

Places of citizenship in Athenian forensic oratory

Christine Plastow

There is a strong relationship among citizenship, place, and social practice.¹ If one has citizenship, it must be citizenship of somewhere; people without citizenship are sometimes described as ‘displaced’. Even the modern concept of being a ‘global citizen’ relies on a notion of transcending national boundaries. Citizenship can be conceived of as both a vertical relationship with the state connected with a set of political rights and duties, and a horizontal sense of social belonging; both conceptions ‘are intricately related to space, territory, borders and boundaries, subjectivity, and social practices’ (Ehrkamp and Jacobsen 2015: 153). In addition, citizenship, like many other identities, is not simply something a person has, but something they can enact through their behaviour. Enacting citizenship does not simply refer to engagement with citizen rights and responsibilities, but also ‘citizenship as lived experience in daily life, and as social practice’ (Ehrkamp and Jacobsen 2015: 154). This idea, too, has important connections to place, particularly what Tim Cresswell calls place as a ‘material practice’: the concept that places become places as a result of human behaviour and action, that ‘places are performed on a daily basis through people living their everyday life’ (2004: 34). In other words, it is the often-repeated performance of certain human behaviours in specific locations that transforms those locations into places from undifferentiated spaces. When those behaviours include elements of citizenship, the places they create become imbued with specifically citizen connotations. These connections between citizenship and place are not limited to the modern world, and indeed in ancient Greece the association was perhaps particularly strong due to the predominance of state organization into *poleis*, meaning that one’s citizenship was tied to a relatively small area (Hansen 2004: 70-72; see also Rhodes in this vol.).

In the *Politics*, Aristotle’s conception of successful citizenship is closely tied to space, particularly the ideal size of the *polis* (1326a-1327a). He notes that the population should be neither too large nor too small, but the right size ‘for the citizens to know each other’s personal characters’ (1326b; trans. Rackham 1932), which implies a certain spread of population across space that would allow for such a face-to-face society. The land itself, according to Aristotle, should be ‘of a size that will enable the inhabitants to live a life of liberal and at the same time temperate leisure’ (1326b; trans. Rackham 1932) – once again, neither too large nor too small, with enough but not excessive space for each citizen – and that it must ‘be well able to be taken

in at one view' (1327a; trans. Rackham 1932), for the purposes of effective military defence and easy distribution of produce and raw materials. Aristotle also relates the connections between population and place made by Hippodamus of Miletus, who he says divided both the population and the land each into three parts in order to achieve the necessary purposes of the state (*Pol.* 1267b).

Place can also be a useful lens through which to read Athenian forensic oratory.² The genre is intrinsically associated with Athenian citizenship: speakers in the courts of Athens aimed to persuade a citizen jury, and often did so by invoking and exploring citizen ideals and paradigms. For many of the participants in a trial, the courtroom may not have been an everyday space, and it would have held powerful ideological meaning even for those frequent litigants or jurors who did attend more often. The broader spaces of the city of Athens, including both public spaces such as the Assembly and private homes also held ideological power which could be exploited rhetorically (e.g., Shear 2011: 263-285; Lehmann 2019; n.2 above). Even spaces on the boundaries of Attica as well as further abroad could hold rhetorical meaning for Athenian audiences, as for example Phyle and Sparta do in Lysias, Macedon in Aeschines, the Chersonese in Demosthenes, and Lesbos in Antiphon.³

This chapter focuses on the rhetoric of citizenship through two forms of placemaking. The first I call ideological placemaking: places given specific meaning with regard to citizenship by their monumental, memorializing construction, which was often ascribed to prominent ancestors whose behaviour could be held up as a paradigm of citizenship, and the meaning of which is then solidified over time by the repeated connection of the place to citizen ideals embodied by the ancestors and emulated by later citizens.⁴ The second I call procedural placemaking: places whose connection to citizenship comes from their everyday use in the procedures of citizenship – the enactment of citizen rights and duties – which then accretes until the place becomes emblematic of good, engaged citizen behaviour. In both types, the place becomes associated with the institutions of citizenship and democracy and 'takes on a rulelike status in social thought and action', dictating the norms to which future citizens should adhere (DiMaggio and Powell 1991: 9). In this way, citizen places both are formed by citizen behaviour and serve to reinforce its correct enactment.

In this chapter, I examine the use of two Athenian places related to citizenship in the forensic speeches: the Propylaia and the Bouleuterion. The Propylaia is an example of a space connected with ideology: it is not used so much as experienced as part of a number of civic rituals and activities associated both with citizenship and with Athenian victory and superiority. As a result, it holds rhetorical power as a reminder of the lineage and heritage of Athenian

citizenship. The Bouleuterion, by contrast, is associated with procedure as the site of a large amount of everyday citizen activity necessary to the running of the city. In rhetorical terms, then, it can be useful as a synecdoche for the democracy, and holds particular potency as a site for the potential corruption of the city if the judges fail to do their job. I end with an examination of two passages from Aeschines that employ the concept of the removal of the Propylaia and the Bouleuterion to Thebes, which solidifies the ideological power and association with Athens and Athenian citizenship of these two sites, and inverts other rhetorical uses to make a particularly powerful political argument.

