

ACTA CLASSICA UNIV. SCIENT. DEBRECEN.	LVI.	2020.	pp. 327–340.
--	------	-------	--------------

RELIGIOUS VOCABULARY IN DEMOSTHENES' SPEECH AGAINST TIMOCRATES

BY DÁNIEL SERES

Institute of Ancient History, Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest
d.seres@gmail.com

Abstract: In this study I argue that the words “ἱερόσυλος” (temple-robber) and “κατάρατος” (accursed) are key elements in Demosthenes' speech against Timocrates. In both cases, I argue that in this speech elements of religious vocabulary are clearly used: Demosthenes legitimately and convincingly uses such strong expressions against his opponents. As these words rarely occur in texts of the classical period, I shall examine in parallel the prose texts of the fifth to third centuries BC, furthermore the epigraphical sources and the dramas, which are the primary requirements to understanding the role of these words in argument.

Keywords: ἱερόσυλος (hierosylos), κατάρατος (kataratos), Demosthenes, Against Timocrates

In 345 BC Androtion, Melanopus and Glauketes were sent as ambassadors to Mausolus, the ruler of Caria.¹ On their voyage they captured a ship from Naucratis with a cargo worth nine and a half talents. Instead of handing the money to the state treasury and the gods, they kept it. Euctemon proposed a decree that the cargo along with a serious fine – the new sum was more than twenty-four talents – should be handed over. The three men brought against Euctemon a prosecution for illegal proposal (*graphe paranomon*). The court released Euctemon, so the bill he had filed remained in force and sentenced Androtion and his colleagues. At that time, Timocrates passed a bill² with great haste that proposed the following in a nutshell: if an Athenian citizen is imprisoned for some kind of a public debt, he should have the right to have a guarantor who pays for the debt instead of him by a specified date, and in that case he could leave freely. If the guarantor fails to do so, he will also be imprisoned and his property will be confiscated. In response, Diodorus took Timocrates to trial, claiming that the law was inexpedient (*graphe nomon me epitedeion*).³

¹ For the historical context and the speech itself, see MacDowell 2009, 181–195, Harris 2018, 108–117. In short, see Worthington 2013, 104–105.

² Dem. 24.39–40.

³ Demosthenes wrote the speech, or at least most of it. Many scholars also draw attention to the text-critical problem, MacDowell 2009, 193–196, Worthington 2013, 104–105, Wayte 1893,

There is a newer aspect of religious research.⁴ Researchers are focusing on the religious aspects of the 4th century BC orations in order to better understand the argumentations of the speeches. The question is whether these sources are part of a specific, more or less fact-based legal argument or rather part of a rhetorical tool that focuses on emotions. Sometimes these are only a word or a phrase in the structure of the speech. Later, I will argue that Demosthenes uses the words “ιερόσυλος” (temple-robber) and “κατάρατος” (accursed) against his opponents, Timocrates and Androtion, legitimately and convincingly.⁵

Temple-robbers

The expression “temple-robber” (ιερόσυλος)⁶ is a part of the psychological toolkit in the speech, as Demosthenes refers not to Timocrates, but to Androtion and his companions with such qualification, and so in proceedings against Timocrates it cannot be connected exclusively to strict legal argumentation. He aims to reduce Timocrates’ reputation and lessen his credibility by stating that Timocrates only presented this draft bill for the sake of pitiful and sacrilegious people. If we want to get an accurate picture of what effects this term may have had on the audience, we need to have a deeper understanding of the context and the texts related to it:

“οὐ γὰρ δὴ ἔρεϊ γ’ ὡς τοὺς τοιούτους οὐ καὶ προσήκει καὶ οἱ νόμοι κελεύουσιν ταῖς μεγίσταις τιμωρίαις ἐνόχους εἶναι, οὐδ’ ὡς οὗτοι, ὑπὲρ ὧν εὔρηκε τὸν νόμον, οὐ καὶ κλέπται καὶ ἱερόσυλοι εἰσιν, τὰ μὲν ἱερά, τὰς δεκάτας τῆς θεοῦ καὶ τὰς πεντηκοστὰς τῶν ἄλλων θεῶν, σεσυληκότες καὶ ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀποδοῦναι αὐτοὶ ἔχοντες, τὰ δ’ ὅσα, ἃ ἐγίγνετο ὑμέτερα, κεκλοφότες. διαφέρει δὲ τοσοῦτον αὐτῶν ἢ ἱεροσυλία τῶν ἄλλων, ὅτι τὴν ἀρχὴν οὐδ’ ἀνήνεγκαν εἰς τὴν ἀκρόπολιν, δέον αὐτούς.”

221–235, but Harris (2018, 117. note 24.) refutes them. Diodorus performed it, just like the one against Androtion. *Lib. Hyp.* 22–23.

⁴ The best example of such research is Martin 2009, which provided the basis for this work.

⁵ There are 265 mentions of the word “ιερόσυλος” and 811 of the word “κατάρατος” in the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* database (run under Diogenes v. 3.1). A full lexicographical research would go far beyond the limits of this study. Therefore only the fifth to third centuries BC occurrences will be analyzed, in order to see the changes in the meanings of the studied words in a bit wider context. For the usage of these words during the previous and following centuries – in general – see LSJ and BDAG s.v. ἱερόσυλος, κατάρατος and PGL s.v. ἱεροσυλέω, ἱεροσυλία, ἱερόσυλος, καταράομαι.

