

UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI

May 23 1952

I hereby recommend that the thesis prepared under my supervision by Anne Evelyn Kingsbury
entitled The Historical Scholia to Aristophanes: An Evaluation

be accepted as fulfilling this part of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Approved by:

Malcolm F. H. H. H.

THE HISTORICAL SCHOLIA TO ARISTOPHANES
AN EVALUATION

A dissertation submitted to the
Graduate School of Arts and Sciences
of the University of Cincinnati
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

1952

by

Anne E. Kingsbury

A.B. Bryn Mawr College 1947

M.A. Bryn Mawr College 1948

CINCINNATI
UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY

SEP 2 1952

UMI Number: DP15853

INFORMATION TO USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleed-through, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

UMI[®]

UMI Microform DP15853

Copyright 2009 by ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

ProQuest LLC
789 E. Eisenhower Parkway
PO Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. The Problem and the Method.....	1
II. The Formation of the Commentary.....	6
III. The Manuscript Tradition.....	27
IV. Editions and Studies.....	44
V. Early History.....	49
VI. The Persian Wars and the Fifty Years.....	87
VII. The War Years.....	171
VIII. The Post-war Years.....	248
IX. Scholia and History.....	267
Appendices	
1. Testimonia.....	287
2. The Scholiasts' Use of Thucydides.....	352
Indices	
1. Index of Scholia Cited.....	364
2. Index of Proper Names.....	371
Bibliography and Abbreviations.....	395

29.9.52 cant

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.³ 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 excerptors. 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, Quaestiones ad scholia Aristophanea historica pertinentes (Diss., Halle, 1800); 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.¹ There is independent evidence that others studied the metre, prosody, prosopography, myths and historical allusions in Old Comedy.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

1

Aristophanes of Byzantion, Kallistratos, Aristarchos, Ammonios, Apollonios Rhodios, Apollonios Dyskolos, Chairis, Eratosthenes, Euphronios are quoted regularly.

2

Boudreaux, Le texte d'Aristophane et ses commentateurs, pp. 10-13, lists some of the early scholars who may have contributed to the commentary. White, 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.

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 comedies⁴ 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, 567, 588, 694, 790-791, 826, 1422; Acharnenses, 654; Vespae, 157, 213, 604, 675, 722, 804; Pax, 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.⁵

Hypomnemata to eight of the comedies were composed by Aristarchos as well as by Euphronios,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.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 οἱ κωμωδούμενοι, the first prosopography of comedy. Four notes mention the work.⁸ Although Chairis produced some sort of commentary to

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

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.

⁶ Hypomnemata are cited on Plutus, 385,1037; Ranae, 1248; Vespae, 544,968; Pax, 758; Aves, 283,556,1075,1242,1403.

⁷ His use of athetesis is noted on Ranae, 1437-1441.

⁸ On Vespae, 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 $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\ \kappa\omega\mu\omega\delta\iota\alpha\varsigma$ ¹² and he may have been Tzetzes' source. Identity of other Pergamene commentators is

9

On Ranae, 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, 1238, 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 Ranae, 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.¹³ His ability to deal with historical allusions appears to be far superior to that of Aristarchos.

Asklepiades of Myrleia, 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.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.¹⁵ Since

¹³

On Ranae, 78,124,308,970,990,1196; Vespae, 240; Aves, 1569; cf. Boudreaux, op. cit., pp. 82-83.

¹⁴

On Ranae, 1270,1276,1331,1344; Aves, 348,567; cf. Boudreaux, op. cit., pp. 86-88.

¹⁵

On Ranae, 55,223,611,849,1211,1282, 1284; no two concern the same subject. Timachidas appears to have

only one gloss recalls Apollodoros¹⁶ 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;¹⁷ the excerptors name him once.¹⁸ His was not the only work on tropes written in a period when the complexities of grammar, prosody and lexicography occupied 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.

¹⁶

On Ranae, 320; Apollodoros contributes a note about Diagoras of Melos.

¹⁷

White(op. cit., pp. xlii-xliii) and Rutherford(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 Dyskolos and Herodian; they are perhaps often given credit that belongs to Tryphon.

¹⁸

On 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.¹⁹ 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

19

Boudreaux, op. cit., pp. 96-111, is conservative in his attributions to Didymos. Schauenberg, De Symmachi in Aristophanis interpretatione subsidis, pp. 1-37, with Boudreaux, remarks upon the use of $\mu\eta\pi\sigma\tau\epsilon$ in the sense of "perhaps" by Didymos; Schneider, De veterum in Aristophanem scholiorum fontibus commentatio, p. 112, argues that Symmachos also uses $\mu\eta\pi\sigma\tau\epsilon$ 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' $\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\xi\iota\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\ \mu\eta\pi\sigma\tau\epsilon$. Suidas, in turn, quotes from Hesychios. Thus, argues Schnee, excerpts in the scholia, identical with Hesychios' definitions, may well come from Didymos' commentary.

after Christ; the scholia appeal to him twice to settle problems of syntax.²⁰ Seleukos, possibly the grammarian whom Suetonius²¹ places in Tiberius' court, is also called upon twice in this capacity.²² 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.²³

A fourth scholar of the late Roman period is Herodian, son and pupil of Apollonios Dyskolos. He is quoted mainly for accentuation and prosody.²⁴

Colometry of the text has been attributed to

²⁰ On Equites, 580; Pax, 778.

²¹ Tiberius, 56.

²² On Thesmophoriazusae, 840, 1175.

²³ Theodorus Priscianus, Euphoriston, 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;²⁵ 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 Ranae.²⁶ Aristophanes of Byzantion was probably the source used by Heliodoros and Hephaisteion.²⁷ 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; Pax, 1353; subscript to Nubes in codex V (see below pp. 25-26).

26

On Ranae, 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 semelia 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.²⁸

28

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 Phaeinos, Symmachos and ἄλλοι τινές are cited.²⁹ Symmachos we know as the compiler of the variorum. Phaeinos 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.³⁰ Didymos has been identified tentatively as one of the ἄλλοι τινές by modern scholars who believe that the excerptors drew from Didymos' variorum directly rather than through Symmachos. 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; Phaeinos 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 ἄλλοι.³¹ 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.³² Shorter excerpts were added as glosses.

³¹

Schnee, op. cit., pp. 34-36; Boudreaux, op. cit., pp. 181-184; White, op. cit., pp. lxvii-lxix.

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.³⁵ The work of Thomas

35

Hopfner, Sitzungsber. Ak. Wien, CLXXII, 3(1912), supplies the criteria for differentiation among the three annotators. Koster, Scholia in Aristophanis 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, Charakteria Alois Rzach zum achtzigsten Geburtstag dargebracht, pp. 58-85). Koster, Mnemosyne, LX(1933), pp. 113-134, replies to Holzinger and further criticises Hopfner. Aubreton, Démétrius Triklinios et les recensions médiévales de Sophocle, pp. 55-58, agrees fully with Hopfner. In another article, Holzinger argues that Triklinios was the author of a commentary on the

and Demetrios 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.

metres used in Pax (Holzinger, Sitzungsber. Ak. Wien, CCXVII, 4 (1939), p. 114.

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 vitiis 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 unquam 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 Urbino until 1482. It was used for the Juntine edition of Lysistrata and Thesmophoriazusaë, but disappeared thereafter until 1712. The catalogue at the library in Ravenna states: Codices mss. Pisani emti ac translati in Classensem Bibliothecam anno 1712 mense MaioAristophanis comoediae Grece 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 comoediae 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 mss. in the Laurentian library, called R a codex of the tenth century. Martin, Les scholies du manuscrit d'Aristophane à Ravenne, 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.⁵

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.⁶ In the thirteenth and fifteenth 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.⁷ It is often impossible

5

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."

6

Martin, op. cit., pp. 4-7.

7

No commentary was supplied for Equites, 216-1407; Aves, 239-394; Lysistrata, 376-404; and Pax, 1039-end.

to decide, without the aid of other manuscripts, where the join has been made between an inferior and a valuable note, particularly 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. Additions 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!"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.¹³

¹²

Allen, op. cit., pp. 14-15.

¹³

Cf. Allen, 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 (saec. XIII) contains seven comedies¹⁴ 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 C 222 (saec. 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."

¹⁴

Nubes, Ranae, Plutus, Equites, Vespae, Acharnenses

the fact that it contains the superscription: βίβλος ἀριστοφάνους, τζέτζην φορέουσ' ὑποφήτην In other words, it is the oldest manuscript extant with scholia by Tzetzes.

5. M: Ambrosianus L 39 (saec. 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, Vespae 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 (saeo. 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

¹⁷

Coulon, Hermes, XLV (1910), pp. 419-420, 426, 444-447. His opinion of the codex is favourable: "Dem Ambrosianus M ist mehr noch als dem Parisinus A unrecht getan worden....bei unsre Untersuchung,...die Lesarten von M und A zur Constituirung des Textes mit Consequenz herangezogen würden....Es ist nicht schlechthin an alle Codices, die jüngerem 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 heranreicht, einen getrübbteren 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.¹⁸ The Ecclesiazusae has scanty notes, while there is a full commentary to Acharnenses. In Acharnenses, also, corrections are frequently made in the text and scholia, but Vespae and Pax 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, Γ 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 Aves and the complete Lysistrata with full scholia and glosses. In appearance the codex resembles Γ closely. The folium of Aves and the first three folia of Lysistrata in Leidensis Vossianus were copied by the scribe who wrote the text of Aves in Γ. The scholia and

¹⁸

Zacher, Jahrb. f. class. Phil., Supplementband XVI (1888), p. 551.

glosses to both plays in Leid. Voss. 52 resemble those to Aves in Γ , 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 Γ .¹⁹

8. Ⓜ: Laurentianus 2779 (saec. XIV) contains prolegomena and text of four comedies with scholia and glosses.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.²¹ Tzetzes' notes have not been included.

19

Zacher, Jahrb. f. class. Phil., Supplementband XVI (1888), pp. 549-550.

20

The plays are Nubes, Ranae, Aves, and Plutus.

21

Zacher, Jahrb. f. class. Phil., Supplementband XVI (1888), p. 548.

9. U: Urbinas 141 (saec. 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 σοφωτάτου TZETZOY ἐξηγήσεις 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 (saec. 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. xcvi; 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:

11. Vaticanus 1294 (saec. XIV) contains the four "Byzantine" plays and scattered glosses. A superscription precedes the first: "Aristofane, le primo quattro Comedie, con scholiij in margine sotto nome parte di Aristofane Grammatico, parte di Demetrio Triclinio, di mano del quale e scritto il libro..."²⁴ Other notes indicate that the scholia are from the Encheiridion of Hephaisteion, from Platonios' περὶ διαφορᾶς κωμῶν and περὶ διαφορᾶς χαρακτήρων, and from the synopsis of Aristophanes' vitae made by Thomas Magister.²⁵ The notes citing Hephaisteion and Platonios 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

24

Signed by Fulvius Ursinus; Zacher, Jahrb. f. class. Phil., Supplementband XVI (1888), pp. 604-605.

25

Zacher, Jahrb. f. class. Phil., Supplementband XVI (1888), pp. 604-605.

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 (saec. XIV) contains Plutus, Nubes and Ranae. Plutus has scholia and glosses copied by three scribes, one of whom continued with Nubes and Ranae. 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 (saec. 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.²⁸ 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 1294.²⁹

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 wahrscheinlich, 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 Triklinius 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 (saec. 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 (saec. XV) contains three plays, Plutus, 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.

31

Zretti, Riv. di Fil., XVIII (1890), pp. 413-420;
Novati, Riv. di Fil., VI (1878), pp. 499-501.

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 papyri³³ 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 (saec. 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.

³³

For the papyri see Körte, Bursian's Jahresbericht, CLII (1911), pp. 267-271; Wüst, Bursian's Jahresbericht, CXCV (1923), pp. 137-138.

2. An Oxyrhynchos papyrus published by Grenfell and Hunt³⁴ 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,³⁵ in cursive uncials 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,³⁶ in clear uncials of the early fifth century, preserves a few lines of Aves (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.

³⁵ Grenfell and Hunt, op. cit., pp. 217-220.

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.³⁷ 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 fragment³⁸ 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 plays. Sometimes he uses the text and

³⁷

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

³⁸

Comparetti, Papiri Greco-Egizii, II, 1 (1908), pp. 9-18.

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 MA². 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 archetype 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 twenty³⁹-five years).

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

39

See note 32 on page 18 above; Zacher, Jahrb. f. class. Phil., Supplementband, XVI (1888), pp. 684-690. See also Cary, Harv. Stud. Class. Phil., XVIII (1907), pp. 192-194; Schnee, De Aristophanis codicibus capita duo, pp. 4-11 and bibliography there cited. For full discussion of the relationship between the papyri and archetype of the mss. see Zuntz, Byzantion, XIII (1938), pp. 631-690 and Byzantion, XIV (1939), pp. 545-605. Cf. van Bamberg, De Ravennate et Veneto Aristophanis Codicibus; Pasquali, Storia della tradizione e critica del testo d'Aristofane.

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 ancestors of V descended a third branch that included Suidas' codex and the exemplar of M.⁴⁰

Θ A Γ 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 Θ A Γ agree with RV or with V against R. It is possible that V and x have a common ancestor (β)⁴¹ 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 Thesmophoriazuserum 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., Supplementband, XVI (1888), pp. 667 and 688-690.

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.⁴² Tzetzes' scholia and text are closer to V than to R and, consequently, closely related to the commentary and text in ΘΑΓ.

The later codices have been classed as deteriores. Many share good readings and adequate commentary with RVMΣ 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 Demetrios Triklinios. These men preserved the Alexandrian metrical commentary and, in addition, provided good notes of their own.⁴³

42

White, Harv. Stud. Class. Phil., XII (1901), pp. 69-72; Zacher, Jahrb. f. class. Phil., Supplementband, XVI (1888), pp. 601-602.

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 Γ¹⊙ and in M. All the mss. employed by Musurus have not yet been identified and some may have disappeared. Recently Estensis III D 8 (saec. 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.³ 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 Baroccianus 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.

³

White, Class. Phil., I (1906), p. 257.

Brunck collated some mss. in the Bibliothèque Royale for his edition of 1783.⁴ 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 RV⁷, Laurentianus 31,16 (Δ), ⊕ 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 mixed 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 Handschriften und Klassen der Aristophanesscholien, which is a detailed account of the major codices that has 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 $\beta\acute{\alpha}\tau\tau\omicron\upsilon \sigma\acute{\iota}\lambda\phi\iota\omicron\nu$ or $\beta\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda' \acute{\epsilon}\varsigma \kappa\acute{o}\rho\alpha\kappa\alpha\varsigma$ 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 $\Pi\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\tau\alpha\iota$, written by the poet in Vespae (1271-1273), inspires the scholiast to a definition and a

brief historical footnote:

πενέστας δὲ λέγεσθαι φασὶ τὸ θητικὸν παρὰ τοῖς
Θετταλοῖς. ἔθνος δὲ ἦν πάλαι ἀπὸ Πενέστου τῆν
ἐπωνυμίαν ἔχον, ὃς ἀνέφερε τὸ γένος εἰς Θεσσαλὸν τὸν
Ἡρακλέους. δέον οὖν εἰπεῖν μετὰ τῶν πολιτευομένων
συνῆν, εἶπε μετὰ τῶν Πενεστῶν, ἀντὶ τοῦ μετὰ τῶν πενή-
των. καταλελυμένον γὰρ ἦν ἐκεῖνο τὸ σύστημα τῶν
Πενεστῶν, καὶ λοιπὸν οἱ πένητες καὶ οἱ θῆτες Πενέσται
ἐκαλοῦντο.

Plato (T224) mentions the relation between Πενέσται 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 Πενέσται is
noted by Aristotle (Politics, 1269a 37). Elsewhere, Philo-
krates (T80) supplies a brief history of the Πενέσται who
were enslaved as a result of capture in war, not racial
strain; they were the pre-Thessaliote inhabitants of Perr-
haibia and Magnesia.

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

The origin of the name Πενέσται did not concern

the early writers, but Archemachos traced it from an earlier name given the Thessaliote helots, *πενέσται*. Dionysios of Halikarnassos (T108) bases his derivation on linguistic differences between the Attic and Thessalian words for thete. Hesychios (s.v. Θῆτες; T136) offers the definition: *παρὰ τὸ πένεσθαι, ἐργάζεσθαι*. He has several meanings for *πενέσται* (T138): men enslaved in war (as opposed to racial servitude), farm labourers, helots, *λατρεῖς* (a suggestion also made by Dionysios of Halikarnassos) or workers of any kind.

