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THE HISTORICAL SCHOLIA TO ARISTOPHANES

AN EVALUATION
CHAPTER ONE

THE PROBLEM AND THE METHOD

To the student and to the teacher of all ages, but particularly before the Renaissance, the works of a Greek or Roman author have provided not only materials to be read, but a text to be glossed and explained, names to be identified and difficult lines to be paraphrased. Armed with a text and a set of scholia a man had all he needed to educate himself and others. In his hands was a thesaurus of history, geography, archaeology, language and rhetoric. He used the classical writers as the foundation for a learning that treated ancient literature as a living part of his own existence. "Far from childish naiveté is this independence of mind and command over material. The aim was eminently practical and the writer got from his ancient source a glimmering of the truth that it was his object to teach.... The medieval scholar would doubtless be amused at our suspicions of his intelligence." ¹

The grammarians, lexicographers, scholiasts, glossators and polymaths from the Alexandrian period on never lost contact with their literature as a whole even while they excerpted

and wrote learned notes. The scholiast tried to make his author comprehensible in order to draw both students and readers to the text, where they would enjoy the content more because they had a better understanding of it.

For over nine hundred years the scholia to the plays of Aristophanes have been used by readers interested in the poet and by scholars working in almost every field of Hellenic study. More recently extensive work has been done with the scholia themselves in an effort to evaluate their worth as sources for information about Greek language and life. Notes on prosody and grammar along with definitions have been proved sound and used without question. Scholia concerned with prosopography and history have met with more scepticism. Little confidence has been placed in their reliability and few scholars will use them as authentic evidence, especially for events not mentioned elsewhere.

The main purpose of this study is an evaluation of the "historical" notes.\(^2\) One investigation of this material

---

\(^2\) I employ the term "historical" in a narrow sense to include notes on (1) the political history, internal and external, of Athens (chiefly) and of the Hellenic cities; (2) the antiquities of Hellas; (3) the leading personalities, who had most influence upon the political tone and activity of the Aegean states.
has been made. It does not include all the historical notes and it has been outdated by discovery and careful study of fragments of manuscripts, coins and papyri since 1889.

The method that promises best hope to the historian of establishing rules of acceptability amid this mass of comment is fundamentally comparative; that is, the scholia must be subjected to the touchstone of other witnesses of whose reputation we are better informed. Principles to govern our belief or disbelief in a given scholion may emerge.

I start with an exposition of the background necessary to my own investigation. Here I deal first with the history of the commentary as we have it; I discuss briefly, in chronological order, the encyclopaedists, lexicographers, ancient text critics and other learned men who are cited in the scholia or whose work probably contributed to the marginalia without acknowledgement by the exceptors. Chapter III contains descriptions of the principal codices and papyri which bear scholia, followed by a summary of the manuscript-tradition to 1498. Chief editions of the text and scholia since publication of the Aldine are listed along

3 William Meiners, Quæstiones ad scholia Aristophanis historica pertinentes (Diss., Halle, 1900); see the review by
with critical notes, in chapter IV, in the second half of which I refer to the articles and monographs that are of most value for one who would make critical use of the scholia.

Chapters V-VIII are, essentially, a catalogue in which the chronological divisions have been made, quite arbitrarily, on the basis of convenience. Each pertinent scholion is quoted in full; it is followed by reference to all other ancient evidence relevant to the subject. Where the contribution of a scholion is unique, some attention is paid to the argument of historical probability. In general, however, I have not analysed each scholion exhaustively or attempted to make a final pronouncement regarding its credibility. Rather, I have in these chapters set out the scholia alongside the other testimony for the perusal of the reader, and have postponed my own conclusions to chapter IX. Thus the reader will find the evidence alone in chapters V-VIII and my interpretation of that evidence in chapter IX.

The testimonia of the other authorities, which might unduly encumber the body of the investigation, have been gathered alphabetically by author and numbered (from T1), for ease of reference, in an appendix. Also to be found in

Bachmann, in B.Ph.W, XIV (1893), pp. 1281-1285. Bachmann observes that the work is excellent so far as it goes but that it needs continuation and expansion.
an appendix, since it is not strictly relevant to the main purpose of this investigation, is a brief discussion of the use made of Thucydides in the scholia.
CHAPTER TWO

THE FORMATION OF THE COMMENTARY

Most of the commentaries to the works of classical authors are the result of generations of good, bad and indifferent scholarship, excerpted and assembled to form a continuous set of notes. Coherence and value depend upon the ability of the scholiasts to choose wisely and to organise a variorum that will be free of error and contradiction. It is usually impossible to discover all the original and intermediate sources of a variorum since the excerpts are often spliced together with little direct reference to earlier work. Fortunately, the notes to Aristophanes contain numerous references to authors or commentators from whom information was drawn. As a result, the history of the Aristophanic variorum can be described with tolerable accuracy.

There is no evidence in the scholia or elsewhere for the exact date of the earliest commentary. More than one scholar of the fourth century B.C. may have taken it upon himself to explain allusions to Athenian affairs, discuss metre and supply a background of factual notes that would make the comedies easier to understand. Reasonable likelihood is not proven fact, however, and little has come of efforts to trace the earliest annotation.

We do know, however, that sources of the marginalia
go back to the third century B.C.; Alexandrian scholars are frequently cited by the later scholiasts.\textsuperscript{1} There is independent evidence that others studied the metre, prosody, prosopography, myths and historical allusions in Old Comedy.\textsuperscript{2}

Zenodotos, librarian at Alexandria early in the third century B.C., assigned to Lykophron the classification of all comedies in the library. Vitae, didaskalia and notes to explain lines in the plays were included in the nine or more volumes of Lykophron's collection; he probably did not write the hypotheses. A more extensive work on Old Comedy appeared in the twenty volumes written, not much later, by Eratosthenes. Twenty-one notes cite him for various types

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Aristophanes of Byzantion, Kallistratos, Aristarchos, Ammonios, Apollonios Rhodios, Apollonios Dyskolos, Chairis, Eratosthenes, Euphronios are quoted regularly.
\item Boudreaux, \textit{Le texte d'Aristophane et ses commentateurs}, pp. 10-13, lists some of the early scholars who may have contributed to the commentary. White, \textit{The Scholia on the Aves of Aristophanes}, pp. ix-lxxxv, provides a more extensive list of scholars who might, on the basis of works that they are known to have written on prosody, grammar, unusual words and religious history, have been excerpted by contemporary and later annotators.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
of information. Euphronios, teacher of Aristophanes of Byzantion, is also named in the scholia, especially in prosopographical notes. There is not enough of his commentary remaining, however, to allow a determination of the exact nature of his work.

In the year 195 B.C. Aristophanes of Byzantion was appointed librarian at Alexandria. It was probably after this date that he edited the text of Aristophanes Comicus, adding critical signs that later ancient editors and mediaeval scribes copied faithfully. The _semeia_ survive in many of the extant codices. Although the scholia contain a few references to Aristophanes Byzantinos, evidence that the librarian wrote a commentary is lacking.\(^3\) Kallistratos, a pupil of Aristophanes Byzantinos, is cited in notes to six of the comedies\(^4\) but this fact need not be accepted as proof that he wrote a commentary. It is quite possible that these notes derive from lecture notes made by his students.

---

3. He is cited on _Nubes_, 967, 1007, 1150; _Ranae_, 153; _Aves_, 1342, 1541, 1620.

4. _Plutus_, 179, 385, 718, 1111; _Ranae_, 92, 223, 270, 587, 588, 694, 790-791, 826, 1422; _Acharnenses_, 654; _Vespae_, 157, 213, 604, 675, 722, 904; _Ery_, 344, 1060, 1126, 1165; _Aves_, 436, 440, 530, 933, 997, 1337, 1378. He was the first to use Euphronios' _hypomnemata_ for notes to other authors.
as one critic suggests.\textsuperscript{5}

*Hypomnemata* to eight of the comedies were composed by Aristarchos as well as by Euphronios,\textsuperscript{6} although in the commentary Aristarchos is not connected with the *hypomnemata*. He is quoted for lexicography and is once adduced as a textual critic.\textsuperscript{7} Unlike Kallistratos, he was not at his best in history and politics.

Three of his pupils, Ammonios, Chairis and Apollonios, are quoted in the variorum. Ammonios, who was also a pupil of Aristophanes Byzantinos, wrote \textit{α} \textit{ευπρόγευστος}, the first prosopography of comedy. Four notes mention the work.\textsuperscript{8} Although Chairis produced some sort of commentary to

and possibly to Aristophanes, although his information is not attributed to Euphronios by the scholiasts.

\textsuperscript{5} Boudreaux, op. cit., pp. 48-51; there is no indication that Kallistratos is attacking Aristarchos for the latter's departure from the critical doctrines of Aristophanes, although he does do this in his other work.

\textsuperscript{6} *Hypomnemata* are cited on *Plutus*, 385,1037; *Ranae*, 1240; *Vesperae*, 544,969; *Pax*, 759; *Aves*, 283,556,1075,1242,1403.

\textsuperscript{7} His use of \textit{athetesis} is noted on *Ranae*, 1437-1441.

\textsuperscript{8} On *Vesperae*, 947,1238; *Pax*, 363; *Aves*, 1297.
Aristophanes, he is cited only twice.⁹ Apollonios, son of Chairis, is mentioned once,¹⁰ and there is no evidence that he did intensive work on Aristophanes.

Alexandria was not the only centre of learning where Aristophanes and Old Comedy were popular.¹¹ Four scholars at Pergamon are known to have devoted themselves to the text and content of the comedies. In addition, some of the notes written by Tzetzes acknowledge Krates. Whether this is Krates of Mallos, a Pergamene, is debatable. An Athenian Krates wrote ρεφαλλον ¹² and he may have been Tzetzes' source. Identity of other Pergamene commentators is

---

⁹ On Renae, 1028; Vespae, 672. Both notes quote him for definitions of rare words; perhaps he compiled a lexicon of unusual words in Aristophanes. Many notes deal with obscure or unfamiliar words and Chairis may have been the source for some of them.

¹⁰ On Vespae, 1232, in dispute with Ammonios over the case-form of a word.

¹¹ See White, op. cit., pp. xxii-xxv, for Alexandrian scholars who did not make studies of Aristophanes or of Old Comedy but whose work may have been excerpted for the variorum.

¹² Boudreaux, op. cit., p. 80; Krates is cited on Renae, 294; Vespae, 352,884; and in the Hypothesis to Pax.
not a problem. In the second century B.C. Demetrios Ixion, who followed Krates Mallotes' critical doctrine, wrote an exegesis of the comedies which he intended as an attack on Aristarchos' theories. The few notes excerpted from him indicate that he disagreed with Aristarchos but did not attempt a polemic.\textsuperscript{13} His ability to deal with historical allusions appears to be far superior to that of Aristarchos.

Asklepiades of Myrlaia, a scholar of the first century B.C. was like Demetrios in opposing the textual canon of Aristarchos and his circle. On Aves and Ranae are six notes that indicate marked antipathy to Aristarchean methods, although there is no direct reference to Aristarchos.\textsuperscript{14} Two other members of the school at Pergamon, Timachidas of Rhodes and Apollodoros of Tarsos, both writing in the second and first centuries B.C., produced commentaries to Ranae. Excerpts in the scholia do not show how complete Timachidas' study was, but suggest that he was a pedant of mediocre ability.\textsuperscript{15} Since

\begin{itemize}
\item On Ranae, 79, 124, 300, 970, 990, 1196; Vespae, 240; Aves, 1569; cf. Boudreaux, op. cit., pp. 82-83.
\item On Ranae, 1270, 1276, 1331, 1344; Aves, 348, 567; cf. Boudreaux, op. cit., pp. 86-88.
\item On Ranae, 55, 223, 611, 849, 1211, 1292, 1284; no two concern the same subject. Timachidas appears to have
\end{itemize}
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only one gloss recalls Apollodoros\textsuperscript{16} no conclusions can be
drawn about the quality of his annotations.

After 100 B.C. several scholars investigated tropes
in Old Comedy. Tryphon, a resident at Rome under Augustus,
is often credited with all or most of such material in the
commentary to Aristophanes;\textsuperscript{17} the excerptors name him once.\textsuperscript{18}
His was not the only work on tropes written in a period when
the complexities of grammar, prosody and lexicography occu-
pied any man with pretensions to scholarship.

Late in the first century B.C., soon after Tryphon's
work appeared, Didymos Chalkenteros compiled a variorum
excerpted from Alexandrine, Pergamene and Greco-Roman studies

attempted everything: prosody, historical allusions, etymology,
paraphrase, definition and textual criticism.

\textsuperscript{16} On \textit{Ranae}, 320; Apollodoros contributes a note about
Diogoras of Melos.

\textsuperscript{17} White (\textit{op. cit.}, pp. xlii-xliii) and Rutherford (\textit{Scholia
Aristophanica}, III, p. 200) are certain that Tryphon is the
major source. Rutherford argues principally on the basis of
style. Tryphon was heavily excerpted by Didymos, Apollonios
 Dyskulos and Herodian; they are perhaps often given credit
that belongs to Tryphon.

\textsuperscript{18} On \textit{Aves}, 877.
of Aristophanes and Old Comedy. His interests were varied. Sixty-nine references to him in the scholia quote him for history, literature, grammar, religious custom, prosody and lexicography. Apart from the direct citations many others have been assigned to him on linguistic grounds. Excerpts from his variorum are extant in Photios, Hesychios and Athenaios.

Most of the later Roman scholars quoted in the commentary confined themselves to the study of grammar. Apion, a pupil of Didymos, was at Alexandria in the first century.

Boudreaux, op. cit., pp. 96-111, is conservative in his attributions to Didymos. Schauenberg, De Symmachio in Aristophanis interpretatione subsidii, pp. 1-37, with Boudreaux, remarks upon the use of μήμπτωτι in the sense of "perhaps" by Didymos; Schneider, De veterum in Aristophanem scholiorum fontibus commentatio, p. 112, argues that Symmachos also uses μήμπτωτι in this sense and he prefers to attribute to Didymos only the notes that cite him. Schnee, Ein Beitrag zur Kritik der Aristophanesscholien, pp. 34-46, observes that Hesychios drew from Didymos' μήμπτωτι. Suidas, in turn, quotes from Hesychios. Thus, argues Schnee, excerpts in the scholia, identical with Hesychios' definitions, may well come from Didymos' commentary.
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after Christ; the scholia appeal to him twice to settle problems of syntax. Seleukos, possibly the grammarian whom Suetonius places in Tiberius' court, is also called upon twice in this capacity. Both Apion and Seleukos wrote treatises on sentence-structure; from these, probably, the notes were excerpted. Other scholia concerned with syntax have therefore been attributed to the two grammarians.

The Apollonios mentioned in several notes may be the Apollonios Dyskolos whom Priscian thought to be the finest of all grammarians.

A fourth scholar of the late Roman period is Herodian, son and pupil of Apollonios Dyskolos. He is quoted mainly for accentuation and prosody.

Colometry of the text has been attributed to

---

20 On Equites, 580; Pax, 778.
21 Tiberius, 56.
22 On Theophorizusae, 840,1175.
23 Theodorus Priscianus, Euphoristos, I,11,1. Apollonios appears on Plutus, 103; Ranae, 357,420,501,791,826, 849,963,1124,1270,1294,1338,1437; Equites, 22; Pax, 363,1126; Aves, 1242; all deal with grammatical construction or syntax.
24 On Nubes, 451; Ranae, 222,926; Equites, 22,487,1150, 1185; Vespae, 234,610; Pax, 62,70,153,415,925,1150; Aves, 877, 1680.
two writers of the first two centuries after Christ. Heliodoros (saec. I), is named in a subscript and two glosses; he is responsible for much of the colometry as we have it, although his work is probably not original. Hephaisteion, another colometrist (floruit 130-169), is quoted in a long note to Ranæ. Aristophanes of Byzantion was probably the source used by Heliodoros and Hephaisteion. There is no evidence that Hephaisteion attempted a colometry of the plays, or even a partial commentary. His Encheiridion undertook the lyrical and metrical division of solo lyric and comic passages; surely he used selections from Aristophanes to demonstrate his system of cola. The note attributed to Hephaisteion is, in all probability, taken from his book, and there may be in the scholia other borrowings from him without acknowledgement.

25 On Vespae, 1282; Fax, 1353; subscript to Nubes in codex V (see below pp. 25-26).

26 On Ranæ, 1264; the note is absent from codices RV.

27 Boudreaux, op. cit., pp. 138-143. Hense, Heliodoreische Untersuchungen, pp. 14-16, believes that Heliodoros published an edition of Aristophanes with running commentary as well as the colometry and semeia of the plays; the scant evidence does not support his thesis.
In the second century Symmachos (floruit 110 – 120), following Didymos' example, compiled a variorum. He is cited over forty times in the scholia and, in turn, identifies some of his sources, Seleukos, Apion, Herodian and Didymos. He is critical of the authorities and often quotes in order to disagree, particularly in the case of Didymos. This characteristic, fortunately, has made it possible to trace many notes through Symmachos to Didymos, and, since Didymos' commentary contained little original scholarship, to the Alexandrine and Pergamene commentators to whom Didymos was indebted. The majority of the notes that name Didymos include reference to Symmachos. Where Didymos alone is mentioned it is usually to disagree with him. Occasionally a scholion is composed of two notes, without names, the second clearly written to contradict the first. In such cases the first may be from Didymos, the second from Symmachos; the scholion, then, may be taken from Symmachos' variorum. What we have of Didymos comes probably not direct from his variorum but through Symmachos.  

---

Schnee, op. cit., pp. 35–36, 38, and 45–46. Novati, Studia di Filologia Graeca, I, argues throughout his paper that scholia in which there is no disagreement or in which Symmachos is not named nevertheless may often be ascribed to Didymos via Symmachos.
In subscripts to three comedies Phaeinōs, Symmāchōs and Ἐὐρήκης are cited. Symmāchōs we know as the compiler of the variorum. Phaeinōs is a figure of mystery whose name appears only in the scholia to Aristophanes. The six notes quoting him indicate that he may have been a grammarian, and a stupid one. Didymos has been identified tentatively as one of the Ἐὐρήκης by modern scholars who believe that the excerptors drew from Didymos' variorum directly rather than through Symmāchōs. Irenaios, Palamedes, Athenaios, Telephos of Pergamon and various others of the

29 Nubes, Aves, and Ranae in codex V have the subscript.

30 Equites, 963,1129,1220,1150,1256; he is named once in the Etymologicum Magnum (IV, p.136) in a note based on Aves, 530. His dates are unknown. White, op. cit., pp. lxviii-lxix, suggests that he lived after the third century and may have written a commentary to a few of the plays. Boudreaux, op. cit., pp. 162-163, says only that he is not of an "époque tardive." Wilamovitz puts him in the late Byzantine period (i.e., saec. XIII), which is impossible; Euripides Heracles, I, p. 181; Phaeinōs is in codex V, a manuscript that cannot be placed later than the middle of the eleventh century, or perhaps the early part of the twelfth (see below, pp. 25-26). For further bibliography see Gudeman, Grundriss der Geschichte der klassischen Philologie, pp. 79-80.
first three centuries after Christ have been suggested among the ἀλλοι. It is true that these men were grammarians, not commentators, and there is much grammatical material of a post-Alexandrian type in the marginalia. Nevertheless, to attempt certain identification seems dangerous. As evidence that Didymos was excerpted directly the subscripts are, of course, worthless.

After the middle of the third century, as interest in lexica, grammars, glossaries and encyclopaedias increased, learned antiquarians found in Aristophanes a treasury of prosody and construction, rare words and miscellaneous items about Greek religious and social customs. In turn, the commentary acquired excerpts from the handbooks. The final redaction of the scholia antiqua was completed by anonymous scholars and transcribed from time to time as marginalia to a parchment text. Shorter excerpts were added as glosses.

---


32 White, op. cit., pp. lxx-lxxii, dates the archetype to the seventh century; Boudreaux, op. cit., pp. 187-188, prefers the sixth century. Zuntz, Byzantion, XIV(1939), pp. 546-614, argues for the eighth or early ninth centuries on the basis of difference in physical arrangement between papyri and manuscripts. For further discussion see Chapter III below.
The cola and critical *sigma* and *antisigma* were copied into the codices last.

With each copy there were additions by scholars, emendation and further contamination by scribes. For a century or more such corrosive material altered the text and scholia considerably. Some scribes shortened or omitted scholia. Others could not copy the earlier hands correctly into minuscule. Ignorant "correctors" added meaningless and contradictory notes. Before the eleventh century the commentary was filled with *deteriora* and many of the *scholia antiqua* had been mutilated to make room for later notes.

Byzantine scholars undertook a reedition of the marginalia and text. At an uncertain date, possibly in the eleventh century, a Byzantine critic emended the scholia and added some good new material to make a third *variorum*.\(^{33}\) Emendation and addition continued until Johannes Tzetzes, in the twelfth century, rewrote the scholia, extirpated many *deteriora* and added notes of his own, drawn largely from Suidas, Konstantinos Porphyrogennitos and others who had used Aristophanes' work as a source for their *lexica*.\(^{34}\)

The metrical notes, dating to the later Byzantine period, were added by several men, each of whom used and

\[^{33}\] Zuntz, Byzantion, XIV (1939), pp. 570-572.

\[^{34}\] White, *op. cit.*, pp. lxxix-lxxx.
revised his predecessor's work. Manuel Moschopoulos edited and enlarged older scholia in some of the codices, concerning himself principally with syntax and paraphrase. Thomas Magister sought to add to Moschopoulos' work or to clarify it, and gave special attention to the paraphrases. He lacked Moschopoulos' interest in etymology and often turned to polemic against the earlier scholar in order to make his point. The third of this group, Demetrios Triklinios, was concerned with analysis of metrics and altered many of Magister's notes to fit his own canon. He added excerpts from Tzetzes' commentary and may have included some original glosses.\textsuperscript{35} The work of Thomas Hopfner, Sitzungsber. Ak. Wien, CLXXII, 3(1912), supplies the criteria for differentiation among the three annotators. Koster, Scholia in Aristophanes Plutum et Nubes vetera, agrees with Hopfner and disagrees with Holzinger, who proposes certain theories about "layering" of the scholia of Triklinios and would attribute to Triklinios many of the notes that Hopfner and Koster assign to Magister (Holzinger, Charis- teria Alois Rzach zum achtzigsten Geburtstag dargebracht, pp. 58-85). Koster, Mnemosyne, LX(1933), pp. 113-134, replies to Holzinger and further criticises Hopfner. Aubreton, Demetrius Triklinius et les recensions médiévales de Sophocle, pp. 55-58, agrees fully with Hopfner. In another article, Holzinger argues that Triklinius was the author of a commentary on the
and Demetrius in the fourteenth century is the last for which the scholia supply evidence before the printed edition of text and commentary published by Aldus in 1498.

CHAPTER THREE

THE MANUSCRIPT TRADITION

Over two hundred and forty manuscripts and sixteen papyri contain plays of Aristophanes in whole or in part. In twelve of the papyri and one hundred and forty of the manuscripts are scholia and glosses. To deal at length with all the codices and the textual tradition is not within the scope of this study.¹ Fifteen are of primary importance for their

¹ Most of the codices, with or without scholia, are useful to the textual critic who wishes to prepare apparatus and stemma but offer little of interest for study of the scholia. A full collation has yet to be made and critics in general share the feeling expressed by van Ijzeren, De vitia quibusdam principum codicum Aristophanorum, p. 3: Immo, optimi sunt libri manuscripti, sed hac una de causa optimi, quod ceterorum maior est nequitia; praestantes vero nemo umquam eos vocare poterit. The distinction between scholion and gloss is as follows: a scholion is a long marginal note; a gloss is a short note, never more than a sentence, often interlinear, sometimes marginal. A scholion may provide information about any subject, history, religion, prosody, grammar or myth; a gloss usually deals with lexicography, stage directions, change of speaker, brief identifications or emendations and additions to the text.
scholia. A brief discussion of each, with a general account of their relationship, is sufficient foundation for the references that will be made in later chapters.

1. R: Codex Ravennas 137,4,A (saec. X-XI)² has eleven comedies in minuscules with uncial scholia and glosses.³ The codex was in the library of Urbinas until 1482. It was used for the Juntine edition of Lysistrata and Thesmophoriazusae, but disappeared thereafter until 1712. The catalogue at the library in Ravenna states: Codices ms. Pisani omni ac translati in Classensem Bibliothecam anno 1712 mense Maio Aristophanis comicis Graecis cum Anonymi notis iis quoque grece scriptis. Codex membrum vetustiss. fol.⁴ No attempt

² For studies and editions of the manuscripts see the bibliography.

³ Van Leeuwen, Aristophanis comicis undecim cum scholiis, p. vii, dates the ms. to the latter part of the tenth century. A colophon informs us that Cyrillus Martinus of Florence, who catalogued the ms. in the Laurentian library, called R a codex of the tenth century. Martin, Les scholies du manuscripts d’Aristophane à Ravenna, étude et collation, pp. 3-4, dates the codex to the early part of the eleventh century.

⁴ Van Leeuwen, op. cit., p. vi; the information appears on p. 87 of the Ravenna catalogue.
was made to collate the manuscript until Invernizi published an imperfect and badly organised edition in 1794 at Leipzig. Since that time R has been used for all full editions of text and scholia and has become the standard with which the other codices are collated.\footnote{Many editors have been tempted to ignore Housman’s warning against “leaning on one manuscript like hope on her anchor and trusting to Heaven that no harm will come of it.”}

The scholia in R are by no means a superior collection. They were added by two scribes. One omitted parts of the commentary found in his exemplar because he refused to crowd and spoil his calligraphy. The other made omissions through carelessness.\footnote{Martin, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 4-7.} In the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries unknown “correctors” added brief scholia and interlinear glosses. As a result of omission, correction and scribal error the scholia are not of a high quality and cannot be used without reference to the “full” commentaries in other codices. Comparison with mss. of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries indicates that sources quoted by name in the exemplar often were not cited in R. Lacunae are frequent, generally in the section copied by the second scribe.\footnote{No commentary was supplied for \textit{Equites}, 216-1407; \textit{Aves}, 239-394; \textit{Lysistrata}, 376-404; and \textit{Pax}, 1039-end.} It is often impossible
to decide, without the aid of other manuscripts, where the join
has been made between an inferior and a valuable note, particu-
larly when part of the latter has been omitted. The scholia
are not completely valueless, however, for they often supply
correct readings. Codex R, in addition, is the only early
(pre-thirteenth century) manuscript that contains text and
scholia for all the comedies.

2. V: Venetus Marcianus 474 (saec. XI) is a minuscule
text of seven plays with full commentary and glosses. 8 A
colophon at the beginning of the manuscript states that it
once belonged to Cardinal Bessarion. Little else is known of
its early history except that it was in Venice until 1722. 9
The first collation of V was made by Bekker in 1818,10
although Zanetti and Bongiovanni had described and catalogued
it eighty-nine years before. 11

Three scribes wrote the text and commentary. Addi-
tions and corrections were made by a director who "literally

8 The missing plays are Acharnenses, Lysistrata,
Thesmophoriazusae and Ecclesiazusae.

9 Allen, Facsimile of Codex Venetus Marcianus 474, p.20.

10 Allen, loc. cit.

11 Allen, loc. cit.
collaborated with his staff; he recopied their character, inserted endless marginalia which they left out, and even now and then...snatches the pen from their hands and impatiently writes six lines to start a page, all the scholia on a page, or even a page or two of text.\textsuperscript{12}

The scholia and glosses are extensive, often covering more of a page than the text itself. In many cases the scholia to a line on the recto are carried over to the verso. Lemmata, numerals or signs join the text to the notes, possibly indicating that the same three systems existed without organisation of any kind in the exemplar. Use of ligatures, abbreviations and small cursive hand, irregular arrangement of scholia in relation to the text and the crowding of notes and text make the scholia difficult to read. The exact content of some adscripts is still uncertain. The effort required is worth while, however, for V preserves the most extensive and best commentary to Aristophanes.\textsuperscript{13}

\textsuperscript{12} Allen, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 14-15.

\textsuperscript{13} Cf. Allen, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 5: "The Venetus furnishes...the most trustworthy text...of the learned comment of the Alexandrine scholars on Aristophanes. In contrast with this the scholia in the Ravennas may be justly characterised as meagre, incomplete, and often incoherent....The editor...."
3. A: Parisinus 2712 (saeq. XIII) contains seven comedies\textsuperscript{14} with scholia, and glosses to Nubes and Ranae (1-159). The entire manuscript was copied by one scribe using a minuscule hand; corrections have been made by a later editor. The readings in the text and scholia often agree with and occasionally surpass those in R and V.

Most of the scholia in A are excerpted from the corpus antiquum. Among the glosses are a few notes on metre similar in content and style to those of Magister and Triklinios. The scholia have no great value as an independent commentary so long as V exists, except for the notes that are supplied to Acharnenses, which is not in V. Elsewhere A often provides the correct reading of a note where R and V have been corrupted or where V is illegible.

4. Am: Ambrosianus G 222 (saeq. XIII) contains the four "Byzantine" comedies, Plutus, Ranae, Nubes and Aves. Plutus is accompanied by scholia and glosses; the other plays have scholia only. Some adscripts have been excerpted from the scholia antiqua but the value of the codex lies in

---

omitted much valuable commentary; frequently he made his extracts so negligently or so ignorantly that the note now found in Ravennas is meaningless and would remain unintelligible but for the corrective treatment furnished by V.\textsuperscript{14}

\textsuperscript{14} Nubes, Ranae, Plutus, Equites, Vespa, Acharnenses
the fact that it contains the superscription: βιβλος ἀριστοφάνους, τις ετην φορέουσα ἰποφήτην .... In other words, it is the oldest manuscript extant with scholia by Tzetzes.

5. M: Ambrosianus L 39 (easv, XIV) has text of six comedies with scholia and glosses to five plays and part of the sixth.15 Preceding the text are two vitae and a list of the plays of Aristophanes, probably a remnant of the list made by Lykophron or Euphronios.16 The scholia were added by two hands and the glosses by three. As in A the scholia are largely excerpts from the old commentary. The glosses and Aves.

15 Nubes, Ranae, Plutus, Equites, Veapae and Aves (with scholia to 1-200).

16 Such a list, curiously enough, is not found in the earlier manuscripts. If Symmachos had the complete list in his variorum the scribes of the archetype would have included it, surely. It is possible that copyists listed only the plays extant; the commentary as we have it indicates that only eleven plays were known at the time when the archetype was made. The scribe of M added the full list, probably taken from someone other than Symmachos.
are Byzantine, of good quality and in no way similar to the
scholia deteriora so common in the late Byzantine codices.
Readings in M often agree with A, and the two codices share
many errors. Sometimes the reading of MA is correct where R
or RV err, especially in the scholia and glosses to Nubes. 17
Occasionally M corrects or enlarges a note in A.

6. Γ: Laurentianus 31,15 (saec. XIV) contains six
plays with scholia and glosses. In the prolegomena seven plays
are listed, but Lysistrata and the last folium of Aves are
missing. The text was copied by two scribes, the marginalia
by two others. A fifth added interlinear glosses. Corrections
were made by a sixth, aided by one of the scholiasts. The

His opinion of the codex is favourable: "Dem Ambrosianus M ist
mehr noch als dem Parisinus A unrecht getan worden....bei unserer
Untersuchung,...die Lesarten von M und A zur Constituirung des
Textes mit Consequenz herangezogen würden....Es ist nicht
schlechthin an alle Codices, die jüngeren Datums als RV sind,
ein- und derselbe Masstab anzulegen. M und A haben neben RV
selbständigen Wert, nur dass sie, weil eben ihr alter nicht an
das von RV hinausreicht, einen getrübteren und verderbteren
Text als diese beiden Handschriften bieten."
quantity and type of annotations vary. For example, it is clear that the scholiasts used one exemplar and the glossators another for the commentary to *Equites*. The glossators' codex had longer glosses and different lemmata. The *Ecclesiastae* has scanty notes, while there is a full commentary to *Acharnenses*. In *Acharnenses*, also, corrections are frequently made in the text and scholia, but *Vespe* and *Fex* are almost without emendation. They seem to have been copied from the exemplar by a scribe who, perhaps fortunately, had no taste for editing.

The entire commentary, in spite of variation in exemplars and copyists, is largely excerpted from good *scholia antiqua* with a few Byzantine additions. Like A and M, $\Gamma$ sometimes provides the correct reading where R and V are in error, and occasionally supplies an ancient scholion not found in the earlier codices.

7. Leidensis Vossianus 52, once 77 and 191 (*saec. XIV*), contains the last folium of *Ayes* and the complete *Lysistrata* with full scholia and glosses. In appearance the codex resembles $\Gamma$ closely. The folium of *Ayes* and the first three folia of *Lysistrata* in Leidensis Vossianus were copied by the scribe who wrote the text of *Ayes* in $\Gamma$. The scholia and

---

glosses to both plays in Leid. Voss. 52 resemble those to Aves in $\Gamma$, not only in the character of the script but in content and quality. Comparison of other details in the two codices proves that Leidensis Vossianus 52 was once part of $\Gamma$.\textsuperscript{19}

8. $\mathbb{C}$: Laurentianus 2779 (saec. XIV) contains prolegomena and text of four comedies with scholia and glosses.\textsuperscript{20} Two scribes copied the text and most of the scholia. Five glossators added marginal and interlinear notes. In the last folium Byzantine scholia were written into the commentary sometime after the text had been copied, perhaps early in the fifteenth century. The remaining scholia were excerpted from the corpus antiquum and follow V and R closely in readings and content. The glosses, added by hands other than those that copied the text and scholia, are for the most part excerpted from the commentaries of Magister and Triklinios.\textsuperscript{21} Tzetzes' notes have not been included.


\textsuperscript{20} The plays are Nubes, Ranae, Aves, and Plutus.

9. U: Urbinas 141 (saeec. XIV) contains notes excerpted from Tzetzes' commentary. The four "Byzantine" plays of U have text, glosses and scholia copied by one scribe. A superscription to the first play, Plutus, states: τοῦ σοφο-τάτου TZETZOY ἔγιγνες εἰς τὸν Ἀριστοφ. The notes in U have been badly contaminated in the exemplar,22 however, and are by no means the best remnants of Tzetzes' work.

10. Parisinus supplementum 655 (saeec. XIV) was copied at a later date than U. It contains only Plutus with scholia and glosses, which lack both the alterations made by scholars of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries and the corruptions from the exemplar. Notes on metre are particularly good and have been fully copied; numerous comments on prosody are absent from RVMA.23 Rarely, Parisinus contains a correct

---

22 White, op. cit., p. xcviii; Zacher, Jahrb. f. class. Phil., Supplementband XVI (1888), pp. 583-584. I use "exemplar" to mean the codex from which a given ms. was copied. By "archetype" I designate the ms. from which has descended a family of codices. For example, U may have u as an exemplar, while both U and u and other mss may go back to the archetype Y.

23 Zacher, Jahrb. f. class. Phil., Supplementband XVI (1888), pp. 584-585; Koster, op. cit., p. II.
reading with MA against RV.

Scholia by Thomas Magister and Demetrios Triklinios are found in five principal codices:

II. Vaticanus 1294 (saeq. XIV) contains the four "Byzantine" plays and scattered glosses. A superscription precedes the first: "Aristofane, le primo quattro Comedie, con scholio in margine sotto nome parte di Aristofane Grammatico, parte di Demetrio Triclinio, di mano del quale e scritto il libro..." Other notes indicate that the scholia are from the Encheiridion of Hephaisteion, from Platonius' περὶ διαφορῶν καταγωγῶν and περὶ διαφορῶν ἀποκατέργασιν, and from the synopsis of Aristophanes' vitae made by Thomas Magister. The notes citing Hephaisteion and Platonius were probably excerpted from a variorum rather than from the works of the two men. Magister may have added the excerpts to notes of his own which were later copied by Triklinios. On the other hand, Triklinios may have gathered excerpts from the variorum, including notes citing Aristophanes Byzantinos. These he added to scholia.

---


that he copied from Magister's commentary. In either case, scholia on metre, largely identical with those of Magister and Triklinios found in other codices, comprise the greatest part of the commentary. A few observations on history, grammar and antiquities were taken from the scholia antiqua.

12. F: Parisinus 2820 (sæc. XIV) contains Plutus, Nubes and Ranæ. Plutus has scholia and glosses copied by three scribes, one of whom continued with Nubes and Ranæ. The scholia are excerpted almost entirely from the notes of Magister and Triklinios, with a few additions from Manuel Moschopoulos. The copyist may have drawn from Triklinios and, through him, from Magister and Moschopoulos. It is possible, however, that the scribe borrowed from the notes of Magister and Triklinios separately, and from them acquired material written by Moschopoulos. 26

13. Parisinus Q Regius (Bibliothèque Nationale) 2821 (sæc. XIV) contains text of three plays with scholia and glosses. The scholia are excerpts from the antiqua, similar to scholia in V but often shorter, combined with Byzantine commentary on metre. Some believe that Thomas is sole source for the metrical notes. 27 Others suggest that the adscripts

26 Zacher, Jahrb. f. class. Phil., Supplementband XIV (1888), pp. 615, 625 and 626.

27 Zacher, Jahrb. f. class. Phil., Supplementband XIV
in Regius 2821 are from work of the youthful Triklinios while the notes in Vaticanus 1294 were borrowed from his later years. The codex has other scholia not in V, principally in the commentary to Nubes. Some are excerpts of Tzetzes' notes, some have been attributed to Moschopoulos and to other late Byzantine writers who dealt with metrics. For the most part they are like those in Vaticanus 1294.

---

XVI (1888), pp. 627 and 635-636.

28 See note 35 on pp. 20-21 above.

29 Zacher, Jahrb. f. class. Phil., Supplementband, XVI (1888), pp. 627 and 644-645. Zacher suggests that much of the commentary on metrics is from Triklinios: "Es ist daher wahr-scheinlicher, dass Tzetzes Moschopoulos und Thomas von einem vierten benutzt und auszüge aus ihnen zu einem ganzen verwebt sind. Nun zeigt die manier unserer paraphrase die grösste ähnlichkeit mit der oben...manier des Triklinius. Von Tri-klinius haben wir auch sonst in den scholien zu Q spuren gefunden, Triklinius ist der byzantinische metriker... und zu Wolken und Fröschen bietet Q reichliche metrische scholien unzweifelhaft byzantinischer herkunft - werder wir also die redaction der scholien Q nicht lieber dem Triklinius zuschreiben als irgend einem unbekannten anonymus derselben zeit?"
14. Coislinianus 192 (sae., XV), a codex in the Bibliothèque Nationale, contains the four "Byzantine" plays with scholia which, in part, derive from Magister and Triklinios. The manuscript shows clearly that Triklinios' marginalia are the emended metrical notes of Magister that are found in Vaticanus 1294 and Parisinus Q. 30 Scholia Coisliniana and scholia Vaticana are often identical; but Triklinios and Magister are frequently cited by name in the former and not in the latter. Triklinios may have used Thomas Magister, made alterations and added his own contribution to form a new commentary.

15. Cremonensis 12229 L 6 28 (sae., XV) contains three plays, Flutus, Nubes and Ranae, with interlinear glosses and scholia written in two columns. One copyist wrote the text and inner column of commentary, taking his material in the main from scholia antiqua. The outer column was added later and consists of Byzantine paraphrases and metrical notes attributed to Triklinios. 31 The Byzantine notes, despite contamination by recentissima, are not worth-

---

30 Koster, Mnemosyne, LX (1932), pp. 116-117 and 121-124.

less. Many of the paraphrases were taken from Moschopoulos and Magister and most of the metrical commentary from Triklinios. Occasionally the text and inner column of notes supply correct readings with MA against R or Rv. 32

The papyri 33 containing fragments of text or commentary are few. They do, however, throw light on the history of the text before the tenth century:

1. P. Oxy., VI, no. 856: this, the oldest extant fragment of Aristophanes, contains part of the commentary to Acharnenses, 108-671. The fragment must be dated no later than the third century after Christ. The script is a small, neat uncial with occasional abbreviations similar to those in the papyrus of Aristotle's Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία (saecl. III). Evidently there is no relation between this commentary and the scholia antiqua of Symmachos' variorum. The papyrus occasionally has a gloss on words that attract no later comment. Notes tend to be shorter than adscripts in V and, in general, scholia and glosses are less frequent.

32 Novati, Riv. di Fil., VI (1878), pp. 507-509.

2. An Oxyrhynchus papyrus published by Grenfell and Hunt in 1905 was written between 350 and 450 A.D. and has part of Equites (37-46 and 89-95) with a gloss and fragments of two scholia. The script is a cursive uncial with a few corrections added by a contemporary hand, which also inserts accents and breathings. The text is identical with that of the chief codices. The marginalia show some connexion with the scholia, particularly with the better antiqua.

3. A related fragment in cursive uncialis of the same date, reveals parts of Lysistrata (433-447 and 469-484) without scholia. One correction has been made by a second hand which may also have added the marks of elision; there are no accents or breathings and the text is not significant.

4. A papyrus from Fayum, in clear uncialis of the early fifth century, preserves a few lines of Ayes (1057-1085 and 1101-1127) with scattered glosses. For the most part the text is that of RV, with occasional correct readings where R or RV are wrong. Some of the glosses are in

---

34 Mélanges Nicole, pp. 212-217.
36 Weil, Rev. de Phil., VI (1882), pp. 179-185.
RV; a few do not appear in any of the manuscripts. It is clear from this fragment that errors in copying began early and that the exemplars of the papyri and of the manuscripts were not the same; the papyri enjoyed an earlier and perhaps different tradition.

In twelve other papyri, all of the fourth and fifth centuries, fragments of plays have been found. Where there is text, glosses and scholia are rare. Usually a marginal note is no more than two or three words in length, meant to supply a definition or give a stage direction. No papyrus containing text with full marginalia, like the manuscripts, has yet been found.

Egypt has borne one other fragment containing scholia to a comedy by Aristophanes and probably of the third century after Christ. Theramenes and the son of Skellios are named. Attempts to identify the play, however, have been unsuccessful.

Besides the manuscripts and the papyri there is a third source for the text and scholia. Suidas, the lexicographer of the tenth century, cites over four thousand words and phrases from the papyri. Sometimes he uses the text and

37 Zuntz, Byzantium, XIV (1939), pp. 545-546, 569-574 and 601-605.

and adds commentary; often he includes scholia and glosses.
From the variants in Suidas we conclude that he did not gather
these from the immediate exemplars of RV. Not seldom he
has a correct reading with V against R; infrequently he
shares with R a reading that is not in V; but commonly he
is correct against RV. His notes are closer to V than to
R. Suidas' manuscript, now lost, lies between RV and MA ≈.
His notes add little to the scholia.

Attempts to construct a comprehensive stemma have
met with failure. Almost every manuscript has good scholia
and readings for some plays and wretched notes and text for
others. Only V has scholia that are consistently good and
V lacks four plays. R has the text of all the plays but
its scholia, at best, are mediocre and lacunae are extensive.

For the purposes of this study, a summary of the
relationship among the important manuscripts is sufficient.
The first parchment archetype has been placed as late as
the ninth century and as early as the fifth. The exemplar
of the papyri could not in any instance have been the archetypal
of the manuscripts. The earliest manuscript, R, is not
consistently accurate. Its text has obviously been taken
from an exemplar that suffered at the hands of correctors
and careless scribes. Suidas (S) is often superior to R,
yet it is likely that the archetype of the codex from which
Suidas drew was the archetype of the exemplar Ravennatis.
V, also, is superior to R, yet coincides with R in so many correct readings that it surely descended from the same archetype, although not from the same exemplar. The archetype of our manuscripts, then, probably existed before the beginning of the ninth century and after the middle of the sixth century (i.e., the archetype must be later than the latest papyrus, and had text with marginal commentary, a system not practised earlier; at the same time, it must be earlier than R by at least twenty-five years). 39

Suidas' exemplar (Σ), now lost, agrees often with M, a good codex. The reading of RV or of R may be corrected by MΣ or by M alone. The exemplar of M was closely related to the exemplar Veneti and to Σ but was not a gemellus of either codex. The tradition of the archetype was

probably carried to R through one family of codices and to
V through a second, that had suffered less from error and
corruption than the ancestors of R. From one of the ances-
tors of V descended a third branch that included Suidas' 
codex and the exemplar of M.  

\[\Theta \Delta \Gamma\] are closely related to one another and
probably descend from a single exemplar (x); the variations
in text are merely differences of scribe and time. In many
readings \[\Theta \Delta \Gamma\] agree with RV or with V against R. It is
possible that V and x have a common ancestor (\(\beta\)) which
underwent various emendations at the hands of Byzantine
scholars after V was copied and before x was transcribed.
When two or three of the offspring of x agree, or when two
or three support V against R, they may be trusted. Single
codices of the x group must be used with caution.

---

40 See Buenger, De Aristophanis Equitum Lysistratae
Theamophoriazusarum apud Suidam reliquiis, pp. 100-101;
Zacher, Jahrb. f. class. Phil., Supplementband, XVI (1888),
pp. 706-708, 712-713 and 736-373.

41 Schnee, De Aristophanis codicibus capita duo,
pp. 36, 39, 42 and 45; Zacher, Jahrb. f. class. Phil.,
Tzetzes' exemplar (T) had full scholia, in some cases more extensive than the scholia in V. The corpus antiquum in manuscripts copied after the fourteenth century was probably transmitted through T. Tzetzes' scholia and text are closer to V than to R and, consequently, closely related to the commentary and text in Θ ΔΓ.

The later codices have been classed as deteriores. Many share good readings and adequate commentary with RVML and occasionally three of four stand together to supply a correct reading where the earlier manuscripts are in error. Several of the later codices are the only source that we have extant for the notes of Tzetzes, Manuel Moschopoulos, Thomas Magister and Demetrius Triklinios. These men preserved the Alexandrian metrical commentary and, in addition, provided good notes of their own.

---


43 The Byzantine notes have been of value in tracing the Byzantine commentary to other ancient authors. The work of Hopfner (see note 35 on pp. 20-21 above) on Aristophanes helped Aubreton to distinguish the Byzantine notes of Magister and Triklinios in the manuscripts of Sophokles.
CHAPTER FOUR
EDITIONS AND STUDIES

The editio princeps of text and scholia was published at Venice in 1498 by Aldus, who omitted Lysistrata (the mss. available contained poor copies of this play). The commentary, edited and corrected to some extent by Marcus Musurus, combines scholia antiqua to all of the plays and the late Byzantine notes of Magister and Triklinios to Plutus, Nubes and Ranae. The Byzantine scholia were probably excerpted from U and Ambrosianus C 222. Early scholia resemble closely the commentary in ΓΘ and in M. All the mss. employed by Musurus have not yet been identified and some may have disappeared. Recently Estensis III D 8 (saeq. XV) has been added to the group as another source for the scholia recentiora.¹ Some notes agree with readings in Suidas' lexicon, but neither R nor V was used. It is evident that the Aldine, so long as some early mss. cannot be found, serves not merely as an edition but as a valuable codex.²

1 White, Class. Phil., I (1906), pp. 266-267.
2 Zuretti, Analecta Aristophanea, reviewed by Holzinger, Bursian’s Jahresbericht, LXXI (1892), pp. 26-33;
In 1515 the Florentine Giunta press published an edition of nine plays without scholia. Thesmophoriazusae and Lysistrata appeared in a separate volume four months later, the first edition to be made with the help of R. A second edition of nine plays with scholia and glosses emerged in 1525. The scholia are largely from RV, although the editor, Francinus, did not have R at hand and had to use an apograph. The readings of the second Giuntine follow the older tradition even when it is obviously wrong. In addition to V and R, at least two others (unidentifiable) were consulted.

In 1710, Küster edited a variorum based on U, Palatinus Vaticanus 67 (saec. XV), Bodleianus (saec. XV), Arundelianus (saec. XIV), an apograph of Vossianus 77 (saec. XV-XVI) and Barocciianus 38 (saec. XV-XVI). The scholia Vossiana, never before published, contained some new readings for the text as well as a few good and unique scholia. Scholia Barocciana, mostly from Tzetzes, Magister and Triklinios, are similar in content and style to the late scholia in Coislinianus and U. Küster's edition offers little from the corpus antiquum, but is still the most convenient source for the late Byzantine notes.

Zacher, Philologus, Supplementband, VII (1899), pp. 437-530, especially 455-459.

Brunck collated some mss. in the Bibliothèque Royale for his edition of 1783. His emendations to RVM, based on variants in the new codices, are occasionally useful, often ridiculous.

Before 1830, numerous editions of scholia and text of single plays or groups had been made. The text was subjected to correction and emendation. Treatment of the commentary was not consistent: some editors omitted parts, others added arbitrarily. The best work in textual criticism was done by Dobree when, in 1820, he collated all the known mss. and added six new codices in his apparatus. He reread Arundelianus but his master collation of the scholia and glosses was terminated by his death. The task of editing the scholia passed into less critical hands.

Dindorf, in 1830, was first to edit a complete set of the scholia to all plays, basing his work principally upon RVM, Laurentianus 31,16 (Δ), Θ and codices of the later period. His edition is a variorum, rich in material, but badly organised and difficult to use. The notes are so thoroughly mitred together that it is often impossible to assign a note or a part thereof to the parent ms. if the

---

4 Besides R and V he used Parisinus (Bibliothèque Royale) 2712 with 2715, 2717, Bombycinus supplementum (Regius) 135, Regius 2820, Monacensis 492 (a transcript of R) and codex meus (D), unidentified.
latter is not R or V. The *apparatus* leaves much to be desired. Dübner presented a second edition of the *corpus* in 1842 and a third in 1877, but did little to make the scholia more convenient to use.

Since Dübner's edition no complete transcript of the commentary has been undertaken. Numerous articles and monographs have dissected scholia to single plays or scholia found in one or a few mss. Rutherford's edition and translation of the scholia in R was not favourably received; his choice of scholia had been inferior and his work was full of errors. He omitted or bracketed parts of notes and accepted readings in R that are patently erroneous. His edition demands continual reference to Dindorf.

In 1914, White prepared an excellent edition of the scholia to *Aves* as the first in a series based upon an accurate collation of all the manuscripts. He supplied a complete *apparatus criticus* and a running commentary; the introduction is a valuable addition to Aristophanic scholarship. White died before the work could progress further.

In 1888, Konrad Zacher wrote a monograph, *Die Handsschriften und Klassen der Aristophanesscholien*, which is a detailed account of the major codices that have not yet been superseded. Zacher describes RVMPA, Suidas' codex and the Aldine; he reports his study of the mss. containing notes
by Tzetzes, Magister and Triklinios, and prints apographs of their commentary to Nubes, Ranae, Equites and Plutus. His attempt to build a comprehensive stemma has been rendered obsolete by the papyri and by more recent collations. The evidence which he draws from the scholia, however, has not lost its value. His date for the archetype has been questioned but his reconstruction of it has been affected little.

White's introduction (Scholia on the Aves) surpasses that of Rutherford (Scholia Aristophanica) but is confined to the single play. It is to White that we are indebted for the most informative study of editions since 1498.\(^5\) He discussed the history of each edition, lists the mss. collated, and reviews the more important publications.

An accurate and extensive history of the early scholiasts was compiled by Boudreaux.\(^6\) His death in 1917 left his work unfinished. His respect for scholia and scholiasts, a quality lacking in White and Rutherford, has helped to make his book an important contribution to classical scholarship.

\(^5\) Class. Phil., I (1906), pp. 1-20 and 255-278.

\(^6\) Le texte d'Aristophane et ses commentateurs (Paris, 1919).
CHAPTER FIVE
EARLY HISTORY

In the plays of Aristophanes events and personalities of the fifth century predominate. He had little reason to recall early history for his audience. Naturally, the historical scholia emphasise the period between 490 and 406 B.C., although allusions to a few memorable features of the earlier age did not escape notice. The marginalia define, explain, quote sources and supply background; such expressions as Ἄρα τὴν σιλπην or ζέλλ' ἡμορέμας might have puzzled a later reader. Legend, rationalisation of myth and aetiology are as plentiful in such notes as in the ancient sources, for recorded early history is likely to be an amalgam in which lore and fact are not easily distinguished. An event which scholars once believed true later proves to be an aetiological myth; a legend, subjected to new kinds of evidence, unknown to historians of the nineteenth century, is transformed into history.

Herodotos, the Atthidographers and Aristotle received and handed on the mixture that was Greek History before 500 B.C. The scholiasts took much from these sources, whether directly or otherwise.

The word Παρθένε, written by the poet in Vespae (1271-1273), inspires the scholiast to a definition and a
brief historical footnote:

πευέσται δὲ λέγεσθαι φασὶ τὸ θητικὸν παρὰ τοῖς Θεσσαλίσι. ἔθνος δὲ ἦν πάλαι ἀπὸ Πευέστου τὴν ἐπωνυμίαν ἔχον, ὡς ἀνέφερε τὸ γένος εἰς Θεσσαλίν τὸν Ἡρακλέους. δέουν οὖν εἰπεῖν μετὰ τῶν πολιτευμένων συνήν, εἰπε μετὰ τῶν Πευέστων, ἀντὶ τοῦ μετὰ τῶν πεντήκων. καταλελυμένον γὰρ ἦν ἐκεῖνο τὸ σύστημα τῶν Πευέστων, καὶ λοιπὸν οἱ πένητες καὶ οἱ θῆτες Πευέσται ἐκαλοῦντο.

Plato (T224) mentions the relation between Πευέσται and Herakleia and compares their position to that of the Helots under Spartan rule. Like the scholiasts he calls them an ἔθνος.

The comparison between Helots and Πευέσται is noted by Aristotle (Politics, 1269a 37). Elsewhere, Philokrates (T80) supplies a brief history of the Πευέσται who were enslaved as a result of capture in war, not racial strain; they were the pre-Thessaliote inhabitants of Perrihaibía and Magnesia.

A more detailed history was given by Archemachos in the Eubolika (T35). Inhabitants of Arne or Arnaia, rather than move from their homes into Boiotia, voluntarily enslaved themselves to the conquering Thessalians in return for promise of dwelling and protection.

The origin of the name Πευέσται did not concern
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relation was to the Thessaliotes did not rouse the scholiasts' interest; part of the note summarises Theopompos and Archemachos. In a scholion to Theokritos (T253) is another discussion of πίνηται in which a connexion with πίνηται is made. Implied, rather than expressly stated, this information is also given by Aristotle (T676 and Suidas(T251); they were called πίνηται because of their misfortunes and because of the labour required of them. Πίνηται were, like the πίνηται, not a happy group, even though the latter were enslaved at their own wish.

A scholion to Nubes (133) bears some relation to the note about πίνηται. Here it is the scholiasts' intention to explain the history of οὐλίται κόρακας:

ἀπεκτείνει κόρακας. ἔστι δὲ παροιμία ἐπὶ κατάρας λεγομένη... Βοιωτοὶ γὰρ ἀναστάτοις ἦσαν ἡθούμενοι καὶ περὶ ἀποκλίσεως μαντευομένους εἶπεν ὁ θεὸς ἐκεῖ κατοικεῖν, ἐνθα δὲ ἰδὼν λευκὰν κόρακα. οἱ δὲ ἐν θεταμένῃ παρά τῶν Παγασσεικῶν κόλπων εἶδον περιπταμένους τῶν τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος λεροῦ κόρακας, ὥς παιδεῖς ἀφήκαν γυψώσαντες ὑπὶ μέθης, καὶ τελείωσαν τὸν χρησμὸν φήσαντες ἐνταῦθα κατάκησαν. οἱ δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἱδίου λέγοντι τὴν παροιμίαν φασίν. ἐν γὰρ τοῖς ἐρημοτέροις τόποις ἐπὶ τῆρετ τὰ πτώματα.
The note is repeated to explain *Plutus* (604).

A similar explanation of θάλς κόρεμα was included by Apostelis (T32) in his lexicon. He adds that the Boiotians were later pushed from the land around the Pagasitic Gulf by the Aiolians and the area formerly inhabited by them came to have unpleasant connotations.¹

As an explanation of θάλς κόρεμα the three accounts are clearly aetiological. As notes on early Greek wanderings they may hint at the truth.

Thucydides (I, 12, 2-3) recalls that there were stasis in some Hellenic cities upon the return of the Greeks from the Trojan War. Sixty years after the end of the War the Boiotians were driven from Arne into the Kadesia by Thessalians. The traditional date for the fall of Troy is ca. 1183 (Eratosthenes). The Marmor Parium sets it earlier, in 1208. Thessalio activities against the Arneians would, then fall between 1148 (the upper limit) and 1123 (the lower). Archaeologically, Thessalian and Dorian cultures in Aiolic Greece may have intruded in the second half of the twelfth

¹ Cf. an unknown lexicographer, copied in Codex Monacensis Graecus 263 (Rupprecht, Philologus, Supplementband, XV (1922), p. 132): the Boiotians were told by the god to migrate to where they found white ravens, they obeyed, the new land was "Korakas" and in later times, after the Aiolians had
century.² Dialect and archaeological investigations point to a culture in Thessaly, in the general area of the Pagasitic Gulf, that has close relation to Boiotian and Thessalian civilisation in the Late Bronze Age.³

Herodotos (VII, 176, 4) states that Thessalians came originally from the Aeolic land of the Thesprotians. Linguistic similarities between Thessalian and Boiotian groups suggest to Gomme that the Boiotians were earlier emigrants from Epeiros. The few artifacts and sherds of the Middle and Late Bronze Age from south central Epeiros resemble pieces of the Late Bronze Age found in Thessaly.⁴

 driven the Boiotians away, exiles and criminals were sent there. Cf. also Suidas, s.v. θηλωκας; the Boiotians originally lived at Arne and were sent θηλωκας by the god.


⁴ Kaeust, s.v. Epeiros, in P.W., R.E.; Hammond, B.S.A., XXXII (1931-1932), pp. 131-179. Since our knowledge of Northern and Western Greece is still extremely scant, the archaeological argument must not be pressed. Furthermore, the last extensive excavations in Thessaly were done forty years ago;
Thucydides, Herodotos, archaeology and dialect support the scholia thus far quoted concerning the migration of people to an area around the Pagasitic Gulf at Arnaia where they remained until later migration forced all of them, except those willing to serve the new masters of the land, southward from Thessaly into Boeotia. One scholion attributes the original push that sent the Arneians down to the Pagasitic Gulf to Thracians.

Another note that mingles fact with legend explains the phrase Βάττου σύλφιον in Plutus (925):

Βάττους Κυρήνην ἐκτισεν, ἐλθὼς ἀπὸ Θῆρας, τῇ κατὰ Κρή την υἷον· ἐν τιμήσαντες Λιβνεὶ ἐχάρισαντο ἀβτῷ τῷ κόλλιστον τῶν λαχάνων τὸ σύλφιον, καὶ ἐν νομίσματι αὐτῶν ἐξάραγαν, τῇ μὲν βασιλείᾳ, τῇ δὲ σύλφιον παρά

cf. Blegen, B.S.A., XLVI (1951), pp. 20 and 24, especially 24: "Innumerable untouched preclassical sites still exist in Greece. Surely one or several could be found, perhaps in Thessaly, Boeotia, and the Peloponnesos, the systematic excavation of which in the light of present knowledge might yield answers to many of the problems that confront us.... No major excavation in this field has been undertaken for a decade. It is time to call on the spade again."
τῆς πόλεως δεχόμενον, ὡς Ἀριστοτέλης ἐν τῇ
Κυρηναίων πολιτείᾳ ἔνθεν καὶ ἡ παροιμία ἐπὶ τῶν
dιαφόρων καὶ ἐξόχους τιμᾶς δεχομένων. Ἀλλωσ.
sίλφιον βοτάνη πολυτίμητος· ἡ δὲ σίτια τοιαύτη
ἔστὶ. Βάττος, ὁ καὶ Ἀριστοτέλης, πόλις ἐν Διβθῃ
Κυρηνῆς λεγομένην ἔκτισε κατὰ τὸν δοθέντα αὐτῷ παρά
tοῦ Ἀπολλωνοῦ χρησμοῦ· καὶ οἱ πολίται οἱ Κυρηναῖοι
ἀνταπόδοσιν τῆς εὐεργεσίας βουλόμενοι χαρίσασθαι
τῷ βασιλεῖ, ἐποίησαν δακτύλιον, ἐν ᾗ ἡ πόλις αὐτῶν
προσφέρει τῷ βασιλεῖ τὸ σίλφιον. καὶ τὸ φύλλον ἐν
αὐτῶ καὶ ὁ καρπὸς καὶ ὁ καυλὸς καὶ ὁ ὀψὶς καὶ
ἄκλως τὸ πᾶν αὐτὸν πολλής τιμῆς ἄξιόν ἔστιν. καὶ
οἱ Ἀμπελιώται ἔνθεν Διβθῆς, εἰς Δελφοὺς
ἀνέβασαν καυλὸν σίλφιον, ὡς φησὶν Ἀλεξανδρίδης.
.... ὁμοία κύριον τὸ κοινὸς βάλσαμον. ὁ Βάττος
οὗτος ἔκτισε τὴν Κυρηνῆν, ἔνθα τὸ σίλφιον γίνεται,
οὗ ὁ ὀψὶς πολλὸς ἄξιός ἐστι. τιμῶντες οὖν αὐτὸν
οἱ Κυρηναῖοι ὡς ἀρχηγήτην, χρυσὸν αὐτοῦ τὴν
εἰκόνα πεποιημένην, τὸ σίλφιον ἐν τῇ δεξιᾷ
φέρουσαν, λίθους καὶ μαργάριτας κεκοσμημένους. λαμβ
βάνεται οὖν εἰς παροιμίαν τὸ τοῦ Βάττου σίλφιον ἐπὶ
tῶν πολυτελῶν.

Earliest mention of Battos of Kyrene is in the
fourth and fifth Pythian Odes of Pindar. Battos, according
to Findar (T219), was seventeenth in descent from Euphemos, son of Poseidon. He founded Kyrene and the Kyrenaian cult of Battos (T217, T219, T220). His grave lay on the outskirts of the agora at Kyrene where he was worshiped in Findar's time as oikistes (T222).

Herodotos gives a lengthy account of the founding of Kyrene (IV, 150-160) based on two versions of Battos' story, the Theraian and the Kyrenaian. In the first Grinos of Thera was told by the Delphic oracle to found a city in Libya. When he declared himself too old, the task was assigned to the young Battos who had accompanied him. Once home, Battos forgot the oracle until a seven-year drought forced him to return to Delphi where the oracle reminded him of the task unfulfilled. With a Phoinikian as guide, a few Theraians set out, reached Platia off the coast of Africa and colonised it.

The Kyrenaian version differs. Battos was the son of Phronima and was so called because he had a lisping and stammered. Herodotos prefers to define Καττός as the Libyan word for "king," first used in address to him by the Pythian priestess at Delphi who gave him the oracle that he should colonise Libya. After various misadventures including a drought at Thera, two unpleasant years on Platia and a second oracle, Battos settled Kyrene, where he reigned for forty years.
Schol. Kallimachos (T167) tells us that Battos settled Kyrene only after a battle with some fierce lions. In the course of the encounter he was so frightened that he regained his powers of speech and was able to cry for help. He thus fulfilled both predictions made by the oracle.

Diodoros (VIII, 29) quotes in full the oracle given to Battos at Delphoi. He goes on to describe Battos' just rule of Kyrene in contrast to the harsh despotism of his son Arkesilaos (VIII, 30), a reflection of Pindar's earlier praise for Battos.

Justin(XIII,7) summarises the "Kyrenaian" story reported by Herodotos although he calls Grinnos the father of Battos where Herodotos indicates no relationship. Unique among the sources, Justin declares that Battos' real name was Aristaios. From Pindar on, reference to Battos included regularly an attempt to supply his original name, Aristaios or Aristoteles. The historian Akesandros declares that Eurypylos, king of Libya, married the woman Kyrene. Two

Ancient writers and later excerptors state that Battos' name was Aristoteles. The scholia to Aristophanes and Diodoros, however, mention Aristoteles as a separate figure who was companion to Battos at Delphoi and on the voyage to Kyrene. Herodotos offers no information. Pindar is earliest to equate Aristoteles and Battos.
sons, Antouchos and Aristaios, were born to them. 6 Again the confusion of two similar names connected with Kyrene is evident. It is impossible to know which should be rejected; earlier writers prefer Aristoteles. A careless or hurried copyist might easily have read "Aristaios" for "Aristoteles", particularly if he were translating Greek into Latin.

The name Κατταρος to Herodotos means "king," to the Kyrenaicans "stammerer." Suidas implies the meaning "king" in his phrase Ἐνευέεια Κατταρος. Like Herodotos, Hesychios (T30) defines Κατταρος as the Libyan word for "king." In another note (T31) Hesychios rationalises the tale of Battos, cikist and king, by equating Κατταρος with the Kyrenaican word for "great honour!" A man described as Κατταρος was as superior among men as was "silphion" among plants; hence the phrase for the highest honour a man could be given.

On Battos and silphion Suidas has three notes. A short explanation (T244), similar in content to Hesychios’, connects the name with the great honour given to one of the Battai by the Kyrenaicans, who were so pleased with him that they made silphion his personal emblem. That they used silphion as a coin motif and that they sent plants to the

---

6 Schol. Apollonios Rhodios, II, 498; cf. T31 which names Aristoteles as founder of a colony in Libya.
god at Delphi showed in what esteem the Kyrenaians held the 
local crop. Another note of his, excerpted from the scholia 
to Aristophanes, describes silphion and mentions Battos as 
the founder of Kyrene. Elsewhere, Suidas gives a third account 
of Battos (Aristoteles), borrowed for the most part from the 
scholion to Aristophanes and from Hesychios (T131).

The great tribute paid to Battos by the Kyrenaians 
in the form of a rich gift is remarked twice in the scholion. 
Pausanias (X, 15, 6) reports that a chariot with Battos' image 
in it was sent as a gift to Delphi. Others speak of Battos' 
good leadership without reference to gifts. Pindar alone 
indicates that there was a cult of Battos.

The date of Kyrene's founding is still in doubt. 
Any year between 690 and 650 will satisfy Herodotos. Archaeo-
logy brings us no closer. It offers evidence of Greek culture 
and influence not too long before the mid-seventh century, 
but whether trade or settlement is responsible cannot be 
declared. In any case the story of Battos does not seem 
hoary with age and may be close to the truth. Certainly 
there are few improbabilities. The oracle is post eventum 
and details in Herodotos and others cannot stand close 
investigation; the scholiasts include none of them, and 
merit trust.7

-----------
7 Cf. Meyer, s.v. Battos, and Broholm, s.v. Kyrene, 
in P.W., R.E.
Aristophanes' quotation of a familiar proverb gave the scholiasts an opportunity to discuss early Ionian history. In *Plutus* (1002) is the line "πάλαι ποτ' ἦσαν ἀλκιμοῖοι Μίλησιοι. Annotators made use of varied traditions in explanation:

tinēs faisin, ὅτι ἐν τοῖς παλαιοῖς χρόνοις ἴσχυρο-
tatoi ἦσαν οἱ Μίλησιοι καὶ ὅποι προσετίθεντο πάντως ἐνίκων. Πολυκράτης οὖν ὁ Σάμιος συγκροτῶν πόλεμον πρὸς τινα ἢθέλησεν αὐτοῦς λαβεῖν εἰς συμμαχίαν, καὶ εἰς τὸ μαντεῖον ἀπῆλθεν ἐρωτήσαν περὶ τούτου· ὃ δὲ θεὸς ἔχρησεν

"ἤσαν πότ' ἦσαν ἀλκιμοῖοι Μίλησιοι.

"irmedos. περὶ τῆς παροιμίας ταῦτης Δήμων οὕτω φησί

"τῶν Καρθήν περὶ τοῦ πολέμου πρὸς τὸν Ἀμπρακίωντα βουλευσαμένων, ἀλκιμωτάτους ὡτας τῶν ἐν πολέμῳ γειτῶν, τινας χρῆ ποιεῖν θὰ συμμάχους, οἱ μὲν τοῦς Μιλησίους ἤγοντο δεῖν παρακάλεῖν· καὶ γὰρ εὐθυμέρουν τότε μάλιστα τῶν περιοίκων καὶ διὰ τὸ γειτονίαν τῆς Κάρια τῆς τοτῶν χώρων· οἱ δὲ δια-
λόθος εἶναι πρὸς τοὺς Πέρσας συνεβολευον, τὴν τοτῶν ἀρχὴν μεγίστην γεγονέναι φάσκοντες καὶ πάντων ἀλκιμωτάτους εἴναι κρατοῦσας τῆς 'Ασίας. ἔδοξεν οὖν τοῖς Καρθή συμφόρησα τὸν Ἀπόλλωνα πότεροι τῶν χρησιμῶν ὀρθῶς ἐκλαμβάνουσι. τὸν δὲ
θευν ἀποκρίνασθαι
pálai ποτ' ἦσαν ἄλκιμοι Μιλήσιοι.
toῦ δὲ χρήσμοι διαδοθέντος εἰς τὰς Άσιάτιδας πόλεις,
oi μὲν Μιλήσιοι τὴν προφήτην αἴτιασάμενοι διεφθάρθαι
χρήσασιν ὑπὸ τῶν μηδίζωτων πανδημεί τοῖς Καροί βοηθήσαντες, καὶ τοῖς Πέρσαις μετ’ ἐκείνων συμβαλόμενες,
σχεδόν ἀπαίτησι ἀπέθανον. τὸν δὲ χρησμὸν διὰ τὴν
ἀλήθειαν εἰς παροιμίαν ἔλεγεν φασὶ." Ἀλλὰς.
ἰσχυρὸν ποτ’ ἦσαν οἱ Μιλήσιοι, ὡς καὶ Ἀδακρέων φησὶ.
pολεμομένους γὰρ Κάρας ὑπὸ Δαρείου τοῦ 'Υστάσπου,
tοῦτον λαβεῖν τὸν χρησμὸν, πυθανομένους εἰ πρὸς
λάβοντι συμμάχους τοὺς Μιλήσιους.... εἴρηται δὲ ἡ
παροιμία ἐπὶ τῶν πρῶτων μὲν εὐδαιμονοῦται νῦν δὲ
ἀτυχοῦσιν.... οἱ Μιλήσιοι πάλαι ἐπὶ ἀνδρὶς θαυμαζό-
μενοι, καὶ σύμμαχοι τοῖς βουλομένοις ἐγίγνοντο.
ἐλέγχετε ὅμως τινὲς εἰς τὸν 'Απὰλλωνα, καὶ πυθανο-
μένοι αὐτοῦ, εἰ δὲ Μιλήσιους συμμάχους λαβεῖν, χρησμὸν
ἐλαθοῦν, ὅτι "πάλαι ποτ' ἦσαν ἄλκιμοι Μιλήσιοι!
ἐπεκράτησε δὲ τούτο εἰς παροιμίαν.