⁶ The common translation of the word “ιερόσυλος” is “temple-robber”, but this translation is somewhat misleading since they did not have a temple in every *temenos*. However, stealing an olive branch, a votive object, or as in this present case 57,000 drachmas, was still considered a temple robbery since they were the property of the deity. For strict regulations on sanctuary areas, see Nemeth 1997, 21–30, Lupu 2009, 9–40.

“Timocrates will certainly not deny that justice and the laws require that such men be subject to the greatest punishments nor that these men for whose benefit the invented the law are thieves and looters of sacred property (κλέπται καὶ ἱερόσυλοι) when they have seized and still retain tithes of the goddess and the fiftieths of the other gods instead of returning them and that they have stolen public property that belongs to you.”⁷

It is evident from this text that Demosthenes does not really divert from the facts by using the word “ἱερόσυλος”. The 12 percent of the amount appropriated by Androtion and his companions should be unambiguously treated as sacred property, therefore even if Demosthenes escalates their sins from theft to temple-robbery, he still has evidence for his claims. The question is whether in the particular case of theft, at least on a theoretical level, could this act be classified as a temple-robbery or does Demosthenes just use this phrase to imply ‘thief’ is synonymous with “robber”. Let’s examine what the contemporary – the fourth to third centuries BC – texts say about the use of the word “ἱερόσυλος”.

Lysias in his speech against Nicomachus, a clerk, the orator uses the phrase as follows:

“I ask you therefore, gentlemen of the jury, to bear in mind that when we act according to the decrees, the traditional sacrifices are performed in full, but when we act according to the inscribed stones which this man has put up, many of the rites are suppressed. And in the middle of everything, this temple-robber charges around, claiming that his activity as *anagraphheus* owes more to religious propriety than to penny-pinching.”⁸

It is evident from the speech that the term “temple-robber” is not to be understood literally but rather in the broader sense of the meaning as a rogue. Since no concrete robbery has occurred, the accuser altered the expenditures of the sacrifices. The only reason why we can consider Nicomachus as a robber is because he was in his position of payment for 6 years rather than the agreed 4 months.⁹ In the preserved texts from the Old and New Comedies, the authors such as Aristophanes or Menander use this phrase in the previously discussed general sense.¹⁰

In Plato’s *Law*, he deals with the issue of temple-robbery in several instances.¹¹ The following piece provides the most information:

“[854d] If a man is caught thieving from a temple and is a foreigner or slave, a brand of his misfortune shall be made on his face and hands, and he shall be whipped, the number of lashes to be decided by his judges. Then he shall be thrown out beyond the boundaries

⁷ Dem. 24.120, translated by Edward Harris

⁸ Lys. 30.21, translated by S. C. Todd.

⁹ Lys. 30.2.

¹⁰ Ar. *Pl.* 30.; Men. *Asp.* 227., *Dys.* 640., *Epit.* 935., 1064., 1100., 1122., *Pk.* 366., *Sam.* 678.

¹¹ Pl. *Lg.* 854d–855a, translated by Plato considers temple robbery so sinful of a crime, that in his opinion, the mere thought of it should be driven away by ritual cleansing, see Pl. *Lg.* 854a–c.

of the land, naked. Perhaps paying this penalty will teach him restraint and make him a better man: after all, no penalty imposed by law has an evil purpose, but generally achieves one of two effects: it makes the person who pays the penalty either more virtuous [854e] or less wicked. If a citizen is ever shown to be responsible for such a crime – to have perpetrated, that is, some great and unspeakable offence against the gods or his parents or the state, the penalty is death. The judge should consider him as already beyond cure; he should bear in mind the kind of education and upbringing the man has enjoyed from his earliest years, and how after all this he has still not abstained from acts of the greatest evil. But the very tiniest of evils will be what the offender suffers; indeed, he will be of service to others, by being a lesson to them when he is ignominiously banished from sight beyond [855a] the borders of the state.”¹²

The same rigour appears in the most frequently quoted Xenophon script in connection with temple-robbery:

“Or if you do not wish to do this, try them under the following law, which applies to temple-robbers and traitors: namely, if anyone shall be a traitor to the state or shall steal sacred property, he shall be tried before a court, and if he be convicted, he shall not be buried in Attica, and his property shall be confiscated.”¹³

From the above-mentioned sources, it can be stated that if the context shows that a temple-robbery was actually committed, then we are facing one of the most serious criminal offences. In the case of Androtion and his colleagues, this category of criminal law clearly did not exist, as there is no indication that anyone tried to prove this during the judicial proceeding. Though there is no legal punishment, Demosthenes still indicates that with his usage of words that this crime was committed or perhaps an even more serious one:

“Their sacrilege is greater than that of others because they never brought money to the Acropolis at all when they were required.”¹⁴

Demosthenes’ argument does not stand legally. However logically it is correct, as part of the money should have been paid into the treasury of different temples but the accused did not fulfil this obligation. Thus, the property of the temples was effectively stolen, therefore they could be called a temple-robber. This is not only the thought process of the researchers of the 21st century, the same chain of

¹² Pl. *Lg.* 854d–855a, translated by Trevor J. Saunders. He once again reaffirms the very seriousness of temple robberies at the beginning of Book X. cf. Pl. *Lg.* 884–885a.

