Albert A. Stepanyan
Doctor of Sciences in History

PLAY AND THE ATRICALITY IN CLASSICAL ATHENS
(plots, masks, and characters)[*]

Key words – theory of social play, the theatricality of Athens' landscape, Aristotle's theory of poetics, tragedy-comedy and forms of social behavior, polis and social solidarity in tragic movement, four theatrical and historical heroes of Classical Athens and their intellectual legacy – Prometheus, Antigone, Pericles and Socrates.

Introduction

The main objective of this study is the metaphysics of the urban space of Athens in the classical age. It determined the forms of transition of the social behavior of citizens from ancient religious algorithmic rituals to creative theatricality. Both poles comprised various aspects of human life - private and public, political and psychological, legal and religious. However, transitivity was not exhaustive: the poles, although modified, persisted for a long time. This made the Athenian community multi-dimensional, which was quite evident in the landscape of the city. We decided to overcome the usual formality of the architecture of the City, highlighting its metaphysical features on the background of political philosophy and mathematics, moral theory, and aesthetics. In this regard, the following points of the Athenian landscape are subject to analysis and interpretation - the City walls and gates, the Areopagus, the Agora, the Acropolis, and the Theater of Dionysus. They represented different situations of verbal games that formed the basis of social

---

relations in Athens. For this purpose, we are going to turn to the ideas and concepts of the Sophists, Socrates, Thucydides, Isocrates, Plato, and Aristotle. We believe that such an interpretation will allow us to address the problem of the influence of social performance on the historical process. We are talking about theatricality in its widest scope, affecting such areas of literary creativity as philosophy, rhetoric, and historiography.[1]

We will cover all the variety of these problems without entering their details. We are interested in the overall perspective of the social and cultural experience of Athenians. An experience that generated various textual units, both of verbal and extraverbal character.[2]

1. Classical Athens: Landscape and its Mathematical Background.

In the age under consideration, Athens was the leading city-states of Greece. The Greeks named it a polis, and Aristotle defined it as a *political community* with three principal components: space (τόπος), population (ἄνθροποι), and constitution (πολιτεία). Combining natural and political stimulus it "[…] comes into existence for the sake of life, it exists for the good life" [Aristot., Polit., I, 1252b, 25]. For the philosopher, every well-governed state is a *living being* with its body (space), soul (population), and reason (constitution) [cf. Aristot., Polit., 3, 1276a, 5-10.].[3] He gave priority to the component of the constitution as he considered citizens *political animals*.[4] However, he never forgot about the other two components. Following this approach, we decided to start our discussion of Athens from its body. We mean to focus attention on the metaphysics of the walls and gates.

---

1 We proceed from the renowned concept which observes the Athenian social and political landscape in terms of theatrical performance. Scholars agree that "[…]democratic Athenian political life in the fifth and fourth centuries was also deeply theatrical outside the formally designated theatrical spaces". **Cartledge**, 1997, 3.

2 The ancient legend of the founding of Athens reveals an obvious inconsistency in Greek intellectual tradition. On the one hand, it denies the role of Poseidon in founding the City as a less technological deity (salty spring) and attributes it to Athena, emphasizing her wisdom, practical reason, and creative skills (olive tree). On the other hand, Plato's famous utopic narrative on Atlantis depicts Poseidon in opposite tones; he is the central deity of a high-technological civilization. In this connection, Socrates even thought about replacing Poseidon with Athena [Plato, Crit., 26a].

3 Aristotle came from the Sophists' concept of the organic character of states. The philosopher saw an obvious analog between states and individuals. On this, he was in full agreement with Plato [Rep., II, 368, d-c]. See **McCloskey**, 1963, 306-317; **Neu J.,** 1971, 239-243.

4 Scholars single out two opposite poles in the Aristotelian concept of the political animal (ζῷον πολιτικόν), the higher and the lower. The former indicated a life with moral virtues – valor, wisdom, temperance - oriented to communal happiness (εὐδαιμονία), while the latter pursued only somatic pleasures. The second case was considered typical for animals who "[...] have no idea what is good and what is bad, just and unjust" [Aristotle, Polit., I, 1253a, 1]. See **Roberts**, 1989, 187-189; **Abbate**, 2016, 54-59.

In the Classical Age, the City shaped a pentagon tending to grow into a circle. It consisted of five districts (demes) and correspondingly had five gates: the Dilpylonean (western, to Academy), the Sacred (western, to Eleusis), the Acharnian (north, to the deme Acharnai), the Diochares (east, to Lyceum), the Dead (southern, to Mouseion). They connected the City with different parts of Attica and Greece.[5]

Aristotle found that "The layoff of a city should be regular enough for beauty, but not so regular as to make defensive warfare difficult". In this regard, he stated that the state walls were mostly of practice (military) need (ποιῆσαι) [Aristot., Polit., VII, 1331b,18-20]. However, an experienced eye would not entirely share this approach. He would take into account the data of number-metaphysics well known to the educated people of his time. This assumption was worked out by presocratics, especially, Pythagoras and Empedocles. About the Pythagoreans, Aristotle particularly states: "[…] they supposed the elements of numbers to be the numbers of all things, and the whole heaven to be the musical scale and number" [Aristot., Met., I, 985b. 27- 986a, 2.].[6] Meanwhile, Plato emphasized also the educational aspect of mathematics since it "[...] draws the soul away from the realm of becoming into the realm of what is" [Plato, Rep., VII, 521d, 3-4]. Therefore, the mathematical method he applied to all areas of intellectual activity by revealing "[…] the explanation of each thing, why it comes-to-be, why it ceases-to-be, why it is" [Plato, Phaedo, 96a, 9-10]. The philosopher found it quite helpful also for the training of statesmen.[7]

Developing this idea, Plato worked out his renowned metaphor about the perfect number of citizens in the ideal city. He found it would be equal to 5040, a number personifying the harmonic symmetry: "Number as a whole comprises every division for all purposes; whereas the number 5040, for purposes of war, and in peace for all purposes connected with contributions and distributions, will admit of division into no more than 59 sections, these

---

5 The typological characteristics of city planning were mostly advanced under the creative experience of the Great Colonization. In the Classical Age, they were systematized and materialized best of all in Athens by the efforts of the architect Hippodamus. He introduced the *method of the divided city*. Plato composed the utopia of an ideal city proceeding from the same experience. See **Lévêque**, **Vidal-Naquet**, 1984, 81-84; **Pounds**, 1969, 139-140.

6 "All things known have numbers". They were recognized as not only detonating but also governing all things. The problem of philosophers was to uncover their harmony through quotations, theorems, and axioms. See **Ferguson**, 2008, 68-72. According to Aristotle, the being exists in fulfillment and potency, and in both cases, it is measurable through numbers [Aristot., Met., XIII, 1078a, 22-27]. Cf. **Jounan**, 2019, 648.

7 See **Mueller**, 1999, 180; **Ferguson**, 2008, 125-126.

being consecutive from one up to ten." [Plato, Leg., V, 738a].[8] The philosopher paralleled the mathematical and social aspects of discussion and believed it would generate a symmetry useful in running different aspects of communal life from marriages to the government, taxation, army, education, and morality. He traced in it the source of justice and moderation.[9]

Despite this practical approach, metaphysics considered numbers in the frame of deep meanings and relations. It found that the *existent one* was not a real number, because it was "[...] both one and many, whole and parts, limited and of infinite number" [Plato, Parm., 145a].[10] It was considered to be a point, a source of a wide range of possibilities. As for the dyad, it was a line with a beginning and end. It was thought of as the beginning of all *even numbers* (femininity). As to the triad, it represented an *even-odd number* (masculinity) and revealed the latent principle of the existent one comprising three important components – a beginning, a middle, and an end. The first visual expression of this latency was thought of as a triangle.[11]

Against the line, having only a beginning and end, it comprised all the three mentioned poles. According to the Greek mathematicians (from Pythagoras to Plato), they were also typical for other geometric figures - square, pentagon, hexagon, octagon - especially, in their desire to grow into a circle and, rearward, from a circle into themselves.[12] An experienced eye could trace these metamorphoses in the architectural details of Classical Athens and feel himself in the overall play of visual forms and meanings.[13]

In this regard, we would like to single out the pentagon which, as we noted above, shaped the form of Athens' walls. According to Greek mathematics, the number five was a sum of the two (female line) and the three

---

8 According to Plato, the principal divider of the *whole number* 5040 is twelve with a metaphysic meaning: "[…] and each of such portion must be regarded as a sacred gift of God, conformed to the months and revolution of the universe" [Plato, Leg., 771b]. Cf. **Charbit**, 2002, 216-218.

9 Scholars see these features as sources of sovereignty and collectivity of the board of citizens. In this view, two opposite paradigms were traceable in Classical Athens: *historical* brought about by Cleisthenes and *utopic-contemplative* composed by Plato. See **Lévêque, Vidal-Naquet**, 1984, 146. On the second aspect see **Macé**, 2020, 108-110.

10 Behind all these dimensions, Plato saw specific geometric proportions based on equivalence (ἰσότης) and similarity (ὁμοιτης). The philosopher also applied this approach to the social, cognitive, and esthetic aspects of his investigation. See **Cherniss,** 1951, 399-400.

11 The triangle was thought of as a universal geometric figure to describe and comprehend the other figures with a perspective to explain their mutual (real or imagined) transitions. Cf. **Heath**, 1921, 76-77; **Hahn**, 2017, 32-40.

12 The problems of the circle, sphere, and cylinder occupied an important place in Greek mathematics – Archytas, Plato, Eratosthenes, Euclid, Archimedes, Hipparchus, Theodosius etc. Cf. **Heath**, 1921, 257-259; **Saito and Sidoli**, 2012, 135-139, 144-149.

13 "The Pythagoreans of Plato's day, including Plato himself, held that the beginning was a blank where there inexplicably appeared a spot, which stretched into a line, which flowed into a plane, which folded into a solid, which cast a shadow, which is what we see" **McEvilley**, 2001, 11-12.

(masculine triangle) and represented the idea of marriage, family, and continuity.[14] Consequently, Athens was imagined as a living being. Following Empedocles, who identified the basic geometric figures (square, circle, triangle, and rhombus) with primary elements, one could also assert that Athens represented harmonic combination of earth, water, air, and fire [cf. Diog. Laert., Vit. Phil., VIII, 76, 6-7].[15]

Returning to the principle of the trinity of the whole, Aristotle considered it in the light of verbal creativity and saw its highest expression in the narrative which made up the core of the theatrical plot (φάβυλα). In the further interpretation of the topic, we will touch on this aspect in detail, but for now, it is enough to state that, despite other aspects, Athens was a space of verbal communications in the forms of religious and political, philosophical, and commercial, banal and poetic narratives.

Summing up the results of this facet of the discussion, it must be asserted that *extraverbal and verbal plays* dominated all forms of social relations in the City. That is why scholars represent the latter as a *social drama*[16] focused on Areopagus, Agora, Acropolis (Parthenon), and (of course) Dionysian Theatre. Each of them had particular features which require a particular interpretation and understanding.

2. **Areopagus** (ἡ βουλή ἡ ἐξ Ἀρείου πάγου).

This Assembly was most effective in the Archaic age (the eighth-sixth century BC.). According to historical legend, it was primarily an advisory body during the royal period of Athenian history.[17] Gained the function of a governing aristocratic council after the death of the last king.

> *The historical legend means the semi-mythical Codrus who was a wise and moderate man and, like other kings, was endowed with three branches of exclusive power - military, priestly, and executive. In his days, a war broke out between Athens and Sparta. The Spartan*

---

14 About the nuptial character of the five and its connection with ether and pyramidal form in Pythagorean number metaphysics see **Oliver**, 1875, 136-138.

15 Scholars survey another version of the correspondence of the primary elements and geometrical forms in the mathematical system of Pythagoras. See **Zeller**,1930, 53-54; **Bogdanović**, 2013, 117-118.

16 In this connection, S. Godhill seems most correct asserting that the Athenian drama festival was "[…] an institution of the democratic polis and that the plays constantly reflected the genesis in a fifth-century Athenian political environment." **Godhill**, 2000, 35.

17 **Hignett**, 1952, 45.

army surrounded Athens, but the soldiers were ordered not to kill the Athenian king. The Delphic oracle predicted the defeat of the Spartans if this condition was violated. However, Codrus, who also knew about this prophecy, disguised himself as a peasant and provoked the Spartan warriors to kill him. Hearing of this, the Spartans retreated. According to legend, the Athenians decided to give up the royal authority, as they did not see anyone worthy of this rank.[18] Of course, this is an idealistic version of the story. The fact is that Codrus reigned during the Dorian invasion in the eleventh century BC. and could not be the last king of Athens. Aristotle seems more correct in asserting that nothing extraordinary happened after Codrus.[19] The royal power was interrupted much later and not without contradictions and clashes.

The above-mentioned three main functions of royal power were divided among three archons – the polemarch, the basileus, and the eponym.[20] Later, six new archons joined them – thesomothetae, who was in charge of legal affairs based on customary law (θέσμος): "[…] to write down the statues and present them for the resolutions of disputes" [Aristot., Ath. Polit., I, 4]. All these offices were elective and were occupied by representatives of the group of noble families: "[…] officials were appointed based on good birth and wealth; at first men held office for life, subsequently for ten years" [Aristot., Ath. Polit., I, 3]. Later, they were elected for a year. However, this did not radically change the situation - an oligarchic regime continued to dominate Athens for a long time.

The same principle manifested itself in the legislative wing of power, which belonged to the Areopagus. Periodically, it took place at night in the area of Ares Hill.[21] In this regard, it seems important to recall the idea of Aristotle, which traced a correspondence between the given landscape and the form of the political regime. In particular, in mountainous and hilly places, it saw the possibility of a monarchy and oligarchy [Aristotle, Polit., VII, 1330b,

---

18 **Fontenrose**, **Gomme**, **Cadoux**, 1992, 257. The source of this historical legend is considered the oration of Lycurgus, In Leocratem, 84-87.

19 Aristot., Ath. Pol., 3; Pusan., VII, 2, 1. Cf. **De Laix**, 1973, 7-11.

20 The transition from early monarchies to aristocratic regimes made up the important side of the Archaic age. Usually, scholars put out the ideological and legal aspects of the process, which are still obvious in Homer. See **Vernant**, 1984, 39-42.

21 Under Mycenean kings, Areopagus was an advisory board, and only after the decline of royal authority, it came to the fore as the main decision-making state institution of the aristocratic (eupatridae) regime. See **Amber**, 2010, 11-18.

18-21].[22] This statement was quite appropriate in our case: indeed, the Areopagus consisted of representatives of the same group of noble families elected by birth. In early times, as the most powerful state institution, it fulfilled legislative, administrative, judicial, and religious functions. It settled all important issues of the domestic and foreign policy of Athens: "The council of the Areopagus had the function of watching over the laws, and administrated the most and the greatest of the city's affairs, having full power to chastise and punish all the disorderly" [Aristot., Ath. Polit., I, 6].[23] In the morning they announced their decisions to the people by convening the Popular Assembly, which had no authority to discuss, change or refute them.[24]

It must be added that the Areopagus reached a consensus through the authority of elders. As a result of the absence of discussion and argumentation, semantic silence dominated in this Assembly: young members accepted prepositions of elders joining their group. Problems were settled in strict accordance with *mos maiorum* which was assessed to have a direct concern with the will of gods. In this regard, it is relevant to recall that the Olympic gods were modeled after a noble patriarchal family.[25] This was deeply embedded in minds, and Aristotle means just this fact emphasizing that, in opposition to the barbarians, "[...] our nobles consider themselves noble not only in their own country but everywhere […]" [Arist., Polit., 1, 1255a, 34-35]. This perception added a new feature to their oligarchy – (real or imagined) absolutism. Of course, this deepened the breach between the common people and the nobility.

A counterweight to the Areopagus (certainly, only in some specific features) was the aristocratic ***symposium*** (συμπόσιον) – wine party. [26]

---

22 The philosopher connects the different kinds of landscapes with different possibilities of social and political participation of citizens in communal life. According to him, to a lesser extent, this is possible under tyranny and to a greater extent under polity – a moderate democracy. He recognized that the best form of government. See **Cherry**, 2009, 1406-1408.

23 For a more detailed analysis see **Smith**, 1927, 61-68.

24 Some scholars are inclined to think that, in the age of domination of democracy, Areopagus formed the conservative pole of defending the state order and equality of citizens. This change was obvious, particularly, after 460-s BC. when the leader of democrats Epilates launched a decisive attack on this still aristocratic institution. See **Smith**, 1927, 68-69; **Hignett**, 1962, 63; **Raaflaub**, 2007, 105-107.

25 Scholars think that the absolute image of Zeus originated from the Mycenean times when the terms "king", "household lord" and "father" were identical. In this form, it is present in the texts of Homer and Hesiod (πατὴρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν). See **Miller Calhoun**, 1935, 15-17.

26 The following formula of Theognis expresses a symposium's intellectual ideal: "You should be invited to a feast and beside a noble man who knows every kind of skill" [Theognis, 563-566]. Cf **Papakonstantinou**, 2012, 12-14.

Usually, symposiarches (hosts of such parties) sketched the plot of the forth-coming event outlining its semantic beginning, middle, and end. Usually, the event was held on nights, in men's apartments of the house (ἀνδρών). Despite delicious food, wine, music, and dance, attendees enjoyed talks on various aspects of social life, morality, and aesthetics. Archaic vase paintings visualize many symposium scenes.[27] Plato's texts (and particularly, the *Symposium*) give the opportunity for revealing their principal traits.

In light of the number metaphysics, the plot of a symposium represented a triangle, the three angles of which were identic with the three abovementioned phases of it – the beginning, middle, and end. On the other hand, a triangle was held to have also a profound essential meaning corresponding to the air – one of the basic primary elements.[28] In its turn, the air was identic with (both cosmic and human) soul and was believed to give birth to meaningful words and sentences, talks, and ideas. The best form of that was the pursuit of wisdom through dialogues.[29] Consequently, a symposium was dialogical resting on logical argumentation and aiming at the desired conclusion. All this process was full of mental and emotional enjoyment (ἡδονήτης). In this vein, a new genre of activity started the meaning of which was the logical pursuit of wisdom – a far analog of philosophy.[30]

3. **Agora** (ἀγορά).

This center of Athens was located northwest of the Acropolis, between Areopagus Hill and Market Hill. A flat space (ὁμαλότης), according to Aristotle, was suitable for democracy [Aristot., Polit., 7, 1330b, 20].[31]

---

27 On the social semantic and esthetic aspects of the Athenian "symposium culture" see in detail **Topper**, 2009, 3-26.

28 This understanding was manifest in the philosophical system of Empedocles who, most probably, inherited it from the Pythagoreans. Plato applied it to his interpretation of the Cosmos and human beings. Empedocles emphasized everything consisted of the four primary elements – fire, air, water, and earth. Two principal modes of a relationship dominated between them – amity and strife – the balance of which created the spherical Cosmos [Aristot., Met., 1000b, 14-15]. It was regarded as a self-equal deity [Simplicius, In Aristotelis *De Caelo*, 529, 1-15].

