King's Research Portal

DOI:
10.1163/1568525X-12342558

Document Version
Peer reviewed version

Link to publication record in King's Research Portal

Citation for published version (APA):
Van Hove, R. (2018). A Dream on Trial: *The Contest of Oracular Interpretations and Authorities in Hyperides*' In Defence of Euxenippus. *Mnemosyne*, *72*(3). https://doi.org/10.1163/1568525X-12342558

Citing this paper
Please note that where the full-text provided on King's Research Portal is the Author Accepted Manuscript or Post-Print version this may differ from the final Published version. If citing, it is advised that you check and use the publisher's definitive version for pagination, volume/issue, and date of publication details. And where the final published version is provided on the Research Portal, if citing you are again advised to check the publisher's website for any subsequent corrections.

General rights
Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the Research Portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognize and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

•Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the Research Portal for the purpose of private study or research.
•You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
•You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the Research Portal

Take down policy
If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact librarypure@kcl.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Download date: 20. Oct. 2020

A Dream on Trial:

The Contest of Oracular Interpretations and Authorities in Hyperides' *In Defence of Euxenippus*

Rebecca Van Hove
King's College London, Dept. of Classics
Max Weber Centre for Advanced Cultural and Social Studies, Erfurt
rebecca.van_hove@kcl.ac.uk

Abstract
This paper re-examines Hyperides' speech *In Defence of Euxenippus* as evidence for the role of divination in fourth-century BCE Athens. The oration recounts an occasion of oracular divination through incubation at Amphiaraos' sanctuary in Oropos, whereby the Athenian Assembly ordered individuals to undergo incubation to resolve an issue concerning land ownership. This paper argues that Hyperides' speech not only furnishes crucial evidence which broadens our understanding of divination beyond the famous oracle at Delphi, it also provides us with a valuable case study for the *process* of oracular consultation. The paper analyses the different stages of this process, including the selection of incubants, the nature of the dream received and the aftermath of incubation, demonstrating how the dream could be contested. It thereby sheds new light on the complexities of oracular transmission and interpretation, both of which are open to contestation as a result of the multiplicity of religious authority.

Keywords
Oracles - Incubation - Athens - Oratory - Greek religion – Hyperides

Some time in the late 330s or early 320s BCE, a dispute arose over ownership of a hill near Oropos, a territory near the border of Boeotia and Attica.[1] Oropos had recently been restored to Athenian control, most likely by Alexander in 335, and the Athenian Assembly had subsequently divided the five hills surrounding Oropos into lots and allocated them to the ten Athenian tribes in groups of two, as a speech by the orator Hyperides recounts (Hyp.

[1] Control of Oropos was repeatedly disputed in the fifth and fourth centuries: it is thought to have first been settled by Eretria in Euboea, before swinging between Theban and Athenian control. Oropos was used by the Athenians as a naval base during the Persian Wars (Hdt. 6.100-101) and remained in Athenian hands until 411 BCE (Thuc. 2.23.3). Thebes then regained control but by 371 Athens had recovered it, before losing the territory again in 366: see Cosmopoulos (2001), 14-16 for a brief overview of the territory's history.

4.16).[2] A dispute arose, however, about one particular hill, appointed to the tribes Hippothoönthis and Acamantis: it was claimed this land actually belonged to the god Amphiaraos, whose sanctuary stood in Oropos, and that the hill was thus unlawfully allocated to the two tribes. In order to resolve this conflict the Assembly of Athens decided to send a group of men to Amphiaraos' sanctuary to undergo incubation and ask the god himself for his opinion on the matter. A question of land ownership therefore became, as this article will show, one of competing oracular interpretations.

The orator Hyperides recounts these events in his speech *In Defence of Euxenippus* (Hyp. 4) written for Euxenippus Ethelokratous of Lamptrai, who was one of the incubants in the affair. The speech is unusual and exceptional: it is the only oration preserved from classical Athens which discusses an instance of oracular divination by way of a dream. Moreover, this oracular enquiry does not present the god with a therapeutic request, as is customary at Amphiaraos' Oropian sanctuary in the fourth century, but rather submits to the god a question of public decision-making.[3] Divination in the ancient Greek world constituted an assemblage of techniques and methods used to seek the counsel of the gods. The most prestigious form of divination in the classical period was oracular, which itself existed in various forms, whether functioning through dreams - as in the case of Oropos - or prophets.[4] The affair of Euxenippus itself raises a number of intriguing questions regarding the role of oracles in public decision-making, which forces us to rethink the usual picture of oracular divination, built up as it is largely from sources concerning the more famous oracle of Apollo at Delphi. Why did the Athenians decide to consult the oracle here with a question of land allocation? How did oracular consultation through incubation, usually employed for individual, therapeutic consultations, work with regards to a collective, public issue which involved two of the city's tribes? And, most significantly, what does this rare source for the *process* of oracular consultation tell us about how authority was negotiated in this public decision-making process, in which a divine dream undergoes human transmission and multiple interpretations, in order to become a decision-making tool in a matter of land allocation?

This paper offers a re-examination of Hyperides' speech *In Defence of Euxenippus*, which intends to both deconstruct the oracular case at its heart and contextualise the speech as a source for the role of divination in the public life of classical Athens. Of course, the exceptionality of the case means we cannot automatically or unquestioningly regard it as

---

[2] Traditionally the restoration of Oropos had been attributed to Philip II in 338 (on basis of Paus. 1.34.1 and [Dem.] 9). Recently however Knoepfler's assignment of this restoration to Alexander in 335 has become accepted: see Knoepfler (2001), 367-389.

[3] The only other references to dreams of any kind in Attic oratory are a tale of Helen visiting Homer in a dream in Isocrates' *Helen* (Isoc. 10.65) and two accusations against Demosthenes by Aeschines: Aeschin. 2.10 alleges that Demosthenes in his prosecution speech told a story about a dream of a priestess in Sicily – this is not preserved in Demosthenes' *On the False Embassy* though. In the second accusation Aeschines accuses Demosthenes of, upon hearing the news of Philip's death, pretending he had received this news directly from Athena and Zeus in a dream (Aeschin. 3.77, 219).

[4] On Greek divination in general, see Johnston (2008); Beerden (2003); Johnston and Struck (2005).

representative of general oracular practice. Furthermore, the use of the speech as a source is made complex by the rhetorical nature of Hyperides' oration: his narrative evidently shapes and constructs events in such a way as to best substantiate his argument of defence in Euxenippus' impeachment trial. Nonetheless, if we proceed with caution and awareness of both the case's singularity and of the rhetorical nature of the depiction found in Hyperides' speech, the affair of Euxenippus can illuminate certain aspects of the divinatory process which remain largely hidden in other sources. Hyperides' speech affords us a valuable rare glimpse into the process of how divine signs were employed by presenting the different stages involved: from the type of issue which requires oracular advice to the decision to consult the oracle, from the functioning of the divinatory consultation itself to the subsequent interpretation of the sign and the final resolution of the problem. Yet this process and its results have not received the attention they deserve: general studies of divination largely ignore Euxenippus' case.[5] The few scholars who have examined it, meanwhile, limit themselves primarily to the question of purpose: they merely weigh up the political, economic or religious considerations which affected why the Athenians here decided to consult the oracle, but they do not go far beyond this *reason* for the consultation.[6] In contrast, this paper sets out to explore the important ignored issues of the functioning of the oracle and its consequences, investigating how divination is here actually used for conflict resolution.

As divination provided the ancient Greeks with the most direct means of accessing indications of the will of their gods, the role of oracles in Athenian life has long been an object of study and has functioned as a cornerstone of the wider debate on the role of religion in Athenian democracy. Scholarship on 'official' oracular divination, the consultation of oracles by officials or city states, in matters concerning public, political or military affairs, has focused largely on Apollo's oracle at Delphi, for which we have the most evidence, both literary and epigraphic.[7] Recently, the publication of the lead inscriptions from the oracle at Dodona has opened up the debate somewhat beyond Delphi.[8] Yet the nature of the Dodonian oracular questions, sustaining and sustained by a growing scholarly interest in the role of the individual in religion, has been very much geared towards recognising the importance

[5] Martin (2009) does not discuss the speech or its dream, nor do the general studies of divination of Beerden (2013) and Trampedach (2015), who furthermore make no mention of the oracular cult of Amphiaraos at all. Flower (2008), which focuses on seers, discusses Amphiaraos in his role as *mantis* in Aeschylean tragedy but does not refer to his oracular cult. Johnston (2008), 90-95 discusses Amphiaraos' cult but presents it as a healing cult and does not mention the evidence, such as Hyperides' speech, which describes the cult's oracular function too. Remarkably, the case is only referenced in a short footnote in Näf (2004), 53, a monograph dealing with dreams and their meaning in the ancient world and which dedicates two chapters to dreams in classical Greece.

[6] Harris (2009), 157; Engels (1989), 222-238; Papazarkadas (2011), 44-45, 102-106; Renberg (2017), 311.

[7] See e.g. Bowden (2005); Parker (2005), 89-115.

[8] Rosenberger (2013); Eidinow (2007); Lhôte (2007).

of divination in private everyday life.[9] With regards to divination in public discourse, in the political and legal decision-making of Athens, Delphi still rules the roost. Scholars have concentrated on the question of the function of official consultations: from early-twentieth-century attitudes which derided oracular divination as charlatanism or mere formalities, theories have evidently moved on to focus on the role of divination in its social setting, or as a lens through which to view the mentalities of cultures which make use of such practices.[10] Public divination has come to be seen as a regulatory device, used to gain consensus in situations where this is lacking, or – taking it more seriously – as a way of dealing with contingency and risk.[11] This paper aims to throw new light on the subject of Greek public divination by examining a source – and oracle – neglected in this regard, proposing an alternative way of interpreting the function of oracular consultations.