¹³ Xen. *HG.* 17.22, translated by Carleton L. Brownson. The absence of funeral and death penalty also appears in the works of Diodorus Siculus cf. D.S. 16.25.2., 16.31.1., 16.56.5.

¹⁴ Dem. 24.120, translated by Edward Harris. Martin 2009, 127–135. does not mention this text. The previous Wayte edition identifies the problem, but ends it by stating that it is not clear why they would have committed a more serious sin cf. Wayte 1893, 185. Edward Harris does not comment on the quoted part in his new translation cf. Harris 2018, 161.

thought can be observed in the following contemporary¹⁵ healing inscription from Epidaurus:

“Echedorus received the tattoos of Pandarus along with those he already had. He had taken money from Pandarus in order to make a dedication to the god at Epidaurus for him, but he did not hand it over. Sleeping here, he saw a vision. It seemed to him that the god came to him and asked whether he had any money of Pandarus to make a dedication for Athena in the sanctuary. He answered that he had taken nothing of the kind from him, but that if he would make him well, he would have an image inscribed and dedicate it to him. At that the god seemed to tie Pandarus’ fillet around his tattoos and to order him, when he went outside the Abaton, to take off the fillet and wash his face at the fountain and to look at his reflection in the water. When day came, he went out of the Abaton and took off the fillet, which no longer had the letters, but when he looked into the water, he saw that his own face bore his original tattoos and had taken on the letters of Pandarus.”¹⁶

Echedorus similar to Androtion appropriated the sum that was entrusted to him, before he could offer it to the God, as such the God applied a punishment for slaves, quoted from the Platonic Laws, marking and stigmatizing him with a new tattoo.¹⁷

Demosthenes to emphasize his claim and to further inflame the audience’s sense of outrage, in the next caput he equates Androtion and his colleagues’ actions with another sacred sin, accusing them of *hybris*:

“By Olympian Zeus, I think, men of the court, that insolence and arrogance did not come upon Androtion by accident, but were sent by the goddess so that just like those who hacked the wings from the statue of Victory and brought destruction on themselves, these men too will in the same way bring about their own destruction by accusing each other and paying a tenfold penalty according to the law or be put in prison.”¹⁸

Accursed people

The use of word the “accursed” (*κατάρατος*) strengthens the specific legal argument as Demosthenes uses this phrase for Timocrates:

¹⁵ The corpus is dated to the 4th century BC cf. IG IV² 121–124. For research on the healing inscriptions, see Herzog 1931, Dillon 1994, LiDonnici 1995, Solin 2013.

¹⁶ IG IV² 121, 54–68 (A7), translated by Lynn R. LiDonnici.

¹⁷ Research assumes about Pandorus (see his story on panel A6) the protagonist, Echedorus that could have been a slave or a soldier because of his tattoos cf. LiDonnici 1995, 91. note 15.

¹⁸ Dem. 24.121, translated by Edward Harris. Harris (2018, 161. note 191.) assumes (in line with the scholion associated with the text cf. Schol. ad Dem. 24.121. 239b.) that this is the statue of Athena in Parthenon, holding a winged Nike in her hand cf. Paus. 1.24.5–7.— the specific event is unknown.

“ἢ πῶς οὐ κάκιστος ἀπάντων ἀνθρώπων δικάως ἂν νομίζοιο, ὅστις, ὃ κατάρατε, περὶ πλείονος φαίνει τοὺς κλέπτας καὶ τοὺς κακούργους καὶ τοὺς ἀστρατεύτους τῆς πατρίδος ποιούμενος, καὶ διὰ τούτους καθ’ ἡμῶν νόμον τίθης;”

“How would it not be right to consider you the worst person in the world, you damned criminal (ὃ κατάρατε), who clearly care more about thieves, criminals, and men who have deserted our country and for their sake have passed a law that harms us?”¹⁹

Demosthenes accuses Timocrates among others, stating that the law introduced in Androtion’s interest was not proposed on a suitable day. Therefore he committed a religious crime, as such the use of the term “accursed” is justified. The next three short passages accurately summarize the accusations of Demosthenes:

“Yet although there were so many requirements, Timocrates here did not meet any of them: he did not display the law, did not allow anyone who read it and wished to lodge an objection to do so, and did not wait for the time appointed by law. The meeting of the Assembly during which you voted about the laws took place on 11th Hekatombaion. He immediately proposed his law on the next day, the 12th, though that was during the Kronia and when the Council was in recess.”²⁰

“Here is the proof: when the *nomothetai* hold a meeting about these matters, the budget and the Panathenaea, no one has ever introduced any law, be it better or worse. Yet Timocrates here was casually passing laws concerning matters that the decree did not order and the laws do not allow: he believed that the time appointed by the decree had more authority than the time stated in the laws. He was not afraid at all if—when you were all celebrating the holy month when the law prohibits men from doing wrong, whether public or private, to each other either and does not allow any business to be transacted except about the festival—he will clearly be harming not just one individual but the entire city.”²¹

“When the city has granted us immunity from suffering anything painful or terrible at this time by instituting the sacred month, how is it not intolerable for the city itself not to receive this protection against Timocrates but to suffer the greatest injustices during this sacred month? For what greater injustice could a private citizen do than to destroy the laws that regulate its affairs?”²²

Nowadays scholars accept Demosthenes’ accusation, which means that Timocrates committed a procedural mistake when proposing the law so it must be annulled.²³ Thus the next question is whether word “κατάρατος” still had religious

¹⁹ Dem. 24.107, translated by Edward Harris. Repeats the phrase in caput 198.

