established in so as to affect male sexual attitudes and behaviours exclusively. Admittedly, ideological components evident in this depiction of marital arrangements are likely incidental, to some degree. The young man is represented as the agent with control over initiating sexual liaisons, inasmuch as the locus of liaisons necessitated his movement. Therefore, it is only sensible that measures designed to restrict sexual activity target the male partner. Nevertheless, Xenophon's framing of the Lycurgan

declaration in this matter implicitly associates ideals of sexual restraint with the male sexual role, as it places the ideological onus of moderation in marital sex on the male partner.

Xenophon depicts shame associated with being spotted coming or going from marital relations as a male concern. From this, we could assume that the shame, ideologically associated with excessive desire for sex, would imply that the opposite – restraint in sexual matters – was an important masculine virtue. However, Xenophon's text requires further analysis. The shame associated with marital sexual liaisons initially appears to apply only to those having recently married. By commenting that it was specifically at the onset of marriage when couples were thought to engage in excessive sexual intercourse, Xenophon suggests that different sexual behaviour was expected at different stages of life. Tendencies towards sexual excess, represented as characteristic of the young, do not appear to be expected in more mature men. This is reflected in the text's lack of restrictive measures outlined to govern sexual relations in long-established marriages. This suggests that sexual excess was not considered to be something that required especially vigilant monitoring as a matter of course. Rather, Xenophon's portrayal suggests that sexual restraint can be seen as a characteristic expected in mature men – either due to the presumption that men's desire for marital relations would naturally wane over time, or as a result of men's habituation in the practice of restraint, provided via the regulations to which he was subjected at the time of greatest ardour. Thus, ideals of male marital sexual restraint are presented as being in need of regulation, only for a particular period in a man's lifetime in which excess was

to be expected.[140] However, it is important to note that Sparta's unique arrangements concerning marriage somewhat alter this interpretation. As the newlywed Spartan man is depicted as being under the age of full maturity,[141] and therefore did not cohabit with his wife – but rather had to make visits for the purpose of intercourse, this is also the period in which his sexual habits would be most visible to society at large. Consequently, it is possible that any assumptions regarding disparity in sexual expression between newlywed and more mature men were largely informed by the lack of a similar metric by which to observe the frequency of the sexual liaisons undertaken by men who cohabitated with spouses. Furthermore, while Xenophon states that the purpose of the stigma was to restrict intercourse *tout court*, he locates the source of shame not as engagement in excessive marital intercourse itself, but in being *seen* coming or going from the act.[142] This emphasis suggests that, for Xenophon, the important factor in Spartan masculine sexual ideology was the *appearance* of moderation. This could indicate that he believed Spartan ideology surrounding male sexuality to be predominantly appearance-based.[143] However, as Xenophon represents the measures as being results-based in their aims, it is again possible that any ideological resonances, discernable in the text, are incidental rather than intentional.

After his treatment of regulations for newlyweds, Xenophon goes on to describe a number of societally-accepted sexual arrangements, which he

---

[140] Cf. comments on *paidiskoi* at 3.1.5, which assert that, due to their proclivity towards indolence, adolescents required constant supervision.
[141] See p. 105-6.
[142] Cf. Xenophon's discussion on Spartan practices regarding *paides*' thefts (2.6-9).
[143] Higgins 1977, 67-8. See also Harman 2009, for discussion of the ways in which Spartans are presented in the *Lac.* as affirming and performing social identity through visual spectacle.

asserts Lycurgus instituted as means to maximise citizens' procreative potential. Xenophon outlines restrictions placed on the acceptable window of time in which a man could, ideally, enter into marriage to ensure the best procreative potential (1.6):

> In addition to this, he also put a stop to each of the men taking a wife whenever they wished. He instituted marriage-making in the prime of their bodies, believing that this was conducive to fruitfulness.

But immediately after this, Xenophon informs readers of two provisions put in place specifically to address problematic situations evidently present in Spartan practice (1.7-9):

> If, however, it should happen that an old man has a young wife, seeing that men of such an age keep an especially close guard over their wives, he established the opposite practice: for he required an old man to bring in a man of the sort whose physical or mental qualities he admired, for the purposes of procreation. And if some man did not wish to dwell together with a wife, but was desirous of fine progeny, he established this custom as well: if a man saw a woman who was noble and blessed with children, and was able to obtain her husband's permission, he might beget children of her. And he made many such concessions. For the women desire to have two households, while the men wish to acquire brothers for their sons, who have a share in their family and strength, but who will not lay claim to their property.

In this passage, Lycurgus is represented as anticipating human weaknesses which would could potentially endanger optimal procreation. He is shown to remedy this situation by introducing regulations and incentives – appealing to desires and concerns of both men and women – to guarantee favourable outcomes. In the case of old men who have young wives, the issue Xenophon presents is that the (presumably) waning sexual appetite expected of elderly men,[144] taken in combination with the jealous watch they keep over their wives, risked squandering young women's procreative potential. The solution devised can be seen to incorporate an ideological element into the regulation.

[144] Cf. Plut. *Solon* 20.2-4.

While Xenophon portrays introduction of a young man to impregnate the woman as compulsory, the qualities for which the would-be impregnator is chosen are within the husband's control. The text does not explicitly relate what type of young man a husband must seek out in these circumstances, rather asserting that the man should be chosen for those qualities of body and mind which the husband admires. Leaving this assessment to the realm of individual choice perhaps indicates an effort to make the requirement more palatable by appealing to the husband's ideals. As the child would be produced on the husband's behalf, the husband is given leave to select the qualities which he most desires the child to possess, thus giving him a sense of personal involvement in the act of procreation. We see a similar process in the allowances made for the man who did not wish to marry: he is given leave – pending receipt of the husband's permission– to select a married woman whose qualities (and those of her children) he admires, to bear a child for him.

These ideological incentives are paired with material incentives at 1.9. Xenophon does not represent material incentives as part of Lycurgus' designs, but shows them to ultimately serve Lycurgan eugenic goals. Here male and female interests in household arrangements are compared. Xenophon asserts that women approve of alternative procreational arrangements from desire for increased personal standing. Men are depicted as agreeing from desire to increase the sphere of influence of their household as a whole, while minimising the partibility of sons' inheritance; an aim which could be accomplished via creation of kinship bonds between their sons and the sons of

other fathers. In this respect, men's and women's material concerns are portrayed as similar and complementary – although women are portrayed as being concerned solely with their own personal influence, whereas males are represented as having a wider sphere of concern.

Xenophon's treatment of marital arrangements has interpreted to support significantly different views regarding male-female relations in Sparta. Cartledge and Millender interpret the text of *Lac.* 1.7-9 – and particularly 1.8 –[145] as a scenario highly suggestive of a male-dominated society, as the husband is described as "he who had her [the wife]" and is empowered to loan her out to beget children for himself or other men.[146] In contrast, Pomeroy asserts that the Spartan marriage practices presented by Xenophon indicate a high level of active female involvement, if not female dominance.[147] I would argue that Xenophon's portrayal presents a scenario that lies somewhere between these standpoints. Pomeroy argues that there is no evidence in the sources to prevent scholars from assuming women were active in marital arrangements. This is true, however the text also does not support the view that women were chief agents in forming such arrangements. In Xenophon's description of the process by which the arrangements are put into action, he places the emphasis on the roles of male participants. It is the elderly husband who selects the man he wishes to impregnate his wife, based on his assessment of that man's qualities (1.7). And it is the unmarried man who selects a woman, based on his

[145] εἰ δέ τις αὖ γυναικὶ μὲν συνοικεῖν μὴ βούλοιτο, τέκνων δὲ ἀξιολόγων ἐπιθυμοίη, καὶ τοῦτο νόμιμον ἐποίησεν, ἥντινα ἂν εὔτεκνον καὶ γενναίαν ὁρῷη, πείσαντα τὸν ἔχοντα ἐκ ταύτης τεκνοποιεῖσθαι.
[146] Cartledge 1981, 103, 105; 2001, 122; Millender 1999, 366. See also Moore, 1975, 98; Christesen 2012, 213.
[147] Pomeroy 2002, 44-5.

assessment of her qualities, and obtains permission from her husband to beget a child from her (1.8). This is not to say that a woman would likely have had no input in this process, in actuality, but this is not the aspect of the arrangements highlighted by the text. However, Xenophon's account of female motivation for entering into such arrangements – which he, incidentally, relates before male motivations – does suggest a level of active interest on the woman's part, even if it is not presented as the determining factor in the formation of the arrangements. Furthermore, Xenophon's assertion that producing children for multiple men extends a woman's influence, and that this extended influence was eagerly desired by women, is likewise not suggestive of female passivity in such arrangements.

In terms of the desired outcome of child-production, the *Lac.* has been seen to indicate Spartan preference for male offspring. [148] Desire for male offspring can indeed be read in the representation of fathers' concerns. Xenophon explicitly states that men's willingness to loan their wives to others for procreation stems from a desire to gain brothers for their sons – implying the primary desirability of specifically male offspring in the minds of Spartan men (1.9). However, this motivation is portrayed as separate from Lycurgus' expressed concerns. As will be discussed later, section 1.9 should not be read as an aim of the lawgiver, but rather it is presented as being the incentives by which individuals were encouraged to fulfil the lawgiver's true aim – which remains the production of vigorous offspring in general. Furthermore, desirability of male offspring is presented as directly related to the context of

[148] Cartledge 2001, 115.

alternative marital arrangements. This cannot be seen as a blanket statement in which Spartan men are represented as exclusively desirous of male offspring in every context, as Xenophon does not indicate what sort of offspring men desired within the context of a typical marriage.

It is also significant that Xenophon culminates his discussion on child-production by inviting readers to assess whether or not Lycurgus was successful, in his concern for eugenics, in achieving men of exceptional size and strength in Sparta (1.10). This statement could be read to imply that the primary concern for Spartan procreative arrangements was specifically that – to create men who were superior physical specimens – and thus, was primarily oriented towards valuation of males over females. However, here too careful attention to the reading of the text is crucial. Xenophon states, at the outset of the work, that the aim of his discussion is examination of the institutions which enabled Sparta to attain a high level of power and renown in Greece (1.1) and frames the discussion of procreation in that context. This goes some way towards explaining why Xenophon's final words on the matter appear weighted in favour of the masculine. It may be the case that large strong men are presented here as the ideal output of the Spartan eugenic programme because they are the type of offspring that do the most to further Spartan power within Greece. It is therefore entirely possible that Xenophon's presentation does not reflect a Spartan ideological preference for masculine offspring.

In light of the nuances of the text, I would suggest that the reader is presented with three different ideals, in relation to the concept of Spartan child-

production. First, there is Xenophon's depiction of the Lycurgan view, which reflects preference for neither gender (or their associated traits). Second, there is the expressed attitude of certain Spartan men, which can be seen to suggest the primary desirability of male offspring in particular situations – but which does not necessarily represent the universal opinion of Spartan men. And finally, there is Xenophon's evaluation of the end-result of Spartan procreative measures, which places primary emphasis on the production of excellent male specimens – but which should be seen to reflect Xenophon's authorial aims, and not necessarily Spartan concerns.

1.1.2. Female Ideological Roles

Beyond marital arrangements, the few other references Xenophon makes to women in the *Lac.* typically have little to do with actual women. Rather, they are made in those instances where women are mentioned in relation to masculine ideals. In chapter III, Xenophon associates the manifestation of σωφροσύνη exhibited by male Spartan adolescents with women in the sense that their display of modest or decorous behaviour is superior to that of women (3.4):[149]

> Furthermore, wishing modesty to be strongly implanted in them, he commanded them to keep their hands within the cloak when in the streets, and to walk silently, and not look around, but to fix their eyes in front of their feet. In this way, it is clear that the male race is stronger in self-control than the female race.

[149] See North 1966, 131 on descriptions of the σωφροσύνη characteristic of women and the young. Lipka 2002, 138, n. 3.4[6] highlights the distinction made in Arist. *Pol.* I 1260a 20-23 between male and female σωφροσύνη. Gray 2007, 149, goes as far as describing Xenophon's comments on the σωφροσύνη displayed by adolescent Spartan males as an example of "gender blurring".

Reference to women is also made in the discussion of proper masculine appearance (11.3):

> He devised equipment of this sort for battle: they were to have a red cloak, believing this [garment] to have the least in common with that [the clothing] of women, and to be most warlike…

Here women are presented as a simple antithesis of what constitutes ideal male self-presentation. Thus, what is depicted as most visually masculine is ultimately that which appears least feminine.[150] The treatment of women in these instances by Xenophon is cursory, and the focus on women is solely concerned with their relation to ideas of masculine discourse, representation and performativity, and hegemonic masculinity. The primary purpose, therefore, of references to women in the *Lac.* outside of women's role in procreation seems to involve their ideological usage in the establishment and enforcement of masculine ideals.

The use of women to encourage maintenance of male standards of behaviour is especially visible in Xenophon's reference to women in the context of sanctions placed on men who fail to live up to masculine ideals of courage (9.5):

> …he [the coward] must provide for his female relations at home, and explain to them the reason for their lack of husbands; he must suffer a hearth devoid of wife, and at the same time pay a fine for this…

In this area of Spartan practice, Xenophon represents women as motivating factors against male transgression of behavioural codes. Women contribute to deterrence of cowardly behaviour on two levels: conceptually, and relationally. Conceptually, a wife is represented as a prize denied to the coward. And

[150] David 1989, 6.

female interaction – or rather lack thereof – provides a relational aspect to this sanction as, presumably, the coward is denied a wife due to the unwillingness of women (as is the case with their male counterparts) to be associated with such a man. Since Xenophon presents bachelorhood as a fineable transgression (9.5), the coward is not only deprived of the practical benefits of a wife, he also has additional stigma associated with transgression of the laws. Rebenich suggests that bachelorhood, in and of itself, was a social stigma in Spartan society.[151] This is perhaps overstating the case somewhat since, presumably, one could extricate himself from stigma by producing offspring without marriage (in an arrangement of the sort outlined at 1.7-9). However, while Xenophon does not explicitly mention that cowards were debarred from begetting offspring in this way, it would be extremely unlikely that any man would loan the procreative services of his wife to a dishonoured man – nor would any woman likely be a willing participant in such an arrangement. Thus, Xenophon portrays the stigma which a dishonoured man brought upon himself by his cowardice as further compounded by failure to live up to his procreative duties as a man.

Relational incentivisation is also evident in the coward's shameful burden of having to explain to the women of his household why no one would have them as wives. There has been some discussion concerning the meaning of ἀνανδρίας here – whether it is his own unmanliness, or their husbandless condition, that the disgraced man must explain to his female relations.[152] I am

[151] Rebenich 1998, 119, n. 97.
[152] Moore 1975, 112; Lipka 2002, 178 on 9.5[5]; Gray 2007, 169 on 9.5.

inclined to prefer the latter translation, as it fits more aptly with Xenophon's statement that the coward must provide for female relatives at home (9.5). But, in either case, the burden of explanation remains. This suggests that women played an active role in relationally upholding the ideals of bravery, as the necessity of the explanation anticipates censure from the women – which Xenophon presents as a deterrent to male cowardice.[153]

1.2. Education as Socialisation

In the *Lac.* Xenophon represents the Spartan education system as an institution which functioned primarily to imbue ideologically grounded patterns of behaviour. Scholars have commented that Spartan education in the *Lac.* resembles not so much a traditional education, as a process of indoctrination and socialisation, wherein boys internalised ideologies of Spartan manhood.[154] This section will examine Xenophon's depiction of education and upbringing for the three age groups (*paides*, *paidiskoi*, and *hebontes*) individually, to examine the qualities which the upbringing is represented as inculcating and the methods by which it brought about desired effects. After that, I will examine the effect of education by discussing qualities, emphasised in the education process, apparent in Xenophon's portrayal of adult Spartan men. Xenophon also associates Spartan pederasty with education, but pederasty will be discussed separately.[155] Since Xenophon portrays education as an institutional process, the category which will (naturally) be most prominent in this discussion is that of institutions. However, other categories, including

[153] Vernant 1991, 65.
[154] Cartledge 2001, 44; Ducat 2006a, 144-5.
[155] See p. 69.

representation and performativity, relations between men and hegemonic masculinity, and discourse, will also factor into analysis.

1.2.1. *Paides*

Xenophon begins his account of the rearing process, in chapter II of the *Lac*., with a discussion of the *paideia* – that is the programme set out for pre-adolescent boys (*paides*). This section relates primarily to the categories of discourse and institutions – discourse, because Xenophon identifies three key ideals which the system sought to implant in boys; and institutions because Xenophon's account here is concerned with the institutional manner in which the *paideia* achieved desired results. Xenophon initiates this discussion by briefly outlining education undertaken by "the other Greeks", to establish it as a point of contrast for the programme prescribed for Spartan *paides* (2.1). He ends, at 2.14, by inviting readers to assess whether the education provided by Spartans or "others" produced men who better embodied the ideals of obedience (πειθώ), respect (αἰδώς), and endurance/self control (ἐγκράτεια). Xenophon thus represents the cultivation of these qualities in boys as the primary goal of Spartan *paideia*.

As a whole, the chapter is ideologically tinged, since Xenophon is largely unconcerned with academic elements of education. Other elements of education, such as γράμματα and μουσικὴ, receive brief mention as being among the subjects which boys in other *poleis* learn from their tutors (2.1), but such matters are not the focus of his contrast between Sparta and "elsewhere". Humble suggests that it is likely that elements of education such as reading,

writing, music, and wrestling were not highlighted by Xenophon because they were not conducted in a markedly different way in Sparta than elsewhere,[156] emphasising the ideological focus of Xenophon's text.

Xenophon's contrast focuses on two main elements. 1) The private education of *paides* elsewhere, left to the discretion of fathers, is contrasted with the collective and centralised programme prescribed for Spartan *paides* (2.1-11):

> The other Greeks who claim to educate their sons well, as soon as the boys become acquainted with the spoken word, they immediately place them under the charge of servant tutors, and immediately send them to schools to learn writing and music and wrestling… But Lycurgus, contrary to allowing each [father] to privately appoint a slave tutor, established a man to rule them, out of the men from which the greatest offices are appointed, who is called the *"paidonomos"*. And he authorised him to gather the boys together and, if observing any misbehaviour, to punish theme severely. And he gave him some of the *hebontes* equipped with whips, in order that they may punish them whenever necessary, so that great respect, and great obedience are always present there… In order that, if the *paidonomos* was away, the boys would not be left wanting a ruler, he authorised any citizen present to impose upon them any commands the thought to be good, and to punish someone if he erred. And this caused the boys to be more respectful; indeed, not only boys but men are respectful to rulers in this way. And in order that the boys would not lack a ruler, even if no adult man happened to be present, he appointed the sharpest of the *eirens* to rule each troop. And thus, there boys are never without a ruler.

2) The indulgent and weakening treatment of *paides* elsewhere is contrasted with the strict and strengthening treatment of Spartan *paides* (2.1-5):

> And [elsewhere] they soften boys' feet with sandals, and weaken their bodies with changes of cloaks; and they customarily grant them food by the measure of the stomach… But instead of softening their feet with sandals, he [Lycurgus] required them to strengthen their feet by going barefoot, believing that, if they made a practice of this, they would climb uphill more easily, and descend more steadily; and that they would leap and spring and run more swiftly barefoot, if he had cultivated this practice, than a boy wearing sandals. And rather than weakening them with practices concerning cloaks, he accustomed them to having a single cloak throughout the year, believing that, in this way, they would be better equipped towards cold and heat. Regarding food, he required the *eiren* to provide them with as much necessary so that they would not be filled to the point of repletion, and not be unacquainted with living in want;

[156] Humble 1997, 194 For discussion of academic elements of Spartan education see: Beck 1993, 24-5, 27; Ducat 2006a, 43-70, 134-5; Gray 2007, 153 on 2.1

> believing that, being reared in this way, they would be better able to toil on without food if necessary and, if the order were given, to endure longer on the same amount of food; and that they would want fewer delicacies, and would be more tolerant of all food, and would live more healthily. And he believed that nourishment which makes the body slender would be more conducive to increasing height than food which increases girth.

These two elements come together throughout chapter II. Xenophon presents Spartan *paideia* predominantly as a process of hardening boys, both physically and psychologically, to be better able to endure various forms of hardship. The main body of the chapter's text is concerned with a number of features of *paideia*, which are contrasted with practices "elsewhere", and expressed as imparting one of the three central qualities of ἐγκράτεια, πειθώ, and αἰδώς – all of which are reflected in the text. The atmosphere of constant, collective, supervision and the requirement for boys to submit to physical punishment for lapses in conduct are described as promoting πειθώ and αἰδώς (2.1-2, 10-11). Here, there is an element of physical endurance involved in the requirement of submission to floggings, but the main emphasis is placed on developing desirable mental attitudes and associated behaviours. Measures such as accustoming boys to go unshod, without changes of clothing, and with little food, are presented as concerned primarily with hardening thought to produce physical benefits. As such, they are depicted as being aimed towards strengthening the *paides*' endurance of hardship, thus developing ἐγκράτεια (2.3-6, 14). This can be seen as reflecting psychological hardening as well. For instance, practices thought to better equip boys to carry on with duties while enduring the effects of hunger not only reflect concerns to strengthen them physically, but also habituate them in the requisite mindset. Moreover, when Xenophon recounts measures by which *paides* are permitted to alleviate a measure of their physical suffering through theft of food (2.6-8), the emphasis

on the benefits of this practice is placed primarily on mental qualities. Xenophon asserts that this education was designed to make the boys more cunning and resourceful (specifically with respect to provisioning: μηχανικωτέρους τῶν ἐπιτηδείων) and warlike (πολεμικωτέρους), as well as promoting physical fitness and endurance of pains (2.6-7).

1.2.2. *Paidiskoi*

With the beginning of chapter III, Xenophon shifts his focus from the *paides* to the *paidiskoi*. Although Xenophon states that his discussion of the *paideia* has concluded with the close of chapter II, the measures he describes for *paidiskoi* have many similar characteristics. This suggests that prominent ideological values and patterns of behaviour, cultivated by the *paideia*, continued to be developed in an institutional setting for *paidiskoi*. As with the *paideia*, Xenophon begins this section with comparison of Spartan practice to that of "elsewhere" (3.1-3):

> When they step out of the age of childhood into adolescence, at this age, others release them from their tutors, and no longer does anyone rule them, but they are left to their own devices. But Lycurgus judged contrary to this. For he observed that the greatest willfulness is implanted in those of that age, and exceeding *hubris* arises, and powerful yearning for pleasure manifests, so at that age he heaped upon them the greatest amount of toil, and he designed a programme of the greatest occupation. And, establishing that the penalty if someone should flee from these duties was that he would no longer retain honours, he made it so that not only public officials, but also those who cared for each of them would take care, so that they would not, by shirking their responsibilities, become entirely without repute in the city.

In this section, a similar – if intensified – mode of instruction is observable. As with the *paideia*, the programme prescribed for *paidiskoi* is presented as institutional in nature: laid out for all alike, rather than subject to individuals' discretion. The atmosphere of intense supervision is also carried over, and

indeed strengthened, to meet the *paidiskoi's* increased need. And while Xenophon still places emphasis on general public interest in the supervision of *paidiskoi*, with the addition of harsher and more lasting consequences for failures he depicts concerted effort to ensure involvement on the part of those who were personally invested in individual *paidiskoi* (τοὺς κηδομένους). As with the *paides*, this programme is represented as producing desirable patterns of behaviour in *paidiskoi*.

There is, however, a shift in the ideological/discursive aspects of the account. In chapter II, Xenophon relates that the intense supervision and punishment for lapses causes πειθώ and αἰδώς to be implanted in *paides*. But the articulated effect of the *paidiskoi's* programme is the modulation of behaviour, exclusively, with no mention of inculcation of qualities or ideals – perhaps implying that behavioural modulation was all that was accomplished. It is possible that no ideological effect is expressed here because Xenophon believed ἐγκράτεια, πειθώ, and αἰδώς to be fully implanted via the *paideia*, so that all that was now required were superficial corrections of behaviour. However, this is not how he presents the situation. The text tells that *paidiskoi* had the greatest amount of toil imposed upon them at the time of life at which they were believed to be most susceptible to indolence and pleasures (3.1-2). Lycurgus is said to have observed the tendency of *paidiskoi* to become willful and pleasure-seeking. Xenophon attests that Lycurgus' response to this tendency was not to provide education in resistance of pleasure, but rather to prevent exposure to destructive pleasure entirely, via increased work and stricter supervision. Thus, while boys became well acquainted with hardship,

there is no indication that they became accustomed to resist pleasure.[157] The emphasis on compulsion and fear in the enforcement of behaviour could lead to the impression that ideals performed by Spartan men were superficial rather than internally developed.

Another interesting difference is observable. Chapter II details, at length, methods employed to produce desirable character traits in *paides*, but Xenophon makes no mention of intrinsic characteristics likely to be observed in boys in this age category. In this respect, the text treats them as veritable blank canvasses, onto which ideal character traits may be imparted. Conversely, Xenophon does not relate ideological characteristics implanted in *paidiskoi* by their prescribed lifestyle, he does list character traits represented as naturally characteristic of males at this stage of life. The obstinate and pleasure-driven features of the *paidiskoi's* character are described as being so deeply-rooted that a considerable share of the measures established for their benefit must be targeted at counteracting these qualities.

The sole ideal Xenophon explicitly indicates is carried over from the *paideia* to the programme for *paidiskoi* is αἰδώς (3.4-5):

> And wishing to strongly implant respect in them (πρὸς δὲ τούτοις τὸ αἰδεῖσθαι ἰσχυρῶς ἐμφῦσαι βουλόμενος), he commanded that, in the streets, they must keep their hands within their cloaks, and must walk silently and not look around, but rather fix their eyes upon their feet. And the effect of this is that the male sex is stronger with respect to decorum (σωφρονεῖν) than the female. At any rate, you would be less likely to hear a sound from them than from a stone, and you would less likely to turn their eyes than those of a bronze. You would suppose them more modest (αἰδημονεστέρους) than a maiden in her chambers. And if they are asked something at mess you would be well pleased merely to get an answer from them. Thus, did he manage the *paidiskoi*.

[157] An idea Xenophon shares with Plato. See pp. 150-52.

As with the management of their negative character traits, the method by which Lycurgus seeks to promote αἰδώς in *paidiskoi* is imposition of strict behavioral controls. And, as with the earlier section, the effect is primarily presented as the modification of said behaviour. Interestingly enough, in the only statement wherein Xenophon seems to imply internalisation of a quality in *paidiskoi*, the ideal is σωφροσύνη rather than αἰδώς. Xenophon recounts that efforts to promote αἰδώς in *paidiskoi* had the effect of making them stronger with respect to decorum (εἰς τὸ σωφρονεῖν ἰσχυρότερόν) than females (3.4). Of course, the concepts of σωφροσύνη and αἰδώς are closely related in this passage – as are their effects. The reference to σωφροσύνη is made in one of two comparisons of the conduct of *paidiskoi* to that of females. In the other, the concept of αἰδώς is employed, and in both cases the term concerned carries the sense of modesty. Nevertheless, the variation of terms employed in this passage is significant, as it provides one of only two references to the idea of σωφροσύνη in the *Lac*.[158]

The appearance of σωφροσύνη as a characteristic of *paidiskoi* is significant, as a number of scholars have argued that σωφροσύνη does not appear to have been an important virtue in Xenophon's assessment of Spartan value system, and that that the deliberate impartation of σωφροσύνη by the educational system is not a *topos* of Sparta in his works.[159] In fact, Humble argues that the cultivation of σωφροσύνη was deliberately *not* attributed to Sparta by

[158] The other is made regarding appropriate behaviour during sacrifices made before kings set out on campaign (13.5).
[159] Humble 1999b; Tuplin 1994; Lipka 2002, 138-9 on 3.4. This is a point of divergence between Xenophon and Thucydides. See pp. 202-7.

Xenophon.[160] Humble asserts that cultivation of σωφροσύνη is never mentioned by Xenophon as an aim of the Lycurgan educational system, and is mentioned as an aside.[161] In her extensive examination of the concept, North remarks that σωφροσύνη was a virtue that could always be appropriately associated with women and children, while men's relationship with the virtue is more complex. She asserts that, while Xenophon describes σωφροσύνη as present in descriptions of the young in the *Lac.*, it is replaced by "manly valour" as the boys approach manhood.[162] However, Xenophon does not employ this term in his discussion of *paides*.[163] And while, αἰδώς is attributed to *paides*, it is used primarily to convey ideas of respect towards authority, rather than the sense to which αἰδώς, and the closely related σωφροσύνη, are employed in the comparisons with females. Indeed, the "respect" sense of the term can be seen to be reflected more in descriptions of the silence and stillness of the *paidiskoi*. This could suggest that we are meant to understand the usage of these terms in these instances as being fundamentally different from usages of αἰδώς elsewhere in the text; meaning that σωφροσύνη exhibited by males constitutes a quality which Xenophon represents as unique to males of the *paidiskoi* age-range.

Humble suggests that the σωφροσύνη exhibited by the *paidiskoi* is associated with the feminine form of the virtue, as it is presented as being concerned with modesty and chastity.[164] This feminine interpretation of σωφροσύνη is perhaps

[160] Humble 2002, 89-90.
[161] Humble 1999b, 341-3; Humble 2007, 295.
[162] North 1966, 130-31 n. 24.
[163] Humble 1999b, 339.
[164] Humble 1999b, 341-3.

intensified by the perceived sexual undercurrent of the passage. Ducat asserts that Xenophon portrays boys' conduct with feminine overtones at the time of life when they were becoming old enough to begin pederastic relationships. He suggests that this behaviour caused men to view these boys as suitable sexual objects, which strengthens the association of σωφροσύνη with femininity in the scenario described in the *Lac*.[165] The association between women and σωφροσύνη suggests that Xenophon sought to express the feminine form of the virtue in this passage, which occurred as a veritable side-effect in Spartan adolescent males (and one that they were expected to grow out of). The conspicuous absence of a masculine form of σωφροσύνη from Xenophon's discussion of cultural ideals, embodied by Spartan men elsewhere in the *Lac.*, suggests that σωφροσύνη was not a virtue Xenophon believed the Spartan system intended to implant in males. Thus, mention of a feminised version of σωφροσύνη as a temporary side-effect of males' training in αἰδώς provides the closest approximation to a comparison between male and female ideals in the *Lac.*; a comparison which perhaps reaffirms αἰδώς as the ideal Xenophon represents as typically encouraged in Spartan males.

1.2.3. *Hebontes*

When Xenophon moves to discuss the *hebontes* in chapter IV, there is yet another focal shift regarding discursive ideals and institutional methods. As with the *paidiskoi*, males in this grouping are described as having a distinguishing character trait: they are prone to rivalry (4.1-2):

> And he was the most zealous concerning the *hebontes*, believing that these, if they should become of the desirable sort, would render the most good unto the city. For seeing that, amongst those in whom the greatest spirit of

[165] Ducat 2006a, 14-5.

> rivalry is innate, there arises the choruses most worth hearing and the gymnastic contests most worth seeing. He believed that if the *hebontes* could be gathered together in a strife for excellence, they would thus attain the greatest extent of manly excellence. Therefore, I will relate how he set them together in this way.

Here too, the text transmits institutional efforts to modulate behaviour. But unlike *paidiskoi*, whose characteristic trait is portrayed as predominantly negative, the spirited rivalry characteristic of the *hebontes* is represented as primarily positive – in need of direction rather than suppression. The remainder of Xenophon's treatment of the *hebontes* is devoted to detailed description of the selection of the *hippeis*, depicted as a catalyst to instigate the process for channelling rivalry (4.3-6). I will not go into detail regarding this process at this point, as it will be subjected to lengthy examination later.[166] However, I wish to highlight one aspect of the text. Mention of the three qualities professed to have been the focus of the *paideia* are largely absent from Xenophon's treatment of the qualities he alleges Lycurgus desired to implant and nurture in *hebontes*. The sole exception is that we do see mention of the ideal of πειθώ (4.6):

> And they must keep themselves fit. For, owing to the strife, they spar whenever they meet. However, anyone present has power to part the fighters. And if anyone disobeys the one parting them, the *paidonomos* takes him to the ephors; and they fine him heavily, in order to make him aware that he must never be willing to disobey the laws due to sudden impulse (καθιστάναι βουλόμενοι εἰς τὸ μήποτε ὀργὴν τοῦ μὴ πείθεσθαι τοῖς νόμοις κρατῆσα).

However, unlike Xenophon's account of the *paideia*, the text here does not represent πειθώ as a quality intended to be actively cultivated by the strife for manly excellence, but rather an established ideal of which *hebontes* must be reminded if – in their passion – they should neglect to observe it.

[166] See p. 104.

1.2.4. Influence of *Paideia* on Adult Life

In Xenophon's description of how education moulded individuals into the sort of men valued by Spartan society, discursive ideology is shown to play a prominent role. In chapter II, Xenophon repeatedly emphasises three idealised traits which Sparta sought to cultivate in her men: endurance (ἐγκράτεια), respect (αἰδώς), and obedience (πειθώ).[167] Xenophon's treatment of other ideological systems, in comparison with that of Sparta, indicates that he viewed this particular combination of, and emphasis on, these qualities to have been characteristically Spartan in nature. In the *Memorabilia* Xenophon claims that the Spartan focus on physical endurance, respect, and obedience was lacking in Athens – to the detriment of Athenian society (*Mem.* 3.5.13).[168] The *Cyropaedia* illustrates the system of education in a fictionalised Persia. The structure of this account has parallels to Spartan education in the *Lac.*, but with a distinctly different emphasis on qualities desirable in men (*Cyrop.* 1.2-16). This suggests that what Xenophon did not simply his own ideals under a Spartan façade in the *Lac.*, but rather those which he intended to represent his impression of Spartan values.[169] However, as we have seen, the carry-over of efforts to inculcate these ideals beyond the initial *paideia* appears minimal in Xenophon's treatment of the *paidiskoi* and *hebontes*. This absence seems out of place, as Xenophon suggests that these are the qualities that one would expect to observe in Spartan men, as a result of their education (2.14).

---

[167] Moore 1975, 101; MacDowell 1989, 55; Humble 1999b, 341. Humble highlights Xenophon's emphasis on the development of these qualities in boys from the ages of seven to fourteen. Several scholars note the primacy of αἰδώς, especially, in Spartan education: MacDowell 1986, 55; Ducat 2006a, 143; Humble 1999b, 342.
[168] North 1966, 128-9; Strauss 1972, 111.
[169] Humble 1999b, 341-4.

It is worthwhile to also explore whether or not ideals highlighted in *paideia* are also conspicuous in the *Lac.*'s depictions of adult Spartiates. Ducat asserts that all three qualities are carried forward into adulthood, retaining primacy of placement amongst Spartan men's cardinal ideological virtues throughout life.[170] However, he acknowledges that much of this must be understood through allusion. For instance: ἐγκράτεια is alluded to at 4.7, where Xenophon relates that adults must exercise so that they can endure the strains of soldiering; and αἰδώς can be understood as the desired effect of a number of measures aimed at eradicating shameless or obscene conduct in *syssitia* in chapter V. Moreover, there is one explicit mention of αἰδὼς at 5.5, where Spartan messes are contrasted with dinner parties elsewhere, noteworthy for their lack of αἰδὼς: καὶ γὰρ δὴ ἐν μὲν ταῖς ἄλλαις πόλεσιν ὡς τὸ πολὺ οἱ ἥλικες ἀλλήλοις σύνεισι, μεθ᾽ ὧνπερ καὶ ἐλαχίστη αἰδὼς παραγίγνεται. Xenophon represents the promotion of αἰδὼς, in this instance, via *syssition* practice. However, it is ambiguous whether the ideal is presented as characteristic of adult Spartan males, *tout court*, since its manifestation is presented as situational: αἰδὼς occurs as part of a situation in which younger men are meant to benefit from the example of their elders, suggesting that their educative role necessitated the display of αἰδὼς by older men. Indeed, Xenophon's comparison of Spartan mixed-age messes with customs held "elsewhere" implies that Spartan men might be inclined to act quite differently were they in the company of their contemporaries alone.

[170] Ducat 2006a, 143-4. See also Humble 1999b, 342-3; Lipka 2002, 119-20, on 2.2[6]; Christesen 2012, 218-9, 226, 242-3.

When dealing with explicit references in the *Lac.*, only πειθώ is especially prominent in descriptions of ideals cultivated in adult males, being the main theme of chapter VIII: Xenophon describes the considerable care taken to ensure that πειθώ was deeply rooted in men occupying the highest societal positions, so that it was a point of honour for those considered best to appear the most obedient and respectful to the authority of the *polis* (8.1). He asserts that it was a badge of honour for men, no less than boys, to appear eager to obey authority (8.2). Πειθώ is listed as a factor in the establishment of the ephorate (8.3) And Lycurgus' effort to obtain Delphic approval of his laws is related as a device enacted to ensure πειθώ with respect to the laws (8.5). This emphasis resonates with Xenophon's treatment of Spartan societal ideals elsewhere as well. For instance, in the *Agesilaus,* Xenophon highlights the king's obedience to *polis* authority as being amongst his most praiseworthy qualities (6.4). There is more to say regarding the significance of the ideals Xenophon portrays as important for Spartan men for our interpretation of how the *Lac.* represents Spartan society. But since this concerns Xenophon's overall portrayal of Spartan ideals in the work, for the sake of clarity, I will return to this idea at the end of this chapter.[171]

If the predominance of αἰδώς, ἐγκράτεια, and πειθώ is reflected somewhat inconsistently throughout the *Lac*., Xenophon's representation of the methods involved in rearing is more uniform. In addition to the arduous lifestyle mandated by the Spartan education system, relations between men are

[171] See p. 127.

presented in the *Lac.* as having been the primary vehicle for the impartation of desired traits onto boys during their education. Males of the community, from every age group, are depicted as the principal agents by which societal values were promoted and enforced throughout the rearing process. Xenophon portrays influence of the family as minimised from an early age. Familial influence is not eradicated, as can be seen in the father's role at 6.1-2 and reference to individuals who had personal interest in *paidiskoi* (τοὺς κηδομένους) at 3.3. However, in both cases, the familial role is portrayed as supplementary, reinforcing official programmes rather than supplanting them, while public figures come to the fore. Xenophon tells us that not only was the *paidonomos* given ultimate authority in matters of upbringing; *eirens*, *erastai*, fathers of other boys, and male citizens at large were also charged with keeping watch over the *paides* and punishing lapses in acceptable conduct (2.2-3, 6.1-2). Public officials, and fellow citizens are depicted in positions of authority in dealings with *paidiskoi* (3.3). *Paidiskoi* are also mentioned within the context of the public mess (5.5), where the discussion at 5.5 suggests they would be subject to the example and observance of their elders. The *paidonomos*, as well as fellow citizens, are depicted as holding authority in the case of *hebontes* as well (4.6).

Xenophon's emphasis on homosocial instruction and motivation, employed to uphold societal values, is represented as being carried forward into adulthood as well. Indeed, the effect of male interaction is one of the most prevalent features of the *Lac.*, and Xenophon seems to depict daily male relations as one of the strongest contributing factors to the maintenance of standards of Spartan

masculine conduct. As will be discussed in further detail later,[172] male-only institutions, are portrayed as providing reinforcement for behavioural ideals by creating arenas in which one was constantly subject to scrutiny and evaluation by other men, thus inculcating a public and communal mindset. Attitudes towards the *gerousia* and towards the power of the ephorate (8.4) represent a high value placed on respect for structures of hierarchy and authority within the *homoioi*. Xenophon recounts that Lycurgus took pains to ensure the support of the most powerful men for his laws before attempting to impose them upon the general population (8.1). And (as mentioned) he describes efforts to ensure that obedient respect for authority was displayed by men of high standing (8.1). These sections of the *Lac*. also suggest that promotion of respect for hierarchy and authority between men were employed to encourage the display of masculine ideals, particularly πειθώ, at the highest levels of adult society. The aim of these measures was exemplary: the most powerful men provided the best examples. Thus, those men positioned lower within hierarchies implicit in the citizen class, desiring both to achieve the status of their betters and to be approved by them, would be expected to emulate their behaviour.

1.3. Pederasty

While Xenophon represents pederasty as a Spartan educational practice, he distinguishes it from the main programme of education, and singles it out for separate treatment. Therefore, I have also chosen to separate pederasty from my main exploration of Spartan education in the *Lac*. When considering the

[172] See p. 79.

implications of pederasty for the construction of Spartan masculinity, two main aspects should be addressed: first, the relational and educational functions of pederasty in moulding Spartan men; and second, to what extent Xenophon's description of chaste pederasty should be taken as true to Spartan ideals. Xenophon's treatment of ideal Spartan pederastic relationships relates primarily to three categories: attitudes towards sex, relations between men and hegemonic masculinity, and institutions (inasmuch as pederasty is depicted as a form of education [2.12]).

After detailing a number of other *poleis*' pederastic practices – demonstrating diversity of opinion concerning pederasty in the Greek world (2.12) – Xenophon describes the form of pederastic practice approved by Lycurgus (2.13-14):

> But Lycurgus judged entirely differently in these matters. For if someone, being good himself, honoured a boy's soul and attempted to make him a friend without reproach and join with him, he [Lycurgus] approved, and believed this to be the finest education. But if someone appeared desirous of the boy's body, then he established this as most shameful and made it that in Lacedaemon lovers stay away from boys no less than parents abstain from sexual relations with their children and brothers from sisters. I do not wonder, however, if these things are disbelieved by some: for in many cities, the customs do not oppose desire for boys.

In this passage, Xenophon provides a clear, if not overly detailed, account of how Spartan pederastic relationships should ideally relate to education, relations between men, and attitudes towards sex.

The first item to discuss is the manner in which the relationship is depicted as forming. Xenophon represents ideal pederasty as being quasi-institutional in nature, as he introduces it within the context of *paideia*: "It seems to me that something must be said concerning the love of boys (τῶν παιδικῶν ἐρώτων);

for this has relation to education (παιδείαν)" (2.12). However, when Xenophon describes how the pederastic relationship is formed, the institutional/educational element is secondary. Rather, he emphasises the element of choice involved in the formation of the relationship. Commencement of the relationship is expressed as relying on the individual discretion and active interest of the would-be *erastes*, who is represented as solely responsible for the decision to initiate the association. Moreover, as Xenophon relates that the interested man attempts (πειρῷτο) to establish a relationship, the text implies an element of freedom of choice and reciprocity on the part of the boy (παῖς) as well. It is only at this point that the figure of Lycurgus enters into the picture, granting his approval to such unions and deeming them most educational. This is a distinctly different emphasis from what we see in Xenophon's description of the shameful form of pederasty, in which the boy was sought after for his body. In this circumstance, the figure of Lycurgus is more central, and the language employed is more evocative of regulation. We are told that Lycurgus established (θεὶς) this behaviour as shameful and made it (ἐποίησεν) so that these sorts of relations were as taboo as incest. Thus, Xenophon's overall emphasis seems to suggest that, while improper sexual attitudes towards pederasty were regulated against, the societally-approved form was only semi-institutional, since the educative element was subsumed within a union which was primarily relational in nature, and subject to the personal choice of the individuals involved.

To what degree Spartan pederasty can be deemed an official element of the institution of education, in any historical actuality, has been a matter of some

debate. Arguments have been made on every point of the spectrum: from the view that Spartan pederasty was a fully institutionalised part of the educational system – not only officially approved, but legally enforced[173] – to the view that pederasty was fundamentally incompatible with the educational system, but remained prominent as a way for elite families to circumvent the institutionalised equality of the educational system.[174] However, both extreme perspectives require us to reject an element of Xenophon's presentation. If we accept the view of pederasty as fully institutionalised, we must disregard Xenophon's emphasis on the element of choice. If we accept the assertion that pederasty was entirely incompatible with "official" education, we must overlook the Lycurgan stamp of approval that Xenophon places on the relationship. Middle-of-the-road views are more convincing than either extreme, as they not only allow for the possibility that pederastic relationships had functions within both the educational and familial spheres, but also resonate more closely with Xenophon's account. One such view is held by Ducat. He argues that Xenophon's association of pederasty with the educational system implies that, like other aspects of education, pederasty was likely both institutional and obligatory. However, Ducat also notes that Xenophon puts great stress on personal choice and frames the formation of pederastic relationships as a private matter, which could mean that not every boy had an *erastes* – though failure to procure one could have had an adverse effect on boys' futures.[175]

---

[173] Cartledge 2001, 86-7 & 2003, 69.
[174] Link 2009, 93-101. Between the two extremes are a number of views which argue for varying levels of institutionalisation present in Spartan pederasty, e.g. Jaeger 1939, 195; MacDowell 1986, 64-5; Rebenich, 1998, 98-9, n. 32; Lipka 2002, 134 on 2.13[1].
[175] Ducat 2006a, 164-8.

Returning to what Xenophon specifically conveys in the *Lac*.; the main difficulty examining Xenophon's depiction of pederasty's contribution to the formation of Spartan masculinity is that, while Xenophon portrays ideal Spartan pederasty as highly educative, he does not recount what information or qualities – necessary for adult male life – it imparted. Xenophon's adamant emphasis on valuing boys' souls over bodies has been seen to reflect a concern with the cultivation of self-control.[176] But here, Xenophon's stress is more reflective of concern for the *erastes*' motivation and behaviour, rather than the qualities he should aim to impart to his beloved. We are in a better position to examine the mode by which Xenophon specifies that pederasty contributed to a boy's education: that is, via mutual association in an upstanding relationship.

Xenophon stresses that not only should the *pais* be sought for the excellence of his soul, but also that the *erastes* should be a good man himself (2.13). Based on their respective excellences, the two are said to form a "friendship without reproach". Xenophon thus emphasises the relationship itself, rather than specific qualities, as the main educative principle, suggesting that the education provided was to be fundamentally relational in nature. The *erastes* would provide a positive example of an adult male to the younger partner, who would be nurtured via their close association.[177] Beyond merely providing a passive example for emulation, the text suggests that *erastai* could be expected

[176] Lipka 2002, 135, on 2.14[4].
[177] Cartledge 2001, 87; Ludwig 2002, 326.

to take an active role in their beloveds' development. Regarding the *paidiskoi*, Xenophon recounts (3.3):

> And, establishing that the penalty if someone should flee from these duties was that he would no longer retain honours, he made it so that not only public officials, but also those who cared for each of them would take care, so that they would not, by shirking their responsibilities, become entirely without repute in the city.

Xenophon situates the establishment of the pederastic relationship at the stage when a boy was still a *pais*, but places his discussion of pederasty at the end of his treatment of *paideia* – perhaps indicating that the pederasty was introduced at the stage of transition from *pais* to *paidiskos*. Therefore, one would expect that the *erastes* would be counted amongst those who "cared for" a *paidiskos* (τοὺς κηδομένους), and thus would be engaged with monitoring his performance of required duties.

Further insight into the pederastic relationship can be gained by looking beyond Xenophon's description in the *Lac*. to his portrayal of the relationship between Archidamus and Cleonymus, described in the Sphodrias episode in Xenophon's *Hellenica* (5.4.25-33), to be discussed in more detail in Chapter 4.[178] This passage provides a number of insights into the relationship. We are told that Cleonymus approached Archidamus with a request on behalf of his father while Archidamus was at his *syssition* (5.4.28), and that Archidamus was accustomed to going often to visit Cleonymus (5.4.29). This suggests that interaction between pederastic partners was expected to be frequent and occurred within a variety of settings. Additionally, the specific setting of the *syssition* possibly supports the suggestion that a boy's *erastes* played a role in

[178] See pp. 255-69.

providing him access to the world of adult men.[179] We are shown scenes where the relationship displays a role in providing emotional support and connectedness between members. This can be seen in the depiction of Archidamus weeping with Cleonymus upon hearing of his father's plight (5.4.27), as well as in the gratitude and devotion towards his *erastes* expressed by Cleonymus upon hearing of his father's acquittal (25.4.33). We are told that Cleonymus' response to Archidamus' efforts on his behalf is expressed in a vow to prove his friendship worthy of honour, dutifully fulfilled, suggesting that the relationship inspired Cleonymus to conduct himself honourably not only in battle,[180] but in all things (5.4.33):[181]

> And he did not speak false, but while he lived he did every fine thing that a Spartan ought to do. And moreover, at Leuctra, fighting before the king with Deinon the polemarch, falling three times, he was the first to die in the midst of the enemy. And while this grieved Archidamus to the utmost, nevertheless as he promised, he did not bring him shame, but rather honour.

Scholars have also suggested that, beyond their educative and ideological value, pederastic relationships could have served political functions amongst members of the elite, and that pederastic relationships may have been involved in the creation and maintenance of the political elite through a system of nepotism.[182] These ideas are also supported by the example of Archidamus and Cleonymus as well, as the political dimension and application of pederastic practice is central in this episode; Sphodrias' desire to exploit his son's relationship with Agesilaus' son, in order to secure the support of an opposing

---

[179] Kennell, 125-6; Ducat 2006a, 164-6, 169.
[180] Xenophon's comments at *Sym.* 4.10-18 associate Spartan pederasty with good conduct in battle.
[181] See Gray, 2007, 156, on 2.12-4 for Cleonymus' death as evidence of the promotion of moral qualities by a pederastic relationship.
[182] Cartledge 1987, 151-2; 2001, 86-105; Link 2009, 93-101.

political faction, provides the context in which the details of the relationship are divulged (5.4.25-6).

The last aspect of Spartan pederasty remaining to be discussed is the manner in which Xenophon's represents Spartan attitudes towards sex. Despite Xenophon's straightforward description of the form of pederasty approved by Lycurgus, which asserts that ideologically approved Spartan pederasty was chaste, there has been considerable discussion about the "true" nature of Spartan pederasty. A number of scholars find Xenophon's presentation of Spartan pederasty – a purely educational affair with no sexual dimension or motivation – highly suspect. For instance, some view Xenophon's depiction of Spartan pederasty as blatant Socratic rhetoric, conforming to ideals expressed by the Socrates represented in Xenophon's other works, and to which some assume Xenophon also adhered.[183]

However, there are a number of reasons for rejecting this interpretation. Views such as that expressed by Thornton, who sees Xenophon as anxious to absolve the Spartans from the taint of sexual pederasty because he, like Socrates and Plato, "considers sexual relations between men a depravity that all right-thinking men should abhor as much as they would incest",[184] place an overemphasis on pederastic sex – rather than non-procreative sex in general – as Socrates' personal bugbear. In Xenophon's Socratic works, the pederastic relationship is often vaunted for its didactic value. And in instances in which

[183] Hindley 1994, 361;1999, 74; Thornton 1997, 103; Lipka 2002, 134-5, on 2.13[3].
[184] Thornton 1997, 103.

he transmits Socrates' rigorous stance against physical expression in pederastic relationships, Xenophon indicates disparity between his personal view and that of his mentor. In the *Memorabilia* Xenophon presents Socrates' complete denunciation of expressions of *eros* towards boys, as indicative of remarkable powers of self-control, and suggests that Socrates' stance was considerably more severe than prevalent public opinion (1.3.8-15). Moreover, when Xenophon recounts an instance wherein Socrates is scandalised by the knowledge that Critobulus had kissed an attractive boy (*Mem.* 1.3.10), Xenophon joked that he (Xenophon) would be tempted to perform such "scandalous" behaviour himself. Additionally, Critobulus' speech in Xenophon's *Symposium* (4.10-18), makes an eloquent argument that pederastic relationships, inspired to some extent by physical qualities, can still be conducive to virtue for participants. Moreover, while Xenophon's representation of the Lycurgan stance on pederasty may have had parallels with his presentation of Socrates, the *Lac.* itself is not a Socratic work. Thus, Xenophon had no need to represent Spartan pederastic practice as being in line with Socratic ideals in order to designate it as ideologically upright within Spartan society. And yet, in spite of professed personal acceptance of physical expression within pederastic relationships, Xenophon maintains – not only in the *Lac.* but in the *Symposium* as well – that, in order to be ideologically acceptable, Spartan pederasty had to be chaste (8.35):[185]

> But the Lacedaemonians, who believe that if someone should experience desire of the body (ἐὰν καὶ ὀρεχθῇ τις σώματος), he shall no longer obtain what is fine and good (καλοῦ κἀγαθοῦ), make their beloveds so perfectly brave (ἀγαθοὺς) that, even if they should be arrayed with foreigners and not with their own *erastai*, they are nonetheless ashamed to desert those with them. For the goddess they worship is not Shamelessness (Ἀναίδειαν) but Modesty (Αἰδῶ).

[185] Rebenich 1998, 102, n. 40.

In this light, it is reasonable to believe that Xenophon's insistence upon the non-sexual nature of Spartan pederasty reflects his interpretation of Spartan attitudes, which held pederastic chastity as the ethical standard *par excellence*.

Scholars who assert Xenophon's portrayal of Spartan pederasty was deliberately mendacious and designed respond to prevalent contemporary belief that Spartan pederasty was indeed sexual,[186] point to sources which suggest that Spartans were widely reputed for proclivities towards same-sex relation. These include Plato's comments on the carnal nature of Dorian of pederasty (*Laws* 1.636B, 8.836A-8.837D; *Rep.* 3.402E - 3.403C); comedic allusions, such as the Spartan delegates in the *Lysistrata* expressing a singularly anal fixation in their sexual imagery (1148-1188);[187] and – ironically – Xenophon himself, since his description of a certain Thersander as an imitator of Laconian ways (ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀλκῆς ἰσχύος, ἅτε λακωνίζων, ἀντεποιεῖτο: *Hell.* 4.8.18) has been taken as a *double entendre* suggesting Spartans' same-sexual proclivities.[188] However, the strength of Xenophon's assertions in the *Lac*. regarding Spartan pederastic ideals does not indicate that he believed that Spartan always followed ideal practices.[189] Even scholars who are adamant that physical pederasty was likely not illegal in any real sense and

[186] Moore 1975, 101; MacDowell 1986, 64-5; Powell, 1989, 176; Kennell 1995, 124; Thornton 1997, 86-7, 103, 194-5; Cartledge 2001, 94, 97, 2003, 69; Lipka 2002, 134-5, on 2.13[3]; Ducat 2006a, 11-2, 15.
[187] Although the situation presented by comedic allusion is not straight-forward. For instance, Dover 1978, 185-90, notes that references to Spartan fondness for anal intercourse do not necessarily imply a male object. Indeed, the object to which Spartan anal fixation was focused in the *Lysistrata* was the female personification of peace. Dover also cautions that plays written at a time of Athenian-Spartan aggression could be more indicative of the employment of comedic trope to slander one's enemies than of actual Spartan reputation.
[188] Strassler 2009, 392 n. on 4.8.18b.
[189] As discussed, the history section (p.269), Xenophon gives a number of scenarios which could indicate that practice frequently did not match ideology.

occurred in Spartan practice, recognise that the importance of Xenophon's comments lies not in the absolute truth of non-sexual Spartan pederasty, but in his assertion that Spartan pederasty's ideal form was thought to be morally and educationally improving.[190] The important fact was the existence of the ideal, not whether it was upheld in every instance. For Xenophon, the respectable Spartan man did not have sexual relations with boys. Therefore, individuals' adherence (or lack thereof) to this mandate of acceptable masculine sexual expression provides another measure by which their character, at large, could be assessed. Indeed, this is reflected in Xenophon's awareness and discussion of Spartan men's same sexual relationships in his other works.[191]

1.4. All-Male Institutions of Hunting and *Syssitia*

Xenophon states that his primary reason for writing the *Lac.* was to relate the institutions (ἐπιτηδεύματα) that allowed Sparta to become successful (1.1).[192] In line with this stated purpose, he provides detailed descriptions of several all-male Spartan social institutions. These provide valuable material for examination of Xenophon's depictions of Spartan masculinity in his philosophical writing. Education, as an institution, has already been discussed. This section will therefore focus on two social institutions listed by Xenophon as being among those most important for adult males: hunting and *syssitia* (4.7, 5).[193] The categories of construction of masculinity most prominent in the

---

[190] MacDowell 1986, 62-5; Cartledge 2003, 69.
[191] See p. 276.
[192] There has been discussion over what exactly Xenophon means by τὰ ἐπιτηδεύματα, but for the purposes of this investigation, I am following Whitby 1994, 90; Lipka 2002, 100 on 1.1[8], who assert that the term, in Xenophon's usage, can be understood as referring to "social institutions" generally.
[193] Contests for excellence also featured on this list. However, contests will be discussed in more detail later. See p. 96.

following discussion of these institutions are: institutions, representation and performativity, discourse, and relations between men and hegemonic masculinity.

1.4.1. Hunting

Xenophon portrays hunting as an important practice for Spartan men (4.7):

> For those who have passed the age of youth, from whom the greatest offices are appointed, while the other Greeks remove from these the necessity of continuing to care for their strength, but nonetheless require them to serve in the army, Lycurgus established the finest practice for those of this age to be hunting, if some civic duty did not prevent them, so that they would be able to bear the toils of soldiering no less than the young men.

Xenophon's association of Lycurgus with hunting practice suggests represents hunting not as a mere pastime, but rather a formalised institutional practice. The institutional nature of hunting is further reinforced by the suggestion that hunting was obligatory, implied through comparison with other Greeks who were not obligated to take such pains to maintain fitness (4.7). The primary purpose of this institution is expressed, in the *Lac*., as sustaining adult males' physical fitness for war. Xenophon's discussion of hunting as training for war in the *Lac*. is fairly brief, compared with his treatment of the ideal form of hunting in the *Cynegeticus.* In this work, Xenophon elaborates further on the aspects of the hunt that make it particularly suitable to prepare men for both the physical and moral demands of soldiering (12.1-9).[194] Physically, we are told that hunting promotes bodily health (12.1); it improves endurance, rendering men better able to perform soldierly labours including marching under arms, sleeping in the rough, guarding posts (12.2), maintaining one's position, and carrying out orders (12.3); and that hunting increases familiarity

[194] Johnstone 1994, 228.

with rough terrain, making men more sure-footed and capable in attack and retreat (12.4). As it relates to moral concerns, we are told (*Cyn.* 12.7-9):

> It makes them sensible (σώφρονάς) and just (δικαίους), because it educates them in truth – and they perceived that they were fortunate in war and other things because of such men. And it does not deprive them of any fine pursuit that they wish, like other wicked pleasures, which they should not learn. From men of this sort do good soldiers and generals arise. For their toils remove what is shameful and insolent from both soul and body and increase desire for virtue (ἀρετῆς); they are the best, for they will not look upon injustice in their own *polis* or suffer wickedness upon the land.

While Xenophon concedes that the benefits to body and character bestowed by hunting can be possessed by women as well, citing Atalanta and Procris as examples (*Cyn.*13.18), this association remains in the mythological realm. Xenophon's discussion of the real-world practice of hunting places it firmly within the realm of activities undertaken exclusively by males, thus giving it characteristically masculine connotations.[195] While it is true that Xenophon's portrayal of hunting in the *Cynegeticus* is considerably more idealised and exaggerated than his comparatively laconic and practical account of hunting's benefits in the *Lac.*, in both cases hunting is professed to have both physical and ideological benefits for men. Moreover, despite the difference in scale, the benefits related in the two works (both physical and ideological) are in line with one another.

Additional references to hunting in the *Lac.* illuminate other roles this institution is depicted as playing in male spheres. We are told that the proceeds of the hunt were one way in which a man could contribute additional fare (beyond the minimum contributions of foodstuffs required as *syssition* dues) to

[195] Anderson 1985, 26-9; Kennell 1995, 77; Barringer 2001, 10-15, 40-45; Lipka 2002, 147-8 on 4.7[3]; Knottnerus and Berry 2002, 13; Hodkinson 2006, 136.

his *syssition* (5.3). Xenophon also recounts that Lycurgus put in place provisions to ensure that all citizen males could partake in the hunt, including mandated sharing of hunting dogs and trail rations (6.3-4). These supplementary references to hunting are given less significance, in the text, than the connection between hunting and soldiering. However, analysis of these minor references reveals implications for Spartan ideas of masculinity, as significant as hunting's connection to war. Information can be gleaned from these references which indicate effects of hunting on discourse and male relations,[196] suggesting that hunting could impact a man's status in relation to his economic standing and personal ability.

Hunting is represented as integral to relations between men. Anderson asserts that Xenophon creates the impression that hunting expeditions were undertaken in small and intimate groups. He suggests that the discussions of hunting between the kings Agesilaus and Agesipolis in the *Hellenica* (5.3.2) indicate the importance of hunting in fostering male relationships – not only between contemporaries, but also inter-generationally.[197] In the *Cynegeticus*, Xenophon sees ideal hunting as a practice that promotes co-operative behaviours and ideals.[198] He contrasts the huntsman, presented as willingly

[196] I have refrained from discussing certain treatments of Spartan hunting which collate Sparta with Crete, and discuss Dorian connotations of hunting more generally. As I intend to limit my exploration to the significance of hunting which can be reasonably drawn from the *Lac.*, these studies are, regrettably, beyond the scope of my project. For further reading see Jaeger 1945, 165; Anderson 1985, 29; David 1993, 398-9; Barringer 2001, 10-12; Lipka 2002, 147-8 on 4.7[3]; Knottnerus and Berry 2002, 13. See Cartledge 2003a, 281, for discussions of hunting as training (both ritual and literal). See Barringer 2001, 10-11, 13, 47, for discussion of hunting as an initiation ritual for boys into adult society. See David 1993, 400-1; Barringer 2001, 113-4; Lipka 2002, 147-8 on 4.7[3], for associations between hunting and pederasty.
[197] Anderson 1985, 27-8. For further discussion on ways in which hunting was seen to foster comradery, see David 1993, esp. 398-9, 403.
[198] Johnstone 1994, 228-9.

engaging in self-sacrificing activities for the benefit of his *polis*, with the politician, depicted as harming even friends for the sake of personal gain (13.15-17). Measures to ensure hunting's accessibility are also rooted within the realm of male homosocial relations. Xenophon's account exclusively emphasises the positive impact that these measures were believed to have had on male relations: "And he established for hunting dogs to be used commonly, so that those who are in need of dogs invite [their master] to the hunt; and if he does not have leisure, he gladly sends the dogs" (6.3). Hodkinson notes that Xenophon stresses the necessity to invite the dog-owner to the hunt, making an element of camaraderie implicit in an otherwise economic arrangement.[199] Shared experiences between lender and borrower of dogs may also have fostered conviviality between rich and poor, by providing pretext for social interaction between men who might not have other cause to engage with one another.