Who eventually makes the decision regarding the disputed land in Oropos, and how do they do so? This study sets out to answer this question by paying attention to the different actors involved in the decision-making process, their assigned roles, and their authority. After a short introduction to the speech itself, the analysis will deconstruct the different stages of the oracular consultation. It will commence, first, with the Assembly's decision to consult the oracle, paying particular attention to the selection and identity of the incubants. Second, it will move on to Oropos and the incubation rite itself, scrutinising the way in which the nature of the dream is experienced and articulated by the dreamer. As Hyperides' account of the events leading up to the court case are rather confused, it will be necessary here to attempt to reconstruct the details of the speech's narrative, in particular to clarify the content of the dream and its relationship to the subsequent trial. The third section of this paper will put Euxenippus' dream in a wider context by surveying comparable evidence for oneiromancy in the Greek world. The final section will examine the aftermath of the consultation, which constitutes the stage of the oracle's interpretation. It will demonstrate how contested this interpretation of the dream was, as expressed through the discussion of the Assembly upon Euxenippus' return, the decree proposal which a man called Polyeuctus made regarding the dream, and Polyeuctus' subsequent prosecution of the dreamer Euxenippus. This analysis will therefore provide an investigation into the different agents

---

[9] Mikalson (1983), 48; Harris (2009), 155-156. But contra Bonnechère (2010), 156-158 who recognises this distinction can be moderated.

[10] For an overview of early twentieth-century scholarship see Johnston (2005), 1-10; Beerden (2013), 9-18.

[11] The first approach: Morgan (1989) sees it as a tool for promoting political and social stability, as a way of dealing with difference and disagreement. Arnush (2005) subscribes to this too. He makes the separation between religious and 'political' consultations too strong: see especially 101. Bonnechère (2010) challenges the political reading such an approach can lead to, in which oracles are considered simply tools for the Greek states or its leaders which give the appearance of external authority. Nonetheless Bonnechère similarly characterises the function of oracles – in this article specifically double oracular consultations – as a way for consultants to guarantee their course of action is seen as respectable and enlightened. On the second approach see Bowden (2005); Eidinow (2007). Also Rüpke (2013) who sees divination as a way of dealing with uncertainty "which identifies and articulates consent and dissent by using certain social roles to interpret standardised signs and to ritually deal with them. In such a performance a specific appropriation of social roles and religious traditions is indicated." (9).

invested with authority in this decision-making process - the god, the demos, and various individuals - as well as the challenges made to different holders of authority throughout the whole process.

1. *Hyperides' oration*

The story of disputed Oropian land and of the ensuing dream which Hyperides recounts in his speech *In Defence of Euxenippus* is an incomplete one, the narrative riddled by significant uncertainties. What exactly happened at the sanctuary at Oropos and, more significantly perhaps, what exactly happened upon the incubants' return to Athens is not straightforward to ascertain, as Hyperides does not give a full narrative of the events. It will be useful to introduce here first the facts which the speech does report, before examining briefly how the holes in the narrative may be explained by looking at the place of this oration within the trial it forms part of.

After the land dispute arose and the Assembly sent three men to incubate in Oropos, Euxenippus reported to the Assembly the dream he had experienced there (Hyp. 4.14). The content of the dream is unclear, yet what we know is that a man called Polyeuctus subsequently proposed a decree requiring the two tribes to return the land to the god Amphiaraos and the remaining eight tribes to provide compensation to Hippothoönthis and Acamantis for their loss of land and revenue (Hyp. 4.15). This proposal, however, was considered to contravene existing laws, as Polyeuctus was convicted for proposing an illegal decree after a successful γραφή παρανόμων ('prosecution for illegalities') was brought against him (Hyp. 4.16). He did not give up on the issue and subsequently brought a charge of bribery by εἰσαγγελία (impeachment) against Euxenippus, alleging that the latter had accepted bribes for his report of the dream.[12] The trial came to court between 330 and 324 BCE, and Hyperides' oration, delivered by the orator himself, defends Euxenippus from this charge.[13] The outcome of the trial is unknown.

That Hyperides' narration of the actual events preceding the trial is limited could be explained by the fact that the oration is a συνηγορία, a speech delivered by a supporting speaker after the main litigant had already presented his case.[14] The majority of Hyperides' speech is consequently taken up by two lines of argument not directly related to the central narrative. The first is a procedural one, as Hyperides starts his defence by arguing that the prosecutor Polyeuctus is abusing the procedure of εἰσαγγελία and that it is inappropriate for

[12] The εἰσαγγελία is n. 124 in Hansen (1975). For the working of the procedure see Hansen (1975), esp. 21-28.

[13] Whitehead (2000), 157 and Cooper (2001), 103 think an early date within this period is most likely.

[14] This is established by a reference Hyperides makes in the oration itself to a previous speaker: ὅπερ ὁ πρότερος ἐμοῦ λέγων εἶπεν (...) (Hyp. 4.15). Babington (1853), xv, who first identified the speech as Hyperides' in 1853, already argued for its identity as '*logos sunegoros*'. For a detailed study of συνήγοροι see Rubinstein (2000), 17 who suggests there may have been multiple συνήγοροι in this case.

a charge of this type (Hyp. 4.1-9, 27-30).[15] He contends that the section of the impeachment law which covers bribes applies not to all Athenians, but only to ῥήτορες, and that it is thus not applicable to Euxenippus, whom he portrays as an ἰδιώτης, a private citizen, in no way a public political figure (7-9, 27-30). We will return to the question of how accurate this representation of Euxenippus as ἰδιώτης really is. The second key line of argument the speech presents is an argument of relevance, as Hyperides refutes the relevance of additional charges made by the prosecution against his defendant (19-26: charge of pro-Macedonian sympathies, 31-37: implicit accusation of having amassed great wealth dishonestly). Only in paragraphs 14-18 does Hyperides discuss the actual indictment for bribery brought against Euxenippus. His narrative does not recount the content of the dream, nor do we find out what report Euxenippus then made to the Assembly, or what debate this generated. Presumably these details would have already been discussed both by the prosecution and by the first speaker for the defence.[16] However, these missing elements, central as they are to the whole case, make it very difficult to build up a coherent and complete picture of the case: as it is, scholars disagree on its basic details.[17] We are not even sure, for example, whether Euxenippus' dream was understood as supporting the claim of the god, or that of the two tribes. In this article's analysis of the use of the oracle as a source of authority and its role in this legal decision-making process, it will thus also be necessary to attempt to reconstruct an outline of the basic details of the case from this narrative section of the speech.

2. *Who dreams for the demos?*

To commence the analysis of the oracular consultation the first point to consider is the decision to consult the oracle. Hyperides starts his narrative of events by stating that:

> the people ordered (ὁ δῆμος προσέταξεν) Euxenippus, as one of three (τρίτῳ αὐτῷ), to lie down in the temple; and he tells us that he fell asleep and saw (ἰδεῖν) a dream (ἐνύπνιόν) which he reported to them. (Hyp. 4.14)[18]

---

[15] On the reconstruction of the εἰσαγγελία law based largely on this passage, see MacDowell (1978), 184-186; Hansen (1975), 12-20. Hyperides makes a very similar argument in his speech *In Defence of Lykophron*: Hyp. 1.8-12. Cf. Whitehead (2000), 158, who analyses the similarity in strategies and notes that in both cases the orator attempts to create a "conceptual gulf" between procedures designed to hold public figures to account, and the character of the defendant as a private individual.

[16] As Whitehead (2000), 201 points out.

[17] For example, the basic chronology of events as presented here (oracle consultation is followed by Polyeuctus' decree proposal, which in turn is followed by the εἰσαγγελία trial) is not even wholly accepted: Van Lieshout (1980), 176 and Horster (2004), 72 both construct a completely different narrative of these events, alleging that first Polyeuctus proposed his decree, then Euxenippus was ordered to consult the god, and Polyeuctus then disputed the dream by lodging the εἰσαγγελία charge. However, this chronology is illogical and does not accord at all with the narrative as Hyperides describes it. At paragraph 15, for example, he makes it explicit that the element which is "based on the dream" is the ψήφισμα, the decree, making it clear that the decree is posterior to the dream.

[18] The same verb προστάσσω is used here of the Athenians tasking Euxenippus with consulting the god, as well as of the god tasking Euxenippus with his message: ἃ ὁ θεὸς αὐτῷ προσέταττε ταῦτ' ἐξαγγείλας πρὸς Ἀθηναίους (Hyp.4.14). See Whitehead (2000), 200.

According to the orator it is the Athenian people who made the decision to send incubants to Amphiaraos: Hyperides does not specify how exactly, but most probably this was accomplished through a decree of the Assembly, similar to how embassies or messengers were assigned their tasks to visit other states.[19] The demos makes the choice of which resolution strategy to employ, and they elect to consult the oracle. The god, Amphiaraos, is seen as the ultimate authority; the oracle consultation, a technique to ascertain knowledge of the god's will. Explaining the Assembly's reasoning here has preoccupied most of the recent scholarship on the speech. William Harris, for example, in his study on dreams emphasises the personal involvement of the god as an explanation for the decision by the Athenian demos to consult the oracle.[20] As the conflict concerns land potentially belonging to the god (or to his sanctuary), it would have made sense to attempt to obtain the god's judgement in the matter. Nikolaos Papazarkadas, on the other hand, examines the case in economic terms, focusing on the financial exploitation of the land's forest wealth, and thereby awards little attention to the religious dimension.[21] Johannes Engels instead provides a political reading of the speech, seeing it primarily as a battle between two major Athenian politicians, with Hyperides on the defence opposite the politician Lykourgos on the side of the prosecution.[22] While Engels may very well be overstating the role of the two politicians within the trial itself, the significance of the political climate is demonstrated by epigraphic evidence, which points to considerable attention awarded by Athens to Oropos in the 330s and 320s BCE.[23] This case probably formed part of a protracted debate on the allotment and exploitation of land following Athens' reacquisition of the territory of Oropos, as the evidence for another similar dispute surrounding land distribution in Oropos in the 330s (*Agora* 16.84) indicates too.[24]

---

[19] See for example IG II^2 31, an Athenian decree from 386/5 concerning Hebryzelmis, king of Odryssa, which denotes that three men shall be elected to take news to Hebryzelmis concerning the request of the envoys he himself sent. See also, for example, IG II^2 43; IG I^2 57; and for descriptions by the orators of the selection of embassies in the Assembly, see also for example Aeschin. 2.15; 2.17; Andoc. 2.35; Dem. 18.178.