Elements of the story go back at least to Herodotos.
In the fifth book of his history he tells how the Karians
fled from Dareios and took refuge in the temple of Zeus at
Labranda. There they discussed whether it would be better
to surrender to Dareios or to leave Asia. Some Milesians
happened to visit the shrine, heard of the Karians' plight
and offered to help them fight the Persians. Battle was
joined and the Milesians were utterly routed (V, 118-121).

The account given by Demon in the scholion is similar, in outline, to Herodotos', but details vary: the Karians were fighting the Ambrakiotes and sought an ally, Persia or Miletos. Diodoros' epitomiser (X, 25) agrees with Herodotos, with the addition of the oracular saying that became a proverb.

The version given by Zenobios has the same elements (T 256). The Karians were at war with Dareios and sought Miletos as an ally, but received an oracle warning them of Miletos' danger. Like the scholiast, Zenobios attributes the proverb in its final form to Anakreon.

In Strabo's report (XIV, 659) there is a clue, also contained in Herodotos' work, to Demon's statement that the Karians were about to move against the Ambrakiotes, neighbours of Karia. Strabo describes the location of the oracle of Zeus Stratios at Labraunda; Herodotos says that the Karians had fled to Labraunda for asylum. Παντωκράτορ as may be a misreading of Παντόκρατος. The same explanation might also account for Παντοκράτος in Zenobios' story.

That Polykrates was involved, as the scholion states, other writers do not say. So far as we know from other sources, Polykrates was not closely involved with Miletos at any time. 8

8 That the scholiast confused the activities of
The differences between the story told by Demon and those of Herodotos, Diodoros, Strabo and Zenobios may be explained in several ways. Demon's version is not unlike Herodotos' although it has suffered contamination. Demon made minor alterations; he did not use his sources carefully or he misinterpreted them. Demon writes that the Karians argued whether to ally themselves with Miletos or Persia. At the end he reports that "almost all of the Milesians were killed by the Persians." This does not seem to follow closely upon the rest of the report if it is assumed that one event, the defeat of Miletos, resulted from the alliance of Miletos with Karia against some enemy, not Persia. It is entirely possible that some time passed between the moment when the oracle was given to the Karions, who may or may not have taken heed, and the eventual fall of Miletos at Persian hands. The final statement may have been an afterthought, included to prove that the oracle had predicted truly.

Another scholion which combines legend with what may be history supplies information about the Greek festival called Apatouria. To explain an allusion in Acharnenses (146) a description of the celebration and two reasons for its naming are given:

---

Polykrates with Samos' later alliance with Miletos at the time of the Ionian revolt is unlikely. Perhaps the scholion is right.
λέγει δὲ νῦν περὶ Ἀπατορίων, ἐνερτή ἐπισήμων δημοτελοῦσα, ἀγομένης παρὰ τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις κατὰ τὸν Πυανεψίωνα μὴν ἐπὶ τρεῖς ἴμερας. καλοῦσι δὲ τὴν μὲν πρώτην ὀδρψεως, ἐπειδὴ φράτορες ὅσια συνελέβοντο εὐσχῶντο. τὴν δὲ δευτέραν ἀνάρρυσιν, ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀναρρυσίν, τοῦ θεοῦ. ὥσπον δὲ Δίῃ φρατρίῳ καὶ Ἀθηναῖ. τὴν δὲ τρίτην κοπρεώτιν, ἀπὸ τοῦ τόδε κοσμίου καὶ τὰς κόρας ἐγγράφειν εἰς τὰς φρατρίας. ἐν ἡ ἐγράφη ἐν τῇ πολιτείᾳ οὐ οἶδε Σιτίλκους. ὡς αὐτίς, πόλεμος ἡ Ἀθηναίοι πρὸς Βοιωτοὺς περὶ Κελαινῶν, ὡς ἡ χωρίς ἐν μεθορίοις. Σάρθος δὲ Βοιωτὸς προεκαλέσατο τὸν Αθηναίων βασιλέα θυμοίτην. οὐ δεχόμενον δὲ, Μελανθός εἰκοδημῶν, Μεσθυὸς τὸ γένος ἀπὸ Περικλημένου τοῦ Πηλέως, ὑπέστη ἐπὶ τῇ βασιλείᾳ. μονομαχοῦσιν δὲ, ἐφάνη τῷ Μελανθῷ τὸς ὀπίσθεν τοῦ Σάρθου, τραγὴν, τοῦτόσιν αἰγίδα μελαιωμαν, ἐνημερώσατο. ἐφὶ οὖν ἄδικεὶν αὐτῶν δεύτερον ἴκουτα. ὡς ἐπεστράφη. ὡς παῖσας ὀποιτείνως αὐτῶν. ἔκ τοῦ τῶν ἐν τῇ ἐσχίσματι Ἀπατορίᾳ καὶ Διονυσίων μελαναγιδῶν βωμῷ ἐσωμάκασαντο. οἱ δὲ χάσιν ότι τῶν πατέρων ὑμῶν συνερχομένων διὰ τὰς τῶν παῖδων ἐγγραφὰς οἴον διομα- πατρία λέγεσθαι τὴν ἐσχίσματι. ὅποιῳ τρόπῳ λέγομεν ἄλοχον τὴν ὁμβλεκτρον, καὶ ἀκοιτίν τὴν ὁμοθοιτείν, οὕτω καὶ Ὀμοπατρία Ἀπατορία.
only a version of the history of the name is included, a conversation between the protagonists is inserted, perhaps to make the tale more vivid, and the order of days in the festival is different; the scholiasts refer to the note to Acharnenses (146).

Herodotus is twice preoccupied by the celebration. The Egyptians, he says, sacrifice a pig to Dionysos on the eve of Dorpeia (II, 48, 1). In all other respects, however, Apatouria is an Ionian festival held by the eastern Greek cities and the islands as well as by the communities on the mainland (I, 147, 2).

A like description and history are given by the annotators of Plato's Timaeus (T226) and Symposium (T225). Hesychios' only reference to the festival (T135) defines Dorpeia as the first day of Apatouria. Suidas gives a long definition, excerpted from the scholion to Acharnenses, including the reference to Dionysos Melanaigis. In all but a few details and some minor omissions Suidas' note and the scholion are the same.9

In the Anecdota the names of the three days of the Apatouria are defined and followed by the story of the battle between Xanthos and Melanthos for supremacy over borderland.10 Nothing is added except appeals to Homer and Epicharmos


further to explain ἀνάγγελον and κοιμᾶτος.

In the note to Pax the scholiast places ἀνάγγελον as the last day of the festival; for Acharnenses, Plato's scholiasts, Hesychios and the Anecdota ἀνάγγελον is the second day. The variant may be insignificant. Since the purpose of the three-day celebration was the enrollment of boys in the phratries, the κοιμᾶτος, or day for enrollment, would probably have come last as the climax to feasting and sacrifices.

The other element in the scholia, the combat between Xanthos and Melanthos, won by Athens through an ἱστόρια, appears frequently later. Earlier, Herodotos refers to Melanthos as a Pylian, the father of Kodros, and a king of Athens (I, 147, 1); both Melanthos and Kodros were Neleids (V, 65, 3).

While Melanthos and Kodros are well known to earlier writers, including Aristotle and the Atthidographers, only in later accounts is the full story of the battle reported. The scholia to Plato are similar to schol. Acharnenses (146). Polyaiinos (T230) adds that an oracle, correctly interpreted by Melanthos, helped him to defeat the Boiotian king.

Melanthos was an ancestor of the Medontidae, according to Pausanias (IV, 5, 10), who assigns the dubious honour of encompassing Xanthos' death to Andropompos (IX, 5, 16).
No other source, early or late, considers Andropompos for this role. The only other mention of the name is in the chronicle of Eusebius who states (under 1131 B.C.) that Andropompos was father of Melanthos, the victor at Kelainai. The success of Melanthos, he adds, established the Medontiai, Melanthos and his son Kodros, as a new dynasty in Athens.

Probably the story as a whole is aetiological, an attempt to explain two phenomena: the origin of Apatouria and the succession of the Neleidai to the throne. The connexion of the battle and Apatouria may be ephemeral; the correct explanation is probably that supplied by the scholiasts in the alternate version. Apatouria developed linguistically from διαπατοφα, since the κοινωτις seems always to have been the main purpose of the festival.

Whether there is any history here is another matter. Variations are minute but numerous. Melanthos is son of Andropompos in one version; in another, son of Periklymenes and grandson of Neleus. In all accounts except one he is called a Messenian, from Pylos; schol. Pax calls him an Arkadian. He is made, variously, the king of Athens, a trusted general for the king Thymoites or a Messenian who received the kingdom for his clever deed. Much of the story, surely, is legend: the battle between light (Ξύνδος) and dark (Μαλιτόνδος) for some important possession is common to folk-tradition in many countries. Further, the tale has local
interest, for Melanthos was eponymous of the deme Melainai.

The territorial dispute, however, may be historical. Following the year 508 the Athenians and Boiotians were involved in border disputes near Hysiai and Oinoi, at the time when Kleomenes seized Eleusis (Herodotos V, 74, 2). The scholia to Plato state that Oinoi was the scene of battle between Athens and the Boiotians. The Μελαιναῖον(Μελαιναῖον)Χώρονορ borderland in schol. Acharnenses and schol. Paxy is the later deme of Melainai. On the map of Attike, Melainai neighbours on Oinoi. The location, then, may be that of the battle which the Athenians won in 508/7.

In a note to Nubes (984) the scholiasts relate that the oldest Athenians plaited τέττιγας of gold into their hair. Thucydides (I, 6, 3) is named as the source:

άρχαιον τὸ τοῦτο τέττιγας ἀναπλέκειν τουτέστι τοῦς κρω-βέλους. "Ἀλλάς. οἱ ἀρχαιότατοι τῶν Ἀθηναῖων τέττιγας χρυσοῦς ἐν τοῖς τῶν τρικών πλέγμαιν εἶχον, διὸς οἱ τέττιγες μοισικοὶ ὤστε, ἀνάκεινται τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι. ὡς ἡ πατρίνη τῆς πόλεις. τὰ δὲ Διακόλεια τῶν ἀρχαιότατων ἐσφαλμένα, τὰ καὶ Διάσπα. οὕτως δὲ ἔλεγεν ὃ τῷ πολλεῖ Διὶ ἔθετο. τοῦτο δὲ τέττιγας παρέλαβεν, ἔπειδὴ οἱ πάλαιοι κατὰ τὴν ἀναπλοχή τῶν τριχών χρυσῶν ἔχρων τέττιγα, τεκμηρίων τοῦ φαίνεσθαι ὧτι αὐτόχθωνες εἶναι οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι, ὡς καὶ οἱ τέττιγες. καὶ Ἑλληνιδῆς
"καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι αὐτοῖς τῶν εὐδαιμόνων οὐ πολὺς χρόνος ἔπειθε Χιτωθάς τε λυνοῦσ ἐπικύσατο φοροῦντες, καὶ χρυσῶν τεττιγες ἐν ἔρισι κραβόλων ἀναδομομοι τῶν ἐν τῇ κεφαλῇ τριχῶν!"

In one gloss the scholiasts to *Nubes* equate the τέττιγες with the κραβόλος; elsewhere, the two are treated as separate adornments.

To explain an allusion in *Equites* (1331) the scholiasts repeat the information, adding that it was an ancient custom for well-born boys and men to wear their hair decorated with τέττιγες and κραβόλοι. Again, the source is Thucydides. Herakleides Pontikos adds that the victors of Marathon were allowed to wear τεττιγες in their hair. It may well be that the word πρεσβύτερος in Thucydides refers not to older men of the last generation, but to older men in each generation down to the time of the Peloponnesian War. *Schol. Equites* (1331) implies that the custom was ancient; if they came of good family, men and boys were permitted to wear τεττιγες; *schol. Nubes* (934) agrees.

A few of the notes dealing with early history supply information about events so well known to the earlier Greek

11 Athenaios, XII, 512 b-c.

authors that we have considerable evidence against which to check them.

The phrase ἐκ τῶν Ἀλεπειῶν Ἐκίτες (445) is explained by a long account of the Kylonian revolt:

tῶν μετεχθυτῶν τοῦ Κυλωνείου αὐτοῦ, ὑπὲρ εἰς τὴν Ἀθηνᾶν δοκεῖ γενέσθαι ἀσβεσμα, ἐπειδὴ ἤκουσεν οἱ συγκατακλεισθέντες τῷ Κύλωνι ἐν τῇ ἀκροπόλει εἰς τὴν κρίσιν κατέβησαν ἐν Ἀρείῳ πάγῳ, ἐπὶ τοῦ ἐδούσ τῆς θεοῦ ἔξω ἀφανεῖς τὴν ἴνατην. ἦς διαρροεῖσθαι, λέοντος αὐτοῦ ἐβαλλον οὗ Ἀθηναῖοι. ἀληθηρῶν ὑπὲρ ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐναγών, ἀληθηρῶν: τῶν ἀμαρτησάντων εἰς Ἀθηνᾶν. Κύλων γὰρ Ἀθηναίος ἄνθρωπος, μεγαρίδα γυναικα γῆμας θεαζόμενος θυγατέρα, θέλων τυραννεῖν, ἐλαβε χρήσμων τῇ μεγάλῃ ἐφορτή τοῦ Διὸς ἐκείθεσθαι τῇ πόλει. ἐν Ὀλυμπίᾳ ἀπὸ ἐκεῖθεν, νομίζων ταύτην εἶναι μεγάλη ἐφορτήν, ὄνειρων προσλαβῶν πάρα θεαζόμενος, μὴ γυναῖκες τὰ τὰς Δίας ἡμῖν ἢ μεγάλη ἐφορτή. ἐκείθεν τῇ ἀκροπόλει ἐλήματεν καὶ ἀλικεται. ἐλήφθη δὲ συλῶν τὸν χαραὶ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς καὶ σύνοιτο μὲν ὁ Κύλων φεβεύει, τοὺς δὲ ἄλλους φοινεύει, τινὰς δὲ μὴν ἴκετας ἐκ τῶν βωμῶν ἀποσκοπάντοις ἀπέκτειναν. τοὺς οὖν ἀμαρτάνοντας εἰς τοὺς ἴκετας ἀληθηρῶν ἐφασχόντος ὁμοίως καὶ ἐξέβαλον τῆς πόλεως, δὴ τοὺς ἀρχαίων νόμων παρέβησαν τοὺς ἴκετας φοινεύσαντες.

"Ἀλλας. Κύλων τὴν ἀκρόπολιν κατέλαβεν ἐπὶ τυραννίδι.
καὶ ἐλήφθη ποτὲ συλλήφθη τὸ λαέρκη τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς. καὶ
ὑπὸ Ἀθηναίων ἐκλείσθη. καὶ σύνων ἐκεῖνος εὐρῆ
καιρὸν, φυγὴ ἔχοντων. καὶ οἱ φίλοι ἔφυγον εἰς τοὺς
βωμοὺς τῶν θεῶν. οὓς σύντοι ἀποσκάπτοντες ἀπέκτειναν,
ἐθεῖν ἀλήθροι ἐκλήθησαν.

Herodotos' report (V, 71) is similar, but contains
two variants. According to him the prytaneis of the naukrar-
ies, not the archons, seized and killed the revolutionists.13
Also Herodotos omits the oracle and the relationship between
Kylon and Theagenes of Megara.

Resemblance between the scholion and the story told
by Thucydides (I, 126, 2-12) is very close. Both mention
Kylon's Megarian connexions, both speak of the oracle and
Kylon's unfortunate misinterpretation of it and both refer to
the archon, Megakles, as one of the 'ἀληθρίοι', where
Herodotos calls the slayers 'ναγγεί; Thucydides has details
lacking in the scholiasts' more summary version: the Athenians
left solution of the problem in the archons' hands; the be-
sieged suffered greatly from hunger and thirst. Thucydides

13 Cf. Harpokration, s.v. Ναυκράτης (T 124); he
attempts perhaps to reconcile Herodotos' statement about
the prytaneis with other ancient authors' reports that the
revolutionaries were killed by the archons. See also How
and Wells, Commentary, II, p. 38.
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implies, further, that Kylon first planned to seize the city after he heard the oracle. The scholiast and Herodotos both suggest that Kylon had been planning a coup d'état for some time and had his plan confirmed by the oracle.

A fragment of the account given by Aristotle (T67) is extant. With Herodotos he calls the slayers ἐνοχεῖοι. Pausanias' version (VII, 25, 3) is brief and offers nothing new. Plutarch (Solon, 12) declares that the Kylonians were slain because the rope which they had stretched from the altar of the goddess (Athene Polias) broke. The archons received this as a sign that the goddess would not protect the revolutionaries suppliant to her. Only those who sought protection from the archons' wives were spared. The rest, except Kylon, were killed by men whom the Athenians later called ἐνοχεῖοι.

It would be labouring a small point to suggest that the scholiast follows the former rather than the latter merely because Thucydides uses the term ὀλίγοις and Herodotos ἐνοχεῖοι. At the end of the note both words are given. Other similarities between the scholion and Thucydides, however, and the inclusion of details not in Herodotos or in others employing the term ἐνοχεῖοι are more acceptable as evidence for the consultation of Thucydides for materials rather than Herodotos by the commentators.

Both Thucydides and the scholiasts mention Diasia,
the great festival to Zeus. Like Thucydides, Suidas and Hesychios ascribe the celebration to Zeus Melichios. Schol. Nubae (984), excerpted by Suidas, equates Diasia with Dippoleia, a festival dedicated to Zeus Polios. Herodotos and Plutarch are completely silent on this score. Commentators to Aristophanes may have had both Thucydides and Herodotos at hand; it is clear which version they preferred.\textsuperscript{14}

Among the best remembered experiences of early Athenian history was the Peisistratid tyranny. Aristophanes harks back to the tyrants over thirty times in the plays. The scholiasts noticed these allusions, sometimes in a word or two, sometimes in a full story that combines material from Herodotos, Thucydides, Aristotle and the Atthidographers. The several scholia, chronologically, cover the period from the beginning of Peisistratos' tyranny to the activities of Kleomenes after the Peisistratidai had been driven out.

A scholion to Vespae (1223) refers to Peisistratos' leadership of the Diakrinoi, before he became tyrant:

\begin{quote}
\textit{ως εἰς ταύτην ἑαυτοῦ ἀνοσέμνων τὴν τάξιν τοῦ πολιτεύμα-
τος. κατὰ γὰρ τοὺς Σόλωνος νόμους τρεῖς ἦσαν αἱ τάξεις, μία μὲν τῶν Παραλίων, ὧν προειστήκει Μεγαλῆ, ἕτερα δὲ τῶν Πεδιέων, ὧν προειστήκει Δυνούργος, τρίτη δὲ τῶν Διακρίων, ὧν προειστήκει Πεισίστρατος.}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{14} See Appendix II below.
Herodotos implies that Peisistratos formed a third party only after a period of stasis between the Pedioi and the Paralioi (I, 59, 3).

Aristotle, like the scholiasts, knows three parties, all of which had been in existence for some time before Peisistratos (Athenaiou Politeia, 13, 4). Plutarch (Solon, 29, 1) dates the party stasis to a time after the departure of Solon. In his description of Peisistratos' constituency he is far more harsh than Aristotle; the scholiasts attempt no description of the membership of each group.

In a note to Eupites (449) the scholiasts name Peisistratos' wife:

ἐπαιδε... καὶ παρὰ τὸ τυράννου ὄνομα τοῦ 'Ἰππίου, ἄφετε τῷ ὄντω τοῦ 'Ἰππίου περιεργότερον ἔχρησατο. ὅπλου μὲν γὰρ καὶ ἐκ τῶν προειρημένων, οὐχ ἤμεντα δὲ καὶ ἀνὰ τοῦτων, ὅτι μὴ αὐτὸς ὁ 'Ἰππίας κατέστησε τὴν τυραννίδα, ἀλλὰ παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμα τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς παρέλαβε τοῦ Πεισιστράτου.... Ἀλλωσ. Πεισιστράτου γυνὴ γέγονεν ἡ Ἡμίρηνη, 'Ἰππίου καὶ 'Ἰππάρχου μήτηρ .... ταύτην ὁ Πεισιστράτου ὁπλεῖ κατήγαγεν εἰς Ἀθήνας ἐφ' ἄρματος, ἐφασκεν Ἀθηναίαι εἶναι βουλόμενοι τυρρανεῖν.

Ancient sources indicate that Peisistratos was married at least twice. Herodotos (I, 61, 1) notes that Peisistratos
had two grown sons before he married Megakles' daughter, by whom he had no children. Aristotle is aware of four sons, Hippias and Hipparchos by the first wife and two more, Iophon and Thessalos, by the Argive Timonassa, a morganatic wife (Athenaion Politeia, 17, 3-4).

Thucydides (VI, 55, 1) states that Myrrhine was Hippias' wife. In no extant ancient work is she named as the wife of Peisistratos or the mother of Hippias. Aristophanes makes it clear that Hippias was her husband.

Confusion on the annotators' part shows in the remainder of the note: Peisistratos returning to Athens with the woman in his chariot, and wishing to be tyrant, said that she was Athene. Herodotos (I, 60, 4-5) and Aristotle (Athenaion Politeia, 14, 4) relate that Peisistratos made good his return after the first exile because he was accompanied by Phya, dressed as Athene, to impress the Athenians. Kleitodemos (T169) says that the wife of Hipparchos, brought to Athens in a carriage by Peisistratos, was Phya, daughter of Sokrates. Did the scholiast draw his note from inferior sources, did he make the error himself, or did he contaminate several notes with didastraous results? There is no safe answer.

The affair of Phya paved the way, according to Herodotos and Aristotle, for Peisistratos' second tyranny. After a further period of exile, he was again bent on
returning to Athens (Herodotus, I, 61-62). The use of Παλληνάς by Aristophanes (Acharnenses, 234) reminds the scholiasts that Peisistratos faced opposition at Pallene when he attempted what was to be his final restoration:

ο Παλληνάς δῆμος ἐστι τῆς Ἀττικῆς, ἐνθα συνέστη πόλεμος...ἐκεῖ διεκινθήκα καὶ τραχεός ἔχειν... ὃς πόλη κράσις Πεισίστρατον τὴν τύραννον, ἡμίκα συνεστήσαμεν ἐν Παλληνῆ τῇ μάχῃ. μέμνηται δὲ τοῦτο καὶ Ἀνδροτίων καὶ Ἀριστοτέλης ἐν Ἀθηναίων πολιτείᾳ.

Herodotus' story of the return (I, 62, 3-4) is similar. The Peisistratidal met the Athenians at Pallene near the Leipsydrium and defeated them. Aristotle's version (Athenaion Politeia, 15, 3) is much the same. Two references to the incident are made by Andromides (T20, T21) who recounts that Leagoras and Charias led the revolt against the tyrants at Pallene, near the temple, and were exiled as a result.

The scholiasts name their sources, who may have been used at first hand but were, more probably, acquired through an intermediate. Our text of Aristotle (Athenaion Politeia, 15, 3) shows no discrepancy; the fragment of Androtion comes from the scholion. Aristotle and the scholiasts, who have less detail, are in agreement with Herodotus.
Scholia concerned with the Peisistratidai tell more about Hippias than about his father, particularly when Aristophanes uses the word τραννος. Even where the scholiasts deal primarily with Peisistratos, they do not omit Hippias.

Hippias, it is agreed, was the eldest of the sons; the tyranny fell to him, therefore. On Vespae (502) is the following:

άντι τοῦ εἶ καταστήναι βούλομαι ἐμαυτῷ τυραννίδα. οὖτος δὲ τραννος δεινὸς, τοῦ πατρὸς Πεισίστρατον τυραννικέτερος. ὁ δὲ Ἰππιάς ἐτυραννήσειν, οὐχ οὖ "Ἰππαρχοι. καὶ οὐδεὶς δὲ παῖς οἱ Πεισίστρατίδαι τραννοί εἶλοντο. Ἀλλὰς, χαλεπὴ γὰρ ἢ Ἰππιάου τυραννίς ἐδόκει γεγονέναι, πολὺ τῆς τοῦ πατρὸς Πεισίστρατου χείρων. μνημονευεῖ δὲ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐν Λυσιστράτῃ [619]. εἰκότως δὲ τεσσάρων ὄντων κατ' ἐνίον τῶν Πεισίστρατίδων, τῶν 'Ἰππιαν παρέλαβεν. πρεσβυτάτους γὰρ ἢν αὐτός καὶ τὴν τυραννίδα εἶχε, καθὰ καὶ θεουκνίδης φησὶ. δοκεῖ δὲ ἢ τυραννίς καταστήναι, ὡς φησίν Ἐρατοσθένης, ἐκτὸς ἔτη ν, τοῦ ἀκρίβους διαμαρτάνων, Ἀριστοτέλους μὲν τεσσαράκοντα καὶ ἐν φήσαντος, Ἡροδότου δὲ ἐκ καὶ τριάκοντα.

A note to Lysistrata (619) deals with the same subject:
Herodotos (V, 55), Thucydides (I, 20, 2) and Aristotle (Athenaion Politeia, 17, 3-4) tell the same story.¹⁵

A more vexing problem is the number of Peisistratidai. The note to Lysistrata (619) flatly declares that Peisistratos had four sons. The gloss to Vespas (502) is more cautious; it begins with the reservation "some say."

Herodotos mentions Hippias and Hipparchos (V, 55) and an illegitimate son Hegesistratos, the tyrant of Sigeion (V, 94, 1). Thucydides names three, Hippias, Hipparchos and Thessalos (I, 20, 2). Aristotle is the first to list four sons, Hippias, Hipparchos, Thessalos (also called Hegesistratos) and Iophon (Athenaion Politeia, 17, 4). By giving Thessalos an alternate name, Aristotle reconciles Thucydides and Herodotos, but the mysterious Iophon is not in earlier histories.

¹⁵ Cf. also schol. Equites, 449, on p. 75 above.
To the scholiasts the tyranny appears to have been a joint rule. "With his brothers" Hippias received the tyranny from Peisistratos (cf. schol. Equites, 449); all the Peisistratidai were called tyrants (Vespae, 502). Hippias, then, acted as hegemon. Perhaps this view of the four sons as four tyrants, sharing the rule explains the alternate version discarded by Thucydides: that Hippias, rather than Hipparchos, was the tyrant killed by Harmodios and Aristogeiton (VI, 54-58).

The tyrannicide is the theme of two scholia. Schol. Equites (786) follows the tradition that Thucydides opposed:

εἰς Ἀρμόδιον δὲ καὶ Ἀριστογείτωνα τὸ γένος ἀνὴν-εγκεῖν αὐτοῦ, ἔπει καὶ οὗτοι εὐνοιας πολλὰς ἀκῆν-ἐγκατέ δόξαν, ἐπιθέμενοι τοῖς τυράννοις, καὶ τὸν Ἰππιαν διαχειρισάμενοι, ἢς φθάσαντες προείκομεν. τοῦτο πρῶτον ἐπιδείκνυσι τὴν εἰς τὴν πόλιν εὐνοιαν.

The scholion to Lysistrata (632), which, ambiguously, calls the victim τύραννος, is a paraphrase of Aristophanes:

"Ἀλλὰς...διότερ Ἀρμόδιοι καὶ Ἀριστογείτων. οὗτοι γὰρ ἀκὶ τῶν μυρσίνων κλάδων τὰ γίφη ἀνασκάσαντες τὴν τύραννον κατέβαλον."
Since the scholion to _Vespae_ (502) remarks that all of the Peisistratidai were called _τύφλοι_ perhaps even the scholiasts used the term loosely. By _τυφλον_ Hipparchos may be meant. The sources after Thucydides agree that Hipparchos was the victim of Harmodios and Aristogeiton.\(^\text{16}\) Part of the note to _Lysistrata_ (632) is quoted from a skolon in praise of the assassins.\(^\text{17}\) The scholiasts say nothing else about them.

The glossators commented on the change that overcame Hippias after the death of his brother. He was a cruel tyrant, much worse than his father (schol. _Vespae_, 502). Schol. _Lysistrata_ (619) cites an example of his tyranny, the wearing of the _κατωκέκαλα_ which he forced on the citizens of Athens. Hesychios (T140) and Pollux (VII, 68) define these as rough garments which would make the wearers ashamed to go into the city. Athenaios (VI, 271 d) introduces the _κατωκέκαλα_ as a class of helots established by the Sicyonian Kleisthenes.

The use of _λυκόν_ as a bodyguard, another tyrannical institution, refers perhaps to all periods of the tyranny. The word is defined in schol. _Lysistrata_ (665):

\(^{16}\) A remnant of the older tradition (that Hippias was assassinated) remains perhaps in Arrian (T73).

\(^{17}\) Cf. Athenaios, XV, 695 a-b.
Peisistratos, according to Herodotos (I, 59, 5) was supplied with a guard of ἀργυρεύς after the attack that he declared Megakles had made upon him. Apostolis (T33) defines ἀργυρεύς as another name for ὄρμηλα. Clubs may have been exchanged for spears when the tyrant became more suspicious. Thucydides (VI, 57, 1) speaks of the ἀργυρεύς whom Hippias had with him at the time of Hipparchos' murder. Aristotle (Athenaion Politeia, 18, 4) also mentions the ἀργυρεύς who killed Harmodios as he fled from the scene of assassination.

The tyranny continued for a few years after Hipparchos' death. The duration was uncertain, to the scholiasts at least, for the note to Lysistrata (619) offers three possibilities. Thucydides (VI, 59, 4) declares that Hippias was tyrant for three more years and was deposed in the fourth year after Hipparchos' death. Aristotle (Athenaion Politeia, 19, 2)
follows Thucydides, Herodotos says nothing of a six-year tyranny, but does postulate a period of thirty-six years for the time during which the Peisistratidai ruled Athens. The scholiasts' incorrect attribution may be the result of careless omission, either of the letter representing "thirty" or of the phrase (ἰς) ἄνα ἡ ὀπέρκοµνα. The length of the Peisistratid tyranny as a whole was also a vexing problem to the annotators as it is to modern scholars. Again, the possibilities are laid before us.¹⁸

The note to Lysistrata (665), quoting Aristophanes Byzantinon, remembers that the Alkmionidai fortified the Leipsydron against the tyrant. To Herodotos (V, 62, 2), the Alkmionidai had been exiled by the Peisistratidai, whether with Megakles after the third return of Peisistratos or later by Hippias he does not state. They returned to fight, but did not defeat Hippias. Aristotle (Athenaion Politeia, 19, 4–5) couples this event with the ill-fated attack made by the Spartan Anchimolios in response to an oracle bidding Sparta to free Athens from the tyrants.

Schol. Lysistrata (1153), drawing on Aristotle (Athenaion Politeia, 19, 4–5), describes the downfall of

¹⁸ Schol.Vespae, 502. Herakleides (T 129) gives Peisistratos thirty-three years of rule, including the exile, but makes no computation for Hippias.
Hippias at the hands of the Spartans who were urged on by the Pythia:

'Αριστοτέλης φησὶ μετὰ τὴν Ἰππάρχου θάνατον χρησὶν γενέσθαι τοῖς Δάκωσιν καταλθεῖν τὴν τυραννίδα, τῇς Πυθίαις, ὡς οἱ Ἀλκμαιωνίδαι ἐμισθώσαντο τὸν ἐν Δελφοῖς νεῶν οἰκοδομεῖν, συνεχῶς τὸ τοῦτο χρῆσθαι αὐτοῖς μαντευομένοις, ἔως πρῶτον μὲν Ἀγκυμόλιον ἔπεμψαν κατὰ θάλασσαν, ἵπποι προσφυγόντες δὲ αὐτοῖς ὀργίστεντες οἱ Δάκωνες Κλεομένη τὸν βασίλεα σὺν μείζονι ἐξεπεμψαν στόλῳ, καὶ νικήσας τὸν Θεταλοῦς ἐισήλθεν εἰς τὴν Ἀττικὴν καὶ τὸν Ἰππίαν συνέκλεισεν εἰς τὸν Πελαγίκον τεῖχος, ἔως ὅτι παιδεῖς τῶν τυραννῶν ἐξεβίναις ἐξαλο-
san.

The slight variations are chronological. Herodotos places the Alkmaionid activity first. After their misfortune, they contracted to build a temple at Delphoi if the oracle would promise to advise any Spartans who visited the Pythia to free Athens from the tyrant (Herodotos, V, 62-63). Anchimolios' defeat followed.

When Thessalians aided Hippias was doubtful, whether against Anchimolios or later against Kleomenes. The scholiasts make a general statement in the note to Lysistrata (1152) which paraphrases Aristophanes:
καὶ γὰρ τῶν Θεσσαλῶν οἱ πλείστοι ἐβοήθησαν Ἰππίᾳ.

The help given by Thessaly was well known. The Thessalians helped to defeat Anchimolios, Herodotos reports, but were in turn beaten by Kleomenes (V, 63,4 and 64, 1). Aristotle (Athenaion Politeia, 19, 5) speaks as though the Thessalians had already allied themselves with Hippias against the Alkmaionidai at the Leipsydrion before Anchimolios came to Attike. They stayed to help the Peisistratids until routed by Kleomenes. With the arrival of Kleomenes the Peisistratidai were driven to the Akropolis, besieged there and finally forced to leave Athens in order to regain their children whom the attackers had seized as hostages.19

A scholion to Lysistrata (273) provides the epilogue to the history of the Peisistratidai:

Herodotos, V, 64-65; Aristotle, Ath. Pol., 19, 6.
It is unlikely that the scholiast saw the stele; the wording of the last sentence in the note suggests that one of his sources did. Along with lexica and encyclopaedias, collections of inscriptions and epitaphs were not uncommon in the Hellenistic and later ages.\(^{20}\)

Herodotos (V, 70–76) tells in detail the story of Kleomenes who was invited by Isagoras to help him against Kleisthenes. He made an unsuccessful attack against Athens and left, after a period of siege on the Akropolis. He managed to work considerable havoc on Attike as he retreated. In collusion with the Sciotians on the north and the Korinthians on the south he seized various demes at a distance from the city.\(^{21}\)

Aristotle's version (Athenaion Politeia, 20) has minor differences. The only later writer to describe the event is Pausanias (III, 4, 2), whose summary treatment offers nothing new. In several notes dealing with the Peisistratidae the scholiasts' tale is most like that of Aristotle, and closer to Thucydides than to Herodotos. In the note on Kleomenes the scholiasts' treatment most resembles that of Aristotle.

---

\(^{20}\) E.g. ψηφίσματα οὐναγώγα of Krateros.

\(^{21}\) Cf. schol. Acharnenses, 146, om pp. 164–165 above.
CHAPTER SIX

THE PERSIAN WARS AND THE FIFTY YEARS

Aristophanes' references to the Persian Wars are comparatively few. His use of the word ἔφεσις in Equites (1562) reminds the scholiasts of an incident that preceded the Wars:

τόπος Ἀθηναίοι βαθῆς, ὅπου καὶ τοὺς Δαρείου προσβείς ἔβαλον. πάντα δὲ τὰ ἐκεῖ βαλλόμενα ἀφανῆ ἔκοιτο.

In Ranae (574) there is another allusion to the ἔφεσις, which the scholiasts describe in more general terms; it was a place for execution:

τινὲς φασὶ τὸν Διδυμοῦν λέγειν τοῦτον τὸν στίχον. ὁρυγμα ἐν Ἀθηναίοι, εἰς ἐπεβάλλοντο οἱ κακόργοι.

The longest note, in the commentary to Plutus (431), supplies the mythological history of the sinister ἔφεσις:

χάσμα τι φρεατῶδες καὶ σκοτεινὰ ἐν τῇ Ἀττικῇ, ἐν ὕ τοὺς κακοργοὺς ἔβαλον. ἐν δὲ τῷ χάσματι τοῦτῳ ὑπήρξον ὑγιεῖνοι, οἱ μὲν ἄγω, οἱ δὲ κάτω. ἐνταῦθα τὸν θρόνα τοῦ τῆς μητρὸς τῶν θεῶν ἐνέβαλον ὡς μεμηνότα, ἐμείδῃ προέλεγεν ότι ἔρχεται ἡ Δημήττηρ εἰς ἐπισήτησιν τῆς κόρης. ὡδὲ θεῖα ὀργισθεῖσα ἀκαρπίας ἐπεμψε τῇ χώρᾳ καὶ γυναῖκες τὴν αἰτίαν διὰ χρησμοῦ, τὸ μὲν χάσμα κατέχουσαν, τὴν δὲ
The unpleasant fate of the Persian messengers is reported by Herodotos (VII, 133, 1). Xenophon speaks of the death penalty that sentenced a man to be hurled into the ζηραθορήν, for a crime (Hellenica, I, 7, 20). Other definitions of the word are to be found principally in the lexica. Harpokratos (T119) has a brief general note which locates the pit in the deme (sic) Hippothoeaitis. Of the four entries in Suidas' compendium the longest (ς.ν. ζηραθορήν) is identical with the scholion to Plutus and the second is the same as Harpokratos'. The third (T243) differs slightly from the scholion to Ranae; the fourth (T246) states that Datis sent an embassy to Athens for earth and water, but the visitors were not well received. The Anecdota (T86) disagree with Harpokratos about the identity of the deme owning the rights to the well; it was Keriades of the tribe Oineis.

The Athenian response angered Dareios and helped to provoke the invasion of 490 B.C. The battle of Marathon and its context are mentioned in six of the plays.

General Datis is named more often than his colleague Artaphernes. To Fax (289) there is a scholion about his parentage and an incident in his life:

1 Cf. Plutarch, Aristides, 3, 2.
2 The source is probably Herodotos VII, 133.


He is elsewhere described as general at Marathon (Acharnenses, 84):
καὶ Ἀρταφέρνου τῶν στρατηγῶν τοῦ Περσῶν βασιλέως ἐίπε Μαραθῶνα ἐμβεβληκότων. περιέμενον τὴν πανσέληνον ἐπὶ τῷ τότε ἐξελθεῖν ἐπὶ τῶν πόλεων. πρὶν οὖν ἐκείνους παραγενέσθαι, κατάφρωσαν οἱ 'Αθηναῖοι τῶν πόλεων.

He led an army of fifty thousand, report the scholiasts to Nubes (986):

τόσα ἐν Μαραθῶνα τρωπωσμένου τὴν Δαρείου στρατιάν, ἢν Δατίς ὁ τούτου στρατηγὸς ἤγαγεν οὕσαν περὶ πεντηκονταμιριάδας. [τὸ δὲ ἐντετυλθαι, τὸ ἐναντίον τῷ γυμνοθαι].

A gloss to Equites (781) states that he was a satrap sent to Greece by Dareios:

τόπος τῆς Ἀττικῆς, εἰς δὲν ἐνύρμησαν Δατίς καὶ Ἀρταβαζώς, Μηδικὸν σατράπαι, πεμφθέντες ὑπὸ Δαρείου βασιλέως καταδουλώσασθαι τὴν Ἑλλάδα. ἑνὸς συμβαλὸντες αὐτοῖς οἱ 'Αθηναῖοι Μιλτιάδου στρατηγοῦντος, μὸνον Πλαταιῶν συμμαχοῦσάντων αὐτοῖς χίλιοις ἄνδρας καὶ οὕτω πληρωθέντος τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς δυνάμεως, τοῖς Ἑλλησὶ τῆς ἕλευθερίᾳ αἰτίοι κατέστησαν, μὸνοι ἐξ ἁπάντων τῶν Ἑλλήνων τὸν πρῶτον τῶν Περσῶν διαφθείραντες.

The note to Pax (289) concerning Datis' inability to speak like a Hellene is repeated by Suidas (T246). Diodorus (X, 27, 1-3) recounts that Datis, once he reached Greece, went to Athens but could not persuade Miltiades to surrender. This variant,
which is in Diodoros alone, may have been reported in the Atthides and become the scholion which has been preserved by the annotators to Pax; i.e., when Datis came to Athens, he addressed Miltiades and the assembly in Greek, but his hearers refused to agree to his suggestions and, in addition, laughed at the barbarisms in his speech.

The battle of Marathon is discussed briefly in the scholia to Pax (289) and to Equites (781). Herodotos (VI, 105-118) is the locus classicus; an excerpt preserved from Diodoros (X, 27) and the shorter discussions of Plutarch (V, 1-4), Nepos (T197) and Justin (II, 8-10) summarise the action.

The size of the Persian forces (schol. Nubes, 986), is also mentioned by Lysias (T180); Isokrates (T144) declares only that there were many myriads and Suidas (T250) is most conservative with a count of thirty thousand barbarians.

That Spartan aid failed to arrive in time, because the phase of the moon would not permit, had made the Athenians all the more proud of their success at Marathon. Their allies had been only a few slaves and Plataiains (cf. schol. Ranae, 689). The scholiasts mention the Spartan absence twice: the Lakonians did not arrive (schol. Acharnenses, 84) and the Athenians had perforce to fight alone (schol. Equites, 781). The emphasis laid by the latter scholion on Athens' role in preserving Greek freedom echoes the tone of Pheidippides' speech to the Lakonians in Herodotos (VI, 106, 2-3).
Herodotos (VI, 120, 1) says that the Lakonians reached Attike with two thousand men after the eclipse of the moon and, incidentally, after the battle of Marathon. The rule that Spartans should not lead out an expedition unless the moon was propitious is explained by Pausanias (I, 28, 4) and Plutarch, (De Mal. Herod., 861 F). Suidas (T250) and Strabo (IX, 399) have nothing to add nor does either disagree with the earlier accounts. Plato (Laws, 698 E) reports that the Lakedaimonians arrived on the day after the battle.

Herodotos (VI, 108, 1) refers to the Plataian assistance but says nothing of slaves. Some later writers mention the Plataians alone; others include reference to slaves who allied themselves with the Athenians. Justin (II, 8–10), Nepos, (Miltiades, 5), Suidas (T250) and Strabo (IX, 399) report briefly upon the battle and all, except Strabo, remember the valour of the Plataians. Pausanias (I, 32, 3) adds slaves to the list: if their slaves had shown bravery in battle, the Athenians allowed them to be buried with free men who had perished. Thus, at Marathon was placed a tomb for the Plataians and slaves who participated in the battle, for it was at Marathon that slaves first engaged in combat.

When the Persians had left the Athenians set up a trophy at Marathon, say the scholiasts to Lysistrata (285):

τρόπαιον δὲ τὸ ἐν Μαραθῶν τὸ κατὰ Περσῶν. Ἡ γὰρ Μαραθῶν τῆς τετραπλέως μέρος. τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ Οἰνόπη, Προβάλλετος.
Τρικαλούθης.

An inscription (T38) mentions a festival commemorating the victory at Marathon. It may be the one described by Plutarch (De Mal. Herod., 862 B). Pausanias writes of the memorial to the Athenians κατὰ χώραν (I, 29, 4), a tomb with stelai on which the names of the dead were inscribed (I, 32, 3), one for Athenians, another for Plataians and slaves.³

According to a scholion to Equites (660), Kallimachos, as polemarch, promised a great sacrifice to Artemis:

τῇ Ἀρτέμιδι. Ἰδίως γὰρ οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι σέβομεν καὶ τιμῶμεν τῇ Ἀγροτέραν "Ἀρτεμίν. "Ἀλλως. ἐξ ἱστορίας. Καλλίμαχος ὁ πολέμαρχος λέγεται εὐχαριστεῖ τῇ Ἀρτέμιδι τοσατᾶς βοῶς θυσίας, δεσνὰς ἀν φοινείκη βαρβάρους ἐν Μαραθῶνι. ἔπειτ' ἐπὶ πολλὸν ἐφοινείκησαν, μὴ δυνάμενος τοσατᾶς βοῶς θυσίας, ἔθυσε χιμαιρας.

Slight confusion in the scholion is evident: Kallimachos was killed in the battle (Herodotus, VI, 114). Whether any sacrifice had been promised by him we are not told elsewhere. In De Mal. Herod. (862 B) the festival described includes the slaughter of beasts equal in number to the slain barbarians. Allian (T2)

³ The trophy is noted also by Isokrates (T145). Cf. the inscription of Kallimachos, L.G., I, 2, 609 (T137), as restored by Fraenkel in Erano, XLIX (1951), pp. 63-64. See also T122.
declares that Miltiades promised to sacrifice animals to Artemis Agrotera. Of Kallimachos we are sure only that he was polemarch.\textsuperscript{4} Miltiades is the hero among the generals.\textsuperscript{5} Xenophon (\textit{Anabasis}, III, 2, 12), most of whose report is very like the scholion to \textit{Equites} in wording, states that all of the Athenians who fought at Marathon made the promise to Artemis:

\begin{quote}
καὶ εὐξάμενοι τῇ Ἀρτέμιδι ὀλόσοψες κατακάμοιεν τῶν πολεμιῶν τοσάπτας χιμάφρας καταθῆκεν τῇ θείᾳ. ἐπεὶ οὖν εἰχον ἰκανὺς εὑρεῖν, ἔδοξεν αὐτοῖς καὶ ἐνιαυτῶν πεντάκοσιας θείας, καὶ ἔτη υἱῶν ὀποθοῦσιν.
\end{quote}

Perhaps Kallimachos did promise such a sacrifice. The inscription proves existence of a cult of Marathon, and the festival, surely, would include sacrifices; the general preparing to face a critical engagement might have made such a vow, whether he was Kallimachos or Miltiades. Tradition gave to Miltiades first place in the battle, and this may be a usurped honour. Later, the elected strategia became the chief magistracy and the polemarch, chosen by lot, was of no political or military

\textsuperscript{4} Cf. Suidas (T250).

\textsuperscript{5} Herodotos, VI, 110; Plutarch, \textit{Aristides}, 5, 1; Strabo, IX, 399; Diodoros, X, 27; Justin, II, 8-10; Nepos, \textit{Miltiades}, 4-5; T172.
significance; this could have enhanced the glory of Miltiades at the expense of Kallimachos.\(^6\)

The scholion to \textit{Lysistratēs} (285), in agreement with Stephanos (T239) and Strabo (IX, 383), lists the towns that composed the tetrapolis of which Marathon was a part.

After the defeat at Marathon, the Persians left the Greek states in peace until Xerxes, seeking vengeance, launched the great invasion of 480. Aristophanes refers to the battles of Thermopylae, Artemision and Salamis.

The one scholion mentioning the battle at Thermopylae glosses \textit{Equites} (55):

"\textit{Αλλωσ. ἐν τῇ Πύλῃ, τόπος δὲ οὗτος τῆς Δακωνικῆς στειφῆς, διείργης καὶ ἀποχωρίζων τᾶς ἀπὸ τῆς Θεσσαλίας καὶ Δακωνί- μονίας εἰσοβλάσ. Εὐθα καὶ Δευνιδᾶς πρότερον τῶν Μακεδόνων βασιλεύς, ἀμα καὶ Σπαρτιάτων, ἀπέστη Ἑρέμη τῷ τῶν Περσῶν βασιλεῖ, καὶ πολλάς τῶν Περσῶν ἀποκτείνας, ἀριστεῖς ἔτελεθτησε, νυκλωθεῖς ἐν προδοσίᾳ, ἦπι Μεγαλου τοῦ ἡεῖς δείξαντος τοῖς Περσαῖς διὰ τῶν ὅρων δόδων."

The confusion between Pylos and Thermopylae at first seems rather incongruous. Surely the sources used by later commentators would have made the difference clear. To have declared that Thermopylae is a narrow pass lying between Lakonia and Thessaly, and that Leonidas was king of the Makedo-

nians as well as the Lakonians suggests a series of lacunae or an abysmal ignorance.

The note shows that the scholiasts have summarised the story correctly. Herodotos (VII, 208–228) has no conflicting details. Thermopylai is a narrow pass, leading to Thessaly; Leonidas, king of Sparta, fought Xerxes there, and died with all his warriors, bravely defending the pass, betrayed by Ephialtes who had showed the Persians a road through the mountains. Why, then, are there the initial confusions and misstatements?

The lexica explain the first blunder. Suidas (T247) says that the pass is a place in Attike called Thermopylai by most Hellenes, but Pylai by the local residents. According to Photios (T215) Pylai is another name for Thermopylai, a narrow pass from Thessaly into Phokis. Harpokration (T121) says that some call this city (sic) Pylos.

In the lines glossed (Equites, 54–55), Aristophanes remarks: καὶ πρὸς γ’ ἐμοῦ μάζαν μεμοχότος ἐν Πυλῷ Λακονίκῃ... Possibly a scholiast or earlier commentator who was none too familiar with Greek geography found the shorter form of the name Thermopylai in a note and used it, thinking that Pylai was the same as Pylos. But how could he explain the word Λακονίκῃ in Aristophanes' line? Perhaps the battle at Pylos was not familiar to him, but he did know about the more famous conflict in the narrow pass where Leonidas made
his last stand. With the addition of geographical names he solved the problem to his own satisfaction, so arranging the location of Thermopylae that the word Δωμωνίης was explained, while the story itself remained unchanged. It would appear, from the annotator's choice of Thermopylae rather than Pylos, that he was familiar with Herodotus but not with Thucydides. This seems, to me, the reasonable explanation for what is, at first glance, a hopeless muddle.

The battle of Artemision, the naval conflict that accompanied the defeat at Thermopylae, is the subject of one brief note that is largely a paraphrase of Lysistrata (1251):

ἀκρα ἐστιν Ἔβοιας τῷ Ἀρτεμίσιον, ἐνθα ἐπολέμησαν τῷ Ἐδρηγε οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι.

The battle is described by Herodotus (VIII, 1-17); Artemision is a part of the land belonging to Hestiaia (VII, 174, 2) in Euboeia (VIII, 6, 1).

There are few references elsewhere. Diodorus (XI, 12, 4-8) has a brief description of the sea battle. Pausanias (III, 16, 6 and X, 14, 3) mentions it as an encounter at sea between the Greeks and the Great King. According to Stephanos (T237) Artemision was a city on the island of Euboeia. Isokrates (T146) speaks of the battle and Plutarch, supports with a brief note (De Mal. Herod., 867 D). Plutarch (Themis-
tooles, 9) gives substantially the same brief account. All are in agreement with what little information the scholion offers.

Like Marathon, the battle of Salamis was a proud memory, for Athens and much of Hellas. Aristophanes alludes frequently to Themistokles, who made Greek success at Salamis possible. As with other battles, the scholiasts do not describe the actual conflict.

Themistokles' clever interpretation of the oracle about wooden walls is mentioned twice. The scholion to Equites (886) supplies one line of the Pythia's reply:

"ὅτι σοφίας δέδων ὀπηνήγατο ὁ Θεμιστοκλῆς, σαφηνίσας Ἀθηναίοις τὸν δοσθένα χρησμὸν
teikhos Triotogenei xulion diado ephoska Zebas.

όλλων γὰρ ἀλλα λεγόντων, Θεμιστοκλῆς ἔφη τὰς τριήρεις λέγειν xulion teikhos. καὶ τὸν Πειραιᾶ δὲ teikízas, ὥς εἴρηται, καὶ τὰ μακρὰ τεῖχη ποιήσας τὰ διήκοντα ἀπὸ τῆς πόλεως μέχρι τοῦ Πειραιῶς, ἐπὶ πλέον ἐδοξε σοφίας.

The scholiasts to Equites (1040) offer the same information but quote more of the oracle:

"τὰς ναύας φησὶ, μετέστησαν δὲ τότε εἰς Σαλαμῖνα. οὐτὸς δὲ ὁ χρησμὸς ἐπιδύτως τοῦ βαρβάρου ἔδθη. ἀγνοοῦντων δὲ αὐτῶν καὶ βουλομένων xulína teikídas tìn xóllin teikídas, Θεμιστοκλῆς ὁ στρατηγὸς νοήσας τὸν χρησμὸν, ἐπε teikídas tὰς ναύας λέγειν. ἔστι δὲ ὁ χρησμὸς"
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ἀντι δὲ Μαραθώνος, Σαλαμίνος μέμνηται, ὅπου ναυμαχία Περσῶν ἐγένετο, ἐν Μαραθώνι ἐκ πεζομαχίας. καὶ ταῦτα δὲ ἡ Σαλαμίνος ὄλγον πρὸ τῆς Ἐλευσίνου πόλεως, ἱερᾶς Δημητρείας καὶ Κόρης, πλῆρης οὖσα κατορθωμάτων Ἐλληνικῶν. καὶ γὰρ ἐνταῦθα πολλὰς τῶν Περσῶν Ἀθηναίων κατευνάμεχας τριήρεις ὁλίγῳ ἀρίθμῳ, θεμιστοκλέους στρατηγοῦντος. ἔνθα καὶ πέτρα Εἰρεσία οὕτω καλουμένη, ὡς ἐπὶ τῷ ὄψιν τοῦ τρόπαιου οὖσα τῆς Ἀττικῆς.

The Persians far outnumbered the Greeks (schol. Nubes, 304):

eἰ γε καὶ τῶν Ἰακχοῦ ἐχθρευσαν ταῖς θεαῖς, ὡς Ἡρόδοτος ἦς, 65, ἰστορεῖ. ἐν γὰρ τῇ περὶ Σαλαμίνος ναυμαχίᾳ κατὰ πολὺ λειπομένων τῶν Ἐλλήνων τοῦ πλῆθους τῶν Περσικῶν νεῶν συμμαχήσαι τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις τὴν Δημητρείαν καὶ τὴν Κόρην ἰστορεῖ, μέγιστον τῆς συμμαχίας ἐπιδειξάμενας καὶ ἐναργείστατον τεκμηρίου. μελλόντως γὰρ λοιπὸν τῶν Ἐλλήνων καὶ τῶν βαρβάρων εἰς κείρας ἔχειν, πρῶτον μὲν πλείστον ὑπὸ τοῦ κοινορ-τῆν ὀπὸ τῆς Ἐλευσίνου αἱρομένου πάση τῇ στρατιᾷ κατάδηλου γενέσθαι. εἰτὰ τούτον εἰς οὐρανὸν ἀνιώτα τα καὶ γεννημένον νέφος διὰ μέσου τοῦ στρατοκόλου χωροῦσα, τῶν Ἰακχοῦ βοῶν. μυστικῶς δὲ λόγος.

The location of Salamis and the full story of the battle are contained in Herodotos (VIII, 40–107 passim), and in the
shorter accounts of Diodorus (XI, 16-19), Justin (II, 17-27), Plutarch (*Themistocles*, 11-16) and Aristodemos (T51). Suidas (*Σαλμίνος*) used the scholion to *Equites* (785) for his entry. Thucydides (I, 73, 5 - I, 74, 1), echoed by Polyainos (I, 30, 3), says only that Themistokles managed to set the battle in a narrow area around Salamis where the few Greek ships would have the advantage. Photios (T212) has the briefest report: Xerxes was defeated in a sea battle and fled from Athens. According to Stephanos (T238) Salamis is an island and a city opposite Attike.

The scholiasts preserve the cry of "Iacchós" that rose from a cloud of dust moving south towards Salamis from the Thriasian Plain. Herodotos (VIII, 65) tells about the cloud of dust from Eleusis and the voices that cried "Iacchós!" Demaratos of Sparta heard the sound in the cloud and was told that the participants in the festival of Demer and Kore cry thus (Herodotos, VIII, 65, 4). Plutarch (*Themistocles*, 15, 1) describes the phenomena briefly. The story is repeated in two scholia to Aristeides (T44 and T50) which add that the provenience of the cloud made clear the fact that Demeter and Persephone were to be on hand at the battle.

Of the allies of Xerxes Aristophanes and the scholiasts name only Artemisia. In schol. *Lysistrata* (675) her lineage and position are given.
According to Herodotos (VII, 99) she was the daughter of Lygdamis and, like her father, a Halikarnassian and ruler of Halikarnassos, Kos, Nisyros and Kalydnos. She, of all the allies, gave the best counsels to Xerxes and fought best at Salamis (VIII, 87-89). So brave was she that the king declared his men fought like women and his women like men (Herodotos, VIII, 88). 8 Aristodemos (T51) follows Herodotos about the queen of Halikarnassos who fought like a man. A longer description comes from Justin (Tl60), who treats the remark made by Xerxes as though he had thought of it himself. The brief report in Pausanias' guidebook (III, 11, 3) identifies Artemisia as the queen of Halikarnassos who performed brave deeds fighting for Xerxes at Salamis. Suidas (T242) has two notes: first, the remark of Xerxes about her bravery; second, that she was queen.

No writer except the scholiasts call her an Ephesian. She is, in all accounts elsewhere, queen of Halikarnassos and a Halikarnassian by birth. Herodotos, however, states that she took Xerxes' sons with her, at the king's request, while he fled from Salamis (VIII, 104, 4); Plutarch, (De Mal. Herod., 869 F - 870 A) repeats the story. The scholiasts' error may

8 The scholiasts suggest the latter in one word, ἰενδραγάθησθεν.
be taken from the excerptors who inferred from her journey to Ephesos that the city was her place of birth.

Aristophanes alludes as frequently to the events and personalities of the pentekontaetia as he does to those of the years after 432 B.C. The Hellenic victory over the eastern barbarians, the Delian Confederacy, the growth of the Athenian empire, the careers of Themistokles, Aristeides, Kimon and Perikles were all vivid memories to the Athenians.

Scholia concerning the Fifty Years are often detailed, particularly for what might be less familiar than Salamis and Marathon to later readers. In contrast to the notes on early history, these marginalia have little that suggests folk-lore or aetiology. Comparison with other accounts, both primary and secondary, will reveal the interest and value of these scholia.

In his history of the pentekontaetia, Thucydides begins with the rebuilding of the walls of Athens and the objections of the Spartans (I, 89,3 - 92). A note to Equites (814) summarises the story:

αἰνώτεται δὲ ὁδὸν τὴν ἱστορίαν θεμιστοκλέους, διὰ τὴν πόλιν ἐτεῖχισεν, καὶ ταῦτα παρὰ γνώμην τῶν Πελοποννησίων ἀπαθήσας αὐτῶν. φασὶ γὰρ τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων μαθητῶν ἐκτείχισθαι τὰς Ἀθηναίας καὶ μὴ ἐπιτρέποντων, καταστρατηγῆσαι τὴν θεμιστοκλέα ἐπὶ τῷ δεῖξαι τοῖς Λακεδαιμονίοις δι᾽ ἐπὶ τῷ κοινῷ τῆς Ἑλλάδος συμφέροντι τείχισθαι τὴν πόλιν. χείροτονθεὶς δὲ πρεσβευτὴς τοῖς μὲν Ἀθηναίοις
καὶ ἐκείνην ἐντολὰς τειχίζειν πάση σπουδὴ τὴν πόλιν, μὴ
φειδομένους μὴτε ἱδίου μὴτε δημοσίου των ὁικοδομήματος,
τοῖς δὲ συμπροσβεβευταῖς προσέταξε βραδινὸν ἑλθεῖν εἰς
τὴν Δακεδαίμονα. αὐτὸς δὲ ἀφικόμενος ἑκεῖσε καὶ τῶν Δακε-
δαιμονίων ἀξιοῦντων αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ κοινὸν παρεῖναι, καὶ
λέγειν ὧν χρήσιν ἀφικόμενοι, τὸ μὲν πρῶτον εἰς τὴν παρουσίαν
ὑπερετίθετο τῶν πρεσβεῶν. μὴ γὰρ ἀσφαλές ὑπάρχειν αὐτῷ
κοινὸς ἐντολὰς λαβὼν μόνον ἀκοπληρώσαι τὴν πρεσβείαν.
καὶ ἂν συνελθεῖν ὅτι μὴ διεγένετο, καὶ οἱ συμπροσβεβεῖν παρῆσαν, ἂν δὲ τοῦ τείχους
ικανῶς προκεχωρηκτός τοῖς Δακεδαιμονίοις ἤγγελον ὅτι
τετειχίσθησαν λοιπὸν εἰς Ἁθῆναι, παρελθὼς ἑπείθον αὐτοῦ
μὴ ταχέως πιστευέιν τοῖς βουλουμένοις εἰς ἑκραν καταστήσαι
τὴν πόλιν, ἀλλ' ἐπιλεξομένους αὐτὸν ἄνδρας τοὺς εὐνοίας καὶ
πίστει διαφέροντας ἐπόστασις ἐκπέμψαι. μέχρι δὲ τῆς ἐκείνων
παρουσίας θυμοῦν ἑαυτὸν καταπηγγέλλειν, κἂν τοῦτο τριβὴν
τινα χρόνου ἐμποίησαν. πεισθέντως οὖν Δακεδαιμονίων καὶ τοὺς
μάλιστα διαφέροντας εὐνοίας καὶ πίστει τῶν πολιτῶν πεμψάντων,
λάθρα τοῖς Ἁθηναίοις πέμψας προσέταξε μὴ πρότερον τοῖς
Δακεδαιμονίωι ἄνδρας ὀπίσω πάλιν ἑλθεῖν ἔδοσεν, πρὶν αὐτῶν
tε καὶ τοὺς συμπροσβεβεῖς ἀπολύσωσιν Πελοποννήσιοι.
A scholiast to *Equites* (816) adds that Themistokles built the Long Walls as well:

τὸν γὰρ Πειραιῶν Θεμιστοκλῆς προσέβαλε τὴν πόλιν. τὸ δὲ παρέθηκε, προσέβηκε, προσεκόλλησε τὰ μακρὰ τείχη.

Another note to *Equites* (886) offers the same information:

καὶ τὸν Πειραιῶν δὲ τείχισας, ὡς εἰρηται, καὶ τὰ μακρὰ τείχη ποιῆσας τὰ διήκονα ἀπὸ τῆς πόλεως μέχρι τοῦ Πειραιῶς, ἐπὶ πλέον ἐδοξεὶ σοφὸς.  

Aside from Thucydides' account there are numerous other references to Themistokles' walls. Aristotle (*Athenaion Politeia*, 25, 4) reports that Themistokles and Aristeides built the walls together. Dinarchos (T106) also implies cooperation between the two statesmen. Spartan unwillingness to have Athens refortified is emphasised by Lysias (T182), Demosthenes (T91) and Isokrates (T155), who adds a note about the

---

9 The meaning of ὡς ἐκείνη is "as has been said elsewhere" not "as has been said earlier in the commentary" (i.e., in schol. *Equites*, 815). Schol. *Equites*, 815, is in R and V, from which schol. *Equites*, 886, is absent.
improvements Themistokles made in the harbourage at Peiraeus. The ephors were bribed by Themistokles not to hinder the construction, Theopompos reports (Plutarch, Themistokles, 19, 1). Andokides (T25) agrees with the other accounts in his own summary presentation.

Aristodemos' history of the affair (T52), although shorter, resembles closely the versions of Thucydides and the scholiasts and includes the dimensions of the walls built around Athens and her port. The narrative of Diodoros (XI, 39-41) is largely Thucydidean, with some unnecessary, but picturesque, details added. Pausanias (I, 1, 2) is concerned with Peiraeus and the new harbours, which Plutarch (Themistocles, 19, 4-6) also hastens to describe. The latter categorically denies Aristophanes' remark that Themistokles joined the port to the city; "rather did he accommodate the port to the city and the land to the sea!"

The lengthy disquisition by Nepos (Themistocles, 6-7) repeats Thucydides, with full explanation why the Spartans did not wish the Athenians to rebuild the walls. He declares, further, that Athens knew she would some day have such glory that she would come to war with Sparta and need her walls for protection. The greatness of Athens is also the reason given by Justin (II, 15) to explain Spartan anxiety; the clever Themistokles realised this and so carried out his plan to have the walls built without Spartan interference. Another summary
is by Polyainos (I, 30, 5), who emphasises Themistokles' shrewdness.\textsuperscript{10}

In general the scholiasts appear to have summarised the story adequately. There is, however, the problem of schol. \textit{Equites}, 886. The Long Walls were built not by Themistokles but by Perikles some years later.\textsuperscript{11} It is true that Plutarch (\textit{Themistocles}, 19, 6) corrects Aristophanes and points out that Themistokles made the city appendant to the port, Peiraieus. This statement does not indicate, I think, that Plutarch attributed the Long Walls to Themistokles, especially since he says

\begin{center}
\textsuperscript{10} That the fortifications of Peiraieus were built later than the walls around Athens is clear from Thucydides, Plutarch and archaeological evidence. Themistokles gave his attention to civic improvements in the port. The scholiasts, interested in Themistokles' connexion with the walls of both cities, place less emphasis on the chronological factor and seem to imply that both sets of walls were built while the general was creating a diversion in Sparta. The note so abbreviates the original report that it is difficult to know whether the scholiasts realised that there was a lapse of time between the two building programs.

\textsuperscript{11} Thucydides, I, 107, 1; Plutarch, \textit{Pericles}, 13, 5–7.
\end{center}
elsewhere that Perikles built them. Rather, Plutarch wished
to show that Themistokles turned Athenian attention from the land
to the sea, to her port, her trade and her navy. In this sense
he made Athens "depend on" Peiraeus.

In Aristodemos' version (T52) mention of the Long
Walls is included in his account of the port and city walls
all of which the Athenians built while Themistokles was in
Sparta. With the scholiasts to Equites (886), Aristodemos
seems to be the only writer to carry the tradition that
Themistokles was responsible for the Long Walls. Lysias
(T182), remarking upon the unwillingness of the Spartans to have
the walls built in 479, mentions in contrast the unwillingness
of the Athenians to have Sparta tear down the walls (i.e.,
the Long Walls) in 404. Aischines (T10) says "at this time
Peiraeus was fortified and the north wall was built! Ando-
kides (T23) notes, "Peiraeus was first fortified at this time,
then the long wall to the north was built! All three orators,
although Lysias does not expressly mention the Long Walls, make
it seem that Peiraeus was fortified and the Long Walls built
at the same time. Ergo, Themistokles built them. To all
appearances the source of error in Aristodemos and the scholion
leads back to misunderstanding of the orators' statements.\(^{12}\)

\[^{12}\] Cf. Gomme, Commentary, I, pp. 260 and 211-215, for
archaeological studies of the Themistokleian walls around

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
In 478/7 a congress of Greek states, meeting at Delos, voted to set up a common store of ships and money, πρὸς τὸν βαρβάρον (Thucydidès, I, 96, 2 = 97, 1). The money was to be kept at Delos under the guardianship of the Athenian hellenotamiai. Schol. Lysistrata (651-653) make a brief allusion to the fund:

ἐγένετο δὲ ἐπὶ τῶν ἰθίδικα ὕψιστα, δοῦτο ἐκαστοῦ κατὰ δύναμιν συμβάλλεσθαι εἰς τὰ κοινὰ χρήματα. (653): ὡς αὐτῶν τὰ ἰθιδικά χρήματα δαπανησάντων. — παρέταξεν Ἀριστείδης δοῦναι τοῖς συμμάχοις ἐπὶ τοὺς βαρβάρους πολέμοις.

Thucydidès (I, 96, 1-2) has a short description of the way in which the fund was to operate. He does not mention Aristeides.

Athens and Piraeus and the Long Walls. The structure of the earlier fortifications shows haste and work largely by amateurs. The Long Walls give evidence of careful and protracted construction by professional masons. It should be remembered, further, that this scholion is not in R or V. V contains the scholia to Equites, 815-816, where the account is correct throughout.


14 The scholion to Lysistrata, 651, is clearly a paraphrase of Aristophanes. Cf. T194 and T195.
part in the τάγις, and the scholiasts make no reference to
hellenotamiai, and, further, speak of χρήματα where Thucy-
dides mentions the two methods of contribution. Otherwise,
there is no disagreement.

The date of the synod and the assessment of Aris-
teides is set by Aristotle (Athenaion Politeia, 23, 5) in the
archonship of Timosthenes in the third year after the battle
of Salamis. Dinarchos (T106) also mentions Aristeides and,
erroneously credits him with the transfer of the treasury to
the Akropolis. Other orators, notably Aischines (T12) and
Andokides; (T26), emphasise the rôle played by Aristeides.
Plutarch (Aristides, 24, 1-4) describes Aristeides' method of
assessment and Diodoros (XI, 47) reports that the cities were
taxed according to wealth. 15 Pausanias (VIII, 52, 2) and
Aelian (T6) recall only that Aristeides made the first ass-
essment. The scholiasts appear to have treated Aristeides' assessment and its purpose correctly, if summarily.

For reasons best known to the Athenians, Themistokles
was ostracised not long after the walls were finished. One
note to Equites (819) reports the ostracism:

εξωστράκισε γιὰ τὸν θεμιστοκλῆ & δῆμος.