²⁰ Dem. 24.26, translated by Edward Harris.

²¹ Dem. 24.29, translated by Edward Harris.

²² Dem. 24.31, translated by Edward Harris.

²³ Martin 2009, 132, Canevary, 2013, 80–104. A similar problem arises in Aeschin. 3.67.: “He proposed that the Presidents (*prytaneis*) convene an Assembly on the eighth of Elaphebolion, the day of the sacrifice to Asclepius and the opening ceremony (*proagon*) of the festival, on the sacred day, an occurrence without precedent in anyone’s memory.” Chris Carey’s translation.

connotation or did the word lose this. In his analysis, Gunther Martin believes that in this special circumstance the religious connotation could still exist.²⁴ Later, I am not only going to argue that this religious connotation is possible but also unavoidable based on the parallel texts.

Accursed people in epigraphical sources

It is without a doubt that in the case of epigraphic sources the word “κατάρατος” has religious connotations. According to Searchable Greek Inscriptions – Phi – Database, the word “κατάρατος” appears in some form in a total of 24 inscriptions.²⁵ Of these, only seven inscriptions belong to the studied period.²⁶ It appears in the decree’s clauses: if someone breaks the rules set out there, the person becomes an outcast both in religious and legal terms. Let us look at, for example, the surviving inscription in Erythrae in Asia that regulates the filling of various positions. The text of the law is clear, if someone breaches the clauses, the person becomes outlawed in both religious and legal terms. It is undebatable that the word “κατάρατος”, in this dialectical form (κατάρητος), has a strong religious connotation in a similar text:

“Ἀπελλίας εἶπεν· ὅσοι ἤδη ἐγραμματεύσαν ἀπὸ Χαλκίδου ἕκασθεν, τούτων μὴ ἐξεῖναι γραμματεῦσαι ἔτι μηδενὶ μηδεμιῇ ἀρχῇ, μηδὲ τὸ λοιπὸν γραμματεῦεν ἐξεῖναι μηδενὶ πλέον ἢ ἅπαξ τῇ αὐτῇ ἀρχῇ, μηδὲ ταμίηπλέον ἢ ἐνὶ μηδὲ δύο τιμαῖς τὸν αὐτὸν· ὅς δ’ ἄγ γραμματεύσῃ ἢ ἀνέλθῃ ἢ εἴπῃ ἢ ἐπιψηφίσῃ, κατάρητόν τε αὐτὸν εἶναι καὶ ἄτιμον καὶ ὀφείλῃεν αὐτὸν ἑκατὸν στατήρας· ἐκπρηξάσθων δὲ οἱ ἐξετασται ἢ αὐτοὶ ὀφειλόντων· ἄρχεν δὲ τούτοις μῆνα Ἀρτεμισιδῶνα ἐπ’ ἱροποιοῦ Πόσσεος· ἔδοξεν τῇ βου[λῆ]· ὅς ἂν ποιή]σῃται γραμμα[τέα παρὰ τὴν στ]ήλην, ὀφε[ιλέτω — στατήρας]”

“Apellias has proposed: People who were secretaries from the year when Chalkides was archon²⁷ and onwards, no one of them is allowed to be secretary or to hold any other office. No one is allowed in the future to become a secretary more than once for the same office or treasurer more than once or to be elected in two offices simultaneously. Anyone who

²⁴ Martin (2009, 134.) is very careful stating: “...a word which is elsewhere employed as a term of abuse that has more or less lost its religious significance, but may in this instance be linked to Timocrates’ expulsion to Hades.” Wayte (1893, ad loc.) does not mention the possible problem of interpretation in any place, nor does Vince (1935, ad loc.) – however in the Loeb series translations are only commented in exceptional cases.

²⁵ IG III App. 77 (=TheDeMa. 106.16.); IG IX, 1² 1,148; IG XII, 2,526., 9,955., 9,1179; IG XII, 6,1,6; Erythrai 32; Halikarnassos 157; Labraunda 15; Mylasa 10*5; Sinuri 8; Teos 186; TAM IV 1,269; TAM V, 1,20, 3,1531; IMT skam/NebTaeler 192; MAMA IV 27–28., 335., 354., 356; CIG 3882b; Waelkens, Türsteine 492; Heberdey-Wilhelm, Reisen 38,94. IMT skam/NebTaeler 192.

²⁶ IG III App. 77 (=TheDeMa. 106.16.); IG IX, 1² 1,148; IG XII, 2,526; Halikarnassos 157; Labraunda 15; Sinuri 8; IMT skam/NebTaeler 192.