29 Aaccording to the Philosopher, the word (and, consequently, the dialogue) arose as a result of the combination of the divine and the profane, the natural and the conditional principles. The human soul was recognized as their concentration [Plato, Crat., 33]. See in detail **Partee**, 1972, 113-121.

30 Philosophical symposium genre probably, inherited its plot structure from the wine symposium. See **Wolz**, 1970, 323-326.

31 This idea reflects another aspect of the Aristotelian concept of tracing a connection between a political regime and its natural environment. Above we demonstrated this connection concerning the monarchic principle. Most probably, L. Gaeta proceeds from this concept defining "Athenian space was political in nature". **Gaeta**, 2004, 471.

It was also thought of as the space of slip of commodities and prices, religious feelings and rates, rational argumentations and conclusions. Proceeding from the market theory, we trace the source of this market slip in money - the equivalent of all values. As a medium of universal circulation, it contained opportunities for commodities to cross their well-established material boundaries for being exchanged and sold as socially significant values: "Money, therefore, is not a thing, but a set of relations".[32]

The same process took place in Athens and other advanced Greek polises in the archaic age, in the 8th-6th centuries. BC. when traditional castles were reconstructed into economic centers. Along with this, the process of synoikismos acquired significance - the unification of villages of a given territory into a civil community with its common administration, laws, and courts: "When several villages are united in a single community; perfect and large enough to be nearly or quite self-suffing, the state comes into existence […]"[Aristot., Polit., I, 1252b, 25-30]. Meanwhile, Plato was inclined to trace practical purposes in this process of unification: "[…] one man calling in another for one service and another for another, we, requiring many things, gather many into one place of abode as associates and helpers, and to this dwelling together we give the name city or state" [Plato, Rep., II, 369c]. He proceeds from the theory of the social division of work bringing individuals into a complementary relationship.[33]

Agora was thought of as the location of this complementarity - a marketplace with artisan manufactories, shops of merchants and bankers. In time, to the overall slip of commodities, the slip of individuals was added – from their diversities in social status and psychology to unity.[34] The Sophists were the first thinkers who set out to discuss this problem from the point of view of logical argumentation and moral values. Due to their intellectual efforts, the dialogue was recognized as an effective way to overall social communication. Particularly, this led to a change in the system of basic truths and

---

32 This is the well-known formula of **Marx,** 1976, 165. He recognized it as a key for describing and understanding society's whole complex economic relations. In archaic Athens, the like ideas were developed by M. Finley and his followers who built their theoretical consideration on ancient authors and archeological material. See **Green**, 2000, 30-32; **Ober,** 2022, 316-325.

33 Modern sociology proceeds from the idea that the division of labor results in the organic and contractual forms of social solidarity. See **Durkheim**, 1897, 200-209.

34 Cf. **Fuller**, 1931, 7.

values through rational description, interpretation, and conclusion.[35] In this regard, Agora acquired new masks – artificial and serious, fictional and philosophical.

From the point of view of this development, another historical experience of the Greeks deserves particular attention. We mean the great colonization of the eighth -sixth centuries which comprised the whole ecumene from Spain to Colchis.[36] Numerous city-states were founded in this area, and the Greek civilization acquired the qualities of network organization.[37] The next peculiarity of this process was also of undoubted significance. For explaining it, we have to pay attention to the following fact: during his socialization, every member of society has usually to master the rules of his community and obey them - a system of laws and moral principles, rates, and forms of behavior. However, this subordinate position was shaken during Greek colonization, as people themselves began to determine the basic parameters of their future homeland – what geographical location, natural resources, communications, crafts, political regime, institutions, laws, etc.[38] The head figures of colonization as eminent lawgivers (νομοθέται) were even deified with their statues erected in city squares. This deductive approach gave rise to creative experience aimed at improving the living conditions in a given city-state.[39] Hereafter, the time of reformers started. The biggest of them was considered Solon of Athens (594 BC.) who abolished the debt slavery, embarked to set up the class of middle property, and (at the expense of the influence of nobility) expand the role of the Popular Assembly in the decision-making procedure.[40]

---

35 Sophists introduced an anthropocentric worldview system focused on human perceptions and logical operations in pursuit of truth. They saw the aim of this mental activity as a way to the rational reconstruction of social life. See **Zeller**, 1931, 77-80.

36 Plato thought that colonization was intrinsic to the Greek mode of life. For a married couple "[…] it is necessary to leave their own houses to their mother and father and bride's relations as if they were going off to found a new colony" [Plato, Leg., VI, 776a]. In real history, the process of colonization was stimulated by different causes – political, economic, and religious. It resulted in new settlements of different statuses and specializations - agriculture. Industry, trade, navigation. See **Graham,** 1992, 264-265; **Graham**, 2001, 1-25.

37 Greeks inherited the practice of network colonization consisting of *flexible units* from the Phoenicians. They made the process more effective through the technologies of the new times. Cf. **Malkin**, 2011, 6-9.

38 This *reverse situation* engendered social reformation which applied to the social life creative efforts typical for artisan work (ἔργος) with its economic and political, psychological and religious consequences see **Austin, Vidal-Naquet**, 1977, 53-57; **Ober**, 2022, 333-341; cf. **Ստեփանյան**, 2014, 283-289.

39 About these aspects of the polis commonality see in detail **Blok**, 2013, 166-171.

40 Scholars consider Solon's reformation a turning point in Athenian and the entire ancient democracy. Their institutional innovations opened an époque of social transitivity which covered the whole sixth century BC. See **Graham, Cadoux**, 1992, 999-1000; **Greenridge**, 1896, 151-156**; Ober, 2022, 185-195**; cf. **Ստեփանյան**, 1984, 1–32;

The époque of the seventh-sixth century is known as the time of early tyranny. The tyrants waged a struggle against the absolute dominance of the nobility. It took many forms, from a conspiracy of an ambitious group to a popular uprising. Their leaders, coming to power, usually administrated reforms that met the urgent expectations of the people – the abolition of debt slavery, the allocation of allotments to the poorest peasants, the introduction of stable laws and courts, the development of crafts, trade, and exchange. As a result, a class of middle owners came to the fore. In general, these changes ensured the transition from patrimonial structures to rational state regimes. This process was noticeable, especially in the developed city-states - Millet, Samos, Corinth, Megara, etc. However, tyranny also had a negative facet. Over time, tyrants began to place themselves above laws and rights and live in luxury - bodyguards, purple clothes, vanity and selfishness, drunkards, women, and parasites. It soon became clear that tyranny had come to an end, and the middle class did away with that.[41] At this point that the distinction between Solon and the tyrants became more obvious: he acted as the people's chosen judge (αἰσυμνήτης) and voluntarily put aside extraordinary authority after his office term. This self-control (σωφροσύνη) charted the path of Athens' democratic development for the visible future.[42]

a. Popular Assembly (ἐκκλεσία) must be discussed just in the frame of these essential changes. It gained importance with the development of democracy and reached its high in the days of Pericles (461-429 BC.).[43] It is recognized as the Golden Age of Athens when Greece achieved victory over the Achaemenid Empire in a long and exhausting war. Athens was the leading force of the Greek resistance with her navy and skilled sailors who come from democratic backgrounds. Under their influence, the process of democrati-

---

41 From numerous studies on various aspects of the problem of early Greek tyranny and particularly its transitive character from aristocratic hierarchy to egalitarian democracy see **Drews**, 1972, 132-138; **Cawkwell**, 1995, 76-78; **Fleck and Hanssen**, 2013, 399-400.

42 In the actions of tyrants, scholars put out three basic components: wealth, divinity, and envy. In this light, they do not trace cardinal distinctions between the renowned Greek tyrants and Solon. He is considered an *Athenian model of tyranny*. In his actions, Solon saw in himself wealth and divine insolence, destruction and justice. Cf. **Graham,** 2017, 34-39.

43 On the long history of the evolution of Ecclesia and its apogee in the age of Pericles as the sphere of overall participation and equality, complementarity and social initiative see **Gomme, Cadoux**, 1992, 376-377; **Sinclair**, 1997, 17-23. It is quite noticeable that scholars trace parallels between the Greek agoras and the city centers of the Ancient Near East as the places of popular assemblies. **Horst**, 2017, 239-250.

zation of the postwar City reached completion. Pericles was the key figure in this achievement.

> *More precisely, the reformation of Pericles was in affinity to that of Cleisthenes (506 BC).[44] After the tyranny of Peisistratus and his sons, he carried out significant changes in the Athenian social and administrative system: a. instead of a tribal division, he introduced ten territorial-administrative phylae, consisting of numerous villages, b. formulated the institution of citizenship and determined the conditions for its acquisition, c. established a new state-council, Prytanea, accessible to all citizens, c. as a counterweight to the aristocratic archons, he established a board of the ten commanders (στρατέγοι), senior military and administrative officials, d. regulated the activities of the Popular Assembly and, as an effective means of self-defense of the emerging democracy, introduced the so-called ostracism - the exile of its tough opponents for a while.[45]*

Pericles summarized the experience of previous reformers in his *Constitution* purposed to establish equilibrium between social classes. For reaching this end, he undertook the following steps: *a.* Introduced the overall isonomy (ἰσονομία) – equality of all citizens before the law, despite their differences in origin and property status, education and mentality, moral values, and aesthetic perceptions. This equality was gained not by arithmetic principle, but by a geometric correspondence, which could be formulated as follows: "less from the needy, more from the fortunate". It paved the path to the overall complementarity of Athenian citizens. This trait was considered the ideal of the Athenian Popular Assembly: in a geometrical sense, it represented a circle (or sphere), each point of which was symmetrical about the center. Of course, in reality, Athenian Agora was far from the shape of a circle, but we are talking about the metaphysical side of the problem. *b.* In the days of Pericles, the Assembly functioned as the supreme state institution covering all significant aspects of communal life - legislative, executive, and

---

44 Herodotus left a short but rather exact characterization of Cleisthenes: "the man who established [territorial] tribes and democracy for Athens" [Herod., VI, 131,1]. On Cleisthenes' innovations and their influence on the different aspects of the democratic development of Athens see **Lewis**, 2004, 287-309. Meanwhile, the popular memory linked this new model with the archaic model of democracy defining it as *a traditional mode of government* (πάτριος πολιτεία). See **Anderson**, 2003, 34.

45 In the Classical age, the activities of Ecclesia proceeded according to legal and administrative procedures well known to all citizens. See **Hansen**, 1979, 43-49.

judicial. It personified the phenomenon of *direct democracy* since every citizen could represent his voice and will. *c.* Pericles introduced the practice of filling public offices by a lot. The justification for this was the same principle of complementarity - all citizens were equal legal entities. Only two offices made up the exception, the boards of commanders and treasurers: for the first case, experience and skills, for the second case, property, and knowledge were required. *d.* Salaries were established for public offices, allowing poor citizens to be involved in different levels of state government. The same was also true for the attendance of the Assembly. *e.* A special fee was set for attending performances because the theatre was considered a *school for citizens*.[46]

All these innovations held together the board of Athenian citizens with more effective binds. According to them, the Athenians constituted a community of free landholders and slaveholders, regardless of whether they had private allotments or slaves. The argument was that all citizens participated in the state's ownership of land and slaves. In this view, one more consideration gains importance: despite the significant number of slaves (60-100.000), the gross national product of Athens was created predominately by free producers.[47] The third trait stated that all citizens were soldiers ready to guarantee the liberty of the homeland with their own lives. In conclusion, *courage*, *moderation*, and *justice* were recognized as basic values securing the moral unanimity of the whole board of citizens.[48] The Assembly was recognized as the area for reaching this unanimity.[49] The objective of every true leader (and his close entourage) was to prepare it through dialogues with the mass.

The situation could be compared with the Socratic maieutic method of discovering truths by a mentor with his pupils.[50] According to the philosopher, "Man is the measure of all things " since eternal values were

---

46 All these achievements made up the uniqueness of Athenian social and political, legal and cultural system of communal life based on the equilibrium of diversities. See in detail **Samons II**, 2009, 6-23.

47 This fact composed the particularity of not only the Athenian economy but also culture and global mentality. Of numerous studies on this problem see **Доватур**, 1980, 67-78; **Kalle**t, 2009, 87-95.

48 These and other important moral values were considered the results of the harmony of private and public interests of citizens in various areas of social commonality. See **Starr**, 1978, 49-52; **Humphreys**, 2004, 225-236. Some scholars define the new Agora in theatrical terms as a *showcase for a new regime*. See **Anderson**, 2003, 87-92; **Ober**, 2022, 258-261.

49 **Starr**, 1990, 43-44; **McGregor**, 2014, 89-90.

50 Plato put in his mouth the following definition: "Well, my midwifery has all the standard features, except that I practice it on men instead of women, and supervise the labor of their minds, not their bodies" [Plato, Theatet., 150b,1]. See **Field**, 1992, 997-998; **Benson**, 2011, 185-191.

installed in his soul from his birthday. The problem of education was to reveal them through the efforts of a skillful mentor. Through the system of successive questions and answers, he created a situation of critical thinking (prepositions, evaluations, conclusions) and leads pupils to truths. So, a mentor opened "the hidden knowledge" and made pupils believe that it was intrinsic to their souls.[51]

Aristotle added a new feature of this belief: "[…] the goodness of a citizen consists in ability both to rule and be ruled (ἄρχειν καὶ ἄρχεσθαι)" [Aristot., Polit., III, 1277a, 25]. In the case of the Assembly, the role of the mentor, certainly, belonged to the leader of democracy and his close entourage. Meanwhile, Plato found in the mission of a mentor element teaching and persuading the mass (διδάσκειν καὶ πείθειν) [Plato, Leg., VII, 720a, 1-2]. He compares the activity of the leader with that of a physician to secure the health of his patients [Plato, Rep., I, 342c].[52] Hence ensues the following conclusion - a *pure democracy* was principally impossible. In Classical Athens, it was Pericles that led the demos. From this point of view, the formula of Thucydides sounds very appropriate: "In short, what was nominally a democracy became in his hands government by the first citizen" [Thuc., II, 65, 9]. Pericles and his associates moderated the ultimate intentions of the people. As subsequent history attests, this was what kept the Athenian people from degrading into a chaotic mob.[53]

In some senses, the Assembly reminded a play with definite rules and roles to reach adequate decisions for the sake of the common good.[54] One of the purposes of this public play was the combination of the two opposite aspects of state authority – persuasion and (soft and hidden) compel. In this vein, we have to remember that the Periclean regime was on the summit of the pyramid of the Delian Ligue. Only on the material resources of this

---

51 An important element of the Socratic method was thought of as the *elenchus* – the refutation of well-known ideas, comprehensions, and arguments of the interlocutor to penetrate the depths of things and concepts.

52 Plato discusses statesmanship within the framework of crafts and, in particular, medicine. Cf. **King**, 1954, 46.

53 In this case, the crowd turned into a tyrant, imposing its will on other segments of society. It was especially intolerant of intellectuals who advocated freedom of thought and action. See **Graham**, 2017, 181. According to Aristotle's political theory, a polity usually degraded into its antiform - democracy. Usually, it was uncontrolled by law and was defined as ochlocracy [Aristot., Eth. Nick., VIII, 1160b, 10-22].

54 Scholars view classical Athens as a social drama with the active participation of the citizens as the audience. Moreover, this audience is thought of as the City. See in detail **Godhill**, 1997, 57-66.

imperial construct, were the mentioned equities and complementarities were possible.[55]

b. State Council (βουλή) was the second public institution that symbolized the play of social solidarity in Agora. In the time of Pericles, it consisted of five hundred members, chosen by lot from the ten administrative divisions of the Athenian state. Fifty of them made up a group, prytanea, which had to function for a month. In a sense, Boule was copying the functions of the Assembly, but only on a day-to-day regime. It was a kind of complement to direct democracy and carried out probouleutic and executive, financial, and judicial functions. In particular, it: *a.* developed a schedule for the forthcoming session of the Assembly and determined the issues to be resolved, *b.* discussed bills to be passed in the Assembly, *c.* carried out the state's current domestic and foreign policy, *d.* controlled state magistrates and periodically held hearings about their activities in different areas, *e.* prepared cases for discussion of the Assembly as the highest court - murder, state treason, and corruption, *f.* controlled the young generation's education process. In all these cases, the success of Boule's activities was impossible without equality and dialogic consolidation of its members. In their oath upon taking the office, they solemnly promised to serve for the benefit of Athenian people and state [cf. Aristot., Ath. Pol., 22, 2].[56]

c. Athenian Lawcourt (ἡλιαία) consisted of 6000 juries and played an important role in the semantics of the Agora space. It had essential parallels with the Assembly since every citizen had the right to participate in deliberative or judicial office: "Whoever is entitled to participate in an office involving deliberation or decision is, we can now say, a citizen in this city[…]" [Aristot., Polit., 3, 1275b, 18]. The members of this court were also elected for a year by lot and also performed their duties for wages. Depending on the type of case, different magistrates presided over the court – mostly by archons, strategoi, pedagogies, etc.[57] Consisting of 201, 501, or (even) 1001

---

55 Two opposite principles were combined in the Classical Athenian state structure – empire and democracy. The connecting link between them was considered naval warfare. Cf. **Raaflaub**, 2007, 119-122.

56 **Gomme and Cadoux**, 1992, 178-179.

57 In the Periclean age, mutual complementarity prevailed in relations between the Assembly and Lawcourt, and this understanding is present in Aristotle [Aristot., Pol., II, 1273b, 42-45]. However, by the end of the fifth century, the Assembly fell under oligarchic intentions: "The assembly's weaknesses related to both composition and procedures: ordinary citizens did not necessarily dominate, unscrupulous speakers could wield excessive power, and voting by raising hands invited intimidation and corruption." In this situation, the Lawcourt (limiting the influence of the Assembly) became the *more democratic institution*. **Cammak**, 2013, 132-133; **McGregor**, 2014, 90-91.

remembers held meetings in three neighboring buildings. The process of the lawsuit was competitive: both sides, prosection, and defense, presented their arguments before the judges, and they (through discussion of the details of the case) reached a verdict by a majority of votes.[58] Over time, a new genre of rhetoric appeared – court oratory whose representatives, as adepts of law, composed speeches for their customers. It should be added that the court sessions were open to the public, and every citizen could share his considerations with the jury and influence the rendering of a verdict.[59] A complicated process of voting was set up to avoid corruption and secure justice acceptable to the majority of citizens. In the assessment of the court's mission, Aristotle's account seems very valuable: "Whoever controls the courts controls the state." [Aristot., Pol., III, 1275b, 20].[60]

d. Philosophical and rhetorical gestures of Agora

In Agora's overall gliding of meanings, the philosophical experience played a particular role. It was connected with the activity of the Sophists and Socrates. The Sophists were *itinerant teachers* whose worldview system varied from that of the natural philosophers. Protagoras, Gorgias, Hippias, Philebus, and Antiphons were the most prominent. In arguing their ideas and concepts, they used oral contests when every side defended its approaches. Scarce accounts have been preserved of them and mostly in the writings of their opponents – the Stoics, Plato, Aristotle. Sometimes they contradicted each other, however, in their conversations, contemporaries traced common subjects focused on problems of humans – their thinking abilities (logic) and moral values, social responsibilities, and political forms of solidarity.[61] The locus communis of their teaching was to teach men how to restrain their opposite intentions and live by nature and justice. First of all, this concerned leading statesmen who were able to achieve their goal through educating the mass of citizens: "And this is prudence both in private and public affairs; he will learn how to manage his house in the best possible way, and he will be able to speak and act in the most powerful way in the affairs of the state

---

58 The activity lawcourts and their role in the communal life of the Classical Age Greece see **Ober,** 2022, 478-286.

59 On the Athenian criminal and civil law procedure and its typological parallels with modern cases see **Carey**, 1994, 179-183.

