

In 323, Dinarchus contrasted Demosthenes' alleged betrayal of Thebes in 335 to the Theban support for Thrasybulus in 404, corroborating his historical paradigm by pointing to the elders (___ π_____) and the Theban decree in favor of the Athenian exiles, "so often read out before [the Athenians]" (Dinarch. 1.25). Presupposing that the orators drew their information from the historians, scholars have often treated such corroborations as mere rhetoric, used by the orator to make his knowledge of the past acceptable to his ignorant audience (Pearson, *CP* 1941, 215-219). Proposing an alternative model for the orators' historical paradigms, this paper takes Dinarchus' corroborations seriously and seeks to contextualize his allusion within the complex net of remembrances and beliefs held by his audience. In Athens, the memorialization of the return of the exiled democrats functioned as a fixed point for the memory of Theban aid. On several occasions (395, 383-79, 335) Thebans utilized this event to garner Athenian support, thus repeatedly reviving this memory in Athenian public discourse.

Although scholars have extensively studied the orators' use of the past, focusing on narrative-rhetorical aspects (Jost 1935, Nouhaud 1982), the orators' sources, and their immediate political concerns (Perlman, *Scripta Hierosolymitana* 1961), in concentrating on the speaker's technique, they have ignored the role of the audience. Yet the orators did not operate within a socio-political vacuum, but had to take the attitudes of their listeners into account. For contextualizing the orator's historical allusions, the concept of social memory is an invaluable analytical tool (cf. Thomas 1989; Fentress & Wickham 1992).

The historicity of the Theban decrees in support of the Athenian democrats is confirmed by Diodor. 14.6.3; Plut. *Lys.* 27.3, and Plut. *Pelop.* 6.5, whose accounts are derived – via Ephorus – from the *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia* (Hamilton 1979, 149f.; Cartledge 1987, 283). In Thebes, this event was remembered as a manifestation of the Theban character in the tradition of the Theban culture heroes Heracles and Dionysus (Plut. *Lys.* 27.4) and memorialized in form of colossal statues of Athena and Heracles, dedicated by the grateful Thrasybulus and the other exiles (Pausan. 9.11.6). For the Athenians, the re-establishment of democracy was a pivotal event, and the return of the exiled *demos* from Phyle therefore deeply rooted in Athenian historical consciousness (Wolpert 2002). Monumental inscriptions such as the citizenship grant of 401/0 for the *xenoi* aiding the exiles in Phyle could help to preserve the memory of the democrats' foreign (e.g. Theban) supporters (Rhodes&Osborne 4 = *IG* II² 10).

Nevertheless, transmission of this memory of Theban support down to Dinarchus' generation was by no means secured since, for the most part, Thebes played a negative role in Athenian social memory: the Thebans were remembered as prototypical medizers (Isoc. 14.30,61; Dem. 14.33f.; Dem. 6.11; [Dem.] 59.95; Isoc. 12.93) and their proposal to eradicate Athens in 405 left a deep mark on Athenian collective consciousness (Andoc. 3.21; Isoc. 14.31f.; 7.6; 15.319, Dem. 19.65f).

Yet the occurrence of several analogous situations (the expulsion of Theban democrats by a Spartan-backed junta in 383 (Xen. *Hell.* 5.2.31), Alexander's prohibition against harboring any Theban refugees in 335 (Diodor. 17.15.3)) and the diplomatic practice of recounting former benefits when lobbying for support (including the quotation of past decrees) periodically refreshed the memory of Thebes' support for Thrasybulus in Athens (Xen. *Hell.* 3.5.8.; Plut. *Pelop.* 6.3-5). Dinarchus' references to the elders and the much-cited Theban decree can therefore be taken seriously and indicate two important carriers of social memory in 4th-century Athens.