Sharing of provisions is also presented by the text as a measure intended to decrease tensions inherent in the various hierarchies and inequalities that existed among the *homoioi*. The tools and provisions necessary for hunting comprise a significant portion of Xenophon's treatment of the private property which was to be made available for common use. Xenophon asserts that the goal of this measure was that "even those having little, share in everything in the land" (6.5). Thus, hunting is portrayed as a pastime deliberately made available to poor men, to foster a sense of shared involvement in activities otherwise reserved exclusively for the rich. Although rather idealised – and

[199] Hodkinson 2000, 179, 200.

somewhat lop-sided – in its emphasis (as will be discussed later), there is a good deal of merit to Xenophon's representation of hunting as a levelling mechanism. Operating as such, hunting as an institution was associated with ideologies of manhood in a number of respects. As hunting was situated within the elite milieu,[200] granting poorer men access to this pastime likely gave them a degree of shared standing in elite male ethos as well.[201] Furthermore, hunting prowess is revealed as a means of providing poor men with opportunities for prestige, via contributions from the hunt to *syssitia*. Kennell describes hierarchy, implicit in descriptions of Spartan *syssitia*, as associated with an atmosphere of "competitive display of generosity", in which the spoils of the hunt were one of only two approved expressions – the other being the produce of one's estate, in the form of wheaten bread, which the text associates exclusively with the rich: οἱ δὲ πλούσιοι ἔστιν ὅτε καὶ ἄρτον ἀντιπαραβάλλουσιν (5.3).[202] A successful hunter could increase his social credit amongst his mess-mates by providing a bonus food item to the table, regardless of his economic status.[203]

Xenophon's account of hunting in the *Lac*. (not unlike the *Cynegeticus)* seeks to promote the aspects of hunting which build cohesion. However, the text also illuminates (albeit implicitly) ways in which the customs associated with hunting could serve to reinforce the hierarchical social advantage of rich men over poor. Hodkinson rightly cautions against reading too much into the

[200] Johnstone 1994, 227-8.
[201] Anderson 1985, 25-6; David 1993, 394-5; Barringer 2001, 10, 44-5; Lipka 2002, 147-8 on 4.7[3].
[202] Kennell 1995, 130.
[203] Fisher 1989, 31-2; David 1993, 400-402; Hodkinson 2000, 130; Cartledge 2003a; 280; Link 2004, 5.

potential of institutionalised sharing as a levelling measure, since the measures mentioned by Xenophon fell far short of allowing the poor access to everything enjoyed by the rich, and these measures had more symbolic than economic value.[204] Moreover, David points out an element of paradox in this supposedly equalising measure. Such measures could actually have served to enhance the prestige of wealthy Spartans and accentuate the divide between those who had things to lend out and those who were required to borrow. This especially evident in the case of hunting dogs, as the procedure Xenophon outlines necessitates that those who lack dogs invite the dog-owner on the hunt – meaning that dogs could be borrowed outright only if their master was otherwise engaged: ὥστε οἱ μὲν δεόμενοι παρακαλοῦσιν ἐπὶ θήραν, ὁ δὲ μὴ αὐτὸς σχολάζων ἡδέως ἐκπέμπει (6.3).[205]

Because Xenophon promotes only one side of the picture, it is difficult to assess which were of greater significance: the elements emphasised by the text (which underemphasise the gap between rich and poor), or those which are implicit (which accentuate the gap). Contributions made by a hunter could arguably have had a greater weight in terms of boosting his reputation for masculine achievement than those of the man who provided the "luxury" of wheaten bread, due to hunting's associations with warfare. Hunting's connection to ideals of the fine citizen and soldier could lend ideological weight to the achievements of a proficient hunter.[206] Additionally, David suggests that conversations about hunting likely made up part of the talk of

[204] Hodkinson 2000, 23, 200-1.
[205] David 1993, 403.
[206] David 1993, 394; Barringer 2001, 13, 41 discuss the close ideological association between the fine hunter and soldier. See also Anderson 1985, 29; Christesen 2012, 239.

"fine things", which took place in Spartan *syssitia*, serving to further position members within the hierarchy based on their relative successes or failures.[207]

Due to the abovementioned associations, it is possible that Xenophon intends to represent hunting as an avenue by which an impoverished man could attain a similar or greater level of social credit within the setting of the *syssition* to those richer than himself, by means of personal *aretē*.[208] However, such suggestions require qualification. Whatever hunting's association with war might imply for the proficient hunter's masculine excellence, in the text Xenophon presents contributions made from the hunt and from wealth (in the form of wheaten bread) as equal, and refrains from commenting on any ideological implications. Furthermore, wealthy men were as likely as poor men to be proficient hunters. This is especially so, since they had more ready access to necessities such as hunting dogs – the procurement and training of which, as outlined in the *Cynegeticus* (2.5-9, 5.15-21, 7.6-12), would have been both costly and time consuming.[209] When this is combined with awareness of the implicit implications in Xenophon's account of hunting etiquette (that it held the potential to further distinguish rich men) the level of social benefit poor men could attain by hunting becomes questionable. Indeed, Xenophon's portrayal indicates the possibility that hunting may also have contributed (although perhaps inadvertently) to establishing a wealth-based hierarchy amongst men and making wealth a factor in the ideology of male achievement.

[207] David 1993, 402.
[208] Cartledge 2003a, 280.
[209] Johnstone 1994, 229.

1.4.2. *Syssitia*

Xenophon represents s*yssitia* as a key institution, serving important social functions for Spartiate men of all ages.[210] Perhaps most significantly, acceptance into a *syssition* was a landmark signifying a young man's integration into the society of adult males;[211] as well as being a necessary criterion for attainment of citizenship and societal status.[212] Xenophon depicts the primary function of *syssitia* as contributing to regulation of acceptable standards of masculine behaviour via institutionalised socialisation (5.2):

> So Lycurgus, having ascertained that the Spartiates were dining at home, just like the other Greeks, thought this to be the cause of a great deal of slacking off. He brought the messes out into the open, believing that this would result in the least transgression of orders.

The main aims of the *syssitia's* moderating role are presented as promotion of inter-generational social-cohesion and limitation of expressions of excess and hubris among the *homoioi*.[213] The text portrays publicly-conducted, mixed-age messes as Lycurgus' solution to excessive consumption of food and drink, obscene speech and conduct, and shamelessness – likely to result if men were allowed to engage in private dining (5.2-7). Xenophon describes a number of ways in which *syssitia* accomplished the lawgiver's aims, pertinent to concepts of masculinity. *Syssitia* are presented as involving relations between men, representation and performativity, and discourse in order to fulfil their function. I will begin with the exploration of how the *syssitia,* as an institution, sought to imbue and promote approved ideology and practice via regulation of male discursive and performative expression. Then I will move on to the

[210] Cartledge 2003a, 279.
[211] Kennell 1995, 130.
[212] Cartledge 2003a, 85, 279; Hodkinson 2006, 143.
[213] Fisher 1989, 32; Hodkinson 2000, 218; Knottnerus and Berry 2002, 23; Figueira 2003, 62.

mechanism of regulation, modulated primarily via relations between men within individual *syssitia*. I will also aim to assess features of *syssitia*, as related by Xenophon, that may have resulted in deviation in actual practice from the ideal operation he outlines in the text.

Xenophon depicts a concerted effort to regulate male behaviour and discourse via the *syssitia*, bringing it in line with particular modes of officially-approved ideological expression. The relocation of the dining setting from the private to the civic sphere, accomplished by the creation of messes, is described as deliberately designed to heighten men's awareness of the need to maintain acceptable conduct, not only at the meals themselves, but also on the way home from dining. The sense of being on display inherent in this arrangement would likely produce a performative response in attendees, who would seek to conform behaviour and discussion to the required standards (5.3-7). A notable example is that awareness of the need to walk home after dining (and presumably awareness of one's visibility during this walk), was said to steer men towards habits of moderation (5.7):

> And this eating outside produced good results. For, being compelled upon departing to walk home, they take care not to stumble under the effects of wine; knowing that they cannot stay there where they dined, and that they must do the same in the darkness as in the day.

In addition to performative behavioural codes affecting conduct, *syssitia* discussion was also directed towards particular, approved themes. Xenophon relates that undesirable talk and actions – such as hubris, drunken behaviour (παροινίαν), shamelessness (αἰσχρουργίαν), and obscenity (αἰσχρολογίαν) – were minimised by the promotion of edifying discussion topics (5.6). We are

told that it was customary to discuss "fine deeds done in the *polis*" (καλῶς τις ἐν τῇ πόλει ποιήσῃ) at mess. Xenophon places his treatment of the discussion of fine deeds within the wider context of Lycurgus' creation of *syssitia* as an official institution to combat the cultivation of undesirable male behaviour. This suggests that understanding of "fine deeds" were likely intended to be informed, to some degree, by ideals officially approved at the *polis* level. Modes of conversation within *syssitia* can, in this light, be seen as concerned with the promotion of *polis* ideology concerning excellent male conduct and achievement – both through the repetition of principles and the honour associated with being the one who has accomplished such deeds.[214] This is, of course, only one dimension of the discussion of "fine deeds". In practice, it is likely that ideas about what constituted "fine deeds" varied somewhat from mess to mess. Moreover, since Xenophon presents us with an idealised depiction (as he does throughout the *Lac*.), it is likely that actual *syssitia* conversation strayed from such "approved" topics from time to time – especially since Plutarch made mention, on more than one occasion (Plut. *Inst.* 1, *Lyc.* 12.5), that conversations that took place in the mess were held as confidential between mess-mates. Nevertheless, discussion of outstanding male performance, and honour associated with being the subject of such discussion, can be seen to contribute to the discursive construction of masculinity.

S*yssitia* conversation can be seen to form a multi-level discourse of male excellence situating men socially, both within individual *syssition* and within

[214]Whitby 1994, 110-1; Fisher 1989, 37-8; Hodkinson 2000, 217.

society at large. For example, Fisher suggests that the implications of *syssitia* discussion could impact a man's ideological self-evaluation on a number of levels within society. He suggests that small achievements were more likely to be praised in one's *syssition* than on a state level, while great accomplishments would not only be lauded by one's own *syssition* but could also reflect on the collective *aretē* of the *syssition* as a whole.[215] It is somewhat questionable to what degree a man (or his *syssition*) whose deeds were discussed in multiple *syssitia* would likely benefit socially from this fact. If we accept Plutarch's assertion that *syssition* conversation was bound to secrecy, the celebrated individual may never have become aware of his popularity. However, being the subject of widespread discussion and esteem, however covert, would undoubtedly spill over into spheres beyond the *syssitia*, and impact a man's reputation within the wider society, perhaps even gaining him a publicly awarded post – just as some of Brasidas' appointments (such as eponymous ephor [Xen. *Hell.* 2.3.10]) may have resulted from public acclaim.[216] Thus, *syssitia* discussion could have impacted men's internalised sense of masculine achievement on multiple levels. A man whose achieved excellence in smaller matters, unlikely to be recognised on the society-wide level, would nevertheless receive a modicum of recognition for his performance. This would, in turn, help him to reconcile himself to his position within the larger societal hierarchy of men. And the lucky mess-mates of a man widely recognised for masculine excellence would have found their own ideological standing enhanced via association.

---

[215] Fisher 1989, 39-40. See also Hodkinson 2000, 363 regarding emphasis placed on the attitudes of the *syssition* when one of its members is elected into the *Gerousia* in Plut. *Lyc.* 26.
[216] Hodkinson 1983, 260-261.

The most prominent aspect of Xenophon's depiction is the influence of relations between men on encouraging conformity of male behaviour to accepted standards and promoting cohesion between adult men of various stages of life. Xenophon's portrayal suggests that age-mixing in the messes had a two-fold effect in reinforcing upstanding conduct in young men. One of these is explicit in the text, and one is implied. The idea explicitly highlighted is that the elders' example would have an instructive effect on the young (5.5-6). Furthermore, we are told that, in states where dining parties customarily comprise men of similar ages, one will find little modesty (αἰδὼς) at such gatherings (5.5). Xenophon indicates that Lycurgus believed the presence of men other than one's contemporaries was thought to have a sobering effect on behaviour, in and of itself. The emphasis on elders' good example suggests that this effect would be the strongest on young men; they would be less inclined to be ill-mannered in the presence of their elders, than in the company of peers alone.[217] However, also implicit is the likelihood that the presence of young men would serve to promote older men's adherence to approved conduct, since they were required to provide the young with the good examples to which the text refers. The overall effect evinces a reciprocal relationship, promoting conformity to approved standards of deportment on the part of young and old alike.[218] Moreover, while the overt portrayal of relations between older and younger men focuses on the active, instructive aspects of interaction, the implicit aspects bring a performative dimension to such

[217] Powell 2001, 226.
[218] Moore 1975, 106; Fisher 1989, 36; Lipka 2002, 156 on 5.6[1]; Ducat 2006a, 166.

relations. The modulating effect of age-mixing relies upon men's awareness of the gaze of senior or junior messmates, and adjustment of conduct in response to that gaze.

Other aspects, connected to relations between men, can be seen in Xenophon's emphasis on what can be interpreted as levelling measures within *syssitia*. Xenophon's description of the material aspects of *syssitia* – such as emphasis on simple fare and moderate consumption (5.3-4) and prohibition from monetary spending on messmates (7.3-4) – places primary emphasis on the desire to promote moderate habits, and the cultivation of a mindset which values individuals' achievement over wealth. However, the expressed desire for such measures to cultivate a uniform standard of living (7.3) suggests that they were also intended to have a levelling effect, fostering feelings of equality and cohesion between a *syssition's* richer and poorer members.[219]

Xenophon's discussion of drinking practice also indicates a measure prescribed to promote moderation. He recounts that: "[Lycurgus] put a stop to compulsory drinking, which overthrows the body and the mind, rather allowing each to drink whenever he had thirst, believing that this sort of drinking is least harmful and most pleasant" (5.4). While Xenophon's text lacks details, recounted by Critias (*Athen*. X.432D, XI.463E), that this was accomplished by providing each man with his own cup to drink from as he chose and abolishing the passing of cups and making toasts (which obliged men to drink), it nonetheless indicates how this might promote the value of

[219] Moore 1975, 108; Kennell 1995, 130; Hodkinson 2000, 218; Christesen 2012, 232.

restraint in the context of male sociable relations. The abolition of compulsory drinking and the allowance for men to drink as they saw fit places the onus for sober and respectable behaviour squarely on the individual. Presumably, Lycurgus thought that drunkenness was more likely to occur in contexts where one could be reasonably assured that one's fellows were imbibing in similar fashion, as any violation of ideals of sobriety would be shared by all present. Leaving the responsibility of determining how much to imbibe in the *syssition* to individual discretion would mean that one would have no guarantee that others would be inclined to drink heavily and would thus, perhaps, err on the side of caution, not desiring to be marked out for indecorous behaviour. This seems to be Xenophon's predicted effect of drinking practice, as he invites the reader to try to discern what occasion these messes could possibly provide for men to ruin themselves or their households by drunkenness or gluttony (5.4).

Xenophon's account of Spartan *syssitia*, as with hunting, places emphasis firmly on the equalising aspects. However, the text also indicates *syssitia* could be deeply hierarchical in structure. This suggests that *syssitia* also fostered competition between men (another category of the construction of masculinity) to increase their social position within mess hierarchy.[220] As mentioned, a man could increase his status through food donations, or by being the subject of praise for fine deeds. Theoretically, hierarchical ranking based on such qualifications is not necessarily at odds with larger goals of equalisation; such criteria for honour were accessible to all Spartiate men. However, the ideology which Xenophon suggests positioned men within the *syssition* hierarchy may

[220] Hodkinson 2000, 356-7.

have been in conflict with institutionalised ideals of performance-based masculine excellence, as it again advantaged the wealthy.[221]

Xenophon claims that *syssitia* were, ideally, an institution which devalued materialism by prohibiting against spending material wealth on messmates as a means to gain honour (7.4). However, the acceptability of the contribution of wheaten bread seems to have provided a way for affluent members to employ their wealth, while technically abiding by the prohibition. Social credit associated with the contribution of surplus foodstuffs wold grant access to elevated positions within the masculine hierarchy of the *syssitia*. The wealthy had greater likelihood of procuring credit via this avenue since, in historical actuality, only the rich would likely have had the option of planting the less reliable wheat crop, owing to their surplus of land. Poorer men would need the majority of their land to plant the barley required for compulsory mess dues.[222] While a poor man may have the opportunity to earn credit through hunting ability, a rich man had both hunting ability and the produce of his estate by which to gain the same credit. This idea seems to be borne out by the text. Xenophon's description of surplus food items lists only game and wheaten bread, the latter of which Xenophon associates specifically with the rich: "But many additions come from that which is taken in the hunt; and the rich sometimes substitute wheaten bread instead" (5.3). Men's maneuvering for hierarchical status within the *syssitia* is not a stated aim of Xenophon's depiction of this institution. In fact – far from supporting professed ideals –

[221] Hodkinson 2000, 23-4, 179, 356-7.
[222] Cf. Hodkinson 1989, 80.

certain features of the *syssitia* seem to somewhat undermine its stated purpose: Xenophon's account of competitive giving within *syssitia* implies that the rich could, in effect, purchase a certain amount of hierarchical standing.[223]

This is not to say, however, that Xenophon portrays the advantage of the rich as all-encompassing. Several non-material elements are represented as contributing to hierarchy of men within the *syssitia*. Explicitly mentioned are age and prowess in hunting. Additionally, other areas of personal accomplishment, such as political or athletic achievement, may have played a role – depending on what qualified as "fine deeds" worthy of *syssition* discussion. Moreover, simply holding a place in a *syssition* positioned a man in the upper echelon of Spartan society – above countless men of subaltern status – via its bestowment of citizen rights. Fisher suggests that such awareness of this would have suppressed the discontent of less fortunate citizens and fostered cohesion amongst the minority of men – rich and poor alike – who occupied a position within the Spartan citizenry.[224]

Indeed, the present investigation is somewhat limited by Xenophon's lack of elaboration on *syssitia* with respect to non-Spartiates. Ideological usage of *syssitia* in relation to these groups would have, undoubtedly, impacted relations between Spartiate and non-Spartiate males (thus having bearing on Spartan constructions of masculinity).[225] For instance, Plutarch (*Lyc*. 28. 4-5) relates that helots were forced to drink in the messes, to demonstrate to young

[223] Flower 1991, 90; Lipka 2002, 152-3 on 5.3[4]; Hodkinson 2000, 23-4, 179, 356-7.
[224] Fisher 1989, 40.
[225] Fisher 1989 has made interesting suggestions regarding uses the syssitia may have had with respect to subclasses within the Spartan system.

men the ill-effects of drunkenness, and that they were made to perform low songs and dances (and forbidden from performing noble ones). With such treatment, Plutarch asserts, they proved the saying: “in Lacedaemon a free man is especially free, and a slave is a slave indeed” (28.5). Plutarch’s account suggests that the treatment of helots, within the context of *syssitia*, would have been instructive and cohesion-building for Spartiates. Helot demonstration of drunkenness and coarse behaviour would be off-putting, not only because it would point out the more repulsive aspects of diminished inhibition, but also because coarse and drunken behaviour would consequently be associated with helots themselves. Identification of helots as embodying these anti-ideals would likely reinforce the desirability of sober, respectable conduct encouraged within s*yssitia*, as well as promote cohesion between *syssition* members via shared dissociation with and disdain for the helots present. Unfortunately, these ideas fall outside the scope of this study. Therefore, the overall picture of Spartan *syssitia* in the *Lac.* is that of an institution which operated (if imperfectly) to stress conformity to approved behavioural codes; motivated by men’s concern for maintaining exemplary appearance among one’s fellows, as well as competitive desire for honour and position.

1.5. Competition

Thus far, discussion of male interaction has focused predominantly on instructive or hierarchical relationships. The mode of transference of desired traits in such relationships is represented as being positive in nature; accomplished through archetypal modeling by senior or enviable Spartan men. While there are indications of competitive elements in the above analysis of

relations between men, the impression given by the text is that these elements are incidental and are not presented as intentional vehicles for the transmission of masculine ideals. However, Xenophon's portrayal of competition between Spartan men also suggests intentional employment of male antagonism for cultivation of culturally vaunted expressions of manhood. The primary constructionist categories evident in Xenophon's account of male competitions are competition and relations between men and hegemonic masculinity. Also evident (though to a lesser extent) are the categories of institutions and representation and performativity.

In what follows, I will discuss Xenophon's depictions of various male competitions for excellence occurring during the course of a Spartan man's life and what significance these may have had on the development of Spartan masculinity throughout the lifespan. I will then look more closely at the competition surrounding the institution of the *hippeis* as a paradigm example and analyse this as a possible mechanism of hegemonic masculinity.

1.5.1. Competition Promoting Societal Ideals Throughout the Lifespan

The atmosphere of competition pervades Spartan life in the *Lac*., and Xenophon records instances of formalised male competition at a number of points throughout the lifespan. These include the following instances:

(1) at the time of boyhood, the ritualised competitive theft at the ritual of Artemis Orthia (2.9):

> And while he [Lycurgus] established that it was an honour to steal as many cheeses as possible from Orthia; he put upon others the duty to whip these [the thieves], wishing to show in this way that by suffering for a small time one is made fortunate and of good repute for much time. And he showed

> in this way that where swiftness is required, the lazy take little benefit and many troubles.

(2) for adolescents, selection of particular *eirens* to act as leaders (2.11):

> And so that if there ever happened to be no man in attendance, the boys would not be bereft of a leader, he appointed the sharpest of the *eirens* to lead each troop.

(3) for young men, selection of the *hippeis* (4.3):

> Now the ephors choose three men from those who are in full bloom, and these are called *hippagretai*. And each of these selects one hundred men, making clear why he calls one and rejects another.

(4) for fully mature men, eligibility to compete for political offices (4.7):

> And for those who had passed through the age of the *hebontes*, from whom now the greatest offices were appointed…

(5) for old men, the contest to join the *gerousia* (10.1-3):

> And it seems to me that Lycurgus made fine laws by which excellence was practiced even into old age. For by imposing the selection of the *gerousia* at the end of life, he made it so that even in old age there would be no neglect of noble conduct. And admirable also is the aid he gave to good old men. For he established the elders as judges in capital trials, and he made old age to be more honoured than the prime of bodily might. And naturally this contest of men is pursued with the greatest zeal. For contests of gymnastics are fine, but they are of the body; but the contest concerning the elders produces judgement of good souls. Therefore, as much as the soul is mightier than the body, so are the contests of souls worthier of zealous pursuit than those of the body.

Repeated contests between men, demanding that they prove and re-prove themselves at every stage of life, can be seen to factor into the construction of Spartan masculinity. The cumulative effect of such contests suggests a system of unending competition, necessitating men's demonstration of continual commitment to *polis* ideals. Knottnerus and Berry suggest that elements of Spartan practice fall under the umbrella of what they term to be "ritualised practices". These are seen to consist of stylised and repetitive actions, laden with ideological significance, undertaken within social interaction in both

institutional and informal contexts.[226] "Ritualised action repertoires" are seen to comprise much of daily interaction, taken for granted by subjects (making internalisation of connected ideas largely subconscious), as well as playing a role in special events – such as competitions – the distinctiveness of which serves to heighten the salience of associated rituals.[227] They assert that this combination of mundane and extraordinary ritualised practice contributes to the reconciliation of individuals and embedded groups with the dominant ideals of the larger society as they "provide the symbolic meanings that could easily develop into belief systems that serve to validate or legitimate a group and its activities".[228]

These ideas can be seen reflected in Spartan competitions. Interaction surrounding the selection of the *hippeis* provides a particularly relevant example as it showcases the operation of ritualised interaction on both the ceremonial and mundane levels. The process of selection and rejection itself portrays stylised interaction at the ceremonial level, with the selection of individuals and articulation of reasons for acceptance or denial (4.3). This is then followed up by continual monitoring of *hippeis'* behaviour, undertaken by the unchosen, as well as the physical altercations we are told took place whenever members of these two groups happened to meet (4.4-6). This suggests that ideals established at the ceremonial level, via the competition itself, were reinforced through repetitive regular practice within the context of daily life. Thus, mandated male competition among males in the *Lac.* can be

[226] Knottnerus 1997; Knottnerus and Berry 2002, 8-12.
[227] Knottnerus and Berry 2002, 11-12, 14, 18, 22
[228] Knottnerus and Berry 2002, 19.

seen as tools promoting dominant societal ideologies, operating via compulsion towards the public practice of a set of ideals, failure to adhere to which carried the threat of disenfranchisement.

The use of competition to promote the cultivation of ideals, in the *Lac.*, is targeted primarily towards contemporaries. This is the converse of the tactics Xenophon recounts were used in mixed age-groupings, which tend towards the promotion of harmony and emulation. Xenophon's discussion of the *hippeis (*4.3-6) gives special attention to institutionalised rivalry between young men;[229] while the contest for admission into the council of elders (10.1-3) highlights a significant instance of male competition undertaken in old age. This suggests that in the ideal system, institutionalised competition was employed to ensure men's continued investment in societal values throughout the lifespan.

The contests Xenophon chooses to single out for special focus – which suggests that he considered the results of these particular contests to be significance for the reputation and social position of the men involved – are held at the extreme opposite ends of a man's term of full participation in adult society. This could indicate that the underlying assumption made in this text is that competition was particularly useful to ensure social investment at those times of life in which men were most likely to exhibit propensity towards deviation from societal ideals. It is true that the *Lac.* does not present the *hebontes* as the most problematic age group. Rather, Xenophon's Lycurgus

[229] See p. 104.

suggests that *paidiskoi* were the age-group was most likely to exhibit anti-social propensities (3.2):

> [Lycurgus] observed that the greatest willfulness grows in boys of such an age, and the greatest hubris manifests itself, and powerful yearning for pleasures take hold of the mind.

And for *paidiskoi*, it is not competition, but rather strenuous discipline and work, that Lycurgus prescribes to circumvent anti-social tendencies (3.2-5). Nevertheless, I would argue that Xenophon also portrays *hebontes* as a potentially problematic age-group.

Xenophon places Lycurgus' thoughts on the value of positive rivalry (φιλονικία) specifically within the context of his treatment of the *hebontes* (4.1-2). That Xenophon depicts the technique of harnessing *hebontes*' strife as a particularly effective method of dealing with this age group could suggest that tendency towards contentiousness was associated with *hebontes* – as does his depiction of antagonism as the predictable outcome of the selection of the *hippeis*. Indeed, this sentiment is echoed by Plutarch, who records that a certain Paedaretus drew the attention of the ephorate by responding to rejection with cheerful good humour (Plut. *Apoph*. 60). Presumably due (in part) to such tendencies, Xenophon relates that Lycurgus had special concern for this age group: περί γε μὴν τῶν ἡβώντων πολὺ μάλιστα ἐσπούδασε (4.1). The measures put in place to ensure that the combative tendencies of young men remained constructively channeled are represented as taking the form of institutionalised competition. On the other end of the age spectrum, David has remarked that the elderly constitute a group especially at risk of social disengagement arising

from feelings of disenfranchisement.[230] Of course, marginalisation of the elderly is far from universal, and many societies esteem the aged. And Sparta was particularly noted, even in antiquity, for significant societal veneration of elders. David asserts that this veneration, as well as the prominent role the elderly played in important societal institutions and practices, resulted in disaffection of the elderly being especially uncommon in Sparta.[231] Viewed in this light, Xenophon's description of the competition for the *gerousia*, which accentuates Lycurgus' concern to avoid neglect of societal ideals on the part of elderly men (10.1), could indicate an effort to avoid the disaffection of elderly men, similar to the effort to encourage *hebontes*' societal engagement evident in Xenophon's portrayal of the *hippeis*.

In addition to promoting men's continuing societal investment, competitions in the *Lac.* are shown to establish ideal standards for male conduct at various life-stages. The examples of the *hippeis* and the *gerousia* may suggest that masculine ideals varied throughout the lifespan. Xenophon does not specify the nature of the qualities for which men were chosen to become members of the *hippeis*. However, he does discuss the resulting strife at length. Moreover, he asserts that it is from this strife that manly valour is cultivated (4.2). The rivalry described in this section manifests itself in physical confrontation, which is directed largely to promote ideals of physical prowess and obedience to authority figures (4.4-6). The qualities honoured by the selection of the *gerousia* are near polar opposites to those promoted by the strife surrounding

[230] David 1991, 51.
[231] David 1991, 45, 49-50, 53, 94, 106-7.

the selection of the *hippies*. Here Xenophon places emphasis of the qualities of the soul (ψυχή) over those of the body, as well as the promotion of individual discernment rather than merely steadfast adherence to cultural codes (10.2-3). The considerable divergence in ideals in these two competitions suggests that what characterised an excellent Spartan man was expected to change and evolve throughout the lifespan.

The contests most highlighted by Xenophon, set at specific points in a Spartan man's life, can be seen to play a significant role in establishing the benchmark masculine values expected to be exhibited by men at various stages of development, and to situate men at certain societal positions in relation to those ideals. In so doing, a number of the competitions Xenophon depicts can be seen as examples of institutionalised mechanisms, establishing a framework of hegemonic masculinity within the Spartiate class. The hegemonic forms of masculinity established by such competitions were comprised, to a large extent, by representation and performativity, as they involved the requirement to actively demonstrate one's commitment to and possession of the vaunted ideals on the public stage – indeed, at specific official *polis* events. This idea will be explored in detail in the next section, which focuses on Xenophon's description of one such competition and demonstrates how the situation Xenophon relates corresponds to theories concerning the formation of hegemonic masculinity.

1.5.2. The *Hippeis*: A Case Study of Hegemonic Masculine Competition

This section began by asserting that depictions of competitions between men in Xenophon's *Lac.* can be viewed, in part, as mechanisms of hegemonic masculinity. Moreover, such mechanisms can be seen as official efforts to propagate hegemonic masculine ideology for political purposes. These ideas can be further explored through analysis of Xenophon's portrayal of the *hippeis* as a case example. The selection of the *hippeis* is Xenophon's most in-depth description of competition between Spartiate males. It is also a depiction which shows ideals of competition, representation, and performativity working towards the formation of an official brand of hegemonic masculinity. In what follows, I intend to apply a sociological lens to Xenophon's description of the selection process and the strife which resulted from it. In so doing, I will move beyond Xenophon's own explanation of how the *hippeis* contributed to the formation of manly virtue, to suggest that it is reasonable to view the selection as a mechanism of hegemonic masculinity. As such, it is depicted as employing ideology to funnel *hebontes*' rivalrous tendencies towards *polis* interests.

Xenophon details the process of selection at *Lac.* 4.3-4:

> Now the ephors choose three men from those who are in full bloom (ἀκμαζόντων), and these are called *hippagretai*. And each of these selects one hundred men, making clear why he calls one and rejects another. Thus, those who do not happen to be among the honoured are hostile towards both those who dismissed them and towards those who were chosen instead of them, and they watch one another closely, to see if anyone should shirk the practices of honour.

The *hippeis'* selection is presented as the catalyst for the profitable form of strife amongst the *hebontes*. Xenophon asserts that this strife is produces manly virtue, which benefits the *polis* (4.5):

> And so arises the strife which is both dearest to the gods and the most political, in which it is made known what a good man ought to do. So it is that each separately endeavours to always be their most excellent; so that if there should be need, each of them may aid the *polis* with all his might.

Ducat suggests that, with the *hippeis*, Sparta had discovered the educational and political benefits of rebelliousness; that by redirecting young men's contentiousness towards one another, dominant societal ideologies and authorities were able to harness young men's natural tendencies at the time of life when men were most likely to rebel.[232] I agree that this is an apt interpretation of the scenario Xenophon portrays in the *Lac*. But, I would like to take this idea one step further by proposinging that Xenophon's depiction of how the *hippeis* functioned as an institution suggests that the rebelliousness was harnessed in a very specific way: the episode reads as a nearly textbook example of an apparatus of hegemonic masculinity.

To begin, in the selection of the *hippeis*, the identification of hegemonic masculine achievement is expounded by the *hippagretai*. These are men who are, themselves, presented as exemplars of the hegemonic ideal, thus empowered to identify the ideal embodied in others. There is some uncertainty about whether the *hippagretai* were themselves *hebontes* or mature men,[233] which of course somewhat affects the interpretation of their position within the process. It is reasonable to assume that the hippagretai would have been chosen from those considered fully-adult since they were given charge of their unit of *hippeis*,[234] and Xenophon asserts that men were eligible for the most important offices after they had passed from the hebontes age-range (4.7). However,

[232] Ducat 2006a, 172-4.
[233] See e.g. Hodkinson 2002, 110; Davies 2017b, 487;
[234] Xen. *Lac*. 4.3, *Hell*. 3.3.9.

Xenophon's portrayal also provides reason to believe that the *hippagretai* were *hebontes* themselves. Xenophon says that the *hippagretai* are chosen "from those who are in full bloom" (ἐκ τῶν ἀκμαζόντων). This echoes language employed earlier at 1.4, when he explains that Lycurgus thought men should marry when they were "in the bloom of their bodies" (ἐν ἀκμαῖς τῶν σωμάτων). Here as well, Xenophon's description is somewhat vague with respect to precise age. However, his assertion that Lycurgus established the principle that men should be ashamed to be seen coming or going from conjugal visits with his wife in order to prevent excessive sexual congress in the period immediately after marriage (1.5), could suggest that men "in bloom of their bodies" were *hebontes* not yet old enough to cohabit with their wives, thus necessitating the need for them to visit in order to fulfil their marital duties.[235] Moreover, Xenophon asserts that those not selected for membership in the *hippeis* would be at odds with the those who did not choose them (*hippagretai)* as well as with those chosen instead of them (the *hippeis*). Animosity directed towards the *hippagretai* would be more appropriate if they too were *hebontes* than if they were older men – towards whom a higher level of respect and deference would be expected. Therefore, it is reasonable to suggest that *hippagretai*, also "in full bloom", were likely *hebontes*, and men to exemplify the ideals of that age group. However, neither likelihood prevents the interpretation that the *hippagretai* are here established as a hegemonic ideal for emulation.

[235] The idea that men married while they still slept with their age-mates (meaning that they were *hebontes*) is explicitly recounted by Plutarch *Lyc.*15.

Moving, then, to the selection of the main body of the *hippeis*, Xenophon highlights that an essential part of the selection process involved the *hippagretai* explaining to those assembled why they selected or rejected each candidate. This selection established the *hippeis* as those amongst the *hebontes* who embodied the hegemonic ideal and outlined the features that defined said ideal. Xenophon relates that the selection and judgement created feelings of intense rivalry between the chosen and unchosen, with rejected candidates being especially vigilant in their watch of the chosen, lest any of those preferred over them lapse in their commitment to the ideals for which they were selected (ἐάν τι παρὰ τὰ καλὰ νομιζόμενα ῥᾳδιουργῶσι [4.5]). These are ideals couched in prominent Spartan ideology, as τὰ καλὰ here refers to the way of life associated with the ideals of Spartan citizenship.[236] Moreover, the description of the chosen as being among the honoured τῶν καλῶν, is also evocative of societal ideals, suggesting that the *hippeis* constituted an officially recognised archetype of excellence. The process of selection was initiated by *polis* officials, and the chosen were publicly acknowledged for exemplifying a particular, societally valued, brand of masculine excellence – thus ensuring the primacy of *polis* interests in the establishment of the ideals governing individual comportment.[237] Furthermore, the public nature of the display would serve to strengthen the significance both of the competition itself, and those values it sought to venerate.[238]

[236] MacDowell 1986, 42-3. See also chapter 4.
[237] Figueira 2006, 65; Gray 2007, 160 on 4.5.
[238] Knottnerus and Berry 2002, 21; Figueira 2006, 63; Harman 2009, 372-3.

It is important to note, however, that Xenophon does not identify the selection ceremony, itself, as the site wherein masculine virtue was cultivated, but rather the strife between *hebontes* arising from the selection (which will be discussed momentarily). Nevertheless, Xenophon's assertions are not incompatible with the identification of the *hippeis* as representing a hegemonic ideal. Lipka rightly notes that Xenophon presupposes that the "strife for virtue" required incentive, incentive provided by the public contest of selection.[239] Additionally, by establishing the archetypal ideal of the *hippeis* as the catalyst for strife, the hegemonic mechanism directs the young men's contention by providing a benchmark upon which to focus their efforts and a set of hegemonic ideals understood to define it.

As mentioned, Xenophon explicitly associates the strife following the selection of the *hippeis* with the cultivation of excellent Spartan manhood, by stating that this was the sort of contest which set the standard of what was needed to be thought a good man (ἐν ᾗ ἀποδέδεικται μὲν ἃ δεῖ ποιεῖν τὸν ἀγαθόν [4.5]). He relates that it was through this sort of strife for excellence that Lycurgus believed young men reached the highest level of manly excellence (οὕτως ἂν καὶ τούτους ἐπὶ πλεῖστον ἀφικνεῖσθαι ἀνδραγαθίας [4.2]). This was a brand of excellence explicitly expressed as produced by a process political (πολιτικωτάτη) in nature (4.5). Moreover, it is depicted as an excellence which was put to political uses. Xenophon depicts the unchosen as directing their dissatisfaction towards those who rejected them and those who were preferred over them, manifesting a concerted and consistent effort to outdo their rivals in

[239] Lipka 2002, 143 on 4.2[5]

the cultivation of manly excellence. Additionally, displeasure with those who succeeded where they failed manifests in the unchosen becoming concerned with strict policing of their fellows for any lapse in conduct. Thus, the discontent of those rejected is channeled in such a way as to render them not only complicit in their attitudes towards *polis*-endorsed ideology, but also actively invested in its promotion.

Ducat offers a slightly different interpretation of the focus of the unchosen's animosity. He argues that animosity resulted because the *hippeis* symbolised the authority of the established order, which the unchosen desired to challenge.[240] I disagree with Ducat's interpretation on this point, because Xenophon portrays the unchosen's animosity directed specifically towards individuals rather than the ideals they represent. In fact, far from displaying challenge to the authority of established ideals, Xenophon represents the unchosen as self-established enforcers of those ideals. Thus, according to Xenophon, the result of this process was that each and every young man strove to be their best, to the benefit of the *polis*, and that each was able to cultivate excellent (if not hegemonic) masculine virtue.

One final note is that, although not mentioned in Xenophon's description, the function of the *hippeis* as part of a mechanism of hegemonic masculinity would be strengthened by the likelihood that the roster of the *hippeis* was mutable, likely undegoing complete reselection on a yearly basis.[241] A partial

[240] Ducat 2006a, 174.
[241] Moore 1975; Hodkinson 1983, 248-9; Figueira 2006; Ducat 2006a; Humble 2007.

yearly re-selection of the *hippeis* would be necessitated to replenish numbers lost due to some members rising beyond the age of eligibility.[242] And Xenophon's description suggests that with each ceremony of selection, the entire group was recast from the *hippagretai* onwards. This would mean that the hegemonic position held by those *hippeis* who remained eligible for future selection was tenuous; their membership in this hegemonic group was secure only so long as they continued to performatively display associated qualities.[243] Such mutability would also provide additional incentive for the unchosen, and better guard against disaffection. The possibility that they could eventually replace those preferred over them would encourage the unchosen to maintain an orthodox presentation of masculinity and conform to promoted ideals. Personal interest would likely also ensure their considerable vigilance in monitoring the *hippeis*' conduct. Observing failure would provide grounds for current *hippeis* to be excluded from the next selection and, consequently, could offer opportunities for the observers to vault themselves into the coveted position of the "truly manly", thus further reinforcing the approved masculine ethos.[244] Xenophon's assertion that this kind of competition guaranteed that all parties constantly strive to be as good as possible and support the *polis* (4.5) demonstrates that the intended result of the process, incited by the selection of *hippeis*, is that both chosen and un-chosen *hebontes* would seek to support the ideals upon which the selection was based. Thus, by making contests of manly excellence between young men public and political displays, the system is represented as turning any tendencies towards contentiousness, expressed by

[242] Davies 2017b, 488. Contrast with Figueira 2006, 65-6.
[243] Figueira 2006, 65.
[244] Ducat 2006a, 103; Figueira 2006, 64-5; Humble 2007, 298.

hebontes, inward towards one another and turned their interests towards upholding the system and the values it represented.[245]

1.6. Military Visual Self-Presentation

In the *Lac.*, Xenophon details a number of Lycurgan attitudes related to the appearance and performative self-presentation of Spartiate men and boys. Multiple areas of male Spartiate life that he describes reflect concern with the ideology of warrior-manhood. However, this section will focus primarily on descriptions of Lycurgan mandates concerning adult male appearance – those which applied specifically to Spartiate men, as well as those which extended to the entire Lacedaemonian army.

Regulations in matters of outward presentation place significance on the role of visual spectacle in the maintenance and transmission of Spartan masculine ideals. Xenophon indicates that Lycurgus gave considerable attention to even the most minute matters of masculine self-presentation. Such regulations are expressed as largely practical measures, to do with uniform equipping of Lacedaemonian soldiers. But some appearance-based regulations, such as those concerning hair and mandates towards regular exercise (5.8, 11.3, 12.5) – which would significantly affect bodily appearance – take these identity markers out of a purely military context. This suggests that men's physical appearance was never left entirely to individual choice.[246] Xenophon's description of Spartan practice concerning adult male appearance relates to

[245] Figueira 2006, 64-5; Ducat 2006a, 174; Gray 2007, 159-60 on 4.1-4, 4.4.
[246] See p. 121 for discussion of the level of individual choice implied by Xenophon's assertion that Lycurgus "allowed" men to grow their hair long.

multiple categories of masculine construction; most prominent is representation and performativity, but relations between men and hegemonic masculinity are evident as well.

Xenophon recounts that, when serving in the army, male personal appearance was regulated in great detail, with Lycurgus prescribing a number of features of men's outward appearance (11.3):

> He devised equipment of this sort for battle: they were to have a red cloak, believing this to have the least in common with that of women and to be most warlike; and a bronze shield, for this is polished most quickly and dulls slowly. And he allowed those beyond the age of youth to grow their hair long, thinking that thus they would appear taller, freer, and more terrible to behold.

On first glance, these measures appear to be utilitarian and of limited scope, since regulated appearance applied only during campaign. However, these mandates can also be seen as a socio-political tool perpetuating a number of masculine ideals. These ideals are connected to Spartiate citizen identity, between Spartiate and non-Spartiate members of the Lacedaemonian army, and the shared masculine identity of the army as a whole in contrast to outsiders.

I will begin analysis of the ideological impact of appearance-based regulations within their most immediate context: the realm of military action. Regulation of aspects of military self-presentation, imposed upon the entire Lacedaemonian army, leads into discussion of the ideological impact that representational and performative mandates potentially had on relations between Spartiate and non-Spartiate men. Xenophon's discussions of interaction between males, in the *Lac.*, focus primarily on the citizen class. And while the *Lac.* does contrast the Spartans with "others", it remains on the

level of impersonal comparison. The "others" concerned are primarily situated in *poleis* outside the Spartan ethos; and discussion focuses on institutions and practices of other *poleis* only inasmuch as they differed from Sparta's. The sole area in which the *Lac.* references interaction between Spartiates and non-Spartiates is contained within the discussion of military matters (11-12). While Xenophon's coverage of these matters has more to do with practical considerations than with the ideology of masculinity, there is ideological significance to be gleaned from his treatment.

Xenophon notes the visual effect of dress and hair on creating an intimidating appearance (11.3). This suggests that the visual spectacle created by displaying an impressive and uniform front was a useful ideological tool, employed by the Lacedaemonian army to create a psychological effect on enemies.[247] However, the effectiveness of such visual spectacle likely had internal applications as well. Adoption of uniform dress for the entire army, and the extension of Spartiate requirements for physical exercise to all Lacedaemonians during campaign (11.3, 12.5), could promote cohesion, not only amongst Spartiates, but also between the army's Spartiate and non-Spartiate members. These factors likely have significance for the ideology of masculinity as well. They could create a feeling of common identity among members of the Lacedaemonian army,[248] as well as shared feeling of masculine superiority over the enemy, if the latter appeared daunted by the sight of them.[249]

---

[247] Moore 1975, 114; Powell 1989, 179; Knottnerus and Berry 2002, 26-7; Christesen 2012, 236.
[248] See Shipley 1997, 200-5, 2004, 569, 2006, 52, 67-71, for discussions of feelings of common Lacedaemonian national identity between Spartiates and non-Spartiates.
[249] David 1989, 3-4, 6; Hodkinson 2000.

While the regulations discussed may have promoted cohesion between diverse elements of the Lacedaemonian army in relation to enemy soldiers, it is possible that they served a double function. The same regulations designed to create the image of a united front to the enemy may have had a converse effect internally. Spartan-mandated regulations concerning masculine self-representation and performativity could have served to establish hierarchy within the army, with Spartiate soldiers occupying the hegemonic position and ideologically subordinating non-Spartiates. From the perspective of the enemy, efforts to ensure that all army members wore similar dress and undertook the same exercises might have rendered members of Lacedaemonian army virtually indistinguishable, but internally these same features could establish differences. Xenophon relates that, on campaign, a regimen of gymnastic exercise was prescribed for the entire Lacedaemonian army (12.5). The text implies that such exercise was already a core feature of Spartiate men's daily lives, since Xenophon contrasts Spartan commitment to fitness for war with "others" who do not take similar pains (4.7). Thus Spartiates, familiar with exercises imposed on non-Spartiate members of the army only while on campaign, would likely have made a better showing and possibly have possessed better physique, signifying Spartiate superiority. Similarly, the characteristic Spartan hair style Xenophon describes provides a noticeable indicator of the Spartiates' particular brand of masculine aesthetic. If distinctive to the Spartiate contingent, this hairstyle would once again serve to distinguish them from others in the larger Lacedaemonian force; if emulated,

the adoption of the ideologically-charged hairstyle by non-Spartiates would denote their tacit conformity with the Lycurgan ideals it signified.

Furthermore, the same factors may have served to mark out class distinctions within *perioikic* contingents. While heavy manual labour undertaken by *perioikic* farmers of lower orders might have rendered them as physically fit as Spartiates, there would likely have been notable differences in physique. Xenophon relates the care with which the Spartan gymnastic programme ensured that men exercised different parts of the body equally (5.9). Such care would not only result in fitness, but also a balanced physical aesthetic. In contrast, heavy repetitive labour often results in unbalances in physique, as the body adapts to suit the required tasks. Similarly, the Spartan custom of growing out the hair may have been impractical for those employed in regular labour. In contrast, the wealthy leisured segments of *perioikoi* would be more likely be familiar with the sorts of exercises undertaken on campaign, and to have physiques resembling those of Spartiates – either from their ability to engage in similar programmes of targeted gymnastics, or potentially from first-hand exposure to the Spartan programme, if *perioikoi* were included among the *trophimoi*.[250] The result of these differences may have been to mark out the superiority of elite *perioikoi* in comparison to those of modest means, employing the Spartiate ideal as a point of reference. Thus, masculine representation and performativity could have operated on two levels within the Lacedaemonian army: both to create cohesion which established the

[250] *Trophimoi* were the "foster brothers" of the Spartans – boys from other *poleis* sent to Sparta to partake in the Spartan upbringing.

Lacedaemonians united as men superior to enemy men, and to form an ideological masculine hierarchy within the army, in which Spartiates stood out as the ideal.

While the abovementioned regulations on appearance are presented as being limited to the time in which men were actively involved with campaigning, there are reasonable grounds to believe Xenophon's portrayal suggests that aspects of masculine identity, formed from military self-presentation, spilled-over into the civic realm. This is due, in large part, to aspects of physical appearance which, though only mandated during active service, were likely permanent fixtures of citizen male appearance.

While the famous red cloak may have been worn only during military action, thus being not necessarily of great significance to Spartan men's civic identity, regulations concerning hair and physical fitness governed non-removable aspects of self-presentation. Xenophon represents these visual ideals, stamped into a man's flesh itself, as subject to perpetual observation and evaluation. He recounts that Lycurgus observed the sort of body that results from acceptable physical exertion and, on this basis, the senior member of the gymnasium was to ensure that the level of exercise performed by men was sufficient relative to the amount of food they consumed (5.8). Xenophon's discussion of hairstyle (11.3) reads a bit more ambiguously. The language employed suggests an element of personal choice, as we are told that Lycurgus allowed men over the age of youth to grow their hair long (ἐφῆκε δὲ καὶ κομᾶν τοῖς ὑπὲρ τὴν ἡβητικὴν ἡλικίαν). However, despite the absence of a direct mandate, it is

reasonable to argue that a reader of the *Lac*. would imagine that most, if not all, adult Spartiates as conforming to this style. Xenophon's Situation of permission to grow one's hair specifically at the point of attainment of a certain stage of life marks the hairstyle out as a rite of passage. This, combined with the Lycurgan association of long hair with a number of desirable attributes, represents long hair as an honour to be coveted by Spartan men. And although Xenophon does not indicate that long hair, like an athletic physique, was encouraged outside of war, it is nonetheless reasonable to assume that the hairstyle was maintained during peacetime as well. This is simply a practical consideration, as the slow process of hair growth makes it more likely that a man who wished his hair to be long for battle would maintain the style, rather than repeatedly regrow it. David asserts that control over matters of dress and hair should be viewed as suggestive of a high level of official control over non-verbal modes of communication.[251] Xenophon presents this official control as associated primarily with one specific area of a Spartan man's life – his role in the military. However, because the regulations applied in the military context create effects which remain with a man in all spheres, temporary mandates would cast the spectre of this official control – be it deliberately or inadvertently – into the civic realm as well.

I have discussed Xenophon's association of mandates governing a Spartiate's hair and physique with his role as a soldier, and the likelihood that features of mandated appearance carried over into a man's civic identity. What remains to discuss is the level to which Xenophon's presentation implies a specifically

[251] David 1989, 4-5; 1992, 11-2; 1999, 19.

military identity in ideals for adult males' self-presentation. Xenophon's assertion that regulations governing appearance designed by Lycurgus with a view to war implies that these features of appearance would have carried military ideology into men's civic identity. Thus, in this scenario, a Spartan man's hair and physique would be potent signifiers of the degree to which he successfully embodied ideals of warrior-masculine excellence, which he carried with him beyond the military context.[252] However, Christesen notes that, in the matter of "playing the part of the soldier", there is a level of differentiation between military reality and social role.[253] And Hodkinson has argued persuasively that Sparta was not as militarily driven as many believe.[254] In light of this, it is possible that the effect of this military self-styling on men's civic identity was primarily representational in nature – that is, having more to do with the affectation of military identity than indicating the pervasiveness of the martial concerns in the civic sphere. It is nevertheless significant that, while Xenophon describes mandates on the appearance of *paides*, *paidiskoi*, and dishonoured men within the civic context, his only account of societally mandated self-styling for citizen men is that which, he suggests, is ideologically charged with martial masculine ideals. The accentuation of relationship between regulated appearance and the military suggests that Xenophon thought much of the ideology attached to Spartiate

[252] David 1989, 6; 1992, 13; Vernant 1991, 66, 120; Christesen 2012, 235.
[253] Christesen 2012, 226, 234-5.
[254] Hodkinson 2006, 111-4, 126-7, 134-6, 138-40, 143-7 points out that the majority of institutions described by Xenophon are designed with an aim of civic rather than military utility, that Spartan methods of training for war did not differ greatly from those employed by other Greek states, that practical military considerations had limited impact on Sparta's internal politics and society, and that the majority of a Spartan man's time was spent engaging in various civic obligations rather than in ceaseless military training. See also Jaeger 1939, 81 on the origin of the perception of Sparta as a glorified military camp, and Christesen 2012, 234-7.

self-presentation revolved around his identity as a warrior.[255] An ideological emphasis placed on martial visual self-presentation, in a society which was otherwise not excessively driven by military enterprise, could be indicative of the ideological importance this mode of self-presentation had in terms of social roles. Such social-self presentation, which could be enacted in a number of societal contexts, likely had a strong impact on masculine identity.[256]

However, Xenophon also associates Spartan hairstyle and physique are also associated with ideals of freedom, suggesting that adult men's appearance had ideological significance beyond the military. As mentioned earlier, Xenophon's description suggests that the hairstyle was cultivated to make men appear especially free and fierce. And we are told that the programme of physical exercises undertaken on campaign (and presumably those undertaken at home as well) had a psychological effect on men: "The result is that they become more magnificent to themselves, and they appear freer than other men" (12.5). David proposes that the concern, displayed in the *Lac*., to create an appearance for citizen men which underscored their freedom suggests that appearance was designed to emphasise disparity in status and identity between Spartans and their helot slaves.[257] In light of this argument, it could well be the case that the primary ideological significance of adult Spartiate hair and physique was to mark him out as a member of the free and privileged citizenry, and that – despite Xenophon's emphasis – any military associations may have been of secondary importance.

[255] Vernant 1991, 66, 120; Link 2004, 6; Christesen 2012, 235.
[256] Christesen 2012, 198, 226, 234-7.
[257] David 1989, 8-9; 1992, 15, 18. See also Vernant 1991, 232.

The characteristic dress and hair of adult Spartiate males may also have provided emphatic visual distinction between full citizens and others occupying subordinate societal positions, such as women, boys, and the dishonoured.[258] For instance, the *Lac.* represents dishonoured status as imposing strong visual and performative requirements on dishonoured men, enforced by social pressure.[259] The ideological role of the dishonoured in reinforcing a hegemony of men within Spartan society will be discussed shortly.[260] However, visual and performative aspects of dishonoured status deserve mention at this point, since the negative self-presentation Xenophon depicts as required of these men would provide a highly visible counter-example to the fully-enfranchised Spartiate. Xenophon relates: "He [the dishonoured man] must not wander around anointed nor imitate the un-reproached, or he must receive blows from his betters" (9.5). The disparity in self-presentation between the fully enfranchised and entirely disenfranchised Spartan male would heighten the significance of enfranchised vs. dishonoured status through the starkness of the contrast.[261] Similarly, it has been suggested that different regulations governing the outward appearance of boys and adult men in the *homoioi* class were intended to reflect male identity and mark their distinctive societal positions. In this case, mandated self-presentation of boys has been thought to serve the ideological function of highlighting their liminal

[258] David 1989, 8-10, 1992, 17-20; Vernant 1991, 120, 232-4; Hodkinson 2000, 226. I will not go into detail regarding differences in appearance between Spartan men and women, as the majority of the information available about the appearance of Spartan women does not come from Xenophon.
[259] MacDowell 1986, 45. See also David 1989, 5; Harman 2009, 372.
[260] See p. 121.
[261] David 1989, 9-10; 1992, 20-1; Vernant 1991, 233; Harman 2009, 372.

status. Whether it was the austere, single-cloaked, unshod, appearance of *paides* (2.3-4), or the demure appearance of *paidiskoi*, required to keep their hands inside their cloaks and their eyes downcast (3.4-5), or even the *hebontes*, not yet permitted to grow out their hair (11.3); mandated appearance for males who had yet to achieve complete citizen status was visually distinct from full members of society. Thus, age-related milestones signifying increasing acceptance into the society of adult males can be seen as marked by important visual signifiers.[262]

1.7. Sanctions on Cowards

In chapter IX Xenophon lists a number of dishonouring sanctions which those displaying cowardice are made to endure (9.3-6). At 10.7 he attests that cowardly behaviour could even result in complete exclusion from the *homoioi*: "but if someone should shrink in fear from labouring to uphold the laws, he made known that that one should no longer be considered to be one of the *homoioi*". Although Xenophon alludes elsewhere to the possibility that Spartiates could become disenfranchised for other reasons,[263] his discussion of this fate in the *Lac.* is reserved only for the cowardly. Numerous sanctions and potential loss of citizenship are represented as the consequences of failure to meet an important behavioural requirement expected of Spartan men. Xenophon's description of sanctions and customs governing interaction between dishonoured men and those in good standing have several features

[262] Vernant 1991, 66, 120-2, 230-3; David 1992, 12-3, 19; Ludwig 2002, 186-7.
[263] Xen. *Hell.* 3.3.4-11. See also Arist, *Pol.* 1271a26-37.

which can be seen to serve the interests of the *polis* by promoting adherence to prominent ideals of manhood. Xenophon states (9.4-6):

> For in other *poleis*, whenever someone should become cowardly, he has only the name of coward. The coward frequents the same market as the good man and sits next to him and goes to the same gymnasium, if he wishes. But in Lacedaemon, everyone would be ashamed to associate with the coward in the mess, or to be paired with him in a bout. And often one such as this is left over when teams are split for playing ball, having not been given a place; and (often) in the chorus, he is expelled to the shameful place; and in the streets, he must give way and when seated he must rise up even for the younger. And he must provide for his female relatives at home, and he must explain to them the cause for their lack of husbands. And he must suffer his hearth to be empty of a wife, while at the same time he must pay a fine for it. He must not wander around anointed nor imitate the un-reproached, or he must receive blows from his betters. I do not wonder that, with dishonour such as this laid upon the coward, death is preferred to such a dishonoured and shameful life.

There several constructionist categories evident in Xenophon's description. His discussion concerning treatment of cowards encompasses ideas of representation and performativity, and relations between men and hegemonic masculinity.

The first aspect of sanctions to examine is the largely visual and performative character of dishonoured status. Xenophon lists some penalties which affect the sufferer on a predominantly individual level, such as inability to contract marriages for himself or female relatives[264] along with monetary hardships said to result from that inability. However, the primary focus in Xenophon's account of the unenviable life of cowards is the effect dishonour had on a man's place within society. Xenophon paints a picture of demotion to contemptible status, wherein the dishonoured man is subjugated to nearly complete social exclusion and conspicuously marked by visual indicators.[265]

[264] Discussed earlier, see pp. 53-4.
[265] Gray 2007, 169 on 9.5; Harmon, 2009, 371-2.

Descriptions of the dishonoured are punctuated by notions of representation and performativity. The dishonoured man is required to adopt a self-representation that communicates his lowliness to all who encounter him. Being disallowed to assume an appearance that emulates that of good men (9.5), the dishonoured's appearance marks him out as a violator of acceptable conduct and an suitable target for ridicule.[266] Moreover, the visual expression of the coward's degradation is not conveyed through appearance alone. Rather, he is required to actively perform – and thereby acknowledge – his masculine inferiority in all forms of social interaction, whether by yielding in any situation in which one man must defer to another or by placing himself up for consideration for various social activities, thereby inviting the probability of scorn and exclusion.

It is interesting that Xenophon's description of the likely outcome of the dishonoured man's attempts to become a member of a ball team or chorus seems to assume that he will attempt to engage with his fellows. This could perhaps suggest that the coward was not permitted the option of declining to participate (or at least to *attempt* to participate) in these forms of social interaction. One would assume that, in conditions such as those described, a dishonoured man would, in all likelihood, withdraw from social life to the greatest extent possible, seeking to minimise further disgrace. And yet, the descriptions appear to presume that the coward would do just the opposite. One would not expect anyone – save the extreme masochist – to willingly put himself in situations in which further humiliation was all but guaranteed. Thus,

[266] David 1989, 15.

it is reasonable to suggest that placing himself in such public situations may have been a mandated aspect of the coward's condition, and that the public spectacle this provided was intended to serve a purpose. Harman suggests that the visual self-presentation required from the dishonoured – that he not emulate the good (9.5) – suggests that he was meant to be a visible example of one whose identity is not only a moral, but also a political failure.[267] This idea seems to be supported by Xenophon's inclusion of cowards among those whose crimes are most detrimental to the well-being of the *polis* at large (10.6):

> For he believed, it seems, that only those [directly] harmed by someone who enslaves or defrauds or steals are wronged, but entire *poleis* are betrayed by cowards and the unmanly. So, it seems reasonable to me to have imposed the greatest penalties upon these.

Since cowards' transgressions are represented as problematic for society, it is understandable that the repercussions are largely enacted at the societal level. The coward is not merely punished for his own sake. Rather, his punishment is, at once, personal and relational. His condition is both a humiliating and enduring reminder of personal failure and a visible warning for others to avoid behaviours which cause such disgrace.

Expanding on the relational aspects of the sanctions described, I will next explore the impact that Xenophon's account suggests interactions with cowards had on other men's expression of identity. Xenophon presents a number of the sanctions as relational, requiring an active performative stance on the part of dishonoured and citizen alike. As such, they are depicted as having implications for ideological expression of Spartan masculinity beyond

[267] Harman 2009, 372.

the effects on individual dishonoured men. Sanctions can also be viewed as a mechanism of hegemonic masculinity, encouraging Spartan men's commitment to socially venerated masculine ideals.

One potential hegemonic mechanism has already been discussed, in the institution of the *hippeis*. Sanctioning of cowards provides an example of hegemonic framework operating in a different way. The performative self-presentation required of the dishonoured, discussed above, would serve to mark him out as an inferior type of man, and communicate that his transgression of approved masculine deportment should be avoided. But it seems that it was not enough to simply present the dishonoured man as a visceral example of the cost of failing to live up to societal ideals. Rather, Xenophon's description suggests other men's interactions with a dishonoured man were extremely symbolically laden and involved performative visual elements. As such, these interactions were equally visceral displays of these men's approval of, and adherence to, societal ideals. Xenophon's assertion of the universally felt shame Lacedaemonian men would experience at the thought of mixing with cowards at mess or in wrestling matches, along with his account that cowards were often excluded from ball games and relegated to ignominious places in choruses (9.5), implies that ostracism of the coward was the expected course of behaviour. These expected behaviours are somewhat limited in the requirements they place on Spartiates in good standing, since they create pressure to avoid engaging with cowards, but do not appear to mandate it. Moreover, Xenophon's assertion that cowards were *often* excluded from games and assigned shameful choral positions, indicates the possibility

that men in good standing could (and occasionally did) deviate from shunning a coward, instead electing to include him in group activities – although one might expect that choosing to include the coward would reflect poorly one's own reputation. This idea is supported by Xenophon's account of the more active roles men in good standing were expected to take in sanctioning cowards; expressed in behaviours of stylised interaction. Men were to interact with the dishonoured so as to force him to perform his inferior status – such as making him rise from his seat (9.5); and they were to perform their disdainful superiority by inflicting blows on this man if he was not, in their estimation, enacting his degradation as well he ought (9.5). Thus, when Xenophon depicts other Spartan men as seeking to avoid incurring some of the shame associated with the cowards, he shows them performing their own, societally approved, exhibition of masculinity. Their interactions with the coward performatively demonstrate their approval of the dominant ideological standard and, in turn, serve to establish their own identity as men in relation to both the coward and approved societal standards.[268]

My earlier discussion of the *hippeis* provides an example of a mechanism of hegemonic masculinity which operated by exploiting men's desire to attain the hegemonic position. But one can also see frameworks of hegemonic masculinity operating in Xenophon's description of the expected societal treatment of cowards. In the case of cowards, the mechanism operates from the negative end of the spectrum. Societally approved masculine ideals are promoted by the identification of a hegemonic anti-ideal, from which

[268] Harman 2009, 372.

individuals are expected to actively disassociate themselves. This idea is in keeping with theories of hegemonic masculinity. While individuals are seen to display orthodox or complicit masculinity primarily through emulation of the hegemonic ideal, orthodox status can also be maintained by demonstrating one's rejection of, and superiority over, men who embody subaltern masculinities (such as the coward).

1.8. Masculine Ideals and Xenophon's Overall Portrayal of Sparta

Ideology related to Spartan masculinity contained in the *Lac.* (such as the primacy of ἐγκράτεια, πειθώ, and αἰδώς in Xenophon's depiction of qualities produced by Spartan *paideia*) can be seen to factor into Xenophon's personal evaluation of the Spartan system and mindset. This evaluation is, of course, far from neutral, but rather tailored to his larger authorial purpose in the *Lac.* The *Lac.* contains conspicuously few overt value judgements, either positive or negative, of Spartan ideals and practices. More than anything, Xenophon presents the Spartans as *successful* in achieving their aims, and details the institutions ascribed to their lawgiver which enabled them to achieve success. Whether the virtues the Spartans sought to instill in their men, and the aims which these virtues were intended to aid in achieving, were admirable or not, Xenophon generally leaves up to readers to decide – and invites us to do just that (1.10, 2.14). Admittedly, it is debatable how genuine this invitation is. Scholars have often assumed that Xenophon intends the reader to arrive at a positive evaluation.[269] However, success does not necessarily equate to goodness. Humble (2007) made a persuasive argument that such encomiastic

[269] E.g. Jaeger 1945, 169; Gray 2007, 152 on 1.10.

reading of the *Lac.* results mainly from approaching the work with the attitude that its encomiastic nature is a foregone conclusion. She argues that engaging with the work without making this initial assumption will reveal a richer reading which shows Xenophon to present the institutions in a light that is not always positive. In this context, Xenophon's invitation to decide whether or not the elements of the Lycurgan system are positive or not can be taken as genuine.