---

15 Perhaps in a manner similar to the Persian Arta-
phrenes' system (Herodotos, VI, 42, 2); see A.T.L., III,
pp. 234-235 with notes 1-3.
The ostracism is well documented. Thucydides (I, 135, 3) is the earliest literary source extant, followed by Diodorus (XI, 55, 3) and Plutarch (Themistocles, 22, 4–23, 1) and Nepos (Themistocles, 8, 1). A later account is given by Aristodemos (T53 and frg. 6 Jacoby). Concrete primary evidence, of course, is the body of ostraka bearing Themistokles' name.16

While he was spending his ostracism in Argos, Themistokles was accused of Medism by the Spartans and forced to flee for his life. His exile and death are the subject of an interesting scholion to Equites (84):

θεμιστοκλῆς ὁ καταναυμαχήσας ἐν τῇ περὶ Σαλαμίνα ναυμαχίᾳ τῶν βαρβάρων, εἷς τῶν δυτεροῦ φυσαδευτῶν ὑπὸ τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἐπὶ προδοσίας αἰτίας ψευδεῖ, καταφυγὼν πρὸς Ἀρταξέρξην τὸν Ξέρξου παῖδα, καὶ τιμηθεὶς τὰ μέγιστα παρ᾽ αὐτοῖ, ὡς καὶ τρεῖς πόλεις εἰς ὅψιν καὶ ἄρτον καὶ ποτῖν λαβεῖν, Μαγνησίαν, Μυσίνα, Δάμφακον, ἐπηγείλατο αὐτῷ τὸ καταδουλώσασθαι τὴν Ἑλλάδα, δύναμιν εἰ λάβοι. παραγεινόμενος δὲ εἰς τῷ στρατευματὶ εἰς Μαγνησίαν καὶ καταγωγὴς ἐαυτοῖ, εἰ δὲ αὐτῶν σωθέντες Ἔλληνες δὲ ἄτοι δουλεύοντοι βαρβάροις, προφάσει χρησάμενος ὡς θυσίαν ἐπιτελέσας βοθλοίτο καὶ

16 Thompson, Hesperia, Suppl. IV (1940), p. 32; Vanderpool, Hesperia, XV (1946), p. 274.
ιερουργήσαι τῇ Δευκάφρυν 'Αρτέμιδι καλομένη, τῷ
tάβρῳ ὑποθελὼ τὴν φίλην, καὶ ὑποδεξάμενος τὸ αἷμα καὶ
χαρῶν πιὰν ἐτελεσθήσεις εὐθέως. οἴ δὲ φασίν οἳ συνο-
eίδως ὁ θεμιστοκλῆς οἳ σιδὰ σιδὰ τῇ διαπράξεσθαι τῷ
βασιλεῖ ἀπερ ἐπηγγείλατο, οὕτως ἐπὶ τὴν τοῦ θανάτου
αἴρεσιν παρεγένητο. τούτου οὖν τὸν τρόπον βέλτιον εἶναί
φασι καὶ αὐτοὺς ἀποθανεῖν, κατὰ σήμα τοῦ θεμιστοκλέους,
διαβάλλει δὲ τοὺς 'Αθηναίους ὡς κακοὺς περὶ τοῦς σεβρέγεται.
"Ἀλλα, μετὰ τὴν Ξέργην φυγὴν Δακεδαιμόνιοι προδοσίας
κρίνουσι καὶ φονεοῦσι Παυσανίαν τὸν ἵδιον βασιλέα,
Κλεομέδοντο καὶ 'Αλκαθδᾶς νῦν. ἔπικράτως δὲ διακεῖμενοι
πρὸς θεμιστοκλέα διὰ τῶν τείχισμάν τῆς 'Αττικῆς, μετα-
στέλλονται αὐτῶν εἰς κρίνιν, φάσκοντες Παυσανίαν ὠμολογη-
κέναι καὶ αὐτῶν κοινωνεῖν ἐν τῇ προδοσίᾳ. 'Αθηναίων δὲ
βουλομένων ἀποστέλλειν αὐτῶν, φυγὴν ἤκε πρὸς 'Αρταξέρξην,
καὶ Μηδικῆν φωγῆν μᾶθαι ἐκδίδαξεν αὐτὸν καὶ ἔσωσε τὸν πατ-
ἔρα Ξέργην ἐκ συγκρωμάτων τὼν "Ἐλλησί διολύσαι τὰ ἐπὶ
Σπατοῦ καὶ 'Αθηνίων διαζέβημα. ἐφ' οἷς εὐχαριστήσας ὁ
βασιλεὺς δωρεῖται αὐτῷ τρεῖς πόλεις, Μαγνησίαν εἰς σῖτον,
Αἰμμακαν εἰς οἶνον, Μυκήνας εἰς ὅψα, ὡς δὲ Νεάτης, καὶ
Περκάτης εἰς στρωμήν καὶ Παλαίσκην εἰς στολήν. στρατὸν
δὲ λαβὼν αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ πορθήσει τῆς 'Ελλάδος, περὶ τὴν 'Ἰωνίαν
ἐν Μαγνησίᾳ γενέμενος, θῶν, ὡς ἐνρήται ἄνω, τελευτᾷ καὶ
μετὰ θάνατον τὸν μισοβάρμαρον ένδεικνύμενος τρόπον.
λοιμωξάντων δὲ Αθήναιοι, ὁ θεὸς εἰσὶς μετάγειν τὰ στα
The scholiasts say nothing of Themistokles' residence in Argos, but give the impression that he was in Athens when he heard of the Spartan accusation and fled before the trial. Thucydides (I, 135, 3) states that he was at Argos and, hearing news of the threat, fled. Aristodemos (T55) repeats Thucydides' version. Nepos (Themistocles, 8, 2-3) mentions Themistokles' absence at the time when the Spartan messengers arrived to accuse him. Plutarch (Themistocles, 23, 1) and Diodoros (XI, 55, 4) agree that Themistokles was not in the city. The reason for the scholiasts' omission of the fact that Themistokles was not in Athens is, perhaps, the same that caused them to omit the account of his travels between Argos and Sardis, arbitrary selection of the facts most pertinent to Aristophanes' line.

A shorter scholion, to Vespas (947), might first escape notice as a reference to Themistokles, but the story that it tells about Thoukydides, son of Melesias, fits
him not at all:

Θουκυδίδης λέγει τὸν Μελησίου Ἀλωπέκηθεν. τοῦτον δὲ ἐξωτερικῶς Ἀθηναῖοι τῇ ἑτη κατὰ τὸν υἱόν... δὲ δὲ ὁ Ἀθηναῖων ὄχλοις ἀείφυγαν αὐτοῦ καταγγέλει ἐδήμησε τὴν οὔσιαν, καὶ πρὸς Ἀρταξέρξην ἢμε φεγγυν, σαφῆ ποιεῖ Ἰδομενεὺς διὰ τοῦ β' τὸν τρόπον τούτον, "οἱ μὲν τοι "Ἀθηναῖοι αὐτοῦ καὶ γένους ἀείφυγαν κατέγυρσαν, προδιδότως τὴν Ἑλλάδα, καὶ αὐτοῦ ἡ οὔσια ἐδημεθήθη!"

The scholiasts erred only in the name, probably through careless transcription.

Ephoros (excerpted in De Mali. Herod., 855 F) and Plutarch (Themistokles, 23, 3-4) go beyond Thucydides' account and that of the scholiasts to report Pausanias' attempt to involve Themistokles in treason. Themistokles wanted no part of the plan. Plutarch mentions letters used by the Spartans as evidence for collusion. The scholiasts remark only that the Lakedaimonian accusation was false. Thucydides (I, 137, 4) quotes a letter in which Themistokles reports to Artaxerxes his unjust treatment at the hands of the Athenians and Spartans. Although he transforms the letter into a speech made before the Mede, Diodoros (XI, 56, 6-8) retains the statement that the Greeks had been unjust.\textsuperscript{17}

\textsuperscript{17} Cf. Demosthenes (T95) and Hesychios (s.v. Θεμιστοκλῆς).
Having fled from trial at the hands of the enraged Athenians, Themistokles reached Persia, after various adventures, and according to Thucydides (I, 137, 1) and Nepos (T199) wrote to Artaxerxes about his difficulties, reminded the king that Xerxes had been saved after Salamis through his offices, and asked for help in return. Diodoros (XI, 56, 6-8), the scholiasts and Aristodemos (T55) report that Themistokles spoke to the king either after learning Median, as the scholiasts and Aristodemos state, or through interpreters, as Plutarch (Themistocles, 28, 1-2) and Diodoros have it. Thucydides (I, 138, 1) and Diodoros recall that he learned the Median language and customs after a year or more spent in Persia. According to Valerius Maximus (T255), Themistokles learned the local tongue before he had any communication at all with the Great King.

'*Αθηναῖος δήμαρχος, Νεοκλέους γίνετο, ἀσώτος τὴν πρῶτην ἡλικίαν γενόμενος, μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα στρατηγὸς αἱρεθεὶς καὶ κτίσας τὸν Πειραιᾶ καὶ ναυμαχία νικήσας τὸν Πέρσας κατὰ Σαλαμίνα καὶ φθονηθεὶς φεύγει πρὸς Ἀρταξέρξην τὸν τῶν Περσῶν βασιλέα καὶ σφόδρα τιμηθεὶς τῇ αὐτοῦ ἡμικάζετο μετὰ ταύτα τοῖς Ἑλλησὶ πολεμεῖν. καὶ μὴ βουλθεὶς προδοῦναι τὴν πατρίδα καὶ τὸ ἐαυτοῦ κλέος, ταβρεῖον αἰμα πιθῶν ἀπώλετο. ἔγραψεν ἐπιστολὰς φρονήματος γεμόθις.

18 Cf. Nepos, Themistokles, 10, 3; Plutarch, Themis-
The reminder of what Themistokles had done for Xerxes in 480, mentioned in the scholion to Equites (84), is noted earliest by Herodotos (VIII, 110, 3) and Thucydides (I, 137, 4). Polyainos (T233), Nepos (T193) and Diodoros (XI, 19, 5) report the incident without variations. Herodotos (VIII, 110, 3) implies that Themistokles falsely claimed to have saved the bridge for the express purpose of allowing Xerxes to escape.\(^\text{19}\) The later accounts do not share Herodotos' view of Themistokles' character and the scholiasts appear to follow the less biased tradition.

As token of his thanks the king gave Themistokles cities to supply his wants: Myous to provide cooked food, Magnesia for bread and Lampsakos for wine.\(^\text{20}\) One scholion lists the three cities; the other note to Equites (84) adds that Perkote supplied bedding and Palaiskepsos clothing. Thucydides (I, 133, 5) names the three cities;\(^\text{21}\) Athenaios (T76) adds Perkote and Palaiskepsos; according to Plutarch (Themistocles,

---

\(^{19}\) Cf. VIII, 108-109.

\(^{20}\) For the flight of Themistokles to Persia and its chronology see Α.Τ.Λ., III, pp. 111-113 and 199-201.

\(^{21}\) Diodoros (XI, 57, 7), Strabo (XIV, 636), Nepos (Themistocles, 10, 3) and Aristodemos (T55) agree with Thucydides.
29, 10), Phanias of Eresos and Neanthes of Kyzikos included the other two cities in their stories.\textsuperscript{22} Themistokles issued coinage, examples of which have been found on the site of Magnesia ad Meandrum.\textsuperscript{23}

In return for munificent bounties, Themistokles prepared to attack Greece in fulfillment of his promise to Artaxerxes.\textsuperscript{24}

\textsuperscript{22} Cf. [Themistokles], Letters, 20 (Hefcher, Epistolographi Graeci, pp. 758–762, especially 761). Note that Neanthes is also named as a source for the additional cities in schol. Equites, 84.

\textsuperscript{23} Head, Historia Numorum\textsuperscript{2} p. 581; Gardner, J.H.S., XXXIII (1913), p. 165.

\textsuperscript{24} Thucydides, 1, 138, 2, states that he offered to attack Greece because of Greek treachery to him; Plutarch, Themistocles, 28, 2, says that Themistokles styled himself an enemy of the Greeks; the King, remembering this, bade him attack the Hellenes (31, 5). Nepos (T199) and Hesychios (s.v. Θεμιστοκλῆς), followed by Suidas (see pp. 114–115 above, note 17), remarks that Themistokles offered to enslave Greece, and Aristodemos (T55) affirms that Themistokles volunteered to defeat the Greeks if the King would provide an army. Most of the accounts, including the scholion, suggest that Themistokles, in his initial disgust with the Athenians, made a
Themistokles received his army, led the expedition as far as Magnesia in Ionia and there, for one reason or another, took his own life. The scholiasts suggest that he committed suicide either because he was ashamed of what he planned to do or because he could not fulfill his promise and feared to return to Persia. Thucydides believes that rash promise to fight Greece whenever Artaxerxes might wish, and that the King sometime later took him at his word.

Diodoros (XI, 58, 2) reports that "some say" the king bade him to attack; he goes on to suggest and explain something of the controversy that raged among later writers over Themistokles' character (supplementing in part Thucydides' sketch in I, 138, 3-6): ἧμεῖς δὲ πάνεμεν ἐπὶ τὴν τελευτήν ἀνδρὸς μεγίστου τοῦ Ἑλλήνων, περὶ οὗ πολλοὶ διαμφισβητοῦσι, πότερον οὖσα αὕτης τὴν πατρίδα καὶ τὸν ἄλλους Ἑλλήνας ἐφύγεν εἰς Πέρσας, ἢ τοῦντίουν ἢ τε πόλει καὶ πάντες οἱ Ἑλληνες ἐθεργησθέντες μεγάλα τῆς μὲν χάριτος ἐπέλαθοντο, τὸν δ' ἐθεργήτην ἤταγον αὐτῶν, ἄδικως εἰς τοὺς ἐσχάτους κυνήγουν. εἰ δὲ τις χωρὶς φθόνου τὴν τε φθονίαν τάνδρας καὶ τὰς πράξεις ἐξετάζει μετ' ἀνριθείας, εὑρήσει πάντων ὧν μυθοποιοῦμεν ἀμφοτέρως τοὺς εἰρημένους πεπρωμενήθητα. διὸ καὶ θαυμάσειν ἄν τις εἰρήτως, εἰ στερῆσαι ὁπότῳς αὕτους ἀνδρὸς τοιούτου τὴν φθονίαν ἠθέλησαν. τὸς γὰρ ἔτερον, τῆς Ἐκάρτης πλέον ἱσχυσθησα καὶ τοῦ ναυτικοῦ τῆς Ἡγεμονίαν ἔχοντος Εὐρυμνιάδον τοῦ Ἐκαρτιάτου.
Themistokles died willingly, some say in Magnesia, because he could not do what the King wished. Whether he was prevented by military or by moral scruples the historian fails to indicate. Diodoros (XI, 58) gives no reason for the act. Themistokles could not betray his countrymen, Plutarch explains (Themistocles, 31, 5), and so committed suicide in Magnesia. Nepos, by his own admission, follows Thucydides (TI99). Themistokles, say Hesychios and Suidas (ε.γ. Θεμιστοκλῆς), wished to fulfill his promise but could not betray

\[
\text{τὰς ἵδιαις πράξεις ἀφείλετο τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς ταύτην τὴν δόξαν;}
\]
\[
\text{τίνα δ' ἀλλ' ἰστορίκαμεν μιᾶ πράξει ποιήσαντα διενεγκεῖν αὐτὰν}
\]
\[
\text{μὲν τῶν ἡμετέρων, τὴν δὲ πόλιν τῶν Ἑλληνίδων πόλεων, τοὺς δ'}
\]
\[
\text{"Ἑλληνας τῶν βαρβάρων..."τίς δὲ πολέμου μεγίστον κατασχέτος}
\]
\[
\text{αὐτὴν διέσωσε, μιᾶ δ' ἐπινοεῖ τῇ περὶ τοῦ ἑγγαματος γενοµένη}
\]
\[
\text{τὴν πεζὴν τῶν πολεµίων δυναµῆν ἐξ ἡµιώνου µέρους ἐπακείντησεν, ὥστε}
\]
\[
\text{ἐφεξῆς µετὰ τοῦ ἑγγαματος γενοµένη τῷ Ἑλληνὶ; διὸκερ ὅταν τὸ µέγεθος τῶν}
\]
\[
\text{ἔργων αὐτοῦ θεωρήσαµεν, καὶ σκοποῦντες τὰ κατὰ µέρος ἐπρώµεν}
\]
\[
\text{ἐκεῖνον µὲν ὑπὸ τῆς πόλεως ἡττηµαχόµενον, τὴν δὲ πόλιν διὰ τὰς}
\]
\[
\text{ἐκεῖνον πράξεις ἐπαρµόζετεν, εἰκὸνες τὴν δοκοῦσαν εἰναὶ τῶν}
\]
\[
\text{ἀπασῶν πόλεως σοφωτάτην καὶ ἐπεικεστάτην χαλεπώτατην πρὸς ἐκεῖνον}
\]
\[
\text{ἐφύσκοµεν γεγενηµένην.}
\]
\[
\text{περὶ µὲν οὖν τῆς θεµιστοκλῆους ἄρετῆς εἰ καὶ πεπλευκὲς}
\]
\[
\text{ἀκαµέν μαρτυρῶν, ἀλλ' οὖν οὐκ ἀξίων ἐκρίναµεν τὴν ἀρετὴν αὐτοῦ}
\]
\[
\text{παραλιπεῖν ἀνεπισήµατον.}
\]
his countrymen, an opinion in which Aristodemos concurs (T55).

The dramatic means by which he chose to commit suicide interests the scholiasts who also note that Symmachos denied the truth of the story since neither Thucydides nor Herodotos vouched for it. Only Thucydides (I, 138, 4), Nepos (T199), and, perhaps, the scholiasts, give no credence to the tale, and Nepos is not an independent witness25

Themistokles' bones were buried in Magnesia and later, by a ruse, dug up and taken to Athens to rid the city of a plague (schol. Equites, 84). Nepos (T200) reports that the bones were carried secretly into Attike, not because of opposition from the Magnesians, but because Athenian laws had exiled the traitor – and his bones – permanently. Pausanias (I, 1, 2) saw Themistokles' tomb in the port, Peiraeus, near the largest harbour. There the bones, brought from Magnesia by some Athenians, were buried. The people of Magnesia, Thucydides says (I, 138, 5), have a memorial to Themistokles in their agora, but his bones (I, 138 6) were carried to Attike and secretly buried there, since he died in exile as a traitor. Plutarch (Themistocles, 32, 4) agrees that a statue of the man was in the agora at Magnesia, while his bones (32, 5) were buried in Peiraeus, in a tomb seen by Diodorus the periegete.

---

25 See also below, note 27 on p. 122. The scholiasts are attempting, surely, to explain Aristophanes' reference (Equites, 84–85) to Themistokles' reported manner of suicide.
The details added by the scholiasts to the story of the Athenian theft of the hero's bones appear in no other source. Probably they are late additions meant to give colour to the story. They may be excluded or accepted without altering the account. On the other hand, the secret burial in Attike, not mentioned by the scholiasts, seems highly probable. If the bones were brought back because the oracle had told the Athenians that that alone was the remedy for the plague, secrecy would hardly have been necessary. There is no difficulty, further, in reconciling a secret burial not long after 460 B.C. with a tomb seen by Pausanias and Diodoros the periegete in Peiraeus. Probably the tomb was built after Thucydidès' time, when the feeling against Themistokles had changed to hero worship. Shortly after his death, surely, the Athenians might have hated the man enough to make a secret burial necessary. Later they came to realise Athens' debt to him. Certainly Aristophanes, ever the iconoclast, does not treat him or his deeds slightingly, nor does he anywhere imply that Themistokles was a traitor.²⁶

The scholia about Themistokles in general agree with other accounts, add some minor and not unreasonable details, alter tradition only to explain why the bones were taken from Magnesia and admit Symmachos' query concerning the veracity of the tale that Themistokles committed suicide by drinking

bull's blood.  

Athens, by the part that she played in formation of the Delian Confederacy, became hegemon (Thucydides, I, 96, 1), a role which Sparta clearly did not begrudge her. A scholiast to Lysistrata (1138) makes an allusion to Athené's hegemony:

ταύτα καὶ οἱ συντεταχθές τὰς Ἀθηνᾶς ἱστοροῦσιν περὶ τῶν Δακεδαίμονων. ὁ δὲ Φιλόχορδος φησὶ καὶ τὴν ἡγεμονίαν τῶν Ἀθηναίων λαβεῖν διὰ τὰς κατασχοῦσας φῆμι Δακεδαίμονα συμφορὰς.

27 To trace further the origin of the story that Themistokles died by drinking bull's blood is not pertinent to this study. It should be remembered, however, that in Plutarch (Themistocles, 31, 5) "some say...that Themistokles died by drinking bull's blood while he was sacrificing; others report that he poisoned himself! The more colourful story may have developed from the true account: Themistokles drank poison, perhaps while he was performing a sacrifice, and died. The story of Ὑσσαμμετιχος' death (Herodotos, III, 15, 4), may have helped in fabrication of the tale.

28 Cf. Thucydides, I, 95, 7; Plutarch, Aristides, 23, 7-8; Diodoros, XI, 50; Isokrates (T149); Aristodemos (T54); Nepos (T194). The "willingness" of Lakedaimon is emphasised
In 478 and the years immediately following, the Spartans were not particularly troubled by Athens' growth. The lines of Aristophanes (Lysistrata, 1137-1142) clarify the reference:

ΔΥ. εἴτε ὁ Δάκων, πρὸς γὰρ ὑμᾶς τρέψομαι, οὖν ἢ ὅτε ἔλθων δεύτερο Περικλείδας ποτὲ ὁ Δάκων Ἀθηναίων ἱκέτης καθέξετο ἐπὶ τούτοι βωμοῖς ἀκράς ἐν φοινικίδι, στρατιῶν προσαιτῶν; ἢ δὲ Μεσσήνη τότε υμῖν ἐπέκειτο, χωθεὶς σείσθε ἀμα.

The real assumption of hegemony, according to Philochoros, came some years after the first meeting of the Delian synod. During that time Athens and Sparta had been going separate ways. Not until the Thasian appeal to Sparta that she force Athens to end the siege of Thasos does there appear to be friction: θεσίοι δὲ νικηθέντες μάχη καὶ πολιορκομένοι Δακεδαιμονίους ἐπεκαλοῦντο καὶ ἐπαμίβειν ἐκέλευσον ἐσβολύτας ἐς τὴν Ἀττικὴν. οὐ δὲ ὕπεσκέτο μὲν κράτα τῶν Ἀθηναίων...

by all writers except Aristotle (Athenaion Politeia, 23, 3) who remarks that the Athenians took hegemony of the sea, "the Lakedaimonians being unwilling!" The unwillingness, perhaps, may have referred to Spartan reluctance to have Athens take hegemony, but probably does not. The Spartans allowed
Just as the Spartans were preparing to invade Attika an earthquake devastated Lakedaimon, particularly the city. The Helots, including the Messenians, revolted and fled to Ithome, where they were besieged by Spartans and later, at the Spartans' behest, by Athenians and other allies. The scholars to Lysistrata (1137) have a note:

οἱ μὲν γὰρ Ἀθηναῖοι καταπονομέων αὐτὸς ὑπὸ Μεσσηνίων διέσωσαν, οἱ δὲ Δακεδαιμόνιοι καθεύλου τὴν ... τυραννίδα βοηθοῦντες Ἀθηναίοις.

Another gloss about the revolt is written to Lysistrata (1141):

οῆμαινε οτι πόλεμος ἢν αὐτοῖς πρὸς Μεσσηνίους.

A third is attached to Lysistrata, 1142-1144:

σεισμὸν γὰρ συνυόλ εξένυντο δὴ τὸ πόλεμος συνειστήκει. Κίμων, μετὰ τὴν ἐν Πλαταιάς μάχῃ 1β' ἐτεί θρησον. ταῦτα ἦν ἐπὶ θεαγενίδου. καὶ γὰρ τοῦ Ταυγέτου τι παρέρρατη καὶ τὸ φίδειον καὶ θερα καὶ οἰκίαι πλεύσαται, καὶ Μεσσηνίοι ἁποστάτες ἐπολέμουν καὶ οἱ εἶλατε ἀπέστησαν, ἐως Κίμων ἔλεον διὰ τὴν ἱκετηρίαν ἔσωσαν αὐτοῖς.29

the Athenians to take hegemony because they themselves did not wish it; this latter seems rather to be Aristotle's implication.

29 The chronology of the decade 470-460 B.C., because it is badly confused in the ancient texts, is not of significance to this investigation. I refer the reader to A.T.L., III,
The earthquake and the Helot revolt are discussed not only by Thucydides (I, 101, 2 - 103, 4) and Pausanias (IV, 24, 5) but by Plutarch (Cimon, 16, 6 - 17), who dates the catastrophes to the fourth year of Archidamos' rule in Sparta. After a period of fruitless siege, the Lakonians asked help from Athens, but, later, sent the Athenians home, perturbed by the splendour of the hoplite array. Diodoros reports the earthquake (XI, 63, 1-2) and the revolt (XI, 64, 2): the Spartans sent the Athenians home (XI, 64, 2-4) because they feared that partiality to the Helots was developing among the Athenian forces. Here, perhaps, is the seed of the tradition that school. Lysistrata (1144) carries much further by saying that Kimon and the Athenians actually freed the Messenians. Pausanias (IV, 24, 6), like Thucydides, gives fear that the Athenians would begin revolutionary activity as the

pp. 158-180, especially 175-177 (table), with the bibliography there cited. This scholion, it should be remembered, is largely in error; it was copied from Philochoros, a poor chronographer, and its information is of dubious value. Kimon did not go to the Peloponnese immediately upon receiving the call for help; Kimon did not free the Messenians. The line in Aristophanes' play clearly praises Kimon's aid to Lakedaimon, not to the Helots, as the note would have it. Schol. Lysistrata (1144), furthermore, is in complete disagreement on these
reason for their dismissal by the Spartans. Another source for the siege of Ithome, Xenophon (HeII., VI, 5, 33), with Aristophanes emphasises the fact that Athens aided Sparta who was hard put to defend herself from the Helots. 30

The affair of Ithome not only brought to light the Spartan fear of Athens' growing power, but also indicated something of the hatred brewing between the two states. The scholiast to Lysistrata (1138) gives a faint suggestion of what Thucydides relates (I, 103, 3; I, 118, 2). Diodoros (XI, 64, 3) is equally outspoken: μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα ἀλλοτρίως ἔχοντες τὰ πρὸς τοὺς Δακεδαίμονις ἔπληκτον τὴν ἔχθεσιν ἐξεπέμψειον. διὸ καὶ ταῦτα μὲν ἄρχην ἔλαβον τῆς ἀλλοτριότητος, ὕστερον δὲ αἱ πόλεις διηνέχοντο, καὶ μεγάλους ἑπανέλθεις τοὺς πολέμους ἐπέλησαν ὅπου τὴν Ἑλλάδα μεγάλων ἀτυχημάτων.

Besides these difficulties, trouble was stirring points with schol. Lysistrata (1137), where the note, although brief, is correct. Perhaps, however, ἀλλοτρίος refers to the Spartans.

30 Sparta might have been in danger. Her population, never large, was much decreased by the quake which had killed many Spartiates, particularly the women and children in the city. Porter, Hermathena, XLIX (1935), pp. 1-15, argues this point vigorously. Why else, he asks, were the Spartans so anxious to return home from Tanagra in 457, and so eager to retrieve the 120 Spartiates captured on Sphakteria.
elsewhere. In Egypt Inaros led a revolt against the Persian overlords and, soon, Athens was involved. In a note to Aves (484) is a reference to the uprising:

Δαρείος βασιλεὺς ἦν, Μεγάρας ὁ σατράπης, πορθήσας Μέμφιδα. οὗτος σατράπης Δαρείου ὁ τῆς Αἰγυπτίου ἔλους. οὗ μνημονεύει Θουκυδίδης ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ 103 γράφων οὕτως "Μεγάρας τὸν Ζωκηρόν πέμψει ἀνδρὰς Πέρσην μετὰ πολλῆς στρατιᾶς, ὀς ἀφικόμενος κατὰ γῆν, τοὺς τε Αἰγυπτίους καὶ τοὺς συμμάχους μάχῃ ἐκράτησε καὶ ἐκ Μέμφιδος ἤλασε τοὺς Ἑλλήνας!"

The revolt of Inaros is reported also in a scholion to Plutus (178):

ἐκ τοῦτον Ἀθηναίοι ἐπέψαν τοῖς Αἰγυπτίοις συμμαχίαν εἰς τὸν πρὸς Πέρσας πόλεμον, καὶ εἷς χοῖρον φιλίαν καὶ συμμαχίαν πρὸς ἀλλήλους.... "Ἀλλαξε ὁ τε Χέργης ἐκ Αἰγυπτίους ἐστράτευετο. οἱ Ἀθηναίοι συμμαχίαν αὐτοῖς ἀπέστειλαν. ὁ Χέργης ἐκ Αἰγυπτίους ἐστράτευεσσεν, οἱ δὲ Ἀθηναίοι συνεμάχησαν αὐτοῖς.... "Ἀλλαξε. Ἰνάρως ὁ τῶν Αἰγυπτίων βασιλεὺς ἀπέστησε τοῦ βασιλέως Χέργου μοῦραν τιμα τῆς Αἰγύπτου, καὶ χρηματα πέμψας τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις ἔλαβε συμμάχους, οἵτινες καὶ διαφέρουσας εἰς τὴν Αἰγύπτου, καὶ ἐν τῷ τῶν τοῦ Νείλου στομάτων ἀνασκελεσσαντες, προσέσχον τοῖς ἔλεσι. Μεγάρας ὁ τοῦ βασιλέως Περσῶν
στρατηγὸς τοῦ ποταμοῦ διακάψας καὶ ἄλλαξε τρέψας εἶλεν ἐνείπονος ἐπὶ γηρᾶς καὶ ὀπέκτεινεν.

Both scholia show confusion about the incumbent of the Persian throne. Neither mentions Artaxerxes, whom Thucydides (I, 104, 1) names as king in 460/59 (so too Diodoros, XI, 74, 1, and Aristodemos, T56).

That the Athenians came to help Inaros is certain; Thucydides (I, 104, 2) with Diodoros (XI, 74, 2) says only that the Greek forces came from Kypros at Inaros' request. Herodotos (III, 160, 2) names the Athenians as allies of the Egyptians in revolt. The scholiasts' remark that the Egyptians sent money to Athens in order to get help (schol. Plutus, 178) may indicate that they paid in advance for the services of Athenian mercenaries or that money seemed the most effective form of persuasion for the demos.31

The failure of the Egyptians, even with Athenian help, to drive out the Persians, is reported, in summary form, by the scholiasts to Plutus (178). Thucydides (I, 109-110 and 112, 2), Herodotos (III, 12, 4), Diodoros (XI, 77 and XII, 3-4), Aristodemos (T56) tell the same story.33

31 Cf. Allian (T3); Isokrates (T148); Justin (T162) who dates the fall of Ithome wrongly after the Egyptian campaign; Ktesias (T173) who says merely that Egypt asked Athens' help.

32 Cf. Isokrates (T148); Allian (T3); Justin (T162);
Details, then, are accurate. The one glaring problem in the scholia to *Aves* and *Plutus* is the confusion of names: Dareios is King of Persia and Megabazos the satrap who led the army in Egypt (schol. *Aves*). Schol. *Plutus* recognises Xerxes as King of Persia. The errors arise probably from an insecure knowledge of the Persian king list, or (particularly in schol. *Plutus*) from a scribal blunder (Xerxes for Artaxerxes). The same annotators did not excerpt both notes, since schol. *Aves* is in codices R and V, but schol. *Plutus* is in neither and appears only in codices of later date. Aristophanes (*Aves*, 484) joins the names of Megabazos and Dareios; the former was known to have had some connexion with the war in Egypt. The scholiasts may have inferred from the playwright.

There is another reason, perhaps, for the confusion. Herodotos (III, 12, 4) says that Xerxes' brother Achaimenes died fighting Inaros who led a revolt in Egypt. For one with a hazy knowledge of Persian and Egyptian history it would have been easy to assume that Xerxes was still alive.

Whether the scholiasts failed to distinguish between the revolt of 460 and the earlier uprising in 484 is uncertain. Two notes in schol. *Plutus* (178) refer to a conflict between Xerxes and the Egyptians. The Athenians, it is emphasised,

and Ktesias (T174 and T175).
sent an allied force to Egypt. According to Herodotos (VII, 7) Xerxes stopped at Egypt, in the second year after Darius’ death (i.e., 484) to put down a revolt. Egyptian sources report that Egypt built some sort of fortification against the Persians at the mouth of the Nile. Nothing is said about Athenian forces sent to help. One may readily understand how both revolts came to be dated to Xerxes’ reign. There is also a possibility that the Greek aid mentioned by the scholiasts is misinterpretation of mercenary help given by the Greeks already in Egypt, living at Memphis (Herodotos, II, 154, 3-4).

One problem remains. Where the scholiasts to Aves have the satrap Megabazos, Thucydides (I, 109, 3) has Megabyzos (Megabyxos). Aristophanes (Aves, 483), names Megabazos without indicating his part in the Egyptian affair — either name could be read in the text of Aves without altering the

33 How and Wells, Commentary, II, pp. 127-128.

34 A demotic chronicle in the Louvre states that Amasis assigned lands and revenues at Memphis, Boubastis and Heliopolis to the Greeks (cf. How and Wells, Commentary, I, p. 244). Herodotos recalls that there had been Greeks in Egypt, at Memphis, since Amasis moved them there from Stratopeda, a little below Boubastis (II, 154, 3). See Cook, J.H.S., LVII (1937), pp. 227-237.
meaning of the line. A check is provided by Herodotos (III, 160, 2), who calls Megabyxos (Megabyzos), son of Zopyras, the Persian general who fought the Egyptians in revolt and worsened their Athenian allies. He, not Megabazos, was the general who plundered Memphis (Thucydides, I, 109, 4). 35 It was Megabazos (Thucydides, I, 109, 2-3) who came to Sparta to bribe the Lakonians to draw Athens' attention from Egypt by threatening an attack on Attike.

Shortly after Inaros roused the Egyptians against Persia, the First Peloponnesian War began. Aristophanes makes few direct references to it. Myronides, one of the generals, is mentioned in Lysistrata (801) and the scholiasts contribute a biographical note:

Δ'ο λυρωκίδα μίσας, ὡς ἐν ταῖς Ἐκκλησιαζοθείς [303] δεξάμενα. ἐνθάδε τοῖς μέμνημαι τοῦ ἐν Οἰνοφόροις νικήσαντος.

Thucydides (I, 108, 2-3) relates that Myronides, after the

---

35 White, Scholia on the Aves, p. 102, notes that ABGU of Aristophanes have Μεγαβόζου; "for the playwright quotes Thucydides with particularity!" White fails to indicate which ms. are to be identified as ABGU. These are not the letters used by Hall and Geldart in their edition of Aristophanes, which antedates White's by five years.
victory, at Oinophyta, took as hostages one hundred of the wealthiest Boiotians. Plutarch (Aristides, 20, 1) remembers him as a colleague of Aristeides. Diodorus (XI, 81, 4-5) calls him a clever and active commander, and reports two battles around Oinophyta where other sources note only one: Myronides first won a victory over the Boiotians, which made him the military equal of Kimon and Themistokles; later, he defeated all of Boiotia except Thebes.36

In later years, when the Spartans sent to Athens, bidding the people to remove the curse of the Alkmaionidai, as represented by Perikles, the Athenians replied that Sparta should, in turn, rid herself of the curse of Tainaron. The scholiasts comment in a note to Acharnenses (510):

Ταίναρον γάρ ἐστι τῆς Δακωνικῆς ἀκρωτηρίου, ἐν ὕπο στόμιον ἦν κατάγouv eis Λακωνίαν. Ἐνταῦθα δὲ ἦν καὶ Ποσειδῶνος ἱερὸν Ἀσφαλείον. τούτο δὲ εἶπεν, ἐπειδὴ τόυτο εἰλικτὰς οἰκεῖας καθοσθύνας ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τοῦ Ποσειδῶνος τοῦ Ταίναρου οὕτως δείσαντες ἀνεῖλον Δακωνικῶν, καὶ διὰ τούτο ἐδόκομοι ἐναγεῖς εἶναι.

The ἄγος, reports Thucydides (I, 128, 1), was said to be the cause of the earthquake that preceded the Helot revolt in 465. Pausanias (VII, 25, 3), repeating the story, explains

that the earthquake was caused by Poseidon "the earth-shaker" whose temple had been defiled. Elsewhere (IV, 24, 5) he dates the event to Olympiad 79, in the archonship of Archimedes (sic)\textsuperscript{37} and subjoins the first revolt to the later affair of Ithome. Suidas (s.v. Ταίναρου) repeats the scholion to Acharnenses. In a second note (T241) he stresses the fact that Sparta broke the right of sanctuary. Aelian's story (T5) repeats that of Pausanias.

Servius mentions (T256) the location of Tainaron; the scholiast to Lucan (T176) adds that the name belonged to both a mountain and a city. It was a city only, according to Pindar (T219) and the scholiasts to Pindar (Pyth., 4, 43-45). The scholiasts to Apollonios Rhodios (T29) call it a lake. Strabo's description of the locale (VIII, 363) is more detailed.

The connexion with Poseidon and Hades is well documented. Thucydides (I, 128, 1) speaks of the temple of Poseidon, and later writers - Pausanias (III, 12, 5), Hesychios (T135), Mela (T139) - agree. All except Thucydides add that the entrance to Hades is there\textsuperscript{38}. The scholiasts to Lucan and Pindar describe the opening of the passage in vivid phrases

\textsuperscript{37} Ἀρχεδημίδης , archon 464/3. See Hill, Sources\textsuperscript{2} p. 392

\textsuperscript{38} Pindar (T219); Apuleius (T34); schol. Lucan (T176); schol. Pindar (Pyth., 4, 43-45).
and include the wail of souls in torment. Strabo (VIII, 363) says that it was through this opening that Herakles brought Kerberos into the world of mortals. A papyrus supplies evidence that sacrifices to the nether gods were held on Cape Tainaron.39

The Sacred War of 449-44740 was hardly more than a protracted skirmish. Drawing from Philochoros, Eratosthenes, Theopompos and Thucydides the scholiasts to Aves (556) take pains to describe it:

ο ἱερὸς πόλεμος ἔγενετο Ἀθηναίοις πρὸς Βοιωτοὺς ὀρομένους ἐφελέσθαι φωκέων τὸ μαντεῖον. νικήσαντες δὲ φωκέωι πάλιν ἀπέδωκαν, ὡς Φιλόχορος εὐ τῇ δ’λέγει. δῶς δὲ ἱεροὶ πόλεμοι γεγόνασιν, οὗτος τε καὶ ὅπερ φωκέωι ἐπέθεντο ἄκεδαιμονιοί. ἐν ἑνὶ οὖν ὑπομνήματι ταῦτα λέγεται ἱερὸν πόλεμον λέγει, καθ’ πρὸς θεοὺς ἔσοιτο. αὐτὰ δὲ τοῦ ἱεροῦ πολέμου μημονεῖ τοῦ γενομένου Ἀθηναίοις πρὸς φωκέας ύπὲρ τοῦ ἐν Δελφοῖς ἱεροῦ. ἐσχεδίασται δὲ ὑπ’ αὐτῶν. οὐ γὰρ πρὸς φωκέας ύπὲρ τοῦτον ἐπολέμησαν, ἀλλ’ ύπὲρ φωκέων, διὰ τὸ πρὸς ἄκεδαιμονίους ἔχθος. γεγόνασι δὲ δῶς πόλεμοι ἱεροὶ. πρῶτος μὲν ἄκεδαιμονίους πρὸς

39 Archiv. für Papyrussforschung, II (1903), no. 125 (p. 566).

40 For the date see A.T.L., III, pp. 178-179 with notes 64 and 65.
Thucydides (I, 112, 5) is extremely brief and gives no indication that there was a break in the armistice between Athens and Sparta. Except for his addition that Pericles led the Athenian expedition to Delphi, Plutarch (Pericles, 21) makes no changes in the story. Aristodemus (T58) calls the war "Hellenic," saying that the Athenians drove away the Lokrians to whom the Spartans had given charge of the sanctuary.

Suidas (ε.γ. ἱερὸς πόλεμος) remarks that there were two Sacred Wars; the second was between Athenians and Boiotians on behalf of the Phokians.41

41 It should be noted that Suidas is a combination of several parts of the scholion to Aves. Philochoros' information that there was a Sacred War between Athens and Boiotia is probably a rather confused account of the first Sacred War, fought in the early sixth century as culmination of a dispute between
Notable is the correction made by the scholiasts to Philochoros' version that Athens fought Phokis because of the sanctuary. Obviously they, or their source, checked Philochoros' information against that of other historians mentioned in the glosses and found that Philochoros was in error.

In 456/5 Aischylos died. He was not forgotten; a scholion to Acharnenses (10) mentions the posthumous honour awarded to him:

οὐ γὰρ ἔξη κατ' ἐκείνου τοῦ χρόνου. ἔτελεσθησε γὰρ ἐπὶ ἄρχοντος Καλλίου τοῦ μετὰ Μυησίθεου τὸτε πρῶτον ἐνιαυτῷ λεῖ. τιμῆς δὲ μεγίστης ἔτυχε παρὰ Ἀθηναίοις δ' Αἰσχύλου, καὶ μόνον αὐτοῦ τὰ δράματα ψηφίσματι κοινῷ καὶ μετὰ θάνατον ἐδιδάσκετο.

The anonymous writer of the Vita Aeschylī remembers that the Athenians were so proud of Aischylos that they voted to present his tragedies after his death (T16). Philostratos\(^{42}\) states that Aischylos was termed the Father of Tragedy; that

---

Krisa and Delphoi. Eventually Thessaly, with the help of Athens and Sikyon, became involved in a war against Phokis, Krisa and perhaps some Boiotians. Thus it might be assumed that Athens and Boiotia were at war with each other. Cf. Pieske, s.v. Krisa, in P.W., R. E., and the bibliography there cited. Cf. T58.

\(^{42}\) Vita Apollonii, 6, 113; p. 220 Kayser.
his plays, presented after his death, were often awarded the prize. Quintilian (T236) says the same.

The date of his death, supplied by the scholiasts, thirty years before the presentation of Acharnenses, agrees with the date accepted by modern scholars.43

Thucydides' account of the Fifty Years shows that Athens had a number of difficult moments as she gradually exchanged her hegemony for leadership of the empire. Aristophanes seldom refers to imperial problems, however, and the only allusions to trouble before 431 with which the scholiasts attempt to deal are two references to Euboea. The revolt of 446 caused Athens, by herself, some anxious moments, as a scholion to Nubes (213) remarks:

εἰς φόρου ἐξετάσθη, πλείονα φόρου παρέχουσα. δηλοὶ δὲ καὶ τὸ ἡμείσθαι. ἐκληροδόχησαν δὲ αὕτην 'Αθηναίοι, κρατήσαντες αὕτης. πρὸς τὸν χρόνον ἀπήντησε καὶ τὸ μὴκος τοῦ πολέμου.... ἐκπαραδόχησαν δὲ αὕτην 'Αθηναίοι μετὰ Περικλέους, καὶ μάλιστα χαλκιδέας καὶ 'Ερετρίδας... Περικλέους δὲ στρατηγοῦντος καταστράφησαν αὐτοὺς πᾶσάν φησὶ φιλόχορος καὶ τὴν μὲν ἄλλην ἐκ διμολογία καταστάθηκε, 'Εστιαίεων δὲ ἀποικισθέντων αὐτοὺς τὴν χώραν ἔχειν. Περικλῆς γὰρ αὕτην ὅκω τοὺς 'Αθηναίους ἔποιήσευ, ἐν πολέμῳ νικήσας τοὺς

43 Cf. Dieterich, s.v. Aischylos, in P.W., R.E.
"Ἀβαντας. διδ παρετάθη τοῖς φόρους καὶ ἐκφορτίσθη·
ἡς τῶν Ἀθηναῖων ἐπιτεινάντων τοὺς φόρους αὐτῆ...·
ὁ μὲν γὰρ τούτο εἰρήκει, δῆτι μακρὰ καὶ ἐπιμήκης ἡ
Εὔβοια, ὁ δὲ ἐπὶ αὐξήσεως τούτο φόρων ἐξέλαβε. παρα-
στησάμενος γὰρ Περικλῆς τὴν Εὔβοιαν, ἐξέτεινε τοὺς αὐτῆς
φόρους ἐπὶ πολὺ.

Thucydides (I, 114) reports the activities of Perikles against
Euboea. After he had subdued the island, Perikles made treaties
with the cities, Chalkis and Eretria. Only Hestiaia was
punished: her inhabitants were sent away and a klerouchy estab-
lished in her territory.44

Plutarch (Pericles, 22 and 23, 3–4) and Diodoros
(XII, 7 and 22) agree, adding that the Hippomotai were the prin-
cipal objects of Perikles' attention at Hestiaia since they led
the revolt. Theopompos (frg. 387 Jacoby) traces the expelled
Hestiaians to a new home in Macedonia. The orators, Andokides
(T24) and Aischines (T11) speak of Euboea, rather than Hestiaia, as
the area used for the Athenian apoikia.

The scholiasts use the words κληρουχία and ἀποικία
For the distinction see A.T.L., III, pp. 284–286 with notes
46 and 47. The word kleros in Vespae (217) has been used by the
scholiasts in a note that is wholly a paraphrase of the passage.
A note to Vespae (715) mentions the number of medimni in each kleros on Euboea:

"Ἀλλὰς. τὴν Ἑβοϊαν φασὶν αὐτὸν κατανεμημέναν ύμῖν καὶ κλῆρον ἑκάστῳ μεδιμνῶν υ.

The number is not unreasonable. Ailian (T4) says that two thousand kleroi were set up on the confiscated land. Eighty thousand medimni would be set aside for the klerouchy on the land which the Hippobatai had owned.

The primary evidence for the settlement of Euboea after the revolt of 446/5 lies in the decrees. The regulations for Chalkis are inscribed on a stele that is in almost perfect condition (I.Ś., I² 39; D17 in A.T.L., II). Regulations for Eretria are in a fragmentary state (I.Ś., I² 17; D16 in A.T.L., II) as are those for Hestiaia (I.Ś., I² 40/41), but both can be restored sufficiently to show something of the relationship between Athens and the two cities after 446. Another decree concerned with Euboea (I.Ś., I² 376) deals with temene owned by Athens in Chalkidic and Eretrian territory. Photios (T210) mentions a decree listing the hostages taken from Eretria after the revolt.


46 See Raubitschek, Hesperia, XII (1943), pp. 28-33, who publishes a new fragment.
The Chalkidians are called by Thucydides ὑπῆκοι καὶ φόρου ὑποτελεῖς (VII, 57, 4). That tribute was paid by the Euboeic cities is confirmed by the quota lists. The scholiasts to Nubes state that Perikles increased (ἐγέτευε) the tribute. The quota lists deny this; after the revolt the assessment of Chalkis and Eretria were lowered in compensation for the new klerouchies.

Scholia to Equites (237-238) discuss both Chalkis and the Chalkidike:

οἱ δὲ Ἀθηναίων εἰσὶ μὲν ἔν τῇ Ἑθεῖᾳ ἄποικοι Ἀθηναίων, εἰσὶ δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ Θάκχης οἱ Ἀθηναίων, ἄποικοι ὑπερτέες ἀπὸ τῆς Ἑθείας. πολλὰ δὲ ἦν τότε χωρία τῆς Θάκχης ὑποκόλλουσα τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις. περὶ δὲ ἦν νῦν λέγεται, καὶ γὰρ ἐπὶ Θάκχης Ἀθηναίων ἡσαυ ὑπῆκοι τῶν Ἀθηναίων. ὁποῖον οὖν ὅτι τὸ πνημίου ποτό γενετοκλιδὸν ἔστι... διὰ τὸ κατ᾽ ἑκεῖνου τῶν καιρῶν ἀκοστήναυ αὐτῶν τῶν Ἀθηναίων. ἀκοστήσαντι δὲ ἀπὸ Ἀθηναίων Ἀθηναίων ἐπὶ Ἑθείαν ἄρχοντος. πόλις Ἑθείας, ἄποικοι Ἀθηναίων. ἔχρωντο δὲ τοῖς

---

47 See the Register of A.T.L., I, s.v.y. Ἑρετρίης, Ἑστιαιης, Χαλκίδης; see also A.T.L., II, p. 80 (s.v. Ἑρετρίης). Note the cessation of tribute from Hestiaia after 446.

The reference to the Chalkideis as *apoikoi* of Athens in Euboea may be a reference to the klerouchs on Chalkis' territory mentioned by Herodotos (V, 77, 2; VI, 100, 1). However, this may equally well be an allusion to the klerouchy led by Tolmides (Pausanias, I, 27, 5). The scholion gives no hint of date.

For the statement that the Chalkidians in Euboea established an *apoikia* in Chalkidike there is indirect evidence in Herodotos (VII, 185, 2) who is first to mention the Thrakian area as Chalkidike and call the inhabitants *Χαλκιδικῶν γένος* (cf. VIII, 127). The settlements made by Chalkis and Eretria in that area date to the eighth century. Theopompos (frg. 387 Jacoby) tells us of a movement of Hestialians to Makedon; this may belong after the dispossession of 446.

For the scholiasts' remark that many states in Thrake were obedient to Athens there is copious evidence in Thucydides and the tribute quota lists.

The scholion (*Equites*, 237) states that the Chalkideis revolted from Athens in the archonship of Eukleides (404/3).


50 *E.g.*, Thucydides, I, 57, 5; II, 79, 99, 101; IV, 7. See the Thrakian panel in *Α.Τ.Ε.* I, p. 459, and the Register
We are unaware of revolts at this time either in Chalkis or in the Chalkidike. Nor are there signs of dissension in 427/6, the archonship of Eukles, with whom Eukleides might be confused. In 424/3, however, Brasidas was busily engaged in alienating the cities of Chalkidike. Thucydides speaks of revolts in Skione and Mende (IV, 120, 1 and 123, 1; cf. 167, 3 and 109). In this year one of the strategoi sent to Thrake to deal with Brasidas was Eukles (Thucydides, IV, 104, 4). Has the general Eukles of Thucydides become the archon Eukleides of the scholion?

Besides his concern with the foreign affairs of Athens, Perikles had to face opposition within the city. After the death of Kimon, his brother-in-law, Thourkydides became leader of the oligarchic party and Perikles' most active opponent. A lengthy note to Vespaee (947) discusses Thourkydides' political life and what came of it:

Θουκυδίδης Μελησίου νῦς Περικλῆς ἀντιπολιτευόμενος, τέσσαρες δὲ εἰς θουκυδίδια Ἀθηναίοι, ὁ ἱστοριογράφος καὶ ὁ Γαρλήττιος καὶ ὁ Ἡθολόδος καὶ οὗτος ἤστων ἄριστος τυγχάνων, διὰ κατηγορήσεις εὑν τῷ δικάζειν οὐκ ἥδυνθη ἀπολογησάσθαι ὑπὲρ ἑαυτοῦ, ἀλλ' ὀσπερ ἐγκατεχομένην ἐσχὲ τὴν γλώτταν, καὶ οὕτω κατεδικάσθη, εἰτα ἑξωσοτράκισθη. Ἄλλως, πρὸς τὴν ἱστορίαν, μήποτε ο Περικλῆς ἀντι-
The earliest source to mention Thoukydides' position in the Periklean city is Aristotle (T62): Perikles represented the demos, Thoukydides the others in the city. Plutarch (Moralia, 802C) explains Thoukydides' political affiliations: he was one of the ἅριστοι; he led the opposition of the ἀγαθὸς and καλὸς against the demagogue Perikles (Plutarch, Nicias, 2, 2). Thoukydides was an able politician, an ardent proponent of the aristocracy and disapproved of any form of indulgence to the commons (Plutarch, Pericles, 11, 1-3). A passage in the anonymous Vita Thucydidis (6-7), accepted by most historians

51 On the opposition between Perikles and Thoukydides see Wade-Gery, J.H.S., LII (1932), pp. 205-227.

52 Cf. Aristeides (T46, 2) and schol. Aristeides (T45 and T46); Satyros (frg. 14 Müller).
as reference to Thoukydides rather than to the writer, mentions a single illustration of the controversy: Πυριλάμπης γάρ τις τῶν πολιτῶν ἀνδρὰ φίλον καὶ ἐφώμενον ἰδιον διὰ τινά ἤλο- τυπήσας ἐφώμευσε, ταῦτα δὲ τῆς δίκης ἐν Ἀρείῳ πάγῳ κρινομένης πολλὰ τῆς ἰδίας σοφίας ἐπεδείξατο, ἀπολογίαν ποιούμενος ὑπὲρ τοῦ Πυριλάμπου, καὶ Περικλέους κατηγοροῦντος ἑυκία. Ὁ δὲ ἐκεῖνος ἀπὸ τῶν ἐλομένων Ἀθηναίων ἀρχῶν προέστη τοῦ δήμου.

As the scholiasts say, the situation led to the ostracism of Thoukydides. This is described by Plutarch (Pericles, 14, 3) and by the anonymous Vita Thucydidis (7). Ostraka of Thoukydides of the Alopeke, or Thoukydides son of Melesias, have been found in the Athenian agora.

The scholiasts observe that there were three other men named Thoukydides: the historian, son of Oloros, Thoukydides Gargettios and Thoukydides Thetatalos. The historian was general in Thrake reports the scholion. The Thoukydides of Thucydides, I, 117, 2, may be Gargettios. Thetatalos

54 Vanderpool, Hesperia, Suppl. VIII (1949), pp. 394-411.
55 Kirchner, F.A., I, no. 7272; Gomme, Commentary, I.
occurs only in the scholion, unless Thetatalos is the same as Thucydides Pharsalios (Thucydides, VIII, 92, 8); the exceptor or scholiast may have blundered. The historian Thucydides himself supplies most of what is known about his own life; the Vitae supplement it.

In the face of oligarchic opposition, Perikles carried out a domestic programme that embraced the constitution, city-planning, colonisation and the food-supply. The commentary to Aristophanes has scattered notes on these activities. To Acharnenses (548) there is a gloss on the building programme both on the Akropolis and in the city and Peiraeus:

τῆς λεγομένης ἀλφιτοπώλιδος, ἦν ὁμοδήμος Περικλῆς ὅπου καὶ σῖτος ἐστέκειτο τῆς πόλεως. ἦν δὲ περὶ τῶν Πειραιῶν στεναχώσις ὅτι διὰ τὸ πλήθος τῶν συναγομένων ἐπισιτιστῶν.

No writer of classical times or later refers to a grain market in Peiraeus, but there is evidence for the civic development that went on there at Perikles' behest. Aristotle (Politics, 1267b) mentions the replanning of the port city by Hippodamos and supplies a description of the efficient way in which the planning was done. Harpokration (T123), quoting Demosthenes, places the Hippodameion in Peiraeus;

p. 354.
it was built in memory of the architect Hippodamos. Hippodamos also built the roads and streets in Periaieus, Photios says (Ill, 11-17 Porson). The replanning of the port can be dated to the time of Perikles' ascendency by the fragments of boundary stones.

None of this, to be sure, proves that Perikles was responsible for the building of a grain market in Periaieus, but, if so extensive a programme was carried on there, a grain market may well have been one of the needed elements. A note to \*vespae (718) about a shortage of grain in the city in the archonship of Lysimachides (445/4) makes it plausible:

\[\text{τοιούτῳ ἐστὶ παρόσον ἐν ταῖς διανομαῖς τῶν πυρῶν ἔξ-}
\[\text{ητάξωντο πυρῶν οἱ τε πολίται καὶ μη, ὡστε δοκεῖν ἔχειν}
\[\text{φεύγειν εἰς κρίσιν καθισταμένους. φησίν οὖν φιλόχορος}
\[\text{αὐτὸς ποτὲ τετρακιςχιλίους ἐπτακοσίους ἕν ὄψηναι παρ-
\[\text{εγγράφους, καθόπερ ἐν τῇ προκειμένῃ λέξει δεδηλώται.}
\[\text{τὰ περὶ τὴν Ἐθύδιαν δόναται καὶ αὐτὰ συνάδειν ταῖς διδασκα-
\[\text{λίαις. πέρνοι γὰρ ἐπὶ ἄρχοντος Ἰσάρχου ἐστράτευσαι}
\[\text{ἐπ' αὐτῇ, ὡς φιλόχορος. μὴποτε δὲ περὶ τῆς ἐξ ἀλῆπτου}
\[\text{δωρεῖς ὁ λόγος, ἡν φιλόχορος φησὶ Παμμήτιχου πέμψει}
\[\text{τῷ ὀίμῳ ἐπὶ Δυσιμαχίδου μυριάδας τρεῖς, πλὴν τὰ τοῦ}

56 TL39 and TL40; letter forms date between 480 and 445/4.
Schol Plutus (178) also refers to grain sent by Egypt to Athens in time of shortage:

ἐπὶ Ἀμασίδος 57 Αἰγυπτιῶν βασιλέως ἐν σιτοδεία ὄντες οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι ἔκεμψαν πρὸς αὐτῶν αἰτοῦτες σῖτον· καὶ ἔκεμψαν αὐτοῖς ικανόν... διὸ καὶ Παμμήνιος λέγεται πέμψαι πυρῶν μυριάδας τρεῖς... σῖτον δὲ ἔκεμψε τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις μυριάδας τριάκοντα. 58

57 The name may be an example of the annotators' ignorance of the Egyptian king list. See above pp. 128-130.

58 Only Plutarch (Pericles, 37) mentions this event.
To prevent recurrence of the crisis Perikles may have seen to the building of a grain market and storehouse in Peiraeus.

Perhaps as much to relieve Athens of some of her excess population as to establish a panhellenic colony Perikles sent out a group to settle Thourioi, near the site of Sybaris.\(^59\) The scholiasts recall the enterprise in a note to Nubes (332\(fr\)):

\[\text{θεουριομάντεις δὲ οὐ τοὺς ἀπὸ θεουρίου μάντεις, ἀλλὰ τοὺς εἰς θεουρίου, πόλιν Σικελίας, πεμφθέντας ἐπὶ τῷ κτίσαι αὐτήν· ἐπέμψαν δὲ δέκα ἄνδρας. Ὁ μὲν Λάμπων ἦν ὁ μάντης, ἐν ἑγγύτητι ἐκάλουν. Ἡμὶ δὲ καὶ τῶν πολιτευομένων πολλάκις. λόγους δὲ συνεχῶς ἔισ-}\]

quoting, as the scholiasts do, from Philochoros. I.\(g\), II, 31 seems to allude to a lack of grain, and may refer to the shortage during which Egypt helped Athens, perhaps in return for the favour Athens had done when she sent help against the Persians. The note, as a whole, is excerpted from Philochoros.

\(^59\) Cf. Wade-Gery, J.H.S., LII (1932), pp. 217-219, who argues that the colonisation of Thourioi was more akin to the policies of Thoukydides and the oligarchs than to Perikles and the "democrats!" But see Ehrenberg, A.J.P., LXIX (1948), pp. 149-170.
A scholion to Aves (521) speaks further of Lampon:

According to Diodoros (XII, 10, 4) the Athenians colonised Thourioi under the direction of an oracle which had told them to settle near a fountain. With Lampon as their leader, the colonists sailed to Italy and settled near the fountain called Thourion. Later (XII, 35, 1) he says that the colonists at Thourioi came from many cities. Strabo (VI, 263) reports that Sybaris was destroyed and Thourioi, named after the spring, founded near the site. The lexicographers, Photios (T211) and Hesychios (T139), repeat that Lampon accompanied the colonists and that the founding of Thourioi was carried out after omens had been received. Plutarch (Moralia, 835d) supplies the date of founding and (Pericles, 11, 5) agrees with other writers that Perikles sent colonists to found Thourioi (cf. Moralia, 812d) near the site of Sybaris. Lampon, the exegete,
is named in Kratino's Drapetides (T170 and T171), a play which made many allusions to the new colony.

A distinguished member of Perikles' circle, famous among the Athenians for her intellectual attainments, was the woman Aspasia. In the comedies of Aristophanes, as a matter of course, she appears several times, by name or by unmistakable allusion. The scholiasts speak of her learning in a note to Acharnenses (527):

τῇ μίᾳ τοστὶν ἐκέχρητο οἱ Περικλῆς· δι' ἧν ὀργίσθης ἔγραψε τὸ κατὰ Μεγαρέων ψήφισμα, ὁπογεεύον δέχεσθαι αὐτῶς εἰς τὰς Ἀθήνας. Ὑπερ ἐκεῖνοι εἰργὴμενοι τῶν Ἀθηνῶν πρὸς ἐφυγον τοῖς λακεδαιμονίοις. Ὑμὸς Ἀσπασία Περικλῆους ἦν σοφίστρια καὶ διδάσκαλος λόγου βητορικῶν. Θυτερον δὲ καὶ γαμεθῇ γέγονε.

In a gloss to Equites (969) she is coupled with Perikles:

ὅπως γὰρ ἐκείραξεν ἐν τοῖς δικαστήριοις, Ἀσπασία καὶ κύρις, τούτεστιν ὁ Περικλῆς.

Athenaios (T82) speaks of her wisdom; Harpokration (T118) quotes from Plato's Menexenos to describe her further. Many Athenians talked with her, Plutarch remarks (Pericles, 24, 7), in order to learn the oratorical arts in which she was so proficient. She had Perikles as a student of rhet-

---

60 Menexenos, 235a; Xenophon, Memorabilia, II, 6, 36;
oric and oratory.  

Her profession as hetaira and mistress of a bawdy-house is mentioned by several writers beside the scholiasts. Athenaios (T82) declares that she was the madam with the most beautiful girls in Athens. She had a certain Thargelia who was call-girl to the more important men in the city (Plutarch, Pericles, 24, 3-4).e The scholiast to Aristeides (46, 2128 Frommel) says that she spent some time in a Milesian brothel but, on arriving in Athens, was elevated to respectability by Perikles. Alkiphron (T17) and Suidas (s.v. 'Ἀσπασία) agree that her earlier profession was that of hetaira, after which she became a rhetorician and a courtesan.

Suidas (s.v. 'Ἀσπασία) calls her Perikles' mistress and, later, his wife, mother of Perikles II. Plutarch (Pericles, 24, 9) agrees that Perikles, greatly enamoured of Aspasia, married her. There are two reports of a trial in which she was involved. According to Athenaios (T84) she escaped condemnation for sacrilege by means of Perikles' pleading. Plutarch (Pericles, 32, 5) declares that Perikles freed Aspasia from a charge of sacrilege. Schol. Equi-

Xenophon, Economicus, 3, 14.

61 Aristeides, 46, 131; Alkiphron (T17); Ἡμωλάν, (T178); Suidas, s.v. 'Ἀσπασία, copies schol. Achamnenses(527).
tes states that he was written in the court records as Ασπασίας Κύριος; it is uncertain when he became her legal protector. If the trial came at a time when Pheidias and Anaxagoras were also being used as media for attack upon Perikles, it probably occurred after she became his wife\(^{62}\) and it would not have been necessary to make her his "ward" also. Κύριος of course, may mean simply "master of the house."\(^{63}\)

Aspasia's relationship to Perikles thus developed as she passed from ward (?) to teacher to wife. Before the wedding, she may have been his mistress, or, as a metic, his common-law wife, and as such considered his mistress by the Athenian citizens, since a metic could not legally be married to a citizen.\(^{64}\)

Suidas(\textit{s.v.} 'Ασπασία) and Harpokration (Τ11) state that Aspasia was responsible for two wars, one with Samos and the great war with the Peloponnesos. One scholion to \textit{Vespa}

\(^{62}\) Plutarch (\textit{Pericles}, 32, 5) implies that they were married at this time.

\(^{63}\) The record of guardianship may come from a collection of decrees, \textit{e.g.}, by Krateros (Ψηφισμάτων συμβουλης).

\(^{64}\) Cf. Peisistratos' relationship to Timonassa. The tradition that Aspasia was a hetaira and a madam may well have begun with the comic poets to make sport of Perikles.
(283) mentions the war between Samos and Athens, and blames Athens' interference on Miletos, not on Aspasia:

τὰ περὶ Σάμου ἐννεακαιδεκάτῳ έτει πρώτερον ἐπὶ Τιμοκλέους ἄρχοντος γέγονε. Μιλησίων γάρ ποτε καὶ Σαμίων μαχημένων Ἄθηναιοι παρακληθέντες ὑπὸ Μιλησίων εἰς συμμαχίαν ἐπεστράτευσαν κατὰ τῶν Σαμίων, Περικλέους ἠγούμενον τοῦ Σαμῆλπου. κακῶς δὲ διατεθέντες Σάμιοι ἐπε-χείρησαν πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα τῶν Περσῶν ἐπελθεῖν. καὶ δὴ τοῦτο μαθόντες Ἄθηναιοι τρίηρεις πολεμικὰς κατ' αὐτῶν κατεσκέβασαν, Περικλέους εἰς σημνοσμένου αὐτῶν. τοῦτο δὲ μαθόντες Σάμιοι μηχανὴν τινα κατασκεβάσαν κατ' αὐτῶν, ἢ μαθόντες Ἄθηναιοι ὑπὸ τινος Καρυστίωνος ἐφυλάξαντο, καὶ Σαμίοις μὲν κακῶς διέθηκαν, τῶν δὲ Καρυστίωνος ἐτίμησαν σφόδρα μετὰ τοῦ γένους καὶ τῆς αὐτῶν πολιτείας ἑξῆκαν. ὡς οὖν τινος ἐξαπατήσατος καὶ εἰπόντος ἑαυτῶν εἶναι τὸν μηνυτὴν τοῦ σκαιρορίματος τῶν Σαμίων, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἀπολυθέντος, φησιν ὅδυνηθαι τῶν φιλοκλέων, ὡς ταῖς καταδίκαις μᾶλλον χαίροντα. — τὰ περὶ Σάμου ἵπτ' έτει πρώ-τερον ἐπὶ Τιμοκλέους γέγονε καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ ἔξης Μορυχίδου.

.... Ἄθηναιοι δὲ Μιλησίους ἐπαγαγόμενοι ἐκάκωσαν τὴν Σάμου καὶ ἐμφρούρουν ἐπιτίθεσαν, τὴν δημοκρατίαν κατα-στήσαντες διὰ Περικλέους. Σάμιοι δὲ ἀπέστησαν πρὸς βασιλέα καὶ τότε οἱ Ἄθηναιοι τελέσαν αὐτούς κατεκολ-έμησαν, ἔνα πάλιν προσηγγέλθη Περικλέη ὅτι φοίνικοι νήσε
Timokles was archon in 441/0, nineteen years before the presentation of Vespae. Thucydides (I, 115–117) is the standard source for the war: Miletos, at war with Samos over Priene, asked for Athenian aid. The Athenians subdued Samos, took hostages and left a guard, but, once they were gone, the Samians revolted, retook the hostages from Lemnos, and prepared to attack Miletos. Perikles and the fleet returned to Samos and waged a victorious sea battle. Diodoros (XII, 27–28) has a story similar in outline, but inserts the machine constructed by Artemon as an aid to the Athenians; he also knows of support from Chios and Mytilene. Plutarch's story is longer (Pericles, 25–28). Perikles was influenced by Aspasia to support Miletos. Although bribed by some Samians not to set up a democracy, Perikles was adamant. In revenge the Samians revolted, to be defeated, partly by Artemon's machine, nine months after the stasis began.

Diodoros and Plutarch agree with the scholiasts that the Persians had sent a fleet to help Samos; Thucydides (I, 116, 3) remarks that Persian ships were on the way.

Perikles destroyed the city walls, fined the Samians a sum that would pay the cost of the war, and deprived
them of ships (Thucydides, I, 117, 3). Plutarch and Di-
doros agree. No tribute was assessed and relations between
the two states seem to have been amicable for some time
thereafter. 65

Plutarch is critical of Douris of Samos for his
calumny of Perikles and the Athenians which some later
historians and exeptors took to be true. Schol. Vespaes
(283) does not echo the unfavourable tradition. A note to
Nubes (859) refers to another accusation levelled at Peri-
kles by the comic poets and by late writers:

Περικλῆς πολλῶν ὄντων χρημάτων ἐν τῇ ἁμορφολεί, εἰς τὸν
πόλεμον τὰ πλεῖστα ἀνάλωσε. φασὶ δὲ ὅτι καὶ λογισμὸν
dιάδοσα, τάλαντα εἴκοσι ὀψλῶς εἶπεν εἰς τὸ δέον ἀνηλω-
κέναι. φησὶ δὲ "Εφορος ὅτι μετὰ ταῦτα μαθήτες οἱ
Δακεδαιμόνιοι Κλαυνδρίδην μὲν ἐδήμευσαν, Πλειστοάνακτα
δὲ έπει τάλαντοι ἐξημίσαν, ὑκολαβότες ὅφωδοκησαντας
αὐτοῖς, διὰ τὸ φείσασθαι τῆς λοιπῆς Ἀθηναίων γῆς, ὅποι
τῶν περὶ τὸν Περικλῆα, μὴ θελήσαντα γυμνῶς εἰκείν ὅτι
dέδωκα τοῖς Δακεδαιμονίων βασιλεύσι τὸ ἐνδέες. "Αλλως.

65 Cf. Gomme, Commentary, I, pp. 354-355; he points
out that Samos continued to coin her own money (cf. Gardner,
J.H.S., XXXIII [1913], pp. 160-161) and was powerful in 411
(Thucydides, VIII, 76, 4). Cf. Aristodemos (T59).
Περικλῆς, Ἄθηναίων στρατηγός, χρήματα τοῦ δήμου τοῦ λαβὼν ἔστε κατασκευάσαι ὀλόχρυσον ἄγαλμα τῇ Ἀθηναῖ, ἐλεφάντινον ποιήσας, τὰ πολλὰ ἐσφετερίζατο, συμποιηθοῦν εἰς πλεῖστα ἀναλώσαι ἡρωτάτου ποῦ ἀνηλώθη, ὧπο μεγαλονοίας ἔλεγεν, εἰς τὸ δέον ἀνήλωσα. "Ἄλλως. Περικλῆς τοῖς ἔφοροις Δακεδαιμονίων Κλεανδρίδη καὶ Πλειστοάνακτο χρήματα δέδωκεν ὑπὲρ προδοσεως, καὶ τούτων ἀπαιτοῦμεν ὑπὸ τῆς πόλεως λόγου, οὐκ ἀξίων εὐτῶν τε καὶ τοὺς Δακεδαιμονίους κατασχῆνειν, ἔλεγεν, εἰς τὸ δέον ἀνήλωσα. τοῦτο δὲ γυναῖκας οἱ Δακεδαιμόνιοι τὸν μὲν Κλεανδρίδην ἐφόνευσαν, τὸν δὲ Πλειστοάνακτα δεκατέυχε ταῦτα τοῖς ἐξημίωσαν, οἷς ἑυτές αὐτοῖς, διὰ τὸ φείδασθαι τῆς λοιπῆς Ἀθηναίων γῆς, δωροδοκησαντα ἐκ τῆς Ἀττικῆς ἀναχωρῆσαι. Περικλῆς Ἀθηναίων στρατηγὸς λόγου ἀπαιτοῦμεν ὑπὲρ χρημάτων καὶ δεδωχές χρήματα Κλεανδρίδη τῷ ἀρμοστῇ Δακεδαιμονίων, ἐπὶ προδοσία, τοῦτο οὖν ἐδήλου, ἀλλ' εἰς τὸ δέον ἔλεγεν ἀναλώσαι ταῦτα.

Pherekrates (T207) and Eupolis (T114) speak of ten talents, perhaps in reference to Perikles' rumoured bribery of Lakedaimon. The scholion itself is based upon Ephoros' account. Plutarch (Pericles, 23, 2) names Theophrastos as source for the information that Perikles bribed the Lakonians not to start war until he was ready. The sum used for bribery varies: Ephoros gives twenty talents, the comic poets and Theo-
One of the grievances which the Corinthians laid before the Peloponnesians in an effort to persuade them to make war upon Athens was the Athenian siege of Poteidaia, a Corinthian colony. A brief scholion to *Equites* (438) summarises the background, the siege and the results of the Poteidaian affair:

Ἐπιστεύει τῷ ὀνόματι... ἢ ἔδε Ποτίδαισι πόλις ἐστὶ πρὸς τῷ Ἰσθμῷ τῆς Παλλήνης κατακεκλεμένη, Κορινθίων μὲν ἁποίκος, Ἀθηναίων δὲ συμμάχοι καὶ φόρους ἐπέλει. ἐς ἀποστάσιαν πολιορκήσαντες οἱ Ἀθηναίοι πολιορκία μακρὰ, ὡς καὶ σφῶν αὐτῶν γενέσθαι κατανακάσαι, παρέλαβον, καὶ ἔκατοδοτοῦσιν σαυτοῖς τὴν πόλιν, ἀπὸ τὰβῆς φησὶν τῆς πόλεως κεκλεφθείαι ἐκείνα τῶν αὐτῶν τῶν Κλέωνα... 

