

**ATINER's Conference Paper Proceedings Series**

LIT2017-0021

Athens, 22 August 2017

**Themistocles' Hetairai in a Fragment of Idomeneus of Lampsacus:  
A Small Commentary**

Marina Pelluci Duarte Mortoza

Athens Institute for Education and Research

8 Valaoritou Street, Kolonaki, 10683 Athens, Greece

ATINER's conference paper proceedings series are circulated to promote dialogue among academic scholars. All papers of this series have been blind reviewed and accepted for presentation at one of ATINER's annual conferences according to its acceptance policies (<http://www.atiner.gr/acceptance>).

© All rights reserved by authors.

**ATINER's Conference Paper Proceedings Series**

LIT2017-0021

Athens, 24 August 2017

ISSN: 2529-167X

Marina Pelluci Duarte Mortoza, Independent Researcher,  
Federal University of Minas Gerais, Brazil

**Themistocles' *Hetairai* in a Fragment of Idomeneus of  
Lampsacus: A Small Commentary<sup>1</sup>**

**ABSTRACT**

This paper aims to be a small commentary on a fragment cited by Athenaeus of Naucratis (2nd-3rd AD) in his *Deipnosophistai*. This is his only surviving work, which was composed in 15 books, and verses on many different subjects. It is an enormous amount of information of all kinds, mostly linked to dining, but also on music, dance, games, and all sorts of activities. On Book 13, Athenaeus puts the guests of the banquet talking about erotic matters, and one of them cites this fragment in which Idomeneus of Lampsacus (*ca.* 325-270 BCE) talks about the entrance of the great Themistocles in the *Agora* of Athens: in a car full of *hetairai*. Not much is known about Idomeneus, only that he wrote books on historical and philosophical matters, and that nothing he wrote survived. Only fragments cited by other authors made their way into Posterity. Themistocles (524-459 BCE) was a famous Greek politician and general, one of the main organizers of the Athenian resistance to the Second Persian Invasion of Greece (480-479 BCE). It was him who personally led the Greek fleet in the Battles of Artemisium and Salamis (both in 480 BCE) against the Persian fleet. The fragment by Idomeneus that interests this study only appears in the work of Athenaeus, and nowhere else, it is small and does not contain much information on the matter. The main objective of this paper is to use this fragment to continue the discussion on the status of women in ancient Greece: it aims to make a quick commentary on the different functions of the *hetairai*, the *pornai*, the female servants and the married woman in the society of Classical Greece (around 5th-4th BCE), in an attempt to reach a better understanding of their social roles.

Keywords: *hetairai*, *pornai*, Idomeneus of Lampsacus, Themistocles, Athenaeus of Naucratis

---

<sup>1</sup> Ἰδομενεὺς Λαμψακηνός - Idomeneus of Lampsacus *ca.* 325-270 BCE - *apud* Athenaeus of Naucratis, *Deipnosophistai* 13.37.1-4.

## Introduction

There are not many accounts of the life and work of Idomeneus of Lampsacus. Scholars suppose that he was a disciple of Epicurus and that he lived in the city of Lampsacus, in the region of the Hellespont, between the third and the fourth centuries BCE. Researchers also try to guess some of the titles of his works by citations on works of other authors that survived the passing of time. Some of the titles written by Idomeneus might have been *History of Samothrace* and *On the Socratics*. Another title might have been something that described a work on Athenian great political leaders, for many of the citations of Idomeneus' work are commentaries about the lives of Peisistratus, Pericles, Demosthenes, Hyperides, Phocion, and Themistocles, among others.<sup>2</sup> Therefore, no work by Idomeneus survived to reach our days and only citations of his writings were delivered to us through the works of other authors, like the *Deipnosophistai* by Athenaeus of Naucratis.

Athenaeus of Naucratis was a rhetorician and grammarian that lived between the second and the third centuries CE. His only surviving work is a compilation of all sorts of stories, from gossips on the lives of eminent members of society to philosophical debates. It is called the *Deipnosophistai*, which can be translated as "The Dining Sophists", "Scholars at the Dinner Table", or something of the like. Fifteen books of this work arrived into Modern Times, some of them are just epitomes, though. In them a character named Athenaeus narrates to his friend Timocrates all that was said and done by the guests during a banquet offered by a man called Larensius. It is in the thirteenth book that the citation of Idomeneus of Lampsacus that interests this paper appears. In this book the guests are talking about love matters, like women, prostitutes, courtesans and the mistresses of famous men. The subject is already hinted out in the first speech, by the invocation of a divine helper, very much in the "evoking the Muse stile" well known to the Greek epics since the first two by Homer. In the case of this book by Athenaeus, the Muse of love is invoked, in order to grant the speaker access to a continuous memory that will allow his speech to flow smoothly and truly: "Come now, Erato, stand close and tell me what discourses about love and the things on love were said".<sup>3</sup>