Compelling arguments have been made to suggest that the *Lac.* should be interpreted as a cohesive description of a paradoxical system that allowed for Sparta's rise to pre-eminence, yet contained the seeds of its own destruction.[270] Xenophon's treatment suggests that the Spartan system operated largely through the use of compulsion to encourage men to display approved virtues, and fear of sanctions that resulted from failure. (2, 3.1-3, 5.2-7, 6.1-3, 7.2-3, 7.5-6, 8.5, 9, 10.1-7).[271] The emphasis of compulsion and suppression over education is evident from the outset of the *paideia*, is especially prevalent in chapter III, and is observable throughout the work in descriptions of the lives of Spartan males of all ages.

Xenophon's identification of ἐγκράτεια, πειθώ, and αἰδώς as Sparta's most promoted masculine traits can also be seen to suggest the superficiality of Spartan men's virtue. Here, contrast of these virtues with that of σωφροσύνη becomes important. The simple, feminised, depiction of σωφροσύνη in the

[270] Humble 2004, 227; 2007, 295; Gish 2009, 365-6.
[271]Tuplin 1994, 157; Higgins 1977, 69. Lipka 2002, 119-20 on 2.2[6], asserts that both αἰδώς and πειθώ were strongly associated with fear in the Spartan mindset.

Lac. has been contrasted with Xenophon's presentation of the virtue in other works. While it has been suggested that Xenophon's *Cyropaedeia* used Sparta as a positive model, Tuplin argues that, when compared to the *Lac*., Xenophon's elaboration on idealised education in the *Cyropaedeia* proves unflattering to Sparta.[272] Humble suggests that Xenophon's *Cyropaedeia* depicts σωφροσύνη, understood as the capacity to behave according to principles of internalised justice, as an extremely important virtue cultivated in Persian boys (1.2.6, 1.2.8, 1.2.9).[273] She sees Xenophon's emphasis on σωφροσύνη in his Persian ideal as illuminative of lack of similar feeling in the Spartan mindset.[274] While North does not discuss the *Lac.* in her exploration of Xenophon's conception of σωφροσύνη, she does discuss elements of the virtue exhibited by Sparta in Xenophon's other works. North suggests that Xenophon viewed Spartans as possessing virtues that were elements of full Socratic σωφροσύνη, but which failed to achieve the complete virtue.[275] However, Xenophon represents Spartan αἰδώς – depicted as the masculine virtue related to self-control – as functioning very differently from the internalised σωφροσύνη Xenophon illustrates in other works. Spartan αἰδώς has been seen as fundamentally appearance-based, requiring the concept of an audience to function.[276] While Xenophon's Persians are seen as aiming to dispose men against doing wrong by positive means, the Spartan system is seen to employ a punitive method focused on ensuring that men demonstrate approved standards

[272] Tuplin 1994, 134-5.
[273] Humble 1999b, 343.
[274] Humble 1999b, 341-4, 2007, 295.
[275] North 1966, 125-30. See also Humble 2007, 295.
[276] Cairns 1993, 2-3, 14-8. Lipka 2002, 107 on 1.5[3] discusses the relationship between αἰδώς and the conception of "being seen" in Sparta.

of conduct, specifically in public.[277] The Persian emphasis on σωφροσύνη is represented as causing Persian males to behave justly with or without an audience.[278] Persian σωφροσύνη appears to contrast, in Xenophon's works, with Spartan emphasis on an αἰδώς based in concern for one's status in relation to others and achieved through presentation of conformity to culturally-vaulted standards of behaviour. As a result, Xenophon depicts Spartan males behaving, publicly, in such a way as to avoid punishment or diminishment of status. This contrast has been seen to reflect the difference between Xenophon's portrayal of Spartan performative virtue and his own conception of virtue, exemplified in his idealised Persia.[279]

If this interpretation is correct, it suggests that Xenophon's depiction of the ideals of ἐγκράτεια, πειθώ, and αἰδώς, embodied by Spartan men, suggest that they are considerably performative in nature. This emphasis on cultivation of virtue primarily for the purpose of public display is not restricted to Spartan education in the *Lac*. Rather, it is a recurring theme throughout the text and paints the picture of a society which stressed external conformity more than inner justification, to the point where appearance became reality. Harman asserts that seeing and being seen were the primary methods by which Spartan men performed – and thus confirmed – their identity.[280] Emphasis on public performance in the description of Spartan ideals has an effect on Xenophon's portrayal of Spartan masculinity. Focus on visual expressions of manhood and

[277] Tuplin 1994, 157.
[278] North 1966, 130-31.
[279] Higgins 1977, 69-71; Humble 1999b, 344.
[280] Harman 2009, 372. Powell 2004, 378 argues, in a similar vein, that Spartans were experts in presenting visual spectacle.

emphasis on visual mechanisms and external pressure to ensure that men behave virtuously can be seen throughout the *Lac*. and are also evident in Xenophon's portrayal of Spartan sexual attitudes, relations between men, and competition.

Xenophon's focus on the necessity for Spartan use of continual observation and fear of punishment to ensure individuals' continued performance of societal ideals may have been emphasised to reflect perceived flaws in the Spartan system. Such ideology could aid in explaining why Sparta thrived as long as its sphere of influence remained predominantly restricted to the Peloponnese but faltered when it extended beyond – when expansion required Spartan commanders and governors to be separated from strict state supervision. This is, of course, far from the only idea concerning the nature and purpose of the *Lac*., but, Xenophon's depiction of Spartan ideals and character traits in the lack, correspond well with the difficulties he depicts Sparta as facing in the *Hellenica.*[281] It is therefore possible that the surface-deep nature of Spartan virtue was accentuated by Xenophon to suit this purpose.

[281] See Chapter 4.

Summary

All seven constructionist categories are evident in the *Lac.*

Men and women:

The category of men and women is primarily represented in Xenophon's discussion of procreation. Male and female motives for engaging in extra-marital procreative arrangements are placed in comparison and Xenophon portrays divergence in male and female desires. Whereas females are motivated primarily by desire for personal gain, males are represented as entering into such arrangements to increase the influence of their households.

References to women are also employed to emphasise masculine ideals. Comparisons of men and women are made to highlight *paidiskoi's* excellent display of σωφροσύνη, and to establish ideals of male dress (that which is least feminine). And Xenophon portrays employment of women to promote male adherence to behavioural standards, reflected in the role of women in sanctions on cowards.

Attitudes towards sex:

While physical contributions and desires of male and female partners in the sexual act are presented as equal, maintenance of ideological elements of

approved marital practice are represented as a male preserve. Xenophon's presentation of Lycurgan marital regulations seem to promote an ideal of sexual restraint. However, this is undermined through the employment of shame with respect to appearance-based regulations as the chief enforcing principle. Thus, Xenophon depicts a situation in which excessive sexual expression is not censured, as long as the appearance of sexual restraint is maintained.

Discourse:

The three dominant ideals that are prominent in Xenophon's discussion of qualities desired in Spartan men are: ἐγκράτεια, πειθώ, and αἰδώς. These are cultivated in a variety of ways. Education, competition, homosocial relations, societal sanctions, *syssitia*, hunting, and social heirarchies are all depicted as instrumental in the promoting men's ongoing adherence to these ideals. Xenophon's presentation also suggests that, of the three, different qualities were most prominent at different times of life. While all three qualities are prominent in the description of the upbringing, only πειθώ and (to a lesser degree) αἰδώς remain so in Xenophon's discussion of adult Spartan men.

The text also portrays certain qualities as characteristic of men at various stages of life. Indolence, pleasure-seeking, and obstinance are represented as characteristic of *paidiskoi*, contentiousness is characteristic of hebontes, and – while the text does not explicitly state this – an excess or lack of sexual desire is possibly implied as characteristic of young and old men, respectively. These

are represented as naturally occurring characteristics, which societal processes aim to either supress or properly channel.

Moderation of male discourse is also represented as means by which masculine ideals were upheld. This is especially evident in Xenophon's depiction of *syssitia* practice, which relates the promotion of approved topics of discussion and suppression of unseemly topics or modes of communication. Societally approved discourse is depicted as morally-improving and discouraging of expressions of excess or hubris.

Institutions:

Spartan education is portrayed as a process wherein ideals of excellent Spartan manhood are cultivated. Xenophon depicts education as placing focus on the ideals of ἐγκράτεια, πειθώ, and αἰδώς. In chapter II, practices aimed at hardening *paides* are expressed as cultivating ἐγκράτεια, while the atmosphere of intense supervision and compulsion is depicted as promoting πειθώ, and αἰδώς. Chapter III stresses cultivation of αἰδώς in *paidiskoi* through strict behavioural codes and constant supervision – although Xenophon's portrayal indicates that measures for *paidiskoi* aimed at modulating behaviour rather than in encouraging internalisation of ideals.

Pederasty is represented as an element of Spartan education the *Lac.* However, Xenophon represents pederasty as semi-institutional by emphasising elements of individual choice and personal relations in his treatment of Spartan pederastic practice. The *Lac.* represents Spartan pederasty as providing

relational instruction to young Spartan males via association with an older male role-model, who would display concern for their well-being and performance.

Hunting and *syssitia* are represented as important all-male institutions, obligatory for Spartiate citizens. Xenophon represents hunting's primary institutional functions as the promotion of ongoing physical fitness in adult men and providing training for war. Xenophon portrays *syssitia* as designed primarily to encourage men to maintain a standard of temperate and respectful behaviour through a system of reciprocal supervision among mess-mates. Additionally, Xenophon's depiction of competitive giving and discussion of fine deeds in *syssitia* suggest this institution provided a performance-based avenue for Spartan men to gain social credit and esteem.

Competition:

Xenophon depicts male competition occurring regularly, at every stage of men's lives. Xenophon represents frequent competition as a method employed to encourage continual societal engagement and adherence to societal ideals throughout the lifespan. Differences in the nature of competitions, and differences in Xenophon's portrayal of their associated qualities, suggest that the qualities depicted as representative of the masculine excellence varied throughout the lifespan. For instance, the atmosphere surrounding competition for the *hippeis*, which emphasised physical prowess and profitable rivalry, and the competition of *gerousia*, which valorises qualities of the soul such as wise judgement, represent considerably different images of the masculine ideal.

Representation and performativity:

Xenophon describes a number of appearance-based regulations with military associations in the text. Measures described, concerning Spartan men's hairstyle, dress/equipment, and specialised program of physical fitness have implications for masculine identity. In the context of the larger Lacedaemonian army, distinctive features of Spartan appearance (mandated during campaign) serve to identify Spartiates as masculine archetypes, in relation to which the larger army could be ideologically stratified. Mandates for uniform equipment and engagement in exercises Xenophon attests were required of the entire army during campaign could provide grounds for cohesion and creation of shared masculine identity within the larger Lacedaemonian army.

Aspects of military appearance also have implications for Sparta's civic sphere. While Xenophon attests that appearance was only mandated while on campaign, some features of military-appearance (such as long hair and the physique which would result from Spartan fitness programmes) would be non-removable, suggesting that aspects of military identity would be carried over into Spartan men's civic identities as well. However, these features of masculine appearances are represented as having additional ideological associations (particularly, they are strongly associated with the ideal of freedom) which take them out of the purely militaristic realm.

Sanctioning of cowards is represented as requiring dishonoured men to assume visual signifiers, and actively perform their marginalised status. Xenophon's

portrayal of social sanctioning has strong associations with the ideology of Spartan masculinity, since it is presented as punishment for violating approved standards of comportment in battle. Xenophon represents every aspect of dishonoured men's mandated appearance and behaviour as designed to continually signify their failure to live up to societal ideals. Moreover, promoted modes of interaction between dishonoured and non-dishonoured also contain performative elements, since Xenophon portrays Spartan men as performing their status and identity through public castigation of the coward. Finally, an atmosphere of constant display and observation is pervasive in Xenophon's portrayal of Spartan society in the *Lac*. This element is emphasised in descriptions of several Spartan institutions, competitions, regulations, and practices. Pressure is placed on males of all ages to actively perform their societally approved identities within the public sphere. Xenophon emphasis on the appearance-based nature of several Spartan regulations and practices represents many Spartan masculine ideals as predominantly performative in nature. The text suggests that Spartan practice encouraged men to perform societally-approved identities in the public sphere, while providing little incentive for men's internalisation of ideals.

Relations between men and hegemonic masculinity:

Xenophon represents homosocial relationships as significant to the formation of Spartan masculine identity. Interaction between men is emphasised at every stage of life. Supervision of the young by older men of varying ages, model pederastic practices, positive inter-generational behavioural modelling, participation in all-male institutions, promotion of respect towards elders and

authorities, agonistic competition with contemporaries, and censure of dishonoured men are all portrayed as instrumental to the cultivation and maintenance of societally vaunted comportment in Spartan males.

Beyond its institutional functions, Xenophon depicts Spartan hunting practice as useful in the promotion of positive relations between men. Protocols, Xenophon records, regarding the borrowing and lending of hunting dogs are suggestive of a levelling measure designed towards enabling less affluent men to engage in hunting and encouraging social mixing between men of disparate economic status. However, implicit in Xenophon's account is the likelihood that the borrowing and lending of dogs created a condition of inequality the relations between richer and poorer men, which could lend itself to development of hierarchy in these homosocial associations.

Similar to hunting is the *syssitia*. Xenophon presents syssitia, which mixed men of different ages and economic status and emphasised on uniformity and frugality among members as levelling measures. The inclusion of game meat as one of only two ways in which members could contribute extra items to the meal gave poorer men access to the esteem that would accompany such contributions. However, Xenophon's explicit association of wheaten bread (the other acceptable bonus contribution) with the rich indicates that wealthy men were advantaged in the sphere of competitive giving, suggesting that *syssitia* could promote formation of wealth-based hierarchies between men as well. Beyond their economic aspect, Xenophon recounts that *syssitia* employed homosocial male relations to promote adherence to behavioural ideals.

Discussion of certain men's fine deeds provided models for emulation, as did the mixing of ages. Xenophon asserts that young men learned from the example of their elders within *syssitia*, which also required elders to model the approved standard of respectful behaviour within the context of the *syssition*. This description of *syssitia* practice could also suggest that age was a factor that could contribute to formation of hierarchies of men within *syssitia*.

Xenophon's portrayal of the selection of the *hippeis* and the sanctioning of cowards provide two instances wherein hegemonic masculine stratification is observable. The institution of the *hippeis* create a hegemonic ideal which stratifies the larger body of *hebontes*, and employs masculine competition (in the selection ceremony, the subsequent rivalry between chosen and unchosen, and stylised physical altercation between *hebontes*) to encourage the active investment of all *hebontes*' in upholding the ideological features which define the hegemonic ideal. Sanctioning of cowards provides a framework of hegemonic stratification operating from the opposite end of the spectrum. The coward is represented as embodying an anti-ideal, in relation to which men in good-standing are invited to position themselves. Active castigation of cowards is depicted as a way in which Spartan men distance themselves from the dishonoured and perform their own identity.

2. Plato

The works of Plato most suitable for an exploration of Spartan masculinity are the *Republic* and *Laws*, as these are the works which most explicitly reference the features of Spartan society and character,[282] as Plato understood them. Both works are exercises in utopia-building in which Spartan and Athenian societies are employed as points of comparison. As such, both types of society (and, indeed, several other types of society, as well) are subjected to considerable critique. This is especially the case in *Laws*, as Plato casts two members of the Dorian societal ethos (a Spartan and a Cretan) as the interlocuters of his Athenian spokesman, making their respective societies principal foci for evaluation of the shortcomings of existing political systems. Consequently, the following analysis, which largely isolates Plato's depictions of Spartan manhood within these particular works, runs the risk of creating the impression that Plato's view of Spartan society is particularly negative, since his criticisms of Spartan ideology and institutions generally outnumber his praises.[283] However, if Plato is critical of Spartan ideals, he is equally, if not even more, critical of those held by other societies including his own. The *Republic* depicts the timocratic society, reflective of Sparta, as only one step away from the ideal society, and the timocratic society and man are share many qualities with the ideal (547B-550C). Conversely, the democratic society and man are depicted as only one step away from tyranny – the most deplorable societal form in Plato's evaluation (557A-561E). The *Republic* gives the impression that, in Plato's view, if Spartan manliness embodied an incomplete and lop-

[282] Or Spartan-type, in the case of *Republic*.
[283] Ducat 2006a, 53.

sided form of the virtue, at least it embodied *some* virtue. By comparison, Plato's portrayal represents the democratic man as not only deficient with respect to virtues but as having reached such a level of degeneracy, and so twisted the nature of virtues, that what he calls by the names of virtues are in fact the worst of vices. With regard to ἀνδρεία, Socrates says that the quality which the democratic man calls by its name is in fact utter shamelessness (ἀναίδειαν) (560E-561A).[284]

An argument can also be made that, in his ideal society in *Republic*, Plato presents an ideal which is genderless.[285] Therefore Plato's critique of Spartan masculinity is somewhat mitigated by the possibility that it was presented by one who was, perhaps, seeking to deliberately subvert constructions of masculinity in general, in order to serve his larger philosophical aims. The enquiry in the *Republic* was intended, after all, to imagine a city formed with the single-minded aim of embodying perfect justice; so, it is understandable that actual societies might come off badly in comparison. As Forde has

[284] For discussion of the divergence between Plato's treatment of masculinity and the masculine ethos of contemporary Athens see, for example, on opposition to sophistry: Guthrie, 1969, 38-40; 1971, 20-1; Brown 1988, 595. On Plato's aversion to prevalent ideas within Athenian political and sophistic thought on the nature of ἀνδρεία, see: Devereux 1977 & 1992; Schmid 1985; Gould 1987; Tessitore 1994; Emlyn-Jones 1999; Schwartz 2004; Rabieh 2006; Balot 2007, 40-3, 46-52; Morris 2009. On gendered ridicule and suspicion of Socrates in Platonic works as indicative of his opposition to things deemed important for manly valour in Athenian ideology, see: Saxonhouse 1976, 206; Salkever 1986, 237; Brown 1988, 597-8; Rabieh 2006, 31-2. Plato's discussion here is also evocative of Thucydides' description of the redefinition of words during the time of *stasis* in Corcyra (Th. 3.82.3). See pp. 203-4.

[285] Of course, the excellence of Plato's guardians has been the subject of much scholarly attention; and there are a range of views – from the view that both male and female guardians represent a particularly masculine form of excellence, to the idea that guardians' virtue is entirely genderless. For discussion of gender and excellence in Plato see, for example: Annas 1976; Saxonhouse 1976; Martin 1977; Okin 1977; Bluestone 1987; Scaltsas 1992; Smith 1994; Spellman 1994; Vlastos 1994; Kochin 1999; Rosen 2005, 186; Sandford 2010.

astutely commented: "By the standard erected in the *Republic*, every society that has ever existed is unjust".[286]

Unfortunately, full exploration of Plato's treatment of Athenian masculinity in comparison to that of Sparta, as well as how both can be seen to fit into his larger philosophical approach to gender, remain outside the scope of the current project. Therefore, in what follows, I will first examine depictions of Spartan masculinity within the *Laws* and the *Republic* individually. I will then explore some limitations of Plato's critique of the timocratic/Spartan masculine type via analysis of his treatment of the auxiliary guardians, read as analogous to the timocratic/Spartan masculine type. I have chosen to structure my analysis by beginning with the *Laws*. While this will mean exploring the texts in reverse chronological order, I believe that it will be worthwhile to discuss the discourse of *Laws*, as it references Sparta explicitly, before discussing the *Republic's* timocracy, which represents Sparta pseudonymically. I will conclude with analysis of auxiliary guardians, on which my examination of both the *Laws* and *Republic* have bearing.

2.1. *Laws*

Plato discusses a number of aspects of Spartan society in his *Laws*.[287] In this work, the primary Athenian character engages with a Spartan interlocutor. The reader thus benefits from receiving explicit assessments of Spartan society and institutions. However, it is still necessary to take care when speaking of the

[286] Forde 1997, 668.
[287] Morrow 1960, 54, 299-301, 317, 330, 533-5; Irwin 1992, 62; Powell 1994.

representation of Spartan society in the *Laws*, as the Athenian often addresses the Spartan and Cretan characters together, and at times conflates Spartan and Cretan society and institutions into a larger common ethos.[288] Evaluation of Spartan society is spread throughout the work, and much of the discussion is associated with concepts of masculinity. The main constructionist categories evident in the *Laws* are: institutions, attitudes towards sex, and men and women. In what follows, I will break down my exploration of the *Laws* according to these constructionist categories. The category of discourse is also noticeable in the *Laws* and pervades all areas of discussion relating to masculinity, as the work in question is a dialogue in which the Athenian character seeks to discursively modify his interlocuters' understandings of the ideological significance of the various institutions and customs of their respective societies. Therefore, rather than analysing the category of discourse on its own, discourse will instead be discussed in relation to the categories of institutions, attitudes towards sex, and men and women.

2.1.1. Institutions

Most of the subject-matter specifically addressing Spartan society can be found early in the work, in the discussion of prominent institutions and their purposes. The dialogue begins with the three characters (an Athenian, a Cretan, and a Spartan) deciding to pass the time with a discussion of customs and laws

[288] Clinias and Megillus are meant to be representatives not only for their own cities, but also for an assumed shared Dorian tradition (e.g. Morrow 1960, 32-5, 66-7, 533-4; Long 2013, 139-40, 157, 160). Moreover, the legendary Spartan lawgiver Lycurgus is particularly connected to Crete due to the tradition that he travelled to Crete and was influenced by Cretan customs in the formation of the laws which he brought back to Sparta (Plut. *Lyc*. 4).

(Plat. *Laws*, 625A),[289] which eventually leads to an exercise in framing laws for a proposed Cretan colony (Magnesia) (702B-D). The Athenian opens the discussion with a focus on institutions, inquiring as to the purpose of the laws concerning *syssitia*, gymnasia, and military equipment (625C). The Cretan, Clinias, replies with an assertion that the lawgiver designed these institutions with a view to achieving success in war. The Spartan, Megillus, in turn, assents that this assessment holds true in Sparta as well (625C-626C). In response, the Athenian enters into a lengthy discussion of why peace is preferable to war (626D-628E) culminating in the assertion that, "[one] is not a consummate lawgiver if he does not frame laws concerning war for the sake of peace, rather than those of peace for the sake of war" (628D-E). Clinias concedes the correctness of this argument but reaffirms that he would be surprised to find that Cretan and Spartan institutions were not directed entirely towards warfare (628E). Again, the Athenian intercedes to convince his companions that, if this is their view, they must surely misunderstand the intentions of their lawgiver (630D), leading into a lengthier discussion concerning the merits and shortcomings of these states' laws and institutions – particularly those related to ideologies of ἀνδρεία, καρτερία, and σωφροσύνη.[290]

Before looking into these institutions and their associated ideologies in more detail, it is useful to first speak briefly regarding the overarching discussion and its nuances, which affects the analysis of Spartan society. One way that Plato's representation of Sparta in *Laws* has been interpreted is that of a

[289] Henceforward, in the *Laws* section of this chapter, all text references will refer to Plato's *Laws* unless otherwise stated.
[290] Cf. Xenophon's discussion of ἐγκράτεια, πειθώ, and αἰδώς as ideals in Spartan education and society (see pp. 54-68).

society excessively concerned with the pursuit of aggressive warfare. Moreover, an offshoot of the apparent Spartan fixation on warfare in the work is the view, held by Kochin, that Spartans are depicted as primarily concerned with the associated virtue of manly courage (ἀνδρεία).[291] This leads to the interpretation that Sparta is presented as a society in which manliness was valued as the preeminent virtue, defining the culture as a whole. Kochin's perception of this value structure leads him to interpret *Laws* as depicting Spartans as characterised by excessive ἀνδρεία which has negative consequences for character development in Spartan men – consequences with which the Athenian takes issue.[292] This interpretation seems to be supported by the discussion in book II, where the Athenian criticises excessive Spartan militarism, and asserts that a man would be a better warrior if he accorded ἀνδρεία its proper place in the hierarchy of virtues[293] – fourth rather than first (insinuating that Spartans situate ἀνδρεία in the primary position).[294]

However, as Hodkinson has rightly pointed out, the nuances of the text serve to somewhat deter a such a straightforward reading.[295] In the to-and-fro of discussion, it is apparent that there is a disconnect between the understandings Clinias and Megillus hold regarding the intended purpose and nature of Spartan (and Cretan) institutions, and those advocated by the Athenian.[296] The Athenian's intervention leads the reader away from a purely militaristic

[291] Kochin 2002, 40, 50, 91-2.
[292] Kochin 2002, 5, 20-1, 39; Ducat 2006a, 57, 59-60.
[293] Plat. *Laws* 631C-D: ἀνδρεία is placed last, after wisdom (φρόνησις), moderation or temperance of soul (νοῦ σώφρων ψυχῆς ἕξις), and justice (δικαιοσύνη).
[294] Balot 2007, 37-9; Ducat 2006a, 57-8.
[295] Hodkinson 2006, 124-6.
[296] Long 2013, 156.

understanding of these institutions. Moreover, in the Athenian's appeal to the authority of the lawgiver, and in his insistence that his companions must have mistaken their lawgivers' intentions, the reader is directed to accept the Athenian's interpretation as correct.

However, the discrepancy of interpretation, expressed by individuals within the dialogue, is also significant in and of itself. The dialogue depicts the typical Spartan man, personified by Megillus, as deriving the chief ideological meaning of several important institutions from their associations with warfare. When the Athenian attempts to lead his companions away from this view, Clinias, speaking on behalf of both Sparta and Crete, expresses considerable scepticism at the idea that utility for war might not have been the whole of the lawgivers' intention when devising these institutions. And it is only after lengthy discussion that the Athenian is able to convince them to consider an alternative interpretation. It may very well be that Plato intended to suggest that the average Spartan misunderstood the range of purposes their lawgiver conceived for institutions which Spartans currently valued primarily for utility in matters of war. But if even if Plato did intend readers to understand that the aforementioned institutions may were intended to implant manifold ideals in Spartan men, which they failed to appreciate, this Spartan, the "misunderstanding" is of no small consequence. Because, regardless of the "correctness" of Megillus' interpretation, Plato's presentation here nevertheless represents war-related ideology as being most significant in informing an average Spartan's understanding of particular institutions, and

this was the aspect of said institutions that Plato represents as having the greatest influence on the worldview of Spartan men.

The picture *Laws* paints of the roles of all-male institutions in shaping Spartan men can be further expanded by discussing the qualities they are shown to impart. The ideology of ἀνδρεία is associated with a number of Spartan institutions and is the subject of considerable discussion in the *Laws*. The Athenian character demonstrates that the Spartan system suffers from a misconception of what true ἀνδρεία must entail.

This misconception is similar to that expressed by the titular character in Plato's *Laches*, which takes the proper definition of ἀνδρεία as its subject. Over the course of the dialogue, Laches' assertion that ἀνδρεία must be some form of endurance is repeatedly subjected to refinement of definition by Plato's Socrates, until it is ultimately rejected as insufficient (*Lach.* 192B-194B). It has been suggested that the perspectives of Laches and Nicias (Socrates' other interlocuter in the *Laches*) represent two one-sided views of ἀνδρεία. Scholars have seen Laches as a characterisation of the Spartan stress on endurance (καρτερία), while Nicias embodies the Athenian stance on the prevalence of intellectual qualities.[297] Devereux points out that Socrates does not reject Laches' idea that "endurance of the soul" is a necessary aspect for ἀνδρεία (in fact, Devereux suggests that, if one were keeping score, Laches' argument comes out better than that of Nicias).[298] Instead, Socrates' dismissal

[297] Devereux 1977, 134-5; Emlyn-Jones 1999, 128-30, 135; Gould 1987, 266; Tessitore 1994, 122.
[298] Devereux 1977, 134-5.

of Laches' definition lies in its incompleteness. When he is pressed to conceive of a definition of ἀνδρεία outside of the strictly military context, Laches begins to struggle.[299]

In the *Laws* Spartan cultivation of ἀνδρεία can be seen to place similar emphasis on endurance of hardship. Sparta's institutions are presented as bearing much of the onus for improper cultivation ἀνδρεία. For instance, Plato represents Spartan education as predominantly an exercise in hardening to suffering.[300] This, cultivation of endurance over pains is not presented as intrinsically problematic or without value. Plato's Athenian does not deny that Spartan training in endurance creates men who possess well the virtue of mastery over pains (635B-C). He describes the mode of hunting favoured by Spartans as cultivating a manliness that is divine (ἀνδρείας τῆς θείας) (824A). And he praises the Spartan system at length, both for implanting obedience to and respect for the laws and elders in Spartan men (1.634D-E). Moreover, Plato adapts many Spartan institutions and educational practices (albeit with modifications) for use in his ideal city.[301] And a number of scholars have commented about the inspiration the *Laws* seems to draw from Sparta in the creation of Magnesia.[302]

However, Plato's Athenian points out that it is possible – and indeed essential if one is to possess full ἀνδρεία – for individuals to exhibit endurance

[299] Devereux 1977, 134; Schmid 1985, 114-5.
[300] Ducat 2006a, 282.
[301] David 1978, 486-7; Ducat 2006a, 60; Hodkinson 2006, 124, 143.
[302] E.g. Morrow 1960, 45-6, 48-9, 299-300, 351, 533-5; David 1978, 486-7; Irwin 1992, 62; Ducat 2006a, 54-55; Ludwig 2007, 210-12; Hunter 2011.

(καρτερία) not only with regard to suffering, but with regard to pleasures as well (τοῖς γε δυναμένοις καρτερεῖν ἐν ταῖς ἡδοναῖς 635D). In fact, he suggests that this form of endurance may actually be the more important form; it enables men to withstand those things which are most alluring, and thus destructive when pursued to excess (633D-E, 635D). Plato's Athenian suggests that cultivation of σωφροσύνη enables one to properly withstand pleasures. Thus, fully developed ἀνδρεία is represented as comprised of the proper balance of both σωφροσύνη and καρτερία (635-6).

The problem, addressed in *Laws*, with Spartan conceptions of ἀνδρεία, and the institutions and customs seen to inculcate it, then, appears to be one of balance. After attaining the agreement of his fellows that the proper definition of ἀνδρεία should include mastery over pleasures as well as pains (633D-634A), Plato's Athenian seeks to discover which practices in Sparta and Crete aim at mastery over pleasures, asserting that their lawgivers surely did not frame laws to create "a lame courage (χωλὴν τὴν ἀνδρείαν), able to withstand on the left, but unable to resist enticing and flattering things on the right" (634A). One may be inclined, however, to question the sincerity with which Plato has his Athenian make this assertion. In the discussion following it, not only do the characters fail to discover any Spartan (or Cretan) institutions which can be definitively seen to foster mastery over pleasures, the Athenian actively refutes all suggestions put forward by his companions.

The institutions associated with the cultivation of ἀνδρεία, listed by Megillus (632E-633C), include: the *syssitia*, the gymnasia, hunting, boxing-matches,

practice of thefts, the *crypteia*, the *gymnopaidiai*, and (he asserts) countless others (633A-C).[303] The first three are professed to be oriented with a view to war. The additional institutions are also mentioned in association with war but are primarily noted for their focus on endurance of hardships (καρτερήσεις). Due to the professed purposes and effects of these institutions that Plato places into Megillus' mouth, they are associated with cultivating specifically the part of ἀνδρεία which teaches men how not to be mastered by pains. However, when called upon to list institutions aimed at promoting mastery over pleasures, Megillus is at a loss (634A-C).

The Athenian follows up the examination of Spartan ἀνδρεία with discussion of the related quality of σωφροσύνη, the idea of endurance with respect to pleasures, leading into a discussion of Sparta's prohibition of *symposia*, and of the merit of such gatherings in general (636E-641D). Spartan practice is found wanting with respect to moderation because, as mentioned earlier (634A-B), true mastery requires exposure to the thing one wishes to master. Spartan regulations are initially professed to establish a principle of temperance by forbidding drunkenness altogether (636E-637A). When further pressed by the Athenian to consider which Spartan institutions promote self-control (σωφροσύνη), Plato has Megillus propose the *syssitia* and the gymnasia (635E-636A). The Athenian acknowledges that these are indeed responsible for many good things (he does not elaborate at this point, but one may assume that they are the qualities listed above), but he does not accept σωφροσύνη as one of

[303] Hodkinson 2006, 125.

them.[304] In fact, Plato's Athenian asserts that these institutions are responsible for the immoderate prevalence of sexual pederasty in Spartan society; insinuating that, rather than imbuing Spartan men with σωφροσύνη, the *syssitia* and gymnasia did exactly the opposite (636B). Thus, Plato represents the effect produced by these Spartan institutions as causing men to never develop true moderation at all.[305]

The imbalance of Spartan endurance is presented as problematic. Whereas endurance of pains can be enforced, endurance of pleasures through σωφροσύνη requires a level of autonomous judgement that the text suggests was not promoted by Spartan institutions, necessitating a situation wherein individuals must be subjected to a high level of state-control in order to ensure continuing adherence to ideals concerning restraint.[306] Thus Spartan men are portrayed as conducting themselves in a *polis*-approved manner – not from personal sense of justice or self-mastery – but due to constraints imposed by the societal system.[307] While measures of this nature might be effective as long as individual Spartan men remained within their city or on regimented campaigns, under the watchful eyes of various authorities, the suggestion made is that Spartan ideals were in danger of crumbling if this strict control were to be removed. In the *Laws*, Plato's Athenian stresses this point through repeated references to Sparta's prohibition on *symposia*, asserting that such gatherings

[304] Plato's assessment of Spartan practice differs here from other authors. For example, Xenophon asserts that the *syssitia* did expose Spartans to drink in moderate quantity (*Lac.* 5). For discussion see p. 93.
[305] Morrow 1960, 48.
[306] Kochin 2002, 22.
[307] Kochin 2002, 57-9.

hold no terror to one trained to withstand pleasures;[308] and by insinuating that whenever strict enforcement was removed Spartan men became slaves to every manner of excess (635C-D). Plato has Megillus (perhaps unwittingly) verify this insinuation by comparing Spartan sobriety to the rampant drunkenness he witnessed among Spartan colonials at Tarentum (637B).[309] Thus, if Spartan ἀνδρεία comes up lame in the Athenian's assessment, it does so because it has only dealt with one side of things which must be endured by one who truly deserved to be called ἀνδρεῖος.

2.1.2. Attitudes Towards Sex

The *Laws*' treatment of attitudes towards sex contains overlap with its treatment of institutions. As previously mentioned, Plato has his Athenian express the view that Spartan pederastic practice is incompatible with the cultivation of virtue and has him link Spartan pederasty to the all-male institutions of the *syssitia* and *gymnasia*. These institutions are portrayed as double-edged swords: they may promote some admirable qualities, but they lead to abominable excess in their promotion of sexual pederasty (636A-E). This sort of pederasty, which Plato depicts as common practice in Sparta, is presented as problematic in a number of ways. A passage discussing Spartan institutions provides the first.

Plato's Athenian asserts that it is a subversion of natural procreative sex due to failure to control one's desire for pleasure. He elaborates further on the topic of

[308] 641A-B, 645C, 645D-646A, 646D-647A, 648D, 649D, 652A.
[309] Kochin 2002, 91.

pederasty in general, and on the form of pederasty approved by the society established in the *Laws* (835D-837E). This discussion provides additional information on the issues associated with carnal Spartan pederasty, especially as they relate to the cultivation of ideal manhood. The proper expression of pederastic love, expressed in the *Laws*, is one that contains no physical element, but is entirely concerned with the betterment of the beloved's soul (837B-D). Pederastic practice in which the physical aspect was prominent (if not dominant) is represented as a corruption of natural pleasures (636B).

In the *Republic*, unchaste pederasty is presented as a failure with respect to moderation (402E-403C), but in the *Laws* Spartan pederasty is presented as having two-fold implications (836D-E). This passage reaffirms the earlier assertion that being mastered by pleasure in the form of excessive, non-procreative sex is a failure with respect to moderation on the part of the *erastes*. This is also represented as a failure with respect to masculinity, since mastery with respect to pleasures is an aspect of complete ἀνδρεία, and to be expected of ideal masculine conduct. The second area in which sexual pederasty relates to ideals of masculinity concerns the *eromenos.* The assumption of the woman's role in the sexual act is expressed by the Athenian as an effeminising act – a failure with respect to manliness on the part of the *eromenos*.[310]

Kochin suggests that the view of Sparta where a high estimation of ἀνδρεία is combined with a sexually segregated lifestyle, provide conditions that result in

[310] Ducat 2006a; Kochin 2002.

the prevalence of pederasty in Spartan society.[311] Viewed in this light, the *Laws* can be seen to portray an ironic situation wherein Spartan over-estimation of manliness causes Spartan men to undermine the very manliness they prize by seeking out boys as sexual objects, feminising them through their sexual submission rather than rearing them to be true men, as is the duty of the proper *erastes*. The Athenian's final assessment of those involved in such relationships outlines its effect on the manhood of both (836D-E):

> Come now, if we concede that this practice [sexual pederasty] is now lawful, and fine rather than shameful, to what extent will it contribute to excellence? Will it either cause a manly character (ἀνδρείας ἦθος) to be implanted in the soul of the seduced, or temperance of character in the soul of the seducer? No one would ever believe this, rather, entirely to the contrary; all would blame the weakness (μαλακίαν) of the one who yields to pleasure and is not able to endure (καρτερεῖν), and will they not censure the one who imitates a woman for his likeness to the model?

2.1.3. Men and Women

Despite the shortcomings attributed to Spartan society, Plato acknowledges Sparta's effectiveness in regulating the behaviour of its men (780).[312] Lack of similar regulation for women is presented as resulting in considerable disparities between the conduct of men and women. Plato depicts areas of life outside of public view as being exempt from institutional control. As the Spartan institutions (such as the *syssitia*) useful for moderating individuals' behaviour to societal standards were exclusively the domain of men, the contrast between public restraint and private excess takes on a gendered dynamic. This is illustrated in the *Laws*' depiction of Spartan women. The *Laws* suggests that because Spartan women have no place in public male

[311] Kochin 2002, 89-90, 92-3, 113-15.
[312] Morrow 1960, 52; Powell 1994, 279.

spaces and practices, they are unregulated and run wild in a number of respects.[313] Plato illustrates this idea with assertions that Spartan women were given to luxurious excess and useless in defence of the city (805E-806C).

In his discussion of the regulations to which Magnesia is to subject its female citizens, Plato's Athenian repeatedly stresses the anticipated difficulty in bringing women into full public participation (780D-781E; 834D). He attributes this difficulty to innate female weakness which, exacerbated by habituation, will cause women to vehemently resist being brought into the public sphere. And yet, Plato also has his Athenian argue that this is the very reason women must be brought into public life. The relative weakness of women requires their incorporation into the public sphere if society is to operate effectively (780D-781E).[314] Plato sees no provision for women in Sparta's laws, so they are seen to fall victim to the excesses of a "womanish" character.

Of course, the polarity in gender relations should not be overstated. Plato has his Athenian place Spartan arrangements concerning women ahead of those of the Thracians and the Athenians (805D-E) and describes them as a "midway" approach which does well in certain respects, but wrongly neglects to train women to defend their *polis* (805E-806B).[315] Just as Plato asserts that Spartan women make Sarmatian women appear as men (806B-C), a Spartan woman might not seem excessively feminine when compared to her cloistered

[313] Okin 1977, 367; Redfield 1977-8, 148-9, 161; Kochin 2002, 91-2.
[314] Forde 1997, 161-3.
[315] Morrow 1960, 330.

Athenian counterpart. However, because criticisms of the lack of formalised regulation for Spartan women is presented as owing to their exclusion from public institutions and practices, the disparity between public and private in Spartan society is portrayed, to some extent, as a gendered issue.

One final remark on men and women involves returning to the discursive understanding of ἀνδρεία. The lop-sided Spartan perception of this virtue, portrayed by the *Laws*, can perhaps be seen as linked to relations between men and women on a conceptual level. In the *Laws*, the element missing from the Spartan form of the virtue was that of σωφροσύνη. The consequence of failure to instil this virtue is depicted as unmanly slavishness to pleasures (635C-D):

> And I think that this same lawgiver ought to have been similarly minded towards pleasures as well, saying to himself that: if our citizens grow up from youth without experience of the greatest pleasures, and should come amongst pleasures being untrained in resisting and refusing to act shamefully, then because of their favourable disposition towards pleasures, they will suffer just as those defeated by fears. They will be enslaved in another and more shameful way to those who are able to endure in pleasures and who have mastered pleasures – people sometimes entirely wicked. And they will have a soul partly slave and partly free. And they will not be worthy to be called manly (ἀνδρεῖοι) and free.

Elsewhere (802E), ἀνδρεία is represented as the characteristic quality of men, while σωφροσύνη is a quality seen as characteristic of women.[316] Thus, it is possible that Spartan rejection of σωφροσύνη is here presented as, to some extent, a rejection of the feminine – a rejection which, ironically, hampers men's ability to display full ἀνδρεία. Kochin suggests that this idea is also highlighted in the ideal city of Plato's *Republic*. Both male and female guardians are shown, due to their education, to exhibit a new type of ἀνδρεία which – unlike traditional Greek conceptions – can incorporate the best aspects

[316] Morrow 1960, 331; Kochin 2002, 19.

of virtues which had previously been associated exclusively with either masculinity or femininity. The enlightened guardians incorporate the "feminine" virtue of σωφροσύνη as a central feature of their collective masculinity.[317]

2.2. *Republic*

The majority of explicit evaluation of the Spartan – or at least a Spartan-type – society and character, in the *Republic*, is found in book VIII where Plato's Socrates describes the timocratic constitution and man (544A-550C).[318] The work initially connects this type to both the Cretan and Laconian constitutions (544A); however, as the narrative moves to discuss timocracy – and the type of man timocracy produces – in greater detail, timocracy is associated more specifically with Laconian society (545A). Therefore, the description of timocracy in book VIII is a suitable passage to examine in relation to depictions of Spartan masculinity.[319] Plato's Socrates identifies the timocracy as the best of the "inferior" (χείρους) types of society and marks it as the first stage of hypothetical degeneration from the ideal (545A-D). While Socrates identifies shared features between the ideal and timocratic societies, he also levels a number of criticisms against the timocratic character, owing to its failure to live up to the precepts of the ideal. Several features Plato associates with timocracy have bearing on formation of masculine identity and achievement in the timocratic society. The primary constructionist categories

[317] Kochin 1999, 416.
[318] Unless otherwise stated, all text references in this section will refer to Plato's *Republic*.
[319] Morrow 1960, 46; Redfield 1977-8, 157.

evident in the text are: men and women, relations between men and hegemonic masculinity, discourse, and institutions.

In his discussion of the inferior types of societies and their associated men, Plato has Socrates begin by describing the timocratic society and man. Throughout the description, we are given a litany of traits said to characterise the timocratic type of man. He is distrustful of the wise, prefers rulers who are spirited and simple, and is exceedingly warlike (547D-548A). He is disdainful of wealth in his youth but grows ever more covetous of it as he ages, hoarding wealth and chasing after pleasures in secret (548B-C, 549A-B). He enjoys music, poetry and speeches, but lacks skill in these areas himself. Instead, his talents run towards physical training, hunting, and matters of war (549E-550A). He is excessively harsh with slaves but civil to the free, he is particularly obedient to rulers, and he is a lover of offices and honours (549E-550A). To explain how such a society and character arise, Plato's Socrates gives a two-fold account. First, he discusses forces which drive the timocratic society as a whole, explaining how degeneration from the ideal occurs on a societal level. Next, he explains how the timocratic character is formed on the individual level, with a hypothetical account of the sort of rearing that creates the timocratic type of man. I will examine both levels of this depiction, in turn.

2.2.1. Development of Timocratic Masculinity at the Societal Level

The first stimulus to which Socrates attributes timocracy's decline from the ideal is "inopportune" procreation (545D-546D).[320] This is represented as creating a shift in men's character with institutional implications.[321] This institutional impact is said to then further influence the development of individual character in a sort of vicious cycle.[322] In Plato's account, the timocratic society consequently comes to be ruled not by the truly wise, but by individuals driven by the spirited element of the soul. Consequently, society becomes excessively warlike and tends toward materialism – albeit secret materialism – due to its new-found desire for wealth (547D-548A). Institutions are identified as being chiefly responsible for this character shift: namely, the educational system and household – along with the private property associated with the household.

Plato represents timocratic education as imbalanced, stating that the spirited timocratic nature prefers gymnastics to music and neglects philosophical training (548B).[323] This hearkens back to an earlier description of dangers inherent in a similarly imbalanced education. In book III, Plato has Socrates stress that proper education for the guardian class, in his ideal *polis,* must

---

[320] The words Plato uses to express "inopportune" with reference to begetting are οὐ δέον (546B), and παρὰ καιρόν (546D). Exactly what about these conceptions makes them "inopportune" is less certain. Plato provides a complicated numerical explanation of ideal begetting, which has inspired considerable debate. Plato's "Nuptial Number" has been thought to be a calculation to determine either the times of life most suitable for mating, or auspicious parental parings. Whichever interpretation is correct, the result is said to be offspring of lesser quality than in previous generations. For detailed discussion see, e.g. Ehrhardt 1986; Fossa and Erickson 2001.
[321] 546D-547C, 547D-548C.
[322] Hobbs 2000, 27.
[323] This is a point of departure from other sources' accounts of Spartan education, which included musical education (Plut. *Lyc*. 21).

include the suitable mix of physical and musical/poetic elements, and warns of the effects that neglect of either would have on a man's character.

The properly educated and harmonised soul is temperate and courageous, while improper education leads to a boorish and cowardly character. This is because overemphasis on gymnastics leads men to become savage (ἀγριότητός), while over-emphasis on music makes men soft (μαλακός) (410D-411A). Of particular interest is Plato's observation that, "This savagery is produced by the spirited part of one's nature which, if it is reared rightly, becomes manly/courageous (ἀνδρεῖον), but if stretched more than needful is likely to become hard (σκληρόν) and harsh (χαλεπὸν)" (410D). The musical side of education is presented as training which tempers the guardians' character with the moderation required to avoid personal extravagance and – more importantly – to reconcile themselves to the rule of reason, so that they may properly benefit the city as protectors.[324] Without this aspect, education risks overstimulating the spirited part of a man's nature into developing an over-valued and exaggerated expression of ἀνδρεία, which ceases to be true ἀνδρεία at all.[325]

As several scholars have noted, ἀνδρεία is central to ancient Greek conceptions of masculinity; war and other endeavours requiring the sort of courage expressed by the concept of ἀνδρεία were seen as most representative of what it meant to be a man – reflected in the most literal understanding of ἀνδρεία:

[324] Kochin 1999, 408-9.
[325] Rosen 2005, 122-3.

"manliness".[326] At the point in book III in which the above exchange occurs, the reader has not yet been introduced to the possibility of female guardians, making it likely that the understanding of ἀνδρεία was intended to be invested with some of the term's gendered connotations.[327] With this interpretation of ἀνδρεία, one can interpret the harshness which Plato ascribes to overstimulation of the spirited element as related to ideas of masculinity, sunce it is the same natural "fierceness" which develops into ἀνδρεία or harshness, dependent upon training.

The appropriate development of philosophical training is precisely what the text presents as lacking in timocratic education (548B). Thus, cautions given over the failure to properly educate the spirited individual in book III also apply to the spirited timocrat. He can be seen to develop the same sort of harshness, due to his neglect of "the true Muse". Over-emphasis on spiritedness, according to Plato's Socrates, is invariably accompanied by diminished intellectual and reasoning capabilities (411C-E), so that the excessively spirited man is "hateful of dialectic (μισόλογος) and unrefined. He no longer makes use of persuasion and argument, but accomplishes everything with force and savagery, just like a beast" (411D-E).

The education of the timocratic society echoes back to the description of the unharmonised education in 410-11 which is depicted as cultivating spiritedness, past the point of ἀνδρεία, to that of savagery, resulting in men

[326] E.g. Rorty 1986, 162; Salkever 1986, 233; Hobbs 2000, 13; Balot 2007, 37-9; Kochin 1999, 418.
[327] Hobbs 2000, 13, 23.

who exhibit a warlike and exploitative nature. This is borne out in the timocrat's treatment of others – and is especially apparent when one compares behaviour of timocratic men to that of their closest counterpart within the *Republic*: the auxiliary guardians. The *Republic's* auxiliaries would be educated with the proper mix of spirit-promoting and moderation-promoting elements (a mixture not attributed to timocratic education).[328] Thus, although auxiliaries are portrayed as higher in calibre than the production-oriented class, they would nevertheless function as protectors of these inferiors, living selflessly for the good of the city.[329] The timocratic society falls short of the ideal conduct expressed by auxiliaries, inasmuch as timocrats are depicted as turning towards the exploitation of those they ought to protect (547B-D).

The text portrays a shift in focus from protection and education to self-aggrandisement which creates men characterised, above all, by "high-spiritedness" (548C). This, in turn, creates the conditions which allow for exploitation of those the spirited man deems lesser. The typical timocratic man is portrayed as excessively desirous of personal honour, and capricious – in that he is deferential and obedient to his rulers, contentious to those he views as equals, and harsh with his slaves – in a way not exhibited by men properly educated in the virtues (548C-549B).[330] The injustice and disparity that the timocratic man employs in his treatment of others can be interpreted as the predictable result of a spirit-oriented education, developing manly ἀνδρεία to

[328] Hobbs 2000, 27-8.
[329] Kochin 1999, 410-11.
[330] This is perhaps a deliberate reference to Sparta. Kochin 1999, 410-11 suggests that Plato's depiction of timocratic harshness with slaves echoes depictions of Spartan contempt for the servile helots whose labour founded the basis of their economy

the point of savagery. We are told that, educated in inferior fashion, the timocratic society entrusts its rule no longer to those governed by wise reason, but instead to those who are spirit-driven (548D-E).

In Plato's narrative, exploitation of the producing class and the creation of private property for the ruling class, via re-distribution of land, gives rise to the influence of the household. This arena is represented as the driving force behind the timocratic man's materialism. The honour-loving timocrats avoid the appearance of avarice in public where there are measures in place against acquisitive tendencies; but the private household provides them with an outlet for this aspect of their character, and the text asserts that in this sphere it is expressed with abandon (548A-B). This is presented as relating to ideas of gender as well, and to relations between men and women in particular.

There is a direct association between male-female relations and the promotion of materialistic tendencies; Plato has Socrates highlight women as a main object of luxurious spending (548A-B):

> "Indeed," said I, "Men of this sort will be desirous of wealth, just as in oligarchies, and will revere silver and gold fiercely in secret, acquiring treasuries and private store-houses, where they can deposit them secretly, and also the enclosures of their homes, literal private nests, in which they lavish and spend greatly on their women and whatever others they wish."

In this passage, women are fixed within the private household sphere, separated from the constraints of public appearances, and function to provide stimulus and justification for men's private desires. The conditions provided by the household, amenable to privately giving oneself over to excess, are presented as being exacerbated by the flawed education of the timocratic man (548B-C):

> And will they not therefore be stingy with money, seeing as they esteem it but may not procure it openly; fond of spending others', owing to their passions, but enjoying their pleasures secretly, fleeing the laws just like boys their fathers; because they have been educated not by persuasion but by force, and have neglected the true Muse, that which accompanies discussion and philosophy, and because they have held gymnastics in greater esteem than music?

Plato's Socrates asserts that the education of the spirited man is one of compulsion (βίας) and lacking in persuasion (πειθοῦς) (548B). While this education nurtures the spiritedness that encourages men to present the appearance of moderation in public, it does nothing to cultivate the autonomous and internalised virtue to uphold such ideals in private, resulting in a sort of immaturity of outlook.[331] The timocratic men are presented not as autonomous adult men. Rather, running from the restrictive laws to the secret enjoyment of luxury, they are likened unto boys running from their father. Thus, the ideals and behaviour displayed by Spartan men of the timocratic type are unfitting for proper adult men within an ideal society.

2.2.2. Development of Timocratic Masculinity at the Individual Level

After outlining societal factors which cause an ideal society to devolve into timocracy, Plato's Socrates next presents a tableau of the rearing of a hypothetical timocratic male. The highly-fictionalised account of the formation of the prototypical timocratic man does not reflect the actualities of Spartan practice, and likely had other inspirations as well.[332] However, one must assume that Plato associated this portrait with the Spartan-inspired timocratic

[331] Hitz 2010, 114-5, 123.
[332] Walcot 1987 provides discussion of possible influences that may have contributed to the creation of the mother-figure in this section.

character for a reason, and thus should be seen to reflect his understanding of the forces involved in the moulding of such a character.

When explaining how men of timocratic character are formed, the focus shifts, and Socrates' description turns from the public and institutional to the private and relational. The initial and predominant influence on the formation of a timocratic man's defining characteristics is represented as founded in the relations between men and women within the home (549C-E):

> "How does he [the timocratic man] come to be?" He [Adeimantus] said. I [Socrates] said, "Whenever he first listens to his mother complaining that her husband isn't one of the rulers, and that because of this she is diminished amongst the other women. Then, seeing that he is not particularly keen in matter of money, and that he does not fight when reproached either in private lawsuits or in the public halls, but bears things such as this lightly, and when she perceives that he is always turns his mind to his own thought and neither honours nor dishonours her overmuch, and on account of all of this she complains and tells the boy that his father is unmanly (ἄνανδρός) and exceedingly slack, and all of the other things which women love to repeat in such cases."

This passage places the mother at the centre of a boy's initial understanding and formation of masculine identity. The boy's understanding is informed first passively, though listening to his mother's complaints about his father; and then more actively via his own relations with his mother, when his mother uses these complaints to illustrate criteria of unmanly behaviour to her son. This primary formation of masculine identity is depicted as fashioned in direct response to female needs and demands. Plato has Socrates begin with a woman whose attitude towards, and interaction with, her husband is motivated exclusively by her own concerns – predominantly her standing in relation to other women and her desire for wealth, both seen as a reflection of status and

desired for its own sake.[333] Her ability to influence her husband is presented as limited, prompting her to turn her attention towards her more malleable son.[334]

The woman employs gendered discourse towards her son. Now her complaints are not merely points of personal dissatisfaction, they are a lesson in what it means to be a real man. This discursive turn has a two-fold effect: it gives the mother's complaints added weight by appealing to ideals of manhood (i.e. disparagement of the father as ἄνανδρός) and, at the same time, it serves an ontological function in establishing, in the boy's understanding, what character traits constitute said ideals. The discourse of masculinity promoted by the mother locates the first understandings of timocratic manhood in terms of masculine action. This is represented as 1) male responsiveness to female need, and 2) embodiment of a set of masculine ideals primarily concerned with enthusiastic pursuit of position and wealth, as well as the esteem that accompanies these possessions.

The inculcation of these types of masculine values is further reinforced by the servants of the family. This is presented as an extension of the influence of the private realm, and thus the mother who characterises it. As such they employ a similar use of masculine discourse when seeking to influence the boy (549E-550A):

> "And you know" I [Socrates] said, "That the slaves of such men – those who are seemingly loyal – will sometimes say such things secretly to the son. And if they see someone owing money, or any other wrongdoer, whom the father does not prosecute, they exhort the son to take vengeance on all such as these when he becomes a man, and to be more of a man than his father."

[333] Hobbs 2000, 28-9.
[334] Walcot 1987, 13.

The driving forces of personal reputation and material wealth, imprinted on the timocratic boy's emerging masculine identity, are represented by Plato as lesser concerns than those which drive the ideal society. Thus, in this passage, the influence of the private household is problematised and associated with the creation of an inferior and materialistic ideology of manhood. Whereas the spirited ἀνδρεία exhibited by auxiliaries in the ideal state is portrayed as directed by reason towards ends which benefit the community as a whole, masculine honour here is associated with the ability to procure and defend one's property and reputation.[335] This ideology is represented as being promulgated relationally, primarily between mother and son, by means of a gendered discourse which labels the philosophically-minded father a paradigm of failed masculinity not to be emulated.

As the hypothetical timocratic male subject moves beyond the private sphere into the larger society, the passage shows his character also being shaped relationally in the public realm. Here we can see the influence of relations between men. We are told that (550A-B):

> And going out he hears and sees the same sort of things. Those concerned with their own affairs are called foolish and are held in little esteem, while those who do not mind their own business are honoured and commended. And then, the youth, seeing and hearing all such things, but also hearing his father's words, and seeing his pursuits from close at hand contrasted with those of others, he is pulled by both. His father watering and growing the element of reason in his soul, and the others the appetitive and spirited elements. And because he is not a bad man by nature, but has fallen into the bad company of others, being pulled by both of them he comes to the middle. And he hands over the rule of himself to the middle way of love of victory and spiritedness and becomes a haughty and honour-loving man.

[335] Hobbs 2000, 29.

This passage illustrates the development of the timocratic youth's character through relation to the teaching and example of his father on the one hand, and through observation of relations between adult men in society on the other. The tension between the character traits imparted by the father and other men, respectively, are likely hyperbolic, as the description here is one of a society and character in flux. Thus, the timocratic youth in this piece is a transitional character, torn between philosophic ideals (embodied in the father) and baser drives (embodied in the other adult men he encounters). The competing drives from which his "middle ground" character develops are represented as being those of a timocracy in development. However, the end-product – the fully-developed timocratic man with whom the passage ends, and who has the character traits associated with an established timocracy[336] – is represented as still embodying these competing drives. The timocratic character remains defined as one pulled equally by honour-related and appetitive drives to produce the typical spirited character, which would presumably replicate in a more stable fashion in successive generations.

Description of the relations between male figures, within the narrative itself, is of as much interest as the drives these figures represent. The youth's relations with his father are expressed as involving personal instruction and close observation of the father's conduct and dealings with the outside world. The influence of other men on the boy's development is presented as more remote in nature – comprising observed interactions within the public sphere, with a focus on honour-generating behaviours. The influences of careful and deliberate

[336] Blössner 2007, 361.

instruction by the father and the appeal of honour attained by societally-approved male interactions are represented as evenly matched. Socrates thus presents a view of a society wherein relations both with the father and with other adult men are instrumental in forming the boy's character. This portrait could also suggest that, in Plato's view, observation of the effects of extra-familial male role-models and societal pressure carried equal weight to more personal male relationships in cultivating the character of timocratic men. However, the fact that the father's instruction and example are expressed as contributing equally to the moulding of his son in this particular example – a scenario wherein the father's example was otherwise universally reviled, both within the home and without – could also indicate fathers having greater influence on sons' development than extra-familiar male role models.

2.3. The Spartan-Masculine Type Elsewhere: The Auxiliary Guardians

When evaluating Plato's assessment of the limitations of Spartan character and the role that Spartan attitudes towards masculinity played in the formation of said character it is also worth noting that, even in his ideally just society in the *Republic*, Plato does not seem to be able to entirely remedy the problematic elements he perceived in Spartan character.

The societal class in the idealised *polis* of the *Republic* which corresponds most closely to Plato's characterisation of Spartan, or timocratic, character is the auxiliary guardians. The auxiliaries are the subsection of the guardian class whose role would be to support full guardians in their defence of the state. Their primary preoccupation would be with warfare (374A-E), and their nature

is characterised first and foremost by abundant courage (ἀνδρεῖος) and spiritedness (θυμοειδής) (374E-375B). All members of the guardian class would receive the same balanced education, but the auxiliaries are those who, in spite of their education, would prove unable to pass the tests that determine which of the guardians are also fit for rule (412C-414B). Thus, they are relegated to support-roles and induced to serve well by promises of honours, for which they are eager (465D-466B, 468B-469B). The similarities in Plato's portrayals of their characteristics are such that it is reasonable to suggest that timocratic men of the Spartan type are depicted as the auxiliaries' near real-world equivalent.

Before discussing the implications of this identification, it is beneficial to consider an alternative view expressed by Wilberding. He asserts that the type of "second best" citizens personified by auxiliaries and Spartans, respectively, are fundamentally different and argues against identifying the auxiliaries with the timocratic or Spartan character type.[337] In his view, the timocratic individual will necessarily fall short of full virtue because he – like his society – is ruled by the spirited part of the soul. He allows spirit to supersede reason, resulting in disharmony within the soul. His "second best" status is, therefore, not necessarily a reflection of his capabilities; rather, it is a reflection of misplaced internal priorities which prevent him from attaining a fully just existence. Conversely, he suggests that the auxiliary, as a member of the just society, will have a harmony within his soul comparable to that of the full guardian; falling short of full guardian status only with respect to intellectual

[337] Wilberding 2009.

capabilities.[338] Wilberding sees the auxiliary as being the "second best" type of person because he is a fully just and internally harmonised individual who has risen to the pinnacle of his limited capabilities.

However, this interpretation does not accurately reflect Plato's presentation of the auxiliaries. As Kossman rightly pointed out, political justice and individual justice are not directly analogous.[339] Virtues such as wisdom and courage are expressed civically in the *Republic* as belonging to the whole, due to the presence of members within the whole who possess those virtues individually (even if such individuals are few in number). The virtues of moderation and justice are represented differently – belonging to the whole by virtue of correct balance of parts within the whole.[340] Following this idea, a society can be perceived to be just as a whole – that is, possessing the correct balance of virtues – without every member of the society individually possessing all virtues required to achieve the balance of the soul that creates individual justice. While Wilberding is correct in saying that Plato presents auxiliaries as achieving to the height of their capabilities,[341] it does not follow that the height of their capabilities necessarily includes attainment of the soul-harmony required for individual justice. As Ferrari astutely notes, if justice in the individual requires the proper subordination of the spirited element of the soul to the reasoning element, then limitations in intellectual capacity may suggest that some individuals are unable to attain justice on an individual level.[342] In

[338] Wilberding 2009, 360.
[339] Kossman 2007, 125.
[340] Kossman 2007, 125-8. See also *Rep*. 428E-435B on the relationship between the virtues of wisdom, courage, moderation and justice within the just society.
[341] Rabieh 2006, 110-13, 122-3.
[342] Ferrari 2007, 188-9.

fact, the strong suggestion that can be inferred from the *Republic* is that only the complete guardians, who will become the philosopher rulers of the just society, can be understood as embodying justice on an individual level.

Plato asserts at 428 that, though there are many types of knowledge and judgement, there is only one sort that can truly be considered wisdom, and that this is possessed only by the smallest segment of the populations who are the ruler-guardians (428D-429A):

> "But is there," said I [Socrates], "some knowledge in the city just founded by us, possessed by any of the citizens, which does not deliberate on some particular thing in the city, but rather on the city as a whole and how the city will have the best relations with itself and with others?"
> "Indeed, there is."
> "What is it?" I said, "and in whom can it be found?"
> "It is guardianship, and it is found in those rulers whom we just now called complete guardians"
> "So then, what do you call the city because of this knowledge?"
> "Well counselled," he [Glaucon] said, "and truly wise."
> "And which," I said, "do you think will be more plentiful in our city, coppersmiths or these true guardians?"
> "Many more smiths." he said.
> "And," I said," of those who have such knowledge so as to be called by a certain name, would not these guardians be the least numerous?"
> "By far."
> "Then, it seems that the whole city, founded according to nature, would be wise as a whole, because of this smallest portion of itself, and the knowledge which this part has, which leads and rules."