[20] Harris (2009), 157; see also Renberg (2017), 311.

[21] Papazarkadas (2011), 44-45, 102-106.

[22] Engels (1989), 222-238. He goes so far as to suggest that Lykourgos encouraged Polyeuctus to bring the impeachment charge, though there is no evidence for this (228).

[23] A decree (I. *Orop*. 297 = *IG* II^3 1 348) passed in 332/1 BCE proposing honours for Phanodemos of Thymaitadai tells us that he was involved with the recent reorganisation of a festival in honour of Amphiaraos, the Great Amphiareia – these were first held in 329/8 BCE, and modelled by the Athenians on the Great Panathenaea; Lykourgos was also involved: *I. Orop.* 298. Around this time a new fountain and drainage system were also installed at the Amphiareion: *I Orop.* 292, 295 concerns the fountain; *I Orop.* 347-60 are the dedications. See Papazarkadas (2011), 44 for discussion of these. At the same time as Phanodemos received honours, a decree was also passed – proposed by the same Phanodemos – proposing honours for the god Amphiaraos himself (I. *Orop*. 296 = *IG* II^3 1 349). This decree is unique, as it is the only occasion we have of the Athenian assembly honouring and crowning a god (rather than a mortal): see Scafuro (2009), 59-86, who points out the similarities of this crowning to the honours Athens awarded to foreigners, and argues the crowning is both symbolic and political (77). This is a completely unparalleled practice, and can been taken as an indication of the importance awarded by Athens in the 330s to its recently re-acquired territory at Oropos. On the relationship between Athens and Oropos in the early Hellenistic period see also Wilding (2015).

[24] See Papazarkadas (2009) on this inscription.

Political, economic and religious considerations therefore all had a role to play in the Athenians' choice of strategy for this decision-making process. However, in focusing solely on explaining the *reason for* the consultation, these more recent readings overlook the intricacies of the decision-making process itself, and the mechanisms and strategies involved in trying to resolve this dispute of land allocation. They thereby ignore the remarkable value of the speech for our understanding of incubation and divination more generally. In order to contribute to this broader picture, this article will examine the steps which took place after the initial decision to enquire of the god.

The next such step is the choice of envoys sent to Oropos to undergo incubation on the city's behalf. As the goal was to ask the god about the ownership of a particular hill, this is a case of what we may call divinatory incubation. In his recent study of incubation in the ancient world, Gil Renberg advocates for the importance of recognising a distinction between two types of incubation, which he calls 'therapeutic' and 'divinatory' respectively.[25] The first describes the practice of the sick and injured seeking medical attention at incubation sanctuaries, whereby the god would be expected to heal the incubants in their sleep or provide medical advice to them in their dreams. Divinatory incubation, on the other hand, concerns the practice of "seeking dreams about matters other than health concerns, either public or private".[26] In other words, it is an oracular consultation as found at Delphi or Dodona, but differs in terms of the mechanism through which the divine message is transmitted. Renberg's terminology is helpful to distinguish between two practices which, while sharing many of the same logistics and characteristics, remain distinct in certain important respects.

In addition, therapeutic incubation appears to develop later than the divinatory kind – only from the fourth century onwards – and appears to have had a larger and more popular base of consulters.[27] Amphiaraos' sanctuary at Oropos seems to have fulfilled both functions at various times. Amphiaraos, although of Argive origin, was a hero, at times a seer, connected to Thebes, as one of the mythical Seven Against Thebes (Aesch. *Septem* 569-619).[28] He is said to have been swallowed up by the earth during his escape from this battle before subsequently re-emerging as a god (Pindar, *Olympian* 6. 13-14; see also Pindar *Nemean* 9, *Pythian* 8). Early references to the hero indicate his cult and sanctuary was situated in Thebes: incubation took place here and, more specifically, of the divinatory kind (Hdt. 1.46-52; 8.133-134). Amphiaraos' cult, when situated at Thebes, appears to have provided divinatory

---

[25] Renberg (2017), 21-30.

[26] Renberg (2017), 21.

[27] Divinatory incubation is less well-attested than the therapeutic variety: see Renberg (2017), 310-328. How far the sparser evidence and precedential timeframe of divinatory incubation is a reflection of reality, or rather the consequence of what sources have survived, cannot be determined with certainty.

[28] He is presented as a μάντις in Aeschylus' play, as also in Eur. *Phoenissae* 173; 1111. On Amphiaraos and his portrayal in myth see Sineux (2007).

incubation.[29] However, the cult somehow changed location or was transferred in the late fifth century, when sources start referring to the Amphiareion in Oropos, the site which Euxenippus consults a century later.[30] Only once it is based in Oropos is therapeutic incubation attested for Amphiaraos' cult and this became the principal type of incubation practiced at Oropos, though as Euxenippus' consultation on behalf of the Athenian demos shows, the divinatory type did endure too.

The vast majority of evidence for incubation concerns the therapeutic kind. There the incubant is mostly necessarily the person with the complaint or health issue him- or herself.[31] Consequently, incubation is generally portrayed as a very personal experience, in which the incubant hopes to achieve direct contact with the deity. In this case from fourth-century Athens, however, the incubant is a delegate enquiring about a collective matter and the selection of envoys to incubate on the city's behalf is therefore an exceptional step in the incubation process. One might expect the identity of the incubant to be an issue of importance: would this position require a particular status or religious authority of some sort, or could anyone be sent? Furthermore, the issue is made even more noteworthy by the fact that not just one, but three individuals are sent to undergo divinatory incubation for the same purpose. This is, as Renberg points out, completely unparalleled in the ancient world.[32] It is therefore worth examining this selection of incubants more closely, which may illustrate what exactly the role of dreamer was understood to involve.

As quoted above, Hyperides states that Euxenippus was sent "as one of three" (Εὐξενίππῳ τρίτῳ αὐτῷ) (Hyp. 4.14). Euxenippus' two companions are not named, nor mentioned again in the rest of the speech. Could this differentiation between the named Euxenippus and his anonymous companions reflect a differentiation in their status or the manner in which they were chosen as members of the incubation party? Or is it simply a consequence of the fact that the two unidentified men are irrelevant to the impeachment case? In his commentary on the speech, David Whitehead builds upon Kenneth Dover's study of the usage and meaning of the idiom 'αὐτός + ordinal numeral' to argue that this construction does not imply a hierarchy: "rather than implying that the other two members of the trio were formally subordinate to Euxenippus, it indicates that he is the only one whom the user of the phrase wished or needed to mention by name."[33] From Hyperides'

[29] Hdt 1.46-52: Croesus consulted Amphiaraos' oracular shrine as part of his test of the oracles. Herodotus also tells of a consultation in 479 BC by Mys, Mardonius' agent (8.133-34). According to Hdt (8.134) Thebans themselves were not allowed to consult the oracle, after Amphiaraos told them to elect him as either their ally or their prophet – they chose the former.

[30] How or why the oracle came to move to Oropos is unclear: according to Strabo (9.2.10) it was moved on advice of the oracle, though it is also possible it was introduced at Oropos while still existing in Thebes: see Parker (1996), 146-149 and now Renberg (2017), 660-676. For the dating of the sanctuary's foundation in Oropos to the late fifth century see Cosmopoulos (2001), 14.

[31] For a handful of exceptions to this, recorded on the Epidaurian inscriptions, see the references in n. 59 and 60.

[32] Renberg (2017), 311. He does suggest one possible parallel from Late Antique Egypt, though this is uncertain.

[33] Whitehead (2000), 200, who lists Dem. 18.16; Aeschin. 2.178; Isai. 7.38 and Din. 8 frg.2 as comparable passages in Attic oratory. For a list of the use of the idiom in other sources see Dover (1960), 70-71.

language itself it is thus not possible to make assumptions about the way in which the selection of incubants was made, nor does it suggest Euxenippus stood out from his two companions, other than in his relevance to Hyperides' specific argument.

However, this supposed parity and equality between the three incubants may be questioned, by re-examining, first, Hyperides' portrayal of his defendant, and, secondly, by comparing this case with epigraphic evidence for how Athenians selected delegates in other cases. Not much is known about Euxenippus, save that he was a wealthy Athenian citizen who had acted as trierarch before 334/3 BC (IG II^2 1623), and was elderly (Hyp. 4.13) by the time of his impeachment by Polyeuctus. Hyperides presents his defendant as much as possible as an ordinary citizen, an ἰδιώτης (13, 30). But this depiction is possibly misleading. As discussed above, it forms part of Hyperides' discussion of the ἰδιώτης /ῥήτωρ distinction made in the εἰσαγγελία law and, in addition, his objection to the prosecution's use of the impeachment procedure. It has long been recognised that ῥήτωρ is an imprecise term: while legally it referred to anyone who had ever addressed the Assembly – as Euxenippus had done at least once, in reporting his dream to the people – it is often used in a more precise sense to denote someone who played an active role in politics. It is in this latter sense that Hyperides talks about ῥήτορες (8, 9, 27).[34] Considering its rhetorical value in the speech's argumentation, one should evidently therefore not take Hyperides' portrayal of Euxenippus as ἰδιώτης at face value.

Moreover, another story mentioned in the defence speech actively challenges this portrait. Hyperides tells us that "Euxenippus allowed Olympias (ἐάσας Ὀλυμπιάδα) to dedicate a cup to the statue of Health (Ὑγιεία)" (Hyp. 4.19), as part of the refutation of accusations of pro-Macedonian sentiments with which the prosecution accuses Euxenippus.[35] A statue to Hygieia is known to have been set up on the Acropolis in the late fifth century (IG I^3 506) and by Pausanias' time there are two: "Health, whom legend calls daughter of Asclepius, and (...) Athena, also surnamed Health" (Paus. 1.23.4).[36] The cult of Hygieia in Athens was connected primarily to Athena Hygieia before the introduction to the city of Asclepius in 420 BCE, after which Hygieia became more commonly presented in association with this new healer god, as his companion.[37] Hygieia is in addition also connected to Amphiaraos and according to Pausanias (1.34.3) was represented alongside the male healer god on the altar at Oropos.[38] What matters here is that Euxenippus, through

[34] As Hansen (1989), 17 points out, "the two different uses of *rhetor* in Athens illustrate (...) a gap between the constitution and how it works".

