

2013-12-13

Depictions of Spartan Masculinity in Thucydides and Xenophon

Heydon, Kendell

Heydon, K. (2013). Depictions of Spartan Masculinity in Thucydides and Xenophon (Master's thesis, University of Calgary, Calgary, Canada). Retrieved from <https://prism.ucalgary.ca>. doi:10.11575/PRISM/25553
<http://hdl.handle.net/11023/1197>

Downloaded from PRISM Repository, University of Calgary

UNIVERSITY OF CALGARY

Depictions of Spartan Masculinity in Thucydides and Xenophon

by

Kendell Heydon

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES
IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS

DEPARTMENT OF GREEK AND ROMAN STUDIES

CALGARY, ALBERTA

DECEMBER, 2013

© Kendell Heydon 2013

Abstract

Because we have no Classical Spartan writing we are reliant on the views of outsiders to try to reconstruct their social mores. Using traditional philology combined with social constructionist theory I examine how Thucydides and Xenophon depict Spartan masculinity. I have found that these authors differ in their descriptions of the Spartan masculine subject, reflecting primarily the purposes for which they wrote. Despite this, both authors describe inter-Spartan relations and relations between Spartiates and “others”, both within the Spartan system and those external to it, so as to suggest that the employment of officially propagated images of Spartan masculinity played a significant role in Spartan dealings. Accounts of Spartan employment of masculine ideology correspond significantly to hegemonic frameworks discussed in social constructionist theories of masculinity, suggesting the veracity of these aspects in accounts of Spartan society as well as the applicability of constructionist frameworks to the study of Spartan masculinity.

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I would like to thank my supervisor Dr. Noreen Humble for all her time and effort, for her invaluable guidance and knowledge, and for her patience with me during this process. I would like to thank the members of my examining committee Dr. John Vanderspoel and Dr. Jewel Spangler for giving their time and expertise to review my work. I would like to thank the University of Calgary and the department of Greek and Roman Studies for the academic and financial support I have received over the course of this degree. I would like to thank the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council for the funding they have provided. And lastly, I would like to offer my heartfelt gratitude to my family, without whose love and support I could never have accomplished all that I have thus far.

Table of Contents

Abstract	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
Table of Contents	iv
Chapter 1: Background and Methodology	1
Chapter 2: Thucydides	29
2.1 Introduction	29
2.2 Discourse	30
2.3 Representation and Performativity	41
2.4 Relations Between Men and Hegemonic Masculinity	52
Chapter 3: Xenophon Philosophy	59
3.1 Introduction	59
3.2 The Relation of Men and Women	60
3.3 Attitudes Towards Sex	63
3.4 Institutions	67
3.5 Discourse	74
3.6 Representation and Performativity	78
3.7 Relations Between Men and Hegemonic Masculinity	81
Chapter 4: Xenophon History	88
4.1 Introduction	88
4.2 Attitudes Towards Sex	88
4.3 Discourse	96
4.4 Relations Between Men and Hegemonic Masculinity	104
Chapter 5: Conclusion	115
Bibliography	122

Chapter 1: Background and Methodology

The idea of masculinity 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.¹ While this has proved fruitful for producing an abundance of material on the subject matter of masculinity, the sheer diversity of material and approaches can make the task of deciding which methodological frameworks to apply to a historio-cultural examination of the construction of masculinity in Classical Sparta daunting. In this chapter I intend to discuss the prominent theoretical frameworks that have been applied to masculinity within the field of sociology.² I will highlight the theoretical merits and shortcomings of these theories, examine the specific challenges encountered when applying sociological gender theories onto a historical study, and, finally, suggest that the most useful approach to the study of masculinity in Classical Sparta is to incorporate social-constructionist theory within a customary historical approach.

When one looks broadly at the theories concerning the formulation of gender, the two most distinct, and oppositional, perspectives that come to light are those of essentialists and of constructionists.³ The core of essentialism lies in the belief that gender arises from a fundamental essence, usually believed to proceed from biological sex, and therefore that there is a 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

¹ Bickrell (2006), 87; Fletcher (2011), 61.

² I recognise that significant contributions have been made in masculinity research in many other fields such as psychology and anthropology as well (e.g. Jacobson, Michaelson and Aaland [1976], Gutmann [1997], Lancaster [2002], Diamond [2006], Moss [2006]), However, as the methods employed by such fields rely heavily on accounts of personal 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.

³ Higate (2003), 28; Howson (2006), 55.

and discourse, often with political aims. Both frameworks contain a number of approaches which warrant further examination.

The origins of modern essentialist gender theories can trace their origins to developments in the Western world beginning in the 16th century, coming to a head in the last two hundred years when the influences of capitalism and imperialism led to a rejection of gentry masculinity. These theories, which became prominent in nineteenth century ideology, gave birth to the idea of separate spheres of action for men and women,⁴ and generated significant interest in the idea of sex-difference, spawning, in turn, much research— especially within the field of psychology— which continues into present times.⁵ Beginning with Freud, the idea that “anatomy is destiny”⁶ was espoused by proponents of the belief in innate disparity between the sexes to account for not only biological, but also social differences in the roles of men and women.⁷ While Freud’s theories of the formation of gender involved complex and lengthy processes,⁸ 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.⁹

Within this view, 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 views the roles which society places upon men and women as being the outward expressions of these intrinsic natures.¹⁰ The ways in which societal roles function in accordance with the essential nature of males and females, however, is a matter of debate. Clatterbaugh, e.g., highlights the differences between standpoints of moral conservatives, who believe that gender roles present in the traditional nuclear family are designed to harness the negative attributes of essential masculinity into the socially beneficial role of protector and provider, and biological conservatives who believe that these same roles are those most consistent with the essential natures of men and women.¹¹ Both groups of essentialists, however, are in agreement that adherence to traditional sex roles is both advantageous

⁴ Connell (2002), 246-9, 252-3.

⁵ Connell (2005), 21; Howson (2006), 56.

⁶ Adams and Savran (2002), 338.

⁷ Jackson (1991), 201.

⁸ Connell (2005), 7-11.

⁹ Reeser (2009), 22.

¹⁰ Clatterbaugh (1990), 100-2; Connell (2005), 22; Hausman (2011), 35.

¹¹ Clatterbaugh (1990), 100-18.

and natural because it acts in congruence with the natural biological essence of men and women.¹² In accordance with the biological focus of their ideas, essentialist theory often employs sociobiological methodology in its arguments. Sociobiology is “the systematic study of the biological basis of all social behavior”,¹³ 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.¹⁴ The sociobiological school of thought asserts that masculinity is a force natural to men’s bodies which has arisen from evolutionary forces.¹⁵ Most recently, sociobiologists have sought to find the foundations of social behavior within the human genetic code itself.¹⁶ Essentialist applications of sociobiology and role theory have been historically used, therefore, to advocate the separation of social roles along gendered lines, defend the structures of hegemonic masculinity and of the traditional family, and oppose feminist movements.¹⁷ Essentialist ideas have also factored prominently in the literature concerning the perceived “crisis of masculinity”. Finding its origins in the second wave men’s movement, crisis adherents view masculinity as under attack. They believe that the expectations modern culture has imposed upon essential masculinity serve to weaken it which causes the perception of “role strain”. As a result, proponents of this view have called for a return to what they call “true masculinity”.¹⁸

Essentialist views were particularly popular during the nineteenth century. Not only did essentialist ideas of separate male and female spheres of action fit nicely with bourgeois capitalist ideology, they were also agreeable to feminists of that period. The idea that males and females were biologically and psychologically distinct from one another was seen as a positive change from the earlier idea that females were a lesser, or inverted form of males. This new idea of the female as a separate, rather than an inferior, category of human aided in the women’s emancipation movement.¹⁹ The relegation of

¹² Clatterbaugh (1990), 100-18; Howson (2006), 56; Atkinson (2011), 5.

¹³ Clatterbaugh (1990), 102; Howson (2006), 58.

¹⁴ Clatterbaugh (1990), 102; Howson (2006), 56; Atkinson (2011), 5.

¹⁵ Connell (2005), 46; Howson (2006), 56; Reeser (2009), 33.

¹⁶ Howson (2006), 55.

¹⁷ Clatterbaugh (1990), 100-19; Jackson (1991), 201; Atkinson (2011), 5; Jackson and Balaji (2011), 20.

¹⁸ Carrigan Connell and Lee (1985), 26-7, 39; Reeser (2009), 33; Catano and Novak (2011), 2; Jackson and Balaji (2011), 20.

¹⁹ Connell (2005), 21.

males to the economic and political spheres of action and females to the domestic also enabled women to have a greater degree of freedom and authority within those spheres considered to be feminine.²⁰ Role theory has also been seen as having advantages over other approaches. For example, unlike psychoanalysis role theory can provide an explanation for historical change in the characteristics of sex roles.²¹ While essentialists claim that gender and its associated roles are biologically based and proceed from one's sex,²² they still understand them to be social manifestations of sex and, as such, susceptible to the influence of culture.²³ Thus role theory also provides an explanation for the phenomenon of "role strain", which essentialists believe occurs when the cultural pressures placed upon a sex role are excessively incongruent with essential masculinity or femininity.²⁴ Claiming a basis in science has also been a strong selling point for essentialist ideas, as Connell notes that science holds hegemony in our culture, and all major discourses make an attempt to appear scientific.²⁵ Finally, perhaps essentialism's greatest charm has been its common-sense appeal.²⁶ For many people, accounts of the roles stemming from essential masculinity or femininity coincide with their own internalized gender identities, thus such essentialist accounts seem to simply make sense.²⁷ Hausman notes that for many it seems natural to accept an essential gender difference, as doing so allows people to understand the dissimilar experiences of the sexes. They are therefore willing to reinforce ideas of natural masculinity or femininity with stories about gender.²⁸

In spite of this appeal, however, essentialist ideas, particularly those within the frameworks of sociobiology and role theory, have met with considerable recent criticism. Firstly, doubt has been thrown on their scientific claims. Although a vast amount of research has been conducted in the area of sex-difference, actual psychological disparity between the sexes is so slight as to render it non-existent, were we not culturally cued to

²⁰ Connell (2002), 252; Connell (2005), 68.

²¹ Connell (1993), 124; Connell (2005), 23.

²² Reeser (2009), 72-3.

²³ Connell (2005), 23; Howson (2006), 55-6.

²⁴ Carrigan, Connell and Lee (1985), 26-7, 39; Connell (2005), 23, 25; Atkinson (2011) 10-1.

²⁵ Connell (2005), 6.

²⁶ Connell (2005), 39.

²⁷ Connell (2005), 39; Reeser (2009), 51-2; Hausman (2011), 136.

²⁸ Hausman (2011), 136.

exaggerate the significance of sex-difference.²⁹ Role theory is therefore understood to distort the view of social realities by grossly exaggerating the biological difference between males and females, thereby justifying vast social disparity between the sexes, which the empirical data simply does not support.³⁰ Another 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, so that any deviation from the normative performance of sex roles becomes unexplained phenomena and is counted simply as a failure in socialization.³¹ When one does view one's masculinity or femininity as an essential trait, critics of essentialism suggest that this perception is not due to natural inclination, but that such views are held precisely because we are culturally conditioned to hold them.³² Masculinity only seems natural because the cultural processes by which it is constructed work in such a way so as to make it appear natural, eternal, and unchanging.³³ Critics further claim that, when essentialist views are put under scrutiny, it becomes apparent that there is no "true" or "essential" masculinity because the "essences" chosen by those arguing for essentialist views of gender are arbitrary and differ from scholar to scholar.³⁴ There are also a number of situations in which ideas of an ingrained and unchanging masculinity fall apart. This occurs when masculinity is viewed in the context of different cultures (and time periods) whose social organization differs from that of modern Western societies,³⁵ or when one observes that changes occur in the presentation of masculinity throughout the lifespan.³⁶ Finally, many arguments have been made that essentialist frameworks are too logically and theoretically weak to support an understanding of the construction of gender, as they are logically vague, oversimplified, and rely on a superficial analysis of human personality without

²⁹ Connell (2005), 21.

³⁰ Connell (2005), 21, 26.

³¹ Carrigan, Connell and Lee (1985), 39.

³² Tolson (1977), 121-9; Reeser (2009) 51-2.

³³ Reeser (2009) 51-2.

³⁴ Connell (2005), 69; Reeser (2009), 2, 75.

³⁵ Reis and Grossmark (2009), 1-2.

³⁶ Ellis (2011), 264.

leaving room for social structure;³⁷ they exaggerate biological sex-difference while ignoring other contributing factors such as race, class and sexuality;³⁸ they are historically static, in that they fail to see historical change as arising from discourse within gender relations, instead always viewing change as something that “‘happens’ to sex-roles”; and they are ultimately conceptually, practically, and empirically inadequate due to the fact that, “ the ‘male sex role’ does not exist.”³⁹ So while some still adhere to essentialist beliefs concerning gender, prevalent approaches to the subject matter have shifted towards constructionist frameworks.⁴⁰

Constructionism, like essentialism, can also trace its ideas back to Freud.⁴¹ But while essentialist ideology presented the development of normative internalized gender roles, as well as heterosexuality, out of biological gender as a natural unproblematic process,⁴² constructionist ideology came to see the construction of normative heterosexual masculinity (and by extension femininity) as socially and culturally instituted over the course of a whole life.⁴³ Constructionist theories really took root, however, out of the feminist movements in the 1960s through the 1980s.⁴⁴ This began with the rejection of role theory: feminism in the 1970s viewed the internalization of sex roles not as natural, but as a cultural mandate imposed as a means to relegate females to a subordinate position.⁴⁵ From the movement in the 1970s to write women’s history arose a complementary need for a new men’s history. This men’s history would take many ideas and approaches from the women’s movement, and would come to view the construction of masculinity as a key topic.⁴⁶ It was from this first wave of the men’s movement in the 1970s, with its pro-feminist leaning and commitment to institutional analysis and change, that the real seeds of constructionist frameworks of masculinity developed.⁴⁷ Two

³⁷ Connell (1993), 124; Connell (2005), 26.

³⁸ Connell (2005), 26.

³⁹ Carrigan, Connell and Lee (1985), 40-1.

⁴⁰ Hausman (2011), 135; Pleck (1995), 37.

⁴¹ Anderson (2009), 35.

⁴² Connell (2005), 10-1.

⁴³ Tolson (1977), 129.

⁴⁴ Catano and Novak (2011), 2-5.

⁴⁵ Connell (2005), 23.

⁴⁶ Adams and Savran (2002), 2; Connell (2005), 28; Catano and Novak (2011), 2-3; Tosh (2011), 17-8.

⁴⁷ Adams and Savran (2002), 5; Tosh (2011), 17-8.

constructionist views which came to be especially prominent from this time onwards are those of social-constructionism and post-structuralism.

Social-constructionist theory rejects the idea that masculinity is naturally occurring and emanates from a biological essence. Instead, it sees masculinity as a cultural construction which is fashioned outside the human body,⁴⁸ and which, in turn, is seen as a configuration of social practice which contributes to the structure of power within a particular moment in time.⁴⁹ Social constructionists view masculinities as relational above all else, as they believe that masculinity cannot exist except in relation,⁵⁰ both between men and women as well as between men.⁵¹ Furthermore, this theory does not view gender relations as the only factor in the creation of masculinity. Masculinity is rather just one of a number of subjectivities which intersect in both individual lives and in the fabric of society. Thus gender must also be examined in relation to a number of other subjectivities including race, class, sexuality and age.⁵² As masculinity is not taken to be a personal construction, but rather part of societal ideology, social-constructionist theories shift focus from the individual to the societal, and from experience to representations; the result being to look at masculinity as a cultural project.⁵³ As a relational construct, masculinity is primarily constructed through interaction and is seen as having three prominent sites of interactional construction: language, representation, and institutions. The contribution language has in 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 idealized masculinity which are comprised of visible traits. These representations are culturally exalted, and intentionally propagated through any number of channels, from the political to mass media. Thus, not only individuals, but

⁴⁸ Howson (2006), 56.

⁴⁹ Jackson (1991), 210; Howson (2006), 57; Reeser (2009), 12, 51-2; Alexander (2011), 55-6; Jackson and Balaji, (2011), 17.

⁵⁰ 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.

⁵¹ Howson (2006), 57; Alexander (2011), 55-6; Arnold and Brady (2011), 3-4.

⁵² Adams and Savran (2002), 155; Reeser (2009), 12; Arnold Brady (2011), 3-4; Tosh (2011), 22-3.

⁵³ Arnold and Brady (2011), 3-4; Tosh (2011), 22-3.

corporations, institutions and even nations can be seen as taking on particular representations of masculinity.⁵⁴ The culturally approved forms of masculinity are thus seen to be institutionalized. Institutions which social-constructionists highlight as being key to the construction of masculinity include the traditional family, school, athletics, the state, and the military.⁵⁵

Further, social-constructionist theories do not view culturally promoted and institutionalized masculinity as an arbitrary construction, rather they view it as “hegemonic masculinity”, which is deliberately framed and propagated by power regimes in order to produce a dominant gender hierarchy which reinforces men’s dominant social position.⁵⁶ Constructionists, therefore, take a particular interest in instances of hegemony in gender in an effort to understand the continuation of patriarchy, and the conditions under which some masculinities are deemed more appropriate than others. Anderson asserts that hegemony is a process of social subordination stratification which functions by convincing those positioned beneath the dominant ideal that their subordination is right and natural.⁵⁷ When hegemony is applied to gender, it is seen to provide the hierarchal framework by which patriarchy is justified on the basis of deep-seated differences between the sexes.⁵⁸ To bring this about, a hegemonic masculinity is created and culturally exalted as the ideal.⁵⁹ Hegemonic masculinities are then placed in relation and contrast to complementary submissive femininities.⁶⁰ This stratification occurs on all levels, involving cultural persuasion on the part of mass media, the division of labour, and enforcement by the state.⁶¹ Jackson points out that those features of traditional femininity— such as fragility, vulnerability, and gentleness— which are used to consign women to subordinate roles in society economics and politics, are culturally approved

⁵⁴ Reeser (2009), 180; Alexander (2011), 52-5; Atkinson (2011), 158-9.

⁵⁵ Tolson (1977), 121-9; Morgan (1994), 445-8; May (1998), 117-8; Connell (2005), 73; Anderson (2009), 54, 56-7.

⁵⁶ 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.

⁵⁷ Anderson (2009), 30-1. One of the significant limitations of hegemonic discussions is that they assume the universality of Western gender regimes. They therefore often try to impose societal frameworks upon societies to which they are ill-fitting.

⁵⁸ Anderson (2009), 36.

⁵⁹ Atkinson (2011), 32.

⁶⁰ Jackson (1991), 201-2; Anderson (2009), 34-6.

⁶¹ Carrigan, Connell & Lee (1985), 53; Connell (2005), 72.

and rewarded with “exaggerated shows of deference and indulgence”.⁶² The idealized, or hegemonic, type of masculinity is not the only masculinity that exists within a culture, nor is a universal archetype. Hegemonic masculinity is 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.⁶³ It has also been noted that hegemonic masculinity is not even usually the most prevalent form of masculinity, but that it is merely an exemplar in relation to which other forms position themselves.⁶⁴ This is especially the case, as hegemonic masculinity is not something that can be attained by the performance of its associated traits alone, but also by possessing the appropriate status in terms of class, race, and appearance. The implication of this is that many are able to possess so-called “orthodox-masculinity” without achieving hegemonic status.⁶⁵

While the prime purpose of hegemonic masculinity is seen to be the continuation of patriarchy, thus making women the primary subjugated group,⁶⁶ the functioning of hegemonic masculinity is reliant on the subjugation of other subordinate masculinities as well.⁶⁷ Understanding hegemonic relationships between men is seen as important in understanding not only the diversity of masculinities, but also the relations between them; the ability to impose definitions on other masculinities is what defines hegemony in gender.⁶⁸ Subordinate masculinities are often marginalized on the grounds that they bear resemblance in some way to femininity: e.g. the modern hegemony of heterosexual men over homosexuals, whose object of desire is seen to feminize them.⁶⁹ Subordinate masculinities have also been relegated along racial lines, as can be seen in the modern idealization of Western white representations of masculinity paired with the “othering” of non-white masculinities.⁷⁰ Privilege is gained by one’s position on the hegemonic ladder,

⁶² Jackson (1991), 201-2.

⁶³ Anderson (2009), 30-2.

⁶⁴ Carrigan, Connell & Lee (1985), 51; Connell (1993), 133; Connell (2005), 77.

⁶⁵ Anderson (2009), 41-2.

⁶⁶ Adams and Savran (2002), 2; Bickrell (2006), 97-8; Anderson (2009), 34-5.

⁶⁷ Carrigan, Connell & Lee (1985), 51; Roper and Tosh (1991), 90; Connell (2005), 78; Howson (2006), 60-1, 63-4.

⁶⁸ Carrigan, Connell & Lee (1985), 51; Connell (2005), 37.

⁶⁹ Connell (2005), 78; Howson (2006), 63; Anderson (2009), 39.

⁷⁰ Dryer (2002), 262-71; Price (2006), 255-7, 273-4, 281-3; Hall (2011), 33-8.

accomplished by emulation of the idealized forms while actively marginalizing subordinate forms of masculinity.⁷¹ 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. Rather, subaltern masculinities are allowed to exist and are, at times, even given authorization to be societally recognized, but always in ways that portray them as novel (and thus non-traditional and inferior), which ultimately is seen to serve the purposes of the hegemony.⁷²

Perhaps the largest identity group responsible for supporting hegemonic masculinity is made up of those who possess “complicit” masculinities. These are men who are seen as exhibiting many traits of hegemonic masculinity, but who fall short of the idealized form.⁷³ The majority of men in Western society are seen as falling under this heading. By acting out the culturally approved masculine behaviors, they are seen as possessing “orthodox masculinity”. However, as 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 possess full hegemonic masculinity.⁷⁴ These men emulate the hegemonic form and benefit from positioning themselves in relation to it.⁷⁵ Constructionists argue that it is the acceptance of hegemony by complicit masculinities which allows the hegemonic form to maintain an association with the majority of men, thus legitimizing the continuation of the hegemonic gender order.⁷⁶ These men are also those who perceive a crisis in masculinity most deeply when hegemony breaks down.⁷⁷

Post-structuralism shares many social-constructionist ideas, so much so that they have, at times, been taken to be synonymous.⁷⁸ But post-structuralist frameworks go one step further in naming discourse, not institutions, as the primary site of gender construction. Reeser, who employs a humanities-based methodology focused around post-structuralist theory, states that one cannot view institutions as the primary creator of

⁷¹ Anderson (2009), 32, 42; Atkinson (2011), 46-7.

⁷² Howson (2006), 63-4.

⁷³ Connell (2005), 79; Howson (2006), 65; Atkinson (2011), 33.

⁷⁴ Anderson (2009), 41-3.

⁷⁵ Connell (2005), 79; Howson (2006), 65; Atkinson (2011), 33.

⁷⁶ Howson (2006), 65.

⁷⁷ Atkinson (2011), 33.

⁷⁸ Bickrell (2006), 89.

masculinity because masculinity also helps to create institutions, making the construction of both masculinity and institutions circular. Nor, he asserts, can discourse be considered to be simply the tool of institutions as it takes on a life of its own, and that institutionally created discourse concerning masculinity can move beyond the framework of institutions— even in ways the institution had not intended. Instead, Reeser encourages one to view masculinity as an ideology, that is, “a series of beliefs that a group of people buy into and that influences how they go about their lives”. It is an ideology that is 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, masculinity is seen to be created and propagated in a number of ways, such as through images, myths, discourse, and practices. Language and discourse are seen as especially important as post-structuralists stress that, because language defines the way we experience the world, it can never be separated from ideas of masculinity.⁷⁹

The discursive production of masculinity, beginning from birth— as soon as the child is assigned the term male or female—is also seen as circular and self-affirming.⁸⁰ Thus, the gendering of the masculine subject is seen as an act that takes place not once, at the discovery of “natural” sex, but as a process that must be continually re-established and affirmed; this is accomplished every time we use gendered language to make reference to the subject.⁸¹ Masculinity as a discursive construction can be appropriated by power regimes, and its ideological employment can serve to encourage conformity, i.e. discourse plays an important role in the “normalization” of individuals.⁸² However, because discourse is deeply relational and always changing discursive constructions of masculinity are seen as unstable and always in flux.⁸³ This unstable nature in turn means that the power of hegemonic masculinity is not absolute, but reflective of the dominant ideologies of a particular moment in time, and subject to resistance from other masculinities and from women.⁸⁴

⁷⁹ Reeser (2009), 9-10, 20-31.

⁸⁰ Whitehead (2002), 67.

⁸¹ Reeser (2009), 77.

⁸² Whitehead (2002), 66-7; Reeser (2009), 31-2.

⁸³ Butler (1999); Connell (2005), 72; Reeser (2009), 35.

⁸⁴ Whitehead (2006), 10; Reeser (2009), 34-5.

As well as discourse, the idea of “performativity” is central to post-structuralist theory, as a method in which masculinity is constructed. Following the ideas of Judith Butler,⁸⁵ 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 behaviors which are made available to them relationally through discourse and prior performances.⁸⁶ This constant performative repetition may serve to make masculinity seem natural—indeed that is what it is intended to do— but in fact it reveals the hollowness of the construction, which necessitates that such repetition be undertaken for it to exist.⁸⁷ The twin influences of discourse and performativity are considered to be so crucial in the construction of gender, that post-structuralist theory argues that they can even be seen to create sex. In this framework, the body is seen as a *tabula rasa* upon which any number of symbols can be inscribed, whose only significance is that which is culturally afforded to it.⁸⁸ Post-structuralists thus reject the notion that while gender is a social construct, sex is a stable distinction of biological origin.⁸⁹ 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.⁹⁰

There are many advantages to constructionist approaches. For example they are useful frameworks for looking behind the dominant ideology of any given culture in order to see the ways in which the culture forms its ideal archetypes. This is especially important for masculinities, as culture constructs them in such a way as to make them seem natural and stable.⁹¹ Further, constructionist frameworks have an advantage over those of essentialism in that they are better able to account for inconsistencies in performances of gender. The existence of a diversity of masculinities in different cultures and time periods, for example, is poorly explained by the idea of a core essence of gender. Constructionism also provides a method for understanding and explaining the

⁸⁵ Adams and Savran (2002), 4; Higate (2003), 28; Bickrell (2006), 93; Reeser (2009), 81-3.

⁸⁶ Adams and Savran (2002), 4; Whitehead (2002), 67; Higate (2003), 28; Bickrell (2006), 93; Reeser (2009), 81-6; Alexander (2011), 52.

⁸⁷ Reeser (2009), 81-6.

⁸⁸ Butler (1999), 9-13; Connell, R.W. (2005), 51; Reeser (2009), 91.

⁸⁹ Bickrell (2006), 93; Reeser (2009), 72-5, 78, 85-6, 91, 93-4.

⁹⁰ Reeser (2009), 72-5, 78, 85-6, 91, 93-4.

⁹¹ Butler (1999), 46; Reeser (2009), 10-1.

mechanisms of subjugation, characteristic of gender relations, which cannot be accounted for by biology.

Despite the current dominance of constructionist frameworks as the basis upon which scholars view 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, which can be vastly different.⁹² Another criticism is 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, where the subject chooses their behaviors at will from the available options.⁹⁴ Some think it also goes too far in rejecting biological influence,⁹⁵ and in fact sometimes, paradoxically, cannot entirely rule out the possibility of masculinity emanating from biology, at the same time as not allowing biological sex to have meaning outside of discourse.⁹⁶ Finally, perhaps the harshest criticism leveled at constructionist theories is that because of their view that nothing has any inherent meaning, they have become divorced from any sense of realism;⁹⁷ a view particularly directed at post-structuralists, even by adherents of social-constructionism.⁹⁸

In addition to the weaknesses of the theoretical frameworks employed by sociological discussions of gender construction, there are additional challenges when attempting to apply such frameworks to a historical study. Modern theoretical frameworks present themselves as existing in the realm of pure ideas, but they are rooted both historically and culturally within Western intellectual thought and society from at least the eighteenth century onwards. European presentations or an “ideal type” of man and woman came to be used as an ideological tool which was employed in the building of empire and colonialism, so that the European/American brand of “white masculinity” was imported the world over.⁹⁹ Scholars have noted that modern masculinity studies have

⁹² Arnold and Brady (2011), 4-5.

⁹³ Higate (2003), 28. For some psychoanalytical approaches to masculinity, see n. 2.

⁹⁴ Connell (2005), xix.

⁹⁵ Hausman (2011), 135.

⁹⁶ Higate (2003), 28; Reeser (2009), 78.

⁹⁷ Connell (1993), 65, 124-5.

⁹⁸ Anderson (2009), 33 is a good example.

⁹⁹ Connell (2005), 68; Jackson and Balaji, (2011), 18-9, 22-3. This “globalization” 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.

grown out of this tradition, which has resulted in an ethno-centric Western masculinity being *the* masculinity although it reflects a very recent type of masculinity, practiced by an extremely small segment of the world's population, in a single cultural milieu, at a certain moment in time.¹⁰⁰ This privileging of modern Western masculinity in theoretical frameworks of gender construction has caused difficulties when one attempts to study the construction of gender within the context of a different culture or a different historical period.

The first 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 will often (in fact almost always) be radically different than our own.¹⁰¹ While this fact may seem obvious, many gender theorists are still insistent upon imposing modern Euro-American models of gender on cultures and time periods to which they simply do not fit,¹⁰² dismissing any masculinities which do not correspond with these models rather than examining them within their own historical and cultural contexts.¹⁰³ Therefore, when embarking on a study of historical masculinity, it is important to attempt to define the construction of masculinity within the specific historical and cultural context under examination.¹⁰⁴ Not only are modern gender models temporally based, they are also based within the realm of particular fields and movements, and so theoretical frameworks will reflect the preoccupations of the fields from which they originated.¹⁰⁵ Constructionist theories in particular, as they stem from the feminist and gay liberation movements, are often politically-charged.¹⁰⁶ With this awareness, the historian must be careful to avoid taking the political agendas associated with many of the general models along with the models themselves.

There are still other pitfalls when examining historical masculinity. Scholars must take care to avoid insensitivity towards how the experience of being male was perceived

¹⁰⁰ Connell (1993), 125; Connell (2005), 68; Jackson and Balaji (2011), 21-3.

¹⁰¹ 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.

¹⁰² Connell (1993), 127-8; Fletcher (2011), 61; Hubbard (2011), 189.

¹⁰³ Jackson and Balaji (2011), 17.

¹⁰⁴ Jackson and Balaji (2011), 17, 22-4.

¹⁰⁵ Connell (2005), 6, points out that Freud and Longmore, e.g., were working within the practice of psychotherapy. Also, see Bickrell (2006), 87.

¹⁰⁶ Connell (2005), 6, 39; Ellis (2011), 263; Tosh (2011), 17.

in the past, as well as the primacy modern gender theory places on the contrasts of male-female and heterosexual-homosexual. Masculinity, as it is understood in the modern sense, did not exist before the eighteenth century, yet historians often treat masculinity and historical concepts like “manhood” as though they were synonymous.¹⁰⁷ Scholars of medieval and early modern periods argue that this displays a gross insensitivity, as concepts such as masculinity, manhood, and manliness are all distinct and complex constructions. In treating these categories as though they were equivalent, historians are guilty of overlooking how they were historically constructed.¹⁰⁸

Many scholars have asserted that modern gender models over privilege the dichotomy between male and female.¹⁰⁹ This has arisen partially from Marxist and feminist concerns with hegemony and patriarchy’s perceived oppression of one part of humanity by the other,¹¹⁰ as well as from a historical societal 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. Scholars have pointed out that even when masculinity was historically defined in binary contrast, it was not necessarily contrasted with femininity. In the Victorian period, for instance, manliness was defined in contrast with the uncivilized or immature more than with the feminine.¹¹¹ Those who believe that the male-female contrast has been over-privileged call for an understanding that, to examine truly historical constructions of masculinity, scholars must shift primacy away from the male-female binary, and look into countless other subjectivities.¹¹²

Masculinity theories have also placed a great deal of import on the contrast between heterosexual and homosexual.¹¹³ This is somewhat ironic, as masculinity discourse has been seen to hold a great deal of responsibility for the creation of the categories of heterosexual and homosexual and the distinction between them. Historians

¹⁰⁷ Fletcher (2011), 60-1; Jeleniewski Seidler (2011), 436.

¹⁰⁸ Ellis (2011), 264-5; Jeleniewski Seidler (2011), 436.

¹⁰⁹ 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”.

¹¹⁰ Ellis (2011), 265; Hubbard (2011), 189.

¹¹¹ Ellis (2011), 265-6.

¹¹² Roper and Tosh (1991), 88-9; Reeser (2009), 218; Ellis (2011), 264; Jeleniewski Seidler (2011), 436-7, 444.

¹¹³ 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.

trace the creation of the homosexual as a category of person to the nineteenth century,¹¹⁴ asserting that prior to this homosexual acts were viewed simply as something that one might engage in, but at that time the idea of a homosexual person was both created and pronounced deviant; from this action the normative categorization of heterosexual emerged.¹¹⁵ 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.¹¹⁶ In light of this, while sexuality may be an important factor in modern constructions of masculinity, sexuality does not necessarily have the same weight or implications on historical constructions of masculinity. For example, medieval scholars stress that Medieval notions of manhood had little to do with sexuality of any kind, as members of the clergy who were prohibited from sexual activity could nonetheless possess the attributes of manhood.¹¹⁷ To this end, scholars must avoid placing implications on sexuality, or even attempting to assign categories of sexuality to societies to which they are not relevant.¹¹⁸

Despite the imperfections that are inescapable when one deals with any sort of theoretical framework, there are many reasons for considering social-constructionist frameworks to be well suited to the historical study of Classical Spartan masculinity.¹¹⁹ To begin, the fact that social-constructionism moves 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,¹²⁰ presenting readers not so much with information of an experiential nature, as the presentation of societal ideals. Therefore social-constructionism's favouring of representation over experience is compatible with the source-material available. The emphasis constructionist theories place upon literary

¹¹⁴ Connell (2002), 249, 252-3; Howson (2006), 62.

¹¹⁵ Howson (2006), 62.

¹¹⁶ Connell (2005), 8-11; Reeser (2009), 73.

¹¹⁷ Fletcher (2011), 60-1.

¹¹⁸ Bickrell (2006), 91.

¹¹⁹ Whereas I intend to employ a primarily social-constructionist framework, there are some ideas more in associated post-structuralism, which have appeal. I will discuss these also.

¹²⁰ 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.

analysis is appealing for much the same reason. None of the prominent authors in antiquity who write about Sparta were themselves Spartan. So not only is the scholar faced with the fact that views expressed by ancient authors represent those of a small segment of the population, namely the educated elite, but the views are not even native to the culture discussed. To this end, the emphasis constructionist, particularly post-structuralist, views place on not merely accepting the representation of masculinity presented by the dominant ideology, but looking beyond this to find meaning,¹²¹ lends itself to a level of textual analysis which may prove beneficial towards cutting through the class and cultural biases which colour many authors' accounts of Sparta. Perhaps the best reason to employ a social-constructionist framework to a historical examination is that such an application has been employed 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 for greater insights than one would discover from historical methods alone.¹²² As masculinities are cultural constructions, there is no form of masculinity that is not reflective of that culture; even masculinities which subvert or resist cultural ideals are functioning in interaction with them.¹²³ In this light, the normative codes and practices of masculinity within a culture should still be the central site of focus,¹²⁴ but one should just make sure to look deeper than the dominant ideology into factors such as reception and interpretation of ideological representations of masculinity

Of course, no matter how sound the frameworks employed, any historio-cultural project faces difficulties and limitations, especially one which deals with antiquity. 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 but also incomplete source material is often difficult to interpret.¹²⁵ The dependency of historians on written materials and archival records also presents a challenge since it makes it difficult, if not impossible, to examine those aspects

¹²¹ Reeser (2009), 10-1; Arnold and Brady (2011), 4-5.

¹²² Berg (2011), 97.

¹²³ Connell (1993), 126-7.

¹²⁴ Tosh (2011), 22.

¹²⁵ Berg (2011), 97.

of society which are unspoken or have been suppressed.¹²⁶ Not only have we no elite Spartan sources for classical Sparta but we have no direct accounts and very little information about the helot and *perioikic* classes which were so integral to the Spartan social order. It is important to remain sensitive to all such factors when embarking on an examination of the construction of Spartan masculinity.

Before moving to the examination of the construction of classical Spartan masculinity in Thucydides and Xenophon, it will be useful to take a moment to look at approaches that have been taken by scholars in examinations of masculinity in Classical Athens. A few key areas have been highlighted. First, 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: what women were was “by definition, what men were not, and for either sex to take on the characteristics of the other was a matter for often adverse comment”.¹²⁷ Because gender relations in the ancient world were hierarchical in nature, the oppositions between feminine and masculine traits were also seen as those of the superior vs. the inferior.¹²⁸ This can be seen in the structure of male-female relations within Athenian society in such things as the sharp 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 publically display manliness through feats and competition.¹²⁹ Despite the biological origin of this qualifier for masculinity, some have perceived the position of men as precarious.¹³⁰ Winkler believes that in the fiercely competitive environment of 4th century BCE Athens, a man was only a misstep away from symbolic demotion to the status of woman; and further that the structure of public discourse in Athenian society was characterized by the polarization of extreme opposites: to fail in

¹²⁶ Jeleniewski Seidler (2011), 437-8.

¹²⁷ Harries (1998), 185. That fundamentally opposed natures were ascribed to men and women in antiquity is seen in descriptions which define men and women as being opposite in the most basic ways, such as describing men as hot and dry and women as wet and cold (see e.g. Aristotle *Probl.* 4.35.879a33-4; 4.38.88a12-20).

¹²⁸ Carson (1990), 137; Harries (1998), 185.

¹²⁹ Fisher (1998), 69-70. See also Roisman (2005), 67, who suggests the competitive, zero-sum mentality associated with masculinity in the argument that masculine excellence was achieved to the extent that one could assert superiority over others. In the speeches of Lysias, Demosthenes and Hyperides, Roisman sees masculine prestige as comparative; in order to gain honour one must put one's opponents to shame.