The excerpt that will be discussed by this paper was taken from a part of this book in which the guests are making remarks on the life and legacy of Themistocles (*ca.* 524-459 BCE), one of the renowned Athenian politicians of Antiquity. Themistocles amassed the positions of archon and *strategos*. It was he who started the construction of the Piraeus Port, and that defined it as the main port of Athens. It was also Themistocles who approved a bigger spending of silver coins to increase the Athenian fleet from seventy to two hundred battleships. This renewed fleet proved crucial in the defense of the city against the Persians in 479 BCE. It was also him who led the Athenians against the

<sup>2</sup> Smith 1854, 563; for the city of Lampsacus, see Smith 1857, 118-119.

<sup>3</sup> Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistai* 13.1.14-16: εἰ δ' ἄγε νῦν, Ἐρατώ, πάρ θ' ἴστασο καί μοι ἔνισπε, τίνες λόγοι περὶ αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἔρωτος καὶ τῶν ἐρωτικῶν ἐλέχθησαν. My translation.

same Persians during the Second Persian War of the fifth century BCE (480-479 BCE). He took part both in the terrestrial battle of Thessaly and in the naval battles of Artemisium and Salamis. However, there are no records of his participation in the final battles of Plataea and Mycale in 479 BCE. On those two occasions the Athenians were led by Aristides and Xanthippus, while the whole Greek allied army was led by the Spartan kings Pausanias (the regent for the son of Leonidas, who was still too young to assume his place at the throne), in the infantry, and Leotychides, in the navy. After the victory at Salamis what is known about Themistocles is that he got into a conflict with the Spartans and was ostracized in 470 BCE. He then went to live in Argos, and records show he wandered around the Peloponnesian cities that opposed the Spartans. The Spartans finally accused him of being involved with Pausanias, and of being in collusion with the Persians together with him. Themistocles then fled to Asia Minor. Meanwhile, the Athenians convicted him to death in his absence. In 465 BCE the Persian king, Artaxerxes I, proclaimed him governor of Magnesia, where he lived for the rest of his days.<sup>4</sup>

In the selected excerpt, Athenaeus cites a commentary that Idomeneus of Lampsacus would have done about Themistocles, that the Athenian *strategos* would have entered the city of Athens in a car equipped with *hetairai* to celebrate one of his many victories. He cites that the car's "equipment" was four *hetairai*, and that Themistocles conducted it across the crowded *agora* without any shame:

And didn't Themistocles, as said by Idomeneus, get in the city passing through the crowded *agora* in a car equipped with *hetairai*? They were Lamia, Skione, Satyra and Nannion.<sup>5</sup>

The Greek words for "equipped car" are "ἄρμα ζευζάμενος", which would literally mean: a car in which *hetairai* are yoked, which means they are pulling the car, as if they were the horses. The strict meaning of the verb ζεύγνυμι is "to yoke", and it is used to indicate the act of submitting an animal to drag a car or carriage.<sup>6</sup> It can also mean "harness, saddle and bridle" a horse for mounting, and in the same sense it can be used as "to bind fast", and "to tame". The other meanings are not very useful, as they are related to matrimony, and Themistocles did not join any of the *hetairai* portrayed in this description in wedlock. Thus, this fragment is very visual, and gives us the exact image of what Themistocles did to these women: he yoked them as horses, and put them to drag his car around the crowded *agora* of Athens. Judging by this attitude of Themistocles, one can think about the treatment these type of women workers got from society: they were treated as animals, as objects that served to the amusement and entertainment of others, men, for the greatest part.

<sup>4</sup> Hornblower & Spawforth 1996, 1497-1498; Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistai* 13.37.1-13.37.4.

<sup>5</sup> *Fragmenta* 5a3 - Athenaeus XIII: Θεμιστοκλῆς τε, ὃς φησιν Ἰδομενεὺς, οὐχ ἄρμα ζευζάμενος ἑταιρῶν πληθούσης ἀγορᾶς εἰσήλασεν εἰς τὸ ἄστυ; Ἦσαν δὲ αὗται Λάμια, καὶ Σκιώνη καὶ Σατύρα καὶ Νάννιον. My translation.

<sup>6</sup> Liddell, Scott and Jones 1996, 754.