The longest discussion of the word *πενέσται* is supplied by Suidas (T251) who borrowed from several accounts. ^Because they loved Arneia, dwellers there, after defeat in a war with the inhabitants of Thessaly, became slaves to the victors rather than move on to Boiotia. One of Suidas' derivations traces the word from *πενέσται* to *πενίσται*, another treats it as the Thessaliote equivalent for the better-known helot: one conquered in war and made slave to the conquerors while granted the right to possess and farm land for his own benefit and that of his masters, in the manner of a feudal serf.

Although there is seldom verbal similarity, the scholiasts, except for the remark that the *πενίσται* were so named because they were descended from Penestros, agree with other accounts. How the *πενίσται* were enslaved and what their

relation was to the Thessalians did not rouse the scholiasts' interest; part of the note summarises Theopompos and Archemachos. In a scholion to Theokritos (T253) is another discussion of *πενίσται* in which a connexion with *πένητες* is made. Implied, rather than expressly stated, this information is also given by Aristotle (T67^a) and Suidas (T251): they were called *πενίσται* because of their misfortunes and because of the labour required of them. *Πένητες* were, like the *πενίσται*, 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 *πενίσται*. Here it is the scholiasts' intention to explain the history of *ῥάλλ' ἐς κόρακας* :

ἄπιθι ἐς κόρακας. ἔστι δὲ παροιμία ἐπὶ κατάρως λεγόμενη.... Βοιωτοῖς γὰρ ἀναστάτοις ὑπὸ θρακῶν γενομένοις καὶ περὶ ἀποικίας μαντευομένοις εἶπεν ὁ θεὸς ἐκεῖ κατοικεῖν, ἔνθα ἂν ἴδωσι λευκὸν κόρακα. οἱ δ' ἐν θετταλίᾳ παρὰ τὸν Παγασητικὸν κόλπον εἶδον περιιπταμένους τοὺς τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος ἱεροὺς κόρακας, οὓς παῖδες ἀφῆκαν γυνώσαντες ὑπὸ μέθης, καὶ τελεῖσθαι τὸν χρησμὸν φήσαντες ἐνταῦθα κατόκησαν. οἱ δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ ῥῶου λέγεσθαι τὴν παροιμίαν φασίν. ἐν γὰρ τοῖς ἐρημοτέροις τόποις ἐπιτηρεῖ τὰ πτώματα.

The note is repeated to explain Plutus (604).

A similar explanation of βαλλ' ἰς κόρακας was included by Apostolis (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 βαλλ' ἰς κόρακας 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 staseis 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 Kadmeia by Thessalians. The traditional date for the fall of Troy is ca. 1183 (Eratosthenes). The Marmor Parium sets it earlier, in 1208. Thessaliote 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 Aioliāns 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 Aiolic 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. (βαλλ' ἐς κόρακας: the Boiotians originally lived at Arne and were sent ἐς κόρακας Λαονοῦς, the god.

³ Cf. Cauver, s.v. Boiotia, and Lippold, s.v. Thessalia, in P.W., R.E.; Myres, Who Were the Greeks, pp. 150, 157, 238-239, 366, 416, 461; Wace and Thompson, Prehistoric Thessaly, passim.

⁴ Kaerst, 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 Boiotia. One scholion attributes the original push that sent the Arneians down to the Pagasitic Gulf to Thrakians.

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

Βάττος Κυρήνην ἔκτισεν, ἑλθὼν ἀπὸ Θήρας, τῆς κατὰ Κρήτην νήσου· ὃν τιμήσαντες Αἰβυεὲς ἐχαρίσαντο αὐτῷ τὸ κάλλιστον τῶν λαχάνων τὸ σίλφιον, καὶ ἐν νομίσματι αὐτὸν ἐχάραξαν, τῇ μὲν βασιλείᾳ, τῇ δὲ σίλφιον παρὰ

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
 διαφόρους καὶ ἐξόχους τιμὰς δεχομένων. Ἄλλως.
 σίλφιον βοτάνη πολυτίμητος· ἡ δὲ αἰτία τοιαύτη
 ἐστί. Βάττος, ὁ καὶ Ἀριστοτέλης, πόλιν ἐν Λιβύῃ
 Κυρήνην λεγομένην ἔκτισε κατὰ τὸν δοθέντα αὐτῷ παρὰ
 τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος χρησμόν· καὶ οἱ πολῖται οἱ Κυρηναῖοι
 ἀνταπόδοσιν τῆς εὐεργεσίας βουλόμενοι χάρισσασθαι
 τῷ βασιλεῖ, ἐποίησαν δακτύλιον, ἐν ᾧ ἡ πόλις αὐτῶν
 προσφέρει τῷ βασιλεῖ τὸ σίλφιον. καὶ τὸ φύλλον δὲ
 αὐτοῦ καὶ ὁ καρπὸς καὶ ὁ καυλὸς καὶ ὁ ὅπδος καὶ
 ἅπλῳς τὸ πᾶν αὐτοῦ πολλῆς τιμῆς ἄξιόν ἐστιν. καὶ
 οἱ Ἀμπελιῶται δὲ ἔθνος Λιβύης, εἰς Δελφοὺς
 ἀνέθεσαν καυλὸν σιλφίου, ὥς φησιν Ἀλεξανδρίδης.
 ὄνομα κύριον τὸ κοινῶς βάλσαμον. ὁ Βάττος
 οὗτος ἔκτισε τὴν Κυρήνην, ἔνθα τὸ σίλφιον γίνεται,
 οὗ ὁ ὅπδος πολλοῦ ἄξιός ἐστι. τιμῶντες οὖν αὐτὸν
 οἱ Κυρηναῖοι ὡς ἀρχηγέτην, χρυσῇν αὐτοῦ τὴν
 εἰκόνα πεποιήκασιν, τὸ σίλφιον ἐν τῇ δεξιᾷ
 φέρουσιν, λίθοις καὶ μαργάραις κεκοσμημένον. λαμ-
 βάνεται οὖν εἰς παροιμίαν τὸ τοῦ Βάττου σίλφιον ἐπὶ
 τῶν πολυτελῶν.

Earliest mention of Battos of Kyrene is in the
 fourth and fifth Pythian Odes of Pindar. Battos, according

to Pindar (T218), 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 Pindar'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 Delphoi 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 lisp and stammered. Herodotos prefers to define βαττος as the Libyan word for "king," first used in address to him by the Pythian priestess at Delphoi 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.⁵ 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

5

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 βαττος to Herodotos means "king," to the Kyrenaians "stammerer". Suidas implies the meaning "king" in his phrase ἐνὶ τοῦ βαττων . Like Herodotos, Hesychios (T130) defines βαττος as the Libyan word for "king". In another note (T131) Hesychios rationalises the tale of Battos, oikist and king, by equating βαττος with the Kyrenaian word for "great honour". A man described as βαττος 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 Battoi by the Kyrenaians, 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 Delphoi 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 Delphoi. 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. Archaeology 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 decided. 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 ἄλκιμοι Μιλήσιοι*. Annotators made use of varied traditions in explanation:

τινὲς φασιν, ὅτι ἐν τοῖς παλαιοῖς χρόνοις ἰσχυρότατοι ἦσαν οἱ Μιλήσιοι καὶ ὅπου προσετίθεντο πάντως ἐνίκων. Πολυκράτης οὖν ὁ Σάμιος συγκροτῶν πόλεμον πρὸς τινὰς ἠθέλησεν αὐτοὺς λαβεῖν εἰς συμμαχίαν, καὶ εἰς τὸ μαντεῖον ἀπῆλθεν ἐρωτήσων περὶ τοῦτου· ὁ δὲ θεὸς ἔχρησεν

ἦσαν ποτ' ἦσαν ἄλκιμοι Μιλήσιοι.

Ἄλλως. περὶ τῆς παροιμίας ταύτης Δήμων οὕτω φησὶ "τῶν Καρῶν περὶ τοῦ πολέμου πρὸς τοὺς Ἀμπρακίωτας βουλευσαμένων, ἀλκιμωτάτους ὄντας τῶν ἐν πολέμῳ γειτόνων, τίνες χρὴ ποιεῖσθαι συμμάχους, οἱ μὲν τοὺς Μιλησίους ἡγοῦντο δεῖν παρακαλεῖν· καὶ γὰρ εὐημέρουν τότε μάλιστα τῶν περιοίκων καὶ διὰ τὸ γειτνιάειν τῇ Καρίᾳ τὴν τοῦτων χώραν· οἱ δὲ διαλύσασθαι πρὸς τοὺς Πέρσας συνεβούλευον, τὴν τοῦτων ἀρχὴν μεγίστην γεγονέναι φάσκοντες καὶ πάντων ἀλκιμωτάτους εἶναι κρατοῦντας τῆς Ἀσίας. ἔδοξεν οὖν τοῖς Καρσὶν ἐρωτῆσαι τὸν Ἀπόλλωνα πότεροι τὸν χρησμόν ὀρθῶς ἐκλαμβάνουσι. τὸν δὲ

θεδν ἀποκρίνασθαι.

πάλαι ποτ' ἦσαν ἄλκιμοι Μιλήσιοι.

τοῦ δὲ χρήμοϋ διαδοθέντος εἰς τὰς Ἀσιάτιδας πόλεις, οἱ μὲν Μιλήσιοι τὴν προφῆτιν αἰτιασάμενοι διεφθάρθαι χρήμασιν ὑπὸ τῶν μηδιζόωντων πανδημεῖ τοῖς Καροῖ βοηθήσαντες, καὶ τοῖς Πέρσαις μετ' ἐκείνων συμβαλόντες, σχεδὸν ἅπαντες ἀπέθανον. τὸν δὲ χρησμὸν διὰ τὴν ἀλήθειαν εἰς παροιμίαν ἐλθεῖν φασι." Ἄλλως.

ἰσχυροὶ ποτ' ἦσαν οἱ Μιλήσιοι, ὥς καὶ Ἀνακρέων φησί. πολεμουμένους γὰρ Κᾶρας ὑπὸ Δαρείου τοῦ Ὑστάσπου, τοῦτον λαβεῖν τὸν χρησμὸν, πυνθανομένους εἰ προσλάβοιεν συμμάχους τοὺς Μιλησίους.... εἴρηται δὲ ἡ παροιμία ἐπὶ τῶν πρότερον μὲν εὐδαιμονούντων νῦν δὲ ἀτυχοούντων.... οἱ Μιλήσιοι πάλαι ἐπ' ἀνδρίᾳ θαυμαζόμενοι, καὶ σύμμαχοι τοῖς βουλομένοις ἐγίγνοντο. ἐλθόντες οὖν τινὲς εἰς τὸν Ἀπόλλωνα, καὶ πυνθανόμενοι αὐτοῦ, εἰ δέη Μιλησίους συμμάχους λαβεῖν, χρησμὸν ἔλαβον, ὅτι "πάλαι ποτ' ἦσαν ἄλκιμοι Μιλήσιοι!" ἐπεκράτησε δὲ τοῦτο 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 258). 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. Ἀμβρακίωτας may be a misreading of Λαβραυνδέος. The same explanation might also account for Βραγχιδᾶς 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

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 Karians, 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 Ἀπατουρίων, ἑορτῆς ἐπισήμου δημοτελοῦς, ἀγομένης παρὰ τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις κατὰ τὸν Πυανεψιώνα μῆνα ἐπὶ τρεῖς ἡμέρας. καλοῦσι δὲ τὴν μὲν πρώτην δόρπειαν, ἐπειδὴ φράτορες ὀψίας συνελθόντες εὐωχοῦντο· τὴν δὲ δευτέραν ἀνάρρυσιν, ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀναρρῦειν, τοῦ θύειν· ἔθνον δὲ Διὶ φρατρίφ καὶ Ἀθηναῖ· τὴν δὲ τρίτην κουρεῶτιν, ἀπὸ τοῦ τοῖς κοῦρους καὶ τὰς κόρας ἐγγράφειν εἰς τὰς φρατρίας· ἐν ᾗ ἐγράφη ἐν τῇ πολιτείᾳ ὁ υἱὸς Σιτάλκους. ἡ δὲ αἰτία, πόλεμος ἦν Ἀθηναίοις πρὸς Βοιωτοῖς περὶ Κελαινῶν, ὃ ἦν χωρίον ἐν μεθορίοις. Ξάνθος δὲ Βοιωτὸς προεκαλέσατο τὸν Ἀθηναίων βασιλέα θυμοίτην. οὐ δεξαμένου δὲ, Μέλανθος ἐπιδημῶν, Μεσσήνιος τὸ γένος ἀπὸ Περικλυμένου τοῦ Νηλέως, ὑπέστη ἐπὶ τῇ βασιλείᾳ. μονομαχοῦντων δὲ, ἐφάνη τῷ Μελάνθῳ τις ὀπισθεν τοῦ Ξάνθου, τραγῆν, τουτέστιν αἰγίδα μελαναν, ἐνημμένος. ἔφη οὖν ἀδικεῖν αὐτὸν δεύτερον ἦκοντα. ὁ δὲ ἐπεστράφη. ὁ δὲ παίσας ἀποκτείνει αὐτὸν. ἐκ δὲ τοῦτου ἢ τε ἑορτὴ Ἀπατούρια καὶ Διουόσου μελαναίγιδος βωμὸν ἐδωμάσαντο. οἱ δὲ φασιν ὅτι τῶν πατέρων ὁμοῦ συνερχομένων διὰ τὰς τῶν παίδων ἐγγραφὰς οἶον ὁμοπατρία λέγεσθαι τὴν ἑορτήν. ὁποίῳ τρόπῳ λέγομεν ἄλοχον τὴν ὁμόλεκτρον, καὶ ἄκοιτιν τὴν ὁμόκοιτον, οὕτω καὶ Ὅμοπατόρια Ἀπατόρια.

A note on the same subject is appended to Pax (890). The content is in general the same as that of schol. Acharnenses, but

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).

Herodotos 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

9

Cf. above pp. 39-40.

10

Anecdota, I, pp. 416-417.

further to explain ἀνάρρσις and κούρσις.

In the note to Pax the scholiast places ἀνάρρσις as the last day of the festival; for Acharnenses, Plato's scholiasts, Hesychios and the Anecdota ἀνάρρσις 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 κούρσις, 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 ἀπατή, 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 Attidographers, only in later accounts is the full story of the battle reported. The scholia to Plato are similar to schol. Acharnenses (146). Polyainos (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 rôle. The only other mention of the name is in the chronicle of Eusebios who states (under 1131 B.C.) that Andropompos was father of Melanthos, the victor at Kelainai. The success of Melanthos, he adds, established the Medontidai, 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 ὁμοπατορία, since the κορυβαῖς 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 (Ξάνθος) and dark (Μαλίνθος) 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 *Μελαινῶν* (*Κελαινῶν*) *χώρου* borderland in schol. *Acharnenses* and schol. *Pax* 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:

ἀρχαῖον τὸ τοὺς τέττιγας ἀναπλέκειν τουτέστι τοὺς κρω-
βύλους. Ἄλλως. οἱ ἀρχαιότατοι τῶν Ἀθηναίων τέττιγας
χρυσοῦς ἐν τοῖς τῶν τριχῶν πλέγμασιν εἶχον, διότι οἱ
τέττιγες μουσικοὶ ὄντες, ἀνάκεινται τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι. ὃς
ἦν πατὴρ τῇ πόλει. τὰ δὲ Διιπόλεια τῶν ἀρχαιοτάτων
ἑορτῶν, τὰ καὶ Διάσια. οὕτως δὲ ἐλέγετο ἃ τῷ πολιεῖ
Διὶ ἐθύετο. τοὺς δὲ τέττιγας παρέλαβεν, ἐπειδὴ οἱ
καλαιοὶ κατὰ τὴν ἀναπλοκὴν τῶν τριχῶν χρυσῷ ἐχρῶντο
τέττιγι, τρεκμήριον τοῦ φαίνεσθαι ὅτι αὐτόχθονες
εἶεν οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι, ὥς καὶ οἱ τέττιγες. καὶ Θουκυδίδης

"καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι αὐτοῖς τῶν εὐδαιμόνων οὐ πολλὰς
 χρόνος ἐπειδὴ χιτῶνάς τε λινοῦς ἐπαύσαντο φοροῦντες,
 καὶ χρυσῶν τεττίγων ἐν ἔρσει κρωβύλων ἀναδοῦμενοι
 τῶν ἐν τῇ κεφαλῇ τριχῶν!"