The Propylaia

The Propylaia is mentioned by name seven times in the surviving forensic speeches and fragments, roughly equalling mentions of the Parthenon.⁵ This may seem surprising: in ritual terms, the monumental gateway is far from the most important structure on the Acropolis, and the precinct beyond it not only held the temple to the city's patron goddess and formed the centre point for the most important Athenian festival, the Panathenaia, but was also an emblem of Athens' victory over the Persians and hegemony within Greece, at least in the classical period (schol. 121 Dilts ad Dem. 3.25; Westwood 2020: 256).⁶ But visually, at least, the Propylaia was very significant: it was designed to 'overwhelm' visitors to the temples and provide a suitably magnificent entryway into this important area (Shear, Jr 2016: 283-284; Hurwit 2004: 162). The central halls stood around 14.5m tall, only slightly shorter than the Parthenon itself.⁷ Viewed from a distance, and particularly from the Pnyx, the Propylaia was highly visible, designed to complement rather than obstruct sight of the Parthenon, and must have been seen as an intrinsic part of the whole, both aesthetically and ritually, in forming an important threshold between space inside and outside of the Acropolis.⁸ In this way, it is easy to see how the monumental entranceway may have become a synecdoche for the Acropolis more broadly, and indeed for everything the Acropolis stood for in the Athenian imagination (Kostopoulos 2019: 94).⁹

References to the Propylaia appear in the surviving works of Demosthenes, Aeschines, and Lycurgus; this is perhaps unsurprising, given the often-political content of speeches by those orators and the rhetorical potential of the gateway to evoke matters related to the *polis*. Most of the references mention the Propylaia as part of a list of structures, alongside others both on the Acropolis and elsewhere in Athens. Only one of these instances, however, refers

explicitly to the man who Plutarch and others considered largely responsible for the Propylaia's construction: Pericles (Plut. *Per.* 13). It appears in a fragment of Lycurgus (speech 14 fr. 2 Loeb):

Pericles, having captured Samos and Euboea and Aigina, and built the Propylaea and the Odeion and the Hecatompedon, and placed countless talents of silver in the Acropolis, was crowned with an olive wreath.

The fragmentary nature of the text means it cannot properly be contextualized, though it does appear to be a forensic oration and is associated with the titles *Against Demades* or *Against Cephisodotus on the Honours to Demades*. Although, as we shall see, the other references to the Propylaia in the orators make clearer connections between the gateway and citizen values, what we can confirm from Lycurgus is the status of the Propylaia's construction as something praiseworthy. Pericles' building project is placed alongside his military achievements and financial gain for the city as reasons for his crowning – a sign of his successful (indeed, exceptional) fulfilment of his citizen duty towards Athens. Although Pericles was certainly no ordinary citizen, this reference to the Propylaia gives a foundation for understanding the more complex rhetorical uses of the structure that appear in Demosthenes and Aeschines as ways of evoking citizen values.

More frequently, these lists of buildings are associated by the orators with collective groups of Athenian ancestors. An indicative passage is from Demosthenes *Against Androtion*, during Demosthenes' argument about the necessity of taking a council's shipbuilding activity into account when awarding crowns for successful service (Dem. 22.13):

For instance, anyone could give many examples, both from the past and from recent events, but among those that are familiar to everyone from hearing about them, if you wish, there are the men who built the Propylaia and the Parthenon and decorated the rest of the temples with the spoils taken from the barbarians, achievements that rightly give us all a sense of pride. You certainly know this from hearing about it that after leaving the city and being shut off on Salamis, they saved all their own possessions and the city by winning the victory at sea because they had triremes. They were also responsible for bringing the rest of the Greeks many great benefits, the memory of which not even time can erase.
(trans. Harris 2008)

This is the earliest surviving explicit reference we have to the temple on the Acropolis as ‘the Parthenon’ (Giannadaki 2020: 166). The rhetorical effect is compounded by rolling together the construction project with the battle at Salamis, despite these events happening a generation apart.¹⁰ The Propylaea and other structures are strongly associated with noble and, crucially, victorious ancestors at a key turning point in the Greco-Persian war, and are thus identified as a source of great pride for the Athenians. The reference to the buildings is designed to remind the audience of the Athenians who came before them and the values they embodied, grounding their legacy in a physical memorial with which the jurors would have been very familiar, and which some of them may have even seen on their way to the courtroom.¹¹ The context of the speech, a debate over the award of a crown for acceptable service to the democracy, makes it clear that the values being espoused here are not solely those of victory and honour, but specifically that the citizen men who built these structures served their city well. Although Demosthenes does not explicitly identify ‘those who built the Propylaea and the Parthenon’ as Athenian citizens, his reference to the ‘barbarians’ defines them against their opposite and makes their identity implicitly clear. The invocation of these past generations of men as paradigmatic Athenian citizens would have been apparent to his audience. This is what I have called ideological placemaking: the ideology of Athenian citizenship is connected to the structure of the Propylaea, turning it into a place with specific connotations for the citizen audience. This makes it a valuable signifier of citizen values for rhetorical purposes. In this case, Demosthenes seeks to encourage the jury to approve the awarding of crowns only to men who have embodied the same values as these generations of ancestors, thus setting a high standard for Athenian citizen duty.