Ferrari makes an additional differentiation between the guardian class, comprising both auxiliaries and complete guardians, and the philosopher-rulers.[343] However, I would argue that that the text of *Republic* 428 suggests that it is, in fact, the complete guardians whom Plato identifies as those of the philosophical nature intended to rule, and who will undergo the further philosophical education outlined later. This leads to the re-classification of the guardians discussed up until that point as "auxiliaries". Moreover, the text at

[343] Ferrari 2007, 190-91.

414A states that those who pass all tests of guardianship are to become both guardians and rulers: καὶ ἀκήρατον ἐκβαίνοντα καταστατέον ἄρχοντα τῆς πόλεως καὶ φύλακα, while the discussion of the higher course of advanced education at 525B asserts that the complete guardian is both soldier and philosopher: ὁ δέ γε ἡμέτερος φύλαξ πολεμικός τε καὶ φιλόσοφος τυγχάνει ὤν.[344] As the rulers are the only individuals whose reasoning part has the requisite knowledge to direct the city properly,[345] it follows that it is only these individuals whose reasoning part can direct the rest of their soul-parts to achieve the balance necessary for an individually just life.[346] The rule of reason, for anyone other than the true philosopher, means not the rule of one's *own* reason; rather it means deferral to the rule of one whose reason is fully developed – that is, the philosopher-ruler.[347]

This idea seems to be borne out in Plato's portrayal of the auxiliaries. The reason which directs them is not depicted as their own, rather it is that of the philosopher guardians. Plato does not represent the auxiliaries as limited but individually just. He represents them as spirited individuals who *become* just, within the context of their society, through their deferral to the philosopher-rulers whose reason is able to properly subordinate and direct the auxiliaries' spirited nature.[348] Since Plato has Socrates suggest that the ideal mode of education for the guardians is incapable of producing true wisdom in all

[344]Rosen 2005, 125-6 provides a description of the division between ruling and auxiliary guardians which corresponds with my own interpretation of the text.
[345] Lauriola 2009, 113.
[346] Rosen, 2005, 171 suggests that the philosopher rulers are the "only fully human beings in the just city".
[347] Hitz 2010, 115.
[348] Rosen 2005, 86-7, 125-6. See also Hobbs 2000, 29 for discussion of the auxiliaries as the ideal example of thumoedic impulses guided by reason.

individuals – instead, successfully producing it only in those individuals with innate philosophical capabilities –[349] the desired outcome of the education of auxiliaries is that their spiritedness be harnessed and subordinated to the rule of those who are capable of attaining wisdom.[350]

Hence, the *Republic* gives no indication that the auxiliaries' character differs significantly from that Plato ascribes to his Spartan-inspired timocratic man, other than in the auxiliaries' willingness to be directed by the philosopher-rulers. In Plato's portrayal, the timocratic regime does not arise principally because sufficiently rational individuals come to choose a second-rate morality which gives honour primacy of place.[351] Rather, the first action in the degeneration of the ideal state to a timocracy is improper breeding which leads to deficient production of individuals of the philosophical type (545d-547a). This, in turn, leads to the decline from the best modes of education and gives rise to the predominance of the spirited element which results in the further denigration of philosophic ideals in favour of honour-seeking ideals (547a-548c). So, from Plato's description of the rise of the timocratic out of the once-idyllic society, it would appear that individuals of the timocratic character do not cease to exist in his just society – merely that their desire for honour is harnessed and directed towards just aims by the rulers.

If Plato perceives this character-type to be problematic, then it does not seem to be a problem that he envisages his ideal society as being able to eradicate. In

[349] Rabieh 2006, 113; Morrison 2007, 235.
[350] Rabieh 2006, 109-10, 113, 122-3; Rowe 2007, 45.
[351] See Wilberding 2009, 361.

fact, it is the inevitable rise of these traits that Plato depicts as the unavoidable undoing of a just society. The sole difference between the auxiliary character-type and that of the timocratic/Spartan type is that in the just society this character type is properly subordinated, whereas in timocratic Sparta it is allowed to rule.

I can now return to considering the implications of the close similarities between the auxiliaries and the (Spartan) timocratic men for Plato's assessment of the limitations of Spartan character and of Spartan approaches towards developing its approved types of masculinity. In the *Republic* – where the ideal society is represented as functioning precisely as per Plato's vision – the depiction of the auxiliaries suggests that Plato is not able to provide fully satisfactory alternatives to those Spartan methods of controlling and directing their spirited men with which he finds fault.

In the *Republic* (548B) and the *Laws* (633-6), Plato faults Sparta and the Spartan-inspired timocracy for inculcating ideals in its men exclusively by means of compulsion and not teaching them to withstand pleasures and pains equally. Plato's ideal programme of education relegates the auxiliary guardians to their role within the community partially by means of persuasion – chiefly by means of the "noble lie" by which the rulers aim to convince the auxiliaries that they have no need of material wealth (416E-417A).[352] However, compulsion remains the principal method for stabilising the auxiliaries' ideal societal role. In the *Laws* Plato makes a point about Spartan shortcomings by

[352] Hitz 2010, 115.

illustrating the compulsion at work in Spartan laws which prevent inebriation (637A-B), revealing that there is no real self-control imbued, as the seeming temperance results merely from Spartan men being kept away from *symposia* entirely.[353]

In spite of his seeming disapproval of such measures, Plato employs similar tactics in his treatment of the guardians' upbringing and mode of life. In the discussion of how to properly rear and educate the youths (νεανίαι) who will become guardians (an education characterised by heavy censorship and prohibition),[354] he has Socrates assert that the guardians must be kept from exposure to indulgence in laughter (388E-389B), food drink and sex (389D-390C), intoxication (403E), and money (390D-E). These things are not only to be prohibited in their physical manifestations; the guardians are not even to be exposed to the metaphysical pleasure of such indulgences in their poetic expression. It is difficult to perceive how Plato's proposed education means to teach his guardians self-control with respect to pleasures when it does not allow exposure to said pleasures – even in the abstract.

One of the main criticisms of the Spartan-inspired timocratic man in the *Republic* underlined the superficiality of his virtue. *Republic* presents the timocratic man's education by compulsion rather than persuasion (οὐχ ὑπὸ πειθοῦς ἀλλ᾽ ὑπὸ βίας πεπαιδευμένοι) as resulting in creating honour-driven men who are outwardly noble, but inwardly driven by love of money and

[353] Morrow 1960, 48.
[354] At this point Plato has not yet distinguished between the ruler-guardians and the auxiliary-guardians.

pleasures – horded up secretly in private (548A-C). It is interesting, then, that despite Plato's professed certainty of the superiority of persuasion, he does not seem convinced that the persuasion used in his own programme of education would be sufficient to secure desired behaviour of the auxiliary guardians, in and of itself. This is demonstrated by continuing restriction of exposure to dangerous pleasures depicted in the auxiliaries' adult lives.

After describing the primary education, to which all guardians would be subjected, in books II and III – and immediately after detailing the noble lie, intended to persuade all citizens to be satisfied with their societal role (414C-415D) – Plato's Socrates describes additional measures which would compel auxiliary guardians to adhere to their approved lifestyle – measures that prudence necessitates be put in place alongside education, to ensure that the auxiliaries would do good rather harm to their fellow citizens (416B-417A):

> "Must we not guard in every way so that the auxiliaries (οἱ ἐπίκουροι) do not act in this way towards the citizens?"
> "We must," he [Glaucon] said.
> "And would they not be provided with the greatest caution if their education was truly fine?"
> "But surely it was," he said.
> And I [Socrates] said, "It is not fit to affirm this, Glaucon my friend, but what we were just saying is that they should have correct education, whatever that is, if they are destined to have what will most make them gentle towards one another and towards those guarded by them."
> "That's right," he said.
> "Moreover, in addition to this education, someone thoughtful might say, that they must have housing and other property provided for them, which will neither hinder them from being the best guardians, nor induce them to do evil to their fellow citizens."
> "That's true."
> "Consider then," I said, "whether they must live and dwell in such a way as this, if they are destined to be this sort. First none must procure private property, save for what is absolutely necessary. Then, none must have any dwelling or treasury, which not everyone who wishes may enter. And their provisions will be as much as are needful for champions of war sensible and courageous, and they must receive from the other citizens a fixed amount as wages for their guarding, of such an amount as to leave no surplus remaining at the end of the year, but also no lack. And frequenting

> the common mess they will live commonly as soldiers in a camp. And it will be told to them that they have divine gold and silver, from the gods, always in their souls, and have no need for human riches besides; and that divine law prohibits them from mixing and tainting their divine possession with mortal acquisition, because many unholy things have arisen because of the currency of the multitudes. But for them alone of those in the city, it is unlawful to touch and to handle gold and silver, nor to be under the same roof, nor to wear nor to drink from gold or silver. And, in this way, they would save themselves and the city."

Although Socrates asserts that a truly good education should imbue auxiliaries with the sought-after mindset, the education he himself prescribes is not put to the test for sufficiency in this regard. It is uncertain whether or not the education of persuasion imposed upon auxiliaries has succeeded in creating auxiliaries who have internalised the principles it promotes. Rather, what ultimately ensures that the auxiliaries do not harm their fellow citizens is their total separation, from both their fellow citizens and ownership of material goods.

It is likewise impossible to determine whether the *Republic's* honour-loving auxiliaries would be any less likely than the honour-loving timocrats to hoard up luxuries in private, by virtue of their education. Plato has eliminated the idea of a private sphere entirely for the auxiliaries. Not only are they to be prohibited the means to accumulate wealth, they are also to be forbidden any private place in which to enjoy it. Thus, the education of the auxiliaries within the ideal state does not definitively suggest the inculcation of virtues, it has merely made the necessity to maintain the appearance of virtue in the honour-loving individual all-pervasive – indeed, the measures put in place to ensure that there be no opportunity for difference between auxiliaries, whatsoever, are so extreme that Rosen ponders whether they are tantamount to depriving the

auxiliaries of their humanity.[355] If anything, the texts suggests that Plato thought the result of allowing auxiliaries access to private living and personal property would be disastrous (417A-B):

> But whenever they shall acquire private land and houses and money, they will be house-managers and farmers instead of guardians. And they will become the masters and the enemies of their fellow citizens instead of their allies; and so, hating and being hated, conspiring and being conspired against, they will pass their whole life fearing much more enemies within rather than those without. And then flying themselves and the city nigh unto destruction.

I have sought to show that the characteristics Plato associates with the timocratic or Spartan type (and indeed characteristics strongly related to that character-type's expression of manhood) are evident in his portrayal of the auxiliary guardians. In so doing, I have hoped to convey the idea that, while this character-type is presented as flawed in the text, it is nonetheless represented as contributing an integral part to the overall perfection of Plato's ideal society. This could suggest Plato's perception of the considerable potential of the Spartan-masculine type when properly utilised. Moreover, the criticisms levelled at deficiencies in this character-type within existing societies are mitigated by the presence of the same problems among Plato's auxiliaries – suggesting that the problems perceived were insoluble, even within the context of Plato's ideal.

[355] Rosen 2005, 129.

Summary

Examination of Plato's exercises in utopia-building has yielded a considerable amount of material concerned with a number of categories of construction of masculinity (in portrayals of Spartans in the *Laws*, and the Spartan-like timocrats in the *Republic*). Those areas most prominent in the works were: discourse, institutions, attitudes towards sex, men and women, and relations between men and hegemonic masculinity.

Discourse:

The category of discourse is especially prevalent in the *Laws*, since the work illustrates a process whereby characters' interpretations of the values and ideologies associated with a number of Spartan/Dorian practices of institutions are discursively adjusted and redefined. Plato's Athenian employs discourse to adjust Spartan understandings of their lawgiver's purposes in the creation of a number of Spartan institutions (the *syssitia*, the gymnasia, the military, etc.). This leads into a larger critique of both Spartan/Dorian valuation of ἀνδρεία, within the hierarchy of virtues, and the Spartan/Dorian conception of ἀνδρεία as a whole. The treatment of ἀνδρεία (literally "manliness", represented most often as "courage", ἀνδρεία is an important concept in the exploration of masculinity) suggest that the Spartan/Dorian understanding of the virtue places excessive emphasis on the element of καρτερία, or endurance of hardship, and insufficient emphasis on the element of σωφροσύνη, here understood as endurance of pleasures. The text asserts that true ἀνδρεία should contain a

proper balance of these elements and that Sparta's exclusive focus on καρτερία results in an incomplete or lop-sided expression of ἀνδρεία.

Discourse is also present in the treatment of timocratic manhood in the *Republic*, although in a different context than the *Laws*. While the *Laws* employs discourse to deconstruct presumed notions of Spartan masculinity, he Republic portrays discourse within the context of daily interactions as contributing to the construction of timocratic masculine identity. This is especially conspicuous in Plato's portrayal of interactions between timocratic mother and son (an example wherein the category of 'discourse' overlaps with 'men and women'). The woman is portrayed as discursively redefining her husband's positive traits, generated by his philosophical nature, as weakness and unmanliness. She goes on to present a definition of manliness to her son which is comprised of wealth and honour-generating behaviours.

Institutions:

In the *Laws*, Spartan institutions are held largely responsible for both the development of Spartan ἀνδρεία, and for its shortcomings. The *syssitia*, the gymnasia, hunting, boxing-matches, practice of thefts, the *crypteia*, the *gymnopaidiai*, are highlighted by the text for their association with the cultivation of ἀνδρεία. An addition to their associations with war, Plato emphasises the role played by these institutions and others in the cultivation of καρτερία, which is represented as the chief constituent of Spartan ἀνδρεία. Plato also places onus on Spartan institutions for the want of σωφροσύνη

evident in Spartan ἀνδρεία, through their failure to expose Spartan men to pleasure.

The *Republic* continues to problematise the institutions of the Spartan-like timocracy. As does the *Laws*, the *Republic* targets the institution of education as contributing to imbalance in men's characters. However, the imbalance Plato's Socrates ascribes to timocratic men is an excess of the spirited element and neglect of the philosophical. This imbalanced, spirit-driven nature attributed to timocratic men in the *Republic* is represented as creating timocratic men who are characteristically honour-driven, obedient to superiors, contentious towards equals, and harsh towards inferiors.

Attitudes towards sex:

In *Laws*, Plato takes issue with Spartan/Dorian pederasty, which he represents as predominantly sexual in nature. This mode of pederasty is portrayed as undermining masculinity in two respects: it is seen to violate the ideal of σωφροσύνη, necessary for development of proper ἀνδρεία; and it effeminises the receptive partner. Attitudes towards sexuality and institutions overlap in the *Laws*, as Plato places blame on the *syssitia* and gymnasia for promoting sexual pederasty. This overlap creates a somewhat ironic picture, as the *syssitia* and gymnasia are two institutions named as influential in the cultivation of both Spartan/Dorian καρτερία, and Spartan/Dorian ἀνδρεία as a whole. Plato's depiction of these institutions complexify the picture of Spartan masculinity he creates, due to their promotion of seemingly mutually contradictory qualities.

Men and women:

In the *Laws*' portrayal of Spartan society, societal regulation of individuals' behaviour takes on a gendered dynamic, since Plato's Athenian problematises the situation of women within the private realm. Due to the imbalance in the institutional control placed on men and women, respectively, the *Laws* treats Spartan discipline, martial ability, and restraint as masculine preserves, while the aspects of excess and materialism are associated with the private realm and the women who occupy it. Overall, with respect to 'men and women' the *Laws*' employs comparison and contrast of Spartan men and women to illustrate masculine qualities.

In *Republic*, the category of 'men and women' is reflected primarily in depictions of interactions between timocratic males and females and their effects on timocratic manhood. Relations between men and women are represented as significant to the development of masculine identity, since, in the account of the hypothetical timocrat, the boy's relationship with his mother provides the first instance in which masculine values are articulated. The boy's first understandings of what it means to be a "true man" are created in response to female desires and demands. The mother's influence promotes the qualities of materialism and desire for honour. The timocratic woman is portrayed as situated within the private realm of the household, and as such her the household is also depicted as an extension of the woman. The household is portrayed as largely responsible for inculcation of traits, depicted the most negative of those characteristic of timocratic men: materialism and the tendency to be secretly covetous of wealth. The household is represented as a

feminised space which provides men an outlet, free from societal constraints, for these traits to flourish.

Relations between men and hegemonic masculinity:

In the *Republic*, relations between men are depicted as having influence on the development of timocratic masculinity. In the example of the hypothetical timocrat, the boy is positively influenced by the personalised model provided by his philosophically-minded father, and negatively influenced by observations of other adult men within society. The models of competing masculine ideals are said to result in the development of competitiveness, spiritedness, and desire for honour in timocratic men's character.

The auxiliaries:

The issues Plato found with Spartan masculine ideals and characteristics were shown to be difficult to resolve, even within the idealised society presented in the work. The auxiliary guardians of Plato's *Republic* shared many traits associated with timocratic masculinity. Exploration of the auxiliary guardians suggested that Plato was unable to invent a solution for the shortcomings he found with the ideals of timocratic manhood and the type of men they produced. Even within his ideal society those depicted as having a timocratic type of disposition were shown to display many of the same faults as the products of the hypothetical timocracy, highlighting the complexity of individual characteristics Plato associates with Spartan/timocratic masculinity and their role in the formation of men's overarching character.

3. Thucydides

This chapter will be devoted to analysis of a number of episodes within Thucydides' *History*, and will focus on the following: several speeches; the helot massacre; elements of Thucydides' depiction of Brasidas; and the disaster for Sparta at Pylos.[356] References to masculinity and its associated ideology are far less pronounced in Thucydides than in other sources examined in this study. Constructions of Spartan masculinity are evident in the *History* and contribute to Thucydides' depiction of Spartan character and its operation in the larger world; however, this function of masculinity within the work is frequently implicit. In my attempt to identify and analyse these resonances, it is not my intention to overinflate their importance or to assert that Thucydides was in any way attempting to emphasise masculine ideology.

With that in mind, the three categories of analysis most prominent in Thucydides' characterisations of Spartan masculinity are relations between men and hegemonic masculinity, representation and performativity, and discourse. Thucydides does offer glimpses into other categories of masculine construction which will not be fully examined in this chapter. For example, construction of masculinity through competition is present in Thucydides and will be touched upon, but not fully developed.[357] This is because such

[356] All references to source material in this chapter will refer to Thucydides' *History*, unless otherwise stated.

[357] There are several instances in the text which highlight the role competition in the development of Spartan ideas of manhood. For instance, consider Archidamus' speech before the Spartan assembly (1.80.1), where he acknowledges that young Spartan men would likely be eager for war (the activity which was supreme in proving one's masculine excellence). Ideas of competition are also prominent in Thucydides' portrayal of internal Spartan politics which factored into Brasidas' Northern campaign (See Lewis 1977, 32; Powell 2000, 179) – especially in comments regarding both why Brasidas was keen to pursue the campaign (it

instances do not feature as prominently in the *History* as the highlighted categories. Therefore, due to restrictions of space, I will discuss other elements of masculine construction only inasmuch as they relate to the selected categories.

Additionally, there are several "one-off" instances in which Thucydides makes reference to subject-matter which could be examined under the categories selected for this study. One example occurs in the Archaeology, where Thucydides makes passing reference to Sparta's discovery of "the common", Spartan simplicity in manner and style, and athletic nudity (1.6.1-5). These can be seen as factoring into the representation and performance of Spartan ideals of masculinity. Interesting as these instances may be, they will not be discussed in what follows, as they are not developed extensively in the text. Although the constraints of my present project do not allow me to delve into every mention Thucydides makes of topics related to Spartan masculinity, these are areas of inquiry which could be expanded in future work.

Returning to areas which will be examined in-depth, often these categories overlap within the work. For example, the structures of hegemonic masculinity may facilitate the development of a particular discursive construction of masculinity, or a particular discursive picture of Spartan masculine excellence must be continually substantiated via complementary performative representation for the discourse to maintain its ideological strength.

---

brought him honour, see 5.16.1), and in descriptions of why Spartan officials became increasingly less keen to see Brasidas' continued success (due, in part, to jealousy, 4.108.7). See also Lewis 1977, 32.

Constructions of masculinity can be seen to feature in depictions of Spartan character on both the individual and collective levels. Thus, ideologies of Spartan masculinity have significant impact on the events of the *History*, as they are employed by various players – both individuals and collective entities – to achieve a variety of ends. In this chapter I will seek to show how these three categories of masculine construction were developed in Thucydides' *History* by exploring a number of episodes in which they can be seen to feature prominently.

3.1. Speeches

Early on in the *History*, Thucydides provides the reader with speeches which discursively construct several distinct images of Spartan masculinity. These include: the Corinthian speech at the first congress at Sparta (1.68-71), the Spartans' private debate at this congress (1.79-88), and Pericles' funeral oration (2.34.8-2.46). While these primarily reflect the category of discourse, they also contain elements of relations between men and hegemonic masculinity, and competition; all of which the following section will seek to examine.

3.1.1. The Corinthians

The actions and speeches of the Corinthians during the lead-up to war play a prominent role in developing Thucydides' representation of Spartan character (of which Spartan masculinity is an element). The Athenians and the Spartans are also portrayed as constructing images of Spartan manhood within the

History.[358] However, Crane argues that the Corinthian characterisation is most influential on the dominant perception of Spartan "national character" portrayed in the work.[359] This characterisation is accomplished primarily through the Corinthian speech in the first congress at Sparta. The Corinthian portrayal of Spartan character is formed primarily through manipulation of understandings of Sparta's ideological role as the head of its system of alliances. The Corinthian tactics focus primarily on ideas of political ἡγεμονία, which is distinct from hegemonic masculinity. However, in what follows, I will argue that the Corinthian appeal to ἡγεμονία in this speech also employs masculine ideals. Thus, the ideology of hegemonic masculinity is also present, and works to bolster Corinthian rhetoric regarding political ἡγεμονία.

In Thucydides' *History*, scholars have viewed a significant a contrast made between Athens and Sparta through the depiction of each *polis'* position within its respective alliance-system. Where Athens is seen to be portrayed as an absolute imperial power, maintaining rule primarily through force, the representation of Sparta's pre-war position in relation to its allies is viewed as hegemon of a fluid association.[360] Thus Lendon asserts that, despite Sparta's capacity to subjugate certain allies militarily, much of its ideological reputation, power, and position were based on allies' continued willing subordination.[361] As well as being an actual system of political and military alliances, the so-called "Peloponnesian League" (in reality a series of bilateral alliances between "the Lacedaemonians and their allies") also contained a

[358] See pp. 201-18.
[359] Crane 1992, 227-9.
[360] Brunt 1965, 256; Lendon 1994, 177; Lebow 1996, 249; Crane 1998, 213.
[361] Lendon 1994, 170-2.

significant ideological element, working alongside the political dimension to promote smooth functioning of various alliances. Indeed, Crane argues that ideology was perhaps more significant than military might for Sparta's maintenance of primacy in alliances, because Sparta's capacity to "project overwhelming force" was limited.[362] My discussion of the Peloponnesian League will focus primarily on the use Thucydides has the Corinthians make of hegemonic ideology, which can be seen to incorporate elements of hegemonic masculinity.[363]

Some preliminary explanation of the Corinthians' role within the Peloponnesian League's ideology of hegemonic masculinity is appropriate before examining Thucydides' text. Due to the hegemonic structure evident in the portrayal of Sparta's relations with allies, the ideology employed between Sparta and League members can be seen to have strong parallels with what social constructionists term hegemonic masculinity: an ideological system which culturally venerates one form of masculine expression as ideal, or hegemonic, and stratifies other masculinities beneath the hegemonic form, either by subjugation or through the willingness of those embodying certain subaltern forms to exalt the ideal.[364] This framework of hegemonic ideology

[362] Crane 1998, 213, 235.
[363] By isolating and emphasising ideological aspects of the Peloponnesian League, it is not my intention to overinflate the role of ideology in Sparta's alliances, or to downplay other dimensions which have less bearing on the current examination. For a comprehensive list of the major treatments concerning the precise organisation and operations of the Peloponnesian League see Sommerstein and Bayliss 2013, 212-33.
[364] For sociological discussions of hegemonic masculinity see e.g. Tolson 1977; Carrigan, Connell and Lee 1985; Jackson 1991; Roper and Tosh 1991; Morgan 1994; May 1998; Adams and Savran 2002; Dryer 2002; Connell 2005; Bickrell 2006; Howson 2006; Price 2006; Whitehead 2006; Anderson 2009; Reeser 2009; Alexander 2011; Arnold and Brady 2011; Atkinson 2011; Hall 2011; Tosh 2011; Heydon 2013.

can be seen to operate in depictions of Sparta's relations with influential allies.[365]

Powerful *poleis*, such as Corinth and Thebes, were not thought to be beholden to Sparta in the same way that smaller states were.[366] Also, as Sparta's most militarily and politically useful allies, they were important to the continuing efficacy of the alliance system. Since Sparta's hegemonic status relied on sustained support from powerful allies, it was placed in a position of having to acknowledge the support from these allies in significant ways.[367] While gestures of reciprocity between Sparta and smaller states such as Tegea have been seen as largely symbolic,[368] more independent allies such as Corinth could expect more tangible returns for deference to Sparta.[369] In terms of ideology, states like Corinth are seen to occupy a "complicit" position within the hegemonic structure.

Complicit positions are vital to hegemony as they allow the entity occupying the hegemonic position to stratify and subordinate those under it. Removal of that base of willing support would undermine the hegemon's ability to exert

---

[365] This applied not only to issues of ideology, but also to the question of an ally's degree of political subjugation or autonomy. See Kagan 1969, 18; Lendon 1994, 71; Bolmarcich 2005, 7-8, 28-9, 31-4.
[366] Bolmarcich 2005, 8, 32-3; Debnar 2001, 46, 225.
[367] For discussion of constraints on Sparta's ability to act at will due to the need to ensure ongoing support of allies see: Larsen 1934, 4-5; Finley 1942, 120-1; Brunt 1965, 257; Fliess 1966, 106; Lebow 1996, 238; Crane 1998, 214-15, 218-20, 316.
[368] Crane 1998, 180-4 puts forth Herodotus' depiction of relations between Sparta and Tegea as an example of the benefit of Sparta providing symbolic reciprocity with a less powerful ally that could have been subjugated by force.
[369] Kagan 1969, 22-6, for instance, discusses Corinth being able to have an un-ignorable voice with Sparta and, at times, even dictate Spartan policy due to their power and position. He describes the circumstances under which Sparta entered into war with Athens as indicative of "the Corinthian tail wagging the Spartan dog".

authority over those occupying subjugated positions. Complicit positions offer ideological deference to the hegemon, rather than asserting equality. In so doing, they benefit ideologically and politically from positioning themselves favourably in relation to the hegemon, without assuming the responsibilities incumbent on those in the hegemonic position.[370] This is the lens through which I will analyse the Corinthian speech.[371]

At the first congress at Sparta (1.67-1.88), in the lead-up to war, the Corinthian speech invokes the ideology of hegemonic masculinity in such as way as to suggest Corinthian awareness of their advantageous ideological position within the hegemony. This is reflected in both the tone and the content of the speech. In the first congress, Corinthian awareness of the strength of their position is made immediately identifiable by the audacity with which Thucydides has them present themselves as empowered to educate Sparta about what its vital concerns should be, and to reproach Sparta for neglect of allies (1.69.1-1.70.1).[372] Although Thucydides has the Corinthians portray their criticisms as constructive admonishment from friends and allies, rather than denunciation from enemies, the tone is nevertheless severe (1.69.6-1.70.1):

> And we hope that none of you will consider this that has been spoken to demonstrate enmity rather than complaint. For men complain to friends who are in error but accuse enemies who have injured them. And at the same time, we consider ourselves to have as much right as any other to impute fault to a neighbour.

[370] For detailed discussion of complicit masculinity see Connell and Messerschmidt 2005, 832-9, and Dowd 2010, 29.
[371] This is a description of relations which focuses purely on the ideological dimension of the hegemonic structure. In actuality, it may have been the case that Corinth's seeming complicity within the structure of its alliance with Sparta was coerced by the terms of the oath of alliance; Sommerstein and Bayliss (2013, 228-33) argue that the terms of the oaths Sparta's allies swore changed at the time of the Thirty Years' Peace, from a looser offensive alliance, to a more comprehensive alliance of offence and defence, which resulted in a situation tantamount to requiring allies to follow Sparta's foreign policy.
[372] Debnar 2001, 35, 44, 46.

The harshness with which Thucydides indicates that the Corinthians felt free to speak is indicative of Corinth's importance within the hegemonic structure.[373]

Some have suggested that the Corinthian speech of gives little attention to the political situation of the time.[374] However, Crane argues that this seeming Corinthian oversight should be taken as a deliberate part of the rhetorical strategy of the speech. Crane asserts that there was no true necessity for Sparta to enter into war at that time, as the issues between Corinth and Athens could have easily remained a private dispute. He suggests that drawing attention to specific grievances of allies, or specific Athenian actions, could have actually been detrimental to Corinth – it would reveal that Athenian expansion was, in fact, not an immediate threat to Sparta (and the Spartan track-record of assisting allies, when Sparta itself was not directly affected, was less than stellar).[375] Therefore, Corinth's best bet to garner Spartan support would be to create a generalised ideological basis for war.[376] This appears to be precisely the approach Thucydides has Corinth adopt, as Crane sees one of the main purposes of the Corinthian analysis of Spartan character as being to "undermine the ideological position by which Sparta justifies its reluctance to act".[377] The Corinthian speech keeps the focus on Sparta, resting largely on broad ideas of injustice and the responsibilities of the hegemon.[378]

---

[373] Crane 1992, 232; Bolmarcich 2005, 31-2.
[374] Larsen 1934, 4-5; Finley 1942, 120-1; Jansson 1993, 161; Cartledge 2002, 200.
[375] Crane 1992, 234-7.
[376] Cogan 1981, 22-5, 27, 213; Debnar 2001, 35, 40-1, 228; Price 2001, 152-3.
[377] Crane 1992, 235-6.
[378] Larsen 1934, 4-5.

The contrast between Athenian and Spartan character as a rhetorical tactic in this speech has been much discussed.[379] Indeed, this ideology plays, arguably, the most prominent role in the strategy of the speech.[380] However, ideology of masculinity also has a role (if a less pronounced one) in discourse which formed the Corinthians' ideological justification for war. This runs as an undercurrent throughout the speech and is presented as contributing to rhetoric which was designed to exploit Spartan concern for Sparta's reputation and for the stability of its position as hegemon.

When references to hegemonic ideology within the speech are isolated, there is an observable shift in focus away from the polarised Athens-Sparta picture. Here it is possible to see ideals of hegemonic masculinity at play in the speech. Discussion of Spartan collective manhood in the Corinthian speech focuses entirely on Sparta's role as hegemon within the Peloponnesian League. The Corinthians stress the responsibilities of this ideological position and present hegemonic obligation as intrinsic to Sparta's collective masculine honour. The addition of hegemonic masculine discourse adds another ideological dimension to the appeal, giving it additional clout. The Corinthians lead with appeals to reputation and hegemonic ideals, repeatedly emphasising how Spartan inactivity is detrimental to both. They first emphasise Sparta's prestige as a perceived liberator; contrasting Spartan reputation with current actions – where Spartan refusal to act against Athens is portrayed as neglect tantamount to the active deprivation of allies' liberty – Thucydides' Corinthians accuse the

[379] Cogan 1981, 22-8, 193-4, 212-3.
[380] Wassermann 1964, 289-90; Hussey 1985, 125; Roisman 1987, 385; Orwin 1994, 75; Dawson 1996, 103; Heilke 2004, 130; Debnar 2001, 44-6; Desmond 2006, 367; Monten 2006, 12-3; Tritle 2010, 11.

Spartans of failing to be worthy of the reputation by which they hold hegemony (1.69.1):[381]

> And you are responsible for all this…you who then and now are always depriving not only those who have been enslaved by them [the Athenians], but also those who have been, as yet, your allies, of their freedom. For it is not the one who is enslaving who truly does this, but rather the one who, having the power to put a stop to them, allows it; especially if that one holds the reputation of excellence as the liberator of Hellas.

A few lines later, they reiterate their assertion that Sparta's inactivity belies its good reputation. The Corinthians comment that Sparta defends itself not through taking action, but by merely presenting the appearance that it would do so (1.69.4-6):

> For you alone, O Lacedaemonians, of all the Hellenes remain quiet and defend yourselves, not by enacting any force, but by appearing as though you intend to enact force. And you alone do not put down your enemy but wait for their power to increase twofold. And yet you used to be said to be dependable, but your reputation surpasses your deeds. For we ourselves know that the Mede came from the ends of the earth to the Peloponnese before any worthy force of yours came to meet them… Indeed, expectations from you have already destroyed some who were unprepared because of their faith in you.

The appeal in this passage does not focus on specific acts, which would provide legal cause for Sparta to declare war on Athens. Rather, it is entirely fuelled by ideology. After criticising Spartan quiescence, the Corinthians suggest that this pattern of behaviour undermines Sparta's reputation, and finish with the accusation that faith in Spartan help brings ruin to its friends. This accusation highlights the hegemon's responsibility to aid subordinates suffering injustice and to set an example reaffirming the hegemonic ideal.[382]

Following these initial rebukes, the Corinthians elucidate the major aspects of Spartan character, vis-à-vis the Athenian antagonists: where Athens is

[381] Finley 1942, 122; Lebow 1996, 238; Debnar 2001, 40-2.
[382] Larsen 1934, 4-5.

innovative and strives to extend its possessions, Sparta is conservative and seeks to maintain what it has; the Athenians are swift to act – even beyond their means – while the Spartans are slow to act, and when forced to do so, never go as far as their power would justify; Athenians are never at home, Spartans are afraid to leave home; and Athenians are daring beyond reason, but Spartans are irrationally distrustful of their own judgement (1.70.1-4). They then discursively reinterpret ideals portrayed as traditional to Sparta, suggesting they are out-dated when compared to the character of their adversary (1.71.1-3):

> … fair dealing to you is based on the idea that if you do not wrong others, you do not need to risk what is yours by stopping others from harming you. But you could scarcely succeed with this policy if you dwelt beside a *polis* similar to yourself; but now, as we have just made clear, your customs are old-fashioned compared with theirs. And, just as in art, it is necessary for innovation to prevail. And while unaltered customs might be best for the tranquil *polis*, those under many constraints for action require many contrivances. Thus, out of its great experience, Athens' innovations are greater than your own.

Having declared that their hesitation speaks of irrational self-doubt (1.70.3-4), and explained why Spartan ideas of fair-dealing – which might justify hesitation – are out-dated, Thucydides then has the Corinthians insinuate that further delay would not be seen as display of supposed virtue, but tantamount to betrayal of allies, which would endanger Sparta's hegemonic position (1.71.4-5).[383]

Admittedly, much of the strategy Thucydides has the Corinthians employ thus far can be ascribed to hegemonic ideology at large, without specific reference to ideas of manhood. However, the accusations take on masculine undertones

[383] Debnar 2001, 41-5.

(albeit subtle ones) in the invocation of example set by Sparta's forefathers. Thucydides has the Corinthians admonish Sparta not to allow the Peloponnese to become less than it was in the time of Sparta's forefathers: "Because of these things, resolve to do well and endeavour not to allow the Peloponnese to become less than what your fathers handed down to you" (1.71.7). With this statement, Thucydides has the Corinthians take their admonishment out of the impersonal realm of the responsibilities of *poleis* in alliance and bring it into that of personal reputation. By suggesting that contemporary Spartans are not what their fathers were, the Corinthians call into question not only Sparta's status as hegemons but also contemporary Spartans' their status as men and encourage them to meet or even surpass the example set by their fathers.

In so doing, the speech is depicted as aiming to incite Spartan ambition for honour in the Hellenic world.[384] Thucydides perhaps intended this invocation of forefathers to carry particular weight, as Crane asserts that the ideology of patriarchal authority is prominent throughout the *History*. He argues that abstract and generalised "fathers" are held as ideals for emulation, and factor heavily in the rhetoric of all Greek states within the work.[385] Throughout the speech, references to Spartan honour focus on Sparta's embodiment of the hegemonic ideal within the Peloponnesian League, and the pressure incumbent upon their position to act in ways that uphold that ideal. By presenting the Corinthian appeal by means of ideological invective in the presence of Sparta's other allies, Thucydides shows the Corinthians forcing Sparta into a position

[384]Lebow 1996, 239; Debnar 2001, 41-2, 46.
[385] Crane 1996, 85, 100-3, 109. See also Balot 2004, 417-8, for the use of forefathers and emblematic figures as models of masculine courage in Athenian thought.

where failure to act against Athens becomes tantamount to an admission of the sort of weakness that would ideologically disqualify it from the supreme position.

In the culminating moment of the speech, the Corinthians threaten to leave the alliance if Sparta does not act (1.71.4-6):

> So, let this mark the end of your sluggishness. And now aid Potidaea and the others, as you promised, by swift invasion of Attica, and do not give up friends and kinsmen to their most hated foes and turn the rest of us to some other alliance out of despair. And doing so would not be deemed unjust by the gods who received our oaths or the men who witnessed them. For breach of treaty falls not upon those who seek other allies because of abandonment, but rather on those who to not provide aid to their alliance.

In this moment, both elements of character contrast and hegemonic ideology, employed in the speech, can be seen to coalesce. Spartan anxiety, which Thucydides has the Corinthians foster via discussion of Athenian expansionism and description of the contrasting Athenian and Spartan characters, is further heightened, by the threat of losing an ally integral to Sparta's hegemony. As discussed, complicit positions, such as Corinth's, are key to the ideological integrity of the hegemonic structure. In this case, Corinthian withdrawal of support at a critical time would undermine Spartan ideological authority as hegemon, and potentially destabilise Sparta's system of alliances. The Corinthian act of issuing this threat amidst the atmosphere of unease they created, regarding Athenian ambition, is presented as intended to heighten Spartan awareness of their need of Corinth to maintain the stability of their alliance-structure; since the perceived Athenian threat would make the integrity of their hegemonic alliance especially important.[386]

[386] Lebow 1996, 238; Crane 1998, 215; Tritle 2010, 28 have all remarked on how damaging revocation of Corinthian support would have been to Sparta's system of alliance, both

The Corinthian speech presents a picture which, in part, illustrates the efficacy of discursive employment of hegemonic ideology (within which are imbedded hegemonic masculine ideals) within a hegemonic framework. By upholding hegemonic ideology Corinth, acting from a complicit position, is depicted as leaning on the power of the hegemonic ideal to demand that Sparta-as-hegemon act in accordance with the ideology – regardless of the consequences for Sparta. Thus, Thucydides depicts the hegemon being manipulated into a course of action which serves primarily the purposes of Corinth (Sparta's supposed subordinate).

Archidamus' speech to the Spartan assembly also suggests the power of the complicit position within hegemony to effect outcomes whose effects would be incurred primarily by the hegemon, as he cautions that the Corinthians may say what they like, but it is Sparta that would ultimately bear the responsibility of war and its outcomes (1.83.3).[387] And, while the role of masculinity in the hegemonic maneuvering of the Corinthian speech remains an undercurrent rather than the driving force of the rhetoric, it is nevertheless a significant element. As we will shortly see in the Spartan response, Corinthian tactics, focusing on ideas of Spartan reputation and hegemonic responsibility, are portrayed as perceived by the Spartans as being, first and foremost, an attack on their masculine virtue.

ideologically and materially. For discussion of how the anxiety inducing rhetoric would have made the Corinthian threat to abandon Sparta particularly effective, see Cogan 1981, 24-5.
[387] Crane 1998, 204.

Spartan Pre-War Speeches:

Thucydides recounts (1.79.1-2):

> …After the Lacedaemonians had heard the complaints of the allies against the Athenians and the words of the Athenians, they made all withdraw and deliberated amongst themselves concerning the present matters. and the judgement of the majority came to the same conclusion; the Athenians were already committing wrong, and war must be declared with all speed.

But before the vote was cast, King Archidamus and the ephor Sthenelaidas presented two final speeches, against and for declaring war. These speeches have been viewed as an appeal to emotion and propaganda trumping an appeal based fundamentally on reason.[388] Thus, the Spartan debate fits into a larger pattern within Thucydides' narrative (wherein speeches and debates factor prominently), which portrays reason and traditional morality being increasingly supplanted by mendacious emotional rhetoric.[389]

The Spartan debate is portrayed similarly to the situation in the Athenian assembly which resulted in the Sicilian Expedition (6.8-26). In particular, Archidamus' speech bears considerable parallels to Nicias' argument against the expedition.[390] Like Archidamus, Nicias seeks to alter what is likely an already foregone conclusion (6.9.1); he appeals to his own age, experience, and honour – as well as to the aged members of the assembly (6.9.2, 6.13); he cautions against the exuberant desires of inexperienced youth (6.12); he gives a cogent assessment of his *polis*' weaknesses, as well as the costs and dangers of the proposed venture (6.10-12, 6.20-23); he appeals to σωφροσύνη (6.11.7); he warns against seeking to appease outsiders who talk a good game, but will not

[388] Wassermann 1964, 290; Bloedow 1981 129-43 and 1987, 63-4; Lebow 1996, 239; Debnar 2001, 75-6.
[389] Wassermann 1953, 194; 1964, 290.
[390] Wassermann 1953, 195.

bear the chief danger (6.12.1); and he asserts that the men of his audience should not feel ashamed, or fear being thought cowardly for voting against war (6.13.1). To a lesser extent, the speeches of Alcibiades and Sthenelaidas also share similar themes;[391] inasmuch as Alcibiades also emphasises the necessity of aiding one's allies (6.18.1-3) and appeals to reputation (6.18.6-7). Thus, the speeches Thucydides gives to Archidamus identify him (like Nicias) as one of a number of figures who embody the voice of reason, but whose wise warnings ultimately go unheeded. Sthenelaidas (like Alcibiades) is represented as one whose use of clever but dangerous rhetoric leads his people into a detrimental course of action.

Breakdown of reason is a recurrent motif in the *History*,[392] and I do not aim to add to the already considerable analyses of this topic. However, the speeches of Archidamus and Sthenelaidas are also useful for my purposes, as they both employ ideological elements relating to categories of masculine construction including: representation and performativity, hegemonic masculinity and relations between men, and discourse. Moreover, both speeches respond to the Corinthian accusation of unmanly weakness, which Thucydides depicts as perceived by the Spartans. Portrayals of Archidamus and Sthenelaidas here have been read as representing divergent Spartan ideals,[393] with each speech

[391] Wassermann 1953, 194.
[392] Other prominent examples where Thucydides takes pains to demonstrate the failure of the voice of reason and traditional morality include: his description of the breakdown of morality during the plague (2.53); his assessment that the Athenians doomed themselves after the death of Pericles, when his successors left off following his advice and resorted to demagoguery to gain supremacy (2.65.5-13); the Plataean Debate (3.53-68); his description of the *stasis* at Corcyra (3.82-5); and the Melian Dialogue (5.84-116).
[393] Kagan 1969, 304; Pouncey 1980, 58; Bloedow 1981, 135-6, 142-3; 1987, 63-4; Crane 1988, 212; Hornblower 1991; Orwin 1994, 57; Luginbill 1999, 109; Debnar 2001, 59-61, 69; Cartledge 2003a, 161.

advocating different aspects of traditional Spartan values to reinforce its positions.[394] In the following section I will explore the elements of masculine ideology evident in both speeches and elucidate the way in which Thucydides depicts speakers' differing employment of masculine ideology affecting the outcome of the vote.

3.1.2. Archidamus

As his main argument against hastily declaring war, Thucydides has Archidamus provide a rational assessment of Sparta's material strengths and weaknesses vis-à-vis Athens, which highlighted Spartan unpreparedness for large-scale warfare (1.80.2-1.82.6). But Archidamus' speech also provides an ideological justification for caution, which responds to allies' accusations of Spartan weakness (1.83.1-1.84.5):

> And none should think it cowardice (ἀνανδρία) for many to not hasten to attack a single city. For they have no fewer allies than we do – and theirs pay tribute – and war is not so much a matter of arms as of money, which renders arms serviceable; especially when a land power faces a sea power. Therefore, let us first provision ourselves, and not be carried off by the words of our allies beforehand. For we will bear the greater share of the responsibility, whether things turn out for good or ill; and we have a right to tranquil consideration of them. And the slowness and hesitation, which they especially censure us for, should not make you ashamed. For if we attempt to hasten the war we will delay its conclusion through our ill-preparedness. Moreover, we have always inhabited a free and famous city. That quality they censure is really rational moderation (σωφροσύνη ἔμφρων)… [84.3] And we are both warlike (πολεμικοί) and wise (εὔβουλοι) because of our orderliness (εὔκοσμον), for shame (αἰδὼς) is the greatest part of moderation (σωφροσύνης) and courage (εὐψυχία) is the greatest part of shame (αἰσχύνης).[395] And we are reared with too little learning to despise the laws, and with too severe a sense of moderation (σωφρονέστερον) to disobey them. And we are raised not to be over-wise in useless things – such as that which well finds fault with enemies' preparations in word, but fails to assail them similarly in deeds – but rather to consider our neighbours' thought to be like our own, and that the happenings of chance are not decipherable by reasoning. And we always make preparations against the enemy considering that his plans are good.

[394] Wassermann 1953, 193-4; 1964, 289; Parry 1957, 81, 128; Cane 1988, 197; Cartledge and Debnar 2006, 577.
[395] Here αἰδὼς and αἰσχύνη are treated as synonymous. See Hornblower 1991, 128-9 on 1.84.3.

> And we needs must not hope in their errors, but in the soundness of our own provisions. And we must not consider there to be much difference between man and man, but that the strongest is he who is reared most severely. Therefore, these things which our fathers (πατέρες) have passed down to us, which have always benefited us through our care for them, we must not let fall to the wayside. And we must not, being hurried, decide in the short space of a day a matter concerning many lives and fortunes, and cities, and which has great bearing on reputation; but rather we must decide calmly. And this we are able to do more than others because of our strength.

Archidamus justifies assertions that allies' censure both is ill-founded, and that accusations should not cause embarrassment by his characterisation of a Spartan excellence which is intrinsic, produced by its unique upbringing and – as such – a stable core of identity.

Archidamus' discourse relies heavily on the idea of Spartan tradition.[396] He lists a litany of Spartan virtues – including shame, bravery, obedience and rationality – and proclaims that the virtue from which all others stem is σωφροσύνη, in the sense of self-possession and moderation.[397] By focusing his discourse on the traditional Spartan way of life, the speech creates an understanding of Spartan masculine excellence that does not require external validation, and therefore cannot be undone by external censure.[398] Moreover, it suggests that the very reason Sparta can display an abundance of wise moderation – falsely belittled as slowness and hesitancy by their allies – is

[396] Wassermann 1953, 196-7; Kagan 1969, 301-2; Debnar 2001, 66-9. Admittedly, Archidamus' portrayal of Spartan values and character here must be understood as having been constructed by Thucydides partially so that Pericles could criticise these same ideals in the Funeral Oration (2.37-40). As Bosworth 2001, 2, 15-16 argues, since Thucydides attests the funeral oration was widely heard, it is reasonable to assume that, of the two, Archidamus' speech likely contains more deviation from the original. However, since Archidamus is portrayed as a sympathetic figure here, one can assume that Thucydides did not build this picture of Spartan character exclusively as a counterpart to Pericles's critique. Therefore, Archidamus' speech contains content useful for analysis of Thucydides' portrayal of Spartan masculinity.
[397] Crane 1988, 206; Francis 1993, 207; LSJ*S.V.* σωφροσύνη, 2.
[398] Wassermann 1953, 196-7; Crane 1988, 204-5; Debnar 2001, 59-60.

Sparta's considerable strength (1.84.5). And by associating these practices with Spartan forefathers (πατέρες), Thucydides has Archidamus respond to the masculine ethos raised in the Corinthian speech, negating its assertion that Spartan hesitancy would endanger the legacy handed down to Spartans by their fathers (1.71.7). Holding this view, Archidamus could dismiss the accusation of weakness/ἀνανδρία as a concern (1.83.1). Because the opinions of outsiders were powerless to affect Spartan ἀνδρεία, Archidamus advised that the insult should not cause the Spartans to feel shame, but rather indignation against those offering insult.[399]

The language employed in dismissing the accusation of ἀνανδρία with an appeal to σωφροσύνη is also interesting here. Ideas relating to cowardice, and concern over being perceived as cowardly, occur frequently within the *History*. Cowardliness represented by words related to μαλακία (effeminacy/softness) appear to be the most common,[400] while words relating to δειλία (timidity or fearfulness) appear as well.[401] While both these terms – μαλακία especially – can be seen to relate to conceptions of masculinity, cowardice expressed by ἀνανδρία is rare in the text. It occurs elsewhere only in one other instance and in both instances, it is linked with the reclassification of σωφροσύνη. At 3.82 Thucydides recounts the evil effects of revolution, amongst which is the pernicious redefinition of words and ideals (3.82.3):

> And words exchanged their customary meanings for those which were assigned to them. For reckless boldness came to be considered the courage (ἀνδρεία) of a true friend; cautious hesitation, specious cowardice (δειλία); prudence a cloak for unmanliness (τὸ δὲ σῶφρον τοῦ ἀνάνδρου

[399] Debnar 2001, 66-7.
[400] E.g. 1.122.4, 2.40.1, 2.42.4, 2.43.6, 2.61.4, 2.85.2, 3.37.2, 3.40.7, 3.45.3, 5.7.2, 5.9.10, 5.72.1, 5.75.3, 6.13.1, 6.29.3, 6.78.4, 7.68.3, 7.77.7, 8.29.2, 8.50.3.
[401] E.g. 1.122.3, 2.62.4, 3.74.2, 3.82.4, 5.100, 4.69.3, 4.103.1, 6.36.1, 8.26.1.

> πρόσχημα); to be intelligent in all matters was to be inactive in everything. And frantic rashness was ascribed to manliness (ἀνδρὸς μοίρᾳ προσετέθη)…

This passage resonates with Archidamus' speech regarding the dangers of mistaking σωφροσύνη for ἀνανδρία. It also echoes the Corinthian rhetoric, which asserted that bold action would demonstrate that Sparta was a true ally, while hesitation would be a mark of cowardice. The negative spin Thucydides emphasises here serves to elucidate ideological manipulation in the Corinthian speech and point to the destructive potential of such rhetoric. Moreover, this section associates the renunciation of principles relating to intelligence and prudence with the ideology of manhood more explicitly than do the speeches of either the Corinthians or Archidamus. In so doing this section indicates the role masculine ideology could play in providing justification for disastrous political shifts.

Masculine ideology can also be observed in the way Thucydides frames Archidamus' approach to the assembly. From the outset of the speech, Archidamus is depicted appealing to ideals concerning relations between men. A number of scholars have noted that (among their other differences) Archidamus' address appears primarily directed towards senior members of the assembly, while Sthenelaidas' subsequent pitch seems geared to resonate with the sensibilities of young men.[402] This interpretation of Thucydides' presentation of speakers' respective intended audiences is not without merit. However, as Thucydides relates that much of the zeal with which both sides conceived the commencement of war was ascribable to both sides having an

[402] Wassermann 1953, 195; Cartwright 1997, 49 on1.86; Debnar 2001, 60.

abundance of young men (2.8.1), the idea that Archidamus was neglectful of this influential contingent of his audience is not in keeping with Thucydides' portrayal of Archidamus as a wise and astute figure. I would suggest that Archidamus' speech also portrays an attempt to impress his ideological stance upon the young members of the audience – although he does so somewhat more implicitly than does Sthenelaidas.

Archidamus' speech begins by drawing attention to his impressive age and experience (1.80.1):

> I myself have already experienced many wars, O Lacedaemonians, and I see many of you who are of the same age, and thus will not suffer what many do – yearning for war due to inexperience, or from belief that it is good and safe.

This tactic was ostensibly aimed at those who shared his age and experience and would therefore share his view. However, I would argue that Archidamus' reference to age and experience is represented as intended to impact young men, no less. With this opening, Thucydides has Archidamus gently dismiss young men's eagerness for war as the product of the inexperience and naiveté of youth, while representing men of experience – Archidamus, himself, foremost amongst these – as ideals of masculine excellence which young men should emulate, and to which they must defer.[403]

Even though Archidamus does not directly address the young men in the audience, his focus on age-related ideals of respect between men, suggests that Thucydides depicted an Archidamus who expected his speech would resonate with them. The argument may superficially appear to be aimed primarily

[403] Cartwright, 1997, 47 on 1.80; Cartledge 2003a, 163.

towards the older men, but the message to the young is clear. It was the responsibility of young men to avoid being carried away by appeals to masculine reputation, made by those who would prey on their inexperience. Instead, they should know their place in the proper order of things and defer to the wisdom of their elders. Furthermore, Thucydides' portrayal of Archidamus' appeal to age and experience is in keeping with other authors' portrayals of Spartan ideals regarding age. Such depictions stress that ideal Spartan relations which commanded reverence for age, afforded the elderly regular displays of respect,[404] and suggest that deference to elders in serious matters was not merely superficial or symbolic.[405] Archidamus' appeal to experience appears designed to resonate with such ideals, evoking veneration.

Due to Spartan reverence for age, Archidamus' tactic was likely meant to be understood as effective – up to a point – in producing deference from younger men.[406] However, from an ideological perspective, the focus on excellence of age appears to contain pitfalls which can be seen to somewhat undermine the efficacy of the argument, as masculine discourse carries different meanings at different stages of life. Archidamus' speech enshrined σωφροσύνη and his character is seen by many as intended to exemplify this virtue.[407] But while Thucydides has Archidamus ascribe production of Spartan σωφροσύνη to its

[404] Hdt. 2.80; Plut. *Apoph*. 69; Plut. *Lyc*. 15.2, 20.6 Xen. *Mem*. 3.5.15. For comprehensive discussion of old age in Sparta, see David 1991.
[405] For instance, this idea is reflected in Xenophon's descriptions of the mixing of ages in the messes – aimed at educating the young via the examples of their elders (Lac. 5.5) – and his relation that the contest for the gerousia demonstrated the noblest qualities, for which these elders were, consequently, both given the highest respect and empowered to deliberate on the highest matters (Lac. 10.1-3).
[406] Debnar 2001, 59-60.
[407] For the idea that σωφροσύνη is a particularly Spartan virtue in Thucydides see e.g. Wassermann 1953, 194-5; Hornblower 1987, 162.

educational system, the emphasis placed on age suggests that Archidamus' own σωφροσύνη stems as much from experience as schooling.[408] Archidamus and his contemporaries were experienced in war, and had reached an age sufficiently advanced to warrant societal respect.[409] Thus, their masculine excellence was secure.

Thucydides has Archidamus assert that the Spartans should not feel shame at accusations of unmanliness. However, he places this assertion into the mouth of a man speaking from a position of having nothing, personally, of which to be ashamed; any accusations could be negated by a long track-record irrefutably affirming his personal masculine honour. Therefore Archidamus' ideological stance is based, in part, on ability to view the situation from a position which the young men did not have the luxury of sharing. In contrast, the young men would likely have felt that they had a great deal to prove – the speech itself implies as much, stating that the young and inexperienced would likely be those most eager for war (1.80). Therefore, Thucydides may be indicating that Archidamus' reference to his considerable experience in war could well have served to intensify young men's desire to gain experience of their own.

[408] Cartledge 2003a, 163 notes that Archidamus spoke "with all the weight of his inherited authority and acquired prestige and influence".
[409] Wassermann, 1953, 195, suggests that it is only because there is no doubt of Archidamus' own bravery that he is able to promote a program of caution.

3.1.3. Sthenelaidas

Thucydides has been seen to personify, in the characters of Archidamus and Sthenelaidas, two clashing modes of being (in both character and politics) evident within contemporary Spartan society.[410] In keeping with this idea, Thucydides creates, in Sthenelaidas' speech, a rhetorical tactic almost entirely the converse of what he presents through Archidamus (1.85.3-86.1):

> …Finally, Sthenelaidas, who was one of the ephors at that time, came forward. And he spoke [to the Lacedaemonians] as follows:
> The many words of the Athenians I do not understand. For they spoke much in praise of themselves but nowhere denied that they were doing wrong to our allies and the Peloponnese. And yet, if they acted well against the Mede then, but poorly towards us now, then they deserve a double penalty because they have become bad rather than good.

Sthenelaidas' speech responds to the speeches of both Archidamus and the Corinthians, seeking to negate Archidamus' assessment and restore that of the Corinthians.[411] He gives no attention to rational and material concerns, instead relying predominantly on emotional appeal. To give added ideological force to his position, he argues for an understanding of Spartan masculine excellence very different from that advocated by Archidamus.

While Archidamus' employment of ideology focused inward, Sthenelaidas brings the issues of Sparta's duties to, and reputation with, its allies to the fore (1.86.2-5):

> But we are the same then and now, and if we are wise (σωφρονῶμεν) we will not overlook the injustices being committed upon our allies, nor delay enacting vengeance, as they have no delay of suffering. For others have much money and many ships and horses, but we have good allies, who must not be given up to the Athenians; and we must not decide in lawsuits or in words, because it is not by words that we are harmed, but we must render assistance swiftly and with all might. And let us not be told that it

[410] Wassermann 1953, 194.
[411] Cogan 1981, 30-2.

> is fitting for us to deliberate while being wronged; on the contrary, long hesitation is rather fitting for those who have injustice in contemplation.

Sthenelaidas' declaration that Sparta should be the same now as ever, and his admonition concerning the importance of heeding the allies' complaints, emphasise concerns of reputation. With this mindset, Thucydides has Sthenelaidas co-opt the importance placed on σωφροσύνη, developed in the preceding speech, by redefining its meaning to reinforce concerns of reputation and the actions reputation demands.[412]

By focusing on Sparta's responsibilities to allies, Sthenelaidas' speech echoes and reinforces Corinthian rhetoric. The Corinthians appeal to masculine ideals with the admonition that the Spartans have responsibilities – both as hegemons and as men – to protect allies suffering under Athenian injustice, has already been discussed.[413] By echoing Corinthian sentiment regarding Sparta's duty to its allies (1.86.2), Sthenelaidas taps into the ethos of masculine honour, constructed discursively by the Corinthians.

While scholars have seen Archidamus' rational assessment as the better argument, Thucydides depicts Sthenelaidas' emotional appeal as the more effective tactic under these circumstances –[414] a tactic whose efficacy Thucydides had already established with his portrayal of the Spartan response

---

[412] Debnar 2001, 73 relates a similar idea, suggesting that the key difference in the speeches lay in the way each speaker made use of the concept σωφροσύνη, which Archidamus associated with "the rational calculation of the nature of the proposed war and Sparta's resources (1.80.2)", and Sthenelaidas with "acting as they always have by bravely protecting their allies and punishing wrongdoing through military action".
[413] See pp. 187-201.
[414] Allison 1984; Crane 1988; Francis 1993; Debnar 2001 suggest that Sthenelaidas deserved more credit than he generally receives (contrast with Bloedow 1987, 63-4), as his particular genius lay primarily in judgement of the crowd. Compare Hunter 1988, 25-6; Tsakmakis 2006 on crowd mentality.

to Corinth's accusations. As mentioned above, Thucydides recounts the heightened emotional atmosphere of the assembly prior to the debate (1.79.2).[415] By making σωφροσύνη the ideological centrepiece of his discourse, Thucydides portrays Archidamus as attempting to restore the emotional equanimity of his audience by arguing that Spartan excellence does not require external validation or suffer from external censure (1.84.1-3).[416] Archidamus' speech repeatedly stresses that the Spartans must remain calm, and not allow themselves to feel shamed (1.81, 1.82.5-6, 1.83.3, 1.84.1, 1.85).[417] The picture this paints is one of an assembly that was not, in fact, displaying traditional Spartan self-possession – suggesting both the emotional effect of Corinthian rhetoric on the Spartans, and that Archidamus' appeal to σωφροσύνη was unsuccessful in restoring his audience to a rational mindset.

While Thucydides portrays Archidamus undertaking the difficult task of attempting to restore the assembly to an emotional state capable of appreciating a rational assessment of Sparta's unpreparedness for war, Sthenelaidas' task is shown to be comparatively simple. He has merely to subvert Archidamus' efforts, and maintain the emotional atmosphere already present in the assembly. Some have thought it outrageous that Sthenelaidas does not respond to Archidamus' valid points about Spartan unpreparedness.[418] However, Sthenelaidas has no need to negate these arguments.[419] Rather, Thucydides supplies him with a convenient discursive foundation in the ideas

[415] A point overlooked by many scholars: e.g. Allison 1984, 14; Crane 1988, 199.
[416] Wassermann 1953, 196-7; Crane 1988, 204-5; Debnar 2001, 59-60.
[417] Wilson 1990, 51; Debnar 2001, 61.
[418] Bloedow 1981; 135-6; Hussey 1985, 129.
[419] Allison 1984, 14; Crane 1988, 212.

presented by the Corinthian speech. The ideological concerns of hegemonic responsibility and the importance of self-representation for the maintenance of reputation are represented as effective tools for inciting emotional response, and Thucydides emphasises them again through Sthenelaidas. Thus Archidamus' warnings about Sparta's unpreparedness are dismissed by appeal to ideology: Sparta's great resource is the men who fight for it – some of whom are being threatened by Athens. In the face of men of such quality, the material advantage possessed by Athens is dismissed as a trifling matter: "For others have much money and many ships and horses, but we have good allies, who must not be given up to Athens" (1.86.3).

The emphasis on the superiority of the allied men as a Spartan resource may have held particular significance, playing on the ideology of Dorian superiority in comparison to Ionian opponents.[420] Two main concepts become clear in Sthenelaidas' speech. The first is that injustice was being committed by Athens. The second is that Spartan reticence, in the face of such injustice, would belie Sparta's honour – as Sthenelaidas ends his justification for immediate action by asserting a vote for war was is the only course of action worthy of Sparta: "Therefore vote, O Lacedaemonians, in a manner worthy of Sparta – for war; and do not suffer Athens to become greater, and let us not utterly betray our allies, but with the gods, let us advance against the wrong-doers" (1.86.5). Sthenelaidas represents both ideas as insufferable and declares

[420] Crane 1988, 212-3; Debnar 2001, 73.

the responsibility of immediately rising to meet both challenges as an imperative for all Spartan men.[421]

Sthenelaidas' employment of emotional diatribe and his focus on the need to act in a manner worthy of Sparta could also reflect age-relations between men. If, as Thucydides asserts, the decision for war was largely culpable to the abundance of young men on both sides, it is possible that the influence of Sthenelaidas' emotional discourse is meant to be understood as strengthened by the disparity of ages in the assembly.[422] Lebow suggests that the emotional response of the assembly, which Thucydides depicts as a result of earlier complaints against Spartan reticence, was extreme partly because Sparta's young men, with their insular upbringing, had "no previous exposure to this kind of emotional pressure".[423] Sthenelaidas' speech presents almost a caricature of what Archidamus warns against: someone who would prey on the young men's inexperience. Sthenelaidas' goal was to be achieved by continuing to intensify this emotional pressure, demanding that the assembly have done with useless words and confirm their worth as Spartans through their actions, by voting for war. This may have resonated with personal masculine worth as well, since this speech capitalises upon the idea of personal worthiness. Sthenelaidas is shown to exploit the heightened emotional state of his audience to call upon the Spartans to defend their *polis'* honour explicitly, and implicitly their personal honour, which was entwined with it.[424]

---

[421] Crane 1988, 218.
[422] Finley 1942, 129-30 suggests that these speeches were likely meant, in part, to highlight the incongruent positions in the Spartan assembly between older and younger men.
[423] Lebow 1996, 238-9.
[424] Lebow 1996, 252.