As we can see, one of these *hetairai* was called Lamia. This Lamia was not the same Lamia that was a renowned lover of Demetrius Poliorcetes, obviously, for there is more than a century between the two of them, Themistocles being much older than Demetrius.<sup>7</sup> Demetrius' Lamia is much more famous than Themistocles's. Authors of the Hellenistic Times and beyond talked much about her.<sup>8</sup> The Lamia of Themistocles only appears in this fragment by Idomeneus, cited by Athenaeus. There is also another Lamia that is referred by Diogenes Laërtius as the lover of Demetrius of Phalerum, but she is described as a noble citizen of Athens.<sup>9</sup> This lady lived in the same time as the Lamia that was the *hetaira* of Demetrius Poliorcetes, but nothing of this is of much interest to this study. What matters here, and what this article will try to argue on, is the position of *hetairai* in the Athenian society of the Classical Period.

### Ἑταίρα, Πόρνη, Παλλαγή

We have just seen that Themistocles yoked women to his car as if they were animals in the fragment by Idomeneus. The Greek word used for describing these women is ἑταιρῶν. The *LSJ* defines the Greek word ἑταίρα as "companion", at first, and "courtesan", secondly. The Greek word πόρνη is defined as "whore, prostitute".<sup>10</sup> Chantraine follows the entry by the *LSJ* and defines ἑταίρα the same way, as "companion, courtesan", but establishes a comparison between three words used by the Ancient Greeks to designate the feminine activities of "caring" for the men: πόρνη, παλλακή and ἑταίρα. He defines the meaning of πόρνη as "prostitute, whore", "definition of a woman that is prostituted against or according to her will, honestly different (and much more pejorative) than ἑταίρα, 'girlfriend' and than παλλακή, 'concubine'"<sup>11</sup>,

<sup>7</sup> There are exactly 122 years between the death of Themistocles, *ca.* 542-459 BC., and the birth of Demetrius Poliorcetes, 337-283 BCE.

<sup>8</sup> On the Lamia that was the mistress of Demetrius Poliorcetes see Demochares, *apud* Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistai* 6.62.1-6.62.19 and Plutarch, *Demetrius* 27; Machon, *apud* Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistai*, 13.39.1-13.39.25; Phylarchus, *apud* Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistai* 14.3.37-42; Polemon of Athens, *apud* Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistai* 13.38.17-22 and 6.62.15-19; Plutarch, *Demetrius* 10.2.1-3.1, 16.5.1-7.1, 19.6.1-4, 24.1.1-6, 25.9.1-5, 27, and *Comparison of Demetrius and Anthony* 3.1.1-4.1; Clement of Alexandria, *Protrepticus* 4.54.5.5-6.8; Alciphron, *Epistula* 4 - *From Lamia to Demetrius*; Claudius Aelianus, *Varia Historia* 12.17.1-8 and 13.8/9.1-5.

<sup>9</sup> Diogenes Laërtius, *Lives and Opinions of Eminent Philosophers* 5.76.1-5: [...] οὐκ εὐγενὴς ὢν. ἦν γὰρ ἐκ τῆς Κόνωνος οἰκίας, ὡς Φαβωρίνος ἐν πρώτῳ τῶν Ἀπομνημονευμάτων φησὶν· ἀλλ' ἀστὴ καὶ εὐγενεῖ συνώκει Λαμιά τῇ ἐρωμένη, καθάπερ ὁ αὐτὸς ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ φησὶν. - [...] he (Demetrius of Phalerum) wasn't noble. For he was of the house of Conon, as says Favorinus in the first book of his *Memories*: but he lived together with the citizen and noble lover Lamia, as the same also tells us in his first book.

<sup>10</sup> *LSJ*, 1996, 700 and 1450.

<sup>11</sup> Chantraine, 2009, 363 ἑταίρα, entry for the verb πέρνημι p. 856 ("dit d'une femme que l'on prostitue ou que se prostitue, franchement différent (et plus péjoratif) de ἑταίρα «petite amie» παλλακή «concubine»"), redirected from πόρνη, p. 895. Chantraine, 2009, p. 823, affirms that

stipulating a gradation among these words. Thus, according to Chantraine, the worst is πόρνη, after it comes παλλακή, and finally ἑταίρα (that he translates very unusually as girlfriend). Therefore, it is established that there is a difference between the classes of "caregivers" delimited by the usage of each of these words, we just do not know the nuances of their application.

In the speech *Against Neaira* the author (Demosthenes, Pseudo-Demosthenes or Apollodoros of Acharnae)<sup>12</sup> affirms, "For we have the *hetairai* for pleasure, the concubines for the daily care of the body, and the wives to make children, and to be a trustworthy guardian of the domestic things".<sup>13</sup> The author of this speech does not use the word πόρνη; the women that serve to give pleasure to men are the ἑταίραι. Thus, we could say that this speech could be used to confirm that there is truly a certain gradation between these words.