[35] Some have argued that the statue of Health to which Olympias dedicated a cup was not the one on the Acropolis, but one which stood in the Amphiareion in Oropos (Paus. 1.34.3 records that Hygieia had a place on the sanctuary's altar): Stafford (2000), 132; Mitchel (1970), 24. Yet this is in contradiction to Hyperides' explicit placement of the shrine which Olympias honoured, as in Athens (Hyp. 4.26).

[36] According to Plutarch this was dedicated by Pericles (Plut. *Life of Pericles* 13 7.8).

[37] On the history of the cult see Levente (2003), 39-46; Stafford (2005).

[38] See Sineux (2007), 142-147 for discussion of the altar and other evidence for the relationship between Amphiaraos and Hygieia.

Olympias' dedication, is connected by this story to the cult of Health. This has led some scholars to suggest that Euxenippus either held a priesthood at Athens, or that he was a priest of Hygieia at the sanctuary of Oropos itself.[39] This latter suggestion is speculative though, based only on a dedication found at the Oropian Amphiareion inscribed to Hygieia by Euxenippus (SEG 15.291).[40] The dating of this dedication to between 338 and 322 BCE makes its relative chronology with regards to the incubation case unknown: it is therefore possible the dedication is a consequence or result of Euxenippus' incubation assignment, and the inscription therefore cannot be used as evidence for a *prior* connection to the Amphiareion. The story regarding Olympias nevertheless tells us something. As Whitehead states, "his 'allowing' (of Olympias to dedicate) makes it necessary to suppose that Euxenippus was acting in some sort of official capacity".[41] Whitehead does not follow through with what this means for our understanding of the oracular consultation process, yet this is highly suggestive. If Euxenippus held some kind of connection to the cult of Hygieia, might this have influenced the Assembly's selection of him as incubant on behalf of the city at the sanctuary at Oropos, where Amphiaraos was closely connected to the cult of Hygieia? Was the role of incubant here awarded on the basis of some form of experience, knowledge or expertise with regards to a relevant cult?

This possibility may be further explored by an examination of comparable epigraphic evidence. Inscriptions from classical Athens show that on occasion delegates for a religious task were chosen for their expertise in such matters, alongside delegates elected by lot. The decree concerning Chalkis (IG I^3 40) of 446/5 BCE can be taken as a potentially useful parallel to our case. This inscription discusses the terms of Athens' settlement with Chalkis after its revolt, and states as one of its demands that "the sacrifices required by the oracles (τὰ δὲ ἱερὰ τὰ ἐκ τôν χρεσμôν) concerning Euboea are to be carried out as soon as possible by Hierokles and three members to be elected from the Council (μετὰ ἱεροκλέος τρε̂ς ἄνδρας, *h*ὸς ἂν ἕλεται *ḥ*ε βολὲ σφôν αὐτôν)" (64-9).[42] This Hierokles is considered the same man who as χρησμολόγος ('expounder of oracles') makes an appearance in Aristophanes' *Peace* (*Pax* 1047).[43] The Chalkis decree thus appears to appoint a named religious expert, along with three others who are unnamed and elected (presumably by lot), to carry out the sacrifices required by an oracle.

In a similar vein, Hyperides' naming of only Euxenippus could potentially be a reflection of the way in which the decree of the Assembly, which would have ordered the consultation of Amphiaraos, had appointed members for the incubation party, suggesting

---

[39] Priesthood in Athens: Petrakos (1997), 265; Engels (1993), 229. In Oropos: Mitchel (1970), 24.

[40] The inscription reads "Good health. Euxenippus Ethelokratous dedicated (this)": see Petrakos (1997), 265-267.

[41] Whitehead (2000), 215. Contra Babington (1853), xv. Papazarkadas (2011), 103 calls Euxenippus a "politician", but does not examine the question of his identity or the requirements of fulfilment for the role of incubant. Renberg (2017), similarly ignores the issue of the incubants' identity.

[42] See Meiggs and Lewis (1988), 138-144 for discussion.

[43] Bowden (2003), 266.

Euxenippus would have been chosen by name, with the other two elected by lot. This then might suggest that Euxenippus was considered an 'expert', in a comparable vein to the χρησμολόγος in the Chalkis decree.[44] Of course, we also know of instances where it is clearly stated that all the envoys sent to an oracle were chosen by lot in the same way, without anyone singled out as expert. The decree concerning the Sacred Orgas is such an example, where the people chosen to deliver the question to the oracle are "three men, one from the council and two from all Athenians" (IG II^3 1 292, l. 43-44). There is no suggestion of either differentiation or expertise here. However, the process used for the oracle consultation in this case of the Sacred Orgas is sufficiently different from Euxenippus' case and plainly does not even provide any opportunities at all for a potential need of expert knowledge to manifest itself.[45]

The paucity of sources recording formal consultations of oracles by Athens means it is hard to draw certainties from comparisons, but nonetheless the Chalkis decree raises the possibility that Euxenippus could have been chosen specifically for this assignment because he was somehow considered authoritative in religious or, more specifically, incubatory matters. This hypothesis may be further strengthened by Hyperides letting slip Euxenippus was by some means connected to the cult of Hygieia. Either through an official position linked to a related cult, or through some form of 'expertise', Euxenippus might have been consciously selected to incubate in Amphiaraos' temple. Of course, this hypothesis cannot be proven. Furthermore, what exactly such 'expertise' might have constituted would be just as difficult to determine: even with regard to known roles of 'religious experts' who deal with divination, such as μάντεις (seers/diviners) and χρησμολόγοι, or religious office holders, such as ἐξηγείται ('expounders'), very little is known of what their actions actually involved and thus what form their authority or expertise took.[46] Nonetheless, it is important to keep this possibility of Euxenippus being a consciously-chosen incubant in mind, as it allows us to consider the role of the individual within this collective decision-making process. We will come back to this in the analysis of the negotiation of authority which takes place in Athens upon the return of the incubation party. Furthermore, who the demos sends to dream on its behalf also tells us something about what the demos expects the dream to look like, and what the exact role of the dreamer subsequently is, which this next section shall address.

3. The nature of Euxenippus' dream

[44] It is of course not possible to extrapolate any certainties regarding the relation between Hyperides' wording here and the exact wording of the decree which would have ratified the oracle consultation.

[45] See Bowden (2005), 88-95 for discussion of the procedure using two sealed vases, which resulted in any interpretation of and reaction to the oracular answer taking place in front of the *ekklesia* in Athens, rather than on the envoys' expedition; see also Rhodes and Osborne (2003), 272-281.

[46] See in particular Dillery (2005).

After appointment to their mission, Euxenippus and his two companions travelled to Oropos to obtain their divine message. A law code discovered at the Oropian Amphiareion, dating to 387-377 BCE, delineates part of how the process of incubation functioned (I. *Oropos* 277 = LSCG 69).[47] It regulates the rights and duties of the priest and the warden of the temple (the νεωκόρος) as well as the behaviour of worshippers undergoing the process of incubation. After paying a fee and offering sacrifice to the god, the incubant's name and city were recorded, and he or she then went to sleep overnight in the temple, hopefully waking up with a dream message from the god.[48] The rite of incubation was considered a way of facilitating a prophetic dream: by sleeping in the god's temple, and importantly after having offered sacrifices to him or her, an individual increased the chances of a god appearing in their dream or somehow bestowing on them a divine message.

What form Euxenippus' dream might have taken in the case of the disputed Oropian hill is unclear. As we have seen, Hyperides simply reports that Euxenippus "tells us that he fell asleep and saw a dream" (οὗτος δὲ κοιμηθεὶς ἐνύπνιόν φησιν ἰδεῖν), which he then later "reported to the people" (ὃ τῷ δήμῳ ἀπαγγεῖλαι) (Hyp. 4.14). Yet what kind of shape the dream might have taken - as experienced by Euxenippus - and how explicitly it might have conveyed an answer to the question at hand matters, as it helps us understand the role of incubants and the reception of the dream. Were the incubants merely transmitters of a simple message, in essence fulfilling the role of a straightforward messenger - similar to envoys sent to Delphi for public consultations? Or was the dream ambiguous and in need of interpretation, which would raise the crucial question of who held the authority to interpret this dream? In order to answer these questions, it will be necessary to attempt to reconstruct what the dream, as experienced and reported by Euxenippus, might have been like.

To do so, we will have to start first of all from what Hyperides tells us about the relationship between the dream and the subsequent decree proposal made by Polyeuctus, by examining here his narrative in full. He recounts that Euxenippus reported his dream to the demos and continues by stating:

> If you assumed, Polyeuctus, that this was true and that he [Euxenippus] reported to the people what he actually saw in his sleep, what is his crime in proclaiming to the Athenians that which the god had commanded him? If on the other hand, as you say now, you thought that he misrepresented the god (καταψεύσασθαι τοῦ θεοῦ) and, out of partiality for certain persons, did not report the truth to the people, rather than propose a decree disputing the dream (οὐ ψήφισμα ἐχρῆν σε πρὸς τὸ ἐνύπνιον γράφειν) you ought to have sent to Delphi, as the previous speaker said, to discover the truth from the god. But instead of doing that, you proposed a decree against two

[47] For the dating see Petropoulou (1981), 55-63. Oropos would have been autonomous at this time. Lupu (2003) argues that this is an update and replacement of the earlier sacred law LSCG Suppl. 35.

[48] *I. Oropos* 277.39-47. On the nature of the sacrifice performed by the incubant, as well as later evidence which describes dietary restrictions in the period leading up to incubation, see Sineux (2007), 120-129, 136-148.