Because of their enmity to Corinth, Thucydides says (I, 56), the Athenians demanded that the Poteidaians, who lived on the isthmus of Pallene, tear down their walls and give hostages.

---

66 Ephoros and Theophrastos may have attributed to an earlier period the accusation that Pericles faced over the building of the Parthenon statue; see below, pp.162-166. The scholion to *Nubes* mentions both charges to explain Aristophanes' rather ambiguous line, and there may have been similar confusion of the two occasions by earlier historians.
When the order was refused, Athens sent a force under Kal-lias to restore discipline (Thucydides, I, 61, 1). Upon the city's surrender, after a long siege (Thucydides, II, 58, 1 and 67, 1), the Poteidalians were allowed to leave the city with one garment apiece and enough money for the journey (Thucydides, II, 70, 1). Diodoros (XII, 46) adds only that the Poteidalians went to live with the Chalkidians in Thrake; Isokrates' account (T157) is as short as the scholion although he notes that Phormio was the leader of the Athenians. Thucydides (I, 63, 3 and 64, 2; II, 29, 6 and 58, 2) and Diodoros (XII, 37, 1) realise that Kallias was sent with the first army against the city whereas Phormio came later with a force of sixteen hundred men, after Kallias fell in battle. Only the scholiasts speak of the enslavement of the citizens; some of them may have been, but most went away. Diodoros (XII, 47, 6-7) declares, indeed, that the Athenians took the city and the land and made a klerouchy from it.

Enslavement as a form of punishment for revolt was used by the Athenians later during the Peloponnesian War (e.g., Sikone; Mytilene would have suffered the same fate had not the original plan been vetoed).

The decree passed against Megara by Perikles was considered, if we are to believe Aristophanes, as a major cause of the Second Peloponnesian War. This tradition,

---

67 Cf. Thucydides, I, 139, 1-2: .... καὶ μᾶλιστα γε
fostered by the comic poets, is prominent in later authors. 68

The scholiasts, whether to explain Aristophanes or because they followed the general tradition, express the same feeling. Only Thucydides appears to doubt that Megara's grievance was the principal cause of the war.

Megara was at fault, declares a scholion to *Pax* (246):

σύμμαχοι δὲ Δακεδαμονίων Μεγαρείς. καὶ ὅτι πάσα ἡ τοῦ πολέμου πρόφασις δι' αὐτῶν δοκεῖ γεγονέναι χάριν τοῦ τὸ πινάκιον συνθέντως τὸ κατ' αὐτῶν εἰς τὴν Περικλέους χάριν, ὡστε μήτε γῆς μήτε λιμένων Ἀττικῶν ἐπιβαίνεις τούς Μεγαρείς. εἰκὸς τὸν οὖν εἰς τὸ κεχαρισμένον τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις τοὺς τοῦτον ἔχοντας παρείσαγεν ἐκ τοῦ πολέμου συντριβομένους εἰς τέλεον. ὅμως δὲ ταῦτα λέγων ὁ Πολιεμός, σκόροδα ὥστε ἐις τὴν θυελλα...

πάντων καὶ ἐνδηλικτα προβλεγον τὸ περὶ Μεγαρέων ψήφισμα καθελούσι μὴ ἄν γίγνεσθαι πόλεσιν, ἐν γ' εἰρήνη τοῖς μὴ κρησθαι καθελούσι μὴ ἄν γίγνεσθαι πόλεσιν τοῖς ἐν τῇ Ἀθηναίων ἀρχῆς μηδὲ τῇ Ἀττικῇ ἁγορᾷ. οἱ δὲ Ἀθηναίοι οὕτε τάλλα ὑπήκουσιν οὕτε τὸ ψήφισμα καθηρουν, ἐπικαλούσθεν ἐπεργαζόμενος Μεγαρέως τῆς γῆς τῆς ἱερᾶς καὶ τῆς ἀοριστοῦ καὶ ἀνθρωπῶν ὑποδοχὴν τῶν ἀφισταμένων.

68

Cf. *Plutarch*, *De Mal. Hercul.*, 856 A.
Another scholion to *Pax* (609) explains why:

ἐπεὶ ψηφίσμα περὶ τῶν ἑγαρέων ὁ Περικλῆς ἔγραψε, μήτε γής μήτε λιμένων αὐτοῦς ἐπιβαίνειν Ἀττικῶν, εἰ δὲ μῆ, τῶν ληφθέντα ἀγώγιμον εἰναι. ἐφ᾽ ὃ κινητεύον πάσα ἡ Ἑλλάς τὸν πόλεμον ἐποίησε, τιμῶς δὲ φασιν ὅτι ἐπλεξεν αὐτοῖς, καὶ κατηγόρησεν ἅμα τῶν ἀρτασάντων γυναικῶν Ἀθηναίων ἐν ἐστή, συμβολεύοντας πολεμεῖσθαι.

A note to *Acharnenses* (527-528) agrees:

ὁ Περικλῆς... ὄργυσθείς ἔγραψε τὸ κατὰ ἑγαρέων ψηφίσμα, ὁ παγόρευον δέχεσθαι αὐτοῦς εἰς τὰς Ἀθήνας. δειν ἐκεῖνοι εἰρήμενοι τῶν Ἀθηνῶν προσέχοντος τοῦ Δακεδαίμονος. ἡ δὲ Ἀσπασία Περικλέους ἢ σοφίστα τριά καὶ διδάσκαλος λόγων ρητορικῶν· ἐνταῦθα εἰς τὸν Περικλέα ἀνθέλεται ἄγαγεν τὴν αἰτίαν τοῦ πολέμου, οὐκ εὐπρεπὴ αὐτῷ προσάπτων πράξαιν.

A scholion on *Pax* (502) refers to this note:

αἰτίαν ἔλθον ὁ ἑγαρεῖς ὁ ἄρχηνοι γενέσθαι τοῦ πολέμου διὰ τὴν ἀρπαγήν τῶν πορνῶν Ἀσπασίας καὶ τὴν ἐπὶ τοῦτοι ὁργὴν Περικλέους καὶ τὸ ψηφίσμα, ὡς ἐβ' Ἀχαρνεῦσι 527, φησὶν.

Another gloss to *Acharnenses* (524) adds the name of Alki-
biades to the story:

οἱ ἀπὸ τῶν Ἄθηναιῶν Ἑγαρέας γυναικὰς Σιμιάθαινον...
ταῦτα δὲ καὶ Ἀλκιβίαδος ἡράσθη, δὲ καὶ δοκεῖ ἀναπελειπεῖ
ἐναὶ τιμᾶς ἡπακέναι τὴν πόρυν.

Another scholion to explain a line in Acharnenses (532),
cites the reason given by Perikles for proposal of the decree:

ἐπεὶ ὁ Περικλῆς γράφων τὸ ψήφισμα εἶπε Ἑγαρέας μήτε ὡς ἄγορὰς μήτε θαλάττης μήτε ἱπείρου μετέχειν. ἐπεὶ οὖν ὁμοία τοῖς Τιμακρέουτος ἔγραψε, διὰ τούτο εἶπεν δι᾽ ἔτιθει νόμος διὸσκερ σκολιὰ γεγραμμένος. ἐνεκάλεσε δὲ ὁ Περικλῆς τοῖς Ἑγαρεύσιν δι᾽ τὴν ἱερὰν γῆν τὴν ἄργαδα ἐγεώργησαν.

The decree, itself, that Ἑγαρά have no admission to the ports
or the markets of Athens, Attike and the empire was familiar
to the scholiasts.69

Thucydides (I, 139, 1), Plutarch (Pericles, 29, 5) and Diodoros (XII, 39, 5) supply the terms of the decree,
agreeing completely with the scholiasts. Aelian (T8) states
only that the Ἑγαρέας πινάκιον was cause of the Pelopon-
nesian War. The orators are less clear; Andokides (T24)
and Alischines (T11) report that the war came about διὰ
Ἑγαρέας.

69 See schol. Pax, 246, and schol. Acharnenses, 532.
What caused Perikles to move such a decree? The scholiasts, to explain Aristophanes' allusions, note several theories that had been suggested by others. Two of the reasons are in "Plutarch" (De Nat. Herod., 856 A): ὥσπερ οἱ κωμικοὶ τοῦ πόλεμον ὑπὸ τοῦ Περικλέους ἐκκενδεσθήσαντες δὲ Ἀσπασίας ἐν διὰ θείαν ἀκοφοινομένω, οὐ φιλοτιμίας τινα καὶ φιλονεικίας μᾶλλον στορεᾶτο τὸ φόνημα Πελοποννησίων καὶ μὴν δῶσι ὑψεῖται Δακεδαιμονίων ἐθελήσαντος. The first, Aspasia, is discussed in schol. Acharnenses (527). For Pax (609) there is another note to the same effect. Marginalia to Pax, 502, and Acharnenses, 624, are to the same effect. Aristophanes alludes to Aspasia but lays emphasis on the Megarian decree. Thucydides, characteristically, says nothing of her, but some later writers link her to the war. Plutarch (Pericles, 30, 4) says that Megara blamed the war on Aspasia (and Perikles). Harpokration (T118) calls her the cause of war, and Athenaios (T62) follows. The fact that she was rumoured to be a madam fitted well with the story that the Megarians had stolen some of her women and thereby so angered Perikles that he issued the decree in revenge, and at her request. Aristodemos (T60) reports the story fully.

Pheidias shares equal honours with Aspasia, in the

---

70 See above, pp. 150-152.
comedies and in later literature, as cause of the war. The scholiasts to *Pax* (605) describe his part in it:

Φίλόχωρος ἐπὶ Θεοδώρου ἄρχοντος ταύτα φησι, καὶ τὸ ἅγιον τὸ χρυσότι τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ἐστάθη εἰς τὸν νεών τὸν μέγαν, ἔχον χρυσόν σταθμὸν ταλάντων μὸ; Περίκλεος ἐπίστατος, Φειδίας δὲ ποιήσαντος, καὶ Φειδίας ὁ ποιήσας, δόξας παραλογίζεσθαι τόν ἑλέφαντα τόν εἰς τὰς φολίδας, ἐκρίθη, καὶ Φυγὼν εἰς Ἡλίων ἐργολαβήσαι τὸ ἅγιον τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ Ἐλυσίς. Λέγεται, τοῦτο δὲ ἐξεργασάμενος ἀποθανεῖν ὑπὸ Ἡλίων ἐπὶ Πυθοδώρου, δὲ ἔστω ἀπὸ τοῦτον ἐβδομαδας, ἐπὶ Μεγαρέων εἰπὼν, ὅτι καὶ αὐτῷ κατεβὸν Ἀθηναίων παρὰ Δαμηδωρίους, ἀδίκως λέγουσι εἰργεσθαι ἀγορᾶς καὶ λιμένων τῶν παρ᾿ Ἀθηναίοις. οἱ γὰρ Ἀθηναίοι ταύτα ἐπηρεάσαντο Περίκλεος εἰπὼντος, τὴν γῆν αὐτῶν αἰτιώμενοι τὴν ἱερὰν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀπεργάζεσθαι. λέγουσι δὲ τινες ὅτι Φειδίας τοῦ ἅγιοντος τοῦ ἁγιαματοκοιμοῦ δόξαν παραλογίζεσθαι τὴν πόλιν καὶ φυγαδευθέντος, ὁ Περίκλης φοβηθεὶς διὰ τὸ ἐπιστατῆσαι τῇ κατασκευῇ τοῦ ἁγιαματο καὶ συνεγνωσθεὶ τῇ κλοπῇ, ἔγραψε τὸ κατὰ Μεγαρέων πινάκιον καὶ τὸν πόλεμον ἐπήνεγκεν. ἦνα ἀπηχολημένοις Ἀθηναίοις εἰς τὸν πόλεμον μὴ δῷς εὐθύνας, ἐγκαλέσας Μεγαρεύοντι δὲ τῇ ἱερᾶς ὀργᾶδα ταύτῃ θεῶν ἐργασάμενοις. ἀλογοῦ δὲ Φαινεῖται ἢ κατὰ Περίκλεος ὑπόνοια, ἐπὶ ἔτει πρώτερον τῆς τοῦ πολέμου ἀρχῆς τῶν περὶ Φειδίαν γενομένων. ὁ Φειδίας δὲ φίλοχωρος
φησίν, ἐπὶ θεοδώρου ἄρχοντος τὸ ἁγαλμα τῆς 'Αθηνᾶς κατασκευάσας ὑφεῖλετο τὸ χρυσίου ἐκ τῶν ὀρακλήτων τῆς χρυσελεφαντίνης 'Αθηνᾶς, ἐφ' ὑπ' καταγγελθείς ἐξημικώθη φυγῇ γενόμενος δὲ εἰς Ἑλίν, καὶ ἐργολαβήσας παρὰ τῶν Ἑλείων τὸ ἁγαλμα τοῦ Δία τοῦ Ὄλυμπου, καὶ καταγγέλθεις ὅπ' αὐτῶν ὡς υστεροσκόμενος ἀνηρεθείς.\[1]

Schol. Fax (606) offers supplementary information:

ἔδοξεν γὰρ ὁ Περικλῆς συνεγνωσθεῖν τὴν κλοπήν, ἐπειδὴ καὶ ἐργαποιηθεῖν ὑπὸ τῶν 'Αθηναίων κεχείρωθηνται. φοβηθεὶς οὖν αὐτοῦ διελεγχθῆναι τὰ κλαπά, ἐκίνησε τὸν Πελοποννησιακὸν πόλεμον, ἐλπίσας ταραχὴς γενομένης καὶ περὶ τὸν πόλεμον ὀπασχοληθέντων τῶν 'Αθηναίων εὐθύνας μὴ παρασχεῖν.

It is quite true that considerable turmoil was raised over the reported collusion between Perikles and Pheidias, or the theft by Pheidias alone, in connection with the gold and ivory statue. Philochoros supplied the information in schol. Fax, 606, which one of the annotators questioned: Pheidias died in Elis in 432, and his death would make futile any attempts to use the Megarian decree to cover his acts. The

\[1\] Cf. schol. Nubes, 859, quoted on pp. 155-156 above.
accusation. points out the scholiast, had been made seven years before.

Diodoros (XII, 39, 1-2) describes the trial and sees behind the accusation hatred of Perikles. According to him (XII, 38, 2-3), there was quite another reason for the Megarian decree: Perikles was about to be called to account for some expenditures and, to escape trial, directed Athenian attention elsewhere.72

Aristodemos (T50) has a similar account: Pheidias was convicted of theft and Perikles, fearing that he might be implicated, put through the decree. Pheidias' theft, according to Plutarch (Pericles, 31, 3), is the most disreputable reason given for the decree, for Pheidias had so attached the gold that it could be removed and weighed if peculation were charged. Plutarch continues (Pericles, 32, 3) with the report that Perikles feared repercussions from the affair and so stirred up a war that he might become sole hope of the city in distress. Plutarch, by his own admission does not believe this version.

Two fragments from Apollodoros' Chronica73 discuss

---

72 See the tradition concerning Perikles' bribery, pp. 155-157 above. For the story that Alkibiades had suggested that Perikles find a way to escape rendering an account see Ephoros, frg. 119 Jacoby; Aristodemos (T50).

73 J. Nicole, Le procès de Phidias dans les chroni-
Pheidias' case, but not enough remains to show whether Apollodoros regarded it as cause for war. Suidas (T252) explains that the sculptor had been accused of a dishonest report on the amount of ivory; Perikles had a part in the theft and, to avoid a euthyna, carried out a plan to start war.

A third reason for the war, mentioned by the scholiasts to Acharnenses (532) and Pax (483), was that Megara, so charged Perikles, farmed the sacred land.74 Plutarch (Pericles, 30, 2-3) says that Perikles nursed a private grudge against Megara and sent Anthemokritos to give an order of cease and desist which would annoy the Megarians and lead them to stir up trouble of some sort. The Megarians killed Anthemokritos, and Perikles, now having a valid reason for his attack, issued the decree under the authorship of Charinos. Anthemokritos' death is mentioned by Pausanias (I, 36, 3), who saw his grave on the road from Eleusis.

Quintus Apollodorus (Geneva, 1910), discusses two fragments of the Chronica on papyrus. Pheidias was accused of stealing the ivory from the statue, not the gold as Plutarch says; he was tried, released on bail by the Eleians, who deposited forty talents, in order that he might finish the statue of Zeus at Olympia.

74 Schol. Thucydides, I, 139: the land between Megara and Attike which was sacred to the Eleusinian divinities.
to Athens\(^75\)

In 446 the Megarians had massacred an Athenian garrison (Thucydides, I, 114, 1). They had helped Korinth in 435 (Thucydides, I, 27, 2) and in 435 (Thucydides, I, 46, 1) against Athens. At the time of the Samian revolt, Byzantion, a daughter state of Megara, had assisted Samos against Athens (Thucydides, I, 115, 5). Athens had several grievances against Megara and, further, possession of the Megarian ports could be most advantageous to Athens when she wished to harry Korinth, whether in peacetime commercial rivalry or in war.

How long the Athenians had openly shown their bitterness toward Megara is not certain. Aristophanes (Acharnenses, 515-522) implies that they passed an earlier decree to keep Megarians from the Athenian ports and markets\(^76\). Aside from the lines in Acharnenses, however, there is no evidence for an early decree and the passage itself may be interpreted in several ways. Thucydides (I, 67, 4) says that there were "not a few controversies" between Athens and Megara, and Starkie and Cornford take this as a reference to the early decree. I suggest that it can allude merely to the pro-Korinthian attitude of Megara and to the

\(^75\) Cf. Anecdota (T85).

\(^76\) See, Starkie, Acharnians, p. 252; but cf. Gomme,
massacre of 446. After the massacre of the garrison the Athenians prepared to punish the Megarians, but were delayed by the revolt of Euboia. Feeling may have risen so high against the Megarians that they were not welcome in Attike, but a decree need not necessarily have been passed. Later, after Megara showed her sympathies to Korinth, with whom Athens was already waging a cold war, Perikles and other statesmen may have seen an opportunity to harass the enemy further by accusing the Megarians of farming the holy land. The death of Anthemokritos was incidental but helped to persuade the demos that it was right to take severe measures against such a state. The Megarian decree was passed, serving to keep her ships out of every port in the Empire, a crushing blow for a state so poor in land and domestic trades as Megara. For Flutarch, the decree of Charinos followed the murder and gave orders that the Megarid be invaded twice each year. Thucydides says nothing of this decree, but does state that the Athenian forces invaded Megara during the war twice a year. Demosthenes (T105) avers that the Megarians were kept from attending the mysteries because of the murder. It is notable that the scholiasts say no-

Commentary, I, p. 447; Cornford, Thucydides Mythistoricus, pp. 25-38, agrees with Starkie.

77 E.g., Thucydides, II, 31, 3.
thing of a decree of Charinos, nor does any other writer.78

The farming of the sacred land is in Thucydides, who, with the scholiasts, implies that this was a professed reason for the decree, but not the only one. The emphasis placed upon the Megarian decree as a cause for war (cf. Thucydides, I, 139, 1) argues that it was a major cause. Aristophanes plays upon the theme as do later writers, and the excerptors follow, despite Thucydides, or perhaps because they misinterpret Thucydides' rather shadowy statement. The scholiasts used the accounts given them and so perpetuated the idea that the Megarian decree, and this means Perikles as the writer of the decree, was the main cause for the Second Peloponnesian War.79

78 Gomme, Commentary, I, p.450, suggests that the decree of Charinos was passed after the war began, as a protective measure, and as a means of annoying the enemy. Cf. Adcock, C.A.H., V, pp. 477-480. Gomme's suggestion acknowledges that of Beloch.

79 Opinion followed the tradition that Perikles was responsible for the war just as was Nikias later for the peace (cf. Plutarch, Nicia, 9); the problem was to find in what way he had caused it and what were his personal reasons for the decree. Was it Pheidias or Aspasia or the pretense that sacred land had been violated? The Megarian de-
cree, along with enmity to Perikles shown by accusations of bribery, peculation and demagoguery, led to anti-Periklean feeling that arose especially after the Athenians, at his order, suffered their land to be wasted, were forced to live crowded in the city and were attacked by plague (cf. Thucydidès, II, 59). The comic poets probably reflected it and were followed by the Atthidographers. Those who wrote later and the scholars who excerpted from them had a less critical sense that Thucydidès and added the tradition of comedy and the Atthidographers to his history. The scholiasts preserve the amalgam.
CHAPTER SEVEN
THE WAR YEARS

Aristophanes began production during the Archidamian War. In the early plays he commented freely on the contemporary scene before his audience of citizens, metics and visitors. Many of his allusions were so familiar, even to readers many centuries later, that the scholiasts did not trouble to explain them. In other cases they supplied notes. Rarely are the scholia so discursive as those which we have already examined. Often the scholiasts merely paraphrase Aristophanes. Nevertheless there are still many scholia for this period that reveal a critical and selective use of sources other than the plays themselves. The notes as a whole have less historical continuity than do those concerned with the earlier period; certain significant actions and prominent statesmen of the Archidamian War are fully discussed, but there is comparatively little concerning the years that followed the Peace of Nikias. Individuals associated with the period 431–406, however, are identified, sometimes briefly, sometimes in detailed glosses that contribute to Athenian prosopography. The importance and value of notes about the Peloponnesian War, aside from those which draw their information from the plays only, can best
be shown by comparison with our other sources of information.

Just before the opening conflicts of the Second Peloponnesian War, the Spartans made some final efforts toward peace. A scholiast to *Pax* (435) names one of the ambassadors who came to Athens:

οἶκε διὰ τοῦτων αἰνώτεροι τὴν ὑπὸ Μελησίππου λεχθείσαν ἄπειλην. ἔν ἄρχῃ γὰρ τοῦ Πελοποννησίακου πολέμου πεμφθεὶς πρεσβευτὴν ὁ Μελησίππος ὑπὸ Ἀκεδαίμων ἐκ τῶν Ἀθηναίων, ὡς οὖν ὑπήκουσαν οἱ Ἀθηναίοι, ἵκειον ἀπαλλαττόμενος λοιπὸν καὶ γενόμενος ἐκ τῶν ὀρίων εἰπείν ὡς θὰ ἦν ἡ ἡμέρα πολλῶν καὶ μεγάλων κακῶν τῶν Ἑλλήσιν ἀρξεῖ.

According to Thucydides, Melesippos was a member of two such embassies. On the first he was one of several who wished to negotiate, but Athens paid no attention. He returned home (Thucydides, I, 139, 3 and 145, 1) with the other legates. The attack on Plataia followed sometime after. At Archidamos' bidding, Melesippos went back to Athens (Thucydides, II, 12, 1-2), but was no more successful after the Plataian

---

1 "Was this attack made...from a desire to force the issue, to prevent Sparta from sending more embassies?" Gomme, *Commentary*, I, p. 450.
affair. The statement which the scholiasts attribute to Melesippos was perhaps taken from the passage in Aristophanes (Pax, 435-437):

ΤΡ. σπένδοντες εὐχάριστα τὴν νυν ἡμέραν
"Ἄλληςιν ἀρδαί πᾶσι πολλῶν κἀγαθῶν,
χορτὸς προθήμως χυλλάβοι τῶν σχοινίων....

There is, however, a similar clause in Aristeides' work (46, 175, 14-17) and in the scholia thereto (T48), which calls the war against the Peloponnesos the beginning of many evils for the Hellenes:2

Once the war began, or perhaps before it began, both sides made active search for aid from other nations, particularly Persia. The scholiasts twice recall that Sparta was successful in her attempts to enlist the Mede. In a note to Pax (107) is a brief reminder:

τούτῳ δὲ λέγει, ὅτι Δακεδαιμονίους ἐβοήθουν οἱ Πέρσαι ἐν τῇ πολέμῳ τῷ Πελοποννησιακῷ.

Schol. Equites (969) refers to Kyros' assistance to Sparta:

ὁ δὲ Σμικρήθης ἑρακλῆς βασιλεὺς. κύριον δὲ ἀντὶ τοῦ

---

2 Cf. Plutarch, Nicias, 9, 9: Pericles was the beginning of many evils for the Greeks. Cf. also Herodotos, V, 97, 3, for use of the phrase in a similar context.
Throughout the war, according to other sources, Sparta received or sought help from the East. Thucydides (I, 82, 1) mentions the barbarians whom Sparta had allied to her own forces. After Plataia (Thucydides, II, 7, 1) both Lakedaimon and Athens planned to send to the Great King for help; Lakonia and Korinth managed to win Kyros' favour (Thucydides, II, 65, 12 and 67, 1). In 425, Artaphernes was arrested at Eion when he was returning from a visit to the Spartan king (Thucydides, IV, 50, 1).

Many years later, near the close of the Dekeleian War, Lysandros sought help from Kyros, son of Dareios and satrap of Lydia, according to Xenophon (Hellen., I, 5, 1; II, 1, 10-11). Thucydides does not indicate that Kyros was an official in Lydia, although as son of the King he undoubtedly held some high position.

Perikles set forth his principles for conduct of the war and immediately, before the first invasion of Attic territory, put them into operation. The scholiasts to Ranæ (1463) supply a partial statement of the principles:

---

Cf. Diodoros, XIII, 70; Plutarch, Lysander, 4, 1, 3, 5.


τὴν Περικλέους γυνῆν λέγει. εἶ τὴν Ἀττικὴν ὡς πολεμίαν ἔδωκει τέμνεσθαι, ἡ μὲν οὐ τέμνουσι, τὴν δὲ Δακωνικήν περικλείσσουσιν. Ἀλλωσπ. ἔπληθεν τὴν Περικλέους φέρεται γυνῆν, ὡς συνεβολήσεν περιπλεῦν τὴν Πολεμίαν, μὴ μάχεσθαι δὲ τεμνομένην τῆς Ἀττικῆς. Ἀλλωσπ. τοι- αὕτην γυνῆν καὶ Περικλὲος συνεβολήσεσεν Ἀθηναίοις Δακωνικοῦς εἰςβαλλόντων εἰς τὴν Ἀττικὴν, μέγα βοῆς ἡ μέγα βοῆς ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ μέγα βοῆς ἡ 

There is a similar note to Ranae (1465):

καὶ τοῦτο κατὰ τὴν Περικλέους γυνῆν, ὡς ἔκελευεν Ἀθηναίοις, ἐμβαλλόντων Δακωνικοῦς εἰς τὴν Ἀττικὴν, μὴ ἐπεξεύρει, ἀλλ' εἰς τείχους μένειν, αὐτοῖς δὲ διὰ τῶν πλοίων ἐκδύνα τῇ Δακωνικῇ. τὸν οὖν κατὰ γῆν πόρον ἀπορίαν ἡγεῖτο, τὸν δὲ διὰ θαλάσσῃς, τοῦτον ἡγεῖτο πόρον. καὶ οὕτως: εἷς μὲν πόρον ἡγεῖτο χρημάτων, τὸ ναῦς ὥς πλεῖστας ἔχειν· τὸν δὲ ἄλλον ... vacat... πόρον, δὲ τὸν ἐὰν τῇ γῇ ὑπὲρ, τοῦτον ἀπορίαν νομίζειν· οἷον τὰ θεωρικά, ἡ δικαστικά, ἡ ἐκκλησιαστικά. συμβολεῖται οὖν πᾶσαν τὴν ἐν τούτῳ γιορμένην δικαίων τοῖς ναι διότι αὐτοῖς ἀρχισαί. πρὸς ταύτην δὲ τὴν ἐννοιαν καὶ τὸ ἐπιφερέμενον ἀκόλυθον.

The crowded conditions of Athens, once the plan went into
effect are reported in a note to Equites (792):

ὅτι διὰ τοῦ πόλεμον οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι ἐκ τῶν ἀγρῶν εἰσερχόμενοι ἐν ταῖς περιτείχουσι γῆ ἐν τούς σκηναίοις θησαυροὺς τῇ πόλει τῶν οἰκημάτων.

The scholiasts to Equites (793) recall, further, that the dwellers in the city were directed to guard the walls and towers:

ἡ διὰ τὸ τοὺς ὄρνες τούτους μάλιστα τοῖς πύργοις ἐπικαθήθησαν καὶ τοῖς τείχεσιν, εἰς οὗς οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι ἐκμεταλλοῦν διὰ τοῦ πόλεμον φρουροῦντες τὴν πόλιν.

In his history of the period Thucydides discusses the policy, which had four parts: there should be no land battles against the Peloponnesse; the fleet should be prepared and be the chief weapon against Sparta; the allies should be controlled (II, 13, 2); the Long Walls and the Phaleric wall were to be guarded carefully (II, 13, 6). Diodoros (XII, 42) repeats the information; Aristotle (Athenaión Politeia, 24, 1) mentions only that the people of Attike left the fields and came into the city. Plutarch's version (Pericles, 33, 4-5) is fundamentally like that of Thucydides.

The crowded conditions of the city have eloquent testimony in Thucydides' vivid description (II, 52): plague and lawlessness roused discontent and hatred for "Perikles'
war" (II, 59). Diodoros (XII, 45) presents the picture without details. The Athenians blamed Perikles for their misfortunes, especially because he bade them come into the city to become easy victims of the plague, reports Plutarch (Pericles, 34, 5).

The scholiasts to Equites (262) refer briefly to the importance of the Thrakian Chersonese as an Athenian sphere:

χερσόνησος τῆς ἑβρίνης χωρίων καὶ πόλεως, ὑποτελῆς τῶν Ἀθηναίων, εὐφόρος ἐν πυρῷ. δόξην καὶ ἐστιαγώγουν οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι.

The Chersonese had been Athenian since 479 and its settlements had paid their tribute regularly.4

Lysias (T188) remarks that the Athenians received grain from the Chersonese each year and Thucydides (II, 29) reports that the Athenians had an alliance with Sitalkes I of Thrake who supplied men to the Athenian forces (II, 67, 2), grain for the army fighting in the Thrakeward region (II, 101, 5) and the services of his son Sadokos, whom the Athenians had made a citizen (II, 29, 5).5

---

4 See A.T.L., III, pp. 205-206 with notes.

5 Cf. Schol. Acharnenses (145), which identifies Sadokos as son of Sitalkes of Thrake, an ally of Athens. The
One of the most capable men on Perikles' military staff was the admiral Phormio, whose prowess is twice remembered by Aristophanes. The scholiasts elaborated in three notes. One, to 

**Pax** (347), describes Phormio and his recent victory over the Peloponnesians:

λέγεται δὲ ὁ Φορμίων νικήσαι ναυμαχίας β' Δακεδαιμονίους στρατηγήσας. λιτὸς δὲ οὕτως καλ στρατιωτικός. τὸ δὲ ἐσελθεῖν, ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀνεμεινε ϕορμίων. — φιλο-πέλεμος γὰρ καὶ αὐστηρὸς ὁ Φορμίων. στιβάδας δὲ, ἐπεὶ οί στρατιώται χαμαικοτοῦσιν, ἀναγράφεται δὲ ὁ Φορμίων ὥσπερ ναυμαχίας νικήσαι Δακεδαιμονίους στρατηγήσας. λιτὸς δὲ οὕτως καλ στρατιωτικός. διὰ καὶ στιβάδας εἶπε Φορμίωνος.... καὶ Διονύσιος ἐν Ταξιάρχοις παρ' Ἐγκλιδί μανθάνων παρὰ τῷ Φορμίωνι, τοὺς τῶν στρατηγῶν καὶ πολέμων νόμους.... ὁ Φορμίων δὲ οὕτως ὁ Θηραῖος τῷ γένει, ὡς Ἀσπιου, ὃς καθαρῶς στρατηγήσας πένης ἐγένετο. ἀτιμωθεῖς δὲ ἣ τοῦ μὴ ῥένωσα τὰς ρ' μιᾶς τῆς εὐθύνης ἀποδοθοῦν, ἐν ἄγρῳ διετρίβετο, ἡς Ἀκαρναῖοι στρατηγὸν αὐτὸν ἠτούν. ὁ δὲ οὕχ ὑπῆκοος, φάσκων μὴ ἔγειρα τοῖς ἀτίμοις. ὁ δὲ

scholiasts observe that some call him Teres (which, in fact, was his grandfather's name; Thucydides, II, 29, 1) and others insist that his name was Sitalkes. The scholiasts mention these variants but agree with Thucydides that the correct name was Sadokos.
In Equites (562) is a gloss about his eutuxia in warfare and his recent triumphs:

στρατηγὸς δὲ Ἀθηναίων ναυτικότατος ὁ Φορμίων, καὶ πολλάκις εὐτυχῆς ἐν ναυμαχίαις καὶ ἐν τῇ πρὸς Δακεδαιμονίους μάχῃ κατορθῶσας νῦν νὰ ὅσθησιν.

Schol. Equites (563) supplies a shorter note:

ἐπεὶ νεωτί Ἀθηναίοι Φορμίωνος στρατηγοῦντος περὶ ναυμαχίαν ἰδραγαθήσαν.

Schol. Lysistrata (804) makes summary mention of his reputation as general:

Φορμίων, στρατηγὸς, σφόδρα εὐδόκιμος, Ἀσωπίου νῦν. Ὁ ὁρτάδης...ἐχὼν ἐκμομβιοῦντο.

Thucydides (I, 64, 2) names Phormio as son of Asoplos, and among other battles reports the two in which he fought success fully with the Peloponnesian fleet in the summer of 429 (II,
83-84 and 86-90 passim). Diodoros (XII, 48) is shorter but the details are no different. Thucydides (II, 83, 3) states that the Peloponnesians had forty-seven ships; the scholiast to Equites says that the Athenians and Phormio destroyed fifty-seven ships. A scholion to Aristeides (13, 139, 1) has forty-seven ships destroyed in the first battle and fifty-seven in the second. One codex of Thucydides (B, Vaticanus 126) has the number of ships as seventy-seven. Only Pausanias believes that Phormio was punished by Ἀριτωμία before he made an expedition to Akarnania in 429/8 (I, 23, 10; for date cf. Thucydides, II, 102, 1). His abilities as tactician and strategist are implied in the few fragments extant of Eupolis' Taxiarchoi (T11; T112) in which Phormio is presented as Dionysos' tutor in military arts.

Another distinguished general of the Archidamian

---

6 Numbers, particularly numbers designated by letter, are the first to suffer alteration when a text is copied. Diodoros, the only other source dealing with this incident, agrees, with the majority of manuscripts of Thucydides, that the Peloponnesians had forty-seven ships to the Athenians' twenty. Whether the variation is the result of scribal miscopying or whether it comes from a text of Thucydides whose tradition appears now only in the scholion and in the gloss to Aristeides is impossible to say. For the scholiasts' text of Thucydides see below, pp.
War was the Spartan Brasidas, whom the scholiasts identify in a note to Pax (282):

ο Βρασίδας ο Τέλλιδος παῖς, ὃς ἦν Δακεδαιμονίων στρατηγός. καὶ οὗτος ὃς ἀνθίστατο τῇ εἰρήνῃ. ἐτελεύτησε δὲ ἐν Θρᾴκῃ.

Thucydides calls him the son of Tellis (II, 25, 2) and describes his campaigns until his death at Amphipolis. One of the major principles of Pericles' strategy was maintenance of control over tributary states of the empire. Once the war had begun the expenses of the fleet and troops made the tribute more necessary than ever. The method of assessment of the φόρος and its stewarding in Athens since the treasury of the Confederacy had been moved from Delos in 454/3 were of great importance to every Athenian. In the comedies Aristophanes mentions or alludes to the tribute which played so great a part in financing the war. In Acharnenses allusions to the City Dionysia remind the scholiasts several times of the season at which the allies brought their tribute to the city. Acharnenses (378) first refers to the Dionysia and the glossators are brief:

---

7 E.g., IV, 73, 81, 85, 108, 2 and 114. For activities at FYlos and in Thrake and his opposition to the peace towards the end of the war see below pp. 211-213 and 215-220.
The information is similar in schol. *Acharnenses* (504):

εἰς δὲ τὰ Διονύσια ἔτη οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι κομίζειν τὰς πόλεις τοὺς φόρους....

Demosthenes (T92) mentions the great number of visitors who could be seen in Athens at the Dionysia. Proof that the tribute was due at that time is supplied in the *Degree of Kleinas* and in the decree concerning the collectors of the tribute.

In a note to *Plutus* (1193) the scholiasts describe the location of the treasury in which the φόροι was placed:

όπισω τοῦ νεῶ τῆς καλουμένης πολιάδος Ἀθηνῶν ὑπάρχοντο, ὃποιον ἐγείροντο πρὸς ἔσοχθος ὑποθέτουσαν. "Αλλα, ἐκ τῆς ἁρματίσμενῆς καρποκολίνης ἱστομῆς ἔσχα τοῦ τῆς Ἀθηνῶν ναοῦ. τῆς θαρπαίας ὑποθέτου: εἰς τὴν ἁρμακολίνην ἀνεφόρου τὰ χρήματα, κανταθάνου ὑποθέτου, καθα

---


καὶ θεουκολήθαι φησιν ἐν τῇ δευτέρᾳ 13, οὕτως ἔχει ἀρχι-δυτῶν δὲ ἐν τῇ ἄκρῃ δελεῖ αἰὲ ποτὲ ἀργυρίου ἐπισήμου· ἐξακολουθῶν ταλάντων· τὰ γὰρ πλείστα τριάκοσίων ἀπο-δέουν περιεγένετο, ἀφ' ὧν ἔστε ἡ προπόλεως τῆς ἄκρω-πόλεως καὶ ἐστε τὰλα οἰκοδομήματα, καὶ ἐς Ποτίδαιαν ἐπανηλέθη.

There is copious literary evidence to prove that the treasury was maintained in the opisthodomos10. The orators, Andokides (T24) and Aischines (T11), remind their audience that the treasure brought from Delos was kept in the opisthodomos on the Akropolis in charge of the tamiai. Two scholia to the orations of Demosthenes (T102 and T104) state that the opisthodomos was the building on the Akropolis, toward the rear of the hill, in which was kept the money belonging to Athene and the other gods. Harpokration (T126) lists the duties of the tamiai, including the administration of the tribute. Photios (T214) locates the opisthodomos behind the temple of Athene. The scholiast to Lucian (Timon, 53 Rabe) says that the opisthodomos was behind the innermost sanctuary and was used as depository for the city's treasures. Primary evidence for the use of the opisthodomo- 

10 The location of the opisthodomos is still the subject of much dispute.
that Athene's moneys are to be guarded in the opisthodomos.\footnote{11} Borrowings from Athene Polias, to whom the tribute quota was dedicated, are attested epigraphically\footnote{12}

A scholion to *Lysistrata* (173) mentions that the treasury(of Athene Polias) contained one thousand talents\footnote{13}

Principal evidence for the sum and the use of it at the time of presentation of the *Lysistrata* is given by Thucydides (VIII, 15, 1), who states that the Athenians voted, in 412/1, to use the thousand talents which they had reserved, as the "Iron Reserve," on the Akropolis in the treasury of Athene.\footnote{14}

\footnote{11} A.T.L., D1, lines 15-18, and D2, lines 24-25.

\footnote{12} E.g., I.G., I\textsuperscript{2} 324.

\footnote{13} The amount is noted in both V and R.

\footnote{14} Thucydides, II, 24, 1: there is a striking similarity between the wording of the vote given here and the words of the scholiasts to *Lysistrata*. The phrase ἃ χρήματα κινεῖν is employed by Thucydides in both passages referring to the thousand talents, and once elsewhere (I, 143,
Schol. Plutus (1193) contains a direct quotation from Thucydides (II, 13, 3), with two variants from the book-text\(^{15}\) which, if accepted, make a considerable difference in our interpretation of the Athenian financial situation in 431/0.

Chios, one of the three remaining naval allies, is twice mentioned by Aristophanes; the scholiasts add some information about the relations between the two states. A note to Avis (880) describes Athens' treatment of Chios:

1), in reference to use of the Olympian moneys. Of other early prose authors, only Demosthenes uses the phrase (T93 and T97; one passage repeats the other verbatim), in reference to the removal of moneys from the opisthodomos. In D13, lines 6-7, the verb is again employed of money (\textit{A.T.L.}, II, p. 61: \textit{κινέτω, τὰ ἐν δήμοςι〈ἐω〉 ὁποιεῖμενα τάλαγῳ τα...\). Here the clause comes (probably) from the decree; it is most likely that Thucydides too was following documents. The note in codices R and V was originally excerpted, we may conjecture, from Thucydides.

\(^{15}\) For a detailed analysis of the variants and their effect on our understanding of Athenian finances at the beginning of the war see \textit{A.T.L.}, III, pp. 118-132; see also below, pp.
καὶ τοῦτο ἄφ᾽ ἱστορίας ἔλαβεν. ὁ θύχωντο γὰρ Ἀθη- ναῖοι κοινῆ ἐπὶ τῶν θυσιῶν έαυτός τε καὶ Χίους, ἐπεἰ δὲ ἔχειμον οἱ Χίοι συμμάχους εἶν 'Ἀθῆνας, ὥστε κρέαζε πολέμου προσήν. καθάραι θείομεθα ἐν τῷ ιβτ财力 τῶν φιλιππικών φησιν οὕτως ὡς ὀλοκληρώθηκεν ἡ πολεμία τῶν ταῦτα πράτταντες ἁπείχουν. ὡστε τὰς εὐχὰς κοινὰς καὶ περὶ ἐκ- είμων καὶ σφῶν αὐτῶν ἐποιοῦντο, καὶ σπέρμοις ἑνὶ ταῖς θυσίαις ταῖς ὑμοῖς ἡμῖν τοῖς θεοῖς Χίους διδόναι τάγαθα καὶ σφήναν αὐτοῖς: λέγει δὲ περὶ Χίου καὶ Εὔπολις ἐν Πόλεσιν...ὅ ὡς ὑπερήφανον ἐν τῷ Δηλιακῷ καὶ ὀτὶ Χίοι θύχωντο Ἀθηναίοις δεδήλωσεν.

Theopompos, Eupolis and Hypereides are listed as sources. Chios was an original member of the Delian Confederacy. With Lesbos and Samos, she was never tributary but supplied ships and men when there was need. Aristotle (T61) makes an exception of these three islands in his passage on the despotism of Athens.

Chios was allied with Athens (Thucydides, II, 9, 4) and helped the city materially17. It was not until 412,


17 E.g., against the Peloponnesians (Thucydides, II, 56, 2), at Sphakteria (IV, 13, 2), at Melos (V, 84, 1), at
under great strain, that she actually revolted from Athens (Thucydides, VIII, 14, 2; cf. T186) along with Rhodes, Mytilene and Byzantion. She became an ally of Athens after the Korinthian War and the other three states followed suit (T152 and T153). 18

The scholiasts, defining the word κιβόηλια in a note to Aves (158), mention war between Chios and Athens; this is clearly the revolt of 412 B.C.:

τὸν ἐκ τοῦ ἄργυρου βῆμαν. μοιχητήριαν καὶ ζηλοτυπίαν:
ἀμα δὲ ἄτι τὰ νομίσματα κιβόηλια λέγεται παρὰ τὸ ὑπὸ Χίων δεδηληθοῦσιν. Ἀλλωσ. κιβόηλα ἔλεγετο νομίσματα τὰ ὑπὸ Χίων δεδηλημένα, ἣτοι βεβλαμμένα, κατὰ τροχήν τοῦ χ εἰς κ. 'Ἀθηναίοι γὰρ καὶ Χῖοι πρὸς ἄλλους ἐμάχοντο, διὸ τὰ Χίων νομίσματα μετὰ τοῦ χ στοιχείον 'Ἀθηναίοι ἐγχαράζοντες ἀπεστρέφοντο....

To Pax (171) is another note implying Chian unrest:

ἀμα δὲ ὡς ἐκ κάσως προφάσεως τῶν 'Ἀθηναίων συνοφαστούχων καὶ ζημιοθετούν τὰς πόλεις.... η μάλλον αὐτός καμφῳδεῖ διὰ τὸ ὑπονοεῖν αὐτοῦς ἀποστηθεσθαι τῶν 'Ἀθηναίων.

Poteidaia (VI, 31, 2) and at Syracuse (VI, 43, 1).

18 Cf. the treaty between Athens and Chios in 384/3; I.G., II² 34.
Thucydides (IV, 51), writing of the winter of 425/4, tells us that the Chians, under suspicion of subversive activities, gave pledges to the Athenians, guaranteeing their loyalty. A recently discovered fragment of a decree, it is likely, specifically cites these pledges. It may well be that the original scholiast here knew Thucydides and had in mind the unrest in Chios in 425/4.

Reference, in the note to Pax, to the Athenian penchant for fining her subject states has nothing to do with Chios, surely. On occasion Athens charged indemnities when a state revolted and great expense was entailed in forcing its return to allegiance.

In the scholia is one other reference to fines. The annotators to Aves (1422) mention the court trials to which the allies were continually being brought at Athens:

19 Ἐπεὶ ποιησάμενοι μέντοι πρὸς Ἀθηναίους πίστεις καὶ βεβαιώθηται ἕκ τῶν δυνατῶν μηδὲν περὶ σφᾶς νεκτερον βουλέσθειν.

20 Meritt, Hesperia, XIV (1945), pp. 115-119.

21 Compare the scholiasts' language with that of Thucydides (...'Αθηναίων καὶ ὑποπτευομένων ἐς αὐτὸς τι νεκτερεῖν). The tone is the same?

22 Cf. the fine paid by Samos to cover the cost of her
The theme is well known from the "Old Oligarch." Aristophanes in _Vespae_ (658–659) lists the sources of income for Athens collected by the _kolakretai_; fines are included. The scholiasts to these lines make no attempt to explain the exact nature of the fines, which were probably from civil cases at law. It is possible that the scholiasts acquired their knowledge of Athens' litigiousness and "playing the sycophant" with her allies from the lines of Aristophanes.

Finally, in schol. _Aves_ (158) there is the reference to the Chian coin. Suidas ( _s.v._ χιβδηλία and μοχ-θηρία ) takes his information from the scholia to Aristophanes. Cassius Dio (T107) notes the coin briefly and Hippokrates (T136) says a few words about its baseness. There is general agreement that the χιβδηλία was a Chian coin of bad stamp; the name was used metaphorically to designate poor quality.

In spite of the war, endemic plague and the strain


23 _Xenophon_, _Ath. Pol._, 1, 16.

24 Cf. Starkie, _Wasps_, p. 250.
of holding the empire, the Athenians at home still found opportunity to amuse themselves with the plays presented yearly at the Dionysia and the Lenaia. Aristophanes' first comedy, the Babylonians, was produced in 427 at the Dionysia and roused the anger of a statesman who felt that the magistrates had been degraded in the presence of visitors from the allied states. The scholiasts to Acharnenses (378) have a report of the incident:

τούς Βαβυλώνιους λέγει. τούτους γὰρ πρὸ τῶν Ἀχαρνέων Ἀριστοφάνης ἔδιδαξεν, ἐν οἷς πολλοὺς κακοὺς εἶπεν. ἐκφύγοντες γὰρ τὰς κληρονομίας καὶ χειροτονητὰς ἀρχὰς, καὶ Κλέωνα, παρόντων τῶν ἡγέμων...καὶ δὶα τούτων ὀργισθέντως ὁ Κλέων ἐγράψατο αὐτῶν ἀδίκιας εἰς τοὺς πολίτας, ὡς εἰς θύρων τοῦ δήμου καὶ τῆς βουλῆς ταύτα πεποίηκότα. καὶ ἐνιὰς δὲ αὐτῶν ἐγράψατο καὶ εἰς ἀγώνα ἐνέβαλεν.

The lines of Aristophanes supply the primary evidence. Kleon was not acting without precedent when, in 427/6, he hailed the poet into court on a charge of license. A note to Acharnenses (67) recalls a bill meant to censor comedy:

οὗτος Ἐθυμένης, ὁ ἀρχων, ἐφ' ὦ κατελθῇ τὸ ψῆφισμα τὸ περὶ τοῦ μη κακωδείν, γραφεῖν ἐπὶ Μορυχίδου. ἦσυχος δὲ ἐκείνῳ τε τῶν ἐνιαυτοῦ καὶ ὧδο τοῦ ἐξῆς ἐπὶ Πλατωνίκου τε καὶ Θεοδώρου, μεθ' ὦς Ἐθυμένους κατελθῇ.
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trope (414 B.C.; Argumentum ad Aves, p. 209 Dübner) alludes (frg. 26 Kock) to Syrakosios and the attack on comic license, the latter's must be placed earlier than 414.

There are few other references to censorship of comedy. [Xenophon] says that the demos did not itself care to be lampooned, but liked to see statesmen and men of rank made the butt of public jest (Ath. Pol., 2, 18). Plutarch (Solon, 21, 1–2) mentions an old law that fined anyone who abused another verbally in public courts, assembly and at festivals. The fine was a nominal sum, three drachmas, and would have been of little account in Aristophanes' day. Two orations of Lysias against Theomnestos (10 and 11), belonging in 384, give evidence for a law which listed the accusations that one man could not make against another in public; included among these is the charge that a man had thrown away his shield in battle. Aristophanes frequently calls Kleonymos ἰψακίας, last in Thesmophoriazusae (indirectly, to be sure). The law, then, dates between Thesmophoriazusae (411/0) and 384. The early law, that of Morychides, was passed at the time of the Samian revolt. The law of Antimachos may have been an attempt to restrict comedy but was not particularly successful, if one may judge from Aristophanes. It may have been under this law that Kleon attempted to curb the poet's license. The time was difficult for Athens and again some may have felt that the allies should not be witness to Aristoph-
phanes' iconoclasm. In 413/2, Athens was struggling to recover from the disaster in Sicily; at such a moment her dignity and power must be reasserted, not sapped by lampoons. To be sure, Aristophanes is principal source for the bills of Antimachos and Syракост.grad and for the attack by Kleon; the scholiasts probably acquired their information from the passages annotated. In a matter such as censorship of comedy, however, Aristophanes probably can be trusted.25

Kleon's attempt to silence Aristophanes must have failed; after the Babylonians, he presented Acharnenses and then Equites, both plays well filled with allusions to the statesmen at Athens most prominent in the years after Perikles' death. One of them is Lysikles, whom, as a scholion to Equites (132) recalls, Aspasia had married:

τινὲς δὲ, δὴ Λυσικλέα λέγει, δὲ προβατοπώλης ἐλέγετο.
ψ ἐγαμμῆθη 'Ασπασία.

His occupation and his demagoguery are marked in two passages in Equites (739 and 765) on which the scholiasts comment:

νευρορράφοις δὲ φησὶ διὰ τὸν προβατοπώλην Λυσικλέα.

Λυσικλέας ὡς προβατοπώληπος διεβέβλητο.

25 For further discussion of these scholia see Radin,
A.J.P., XLVIII (1927), pp. 215-230, especially 222-226; Starkie,
Harpokration (T118), excerpting from the Menexenus, reports that Aspasia lived with the demagogue Lysikles. According to Plutarch (Pericles, 24, 6) Aischines wrote of an affair between Aspasia and Lysikles followed by their marriage. To Thucydides (III, 19) Lysikles is a tribute-collecting strategos (428/7 B.C.).

The use of the term δημαγωγός to describe Lysikles' political situation is not misleading. As West has pointed out,²⁶ Lysikles' connexions with Aspasia and his consequent rise to power, probably through her influence, indicate that the ex-cattle dealer made no effort to break with the Periklean war policy. Perikles himself had been called a demagogue in contrast to such men as Thucydidides, and those who continued to favour his principles would, naturally, be considered demagogues. Aischines the Sokratic said that Lysikles was of low birth (Plutarch, Pericles, 24, 6-7); the scholiasts to Aristophanes cast no slur. If he was elected strategos in 428, he was not particularly disreputable. A cattle-dealer, welcomed into the ranks of Perikles' followers, must have been moderately wealthy, at least a member of the bourgeoisie.²⁷

Acharnians, p. 243; Starkie, Wasps, p. lxii.

²⁶ Cl. Phil., XIX(1924), pp. 132-133.

²⁷ Cl. Phil., XIX(1924), p. 132.
Of the main figures of the Archidamian War no man has become better known than Kleon. The picture of this man, as the two chief sources for his life and activities have presented it, is anything but attractive. To Thucydides and Aristophanes he seems to have typified all that was bad for the Periklean state, and Aristophanes lampoons him unmercifully in the early plays; *Equites*, in fact, was written expressly to lacerate him publicly. The annotators seized upon these allusions, sometimes making a paraphrase of the line, sometimes excerpting from several writers for a detailed gloss.

Kleon's judicial attack on Aristophanes is the earliest incident in Kleon's career preserved by the scholiasts; he was surely attacked in *Babylonians* as he was in *Equites* and *Acharnenses*, which indicates that he was active enough to win unfavourable notice from the writer before 427. He catered to the Athenians' pleasure, state the scholiasts to *Equites* (331):

> καὶ ὁ Κλέων γὰρ πρὸς χάριν καὶ κολαμέαν ἐδημηγορεῖ ἐπεὶ καὶ ὁ Κλέων ἔδοξε καὶ τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις εὐδοκιμεῖν διὰ τὸ πρὸς ἴδιαν ἱδιαίην καὶ χάριν ἐπημηγορεῖν.

This is more likely a paraphrase of Aristophanes than a vague allusion to Kleon's increase of the jurors' pay. His voice was most annoying to the poet, reminding him of a raging
river or a great gong, as the scholiasts paraphrase it in several of the marginalia. 28 The scholiast to Equites (44) describes him succinctly, drawing much of his portrait from the lines of the play:

His father’s name, Kleainetos (not Kleonymos), is confirmed by Thucydides (III, 36, 6), who indicates also that Kleon was the strong man of the city. Aristotle (T62) speaks of his parentage, his method of harangue from the bema and his demagoguery. The information about his parentage and general character is repeated by Aelian (T1).

Relations between Kleon and the knights in Athens could hardly be termed friendly, as the scholiasts to Equites realise. A note to line 226 of the play declares that Kleon and the knights abused each other:

28 E.g., Equites, 248, 262, 624, 692, 696.
κακὰ μηχανώμενοι. κατηγόρησε γὰρ αὐτῶν ὃς λειποστρατοβύτων. διὰ τούτο οἷν ἐμυθήσθη αὐτῶν Ἁριστοφάνης.

A note to Equites (247), clearly deriving its information from the play, states the knights' opinion of Kleon:

ταραξιπόστρατον δὲ καλοῦσι τὸν Κλέωνα, τοιτέστι τὸν ταράζαντα τὸ πλήθος τὸ ἱππικὸν. τούτο δὲ εἶπεν, ἵνα δῷξειν εἰκόνως αὐτῷ χαλεπαίνειν καὶ αὐτοῖς καὶ πολεμεῖν. ὧν μὲν τὸν Κλέωνα διέζη διὰ πάντων λυμαινόμενον τὴν πόλιν, διαφθείροντα μὲν τὸ ἱππικὸν, σφετεριζόμενον δὲ τοὺς φόρους.

Another paraphrase (Equites, 630), is in the same vein:

ἐπεὶ οὖν ὁ Κλέων ψευδὴ κατὰ τῶν ἱππών κατηγόρησε, καὶ ἡ βουλή πείθεσθαι ἐδόξει, ψευδατραφέξεις εἶπε πλέαν τὴν βουλὴν γεγονέναι, διαβάλλων μὲν ὡς ψεύσμα τὸν Κλέωνα, τῆς δὲ βουλῆς καθαπτόμενος....

The charge that Kleon was forced to disgorge five talents is the subject of schol. Acharnenses (6):

ἐξημιώθη γὰρ ὁ Κλέων πέντε τάλαντα διὰ τὸ υβρίζειν τοὺς ἱππέας. παρὰ τῶν νησιωτῶν ἔλαβε πέντε τάλαντα ὁ Κλέων, ἵνα πείσῃ τοὺς Ἀθηναίους κουφίζαι αὐτοῖς τῆς εἰσφορᾶς αἰσθημένοι δὲ οἱ ἱππεῖς ἀντέλεγον καὶ ἀπήτησαν αὐτῶν. μέμνηται θεοπομπός.
The fine of five talents is discussed in another scholion to Acharnenses (8):

εἰς τὸ δρᾶμα οὗτ τῶν ιππέων ἀποτείνεται. διὰ τούτου
γὰρ φαίνεται καταδικασθέις ὁ Κλέων τὰλαντα eις ἄξιον
οὗν φησιν 'Ελλάδος τὸ καταδικασθῆναι τοῦ Κλέωνα.

According to the scholiast to Lucian (T177) Kleon was once paid ten talents by the people of Lesbos to vote to rescind the punishment that the Athenians had decreed for Mytilene. Thucydides (III, 49) suggests that the Athenians were persuaded by Diodotos to nullify their decree; Kleon had been adamant in his own speech. Scholars have held various opinions about the line and the notes to it. There is no evidence elsewhere, except in Theopompos, who is quoted by the scholiasts to Acharnenses, that Kleon was or was not bribed, found out by the knights and called to account. The charge may be true or may be the kind of slander to which prominent Athenians were subject (e.g., Themistokles and Perikles). Aristophanes' line implies, however, that Kleon was forced to pay up; the reason is uncertain. Kleon called the knights deserters, says Theopompos; during the years when the Peloponnesians were invad-

29 See Starkie, Acharnians, pp. 241-243, for discussion of the several suggestions.
ing Attike, the knights sometimes fought them (Thucydides, III, 1) and sometimes failed to take any offensive measures at all (II, 19, 2; III, 26).

Kleon's grievance shows in his accusation of Laches for peculation, as preserved in schol. Vespa (204):

τοῦτο δὲ φησιν, ὡς τοῦ Κλέωνος ἐδὲ δίκην ἐκαταγόντος τὸν Δάχτην. στρατηγὴς δὲ αὐτὸν φησὶ Δημήτριος ἐπὶ ἄρχοντος Ἐυκλέους πρὸ τριῶν ἑτῶν εἰς Σικελίαν πεμφθέντα μετὰ νεῶν δεουτίνους βοηθήσουτα. οἱ δὲ περὶ τὴν φιλωκεροῦ διαδέχασθαι αὐτὸν φασὶ Σοφοκλῆα καὶ Πυθόδωρον, ὃς καὶ φησὶ ζημιωθῆναι. εἰκὸς γοῦν μετακαληθῆναι αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὴν κρίσιν, ἢ οὐν ὁ κωμικὸς μνημονεύει.

Schol. Vespa (241) mentions a part of the same incident:

ὡς τοῦ Δάχτην δὲ τα δημοσία σφετερισμένου καὶ πλουτήσαντος.

Whether this occurred after the first Sicilian expedition (427/6), when Laches was strategos (Thucydides, III, 86, 1, 90, 2 and 103, 3) is not known. There is no evidence elsewhere for the charge; it is not implausible.

Another accusation of bribery was leveled at Kleon, according to schol. Equites (438):

Ποτίδαια πόλις...ἀπὸ τοῦτης φησὶ τῆς πόλεως κεκλοφέναι
δέκα τάλαντα τοῦ Κλέωνα, καὶ τοῦτος φιλονεικών αὐτὸν ἀμείρεωθαὶ τοῖς ἵσοις, ἐπεὶ πρῶτος ἐκεῖνος ἐφησεν αὐτῷ σφετερίσασθαι τῆς πόλεως τάλαντα πολλά.

The scholion to Lucian (T177) may preserve this story, with Lesbos substituted for Poteidaia. Again, there is no evidence for this elsewhere.

Three notes to Equites state that Kleon was anxious for the tribute. Schol. Equites (313 and 361) explain why Aristophanes compared him to a tunny-watcher on the rocks:

φησὶν ὅτι καθάπερ τοὺς θυμοσκόπους εἰσίν τοὺς δίκτυον οὐ λαμβάνουσιν οἱ θυννοὶ, οὕτως οὐ λαμβάνοντι τὸν Κλέωνα τῆς πόλεως ἐπιμαίνοντες οἱ τοὺς φόρους φέροντες.

...ὁμειείζει οὖν αὐτῷ, ὅτι τὰ δημόσια νοσφίζεται χρήματα....

ἐπεὶ οὖν ὁ μὲν Κλέων ἐφῆσεν θυννοὺς θέρμοις κατασκεύαζεν.... Μιλῆσας δὲ εἶπεν, ὡς τοῦ Κλέωνος τοὺς Μιλῆσας ταράσσοντος καὶ ἑπηρεάζοντος.

A third gloss, to Equites (1034), recognises his abilities as tribute-collector:

ὅτι τοὺς φόρους τῶν μησῶν καὶ τῶν πόλεων ἀφήρμαζεν.... οὕτως καὶ ὁ Κλέων, ἐὰν τι τοῖς υποίκαι περιλείψῃ, καὶ τοῦτο λαμβάνει.
Two fragments of Eupolis' comedies (frgs. 290 and 291 Kock) pity the states that must pay tribute to Kleon:

ω καλλιστη πόλι πασῶν, ὡς κλέων ἐφορᾷ,
ὡς εὐδαιμων πρῶτευον τ' ἦσαν νῦν τε μᾶλλον ἔσει

ἔδει πρῶτον μὲν ὑπάρχειν πάντων ἱστορίαν....

Although there is no direct reference to it in the scholia, the assessment of 425/4 may well have given Kleon his reputation. The assessment was notorious; Plutarch (Aristides, 24, 2) declares that the demagogues, after Perikles' death, trebled the tribute to reach a total of thirteen hundred talents. The orators, Andokides (T24), [Andokides], (T26) and Aischines (T11) have misdated the assessment that trebled the amount, but come within one hundred talents of Plutarch's figure. Primary evidence for the trebling of the tribute, of course, is in the assessment decree with the list of assessed cities.30

In the scholia to Vespae are several references to the increase of the jurors' pay by Kleon. The dikasts were to receive three obols. Schol. Vespae (88) knows this:

ἡσαν δὲ ἡλικιατι τὸν ἄριστον φ'. ἐδίδοτο δὲ αὐτοῖς

30

A.T.L., II, A9; for the total see line 181 and Meritt and West, Ath. Ass., pp. 88-90.
χρόνων μέν τινά δόο ὀβολοί, ὑστερον δέ Κλέων στρατη-
γήσας τριώβολον ἐποίησε ὀκμάζοντος τοῦ πολέμου τοῦ
πρὸς Λακεδαιμονίους.

Other similar notes gloss Vespae and Equites. A passage
in Ranae (1463-1466) proves that the dikasts' pay continued
after 410, although suspended in 411 (Thucydides VIII, 65, 3).
Plutarch (Nicias, 2, 3) says that Kleon had greatest author-
ity in the state because he had won from the people the power
to give stipends. The reference in schol. Equites (331) to
Kleon's catering to the pleasure of the demos may well refer
to the dikastic increase and to the stipends mentioned by
Plutarch.

Aristotle, speaking of the statesmen who followed
Perikles in Athens (T62), compares the demagogue Kleon to
a man whom he apparently considered to be the outstanding
member of the conservative, aristocratic group, Nikias. An
important leader during the Archidamian War, Nikias was pre-
sented as one of the Paphlagonian's opponents in Equites,
and appears occasionally elsewhere. He is described, brief-
ly, in two notes. To Equites (358) is a scholion concern-
ing his prudent nature, which was to his detractors dilatory:

δυσοίκουστος δὲ ὁ Νικίας. ἐμφαίνει δὲ, ὡς καὶ αὐτὸς
tῶν εὐδοκιμοῦντων ἤν στρατηγὸς. καὶ ὁ νῖκες Στράτιππος.

31 On Vespae, 242, 300; Equites, 51, 255.
He is also remembered in a note to *Aves* (639):

"οτι βραδις ἦν Ἵνικιας περὶ τὰς εξόδους, καὶ ὡς διαβαλλόμενοι, οὐχὶ προνοητικὰς ἦν, ἀλλ' ἀμελητικὰς. τινὲς δὲ φασὶ διὰ τὸ προνοητικὸν καὶ μὴ προπέτες τοιοῦτον αὐτὸν εἶναι."

His desire for good fortune, which surely directed many of his "cautious" actions, was first noticed by Thucydides who says that his greatest wish was for good luck (V, 16, 1) and that he was, in fact, outstandingly fortunate in what he undertook (VI, 17, 1). Plutarch (Nikia, 2, 5) commemorates Nikias' eagerness for others to consider him fortunate. His enemies despised him for what they called delaying tactics (Thucydides, VII, 42, 3), particularly when he kept his forces from an immediate attack on Syracuse. He was one of the wealthy, aristocratic strategoi (Plutarch, *Nikia*, 2, 2; cf. Aristotle [*T62*]) and a most successful military commander (Thucydides, V, 16, 1). In contrast to Perikles, who was thought to be the cause of evils for the city, Nikias was the cause of much good for Athens (Plutarch, *Nikia*, 9, 9; Lysias [*T187*]).

The scholiasts to *Equites* (609) report one of Nikias' early successes as a campaigner, the attack on Kenchreai in Korinthia:
The Athenian victory is recorded by Thucydides (IV, 42, 1 and 3; 44, 2-3). Polyainos (T234) praises Nikias for the tactics he used in the battle.

The enmity between Athens and Corinth, which, surely, had been the chief cause of the war and led to such campaigns as Nikias waged against Kenchreai, is mentioned by the scholiasts to Nubes (710):

In his first book Thucydides makes clear the hatred that the two states had for each other, not only in the few years preceding the Second Peloponnesian War, but earlier. His statement is brief: καὶ ἔσχον Ἀθηναῖοι Μέγαρα καὶ Πηγάς, καὶ τὰ μακρὰ τεῖχη φυλοφυλακτάν μεγάλευσι τὰ ἀπὸ τῆς πόλεως ἐς Νίσαιαν καὶ ἑφυροῦσαν αὐτοῖς. καὶ Κορινθίοιες μὲν ὁμοὶ ἤκιστα ἀπὸ τοῦτο τὸ σφοδρὸν μίσος ἤρξατο πρῶτον ἐς Αθηναίους γενέσθαι. (I, 103, 4)
In their accounts of the causes and subsequent history of the war Plutarch (Pericles, 29–34) and Diodorus (e.g., 12, 36) thoroughly implicate Korinth and emphasise the ill feeling between the two states.

The scholiasts declare that Korinth laid waste Attike "at this time". There is no evidence for an invasion, after Pylos, by any Peloponnesian state. Indeed, if Nikias was campaigning vigorously in the Korinthia in 424 (Thucydides, IV, 42–45) the majority of Korinthian forces were arrayed against him there. The scholiast's explanation may be only a paraphrase of the clause "the Korinthians were pressing upon Athens"; or may be ex post facto, a reflection of earlier invasions of Attike made by Peloponnesian forces of which the Korinthians were certainly a part.

The unhappy Megara, blamed by the Athenians as cause of the war, suffered badly in the first years. The scholia to Pax (481–483) describe her situation:

Δὲ καὶ τοῦτων βαρέως φερόντων ὅτι ἔκσκοποῦσι παραφωνεῖν, βουλομένων δὲ τὴν εἰρήνην διὰ τὸ μάλιστα πεπείσθαι τῷ λιμῷ καὶ τῇ πολέμῳ.

Cf. also, "Thucydides' numerous references, e.g., I, 108, 5; 114, 1; 124, 3."
πάνυ γάρ καὶ διαπροσώπως ἐμμοσοῦτο ὑπὸ τῶν 'Ἀθηναίων δι' ὑπειρήσαμεν τρόπουν.

καὶ ἐπεθύμουν μὲν τὴν εἰρήνην, διὰ δὲ τοῦ 'Ἀθηναίους ἀνεβάλλουσαν αὐτὴν, ὡς φησὶ Θουκυδίδης.

λιμὼτειν αὐτοῖς λέγει, ἐπειδὴ δὲ μὲν εἰρήνη ἦν,

εἰσήρχουσα εἰς τὴν 'Ἀττικὴν καὶ ἀπεστρέφουσα διὰ τὸ πωλεῖν καὶ συναλλάσσειν, οὐκ ἔδει πολέμου δυντος ἐφοβοῦντο εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν 'Ἀττικὴν καὶ ἀγοράσαι ὃν ἔχρησον. ἔγαγον γὰρ εἴη τὸν 'Ἀττικήν καὶ ἀγοράσας αὐτὸς τὸν πολέμον. ἔγαγον 'Ἀττικήν καὶ ἐφοβοῦντο τὰ τροφᾶς διὰ τὸ καὶ πλησιάζειν αὐτή, καὶ διὰ τὸ ὀλίγην παντοτάσσειν ἔχειν χώραν τὴν γεωργομένην.

ἐνδεῖσιν ὅτι τοῦ 'Ἀθηναίους ἐπεξείπτας αὐτοῖς καλύπτει τὴν παρ' αὐτοῖς γῆν γεωργεῖν. ὡς οἰς εἰς πολιορκίαν κατέστησαν αὐτοῖς οἱ 'Ἀθηναὶ τὴν Νισαιαν, τειχίσαντες....

Athens invaded the Megarid twice each year (Thucydides, II, 31, 1; IV, 66, 1) and saw to it that she was made to suffer deprivation of all but the absolute necessities (cf. Andokides „Τ24”). Of course Megara could carry on no trade with Athens or the allied states of the empire.33 Matters came to such a point that stasis grew in the Megarid and some of

33 By seizure of Minoa, Nikias had managed to close the chief Megarian port, Nisaia, and set up an effective blockade (Thucydides, III, 51); cf. Plutarch, Nicia, 6, 3.
the citizens asked Athens to seize Megarian Nisaia (Thucydides, IV, 66, 2) and save the democracy. The Athenian forces succeeded, but were not allowed to remain long. Brasidas, who happened to be nearby, came to Megara at the request of the oligarchs and besieged Nisaia. Soon he had removed Megara from Athenian hands (Thucydides, IV, 70-74) and the fall of Nisaia was a question of time. The Megarians recaptured the long walls of Nisaia (Thucydides, IV, 109) and the city surrendered soon after; the Athenians left, Brasidas allied Megara to Lakonia and established the oligarchs in power in Nisaia (Diodorus, XII, 66; 67, 1).

Somewhat later, when the Lakedaimonians were negotiating for peace, Megara refused to join (Thucydides, V, 17, 2), perhaps through bitterness, since Athens had been allowed to have Nisaia which she said she had captured with the consent of the citizens, not by armed attack, and perhaps through fear, as the scholiasts report. The element of fear, however, may be part of the tradition, which Thucydides does not follow, that Megara was the main cause of the war and as such had every reason to fear Athenian revenge in time of peace.