Marina Gurina affirms that the connection between the *hetaira* with her lover(s) was in the great majority of times a long-lasting one, and that such connection was the reason why many of these women were cited in Literature with the name of their main lovers, like "the *hetaira* of Olympiodorus", "the *hetaira* of Athenogenes".<sup>14</sup> However, there is a long-going discussion on the differences between *hetaira* and *porne*. Gurina herself punctuates that such difference is not well established and affirms that

the differences among the *hetairai* and the *pornai* in the texts are unclear, but Modern Historiography attempts to establish an opposition in terms of *status*: the *hetaira* would be similar to a luxury courtesan or a lover, sustained most of the times by one or two men. On the contrary the *porne* would be similar to the street or brothel prostitute, that would offer sex in exchange for money to a numerous and anonymous clientele. In truth there is a frequent superposition of the two terms in the ancient sources and it is hard to keep the distinction. Both *hetaira* and *porne* can be slaves or free, both can have a maintainer or be autonomous.<sup>15</sup>

---

the word παλλακή "is also employed in sacred prostitution" ("le mot s'emploie aussi pour la prostitution rituelle").

<sup>12</sup> There is a debate around the authorship of this speech that has been going on since Antiquity, for it was found together with the speeches of Demosthenes, but does not seem to belong to him, according to some scholars. It was attributed to a "Pseudo-Demosthenes" since Ancient Times and nowadays it is commonly attributed to Apollodoros of Acharnae, an Athenian politician and logographer.

<sup>13</sup> Demosthenes (or Pseudo-Demosthenes, or Apollodoros of Acharnae), *Against Neaira* 122.4-7: "τὰς μὲν γὰρ ἑταίρας ἡδονῆς ἕνεκ' ἔχομεν, τὰς δὲ παλλακὰς τῆς καθ' ἡμέραν θεραπείας τοῦ σώματος, τὰς δὲ γυναῖκας τοῦ παιδοποιεῖσθαι γνησίως καὶ τῶν ἔνδον φύλακα πιστὴν ἔχειν". Greek text by Rennie, 1960 = *TLG*. My translation.

<sup>14</sup> Gurina, 2008, 131.

<sup>15</sup> Gurina 2008, 134: "Las diferencias entre las heteras y las *pornai* en los textos no son claras pero en la historiografía moderna se ha tendido a establecer una oposición en términos de estatus: la hetera, sería la cortesana de lujo o amante, a menudo mantenida solo por uno o dos hombres. En cambio la *porne* sería la prostituta de la calle o del burdel, que ofrecía sexo por dinero a una numerosa y anónima clientela. En realidad, hay una superposición frecuente de los dos términos en las fuentes antiguas y a menudo es difícil mantener la distinción. Tanto la hetera quanto la *porne* pueden ser esclavas o libres, ambas pueden tener un mantenido o ser

Thus it seems complex to precise the differences in the employment of these two words, for their usage is often indiscriminate.<sup>16</sup>

Lisley Kurke, on her part, affirms that the word πόρνη seems to be used more pejoratively in Greek Archaic Poetry, whilst the word ἑταίρα appears in more delicate contexts, contexts that bear a refined aura. Kurke punctuates that the word ἑταίρα is never explicit in poems of symposia, and that it is only through subtle phrases that the reader of such poetry can perceive that the poet is talking about a *hetaira*. Based on this confirmation Kurke sustains that "this suggests that '*hetaira*' is a term of derision, applied by those outside the aristocratic symposium to mock the sympotic equality of prostitute and elite participant (*hetairos*)".<sup>17</sup> She disagrees of the freedom and independence some say that the *hetaira* had, for she affirms that during the symposium "[...] the women functioned as so much the sympotic furniture, like the couches and pillows — objects to serve the needs of the male symposiasts and create a certain atmosphere".<sup>18</sup> Thus, Apollodoros does not sound so biased when he pronounces the division of the social whole of women in these three categories of *hetaira*, concubine and wife, all with the unique purpose to serve men in their most basic needs: pleasure (sexual and non-sexual), body care and offspring. Thus, also, Themistocles does not seem so horrible when he attaches *hetairai* to a car to drag him around the *agora* of Athens, even if that hurts our Contemporary sensibility: they were seen as objects, like animals, like furniture, so, the males that "owned" them, could make any use they wanted of them.