In one gloss the scholiasts to Nubes equate the τέττιγες with the κρωβύλος; 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 κρωβύλοι. Again, the source is Thucydides. Herakleides Pontikos adds that the victors of Marathon were allowed to wear τέττιγες in their hair.¹¹ 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.¹² Schol. Equites (1331) implies that the custom was ancient; if they came of good family, men and boys were permitted to wear τέττιγες; schol. Nubes (984) 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.

¹² Cf. Gomme, Commentary, I, pp. 101-102 and 103.

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

The phrase *ἐκ τῶν ἀλιτηρίων* in Equites (445) is explained by a long account of the Kylonian revolt:

τῶν μετεχόντων τοῦ Κυλωνείου ἄγους, ὅπερ εἰς τὴν Ἀθηνᾶν δοκεῖ γενέσθαι ἀσέβημα, ἐπειδὴ περ οἱ συγκατακλεισθέντες τῷ Κύλῳ ἐν τῇ ἀκροπόλει εἰς τὴν κρίσιν κατέβησαν ἐν Ἀρείῳ πάγῳ, ἐκ τοῦ ἔδους τῆς θεοῦ ἐξῆσαντες τὴν ἱκετηρίαν. ἥς διαρρυσίσης, λίθοις αὐτοὺς ἔβαλλον οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι. ἀλιτηρίων δὲ, ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐναγῶν. ἀλιτηρίων: τῶν ἀμαρτησάντων εἰς Ἀθηνᾶν. Κύλων γὰρ Ἀθηναῖος ἀνὴρ, Μεγαρίδα γυναῖκα γήμας Θεαγένους θυγατέρα, θέλων τυραννεῖν, ἔλαβε χρησμὸν τῇ μεγάλῃ ἑορτῇ τοῦ Διὸς ἐπιθέσθαι τῇ πόλει. ἐν Ὀλυμπίᾳ δὲ ἐπιθέμενος, νομίζων ταύτην εἶναι μεγάλην ἑορτήν, δύναμιν προσλαβὼν παρὰ Θεαγένους, μὴ γνοὺς ὅτι τὰ Διάσια ἦν ἡ μεγάλη ἑορτή. ἐπελθὼν τῇ ἀκροπόλει ἐλήστευε καὶ ἀλίσκεται. ἐλήφθη δὲ συλῶν τὸ ἱερόν τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς. καὶ αὐτοὺς μὲν ὁ Κύλων φεύγει, τοὺς δὲ ἄλλους φονεύουσι, τινὰς δὲ καὶ ἱκέτας ἐκ τῶν βωμῶν ἀποσπάσαντες ἀπέκτειναν. τοὺς οὖν ἀμαρτάνοντας εἰς τοὺς ἱκέτας ἀλιτηρίους ἔφασκον. οὗς καὶ ἐξέβαλον τῆς πόλεως, ὅτι ἐκ τῶν ἀρχαίων νόμων παρέβησαν τοὺς ἱκέτας φονεύσαντες. Ἄλλως. Κύλων τὴν ἀκρόπολιν κατέλαβεν ἐπὶ τυραννίδι.

καὶ ἐλήφθη ποτὲ συλῶν τὸ ἱερὸν τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς. καὶ
 ὑπὸ Ἀθηναίων ἐκλείσθη. καὶ οὕτως ἐκεῖνος εὐρὼν
 καιρὸν, φυγῇ ἐχρήσατο. καὶ οἱ φίλοι ἔφυγον εἰς τοὺς
 βωμοὺς τῶν θεῶν. οὓς οὗτοι ἀποσπάσαντες ἀπέκτειναν,
 ὅθεν ἀλιτῆριοι 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 ἀλιτῆριοι, where Herodotos calls the slayers ἐναγῆς. Thucydides has details lacking in the scholiasts' more summary version: the Athenians left solution of the problem in the archons' hands; the besieged suffered greatly from hunger and thirst. Thucydides

¹³

Cf. Harpokration, s.v. Ναυκραρικά (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.

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 had his plan confirmed by the oracle.

A fragment of the account given by Aristotle (T67) is extant. With Herodotos he calls the slayers ἐνναγείς. 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 ἐνναγείς.

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 ἀλιτῆρες and Herodotos ἐνναγείς. 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 ἐνναγείς 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. Nubes (984), excerpted by Suidas, equates Diasia with Diipoleia, 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.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 Attidographers. 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 Diakrioi, before he became tyrant:

ὡς εἰς ταύτην ἑαυτὸν ἀναπέμπων τὴν τάξιν τοῦ πολιτευματος. κατὰ γὰρ τοὺς Σόλωνος νόμους τρεῖς ἦσαν αἱ τάξεις, μία μὲν τῶν Παραλίων, ὣν προειστήκει Μεγακλῆς, ἑτέρα δὲ τῶν Πεδίων, ὣν προειστήκει Λυκούργος, τρίτη δὲ τῶν Διακρίων, ὣν προειστήκει Πεισίστρατος.

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 (Athenaion 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 Equites (449) the scholiasts name Peisistratos' wife:

ἔπαιξε... καὶ παρὰ τὸ τυράννου ὄνομα τοῦ Ἰππίου, ὥπερ τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ Ἰππίου περιεργότερον ἐχρήσατο. δῆλον μὲν γὰρ καὶ ἐκ τῶν προειρημένων, οὐχ ἥκιστα δὲ καὶ ἀπὸ τούτων, ὅτι μὴ αὐτὸς ὁ Ἰππίας κατέστησε τὴν τυραννίδα, ἀλλὰ παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς ἅμα τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς παρέλαβε τοῦ Πεισιστράτου.... Ἄλλως. Πεισιστράτου γυνὴ γέγονεν ἡ Μυρρίνη, Ἰππίου καὶ Ἰπάρχου μήτηρ ταύτην ὁ Πεισίστρατος ὁπότε κατήγαγεν εἰς Ἀθήνας ἐφ' ἄρματος, ἔφασκεν Ἀθηναίαν εἶναι βουλόμενος 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 disastrous 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 (Herodotos, I, 61-62). The use of Πάληναδε by Aristophanes (Acharnenses, 234) reminds the scholiasts that Peisistratos faced opposition at Pallene when he attempted what was to be his final restoration:

οἱ Παλληνεῖς δῆμος ἐστὶ τῆς Ἀττικῆς, ἔνθα συνέστη πόλεμος....ὥμῳ διακεῖσθαι καὶ τραχέως ἔχειν... ὡς πάλαι πρὸς Πεισίστρατον τὸν τύραννον, ἥνικα συνεστήσαμεν ἐν Πάλλῃνῃ τὴν μάχην. μέμνηται δὲ τοῦτου καὶ Ἀνδροτίων καὶ Ἀριστοτέλης ἐν Ἀθηναίων πολιτείᾳ.

Herodotos' story of the return (I, 62, 3-4) is similar. The Peisistratidai met the Athenians at Pallene near the Leipsydrion and defeated them. Aristotle's version (Athenaion Politeia, 15, 3) is much the same. Two references to the incident are made by Andokides (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 Androktion comes from the scholion. Aristotle and the scholiasts, who have less detail, are in agreement with Herodotos.

Scholia concerned with the Peisistratidae tell more about Hippias than about his father, particularly when Aristophanes uses the word τύραννος. 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:

ἀντὶ τοῦ εἰ καταστῆσαι βούλομαι ἑμαυτῷ τυραννίδα.
οὗτος δὲ τύραννος δεινός, τοῦ πατρὸς Πεισιστράτου
τυραννικώτερος. ὁ δὲ Ἰππίας ἐτυράννησεν, οὐχ ὁ
Ἰππαρχος. κοινῶς δὲ πάντες οἱ Πεισιστρατίδαι
τύρανοι ἐλέγοντο. ἄλλως. χαλεπή γὰρ ἡ Ἰππίου
τυραννὶς ἐδόκει γεγονέναι, πολὺ τῆς τοῦ πατρὸς
Πεισιστράτου χείρων. μνημονεύει δὲ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐν
Λυσιστράτῃ [619]. εἰκότως δὲ τεσσάρων ὄντων κατ'
ἐνίους τῶν Πεισιστρατιδῶν, τὸν Ἰππίαν παρέλαβεν.
πρεσβύτατος γὰρ ἦν αὐτός καὶ τὴν τυραννίδα εἶχε, καθὰ
καὶ Θουκυδίδης φησί. δοκεῖ δὲ ἡ τυραννὶς καταστῆναι,
ὥς φησιν Ἐρατοσθένης, ἐπὶ ἔτη ν, τοῦ ἀκριβοῦς δια-
μαρτάνων, Ἀριστοτέλους μὲν τεσσαράκοντα καὶ ἐν φήσαντος,
Ἡροδότου δὲ ἑξ καὶ τριάκοντα.

A note to Lysistrata (619) deals with the same subject:

τεσσάρων ὄντων τῶν Πεισιστρατιδῶν, εἰκότως τοῦ
 Ἰππίου μόνου ἐμνημόνευσεν. πρεσβύτατος γὰρ ἦν οὗτος
 τῶν ἄλλων καὶ τὴν τυραννίδα ὑπέθετο, καθάπερ Θουκυδίδης
 φησί. κατέσχε δὲ ἡ τυραννίς ἐπὶ ἔτη γ', οἱ δὲ δ'
 Ἡρόδοτος δὲ σ'. Ἄλλως. οὗτος τύραννος ἦν, ὃς ἐποίησε
 τοὺς Ἀθηναίους κατωνάκας φόρειν, ὅπως μὴ δυνήθῃσι
 προενεγκεῖν τὰς χεῖρας. τοῦτον δὲ κατέλυσαν οἱ
 Λακεδαιμόνιοι.

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 Peisistratids.
 The note to Lysistrata (619) flatly declares that
 Peisistratos had four sons. The gloss to Vespae (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 Peisistratidae 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 Ἀριστογείτονα τὸ γένος ἀθη-
εγεν αὐτοῦ, ἐπεὶ καὶ οὗτοι εὐνοίας πολλάκις ἀθη-
ἐγκαντο δόξαν, ἐπιθέμενοι τοῖς τυράννοις, καὶ τὸν
Ἰππίαν διαχειρισάμενοι, ὥς φθάσαντες προείκομεν.
τοῦτο πρῶτον ἐπιδείκνυσιν τὴν εἰς τὴν πόλιν εὐνοίαν.

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

"Ἄλλως....ὥσπερ Ἀρμόδιος καὶ Ἀριστογείτων. οὗτοι
γὰρ ἀπὸ τῶν μυρσίνων κλάδων τὰ ξίφη ἀνασπάσαντες
τὸν τύραννον κατέβαλον.

Since the scholion to Vespae (502) remarks that all of the Peisistratidai were called τύραννοι, perhaps even the scholiasts used the term loosely. By τύραννος Hipparchos may be meant. The sources after Thucydides agree that Hipparchos was the victim of Harmodios and Aristogeiton.¹⁶ Part of the note to Lysistrata (632) is quoted from a scholion in praise of the assassins.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 κατωβάκα, 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 κατωβάκα φόροι as a class of helots established by the Sikyonian Kleisthenes.

The use of λυκόνες 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.

λυκόποδας ἐκάλουν, ὡς μὲν Ἀριστοτέλης, τοὺς τῶν
 τυράννων δορυφόρους. τοὺς γὰρ ἀκμάζοντας τῶν οἰκετῶν
 ἐπὶ τῇ τοῦ σώματος φυλακῇ ἔβαλλον. λυκόποδες δὲ
 ἐκαλοῦντο, ὅτι διὰ παντὸς εἶχον τοὺς πόδας λύκων δέρμασι
 περικεκαλυμμένους, ὥστε μὴ ἐπικαίεσθαι ἐκ τοῦ περιέχον-
 τος. τινὲς δὲ λυκόποδας, διὰ τὸ ἔχειν ἐπὶ τῶν ἀσπίδων
 ἐπίσημον λύκον. ὁ δὲ Ἀριστοφάνης ἔφη τοὺς νῦν λεγο-
 μένους Ἀλκμαιωνίδας, οὗτοι γὰρ πόλεμον ἀράμενοι πρὸς
 Ἰκτίαν τὸν τύραννον καὶ τοὺς Πεισιστρατίδας ἐτείχισαν
 τὸ Λειψύδριον.

Peisistratos, according to Herodotos (I, 59, 5) was supplied
 with a guard of δορυφόροι after the attack that he declared
 Megakles had made upon him. Apostolis (T33) defines δορυφόροι
 as another name for κερυυγφόροι. Clubs may have been
 exchanged for spears when the tyrant became more suspicious.
 Thucydides (VI, 57, 1) speaks of the δορυφόροι whom
 Hippias had with him at the time of Hipparchos' murder. Aris-
 totle (Athenaion Politeia, 18, 4) also mentions the δορυφόροι
 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 possi-
 bilities. 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 (τῷ) τε καὶ τριάκοντα. 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 Byzantinos, remembers that the Alkmaionidai fortified the Leipsydriion against the tyrant. To Herodotos (V, 62, 2), the Alkmaionidai 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 (T129) 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:

Ἀριστοτέλης φησὶ μετὰ τὸν Ἰππάρχου θάνατον χρησμὸν γενέσθαι τοῖς Λάκωσιν καταλβεῖν τὴν τυραννίδα, τῆς Πυθίας, ὡς οἱ Ἀλκμαιωνίδαι ἐμισθώσαντο τὸν ἐν Δελφοῖς νεὼν οἰκοδομεῖν, συνεχῶς τοῦτο χρώσης αὐτοῖς μαντευομένοις, ἕως πρότερον μὲν Ἀγκιμόλιθον ἔπεμψαν κατὰ θάλασσαν, ἀποκρουσθέντος δὲ αὐτοῦ ὀργισθέντες οἱ Λάκωνες Κλεομένη τὸν βασιλέα σὺν μείζονι ἐξέπεμψαν στόλῳ, καὶ νικήσας τοὺς Θετταλοὺς εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὴν Ἀττικὴν καὶ τὸν Ἰππίαν συνέκλεισεν εἰς τὸ Πελαργικὸν τεῖχος, ἕως οἱ παῖδες τῶν τυράννων ἐξιόντες ἐάλωσαν.

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 πλεῖστοι ἐβοήθουν Ἱππία.

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:

Λακεδαιμόνιος ὢν στρατηγὸς [Κλεομένης], ἐπιστρατεύ-
σας τῇ Ἀττικῇ μετὰ τινων Ἀθηναίων ἐπὶ τυραννίδι,
τὴν ἀκρόπολιν κατέσχε. πολιορκηθεὶς δὲ ὑπὸ τῶν
Ἀθηναίων καὶ ἀφεθεὶς ὑπόσπουδος, ἀπὶ τῶν οἴκαδε πάλιν
Ἐλευσίνα κατέσχε. τῶν δὲ μετὰ Κλεομένους Ἐλευσίνα
κατασχόντων Ἀθηναῖοι τὰς οἰκίας κατέσκαψαν καὶ τὰς
οὐσίας ἐδήμευσαν, αὐτῶν δὲ θάνατον ἐψηφίσαντο. καὶ
ἀναγράψαντες εἰς στήλην χαλκῇν ἔστησαν ἐν πόλει παρὰ
τὸν ἀρχαῖον νεών.

19

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 Boiotians 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 Peisistratidai 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. Ψφισμάτων συνάγωγη of Krateros.

²¹

Cf. schol. Acharnenses, 146, on 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 βάραθρον in Equites (1362) reminds the scholiasts of an incident that preceded the Wars:

τόπος Ἀθηναίων βαθὺς, ὅπου καὶ τοὺς Δαρείου πρέσβεις
ἔβαλον. πάντα δὲ τὰ ἐκεῖ βαλλόμενα ἀφανῆ ἐποίησε.

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

τινὲς φασὶ τὸν Διόνυσον λέγειν τοῦτον τὸν στίχον. ὄρυγμα
ἐν Ἀθηναίῃς, εἰς ὃ ἐβάλλοντο οἱ κακοῦργοι.