60 On the problem of (real or possible) combination laws and moral values in the courts of democratic Athens see **Adkins**, 1972, 119-126.

61 The principled approach of the sophists contained three aspects of philosophical contemplation - justice, nature, and convention. All of them were discussed in general coverage. Particular attention was paid to the human mind, capable of comprehending the diversity of the world through logic. See **Barney**, 2009, pp. 82-86.

"[Plato, Prot., 319a]. According to Protagoras, people came to collective life, overcoming their wild nature since "[...] the state can exist only if everyone is an expert in this matter, virtue" [Plato, Prot., 326b]. The most important of the virtues was recognized as "the desire for justice, law, and mutual reverence." They could be implanted into humans through training when they grow into citizens. According to the Sophists, this constituted the core of *state art* - the main instrument of the social reformation they proposed.[62] The wisdom imparted on Agora was aimed at bringing the microcosm and macrocosm into harmony, comprising citizens, their social community, and the Cosmos.[63] However, in the search for systematic and complete knowledge, the late Sophists sometimes fell into contradicttions with practical wisdom and virtue [Isocrates, Antidosis, 84].[64]

This ratio was the starting point for the system of Socrates – an intellectual "philosophizing in the Agora".[65] He was the teacher of Plato who depicts him as the central figure in his numerous dialogues: in contests with other philosophers, he has the last word of the conclusion. Frequently, Plato puts on the teacher's mask, and it is quite difficult to differentiate their approaches to the same problems of ontology, sociology, anthropology, jurisprudence, ethics, and esthetics.

Absolute heavenly justice - the exact position of the stars, the rotation of the planets, the change of seasons and days - Socrates opposed the relativity of human justice. He considered the heavenly absolute to be the supreme Good or God, emphasizing the inferiority of all forms of being about Him. Particularly, Socrates singled out the two opposite poles of this overall correlation – supreme God and human being.[66] It was believed that the latter kept a divine spark in his soul from the moment of his birth. We outlined above, it was in the form of heavenly truths and virtues to be opened during his education. This implied the important maxim of Socrates' moral theory -

---

62 Socrates inherited this approach, see **Ober**, 2022, 254-258.

63 This comprehension was obvious in Protagoras' system. The coverage of human problems allowed him to discuss them in typological, moral and esthetical analogs. Respect for the law and a sense of justice was recognized as the path to harmony. Cf. **Zeller**, 1930, 89; **Kerferd**, 1997, 231.

64 Plato called this experience *antilogic* since it was focused on the refutation of the given argument but not on the search for truth [Plato, Rep., V, 454a, 5]. Cf. **Kerferd**, 1997, 227-228.

65 t is the common characteristic of a *public philosopher* that Xenophon fixes in his readers. **Griswold**, 2011, 335.

66 "[…] since individual beings in the universe are either the products of intelligent design (γνώμη) or mere dumb luck (τύχη) and since human beings are clearly products of intelligent design, we then ought to be persuaded that there exists a vastly knowledgeable and powerful God, a God who is moreover a "loving and wise Maker (δημιουργός)" [Xen., Mem., I, 4, 2–7; cf. IV, 3,1–18]. Cf. **McPherrran**, 2011, 127.

"Know thyself".[67] Certainly, this was about the good life the end of which "[…] is to be like God, and the soul following God will be like Him" [Plato, Theatet., 176b, 5-8]. The theory of likeness to God (ὁμοίωσις θεῷ) expressed the movement of a soul to God through knowledge, for "There is one good, knowledge, and one evil, ignorance". In other words, no one erred voluntarily, he could do it because of his ignorance [cf. Plato, Prot., 345c, 4-6]. Education was called upon to fill this deficiency and form a new type of people.[68] The following dictum of Socrates undoubtedly concerned him: "Man is the measure of everything."

A community of such people had a chance to achieve absolute social justice, which stated that no one could suffer from injustice if no one had earlier benefited from it. [cf. Plato, Rep., II, 358c-359a]. This self-restraint, let us repeat, was based on high (private and social) virtues – wisdom, piety, valor, and self-control. Consolidated around them people came to a social agreement to live with common laws and interests, habits, and institutions. Only then, the city-state could achieve its real end. In the Socratic system, moral values occupied a leading position in composing the ground for different kinds of social relations – political, judicial, economic, cultural, etc. The path to this complex symmetry was the education of citizens.[69]

The Agora area had fourfold personifications: Popular Assembly, State Council, Court of Juries, and Philosophical School. In this respect, rhetoric also played an effective role in Agora's experience.[70] Initially, it was part of literary, dramatic, and philosophical prose, but later formed a specific genre. Isocrates formulated it as an "[…] endowment of our human nature which raises us above mere animality and enables us to live the civilized life" [Isocrates, In soph., 16]. At the same time, he stated rhetoric to be practical wisdom (φρόνησις): "[…] to enable us to govern wisely both our household

---

67 According to Pausanias, the seven sages of Archaic Greece "[…] came to Delphi and dedicated to Apollo the celebrated maxims: "Know thyself" and "Nothing in excess." [Paus., Description, 24,1]. They were inscribed in the fore-temple of the sanctuary. In Socrates' intellectual system, these wisdom maxims grow into philosophical formulas – explainable, perceptible, and comprehendible. In this regard, Aristotle's formula about the main achievements of Socrates is rather correct: "inductive arguments and defining the universal" [Aristot., Met., XIII, 1078b, 27].

68 In Classical Athens, the problem of the interdependence of democracy and knowledge occupied a central place. The influence of different kinds of knowledge (technical, social, and latent) on the decision-making procedures and practical policy. This fact was recognized and (even) directed by the state. See in detail **Ober**, 2008, 90-97, 106-117.

69 "However, much he contrasted a political "ideal" with the unsatisfactory reality of the historical polis, he did not otherwise agitate for the radical reformation of his polis by, say, proposing measures in the Assembly or organizing reform movements." See **Griswold**, 2011, 336.

70 In this view, scholars usually pay attention to one of the basic rights of Athenian citizens – the freedom of speech (παρρησία) in the public sphere on public matters. **Wohl**, 2009, 162.

and enable us to govern wisely both our households and the commonwealth – which should be the objects of our toil, of our study, and of our every act" [Isocrates, Antidosis, 85].[71] In this understanding, he was followed by Lysias, Isaeus, Demosthenes, and many others. Aristotle gave the comprehensive formula of rhetoric: "Rhetoric may be defined as the faculty of observing in any given case the available means of persuasion" [Aristot., Rhet., I, 2, 1355b, 25]. In this regard, rhetoric was recognized as τέχνη λόγων and was included in the system of teaching *practical wisdom* [cf. Isocrates, In soph., 15].[72]

Metaphorically, everything said about the Agora could be summarized as follows: in the *plot of democracy*, all the mentioned voices and masks complemented each other, composing a polyphony of different approaches, ideas, and understandings.

4. **Acropolis** (ἀκροπόλις).

It was the sacred center of Athens – two-three hundred meters higher than the City. From the Agora to the Acropolis, a staircase ran called the Propylaea. In the Golden Age of Athens, it was reconstructed by the architect Mnesicles into a gallery with Doric marble columns. Nearby was the Pinotheke, designed for the exhibition of paintings and sculptures by prominent artists. It was believed that through it, people moved from the external (everyday) to the internal (essential) level of life. In a deeper sense, it looked like a transition to the divine. In front of the Propylaea and Pinotheke was erected the Statue of Athena Promachos.[73]

In the same Age, the temples of Athena Nike, Poseidon, Zeus Polieus, Erechteus, Cecrops, Artemins Brauronia, Pandrosos, and Aglauros were built or reconstructed on the Acropolis. The Altar of Athena completed the architectural complex of the Acropolis. It was conceived as an area of standard-sacred speeches (prayers and votives) to the deities, delivered by priests and ordinary visitors: only ritual postures, pauses, and recitatives -

---

71 Aristotle developed this idea of Isocrates and other theorists of rhetoric about the connection between the art of persuasion and practical wisdom. **Self**, 1979, 132-137.

72 About the problems of the origins and the development of Greek rhetoric from Homer to the Fourth century BC. see **Kennedy**, 2001, 7-17.

73 **Fyfe, Wycherley**, 1992, 887-888.

without logical discussion, argumentation, and conclusion.[74] Developing this idea Aristotle asserts that "[…] a citadel-hill (acropolis) is suitable for oligarchy and monarchy" [Aristot., Polit., VII, 1330b, 20].[75] In both cases, the highest point of perception was ecstasy.[76]

However, the focus of this religious experience (meaningful silence) was the Parthenon, a Doric-style temple dedicated to Athena Pallas, the tutelary deity of the City. It was built in 447-338 BC. under the supervision of Pericles himself.[77] The architects Ictinus and Callicrates erected the building, and the sculptures of Phidias decorated its exterior and interior.[78] The temple was considered the embodiment of an ideal harmony set up in strict accordance with Greek geometry, which we discussed when sketching the metaphysics of the Athenian city walls. The creators of the Temple proceeded from the idea that the daughter of Zeus was the goddess of wisdom and technology.

Features of the Parthenon's metaphysics. Greek architecture required each temple to be composed of the same standard elements. In this respect, the Parthenon made no exception; its first significant element was the temple base (στυλοβάτης) - a square (or cube), personifying the number four. It was usually associated with the underworld (Hades). It was also considered identical to the primary element of the earth - stability, good luck, and afterlife justice. The second element of the temple was the peristyle (colonnade), consisting of fifty columns (8:17 + 8:17), and each was considered as a circle (or cylinder), resulting from the smooth flow of the square into that shape. In this light, it is appropriate to recall the idea of Pythagoras that the circle was the parent of all subsequent forms - triangle, square, pentagon, and their derivatives. In numerical display, what was said looked like a movement from

---

74 We mean the so-called popular religion of the Greeks the core element of which was made up of the transitive situation of an adept – initiation, sacrifice, procession, prayer, etc. Cf. **Nilsson**, 1940, 58-64; **Mitchell-Boyask**, 1999, 43-53. For political power, constitutive and representational rites were considered very important. **Goodin**, 1978, 285-290.

75 This is about the same theory of Aristotle on *environmental determinism* tracing a connection between a landscape and a political regime. We have already touched on the problem by discussing Athenian democracy and the Agora.

76 The modern word is derived from the Greek ἔκτασις – a *stand out* from the usual values, which was "[...] usually associated with "Hellenism", [and] arose from those layers of Greek life that were overwhelmingly male, urban, representatives of the upper class, Athenians and, insofar as they were sympathetic to religion, religiously conservative." **Cassidy**, 1991, 23. This state was associated first with the image of Dionysus. **Henrichs**, 1984, 207.

77 "[…] he boldly suggested to the people projects for great constructions, and designs for works which would call many arts into play and involve long periods of time, in order that the stay-at-homes, no whit less than the sailors and sentinels and soldiers, might have a pretext for getting a beneficial share of the public wealth" [Plut., Pericles, XII, 5].

78About the historical circumstances of the Parthenon building and this enterprise's ideological background, see **Lapatin**, 2009, 135-144.

four to five. In other words, the peristyle personified the number five, which, as it was stated above, personified the idea of marriage and succession.[79]

Above the Doric capitals, the frieze was situated consisting of triglyphs and metopes. Metopes depicted mythical subjects with well-known battle scenes: on the western wing, the battle of Athenians and Amazons (Amazonomachy); on the northern, the battle of Achaeans and Trojans; on the eastern, the battle of gods and giants (Gigantomachy) on the southern – the battle of Centaurs and Lapiths. All these war scenes were marked by a common storyline telling about the transition from chaos to order on the cosmic and social levels. This was thought of as the key idea of the Temple.[80]

Under the triangle roof, two triangle pediments were situated, on opposite axes of the temple – eastern and western. Over the temple entrance, was the eastern depicting the birth of the goddess Athena (from the head of Zeus); while the western was dedicated to the competition of Poseidon and Athena over the right of founding the City. In other words, both pediments depicted scenes of birth: in the first case, of the goddess, and in the second case, of Athens. It must be also paid attention that they were paralleled with the scenes of their metopes, correspondingly, a. Gigantomachy (a new cosmos and new generation of gods), b. Amazonomachy (a new Athens after the attack of Amazons). The eastern and western triangles, certainly, were identified with the primary element of the air, along with the earth of the base, symbolizing the essential movement – from the body to the soul - hidden in the concept of the temple. On the whole, a mythological and sacred silence and secret dominated the temple, as far as the mythical subjects were deprived of logical and psychological development. The center of this semantic situation was the sculpture of Athena shaped by Phidias of gold and ivory - a sui generis vertical axis of the temple implying a triple movement from the underworld to the material world and the divine heaven. On these three elements of overall equilibrium, Plato states: "For when of any three numbers, whether expressing three or two dimensions, one is a mean term, so that as the first is to the middle, so is the middle to the last; and conversely as the last is to the middle, so is the middle to the first; then since the middle becomes

---

79 As has been demonstrated above, the walls of Athens were constructed according to the same pentatonic symmetry, and an advanced observer could easily trace their semantic connection with the idea of birth and continuation recognized as principal values of the rising democracy. Cf. **Ahmeti, Hoxha**, 2021, 140-143.

80 Parthenon (like Athens of the Classical age) was designed to demonstrate the idea of overall symmetry.

first and last, and the last and the first both become middle, of necessity all will come to be the same, and being the same with one another all will be a unity" [Plato, Tim., 32a].

Along with the vertical axis, the Parthenon also had a horizontal axis: the pre-temple, the temple, and the treasury. It denoted a movement from the profane to life's sacred and eternal symbols. The intersection of two axes occurred in the same sculpture of Athena. In strict accordance with the potencies of the goddess, the principle of creation and re-creation dominated both in the fragments and in the entire structure of the Parthenon.[81]

Along with prayers, both axes were filled with ancient legends (myths and epics), known to citizens since childhood. Their plots could only be developed from the reverse perspective of advanced observers. Accordingly, they were deprived of development for the profane. In this respect, the content of ancient legends was considered identical to the semantic silence that dominated outside the Agora and the Theater of Dionysus. We have already discussed the first case, now it is the turn of the second.

5. Theatre of Dionysus.

Theatre originated in the sixth century BC. from the feasts dedicated to Dionysus, the god of vegetation. The feasts – Lenaea and Anthesteria - demonstrated his yearly revival and death causing ritual gaiety and grief in rural communities.[82] The process gained vitality when through the efforts of the tyrant Pisistratus.[83] Two theatrical genres came into existence in this regard – comedy and tragedy.[84] The first was judged to have concerns with daily facts and events: "Comedy […] is an imitation of what is inferior to a greater degree, not however with respect to all vice, but the laughable is a proper part of the shameful and ugly"[Aristot., Poet., V, 1449a, 32-35]. By the words of the philosopher, comedy is laughable but painless and not

---

81 Contemporaries and later researchers traced in (or ascribed to) the Parthenon's layout a sui generis semiotics and number metaphysics, religious semantics and architectural symmetry, political ideology and social program. See **McCague**, Hoxha, 2021, 139-142. We find quite available the idea that contemporaries assessed the Parthenon "as not so much democratic as imperialistic", **Cartledge**, 2021, XII.

82 On the process and phases of the generation of the theatre from Dionysian gaiety and suffering see **Vernant, Vidal-Naquet**, 1990, 181-188, cf. **Фрейденберг**, 1978, 515-520.

83 See **Nilsson, Rose, Richardson**, 1992, 352-353. Cf. **Zatta**, 2010, 56.

84 Scholars see deep parallels between laughter and crying. In social psychology, laughter (as well as crying) "[…] is associated with the play mood and probably serves specialized functions in play activity". **Piddington**, 1963, 146.

destructive. As for tragedy, it is defined as "[…] an imitation of an action that is complete in itself, as a whole of some magnitude; for a whole may be of no magnitude to speak of. Now a whole is that which has a beginning, middle, and end (ἀρχὴν καὶ μέσον καὶ τελευτὴν)" [Aristot., Poet., 7, 1450b, 25-30]."[85]

In this study, we do not look at all (even very important) aspects of theatre and poetry. We see our task in the description, interpretation, and understanding of the phenomenon of play and theatricality in the context of the communal life of Athens.[86] In this regard, we think to pay special attention to its different expressions, from the metaphysics of architectural forms to the structure of human characters engaged in theatrical performances both as actors and audiences.

a. Main architectural elements of theatre.

In Athens, the theatre of Dionysus was situated on the southern slopes of the Acropolis. The construction was started in the mid-sixth century and reached its completion at the beginning of the fourth century BC. It had a standard layout - the scene, orchestra, and amphitheater with 17 000 seats. Pericles and his intellectual entourage viewed the theatre as an important educative institution and set up a fund for providing free seats at public spectacles (θεωρικόν). This educative role was particularly concerned with high social ideals, values, and emotions – a function that was intrinsic to Greek culture on the whole.[87]

Unlike a temple, the theatre was focused on the direct perspective of an observer ready to change the borders and semantic codes of old legends and epic tales. The said was first encoded in the theatre's architecture, and the principal elements of it had deep metaphysical meaning. *First, the amphitheater* (ἀμφιθέατον), was a hemisphere for spectators' seats. The term reached back to the verbal form θέαομαι – *to view, observe, contemplate*.[88] It asserted the difference from sacred rituals, the meaning of which was accessible and understandable only to a group of priests and adepts. In contrast to this, the

---

85 About Aristotle's tripartite dramatic narrative concept and its impact on ancient and modern narrative theory, see **Lively**, 2019, 25-41.

86 In this regard, we must keep in mind that, in some senses, Athenian citizens were tragic persons "[…] constituted within the space encompassed by the pair *ethos* and *daimōm*. If one of them was eliminated, he vanished." It is about the character and the fortune of men. **Vernant, Vidal-Naquet**, 1990, 37.