In 425/4 one of Athens' most surprising victories resulted in the capture of Lakonian prisoners, an event so unusual that the whole of Greece was awed. Since Kleon was involved, the affair became one of Aristophanes' favourite allusions if only to indicate how Kleon had boasted about his
ουπ. Ιν την κομματα το Εκατερινα προς ανεζειν, η μεσονται και
θυσιασμος λα 
κατω δε αυτως. Δομοσθενης στρατηγις
'Αθηναιων, αποστολας εις εικελιαν δια την αντιθε
πολεμον, παρακλησιν την Πόλεως και την Σφακτηριαν δυναμει
προλαβων, τριακοσιους ειληφεν αιχμαλωτους, και εδηλωσεν
'Αθηναιοι γι τι βοθλουται περι των γενεθθαν. Αλλως
δε αλλα λεγοντων, Κλεως αναστας επηγειλατο ημερων άριθ
молν προσθειν, εις εκείνων άξειν αυτοθε, ου γελωτα πολλαν
κατ' αυτοθγ γενεθθαν. Αγαγων δε αυτοθε ου δηθαν πραξίν
καταρθωσας επεσεμωντο....ενταθα ουν ο δομοσθενης απο-
βαινον ποιησαμενα δυν ολιγοις, εξεταιχε το χωρλον,
kαλ κατεστησε φροβριον. Βοηθησαντων δε των Δακεδαιμο-
kων δια ταχοις Βραιδου στρατηγοντωσ, αυτεο τε το
Βραιδος απεβαλε την ασπιδα και πολλοι των Δακεδαιμο-
kων απεθανουν εν τη μαχη. Ενιοι δε κατεψυχον κατακονθω
μενοι εις την και αντικρη υπερδα την Σφακτηριαν και
αυτεο δομοσθενης μετεπεμψεσε απο των 'Αθηναιων, ου
pλειον υπωνεμενοι χρησαμενον τους άνδρας εκκολορκοη.
ο ουν Κλεως γυναι οτι υπε της αναγκης και λαμον και διψου
οιχ οιοι τε έσανται πλειοσιν αντεχειν ημερας, έπει και
τουτο ηγηκεν οι απο του στρατοπέδου αφικνουμενοι, παρ-
ελθων εις την δημου, ει λαβοι δυναμιν, ου αιτε δομο-
σθενης, επηγειλατο εντος εικοσιν ημερων παραστησειν τους
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Kleon's attack on the competence of the other strategoi is mentioned in a scholion to Equites (7):

τούτῳ δὲ εἰπεν, ἐπεὶ διαβάλλων ὃ Κλέων τοὺς ἄλλους στρατηγοὺς καὶ προσκροῆς τῷ δήμῳ εἰς ἑαυτὸν βλέπειν τόσθ' Ἀθηναίους ἐποίησε.

His cleverness and sense of timing, noted in schol. Equites, 55, is reported in schol. Equites, 1056:

τούτῳ δὲ, ἵνα δεῖξῃ ὡς Δημοσθένους, οὗ τοῦ Κλέωνος τὸ κατόρθωμα...ταῦτα δὲ λέγει διὰ τὰ ἐν Πιλψ, ὁ Δημοσθένης μὲν προήυσεν, οὕτως δὲ ἱδιοποίησατο.34

A gloss to Pax (219) turns to the results of Pylos:

καὶ πάλιν ἠδονοὶ τῆς εἰρήνης δεδεμοῦν τυχεῖν οἱ Δακεδαιμόνιοι, ἔαν ἀσφαλέως κατέχωμεν τὴν πόλιν...καὶ διὰ τῶν ληφθέντων τριακοσίων ἐν Σφακτηρίᾳ, καὶ διὰ τὸ ἐπιτείχίσμα δὲ περὶ Ἀθηναῖοι κατέστησαν ἐν Πιλψ, καὶ ὅτι ληφθεῖσα αὐτὴς περὶ εἰρήνης πρῶτοι Δακεδαιμόνιοι πρὸς Ἀθηναίους ἐπέσησαν.

34 Similar notes in Equites about Pylos need not be quoted here: 392, 469, 668, 703, 742, 1066.
A full description of the affair, including the location of Pylos and the three names given to the district, is contained in a schollon to Νυβής (186):

Πάλος, χωρίον τῆς Δακωνίκης, ἐνθά κλέων στρατηγησας τοῦς τριακοσίους τοὺς αἰχμαλώτους ἀπὸ Σφακτήριας ἔλαβεν. εἵνες οὖν τούτους καὶ ἔτι τὸν τοῦ αἰχμαλωτισμοῦ φόβον καὶ ἐτὶ τὸ πολλαῖς μὲν ἡμέραις πεπολιορκηθαί ἐν ἐρήμῳ νῆσῳ καὶ ἀφ' ἧς οὔδεν τῶν ἐπιτηδείων ἦν λαβεῖν, πολλὶς δὲ καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἀλώσιν συγκεκλεύθασι χρόνῳ δεδεμένους ἐν ἐχθρώ, ἄρχοντα τε καὶ ἵσθοντα καὶ δυσείδεις γεγονέναι. ἵστεν δὲ ὅτι τρεῖς ἔπωνυμίας εἶχεν ὁ τόπος, Πάλος, Κορυφάσιον, Σφακτήρια. "Ἀλλαὶ. Πάλος, οὖσα πλησίον Πελοποννήσου, ταῦτη ἐν τῷ Πελοποννησιακῷ πολέμῳ Δάκης προκατασχῶν, ὁ τῶν 'Αθηναίων στρατηγῶν, φροβρίου φιλοδέμησεν. ὲδεν ἐξορμήσεις τὴν παράλιαν ἐδῆμο τῆς Δακωνίκης. Δακωδαμίνοι γούς καταλύσαι τὸ φροβρίον θέλουτες, ἐπεκλείσαν τῇ νῆσῳ καὶ παραστηθήσαντες ἀνδρας ἐπτακοσίους ἐντὸς τοῦ φρουρίου κατέληπον. 'Αθηναίοι οὖν ἐπεμψαν πολλὴν τινα στρατιὰν κατὰ τῶν ἄνδρῶν τοῖς μετὰ Κλέωνος στρατηγοῦ. ἔλθων οὖν ὁ Κλέως μετὰ τῆς στρατιᾶς καὶ πλείστου χρόνου τοὺς πολιορκήσας, θύετεν παρεκτῆσαι καὶ αἰχμαλώτους λαβῶν ἑθηναζε ἤγαγεν, οἷς ἐτὶ τὸ πολὺν λιμὸν, ἓν ὑπάντησαν ἐτὶ τῆς πολιορκήσας, καὶ ἐτὶ τὸ κατακαλεσθῆναι ἑθηναζε εἰς ἐιρκτῆν πάνω ἄχρον ἦσαν.
The campaign at Pylos is well documented by other writers. Thucydides (IV, 2-41) provides a full description; Diodoros' account (XII, 61-63) is much shorter but the elements are the same. Plutarch (Nic. 7) has nothing new. The wretched condition of the Spartans besieged on Sphakteria, with little water and no food except what was smuggled from the mainland by swimmers, forced their ultimate surrender. Demosthenes would have conquered them in a few days but Kleon received the glory because he timed his arrival so well (Plut. Nic. 8, 1). The Athenians, who had considered his promise mad (μαθώμενης), underestimated the cleverness of their man, just as the victory at Pylos later led Kleon to overestimate his own military genius because he mistook timing for strategy.

The loss of three hundred Spartiates was a body blow to Lakonia. She at once sued for peace, fearing Helot unrest and a statewide revolution (Thucydides, IV, 41, 3). The Athenians had earlier refused to make peace unless Sparta accepted the outrageous terms suggested by Kleon (Thucydides, IV, 21, 3), and refused again, after the prisoners were taken (Diodoros, XII, 63, 3).

Kleon's unprecedented victory gave him and many of the citizens a proud moment at the expense of Demosthenes

---

Cf. schol. Equites, 469.
and Nikias. According to Aristophanes and the scholiasts who paraphrase his lines Kleon was crowned by the city (Equites, 1225 and scholion) and won himself a seat in the Prytaneion (Equites, 766 and scholion). 36

Kleon's opposition to the peace which Lakonia wanted after the prisoners were taken from Sphakteria and his later opposition whenever the Spartans suggested a truce is mentioned perhaps as often by Aristophanes as the incident at Pylos. A note to Vespae (41) dates Kleon's refusal:

"ἀλλως τε ὅτε καὶ ἀφ' ἑστιάσει τοῦτό φασί. καὶ γὰρ πρὸ δῦο ἠτῶν τῆς διδακτιας τοῦτου τοῦ δρᾶματος, ἄκκακομοιών περὶ εἰρήνης πρεσβευσμένων ὁ Κλέων ἀνήλπε τὸν προσβείς;"

Schol. Fae (479) quotes Thucydides twice:

"καὶ ὁ Θουκυδίδης [4, 117, ἱστορεῖ, λέγων μάλιστα τῆς εἰρήνης ἀντιποιεῖσθαι τοῖς ἄκκακομοιοῖς διὰ τοῦτος"

---

Schol. Equites, 411, states that Kleon waged battles in Akarnania and Aitolia. These are territories in which Phormio and Demosthenes carried on campaigns but there is no evidence for Kleon's activity there. Thucydides, Diodorus, and Flutarch assign his military ventures only to Pylos and Thrake. Faulty geography may be responsible for the false story. For another example of geographical confusion see above.
ληφθέντας αὐτῶν ἐν Σφακτηρίᾳ. λέγει γὰρ οὕτως "τῶν γὰρ ἀργός περὶ πλείονος ἐποιοῦντο κοιμᾶσθαι, ἦς ὅτε ὁ Βρασίδας εὐτύχει! καὶ ἐν ἄλλοις Ἰ, 15,, "ταῦτα οὖν ἀμφοτέρως αὐτοῖς λογιζομένοις ἐδόκει ποιητά ἐναι ἡ σπάσασι, καὶ οὐχὶ τοῖς τῶν Δακεδαίμονοι, ἐπιθυμία τῶν ἀνδρῶν τῶν ἐκ τῆς ψήσου κοιμᾶσθαι. ὡς τῷ ὅ ὁ αἱ Ἐπαρτιάται αὐτῶν πρῶτοι τε καὶ ὄμοιως σφίσι συγγενεῖς. ἠρέμως μὲν οὖν καὶ εὐθὺς μετὰ τὴν ἀλωσιν αὐτῶν πρᾶσσειν. ἄλλ' οἱ Ἀθηναίοι μὲν οὕτως θέλοντες ἐξελπορομένοις ἐπὶ τῇ ἱσθι καταλέγονται, μάλιστα δὲ οἱ τῶν ἐδεδεμένων συγγενεῖς ἐνήγον καὶ ἐσποδάζον, ὡς ἄν εἰρήνη γένηται! "Ἀλλα, ταῦτα οὐ μὴν διὰ τὸ κεκμηκέναι τῷ πολέμῳ, ἄλλα καὶ διὰ τῶν ἐν Σφακτηρίᾳ τρικόσιους τῶν δεδεμένων τῷ χθεὶ τῆς ποδοκάκης τοῦ νῦν καλομένου κόσμου.\*37
g

The scholiast to Pax (665), quoting Philochoros, adds details:

Φιλιχορὸς φησιν οὕτως "Δακεδαίμονοι περὶ διαλύσεων ἐπεμψαν πρέσβεια πρὸς Ἀθηναίους, σπουδαὶς κοινοπάμενοι

pp. 95-97.

37 In each excerpt there are variations from Powell's text; see below, pp. . The first excerpt is in R and V, the second in V but not in R.
πρὸς τοὺς ἐν Πήλω, καὶ τὰς ναῦς αὐτῶν παραδόντες οὕσα
ξῆθεν Κλέωνος δὲ ἀντειπότος ταῖς διαλύσεις, στασιάσας
λέγεται τὴν ἐκκλησίαν. ἔρωτὴσαι δὲ συνεβή τὸν ἐπιστά
tην. ἐνίκησαν δὲ οἱ πολέμειν βουλόμενοι! "Ἀλλα
μετὰ τὰ ἐν Πήλῳ. ἐπὶ Κλέωνος γὰρ προσβεβασμένων
Δακεδαίμονίνων, ἐστασίασαν ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, ὡς φίλοχορᾶς
φησι. μετὰ τὰ ἐν Πήλῳ καὶ τοὺς αἰχμαλώτους οὐκ ἔλαβεν
ὁ Κλέων, ἔπεμψαν Δακεδαίμονίνων πρὸς Ἀθηναίους ἐπαγγελ-
lόμενοι δώσειν τὰς τρίχρεις ὡς εἰλήψασι τῶν Ἀθηναίων
ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ, ἀμα δὲ καὶ περί εἰρήνης καὶ σπουδῶν. ἀντι-
eἰπεν οὖν τότε Κλέων, καὶ τοῦ ἐπιστάτου τρίτου ἔρωτῆσαι
τὴν βουλὴν τί βοθλεταί, εἰρήνην ἡ πόλεμον, εἴλετο ἡ
βουλὴ τῶν πόλεμου συνεστάναι.38

Another excerpt from Thucydides is given in schol. Equites (793):

ὅτι ὁ κωλώνος παρασθαί τὸν πόλεμον ἔστιν ὁ Κλέων.

ὅπερ οὖν καὶ θουκυδίδης ἐν 5, 16, ἱστορεῖ διὰ τούτων,

"εἴπερ δὲ καὶ ἂν ἄμφιδολει ἤπτα τοῖς Ἀθηναῖοις
ἐγένετο, καὶ τεθυκέται Κλέως τε καὶ ἤρασίδαι, οὗ ἄμφότεροι
μάλιστα ἤμασθον ὑπαντούντα τῇ εἰρήνῃ, ὁ μὲν, διὰ
τὸ εὐτυχεῖν τε καὶ τιμᾶσθαι ἐκ τοῦ πολέμου, ὃ δὲ γενο-

38 For other notes on the peace see schol. Pax, 638
and 211; schol. Equites, 668 and 794.
Kleon urged Athens to enlarge her maritime empire, according to a note to Equites (630):

ἐθαλαττοκράτουν γὰρ οἱ Ἀθηναίοι. ὡς τοῦ Κλέωνος συνεχῶς προφερομένου τὴν κατὰ θάλατταν δυναστείαν.

The occasion for this statement is not certain. It may go back to Kleon's support of the first Sicilian expedition, to his inclusion in the assessment of 425/4 of the names of maritime states that had never been separately assessed or that were, in some cases, not a part of the empire, or it may have been an echo of the feeling that underlay Kleon's speech about Mytilene (Thucydides, III, 37-40).

A scholion to Pax (214) is in part a paraphrase of Aristophanes:

ἀντὶ τοῦ τοιούτου τι ἔλεγον. ἔδω μὲν γὰρ οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι μικρὸν ἐν τῇ μάχῃ κρατήσαντες, εἴθεκας λέγουσι, νὴ τοὺς θεοὺς, ψυγὸν οἱ Ἀθηναίοι δώσουσι δίκαια. καὶ πάλιν ἔδω οἱ Ἀθηναίοι νικήσαντες, εἰτα Λακεδαιμόνιος ἐλέεισιν εἰρήνην κοιθᾶσι βουλδέμενοι, εἴθεκας ἀντιλέγουσιν Ἀθη—

39

Again there are several variations in the text.

40

Cf. West, Cl. Phil., XIX (1924), pp. 144-146, and
Thucydides, however, announces that Brasidas and Kleon were both enemies of peace (V, 16, 1) and, like Kleon, Brasidas may have had a following in Sparta sufficient to shift the vote of the assembly from peace to war. When he failed (after the beginning of the siege on Sphakteria and after the three hundred Spartiates were taken prisoner) Kleon succeeded.

On one occasion neither was successful in prosecuting the war, as the scholiasts to Equites (794) infer in a note about the one-year truce:

παρ’ ἱστορίαν τοῦ Ἀρχετολέμου ἐμῳδήμευσεν. ὡς ὁ έν τούτῳ Ἐχαρίστων τοῦ Κλέωνος, ἐνιαύσιον ἐποίησαν πρὸς ἄλλους ἐκεχειρίαν οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι καὶ οἱ Πελοποννησιοί, προσβιόντες πέμψαντες πρὸς ἄλλους, οὐ μὴν Ἀρχετολέμου προσβεβοῦσθαι τινος, ἀλλὰ τῶν μὲν Δακεδαίμονι τὸν πρὸς τὴν Ταῦρος Ἐκεχειρίαν, Ἀθηναίοις, Περικλείδαις, Αἰγείαις, Εὐφαμίδαις, Ἀριστοδήμου, Σικυώνιοι δὲ Δημήτριος Ναυκράτους, Μενεκράτης Ἀμφιδρόου, Επιδαυρίων δὲ Ἀμφίας, Ἀθηναίων δὲ τοῦ στρατηγοῦ Νικίας ὁ Νικηφράτους, Ἀυτοκλῆς Τολμαίου, ἐγένετο δὲ πόλεμος ἐπὶ ὄκτωκαίδεκα ἔτη. καὶ οὔτως ἦ
Thucydides (IV, 117, 1) mentions the one-year truce made while Kleon and Brasidas were still alive. Diodoros (XII, 72) speaks of the one-year truce and explains why it did not last. In the scholion to Lucian (T177) the glossator comments on the imperialism of Kleon and dates his refusal to countenance a Lakedaimonian proposal for peace to 426/5.

One scholiast to Nubes (584) reports an eclipse of the moon in the archonship of Stratokles (425/4); a second, on the next line, equates an eclipse of the sun with the year of Kleon's election to the strategia (425/4).!

41 Kleon was irregularly appointed for the campaign at Fylos (425/4); Thucydides, IV, 29. 1. He was elected in the spring of 424 for 424/3; Nubes, 581; West, Cl. Phil., XIX
In 424/3 Brasidas, at large in Thrake, caused 
Skione to revolt from Athens, as schol. Vespa (210) notes:

Φιλόχροος εἰς Ἰσάρχου φησὶ πρὸ ἐνιαυτοῦ Βρασίδαν ἀποστῆναι Σκιουρίους τῶν Ἀθηναίων. Ἀθηναίοις δὲ φασὶ λ' τριήρεις πρῶτον πέμψατε Σκιουρίην περι-
τειχίσατε, ὥστερον δὲ μαθὸντες ἀποστῆναι αὐτῶν, ἀποστεί-
λαί ατρατὴν καὶ πολιορκῆσαι καὶ ἀποτειχίσαι αὐτίς ὡς 
τὸ πρῶτον. Εὔστε δὲ χαρίου θράκης πολέμιον Ἀθηνα-
ικὸς, τὸ ἐφροῦρον ἐπεικῶς, τῷ πολιορκήσαντες ἀπετει-
χίσαν.

Thucydides (IV, 120) reports the insurrection. The Athenians 
took immediate action (IV, 122, 4 and 129, 4); they surrounded 
the city and laid siege to it. The conquest was only a matter 
of time (IV, 131, 3 and 132, 1) and the Athenian forces, after 
exacting punishment (IV, 133, 4), left a garrison and went 
home.

Brasidas continued his activities in Thrake and 
Torone was next to revolt. Kleon, having won reelection as 
strategos in the spring of 422 (Diodoros, XII, 73), sailed 
for the Thrakian coast, after the armistice, with a size-
able force (Thucydides, V, 2, 1-2), took Torone after a short 
battle (Diodoros, XII, 73; Thucydides, V, 3, 5) and sailed to 

Amphipolis (Thucydides, V, 6, 1).

Two notes to Pax, 282-284 and 48, tell of the meeting of Athenian and Peloponnesian forces at Amphipolis and its result:

ὁ Βρασίδας ὁ Τέλλιδος πάις, ὃς ἦν Λακεδαιμονίων στρατηγὸς, καὶ οὗτος ἐξ ἀνθίστατο τῇ εἰρήνῃ. ἐτελεύτησε δὲ ἐν θράκη.
καὶ γὰρ εἰς συμμαχίαν πεμφθεὶς ὁ Βρασίδας ἐπὶ θράκην, κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν χρόνον Κλέωνι τελευτᾷ.
ἐν 'Αμφιπόλει γὰρ τῆς θράκης μονομαχήσαντες ὁ τε Κλέων καὶ ὁ Βρασίδας ἀλλήλους ἀνέτιλον.

48, Ἕρατοσθένης γὰρ ἐπὶ θράκῃς τοῦ θύματος Βρασίδου καὶ Κλέωνος ὅσιόν μηνὶ προγεγονέναι φησὶν. καὶ αὐτὸς δὲ ἐν τούτοις φησίν ἀπὸλοιπῶν 'Ἀθηναίοις ἀλετρίβανος.'

Kleon was struck down by a peltast (Thucydides, V, 10, 9) and Brasidas died of wounds shortly after (Diodoros, XII, 74), when the victory was safely in the Peloponnesian grasp. Suidas (T245) gives a biography of Brasidas, who died, along with Kleon, in the tenth year of the Archidamian War. The scholiast to Lucian (T177) places the deaths of Kleon and Brasidas in the archonship of Ameinias. That Brasidas and Kleon killed each other in single combat (schol. Pax, 284) is a piece of romantic fiction, designed perhaps to create the ironical scene of the two chief contenders and enemies of
peace dying at each other's hands to pave a way for the Peace of Nikias. Thucydides and Diodoros make it clear that Kleon died sometime earlier in the battle than Brasidas, and that they were fighting each other only in the most general sense as the commanders of two opposing forces.

The Peace of Nikias, drawn up between Athens and Sparta in the spring of 421 after the deaths of Kleon and Brasidas, resulted in a considerable relief in both states, although some of Sparta's allies were far from pleased. Nikias, says Plutarch (Alcibiades, 14, 2), was the author of peace among the Greeks as Perikles had been the author of war. The scholiasts, however, nowhere mention Nikias as the negotiator of the peace. There is an allusion in Pax (466) to the Peace of Nikias:

ἐπὶ γὰρ Ἀλκαίου σπουδᾶς φησὶ γεγονέναι φιλόχροος 
περιεχομεναί Ἀθηναίοις καὶ Λακεδαιμονίοις καὶ τοῖς 
συμμάχοις πλῆν Βοιωτῶν καὶ Κορινθίων καὶ Ἡλείων.

Thucydides discusses fully the terms of peace and the participants (V, 17-19). Korinth refused to join (V, 30, 1), but made a separate treaty with Elis, and Argos (V, 31, 1). Boiotia and Megara allied themselves with neither side.\textsuperscript{42} Athens

\textsuperscript{42} Cf. Diodoros, XII, 75-76; schol. Andokides (T24), which dates the treaty to Ariston's archonship (421/0); Plu-
later made a separate treaty with Elis, Mantinea and Argos (Thucydides, V, 47, 8-10). An inscription (I.G., I² 86) preserves the terms of the agreement among the four states.

Argos' method of playing both sides against each other and favouring neither, a role that she filled well after the treaty was ratified, is discussed in three scholia to Pax. The first (to Pax, 475) quotes Philochoros:

ως τῶν Ἀργείων ἐκαμφοτεριζόντων μὴ ποὺε ἰντ χίν τοῦτος.
διό καὶ φιλόχορος φησι πολεμοῦντας πάλιν πρὸς Κορινθίους
προσλαμβάνεσθαι καὶ τοῦτο Ἀργείους.

More detail is supplied in the second (Pax, 476):

ἐπεὶ Ἀργείοι κατεγέλασαν Δακεδαιμονίων καὶ Ἁθηναίων
ἄλληλοις μαχουμένων, ἐπείκερ παρ' ἀμφοτέρων λαμβάνοντες
χρήματα ἐπολέμουν... αἰνιγμένη δὲ εἰς Ἀργείους, ἐν τωτῷ
τῷ πολέμῳ ἐκαμφοτεριζόντας· διὸ καὶ πολλὰ ἔκαμφδοντο.

The third repeats Philochoros' statement and acknowledges Argive prowess in war (Pax, 477):

ὡς τῶν Ἀργείων ἐκαμφοτεριζόντων, καὶ ἀποκλινόντων, ὅποτε
μὴ ποὺε ἰντ χίν τοῦτος, καὶ πρὸς Δακεδαιμονίους. — καὶ ὁ φιλόχορος
φησι, πολέμοποιοῦντας πάλιν τοὺς Κορινθίους προσλαμβάνεσθαι
καὶ τοῦτο Ἀργείους, ἀπεμφαίνει σοῦ καὶ ταῦτα διχόθεν.

tarch, Nicias, 9, 4-9.
When Sparta called upon the Peloponnesian states for help against Athens early in the war, Argos declined aid (Diodoros, XII, 42, 4). Throughout the Archidamian War, Sparta was suspicious of Argos (Thucydides, V, 14, 4) and events subsequent to the battle of Amphipolis proved that her fears had justification. Argos allied herself separately with Korinth, after peace was struck between Athens and Lakedaimon (Thucydides, V, 27, 1-2), and started a movement to bring over to her side those who hated or envied Sparta. She hoped for hegemony of the Peloponnesos (Thucydides, V, 28, 1) for she had become prosperous from treaties with both Athens and Lakedaimon (V, 28, 2) and remained ambitious. Disagreement with Sparta over Lepreion led Elis to join Argos (V, 31, 1) and, with Lakonia and Boiotia at odds, turn to Athens for an alliance (V, 44, 1). A third stroke for Argos against Sparta was the Tegeate threat to desert Lakonia in her favour.

Whether or not Argos wanted peace, other sources fail to state. Aristophanes implies that she did not, and Thucydides' remark about her good fortune from double dealing in the war (V, 28, 1) makes it probable that a state of
war in which she suffered no harm but made considerable
profit was all to Argos' taste.

Three years after the Peace of Nikias was drawn up,
Athens and Sparta were again at each other's throats. There
was trouble at Mantinea, as a note to Aves (15) points out,
excerpting from Androtion:

πρὸ δὲ ἐτῶν δ' κακῶς περὶ Μαντινείαν ἀπήλλαξαν, ὡς καὶ
touς στρατηγοὺς ἀποβαλεῖν Δάχητα καὶ Νικόστρατον, καθά
καὶ Ἀνδροτίων φησίν. "Ἀλλως. ὃτι οὕτως ἐλεγον καὶ
ἐπὶ τῶν τόπων, οὕτω τοῦ ὁρμοσκοπᾶν....

The separate alliance made in 420 by Athens, Argos, Mantinea
and Elis bore bitter fruit for Athens. Mantinea was threaten-
ing revolt to Argos, which the Spartans hastened to prevent
(Thucydides, V, 64). The Argives and their allies, including
Athens, gathered to drive off the Lakonians and Arkadians,
but suffered a severe defeat. Many Athenians were killed,
among them the two generals, Laches and Nikostratos (V, 74, 3).
Diodorus (XII, 79) follows Thucydides and Androtion, whom
the scholiasts cite, seems to have received his information
ultimately from the same source.

On the Athenian political scene Perikles' heir was
Nikias. To Thucydides and the comic poets, Kleon's heir was
the reputed lamp-maker, Hyperbolos. Obviously he roused
less fear in his opponents than Kleon, for the nature of the
attack Aristophanes makes against him is less bitter and more ribald. The scholiasts are interested in these allusions to him and give some information about his character, background and activities in Athens and elsewhere. A gloss to Pax (692) speaks of his foreign origin:

οἱ τυχοσκόλης ὁ Ὕπερβολος. τινὲς δὲ φασὶν αὐτὸν
Σήρον. καὶ Κρατίνος δὲ ἐν Ἑπύπη " Ὕπερβολον δ' ἀπο-
εβέσας ἐν τοῖς τύχοις γράψαν." A second (to Pax, 681) names his father and explains why men like Hyperbolos were honoured by the demos:

ὁ μὲν τὸν Κλέωνα Ὕπερβολος ἐπολιτεύσατο. Χρήματος
d' ἰδεῖς ἢν Ὕπερβολος, ἄδελφος δὲ Χάρωνος, τυχοσκόλης,
φαύλος τοῦτο τρόπων. οὔτος μετὰ τὴν τοῦ Κλέωνος δυνασ-
tείαν διεδέχατο τὴν δημαρχίαν. ἀπ' αὐτοῦ δὲ πρῶτον
ἐρχαίτω Ἀθηναίων φαύλοις παραδίδονα τὴν πόλιν καὶ
tὴν δημαρχίαν, πρῶτον δημαρχοῦντων πάνω λαμπρῶν
πολιτῶν. προεῖλετο δὲ τούτω τοιούτω τὸ δῆμος, ἀπιστῶν
διὰ πόλεμον τὸν πρὸς Ἀκεδαίμονικας τοῖς ἐνδόξοις τῶν
πολιτῶν, μὴ τὴν δημοκρατίαν καταλθεῖν. ἐξουσιασθεὶς
d' οὖτος, ὃς δὲν ἦν ἔμπροσθεν φόβον καὶ ἄξιωματος, ἅλλα διὰ
κοινότητας καὶ ἀλέξειν τῆς πόλεως. ἔν Σάμῳ δὲ διατρίβον,
ὑπὸ τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἐχθρῶν ἐπιβουλευθέντα ἀπέθανε, καὶ τὸν
νεκρὸν αὐτοῦ εἰς χάκκοις βαλόντες ἔρριψαν εἰς τὸ πέλαγος.
Scholia to *Nubes* (554-555) speak briefly of his mother:

προσθήκη γράφει μεθύσης, τὴν δοκοῦσαν μητέρα εἶναι τοῦ 'Ὑπερβόλου.

τὴν μητέρα 'Ὑπερβόλου. ἦν: Γράφει.

She is noted also in schol. *Thesmophoriazusae* (840):

πολλάκις εἶπον δὲ προβάλλει ο Ὀμηρικὸς ἐν τῷ πρὸς Πολύβιον προτατικῷ τὸς ἑ 'Ὑπερβόλου μητήρ. οὐκ ἔχομεν δὲ εἰπεῖν. εἰ δὲ χρῆ τὰ τοιαῦτα ζητεῖν, ζητεῖτωσαν καὶ τὴν ἔξησ.

Schol. *Flutus* (1037) mentions her:

ὁτι δὲ συμβάλλεται πρὸς τὸ ἐν λαρικῇ Εὐπόλιδος, οἶδα.

κάκει γὰρ τὴν 'Ὑπερβόλου μητέρα τηλικά εἰκάζει τῇ πλατέιᾳ σανίδι.

The father, explain the scholiasts to *Vespaiae* (1007), was a man of low station and foreign birth; the son was no better:

ὑπὲρ τῆς ποιησίας δὲ 'Ὑπερβόλου εὐρηται, καὶ νῦν δὲ ὀλίγα παραγράψομεν. Ἀνδρὸς 

φησὶν τοῖνυν ἔργη τῆς ἑ 'Ὑπερβόλου λέγειν αἰσχύνομαι· οὐ δὲ μέν παθήρ ἐστι γενέσθαι ἕττ' ὃς δὲ Σένων ἢν καὶ βαρβαρὰς λυχνισότως τὰς ἑκάστους 

θεσπομονεῖ· δὲ φησὶν 

καὶ τὸν νεκρὸν αὐτοῦ καταστρωθῆναι, γράφως δὲτι " εξωστράπ..."
κισαν του ὑπέρβολου ἐς ἔτη· ὁ δὲ καταπλεύσας εἰς
Σάμου καὶ τὴν οἰκησίν αὐτοῦ ποιησάμενος, ἀπέθανεν.
καὶ τοῦτον του νεκρὸν εἰς ἀσκὸν ἀγαγότες εἰς τὸ πέλαγος
κατεπόντωσαν.

Hyperbolos was a lamp-seller remark the scholiasts to Equites
(739); he was the demagogue who followed, as head of the demos,
the cattle-dealer Lysikles:

ὁ ὑπέρβολον. καὶ αὐτὸς γὰρ δημαργῶς ἦν λυχνοποίης
ὅνε, νευρορράφοις δὲ φησι διὰ τὴν προβατοπώλην Δυσικλέα.

Schol. Acharnenses, 846, has another note about Hyperbolos' character and position:

τοῦτον ὡς φιλόδικον διαβάλλει συνεχῶς Ἀριστοφάνης. ἦν
δὲ στρατηγὸς Ἀθηναίων.

Androton (T29), supported by the ostraka, says that Hyperbolos was son of Antiphanes. Ailian (T7) mentions Hyperbolos lowly origins; the comic poets often refer to him as foreign, and seem

---

43 See also schol. Nubes, 1065, Pax, 692, Equites, 1034.
43a Shear, Hesperia, VIII (1939), p. 246.
44 E.g., Plato Comicus (T227 and T228), Polyzelos
(T235). Hermippus (frg. 8 Kock) and Eupolis (frg. 183 Kock)
lampoon his mother.
to have emphasised his trade as lamp-seller (e.g., Kratinos, frg. 196 Kock).

Schol. Acharnenses (846) remarks upon his litigiousness; Apostolis (XVII, 68) remembers a proverb that this trait produced: men are called litigious ὑπὲρ τὸν Ὑπερβολοῦν.

Aristophanes (Equites, 1300-1315) is the only evidence we have that Hyperbolos wanted a fleet to attack Carthage. Perhaps he was here following Kleon's principle of imperialism; if he did make such a request, it must have antedated Equites and, consequently, Kleon's death. Schol. Equites (739) reports that Hyperbolos was a man known in Athenian politics, but schol. Nubes (624) makes clear that he was not a man of first importance so long as Kleon was alive:

οὐδέπω γὰρ διέπρεπε κλέωνος ἔτι ἐστὶ ζωτός. μετά γὰρ τοῦ ἐκείνου θάνατον ἡγιάζη.

Later he may have been elected strategos (schol. Acharnenses, 846).45 At the Lenaia in 421 Eupolis presented the play Marikas, an attack directed against Hyperbolos as Equites had been directed against Kleon, states schol. Nubes (591):

καὶ μὴν ὡς μετὰ θάνατον κλέωνος φαίνεται γεγραφὼς τὸ δράμα, ὅπου γε τοῦ Μαρικᾶ Εὐπόλιδος μεμηχανεί, ὡς ἐδιδάχθη καθ' Ὑπερβολοῦν μετὰ τοῦ κλέωνος θάνατον.... ἐν οἷς

45 Cf. Eupolis, T110.
A scholion to Nubes (553) is similar:

τὸ δρᾶμα ἐν ὦ τοῦ 'Ὑπερβολοῦν Ἐὐπολίς ἐκκυμάτει Μαρικᾶς ἐκαλεῖτο.\(^{46}\)

Thanks to collusion between Alkibiades and Nikias, Hyperbolos was ostracised (cf. schol. Paxe, 681), the scholiasts to Equites (855) tell us:

μέχρι δὲ 'Ὑπερβολοῦν ὡστρακισμὸς προελθὼν ἐπ' αὐτοῦ κατελθήσα, μὴ ὑπακοεσάυετε τῷ νόμῳ διὰ τὴν ἀσθενείαν τὴν γεγενημένην τοῖς τῶν 'Ἀθηναίων πράγμασιν ὀστερον.

Plutarch (Nicias, 11; Alcibiades, 13, 3-7) gives a detailed story of the ostracism, what brought it about and its effects. Passing mention of the affair is made by Androton (T28) and Philochoros (T208).

He died on Samos, say the scholiasts to Vespae (1007), before his ostracism had ended. A note to Ranae (569) declares that he was killed by the Samians:

The scholiasts to Vespae, 1007, suggest rather that his assassins were hostile Athenians visiting Samos. Thucydides (VIII, 73, 3) reports his ostracism, his death at the hands of certain Athenians and sums up his character in two words: μοχθηρός ἀνθρώπος. He was ostracised, says the historian, not because his power was feared but because of the wretchedness and shame of the city.\(^{47}\)

The scholiast to Fax (681) refers to Hyperbolos and to the political conditions at Athens from the time of Kleon. Numerous comparisons may be made between this remark and comments in other authors concerned with this period. The same idea is in Thucydides' estimate of Kleon and of Athens during the years between 425 and the rise of the Four Hundred. Aristotle (T62) displays a similar and parallel attitude. Aristophanes' plays, particularly Equites, Vespae, and Fax, present a no less serious picture.\(^{48}\)

\(^{47}\) Schol. Fax, 681, is clearly taken from Thucydides.

\(^{48}\) West, Cl. Phil., XIX (1924), pp. 124-146 and 201-228.
A scholion to Aves (186) describes Athens' treatment of Melos, the island besieged by Nikias in 426, and sacked and enslaved in 416/5:

ἐν τοῖς Πελοποννησίοις κατὰ πάντων Μηλίων Νικίαν
πέμψαντες Ἄθηναιοι, ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ἐπολιορκησαν αὐτοὺς,
ὡστε λιμῷ διαφθεῖραι. τῷ δὲ πρῶτῳ ἔτει Νικίας Μήλου
παρεστήσατο, οὐ μόνον μηχανῶν προσαγωγῆ, ἀλλά καὶ
λιμῷ, διὰ τὸ ὀποστῆναι αὐτῶν, πρόην ὑποτελῆ οὕσαν....
Μῆλος δὲ ἔστι πόλις Θεσσαλίας. καὶ οἱ Μηλίοι πολεο-
κομβοιοι ὑπὸ Ἄθηναιων λιμῷ ἐπιέσθησαν καὶ παραδεδω-
κασιν ἐκατόβα, ἢς θουκυδίδης ἐν τῇ πέμπῃ.

The first part here concerns the earlier siege of Melos.
Thucydides (III, 91, 2) says that the Athenians sent Nikias to Melos, an island that did not wish to obey Athens or become her ally; he laid waste the land. Melos never paid tribute to Athens. She is listed in the assessment of 425/4; this does not mean that she paid.

The later attack and siege are described by Thucydides (V, 84–116). Melos was a Lakonian colony that would not submit to Athens (V, 84, 3); the Athenians came to besiege the place by land and sea, and, when the Melians arrived for a parley, offered nothing less than unconditional

49 See the Register of Δ.Τ.Ι., I, s.v. Μήλιοι.
surrender (V, 87-111). The Athenians carried out their threat: the men were killed, women and children were enslaved and the island was colonised by Athenians (V, 116, 2). Isokrates includes the punishment of Melos as one of the evils for Hellas which Athens had caused (T147)\textsuperscript{50} a charge that was unanswerable (T151). Hesychios (T132) and Zenobios (T257) know Thucydides' description of the Athenians' ill treatment of Melos. Strabo (X, 484) says only that the Athenians killed most of the Melians, and Diódoros' account (XIII, 30, 6) is almost as brief. Alkibiades' treatment of one of the Melians is reported by Andokides (4, 22-23) and Plutarch (Alkibiades, 16, 4), who tell us that Alkibiades purchased one of the Melian women, had a son by her and reared him.

The scholiasts offer the surprising information that Melos was a Thessalian city. In southern Thessaly there was a people called Μηλίες (Herodotos, VII, 132, 1), a Thessalian ethnos. Thucydides (III, 92, 1-2) reports that the Melians were composed of three groups, the Trachinians, the Irians, and the Paralians; in this area the Spartans hoped to set up a post where they could equip a fleet against Euboia, since the distance was short, and prepare men for a land march to Thrake. The Μηλίες appear in Aristotle (T68) as a Thessalian race.

\textsuperscript{50} Isokrates (T154 and T150).
Kleon and Hyperbolos had gone, to be sure, but when the representative from Egesta came to Athens to ask for help against Syracuse, there was another politician who saw possibilities for a campaign against Sicily to enlarge the Athenian empire westward. Alkibiades favoured the expedition from the first; Nikias opposed, and the debate was warm. A few scholia recall how the cautious Nikias pleaded first to avoid the campaign, then, when Alkibiades had won his case, to delay it until Athens was better prepared. The scholiasts to *Pax* (450) quote Thucydides to give a resumé of the argument:

"Εινὲ τὸ ταῦτα εἰς Ἀλκιβιάδην αἰνιττεσθαι, ὥς ποῦ ἔφθασεν καὶ Ἳικυνδίς ἐν τῇ Νικίᾳ δημηγορίᾳ καὶ ἐν τῇ αὐτοῦ Ἀλκιβιάδου, τὸν μὲν Νικίαν παραινεύνατα τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις ποιῶν, μὴ πειθομένους αὐτῷ πόλεμον ἀρασθαί τοσοῦτον, οὕτως λέγον "εἰτε τὰ τρόφιμα ἀσμένοις αἴρειες, παραίνει ἐκπλεῖν ὑμῖν ταῦτα μᾶλλα σκοπῶν, ἄλλως τεκνὶ νεότερος ἐτί ὁ ἐντὸς τὰ τρόφιμα, ὅπως θαυμοσθῇ μὲν ἀπό τῆς ἱπποτροφίας, διὰ πολυτέλειον καὶ ἄφελην, ἐκ τῆς ἀρχῆς ὁ τότι πάρασχετε τῷ τῆς πόλεως κινόνων ἱδίᾳ ἀπολαμβάνασθαι! αὐτὸν δὲ τὸν Ἀλκιβιάδην, ὃτι βοβλετᾷ στρατηγεῖν μὴ ἀρνομένου διὰ τοῦτων "καὶ προσπηκὼν μοι μᾶλλον ὃ Ἀθηναίοι ἐτέρων ἀρχεῖν ἀνάγκη γὰρ ἐντεθεῖν ἀρξασθαι, ἐπειδὴ μοι Νικίας καθήγατος καὶ ἄξιος νομίζω εἶναι!"
In the sixth and seventh books Thucydides fully describes the Sicilian campaign. The discussion between Alkibiades and Nikias he recounts in detail (VI, 8-14; 20-23). Andokides (T18) has a reference to the debate and Alkibiades' partiality for the Sicilian campaign. The story given by Thucydides is twice told by Plutarch (Alcibiades, 17-18,1; Nikias, 12), and Diodoros (XII, 83, 5-6) summarises the debates and the opinions of each side.

Just before the fleet, led by Nikias, Lamachos and Alkibiades, started for Sicily in 415, the Athenians were roused to anger and panic by an act of sacrilege, the mutilation of the Hermai. Two scholia discuss the incident. The circumstances are given in a note to Lysistrata (1094) along with assignments of responsibility from Thucydides and Philochoros:

παρόσον οἱ Ἐρμοκοπίδαι ἡκρωτηρίασαν τοὺς Ἐρμᾶς, ὅτε ἐπὶ Σικελίας ἐμελλον πλεῖν πρὸ ἐτῶν τεσσάρων τῆς καθέσεως τοῦ τοῦ δράματος. τὴν δὲ αἰτίαν ταύτην οἱ μὲν τοῖς περὶ Ἀλκιβιάδην προσέγραψον, ὡς θεοκρίνειον, οἱ δὲ Κορινθίοις, ὡς Φιλόχορος. μόνον δὲ φησιν οὐ περικοπῆαι τοῦ Ἀνδοκίδου Ἐρμῆν.

In a comment on Aves, 766, the scholiasts cite the punishment of the guilty:

ἐνὶ δὲ ἀν τις συμπεπραξάς τοῖς ἐρμοκοπίδαις ὁ Πεισίων,
Thucydides (VI, 27) recounts what happened and declares further that the Athenians were much angered at Alkibiades who was under suspicion (VI, 61, 1). Thucydides does not imply that he believes the charge. A less detailed account is given by Plutarch (Alcibiades, 20, 5); Andokides is most damning to Alkibiades. Not all authorities implicated him; Kratippos (Plutarch, Vitae X Orat., 834 c) says that some Corinthians, helping a group of Athenians, were to blame, and this is the version of Philochorus, as the scholiast to Lysistrata says.

Andokides (T19) and Plutarch (Alcibiades, 21, 1) report that only the Herm in front of Andokides' house was left unmutilated (so schol. Lysistrata, 1094). Andokides, by his own admission, had been privy to the plot, but had not agreed to take active part. Ephialtes, without Andokides' knowledge, had promised that Andokides would participate. Andokides heard nothing about the moment to act and, since the rest assumed that he would take care of the Herm before his own house, this was not mutilated at all.
Despite the furor in Athens after the sacrilege, the expedition set out. Not long after it had started, however, the state ship, Salaminia, under orders from the boule and demos, sailed after Alkibiades to bring him home for trial on a charge of defiling the Mysteries. Schol. Aves (147) names and defines the use of the two state ships:

ὅσο εἰσὶ νῆς παρὰ τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις οὐρατιδες, ἡ Πάραλος καὶ ἡ Σαλαμινία. διὸ ἐν Σαλαμινίᾳ τοῖς ἐκκαλουμένοις εἰς κρίσιν ἦγεν, ἐπ' Ἀλκιβιάδου φησὶ πεμφῆναι θουκυδίδης, ἐξ Πάραλος τὰς θεωρίας ὑπῆρεν, τοιτεστὶ τὰ εἰς θυσίαν πεμπόμενα.52

Thucydides (VI, 53, 1) reports the voyage of the ship after Alkibiades. The Paralos brought news of the defeat at Aigospotami (Xenophon, Hell., II, 1, 29); it had sailed from Samos to Athens just as the Four Hundred took charge in the city (Thucydides, VIII, 74). Plutarch (Moralia, p. 810c) says that the two ships were used only for necessary business of the state. The Etymologicum Magnum (T109), perhaps alluding to the affair of Alkibiades, states that the ships were sent after generals and on other important missions.

52 For other notes on the two ships, without reference to the voyage of the Salaminia after Alkibiades, see schol. Acharnenses, 1158, Reae, 204, Aves, 1204.
Hesychios (T134) reports that they were swift ships, one for holy tasks and sacrificial cargo, the other for state business.\(^{53}\)

Lamachos received some attention from Aristophanes who portrayed him as the war-loving soldier whose hard tasks and wounds contrasted so unfavourably with the happiness and feasting of the peaceful Dikaiopolis in Acharnenses.\(^{54}\) The scholiasts paraphrase most of the allusions in Acharnenses which, in general, need no explanation. There are two notes which tell more about Lamachos than Aristophanes implies in his lines. Schol. Acharnenses (270) mentions his part in the Sicilian expedition:

ο Δάμαχος ούτος Ἀθηναίων στρατηγὸς, νῦν Ἑνοφάνους,
δε, ὅτε εἰς Σικελίαν ἐπέσε τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις, ἔχειριστόνης
ἡν δὲ μετὰ Ἀλκιβιάδου καὶ Νικίου, ὃς ἱστορεῖ Θουκυδίδης
διὰ τῆς τῆς ε ἢν δὲ φιλοκόλλημος οὔτος.

Scholia to Thesmophoriazusae (840-841) date his death:

τὸν γὰρ πατέρα μόνον οἶδα Δαμάχου, Ἑνοφαντοῦ.

ἐπαινεῖ τὸν Δάμαχον τούτον. Ἡδὲ γὰρ ἐτευγήκει ἐν Σικελίᾳ
τετάρτῃ ἔτει πρῶτον.

---

\(^{53}\) Cf. Harpokration (T103) and Photios (T216).

\(^{54}\) E.g., Acharnenses, 270, 566, 593-619, 964, 1071-1074.
The scholion to *Thesmophoriazusae* perpetuates, probably, a copyist's error in calling Lamachos son of Xenophantos, rather than Xenophanes (*Acharnenses*; *Thucydides*, VI, 8, 2). Plutarch (*Alcibiades*, 21, 5) refers to Lamachos' strong and warlike character; he was a brave and just man, ready for battle (*Nicias*, 15, 1). *Thucydides* (VI, 8, 2), Diodoros (XII, 84, 3), Andokides (T18) and Plutarch (*Nicias*, 12, 4) know that he was one of the three strategoi chosen to go to Sicily in 415. According to Diodoros (XIII, 2) the three men did not get on well together, since they could not come to any agreement about the strategy of the campaign. After Alkibiades left, under escort of the *Salemnia*, the two remaining generals started their onslaught on Syracuse. The campaign, which went well for a time, eventually reversed its course and ended in utter disaster; Lamachos died in battle and Nikias was executed after capture (Plutarch, *Nicias*, 18, 4; *Thucydides*, VI, 101, 6 and 103, 3). Only Alkibiades survived the fateful campaign (Diodoros, XIII, 8).

When news of the debacle had been brought to Athens the initial shock among the citizens was soon replaced by a desire to take revenge upon the orators and seers who had favoured the expedition; fear was abroad in the city (*Thucydides*, VIII, 1-2). The fighting potential was greatly diminished, the treasury was low, the Athenians were sure that all the allies would revolt at once; among other reme-
dies, they sought the aid of good counsellors by electing a group of elders who should "deliberate beforehand" (Thucydides, VIII, 1, 3). The probouloi are defined by a scholion to Lysistrata (421):

\[ \text{προβολοὶ δὲ πρὸς τοὺς ἡμέρας ἀλλοι καὶ ἐσηγησόμενοι τὰ δοκοῦντα βέλτιστα τῇ πολιτείᾳ μετὰ τὴν ἐν τῇ Σικελίᾳ συμφορᾶν.} \]

Besides Thucydides, Aristotle (T63) speaks of the probouloi, ten in number, to whom twenty were added later during the intrigues that preceded the establishment of the Four Hundred. The scholiast knows of the second board. Sophokles was one of the ten (T72) and, with the others, was subjected to the proposal of Peisandros to set up the Four Hundred.  

Alkibiades, meanwhile, had escaped the Salaminia at Thourioi and fled to Lakedaimon, where he found the Spartans willing participants in his plans against Attike. Three notes in the commentary pertain to his advice to Sparta; schol. פαξ (451) says that Alkibiades suggested a new method of harrying the Athenians:

\[ \text{πάλιν πρὸς Ἀλκιβιάδην, ἐπεὶ πρὸς Λακεδαιμονίους φυγὼν ἐγένετο τῷ Δεμήλειαν αὐτῶν ἐπιτεϊχίσαι, διὸ καὶ δοῦλον αὐτῶς καλεῖ, διὸ τὴν Κοισδραν, ἢτις δοῦλη ἦν....} \]

---

55 Cf. Lysias (T183).
A note to Ranae (1422) speaks both of the first escape and the later voluntary departure after the battle of Notion (407):

περὶ τῆς δευτέρας αὐτοῦ λέγει ἀποχωρήσεως, ἣν ἐκὼν ἔφυγε, κατελέθων μὲν ἐπὶ Ἀντιγένους πρὸς ἐνιούτων τῶν Βατράχων, διὰ δὲ τὸ πιστεύει τῷ κυβερνῆτῃ τὸ ναυτικὸν καὶ ἤτηθη ὑπὸ Δυσαύρου δυσχεραινείς ὑπὲρ Ἀθηναίων. ἄνδρον δὲ διαφέρεται πρὸς ἕννοιντα περί τῆς καθόδου. Καλλιστράτος δὲ φησὶν ὅτι οὕτως ἦν ὁ καρδα, καθ' ὅν ἐκὼν ἔφυγεν ὁ Ἀλκιβιάδης. ὁ δὲ Ἀρίσταρχος φησι, καθ' ὅν ἐκπέφυγεν ἐν Δακεδαιμονίᾳ διατρίβων ἐπείσε ἐκαθεδαιμονίους Ἀθηναίοις δεκέλειαν ἐπιτείχισαί τελέως δὲ πταίουσι. λέγει οὖν περὶ τῆς δευτέρας ἀποχωρήσεως, ἣν ἐκὼν ἔφυγε... Ἀλκιβιάδης γὰρ φθείρει Ἀθηναίοις ὡς ἔφυγε μὲν καὶ πρὸς τεν τινα αἰτίαν ἐν πόλεως, κατελέθων δὲ ὡστερον καὶ ναβαρχὸς καταστάσεις ἐνπεσιστέθατο τὸ ναυτικὸν Ἀντιδρών τόκῳ ὑπὸ καὶ ὑπὸ Δυσαύρου ἤτηθεν εὐθανασίους φοβηθεῖς Ἀλκιβιάδης μεταχωρεῖ πρὸς Δακεδαιμονίους, οὕτω καὶ πειθεὶς Ἀθηναίοις ἐπιτείχισα δεκέλειαν. ἡ δὲ δεκέλεια χώρα ἐν τῇ Ἀττικῇ, ἢ τεκνισθεὶσα μέγας ἣν κνεῦνος Ἀθηναίοις μὴ δυσαμένους ἔξελθεν.

A marginale to Ranae (1427) contains a general characterisation of Alkibiades, probably a paraphrase of the text of the play:

ταύτα δὲ φησιν Ἐξορισθὲς περὶ Ἀλκιβιάδου, ὡς δώτος αὐτοῦ τοιούτου, βραδέως μὲν ὅφελος τοις τὴν πατρίδα, ταχ-
Thucydides treats Alkibiades' escape (VI, 61, 7) and his plan for Spartan victory (VI, 88, 9): if Deceleia is fortified the Lakedaimonians will be able to get supplies from the farms nearby, will be able to cut Athens from her supply of silver from Laurion and the tribute from her allies (VI, 91, 6-7). Plutarch (Alcibiades, 23, 1-2) says the same; Lysias (T185) adds that Alkibiades urged the Spartans to stir up revolts among the islands. Diodoros (XIII, 5, 4) has nothing different. Alkibiades told the Spartans that he would help them, not against his country but against men whom he considered enemies (Nepos, Alcibiades, 4, 4-5); the Lakedaimonians followed his advice, fortified Deceleia and urged Ionia to revolt (T191). They ravaged the country, seized Deceleia and carried on a war from the fortress with great success (Thucydides, VII, 18, 1-19). Thucydides describes the evil effect of this strategy upon Athens: there was continual invasion, twenty thousand slaves deserted, the horses fell dead of overwork, the city was under continual garrison and guard and food could be brought only from Euboia at great expense (VII, 27, 1-28, 1).

Despite his betrayal, which had had such devastating effects upon Athens, Alkibiades' desire to return to his home was well received. A scholion to Ranae (1422) mentions
his return in the archonship of Antigones, his welcome and the reason for his second, voluntary exile. He had won Tissaphernes’ support for Athens provided that the Athenians established an oligarchy; this news he conveyed to Peisandros, who was a Samos, and Peisandros relayed the message to Athens (Thucydides, VIII, 47; Nepos, Alcibiades, 5, 1-3)\textsuperscript{56} In return for the promise that Tissaphernes would help, the demos kept its peace and allowed the establishment of an oligarchy, the Four Hundred (Thucydides, VIII, 49, 1-3). Alkibiades was awarded a generalship (Nepos, Alcibiades, 5-6; Justin ρT163;). With a few ships and a moderate force he carried on successful operations along the Thrakian coast. Later, he learned that Lysandros was at Ephesos, and with the larger part of his fleet he sailed to meet Thrasyboulos at Phokaia, leaving his general Antiochos at Notion with ten ships and strict orders not to sail after Lysandros if the latter should make his appearance (Xenophon, Hellenica, I, 5, 11-12; Nepos ρT192 and T193; Diodoros, XIII, 71; Plutarch, Lysander, 5, 1; Alcibiades, 35, 6-7).

Antiöchos was tempted to disobey when Lysandros sailed past; he was defeated and killed and his ships seized as booty. Alkibiades’ enemies persuaded the Athenians that the defeat had come about through Alkibiades’ collusion with the Spartan forces; he was impeached and voluntarily exiled him-

\textsuperscript{56} Cf. Plutarch, Alcibiades, 24-25.
self to Thrake where he joined in successful battle with some Thrakians, freed Athenian prisoners and established himself in a small fortress to remain virtually incommunicado until the fateful day of Aigospotamoi.

Before Alkibiades' second exile, the unfortunate Phrynichos, who had worked to prevent the Alkmaionid's return, realised the danger in his opponent. A scholion to Lysistrata (313) describes Phrynichos' punishment for attempting to harm the demos:

Δίδυμος καὶ Κράτερδας φασὶ ταῦτα σινιττεσθαι εἰς φρύνικος τὸν Στρατωμίδου. ἕκασθε λέγοντα γὰρ πρὸς τὸν δήμον ἐν Σάμῳ στρατηγῷ· 'ὅστε ἐφησάτο καὶ τὸν ἰσός οὗ δῆμος δήμοις εἴναι τὰ φρύνικον χρήματα καὶ τῆς θεοῦ τὸ δέκατον μέρος, καὶ τὴν οἰκίαν κατεσκαφθαι αὐτοῦ. καὶ ἄλλα

Xenophon, Hellenica, I, 5, 16-17; Plutarch, Lysander, 5, 2; Alcibiades, 36, 1-2; Nepos, Alcibiades, 7. The scholiast to Ranae (1422) has confused the two exiles slightly in the latter part of the note, when the fortification of Dekeleia is dated after the second departure. Otherwise, the scholia agree with other accounts. The confusion in chronology is not in codices V or R; the rest of the gloss is.

Schol. Pax, contained in V. has the correct version.
πολλα κατ' αυτον έγραψεν έν στήλη χαλκη. και εν Βατραχοις.

Schol. Ranae (688) also knows his fate:

"Αλλωσ, στρατηγουντος αυτον ηττηθησαν 'Αθηναιοι, και πολλοι αυτο προσεκροθησαν, δε προδοτι των πόλεμων. τινες δε των κωμικων ποιηθη λεγοντι, δε ηνουμενους των χοροσ εισηγη και παλαινταις. εγενετο δε στρατηγος, επο ου πολλοι ημαρτον των στρατηγων και ομιλησεν εγενετο.

Krateros, whom the scholiasts to Lysistrata cite, probably was responsible for the record of the inscription. The principal source for Phrynichos' story is Thucydides: Alkibiades, in return for Phrynichos' enmity, wrote a letter to Samos, accusing him, and asked that he be put to death; Phrynichos retaliated by telling the Spartan Astyochos how he might best defeat Samos (VIII, 50, 4-5). Peisandros accused Phrynichos to the demos who at once deposed him with his colleague at Samos, Skironides (VIII, 54, 3). Phrynichos' opposition to the democracy was well known (VIII, 90, 1) and, even after the demos had calmed a little toward him, there was a plot against his life and he was assassinated in the agora, not long after returning from an embassy to Lakedaimon (VIII, 92, 2). The demos condemned him after his death and decreed that his bones be cast from Attike (Plutarch, Alcibiades, 25, 5-12).
Probably at the same time the stele was inscribed with regulations for the raising of his house and confiscation of his property.

One of the last major conflicts of the Dekeleian War was the naval battle at Arginousai, a victory for the Athenian forces and a defeat for Athenian morale. The play Ranae was presented shortly after the battle and alludes to Arginousai frequently. Several notes, some paraphrasing Aristophanes, refer to the battle and to its after-effects. A scholion to Ranae, 35, explains that the slaves who fought with Athens at Arginousai were freed:

πρὸς τοὺς χρόνους, ὧν τῷ προτέρῳ ἦτε ἐπὶ Ἀντιγένους περὶ Ἀργίνουσαν ἑνίκων ναυμαχίας οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι συμμαχοῦσιν δοῦλων, προκειμένουτες ἄλλας ναυμαχίας, οὕστινα ἥλευθερωσαν πρὸς τούτῳ οὖν χαριευτικῶς λέγει, ὅτι εἰπερ ἐνευμαχήσειν, καὶ ἀφείμην ἑλεύθερος. Ὁτε οἰμώζειν ἄν ἔλεγον σοι. ἂ ἐξ Ἀργίνουσα πόλις τῆς Αἰολίδος, ἀντικριθεὶς δὲ λέβοι ζειμόνην καὶ Μαλίας καλομένην ἀκρας.

Schol. Ranae (694) repeats the information:

tοὺς συμμαχήσαντας δοῦλους Ἑλλάνικδος φησιν ἑλευθερώθηκαι, καὶ ἐγγραφέται τοῖς Πλαταιοῖς συμπολιτεύσασθαι αὐτοῖς, διεξεῖν τὰ ἐπὶ Ἀντιγένους τοῦ πρὸς Καλλίου.

A gloss to an earlier play, Nubes (6), speaks of the slaves' part at Arginousai:
πόλεμος ἢν κατ’ ἐκείνο καιρὸς καὶ τοσοῦτον ἐξυστίχη-
σαν Ἀθηναῖοι ὡστε μηδὲ τὰ σώματα τῶν ἀποθανόντων ταφῆναι
ἐὼς οὗ οἱ δοῦλοι ἐξελέγαντες ἐνίκησαν τοὺς Λακεδαίμονίους
περὶ Ἀργυροσας καὶ τὰ σώματα τῶν ἀποθανόντων ἐκδίκησαν
καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἠλευθερώθησαν καὶ οὐκ ἔχει οὔδεν τούτων
δοῦλον... φασίν ὡς Ἀθηναῖοι, Λακεδαίμονίους ἔβα Ἀργυ-
ροσας ναυμαχήσειν μέλλοντες, προείπον τοῖς δοῦλοις, ὡς
εἶ τις αὐτῶν συμπαρατάσσεται τῇ ναυμαχίᾳ, τιμῆσαι εἰς τὸ
λοιπὸν ἀπολαβθείναι. Ὑπηκοότων οὖν τῶν δοῦλων, Λακε-
δαίμονες ἐνίκησαν, καὶ ταύτα μὲν τινες φάσκουσιν. τὸ
ὁ ἀληθὲς οὕτως ἔχει. Ἀθηναῖοι καὶ Λακεδαίμονίους
πόλεμος ἦν. οὐκ ἦθελον οὖν Ἀθηναῖοι τοὺς δοῦλους κολά-
ζειν, εἰ τι παίκσαειν, δεδότες μὴ πρὸς Λακεδαίμονίους
αὐτομολῆσωσί. τὸ δὲ ὅτε ποτὲ μὲν μόνον χρόνον ἐδολι,
pοτὲ δὲ καὶ χρόνον καὶ αἰτίαν, ὡς ἐστὶν καυταῖθα.

The location of Arginousai is described by Pliny (H.N., V.
140), Harpokration (T117) and Strabo (XIII, 617), who agree
with the scholiasts that it is an Aiolic city opposite Les-
bos.

Xenophon describes fully the battle of Arginousai
which took place opposite Mytilene (Hell., I, 6, 1-28) and
specifies that the slaves participated (I, 6, 24). Just as
the Athenians made metics and foreigners citizens if they
would fight, says Diodorus (XIII, 97, 1), so did they make
the slaves citizens of Athens after their brave action at
Arginousai (XIII, 98-100).
After the battle was over, the generals prepared to pursue the Lakedaimonians who had turned in flight. They left some ships to collect the dead and wounded, but a sudden storm frightened the men who had been directed to gather the bodies and they fled. A scholion to Ranae (191) alludes to this:

τὴν περὶ Ἀργευούσαν φησὶ ναυμαχίαν, ἣςαν γὰρ δοῦλοι τότε ναυμαχήσαντες, περὶ οὐδενὸς ἠλλον ἢ περὶ τῶν ἱδίων κρεῶν, τούτεστι σωμάτων...περὶ τῆς ἐν Ἀργευούσαις ναυμαχίας, ἐν ἵ ἐνίκως μὲν οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι, τοὺς νεκροὺς δὲ ἐκκαθήκασαν ἀνελέσθαι ὑπὸ χειμῶνος. ἦγοι οὐ καὶ τῶν ἑκατέρων ἐπώλουτο καταδικάσθηκέναι οἱ ὑπομεῖναντες ἦγοι. "Ἀλλαξ吸引力 διάφοροι αἱ γραφαὶ· οἱ μὲν γὰρ κρεῶν, ὡς Ἀρίσταρχος φησὶν ἐπὶ τῶν σωμάτων λαμβάνεονται πολλὰ καὶ ὡς ποτὲ τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἐν περιστάσει γενομένων καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν ψυχῶν ἀγωνιζόμενων, προσλαβέειν τοὺς δούλους καὶ ἀντεροῦ ἐλευθερίας ἀξίωσαι. Εἶτεροι δὲ φασὶν αἰνίττεσθαι τῇ περὶ Ἀργευούσαις ναυμαχίας, ἦ γὰρ τῶν νεκρῶν ἡγώνισαν.

Schol. Ranae (698) agrees:

Ἰὼν περὶ τῶν δ' στρατηγῶν λέγει τῶν σωθέντων ἐκ τῶν δέκα τῶν περὶ Ἀργευούσαν ναυμαχησάντων. καταδικάσθηκαν γὰρ αὐτοὶ μὴ ἀνελέσθην τόσο νεκροῖς. καὶ οἱ μὲν ἦγοι ὑπομεῖναντες θανάτῳ ἐκολάσθηκαν, οἱ δὲ λοιποὶ δ' ἔφυγον....
A list of the generals at Arginousai is given by the scholiasts to *Ranæ* (1196), excerpting from Philochoros:

ἐῖσ’ Ἐρασινίδης τῶν περὶ Ἀργίνουσαν στρατηγησαόντων δυστυχῶς. Ὅπεθεν δὲ ὁμοσία, οὕτως τε καὶ οἱ υπομείναντες, θράσυλλος, Περικλῆς, Δυσίας, Ἀριστοκράτης, Διομέδων, δὲ φησὶ Φιλόχορος. Δημήτριος δὲ φησὶ, περιττότερον τι γευέσθαι τῷ Ἐρασινίδῃ....

Kallikratidas had died in battle (Plutarch, *Lysander*, 7,1; Cicero, *De Officiis*, I, 24); the rest, when they found that storm had prevented collection of the dead and dying, set sail for Athens, hoping for the gratitude of the demos after such a victory over the Lakedaemonian forces.
CHAPTER EIGHT
THE POST-WAR YEARS

Aristophanes continued to write until 388/7, but the references to current politics and figures are infrequent. *Ecclesiazusae* and *Plutus* have many allusions to the war but few to the years after. In addition, *Ecclesiazusae* was a play so little read in later ages\(^1\) that the scholia to it are brief and largely uninformative. *Ranae* is not a political comedy; its few historical references are for the most part concerned with events before 415, with the exception of several allusions to Arginoussai and a long passage (1422-1434) concerning Alcibiades. *Plutus* was one of the last plays; its commentary is in major part an exegesis on prosody. Scholia about the years after Arginoussai are, consequently, few in all the comedies. Where they offer any details they deal rather with individuals than with the events of these years.

Feelings after Arginoussai ran high. Urged on by Theramenes, the Ekklesia voted that the generals be tried, but was so angry that it condemned, almost without a hearing, those strategoi who returned. Two of the generals had

\(^1\) Cf. chapter III above; *Ecclesiazusae* is in two codices only, as are *Lysistrata* and *Thesmophoriazusae*, both of which have in their commentaries mention of figures import
heard of the outcry at home and never returned to Athens. The scholiasts refer to the trial and the generals who suffered punishment. Theramenes' part in the condemnation is emphasised by Xenophon (Hell., I, 7, 4 and 8). Diodoros (XIII, 101, 1-6) explains how Theramenes and Thrasyboulos roused the demos by sending letters about Arginousai; the men who returned were tried, Konon was freed, and six were executed. A list of the generals who were sentenced is supplied by Xenophon (Hell., I, 7, 1-2), who agrees with the scholion to Ranae (1196). Plutarch (Pericles, 37, 7) reports that Pericles the younger was one of the generals executed. Only Sokrates, son of Sophroniskos, then a bouleutes, would not condemn the officers.

Final victory seemed to the Athenians a matter of time. Peace with Sparta would be made only when Sparta was totally defeated and, after Arginousai, this was quite possible. Another year of war did not lower Athens' hopes; men, money and ships were sent in continued attacks on the enemy until it appeared that the Peloponnesian forces must surrender, perhaps at the Aigos River where both sides had marshalled their navies, each watching for a time most propitious

ant after 406.

---

2 See pp. 247-248 above.

3 Apology, 20, 1; Xenophon, Mem., IV, 4, 2; Valerius
to fight the other. Aigeopotamoi was the deciding battle; the Athenian defeat was the end of the Second Peloponnesian War.

Before Lysandros left Athens he oversaw the destruction of the Long Walls and the change of government from democracy to oligarchy. The institution of the Thirty is mentioned by the scholiasts to Plutus (1146):

"ὅτι μετὰ τὸ κατελθεῖν τούς μετὰ θρασυβόλου φυλὴν καταλαμβάνεις καὶ νικήσαντας ἐν Πειραιᾷ τοὺς τριάκοντας ἤσσας ἐνδοξᾶς μὴ μυθισκάκησαι καθάπαξ ἀλλήλοις μηδὲν τοὺς πολίτας. ἀλλὰ ταῦτα γε οὕτω ἐπέκρατο ὡδέ τὰ ἐπὶ τῶν τριάκοντας ἢδη ἢ γὰρ ἀλλὰ καὶ ὃς Φιλόχορδος φησίν, πέμπτῃ ἔτει θόστερον τῇ θρασυβολοῦ γενομένης Κρίταιας ἐν Πειραιᾷ τελευτᾷ...."συνήθεντο γὰρ μετὰ τὸ μεταγαγεῖν μὴ μυθισκάκησαι...."Ἀλλος. Θρασύβουλος βουλήμενος καταλύει τοὺς λ᾽ καταλαβὼς φυλὴν, τόπους τινὰ, κάνεις συμμάχους λαβὼν, κατέλυσε. καὶ ἔκει ἄλαζονικὸν ἐφθέγγα, ἤκουσε, μὴ μυθισκάκησαι, καὶ ἐγένετο παροιμιακὸν...."Φυλὴ γὰρ τόπος οὕτω καλοβιονεῖς. περὶ δὲ θρασυβολοῦ εἰρήται ὅλα τὸ ἐπαινεῖσθαι, ὅτι ἐκεῖ ἐφόνευσε τοὺς λ᾽ τυράννους.

Xenophon (Hell., II, 3, 1–2) names the thirty men who ruled Athens, appointed in the archonship of Pythodoros. Lysandros, when he had accomplished this, sailed away to Samos (II, 3, 4).

Maximus, III, 8, 3; Athenaios, V, 218a.
Of the Thirty Tyrants whom Xenophon lists the scholiasts supply information about four. Theramenes, son of Hagnon, is most frequently mentioned, first as the man who persuaded the Ekklesia to lay charges against the generals who had failed to pick up the dead at Arginousai, later as one of the leaders of the Thirty. Schol. Nubes (361) sketches his background:

diδάσκαλος δὲ ἦν οὖτος ὁ Πρόδικος, καὶ θεραμένες τοῦ ἐπικαλουμένου κοθόρυν, δὲ τῆς τῶν τριάκοντα τυραννίδος μετέχει. κόθορυν δὲ ἐκαλεῖτο οὖτος, ἐπεὶ καὶ τοῖς τριάκοντα συνέσπευδε καὶ τῷ πλῆθει. καὶ γὰρ δὲ κόθορυν τὸ ὑπόθημα ἀμφοτέροις ἀρμόζει τοῖς ποσὶ.