¹³⁰ Winkler (1990), 178-82; Gleason (1995) 77-81.

any way to appropriately display one's manliness resulted in being relegated as a *kinaidos*.¹³¹ This polarity and the rigidly hierarchical structure in Athenian society leads scholars to argue that this opposition between what was seen as male and female came also to typify relations between males with regards to ideals of masculinity. Thus the separation of 'masculine' and 'feminine' males, or traits in males, is also a criterion for judging masculinity.¹³²

Secondly, perhaps the area of life that is most discussed in investigations of masculinity in antiquity is that of sexual experience. This is because, as several researchers have noted, public life in the ancient world, both social and political, was a gendered arena in which performance of manhood—of which sexual behavior comprised a significant component—was of considerable import.¹³³ When it came to sexuality in Athens, it seems that the role played in the sexual encounter was of prime importance in determining conformation or deviation from proper gender roles.¹³⁴ For adult citizen men this meant taking the penetrative role in intercourse.¹³⁵ Halperin describes the sexual act as being viewed in classical Athens as a deeply polarizing experience in which one party is seen to act upon another. He asserts that the performance of the sexual act by the active player upon a passive partner established their roles as social superior acting upon social inferior, creating a microcosm of the social hierarchy which governed Athenian society; thus sex was not so much an expression of a man's inner nature but of his social position.¹³⁶ Sex between adult citizen males was nearly inconceivable, and a man who had been identified as either a *kinaidos* or a prostitute stood to lose all citizen rights.¹³⁷ The rationale was that by allowing himself to be penetrated, he relinquished the autonomy of person that was his right as a man, and had willingly placed himself into the

¹³¹ Winkler (1990), 178-182. The term *kinaidos* is usually understood to denote an adult male who is sexually submissive, although the term has been understood to have wider connotations, to one who was considered excessive in all aspects of life. See p. 26.

¹³² Winkler (1998), 182.

¹³³ Halperin (1990a) 11; Halperin (1990b), 31-2; Winkler (1998), 177.

¹³⁴ Winkler (1998), 174, 177, 182.

¹³⁵ Dover (1978), 68, 83, 103-4; Halperin (1990b), 30-3 (referencing e.g. Bacchylides' Third Dithyramb); Winkler (1998), 203.

¹³⁶ Halperin (1990b), 29-33.

¹³⁷ Aeschin. 1.13-4, 19-22; Halperin (1990b), 31-3; Halperin (1990d), 93-4; Winkler (1998), 177.

socially inferior position occupied by women, foreigners, and slaves.¹³⁸ It was not, therefore, the fact that a man may prefer sexual intercourse with males that stood to render him effeminate but the assumption of the passive or receptive role in intercourse.¹³⁹ The interchangeability in texts of the terms “woman” and “boy” as the sexual objects of men reveals an understanding of a single active masculine sexual experience for which the object may acceptably vary according to individual preference.¹⁴⁰ Along this line of thinking, the assumption of the passive sexual role was acceptable for a youth who would one day become a citizen, so long as he abided by the societal standards surrounding pederastic practice; boys were viewed as being sexually inert, and would therefore not be submitting due to womanish passions.¹⁴¹ However an adult male who assumed the passive role in the sexual act was seen as having done so because he was so ruled by his extreme lust that the “normal” active role alone could not satisfy him.¹⁴² Because of this, Winkler asserts that challenges to a man’s citizenship rights on the grounds that he had feminized himself sexually were powerful political tools used by Athenian ruling elite to oust potential political rivals.¹⁴³ Therefore, men who aspired to a career in politics had to be especially concerned with presenting an appropriately masculine image of activity and domination, as failure to do so could adversely affect one’s ability to participate in the political life of the *polis*.¹⁴⁴ Hubbard,

¹³⁸ Halperin (1990b), 23; Halperin (1990d), 96-7; Winkler (1998), 179-80, 185-6. See also Roisman (2005), 72, on the “Athenian’s respect for the free man’s personal autonomy”. Roisman argues that even physical violence was seen as an act that shamed the victim. In light of this, willing submission to acts that violated personal autonomy was viewed as especially heinous.

¹³⁹ Foucault (1985), 188-91, 215-6; Halperin (1990b), 33-5; Winkler (1998), 203.

¹⁴⁰ Halperin (1990b), 33-6. Halperin asserts that this is the case because it is the passive role and not the gender of the sexual partner which represented the sort of inordinate lust that was characteristic of women; while male desire was characterized as object-oriented, female desire was seen as objectless because it was fueled by the biological need for penetration, regardless of the penetrating agent.

¹⁴¹ Foucault (1985) 207-9, 218-20; Halperin (1990a), 5; Halperin (1990b), 36; Halperin (1990d) 93-4.

¹⁴² Foucault (1985), 83-5; Halperin (1990b), 23-5; Winkler (1998), 177.

¹⁴³ Winkler (1990), 177.

¹⁴⁴ Halperin (1990b), 30; Winkler (1998), 177, 203. The vast majority of the scholarly discussion surrounding sexuality, and especially same-sexual relations, in antiquity has focused on the power dynamic between the active and passive partners, and asserts that the only time in which a man’s sexual experience became problematic for his masculinity was when he violated the parameters of what was his socially acceptable sexual role. However it has been suggested that pederastic relationships, even when ‘properly’ conducted, may have been viewed as problematic for the masculinity of those involved in them by Athenian society at large (see Dover 1978, Hubbard 1998). It has been suggested that this is especially the case when pederastic relationships were seen as being in violation of Athenian democratic ideals such as *σωφροσύνη* or civic egalitarianism. To that end, I will make note of these arguments rather on when I discuss the relation between these topics and Athenian masculinity ideology.

however, challenges this idea, arguing that pederasty was a practice associated in Classical Athens with the small aristocratic and laconizing elite. Therefore in this view of democratic ideology, pederasty was a feature of a lifestyle which was viewed by the general populace as being luxurious and extravagant, and which rendered those who lived in this manner effeminate and the activity akin to prostitution; especially reflected in the plays of Old Comedy where both *erastes* and *eromenos* were the subject of comic invective.¹⁴⁵ The disparity in views on pederastic activity therefore seems to reveal differences in perceptions of masculinity along class lines.

Further, the discourse used when talking about men and manhood significantly affects constructions of masculinity. The concept of self-control, has been thought by some to be the central feature related to manhood in Classical Athens.¹⁴⁶ The greatest assumed difference between men and women in antiquity is perceived to be the male's capacity for self-control, and the female's lack thereof.¹⁴⁷ The *σωφροσύνη* of a man was seen as being his capacity for self-rule, while the same concept, as it applied to a woman, was concerned with her submission to her husband's rule.¹⁴⁸ This was especially the case in Classical Athens as this was an area in which the ideology of masculinity and the ideology of democracy intersected. The importance of self-restraint has already been highlighted in terms of sexual appetite by the constraints placed upon *kinaidoi* and male prostitutes, and in those instances where masculinity is defined along sexual lines it is precisely the lack of restraint which renders a man effeminate and unfit for political life.

¹⁴⁵ Hubbard (1998), 49-67. See also Roisman (2005), 85-90. This also points to a disparity of views as Roisman points out ways in which pederasty was associated, in elite mindsets, with tenants of superior aristocratic manhood. Dover (1978), 145, also noted that when one moves from examination of Plato to comedy, discussions of homosexuality become peripheral and the main mode of sexual expression is heterosexual.

¹⁴⁶ Foucault (1985) 21, 30-1; Van Wees (1998), 16; Roisman (2005), 163-85. Although Roisman (2005), 76-9, argues that there were different ideologies associated with different ideals of manhood: "Men who were self-controlled... and public-spirited went to court. Those who were courageous, high-spirited, and unwilling to brook slights to their honour retaliated physically". Roisman asserts that the incompatibility of these competing views of manhood was highlighted by Plato's relation of how moderation could be mistaken as unmanliness, while shamelessness could be mistaken as manliness.

¹⁴⁷ Carson (1990), 138; Harries (1998), 186; Van Wees (1998), 16-8. Although *σωφροσύνη* is a term that has also been seen to have different connotations depending to whom it was applied (See Arist. *Pol.* I 1260a 20-3). The masculine understanding of *σωφροσύνη*, in the form of self-mastery, is greatly differentiated from the form of the virtue expected of women and children, which was manifested as obedience and modesty; as North (1966), 131, remarked: "Whatever else it may become, *sophrosyne* throughout Greek literature is always the virtue proper to the young, and of course to women, i.e. to all those members of society of whom obedience was required".

¹⁴⁸ Carson (1990), 142.

Scholars have remarked that the reason sexual deviance carried such heavy penalties¹⁴⁹ was that men who were willing to sell or give up their masculine autonomy were seen as being weak-willed, thus likely to sell-out the good of the state as easily as they sold their own bodies.¹⁵⁰ Socratic views on homosexual activity, while idiosyncratic, also found their basis in the discourse of moderation. Socrates held the view that those who lusted after boys allowed the physical element, which was the lesser good, to take priority over the higher concerns of the soul and intellect; thus he condemned physical pederasty.¹⁵¹ The *kinaidos* surrenders his masculinity because his is a lifestyle driven primarily by his various appetites which he fails to control in proper masculine fashion. Therefore, achieving moderation in any number of appetites, including the desires for food sleep and sex, was seen as factoring directly into masculine success¹⁵² and directly tied to one's ability to be a successful citizen.¹⁵³ Thus the maintenance of masculine self-control was an on-going, often arduous process, which called for the subject repeatedly making the deliberate choice to perform the mandates of masculine behavior.¹⁵⁴

Finally, democratic ideology came to have great bearing on concepts of Athenian masculinity in the Classical period, by virtue of membership in the citizen body a type of civic masculinity was acquired which was based on the mythology of autochthony.¹⁵⁵ Loraux argues that Athenian funeral orations show the attribution of a type of *andreia* to Athenian citizens which was viewed as being superior to that possessed by citizens of other states, who could not claim to be autochthonous.¹⁵⁶ These ideas together enforced a hierarchy of masculinity, not only between Athens and other states, but also within Athens itself between men of citizen status and those such as metics and slaves who, by virtue of their birth, were viewed as occupying lower positions on the ladder of masculinity.¹⁵⁷ In addition to developing ideas of division in masculinity between men and men, the ideology of citizenship also served to further enlarge the division between

¹⁴⁹ See pp.19-20 above.

¹⁵⁰ Halperin (1990d), 95-8; Winkler (1998), 181, 189-93. See also Roisman (2005), 66-7.

¹⁵¹ Dover (1978), 157-9. Admittedly, however, the view of Socrates cannot be seen as typical of the prominent ideology of Classical Athens.

¹⁵² Foucault (1985), 43-9, 55-60, 62, 64-70, 78-9, 82; Fox (1998), 10; Winkler (1998), 176-81.

¹⁵³ Foucault (1985), 82; Halperin (1998d), 95-6, 98.

¹⁵⁴ Fox (1998), 13-5.

¹⁵⁵ Roisman (2005) 131-5.

¹⁵⁶ Loraux (1993), 11, 51.

¹⁵⁷ Loraux (1993), 11, 50-1.

men and women inasmuch as it created the need for greater regulation of female sexual activity in order to assure the legitimacy of offspring.¹⁵⁸ Cartledge stresses that civic masculinity was also an especially important concept during the period of Athenian imperialism in the 5th century BCE, as the connection between imperialistic war and masculinity had a bearing on how Athenians defined masculinity.¹⁵⁹ As fighting the barbarian threat was the inciting action of Athenian expansion, barbarians were portrayed as the anti-type of Athenian masculinity and provided a polar opposite against which the Athenians compared themselves. With the growth of the Athenian empire, there occurred a greater stratification and hierarchy in Athenian concepts of masculinity: while Athenians and barbarians occupied opposite poles on the scale of manliness, those who were citizens of Athenian allies, colonies, and subject states were seen to occupy an intermediate position in the hierarchy of Athenian masculine ideology.¹⁶⁰

It should also be mentioned that although examinations of Athenian masculinity gave greater attention to the subjects discussed above, and subjected them to deeper analysis, passing reference is made to the role of other Athenian institutions and practices as contributing to the formation of Athenian masculinity. Some institutions that were highlighted by scholars include the importance placed on the *gymnasia* and *symposia* (with their emphasis on the performative aspects of gender which required men to prove and reprove their status through adherence to societally approved standards of masculinity), rites of initiation such as enrollment into the *phratries*, and competitions

¹⁵⁸ Loraux (1993), 11, 19; Lape (2001), 98-9, 108.

¹⁵⁹ Cartledge (1998), 54-5. Also Roisman (2005), 106-13, on the hoplite ideal of manhood. Their assertions that, in the context of imperial Athens, the hoplite warrior came to be seen as the masculine ideal *par excellence*, can be seen as somewhat at odds with interpretations of the artistic evidence. Osborne (1998), 29-41, for example, suggests that changing expressions of manhood are evident in funeral monuments which display a marked shift from aristocratic masculinity, which focused on depictions of men engaged in war, hunting, and sport, to the masculinity which was representative of the new democracy, and in which domestic and civil forms of masculine behavior were idealised. However, if both interpretations of the respective evidence are correct, it could be indicative of the political atmosphere of the 5th century—particularly during the Peloponnesian war—having a significant impact on trends in the perception of masculinity.

¹⁶⁰ Hall (1989), 80, suggests that the three main flaws of barbarian psychology, hierarchicalism, immoderate luxuriousness, and unrestrained emotionalism, were countered by the Greeks who saw themselves as egalitarian, austere and self-disciplined. Cartledge (1998), 56-61, describes the polar opposition of the masculine Athenian and effeminate barbarian, and relates that the ideological stratification of Athenian allies and subject states was accomplished discursively (they were called ‘the cities which the Athenians control’), as well as performativity in the roles required of Athenian allies at festivals such as the Great *Dionysia* and the Great *Panathenaia* (at which allied participation was compulsory) which emphasised Athenian superiority and allied subjugation.

designed to display manly excellence, especially the *euandreia* competition at the *Panathenaea*.¹⁶¹ It is important to make reference to these since discussion of Spartan institutions and practices, particularly those which are portrayed as having some parallels to those of the Athenians, will be significant in my examination of Spartan masculinity, not only because of their connection to Athenian ideas of masculinity, but also because constructionist frameworks highlight institutions and practices which have ritualistic or performative aspects as being key sites for the construction of masculinity in general.

Historians of gender and sexuality are aware of the hazards associated with their study. For example, in order to make proper use of a source one must be certain to understand the purpose of that source, as failing to do so might result in misinterpretation due to failure, for example, to perceive comedic or ironic notes.¹⁶² Another hazard is over-estimating the extent to which the “history of ideas” 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.¹⁶³ Halperin too notes that if manly conduct described in philosophical works can be seen as the society’s ideal mode of behavior in any given situation, it would be dangerous to assume that societal norms always lived up to such ideals.¹⁶⁴ Moreover, several scholars note that philosophical works often are not expressive of the norms of the society from which they originate to any extent, but that philosophers represent a small intellectual elite whose work was often polemical in nature towards the ideology of their culture, and was often disregarded if not explicitly derided by society at large.¹⁶⁵

The next two difficulties are vulnerabilities which are possible in any historical study, but which have been found to be particularly problematic for scholars attempting to uncover historical gender and sexual identities. These are the tendencies of researchers 1) to impose modern categories and ideals onto societies to which they do not apply, and

¹⁶¹ See Cartledge (1998), 61, and Fisher (1998), 69-71.

¹⁶² E.g. see Heap (1998), 116-7, on the intrinsic danger in taking comedic works at face value, as the modern reader might well miss a joke which would have been obvious to ancient audiences. Fox (1998), 7-9, criticizes Winkler’s idea that masculinity in Athens was a zero-sum game in which one occupied the position of either the hoplite or the *kinaidos*, on the grounds that Winkler’s conclusions are based upon a failure to understand the irony intrinsic to the Socratic works such as Plato’s *Gorgias*.

¹⁶³ Fox (1998), 7-9, 12, 16-9.

¹⁶⁴ Halperin (1990c), 58-9. Halperin contends that some works stress ideals precisely because contemporary society was viewed by the authors as falling short in their adherence to them.

¹⁶⁵ Winkler (1990), 172-4; Fox (1998), 11-2.

2) to begin their project with an image of their subject in mind, and then to seek out and privilege evidence which supports their forgone conclusions. For example, both Fox and Halperin perceive an over-privileging of the sexual experience as being a core identity feature. Fox notes that the idea of sex as the centre of being has only arisen in modern times alongside the rise of the concept of sexuality,¹⁶⁶ and Halperin notes the tendency of modern societies to view the concept of “sexual identity” (i.e. the internalization of either a homosexual or heterosexual identity which then informs both sexual experiences and understanding of gender) as a historical constant.¹⁶⁷ He sees this as problematic when examining Greek sexual and gender experience, because judgement on adherence to or deviance from appropriate gender roles was not made on the sexual object preferred by the subject, but on the role the subject performed in the sexual encounter.¹⁶⁸

Indeed, the historian of Greek and Roman sexuality is particularly vulnerable to the abovementioned snares, both because of the modern Western tendency to view ourselves as the direct descendants of Greco-Roman culture and thought,¹⁶⁹ and because of the appropriation of Greek sexual experience to provide parallels for contemporary homosexual experiences.¹⁷⁰ However there can, ironically, also be a danger in taking the concept of the “otherness” of ancient societies too far. Halperin remarked, concerning Patzer’s exploration of classical Athenian paederasty, that his understanding of sexual identity as a modern concept led him to view paederastic relationships in classical Athens as being entirely initiatory in nature, and devoid of homoerotic desire—a conclusion which is not supported by the texts.¹⁷¹ On top of these problems is perhaps one final one: the fact that gender studies is frequently politically charged. Fox believes that the only remedy is the acceptance that any “real” representation we may find for the masculine subject will be partial and may leave us with more questions than answers, as

¹⁶⁶ Fox (1998), 10-1.

¹⁶⁷ Halperin (1990a) 7-9; Halperin (1990b), 15-6, 38, 40.

¹⁶⁸ Halperin (1990b), 25, 30-3, 40. Contra Hubbard (1998), who views homosexual behaviour in Classical Athens, as marginalizing in the view of all save for a small elite. I would argue that this arose more from anti-aristocratic sentiment than it did with any understanding of “the homosexual” as a type of person.

¹⁶⁹ Foxhall (1998a), 1-3.

¹⁷⁰ Halperin (1990a), 1-3.

¹⁷¹ Halperin (1990c), 56-61 on Patzer (1982).

examinations of masculinity deal with individual subjective experience which can never be fully represented by the texts.¹⁷²

Of course, when dealing with Sparta, not only are all these difficulties still to be dealt with, but they are also compounded by the fact that the main sources we have which are contemporary with Classical Sparta are almost entirely Athenian. This means, first, that they are writing about a culture to which they do not belong. Secondly many of the Athenian sources are written when Sparta and Athens were engaged in open hostility with one another. And finally often when these authors discussed aspects of Spartan culture they did so in the service of a greater aim in their writing, which often had more to do with Athenian concerns than those of Sparta. Therefore, when one is examining Spartan masculinity one must be especially careful with the source material presented. With these ideas in mind I will now turn towards the principal concern of this work, which is to explore the construction of classical Spartan masculinity as it is represented by two Athenian authors, Thucydides and Xenophon.

In the search for what made Spartan men men, I will use a combination of methodologies: social constructionism together with historiographical analysis. Further, the areas which constructionist frameworks highlight as being important for the cultural creation and maintenance of gender, and which scholars have suggested were of import in Athenian masculinity ideology will provide structure to the investigation.¹⁷³

1) The relation of men and women: As mentioned, the relational practice between men and women is perhaps the most fundamental area 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: While it has been debated whether or not scholars have overvalued the influence of sexual activity on perceptions of manhood in antiquity, the large amount of attention that has been given to the subject with regards to masculinity in Athens, and the Greek world at large, means that of would be remiss not to include it in

¹⁷² Fox (1998), 6-7, 12, 18-9.

¹⁷³ It is likely that each source examined will highlight some of these areas but not others, and as such the discussion will vary with the source and examine those areas which the source in question brought forth as significant.

an examination of Spartan masculinity. Moreover, the fact that sources from antiquity do 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: In the survey of scholarly exploration of Athenian masculinity institutions were not as often the focus of attention as the perhaps should be. Institutions will, however, be a prominent feature of the exploration of Spartan masculinity, both because a great deal of attention was paid to Spartan institutions by ancient authors (particularly those which were viewed as being novel or contributing to the ‘otherness’ of the Spartans), and because constructionist frameworks cite institutions as one of three key sites of interactional gender construction.¹⁷⁴

4) Discourse: The idea of the importance of discourse to gender construction has a place in social constructionist frameworks, but even more so in post-structural approaches. Borrowing ideas from such approaches, I will try to discern key features of the ideology of masculinity from the words employed in discussions of manhood. Analysis of the words and concepts which occupied pre-eminence in the discourse surrounding masculinity in Sparta, as well as how the ideology of Spartan masculinity as a whole was used discursively, will prove illuminative, both of the character of Spartan masculinity, and of the 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 must be affirmed and reaffirmed through the repeated projection and performance of culturally accepted standards of appearance and deportment demand that a rhetoric of behaviour and appearance be created, which must then be continually played out in the public arena. This paper will examine this rhetoric as it applies to Spartan masculinity.

6) Relations between men and hegemonic masculinity: Discussions of power relations and hierarchal masculinity between groups of men has always played a prevalent role in the examination of masculinities. This is especially the case when one

¹⁷⁴ The other two sites are language and representation, which will also be examined.

examines the masculinity of a culture at large. It will be useful to attempt to identify the culturally institutionalized archetypes of idealized masculinity and to examine how these ideals factored in relations not only between men of the Spartiate class and those of ‘others’ such as the various subclasses (not just *perioikoi* and helots, but also *hypomeiones*, *mothakes*, etc.), and non-Spartan allies, but also between members of the Spartiate class itself— 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 Sparta will be emphasised in the form of case studies, which will aim to show in what manner the hegemonic mechanism operated, and what ideological or political ends it was meant to achieve.

Structurally, the material will be divided by author. Xenophon’s work will be subjected to further division between his historical and philosophical writing. The above mentioned topics will thus be addressed in the context of both author and genre. Viewing the highlighted topics in this way will make allowance for the possibility that a single author may present Spartan masculinity differently depending on the genre and purpose of his individual works. It will also help to maintain the understanding that the ideas surrounding Spartan manhood were not presented in a void. This will aid literary analysis by allowing us to view the assertions being made about Sparta within the context of the works in which the assertions are made, so that we do not merely take them at face value without consideration of the greater purposes of the works themselves.

Chapter 2: Thucydides

2.1 Introduction

For the most part Thucydides was not overly concerned with social history. The project he undertook, in chronicling the events of the Peloponnesian War, is primarily political and military in nature. The process by which men were shaped is left largely undiscussed by Thucydides (indeed, as are the processes of formation for most of the traits which make up the national characteristics of states featured in the *History*). But what is able to be gleaned from Thucydides' work is the role that various ideologies and characteristics such as masculinity played on the national stage. When reading Thucydides it is possible to see masculinity operating on both individual and national levels. As discussed earlier, social-constructionists see societies as creating and promulgating expressions of masculinity which are then idealized, so that nations can be seen as embodying particular representations of masculinity unique to themselves.¹⁷⁵ The ideology of these national masculinities functions both internally, on individuals within the state, and externally, in interactions with other nations and, thus, play a role in international relations. The idea of "national masculinity" is particularly well-suited to an exploration of masculinity in Thucydides, as scholars have noted the analogy of the individual and the city as a comparative model being employed extensively by Thucydides throughout the *History*.¹⁷⁶ Morrison suggests that the development of this sort of political history was one of the key aims of Thucydides' early work, and that by understanding that cities behave like individuals in significant ways one can gain insight into the behaviours and motivations of the different city-states.¹⁷⁷ As with individuals, ideology can be seen to be a great motivating factor for states; in particular, we will see that national ideology wrapped up with ideas of masculinity can have significant political ramifications. Thucydides, therefore, presents the reader with the end of the process of the construction; namely nations that are represented as possessing particular characters and ideologies and men

¹⁷⁵ See pp. 7-8 above.

¹⁷⁶ Morrison (2006), 103-4. In a similar vein, Ste Croix (1981), 27, discusses Thucydides' concept of "human nature", being applicable to both individuals and collective groups. See also Reinhold (2002), 47. Pouncey (1980), 58, suggests that the Spartan debates in book one show Thucydides' intention to portray individuals as representative of their nation's type or character, and that individual actions are only of interest if they contribute to the whole of the identity and motivation of the state. Bradford (1994), 68-9, and Hunter (1988), esp. 25-6, express similar views.

¹⁷⁷ Morrison (2006), 106, 109.

who are presented in relation to their nation's "type" and whose conduct displays their adherence to or deviation from particular aspects of their national type.¹⁷⁸ This examination of Thucydides, therefore, will focus on Spartan masculinity at both individual and national levels, and the categories which provide the most fruit for the examination are discourse, representation and performativity, and relations between men and hegemonic masculinity.¹⁷⁹

2.2 Discourse

In the speeches of Archidamus and Sthenelaidas, following the First Spartan Congress, we are given a compelling example of the power of the discourse of masculinity. This debate between the king and ephor has been seen by some as an example of an appeal to emotion and propaganda trumping an appeal based fundamentally on reason.¹⁸⁰ This is true, but there is more going on. I would argue that the real key to understanding why Sthenelaidas prevailed lies in the fact that, while Archidamus made his ideological appeal to concepts such as tradition and self-possession, Sthenelaidas rooted his argument in concepts fundamental to Spartan ideology of manhood.

Both Archidamus and Sthenelaidas are depicted as employing different aspects of traditional Spartan values to reinforce their positions. Although their approaches are at great variance, a number of scholars have remarked that the comportment of both Archidamus and Sthenelaidas are eminently Spartan in different ways.¹⁸¹ First,

¹⁷⁸ Wassermann (1953), 193; Westlake (1968), 122, 136, 148-50; Roisman, (1987a) 418-9.

¹⁷⁹ It is not possible, within the confines of the present examination, to discuss every instance in which Thucydides makes reference to subject matter which has some bearing on masculinity. E.g. in the *Archaeology*, Thucydides makes passing reference to Sparta's discovery of "the common" in the simplicity of Spartan manners and style, and Spartan athletic nudity (Th. 1.6.1-5), both of which can be seen to have bearing on the Spartan social construction of masculinity. This material, however, merits future inquiry.

¹⁸⁰ Wassermann (1964), 290; Bloedow (1981) 129-43 and (1987), 63-4; Lebow (1996), 239; Debnar (2001), 75-6. Bloedow, in particular, argues that any rational reading of the speeches psychologically prepares the reader only for the vote to land in agreement with Archidamus' masterful speech. He says that the fact that Sthenelaidas' speech, which was brief, based on emotion and with very little substance, and which failed to refute Archidamus' insightful points, won the day was not only astonishing, but "psychologically, virtually impossible". Bloedow thus places the responsibility for this "unbelievable" vote on the irrational atmosphere of the assembly. Debnar concedes that Thucydides' may have intended to highlight the irrational nature of the vote in Sthenelaidas' speech, but argues for the skillfulness of the propagandistic rhetoric of the speech itself.

¹⁸¹ Cartledge and Debnar (2006), 577. But there are many analyses of the characters of these two Spartans. E.g., Wassermann (1953), 193-4 and (1964), 289, sees Archidamus as representative of the self-assurance of Spartan traditionalism while Sthenelaidas stands for Sparta's new brand of "aggressive toughness", and says their speeches are meant to "illustrate the clash in contemporary Spartan society between two opposite characters, tempers, ages, and policies". Parry (1957), 81, 128, and Cane (1988), 197, view Archidamus

Archidamus seeks to change the meanings of the Corinthians' various accusations through the use of discourse, making these accusations instead into an impressive catalogue of Spartan strengths, with a heavy emphasis on tradition.¹⁸² Above all else, Archidamus appeals to Spartan σωφροσύνη, in the sense of self-possession and prudence.¹⁸³ Archidamus keeps returning to the idea that the Spartans should not be ashamed or provoked by the accusations of their allies stressing that, as the excellence of Spartan character is a product of their upbringing and is reliant upon the traditional Spartan way of life, it does not need external validation to thrive, nor does it suffer from external censure.¹⁸⁴ Scholars have suggested that, both in his own conduct, and in centering his catalogue of Spartan virtues around aspects and expressions of σωφροσύνη, Archidamus exemplifies this virtue, which is an essential part of Thucydides' portrayal of a particularly Spartan character.¹⁸⁵ This may very well be true, but by returning again and again the importance for the Spartans to remain calm, and not to allow themselves to feel shamed by the opinions of others,¹⁸⁶ Archidamus suggests at the assembly the Spartans were not, in fact, self-possessed. Allison and Crane point out that many scholars overlook Thucydides' assertion that before Archidamus spoke the majority of Spartans, having been convinced by their allies of Athens' injustice, were in favor of war, and that this opinion was accompanied by considerable agitation and a sense of urgency.¹⁸⁷ Even though, therefore, Archidamus' main argument for delaying hostilities was based on a rational assessment of Sparta's material strengths and weaknesses in comparison with those of Athens, in order to express Sparta's current unpreparedness for such an

and Sthenelaidas as variations on a single theme, applying characteristically Spartan ideology to further disparate attitudes. Pouncey (1980), 58; Bloedow (1987), 63-4; Cartledge (2003a), 161; and Debnar (2001), 59-61, 69, find Sthenelaidas to be stereotypically Spartan in the shortness of his speech, his bluntness and his appeal to the martial ethos. Bloedow (1981), 135-6, 142-3, Orwin (1994), 57, Luginbill (1999), 109, and Debnar (2001), 59-61, 69, see Archidamus' attitudes, and the content of his speech, as being in harmony with the Spartan ethos in its emphasis on tradition, its conservatism and its focus on rational judgement.

¹⁸² Th. 1.84; Wassermann (1953), 196-7; Kagan (1969), 301-2; Debnar (2001), 66-9.

¹⁸³ Th. 1.84-6.; Crane (1988), 206; Francis (1993), 207; LSJS.V. σωφροσύνη, 2.

¹⁸⁴ Th. 1.84.2-3; Wassermann (1953), 196-7; Crane (1988), 204-5; Debnar (2001), 59-60.

¹⁸⁵ Wassermann (1953), 194-5; Hornblower (1987), 162; Francis (1993), 207-8. points out that σωφροσύνη is rarely ascribed to the Athenians by Thucydides; Wilson (1990), 51, also comments that the phrase "εἰ σωφρονοῦμεν" is rarely employed by the Athenians in Thucydides. Humble (2002), 86-7 notes, however, that it is a concept associated with the oligarchic faction in Athens.

¹⁸⁶ Th. 1.81, 1.82.5-6, 1.83.3, 1.84.1, 1.85; Wilson (1990), 51, Debnar (2001), 61.

¹⁸⁷ Th. 1.79.2; Allison (1984), 14; Crane (1988), 199.

undertaking,¹⁸⁸ in light of the emotional atmosphere of the assembly Sthenelaidas' diatribe was the better tactic to employ.¹⁸⁹ If both Archidamus and Sthenelaidas sought to hold a mirror up for the Spartan audience to show them a particular self-image of themselves, Sthenelaidas was the one who read the audience correctly and whose "bellicose rhetoric carries the day by appealing to his audience's pride in their martial heritage".¹⁹⁰

It has been seen as outrageous that Sthenelaidas, in his response, did not counter any of Archidamus' very valid points.¹⁹¹ Sthenelaidas, however, had no need to negate Archidamus' argument.¹⁹² He employed a more forceful weapon: Sparta's ideology of masculinity. Keeping his message simple,¹⁹³ he argues that the Spartans have responsibilities, both as hegemon and as men, to protect those who look to them from injustice. He blazes past and dismisses Archidamus' warnings of Sparta's unpreparedness: what concern can such things be in the face of the suffering of those Sparta is worn to protect, and what use are material advantages in the face of the men of Sparta and its allies? This line of argument would have held special significance for the Spartans, as it plays upon the ideology of the superiority of Dorian men in comparison to their Ionian opponents.¹⁹⁴ Two main concepts become clear in Sthenelaidas' speech: injustice is being committed by the Athenians, and Sparta's collective manhood has been called into

¹⁸⁸ Th. 1.80-3.

¹⁸⁹ Allison (1984), Crane (1988), Francis (1993), and Debnar (2001), are among those who suggest that Sthenelaidas displays more political and rhetorical acumen than he is generally given credit for. Allison in particular argues for a sophisticated use of rhetoric on the part of Sthenelaidas, which Bloedow (1987), 63-4, finds inconsistent with his rather crude characterization. But, as Allison suggest, the speech did not need to be linguistically sophisticated since it is sophisticated in other ways, particularly in Sthenelaidas' judgement of the crowd. Hunter (1988), 25-6, says eloquently of crowd mentality that, as it bases judgements on pageantry rather than reason, "it is easily manipulated and so deceived. Instinctively, it follows that speaker who most delights it and who most appeals to its whims". Compare also Tsakmakis (2006) who argues that leaders' images and impressions are often more important than actual information as images "are part of a group's common perception which strengthen solidarity".

¹⁹⁰ Debnar, (2006), 76,

¹⁹¹ Bloedow (1981), 135-6. Hussey (1985), 129, notes that he didn't even try to refute Archidamus' points.

¹⁹² Allison (1984), 14, argues that, if one looks to the circumstances surrounding Sthenelaidas' speech, his tactics and the reasons for which he did not need to refute Archidamus' points are abundantly clear. Crane (1988), 212, emphasises that Sthenelaidas was remarkably successful at undermining Archidamus' arguments even without properly responding to them.

¹⁹³ It has also been seen as an example of Spartan brachylogy, establishing Sthenelaidas from the outset as a traditional no-nonsense Spartan. Kagan (1969), 304; Pouncey (1980), 58; Crane (1988), 212; Hornblower (1991), 130 on 1.86.1; Francis (1993), 203-5; Cartwright, (1997), 49 on 1.86; Debnar (2001), 69-70; Cartledge (2003a), 161.

¹⁹⁴ Crane (1988), 212-3; Debnar (2001), 73.

question—and it is the responsibility of Spartan men to meet both challenges without delay.¹⁹⁵

The determining ideological factor in the debate, therefore, is the way masculine self-worth was defined by both speakers.¹⁹⁶ As mentioned, Archidamus advocated an understanding of Spartan excellence as intrinsic and unthreatened by external pressures. Sthenelaidas, conversely, pushes for a view of masculine excellence as based in one's performance in the eye of others, meaning that it is very much vulnerable to external censure. Thus, whereas Archidamus dismisses the Corinthian accusation of *anandreia* (“cowardice/unmanliness”), indicating that the insult should not be a cause of shame for Spartans, but rather a cause of indignation against those who made it,¹⁹⁷ Sthenelaidas argues that, as Sparta's *andreia* (“bravery/manliness”) was largely what others thought it to be,¹⁹⁸ so the Spartans *should* feel shame. Sthenelaidas ends his speech by saying that the honour of Sparta demands immediate action;¹⁹⁹ this view of masculine honour prevailed.

It is possible that the influence of Sthenelaidas' masculine discourse was strengthened by the disparity of ages in the assembly: Archidamus' focus was primarily on the old and Sthenelaidas' on the young.²⁰⁰ The discrepancy in perspective of these different age groups, in part, accounts for the ways in which the various ideologies

¹⁹⁵ Crane (1988), 218.

¹⁹⁶ Debnar (2001), 73, expresses a similar idea in suggesting that a key difference in the speeches revolved around 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”. I would argue that the ideology of masculinity factors into this distinction, as Sthenelaidas' use of the term is designed to co-opt the ideological concept that was the centre of Archidamus' basis of Spartan self-worth for his own purposes. Archidamus focused on concepts such as reasonableness, self-possession, and tradition as those qualities that defined Spartans, but in Sthenelaidas' usage the Spartan who was truly σώφρων was the one who upheld masculine ideals in the defense of Sparta's allies and honour. Contrast Humble (2002), 99 n. 9, who suggests that Sthenelaidas' use of *en sophronomen* (ἐν σωφρονῶμεν “if we are sensible” [Th.1.86.2]) may not be ideologically tinged since it is a “widely used generic phrase”.

¹⁹⁷ Debnar (2001), 66-7.

¹⁹⁸ Wassermann (1953), 195; Crane (1988), 217-20.

¹⁹⁹ Th. 1.86.5.

²⁰⁰ Finley (1942), 129-30, argues that the speeches were likely meant, in part, to point out the incongruent views of the old and young in the Spartan assembly; Cartwright (1997), 49 on 1.86; Debnar (2001), 75, also 60, where she highlights the emphasis placed on the experience of the aged, not only in Archidamus' speech to the Spartan assembly, but also in his address to the league commanders before the first invasion of Attica (Th. 2.11.1). Wasserman (1953), 195, argues that Archidamus primarily directed his words to the experienced men of the assembly.

employed by the speakers were received by their audience. Indeed, Archidamus began his speech with a reference to his significant age.²⁰¹ This reference was, undoubtedly, meant to establish him as one deserving of esteem, and to whom it was the best interests of all to pay heed.²⁰² And, due to the Spartan's reverence for age,²⁰³ Archidamus' appeal to his own considerable experience likely did, in part, produce the desired effect.²⁰⁴ However, Archidamus' focus on the excellence of age, both as the basis of his position and as the primary quality of his target audience,²⁰⁵ had other ramifications, as masculine discourse carries different meanings at different stages of life. Archidamus could afford to speak of immovable excellence because he had nothing to prove. As one who was experienced in war and who had reached the time of life significant to warrant societal veneration on the basis of age (not to mention the prestige accorded to him by virtue of his royalty) his masculinity was secure.²⁰⁶ If Archidamus counsels that Spartans should not feel shame at the censure of others, he is speaking from a position of having nothing personally of which to be ashamed, as he can point to a long track record affirming his masculine honour. The young men addressed by Sthenelaidas did not view the situation from that place. The Spartan education system was highly competitive and placed great value on repeatedly performing masculine excellence. The atmosphere of constant observation in which boys and young men lived their lives, as well as the precarious nature of achievements of masculine excellence, likely impressed upon these young men both the incredibly visual character of Spartan masculinity, as well as how vulnerable masculine achievement was to the opinions of others.²⁰⁷ Unlike Archidamus and his contemporaries, the young men in the assembly would most assuredly have felt that they had a great deal

²⁰¹ Th. 1.80.1.

²⁰² Cartwright, (1997), 47 on 1.80.; Cartledge (2003a), 163.

²⁰³ Sparta's reputation of reverence for age is well documented: Hdt. 2.80; X. *Mem.* 3.5.15; Plut. *Apoph.* 69; Plut. *Lyc.* 15.2, 20.6.

²⁰⁴ Debnar (2001), 59-60.