Another passage with more direct connections to citizen values, and which makes more explicit the idea of collective production and ownership of the Propylaea and other civic structures, appears later in the *Against Androtion*, and is also replicated exactly in the *Against Timocrates* (Dem. 22.75-76 = Dem. 24.183-184):

He did not understand that the *dēmos* have never been eager to acquire wealth but rather to acquire fame above anything else. Here is a proof: when the *dēmos* had the most money of the Greeks, they spent it all on the pursuit of honour. When they paid the tax from their private property, they shunned no danger in their pursuit of fame. What they acquired from this effort is everlasting, both the memory of their deeds and the beauty of the dedications set up to

commemorate them: the Propylaia, the Parthenon, the stoas, the shipsheds. Not two little jars, or even three or four gold ones, each weighing a few pounds, which you will propose to melt down whenever you see fit! (trans. Harris 2008)

Here, the creator of the Propylaia and other monumental structures is not a particular group of ancestors, but rather the *dēmos* at large, the collective citizen body. In this instance, the Propylaia is presented explicitly as emblematic of *all* past citizens' love of honour and willingness to spend civic funds on building projects, rather than hoarding their wealth. These building achievements, which earlier in the speech gave 'us all a sense of pride' despite being the work of a limited group, are now reconfigured as the production of the *dēmos* as a cohesive entity. What was achieved by Pericles was achieved by the whole citizen body, and as a result was imbued with the values of that body (Blanshard 2014: 261-265). It is also notable that Demosthenes refers to προπύλαια ταῦτα, 'the Propylaia here', as he will also do in the passage from his *Against Aristocrates* discussed below, making the audience's familiarity with the structure even more explicit. As Ifigeneia Giannadaki notes, this moment of *deixis* may have been accompanied by a gesture towards the structure, which could plausibly have been seen from certain locations in the agora hypothesized to be the site of the law courts (Giannadaki 2020: 383-384, Boegehold 1995: 97, 104-113).¹² In any case, the presentation of the Propylaia alongside historical anecdotes, as in the earlier passage from the same speech, creates a 'rhetorical employment of geography interwoven with memory and commemoration of the past [that] relates especially to the Akropolis monuments as symbols of great civic and religious display' (Giannadaki 2020: 383). The desire for glory rather than riches is clearly established as a citizen value, a rhetorical strategy designed to attack both Androtion and Timocrates by connecting them with the baser value of obsession with money and thus uncitizenlike behaviour.

This connection between the Propylaia (and associated structures) and Athenian citizen values, and the subsequent disassociation of the speaker's opponent from those values, is also employed as a strategy in Demosthenes *Against Aristocrates* (Dem. 23.206-207):

Yet certainly in the past the city was wealthy and famous in public, but no one in private rose above the many. Here is the proof: the house of Themistocles, that of Miltiades, and those belonging to famous men at that time, if any of you knows what they are like, he sees that there is nothing more arrogant than the average about them, but the buildings of the city and the adornments were so

great and of such a type that no possibility was left for succeeding generations to surpass them, the Propylaia, the shipsheds, the stoas, the Piraeus, and all the other buildings that adorn the city. (trans. Harris 2018, adjusted)

In this case, the modesty of the houses of the individual prominent citizens of the Athenian past contrasts with the grand nature of their public construction work; the comparison is presented as representative of the democratic equality of all citizens. The public buildings are figured as belonging to the city and to the citizens, and demonstrate the *polis*' wealth and success rather than that of individual 'great men'. This passage comes at the end of a rather lengthy and stern rebuke of the jury, who Demosthenes accuses of letting wrongdoers get away with anything as long as they flatter their judges (Papillon 1998: 73-75). The reference to the Propylaia, situated firmly in Athenian space once again, is clearly designed to remind the jurors of their citizen duty and the glory that can be achieved by pursuing it, rather than letting themselves be won over by criminals who would rather prioritize their own advancement.

An interesting counterpoint to Demosthenes' rhetorical use of the Propylaia appears in Aeschines *On the Embassy*, as Aeschines recalls the debates around the peace with Philip (Aeschin. 2.74-75):

This was the city's situation at the time we were discussing the peace. And the public speakers acting in unison stood up and made no attempt to offer measures for the city's rescue but urged you to look to the Propylaia of the Acropolis and remember the naval battle against the Persians at Salamis and the tombs and trophies of our ancestors. For my part, I said that, while you should remember all this, you should imitate our ancestors' wisdom but avoid their errors and their ill-timed ambition... (trans. Carey 2000)

Aeschines does not name his opponent Demosthenes here, and there is no mention of the Propylaia in Demosthenes *On the Dishonest Embassy*, but the similarity between Demosthenes' forensic (and deliberative) strategies elsewhere and Aeschines' description of the tactics of rhetors makes his target clear (Kostopoulos 2019: 91-92). Aeschines may be being hyperbolic in the suggestion that this was a strategy used by multiple speakers in the Assembly; we cannot know for sure, as no instances are recorded beyond one in Demosthenes (13.28). What is apparent is that Aeschines is attempting to deconstruct the trope of encouraging excessive reverence for the ancestors by associating them with the great monuments of Athens.

He makes explicit the rhetorical connection between (imagining) seeing the Propylaia and thinking about historical events, highlighting the persuasive matrix among sight (as in ‘this Propylaia here’), memory, and citizen honour employed by Demosthenes (Westwood 2020: 255-256; cf. Lycurg. *Leoc.* 17). His argument implies that references to monuments such as the Propylaia, which held such significance for the Athenian audience, may blind the Athenians to reality and encourage them to focus on the reputation of their forefathers over the needs of the moment at hand. His counterpoint to such an argument is to moderate the audience’s pride by reminding them of the failures that accompanied such visible successes and urge caution in the face of such flattering rhetoric. For his part, Demosthenes strikes back against Aeschines’ rhetoric here at Dem. 19.16, 307, and 312-313 (cf. Greaney 2005: 40); in the latter passage, he says that one such as Aeschines who deprives the ancestors of their deserved glory should himself be deprived of his *epitimia*, his enjoyment of citizen rights, reaffirming his own strong rhetorical connections among the praise of the ancestors, the glory of the monuments of Athens, and the proper citizen ideology.