Both Kurke and Gurina end up concluding that even though these two words can be used as synonyms, they are applied in diverse discourses. According to Kurke

The opposition of *hetaira* and *pornê* seems to function within a complex network of economic, social, and political differentiation of middling and elitist traditions, whereby the aristocratic symposium invents the *hetaira* to shield itself from the public sphere, which it figures and traduces through the obscenity of the *pornê*.<sup>19</sup>

Thus, the relationship between these two feminine figures would enclose more than just different roles or *status*es in the patriarchal Ancient Greek society. Gurina seems to agree plainly with Kurke, for she sustains that

it is possible to say that there are two distinct discourses about women that obtain money from sexual activity. In the first of them the figure of the *hetairai* is associated with concrete women that are many times identified

---

autónomas".

<sup>16</sup> Gurina 2008, 131-134; Kurke 1997, 107-108, where she points out the difficulties of such distinction and the mistakes made by researchers in this direction.

<sup>17</sup> Kurke 1997, 112-113.

<sup>18</sup> Kurke 1997, 119.

<sup>19</sup> Kurke 1997, 145.

by a specific name, and from whom it is pointed out that they exercised control over men and their appetites. The other type of discourse is associated with the *porne*, and tries to depersonalize and codify her body and her services.<sup>20</sup>

Kapparis, however, does not seem to believe in a gradation between the two words. He sustains that *porne* was a generic word to designate women who would get money in exchange for sexual favors, and he sees *hetaira* as one of the many specifications of that word.<sup>21</sup> Glazenbrook follows him in this opinion, for she affirms that there is no archeological or literary evidence to sustain such a big difference between those two categories of women. She asserts that the *pornai* were normally slaves, and that the *hetairai* were probably free or freed women. The two main differences she points at between those two categories of prostitutes are the cost, and the relationship with their clients. The relationship between a *porne* and her client would be more ephemeral and cheap than the connection developed by a *hetaira* and her lover. This lover would have to support the *hetaira's* every needs, which could cost generous portions of money, what made *hetairai* inaccessible to the impoverished. Only really rich men could afford a relationship with a *hetaira*. Thus, Themistocles and his car yoked with four of them is a public displacement of power on his part. Thus, the *hetairai* did serve their purpose as objects that show the condition of a certain male in Classical Athenian society: only the really powerful could maintain them. Themistocles probably had to pay for such excess, though, for the *polis* was not know for tolerating excesses or such extravagant demonstrations from her citizens. We shall see ahead what was the politics towards such situations.

Glazenbrook, however, in an essay where she discusses the role of the "brothel" in the life of Ancient Athens, presents evidence that even the *pornai* could have had a good life, much like the *hetairai*. Jewelry and rich objects of female adornment were found in some of the rooms in places that researchers believe to be "brothel-like" in Ancient Athens. When she brings together the archeological evidence and the literary records pertinent to this subject, Glazenbrook concluded that the situation with prostitution in Ancient Athens was in many ways the opposite of what it had been thought of for many years.

First: it appears that there were no specific places for the whorehouses to be, like a specific prostitution zone in the city in the molds of today's cities; according to the literary and archeological records, women could sell their services at any place, any time. Second: the places where the whores would work were not specific for sexual encounters, actually it seems that in many cases the ladies developed other activities like weaving, or making food, or

---

<sup>20</sup> Gurina 2008, 134: "Puede decirse que hay dos discursos distintos sobre las mujeres que obtienen dinero por el sexo. En el primero se asocia la figura de las heteras a mujeres concretas, a menudo identificadas con un nombre específico y de quienes se señala el control que ejercen sobre los hombres y sus apetitos. Otro discurso, asociado a la *porne*, intenta despersonalizar y codificar su cuerpo y sus servicios".

<sup>21</sup> Kapparis 2011, 223.



dealing with other crafts, and that prostitution was a complementary activity, sometimes only resorted to in times of need.<sup>22</sup> Brothels in the sense we know today, or structures similar to nowadays brothels or whorehouses apparently did not exist in Ancient Athens, like they existed in old Rome and Pompeii.<sup>23</sup> Third: many of the places where whores worked were very enjoyable, and offered activities to entertain the clients in many other ways that not only the sexual way. Glazenbrook cites the example of an old building found in the neighborhood of the Olympic equestrian center close to Athens, where inscriptions with the name Nannion were found, and that revealed that there were trees planted around an internal patio, with a fountain (the same structure had been found in building Z in the region of Kerameikos, Athens).<sup>24</sup> Nannion was a common prostitute name, as it can be seen by the excerpt in analysis. Fourth: the common *porne* could be as rich as the *hetaira*, but probably would not cost so much, for she would attend a greater number of men; some of these whores became pimps, some of them even "married" one of her clients.<sup>25</sup>