87 In this respect, it is necessary to recall: "According to Greek ideas, it was the knowledge that moved men to act. […] No Athenian ever believed that knowledge could exist for any other purpose than to lead to right action". **Jaeger, 1945, 388.**

88 This visibility and acoustics were gained through the symmetry of the amphitheater based on the 3:4:5 triangle or bisected equilateral triangle. See **Wilson Jones**, 2006, 152.

entire theatrical audience was involved in the performance and could watch its details from different points of the amphitheater.[89] In a metaphysical sense, the hemisphere implied a desire for completion in a full sphere. But the second hemisphere was invisible and inaudible.[90] Only some Greek texts identified it with the mask of a barbarian who could understand nothing in the theater and even lost consciousness due to shock.[91] **Second**, *the scene*: in previous times, it was located on the same level as the orchestra but later separated and occupied a higher position. The term (σκηνή) denoted a tent or booth where actors changed garments and masks for specific characters and actions. Afterward, it turned into a high wall with decorations adequate to the Fabula and situation. Formerly, one actor (σκηνικός) played on the scene but soon the second and even the third appeared.[92] They maintained dialogues both with the chorus and each other. The actors differed in the importance of their roles. The bearer of the central role was named the protagonist who was focused on the plot's principal dramatical and emotional movements. Usually, actors wore a mask (προσωπεῖον), denoting their character in the given situation - cry, smile, and seriousness. It was believed that the masks could absorb an actor's individuality, forcing him to speak and act according to the emotional development and logic of the plot. This situation was judged as ecstasy under Dionysus.[93] **Third**, *the orchestra* which resulted from the old feasting community was a group consisting of at least eight (sometimes even fifty) members (commoners) of different statuses – age, sex, and social position. They had a collective voice therefore Aristotle finds that "The chorus must also be regarded as one of the actors; it must be an integral part

---

89 In this regard, the amphitheater can be formulated as a space of vision and hearing (ὄψις καὶ ἄκουσις). Herodotus considered them the main sources of information [Herod., II, 8, 1-3, IV, 81, 1-2, 195, 2; cf. Thucyd., I, 22, 2]. If this analog is correct, one can even compare the "work" of a historian with that of a theatrical audience. In both cases, it was important to proceed from senses to comprehension. See **Marincola,** 1987, 125-126; **Dewald**, 1987, 158-159.

90 More precisely, the amphitheater was a downward-facing semi-conical figure with a cut-off sharp end, which made up the space for the stage and orchestra. Cf. **Fyfe, Wycherley**, 1992, 1051-1052. Naturally, each level of the semi-cone was a semi-circle (or oval) oriented to the center of the scene. Through numerous (both imaginary and real) rays, there was feedback communication between the amphitheater and the stage. This determined the reversibility of these two important poles of the theatre.

91 The invisible and mute half of the theatre (especially from the second half of the fifth century BC) was associated with barbarism. Most likely, the great victory over the Persians gave the Greeks reason for the new mythology to portray themselves in terms of masculinity, and the barbarians - in femininity. **Castriota**, 2005, 90. The transition from a relatively mild attitude towards the barbarians to this rigorism can be traced in many genres of Greek writing from tragedy to historiography. See **Benjamin**, 2014, 125-126.

92 **Easterling**, 1997, 152-153. From this point of view, the effort of scholars to trace parallels between theatrical performances and Attic (red-figured) vase paintings must be recognized as quite effective. Cf. **Csapo**, 2010, 25-38.

93 Tragedy masks originated from ritual masks, particularly, those of dithyramb leaders. However, they gained *intention, movement and flexibility* only in dramatic actions. See **Jevons**, 1916, 191; **Фрейденберг О. М.**, 1997, 219. Cf. **Damon**, 1989, 320-321.

of the whole and participate in the action […]" [Aristotle, Poet., XVIII, 1456a, 25-28]. Often, it expressed its attitude to current dramatic events in songs, dances, and recitations (strophe-antistrophe).[94]

It was also believed that the chorus prepared the audience's opinion on different social, moral, legal, and religious problems through refutation of excesses of the same quality or character (demonstrated by actors) and gaining a rational and emotional means of thought of as a virtue.[95] The said pointed out one of the most important axes of theater semantics - from the stage to the orchestra and the amphitheater, and vice versa, from the public to the chorus and actors. It was intended to consolidate different aspects of the performance and reveal its main idea. Despite the first vertical axis, the second had a horizontal direction and moved from the theatrical entrance to the exit. As it was emphasized above, everyday life dominated beyond the entrance, full of ancient myths, legends, and epic tales. As a rule, all the City inhabitants knew them, which was a sign of their maturity. However, they did not represent expanding knowledge, as folklore tales were based on bare statements and descriptions without argumentation and interpretation, reflection and conclusion.[96] Therefore, we have formulated them as semantic silence.

Meanwhile, based on semi-circle (and semi-conical) forms theatrical architecture revealed its metaphysical connection with the idea of overall slip. We decided to take into account the well-known Platonic allegory of the intellectual cave for demonstrating the substantial aspects of this slip - from semantic stillness to development, meaning silence to argumentation, description to understanding. In this case, the theater audience could be compared to cave dwellers: chained to their places from birth, they faced the cave wall.[97] Due to this, they could only observe the shadows of wooden or woolen puppets - people, animals, things - shown behind them from the wall, in the light of a fire. Consequently, they were not able to perceive the true essence of things and lived among the shadows.

---

94 It deserves to put out the following fact: despite the essential changes, the chorus remained synonymous with performance in Greek theatrical terminology of the fifth-fourth centuries BC. The dramatic poet was called a *trainer of the chorus* (διδάσκαλος). See **Bacon**, 1994, 6-7.

95 We proceed from the assessment of A. W. Schlegel which (despite some rigorism) is acceptable in general. He identified the chorus as an *ideal spectator*. **Schlegel**, 1876, 151.

96 On these and other characteristics of mythical thinking see **Levi-Strauss**, 1955, 429-430; **Levi-Strauss**, 1966, 217-219; **Levi-Strauss**, 1981, 69-72; **Степанян**, 1991, 7-17.

97 For a semantic parallel between the Platonic cave mythology and the puppet theater, see **Ahmad**, 2016, 88-89.

Some scholars pay attention to the following fact: as conceived by the architect (or just by chance), the audience of the theater of Dionysus, indeed, sat in a cave position - with their backs to the Acropolis and, in particular, to the Parthenon. And divine eternal truths seemed to be reflected on the theater stage as shadows.[98]

According to Plato, only some advanced cave inhabitants could break the chains, turn around, go to the cave entrance and look at the Sun - the source of true knowledge. Having coped with the pain in the eyes of the first hours, they gradually got customed to the natural light, gaining knowledge about the cosmos and eternal truths. In this way, instead of the bodily eye, the mind's eye took priority in them. In this way, these former prisoners could "[…] continue to ascend until they arrive at the Good". However, they were destined to "[…] descend again among the prisoners in the cave, and partake of their labors and honors, whether they are worth having or not" [Plato, Rep., VII, 519a].[99]

b. Main semantic features of the tragic plot.

In theatre, the mentioned returnees could be identified with the poets – the authors of tragedies. Their creative activity started when they put on the folklore material a perception to form a plot.[100] As a result, *an ambiguous and deprived of actuality matter* gained structure and dramatic movement through the place, characters, and actions.[101] Aristotle sees the function of a tragic poet in describing "[…] not the thing that has happened, but a kind of thing that might happen, i.e. what is possible or necessary. The distinction between historian and poet is not in the one writing prose and the other verse […] it consists really in this, that the one describes the things that have happened, and the other a kind of things that might be" [Aristot., Poet., 9, 1451a, 35-1451b, 5].

---

98 Composing his allegory of the cave, Plato, most probably, proceeded from ritual puppet theatres well known in the Greek and other traditional cultures. **Gocer**, 2000, 119-122. This allegory was adopted by Christian intellectuals. **Ursic**, 1998, 85-90

99 The cave allegory can also be interpreted as a movement from the somatic and affective parts of the human soul to the highest reasoning part of augmented rational knowledge and comprehension (τὸ φιλόσοφον). **Ferguson**, 1922, 19-21.

100 The connection with the *rude folklore material* was traceable both in semantic and semiotic codes of tragic a plot. However, it composed only one side of the latter: in reality, a poet proceeded also from the ideas and senses of his time. He bestowed individual features and characters upon typical epic heroes making them recognizable to the theatrical public (the contemporaries). See **Фрейденберг**, 1997, 162-165, 173-175.

101 Nevertheless, the transition from one level to the other was not so soft and organic. Scholars speak about "tensions between myth and the forms of thought peculiar to the city". **Vernant, Vidal-Naquet**, 1990, 43.

One could also discuss the work of a tragic poet proceeding from Aristotle's theory of the so-called, actual thing (ἐνεργείᾳ ὄν). A master manufactured it of a rough matter personifying the potentiality of the thing. Only under a specific form (εἶδος or μορφή), it acquired actuality and reached its real essence (ἐντελέχεια). The latter was thought of as identic with the thing's purpose or destiny (τέλος) [Aristot., Metaph., 1047b, 30 -1048a,30].

Only in this case, a tragic poet could lead his audience to the true meaning of his plot. However, not all audiences were able to reach this level; many of them remained on the level of puppet shadows. And the poet had to combine their views and understandings since as a returnee he resembled a state legislator: "[…] who did not aim at making any one class in the state above the rest; the happiness was to be in the whole state, and he held the citizens together by persuasion and necessity, making them benefactors of the state, and therefore benefactors of one another" [Plato, Rep., VII, 519e]. The poet had the same target in the theatre - to secure homonymy, justice, and moral unanimity of all audiences despite their diversities. To this end, he had to master his primary matter according to his idea acquired through high inspiration, on the one hand, and professional skills, on the other hand.[102]

One could also interpret the situation in light of the atomist theory formulated by Leucippus and Democritus. It was well-known in Classical Greece and considered a true thing as a combination of undividable material elements (atoms) and void. Atoms had different masses and shapes, magnitudes and speeds, nevertheless, they made up a unity due to their mutual attraction.[103] The latter could be compared with the benefaction of social individuals whereof spoke Plato.

As a rule, the intrigue of tragic performance started with a situation of overall or partial disturbance under different circumstances – moral, legal, and psychological. Aristotle defines this breach as *peripety or reversal* (περι-πέτεια) – *a sudden change of condition or fortune* "[…] from one state of things within the play to its opposite, and that too as we say, in the probable

---

102 See **Burian**, 1997, 181-190. The central element of the dramatist's work implied the overpowering of the tragic crisis (peripety) and the leading the dramatic action to a denouement. **de Romilly**, 1968, 12-23.

103 Atomist theory exercised great influence on posterior philosophical systems of antiquity both of natural-philosophical and social-ethical character: the Stoics, Plato, Aristotle, Epicurus, etc. See **Furley**, 1992, 327-328; **Zeller**, 1930, 64-68.

or necessary sequence of events […]" [Aristot., Poet., 11, 1452a, 22-24]. As a rule, the reversal was followed by *discovery*: "a change from ignorance to knowledge, and thus to either love or evil" and *suffering* "an action of a destructive or painful character" [Aristot., Poet., 11, 1452a, 30-33, 1452b, 16-17]. In its turn, suffering gave rise to pity and fear and led the dramatic performance "to its purification (κάθαρσις) of such emotions [Aristot., Poet., 7, 1449b, 27-28]. The catharsis was thought of as the denouement of the complication innate to every plot. It was recognized as the emotional and rational purpose of tragedies.[104]

In its turn, the purification charted the path to the restoration (or rather, re-creation) of peace, justice, and moral order. However, this restoration *sounded* already beyond the textual boundaries of the plot. The choir usually alluded to it in its last stasimon.[105] It achieved its profound purpose in the reverse perspective of the audience. This understanding outlines a new path to the Aristotelian theory of tragedy as an imitation of a "perfect, integral and known in magnitude" action.[106]

The development of a tragic plot also had a formal aspect consisting of three phases. We have already touched on this aspect, singling out its beginning, middle, and end: "A beginning is that which does not itself follow anything by causal necessity, but after which something naturally is or comes to be." The *end* makes the opposite pole of the dramatic movement: "An end, on the contrary, is that which itself naturally follows some other thing, either by necessity, or as a rule, but has nothing following it." For the completeness of the plot, attention must be paid to the middle as well: "A middle is that which follows something as some other thing follows it" [Aristot., Poet., VII, 1450b, 25-30]. Summing up the said, Aristotle concluded: "A well-constructed plot, therefore, must neither begin nor end occasionally but conform to these principles." However, the formal division contained profound changes and led to the denouement of the main plot conflict.[107] We

---

104 The kinship of catharsis with old purification rituals is considered to be quite obvious. Particularly, scholars emphasize the role of the rituals devoted to Dionysus. See **Фрейденберг**, 1997, 153.

105 This is first about the Sophoclean chorus which is closely engaged in the dramatic play and is indeed a *collective actor*. See **Weiner**, 1980, 206. Meanwhile, in Euripides' tragedies, the role of the chorus he role of chopyc is more modest: the dialogues and actions of the characters predominate. See **Easterling**, 1997, 155-156.

106 *Fear* and *pity* were only the striking emotions leading to *catharsis*. In reality, numerous other emotions (typical and ad hoc) conveyed them to the telos of tragedy. See **Scharper**, 1968, 132-136.

107 However, the situation was not so rigorous: on the one hand, the dramatists were rule-bound, on the other hand, they were rather free for improvisation. **Easterling**, 1997, 154.

can parallel the tragic plot with a triangle which is metaphysically determined as the primary element of air and (correspondingly) the human soul.

Most probably, Aristotle formulated these principles from the experience of the great tragic poets of the fifth century BC. – Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides. Certainly, they were present in other genres of literary creativity as well. This concerned presumably history under the pen of Thucydides, an author who depicted history as a performance with eminent (and secondary) characters.

In this regard, it is also apt to recall that in tragedy, characters were thought of as masks made of wood or clay. They were sui generis indices of scenic actions: "Again, tragedy is the imitation of an action; and an action implies personal agents who necessarily possess certain distinct qualities both of character and thought" [Aristot., Poet., VI, 1449b, 35-40].[108] As noted above, during the performance, actors got absorbed by the mask characters and lost their individuality becoming an element of the tragic performance as a whole. And the highest point of this absorption was the actor's ecstasy.

c. *Some Ideal tragic characters*

To interpret this aspect, we must return to the above-cited passage from Plato. We mean the mutual benefaction of citizens of an ideal state (εὐεργετεία). Most likely, the idea came from the social interpretation of the atomistic theory of the mutual attraction of social atoms (individuals).[109] It gave citizens the willingness to guarantee the state's order and freedom with their own lives. The willingness for self-sacrifice by religious, legal, and moral stimuli was considered the highest motive of human life. Consequently, it became one of the focuses of classical tragedy and philosophical prose.[110] We find the following four characters could be assessed as the best examples of this kind of behavior - Prometheus of Aeschylus, Antigone of Sophocles (on the theater stage), Athens (a collective hero on the stage of Greece), and Socrates (on the stage of Athenian Agora).

---

108 However, W. Kaufman believes that a modern scholar can overpass Aristotle in understanding tragedy while defining it as a form of literature that presents a symbolic action that moves to human suffering. **Kaufmann,** 1968. 85.

109 This problem gained popularity in modern sociological theory, particularly thanks to the works of E. Durkheim, T Parsons, and N. Luhmann. See in detail **Lewis and Weigert**, 1985, 455-468.

110 Modern existential philosophy encountered the same problem of the relationship between the self and others. M. Heidegger discussed it in the ontological and semantic network "being- in the - world, being -with, and being a self". They are surrounded by *others*. However, "*The others* do not mean everybody else but me – those from whom the I distinguish itself." **Heidegger**, 1996, 118.

Prometheus. Before becoming the main opponent of Zeus, his image typologically developed through primary phases. At first, he was a mythological trickster, destroying social and moral taboos, later he took on the civilizing role of mankind, becoming the deity of fire, crafts, skills, and knowledge: "I found men mindless and gave them minds, Made them masters of their wits."[111] More certainly, he taught them how to obtain metal from ore, cultivate fields, build cities, and sail overseas [Aesch., Prom., 440-480]. He stole all these skills from the Olympians, and the almighty Zeus decided to punish him by chaining him to the Caucasus Mountains. Day after day, God's *broad-winged eagle devoured the immortal liver of the hero*, causing him terrible pain. Prometheus (the Fore-thinker) knew about this consequence in advance, but this did not stop him. Developing the ancient mythical tale into a tragic plot of "Prometheus Bound", Aeschylus emphasized the hero's beneficence, which also means his voluntary self-sacrifice.

Prometheus carries out his mission against the tyranny of Zeus, as he foresees that God will sooner or later recognize the legitimacy of his actions and the right of people to civilized life. He foresees also that this will happen in exchange for his willingness "[...] to show a new plot whereby he (Zeus) can be spoiled of his throne and his power" [Ibid., 172-173]. In particular, it is about the new marriage of Zeus and the birth of a new offspring that will overthrow him. The chorus outlines the possibility of a compromise between the opponents on this ground.[112] However, this does not diminish the value of Prometheus' deed. Even Hermes, the faithful servant of Zeus, recognizes this, formulating it as *a self-willed calamity* [Ibid., 965]. In a deeper sense, Aeschylus believes in the same harmony which later made the focus of the philosophical utopia of Plato on overall benefaction in an ideal social community. And parallels between the true lawgiver and the new supreme deity are quite apparent.

Antigone. This is a modest young girl of the Theban royal family, who must choose between divine justice and human law. She is the eldest daughter

---

111 On the mythological aspect and Prometheus's contradictory character, see Hesiod, *Theogony*, 510-580. A character which in later development gave rise to the sacred fighter and victim for the sake of human freedom and welfare. See in detail **Vernant**, 1988, 183-201. Cf. **Beal**, 1991, 358-362.

112 In complex and compound tragic situations, a compromise was habitual for classical plots. Sometimes, it was reached in Athens under an archaic king (Theseus, in *Oedipus at Colonus* by Sophocles) or the Areopagus council (in *Eumenides* by Aeschylus). Although in the fifth century, they had already lost their dominant position and influence, however in (utopic) social axiology, they were still assessed as bearers of justice and moral perfection. See **Allen**, 2005, 374-379.

of Oedipus, and, like the other members of her family, is haunted by the same blind fate that caused her father so much suffering. The tragic hero was finally acquitted at the trial in Athens and received divine mercy for irresponsibility in his crimes - patricide and incest libido with his mother. However, his two sons – Eteocles and Polyneices, quarreled over the royal authority and soon it grew into a military conflict under the walls of Thebes: Eteocles fought for the City, Polyneices against it having at his disposal the Argive forces. They killed each other in a duel: "They fought as bravely and died as miserably" [Soph., Ant., 18].[113] While one was glorified, the other, on the contrary, was cursed. Human law forbade the latter to be buried by ancient sacred rites: "He is to have no funeral or lament, but to be left unburied and unwept" [Ibid., 26-27]. The new king Creon decreed: "Anyone who acts against this order will be stoned to death before the city" [Ibid., 41-43]. He recognized it as *a crime for all of Thebes*.