One last appeal to the ideals of Spartan masculinity in this episode should be mentioned. This is not made in Sthenelaidas' speech itself, but serves to supplement it. Thucydides has Sthenelaidas capitalise on his discursive construction of collective Spartan masculine honour – under attack and requiring immediate defence – by demanding an immediate performative display of individual masculine honour, which would validate his discursive construction. This is the vote, which Sthenelaidas calls for at the precise moment of greatest emotional intensity in the assembly: "With these words he, being ephor, put the vote to the assembly of the Lacedaemonians" (1.87.1).[425]

After the initial vote by shouting, Thucydides recounts that Sthenelaidas asserted that he could not tell which side was louder, and required individuals to demonstrate their vote by physical separation (1.87). Scholars have discussed at length why, exactly, Thucydides' Sthenelaidas creates the necessity for a visible spectacle of assembly members' votes. Some appear to be influenced by Thucydides' failure to state whether the vocal majority was actually unclear, and take Sthenelaidas' uncertainty as genuine.[426] However, most read the text as presenting the demand for physical separation as a ploy, either to emphasise the already dramatic majority, or to put pressure on waverers.[427] Although the text itself does not settle these questions definitively, Sthenelaidas' insistence on a vote by physical separation makes everyone's

[425] Finley 1942, 135; Stahl 1973, 77; Allison 1984, 14; Cartledge 2003a, 161, 163 for discussion of the idea that one voting against war, at this point, would be seen as essentially being indicative of cowardly unmanliness.
[426] E.g. Tritle 2010, 29.
[427] Kagan 1969, 305; Westlake 1973, 100; Hornblower 1991, 130 on 1.87.2.

position abundantly clear, as voters are now required to visually signal their view, rather than merely voicing their position.[428] Thus, the performative requirement created by the vote is heightened further by the demand for physical separation. Sthenelaidas' speech makes a vote for war synonymous with the avowal of Spartan honour (explicitly) – by asserting that this was what Spartan honour demands (ψηφίζεσθε οὖν, ὦ Λακεδαιμόνιοι, ἀξίως τῆς Σπάρτης 1.86.5) – and manly excellence (implicitly) – by echoing the Corinthian speech which Thucydides portrays as having been perceived as an accusation of Spartan ἀνανδρία.[429] Sthenelaidas subsequently makes the vote for war a visual spectacle, requiring men to either perform their excellence by voting for war or to expose themselves as unmanly cowards by voting against it.[430] Thus, Thucydides depicts Sthenelaidas forcing a situation in which few Spartans would be expected to cast a vote that could make them appear cowardly – all but guaranteeing his desired outcome.[431]

3.1.4. Pericles' Funeral Oration

Pericles' Funeral Oration compares the openness of Athenian society and the non-professional nature of Athenian hoplites with Sparta's closed and highly regimented society. In so doing, the speech constructs an image of the Spartan

[428] Hornblower 1991, 131 on 1.87.2.
[429] Francis 1993, 204 argues that throughout the speech Sthenelaidas established the war as an act of τιμωρία on the part of Sparta against audacious Athenian ἀδικία.
[430] Hornblower 1991, 131 on 1.87.2; Tritle 2010, 29 discuss the possibility that peer pressure was a considerable factor in the second vote, supporting the idea that no one would wish to appear cowardly. Additionally, Thucydides' description of a Megarian vote, which officials compelled be given openly (καὶ τούτων πέρι ἀναγκάσαντες τὸν δῆμον ψῆφον φανερὰν διενεγκεῖν 4.74.3), also suggests visual spectacle in voting being employed to coerce the response desired by those conducting the vote, as it reversed an oath the restored oligarchs took to not seek vengeance.
[431] Cartledge 2003a, 163.

man based on polar opposition to the superior man characteristic of Athens (2.37.2-39.4):[432]

> The freedom with which we conduct politics also characterises ordinary life. There, far from practising a jealous watch over one another, neither we feel required to be angry with our neighbour for doing what he pleases, nor assume sour looks which, while not harmful, are still distressing. And while we conduct our private associations with such ease, we are especially fearful not to transgress the laws in our civic life, always hearkening to the authorities and the laws… [39.1] And, in military policy, we are the opposite of the enemy as well; for we open up our city publicly and we never, by expulsion of foreigners (ξενηλασίαις), hinder anyone from learning or observing; even if some enemy might be aided by seeing that which we do not conceal, trusting not in preparations full of deceit but rather in the good spirit of our citizens. And in matters of upbringing, while they pursue manliness through painful training straight from the earliest youth, we live freely and advance no less than they into equal dangers… [4] And indeed, if with a practice of ease rather than work, and with a manliness not of custom but of character, we are willing to risk danger, are we not superior in that we do not toil in anticipation of hardship, but when it appears we meet it with no more cowardice than those who are always toiling.

With these assertions, Thucydides has Pericles echo and contest two ideas put forth in Archidamus' speech to the Spartan assembly: the similarity of nature inherent in all men and the distinction of the Spartan education system in instilling excellence and courage. Pericles implicitly rejects Archidamus' assertion that all men are alike in nature by highlighting a naturally inborn form of ἀνδρεία exclusive to Athenian men (2.39.4).[433]

As Athenian ἀνδρεία is presented as developing spontaneously and without effort, the Spartan education system's endeavour to cultivate masculine excellence in Spartan men suggests an attempt to compensate for their natural

[432] Loraux 1986, 150; Millender 1996, 319-20.
[433] Edmunds 1975, 45, Price 2001, 181. Balot 2001, esp. 512-3, 520-1; 2004,407-11, argues that Athens attempted to present a distinctive brand of Athenian courage which was both a natural outgrowth of, and also core foundation for democratic values inherent in Athenian society – although he identifies the rational nature of Athenian ἀνδρεία, not its naturalness, as its central trait.

want of manliness. Pericles' speech portrays Spartans as devoting a lifetime of arduous training towards the pursuit of the sort of masculine valour which Athenian men manifest organically, in abundance. Moreover, the contrast Pericles draws between the restrictive Spartan lifestyle attempts to cultivate manliness through education, and Athenian freedom and in-born manliness, serves to suggest that Spartan masculine valour would crumble without the continual pressure from societal forces. Pericles asserts that Athenian men need not fear the Spartans' extensive training because such training produces artificial (thus flawed) ἀνδρεία, which is no match for natural Athenian valour.[434]

In addition to representing Spartan masculine valour as the result of a laborious and unnatural process, the speech suggests that, even once attained, Spartan ἀνδρεία remains a precarious artificial construct.[435] In service of this idea, Thucydides has Pericles make much of Sparta's practice of *xenelasia*. He asserts that Athens opens her gates to foreigners, because providing opportunities for foreigners to learn from Athens' example is more important than fear that some enemy may, in this way, gain an advantage (2.39.1). This serves to "other" the Spartans in and of itself, as it highlights contrary Spartan practice as indicative of a suspicious nature.[436] But since this is immediately followed by the description of Sparta's flawed efforts to imbue their citizens with ἀνδρεία, the reader may well wonder if Spartan isolationism is, in part, a response to the limited success of such efforts. It suggests that the hard-won

[434] Loraux 1986, 152 provides a summary which situates Pericles' rhetoric on this point within the tradition of aristocratic thinking.
[435] Millender 1996, 340-1.
[436] Figueira 2003, 58, 71.

Spartan valour – arduous though it was to cultivate – was apparently insufficient to inspire self-confidence, evidenced by the lengths to which Sparta would go to avoid giving potential enemies any advantage.

In Pericles' conception of Spartan manhood Thucydides demonstrates employment of masculine ideology as a political tool. Price asserts that Pericles' Funeral Oration was designed for a specific purpose, employing rhetoric suited to the immediate circumstances.[437] Thus, the discursive constructions of Spartan and Athenian ἀνδρεία developed in the funeral oration are politically charged and serve a propagandistic purpose.[438] The establishment of a secure conception of Athenian manly courage may have been of particular importance at this point in the war, as Pericles' policy of remaining behind the walls (rather than engaging enemy invaders) was cowardly by traditional standards, and would have been demoralising to Athenian men.[439] This is reflected in Thucydides' account of the first invasion of Attica, wherein he relates that allowing the enemy to ravage Athens' territory seemed an insufferable insult, especially to the young men, and produced considerable resentment towards Pericles and his policy.[440] Tritle asserts that Thucydides' Pericles specifically developed particular images in the funeral oration designed to buttress Athenian confidence in their own courage by attempting to demolish the Spartan mystique, replacing the prominent perception of Spartan men as unshakably courageous, with the idea

[437] Price 2001, 172-3.
[438] Miller 2000, 72-3.
[439] Strassler 1990, 115; Balot 2004, 411-2.
[440] Th. 2.21. Cf. with Archidamus' efforts to reaffirm Spartan masculinity in his justification for not going to war (pp. 201-7).

that their personal shortcomings made their collective military force unintimidating.[441] Balot suggests that earlier Athenian definitions of ἀνδρεία relied on a self-definition created in polar opposition to Persia. These definitions were unsuitable for the present war because Athens' Sparta played a key role in combatting the Persian threat. Therefore, Spartans could not be classified as cowardly using the traditional model.[442] Therefore, the new contrast focuses on innate Athenian manly courage, a naturally occurring outgrowth of Athenian democratic character, vs. the laborious and reflexive Spartan manly courage, which was no true courage at all.[443]

3.2. The Helot Massacre

Thucydides' portrayal of Sparta's covert extermination of some 2000 helots (4.80.3-4) showcases the employment of performative display in Spartan suppression of underclasses. These performative elements incorporate ideology related primarily to the category of representation and performativity. This episode has been subjected to discussion concerning many topics which lie outside the scope of the present examination. These include the massacre's date,[444] its impact on Spartan-helot relations,[445] and even its historicity.[446] My

[441] Tritle 2010, 47. Price 2001, 181 points out that in Pericles' conception of the superiority of innate Athenian courage, he actually disparages traditional military preparation –preparation for which Sparta was well known and which rendered them intimidating.
[442] Balot 2004, 212, 406, 411-14.
[443] Balot 2001, 520-1; 2012; Edmunds 1975, 45; Price 2001, 181.
[444] For discussion of the probable date of the massacre: Willets 1957, 57; Talbert 1989, 23; Jordan 1990, 55; Bradford 1994, 74-5; Whitby 1994, 98-9; Hornblower 1996, 266, on 4.80.3-4; Hunt, 1998, 116-7; Paradiso 2004, 187-8.
[445] Whitby 1994, 98-9; Paradiso 2004, 188; argue for propagandist understandings of the report of the helot massacre. Talbert 1989 argues that if the massacre did take place, it does not reflect Spartan propaganda or the actuality of the helot threat, but rather Spartan fear of the helot threat. Cartledge 2003b, 22, believes that it should be taken as Thucydides' paradigm case, illustrating regular Spartan's treatment of helots.
[446] Talbert 1989, 23; Whitby 1994, 98; Bradford, 1994, 74-5; Hornblower 1996, 267 on 4.80.3-4; Paradiso 2004, 186-7; Tritle 2010, 93 question the veracity of the Thucydides' account.

concern is not to resolve these issues. Rather, I aim to explore the role ideals of masculinity play in Thucydides' representation of this episode. I will examine the presentation of the massacre in two respects. First, its presentation as a deliberate performative display undertaken by the Spartans, intended to provide a cautionary example to those believed to have deviated from approved ideological-hierarchal stratification of free and slave men. And second, its connection to Brasidas' northern campaign, which transmits messages regarding Brasidas' efficacy in the command of helots similar to those eliminated in the massacre.

Couched within the account of Brasidas' northern campaign, Thucydides relates the following (4.80.2-5):

> And they [the Spartans] also wanted an excuse to send off some of the helots, lest the current state of affairs in Pylos give them cause for rebellion. Since fear of their numbers and wilfulness caused them to once enact the following (for many of the Lacedaemonian's arrangements concerning the helots have always been exceedingly concerned with keeping guard of them), they proclaimed that as many of them as deemed themselves worthy, having best distinguished themselves in affairs of war, should be selected and they would be set free. They were making a test of it, thinking that those who first deemed themselves worthy to be set free, would do so because of their high spirit, and be the most likely to rebel. And having selected as many as two thousand, they [the helots] crowned themselves and went around the temples, as though they were being set free. But then, not much later, they did away with them, and no one knew in what way each one of them was killed. So now, they were eager to send seven hundred as hoplites with Brasidas, and he raised the rest of the force from the Peloponnese, persuading them with money.

It is significant that Thucydides makes services rendered in warfare the basis for a helot's self-nomination. Hunt argues that war was of great ideological importance, in part, because war was the arena wherein the most important

---

Oliva 1971, 164-5; Hunt 1998, 116-7; Cartledge 2003b, 21; Harvey 2004, 200; Cartledge and Debnar 2006, 565 accept the massacre's historicity.

virtues embodied by the Greek male were displayed. He suggests that, for helot troops, military service may have boosted their self-esteem, creating expectation of better treatment once they had proven their worth in war.[447]

However, it must be acknowledged that the significance of masculine achievement in matters of war, in the case of this particular group of helots, is debatable. Service rendered "in affairs of war" (ἐν τοῖς πολέμοις) is fairly ambiguous and could easily refer to non-combatant roles which helots were known to have performed. For instance, recounts that such service was performed by helots during the Pylos incident, who brought supplies to the besieged combatants (4.26.5-8). If this was the nature of the service rendered, it may have somewhat mitigated the ideological significance drawn from the helots' achievement. Nevertheless, even non-combatant service in war falls under war's ideological purview, and thus extends some of its ideological significance to those concerned. Moreover, the ambiguity of Thucydides' wording retains the possibility that some, if not all, of the helots in question performed combative functions, and thus could draw full ideological significance from said roles.

However, the most noteworthy factor in the episode for my purposes – and that which alerts the reader to the ideological significance of the episode – is the emphasis placed upon the spiritedness, or wilfulness, of the helots killed. This is a factor related twice by Thucydides in different terms: We are told that the Spartans feared their wilfulness (σκαιότητα). The Spartans believed that those

[447] Hunt 1998, 154, 116-7.

who nominated themselves for manumission would do so "ὑπὸ φρονήματος" and that being this sort they would be those most likely to rebel (4.8.3). The concept of φρόνημα is a difficult one to render elegantly into English, as it has no direct correlation. The idea it encapsulates is that of high-minded self-belief, which arises from feelings of one's inherent worthiness; in negative usages it reflects a sense of presumption or arrogance. And it is this idea of helot self-esteem that the episode presents as being threatening to the status-quo of relations between men in Spartan society.

The helots deemed problematic by the Spartiates are not represented as those who were objectively strongest, or those who had performed most competently in battle. Rather, they were those who believed that they had met standards worthy of being granted the status of free men. This attitude makes the circumstances of this episode distinctly different from cases where Sparta offered freedom and status as *neodamodeis* to encourage helot enlistment. In those cases, the offer of freedom for future service places the onus on helots to become worthy of their freedom, while the power to deem individuals worthy remained in the hands of the Spartan *polis*.[448] Conversely, in the case of the massacre, Thucydides portrays the attitude of free men being exhibited by helots who had not yet been enfranchised – evident in their belief that they deserved freedom for past service. Feelings of entitlement, displayed by the helot man who put himself forth as worthy of freedom, would indicate his

[448] For instance, Luraghi 2002, 229 asserts that Spartan state monopoly on manumission "made sure, in a very Spartan way, that only merits towards the community could bring freedom to a helot". See also Hunt 1998, 173, who argues that Sparta's military hierarchy could incorporate men from different levels of society, such as the *neodamodeis*, without posing a threat to Spartan supremacy.

failure to internalise the self-representation required of him; thus rendering such a man problematic to the masculine ideological hierarchy of the Spartans. Thucydides' portrayal of the Spartan response suggests that not only would such deviations need to be eliminated, but audacious display of unacceptable self-representation on the part of helots would require an equally powerful performative display to demonstrate the correct position of these "problematic" men.

The massacre itself is presented first and foremost as a practical measure to eliminate a sector of the helot population considered to pose a threat to the existing social order. However, if mere threat-elimination was all that was desired, the upstarts could have been quietly killed without the spectacle of crowning and procession. The performative element of the parade has the effect of giving the practical measure a double purpose;[449] it also becomes an ideological tool, powerfully exemplifying Spartan superiority. Thus, Thucydides' depiction of this episode can be seen as an impressive example of the use of performative display in order to give visceral force to the desired ideological message.[450]

---

[449] Outside of the context of the narrative it likely served other of Thucydides' authorial purposes as well. For example, Whitby 1994, 98-9argues that Thucydides' account is reflective of Spartan propaganda. However, if one accepts a propagandistic reading of the episode, it is unlikely that it is reflective of *Spartan* propaganda, since it does not cast the Spartans in a particularly positive light. In addition to portraying the Spartans as acting out of feelings of insecurity to enact a mendacious and cruel plan, the mention of the helots' religious procession serves to depict the Spartan massacre of them as an impious act as well – hardly a self-image one would expect the Spartans to wish to propagate.

[450] While Whitby 1994, 98-9 prefers the view that the episode reflects propaganda rather than true events, he asserts that if it did occur, it is indicative of Sparta's considerable skill in helot-control.

In the ceremony, helots displayed themselves performing the status of free men – status that they had claimed for themselves rather than one bestowed upon them by the Spartan *polis* (by rights, the only body with the authority to affirm such status). That the narrative recounts that they were shortly disposed of in an ignominious manner should also be viewed, in its own right, as a performative display. How secret the killings were meant to be is debateable. Harvey highlights that the promenade around the shrines would have been highly visible. He asserts that the important distinction Thucydides makes in the text is not that no one knew that the helots were killed, but rather that no one knew how *each* of them were killed.[451] Harvey's argument here suffers somewhat from its over-reliance on imparting particular significance to Thucydides' inclusion of the word "each" – which could be easily explained as an instance of rhetorical flourish. However, the same argument could be applied to those who place excessive emphasis on Thucydides' relation that "no one knew" how the helots died to assert that the *fact* of the deaths remained widely unknown. Thus, Harvey's point still stands: the text implies that while the individual murders were carried out in clandestine fashion, the fact of the killing itself was no secret, but was meant to create an impression.

Seen in this light, Thucydides depicts killings conducted in an extremely stylised display. It was also display which carried considerable ideological significance: those who had so publicly declared their masculine excellence and personal self-worth disappeared silently and without a trace. Such an event would create a lasting impression. This, in turn, would go far towards

[451] Harvey 2004, 207.

lessening the need for more regular displays of intimidation. It would communicate that those helots claiming self-worth were incorrect in their assumption and indicate the costs of overestimating one's place to other helots; thus, reaffirming the correct social order. Furthermore, the extraordinary scale of the event would increase its impact in two ways. Memory of large-scale slaughter would strengthen the impact of more everyday measures to ideologically subjugate the helot population. And the sheer number of those killed would intensify the sense of the insignificance of the helots killed, as well as increase helot fear of their Spartiate masters – so terrifyingly efficient that they could dispose of those most spirited helots in such a way so as to make it seem like they simply vanished. Thucydides' description can be seen to portray an exceptional performative mechanism, deliberately executed by the Spartan authorities, to reinforce the self-representation and understanding of the hierarchy of men within the Spartan social system which Sparta typically imposed on its helots through less extreme measures.[452]

My discussion thus far has focused on an interpretation of the role of masculine representation in the performative elements of the episode, which analyses the episode exclusively within the immediate context of the narrative.

[452] Contrast with Jordan 1990; Hornblower 1996, 267, on 4.80.3-4 who suggest that the Spartans' offer of freedom was genuine at first, but that a subsequent loss of nerve resulted in the episode being concluded with mass-murder. However, Jordan's suggestion that that the ceremony described by Thucydides was an unsanctioned emulation on the part of the helots of the ceremony performed by new members of the *Gerousia*, and that this was so threatening to the Spartans as to prompt a sudden reversal of intention, resulting in the massacre of some 2000 men, is unconvincing. Harvey 2004, 203-4 refutes these ideas, and argues that an interpretation of the Spartans' offer of freedom as genuine is in direct contradiction with the text, which clearly indicates the fictitious nature of the offer of freedom and the premeditated nature of the massacre. While it remains possible that, the massacre might not have been as premeditated as Thucydides represents it, this analysis deals with Thucydides depiction of events, which treats the offer of freedom as entirely fallacious.

But of course, this episode likely served other purposes as well. When discussing the larger purposes of this episode, most treatments have seen the portrayal of Spartan treatment of helots, and the negative light this casts on Sparta, as the primary message of the episode. However, it is possible to examine the implications of the helot massacre in another light, by suggesting that depicting the extreme measures by which Sparta was thought to control their subject population is not the sole reason for the inclusion of this episode. Indeed, my argument is that it is possible that Thucydides intended this episode to emphasise Brasidas' effectiveness as a commander. This idea can be seen by viewing Thucydides' description of the massacre in tandem with his account of Brasidas' campaign. Few have interpreted Thucydides' account of the massacre as having anything to do with his characterisation of Brasidas,[453] and exactly what Thucydides meant audiences to take from the account is a matter of some debate. However, in my view, it is reasonable to believe that Thucydides chose his placement of the massacre, in part, in order to emphasise Brasidas' effective management of helot troops; and that the ideology of masculinity is employed in the narrative to serve this end.

While the massacre's date has been subjected to considerable conjecture, it is unlikely that Thucydides' placement of the account, within the narrative, reflects the time within which it took place. Its immediate context is the account of Brasidas' northern campaign, which employed the services of seven hundred helots. While some scholars prefer to date the massacre as

[453] Bradford 1994, 74-5, is an exception to this; although he interprets the incident as designed to remind the reader of the general tendency towards duplicity in all Spartans.

contemporary to this campaign,[454] Paradiso notes that one could hardly believe so many helots would volunteer for service, when martial service had so recently been a factor in the extermination of many of their fellows.[455] Moreover, Thucydides' framing of the narrative may support the view that the massacre did not occur at the time of Brasidas' campaign, but was meant to be taken as an event from the annals of history – possibly even one with which Thucydides expected his readers to be acquainted.

The framing of the massacre bears considerable resemblance to the manner with which Thucydides presented the story of Harmodius and Aristogeiton (6.54-9). In both cases Thucydides drops out of his relation of contemporary events to recount a particular incident of note, on whose completion he resumes the main narrative. And in both instances, the significant event of the digression is used to inform the reader's understanding of the mind-set governing contemporary actions. In the case of Harmodius and Aristogeiton, we are told that these historical events informed the Athenian reaction to the mutilation of the Herms, as they feared it was indicative of a tyrannical plot (6.5.3):

> For the people, having heard how oppressive the tyranny of Pisistratus and his sons had become before it finished, and moreover that it was not put down by themselves or by Harmodius but by the Lacedaemonians, were always in fear and took everything suspiciously.

If the episode's placement in the history is not ascribable to its chronology, it is possible that this particular event was chosen to illustrate the Spartans'

[454] Willets 1957, 57; Lewis 1977, 27-8; Talbert 1989, 23; Jordan 1990, 55.
[455] Paradiso 2004, 187-8.

mindset, at this moment in time, for another reason. My suggestion, that the episode was intended to inform readers' understanding of Brasidas' character and capabilities, is supported by features of the text. First is the framing of the episode. Although at 4.80.4 Thucydides recounts that the 700 helot troops accompanied Brasidas at the outset of his undertaking, this is not the first we hear of Brasidas' operations. Rather, Thucydides begins his discussion of the campaign at 4.70, with Brasidas readying his army in the vicinity of Sicyon and Corinth. He goes on to relate a number of Brasidas' exploits, including his efforts to prevent Megara from falling to Athens (4.70-4), and his march through Thessaly (4.78-9). After this, Thucydides backtracks to recount the commencement of the campaign – and the tale of the massacre, presented as context to elucidate the feelings informing the Spartan decision to include a sizable helot contingent in Brasidas' force. This suggests that Thucydides went out of his way to situate this narrative firmly within the account of Brasidas' exploits. Next, Thucydides (4.80.3) relates that the Spartan officials carried out the helot massacre because they were apprehensive about helot numbers and wilfulness (σκαιότητα). This account was chosen with the express purpose of explaining the Spartan sentiment regarding their helots at the outset of the campaign. Moreover, the episode is bracketed by assertions that the Spartans were happy to send a large number of helots away (καὶ ἅμα τῶν Εἱλώτων βουλομένοις ἦν ἐπὶ προφάσει ἐκπέμψαι, μή τι πρὸς τὰ παρόντα τῆς Πύλου ἐχομένης νεωτερίσωσιν at 4.80.2, and καὶ τότε προθύμως τῷ Βρασίδᾳ αὐτῶν ξυνέπεμψαν ἑπτακοσίους ὁπλίτας, at 4.80.4). This draws a direct correlation between the helots massacred and those who accompanied Brasidas on campaign; perhaps suggesting that Thucydides meant audiences to infer that

the helots with Brasidas were of the same sort of temperament which Sparta found particularly concerning. Finally, the association is further strengthened by the fact that Thucydides did *not* disclose the date of the massacre. By letting the episode exist independent of the context of time, and bound only by its placement in the narrative as a precursor to Brasidas' campaign, Thucydides eliminates any factors which could diminish associations between the helots killed and those who joined Brasidas' force. Thus, Thucydides' juxtaposition of the massacre which was motivated by fear of "wilful" helots, with Brasidas' single-handed command of 700 helots serves to highlight Brasidas' skill in managing the sort of helots that the Spartan *polis* authorities considered especially difficult to manage. Further bolstering this idea is the relation of helot troops sent with Brasidas being immediately followed by an account of Brasidas' virtues (4.81.1). This presentation serves to underscore the impression that, while Sparta sent these helots away out of fear, Brasidas, due to his excellent qualities, was able to manage them with ease.

3.3. Brasidas

Brasidas is a particularly enigmatic character within Thucydides' *History*. Considerable scholarly discussion (producing significantly differing views), has been devoted to the particularities of how Thucydides intended readers to understand Brasidas' character.[456] Of particular interest has been that, despite being generally considered atypical of the "Spartan-type" presented in the

[456] Positive estimations of Brasidas include: Wassermann 1964; Francis 1993, 211-2; Foster 2012, 193-4. Negative assessments include: Bradford 1994, 74-5; Price 2001, 248-9. Neutral or ambivalent views include: Hornblower 1996, 53-4; Heilke 2004.

History,[457] he is nevertheless depicted as having been perceived, by many Northern *poleis*, as the model Spartan [458] – and that this is presented by Thucydides as being instrumental to the confidence in Sparta fostered in these *poleis*.[459] However, dealings with northern *poleis* are not the only instances in which Thucydides creates archetypal ideals via the character of Brasidas. Brasidas is also portrayed as employing such ideals in his exhortations to his own forces. And it is these speeches which are of most interest to the present inquiry.

In speeches designed to encourage his troops and inspire excellent conduct in battle, it is possible to discern ideas connected to the construction of masculine ideals. Brasidas is depicted as making good ideological use of discourse, which focuses on the ideal representation and performativity of the men under his command. Moreover, inasmuch as Brasidas is shown to call a diverse group of individuals to aspire to a shared idealised ethos, his speeches also reflect ideas of relations between men. Viewed in this way, it is possible to see elements of construction of masculinity presented in these speeches as part of a larger ideological campaign, centred around the ideology of performative representation, and designed to promote his troops' cohesion and effective

[457] Features viewed as marking Brasidas as atypical usually include his depiction as being swift in action (2.25.2, 2.86.8, 4.11, 4.70, 4.81.1), his reputation for mild treatment of individuals under him and allied states (4.8, 4.105, 4.108, 5.11), his capacity for eloquent rhetoric (4.84.2, 4.108.5, 4.121), and his penchant for employing tactics of persuasion and manipulation over force (4.81, 4.84-8, 4.103, 4.106, 4.114, 4.120). However, what these features signify is also a matter of some debate; for discussion, see Wassermann 1964, 293-4; Westlake 1968, 148-50; Edmunds 1975, 90; Cane 1992, 229, 248; Millender 1996, 340-51; Cartwright 1997, 187 on 4.81; Luginbill 1999, 116; Debnar 2001, 174-5, 183-4; Powell 2001, 200; Heilke 2004, 125-31; Gribble 2006, 466-7.
[458] Wassermann 1964, 292; Gribble 2006, 166-7.
[459] For instance, 4.81.3 notes the hopeful goodwill that Brasidas' self-presentation generated for Sparta in the opinions of the northern cities. See also Lewis 1977, 29; Powell 2001, 176.

action. By framing the rhetoric in this way, in what follows I intend to show that representational construction of a masculine ideal is an element of the rhetoric which Thucydides depicts as a tool employed by Brasidas to further his political and military aims.

Brasidas' speeches of exhortation to his forces at Lyncestis (4.126) and Amphipolis (5.9) are those wherein ideologies of masculine discourse, self-representation, and performativity can be most clearly perceived in the rhetoric Thucydides has Brasidas espouse. Some see these speeches as appealing to a Dorian/Spartan ethos.[460] This ethos provides an ideological reference-point around which Thucydides' Brasidas proffers his troops a means of self-identification through corresponding masculine self-representation. This, in turn, serves to provide a cohesive ideological identity for a force made up of men of vastly disparate origins. Brasidas commanded a mixed force comprising helots, mercenaries, and Northern allies. This is a group of men who represent a number of incongruent motivations and ethnic identities. Despite this, in both speeches, Thucydides has Brasidas make a point of addressing his force as Peloponnesians (4.126.1, 5.9.1). And in both instances, he asserts that their shared status as Dorians and Peloponnesians imbues them with innate excellence, which should serve as their source of confidence in a confrontation with Ionians and barbarians.[461] At Lyncestis he says (4.126.2):

> For the valour (ἀγαθοῖς) you display in war is not because your allies are present on each occasion, but because of your native excellence (ἀρετήν); and neither do great numbers of others frighten citizens of cities like yours, in which the many do not rule the few, but rather the few rule the many, holding dominion by nothing other than strength at arms.

[460] Wassermann 1964, 294-5; Debnar 2001, 196; Powell 2001, 239.
[461] Cartwright 1997, 196, on 4.126; Debnar 2001, 195-6. Contrast with Hunt 1998, 59, who asserts that Brasidas appealed to the different sections of his force separately.

And at Amphipolis (5.9.1):

> Men of the Peloponnese, let this brief statement suffice to make clear that we have come from the sort of land which has always been free due to good courage (εὔψυχον), and that you are Dorians about to fight Ionians, against whom you are accustomed to be mightier…

It may seem odd to address a mixed force in these terms, but some scholars have noted the potential of this sort of rhetoric for creating group-cohesion.[462] Jansson argues that collective identity-building is most readily done by appealing to an established essential identity, and by othering the enemy.[463] He suggests that the Dorian/Ionian divide could prove particularly effective in "othering" a Hellenic enemy.[464] Appealing to such ideology exploits the well-established tradition of ascribing to Dorians natural superiority and to Ionians innate weakness and effeminacy.[465] Moreover, it follows the lines of rhetoric one might expect to hear from a Spartan commander, as this was apparently one of the main lines of propaganda employed by Peloponnesians during the war, to "other" the Athenians and strengthen unity.[466] Thus this ideology could serve as a focal point around which to construct a common (if fictitious) identity within a mixed force.

The primary mode by which Thucydides has Brasidas construct this common identity is discourse. But the discourse itself focuses heavily on ideas of men's

---

[462] Hornblower 1996, 397, on 4.126.1; Debnar 2001, 195-6.
[463] Jansson 1997, 148-50; 154-9, 162.
[464] Jansson 1997, 153-6; Price 2001, 154.
[465] Alty 1982, 7-9, 11; Price 2001, 155. For references to the luxurious living, effeminacy and cowardice of Ionians, and general negative opinion, see: Ath. 12.26; 28-34; Aristoph. *Thes.* 163; *Peace* 932; Hdt. 1.143; Th. 6.82.4.
[466] Debnar 2001, 229; Price 2001, 151-61. For propaganda/attitudes focused on the Dorian/Ionian divide during the war see e.g.: 1.124.1, 3.92, 5.9.1, 6.6.2, 6.77.1, 6.80, 7.5.4; 8.25.3.

performative representation. Thucydides has Brasidas close his exhortation at Amphipolis with the following (5.9.9-10):

> And you [Clearidas] be yourself a noble man (ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς), as is fitting for you being a Spartiate; and you, allied men, follow [him] like men, and know well that willingness (ἐθέλειν), shame (αἰσχύνεσθαι), and obedience (πείθεσθαι) towards one's commander make for a fine soldier. And this day you will become either free men, if you are noble, and allies of Lacedaemon, or slaves of Athens; and even if you are fortunate enough to make it through without being enslaved or killed, your slavery will be more grievous than before, and you will hinder the liberation of the rest of the Hellenes. So, show no weakness, seeing how great a matter it is, And I will show that the sorts of things which I exhort to my fellows, I will carry out in deeds myself.

Here, Brasidas first encourages Clearidas to conduct himself with the nobility that befits his Spartan identity.[467] Thus, he identifies the conceptual Spartiate as ideal. He then invites the rest of the force to identify with and emulate this Spartiate model of excellence, entreating them to be worthy allies of Lacedaemon and to display the qualities of willingness (ἐθέλειν), honour (αἰσχύνεσθαι), and obedience (πείθεσθαι). These are qualities represented as intrinsic to the Spartan ethos, which echo the sentiments of Archidamus' speech at the first Spartan congress.[468] By affirming the innate valour of his army and attesting that their conduct in this most significant contest will determine their identity, Thucydides has Brasidas suggest that, through adherence to specific ideals, his troops could adopt this superior Dorian-masculine ethos for themselves. This discursive approach negates the need for common Dorian ethnic identity to be true in order for it to be effective.[469] Rather, this speech discursively creates a new masculine identity by adapting the extant Dorian tradition, and offers men of mixed origins the opportunity to

[467] Perhaps because Clearidas was still a *hebon* (4.132).
[468] The qualities of obedience and shame expressed by Thucydides in this speech are akin to the qualities of obedience (πειθώ), and shame-based respect (αἰδώς) identified by Xenophon as important in the Spartan rearing process.
[469] Jansson 1997, 148-50, 154-9, 162.

earn a place within this collective identity, via adherence to the approved mode of self-representation in battle.[470]

The collective identity Thucydides creates in Brasidas' speech is rhetorically effective in terms of ideological accessibility, because it presents attainment of ideal status as the result of performance alone, irrespective of considerations of birth or origin. This idea is perhaps best exemplified by considering the rhetoric with reference to the army's helot contingent. These were men who were arguably furthest from the Dorian-masculine ethos presented as ideal. In reality, they were removed from the ideal by their birth, unfree status, and standing within Spartan social hierarchy. If scholars have thought the rhetorical approach Thucydides has Brasidas employ to be misaligned with an address to a mixed force, this feeling seems compounded when they consider the presence of helots within said force.

Opinions of Brasidas' intentions regarding the helot contingent of his army are mixed. For instance, Hornblower suggests that Brasidas' emphasis on the pride soldiers can take in being from lands where "the few rule the many" would be less than encouraging in addressing many of "the ruled".[471] Similarly, Debnar wonders what effect the comparison of real slavery and the metaphorical slavery described by Brasidas would have had on helot soldiers who were well acquainted with actual slavery. [472] Hunt asserts that, if anything, the rhetoric of

[470] Debnar 2001, 196. Contrast with Hornblower 1996, 397 on 4.126.1 and 4.126.3; 442-3, on 5.9.1, who acknowledges the likelihood that Brasidas was using the term "Peloponnesians" honorifically to foster cohesion but believes that doing so may have put him on rhetorically thin ice.
[471] Hornblower 1996, 398-9 on 4.126.2; Hunt 1998, 59.
[472] Debnar 2001, 296.

these speeches demonstrates how little helot troops were regarded. In his view, Brasidas' speeches effectively ignore the presence of helots, even though helot soldiers made up a considerable segment of the force and were important to the campaign.[473] It is possible to account for the perceived inappropriateness of Brasidas' stress on the pride of being from a land where the few ruled the many in a speech which addressed some of the many ruled, by emphasising that it is not, of course, Brasidas' words we are reading, but rather those of Thucydides. Indeed, the irony of Brasidean insensitivity perceived by scholars in these speeches may well have been the point – and was intended to reflect on readers' perceptions of the Spartans.

However, while authorial irony is a possible explanation of the tactics Thucydides has Brasidas employ, I would also suggest that – remaining exclusively within the context of the narrative – Brasidas' remarks need not be read as unsuitable or divisive. Rather than being indicative of Brasidas' ignoring or estranging the helot troops, drawing a distinction between real versus ideological slavery could be particularly effective rhetoric to employ with those acquainted with actual slavery. At Amphipolis Brasidas warned that, depending on their conduct, the battle would make the men he addressed either free allies of Lacedaemon or slaves of Athens. In a seemingly contradictory turn of phrase he said that, in the latter case, even if they escaped death or enslavement, their bondage would be worse than before. Here Thucydides has Brasidas draw distinction between actual and conceptual slavery; asserting that it was not the condition of physical slavery that was

[473] Hunt, 1998, 58-9.

most deplorable, but the ideological slavery that resulted in failing to live up to the standards set for them as men (5.9.9). Those who failed in their duty would be slaves, even if they were free. And those who conducted themselves as they should would become, by their efforts, free men worthy of being called Lacedaemon's allies. In this ethos, helots – no less than any other section of the army – were invited to identify with, and represent themselves according to, Spartan masculine ideology. In so doing, these helots are offered symbolic elevation to the level of free Dorian men – and perhaps more, since it is possible that Brasidas' exhortation also alluded to the offer of actual freedom (that was indeed later given to his helot soldiers) one could obtain via excellent performance.

If, as discussed earlier, the helot massacre was partially intended to insinuate that the helots under Brasidas' command were of an unruly sort – then Thucydides may have used references to helots in the Northern campaign to suggest Brasidas' effective management of his force (and the effectiveness of the rhetoric Thucydides has Brasidas employ in his speeches to them). The next explicit reference to these helots, following their time with Brasidas, shows them as anything but revolutionary. When Brasidas' helot troops were freed, Thucydides distinguishes them from the *neodamodeis* settled at Lepreum, making note of their special title of Brasideioi (5.34.1). Thucydides' mention of this honorific does not suggest Bradidas' alienation of helots under his command, but rather intimates the idea of connection between these helots

and their commander. [474] Hunt asserts that the Spartans cared little for winning over the "hearts and minds" of the slaves who fought for them, and cautions that helots' loyalty to Brasidas should not be seen as indicative of their inner feelings.[475] However, if my interpretation is correct, and we can read Brasidas' speeches as containing identity-building rhetoric partially tailored to the helot section of his army, it is possible to interpret Thucydides' portrayal differently, and suggest that the loyalty of the Brasideoi may have been depicted (in part) as the result of effective use of ideology.

3.4. Pylos/Sphacteria

One final topic that deserves attention is the effect Thucydides depicts the capture of 120 Spartiates on Sphacteria as having on perception of the Spartans, both in their own eyes and those of others. While the fallout from the Pylos/Sphacteria incident yields a broader examination of general trends rather than extensive analysis of a specific episode, it is worth examining nonetheless, as it references discourse laden with gendered themes and speaks to both the limitations of discourse and the relationship between discourse and performativity in construction of masculine identity.

Thucydides relates that in summer 425 BC Athenian forces under Demosthenes fortified a position on Pylos in Messenia (4.3-4). The Spartans moved to attack the Athenian position, intending to take it by blockade, and so occupied the island of Sphacteria, near Pylos (4.8). The unsuccessful Spartan

[474] Cartledge 2003a, 187-8 suggests that the nickname is meant to indicate a special bond between Brasidas and his helot troops.
[475] Hunt 1998, 116-8.

endeavour met with a reversal of fortune, which resulted in Spartan soldiers being trapped on Sphacteria and blockaded by the Athenians (4.9-16). An extended siege ensued, during which the Spartan force suffered from lack of supplies (4.23-6), and natural disaster (when a fire burned off the brush cover and revealed their position to the enemy 4.30). Finally, the Athenians attacked and, after a lengthy battle in which the Spartans suffered considerable loses, the Spartans found themselves surrounded (4.31-6). When asked to surrender, they finally capitulated, after consulting with Spartan authorities on the mainland (4.37-8). The loss of an unknown number Spartiates and capture of 120 (4.38.5) is presented by Thucydides as a considerable blow to Sparta. Moreover, he relates that the Spartans' failure to fight to the death in this instance caused considerable shock to the other Greeks and that of all the events of the war, none was so "against expectation" (παρὰ γνώμην) in the eyes of the Greeks as was this surrender (4.40).[476]

The discursive constructions of Spartan masculine excellence presented by the Spartans and Corinthians (and even the discussion of Spartan manly courage offered by Pericles, in its emphatic attempt to dismantle the Spartan reputation for courage in war) in the early stages of the *History* placed no small emphasis on Sparta's reputation of excellence in war and exceptional courage. This reputation was informed considerably by the episode of three hundred Spartiates choosing to fight to the death at Thermopylae, against overwhelming odds.[477] However, when the contingent of Spartans occupying

[476] Finley 1942, 197; Crane 1988, 231.
[477] Hdt. 7.220.

the island of Sphacteria found themselves facing a similar situation, they elected to surrender rather than die in battle (4.38). In so doing, the actions of these men are depicted as incongruent with the reputation that formed a significant portion of prominent discursive constructions of the Spartan masculine ideal in the *History* –[478] an incongruency which is portrayed as having negative consequences for Spartan image. In his descriptions of the reactions to these events on the part of the Spartans and other Greeks, Thucydides indicates that, for ideological identity to be upheld, discursive constructions of Spartan masculine excellence required a continual substantiating performative aspect.[479] Moreover, the episode suggests that the mode of performance had to specifically correspond with the precise discourse on which standards of Spartan masculine courage were based in order for that performance to uphold the perception of Spartan masculine courage.

Foster argues that Thucydides' depiction of the Spartans who fought and surrendered on the island does not support the opinion he claims was held by the Greek world at large, that they surrendered due to cowardice. Rather, he asserts that Thucydides meant readers to understand that the Spartans captured on the island actually fought admirably.[480] Indeed the impression given is not of a hasty surrender, resulting from desire to be spared hardship. We are told that the siege lasted for 72 days under extremely harsh conditions, as the men

[478] For discussion of Pylos as intended by Thucydides to invite a direct comparison to Thermopylae, see Epps 1933, 14-6; Finley 1942, 197; Crane 1988, 231; Rood 1998, 37-9; Luginbill 1999, 86-8; Debnar 2001, 165; Foster 2012, 211.
[479] See Rood 1998, 36-7: "The Spartans' claim to have "the greatest reputation of the Greeks" imposes the need to maintain it".
[480] Foster 2012, 211. See also Finley 1942, 197 who says that Thucydides "dwelt amply" on the heroism of the Spartans on the island.

on the island were only provided with regular provisions for 20 days (4.39). Before the final battle they were given the opportunity to avoid the conflict and refused, despite being considerably outnumbered (4.30.4-4.31.1). The ensuing battle is described as lengthy, with Athenian light-armed troops surrounding the Spartan forces and wearing them out by attacking at distance with missiles, so that the Spartan hoplites could not engage with the enemy or make use of their skills (4.32-4). When they finally managed to retire to a position that prevented encirclement, Thucydides relates that they held off their attackers for most of the day, until finally – as at Thermopylae – they found themselves surrounded once more, when the Messenian commander led a force of light troops by a hidden path to a position above the Spartan force (4.35-6). Even then, Thucydides recounts that that the Spartan commanders did not agree to surrender until they had consulted with forces on the mainland. (4.38).

Rood argues that Thucydides presents the eventual surrender as an example of failure in Spartan leadership, since the surrender was given only after the deaths of two commanding officers and after the third-in-command's request for instructions from Spartan authorities received an ambiguous and unhelpful response.[481] The captured Spartans themselves are depicted as performing in accordance with their good reputation, for as long as was reasonably possible.[482] In view of this, the only real shortcoming exhibited by the captured Spartiates was their failure to live up to the expectation of Spartan men, established by the precedent set at Thermopylae: that they would fight to the

[481] Rood 1998, 36-7.
[482] Foster 2012, 210-1.

death rather than surrender. Thucydides' depiction of the Greeks' reaction to the Spartan surrender suggests that, regardless of the considerable bravery displayed by Spartans who found themselves in a different circumstance from those who fought at Thermopylae, it was the particular representation of bravery established by Thermopylae which fuelled the Spartan reputation for masculine courage. This incident shows the power of a particular ideology to influence perception, as it shows that the promulgated ideological requirements for Spartan courage were powerful enough to render the actualities of events meaningless when they did not conform to expectations set by the approved ideology.

After the capture, Thucydides recounts an exchange between an Athenian ally and one of the Spartan prisoners (4.40.2):

> Indeed, people could not believe that those who surrendered were the same sort as those who had died; and one of the Athenians' allies some time later asked one of the prisoners from the island, in order to vex him, if those of them who had died were the fine and brave men (καλοὶ κἀγαθοί). And he was answered that the spindle, meaning the arrow, would be worth much if it could discern the brave (ἀγαθοὺς); illustrating that those killed were those who happened to be hit by the stones and arrows.

This exchange, laden with gendered language and associations, depicts a discursive attempt to repair the perception of identity which had been damaged by performance. The response seeks to cast Spartan actions on the island as being in concord with the traditional ideology of Spartan masculine courage.[483] Thucydides not only has the Spartan assert that there is no difference in quality between those who surrendered on the island and those who died; he has him

[483] Crane 1988, 231-2 describes the Spartan's reply as an attempt to assimilate the defeat into Sparta's traditional values. See also Rood 1998, 38; Tritle 2010, 91.

take up the ideological track of his antagonist, flipping the script to suggest that it was his enemies' conduct which was unmanly.

He associates archery with femininity, employing the term "spindle" (ἄτρακτον) for arrow,[484] suggesting that, far from being able to discern which of the Spartan soldiers were brave, Athenian tactics rather demonstrated their own cowardice. The retort may have also been intended to reference the cowardice of the antagonising Athenian ally directly, since the peltasts and archers who accompanied Cleon to Pylos were provided by Athens' allies. The Spartan prisoner's rejoinder implies that the battle concerned was not one which tested the Spartans' traditional courage, or one in which such courage would have been of benefit.[485] Crane's astute explanation of the Spartan reply illuminates the discursive strategy Thucydides has the Spartan employ, which attempted to restore those who surrendered as the superiors of their enemies even in defeat, within the traditional hoplite ethos, via discourse: "the Spartans, it is implied, surrendered as much from disdain as from anything else. Unable to lay down their lives in the exchange of blows from one line of hoplites to another, the Spartans give up the entire contest."[486]

And yet, however pithy he made the Spartan's reply, Thucydides also indicates that such rationalising discourse alone would not be able to restore Sparta in the sphere of public opinion. Here too, the texts reflect the idea of discourse being weighed up against performativity, due to the strong parallels between

[484] Edmunds 1975, 102.
[485] Edmunds 1975, 103-8.
[486] Crane 1988, 233. See also Edmunds 1975, 102-4.

Thermopylae and Pylos – instances wherein the Spartans faced a comparable dilemma but made entirely different decisions. The prisoner's characteristically laconic retort attempted to explain a decision which was not in keeping with the perceived Spartan performative representation established by Thermopylae. But Thucydides makes it clear that it was this performative ideal by which Spartan actions were judged, and would continue to be, judged.

If the sentiment expressed by the Spartan prisoner is meant to reflect Spartan perceptions of the effect of the disaster on their identity and reputation, Thucydides represents it as largely unconvincing – even to the Spartans themselves. Thucydides depicts the disaster on the island as having significant effects internal to Sparta in a number of ways. The first is regarding Spartan attitudes towards the prisoners, when they were finally returned (5.34.2):

> As for those who had been captured on the island and had surrendered their arms, it was feared that these would think that they would be degraded because of their misfortune and make an attempt at revolution if they retained their citizen rights. So, they rendered them disenfranchised (ἀτίμους), although some held office at that time, and deprived them thus: so that they were no longer able to hold office or to buy or to sell anything. But after some time, they became enfranchised again.

While we are told that the disenfranchisement of the former prisoners was not the result of perceptions of their cowardice, the text indicates that this was nevertheless how their surrender was perceived. That the Spartans were so convinced that those on the island would assume that their actions would result in dishonour, to the point of anticipating possible negative outcomes of such assumptions and making pre-emptive efforts to curtail them, suggests that this was in fact the correct perception of the surrender. The assumption that the former prisoners would not believe that they would *not* be disgraced for their actions, suggests that Thucydides depicts the actions concerned as disgraceful

in the minds of both the former prisoners and their fellow citizens, regardless of what the response to them was.

Thucydides also indicates that the capture of the Spartans on the island was a significant contributing factor to collective Spartan loss of self-confidence at this stage in the war. He relates that the setbacks suffered by Sparta at Pylos and Cythera were among the significant events which caused the Spartans to lose all confidence in their abilities – to the point of believing that anything they attempted would end in failure (4.55.4). Debnar remarked that "[the Spartans] were extraordinarily brave, in part because they believed they were and because others believed the same".[487] Thucydides portrayal depicts Spartan self-belief as promoted by discourse which was, itself, informed by prior Spartan performance in hoplite warfare.[488] Set-backs in the Archidamian War suggested that the type of warfare which was deeply associated with the performative aspects of Spartan masculine self-identification was no longer effective. Thucydides' portrayal of the Spartan response to their failure to perform adequately in this arena is that of a crisis situation – not only in warfare but also in masculine identity which proved morally devastating for Sparta.[489]

[487] Debnar 2001, 166.
[488] Crane 1988 argues that Archidamus' conception of Spartan internal σωφροσύνη, which prevented Spartans from becoming distressed from setbacks, failed to appreciate the degree to which Spartan courage was intertwined with successful hoplite warfare.
[489] Finley 1942, 197 who argues that the situation was such that "it seemed to the Spartans that the very foundations of their state and army had crumbled and that a new society with which they could no longer cope was in the ascendant". See also Debnar 2001, 166-7.

Such ideas are contradicted by some, such as Epps and Luginbill, who view episodes highlighting Spartan hesitancy and pessimism as indicative that Thucydides intended to represent Sparta's national character as particularly fearful in nature.[490] However, these arguments for an innately fearful Spartan disposition are unsatisfactory. They fail to explain the origin of the supposed fearful Spartan character and are contradicted by ideas elsewhere in Thucydides which ascribe courage to the Spartans.[491] Hodkinson proposes that periods of Spartan inertia and self-doubt, frequently observable in Thucydides, resulted primarily from external factors; such as instances when Spartans were unfamiliar circumstances, or when events or divine portents did not seem to affirm the correctness of Spartan decision-making. He suggests that this habitual loss of confidence stemmed – in part – from aspects of the Spartiate way of life, such as clearly defined expectations and constant supervision and evaluation. He suggests that these aspects contributed in forming a Spartan character which required constant validation from external forces.[492]

I would suggest that a similar pattern is observable in the relationship between Spartan performative representation and self-confidence. Rather than indicating the presence of innate qualities (such as fearfulness) in Spartan nature, Thucydides' presentation of the breakdown in Spartan self-identification following the events which transpired at Pylos and Sphacteria (manifested in their subsequent complete lack of self-confidence) instead suggests that Thucydides represents Spartan masculine self-image as

[490] Epps 1933; Luginbill 1999, esp. 88-91, 105-6.
[491] E.g. Crane 1988, 234.
[492] Hodkinson 1983, 265-76.

outwardly socially-constructed rather than innate – thus requiring continual supporting performative action on the part of Spartan men to maintain ideological potency. Thus, in the fallout from Sphacteria, Thucydides presents ideological representation and performativity as vitally linked: when the ideologically-promoted form of Spartan masculine representation was challenged by the failure of Spartan men to perform in a way that corroborated discourse, the ideology is depicted as severely damaged, which then contributed to rendering the Spartans insecure to the point of being almost completely incapacitated.

A number of scholars have noted that Thucydides takes care to highlight the contrast between what people say in the speeches and what they are shown to do in the narrative, and believe this contrast between words and deeds to be a major Thucydidean theme.[493] Thucydides' narrative has been seen to suggest that performance held the greater sway over perception than did discourse.[494] This idea is contradicted by Lebow, who asserts that Thucydides gave "pride of place" to *logoi*.[495] I agree with Lebow that social conventions, often established primarily by discourse, create "the intersubjective understandings on which all action depends". However, I would argue that, although discourse may create such understandings, Thucydides' narrative directs the reader to the understanding that without complementary action the power of discourse falls apart.

[493] Hunt 1998, 130; Ober 1998; Lebow 2001, 547-9, 554, 558.
[494] This also fits into Thucydides' theme of words and deeds discussed by Ober 1998, who argues that, of the two, Thucydides prioritised deeds.
[495] Lebow 2001, 554.

The relationship between discourse and performativity required to maintain Spartan masculine ideals of excellence in battle fits this pattern. Therefore, although Thucydides depicts the ideals of Spartan masculine excellence which shaped perceptions of Spartan men throughout the *History* as constructed primarily via discourse (such as in the various speeches made by Spartans and others), the efforts of discourse alone are shown to be insufficient to maintain the ideological force of the images they create – as is reflected in limited effectiveness of the Spartan prisoner's attempts to shore up perceptions of Spartan masculine by means of discourse alone. Moreover, when the Spartans finally do regain their self-confidence and their reputation in the eyes of their fellow Greeks, Thucydides portrays this as a feat accomplished via performative action rather than discourse.[496] Thucydides recounts that it was not until Sparta's impressive showing at the battle of Mantinea that the perception of Spartan cowardice, engendered by the surrender at Sphacteria, were rectified (5.75.3). That Thucydides portrays this one instance of preeminent performance as entirely sufficient to restore Spartan reputation and self-worth – despite the Spartans having suffered a series of misfortunes and utter loss of confidence – makes Mantinea a notable illustration of the power of performative action. Therefore, the relationship between discourse and performativity, as it relates to masculine identity in the fallout of the Pylos/Sphacteria episode, can be seen to conform to Thucydides' larger pattern of presentation of the interconnectedness of words and deeds.

[496] See Edmunds 1975, 101; Cartwright 1997, 208, on 5.28; Crane 1988, 233-4.

3.5. Thucydides' Overall Presentation of Spartan Masculinity

Scholars have debated precisely what sort of history Thucydides was, in fact, writing;[497] but it is generally agreed that he was not particularly concerned with social history and cultural history.[498] Rather, his focus in chronicling the events of the Peloponnesian War reflects primarily political and military concerns. Those who have examined Thucydides' account have viewed it as focusing primarily on power politics,[499] which makes the *polis* the primary unit for evaluation[500] and renders citizen men virtually the only relevant players in the narrative.[501] By the same token, Thucydides is believed to downplay or ignore the influence of the household,[502] prioritise the *polis* over family politics,[503] and avoid mention of non-citizen males (slaves, women, children, etc.) wherever possible.[504] Some of this has been thought to reflect prominent Athenian attitudes of the day,[505] but Crane asserts that Thucydides' inclusions and exclusions primarily reflect his own predilections, as his exclusion of women, children, and the domestic realm far surpasses that of his contemporaries.[506] This makes examination of Thucydides' constructions of masculinity challenging, as ideas associated with Spartan masculinity in his

---

[497] For a list of major treatments of Thucydides as a scientific, modern, or postmodern historian see Desmond 2006, 359 n. 2. Other views have seen Thucydides as a constructivist (e.g. Lebow 2001), a writer concerned with creating psychological portraits of the character traits of different city states (e.g. Bradford 1994, 68-70), or comparable to a modern journalist in the style in which he relates events (e.g. Badian 1993, 127).
[498] E.g. Crane 1996, 77.
[499] Desmond 2006, 374.
[500] Crane 1996, 109-11. See also Morrison 2006, 109, who highlights that early in the *History*, Thucydides places primary focus on action and speech performed by cities as political units rather than actions and speech of individuals.
[501] Hunt 1998, 141-2.
[502] Crane 1996, 77, 83-5.
[503] Crane 1996, 109-11.
[504] Crane 1996 92; Hunt 1998, 2, 54-6, 142; Crane 1996, 92.
[505] Crane 1996 83, 92, 95, 100, 109; Hunt 1998, 54-6, 121-35.
[506] Crane 1996, 75-7, 83-5, 92, 94-5, 100, 109-11.

work reflect this *polis*-level view. Spheres of gender construction concerned with the shaping of individuals' masculine identity, and defining those masculine subjects' interpersonal relations, are mostly absent from Thucydides' account. The categories of gender construction to which Thucydides gives attention are areas which correspond to his focus on the *polis* as the central societal unit, and which can be shown to be ideologically useful to further political goals and to play a role in the exchange of power on an inter-*polis* level.

As discussed earlier,[507] constructionists believe that individual societies create and promote idealised expressions of masculinity unique to themselves, so that nations can be seen as embodying particular national representations of masculinity. In a similar vein, Thucydides depicts, by means of discourse and representation, certain expressions of masculinity characteristic of particular *poleis*. These expressions are elements of the larger "national" characters (that is those character traits associated with different *poleis*) which he imposes upon the major players of his narrative. These are often implicit within discourse, rather than being primary or overt foci. The masculine expression of individual men is not represented by Thucydides as something which is to be evaluated within its own right. Rather, individuals' masculine expression is generally presented in relation to their *polis*' "type" and their conduct is judged by its adherence to or deviation from particular aspects of their type.[508] Even men who do receive considerable individual treatment in the *History*, such as

[507] See pp. 16-17.
[508] Wassermann 1953, 193; Westlake 1968, 122, 136, 148-50; Edmunds 1975, 89-90; Roisman, 1987a 418-9.

Archidamus, Pericles, and Brasidas, reflect a primary concern with *polis* character, since these are all presented as being in some way archetypal of their *polis*.[509] Thus, relations between men and hegemonic masculinity in Thucydides are not represented primarily in relations between individual men, but in the relations of national masculine entities. Thucydides' *polis*-centred approach treats the city as a collective political unit in terms of speech and action.[510] Characterised in this way, cities are, in part, collective embodiments of masculine subjectivities, the relations of whose characteristic masculinities are shown to play a role in inter-*polis* politics. Thus, the political utility of masculine ideology is the aspect which dominates Thucydides' depictions of Spartan masculinity.

Summary

The categories of discourse, representation and performativity, and relations between men and hegemonic masculinity were found to be the most fruitful areas of investigation when examining Thucydides. Several interesting findings emerged in each category.

Discourse:

A number of speeches, presented by both Spartan and non-Spartan speakers in Thucydides' *History*, represent the "Spartan man" as a collective ideological type. These speeches develop and employ competing ideals of masculine excellence in their rhetoric, which factor into the differing images of Spartan

[509] See eg. Edmunds 1975, 89-90; Pouncey 1980, 58; Bradford 1994, 68-9; Hunter 1988, esp. 25-6.
[510] Morrison 2006, 109.

character that emerge in the text. Thucydides represents different speakers, for different political purposes, manipulating their audiences' understanding of what ideals do and should comprise Spartan masculine excellence. These ideas are highlighted in the differences between the depictions of Spartan character expressed in the speeches of Archidamus, Sthenelaidas, Pericles, and the Corinthian envoys discussed above. These speeches develop qualities which they portray as characteristic of Sparta (such as hesitancy, preparedness, caution, conservatism, etc.). However, each seeks to redefine these characteristics in accordance with speakers' aims. Of particular interest is the concept of Spartan σωφροσύνη. This concept is manipulated, explicitly or implicitly, by all the abovementioned speakers. It is undermined in the Corinthian speech by the (perceived) implication that σωφροσύνη is merely a mask for Spartan ἀνανδρία. This insinuation is countered in Archidamus' speech, which reaffirms σωφροσύνη as a source of Spartan strength. Sthenelaidas' speech confirms the value of σωφροσύνη, but redefines its meaning to promote undertaking action to uphold Spartan honour. And Pericles plays upon the understanding of σωφροσύνη, developed in Archidamus' speech, to illustrate the fragility and artificiality of Spartan masculine excellence. This is illuminating, as it suggests that the prevailing characterisation of "the Spartan man" in the *History* (that conveyed by the Corinthians) is represented as politically charged, and contingent on the historical and political context in which it was articulated.

Discourse concerning ideas of masculine excellence is also evident in efforts to create cohesive identity between Spartans and non-Spartan allies. This is

evident in Brasidas' construction of a common masculine ethos for an army comprising men of disparate ethnographic and ideological backgrounds. Brasidas' rhetorical ploy employed the conceptual Spartan man as archetypal ideal, and focused on the qualities of willingness, shame, and obedience (portrayed as characteristically Spartan) as the defining features for inclusion.

Finally, employment of masculine ideals is also reflected in discourse relating to reputation (an area in which discourse overlaps with representation and performativity). Many of the abovementioned speeches appeal to Spartan masculine reputation to incentivise the desired response. Additionally, masculine discourse within the *History* is not only represented within set-speeches. And the reply made by a Spartan prisoner to an Athenian ally's attack on his personal honour, employed a gendered discourse (which affirmed the masculine excellence of Spartan hoplites and condemned the effeminate tactics of light-armed troops) in an attempt to shore up Spartan reputation, damaged in the aftermath of Pylos.

Representation and performativity:

Closely related to the category of discourse in the text is that of representation and performativity. In Thucydides' depiction of the masculine discourse employed by Spartiates for the purposes of self-identification, the text indicates that discursive constructions of the Spartan masculine ideal required confirming performative representation to maintain its ideological efficacy. For instance, the cohesion-building ethos, constructed in Brasidas' speeches to his army, asserts that inclusion in the ideal masculine collective is accessible via

individuals' performance in battle – even for those whose inalienable characteristics (such as the helots) should exclude them. The necessity of performative action to confirm discursive masculine ideals is also reflected in the damage suffered to Spartan morale and reputation when their citizens' performance at Pylos failed to meet the standards created by Spartan discursive identity. Moreover, attempts to restore damaged reputation via discourse alone are represented as ineffective – as can be seen in the case of the Spartan prisoner – and reputation is represented as ultimately upheld via performance, illustrated by the response to Spartan success at Mantinea, which saw Spartan masculine reputation fully restored.

Additionally, the category of representation and performativity is represented as playing a role in the stratification of men within Spartan society. The episode of the helot massacre represents the qualities of wilfulness and an elevated sense of self-worth as unacceptable, to the Spartan mind-set, for men of helot-status and depicted the employment of performative demonstration to remedy the problematic ideological stance of certain subaltern men (which creates overlap with the category of relations between men and hegemonic masculinity).

Relations between men and hegemonic masculinity:

The category of relations between men and hegemonic masculinity, as it relates to both the interaction between *poleis*, within the history, and Thucydides' representation of individual men as adhering to, or deviating

from, their *polis*' characteristic "type" of man, has been discussed above.[511] However, this category was evident elsewhere as well. For instance, the speeches of Archidamus and Sthenelaidas manipulate ideals of age-based relations between men in the service of their respective aims. Hegemonic masculine ideology is also reflected in motivations provided by Brasidas' cohesion-building rhetoric. This can be seen in Brasidas' creation of a masculine ideal and incentivisation of his troops through the assertion that they all – even the most marginalised, such as the helot contingent – could ideologically benefit by emulation of the ideal's associated qualities.

[511] See p. 247.