The Bouleuterion

At the time of the orators, Athens had two Bouleuteria, or council-houses, in the agora: the Old Bouleuterion, which had previously been used as the meeting place of the Boule but by that time was used as a record store and also housed the Metroon, which often gives its name to the whole building in modern scholarship; and the New Bouleuterion, constructed in the late fifth century, which served as the current council house.¹³ The buildings stood beside each other on the western side of the agora, and together with the *tholos* building where the *prytaneis* worked they formed a small precinct where the everyday operation of Athens was managed. The very word *bouleutērion*, a place for the *boulē*, connects it intrinsically to citizenship, at least in the Athenian context (Miller 1995: 143-144). One had to be a citizen to serve on the Boule, and though others such as enslaved people must have had access to the building, it seems certain that it was most frequently occupied and used by citizen councillors in the process of conducting the democratic business of the city.

References to the Bouleuterion in the forensic speeches are rather more common than references to the structures on the Acropolis. The Bouleuterion is, unsurprisingly, regularly associated in the speeches with the Boule, and often becomes representative of that institution of the Athenian democracy. In forensic oratory, the Bouleuterion acts as a powerful signifier

of citizenship and the *dēmos* of Athens, both as a building itself and as a site of citizen behaviour and activity.

A number of the references to the Bouleuterion in the forensic speeches simply describe various uses of the building: as well as the seat of the Boule, it is identified as a treasury, record store, and the site of announcements of the awards of crowns by the Boule.¹⁴ The most obvious effect of these references is to provide scene setting for the speaker's narratives: the grounding of events in the reality of time and space increases the persuasiveness of a speaker's story. But the resonance of the Bouleuterion in the Athenian mind may also have led to additional, more subtle rhetorical effects. These specific uses of the building serve to connect the Bouleuterion with technical features of the Athenian democracy, processes that would only have been open to citizens and may have reminded the audience of their distinctive status (cf. the descriptions of Boule meetings in, e.g., Dem. 21.116 and 161-162). Such a connection has also been argued by Simon Hornblower (2009) with regard to Thucydides, in that the historian avoids descriptions of the Boule in action in order to downplay the technical deliberative processes of democracy and emphasize his narrative of the Athenians' impulsiveness.

Thus, this specific spatial grounding in forensic oratory also serves to identify the jury as an in-group and aims to create unity among them, which could contribute to a more decisive verdict. Two mentions of inscriptions that appeared within or near to the Bouleuterion would have had similar effects, heightened by the fact that the inscriptions were connected particularly to civic ideals. The two inscriptions refer to the illegality of obviously undemocratic acts: tyranny in Lycurgus, and serving on the Boule under the oligarchic regime of the Thirty in 404/3 BCE in Andocides (Lycurg. *Leoc.* 124, 126; Andoc. 1.95). The invocation of these inscriptions in the speeches, like the uses of the Propylaia in other examples, will have served to remind the jurors how to do their duty in a citizen-like way; indeed, the inscription of laws protecting the democracy on and around a building that housed some of its most important day-to-day activity must have had a powerful effect on citizens using the Bouleuterion. Still other, somewhat metonymic, references make explicit the Boule's role as a smaller counterpart to the *dēmos* and a sub-group and proxy of the Athenian citizenry (Dem. 18.169; Aeschin. 3.250).

The most effective rhetorical uses of the Bouleuterion, though, describe the citizen-like or un-citizen-like behaviour that occurred within it. Lysias *On the Property of Aristophanes* equates being seen in the Bouleuterion with being present in public citizen life (Lys. 19.55):

I have now reached the age of thirty, and I have never in any way spoken against my father. Nor has any citizen prosecuted me, and although I live close to the

Agora, never until this misfortune occurred was I seen either in court or in the Bouleuterion. (trans. Todd 2000)

The speaker suggests that, by keeping out of the Bouleuterion and law-courts, he has been keeping out of trouble, though not, as he goes on to highlight, neglecting his financial obligations as a citizen. Indeed, in the forensic speeches, the act of going into the Bouleuterion can pose a danger to the democracy and to citizen ideals if done at the wrong time. In the *Against Androtion* Demosthenes populates the Bouleuterion with unscrupulous or unreliable characters, from the conspirators who hold the Boule for themselves and the ‘talkers’ who will rule the Boule if Androtion is acquitted, to Androtion’s own poor attendance at the Boule, a further indicator of his inability to do his citizen duty well.¹⁵ Aeschines, too, demonstrates the potential for corruption of democratic processes in the Bouleuterion by describing a vignette of Demosthenes’ conspiratorial machinations in apparently taking advantage of an inexperienced councillor (Aeschin. 3.125). In several speeches of Lysias, coming into the Bouleuterion means coming into contact with the Thirty, either to be tried, convicted and sentenced to death for being a loyal democrat; to try and fail to remain loyal to the city while they ruled; or to be actively complicit in their plans.¹⁶

One forensic discussion of behaviour in the Bouleuterion is particularly powerful for its demonstration of the potential for inappropriate citizen behaviour to endanger not just the democracy but the fabric of the city itself. The speaker in Antiphon *On the Chorus Boy*, a *chorēgos* accused of homicide, alleges that his opponents’ charge is false because they did not do everything possible to prevent him from fulfilling his duty as a member of the Boule (Antiph. 6.45; Gagarin 1997: 245):

But these men knew the law well and saw me entering the Bouleuterion as a member of the Boule—and in the Bouleuterion there stands a shrine to Zeus of the Boule and Athena of the Boule, and the *bouleutai* go and pray in it, and I was one of the ones who did this, and I entered all the other shrines with the Boule, and I sacrificed and prayed on behalf of this city... (trans. Gagarin 1998, adjusted)

Accusations of homicide at Athens came with a restriction on movement, which included a ban on entry to certain public buildings and spaces including the Bouleuterion.¹⁷ Similar restrictions applied to impiety charges (e.g., [Lys.] 6.24-25). What is crucial in this passage from Antiphon

is that the speaker went about his normal Boule duties in the Bouleuterion, including praying at the relevant shrines. The restriction existed in part to prevent the pollution of public and religious places by a killer with blood on his hands, and this passage would have been designed to persuade the jury that the prosecutors cannot have been serious about the charges if they were willing to allow such an obvious offence against the purity of Athenian space (Plastow 2020: 66-71). Antiphon's strategy is an inversion of those outlined above: the true offence against Athens is not the *chorēgos*' behaviour in the Bouleuterion, but his prosecutors' failure to prevent it.