This meant that the corpse of Polynices would be "meat for dogs and wild birds", and his soul would be doomed to the eternal torment of wandering between heaven and earth. Antigone is determined to save the soul of her unfortunate brother, although she knows about the death penalty awaiting her for disobedience. She chooses death because she understands that fate continues its atrocity and must stop it with all her might. She gradually comes to the idea of self-sacrifice for restoring general order and justice. This is her free choice (αἵρεσις).[114] To fully appreciate her case, we must remember that, under other circumstances, she would have been happy with the king's son, Haemon, with the prospect of becoming the queen of Thebes.

However, Antigone represents the kind of human who tries to combine divine justice with *the laws of the land*. Sophocles recognizes Antigone as *a child of the gods* [ibid., 845]. In the reverse perspective of his advanced audiences, he outlines parallels between Antigone and Semele, who gave

---

113 The duel of the two brothers must be discussed in the chain of binary oppositions composing the semiotic cod of the plot of *Antigone*: divine-profane, peace-strife, justice-corruption, moral-immoral, etc. See in detail **Rabinowitz**, 2008, 155-166. O. Freidenberg revealed the features and nuances of this semiotic algorithm proceeding from Aeschylus' *Seven against Thebes*. **Фрейденберг**, 1998, 373-376. 384-386.

114 The experience of Greek tragedy on free will and destiny was summarized by Aristotle and the Stoics from different points of view. While Aristotle discussed the problem proceeding from human characters, the Stoics considered its cosmic coverage. See **Frede**, 2011, 19-39; cf. **Müller**, 2016, 12-18. Following the Stoics, Philo of Alexandria introduced the concept into Biblical studies. Later, Christian intellectuals adopted it as a path to the rebirth of a human into God's image. Origen considered God's free will to be the great grace to His creatures. See **Linjamaa**, 2019, 146-155.

birth to Dionysus at the cost of her life. Meanwhile, the *laws of the land* are preferable for Creon.[115] In the eminent *Ode to Man*, the chorus is quite antipathic to this kind of man: "Never may I sit his side, or share the thought of his heart" [ibid., 375].[116] At the end of the tragedy, Creon is punished: his son Haemon and later wife Eurydice commit suicide for the sake of love: the son for his bride, the mother for her son. And the poet formulates the catharsis of the tragedy as follows: "Wisdom is supreme for a blessed life, and reverence for the gods" [Ibid., 1347-1350]. Only in this case, the willful and deliberate victim could be the motive for the continuation of life and welfare.[117]

It remains to remind that *Antigone* by Sophocles was performed in Athens, in 441 BC., that is, in the time of Periclean social experience (the complementarity of citizens), on the one hand, and the flexible balance between democracy and the absolute authority of its leader, on the other. Scholars see the plastic form of this complex symmetry in the sculptures of Polycleitus. Particularly, this is true about his *Doryphoros* shaped by opposite numbers, qualities, and movements: odd-even, one-many, left-right, rest-movement, bottom-top, material-spiritual, etc.

Athens - a Collective Tragic Hero. We decided to discuss this hero against the background of the Greek history of the fifth century BC, highlighting its most important phases. However, in the historical tragedy of Athens, one of the main principles of the genre (requiring events to happen during one day-light) was transgressed. Every phase of the historical tragedy covered a long-time duration - from years to decades.

The first phase saw the self-victim of the City in the Greco-Persian war (499-449 BC.). It was more than apparent in the second invasion of the enemy when the City was captivated and robbed. Its walls and squares, houses and temples were destroyed, fields and vineyards were burnt. Citizens found refuge in neighboring islands. Many of them came to Salamis wherefrom they could watch their abandoned homeland. The destruction was

---

115 In this regard, Hegel demonstrated two paradigms of life – natural ethical and rational, embodied in two opposite laws and sexes: "[…] the law which is manifested [to ethical self-consciousness] is in the essence tied to its opposite, the essence is the unity of both, but the deed has only carried out one law in contrast to the other" **Hegel**, 1977, 283.

116 Some scholars are inclined to see the essential features of Pericles in the tyrannical and self-righteous image of Creon. See **Ehrenberg**, 2011, 190.

117 In philosophy (the Stoics, Plato, and Philo of Alexandria) wisdom looks out as intrinsic intellect and acquired knowledge of human beings. See **Wolfson**, 1942, 138-139.

of such scale that the Greek opponents spitefully named the Athenian leader Themistocles "a man without a city" [Herod., VII, 61, 1].

In this critical situation, Athens could give up to the enemy's mercy (like some other city-states) or gather its population and move to Italy to found a new city [Ibid., 62, 2]. However, its free choice was to keep on resisting and force the allies (first of all the Spartans) to fulfill their duty to the end. In some senses, this stance could be defined as self-victim for the Panhellenic case. We are inclined to identify these events with tragic peripety.

Themistocles foresaw a similar course of events and in good time convinced the Athenians to invest public finances in building a navy. This project implied replacing the hoplite units. Indeed, in a short time (483-480 BC), two hundred triremes were built with well-trained crews. Behind this *purely military device*, contemporaries traced a radical program of social reforms. The fact is that the hoplite army was created according to a property qualification - the soldiers had to cover the costs of their rather expensive equipment. Thus, only the upper classes could afford to serve in the elite detachments of hoplites, which provided them with high social prestige. As for the fleet, it did not demand such expenses; only the knowledge and skills of sailors were required. This gave the lower classes access to the navy and, consequently, to social influence.[118] Even under aristocratic commanders (Euribiades, Cimon), the fleet retained this feature, now based on the idea of Athenian identity and patriotism.[119] In this regard, Aeschylus is very accurate in describing the Battle of Salamis:

> *Now, sons of Hellas, now!*
> *Set Hellas free, set free your wives, your homes,*
> *Your gods' high altars and your fathers' tombs.*
> *Now all is on stake [Aeschylus, The Persians, 401-405].[120]*

---

118 In reality, the situation was not so simple. During the 470s-460s the majority of the urban lower classes were away as oarsmen of the fleet, and due to that the upper classes again gained influence. The leaders of the people would put great effort to further the state's democratization. We mean first of all the reform of Ephilates undertaken in 462/461 BC. to lower the role of the Areopagus. See **Ehrenberg**, 2011, 169-171.

119 About this problem, see **Strauss**, 1996, 313-326. Nevertheless, in poetry and rhetoric, hoplites continued to be assessed as ideals of valor and courage. As for sailors, they symbolized a *collective weapon* without individual valor and focus on traditional shield-and-spear. **Pritchard**, 2018, 232-236.

120 In a deep sense, Sophocles portrays the battle as a scene of collective action that stimulated a new identity of the Athenians based on their complementarity. The idea of collective action was the focus of the democratic lower classes, and the Periclean propaganda instilled in this perception a color of Athenian exceptionalism. See **Ober**, 2008, 75-79.

By all accounts, the great victory over the Persians was won by the efforts of a rising democracy. It was a reward for the Athenians' collective self-sacrifice anticipating the age of Pericles whereof we spoke above. It made the heart of the next phase of the Athenian historical tragedy – the catharsis described in detail in the so-called *Funeral Oration* of Pericles.

We plan to discuss some significant aspects of this document. In this regard, the following fact must be taken into consideration: the text of the Oration has been preserved in Thucydides and, undoubtedly, was worked out under his pen in accordance with the political ideas and literary-rhetorical skills of the time. His approach in similar cases is well-known: "I have therefore put into the mouth of each speaker the sentiments proper to the occasion, expressed as I thought he would be likely to express them, while at the same time, I endeavored, as nearly as I could, to give the general purport of what was actually said"[Thucyd., I, 22, 1].

The Oration was delivered in 431 BC. when the Peloponnesian War had already broken out with the Greeks fighting each other for dominance "over land and sea". The bodies of the first fallen warriors were brought to Athens and the Oration was composed just on this occasion. However, mourning was not its main feature. It was dedicated to the high social and individual values of the citizens. In this vein, one could even formulate the text as a retrospective utopia, like those found in the works of Plato.[121]

In the Oration, the leader first emphasizes the freedom of Athenian state form (ἐλευθέρα πολιτεία) and the homogeneity of its citizens. Both of these features are recognized as the basic conditions of democracy.[122] Their mutual complementary and responsibility follow just from that: "Our constitution does not copy the laws of neighboring states; we are rather a pattern to others than imitators ourselves. Its administration favors the many instead of the few; this is why it is called a democracy. If we look at the laws, they afford equal justice to all in their private differences; if to social standing, advancement in public life falls to reputation for capacity, class considerations not being allowed to interfere with merit; nor again does poverty bar the way, if a man is able to serve the state, he is not hindered by the obscurity of his

---

121 The utopian nature of the *Oration* indicated Pericles' intention to solve everyday problems by strict logic, which represented the advantages of Athenian democracy as an indisputable fact. See **Gaiser,** 1975, 41.

116 For the analysis of the social, political, legal, and psychological aspects of these basic features of Athenian democracy see **Hansen**, 1996, 93-100.

condition" [Thucyd., II, 37, 1]. It implied no arithmetic but geometric-complementary equality requiring every citizen to invest in collective good according to his material and intellectual capabilities. It generated "equal justice to all in their private differences".[123] In a metaphysic sense, this construct - "from diversities to unity" - alluded to the figure of the circle with a feature of overall slip.

The same perception is traceable in the next principal trait of the City singled out by Pericles. It is distinct in the passage where Athens is depicted as *the school of all Greece*: "I say that Athens is the school of Hellas and that the individual Athenian in his own person seems to have the power of adapting himself to the most varied forms of action with the utmost versatility and grace. This is no passing and idle word, but truth and fact; and the assertion is verified by the position to which these qualities have raised the state" [Ibid., 41, 1-2]. From this point of view, we come back to the Socratic concept of maieutic (midwifery), with the difference that Athens now acted as a mentor and the rest of the Greek cities as its pupils.

This parallel alludes to the idea of identifying Pericles with Socrates and Athens with PanHellenic agora. According to the leader, it required a new mode of relationship in inter-Hellenic affairs: "In generosity we are equally singular, acquiring our friends by conferring not by receiving favors. Yet, of course, the doer of the favor is the firmer friend of the two, in order by continued kindness to keep the recipient in his debt; while the debtor feels less keenly from the very consciousness that the return, he makes will be a payment, not a free gift" [Ibid., 40, 4].[124] In other words, this new idealistic model of relations implied the benefaction of Athens to allies. By developing this assumption, an advanced audience could conclude that Athens entered the Peloponnesian War just for this sublime purpose. The next conclusion would be about the self-victim of this collective hero from his generosity.

Of course, one could object to this idealistic interpretation. But it is impossible to pass by the well-known definition of Aristotle: […] comedy

---

123 On this fundamental principle see **Sicking**, 1995,409-413. Some scholars proceed from the idea that, in Periclean Athens, no united ruling elite, political parties, or mass organizations and movements existed. The board of citizens acted as a whole – economically and socially, politically and psychologically, religiously and individually. The concept of δῆμος expressed the unity and sovereignty of Athenians. See in detail, **Ober**, 1989, 132-147.

124 Sallust borrowed and ascribed to Rome the same idea of generosity to friends and considered this the most effective way to establish its dominance and hegemony over the territory stretching from Britain to Egypt, the Pillars of Hercules to the Euphrates - provinces, autonomous cities, communities, and kingdoms. According to Sallustus' formula, Romans "[…] were lavish in their offerings to the gods, frugal in the home, and loyal to their friends" [Sallust., Cat., IX, 3].

aims at representing men as worse, tragedy as better than in actual life" [Aristot., Poet., 2, 1448a, 36-38]. In the Funeral Oration, Athens is depicted with better features of a tragic hero who looks at catharsis: "For Athens alone of its contemporaries is found when tested to be greater than its reputation […]" [Thucyd., II, 41, 3].

Following Aristotle's ideas, one could define the City as a chain of events designed to show what could happen by chance and necessity. Let us state again, this was due to the constitution of Athens being considered a balanced democracy. However, Periclean assessment of democracy differed from that of Aristotle: he shaded the formal side of this political regime and emphasized the moral qualities of citizens. In them, he traced the real cause of the success or failure of the community.

Soon, history came to prove this understanding. After Pericles' death (429 BC.), the citizen board of Athens began to degrade because of internal contradictions and egoistic endeavors.[125] People saw that real history could be different from the ideal: the Peloponnesian War began to inflict defeat and suffering on Athenians.

Undoubtedly, the readers of the Funeral Oration were among the followers of this understanding. But they were able to get acquainted with it only after 411 BC. when the History by Thucydides was brought to an end and published. At that time, the military catastrophe was already obvious.[126] So, for an adequate interpretation of Oration, the vision and judgment of the opposition intellectuals are quite demanded.

Opposition intellectuals perceived life in Athens as *bare prose*, without artistic metaphor and philosophical generalization. Within the real historical time, this indicated the process of the fall of the balanced Periclean democracy into the power of a mob. Paradoxically, this was the starting point of a new tragedy with Socrates as the central hero.

Socrates. While discussing the polyphony of the Agora, we had a chance for outlining some essential aspects of his philosophical system. We

---

125 In his numerous comedies, Aristophanes portrayed the process of degradation in grotesque features. See **Fairbanks**, 1903, 659-666; **Heath**, 1987, 12-26.

126 It was a crisis of the traditional balanced political regime, the style of life, and (even) textuality. Thucydides' narrative expressed this fact: its style based on the balance of poetic and archaistic narrative units did not meet the new times' extremism of thinking and behavior. And taking also into account other important considerations, he stopped his writing in 411 BC. Cf. **Wade-Gery, Denniston,** 1992, 1068-1070; cf. **Dewald**, 2005, 26.

proceeded from the phrases of the philosopher preserved mostly in Plato. Now we are going to repeat this experience against the background of his behavior in his last days, remembering that the life path of a true philosopher is also a text consisting of his ideas and theories.[127]

In this regard, let us start from the same idea: Socrates contrasted absolute celestial justice (the exact position of the stars and the rotation of the planets) with the relativity of divine and (to a greater extent) human justice.[128] The philosopher emphasized that heavenly truths are laid in people's souls from their birthdays to be revealed in education. In other words, he traced a direct connection between men and heaven (absolute Good). Certainly, this statement concern neither the mob nor the traditional gods. It required a new board of citizens and a new elite group.[129]

Meanwhile, Socrates' conservative opponents – Meletus, Anytus, and Lycon - saw in this approach disgrace to the Olympian gods since he taught the youth: "[…] not acknowledge the gods which the state acknowledges, but some other new divinities or spiritual agencies in their stead" [Plato, Apol., 24b, 8-10]. This accusation gained new colors in the last period of the exhausting Peloponnesian war (410-404 BC.) when the emotional and short-sighted politics of the crowd and its leaders prevailed.[130] As it was stated above, the balanced democratic regime of the Periclean age had already degenerated into ochlocracy. Plato saw in this an inevitable process when: "Democracy leads to anarchy, which is mob rule based on pleasures and desires" [Plato., Rep., VIII, 560d, 6-8]. As a result, Athens lost the war, signed a humiliating peace treaty and surrendered to the mercy of Sparta and its allies.

In this vein, Socrates' opponents became more aggressive. They brought a lawsuit against him, intending to show him (and his entourage) guilty of the

---

127 On the coherence of the way of life of a true philosopher and his worldview system see in detail **Hadot**, 1995, 264-276.

128 It is about *natural and conventional justice* worked out in Western philosophical and legal thought beginning from the Sophists and, especially, Socrates. See **Barden, Murphy**, 2010, 66-71.

129 Identifying the Platonic image of Socrates with the real historical Socrates, we must attribute to him the political ideals of his disciple and think of an ideal republic under philosophers. See **Dobbes**, 1985, 819-821. Nevertheless, it seems more likely that the political colors of Socrates were softer: he proceeded from the personality and its moral qualities, for recognized the happiness of its members as the main and of the social community. **Long**, 2012, 18-20.

130 This process had also deep economic causes: great expenditure of public finances on military needs, pauperization of lower classes, and their absolute dependence on oligarchs brought to the fall of Athenian democracy at the last period of the Peloponnesian war. See **Pritchard**, 2018, 172-174. On the theoretical (polit-economical) coverage of the problem see **Tridimas**, 2015,106-109.

defeat. The philosopher openly demonstrated this motive: "[…] because you wanted to escape the accuser, and not give an account of your lives" [Plato, Apol., XXXII, 39a, 25]. Following this line, the Athenian tribunal remained deaf to the sophisticated arguments of Socrates and voted for the death sentence. The philosopher was quite persistent, and Plato's text leaves a *strange impression*: if he showed compliance and flexibility, perhaps he would only have been ostracized - exiled for a while. It was a common practice for such "crimes". From this assumption ensues the following curious fact of the last days of Socrates: he was eager to meet his death, as now felt himself a stranger in his native City: "I already see that the time has come when it is better for me to die […]" [Plato, Apol., XXXII, 40a, 15].[131]

And he died taking poison and talking to his close intellectual entourage about eternal moral virtues. In light of this, the death of the philosopher looked like a self-victim for the same ideal of social community whereof spoke Plato in his Republic. This voluntary suicide happened in Athens, in 399 BC. Socrates' last words were the best illustration of that: "I go to die and you to live; but which of us goes to the better lot, is known to none but God" [Plato, Apol., XXXIII, 42a, 20]. Let us remind again that it is about the absolute moral Good. [132]

Proceeding from this understanding, Socrates was determined to restore a moderate and balanced course of communal life under well-trained leaders. He did not absolutize any political regime: like the former heroes of our discussion, he considered human life firstly in moral values and saw the main source of that in eternal law and justice. In this regard, the life and death of the philosopher (certainly, in Plato's interpretation) acquired features of a tragic plot to be performed for future intellectual generations.[133]

---

131 On the interpretation of Socrates' trial see **McPherrran**, 2011, 130-134.

132 Meanwhile, Plato's *Crito* demonstrates another motivation in Socrates' behavior: he believes in the social contract and primacy of law and thinks that injustice cannot be overpassed by injustice [Plato, Crito, 49c-d]. See **Greenberg**, 1965, 60-64; **Rosano**, 2000, 460-466. Therefore, he denies Crito's offer to escape from prison. Some scholars interpret *Crito* as a tragic plot about the suffering and death of Socrates. If this assumption is correct, we must pay attention to the lack of a chorus and state the rhetorical character of this tragic plot. We think that the same is right about Plato's *Apology* as well. Other scholars even call Plato a tragic poet. See **Kaufmann,** 1968, 22-23. Perhaps, Plato developed the tradition of Euripides who quite diminished the role of a chorus in his tragedies. In this regard, scholars find them more philosophical.

133 In this regard, it is impossible to agree with F. Nietzsche, who found that "Socratism is a murderous principle". On the same ground, he even identified the philosopher as Dionysus's opponent, who personified death and resurrection. **Nietzsche**, 1999, 64. As for modern scholars, they typologizing deaths of Greek philosophers – by suicide, starvation, illness, despair, god's will, etc. - put out the *punishment of religious impiety* and connect it with Socrates and (even) Aristotle. See **Grau**, 2010, 370-371. However, the religious aspect was only the visible side of Socrates' case: it implied an essential reformation of a democratic society.