4. Xenophon's Historical Writing

This chapter will explore Xenophon's historical writing; focussing primarily on the *Hellenica*, with examples drawn from *Anabasis* and *Agesilaus* where appropriate. Admittedly, the *Agesilaus*, as an encomiastic work, presents a deliberately slanted portrayal of events. However, historical works with overtly moralising features can be particularly useful to discussion of identities such as masculinity, as they highlight ideological concerns more overtly than do works wherein ideology is more implicit. As with Thucydides' *History*, constructions of masculinity are most readily observable within certain episodes wherein they function in noteworthy ways. Therefore, analysis in this chapter will examine Spartan masculinity episodically. But unlike the collective focus observed in Thucydides' work, Spartan masculine ideology is most observable on the individual level; that is, in Xenophon's characterisation of particular Spartan men and the impact individuals' characters have on the situations with which they are involved. Individuals' characters are depicted as resonating with collective masculine ideals (particularly, they can be seen to bear relation to ideals Xenophon depicts in the *Lac*.). But, overall, Xenophon's historical works are much more individualistic in their portrayals of Spartan masculinity; and masculine expression varies significantly between the various Spartan individuals presented in the work. This chapter will comprise three main sections: the trial of Sphodrias; three episodes associating problematic same-sex relations with other failings; and the conspiracy of Cinadon.

4.1. The Trial of Sphodrias

At *Hellenica* 5.4.20-33 Xenophon narrates that, fearing the possibility that they would have to fight the Spartans alone, the Thebans manipulated the Spartan harmost Sphodrias into invading Attica, in order to turn Athens against Sparta. Sphodrias' subsequent unauthorised attempt to capture the Piraeus was a spectacular failure. This left the Athenians calling for his blood, and Spartan ambassadors in Athens promising that it would be provided. However, Xenophon recounts that Sphodrias appealed to his son Cleonymus to advocate on his behalf to the boy's *erastes* Archidamus – who happened to be the son of the Spartan king Agesilaus. Archidamus, moved by his beloved's appeal agreed to approach Agesilaus on behalf of Sphodrias. While Xenophon asserts that Agesilaus was initially unreceptive to his son's efforts, Archidamus' intercession was nevertheless shown to set in to motion circumstances which resulted in Sphodrias' shocking acquittal at trial, despite his obvious guilt. Cleonymus responded to Archidamus' assistance with gratitude, vowing to never give him cause for shame in their friendship – a vow which Xenophon proclaims Cleonymus proved by dying heroically at Leuctra, fighting in defence of the king.

This episode showcases several categories of masculine construction: attitudes towards sex, relations between men and hegemonic masculinity, institutions, competition, and discourse. These are displayed in two aspects of the narrative: (1) Xenophon's portrayal of the pederastic relationship, which involves attitudes towards sex, relations between men and hegemonic masculinity, and institutions; and (2) the tactics Xenophon has Agesilaus employ to justify in

his endorsement of Sphodrias' acquittal, which involves competition and discourse. The pederastic relationship between Cleonymus and Archidamus, the sons of Sphodrias and Agesilaus respectively, is represented as playing a significant role in the process by which Agesilaus came to support Sphodrias' acquittal (5.4. 24-33). Once so disposed, Agesilaus employed discourse concerning Sphodrias' excellence within the ethos of competitive masculine achievement as the basis of his endorsement for acquittal.

In what follows, I will first examine the two aspects of the episode individually. In so doing, I will explore what messages Xenophon may have intended to convey about Spartan masculinity, as well as the ways and effect to which masculine ideology was employed within the context of the episode. Then, I will explore the relation of such masculine ideology to the characterisation of individuals in the wider context of Xenophon's characterisation of Spartan men throughout his historical works.

4.1.1. The Pederastic Relationship

In this episode, the categories of attitudes towards sex, relations between men and hegemonic masculinity, and institutions, overlap in Xenophon's depiction of a Spartan pederastic relationship; as Xenophon's treatment deals with attitudes towards Spartan pederasty, the ideals associated with pederastic relationships, and the interaction of such relationships with other competing claims and duties. The relationship between Cleonymus and Archidamus is the most prominent example of a pederastic relationship in the *Hellenica* and, indeed, the most detailed example of an official Spartan pederastic relationship

available to us.[512] The task of interpreting Xenophon's portrayal of this relationship is complex, as it seems to enshrine the positive aims and outcomes of Spartan pederasty, even as it is portrayed as a contributing factor in a decision which was not only unjust, but which had significant negative political ramifications for Sparta. How then are we to interpret a relationship presented with such ambivalence? In what follows, I intend to suggest that Xenophon presents the reader with a two-fold understanding.

First, is a view of the relationship from the societal perspective, within the context of the episode itself; where the admirable aspects ultimately serve to outweigh the negative context, vindicating the relationship. This view suggests that the masculine ideals, enshrined by the relationship, are represented as being of sufficient consequence in the collective Spartan mindset to justify the questionable conduct of its members.

Second is the authorial view, which does not deny the positive aspects – and is partially sympathetic to their redeeming qualities – but nonetheless suggests that the value given to pederastic ideals is problematic. The problematic elements are portrayed as reflecting on the relationship itself, as well as the societal value given to the ideology that enshrines it.

[512] Interestingly, the relationship between Lysander and Agesilaus, labeled as pederastic by Plutarch (*Ages*. 2, *Lys*. 22.3), is not presented in this light by Xenophon. And indeed, Xenophon's account of Agesilaus' succession (3.3.1-4) tends to minimise Lysander's significance in events, compared to Plutarch's treatment (*Ages*. 3, *Lys*. 22.3-6).

Despite making no secret about the disgust many (likely including Xenophon himself)[513] felt at the outcome of the trial (5.4.24) and emphasising the role of the pederastic relationship in bringing that outcome about, Xenophon opens the episode by portraying this relationship as seemingly ideal. Its depiction within the narrative attests its honourable nature: Xenophon introduces Cleonymus as "both the fairest (κάλλιστός) and the most esteemed (εὐδοκιμώτατος) of his generation (ἡλίκων)" (5.4.25). He frames Archidamus' love for Cleonymus within the context of those qualities, suggesting that Archidamus chose Cleonymus for noble reasons, and perhaps that the relationship was also instrumental in cultivating these qualities. Their association was conducted openly, in public locations such as the *syssition* (5.4.28), indicating no fear of societal condemnation. On the contrary, Xenophon's revelation that Sphodrias' supporters were concerned when Archidamus' *stopped* visiting Cleonymus for a time (5.4.29), rather suggests public approval of the union. Xenophon's account of the grief Cleonymus' death caused Archidamus (5.4.33) attests to longevity of their intimacy. These factors all suggest that the relationship is presented as an example of the ideologically approved form of Spartan pederasty outlined in the *Lac*.[514]

Adding to the positive interpretation are elements of the framing. The Herodotean, story-telling, quality of the episode has been noted,[515] as have a number of features which mark it out as belonging to the tradition of *paidikos logos* of which Xenophon, as well as the general Spartan populace, were

[513] Tuplin 1993, 126; Humble 1997, 147-8; Parker 2007, 23.
[514] Hindley 1999a, 80; Hodkinson 2007, 58; Gray 2007, 156 on [Xen. *Lac.*] 2.12-14. See p. 69 for discussion of ideal pederasty in the *Lac*.
[515] Dillery 1995, 233-4.

fond.[516] This manner of framing signals the reader to expect the story to impart a moral lesson.[517] After the initial negative association (that the story that would follow resulted in "the most unjust judgement ever determined at Sparta"), the "story" portion of the episode is framed in such a way as to downplay the actualities of the political situation. The narrative instead stresses ideological considerations over those of politics or justice. The episode highlights positive relations between men, in the form of honourable conduct in personal relationships as well as the strength of bonds in Cleonymus' relationships with his father and *erastes* alike.[518] Cleonymus' request to Archidamus, on behalf of his father, has been seen to portray Cleonymus' filial devotion, signifying closeness between father and son.[519] Such emphasis serves to somewhat downplay the injustice of his request, and any untoward usage Cleonymous made of his pederastic connection. Rather, Xenophon places focus on the youth's willingness to risk his own preeminent reputation for his father's sake.[520] The interaction between Archidamus and Cleonymus, likewise, indicates both their intimate bond and Archidamus' high-minded concern for his *eromenos*.[521] Despite what Athenian readers may have thought of such associations,[522] Xenophon asserts that this kind of relationship was highly valued in Sparta, and viewed as integral to the formation of Spartiate men. Thus, Archidamus' efforts to convince his father are presented as enacted out of concern for the type of relationship which Xenophon asserts in the *Lac.*

---

[516] Gray 1989, 62-3.
[517] Gray, 1989 61-2.
[518] Dillery 1995, 233-4.
[519] Hodkinson 2007, 59.
[520] See p. 267 for discussion of the possible implications of Cleonymus' behaviour, in this episode, may have had on his future prospects.
[521] Hodkinson 2007, 57-8.
[522] See p. 261.

(2.13) was considered the "highest form of education" in Sparta. The episode also closes with emphasis on the nobility of the bond, framed in relation to masculine excellence: Cleonymus is depicted as bringing masculine honour not only to himself, but also to his *erastes*, via ideal performance. The relationship, shown to be motivated by mutual regard and respect, is now represented as inspiring the noblest *philia* in Cleonymus. This *philia* was expressed in Cleonymus' heroic death, fighting to the utmost so that Archidamus would never have cause to feel shame over their friendship (5.4.25-27, 33).[523] Thus, on one level, the masculine ideology of the pederastic relationship may be seen to mitigate any potential blame, placed upon its members, for its role in a decision with negative political consequences. By framing Archidamus' intercession on behalf of Sphodrias as intrinsically entwined with honourable concern for his beloved, a morally upright interpretation is made possible for these actions – even though they are presented as leading to an ultimately amoral outcome. This emphasis on the "love-story" angle of events may also have partially circumvented moral condemnation of Spartan actions as a whole in this trial: rather than revealing merely Spartan lack of concern for injustice, framed in this way, the decision to acquit instead demonstrated Spartan commitment to clashing – yet ultimately honourable – ideological concerns.

The depiction of Cleonymus' ongoing excellence may have outweighed any impropriety for which he was guilty, in the minds of some, with his heroic death ultimately vindicating the pederastic relationship – despite its negative

[523] Dover 1987, 202-3; Gray 1989, 61-2; Hodkinson 2007, 58, 61-2.

associations.[524] However, Xenophon's presentation suggests that, while such a view may have been held by those internal to the narrative, the reader was not meant to take such a straightforward interpretation. Despite its apparent respectability, the episode also envelops the relationship with an air of infamy. Mitigating factors of the narrative do not allow the reader to forget the reason why the relationship makes its appearance: the determinative role it played in "the most unjust judgement ever determined at Sparta" (5.4.24). Undoubtedly, Archidamus' appeal to Agesilaus was not the only factor which led to the latter's endorsement of Sphodrias' acquittal.[525] Indeed, Xenophon has Agesilaus explicitly avow that this was *not* the cause of his decision (5.4.28-32).[526] Hodkinson has noted that the apparent closeness between Cleonymus and his father emphasises the lack of similar feeling in the depiction of Archidamus and Agesilaus' relationship.[527] Beyond his initial reluctance to approach Agesilaus (5.4.28-30), when Archidamus finally makes his appeal it is not warmly received. The first time Archidamus raises Cleonymus' request to his father, it is flatly denied (5.4.30). And Agesilaus' assurance that he did not blame Archidamus for making an appeal on Cleonymus' behalf does – in fact – carry a note of implied censure; since Agesilaus asserts that he could not grant such a request without incurring censure himself. With his second approach (5.4.31), Xenophon has Archidamus change his tactic to echo that employed by Sphodrias and Cleonymus, asking his father to pardon Sphodrias – despite his wrongdoing – "for our sakes" (ἡμῶν ἕνεκεν). However, Agesilaus is not swayed by his approach. Rather, he responds that he would endorse an

[524] Powell 2001, 221; Hodkinson 2007, 58; Gray 2007, 156 on [Xen. *Lac.*] 2.12-14.
[525] Tuplin 1993, 127. See p. 274 for further discussion.
[526] See also Cartledge 1987, 136, 2003, 224.
[527] Hodkinson 2007, 59-60.

acquittal “if it could be honourable for us” (οὐκοῦν ἂν μέλλῃ καλὰ ταῦθ᾽ ἡμῖν εἶναι, οὕτως ἔσται). Through this response Xenophon suggests lack a of parental motivation informing Agesilaus’ actions, and indicates a very different interpretation of the correct course of action, giving the reader a suggestion of the potentially negative implications of filial devotion.

Regardless of the motivations Xenophon ascribes to Agesilaus, he nevertheless crafts the content and momentum of the narrative in such a way as to render the episode dominated by the pederastic relationship. Xenophon suggests that, before discussing the matter with his son, Agesilaus did not see any grounds on which he could justifiably acquit (5.4.30). Archidamus’ intervention is thus depicted as instrumental in the process whereby Agesilaus found that justification. By presenting Archidamus as the sole outside contributor to the progression of Agesilaus’ decision-making, Xenophon – by extension – portrays the relationship which motivated Archidamus’ involvement as significant as well. The pederastic relationship also made a substantial contribution to the tone and atmosphere of the episode, indicating to the reader how the relationship ought to be viewed. Tuplin asserts that Xenophon’s decision to situate his account of Archidamus’ and Cleonymus’ affiliation specifically within the context of the Sphodrias episode was a deliberate attempt to tinge the content of the entire incident with undertones of its homosexual element. He suggests that this is tuned to Athenian readers’ sensibilities. The sense of outrage inspired by the decision is heightened by pandering to Athenian distaste towards their perceptions of Spartan same-sex

relationships.[528] If Xenophon did structure the episode this way, it suggests understanding and manipulation of his audience's assumptions regarding Spartan pederastic relationships in order to guide readers to the desired interpretation of both the relationship and the events with which it was enmeshed.

There are additional aspects of the pederastic relationship's presentation which flag its problematic elements. Consider the relationship's members. The ambivalent element of the portrayal of the relationship (and its associated masculine values) comes especially into focus when one examines the depiction of Cleonymus more carefully. There has been a tendency to focus primarily on depictions of Archidamus and Agesilaus in this episode. This is reasonable, as these are the characters around whom most of the action revolves. This focus garners a predominantly positive interpretation of the relationship and its associated values. As a result, it is possible that the reader may miss signposts in the text which point to negative elements inherent in the relationship and its members. Gray has aptly illustrated the tragic dilemma which Archidamus is portrayed as facing. Caught between competing value systems, he is depicted as compelled to choose between the mandates of justice or loyalty to his *eromenos*.[529] The internal struggle Archidamus faced in approaching his father, and his persistence despite initial rebuff, garner sympathy for his stance by demonstrating that his struggle was real and his commitment to helping Cleonymous was no easy matter. Furthermore, Gray

[528] Tuplin 1993, 127.
[529] Gray 1989, 59-62.

asserts that the portrayal of Archidamus' ingrained reticence paints him as the shining paradigm of Spartan youth: an ideal product of the Lycurgan system, whose innate deference and respect are overcome only with difficulty – and for the noble cause of *philia*.[530] This focus gives the reader the impression of a respectable relationship between noble young men, which was tragically used by others for ignoble ends.

However, Archidamus comprises only one half of the relationship. To see the complete picture, Cleonymus must be subjected to similar scrutiny. He is introduced, as Gray puts it, "in a burst of light".[531] This seeming brilliance has led many to take this initial description at face value, apparently blinding them to the disparity between how Cleonymus is perceived and how he behaves. Furthermore, Cleonymus' portrayal contains parallels to the description of Sphodrias (which is less than flattering), perhaps suggesting that father and son were cut from the same cloth. Xenophon recounts that Sphodrias' claim to fame was founded in his performance as a *pais*, *paidiskos*, and *hebon* (ὅστις μέντοι παῖς τε ὢν καὶ παιδίσκος καὶ ἡβῶν πάντα τὰ καλὰ ποιῶν διετέλεσε [5.4.32]). Cleonymus is presented likewise. In the description which establishes Cleonymus' reputation, Xenophon states that he was, "the age just out of the *paides*" (5.4.25). This suggests that, at the time of the episode, his excellence was established via performance in the first grade of Spartan education. The assertion that he was the most preeminent specimen of his current age-group attests his on-going excellence as a *paidiskos*. And the

[530] Gray 1989, 61.
[531] Gray 1989, 59.

descriptions of his death (5.4.33, 6.4.14) attest to his eventual distinction as a *hebon*. Like Cleonymus, later in the narrative, we learn that Sphodrias also gained a reputation for excellence based on performance throughout his upbringing (5.4.32), indicating that Cleonymus' excellence was akin to his father's. The description at 6.4.14, in particular, invites the reader to compare Sphodrias and Cleonymus, as it narrates their deaths in tandem. However, such similarity leads one to speculate whether father and son were also alike in their shortcomings. It is significant that when Cleonymus is introduced, his positive description focuses entirely on how he *appears* to other Spartans: he is fair and of good repute (5.4.25). Xenophon's focus on perceived excellence suggests that, as with his father, an excellent reputation did not guarantee excellent conduct. Such speculation is confirmed by the episode's events, as Cleonymus' behaviour does not bear his reputation out – especially when it is analysed in comparison to the conduct of Archidamus. If one accepts Gray's interpretation of Archidamus in this episode, it follows that Xenophon invites the reader to view Cleonymus through the same lens. Cleonymus' dilemma was akin to that of Archidamus. He too faced a decision between honouring filial bonds or serving the best interests of Sparta – and of justice itself.

If we can have sympathy for Archidamus choosing wrongly, because we can see him struggle to do right, we are *not* compelled to similar feeling for Cleonymus. Far from struggling between mutually exclusive ideals, Xenophon depicts Cleonymus as responding to his father's appeal, seemingly without a second thought, and with only as enough delay to work up his nerve – a

process which was extremely brief in comparison to what Xenophon portrays Archidamus going through to approach Agesilaus (5.4.26):

> Therefore, Sphodrias said to Cleonymus, "It is possible for you, son, to save your father, by begging Archidamus to make Agesilaus well-disposed towards me at trial." And, hearing this, he emboldened himself to approach Archidamus and begged him to become his father's saviour for his sake.

Furthermore, if Archidamus garners sympathy by embodying the noble Spartan youth, how much more should the same standard (if not greater) of behaviour be expected of Cleonymus? Recall that Archidamus is depicted, not as an adolescent, but as an established young man with a place in a *syssition* (5.4.28) who is the senior member of a pederastic relationship. It is Cleonymus whom Xenophon describes as being of "the age just out of the *paides*" (making him a *paidiskos*) at the time of the episode. Thus, it is from him that the standard of reticence, exhibited by Archidamus, should rightly be expected.[532] Yet there is no suggestion of any such reticence in Xenophon's depiction. The setting and manner of Cleonymus' plea for Archidamus' aid are easy to overlook, as these aspects are eclipsed by the emotionality of Cleonymus' distress, and Archidamus' noble concern for his beloved. However, as Hodkinson rightly points out, these factors have significant implications for the portrayal of Cleonymus, inasmuch as they place him in violation of the code of acceptable behaviour for Spartan *paidiskoi*.[533] To take advantage of his connection with Archidamus, Cleonymus acted more brazenly than Xenophon elsewhere claims would have ever been acceptable for a youth of his age. The public spectacle created by Cleonymus' petition flies in the face of Xenophon's account of approved public behaviour for *paidiskoi* in the *Lac*.:

---

[532] Indeed, if we are to judge by the Xenophon's depiction of the character of *hebontes* at *Lac*. 4, we might have expected more boldness to be displayed by Archidamus.
[533] Hodkinson 2007, 57.

such extreme modesty that one would be greatly pressed to convince a boy to utter a sound, even in response to a direct question (3.4-5). Moreover, Hodkinson emphasises that making such a public appeal, violating expected behaviours, in the context of Archidamus' *syssition* (which Cleonymus may have hoped to become a member of himself),[534] was no insignificant thing – but could have had a negative impact on Cleonymus' future prospects, and acceptance into the world of adult males. The precarious position in which Cleonymus' behaviour may have put him may even be indicated by the reactions of other Spartans in the episode. Xenophon recounts at 5.4.29 that when Sphodrias' supporters saw that Archidamus no longer visited Cleonymus they were anxious because they thought Archidamus had been rebuked by his father. This portrayal undoubtedly indicates concern regarding Sphodrias' fate; but Xenophon may also suggest anxiety over what this turn of events could mean for Cleonymus' prospects, since the youth had seemingly been abandoned by his prominent and formerly attentive *erastes*.

The above discussion has sought to demonstrate that, in this episode, Xenophon portrays Cleonymus' behaviour as not in keeping with the expectations the Spartan system set upon him. When held up to the standard set by Archidamus – who more rightly displayed a mode of behaviour fitting for a Spartan youth – Cleonymus' failure to demonstrate a similar standard of deportment magnifies the sense of his impropriety. But Cleonymus' impropriety can not be seen to reflect on himself alone. Rather, it reflects also

[534] For discussions of the possibility that boys were introduced to prospective *syssitia* by their *erastai*, see Hodkinson 1983, 252-3; Ducat 2006, 93-4, 164; Link 2009, 98.

on Archidamus, as well as the relationship they share, by virtue of institutional nature of Spartan pederasty, outlined in the *Lac*. (2.13). As the pederastic relationship and meant to be educative, Cleonymus' failure to emulate the ideals embodied by his *erastes* must be seen – on some level – as a failure in educative efficacy, evident in this most emblematic of pederastic relationships. However much Archidamus may be seen to embody Spartan ideals, in his petition to his father, the episode suggests that he has apparently failed to inspire the same standard of behaviour in his *eromenos*. Furthermore, Archidamus' response to Cleonymus can be viewed as an even more active failure, in his role as *erastes*. Archidamus, observing the impropriety of the request – both in nature and manner – might have responded in a corrective manner, as Agesilaus did upon Archidamus' first approach. However, rather than immediately correcting his *eromenos*' failings (halting the perversion of justice in the process), Xenophon depicts Archidamus as instead becoming complicit to Cleonymus' aims. Therefore, if decorous behaviour and concern for justice were ideals meant to be transmitted through pederastic relationships, this relationship is portrayed as failing. And, however shocking Cleonymus' behaviour may have been, he was still a mere adolescent in need of proper instruction.[535] Therefore, it is likely that Xenophon did not intend the true censure to fall on Cleonymus himself, but rather on the system of values which not only failed to correct his unthinking preference for concerns of family over other considerations, but which he also depicts reinforcing these incorrect priorities.

[535] Plutarch (*Lyc.* 18.4) attests that *erastai* were considered to be culpable for failings in their beloved's conduct.

However, despite its failings, the relationship was nevertheless represented as successful in some respects. Its primary arena of success is within the ethos of competitive masculine achievement. As mentioned, the excellence of Archidamus' and Cleonymus' pairing appears tied to this ideology. Archidamus' love is introduced in the same breath that tells of Cleonymus' supreme reputation. Their *philia* is represented as further nurturing Cleonymus' excellent qualities, culminating in his noble death at Leuctra. Thus, the educative nature of the relationship, expressed by this episode, can primarily be seen this particular area of life. I suggest that, both via its successes and failures, the pederastic relationship is shown to be problematic, as it suggests that the private elements of Spartan pederastic relationships, characterised by concerns of individual excellence and *philia*, dominated over the publicly-endorsed elements, concerned with societal well-being and justice. Thus, the role of the pederastic relationship in this episode calls into question the prominent place given to the ideology of masculine achievement within the hierarchy of values, as its primacy allows its manipulation to mitigate the mandates of justice.[536]

4.1.2. Agesilaus' Tactics

When Archidamus first entreats his father to pardon Sphodrias, Agesilaus responds, "but I do not see how I could, myself, obtain pardon from the *polis* if I do not judge unjust a man who has done harm to the *polis* for the sake of

[536] Dillery 1995, 234 argues that the juxtaposition of Cleonymus at Leuctra with the acquittal of his father emphasises the point that ideological bonds of friendship prevail while the city is ruined.

money" (5.4.30). This response references two sets of ideological criteria by which Sphodrias' actions could be evaluated. Firstly, he could be judged by the universal mandates of justice, which would find him undeniably guilty. Xenophon conveys several pieces of information which inform this interpretation. He states that Sphodrias' actions were thought egregious by Spartans and Athenians alike (5.4.22-3). He also represents Sphodrias' behaviour as motivated predominantly by selfish concerns of material wealth and personal reputation. Both factors can be seen at 5.4.20, by insinuations that bribery may have factored into his invasion: "They [the Thebans] persuaded Sphodrias, the harmost of Thespiae, by giving him money as it is suspected, to invade Attica"; and by relaying Sphodrias' boasting: "And that man, persuaded by them, alleged that he would capture the Piraeus, as it was without walls. And he led out his soldiers from Thespiae, after dining, asserting that he would arrive at the Piraeus before day". Moreover, in recounting the wide-ranging outrage in response to his acquittal (5.4.24, 5.4.34) Xenophon indicates the injustice of Sphodrias' actions in the opinions of the Greeks at large.

The other ideological standard by which Sphodrias could be judged is usefulness to Sparta. Dillery has discussed "the dichotomy between Sparta's internal *arete* and her external brutality":[537] namely, Xenophon indicates that what matters to Sparta is honourable conduct at home and effective conduct away, the justice of which is subordinated to its efficacy. To explore the effect of this ideology in Spartan judgement, it is useful to compare Sphodrias to Phoebidas (5.2.25-8):

[537] Dillery 1995, 218, 233-4.

> Now since the Thebans were divided by factions, it happened that the polemarchs Ismenias and Leontiades were at odds with one another. And each of them was the leader of a political association. And indeed Ismenias, because of his hatred of the Lacedaemonians, would not even approach Phoebidas. However, Leontiades conversely paid court to him and when he had become intimate with him he spoke thus: "Phoebidas, it is possible for you this day to render the greatest good to your fatherland. For if you follow me with your hoplites, I will lead you into the Acropolis. And Thebes will be entirely under the control of the Lacedaemonians and those of us who are your friends… And Phoebidas, when he heard this, felt his spirits lifted, for he had a desire to do some radiant thing greater than for life itself; he was not, however, considered to be rational or altogether sensible. And when he had agreed to this, he [Leontiades] bid him to set out, as he was prepared to set forth. And Leontiades said "When it is the right time, I will come to you and lead the way for you myself."

And (5.2.32)

> And with these things having been done, they chose another polemarch instead of Ismenias, but Leontiades immediately journeyed to Lacedaemon. And there he found both the ephors and a multitude of the citizens angry with Phoebidas, because he had not been ordered by the state to do these things. But Agesilaus said that if he had done something harmful to Lacedaemon, then it would be just to punish him, but if beneficial, the age-old custom is that it is permissible to extemporise in this way.

These cases contain several parallels. Phoebidas, like Sphodrias, is depicted as acting primarily from shallow self-interest. Both engaged in unauthorised activities, showing themselves willing to subvert state interests – and even laws of piety, in the case of Phoebidas –[538] for the sake of personal gain and glory. Both faced disciplinary action at home but were ultimately exonerated – largely due to Agesilaus' influence.[539] However, there is also one significant difference: Phoebidas' seizure of the Theban Cadmea was successful, while Sphodrias' attempt on the Piraeus was not.

[538] Although the harm done to Sparta took longer to materialise in the case of Phodrias, Xenophon nevertheless portrays Phodrias' actions as detrimental to Sparta. Xenophon viewed the occupation as impious, and portrayed the retaking of the Cadmea – and, to a certain extent Thebes' role in Sparta's loss of supremacy – as an act of divine retribution (5.4.1-12).
[539] Tuplin 1993, 126.

Dillery notes that Xenophon's Agesilaus was able to effectively equate expedience with justice in his appeal on behalf of Phoebidas due to the latter's success.[540] However, as Sphodrias was spectacularly *unsuccessful* in his attempt to capture the Piraeus, Xenophon could not have Agesilaus appeal to any advantage Sphodrias' actions brought Sparta or claim that the end-result of his actions compensated for the exclusive concern for personal gain which motivated them. Thus far into the episode, it is clear that if Sphodrias was to be judged on the basis of either objective justice or benefit to Sparta, acquittal would be impossible.

Despite Agesilaus' initial certainty that pardon was impossible, Xenophon presents Archidamus' second appeal (to spare Sphodrias despite his guilt) as a turning-point. This time, Agesilaus responds to with: "if it can be possible for this to be honourable for us, it will be so" (5.2.30-1). This cues the reader to a possible justification for pardon, as yet unexplored. It would be impossible to acquit Sphodrias on the basis of his actions. However, a case could be made to overlook those actions, if honourable justification could be found – justification that would not reflect poorly on Agesilaus for proposing it. To this end, an alternative ideological argument would be required. The remaining narrative reveals that this alternative argument was grounded in the ideology of masculine achievement.

The official line Xenophon gives Agesilaus to endorse Sphodrias' exoneration was that because: "as a boy, a youth and a young man he did and accomplished

[540] Dillery 1995, 218, 233-4.

every honourable thing, it is difficult to execute such a man, because Sparta has need for such soldiers" (5.4.32). The terms used for the ages at which Sphodrias demonstrated his excellence are reflective of official Spartan terminology, as they are the terms Xenophon employed in his discussion of the stages of Spartan upbringing.[541] Additionally, the "τὰ καλὰ" employed by Agesilaus, here, does not merely suggest a general sense of honour. Rather, by its use within the context of the official mode of Spartan upbringing, Xenophon evokes the benefits and requirements of Spartan men's way of life, associated with citizenship.[542] Xenophon's usage of such terminology here reveals the discursive approach he has Agesilaus employ. Xenophon portrays Agesilaus as seeking to evade reprisal for dishonourable conduct by one ideological standard, by presenting another ideological standard – one in which Sphodrias excelled – as bearing greater significance. The basis of Agesilaus' disinclination to execute Sphodrias is represented as the accused's demonstration of superior performance throughout his formative education – which Xenophon presents, in the *Lac.*, as a time of life wherein internalising and performing societal ideals of Spartan manhood were a particular focus.[543] Xenophon has been seen to suggest, via Agesilaus' emphasis on upbringing, that performance during this stage of life was of considerable significance to a man's later reputation and influence.[544] The line of reasoning given to Agesilaus here is the inverse of his reasoning in the case of Phoebidas. Employing the internal/external dichotomy: in evaluation of Sphodrias,

---

[541] Hodkinson 1988, 113-15.
[542] MacDowell 1986, 42-3. The usage here seems similar to Xenophon's employment of "τὰ καλὰ" to describe the standard of behaviour expected of the Spartan hippeis at Lac. 4.5 (see pp. 107).
[543] See pp. 54-69.
[544] Hodkinson 2007, 54-5. See also Hodkinson 1983, 248-50; Ducat 2006.

Agesilaus asserts that greater significance should be placed on internal concerns. He advocates that Sphodrias' demonstration of internalisation of and commitment to ideals of masculine excellence within Spartan society should be sufficient to mitigate externally detrimental actions. The outcome of the episode suggests that employment of discourse, informed by exclusive focus on exhibition of ideal masculine comportment throughout the upbringing, was sufficient to allow Agesilaus to use his influence to secure Sphodrias' pardon without incurring accusations of injustice himself.

Of course, as a number of scholars have noted, Sphodrias' personal excellence likely had little to do with Agesilaus' actual motivation in endorsing his acquittal. To examine the full effect of Xenophon's portrayal of the discourse of admirable masculine achievement as a political tool in this episode, something must be said of the factors, evident in the narrative, which likely comprised the larger part of Agesilaus' inclination to acquit. Several works have discussed a number of considerations and political motivations which likely informed Agesilaus' decision. Moreover, while not being the focus of the episode, the narrative nevertheless reveals insight into Spartan political workings and patronage.[545] Mention of Agesilaus' many daily petitioners, combined with Archidamus' mention of individuals who could accomplish things for him in the state (5.4.27-8), are likely intended to emphasise Sparta's patronage system, as well as Agesilaus' personal political agenda. Xenophon mentions that Sphodrias was a partisan of Agesilaus' rival king Cleombrotus

[545] De Ste. Croix 1972a, 75-6; Hodkinson 1983, 263-4; Gay 1989, 62; Cartledge 2001, 105; Hodkinson 2000, 35-6; 2007, 47-53.

(5.4.25). Xenophon's discussion of the two rival blocs has been seen to indicate Agesilaus' motivation in this episode.[546] This suggests that Agesilaus' emphasis on ideological concerns in his defence of Sphodrias is portrayed as a smoke-screen, to some degree. By placing exclusive focus on the masculine ideals embodied in Sphodrias' personal accomplishments, Xenophon does not depict Agesilaus as merely finding ideological justification for an acquittal. He also portrays him as obscuring political motivations which informed his desire for acquittal, which likely had greater bearing on the outcome of the trial than his professed ideological considerations.

This disconnect between professed and implicit motivations highlights the utility of masculine ideology as dressing for political manoeuvring. It conveys the prevailing sentiment which Xenophon's Agesilaus intended the recipients of his discourse to take away – a sentiment which the episode suggests was effective. As mentioned earlier, Agesilaus could not advocate Sphodrias' acquittal based on the outcome of his actions. But neither could he justify his endorsement of a pardon on the basis that it would further his personal political goals – especially when the alienation of Athens, which would result from a pardon, would undoubtedly prove detrimental to Sparta as a whole. Thus, enters the discursive appeal to the ideology of masculine achievement. That this ideological defence is presented as successful, in an instance in which there was really no legitimate justification to acquit, suggests that Xenophon

[546] For discussions of possible political motivations behind Agesilaus' desire to acquit see: Cartledge 1987, 37, 147; Humble 1997, 147-8; Cartledge 2001, 104-5; Cartledge 2003a, 224; Hodkinson 2007, 55.

represented it as the sort of ideology that would resonate effectively with the Spartan mindset.

Even if Agesilaus' appeal to masculine ideology was nothing more than empty rhetoric, rhetoric is useful to cover true motives only if it has a considerable level of mass appeal. That Xenophon has Agesilaus employ the ideology of excellent masculine comportment to make his desire for the acquittal of Sphodrias palatable suggests its perceived importance in the hierarchy of Spartan values. Thus, Xenophon's account of the discursive stance employed by Agesilaus in this case suggests two things: Xenophon presents the ideology of competitive masculine excellence as having primacy of place amongst competing Spartan value systems;[547] and he depicts the rhetoric of masculinity as a useful discursive ideological tool, which could be employed to influence real-world politics within the Spartan system.

4.1.3. Problems with Spartan Masculine Ideals in the Larger Context

The scepticism, expressed by some,[548] regarding Agesilaus' assertion that Sparta had need of such soldiers as Sphodrias (5.4.32) is indeed justified. However (as discussed), to make plausible grounds for pardon, this statement must have reflected Xenophon's impression of the Spartan value-system on some level. In what follows I will attempt to place Xenophon's portrayal of this endorsement for Sphodrias' acquittal into larger context.

[547] Xenophon depicts Agesilaus as employing masculine ideology for effect in other instances as well, such as at *Ages*. 9.6, where he seeks to diminish the honour associated with chariot-race victories by demonstrating that they demonstrate merely wealth and not ἀνδραγαθίας.
[548] E.g. Tuplin 1993, 127.

Xenophon presents *both* Sphodrias and Cleonymus as ideal Spartans, within the ideology of competitive masculine performance. The success this ideology is portrayed as having, in excusing less-than-ideal behaviours in both cases, can be seen to result from the value Xenophon suggests Spartan society placed on such ideology. However, the disconnect between Sphodrias' performance in masculine competition within Spartan society and the difficulties caused by his conduct outside Sparta suggests that the qualities Xenophon indicates Sparta most valued were not necessarily those he believed best benefited Sparta's goals. Xenophon highlights the tension between this ideology and other value systems which he presents as equally if not more important for Sparta's success. In doing so, I argue that Xenophon calls into question the place afforded to this competitive-masculine ideal within the Spartan hierarchy of values.

The character and value system embodied by Sphodrias is not represented as unique to him. Sphodrias' characterisation places him largely in line with the values and systems the *Lac*. attributes to Spartan society.[549] Emphasis placed on appearance-based virtues, reputation, self-interest, and competition could easily foster attitudes which saw masculine achievement as more important than other virtues. Potentially negative consequences of this hierarchy of values were mitigated as long as Sparta remained insular. Strict supervision of citizens and threats of punishment for any lapse in conduct is portrayed as preventing men's desire for personal excellence from conflicting with *polis*

[549] Humble 2004, 221. For additional comments on the incompatibility of the Spartan system with empire, see Parke, 1930, 77; Smith 1954, 287; Higgins 1977, 67; Cartledge 1987, 405; Tuplin 1993, 165.

interests.[550] However, in the *Hellenica*, Xenophon appears to reveal the incompatibility of Spartan internal practice with Sparta's imperial goals. When Sparta's sphere of influence moved beyond the Peloponnese, and the previously maintained level of supervision was no longer possible, Xenophon represents qualities promoted by Spartan value systems coming into conflict with the best interests of inter-*polis* politics.[551] Thus, Xenophon demonstrates that Sphodrias' desire for personal glory – a characteristic fostered by the importance of competitive masculine achievement – rendered him susceptible to the persuasion (and perhaps bribery – see 4.5.20, 4.5.30) of the Thebans. He was manipulated into an invasion of Attica, devised by the Thebans for the sole purpose of creating animosity towards Sparta (5.4.20-5).

Moreover, the mode of characterisation which defines Cleonymus and Sphodrias as excellent by the standards of the Spartan competitive-masculine ethos, but renders their behaviour problematic in many respects, is a recurrent trend throughout the *Hellenica*, and can be observed in a number of prominent Spartan men. The above-mentioned characterisation of Phoebidas shows him to possess similar character traits, with similar results. At 5.2.28 we are told he was motivated by his all-consuming desire "to do some radiant thing" (καὶ γὰρ ἦν τοῦ λαμπρόν τι ποιῆσαι πολὺ μᾶλλον ἢ τοῦ ζῆν ἐραστής). This desire – which the text implies allowed him to excel in competition with other Spartans, gaining a commanding position despite not being "considered to be rational or altogether sensible" – also made him susceptible to flattery and

[550] Humble 2004, 222-3.
[551] Higgins 1977, 67-9; Humble 2004, 225.

manipulation. In the *Lac.* (14.1-7) Xenophon alleges that immoderate Spartan preoccupation with wealth and glory over honourable conduct led to their current corrupt practices.

This sort of preoccupation with aggrandisement, whether for personal glory or wealth, is further represented throughout the *Hellenica* and *Anabasis* in the generally negative portrayal of Spartan harmosts. In the *Anabasis*, the harmosts Anaxibius and Aristarchus are represented as susceptible to flattery and manipulation, greedy, corrupt, and often foolish in their actions.[552] Moreover, they are shown to work against the interests of the Ten Thousand. Anaxibius was said to have reneged on promises to pay the army (7.1.2-11). Xenophon contrasts his order, given to the incoming harmost Aristarchus, to sell those of Cyrus' army remaining at Byzantium with the previous harmost's (Cleander) compassionate treatment of them (7.2.5). Aristarchus, is depicted as being persuaded by Pharnabazus to actively impede the Ten Thousand's movement, withholding promised pay and provisions, and selling them into slavery (7.2.12-15, 7.3.3-4, 7.6.13-14, 7.6.24-7). In *Hellenica*, the behaviour of Spartan harmosts is represented as a major point which alienated allies and aided those advocating rebellion against Spartan hegemony (3.5.10-15). Related to this, Tuplin perceives a general pattern of characteristic Spartan arrogance which results in the defeat of Spartan generals and, when paired with tendencies towards injustice in relations with allies, serves to alienate them.[553]

[552] Tuplin 1993, 126; Humble 1997, 93-106, 233-4; 2004, 220.
[553] Tuplin 1993, 164-5.

Furthermore, Xenophon repeatedly portrays cases which suggest that an ethos that valorised personal accomplishment, attained through antagonistic competition, motivated and excused conduct which was detrimental to Sparta's national interests. A number of instances illustrate this idea. Concern over Lysander's personal power placed Pausanias and three of the ephors in competition with him and his supporters in Sparta's response to the appeal from the Thirty at Eleusis in 403 BC; a response in which Xenophon depicts these groups working at cross-purposes (2.4.28-38). During his invasion of the Argolid in 388 BC, Agesipolis' desire to outdo the accomplishments of Agesilaus' recent invasion of Argos led him to ignore divine portents (4.7.4-7), casting his competitive desires in a negative light.[554] Competitive concern for honour can even be seen in Agesilaus' dismissal of Lysander in 396 BC (3.4.7-10). Xenophon's portrayal of events suggests that this ethos continued to have considerable influence in Spartan decision-making, despite its negative effects. I therefore suggest that the emphasis Xenophon places on the role of this ideology, in episodes like the trial of Sphodrias, showcases the incompatibility of Spartan competitive masculine values with the mandates of effective inter-*polis* relations.

4.2. Associations Between Same-Sex Relations and Failure

The *Hellenica* contains three episodes in which Xenophon recounts the military failing of a Spartan commander in conjunction with reference to that commander's same-sex relations: those involving Thibron, Anaxibius, and Alcetas. In all three episodes, events are portrayed in a way which suggests

[554] Tuplin 1993, 75.

that the commanders' sexual conduct was related to their failure. Therefore, the category of construction of masculinity that this section will be concerned with is almost exclusively that of attitudes towards sex.

Admittedly, three episodes, in a work the size of the *Hellenica*, is far from constituting an overwhelming trend. Nevertheless, this association between certain Spartan commanders' sexual behaviour and their military carelessness or ineptitude is notable enough to have been commented on by several scholars.[555] Furthermore, this association is, in the *Hellenica*, unique to Spartan commanders. In what follows, I will show that the manner in which Xenophon constructs the failings of Thibron, Anaxibius, and Alcetas increasingly suggests that deviant or excessive sexuality was observable in failed Spartan military commanders. This, in turn, involves ideas of Spartan masculine sexual attitudes in understandings of these individuals' capability in other spheres of life; in this case war, which has itself been viewed as an arena for the display of particularly masculine achievement.[556]

It will be useful to begin by relating these episodes in chronological order. I will then discuss why sexual behaviour should be seen as important in interpretation of the events. Finally, I will examine the cumulative effect of these episodes in shaping understandings of the relationship between Spartan men's sexual conduct and their abilities in other spheres.

[555] Tuplin 1993, 129-30; Humble 1997, 135, n. 98, 162, n. 192; Hindley 1999, 126.
[556] Hindley 1994, 348-9.

The first military disaster, in 391 BC, involves Thibron and a sexual innuendo. Xenophon recounts a raid on the Spartan camp responsible for the death of Thibron himself and the flight of the rest of the army with high casualties (4.8.18-19):

> However, as time went on, Strouthas, having observed that on each occasion that Thibron made an expedition it was disorderly and contemptuous, sent horsemen to the plain and ordered them to charge and surround their enemy and to carry off whatever they were able. Thibron happened to be retiring in his tent after breakfast with Thersander the *aulos*-player. For he was not only a fine *aulo*s-player but he also claimed to be very strong, since he was a great imitator of Spartan ways. Then Strouthas, seeing that the enemy was coming to help in disorder, and that those in front were few, came forth bringing many horsemen drawn up in good order. And they killed Thibron and Thersander first. And when these fell they put the rest of the army to flight as well, and pursuing, they struck down a multitude. Some of them escaped safely to friendly cites, but more were in camp because they learned of the expedition too late. For often, as with that time also, Thibron made expeditions without giving word.

Close on the heels of Thibron's disastrous death comes that of Anaxibius, in 389 BC. As with Thibron, Xenophon makes his same-sex relationship a prominent feature of the episode. Xenophon recounts the details of Iphicrates' fatal ambush on Anaxibius' forces, and Anaxibius' response (4.8.38-9):

> And Anaxibius knew there to be no hope of deliverance, seeing that his army was stretched along a long and narrow way, and considering that those who had gone ahead would clearly not be able to come to aid him uphill, and also seeing that all were struck with panic when they saw the ambush, he said to those with him: "Men, it is noble for me to die here, but you hasten to safety before coming to engagement with the enemy. Having said this, taking his shield from his shield bearer, he died fighting at that place. However, his *paidika* stayed beside him, and of the Lacedaemonian *harmosts* who had assembled from their cities about twelve also died fighting with him, but the rest fell fleeing. And they pursued them even as far as the city. And about two hundred others fell and around fifty of the Abydene hoplites.

Further on in the narrative (5 chapters later) – but not so far removed that the earlier events would be distant from readers' minds – Xenophon describes an episode in 377 BC, in which Alcetas' preoccupation with an attractive boy from Oreus resulted in a costly and embarrassing reversal of fortune (5.4.56-7):

> And the Thebans, being exceedingly pressed for want of grain, because they had not taken produce from the land for two years, sent men and two triremes to Pagasae for grain, giving them ten talents. But Alcetas, the Lacedaemonian who was guarding Oreus, when those men were buying the grain, manned three triremes, taking care that it should not be made known. And when the grain was en route Alcetas seized both the grain and the triremes. And the men he took captive were no less than three hundred. And those he shut in on the acropolis, where he himself was quartered. Now, as the story goes, there was a certain boy, very fine and noble (καλοῦ τε κἀγαθοῦ), as they say, and Alcetas would go down from the acropolis and occupy himself with him. The prisoners, observing his negligence, seized the acropolis, and the city revolted as well. So, after this, the Thebans were able to transport grain with ease.

To analyse the implications of the prominence of sexuality in these episodes, it is necessary to first make the case that sexual behaviour was, in fact, prominent. Taken at face value, one need not give a sexual interpretation to any of these episodes. Moreover, none of the male-male relationships in the *Hellenica* are conclusively sexual in their expression. A sexual element is often alluded to (sometimes strongly so) but details of same-sex intercourse are never overtly stated. This could suggest either that such relationships did not contain a dimension of sexual expression, or that explicit mention a physical aspect was deemed unnecessary, since it would be taken for granted. I am inclined to suspect the latter, since even in an episode with overtly sexual connotations, which praises Agesilaus' superior self-control for resisting the physical charms of Megabates' son (*Ages*. 5.4-7), Xenophon keeps the entire affair rather innocent – never referring to anything more than the offer of a kiss. Moreover, Xenophon's reticence is shared with other writers of the period, so much so that the reserve with which Classical historians and philosophers deal with sexual matters is thought to be typical of such works.[557] In light of this, lack of explicit

[557] Davidson 2001, 30.

sexual detail does not negate the likelihood of a sexual element in the relationships showcased in these episodes. Rather, examination will demonstrate that each episode contains features which strongly support the interpretation that sexual behaviour is prominent in the episode. Furthermore, I will suggest that the primacy of the sexual element becomes clearer when viewing the episodes together.

Beginning with Thibron: Xenophon highlights that at the time of the raid, "Thibron happened to be retiring in his tent after breakfast with Thersander the *aulos*-player" (4.8.18). Thibron's tent-activities are key to Xenophon's portrayal of events. They explain why, far from being a capable commander ready to organise and lead his men during the raid, he was instead the first to fall. Caught unawares, Thibron was not with his soldiers and thus failed to properly organise his haphazard counter-attack.

Xenophon's description is also rife with sexual innuendo. From the outset, Thibron retiring to his tent might have struck the reader as odd due to the time of day – after breakfast. Other mentions of soldiers breakfasting in the *Hellenica* show them engaging in activity immediately afterward (2.1.22, 4.5.3, 5.4.38, 6.5.17), or even moving to action without breakfast, out of need or to gain an advantage (5.4.41, 7.5.15). Moreover, Jason of Pherai's ability to continue his work even *while* taking meals when necessary is a point of praise in Polydamas' speech, which asserts that Jason possessed both a commendable work ethic and considerable mastery over bodily desires (6.1.15-6) – an area of mastery which Xenophon describes Thibron as sorely lacking (4.8.22). Even if it did not lead

to speculation that Thibron and Thersander were engaged in sexual activity, returning to his tent likely would have struck readers as the sort of inactivity indicative of indolence,[558] likely signalling the reader to expect no good ends.

More significant, though, is Xenophon's description of Thersander. He was "claimed to be very strong, since he was a great imitator of Spartan ways" (ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀλκῆς ἰσχύος, ἅτε λακωνίζων, ἀντεποιεῖτο [3.8.18]). A number of scholars have seen this as a *double entendre* suggesting Thersander's homosexual proclivities.[559] This interpretation is based largely on assertions that the concept of "laconising" in Athenian thought in general, and especially within the context of theatrical comedy, was widely associated with male homosexual relations.[560] The identification of Thersander as an *aulos*-player may also hint that the tent visit had a sexual aim. *Aulos*-girls, frequently engaged to entertain at Athenian *symposia*, were widely known to sell sexual favours as well as their musical abilities.[561] Thus the identification of Thersander as an *aulos* player might have been meant to imply that he, like the *aulos-girls*, might be offering something other than his musical skill. Admittedly, asserting that mention of Thersander's abilities with the *aulos* is a definite reference to sexuality would be overstating the case. Other characterisations of *aulos* players exist, and sexual implications of the instrument are primarily attributed to female players.[562] Nevertheless, the possibility that the *aulos* reference was meant to be a sexual allusion is

[558] Indolence itself can be seen to be related to deviant or excessive sexual behaviour inasmuch as both are seen to be symptomatic of the lack of control over bodily desires required for a man to be seen as truly capable.
[559] Tuplin 1993, 78; Hindley 1999, 126; Strassler 2009, 166, n. 4.8.18b.
[560] Dover 1978, 187-8; Rebenich 1998, 101-2, n. 40; Ludwig 2002, 178; Skinner 2005, 118-24. See also Cartledge 2001, 91-105 on pederasty in general.
[561] Davidson 1997, 80-3. See also Starr 1978; Glazebrook 2014; Goldman 2015.
[562] Goldhill 2014, p.194, n. 24.

reasonable in this case, in light of other euphemisms in place. Even if the reference to Thibron's musical abilities was not intended to be sexual, it would nevertheless marks him out as a problematic figure to the Athenian reader, due to the general ambivalence with which the *aulos* was received in Athenian thought.[563] Moreover, a possible third innuendo has been suggested, whereby Xenophon's depiction of Thersander insinuates that the Thibron's sexual behaviour was deviant. Strassler proposes that by recounting Thersander's claim of strength in the context of his laconising, Xenophon took the innuendo a step further to imply that Thersander was likely the active partner in the sexual relationship.[564]

While it is not strictly necessary to interpret Xenophon's meaning in this way, the tone of the entire episode does suggest a considerable amount of innuendo, making a sexual meaning behind Xenophon's description likely. If Xenophon's purpose was merely to describe Thibron's whereabouts at the time of the raid, the explanation that he was in his tent would have sufficed. Instead, Xenophon adds an additional explanatory note, rife with sexual undertones, insinuating *why* Thibron might have been particularly distracted at the time of the attack. Moreover, as if to remove any doubt as to the carnal nature of Thibron's activities, Xenophon ends his account with an explicit comparison with Diphridas, whom Xenophon pronounces superior inasmuch as he was not mastered by "pleasures of the body" (οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐκράτουν αὐτοῦ αἱ τοῦ σώματος

[563] Wilson, 1999 for extensive treatment of the *aulos* in Athenian thought and discourse.
[564] Strassler (ed.) 2009, 166, n. 4.8.18b. For additional discussion of the possibility of Thibron's sexual passivity and its implications for the interpretation of Xenophon's messages about sexual attitudes, see pp. 292-5.

ἡδοναί [4.8.22]). It therefore seems highly likely that Xenophon intended his readers to take away a sexual understanding of events.

Turning to Anaxibius, when Xenophon's recounts this commander's last stand, he gives special mention to a young man, referred to only as Anaxibius' *paidika* (4.8.39). The placement of this brief reference, at the culminating moment of the disastrous raid, makes Anaxibius' relationship, conspicuous. The term *paidika* itself is suggestive of a sexual, or at least romantic, relationship. It was frequently employed in reference to the junior partner in such relationships,[565] as well as to describe love stories – particularly those which concerned boys.[566] Furthermore, the episode is framed in such a way – with heroic flair that depicts the youth remaining steadfast beside his *erastes* in a hopeless battle, while others attempted to flee – that some have seen it to highlight the positive martial qualities which such relationships could impart.[567]

In the case of Alcetas, his association with the boy from Oreus plays an even more prominent role in events than did similar associations in the earlier episodes. Xenophon states that it was Alcetas' preoccupation with the boy that caused the disaster. Several features of the text imply that the attention Alcetas bestowed upon the youth was undertaken with amorous motivation. Xenophon

[565] E.g. Plat. *Parm.* 127b; Plat. *Phadr.* 239a; *Prot.* 315e; *Sym*. 178e; Th.1.132;
[566] Xen. *Cyrop*. 1.4.27; *Hell.* 5.3.20, 4.1.39-40.
[567] Ogden 1996, 117-20; Powell 2001, 229-30. But it is unlikely that this is an example of official Spartan pederasty. While there are indications that it was possible for *erastes* and *eromenos* to both be of fighting age within the official Spartan system of educational pederasty (evidenced by Xenophon's *Symposium* 8.34-5 asserting that Spartan practice was such that *erastai* and *eromenoi* fought bravely even when not stationed together), the fact that Anaxibius was *nauarchos* 12 years earlier in 401/0 BC, at the time of the events recorded in Xenophon's *Anabasis* (Xen *Hell*. 3.1.1-2; *Anab*. 5.1.4), suggests that he would have been too old for such an arrangement at the time of the episode concerned.

begins with a story-telling motif detailing the boy's charms which proved so distracting to Alcetas.[568] This motif makes the episode reminiscent of παιδικῶν λόγων. Description of the boy is not limited to physical attractiveness, rather Xenophon states that he was "μάλα καλοῦ τε κἀγαθοῦ". The term καλοκἄγαθος is one that was used first to describe aristocracy but later, with the rise of democracy, was appropriated by the Athenian elite as a moral quality of gentlemanliness by which they distinguished themselves from the majority.[569] Xenophon's description of the boy in aristocratic terms suggests that he was a member of Oreus' citizen elite, and Alcetas' efforts to spend time with him may have been viewed as honourable. This could have made it an attempt at local bridge-building, not unlike Agesilaus' guest-friendship with Pharnabazus' son (4.1.39-40),[570] or elite citizens of other *poleis* sending their sons to be educated at Sparta (See, e.g. 5.3.9). However, the fact that the precise nature of the association was left unclear allows for the possibility that Alcetas' interest was purely physical and casts additional ambiguity on an association which was shown to have demonstrably calamitous consequences.

Viewing these three episodes together serves to strengthen the impression that it was Xenophon's deliberate intention to draw a connection between the sexual behaviour exhibited by these men and their larger characters and capabilities. One aspect that becomes particularly striking when the episodes

---

[568] ἀκολουθοῦντος δέ τινος τῶν Ὠρειτῶν παιδός, ὡς ἔφασαν, μάλα καλοῦ τε κἀγαθοῦ (5.4.57).
[569] See κἄλοκἀγἄθ-ικός, ή, όν, [*The online Liddell-Scott-Jones Greek-English lexicon*, 2011. http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/lsj/#eid=1&context=lsj (Oct. 5, 2015)], for the various uses of this term in primary sources. See also, Skinner 2005, 143, 149, 172.
[570] Cartledge 1987, 193 perceives pederastic overtones in the description of the *xenia* relationship between Agesilaus and Pharnabazus' son, suggesting that Xenophon's depiction indicates that Agesilaus was likely not impervious to the young man's charms, but that political considerations were the determining factor in this association.

are viewed in conjunction is that, while they all contain similar elements, in only one of the three is the relation of a sexual dimension strictly necessary for the understanding of events. Only with Alcetas are the commander's same-sexual exploits portrayed as directly causing military disaster. Interestingly, this is the only episode in which the commander's actions otherwise suggest competence. With Thibron and Anaxibius, not only is the sexual dimension not the direct cause of disaster, it is also entirely incidental to understandings of the events. In these cases, the reader does not require relation of sexual behaviour to doubt these men's capabilities as commanders, since Xenophon explicitly states their limitations.

Xenophon consistently portrays Thibron as a disgraceful and careless leader who conducted campaigns in a haphazard manner and was directly responsible for much of his soldiers' misbehaviour (3.1.7-8, 3.2.1, 3.2.6-7, 4.8.18-19, 4.8.22).[571] This characterisation alone provides ample reason to expect Thibron's conduct to catch up with him eventually.[572] Moreover, Xenophon had already emphasised that Thibron's disorganisation had had emboldened Strouthas to order the fatal raid. Therefore, while it carried this theme of personal disorder through to the account of his death, it was not essential for Xenophon to detail Thibron's dalliance to account for Spartan disorder during the attack. Yet, when relating Thibron's final martial failure, Xenophon explicitly associates this catastrophe with an allusion to his sexual

[571] Humble 1997, 16-24.
[572] Dillery 1995, 27-8.

intemperance – suggesting that Xenophon intended to highlight Thibron's sexual behaviour as a key factor in this disastrous episode.

Xenophon's portrayal of Anaxibius' command is similarly unflattering:[573] so much so that it has been described as "a case-study in bad generalship".[574] Anaxibius' command is introduced from the outset with an air of ambivalence. Xenophon recounts that he was sent out as *harmost*, even though Dercylidas was doing an admirable job, specifically because Anaxibius had friends among the ephors and could arrange such a commission (4.8.32). Despite recounting Anaxibius' initial successes (8.4.33-4), during the episode which would prove his last, Xenophon describes his conduct as impious and disorderly. Not only did Anaxibius set out from Abydos in disregard of sacrificial portents, but he did so in a haphazard way which allowed his forces to become spread out, making them easy targets. In fact, Xenophon asserts that Anaxibius' force were in such a dismal state that he knew their situation was hopeless from the moment the attack commenced (8.4.36-8):

> But Anaxibius returned, although it is said that none of the sacrifices were favourable that day, but he disdained them because he was journeying through friendly territory to a friendly city, and because he heard from those he encountered that Iphicrates was sailing up towards Proconnesus, he conducted his march in a careless fashion... [38] And Anaxibius knew there to be no hope of deliverance, seeing that his army was stretched along a long and narrow way, and considered that those who had gone ahead would clearly not be able to come to aid him uphill, and also seeing that all were struck with panic when they saw the ambush.

Anaxibius' limitations are made more prominent by his implicit comparison with Iphicrates (presented as Anaxibius' antithesis), whose superiority

[573] This occurs in the *Anabasis* as well (Xen. *Anab*. 7).
[574] Tuplin 1993, 78.

Xenophon exemplifies by the careful and deliberate manner in which he planned and executed the fatal raid (8.4.35-7).

Beyond the immediate context of their campaigns, readers' familiarity with Xenophontic writing would create the expectation that carelessness guarantees eventual failure. Dillery argues that Xenophon emphatically associates good order with success and poor order with failure (in all realms of life) in a number of works, both historical and philosophical, to a level which indicates that order was essential to his world view – meaning that the disorder and negligence habitually displayed by Thibron and Anaxibius would have been sufficient to signal their impending doom.[575] Therefore, Xenophon's decision to prominently feature a sexual dimension, in episodes where that element was entirely incidental to events, must be understood as deliberate and significant. Portrayal of Anaxibius' behaviour is reminiscent of Thibron, in the disdainful and careless manner with which both conducted operations. Therefore, it is possible that the prominence of Anaxibius' *paidika* in the episode is meant to be, on some level, also reminiscent of the homosexual activities of Thibron who, like Anaxibius, made poor military decisions, but whose same-sexual activity took a more direct role in the episode of his death. Although, as noted, there is nothing explicitly suggesting that relationship between Anaxibius and his *paidika* was dishonourable, this relationship becomes suspect, inasmuch as it features in an episode of military defeat caused predominantly by Anaxibius' failings as a general. Taken together with the other episode, a recurring association begins to

[575] Dillery 1995, 27-38.

emerge between certain types of homosexual activity and military ineffectiveness.[576]

The next task is to establish what aspect of same-sex activity Xenophon presents as problematic. The first possibility is that the problem is simply the involvement of these men in same-sex relationships, with an implied dimension of physical expression. However, as discussed,[577] a generally negative attitude towards male same-sex relationships – even towards a physical dimension in such relationships – is not typically a feature of Xenophontic writing. Moreover, if Xenophon's Socratic works suggest that the negative portrayal of particular male same-sex relationships does not reflect his personal wholesale disapproval of such relationships, Xenophon's historical writings suggests that he did not believe this wholesale disapproval to be reflective of the sum of Spartan attitudes either.

In the *Lac*. Xenophon does indeed present a single model of educative pederasty as the Spartan ideal for male same-sex relationships. However, he provides indications elsewhere that more relaxed views concerning same-sex relationships may have been acceptable within Spartan thought. For instance, an attitude of acceptance, and even encouragement, was expressed by Agesilaus in both the *Hellenica* and in Xenophon's idealised portrayal in the *Agesilaus* – wherein he portrays Agesilaus as an exemplar of admirable behaviour. Xenophon tells us that Agesilaus showed appreciation for

[576] Tuplin 1993, 78, 129-30.
[577] See pp. 76-80.

physically attractive boys and enjoyed telling παιδικῶν λόγων (*Ages.* 8.2; *Hell.* 4.1.28, 4.1.40, 5.3.20).[578] Xenophon also recounts Agesilaus' efforts to aid a boy with whom Pharnabazus' son was besotted, on the latter's behalf (4.1.40, 5.4.25-33), indicating Agesilaus' support of aspects of male same-sex relationships other than the strictly educative model enshrined in the *Lac*. The overall pattern of behaviour and expression of opinion evident in Xenophon's portrayal of his own attitudes and those of Agesilaus come out in favour of same-sex relationships in general. Moreover, they suggest that pederastic conduct could acceptably contain appreciation of the physical, as long as this was not the predominant motivating factor of the relationship.[579]

If it is unlikely that the problematic sexual expression presented in the text was that of same-sexual activity *tout court*, then some particular aspect of same-sexual expression must render the activity problematic in these episodes. To explore this question, I will begin again with Thibron. Of the three episodes, his most strongly insinuates deviant sexuality and, as it appears first, it sets the tone for the subsequent episodes.

If the suggestion that Xenophon's innuendo hints at the roles of the participants is correct,[580] then the deviant quality of Thibron's sexual behaviour could be his violation of the expectation that adult Spartiate males were to be sexually dominant. This interpretation would place Thibron's

[578] Hindley 1994, 361.
[579] For discussion of Xenophon's characterisation of morally acceptable pederastic relationships, which place an emphasis on self-control as the guiding principle but which need not exclude physical expression see Hindley 1994, 347-9, 361; 1999a, 85-7; 1999b, 125-8; Percy 2005, 38-9.
[580] See p. 286.

deviance in line with the "penetration model" of sexuality in antiquity. According to this model, expression of passive sexuality would have reflected especially poorly on Thibron's character because sexual acts were polarising expressions of power and domination in which the active partner gains masculine social credit at the expense of the passive partner, who loses credit by willing assumption of the sexual role relegated to women, minors, and slaves.[581] However, this paradigm has been subjected to recent challenge.[582] And, even if the penetration model is accurate, Thibron is the only commander, in the episodes concerned, whose portrayal suggests sexual passivity. In the cases of both Anaxibius and Alcetas, the language of the text suggests that their sexual role would be acceptable according to the penetration model – and yet both same-sex relationships are presented as equally problematic. So Thibron's possible sexually passivity cannot explain the problematisation of sexuality in these episodes.