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

χάσμα τι φρεατῶδες καὶ σκοτεινὸν ἐν τῇ Ἀττικῇ, ἐν ᾧ τοὺς
κακοῦργους ἔβαλλον. ἐν δὲ τῷ χάσματι τοῦτω ὑπῆρχον ὀγκί-
νοι, οἱ μὲν ἄνω, οἱ δὲ κάτω. ἐνταῦθα τὸν Φρύγα τὸν τῆς
μητρὸς τῶν θεῶν ἐνέβαλον ὡς μεμνηότα, ἐπειδὴ προέλεγεν
ὅτι ἔρχεται ἡ Δημήτηρ εἰς ἐπισήτησιν τῆς Κόρης. ἡ δὲ
θεὸς ὀργισθεῖσα ἀκαρπίας ἔπεμψε τῇ χώρᾳ καὶ γυνόντες
τὴν αἰτίαν διὰ χρησμοῦ, τὸ μὲν χάσμα κατέχωσαν, τὴν δὲ

θεδν θυσίαις ἔλαον ἐποίησαν.

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 βάρυρον, for a crime (Hellenica, I, 7, 20).¹ Other definitions of the word are to be found principally in the lexica. Harpokration (T119) has a brief general note which locates the pit in the deme (sic) Hippothoētis. Of the four entries in Suidas' compendium the longest (s.v. βάρυρον) is identical with the scholion to Plutus and the second is the same as Harpokration's. 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.² The Anecdota (T86) disagree with Harpokration 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 Pax (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.

Δᾶτις σατράπης Περσῶν, εὐδοκίμησας κατὰ τινὰ χρόνον (πολεμῶν), ἑλληνίζειν δὲ βουλόμενος εἶπεν ἡδομαι καὶ χαίρομαι, καὶ ἑβαρβάρισεν· ἔδει γὰρ εἰπεῖν χαίρω. ἅμα δὲ οὗτος εἶπε πρὸς τὸ ὁμοιοκατάληκτον. οὐκ εἴρηται δὲ τὸ χαίρομαι· αὐτὸ γὰρ τὸ χαίρω αὐτοπαθὲς ὃν προὔφηρπασεν αὐτοῦ τὸ σημαίνδμενον. λέγεται δὲ τὸ τοιοῦτο δατισμὸς. — στοχάζεται ὅτι εἴη αὖ διαμνημονευόμενος περὶ Δᾶτιδος τοῦ Πέρσου, ὅτι εἶπέ ποτε παρὰ τινὰ συνουσίαν ἡδομαι καὶ χαίρομαι, ἑλληνίσει τι θέλων. καὶ γὰρ καὶ παρὰ παλαιότερου τινὸς εὐφαίνεται. εἴη δὲ ὑπαρχος τοῦ βασιλέως τῶν ἐλθόντων ἐπὶ Μαραθῶνα, ὃν καὶ φυγεῖν φασὶ πολλὸν χρυσὸν καταλιπόντα. Ἄλλως. Δᾶτις τῶν ἐν Μαραθῶνι παραταξαμένων Ἀθηναίοις στρατηγὸς Δαρείου, ὃν φασιν ἀντιποιήσασθαι τῆς Ἀττικῆς ὡς ἰδίας· ἀπὸ Μήδου γὰρ τοῦ Μηδείας καὶ Αἰγέως ἐδόκει εἶναι. Ἄλλως. Δᾶτις σατράπης Περσῶν βασιλέως, ὅστις συνεχέστερον πρεσβευόμενος εἰς Ἀθήνας ἡράσθη τῆς αὐτῶν πολιτείας, καὶ μέινας ἐκεῖ ἐβούλετο ἑλληνίζειν τῇ ὁμίλῃ, καὶ ἑβαρβάριζεν καὶ τοὺς τρόπους καὶ τοὺς λόγους. τινὲς δὲ Δᾶτιν λέγουσι τὸν τραγικόν, κακῶς ὑπονοοῦντες· ἐκεῖνος γὰρ υἱὸς ἦν Καρκίνου οὗτος δὲ ὑπαρχος Περσῶν.

He is elsewhere described as general at Marathon (Acharnenses, 84):

οἱ γὰρ Ἕλληνες πάντα ἔπραττον πρὸς τὴν σελήνην ἀποβλέποντες, καὶ μάλιστα οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι. Δᾶτιδος γοῦν

καὶ Ἀρταφέρνης τῶν στρατηγῶν τοῦ Περσῶν βασιλέως εἰς Μαραθῶνα ἐμβεβληκότων. περιέμενον τὴν πανσέληνον ἐπὶ τῷ τότε ἐξελθεῖν ἐπὶ τὸν πόλεμον. πρὶν οὖν ἐκείνους παραγενέσθαι, κατῴρθωσαν οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι τὸν πόλεμον.

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

τοὺς ἐν Μαραθῶνι τρωπωσαμένους τὴν Δαρείου στρατιάν, ἣν Δᾶτις ὁ τούτου στρατηγὸς ἤγαγεν οὖσαν περὶ πεντήκοντα μυριάδας. εἰς δὲ ἐντετυλίχθαι, τὸ ἐναντίον τῷ γυμνοῦσθαι.

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

τόπος τῆς Ἀττικῆς, εἰς ὃν ἐνῶρμηναν Δᾶτις καὶ Ἀρτάβαζος, Μηδικοὶ σατράπαι, πεμφθέντες ὑπὸ Δαρείου βασιλέως καταδουλώσασθαι τὴν Ἑλλάδα. ἔνθα συμβαλόντες αὐτοῖς οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι Μιλτιάδου στρατηγοῦντος, μόνων Πλαταιέων συμμαχούντων αὐτοῖς χιλίοις ἀνδράσι καὶ οὕτω πληρωθέντος τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς δυνάμεως, τοῖς Ἕλλησι τῆς ἐλευθερίας αἵτιοι κατέστησαν, μόνοι ἐξ ἀπάντων 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). Diodoros (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 Plataians (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' rôle 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):

τροπαιου δὲ τὸ ἐν Μαραθῶνι τὸ κατὰ Περσῶν. ἡ γὰρ Μαραθῶν
τῆς τετραπόλεως μέρος. τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ Οἶνῳ, Προβάλινθος,

Τρικλίδουθος.

An inscription (T138) 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 σέβουσι καὶ τιμῶσι
τὴν Ἀγροτέραν Ἀρτεμιν. Ἄλλως. ἐξ ἱστορίας. Καλλίμα-
χος ὁ πολέμαρχος λέγεται εὐχασθαι τῇ Ἀρτέμιδι τοσαύτας
βοῦς θῆσαι, ὅσους ἂν φονεύσῃ βαρβάρους ἐν Μαραθῶνι.
ἐπειδὴ δὲ πολλοὶ ἐφονεύθησαν, μὴ δυνάμενος τοσαύτας βοῦς
θῆσαι, ἔθυσσε χιμαῖρας.

Slight confusion in the scholion is evident: Kallimachos was killed in the battle (Herodotos, 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. Ailian (T2)

3

The trophy is noted also by Isokrates (T145). Cf. the inscription of Kallimachos, I.G., I², 609 (T137), as restored by Fraenkel in Eranos, 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.⁴ Miltiades is the hero among the generals.⁵ Xenophon (Anabasis, III, 2, 12), most of whose report is very like the scholion to Equites in wording, states that all of the Athenians who fought at Marathon made the promise to Artemis:

καὶ εὐξάμενοι τῇ Ἀρτέμιδι ὅσους κατακάνοιεν τῶν
πολεμίων τοσαύτας χιμαῖρας καταθύσειν τῇ θεῇ. ἐπεὶ
οὐκ εἶχον ἱκανὰς εὐρεῖν, ἔδοξεν αὐτοῖς κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν
πεντακοσίας θύειν, καὶ ἔτι νῦν ἀποθύουσιν.

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

4

Cf. Suidas (T250).

5

Herodotos, VI, 110; Plutarch, Aristides, 5, 1; Strabo, IX, 399; Diodoros, X, 27; Justin, II, 8-10; Nepos, Miltiades, 4-5; T172.

significance; this could have enhanced the glory of Miltiades at the expense of Kallimachos⁶

The scholion to Lysistrata (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 Thermopylai, Artemision and Salamis.

The one scholion mentioning the battle at Thermopylai glosses Equites (55):

"Ἄλλως. ἐν τῇ Πύλῳ. τόπος δὲ οὗτος τῆς Λακωνικῆς στενδός, διείργων καὶ ἀποχωρίζων τὰς ἀπὸ τῆς Θεσσαλίας καὶ Λακεδαιμονίας εἰσβολάς. ἔνθα καὶ Λεωνίδας πρότερον τῶν Μακεδόνων βασιλεὺς, ἅμα καὶ Σπαρτιατῶν, ἀντέστη Ξέρξῃ τῷ τῶν Περσῶν βασιλεῖ, καὶ πολλοὺς τῶν Περσῶν ἀποκτείνας, ἀριστεύων ἐτελεύτησε, κυκλωθεὶς ἐκ προδοσίας, Ἐφιάλτου τοῦτος δείξαντος τοῖς Πέρσῃσι διὰ τῶν ὁρῶν ὁδόν.

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

6

See How and Wells, Commentary, II, p. 109.

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 πρόην γ' ἔμοῦ μᾶζαν μεμαχότος ἐν Πύλῳ Λακονικῇν...

Possibly a scholiast or earlier commenrator 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 Λακονικῇν 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 Thermopylai that the word Ἀρκονύκη was explained, while the story itself remained unchanged. It would appear, from the annotator's choice of Thermopylai rather than Pylos, that he was familiar with Herodotos 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 Thermopylai, is the subject of one brief note that is largely a paraphrase of Lysistrata (1251):

ἄκρα ἐστὶν Εὐβοίας τὸ Ἀρτεμίσιον, ἔνθα ἐπολέμησαν τῷ
Ξέρξῃ οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι.

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

There are few references elsewhere. Diodoros (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 Eubolia. 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 δόξαν ἀπηνέγκατο ὁ θεμιστοκλῆς, σαφηνίσας

Ἀθηναίοις τὸν δοθέντα χρησμόν

τείχος Τριτογενεῖ ξύλινον διδοῖ εὐρύοπα Ζεὺς.

ἄλλων γὰρ ἄλλα λεγόντων, θεμιστοκλῆς ἔφη τὰς τριήρεις λέγειν ξύλινον τεῖχος. καὶ τὸν Πειραιᾶ δὲ τειχίσας, ὥς εἴρηται, καὶ τὰ μακρὰ τεῖχη ποιήσας τὰ διήκοντα ἀπὸ τῆς πόλεως μέχρι τοῦ Πειραιῶς, ἐπὶ πλεον ἔδοξε σοφός.

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

τὰς ναῦς φησι. μετέστησαν δὲ τότε εἰς Σαλαμίνα. οὗτος δὲ ὁ χρησμός ἐπιδύτος τοῦ βαρβάρου ἐδόθη. ἀγνοούντων δὲ αὐτῶν καὶ βουλομένων ξυλίνῳ τειχίδαι τὴν πόλιν τείχει, θεμιστοκλῆς ὁ στρατηγὸς νοήσας τὸν χρησμόν, εἶπε τεῖχος τὰς ναῦς λέγειν. ἐστὶ δὲ ὁ χρησμός

τεῖχος Τριτογενεῖ ἔθλινον διδοῖ εὐρύοπα Ζεὺς,
 μοῦνον ἀπόρθητον τελέειν διὰ Παλλάδα κόβρην.
 μὴ δὲ σὺ γ' ἵπποσύνην μενέειν καὶ πεζὸν ἰδόντα,
 νῶτον ἐπιστρέψαις, ἔτι γάρ τοι κἀντίος ἔσται.
 ὦ θεῖη Σαλαμίς, ἀπολεῖς δὲ σὺ τέκνα γυναικῶν,
 ἥπου σκιδναμένης Δημήτερος ἡ συνιοῦσης.

Schol. Equites, 1040, with its suggestion of controversy between Themistokles and other Athenians who preferred to wall the Akropolis with wooden barricades, summarises Herodotos (VII, 142-143). Diodoros (XI, 15), Plutarch (10, 1-4)⁷ and Nepos (Themistocles, 2) have the same story, as do Justin (T159) and Polyainos (T232) whose version is shortest. Suidas (T240) explains how Themistokles reached his decision to depend on a fleet to ensure victory: the Pythia would not have called Salamis θείη in her oracle to the Greeks had she meant that the Hellenes were to be destroyed there; a battle fought at Salamis with wooden ships would give the victory to Greece. Thucydides makes no reference to the oracles; the battle was fought at sea, he writes, because the Greeks were not strong enough to stand against the full force of the Persians on land (I, 73, 4).

In a note to Equites (785) the scholiasts locate Salamis and the battle:

7
 In Themistocles.

ἀντὶ δὲ Μαραθῶνος, Σαλαμῖνος μέμνηται, ὅπου ναυμαχία
Περσῶν ἐγένετο, ἐν Μαραθῶνι δὲ πεζομαχία. κεῖται δὲ
ἡ Σαλαμὶς ὀλίγον πρὸ τῆς Ἑλευσῖνος πόλεως, ἱερᾶς
Δήμητερος καὶ Κόρης, πλήρης οὔσα κατορθωμάτων Ἑλληνι-
κῶν. καὶ γὰρ ἐνταῦθα πολλὰς τῶν Περσῶν Ἀθηναῖοι
κατεναυμάχησαν τριῆρεις ὀλίγῳ ἀριθμῷ, θεμιστοκλέους
στρατηγοῦντος. ἔνθα καὶ πέτρα Εἰρεσία οὕτω καλουμένη, ὥς-
περ διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος τρόπαιον οὔσα τῆς Ἀττικῆς.

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

εἶ γε καὶ τὸν Ἰακχὸν ἐχόρευσαν ταῖς θεαῖς, ὥς Ἡρόδοτος
2, 65, ἱστορεῖ. ἐν γὰρ τῇ περὶ Σαλαμῖνα ναυμαχίᾳ κατὰ
πολὺ λειπομένων τῶν Ἑλλήνων τοῦ πλήθους τῶν Περσικῶν
νεῶν συμμαχῆσαι τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις τὴν Δήμητραν καὶ τὴν Κόρην
ἱστορεῖ, μέγιστον τῆς συμμαχίας ἐπιδειξαμένας καὶ ἐναργέστα-
τον τεκμήριον. μελλόντων γὰρ λοιπὸν τῶν Ἑλλήνων καὶ τῶν
βαρβάρων εἰς χεῖρας ἥξειν, πρῶτον μὲν πλεῖστον ὅσον κονιορ-
τὸν ἀπὸ τῆς Ἑλευσῖνος αἰρόμενον πᾶση τῇ στρατιᾷ κατάδηλον
γενέσθαι. εἶτα τοῦτον εἰς οὐρανὸν ἀνιδντα καὶ γενόμενον
νέφος διὰ μέσου τοῦ στρατοπέδου χωροῦντα, τὸν Ἰακχὸν
βοᾶν. μυστικὸς δὲ λόγος.

The location of Salamis and the full story of the battle are
contained in Herodotus (VIII, 40-107 passim), and in the

shorter accounts of Diodoros (XI, 16-19), Justin (II, 17-27), Plutarch (Themistocles, 11-16) and Aristodemos (T51). Suidas (s.v. Σαλαμῖνος) 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 "Iacchos" 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 "Iacchos". Demaratos of Sparta heard the sound in the cloud and was told that participants in the festival of Demeter and Kore cry thus (Herodotos, VIII, 65. 4). Plutarch (Themistocles, 15, 1) describes the phenomena briefly. The story is repeated in two scholia to Aristides (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.

Ἀρτεμισία Λυγδάμιδος θυγάτηρ τὸ γένος Ἐφεσία, ἥτις
 συνεμάχησε ἔρξῃ κατὰ τῆς Ἑλλάδος καὶ ἱκανῶς ἠνδραγάθησεν.

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 (T160), 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, ἠνδραγάθησεν.