Epilogue

During the Classical Age, Athens' geographical location, social structure, political regime and mentality rested on the principle that could be formulated as unity through diversities. The four poles of the City – Areopagus and Acropolis, Agora and Theatre of Dionysus – demonstrated these diversities. The first pair revealed the hierarchic and ritual code of social behavior focused on the algorithmic imperative which (in a deep sense) excluded discussion and argumentation of emotional and rational truths. Problems were settled according to the ancestral authority incarnated in *mores maiorum*. The second pair rested on critical and creative thinking, play and variability of social behavior combined with dialogue and logical argumentation. They gave rise to social reformation designed to improve the basic parameters of communal life. In this regard, philosophy and theater, rhetoric and historiography came to the fore. Their particular desire was to draw a lesson from the events of everyday life and give an answer to the question "What could happen by accidence and necessity".

This approach concerned the ideal of the city-state requiring a strong solidarity among its members. The highest form of this solidarity implied the self-sacrifice of (certainly, outstanding) citizens for the sake of the common good. This paved the way for a sophisticated and artistic perception of the individual and his role in history.

To demonstrate this metamorphosis, the images of four heroes are singled out. Two of them were theatrical and acted on the stage of the Theatre of Dionysus – Prometheus and Antigone. Under the pens of Aeschylus and Sophocles, they personified a complete action aimed at voluntary self-sacrifice for the sake of high moral values and justice. On the other hand, two real historical heroes are portrayed whose complete actions were focused on Athens's Agora. One of them is Athens itself as a collective hero personified by Pericles, the other is the philosopher Socrates. While the first pair of heroes acted in the frame of a performance time, the second pair acted in the real historical time of the fifth century BC. However, in both cases, the main

features of the tragic plot are quite obvious its beginning, middle, and end. During this movement, the essential metamorphoses of action and characters happened - from peripety of fear and suffering to a catharsis of purgation and liberty.

For historical heroes, these changes were explicable in their *self-narratives* - "Funeral Oration" by Pericles and "Apology of Socrates" by Plato. A comparative analysis of the two texts gives reason to assert that "the optimism of Pericles was just as tragic as the pessimism of Socrates". Behind this metaphor, an experienced eye could trace a mathematical equation aimed at proving the Common Good. This statement was also applicable to the Athenian architectural environment - points, lines, triangles, squares, pentagons, and circles. Amid their various (rational and metaphysical) combinations, fictional and real heroes lived in political, philosophical, and theatrical imitations, poses, and plays. All these aspects of identity demonstrated the readiness of the Athenians for innovations and re-creation.

Ալբերտ Ա. Ստեփանյան – գիտական հետաքրքրությունների շրջանակում են անտիկ շրջանի և վաղ միջնադարի հայոց պատմության հիմնահարցերը:

Էլ. հասցե` bertstepanyan48@gmail.com

ԽԱՂԸ ԵՎ ԹԱՏԵՐԱՅՆՈՒԹՅՈՒՆԸ ԴԱՍԱԿԱՆ ԱԹԵՆՔՈՒՄ
(խաղընթացներ, դիմակներ և կերպարներ)

Ալբերտ Ա. Ստեփանյան
Պատմ. գիտ. դոկտոր

Բանալի բառեր – ընկերային խաղեր, դասական Աթեն-
քի տարածքի թատերայնությունը, Արիստոտելի քերթողա-
կան արվեստը, ողբերգություն-կատակերգությունը և ըն-
կերային պահվածքը, պոլիսի մշակութային, կրոնական և
քաղաքական համախմբման տարակերպերը, դասական
Աթենքի չորս թատերային և իրական-պատմական հերոս-
ներն ու նրանց մտահոգելոր ժառանգությունը, Պրոմեթևս
և Անտիգոնե, Պերիկլես և Սոկրատես:

Դասական շրջանի Աթենքի տեղանքը, ընկերային կառույցը,
վարչակարգն ու մտայնությունը կարգաբերված էին համաձայն մի
սկզբունքի, որը հաճախ բանաձևվում է իբրև «միասնություն ըստ
տարասեռությունների»: Սկզբունքն այս, ի մասնավորի, բացահայտ-
վում էր քաղաքի չորս հիմնարար իմաստային բներներում՝ Արեոպա-
գոս և Ակրոպոլիս, Ագորա և Դիոնիսական թատրոն: Ընդսմին, առա-
ջին զույգն արտահայտում էր ընկերային պահվածքի աստիճանա-
կարգային և ծիսա-սրբազնային կողը: Այն ուներ ալգորիթմիկ-իրա-
մայական բովանդակություն և բացառում էր զգացական և բանա-
կան արժեքների քննարկումն ու փաստարկումը: Դրան հակառակ՝
երկրորդ զույգը հիմնված էր քննադատական և ստեղծագործ մտա-
ծողության, խաղի և ընկերային պահվածքի տարակերպումների վրա,
որոնց կայացման հիմնական միջոցը երկխոսություն ու բանական
փաստարկն էին: Այս առնչությամբ սկեցին առանձնակի կարևորվել
իմաստասիրությունն ու թատրոնը, ճարտասանությունն ու պատմա-
գրությունը: Դրանք խնդիր ունին դասեր քաղելու առօրեական անց-
քերից և պատասխան տալու այն հարցին, թե «ինչ կարող էր տեղի
ունենալ ըստ պատահականության և անհրաժեշտության»:

Նման մոտեցումն առնչվում էր քաղաք-պետության տեսլակա-
նին, որն իր հերթին ենթադրում էր քաղաքացիների սերտ համա-
խմբում: Վերջինիս բարձրագույն ձևը ցոլանում էր իրրն (ականավոր)
քաղաքացիների ինքնագոհողություն հանուն հանուր բարիքի: Այն
հիմք էր նախապատրաստում անհատի պատմական դերակատա-
րության «արվեստական և խորիմաստ» ընկալման համար:

Այս կերպափոխությունների քննարկման նպատակով հոդվա-
ծում առանձնացված է չորս հերոսական կերպար: Երկուսը թատերա-
յին են՝ Պրոմեթևսը և Անտիգոնեն: Ընդ գրչավ Էսքիլոսի և Սոֆոկլե-
սի նրանք մարմնավորում են մի «ամբողջական գործողություն»՝ միտ-
ված առ ինքնական զոհողություն հանուն արդարության և բարոյա-
կան բարձր արժեքների: Մյուս երկու հերոսները պատմական անձեր
են՝ երեխներանգված Ագորայի հետնախորքի վրա՝ Պերիկլեսը և Սոկ-
րատեսը:

Մինչ առաջին զույգը գործում է թատերական-պայմանական
ժամանակի ծիրում, երկրորդը՝ իրական-պատմական ժամանակի
(Ք. ա. 5-րդ դար): Այդուհանդերձ, երկու դեպքում էլ ակներն է ող-
բերգական խաղընթացը՝ իր սկզբով, զարգացմամբ և ավարտով:
Հրնթացս այս շարժման անցում է կատարվում «վախից ու տառա-
պանքից» դեպի կատարսիս (մաքրագործում):

Նման անցումը նկատելի է հատկապես Պերիկլեսի «Հուղարկա-
ձառ» և Պլատոնի «Ջատագովություն Սոկրատեսի» երկերում: Դրանց
համեմատական քննությունն իրավում է մեզ հաստատագրելու, որ
«պերիկլյան լավատեսությունը նույնքան ողբերգական է, որքան
սոկրատյան հոռետեսությունը»: Փորձառու աչքն այս փոխաբերու-
թյունից անդին կարող է տեսանել մաթեմատիկական հավասարում՝
միտված ապացուցելու Հանուր Բարիքը: Նման հաստատումը կիրառ-
կելի է նաև աթենական ձարտարապետության նկատմամբ՝ կետեր,
գծեր, եռանկյունիներ, քառանկյունիներ, հնգանկյունիներ և շրջան-
ներ: Դրանց տարասեռ համաբերությունները գոյում էին ի մեջ քա-
ղաքական, իմաստասիրական և թատերական կրկնօրինակումների,
կեցվածքների և խաղերի: Ինքնության այս բոլոր դիտանկյունները
ցուցանում էին աթենացիների պատրաստակամությունն առ ինքնա-
նորոգում և ինքնասեղծագործություն՝ թե՛ ժողովրդավարության,

թե՛ ազնվապետության, թե՛ մենիշխանության տարրերի առկայու-
թյամբ:

Резюме

ИГРА И ТЕАТРАЛЬНОСТЬ В КЛАССИЧЕСКИХ АФИНАХ
(сценарии, маски, образы)

Альберт А. Степанян
Доктор ист. наук

Ключевые слова – социальные игры, театральность про-
странства классических Афин, поэтика Аристотеля, трагедия-ко-
медия и формы социального поведения, полис и солидар-
ность граждан вокруг общих морально-правовых ценностей, че-
тыре выдающихся театральных и исторических героя клас-сичес-
ких Афин – Прометей и Антигона, Перикл и Сократ, и их ду-
ховно-интеллектуальное наследие.

Географическое пространство, социальная структура, политический
строй и менталитет граждан Афин классического периода подчинялись
принципу, который обычно формулируется как «единство противопо-
ложностей». Принцип этот, в частности, проявлялся в четырех главных
полисах Города – Ареопаге и Акрополе, Агоре и Театре Диониса. Первая
пара отражала иерархический и ритуально-сакральный код социального
поведения граждан. Он имел алгоритмический и императивный характер
и исключал возможность интерпретации и аргументации эмоциональных
и рациональных ценностей.

Вторая пара, наоборот, строилась на критическом и творческом ос-
воении социального пространства. При этом, особую ценность приобре-
тали философия и театр, риторика и историография. Они были нацелены
на извлечение уроков из повседневности, с тем чтобы постигнуть суть
вещей: «что же могло бы случиться по случайности и необходимости».

Подобный подход имел целью раскрыть идеальный образ города-
государства (полис), который, в свою очередь, предполагал тесную со-
циальную солидарность его граждан. Наивысшая форма этой солидар-
ности представлялась как готовность сограждан к самопожертвованию

ради всеобщего блага. Добавим, что подобное восприятие готовило почву для «строго логического и эмоционально-артистического» понимания роли исторических (выдающихся) личностей.

Для раскрытия сути подобной метаморфозы в статье выделены четыре образа. Два из них имеют театральный характер – Прометей и Антигона. Они изображают «единое действие», нацеленное на самопожертвование ради всеобщей справедливости и моральных ценностей. Два других героя – Перикл и Сократ – исторические личности, действующие на семантико-семиотическом фоне Агоры. Соответственно, первая пара действует в условно-театральном, вторая – в реально-историческом измерении (V в. до н.э.). Однако в обоих случаях очевиден трагический сценарий со своим началом, развитием и концом. Это эмоционально-мыслительное движение, в русле которого происходит переход «от страха и страдания» к катарсису (очищению).

Подобное смысловое движение особенно очевидно в «Похоронной речи» Перикла и «Апологии Сократа» Платона. Сравнительный анализ двух текстов дает основание утверждать, что «Периклов оптимизм столь же трагичен, как Сократов пессимизм». Опытный глаз может узреть за этой метафорой математическое уравнение с доказательством Всеобщего Блага. Это же понимание действенно и в архитектуре – точки, линии, треугольники, квадраты, пентагоны и круги.

Их разнородные соотношения определяли суть политических, философских и театральных имитаций, поз и жестов. Они рассматривались как игры идентичности афинян, открытых к самовосстановлению и самотворчеству в условиях элементов демократии, аристократии и монархии.

Abbreviations

AD – 2004 - P. J. Rhodes (ed.), Athenian Democracy (Edinburgh, UP).

AHK – 1996 - P. Bidle, et al. (eds), Aspects of Hellenistic Kingship (Aarhus, UP).

CAPh – 2009 - M. L. Gill and P. Pellegrin (eds), A Companion to Ancient Philosophy (Malden (Ma), Oxford, Willey-Blackwell).

CCS – 2011 - D. R. Morrison (ed.), Cambridge Companion to Socrates (Cambridge, UP).

CAGG – 2013 - H. Beck (ed.), Companion to Ancient Greek Government (Malden (Ma), Oxford, UP).

CCAP – 2009 - J. Loren, Samos II (eds), The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Pericles (Cambridge, UP).

CCAR – 2009 - E. Gunderson (ed.), The Cambridge Companion to Ancient Rhetoric (Cambridge, UP).

CCGL – 2005 - M. Gagarin and D. Cohen (eds), The Cambridge Companion to Greek Law (Cambridge, UP).

CCGT – 1997 - P. E. Easterling (ed.), The Cambridge Companion to Greek Tragedy (Cambridge, UP).

CCHW – 2006 - G. R. Bugh (ed.), The Cambridge Companion to the Hellenistic World, (Cambridge, UP).

CHHP – 1999 - K. Algra, J. Barnes, J. Mansfeld, M. Schofield (eds), The Cambridge History of Hellenistic Philosophy (Cambridge, UP).

CCP – 1999 - R. Kraut (ed.), The Cambridge Companion to Plato (Cambridge, UP).

CCRR – 2004 - H. I. Flower (ed.), The Cambridge Companion to the Roman Republic (Cambridge, UP).

CCSAM – 2007 - A. J. S. Spawforth (ed.), Court and Court Societies of Ancient Monarchies, (Cambridge, New York, Cambridge UP).

CGT – 2005 - J. Gregory (ed.), A Companion to Greek Tragedy (Malden (Ma), Oxford, Blackwell).

CHHPh – 1999 - K. Algra et al (eds.), The Cambridge History of Hellenistic Philosophy (Cambridge, UP).

CHI – 1983 - E. Yarshater (ed.), The Cambridge History of Iran, v. 2 (Cambridge, UP).

GR – 2007 - G. R. Bugh (ed.) The Cambridge Companion of The Hellenistic World (Cambridge, UP).

CRR – 2010 - N. Rosenstein and R. Morstein-Marx (eds). A Companion to the Roman Republic (Malden, Oxford, Wiley-Blackwell).

D – 1996 - J. Ober and C. Hedrick (eds.), Demokratia: A Conversion on Democracies, Ancient and Modern (Princeton, UP).

HCRHP – 2001- S. E. Porter (ed.), Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period, 330 BC. – AD. 400 (Boston and Leiden, Brill Academic).

HMPAT – 2012 - K. Chemla (ed.), The History of Mathematical Proof in Ancient Traditions (Cambridge, UP).

II – 1993 - A. Bulloch, et al. (eds.), Images and Ideologies: Self-Definition in the Hellenistic World (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London, University of California Press).

MTAD – 1990 - J.-P. Vernant and P. P. Vidal-Naquet, Myth and Tragedy in Ancient Greece (New York, Zone Books).

MIPSP – 2000 - V. Curtis (ed.) Mesopotamia and Iran in the Parthian and Sasanian Periods: Rejection and Revival (London, British Museum Press).

OCD – 1992 - Oxford Classical Dictionary, 2d edition, ed. by N. G. L. Hammond and H. H. Scullard, (Oxford, Clarendon Press).

ODAG – 2007 - K. A. Raaflaub, J. Ober, R. Wallace (eds), Origins of Democracy in Ancient Greece (Berkeley, California UP).

PAL – 2005 - J. M. Barringer, J. M. Hurwit (eds), Periclean Athens and Its Legacy (Austin, Texas UP).

PCGC – 2011 - O. M. van Nijf & R. Alison (eds), Political Culture in the Greek City after the Classical Age (Leuven, Paris, Walpole (Ma)).

PW – 2013 - B. Gibson and Th. Harrison (eds), Polybius and his World: In Memory of F.W. Walbank (Oxford, UP).

RABPW – 2017 - C. Graml, A. Doronzio, V. Capozzoli (eds.), Rethinking Athens Before the Persian Wars. Proceedings of the International Workshop at the Ludwig-Maximillian's-Universität München (Munich, 23-24 February).

RE – 1894 - A. Pauly, G. Wissowa, W. Kroll, K. Mittelhaus, K. Ziegler (eds), Realencyclopädie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft (RE), Bd. 1/2 (Stuttgart, Vrlg. Metzler).

RHPh – 1997 - C. C. W. Taylor (ed.), Routledge History of Philosophy, v. 1, From the Beginnings to Plato (London, New York, Routledge).

RPAG – 1999 - M. W. Padilla (ed.), Rites of Passage in Ancient Greece: Literature, Religion, Society (Lewisburg, Bucknell UP).

SD – 2020 - Y. Sintomer, L. Lopez-Rabatel (eds), Sortition & Democracy. History, Tools, Theories (Exeter (UK), Imprint Academic).

WBCZ – 2015 - M. Strausberg and Y. S.-D. Vevaina (eds), The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Zoroastrianism (Malden (Ma), Oxford, Wiley Blackwell Publ.).

Bibliography

Primary Sources

1. **Aeschylus**, 1956, The Complete Greek Tragedies, ed. by D. Grene and R. Lattimore (Chicago, UP).
2. **Aristotle**, 1984, The Complete Works of Aristotle, v. 2. The revised Oxford translation, ed by J. Barnes (Princeton, UP, London, Heinemann LTD).
3. **Dio Cassius**, 1914, Roman History, with an English translation by H. B. Foster and E. Cary Cambridge (Ma), Harvard UP).
4. **Diodorus Siculus**, 1933, The Library of History, v. 1, translated by C. H. Oldfather (Cambridge (Ma), London, Harvard UP).
5. **Diogenes Laertius**, 1935, Lives of Eminent Philosophers, with an English translation by R. D. Hicks, in 2 vol. (London, W. Heinemann, New York, P. G. Putnam's Sons).
6. **Herodotus**, 1926/1931, Histories, with an English translation by A. D. Godley, in 4 volumes (Cambridge (Ma), Harvard UP, London, W. Heinemann LTD).
7. **Isocrates**, 1927-1929, with an English translation by G. Norrin, v. 1-2, (London, W. Heinemann, New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons).
8. **Pausanias**, 1918, Description of Greece, v. 1-2, translated by W. H. S. Jones (Cambridge (Ma), Harvard UP).
9. **Plato**, 1997, Complete Works, edited with Introduction by J. M. Cooper, associate editor D. S. Hutchinson (London, Hackett Publ.).
10. **Plutarch**, 1912, 1914, 1916, Lives, v. 1-3, with an English translation by B. Perrin (Cambridge (Ma), Harvard UP, London, Heinemann LTD).
11. **Propertius**, 1990, Elegies, edited and translated by G. P. Goold (Cambridge (Ma), Harvard UP).
12. **Seneca**, 1917, Epistles, v. 1, translated by R. M. Gummer (Cambridge (Ma), Harvard UP).
13. **Simplicius**, 1884, In Aristotelis *De Caelo* Commentaria (Berolini Types et Impensis Georgii Reimeri).
14. **Sophocles**, 2001, The Complete Play, translated by P. Roche (New York, Signet Classic).
15. **Tacitus**, 1937, Annals, v.5, with an English translation by J. Jackson (Cambridge (Ma), London, Harvard UP).
16. **The Complete Euripides**, 2009, v. IV, ed by P. Burian and A. Shapiro, Bacchae and Other Plays (Cambridge, UP).
17. **The History of Rome by Titus Livius**, 1893, with the epitomes and fragments of the lost books, literally translated, with notes and illustrations W. A. McDevitt (London, Macmillan Press).
18. **The Odes of Horace**, 1907, A translation and exposition by E. R. Carnsey (London, Swan Sonnenscvhein & Co.).