²⁰⁵ Wassermann (1953), 195; Stahl (1973), 77. Wassermann highlights the tragic element in Archidamus addressing primarily the older and experienced members of the assembly, when it was the young who most needed to take heed of his council.

²⁰⁶ Wasserman, (1953), 195, asserts that it is the fact that there is no doubt of Archidamus' own bravery that he is able to promote a program of caution. Cartledge (2003a), 163, emphasises the fact that Archidamus spoke "with all the weight of his inherited authority and acquired prestige and influence".

²⁰⁷ Hussey (1985), 129, also argued that Archidamus' negative line of reasoning was an ineffectual tactic to employ on the products of Sparta's education system, which lacks a focus on rational evaluation. The intricacies of the Spartan education system and its relation to the construction of Spartan masculinity will be discussed at length in the next chapter on Xenophon's *Lacedaemoniorum Politeia*.

to prove²⁰⁸ (Archidamus implies as much in his insinuation that the young and inexperienced would be eager for war).²⁰⁹ Sthenelaidas made good use of this attitude in calling upon the Spartans to affirm not only their own masculine honor, but that of their country. As Lebow argues, the young Spartans, seeking honour and glory, felt their own self-esteem to be entwined with State honour, inasmuch as they were encouraged to live for the service of Sparta and to internalize its ideology,²¹⁰ so that an affront to the honour of Sparta was also a personal affront. In addition, Sthenelaidas' employment of highly emotional invective was particularly well suited to his target audience of young men. While Archidamus places the emphasis on the Spartan education system for the cultivation of moderate self-possession, his speech makes it clear that his own *σωφροσύνη* stems as much from his experience as his schooling. Lebow suggests that the young men in the Spartan assembly had "no previous exposure to this kind of emotional pressure",²¹¹ so that Sthenelaidas had merely to continue intensifying the pressure they had already been made to feel by the Corinthians and other allies, and demand that they cease speaking and make their actions confirm their worth as men and Spartans, in order to ensure their acquiescence to his goal.

Sthenelaidas, furthermore, made full use of the effect of his appeal to masculine discourse by immediately calling for the vote at the moment when the emotional pitch of the assembly was at its highest.²¹² The emphasis on performativity created by the vote was pushed even a step further by the demand that the separation be made a visible rather than a vocal distinction: while shouting to vote gave a degree of anonymity, forcing a physical separation created a powerful visual spectacle in which no one's position was left open to speculation.²¹³ There has been considerable discussion as to what exactly was

²⁰⁸ Hussey (1985), 129, argues that the heavy emphasis of educational system on martial success as the only acceptable form of glory, necessitates that the young be in favour of war, as to be opposed would be tantamount to willingly passing up their only opportunity to gain their culture's most highly vaunted form of masculine achievement.

²⁰⁹ Th. 1.80.

²¹⁰ Lebow (1996), 252.

²¹¹ Lebow (1996), 238-9.

²¹² Th. 1.87. See Finley (1942), 135, Stahl (1973), 77, Allison (1984), 14, and Cartledge (2003a), 161, 163, for the idea that to vote against war would be seen, at this point, as being tantamount to a display of cowardice and unmanliness. Here the force of masculine discourse and performativity are inextricably intertwined in their effect at securing the vote for war. (For discussion of the double feedback loop created by the association of words and deeds see Parry [1957], 547, 558).

²¹³ Hornblower (1991), 131 on 1.87.2.

Sthenelaidas' aim in alleging that he could not tell the vote from shouts alone, creating the necessity for a visible spectacle of the opinions of assembly members,²¹⁴ but regardless of the precise reason the ideological impact is clear: Sthenelaidas had made a vote for war tantamount to a demonstration of manly vigour and Spartan honour, and then called upon men to visibly perform their role as men in voting in favour of Spartan honour.²¹⁵ Even if the majority had been in favor of war before Sthenelaidas called for them to physically demonstrate it, he created a situation which would undoubtedly result in his desired outcome because, as Cartledge eloquently put it, Sthenelaidas, “exploited the Spartans’ culturally-induced notions of patriotism and bravery to get them to—literally—stand up and be counted”, the understanding being that no Spartan would desire to risk a vote that could make him seem to be a coward.²¹⁶

While the main focus of this section, up until this point, has been on Thucydides’ representation of Spartan discursive self-presentation, something should be said about the ways in which Thucydides displays outsiders re-creating the image of the Spartan man through discourse. Thucydides has both the Athenians and Corinthians discursively construct pictures of what it means to be a Spartan man, and these images dominate understandings of Spartan “national character” in the *History*. Outsider discourse in the *History* primarily seeks to define the Spartan character in polar opposition to that of the Athenian.²¹⁷ While the particulars of the Spartan “national character” (most fully expounded in the speech of the Corinthians at the first Spartan congress) has been analysed many times at length,²¹⁸ what is of concern here is the way in which concepts

²¹⁴ Kagan (1969), 305, does not believe that there was any doubt about the majority vote in favour of war after the shouting vote, but that Sthenelaidas “wanted to make the size of the majority dramatically evident in case of a later shift in Spartan opinion”. Westlake (1973), 100, suggests that Sthenelaidas employed the vote by division as a tactic to gain a sizable majority, believing that the undecided, and even some of those who had shouted their support for Archidamus’ position, would not have the nerve to display themselves as voting against the predominant view that the Athenians had violated the peace. Hornblower (1991), 130 on 1.87.2, emphasizes the view that the call for a vote by separation was not meant to show how great the majority was, but was intended to apply moral pressure on waverers.

²¹⁵ Francis (1993), 204, argues that throughout the speech Sthenelaidas had brandished the term *adikia* like a sword, and that, by the time of the vote, he has made the war with Athens an act of *timoria* on the part of Sparta against such *adikia*. Hornblower (1991), 131 on 1.87.2, and Tritle (2010), 29, make note of the possibility of the influence of peer pressure being a considerable factor in the second vote.

²¹⁶ Cartledge (2003a), 163.

²¹⁷ Wassermann (1964), 289. See also Hussey (1985), 125; Roisman (1987), 385; Dawson (1996), 103; Millender (1996), 287-8, 302-3; Heilke (2004), 130; Tritle (2010), 11.

²¹⁸ Wassermann (1964), 290; Orwin (1994), 75; Debnar (2001), 35-7, 42, 44-6, 56. Also see nn. 47 and 48 above.

central to Spartan masculinity were employed by outsiders in order to twist them into an image of a Spartan man radically different from that the Spartans sought to present.

The Corinthian portrayal, stressing Athenian inventiveness and enterprise in contrast with Spartan reticence and complacency, has been seen as the measure against which Thucydides aimed to portray Spartan “national character”,²¹⁹ as well as being the primary template for the typical Spartan man in the work.²²⁰ With respect to masculinity, the Corinthians’ discussions of Spartan isolationism and hesitancy have particular import. Spartan isolationism becomes associated with notions of masculinity due to the hegemonic nature of the Peloponnesian League.²²¹ In their speech, the Corinthians suggest that Spartan isolationist tendencies made them out of touch in a way that could disqualify them from their hegemonic position. Thus Corinthian discourse concerning Spartan masculinity is inextricably connected with the contemporary political situation, created with an aim to incite their Spartan allies to action, and thus can be seen to be framed largely within the ethos of hegemonic masculinity.

As will be discussed further later,²²² the Corinthians give little attention to the political realities of the various systems of alliance at the time²²³— indeed scholars have argued that the decision to go to war at that time had, in reality, little to do with the legalities of the situation.²²⁴ Instead, the Corinthian’s appeal rested entirely on ideas of injustice and the responsibilities of the hegemon to those allies who were subordinate to it.²²⁵ The Corinthians made much use of Sparta’s reputation as a liberator, referring to its prestige in this arena both among the allies and in its own self-image, and thus accusing them of depriving their own allies of liberty through their inaction and neglect.²²⁶ They imply, therefore, that failure, either from indifference or inability, to protect the interests

²¹⁹ Th. 1.68-72; Jaeger (1939), 395; Luginbill (1999), 83; Cartledge (2002), 200; Cartledge and Debnar (2006), 561-2; Raaflaub (2006), 217.

²²⁰ Th. 1.71.3, 2.87-9, 8.96.5; Millender (1996), 298, 304-6; Luginbill (1999), 86, 105; Rood (1998), 44-5; Heilke (2004), 130; Raaflaub (2006), 218.

²²¹ See further below pp. 52-8.

²²² The larger picture of Corinthian– Spartan relations will be discussed in the view of relations between men and hegemonic masculinity.

²²³ Cartledge (2002), 200, argues, e.g., that the Corinthians had little concern for Sparta's internal economics and politics, but that they were concerned about Spartan character inasmuch as it affected diplomatic relations with Athens.

²²⁴ Larsen (1934), 4-5; Finley (1942), 120-1; Jansson (1993), 161.

²²⁵ Larsen (1934), 4-5.

²²⁶ Th. 1.69.1; Lebow (1996), 238; Debnar (2001), 40-1.

of those who look to them for leadership diminishes the Spartans as men and renders them unworthy of occupying their dominant position in the hegemonic structure.²²⁷ The Corinthians turn attributes integral to the Spartan character into points of negative comparison with the Athenians.²²⁸ In their admonition not to allow the Peloponnese to become less than it was in the time of Sparta's forbearers, the Corinthians not only bid the Spartan men to examine their national prestige in comparison with that of their fathers, but also allude that Sparta could, through action, regain former glory. In this way they aim to incite the Spartans to prove themselves as worthy as their ancestors were, and to obtain the same level of honour in the eyes of the Greek world.²²⁹ Finally, by presenting a call to action centering on ideological invective in front of Sparta's other allies, the Corinthians were able to make full use of ideology to side step political realities and force the Spartans into a position where,²³⁰

they must either explicitly deny that the allies are suffering harm at the hands of the Athenians or act to protect them. If they allow the allies' complaints to go unchallenged, inaction can be nothing but a sign of cowardice and weakness.²³¹

Athenian discourse on Spartan masculinity can be seen in the funeral oration of Pericles, who, like the Corinthians, twists ideas associated with the construction of Spartan masculinity to become expressions of Spartan weakness rather than strength. The focus in the funeral oration is on two main aspects of Spartan culture: isolationism and education. Isolationism, especially in the form of the institutionalized expulsion of foreigners, was seen as reinforcing the Spartans' perception of their own uniqueness and superiority, as well as guarding against contamination from the inferior cultures and ways of others.²³² This has a bearing on the ethos of masculinity, as one of the ways other cultures could corrupt Spartans was by feminizing them. Pausanias, for example, was not

²²⁷ Th. 1.69; Finley (1942), 122; Debnar (2001), 41-2.

²²⁸ Th. 1.170.1-1.170.3; Debnar (2001), 44-5, 85.

²²⁹ Th. (1.71.7); Lebow (1996), 239; Debnar (2001), 41-2, 46.

²³⁰ This depiction of Spartans not only had resonances throughout Thucydides' *History*, but perhaps also gained power in the eyes of contemporary Greeks. This is reflected in those incidents when Sparta showed itself to be hesitant (especially in those instances of Spartan setbacks), resulting in the interpretation of these actions as expressions of weakness or effeminacy (e.g. Th. 1.83.1, 2.18.3, 2.85.2, 5.75.3 and Luginbill [1999], 91), until Sparta gave the Greeks reason to believe otherwise through action (e.g. Th. 5.75.3 relates that the Spartans, by their actions at Mantinea, were able to dislodge ideas of their weakness in the mind of the other Greeks).

²³¹ Debnar (2001), 37. See also Cartledge and Debnar (2006), 564.

²³² Figueira (2003), 49, 51-3, 62. See also Debnar (2001), 35-6.

only portrayed as incurring the displeasure of the Ionian Greeks but was reported as readily adopting all the behaviours and trappings of effeminate orientalism.²³³ The importance of the Spartan education to their masculine self-identity was made clear already in Archidamus' speech where he expressed the idea that their strict education was literally what made Spartan men so superior.²³⁴

Pericles based a large portion of his speech in a comparison of the openness of Athenian society, and the non-professional nature of Athenian hoplites, with Sparta's closed and highly regimented society.²³⁵ It has been suggested, however, that such comparison is not necessarily reflective of Athenian thought in general, but constitutes a rather narrow, and perhaps excessive, focus on contrasting Athens with its current enemy.²³⁶ Pericles implicitly rejects Archidamus' idea that all men are alike in nature. Instead, he presents the Spartans as devoting a lifetime of training towards the pursuit of manliness, alluding that the effort Spartans put towards creating truly manly men is indicative of an absence of naturally occurring manly valour in the Spartan character. Thus Athenians, who, Pericles claims, possess an ample supply of manly valour simply by virtue of being Athenian, need not fear Spartan training because natural Athenian valour is more than a match for artificial efforts.²³⁷ In addition to presenting the acquisition of Spartan masculine valour as arduous and unnatural, Pericles suggests that, as an artificial construct, Spartan masculine courage is also precarious:²³⁸ isolationism "others" the Spartans, is antisocial, is indicative of a suspicious nature,²³⁹ and is evidence that their education fails to truly instil those qualities in Spartan men which they lack naturally. Through discourse, therefore, the positive aspects which could be associated with Spartan isolationism, such as cultural purity and freedom from the moral attitudes of

²³³ Th. 1.77.6

²³⁴ Th. 1.84.4. Rood (1998), 45, points out the constructivist view of this statement in Archidamus' understanding that human behaviour is largely "moulded by circumstance".

²³⁵ Th. 2.39; Loraux (1986) 150; Millender (1996), 319-20. In addition to the attention Pericles draws to Spartan attempts to cultivate manliness through education, his discussion of Athenian freedom (Th. 2.37) implies a contradiction in Spartan society, suggesting that the virtues of manly valour created by their education system require constant and excessive policing to prevent them from breaking down.

²³⁶ Powell (2001), 157. See also Millender (1996), 302, on the exaggerated nature of the Spartan-Athenian dichotomy.

²³⁷ Loraux (1986), 51-2, 152; Millender (1996), 334; Figueira (2003), 59; Tritle (2010), 47.

²³⁸ Millender (1996), 340-1.

²³⁹ Figueira (2003), 58, 71.

others,²⁴⁰ become an expression of weakness, suggestive that Spartan manliness is not strong enough to withstand outside influences. This idea is also reflected in the speech of the Athenian envoys at the first Spartan congress, in which they remind the Spartans that Spartans abroad have a tendency to abandon all Spartan behavioural codes,²⁴¹ a concern which, Thucydides relates, would dictate Spartan external policy for some time.²⁴²

The images of Spartan and Athenian masculinity developed discursively by Pericles and other Athenians are clearly politically charged and, as one can expect from a state at war, these depictions served a propagandist purpose.²⁴³ Indeed, Tritle asserts that the particular images developed by Pericles within the context of his funeral oration were specifically aimed at shoring up Athenian confidence by discursively tearing down the Spartan mystique, and presenting the well-known perception of the Spartan army as comprised of men who possess unshakable courage as, instead, one whose members' natural short-comings made unintimidating.²⁴⁴ That the image presented by Pericles was more reflective of a discursive construct created deliberately for political purposes than material reality can be seen in those instances in which performance greatly deviated from those ideas expressed. Pericles' boasts of Athenian manly valour in practice sometimes proved hollow.²⁴⁵ For example, Demosthenes' address to the Athenian force at Pylos (Th. 4.10) reflected sentiments completely opposite to those expressed by Pericles.²⁴⁶ Beyond particular instances of discrepancy, Cartledge and Debnar argue that the general Athenian/Spartan contrast is perhaps "too neat to be credible", and should be viewed with caution.²⁴⁷ Thucydides himself is far from an impartial recorder of history; his depictions of different constitutions and cultures, as much as his relation of the events of the war, greatly reflect an Atheno-centric point of view.²⁴⁸ In light of these ideas, it is possible to view the images of the characteristic Spartan man which pervade much of Thucydides' *History*, and which have subsequently been viewed as indicative of some of

²⁴⁰ Figueira (2003), 53.

²⁴¹ Th. 1.77.6; Hornblower (1991), 123-4 on 1.77.6.

²⁴² Th. 1.95.

²⁴³ Miller (2000), 72-3.

²⁴⁴ Tritle (2010), 47.

²⁴⁵ Hussey (1985), 124.

²⁴⁶ Miller (2000), 169.

²⁴⁷ Cartledge and Debnar (2006), 561.

²⁴⁸ As Raaflaub (2006), 220, reminds us.

the characteristic traits of Spartan men, not necessarily as illuminating reality, but rather as constructions of Spartan masculinity created by outsiders for specific political purposes, and accomplished mainly by means of discourse.

2.3 Representation and Performativity

The relationship between discourse and representation or performativity in the realm of Spartan masculinity ideology can be seen prominently in Thucydides' *History*. While the Spartan "mirage" which informed views of Spartan men throughout the *History* is constructed largely through discourse, events of the *History* also suggest that discourse alone was insufficient to maintain the ideological strength of the image, but that substantiating performativity on the part of Spartans was required.

The ramifications which Spartan setbacks in the Archidamian War, particularly at Pylos and Cythera, had on Sparta's image reveal the extent to which such discourse depended on complementary performative representation. Thucydides (4.55, 5.14) relates the profound impact Sparta's losses in these two instances had in the eyes of both others and themselves. The effects of these incidents on Spartan morale are presented as being even more detrimental than the material losses. We are told that the Spartans, depicted as hesitant to begin with, now become almost completely incapacitated by the reversal of their expectations. Thucydides asserts that the failure of Spartan men to perform in battle in accordance with the self-defining image of military manhood promulgated by conventional Spartan discourse, shocked the Spartans to the extent that they lost confidence in themselves entirely, and thought that anything they attempted would be doomed to failure.²⁴⁹ Some have seen Spartan hesitancy and pessimism in episodes such as these as being indicative of Thucydides presenting Sparta as possessing a particularly fearful national character.²⁵⁰ These views rightly stress Thucydides' intent for the audience to compare those Spartans who fought to the death at Thermopylae with those who surrendered at Pylos, and point out the difference between the Spartan attitudes in the two scenarios due to the fact that events played out as expected, and against expectations, respectively.²⁵¹ However, I believe that their conclusions miss the mark,

²⁴⁹ Th. 4.55.4.

²⁵⁰ Epps (1933); Luginbill (1999), esp. 88-91, 105-6.

²⁵¹ Epps (1933), 14-6; Luginbill (1999), 86-8.

and that the episode actually reveals a lack of the existence of characteristics (either positive or negative) “innate” to Spartan nature.²⁵² Lebow emphasises the double-feedback loop created between words and deeds depicted generally in Thucydides’ *History* and notes the potential for damage any time in which there is a discrepancy between the social conventions, which create the “inter-subjective understandings” required for action, and “brute facts”.²⁵³ Thus, Thucydides’ presentation of Spartan reactions to the unexpected (that is, the break down in Spartan self-identification, manifested in their subsequent complete lack of self-confidence) suggests that Spartan masculine self-image should be viewed as socially constructed through discourse and performative representation, which require a significant level of agreement with one another for the Spartan self-identifying ideology to function as it was intended.²⁵⁴ “they [the Spartans] were extraordinarily brave, in part because they believed they were and because others believed the same”.²⁵⁵ When the ideologically promoted form of Spartan masculine self-representation is challenged by the failure of Spartan masculine performativity (i.e. the performance in battle of actual Spartan men) to live up to the discourse which seeks to inform it, the discourse loses its power and Spartan self-defining ideology is severely damaged.

²⁵² Crane (1988), 230-1, for example, argues that the Spartan response to setbacks reveals Archidamus’ assertion of an entrenched Spartan *σωφροσύνη* which shields Spartan men from being influenced by success and failure alike as being false.

²⁵³ Lebow (2001), 547-9, 554, 558. See also Debnar (2001), 231, who suggests that this sort of consistency between words and actions is portrayed by Thucydides as being particularly important to Spartan mentality.

²⁵⁴ The view that all of Sparta’s structured way of life was aimed at suppressing the innate fear present in Spartan character, and that this is revealed any time in which events do not unfold precisely as the Spartans had intended, is unsatisfactory. It does not explain the origin of the supposed fearful Spartan character. This view also contradicts ideas elsewhere in Thucydides, as Crane (1988), 234, points out that at Th. 2.89.2, Phorimo ascribes equal courage to Athenians and Spartans, but says that the courage of each state lies in the areas in which they have been traditionally successful. Also, the view that in order for Spartans to be courageous in battle the situation must unfold in predictable patterns does not answer the question of why the failure of particular Spartans in battle should cause long-ranging effects for Spartan morale as a whole. The understanding of the centrality of hoplite ideals to Spartan conceptions of masculinity, however, does. The reason Spartan set-backs in the Archidamian war were so devastating to Spartan self-image was because the type of warfare which was deeply associated with the performative aspects of Spartan masculine self-identification was no longer effective. Crane (1988), argues that, with his talk of internal *σωφροσύνη*, Archidamus failed to anticipate the degree to which Spartan courage was intertwined with successful hoplite warfare; thus, failure to perform adequately in this vital aspect of self-identifying discourse would cause a crisis-situation not only in warfare but also in masculine identity, as “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” (Finley [1942], 197). See also Debnar (2001), 166-7.

²⁵⁵ Debnar (2001), 166.

When expanding the view beyond the impact of the Spartan surrender at Pylos on Spartan self-image, the shock caused throughout the Hellenic world by the Spartans' failure to live up to their reputation in this instance shows the influence of Spartan performativity on the other Greek states' perception of Spartan men. Thucydides says specifically 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,²⁵⁶ Thucydides, in his explicit association of Pylos with Thermopylae, shows that Sparta's reputation for bravery in the Greek world was based on the precedent of Spartans fighting to the death at Thermopylae.²⁵⁷ The necessity of Spartan performativity to uphold this image for the maintenance of Spartan reputation is made painfully clear by the fact that a single episode which displayed deviation from this precedent was sufficient to shatter Sparta's military reputation in the eyes of its contemporaries.²⁵⁸ Furthermore, the double feedback loop requiring performativity to uphold specifically the images created by discourse is underlined by the fact that the Spartans captured on the island did, in fact, fight admirably.²⁵⁹ The eventual surrender was no cut-and-dried matter: it only occurred after the deaths of two Spartan commanding officers and the reception of ambiguous and unhelpful advice from Spartan authorities on the mainland.²⁶⁰ The surrender can thus be seen as largely representative of a failure in Spartan leadership, and not a failure of the Spartiates on the island to live up to their famous character.²⁶¹ If Thucydides did mean to represent the captured Spartans as performing commendably, for as long as was reasonably possible, then their only real failing was that their performance did not live up to the defining representation of Spartan men, created at Thermopylae: men who fight to the death rather than surrender. That Thucydides represents this failing as being sufficient to obliterate Sparta's image shows specificity of the double-feedback loop between performativity and discourse—which both must conform particularly to the approved ideology, suggesting that Thucydides saw this association as being powerful enough to

²⁵⁶ Th. 4.40; Finley (1942), 197; Crane (1988), 231. Rood (1998), 36-7: "The Spartans' claim to have 'the greatest reputation of the Greeks' imposes the need to maintain it".

²⁵⁷ Finley (1942), 197; Crane (1988), 231; Rood (1998), 37-9; Debnar (2001), 165; Foster (2012), 211.

²⁵⁸ Tritle (2010), 89.

²⁵⁹ Foster (2012), 211. See also Finley (1942), 197, who says that Thucydides "dwelt amply" on the heroism of the Spartans on the island.

²⁶⁰ Rood (1998), 36-7.

²⁶¹ Foster (2012), 210-1.

render the actualities surrounding real-world events meaningless if they do not fit into the approved ideology.

Further evidence to suggest that without supporting performance discourse fails to shore up masculine ideology can be seen in analysis of a statement attributed to one of the captured Spartans on Pylos. In response to a taunt asking if all of the brave Spartans had been killed on the island, he acerbically remarked that “the spindle, meaning the arrow, would be worth much if it could distinguish the brave” (πολλοῦ ἂν ἄξιον εἶναι τὸν ἄτρακτον, λέγων τὸν οἰστόν, εἰ τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς διεγίγνωσκε).²⁶² This pithy statement can be seen as an attempt to reconcile the image of Spartan actions to the traditional ideology of Spartan masculinity via discourse.²⁶³ The unnamed Spartan not only displays contempt for his enemies’ unmanly conduct by associating them with women in the use of the term “spindle” (ἄτρακτον) for arrow, but also seeks to re-establish the Spartans within the traditional hoplite ethos as the superiors of their enemies, even in defeat, through the skilful use of discourse; Crane aptly explains the Spartan’s discursive strategy, in a way which warrants quoting at length:

The Spartans did not push the contest to its limit and surrender their lives, because the contest was not fought between equals. The cowardly recourse to missiles such as arrows and rocks demeaned the Athenian forces, and 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. Thus the unnamed Spartan attempts to convert a humiliating defeat into a moral victory that asserts Spartan status.²⁶⁴

But for all of its rhetorical ingenuity, this sort of discourse was largely ineffectual in changing public opinion about Sparta. Regardless of the particulars of the Pylos catastrophe, it caused Sparta’s reputation to continue to suffer subsequently; until it reached a point in 418 BCE where it seemed that Sparta’s standing had never been so low in the eyes of its fellow Greeks. This situation was ultimately only rectifiable through Spartan performance at the battle of Mantinea.²⁶⁵ Miller notes the stress on action over

²⁶² Th. 4.40.2.

²⁶³ 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.

²⁶⁴ Crane (1988), 233.

²⁶⁵ Th. 5.75.3; Cartwright (1997), 208, on 5.28; Crane (1988), 233-4.

words in the Spartan exhortation before the battle at Mantinea,²⁶⁶ suggesting awareness that Spartan performativity was required to repair Sparta's image, as discourse by itself would not suffice.

Another area of Thucydides' *History* in which the effect of representation on Spartan masculine image is particularly prominent in a different way is Thucydides' description of Brasidas' Northern campaign.²⁶⁷ A number of scholars have discussed at length Brasidas' character and, though their views differ in the particulars,²⁶⁸ many agree that, in his depiction as a man of swift action, his reputation for just and moderate conduct, his capacity for eloquent rhetoric, and his penchant for employing tactics of persuasion over those of compulsion, he is atypical of the Spartan "national character" Thucydides sought to present in the *History*.²⁶⁹ This is so much so, that some have suggested that Brasidas actually embodies the antithesis of that character,²⁷⁰ or that he is presented as bearing more relation to Thucydides' depiction of the typical Athenian character than that of the Spartan.²⁷¹ Yet Wassermann asserts that, other than Archidamus, no other Spartan was presented by Thucydides as so archetypal of Sparta as Brasidas.²⁷² This assertion certainly echoes the sentiments of those cities induced by Brasidas to join the Spartan cause, who, Thucydides relates, were imbued with good will by Brasidas' conduct, not only towards Brasidas himself, but also towards the Spartans in general, whom they hoped were like him.²⁷³ The fact that Brasidas came to represent, in

²⁶⁶ Th. 5.69.2. Miller (2000), 132-3.

²⁶⁷ Most of my discussion concerning Brasidas will take place in this section, even though it will be clear that discourse and hegemonic masculinity are important too.

²⁶⁸ E.g. Wasserman (1964), 293 argues that Thucydides views Brasidas possessing "matter-of-fact efficiency with the aristocratic standards of a gentleman"; Francis (1993), 211-2, sees Thucydides' presentation of Brasidas as "of one who, 'transcends the more restrictive aspects of Spartan temperament and seems, at least in the field, to assimilate some of the qualities of Periclean leadership'; 3) Bradford (1994), 74-5, believes, by contrast, that Thucydides wished to reveal that the Greeks were deceived in their high opinion of Brasidas; 4) Hornblower (1996), 53-4 believes that Thucydides was seduced by Brasidas and sought largely to portray him as a romantic-loner, but that in reality he was likely more like the Spartans at home than one would expect; 5) Heilke (2004) considers Thucydides presented Brasidas as an excellent but ambivalent figure.

²⁶⁹ Debnar (2001), 174-5; Powell (2001), 200; Heilke (2004), 125-31; Gribble (2006), 466-7. Wassermann (1964), 293-4 by contrast sees Brasidas as atypical in the sense that he considers him to embody the best qualities possible in Spartan character, which his countrymen fail to live up to.

²⁷⁰ Westlake (1968), 148-50; Millender (1996), 350-1; Luginbill (1999), 116.(and n. 111 above).

²⁷¹ Wassermann (1964), 294-5; Millender (1996), 349; Cartwright (1997), 187 on 4.81; Debnar (2001), 174-5, 183-4; Heilke (2004), 130.

²⁷² Wassermann (1964), 292.

²⁷³ Th. 4.81.3; Powell (2001), 176.

the eyes of the northern cities, “the Spartan” as a type— despite Thucydides’ assertions that he was, in fact, atypical— is indicative of Brasidas’ proficiency in remoulding the image of what a Spartan man was to suit his own purposes through means of representation and performativity.²⁷⁴ Brasidas invited his audience to view him as the embodiment of the Spartan ethos, and presented affronts to Spartan offers of “liberation” as personal affronts. Thus he manipulated his audience to buying into Spartan propaganda by appealing to sentiment. In service of his representation, Brasidas stressed the conformity of words to actions.²⁷⁵ Throughout Thucydides’ description of Brasidas’ campaign, there is an emphasis on perception and the awareness of public image in the accounts of his conduct—²⁷⁶conduct which proved exceptionally useful for Brasidas’ political purposes.²⁷⁷

Debnar suggests that Brasidas took advantage of his audiences’ ignorance when it came to the character of most Spartans, allowing him to use his own conduct to insinuate that the allies would find other Spartans equally agreeable to their sensibilities, knowing that they had no way to tell that the representation of Spartan men presented by Brasidas was not entirely truthful.²⁷⁸ In the depiction of the carefully calculated nature of the conduct which won Brasidas the admiration of the northern Greeks,²⁷⁹ as well as

²⁷⁴ Though there is considerable disagreement among scholars about exactly how this is achieved: Debnar (2001), 183-4 sees him as egocentric in his speeches; Wassermann (1964), 292, argues that his language works on a personal rather than a political level. Although Millender (1996), 349-51, suggests that the excessive focus on the figure of Brasidas in descriptions of the northern campaign may stem, in part from Thucydides’ unwillingness to deviate from his established Spartan-Athenian antithesis, and thus depicts episodes which would highlight instances of Spartan celerity and ingenuity as being due to the efforts of a single “Athenianized” Spartan leader. In support of this idea, Millender points out that the Thucydides employs a similar approach in the case of Sicily and Gylippus.

²⁷⁵ I.e. he was effective because matched his discourse and self-representation with confirming performativity. Powell (2001), 239, argues that although Brasidas is portrayed as untypically Spartan in his eloquent speech, he can be seen as very Spartan in his assertion that his words are not empty, as can be seen in his speech at Th. 5.9.10, when he remarked that his exhortation would be confirmed by his own actions in battle.

²⁷⁶ Rood (1998), 73.

²⁷⁷ Hornblower (1996), 60.

²⁷⁸ Debnar (2001), 179-80. See also Tsakmakis (2006), 181-2, who asserts that “[the Northern Greeks] hatred for Athens and the quest for a strong ally made it easy for Brasidas to convince them that he was different”. Tsakmakis argues that once Brasidas had presented an idealized Spartan-image which appealed to the Northern allies, that image substituted reality, as public image is primarily based on appearance rather than reality, even if the image is false.

²⁷⁹ Rood (1998), 72-3, emphasises the idea that Brasidas conducted himself with consideration of public opinion foremost in his mind. See further below.

numerous references to Brasidas' use of deceit,²⁸⁰ Thucydides' account leads the reader to the conclusion that, by deliberately creating a representation of Sparta embodied in himself, Brasidas was able to execute the political programme of his campaign primarily through persuasion based on ideology.²⁸¹

Brasidas' employment of particularly masculine representation can be viewed in full effect in his speeches of exhortation to his force at Lyncestis and Amphipolis. Wassermann has asserted that Brasidean exhortations constitute a veritable encomium of traditional Spartan values, and indeed, the imagery Brasidas encourages those serving under him to appropriate for the purposes of their own self-identification is firmly rooted within the Dorian, and particularly Spartan, masculine ethos.²⁸² Brasidas begins both speeches by addressing the troops as Peloponnesians; he encourages them not to despair because of the desertion of their allies; he calls upon them to base their valour on their native courage as Peloponnesian men—a courage which he advocates should be bolstered by the fact that they are Dorians fighting against Ionians; he extolls Spartan military-masculine virtues which he urges the men to uphold, and he promises to show that his own actions will conform to his words, lest anyone should think those words hollow.²⁸³ The significance of this line of rhetoric becomes especially clear when one notes that Brasidas was addressing an army comprised of helots, mercenaries and northern allies,

²⁸⁰ Th. 4.85.7, 4.88.1, 4.108.5, 4.122.3, 4.122.6, 4.123.1, 5.16.1. Rood (1998), 72-3; Hornblower (1996), 54-60; Debnar (2001), 174-5. Heilke (2004), 131-3, argues that Thucydides' references to Brasidas' use of deceit are meant to reveal the ambiguous nature of his successes and allow Thucydides to reveal that the "attribution of justice" to Brasidas is, in actuality, "a deceptive appearance whose seductive power will end either with Athenian revenge on some of the "liberated" cities or with Spartan tyranny". For opposing views which stress Brasidas' justice and moderation, and have argued that Thucydides portrayed him as a genuinely just man, deserving of admiration see, Wassermann (1964), 292-5; Brunt (1965), 275-6; and Orwin (1994), 79-80. Brunt argues that if Brasidas' promises to Northern allies ultimately proved false due to the decisions of the authorities in Sparta, Brasidas' intent in making them were nonetheless likely to have been genuine.

²⁸¹ Brasidas' willingness to employ real-politik and threat of force has not gone unnoticed by scholars: e.g. Westlake (1968), 152; Hornblower (1996), 276-8 on 4.85-7, and 280 on 4.85.6; Cartwright, (1997), 187-8 on 4.84, 4.87; Debnar (2001), 187-90; Heilke (2004), 126; Tamiolaki (2013), 56-7. But Hornblower (1996), 284-5 on 4.88.1, says that Thucydides listed threat and persuasion equally and without emphasis on one as the "real" reason for Brasidas' success, asserting that it was important for Thucydides to relate that Brasidas' propaganda was effective. And Cartledge (2003a), 188, asserts that, while Thucydides wanted his readers to be aware of Brasidas' use of intimidation, he nonetheless sought to impart the impression that Brasidas was eminently successful primarily because of his use of persuasion, partly because as Thucydides was one of the generals unsuccessful in preventing Brasidas from taking Amphipolis, it was in his best interest not to diminish the image of the man who bested him.

²⁸² Wassermann (1964), 294-5, and Debnar (2001), 196.

²⁸³ Th. 4.126, 5.9.

many of which were not even Dorian, never mind Peloponnesian.²⁸⁴ A number of suggestions have been made as to why Brasidas employed such ideology in addressing troops to which it was not applicable, but I am inclined to agree with the view of Hornblower that Brasidas was employing the title of “Peloponnesian” honourifically, within the context of cohesion-building rhetoric.²⁸⁵ The important factor in Brasidas’ representation was the creation of a collective identity which is most readily done by appealing to an established essential identity (true or otherwise), and by othering the enemy.²⁸⁶ Dorian-masculine ethos, often employed by Peloponnesians provided Brasidas with natural focus for the creation of collective identity for his army due to the long tradition asserting Dorian natural superiority and courage in contrast to Ionian natural weakness and effeminacy.²⁸⁷ Brasidas was suggesting, therefore, that, regardless of their actual ethnic and geographic heritage, the soldiers could, in effect, *become* a part of the Dorian-masculine ethos by affirming this adopted self-representation through their performance in battle.²⁸⁸

The success of Brasidas’ representational tactics can be especially seen in Thucydides’ reference to the helot soldiers in Brasidas’ army. Some have questioned the effectiveness of Brasidas’ rhetoric about slavery in the face of his (recently emancipated) helot troops.²⁸⁹ However, Thucydides’ descriptions of these particular helots seem to suggest the contrary. That they come to be called “Brasideans”, for example, indicates a special bond between these men and their commander.²⁹⁰ The distinction Thucydides later draws between the Brasideans and the other *neodamodeis* settled at Lepreum,²⁹¹ as

²⁸⁴ Th. 4.126. 5.9; Cartwright (1997), 196, on 4.126; Debnar (2001), 195-6.

²⁸⁵ Hornblower (1996), 397 on 4.126.1.

²⁸⁶ Jansson (1997), 148-50, 154-9, 162. Jansson notes that through the use of discourse and representation, identities can be appropriated and groups can be symbolically excluded from identities which should technically include them.

²⁸⁷ Alty (1982) 7-9, 11; see also Debar (2001), 229. In addition to the longstanding topos regarding natures of Dorians and Ionians, Jansson (1997), 153-6, argues that the Dorian ethos would be a particularly useful identity-defining category, as the Dorian-Ionian split effectively divides the Greek world in two, and allows Brasidas not only to create a collective identity for his forces, but also to collectively other the enemy “on basis of long-established ethnic identity”.

²⁸⁸ Debnar (2001), 196.

²⁸⁹ Hornblower (1996), 398-9, on 4.126.2; Debnar (2001), 296.

²⁹⁰ Cartledge (2003a) 187-8.

²⁹¹ Th. 5.34.1.

well as Thucydides' juxtaposition of the account of the helot massacre²⁹² with the description of Brasidas embarking on his mission with, among others, 700 helot troops,²⁹³ further supports this idea. By including the helot troops in these addresses he rhetorically elevates them to the level of free Dorian men, through his invitation to them to adopt this self-representation. One could even argue that the references to real versus ideological slavery may have been intentionally aimed at the helot contingent of Brasidas' force: by participating in and identifying with Spartan masculine ideology, they are investing in the ethos and emancipating themselves ideologically. Thucydides' treatment of the Brasideans suggests that these men did, in fact, buy into the brand of Spartan masculine self-representation which Brasidas offered them.