²⁷ Hieropoios: eponymos office-holder in Erythrae cf. Shrek 1991, 252.

becomes a secretary or is elected or proposes or votes for such a proposal, he shall be damned (κατάρητόν) and disenfranchised (ἄτιμον) and he shall owe a hundred staters...²⁸

The words “κατάρατος” or “ἐπικατάρατος” appear on three curse tables. Due to the type of inscription, there is no doubt about the presence of religious connotation. It is worthwhile to exclude two of the curse tablets from our study due to their large time and spatial differences.²⁹ Content-wise we do not have any reason for this. In the TheDeMA 178 text the accursed person appears as a qualifier, while in the TheDeMa 226 text the studied word appears as an imperative. The third curse tables fits into our analysis perfectly: it was engraved in a lead plate in the 3rd century BC in Attica, and the word “κατάρατος” is also used here as an imperative.³⁰

Accursed people in dramas

We can read the word “κατάρατος” for the first time in five different pieces of Euripides. Let us examine where it is possible that this expression has a religious connotation!

In *Medea*, this word appears two times, both from the mouth of Medea.³¹ In the first case she uses it for her children, and secondly for her husband. In both cases we can explain religious connotation since Jason breaks the sanctity of his marriage to Medea with his new marriage, bringing death on his children and his new wife, Glacue.

In *Hippolytos*, the dying Hippolytos calls himself “κατάρατος”.³² By only honouring the virgin goddess, Artemis, he commits hybris against Aphrodite because he is not concerned about love, so here the religious connotation is also entirely legitimate.

Andromache can rightly call herself accursed.³³ The events of the Trojan war seal the fate of her homeland, her family and her own life. Troy falls according to Hera’s wish, her husband Hector gets killed and later she becomes the servant

²⁸ Erythrai 32, translated by Ilias Arnaoutoglou. The inscription is dated to the 5th or 4th century BC; for further related resources and literature see Arnaoutoglou 1998, 84.

²⁹ Here I would like to thank Professor Martin Dreher for providing access to the Thesaurus Defixionum Magdeburgensis (TheDeMA) that he edited. The two curse tablets: TheDeMa. 178.5–6. (= Audollent 1904, Nr. 155.). The exact form – ἐπικατάρατος – dated to the 2nd century AD from Chalcis. TheDeMA. 226.2. (= IG XII 9, 955.) The exact form – ἐπικατάρατος – dated to the third quarter of the 4th century, discovered in Rome.

³⁰ TheDeMa. 106.16. (= Wunsch 1897, Nr. 77.)

³¹ Eur. *Med.* 112, 162.

³² Eur. *Hipp.* 1362.

³³ Eur. *Andr.* 838–839.

of Neptolemus, Achilles' son. Andromache, however, did not commit a sacred crime therefore in this case there is no extra connotation to the term "κατάρατος", but rather Euripides uses the term as a synonym of poor and unfortunate.³⁴

Helen, similar to Andromache, has every reason to feel the same way.³⁵ Because of Paris' decision to give the golden apple to Aphrodite, their love triggered the start of the Trojan War which caused the suffering and deaths of many Greek and Trojan people. Helen, however, desecrates her marriage to Menelaus, even if she does so by the will of Aphrodite, thus religious connotation could be justified here.

In *Hecabe* the word "κατάρατος" occurs twice.³⁶ First, Hecabe calls Polymestor accursed for killing her son Polydorus who came to the Thracian ruler to seek refuge. Polymestor is rightly considered to be accursed since he came as a guest, as a supplicant. However, in the second part of the drama, when Polymestor calls the slaves accursed for helping Hecabe to fulfil her plans, to kill his children and to blind him, he is only cursing when using the term "κατάρατος" since they did not commit any religious crime.

We can also find this term in several comedies of Aristophanes. In *The frogs*,³⁷ *Peace*,³⁸ *Ecclesiazusae*³⁹ and *Lysistrata*,⁴⁰ the term has no religious connotation. However, in *Thesmophoriazusae* Austin and Olson claim that there are three⁴¹ instances where this word has religious meaning. They argue that Mnesilchus, Euripides' relative can rightly call himself accursed, as the Sychtian guard him because as a man he attended the Thesmophoriazusae, therefore breaking the basic rule of the festival.⁴² The effect can be further enhanced by the context. The term "κατάρατος" appears where parodies of Euripides follow one another. In the case of such a rare expression, we may rightly assume that parallel Euripidic characters and stories have been recalled by the audience. This could have increased both the

³⁴ The immortal gods could seal the fate of any human being without any concrete human action or sacrilege e.g. when prophecies inevitably define the destiny of men (Achilles, Oedipus etc.). But in the case of Andromache there is no mention about such divine verdict on her fate, so she is just a victim of the terrible events of the Trojan War.

³⁵ Eur. *Hel.* 54.

³⁶ Eur. *Hec.* 716, 1064.

³⁷ Ar. *Ra.* 178.

³⁸ Ar. *Pax.* 33, 1076b, 1272.

³⁹ Ar. *Ecc.* 949.

⁴⁰ Ar. *Lys.* 530, 588.

⁴¹ Ar. *Th.* 1048., 1097, 1109.

⁴² Austin–Olson 2009, 320. The other commentaries on the occurrence of the word "κατάρατος" do not deal with the possible interpretations of it at all, nor do they mention it cf. Ussher 1986, Henderson 2002, Stevens 2002.

comic effect and the power of the word “κατάρατος.” In five out of eight occurrences of the term in Euripides’ texts there are religious connotations.