It is crucial that, when expressing these fears of corruption, the orators use the language of the Bouleuterion rather than simply the Boule. It is clear that, despite law and expectation, some councillors and other citizens will not discharge their duties in the correct way. But if human behaviour is what creates a place, human *misbehaviour* along socially agreed lines endangers the integrity of that place, and thus could cause the original expectations of correct action to disintegrate. The grounding of the wrong action in a physical space makes it a more real and insidious threat, not only to the individuals involved, but to the institutions of Boule, *dēmos*, and democracy to which that place has become intrinsically connected through repeated use in their service. This serves rhetorically to elicit from the jurors increased alarm and anger at the purported misbehaviour, and to activate their sense of citizen duty and feeling of protectiveness towards the democratic process. The implication is clear that a good citizen is someone who respects democratic processes through behaving properly with regard to democratic space (and vice versa), though what 'behaving properly' entailed could vary depending on the political circumstances.

Alongside the rhetorical construction of the Bouleuterion as a site of good or bad citizen behaviour, it is also presented as a place to police that behaviour. The Bouleuterion was the location of the first stage of the *dokimasia*, an automatic procedure that assessed a potential archon or councillor's right to serve in the role before he took it up; it was also the site of certain *eisangelia* procedures, a form of impeachment that could be brought at any time during a public official's career if he were suspected of misbehaviour relating to the office. Pseudo-Demosthenes gives us a clear account of the latter ([Dem.] 47.41-42):

Well then, after I had been robbed of the security and then beaten by Theophemus, I went to the Boule; I showed the members my bruises and described what I had suffered and said that it had happened while I was trying to recover equipment for the city. The Boule was angered at the treatment I had

received and, seeing my condition, believed the outrage was directed not against me but against themselves and the *dēmos* who had voted for the decree and the law that had made it obligatory to recover the equipment. The Boule therefore ordered me to denounce [*eisangellein*] the man... he was convicted in the Bouleuterion and judged to be acting against the law. (trans. Scafuro 2011, adjusted)

The logographer emphasizes the Bouleuterion as the location of judgement, and also explicitly ties the behaviour that the *eisangelia* is seeking to redress as a crime not just against the individual but against the Boule, the *dēmos*, and the law itself: the three branches of the Athenian democracy. By failing to facilitate the smooth transition of the trierarchy, an institution closely related to citizenship, Theophemus was standing against the whole democratic system.¹⁸

Elsewhere, Lysias clearly illustrates the role of the Boule in maintaining standards for public officials through these procedures (Lys. 31.1-2):

I would never have expected Philon to reach such a level of audacity, members of the Boule, that he would be willing to appear before you to face his *dokimasia*. However, since he is audacious not just in one respect but in many, and since I took an oath when I came into the Bouleuterion that I would offer the best advice for the city, and since moreover it is required by that oath to make known if one is aware that any of those selected by lot is not suitable to serve on the Boule—for all these reasons I shall deliver the accusation against Philon here. (trans. Todd 2000, adjusted)

Here, entering the Bouleuterion to take up a role as a councillor becomes a signifier for the act of protecting the city and its citizens from those who are not qualified to serve it well.¹⁹ Aeschines also emphasizes this role to highlight where a previous Boule failed in this task, leaving the law court, another citizen group, to take up the task (Aeschin. 1.112). In these extracts, the Boule appears more self-reflexive, offering up an ideal of casting out those who behave unacceptably from within the citizen space, albeit one that they cannot always live up to.

But condemnation of poor citizen behaviour in the Bouleuterion does not require a formal procedure to occur. Aeschines relates an incident during which Demosthenes gave a

mocking account of Alexander in the Boule, and Aeschines had to censure him (Aeschin. 1.169):

I criticized Demosthenes in the Bouleuterion not out of a desire to curry favour with [Alexander] but because I felt that if you listened to such things, the city would appear to share the speaker's lack of decency. (trans. Carey 2000, adjusted)

Aeschines is clear that the Boule is the city's representative, and that their treatment of a speaker could be taken to indicate the collective view of the citizens towards that person. The Bouleuterion almost becomes a microcosm of the city itself, and the danger of allowing bad citizen behaviour to proliferate there is an indicator of the far greater damage that could be caused if it proliferates throughout the city at large.