The final instance I wish to highlight, in which the performative aspect of Spartan masculinity comes to the fore also concerns the helots. This is Thucydides' account of the Spartans' surreptitious murder of some 2000 helots.²⁹⁴ This episode has been the focus of a considerable scholarly debate, with scholars at variance concerning almost every aspect of the episode including its date,²⁹⁵ what it may have meant for Spartan-helot relations,²⁹⁶

²⁹² Thucydides' description of the helot massacre has been the subject of a great deal of scholarly debate (see below pp. 49-50). Some (see Willets [1957], 57; Talbert [1989], 23; Jordan [1990], 55), believe that the juxtaposition of Brasidas' campaign and the helot massacre is reflective of the likely date of the massacre, but rarely do scholars argue that the juxtaposition is meant to imply something about the character of Brasidas—a notable exception being Bradford (1994), 74-5, who argues that it is meant to highlight the duplicity of all Spartans, Brasidas included. But I believe these views miss the mark. Thucydides' juxtaposition of the massacre (which was motivated by the Spartans' concern about being able to control such "high-spirited" helots), with Brasidas' single-handed command of 700 helots, was framed partially to highlight Brasidas' remarkable skill. The juxtaposition implies that these 700 were the same sort of helots that those in Sparta felt uncontrollable and best killed. Thucydides' subsequent description of Brasidas' successful command of the helots on campaign thus highlights Brasidas' skill as a leader. Finally while the distinction of Brasidas' helot-troops from the *neodamodeis* has caused some scholarly concentration—MacDowell (1986), 41, says that the passage is problematic because it separates helots freed for fighting with Brasidas from *neodamodeis*, calling into question the exact status of *neodamodeis* (although Th. 7.58.3 strongly implies that the *neodamodeis* were helots freed for military service by making the sole distinction between themselves and other helots in the army that the *neodamodeis* had already received their freedom)—if we view the distinction between the Brasideans and the other *neodamodeis* as lying solely in the connection of the former to Brasidas, the passage is not problematic, and fits the pattern of Thucydides' efforts to portray Brasidas' excellence through (among other things) his success with the helots serving under him.

²⁹³ Th. 4.80.

²⁹⁴ Th. 4.80.3-4.

²⁹⁵ Willets (1957), 57, and Talbert (1989), 23, believe that the massacre would have taken place around the same time as Brasidas embarked on his campaign. Jordan (1990), 55, suggests that it occurred after the capture of the Spartiates at Pylos. Whitby (1994), 98-9, says that the exact date is unknowable, but conjectures that if the massacre took place it would have been considerably earlier than Brasidas' northern campaign as a massacre of that scale would require a "long convalescence in Spartan-helot relations" before helots would be once again willing to volunteer for an offer similar to that by which their fellows

as well as whether or not the massacre ever took place.²⁹⁷ Much of this debate lies beyond the scope of this discussion, and what is of concern at present is how the massacre can be viewed as a performative display, aimed at providing a visceral cautionary example to those who would deviate from the approved Spartan ideology concerning the hierarchal stratification between free and slave men. The most significant factor in the episode is the emphasis placed upon the high-spiritedness, or presumptuousness, (φρονήματος) of the helots killed.²⁹⁸ Thucydides relates that the helots deemed problematic were those who believed that they had met standards worthy of free men, not for future service to the state, as was the case with the *neodamodeis* we see being employed increasingly by Sparta later,²⁹⁹ but because they felt that they *deserved* to be set free based on their prior conduct.

The Spartans employed a number of measures to ensure that the helots were as subjugated ideologically through a cultivated belief of their own innate inferiority, as they were in actuality.³⁰⁰ They were, for example, especially concerned to oppose all attempts, on the part of Athenians and others, to cultivate any sort of Messenian national identity.³⁰¹ Additionally, the Spartans attempted to impose upon the helots a collective identity of their own devising, which Hornblower points out involved considerable care

were tricked. Bradford (1994), 74-5, says that the revolt would not have happened at the same time as Brasidas' campaign. Hornblower (1996), 266, on 4.80.3-4, says that, "Th. leaves the date of this incident timeless, floating in the air". Paradiso (2004), 187-8, argues that the chronological problem is not easily reconciled, as there are issues with back-dating the massacre to the distant past, but it is also difficult to accept that 700 helots who served with Brasidas would have been eager to volunteer had 2000 of their fellows just been brutally slain.

²⁹⁶ Talbert (1989) sees the incident as more reflective of Spartan fears than a real helot threat. Whitby (1994), 98-9, argues that it is more suggestive of Spartan propaganda than the realities of Sparta's situation regarding its helots, but argues that if it did occur it indicates Sparta's considerable skill in helot-control. Cartledge (2003b), 22, asserts that the massacre should "be read as his paradigm case of the Spartan's regular treatment of Helots". Paradiso (2004), 188, believes that the massacre most likely represents official Spartan propaganda to send a message to Messenians and runaway helots.

²⁹⁷ Talbert (1989), 23; Whitby (1994), 98; Bradford, (1994), 74-5; Paradiso (2004), 186-7; and Tritle (2010), 93, call into question the veracity of the incident, while Oliva (1971), 164-5; Cartledge (2003b), 21; Harvey, (2004), 200; and Cartledge and Debnar (2006), 565, argue for its historicity. Hornblower (1996), 267, on 4.80.3-4, asserts that it is hard to believe that the whole story is true, as he does not think that it would have been easy for the Spartans to dispose of so many at once without modern methods.

²⁹⁸ Orwin (1994), 83-4 frames the affair as a type of parody where here Thucydides has the Spartans kill their helots for succeeding to meet the standards expected of citizens.

²⁹⁹ 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".

³⁰⁰ See also Whitby (1994), 108-9; Cartledge (2003b), 19-20; Luraghi (2003), 123.

³⁰¹ Luraghi (2008), 101, 199-208, 223. Although Luraghi views the perioikoi of Messenia as the most likely candidates for the creation of the Messenian national identity among helots.

on the part of the Spartans to reinforce the imposed representation of helot nature through repeated performative displays of Spartan superiority and helot inferiority.³⁰² Feelings of entitlement on the part of helot men would mean that they had failed to internalize the self-representation required of them by the Spartan system. If Thucydides' construction of the massacre accurately represents Spartan tactics, the manner in which Sparta dealt with this problem provides a masterful example of the use of performativity to drive home the desired ideology. On the most practical level, the Spartans rid themselves of a problem by eliminating a sector of the helot population which they considered to pose a physical threat to the existing social order. However, they are depicted as doing so in such a way as to turn this practical measure also into an ideological tool, in the form of a powerful exemplary display of Spartan superiority. In the ceremony, the helots who were put on display were those who selected themselves as the worthiest. Their subsequent ignominious deaths reaffirmed the correct social order and sent a pointed message to other helots of the consequences of overestimating their place in the world. Furthermore, the scale of this display would likely have been viewed as extraordinary,³⁰³ increasing its impact. Memory of the incident would lend weight to the smaller, more commonplace, performative displays of helot inferiority, making the need for such large-scale displays rare. Therefore the massacre, as reported by Thucydides, can be viewed as an exceptional and evocative performative display, deliberately executed by the Spartan authorities, to reinforce the representation which Sparta typically sought to impose on its helots through less extreme measures.³⁰⁴

³⁰² Hornblower (2011), 268-9. See also Luraghi (2008), 101, 198, 200, 203-4.

³⁰³ Although Cartledge (2002), 211, believes that the massacre reflects aspects of Sparta's normal treatment of the helots, he does, however, acknowledge the hyperbolized scale of the display.

³⁰⁴ Opposition to the view that the massacre of the Helots was premeditated is expressed by Jordan (1990) and Hornblower (1996), 267, on 4.80.3-4, who suggest that the Spartans' original offer of freedom to the helots was genuine, but that they lost their nerve resulting in mass-murder. Jordan's suggestion that what so unnerved the Spartans so as to compel them to undertake the unplanned massacre of some 2000 men, was that the ceremony described by Thucydides was an unsanctioned emulation of that performed by new members of the *Gerousia* (and that this was unbearable to the Spartans), is unconvincing. Harvey (2004), 203-4, admirably refutes these ideas, arguing that if Thucydides had meant readers to understand that the ceremony was only meant to be performed by members of the *Gerousia* he would have made that clear, and pointing out that the interpretation of the Spartans offer of freedom as genuine is in direct contradiction with the text, which asserts that Spartans made as if to free the helots, and that the massacre was planned from the outset. Furthermore, Cartledge (1991), 381, stressed the need Sparta would have had to employ tactics of conditioning and "Machiavellian manipulation" to control a population of helots which vastly outnumbered them. The massacre can be seen as an example of an especially violent manipulative tool. Harvey (2004), 207, highlights that while the murders themselves were carried out in secret, the promenade

2.4 Relations Between Men and Hegemonic Masculinity

One of the areas in which the city-as-individual analogy employed by Thucydides is most useful to an exploration of masculinity is in the relationships between Sparta and its allies. With regard to Thucydides' treatment of cities, Morrison commented that Thucydides' approach of focusing on the city as a political unit in terms of speech and action, "is indicated by his choice to have cities speak as a whole: "the Corinthians say...", "the Thebans say...", "the Plataeans say...".³⁰⁵ Characterized in this way by Thucydides, cities come to be, in part, collective expressions of masculine subjectivities. In their interactions, it is possible to view cities figuratively as individual masculine subjects, upon whom the influence of masculine ideology and structures of hegemonic masculinity factor in the same ways as they do on individual men. The hegemonic structures of national masculinities can be particularly seen in depictions of Sparta and its position within the Peloponnesian League, and the ways in which the ideologies of national masculinities can be exploited within such hegemonic structures are especially prevalent in Thucydides' portrayal of the interaction of members of the Peloponnesian League prior to the outbreak of the Archidamian War.

Unlike Athens, whose position in relation to that of its allies, as depicted by Thucydides, appears that of an imperial power who rules primarily through force, Sparta's position as head of the Peloponnesian League prior to the war with Athens was more tenuous, as that of the hegemon of an association of a comparatively fluid nature.³⁰⁶ As a hegemonic power, Sparta relied considerably on the ideological credit, and its subordinated allies (to a greater or lesser degree) freely bestowed upon them the position

around the shrines would have been highly visible, and that the important distinction in the text that no one knew how *each* of the helots were killed, implies that the massacre itself was not the secret, and that people were meant to know that the helots *were* killed. Thus, by performing the murders in an extremely stylized display, the Spartans would have created a lasting impression which would have lessened the need for more regular displays of violence.

³⁰⁵ Morrison (2006), 109.

³⁰⁶ Brunt (1965), 256; Lendon (1994), 177; Lebow (1996), 249; Crane (1998), 213. The debate regarding the precise organization and operations of the Peloponnesian League has been well documented, see Bolmarcich (2005), 5, nn. 1&2, for a list of the major treatments. While the Peloponnesian League obviously had important functions beyond the realm of ideology, and the league's cohesion was the result of more than just hegemonic ideology, for my purposes I am limiting my discussion of the Peloponnesian League to its hegemonic and ideological functions in relation to Spartan power and prestige. To this end, the following discussion may seem to inflate the importance of the role of masculine ideology in the structure of the league, but this is the necessary result of artificially isolating this aspect of league construction from its greater context for the purposes of analysis.

as the hegemonic ideal. Crane argues that hegemonic ideology was as, if not more, responsible for Sparta's prominent position as was any material militaristic power which Sparta possessed.³⁰⁷ Thus Sparta's sustained position at the top of the hegemonic ladder, as well as its reputation and power, depended largely on the continuing willingness of Sparta's allies to be subordinated to it. This, in turn, created constraints on Sparta's ability to act unilaterally, since there was a need for Sparta to act in ways that would ensure the ongoing support of its allies.³⁰⁸ Whatever theoretical and constitutional rights Sparta had over its allies, in actual practice the authority of Sparta to dictate mandates to league members was far from absolute, as is illustrated by those instances in which Sparta acted against the desires of her allies, which generally proved disastrous due to allied reticence.³⁰⁹ So great was Sparta's dependence upon the cooperation and good will of its allies that Lebow suggests that Sparta's position should, in reality, be seen as that of "primus inter pares" rather than that of absolute ruler.³¹⁰

The hegemonic structure of the league was quite complex. Bolmarcich argues that there were at least two status-levels of individual states within the league, that of those (usually small) states whose relationship to Sparta was that of subjugation, and that of Sparta's autonomous (and considerably more powerful) allies.³¹¹ Bolmarcich believes that the necessity to impose oligarchic governments and swear "to follow wherever Sparta might lead and to have the same friends and enemies" was obligatory only for those allies who had been conquered by Sparta, but that Sparta did not aspire to such control over more powerful allies such as Corinth and Thebes.³¹² These more powerful allies, for their part, offered Sparta token deference but have been seen as being, in reality, Sparta's peers.³¹³ Sparta is thus seen as relating to its subordinated allies on two levels, each of which reinforces the other.³¹⁴

³⁰⁷ Crane (1998), 213, 235.

³⁰⁸ Larsen (1934), 4-5; Finley (1942), 120-1; Brunt (1965), 257; Fliess, (1966), 106; Lebow (1996), 238; Crane (1998), 214-5, 218-20, 316.

³⁰⁹ Lendon (1994) 170-2.

³¹⁰ Lebow (1996), 249, comparing Sparta's position vis-a-vis its allies, to that of Athens.

³¹¹ Bolmarcich (2005), 7-8, 28-9, 31-4.

³¹² Bolmarcich (2005), 8, 33; also Lendon (1994), 71.

³¹³ Bolmarcich (2005), 8, 32-3; Debnar (2001), 46, 225.

³¹⁴ Lendon (1994), 72; Bolmarcich (2005), 33.

The hegemonic structure of the Peloponnesian League relates to the ideology of hegemonic masculinity in the following way. In the case of both Sparta's stronger and weaker allies, relations can be seen as being fundamentally based on ideology which is strongly related to values of the masculine ethos: that of reciprocity and a conception of honour which the relationship brought to both parties involved. Although in practice, subjugated states may have had little choice in their acquiescence to Sparta, Sparta provided subject states with a reason to maintain vested interest in Spartan supremacy through the presentation of the relationship as being defined by mutual respect. Crane suggests that Sparta's relationship with Tegea, for example, as presented by Herodotus, was a type of relationship to which all small states allied with Sparta could aspire, and can be seen as the paradigm for Sparta's relationships with its subject allies in Thucydides. Crane asserts that this relationship between Sparta and subject states can be seen as being similar to the relationship between a patron god and a hero represented in the Homeric tradition: the smaller power submits to the authority of the greater power but is not degraded by the acknowledgement of the other's superiority. In return for this willing subordination, the small state receives honour and prestige from Sparta in the form of highly symbolic gestures of reciprocity performed before third parties.³¹⁵ If Crane is correct, this presentation places Sparta's relationships with subject states firmly within heroic ideology and creates relationships between states based on the hegemonic structuring fundamental to the ethos of masculinity. The power of such ideology could be translated into real world clout: Sparta's relationships with the small states in its alliance made secure Sparta's hegemonic position, even in the face of occasional rebelliousness from stronger allies such as Corinth and Thebes.³¹⁶

Sparta's alliances with more powerful states were, however, equally important, inasmuch as these states were the most militarily and politically useful of Sparta's allies. In terms of masculinity ideology, these states can be seen to be the possessors of complicit masculinity. Social constructionists view complicit masculinities as being the greatest upholders of the hegemonic ideal, as they stand to gain the most by their position

³¹⁵ Crane (1998), 83-4, 181.

³¹⁶ E.g. consider Th. 5.32.3-4; on which see Crane (1998), 84; Bolmarcich (2005), 33. Crane also notes that the Tegeans were instrumental in helping the Spartans regain some of their lost reputation at Mantinea (Th. 5.71.2).

in relation to the ideal. Thus states such as Corinth and Thebes are not seen as beholden to Sparta but, by offering Sparta ideological deference, they benefit from their favorable position within the hegemonic structure of the Spartan-headed league. They benefit ideologically and politically without the necessity of assuming the responsibilities that come with the hegemonic position. However, as the term “complicit” suggests, the occupation of the complicit position within a structure of masculine hegemony (be it on an individual or a national level) contains an element of free will, and complicit masculinities only remain complicit so long as it suits them to be so. Both the advantageous nature of complicit masculinities, as well as the precarious nature of the hegemonic position (exemplified in the ability of those bearing complicit masculinity to assert pressure upon the hegemon to whom they supposedly defer) is evident in the interaction between Sparta and members of the Peloponnesian League—particularly Corinth—leading up to the league's decision to declare war.³¹⁷

In their speech at the first Spartan congress, the Corinthians portray themselves as Sparta's educators in concerns of vital importance.³¹⁸ The Corinthians offer token flattery and deference to Sparta in acknowledgement of its hegemonic position, but go on to speak with incredible audacity (which one would scarce believe to be sufferable from a subordinate) in their censure of Sparta's neglect of its allies.³¹⁹ Both the tone and the content of the Corinthian speech serve to highlight the considerable liberties accorded to Corinth by its complicit position within the hegemonic structure. In their demands for Spartan action, the Corinthians all but ignore the legality of what they are asking in terms of the thirty-years peace, as well as any actions of their own which may have violated those terms.³²⁰ This attitude illuminates motivating factors of Corinth's complicity in upholding Sparta's prestige as the embodiment of the hegemonic ideal within the league: by supporting Spartan supremacy Corinth can benefit from its relationship to the hegemon, in this instance by leaning on the power of its position within the hegemony to legitimize its presumption in daring to instruct Sparta regarding Sparta's duties to

³¹⁷ Lebow (2001), 549, emphasises the ability of third-parties to manipulate Sparta for their own purposes as one of the major causes of the outbreak of the war, and Cartledge and Debnar (2006), 564, argue that book 1 of Thucydides highlights Sparta's willingness to listen to allies as well as its vulnerability to pressure from allies.

³¹⁸ Th. 1.69.6-1.70; Debnar (2001), 44.

³¹⁹ Debnar (2001), 35, 46.

³²⁰ Debnar (2001), 35, 40-1, 228.

subordinate members of that hegemony. The speech of Archidamus reveals Spartan awareness of their hegemonic positive vis-a-vis the Corinthians: the Corinthians may say what they like, but it is Sparta that would bear the responsibility for whatever the outcome may be.³²¹ The harshness with which the Corinthians felt free to speak is indicative of their importance within the hegemonic structure.³²²

Among those who benefit from upholding the hegemonic framework,³²³ positioning is always a negotiation based on the ability of the hegemonic structure to meet the ideological needs of those who support it. Because Corinth placed great importance on its own relationship to its colonies, whatever advantage Corinth gained through its alliance with Sparta would fail to meet Corinthian ideological requirements if this most important interest could not be protected by Sparta.³²⁴ This is reflected in the ending of the Corinthian speech where the Corinthians state, in no uncertain terms, that if Sparta cannot live up to its responsibilities in defending the interests of its allies, then Corinth will be forced to seek a new allegiance.³²⁵ The ultimatum is expressed with an air of reluctance which should be seen as sincere and not merely expressed for effect.

The internal debate in the Spartan assembly immediately following the first Spartan congress, and the outcome of that debate reflect Sparta's awareness of the precarious nature of its hegemonic position, and the importance of maintaining the cohesion of the hegemonic structure to the sustained supremacy of the hegemon.³²⁶

³²¹ Th. 1.83.3; Crane (1998), 204.

³²² Bolmarcich (2005), 31-2, argues that the status of Sparta's allies can also be discerned by the way in which it treated them. Bolmarcich points out that while some allies were punished severely for displaying rebelliousness, other allies seemed to go their own way quite frequently, seemingly without comment from Sparta.

³²³ There are, of course, a great many within hegemonic structures that do not benefit by the framework, but rather are subjugated by it. This is part of the reason why complicit positions are so vital to hegemony, as those who occupy them are the largest group responsible for maintaining the integrity of the structure through their willingness to uphold the hegemonic ideal, which allows that ideal to stratify and subordinate those under it. For discussion of the position of complicit masculinity within the hegemonic masculine structure see Connell and Messerschmidt (2005), 832-9, and Dowd (2010), 29.

³²⁴ Crane (1998), 213-5.

³²⁵ Th. 1.71.4-6. Lebow, (1996), 238; Crane (1998), 215; and Tritle, (2010), 28, have all remarked on how damaging revocation of Corinthian support would have been to Sparta's system of alliance, both ideologically and materially.

³²⁶ While Thucydides, 1.68-78,73-82; 1.88.87, remarked that it was not the influence of allies' speeches that made the Spartans vote for war so much as their own fear of Athenian expansion, Lebow (1996), 232-7, suggests that there is a contradiction between Thucydides' comments and the narrative. While Thucydides may seek to downplay the influence of the allies in the decision for war, in reality the demands of allies such as Corinth would not have been able to be dismissed with any amount of ease and, in light of

Thucydides' presentation of Archidamus' and Sthenelaidas' speeches illustrate the fact that Sparta was faced with a quandary: on the one hand, they stood to enter a war in which the only hope of success lay in the sacrifice of central elements of the way of life upon which Sparta had based much of its traditional prestige; on the other, if they refused to answer the demands of their allies, they risked weakening the ideological credit upon which their supremacy was largely based.³²⁷ In the face of such a dilemma the use of propaganda and emotional appeal may have been seen as the most effective tactic in securing support for a vote for war.³²⁸ Crane suggests that the positions of Archidamus and Sthenelaidas reflect differing opinions on Sparta's situation in relation to other Greek states, and that Archidamus' points were only rational based on a view of Sparta as autonomous in a way that did not reflect the reality of its hegemonic position.³²⁹ Even scholars who have admired Archidamus' speech acknowledge its basis in traditional values,³³⁰ and see the figure of Archidamus as being, himself, an archetype of the vestiges of a passing age.³³¹ Crane asserts that, in comparison, Sthenelaidas and the Spartans who favoured immediate response to Corinth's call to arms recognized the demands of the changing times: to Archidamus' urging the Assembly not to be swayed by accusations of cowardice, Sthenelaidas responds that Sparta could not afford to be viewed as cowardly because without the support of public opinion her traditional values were ideologically useless.³³² Thus Sthenelaidas' position rested on a perceptive understanding of Sparta's dependence on the status willingly conferred upon it by its allies for the maintenance of its power, and both Sthenelaidas' speech and the outcome of the vote reflect awareness on the part of the Spartans on the complicity of subordinated individuals for the hegemonic ideal they embodied to be upheld.

In the second Spartan congress we see the ability of complicit masculinities to employ ideological credit for their own purposes. Here the Corinthians, having coerced

the fact that Athens is not demonstrated as having done anything at that point which would constitute any direct military threat to Sparta, allied pressure was likely a large determining factor in the Spartans' vote for war.

³²⁷ Crane (1998), 196-7, 199-200.

³²⁸ Debnar (2001), 69-76.

³²⁹ Crane (1998), 216-7, 220.

³³⁰ Wassermann (1953), 194-7; Crane (1998), 203-6, 209; Debnar (2001), 69.

³³¹ Wassermann (1953), 195-7; Wassermann (1964), 293.

³³² Crane (1998), 215-20.

Sparta's cooperation in furthering Corinthian aims through militaristic action by means of their near equal position in the hegemonic hierarchy, actually appropriate Sparta's ideological credit with the allies in their presentation of the proposed war to the league. The Corinthians capitalize on the image of Sparta as the embodiment of the hegemonic ideal to which the subordinated states of the league are meant to conform; they present Sparta's decision to go to war with Athens as the fulfillment of Sparta's obligations as a good hegemon to its dependent allies, and call upon those present to demonstrate their subservience to the hegemonic ideal by voting in accordance with Sparta's view in the matter (which in reality is, at this point, the Corinthian view).³³³ League votes by Sparta's subject states can be seen as occasions in which those states are called upon to vote in favour of the course Sparta has already determined that the League would take, thus fulfilling their hegemonic role by bolstering the position of their hegemon. Because of this, the Corinthians are able to frame the vote in such a way as to present the vote for war as a demonstration of the various allies' commitment and loyalty to the decision approved by the hegemonic ideal.³³⁴ Finally, the Corinthians, in their speech, can be seen as appealing to ideals of masculinity further, as they call upon the Dorian ethos, which they express as having been violated by Athenian presumption.³³⁵ Debnar argues that elsewhere appeals to the Dorian excellence is tantamount to ideas of what it meant to be a "real man", so in calling upon the allies to "act like true Dorians" and follow the lead of their hegemon who has assembled them for the purpose of voting for war,³³⁶ the Corinthians are both calling upon the allies to prove their loyalty to Sparta, and to prove themselves real men.

³³³ Th. 1.120.1.

³³⁴ Lendon (1994), 70-1, 173-7.

³³⁵ Debnar (2001), 88. See also Parry (1957), 147.

³³⁶ Debnar (2001), 118.

Chapter 3: Xenophon Philosophy

3.1 Introduction

This section will focus mainly on Xenophon's *Lacedaemoniorum Politeia* (henceforward abbreviated *Lac.*),³³⁷ and will draw support from Xenophon's other philosophical works where appropriate.³³⁸ While some have argued that Xenophon is laconising to the point of presenting the Spartans in an unrealistically positive light, in general, the *Lac.* contains few overt value judgements—positive or negative. More than anything, Xenophon presents the Spartans as being *successful* in achieving their aims,³³⁹ and detailed the institutions he 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, are admirable or not Xenophon generally leaves up to the reader to decide, and indeed repeatedly invites us do just that.³⁴⁰ What Xenophon

³³⁷ Admittedly, the *Lac.* has not primarily been viewed as a philosophical work. Some view the work as being encomiastic (e.g. Lipka [2002], 17); some view it as admiration of the lawgiver and system but tinged with bitterness due to contemporary Spartans' failure to live up to its precepts (e.g. Weathers [1954], 717-21; Rahn [1971], 507-8; Whitby [1994], 103, 139); some view the criticism of the Spartans' failure to uphold the laws as a proof of the excellence of those laws (e.g. Gray [2007], 217-9); some view the work as being intended to explain primarily how the values of Sparta's social order allowed the state to achieve predominance in Greece, while not necessarily praising Spartan institutions (e.g. Humble [2004], 227, [2007], 295; Hodgkinson [2006] 126-7). The purpose of chapter 14, with its significant change in tone, and sharp contrast between Spartans behavior "then and now", has proven challenging: Prioetti (1987), xii, xv, argued that the *Lac.* was written in conjunction with the *Hellenica*, and that the difference between "then and now" in the *Lac.* is likely the period of time covered in the *Hellenica*. Most agree, however, that the *Lac.* was not a straightforward recording of historical fact. Humble (2004, 2007, forthcoming) has made compelling arguments that the *Lac.* should be viewed as a philosophical inquiry. Recent commentaries on the *Lac.*, written by Lipka and Gray, both make note of philosophical elements in the work (Lipka [2002], 32, Gray [2007], 43-4) but view the work as encomiastic.

³³⁸ I.e. *Memorabilia*, *Symposium*, and *Cyropaedia* where appropriate. Humble (2007) argues that Xenophon, in the composition of the *Lac.* and the *Cyr.* presented an analysis of "a particular political system" and "an alternative and theoretically more successful" system respectively, which would place both within the realm of philosophy, not unlike the works of Aristotle and Plato. I am in agreement, however, with Humble (2002, 2004) and Tuplin (1994, 1996) that the Persia of the *Cyr.* should not be seen as being an idealized Sparta, and that when there are parallels in the descriptions of the education systems in the *Cyr.* and the *Lac.*, they are intended to highlight those ways in which the Spartan system differs from or falls short of Xenophon's idealized Persia. The view of Christesen (2006), that the *Cyr.* had an instructive element aimed toward Spartan military practice, and mapped out strategies for possible Spartan military reform in its descriptions of Cyrus' programme is interesting, and not incompatible with the views of Humble and Tuplin. However this view will not factor into the current examination as it deals primarily with practical military matters and, while matters of war are certainly important in constructions of masculinity, the ideologies of war and of the soldier are, in fact, more important their actualities.

³³⁹ With the notable exception of chapter 14, of course.

³⁴⁰ X. *Lac.* 1.10, 2.14. A number of scholars have highlighted Xenophon's invitation to the audience to decide for themselves concerning the Spartan institutions he presents. Generally, scholars have assumed that Xenophon intends for the reader to arrive at a positive evaluation (e.g. Jaeger [1945], 169, and Gray

does provide is a systematic analysis of the traits which Sparta desired to implant in its men, the purposes its masculine ideology served, and the mechanisms which it employed to form men that conformed to its ideology. In Xenophon's *Lac.* all of the significant areas of gender cultivation which this study seeks to examine are discussed to a greater or lesser extent, making it an excellent source for inquiry into contemporary philosophical perceptions of Classical Spartan masculinity.

3.2 The Relation of Men and Women

The majority of the discussion concerning women is contained within section one and restricts the societal contribution made by women to their capacity to bear children. Xenophon states that it was the view of Lycurgus that the greatest occupation for freeborn women was the production of children.³⁴¹ In line with this, Xenophon presents Spartan practice concerning women (such as women's freedom from domestic tasks, the implication that they were better fed than women elsewhere in Greece, and their physical education) as serving purely eugenic purposes.³⁴² Xenophon also outlines provisions designed by Lycurgus to ensure that the genetic potential of a fine woman be optimized even if her husband was elderly, or in the event that man who was not her husband wished to make use of her for child production.³⁴³ Millender and Cartledge point out that Xenophon's depictions of Spartan marriage, in which the wife is "had" by the husband and can be loaned out at his discretion to beget children for himself or others,³⁴⁴ is highly

[2007], 152 on 1.10). Humble (2007), 291-2 makes a persuasive argument that such encomiastic 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 which is not always positive. See also Humble (forthcoming).

³⁴¹ X. *Lac.* 1.4-10.

³⁴² X. *Lac.* 1.3-4; Rebenich (1998, 90, note 7): Dabei betonte man wie Xenophon, daß körperliche Ertüchtigung, Gymnastik und gesunde Ernährung besonders der Mädchen und jungen Frauen die beste Voraussetzung darstelle, um gesunde Kinder in die Welt zu setzen. ("Here is how Xenophon emphasized that physical exercise, gymnastics and healthy diet especially for girls and young women constitute the best way to put healthy babies into the world"); Lipka (2002), 109 on 1.7-10; Gray (2007), 147-8 on 1.3-4; Moore (2010), 95 on 1.3-4.

³⁴³ X. *Lac.* 1.3-4, 1.7-9; Rebenich (1998), 91, n.12; Lipka (2002), 109 on 1.7-10; Gray (2007), 150-2 on 1.5.7.

³⁴⁴ X. *Lac.* 1.7-9. The idea that the woman is the possession of her husband is especially pronounced when one compares this passage to X. *Lac.* 6.3, in which Xenophon relates how hunting dogs and horses are loaned out in a similar fashion to anyone who might have need of them.

suggestive of a decidedly male-dominated society.³⁴⁵ Moreover, Cartledge asserts that the presentation of Spartan women's value lying solely in being the wife and mother of Spartan warriors suggests that Spartan culture placed a particular value on masculinity, and that any non-eugenic purpose to the education of women was "to socialize the non-military half of the population in the values of a peculiarly masculine warrior culture".³⁴⁶ Christesen expands on this idea. Believing the view of practices concerning women as solely eugenic to be overly simplistic, he asserts that the sort of athletic activities—particularly those which had ritualistic elements—in which Spartan women engaged were "a powerful mechanism for inducing compliance with behavioral norms on the part of both females and males".³⁴⁷ Christesen highlights the utility of female exercise, not only in its ability to create ideal female bodies, but also in its ability to promote adherence to prevailing social norms by fostering an attitude of habitual compliance.³⁴⁸ If Christesen's view is correct, it serves to strengthen the idea of Spartan society as being particularly masculine in character, as it argues against views of participation in athletics on the part of Spartan women as indicative of their empowerment, and stresses rather the role of organized athletic activity in achieving compliance to patriarchal social norms.

Other references Xenophon makes to women in the *Lac.* specifically relate to masculine ideals. Firstly, among sanctions placed on men who fail to live up to manly

³⁴⁵ Millender (1999), 366; Cartledge (1981), 103, 105; (2001), 122; Christesen (2012), 213. The view of Pomeroy (2002), esp. 39-45, that Spartan marriage practices are indicative of a high level of active female involvement (even female dominance) in arrangement is unsatisfactory. She argues that there is no evidence in the sources to prevent scholars from assuming women were passive in marital arrangements, however, this is an assumption since the sources explicitly say men had full control.

³⁴⁶ Cartledge (2001), 115. It is possible that Cartledge is presenting a slightly skewed view here, as the majority of the section speaks in neutral language concerning "child production" (τεκνοποιία), and "offspring" (ἔκγονα) in general. However it is not an unreasonable leap to assume that warrior production was the end goal in the utilization of women for eugenic potential for several reasons. Xenophon states at the outset of the work that the aim of the discussion is to examine the institutions which enabled Sparta to attain a high level of power and renown in Greece (*Lac.* 1.1), and frames the discussion of begetting in that context; Xenophon explicitly states that the willingness of men to loan their wives to others for the begetting of children stems from a desire to gain brothers for their sons- implying the primary desirability of male offspring (1.9); in outlining that the provisions made by Lycurgus for women were centered around their ability to bear children, Xenophon implies that the potential of girl-children is their capacity to bear in turn. Finally, in his invitation for the reader to assess whether or not Lycurgus was successful, in his concern for eugenics, in achieving men of exceptional size and strength in Sparta (εἴ τι διαφέροντας καὶ κατὰ μέγεθος καὶ κατ' ἰσχὺν ἄνδρας τῇ Σπάρτῃ ἀπετέλεσεν, ὁ βουλόμενος ἐπισκοπεῖτω, 1.10), Xenophon implies that the end goal was just that: specifically to create men who were superior physical specimens.

³⁴⁷ Christesen (2012), 225.

³⁴⁸ Christesen (2012), 198, 211-25

ideals of courage are: being forbidden to marry,³⁴⁹ and the responsibility of having to explain to the women of his own household that no one will have them as wives.³⁵⁰ So in this area of Spartan practice, women can be seen as motivating factors against male transgression.³⁵¹ An allusion to women is also made in the discussion of masculine appearance: a red cloak was selected by Lycurgus as the attire for fighting men, not only because of its suitability for war, but also because “he considered this to have the least in common with the clothing of women”,³⁵² suggesting that what was considered most visually masculine was tantamount to that which was least feminine.³⁵³ Finally, Xenophon associates the manifestation of σωφροσύνη exhibited by male Spartan adolescents, with women in the sense that they, like maidens, display modesty or decorous behaviour,³⁵⁴ this is a second-hand reference as it is made in order to highlight the superiority of Spartan men even with respect to this virtue.³⁵⁵ The primary purpose of references to women, therefore, seems to be the establishment and enforcement of masculine ideals.

Finally, the valuing of masculinity over femininity in Spartan society presented by Xenophon is especially evident when one compares the relations between men and women in the *Lac.* to Xenophon’s description of the household in the *Oeconomicus*, in which the husband and wife are presented as partners whose skills and duties are seen as complimentary and equally essential to the functioning of the household.³⁵⁶ A number of scholars have commented on the remarkable emphasis placed by Xenophon on the partnership between Ischomachus and his wife and the large role which must be played

³⁴⁹ Rebenich (1998), 119, n. 97, highlights the fact that bachelorhood was a social stigma in Spartan society. Thus not only is the coward rendered unmanly in the military sphere by his own actions, but he is also prevented from attaining a measure of manhood in another sphere.

³⁵⁰ *X. Lac.* 9.5.

³⁵¹ Vernant (1991), 65. Vernant also notes that the censure of women would be a deterrent to male cowardice.

³⁵² *X. Lac.* 11.3: ταύτην νομίζων ἥκιστα μὲν γυναικεία κοινωνεῖν.

³⁵³ David (1989), 6.

³⁵⁴ *X. Lac.* 3.4-5; See North (1966), 131, for descriptions of the σωφροσύνη expected of women. Lipka (2002), 138 on 3.4.6, highlights the distinction made in Arist. *Pol.* I 1260a 20-3 between male and on female σωφροσύνη, and Gray (2007), 149 on 3.4-5, goes as far as describing Xenophon’s comments on the σωφροσύνη displayed by adolescent Spartan males as an example of “gender blurring”.

³⁵⁵ The areas discussed in this paragraph will be elaborated further in other sections.

³⁵⁶ *X. Oec.* 7.9-32.

by the woman in order to ensure the gentleman farmer's overall success.³⁵⁷ This is not to say that the valuing of male ability over that of females to this degree was exclusively Spartan in character, or that Athenian society conformed to the picture presented by Xenophon in the *Oeconomicus*.³⁵⁸ However, if the *Oeconomicus* can be seen as Xenophon's ideal (even if it was an unattainable one) it reflects a level of valuing of feminine qualities, and the belief that women were equal to men in matters of memory, attention and self-control,³⁵⁹ which he does not present as being evident in Spartan society and ideology.³⁶⁰

Overall, the treatment of women in the *Lac.* suggests that Xenophon was presenting a societal view which valued masculinity over femininity, and saw females as most useful in those respects in which they could serve in creating and preserving superior masculine ability and comportment. As such, the treatment of women in the *Lac.* is cursory, and instances concerning women have more bearing on discussions of masculine discourse, performativity, and hegemonic masculinity.

3.3 Attitudes Towards Sex

Xenophon's treatment of Spartan sexual attitudes is also brief. However the comments he does make are very telling of the role sexual expression was seen to play in the realm of masculinity. In section one Xenophon mentions the restrictions placed upon sexual relations within marriage, particularly at the onset of married life. Xenophon relates that the motivation behind this was eugenic—restricted intercourse was thought to increase desire, in turn promoting more vigorous offspring— but the operation of this sexual

³⁵⁷ Shero (1932), 20; Oost (1977-8), 229; Foxhall (1989), 29-31; Cantarella (1992), 64; Pomeroy (1994), 34-7; Glazebrook, (2009), 239. Glazebrook remarks that Ischomachus' attitude towards his wife, and the level to which he seems to wish to view her as a peer, is ground-breaking.

³⁵⁸ While Shero (1932), 20-1, and Oost (1977-8), 225, suggest that Xenophon's attitudes and depictions of women are likely more or less reflective of contemporary Athenian attitudes, (although Oost [1977-8], 228-9, 234, does suggest that Ischomachus' wife was perhaps something of an exceptional case, and that Xenophon does hint at something akin to a level of equality between sexes), Pomeroy (1994), 31-6, argues that, while there was a shift in view concerning the household in the 5th and 4th centuries BCE, Xenophon is clearly presenting a utopian (although still patriarchal) view of husband-wife relations in the *Oeconomicus* which is not reflected in other contemporary descriptions, such as that of Aristotle, of the operation of the household.

³⁵⁹ X. *Oec.* 7. 26-8.