Accursed people in orations

Gunther Martin rightly states that the word “κατάρατος” as an invocation in Demosthenic corpus only appears in his speech *Against Timocrates* and *On the Crown*.⁴³ It would have been important to add that in the Demosthenic corpus there is further nine⁴⁴ and in the speeches of Dinarchus the word can be found three⁴⁵ more times as a qualifier. Let us review each occurrence.

In the speech, *On Organization* the word “κατάρατος” appears once in the form of “accursed Megarians” (πρὸς τοὺς καταράτους Μεγαρέας).⁴⁶ In this case this word undoubtedly has religious connotation. The Athenians in the second half of the 5th century BC accused the neighbouring Megarians of cultivating a holy, unplanted land called Hiera Orgas, this is clearly a sacred offence.⁴⁷

In the speech *On the Crown*, the term “κατάρατος” is used four times, however, I did not find any implication that would suggest religious connotation. In my opinion, in all four cases, Demosthenes uses this expression in colloquial form.⁴⁸

In the speech, *On the Dishonest Embassy*, the word “κατάρατος” can be found three times.⁴⁹ We can only observe the presence of religious connotation in the first case. Demosthenes almost instantly uses this word for Aeschines, because he refers to the prayer read at the beginning of council meetings that protects the council and its participants from betrayal.⁵⁰

“ἵνα τοίνυν εἰδῆθ’ ὅτι καὶ κατάρατός ἐστιν ὑφ’ ὑμῶν, καὶ οὐδ’ ὅσιον ὑμῖν οὐδ’ εὐσεβές ἐστι τοιαῦτ’ ἐψευσμένον αὐτὸν ἀφείναι, λέγε τὴν ἅρᾶν καὶ ἀνάγνωθι λαβῶν τὴν ἐκ τοῦ

⁴³ Martin 2009, 134. note 59. Dem. 24.107, 198; Dem. 18.209, 212, 244, 290.

⁴⁴ Dem. 13.32; 19.70, 75, 287; 21.164; 23.97, 201, 212; [Dem.] 25.82. (in the form of τρισκατάρατος) Harris (2018, 224. note 119.) adds that the τρισκατάρατος form only appears here in the Athenian tribunal speeches.

⁴⁵ Din. 1.47; 2.4, 15.

⁴⁶ Dem. 13.32.

⁴⁷ The area was linked to the cult of Demeter and Persephone which was present in the nearby Eleusis cf. Plu. *Per.* 30., Thuc. 1.139. For further resources and literature, see Harris 2013, 104–105. note 242.

⁴⁸ Dem. 18.209, 244, 290, 322. In the new English translation they no longer use the word “accursed”, instead they use the phrase “wretch” which translates into miserable and vile cf. Yunis 2005. Although Yunis does not draw attention to any interpretation issues in any of his work (Yunis 2001, 2005.).

⁴⁹ Dem. 19.70, 75, 287.

⁵⁰ The oath is also mentioned in Aeschin. 1.22–23; Dem. 20.107; 23.97; 24.149–151; Din. 2.14,16; Lyc. 1.31; Andoc. 1.31.

νόμου ταυτηνί. “Ἄρά” ταῦθ’ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, ὧ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, καθ’ ἐκάστην τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ὁ κῆρυξ εὔχεται νόμῳ προστεταγμένα, καὶ ὅταν ἡ βουλή καθῆται, παρ’ ἐκείνη πάλιν. καὶ ταῦτ’ οὐκ ἔνεστιν εἰπεῖν τούτῳ ὡς οὐκ εὖ ἦδει: ὑπογραμματεῶν γὰρ ὑμῖν καὶ ὑπηρετῶν τῇ βουλῇ αὐτὸς ἐξηγεῖτο τὸν νόμον τοῦτον τῷ κήρυκι. [71] πῶς οὖν οὐκ ἄτοπον καὶ ὑπερφυῆς ἂν πεπονηκότες ὑμεῖς εἴητε, εἰ ἂ προστάττετε, μᾶλλον δ’ ἀξιοῦτε ποιεῖν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν τοὺς θεούς, ταῦτ’ αὐτοὶ κύριοι γεγενημένοι τήμερον μὴ ποιήσατε, ἀλλ’ ὄν ἐκείνοις εὔχασθ’ ἐξώλη ποιεῖν αὐτὸν καὶ γένος καὶ οἰκίαν, τοῦτον ἀφείητ’ αὐτοί; μηδαμῶς: ὅς γὰρ ἂν ὑμᾶς λάθῃ, τοῦτον ἀφίετε τοῖς θεοῖς κολάζειν: ὄν δ’ ἂν αὐτοὶ λάβῃτε, μηκέτ’ ἐκείνοις περὶ τούτου προστάττετε.”