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, Aristides, 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:

αἰνίσσεται δὲ διὰ τοῦτου τὴν ἱστορίαν θεμιστοκλέους, ὅτι τὴν πόλιν ἐτείχισεν, καὶ ταῦτα παρὰ γνώμην τῶν Πελοποννησίων ἀπατήσας αὐτοῦς. φασὶ γὰρ τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων μαθόντων ἐκτειλίσσεσθαι τὰς Ἀθήνας καὶ μὴ ἐπιτρεπόντων, καταστρατηγῆσαι τὸν θεμιστοκλέα ἐπὶ τῷ δεῖξαι τοῖς Λακεδαιμονίοις ὅτι ἐπὶ τῷ κοινῷ τῆς Ἑλλάδος συμφέροντι τειχίζοιεν τὴν πόλιν. χειροτονηθεὶς δὲ πρεσβευτὴς τοῖς μὲν Ἀθηναίοις

ἔδωκεν ἐντολὰς τειχίζειν πάσῃ σπουδῇ τὴν πόλιν, μὴ φειδομένους μήτε ἰδίου μήτε δημοσίου τούδε οἰκοδομήματος, τοῖς δὲ συμπρεσβευταῖς προσέταξε βράδιον ἐλθεῖν εἰς τὴν Λακεδαιμόνα. αὐτὸς δὲ ἀφικόμενος ἐκέῖσε καὶ τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων ἀξιούντων αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ κοινὸν παρεῖναι, καὶ λέγειν ὧν χρήζων ἀφίεται, τὸ μὲν πρῶτον εἰς τὴν παρουσίαν ὑπερετίθετο τῶν πρέσβων. μὴ γὰρ ἀσφαλὲς ὑπάρχειν αὐτῷ κοινὰς ἐντολὰς λαβόντι μόνον ἀποκληρῶσαι τὴν πρεσβείαν. καὶ ἥσχαλλεν ὅτι μήπω παρεγένοντο. ὥς δὲ χρόνος ἱκανὸς διεγένετο, καὶ οἱ συμπρέσβεις παρήσαν, ἥδη δὲ τοῦ τείχους ἱκανῶς προκεχωρηκὸς τοῖς Λακεδαιμονίοις ἡγγέλτο ὅτι τετειχισμέναι λοιπὸν εἶεν Ἀθῆναι, παρελθὼν ἐπειθεν αὐτοὺς μὴ ταχέως πιστεύειν τοῖς βουλομένοις εἰς ἔχθραν καταστήσαι τὴν πόλιν, ἀλλ' ἐπιλεξαμένους αὐτῶν ἄνδρας τοὺς εὐνοίᾳ καὶ πίστει διαφέροντας ἐπόπτας ἐκπέμψαι. μέχρι δὲ τῆς ἐκείνων παρουσίας ὁμηρον ἑαυτὸν κατεπηγγέλλετο, κἂν τοῦτῳ τριβὴν τινα χρόνου ἐμποιῶν. πεισθέντων οὖν Λακεδαιμονίων καὶ τοὺς μάλιστα διαφέροντας εὐνοίᾳ καὶ πίστει τῶν πολιτῶν πεμψάντων, λάθρα τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις πέμψας προσέταξε μὴ πρότερον τοῖς Λακεδαιμονίων ἄνδρας ὀπίσω πάλιν ἐλθεῖν ἔᾶσαι, πρὶν αὐτὸν τε καὶ τοὺς συμπρέσβεις ἀπολύσῃσι Πελοποννήσιοι.

The walling of the Peiraeus, a later undertaking (Thucydides, I 93, 3-8), occurs briefly in a gloss to Equites (815):

καὶ τὸν Πειραιᾶ γὰρ ἐτείχισεν. ὃς ἀπεῖχε τῆς πόλεως
σταδίους λε', παρὰ θάλατταν ὦν. ἔπαιξε δὲ τὸ ἀριστῶση
πρὸς τὰ ἐπιφερόμενα. πρὸς ὃ ἐπιφέρει καὶ τό, ἰχθῦς
προσέθηκεν.

A scholiast to Equites (818) adds that Themistokles built the Long Walls as well:

τὸν γὰρ Πειραιᾶ θεμιστοκλῆς προσέβαλε τῇ πόλει. τὸ δὲ
παρέθηκε, προσέθηκε, προσεκόλλησε τὰ μακρὰ τεῖχη.

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

καὶ τὸν Πειραιᾶ δὲ τειχίσας, ὥς εἴρηται, καὶ τὰ μακρὰ
τεῖχη ποιήσας τὰ διήκοντα ἀπὸ τῆς πόλεως μέχρι τοῦ Πειραιῶς,
ἐπὶ πλεον ἔδοξε σοφός.⁹

Aside from Thucydides' account there are numerous other references to Themistokles' walls. Aristotle (Athenaion Politeia, 23, 4) reports that Themistokles and Aristekles 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 ὥς εἴρηται 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, Themistocles, 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.¹⁰

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

10

That the fortifications of Peiraeus 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.

11

Thucydides, I, 107, 1; Plutarch, Pericles, 13, 5-7.

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," Andokides (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 211-213, for archaeological studies of the Themistokleian walls around

In 478/7 a congress of Greek states, meeting at Delos, voted to set up a common store of ships and money, πρὸς τὸν βάρβαρον (Thucydides, I, 96, 2 - 97, 1). The money was to be kept at Delos under the guardianship of the Athenian hellenotamiai.¹³ Schol. Lysistrata (651-653) make a brief allusion to the fund.¹⁴

ἔγένετο δὲ ἐπὶ τῶν Μηδικῶν ψήφισμα, ὥστε ἕκαστον κατὰ δύναμιν συμβάλλεσθαι εἰς τὰ κοινὰ χρήματα. (653): ὡς αὐτῶν τὰ Μηδικὰ χρήματα δαπανησάντων. = παρέταξεν Ἀριστείδης δοῦναι τοῖς συμμάχοις εἰ ἐπὶ τοὺς βαρβάρους πολεμοῖεν.

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

Athens and Peiraeus 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.

¹³ Cf. A.T.L., III, pp. 225-243. See also T54, and T161.

¹⁴ The scholion to Lysistrata, 651, is clearly a paraphrase of Aristophanes. Cf. T194 and T195.

part in the τῶξις, and the scholiasts make no reference to hellenotamiai, and, further, speak of χρήματα where Thucydides mentions the two methods of contribution. Otherwise, there is no disagreement.

The date of the synod and the assessment of Aristides 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 Aristides 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 Aristides. Plutarch (Aristides, 24, 1-4) describes Aristides' method of assessment and Diodoros (XI, 47) reports that the cities were taxed according to wealth.¹⁵ Pausanias (VIII, 52, 2) and Ailian (T6) recall only that Aristides made the first assessment. The scholiasts appear to have treated Aristides' 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:

ἐξωστράκισε γὰρ τὸν θεμιστοκλέα ὁ δῆμος.

15

Perhaps in a manner similar to the Persian Artaphrenes' 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 Diodoros (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 καταναυμαχῆσας ἐν τῇ περὶ Σαλαμῖνα ναυμαχίᾳ
τοῖς βαρβάροις, εἴθ' ὕστερον φυγαδευθεὶς ὑπὸ τῶν Ἀθηναίων
ἐπὶ προδοσίας αἰτία ψευδεῖ, καταφυγὼν πρὸς Ἀρταξέρξην
τὸν Ξέρξου παῖδα, καὶ τιμηθεὶς τὰ μέγιστα παρ' αὐτοῦ,
ὥς καὶ τρεῖς πόλεις εἰς ὄψον καὶ ἄρτον καὶ ποτὸν λαβεῖν,
Μαγνησίαν, Μυοῦντα, Λάμψακον, ἐπηγγείλατο αὐτῷ τὸ κατα-
δουλώσασθαι τὴν Ἑλλάδα, δύναμιν εἰ λάβοι. παραγενόμενος δὲ
ἅμα τῷ στρατεύματι εἰς Μαγνησίαν καὶ καταγνοὺς ἑαυτοῦ, εἰ
δι' αὐτὸν σωθέντες Ἕλληνες δι' αὐτοῦ δουλεύσουσι βαρβάροις,
προφάσει χρησάμενος ὥς θυσίαν ἐπιτελέσαι βούλοιτο καὶ

¹⁶

Thompson, Hesperia, Suppl. IV (1940), p. 32;

Vanderpool, Hesperia, XV (1946), p. 274.

ἱερουργῆσαι τῇ Λευκόφρυνι Ἀρτέμιδι καλουμένην, τῷ
 ταύρῳ ὑποθεῖς τὴν φιάλην, καὶ ὑποδεξάμενος τὸ αἷμα καὶ
 χαυδὸν πιὼν ἐτελεύτησεν εὐθέως. οἱ δὲ φασιν ὅτι συν-
 εἰδὼς ὁ Θεμιστοκλῆς ὅτι οὐχ οἶός τε ἦν διαπράξασθαι τῷ
 βασιλεῖ ἅπερ ἐπηγγείλατο, οὕτως ἐπὶ τὴν τοῦ θανάτου
 αἵρεσιν παρεγένετο. τοῦτον οὖν τὸν τρόπον βέλτιον εἶναι
 φασι καὶ αὐτοὺς ἀποθανεῖν, κατὰ σῆλον τοῦ Θεμιστοκλέους.
 διαβάλλει δὲ τοὺς Ἀθηναίους ὡς κακοὺς περὶ τοὺς εὐεργέτας.

Ἄλλως. μετὰ τὴν Ξέρξου φυγὴν Λακεδαιμόνιοι προδοσίας
 κρίνουνσι καὶ φονεῖουσι Πανσανίαν τὸν ἴδιον βασιλέα,
 Κλεομβρότου καὶ Ἀλκαθῶς υἱόν. ἐπικότως δὲ διακείμενοι
 πρὸς Θεμιστοκλέα διὰ τὸν τειχισμόν τῆς Ἀττικῆς, μετα-
 στέλλονται αὐτὸν εἰς κρίσιν, φάσκοντες Πανσανίαν ὁμολογή-
 κέναι καὶ αὐτὸν κοινωνεῖν ἐν τῇ προδοσίᾳ. Ἀθηναίων δὲ
 βουλομένων ἀποστέλλειν αὐτόν, φυγὼν ἦκε πρὸς Ἀρταξέρξην,
 καὶ Μηδικὴν φωνὴν μαθὼν ἐδίδασκεν αὐτὸν πῶς ἔσωσε τὸν πατ-
 ῆρα Ξέρξην μὴ συγχωρήσας τοῖς Ἕλλησι διαλῦσαι τὰ ἐπὶ
 Σηστοῦ καὶ Ἀβύδου διαζεύγματα. ἐφ' οἷς εὐχαριστήσας ὁ
 βασιλεὺς δωρεῖται αὐτῷ τρεῖς πόλεις, Μαγνησίαν εἰς σῖτον,
 Λάμψακον εἰς οἶνον, Μυοῦντα εἰς ὄψα, ὡς δὲ Νεάνθης, καὶ
 Περικώτην εἰς στρωμνὴν καὶ Παλαῖσκηψιν εἰς στολὴν. στρατὸν
 δὲ λαβὼν αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ πορθήσει τῆς Ἑλλάδος, περὶ τὴν Ἰωνίαν
 ἐν Μαγνησίᾳ γενόμενος, θύων, ὡς εἴρηται ἄνω, τελευτᾷ, καὶ
 μετὰ θάνατον τὸν μισοβάρβαρον ἐνδεικνύμενος τρόπον.
 λοιμωξάντων δὲ Ἀθηναίων, ὁ θεὸς εἶπε μετάγειν τὰ ὅσα

Θεμιστοκλέους. Μαγνητῶν δὲ μὴ συγχωροῦντων, ᾗτήσαντο ἐπὶ
 λ' ἡμέραις ἐναγίσαι τῷ τάφῳ. καὶ περισκηνώσαντες τὸ
 χωρίον λάθρα κομίζουσιν ἀνορύξαντες τὰ ὅστα. Σύμμαχος δὲ
 φησι ψεύδεσθαι περὶ Θεμιστοκλέους. οὔτε γὰρ Ἡρόδοτος οὔτε
 Θουκυδίδης ἱστορεῖ. ἔστι γοῦν ἀπὸ Σοφοκλέους Ἑλληνος

ἔμοι δὲ λῶστον αἶμα ταύρειον πιεῖν,

καὶ μὴ τι πλείους τῶνδ' ἔχειν δυσφημίας.

τινὲς δὲ φασιν ὅτι Σοφοκλῆς περὶ Θεμιστοκλέους τοῦτ' οὕτως φησι.

ψεύδονται δὲ, οὐ γὰρ ἔστι πιθανόν.

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 Vespae (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:

Θουκυδίδην λέγει τὸν Μελησίου Ἀλωπεκῆθεν. τοῦτον δὲ ἐξωτράκισαν Ἀθηναῖοι τᾷ ι' ἔτη κατὰ τὸν νόμον.... ὅτι δὲ ὁ Ἀθηναίων δῆμος ἀειφυγίαν αὐτοῦ καταγνοῦς ἐδήμευσεν τὴν οὐσίαν, καὶ πρὸς Ἀρταξέρξην ἦκε φεύγων, σαφὲς ποιεῖ Ἰδομενεὺς διὰ τοῦ β' τὸν τρόπον τοῦτον, "οἱ μέντοι Ἀθηναῖοι αὐτοῦ καὶ γένους ἀειφυγίαν κατέγνωσαν, προδιδόντες τὴν Ἑλλάδα, καὶ αὐτοῦ ἡ οὐσία ἐδημεύθη".

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

Ephoros (excerpted in De Mal. 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 Medes, Diodoros (XI, 56, 6-8) retains the statement that the Greeks had been unjust.¹⁷

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.¹⁸ According to Valerius Maximus (T255), Themistokles learned the local tongue before he had any communication at all with the Great King.

Ἀθηναῖος δημαγωγός, Νεοκλέους υἱός, ἄσωτος τὴν πρώτην ἡλικίαν γενόμενος, μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα στρατηγὸς αἰρεθεὶς καὶ κτίσας τὸν Πειραιᾶ καὶ ναυμαχίᾳ νικήσας τοὺς Πέρσας κατὰ Σαλαμῖνα καὶ φθονηθεὶς φεύγει πρὸς Ἀρταξέρξην τὸν τῶν Περσῶν βασιλέα καὶ σφόδρα τιμηθεὶς ὑπ' αὐτοῦ ἠναγκάζετο μετὰ ταῦτα τοῖς Ἕλλησι πολεμεῖν. καὶ μὴ βουλευθεὶς προδοῦναι τὴν πατρίδα καὶ τὸ ἑαυτοῦ κλέος, ταύρειον αἷμα πιὼν ἀπώλετο. ἔγραψεν ἐπιστολὰς φρονήματος γεμούσας.

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 (T198) 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.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.²⁰ One scholion lists the three cities; the other note to Equites (84) adds that Perkote supplied bedding and Palaiskepsos clothing. Thucydides (I, 138, 5) names the three cities.²¹ Athenaios (T76) adds Perkote and Palaiskepsos; according to Plutarch (Themistocles,

29, 5.

¹⁹ Cf. VIII, 108-109.

²⁰ For the flight of Themistokles to Persia and its chronology see A.T.L., 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.²² Themistokles issued coinage, examples of which have been found on the site of Magnesia ad Meandrum.²³

6 In return for munificent bounties, Themistokles prepared to attack Greece in fulfillment of his promise to Artaxerxes.²⁴

²² Cf. Themistokles, Letters, 20 (Hercher, Epistolographi Graeci, pp. 758-762, especially 761). Note that Neanthes is also named as a source for the additional cities in schol. Equites, 84.

²³ Head, Historia Numorum², p. 581; Gardner, J.H.S., XXXIII (1913), p. 165.

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): ἡμεῖς δὲ παρέσμεν ἐπὶ τὴν τελευτὴν

ἀνδρὸς μεγίστου τῶν Ἑλλήνων, περὶ οὗ πολλοὶ διαμφισβητοῦσι,

πότερον οὗτος ἀδίκησας τὴν πατρίδα καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους Ἕλληνας

ἔφυγεν εἰς Πέρσας, ἢ τούναντίον ἢ τε πόλιν καὶ πάντες οἱ

Ἕλληνες εὐεργετηθέντες μεγάλα τῆς μὲν χάριτος ἐπελάθοντο, τὸν

δ' εὐεργέτην ἡγάγον αὐτῶν, ἀδίκως εἰς τοὺς ἐσχάτους κινδύνους.