³⁶⁰ Several scholars have highlighted attempts on the part of the Spartan state to minimize the importance of the *oikos* (e.g., Jaeger [1939], 195; Cartledge [1981], 103-4, [2001], 85; Hodkinson [1997], 46, [2000], 215; Link [2009], 93-9). Therefore, if Xenophon is suggesting that the contributions of the *oikos* (and thus of the woman whose societal place resides within it) are irrelevant to the success of Spartan society, this further reinforces the characterization of Spartan society at large as being particularly masculine in its ideology.

practice was also framed within an ideological context: Xenophon tells us that Lycurgus established that a man should be ashamed (*αἰδέσθαι*) to be seen going in to his wife or coming out from having relations with her.³⁶¹ This statement carries with it certain connotations concerning the ideology of masculine sexual attitudes, as Xenophon represents them, i.e. it implies that self-control with respect to sex was an important masculine virtue. It also serves to highlight the extremely visual nature of Spartan masculinity ideology.³⁶² While Xenophon states that the purpose of the measure was to restrict intercourse, the important factor was the *appearance* of moderation, as the shame-inducing factor was not, in fact, the actual amount of sex one had with one's wife, but whether or not one was *seen* engaging in displays of intercourse.³⁶³

This section goes on to show that there was often a gap between ideology and practice. Immediately after stating that Lycurgus necessitated that men marry in their prime to promote healthy offspring from sexual relations, Xenophon tells the reader of two provisions Lycurgus put in place to address deviation from these ideals such as when an old man has a young wife (meaning that he married after his prime of life), or when a man does not wish to marry but desires offspring. The former is particularly pertinent to the masculine ideal of restrained and procreative sex as we are told that in this case the old man may invite another to impregnate his wife. When this is paired with Xenophon's comment that Lycurgus encouraged this practice because he perceived that old men tend to keep jealous watch on their young wives, we are presented with an attitude towards sexuality which is neither restrained nor procreative in basis.³⁶⁴ Therefore here Xenophon presents us with an ideology of sexual behaviour which, on the surface level, stresses that a man should possess restraint and engage in sexual activity exclusively for the production of superior offspring, but which evidently frequently breaks down in practice, and prizes appearance over actuality— so that the *real* degree of appropriate masculine sexual behaviour is measured by a man engaging in however much sexual activity he desires, while still maintaining the façade of being sexually restrained.³⁶⁵

³⁶¹ X. *Lac.* 1.5.

³⁶² See Harman (2009) for discussion of the many ways in which Spartans are presented in the *Lac.* as affirming and performing their social identity through visual spectacle.

³⁶³ Higgins (1977), 67-8.

³⁶⁴ X. *Lac.* 1.7-8; Higgins (1977), 67.

³⁶⁵ Higgins (1977), 67-8.

The second instance of the ideology surrounding sexuality in the *Lac.* occurs in section two, in Xenophon's comments regarding Spartan attitudes towards pederasty. After detailing several pederastic practices in other states, to demonstrate the great diversity of opinion on the matter present in the Greek world, Xenophon goes on to claim that the pederastic practice approved by Lycurgus was non-sexual. He expresses that Lycurgus approved of the practice, if a man sought out a boy because of his good character thus desiring to make him into a "friend without reproach" (ἄμεμπτον φίλον), and considered this to be the finest form of education.³⁶⁶ Despite this rather straightforward description, there has been considerable discussion about the true nature of Spartan pederasty. Some believe that Xenophon's presentation of chaste, educational Spartan pederasty is highly suspect, and suggest that it contains an element of over-compensation, since the belief that Spartan pederastic practices were sexual was prevalent in the Greek world.³⁶⁷ One reason for the dominance of this view is that many consider Xenophon's comments about the Lycurgan pederastic ideal to reflect Socratic ideas.³⁶⁸ However, even in works where Socrates' rigorous stance on pederasty is represented, Xenophon shows that his own estimation of the practice is not necessarily in agreement with that of his mentor. In the *Memorabilia* Xenophon presents Socrates, in his complete denunciation of expressions of *eros* towards boys, as one possessing

³⁶⁶ X. *Lac.* 2.13.

³⁶⁷ MacDowell (1986), 64-5; Powell, (1989), 176; Kennell (1995), 124; Thorton (1997), 86-7, 103, 194-5; Cartledge (2001), 94, 97; Cartledge (2003), 69; Lipka (2002), 134-5, on 2.13.3; Ducat (2006a), 11-2, 15. The main evidence for the view that the carnal nature of Spartan pederasty was widely known comes from Plato, in the implications that Dorian forms of pederasty are flawed in that they place focus on physical attributes rather than a concern for the beloved's soul (Plat. *Laws* 1.636b, 8.836a-837d; Plat. *Rep.* 3.402e-403c); as well as from comedic allusions, such as the Spartan delegates in the *Lysistrata* expressing a singularly anal fixation in their sexual imagery (Aristoph. *Lys.* 1148-88). However, it is difficult to prove the correctness of this opinion concerning Spartan reputation from such material. Not only is it open to debate whether or not the few references available suggesting Spartan predilection for pederasty denotes a widespread reputation of the same, but it is even questionable whether these references are always being interpreted by scholars to signify the same things as they did in antiquity. For instance, Dover (1978), 185-90, notes the use of Aristophanes to suggest that the Spartans had a reputation for sex with boys. Dover suggests that because these plays were written at a time of Athenian-Spartan aggression, references used to support ideas of Spartan pederasty could be more indicative of the employment of a negative comedic trope to slander one's enemies than of actual Spartan reputation. Furthermore, Dover notes that there is nothing overtly homosexual about the references to Spartan's fondness for anal intercourse, thus such fondness could have actually *been* the joke, regardless of the sexual object, and without having pederastic implications.

³⁶⁸ Hindley (1994), 361 and (1999a), 74; Thorton (1997), 103; Lipka (2002), 134-5, on 2.13.3. Thorton thinks Xenophon wants to absolve Sparta 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".

remarkable powers of self-control, and whose views concerning pederasty are a model of restraint, far severer than the norms of Athenian society at large.³⁶⁹ Moreover, when Socrates chastises Critobulus for kissing an attractive boy, Xenophon (portraying himself in conversation with Socrates) jokes that he would be inclined to undertake a similar endeavour himself.³⁷⁰ Also, in the speech of Critobulus in Xenophon's *Symposium*,³⁷¹ an eloquent argument is made that a pederastic relationship which is inspired to some extent by physical attraction can still be conducive to virtue for both parties.³⁷² Despite Xenophon's expression of attitudes suggesting that honourable pederastic practice could contain a physical element, Xenophon maintains, not only in the *Lac.*, but in the *Symposium* as well,³⁷³ that in order to be ideologically acceptable Spartan pederasty had to be chaste. In light of prevalent aristocratic Athenian attitudes concerning pederasty (likely including Xenophon's own), expressed above, Xenophon's assertions should not be seen as indicative of bias stemming from Athenian ideology. Nor is the *Lac.* a Socratic work; thus, Xenophon would not be required to represent Spartan pederastic practice in the *Lac.* as adhering to Socratic ideals in order to denote it as ideologically upright. The fact that Xenophon is insistent upon the non-sexual nature of Spartan pederasty strongly suggests that chastity was, in fact, the ethical standard *par excellence* in Spartan attitudes towards pederasty. That being said, there is nothing which implies that the actual practice did not fall short of these ideals at times.³⁷⁴ The important fact was that this ideology existed, not that it was upheld in every instance.³⁷⁵ For Xenophon, the respectable

³⁶⁹ X. *Mem.* 1.3.8-15. Hindley (1999a), 83-5 and (1999b), 142-3. For an opposing view see Gray (1998), 94-7, who believes this passage is indicative of Xenophon sharing Socrates' belief in this matter, and illustrating the way in which Socrates guided Xenophon's younger away from destructive sexual attitudes.

³⁷⁰ X. *Mem.* 1.3.10.

³⁷¹ X. *Sym.* 4.10-8.

³⁷² Hindley (1994), 347; Hindley (1999), 80, 87.

³⁷³ X. *Sym.* 8.35: Λακεδαιμόνιοι δὲ οἱ νομίζοντες, εἴαν καὶ ὀρεχθῆ τις σώματος, μηδενὸς ἂν ἔτι καλοῦ κάγαθοῦ τοῦτον τυχεῖν, οὕτω τελέως τοὺς ἐρωμένους ἀγαθοὺς ἀπεργάζονται ὡς καὶ μετὰ ξένων κἂν μὴ ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ [πόλει] ταχθῶσι τῷ ἔραστῇ, ὁμοίως αἰδοῦνται τοὺς παρόντας ἀπολείπειν. θεὰν γὰρ οὐ τὴν Ἀναΐδειαν ἀλλὰ τὴν Αἰδῶ νομίζουσι. ("And the Lacedaemonians, believing that if someone yearns for bodily things he will never attain fine or good things, accomplish making their beloveds perfectly good so that even when they are arrayed with foreigners and not with their lovers they are just as ashamed to desert those with them. For the goddess the worship is not Shamelessness, but Respect").

³⁷⁴ Indeed, the necessity for Lycurgus to create provisions in his ideal arrangements for marriage for scenarios in which old men came to be in possession of young wives explicitly demonstrates that practice, at times, fell short of Lycurgan ideals.

³⁷⁵ In fact, as will be demonstrated in the history section, Xenophon gives a number of indications that practice frequently does not match ideology, and the rhetoric of proper masculine attitudes towards sex

Spartan man did not have sexual relations with boys. Therefore an individual's adherence (or lack thereof) to this mandate of acceptable masculine sexual expression could become a microcosm of their character in general and indicative of greater dispositions and abilities.

3.4 Institutions

A prime area to examine Spartan masculinity in the *Lac.* is that of institutions, as Xenophon's principal reason for writing the *Lac.* was to relate the institutions that allowed Sparta to become successful.³⁷⁶ A number of these institutions also relate to the cultivation and maintenance of Spartan masculinity at the various stages of life.³⁷⁷

The first important institution is the formal system of education provided for all boys of the Spartiate class. The public education of boys outlined in the *Lac.* deals entirely with discipline and a process of hardening boys so that they are better able to deal with various forms of hardship. Xenophon suggests that this education is completely geared towards making the boys into better fighting men.³⁷⁸ When he refers to the education of boys elsewhere, Xenophon relates that they are given to tutors and go to schools for lessons involving music, wrestling, and reading and writing.³⁷⁹ Xenophon does not say where or if Spartan boys learn these things, and makes no reference to them in his descriptions of the public education system which seems to focus only on training in physical education, military preparation and conditioning to the societal ideology.³⁸⁰ Lack of mention of the “instructive element” of education in the context of Sparta's

with males was a more useful ideological indicator in those instances in which it was violated (see pp.88-94).

³⁷⁶ *Lac.* 1.1. What Xenophon is considering here are τὰ ἐπιτηδεύματα of Sparta. There has been some discussion over what exactly is meant by this term, but for the purposes of this investigation, I follow Whitby (1994), 90, and Lipka (2002), 100 on 1.1.8, who assert that the term can be understood here as “social institutions”.

³⁷⁷ What precisely constitutes an “institution” is not always clear, and not every aspect of Spartan society which could be appropriately termed an institution can be discussed within the scope of this study. I have sought to highlight those institutions discussed by Xenophon which I have deemed likely to have had the greatest impact on the construction of Spartan masculinity, and have touched on others briefly, or not at all. Some too, such as the *gerousia* and the *hippeis*, I have analyzed within the context of other categories, as I believe that their connotations for masculinity are better highlighted by analyzing them in other lights.

³⁷⁸ *X. Lac.* 2.4-7.

³⁷⁹ *X. Lac.* 2.1.

³⁸⁰ Ducat (2006a), 43-70 argues that we should assume that the “instructive element” of education was conducted in private and was done so, to some degree, at the discretion of the boy's father. See also Hodkinson (2009), 447. Contra Beck (1993), 24-5, 27, who argues for separate schools of instruction for music and letters in which Spartan boys aged 7-12 spent the majority of their time.

public education system could, of course, be because Xenophon did not consider these elements of education as having a great impact on Sparta's rise to power and fame, and thus were irrelevant to the purpose of his project.³⁸¹ However, one would think that educational elements, particularly those of an intellectual vein, considered to be of prime import elsewhere, would have at least some influence over a state's overall success. Therefore, if the impartation of "instructional elements" of education had comprised a significant portion of Sparta's public education system, it is difficult to believe that Xenophon would not have given them even a passing reference. If the non-physical elements of the Spartan educational system were, in fact, geared primarily towards imparting official societal ideology this would have had a number of implications. In addition to being a powerful tool to coerce submission to state-approved ideals of masculinity from the earliest ages, the resultant discrepancy in levels of intellectual education between members of the *homoioi* class could have been a significant factor in their position within the social hierarchy of adult Spartiate males as it would have been indicative not only of personal intellectual ability, but also of factors such as wealth and birth from which the discrepancy in intellectual ability would have partially resulted.³⁸²

As mentioned earlier Xenophon related the practice of pederasty to education and arguments have been made both for and against the notion of institutionalized Spartan pederasty. On one extreme is the view that Spartan pederasty was an institutionalized part of the educational system which was not only officially approved, but probably also legally enforced; on the other is the view that it was rather a means for elite families to use these pairings for personal and political advantage, thus circumventing the institutionalized equality and gaining back a measure of the influence which the communal education system sought to minimize.³⁸³ Pederasty must be understood as

³⁸¹ Humble (1997), 194 suggests that it is likely that elements of education such as reading, writing music and wrestling were not highlighted in Xenophon's treatment because they were not conducted in a markedly different way in Sparta than elsewhere. Conversely Gray (2007), 153 on 2.1, argues that Sparta did not pursue other areas of education. I am inclined to agree with Humble's view.

³⁸² Ducat (2006a), 43-70, remarks that private education in intellectual matters would make such learning one of the many ways in which the actual conditions of members of the *homoioi* class could be greatly disparate.

³⁸³ Cartledge (2001), 86-7, (2003), 69. See also Ducat (2006a), 164-8. For the opposing view see Link (2009), 93-101. Jaeger (1939), 195 argues that the Spartan state deliberately made *eros* an important factor in its educational system. MacDowell (1986), 64-5, argues against the idea of institutionalized Spartan pederasty on grounds that if it were institutionalized Xenophon would have said so. Lipka (2002), 134 on

integral to the education system but not thoroughly institutionalised since Xenophon puts great stress in the element of personal choice and frames the formation of pederastic relationships as a private matter. Thus, possibly not every boy had an *erastes*, although failure to procure one could have had an adverse effect on one's future.³⁸⁴

The main difficulty with examining Spartan pederasty as an institution is that Xenophon since he made a point of discussing it separately from other activities which focused on the instillation of ἐγκράτεια, αἰδώς, and πειθώ, does not specify precisely which virtues, necessary for being an adult male, it promotes.³⁸⁵ Yet clearly, in whatever form it took, the *erastes* would become a boy's gateway to the adult male world.³⁸⁶ Further, it would provide a friendly male relationship in a prevalently agonal society, and would impart important male ideology while de-centralizing the role of the father.³⁸⁷ It is, therefore, possible that Spartan pederasty could have operated in the realm of masculine development on two levels: the educational level, advocated by Lycurgus, by which the acquisition of an *erastes* would reflect a boy's personal excellence and provide him with instruction and exposure to the world of adult Spartan males, and the political level, by which the pederastic relationship would be a reflection of the wealth and aristocracy of its members, aiding Spartan males in positioning themselves advantageously within Spartan socio-political hierarchies.

The institutions which promoted adherence to approved forms of masculine conduct were not limited to those which applied solely to boys and youths. Xenophon lists the most important social institutions for grown men to be the practice of hunting,

2.13.1, asserts that pederasty was not institutionalized in Sparta without further comment. Hodkinson (2007), 58, says that while there is no evidence in the sources that say or even imply mandatory pederasty in Sparta, evidence provided by Xenophon in the episode of Sphodrias suggests that pederasty was "thoroughly integrated into the fabric of Spartiate life" (See also Hodkinson [2009], 447). I am inclined to agree with the views of MacDowell and Hodkinson.

³⁸⁴ Ducat (2006a), 164-8.

³⁸⁵ For that matter, Xenophon does not relate the nature of the qualities which are grounds for success or failure in the various contests of manly excellence either. Although it would be fairly safe to assume that the virtue of self-control would be included on that list, especially if the relationship was to remain non-sexual in nature (see Lipka [2002], 135 on 2.14.4). In addition, Xenophon's comments in his *Symposium* (4.10-18) relating Spartan pederasty to good order in battle, as well as the description in *Hellenica* (5.4.33) of Cleonymus honouring the relationship between himself and his *erastes* Archidamus by valiantly fighting to the death at Leuctra, suggest that virtue in martial matters was likely one of the qualities which the pederastic relationship sought to impart (see Gray, [2007], 156 on 2.12-14 for Cleonymus' death as evidence of the impartation of moral qualities by a pederastic relationship).

³⁸⁶ Ducat (2006a), 164-6, 169.

³⁸⁷ Cartledge (2001), 87.

the *syssitia*, and contests for excellence. The purpose of hunting is presented as fairly straightforward by Xenophon, it is intended to promote physical fitness in men so that their soldiering abilities do not wane with age.³⁸⁸ This association between war and hunting placed hunting firmly within the realm of activities undertaken exclusively by men, making it a characteristically masculine activity.³⁸⁹ Xenophon gives the impression of hunts which were undertaken in small and intimate groups, and so, it is argued, that the activity fostered male relationships at the generational and inter-generational level.³⁹⁰ Xenophon also stresses that the ability to borrow someone's hunting dog carried with it a requirement to invite the owner on the hunt, making an element of masculine comradery implicit in an otherwise economic arrangement.³⁹¹

Xenophon's additional references to hunting, which are the contributions that could be made by a hunter to his *syssition*,³⁹² perhaps bear even greater significance on Spartan ideas of masculinity and relations between Spartan men.³⁹³ By providing one's companions with game, a successful hunter could increase his social credit within his *syssition*.³⁹⁴ The spoils of the chase were one of only two approved expressions of "competitive display of generosity" within the *syssition* (the other being the produce of one's estate).³⁹⁵ Such competitive giving was seen as an expression of one's masculine worth, and one mechanism by which a man positioned himself in hierarchical relation to

³⁸⁸ X. *Lac.* 4.7. Anderson (1985), 26-7; Kennell (1995), 77; Barringer (2001), 10-5; Lipka (2002), 147-8 on 4.7.3; Knottnerus and Berry (2002), 13; Hodkinson (2006), 136.

³⁸⁹ Anderson (1985), 29; Barringer (2001), 40-5.

³⁹⁰ Anderson (1985), 27-8, drawing on example of Agesilaus and Agesipolis discussing hunting (*Hell.* 5.3.20). For more discussion on ways in which hunting was seen to foster comradery, see David (1993), esp. 398-9, 403.

³⁹¹ Hodkinson (2000), 179, 200.

³⁹² As well as the provisions Lycurgus put in place for borrowing hunting dogs and trail rations: X. *Lac.* 5.3, 6.3-4.

³⁹³ A number of scholars discuss influences of hunting on a number of areas that could have bearing on the construction of masculinity. These are primarily discussions of hunting as training, not only for men, but for boys as well— figuratively as well as literally as some have seen allusions to hunting in elements of the education system such as thieving and the Orthia ritual (see Jaeger [1945], 165; Anderson [1985], 29; David [1993], 398-9; Barringer [2001], 10-2; Lipka [2002], 147-8 on 4.7.3; Knottnerus and Berry [2002], 13; Cartledge [2003], 281), as an initiation ritual by which boys proved themselves ready to join adult male society (see Barringer [2001], 10-1, 13, 47), and associations between hunting and pederasty (see David [1993], 400-1; Barringer [2001], 113-4; Lipka [2002], 147-8 on 4.73). I have not included these in my discussion as most of the sources refer to Dorian connotations of hunting and lump Sparta in with Crete in their discussions of these areas, whereas it is my intention to limit my exploration to the significance of hunting which can be reasonably drawn from the *Lac.*

³⁹⁴ Fisher (1989), 31-2; David (1993), 400-2; Hodkinson (2000), 130; Cartledge (2003), 280; Link (2004), 5.

³⁹⁵ Kennell (1995), 130.

the other men of his *sysstion*. In the case of hunting in particular, the donations provided by the hunter could arguably have a greater weight in terms of his masculinity than those of the rich man who provided ‘luxury’ items such as wheat bread; the former gains prestige by virtue of his personal *aretē* in the sphere of masculine skill,³⁹⁶ while the latter displays only his wealth.³⁹⁷

Additionally, David suggests that conversations about hunting likely made up part of the talk of “fine things” that took place in Spartan *sysstitia*, which positioned members within the hierarchy, based on their relative successes or failures.³⁹⁸ Finally, hunting seems to have been an equalizing measure in Spartan society, intended to decrease tensions by the various hierarchies and inequalities that existed between men of supposedly equal standing within the Spartan system. The ability of the poor man to gain masculine credit through hunting was facilitated by provisions for private property made available for common use, by which Xenophon asserts that, “even those having little share in everything in the country” (οἱ τὰ μικρὰ ἔχοντες μετέχουσι πάντων τῶν ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ).³⁹⁹ Hodkinson cautions against reading too much into this statement, as the institutionalized provisions towards sharing, mentioned by Xenophon, fall far short of allowing the poor access to everything enjoyed by the rich, and that the value of these measures was more symbolic than economic.⁴⁰⁰ David points out an element of paradox in this supposedly equalizing measure, as being the loaner of things required for hunting could bring an additional measure of prestige to the rich man who had such things to lend. This is evidenced by Xenophon’s relation of the measure of deference that one who wished to borrow hunting dogs display to the owner.⁴⁰¹ However, as hunting carried not only strong ties to the ideology of war, but also to the ideology of aristocracy, being granted access, through the borrowing of hunting dogs, to the same leisured pastime as

³⁹⁶ Cartledge (2003), 280.

³⁹⁷ Making the contribution of game to the *sysstitia* an avenue by which an impoverished member could attain a level of social credit within the setting of his *sysstion* similar to or greater than those richer than himself.

³⁹⁸ David (1993), 402.

³⁹⁹ X. *Lac.* 6.5.

⁴⁰⁰ Hodkinson (2000), 23, 200-1.

⁴⁰¹ David (1993), 403.

their economic superiors, must have provided poorer members of the *homoioi* class some feeling of social standing within the realm of aristocratic male values.⁴⁰²

Membership in a *syssition* was one of the key criteria for a Spartan man's civic status and attainment of citizenship;⁴⁰³ acceptance into a *syssition* was an important landmark for a young man, marking his integration into the society of adult males.⁴⁰⁴ The *syssition*, as described by Xenophon, is shown to have a great bearing on promoting acceptable standards of masculine conduct. The *syssition* was to instill cohesion and social conformity in the behavior of its members, with an emphasis on limiting expressions of excess and hubris between members of the *homoioi* class. Put in contrast to Athenian *symposia* (which were optional, mostly same-age gatherings, often promoting values which clashed with state values), Spartan *syssitia*, which were identical, obligatory, state-mandated, inter-generational gatherings devoted to identical and state sponsored interests and ideologies, functioned as small-scale political systems that reinforced uniformity of society (especially through rules governing dress, food and talk) and sought to limit divergence.⁴⁰⁵ Xenophon describes a number of ways in which *syssitia* accomplished these aims: mixed age groups helped limit misconduct stemming from excessive consumption of food and drink, or from shamelessness and obscene speech, and also compelled young men to be ashamed to behave in an indecorous manner in the presence of elders, who would in turn set a good example for the young.⁴⁰⁶ This reciprocal relationship was thus designed to promote conformity and adherence to approved standards of respectful and uniform masculine deportment on the part of all parties involved.⁴⁰⁷ The customary discussion of “καλῶς τις ἐν τῇ πόλει ποιήσει” was also educational in nature, as the prescribed conversation focused entirely on promoting state ideology, both through the repetition of principles, and the honour associated with being

⁴⁰² Anderson (1985), 25-6; David (1993), 394-5; Barringer (2001), 10, 44-5; Lipka (2002), 147-8 on 4.7.3.

⁴⁰³ Cartledge (2003), 85, 279; Hodkinson (2006), 143.

⁴⁰⁴ Kennell (1995), 130.

⁴⁰⁵ Fisher (1989), 32, 37-8; Hodkinson (2000), 217-8. Also Knottnerus and Berry (2002); Figuiera (2003), 62. Contra Rabinowitz (2009), 166-7, who argues that the *syssition* was not the creation of the Lawgiver, handed down from time immemorial, but the result of efforts in the Classical period, to “recreate that timeless, stable commensal ideal”, undertaken out of the need to redefine and stabilize the citizen body. Rabinowitz argues that the *syssition* should not be viewed as an inverse of the *symposion*, but rather that the Classical *syssition* appears to be an effort to reconstruct the Archaic *symposion* “as it should have been”.

⁴⁰⁶ X. *Lac.* 5.

⁴⁰⁷ Fisher (1989), 36; Lipka (2002), 156 on 5.6.1; Ducat (2006a), 166.

the one who has accomplished such fine deeds.⁴⁰⁸ The public nature of the messes was designed to create the awareness in men that their conduct would be on display, not only at the meals themselves, but also on the way to and from, and thus compel them to conform all behaviour and discussion to the required public standards.⁴⁰⁹ Requirements of orthodoxy in appearance and conduct, combined with emphasis on simple fare and prohibition from monetary spending in the *syssitia*, were a levelling mechanism, designed to foster feelings of equality and cohesion between rich and poor members of a *syssition*.⁴¹⁰

However, the *syssitia* also appeared, somewhat paradoxically, to operate on another level as they were deeply hierarchical in structure. There were a number of ways in which the *syssitia* fostered competition for honour between men and provided men with opportunities to increase their social position within the hierarchy of the mess.⁴¹¹ As well as the possibility of increasing his masculine prestige through food donations, as discussed earlier, a man could raise his position within the masculine hierarchy by being the subject of the praise for fine deeds. Fisher notes that small achievements would be more likely to be praised in one's *syssition* than on a state level, so that even the man whose achievements did not meet the highest standards of masculine excellence would receive some modicum of acknowledgement (thus helping him to reconcile himself to his position within the larger societal hierarchy of men). Great accomplishments, on the other hand, would not only be lauded by one's *syssition*, but would reflect on the collective *aretē* of the *syssition* as a whole,⁴¹² thus engendering both individual and collective masculine prestige.

While the *syssitia* seemed designed to promote the attainment of masculine excellence through the performance of ideologically approved behaviours, the hierarchy in *syssitia* can also be seen as problematic to state-institutionalized masculine ideals. Xenophon attests that the *syssitia* was ideally a non-material institution by stressing that

⁴⁰⁸ X. *Lac.* 6; Whitby (1994), 110-1.

⁴⁰⁹ X. *Lac.* 3-7.

⁴¹⁰ Kennell (1995), 130; Hodkinson (2000), 218; Christesen (2012), 232.

⁴¹¹ Hodkinson (2000), 356-7.

⁴¹² Fisher (1989), 39-40. See also Hodkinson (2000), 363, regarding the emphasis placed on the attitudes of the *syssition* when one of its members is elected into the *Gerousia*.

gaining honour by spending material wealth on messmates was prohibited,⁴¹³ but the acceptability of food contributions from the produce of one's estate also served to give access to elevated positions within the masculine hierarchy of the *syssitia* for the wealthy by virtue of the simple fact that their estates would yield more and a greater variety of produce than those of their poorer messmates.⁴¹⁴ Thus the structure of the *syssitia* could prove problematic for the state-promoted ideology of merit-based achievement by allowing the rich to buy a measure of hierarchical standing.⁴¹⁵ This hierarchical competition, however, it must be remembered, took place among a small minority of citizen men.⁴¹⁶ The overall picture, then, of the Spartan *syssitia* in the *Lac.* is of an institution which stresses αἰδώς, restraint and conformity to approved behavioral codes out of concern for appearance among one's fellows, as well as competitive desire for honour and position among members.⁴¹⁷

3.5 Discourse

Xenophon repeatedly emphasises three traits which Sparta sought to instil in her men, and which are the key focus of the state education system: endurance (ἐγκράτεια), respect (αἰδώς), and obedience (πειθώ).⁴¹⁸ The description of the education of boys and adolescents in sections two and three are aimed primarily at the development of these qualities through measures such as accustoming boys to go without shoes and changes of clothing, and with little food.⁴¹⁹ They do this in an atmosphere of constant supervision,

⁴¹³ X. *Lac.* 7.4.

⁴¹⁴ X. *Lac.* 5.3.

⁴¹⁵ Flower (1991), 90; Lipka (2002), 152-3 on 5.3.4; Hodkinson (2000), 23-4, 179, 356-7. Also Humble (2004), 224-5 on the repercussions of this competition in wealth.

⁴¹⁶ This discussion has been limited to the effects of the *syssitia* among members of Sparta's citizen class. Fisher (1989), 34, 36, 43, makes many interesting suggestions about the uses the *syssitia* may have had with regards to subclasses within the Spartan system, such as 'inferiors', *perioikoi*, and helots, the implications of which would undoubtedly have an effect on relations between Spartiate and non-Spartiate males (and thus would have bearing on Spartan constructions of masculinity) within the Spartan system. Xenophon, however, does not make mention of these uses of *syssitia* in the *Lac.*; they, therefore, fall outside the scope of this study.

⁴¹⁷ Xenophon outlines a number of offices and honors for which men were eligible at various stages of life and for which they competed endlessly (e.g. X. *Lac.* 2.10-1, 4.1-7, 10.1-3). The effect of these contests, and particularly that of the *hippeis* will be discussed in greater detail later, as their greatest impact lies in the constant pressure they put on men to embody and perform ideals of masculinity, and in the interaction between men to create and enforce a framework of hegemonic masculinity amongst Sparta's citizen class.

⁴¹⁸ X. *Lac.* 2.14; MacDowell (1989), 55; Humble (1999), 341, highlights the stress placed by Xenophon on the impartation of these qualities in boys from the ages of seven to fourteen.

⁴¹⁹ X. *Lac.* 2.3-6.

submitting to physical punishment for lapses in conduct at the hands of any youth or adult man placed over them, and are required to conform to especially strict behavioral codes concerning decorum at the time of adolescence (in order to promote *πειθώ* and *αἰδώς*).⁴²⁰ As noted earlier, main elements of Spartan education in the *Lac.* include the indoctrination and socialization by which the boys internalized the ideology of Spartan manhood.⁴²¹ The aspect of communality in the upbringing of boys, serves the double purpose of instilling *αἰδώς* towards the collective citizenry, and in minimising the influence of the family in order to create men who direct their ultimate allegiance to the state.⁴²² The qualities of *αἰδώς* and *πειθώ* also appear to be carried forward and retain primacy amongst cardinal virtues of Spartan men throughout life,⁴²³ Xenophon notes in *Lac.* that it was a badge of honour for men no less than boys to appear eager to obey authority and in the *Agesilaus* he highlights the king's obedience to state authority as being amongst his most praiseworthy qualities.⁴²⁴

Even if the primacy of these qualities in the Spartan system is clearly related by Xenophon, it is still necessary to discuss what about them is particularly Spartan and particularly masculine. Xenophon's discussion of other ideological systems in comparison to Sparta's shows that the particular combination of and emphasis on these three qualities was an area in which Spartan ideology differed from others. In the *Memorabilia* Xenophon expresses a marked difference between Athenian and Spartan attitudes towards physical endurance, respect, and obedience.⁴²⁵ In the *Cyropaedia*, where an account of education in a fictionalized Persia is structured in a parallel way to the account of Spartan education in the *Lac.*, again there is a distinctly different emphasis in the qualities desirable in men, also suggesting that the emphasis of the Spartan system is characteristically its own.⁴²⁶ More difficult is trying to determine what makes these traits principally masculine. Admittedly, arguing that the above-mentioned traits were

⁴²⁰ *Lac.* 2.1-2, 10-11; Humble (1999); Gray (2007), 156 on 2.10-11 and 5.5.

⁴²¹ Cartledge (2001), 44; Ducat (2006a) 144-5.

⁴²² Cartledge (2001), 84, 87, 97; Ducat (2006a), 144-5; Link (2009), 93, 96.

⁴²³ Humble (1999), 342-3; Lipka (2002), 119-20, on 2.2.6, says that *αἰδώς* as a typically Spartan virtue became something of a *topos*; Knottnerus, and Berry, (2002), 11, 20-1, 27-8; Ducat (2006a), 143; Christesen (2012), 218-9, 226, 242-3.

⁴²⁴ X. *Lac.* 8.2 and *Ages.* 6.4.

⁴²⁵ X. *Mem.* 3.5.13; North (1966), 128-9; Strauss (1972), 111.

⁴²⁶ X. *Cyrop.* 1.2-16; Tuplin (1994), 152-3, 156-7; Humble (1999), 341-4.

important especially to the discourse of Spartan masculinity requires a bit of circular reasoning, as the main criterion for listing these as masculine traits is simply that these are the traits Xenophon tells us were cultivated in Spartan men. That Xenophon represents these traits as being viewed as important for Spartan men is clear, but it cannot be determined with certainty if these traits were important *only* for Spartiate men, as Xenophon does not discuss ideological traits considered important for women or non-citizen men. The closest approximation of a comparison between male and female ideals in the *Lac. Pol.* is the discussion of efforts to instill αἰδώς in adolescent boys which had the side effect of causing them to also be more σώφρων than maidens.⁴²⁷ Here the association between women and σωφροσύνη suggests that Xenophon was presenting particularly the feminine form of σωφροσύνη, which occurred as a veritable side-effect in Spartan adolescent males, and implies, by its conspicuous absence from his discussion, that a masculine σωφροσύνη was not a virtue intended to be implanted in Spartan males.⁴²⁸

Xenophon's discourse on the Spartan system stresses its operation primarily by means of compulsion towards displaying approved virtues, and fear of sanctions that accompanied failure to do so.⁴²⁹ Emphasis on compulsion and suppression over education

⁴²⁷ Ducat (2006a), 14-5, Humble (1999), 341-3. Ducat suggests that this passage was erotically charged, describing the boys' conduct with feminine overtones, at a time when they were becoming old enough to begin pederastic relationships. This suggests that this behavior caused men to view these boys as viable sexual objects, which strengthens the association of σωφροσύνη with femininity in the scenario described in the *Lac.*

⁴²⁸ North (1966), 130-1, n. 24, remarks that σωφροσύνη (likely the form described in this passage) was always associated with women and children. 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. However this might even be placing too much emphasis on the σωφροσύνη of young Spartan males, as Humble (1999), 339, points out that σωφροσύνη is never mentioned by Xenophon in his discussion of the youngest age-group of boys. Humble (1999), 341-3, also makes note of the fact that the type of σωφροσύνη, presented here by Xenophon, which has to do with modesty and chastity, is associated with the feminine form of the virtue and is mentioned as an aside. Tuplin (1994), 156-7 also does not regard σωφροσύνη as an important virtue in the Spartan value system, and argues that the σωφροσύνη exhibited by Spartan adolescents was merely an extreme form of αἰδώς in the form of self-effacement. Lipka (2002), 138-9 on 3.4.7, states that the deliberate impartation of σωφροσύνη by the educational system is not a topos of Sparta. Humble (2002), 89-90, argues that the cultivation of σωφροσύνη was not attributed to Sparta by Xenophon.

⁴²⁹ X. *Lac.* 2, 3.1-3, 5.2-7, 6.1-3, 7.2-3, 7.5-6, 8.5, 9, 10.1-7; Tuplin (1994), 157; Higgins (1977), 69; Humble (1997), 197-202 and (1999), 342-4. Richer (1999), 96-100, asserts that while αἰδώς could be seen to govern the actions of both men and women, there were likely separate forms which were seen to preside over the different sexes, and that the particularly masculine form of αἰδώς was closely associated with φόβος. Lipka (2002), 119-20 on 2.2.6, asserts that both αἰδώς and πειθώ were strongly associated with fear in the Spartan mindset.

is especially prevalent in section three which discusses measures taken towards adolescents because of the desire for pleasure that can become rooted in boys of that age. The boys are not taught how to resist temptations. Instead, the problem is dealt with by keeping temptation away from them and imposing upon them additional toil, the result being that they were taught to deal with hardship but not pleasure.⁴³⁰ The emphasis on compulsion and fear in the enforcement of behavior, as well as the selection of ἐγκράτεια, πειθῶ, and αἰδῶς as the most desirable masculine traits seems to be connected to the public nature of Spartan society. Humble suggests that this idea can be seen especially when the Spartan system and ideology in the *Lac.* is compared with that of the Persians in the *Cyropaedia*; the instances in Xenophon's *Cyropaedia* in which σωφροσύνη was shown as being an extremely important virtue cultivated in Persian boys⁴³¹ served to illustrate the lack of similar feeling in the minds of the Spartans.⁴³² As Xenophon presents it in the *Cyropaedia*, the process of education included an effort to instill in the boys a sense of σωφροσύνη seen as the capacity to behave according to principles of internalized justice.⁴³³ The Spartan masculine virtues relating to self-control contain elements of full σωφροσύνη in Xenophon's understanding of the term,⁴³⁴ but are more limited in their scope and fall short of the full understanding of σωφροσύνη.⁴³⁵ The virtue of αἰδῶς, on the other hand, is fundamentally appearance based, and requires the concept of an audience to function.⁴³⁶ Tuplin also notes the difference in emphasis in instruction

⁴³⁰ X. *Lac.* 3.1-3. Humble (1997), 205, suggests that the Lycurgan system would outwardly suppress desire for pleasure, due to fear of punishment, but would actually serve to increase internal desires.

⁴³¹ X. *Cyr.* 1.2.8-9. Humble (1999), 343.

⁴³² Humble (1999), 341-4, (2007), 295. Additionally, Tuplin (1994), 134-5, argues that, when compared, the *Cyr.* proves unflattering to Sparta, which contradicts ideas that Xenophon was either seeking to praise Sparta under the name of Persia, or that he used Sparta as a positive model in his composition of that work.

⁴³³ X. *Cyr.* 1.2.6, 8.31; Humble (1999), 344. For an Alternate view of Persian ideals of justice see Field (2012), 726, who views Persian conceptions of justice to be understood as strict obedience to established laws, "even against what is fitting", if what is fitting contradicts the laws.

⁴³⁴ North (1966), 125-30. While North does not discuss the *Lac.* in this section, she does discuss Xenophon's conception of elements of σωφροσύνη exhibited by Sparta in Xenophon's other works, in which she suggests that Xenophon saw Spartans as possessing virtues that were elements of full Socratic σωφροσύνη, but which failed to achieve the complete virtue.

⁴³⁵ Humble (2007), 295, highlights the insufficiency of the qualities stressed by the Spartan system to promote upright conduct outside of supervised military context, which she suggests is highlighted through analogy comparing the Lycurgan system to that of the *Cyr.* which promotes the full cultivation of σωφροσύνη.