The fact that Thibron was in his tent, conducting private affairs rather than leading his men, was the significant factor – regardless of his sexual role. This suggests that Xenophon's treatment of male sexuality in this case identifies self-control (with restriction of sexual activity to its proper time and place) as the key factor distinguishing acceptable from deviant sexual expressions, and indicates that sexual behaviour was just one of many areas in which men should demonstrate self-mastery.[583] This interpretation still allows for the possibility that Thibron's sexual passivity was implied in the episode, but does

[581] Dover 1978; Halperin 1990b, 23-37.
[582] Eg. Davidson 1998; 2001; 2007.
[583] Dillery 1995, 136.

not require passivity to establish his deviancy. In the ideology of male sexual expression which focuses on self-control, passivity is not seen as the source of deviance but rather its most extreme expression:[584] the pathic is a man who is so mastered by bodily pleasure that he will resort to any ends – including assumption of the passive role – to satisfy his lust. Since this model suggests that deviant sexuality is a matter of degree more than kind, if Xenophon did intend to insinuate sexual passivity on the part of Thibron, such passivity serves to highlight the significant degree to which he was mastered by bodily pleasure. And if this interpretation is reading too much into Xenophon intentions, a sexual interpretation would still stand. Moreover, Xenophon's emphasis on the idea that "pleasures of the body" (σώματος ἡδοναί) mastered Thibron, in comparison to his successor Diphridas (4.8.22), reinforces the idea that Thibron's sexual behaviour is deliberately brought to light in the context of military disaster to draw a correlation between his lack of self-control and his general competency and character.

As mentioned, the Thibron episode, taken as a paradigm example, has all the requisite information to suggest a connection between lack of sexual control and lack of control in military matters. It is the case that most clearly shows the subject in question to be careless in his command. Descriptions of Thibron's command place upon him responsibility for excessive behaviours; and the episode directly links the subject's problematic sexual behaviour to military disaster. If the reader is left in any doubt about the connection between excessive sexual expression and other excessive behaviour, Xenophon's

[584] Winkler 1990; Hubbard 1998.

assessment of Thibron after the fact blatantly associates his lack of control of pleasures to his military incompetence.[585] The other two episodes both have elements in common with the Thibron example. However, both episodes, viewed individually, lack elements necessary to perceive a direct correlation between lack of sexual control and lack of control in other spheres of life. Instead, this association is established in the later episodes via the connection each bears to Thibron. Moreover, the placement of the Thibron episode as the first of the three is such that, when encountering the later episodes, the similarities to Thibron would be immediately evident, as would the similar pattern which all three episodes follow: 1) a commander is introduced, 2) his exploits are recounted, 3) an account of military disaster is told in which a same-sex relationship is given a place of prominence. These features invite the reader to extrapolate, from the clear similarities the latter episodes bear to the portrayal of Thibron, other similarities which are less apparent.

The role that sexual attitudes or behaviour Xenophon may have intended to highlight in Anaxibius episode (4.8.37-9) is more ambiguous. But the feature Anaxibius shares with Thibron is general disorder of command. As Thibron's lack of sexual self-control is indicative of his failings as a commander, it follows that Anaxibius' similar failings in command are likely indicative of sexual excess as well. Moreover, one could argue that certain features of Anaxibius' demise point to such speculation, in and of themselves. The self-sacrificing stance has been highlighted in heroic interpretations of Anaxibius' last stand. This has been used, in turn, to give a similar interpretation to his

[585] See p. 286.

relationship with the *paidika* who chose to stand with him. However, in the text, Anaxibius' lofty sentiments are immediately undermined by Xenophon's frank disclosure that, despite Anaxibius' claim of self-sacrifice for his men's safety, much of his force was cut down (4.8.39). These facts portray Anaxibius' stance as fruitless, casting a pall over his pseudo-heroism and that of those who remained with him.[586] Thus, any perceived credit bestowed upon the pederastic relationship by Anaxibius' self-sacrifice is subverted by its ineffectiveness. Furthermore, whether or not it was atypical for the Spartans to station *erastes* and *eromenos* together in battle, Xenophon tells us that the Boeotians and Eleians did make that arrangement common practice (*Mem.* 8.34). These are also two *poleis* which Xenophon singles-out for liberal and questionable pederastic practices (*Lac.* 2.12). It is not unreasonable to suggest that the questionable sexual practices of these states may have led readers to speculate about their military arrangements as well. In this light, Xenophon may have intended the presence of Anaxibius' *paidika* among his soldiers to resonate with readers' perceptions of the Boeotians and Eleians, casting a similar air of sexual impropriety on Anaxibius' pederastic relationship. If these speculations hold water, they reinforce my suggestion that Xenophon constructed the episode, in part, to insinuate sexual excess in Anaxibius' relationship. However, even if interpretations which stress the moralising influence of the relationship are entirely correct, there is still room for my proposal that the reader is intended to feel ambivalence regarding Anaxibius' sexual propriety, as those feelings would be generated first and foremost by the

[586] Tuplin 1993, 78.

pattern of behaviour established by Thibron, and the noteworthy similarities the Anaxibius episode bears to it.

With Alcetas one can observe a similar process of extrapolation, this time working in the other direction. Instead of extrapolating lack of sexual control from general ineptitude, the reader can extrapolate ineptitude from lack of sexual control. Alcetas does not demonstrate the pattern of poor and disorderly command observable with Thibron and Anaxibius – quite the opposite. Xenophon portrays Alcetas as clever and enterprising. His ability to keep secret his plans to capture the Theban grain shipment and successfully carry them out indicate a capable leader, in control of himself and his forces. The characteristic that relates Alcetas to Thibron is his lack of sexual self-control.[587] Xenophon portrays this as the sole determining factor which turns a brilliant victory into an embarrassing failure.[588] Taken on its own, the reader could view Alcetas' failure as an unfortunate oversight in the career of an otherwise proficient commander. However, when viewed in the context of the two earlier episodes, a different interpretation emerges. Given his likeness to Thibron in sexual impropriety, the reader is invited to infer that, despite appearances to the contrary, Alcetas also resembles Thibron in carelessness as a commander. Thus, the instance in which he conducts himself admirably could be seen as the exception rather than the rule. Reinforcing this interpretation is the fact that, not unlike Anaxibius' superficial display of heroism, any credit Alcetas may have gained from his successful capture of the

[587] Dillery 1995, 235.
[588] Tuplin 1993, 129-30; Krentz 1995, 180, n. 8 on 3.3.7-11.

Theban grain shipment is immediately undone by Alcetas' loss of that grain – and a great deal more – due to his own negligent behaviour.

When taken in succession, the three episodes create a cumulative effect: Thibron establishes the interrelatedness of lack of sexual control and lack of control in other areas; Anaxibius introduces the possibility that this interconnectedness could be present even when one of the two elements (sexual excess) was not readily apparent; finally, Alcetas confirms that possibility, by presenting a case in which the visibly present (sexual excess) and absent (general carelessness) elements are reversed. The overall effect of this pattern suggests that personal self-control (or lack thereof) has influence over all spheres of life. It also indicates that the presence or lack of self-control in one sphere of a man's life can be viewed as an indicator that similar tendencies should be expected in other spheres as well. I am aware that there is a danger of circularity in my analysis – whereby I perceive a pattern, then proceed to use that pattern to inform an analysis of individual episodes which serves to support the perceived pattern. However, the individual episodes bear enough objective resemblance in their features to warrant comparison. Additionally, my analysis involves sufficient reference to ideas concerning both sexuality and military command observable elsewhere in Xenophontic writings to render such an interpretation credible.

Through the pattern described above, Xenophon appears to draw correlation between the homosexual expression of particular Spartan military and political leaders and their larger character and abilities – especially their military and

political competence. What remains to examine is whether the negative associations of these relationships have particular significance in Xenophon's portrayal of Spartans, or if the elements of sexual behaviour Xenophon problematises in these episodes rather reflect a more universal standard of morality observable throughout his historical works.

When viewing the picture presented by the *Hellenica*, association between same-sexual behaviour and other areas of life can be seen as particularly applicable to Spartans, inasmuch as it is only in episodes involving Spartans that the association is made. Additionally, the *Hellenica* is not the only work in which Xenophon portrays sexual self-control as signifying the greater character of a Spartan man. A counter-example to the bad leader, lacking self-control in his same-sex associations, is Xenophon's portrayal of Agesilaus as a good leader who possessed essential self-mastery. In the *Agesilaus* Xenophon enshrines, as a testament of Agesilaus' marvellous self-control, an episode wherein Agesilaus refused to accept a kiss from the physically attractive Megabates (5.4-5). Throughout the *Agesilaus*, Xenophon presents Agesilaus' preeminent self-control over pleasures and endurance of hardships – in sexual and non-sexual matters alike – as being both essential elements of his manly virtue and qualities which made him an exemplary leader.[589]

The emphasis Xenophon places on the correlation between sexual self-control and other forms of self-mastery is prominent in his depiction of a number of Spartan individuals. However, moving beyond the *Hellenica* and *Agesilaus*

[589] Xen. *Ages.* 1.25, 5, 8.6-7, 9.3-5, 9.6. See also *Hell.* 3.4.19.

reveals that Xenophon did not limit this sort of connection between sexual expression and failure to his depictions of Spartans. For example, this idea is present in Xenophon's account of Menon in the *Anabasis* (2.6.21-29). Menon was not Spartan, but the account of his disgraceful death and its accompanying character assessment are reminiscent of the episodes involving Spartan commanders in the *Hellenica*. Xenophon highlights Menon's homosexual exploits and emphasises their deviant nature by relaying the rumour that Menon was said to have been the *erastes* of an adult bearded man when he himself was still a youth – a sensational reversal of accepted practice. As in the *Hellenica* episodes, Menon's deviant same-sexual relationship signposts the inevitability of his failure as a leader.

Moreover, Xenophon's association between lack of self-control in homosexual relations and inadequacies in other spheres is not limited to accounts of military command. The association is the most prevalent in accounts of military commanders,[590] but this is perhaps incidental. When a man's prominence lies elsewhere, the association Xenophon makes between sexual moderation and competency is showcased within the individual's sphere of prominence. This can be seen in the case of Critias. In Xenophon's *Memorabilia*, Critias comes under harsh critique, both for his conduct in politics and for the animalistic lust with which he pursues boys (1.2.29-32). The immoderation expressed by Critias in these divergent spheres is represented as being of a kind, serving to relate his behaviour in politics to that

[590] Hindley 1994.

of his personal life.[591] Agesilaus' sexual moderation is not merely associated with what made him a good military leader, it is associated with what made him a good *man* – in all spheres of life. Thus, the connection between excess in same-sexual relationships and larger failings apparent in the *Hellenica* seems to reflect a more universal morality evident throughout Xenophontic writings, which is attributable to Spartan and non-Spartan men alike.

In the preceding analysis, I isolated the ideological issues surrounding sexual excess, since "attitudes towards sex" contributes one of the categories by which my methodological approach suggests that masculinity is constructed. However, the ideological waters are muddied by the fact that sexual expression is not the only sphere in which the *Hellenica* criticises Spartan men for lack of self-control. While episodes concerning sexual excess are prominent in the narrative, they are nonetheless presented as part of a larger pattern. Lack of self-control displayed by Spartan men, in a number of other areas, is cast in a similarly poor light. Moreover, some such instances follow patterns of narration similar to episodes concerned with lack of sexual self-control.

For example, there is the suggestion that excess in regard to wine (albeit a minor excess) may have had some influence on the events at Leuctra, inasmuch as the text represents Cleombrotus and his compatriots imbibing at an inappropriate time, which affected their conduct in battle (6.4.8):

[591] It is curious that Xenophon does not bring this element into his characterisation of Critias in the *Hellenica*. In his account of the disastrous reign of the Thirty in Athens (2.3.11-2.4.43), Xenophon depicts Critias' other character flaws, particularly his harshness, extremism, and the immoderate way in which he sought to prevent political opposition by putting those best able to oppose him to death (2.3.25-25, 2.3.35-55). But not a word is spoken concerning his sexual excesses.

> And certainly, in the battle, everything turned out against the Lacedaemonians while everything went right for their opponents – even matters of chance. For it was after breakfast that Cleombrotus held his final council for the battle. And they drank a little, just as they would in the midday, and it was said that the wine spurred them on somewhat.

More striking is Xenophon's portrayal of the effects of excessive desire for self-aggrandisement. Throughout the *Hellenica a* number of Spartans are presented as immoderately concerned with personal glory, to the point of neglecting concerns of prudence or justice. This excess typically results in negative consequences. Most notable examples of those exhibiting this form of excess include Phoebidas and Sphodrias, already discussed,[592] and Herippidas, who we are told – like Phoebidas – desired to accomplish something "radiant" (λαμπρόν [4.1.2]). Acting on information provided by Spithridates, Herippidas asked Agesilaus for soldiers to attack Pharnabazus' camp. When fewer troops than he anticipated arrived, Herippidas set out on the raid with less than half the expected force, because he was concerned that the other Spartiates would laugh at him if he did not carry out his plan (4.1.20-25). While the attack was successful, Tuplin asserts that Xenophon did not intend the reader to believe that this success had anything to do with Herippidas and that Xenophon immediately follows up the successful attack by recounting Herippidas' arrogant and unjust decision to strip Spithridates and the Paphlagonians of their share of the booty, which caused them to defect – much to Agesilaus' distress (4.1.26-8).[593]

[592] See pp. 270-1.
[593] Tuplin 1993, 58-9, 164-5.

Akin to excessive desire for glory is excessive concern for honour, the negative consequences of which Xenophon depicts in his portrayal of Callicratidas. Xenophon contrasts Lysander's effective handling of Cyrus, with Callicratidas' failed efforts to procure funds. When Callicratidas demanded money from Cyrus and was told to wait for two days, Xenophon recounts that he responded with impatience and pique, abandoning his efforts and launching into anti-barbarian sentiment (1.6.7-11). This creates the impression of Callicratidas as volatile and excessively concerned with the respect of his person.[594] And if Callicratidas' noble (if vainglorious) proclivity towards fighting to the death at Arginousai fits with the Spartan ethos,[595] Xenophon nevertheless shows that his excessive concern for honour led him to disregard prudent advice, resulting in a disastrous defeat and his own ignominious death (1.6.29-34).[596]

Finally, Xenophon's portrayal of Teleutias is a particularly prominent example of the negative consequences of excess, which has parallels to the Alcetas episode. But in this case, Telutias' form of excess was not that of sex, but rather anger. Like Alcetas, Teleutias is initially presented in a good light. The text repeatedly emphasises his ability as a commander, and the favour and respect his soldiers felt for him (5.1.3, 5.1.14-24, 5.2.37-9) – a fact which, in Xenophon's estimation, rendered him worthy of special praise (5.1.4). However, in the event which led to his death, Xenophon recounts that Teleutias allowed anger – triggered by a reverse in battle – to cause him to act

[594] Krentz 1989, 136 on 1.5.6.
[595] Humble 1997, 112.
[596] Krentz 1989, 156 on 1.6.32-3; Moles 1994, 81-2; Humble 1997; Strassler 2009, 31, n. 1.6.32c.

rashly and to pursue the enemy too closely to their own walls, resulting in a disastrous retreat when his force accosted with missiles (5.3.5-6). Teleutias' fatal failing here leads Xenophon to deliver a moralising assessment, not unlike that concerning Thibron, wherein he cautions against allowing oneself to be mastered by anger (5.3.7).

As with sexual excess, Xenophon's accounts of Spartan men outside the *Hellenica* also link other forms of excess with failure and self-control with success. In the *Anabasis*, Clearchus is depicted as excessively fond of war (2.6.1-10). This is shown to not only limit his abilities as a commander (his severe temperament made men glad to follow him in times of danger, but prone to desertion when danger was no longer pressing [2.6.8-14]), but also to have been the cause of his exile from Sparta (2.6.3-4). Additionally, as mentioned above, Xenophon's praise of Agesilaus' sexual self-control falls within the larger context of his excellent self-control with respect to "all pleasures which overpower many men" (ὅσαι γε ἡδοναὶ πολλῶν κρατοῦσιν ἀνθρώπων), including personal comfort, luxury, wealth, drunkenness, gluttony, sleep, indolence, as well as sex (*Ages*. 5, 9.3-6).

Unfortunately, detailed analysis of all these forms of excess, at the level of attention given to episodes relating to sexual matters, is not possible within the confines of the current study. Consequently, I have focused on the form of excess which most pertains to my methodological framework. However, awareness of similarities in narrative patterns between episodes dealing with sexual excess and those referencing other forms of excess has interesting

implications when considering the bearing of “attitudes towards sex” on constructions of Spartan masculinity. Inclusion of sexual behaviour as merely one of many ways in which a man could exhibit excessiveness – which Xenophon represents as all being largely ideologically analogous – could suggest that sexual attitudes did not hold as singular an ideological significance in construction of masculine identities in antiquity as they do in modern understandings. In light of this, it is possible that “attitudes towards sex” should be viewed within the larger category of “expressions of self-control”. This, suggests that, if we were to contextualise issues of sexual expression within the larger ideological concerns of self-control, it could potentially result in an analysis which is less specifically concerned with masculinity and more linked to other ideological spheres. I would, however, suggest that the category of “attitudes towards sex” is still appropriate when examining constructions of gender in antiquity, due to its connection with biological sex; which arguably has more bearing on gendered identities than the broader areas of self-control and excess. However, I would also argue that it is necessary to maintain awareness of the close connection between attitudes towards sexual behaviours and attitudes towards other forms of behaviour with similar ideological associations. Doing so will avoid the potential of artificially inflating “attitudes towards sex” in the hierarchy of ideological concerns and presenting them as taking on more singular significance than they are due.

4.3. The Conspiracy of Cinadon

The conspiracy of Cinadon (3.3.4-11) is an interesting and much discussed episode in Xenophon's *Hellenica*. The episode details a plot instigated by Cinadon (often thought to be one of the *hypomeiones*)[597] who, motivated by dissatisfaction with his inferior status, plotted to overthrow the Spartiates. Xenophon recounts that this plot was exposed by an unnamed informer, who notified the authorities both of Cinadon's attempt to recruit him and Cinadon's assertions that the conspiracy was supported by a great many – ranging across all of Sparta's underclasses – who held nothing but animosity for the Spartiates. In response, the ephors devised a ruse which sent Cinadon on a fabricated mission to Aulon, providing opportunity to capture him and thwart the plot in before it could be enacted.

This episode provides insight concerning hegemonic stratification within Spartan society. Where Xenophon, in the *Lac.*, provides examples of hegemony among the Spartiates, the conspiracy of Cinadon hints at a hegemonic system (and its associated ideology) between the *homoioi* and those of lesser status. The main category I will explore, in what follows, is relations between men and hegemonic masculinity. But elements of discourse, and representation and performativity are also observable.

[597] See Krentz 1989, 179 n. 6 on 3.3.4-6 for discussion of the people who likely comprised this class, and Cinadon's probable inclusion amongst them.

Cinadon and Hegemonic Masculinity

In his account of Cinadon's failed conspiracy Xenophon depicts hierarchy amongst the various classifications of men within Spartan society. This hierarchy can be seen, in part, as a framework of hegemonic masculinity. In this view, the conspiracy depicts not only dissatisfaction amongst non-*homoioi*, but also a breakdown in the ideological functioning of hegemonic masculinity within the societal system. Several features of the episode point to ideological hegemony playing a role in the stratification of men within Sparta. The first comes in the episode's description of Spartiates. Xenophon has his anonymous informer attest that Cinadon bid him count how many Spartiates versus "allies" (that is, non-Spartiates) happened to be in the Spartan *agora* that day. The resultant tallies of "around forty" and "over four thousand", respectively, implies that even in the very heart of Sparta, the Spartiates made up only about 1-2% of those present (3.3.5).[598] When Cinadon lists those who could be counted on to join an uprising, he mentions several non-Spartiate societal groups: the helots, *neodamodeis*, *hypomeiones*, and *perioikoi* (3.3.6).[599] In this portrayal, Xenophon depicts the *homoioi* in the hegemonic position: a societal position enshrined as ideal and occupied by a select few, in relation to which other groups are stratified.

[598] There is some uncertainty regarding the precise numbers. Lazenby 1997, 439-40, 442, takes Xenophon's "βασιλέα τε καὶ ἐφόρους καὶ γέροντας καὶ ἄλλους ὡς τετταράκοντα" to mean that the "about 40" was exclusive of the king, ephors, and *gerontes*; making the total number of Spartiates observed in the *agora* potentially 70-80. See also Davies 2017a, 231 n. 35.
[599] For discussion regarding the precise definitions of a number of these terms and their possible places within Spartan society, see Oliva 1971, 59-62, 165-78; MacDowell 1986, 40-50; Cartledge 1987, 28; Krentz 1989, 179 n. 5 on 3.3.4-6; Hodkinson 1997; 2000, 336-403; Shipley 2004, 569-70.

That this hegemony incorporates an ideological component, relating to ideals of masculinity, is evident in the manner in which Xenophon introduces Cinadon at 3.3.5: "This was a young man, of strong body and spirit, but not one of the *homoioi*" (οὗτος δ᾽ ἦν καὶ τὸ εἶδος νεανίσκος καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν εὔρωστος, οὐ μέντοι τῶν ὁμοίων). Xenophon indicates that Cinadon successfully embodied the ideological values which, in the *Lac.*, he emphasises as necessary for achieving masculine excellence. Davies notes particular resonance between these texts, as Xenophon's use of εὔρωστος to describe Cinadon mirrors the language with which he recounts Lycurgus' observations of hard-working men, who are similarly described as εὔρωστοί (*Lac*. 5.8).[600] Furthermore, Xenophon's description implies that, were such qualities the sole requirements to be counted amongst the *homoioi*, Cinadon should have belonged to this hegemonic group – but instead, he was excluded for some other, unmentioned, reason.

Xenophon's description of Cinadon's societal position fits with the pattern of hegemonic masculine stratification, wherein attainment of hegemonic masculinity is partially reliant on individuals' performing a mode of self-presentation which conforms to society's ideals, and partially dependent upon embodiment of other subjective criteria – some of which lie outside individuals' personal control.[601] Thus, Cinadon's representation indicates that, in terms of masculinity, he was of the orthodox type – one who performs the ideals associated with hegemonic masculinity, but fails to attain hegemonic

[600] Davies 2017a, 237.
[601] Connell 2005, 79; Howson 2006, 65; Dowd 2010, 29; Atkinson 2011, 33.

status for other reasons.[602] Although Cinadon performs impressively, with respect to those qualities within his control, he evidently lacked requirements which lay outside performative embodiment of societal ideals.[603] Consequently, he was denied hegemonic *homoioi* status.

Of course, if the episode can be seen to suggest a framework of hegemonic masculinity within the ideological stratification of Spartan society, it suggests an ideological framework functioning not entirely as intended. Whatever other conspirators' motivations may have been, the professed incentive Xenophon ascribes to the plot's galvanising figure was entirely ideological. Responding to interrogation, Cinadon's sole professed aim for inciting rebellion was: "to be less than no one in Lacedaemon" (3.3.11). Hegemonic systems seek to incorporate those possessing orthodox masculinities within the hierarchy in such a way that they feel that they benefit from their position, in relation to the ideal, and seek to uphold the system, thus becoming "complicit".[604] Cinadon's rejection of the status-quo therefore indicates Spartan failure to properly implement hegemonic ideology – at least with respect to Cinadon himself. At this point, it may be useful to add a caveat to the analysis. It is not my intention to over-emphasise the "breakdown" of Spartan hegemonic ideology here, as the perceived failure of ideology in this episode reliably provides motivation for Cinadon alone. And, indeed, it is with respect to Cinadon exclusively that the failure of hegemonic ideology will be analysed in what follows.

---

[602] See pp. 18-19.
[603] Hausman 2011, 42.
[604] Connell 2005, 79; Howson 2006, 65; Atkinson 2011, 30.

Xenophon's introduces Cinadon as someone whose station in life was at odds with his character. While it is not overtly stated, the class to which Cinadon most likely belonged was that of the *hypomeiones*, or "inferior" Spartans, as Xenophon tells us that Cinadon was not one of the Spartan *homoioi*. This suggestion – as well as the sense of disaffection associated with dissonance between individual's perceived worth versus their societal status – is even more apparent in Aristotle's mention of Cinadon in the *Politics*. When discussing why factions arise in aristocracies, Aristotle states that "[factions arise] whenever one who is manly (ἀνδρώδης) has no share in honours (τιμῶν); of such a sort was Cinadon who organised an attack upon the Spartans in the reign of Agesilaus" (Aristot. *Pol.* 5.1306b). This portrayal suggests that Cinadon was deprived of citizen honours, not unlike Spartan inferiors demoted for cowardice (although the term *hypomieones* is not explicitly used in either case) which Xenophon describes at *Lac*. 9. In the case of cowards, the ideological causation of their diminished status is clear: Xenophon describes at length the societal code by which cowards were made to feel that their subordination was deserved, due to their personal failings as men.[605] Xenophon's depiction of Cinadon, however, is very different. He recounts that Cinadon was excluded from honours despite exhibiting personal excellence – and felt this exclusion to be undeserved. Since Cinadon is represented as someone who embodied the ethos of Spartan masculine excellence, rather than attempting to reconcile him to his societal position by negative means, if the system were functioning properly, one would expect to observe efforts to reward his orthodox performance, so as to render him complicit in upholding

[605] See p. 121.

prevalent ideology. And indeed, certain features of the episode do suggest such an effort. Cinadon's position in the army, his regular employment on official state business, and his position of command over Spartiates – albeit young Spartiates (τῶν νεωτέρων) – suggest that, even as an "inferior", he attained significant societal status (3.3.7-9).[606]

There has been some disagreement about what Cinadon's duties imply about his status. For example, Whitby suggests that Cinadon's fake mission to Aulon may not have been intended to reflect high status, but rather demonstrate the relative unconcern Spartiates had for *perioikoi* and helots – in that such routine issues did not warrant the attention of full Spartiates.[607] Whitby's interpretation is in line with Aristotle's assertion that Cinadon was entirely excluded from benefits within the Spartan system. However, Xenophon's description merely excludes Cinadon from the highest level of Spartan society. It does not preclude the possibility that his position, within the Spartan hegemony of men, was enviable in comparison to other subaltern individuals. Nor does significant advancement within the Spartan system preclude individuals' feelings of resentment towards their treatment by higher-ups. This idea is reflected in Aristotle's estimation of Lysander: "or [factions arise] whenever those who are great (μεγάλοι) and less than none in excellence (ἀρετὴν) are dishonoured (ἀτιμάζωνται) by those in higher esteem (ἐντιμοτέρων), as Lysander was treated by the kings" (Arist. *Pol.* 5.1306b). Therefore, either interpretation is plausible.

---

[606] Cartledge 1987, 170; Lazenby 1997, 444-6; Mertens 2001, 294; Figueira, 2006, 59; Gish 2009, 353-4; Powell 2010, 119.
[607] Whitby 1994, 102-3.

What is important is not precisely what Cinadon's societal status *was*, so much as what was the status to which he *aspired*. However far Cinadon may have been able to advance within society, Xenophon indicates (through the declaration at 3.3.11) that, for Cinadon, anything short of attainment of the full hegemonic ideological position was unacceptable. This suggests an ideological malfunction: whatever efforts Spartiate practice may have made to reconcile individuals to their positions on the hegemonic ladder, Xenophon presents them as ineffective in the case of Cinadon. Indeed, it is possible that we are meant to understand that the recognition Cinadon was given for his excellence, and the important assignments that presumably were granted to him because of it, may have further contributed to feelings that his subordinated status was undeserved.

While this episode serves primarily to illustrate flaws within the framework of hegemonic stratification, it also (ironically) suggests Cinadon's considerable investment in Sparta's hegemonic masculine ideology. Xenophon's characterisation implies that, within the hegemonic system, Cinadon was imbued with an ideology that caused him to deeply desire a societal position which he could never attain within the established framework. His drive to attain the hegemonic ideal was evidently so strong that it compelled him to plot a revolt to overthrow the persons occupying the hegemonic position within the society in order to attain it himself.[608]

[608] Cawkwell 1983, 246; Flower 1991, 94-5; Tuplin 1993, 52; Gish 2009, 355-6 see a characteristically Spartan ambition as having been Cinadon's prime motivating factor. Oliva 1971, 193; Hooker 1989, 126-7; David 1979, 253-4; Hamilton 1987, 38 attribute a variety of more radical motivations and aims to Cinadon.

The Episode in Larger Context

The situation depicted in the conspiracy of Cinadon has been taken, by some, as proof of the many problems within the Spartan system. Cinadon's assertions of the multitude allegedly ravenous for Spartan flesh, as well as the great concern with which the ephors responded to the conspiracy, have been seen to indicate that the Spartiate class was a powerful minority surrounded by those who bore them unadulterated ill-will.[609] However, the level to which one can view this episode as indicative of a severe breakdown in the Spartan system is dependent on how serious a threat it realistically posed. And I would argue that, even within the context of Xenophon's portrayal, the conspiracy is represented as a relatively minor threat. Of course, the very existence of a conspiracy would imply some failure in the operation of the system, since the system would ideally seek to provide subaltern individuals with sufficient societal investment to prevent instances of conspiracy and revolt from ever occurring. But no system functions perfectly. And voices of dissent occasionally asserting themselves do not necessarily indicate its overwhelming failure. Despite the tense atmosphere with which Xenophon portrays the conspiracy, elements of the narrative belie confidence the reader should have in its severity. In his efforts to recruit the unnamed informer, Xenophon has Cinadon claim that potential co-conspirators were everywhere, since amongst every subaltern, no one could conceal their animosity towards the Spartiates (3.3.6). However, in the same breath, he is also made to admit that the actual number of people actively involved in the organisation of the revolt was small.

[609] De Ste. Croix 1972b, 190-5.

If Xenophon meant readers to accept that anti-Spartiate sentiment was at the level he has Cinadon claim, it is unlikely that he would have depicted the rebellion as so simply and tidily prevented.[610] Therefore, the ephors' swift reaction is indicative not of the severity of the threat, but rather that the system had efficient measures in place for dealing with such minor instances.[611] Xenophon's framing of Cinadon's declaration of unmitigated hatred within the context of a recruitment pitch also undermines confidence that he intended the claim to be taken as realistic. This context presents an instance where Cinadon would be likely to exaggerate the level of animosity for the sake of recruitment.[612] Even David, who takes the account as being indicative of a serious threat, notes elements of the pitch which mark it out as a deliberate recruitment tool.[613] Thus, the significant point here is perhaps not the claim Xenophon has Cinadon make, with the hope of inciting subaltern groups to a large-scale revolt, but the apparent uninterest (Xenophon allows readers to infer) members of said underclasses had towards engaging in revolt. Shipley remarks that the level of enmity Cinadon suggests was directed towards the Spartiates is not astonishing, but the remarkable loyalty displayed towards Sparta by sub-classes such as *perioikoi* is.[614] Even within the narrative itself, there are clues that the level of animosity between the Spartiates and everyone else was not as extreme as Cinadon would have one believe. Davies suggests that the open nature of the Spartan *agora* in the account, where Xenophon depicts unarmed Spartans freely mixing with non-Spartans, points to a lack of

[610] Lazenby 1997, 440-2.
[611] Cartledge 1987, 355; 2002, 234.
[612] De Ste. Croix 1972b, 194; Cartledge 1987, 165; Whitby 1994, 102; Lazenby 1997, 439.
[613] David 1979, 252.
[614] Shipley 1992, 186-8.

hostility – or at least a lack of Spartan concern.[615] Moreover, by recounting that the plot was exposed because a prospective conspirator decided to report Cinadon, rather than align with his movement, Xenophon demonstrates the investment of at least one non-Spartiate in the prevailing social-order. It is unfortunate that Xenophon does not situate the informer at a particular level within Spartan society (although the fact that he was approached by Cinadon makes it certain that he was not of *homoioi* status) or suggest what motivation he might have had for exposing the conspiracy. Nevertheless, Xenophon's account suggests that the informer thought that he would benefit more by reporting the conspiracy by than joining it.

It is similarly unfortunate that Xenophon does not have Cinadon elaborate on details concerning criteria for social stratification of non-*homoioi* groups mentioned in the episode. Nor does he discuss their motivations. As it stands, the episode is only indicative of a breakdown in hegemonic masculinity ideology in the case of Cinadon himself. Indeed, Xenophon provides no ideological motivation to revolt for any other group mentioned – beyond a sense of generalised hatred, ultimately unsubstantiated by his portrayal of events. This lack of elaboration is somewhat characteristic of Xenophon's approach concerning the active involvement and ideological motivations of subaltern men within Spartan society. The *hypomeiones* are referenced only within the context of the conspiracy. The remaining groups mentioned (helots, *neodamodeis*, and *perioikoi*), are mentioned by Xenophon usually in the

[615] Davies 2017a, 234-5. See also Hodkinson 2015, 13-14.

context of their military participation,[616] or (in the case of helots and *perioikoi*) occasional instances of rebellion or other trouble which they caused Sparta;[617] with little reference made to ideological concerns in either case. A more explicit allusion to the helots' place within the Spartan social order is placed by Xenophon into the mouths of the Thebans who, in an address at Athens, assert that Spartans appoint their helots as governors (3.5.12). This accusation is of course, likely an unrealistic depiction, intended to incite outrage at the thought of Sparta treating its slaves better than its free allies. One interesting mention in the Cinadon episode is that the seer Tisamenus was one of the people arrested in connection with the conspiracy. While no mention is made of the details of his identity or status, it is reasonable to assume him to be a descendant of the seer Tisamenus to whom Sparta awarded exceptional citizenship according to Herodotus.[618] If this is the case, it is possible to speculate that Xenophon indicates that his status was dissimilar to that of Spartiates from traditional families, possibly motivating him to join with Cinadon.

The *Hellenica* does, however, include one instance referring to non-*homoioi* in an ideological light. This reference, again, is concerned with the marshalling of troops (5.3.8-9), and the non-*homoioi* group which primarily concerns us is one not mentioned in the Cinadon episode: the *nothoi* (bastards) of the Spartiates.[619] However, Xenophon's description here might be useful, as it is

[616] 3.1.4, 1.3.15, 3.1.4, 3.4.2, 4.3.15, 5.5.14, 5.1.33, 5.2.24, 5.3.9, 5.4.39, 6.5.21, 6.5.24, 6.5.28, 7.1.12, 7.4.27.
[617] 1.2.18, 3.3.8, 6.5.25, 7.2.2.
[618] Herod. *Hist.* 9.35.1.
[619] For detailed discussion on status of the *nothoi*, see Hodkinson 1997.

one instance in which he gives indication of successful ideological incorporation of subaltern men within the Spartan system. Xenophon describes the *nothoi* as "exceedingly well-formed and not unacquainted with the fine things of the city" (μάλα εὐειδεῖς τε καὶ τῶν ἐν τῇ πόλει καλῶν οὐκ ἄπειροι). This description is couched in ideological language and conveys the idea of complicity. The description of their physique (μάλα εὐειδεῖς) is evocative of Xenophon's depiction of the pains with which Spartans attended to their gymnastic pursuits, in order to achieve the ideal physical constitution (*Lac* 5.8-9) – not to mention the similarity to his description of Cinadon's physical excellence. And the mention of "τῶν καλῶν" in particular suggests that Xenophon refers to some benefits enjoyed by Spartiate citizens here.[620] While their illegitimate birth prevented them from attaining full hegemonic status, the passage indicates that the status of the *nothoi* granted them access to partial honours. As a result, Xenophon depicts them as complicit and valuable members of Sparta's military.

The status afforded to the *nothoi* could also indicate an effort to incentivise a segment of the helot population, as their offspring with Spartiate masters were partially integrated into Spartiate society. Hodkinson points to the episode of Sphodrias, with its inclusion of "servants" among the petitioners granted public audience with Agesilaus, as indicative of positive elements within helot-Spartan relations as well as the close personal relationships that could develop between individual Spartans and the helots of their household.[621] As Shipley

[620] See p. 107.
[621] Hodkinson 2007, 52-4.

astutely remarked, "Any power system maintained in this way depends partly on the subordinates internalising the values of the hegemonic power".[622] In order to produce a stable hegemony, the Spartan system of subordination would ideally seek to cultivate at least some degree of investment at all societal levels. So, while the Cinadon episode does not shed much light on the extent to which members of subaltern groups (other than Cinadon himself) were incorporated into prevalent Spartan ideology, the few glimpses Xenophon does provide often indicate some level of incentivisation. While he does not generally describe the conduct of helot and *neodamodeis* troops with the ideologically-charged terms used in his description of the *nothoi*, their frequent inclusion among the Lacedaemonian forces (mentioned above) suggests that they were a well-integrated aspect of Spartan military operations. Furthermore, Xenophon occasionally depicts the helots as demonstrating loyalty – even in instances of Spartan desperation. One such example is the large number of helots willing to take up the offer of freedom in return for fighting in the defence of Sparta during the enemy invasion of 370/369 BC (6.5.28-9).[623] Such instances indicate that Xenophon portrayed helots as having some level of investment in the established societal system, which suggests that employment of some positive ideological methods likely contributed to effective helot subordination.[624] Evidence of ideological elements involved in the stratification of subaltern men within Spartan society is found in a number of sources, both literary and archaeological, and has been discussed at length

[622] Shipley 1997, 213.
[623] Talbert, 1989, 37; Whitby 1994, 101; Flower 1999, 95.
[624] Cawkwell 1983, 245-6.

by a number of scholars.[625] What little Xenophon reveals hints at some level of ideological incentivisation for non-*homoioi*. Therefore, Xenophon's lack of elaboration regarding the ideological concerns (be they related to masculinity or otherwise) of subaltern men within the Spartan ethos perhaps merely indicates that such matters were not his particular concern in the *Hellenica*.

Despite the fact that the Cinadon episode seems to have had little significance for the surrounding narrative (and, indeed, little effect of any sort), Xenophon seems to have devoted considerable attention to its construction. It has been noted that a prominent feature of the episode is the representation of Agesilaus as a capable and divinely-favoured ruler, shortly after his contentious succession to the throne. Therefore, some suggest that the episode may have been intended to indicate divine endorsement of Agesilaus' reign, and that elements of the episode have been exaggerated by Xenophon to serve that effect.[626] Powell even goes as far as to question the historicity of the transmitted version of events, suggesting that the entire conspiracy may have been fabricated by Agesilaus to bolster his position.[627] This is certainly possible, as Hooker notes the value of conspiracies as propaganda after the fact.[628] However, if the conspiracy was proliferated to serve a Spartan propagandistic purpose, it is of questionable efficacy, as the episode (at least

[625] See, for example: David 1989; 1992; Fisher, 1989; Talbert 1989; Cartledge 1987, 1991, 2003; Flower 1991; Vernant 1991; Shipley 1992, 1997, 2006; Hodkinson 1997, 2000, 2007, 2015; Luraghi 2002, 2003, 2008.
[626] Whitby 1994, 102-3; Jehne 1995, 16-7, 173-4; Cartledge 2002; Davies 2017a, 222-4, 229-30.
[627] Powell 2010, 117-21.
[628] Hooker 1989, 126.

Xenophon's version of it) has been seen to reflect poorly on Sparta, highlighting Spartan insecurity and hypocrisy.[629]

Even if the conspiracy of Cinadon was an entirely propagandistic fabrication, it does not negate the importance of the ideology of hegemonic masculinity which the episode highlights. Rather, if the episode was greatly exaggerated or manufactured to serve propagandistic purposes, the discourse of ideal masculinity may have been employed to enhance the propaganda, much as Xenophon depicts similar discourse enhancing Agesilaus' defence of Sphodrias.[630] If the broadcasted version of events was to be useful as propaganda, it must be believable. Moreover, believability must cover all aspects – including Cinadon's motivation – [631] which would again suggest Xenophon's perception that such ideology held potency in the Spartan mindset.[632] The view of the conspiracy as propaganda suggests that men's drive to attain hegemonic societal positions was thought to be of sufficient strength that it could provide believable motivation for insurgency.[633] Although the episode portrays Cinadon as a serious threat, it also enshrines Spartan values. Cinadon's motivation for rebellion is not represented as originating from concerns about Spartan injustice towards societal subordinates. Rather, it is born out of his ambition to emulate and attain the highest echelon of Spartan society. Thus, the conspiracy is presented as a

[629] Krentz 1979 n. 6 on 3.2-6; Tuplin 1990, 52.
[630] See pp. 259-69.
[631] Powell 2010, 118-20.
[632] For discussion of the psychological toll that *atima* likely took on *homoioi* and *hypomeiones* see David 2004, 32.
[633] Hooker 1989, 127.

situation which was serious for the Spartan societal structure, but ultimately one which did not undermine the values of Spartan society at large.[634]

Summary

The categories most apparent in the preceding analysis of episodes from Xenophon's *Hellenica* are: attitudes towards sex, relations between men and hegemonic masculinity, institutions, competition, and discourse.

Attitudes towards sex:

This category is evident in the 'trial of Sphodrias' episode due to the prominence of a pederastic relationship within the narrative. However, any sexual dimension of this relationship is downplayed – beyond the possibility that Xenophon played on Athenian assumptions regarding Spartan pederasty to cast an air of ambiguity around the events in which the relationship was involved. Xenophon's portrayal of this pederastic relationship has overlap between attitudes towards sex and relations between males since, while reference to Spartan sexuality is implicit in the general atmosphere of Xenophon's narrative, an ideology of *philia* between men is explicitly appealed to in Xenophon's depiction of the relationship.

A more explicit reference to attitudes towards sex is evident in Xenophon's portrayal of the relationship between same-sex relationships of certain Spartan commanders and those commanders' military failings. Xenophon frames episodes involving Thibron, Anaxibius, and Alcetas in such a way as to

[634] Cawkwell 1983, 246; Tuplin 1993, 52.

suggest that these men's immoderate sexual conduct in same-sex relationships served as an indicator of their incompetence in military command. These episodes highlight the ideal of sexual moderation as masculine ideal for Spartan men a and suggest a relationship between sexual excess and other character flaws in men. While the episodes examined in this section focus on sexual behaviours, similarities between Xenophon's presentation of these episodes and others suggest that sexual moderation should be viewed as a sub-set of a larger ideology of masculine comportment which values men's moderation in all spheres, and which Xenophon does not represent as a particularly Spartan, but rather a more universal masculine ideal. Due to the apparent universality of many of the moralising features of Xenophon's account, it is difficult to determine whether the masculine ideals which are prominent in Xenophon's accounts of Spartans are represented as specifically Spartan in nature.

Relations between men and hegemonic masculinity:

The Sphodrias episode highlights relations between men by providing a number of examples of male relationships. The pederastic relationship and the father-son relationship between Cleonymus and Sphodrias showcase male homosocial bonds and enshrine the ideal of *philia*. This suggests that Xenophon represents *philia* as an important masculine ideal, cultivated in Spartan all-male relationships of varying types. However, while these relationships and their associated ideals are depicted as societally valued, they are also problematised. Xenophon represents these characters as placing a higher value on the ideal of *philia* than on that of justice. The problematic

nature of placing *philia* and loyalty within personal relationships is illustrated by the comparative lack of closeness evident in interactions between Archidamus and his father Agesilaus. Agesilaus, possibly due to diminished feelings of *philia* towards his son, places emphasis the mandates of justice and honour in decision-making. Moreover Cleonymus' behaviour during interactions with Archidamus is not in keeping with what Xenophon elsewhere describes as acceptable within the Spartan societal ethos. This casts an air of ambiguity on both pederastic and familial relationships, along with the allegiances they create, perhaps suggesting that the values associated with personal bonds between Spartan men could undermine larger societal values.

Hegemonic masculinity is evident in the 'conspiracy of Cinadon' episode, which gives indication of the stratification of groups of men within Spartan society and suggests that subaltern groups drew ideological significance from their position relative to the hegemonic Spartiates. Cinadon's subordinate societal position indicates that factors other than individuals' performative representation of masculine ideals were required to attain hegemonic positions within their hierarchy of Spartan men, since Xenophon depicts Cinadon as an exemplar of masculine ideals. Additionally, Cinadon's professed motive for inciting rebellion ("to be less than no one in Lacedaemon") is suggestive of a break-down in the societal hegemony's process of subordination and stratification since, while hegemonic systems do seek to create desire for attainment of hegemonic status, they also seek to incentivise those embodying "orthodox" masculinity to accept their position on the hegemonic ladder. However, lack of indication of similar disaffection amongst the other subaltern

groups mentioned by Xenophon, along with his descriptions of Spartan *nothoi*, suggests fairly effective ideological subordination within the Spartan societal-system.

Institutions:

The pederastic relationship portrayed in the Sphodrias episode is depicted as representative of the Lycurgan ideal. As such, it is quasi-institutional in nature, and intended to impart qualities desired in adult Spartan men. It is shown to cultivate the ideal *philia* and, consequently, excellent masculine performance, exemplified in Cleonymous' heroic death at Leuctra. However, the failure of the junior partner to uphold behavioural standards that, Xenophon suggests elsewhere, would have been expected of him, indicates the possible failure of this relationship to live up to its educational precepts.

Competition:

Competition factors into the Sphodrias episode. Excellence in competitive masculine achievement – and achievement during the upbringing, in particular – is represented as having significance for Spartan men's adult reputation. Competitive achievement is portrayed as the basis of both Cleonymus' and Sphodrias' reputation for excellence and provides the foundation for Agesilaus' endorsement of Sphodrias' acquittal.

Xenophon portrays highly competitive and honour-seeking behaviours as characteristic to a number of Spartan men, both in the *Hellenica* and other works. This Spartan characteristic is also represented as problematic, as it is

shown to be incompatible with Sparta's imperial goals, and harmful to Sparta's inter-*polis* relations.

Discourse**:**

Discourse involving Spartan ideals of masculinity is shown to have considerable political and propagandistic utility in Xenophon's text. In the Sphodrias episode, Agesilaus is depicted as successfully employing discourse related to the ideology of competitive masculine achievement in his defence of Sphodrias. He substitutes this ideology for one based in ideals of justice, which would require that Sphodrias be condemned. Not only is this discursive approach portrayed as effective in securing Agesilaus' desired outcome, due to Xenophon's expressed importance of competitive masculine achievement in the Spartan value system, it is also shown to provide an effective smoke-screen to mask whatever other motivations Agesilaus may have had for desiring Sphodrias' acquittal.

Conclusions

The preceding examination has sought to investigate constructions of Spartan masculinity, as portrayed in works of Thucydides, Xenophon and Plato, employing methodology informed by social constructionist theories of gender. In particular, the examination has analysed source material with a view to several categories thought to be significant to the construction of masculinity: 1) men and women; 2) attitudes towards sex; 3) institutions; 4) discourse; 5) representation and performativity; 6) relations between men and hegemonic masculinity; and 7) competition. Summaries for the findings of individual chapters have already been discussed.[635] What remains to consider are the similarities and differences between authors' representations of Spartan masculinity, as well as potential future applications of this research.

The category of 'men and women' is prominent in Plato's portrayal of the development of Spartan and Spartan-influenced timocratic masculinities (more so in the case of timocratic masculinity), evident in Xenophon's *Lac*., and largely absent from Xenophon and Thucydides' historiographical accounts. This disparity between philosophical and historiographical works could possibly be attributed to their generic concerns. The philosophical works are concerned with the formation of Spartan men's character traits and ideals, and depicted women as contributing to this process, whereas the historiographical works are primarily chronicling political and military endeavours, which could account for the scarcity of references to women in their works.

[635] See pp. 133, 176, 241, 310.

The contribution of ‘men and women’ to the formation of masculine character in the works of Plato and Xenophon contain similarities, since both authors associate women with concerns related to material wealth and the influence of the household. Additionally, both authors portray women as contributing to the formation of masculine identity both conceptually – in the form of comparisons and contrasts made between men and women – and through relational practice. In comparisons, both authors represent what was characteristically masculine (discipline, orderliness, obedience, etc.) as what was either contrary to, or surpassing of, the feminine. In relational practice Plato portrays women as directly involved in the creation of masculine identity (most exemplified by his depiction of the timocratic mother), while Xenophon represents women as playing more indirect roles in the enforcement of masculine ideals. For example, Xenophon’s description of sanctions on cowards employs relations with women as both incentive – cowards would not be able to marry – and deterrents – cowards would have to explain to their female relatives why no one would marry them – to ensure men adhere to ideals of bravery. A final note is that this category was far less represented – even in philosophical works – than would be expected, considering that this is the site usually thought to be the most important for gender construction by social constructionists.

The category of ‘attitudes towards sex’ is represented the works of Xenophon and in Plato’s *Laws*, but is absent from Thucydides’ treatment of Spartan masculinity. Xenophon and Plato both associate sexual moderation with proper masculinity, depicting fruitful procreative sex as the ideal. This ideal of

moderate generative sexual behaviour is associated with Spartan male-female sexual relations by Xenophon alone, but both authors problematise sexual pederasty. Both authors depict sexual pederasty as corrupting to all participants and accentuate the idea of sexual excess in portrayals of the *erastes* who would pursue boys for sexual gratification. Plato also explicitly depicts sexual pederasty as an effeminising act for the *eromenos*, placing such practice in direct violation of ideal masculinity. There is a point of discrepancy in these authors' treatment of Spartan pederasty, however. While Plato indicates that Spartan pederasty was endemic and was promoted by fundamental aspects of Spartan institutions such as *syssitia* and *gymnasia*, Xenophon portrays ideal Spartan pederasty as chaste and both educative and morally improving in nature in the *Lac.* However, elements of the *Lac.'s* portrayal of Spartan sexual ideals, which accentuate their superficiality, and Xenophon's treatment of Spartan sexual behaviour in the *Hellenica*, perhaps indicate Xenophon's awareness that Spartan sexual practice did not always conform to societal ideals. In such cases Xenophon equates Spartan men's failure with respect to sexual moderation to their larger failure as men, evident in several accounts of military disaster wherein Xenophon strongly implies the engagement of the Spartan men involved in excessive sexual activity with other males.

The category of 'institutions' is of far greater significance in the philosophical works' treatment of Spartan masculinity than in that of the historiographical works. This is likely due, again, to the differences in these works' subject matter. The philosophical works describe the process by which Spartan men are formed (within which institutions are represented as playing a prominent

role), whereas historiographical works depict the products of societal processes engaging in action with the wider world. The historiographical works do give passing reference to Spartan institutions (such as the emphasis Thucydides places on the role of institutions in cultivating Spartan ἀνδρεία in the speeches of Archidamus and Pericles, or elements of Xenophon's portrayal of Archidamus and Cleonymus reflective of ideals of Spartan institutional pederasty), but it is predominantly the philosophical works which deal with Spartan institutions in-depth.

Both Plato and Xenophon represent Spartan institutions as having considerable bearing on the formation and inculcation of Spartan masculine ideals. Xenophon provides a more detailed account of Spartan institutions than does Plato. This is understandable. The *Lac.* is especially concerned with Spartan society and provides a comprehensive treatment of institutions ideals and practices at every stage of life. Plato, has a more specific focus with regard to Spartan society. In the Republic, he is concerned with the features and institutions that cause timocratic societies (such as Sparta) to deviate from the ideal, and in *Laws* his most explicit treatment of Spartan institutions focuses on those represented as instrumental to the formation of Spartan ἀνδρεία, which is perceived as flawed in its manifestation. Despite these differences in focus there is considerable overlap. Both authors represent Spartan education, hunting, boxing-matches, practice of thefts, *syssitia*, *gymnasia*, and the military as important institutions involved in the cultivation of masculine ideals. Both authors attribute development of similar masculine qualities and ideals to these institutions and suggest that these are cultivated by similar methods. Plato

asserts that Spartan institutions aimed to cultivate καρτερία and highlights the discipline, obedience, and respect for authority that Sparta's institutions instil in its men. This contains overlap with Xenophon's identification of the qualities of ἐγκράτεια, πειθώ, and αἰδώς as the ideals Spartan institutions seek to cultivate in men. Additionally, both authors focus on ideas of compulsion and continual supervision in their portrayals of the methods Spartan institutions employ to ensure men's adherence to ideals.

There are also points of contradiction between authors' portrayals. In addition to the differences in institutional practice in relation to sexual attitudes, discussed above. There is a significant difference in the depiction of *syssitia* practice. Plato's assertion that Spartan *syssitia* fail to provide men with training in the resistance of pleasure is contradicted by Xenophon's description of the practice of moderate drinking cultivated by *syssitia*. However, Plato's emphasis on lack of cultivation of σωφροσύνη in *syssitia* is not incompatible with Xenophon's identification of αἰδώς as the chief virtue promoted by *syssitia* practice. Xenophon's portrayal of Spartan αἰδώς depicts it as inherently appearance based, indicating that the moderation it inspires is situational, dependant on the presence and judgement of others to function. Xenophon, like Plato, gives no indication that σωφροσύνη was a virtue cultivated in Spartan males by the *syssitia*, or any other Spartan institution. This is a point of departure with Thucydides, who does portray σωφροσύνη as a Spartan masculine ideal. Moreover, Thucydides' Archidamus explicitly associates Spartan men's cultivation of σωφροσύνη with Spartan education and institutions.

The Category of ‘discourse’ is represented in the works of all three authors, in both philosophical and historiographical genres. Multiple levels of discourse were observable. The idea of discourse was reflected in the language employed by authors in their representations of men and masculine characteristics, in deliberate evaluation and manipulation of masculine ideals by characters within narratives, and in the discursive construction of masculine ideals through relational practice between characters within narratives. Discourse was one of the most illuminative categories, since the manipulation of discourses of masculinity – evident not only in the comparison of different authors’ works, but also within individual works – revealed authors’ representations of Spartan masculinity as both complex and highly situational. In the *Laws*, Plato provided the nearest to what could be termed an overarching picture of Spartan masculinity depicted as applying uniformly to ‘Spartan men’ at large. But even in this work, understandings of masculine ideals were subjected to interrogation and redefinition by characters, and competing ideologies were represented in those practices said to cultivate Spartan ἀνδρεία.

One of the most interesting features to emerge, in the works of all three authors, was the portrayal of the discursive utility of ideologies of Spartan masculinity, which characters are depicted as employing to further personal or political aims. This is evident in Plato’s portrayal of the formation of timocratic masculinity, discussed above, wherein the mother defines masculine ideals to respond to her personal desires. Moreover, the discursive utility of

Spartan masculine ideals is even more prominent in the historiographical works.

Discourses involving manipulations of understandings of masculine identities and ideals are represented as politically useful in the historiographical works of both Thucydides and Xenophon. However, each author's depiction of the discursive employment of masculine ideology is distinct and reflects their individual style and focus. Thucydides' portrayal of Spartan masculinity is primarily concerned will Spartan collective masculine identity. In line with this focus, a number of speeches within his *History* portray speakers' attempts to manipulate audiences' understandings of the collective identity of Spartan men and redefine the features which comprise it, in accordance with their political agendas. For instance, all four of the speeches examined in the 'speeches' section (those delivered by the Corinthians, Archidamus, Sthenelaidas, and Pericles) suggest that σωφροσύνη was a prominent Spartan virtue. But each speech presents a different understanding of σωφροσύνη and its relationship to Spartan masculinity. Conversely, Xenophon's portrayal of Spartan masculinity is much more individualistic in nature. While his narrative is suggestive that certain traits were likely to be characteristic of Spartan men, he represents Spartan masculine identity and ideals primarily through illustration of their expression in the character and actions of individual Spartan men. As such, Xenophon's portrayal of discursive employment of Spartan masculine ideals illustrates multiple – often competing – repertoires of Spartan masculine excellence from which his Spartan characters drew, and depicts Spartan men as situationally choosing and switching between alternative streams of masculine

ideology to fit circumstances. The discursive utility of ideologies of masculinity, expressed in both Thucydides' and Xenophon's works, are suggestive of at least some level of awareness of the constructed and contested nature of ideal Spartan masculinity.

The category of 'representation and performativity' is most prominent in Thucydides and in Xenophon's *Lac.*, although each work places a different emphasis on the role of representation and performativity in the formation of Spartan masculine identity. In Thucydides, representation and performativity is depicted as having strong associations with discourse in the formation and maintenance of Spartan masculine representation. Ideals of Spartan manhood, which are created discursively, are confirmed through performance. This can be seen in the cohesion-building rhetoric of Brasidas, which asserts that excellent performance in battle guarantees individuals a place in the ethos of masculine excellence he constructs within his speeches to his army. This correspondence between words and deed is also evident in the necessity of confirming performative action for the maintenance of Spartan reputation, illustrated by the aftermath of the Pylos disaster. While most of the episodes highlighting representation and performativity in the maintenance of standards of Spartan masculine excellence in Thucydides focus on Spartan reputation in the eyes of "others" and relate to performance in battle, the *Lac*. places focus on the development of masculine reputation internal to Sparta, and associates representation and performativity with a number of societal processes. Xenophon portrays Spartan society as placing emphasis on reciprocal supervision of men of all ages, within the public sphere, creating the need for

Spartan men to continually perform their identities and affirm their adherence to societal ideals. In addition to this pervasive atmosphere, Xenophon associates several mandated features of male appearance with ideologies of military excellence and freedom. Finally, Xenophon highlights visual and performative elements employed in the societal stratification of Spartan men, evident in his depiction of both the *hippeis* and sanctions on cowards. Employment of representation and performativity in stratification of men within Spartan society is evident in Thucydides as well, since his depiction of the helot massacre depicts Spartan authorities employing a performative mechanism to deal with a sub-section of helots whose professed view of their rightful place was deemed problematic.

Relations between men and hegemonic masculinity was evident in all authors' portrayals of Spartan masculinity and was represented as one of the most important sites for the transmission of masculine ideals. Xenophon's treatment of Spartan male relations is the most comprehensive. He highlights a number of homosocial relationships of varying types (familial, pederastic, societal, institution-based, etc.), in both the *Lac*. and the *Hellenica*. Features of male relationships represented by Xenophon, are highlighted by the other authors as well. Instructive age-based relationships are depicted by all three authors, and all three represent direct instruction and behavioural modelling on the part of elders as influential in the transmission of masculine ideals to younger males. However, while Plato and Thucydides focus primarily on the instructional aspects of age-based relationships, Xenophon's depiction of syssitia practice and respect towards superiors suggests that Spartan hierarchical and age-based

relationships were reciprocal in their promotion of adherence to masculine ideals, since they required elders and superiors to provide examples for emulation. Frameworks of hegemonic masculinity were also evident in the works of all three authors and were represented as both contributing to the formation of individual masculine identity, and social stratification of men. Thucydides brings an additional level of hegemonic stratification to his depiction of Spartan masculinity, through the presence of ideals of hegemonic masculinity within the larger context of discourse related to the political hegemony of Sparta and its allies, in the Corinthian speech.

The category of 'competition' was most prevalent in the works of Xenophon. Xenophon depicts agonistic relations between men as having equal, if not greater, influence on the development of Spartan masculinity than did reciprocal or hierarchical relationships. Xenophon's account of numerous competitions throughout the Spartan lifespan, in the *Lac.*, suggests both that competitive achievement was one of the highest standards of Spartan masculine excellence, and that the features seen to define competitive masculine excellence differed throughout the lifespan. Xenophon's narrative in the *Hellenica* corresponds to his portrayal in the *Lac.* For instance, the 'trial of Sphodrias' episode, reinforces the role of competitive achievement in establishing Spartan men's reputation and societal standing. Furthermore, in numerous characterisations (both in the *Hellenica* and in other works), Xenophon represents competitiveness as a defining Spartan feature and portrays many Spartan men as highly competitive in nature – often to their own detriment, or the detriment of Sparta.

The largest contribution of this exploration to understandings of depictions of Spartan masculinity is that it has served to illuminate the complexity of ideologies related to Spartan masculinity in authors' texts. The image of Spartan masculinity does not vary between the representations of individual authors alone. Rather, when examining individual authors' portrayals – both in different works and even within a single work – Spartan masculine ideals are depicted as both multifaceted and variable. My focus on a number of different categories wherein masculinity is constructed has been advantageous for dealing with this issue. My approach has served to elucidate the diversity of constructions of Spartan masculinity evident in Classical Athenian prose works. Moreover, the complexity of texts' representations of the construction of Spartan masculinity is further highlighted by the categories upon which I focused this exploration, since separation of categories is impossible, and analysis reveals considerable over-lap in authors' depictions of the roles and contributions of the various categories to the construction and transmission of Spartan masculine ideals. Moreover, the fact that a number of constructionist categories were evident – in spite of their considerable differences – demonstrates the elasticity of this approach and suggests that it would prove beneficial to the analysis of masculinity in other forms of literature.

This is not to say that my methodological approach – and subsequent analysis – is without its shortcomings. A number of issues arose throughout this study which will require consideration in future work. To begin, while the framework was applicable to all the types of literature examined, it was not

uniformly so. Philosophical works, being more concerned with the realm of pure ideas, tend to treat the subject-matter more thematically; whereas historical works, bound by a chronological narrative framework, tend to feature matters of ideology more episodically. As a result, in my experience, the philosophical works lent themselves more readily to providing an overall picture (albeit a normative one) of Spartan masculinity. In contrast, while detailed analysis – yielding considerable information regarding how ideals of masculinity were depicted as functioning – was possible within particular episodes of historical works, it proved more difficult to glean an overarching picture of Spartan masculinity from such works.[636] The disparity in sources made it difficult to discern an overarching picture of Spartan masculinity, comparison between the normative depictions observed in philosophical works and historical works – which tend to complicate the picture – highlights the inconsistencies between the broad overarching philosophical picture and the diversity in male behaviours depicted in historical sources. However, this could be useful for future efforts to contextualise the sources' depictions and analyse the relation between depictions and historical actuality, as it not only reveals inconsistences between ideals and lived experience, but also portrays instances in which societal ideals are contested by individuals.

Another challenge emerges from the language typically employed in sociological studies of gender, which I would term "the problem of the proverbial they". Simply put, constructionist gender theory attests that the

[636] Speeches in Thucydides being exception to this trend, due to their purpose of establishing and perpetuating "national" character-types.

processes by which gender ideals are propagated within society are often implicit and unconscious – and that even when gender ideologies are deliberately employed by power regimes they can metastasise in unintended ways. However, despite this awareness, the manner in which gender ideology is discussed in these theories tends to give the impression of agency to societal gender ideals and systems; or to imply some sort of authoritarian societal force imposing ideology on individuals. This can result in the impression that "societal ideals" hold a sort of vague authority, similar to the authority of popular convention invoked when speakers commence expressions or assertions with "they say…" (hence, the proverbial they). Moreover, the manner in which gender ideology is discussed in sociology often serves to hyperbolise the importance of these often-unconscious forces on individuals' overall concepts of identity. The focus on Sparta, in particular, as the subject of this study made me especially aware of this tendency, as considerable work has been done in recent years by Hodkinson and others to dispel earlier impressions that Spartan society was particularly authoritarian in nature.[637] Consideration of such work often made me aware of instances where my mode of discussion ran the risk of presenting an unintended authoritarian impression of societal ideology. This, in turn, heightened my awareness of the importance for studies informed by sociological gender theory to be cautious about overstating their cases, in terms of the societal impact of gender ideology. Here too, inclusion of historical sources has helped illuminate this issue. Philosophical works, covered in this thesis, tend to approach construction of societies as a project enacted in a top-down manner. Thus, analysis of such

[637] Hodkinson 2017.

sources can be susceptible to unreflexive reliance on authoritarian forces to explain the operation of ideology within society. Historical sources undermine unconscious assumption of a proverbial "they" directing social processes. Awareness of this tendency in the theoretical framework (and the problems it creates for analysis) is a positive gain in understanding, which has implications beyond the specific study of Spartan masculinity and could contribute to gender studies more broadly. It can lead scholars to mindfulness of this issue in their implementation of theory, in turn leading to subtler and more nuanced interpretations of texts.