εἰ δὲ τις χωρὶς φθόνου τὴν τε φύσιν τῶνδ' ἀνδρῶν καὶ τὰς πράξεις

ἐξετάζοι μετ' ἀκριβείας, εὐρήσει πάντων ὧν μνημονεύομεν ἀμφοτέροις

τοῖς εἰρημένοις πεπρωτευνκότα. διὸ καὶ θαυμάσειεν ἂν τις

εἰκότως, εἰ στερεῆσαι σφᾶς αὐτοὺς ἀνδρῶν τοιοῦτου τὴν φύσιν

ἠθέλησαν. τίς γὰρ ἕτερος, τῆς Σπάρτης πλέον ἰσχυροῦς καὶ

τοῦ ναυτικοῦ τὴν ἡγεμονίαν ἔχοντος Εὐρυβιάδου τοῦ Σπαρτιάτου,

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 (T199). Themistokles, say Hesychios and Suidas (s.v. θεμιστοκλῆς), wished to fulfill his promise but could not betray

ταῖς ἰδίαις πράξεσιν ἀφείλετο τῆς Σπάρτης ταύτην τὴν δόξαν; τίνα δ' ἄλλον ἱστορήκαμεν μιᾷ πράξει ποιήσαντα διενεγκεῖν αὐτὸν μὲν τῶν ἡγεμόνων, τὴν δὲ πόλιν τῶν Ἑλληνίδων πόλεων, τοὺς δ' Ἕλληνας τῶν βαρβάρων;.... τίς δὲ πολέμου μεγίστου κατασχόντος αὐτὴν διέσωσε, μιᾷ δ' ἐπινοίᾳ τῇ περὶ τοῦ ζεύγματος γενομένη τὴν περὶ τῶν πολέμων δύναμιν ἐξ ἡμίσεως μέρους ἐταπείνωσεν, ὥστ' εὐχείρωτον γενέσθαι τοῖς Ἕλλησι; διόπερ ὅταν τὸ μέγεθος τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ θεωρήσωμεν, καὶ σκοποῦντες τὰ κατὰ μέρος εὕρωμεν ἐκεῖνον μὲν ὑπὸ τῆς πόλεως ἡτιμασμένον, τὴν δὲ πόλιν διὰ τὰς ἐκεῖνου πράξεις ἐπαιρομένην, εἰκότως τὴν δοκοῦσαν εἶναι τῶν ἀπασῶν πόλεων σοφωτάτην καὶ ἐπεικεστάτην χαλεπωτάτην πρὸς ἐκεῖνον εὐρίσκομεν γεγενημένην.

περὶ μὲν οὖν τῆς θεμιστοκλέους ἀρετῆς εἰ καὶ πεπλεονᾶκαμεν παρεκβάντες, ἀλλ' οὖν οὐκ ἄξιον ἐκρίναμεν τὴν ἀρετὴν αὐτοῦ παραλιπεῖν ἀνεπισήμαντον.

his countrymen, an opinion in which Aristodemus 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 witness.²⁵

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 Diodoros 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 Thucydides' 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

26

Plutarch, Themistocles, 24, 6; A.T.L., III, pp. 111-113.

bull's blood.²⁷

Athens, by the part that she played in formation of the Delian Confederacy, became hegemon (Thucydides, I, 96, 1), a rôle which Sparta clearly did not begrudge her.²⁸ A scholiast to Lysistrata (1138) makes an allusion to Athens' hegemony:

ταῦτα καὶ οἱ συντεταχότες τὰς Ἀθηναίων ιστοροῦσιν περὶ τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων· ὁ δὲ φιλόχορος φησι καὶ τὴν ἡγεμονίαν τοὺς Ἀθηναίους λαβεῖν διὰ τὰς κατασχούσας πρὶν Λακεδαίμονα συμφοράς.

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 Psammetichos' death (Herodotos, III, 15, 4), may have helped in fabrication of the tale.

28

Gf. 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:

ΛΥ. εἴτ', ὦ Λάκωνες, πρὸς γὰρ ὑμᾶς τρέψομαι,
οὐκ ἴσθ', ὅτ' ἐλθὼν δεῦρο Περικλείδας ποτὲ
ὁ Λάκων Ἀθηναίων ἱκέτης καθέζετο
ἐπὶ τοῖσι βωμοῖς ὥχρὸς ἐν φοινικίδι,
στρατιὰν προσαιτῶν; ἡ δὲ Μεσσήνη τότε
ὑμῖν ἐπέκειτο, χῶ θεὸς σείων ἅμα.

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: θάσιοι δὲ νικηθέντες μάχῃ καὶ πολιορκούμενοι Λακεδαιμονίους ἐπεκαλοῦντο καὶ ἐπαμύνειν ἐκέλευον ἐσβαλόντας ἐς τὴν Ἀττικὴν. οἱ δὲ ὑπέσχοντο μὲν κρύφα 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 Attike an earthquake devastated Lakeldaimon, 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 καταπονουμένους αὐτοὺς ὑπὸ
Μεσσηνίων διέσωσαν, οἱ δὲ Λακεδαιμόνιοι καθεῖλον τὴν
... τυραννίδα βοηθοῦντες Ἀθηναίοις.

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

σημαίνει ὅτι πόλεμος ἦν αὐτοῖς πρὸς Μεσσηνίους.

A third is attached to Lysistrata, 1142-1144:

σεισμοὶ γὰρ συχνοὶ ἐγένοντο ὅτε ὁ πόλεμος συνειστήκει.
Κίμων, μετὰ τὴν ἐν Πλαταιαῖς μάχην ιβ' ἔτει ὕστερον.
ταῦτα ἦν ἐπὶ Θεαγενίδου. καὶ γὰρ τοῦ Ταῦγέτου τι παρερράγη
καὶ τὸ ῥδεῖον καὶ ἕτερα καὶ οἰκίαι πλεῖσται, καὶ Μεσση-
νιοὶ ἀποστάντες ἐπολέμουν καὶ οἱ εἰλωτες ἀπέστησαν, ἕως
Κίμων ἐλθὼν διὰ τὴν ἱκετηρίαν ἔσωσεν αὐτοὺς.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 schol. 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 (Hell., 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 ἄλλοτρίως ἔχοντες τὰ πρὸς τοὺς Λακεδαιμονίους αἰὲ μᾶλλον τὴν ἔχθραν ἐξεπύρρουν. διὸ καὶ ταύτην μὲν ἀρχὴν ἔλαβον τῆς ἄλλοτριότητος, ὕστερον δὲ αἱ πόλεις διηνέχθησαν, καὶ μεγάλους ἐπανελόμεναι πολέμους ἔπλησαν ἅπασαν τὴν Ἑλλάδα μεγάλων ἀτυχημάτων.

Besides these difficulties, trouble was stirring

points with schol. Lysistrata (1137), where the note, although brief, is correct. Perhaps, however, οὐτοῦ 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:

Δαρεῖος βασιλεὺς ἦν, Μεγάβαρος δὲ σατράπης, πορθήσας Μέμ-
φιδα. οὗτος σατράπης Δαρείου ὁ τὴν Αἴγυπτον ἐλὼν. οὗ
μνημονεύει Θουκυδίδης ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ [109] γράφῳν οὕτως
"Μεγάβαρον τὸν Ζωπύρου πέμπει ἄνδρα Πέρσῃν μετὰ πολλῆς
στρατιᾶς, ὃς ἀφικόμενος κατὰ γῆν, τοὺς τε Αἰγυπτίους καὶ
τοὺς συμμάχους μάχῃ ἐκράτησε καὶ ἐκ Μέμφιδος ἤλασε τοὺς
"Ελλήνας!"

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

ἐκ τούτου Ἀθηναῖοι ἔπεμψαν τοῖς Αἰγυπτίοις συμμαχίαν
εἰς τὸν πρὸς Πέρσας πόλεμον, καὶ εἶχον φιλίαν καὶ συμ-
μαχίαν πρὸς ἀλλήλους.... "Ἄλλως. ὅτε Ξέρξης ἐπ' Αἰγυπ-
τίους ἐστρατεύετο. οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι συμμαχίαν αὐτοῖς ἀπέστει-
λαν. - ὁ Ξέρξης ἐπ' Αἰγυπτίους ἐστράτευσεν, οἱ δὲ
Ἀθηναῖοι συνεμάχησαν αὐτοῖς.... "Ἄλλως. Ἰνάρως ὁ τῶν
Αἰγυπτίων βασιλεὺς ἀπέστησε τοῦ βασιλέως Ξέρξου μοῖρᾶν
τινα τῆς Αἰγύπτου, καὶ χρήματα πέμψας τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις
ἔλαβε συμμάχους, οἵτινες καὶ διαπεράσαντες εἰς τὴν
Αἴγυπτον, καὶ ἐν τινὶ τῶν τοῦ Νείλου στομάτων ἀναπλεύσαντες,
προσέσχον τοῖς ἔλεσι. Μεγάβαρος δὲ ὁ τοῦ βασιλέως Περσῶν

στρατηγὸς τὸν ποταμὸν διακόψας καὶ ἀλλαχόσε τρέψας εἶλεν
ἐκείνους ἐπὶ ξηρᾶς καὶ ἀπέκτεινεν.

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.³²

³¹

Cf. Ailian (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); Ailian (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.³³ 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).³⁴

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 Zopyrus, the Persian general who fought the Egyptians in revolt and worsted 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:

Δύο Μυρωνίδαί ἦσαν, ὡς ἐν ταῖς Ἐκκλησιαζούσαις 303, δεδῆλωται. ἐνθάδε τοίνυν μέμνηται τοῦ ἐν Οἰνοφύτοις 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 Μεγαβύζου ; "for the playwright quotes Thucydides with particularity!" White fails to indicate which mss. 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. Diodoros (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 Λακωνικῆς ἀκρωτήριον, ἐν ᾧ στόμιον ἦν κατάγον εἰς Ἄδου. ἐνταῦθα δὲ ἦν καὶ Ποσειδῶνος ἱερὸν Ἀσφαλείου. τοῦτο δὲ εἶπεν, ἐπειδὴ τοὺς εἰλωτας οἰκέτας καθεσθέντας ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τοῦ Ποσειδῶνος τοῦ Ταίναριου οὐδὲν δείσαντες ἀνεῖλον Λακεδαιμόνιοι, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἐδόκουν 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

36

Cf. Gomme, Commentary, I, p. 317.

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),³⁷ and subjoins the first revolt to the later affair of Ithome. Suidas (s.v.Ταίναρον) repeats the scholion to Acharnenses. In a second note (T241) he stresses the fact that Sparta broke the right of sanctuary. Ailian'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 (T189) - agree. All except Thucydides add that the entrance to Hades is there.³⁸ The scholiasts to Lucan and Pindar describe the opening of the passage in vivid phrases

³⁷

*Αρχεδημίδης, archon 464/3. See Hill, Sources², p. 397.

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:

ὁ ἱερὸς πόλεμος ἐγένετο Ἀθηναίοις πρὸς Βοιωτοὺς βουλομένους ἐφελέσθαι Φωκέων τὸ μαντεῖον. νικήσαντες δὲ Φωκεῦσι πάλιν ἀπέδωκαν, ὡς Φιλόχορος ἐν τῇ δ' λέγει. δύο δὲ ἱεροὶ πόλεμοι γεγύνασιν, οὗτός τε καὶ ὁπότε Φωκεῦσιν ἐπέθεντο Λακεδαιμόνιοι. ἐν ἐνίοις τῶν ὑπομνημάτων ταῦτα λέγεται. ἱερὸν πόλεμον λέγει, καθὼς πρὸς θεοὺς ἔσοιτο. ἅμα δὲ τοῦ ἱεροῦ πολέμου μνημονεύει τοῦ γενομένου Ἀθηναίοις πρὸς Φωκέας ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἐν Δελφοῖς ἱεροῦ. ἐσχεδίασται δὲ ὑπ' αὐτῶν. οὐ γὰρ πρὸς Φωκέας ὑπὲρ τούτου ἐπολέμησαν, ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ Φωκέων, διὰ τὸ πρὸς Λακεδαιμονίους ἔχθος. γεγύνασι δὲ δύο πόλεμοι ἱεροί. πρότερος μὲν Λακεδαιμονίοις πρὸς

³⁹

Archiv. für Papyrusforschung, II (1903), no. 125

(p. 566).

⁴⁰

For the date see A.T.L., III, pp. 178-179 with notes

64 and 65.

Φωκεῖς ὑπὲρ Δελφῶν. καὶ κρατήσαντες τοῦ ἱεροῦ Λακεδαι-
μόνιοι τὴν προμαντείαν παρὰ Δελφῶν ἔλαβον. ὕστερον δὲ
τρίτῳ ἔτει πρώτου πολέμου Ἀθηναίοις πρὸς Λακεδαιμονίους
ὑπὲρ Φωκέων. καὶ τὸ ἱερὸν ἀπέδωκαν Φωκεῦσι, καθάπερ καὶ
Φιλόχορος ἐν τῇ δ' λέγει. καλεῖται δὲ ἱερὸς, ὅτι περὶ τοῦ
ἐν Δελφοῖς ἱεροῦ ἐγένετο. ἱστορεῖ περὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ
Θουκυδίδης 1, 112, καὶ Ἑρατοσθένης ἐν τῷ θ' καὶ Θεό-
πομπος ἐν τῷ κε'.

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 Perikles led the Athenian expedition to Delphoi, 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 (s.v. 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 ἔζη κατ' ἐκεῖνον τὸν χρόνον. ἔτελεύτησε γὰρ
ἐπὶ ἄρχοντος Καλλίου τοῦ μετὰ Μνησίθεον τούτων πρότερον
ἐνῖαυτῷ λ'. τιμῆς δὲ μεγίστης ἔτυχε παρὰ Ἀθηναίοις ὁ
Αἰσχύλος, καὶ μόνου 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). Philostratos⁴² 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. Pleske, s.v. Krisa, in P.W., R. E., and the bibliography there cited. Cf. T58.

42

Vita Apolloniī, 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 φόρον ἐξετάθη, πλείονα φόρον παρέχουσα. δηλοῖ δὲ καὶ τὸ ἡπλωσθαι. ἐκληρούχησαν δὲ αὐτὴν Ἀθηναῖοι, κρατήσαντες αὐτῆς. πρὸς τὸν χρόνον ἀπῆντησε καὶ τὸ μῆκος τοῦ πολέμου.... ἐπολιόρκησαν δὲ αὐτὴν Ἀθηναῖοι μετὰ Περικλέους, καὶ μάλιστα Χαλκιδέας καὶ Ἐρετρίεας.... Περικλέους δὲ στρατηγούντος καταστρέψασθαι αὐτοὺς πᾶσάν φησι Φιλόχορος· καὶ τὴν μὲν ἄλλην ἐπὶ ὁμολογίᾳ κατασταθῆναι, Ἑστιάεων δὲ ὀποικισθέντων αὐτοὺς τὴν χώραν ἔχειν. Περικλῆς γὰρ αὐτὴν ὑπὸ τοὺς Ἀθηναίους ἐποίησεν, ἐν πολέμῳ νικήσας τοὺς

43

Cf. Dieterich, s.v. Aischylos, in P.W., R.E.

Ἄβαντας. διὸ παρετάθη τοῖς φόροις καὶ ἐπεφορτίσθη·
ὥς τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἐπιτεινάντων τοὺς φόρους αὐτῇ....
ὁ μὲν γὰρ τοῦτο εἶρηκεν, ὅτι μακρὰ καὶ ἐπιμήκης ἡ
Εὐβοία, ὁ δὲ ἐπὶ αὐξήσεως τοῦτο φόρων ἐξέλαβε. παρα-
στησάμενος γὰρ Περικλῆς τὴν Εὐβοίαν, ἐξέτεινε τοὺς αὐτῆς
φόρους ἐπὶ πολὺ.

Thucydides (I, 114) reports the activities of Perikles against Euboeia. 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 established in her territory.⁴⁴

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

44

The scholiasts use the words κληρουχία and ἀποικία interchangeably; schol. Nubes, 213, and schol. Vespae, 217. 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:

"Ἄλλως. τὴν Εὐβοίαν φασὶν αὐτοὶ κατανεμεμῆναι ὅμῃν καὶ κλῆρον ἐκάστῳ μεδίμνων ν'.

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.G., I², 39; D17 in A.T.L., II). Regulations for Eretria are in a fragmentary state (I.G., I², 17; D16 in A.T.L., II) as are those for Hestiaia (I.G., I², 40/41), but both can be restored sufficiently to show something of the relationship between Athens and the two cities after 446.⁴⁵ Another decree concerned with Euboea (I.G., I², 376) deals with temene owned by Athens in Chalkidic and Eretrian territory.⁴⁶ Photios (T210) mentions a decree listing the hostages taken from Eretria after the revolt.

⁴⁵

For Athens and the Euboic cities see A.T.D., III, pp. 284-297; cf. Gomme, Commentary, I, pp. 340-347.

⁴⁶

See Raubitschek, Hesperia, XII (1943), pp. 28-33, who publishes a new fragment.