⁴³⁶ Cairns (1993), 2-3, 14-8. Although Cairns is not speaking of a specifically Spartan form of αἰδῶς, but is speaking of the concept in general. Richer (1999), 99-100, discusses forms of which are felt before an individual and before a group. He sees opinion as being a great determining factor in the impact of αἰδῶς

in the Persian and Spartan systems, arguing that the Persians provide a positive method to instill values by aiming to dispose people against doing wrong, while the Spartan system employs a punitive method in punishing those who are not publically seen to demonstrate approved standards of conduct.⁴³⁷ Therefore the Persian emphasis on σωφροσύνη, which has a broader scope than αἰδώς and results in Persian males acting justly in private or public;⁴³⁸ versus the Spartan emphasis on αἰδώς, based on concern for one's status in relation to that of others, attained through appearance of conformity to culturally vaulted standards of behavior, results in Spartan males behaving publically so as to avoid punishment or diminishment of status; serves to reflect the different natures of the respective societies.⁴³⁹

3.6 Representation and Performativity

Because of the eminently public nature of Spartan life visibility became an intrinsic aspect to the presentation of ideologically correct masculinity: in a society which stresses external conformity without inner justification, appearance becomes reality. The primacy of visual expressions of manhood and the emphasis of appearing virtuous over actually *being* virtuous can be seen throughout the *Lac*. This goes beyond a matter of mere stylistic choices, to a point where visibly manifesting traits associated with manly excellence became important in every facet of Spartan life, at least in Xenophon's presentation of it. In line with these ideals, Harman asserts that seeing and being seen was the primary method by which Spartan men performed—and thus confirmed—their identity.⁴⁴⁰

Beginning with the ideological significance of physical representation, regulations in matters of outward presentation stress the idea that visual spectacle was used to uphold Spartan masculine ideals. Xenophon relates at length that Lycurgus gave considerable attention to even the minutest matters of masculine self-presentation. The detail with

on behaviour. Richer sees concern not to cause one's *erastes* public shame before the group as being at work in the form of αἰδώς governing the behaviour of Spartan fighting-men, which Xenophon describes in the *Symposium*. Also, see Lipka (2002), 107 on 1.5.3, on the relation between αἰδώς and the conception of "being seen" in Sparta.

⁴³⁷ Tuplin (1994), 157; and Humble (2007).

⁴³⁸ North (1966), 130-1.

⁴³⁹ Higgins (1977), 69-71; Humble (1999), 344.

⁴⁴⁰ Harman (2009), 372. See also Powell (2004), 378, who argues in a similar vein that Spartans were experts in presenting visual spectacle.

which personal appearance is regulated, such as the attention to armour, the wearing of the red cloaks, the possession and styling of long hair, etc.,⁴⁴¹ became a masculine socio-political tool by which the Spartans perpetuated a number of ideals.⁴⁴² The characteristic dress and hair of an adult Spartiate male was a status symbol which provided emphatic visual distinction between himself and those who occupied subordinate societal positions, such as women, boys, the dishonoured, and helots.⁴⁴³ In particular, a citizen male's relegation to the position of the dishonoured is presented as having strong visual and performative elements which were likely socially, rather than legally enforced.⁴⁴⁴

The difference between the regulations governing the outward appearance of boys and adult men in the *homoioi* class has been suggested as having the ideological purpose of highlighting boys' liminal status, whereby milestones, such as reaching the age when he was allowed to grow his hair, were important visual markers of acceptance into the society of adult males.⁴⁴⁵ Further, by accentuating the relationship between many of Lycurgus' mandates on outward presentation and the military, Xenophon reveals that much of the ideology attached to a Spartiate's self-presentation revolved around his identity as a warrior.⁴⁴⁶ While the famous red-cloak may have only been worn during military action, rules concerning hair and fitness governed non-removable aspects of self-presentation, making these bodily markers powerful visible reflections of the degree to which a Spartan male had successfully internalized societal ideals of warrior-masculine excellence.⁴⁴⁷

Hodkinson has argued persuasively that Sparta was not as militarily driven as many believe. He asserts that the majority of institutions related by Xenophon are designed with aims of civic rather than military utility; that Spartan methods of war-training do not differ greatly from those employed by aristocracy of other Greek states; that practical military considerations had a limited impact on Sparta's internal politics

⁴⁴¹ X. *Lac.* 11.3.

⁴⁴² David (1989), 4-5, (1992), 11-2 and (1999), 19. This control over appearance David argues is indicative of a high level of state control over non-verbal modes of communication.

⁴⁴³ David (1989), 8-10 and (1992), 17-20, argues particularly that Spartan self-presentation was designed to highlight the difference between citizens and slaves. Vernant (1991), 120, 232-4; Hodkinson (2000), 226.

⁴⁴⁴ MacDowell (1986), 45. See also David (1989), 5, and Harman (2009), 372, on the influence of social pressure on self-presentation. See further below, pp.85-6.

⁴⁴⁵ David (1992), 12-3, 19; Vernant (1991), 66, 120-2, 230-3.

⁴⁴⁶ Vernant (1991), 66, 120; Link (2004), 6; Christesen (2012), 235.

⁴⁴⁷ David (1989), 6; David, E. (1992), 13; Vernant (1991), 66, 120; Christesen (2012), 235.

and society; and that the majority of a Spartan man's time was engaged in various civic obligations rather than in ceaseless military training.⁴⁴⁸ If this is true, it is remarkable that Sparta nonetheless invested a great deal in warrior-masculine imagery, suggesting that "playing the part of the soldier" had also a social role of ideological importance,⁴⁴⁹ and consequently a strong impact on the creation of masculine identity. This is not to say that there were not practical applications to the imagery associated with Spartan masculine ideology. Xenophon notes the effect of hair on creating an intimidating appearance;⁴⁵⁰ and the visual spectacle created by the hair and dress of the Lacedaemonian army was a useful propagandistic tool for inspiring intimidation in the enemy.⁴⁵¹

In addition, the adoption of uniform military dress for the entire Lacedaemonian army and the extension of Spartiate mandate for physical exercise to all Lacedaemonians, while on campaign, would be valuable ideological tools.⁴⁵² Both of these factors likely had significance for the ideology of masculinity as well, as they would serve to create a feeling of shared national identity and purpose promoting masculine solidarity between the army's Spartiate and non-Spartiate members,⁴⁵³ as well as engendering a shared feeling of masculine superiority over non-Lacedaemonian soldiers, if the enemy was intimidated by them.⁴⁵⁴ On the other hand, within the army Spartan regulations concerning masculine self-representation and performativity would have established a Spartiate's hierarchy over a non-Spartiate: to the enemy, measures such as identical dress and exercise might have made all members of Lacedaemonian army look the same but internally these same features would have established differences. Spartiates, well drilled in exercises which were imposed on non-Spartiate members of the army only while on campaign, would undoubtedly have made a superior showing, serving to mark them out, as would the distinctive Spartan hair style. Masculine representation and performativity can thus be seen to operate on two levels within the Lacedaemonian army: on one level,

⁴⁴⁸ Hodkinson (2006), 111-4, 126-7, 134-6, 138-40, 143-7. See also Jaeger (1939), 81, on the origin of the perception of Sparta as a glorified military camp, and Christesen (2012), 234-7.

⁴⁴⁹ Christesen (2012), 198, 226, 234-7.

⁴⁵⁰ *X. Lac.* 11.3.

⁴⁵¹ Powell (1989), 179; Knottnerus and Berry (2002), 26-7; Christesen (2012), 236.

⁴⁵² *X. Lac.* 11.3, 12.5; David (1989), 3-4; Hodkinson (2000), 225.

⁴⁵³ See Shipley (1997), 200-5, (2004), 569 and (2006), 52, 67-71, for discussions of feelings of common Lacedaemonian national identity between Spartiate and non-Spartiates.

⁴⁵⁴ David (1989), 6.

to create cohesion between Spartiate and non-Spartiate members and to establish the Lacedaemonians as men superior to their enemies; on another level to establish masculine hierarchy within the army, of which the Spartiate members stood out as the ideal.

The public and performative nature of Spartan manhood is also represented by Xenophon in his descriptions of the repeated contests of manly virtue, such as the competition for the *hippeis* and for the *gerousia*,⁴⁵⁵ which demanded that men prove and reprove their virtue at every stage of life, as well as his assertion that the public practice of virtue in general was an official mandate to which the laws of Lycurgus compelled all Spartan men to adhere.⁴⁵⁶ Knottnerus and Berry suggest that the ritualistic nature of many Spartan competitions—both political and athletic—made them useful performative ideological tools as, “ritualized practices provide the symbolic meanings that could easily develop into belief systems that serve to validate or legitimate a group and its activities”.⁴⁵⁷ Thus, mandates towards competition among males can be seen as tools of social-control towards the public practice of a set of ideals of masculine excellence, to which the failure to adhere carried the threat of disenfranchisement, the social aspect of which, itself, was largely expressed via visual spectacle.⁴⁵⁸ The primary objective of the ethos of manhood in these instances appears to be the maintained appearance of conformity and obedience to state-imposed values, as genuine virtue would not need to be compelled.⁴⁵⁹

3.7 Relations Between Men and Hegemonic Masculinity

Xenophon’s discussions of interaction between males in the *Lac.* focus primarily on the citizen class. References of interaction between Spartiates and non-Spartiates is limited to

⁴⁵⁵ X. *Lac.* 2.10-11, 4.1-6, 10.1-3. See Humble (1997), 206-10 for discussion of the extensively competitive nature of the lives of adult Spartan men.

⁴⁵⁶ X. *Lac.* 10. 4-7.

⁴⁵⁷ Knottnerus and Berry (2002), 14, 18. Knottnerus and Berry also saw ritualistic practice as being pervasive in many elements of Spartiate life and designed to impart primarily the qualities of: “(1) extreme simplicity, austerity, and frugality in behavior and living conditions; (2) social unity, harmony, and homogeneity (“equality”) of group members; (3) hierarchical distinctions and disciplined obedience to authorities and the state; (4) aggressiveness, competitiveness, courageousness, and a militaristic bearing; and (5) deceptiveness, secretiveness, and an opportunistic orientation (especially in regard to militaristic activities, techniques of domination, and propaganda)”. (Knottnerus and Berry [2002], 11-2).

⁴⁵⁸ For elaboration on the conditions of disenfranchisement see pp. 85-6.

⁴⁵⁹ Higgins (1977), 69; Humble (1999), 226.

discussions of military matters,⁴⁶⁰ and while Xenophon does contrast the Spartans with ‘others’ in the *Lac.*, the contrast is only in reference to the various institutions and practices of other states in opposition with those of Sparta, and remains on the level of impersonal comparison rather than relational. Thus the male interaction in the *Lac.* serves predominantly to illustrate the ways in which all-male relations between members of the citizen class affected their concepts and performances of masculinity.

Male relations occurring on a daily basis seems to be one of strongest contributing factors in the maintenance of standards of masculine conduct, enforced by the communal and public nature of Spartan society. From an early age the effect of the family is minimised, and in its place males of the community from every age group become the primary means by which societal values are encouraged and enforced. Xenophon tells us that not only is the *paidononos* placed over the boys as the ultimate authority in matters of their upbringing, *eirens*, *erastai*, and the fathers of other boys (as well as male citizens at large) are also charged with keeping watch over boys and punishing lapses in acceptable conduct.⁴⁶¹ The high value placed on respect for structures of hierarchy and authority within the *homoioi* class can be seen in descriptions of attitudes towards the *gerousia* and towards the near-tyrannical powers of the *ephors*.⁴⁶² Part of the emphasis on hierarchy and authority within a class of supposed ‘similars’ is tied to the philosophy that masculine ideals could best be encouraged from the top-down. To this end, Xenophon relates the care Lycurgus took to ensure the support of the most powerful men for his laws before attempting to impose them upon the general population, and to ensure that *αἰδώς* and *πειθώ* were deeply rooted in those men who occupy the highest societal positions, so that it was a point of honour for those considered best to appear most obedient and respectful to the authority of the state.⁴⁶³ The aim of these measures was exemplary: men positioned lower in hierarchies within the citizen class, desiring both to achieve the status of their betters and their approval, will seek to emulate their behaviour.

Male antagonism proved no less useful a tool for the enforcement of masculine ideology. Xenophon gives special attention to the institutionalized rivalry between young

⁴⁶⁰ See p. 80 above for comments on notable exceptions in X. *Lac.* 11-2, in which interactions between Spartiates and non-Spartiates also had ideological implications.

⁴⁶¹ X. *Lac.* 2, 6.1-2.

⁴⁶² X. *Lac.* 8.4 (on the *ephors*), 10.2 (on the *gerousia*).

⁴⁶³ X. *Lac.* 8.1.

men and to the contest to be admitted to the council of elders, undertaken in old age.⁴⁶⁴ This shows that the influence of competition and desire for honour between men was seen as a useful tool to ensure men’s ongoing investment to exhibiting qualities deemed excellent, at times of life in which men were more likely to exhibit propensity towards deviation from societal ideals. These rivalries and contests also played a significant role in the creation of a framework of hegemonic masculinity within the Spartiate class. For example, in section four of the *Lac*. Xenophon details the process in which the ephors select three of the “very best” young men to be designated *hippagretai*. These then each choose one hundred men from among their age class to make up the three units of the elite *hippeis*.⁴⁶⁵ Xenophon highlights that, as part of the process, the *hippagretai* detail why they select or reject the candidates, resulting in a feeling of intense rivalry between those chosen and those not, with the rejected being especially on guard in case any of those being preferred above them should lapse in any way from upholding the ideals for which they were chosen (ἐάν τι παρὰ τὰ καλὰ νομιζόμενα ῥαδιουργῶσι).⁴⁶⁶ This section shows an apparatus of hegemonic masculinity in full effect. Xenophon says that this is the contest which sets the standard of what is needed to be considered a good man (ἐν ἧ ἁποδέδεικται μὲν ἃ δεῖ ποιεῖν τὸν ἀγαθόν), and particularly that it was through this sort of strife that Lycurgus believed young men reached the highest level of manly excellence (ἐνόμιζεν, εἰ καὶ τοὺς ἡβῶντας συμβάλλοι εἰς ἔριν περὶ ἀρετῆς, οὕτως ἂν καὶ τοὺτους ἐπὶ πλεῖστον ἀφικνεῖσθαι ἀνδραγαθίας).⁴⁶⁷ This is indicative of concerted efforts in Spartan society to cultivate an ideal masculinity and desire for manly glory, which was used to further political goals of the state. These goals are overtly stated by Xenophon in his description of the contest as being “in the highest sense political” (πολιτικωτάτη),⁴⁶⁸ and in his disclosure here, and in section three, that Lycurgus was aware that adolescents and young men in particular required close attention, and that— when properly harnessed— the spiritedness which is associated with males of this age could be used for the benefit of

⁴⁶⁴ X. *Lac.* 4, 10.1-3.

⁴⁶⁵ X. *Lac.* 4.2-4.

⁴⁶⁶ X. *Lac.* 4.4-5.

⁴⁶⁷ X. *Lac.* 4.2.5. See Ducat (2006a), 102-3, and Figueira (2006), 64 for discussion of rivalry and policing between young men desirous of a position in the *hippeis*.

⁴⁶⁸ X. *Lac.* 4.5.

the state.⁴⁶⁹ Thus, at the time of life when men were most likely to rebel against the authority and ideology of their society, their rebelliousness would be channelled instead to benefit it.⁴⁷⁰ The competition was thus, “a means for encoding...and representing a particular ethos of masculinity”.⁴⁷¹ The public nature of the display serves to strengthen the significance both of the competition itself, and the values it seeks to venerate.⁴⁷² Thus, by making contests of manly excellence between youths public political displays, the system turned discontent inward, using it to uphold the system’s values.⁴⁷³

Those who succeed in the competition are presented as occupying the highest rung of the hegemonic ladder, and would therefore have a concerted interest in upholding the ideology of masculinity which served their interests. Those failing to receive this honour, consequently, become those who possess complicit masculinity which, as noted in chapter one, is the most necessary group in hegemonic gender construction. Because only an extremely limited number of individuals can be seen to occupy the ideal, or hegemonic, position on the societal ladder of masculinity, proper functioning of the ideological gender framework is reliant on a large base of men who emulate the masculine ideals as much as possible, while falling short of the necessary requirements of ideal masculinity. This group is seen to reinforce the system of hegemonic masculinity through their commitment to upholding the performative aspects their society’s ideology, because doing so positions them in close relation to the ideal, and grants them a favorable position in comparison to individuals who possess subaltern masculinities. Therefore this group serves to uphold the ideal of which they themselves fall short.⁴⁷⁴ This is clearly

⁴⁶⁹ X. Lac. 3.2-4, 4.1-2. The comment specifically refers to youths and does not encompass young men. However, as mentioned earlier, I would argue that descriptions of the contentiousness exhibited by young men, and measures (such as the contest for the *hippeis*) in place to ensure that their combative tendencies remain channeled in constructive ways suggest special concern for this age group as well.

⁴⁷⁰ Ducat (2006a), 172-4.

⁴⁷¹ Figueira (2006), 65. Gray (2007), 160, on 4.5, also highlights the primacy placed on the promulgation of ideals as, “the hippagretai had made it clear in making their selection, so that it is clear ‘what the good man must do’.”

⁴⁷² Knottnerus and Berry (2002), 21; Figueira (2006), 63; Harman (2009), 372-3. Lipka (2002), 143, on 4.2.5, also argues that Xenophon presupposes that the “strife for virtue” requires incentive, which the public contest for selection into the *Hippeis* provided.

⁴⁷³ Figueira (2006), 64-5; Ducat (2006a), 174; Gray (2007), 159-60, on 4.1-4, 4.4; I am inclined, on this note, to prefer Figueira’s view that confrontations and challenges arose between those who were chosen for the *hippeis*, and those who were not, out of the desire for inclusion within this honoured group, rather the view put forth by Ducat, that animosity resulted because the *hippeis* “symbolized authority, established order, directives from on high, everything, therefore, that had to be challenged”.

⁴⁷⁴ See p. 10.

present in the selection of the *hippeis*. The position of those who attain the hegemonic ideal in their selection to the *hippeis* is presented as tenuous, secure only as long as they continue to display the masculine excellence for which they were chosen.⁴⁷⁵ The idea that they could come to replace the chosen would ensure that the unchosen would maintain an orthodox presentation of masculinity and conform to the ideals of the state. Their discontent with those who succeeded where they failed also results in their upholding of the masculine ethos, as they become concerned with strict policing of their fellows for any failure to live up to the societal ideals, by which they may vault themselves into the coveted position of the “truly manly”.⁴⁷⁶ Xenophon’s assertion that this kind of competition ensures that both parties constantly strive to be as good as possible and support the state⁴⁷⁷ clearly demonstrates that the result of the competition is that both chosen and un-chosen turn their discontent towards one another and their interests towards upholding the state ideals, and that the instrument used to bring about this result is an ideal of masculinity. This is a true example of propagation of an ideology of gender in order to further political aims.

Another good example of the enforcement of hegemonic masculinity, this time operating from the other end of the spectrum, is the placement of sanctions upon the cowardly. In book nine of the *Lac*. Xenophon lists a number of ways in which those who violate the ideal of martial manly excellence are made to endure dishonor due to their failures.⁴⁷⁸ While Xenophon alludes elsewhere to the fact that there were other reasons for which a Spartiate man could become disenfranchised,⁴⁷⁹ he limits his discussion in the *Lac*. to those who have lost their standing due to cowardice. The sanctions placed on those deemed deficient had a number of features which were useful in promoting the prominent state-serving ideology of manhood. Harman suggests that in the visual self-

⁴⁷⁵ Figueira (2006), 65.

⁴⁷⁶ Ducat (2006a), 103; Figueira (2006), 64-5; Humble (2007), 298; Harman (2009), 372-3.

⁴⁷⁷ X. *Lac*. 4.5.

⁴⁷⁸ X. *Lac*. 9.3-6.

⁴⁷⁹ X. *Hell*. 3.3.4-11. Xenophon relates that while Kinadon is not one of the *homoioi*, his inferior status is not due to any deficiency in physical prowess or strength of character. Gray (2007), 171 on 10.7, says that Xenophon seems to suggest that disenfranchisement did not occur for financial reasons as Arist. *Pol*. 1271a26-37 claims, and argues that the mess dues in X. *Lac*. 5.3-4 are so meagre that it is hard to imagine anyone falling short. However MacDowell (1986), 112-3, argues that, when Xenophon claims that economic concerns are not inhibitory to citizen standing, he is not thinking of the truly destitute.

presentation required from the dishonoured, that he not emulate the good,⁴⁸⁰ is meant to be a visible reminder of one whose identity is not only a moral, but also a political failure. Xenophon asserts that Lycurgus believed that such individuals would be most damaging to the state, were they allowed to mingle without censure among their betters.⁴⁸¹ Furthermore, Harman believes that the ideological usefulness of the visibly dishonoured is twofold. For their part, the dishonoured present a highly visible example of the cost of failing to live up to societal ideals, and when those who are not dishonoured participate in the corporal punishment of those who are (Xenophon mentions that the dishonoured man who fails to visually represent himself in a manner appropriate to his standing is subject to beatings from his betters),⁴⁸² they also reinforce their approval of the ideological standards and their own identity in relation to them (i.e. their position on the hegemonic ladder) through performance.⁴⁸³ Other features of the punishment of the dishonoured also point to its function as a political tool. Xenophon provides information, such as the fact that the dishonoured were fined for not marrying and that they retained some aspect of citizen status (not unlike boys who did not complete the educational system in an entirely sufficient manner), which suggests they would then be granted a form of ‘inferior’ citizenship.⁴⁸⁴ Ducat argues that the dishonour described by Xenophon is the most extreme form of the sanction, which could suggest that there are varying levels of honour or dishonour at which one could be placed in relation to one’s performance of masculine ideals.⁴⁸⁵ There are also instances in which dishonour for cowardice was not imposed,⁴⁸⁶ or employed temporarily.⁴⁸⁷ Revocable dishonour would

⁴⁸⁰ X. *Lac.* 9.5.

⁴⁸¹ X. *Lac.* 10.6; Harman (2009), 372.

⁴⁸² X. *Lac.* 9.5.

⁴⁸³ Harman (2009), 372.

⁴⁸⁴ Ducat (2006b), 27-9. Not unlike that found elsewhere in other Greek states, Ducat argues (2006a), 147-8, 158-9.

⁴⁸⁵ Ducat (2006b) 27-8, 45-6. Xenophon’s description of the social position of Cinadon could perhaps provide additional support for this idea. (see pp.111-2). Additionally, the existence of categories such as *nothoi* (X. *Hell.* 5.3.9) and *mothakes* (Phylarkhos (*F. Gr. Hist.* 81) F43 (from Ath.271e-f); Ael. *Var. Hist.* 12.43 within the Spartan system, which afforded those with this standing limited access to certain citizen rights (for discussion of the status and privileges of *nothoi* and *mothakes*, see MacDowell [1986], 44-50; Hodkinson [1997], 53-63, 66; Hall [2000]; Shipley [2004]), attest to the existence of varying status levels of men within the hierarchy of the Spartan system. These groupings could also give evidence for the possibility of mutable social standing, as Cartledge (1987), 28, suggests that individuals such as Lysander, who were reputed to have been *mothake* provides evidence for the possibility of advancement from a sub-class to Spartiate status.

⁴⁸⁶ Plut. *Ages.* 30.3.2-4.

certainly be a more valuable tool because it would provide the same counter-ideal as would be achieved by the imposition of irrevocable dishonour. But the possibility of redemption would create incentive for the one on whom sanctions were imposed to maintain adherence to promoting the ideology of manhood which resulted in his abjection, as it also held the key to his restoration. This, in turn, would minimize the possibility for sedition, likely to arise amongst men who considered their dishonoured situation hopeless.

Finally, the most compelling evidence for the idea that the status of dishonoured Spartans such as the ‘tremblers’ was part of a deliberate system to enforce hegemonic masculinity is its apparent rarity of implementation. Ducat points out that, logistically it would have been nearly impossible to enforce the measures described in the *Lac.* on any but the smallest groups of people at one time, and “the severity of the sanction, while it existed, was not proportional to the gravity of the offence, but inversely proportional to the number of those guilty”.⁴⁸⁸ Therefore, despite factual scarcity of cases of Spartan dishonour such as that described by Xenophon,⁴⁸⁹ the fact that the *idea* of severe punishment for failures with respect to manhood was especially prevalent— so much so that Xenophon, a foreigner, was able to discuss the hypothetical sanctions at great length— appears to point to a deliberate propagation of these ideas. This suggests that Spartan power regimes employed fear over the consequences of failing to live up to societal ideals of manhood as a sort of ideological boogeyman for the purpose of behavioral control and to ensure that individual action would conform to state-approved ideology.

⁴⁸⁷ Th. 5.34.

⁴⁸⁸ Ducat (2006b), 48.

⁴⁸⁹ Ducat (2006b), 6, 47.

Chapter 4: Xenophon History

4.1 Introduction

The chapter will examine depictions of Spartan masculinity in Xenophon's historical writing, focussing primarily on the *Hellenica*, with examples being drawn from *Anabasis* and *Agesilaus* where appropriate.⁴⁹⁰ The nature of the *Hellenica*, like that of Thucydides' *Histories*, requires us to examine the masculine subject in interaction with other subjectivities in those areas established as being of particular import to conceptions of masculinity. The three categories of import to masculine construction which are given the most attention in Xenophon's historical writing are sexual attitudes, discourse, and relations between men and hegemony.

4.2 Attitudes Towards Sex

Not much is made of sexual relations between Spartan men and women in Xenophon's historical works—indeed Spartan women are given very little mention in these works overall. Homosexual relationships involving Spartans, however, do receive treatment. There is evidence to show that Spartan homosexual relationships did not always, in practice, live up to the chaste Lycurgan pederastic ideal which is outlined by Xenophon in his *Lac.*; though it is not entirely clear to what extent Xenophon presented the negative consequences of certain relationships between males as correlating to the sexual nature of those relationships. As discussed earlier,⁴⁹¹ Xenophon was not as severe in his views of pederasty as was the Socrates (and for that matter the Lycurgus) which he presented in his works, and there may also be evidence to suggest that the ideologically approved forms of Spartan pederasty were not as rigorous in practice either.

In his descriptions of pederastic relationships conducted by Spartans in the *Hellenica*, Xenophon does provide the reader with positive examples of such associations. The relationship between Archidamus and Cleonymus is represented as being honourable in nature. The public nature of the association, the aristocracy of its

⁴⁹⁰ Admittedly the *Agesilaus*, as an encomiastic work, presents an undeniably slanted portrayal of historical events. However it nonetheless contains historical subject matter, some of which— especially when Xenophon frames an episode in such a way to convey a moral principle— is useful to the present discussion.

⁴⁹¹ See pp. 65-6.

participants, the longevity of the relationship, and the positive qualities imparted by the association, suggest that this relationship was an example of the ideologically approved form of institutional Spartan pederasty.⁴⁹² As such, the relationship is shown to be motivated by mutual regard and respect and able to foster the noblest qualities in its participants, such as a gallant *philia* that found its culmination in Cleonymus' heroic death.⁴⁹³ An example of pederastic relationships resulting in the impartation of manly courage and self-sacrificing *philia* can also be seen in the death of Anaxibius' *paidika*, which has a distinctly heroic flavour: the youth remains steadfast, fighting with his *erastes* in a hopeless battle while many others attempted to flee.⁴⁹⁴ These relationships seem to confirm ideas presented elsewhere of the influence pederastic relationships could have in inspiring admirable comportment in military situations, providing examples of the results which Spartan educational pederasty aimed to produce.⁴⁹⁵

Evidence in Xenophon's historical writings suggests that Spartan attitudes towards the sexual element in pederastic relationships were not as severe as that expressed in Xenophon's *Lac.* Xenophon's treatment of Agesilaus, both in the *Hellenica* and the *Agesilaus*, shows that he had a fondness for comely boys, and enjoyed love stories about boys (*παιδικῶν λόγων*).⁴⁹⁶ His efforts on behalf of the handsome son of Pharnabazos to aid the boy with whom he was enamoured,⁴⁹⁷ could indicate that, in addition to appreciation of the theoretical, Agesilaus took no issue against pederastic relationships in practice. Hindley suggests that the most prominent story which has been held up in support of the idea that Agesilaus advocated complete chastity when it came to boys—the account in the *Agesilaus* of the great self-control exhibited by Agesilaus in his refusal of advances from Megabates—⁴⁹⁸ has more to do with the political implications of Agesilaus' taking the Persian boy on as an official *paidika* than any issue with the

⁴⁹² X. *Hell.* 5.4.25-27, 33; Hindley (1999a), 80; Hodkinson (2007), 58; Gray (2007), 156 on X.*Lac.* 2.12-14, holds this relationship up as the model of ideal Lycurgan pederasty.

⁴⁹³ X. *Hell.* 5.4.25-27, 33; Dover (1987), 202-203; Hodkinson (2007), 58, 61.

⁴⁹⁴ X. *Hell.* 4.8.37-9; Hindley (1999a), 80.

⁴⁹⁵ Ogden (1996), 117-8, argues that homosexual practices within the Lycurgan system were designed towards the creation of good warriors. Both Ogden (1996), 119, and Powell (2001), 229, highlight the possible benefits pederastic and homosexual practices may have had in creating cohesion and loyalty in military contexts.

⁴⁹⁶ X. *Ages.* 8.2; X. *Hell.* 4.1.28, 4.1.40, 5.3.20; Hindley (1994), 361.

⁴⁹⁷ X. *Hell.* 4.1.40.

⁴⁹⁸ X. *Ages.* 5.4-5.

morality of physical pederasty.⁴⁹⁹ If this is correct, the commendable self-control then lies in Agesilaus' willingness to place state interests above his own, even when he found doing so extremely difficult,⁵⁰⁰ and the very difficulty with which Agesilaus refused Megabates can be seen as indicative of his attitudes towards physical relationships with boys. Hindley reminds readers of evidence which points to a disparity between the view of Socrates, which disallows any physical expression in pederastic relationships, and Xenophon's own view.⁵⁰¹ Hindley argues that Xenophon's view of pederastic relationships places emphasis on self-control as the guiding principle which rendered the pederastic relationship acceptable, but that pederastic relationships characterized by self-control need not exclude some physical expression.⁵⁰² The overall pattern of behaviour and expression of opinion evident in Xenophon's portrayal of Agesilaus, the most prominent Spartan of his day, perhaps suggests that acceptable pederastic conduct could, in the Spartan view, contain a certain level of appreciation for the physical charms of boys, as long as this was not the predominant motivating factor of the relationship.

However, despite these favorable examples, homosexual relationships in the *Hellenica* are portrayed in a rather ambiguous light overall. Most notably, there are a number of Spartan commanders whose various calamities Xenophon presents juxtaposed with the description of their participation in deviant or excessive homosexual behaviour.⁵⁰³ In highlighting the homosexual activities of various individuals whom he represents as having rather ignominious military careers, Xenophon seems to be drawing a correlation between dishonourable sexual behaviour and lack of military competency—

⁴⁹⁹ Hindley (1994), 361, and (1999b), 126. Cartledge (1987), 193, expresses a similar thought in his discussion of the *xenia* relationship between Agesilaus and the son of Pharnabazus (X. *Hell.* 4.1.39-40).

⁵⁰⁰ X. *Ages.* 5.4-5; Hindley (199b), 126. Rebenich (1998), 102, note 40, differs in opinion and asserts that Xenophon highlights Agesilaus' homosexual abstinence in the *Agesilaus* as part of his polemic against Athenian preconceptions regarding Spartan homosexual practices; Gray (2007), 156 on 2.12-14, also argues that this is an example of Agesilaus' embodiment of Lycurgan ideas in his resistance of the physical charms of the youth. These views are not without merit, however, Hindley makes a persuasive argument for the consideration of the political aspect of the episode, which does not take away from its moralizing nature, but provides a different view of why Agesilaus is seen as exemplary in this instance.

⁵⁰¹ Hindley (1994), 347-8. See also Percy (2005), 38-9. Although it must be noted that the main sources used to support this view do not explicitly state that sexual intercourse was involved in the relationships they describe (see X. *Mem.* 1.3.8-15, and *Sym.* 4.10-8).

⁵⁰² Hindley (1994), 347-9, 361; Hindley (1999a), 85-7; Hindley (1999b), 125-8. See also Percy (2005), 39.

⁵⁰³ It is true that correlation does not necessarily equal causation, but this tendency in Xenophon's work is significant and has been noted by Tuplin (1993) 129-30. Humble (1997), p.135 n. 98 and p.162 n.192, also notes Xenophon's discussions of the homosexual activities of Anaxibius, Thibron and Alcetas and the possible association between this behaviour and their "carelessness" in military matters.

one of the paramount masculine virtues.⁵⁰⁴ The most obvious examples are the cases of Thibron and Alcetas in which both men were literally caught with their pants down, and their sexual activity was thus directly involved in military disaster.⁵⁰⁵ While Thibron is presented as a disreputable and careless individual throughout his campaigning, and was culpable, according to Xenophon, for a great deal of his soldiers' delinquency,⁵⁰⁶ his final martial failure and resultant demise are presented as being directly related to his sexual impropriety. In the episode of the raid on Thibron's force which resulted in his death, Xenophon makes a point of emphasizing that when the raid occurred, "Thibron happened to be retiring in his tent after breakfast with Thersander the flute player" (ὁ δὲ Θίβρων ἐτύγγανεν ἐξ ἀρίστου διασκηγῶν μετὰ Θερσάνδρου τοῦ αὐλητοῦ). Caught unawares, Thibron and Thersander were the first to fall, resulting in the flight of the rest of the Spartans, many of whom were killed. Xenophon had already stressed the haphazard manner in which Thibron had been conducting his expeditions against Strouthas, so relating Thibron's extracurricular activities at the time of the raid was not strictly necessary in order to account for Spartan disorder during the attack. This suggests that Xenophon wished to establish Thibron's excessive sexual indulgence as a key factor in this disastrous episode. Moreover, in his annotations on the text, Strassler suggests that Xenophon's description of Thersander as one who "claimed to be very strong, since he was a great imitator of Spartan ways" (ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀλκῆς ἰσχύος, ἅτε λακωνίζων, ἀντεποιεῖτο) is a double entendre implying that not only was Thibron well versed in homosexual practices, but that he was likely the active partner in a sexual relationship with Thibron.⁵⁰⁷ If this is the case, Thibron's sexual activity is not only represented as excessive but also deviant. This serves to reinforce the idea that Thibron's sexual behaviour was being brought to light in the context of a military disaster in order to draw

⁵⁰⁴ Hindley (1994), 348-9.

⁵⁰⁵ X. *Hell.* 3.8.18-19, 5.4.56; Tuplin (1993), 78, 129-30; Hindley (1999b), 126.

⁵⁰⁶ X. *Hell.* 3.1.7-8, 3.2.1, 3.2.6-7, 4.8.18-19, 4.8.22. See Humble (1997), 160-4, for discussion of Thibron's qualities as a leader.

⁵⁰⁷ Strassler (ed.) (2009), 166, note 4.8.18b. Tuplin (1993), 78, and Hindley (1999), 126, also see an insinuation of sexual activity between the men in this episode, and it has been argued that "laconizing" in Athenian thought (especially in the genre of comedy) was widely associated, among other things, with male homosexual relations (see Dover [1978], 187-8; Rebenich [1998], 101-2, note 40; Ludwig [2002], 178). See also Cartledge (2001), 91-105 on pederasty in general.

a correlation between the man's character and attitudes towards sex and his general competency.

In the case of Alcetas, the relation between improper sexual indulgence and martial incompetence is even more notable due to the subject's prior successes. Unlike Thibron, Alcetas is presented as enterprising and successful in capturing ships carrying essential Theban supplies. However, we are told that Alcetas lost not only the prisoners and supplies he recently acquired, but also the city he was guarding to the very prisoners whom he brought into it, because he neglected his duties in order to dally with a comely boy.⁵⁰⁸ The ability of sexual misconduct to render one inept is emphasised here by the fact that lack of sexual self-control was the sole factor turning what should have been a brilliant victory into an embarrassing failure.⁵⁰⁹

Even pederastic relationships among Spartans which are presented as being of a respectable nature are surrounded by an air of ambiguity in the *Hellenica*. There is nothing to suggest that relationship between Anaxibius and his *paidika* was dishonorable, and their death fighting side by side has heroic overtones,⁵¹⁰ but Tuplin argues that Xenophon presents Anaxibius as "a case-study in bad generalship".⁵¹¹ Thus it is possible that the mention of Anaxibius' *paidika* in the narration of the commander's death is meant to be reminiscent of the homosexual activities of others who made poor military decisions, denoting recurring association in the *Hellenica* between certain types of homosexual activity and military ineffectiveness.⁵¹²

The most prominent example of a Spartan pederastic relationship in the *Hellenica*, and indeed the one that arguably had the greatest military and political ramifications, was the relationship between Archidamus and Cleonymus. As mentioned, the relationship itself is represented as being reputable in nature. However, Hodkinson aptly pointed out the ambiguous position in which Cleonymus' use of his pederastic connection placed him. In order to take advantage of his connection with Agesilaus' son, for the sake of his father, Cleonymus had to violate the behavioural codes of the acceptable conduct for males of his age, acting in a far more outspoken manner than Xenophon indicates would

⁵⁰⁸ X. *Hell.* 5.4.56.

⁵⁰⁹ Tuplin (1993), 129-30.

⁵¹⁰ Hindley (1999a), 80.

⁵¹¹ Tuplin (1993), 78.