“So that you realize that Aeschines has actually fallen under your curse (καὶ κατάρατός ἐστιν ὑφ’ ὑμῶν) and that sanctity and piety forbid you to acquit him once he has uttered such lies, let the clerk take up the curse that is prescribed by law and recite it. [Curse] This is the prayer, ordained by law, which the herald utters on your behalf at every Assembly and in the Council too whenever it meets. Now, this man cannot say that he did not know about it: when he was a petty clerk and served the Council in that capacity, he himself dictated it to the herald. [71] How then would it not be a bizarre, monstrous act on your part if what you command, or rather, expect the gods to do on your behalf, you yourselves fail to do today when it lies within your power, and if you yourselves set free the very man whom you entreat the gods to obliterate along with his family and household? Do not do it! Should anyone escape your notice, leave it to the gods to punish him. But should someone fall into your hands, do not give the gods any more commands in regard to him.”⁵¹

Although the charges against Meidias were based on the events of Dionysia, where Meidias discredited Demosthenes as a choregus, and even hit him.⁵² In my opinion, the fact that it all happened in a festival is not enough in itself to attribute any additional religious connotation to word “κατάρατος”, no matter how Demosthenes tries to imply that Meidias’ crimes were sacred offences.⁵³

In the speech *Against Aristocrates*, the studied word appears three times.⁵⁴ In two cases it has religious connotations, once because of the curse at the beginning of the assembly, and in the second case, the phrase, once again, “accursed Megarians” is used.⁵⁵

In the speeches *Against Aristogiton*⁵⁶ the word accursed refers both legally and religiously to Aristogiton both by Demosthenes and Dinarchus because

⁵¹ Dem. 19.70–71, translated by Harvey Yuris. In the other two cases, Demosthenes only uses it as a curse word.

⁵² Dem. 21.15–18., Aeschin, 3.52.

⁵³ Dem. 21.164. Harris 2008 (ad. loc.), does not draw attention to the potential problem of interpretation.

⁵⁴ Dem. 23.97, 201, 212.

⁵⁵ Dem. 23.97, 212.

⁵⁶ [Dem.] 25.82. Religious terminology is a strong feature of the whole speech, see Martin 2009, 182–202; Din. 2.15. Dinarchus in the beginning of his speech (2.4) also uses the word “κατάρατος”, but only in a general sense referring to reprobates (πονηρός) and accursed. However, from the context it becomes clear that he is talking about Aristogiton. In the first case,

Aristogeton did not take care of his father, Cydimachus, since he did not even bury him.⁵⁷

In his speech *Against Demosthenes*, Dinarchus claimed that Demosthenes committed a false oath giving the offence additional religious meaning:

“...ἐπιωρκηκῶς μὲν τὰς σεμνὰς θεὰς ἐν Ἀρείῳ πάγῳ καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους θεοὺς οὐς ἐκεῖ διόμνυσθαι νόμιμόν ἐστι, κατάρατος δὲ καθ’ ἐκάστην ἐκκλησίαν γιγνόμενος...”

“...since he has sworn falsely on the Areopagus by the awful goddesses and the other gods, by whom it is traditional to swear there, and has become accursed at every Assembly.”⁵⁸

On the basis of the examined sources we can state that in the orations of the 4th century BC the word “κατάρατος” in appropriate context (10 out of 18 cases) had religious connotations. Depending on the committed crime for which the opponent is called accursed, whether it is closely connected to the accusation or not, it still strengthens the psychological and/or specific legal arguments. This view is strengthened by the fact that Demosthenes at the end of his oration not only recites Timocrates’ sacred crimes in front of the audience, but speaks of Timocrates’ hatred of the gods:

“You did not enact this law without receiving anything in return, Timocrates – how could you? Far from it. There is no other reason you could give that encouraged you to introduce the law than your own god-forsaken greed (ἢ τὴν σαυτοῦ θεοῖς ἐχθρὰν αἰσχροκέρδειαν), for none of these men is your relative, friend, or associate.”⁵⁹

After this, he once again calls Timocrates accursed,⁶⁰ and finally, in a very effective way, Demosthenes takes an oath to Athena, which undoubtedly reminds the audience of Androtion’s – and his colleagues’ – theft:

Worthington (2001, 46.) uses the word “accursed” in his translation, while in the second instance, specific case (Din. 2.15, Worthington 2001, 49.) he refines it and translates as “accursed wretch”. Perhaps it would have been expedient to keep the “accursed” translation in both cases since there is a religious surplus in the meaning of the term “κατάρατος”. Or he could have used “wretch” or “accursed wretch” in the first, more general case and used the term “accursed” in the second one.

⁵⁷ Both speeches refer to the absence of the funeral cf. [Dem.] 25.54; Din. 2.8, 11, 18. the maltreatment of the parents was punished cf. Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 56.6; Dem. 24.103–107.

⁵⁸ Din. 1.47, translated by Ian Worthington.

⁵⁹ Dem. 24.195, translated by Edward Harris.

⁶⁰ Dem. 24.198: “πολλῶ γὰρ δήπου σχετλιώτερ’ ἐπάσχεθ’ ὑμεῖς, καὶ πολὺ μᾶλλον ἂν εἰκότως ἠλέεις τούτους, οἳ δι’ ὑμᾶς, ὧ κατάρατε, τοὺς λέγοντας οὐδ’ ὅτι οὐκ εἰσφέροντες παύονται. καὶ οὐκ ἀπόγρη τοῦτο, ἀλλὰ καὶ διπλᾶ πράττονται, καὶ ταῦθ’ ὑπὸ σοῦ καὶ Ἀνδροτίωνος, οἳ μίαν εἰσφορὰν οὐδεπώποτ’ εἰσενηνόχατε.” “You people have certainly suffered far worse treatment! These men are far more deserving of pity, since they do not stop paying even a bit of their taxes, thanks to you speakers, you cursed man! Even this is not enough, but they are forced to pay double, all because of you and Androtion, who have never once paid the war tax.” Edward Harris’s translation.