The Chalkidians are called by Thucydides ὑπήκοοι καὶ φόρου ὑποτελεῖς (VII, 57, 4). That tribute was paid by the Euboic cities is confirmed by the quota lists.⁴⁷ The scholiasts to Nubes state that Perikles increased (ἐξέτεινε) the tribute. The quota lists deny this; after the revolt the assessment of Chalkis and Eretria were lowered in compensation for the new klerouchies.⁴⁸

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

οἱ δὲ Χαλκιδεῖς εἰσὶ μὲν ἐπὶ τῆς Εὐβοίας ἄποικοι Ἀθηναίων, εἰσὶ δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ Θράκης οἱ Χαλκιδεῖς, ἄποικοι ὄντες ἀπὸ τῆς Εὐβοίας. πολλὰ δὲ ἦν τότε χωρία τῆς Θράκης ὑπακούοντα τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις. περὶ ὧν νῦν λέγει. καὶ γὰρ ἐπὶ Θράκης Χαλκιδεῖς ἦσαν ὑπήκοοι τῶν Ἀθηναίων. φησὶν οὖν ὅτι τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο Χαλκιδικὸν ἐστὶ.... διὰ τὸ κατ' ἐκεῖνον τὸν καιρὸν ἀποστῆναι αὐτοὺς τῶν Ἀθηναίων. ἀπέστησαν δὲ ἀπὸ Ἀθηναίων Χαλκιδεῖς ἐπὶ Εὐκλείδου ἄρχοντος. πόλις Εὐβοίας, ἄποικοι Ἀθηναίων. ἐχρῶντο δὲ τοῖς

47

See the Register of A.T.L., I, s.v.v. Ἐρετριῆς, Ἑστιάιης, Χαλκιδῆς ; see also A.T.L., II, p. 80 (s.v. Ἐρετριῆς). Note the cessation of tribute from Hestiaia after 446.

48

A.T.L., III, pp. 294-297.

ὁστρακίνοις....

The reference to the Chalkideis as apoikoi of Athens in Euboia 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 Euboia established an apoikia in Chalkidike there is indirect evidence in Herodotos (VII, 185, 2) who is first to mention the Thracian area as Chalkidike and call the inhabitants Χαλκιδικὸν γένος (cf. VIII, 127). The settlements made by Chalkis and Eretria in that area date to the eighth century.⁴⁹ Theopompos (frg. 387 Jacoby) tells us of a movement of Hestiaiians 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.⁵⁰

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

⁴⁹

Bradeen, History of Chalkis, pp. 36-69.

⁵⁰

E.g., Thucydides, I, 57, 5; II, 79, 99, 101; IV, 7.

See the Thracian panel in A.T.L., 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. 107, 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 Thukydides became leader of the oligarchic party and Perikles' most active opponent. A lengthy note to Vespae (947) discusses Thukydides' political life and what came of it:

Θουκυδίδης Μελησίου υἱὸς Περικλεῖ ἀντιπολιτευσάμενος.
τέσσαρες δὲ εἰσι Θουκυδίδαι Ἀθηναῖοι, ὁ ἱστοριογράφος
καὶ ὁ Παργήτιος καὶ ὁ Θετταλὸς καὶ οὗτος ῥήτωρ ἄριστος
τυγχάνων, ὃς κατηγορηθεὶς ἐν τῷ δικάζειν οὐκ ἠδυνήθη
ἀπολογήσασθαι ὑπὲρ ἑαυτοῦ, ἀλλ' ὥσπερ ἐγκατεχομένην ἔσχε
τὴν γλῶτταν, καὶ οὕτω κατεδικάσθη, εἴτα ἐξωστρακίσθη.
Ἄλλως. πρὸς τὴν ἱστορίαν. μήποτε ὁ Περικλεῖ ἀντι-

S.V.V.

πολιτευσάμενος. τοῦτο δὲ Φιλόχορος μὲν ἱστορεῖ. ὃς οὐδὲ πάντῃ γνώριμος ἐγένετο· ἀλλ' οὐδὲ παρὰ τοῖς κωμικοῖς, διὰ τὸ ἐπ' ὀλίγον στρατείας ἀξιωθέντα μετὰ Κλέωνος ἐπὶ Θράκης φυγῇ καταψηφισθῆναι. ἔνιοι δέ, ὧν καὶ Ἀμμόνιος τοῦ Στεφάνου ... καὶ τοῦτο δὲ ὑπίδοι τις, ὥσπερ προεῖρηται. ὁ γενόμενος ὀστρακισμὸς ἐμφαίνει τὸν Μελησίου καὶ τὸν ὀστρακισθέντα. Θεόπομπος μέντοι ὁ ἱστορικὸς τὸν Πανταίνου θησὶν ἀντιπολιτεύσασθαι Περικλεῖ, ἀλλ' οὐκ Ἀνδροτίων, ἀλλ' καὶ αὐτὸς τὸν Μελησίου.

The earliest source to mention Thoukydides' position in the Periklean city is Aristotle (T62): Perikles represented the demos, Thoukydides the others in the city.⁵¹ Plutarch (*Moralia*, 802C) explains Thoukydides' political affiliations: he was one of the ἀριστοί; he led the opposition of the ἀγαθοί and καλοί 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).⁵² 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. Aristides (T46, 2) and schol. Aristides (T45 and T46); Satyros (frg. 14 Müller).

as reference to Thoukydides rather than to the writer,⁵³ mentions a single illustration of the controversy: Πυριλάμπης γάρ τις τῶν πολιτῶν ἄνδρα φίλον καὶ ἐρώμενον ἰδίου διὰ τινα ζηλοτυπήσας ἐφόνευσε, ταύτης δὲ τῆς δίκης ἐν Ἀρείῳ πάγῃ κρινομένης πολλὰ τῆς ἰδίας σοφίας ἐπεδείξατο, ἀπολογίαὺν ποιούμενος ὑπὲρ τοῦ Πυριλάμπους, καὶ Περικλέους κατηγοροῦντος ἐνίκᾳ. ὅθεν καὶ στρατηγὸν αὐτὸν ἐλομένων Ἀθηναίων ἄρχων 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.⁵⁴

The scholiasts observe that there were three other men named Thoukydides: the historian, son of Oloros, Thoukydides Gargettios and Thoukydides Thettalos. The historian was general in Thrake reports the scholion. The Thoukydides of Thucydidēs, I, 117, 2, may be Gargettios.⁵⁵ Thettalos

⁵³

Cf. Wade-Gery, J.H.S., LII (1935), pp. 221-222; Hill, Sources,² p. 352.

⁵⁴

Vanderpool, Hesperia, Suppl. VIII (1949), pp. 394-411.

⁵⁵

Kirchner, P.A., I, no. 7272; Gomme, Commentary, I,

occurs only in the scholion, unless Thettalos is the same as Thoukydides Pharsalios (Thucydides, VIII, 92, 8); the excerptor 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 ἀλφειτοπώλιδος, ἣν ᾠκοδόμησε Περικλῆς ὅπου καὶ σῖτος ἐστέκειτο τῆς πόλεως. ἦν δὲ περὶ τὸν Πειραιᾶ. στεναχοῦσης δὲ διὰ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν συναγομένων ἐπισιτισμῶν.

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;

it was built in memory of the architect Hippodamos. Hippodamos also built the roads and streets in Peiraeus, Photios says (111, 11-17 Porson). The replanning of the port can be dated to the time of Perikles' ascendancy by the fragments of boundary stones ⁵⁶.

None of this, to be sure, proves that Perikles was responsible for the building of a grain market in Peiraeus, 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:

τοιούτων ἐστὶ παρόσον ἐν ταῖς διανομαῖς τῶν πυρῶν ἐξητάζοντο πικρῶς οἱ τε πολῖται καὶ μὴ, ὥστε δοκεῖν ξενίας φεύγειν εἰς κρίσιν καθισταμένους. φησὶν οὖν Φιλόχορος αὐθις ποτὲ τετρακισχιλίους ἑπτακοσίους ζ' ὀφθῆναι παρ-εγγράφους, καθάπερ ἐν τῇ προκειμένῃ λέξει δεδῆλωται. τὰ περὶ τὴν Εὐβοίαν δύναται καὶ αὐτὰ συνάδειν ταῖς διδασκαλίαις. πέρυσιν γὰρ ἐπὶ ἄρχοντος Ἰσάρχου ἐστράτευσαν ἐπ' αὐτήν, ὡς Φιλόχορος. μήποτε δὲ περὶ τῆς ἐξ Αἰγύπτου δωρεᾶς ὁ λόγος, ἣν Φιλόχορος φησὶ Ψαμμήτιχον πέμψαι τῷ δήμῳ ἐπὶ Λυσιμαχίδου μυριάδας τρεῖς, πλην τὰ τοῦ

⁵⁶

T139 and T140; letter forms date between 480 and

445/4.

ἀριθμοῦ οὐδαμῶς συμφωνεῖ, ἐκάστῳ δὲ Ἀθηναίων πέντε μεδίμνους. τοὺς γὰρ λαβόντας γενέσθαι μυρίους τετρακισχίλιους διακοσίους μ'. Ἄλλως. σιτοδείας ποτὲ γενομένης ἐν τῇ Ἀττικῇ, Ψαμμήτιχος ὁ τῆς Λιβύης βασιλεὺς ἀπέστειλε σίτον τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις αἰτήσασιν αὐτόν. τῆς δὲ διανομῆς γενομένης τοῦ σίτου ξενηλασίαν ἐποίησαν Ἀθηναῖοι, καὶ ἐν τῷ διακρίνειν τοὺς ἀυθιγενεῖς εὖρον καὶ ἑτέρους τετρακισχιλίους ἑπτακοσίους ἐξήκοντα ξένους παρεγγεγραμμένους. τοῦτο οὖν φησι, καὶ εὖ τῷ ἐρευνᾶσθαι μόγισ ἔλαβε πέντε μεδίμνους, ἐγκαλούμενος ὡς ξένος, καὶ τούτους οὐδὲ ὑφ' ἐν ἐν συντομίᾳ, ἀλλὰ κατὰ μέρος, κατὰ χοῖνικα ἕνα, οὐδὲν διαφέροντος τοῦ σίτου κριθῶν, ὡς κακοῦ σίτου διανεμηθέντος.

Schol Plutus (178) also refers to grain sent by Egypt to Athens in time of shortage:

ἐπὶ Ἀμάσιδος⁵⁷ Αἰγυπτίων βασιλέως ἐν σιτοδείᾳ ὄντες οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι ἔπεμψαν πρὸς αὐτόν αἰτοῦντες σίτον. καὶ ἔπεμψεν αὐτοῖς ἱκανόν..... διὸ καὶ Ψαμμίτιχος λέγεται πέμψαι πυρῶν μυριάδας τρεῖς....σίτου δὲ ἔπεμψε 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 (3320):

Θουριομάντεις δὲ οὐ τοὺς ἀπὸ Θουρίου μάντεις, ἀλλὰ τοὺς εἰς Θούριον, πόλιν Σικελίας, πεμφθέντας ἐπὶ τῷ κτίσαι αὐτήν· ἐπέμφθησαν δὲ δέκα ἄνδρες· ὧν καὶ Λάμπων ἦν ὁ μάντις, ὃν ἐξηγητὴν ἐκάλουν. ἦν δὲ καὶ τῶν πολιτευομένων πολλάκις. λόγους δὲ συνεχῶς εἰς-

quoting, as the scholiasts do, from Philochoros. I.G., I², 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 Thukydides and the oligarchs than to Perikles and the "democrats." But see Ehrenberg, A.J.P., LXIX (1948), pp. 149-170.

ἀγειν ἐφαίνετο περὶ τῆς εἰς Θούριον ἀποικίας. ἀλού-
σης γὰρ Συβάρεως, Θούριοι ἐκλήθησαν ἀπὸ κρήνης Θουρίας.
Ἄλλως. ὡς πολλῶν γενομένων μαντείων ἐπὶ τῆς εἰς Θου-
ρίους ἀποικίας....

A scholion to Aves (521) speaks further of Lampon:

ὁ δὲ Λάμπων θύτης ἦν καὶ χρησμολόγος καὶ μάντις· ᾧ
καὶ τὴν εἰς Σύβαριν τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἀποικίαν ἔνιοι περι-
ᾷπτουσιν, αὐτὸν ἡγήσασθαι λέγοντες Ἀθηναῖον ὄντα σὺν
ἄλλοις θ'.

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 Kratinos' 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 μιᾷ τούτων ἐκέχρητο ὁ Περικλῆς· δι' ἣν ὀργισθεὶς ἔγραψεν τὸ κατὰ Μεγαρέων ψήφισμα, ἀπαγορεύον δέχεσθαι αὐτοὺς εἰς τὰς Ἀθήνας. ὅθεν ἐκεῖνοι εἰργόμενοι τῶν Ἀθηναίων προσέφυγον τοῖς Λακεδαιμονίοις. ἡ δὲ Ἀσπασία Περικλέους ἦν σοφίστρια καὶ διδάσκαλος λόγων ῥητορικῶν· ὕστερον δὲ καὶ γαμετὴ γέγονε.

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

οὕτω γὰρ ἐπεγράφοντο ἐν τοῖς δικαστηρίοις, Ἀσπασία καὶ κύριος, τουτέστιν 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.⁶⁰ She had Perikles as a student of rhet-

⁶⁰

Menexenos, 235a; Xenophon, Memorabilia, II, 6, 36;

oric and oratory.⁶¹

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). The scholiast to Aristides (46, 212B 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. 'Ασπασία) agree that her earlier profession was that of hetaira, after which she became a rhetorician and a courtesan.

Suidas (s.v. 'Ασπασία) 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

Aristides, 46, 131; Alkiphron (T17); Lucian, (T178); Suidas, s.v. 'Ασπασία, copies schol. Achaenenses(527).

tes states that he was written in the court records as Aspasia's 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(s.v. 'Ασπασία) and Harpokration (T118) state that Aspasia was responsible for two wars, one with Samos and the great war with the Peloponnesos. One scholion to Vespae

⁶² Plutarch (Pericles, 32, 5) implies that they were married at this time.

⁶³ The record of guardianship may come from a collection of decrees, e.g., by Krateros (Ψηφισμάτων συναγωγῇ).

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 Σάμον ἑννεακαιδεκάτῳ ἔτει πρότερον ἐπὶ Τιμοκλέους ἄρχοντος γέγονε. Μιλησίων γάρ ποτε καὶ Σαμίων μαχομένων Ἀθηναῖοι παρακληθέντες ὑπὸ Μιλησίων εἰς συμμαχίαν ἐπεστράτευσαν κατὰ τῶν Σαμίων, Περικλέους ἡγούμενου τοῦ Ξανθίππου. κακῶς δὲ διατεθέντες Σάμιοι ἐπεχείρησαν πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα τῶν Περσῶν ἐπελθεῖν. καὶ δὴ τοῦτο μαθόντες Ἀθηναῖοι τριήρεις πολεμικάς κατ' αὐτῶν κατεσκεύασαν, Περικλέους εἰσηγησαμένου αὐτῶν. τοῦτο δὲ μαθόντες Σάμιοι μηχανὴν τινα κατασκεύασαν κατ' αὐτῶν, ἣν μαθόντες Ἀθηναῖοι ὑπὸ τινος Καρυστίωτος ἐφυλάξαντο, καὶ Σαμίους μὲν κακῶς διέθηκαν, τὸν δὲ Καρυστίωνα ἐτίμησαν σφόδρα μετὰ τοῦ γένους καὶ τῆς αὐτῶν πολιτείας ἡξίωσαν. ὥς οὖν τινος ἐξαπατήσαντος καὶ εἰπόντος ἑαυτὸν εἶναι τὸν μηνυτὴν τοῦ σκαιωρήματος τῶν Σαμίων, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἀπολυθέντος, φησὶν ὠδυνῆσθαι τὸν Φιλοκλέωνα, ὥς ταῖς κατάδικαῖς μᾶλλον χαίροντα. — τὰ περὶ Σάμον 10^ο ἔτει πρότερον ἐπὶ Τιμοκλέους γέγονε καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ ἐξῆς Μορυχίδου. Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ Μιλησίους ἐπαγαγόμενοι ἐκάκωσαν τὴν Σάμον καὶ ἔμφρουρον ἐποίησαν, τὴν δημοκρατίαν καταστήσαντες διὰ Περικλέους. Σάμιοι δὲ ἀπέστησαν πρὸς βασιλέα. καὶ τότε οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι τελέως αὐτοὺς κατεπολέμησαν, ἵνα πάλιν προσηγγέλθῃ Περικλεῖ ὅτι φοίνισσαι νῆες

παρεῖεν βοηθοῦσαι Σαμίοις. τοῦτον ἂν εἴη λέγειν
πρὸς τοὺς δικαστὰς ἀπηγγελμέναι καὶ ὠφελῆσαι τὴν
πόλιν.