Removal to Thebes

In the speeches *On the Embassy* and *Against Ctesiphon*, Aeschines twice makes use of the image of the removal of an important Athenian structure from Athens to the Cadmea in Thebes, the city's citadel and equivalent to Athens' Acropolis. These two passages appear in narratives from Aeschines that occur during the period of Athens' conflict and negotiations with Philip of Macedon, albeit over ten years apart. Since the battle of Leuctra in 371 BCE Athens had been wary of Thebes' fluctuating but steadily growing power in central Greece, and the issue of whether to ally with Thebes against Philip or with Philip against Thebes was a point of contention between Demosthenes and Aeschines (Worthington 2012: 186-187).²⁰

The removal of the Propylaea is presented as an indirect quotation of the Theban general Epaminondas and appears as part of Aeschines' quotation of his own speech during a meeting of the envoys to Macedon (Aeschin. 2.105):

'Men who are concerned for the public good should not take on the role of other representatives whom the Athenians could have sent instead of us, while they personally avoid the hostility of Thebes. Epaminondas was a Theban; he did not cower before the prestige of Athens but stated frankly in the Theban Assembly

that they should transfer the Propylaia of the Athenian Acropolis to the front of the Cadmea.’ (trans. Carey 2000)²¹

Aeschines relates that he was arguing both for Philip to sanction Thebes’ destruction of other cities in Boeotia, and for his ability to speak freely against Thebes as part of the embassy on the basis of the decree of the Athenian Assembly, which provided that the envoys should ‘negotiate any other advantage they can’ (Aeschin. 2.104, trans. Carey 2000). Whether Epaminondas ever actually said this cannot be known: presumably it would have had to have been reported to Aeschines, who would not have been present in the Theban Assembly, and Aeschines is already reporting his own speech, so we are at minimum three levels removed from the original statement. In the light of the statement below in *Against Ctesiphon*, it is tempting to believe the formulation is in fact an invention of Aeschines. In any case, the meaning is the same. The transferral of the Athenian Propylaia to the Theban Cadmea would not only be a source of humiliation for Athens and a usurpation of their prominent position in Greece as a whole (Kostopoulos 2019: 97-98; Paulsen 1999: 365). It would also demonstrate Theban power over Athens – and might suggest that, in such a situation, Athenian citizenship becomes worthless.

In the later speech *Against Ctesiphon*, the removal of the Bouleuterion is imagined by Aeschines to already have happened, a metaphor for the concessions Demosthenes pressed the Athenians to make to the Thebans in the course of their alliance, which Aeschines characterizes as a surreptitious act of betrayal (Aeschin. 3.145):

A second crime he committed, much worse than this, was that at a stroke he surreptitiously spirited away our city’s Bouleuterion and the democracy and transferred them to Thebes, to the Cadmea, when he agreed to give the Boeotarchs joint control of our policy. (trans. Carey 2000)

The moving of the council house to Thebes is a potent representation of the concept of handing over control of Athens to the Boeotarchs, the annually elected governors of Boeotia, several of whom came from Thebes. The pairing of the Bouleuterion and the democracy in Aeschines’ image is particularly telling: the building is a clear symbol of the operation of the democracy and the everyday running of the city. In Aeschines’ formulation, Demosthenes has not only given Thebes control over Boeotian territories but over Athens itself, invalidating the ability of Athenian citizens to run their own *polis*.

The fact that Aeschines employs the same image twice with different prominent Athenian structures is striking. It emphasizes the conceptual power that these buildings must have had for the Athenian citizen judges, and their deep connection to the Athenian identity. The idea of removing the Propylaia or the Bouleuterion from Athens to Thebes activates the audience's associations with these buildings in a similar way to their previously mentioned rhetorical uses, though now not to glorify Athens or demonstrate the importance of its daily operations but to show the danger that the city's reputation was in. These images were intended to strike fear into the hearts of the Athenian citizen judges by grounding the concept of the city's overthrow in physical monuments and forcing them to imagine Athens without the accustomed presence of the Propylaia or the Bouleuterion. The rhetoric is also intended to provoke feelings of humiliation: Aeschines presents the structures as if they were gifts or trophies captured by the enemy. This angle is particularly potent in the case of the Propylaia, where a structure that frames the Acropolis, a site emblematic of Athenian victory, is transformed to a symbol of potential defeat. By forcing citizens to imagine their city without two buildings representative of intrinsic aspects of their identity, Aeschines can more forcefully make his anti-Theban point and encourage the jurors to be protective of their city and their citizenship.

Conclusion

While places may be used rhetorically to achieve a variety of effects, specific Athenian locations can evoke a sense of citizen pride and duty that would have been particularly persuasive to the Athenian citizen jury. Citizen behaviour and spatial knowledge gave these places their rhetorical power: we may assume that all Athenian citizens would have known the Propylaia and what it represented historically and ideologically and would have seen it regularly, perhaps even on their way to the law courts. It is likely that many of them would have served as councillors and thus would also be very familiar with the Bouleuterion, and even those who had not served would almost certainly have been aware of the building's use. This short study suggests that speaking about monuments invokes grand civic ideals designed to spur the jurors to act out of honour and the desire to live up to the name of their ancestors. Speaking about more quotidian buildings, on the other hand, often demonstrates the fragility of democratic procedure, and encourages the jury to seek to protect the *dēmos* and the city

through their vote. In both cases, it is the citizen status of the audience that makes such rhetoric particularly persuasive.