To Ranae (541) is another scholion about him:

οὖτος τῶν τὰ πολιτικὰ πραττόντων. σκάπτει δὲ αὐτὸν ὡς εὐμετάβολον ὄντα καὶ πρὸς τὸν καὶρόν ἀρμόζοντα. οὖτος δὲ γέγονεν ὁ θεραμένης διδάσκαλος Ἰοσκράτους, στρατηγὸς δὲ καὶ ὑποκριτὴν εὐμετάβλητος, Ἀγνωστός παῖς, Στειρεῖς τῶν δήμων. τοῦτο πολλὰ μὲν καὶ ἄλλα παραφέρομεν, διὸ δὲ τὰ μέγιστα καὶ σχέτικατα, ἢ τε τῶν ἐν Ἄργειν ὅθεν στρατηγῶν ἀπαγωγή, ἦν αὐτὸς συνεστῆσατο μετὰ Καλλικρῆνον, καὶ ἢ τῶν λέητες καταλύσει τοῦ δήμου καταστάσει. τοιγάρτοι, τῆς τοῦ βίου προαίρεσεν ἐπαξίας τῆς τελευτής ἐτυχεν. ὑπὸ γὰρ αὐτῶν τῶν λ᾽ ἀνηρέθη, Κριτίου κρίναντος αὐτὸν. ἐνιοί δὲ φασὶ καὶ καταφυγόμενα αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τὴν
Athenaios (T79) and Suidas (T248) note that Prodikos was his teacher. Isokrates was his pupil (Zosimos, Vita Isocrat., 2, 1; Plutarch, Vita X Orat., 836f). A noteōto Ranæ (47) offers further biographical information:

ἐνθεν καὶ θηραμένης κόθορυνος ἐλέγετο. ὅτι τοῖς καιροῖς καθομιλεῖν δύναται. ὁ δὲ ξενοφῶν ἐν Ἑλληνικοῖς ἀμφιτρείοις τοῖς ποσῶν ἁμβώς ἀρμόδιον αὐτῶν φησίν.

Plutarch (Nicias, 2, 1) quotes the attacks upon him as an alien from Keos. He was nicknamed κόθορυνος because he tried
to play on both sides of the political fence (cf. Xenophon, Hell., II, 3, 47)\textsuperscript{5} Pollux (VII, 91) knows the name: Theramenes could fit either party at Athens just as a buskin fits either foot. The \textit{Aneudota} (T87) are similar in tone.

Another of the Thirty mentioned by the scholiasts is Drakontides, whom a note to \textit{Vespa}e (157) remembers as a wretch and a trial-monger:

πονηρὸς οὗτος καὶ πλείσταις κατασκευαὶς ἐνεχύμενος, ὁς Πλάτων Σοφιστάς. Καλλιστράτος δὲ ἔνα τῶν λ' φησίν, εἰ μὴ διμωνυμός. Ξεστὶ γὰρ οὗτος ὅ τὸ περὶ τῶν λ'φησισμα περὶ ὀλιγαρχίας γράψας, ὃς Ἀριστοτέλης ἐν Πολιτείαις.

He is listed as one of the Thirty by Xenophon (Hell., II, 3, 2). Aristotle (T64) says that the demos was forced to vote in favour of the bill which he wrote establishing a government of oligarchs, the Thirty. According to Lysias (T184) Theramenes bade the demos turn over the city to the Thirty and to obey the constitution which Drakontides had drawn up.

Three notes mention the tragic poet Theognis, one of the Thirty. Scholia to \textit{Acharnenses} (11 and 140) and a note to \textit{Thesmophoriazusae} recall his frigidity and politics:

\footnote{For his activities in 411, to which parts of schol. \textit{Ranae}, 541, and \textit{Lysistrata}, 490, refer, see above, pp. 241-242.}
Some Athenians were unwilling to return to an oligarchic city. Thrasyboulos, once a member of the Four Hundred and protagonist of Alkibiades, joined to himself a few men at arms and occupied the fortress of Phyle. The scholion to Plutus (1146) describes the move and its results; another note to Plutus (550) is briefer:

ʼανθρι φιλοκόλιδι καὶ παντὸς κρείττονι λόγου, διὰ τὰς ἐπιφανείς αὐτῶν κατὰ τῶν πολεμίων νίκας καὶ διότι κατέλυσε τὴν τῶν λατρεύσαντας εὐποροι γὰρ δὲ καὶ ἐξ αὐτῶν ἐκπεδών μετὰ ταῦτα πιστὰ καταλαβὼν καθεύθεν αὐτοῦ. ...μὴποτε ὁ ἄξιωματικὸς καὶ αὐθάδης.... θρασύβουλος δὲ ὁμοφυλῆς...τοῦ Κολούτεως...θρασυβολὼς τῷ Δίκου, ἀνθρι φιλοκόλιδι καὶ παντὸς κρείττονι λόγου,
Xenophon (Hell., II, 4, 2) narrates how Thrasyboulos with seventy men seized the fortress of Phyle after marching secretly from Thebes.\(^6\) In giving eight hundred men the scholiasts are unique; Xenophon (II, 4, 5) says that Thrasyboulos gathered about seven hundred men to Phyle after he had seized the place. The scholiasts may have assumed that this was the number of men with whom he had occupied the fortress. Before he attacked the Peiraius he increased the number to one thousand (Hell., II, 4, 10).

The Thirty, who at once learned of Thrasyboulos'...

---

\(^6\) Cf. Diodoros, XIV, 32, 1; Nepos (T201 and T203), says that he had only thirty men with him; Pausanias, I, 29, 3, gives sixty.
operations, were uncertain how to counter them. By the time they had reached a decision, Thrasyboulos had already moved against Pelasgic (Hill, II, 4, 10-11). They hastened to attack, with the aid of Spartans and their own hoplites and horse. Sparta sought help from Korinth and Boiotia, both of whom refused (Hill., II, 4, 30). The battle continued for some days (Hill., II, 4, 11-43); in the course of it, Kritias, one of the most active of the Thirty, was killed (Hill., II, 4, 19).

Kritias, associate of Sokrates and one of the chief oligarchs, had caused the death of Theramenes shortly before the conflict with Thrasyboulos. Three scholia (Plutus, 1146, Ranae, 541, and Ranae, 47) cite the fact that Theramenes was put to death at Kritias' insistence. Xenophon enlarges upon their bitter argument, begun because Theramenes charged Kritias with ordering too many proscriptions (Hill., II, 3, 14-15). The trouble grew (Hill., II, 3, 16-49) when Kritias called Theramenes a μηδενος and accused him as chief defaulter at Arginousai who had blamed his colleagues in order to save himself. At last, Kritias asked that Theramenes be executed (II, 3, 50-51) and the sentence was carried out (II, 3, 52-53).

---

Cf. Diodoros, XIV, 32-33; Nepos (T202-T204); schol. Aischines (T15); Justin (T164); Aristotle (T65).
Diodoros (XIV, 4-5) has a summary of Xenophon's story. Harpokration (T122) says only that Kritias accused him before the Thirty.

Kritias' death broke the spirit of the oligarchs and their Spartan allies. Victory for the democrats came soon after (Hell., II, 4, 39) and with it the act of amnesty which guaranteed that no harm would come to those in the city whom the Thirty had favoured (Hell., II, 4, 43).

Thrasymoulos had cast his lot with the democrats when he fled Athens and the Thirty. After their defeat he returned as leader of the demos. The scholiasts to Ecclesiastes (203) so call him:

οὗτος αὐθάδης καὶ δωροδοκός, ἑκερότητα δὲν τοῦ δῆμου, ἡμῶνετο δι' αὐτοῦ πάντα πράττεσθαι.

Demosthenes (T90) and Isokrates (T158) call him δημοτικός in opposition to the oligarchs who had formerly ruled Athens; Isokrates says that he had greatest power in the city.

---

8 Diodoros, XIV, 33, 3; Justin (T165); Nepos (T204).
9 See Diodoros, XIV, 33, 4-6; Nepos (T205); schol. Aischines (T13); schol. Plutus, 1146; cf. Tod, Greek Hist. Inscr., II, no. 100.
Another scholion concerning Thrasyboulos declares that he was once bribed not to speak when a Lakonian embassy came about peace (cf. διωρόδως in schol. Ecclesiastaeusae, 203). The scholion to Ecclesiastaeusae (356) is perhaps a paraphrase from Aristophanes or from one of the other comic poets:

οὗτος ἀντιλέγειν μέλλων τοῖς Λακεδαίμονις πρέσβεσι περὶ σπουδῶν ἐληλυθείν, εἰτα διωροδοκήσας, ἀρχάδας προσεποιήσατο βεβρωκέναι, καὶ μὴ δευσάθαι λέγειν.

A hypothesis to Andokides (T22) mentions a Lakonian embassy which Andokides would not allow to speak; Kirchner suggests that Thrasyboulos may here have been confused with Andokides. The embassy of the hypothesis came to Athens in 392/1 when Thrasyboulos was still in the city. Perhaps he was involved with the ambassadors. This implication, however, may belong earlier, before Aigospotamoi, when the Lakedaimonians sought peace after the defeat at Arginousai and were spurned, or even earlier, when Thrasyboulos was active with the Four Hundred. The scholiasts indicate no date and there were several Lakonian embassies with which Thrasyboulos might well have had dealings. Neither Xenophon nor the orators have anything by which the note may be tested.

Another note which cannot be checked because the date is uncertain is the scholion to Ecclesiastaeusae (193)

Kirchner, P.A., I, no. 7310.
about an alliance between Lakonia and Boiotia:

περὶ δὲ τοῦ συμμαχικοῦ φιλόχροου ἱστορεῖ ὅτι πρὸ
δύο ἑτῶν ἐγένετο συμμαχία Λακεδαιμονίων καὶ Βοιωτῶν.

The date of Ecclesiazusae is not precisely known and we cannot identify the alliance of the note, which, obviously, is not a paraphrase of Aristophanes. Between 404 and 390 there were various occasions on which the Athenians and Boiotians (i.e., Thebans) collaborated against the Spartans. Perhaps Λακεδαιμονίων is a scribal error for Ἀθηναίων.

In 392/1 there was a Spartan attempt to have a general settlement (Hill., V, 1, 29-33); the Thebans assented, the Argives refused, for themselves and the Corinthians. A speech extolling the proposed treaty was made in Athens (Andokides, III) but the terms were rejected and Andokides sent into exile. Peace was not again considered until 386, this time with positive results. The abortive attempt made by Sparta and favoured by Thebes may have been the peace and alliance to which the scholiasts refer.

Another ally of Athens, once her bitterest enemy,

11 Xenophon, Hill., III, 5, 1-2 and 7-16; IV, 3, 15; Lysias, 14, 18, 1 and 16, 13-15; Tod, Greek Hist. Inscr., II, no. 101.

12 Meiners, Quaestiones, pp. 352-354.
was Korinth, as the scholiasts to Plutus (173) report:

φασὶ τοὺς Κορινθίους διὰ τὸ τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἐπικρατεῖς
συμμαχία κεχρησάθαι τῇ ἣκινη δυνάμει. ἦν δὲ καταστήσαντας
ἐν Κορίνθῳ τοὺς ἐξένουσα Κόμων ὁ Ἀθηναῖος στρατηγὸς, καθε-
λὼν Δακεδαίμονίους, ὡς φυλάττοι τὴν ἔφοδον αὐτῶν.

"Ἀλλὰς. ὡς τῶν Ἀθηναίων δὲ οὖσ᾽ ἐντὸς μη βουλομένων πολεμ-
εῖν πρὸς Κορινθίους διὰ τοῦ κινδύνου, μισθουμένων δὲ
ἐξένουσ εἰς τὸν πόλεμον καὶ τρεφόντων αὐτῶς. τούτῳ δὲ
ἐν τοῖς πολλοῖς τῶν πολέμων διεπράττοντο. "Ἀλλὰς. ὡς
ἀεὶ ἐξενικῆν τι ἐχόντων Κορινθίων, καὶ οὐχ ὡς ἐνιοῦ κατὰ
τὸν χρόνον τοῦτον. ὁδὸν δὲ ἐκ τοῦ ἐν δευτέρῳ φέρεσθαι,
ὅσαν ἐνακτῶ ἐξιδιάχθη ὡς αὐτῶν εἰκοστῇ ἔτει ὑστεροῦν· εἰ
μη, ὅπερ εἰκὼς, ἐν τοῦ δευτέρου Πλούτου τούτου μετενή-
κται. ἐκεῖ γὰρ ὅρθως ἔχει. Ἡ δὲ ὁ ἐν τοῖς Δακεδαίμονις
πολέμως συνέστη τρισὶν ἡ τέτρας ἔτει πρῶτοι τοῖς
'Αντικάττροι, ἐφ' οὐ εἴδιδάχθη, καὶ τὸ συμμαχίαν ἐπαν-
θροιστὸ ἐν Κορίνθῳ τῷ δὲ Δακεδαίμονίου ἐν Σικυώνι.

"Ἀλλὰς. μετὰ τὸν πόλεμον τοῦ Πελοποννησιακῆς καὶ αὐτοὶ
οἱ συμμαχοὶ τῶν Δακεδαίμονίων συνεκρότησαν πόλεμον κατ'
αὐτῶν· συνέλαβον δὲ αὐτοῖς Ἀθηναίοι, καὶ ἔσχον τὴν
Κορινθίων ὁμαρτήματα, εἰς ἦν ἐπεμψαν ἐξενικὴν στράτευμα,
καὶ αὐτὶ θρέφον αὐτό. τοῖς δὲ στρατευμάτος ἤρχεν
Ἰφικράτης οὐ στρατηγὸς. "Ἀλλὰς. τοῖς δὲ Σικυῶνοι καὶ Δακε-
δαίμονες ἐν αὐτοῖς Φιλιππικῶν μέμψηται "ὅτι καὶ πρῶτον πατ' ἀκοῦσαν ἐξενικῆν τρέφειν ἐν Κορίνθῳ τὴν πόλιν, οὗ Πολῖ-
Xenophon (Hellen., IV, 4, 1) joins Athens with the Boiotians and Argives who stationed themselves in Korinth and went out to fight Lakedaimon. Androction and Philochoros (frg. 150 Jacoby) believe that Konon was first to fight with mercenaries, and that Iphikrates and Chabrias followed his example when they were fighting Lakedaimon. Polystratos supplied a mercenary army that was based in Korinth, according to Harpokration (T125) and Demosthenes (4, 46) adds that this army too was commanded by Iphikrates and Chabrias. Xenophon remembers the general Iphikrates (Hellen., IV, 8, 34) as leader of the army that camped in Korinth and made forays against the Lakonians.

The Korinthian war was fought a few years before the presentation of Plutus (388 B.C.). The Lakedaimonian base
in allied Sikyon finds its place in Xenophon (IV, 2, 14). Precisely when Korinth was so mistreated by Lakedaimon that the growing animosity toward her erstwhile ally became open warfare Xenophon does not state, but he mentions the Lakonian's dawning realisation that the Korinthians were not eager to help them in war (III, 5, 23). The scholiasts do not suggest that they accept the opinion of certain critics who postulate Lakonian injury of Korinth as the reason why Athens sent mercenaries and three generals to help her against Sparta.

While his colleagues were engaged in land battles in the Peloponnesos, Thrasyboulos was fighting at sea near Lesbos. At his death, the Athenians elected Agyrios to replace him. Three scholia speak of him in no glowing terms. Schol. Ecclesiazusae (102) writes of his generalship in Lesbos:

ο Ἀγγριως στρατηγὸς θηλυκιώδης, ἀρχας ἐν Δέσβῃ.
καὶ τὸν μισθὸν δὲ τῶν ποιητῶν συνέτεμε, καὶ πρῶτος ἐκκλησιαστικὸν δέσωκεν. ὃ δὲ Πρόνοιμος αὐλητὴς...

A scholion to Plutus (176) indicates that he was rich:

οὗτος πλοῦσιος ὤν πολλὰ πληρὺ ἦσσε.

To Ranæ (387) is a note which credits him, or Archinos, with lowering the poets' fees:
toûto eîs 'Arkînou. mhîpote de kai eîs 'Agôrriou.
mmênetai de toûto wâi kai Plàtouw ev ëknavaiâ kai Sànnv-
riôn ev Davnê. ouô toi gàr prôstamenvoi thê dêmosiâs
trapezês thn mèthn thn kàmphiôn emêlwosan kàmphiônêntes.

Demosthenes (T96) describes Agyrrios in different terms;
Xenophon (Hell., IV, 8, 31) speaks of his election as nau-
arch, but has nothing to say of his character, nor has Diod-
doros (XIV, 99, 5). Aristotle (T66) records that he first
voted to pay the ekklesiasts, first an obol and later three
obols, in the year when Eukleidês was archon (403/2).

The comic poets are sources for the item that Agy-
rrios reduced the poets' fees: Plato Comicus (T229) mentions
the election of Agyrrios as strategos; Plato says, in passing,
that he is one of the poets who suffered at Agyrrios' hands.
In another fragment (133 Kock) Plato speaks of the lowering
of the fees, as does Sannyrios (frg. 9 Kock). The attacks
on Agyrrios' character may be a combination of the unfavour-
able reputation which he received at the hands of the poets
bitter toward him, and a paraphrase of the lines in Aristo-
phanes.13

13 In a proxeny decree of 403/2 (I.G., II2 2) Agy-
rrios Kollyteus is secretary of the Boule; he may be our
Agyrrios.
Last to appear in the commentary is Timotheos whose biography is given in schol. *Plutus*, 130:

οὗτος εἰς τοσούτον ἤρθη τῆς, διότι καὶ ἐν οἷς τοῦτο ἢ τὴν δαίμονα φαίνεσθαι. κατασκευάσας δὲ πύργου οὐκ ἀπὸ τῆς ἐφὶ κατασκευάσεως, ἀλλ’ ἀπ’ ἀνδρείας. ὄργισθείσα δὲ ἡ τῆς πένητα αὐτῶν ἐποίησεν. οὐκ εἰσαε δὲ εἰπεῖν, διὰ τὸν πλοῦτον ἐγένετο, ἀλλ’ ἔπηγαγε παρ’ ὑπόνοιαν ἐμπέσοι γέ σοι. "Ἄλλως. ὁ Τιμόθεος πλοῦσις, ᾧμα δὲ καὶ ἄλβιος ἄνήρ, στρατηγὸς Ἀθηναῖος, τείχος ὀκοδομήσας εἰς τοσούτον ἤρθη τῆς, ὡς τὴν δαίμονα φαίνεσθαι ἐν οἷς τοῦτο. καὶ ἐν Ἀθηναῖς δὲ ἐν εἰκόσιοι ἐποίησαν αὐτῶν κοιμώμενον οἱ ζωγράφοι, καὶ τὰς τῆς φεροῦσας αὐτῷ εἰς δίκτυα πόλεις καὶ πορθοῦτα αὐτῶς, αἰνιττόμενοι τὴν εὐδαιμονίαν αὐτῶν.

ολαζονευόμενος δὲ ἐπὶ τῇ εὔνοια ὁ Τιμόθεος ἐφη μᾶλλον αὐτοῦ εἶναι ἢ τῆς τῆς τὰ πραττόμενα. διὸ καὶ ἡ τῆς θεοῦ ὀστερον, νεμεσοπάσκης αὐτῷ τῆς Τῆς. πολλοὶ δὲ Τιμόθεοι κοιμιζοῦνται...ὁ Τιμόθεος στρατηγὸς Ἀθηναῖοι, δει εἰς τοσούτον ἤλθε τῆς τῆς, ὡς τοις ζωγράφοις, αἰνιττόμενοι αὐτῶν τὴν εὐδαιμονίαν, ἐν δίκτυυ ζωγράφων φέρειν αὐτῶν τὰς πόλεις...ἐποίησε δὲ πύργου πολυτελέστατον ἐν Ἀθηναῖς.

Lysias (19, 36) reports that he was son of Konon and a Kypro- cte woman, as Plutarch also states (*Sulla*, 6, 4). He adminis-
tered Konon's great wealth (Lysias, 19, 36; Demosthenes, T98) and was well known for his good luck (Schol. Demosthenes, T101; Plutarch, Sulla, 6, 4). The painting of Timotheos with the cities coming to him and Tyche nearby is mentioned in the scholia to Demosthenes (T101) and by Plutarch, (De Mal. Herod., 856b). The tower built by him is not known elsewhere; Xenophon (Hell., V, 4, 65-66) says that he set up a trophy at Alyzia.

The last historical notes in the commentary concern two events which occurred after Aristophanes' death. Demosthenes spoke against Aristokrates, as a scholiast to Aves (126) tells us:

ἐπεὶ Ἀριστοκράτης Σκελλίου νιάς, ὅν ὁ ρήτωρ Δημοσθένης ἔγραψεν.

Demosthenes' oration was delivered in 353/2 (T94), and Libanius, in the hypothesis to the oration (T99), repeats the words and adds other information about Aristokrates. The Aristokrates of the scholiasts is not, of course, the Aristokrates of Aves.

The scholiasts to Nubes (23), speaking of the brands on race horses, mention in passing Boukephalos, the famous horse for which Alexander named a city:

οἶος, οἶμαι, καὶ ὁ τοῦ Ἀλέξανδρου τοῦ Μακεδόνος Ἑπός
The horse fell in battle near Poros when Alexander was fighting on the borders of India (Strabo, XV, 698) and Alexander built a city there, between the Hydaspis and the Akesinos, named Boukephala in memory of the horse. Arrian (T74) reports that the horse died of old age and illness, not wounds, and was immortalised by Boukephala which Alexander built. Plutarch (Alexander, 61, 1-2) combines the two traditions: Boukephalos was sounded in battle near Poros and died later, when the wounds suppurated and his age left him too enfeebled to fight the infection. Alexander built the city Boukephala, in honour of the horse. Quintus Curtius (T88) and Harpokration (T132) have similar accounts.
CHAPTER NINE

SCHOLIA AND HISTORY

Old Comedy was essentially local in its allusions. Aristophanes filled his plays with references to Athenian politics and public men and incidents so familiar to a contemporary audience that a word or phrase served as a reminder. Thanks to this characteristic his work was supplied with an extensive commentary. Among the scholia in the variorum are many which critics have labeled "historical" without always pausing to examine carefully whether they have any right to such a title. Opinions concerning the value of these scholia have varied widely. A few, with Renkema, believe that there is good material in the commentary: scholia Aristophaniae, licet haud paucas praebeant observationes ineptas ad poetae mentem intellegendam prorsus inutiles, tamen eis qui ipsi Aristophanis operam dant, minime neglegenda esse cuivis hanc materiam paulo accuratius cognosci statim appareat. Continent enim veterum grammaticorum explicationes utilissimas, saepissime locis obscuris claram lucem affundunt, quin etiam veram poetae manum nonnumquam nobis servarunt.¹

¹ Renkema, Studia Critica in scholia ad Aristophanis Aves, introductory remarks, p. 1 (unnumbered).
Others share Rutherford's opinion about the ἰστοριῶν ἀπόδοσις: "There are many allusions in the plays which even the earliest commentators could only annotate by guesses, and as century followed century the number of obscurities augmented. The old learning would seem to have been inaccessible at first hand to the men who compiled the marginal commentaries; and if it had been accessible, it is doubtful that they would have appreciated it at its proper value or used it to any good purpose. It is clear that as represented in the hypomnemata, mostly anonymous, and in the lexica and other books consulted by them, that learning had assumed a most corrupt and fragmentary form. But with this vast subject it is impossible to deal in a sketch of the methods of the scholiasts such as this is. There is no presumption, however, in recording the opinion that in ἰστοριῶν ἀπόδοσις the scholiasts to Aristophanes are so rarely to be trusted that everything they provide of substantial value may be packed into a score or two of pages. On the other side of the account have to be set an encumbering mass of falsehoods and misleading statements due to the improvisation or the charlatancy or the guileless ignorance of scholiasts, and a great deal of nonsense and nastiness generated from silly and undisciplined minds. There is no reason why rubbish should be treated as erudition merely because it is preserved in a brown Greek manuscript, and rubbish undoubtedly the bulk of
is that appears in the scholia. If judged without prejudice it is just the sort of thing that the spirit of comedy exists to make fun of. Rutherford is equally vehement elsewhere in his study of the scholia Ravennatis.

Which judgement of the scholia is closer to the truth? The answer involves a study of several factors: the formation of the commentary, the sources of the commentary and the way in which they were used, the contents of the scholia dealing with isoporia, and so on.

The essential nature of any commentary was clearly understood in letter but not in spirit by Rutherford: "... anybody who tries to use the scholia as a commentary upon the author's text discovers before long that as such they are often unintelligible and self-contradictory, in short that what purports to be a single note may be many notes contaminated; that every clause in some hasty sentence belonged once to a different annotator; that citations on which the commentator's meaning depends have been lost; that what is given as a comment may be really a quotation from some book no longer extant; that the direct and the indirect modes of quotation are used side by side in giving the general sense of a passage in an ancient historian; that what appears to be flat nonsense becomes endowed with meaning as soon as we

---

2 Rutherford, Scholia Aristophanica, III, pp. 387-388

3 Rutherford, Scholia Aristophanica, I, pp. xliii-xxiii.
apprehend that its author had before him an unrecorded but
certain variant. If we regard the scholia from this point of view, the question of form is indeed all important. But
unless documents remain to be discovered containing an entirely different recension of the scholia from any which we now know to exist, the study of the form of the scholia will be little advantaged by a better presentation of the text.... Certainly the subject matter of the scholia to Aristophanes would never have tempted me to edit them. It varies greatly in character in different plays and even at different parts of the same play. The authority for most of it does not admit of being established. To begin with, the nucleus of annotation, round which the commentary upon any one play gradually formed, may have a different origin in every case. According as a play was seldom or often read in schools or in the lectures or rhetors, the manner in which the bulk of its scholia grew inevitably varied.\(^4\)

Rutherford's approach, clearly, is tinged with distaste: such a concatenation of material of all kinds and proveniences is certain to be bad; therefore the scholia are bad. Boudreaux, also, understood the situation, but the tone of his statement is very different: "Un gram-mairien anonyme vers le IV\(^e\)-V\(^e\) siècle constituait donc le texte

des onze comédies conservées d'Aristophane en collationnant les quelques exemplaires complets ou partiels dont il disposait. D'autre part il compila les commentaires d'Héliodore, de Symmaque, de Phaeinus, des commentaires anonymes de nombre et de valeur variables suivant les pièces. Il transcrivit texte et annotations sur un codex de parchemin. Ce codex était l'archetype de notre recension byzantine. Mais, par les contaminations qui s'exerçèrent pendant de longs siècles sur les descendants, par les collations d'exemplaires provenant d'autres sources, par les conjectures, par les additions postérieures, les exemplaires de la même recension se sont chargés de façon inégale d'éléments étrangers. L'unité initiale a fait rapidement place à une diversité nouvelle.5

Boudreaux admits that a commentary is not a unity, but he finds the marginalia no less valuable for that reason. No commentary can be rejected or disparaged because it is the combined work of many men rather than one. A modern commentary, like the mediaeval marginalia, contains the scholarly researches of more than one man. If a commentary is to be questioned it cannot be questioned on this basis alone.

The scholiasts to Aristophanes often named the authors or commentators from whom their information was taken. Some of the sources were poor, most were reputable, a few

5 Boudreaux, Le Texte d'Aristophane, pp. 187-188.
excellent. The scholia vetera can be distinguished, further, from the recentiora in most cases by reference to the codices. The thoughtful editing and emending by Aldus, Musurus and Giunta are of value not only because the early printed editions managed to separate the later accretions from the commentary, but because the three men had access to some good mss. which have since disappeared. "So sind diese Handschriften selbst uns verloren gegangen, the mss. used by Musurus, aber da sie ziemlich wörtlich abgedruckt sind, so haben wir für sie in der Aldina einen Ersatz. Zu diesen Auszügen aus dem alten Sammelcodex fügte Musurus Scholien des Trikliniums und einiges eigene; die auf diese Weise hergestellte Scholienmasse ist dann fort und fort widergedruckt und mitunter durch Neues vermehrt worden, bildet aber noch heute die Grundlage und dem Stamm unserer Scholien. Die Aufgabe eines Künftigen Herausgebers ist, diese Einheit wider in ihre Bestandteile aufzulösen und von den neuen Grundlagen aus eine neue Einheit zu schaffen, oder richtiger, die Einheit des Sammelcodex möglichst widerzustellen."

Studies of the textual tradition and of the scholarship of Alexandrian and later periods, then, provide the

---

historian with the answer to his first problem, the composition of the marginalia, and to part of the second, the sources used by the scholiasts. He can realise that few scholia, probably, are excerpted from a single source but that the notes are the work of many men working at different times. Further, the historian understands that the notes come from a variety of mss. and that scribal error has affected the text, particularly in the transcription of numbers and names.

There remains the other factor, the value of the scholia called "Historical". What are the characteristics of these scholia? Were the scholiasts critical? Did they offer several versions of an event from which the reader might choose or were they arbitrary? When two writers supplied a similar account, with slight variations of detail, did the glossators prefer one source to another? Did they depend upon paraphrase or did they attempt to clarify Aristophanes' historical allusions by additions from other sources? Finally, are the scholia to be treated as historical sources?

Because of the very nature of the scholia, absolute answers are difficult to find. This investigation has shown that sometimes the scholiasts were critical, sometimes they copied several versions of one item; sometimes they paraphrased; sometimes they included quotations excerpted from their sources. The historian knows that marginalia have no pretensions to homogeneity. Often he will find a useful
note in a mass of poor marginalia, or a worthless gloss in an otherwise excellent scholion.

About one-fifth of the scholia in the catalogue embodying chapters V-VIII of this investigation use the text of Aristophanes as the only source for the information they supply. They have no independent historical value, of course. In three notes the scholiasts' patent wrongness is based upon a misunderstanding of the annotated passages. Sometimes a note is apparently unique in its content, but can be proved to derive from Aristophanes. Occasionally the scholiasts warn the reader that they intend to paraphrase and add nothing to

7 There are forty-two paraphrases in the two-hundred and thirty-six historical notes.

8 Schol. Aves, 484(p. 127): Megabazos is confused with Megabyzos (Megabyxos); schol. Equites, 886(P. 99): Themistokles built the Long Walls; schol. Nubes, 213(PP. 137-139): Chalkis' assessment was raised after the revolt of 446.

9 Schol. Equites, 630(P. 197); Acharnenses, 6 and 8 (pp. 197-198); schol. Equites, 7(p. 209); schol. Acharnenses, 1150(p.191); schol. Acharnenses, 378(p. 190); schol. Equites, 262(p. 177).
what Aristophanes provides\textsuperscript{10}

Most paraphrases are concerned rather with individuals than with events. Many of the notes about Kleon are simply deduced from Aristophanes' highly coloured picture of the demagogue.\textsuperscript{11} Information about Hyperbolos,\textsuperscript{12} Aspasia,\textsuperscript{13} and particularly about the less famous Athenians of the plays often comes from the text, which, in many specific cases, is our only extant source.

Some scholia, conversely, deal with well-known events about which the glossators might have provided more useful material had they not depended solely upon the text.\textsuperscript{14} A larger proportion of scholia combine brief paraphrases with

\textsuperscript{10} E.g., schol. Equites, 331(p. 195); schol. Vespae, 241(p. 199); schol. Equites, 438(pp. 199-200); schol. Lysistrata, 1141(p. 124).

\textsuperscript{11} See above, pp. 195-201 and 209-220.

\textsuperscript{12} See above, pp. 224-229.

\textsuperscript{13} See above, pp. 150-152 and 160-162.

\textsuperscript{14} Schol. Pax, 282(p. 189): Brasidas; schol. Equites, 563(p. 179): Phormio; scholia about Hyperbolos (pp. 224-229); schol. Lysistrata, 1251(p. 97): Artemision; schol. Lysistrata, 651(p. 109): the assessment of Aristides; schol. Ecclesiazusae, 102(p. 262) and Plutus, 173(pp. 260-261).
information drawn from other sources; in some there is no paraphrase.\textsuperscript{15}

Frequently the scholiasts name and sometimes they quote their sources. Thucydides is the most popular authority.\textsuperscript{16} The scholiasts occasionally doubt the veracity of other writers; Thucydides is never suspect and at times is used to correct another's error.\textsuperscript{17} A few notes consist principally of excerpts from Thucydides; the scholiasts have merely written a few introductory words.\textsuperscript{18} Only once do the scholiasts seem to doubt Thucydides' statement. A note to \textit{Ranae}\textsuperscript{19} gives a brief sketch of Theramenes' life and character. At the conclusion of the gloss, which is not partial to the statesman, there is the remark "but Thucydides praises him!"

\textsuperscript{15} Sixty-two combine paraphrase and other material; one hundred and thirty-two ignore Aristophanes as a source.

\textsuperscript{16} Of the fifty-five notes naming him and others as sources, eighteen refer to Thucydides or quote from his work.

\textsuperscript{17} E.g., schol. \textit{Acharnenses}, 145(pp. 177-178); schol. \textit{Equites}, 445( pp. 71-72).

\textsuperscript{18} E.g., schol. \textit{Pax}, 479(pp. 212-213); schol. \textit{Equites}, 793(p. 176); schol. \textit{Pax}, 450(pp. 232-233).

\textsuperscript{19} See pp. 251-252 above.
Here Thucydides' judgement is called to account, not his reliability as a historian. 20

The annotators often name several sources for a scholion, occasionally to show that accounts contradict each other, but in most cases to supplement or to support other accounts. 21 In other notes the glossators appeal to several authorities but mention only one or two by name and refer to the rest by τινές or ὧνδ' 22

---

20 For further discussion of Thucydides see below pp.

21 E.g., schol. Vespae, 947(p. 114) checks one source against the others to show an error; schol. Aves, 556 (pp. 134-135) uses the hypomnemata to prove that Philochoros errs; schol. Vespae, 502(p. 78) presents the evidence of Thucydides, Aristophanes, Eratosthenes and Aristotle to prove that Hipplias, not Hipparchos, was tyrant; schol. Lysistrata, 619(p. 79) preserves three versions of the length of Hippias' tyranny; schol. Fax, 347(pp. 178-179) uses quotations from the sources to supply information about Phormio; schol. Lysistrata, 313(pp. 242-243) includes material from Didymos and from Krateros' collection of decrees; schol. Plutus, 173 (pp. 260-261) has a brief summary of several accounts.

22 E.g., schol. Lysistrata, 1138(p. 122), from Philochoros and the Atthides; schol. Aves, 880(p. 186), from Aristotle,
At times the scholiasts attribute information to a single account. Elsewhere, either by naming one or more of the comic poets or by stating that a remark made by Aristophanes is also found in the comic poets, the scholiasts indicate that the source for certain information is Old Comedy.

Regularly, however, the scholiasts make no attempt to attribute information but show only that a note is a contamination or that there were several versions current.

and "others"; schol. Vespae, 502(p. 78), from Thucydides, Aristotle and Herodotos.

E.g., schol. Nubes, 304(p. 100); Herodotos; schol. Lysistrata, 1153(p. 84); Aristotle; schol. Flutus, 1002(pp. 61-62); Demon; schol. Acharnenses, 6(p. 197); Theopompos; schol. Vespae, 210(p. 218); schol. Pax, 477(p. 221-222); Philochoros; schol. Equites, 358(p. 203); Demosthenes; schol. Aves, 13(p. 223); Androtion; schol. Ranae, 47(p. 252); Xenophon.

E.g., schol. Pax, 282 (p. 189); schol. Acharnenses, 846(p. 226); schol. Ranae, 367(p. 263).

E.g., schol. Pax, 289 (p. 59); schol. Equites, 660 (p. 93); schol. Equites, 814(pp. 103-104); schol. Nubes, 332 (pp. 148-149); schol. Nubes, 659(pp. 155-156); schol. Vespae,
The rest of the scholia give a single version or a number of similar accounts, each introduced by ἕλλαθε; the latter were probably gathered together by the scribes who transferred marginalia from several older codices to one new one.26

Errors in the scholia other than those due to misinterpretation of the text are the result of scholiasts' ignorance or of scribal carelessness.27 Ignorance is prob-
ably responsible for the confusion of Thermopylae and Fyllos in schol. Equites, 55(p. 95), for the note which attaches Thoukydides' name to Themistokles' biography (schol. Vespaee, 947, pp. 142-143), and for the statement that Kallimachos was alive after Marathon (schol. Nubes, 986, p. 90).28

Scribal error is probably responsible for the erroneous dating of Athens' troubles in Chalkidike (schol. Equites, 237, pp. 140-141), for the reference to an alliance between Lakedaimon and Boiotia in the 390's (schol. Ecclesia- zusae, 193, p. 259) and for the errors that appear frequently in scholia containing numbers.29

In other scholia, principally those concerned with early history, a brief historical note is often mixed with

---

28 See also schol. Equites, 449(p. 75), which confuses Peisistratos' wife, daughter-in-law, and saviour; schol. Flutus, 178(pp. 127-128 and 147), the strange chronology of the Persian kings; schol. Lysistrata, 675 (p. 102), which identifies Artemisia as an Ephesian. It is to be observed that in all these notes the error is a minor part of the complete scholion.

29 E.g., schol. Lysistrata, 313(pp. 242-243); schol. Vespaee, 502(p. 78); schol. Pax, 347(pp. 178-179), with which cf. schol. Equites, 562(p. 179).
a mass of lore and myth.\textsuperscript{30} A single correct and useful gloss embedded in myth is less frequent, it should be noted, than a false note in a paragraph that is otherwise correct.

Sometimes a scholion contains critical statements by commentators who question the credibility of some historian.\textsuperscript{31} At other times annotators criticise Aristophanes for some historical blunder\textsuperscript{32} or they present a personal opinion on some disputed point.\textsuperscript{33}

\textsuperscript{30} E.g., schol. Nubes, 133(p. 52); schol. Vespae, 1271-1273(p. 50); schol. Acharnenses, 146(p.65); schol. Plutus, 431(pp. 87-88); schol. Acharnenses, 510(p. 132).

\textsuperscript{31} E.g., schol. Vespae, 502(p. 78); schol. Equites, 84(pp. 111-113); schol. Vespae, 947(p. 114); schol. Vespae, 718 (pp. 146-147); schol. Plutus, 173(pp. 260-261).

\textsuperscript{32} E.g., schol. Pax, 246 (p. 159); schol. Nubes, 558(p. 226).

\textsuperscript{33} E.g., schol. Nubes, 6 (p. 245); ὃ ἀληθῆς schol. Thesmophoriazusae, 840 (p. 225) ὃ οὐδὲν; schol. Nubes, 591 (pp. 227-228), where the commentator corrects an error. The expression of personal opinion by the scholiasts is rare; occasionally the scholiasts admit that they are ignorant of some matter.
Occasionally a word used by Aristophanes is glossed in a note that makes no attempt to explain the text but presents a discussion of the word per se and includes information quite foreign to Aristophanes' context.\(^{34}\)

Cross references are seldom made by the commentators. A note to Vespae, 502(p. 78) mentions schol. Lysistrata, 619; a scholion to Lysistrata, 861(p. 131) refers to schol. Ecclesiazusae, 303, and schol. Plutus, 1146 (p. 250) asks the reader to consult schol. Plutus, 550. In a note about the misfortunes of Megara during the war (Fax, 482, pp. 205–206) the scholiasts remind the reader that Megara had become involved "in the way that we have said," a reference, probably, to schol. Fax, 246(p. 159) and 605(pp. 163–164).

In general, information that seems unique in the scholia in fact has Aristophanes as its source. Information for which the scholia alone are a source is rare. Some of this latter withstands the test of historical probability and may be true.\(^{35}\) Some of the notes are, clearly, absurd and with-

\(^{34}\) E.g., schol. Equites, 238(pp. 140–141); schol. Aves, 766(pp. 233–234); schol. Nubes, 23(pp. 265–266); schol. Vespae, 157(p. 253).

\(^{35}\) Schol. Plutus, 1002(pp. 61–62); Polykrates' plan to ally Samos and Miletos; schol. Vespae, 947(p. 114): Perikles' corn market in Peiraeus; schol. Acharnenses, 1150.
out possible basis in fact. One gloss contains information that was supported solely by Thucydides until recent discovery of an inscription which shows that the commentators had interpreted Thucydides correctly.

We see, then, that there are critical scholia, that there are paraphrases; that sources are sometimes acknowledged, sometimes unknown; that some exegeses and notes are too brief to provide any evidence at all. The essential patchwork of the commentary still dominates any opinion, any judgement, any criticism. We are left with the crucial question: do the "historical" scholia merit the adjective? Critical sense, intelligent use of sources, lack of paraphrase are qualities that help to distinguish a good note from recentiora and peiora, but they are not sufficient

---

(p. 191); Antimachos' bill against comic license; schol. Aves, 766(pp. 233–234): identification of one of the Hermokopidal.

36 Schol. Equites, 84(pp. 111–113): Themistokles' bones were brought to Attike to end a plague; schol. Acharnenses, 378(p. 182); Kleon accused Aristophanes of being an alien.

qualities. The ultimate criterion is the validity of the information supplied by any scholion, and here no categorical answer can be given to our question. Each note stands or falls on its own merits. Furthermore, the historian must test each part of a historical scholion before deciding whether to call it history.

This study had as its purpose just such a minute investigation of each historical scholion to Aristophanes. The standards of collation were two: other ancient sources and the principle of historical probability.

And thus the final question remains to be answered: should the historical notes be used with confidence, i.e., should they be treated as credible sources when their information is not to be found anywhere else? The details of the answer are embodied in Chapters V-VIII. To formulate a succinct answer here is difficult. Before the attempt is made the reader should be warned once again of the individuality of the scholia, a quality which militates against accurate generalisation.

This investigation has revealed (1) that the historical scholia have an important value as corroborative evidence; (2) that, on the whole, they are themselves corroborated by manifestly authoritative sources; (3) that, where they stand alone and survive the fair test of histori-
cal probability they may be accepted as evidence and judged as we judge any other historical evidence.

See Gomme's illuminating remarks on the principles of historical criticism in Commentary, I, pp. 84-87.
APPENDICES

1. Testimonia
2. The Scholiasts' Use of Thucydides
APPENDIX I
TESTIMONIA
AILIAN

T1 (Varia Historia, II, 9): ουτιληναιον δε ἢμηδυν ὀποσφάξαι καὶ τοῦτο ἐψηφίσαυτο ἐσηγηματένου κλέωνος τοῦ Κλεανινέτου. τοῦς γε μὴν ἀλησκομένους αἰχμαλώτους Σαμίων στίζειν κατὰ τοῦ προσώπου καὶ εἶναι τὸ στίγμα γλαύκα καὶ τοῦτο 'Αττικήν ψήφισμα.

T2 (Varia Historia, II, 25): τὴν ἐκτην τοῦ μηνὸς τοῦ θαρηλιῶνος πολλῶν καὶ ἀγαθῶν αἰτίων γενέσθαι λέγουσιν οὐ μόνον τοῖς 'Αθηναῖοι ἀλλὰ καὶ ἄλλοις πολλοῖς. αὐτίκα τοῦν Σωκράτης ἐν ταβή εγένετο, καὶ Πέρσαι δὲ ἢττηθενσαν ἡ ἡμέρα ταβή, καὶ 'Αθηναίοι δὲ τῇ 'Αγορά ἀτοθούσι τὰς χιμαρὰς τὰς τριακοσίας, κατὰ τὴν εὐχὴν τοῦ ἑκατοντάδου δρώντες τοῦτο.

T3 (Varia Historia, V, 10): νῆπιν στόλον 'Αθηναίοι εἰργάζουσαν δαυτοῖς ἀεὶ φιλοκόπωσε. κατὰ χρόνους δὲ τὰ μὲν κατορθούσας τὰ δὲ ἢττωμένοι ἀπέλεσαν τριήρεις μὲν ἐν Αἴγυπτῳ διακοσίας σὺν τοῖς πληρώμασι, περὶ Κύπρου δὲ πεντήκοντα καὶ ἐκατόν.

T4 (Varia Historia, VI, 1): 'Αθηναίοι κρατήσαντες Χαλκιδέως κατεκληροθηκαν αὐτῶν τὴν γην ἐς δισεκατόμους κλήρους, τὴν 'Ιππόδοτον καλουμένην χώραν, τεμένει δὲ αὐθάνα
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Τῇ Ἀθηνᾷ ἐν τῷ Δηλάντῳ δυσμαζομένῳ τόπῳ, τὴν δὲ λοιπὴν ἐμισθώσαν κατὰ τὰς στῆλας τὰς πρὸς τῇ βασιλείᾳ στοὰς ἐστηκυλαμέναι, αἰκέραν οὖν τὰ τῶν μυσθοψεύνων ὑπομνήματα εἶχον. τοὺς δὲ αἰχμαλώτους ἔδησαν, καὶ οὖσα ἐνταῦθα ἔθεσαν τὸν κατὰ ἐκλεισθένων θυμὸν.

Τέ (Varia Historia, VI, 7): ὡς οἱ ἀκεδαίμονες ἐκ Ναυάρου ἔκτις παραπονδόματος ἀνεστησαν καὶ ἀπεκτείναν (ὃν ὅπερ δὲ οἱ ἔκτις τῶν εἰληφθέντων), κατὰ μῆνα τοῦ Ποσείδωνος σεισμὸς ἐπιπεσόν τῇ Ἐσάρτῃ τῇ πόλει ἀνδρειῶτα κατεσείσεν, ὡς πέντε μῆνας ἀπολεκτικὴν οἰκίας ἐξ ἀπάθεις τῆς πόλεως.

Τέ (Varia Historia, XI, 9): εἰσὶ δὲ οὕτω, οἷον Ἀριστείδης ὁ Δυσμάχου, ἀνήρ πολλὰ μὲν ἐν πολέμῳ κατορθώσας, καὶ τοὺς φόρους δὲ τοῖς "Ελλησι τάξας....

Τέ (Varia Historia, XII, 43): Ὑπερμᾶλλων δὲ καὶ Κλεοφάντος καὶ Δημάδου, καίτοι προστατῶν γενομένων τοῦ ὅμου τῶν Ἀθηναίων, ὀδδοὶ ἄν εἰποι ὁδοὶ τοῦ πατέρας.

Τέ (Varia Historia, XII, 53): ἔμε δὲ τὸ λέγειν ὅτι τῶν μεγίστων πολέμων αἱ ἀρχαὶ δοκοῦσι πὼς εὐκαταφρονησαν γεγονέναι. τῶν μὲν γὰρ Περσικῶν ἐκ τῆς Μακαρῆς τοῦ Σαμίου πρὸς Ἀθηναίων διαφορᾶς τὴν ἀρχὴν λαβεῖν φασι, τῶν γὰρ Πελοποννήσου δὲ τὸ κατὰ Μεγαρῆς πινάκιον, τῶν δὲ ἔρμων καλοβιοεύνου ἐκ τῆς ἐσπράξεως τῶν εἰκῶν τῶν Ἀμφικτυῶν.
AISCHINES

Τ9 (2, 23): ὃ δὲ οὐδὲν ἀπρατον ἔχων μέρος τοῦ ἀῤῥατος, ὥστε δὲν τὴν φωνήν προσέτατε, ὡς ὅπως Ἀριστείδης ὃ τοὺς φόρους τάξας τοῖς Ἑλλησίοις, ὃ δὲκαι ἐπικαλομένος, δισχεραίνει καὶ καταστείλει διωροδοκίας.

Τ10 (2, 173): ἐν δὲ τούτῳ τῷ χρόνῳ ἔτειχίσαμεν μὲν τὸν Πειραιᾶ καὶ τὸ βόρειον τεῖχος φιλοδομήσαμεν....

Τ11 (2, 175): πάλιν δὲ εἰς πόλεμον διὰ Μεγαρέας πεισθέντες καταστήματι, καὶ τὴν χώραν τιμηθήσας προδέχονται καὶ πολλῶν ἀγαθῶν στερηθέντες, εἰρήνης ἐδεδήμημεν, καὶ ἐκοινωνοῦμεν διὰ Νικηφόρου τοῦ Νικηφόρου. καὶ πάλιν ἐν τῷ χρόνῳ τούτῳ ἐπτακιοχίλια τάλαντα ἀνηνέγκαμεν εἰς τὴν ἀκρόπολιν διὰ τὴν εἰρήνην ταῦτην, τριήρεις δὲ ἐκτησάμεθα πλωίμους καὶ ἐντελεῖς ὅτι ἐλάττουσα ἢ τριακοσίας, φόρος δὲ ἡμῖν κατ᾽ ἐνιαυτὸν προσῆξεν πλέον ἢ χίλια καὶ διακόσια τάλαντα, καὶ Ἱεράμυνσον καὶ Νάξου καὶ Εὐβοίαν εἰχομεν, πλείστας δὲ ἀποικίας ἐν τοῖς χρόνοις τούτοις ἀπεστείλαμεν.

Τ12 (3, 258): Ἀριστείδης δὲ τὸν τοὺς φόρους τάξαντα τοῖς Ἑλλησίοις....

SCHOLIA TO AISCHINES

Τ13 (1, 39): τῶν τριάκοντα, οί λ’ τῆς ποιοῦν διὰ Δακεδαίμονιν κατασταθέντες καὶ τὴν πάτριον πολιτείαν τῶν
Άθηναιών καταλέγοντες ἐλυμήνατο τοῦς Δράκουντας καὶ
Σόλωνος υδάμους. ἀπολαβὼν οὖν ὅ ὦμος τὴν ἡλευθερίαν
eίλετο πολίτας κ` τοῦτο ἤτησενται καὶ ἀναγράφονται τοῦς
dιεφθαρμένους τῶν υδάμων. καὶ ἐψηφίσατο καίνος υδάμους
eἰσφέρειν ἀντὶ τῶν ἀπολωλτῶν ἐπ` ἀρχοντός Εὐκλείδου, ὡς
πρῶτος ἤρξε μετὰ τοῦτο τριάκοντα. πολλὰ μέντοι καὶ δεινὰ
ἐξηρᾶν οἱ λ` τοὺς τε γὰρ ὦμον ἐξέβαλον καὶ τῶν ἐπιφανῶν
tοῦς μὲν ἐβασανίσαν, τοῦς δὲ ἐφυγόδειον ἀφελέμενοι τὴν
οἰκείαν αὐτῶν, τοὺς δὲ ἀπεκτείναν ἀκρίτους, ὡς μὲν ἐνιοῦ
φασιν, π` καὶ ἀ, ὡς δὲ Δυσίας ἐν τῷ κατὰ .... δοκιμασίαι
ἐπιλήψεως. διασχίζοντο φ` γεγυμαίοι μέντοι πλείους αἱρέσει
τῶν πεντῆκοντα. ο` τε γὰρ ἐν ἀπετεῖ δικασταὶ τριάκοντα
ἡςαν καὶ ἐκ τῶν πλούσιων τριάκοντα ἁρέθησαν ὁρολογεῖται,
ὡς δὲ δανεισταὶ ἐπὶ ὀβολὺ τὴν μνῆμα δανείσσοντες. δειγμα
δὲ τῆς τῶν λ` πολιτείας καὶ τὸν ἐστὶν. Κρίτου γὰρ ἐνδε
τῶν λ` ἀποθάνοντο ἔχεστησαν τῷ μυθητι.... ἄρχαντος οὖν
Εὐκλείδου μετὰ τῶν τῶν λ` κατάλυσιν τὰ πρὸς αὐτῶν πραξθέντα
ἀκρα εἰναι ἐψηφίσατο οἱ 'Άθηναιοι. οἱ λ` τρόπων μετὰ
tῶν Πελοποννησιακῶν γευμένοι πλείουν 'Αθηναῖσιν ἐπειδὴ
καθηρεύσασι, ἐρασμόβολον τοῦ ἀπὸ φυλῆς ἀγωνισαμένου, ἱππομα
ἐτέθη ἀμνηστικοῖς τῶν ὀπαρξάντων ἐπ` αὐτῶν.

Τ14 (2, 186): καὶ πάλιν μετηκταὶ τὰ πλεῖστα ἐκ
τῶν 'Ανδροκίδου, ἐστὶ δὲ ψευδὴ. ἡ μὲν γὰρ Νικίου εἰρήνη
ἐπὶ ἀρχοντός Ἀρίστωνος ἐγένετο τῷ τετάρτῳ ἔτει τῆς ὑγιον-
κοστῆς ἐνάτης ὀλυμπιάδος· ἐν δὲ ταῦτα ὅπως ἦτο ἐννακισχίλια
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τάλαντα εἰς ἀκρόπολιν ἀνήγαγον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ προαναφηγμένα ἔκ δήλου μήρια πεντακισθείλια προσανάλωσαν. περὶ τῶν ἀποικιῶν δὲ πεσθεῖτο· οὐ γὰρ ἐπὶ τῆς Νικιδῶν εἰρήνης ἐγένετο, ἀλλὰ πολλοὶς χρόνοις πρότερον.


AISCHYLOS

Τ16 (Vita Aeschyli, 12): 'Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ τοσοῦτον ἡγάσθησαν Αἰσχύλον, ὡς ψηφίσασθαι μετὰ τῶν θάνατον αὐτοῦ τῶν βουλήμενον διάδοσειν τὰ Αἰσχύλου χορὸν λαμβάνειν.... (13): νίκας δὲ τὰς πάσας εἰληφε τρεισκαίδεκα· οὐκ ολίγας δὲ μετὰ τελευτὴν νίκας ἀπηνέγκατο.

ALKIPHRON

Τ17 (Epistulae, IV, 7, 6-7): παιδεθομεν δὲ οὐ χείρον ἡμέως τοῦν νέους. ἐπεὶ συγκρινον, οὐ βολλει, Ἀσκασίαν τὴν ἐταιρίαν καὶ Ξωκράτην τὸν σοφιστήν, καὶ πότεροι ἀμείνους αὐτῶν ἐπαιδεύσει άνδρας λόγισαι· τῆς μὲν γὰρ ὃς εἶ μαθητήν Περικλέα, τοῦ δὲ Κριτίαν.
ANDOKIDES

T18 (1, 11): ἦν μὲν γὰρ ἐκκαθησα τοῖς στρατηγοῖς τοῖς εἰς Σικελίαν, Νικῆ καὶ Δαμάχω, καὶ Ἀλκιβιάδη, καὶ τριήρης ἡ στρατηγία ἡδὲ ἐξαρμεῖ ἡ Δαμάχου.

T19 (1,62): αἰσθάμενος δ’ Ἑθολίτως ὡς ἔχοιμι, λέγει πρὸς αὐτούς δὴ πέπεισμα ταῦτα συμποιεῖν καὶ ὁμολόγησαι αὐτῷ μεθέχειν τοῦ ἔργου καὶ περιμένειν τὸν Ἐρμῆ τὸν παρὰ τὸ φορβαντεῖν. ταῦτα δ’ ἔλεγεν ἐξαπατών ἐκεῖνοι· καὶ διὰ ταῦτα δ’ Ἐρμῆς δὴ ὀρατέ πάντες, δ’ ἐπὶ τὴν πατρίδαν οἰκίαν τὴν ἡμετέραν, ὡς ὁ λιγὸς ἀνεθηκεν, ὡς περιεκάθη μόνος τῶν Ἐρμῶν τῶν Ἀθηναίων, ὡς ἐμοὶ τοῦτο ποιήσαντος, ὡς ἔφη πρὸς αὐτούς Ἑθολίτως.

T20 (1, 106): οἱ γὰρ πατέρες οἱ ἱμετεροὶ γενομένων τῇ πόλει κακῶν μετάλυς, διὸς οἱ τραυμάζοι μὲν εἰχοῦ σὴν πόλιν, ὡς δὲ ἡμῶν ἔφευγε, νικησαντες μαχόμενοι τοὺς τυράννους ἐπὶ Παλληνίως, στρατηγοῦτος δεσφόδρου τοῦ προπάππου τοῦ ἐμοῦ καὶ Χαρίου οὗ ἔκεινος τὴν θυγατέρα ἐισχεῖν.

T21 (2, 26): τάδε γὰρ οὖν ψευσαμένη μοι λαθεῖν οἷον τέσσας τοῦ γε πρεσβυτέρους ἰμῶν, διὸ δὲ τοῦ ἐμοῦ πατρὸς πάππου δεσφόδρας στασιάζας πρὸς τοὺς τυράννους ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἡμοῦ, ἐξὸν αὐτῷ διαλαχθέντι τῇ ἐχθρῶς καὶ γενομένῳ κηδεστῇ ἄρξαι μετ’ ἐκείνῳ τῶν ἀνδρῶν τῆς πόλεως, εἰληφε τὸ μᾶλλον ἐκκεκατεῖν μετὰ τοῦ ἡμοῦ καὶ φεβων κακοπαθεῖν μᾶλλον ἡ προδότης αὐτοῦ καταστήμαι.
Τ22 (Hypothesis, 3): τοῦ Ἑλληνικοῦ μηκύνου μένου πολέμου, καὶ πολλὰ μὲν Ἀθηναίων κακὰ πολλὰ δὲ Δακεδαίμων ὑπομεινάτων καὶ τῶν ἐκατέρων συμμάχων, Ἀθηναίοι πρέσβεις ἀπέστειλαν πρὸς Δακεδαίμονιον αὐτοκράτορα· διὸ ἦστι καὶ Ἀνδοκίδης. τινῶν δὲ προταθέντων παρὰ Δακεδαίμων, καὶ ἀποστειλάντων κακείων ἱδίου πρέσβεις, ἐδοξεῖν διὸτε εἰς τεσσαράκοντα ἡμέρας ἐπιμονείσανσι τὸν ὅμοιον περὶ τῆς εἰρήνης. καὶ ἐπὶ τούτῳ Ἀνδοκίδης συμβουλευθεὶς τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις καταδέγασθαι τὴν εἰρήνην. ἦστι μὲν οὖν συμβουλὴς τὸ εἰδώς κεφάλαιον τὸ συμφέρον. Φιλόχορος μὲν οὖν λέγει καὶ ἐλθεῖν τοῦτο πρέσβεις ἐκ Δακεδαίμονιας, καὶ ἀπράκτως ἀνελθεῖν μὴ πείσαντο τοῦ Ἀνδοκίδου· ὅ ὅμως Διονυσίος νῦν οὖν εἰσαι λέγει τὸν λόγον.

Τ23 (3, 5): πρῶτον μὲν τὴν Πειραιά ἐπείχθσαμεν ἐν τοῦτῳ τῇ χρήσῃ, εἰτα τὸ μακρὸν τείχος τὸ βρέειον.

Τ24 (3: 8–9): πάλιν δὲ διὰ μεγάλας πολεμήσαντες καὶ τὴν χώραν τιμήθησαν προέμενοι, πολλὰς ἄγαθῶν στερηθέντες αὐτῆς τὴν εἰρήνην ἐποιησάμεθα, ἢν ἤμεν Νίκιας ὁ Νικηράτος κατηγόρασο. οἷοι δὲ υἱὸς ἅπαντας εἰδέναι τούτο, διὶ δὲ τάσιν τὴν εἰρήνην ἐκταξιοχίλια μὲν ταλαντα νομίσαμεν εἰς τὴν ἄκρακολον ἀνηγγαμεν, καὶ πλεῖους ἄκρας ἐπικατοίκια καὶ χύλια ταλαντα, καὶ Χερσονήσου τε εἰχομεν καὶ ἐκατά τινας καὶ ἔδροις πλεῖον ἢ τὰ δίοι μέρη τοῖς ἐλλας ἀποικίας καὶ ἕκαστον διηγεῖσθαι μακρὸς ἢ εἰς λόγον.
Σ25 (3, 38): λαθέτες δὲ Πελοποννησίους τείχισά
μενοι τα τείχη.

Σ26 (4, 11): πρῶτον μὲν οὖν πείθας ὑμᾶς τὴν
φρον ταῖς πόλεσιν ἐξ ἀρχῆς τάξας τὸν ὑπ' Ἀριστείδον πάντων
dικαιότατα τεταγμένου, αἱρεθεὶς ἐπὶ τούτῳ δέκατος αὐτὸς
μᾶλλον διπλάσιον αὐτῶν ἐκάστοις τῶν συμμάχων ἐποίησεν,
ἐπιδείξας δὲ αὐτὸν φοβερὸν καὶ μέγα δυνάμενον ἵνα ἀνά
tῶν κοινῶν προσδοκήσατε κατασκευάσατο.

Σ27 (4, 32): αὐχένων δὲ φανήσεσθε ποιοῦντες,
eὶ τούτον ἀγαπάτε τὸν ἀνὴ τῶν ὑμετέρων χρημάτων ταῦτα
κατεργασάμενον....

ANDROTION

Σ28 (Jacoby , frg.42): ὑπέρετος οὖτος, ὡς
Ἀνδροτίων φησίν, ὡς Ἀυτοφύσοις ἡν Περιθοῖδες, ὁν οδ ὁστρα-
kἰσθαι διὰ φανδῆτα.

APOLLONIOS RHODIOS

Σ29 (Scholia , I, 101-104 a): καὶ δὴ διὰ Ταυριάρου
cατελθόντας καὶ ἐπὶ τινος πέτρας καθεσθόντας αὐθεὶς ἀναστήμα
οὐ δεδυνηται. Ἡρακλῆς δὲ ἱστερων κατελθών διὰ τὴν Κέρβερον,
tῶν μὲν θησαμά ἀπέσωσεν ὡς μὴ ἐκεύτη κατελθόντα, τῶν δὲ Περι-
θοῦν εἰσαγα, ἐπεὶ ἔποιησι προαίρεσε ἵνα κατῆλθεν.

Σ30 (Scholia , IV, 1750-1757): εἰς δὲ τις αὐτοῦ
tῶν ὑπογέων τάμος ἔκησεν θήραν, δὴ ἤμισυος γέγονεν
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‘Αριστοτέλης, διὰ τὴν περὶ Κυρήνην ἀποικίας ἡγήσατο.

Τ31 (Scholia, IV, 1760-1764 a): ....καὶ ὄψο-
μάθηθεν θῆρα ἀπὸ σοῦ, ὡς ἄμετρῶς ἐκείνη τῆς ἔκ-
σπάρτης ἀποικίαν ποιήσαντο καὶ μείναντο. (1764 ὃ); ....
ἀπὸ θυρήμου γενώμενος καὶ αὐτὸς εἰς Διβηθ ἡν ἀποικίαν
ηγάγετο ‘Αριστοτέλης.

ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΙΣ

Τ32 (132, 104): ἐς κόρακας, Βοιωτοῖς ὁ θεὸς
ἐχρῆσεν, ὅπου ἂν λευκοὶ κόρακες ὀφθαλμίς, ἐκεῖ κατοικεῖν.

καὶ τὴν Παγάσιτικὴν κόλπου ὑπὸ παιδίων ὁμάκων γυψωθεῖς
κόρακες ἱδονᾶς περιπετομένους τοῖς Ἀκόλλησιν ὥς χωρὶς
κόρακες. Ποστοῦν ὁ διόλεις ἐκβαλλόμενος αὐτῶν, τὸν
φυγαδευόμενον εἰς αὐτὸ ἐπεμψαν. ὃ ὁ δὲ τοῦ ἦτορον ἀναιδοῦς
καὶ δυσοικευτικοῦ ἔμοιον.

Τ33 (139, 141): λυπιδοθεῖς, οὕτως ἐκβιόν τοὺς
τῶν τυράννων δορυφόρους, ὡς δὲ παντὸς εἰκὸν τοὺς κόλας
λίβων δέρματι κεκαλυμμένους ὃ δὲ τὸ ἔχειν ἔπλη τὴν ἀσπίδα
ἐπίσημον λίβων.

ΑΨΟΛΕΙΟΣ

Τ34 (Metamorphoseon, VI, 19): Λακεδαῖοι Achaiae
nobilis civitas non longa sita est: huius conterminam deviis
abditam locis quaere Taenarum. inibi spiraculum Ditis, et per
portas hiantes monstratur iter invium, cuibus te limine trans-
meato simul commiseris, iam canale directo perges ad ipsam
χιΩρι ηχος ῥαγανος.

ARCHEMACHOS

Τ35 (Frg. 1 Jacoby): Ἀρχέμαχος δ' ἐν τῇ τρίτῃ Ἑβραϊκῷ "Βοιωτῶν" φησὶν "τοὺς τὴν Ἀρχαίαν κατοικησάντων οἱ μὴ ἀπαραίτες εἰς τὴν Βοιωτίαν ἄλλ' ἐμφιλοχωρῆσαντες παρέ- δωκαν έαυτοις τοῖς θεσσαλοῖς δουλεῖς καθ' ὀμολογίας, ἐφ' ὅτι οὔτε ἐξάποντιν αὐτοὺς ἐκ τῆς χώρας οὔτε ὀποκτενοῦσιν, αὐτοὶ δὲ τὴν χώραν αὐτοῖς ἐγκατήμενοι τὰς συντάξεις ὀποδῶ- σούσιν. οὖτοι οὖν οἱ κατὰ τὰς ὀμολογίας καταμείναντες καὶ παραδόντες έαυτοῖς ἕκληθησαν τὸτε μὲν μενεσταί, νῦν δὲ πενεσταί· καὶ πολλοὶ τῶν κυρίων έαυτῶν εἰσίν εὐποροτεροί!

ARISTEIDES

Τ36 (13, 160 = Dindorf, I, p. 262): ἦτι δὲ νεών τοσούτων καὶ βελῶν καὶ ομαυών καὶ τεχνῶν καὶ συμμάχων καὶ πάσης ὥσ ἐκεῖν εἰπεῖν τῆς κατασκευῆς μεθεστικυῖα, ὡσπερ ἀρτί τῆς πάσης Σικελίας οἰκιζομένης, κεκενωμένης μὲν τῆς ἀκροπόλεως ταλάντων ὀλίγου δειν μυρίων....

Τ37 (46, 118 = Dindorf, II, p. 159): δημοτικῶς δὲ δὲν τῇ προανεψει καὶ πράττων ὑπὲρ τοῦ πλῆθους ἐναυτὰ θεουκυ- δίῳ πλείστον τῆς ἀγορᾶς προκεπτεῖας καὶ κομψότητος ὀποσχείᾳ.

Τ38 (46, 122 = Dindorf, II, p. 163): ἀλλ' ἐν ἱστο- ρίᾳ καὶ διηγήσει τάληθες ἀκλῆα οὕτωι παραδίδοντες, ὡσπερ δὲν περὶ τῆς Πελοποννησίων εἰσβολῆς, ἢ τινός ἄλλου τῶν ἐφ'
αὐτοῦ διηγήσεται, εἰ μὲν τοῖνυν ἡμισβητεῖτο τῷ θουκυδίδῃ περὶ τούτων, ἄλλος δὲν ἦν λόγος.

Τ39 (46, 149 = Dindorf, II, p. 199): οὖτε γὰρ τοὺς φόρους Περίκλῆς εἰς ἄκειρον ἐστιν ὁ ἐξαγαγόν, ἄλλα καὶ ταῦτα τῆς ὁμετρίας, ὡς φιλή Σώκρατες, εἰ ἦτοι ἡ τῶν αἰτίων, τὸν ἑταῖρον εὐνόησε τὸν σεαυτὸν. ἐκεῖνος γὰρ ἐστιν ὁ πρὸς τοσοῦτον προσαγαγόν τοὺς φόρους, ὡςον οὔτε βουλομένων φέρειν ἐξῆν...

Τ40 (46, 149 = Dindorf, II, p. 200): ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ τοὺς ἀνδρὰς τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων εἶχον Ἀθηναίοι καὶ Πόλιν, οὕτως ἂν αὐτοῖς πλέον ἤτησαι, ἄλλ' εὗρεν ἐλευθέρως ἂν ταῦτ' ἀποδύναμον ποιῆσαι τοῖς Ἑλλησι κοινωνν εἰρήνην. οὕτως γὰρ αὐτῶν τὸν πόλεμον πλεονεξίας ἦν ἡμείς αὐτοῖς προελεύσθησιν συνεβολέυσεν, ἄλλα τοῦ μη τῶν ὑπαρχόντων ἀποστῇν. ἀρχὴν δ' ἐκείνως γε οὖδ' ἡξίου γίγνεσθαι πόλεμον, ἄλλα δικὴ διαλύσθαι περὶ τῶν διαφόρων.

Τ41 (Schol. 13, 142, 18 = Dindorf, III, p. 184): τοῖς ἐν Πόλισι ἀτυχοῦσιν ἀνεύ τῆς πόλεως, ἀπορία, πῶς τῇ ἐν Πόλισι ἀτυχία φυλακτήριον ἤ πόλις τοῖς Ἑλλησι γέγονεν. καὶ φαμέν ὅτι τοῦτο λέγει διὰ τὸ λακεδαιμονίους εἰναι τοὺς ἀτυχθέντας, καὶ ὁμ Ἀθηναίοις, ὡς ὑστερον νικήσειν ἐμελλον. εἰ γὰρ τότε ἦτοχον, οὐκ ἂν ἄ υστερον κατάρρευσαν ἐξεραζαν, κατακλασθέντες τῇ φόβῳ.

Τ42 (Schol. 13, 142, 19 = Dindorf, III, p. 189): τοῖς τοῦ θεοῦ μαντείαις, διπλοὶ ἦσαν οἱ χρησμοὶ. διδοὶ οἱ Τρεῖοι—
γενικὴ ἡμινου τεῖχος ἐφόσον Ζεβε. ὦ δὲ Ἠλληνων ἀπώλειαν ἐθέσκετε τῇ Ἀθηναίων μετὰ τῶν βαρβάρων παράταγμα. διότι ἦσαν αἱ μαντεῖαι· αἱ μὲν διὰ τὸ ἡμινον τεῖχος, αἱ δὲ, διὰ ἀπολούσιαι τέκνα γυναικῶν παρὰ Σαλαμίνα.

Τ43 (Schol. 13, 143,4=Dináorf, III, p. 185): τῶν τῶν Ἠλλήνων κατασχέτων, εἰς τὸ μὴ φυγεῖν· μετὰ γὰρ τὸ νικῆσαι ἐπὶ Αρτέμιδος δραστεῖν ἤθελοντο, καὶ διεκάλυσαν ὁ Θεμιστοκλῆς.