19. **Thucydides**, 1919-1923, History of Peloponnesian War, v. 1-2, translated by Ch. F. Smith (Cambridge (Ma), Harvard UP, London, W. Heinemann LTD).
20. **Velleius Paterculus**, 1924, Compendium of Roman History, with an English translation by F. W. Shipley (London, Heineman).
21. **Xenophon**, 1923, Memorabilia, Oeconomicus, Symposium, Apology, with an English translation by E. C. Marchant (Cambridge (Ma), Harvard UP).

Monographs and articles

22. **Abbate Ch. E.**, 2016, 'Higher' and 'Lower' Political Animals: A Critical Analysis of Aristotle's Account of the Political Animal, The Journal of Animal Ethics, 6/1, 54-66.
23. **Adkins A. W. H.**, 1972, Moral Values and Political Behaviour in Ancient Greece. From Homer to the End of the Fifth Century (London, Chatto & Windus).
24. **Adkins A. W. H.**, 1972, Moral Values and Political Behaviour in Ancient Greece: From Homer to the End of the Fifth Century (London: Chatto and Windus).
25. **Ahmad S**. 2016, Philosophy of Architecture and Architecture as Philosophy: The Potentialities in Accordance to Critical Cermon, International Journal of Architecture, Engineering and Construction, 5/2, 83-97.
26. **Ahmeti S. Hoxha B.**, 2021, Semiotics of the Parthenon as a Pillar of Modern Democracy, Humanities Bulletin, 4/1, 133-146.
27. **Allen D**., 2005, Greek Tragedy and Law, in CCGL, 374-393.
28. **Amber L. I**, 2010, The History of Areopagus Council from its Origins to Ephilates (Montreal, McGill UP).
29. **Asdourian P.**, 1911, Die politischen Beziehungen zwischen Armenien und Rom von 190 v. Chr. bis 428 n. Chr. (Venice, San Lazzaro).
30. **Babnis T.**, 2017, Augustan Poets on Roman-Parthian Treaty of 20 BC. Classica Cracoviensia, 20, 5-44.
31. **Bacon H. H.**, 1994, The Chorus in Greek Life and Drama, Aria: A Journal of Humanities and Classics, 3/1, 6-24.
32. **Badian E.**, 1958, Foreign Clientelae (264-70 BC.) (Oxford, Clarendon Press).
33. **Badian E.**, 1992, Crassus (Dives) Marcus Licinius, in OCD, 295.
34. **Barden G., Murphy T.**, 2010, Law and Justice in Community (Oxford, UP).
35. **Barney R.**, 2009, Sophistic movement, in CAPh, 77-100.
36. **Beal E. F.**, 1991, Hesiod's Prometheus and Development in Myth, Journal of the History of Ideas, 52/3, 355-371.
37. **Benjamin I.**, 2014, The Barbarian in Greek and Latin Literature, Scripta Classica Israelica, XXXIII, 117-137.
38. **Benson, H. H.**, 2011, Socratic Method, in CCS, 179-200.
39. **Bivar A. D. H.**, 2006, The Political History of Iran under the Arsacids, in CHI, v. 3/1, 21-99.

40. **Blok J.**, 2013, Citizenship. The Citizen Body and its Assemblies, in CAGG, 161-175.

41. **Boardman J.**, 2011/2005, Stoa Poikile, in J. M. Berringer and J. M. Hurwit (eds), Periclean Athens and Its Legacy: Problems and Perspectives (Austin, Univ. of Texas Press), 63-72.

42. **Bogdanović**, 2013, The Number and Its Symbolism in Ancient Greece, Journal of Arts and Humanities, 2/6, 116-122.

43. **Borza E. N.**, 1983, The Symposium at Alexander's Court, Ancient Macedonia, 3, 45-55.

44. **Brand D.**, 1993, Dionysiac Tragedy in Plutarch, Crassus, Classical Quarterly, n. s., 43/2, 468-474.

45. **Braud D.**, 1984, Rome and the Friendly King. The Character of the Client Kingship (London and Cambera, Groom Helm, New York, St. Martin's Press).

46. **Brennan T. C.**, 2004, Power and Process under the Republic, in CCRR, 19-53.

47. **Brosius M.**, 2007, New out of Old? Court and Court Ceremonies in Achaemenid Persia, in CCAM, 17-57.

48. **Burian P.**, 1997, Myth into Mythos: The Shaping of Tragic Plot, in CCGT, 178-210. California UP).

49. **Burian P**., 1997, Myth into Mythos: The Shaping of Tragic Plot, in CCGT, 178-208.

50. **Cadoux T. J.**, 1992, Triumviri, in OCD, 1096.

51. **Canepa M. P.**, 2009, The Two Eyes of the Earth. Art and Ritual of Kingship between Rome and Sasanian Iran (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London, the University of California Press).

52. **Canepa M. P.**, 2010, Technology of Memory in Early Sasanian Iran: Achaemenid Sites and Sasanian Identity, American Journal of Archeology 114/4, 582-584.

53. **Carey Ch.**, 1994, Legal Space in Classical Athens, Greece and Rome, 41/2, 172-186.

54. **Carlson M**., 1993, Theories of the Theatre: A Historical and Critical Survey from the Greeks to the Present (Ithaca and London, Cornell UP).

55. **Cartledge P.**, 1997, 'Deep Plays': Theatre as Process in Greek Civic Life, in CCGT, 3-35.

56. **Cartledge P.**, 2021, Preface, in Clair W. St, 2022, The Classical Parthenon. Recovering the Strangeness of the Ancient World (Cambridge Open Book Publishing), XI-XIV.

57. **Cassidy W.**, 1991, Dionysos, Ecstasy, and the Forbidden, Historical Reflections, 17/1, 23-44.

58. **Castriota D.**, 2005, Feminizing the Barbarian and Barbarizing the Feminine: Amazons, Trojans, and Persians in the Stoa Poikile, in PAL, 89-102.

59. **Cawkwell G. L**., 1995, Early Greek Tyranny and the People, The Classical Quarterly, 45/1, 73-86.

60. **Chaniotis** A., 1997, Theatricality Beyond the Theater. Staging Public Life in the Hellenistic World, B. Le Guen (ed.), De la scène aux grandis: théâtre et

représentations dramatiques après Alexandre le Grand, Pallas. Revue d'Études Antiques, 47 (Toulouse, Presses Univ. du Mirail), 219-259.

61. **Charbit Y.**, 2002, The Platonic City: History and Utopia, Population – E, 57/2, 207-236.

62. **Cherniss H.**, 1951, Plato as Mathematician, The Review of Mathematics, 4/3, 395-425.

63. **Cherry K. M.**, 2009, The Problem of Polity: Political Participation and Aristotle's Best Regime, The Journal of Politics, 71/4,1406-1421.

64. **Chilver G. E. F**., 1992, Pompeius, in OCD, 857-858.

65. **Cohen A. P.**, 2012, The Symbolic Construction of Community, 2d ed. (London, New York, Routledge).

66. **Csapo E.**, 2010, Actors and Icons of the Ancient Theater (Malden (Ma), Oxford, Wiley-Blackwell).

67. **Csapo E.,** 2010, Actors and Icons of the Ancient Theater (Malden (Ma), Oxford, Willey-Blackwell).

68. **Damon M.**, 1989, Actor and Character in Greek Tragedy, Theatre Journal, 41/3, 316-340.

69. **De Jong A.**, 2015, Armenian and Georgian Zoroastrianism, in WBCZ, 119-128.

70. **De Lacy P.**, Biography and Tragedy in Plutarch, American Journal of Philology, 73/1, 159-171.

71. **De Laix R. A.,** 1973, Probouleutic at Athens. A Study of Political Decision-making (Berkeley (Ca) UP).

72. **De Romilly J.**, 1968, Time in Greek Tragedy (Ithaca, New York, Cornell UP).

73. **De Romilly J.**, 1970, La *tragédie greque* (Paris: Presses universitaires de France).

74. **Debevoise N. C.**, 1968, A Political History of Parthia, 2d ed. (New York, Greenwood Press).

75. **Demont P.**, 2020, Selection by Lot in Ancient Athens. From Religion to Policy, in Y. Sintomer, L. Lopez-Rabatel (eds), Sortition & Democracy. History, Tools, Theories SD (Exeter (UK), Imprint Academic), 95-115.

76. **Dewald C.**, 1987, Narrative Surface and Authorial Voice in Herodotus' 'Histories', Arethusa, 20/1-2, 147-170.

77. **Dewald C.**, 2005, Thucydides' War Narrative. A Structural Study (Berkeley, Los Angeles, Univ. of California Press).

78. **Dobbes D.**, 1985, The Justice of Socrates' Philosopher Kings, Journal of Political Science, 29/4, 809-826.

79. **Donaldi T**., 1999, Organization and Structure of the Philosophical Schools in CHHP, 55-62.

80. **Drews R.**, 1972, The First Tyrants in Greece, Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte, 21/2, 129-144.

81. **Durkheim E.**, 1897, The Division of Labor in Society, trans. by G. Simpson (London, The Free Press of Glencoe, Collier-MacMillan Ltd.).

82. **Easterling P. E.**, 1977, Form and Performance, in CCGT, 151-177.

83. **Edwell P.**, 2013, The Euphrates as a Boundary between Rome and Parthia in the Late Republic and Early Empire, Antichton, 47, 191-206.
84. **Ehrenberg V.**, 1964, The Greek State (New York, W. W. Norton & Company INC).
85. **Ehrenberg V.**, 2011, From Solon to Socrates. Greek History and Civilization during the 6th-5th Centuries. With a New Foreword by P. Millet (London and New York, Routledge).
86. **Erler M.**, 1999, Epicurean Ethics, in CHHP, 642-674.
87. **Evans J. A.**, 2008, Daily Life in the Hellenistic Age: From Alexander to Cleopatra (Westport, Greenwood Press).
88. **Fairbanks A.**, 1903, Aristophanes as a Student of Society, American Journal of Sociology, 8/5, 655-666.
89. **Ferguson A. S.**, 1922, Plato's Simile of Light, Part II, The Allegory of the Cave, The Classical Quarterly, 16/1, 15-28.
90. **Ferguson K.**, 2008, Pythagoras. His Lives and Legacy of a Rational Universe (New York, Walker Publ.).
91. **Field G. C.,** 1992, Socrates, in OCD, 997-998.
92. **Fleck R. K**. **and Hanssen F. A.**, 2013, How Tyranny Paved the Way to Democracy: The Democratic Transition in Ancient Greece, The Journal of Law & Economics, 56/2, 389-416.
93. **Fontenrose J. E**., **Gomme A.W**., **Cadoux Th. J**., 1992, Codrus, in OCD, 257.
94. **Frede M.**, 2011, A Free Will. Origins of the Notion in Ancient Thought (Berkeley and Los Angeles).
95. **Fuller B. A. G.**, 1931, History of Greek Philosophy. The Sophists, Socrates, Plato (New York, Henry Holt, and Co.).
96. **Funck, B.**, 1996, Beobachtungen zum Begriff des herrscherpalastes und seiner machtpolitischen Funktion im hellenistischen Raum. Prolegomena zur Typologie der hellenistischen Herrschaftssprache', in G. Brands and W. Hoepfner (Hrsg.), Basileia. Die Paläste der hellenistischen Könige (Mainz, von Zabern), 44-55.
97. **Fyfe Th. and Wycherley R. E.,** 1992, Propylaea, in OCD, 887-888.
98. **Fyfe Th. and Wycherley R. E.,** 1992, Theatres, Structure, in OCD, 1051-1052.
99. **Gaeta L.,** 2004, Athenian Democracy and the Political Foundation of Space, Planning Theory and Practice, 5/4, 471-783.
100. **Gaiser K.**, 1975, Das Statsmodel des Thucydides (Heidelberg, Vrlg. F. H. Kerle).
101. **Godhill S.**, 1997, The Audience of Athenian Tragedy, in CCGT, 54-68.
102. **Godhill S.**, 2000, Civic Ideology and the Probleme of Difference: The Politics of Aeschylean Tragedy. Once again, Journal of Hellenic Studies, 120, 34-56.
103. **Goldhill S.**, 1997, The Audience of Athenian Tragedy, in CCGT. 54-68.
104. **Gomme A. W., Cadoux T. J.**, 1992, Boule, in OCD, 178-179.
105. **Gomme A. W., Cadoux T. J.**, 1992, Ekklesia, in OCD, 376-377.
106. **Goodin R. E.**, 1978, Rites and Rulers, The British Journal of Sociology, 29/3, 281-299.
107. **Goodin R. E.**, 1978, Rites of Rulers, British Journal of Sociology, 29/3, 281-299.

108. **Goser A.**, 2000, The Puppet Theatre and Plato's Parable of Cave, The Classical Journal, 95/2, 119-129.

109. **Graham A. J.**, 1992, Colonization, Greek, in OCD, 264-265.

110. **Graham A. J.**, 2001, Collected Papers on Greek Colonization (Leiden, Boston, Köln, Brill).

111. **Graham A. J., Cadoux T. J**., 1992, Solon, in OCD, 999-1000.

112. **Graham Th. A**., 2017, Playing the Tyrant: The Representation of Tyranny in the Fifth-Century Athenian Tragedy. Dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of Ph.D. in the Department of Classical Studies at the Graduate School of Duke University.

113. **Grau S.**, 2010, How to Kill a Philosopher: The Narrating of Ancient Greek Philosophers' Deaths about their Way of Life, Ancient Philosophy, 30, 347-381.

114. **Green K.**, 2000, Technological Innovation and Economic Progress in the Ancient World: M. I. Finley Reconsidered, The Economic History Review, 53/1, 29-59.

115. **Greenberg N. A.**, 1965, Socrates' Choice in *Crito*, Harvard Studies in Classical Philology, 70, 45-82.

116. **Greenridge A. H. J**., 1896, A Handbook of Greek Constitutional History (London, MacMillan and Co. Ltd).

117. **Griswold Ch. L.**, 2011, Socrates' Political Philosophy, in CCS, 333-354.

118. **Griswold Ch. L.**, 2011, Socrates' Political Philosophy, in CCS, 333-354.

119. **Gutzwiller K.**, 2007, A Guide to Hellenistic Literature ((Malden (Ma), Oxford, Blackwell Publ.).

120. **Hadot P.**, 1995, Philosophy as a Way of Life, ed. by A. I. Davidson, translated by M. Chase (London, Blackwell).

121. **Hahn R.**, 2017, The Metaphysics of Pythagorean Theorem (New York, Univ. of New York Press).

122. **Hall R. W**., 2004, Plato. Political Thinkers (London, New York, Routledge).

123. **Hansen M. H.**, 1979, The Duration of the Athenian Ecclesia, Classical Philology, 74/1, 43-49.

124. **Hansen M. H.**, 1996, The Ancient Athenian and Modern View of Liberty as a Democratic Ideal, in J. Ober and C. Hedrick (eds.), Demokratia: A Conversion on Democracies, Ancient and Modern (Princeton, UP), 91-104.

125. **Heath M.**, 1987, Political Comedy in Aristophanes (Hypomnenata 87) (Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).

126. **Heath T. L.**, 1921, A History of Greek Mathematics, v.1, From Tales to Euclid, (Oxford, Clarendon Press).

127. **Hegel G. W. F.**, 1977, Phenomenology of Spirit, translated by A. V. Miller (Oxford UP).

128. **Heidegger M.**, 1996, Being and Time, translation by J. Stambauch (New York State Univ., UP).

129. **Henrichs A.**, 1984, Loss of Self. Suffering Violence: The Modern View of Dionysus from Nietzsche to Girard, Harvard Studies in Classical Philology, 88/2, 205-240.

130. **Herrman G.**, 2000, The Rock Reliefs of Sasanian Iran, in MIPSP, 35-45.

131. **Hignett Ch.**, 1962, A History of Athenian Constitution: to the End of the Fifth Century BC. (Oxford, UP).

132. **Horst C.**, 2017, The Greek Agora in the Context of Sites of Political Assemblies in the Ancient Near East, in RABPW, 239-250.

133. **Humphreys**, 2004, Public and Private Interests, in AD, 225-236.

134. **Jaeger W.**, 1945, Paideia: The Ideals of Greek Culture, v.1, translated by G. Highet (New York, Oxford UP).

135. **Jevons F. B.**, 1916, Masks and the Origin of the Greek Drama, Folklore, 27/2, 171-192.

136. **Jounan A.**, 2019, Aristotle's Mathematicals in Metaphysics M3 and N6, Journal of Speculative Philosophy, Journal of Archeology, 113/1, 3-26.

137. **Justi F.**, 1895, Iranisches Namenbuch (Marburg, N.G. Elwert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung).

138. **Kallet L.**, 2009, The Athenian Economy, in CCAP, 70-92.

139. **Kaufmann W.**, 1968, Tragedy and Philosophy (Garden City (N.Y.), Doubleday).

140. **Keaveney A.**, 1981, Roman Treaties with Parthia circa 95-circa 64 B.C., American Journal of Philology.

141. **Kennedy G. A.**, 2001, Historical Survey of Rhetoric, in HCRHP, 3-42.

142. **Kerényi K.**, 1996, Dionysos: Archetypal Image of Indestructible Life, (Princeton, UP), 290-314.

143. **Kerferd G. B.**, 1997, The Sophists, in RHPh, 225-248.

144. **King L. S.**, 1954, Plato's Concept of Medicine, Journal of the History of Medicine and Allied Sciences, 9/1, 38-48.

145. **Konstan D.**, 1997, Friendship in the Classical World (Cambridge, UP).

146. **Lapatin K.**, 2009, Art and Architecture, in CCAP, 125-153.

147. **Larson J.**, 2007, Ancient Greek Cults: A Guide (New York and London, Routledge Taylor and Francis Group), 117-42.

148. **Laskarēs N. I.**, 1923, Theatrikon Lexicon (Gallo-Ellēnikon) (Athens), 163-164, s.v. *Histoire*.

149. **Lévêque P., Vidal-Naquet P.**, 1984, Cleisthenes the Athenian: An Essay on the Representation of Space and Time in Greek Political Thought from the End of the Sixth Century to the Death of Plato, translated and edited by D. A. Curtis (New Jersey, UP), 81-99.

150. **Levi-Strauss C.**, 1955, The structural Study of Myth, The Journal of American Folklore, 68/270, 428-444.

151. **Levi-Strauss C.**, 1966, The Savage Mind (Chicago, UP).

152. **Levi-Strauss C.**, 1981, Structuralism and Myth, The Kenyon Review, N.S., 3/2, 64-88.