Bibliography

- Bakker, M.P. de (2012a) 'Lysias', in I.J.F. de Jong (ed.) *Space in ancient Greek literature* (Leiden) 375-392
- (2012b) 'Demosthenes', in I.J.F. de Jong (ed.) *Space in ancient Greek literature* (Leiden) 393-412
- Blanshard, A. (2014) 'The permeable spaces of the Athenian law-court', in N. Worman and K. Gilhuly (eds.) *Space, place, and landscape in ancient Greek literature and culture* (Cambridge) 240-275
- Boegehold, A.L. (1995) *The Athenian agora*, vol. XXVIII: *The lawcourts at Athens* (Princeton)
- Buckler, J. and Beck, H. (2008) *Central Greece and the politics of power in the fourth century BC* (Cambridge)
- Carey, C. (1989) *Lysias, selected speeches* (Cambridge)
- (2000) *Aeschines* (Austin)
- Cresswell, T. (2004) *Place: a short introduction* (Oxford)
- DiMaggio, P. and Powell, W.W. (1991) *The new institutionalism in organizational analysis* (Chicago)
- Dinsmoor, W.B. and Dinsmoor Jr, W.B. (2004) *The Propylaia to the Athenian Akropolis II: the classical building* (Princeton)
- Ehrkamp, P. and Jacobsen, M.H. (2015) 'Citizenship', in J. Agnew, V. Mamadouh, A.J. Secor, and J. Sharp (eds.) *The Wiley-Blackwell companion to political geography* 152-164
- Fredal, J. (2006) *Rhetorical action in ancient Athens: persuasive artistry from Solon to Demosthenes* (Carbondale)
- Gagarin, M. (1997) *Antiphon, The speeches* (Cambridge)
- (1998) 'Antiphon', in id. and MacDowell, D.M. (1998) *Antiphon and Andocides* (Austin)
- Giannadaki, I. (2020) *A commentary on Demosthenes' Against Androtion*, introduction, text, and translation (Oxford)
- Gibson, C.A. (2002) *Interpreting a classic: Demosthenes and his ancient commentators* (Berkeley)
- Greaney, G.L. (2005) *Aeschines, De falsa legatione/On the false embassy* (Lewiston, N.Y)
- Hansen, M.H. (2004) 'Introduction', in M.H. Hansen and T.H. Nielsen (eds.) *An inventory of archaic and classical poleis* (Oxford) 1-154

- Harris, E. M. (2008) *Demosthenes, speeches 20-22* (Austin)
- (2018) *Demosthenes, speeches 23-26* (Austin)
- Hobden, F. (2007) ‘Imagining past and present: a rhetorical strategy in Aeschines 3, Against Ctesiphon’, *CQ* 57, 490-501
- Hornblower, S. (2009) ‘Thucydides and the Athenian Boulē (council of five hundred)’, in L. Mitchell and L. Rubinstein (eds.) *Greek history and epigraphy: essays in honour of P.J. Rhodes* (Swansea) 251-264
- Hurwit, J.M. (2004) *The Acropolis in the age of Pericles* (Cambridge)
- Isin, E.F. and Nielsen, G.M. (eds.) (2008) *Acts of citizenship* (London)
- Kostopoulos, K. (2019) *Die Vergangenheit vor Augen* (Stuttgart)
- Lehmann, H.J.C. (2019) ‘The rhetoric of home and homeland in Demosthenes 19 “On the false embassy”’, *AJPh* 140, 643-670
- Liddel, P. (2007) *Civic obligation and individual liberty in ancient Athens* (Oxford)
- Miller, S.G. (1995) ‘Old Metroon and Old Bouleuterion in the classical agora of Athens’, in M.H. Hansen and K. Raaflaub (eds.) *Studies in the ancient Greek polis* (Stuttgart) 133-156
- O’Connell, P.A. (2017) *The rhetoric of seeing in Attic forensic oratory* (Austin)
- Osborne, R. (2018) ‘City and countryside’, in G. Martin (ed.) *The Oxford handbook of Demosthenes* (Oxford) 283-294
- Painter, J. and Philo, C. (1995) ‘Spaces of citizenship: an introduction’, *Political Geography* 14, 107-120
- Papillon, T.L. (1998) *Rhetorical studies in the Aristocratea of Demosthenes*, Lang classical studies v. 11 (New York)
- Paulsen, T. (1999) *Die Parapresbeia-Reden des Demosthenes und des Aischines. Kommentar und Interpretationen zu Demosthenes, or. XIX, und Aischines, or. II* (Trier)
- Plastow, C. (2019) ‘Space, place, and identity in Antiphon “On the murder of Herodes”’, in J. Filonik, B. Griffith-Williams, and J. Kucharski (eds.) *The making of identities in Athenian oratory* (London) 191-205
- (2020) *Homicide in the Attic orators* (London)
- Rackham, H. (trans.) (1932) *Aristotle: Politics*, Aristotle Vol. XXI; Loeb Classical Library 264 (Cambridge, MA)
- Rutishauser, B. (2019) ‘The wealth of metics and Athenian naval power’, in T.J. Figueira and S.R. Jensen (eds.) *Hegemonic finances: funding Athenian domination in the 5th and 4th centuries BC* (London) 233-258

- Scafuro, A. C. (2011) *Demosthenes, speeches 39-49* (Austin)
- Schmidt-Hofner, S. (2018) 'Visions of Attica', in G. Martin (ed.) *The Oxford handbook of Demosthenes* (Oxford) 191-206
- Shear, J.L. (2011) *Polis and revolution: responding to oligarchy in classical Athens* (Cambridge)
- Shear, Jr, T.L. (1995) 'Bouleuterion, Metroon, and the archives at Athens', in M.H. Hansen and K. Raaflaub (eds.) *Studies in the ancient Greek polis* (Stuttgart) 157-190
- (2016) *Trophies of victory: public building in Periklean Athens* (Princeton)
- Steinbock, B. (2013a) *Social memory in Athenian public discourse* (Ann Arbor)
- (2013b) 'Contesting the lessons from the past: Aeschines' use of social memory', *TAPhA* 143, 65-103
- Thompson, H.A. (1937) 'Buildings on the west side of the agora', *Hesperia* 6, 1-226
- Todd, S. C. (2000) *Lysias* (Austin)
- van Rookhuijzen, J.Z. (2020) 'The Parthenon treasury on the Acropolis of Athens', *AJA* 124, 3-35
- Waele, J. de (1990) *The Propylaia of the Akropolis in Athens: the project of Mnesikles* (Amsterdam)
- Webb, R. (2019) 'As if you were there: *enargeia* and spatiality in Lysias 1', in M.J. Edwards and D. Spatharas (eds.) *Forensic narratives in Athenian courts* (London) 151-170
- Westwood, G. (2020) *The rhetoric of the past in Demosthenes and Aeschines: oratory, history, and politics in classical Athens* (Oxford)
- Wohl, V. (2018) 'Jurisdiction and jurisprudence: the topography of law in Demosthenes 23 *Against Aristokrates*', in I. Giannadaki, C. Carey, and B. Griffith-Williams (eds.) *Use and abuse of law in the Athenian courts* (Leiden) 234-248
- Worthington, I. (2012) *Demosthenes of Athens and the fall of classical Greece* (Oxford)