> tribes, entirely conceived by yourself, (ψήφισμα δὲ αὐτοτελὲς ἔγραψας κατὰ δυοῖν φυλαῖν), a measure not only most unjust but self-contradictory also (οὐ μόνον ἀδικώτατον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐναντίον αὐτὸ ἑαυτῷ). This was why you were convicted for an illegal proposal, not because of Euxenippus (δι' ὅπερ ἥλως παρανόμων, οὐ δι' Εὐξένιππον). (Hyp. 4.14-15)

Polyeuctus, we are told here, proposed a decree πρὸς τὸ ἐνύπνιον. Hyperides postulates whether he did so because he accused Euxenippus of lying on account of bribery. Hyperides continues by detailing what happened to this decree:

> You proposed that these tribes [of Acamantis and Hippothoontis] should restore the mountain to Amphiaraos and the sale price of its produce; on the grounds that the fifty boundary officials (τοὺς ὁριστὰς τοὺς πεντήκοντα) had selected it beforehand and set it apart for the god, and that the two tribes had no right to be holding it. A little later in the same decree you propose that the eight tribes provide compensation and pay it to the two tribes so that they are not disadvantaged. But if the mountain really belonged to the two tribes and you tried to take it from them, surely we are entitled to be angry. Alternatively, if it was held improperly by them and it belonged to the god, why were you proposing that the other tribes should pay them money in exchange? They should then have been content to restore the property of the god without also paying a fine. These proposals, when examined in court, were considered not correctly proposed, and the jury voted against you. So if you had been acquitted of the charge, Euxenippus here would not have misrepresented the god (οὐκ ἂν κατεψεύσατο οὗτος τοῦ θεοῦ), but because you happened to be convicted, must that mean ruin for him? (Hyp. 4.16-18)

Polyeuctus' decree ordered that the mountain be returned to Amphiaraos, that the tribes of Acamantis and Hippothoontis restore to the god "the sale price of its produce" (16), and that the other eight tribes should pay Acamantis and Hippothoontis compensation for their loss of land, "so that they would not be disadvantaged" (17). Hyperides labels this decree as κατὰ δυοῖν φυλαῖν (15), "against the two tribes".

If one sets out the various potential outcomes to the question of land allocation, there are three possibilities:

a. the status quo, which would mean the tribes keep the land and the god holds less than he otherwise would;
b. the land is returned to the god and the two tribes are compensated, which means all tribes lose something;
c. the land is returned to the god and there is no compensation, so only the two tribes lose out.

We know that Polyeuctus' decree proposed solution b. However, what solution the dream proposed, i.e. how the dream was understood by Euxenippus, is still not clear: as we have seen, Hyperides describes Polyeuctus' decree as a ψήφισμα πρὸς τὸ ἐνύπνιον (Hyp. 4.15). This

phrase is ambiguous with regard to the exact relation between the decree and the dream and has been much debated by scholars. Crucially, as David Whitehead notes in his excellent commentary of the speech, "all hinges on the sense of the preposition *pros* in the phrase (ψήφισμα) πρὸς τὸ ἐνύπνιον".[49]

The phrase πρὸς τὸ ἐνύπνιον allows for three interpretive possibilities, as Whitehead sets out. The first takes the phrase as meaning (1) "in accordance with the dream". In this sense, the statement would argue that Hyperides' dream reported that the land was sacred and should be assigned to the god. Pierre Sineux subscribes to this line of argument in his recent monograph on Amphiaraos, following Gaston Colin and Churchill Babington.[50] A second possibility understands πρὸς τὸ ἐνύπνιον in (2) the hostile sense, as "disputing the dream". In this view, the assertion would imply the dream was supportive of the claim of the two tribes. John Burtt and Mario Marzi have taken this approach.[51] A third option renders the dream was (3) unclear and that Euxenippus' report to the Assembly was inconclusive. In this last scenario, the ambiguity of the dream - that is, its obscurity of meaning, would allow the tribes to understand it as not contesting their right to the land, and would also allow Polyeuctus to subsequently contest this interpretation by proposing his decree. Whitehead translates the πρὸς τὸ ἐνύπνιον phrase as "based on the dream", which he suggests allows for either the third or the first option.[52]

However, if one carefully examines which of these different possibilities fits Hyperides' narrative, and what solution the dream therefore proposed, option 1 (namely, that the decree is in accordance with the dream, and that both decree and dream thus assign the land to Amphiaraos) can be eliminated. Hyperides, defending Euxenippus, calls the decree of Polyeuctus "most unjust" (ἀδικώτατον: Hyp. 4.15), suggesting there must have been a discrepancy between his client's dream and this "most unjust decree".[53] Furthermore, Hyperides states that Polyeuctus based his decree proposal on the fact that "fifty boundary officials had selected it [the disputed land] beforehand and set it apart from the god" (Hyp. 4.16) - something which we shall return to. The fact that Polyeuctus brings in new evidence here to support his claim implies that he is disputing a previously made claim, i.e. the dream, and that the decree and dream are thus in opposition.[54] If there is an opposition between Polyeuctus' understanding of the situation and that of Euxenippus, then Euxenippus' report

---

[49] Whitehead (2000), 201.

[50] Babington (1853), 9; Colin (1946), 144; more recently Sineux (2007), 105.

[51] Burtt (1954), 475; Marzi (1977), 178-179; cf. also Cooper (2001), 107; van Lieshout (1980), 176.

[52] Whitehead (2000), 202. Horster (2004) similarly suggests the dream was ambiguous but then claims it was understood as in favour of the two tribes: " (...) Euxenippos berichtete von einem ambiguen Traum, den er gehabt habe, woraufhin die Athener beschlossen, daß die beiden Phylen den Berg behalten sollten, da Amphiaraos seine Ansprüche aufgegeben habe" (72).

[53] Cf. Marzi (1977), 178.

[54] The date of this drawing of boundaries is uncertain: Colin (1946), 143 states this must have happened much earlier, possibly between 377-366, Whitehead (2000), 210 on the contrary argues for a more recent date in the mid-330s: only that explains why the dispute arose now and not before.

or his interpretation of the dream must have differed from Polyeuctus' own solution, as proposed in the decree.[55] We have seen that Polyeuctus' decree proposed solution b. By implication, Euxenippus' dream then must have advocated either a or c.

Building on from this, we can consider the fact that Polyeuctus accused Euxenippus of acting on behalf of "certain people" (τισι) who bribed him (Hyp. 4.14).[56] If the dream suggested solution a, the bribers would have to be the tribes who are then advantaged, whereas with solution c the bribers would have to be the god, i.e. the god's sanctuary, as they are the only ones who win out in this scenario. However, the god's sanctuary would win out too in Polyeuctus' supported proposal b, which means that it would make no sense for Polyeuctus to make an accusation of bribery against Euxenippus here. Therefore, if Euxenippus' alleged bribers must have been the two tribes, then Euxenippus' dream must have proposed solution a: the tribes keep their land.

This reasoning by elimination allows us to rule out interpretation (1) of (ψήφισμα) πρὸς τὸ ἐνύπνιον, which contends the decree is in accordance with the dream. We are left then with options (2) and (3), both of which are plausible:[57] either the dream was definitely in favour of the claim of the two tribes, or it was experienced as ambiguous by Euxenippus and open to interpretation - including by the tribes as in their favour.[58] Which of these two options seems more likely is a crucial matter. After all, if the dream was experienced by Euxenippus as ambiguous, this would create the need for a stage of interpretation before the dream could be employed as a decision-making tool in this problem of land ownership. Such a need for interpretation would heavily influence the question of where authority lies in this decision-making process, and what the function of divination here really is. So far, this paper has highlighted the authority of both the Assembly and the individual incubant in the first step of consultation. We shall see that, upon return to Athens, there are a number of contestations and challenges to the dream, before it can be employed to actually resolve the

[55] Another potential argument against the proposal that the dream adjudicated in favour of Amphiaraos and Polyeuctus' proposed decree did so too, is that it is then after all hard to explain why Polyeuctus is accusing Euxenippus of "misrepresenting the god and not reporting the truth to the people" (15). However, it is unclear whether here Hyperides is not speaking only of Polyeuctus' later impeachment, not the original decree proposal: see later, p. 18-19.
The fact that Polyeuctus' decree proposal is judged unlawful (15: παρανόμων) and its proposer punished, while nothing of the kind is said about the dream, could be seen also to suggest that the two must be in opposition. However, one could argue that possibly the opposition to the proposal was concerned with the second clause of compensation – as Hyperides points out (17) this contradicts the first clause assigning the land to the god, as why should the tribes receive compensation if they had no right to the land? This is the line of argument Sineux (2007), 105 adopts. However, it is still unlikely that the dream came down in favour of the god, taking the remainder of the points in the above paragraph into consideration.

[56] See also Hyp. 4. 39: "For Polyeuctus has impeached Euxenippus for speaking against the best interests of the people of Athens, being in receipt of money and gifts from those acting against the people of Athens." The orator goes on to question whether these people are men from inside or outside the city but does not attempt to specify their identity any further.

[57] On the possibility of a divine sign being interpreted as adjudicating against the god's direct interest, see Horster (2004), 72.

[58] Whitehead posits that "paragraph 18's assertion 'had you been acquitted of the charge, there would have been no misrepresentation of the god by Euxenippus here' does not seem reconcilable with option 2" (Whitehead 2000, 203). This however can be refuted, if one understands paragraph 18 in a different sense, see p. 18-19.

original conflict. In order to fully understand these contestations, it will be necessary to determine whether a dream such as Euxenippus' could have been experienced as unclear and therefore whether a stage of interpretation was necessary: this next section will first aim to do so by examining other evidence for divinely-sent dreams in the ancient Greek world, before the paper moves on in its final section to the events of the aftermath of the divinatory process.