Τ44 (Schol. 13, 143,5=Dináorf, III, pp. 185-186): τοῖς ἄπε Ἠλευσόνων φᾶσμαί, Δίκαιος καὶ Δημόρατος, Ἀθηναῖοι οὕτως, καὶ πάλαι φυγάδες ἐκ τὴν πόλεως, οὕτως παρὰ Ἐξέχη γενομένης τῆς συμπλούς, καὶ κοινοντικὴ ἀρετὴν εἰς ἀέρα ἤξε Ἠλευσόνων, ἐφησαν τῷ Βασιλείῳ ὡς καθ’ ὅν ὦ κοινοντες πέσοι ἠπηκολυσαν. πέπτωκε κατὰ Περσικῶν τριήρων, καὶ σκέδασθαι εἰς αὐταῖς εἰς φόβον ἐνήκε τὸν βασιλέα ὥς ὥστερον ἔμελλον πείσεσθαι. ἐν δὲ τῇ τοῦ κοινοντικῆς ἀρσεί, καὶ ὅσοι τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἦσαν μεμηνόμενοι, ἦκουσαν φωνὴς τινος ἐκ δαίμονος τινος, ἀφανῶς λεχθεῖσας, ὡς παρέσταται τῇ παναιχίᾳ Περσεφόνῃ καὶ Δημήτρῃ. μελλοντες τῇ παναιχίᾳ γίνεσθαι κοινοντικῆς ἐγένετο ὁ Ἠλευσόνων. τούτου ἐφράκτησε Δίκαιος καὶ Δημόρατος, φυγάδες οὕτως καὶ μένοντες παρὰ Ἐξέχη, ἐφησαν τῷ Βασιλείῳ, καθ’ ὅν ὦ ἠλθε τὸ κοινοντικῆς οὖτος, πάντως ἔκείνιοι ἠπηκολυσαν. ἠθέθη κατὰ Περσικῶν τριήρων, καὶ διεσκεδάζοντες εἰς αὐταῖς καὶ τεκμηρίου τοῦ μέλλειν νικᾶσθαι τῶν βασιλεά γέγονε τοῦτο. ἦσαν δὲ καὶ ἀπολούσαντες οἱ τῶν.
'Δηναιῶν μεμνημένοι ἀφανῆς καὶ ἀπροβατῶς ἐκ δαίμονος
tινος τῷ ἐπίθεμα τῷ λεγόμενου ἐν τοῖς Ἐλευσινίοις.
καὶ ἐν τούτῳ ἐστοχάσατο Ἀθηναῖοι, ὡς βοηθόση αὐτῆς
Περσεφόνη καὶ Δημήτηρ. τοῖς ἀπ’ Ἐλευσίνοις δὲ φάσματι,
τοῖς ἀπαραδόκους θείμασι.

Τ45 (Schol. 46,118,13=Dindorf, III,p.446): ὁ Κίμων....οι δὲ ὦλιγοι γαμβρῶν ὀντα θουκυδίδην τὸν
Μελισσοῦ τοῦ Κίμωνος ἐπεσκάσαντο, σκυλακώδη ὀντα καὶ
ὁλιγαρχικὴν.

Τ46 (Schol. 46,118,14=Dindorf, III,p.446): πράξι
των ὑπὲρ τοῦ πλῆθους ἐναυτία θουκυδίδης, οὐ τῶν συγγραφέων
θουκυδίδην φησιν ἄλλα ἄλλου τινὸς, ψευτε Ἀθηναῖοι τὰ πολι
τικὰ ἐπιτρέποντες ἐπιθυμοῦντο πάντες, ἢ ἐνθυμομένης τῆς
πόλεως; ἐναυτία δὲ φησιν, ὧτοι φανερῶς τὰ αὐτῶ. αὔξει δὲ
tῶν θουκυδίδην, ἵνα πλέον αὐξήσῃ τὴν Περικλῆ, ὅτι καὶ πρὸς
tοῦτον ἀντιπολιτευόμενος ἄκειχε τὴν πρὸς τὸν ὦλιγον κόλα
κείαν....τοῦτον δὲ τὸν θουκυδίδου καὶ ὁ συγγραφεῖς μέμνηται,
λέγων "ὅ μετὰ τοῦ θουκυδίδου καὶ "Ἀγνωνος."

Τ47 (Schol. 46,175,14=Dindorf, III,p.589): Ὅσπερ
Δασανδρὸν τὀν ἐν Ἁγίῳ ποταμῷ, Δασανδρος, ναβαρχὸς ὧν
Δακεδαμόνων, ἐν Ἁγίῳ ποταμῷ (τοῦτο δὲ τὸ χώριον ἐν
tῷ Ἐλλησόμενῳ τῆς θράκης) ἔμηκας τοῦς Ἀθηναίους, ὡς λέγει
Ἐνδοφῶν, δεκαδαρχίας καθίστη ἐν ταῖς πόλεσι, θέλων ὀλιγαρχιαν
πολιτῶν καὶ ἐντεθζεν στάσεις καὶ ἔθνοι δύνουτο ἐν ταῖς
πόλεσι.
Τ48 (Schol. 46, 175, 17 = Dindorf, III, p. 570)  

πολλοίς καὶ μεγάλοις κακῶν αὐτῶν τοῖς "Ελλησίων ἄρχαντα, διὰ 

τὰς μεταβολὰς τῶν πολιτειῶν αὐτίττεται ὧτι δεκαδαρχίας κατα 

στήσας ἐξήτει μεταβαλεῖ τὰς πολιτείας. διὰ μὴ ἀνεχομένων 

στάσεις ἐγίνοντο.

Τ49 (Schol. 46, 212, 3 = Dindorf, III, p. 645)  

οἴ τινες ἠλάσασθαν τὴς γῆς προετίμησεν ὁ θεμιστοκλῆς, φησὶν δὲ 

"Ἀριστείδης ὦτι, ὥσπερ προείδος ὁ θεὸς τὰς μελλόντας παρὰ 

Πλάτωνος γνεσθαι ἐπιτιμήσεις...

Τ50 (Schol. 46, 213, 18 = Dindorf, III, p. 648)  

τοῦ ἐνεργοῦν ὑπὸ Δήμητρος εἰσαί, τοῦ δὲ αὐτῶν καὶ Διδυμοῦ 

ἄλλοι δὲ παῖδα Διονύσου. ἢ δὲ Ἰστορία τοιαθῆ. ἐνεργοῦν ὑπὸ 

καταληψών τὸ τέμενος ἐπετίμησε κοινωνηθῆαι τῇ ναυμαχίᾳ ὅτε 

γὰρ ἔμελλεν εἰς ναυμαχία γνεσθαι, φονῇ τῷ ἐξυπν. ἦπὶ τοῦ 

Ἰάκχου, καὶ οἱ μὲν μεμυμημένοι ἠμοῦσαν, οἱ δὲ ἀμύητοι ἤπθοντο. 

τῷ δὲ καὶ ἢπὶ τῆς Ἐλευσίνος δόσων κοινωρτὶ ἐλθεῖν ἐπὶ τὴν 

Σαλαμίνα ἐνομίσθη, ὡτὶ ἡ Δημήτηρ καὶ ἡ κόρη ἦλθον συμμαχῆσαι 

τοῖς "Ελλησίων.

ΑΡΙΣΤΟΔΕΜΟΣ

Τ51 (Frag. 1, 5 = Jacoby, II A, p. 494)  

μέγας ἄνθρωπος ἐν 

τῇ ναυμαχίᾳ καὶ ἠριστευθεὶς Ἀμευλᾶς, 

τῶν δὲ βαρβάρων μυθ. Ἀλκαραφάς τὸ γένος, ὡς ἡ Ἀρτεμί 

σία, ἢτις διωκομένης τῆς νεότης ἀνθῆς καὶ κινδυνεύουσα ἀπολέσθαι 

τὴν ἐμπορόθεν ὅταν ἐδοὺς οὕσαν ἐβέβησεν. δὲ ἦς Ἀμευλᾶς ὅπως
σφιμαχού εἶναι τῶν Ἑλλήνων, ἀπετράπη τοῦ διδάκτου. ὁ δὲ Ἱερέως θεασάμενος τὸ νευριμένον εἶπεν· "οἱ μὲν ἄνδρες μόνοι γυναικεῖς γεγόνασιν, αἱ δὲ γυναικεῖς ἄνδρες." (7) ἦττης ὑδρονων δὲ τῶν βαρβάρων καὶ ψυχωτών οἱ Ἑλληνες ἐβολὴν τὸ ἐπὶ τοῦ Ἑλληνακὴν ζεύγος καὶ καταλαμβάνεσθαι Ἱερέως ἐν τῇ ᾿Ελλάδι. Θεομακθής δὲ οὐκ οἰδίμενος ἀσφαλές εἶναι οὐδὲ τοῦτο, δεδομένα μὴ ποτε, ἐδώ ἀπογ纳斯 τὴν σωτηρίαν οἱ βάρβαροι, φιλοκυνομωτέρους ἀγωνίζεται εἰς ὑποστροφῆς, ἀντιπρασίας. κεκυρωμένων δὲ οὐδὲν ἰσχύον ἐπειπέρυ ἱερόν Ἱερέως ὑδρονων δὲ τῇ μέλλον σιν οἱ Ἑλληνες θείαν τὸ ζεύγος· ὁ δὲ φοβηθεὶς ἐφευγεν. (8) ἐν δὲ τῇ ναυμαχίᾳ τῇ περὶ Σαλαμῖνα καὶ οἱ θεοὶ συνεμάχοντο τοῖς Ἑλληνοῖς.

Τ52 (Frag. 5, 1=Jacoby, II A, p. 497): κατὰ δὲ τοῦτον τὸν χρόνον ᾿Αθηναίοι, ἐβουλεύουτο τειχίζειν αὐτήν, οἱ δὲ λακεδαιμονιοὶ οὐκ ἔπετρεμον αὐτοῖς...τὸ δὲ ἀλήθες φθονοῦντες καὶ μὴ βουλεύοντες πάλιν αὔξηθήναι· οὐες θεομακθής συνέσει διαφέρου κατεστρατηχησεν, ἀκριβῶς γιγαντιών αὐτῶν τὸν φόβον.

Τ53 (Frag. 6, 1=Jacoby, II A, p. 497): ὁ δὲ θεομακθής διὰ τὴν ὑπερβάλλουσαν συνεισιν καὶ ἄρετὴν φθονοβολήσει ἐξεδιέξει ἐπὶ τῶν ᾿Αθηναίων....

Τ54 (Frag. 7, 1=Jacoby, II A, p. 498): ἐν δὲ τούτῳ οἱ Ἑλληνες ἀφιστάμενοι ὑπὸ τῶν λακεδαιμονίων διὰ τὸ πικρῶς τυχανεχθαί ὑπὸ τοῦ Παυσανίου προσετίθιντο τοῖς ὧν ἔμαστε φόρους λαμβάνοντες ἀνεγερθαί· ναῦς τε γὰρ
κατεσκευάζον καὶ κοινῶν τῶν Ἐλληνικῶν χρημάτων ἑπισκευάζων συναρμολογεῖ τὴν δήλωσιν, ἱστορικὸν δὲ . . . . . τὸν τὰς Ἐλληνας καὶ κατέστησεν ἑυτὸς ἐν ὀρκυόλει.

Τ55 (Frag. 10, 1=Jacoby, II A, p. 499)

Δικαίως, ἐπειδὴ τα τῶν Παυσανίου ἐποιεῖστιν ἐμελοχρήστηκε, τόθ' Ἐλληναίον ἐπειδῆ ζητοῦσαν ἐν ταῖς Παυσανίου ἐπιστολαῖς κοινωνίας οὐκ ἦν οὕτως ἐνρηκόταν τῇ προδοσίᾳ θεμιστοκλῆς....

(3) ὁ δὲ θεμιστοκλῆς οὐχ ἔχων ὅποιον ὑποστήριζε ἐπὶ τὴν Περσίδα ἐπέλει. . . . (4) καὶ Ἐρέχθη μὲν οὐ κατέλαβε ἕως ἡ "Ἀρταξέρξης δὲ τὸν ἐνδόν αὐτοῦ ὅσιον ἐνεφανίσθη ἄλλα διατρήσας ἐνειαυτόν καὶ μαθὼν τὴν Περσικὴν γλῶσσαν, τότε παρεγένετο πρὸς τὸν Ἀρταξέρξην, καὶ ὑπέμνησεν αὐτὸν τῶν ἐνεργειῶν εἰς τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ Ἐρέχθην, λέγων καὶ τῇ σωτηρίᾳ αὐτοῦ γεγενήθηκαί αὐτίος, ὑπὸ δὲ ἐγὼ λήσοντας τὸν Ἐλληνας τὸ ἐνδύμα. ὑπέσχετο δὲ, εἰ λάβοι στρατὸν παρ' αὐτοῦ, χειρώσασθαι τοὺς Ἐλλήνας. (5) ὁ δὲ Ἁρταξέρξης... ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ στρατὸν καὶ τρεῖς πόλεις... Μαγνησίαν μὲν εἰς σῶτον, Δαμοκὸν δὲ εἰς οἶνον, Μυσίαν δὲ εἰς ὅψιν. λαβὼν δὲ θεμιστοκλῆς καὶ παραγενόμενος εἰς Μαγνησίαν...οὐχ ἤγισκόμενος δὲ εἰς πολεμεῖν τοῖς ὁμοφόλοις δὴν δὲ τῇ Δαινοφρίῃ Ἀρτεμίδι, σφαττομένοι ταραχοὶ ήπυπερηφάνες καὶ πληρώσας αἵματος ἑπίσκεψεν καὶ ἐκελεύθησεν.

Τ56 (Frag. 11, 5=Jacoby, II A, p. 500)

ἐπέλευσαν δὲ καὶ κατὰ Κόρυν καὶ ἐπὶ Διονυσίου. ἔβασιλευσέ
δὲ τῆς Διήνυστος Ἰναροῦ νῦ座谈会上  Ἀρταξέρξου βοηθὸς ἐπηγάγετο αὐτῷ τοὺς Ἀθηναίους, οἷτινες ἔχοντες θαυμάσαντες ἐπὶ ἐτής ἔτη τῶν πολλῶν. (4) μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα μεγάλου Ὕστερον καταστρέφεις ὥσπερ Ἀρταξέρξου, ἀρματώματος τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἐν τῇ καινομένῃ Προσωπίτιδι νήσῳ ἐπὶ τινος ποταμοῦ, ἐκτρέψει τὸ βείθρου τοῦ ποταμοῦ ἐποιήσε τε τὰς ναῦς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ὡπολειφθῆναι.

Τ57 (Frg. 12, 2 = Jacoby, II A, p. 501): παρατεθηκαν δὲ πάλιν ἐν Οἰλοφόροις, στρατηγοῦσαν αὐτῶν Τολμίδου καὶ Πυρωνίδου, ἐνίκησαν Βοιωτίας καὶ κατέσχον Βοιωτίαν.


Τ59 (Frg. 15, 4 = Jacoby, II A, p. 502): τῷ τεσσαρακενδρεκτῷ δὲ έτει Ἀθηναίοι Σάμου πολιορκήσαντες εἶλον, στρατηγοῦσαν αὐτῶν Περικλέους καὶ Σοφοκλέους. ἐν δεπαυτῷ έτει οὕτω λιονταλ αἱ τῶν Λέτων σπουδαῖοι, καὶ ἐνισταταὶ ὁ Πελοποννησιακὸς πόλεμος.

Τ60 (Frg. 16, 1 = Jacoby, II A, p. 502): αἰτίαι δὲ καὶ πλεῖονες φέρονται περὶ τοῦ πολέμου· πρώτη δὲ ή κατὰ Περικλέα. φασὶ γὰρ ότι τῶν Ἀθηναίων κατασκευαζόντων τὴν ἐλεφαντίνην Ἀθηναίων καὶ ἄποδειξάντων ἐργαποιητάτην τὸν Περικλέα, τεχνίτην δὲ Φειδίαν, ἀληθοῦς τοῦ Φειδίου ἑπὶ νοσφίσματι.
εὐλαβηθεὶς ὁ Περικλῆς μὴ καὶ αὐτῶς εὐθὺς ἀπαντῇ, βουλὸ-
μενος ἐκκλίναι τὰς κρίσεις ἐπολιτεύσατο τὸν πόλεμον τοῦτον,
γράψας τὸ κατὰ Μεγαρέων ψήφισμα.... (4) φαν δὲ ὅτι τὸν
Περικλέους σκέπτομένου περὶ τῆς ἀποδόσεως τῶν λόγων ὑπὲρ
τῆς ἐργαποιήσεως Ἀλκιβιάδης ὁ Κλεινίτης, ἐπιτροπερθηκές
ἂν αὐτὸν εἶπεν· "μὴ σκέπτον πῶς ἀποδῶς τοὺς λόγους Ἀθη-
ναίοις, ἀλλὰ πῶς μὴ ἀποδῶς?"

ARISTOTLE

Τ61 (ΠΟΛΙΤΕΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΑΙΩΝ, 24, 2): περισθέντες δὲ
tαῦτα καὶ λαβόντες τὴν ἀρχήν τοῦτος ἔτει, συμμάχοις δεσποτικω-
tέρως ἐξρώτησαν, πλὴν Χίων καὶ Δεσδών καὶ Σαμώων· τοῦτοις
δὲ φύλακας εἰχον τῆς ἀρχῆς ἐμφίεσα τὰς τε πολιτείας παρ'
αυτοῖς, καὶ ἀρχεῖν ὡς ἔτυχου ἄρχοντες.

Τ62 (ΠΟΛΙΤΕΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΑΙΩΝ, 28): ἔως μὲν οὖν Περικλῆς
προεισθήκηκε τοῦ δήμου, βελτίω τὰ κατὰ τὴν πολιτείαν ἦν,
tελευτήσατος δὲ Περικλέους πολὺ χείρω. πρῶτοι γὰρ τότε
προστάτησαν ἐλαβεν ὁ δήμος οὐκ εὐθὺς εἴσηκον καὶ παρ' ἐτοὺς ἐπιει-
kέσιν· ἐν δὲ τοῖς πρῶτοις χρόνοις αἰὲ διετέλευσαν οἱ ἐπιει-
kέσις δημαγωγοῦσας... εἰτα Περικλῆς μὲν τοῦ δήμου, θουκυδίδης
δὲ τῶν ἐτέρων, κηδεσθῆ ὡς Κλίμους. Περικλέους δὲ τελευτή-
sατος, τῶν μὲν ἐπιφανῶν προεισθήκηκε Νικίας ὁ ἐν Σικελίᾳ τελευ-
tήσας, τοῦ δὲ δήμου Κλίμου ὁ Κλεινίτης, ὥσπερ μάλιστα δια-
φθηραι τοῦ δήμου ταῖς ὀρμαῖς, καὶ πρῶτοι ἐπὶ τοῦ βῆματος ἀνέκ-
ραγε καὶ ἐλοιδορήσατο, καὶ περιζωσάμενος ἐδημηγόρησε, τῶν ἄλλων
ἐν κόσμῳ λεγόντων. εἰτα μετὰ τοῦτοι τῶν μὲν ἔτεροι θηραμένης ὁ Ἀγωνων, τοῦ δὲ δήμου Κλεοφῶν ὁ λυροποιὸς, ὅσα καὶ τὴν διωβελίαν ἐκδρισε πρῶτος· καὶ χρόνου μὲν τίνα διεδίδον, μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα κατέλυε Καλλικράτης Παιανιεὺς, πρῶτος ὑποσχόμενος ἐπιθύμειν πρὸς τοῖς δυοῖν ὅμολοιν ἄλλου ὅμολοιν... εἰπὼν γὰρ ἂν ἐξομηλήθη τὸ πλῆθος, ὅστερον μετεῖν τὸν τι προαγαγόντας πολεῖν αὐτοῖς τῶν μὴ καλῶς ἔχοντων. ὀτὸ δὲ Κλεοφῶντος ἡδὴ διεδέχοντο συνεχῶς τὴν δημογωγίαν οἱ μάλιστα βουλόμενοι θεραπευομεθαί καὶ χαρίζομεθαί τοῖς πολλοῖς πρὸς τὸ παρατίγαται βλέπουσε. δοκοῦσι δὲ βελτίστως γεγονέναι τῶν Ἀθηναίων πολιτευσμένων μετὰ τοῦτο ἄρχοντας Νικίας καὶ θουκυδίδης καὶ Θηραμένης. καὶ περὶ μὲν Νικίου καὶ θουκυδίδου πάντες σχέδου ὁμολογοῦσιν ἀνδρᾶς γεγονέναι οὐ μόνον καλοῦς κατάθετα, ἀλλὰ καὶ πολιτικοὺς καὶ τῇ πόλει πάση πατρικῶς χρωμένους, περὶ δὲ θηραμένους, διὰ τὸ συμβῆναι κατ’ αὐτὸν ταραχόντες τὰς πολιτείας, ἀμφισβήτησις τῆς κρίσεως ἐστιν. δοκεῖ μὴν τοῖς μὴ παρέργοις ἀποφαίνουμένοις, οὐχ ὅσπερ αὐτὸν διαβάλλουσι πάσας τὰς πολιτείας κατάλειπεν, ἀλλὰ πάσας προάγει ἐς ὑπὲρ μηδὲν παρανομοεῖν, ὁς δυνάμενος πολιτευόμεθα πάντας, ὅπερ ἐστὶν ἐργον ἀγαθοῦ πολίτου, παρανομοθείς δὲ οὐ συγχωρῶν, ἀλλ’ ἀπεχθανόμενος.

Τ63 (ΠΟΛΙΤΕΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΑΙΩΝ, 29, 2): ἦν δὲ τὸ ψήφισμα τὸ Πυθοδόρου τοιοῦτο: τὸν δὴ δήμον ἐλέεσθαι μετὰ τῶν προϋπαρχόντων δέκα προθυβλῶν ἄλλους εἰκοσὶ ἐκ τῶν ὑπὲρ τεταράκοντα ἐτη γεγονότων, ὅτι πεις ὁμολόγες ἡ μὴ συγγράφειν ἢ ἄν
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ηγούνται βέλτιστα εἶναι τῇ πόλει, συγγράψοντες...

Τ64 (ΠΟΛΙΤΕΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΑΙΩΝ, 34, 2-3): τῷ γὰρ άστερον
έτει, ἐπ' Ὀλεξίου ἄρχοντος, ἠθύπησαν τὴν ἐν δίγοσ ποτα-
μοῖς ναυμάχιαν, ἐξ ᾗ συνέβη κύριον γενόμενον τῆς πόλεως
Δισσάνδρου, καταστήσας τοὺς τριάκοντα τρόπους τοῖς... ὁ
μὲν οἰκοτικὸς διασφάλειν ἐπείρων ὁδοὺς, τῶν δὲ γυν-
ωρίμων οἱ μὲν ἐν ταῖς ἐταιρείαις ὑπέτευ, καὶ τῶν φυγάδων
οἱ μετὰ τὴν εἰρήνην κατελάθησαν, ὀλιγαρχίας ἐπεθύμουν,
ὁ δ' ἐν ἐταιρείᾳ μὲν οὐδεμιὰ συγκαθαστάτωσ. Ἀρχίνον καὶ
"Ἀντών καὶ Κλειτοφῶν καὶ Φορμίσιος καὶ ΕΤΕΡΟΙ πολλοὶ,
προειστῆθηκε δὲ μάλιστα θηραμένης. Δυσάνδρον δὲ προσθε-
μένου τοῖς ὀλιγαρχικοῖς, καταπλαγεῖ ὁ δήμος ἡμαίσθη
χειροτονεῖν τὴν ὀλιγαρχίαν. έγραψε δὲ τὸ ψῆφισμα Δρακούτιδης
Ἀμιδανός.

Τ65 (ΠΟΛΙΤΕΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΑΙΩΝ, 37, 1): ἢδη δὲ τοῦ χειμώ-
νοσ ἑνεστῶτος, καταλαβόντος θρασυβολού μετὰ τῶν φυγάδων
φυλῆν, καὶ κατὰ τὴν στρατιὰν ἢν ἐξῆγαγον οἱ τριάκοντα
κακῶς ἀποχωρῆσαντες...

Τ66 (ΠΟΛΙΤΕΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΑΙΩΝ, 41, 3): διὰς προσειστήκαται
τὸ πλῆθος ὀρθῶς τὴν ἐπικύρωσιν τῆς χειροτονίας, πρῶτον μὲν
"Ἀνθρώπων ὀρθῶν ἐπιδροσαν, μετὰ δὲ τοῦτον 'Ἡρακλείδης ὁ
Κλαῖομενίμης ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐπικαλομένος διώκολον, πάλιν δ' ὁ
Ἀγρίππων τριώβολον.

Τ67 (ΠΟΛΙΤΕΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΑΙΩΝ, ἕτερος 9): τοῦτοι μετὰ
Κύλωνος διὰ τὴν τυραννίδα ἐπὶ τὸν βωμὸν τῆς θεοῦ πεφυ-
γότας οἱ περὶ μεγαλέα ἀπέκτειναν. — καὶ τοὺς δράσατες
ὅσα ἐναγεῖτο ἠλάμμων.
Τ68 (πολιτικα, 1297 b 14 ) : ἐν Μαλιέσι δὲ ἡ μὲν πολιτεία ἦν ἐκ τοῦτων, τὰς δὲ ἀρχαὶ ἁρρύτο ἐκ τῶν στρατευομένων.

Τ69 (πολιτικα, 1311 a 34 ) : οἶον ἡ μὲν τῶν Πεισιστράτηδος διὰ τὸ προσπλακίσαι μὲν τὴν Ἀρμοδίου ἀδελφὴν ἐπηρεάσαι ὅ' ἄρμοδιον (ὁ μὲν γὰρ Ἀρμοδίος διὰ τὴν ἀδελφὴν, ὁ δὲ Ἀριστογείτων διὰ τὸν Ἀρμοδίον)....

Τ70 (πολιτικα, 1315 b 21 ) : χαλ ὑπὲρ καὶ Πεισιστράτων ὑπομείναλ ποτε προσκηθέντα δίκην εἰς ἂν Ἁρμείου πάγου.

Τ71 (πολιτικα, 1315 b 30 ) : δὲ γὰρ ἐφυγε Πεισιστράτων τυραννῶν ὁμώς ἐν ἔτεσι τριάκοντα καὶ τριῶν ἑπτάκαιδεκα ἐτῶν τοῦτων ἐπιτρέπεσθαι, ὑπεκαίδεκα δὲ οἱ παιδες, δοτε τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο ἐτη τριάκοντα καὶ πέντε.

Τ72 (ἀρχ. ῥητορικα, 1419 a ) : ... οἶον Περικλῆς Δίμηνα ἐπήρετο περὶ τῆς τελετῆς τῶν τῆς σωτείρας ἱερῶν, εἰπὼν δὲ ὅτι οὐχ οἴδαι τοὶ ἀτέλεστον ἀκοδεῖν.... οἶον Σοφοκλῆς ἐρωτώμενος ὑπὸ Πεισόνδρου εἶ ἐξοδεῖν αὐτῷ ὁσπέρ καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις προσθῆκε, καταστήσαι τοὺς τετρακοσίους....

ΑΡΡΙΑΝ

Τ73 (Ἀναβασις, IV, 10, 3 ) : τὸν δὲ ἀποκρίνεσθαι Ἀρμοδίου καὶ Ἀριστογείτων, διὰ τὸν ἑτερον τοῦ τυραννοῦ ἐκπέμψαν καὶ τυραννίδα ὑπὶ κατέλυσαν.
Τ74 (Anabasis, V, 14, 4): καὶ γὰρ καὶ ἀφικ-έσθαι ἔσθαν μείζονι δυνάμει τὸν Πόρον καῖδα, καὶ αὐτὸν τε Ἀλάξανδρον τρωθήναι πρὸς αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸν Ἰπποῦν αὐτοῦ ἀποθανεῖν τὴν Βουκεφάλαν, φιλτατοῦ 'Αλεξανδρῷ ἔντα τὸν Ἰπποῦν, καὶ τοῦτον τρωθέντα ὑπὸ τοῦ παῖδος τοῦ Πόρου.

Τ75 (Anabasis, V, 19, 4): καὶ τὴν μὲν Νικαίαν τὴν νίκης τῇ κατ᾽ Ἰνδῶν ἐπάνων ὑπὸμασε, τὴν δὲ Βουκεφάλαν ἐς τὸν Ἰπποῦν τοῦ Βουκεφάλα τὴν μνήμην, ὅσ᾽ ἀπεθανεῖν αὐτοῦ, ὡς βλήθησε πρὸς οὖδενδα. ἀλλὰ ὑπὸ καθοματος τε καὶ ἡλικίας (ὃν γὰρ ἀμφι τὰ τριάντα ἔτη)....

ATHENAIOS

Τ76 (I, 29 f): ὅτι θεμιστοκλῆς ὑπὸ βασιλέως ἔλαβε δωρεὰν τὴν Ἀμψακον εἰς οἶνον, Μαγνησίαν δ᾽ εἰς ἄρτον, Μυσῳντα δ᾽ εἰς ὕπον, Περικάτην δὲ καὶ τὴν Παλαι-, σκῆναν εἰς στρωμαν καὶ ἱματισμὸν. ἐκέλευε δὲ τούτῳ στολήν φορεῖν βαρβαρικήν, ὡς καὶ Δημαράτῳ, δοθῆ τὰ πρότερον ὑπάρχοντα, καὶ στολήν Γαμβρείου προσθῆκε ἐφ᾽ ὅτε μηκέτι ἐλλη- νικοῦ ἱμάτιον περιβάλλεται.

Τ77 (IV, 171 a): βοῆλθεν δὴ ἐγὼ φράσον τὸν εἴμ᾽ ἐγὼ; ὅ τῶν προτενθῶν Δορπία καὶ ομιμόνθη.

Τ78 (V, 213 a): οὖν ἦσθα ἐς τῆν διαψηφισμοῦ δε γενο- μενον κατὰ τῶν περὶ Ερασίνιδην στρατηγῶν, δὴ τοῦτο ἐν Ἀργινοῦ ὁσσαῖν ἐν τῇ ναυμακχίᾳ ἀπολομένου ὁμικόν αὐτοῦ. ἔγενετο δὲ ἡ ναυμακχία ἐν ἄρχοντος Καλλίου, τῇ Περικλέους τελευτῇ δετερον ἔτεσιν εἶκοσι καὶ τέταρτον.
Τ79 (V, 220 b): ὁ δὲ Καλλίας αὐτοῦ περιέχει

τὴν τοῦ Καλλίου πρὸς τὸν πατέρα διαφορὰν καὶ τὴν Πρόδικον

καὶ Ἀναξαγόρου τῶν σοφιστῶν διαμόρφωσιν. λέγει γὰρ ὡς ὁ μὲν

Πρόδικος θεραμένην μαθητὴν ἀπετέλεσεν . . .

Τ80 (VI, 264 a-b): Θετταλῶν δὲ λεγόντων

πενέστας τοὺς μὴ γόνυ δοθλοῦσιν, διὰ πολέμου δ' ἠλθότας,

θεδομομείος δὲ κωμικὸς ἀποχρησάμενος τῇ φωνῇ φησὶν

dιεσκότου πενέστοι πῦσά βουλευθηρία.

Ἀρχέμαχος δ' ἐν τῇ τρίτῃ Εὐβοίκων "Βοιωτῶν, φησιν τῶν τὴν

Ἀρναλῶν κατοικήρατων οἱ μὴ ἀπαράκτες ἐις τὴν Βοιωτίαν ἀλλ' ἐμφυλοχρησάμενον παρέδωκαν ἑαυτοὺς τοῖς Θετταλοῖς δουλεῖν

καθ' ὁμολογίας, ἐφ' ὧν οὔτε ἐξάδουσιν αὐτοὺς ἐκ τῆς χώρας

οὔτε ἀποκτανοῦσιν, αὐτοὶ δὲ τὴν χώραν αὐτοῖς ἐργαζόμενοι

tὰς συντάξεις ἀποδόσουσιν. οὗτοι οὖν οἱ κατὰ τὰς ὁμολογίας

καταμείναντες καὶ παραδόντες ἑαυτοὺς ἐκλήθησαν τὸτε μὲν

μενέσται νῦν δὲ πενέστας, καὶ πολλοὶ τῶν κυρίων ἑαυτῶν

εἰσὶν εὐχορήτεροι." καὶ Ἐυβρικίδης δ' ἐν φρίζῳ λάτριας

ἀυτοῖς ὀνομάζει διὰ τούτων

λάτριας πενέστης ἀμδὸς ἀρχαῖων δόμων.

Τ81 (VI, 265 b-c): ὡς ἱστορεῖ Θεδομομέος ἐν τῇ

ἐβδομῇ καὶ δεκάτῃ τῶν ἱστορίων "Χοιρὸν πρῶτοι τῶν Ἑλλήνων

μετὰ Θετταλοῦς καὶ Δακεδαιμονίους ἔχρησαντο δοθλοῖς, τὴν

μὲν μεντίν κτῆσιν αὐτῶν οὗ τῶν αὐτῶν τρόπον ἑκείνοις...

Δακεδαιμόνιοι μὲν γὰρ καὶ Θετταλοὶ φανῆσονται κατασκευασάμενοι.
τὴν δουλείαν ἐκ τῶν Ἑλλήνων τῶν οἰκοδυτῶν πρῶτερον τὴν χώραν ἦν ἐκείνην υἱῶν ἐχουσίαν, οἱ μὲν Ἀχαιῶν θετηλοὶ δὲ Περραιβῶν καὶ Μαγνητῶν, καὶ προσηγορεύεσαν τοὺς καταδουλωθέντας οἱ μὲν εἶλοτας οἱ δὲ πενέστας.

Τ82 (XIII, 569c - 570a): καὶ Ἀσκασία δὲ ἡ Σωκρατικὴ ἐνεπορευθεὶς πλῆθη καλῶν γυναικῶν, καὶ ἐπλήθυνεν ἀπὸ τῶν ταύτης ἐταιρίδων ἡ Ἑλλάς, ὡς καὶ ὁ χαρίεις Ἀριστοφάνης παρασημαίνεται λέγων τὸν Πελοποννησιακὸν πόλεμον, διὰ τὴν Περικλῆς διὰ τὸν Ἀσκασίας ἔρωτα καὶ τὰς ἀρπαγηθέντας αὐτῆς θεραπεύειται ὑπὸ Μεγαρῶν τὸ δείνου ἀνερρίπτεις πόρνην δὲ Σιμαθεὶς ἱόντες Μεγάραδε νεανίας κλέπτουσι μεθυσκότταβοι.

Τ83 (XIII, 577b): ὁ δὲ Τιμόθεος καὶ οἰκοτομηκός ποτὲ ὑπὸ τοιαύτης εἰς μητρὸς, καὶ χάριν γε αὐτῆς, φησίν, οἶδα, διὰ δὲ αὐτὴν Κόνωνδος εἰμὶ νύς.

Τ84 (XIII, 589e): ἐν τῷ ἐπιγραφομένῳ περὶ θεσμοτοκείου καὶ θουκυδίδου καὶ Περικλέους. Ἀντισθένης δὲ ὁ Σωκρατικὸς ἐρασθεῖτα φησὶν αὐτῶν Ἀσκασίας δὲ τῆς ἡμέρας εἰσιδότα καὶ ἐξιδότα ἕτερον ἐσκάζει ζητήσας τῆς ἀνθρώπου, καὶ πευκοθέου ποτὲ αὐτῆς γραφὴν ἀσεβεῖας λέγων ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς πλείονα ἐδάκρυσεν ἢ διὸ ὑπὲρ τοῦ βίου καὶ τῆς οὐσίας ἐκνιβόησεν.

BEKKER'S ANECDOTA
Τ85 (Ι, 403, 29): Ἄθημικριτός: Ἄθηματος
μὲν ἴνα κήρυξ, ἀπεσφάγη δὲ ὧδε Ἔμαρτων, ὁπαγορεύων αὐτοῖς
thren ἵππα ὄργανα μὴ ἐργάζονται.
Τ86 (Ι, 219, 8): Βάραθρον: πάγια τὰ μὲν ἀνώ θεο-
ὦσα ὀσυρά ποιεῖ, τὰ δὲ κάτω ὑπόχαρα, ὡστε τὸν ἐπιβάτα
καταδίπταν. Ἀθημικριτὸς δὲ ἴνα ἄργα τι ἐν Κερίανδῳ ὅμως τῇς
Οἰνηήδος φυλής, εἰς τοὺς εἰπὶ θεαία τις καταγωγής ἐν-
έμαλλον, ὡστε ὁ διὰ ἀδελειμοῦς εἰς τὸν Κέραδαν ἐνέβαλλον.
Τ87 (Ι, 100, 1): Θηραμένης: τὴν κλητικήν,
Φιλιππίδης Καθόροις.

Curtius Rufus

Τ88 (Historia Alexandrî, IX, 3, 23): oppida quae
que dio condidit: quorum alterum Micaeam appellavit, alterum
Bucephala, equi, quem amiserat, memoriae ac nomini dedicavit
urbem. Elephantis deinde et impedimentis terra sequi iussis
secundo amne defluxit quadraginta ferme stadia sāngulis die-
bus procedens, ut opportunis locis exponi subinde copiae
possent.

Demosthenes

Τ89 (4, 23-24): πολίταισ δὲ παρεῖναι καὶ
συμπλείν ὃδε τάτα κελεῦω, ὅτι καὶ πρῶτον ποτ' ἄκοιον
ζευκτῶν τρέφειν ὑπὸ Κορίνθῳ τὴν κόλιν, ὡς Πολύστρατος
ηγεῖτο καὶ Ἰφικράτης καὶ Χαμηλᾶς καὶ ἄλλοι τινὲς, καὶ
αὖτος ὑμᾶς συστρατεύομαι καὶ ὅλις ἄκοιμων ὅτι Δακεδαῖμο-
νίους παρατατόμενοι μεθ' ὑμῶν ἐνίκων αὐτῶν ὁ ἔξωτος καὶ
ὑμεῖς μετ' ἐκείνων.

Τ90 (19, 280): τοῦτον οὖτως ἐχόντων ὑμεῖς
ἐκείνων τῶν ἀνδρῶν δυτες, οἱ δὲ καὶ τινὲς αὐτῶν ἔτι ἔλεγον,
ὑπομενεῖτε τὸν μὲν εὐεργετὴν τοῦ δήμου καὶ τὸν ἐκ Πειραιῶς,
Ἐπικράτησι, ἐκπεσεῖ ταῖς καὶ κολασθήναι, καὶ πάλιν πρῶτον Θρασ-
βουλον ἐκείνων τῶν Θρασύβουλου τοῦ δημοτικοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἀπὸ
φυλῆς καταγαγόντως τὸν δήμου....

Τ91 (20, 73): γνώσε δ’ ἂν τίς, εἰ παραθέτη πῶς
θεμιστοκλῆς ὁ τῶν καὶ ἔκαστην ἁπάντων ἀνδρῶν ἐνδοξότατος ταῦτα
τοῦτο ἐποίησεν. λέγεται τοῖς ὑμῖν ἐκείνοις τειχιζείτε εἰκῶν τοῖς
πολίταις, κἂν ἀφικνηταὶ τίς ἐκ Δακεδαῖμονος, κατέχειν κελεθὲ-
σας, οἴχεσθαι προσβεβομενον αὐτός ὑπὸ τοῦ Δακεδαῖμονος, λογίων
δὲ γιγνομένων ἑκεῖ, καὶ τινῶν ἀπαγγελλόντως ὡς Ἀθηναίων
τειχίζοντον, ἀρνεῖσθαι καὶ πρέσβεις πέμπετε σκυψομένων
κελεθέσας, ἐπειδή δ’ οὐκ ἦκον οὖτοι, πέμπεις ἔτεροις παραίνετεν.
καὶ πάντες ἐστις ἀκηδόθη ὁν τρόπον ἐξαπατήσαι λέγεται.

Τ92 (21, 10): καὶ τοῖς ἐν ἄστει Διονυσίων ἡ
πομηθή καὶ οἱ παιδεῖς καὶ ὁ κόμος καὶ οἱ κωμόδοι καὶ οἱ
τραγῳδοι....

Τ93 (22, 71): ὁπότ’ ἀλλο τι πράττοντο καὶ χρῆ-
ματα κινῶν ἱερά,...

Τ94 (23, 91): γέγραφε γὰρ ἔνα τὸν ἀποκτείνη
Χαρίδημον, ἀγάλματος ἑστώ, ἓν ὃς τίς ἀφέληται ἡ πόλις ἡ
ΤΘΕ (23, 205): ἐκείνοι θεμιστοκλέα λαβόντες μετ’ αὐτῶν ἀξίων φρονεῖν εὐχόμενα ἐν τῇ πόλει καὶ μηδίσμοιν κατέγνωσαν·

ΤΘΕ (24, 134): ἀλλὰ μετ’ Εὐκλείδην ἀρχοντέ; ὦ ἄνδρες δικασταί, πρῶτον μὲν θρεάβουλον τῶν Κολλυτέα πάντες μέμησθε διὰ δεθέντα καὶ κριθέντι ἀμφοτέρας τὰς κρίσεις ἐν τῷ ὁμιῷ· καίτοι τῶν ἐκ Πειραιῶς καὶ ἀπὸ φυλῆς οὕτως ἦν.... ἔπειτα Ἀγρίριον τῶν Κολλυτέα, άνδρα καὶ χρηστόν καὶ δημοτικὸν καὶ περὶ τὸ πλῆθος τὸ ὑμετέρου πολλὰ σπουδάσατο·

ΤΘΕ (24, 179): καὶ χρῆματα κινῶν ιερά, ὦν ἐνι’ οὐδ’ ἐπὶ τῆς ἕμετέρας γενεάς ἀνετθῆ, μὴ προσογραφήμενο τὴν αὐτὴν φυλακὴν ἠπερ ἐπὶ τῶν εἰσφορῶν φαίνει....

ΤΘΕ (27, 7): εἰς γὰρ τὰν συμμορίαν ἅπερ ἐμοῦ συνετάξαυτο κατὰ τὰς πέντε καὶ εἰκοσὶ μνᾶς πεντακοσίας δραχμὰς εἰσφέρειν, δοσοπερ Τιμίθεος ο ἰδώνως καὶ οὐ τὰ μέγιστα κεκτημένοι τιμῆματ’ εἰσέφερον.

ΤΘΕ (Hypothesis ad Demosthenem, 23, 618): περὶ τοῦτον ἡ χαρίδημον, ψηφίσμα ἔγραψεν Ἀριστοκράτης ἐν τῇ βουλῇ τοιούτῳ· ἐξυ τὶς ἀποκτείνῃ χαρίδημον, ἀγώνιμος ἐστώ ἐξ ἀπάσης τῆς Ἀθηναίων συμμαχίας.... (619–620): καὶ συμβουλεύσαυτος τοῦ χαρίδημον δοῦναι κοινὴ τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις τὴν χερσόνησον ἐκείνηναν οἱ βασιλεῖς καὶ διδώκασι· τοῦτο γνώστες οἱ Ἀθηναίοι τὸν χαρίδημον ἐστεφάνωσαν.
δι ευεργέτην αυτῶν χρυσοὶ στεφάνως, καὶ θετοὺν πολίτην αυτῶν ἐκοινωνοῦτο...οὕτως ἐδιδαχῆτο, λαβὼν παρὰ τὸν Δημοσθένους τὸν λόγον, χρυσίον παρασχὼν, κατηγόρει τοῦ 'Ἀριστοκράτους.

**SCHOLIA TO DEMOSTHENES**

**T101** (Dindorf, 3, 36, 10): πρὸ τοῦ φιλίππου Τιμόθεου ἦν ἐξω τυγχάνων ἐν τῇ Ἐρετῇ καὶ ἐκεῖ ἐκτῆσατο χωρία, ἀκρό ποὺς εὐλήσε καὶ Πεθέναι καὶ Ποτίδαιαν καὶ τὰς ἄλλας. Ἀγαν γὰρ εὐπρόσωπος ὁ Τιμόθεος, ὡστε προσιέναι τὰς πόλεις αυτῆς καὶ τοὺς ἓγγράφους κοιμώμενον γράφειν αὐτῶν καὶ Τάχας αυτῆς τὰς πόλεις προσφερότατα.

**T102** (Dindorf, 13, 170, 6): τὸν οἰκισθέτον, οἶκον ὑπάνθεν τὸν νεῶτερόν τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς, ἐν τῇ άπευθεῖνο τὰ χρηματα, ἢ ἐν τῇ ἀκροπόλει τόπος, ἐνθα τὸ δημόσιον ἀργυρίου ἀπέγειτο καὶ ὁ φόρος.

**T103** (Dindorf, 21, 570, 3): αὕτη γὰρ ἀπεστέλλετο πρὸς τοὺς συμμάχους ἐπὶ Πάραλος, εἰ τι βοηθοῦσι σημαίνειν οὐ Ἀθηναῖοι. ἦσαν δὲ τὸ μὲν πρῶτον ἤσαν δὸς τριήρεις, ἢ τὴν Σαλαμίνα, ἢ τὰ Παλαιάν ἐνόπλουν, καὶ ἢ Πάραλος.

**T104** (Dindorf, 24, 743, 1): οἱ μὲν φαίνεται ἢτι εἰκλεκτό ἄνδρα τῶν χρημάτων αὐτῶν, οι ὣτι τὰ χρῆμα τῆς πόλεως κείμενα ὡς τὸ ὀπίσθοδομον καλομένης τισὶ δανεισά τραπεζίταις τῶν ταμίας...ἀλλὰ ὁ ὀπίσθοδομος τὸ ὀπίσθεν τῆς θεοῦ, ὡς καὶ τὰ χρῆμα τα. ἴστατον δὲ τὰ χρήμα καὶ τῶν ἀλλων ἵππων τῶν θεῶν καὶ τῆς θεουργίας ἐκείτο ἐν τῷ οἰκῆμάτη ὧν τῆς ἀκροπόλεως, τῷ καλομένῳ ὀπίσθοδομῳ, καὶ ἡσυχαί τινες
τεταγμένοι ταμίαι ἐπὶ τῇ φυλακῇ τούτων... ἔδωκεν οὖν αὐτοῖς ἐμπρήσαι τῶν ὁπίσθενον, ἵνα δόξη τα χρήματα ὑπὸ τοῦ πυρὸς ἀναλωθῆναι καὶ μὴ ὑπ’ αὐτῶν.

[DEMOSTHENES]

Τ105 (Blass, 12, 4): Μεγαρέων τοῦ 'Ἀνθεμδρι-τοῦν ἀνελέντων εἰς τοῦτ' ἐλήλυθεν ὁ δῆμος, ὡστε μυστηρίως μὲν εἰργον αὐτοῖς, ὑπομυθήματα δὲ τῆς ἀδικίας ἔστησαν ἀνδρι-άντα πρὸ τῶν πυλῶν.

DINARCHUS

Τ106 (1, 37): ὅσ τοσο μὲν ἀρχαῖος ἐκεῖνος μακρὸν ἀν εἰ ἔλεγεν, 'Ἀριστείδης καὶ Θεμιστοκλῆς, τοὺς ὀρθῶς ἄντε στήκε τα τείχη τῆς πόλεως καὶ τοὺς φόρους εἰς ἀκρόπολιν ἀνανεων-τας παρ᾿ ἐμόντων καὶ βουλομένων τῶν 'Ελλήνων....

DIO CASSIUS

Τ107 (ῬΩΜΑΙΚΗ ΙΣΤΟΙΙΑ, ΛΙΙ, 35, 2): τοῖς μὲν γὰρ ἄλλοις κόσμοι ὡς παρὰ σοῦ τιμὴ φέρει, σοι δ᾽ αὐτῷ μεῖζον μὲν τῶν ὑπαρχόντων οὐδέν ἀν δοθεῖ, ὑποψία δ᾽ ἂν κιβοσὶας πολλῆ προσεγένοιτο.

DIONYSIOS OF HALIKARNASSOS

Τ108 (Ἀντ. Ῥωμ., ΙΙ, 9, 2): ἔκαλον δὲ 'Αθηναῖοι μὲν θητὰς τοὺς πελάτας ἐπὶ τῆς λατρείας, θεταλοὶ δὲ πενήστας....
ETIMOLOGICON MAGNUM

T109 (361, 31): ἐνὶ Δειψεδρίῳ μάχῃ χωρίων ὑπὲρ τῆς Πάρθηνου, ὡς ἐτείχισαν οἱ φυγάδες τῶν τυράννων, ὡς οἱ 'Αλκμαιούδαι προεστῆκεσαν ἐκπολιορκηθέντων δέ αὐτῶν ὑπὸ τῶν περὶ Πεισιστράτου, σκολίων εἰς αὐτοὺς ἔδετο,

αλ' αὶ Δειψεδρίου προδωσόταιροι

οὐκ ἄνδρας ἀπώλεσαν μάχεσθαι ἀγάθως τε καὶ ἀνδρέασας....

(699, 14): Πάροικοι ίερὰ τριήρεις, ὡσπερ καὶ Σαλαμινία καὶ Ἀντίγονε....πρὸς ὑπερεύθειν τῶν ἀναγκαίως ἐπιθέσεως. αὐτοὶ δὲ ἐπὶ αὐτηγοῦσα ἑπέμποντο, καὶ τοιαύτας τινὰς χρείας.

EUPOLIS

T110 (Frg. 192 Kock):

πεπέρακεν μὲν ὁ περακτώλις ἢ φή Μαρικᾶς

T111 (Frg. 250 Kock):

ὑπήρχοι εἰς ὑπεραρχῆς ὡς ἐναριστῶς κύκλου;

ΔΙΟΝ. τι δ' ἔστιν; εἰς ὅμων ἀριστηκόμεν;

ἡ κυρία τὴν μᾶς ὡσπερ ὄρτυνα;

T112 (Frg. 251 Kock):

ἀντὶ πολυκλήν

πιναρδυν ἔχοντι ἀλούτης κάρα τε καὶ τρίβωμα

T113 (Frg. 252 Kock):

ἂν ἂν μέντοι νετερος, κρόκης
πέντε στατήρας είχε, να μα τὸν Δία.
Β. νῦν δὲ βρέχει γε δύο τάλαντα βράδιως.

T114 (Frg. 317, Kock):
κατ' ἀντιβολήν δένα τάλαντ' ἀπετίσαμεν.

EURIPIDES

T115 (ἈΛΚΗΣΤΙΔΗ, Ὑπόθεσις): ἐδιδάχθη ἐπὶ
Πλαυκίου ἄρχοντος τὸ λ.

HARPOKRATON

T116 (Ἀπατοβρια): Δημοσθένης ἐν τῷ πρὸς Βοιωτῶν.
εἰσερχόμενι παρ' Ἀθηναίοις, ἦν ἄγουσι Πνευμάτοις ἐφ' ἠμέρας
δ', ὅσιοι δὲ τὰ περὶ ἑρμηνείας γράφαντες. πόθεν δ' ἐκλήθη
ἀλλοι τὸ πολλοὶ εἰρήκεισι καὶ Ἐφορός ἐν β', ὃς διὰ τὴν ὑπὲρ
τῶν δρίων ἀπάτην γενομένην, ὅτι Ἀθηναίων πολεμοῦτων πρὸς
Βοιωτοὺς ὑπὲρ τῆς Μελαχθῆς χώρας Μέλαθυς ὁ τῶν Ἀθηναίων
βασιλεὺς Ἐανθόν θεαίῳ μονομαχῶν ἀπαθής ἀκέντειναι.

T117 (Ἀργινουσαί): νῆσοι κεῖμενα ἐναντί τῆς
Δέσπου, ἀπὸ Ἀργινοῦ τινὸς.

T118 (Ἀσπασία): Δυσίας ἐν τῷ πρὸς Δίσχῦς τῶν
Σοκρατικῶν οὐ διάλογος ἐπιγραφομένος Ἀσπασία. μυθοπεσοῦσι
δ' αὐτῆς πολλάκις καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι Σωκρατικοὶ καὶ Πλάτων ἐν τῷ
Μενεέκενῳ τῶν Σωκράτην παρ' αὐτῆς φησὶ μαθεῖν τὰ πολιτικά.
ὅτι δὲ τῷ μὲν γένους Μιλησία, δεινῇ δὲ περὶ λόγους. Περικλῆ-
κεοῦσα δὲ φασιν αὐτὴν διδάσκαλον τε ἐμα καὶ ἔρωμένην εἶναι.
δοκεῖ δὲ δυσών πολέμων αίτια γεγονόνα, τοῦ τε Σαμιάκου καὶ τοῦ Πελοποννεσίακου, ὡς ἔστι μαθεῖν παρὰ τε Δομινίου τοῦ Σαμιάου καὶ Θεοφράστου ἐκ τοῦ δ' τῶν Πολιτικῶν καὶ ἐκ τῶν Ἀριστοφάνους Ἀχαρνέων. δοκεῖ δὲ καὶ εἶτ' αὕτη ἡ σχετικέναι οἱ Περίκλης τῶν οἰκειότυπων αὐτῶν Περικλῆς τῶν υἱῶν, ὡς ἔμφασε καὶ Εὔπολις ἐν τοῖς Δήμοις. Δυσὶ κλεῖ δὲ τῷ δημαργῷ συνοικισάσας Πορίστην ἔσχεν, ὡς ὁ Σωκράτικες Αίσχυνος φησίν.

Τ119 (Βάραθρος): ὑπογεγραμμένα εἰς ὁ τοῦ ἑπτανάττῳ κατακρίτους ἐνεβάλλον. δημοσθένης δὲ ἐν Φιλιππικοῖς σὺ κυρίως αὐτὸ λέγει, ἀλλ' ἐκ μεταφορᾶς, οἷον ἐν τῷ ὀλέθρῳ.

Τ120 (Θεσσαλία): Δυσίας ἐν τῷ κατ' Ἑρατοσθένους. οὕτως εἰς ὃν τῶν παρ' Ἀθηναίων λατρέανων, καθά φασιν ἄλλοι τε καὶ Ξενοφῶν ἐν β' Ἑλληνικῶν. τοῦ δὲ ποιητοῦ θείωνιδος μημονεθεί namoktita ev taie prōs Nīkolkēa ὑποθέκαι. οὕτως δ' ἦν Μεγαρέως, ἀπὸ τῶν πρὸς τῇ 'Ἀττικῇ Μεγάρῳ' αὑτὸς γάρ φησιν ὁ ποιητής ἦλθον μὲν γὰρ ἐγγεγραμμένος ἐκ Σικελίης ποτὲ γαῖαν. θυμισάς αὐτὸς Πλάτων ἐν α' Νόμων τῶν ἐν Σικελίᾳ Μεγαρέως ποιήσας ἡφαίστειν. κατηκολοθήσας δὲ τῷ Πλάτωνι οὐκ ὀλίγοι.

Τ121 (Θερμοκτόνων): Ἰσοκράτης Πανηγυρικῷ. ἐν εἷς μὲν τὴν πόλιν ταλάντων πλασμα καλοῦσιν: Φιλεῖς δὲ ψηφίζεσθαι εἰς γῆς περιδόφθος θερμοκτόνων κληθήσαται, ἐπεὶ ἐκεῖ ἦ παθητὴ σφαιρα ὁμότα τῇ 'Βρακχείες' ἐποίησε.

Τ122 (Θηραμένης): Δυσίας ἐν τῷ κατ' Ἑρατοσθένους
δὲ ἀνηρέθη κατηγορήσαντος αὐτοῦ Κριτίου ἐπὶ τῶν λέγοντος αὐτοῦ ἔναν τὸν Λέσι:mm

Τ123 (Ἰπποδάμεια): Δημοσθένης ἐν τῷ πρὸς Τιμόθεου ἀγορὰν φησὶν εἶναι ἐν Πειραιᾷ ὁ καλομενῦν τῷ Ἰπποδάμειαν ἀπὸ Ἰπποδάμου Μιλησίου ἀρχιτέκτονας τοῦ οἰκοδομησαμένου τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις τῷ Πειραιᾷ.

Τ124 (Ναυκρατικά): Δημοσθένης ἐν τῷ κατὰ Τιμοκράτους. μὴποτε βέλτιον φέρεται ἐν τοῖς Ἀττικικοῖς Ναυκρατικά, ἤ’ ἄπει Ναυκρατικοῦ πλοίου ή Ναυκρατικῶν ἐμπλεοντων... ναυκράποις γὰρ τὸ παλαιόν τοὺς ἀρχοντας ἔλεγον, ὡς καὶ ἐν τῇ Ἡρόδοτω δηλοῖ. Ἀριστοτέλης δ’ ἐν Ἀθηναίων πολιτείᾳ φησὶν "κατέστησαν δὲ δημάρχους τὴν αὐτὴν ἑκοντας ἐπιμέλειαν τοῖς πρὸτερον ναυκράποις."η

Τ125 (Πολύστρατος): ἄλλος δ’ αὖ εἰς Πολύστρατος ὁδὲ Δημοσθένης μνημονεύει ἐν Φιλικηρίκοις, λέγων αὐτὴν ποτὲ ἐν Κορώνῳ ζευκίῳ τρέφειν... παρὰ μηδενὶ γὰρ φησὶν ὁ Διδυμὸς εὐρηκέας τὸν Πολύστρατον ἤγοςμενον τοῦ ἐν Κορώνῳ ζευκίῳ τοῦ Πολύστρατος μὲν δέ ἐν τῇ Ἦλληνικῶν ἑαυτῷ ἐν τοῖς Ἐλληνικῶν ἑαυτῷ ἐν τῷ Πολύστρατῳ ἑαυτῷ ἐν τῷ Πολύστρατῳ ἑαυτῷ ἐν τῷ Πολύστρατῳ ἑαυτῷ ἐν τῷ Πολύστρατῳ ἑαυτῷ ἐν τῷ Πολύστρατῳ ἑαυτῷ ἐν τῷ Πολύστρατῳ ἑαυτῷ ἐν τῷ Πολύστρατῳ ἑαυτῷ ἐν τῷ Πολύστρατῳ ἑαυτῷ ἐν τῷ Πολύστρατῳ ἑαυτῷ ἐν τῷ Πολύστρατῳ ἑαυτῷ ἐν τῷ Πολύστρατῳ ἑαυτῷ ἐν τῷ Πολύστρατῳ ἑαυτῷ ἐν τῷ Πολύστρατῳ ἑαυτῷ ἐν τῷ Πολύστρατῳ ἑαυτῷ ἐν τῷ Πολύστρατῳ ἑαυτῷ ἐν τῷ Πολύστρατῳ ἑαυτῷ ἐν τῷ Πολύστρατῷ ἑαυτῷ ἐν τῷ Πολύστρατῳ ἑαυτῷ ἐν τῷ Πολύστρατῳ ἑαυτῷ ἐν τῷ Πολύστρατῳ ἑαυτῷ ἐν τῷ Πολύστρατῳ ἑαυτῷ ἐν τῷ Πολύστρατῳ ἑαυτῷ ἐν τῷ Πολύστρατῳ ἑαυτῷ ἐν τῷ Πολύστρατῳ ἑαυτῷ ἐν τῷ Πολύστρατῳ ἑαυτῷ ἐν τῷ Πολύστρατῳ ἑαυτῷ ἐν τῷ Πολύστρατῳ ἑαυτῷ ἐν τῷ Πολύστρατῳ ἑαυτῷ ἐν τῷ Πολύστρατῳ ἑαυτῷ ἐν τῷ Πολύστρατῳ ἑαυτῷ ἐν τῷ Πολύστρατῳ ἑαυτῷ ἐν τῷ Πολύστρατῳ ἑαυτῷ ἐν τῷ Πολύστρατῳ ἑαυτῷ ἐν τῷ Πολύστρατῳ ἑαυτῷ ἐν τῷ Πολύστρατῳ ἑαυτῷ ἐν τῷ Πολύστρατῳ ἑαυτῷ ἐν τῷ Πολύστρατῳ ἑαυτῷ ἐν τῷ Πολύστρατῳ ἑαυτῷ ἐν τῷ Πολύστρατῳ ἑαυτῷ ἐν τῷ Πολύστρατῳ ἑαυτῷ ἐν τῷ Πολύστρατῳ ἑαυτῷ ἐν τῷ Πολύστρατῳ ἑαυτῷ ἐν τῷ Πολύστρατῳ ἑαυτῷ ἐν τῷ Πολύστρατῳ ἑαυτῷ ἐν τῷ Πολύστρατῳ ἑαυτῷ ἐν τῷ Πολύστρατῳ ἑαυτῷ ἐν τῷ Πολύστρατῳ ἑαυτῷ ἐν τῷ Πολύστρατῳ ἑαυτῷ ἐν τῷ Πολύστρατῳ ἑαυτῷ ἐν τῷ Πολύστρατῳ ἑαυτῷ ἐν τῷ Πολύστρατῳ ἑαυτόμενον τοῖς Πολύστρατοι.

Τ126 (Ταμιάς): Ἰσαίας ἐν τῷ Ἐλλήνων κληρικῶν, ἀρχῆς τις παρ’ Ἀθηναίοις ἄτι οὐ σαίμας, ἵ’ τοῦ αἰρεθέντος παραλαμβάνοι δ’ οὕτω τὸ τῆς ἀγαλμα τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς καὶ τῆς Νίκαις καὶ τοῦ ἄλλου κόσμου καὶ τῆς ἠρμῖνας ἐν τῇ βουλῆς, ὡς φησὶν Ἀριστοτέλης ἐν Ἀθηναίων πολιτείᾳ....
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HEKATAIOS

T127 (Frg. 163 = Jacoby, I, p. 28): Χερρδυνησος, πόλις ἐν τῇ κατὰ Κυνίδου χερρονήσῳ.... ἐστὶ β' πόλις ἐν τῇ ἑρμῆ Χερρδυνησος, περὶ θα ἦν 'Εκαταιος ἐν Περγάμῳ;" ἐν δ' αὕτωι πόλις Χερρδυνησος ἐν τῇ ἱσθμῷ τῆς χερρονήσου," καὶ τὸν πολέτην Χερρονήσιδυ φησι. "Ἀψινθίοισι πρὸς μεσομήριαν ὁμορφόντος ἐρρονήσουτε;"

HERAKLEIDES PONTIKOS

T128 (Frg. 4 = Müller, II, p. 208): τοὺς μετὰ Κληνωνος διὰ τὴν τυραννίδα ἔπλε τῶν βωμῶν τῆς θεοῦ περευγότας οἱ περὶ μεγαλεία ἀπεκτείναν, καὶ τοὺς δράσαντας ὡς ἐναιτει γλαυκών.

T129(Frg. 6 = Müller, II, β. 308): Πεισιστράτως τριάκοντα καὶ τρία ἐν τῇ τυραννίσας, γηράσας ἀπέθανεν.

"Ἱππαρχος ὁ υἱὸς Πεισιστράτου παιδιώδης ἦν καὶ ἐρωτικός καὶ φιλόμουσος, θέσαλος δὲ νεότερος, καὶ ἐρασᾶς, τούτων τυραννοῦτα μὴ δυναθέντες ἀνελείν. "Ἰππαρχον ἀπέκτειναν τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ, "Ἰππίας δὲ πικρότερον ἑτυράννει.

HESYCHIOS

T130(Βάττος): βασιλεὺς, τύραννος. Λέβνης:

τραυλδψων, ἱσχυρόψων.

T131(Βάττος οἰλφιος): παροιμία ἐπὶ τῶν τῆς ὑπερβαλλόντων τιμὰς εὑρίσκομεν. Μετενθύμεσα δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ Κυρηναίου εἰς τῶν Βαττιαδῶν μεταδόθη, ἔξαιρετον τὸ σίλ-
φιον, δὲ εκτελημέναι παρ’ αὐτοῖς, ὅτε καὶ ἐν τῷ νομίσματι
ὅπου μὲν Ἀμμωνα, ὅκου δὲ σύλφιον ἐγκεκράθηκαί.

T132 (Βουκέφαλος): Ἡππος ἐγκεκραμένου ἔχων
τοῖς ἱσχίοις βοθκρανον. καὶ ὁ 'Ἀλεξάνδρος Ἡππος, ἀφ' οὗ
πολιν ἐν Ἰνδοῖς κτίσαν ἐλέγεται.

T133 (Διάστια): ἐστὶν 'Ἀθηναίοι. καὶ συνεδρίων
ἀπὸ τῆς ἐστὶν ἡ ἐπετέλουν μετὰ τινος στυγνότητος ἑσοῦντες.

T134 (Διηπόλεια): ἐστὶν 'Ἀθηναίοι, ἀπὸ τοῦ Πολιεί
ὅτι θείων Ἀθηναίων, εἰς μυθικον τοῦ πελάγου καὶ τοῦ βοῶς.

T135 (δορπία): ἡ τῶν ἀπατουρίων πρώτη ἡμέρα οὕτω
καλεῖται.

T136 (ὑθε): δούλοις, μισθοῖς, παράσιτοι. ἡ ὁ
τὴν μερητικὴν ἑγκάρυμενος παρὰ Ἀθηναίοις.

T137 (θητεία): δουλεῖαι ἐπὶ μισθοῖ.

T138 (θητεία): μισθωτοῖς.

T139 (θουρίωμάντεις): ὅτις περὶ Δάμφωνα. ὑπὲρ
γὰρ εἰς Σαβαριν τὴν ἀποικίαν Δάμφωνα ἀγατεῖν τινὰς οὐ...

μάνου ὑπερ.

T140 (κατωκάθη): ἱματίων, ἔχων ἐν τῶν κάτω μερῶν
νάκων προσεβαμένου, ὅ ἐστι μηλητή. δοκοῦσι δὲ τούτω
ἀμφιέσασθαι Ἀθηναίοι τῶν περὶ Πεισίστρατον τυράννων ἐπαναγ-
κασάντων, ἵνα ύπὸ εὐτελεῖν μή κατιδέσων εἰς τὸ ἄστυ ὁ
πολίται.

T141 (Λειψόδροι): χαρίων τι ὑπὲρ Πάρυηθος, δὲ
ἐτείχοις Ἀλκμαίων.
Τ132 (λιμῷ Μηλίη): παροιμία, ἐκεί Ἀθηναῖοι ἐνδιώκονται Μηλίους πολιορκοῦτες λιμῷ· ὡς θουκυδίδης.

Τ133 (πενήσται): οἱ μὴ γόνφ δοῦλοι, οἵ τινες εἰργάζουσι τὴν θην. τινες δὲ οἱ εἰλωτες, τινες δὲ λάτρεις. ὁ ἐργάται πένητες ἢ ύπνηκοι.

Τ134 (Σαλαμίνιος): μία τῶν ἱερῶν νεών.
Τ135 (ταίναις): παρὰ Δακεδαίμονες ἐστὶ Ποσεί-δῶνος· καὶ ἐν αὐτῇ Ταίναισται. Ταίναιος γὰρ πεδίου Δακωνικῆς.

HIPPOKRATES

Τ136 (ΠΕΡΙ ΑΡΘΡΩΝ ΕΜΒΟΛΙΩΝ, 78): καὶ γὰρ ἄνδρα-γαθικτέρον τοῦτο καὶ τεχνικτέρον, ὅστις μὴ ἐκπευμεῖ δημοιοιδέον κιβδηλίς.

INSCRIPTIONS

Τ137 (I.G., I.2, 609; text of Fraenkel, Eratos, XLIX (1951), p. 63):

ἐκλίμαχος πολέμαρχος Ἀθεναίον τοῦ ἄγνα
τοῦ Μαραθοῦνθεν ἦλθεν ὅπες ὁδριος ἄρει,
παιδί Ἀθηναίων μυκέμεν πένθος τε θλήνατα.

Τ138 (I.G., II.2, 1006, 26-29): παρατεθεμενοι δὲ ἐκ τὸ
ἐμ παραθνυντικτεον ἑστεφάνωσαν τε ἐκ ἐνηγίας τοῖς
κατὰ πόλεμον τελευτθασαν ὑπὲρ τῆς ἑλευθερίας, παρεγεγραμμενο,
καὶ ἐκ τὸ άδμφάραν καὶ ιστόρησαν τὴν γεγονεῖαν ἐκ
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παλαίων χρόνων ὑπὸ τῶν πατέρων τοῦ ἱεροῦ ἱερατείαν καὶ
θεσαυροὺς ἀπῆλθον αὖθις ἦλθεν, εἰς τὴν ἐαυτῶν χώραν.
ἀνεκλείσαν δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ τρόπαιον καὶ ἑθὺναν τῶν Διὶ τῶν
Τροταρών καὶ τῆς ποιμείν τῶν μεγάλων θεῶν ἐποίησαν τῷ τῶν
κλοῖων τὴν ἀμίλλαν.

Τ139 (I.σ., I2, 887 ) : a) ἐμπόριος καὶ ἴδιος
ἀρος.  β) ἐμπόριος καὶ ἴδιος ἀρος.
Τ140 (Ε.σ., I2, 890 ) : a) ἄποροτέρων ἰδιοκό
ἀρος.  β) πορθμείον ἰδίομο ἀρος.
Τ141 (I.σ., I2, 293, 13 ) : παρά ταμιῶν ἐπὶ Τιμω-
κλέος ἄρχοντος....
Τ142 (I.σ., I2, 293, 6-7 ) : "Ἀθηναῖοι ἀκυβελο-
σαν ἐπὶ Μορχίλον ἄρχοντος ἐν τοῖς πρὸς Σαμῖς πόλεσιν.
Τ143 (I.σ., I2, 86, 2-4 ) : ἑποίησαν ἐνοικίαν
περί τοὺς Ἀθηναίους ἐτεὶ καὶ Ἀργείους καὶ Λατινέως καὶ Ἐλείων
πρὸς ὄλλους θυμὸς ὁποῖον αὐτῶν καὶ τῶν ἱσθμιάχων ἤδη ἄρχοι
ἐνιαύτεροι ἄδολος καὶ ἀμβλαβεῖς καὶ, κατὰ γένι καὶ κατὰ θαλάτταν.

ΗΣΟΚΡΑΤΗΣ

Τ144 (4, 86) : ἀποβατῶν γὰρ αὐτῶν ἀθαρσαροὺς, εἰς
τὴν Ἀττικὴν οἱ μὲν οὐ περιεύμεναν τοὺς συμμάχους, ἀλλὰ τὴν
κοινὸν πόλεμον ἤδην ποιησάμενοι πρὸς τοὺς ἀδασιθεὶς τῆς
'Ἐλλάδος καταφρονήσαντες ἀπῆλθον τὴν οἰκεῖαν ἰδίαμαν ἐχοντες,
ὁλίγοι πρὸς πολλὰς μυριάδας, ὡσπερ ἐν ἄλλοτρίασι πυχαὶς
μελλοντες κίνδυνον βεβηθείς, οἱ δ᾽ οὐκ ἐφθασαν πυθόμενοι τὴν περὶ
Τὴν Ἀττικὴν πόλεμον καὶ πάντως τῶν ἄλλων ἀμελήσαντες ἦκον ἴμις ἀμυνοῦσας, τοσαύτην ποιησάμενοι σκούδην, δόσην περ ἀν τῆς αὐτῶν χώρας πορευομένης.