¹ For an overview of modern approaches to these relationships, see, e.g., Painter and Philo (1995) (and the other contributions to the special edition of *Political Geography*), Isin and Nielsen (2008), Ehrkamp and Jacobsen (2015).

² See recent spatial approaches to Athenian oratory e.g., Fredal (2006); Bakker (2012a); Bakker (2012b); Osborne (2018); Schmidt-Hofner (2018); Wohl (2018); Webb (2019); Plastow (2019).

³ Phyle: e.g., Lys. 13.77-82. Sparta: e.g., Lys. 12.58, 13.11-12. Macedonia: Aeschin. 2.22-23, 2.58. Chersonese: Dem. 23.8-15. Lesbos: Antiph. 5.20-29.

⁴ See, e.g., Shear (2011); Westwood (2020); Kostopoulos (2019); Steinbock (2013a: esp. 84-94).

⁵ Propylaia: Dem. 22.13, 22.76, 23.207, 24.184, Aeschin. 2.74, 2.105, Lycurg. speech 14 fr. 2 Loeb. Parthenon: mentioned by name in Dem. 22.13, 22.76, 24.184; referred to as the ‘temple of Athena’ in Dem. 36.16; two mentions to ‘the temple’ with reference to the Acropolis in Isoc. 17.17 and Isae. 5.42 also probably imply the Parthenon. Lycurg. speech 14 fr. 2 Loeb also mentions the ‘Hekatompedon’, ‘hundred-foot temple’, which Harpokration identifies as a reference to the Parthenon. On the naming of the Parthenon, including Demosthenes as the earliest attribution of this name to the great temple of Athena on the Acropolis, see van Rookhuijzen (2020: 4-9).

⁶ On the actual timing of the building programme, some 30-50 years after the Persian wars ended, see Shear, Jr (2016: 5-11).

⁷ For a detailed study of the dimensions of the Propylaia see Waele (1990). The other major work on the architecture of the classical structure is Dinsmoor and Dinsmoor Jr (2004).

⁸ On sight-lines from the Pnyx, see Fredal (2006: 121-123).

⁹ On the power of Athenian monuments in this regard more broadly, see Hobden (2007: 497-498), Liddel (2007: 156-158).

¹⁰ On the chronology of these events, and on this passage and its ancient commentary more broadly, see Gibson (2002: 181-185). On the importance of the collapsed chronology for the argument about ships, see Giannadaki (2020: 166). On the changing associations and meaning of these structures over time, see Steinbock (2013b: 80-81).

¹¹ An even more powerful visual effect along these lines would have been achieved by Demosthenes’ mention of the Propylaia in the Assembly at 13.28; see Westwood (2020: 18); Kostopoulos (2019: 91).

¹² On the value of seeing for rhetoric, see O’Connell (2017).

¹³ The original excavations and identifications are recorded in Thompson (1937: 127-160). For a reinterpretation of the Old Bouleuterion that argues it was in fact a Metroon from its inception, see Miller (1995); against this see Shear, Jr (1995). The word *bouleutērion* was also sometimes used to refer to other meeting-places of councils, such as the Areopagus: see Miller (1995: 144).

¹⁴ Bouleuterion as treasury: Dem. 24.96, 40.20, 59.27; as record store: Aeschin. 2.59, 92; as the site of award of crowns: Aeschin. 3.32, 45, Dem. 18.55.

¹⁵ The conspirators hold the Bouleuterion for themselves: Dem. 22.38; the ‘talkers’ will rule in the Bouleuterion: Dem. 22.37; Androtion does not attend the Bouleuterion: Dem. 22.36.

¹⁶ Loyal democrats tried by the Thirty in the Bouleuterion: Lys. 13.38; loyal councillors entering the Bouleuterion under the Thirty: Lys. 20.1; presence in the Bouleuterion indicates complicity with the Thirty: Lys. 12.25.

¹⁷ E.g., Dem. 20.158, Antiph. 3.3.11, 6.36, Pl. *Leg.* 9.871a; see also Plastow (2020: 57-58).

¹⁸ While it seems certain that the trierarchy was intended to be limited to citizens, for the evidence and complexities of the potential involvement of metics in the trierarchy, see Rutishauser (2019: 235-239).

¹⁹ On the rhetorical distancing from personal involvement in the situation here, see Carey (1989: 185).

²⁰ On the changing relationships between the two states throughout the fourth century, see Buckler and Beck (2008: esp. 233-253).

²¹ Greaney (2005) makes no comment on this passage, except to note that the Cadmea was named after Cadmus, the mytho-historical founder of Thebes.