153. **Lewis D. M.**, 2004 Cleisthenes and Attica, in AD, 287-309.

154. **Lewis J. D. and Weigert A. J.**, 1985, Social Atomism, Holism, and Trust, The Sociological Quarterly, 26/4, 455-471.

155. **Linjamaa P.**, 2019, The Ethics of the Tripartite Tractate (NHCI, 5). A Study of Determinism in Early Christian Philosophy of Ethics (Leiden and Boston, Brill).
156. **Liveley G.**, 2019, Narratology (Oxford, UP).
157. **Long Ch.**, 2012, Socrates: Platonic Political Ideal, Ideas y Valores, 61/149, 11-38.
158. **Luce J. V.**, 1988, Greek Science in its Hellenistic Phase Hermathena, 145/1, 23-38.
159. **MacDermot B.C.**, 1954, Roman Emperors in the Sasanian Reliefs, Journal of Roman Studies, 44 (1954), 76-80.
160. **Macé A.**, 2020, Plato on Drawing Lots. The Foundation of Political Community, in SD, 95-111.
161. **Mackenzie, Howell R.**, 1989, The Sasanian Rock Reliefs at Naqsh-i Rustam, Naqsh-i Rustam 6, The Triumph of Shapur I (Berlin, Dietrich Reimer).
162. **Malkin I.**, 2011, A Small Greek World: Networks in the Ancient Mediterranean (Oxford, UP).
163. **Marincola J.**, 1987, Herodotean Narrative and the Narrator's Presence, Arethusa 20/1-2, 121-137.
164. **Marincola J.**, 2013, Polybius, Plutarch and Tragic History: Reconsideration, in PW, 78-80.
165. **Marshall A. J.**, 1968, Friends of the Roman People, American Journal of Philology, 89/1, 39-55.
166. **Marx K.**, 1976, Capital. A Critic of Political Economy, v.1, Introduction by E. Mandel, translated by B. Fowkes, (New York, Penguin Books).
167. **McCague H.**, 2009, Pythagoreans and Sculptures: The Canon of Polykleitos, Rosicrucian Digest, 87/1, 23-29.
168. **McCloskey H. J.**, 1963, The State as an Organism, as a Person, and as an End in Itself, The Philosophical Review, 72/3, 306-326.
169. **McEvilley Th.**, 2001, The Shape of Ancient Thought: Comparative Studies in Greek and Indian Philosophies (New York, Allworth Press).
170. **McGregor, J. H. S.**, Athens (Cambridge (Ma) and London, The Belknap and Harvard UP).
171. **McPherrran M. L.**, 2011, Socratic Religion, in CCS, 111-137.
172. **Mikalson J. D.**, 2007, Greek Religion: Continuity and Change in Hellenistic Period, in GR, 208-222.
173. **Miller Calhoun G.**, 1935, Zeus Father in Homer, Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association, 66/1, 1-17.
174. **Mitchell-Boyask R.**, 1999, Euripides' *Hippolytus* and the Trials of Manhood (The Ephebia?), in RPAG, 42-66.
175. **Momigliano A.**, 1992, *Tribuni Plebis*, in OCD, 1092.
176. **Mossman J. M.**, 1998, Tragedy and Epic in Plutarch's Alexander, Journal of Hellenic Studies 108/1, 83-93.
177. **Mossman J. M.,** 1998, Tragedy and Epic in Plutarch's Alexander, The Journal of Hellenic Studies, 108, 83-93.

178. **Mueller I.**, 1999, Mathematical Method and Philosophical Truth, in CCP, 170-199.

179. **Müller M. A.**, 2016, Freedom and Destiny in Ancient Greek Thought: Some Footnotes for Contemporary Scientific Research and Education, Advances in Historical Studies, 5, 12-18.

180. **Murray O.**, 1990, Sympotic History, in O. Murray (ed.), Sympotica: A Symposium on the Symposion, (Oxford, UP).

181. **Murray O.**, 1996, Hellenistic Royal Symposia, in AHK, 15-27.

182. **Neu J.**, 1971, Plato's Analogy of State and Individual: "The Republic" and the Organic Theory of State, Philosophy, 46/117, 238-254.

183. **Neumann H.**, 1894, Amicus Populi Romani, in RE, 1832-1834.

184. **Neusner J.**, 1963, Parthian Political Ideology, Iranica Antica, 3, 40-59.

185. **Nietzsche F.**, 1999, The Birth of Tragedy and Other Writings, ed. by R. Guess and R. Spiers, translated by R. Spiers (Cambridge, UP).

186. **Nilsson M. P. N., Rose W. D., Richardson G. W. R.**, 1992, Dionysus, in OCD, 352-353.

187. **Nilsson M.**, 1940, Greek Religion (New York, Columbia UP).

188. **North J. A.**, 2010, The Constitution of the Roman Republic, in CRR, 256-277.

189. **Ober J.,** 1989, Mass and Elite in Democratic Athens: Rhetoric, Ideology, and Power (Princeton, UP).

190. **Ober J.**, 2008, Democracy and Knowledge. Innovation and Learning in Classical Athens (Princeton and Oxford, Princeton UP).

191. **Ober J.,** 2022, The Greeks and the Rational. The Democracy of Practical Reason (Oakland, California UP).

192. **Oliver G.**, 1875, Pythagorean Triangle or The Science of Numbers (London, John Hogg & Co.).

193. **Papadi D.**, 2008, *Moralia* in the *Lives*: Tragedy and Theatricality in Plutarch's *Pompey*, in N. Anastasios, N. Anastasios G. (eds), The Unity of Plutarch's Work: 'Moralia' in the 'Lives', features of the 'Lives' in the 'Moralia' (Berlin, New York, de Gruyter), 111-123.

194. **Papakonstantinou Z.,** 2012, A Delight and Burden (Hes., Sc.400): Wine and Wine-Drinking in Archaic Greece, Ancient Society, 42/1, 1-32.

195. **Partee M. H.**, 1972, Plato's Theory of Language, Foundations of Language, 8/1, 113-132.

196. **Piddington R.**, 1963, The Psychology of Laughter. A Study in Social Adaptation (New York, Gamut Press).

197. **Pounds N. J. G.**, 1969, The Urbanization of the Classical World, Annals of American Geographers, 59/1, 135-157.

198. **Prichard D.,** 2018, The Standing of Sailors in Democratic Athens, Dialogues d'histoire ancienne, 44/2, 231-253.

199. **Prichard D.,** 2019, The Physical Parameters of Athenian Democracy, Antichton, 53, 33-55.

200. **Pritchard D. M.**, 2019, Athenian Democracy at War (Cambridge, UP).

201. **Raaflaub K.**, 2007, The Breakthrough of Dēmokratia in Mid-Fifth-Century Athens, in ODAG, 105-154.

202. **Rabinowitz N. S.**, 2008, Greek Tragedy (Malden (Ma), Oxford, Blackwell Publ.).

203. **Rawson E.**, 1982, Crassorum Funera, Latomus, 41/3, 540-549.

204. **Rebenich S.**, 2001, Historical Prose, in HCRHP, 265-338.

205. **Rehm R.**, 1994, Greek Tragic Theatre (London, New York, Routledge).

206. **Roberts D. H.**, 2005, Beginnings and Endings, in CGT, 136-148.

207. **Roberts J.**, 1989, Political Animals in the "Nicomachean Ethics", Phronesis, 34/2, 185-204.

208. **Rosano N. J.**, 2000, Citizenship and Socrates in Plato's *Crito*, The Review of Politics, 62/3, 451-477.

209. **Russel J. W**., 1982, Zoroastrian Problems in Armenia, in Th. Samuelian (ed.), Classical Armenia Culture (Pennsylvania, UP), 1-7.

210. **Russell, J. W.**, 1987, Zoroastrianism in Armenia (Cambridge (Ma), Harvard UP).

211. **Saito K., Sidoli N.**, 2012, Drawing Diagrams and Making Arguments in Ancient Greek Mathematics: Lessons Drown from Comparisons of Manuscript Diagrams with Those in Modern Editions, in HMPAT, 135-162.

212. **Samons II L. J**., 2009, Introduction: Athenian History and Society in the Age of Pericles, in CCAP, 1-23.

213. **Sampson G. G.**, 2008, The Defeat of Rome: Crassus, Carrhae and Invasion of the East (New York, Casemate Press).

214. **Sandbach F. H.**, 1992, Menander, OCD, 669-670.

215. **Santangelo F.**, 2006, The Impact of Sulla on Italy and the Mediterranean, Ph.D. Thesis (Ann Arbor, MI, ProQuest LLC).

216. **Scharper E.**, 1968, Aristotle's Catharsis and Aesthetic Pleasure, The Philosophical Quarterly, 18/71, 131-143.

217. **Schlegel A. W.**, 1876, A Course of Lectures on Dramatic Art and Literary, translated by J. Black (London, George Bell & Sons).

218. **Schofield M**., 1999, Social and Political Thought, in CHHPh, 1999, 760-769.

219. **Seager R.**, 2002, Pompey the Great (Malden (Ma), Oxford, Blackwell).

220. **Self L. S.**, 1979, Rhetoric and Phronesis: The Aristotelian Ideal, Philosophy and Rhetoric, 12/2, 130-145.

221. **Shahbazi A. Sh.**, 1990, Carrhae, in E. Yarshater (ed.), Encyclopaedia Iranica (New York: Mazda Press), 5/1, 9-13.

222. **Sherwin-White A. N.**, 1984, Roman Foreign Policy in the East, 168 BC. to AD. 1 (London Duckworth).

223. **Shorey P.**, 1921, Τύχη in Polybius, Classical Philology, 16/3, 280-283.

224. **Sicking, C. M.**, 1995, The General Purport of Pericles' Oration and Last Speech, Hermes, 123/4, 404-425.

225. **Sinclair P. K.**, 1991, Democracy and Participation in Athens (Cambridge, UP).

226. **Smith B. H**., 1968, Poetic Closure: A Study of How Poems End (Chicago, UP), 10-14.

227. **Smith G**., 1927, The Jurisdiction of the Areopagus, Classical Philology, 22/1, 61-79.

228. **Smith R**., 1993, Kings and Philosophers, in II, 1993, 202-211.

229. **Stark F.**, 2012, Rome on the Euphrates: The Story of a Frontier (New York: Tauris Parke Paperbacks).

230. **Starr Ch. G**., 1978, The Ancient Greeks, 6th print (New York, Oxford UP).

231. **Starr Ch. G**., 1990, The Birth of Athenian Democracy. The Assembly in the Fifth Century BC. (New York, Oxford UP).

232. **Stepanyan A.**, 2015, Relations between Tragedy and Historical Experience in Plutarch (Crassus, 33), The Journal of the Society for Armenian Studies, 24, 112-123.

233. **Stepanyan A.**, 2018, Westernization in Hellenistic and Early Medieval Armenia. History and Historical Texts (Yerevan, Printinfo).

234. **Stepanyan A., Minasyan L.**, 2018, From War to Peace. Euphrates Frontier in 60-s AD., in M. A. Janković and V. D. Mihajlovič (eds.), Reflections on Roman Imperialism (Cambridge, Scholars Publ.,), 335-345.

235. **Stevens K.**, 2019, Between Greece and Babylonia: Hellenistic Intellectual History in Cross-Cultural Perspective (Cambridge UP), 1-32.

236. **Storey I. C., Allan A. A.**, 2005, A Guide to Ancient Greek Drama (Malden and Oxford, Blackwell).

237. **Strauss B. S.**, 1996, The Athenian Trireme, School of Democracy, in D, 313-326.

238. **Strootman R.**, 2007, The Hellenistic Court. Court Culture, Ceremonial, and Ideology in Greece, Egypt and the Near East, 336-30 BCE (Pproeftschrift ter verkrijging de grad von doctor) (Utrecht UP).

239. **Strootman R.**, 2011, Kings and Cities in the Hellenistic Age, in PCGC, 141-154.

240. **Taplin O.**, 2005, Greek Tragedy in Action (Oxford, UP).

241. **Tarn W. W.**, 1952, Hellenistic Civilization, 3d ed. (Cleveland, New York, Meridian Books).

242. **The History of Rome by Titus Livius**, 1893, with the epitomes and fragments of the lost books, literally translated, with notes and illustrations W. A. McDevitt (London, Macmillan Press).

243. **Thompson D. J.**, 2006, The Hellenistic Family, in CCHW, 93-112.

244. **Topper K.**, 2009, Primitive Life and the Construction of the Sympotic Past in the Athenian Vase Painting, American Journal of Archeology, 113/1, 3-26.

245. **Traina G.**, 2010, Teatro Greco nell' Armenia Antica, in E. Migliario et al. (eds), Societa indigene e cultura Grecoromana, ed., et al. (Rome, L'Erma di Bretschneider), 95-102.

246. **Tridimas G.**, 2015, War Disfranchisement and the Fall of the Ancient Democracy, European Journal of Political Economy, 31/1, 102-117.

247. **Ursic M.**, 1998, The Allegory of the Cave Transcendence in Platonism and Christianity, Hermathena, 165, 85-107.

248. **Vernant J.-P. Vidal-Naquet P.**, 1990, Myth and Tragedy in Ancient Greece (New York, Zone Books).

249. **Vernant J.-P.**, 1984, The Origins of Greek Thought (New York, Cornell UP).

250. **Vernant J.-P.**, 1990, The Masked Dionysus of Euripides' Bacchae, in MTAG, 381-415.

251. **Vernant J.-P.**, 1990, The Tragic Subject: Historicity and Transhistoricity, in MTAD, 237-247.

252. **Von Ungern-Sternberg J.**, 2004, The Crisis of the Republic, in CCRR, 78-100.

253. **Wade-Gery H. T., Denniston J. D.**, 1992, Thucydides, in OCD, 1068-1070.

254. **Walbank F. W.**, 1985, History and Tragedy, in F. W. Walbank, Selected Papers: Studies in Greek and Roman History and Historiography (Cambridge, UP).

255. **Wecowski M.**, 2014, The Rise of the Greek Aristocratic Banquet (Oxford, UP).

256. **Weiner A.**, 1980, The Function of the Tragic Chorus, Theatre Journal, 32/2, 205-212.

257. **Wiles D**., 1987, Tragedy in Action (Cambridge, UP).

258. **Wilson Jones M.**, 2006, Ancient Architecture and Mathematics: Methodology and the 'Doric Temple', Nexus. Architecture and Mathematics, 6, 149-170.

259. **Wohl V.**, 2009, Rhetoric and the Athenian Citizen, in CCAR, 162-177.

260. **Wolfson H. A.**, 1942, Philo on Free Will. And the historical Influence of His View, The Harvard Theological Review, 35/4, 240.

261. **Wolz H. G.**, 1970, Philosophy as Drama: An Approach to Plato's Symposium, Philosophy and Phenomenological Research, 30/3, 323-353.

262. **Zadorojniy A. V.**, 1997, Tragedy and Epic in Plutarch's 'Crassus', Hermes, 125/2, 169-182.

263. **Zatta C.**, 2010, Making History Mythical: The Golden Age of Peisistratus, Arethusa, 43/1, 21-62.

264. **Zeller Ed.**, 1931, Outlines of the History of Greek Philosophy, 13th ed. revised by W. Nestle, trans. by L. R. Palmer (London, Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd).

265. **Ziegler K.-H.**, 1964, Die Beziehungen zwischen Rom und dem Partherreich. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Völkerrechts (Wiesbaden, Vrlg. F. Steiner).

266. **Гоян Г.**, 1952, Тетр древней Армении (по памятникам материальной культуры и древним текстам) (Москва, Изд. «Искуство»).

267. **Доватур А. И.**, 1980, Рабство в Аттике VI-V века до н. э. (Ленинград, «Наука»).

268. **Саркисян Г. Х.**, 1955, Градостроительство в Армении при Тигране II и вопрос о переселении чужестранцев, «Известия АН Арм. ССР. Общественные науки», 2, 43-64.

269. **Степанян А. А.**, 1991, Развитие исторической мысли в древней Армении. Миф, Рационализм, историописание (Ереван, Изд. АН Арм. ССР).

270. **Фрейденберг О. М.**, 1997, Поэтика сюжета и жанра, подготовка текста и общая редакция Н. В. Брагинского (Москва, «Лабиринт»).

271. **Фрейденберг О. М.**, 1998, Миф и литература древности, 2-е исправленное и дополненное издание (Москва, Восточная литература РАН).

272. **Ստեփանյան Ա. Ա.**, 1984, Մ. թ. ա. VIII–VI դարերի Ատտիկան և Սոլոնի բարեփոխությունները (Երևան, ԲԿՄ հրատ.):

273. **Ստեփանյան Ա. Ա.**, 2014, Արխաիկ Հունաստան. կենսատարածքի տեխնոլոգիական կերպափոխումը, ՊՀ (Երևան, «Փրինթինֆո»), 280–241:

274. **Ստեփանյան Ա.**, 2012, Պատմության կերպափոխությունները Մեծ Հայքում. Արտաշիսյան դարաշրջան (Երևան, «Ս. Խաչենց–Փրինթինֆո»):

<div align="center">REFERENCES</div>

1. **Dovatur A. I.**, Rabstvo v Attike VI-V veka do n. e., L., "Nauka", 1980 **(In Russian)**.

2. **Frejdenberg O. M.**, Mif i literatura drevnosti, 2-je ispravlennoje i dopolnennoje izdanije, M., Vostochnaja literatura RAN, 1998 **(In Russian)**.

3. **Frejdenberg O. M.**, Poetika sjuzheta i zhanra, podgotovka teksta i obsh'aja redakcija N. V. Braginskogo, M., "Labirint", 1997 **(In Russian)**.

4. **Gojan G.**, Tetr drevnej Armenii (po pamjatnikam material'noj kul'tury i drevnim tekstam), M., Izd. "Iskustvo", 1952 **(In Russian)**.

5. **Sarkisjan G. Kh.**, Gradostroitel'stvo v Armenii pri Tigrane II i vopros o pereselenii chuzhestrancev, "Izvestija AN Arm. SSR. Obsh'estvennyje nauki", 1955, N 2, s. 43-64 **(In Russian)**.

6. **Stepanjan A. A.**, Razvitije istoricheskoj mysli v drevnej Armenii. Mif, Racionalizm, istoriopisanije, Jer., Izd. AN Arm. SSR, 1991 **(In Russian)**.

7. **Step'anyan A. A.**, Arkhaik Hunastan. kensataratsk'i tekhnologiakan kerpap'okhumě, PH, Yer., "P'rint'info", 2014 **(In Armenian)**.

8. **Step'anyan A. A.**, M. t'. a. VIII-VI dareri Attikan yev Soloni barep'okhut'yunnerě, Yer., BKM hrat., 1984 **(In Armenian)**.

9. **Step'anyan A. A.**, Patmut'yan kerpap'okhut'yunnerě Mets Hayk'um. Artashisyan darashrjan, Yer., "S. Khach'ents'-P'rint'info", 2012 **(In Armenian)**.