4. *Ambiguity in ancient dreaming*

In order to understand the nature of Euxenippus' dream and whether it might have required interpretation, contextualisation through comparison with other evidence for the nature of ancient dreams seems like an obvious step to take. However, the results of such a comparison underscore again the uniqueness of this incubation episode detailed in Hyperides' speech. There are after all practically no comparable literary or epigraphic sources for incubation dreams which are divinatory: the only such sources are a few unusual cases of divinatory incubation briefly described on the Epidaurian miracle inscriptions, and Herodotus' story of the Persian Mardonius, who sent a man called Mys to consult oracles on his behalf, though with what question is not known (Hdt. 8.133-136).[59] Mys visited the incubation oracle of Amphiaraos, though situated in Thebes at this point rather than in Oropos, and paid a man to incubate for him (Hdt. 8.134). While this narrative is interesting for its suggestion that it is possible to incubate on behalf of others, it does not tell us anything about the possible ambiguity of such dreams, nor about any requirement for interpretation.

If we move then to consider evidence for other types of dreams, we find the sources can be divided into two broad categories. The first consists of reports of incubation dreams which are therapeutic: they are alike to our case study in that they are solicited dreams, yet differ in the kind of demand they ask of the god. As incubation was most commonly employed in the ancient Greek world in its therapeutic form, most sources recording incubation dreams concern healing. Inscriptions narrating experiences at the Asclepeion at Epidauros dating from the fourth century BCE recount how incubants could wake up from a night in Asclepius' temple wholly cured, or with the knowledge of how a cure might be achieved, delivered to them in a dream.[60] Literary evidence for incubation ranges from a comedy scene

---

[59] While most stories recorded on the Epidaurian inscriptions concern therapeutic matters (see following note), there are two instances of divinatory incubation, where the god is asked about the location of treasure and about a missing son respectively (IG IV^2 1, 123, l. 8-21 and IG IV^2 1, 122, l. 19-26). Two other stories also do not concern healing but these do not include actual incubation or dreaming: IG IV^2 1, 121, l. 79-89 concerns a broken cup and IG IV^2 1, 123, l. 21-29 a broken promise of a donation to Asclepius: see LiDonnici (1995).

[60] IG IV^2 1, 121-124. In the majority of the stories narrated on these inscriptions the incubants are cured in the night by the god, whom they see in a dream. In a few cases the cure occurs later, after a conversation with the god in the dream (e.g. IG IV^2 1, 122 l. 26-35, l. 82-86). On these inscriptions see LiDonnici (1995). There are a few cases which report incubation outside Epidauros: see e.g. IG IV^2 1, 122, l. 10-19 and IG IV^2 1, 123, l. 29-33 and see also the evidence collected in Edelstein and Edelstein (1945), 208-260 and Girone (1998), 29-39, 75-151.

in Aristophanes' *Wealth* (633-748) to Aelius Aristides' *Sacred Tales,* dating to the second century AD, a rich source of information detailing the experience of an incubator at the sanctuary of Asclepius in Pergamon.[61] In addition, a number of votive reliefs found at Amphiaraos' sanctuary at Oropos present visualisations of the consultant's experience in the case of therapeutic incubation. One example is the relief dedicated by an incubant called Archilos, dating from the first half of the fourth century (NM 3369).[62] The right hand side of the relief shows the incubant asleep, as a snake licks his shoulder in healing, while on the left hand side Archilos is depicted again, here being healed by Amphiaraos himself, portrayed as a bearded man.[63] It thus suggests the belief that in his sleep, Archilos would have direct contact with (in this case be healed by) the god himself. The portrayals of the experience depicted on these reliefs fit in with the dreams described in the Epidaurian inscriptions, which reported conversations with the god and depict dreams as clear, unambiguous and direct. It appears that interpretation here was mostly not necessary. However, there are some exceptions: Aristides' descriptions of his incubatory dreams experienced in Pergamon include an occasion in which he asks the god to clarify a previously-received dream (Aristid. *Or.* 47.55), which suggests the dream's meaning had been unclear. Aristides also makes frequent reference to his discussions of a dream's meaning, as he either interprets the divine messages himself or asks priests or others for their opinions (Aristid. *Or.* 47.12, 48.34-35).[64] One testimony inscribed at Epidauros also suggests that an incubation dream could be cryptic: the inscription tells of a woman who did not understand an ambiguous dream and required the services of a diviner to finally comprehend the god's message (IG IV^2 1, 123, l.8-21).[65] These exceptions demonstrate that incubatory dreaming, while mostly presented as an experience which resulted in a straightforward divine answer upon waking, was not always necessarily so.

How useful these accounts of therapeutic incubation are as direct comparisons for the nature of Euxenippus' dream is unclear: while they do indeed describe dreams that concern personal matters, Euxenippus' consultation differed, as he did not seek healing but rather knowledge of divine will and, furthermore, for the sake of the collective. A more consistent comparison could instead be made with sources concerning non-incubatory dreaming, which make up the second broad category of evidence for ancient dreaming. This consists of reports of non-incubatory prophetic dreams, i.e. unsolicited dreams. In the ancient world, dreams were considered to be potential transmissions of divine messages,

---

[61] See Renberg (2017). On Aristides see Petridou (2015), esp. 186-193.

[62] NM 3369: on this and other votive reliefs from Oropos see Petsalis-Diomidis (2006) and also Platt (2011), 44-46, on the way in which the relief offers multiple representations both of the god – in different guises - and of the mortal experience with the divine.

[63] As Renberg (2017), 272 points out, Amphiaraos is usually depicted in a fashion which closely resembles Asclepius.

[64] See Renberg (2015), who examines the evidence for interpretation of dreams, in particular those which led to religious activities, i.e. offerings or dedications.

[65] Renberg (2015), 240-246.

similar to other divinatory devices, and these could also appear naturally to someone in their sleep, rather than only through incubation. This category is alike to Euxenippus' case in that these dreams are also considered to transmit the will of a deity, yet differ in the context in which they are received. As Xenophon states, "the gods know all things, and warn (προσημαίνουσιν) whomsoever they will in sacrifices, in omens, in voices, and in dreams" (Xen. *On the Cavalry Commander* 9.9).[66] Evidence discussing prophetic dreams is largely literary in nature.[67] The extant evidence depicts dreams as ambiguous, cryptic signs which require interpretation: similar to oracles in some ways, though in their usually unsolicited nature they also closely resemble omens. In many of these sources, interpretation is carried out by the dreamer him- or herself, or upon consultation with friends of family, as Renberg has also demonstrated (see e.g. Hom. *Od.* 19.535-538; Aristoph. *Wasps* 42-53; Xen. *Anab.* 3.1.11-14; Theophr. *Char.* 16.11).[68] However, aside from literary accounts of cryptic dreams, which as mantic narratives often have particular functions within a story or myth, works such as Artemidorus' *Oneirocritica* also provide proof that interpretation was often considered necessary to make sense of the divine message hidden in one's sleep – so much so that here experts, and their handbooks, were employed especially for this purpose.[69]

The broad variety in types of god-sent dreams described in ancient Greek sources, and in particular the lack of any useful directly comparable evidence for incubatory divinatory dreaming, makes it hard to say anything conclusive about how one can understand the nature of the dream as reported by Euxenippus after his night in Amphiaraos' temple. While literary accounts of cryptic dreams and the discussion of dream interpretation found in philosophical works and dream handbooks might suggest that dreams were often perceived by the dreamer as ambiguous enough to require interpretation, it is of course not certain that Euxenippus' dream would have looked anything like the dreams described by Artemidorus. The case of oracles from Delphi, and the discrepancy between the depiction of such oracles in literary sources and those attested in epigraphic evidence, serves as a warning against making too many assumptions too quickly about the nature and form of any divine signs, or the experience of receiving these. Nonetheless, epigraphic and literary evidence for the practices of oneiromancy and incubation show that prophetic dreams could be considered ambiguous and unclear by the dreamer, and require

[66] For discussion see Mikalson (1983), 39-40. For recent studies on attitudes to dreams, and discussion of ancient sources concerning dreams see Harris (2009); Näf (2004). On incubation see also Dodds (1951), 102-134.

[67] For examples of prophetic dreams see tragedy (eg. Eur. *IT* 1264-5; Aesch. *Coeph.* 527-535) or comedy (Aristoph. *Wasps* 24,25; Menander *Dyskolos* 402-426), the exaggerated portrayal of a Superstitious Man (δεισϊδαίμων) by Theophrastus (*Char.* 16), or the analysis and classification of prophetic dreams by Aristotle in his *On Divination through Sleep*. Xenophon provides numerous historical examples of the attention awarded to dreams (see e.g. *Anab.* 3.1.11-12; 4.3.8-9; 6.1.20-24) and as such is a highly useful source for the belief in prophetic dreams. See also Plato's *TImaeus* 71e-72a, which presents some dreaming as a method of divination which requires interpretation.

[68] See Renberg (2015).

[69] Though dated to the second century CE, Artemidorus' handbook of dream analysis was most likely not the earliest of its kind, just the earliest surviving one.

interpretation. Hyperides says that "Euxenippus notified the Athenians of the commands which the god gave him" (ἃ ὁ θεὸς αὐτῷ προσέταττε ταῦτ') (Hyp. 4.14). We might assume therefore that ambiguity could have characterised Euxenippus' dream too, and that it could have been in need of interpretation by Euxenippus himself, or upon his return to Athens.

5. *The aftermath: interpretation and contestation*

A comparison with other sources for prophetic dreams in the Greek world cannot provide a conclusive answer to the question of the nature of the dream, the possibility of ambiguity and the subsequent need for a stage of interpretation. It showed, nonetheless, that this latter notion was a possibility at least. Additionally, analysis of the final stage of the incubatory process, the aftermath of the dream, demonstrates that there was contestation of what had gone before. This next section examines the aftermath of the incubation process, in which different people contest the dream, its transmission and interpretation. This will, as we shall see, allow us to suggest that an ambiguous dream would have been more likely, and will let us conclude with a final scrutiny of where the authority in this decision-making process lies.