⁵¹² Tuplin (1993), 78, 129-30

have been acceptable for a youth of his age, and that he did so in the *syssition*, a setting which could have placed his future acceptance into the world of adult male Spartans in jeopardy.⁵¹³ Further casting a shadow over the positive elements of the relationship is its role in what Xenophon describes as “the most unjust judgement ever determined at Sparta” (ἀδικώτατα ἐν Λακεδαιμόνι ἢ δίκη κριθῆναι),⁵¹⁴ i.e. the acquittal of Cleonymus' father Sphodrias after he had unsuccessfully carried out an attack on Attica while Sparta was in the process of negotiating with the Athenians. His conviction seemed assured until Cleonymus pleaded with Archidamus to intercede with his father, Agesilaus, on behalf of Cleonymus' father. Xenophon presents the pederastic relationship as one of the determinative element in Sphodrias' acquittal.⁵¹⁵

It must be said, of course, that other considerations were also at work in this episode. Xenophon stressed that Agesilaus was almost solely responsible for the outcome of this trial.⁵¹⁶ This, combined with Archidamus' mention of certain individuals who could accomplish things for him in the state,⁵¹⁷ was no doubt meant to emphasize the system of patronage in Sparta as well as Agesilaus' personal political agenda.⁵¹⁸ Sphodrias was a partisan of Agesilaus' rival king Cleombrotus,⁵¹⁹ and the acquittal would have put Cleombrotus, who had previously proven himself ambivalent in the implementation of Agesilaus' policy of aggression towards Thebes, in Agesilaus' debt.⁵²⁰ Cartledge even suggests that the relationship between Archidamus and Cleonymus was set-up by Agesilaus to begin with as a means of opening lines of communication with Cleombrotus' faction, in the hopes of providing such political opportunities as the advantage gained by Agesilaus in the outcome of this episode.⁵²¹ Thus, it is unlikely that the appeal of his son was the only significant factor in Agesilaus' decision to promote the

⁵¹³ Hodkinson (2007), 57. Hodkinson discusses the standards of extremely modest and respectful behaviour expected of youths of Cleonymus' age.

⁵¹⁴ *X. Hell.* 5.4.24.

⁵¹⁵ *X. Hell.* 5.4. 20-33. On which see Tuplin (1993), 126-7.

⁵¹⁶ Tuplin (1993), 127.

⁵¹⁷ *X. Hell.* 5.4.27.

⁵¹⁸ De Ste. Croix (1972a), 75-6; Hodkinson (1983), 128-9; Cartledge (2001), 105. Hodkinson (2000), 35-6, and (2007), 47-53, suggests that the entire episode, and especially Agesilaus' interaction with those who came to petition him during his morning perambulations is indicative of an extensive system of patronage evident in Sparta's social and political spheres.

⁵¹⁹ *X. Hell.* 5.4.25.

⁵²⁰ Cartledge (1987), 37.

⁵²¹ Cartledge (1987), 147 and (2001), 104-5. See also Humble (1997), 147-8 and Hodkinson (2007), 55.

acquittal of Sphodrias, nonetheless, in terms of content, the episode is to a large extent dominated by the pederastic relationship. That Xenophon alludes to the idea that Agesilaus intended to convict before discussing the matter with his son does suggest that Xenophon wished to portray Archidamus' and Cleonymus' relationship as playing a role in the ultimate decision. Tuplin asserts that Xenophon's relation of the affiliation between Archidamus and Cleonymus specifically within the context of the Sphodrias episode was done in a deliberate attempt to portray the content of the entire incident as tinged with undertones of the homosexual element, and thus heighten the reader's understanding of its outrage by pandering to Athenians' distaste towards their perceived notions of Spartan homosexual relationships.⁵²² In this light, although the relationship between Archidamus and Cleonymus may have been honourable in terms of Spartan ideology, Xenophon presents it as being negative in a different way: the overall respectability of the relationship is eclipsed by the disastrous events for which it was presented as being (at least partially) responsible.

In short, therefore, there appears to be a correlation drawn between the homosexual activities of Spartan men and their character, especially with regard to military and political competence, which suggests that one measure of a man worthy of commanding positions lies in not allowing himself to be mastered by excess (sexual or otherwise) in his same-sex relationships. The difficulty, however, is to know whether this idea is particularly reflective of Spartan attitudes, or if it is more characteristic of Xenophon's own opinions on the matter and is considered to be a more universal standard of morality.⁵²³ Hindley, for example, suggests that the notion that sexual self-control was a necessary attribute is one stressed by Xenophon throughout his historical

⁵²² Tuplin (1993), 127.

⁵²³ The pattern of immoderate same-sex relationships being indicative of character failings in other areas is especially prominent amongst Spartan figures in the *Hellenica*, but we are not provided by Xenophon with Spartan opinion of these men's sexual conduct relative to their overall character. Most often Xenophon employs a subtle and ironic method, and manipulates his presentation in such a way so as to allow the facts to speak for themselves. See Higgins (1977), 12; Tuplin (1993), 77. See also Tuplin (1993), esp. 36-41, 163-8 on the rarity of programmatic comments in the *Hellenica* and elsewhere, and the techniques employed by Xenophon to convey his didactic purposes. Also see Krentz (1989), 156 on 1.6.33 for a description of this technique in the death of Callicratidas. Contra Gray (1989), who argues that by utilizing stylistic elements employed by Herodotus in episodes, as well as appealing to well-known contemporary values, Xenophon clearly leads his readers to the desired moral lessons throughout the narrative. See also Humble (forthcoming).

and philosophical works, not just for Spartans but for all those in positions of military command.⁵²⁴

One final point of interest on the matter is worth noting. In those instances in which Spartan *sexual* conduct was strongly suggested to be an element in the episode, the sexual activity was conducted with non-Spartans.⁵²⁵ Contrariwise, in the cases of Anaxibius and his *paidika*, and Archidamus and Cleonymus, there is nothing explicitly sexual about their relationships, as related by Xenophon, which could suggest that these pederastic relationships between Spartiates did conform to Lycurgan ideals.⁵²⁶ These relationships are still expressed in an ambiguous way as far as their implications, for their members and for society at large, are concerned. But the fact that possible sexual aspects are alluded to more forcefully in relationships in which one member was non-Spartan, could suggest that Xenophon is revealing differing attitudes in Spartan pederastic ideology with regards to what sexual behaviour was seen as acceptable for men of citizen status to engage in with one another, versus what a Spartiate could do with non-citizen males.

⁵²⁴ Hindley (1994), 348-9, 361; Hindley (1999a), 77, 81, 85, 87, Hindley (1999b), 125-8. This idea can be seen in Xenophon's account of Menon in the *Anabasis* (2.6.29-9). Menon was not a Spartan, but in the account of his disgraceful death and assessment of his character, Xenophon highlights his homosexual exploits (with special emphasis on the deviant in recounting the rumour that Menon was said to have been the *erastes* of a bearded man while still a youth himself) as attributing to his reprehensible character in a way that is very reminiscent of the treatment of the Thibron and Anaxibius in the *Hellenica*.

⁵²⁵ Thersander was named a "Lacedaemonian *imitator*" (λακωνιζων), meaning that he was not Lacedaemonian himself (X. *Hell.* 4.8.18), and we are told that the boy Alcetas occupied himself with was from Oreus (X. Discourse factors significantly into an examination of Spartan masculinity in the *Hellenica*, on both an individual level and a broader political stage. To illustrate these ideas, this section will focus primarily on the depiction of Spartan harmosts, the role of masculinity ideology in the trial of Sphodrias, and Callicratidas' employment of ideals which the Spartan system sought to implant in her men in order to secure a command which was threatened by the actions of his predecessor. *Hell.* 5.4.57).

⁵²⁶ Admittedly, there is no evidence to confirm or refute a sexual element in the relationship between Archidamus and Cleonymus, and some have seen this relationship as an example of the Lycurgan ideal. Conversely, a number of scholars assert that officially sanctioned Spartan pederastic relationships, did have a sexual element (see Tuplin [1993], 126-30; Hindley [1994], 361; Ogden [1996], 118; Hindley [1999], 80; Cartledge [2001], 86-7, 94-7; Powell [2001], 28; Percy [2005], 37, Scanlon [2005], 66; Ducat [2006a], 11-2, 166).

4.3 Discourse

As with many aspects of Spartan life, the ideology of Spartan manhood stressed appearance and failed to instill any virtues which were more than surface-deep.⁵²⁷ Therefore, when the Spartan sphere of influence moved beyond the Peloponnese and the level of supervision previously maintained was no longer possible, the system contained no provision to prevent the corruption of its subjects.⁵²⁸ In fact, the effect of corruption was ironically magnified by the very system that sought to suppress it by the psychological effect that a regimen of excessive repression of a thing causes the desire for that very thing to become all the stronger.⁵²⁹ Problems with the type of man produced by the Lycurgan system are present throughout the *Hellenica* and the *Anabasis*. In the *Lac.* Xenophon alleges that it is the immoderate Spartan preoccupation with wealth and glory over honourable conduct which led them to much of their current corruption, such as their tyrannical behavior as harmosts,⁵³⁰ and the record in Xenophon's historical writings attests allegations of the dangers present in the character of the Spartan man when abroad as these individuals. Separated from the supervision integral to the Spartan system, they were given the freedom to be corrupt, which they embraced wholeheartedly.⁵³¹ Xenophon's depictions of harmosts in the *Hellenica* and *Anabasis* were far from flattering,⁵³² and even the *Agesilaus* records disreputable practices of Spartan harmosts.⁵³³ And the behavior of Spartan harmosts was a major point which aided in stirring those under Spartan hegemony to rebel against it.⁵³⁴ The problems that exist within the Spartan character abroad are particularly typified in the figures of Phoebidas

⁵²⁷ Humble (2004), 222. See also pp. 78-81 for the focus on appearance inherent in Spartan masculinity ideology.

⁵²⁸ Higgins (1977), 67-9; Humble (2004), 225. For additional comments on the incompatibility of the Spartan system with the political position in which Sparta found itself following the defeat of Athens, see Parke (1930), 77; Smith (1954), 287; Higgins (1977), 67; Cartledge (1987), 405; Tuplin (1993), 165.

⁵²⁹ Humble (2004), 225.

⁵³⁰ X. *Lac.* 14.1-7.

⁵³¹ Humble (2004), 223.

⁵³² Humble (2004), 220. See also Humble (1997), 93-106, for detailed analysis of the character and behaviour of Spartan harmosts in Xenophon's *Anabasis*, in which the harmosts Anaxibius and Aristarchus are represented as greedy, corrupt, susceptible to flattery and manipulation, and often foolish in their actions; a depiction that conforms with Xenophon's characterization of Phoebidas and Sphodrias in the *Hellenica* (see p. 97 below). See Humble (1997), 233-4, for discussion of how character traits, exhibited by harmosts, can be seen as directly resulting from the structure of the Spartan system and the ideology it sought to encourage in its men.

⁵³³ X. *Ages.* 1.17-19; Hodkinson (2000), 427.

⁵³⁴ X. *Hell.* 3.5.10-15.

and Sphodrias. When left to their own devices, Xenophon shows these individuals to be not particularly clever thinkers, weak-willed, susceptible to flattery and bribery, and willing to subvert state interests and even the laws of piety if to do so would afford them personal gain or glory.⁵³⁵ This characterization is represented as the end result of a system which seeks to promote obedience over free-thinking, superficial performative displays of virtue over internalization of virtue, and an prodigious sense of antagonistic competition with one's countrymen (at the expense of every other virtue) as the method by which to attain the highest masculine glory.

That the issues these individuals have abroad can be tied to a character which is archetypal of Spartan males is especially stressed in the case of Sphodrias. Regardless of the real reasons for his acquittal, the official line given by Agesilaus in his endorsement for Sphodrias' exoneration was that because "as a boy, an adolescent and a youth he did and accomplished every fine thing, it is difficult to execute such a man, because Sparta has need for such soldiers".⁵³⁶ And while Tuplin remarks that a cynic might comment that if Sparta "really needed such corrupt incompetents as Sphodrias, she must be in a very bad way indeed",⁵³⁷ Cartledge's view is probably more to the point that the newly indebted, and therefore malleable, Sphodrias was the type of man that Agesilaus personally (rather than Sparta) needed.⁵³⁸ The point, however, is that, in order to cover what were undoubtedly his real reasons for desiring Sphodrias' acquittal, Agesilaus chose the ideology of masculinity as the party-line for the difficulty in executing Sphodrias.⁵³⁹ Agesilaus based his disinclination to execute Sphodrias on the accused's demonstration of superior performance throughout his formative education—a time of life in which internalizing and performing societal ideals of Spartan manhood was a particular focus. Hodkinson argues that Agesilaus' comments about Sphodrias' upbringing suggest that performance during this stage of life was of considerable import to a man's later reputation and influence.⁵⁴⁰ Agesilaus' line of reasoning suggests that Sphodrias'

⁵³⁵ X. *Hell.* 5.2.25-8, 5.4.1, 5.4.20-4; Tuplin (1993), 126.

⁵³⁶ X. *Hell.* 5.4.32: *παῖς τε ὄν και παιδίσκος και ἡβῶν πάντα τὰ καλὰ ποιῶν διετέλεσε, χαλεπὸν εἶναι τοιοῦτον ἄνδρα ἀποκτιννύναι: τὴν γὰρ Σπάρτην τοιούτων δεῖσθαι στρατιωτῶν.*

⁵³⁷ Tuplin (1993), 127.

⁵³⁸ Cartledge (2003a), 224. See also Cartledge (2001), 104-5.

⁵³⁹ Dillery (1995), 218, 233-4 notes the similarities between the cases of Phoebidas and Sphodrias and Agesilaus' choice of expedient rather than just action.

⁵⁴⁰ Hodkinson (2007), 54-5.

demonstration of commitment to ideals of masculine excellence internal to Sparta should be viewed as sufficient to mitigate those qualities which caused him to act in an externally detrimental way. But even if Agesilaus' appeal to masculine ideology was merely empty rhetoric, this is telling in and of itself. Rhetoric is useful in politics to cover true motives only if it has a considerable level of mass appeal. While the faction of Cleombrotus may have been already inclined to acquit, and Agesilaus' supporters may have been expected to align their votes in accordance to Agesilaus' opinion, regardless of its motivation,⁵⁴¹ Xenophon relates the existence of a sizable unaligned group, who would be very much in need of convincing if they were to vote against the execution of one who had so obviously harmed Spartan national interests.⁵⁴² That Agesilaus chose to use particularly the ideology of masculinity to make his desire for the acquittal of Sphodrias palatable, suggests the importance of such ideology in the hierarchy of Spartan values, thus making rhetoric of masculinity a useful political tool.

Moreover, the entire episode was framed in such a way to downplay the actualities of the political situation, and to stress masculine ideals. After relating the opinion held by many (of which Xenophon was undoubtedly one)⁵⁴³ of the injustice of Sphodrias' acquittal, Xenophon relates the manner in which it came to be,⁵⁴⁴ stressing ideological considerations over those of politics or justice. In addition to the masculine excellence of Sphodrias himself, the episode serves to highlight filial bonds, and honorable conduct in personal relationships.⁵⁴⁵ As mentioned, the relationship between Archidamus and Cleonymus framed the discussion of Sphodrias acquittal.⁵⁴⁶ Cleonymus' request was represented as being made out of filial devotion to his father;⁵⁴⁷ the interaction between Archidamus and Cleonymus, likewise indicates their intimate bond,

⁵⁴¹ Gray (1981), 328; Hodkinson (2007), 50.

⁵⁴² *X. Hell.* 5.4.25.

⁵⁴³ Tuplin (1993), 126, and Humble (1997), 147-8, assert that it was Xenophon's intention to relate through his narrative both that the acquittal of Sphodrias was unjust, and that it was unwise with respect to Spartan interests. This would suggest that Xenophon was one of the "many" who disapproved of the Spartan decision in this matter. See also Parker (2007), 23, who views the episode as being constructed in such a way to serve Xenophon's literary purpose to illustrate a moral lesson by the way in which the Spartans were brought down single-handedly by the Thebans, whom they had wronged.

⁵⁴⁴ *X. Hell.* 5.4.24.

⁵⁴⁵ Dillery (1995), 233-4.

⁵⁴⁶ See p. 94.

⁵⁴⁷ Hodkinson (2007), 59. The closeness between father and son is seen as emphasised by contrast to the apparent coolness in the relationship of Archidamus and Agesilaus

as well as Archidamus' high-minded concern for his *eromenos*.⁵⁴⁸ Despite what Athenian readers may have thought of such associations, Xenophon expressed this kind of relationship in Sparta as being integral to the formation of Spartiate men. Thus, Archidamus' efforts with his father are shown as being enacted out of concern for a type of relationship which Xenophon asserted was highly valued in Sparta.⁵⁴⁹ The result of Archidamus' intervention on his beloved's behalf, which is expressed immediately following the relation of Sphodrias acquittal, is also framed in relation to masculine excellence, as Cleonymus is depicted as bringing masculine honour to himself and Archidamus by his heroic performance at Leuctra.⁵⁵⁰ This framing of the episode, along with Agesilaus' use of ideology in his consideration of Sphodrias, can therefore be seen to show the utility of the ethos of Spartan masculinity, both on a personal and a national level, as an ideological tool employed to influence real-world politics.

Another episode in which the ideology associated with Spartan manhood can be seen to be in play is in the struggle between the incoming and outgoing Spartan admirals, Callicratidas and Lysander. Xenophon clearly meant for readers to view Lysander and Callicratidas as foils for one another,⁵⁵¹ but there is considerable disagreement about who Xenophon favours.⁵⁵² The prevalent conclusion is that Callicratidas is to be viewed as more traditionally Spartan in his character, whereas Lysander is portrayed as atypical,⁵⁵³ so much so that some argue that Lysander is of the same sort as Brasidas.⁵⁵⁴ I would argue that one of the determining factors in this opinion is Callicratidas' discursive

⁵⁴⁸ Hodkinson (2007), 57-8.

⁵⁴⁹ X. *Lac.* 2.13.

⁵⁵⁰ Hodkinson (2007), 62, asserts that the heroic hue of Xenophon's depiction of Cleonymus' death in battle is highlighted by the correspondence it bears to Tyrtaeus' description of the Spartan warrior who dies for his country, and is further emphasised by the historical context of Leuctra, as there is an implicit contrast made between Cleonymus and many others whose conduct would not have brought honour to their *erastai*. Dillery (1995), 234, argues that the deliberate juxtaposition of Cleonymus at Leuctra with the acquittal of his father serves to emphasize the point that the ideological bonds of friendship prevail while the city is ruined.

⁵⁵¹ Roisman (1987b), 33; Krentz (1989), 145 on 1.6.1-15; Moles (1994), 72; Laforce (1997), 201-2.

⁵⁵² For arguments in favour of Xenophon holding a positive view of Callicratidas, see: Roisman (1987b), 33; Moles (1994); Laforce (1997). For a negative or ambiguous view see Gray (1989); Krentz (1989); Humble (1997); Kennell (2010), 126-7. For positive views of Lysander see Gray (1989); Krentz (1989); Humble (1997), although Humble argues that Lyander was ambiguous in some respects. For negative views see Moles (1994); Laforce (1997).

⁵⁵³ Proietti (1987), 109; Moles (1994), 72-4, 83; Kennell (2010), 126. Contra Humble (1997), 115, who argues that the character traits exhibited by Lysander can be understood as the reasonable products of the Spartan system.

⁵⁵⁴ Wassermann (1964), 292; Brunt (1965), 275-6.

utilization of concepts related to the ethos of Spartan masculinity.⁵⁵⁵ When Callicratidas replaced Lysander as *nauarch*, the latter did not make the transition easy.⁵⁵⁶ Lysander handed over the command with an insulting boast aimed at asserting his own superiority and goading his opponent.⁵⁵⁷ His supporters were insubordinate and uncooperative, and slandered Callicratidas to the allies, calling into question his competence.⁵⁵⁸ Lysander returned the funds Cyrus had given him,⁵⁵⁹ and likely made arrangements for Callicratidas to have difficulty in securing additional Persian funds,⁵⁶⁰ hampering his ability to secure resources essential to the war effort.⁵⁶¹ Facing this, Callicratidas (unlike Lysander, who stressed his perceived personal superiority) is presented as shoring up his command through discursive ideological appeals in his speeches.

In his first recorded speech Callicratidas calls together the Lacedaemonians present and delivered an insurrection-quelling message firmly rooted within the Spartan masculine ethos.⁵⁶² Callicratidas begins saying that he would be just as glad to remain at home, and is willing to hand over command to anyone who thought himself more capable. He then reminds those assembled that it was not by his own personal choice, but by the will of Sparta that he held his position, and it was thus his duty to Sparta to command the force as best he was able. He finishes by asking the Lacedaemonians

⁵⁵⁵ I am not necessarily in agreement with the view of Callicratidas as “more Spartan” than Lysander, but I seek to argue that his tactical appeal to characteristically Spartan masculine ideals could make him appear so. Humble (1997), 115, argued persuasively that Lysander’s character and actions can be seen as directly resulting from the traditional Spartan system and upbringing. Certainly there are indications that Lysander also manipulated the ideology of the system to effect personal advantage (if true, Plutarch’s account of Agesilaus’ succession [Plut. *Ages.* 3.3-4.1] would be a prime example). This discussion will focus mainly on the character of Callicratidas, as his discourse falls more clearly within the scope of this examination, but the interaction between the character of Lysander and Spartan masculinity ideology—particularly within the context of the effect of competition in the lives of Spartan masculine subjects—is an area worthy of future expansion.

⁵⁵⁶ Laforse (1997), 201-3, argues that Lysander did everything in his power to prevent Callicratidas’ command from being successful.

⁵⁵⁷ X. *Hell.* 1.6.2, Moles (1994), 71-2; Laforse (1997), 203-8.

⁵⁵⁸ X. *Hell.* 1.6.4; Laforse (1997), 208-9.

⁵⁵⁹ X. *Hell.* 1.6.10.

⁵⁶⁰ Laforse (1997), 208.

⁵⁶¹ Gray (1989), 24; Moles (1994), 73. Gray, especially sees Callicratidas’ behaviour, in refusing to take “criticism” from the supporters of Lysander, and reacting excessively to perceived slight to his honour in his dealings with Cyrus, as being harmful to the war effort. Contra Laforse (1997) who views the actions of Lysander, in making it difficult for anyone who would seek to step into the role of *nauarch* after him, as being those which truly harmed the Spartan cause.

⁵⁶² Callicratidas’ addressing the Lacedaemonians first is significant both because the chief agitators were most likely among them, and because a Lacedaemonian audience would likely be most responsive to Callicratidas’ ideological tactics.

whether they would have him remain in command or return to Sparta and report the state of affairs.⁵⁶³ In this speech Callicratidas establishes himself as a “stay-at-home” Spartan man.⁵⁶⁴ This self-presentation serves to align Callicratidas with officially propagated ideology which demanded respect and emulation. In his appeal to the authority of the state Callicratidas displays his own obedience to Sparta, and presents himself as the embodiment of state authority,⁵⁶⁵ necessitating an obedient response on the part of the Spartans present, as such obedience was a prime precept the Spartan upbringing sought to instill as a condition of honorable Spartan manhood.⁵⁶⁶ Finally, in putting the question to those gathered as to whether he should stay (with the understanding that this would be the end to any insubordination), or go home and inform the authorities why he left, Callicratidas appeals to ideological cues on two ways. First he holds forth a veiled threat: intimidation would likely have been particularly effective in quelling insubordination of the Spartiates among the Lacedaemonian troops, as the Lycurgan system employed fear of punishment to keep citizens in line and promoted the creation of men who would respond constructively to these tactics.⁵⁶⁷ Secondly, he does not limit his use of ideology to his own discourse alone, but requires his audience to perform their commitment to the Spartan ideals, in their active agreement to submit to his command as representative of state authority. Callicratidas’ personal expression in this episode is so much in accordance with established Spartan ideology that Prioretti states that, “it would be hard to conceive of a more classic portrait of a Spartan than the one Xenophon provides of Callicratidas in this chapter.”⁵⁶⁸

After Callicratidas’ unsuccessful attempt to attain funds from Cyrus, he does successfully secured funds from the Milesians. The speech, by which Callicratidas secured funds, once again hinges heavily on ideology, particularly of a pan-Hellenic and anti-barbarian nature.⁵⁶⁹ I would argue that, in addition to the ideology of pan-Hellenism, hegemonic masculine ideology is explicit in Callicratidas’ speech to the Milesians. In the beginning of the speech Callicratidas again stresses his obedience to Spartan home

⁵⁶³ X. *Hell.* 1.6.5.

⁵⁶⁴ Moles (1994), 74.

⁵⁶⁵ Roisman (1987b), 25-6; Laforse (1997), 210.

⁵⁶⁶ See pp. 74-5, 97.

⁵⁶⁷ Roisman (1987b), 23-4.

⁵⁶⁸ Prioretti (1987), 12.

⁵⁶⁹ Much examined by scholars: e.g. Roisman (1987b), Krentz (1989), Moles (1994); Laforse (1997).

authority.⁵⁷⁰ Callicratidas' reference to Spartan authority sets Sparta's desires, personified in himself, in the prosecution of the war effort as an ideal of masculine conduct to be emulated. Callicratidas' mention of barbarians in his justification for why the Milesians should zealously throw their support behind Sparta's efforts introduces the barbarians as an anti-ideal. Thus, Callicratidas invites the Milesians, through their support, to identify themselves with Sparta, the ideal; he implies that failure to do so will relegate them to identification with the barbarians, presented as an inferior category of men. This polarity of identification is also expressed in Callicratidas' contrast of Lysander, whom he presents as willing to pander to Cyrus and harm the war effort for the sake of a barbarian, with himself, who he presents as traditionally Greek in his extreme unwillingness to court favor with Cyrus in order to achieve financial gains.⁵⁷¹ To ensure the full effect of his rhetoric, Xenophon suggests that Callicratidas' once again made use of a certain level of intimidation in his dealings with the Milesians, evidenced by their fearful response.⁵⁷² Callicratidas' discursive use of ideological precepts is effective, and he gains the desired funds.

The strength of the hegemonic masculine ideal as a reference point for collective self-identification is illustrated by the continued discursive efficacy of the ideology in spite of instances which revealed it to be nothing more than blatant rhetoric.⁵⁷³ It has been suggested that Xenophon admired Callicratidas' pan-Hellenic ideals,⁵⁷⁴ but there is reason to doubt the authenticity of his anti-barbarian sentiments.⁵⁷⁵ Xenophon's description of the origin of Callicratidas' anti-barbarian attitudes: demanding pay from Cyrus for the sailors, and storming off, uttering threats when he did not immediately

⁵⁷⁰ X. *Hell.* 1.6.8.

⁵⁷¹ Moles (1994), 77-8.

⁵⁷² Despite claims made by Moles (1994), 74, 76-7, that there is no evidence that Callicratidas threatened either group (the insubordinate Lacedaemonian troops, or the Milesians), the fact that in the former example "no one dared to say anything other than that he should obey the commands from those at home" (X. *Hell.* 1.6.6), and in the latter we are told that the Milesians were so eager to support the cause because they were in fear (X. *Hell.* 1.6.12), implies a certain level of intimidation.

⁵⁷³ Higgins (1977), 12 argues that Xenophon displays, throughout his treatment of Callicratidas', the inconsistency of Callicratidas' words and actions. Contra Moles (1994), 76.

⁵⁷⁴ Moles (1994), 75-6.

⁵⁷⁵ Roisman (1987b), 33; Laforse (1997), 196, raised the very valid point that, if Callicratidas was as ardently anti-barbarian as he later professed, then why did he attempt to secure funding from Cyrus to begin with, and accept Persian money later on (X. *Hell.* 1.6.18).

receive it, is not particularly flattering.⁵⁷⁶ His treatment of Athenian prisoners, selling them into slavery a mere day after declaring that no Greek would be enslaved if he was able to prevent it, likewise gives a false ring to his rhetoric.⁵⁷⁷ But in spite of all of this, Callicratidas' discourse continued to be effective.

Finally, the utility of the ideology is further highlighted if one considers it to be the primary vehicle by which Callicratidas retained his command in spite of his comparative inferiority as *nauarch*. A number of scholars note that, despite ambiguity associated with Lysander's character and policy, Xenophon, treats him fairly favorably, arguably more so than Callicratidas.⁵⁷⁸ In asking for an increase of pay for the sailors in lieu of a personal favor when offered one by Cyrus Lysander shows himself as willing to put the needs of his men above his own, whereas Callicratidas' impatience and subsequent pique, which gave rise to his anti-Barbarian sentiment, show him to be volatile and self-serving.⁵⁷⁹ And while Callicratidas' noble (if vainglorious) proclivity towards fighting to the death at Arginusae fits nicely within the Spartan ethos,⁵⁸⁰ it was the practicality shown by Lysander, in such episodes as his refusal to engage a superior force after Notium,⁵⁸¹ that seemed to meet with Xenophon's approval, as Callicratidas' attitude is shown to lead to his ignominious death.⁵⁸² Thus, in many ways, Lysander is

⁵⁷⁶ X. *Hell.* 1.6.6-7. Laforse (1997), 196, argues that the circumstances of this episode are a mark against the idea that Callicratidas' anti-barbarian statements should be taken as sober policy.

⁵⁷⁷ Xen, *Hell.* 1.6.14-5; Higgins (1977), 10-2; Roisman (1987b), 32-3; Krentz (1989), 148 on 1.6.14. Laforse (1997), 212, points out that the premise of Callicratidas' pan-Hellenic rhetoric, proving the superiority of Greeks over the barbarians by winning a war against other Greeks, was fundamentally illogical.

⁵⁷⁸ Prentice (1934), 37; Higgins (1977), 10-1; Krentz (1989), 145 on 1.6.1-15, 147 on 1.6.6; Moles (1994) 83; Humble (1997) 111. Contra Moles (1994), 83; and Laforse (1997), 198-9, 201-2, 206-7, who argues that Callicratidas comes out ahead in the comparison, both in regards to his personal conduct and military efficacy.

⁵⁷⁹ Krentz (1989), 136 on 1.5.6.

⁵⁸⁰ Humble (1997), 112.

⁵⁸¹ X. *Hell.* 1.5.15.

⁵⁸² Krentz (1989), 156 on 1.6.32-3; Moles (1994), 81-2; Humble (1997). Strassler (ed.) (2009), 31, note 1.6.32c also suggests that Callicratidas' response to the sound counsel that retreat would be advisable as the Spartan fleet was greatly outnumbered with "Sparta would conduct herself no worse if he died, but flight is shameful" (ἡ Σπάρτη †οὐδὲν μὴ κάκιον οἰκεῖται† αὐτοῦ ἀποθανόντος, φεύγειν δὲ αἰσχρὸν ἔφη εἶναι.) (X. *Hell.* 1.6.32) should be contrasted with Th. 8.27.2 where an Athenian commander said that he would never allow fear of disgrace to drive him to unreasonable risk, as flight is not shameful, rather it is shameful to be defeated and expose city to danger. Such comparison makes Callicratidas' priority of honour over practicality appear foolhardy, especially since his sentiments are followed immediately by his unimpressive death (X. *Hell.* 1.6.33).

portrayed by Xenophon as an excellent commander,⁵⁸³ regardless of other possibly negative character traits he may possess.⁵⁸⁴ Yet, despite Callicratidas' evident failings as a leader, Callicratidas maintained his authority, and the primary vehicle through which he is shown to do so is his discursive use of ideology in his speeches.⁵⁸⁵

4.4 Relations Between Men and Hegemonic Masculinity

Perhaps the best information Xenophon provides concerning hegemony within the Spartan system in his *Hellenica* is contained within the account of the conspiracy of Cinadon. In this episode, Xenophon reveals the ideology of masculine hegemony between the Spartiate class and the various sub-classes in the Spartan political system, and provides a number of valuable insights into the operation of hierarchy within the system. Firstly, if Xenophon relates competition between members of the *homoioi* for masculine hegemony within that class in the *Lac.*, in the conspiracy of Cinadon, he demonstrated that the *homoioi* represented a small minority who, as a class, occupied the hegemonic ideal within Sparta's larger societal structure. The unnamed informer in the episode relates that Cinadon bid him to count how many Spartiates versus "allies", that is non-Spartiates, there happened to be in the Spartan agora on a given day. The resultant tally of "around forty" to "over four thousand", respectively, implies that even in the heart of Sparta herself, those who were members of the Spartiate class made up only about one percent.⁵⁸⁶ Despite the existence of disparities in wealth and status amongst members of the *homoioi* and the fierce competition within the *homoioi* class for ultimate hegemonic positions, this episode places emphasis on the importance for the *homoioi* of maintaining a unified front within the wider Spartan societal structure to preserve their hegemony over the majority below them.⁵⁸⁷

Secondly, Xenophon reports that Cinadon was not one of the Spartan *homoioi*, but at the same time he notes that Cinadon is not deficient in terms of physical ability or the

⁵⁸³ Krentz (1989), 175. See also Humble (1997), 111-3, 115-8, who does not go as far as claiming Lysander was an ideal commander in Xenophon's view, but asserts that Xenophon viewed him as at least a capable one.

⁵⁸⁴ Moles (1994), 83. See also Laforse (1997), 212, who asserts that it is not possible to positively spin Lysander's willingness to put personal glory ahead of the war effort by returning money to Cyrus.

⁵⁸⁵ Laforse (1997), 210.

⁵⁸⁶ X. *Hell.* 3.3.5, though the number is likely exaggerated for effect.

⁵⁸⁷ Understanding, as Powell (2001), 102-3, puts it that elite members of the *homoioi* class constituted "an oligarchy within an oligarchy".

approved manner of comportment.⁵⁸⁸ Therefore, Cinadon must have been excluded from the *homoioi* for some other failing, which unfortunately Xenophon does not relate.⁵⁸⁹ What is suggested is that, were personal ability and conformity to approved codes of masculine conduct the sole necessities, Cinadon should have been guaranteed a hegemonic position within the Spartan system. This highlights the idea that, as with all hegemonic systems, orthodox self-presentation was not the sole determinant of position on the hegemonic ladder.⁵⁹⁰ Therefore, although Xenophon presents Cinadon as impressively exhibiting the qualities of the hegemonic ideal which were within his personal control, he evidently lacked some requirement which lay outside embodiment of societal ideals. Thus, he was relegated to the position of “inferior” Spartan despite his presentation of orthodox Spartan masculinity.

The most common suggestion put forth by scholars for why Cinadon came to be in the position of an inferior is impoverishment.⁵⁹¹ If this was the case, economic status would serve as a classic example of a quality required to attain hegemonic status that cannot be achieved through orthodox masculine performance. Gish, in particular, suggests that Xenophon deliberately juxtaposes Cinadon’s personal excellence with his non-*homoioi* status in order to highlight the injustice of his societal position.⁵⁹² This injustice was apparently felt by Cinadon as well, and was strong enough for him to risk his not-insignificant position, and significantly more, in an attempt to better his standing.⁵⁹³

⁵⁸⁸ X. *Hell.* 3.3.5: οὗτος δ’ ἦν καὶ τὸ εἶδος νεανίσκος καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν εὐρωστος, οὐ μέντοι τῶν ὁμοίων” (This was a young man, of strong body and spirit, but not one of the *homoioi*).

⁵⁸⁹ Prominent scholarly thought concerning the likely reason for Cinadon’s “inferior” status will be discussed later.

⁵⁹⁰ As mentioned, the achievement of hegemonic masculinity is partially dependent upon possession of a number of subjectivities (including, for example, class, race, age and economic status) over which one has no control (see Connell [2005], 79; Howson [2006], 65; Dowd [2010], 29; Atkinson [2011], 33).

⁵⁹¹ David (1979), 245-7; Cartledge (1987), 170, 355, and (2003), 211 (although in this work Cartledge also suggests the possibility that Cinadon was a Spartan of mixed birth).

⁵⁹² Gish (2009), 352-5.

⁵⁹³ There has been much discussion as to Cinadon’s exact aims. Oliva (1971), 193, alleges that it was “clear” that Cinadon intended to unite the Spartan sub-classes. Hooker (1989), 126-7, believes that Xenophon presents Cinadon, not as just an ambitious Spartan, but as spokesman for all non-*homoioi* classes in the Spartan state. David (1979), 253-4, believes that, whatever the long term goals may have been, the immediate object was to murder as many members of the *homoioi* class as possible. Hamilton (1987), 38, imagines that Cinadon’s objective was to “introduce radical changes to the nature of the Spartan polity”, but does not imagine that he desired that all the societal elements involved in the conspiracy should be elevated beyond “inferior” status. However a number of scholars (see Cawkwell [1983], 246; Flower [1991], 94-5; Tuplin [1993], 52) have seen an eminently Spartan ambition as Cinadon’s prime motivating

Hegemonic systems seek to incorporate those possessing orthodox masculinities within the hierarchy in such a way that become complicit in maintaining the status quo. In light of this, the extreme disaffection felt by Cinadon could point to a break-down in the proper functioning of the system. If Cinadon was demoted due to impoverishment, could be indicative of economic standing taking on a role in the ideology of hegemonic Spartan masculinity which disrupted the functioning of that system.⁵⁹⁴ The economically disenfranchised constituted a group which potentially posed a greater threat to the Spartan system than other subordinated groups such as the *perioikoi* or helots, as disgruntled former Spartiates could give leadership to the various disaffected segments of the population.⁵⁹⁵ Examining the case of Cinadon as a failure in the hegemonic subordination of orthodox masculinities gives weight to these ideas. As discussed earlier, the Spartan system had measures to ensure that those it subordinated felt their position to be deserved.⁵⁹⁶ In the case of Cinadon there is no indication of measures in place to make him feel his demotion was right. Conversely, the behaviour of Cinadon himself is indicative that, unlike those cowed for personal failings, Spartan masculinity ideology actually served to strengthen feelings that his subordinated status was undeserved. And, whereas in other cases of demotion there may have been hope of restoration to coveted hierarchical positions through excellent personal conduct,⁵⁹⁷ demotion due to poverty could have contributed to insurrectionist leanings by engendering feelings of hopelessness. The episode suggests that the system imbued Cinadon with ideology that

factor, and see personal advancement rather than a complete obliteration of the current system as the aim of the conspiracy. Indeed Gish (2009), 355-6, expresses severe doubts as to Cinadon's intention to abolish class distinctions, noting that the informer's claim that he did not even intend to properly arm those whose societal position had not earned them a place in the army (and the arms that came with it), and suggesting that a simple recognition of Cinadon as a rightful member of the *homoioi* would have prevented any thought of insurrection from ever occurring to him.

⁵⁹⁴ David (1979), 241. Although Hodkinson (2000), 436-7, argues that the fact that manifestations of social problems caused by disparity of wealth in the period following the Peloponnesian war were limited to "easily suppressed conspiracies rather than wide-spread popular opposition is clear indication of the helplessness of poor current and former Spartiates in the face of the domination of wealthy elite".

⁵⁹⁵ Cartledge (1987), 170; Whitby (1994), 102-3, 111. Hamilton (1987), 38, sees the seriousness of the plot lying in the fact that it was not a typical helot revolt and included members of other classes such as the *hypomeiones*. Talbert (1989), 35, also argues that the truly alarming fact in the case of Cinadon was the bitterness displayed by Spartan "inferiors", and the potential that they could employ the various underclasses in a large scale solution to personal vendettas, however Talbert sees Spartan apathy in terms of doing anything to reduce this bitterness as proof of their lack of concern that revolt on the part of underclasses could pose any real threat.