“This man indeed had such a high opinion of himself, thinking he would never be brought to justice for this, that he alone of his ten colleagues dared to present his accounts with Androton. Without getting anything in return, for no benefit, Timocrates earns your hatred and introduces laws contrary to all your legislation, then, the final straw, contrary to his own earlier law! By Athena (μὰ τὴν Ἀθηνᾶν), I do not think that this has escaped your notice.”⁶¹

Bibliography

- Arnautoglou 1998 = Arnautoglou, Ilias: *Ancient Greek Laws: A Sourcebook*. London–New York, Routledge.
- Audollent 1904 = Audollent, Auguste: *Defixionum tabellae quotquot innotuerunt tam in Graecis orientis quam in totius occidentis partibus praeter Atticas in corpore inscriptionum Atticarum editas*. Paris.
- Austin – Olson 2009 = Austin, Colin – Olson, S. Douglas: *Aristophanes Thesmophoriazusae*. Oxford–New York, Oxford University Press.
- Canevaro 2013 = Canevaro, Mirko: *The Documents in the Attic Orators. Laws and Decrees in the Public Speeches of the Demosthenic Corpus*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Dielts 1986 = Dielts, M. R. (ed.): *Scholia Demosthenica*. Vol. II. Leipzig, Teubner.
- Dillon 1994 = Dillon, Matthew P. J.: The Didactic Nature of the Epidaurian Iamata. *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, CI, 239–260.
- Harris 2008 = Harris, Edward M.: *Demosthenes, Speeches 20–22*. Austin, Texas University Press.
- 2018 = Harris, Edward M.: *Demosthenes, Speeches 23–26*. Austin, Texas University Press.
- Henderson 2002 = Henderson, Jeffrey: *Aristophanes Lysistrata*. Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- Herzog 1931 = Herzog, Rudolf: *Die Wunderheilungen von Epidauros*. Leipzig.
- Lampe 1961 = Lampe, G. W. H.: *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*. Oxford, Clarendon Press. (= PGL)
- Liddle – Scott – Jones 1996 = Liddle, Henry George – Scott, Robert – Jones, Henry Stuart: *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Oxford, Clarendon Press. (= LSJ)
- LiDonnici 1995 = LiDonnici, Lynn R.: *The Epidaurian miracle inscriptions: Text Translation and Commentary*. Atlanta, Scholars Press.
- Lupu 2009 = Lupu, Eran: *Greek Sacred Law. A Collection of New Documents (NGSL²)*. Leiden–Boston, Brill.
- MacDowell 2009 = MacDowell, Douglas M.: *Demosthenes The Orator*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Martin 2009 = Martin, Gunther: *Divine Talk. Religious Argumentation in Demosthenes*. New York, Oxford University Press.
- Montanari 2015 = Montanari, Franco: *The Brill Dictionary of Ancient Greek*. Leiden–Boston, Brill. (= BDAG)
- Németh 1997 = Németh György: *Hekatompedon. Studies in Greek Epigraphy*. Debrecen.
- Shrek 1991 = Shrek, Robert K.: The Eponymous Officials of Greek Cities III: The Register: Thrace, Black Sea Area, Asia Minor. *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, Bd. 88, 225–260.
- Solin 2013 = Solin, Heikki: Inschriftliche Wunderheilungsberichte aus Epidauros. *Zeitschrift für antikes Christentum*, XVII, 7–50.
- Stevens 2002 = Stevens, P. T.: *Euripides Andromache*. Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- Ussher 1986 = Ussher, R. G.: *Aristophanes Ecclesiazusae*. Bristol, Bristol Classical Press.

⁶¹ Dem. 24.199, translated by Edward Harris. Demosthenes only swears an oath here to Athena in the whole corpus. In his speech *Against Timocrates*, he is sworn to Zeus 11 times cf. 28, 37, 94, 99, 121, 125 (twice), 126, 157, 176, 202.

- Vince 1935 = Vince, J. H. (trans.): *Demosthenes Orationes 21–26*. Cambridge, Massachusetts–London, Harvard University Press.
- Wayte 1893 = Wayte, William (ed.): *Demosthenes Against Androtion and Against Timocrates with Introductions and English Notes*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Worthington 2001 = Worthington, Ian (trans.): Dinarchus. In *Dinarchus, Hypereides, Lycurgus*. Austin, Texas University Press, 1–58.
- (2013) = Worthington, Ian: *Demosthenes of Athens and the Fall of Classical Greece*. Oxford–New York, Oxford University Press.
- Wünsch 1897 = Wünsch, Richard: *Defixionum Tabellae Atticae (IG III 3. Appendix)*. Berlin.
- Yunis 2001 = Yunis, Harvey (ed.): *Demosthenes On the Crown*. New York, Cambridge University Press.
- 2005 = Yunis, Harvey: *Demosthenes, Speeches 18 and 19*. Austin, Texas University Press.