As we have seen, after Euxenippus reported his dream to the Assembly, Polyeuctus became involved in the divination process by initiating two different actions. Both of these contest and challenge elements of the process which had gone before: Hyperides' speech is the result of Polyeuctus' impeachment of the principal incubant for bribery, as Polyeuctus called into question the veracity of Euxenippus' dream report by accusing him of misrepresenting the god – thereby questioning the transmission stage of the decision-making process. Before that, however, Polyeuctus first proposed a decree declaring the hill belonged to the deity.[70] We have seen that this decree proposal was in opposition to the dream. It is, therefore, also an attempt at contesting what had gone before, regardless of the fact that the proposal was eventually declared illegal. What element of the consultation process *exactly* this proposed decree contested is, again, unclear: was it the transmission, i.e. the veracity of Euxenippus' report, as Polyeuctus contested later through the impeachment? Or was it rather the interpretation of the dream? Understanding what the basis of Polyeuctus' intervention was will illuminate, firstly, whether it is possible that the dream was ambiguous, and secondly, the role of individuals in influencing this collective decision-making.

While it would seem most obvious that Polyeuctus' decree questioned the same stage of the process as he did in his later εἰσαγγελία for bribery, if one carefully looks at Hyperides'

[70] Hyperides also describes the decree as a ψήφισμα αὐτοτελὲς. This phrase could be a simple non-technical description, conveying a sense that Polyeuctus 'acted arbitrarily' or 'on his own initiative' in making this proposal, or it could be taken in a technical sense, explaining that Polyeuctus proposed the decree in response to the report of Euxenippus in the *ekklesia*, without prior planning, and thus without presenting it to the *boule* for inspection first, as would have been the normal procedure. Whitehead (2000), 205 understands the phrase in the former meaning; Cooper (2001), 107 takes the latter approach, although he does not accept this without reservations.

words this does not seem to be the case. Hyperides namely implies that the two actions by Polyeuctus did not involve the same elements and that the decree was instead questioning something different, as he says: "If on the other hand, as you now maintain (ὥσπερ νυνὶ λέγεις), you thought that he misrepresented the god and, out of partiality for certain persons, had made a false report to the people, rather than propose a decree disputing the dream you ought to have sent to Delphi, as the previous speaker said, and inquired the truth from the god" (Hyp. 4. 15). Hyperides here hypothetically assigns as Polyeuctus' motive for proposing the decree the same motive he gives for bringing the εἰσαγγελία, yet the temporal parenthesis ὥσπερ νυνὶ λέγεις implies this is not necessarily the case and suggests he might have said something different 'then' from 'now'.[71]

This differentiation is suggested too a few sentences later in the speech, where Hyperides calls Polyeuctus' decree "most unjust and self-contradictory also. This was what caused your conviction for illegal proposals. It was not the fault of Euxenippus" (Hyp. 4.15). Hyperides here unsurprisingly denounces Polyeuctus' decree in strong terms, calling it unjust and inconsistent. His claim that Polyeuctus' conviction was "not the fault of Euxenippus" is evidently rhetorical too, but nonetheless, the fact he can make such a claim suggests that it would be plausible to his audience to declare that Euxenippus had nothing to do with the decree and its conviction as unlawful. Furthermore, Hyperides says something telling about the condemnation of Polyeuctus for bringing an illegal proposal: "These proposals, when examined in court, were considered unsatisfactory, and the jury condemned you. So if you had been acquitted in your trial, Euxenippus would not have misrepresented the god: because you happened to be convicted, must ruin fall on him?" (18). This passage can be interpreted as saying that if Polyeuctus had not been convicted (of bringing an illegal proposal) Euxenippus would not have been accused of misrepresenting the god: therefore if the decree had been passed, Euxenippus would not have stood accused.[72] It is only because Polyeuctus was convicted that he then brought the εἰσαγγελία, and with it the charge against Euxenippus. Therefore, the decree could not have been based on an accusation of Euxenippus as misrepresenting the god, and thus must have brought into question something other than the transmission of the dream. It did not accuse Euxenippus of lying, yet it proposed a solution different from Euxenippus' report. This suggest then that one should understand Euxenippus' report of his dream (or its discussion in the Assembly) and Polyeuctus' proposed decree as competing interpretations of the dream, which each suggested different solutions to the problem of land ownership. The dream, then, might very possibly have been experienced by its human dreamer as an ambiguous, unclear message from the god.

---

[71] Whitehead (2000), 202 recognises this undercutting parenthesis but does not go into its possible implications.

[72] Contra Whitehead (2000), 203. He interprets this passage as irreconcilable with the interpretation that Polyeuctus' decree is "opposing the dream". But if understood as above, this passage does not have to be incompatible with that interpretation. See also earlier.

What Polyeuctus' decree thus questioned is the interpretation of the divine sign, and he does this through the mechanism of a decree proposal, based on the evidence of boundary officials: "(...) your reason being that the fifty boundary officials (τοὺς ὁριστὰς τοὺς πεντήκοντα) had selected it beforehand and set it apart for the god, and that the two tribes had no right to be holding it" (16).[73] The reasons why this previous allotment of the land by boundary officials would have been ignored when the land was more recently divided up amongst the ten tribes is uncertain: possibly it had been forgotten or overridden for some other reason.[74] In any case this argument does not appear to have convinced the judges in the case against Polyeuctus' illegal proposal. Polyeuctus' attempt to question the interpretation of the gods' message by human law and by reference to an earlier land allotment decision made by officials nominated for the task by the polis, is criticised by Hyperides: he argues Polyeuctus should have instead "sent to Delphi, as the previous speaker said, and inquired the truth from the god" (εἰς Δελφοὺς πέμψαντα πυθέσθαι παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν ἀλήθειαν) (Hyp. 4.15). Hyperides makes recourse here to yet another source of authority: Apollo's oracle at Delphi. Hyperides, making use of an argument rhetorically useful for his denunciation of Polyeuctus, suggests thus that only another god, not a mortal using human law, can provide the truth (ἀλήθεια) regarding Amphiaraos' message. In the sentence just above this, Polyeuctus' εἰσαγγελία is described as an accusation of "misrepresentation of the god" (καταψεύσασθαι τοῦ θεοῦ) and "not reporting the truth to the people" (15: μὴ τἀληθῆ ἀπηγγελκέναι τῷ δήμῳ). With this juxtaposition of ἀλήθεια Hyperides makes a point about the hypocrisy of Polyeuctus: while Polyeuctus accuses Euxenippus of lying, Polyeuctus himself did not take the right decision to seek the truth either. Evidently there is a strong and obvious rhetorical element to Hyperides' argument here: he is attempting to portray Polyeuctus' actions as conceited (and even impious), thinking his own opinion more valid than the god's. Hyperides attempts to downplay the relevance and power of transient human constructs such as decrees, in comparison with the expressions of divine will found in dreams and oracles.[75] These different arguments show the complexity of discussing religious authority in the legal and democratic setting of this speech.

6. Conclusion

In this matter of recognising land as potentially sacred, authority in the decision-making process thus exists on different levels. Just as the demos ordered Euxenippus to incubate, so too does the god order him to report the message back to the Athenians, thereby

[73] Papazarkadas (2011), 47 suggests the marking out of sacred land by fifty *horistai* should be seen as part of the Athenians' reorganisation of the cult upon their reacquisition of Oropos.

[74] When exactly these boundary officials demarcated the land is uncertain: Whitehead (2000), 209-211 proposes a date after 335 BC; Papazarkadas (2011), 45 suggests 335-332 BC.

[75] Compare Xen. *Hell.* 7.1.27, who criticises the Thebans and Spartans for not consulting the god about how to bring about peace, instead deliberating about it themselves.

transmitting the will of the god. Euxenippus' apparent connection to Hygieia suggests his selection as incubant could have been a conscious and deliberate choice. Although one cannot be certain whether religious expertise of some sort would have definitely impacted this selection, this possibility highlights in any case the need to reflect on the exact role Euxenippus played in this process. Hyperides claims that only a god can give an authoritative judgement. But as the dream Euxenippus received appears unclear in its suggested course of action, in practice evidently some human agent did have to interpret it – whether the Assembly did so explicitly when faced with Euxenippus' report, or the tribes implicitly did so in taking the dream as a judgement on their right. Furthermore, even though Hyperides criticises him for these contestations, Polyeuctus could twice present a challenge to part of the decision-making process. First, he proposed a decree challenging the interpretation of the dream as presented by Euxenippus to the Assembly (although his decree was not enacted and became discredited, the fact that he proposed it in the first place is interesting), which suggests it is evidently *possible* for an individual to personally present a challenge to a dream interpretation and to suggest a contrary one.[76] Secondly, he brought a court case which challenged the accuracy of Euxenippus' transmission of the dream. The authority to provide an answer to the question at the heart of this case or an interpretation of a divine sign is thus held by different figures: ostensibly by gods, in reality by the Assembly, most likely strongly based on an 'expert' ambassador to the oracle, and even by individuals.

Despite this appearance of a sequence of diverse authoritative acts, however, it is important to note the actual nature of individuals' authority in this oracular process. While the incubation rite is governed by many steps and consequently leaves room for individual agency, as we have seen in Euxenippus' and Polyeuctus' actions, this individual agency remains rather circumscribed: in the end, despite not advertising direct influence on decisions, it is the Assembly which nonetheless legitimises the decisions of individual agents.

Hyperides' *In Defence of Euxenippus* can thus be understood as a speech which illustrates the intricacy of the consultation of a god through incubation, as a process made up of a number of different stages in which human fallibility complicates the transmission of divine will from its expression in a dream through to human understanding of this will. This is especially complex for consultations made by a community, rather than an individual, where, as this case illustrates, a dichotomy can appear between the singularity of a normal individual who has direct and unmediated contact with the god, and the interpretation of this divine contact in the interests of his whole community.[77] As such, it is maybe not surprising that this case appears to be unique. While not unusual per se, the speech's lack of religious argumentation and Hyperides' focus on procedural elements of the case, which are

[76] The negligible fine which Polyeuctus received upon conviction indicates in any case that his decree proposal was not completely unacceptable or particularly unusual. The fact also that Polyeuctus' decree argued that the land should belong to the god, rather than mortals, might have made this more easily acceptable.