This study took care to ensure sensitivity to the possibility that categories, chosen because of their primacy in contemporary sociological models of gender construction, would not necessarily constitute the sole or primary sites with bearing on the formation of Classical Spartan masculinity. As a result, my exploration revealed instances where a category presented itself in an episode and appeared to fit nicely with the theories of masculinity, when examined in isolation. However, when the episode was placed into larger textual context, it became apparent that this focus could present a skewed ideological view. This was evident in examination of attitudes towards sex in the *Hellenica*. When episodes concerned with sexual excess were analysed in isolation, they appeared to suggest the considerable importance that attitudes towards sex could play in assessing individuals' masculine (and general) excellence. However, when one looked beyond these instances, it was possible to observe similar patterns and ideological implications in instances which dealt with other forms of excess. This suggests that, while "attitudes towards sex" is an

important site for construction of ideal Spartan masculinity, it should perhaps be better viewed within the context of a more comprehensive ideal related to issues of self-control. Without this sensitivity, the focus on attitudes towards sex (prominent in modern understandings of masculinity) runs the risk of over-inflating the importance of sexual expression in constructs of Spartan manhood. Therefore, while modern sites of construction of masculinity provide a useful framework for exploration, future work should seek to expand and/or modify categories of analysis to better fit the ideals of their historical/cultural period of study. This insight could contribute to future gender studies in all historical periods, as well as for studies of modern masculinity, as the sites of gender construction emphasised by social constructionist theories of masculinity provide a useful framework which can be modified, as needed to better fit the historical period and society in question.

This thesis indicates considerable scope for future research. Indeed, Spartan masculinity is a concept for which much further examination is possible. As mentioned, much of the treatment in this study has been episodic. Consequently, there was less opportunity for detailed analysis of factors which had bearing on authors' depictions of Spartan masculinity, but which did not feature prominently within a particular episode. For example, my analysis of hegemonic masculine frameworks in the *Lac.* highlighted the *hippeis* and sanctioning of cowards because these are areas to which Xenophon devotes extensive treatment. Also, as inverses, they provide excellent case studies for the ways in which the ideology of hegemonic masculinity could be employed

both positively and negatively. However, these are not the only depictions of masculine hegemonic structuring in the work. Prominent positions (such as *eirens* chosen to be leaders, the ephors, and the *gerousia),* countless honours and appointments for which Spartan men were in constant competition, as well as non-military causes of diminution of male social status (bachelorhood, poverty, etc.), are all depicted as affecting men's positions within the framework of Spartan hegemonic masculinity. More extensive examination of structures of hegemonic masculinity within the *Lac.* could, therefore, serve as the subject of future inquiry. Moreover, there is also considerable future scope for analysis of depictions of a range of real-life behaviours of individual Spartans in the historical sources – in relation to other Spartans, subordinate populations within Spartan society, and other Greeks – which portray Spartan masculinities in action.

Finally, it must be again stressed that this study focused predominantly on analysis of the chosen authors' *depictions* of Spartan masculinity. More investigation is required into the relationship between these depictions and historical actuality. Although I have made some effort to contextualise the material (such as discussion of how the political atmosphere of the period may have coloured the depictions of Spartan men that Thucydides ascribes to the Athenians and Corinthians; or the relation between Athenian and Socratic attitudes towards pederastic activity and what Xenophon presents as the Spartan ideal in his *Lac.),* my analysis has been predominantly directed towards authors' depictions in their own right. Therefore, a prominent area for future inquiry, in particular, is the examination of how these authors' cultural

and political viewpoints, as Athenian contemporaries, may have influenced their depictions of Spartan men. This, of course, is just one of many potential avenues for future inquiry. Analysis of representations of Spartan masculinity – both within the context of authors' depictions in their own right, as well as with a view to historical actuality – could be applied to the wide range of works spanning several centuries (from Tyrtaios to Plutarch and beyond). In short, Spartan masculinity is an interesting and complex topic for which abundant further investigation is possible, and whose potential insights extend far beyond the field of Spartan studies.

Bibliography

Editions of Ancient Texts

All editions of Greek texts are those used by the *Perseus Digital Library*. Ed. Gregory R. Crane. Tufts University. http://www.perseus.tufts.edu

Strassler, R.B. (2009), *The Landmark Xenophon's Hellenika*, New York.

Modern Works

Adams, R. and D. Savran (eds) (2002), *The Masculinity Studies Reader*, Oxford.

Alberti, J. (2002), *Gender and the Historian*, Edinburgh.

Alexander, B.K. (2011), 'Queer(y)ing Masculinities', in R. Jackson and M. Balaji (eds), *Global Masculinities and Manhood*, Urbana, 52-74.

Allison, J. (1984), 'Sthenelaidas' Speech: Thucydides 1.86', *Hermes*, 112:1, 9-16.

Alty, J. (1982), 'Dorians and Ionians', *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 102, 1-14.

Anderson, E. (2009), *Inclusive Masculinity: The changing nature of masculinities*, New York.

Anderson, J.K. (1985), *Hunting in the Ancient World*, Berkeley.

Annas, J. (1976), 'Plato's "Republic" and Feminism', *Philosophy*, 51:197, 307-21.

Arnold, J. and S. Brady (eds) (2011), *What is Masculinity? Historical dynamics from antiquity to the contemporary world*, New York.

Atkinson, M. (2011), *Deconstructing Men & Masculinities*, Don Mills.

Balot, R. (2001), 'Pericles' Anatomy of Democratic Courage', *The American Journal of Philology*, 122: 4, 505-25.

--------- (2004), 'Courage in the Democratic Polis', *The Classical Quarterly*, New Series, 54:2, 406-23.

--------- (2007), 'Subordinating Courage to Justice: Statecraft and Soulcraft in Fourth-Century Athenian Rhetoric and Platonic Political Philosophy', *Rhetorica*, 25:1, 35–52.

Baron, A. (2006), 'Masculinity, the Embodied Male Worker, and the Historian's Gaze', *International Labor and Working-Class History*, 143-160.

Beck, F.A. (1993), 'Spartan Education Revised', *History of Education Review*, 22, 16-31.

Berg, H. (2011), 'Masculinities in Early Hellenistic Athens', in J. Arnold and S. Brady (eds), *What is Masculinity? Historical dynamics from antiquity to the contemporary world*, New York, 97-113.

Bickrell, C. (2006), 'The Sociological Construction of Gender and Sexuality', *The Editorial Board of the Sociological Review*, 54:1, 87-113.

Bird, S. R. (1996), 'Welcome to the Men's Club: Homosociality and the maintenance of hegemonic masculinity', *Gender and Society*, 10:2, 120-32.

Bloedow, E.F. (1981), ‘The Speeches of Archidamus and Sthenelaidas at Sparta’, *Historia*, 30:2, 129-43.
--------- (1987), ‘Sthenelaidas the Persuasive Spartan’, *Hermes*, 115:1, 60-6.
Blössner, N. (2007), ‘City-Soul Analogy’, trans. G. R. F. Ferrari, in G. R. F. Ferrari (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Plato's Republic*, Cambridge, 345-85.
Bluestone, N.H. (1987), *Women and the Ideal Society: Plato’s Republic and modern myths of gender*, Oxford.
Bolmarcich, S. (2005), ‘Thucydides 1.19.1 and the Peloponnesian League’, *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies*, 45, 5-34.
Bradford, A. (1994), ‘The Duplicitous Spartan’, in A. Powell and S. Hodkinson (eds), *The Shadow of Sparta*, London, 59-86.
Brod, H. and M. Kaufman, (eds) (1994), *Theorizing Masculinities*, Thousand Oaks.
Brown, W. (1988), ‘"Supposing Truth Were a Woman...": Plato's Subversion of Masculine Discourse’, *Political Theory*, 16:4, 594-616.
Butler, J. (1999), *Gender Trouble*, London.
Cairns, D. (1993), *Aidōs: The psychology and ethics of honour and shame in ancient Greek literature*, Oxford.
Cantarella, E. (1992), *Bisexuality in the Ancient World*, trans. C. Ó Cuilleanáin, London.
Canto, M. and A. Goldhammer (1985), ‘The Politics of Women's Bodies Reflections on Plato’, *Poetics Today*, 6:1/2, *The Female Body in Western Culture: Semiotic Perspectives*, 275-89.
Carrigan, T., B. Connell and J. Lee (1985), ‘Hard and Heavy: Toward a new sociology of masculinity’, *Theory and Society*, 14, 551-603. (Reprinted (2006) in S. Whitehead (ed.), *Men and Masculinities*, Vol. I, *‘Politics and Power’*, London, 15-63.)
Carson, A. (1990), ‘Putting Her in Her Place: Woman, dirt, and desire’, in D. Halperin, J. Winkler, and F. Zeitlin (eds), *Before Sexuality: The construction of erotic experience in the ancient Greek world*, New Jersey, 135-70.
Cartledge, P. (1981), ‘Spartan Wives: Liberation or licence?’, *The Classical Quarterly*, New Series, 31:1, 84-105.
--------- (1987), *Agesilaos and the Crisis of Sparta*, London.
--------- (1991), ‘Richard Talbert’s Revision of the Spartan-Helot Struggle: A reply’, *Historia*, 40:3, 379-81.
--------- (1998), ‘The *Machismo* of the Athenian Empire - Or the reign of the *phaulus?*’, in L. Foxhall and J. Salmon (eds), *When Men Were Men: Masculinity, power and identity in classical antiquity*, London, 54-65.
--------- (2001), *Spartan Reflections*, London.
--------- (2002), *Sparta and Lakonia: A regional history, 1300-362 BC*, 2nd ed., London.
--------- (2003a), *The Spartans: The world of the warrior-heroes of ancient Greece*, New York.
--------- (2003b), ‘Raising Hell? The helot mirage – a personal re-view’, in N. Luraghi and S.E. Alcock (eds), *Helots and Their Masters in Laconia and Messenia: Histories, ideologies, structures*, Cambridge and London, 12-30.

--------- (2006), *Thermopylae: The Battle that Changed the World*, London & NY.
Cartledge, P. and P. Debnar (2006), 'Sparta and the Spartans in Thucydides', in A. Rengakos and A. Tsakmakis (eds), *Brill's Companion to Thucydides*, Leiden and Boston, 559-87.
Cartwright, D. (1997), *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides: A companion to Rex Warner's Penguin translation*, Ann Arbor.
Catano, J. and D. Novak (eds) (2011), *Masculinity Lessons: Rethinking men's and women's studies*, Baltimore.
Cawkwell, G.L. (1983), 'The Decline of Sparta', *Classical Quarterly*, 33, 385-400. (Reprinted (2002) in M. Whitely (ed.), *Sparta*, Edinburgh, 236-57.)
Christesen, P. (2012), 'Athletics and Social Order in Sparta in the Classical Period', *Classical Antiquity*, 31:2, 193-255.
Clatterbaugh, K. (1990), *Contemporary Perspectives on Masculinity*, Boulder.
Cogan, M. (1981), *The Human Thing: The speeches and principles of Thucydides' History*, Chicago and London.
Cohen, D. (1992), *Law, Sexuality, and Society: The Enforcement of Morals in Classical Athens*, Cambridge.
--------- (2003), 'Law, Society and Homosexuality in Classical Athens', in M. Golden and P. Toohey (eds) *Sex and Difference in Ancient Greece and Rome*, Edinburgh, 151-66.
Cohen, E. (2003), 'The High Cost of *Andreia* at Athens', in in R.M. Rosen and I. Sluiter (eds) *Andreia: Studies in manliness and courage in classical antiquity*, Leiden, 145-65.
Connell, R.W. (1993), 'The Big Picture: Masculinities in recent world history', *Theory and Society*, 22, 597-623. (Reprinted (2006) in S. Whitehead (ed.), *Men and Masculinities*, Vol. I, *'Politics and Power'*, London, 122-44.)
--------- (1995), 'The History of Masculinity', in *Masculinities*, Berkley. (Reprinted (2002) in R. Adams and D. Savaran (eds), *The Masculinity Studies Reader*, Oxford, 245-61.)
--------- (2005), *Masculinities*, 2nd ed., Berkeley.
--------- (2009), *Gender*, 2nd ed., Cambridge.
Connell, R.W. and J. W. Messerschmidt (2005), 'Hegemonic Masculinity: Rethinking the concept', *Gender and Society*, 19:6, 829-59.
Crane, G. (1992), 'The Fear and Pursuit of Risk: Corinth on Athens, Sparta and the Peloponnesians (Thucydides 1.68-71, 120-121)', *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 122, 227-56.
--------- (1998), *Thucydides and the Ancient Simplicity: The limits of political realism*, Berkley.
David, E. (1978), 'The Spartan Syssitia and Plato's Laws', *The American Journal of Philology*, 99:4, 486-95.
--------- (1979), 'The Conspiracy of Cinadon', *Athenaeum*, 57, 239-59.
--------- (1989), 'Dress in Spartan Society', *The Ancient World*, 19:1-2, 3-13.
--------- (1991), *Old Age in Sparta*, Amsterdam.
--------- (1992), 'Sparta's Social Hair', *Eranos*, 90, 11-21
--------- (1993), 'Hunting in Spartan Society and Consciousness', *EMC/CV*, 37:12, 393-414.

--------- (2004), ‘Suicide in Spartan Society’, in T. Figueira (ed.), *Spartan Society*, London, 25-46.
Davidson, J. (1998), *Courtesans & Fishcakes: The consuming passions of classical Athens*, London.
---------- (2001), ‘Dover, Foucault and Greek Homosexuality: Penetration and the truth of sex’, *Past & Present*, 170, 3-51.
--------- (2007), *The Greeks and Greek Love: A radical reappraisal of homosexuality in ancient Greece*, London.
Davies, P. (2013): ‘*Kalos Kagathos* and Scholarly Perceptions of Spartan Society’, *Historia* 62.3, 259-79.
--------- (2017a), ‘The Cinadon Conspiracy as Literary Narrative and Historical Source’, in V. Pothou and A. Powell (eds), *Das antike Sparta*, Stuttgart, 221-43.
--------- (2017b), ‘Equality and Distinction within the Spartiate Community’, in A. Powell (ed.), *A Companion to Sparta*, vol. II, Hoboken, 480-99.
De Ste. Croix, G.E.M. (1972a), ‘Trials at Sparta’, in *The Origins of the Peloponnesian War*, London. (Reprinted (2002) in M. Whitby (ed.), *Sparta*, Edinburgh, 69-77).
--------- (1972b), ‘The Helot Threat’, in *The Origins of the Peloponnesian War*, London. (Reprinted (2002) in M. Whitby (ed.), *Sparta*, Edinburgh, 190-95.)
--------- (1981), *The Class Struggle in the Ancient Greek World*, New York.
Debnar, P. (2001), *Speaking the Same Language: Speech and audience in Thucydides’ Spartan debates*, Ann Arbor.
Desmond, W. (2006), ‘Lessons of Fear: A Reading of Thucydides’, *Classical Philology*, 101:4, 359-79.
Devereux, D. (1992), ‘The Unity of the Virtues in Plato's Protagoras and Laches’, *The Philosophical Review*, 101:4, 765-89.
Diamond, M.J. (2006), ‘Masculinity Unraveled: The roots of male gender identity and the shifting of male ego ideals throughout life’, *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, 54, 1099-130.
Dillery, J. (1995), *Xenophon and the History of His Times*, London.
--------- (2017), ‘Xenophon: the Small Works’, in M.A. Flower (ed.), The Cambridge Companion to Xenophon, Cambridge, 195-219.
Dobbs, D. (1986), ‘For Lack of Wisdom: Courage and Inquiry in Plato's "Laches"’, *The Journal of Politics*, 48:4, 825-49.
Dover, K. (1978), *Greek Homosexuality*, Cambridge.
--------- (1983), ‘Thucydides “As History” and “As Literature”’, *History and Theory*, 22:1, 54-63.
Dowd, N. (2010), *The Man Question: Male subordination and Privilege*, New York.
Ducat, J. (1990), *Les Hilotes*, Paris.
--------- (2006a), *Spartan Education: Youth and society in the classical period*, Swansea.
--------- (2006b), ‘The Spartan “Tremblers”’, in S. Hodkinson and A. Powell (eds), *Sparta and War*, London, 111-62.
Ellis, H. (2011), ‘“Boys, Semi-Men and Bearded Scholars”: Maturity and manliness in early nineteenth-century Oxford’, in J. Arnold and S. Brady (eds), *What is Masculinity? Historical dynamics from antiquity to the contemporary world*, New York, 263-82.

Emlyn-Jones, C. (1999), ‘Dramatic Structure and Cultural Context in Plato's Laches’, *The Classical Quarterly*, 49:1, 123-38.
Ehrhardt, E. (1986), ‘The Word of the Muses (Plato, Rep. 8.546)’, *The Classical Quarterly*, 36:2, 407-20.
Ferrari, G.R.F. (ed.) (2007), *The Cambridge Companion to Plato's Republic*, Cambridge.
Field, L.K. (2012), ‘Xenophon’s *Cyropaedia*: Educating our political hopes’, *The Journal of Politics*, 74:3, 723-38.
Figueira, T.F. (2003), ‘*Xenelasia* and Social Control in Classical Sparta’, *Classical Quarterly*, 53, 44-74.
--------- (2006), ‘The Spartan *Hippeis*’, in S. Hodkinson and A. Powell (eds), *Sparta & War*, Swansea, 57-84.
--------- (2010) “Gynecocracy: How women policed masculine behavior in archaic and classical Sparta,” in S. Hodkinson and A. Powell (eds), *Sparta: The Body Politic*, Swansea, 265-96.
Finley, J. (1938), 'Euripides and Thucydides', *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, 49, 23-68.
--------- (1942), *Thucydides*, Ann Arbor.
Fisher, N.R.E. (1989), ‘Drink, *Hybris*, and the Promotion of Harmony in Sparta’, in A. Powell (ed.), *Classical Sparta: Techniques behind her success*, Norman, 26-50.
--------- (1998), ‘Violence Masculinity and the Law in Classical Athens’, in L. Foxhall and J. Salmon (eds), *When Men Were Men: Masculinity, power and identity in classical antiquity*, London, 54-65.
Fletcher, C. (2011), ‘The Whig Interpretation of Masculinity? Honor and sexuality in late medieval manhood’, in J. Arnold and S. Brady (eds), *What is Masculinity? Historical dynamics from antiquity to the contemporary world*, New York, 57-75.
Fliess, P.J. (1966), *Thucydides and the Politics of Bipolarity*, Louisiana.
Flower, M. (1991), ‘Revolutionary Agitation and Social Change in Classical Sparta’, in M. Flower and M. Toher (eds), *Georgica: Greek Studies in Honour of George Cawkwell* (*Institute of Classical Studies Bulletin*, Supplement 58), London, 78-97.
Forde, S. (1997), ‘Gender and Justice in Plato’, *American Political Science Review*, 92:3, 657-70.
Fossa, J.A. and Erickson, G.L. (2001), ‘The Lord Over Better and Worse Births’, *The College Mathematics Journal*, 32:3, 182-93.
Foster, E. (2012) Thermopylae and Pylos, with Reference to the Homeric Background’, in E. Foster and D. Lateiner (eds), *Thucydides and Herodotus*, Oxford, 185-214.
Foucault, M. (1985), *The History of Sexuality*, vol. II, Trans, Robert Hurley, New York.
Fox, M. (1998), ‘The Constrained Man’, in L. Foxhall and J. Salmon (eds), *Thinking Men: Masculinity and its self-representation in the classical tradition*, London, 6-22.
Foxhall, L. (1989), ‘Household, Gender and Property in Classical Athens, *The Classical Quarterly*, New Series, 39:1, 22-44.
--------- (2013), *Studying Gender in Classical Antiquity*. Cambridge.

Foxhall, L. and J. Salmon (eds) (1998a), *When Men Were Men: Masculinity power and identity in classical antiquity*, London.
--------- (1998b), *Thinking Men: Masculinity and its self-representation in the classical tradition*, London.
Francis, E. D. (1993), 'Brachylogia Laconia: Spartan speeches in Thucydides', *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies*, 38:1, 198-212.
Frank, J. (2007), 'Wages of War: On judgment in Plato's "Republic"', *Political Theory*, 35:4, 443-67.
Gish, D.A. (2009), 'Spartan Justice: The conspiracy of Kinadon in Xenophon's *Hellenika*', *POLIS*, 26:2, 339-69.
Glazebrook, A. (2009), 'Cosmetics and Sôphrosunê: Ischomachos' wife in Xenophon's *Oikonomikos*', *The Classical World*, 102:3, 233-48.
--------- (2014) '"Sex Ed" at the Archaic Symposia: Prostitutes, boys and paideia' in M. Masterson, N. Rabinowitz, and J. Robson (Eds) *Sex in Antiquity: Exploring Gender and Sexuality in the Ancient World*, New York, 157-78.
Gleason, M. (1995), *Making Men: Sophists and self-presentation in ancient Rome*,
Princeton.
Goldhill, S. (2014) 'Is there a History of Prostitution?', in M. Masterson, N. Rabinowitz, and J. Robson (eds) *Sex in Antiquity: Exploring Gender and Sexuality in the Ancient World*, New York, 179-97.
Goldhill, S. and R. Osborne (eds) 1999, *Performance Culture and Athenian Democracy*, Cambridge.
Goldman, M. (2015) 'Associating the Aulêtris: Flute Girls and Prostitutes in the Classical Greek Symposium', *HELIOS*, 42:1, 29-60.
Gould, C. (1987), 'Socratic Intellectualism and the Problem of Courage: An Interpretation of Plato's Laches', *History of Philosophy Quarterly*, 4:3, 265-79.
Gunderson, E. (2000), *Staging Masculinity: The rhetoric of performance in the Roman world*,
Michigan.
Gutmann, M.C. (1997), 'Trafficking in Men: The anthropology of masculinity', *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 26, 385-409.
Gray, V. (1998), *The Framing of Socrates: The literary interpretation of Xenophon's Memorabilia*, Stuttgart.
--------- (2007), *Xenophon on Government*, New York.
--------- (2011), *Xenophon's Mirror of Princes: Reading the reflections*, Oxford.
Graziosi, B. and J. Haubold (2003), 'Homeric Masculinity: NOPEH and ΑΓΗΝΟΡΙΗ", *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 123: 60-76.
Gribble, D. (2006), 'Individuals in Thucydides', in A. Rengakos and A. Tsakmakis (eds), *Brills Companion to Thucydides*, Leiden and Boston, 439-68.
Habib, M.A.R. (2008), *A History of Literary Criticism and Theory: From Plato to the present*, Oxford.
Hall, E. (1989), *Inventing the Barbarian: Greek self-definition through tragedy*, New York.
Hall, M. (2011), 'Negotiating Jamaican Masculinities', in R. Jackson II and M. Balaji (eds), *Global Masculinities and Manhood*, Urbana, 31-51.

Halperin, D. (1990a), *One Hundred Years of Homosexuality: And other essays on Greek love*, New York.
--------- (1990b), 'One Hundred Years of Homosexuality', in D. Halperin, *One Hundred Years of Homosexuality: And other essays on Greek love*, New York, 15-40.
--------- (1990c), 'Two Views of Greek Love: Harald Patzer and Michel Foucault', in D. Halperin, *One Hundred Years of Homosexuality: And other essays on Greek love*, New York, 54-71.
--------- (1990d), 'Heroes and their Pals', in D. Halperin, *One Hundred Years of Homosexuality: And other essays on Greek love*, New York, 75-87.
--------- (1990e), 'The Democratic Body: Prostitution and citizenship in classical Athens', in D. Halperin, *One Hundred Years of Homosexuality: And other essays on Greek love*, New York, 88-112.
--------- (2003) 'The Social Body and the Sexual Body', in M. Golden and P. Toohey (eds) *Sex and Difference in Ancient Greece and Rome*, Edinburgh, 131-50.
Halperin, D., J. Winkler, and F. Zeitlin (eds) (1990), *Before Sexuality: The construction of erotic experience in the ancient Greek world*, New Jersey.
Hamilton, C.D. (1987), 'Social Tensions in Classical Sparta', *Ktema*, 12, 31-41.
--------- (1996), 'The Ideology of Spartan Conservatism', *The Ancient World*, 27:2, 147-55.
Harman, R. (2009), 'Viewing Spartans, Viewing Barbarians: Visuality in Xenophon's *Lakedaimonion Politeia*', in S. Hodkinson (ed.), *Sparta: Comparative approaches*, Swansea, 361-82.
Harries, J. (1998), 'The Cube and the Square: Masculinity and male social roles in Roman Boiotia', in L. Foxhall and J. Salmon (eds), *When Men Were Men: Masculinity power and identity in classical Antiquity*, London, 184-94.
Harvey, K and A. Shepard (2005), 'What Have Historians Done with Masculinity? Reflections on five centuries of British history, circa 1500–1950', *Journal of British Studies*, 44:2, 274-80.
Haskins, E.V. (2005), 'Philosophy, Rhetoric, and Cultural Memory: Rereading Plato's "Menexenus" and Isocrates' "Panegyricus"', *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, 35:1, 25-45.
Hausman, B.L. (2011), 'Do Boys Have to be Boys? Gender, narrativity, and the John/Joan case', in J. Catano and D. Novak (eds), *Masculinity Lessons: Rethinking men's and women's studies*, Baltimore, 132-56.
Heap, A. (1998), 'Understanding the Men in Menander', in Foxhall and J. Salmon (eds), *Thinking Men: Masculinity and its self-representation in the classical tradition*, London, 115-29.
Hearn, J. (2013), 'Methods and Methodologies in Critical Studies on Men and Masculinities', in B. Pini and B. Pease (eds) *Men, Masculinities and Methodologies*, Basingstoke, 26-38.
Heydon, K. (2013), 'Depictions of Spartan Masculinity in Thucydides and Xenophon', MA thesis. University of Calgary.
Heilke, T. (2004), 'Realism, Narrative, and Happenstance: Thucydides' tale of Brasidas', *The American Political Science Review*, 98:1, 121-38.

Higate, P. (2003), '"Soft Clerks" and "Hard Civvies": Pluralizing military masculinities', in P. Higate (ed.), *Military Masculinities: Identity and the state*, Westport, 27-42.
Higgins, W.E. (1977), *Xenophon the Athenian: The problem of the individual and the society of the polis*, New York.
Hindley, C. (1994), 'Eros and Military Command in Xenophon', *The Classical Quarterly*, New Series, 44:2, 347-66.
--------- (1999a), 'Xenophon on Male Love', *The Classical Quarterly*, New Series, 49:1, 74-99.
--------- (1999b), '*Sophron Eros*: Xenophon's ethical erotics', in C. Tuplin (ed.), *Xenophon and His World*, 125-46.
Hitz, Z. (2010), 'Degenerate Regimes in Plato' s Republic', in M. McPherran (ed.), *Plato's Republic: a critical guide*, Cambridge, 103-31.
Hobbs, A. (2000), *Plato and the Hero: Courage, Manliness, and the Impersonal Good*, Cambridge.
Hodkinson, S. (1983), 'Social Order and the Conflict of Values in Classical Sparta', *Chiron* 13, 239-81.
--------- (1997), 'Servile and Free Dependants of the Spartan Oikos', in M. Moggi and G. Cordiano (eds) *Schiavi e dipendenti nell'ambito dell'oikos e della familia*, Pisa, 45-71.
--------- (1998), 'Patterns of Bronze Dedications at Spartan Sanctuaries, *c*. 650-350 BC: Towards a quantified base of material and religious investment', in W.G. Cavanagh and S.E.C. Walker (eds), *Sparta in Laconia: Proceedings of the 19th British Museum Classical Colloquium, 6-8 December 1995*, London, 55-63.
--------- (1999), 'An Agonistic Culture?: Athletic competition in archaic and classical Spartan society', *in:* S. Hodkinson and A. Powell (eds), *Sparta: New perspectives*, London, 147-87.
--------- (2000), *Property and Wealth in Classical Sparta*, London.
--------- (2005) 'The Imaginary Spartan *Politeia*', in, M.H. Hansen (ed), *The Imaginary Polis* Copenhagen, 222-81.
--------- (2006), 'Was Classical Sparta a Military Society?', in S. Hodkinson and A. Powell (eds), *Sparta & War*, Swansea, 111-62.
--------- (2007), 'The Episode of Sphodrias as a Source for Spartan Social History', in N.V. Sekunda (ed.) *Corolla Cosmo Rodewald*, Gdansk, 43-65. Reprinted in (2017), 'The L.F. Bantim de Assumpção (2017) (ed.), Esparta: Politica e Sociedade, Curitiba, 187-231.
--------- (ed.) (2009), *Sparta: Comparative approaches*, London.
--------- (2015) 'Transforming Sparta: New approaches to the study of Spartan society', *Ancient History: Resources for Teachers* 41-44 (2011-2014), 1-42.
--------- (2017) 'Sparta: An Exceptional Domination of State over Society?', in A. Powell (ed.) *A Companion to Sparta*, Hoboken, 29-57.
Hoerber, R.G. (1968), 'Plato's Laches', *Classical Philology*, 63:2, 95-105.
Holmes, B. (2012), *Gender: Antiquity & its legacy*, London.
Holmgren, L.E. (2013), 'Gendered Selves, Gendered Subjects: Interview performances and situational contexts in critical interview studies of men and masculinities', in B. Pini and B. Pease (eds) *Men, Masculinities and Methodologies*, Basingstoke, 90-102.

Hooker, J.T. (1989), ‘Spartan Propaganda’, in A. Powell (ed.), *Classical Sparta: Techniques behind her success,* Norman, 122-41.
Hornblower, S. (1987), *Thucydides*, Baltimore.
---------- (1991-2008), *A Commentary on Thucydides,* 3 vols, Oxford.
--------- (2011), ‘Sticks, Stones and Spartans: The sociology of Spartan violence’, in S. Hornblower, *Thucydidean Themes*, New York, 250-74.
Howson, R. (2006), *Challenging Hegemonic Masculinity*, London.
Hubbard, T.K. (1998), ‘Popular Perceptions of Elite Homosexuality in Classical Athens’, *Arion*, Third Series, 6:1, 48-78.
--------- (2011), ‘Athenian Pederasty and the Construction of Masculinity’, in J. Arnold and S. Brady (eds), *What is Masculinity? Historical dynamics from antiquity to the contemporary world*, New York, 189-225.
--------- (ed.) (2013), *Companion to Greek and Roman Sexualities*, Somerset.
Humble, N. (1997), ‘Xenophon's View of Sparta: A study of the Anabasis, Hellenica and Respublica Lacedaemoniorum’. PhD thesis. McMaster University.
--------- (1999), ‘Sôphrosynê and the Spartans in Xenophon’, in A. Powell and S. Hodkinson (eds), *Sparta: New perspectives,* London/Swansea, 339-53.
--------- (2002), ‘*Sôphrosynê* Revisited: Was it ever a Spartan virtue?’, in A. Powell and S. Hodkinson (eds), *Sparta: Beyond the mirage,* London/Swansea, 85-109.
--------- (2004), ‘The Author, Date and Purpose of Chapter 14 of the *Lakedaimoniôn Politeia*’, in C. Tuplin (ed.), *Xenophon and His World,* 215-28.
--------- (2007), ‘Xenophon, Aristotle and Plutarch on Sparta’, in N. Birgalias, K. Buraselis and P. Cartledge (eds), *The Contribution of Ancient Sparta to Political Thought and Practice*, Pyrgos, 291-300.
--------- (forthcoming) ‘L'innovation generique dans la *Constitution des Lacedemoniens*', in P. Pontier (ed.), *Xénophon et la rhétorique*, Paris.
Hunt, P. (1998), *Slaves, Warfare, and Ideology in the Greek Historians,* Cambridge.
Hunter, R. L. (2009), *Critical Moments in Classical Literature: Studies in the ancient view of literature and its uses*, Cambridge.
--------- *Plato and the Traditions of Ancient Literature: The silent stream*, Cambridge.
R. Patterson, V. Karasmanis, and A. Hermann (eds) (2013), *Presocratics and Plato: Festschrift in honor of Charles Kahn*, Las Vegas.
Hunter, V. (1988), ‘Thucydides and the Sociology of the Crowd’, *The Classical Journal*, 84:1, 17-30.
--------- (2011), ‘Institutionalizing Dishonour in Plato’s “Laws”’, *The Classical Quarterly*, New Series, 61:1, 134-42.
Hussey, E.L. (1985), ‘Thucydidean History and Democritean Theory’, in P. Cartledge and F.D. Harvey (eds), *Crux: Essays in Greek history presented to G.E.M. de Ste Croix on his 75th birthday*, London, 118-38.
Irwin, T.H. (1992), ‘Plato: The intellectual background’, in R. Kraut (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Plato, Cambridge*, 51-89.
Jackson, P. (1991), ‘The Cultural Politics of Masculinity: Towards a social geography’, *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, New Series, 16:2, 199-213.

Jackson, R. and M. Balaji (eds) (2011), *Global Masculinities and Manhood*, Urbana.
Jaeger, W (1939-1944), *Paideia: The ideals of Greek culture*, Trans. G. Highet, 3 vols., Oxford.
Jansson, P. (1993), 'Identity-Defining Practices in Thucydides' *History of the Peloponnesian War*', *European Journal of International Relations*, 3, 147-65.
Jehne, M. (1995), 'Die Funktion des Berichts Über die Kinadon-Verschwörung in Xenophons "Hellenika"', *Hermes*, 123:2, 166-74.
Jeleniewski Seidler, V. (2011), 'Masculinities, Histories and Memories', in J. Arnold and S. Brady (eds), *What is Masculinity? Historical dynamics from antiquity to the contemporary world*, New York, 433-52.
Johnstone, C.L. (2009a), 'Civic Wisdom, Divine Wisdom: Isocrates, Plato, and two visions for the Athenian citizen', in C.L. Johnstone *Studies in Rhetoric/Communication: Listening to the logos: Speech and the coming of wisdom in ancient Greece*, Columbia, 146-87.
--------- (2009b), 'Sophistical Wisdom, Socratic Wisdom, and the Political Life', in C.L. Johnstone *Studies in Rhetoric/Communication: Listening to the logos: Speech and the coming of wisdom in ancient Greece*. Columbia, 86-145.
Jordan, B. (1990), 'The Ceremony of the Helots in Thucydides, IV, 80', *AC*, 59, 37-69.
Kagan, D. (1969), *The Outbreak of the Peloponnesian War*, Ithaca.
Kateb, G. (2004), 'Courage as a Virtue', *Social Research* 71:1, 39–72.
Kennell, N. (1995), *The Gymnasium of Virtue: Education & culture in ancient Sparta*, Chapel Hill.
Keuls, E. (1993), *Reign of the Phallus: Sexual Politics in Ancient Athens*, Berkeley.
Kimmel, M. (1994) 'Masculinity as homophobia: Fear, shame, and silence in the construction of gender identity', in H. Brod and M. Kaufman (eds) (1994), *Theorizing Masculinities*, Thousand Oaks, 119-41.
Knottnerus, J. D. (1997), 'The Theory of Structural Ritualization', in B. Markovsky, M.J. Lovaglia, and L. Troyer (eds), *Advances in Group Processes*, Vol. 14, Greenwich, 257-279.
Knottnerus, J.D. and P.E. Berry, (2002), 'Spartan Society: Structural ritualization in an ancient society', *Humboldt Journal of Social Relations*, 27:1, 1-41.
Kochin, M. (1999), 'War, Class, and Justice in Plato's "Republic"', *The Review of Metaphysics*, 53:2, 403-423.
--------- (2002), *Gender and Rhetoric in Plato's Political Thought*, Cambridge.
Kohák, E.V. (1960), 'The Road to Wisdom: Lessons on Education from Plato's "Laches"', *The Classical Journal*, 56:3, 123-32.
Kossman, A, (2007), 'Justice and Virtue: Inquiry into Proper Difference', in G. R. F. Ferrari (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Plato's Republic*, Cambridge, 116-37.
Kraut, R. (ed.) (1992), *The Cambridge Companion to Plato*, Cambridge
Krentz, P. (ed.) (1989), *Xenophon: Hellenika 1-2.3.10*, Warminster.
--------- (1995), *Xenophon: Hellenika II.3.11-IV.2.8*, Warminster.

Kuhn, H. (1942), ‘The True Tragedy: On the Relationship between Greek Tragedy and Plato, II’, *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, 53, 37-88.
Larsen, J.A.O. (1934), ‘The Constitution of the Peloponnesian League II’ *Classical Philology*, 29:1, 1-19.
Lancaster, R. (1992), ‘Subject Honor, Object Shame’, in *Life is Hard: Machismo, danger and the intimacy of power in Nicaragua*, Berkley. (Reprinted (2002) in R. Adams and D. Savaran (eds), *The Masculinity Studies Reader*, Oxford, 41-68.)
Lape, S. (2001), ‘Democratic Ideology and the Poetics of Rape in Menandrian Comedy’, *Classical Antiquity*, 20:1, 79-119.
Lazenby, J. F. (1997), ‘The Conspiracy of Kinadon Reconsidered’, *Athenaeum* 55: 437-47.
Lauriola, R. (2009), ‘The Greeks and the Utopia: An overview through ancient Greek Literature’, *Revista Espaço Acadêmico*, 97, 109-24.
Lebow, R.N. (1996), ‘Play it Again Pericles: Agents, structures and the Peloponnesian war’, *European Journal of International Relations*, 2, 231-58.
--------- (2001), ‘Thucydides the Constructivist’, *The American Political Science Review*, 95:3, 547-60.
Lendon, J. E. (1994), ‘Thucydides and the ‘Constitution’ of the Peloponnesian League’, *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies*, 35:2, 159-77.
Link, S. (2004), ‘Snatching and Keeping: The motif of taking in Spartan culture’, in T. Figueira (ed.), *Spartan Society*, London, 1-24.
--------- (2009), ‘Education and Pederasty in Spartan and Cretan Society’, in S. Hodkinson (ed.), *Sparta: Comparative approaches*, Swansea, 89-112.
Lipka, M. (2002), *Xenophon’s Spartan Constitution: Introduction, text, commentary*, Berlin.
Livingstone, N. (2007), ‘Writing Politics: Isocrates' Rhetoric of Philosophy’, *Rhetorica: A Journal of the History of Rhetoric*, 25:1, 15-34.
Lloyd, A.B. (ed.) (1996), *Battle in Antiquity*, Swansea.
Loman, P. (2006), 'No Woman No War: Women's Participation in Ancient Greek Warfare', *Greece & Rome*, 51:1, 34-54.
Long, A.G. (2013), *Conversation and Self-Sufficiency in Plato*, Oxford.
Loraux, N. (1986), *The Invention of Athens: The funeral oration in the classical city*, trans. Alan Sheridan, Cambridge and London.
--------- (1993), *Children of Athena: Athenian ideas about citizenship and the division between the sexes*, trans. Caroline Levine, Princeton.
Ludwig, P. (2002), *Eros and Polis: Desire and community in Greek political theory*, New York.
--------- (2007) ‘Eros in the Republic’, in G. R. F. Ferrari (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Plato's Republic*, Cambridge, 202-31.
Luginbill, R. (1999), *Thucydides on War and National Character*, Boulder.
Luraghi, N. (2002), ‘Helot Slavery reconsidered’, in A. Powell and S. Hodkinson (eds), *Sparta: Beyond the mirage*, London/Swansea, 227-48.
--------- (2003), ‘The Imaginary Conquest of the Helots’, in N. Luraghi and S.E. Alcock (eds), *Helots and Their Masters in Laconia and Messenia: Histories, ideologies, structures*, Cambridge and London, 12-30.
--------- (2008), *The Ancient Messenians: Constructions of ethnicity and memory*, Cambridge.

Luraghi, N. and S.E. Alcock (eds) (2003), *Helots and Their Masters in Laconia and Messenia: Histories, ideologies, structures*, Washington.
Lyons, D. (2011), 'Plato's Attempt to Moralize Shame', *Philosophy*, 86:337, 353-74.
MacDowell, D. (1986), *Spartan Law*, Edinburgh.
Macurdy, G.H. (1910), 'The Fifth Book of Thucydides and Three Plays of Euripides', *The Classical Review*, 24:7, 205-7.
Masterson, M. (2005), 'Statius' "Thebaid" and the Realization of Roman Manhood', Phoenix, 59: 3/4, 288-315.
Masterson, M., N. Rabinowitz, and J. Robson (Eds) (2014) *Sex in Antiquity: Exploring Gender and Sexuality in the Ancient World*, New York.
May, L. (1998), *Masculinity and Morality*, Ithaca.
Maynard, S. (1989), 'Rough Work and Rugged Men: The social construction of masculinity in working-class history', *Labour/Le Travail*, 23, 159-69.
McCabe, M. (2000), *Plato and his Predecessors: The dramatisation of reason*, Cambridge.
McDonnell, M. (2006), *Roman Manliness: Virtus and the Roman Republic*, New York and Cambridge.
McPherran, M. (ed.) (2010), *Plato's Republic: a critical guide*, Cambridge.
Mertens, N. (2002), '*Ouk homoioi, agathoi de*: the *perioikoi* in the classical Lakedaimonian *polis',* in A. Powell and S. Hodkinson (eds), *Sparta: Beyond the mirage*, London/Swansea, 285-303
Messerschmidt, J.W. (2009), '"Doing Gender": The impact and future of a salient sociological concept', *Gender and Society*, 23:1, 85-8.
Meuser, M. (2007), 'Serious Games: Competition and the homosocial construction of masculinity', *NORMA: Nordic Journal for Masculinity Studies*, 2:1, 38-51.
Michaelson, E.J. and L.M. Aaland (1976), 'Masculinity, Femininity, and Androgyny', *Ethos*, 4:2, 251-70.
Millender, E.G. (1996), '"The Teacher of Hellas": Athenian democratic ideology and the "barbarization" of Sparta in fifth-century Greek thought', PhD Thesis, University of Pennsylvania.
--------- (1999), 'Athenian Ideology and the Empowered Spartan Female', in S. Hodkinson and A. Powell (eds), *Sparta: New perspectives*, London, 355-91.
--------- (2001), 'Spartan Literacy Revisited', *Classical Antiquity*, 20, 121-64.
--------- (2002), 'Nomos despotes: Spartan obedience and Athenian lawfulness in fifth-century thought', in V. Gorman and E. Robinson (eds), *Oikistes: Studies in Constitutions, Colonies, and Military Power in the Ancient World Offered in Honor of A. J Graham*, Leiden, 33-59.
--------- (2009), 'The Spartan Dyarchy: A comparative perspective', in S. Hodkinson (ed.), *Sparta: Comparative approaches*, Swansea, 1-67.
Miller, W.I. (2009), *The Mystery of Courage*, Cambridge.
--------- (2017), 'Spartan Women', in A. Powell (ed.), *A Companion to Sparta*, vol. II, Hoboken, 500-25.
Moles, J. L. (1994), 'Xenophon and Callicratidas', *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 114, 70-84.
Moller, M. (2007), 'Exploiting Patterns: A critique of hegemonic masculinity', *Journal of Gender Studies*, 16, 263-76.

Momigliano, A. (1978), ‘Greek Historiography’, *History and Theory*, 17:1, 1-28.
Monten, J. (2006), ‘Thucydides and Modern Realism’, International Studies Quarterly, 50:1, 3-25.
Moore, J.M. (1975), *Aristotle and Xenophon on Democracy and Oligarchy*, London.
Moore, K. R. (2005), *Sex and the Second-best city: sex and society in the Laws of Plato*, New York.
Morgan, D. (1994), ‘Theater of War: Combat, the military, and masculinities’, in H. Brod and M. Kaufman (eds), *Theorizing Masculinities*, Newbury Park, 165-82. (Reprinted (2006) in S. Whitehead (ed.), *Men and Masculinities*, Vol. II, ‘*Materializing Masculinity*’, London, 444-59.)
Morrow, G.R. (1960), Plato's Cretan City: A historical interpretation of the Laws, Princeton.
Morrison, J.V. (2006), *Reading Thucydides*, Columbus.
Moss, D. (2006), ‘Masculinity as Masquerade’, *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, 54, 1187-94.
Munteanu, D.L. (2012), *Tragic Pathos: Pity and fear in Greek philosophy and tragedy*, Cambridge.
Neumann, H. (1969), Socrates in Plato and Aristophanes: In memory of Ludwig Edelstein (1902-1965)’, *The American Journal of Philology*, 90:2, 201-14.
North, H. (1966), *Sophrosyne: Self-knowledge and self-restraint in Greek literature*, Ithaca.
Nye, R.A. (2005), ‘Locating Masculinity: Some Recent Work on Men’, *Signs*, 30:3, 1937-62.
Ogden, D. (1996), ‘Homosexuality and Warfare in Ancient Greece’, in A.B. Lloyd (ed.) *Battle in Antiquity*, Swansea, 107-68.
Okin, S.M. (1977), ‘Philosopher Queens and Private Wives: Plato on women and the family’, *Philosophy & Public Affairs*, 6:4, 345-69.
Oliva, P (1971), *Sparta and Her Social Problems*, trans. I. Urwin, Amsterdam.
Oost, S.I. (1977-8), ‘Xenophon's Attitude Toward Women’, *The Classical World*, 71:4, 225-36.
Orwin, C. (1994), *The Humanity of Thucydides*, Princeton.
Osborne, R. (1998), ‘Sculpted Men of Athens: Masculinity and power in the field of vision’, in Foxhall and J. Salmon (eds), *Thinking Men: Masculinity and its self-representation in the classical tradition*, London, 23-42.
Paradiso, A. (2004), ‘The Logic of Terror: Thucydides, Spartan duplicity and an improbable massacre’, in T. Figueira (ed.), *Spartan Society*, London, 179-98.
Parke, H.W. (1930), ‘The Development of the Second Spartan Empire (405-371 B.C.)’, *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 50:1, 37-79.
Parker, V. (2007) ‘Sphodrias’ Raid and the Liberation of Thebes: A study of Ephorus and Xenophon’, *Hermes*, 135:1, 13-33.
Parry, A. (1957), *Logos and Ergon in Thucydides*, Salem.
Pearson, L. (1936), ‘Propaganda in the Archidamian War’, *Classical Philology*, 31:1, 33-52.
Percy, W.A. III (2005), ‘Reconsiderations About Greek Homosexualities’, *Journal of Homosexuality*, 49:3-4, 13-61.

Petersen, A. (2003), 'Research on Men and Masculinities: Some implications of recent theory for future work', *Men and Masculinities*, 6:1, 54-69. (Reprinted (2006) in S. Whitehead (ed.), *Men and Masculinities* Vol. III, *'Identity, Association and Embodiment'*, London, 49-64.)

Pierce, K. F. (1998) 'Ideals of masculinity in New Comedy', in L. Foxhall and J. Salmon (eds), *Thinking Men: Masculinity and its self-representation in the Classical Tradition*, London, 130-47.

Pini, B. and B. Pease (eds) (2013), *Men, Masculinities and Methodologies*, Basingstoke.

Pleck, J. (1995), 'The Gender Role Strain Paradigm: An update', in R.F. Levant and W.S. Pollack (eds), *A New Psychology of Men*, New York, 11-32. (Reprinted (2006) in S. Whitehead (ed.), *Men and Masculinities* Vol. I, *'Politics and Power*', London, 27-48.)

Pomeroy, S. (1994), *Xenophon Oeconomicus: A social and historical commentary*, Oxford.

--------- (2002), *Spartan Women*, Oxford.

--------- (2008), 'Spartan Women among the Romans: Adapting Models, Forging Identities', *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome*, 7, 221-34.

Porter, J. R. (1994), 'Euripides and Sparta', in A. Powell and S. Hodkinson (eds), *The Shadow of Sparta*, London, 1-33.

Pouncey, P. (1980), *The Necessities of War: A study of Thucydides' pessimism*, New York.

Powell, A. (1989), 'Mendacity and Sparta's Use of the Visual', in A. Powell (ed.), *Classical Sparta: Techniques behind her success*, Norman, 173-92.

--------- (1994), 'Plato and Sparta: modes of rule and of non-rational persuasion in the *Laws*', in A. Powell and S. Hodkinson (eds), *The Shadow of Sparta*, London, 273-322.

--------- (2001), *Athens and Sparta: Constructing Greek political and social history from 478 BC*, 2nd edition, London and New York.

--------- (2004), 'The Women of Sparta – and of Other Greek Cities – at War', in T. Figueira (ed.), *Spartan Society*, London, 137-50.

--------- (2010), 'Divination, royalty and insecurity in Classical Sparta', in S. Hodkinson and A. Powell (eds), *Sparta: The Body Politic*, Swansea, 85-132.

Powell, A. (ed.), 2017, A Companion to Sparta, 2 vols, Hoboken.

Prentice, W.K. (1934), 'The Character of Lysander', *American Journal of Archaeology*, 38:1, 37-42.

Price, A. W. (2011), *Virtue and Reason in Plato and Aristotle*, Oxford.

Price, J. (1999), 'Schooling and Racialized Masculinities: The diploma, teachers, and peers in the lives of young African American men', *Youth and Society*, 31:2, 224-63. (Reprinted (2006) in S. Whitehead (ed.), *Men and Masculinities*, Vol. III, *Identity, Association and Embodiment*, London, 253-86.)

Proietti, G. (1987), *Xenophon's Sparta: An introduction*, Leiden.

Poulakos, J. (1995), *Sophistical Rhetoric in Classical Greece*, Columbia.

Raaflaub, K.A. (2003), 'Stick and Glue: The Function of Tyranny in Fifth-Century Athenian Democracy', in K.A. Morgan (ed.), *Popular Tyranny: Sovereignty and Its Discontents in Ancient Greece*, Austin.

Raaflaub, K.A., (2006), ‘Thucydides on Democracy and Oligarchy’, in A. Rengakos and A. Tsakmakis (eds), *Brill’s Companion to Thucydides*, Leiden and Boston, 189-224.
Rabbås, Ø. (2004), ‘Definitions and Paradigms: Laches' first definition’, *Phronesis*, 49:2, 143-68.
Rabieh, L.R. (2006), *Plato and the Virtue of Courage*, Baltimore.
Rabinowitz, A. (2009), ‘Drinking from the same cup: Sparta and late Archaic commensality’, in S. Hodkinson (ed.), *Sparta: Comparative Approaches,* Swansea, 113-192.
Rademaker, A. (2003), ‘Most Citizens are Euruprôktoi Now: (Un)manliness in Aristophanes”, in R.M. Rosen and I. Sluiter (eds) *Andreia : Studies in Manliness and Courage in Classical Antiquity*, Leiden, 115-25.
Rahn, P. (1971), ‘Xenophon's Developing Historiography’, *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, 102, 497-508.
Randall, J.H. ‘Plato's Treatment of the Theme of the Good Life and his Criticism of the Spartan Ideal’, *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 28:3, 307-24.
Rebenich, S. (1998), Xenophon, *Die Verfassung der Spartaner*, Darmstadt.
Recco, G. and E. Sanday, Eric (eds) (2012), *Studies in Continental Thought: Plato's Laws: Force and truth in politics*, Bloomington.
Redfield, J (1977-8), ‘The Women of Sparta’, *The Classical Journal*, 73:2, 146-61.
Reeser, T. (2009), *Masculinities in Theory: An introduction*, New Jersey.
Reinhold, M. (2002), *Studies in Classical History and Society*, New York.
Reis, B. and R. Grossmark (eds) (2009), *Heterosexual Masculinities: Contemporary perspectives from psychoanalytic gender theory*, New York.
Rubarth (2014), ‘Competing Constructions of Masculinity in Ancient Greece’, *Athens Journal of Humanities & Arts*, 1:1, 21-32.
Richlin, A. (2003), ‘Gender and Rhetoric: Producing Manhood in the Schools’, in M. Golden and P. Toohey (eds) *Sex and Difference in Ancient Greece and Rome,* Edinburgh, 202-20.
Robson, J.E. (2006), *Humour, Obscenity and Aristophanes*, Tübingen.
Roisman, J. (1987a), ‘Alkidas in Thucydides’, *Historia*, 36:4, 385-421.
--------- (1987b), ‘Kallikratidas: A Greek patriot?’, *The Classical Journal*, 83:1, 21-33.
--------- (2005), *The Rhetoric of Manhood: Masculinity in the Attic orators*, Berkeley.
Rood, T. (1998), *Thucydides: Narrative and explanation*, Oxford.
Roper, M. and J. Tosh (1991), ‘Historians and the Politics of Masculinity’, in Roper, M. and J. Tosh (eds), *Manful Assertions*, London, 1-24. (Reprinted (2006) in S. Whitehead (ed.), *Men and Masculinities,* Vol. I, *‘Politics and Power*’, London, 79-99.)
Rorty, A. O. (1986), ‘The Two Faces of Courage’, *Philosophy*, 61:236, 151-71.
Rose, S.O. (2010), *What is Gender History?* Cambridge.
Rosen, R.M. and I. Sluiter (eds) (2003), *Andreia: Studies in manliness and courage in classical antiquity*, Leiden.
Rosen, S. (1965), ‘The Role of Eros in Plato's "Republic"’, *The Review of Metaphysics*, 18:3, 452-75.

--------- (2005), *Plato's Republic: A Study*, New Haven.
Runciman, W.G. (2010), *Great Books, Bad Arguments: Republic, Leviathan, & the Communist Manifesto*, Princeton.
Salkever, S.G. (1986), 'Women, Soldiers, Citizens: Plato & Aristotle on the politics of virility', *Polity*, 19:2, 232-53.
Sandford, S. (2010), *Plato and Sex*, Cambridge.
Santas, G. (1969), 'Socrates at Work on Virtue and Knowledge in Plato's "Laches"', *The Review of Metaphysics*, 22:3, 433-60.
Saunders, T.J. (1992), 'Plato's Later Political Thought', in R. Kraut (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Plato*, Cambridge, 464-92.
Saxonhouse, A.W. (1976), 'The Philosopher and the Female in the Political Thought of Plato", *Political Theory*, 4:2, 195-212.
Scaltas, P. (1992), 'Virtue Without Gender in Socrates', *Hypatia*, 7:3, 126-37.
Scanlon, T.F. (2005), 'The Dispersion of Pederasty and the Athletic Revolution in Sixth-Century BC Greece', *Journal of Homosexuality*, 49:3/4, 63-85.
Schmid, W.T. (1992), *On Manly Courage: A Study of Plato's Laches*, Illinois.
Schrock, D. and M. Schwalbe (2009), 'Men, Masculinity, and Manhood Acts', *Annual Review of Sociology*, 35, 277-95.
Scholtz, A. (2004), 'Friends, Lovers, Flatterers: Demophilic Courtship in Aristophanes' "Knights"', *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 134:2, 263-93.
Schwartz, N.L. (2004), '"Dreaded and Dared": Courage as a virtue', *Polity*, 36:3, 341-65.
Scott, J.W. (1986), 'Gender: A useful category of historical analysis', *The American Historical Review*, 91: 5, 1053-75.
Sheppard, D.J. (2009), *Plato's Republic: An Edinburgh philosophical guide*, Edinburgh.
Shero, L.R. (1932), 'Xenophon's Portrait of a Young Wife', *The Classical Weekly*, 26:3, 17-21.
Shipley, G. (1997), '"The Other Lakedaimonians": The dependant perioikic *poleis* of Laconia and Messenia', in M.H. Hanson (ed.), *The Polis as an Urban Centre and as a Political Community*, Acts of the Copenhagen Polis Centre, vol. 4, Copenhagen, 189-281.
--------- (2004), '"Messenia" and "Lakedaimon"', in M. H. Hansen and T. H. Nielsen (eds), *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis*, Oxford, 547-68 and 569-98.
--------- (2006), 'Sparta and its Perioikic Neighbours: A century of reassessment', *Hermathena*, 181, 51–82.
Skinner, M. (2005), *Sexuality in Greek and Roman Culture*, Oxford.
Smith, N.D. (1983), 'Plato and Aristotle on the Nature of Women', *Journal of the History of Philosophy*, 21:4, 467-78.
Smith, R. E. (1954), 'The Opposition to Agesilaus' Foreign Policy 394-371 B.C.', *Historia*, 2:3, 274-88.
Sommerstein, A.H. (1998) 'Rape and young manhood in Athenian comedy', in L. Foxhall and J. Salmon (eds), *Thinking Men: Masculinity and its self-representation in the Classical Tradition*, London, 100-14.
--------- (2009), *Talking About Laughter and Other Studies in Greek Comedy*, Oxford.

Sommerstein, A.H. and Bayliss, A.J. (2013), *Oath and State in Ancient Greece*, Berlin
Spelman, E.V. (1994), 'Hairy Cobblers and Philosopher-Queens', in N. Tuana (ed.) *Feminist Interpretations of Plato*, Pennsylvania, 87-107.
Stadter, P.A. (2012), 'Thucydides as 'Reader' of Herodotus', in, E. Foster and D. Lateiner (eds) *Thucydides and Herodotus*, Oxford, 39-66.
Stahl, H, (1973) 'Speeches and the Course of Events in Books Six and Seven of Thucydides', in H. Stahl (ed.), *The Speeches in Thucydides*, Chapel Hill, 60-77.
Starr, C. G. (1978) 'An evening with the flute-girls', *Past and Present*, 33, 401-10.
Strassler, R.B. (1990), 'The Opening of the Pylos Campaign', *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 110, 110-25.
--------- (ed.) (1996), *The Landmark Thucydides: A comprehensive guide to the Peloponnesian war*, New York.
Strauss, L. (1972), *Xenophon's Socrates*, London.
Talbert, J.A. (1989), 'The Role of the Helots in the Class Struggle at Sparta', *Historia*, 38:1, 22-40.
Tamiolaki, M. (2013), 'Ascribing Motivation in Thucydides: Between historical research and literary representation', in A. Tsakmakis and M. Tamiolaki (eds) *Trends in Classics - Supplementary Volumes: Thucydides between history and literature*, Berlin, 41-72.
Tessitore, A. (1994), 'Courage and Comedy in Plato's Laches', *The Journal of Politics*, 56:1, 115-33.
Thornton, B. (1997), *Eros: The myth of ancient Greek sexuality*, Oxford.
Tolson, A. (1977), 'Boys will be Boys', in A. Tolson, *The Limits of Masculinity*, London, 22-46. (Reprinted (2006) in S. Whitehead (ed.), *Men and Masculinities*, Vol. II, *Materializing Masculinity*, London, 121-39.)
Tosh, J. (1994), 'What Should Historians Do with Masculinity? Reflections on nineteenth-century Britain', *History Workshop*, 38, 179-202.
--------- (2011), 'The History of Masculinity: An outdated concept?', in J. Arnold and S. Brady (eds), *What is Masculinity? Historical dynamics from antiquity to the contemporary world*, New York, 17-34.
Tritle, L.A., (2010), *A New History of the Peloponnesian War*, Chichester.
Tuana, N. (ed.) (1994), *Feminist Interpretations of Plato*, Pennsylvania.
Tuplin, C. (1993), *The Failings of Empire: A reading of Xenophon* Hellenica *2.3.11-7.5.27*, Stuttgart.
--------- (1994), 'Xenophon, Sparta and the *Cyropaedia*', in A. Powell and S. Hodkinson (eds), *The Shadow of Sparta*, London, 127-82.
--------- (1996) *Achaemenid Studies*, Stuttgart.
Tsakmakis, A. (2006), 'Leaders, Crowds, and the Power of Image', in A. Rengakos and A. Tsakmakis (eds), *Brills Companion to Thucydides*, Leiden and Boston, 161-88.
Tzanetou, A. (2012), *City of Suppliants: Tragedy and the Athenian empire*, Austin.
Usher, S. (1999), *Greek Oratory: Tradition and originality*, Oxford.
Van Wees, H. (1998), 'A Brief History of Tears: Gender differentiation in archaic Greece', in L. Foxhall and J. Salmon (eds), *When Men Were*

Men: Masculinity power and identity in classical antiquity, London, 10-53.
--------- (2004), *Greek Warfare: Myths and realities*, London.
Vernant, J (1991), *Mortals and Immortals*, Princeton.
Vlastos, G. (1994), 'Was Plato a Feminist?', In N. Tuana (ed.) *Feminist Interpretations of Plato*, Pennsylvania, 11-24.
Walcot, P. (1987), 'Plato's Mother and Other Terrible Women', *Greece & Rome*, Second Series, 34:1, 12-31.
Walker, J. (2011), *The Genuine Teachers of this Art: Rhetorical education in antiquity*, Columbia.
Walsh, W.H. (1962), 'Plato and the Philosophy of History: History and theory in the Republic', *History and* Theory, 2:1, 3-16.
Walters, K. (1997), 'Invading the Roman body: manliness and impenetrability in Roman thought', in J. Hallett and M. Skinner (eds): *Roman Sexualities*, 29-46.
Wassermann, F.M. (1953), 'The Speeches of King Archidamus in Thucydides', *The Classical Journal*, 48:6, 193-200.
--------- (1964), 'The Voice of Sparta in Thucydides', *The Classical Journal*, 59:7, 289-97.
Weathers, W. (1954), 'Xenophon's Political Idealism', *The Classical Journal*, 49:7, 317-21, 330.
West, C. and D.H. Zimmerman (1987), 'Doing Gender', *Gender and Society*, 1:2,125-51.
Westlake, H.D. (1968), *Individuals in Thucydides*, Cambridge.
--------- (1973), 'The Settings of Thucydidean Speeches', in H. Stahl (ed.), *The Speeches in Thucydides*, Chapel Hill, 90-108.
Wetherell, M. and N. Edley (1999), 'Negotiating Hegemonic Masculinity: Imaginary positions and psycho-discursive practices', *Feminism & Psychology*, 9, 335-56.
Whitby, M. (1994), 'Two Shadows: Images of Spartans and Helots', in A. Powell and S. Hodkinson (eds), *The Shadow of Sparta*, London, 87-126.
White, F.C. (2001), 'Plato's Last Words on Pleasure', *The Classical Quarterly*, New Series, 51:2, 458-76.
Whitehead, S. (2002), 'Desires of the Masculine Subject', in S.M. Whitehead, *Men and Masculinities: Key themes and new directions*, London, 205-21. (Reprinted (2006) in S. Whitehead (ed.), *Men and Masculinities*, Vol. III, *Identity, association and embodiment*, London, 65-81.)
Whitehead, S. (ed.) (2006), *Men and Masculinities*, 5 vols, London.
Wilberding, J. (2009), 'Plato's Two Forms of Second-Best Morality', *The Philosophical Review*, 118:3, 351-74.
Wilson, J.R. (1990), 'Sophrosyne in Thucydides', *Ancient History Bulletin*, 4:3, 51-8.
Wilson, P. (1999) 'The Aulos in Athens', in S. Goldhill and R. Osborne (eds) *Performance Culture and Athenian Democracy*, 1999, Cambridge, 58-95.
Williams, C.A. (1992), *Homosexuality and the Roman Man: A study in the cultural construction of sexuality*, New Haven.
--------- (1999), *Roman Homosexuality: Ideologies of masculinity in Classical Antiquity*, New York.

Winkler, J. (1990), ‘Laying Down the Law: The oversight of men’s sexual behavior in classical Athens’, in D. Halperin, J. Winkler, and F. Zeitlin (eds) *Before Sexuality: The Construction of erotic experience in the ancient Greek world*, New Jersey, 171-210.
Wolfsdorf, D. (2005), ‘Δυναμισ in "Laches"’, *Phoenix*, 59: 3/4, 324-47.
Wyke, M. (1998), *Gender and the Body in the Ancient Mediterranean*, Oxford.