⁵⁹⁶ See pp.85-7.

⁵⁹⁷ See pp. 86-7.

caused him to deeply desire a societal position which he could never attain, but that the ideology had no measures in place to reconcile him to this.⁵⁹⁸

In addition to Cinadon's personal societal position, the episode names a number of sub-classes within the Spartan system including: helots, *neodamodeis*, *hypomeiones*, and *perioikoi*,⁵⁹⁹ all of whom occupied differing positions in the Spartan hierarchy and who likewise derived ideological significance from their position relative to the ideal of the Spartiate or *homoioi* class.⁶⁰⁰ We are, admittedly, disadvantaged in trying to discover exactly how ideological social stratification may have functioned because of lack of information about the underclasses in our sources. Thus any attempt to examine the intricacies of the operation of hegemonic masculinity between the Spartiates and underclasses is nearly impossible, and my resultant examination is unfortunately both broad and somewhat speculative. The only fairly safe assumptions to take from the evidence are: a) that there seem to have been measures to create a hegemony which assigned various Spartan sub-classes differing levels of social status; b) that the Spartiate class embodied the hegemonic ideal in a structure designed to ensure the investment of subaltern men in the ideology of the hegemonic group; and c) that, judging from the actions of the underclasses, the hegemony seemed to be fairly effective and stable for some time.

While the episode itself tells us little about the precise systems in place to effectively subordinate subaltern men, there has been considerable scholarly discussion about the methods which may have been employed on the part of the Spartans in order to maintain the hegemonic structure of their societal system, and the resultant attitudes they may have fostered in the various sub-classes. Much of this discussion has focussed on the relationship between Spartans and helots. A prevalent idea has been that the relationship between Spartans and helots was one of unadulterated animosity, with the former

⁵⁹⁸ Admittedly disenfranchisement due to poverty is just one possible interpretation of the scenario, which I followed due to its utility in outlining possible reasons for the hegemonic framework to ideologically reconcile Cinadon to his position, and it is not my intention to imply that there are no possible alternatives. However, regardless of the reasons for Cinadon's demotion, the episode still stands as an example of a breakdown in the efficient functioning of a system of hegemonic masculine ideology, due to the failure to relegate an orthodox masculinity to a position of complicity.

⁵⁹⁹ X. *Hell.* 3.3.6.

⁶⁰⁰ For discussions on the precise definitions of a number of these terms and their possible places within society see Oliva (1971), 59-62, 165-78; MacDowell (1986), 40-50; Cartledge (1987), 28; esp. Hodkinson (1997), 200, 336-403; Shipley (2004), 569-70.

suppressing the latter primarily through violence and terror.⁶⁰¹ However, as Cartledge argued, in light of how greatly outnumbered the Spartiates were by the helots, it is unlikely that they accomplished their prolonged subordination over this segment of society by force alone, and ideological methods must have also been in place to ensure the subordination of the helots.⁶⁰² A number of negative measures have been suggested to account for the helots' relative submission to the system which enslaved them. It has been suggested that helot acceptance of their lot was the result of systematic conditioning on the part of the Spartans inducing them to buy into the notion of their innate inferiority.⁶⁰³ Their reluctance to join with those external and internal opponents to Spartan authority that arose from time to time has been seen as being, in part, due to the state of ignorance in which they were kept by their masters.⁶⁰⁴

There is merit to these ideas, and negative methods of ideological subordination were undoubtedly used to reconcile helots to their subordinate position, especially since such methods were even used within the Spartiate class, as in the case of the penalties imposed upon cowards. However, while proponents of the view that Spartiate-helot relations were exclusively negative take at face value Cinadon's inclusion of the helots in the group of those who wished the Spartiate class nothing but harm, investment in the established hegemonic system by even the helots, who constituted those most oppressed by the Spartiates, can also be seen in many instances. One example being the large number of helots willing to fight with their Spartiate masters in exchange for freedom at

⁶⁰¹ Ste Croix (1972b), 191-3; Oliva (1971), 44-8.

⁶⁰² Cartledge (1991), 381.

⁶⁰³ As mentioned earlier (see p. 50), David (1989), 8-9, (1992), 15, 18 and Vernant (1991), 232, describe the ways in which helots were required to present themselves visually in such a way to reinforce in both their own minds and those of their masters, the inferiority of helots and the divide in status which existed between themselves and their Spartiate masters. Hodkinson (1997), 52, also suggests negative ideological techniques in reinforcing belief in their own inferiority even in the minds of those helots who may have had the most positive relations with Spartans, as he notes that it was likely those helots most closely integrated into the Spartan household who were forcibly intoxicated and required to perform grotesque spectacles at Spartan messes. Luraghi (2003), 123, asserts that the Spartans took care to impose a collective identity of Spartan devising on the helots and were adamant in their opposition of the recognition of a collective Messenian ethnic identity of the helots. The ways in which the helot massacre in Thucydides can be seen as both a violent effort at helot suppression as well as an ideological tool to assert Spartan superiority and helot inferiority has already been discussed (see pp. 49-51).

⁶⁰⁴ Talbert (1989), 29-30, 32. Additionally, Luraghi (2008), 202-3, argues that "the conditions of Helotic dependency" were not conducive to the formation of the Messenian ethnic identity which served as one of the most prominent ideological tools in the resistance of Spartan rule, and attributed the emergence of this vehicle for opposition to the *perioikoi*.

Mantineia, when they could have easily defected to the side of the invaders.⁶⁰⁵ Loyalty such as this cannot be attained by the use of negative methods of subordination alone; willingness of subaltern groups within the Spartan system to step up to Sparta's defense in this time of need displays the considerable appeal of Spartan ideology, as the loyalty of helots in extreme circumstances could suggest that they viewed advancement within the Spartan system to offer something that Sparta's opponents could not.⁶⁰⁶

The very existence of the next sub-class mentioned as allegedly involved in the conspiracy implies that there was some possibility for improvement in position within the Spartan sub-classes, and reveals evidence of a deliberate effort on the part of the Spartan system to provide a positive cause for helot investment in the system.⁶⁰⁷ While a helot would never become a Spartiate, he could potentially gain freedom as well as additional status and privilege, by becoming a *neodamodeis* (literally "new member of the people").⁶⁰⁸ Talbert points out that, despite concern on the part of Spartan officials from

⁶⁰⁵ X. *Hell.* 6.5.28-9; Talbert, (1989), 37; Whitby (1994), 101; Flower (1999), 95.

⁶⁰⁶ Cawkwell (1983), 245-6. I am not, however promoting an excessively positive view of Spartan-helot relations, nor do I suggest that the Spartans viewed the possible dangers associated with helot subjugations as being of little concern (for this view see Talbert [1989]; Whitby [1994]). These views are unsatisfactory as they rest on the assumption that the Spartans being "sufficiently arrogant to believe the myths of their own superiority" (Whitby [1994], 111) would have proved sufficient for their continued supremacy within their social systems and to deny the realities necessary for the subjugation of a large servile population (see Cartledge [1991]). Hodkinson (1997), 52, and (2000), 336, is right to caution that one should not overly romanticize the relationship between Spartiates and helots. However taking the opposite extreme, that the relations between Spartans and helots were entirely dominated by hatred, with Spartans' entire way of life revolving around brutal suppression of the helots (see Ste Croix [1972b], 191-3; Oliva [1971], Powell [2001], 44-8. 99-101, 225-6) is equally unsatisfactory, as it fails to adequately account for episodes which reveal active helot loyalty beyond mere acquiescence to their enslavement. Moderate views, which suggest that Spartans took active concern in helot relations and implemented mechanisms of both suppression and incentive in their efforts of social stratification and subordination (see Cartledge [1987], 355; Flower [1991], 94-6; Hodkinson [1997] and [2007], 54), are the only ones which can account for the evidence in the sources of investment in the Spartan social hierarchy on the part of helots and other underclasses. While not primarily dealing with helots, Fisher (1989), 36, 40-3, makes an excellent argument outlining how relations between Spartiates and members of underclasses may have been characterized via positive and negative methods within the context of the *syssitia*, and suggests that such methods were instrumental in the social situation which caused Cinadon's conspiracy to fail.

⁶⁰⁷ Luraghi (2008), 203, notes that in the evidence for elites among the helots, these are "characterized by a strong integration to the Lakedaimonian identity".

⁶⁰⁸ There is some discussion concerning the precise status of the *neodamodeis*. And while, it may not be possible to discern all of the particulars of their standing within Spartan society, the freedom did not come with full citizen status; see Willets (1954); Oliva (1971), 167-70; David (1979), 249-50; MacDowell (1986), 40-2; Whitby (1994), 98-9; Hamilton (1996), 152; Shipley (1997), 203, and (2004), 570. Cawkwell (1983), 246, suggests that offers of social advancement were one of the ways in which Sparta sought to gain the loyalty and compliance of oppressed sub-classes, and that the emergence of the *neodamodeis* as a class within Spartan society during the Peloponnesian wars shows a deliberate attempt to promote loyalty in this way on the part of the Spartan system. Cartledge (1987), 290, and (2003), 190, too views the

time to time, the track-record for loyalty on the part of the *neodamodeis* was exemplary,⁶⁰⁹ and it can be seen that at least some helots and *neodamodeis* who fought for Sparta seem to have internalized traditional Spartiate ideals.⁶¹⁰ If true, this suggests that Spartan ideological methods of subordination proved fairly successful in assimilation of the helots and the *neodamodeis* to the hegemonic framework.⁶¹¹

There are number of reasons that the next group mentioned, the *perioikoi*, may have had for accepting their position in the Spartan hegemony. Shipley, for instance, persuasively argues that to consider the *perioikoi* as oppressed subjects of the Spartans is fundamentally flawed,⁶¹² because of the shared nationalistic identity of Spartans and *perioikoi* as members of the larger group of Lacedaemonians.⁶¹³ Under this view, the *perioikoi* would have considerable ideological stake in the success and prestige of the Lacedaemonian state. This would go far towards ensuring their continued investment in upholding the hegemonic Spartiate-headed societal structure. Moreover, it has been noted that the high *perioikic* contribution of hoplites to the Lacedaemonian army, as well as mention of the *καλοὶ κάγαθοὶ* (“fine and noble men”) among the *perioikoi*,⁶¹⁴ are evidence of class differences within the *perioikoi*.⁶¹⁵ Hodkinson suggests a concerted effort to assimilate *perioikoi* to Spartan ideology could be seen in the likely inclusion of members of this class among the *trophimoi* (“foster brothers” of the Spartans), as the Spartan fostering system served to integrate fostered *perioikoi* into the *xenia* system which solidified close association with the Spartan central authority and shaped the

promotion of *neodamodeis* as a method employed by the Spartiates to decrease social tension. However Cartledge views it also as being part of a "divide and conquer" strategy, as he asserts that the promotion of its members served to divide the helot population against itself.

⁶⁰⁹ Talbert (1989), 33.

⁶¹⁰ Talbert (1989), 40.

⁶¹¹ Additionally, Luraghi (2002), 229, highlights the state monopoly on manumission, which was only granted for service to the Spartan community. This could point to the efforts on the part of Spartan authorities to ensure possible grants of freedom and social advancement for helots were intertwined with the official ideology of the Spartan state.

⁶¹² Shipley (2006), 52.

⁶¹³ Shipley (1997), 200-5, (2004), 569, (2006), 52, 67-71. See also Cartledge (1987), 177-8. Shipley (1992), 188, argued that if there was any truth to Cinadon's allegations concerning the *perioikoi* it would be indicative of a marked change of attitude, and that the pressing matter would be not to view the system which had prevailed for a considerable time as ineffective, but to ask what had recently changed.

⁶¹⁴ X. *Hell.* 5.3.9.

⁶¹⁵ Oliva (1971), 59-60; Shipley (1992), 187; Shipley (1997), 202. Indeed, certain *perioikic* men held places of considerable importance and esteem within the Spartan system; X. *Hell.* 5.3.9; Oliva (1971), 111; Shipley (1997), 202, and (2006), 70; Hodkinson (2000), 352-3.

positions they would come to hold within their own local power regimes.⁶¹⁶ In terms of masculinity ideology, therefore, members of elite *perioikoi* could thus be seen as the possessors of complicit masculinities—they would not be able to attain all the benefits that would come with full Spartiate citizen status, but their placement in relation to those who did possess the hegemonic status would favorably position them in the hierarchies of their own communities and ensure their continued propagation of orthodox ideologies.⁶¹⁷

Finally, Cinadon's own standing in the Spartan socio-political order also suggests that the position of being one of the "inferiors" (*hypomeiones*) did not automatically exclude one from significant positions and responsibilities within the societal framework. The ephors' trick to capture Cinadon without inciting rebellion (by sending him out with soldiers under the false pretense that he himself was to arrest certain fictitious others in Aulon) demonstrates that Cinadon was familiar with being employed in official state business such as the transport of prisoners.⁶¹⁸ There has been some debate concerning how Cinadon's duties reflect his status,⁶¹⁹ but Gish has argued persuasively that the details of Cinadon's capture suggest that he was able to attain high status even as an "inferior". Gish highlights that Cinadon being sent out on sensitive missions, and also being given command over members of the *hippeis*—Sparta's most elite force—had to have been common occurrence in order not to arouse the suspicion of pretence. Gish believes that this implies that not only did Cinadon's duties encompass those which would not be given to lower segments of the population, such as *perioikoi*, but that he was trusted with matters that would likely not be given to lower-level Spartiates as

⁶¹⁶ Hodkinson (1997), 64-5 and (2000), 353.

⁶¹⁷ Hodkinson (1997), 64-5. Although, if true, the assertion of Luraghi (2008), 197-208, that major incidences of insurrection against Spartan rule among the underclasses (including the conception of the Messenian ethnic identity) should be attributed to the instigation of the *perioikoi*, and that *perioikoic* involvement in these episode has been downplayed as it did not fit into the fabricated Messenian identity, could alter the picture somewhat, and necessitate reassessment of the role of *perioikoi* in the hierarchy of Classical Spartan hegemonic masculinity.

⁶¹⁸ X. *Hell.* 3.3.8-9.

⁶¹⁹ Whitby (1994), 102-3, sees Cinadon's fake mission to Aulon not so much as a reflection of his own status, but rather the relative unconcern members of the Spartiate class had for underclasses such as *perioikoi* and helots, asserting that their use of Cinadon on such missions indicates that an "inferior" was sufficient to deal with any problems that might routinely occur with them. Cartledge (1987), 170, sees Cinadon's employment by the ephors as indicative of his privileged status. Gish (2009), 352-3 sees the description of Cinadon's task as extraordinary, not only in terms of the position which it meant he apparently held in the eyes of the ephors, but also in its reflection of his personal qualities.

well.⁶²⁰ This perhaps indicates differing status levels even among the Spartan “inferiors”. That the position of Cinadon, before his attempted coup, is far from the demoted Spartan man who is disgraced and left out of citizen affairs, described in the *Lac.*, also suggests some attempt on the part of the Spartan system to acknowledge and reward Spartan “inferiors” who displayed orthodox presentation of Spartan ideals.

Obviously, as discussed, in the case of Cinadon the system failed in the sense that acknowledgement of Cinadon’s excellence apparently served only to reinforce his sense of injustice at being excluded from the ideal, but this is not to say that the system did not prove effective with other “inferiors”. For example, in a later passage Xenophon mentions other groups such as the *nothoi* (“bastards”) of the Spartans, who may have represented some of those who constituted what Xenophon terms Spartan “inferiors” in this instance.⁶²¹ Xenophon describes these men as “exceedingly fine and not unacquainted with the fine things in the city” (μάλα εὐειδεῖς τε καὶ τῶν ἐν τῇ πόλει καλῶν οὐκ ἄπειροι), and, perhaps as a result of this treatment, they are depicted as being valuable and loyal members of Sparta’s military.⁶²² Thus, the possibility of advancement in status to favorable positions within Sparta’s internal hegemonic system would suggest that desire for advancement within the hegemony would be a strong motivating factor at all levels of society. Shipley astutely remarked that any “power system maintained in this way depends partly on the subordinates internalizing the values of the hegemonic power”,⁶²³ therefore the Spartan system would ideally seek to instil some level of investment in the proper functioning of the hegemonic framework among all sub-classes.

The operation of internal Spartan hegemonic ideology between classes can even be seen in the description of the would-be revolt itself. Of course, on one level the very fact that the conspiracy existed reveals a failure in the operation of the system as, ideally, hegemonic ideology would seek to provide sufficient investment in the proper operation of the system to prevent instances of conspiracy and revolt from occurring in the first place. Indeed, the situation presented in the conspiracy of Cinadon has been seen as proof

⁶²⁰ Gish (2009), 353-4.

⁶²¹ X. *Hell.* 5.3.9. For detailed discussion on the possible status of the *nothoi*, see especially Hodkinson (1997).

⁶²² Additionally, if the Spartan system’s measures of incentives and sanctions for Spartan “inferiors” in other cases proved effective, it would serve to strengthen the idea that perhaps those disenfranchised by poverty represented a particular bugbear for Spartan hegemonic ideology.

⁶²³ Shipley (1997), 213.

of the many problems within the Spartan system. The lack of surprise on the part of the ephors when they learned of its existence, and assertions on the part of the conspirators of the great number of those within the Spartan political system who were ravenous for Spartan blood, are taken to indicate that the Spartiate class was a minority in power surrounded on all sides by those who bore them unadulterated ill-will.⁶²⁴ However, the level to which one can view this episode as indicative of breakdown in the Spartan system is dependent on how serious a threat it realistically posed. Cinadon claims that everywhere one looked legions of allies for the conspiracy can be seen, because every sub-class would be happy to “eat the Spartiates raw”. However, it is admitted, in the same breath, that the number of people who were actually party to the organization of the revolt was small.⁶²⁵ This indicates that the level of animosity towards Spartiates may have been somewhat exaggerated to provide useful rhetoric for the recruitment of a rebellion—⁶²⁶ indeed the sentiment is even framed within the context of a recruitment pitch. If the level of anti-Spartiate feeling had actually been at such crisis-level for an extended period of time it is unlikely that rebellion could have been prevented as tidily as it was. This itself has been seen as evidence of an impressive counter-insurgency mechanism in place, designed to deal with minor breakdowns such as conspiracy.⁶²⁷ While some have seen the conspiracy of Cinadon as one of the most significant episodes for Spartan society of that period,⁶²⁸ others have been struck by the large amount of attention given by Xenophon to the episode in light of the fact that it seems to have had very little effect.⁶²⁹ Perhaps the significant point that should be taken from the conspiracy

⁶²⁴ De Ste. Croix (1972b), 190-5.

⁶²⁵ X. *Hell.* 3.3.6.

⁶²⁶ De Ste. Croix (1972b), 194 and Whitby, (1994), 102. Cartledge (1987), 165, believes that it reasonable to assume that some members of all of the groups mentioned by the informer would be disposed to undertake revolution, but even so admits that one should assume a fair level of “agit-prop exaggeration” in the account, and even David (1979), 252, who takes the conspiracy as an incredibly serious threat notes the stress placed on the ratio of Spartiates to would-be conspirators as a deliberate recruitment tool.

⁶²⁷ Cartledge (1987), 355 and (2002), 234.

⁶²⁸ Oliva (1971), 193, believes that this episode is “thought to be the most dangerous revolutionary movement the Spartan government ever had to face”. David (1979), 254, suggests that the strength of the language used to describe the episode reflects the extreme gravity of the situation. Flower (1991), 84, calls this episode: “perhaps the most important conspiracy in Spartan history”. Hamilton (1996), 152, takes Cinadon’s allegations of “the burning hatred” of the Spartan underclasses for their superiors at face value.

⁶²⁹ Whitby (1994), 102-3, points out the ease with which it was crushed, with apparently no repercussions; he suggests that the episode may have had a literary function to highlight the divine endorsement of Agesilaus reign. Jehne (1995), 16-7, 173-4, concurs with this view and suggests that despite being a relatively minor incident, the danger involved in the episode was exaggerated in order to underline

is not the allegations on the part of its leaders about the animosity towards the hegemonic class in Spartan society, but the fact that their hopes for large-scale revolt on the part of the Spartan underclasses were not realized; and the fact that the Spartan hegemonic system held up under the pressure.

Agesilaus' right to the Spartan throne, as it was his sacrificing on behalf of the city which first revealed the threat—thus displaying divine favor for his reign.

Chapter 5: Conclusion

The preceding examination has sought to investigate the depictions of Spartan masculinity as they are portrayed in the works of Thucydides and Xenophon. To do so, this study has employed ideas taken from social constructionist methodological frameworks to analyse the source material. Within this framework the categories which have been investigated are: 1) the relation of men and women; 2) attitudes towards sex; 3) institutions; 4) discourse; 5) representation and performativity; and 6) relations between men and hegemonic masculinity, as these are considered to have particular import to the construction of masculinities.

In Thucydides the categories of “discourse”, “representation and performativity”, and “relations between men and hegemonic masculinity” were the most fruitful areas of investigation. Several interesting findings emerged. First is the observation that Thucydides, through discourse, highlights the idea of the “Spartan man” as the embodiment of a national type. One of the most interesting things that emerged from the analysis of Thucydides’ “Spartan type” is the awareness of the creation of a number of competing conceptions of Spartan national masculinities, which Thucydides represents as being constructed discursively by both the Spartans and outsiders. This is highlighted in the differences between the Spartan character as it is expressed by Archidamus, Sthenelaidas, Pericles, and the Corinthian envoys. Also illuminative is the suggestion that the prevailing characterization of Spartan men in the *History* (seen as being that which was conveyed by the Corinthians) was a politically charged outsider construct, deeply rooted in the historical and political context in which it was articulated. This is of particular import as it is this characterization of Spartan national character upon which many subsequent understandings of the nature of the Spartan man have been based. Another prominent point, brought to light by examining Thucydides, is the relationship between discourse and performativity. In Thucydides’ depiction of the masculine discourse employed by Sparta 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. This can be seen both in

the damage suffered to Spartan morale and reputation when Spartan performance at Pylos failed to meet the standards created by Spartan discursive identity, as well as the success of the rhetoric of Brasidas due to his concern to reinforce words with actions.

In Xenophon's *Spartan Constitution* all six categories pertaining to masculine construction were able to be examined. The Spartan system, detailed by Xenophon, reflects a regard for the display of masculine ideals in every area, and at every stage of Spartan life. The *Lac.* suggests that the officially sanctioned Spartan education and institutions had elements designed to impart and maintain ideology associated with manhood. To this end, the Spartan system was shown to be especially concerned with producing citizen men who exhibited a high degree of restraint and performed their adherence to the ideals of ἐγκράτεια, αἰδώς, and πειθώ. Additionally, inter-Spartan relations (be it between males and females or exclusively between males) are shown to be intended, in part, to reinforce the Spartan masculine ethos, while descriptions of interaction between Spartans and other Lacedaemonians revealed efforts both to create cohesion and hierarchy through the use of masculine ideal. Ideals of masculinity are seen to be present in mandates governing both appearance and behaviour. However, the focus was primarily on the performative display of masculine principles rather than internalization of virtues. To this end, constructions of Spartan masculinity were described by Xenophon as being maintained predominantly by means of constant supervision and scrutiny, as well as the imposition of punishments for failure to perform as required and intense competition for venerated positions within frameworks of hegemonic masculinity.

In the *Hellenica*, as in Thucydides' historical work, it was not possible to explore all the categories which are seen to have a bearing on the construction of masculinities; the three which were most relevant in this work were “attitudes towards sex”, “discourse”, and “relations between men and hegemonic masculinity”. It is clear, however, that there is a considerable correspondence in ideas across Xenophon's works. The behaviour of Spartan men abroad reflects the influence of the highly competitive Spartan system which emphasised only superficial displays of virtue. Competitive desire to attain masculine glory remains a strong guiding principle of Spartan behaviour, while

concern for such virtues as obedience and restraint lessened when individual men were freed from the supervision and compulsion of the Spartan home authority. Spartan masculine ideology outlined by the *Lac.* can also be seen to have an influence on official political and military discourse. This has been illustrated in the rhetoric of Callicratidas, as well as on the hegemonic stratification of society between Spartan citizens and their underclasses shown in the episode of Cinadon. One significant point of departure from the *Lac.* is Xenophon's depictions of Spartan same-sexual relations in the *Hellenica*, which could suggest that Spartan practice did not always conform to the Lycurgan ideals expressed in the *Lac.*. Although Xenophon's ambiguous treatment of these relationships, and the men who conducted them, could indicate that what he expressed in the *Lac.* was still the ideal against which the conduct of these men were being measured.

What has emerged in examination of the works of Thucydides and Xenophon is far from a singular, cohesive picture of Spartan masculine expression. But this does not necessarily imply that the "Spartan man" that was known to Thucydides and Xenophon respectively were fundamentally different ideological constructs. Major differences stem primarily from the fact that the categories of analysis were different for both authors. To illustrate a few examples: the discursive use of masculinity in Thucydides was shown to be used primarily for the purposes of painting a national portrait of Spartan nature to influence readers' understandings of Spartan decisions throughout the course of the war. In Xenophon's *Lac.* discussions of discourse focus on concepts key to Spartan masculine self-identification, while in the *Hellenica* discourse comes to light mainly in the context of the discursive utility of these key ideological concepts in military and political matters. Thucydides emphasises a relationship between discourse and performativity that is not reflected by Xenophon, as Xenophon's work suggests discursive ideology had considerable weight in and of itself. This is illustrated particularly in cases, such as the Sphodrias episode, in which discourse was successfully used to attain particular results, when real-world events would lead one to believe that such results were unlikely. Sexual attitudes and behaviours were noted by Xenophon and undiscussed by Thucydides. Differences also stem from the different manner in which both authors approached their Spartan subjects. For example, in Thucydides we see primarily the idea of a "national" Spartan type, against which individuals were measured as typical or atypical. In the

Hellenica we see more of a propensity for the description of behaviours and attitudes of Spartan men as individuals which, in turn, are represented as the products of the Spartan system outlined in the *Lac.*, and correspond to that work by showing real-world results of Spartan ideology and practice. Ultimately, it is not possible to do a point by point comparison of the differences in the construction of Spartan masculinity represented by Thucydides and Xenophon. This is because neither author set out to write an account of Spartan masculinity. Thus depictions of the “Spartan man” in each work are suited to the purpose of the works in which they are presented, and discrepancies accounts can be seen to have more to do with their individual style and purpose than with any changes in Spartan societal ideology throughout the course of the Classical period. In fact, in the matter of ideology, both authors express belief of concerted efforts on the part of the Spartan system to create and promulgate official conceptions of Spartan manhood and instill them in Spartan men. This can be seen in the funeral speech of Pericles, as well as in the influence of official ideology throughout the *Lac.* In both of these accounts we can see the influence of outsider (if not Athenian) bias, as both accounts serve to “other” the Spartans in their descriptions of Spartan practices.

Whereas the picture of Spartan masculinity was presented differently by each author, there emerges, within the respective areas discussed by each author, evidence to suggest that hegemonic masculinity was used extensively as an ideological tool by the Spartan state. Both authors describe inter-Spartan relations and relations between Spartiates and “others” (sub-classes within the Spartan system, other states within the Peloponnesian League, etc.) in such a way as to suggest that the employment of officially propagated images of Spartan masculinity played a significant role in Spartan dealings. Among the Spartiate class, polarized positive and negative archetypes of masculinity were created, along with their associated rewards and penalties, and employed by the Spartan system as a measure to create competitive investment in state ideology which, in turn, provided a mechanism of behavioural control for the Spartan state. This is evident in the ideal and counter-ideal of the *hippeis* and the cowards in the *Lac.* The Spartiate class as a whole was used as a hegemonic ideal to promote cohesion within the Spartan system, both to stratify the various subclasses, and to motivate them to remain invested in Spartan rule. This was accomplished through benefits gained by advantageous positioning in

relation to the hegemonic ideal, the possibility of societal advancement gained through upholding the ideology of Spartan masculinity ideology, etc. This process has been displayed in Thucydides, for example, by the motivations provided to the helots and *neodamodeis* by Brasidas and others, and in Xenophon in the episode of Cinadon. Finally, the collective masculinity of the Spartan state can even be seen to have an impact on inter-state policy and systems of alliance. This has been shown in the role hegemonic masculinity was seen to play in the ideological cohesion of the Peloponnesian League, and the way this was exploited by the Corinthians in Thucydides. In the *Hellenica* inter-state usage of masculine ideology is seen in the role of Sparta as ideal played in Callicratidas' discourse with the allies. Accounts of Spartan employment of masculine ideology in the works of Thucydides and Xenophon thus correspond significantly to hegemonic frameworks discussed in social constructionist theories of masculinity, supporting both the veracity of these aspects in accounts of Spartan society, as well as the applicability of constructionist frameworks to the historical study of Spartan masculinity. Thus the analysis of Spartan masculinity in the works of Thucydides and Xenophon suggests, if nothing else, Spartan masculinity was a purposefully propagated ideology. While the accounts of individual Spartiates, may serve to show that they had internalized tenants of the Spartan masculine ethos to the extent that they viewed them as essential, the larger picture reveals that Spartan masculinity was a deliberate ideological construction of the Spartan system, employed—quite successfully— both internally and externally by the Spartan state, with a number of ideological, political, and militaristic applications.

Spartan masculinity is a concept for which much future examination is possible. My treatment has been episodic, focusing on incidents in the works which have been seen to reveal the construction and operation of Spartan masculine ethos. Therefore, not every instance which has bearing on Spartan masculinity has been covered. For example, in the treatment of hegemonic masculine frameworks in the *Lac*. I chose to highlight the *hippeis* and the sanctions placed on cowards as they are two areas which received extensive treatment in the *Lac*.. Also, as inverses, these provide excellent case studies for the ways in which the ideology of hegemonic masculinity could be employed both positively and negatively within the Spartan system. Of course, these are not the only cases of masculine

hegemonic structuring in Spartan society. Elevated positions (such as those *eirens* chosen to be leaders, the *ephors*, and the *gerousia*); the countless honours and appointments for which Spartan men were in constant competition; as well as non-military causes of demotions (such as bachelorhood, poverty, etc.) all bore relation to a man's position in the framework of Spartan hegemonic masculinity. A more extensive examination of structures of hegemonic masculinity within the *Lac.* could, therefore, serve as the subject of future inquiry. Similarly, the categories under which the sources were analyzed were chosen due to their importance to contemporary sociological ideas regarding the construction of gender, and thus do not necessarily constitute the sole areas (or perhaps even the primary areas) of Spartiate life which had bearing on the construction of Spartan masculinity. Analysis of Thucydides' and Xenophon's descriptions of Spartan men have revealed aspects of Spartan life, beyond the scope of this examination, which likely had a great impact on the ways in which Spartans perceived themselves as men. For example, though I was able to discuss the subject of competition within the methodological framework I chose, it was not discussed in its own right but in light of how it pertained to "relations between men" or "performativity". However I believe that a deeper inquiry into the correlation between competition and Spartan masculine identification is a project which should be undertaken in the future.

Finally, it must be stressed that this study focused primarily on analysis of Thucydides' and Xenophon's *depictions* of Spartan masculinity. Therefore more investigation needs to be done on the relationship between their constructions and actual Spartan constructions. I have made some effort to contextualize the material (such as discussion of how the political atmosphere of the period may have coloured the depictions of Spartan men which Thucydides ascribes to the Athenians and Corinthians; or that analysis of Athenian and Socratic attitudes towards pederastic activity, with an eye on the purpose of the *Lac.Pol.*, could suggest that Xenophon presented us with a genuine Spartan view on the matter). However much of my analysis, admittedly, has been to some extent dependant on taking the authors' depictions and interpretations at face value, due to the style of analysis undertaken. Therefore a main area for future inquiry is the examination particularly of how these authors' Athenian conceptions of masculinity may have influenced their depictions of Spartan men. For example, I have found that studies

of Athenian masculinity have expressed a high level of preoccupation with ideas of sexuality. While discussions of sexuality were largely absent in Thucydides, both Xenophon's philosophical and historical treatment of Spartan men did include significant discussion of sexual (particularly pederastic) attitudes. It would be interesting to inquire to what extent this may reflect the view some hold of Xenophon as one of the "laconising elite", as studies concerning Athenian masculinity suggest that pederastic practice was of greater concern to this segment of Athenian society, and had a greater bearing on their conceptions of masculinity, than it did for other element of the Athenian population. In short, Spartan masculinity is an interesting and complex topic for which much further inquiry is possible.

Bibliography

Secondary Sources

- Adams, R. and D. Savran (eds) (2002), *The Masculinity Studies Reader*, Oxford.
- Alexander, B. K. (2011), 'Queer(y)ing Masculinities', in R.L. Jackson II 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*, Berkley.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.

- 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), *Agasilaos 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- Connell, R.W. and J. W. Messerschmidt (2005), 'Hegemonic Masculinity: Rethinking the concept', *Gender and Society*, 19:6, 829-59.
- Crane, G. (1998), *Thucydides and the Ancient Simplicity: The limits of political realism*, Berkley.
- David, E. (1979), 'The Conspiracy of Cinadon', *Athenaeum*, 57, 239-59.
- (1989), 'Dress in Spartan Society', *The Ancient World*, 19:1-2, 3-13.
- (1992), 'Sparta's Social Hair', *Eranos*, 90, 11-21.
- (1993), 'Hunting in Spartan Society and Consciousness', *EMC/CV*, 37:12, 393-414.
- De Ste. Croix, G.E.M. (1972a), 'Trials at Sparta', in *The Origins of the Peloponnesian War*, London. (Reprinted (2002) in M. Whitely (ed.), *Sparta*, Edinburgh, 69-77.)
- (1972b), 'The Helot Threat', in *The Origins of the Peloponnesian War*, London. (Reprinted (2002) in M. Whitely (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.
- 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.
- Dover, K. (1978), *Greek Homosexuality*, Cambridge.

- Dowd, N. (2010), *The Man Question: Male subordination and Privilege*, New York.
- Ducat, J. (2006a), *Spartan Education: Youth and society in the classical period*, Wales.
- (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.
- 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*, London, 57-84.
- Finley, J.H. (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.
- Fisher, N. (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.
- 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.
- Foxhall, L. and J. Salmon (eds) (1998a), *When Men Were Men: Masculinity power and identity in classical antiquity*, London.
- Foxhall, L. and J. Salmon (eds) (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.
- 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.
- Gleason, M. (1995), *Making Men: Sophists and self-presentation in ancient Rome*, Princeton.
- 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.
- Gribble, D. (2006), 'Individuals in Thucydides', in A. Rengakos and A. Tsakmakis (eds), *Brills Companion to Thucydides*, Leiden and Boston, 439-68.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- Hodkinson, S. (1983), 'Social Order and the Conflict of Values in Classical Sparta', *Chiron* 13, 241-65. (Reprinted (2002) in M. Whitely (ed.), *Sparta*, Edinburgh, 104-30.).
- (1997), 'Servile and Free Dependents of the Spartan Oikos', in M. Moggi and G. Cordiano (eds) *Schiavi e dipendenti nell'ambito dell'oikos e della familia*, Pisa, 45-71.
- (2000), *Property and Wealth in Classical Sparta*, London.
- (2006), 'Was Classical Sparta a Military Society?', in S. Hodkinson and A. Powell (eds), *Sparta & War*, London, 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.
- 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.

- Humble, N. (1997), *Xenophon's View of Sparta: A study of the Anabasis, Hellenica and Republica 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.
- Hunter, V. (1988), 'Thucydides and the Sociology of the Crowd', *The Classical Journal*, 84:1, 17-30.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- Kennell, N. (1995), *The Gymnasium of Virtue: Education & culture in ancient Sparta*, Chapel Hill.
- 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.
- Krentz, P. (ed.) (1989), *Xenophon: Hellenika 1-2.3.10*, Warminster.
- 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.
- 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. Figuiera (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.
- 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.
- Lloyd, A.B. (ed.) (1996), *Battle in Antiquity*, Swansea.

- Ludwig, P. (2002), *Eros and Polis: Desire and community in Greek political theory*, New York.
- 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.
- MacDowell, D. (1986), *Spartan Law*, Edinburgh.
- May, L. (1998), *Masculinity and Morality*, Ithaca.
- 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.
- Miller, W.I. (2009), *The Mystery of Courage*, Cambridge.
- Moles, J. L. (1994), 'Xenophon and Callicratidas', *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 114, 70-84.
- 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.)
- Morrison, J.V. (2006), *Reading Thucydides*, Columbus.
- Moss, D. (2006), 'Masculinity as Masquerade', *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, 54, 1187-94.

- North, H. (1966), *Sophrosyne: Self-knowledge and self-restraint in Greek literature*, Ithaca.
- Ogden, D. (1996), 'Homosexuality and Warfare in Ancient Greece', in A.B. Lloyd (ed.) *Battle in Antiquity*, Swansea, 107-68.
- 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. Figuiera (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.
- 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.)
- 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.

- 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.
- (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. Figuiera (ed.), *Spartan Society*, London, 137-50.
- Prentice, W.K. (1934), 'The Character of Lysander', *American Journal of Archaeology*, 38:1, 37-42.
- 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.
- 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.
- Rabinowitz, A. (2009), 'Drinking from the same cup: Sparta and late Archaic commensality', in S. Hodkinson (ed.), *Sparta: Comparative Approaches*, Swansea, 113-192.
- Rahn, P. (1971), 'Xenophon's Developing Historiography', *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, 102, 497-508.
- Rebenich, S. (1998), Xenophon, *Die Verfassung der Spartaner*, Darmstadt.
- 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.
- 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*, Berkley.

- 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.)
- 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.
- 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 perioikoic *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.
- Smith, R. E. (1954), 'The Opposition to Agesilaus' Foreign Policy 394-371 B.C.', *Historia*, 2:3, 274-88.
- 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.
- Strassler, R.B. (ed.) (1996), *The Landmark Thucydides: A comprehensive guide to the Peloponnesian war*, New York.
- (2009), *The Landmark Xenophon's Hellenika*, 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.

- 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. (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.
- Trittle, L.A., (2010), *A New History of the Peloponnesian War*, Chichester.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- Whitby, M. (1994), 'Two Shadows: Images of Spartans and Helots', in A. Powell and S. Hodkinson (eds), *The Shadow of Sparta*, London, 87-126.

- 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.
- Wilson, J. R. (1990), 'Sophrosyne in Thucydides', *Ancient History Bulletin*, 4:3, 51-8.
- 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.