[77] Sineux (2007), 219.

in all likelihood influenced by the speech's nature as a συνηγορία, should also be understood in light of the complexity of balancing a standard presentation of the *nomoi* of the city, as well as the judgement of the demos, as authoritative, with Hyperides' attempt to downplay the relevance and power of transient human constructs such as decrees, in comparison with the expressions of divine will found in dreams and oracles. This is of course evidently a rhetorical argument which contradicts the authority invested in the Athenian demos firstly to decide on a manner of action concerning the dispute of the sacredness of the land, secondly to appoint Euxenippus as transmitter of the divine message, and thirdly to play a role in the disputed interpretation of the oracle. The interaction with (and message from) the god is governed by many steps: the choice of individual for the incubation process, his reception of a dream, and the community's acceptance and interpretation (or acceptance of the interpretation) of it. The process of transforming the dream into an understanding of divine will can be challenging, as well as open to challenges.

A final point to consider is how the oracular occasion narrated by Hyperides fits in with the general picture of the role of oracles in fourth-century Athenian society. This paper has demonstrated that, as an unusually informative illustration of the problems we face interpreting the working of, motivation behind and attitudes toward oracular consultation, Hyperides' speech deserves more attention, and the Amphiareion at Oropos merits a place alongside the oracles of Delphi and Dodona as sources for this process. While recent scholarship has looked at divination either as a regulatory device, employed to create consensus in situations where this is lacking, or as a way of dealing with situations of high risk for which human problem-solving could not provide an answer, this case study of the Oropian hill queries the idea that divination is necessarily consensus-building. Here, consulting the oracle does not 'solve' the problem, nor does it simplify the decision-making process. Rather, this case highlights the function of divination as a structuring device. It frames the way in which the resolution of a conflict can be approached, not necessarily simplifying the process, nor guaranteeing a simple and consensual solution, but instead structuring how a solution may be worked towards. Divination does so through the use of a complex procedure, which involves ritual elements and allows individual agency through particular assigned roles, though these remain to a large extent instruments of circumscribed procedure, which is ultimately legitimised by the Assembly. Nonetheless, some room for individual agency remains. The divinatory process is after all complicated by its need for both transmission and interpretation, both of which are open to contestation. Consulting the oracle is therefore only one – if serious – step in the decision-making process, which necessitates also interpretation and debate.[78]

---

[78] I presented an earlier draft of this article at the Max Weber Centre for Advanced Social and Cultural Studies in Erfurt and I would like to thank all the participants of the colloquium for their stimulating comments, in particular Jörg Rüpke and Richard Gordon. I am grateful to Paul Michael Kurtz for his insightful feedback on a subsequent draft of this work, and to the two anonymous reviewers for their helpful critique. This work was supported by a studentship from the Arts and Humanities Research Council UK, as well as by a visiting fellowship at the Max Weber Centre.

Bibliography

Arnush, M. 2005. *Pilgrimage to the Oracle of Apollo at Delphi. Patterns of Public and Private Consultation*, in: Elsner, J., Rutherford, I. (eds.) *Pilgrimage in Graeco-Roman and Early Christian Antiquity* (Oxford), 97-110

Babington, C. 1853. *Hyperidou Logoi B. The Orations of Hyperides for Lycophron and for Euxenippus* (Cambridge)

Beerden, K. 2013. *Worlds Full of Signs. Ancient Greek Divination in Context* (Leiden)

Bonnechère, P. 2010. *Divination*, in: Ogden, D. (ed.) *A Companion to Greek Religion* (Oxford), 145-159

Bowden, H. 2003. *Oracles for Sale*, in: Derow, P., Parker, R. (eds.) *Herodotus and His World. Essays from a Conference in Memory of George Forrest* (Oxford), 256-274

Bowden, H. 2005. *Classical Athens and the Delphic Oracle. Divination and Democracy* (Cambridge)

Burtt, J.O. 1953. *Minor Attic Orators II* (London)

Cooper, C.R. 2001. *Hyperides*, in: Worthington, I., Harris, E.M., Cooper, C. *Dinarchus, Hyperides and Lycurgus* (Austin), 59-158

Cosmopoulos, M.B. 2001. *The Rural History of Ancient Greek City-States. The Oropos Survey Project* (Oxford)

Dillery, J. 2005. *Chresmologues and Manteis. Independent Diviners and the Problem of Authority*, in: Johnston and Struck (eds.), 167-232

Dodds, E.R. 1951. *The Greeks and the Irrational* (Berkeley)

Edelstein, E.J., Edelstein, L. 1945. *Asclepius. Collection and Interpretation of the Testimonies. Vol. 1.* (Baltimore)

Eidinow, E. 2007. *Oracles, Curses, and Risk among the Ancient Greeks* (Oxford)

Engels, J. 1989. *Studien zur politischen Biographie des Hypereides. Athen in der Epoche der lykurgischen Reformen und des makedonischen Universalreiches* (Munich)

Flower, M.A. 2008. *The Seer in Ancient Greece* (Berkeley)

Girone, M. 1998. *Iamata. Guarigioni miracolose di Asclepio in testi epigrafici* (Bari)

Hansen, M.H. 1975. *Eisangelia: The Sovereignty of the People's Court in Athens in the Fourth Century B.C. and The Impeachment of Generals and Politicians* (Odense)

Hansen, M.H. 1989. *The Athenian Ekklesia II: A Collection of Articles 1983-1989* (Copenhagen)

Horster, M. 2004. *Landbesitz griechischer Heiligtümer in archaischer und klassischer Zeit* (Berlin)

Johnston, S.I. 2005. *Introduction. Divining Divination*, in: Johnston and Struck (eds.), 1-28

Johnston, S.I. 2008. *Ancient Greek Divination* (Oxford)

Johnston, S.I., Struck, P.T. 2005 (eds.) *Mantikê: Studies in Ancient Divination* (Leiden)

Knoepfler, D. 2001. *Eretria: fouilles et recherches* (Lausanne)

Levente, I. 2003. *Hygieia in Classical Greek Art* (Athens)

Lhôte, E. 2006. *Les lamelles oraculaires de Dodone* (Geneva)

LiDonnici, L.R. 1995. *The Epidaurian Miracle Inscriptions. Text, Translation and Commentary* (Atlanta)

Lupu, E. 2003. *Sacrifice at the Amphiareion and a Fragmentary Sacred Law from Oropos*, Hesperia 72, 321-340

MacDowell, D.M. 1978. *The Law in Classical Athens* (London)

Martin, G. 2009. *Divine Talk: Religious Argumentation in Demosthenes* (Oxford)

Marzi, M. 1977. *Oratori attici minori. Vol. I* (Turin)

Meiggs, R., Lewis, D. 1988. *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the End of the Fifth Century B.C*, 2nd edn. (Oxford)

Mikalson, J. D. 1983. *Athenian Popular Religion* (Chapel Hill)

Mitchel, F.W. 1973. *Lykourgan Athens. Lectures in Memory of Louise Taft Semple* (Cincinnati), 165-214

Morgan, C. 1989. *Divination and society at Delphi and Didyma*, Hermathena 147, 17-42

Näf, B. 2004. *Traum und Traumdeutung im Altertum* (Darmstadt)

Papazarkadas, N. 2009. *The Decree of Aigeis and Aiantis (Agora I 6793) revisited*, in: Papazarkadas, N., Themos, A.A. (eds.) *Ἀττικὰ Ἐπιγραφικά: Μελέτες πρὸς τιμὴν τοῦ Christian Habicht* (Athens), 165-181.

Papazarkadas, N. 2011. *Sacred and Public Land in Ancient Athens* (Oxford)

Parker, R. 1996. *Athenian Religion. A History* (Oxford)

Parker, R. 2005. *Polytheism and Society at Athens* (Oxford)

Petrakos, V. 1997. Οι επιγραφές του Ωρωπού (Athens)

Petropoulou, A. 1981. *The Eparche Documents and the Early Oracle at Oropus*, GRBS 22, 39-63

Renberg, G. 2015. *The Role of Dream-Interpreters in Greek and Roman Religion,* in: Weber, G. (ed.) *Artemidor von Daldis und die antike Traumdeutung: Texte— Kontexte—Lektüren* (Berlin), 233–262

Renberg, G. 2017. *Where Dreams May Come. Incubation Sanctuaries in the Greco-Roman World* (Leiden)

Rhodes, P.J., Osborne, R. 2003. *Greek Historical Inscriptions: 404-323 BC* (Oxford)

Rosenberger, V. (ed.) 2013. *Divination in the Ancient World. Religious Options and the Individual* (Stuttgart)

Rubinstein, L. 2000. *Litigation and Cooperation. Supporting Speakers in the Courts of Classical Athens* (Stuttgart)

Rüpke, J. 2013. *New Perspectives on Ancient Divination*, in Rosenberger, V. (ed.) *Divination in the Ancient World. Religious Options and the Individual* (Stuttgart), 9-20

Scafuro, A. 2009. *The Crowning of Amphiaraos*, in Mitchell, L., Rubinstein, L. (eds.) *Greek History and Epigraphy. Essays in Honour of P. J. Rhodes* (Swansea), 59-86

Sineux, P. 2007. *Amphiaraos: guerrier, devin et guérisseur* (Paris)

Stafford, E. 2005. *Without You no one is Happy. The Cult of Health in Ancient Greece*, in King, H.

(ed.) *Health in Antiquity* (London), 120-135

Trampedach, K. 2015. *Politische Mantik. Die Kommunikation über Götterzeichen und Orakel im klassischen Griechenland* (Heidelberg)

van Lieshout, R.G.A. 1980. *Greeks on Dreams* (Utrecht)

Whitehead, D. 2000. *Hyperides. The Forensic Speeches* (Oxford)

Wilding, A. 2015. *Aspirations and Identities. Proxenia at Oropos during the Fourth to Second Centuries BC*, BICS 58, 55-81