Therefore, of all the debates created around the functions of women in relation to providing services for men in Ancient Athens what seems clear is that the main difference between *pornai* and *hetairai* resides in the price paid for each of them. It was much more expensive for a citizen to keep a *hetaira* than to just use the services of a *porne*. A *hetaira* demanded a certain level of commitment from a man, not in terms of emotional fidelity, but in financial terms. A *hetaira* would be completely supported by her main lover, or lovers (one or two, not more, researchers seem to agree on that), and would cost him a relatively large amount of money. There are records of families of rich men from Athens complaining about the man that was head of the *oikos* for spending too much on *hetairai* and neglecting their family members. Glazenbrook cites Manthitheus, a son who affirmed in public court that his father spent more money with his *hetaira* Plangon than in his own education.<sup>26</sup>

Thus, as we have seen, Themistocles entering the *agora* of Athens in a car pulled by four *hetairai* would give him a powerful status in the *polis*, for he could afford four of them at the same time. That triumphal entrance was a display of force, power and wealth by Themistocles, who was at his peak in Athenian politics after the victory in Salamis. However, this "extravaganza" may have cost him too much. There are no records of the reason why Themistocles was expelled from Athens, or why he was condemned to death by the *polis* after some time. It might have been that he was too powerful, and needed to be ostracized for a while. How he ended up in Sparta and why he was also ostracized from there is a mystery.

What is certain, though, is that it looks like such extravagant displays of superiority were not taken with such good disposition by Athens in Classical Times. Records of public speeches show that it did not look very good for

---

<sup>22</sup> Glazenbrook 2011, 36, 50.

<sup>23</sup> Glazenbrook 2011, 34.

<sup>24</sup> Glazenbrook 2011, 45-46.

<sup>25</sup> Glazenbrook 2011, 50-52.

<sup>26</sup> Glazenbrook 2011, 52-53.

public men to keep *hetairai*, for the *polis* considered it a waste of money. Such men would be wasting their money on frivolities instead of investing it in the improvement of the *polis* itself. Many renowned men were criticized publically for this reason, as some of the public speeches that reached us can attest for. Therefore, many of these famous politicians would prefer to use the services of top reputed *pornai* than *hetairai*, who could bring them more problems than pleasure. According to Glazenbrook, Athens did not have a problem with men paying for sex, it had a problem with them paying too much for it: "paying for sex is not a problem; paying too much is".<sup>27</sup> Spending money on paid sex was not the issue. Extravagant spending was.

Some of the records of the stories of Demetrius Poliorcetes and his famous *hetaira* named Lamia can illustrate perfectly this "extravagant spending", even though they happened in the Hellenistic Period.

Demetrius Poliorcetes had freed Athens from the government of Demetrius of Phalerum, who was in power since the Athenians had lost their last big-armed movement against Macedonian rule in the winter of 323-322 BCE. This rebellion is known as the Lamian War, for it happened in the surroundings of the city of Lamia, in Thessaly. The Athenians were so grateful that Demetrius had finally freed them that they honored him to the rays of excess. In his work *Demetrius* Plutarch narrates many tales that show both the excessive honors conceded by and the subsequent revolt of the Athenians towards Demetrius Poliorcetes: "This way the Athenians transformed Demetrius, that had been brilliant and very generous in his public benefactions, in an offensive and heavy person, because of the excessive honors they voted to pay him".<sup>28</sup> A great example of such extravagances is the case of the soap:

Of the many faults and illegalities committed in the city, the one they say was the saddest to the Athenians was when he [Demetrius Poliorcetes] commanded them to quickly raise and deliver two hundred and fifty talents to him. It was a severe and devastating harvest. When he saw the silver gathered, he sent it to Lamia and the *hetairai* of her circle so they could buy soap. The disrespect of and the motivation for this action left the people nauseated. Some say this happened to the Thessalians and not to the Athenians. Besides that, Lamia herself imposed a fee to many of the Athenians in order to prepare a banquet for the king. And she offered such an extravagantly excellent banquet that it ended up being described by

---

<sup>27</sup> Glazenbrook 2011, 53.