Τ145 (4, 87): τοὺς μὲν γὰρ ἡμετέρους προγόνους φασὶ τῆς αὐτῆς ἠμέρας πυθέσθαι τὲ τὴν ἀπόβασιν τῶν βαρβάρων καὶ βοηθήσαντας ἐπὶ τοὺς ὀροὺς τῆς χώρας μάχη νικήσαντας τρόπαιον στήσαι τῶν πολεμίων, τοὺς ὑπὲρ τρισίν ἠμέρας καὶ τοσαύταις νυκτὶ διακόσια καὶ χίλια στάδια διελθεῖν στρατοπέδω πορευομένους.

Τ146 (4, 90): οἱ δ᾿ ἡμετέροι πατέρες ἐπὶ Ἀρτέμισι, ἐξήκοντα τρίηρεις πληρώσαντες πρὸς ὑπὸ τὸ τῶν πολεμίων ναυτικὸν.

Τ147 (4, 100): μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα ἡδὲ τινὰς ἡμῶν κατηγοροῦσιν, δε ἐπειδὴ τὴν ἀρχήν τῆς θαλάσσης παρελάβομεν, πολλὰς κακῶς αἰτίαις τοῖς Ἑλληνισι κατεστημένης, καὶ τῶν τε Μηλίων ἀνδραποδίσμων καὶ τῶν Σκιωπαίων διέθρου ἐν τούτοις τοῖς λόγοις ἴμις προφέρουσιν.

Τ148 (8, 86): εἰς Δαριπτοῦ μὲν γε διακόσιαι πλεβοεμοὶ τριήρεις αὐτοῖς τοῖς πληρωμαῖς διεφθάρησαν, περὶ δὲ Κύπρου πεντήκοντα καὶ ἑκατον.

Τ149 (12, 31–32): οἱ δ᾿ ἡμετέροι θεωροπόλεια τῶν ὄμολογομενῶν ἀκασίων αἰτίων εἶναι διδαστα τοῦ τῆς ναυμαχίας γενέσθαι κατὰ τρόπον καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀπάντων τῶν ἐν ἑκείνῳ τῷ χρόνῳ καταρθωθέντων. τεκμηρίων δὲ μέγιστον ἀφελέμανοι γὰρ Δακεδαιμόνιοι τὴν ἤγεμον τοῖς συγκινδυνεῖ.
σαντες τοῖς ἡμετέρους παρέδοσαν. καὶ τοῖς τίνας ἂν τις κρι-
τάς ἰκανώτερος ποιήσαι τοι καὶ πιστοτέρος τῶν τότε πρακτικ-
ων ἢ τοὺς ἐν αὐτοῖς τοῖς ἄλλως παραγενομένους;

T150 (12, 63): καὶ μάλιστα διατίρυειν περὶ τὰ
ῳλίων πάθη καὶ Εἰκωναίων...οἴομένους ταῖς κατηγορίαις
τάβαται καταρρύπανειν τὰς τῆς πόλεως ευεργεσίας τὰς ὀλίγω
πρότερον εἰρημένας.

T151 (12, 89): τοῖς γὰρ ὑπερίβουσιν ἡμῶν τῇ
πόλει τὰς Ῥῃλίων καὶ τὰς τῶν τοιούτων πολιχνίων συμφορὰς
ἀντέλεγον....

T152 (14, 27-28): γενομένου δὲ τοῦ Κορινθιακοῦ
πολέμου διὰ τὴν ὀρίᾳ τὴν τοῦτων, καὶ Δακεδαιμονίων μὲν ἐπ᾽
αὐτῶς στρατευσάντως, δι᾽ ὑμᾶς δὲ σωθέντες...ἀλλ᾽ ἐπειδὴ
dieλθὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ πόλεμου, ἀπολῡσῶμεν ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν Δακεδαιμο-
nίων συμμαχίαν εἰσῆλθον. καὶ Χίου μὲν καὶ Μαυτηναίοι καὶ
Βυζάντιοι συμπαρέμειναν....

T153 (15, 63): ἔστι δὲ τὰ μὲν ἐν ἄρχῃ λεγόμενα
περὶ τῆς εἰρήνης τῆς πρὸς Χίους καὶ Ῥοδίους καὶ Ἡπικόντιος....

T154 (15, 113): τὸ δὲ τελευταῖον Ποταμίδαιαν, εἶν
ἡ πόλις τετράκτιον καὶ διαχάλλων τάλαντα τὸ πρότερον ἀνή-
λωσε, ταῦταν εἰλὲν ἀπὸ τῶν χρημάτων ὁποῖος ἐπὶρις καὶ τῶν
συντάξεων τῶν ἀπὸ θρακῆς καὶ προσετὶ Χαλκίδας ἕκαντας
κατεπολέμησεν.

T155 (15, 307): τίς δὲ ἢ ὃ μετ᾽ ἐκείνου τοῦς Ἑλλη-
nῶς ἐλευθερώσας καὶ τοὺς προγνώσας ἐπὶ τὴν ἡγεμονίαν καὶ τὴν
δυναστείαν, ἴνα ἔσχον, προαγαγών, ἔτι δὲ τὴν φύσιν τὴν τοῦ Πειραιῶς κατατόνω καὶ τὸ τείχος ἀκόμη Δακεδαίμονισι τῇ ἄλλῃ περιβάλλῃ, τὸ δὲ ό μετὰ τοῦτον ἀργυρίου καὶ χρυσοῦ τὴν ἀκρόπολιν ἐμπλήσας καὶ τοὺς οἶκους τόσα ἱδίους μεστοὺς πολλῆς εὐδαιμονίας καὶ πλοῦτον ποιήσας.

Τ156 (16, 25-26): συγγενεῖς γὰρ τοῖς "Ἀλκμαίονιδαῖς
dυντες Πεισιστράτου καὶ πρὶν εἰς τὴν ἀρχὴν καταστήναι μᾶλιστα
αὐτοῖς χρώμενοι τῶν πολιτῶν, οὐκ ἠilliseconds μετασχεῖν τῆς ἐκείνου
tυραννίδος, ἀλλ' εἶλοντο φυγεῖν μᾶλλον ἢ ἄλλης πολιτείας ἰδεῖν
dουλεύοντας. τετταράκοντα δ' ἔτη τῆς στάσεως γενομένης ὑπὸ
μὲν τῶν τυράννων τοσοῦτον μᾶλλον τῶν ἄλλων ἐμισθηθησάντων, ὡσθ' ὅποτε τάκεισαν κρατήσειν, οὐ μόνον τὰς οἰκίας αὐτῶν κατέστησάν
ταυτοῦ ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς τάφους ἀνώρυττον...καὶ τὸ τελευταῖον
'Ἀλκμιῆδης καὶ Κλεισθένης...στρατηγήσαντες τῆς φυγῆς κατ-κατηγοροῦν τῶν δήμων καὶ τοὺς τυράννους ἐξεβάλον...κατέστησαν
ἐκείνην τὴν δημοκρατίαν.

Τ157 (16, 29): καὶ πρῶτον μὲν, ὅτε φορμίων ἔξηγαγεν ἐπὶ θριάσεως χίλιους Ἀθηναίων, ἐπιλεγόμενοι τοὺς ἀρίστους, μετα τοῦτον στρατευσόμενος τοιοῦτον ἢ ἐν τοῖς
κινδύνοις ὅποτε στεφανωθῆναι καὶ πανοπλίαν λαβεῖν παρὰ τοῦ
στρατηγοῦ.

Τ158 (18, 23): καὶ μὴν οὐδὲ τάδε αὐτῶν λέληθεν,
ὅτι θρασίβουλος καὶ "Ἀνυστὸς μέγιστον μὲν δυνάμενοι τῶν ἐν
tῇ πόλει, πολλῶν δ' ἀπεστερημένοι χρημάτων, εἰσόδες δὲ
tοῦτο ἀπογράψαντας, ὅμως οὐ τολμῶσιν αὐτοῖς δίκας λαγχάνειν....
JUSTIN

TI59 (II, 12, 13-15): adventate igitur Xerxe consulentibus Delphis oraculum responsum fuerat, salutem muris ligneis tuerentur. Themistocles navium praesidium demonstratum ratus persuadet omnibus, patriam municipes esse, non moenia, civitateque non in aedificiis, sed in civibus positam; melius itaque salutem navibus quam urbi commissuros; huius sententiae etiam deum auctorem esse. probato consilio coniuges libeosaque cum pretiosissimis rebus abditis insulis reliota urbe demandant; ipsi naves armati conscendunt.

TI60 (II, 12, 23-25): Artemisia autem, regina Halicarnasi, quae in auxilium Xerxi venerat, inter primores duces bellum acerrime ciebat, quippe ut in viro muliebrem timorem, ita in muliere virilem audaciam cerneres.

TI61 (III, 6, 4-6): hanc rem Athenienses graviter ferentes pecuniam, quae erat in stipendium Persici belli ab universa Graecia conlata, a Delo Athenas transferunt, ne deficientibus a fide societatis Lacedaemonii praedae ac rapinae esset. Sed nec Lacedaemonii quievere, qui cum Messeniorum bello occupati essent, Peloponnensenses inmisere, qui bellum Atheniensibus facerent.

TI62 (III, 6, 6-8): Darvae tunc temporis classe in Aegyptum missa vires Atheniensibus erant. Itaque navali
proelio dimicantes facile superantur. interiecto deinde tempore post reditum suorum aucti et classis et militum robore proelium reparant.

T163 (V, 3, 6): qui cum insita genti superbia crudeliter in plebem consuleret, singulis tyrannidis sibi inpotentiam vindicantibus, ab exercitu Alcibiades exul revocatus et duxque classi constituitur.

T164 (V, 9, 6-7): erat inter exules Thrasybulus, vir strenuus et domi nobilis, qui auditum aliquid pro patria et pro salute communi etiam cum periculo ratus, adunatis exulibus castellum Phylæn Atticurum finium occupat.

T165 (V, 9, 13-15): post haec Thrasybulum corrumpere imperii societatem pollicentes conantur. quod cum non contigisset, auxilia a Lacedaemoniis petivere, quibus accitis iterato proeliantur. in eo bello Critias et Hippolochus, omnium tyrannorum saevissimi, cadunt.

KALLIMACHOS

T166 (Hymn., II, 75-76):

εἰς δὲ σε θήρης
οὐλος Ἀριστοτέλης Ἀσβυστίδι πάρθενο γαϊῆ....

T167 (Schol. Hymn., II, 65): ἔφρασε Βάττιφι λέγεται ὅτι οὗτος ὁ Βάττιφι ἄφωνος ἤν. ἀπῆλθεν οὖν εἰς τὸ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος ἱερὸν ἐπὶ τῷ τῶν θεῶν οἴκῳ ἔρωτίσατα περὶ τῆς φωνῆς. ὡς δὲ ἔχρησεν αὐτῷ οὐκέτι περὶ φωνῆς, ἀλλὰ περὶ
μετονομα. καὶ ὁ Βάττος πεισθεὶς τῷ χρησμῷ ἠλθεν εἰς τὴν Διβῆν. λέγεται δὲ εἶναι πολλόνες λέοντες ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ χώρᾳ.

ἐπιδόμης οὖν ὁ Βάττος καὶ λέοντα αἰφνιδίως θεασάμενος τῇ τοῦ φόβου ἀνάγκη βιασθεὶς φθέγγασθαι διέρρηξε τὴν φλέβα ἤτις τὴν ἐκείνου φωνὴν ἔπειξε, καὶ οὗτος φωνήεις ἐγένετο καὶ τὴν Κυρήνην ἔκτισεν, ὅθεν ἔστιν ὁ Καλλιμαχος.

Τ168 (Schol. Hymn., II, 76): οὖλος Ἀριστοτέλης

ὁ αὐτὸς καὶ Βάττος λέγεται, καὶ γὰρ ὁ δοθείς αὐτῷ χρησμὸς τοῦτο παρεμφαίνει: "Βάττο, ἐπὶ φωνὴν ἠλθες" ἀναξ δὲ σε φοβοὺς ἀνύγει ἐν Διβῆν ἐλθεῖν μηλοτρόφου οἰκιστήρα. Ἀσβυ-

στίδα δὲ τὴν λευκὴν λέγει παρὰ τὴν ἁσβεστον. τοιαύτη γὰρ ἡ Διβῆ λευκόγειος.

KLEI(TO)DEMOS

Τ169 (Frg. 15 = Jacoby, IIIΒ, p. 55): καὶ

τὴν καταγαγοῦσαν ἐν Πεισιστρατοῦ ἐπὶ τὴν τυραυνίδα, ὡς

Ἀθηναῖς πειραμένεις ἔχουσαν, καλὴν φησὶ γεγονέναι, ἡτὶς καὶ τῇ θεῷ εἰκαστὸ τὴν μορφήν. στεφανόρχωσις δ’ ἦν καὶ

αὐτὴν ἔξεσθον πρὸς γάμους κοινωνίαν ὁ Πεισιστρατος Ἰππ-

ἄρχω τῷ νίτῃ, ὡς Κλέιδημος ἑστρατεύει ἐν τῇ Νότον. ἔξεσθεν

δὲ καὶ Ἰππάρχῳ τῷ νιδεὶ τὴν παραβίασον αὐτῷ γυναῖκα

φην ἐν τῷ σωκράτους θυγατέρα, καὶ Χάρμου τῷ πολεμαρχήσαντος

θυγατέρα Μυρρίνην ἔλαβεν Ἰππίαι περικαλλεστάτην οὐσαν τῷ

μετ’ αὐτῶν τυραυνεσσάτι. συνέβη δὲ (ὡς φησὶ) τὸν Χάρμου

ἐρασθὴν τῷ Ἰππίου γενέσθαι καὶ τὰν πρὸς Ἀδαμηλίαν Ἔρωτα
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**Kratinos**

T170 (Frg. 57 Kock):

Δάμιώνιος, τὸν οὐ βροτόν ψῆφος δυναται φλεγμὰ διέπουν φίλων ἀπειργεῖν.

T171 (Frg. 62 Kock):

Κρατίνος εὖ Δραπέτιαν ἐπὶ Δάμιώνιος. τὸν αὐτὸν ἀγαθηνα καὶ κυβηλιστὴν εἶχεν, οἰονεὶ θετήν καὶ μάντιν... Κρατίνος Δάμιωνα τὸν μάντιν ὡς ἀγαθηνα καὶ θετήν.

**Ktesias**

T172 (ΠΕΡΣΙΚΩΝ ΕΙΚΟΝΩΝ, 18):

Ἀδίνες δὲ ἐπανιμέν ἐν Πόντῳ, καὶ τοῦ Ὀδηγοῦ στόλου ἡγομένου, ἔπορευε ὡσαυς καὶ τῷ Ἑλλάδα. ἐν Μαραθῶνι δὲ Μιλτιάδης ὑπαντάζει, καὶ νικά τοὺς βαρβάρους, καὶ πίπτει καὶ αὐτὸς Δάδισ. καὶ οὐδὲ τὸ σῶμα Πέρσαις αἰτησιμένους εἴδεθη.

T173 (ΠΕΡΣΙΚΩΝ ΕΙΚΟΝΩΝ, 32):

ἀφίσταται Διονυσίος, Ἰνάρω καὶ Δυνίων ἀνδράς καὶ ἐτέρου Διονυσίου τὴν ἀπόστασιν μελετήσατος. καὶ εὑρίσκεται τὰ πρὸς πόλεμον. πέμπουσι καὶ Ἀθηναῖοι, αἰτησιμένου αὐτοῦ, τεσσαράκοντα νῆσαν. καὶ μελετῶν αὐτὸς Ἀρταγζῆς ἐκστρατεύσαι. καὶ τῶν φιλῶν οὐ συμβουλευόμενων, πέμπει Ἀχαιοὺς ἑπὶ τῶν ἄδελφων, τεσσαράκοντα μὲν μυρίάδας ἐπαγόμενον στράτευμα πεζίκδον, νῆας δὲ π... ἐνικήσευ...
"Ιναρος καὶ κατὰ θάλασσαν, χαριτωμένον εὐδοκιμήσαντος, ὅσ τῶν ἔχ Αθηναῖων τεσσαράκοντα μηδὲν ἐξρηματίζει ναβαρχος.

Τ174 (ΠΕΡΣΙΚΩΝ ΕΚΔΟΓΑΙ, 33): εἶτα πέμπεται κατὰ Ἰναρον Μεγάβυζος, ἐπαγγεμένος ὄλλο στράτευμα πρὸς τῇ ὑπολειψθέντι, μυριάδας εἰκοσὶ...γίνεται οὗν μάχῃ κρατερὰ, καὶ πικτουσιν ἀμφοτέρωσθεν πολλοὶ, πλείους δὲ Αἰγυπτίωι. καὶ βάλλει Μεγάβυζος εἰς τὸν μηδὸν "Ιναρον, καὶ τρέπεται... καὶ νικῶσι Πέρσαι κατακράτος... φεσζεῖ δὲ πρὸς τὴν Ἑβδομαν "Ιναρον, (πόλις Ἰσχυρὰ ἐν Ἀιγυπτίῳ αὐτῆ) καὶ οἱ "Ελληνες δὲ μετ' αὐτοῦ....

Τ175 (ΠΕΡΣΙΚΩΝ ΕΚΔΟΓΑΙ, 35): καὶ ἔδαγεται τέλος τῆς στρατιᾶς ὡς "Ιναρος καὶ οἱ "Ελληνες οὐδὲν κακὸν πείσονται.

LUCAN

Τ176 (Schol., Pharsalia, IX, 36): Taenaron umbris, hic enim ingressus est inferni, ut Vergilius "Taenarias etiam fauces a. h. D."

LUCIAN

Τ177 (Schol., Timon, 30): Κλέωνι, Κλέων δημαργωτὸς ἦν 'Αθηναίων προστάσις αὐτῶν ἐπτὰ ἐτηκρότως δημηγορῶν ἀνέκραγεν ἐπὶ βῆματος καὶ ἐλοιδορῆσατο, θρασὺς ὃ, καὶ οὕτως, οὕτως, καθὼς θεσπομένος ἱστορεῖ, συνελημμέρωσιν 'Αθηναίων παρελθεῖν εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν στέφανον ἔχοντα καὶ κελεύσαι αὐτῶς ἀναβαλέσθαι τὸν σθλλογον – τυγχάνειν γὰρ αὐτῶν
θέωντα καὶ ξένους ἐστὶν ἀπὸ τοῦ σταθεροῦ, ὅτι διαλύει τὴν ἐννοια.

δωρεάν δὲ εἰς ὑπερβολὴν ὑπήρχε καὶ τοῦτο δήλοι

αὐτοῦ ἡ γραφεῖσα ἂν αὐτοῦ ἰσιολήτων ἐπιστολὴ· διὸ τὸν

ἐπιτηδείαν ἀλοῦσα ὑπὸ Πάχτος τοῦ στρατηγοῦ τὴν μὲν

ἐμπροσθεν ἡμέραν συμπείσας τὸν δήμον, ὡς χρὴ λεοβίω

ἀπάντων πλὴν ὑπερθυματίων τοὺς μὲν ἠξώντας ἀκούσας, παίδεας

dὲ καὶ γυναῖκας ἀνδραποδίσασθαι, καὶ τὸ ψῆφισμα τούτο ἀπο-

στείλαν ἐπὶ τῆς Παράλογος τῆς δὲ νυκτὸς τῆς ἐπιστολῆς ἐλθο-

tῶν ὡς αὐτοῦ τῶν ἐπιδημούτων Ἀθηναίων λεοβίω καὶ δέκα

tαλάντως αὐτὸν ἀργυρίου μετελθῶντων μετακεῖσαι πάλιν τῷ

dήμῳ καὶ τρίηρον ἀλλήν ἀποστέλλαν ἀναρροῦσαν τὸ ψῆφισμα.

οὗτως θουκυδίδης ᾧ, τῆς πρὸς δακταλομο-

νίους εἰρήνη, ὃς Φιλόχροος καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης προσθέλει ἄρχοντα

Εὔθυνον. Ἀριστοτέλης δὲ ἐν Πολιτείᾳ ᾧ, καὶ περιγρα-

φομερὸν αὐτοῦ λέγει δημηγορήσας, εἰς τὴν θρασύτητα αὐτοῦ

ἀποσκώπτων. τὰ δὲ ὑπὸ τῆς ὁδοῦ ἡ ἀργαλείαι καὶ μάλιστα

tὰς ὄρφας, ὡς Κρατίνος Σερφίτος. εἰχὲ δὲ καὶ φωνὴν μεγα-

λήν: Ἀριστοφάνης Σφῆνα ᾧ, εἶπ' αὐτοῦ

"Ἕξοψα φωνὴν ἐμπειρημένην ὑδα.

βυσσοδέξης δὲ αὐτὸν λέγεσθαι Ἰδομενεὺς ἦτοι ὡς βυσσοδέξης

υἱὸν ὥς αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ παιδεῖς τὸ ἐπιτηδείαν μεταχειρισμένου.

ἐκαθιστώ ὅπερ καὶ ἐπὶ μάρτυς, ὡς Κρατίνος Σερφίτος. ἐξε-

πλευρᾶς δὲ καὶ στρατηγὸς ἐπὶ ὁμοίως ἀμφίβολον ἐπὶ ἀρχοντῶν Ἀμελλοῦ.
ЛЮКУРГОС

T178 (Amor., 30): τάχα δ' οδέθε Περικλῆς οὕτως
ἀν Ἀσκασία συνηγόρησεν.

LYSIAS

T180 (2, 21): ο γὰρ τῆς Ἀσίας βασιλεὺς... ἐλπί-
ζων καὶ τὴν Εὐρώπην δουλώσεσθαι, ἔστειλε πεντήκοντα μυριά-
δας στρατιών... ἀκέραιον εἰς Μαραθῶνα, νομίζοντες οὕτως ἀν
ἐρμηνευτούσος εἶναι συμμάχων τοὺς Ἑλληνας....

T181 (12, 6): θεότης γὰρ καὶ Πείσσων ἔλεγον ἐν
τοῖς τριάκοντα περὶ τῶν μετοκικῶν... τινὲς τῇ πολιτείᾳ ἀκόμηνοι.
Τ182 (12, 63): καίτοι σφθρ' ἀν αὐτὸν οἴμαι μετὰ θεμιστοκλέους πολεμευόμενον προσποιεῖσθαι πράττειν ὅπως οἰκοδομηθῆσηται τὰ τεῖχη, ὅπτε καὶ μετὰ θηραμένους ὅπως καθαιρεθῆσηται.... ὃ μὲν γὰρ Δακεδαίμονὶς ἔκλετον ἔκοδοσκευάζειν αὐτό, οὗτος δὲ τοὺς πολίτας ἔξαπαθήσας καθείλε.

Τ183 (12, 65): ὃς πρῶτον μὲν τῆς προτέρας ὀλιγαρχίας αἰτιῶτατος ἐγένετο, πείσας ὑμᾶς τὴν ἐπὶ τῶν τετρακοσίων πολιτειῶν ἐλέεσθαι, καὶ ὃ μὲν παθῷ αὐτοῦ τῶν προσβολῶν ὃν ταὐτ' ἔπρατεν....

Τ184 (12, 73): ἀναστὰς δὲ θηραμένης ἐκέλευσεν ὑμᾶς τριάκοντα ἀνδρᾶς ὑπετρέψαι τὴν πόλιν καὶ τῇ πολιτείᾳ χρῆσαι ἤρων Δρακοντίδης ἀπέφαίνειν.

Τ185 (14, 30): καὶ ταῦτ' ὅπε ὃν Ἀλκιβιάδου, ὃς ἔπεισε μὲν Δακεδαίμονὶς ἐκτειχίσαι, ἐπὶ δὲ τὰς νῆσους ἀποστῆσαι ἐκλεσθεῖν, διδάσκαλος δὲ τῶν τῆς πόλεως καθὼν ἐγένετο, πλεονακίας δὲ μετὰ τῶν ἐχθρῶν ἐπὶ τὴν πατρίδα ἐστρατεύσατο ἢ μετὰ τῶν πολιτῶν ἔπεισκόμενος.

Τ186 (14, 36): οὕτε Χίους οὕς ἀπέστησε πάλιν φίλους ποιήσαι, οὕτε ἄλλο ὀνόμα ἄγαθον ὑμᾶς ἐργασασθῇ.

Τ187 (18, 2): πανταχοῦ φαυλίστατο πολλῶν μὲν καὶ ἀγαθῶν αἰτίως τῇ πόλει γεγενημένον, πλεῖστα δὲ καὶ μέγιστα καὶ τοὺς πολέμους εἰργασμένον.

Τ188 (32, 15): φοιτῶν δὲ καὶ σῖτου αὐτοῦ ἐν Χερρονήσου καθ' ἐκατον ἐνιαυτῶν.
POMPONIUS MELA

T189 (II, 51): in Laconico...in ipso Taenaro
Neptuni templum et specus, illi quem in Ponto Acherusium diximus
facie et fabula similis....

CORNELIUS NEPOS

T190 (Alcibiades, 3, 1-3): bello Peloponnesio huius
consilio atque auctoritate Athenienses bellum Syracusanis indix-
erunt. ad quod gerendum ipse dux delectus est, duo praeterea
collegae dati, Nicia et Lamachus. id cum appararetur, prius
quam classis exiret, accidit ut una nocte omnes Hermae, qui in
oppido erant Athenis, deicerentur praeter unum, qui ante ianuam
erat Andocidi...

T191 (Alcibiades, 4, 7): itaque huius consilio
Lacedaemonii cum Perse rege amicitiam fecerunt, dein Deceleam
in Attica munierunt praesidioque ibi perpetuo posito in obsidione
Athenas tenuerunt.

T192 (Alcibiades, 7, 1): haec Alcibiadi laetitia non
nimis fuit diurna. nam cum ei omnes essent honores decreti
totaque res publica domi bellique tradita, ut unus arbitrio
gereretur, et ipse postulasset ut duo sibi collegae darentur,
Thrasybulus et Adimantus, neque id negatum esset, classe in
Asiam profectus, quod apud Cymen minus ex sententia rem gesserat,
in invidiam recidit...

T193 (Alcibiades, 7, 3): timeatur enim non minus
quam diligebatur, ne secunda fortuna magnisque opibus elatus
tyrannidem concupisceret. quibus rebus factum est ut absenti magistratum abrogarent et alium in eius locum substituerent.

T194 (Aristides, 2, 3): namque ante id tempus et mari et terra duces erant Lacedaemonii. tum autem et intemperantia Pausaniae et iustitia factum est Aristidis, ut omnes fere civitates Graeciae ad Atheniensium societatem se applicarent et adversus barbaros hos duces deligerent sibi.

T195 (Aristides, 3, 1): quos quo facilius repellentur, si forte bellum renovare conarentur, ad classes aedificandas exercitusque comparandos quantum pecuniae quaeque civitas daret, Aristides delectus est qui constituerebat, eiusque arbitrio quadrinomena et sexagenae talenta quotannis Delum sunt collata: id enim commune aerarium esse voluerunt. quae omnis pecunia postero tempore Athenas translatae est.

T196 (Conon, 2, 4): qui posteaquam domum a suis civibus revocatus est, quod Boeotii et Athenienses Lacedaemonii bellum indixerant, Conon nihil setius apud praefectos regis versabatur iisque omnibus magno erat usui.

T197 (Miltiades, 4, 1–2): Darius autem, cum ex Europa in Asiam redisset, hortantibus amicis, ut Graeciam redigeret in suam potestatem, classem quingentarum navium comparavit ei-que Datim praefecit et Artaphernem iisque ducenta peditum, decem equitum milia dedit, causam interserens se hostem esse Atheniensi- bus....inde ad Atticam accesserunt ac suas copias in campum Marathonam deduxerunt.
T198 (Themistocles, 5, 1): nam Themistocles, verens ne bellare perseveraret, certiorem eum fecit id agi, ut pons, quem ille in Hellesponto fecerat, dissolveretur ac redivit in Asiam excluderetur, idque ei persuasit.

T199 (Themistocles, 9, 1): scio plerosque ita scriptisse, Themistoclem Xerxe regnante in Asiam transisse. sed ego potissimum Thucydidi credo, quod et aetate proximus de ipsis, qui illorum temporum historiam reliquerunt, et eiusdem civitatis fuit. is autem ait ad Artaxerxen eum venisse atque his verbis epistulam misisse....

T200 (Themistocles, 10, 4-5): de cuius morte multiformis apud plerosque scriptum est, sed nos eundem potissimum Thucydidem austorem probamus, qui illum ait Magnesiae morbo mortuum neque negat fuisse famam, venenum sua sponte sumpsisse, cum se, quae regi de Graecia opprimenda pollicitus esset, prae stare posse desperaret. idem ossa eis clam in Attica ab amicis sepulta, quoniam legibus non concederetur, quod proditionis esset damnatus, memoriae prodidit.

T201 (Thrasybulus, 1, 5): nam cum triginta tyranni praespositi a Lacedaemoniiis servitate oppressas tenerent Athenas, plurimos cives, quibus in bello parserat fortuna, partim patria expulissent partim interfecissent, plurimorum bona publicata inter se divisissent, non solum princeps, sed etiam solus initio bellum iis indixit.

T202 (Thrasybulus, 2, 1): hic enim cum Phylen confugis-
set, quod est castellum in Attica munitissimum, non plus habuit secum triginta de suis.

T203 (Thrasybulus, 2, 5): hinc in Piraeum transiit Munichiamque munivit. hanc bis tyranni oppugnare sunt adorti, ab eaque turpiter repulsi protinus in urbem armis impedimentisque amissis refugerunt.

T204 (Thrasybulus, 2, 7): in secundo proelio cecidit Critias, dux tyrannorum, cum quidem adversus Thrasybulum fortissime pugnaret.

T205 (Thrasybulus, 3, 2): praeclarum hoc quoque Thrasybuli; quod reconciliata pace, cum plurimum in civitate posset, legem tulit, ne quis ante actarum rerum accusaretur neve multaretur, eamque illi oblivionis appellarunt.

PAROEMIA


PHERERKATES

T207 (Frg. 151 Kock):

toῖς δέκα ταλάντοις προστίθεις, ἔφη, ἄλλ' ἄτατα πευτὴκοντα.
PHILOCHOROS

T208 (Frg. 30 = Jacoby, III B, pp. 107-108): μόνος δὲ οἱ περίβολος ἐκ τῶν ἀδέξων ἐξωστρατικήθη διὰ μοχθηρίων τρόπων, οὐ δὲ ὑποψίαν τυραννίδος· μετὰ τούτον δὲ κατελήθη τὸ ἔθος, ἀρξάμενον νομοθετήσαντος Κλεισθένεως, ὅτε τοὺς τυράννους κατέλυσεν, ὅπως συνεκβάλοι καὶ τοὺς φίλους αὐτῶν.

T209 (Frg. 150 = Jacoby, III B, p. 142): ξενικὸν ἐν Κορινθίωσ...συνεστήσατο δ' αὐτὸ πρῶτον Κόινων, παρέλαβε δ' αὐτὸ Ἰφικράτης στέρεστι καὶ Ἀδρίας· ὁ χρησάμενοι τὴν Δακεδαίμονις μόραν κατέκοψαν, στρατηγοῦτος αὐτῶς Ἰφικράτους καὶ Κάλλιου, καθά φησιν Ἀνδροτίδων τε καὶ Φιλοχορος.

PHOTIOS

T210 (Ἐρετρικῆς κατάλογος): ἐπὶ Δφίλου ἀρχοντος ἔγραψαν ψηφισμα τοὺς δήμους καταλέξαι ἐξ Ἐρετρικῶν πλουσιοτάτων.

T211 (Θουρικάντεις): τοὺς περὶ Δάμπουα· τὴν γὰρ εἶναι ἱσθμοῖς ἀποίκιαν οἱ μὲν Δάμπουι ἀνατεθέσιην· οἱ δὲ ξενοκρῖτως· οἱ δὲ τῶν Ἑλληνικῶν Διονυσίων...οἱ δὲ Πλησίππων ἀθηναίων.

T212 (Διακόπτουν): ξέρειν ἄρτησεν ἐν τῇ περὶ Σαλαμίνης ναυμαχίας φεύγειν ἐξ Ἀθηνῶν·

T213 (Δυνάμοδας): Ἀριστοφάνης Λυσίστράτη τοὺς
προς Ἱππίαν ἀγωνισάμενον ἐπὶ Δειψυδρῆς, ὡς γενναίους·
ἐλαθοῦν γὰρ τοὺς δορυφόρους τῶν τυράννων διὰ τὸ κατειλεῖθαι
dέρμασι τοὺς πόδας, καὶ λυκόποδας εἶναι· ἢ διὰ τὸ λύκον
ἑχειν ἐπίσημον ἐπὶ ταῖς ἀσπίσιν ἀπὸ Διονυσίου πρῶτοι.

Τ214 (Ὀπίσθιονος): Ἀδροσθένης ἐν τῷ περὶ Συντάξι-
ης· ἀνεώχων δὴν πρωίνη τινῆς τῶν ὅπισθιοινος· ἐκαλεῖτο δὲ
οὕτως ὁ ὅπισθηνος τοῦ νεό τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς οἰκος, ἐν δὲ ἀκτιθευτο
τὰ χρήματα.

Τ215 (Πῆλαι): Πῆλαι μὲν καλοῦνται οἱ θερμοκλαί·
ἐκλήθησαν δὲ οὕτως, διὰ τὸ στενῆν εἶναι ταύτην εἰσόδου ἀπὸ
θεττάλιος εἰς τὴν Φωκίδα πορευομένοις·

Τ216 (Πάραλος καὶ Σαλαμίνα, πρ. 675–676): ταῦτα
τὰς τρίτας εἶχον διὰ παντὸς πρὸς τὰς ἐπειγοθοῦς ὑπηρεσίας
ἐφ' αἷς καὶ ταύτας τινὲς ἐχειροτονοῦσι· ἐχρῶντο δὲ ἀτοιχιζαί,
εἰ δὲ οἱ στρατηγοὶ μεταπέμφασαν κρίθησομενον, ἀπὸ τ' Ἀλκι-
βιάθου.

PINDAR

Τ217 (Pythian, IV, 5–6): ... Ἀπόλλωνος τυχόν του ἑρεα
χρήσειν οἰκιστήρα Βάττον καρποφόρου Λιβάθας, ...

Τ218 (Pythian, IV, 10): ἐβδόμα καὶ σὺν δεκάτα γενεὰς θη-
ραίον ...

Τ219 (Pythian, IV, 43–45); εἰ γὰρ οἷ-
κοι τῶν βάλε πάρ χεδών Ἁίδης στόμα,
Ταῖναρον εἰς ἑραν Ἐβδομος ἔλθεν,
341.

υδε ηπάρχου Ποσείδώνος ἀνάξ,

T220 (Pythian, V, 55-56):

ὁ Βάττου δ’ ἔκπεται παλαιῶς ὁλβὸς ἔμμα τα καὶ τα νέμων. πάγγοις ἀστεοὶ ὅμμα τε φανερώτατον ἔμμα.

T221 (Pythian, V, 87-88):

tοῦτο εἰ Ἀριστοτέλης ἀγαθον ναυσὶ θοοῖς ἀλβε βαθεῖαν κέλευθον ἀνοίγων.

T222 (Pythian, V, 93-95):

ἐνθα πρῶς

μονὴ ἀγοράς ἐπὶ δίκα κεῖται θανῶν μάκαρ μὲν ἀνδρῶν μέτα ἐναιέν, ἀριστε ἔπειτα λασσεβής.

T223 (Schol. Pythian, IV, 76):

εἰ γαρ οἰκοι νυν βάλει: εἰ γαρ δὴ οὕτου, τὴν βόλου, ἐν τοῖς οὐντοί οἰκοις ἡγαγε παρὰ τὸ χθὲν αὐν τοῦ Ἀιδοῦ στῆμα εἰς τὴν ἱερὰν Ταυναρον παραγεγονέσθε, ἐκ δὲ τοῦτος εἰς Λακεδαιμονα ἐκθέν, ὁ τούτο ἱππικοῦ Ποσείδώνος υδέα. Ταυναρος δὲ πόλεις Δακωνική, εἰς Ἡ καὶ πολῇ ἐστὶν εἰς Ἀιδοῦ.

PLATO

T224 (Laws, 776a):

ἐλάττω δὲ ἢ τε Ἡραμπλεώτων δούλεια τῆς τῶν Μαριανίνων καταδουλώσεως ἔριν ἅν ἔχοι, ἃ τὸ δὲ τοῦ πενετσίλου ἐκθορό...
T225 (Schol. Symposium, 208d): χρόνυς δὲ θυτέρον γενομένης τοῦ Βοιωτῶν ἀμφιβολήθησεν πρὸς Ἀθηναίους, ὡς μὲν τινες, περὶ Οἰνῆς καὶ Πανάκτου, ὡς δὲ τινες, περὶ Μελανίδων, καὶ τῶν Βοιωτῶν ἀξιοδοτῶν τοὺς βασιλέας προκειμένως τιμήσας. ἐνάνθεος μὲν ὁ τῶν Βοιωτῶν βασιλεὺς ὑποδέχεται, θυμότης δὲ ὁ τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἀρνεῖται, λέγων τῷ δευτερομένῳ μουσομάχειν τῇ ἀρχῇ παραχωρεῖν. Μελανίδος δὲ ὑποστάτα τοῦ κίνδυνον ἐπὶ τὸ βασιλεύσαι τῶν Ἀθηναίων αὐτῶν καὶ τοῖς ἐξ αὐτῶν, ἀπλισθημένος προῆι, καὶ πλησίον τοῦ Ἐαυθίου γενόμενον εἶπεν ἡ ἡγέτης, ὡς ἔλθε, οὐ γὰρ ἔτερο ἐπὶ ἔμε ἐκακομενος καὶ οὐ μονοστός, ὡς ὑμολογητό. ἔνανθεος δὲ ταῦτα ἀκοθήσας μετεστράφη, θεδασαθαὶ βουλόμενος εἰς τῷ αὐτῷ ἐπικτημένης καὶ μετασταθέντα βαλὼν αὐτῶν ἀπέκτηυεν, καὶ βασιλεὺς τῆς Ἀττικῆς ἐγένετο. ὡς τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις κρατήσας τῆς χώρας ἐδοξεῖν ἐστὶν ἀγεῖν, ὡς ἐπὶ τῷ πάλαι μὲν Ἀπατεόρια θυτέρων ἐκ τῆς Ἀπατοβρία ἐκείλον. Πάντως ἀπὸ τῆς γενομένης ὀπάτης.

T226 (Schol. Timaeus, 21b): Ἀπατεόρια ἐστὶν Ἀθηναίων εἰς Διδύμων, ἐκ τοῦτο. Μελανίδος ἀντὶ θυμοῦντο τοῦ βασιλέως Ἀθηναίων Ἐαυθίου μονομάχων τῷ Βοιωτῷ ὀπατήσας αὐτῶν εἰπὼν: "παρὰ τὴν ὁμολογίαν, ὡς ἔλθε, δεδεστερος ἢκεῖαν." τοῦ δὲ Ἐαυθίου ἐπιστραφέντας ἦν ἔσος τῶν δεδεστερῶν, αὐτῶν μὲν μὴν ἴδετεν ἐτέος, Μελάνινθον δὲ τοῦτον ἐπὶ ἐπιδρομῆς ἀνελεῖν, καὶ οὕτως ἡ ὀπάτης νικήσα Ἀθηναίους, ὑπὲρ Ὁλυνῆς πολεμοῦντας Βοιωτῶς. ἑιρτατοὺς δὲ ἠμέρᾳ τρεῖς, ὡς ἦν ἐκαλεῖτο ἀνάρρυσθη. τὰ γὰρ θῆματα λέγεται ἀναρρύματα παρὰ τὸν
ἀνω ἐρυθμενα θεσοθαι· καὶ γὰρ ἐν ταθη πολλὰ ἔθετο· ἢ δὲ β’ δορπία, καθ’ ἣν εὐνυχίαι καὶ δεῖκνα πολλά, ἢ δὲ γ’ κομρεὶτες· ἐν ταθη γὰρ τοῦ ποδοῦ ἐνέγαρποι εἰς τοὺς φράτερας, τριτεῖς ή τετρατεῖς ὑπτας. ἐν ἦ καὶ τῶν παιδῶν οἱ ἐντρεχέστεροι ποιήματα ἀττα ἦδον, τὰ τῶν παλαιῶν ῥαψυ- δοὺτες.

PLATO COMICUS

T227 (Frgs. 166-167 Kock):

εὐποιεῖτα, ὡς δύσποτα.

Β. τί δ’ ἔστι; Α. βουλεθεὶν ὄλγου ἱλαχες πάνεν.

ἀταρ οὐ λαχων οἷς ἐλαχες, ἴν νοῦν ἔχησ.

Β. πῶς ἦν ἔχω νοῦν; Α. δι’ ποιηρὶ καὶ εἶνης

ἐπέλαξες ἀνδρὶ, οὐθέπι πάρ ἐλευθέρω.

Τ228 (Frg. 169 Kock):

καὶ τοσοῦτον εὐποιεῖς ἵπποιλαυχ’ ἵπποβολος,

ὡς ταθεῖτα ἐστὶ.

Τ229 (Frg. 185 Kock):

λαβοῦ λαβοῦ τῆς χειρᾶς ὡς τάχιστα μου·

μέλλω στρατηγῷ χειροτονεῖν Ἀργηρίου

προσίσταται μου πρὸς τὸ βῆμα μπουτίλη
POLYAINOS

T230 (I, 19): ΜΕΛΑΝΘΟΣ; 'Αθηναίων στρατηγὸς ἦν Μέλανθος, Βοιωτῶν Ξάνθως. Ἐπολέμουμεν Μελανθῶν πέρι· Μελανθών ημών μεθρίων "Αττικῆς καὶ Βοιωτίας. ὁ θεὸς ἔχρησεν·

τῷ ἐδρασεῖ τεθέσει ὁ μέλας φόνον ἔσχε Μελανθῶς·

τὸν λογίον τὸ θραύσαν ἀποβαίνει τῇ δε. ὁ στρατηγὸς οὐκ ἦν ἐν τῇ νίκῃ πέρι, καὶ συνιότατῳ ὁ Μέλανθος ἔφη "καὶ μὴν ἄδικείς δεύτερος ἰὼν ἐπὶ τὴν μάχην! ὁ Ξάνθως ἐπεστράφη τὸν δεύτερον ὕψισμον καὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ Μελανθοῦ τῷ ξυστῷ διελαθεῖς ἀνηρεθή. "Αθηναῖοι τῷ στρατηγῷ πατήσατε ἐν τῇ νίκῃ κατεστῆσαι, ἢν γε ἡ κληρονομία ἀπατοβρία.

T231 (I, 21, 3): ΠΕΙΣΙΣΤΡΑΤΟΣ; Πεισιστράτου Μεγαλείς διεξελεξατο, καὶ ἢν ὁ Μεγαλης ὑπὲρ τῶν πλουσίων τεταρ-

μένου, ὁ δὲ Πεισιστράτος ὑπὲρ τῶν πειρήτων... ὁ δὲ θήμων... ἐς φυλακὴν τοῦ σωματος ἐξάκιν αὐτῷ τριακοσίους φύλακας, οἴς ἐρυθροῦς χρυσομέμενοι αὐτὸς τε πεβάνον Ἀθηναίων ἐγένετο καὶ τοῖς παισὶ τὴν τυραννίδα κατέλησεν.

T232 (I, 30, 1): ΘΕΜΙΣΤΟΚΛΗΣ; Ἀθηναίοις ὁ θεὸς ἔχρησεν

ὡς θεὶς Σαλαμίδα, ἀπολείσθας δὲ σὺ τέκνα γυναικῶν.

Θεμιστοκλῆς Ἀθηναίων τὸ λόγιον δεδίδον "τα γε τῶν πολέμων ὑποτάσσετε," ἔφη· "οὐ γὰρ ἂν θεὶς τὴν Σαλαμίνα ὁ θεὸς ἀνηγόρευσεν, εἰ ἐμελλεὶς ἀπολλέσθαι τὰ τέκνα τῶν Ἐλλήνων." τοῦτο λεγένθιν ἡμῶν Ἀθηναίοις ἐδωκε, καὶ ἡ νίκη τὴν ἐξήγησιν ἐπιστάσατο.

T233 (I, 30, 4): οἱ Ἐλληνες νικήσαντες ἐν Σαλα-
μὴν βουλευονται πλείων ἐφ᾽ Ἑλλησκούσων καὶ τὸ ζεύγμα λειν, ἵνα βασιλεὺς μὴ φύγῃ. Θεμιστοκλῆς ἀντιβουλευεται λέγων ἃς βασιλεὺς ἀποληπθεῖαι ἀναμαχεῖται τἀχα πολλάκις δὲ ἀπόνοια διδώσεις, ὅσα μὴ ἔδωκεν ἀνδρείας πεμπεῖ δὴ πάλιν ὡς βασιλέα εὐνοῦχον ἄλλον Ἀρδάκην ὑπτωμί προαγορεύοντα· εἰ μὴ φυγοὶ διὰ τάχους, ἡ γέφυρα τοῦ Ἑλλησπόντου διαλεῖται. βασιλεὺς ἔδεισε καὶ φθάσας τῷ Ἑλληνικῷ διέβη τὸ ζεύγμα καὶ φυγὼν ἤχετο· Θεμιστοκλῆς δὲ τοῖς Ἑλλησποντίοις ἐπὶ τὴν ὕκηρα ἀνηθεῖον.

T234 (I, 39, 1): ΝΙΚΙΑΣ: Νικίας, ἐπιπλέσσας τῇ Κορινθίᾳ υπκτωρ, ένθα ὁ Σωλλυθης λόφος, ἀποβιβάζεις Ἀθηναίων ὁπλίτας χίλιους καὶ ἄλλους ἄλλαχθι λοχῆσαι τάχας ἀπέπλευσεν· ἐπὶ δὲ ὑπηγγαζεν ἔσω, πάλιν αὐτός ἐπέπλευσεν. οи μὲν Κορινθεῖοι σκουδὴ ἐκβολθοῦντες ἔδευον, καλύσσοντες ἐκβαίνειν· οι δὲ ἐν ταῖς ἐνέδρασι ἐξανιστάμενοι τοὺς πλείστους αὐτῶν διέφαεραν.

POLYZELOS

T235 (Frg. 5 Kock): Πολύζηλος δὲ ἐν τῷ Δημο- τυνδάρει Φρυγα αὐτών (Ὑπέρβολον) εἶναι εἰς ψο βάρβαρον σκάπτων φησὶ.

QUINTILIAN

T236 (I, 66): tragoedias primus in lucem Aeschylus protulit, sublimis et gravis et grandilocus saepe usque ad
vitium, sed rudis in plerisque et incompositus: propter quod
correctas eius fabulas in certamen deferre posterioribus poetis
Athenienses permisere. suntque eo modo multi coronati.

STEPHANOS BYZANTINOS

T237 ('Artemision): polis Oinwtrwn en mesogeia,
'Emataios Eubobas...estis kai polis Euboeas.
T238 (Salamis): h prds th 'Attikh vesve kai polis,
o polithe Salaminios kai Salamynes.

T239 (Tetraklidas th 'Attikhs): exousa demous kai
polis tettaras, Oinoph Proboalithon Trikouruntho Marabvna.
'Anbrotlw de Tetraklidha phsi dia tov th. ayt prsteron
ekaleito 'Yttvna.

S(O)UIDAS

T240 ('Aegleos): 'Athnaiois de o theos ta mev prta
xrmvenois aevle fegyin: liparosi de exhse teixos Tritot-
genei zhlwv didoi eubobai Zevs mothn epoerhtov telthein,
to the tenva t'ounhes. mou de o y' ipposunh te mevein kai
pezh idnta pollew ap' hepirou stratdou pouxo, all' ipo-
chorein w'ton epistrephas. ep tov poti pantos essh. o theia
Salamis, apolete de o tenva yunivkwn hpon skidnemhth hpmhn-
teres h syvioshs. tauta exeghseato thmstoklhs o Neokleous,
de evleuthoristtta apenphrhai, teixos mev zhlwv ths nath
eihnon. thn de Salamynva theian obh anv ovmasein thn theon, ei
τα τέκνα των Ἑλλήνων ἐμελλεν ἀπολέσειν. συνεβολεύσε
δὲ περὶ τὴν Σαλαμίνα γαμαχῆσαι, καὶ σφᾶς ἐκλῆθη διὰ τοῦτο καὶ στρατηγὸς ἀπεδέλθη.

Τ241 (Ἁπέσασε): οἱ δὲ ἐπαρτιάται ἐκάθεντο τοῦ
θεοῦ ἱερᾶ ἐν Ταίναρου καὶ ἰτοῦ σωτηρίαν. οἱ δὲ ἀπέσασαν
ἀφεῖδος καὶ μόλα ἀπέκτειναν αὐτοῖς.

Τ242 (Ἀρτεμίσια): αὕτη ἡρίστευσε κατὰ Περσῶν. δι᾽
ἥπειροι ἐπεὶ τὸ βασιλεία, ὥστε ὁ άνδρες γνωϊκες γεγονασιν, οἱ δὲ
γνωϊκες ἁνδρες.

Τ243 (Βάραθρον): τόπος βαθεῖα, ὡς τὸ κακοῦργοι
ἐμβάλλονται Ἀθηναίοι καὶ οἱ ἐπὶ θανάτῳ.

Τ244 (Βάττου σιλφίου): ἐκ τῶν σπανίους τιμᾶς
λαμβανόμενων. οἱ γὰρ Κυρηναῖοι ἐν τῶν Βάττων ἐξαίρετον
ἐδοσαν τὸ σιλφίον, καὶ τοῦ σωμάτωτος ἐκ μὲν θατέου Ἀμ-
μανα, ἐκ δὲ θατέου σιλφίου ἐπιζωσαν, οἴδε οὕτω Ἀρβνης Ἀμπελι-
ῶτας εἰς δελφοὺς ἀνέθεσαν κανοῦν σιλφίου.

Τ245 (Βρασίδας, ὁ Τέλλιδος): Ἀκαδαιμονίας στρατη-
γῶς, κεκλίθην ἄποστάσαν πρὸς Ἀθηναίοις πολεμήσας ἀνεκαλέσατο.
ἡρίστευες δὲ καὶ περὶ Πιλῶν στρατηγῶν, ἐπὶ τοῦτοις
σκοπᾶν ἐκέντοτο ἐνιαχῆσαι, ἀς Ἀθηναίοι λείπων ἱράτωτο. περὶ
δὲ Ἀμφικολίας καὶ ἐρήμην ἐσφυγμόν κατέσφεντο ἄντοιχ
Ἀμφικολόν ἐπεγράφατο. δὲ σφᾶς ὁ μέχρι τῆς Βρασίδας καὶ
Κλέωνος τελευτὴς ἔτη ἐπέσχε δέκα. ἐκλῆθη δὲ Ἀρχιδάμιος.

Τ246 (Δάτια): Δάτια καὶ Ἀρταφέρης, Περσῶν καθ-
ημερῶν μετὰ τὴν καθαίρεσιν Μαρσυλίου ἀπέστειλαν εἰς τὴν
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Τ247 (Θερμόπολις): τόπος Ἀθῆνας οὕτω καλεόμενος ὑπὸ τῶν πλείστων Ἐλληνῶν, ὕπο δὲ τῶν ἐπιχωρίων περιοχῶν Πελαι.

Τ248 (῾Επαμένης): Ἀθηναῖος, θύτωρ, μαθητὴς Προδίκου τοῦ Κείου· ἐκείκελείτο Κόστορος, μελετᾶς ῥητορικάς καὶ ἄλλα τινά.

Τ249 (῾Επαμένης): Κείος, σοφιστής.

Τ250 (῾Ιππίας): οὖτος τής εἰς Ἀθηναίους ὅργῆς καὶ τῆς ὑστεροῦ ὁμότητος προΐσχετο αἰτίαν τὸν Ἰππαρχον φήσανθαντα. καὶ πικρῶς ἐκ τοῦ τῶν δεσπότης κἀκεῖ τοῦ χρόνου γενόμενος ὡμως οὐκ ἀπόφητον. ἠλασάν γοῦν οἱ Κεκροπίδαι αὐτὸν. δὲ ἐκ ξυλεῖ τῆς πατρίδος ἐπήγαγο τοὺς Πέρσας συμμάχους...·...ἄν μὲν οὖν οὗτος Ἰππίας ἐπὶ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ πατρίδα σὺν τοῖς Πέρσαις καὶ ἐκπλήττων τοὺς βαρβάρους μέγα ἑπταρε...ἐπει δὲ ἔτηνθαν ὄλοι βάρβαροι, φεύγων ἄθεος αἰς Δήμουν ἄφικεσθαι καὶ κάμνει νόσῳ...Ἀθηναίων στρατηγῶν. οὖτος Δαρείου παροξύναντο ἐπὶ τοὺς Ἀθηναίους στρατεύσαι καὶ τὴν Ἐλλάδα, διὰ Ἰνταφέρους καὶ Δαμίαν σατραπῶν καὶ λ’ μυρίάδων στρατοῦ, καὶ αὐτὸς σὺν αὐτοῖς κατηθὶς γηραιὰς ἥδη ὄν. καὶ ἔλεβαντες ἐσαγημένους μὲν Ἐφετριαν καὶ τοὺς ληφθέντας τῷ βασιλεῖ ἐστειλαν...ἐντεύθεν ἐπὶ Μαραθώνα ἠλθοῦν. Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ ὑπὸ μεγίστῃ στρατηγοῦμενοι τῷ Κιλικίῳ τοῖς βαρβάροις ἐπολέμων.
349.

ησαν. ἀκάλουν δὲ ἐπὶ συμμαχίας καὶ Δακεδαίμονίους διὰ Φιλιπ-πίδου τοῦ ἡμεροβίου, δὲ τοὺς χιλίους καὶ πεντακοσίους σταδίους ἤπνεσε διὰ μίας νυκτὸς. καὶ ὅτι ὁ νόμος οὗκ εἶναι στρατεύειν αὐτοὺς πρὸ παρασήμου, καὶ παρηγήσαντο.... οἱ δὲ Ἀθηναῖοι, συμβουλεύσαντος ἐνδὲ, ἂςαν γὰρ δέκα, περι-μεῖναι τοὺς Δακεδαίμονίους, μιλησάν ἔνδοροφυτώς ἐξ-ιέναι καὶ Καλλιμάχου, ἐξῆλθον αὐτοὶ μὲν ὄντες ὧθεν, Πλαταί-έος ἔχοντες. Καὶ ἐν αὕτη φασὶ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ εὐλικτᾷ. ἐν τούτωι Καλλιμάχου ἐπὶ δορπάτων εἰστήκη οὐκρόθεν, Πολυ-ζήλου δὲ πηρωθείς, ὡς φάσμα θεασάμενος τῷ πάγω κρήτου τὴν ἀσπίδα... ἐμάχετο ὡς ὀρῶν, καὶ διέκρινε τῇ φωνῇ τοῦς ἱδίους καὶ τοὺς πολεμίους.

Τ251 (Πενεσταί): οἱ παρὰ Θεσσαλῶν μὴ γόνυ
δούλοι, υπὸ τῶν ὑπὸ Δίμουνος ἐν Ἄρης νικηθέντων Βοιωτῶν,
οὐ φυγόντων τὴν παρ᾽ αὐτῶν δουλείαν, ἀλλὰ μεινάντων μέχρι
tῆς τρίτης γενέσεως, φιληδονηθέντων ἐπὶ τῇ χώρᾳ. παρέδωσαν δὲ
αὐτούς ἐφ᾽ ὡρκῷ, ἐπὶ τῷ μήτε παθεῖν τι ἐργαζόμενοι, μήτε
ἐκβῆναι ἀπὸ τῆς χώρας. καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ μείναι Πενεσταί καλοδ-
μενοί δόστεροι Πενεσταί μετανο玛θῆσαν, παραφθαρέως τοῦ
χαρακτῆρος. οὐς ἐν Δακεδαίμονι καλοδιών Εἰλωταῖς, τοῖσον
θέτταλοι Πενεσταί λέγοντες. χρώται δὲ τῷ οὐδομαί καὶ
θέτταλοι καὶ Δακεδαιμόνιοι ἐπὶ τῶν κρατηθέντων ἐν τῷ πολ-
εμῷ καὶ δουλευόντως τοῖς κεκρατηκότις.
T252 (Euthyrias): ὁ Ὑπὸ τῆς ἐλεφαντινῆς Ἀθηνᾶς, ἢν Ἐυδίκας ἔκοψαν, ἐκ τοῦ ἀναλόμου ταχεῖα δὴ Περικλῆς καὶ
νοσφισιάμενος ν’ τάλαντα, ἔνα μῆ δὴ τὰς εὐθύνας, τὸν πόλεμον ἐκίνησεν.

SCHOLIA TO THEOKRITOS

T253 (Idyll., 16, 35): πενέστατι, θέσπομήθεν
φησὶ τοῖς δουλευοτας τῶν ἐλευθέρων Πενέστας καλεῖσθαι παρὰ
θεσσαλοῖς, ἀς παρὰ Δακεδαιμονίοις Εἴλωτας. — ... ήγον ὁρο-
φῆν κατὰ μῆνα ἔλαβον ἐν μέτρῳ οἱ πένητες.

VALERIUS MAXIMUS

T254 (III, 8, 3): universa civitas Atheniensium
iniquissimo ac truculentissimo furore instincta de capite decem
praetorum, qui apud Arginussas Lacedaemoniam classem deleuerant,
tristem sententiam tulerat. forte tunc eius potestatis Socrates,
cuius arbitrio plebei scita ordinarentur, indignum iudicantis tot
et tam bene meritos [et, indigna causa impetu invidiae abripi,
temeritati multitudinis constantiam suam obiecit maximoque
contionis fragore et incitatissimis minis compulsus non est ut
se publicae dementiae auctorem ascriberet.

T255 (VIII, 7, 15): quam porro industrius Themistoc-
cles, qui maximarum rerum cura districtus, omnium tamen civium suor-
rum nomina memoria comprehendit per summamque iniquitatem patria
pulsus et ad Xerxem, quem paulo ante devicerat, confugere coactus,
prior quam in conspectum eius veniret, Persico sermone se adsuefecit, ut labore parta commendatione regis auribus familiarem et adsuetum sonum vocis adhiberet.

SCHOLIA TO VERGIL

T256 (Georgs., IV, 467): Taenarias etiam fauces, Taenaros est Laconices litus, in quo specus est, per quem Hercules existimatur descendisse ad Inferos et Orpheus

ZENOBIOS

T257 (IV, 94, Gaisford): Διμήθη Μηλίφι παροιμία εκεί Ἀθηναίοι εἰκάκωσαν Μηλίους πολιορκοῦσες ἐν λιμῷ, ὡς θουκυδίδης ἐν τῇ Σ.

T258 (V, 80, Gaisford): Πάλαι ποτ' ἦσαν ἄλκιμοι Μιλήσιοι, φασὶ τοὺς Κάρας πολεμοῦμένους ὑπὸ Δαρείου τοῦ Πέρσου, κατὰ τινα παλαιάν μαντείαν εἰρημένην αὕτοις τοὺς ἄλκιμωτάτους προσθέσας συμμάχους, ἐλθεῖν εἰς Βραχίδας, καὶ τὸν ἑκατ' θεοῦ ἔρωτιν, εἰ Μιλήσιοι πρόσθεοντο συμμάχους τὸν δὲ ἀποκρίνασθαι,

πάλαι ποτ' ἦσαν ἄλκιμοι Μιλήσιοι.

οὕτως δὲ στίχος εἰρηται τὸ πρῶτον παρὰ Ἀνακρέοντι, ὅς ἤκμασε μάλιστα κατὰ Κῦρον τὸν Πέρσην, τρίτος δὲ ἐστιν ἀπὸ Κῦρου Δαρείου.
APPENDIX 2

THE SCHOLIASTS' USE OF THUCYDIDES

Of all prose writers Thucydides is most frequently quoted or appealed to by the scholiasts both for historical fact and for the use of unfamiliar words and forms. In general, Thucydides is named when information has been drawn from his work, but there are a few notes in which the phrasing indicates that the original source is Thucydides although his name is omitted.

Attributions to Thucydides are readily made with the usual phrases ὡς φησι Θουκυδίδης or φησι Θουκυδίδης

---

1 For Thucydides as grammatical authority see schol. Plutus, 72 and 445; schol. Equites, 762; schol. Acharnenses, 12.

2 E.g., schol. Equites, 445 (pp. 71-72): the assassins of Kylon's followers are called ἑυγατίς by other writers, ἀλτήριοι by Thucydides and the scholiasts; schol. Lysistrata, 173 (p. 184) reports the decision not to use the moneys in the temple, μὴ τὰ χρήματα κινεῖν a phrase which Thucydides alone uses in this context, with reference to the sacred monies of Athene; schol. Pax, 681(above, p. 224) explains, in terms that both paraphrase and copy Thucydides, the reason for Hyperbolos' ostracism.
or ὡς ὗμουσίως (sometimes to support other accounts)² twice to refute some other version⁴). Once, in a note without citation, the scholiasts prefer a version other than Thucydides¹. In several scholia Thucydides alone is cited without reference to other versions.⁶

---

² E.g., schol. Ranee, 541 (above, pp. 251-252); schol. Vaspae, 502 (above, p. 78).

⁴ Schol. Acharnenses, 145 (above, pp. 177-178); schol. Equites, 84 (above, pp. 111-113).

⁵ Schol. Lysistrata, 619 (above, p. 79): the sons of Peisistratos; Herodotos and Thucydides know three, Aristotle and the scholiasts four.

⁶ Schol. Fax, 990 (Thucydides II, 19, 2; 20, 1-5 and 21, 2); schol. Fax, 270 (Thucydides, V, 16, 1); schol. Fax, 242 (Thucydides, VII, 18 and VIII, 95); schol. Ranee, 541 on pp. 251-252 above (Thucydides, III, 33, 1-2); schol. Aves, 186 on p. 230 above (Thucydides, V, 84-116); schol. Lysistrata, 1094 on p. 233 above (Thucydides, VI, 27-28); schol. Acharnenses, 270 on p. 236 above (Thucydides, VI, 8, 2); schol. Aves, 147 on p. 235 above (Thucydides, III, 33, 1 and VI, 53, 1); schol. Fax, 482 on pp. 205-206 above (Thucydides, II, 31, 1 and 31, 3); schol. Aves, 1569 (Thucydides, VIII, 86, 9); schol. Aves, 556 on pp. 134-135 above (Thucydides, I, 112).
A scholion to Παξ, 212 uses Thucydides' opening phrase (I, 1, 1) to prove that the historian blamed the Peloponnesians for starting the war. Schol. Αχαρνήσεις, 1 compares the introduction of Thucydides' history (I, 1, 2) to the beginning of Αχαρνήσεις to show that the playwright and the historian agreed about the importance of the Peloponnesian War.

Besides the scholia which refer indirectly to Thucydides there are several notes that include excerpts from his work. The scholiasts' excerpts frequently differ from the book-text and it seems most convenient to append here each scholion with its variants for comparison with the book-text.

Schol. Νυμφε, 984 in V (pp. 69-70 above) I, 63

\[
\text{ομίττιτ} \hspace{1cm} \text{διὰ τὸ ἄροδιστον}
\]

\[
\text{ἐν ἔροσι} \hspace{1cm} \text{ἐνεροσὶ}
\]

\[
\text{κράβηλων} \hspace{1cm} \text{κράβυλων}
\]

The omission is perhaps due to careless transcription. ἐν ἔροσι or ἐνεροσὶ fits without altering the sense of the passage (the scribe, while in error, is "inadvertently correct"). Codices Monacensis (G) and Palatinus (E) of Thucydides have ἐν ἔροσι; according to Powell, in the Praefatio of the Oxford text of Thucydides (p. iii): \textit{lectio codicium CGM fere semper praestat...nonnullis in locis lectionem unice}.
veram in libris GM exstare.... Codex denique Palatinus est ubi ceteris accuratius exaratus sit.... G belongs to the better tradition, E to the inferior; occasionally both agree on a reading where other mss. differ. Where the reading makes sense, it is dangerous to deny that it may be correct. χρωβήλων is probably a scribal error; there are several genitive plural endings in the passage and the copyist may have added another.

Schol. Aves, 484 in R and V (p. 127 above) I, 109

Μεγάβαζος
πολλῆς στρατιᾶς
ηλασε
Μεγάβυζος
στρατιᾶς πολλῆς
ἐξῆλασε

Both Megabazos and Megabyzos were Persians, active at the time of the Egyptian revolt, and their names were so similar that any scribe might easily have confused them. Some of the codices of Aristophanes have the same error (see above, pp. 129-131). The other variants can be attributed to miscopying.

Schol. Equites, 562 in R and V (pp. 178-179 above) II, ΜΘ, 3

νάυς ὅτ' ἐπὶ καλ τεσσαράκοντα νάυς

No conclusion can be drawn from errors in numbers.
Schol. Plutus, 1193 in R and V (pp. 182-183 above)

αιὲν πότε
περιεγένετο
ἐπαυηλώθη

ἐτι τότε
μυρια ἐγένετο
ἀπαυηλώθη

For a full discussion see above, pp. 183-184 and for full argument concerning the variants see A.T.L. III, pp. 128-132. Both versions make sense textually but the meanings differ significantly. On the evidence of inscriptions and on the basis of linguistic argument Keritt, Wade-Gery and McGregor argue that the scholiast is correct against the book-text, historically and perhaps palaeographically. The excerpt derives from a text of Thucydides current before corruption or the influence of Ephoros altered the book-text.

Schol. Παξ, 479 in V (pp. 212-213 above)

μὲν οὖν θέλουτες ἐξυφαιροῦ-
οὖν ηθελον, εὖ
μένοις

φερόμενοι

The scholiasts' reading οὖν is contained also in codices Monacensis (G) and Palatinus (Ε) of Thucydides. The meaningless ἐξυφαιρομένοι has no syntactical relation to the passage and is a blunder that may have developed through inability to read uncials or through scribal ignorance, i.e., some
one copied words and paid no attention to meaning.

Schol. Pax, 479 in R and V (pp. 212-213) IV, 117

ἐὼς ὅτε

ἐὼς is used interchangably with ὃς in late Greek; ἐὼς ὅτε is not uncommon in Xenophon. But the meaning which each phrase gives to the passage differs greatly; we might assume a different recension of Ἰθυκυδίδης, or, again, a scribe who copied mechanically.

Schol. Equites, 793 in R and V (p. 176) V, 16

ἐπειδὴ καὶ ἐγένετο τεθηκεῖ ἀμφότεροι εὐτυχίας τε νομίζων εἶναι ἀξιοπιστότερος

ἐπειδὴ δὲ καὶ ἐγεγένητο ἔτεθηκεῖ ἀμφότερων ἡσυχίας νομίζων ἄν εἶναι ἀπιστότερος

Most of the variants are mere errors; omission of δὲ, use of the more familiar ἐγένετο (by lectio facilior), omission of the augment, use of the familiar ἀμφότεροι with a resulting slight change in the meaning of the passage; εὐτυχίας is probably a transfer from ἐυτυχεῖν a few words earlier in the line; ἄν may have been omitted because of similarity of
ending in νομίζων ἀν; ἀξιοποιητέρος ("plausible") does not
fit the context of the passage. Again the fault is apparently
scribal.

Schol. Fαx, 450 in V (p. 232 above)          VI, 12
εκπλεῖν ὑμῖν
ταῦτοι μόλις
ἔτι ὅν
διὰ πολυτέλειαν
ἀφελθῇ
ἀρχῆς δὲ
παράσχητε
ἀπολαμβρύνεσθαι

ὑμῖν εκπλεῖν
tὸ ἐαυτοῦ μόνον
dὲ ἔτι
dιὰ δὲ πολυτέλειαν
ἀφελθῇ τι
ἀρχῆς μὴ
dιμακράσχητε
elsαμαμμένεσθαι

ἔτι ὅν is also in codices ABEF of Thucydidnes. Omission and
error may account for διὰ πολυτέλειαν, ἐκπλεῖν ὑμῖν, ἀφελθῇ,
ἀρχῆς δὲ, παράσχητε. μόλις is meaningless here; ἀπολαμβρυ-
νεσθαι ("to become famous") for ἔλλαμπρυνεσθαι ("to be
splendid", "to boast oneself") is an easy mistake.

Schol. Fαx, 450 in V (p. 232)                  VI, 16
προσήκουν
μᾶλλον...ἐτέρων
ἀξιός

προσήκει
μᾶλλον ἐτέρων
ἀξιός ἄμα

προσήκουν may be a misreading with resultant change of the
passage copied. The omission of ἄμα is careless. Perhaps
the copyist inserted ἐτέρων haphazardly when he found that
it had been omitted.

Schol. Plutus, 469 in V

καὶ εἰ μὲν
καὶ ἂν μὲν

This may be a "correction."

Schol. Acharnenses, 1 in V

αὕτη δὴ μεγίστη
αὕτη μεγίστη δὴ

The displacement stems from the homoeteleuton.

Schol. Acharnenses, 394 in V

καὶ πολεμητέα τοῖς Ἀθηναῖοι  
καὶ πολεμητέα εἶναι ἐν

I suggest that the scholiasts are here giving a paraphrase of Thucydides, in the historian's words, which Dindorf has mistakenly printed as a direct quotation.

Many of the variants, clearly, are the product of carelessness and can be paralleled in any classical author.

Schol. Plutus, 1193, might be evidence for an alternate recension of Thucydides, known as early as the fourth century. But there is also the probability that the variants we have noted, other than those in schol. Plutus, 1193, which are epigraphically supported and linguistically closer to Thucydides than the book-text, are the product of error. Where the scholiasts differ from the book-text, the variation is
usually results in a worse text; sometimes it makes no sense at all. The evidence suggests that the variants result not from a different recension but from scribal error or ignorance (i.e., mechanical copying). Where the variants have not altered the meaning the error is no less an error; the copyist has, inadvertently perhaps, retained the meaning of the passage despite the lateration.

The final answer cannot safely be given here, as it might be if we could trace the history of the commentary to Aristophanes further. All the scholia excerpting Thucydides are in codex Venetus and several are in codex Ravennatis; a better knowledge of the history of the two manuscripts might help to solve the problem of variants from the book-text.8

From this excursus there is one conclusion to be drawn. The scholiasts to Aristophanes knew and used Thucydides and trusted him as an authoritative source. The text

---

8 The arguments of those who postulate a second recension of Thucydides, known in the early part of the fourth century, seem to me to be without adequate foundation. The only evidence is the scholion to Plutus, 1193, and I do not feel that an earlier recension must be assumed to explain the correctness of the scholiasts' text (if it is correct) against the book-text. There is in the scholia to Aristophanes no other such occurrence.
from which their excerpts were drawn was, by and large, the book-text that we have; variants, in all but one case, are the result of miscopying, either by commentators or by scribes. The single case remains sub judice.
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