<sup>28</sup> Plutarch, *Demetrius* 10.2.1-3.1: Ἀθηναῖοι δ' ἀπολαβόντες τὴν δημοκρατίαν ἔτει πεντεκαιδεκάτῳ, τὸν διὰ μέσου χρόνον ἀπὸ τῶν Λαμιακῶν καὶ τῆς περὶ Κραννῶνα μάχης λόγῳ μὲν ὀλιγαρχικῆς, ἔργῳ δὲ μοναρχικῆς καταστάσεως γενομένης διὰ τὴν τοῦ Φαληρέως δύναμιν, οὕτως λαμπρὸν ἐν ταῖς εὐεργεσίαις καὶ μέγαν φανέντα τὸν Δημήτριον ἐπαχθῆ καὶ βαρὺν ἐποίησαν τῶν τιμῶν ταῖς ἀμετρίαις ἃς ἐψηφίσαντο. - Then the Athenians recovered their democracy in the fifteenth year after the Lamian War and the battle around Crannon. In the meantime there was an institution that was oligarchic in speech, but monarchic in practice, due to the power of Demetrius of Phalerum. This way the Athenians transformed Demetrius, that had been brilliant and very generous in his public benefactions, in an offensive and heavy person, because of the excessive honors they voted to pay him.

Lynceus of Samos. Because of that as well, one of the comic poets, not unreasonably and according to the truth, called Lamia a "*helepolis*".<sup>29</sup>

This excerpt is a clear illustration to a combination of excessive behaviors some lovers would propagate to please their *hetairai*. It is obvious this narrative takes place in a time when Athens did not have its immense power anymore. It had lost countless wars to both the Spartans and the Macedonians, and it was under the rule of "king" Demetrius Poliorcetes, another Macedonian. And he acted as a tyrant, a political type the Athenians abominated since the early times of their democracy. However, they did not have how to fight him, and had to abide to his caprices.

His favorite *hetaira*, Lamia, is called a *ἐλέπολιν*: "destroyer of cities". *Helepolis* was the name given to the siege towers developed by the Macedonian engineers of Demetrius' army. He used them to take and sack entire cities. Their specific purpose was to end a siege within a minimum amount of time. They were high towers filled with soldiers, which would couple with the walls of a fortified citadel and vomit their content to the most unpleasant surprise of the enemy.<sup>30</sup> Thus, Lamia's and Demetrius' excessive behaviors probably caused many more damages to Athens, beyond the two hundred fifty talents spent in soap, in order for a poet to call her a "destroyer of cities". It is necessary to point out that once more a *hetaira* is being compared to an object, one that is particularly dangerous to a city, and that can cause its ruin.

Thus it seems that the *hetaira* held some good amount of power and influence over her lover, so much that he would disrespect the sovereignty of the *polis* if needed be to please her. Another story of Demetrius disrespecting the *polis*, this time in religious terms, was the following situation:

And then Demetrius, that should have revered Athena if not by any other reason then by the fact that she was like an older sister to him (as he himself liked to say), spread such excesses from the Acropolis that free men and women citizens started to think on how could he do such debaucheries with whores like Crysidis, Lamia, Demus and Anticyra in the place that should have been the cleanest of all.<sup>31</sup>

<sup>29</sup> Plutarch, *Demetrius* 27: Πολλῶν δὲ γενομένων ἐν τῇ πόλει τότε πλημμελημάτων καὶ παρανομημάτων ἐκεῖνο μάλιστα λέγεται λυπῆσαι τοὺς Ἀθηναίους, ὅτι διακόσια καὶ πενήκοντα τάλαντα πορίσαι ταχὺ καὶ δοῦναι προσταχθὲν αὐτοῖς, καὶ τῆς εἰσπράξεως συντόνου καὶ ἀπαραιτήτου γενομένης, ἰδὼν ἠθροισμένον τὸ ἀργύριον ἐκέλευσε Λαμία καὶ ταῖς περὶ αὐτὴν ἐταίραις εἰς σμῆγμα δοθῆναι. ἢ γὰρ αἰσχύνῃ τῆς ζημίας καὶ τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦ πράγματος μᾶλλον ἠνώχλησε τοὺς ἀνθρώπους. ἔνιοι δὲ τοῦτο Θετταλοῖς, οὐκ Ἀθηναίοις, ὑπ' αὐτοῦ συμβῆναι λέγουσι. χωρὶς δὲ τούτων αὐτὴ καθ' ἑαυτὴν ἢ Λάμια τῷ βασιλεῖ παρασκευάζουσα δεῖπνον ἠργυρολόγησε πολλούς, καὶ τὸ δεῖπνον οὕτως ἦνθησε τῇ δόξῃ διὰ τὴν πολυτέλειαν, ὥσθ' ὑπὸ Λυγκέως τοῦ Σαμίου συγγεγράφθαι. διὸ καὶ τῶν κωμικῶν τις οὐ φάσκει τὴν Λάμιαν Ἐλέπολιν ἀληθῶς προσεῖπε.

<sup>30</sup> Plutarch, 2009, 82, especially note 153.

<sup>31</sup> Plutarch, *Demetrius* 24.1.1-6: Δημήτριος δέ, τὴν Ἀθηνᾶν αὐτῷ προσῆκον εἰ δι' ἄλλο μηδὲν ὧς γε πρεσβυτέραν ἀδελφὴν αἰσχύνεσθαι (τοῦτο γὰρ ἐβούλετο λέγεσθαι), τοσαύτην ὕβριν εἰς

The interesting feature of this excerpt is not the religious disrespect, for if Demetrius was acting like a tyrant he would not mind with anything else but himself and his power. The greatest interest of this excerpt for the discussion being carried on this paper is the word Plutarch uses to characterize the women Demetrius would bring to the Acropolis: he calls them *pornai*. This way we can see that Plutarch does not make any differentiation between *hetairai* and *pornai*, for he names Lamia both, on stories of similar content. One can agree with Kapparis that there were no great differences between these two categories of women but the amount of money paid by their customers on their use, and the lasting of the attachment between the two of them.

## Conclusion

Thus we saw that the *hetairai* depended on her supporter to survive, and that she was sustained by him with the only purpose to give him pleasure. We can also conclude that the lives of *hetairai* and *pornai*, and why not, of women in general, lied in the hands of her pimps/clients/benefactors/husbands, that could do as they pleased with them. They could even attach them to a car like as if they were horses. Kapparis refers to this situation of women in Antiquity by saying that "the woman is at the mercy of those who control her body and who can allow or restrict access to her", when talking about female prostitutes.<sup>32</sup> Thus, in the patriarchal society of ancient Athens men had control over their own bodies and destinies, even prostituted men, but women did not have the same luxury: they had to obey and give pleasure to their masters, the men.

Therefore, even though both *hetairai* and *pornai* are linguistic constructs, the fact is that these women were tied to activities of masculine entertainment in Antiquity, and that their economic, political and social conditions were intrinsically connected to the favors received in exchange for the services provided to the citizens of the *polis*.

## References

- Chantraine, Pierre. 2009. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Glazenbrook, Allison. Proneion: Prostitution in Athenian Civic Space. In *Greek Prostitutes in the Ancient Mediterranean 800 BCE-200 BCE*, Allison Glazenbrook; Madeleine M. Henry, Eds. Madison and London: The University of Wisconsin Press, 34-59.
- Gurina, Marina P. 2009. Erotismo y política sexual en la Grecia Antigua. In *Alguien se*

---

παῖδας ἐλευθέρους καὶ γυναῖκας ἀστὰς κατεσκεδάσαε τῆς ἀκροπόλεως, ὥστε δοκεῖν τότε μάλιστα καθαρεύειν τὸν τόπον, ὅτε Χρυσίδι καὶ Λαμία καὶ Δημοῖ καὶ Ἄντικύρα ταῖς πόρναις ἐκεῖναις συνακολασταῖνοι.

<sup>32</sup> Kapparis 2011, 227.

- acordará de nosotras: mujeres en la ciudad griega antigua*, Marina P. Gurina, Ed. Barcelona: Bellaterra Arqueología, 119-136.
- Hornblower, Simon; Spawforth, Anthony, Eds. 1996. *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kapparis, Konstantinos K. 2011. The Terminology of Prostitution in the Ancient Greek World. In *Greek Prostitutes in the Ancient Mediterranean 800 BCE-200 BCE*, Allison Glazebrook; Madeleine M. Henry, Eds. Madison and London: The University of Wisconsin Press, 222-255.
- Kurke, Leslie. 1997. Inventing the *Hetaira*: Sex, Politics, and Discursive Conflict in Archaic Greece, *Classical Antiquity* 16.1 (Abril 1997), 106-154.
- Liddell, Henry G.; Scott, Robert e Jones, Henry S, Eds. 1996. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Plutarco. 2009. *Vidas Paralelas VII - Demetrio-Antonio, Dión-Bruto, Arato-Artajerjes-Galba-Otón*. Introducción, traducción y notas de Juan Pablo Sánchez Hernández y Marta González González. Madrid: Gredos.
- Perrin, B. Ed. 1968. *Plutarch's lives*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Rennie, W. 1960. In Neaeram. In *Demosthenis orationes*, W. Rennie, Ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Schepers, M. A. Ed. 1969. *Alciphronis rhetoris epistularum libri iv*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Ziegler, K. Ed. 1964<sup>1,2</sup>, 1964<sup>2,1</sup>, 1969, 1971<sup>3,1</sup>. *Plutarchi vitae parallelae*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Smith, William. Ed. 1854. *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology*. Vol. II. London: Walton and Maberly, John Murray.
- Smith, William. Ed. 1857. *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Geography*. Vol. II. London: Walton and Maberly, John Murray.