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 Diodoros 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 excerptors took to be true. Schol. Vespae (283) does not echo the unfavourable tradition. A note to Nubes (859) refers to another accusation levelled at Perikles by the comic poets and by late writers:

Περικλῆς πολλῶν ὄντων χρημάτων ἐν τῇ ἀκροπόλει, εἰς τὸν πόλεμον τὰ πλεῖστα ἀνάλωσε. φασὶ δὲ ὅτι καὶ λογισμοὺς διδοὺς, τάλαντα εἴκοσιν ἀπλῶς εἶπεν εἰς τὸ δέον ἀνηλωκέναι. φησὶ δὲ Ἐφορος ὅτι μετὰ ταῦτα μαθόντες οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι Κλεανδρίδην μὲν ἐδήμευσαν, Πλειστοάναντα δὲ ἰε' τάλαντοισι ἐξημίωσαν, ὑπολαβόντες δωροδοκήσαντας αὐτοὺς, διὰ τὸ φείσασθαι τῆς λοιπῆς Ἀθηναίων γῆς, ὑπὸ τῶν περὶ τὸν Περικλέα, μὴ θελήσαντα γυμνῶς εἶπειν ὅτι δέδωκα τοῖς Λακεδαιμονίωι βασιλεῦσι τὸ ἐνδεές. Ἄλλως.

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, Ἀθηναίων στρατηγός, χρήματα τοῦ δημοσίου λαβὼν εἰς τὸ κατασκευάσαι ὀλόχρυσον ἄγαλμα τῇ Ἀθηνᾷ, ἐλεφάντινον ποιήσας, τὰ πολλὰ ἐσφετερίσατο, συμποιησάμενος μετὰ Φειδίου τοῦ πλάστου. ἔπει δὲ κατακρινόμενος ὥς πλεῖστα ἀναλώσας ἠρωτᾶτο ποῦ ἀνηλώθη, ὑπὸ μεγαλονοίας ἔλεγεν, εἰς τὸ δέον ἀνήλωσα. Ἄλλως. Περικλῆς τοῖς ἐφόροις Λακεδαιμονίων Κλεανδρίδῃ καὶ Πλειστοάναντι χρήματα δέδωκεν ὑπὲρ προδόσεως, καὶ τούτων ἀπαιτούμενος ὑπὸ τῆς πόλεως λόγου, οὐκ ἀξιῶν ἐαυτὸν τε καὶ τοὺς Λακεδαιμονίους καταισχύνειν, ἔλεγεν, εἰς τὸ δέον ἀνήλωσα. τοῦτο δὲ γινόντες οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι τὸν μὲν Κλεανδρίδην ἐφόνευσαν, τὸν δὲ Πλειστοάναντα δεκαπέντε ταλάντοις ἐζημίωσαν, οἰήθεντες αὐτούς, διὰ τὸ φείσασθαι τῆς λοιπῆς Ἀθηναίων γῆς, δωροδοκῆσαντας ἐκ τῆς Ἀττικῆς ἀναχωρῆσαι. Περικλῆς Ἀθηναίων στρατηγὸς λόγου ἀπαιτούμενος ὑπὲρ χρημάτων καὶ δεδοκὼς χρήματα Κλεανδρίδῃ τῷ ἄρμοστῇ Λακεδαιμονίων, ἐπὶ προδοσίᾳ, τοῦτο οὐκ ἐδήλου, ἀλλ' εἰς τὸ δέον ἔλεγεν ἀναλῶσαι ταῦτα.

Pherekrates (T207) and Eupolis (T114) speak of ten talents, perhaps in reference to Perikles' rumoured bribery of Lakadaimon. 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-

phrastos ten.⁶⁶

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 Potidaea, a Corinthian colony. A brief scholion to Equites (438) summarises the background, the siege and the results of the Potidaean affair:

ἔπαιξε τῷ ὀνόματι,... ἡ δὲ Ποτίδαια πόλις ἐστὶ πρὸς τῷ Ἴσθμῳ τῆς Παλλήνης κατωκισμένη, Κορινθίων μὲν ἄποικος, Ἀθηναίων δὲ σύμμαχος καὶ φόρους ἐτέλει. ἦν ἀποστᾶσαν πολιορκήσαντες οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι πολιορκίᾳ μακρᾷ, ὥς καὶ σφῶν αὐτῶν γενέσθαι καταναγκάσαι, παρέλαβον, καὶ ἐξανδραποδίσαντες τὴν πόλιν, ἀπὸ ταύτης φησὶ τῆς πόλεως κεκλοφέναι δέκα τάλαντα τὸν Κλέωνα....

Because of their enmity to Corinth, Thucydides says (I, 56), the Athenians demanded that the Potidaeans, 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 Perikles 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 Kallias to restore discipline (Thucydides, I, 61, 1). Upon the city's surrender, after a long siege (Thucydides, II, 58, 1 and 67, 1), the Poteidaians 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 Poteidaians 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., Skione; 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.⁶⁷ This tradition,

⁶⁷

Cf. Thucydides, I, 139, 1-2: καὶ μάλιστα 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 Λακεδαιμονίων Μεγαρεῖς. καὶ ὅτι πᾶσα ἡ τοῦ πολέμου πρόφασις δι' αὐτοὺς δοκεῖ γεγονέναι χάριν τοῦ τὸ πινάκιον συνθέντος τὸ κατ' αὐτῶν εἰς τὴν Περικλέους χάριν, ὥστε μήτε γῆς μήτε λιμένων Ἀττικῶν ἐπιβαίνειν τοὺς Μεγαρεῖς. εἰκότως οὖν εἰς τὸ κεχαρισμένον τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις τοὺς τούτων ἐχθροὺς παρεισάγει ἐκ τοῦ πολέμου συντριβομένους εἰς τέλος. ἅμα δὲ ταῦτα λέγων ὁ Πόλεμος, σκόροδα βάλλει εἰς τὴν θυνείαν...

πάντων καὶ ἐνδηλότατα προύλεγον τὸ περὶ Μεγαρέων ψήφισμα καθελούσι μὴ ἂν γίνεσθαι πόλεμον, ἐν ᾧ εἴρητο αὐτοὺς μὴ χρῆσθαι τοῖς λιμέσι τοῖς ἐν τῇ Ἀθηναίων ἀρχῇ μηδὲ τῇ Ἀττικῇ ἀγορᾷ. οἱ δὲ Ἀθηναῖοι οὔτε τᾶλλα ὑπήκουον οὔτε τὸ ψήφισμα καθήρουν, ἐπικαλοῦντες ἐπεργασίαν Μεγαρεῦσι τῆς γῆς τῆς ἱερᾶς καὶ τῆς ἀορίστου καὶ ἀνδραπόδων ὑποδοχὴν τῶν ἀφισταμένων.

⁶⁸

Cf. [Plutarch], De Mal. Herod., 856 A.

Another scholion to Pax (609) explains why:

ἐπεὶ ψήφισμα περὶ τῶν Μεγαρέων ὁ Περικλῆς ἔγραψε,
μήτε γῆς μήτε λιμένων αὐτοὺς ἐπιβαίνειν Ἀττικῶν,
εἰ δὲ μή, τὸν ληθρόντα ἀγώγιμον εἶναι. ἐφ' ᾧ κινή-
θεῖσα πᾶσα ἡ Ἑλλὰς τὸν πόλεμον ἐποίησε. τινὲς δὲ
φασιν ὅτι ἔπλεξεν αὐτοῖς, καὶ κατηγόρησεν αὐτῶν ὡς
ἀρπασάντων γυναῖκας Ἀθηναίων ἐν ἑορτῇ, συμβουλευσας
πολεμεῖσθαι.

A note to Acharnenses (527-528) agrees:

ὁ Περικλῆς.... ὀργισθεὶς ἔγραψε τὸ κατὰ Μεγαρέων
ψήφισμα, ἀπαγορεῦον δέχεσθαι αὐτοὺς εἰς τὰς Ἀθήνας.
ὅθεν ἐκεῖνοι εἰργόμενοι τῶν Ἀθηνῶν προσέφυγον τοῖς
Λακεδαιμονίοις. ἡ δὲ Ἀσπασία Περικλέους ἦν σοφίσ-
τρια καὶ διδάσκαλος λόγων ῥητορικῶν.
ἐνταῦθα εἰς τὸν Περικλέα βούλεται ἀγαγεῖν τὴν αἰτίαν
τοῦ πολέμου, οὐκ εὐπρεπῇ αὐτῷ προσάπτων πρόφασιν.

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

αἰτίαν εἶχον οἱ Μεγαρεῖς ὡς ἀρχηγοὶ γενέσθαι τοῦ
πολέμου διὰ τὴν ἀρπαγὴν τῶν πορνῶν Ἀσπασίας καὶ
τὴν ἐπὶ τούτοις ὀργὴν Περικλέους καὶ τὸ Ψήφισμα,
ὡς ἐν Ἀχαρνεῦσι [527] φησὶν.

Another gloss to Acharnenses (524) adds the name of Alki-

biades to the story:

οἱ ἀπὸ τῶν Ἀθηναίων Μεγαρικὴν γυναῖκα Σιμαίθαν....
ταύτης δὲ καὶ Ἀλκιβιάδης ἠράσθη, ὃς καὶ δοκεῖ ἀναπεπεικ-
ῆναι τινὰς ἠρπακέναι τὴν πόρνην.

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 Μεγαρέας μήτε οὐ
ἀγορᾶς μήτε θαλάττης μήτ' ἡπείρου μετέχειν. ἐπεὶ οὖν
ὅμοια τοῖς Τιμακρέοντος ἔγραψε, διὰ τοῦτο εἶπεν ὅτι ἐτί-
θει νόμους ὥσπερ σκολιὰ γεγραμμένους. ἐνεκάλεσε δὲ ὁ
Περικλῆς τοῖς Μεγαρεῦσιν ὅτι τὴν ἱερὰν γῆν τὴν ὀργάδα
ἐγεώργησαν.

The decree, itself, that Megara 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. Ailian (T8) states
only that the Μεγαρέων πινάκιον was cause of the Pelopon-
nesian War. The orators are less clear: Andokides (T24)
and Aischines (T11) report that the war came about διὰ
Μεγαρέας.

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 Mal. Herod., 856 A): ὥσπερ οἱ κωμικοὶ τὸν πόλεμον ὑπὸ τοῦ Περικλέους ἐκκαύσασθαι δι' Ἀσπασίαν ἢ διὰ Φειδίαν ἀποφαίνοντες, οὐ φιλοτιμία τινὶ καὶ φιλονεικίᾳ μᾶλλον στορέσαι τὸ φρόνημα Πελοποννησίων καὶ μηδενὸς ὑφεῖσθαι Λακεδαιμονίων ἐθέλησαντος. 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 (T82) follows. The fact that she was rumoured to be a madam⁷⁰ 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:

Φιλόχορος ἐπὶ Θεοδώρου ἄρχοντος ταῦτά φησι. καὶ τὸ ἄγαλμα
τὸ χρυσοῦν τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ἐστάθη εἰς τὸν νεὼν τὸν μέγαν,
ἔχον χρυσοῦν σταθμὸν ταλάντων μδ', Περικλέους ἐπιστα-
τοῦντος, Φειδίου δὲ ποιήσαντος. καὶ Φειδίας ὁ ποιήσας,
δόξας παραλογίζεσθαι τὸν ἑλέφαντα τὸν εἰς τὰς φολίδας,
ἐκρίθη. καὶ φυγὼν εἰς Ἑλιν ἐργολαβῆσαι τὸ ἄγαλμα
τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ ἐν Ὀλυμπίᾳ λέγεται, τοῦτο δὲ ἐξεργασά-
μενος ἀποθανεῖν ὑπὸ Ἑλείων ἐπὶ Πυθοδώρου, ὅς ἐστιν
ἀπὸ τούτου ἑβδομος, περὶ Μεγαρέων εἰπὼν, ὅτι καὶ αὐτοὶ
κατεβόων Ἀθηναίων παρὰ Λακεδαιμονίοις, ἀδίκως λέγοντες
εἶργεσθαι ἀγορᾶς καὶ λιμένων τῶν παρ' Ἀθηναίοις. οἱ
γὰρ Ἀθηναῖοι ταῦτα ἐψηφίσαντο Περικλέους εἰπόντος,
τὴν γῆν αὐτοὺς αἰτιώμενοι τὴν ἱερὰν τοῖς θεοῖς ἀπεργά-
ζεσθαι. λέγουσι δὲ τινες ὡς Φειδίου τοῦ ἀγαλματοποιοῦ
δόξαντος παραλογίζεσθαι τὴν πόλιν καὶ φυγαδευθέντος, ὁ
Περικλῆς φοβηθεὶς διὰ τὸ ἐπιστατῆσαι τῇ κατασκευῇ τοῦ
ἀγάλματος καὶ συνεγνωκέναι τῇ κλοπῇ, ἔγραψε τὸ κατὰ Μεγα-
ρέων πινάκιον καὶ τὸν πόλεμον ἐπήνεγκεν. ἵνα ἀπησχολη-
μένοις Ἀθηναίοις εἰς τὸν πόλεμον μὴ δῶ τὰς εὐθύνας,
ἐγκαλέσας Μεγαρεῦσιν ὡς τὴν ἱερὰν ὀργάδα ταῖν θεαῖν
ἐργασαμένοις. ἄλογος δὲ φαίνεται ἡ κατὰ Περικλέους
ὑπόνοια, ἐπὶ ἑπτὰ ἔτεσι πρότερον τῆς τοῦ πολέμου ἀρχῆς
τῶν περὶ Φειδίαν γενομένων. ὁ Φειδίας, ὡς Φιλόχορος

φησίν, ἐπὶ Θεοδώρου ἄρχοντος τὸ ἄγαλμα τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς
κατασκευάσας ὑφείλετο τὸ χρυσίου ἐκ τῶν δρακόντων
τῆς χρυσελεφαντίνης Ἀθηνᾶς, ἐφ' ᾧ καταγνώσθεις
ἐζημιώθη φυγῇ· γενόμενος δὲ εἰς Ἡλιν, καὶ ἐργο-
λαβήσας παρὰ τῶν Ἡλείων τὸ ἄγαλμα τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ Ὀλ-
υμπίου, καὶ καταγνώσθεις ὑπ' αὐτῶν ὡς νοσφισάμενος
ἀνῆρέθη.⁷¹

Schol. Pax (606) offers supplementary information:

ἔδοκει γὰρ ὁ Περικλῆς συνεγνώκειναι τῇ κλοπῇ, ἐπεὶ
καὶ ἐργεπιστατεῖν ὑπὸ τῶν Ἀθηναίων κεχειροτόνηται.
φοβηθεὶς οὖν αὐτοῦ διελεγχθῆναι τὰς κλοπὰς, ἐκίνησε
τὸν Πελοποννησιακὸν πόλεμον, ἐλπίσας ταραχῆς γενο-
μένης καὶ περὶ τὸν πόλεμον ἀπασχοληθέντων τῶν
Ἀθηναίων εὐθύναι 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. Pax, 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

71

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

ques Apollodore (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 433 (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 Euboea. 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 Plutarch, 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.⁷⁷ 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, Nicias, 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. Thucydides, 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 than Thucydides 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:

δοκεῖ διὰ τούτων αἰνίττεσθαι τὴν ὑπὸ Μελησίππου λεχθεῖσαν ἀπειλὴν. ἐν ἀρχῇ γὰρ τοῦ Πελοποννησιακοῦ πολέμου πεμφθεὶς πρεσβευτὴν ὁ Μελησίππος ὑπὸ Λακεδαιμονίων εἰς τὰς Ἀθήνας, ὥς οὐχ ὑπήκουσαν οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι, ἡξίου ἀπαλαττόμενος λοιπὸν καὶ γενόμενος ἐπὶ τοῖς ὁρίοις εἰπεῖν ὥς ἦδε ἡ ἡμέρα πολλῶν καὶ μεγάλων κακῶν τοῖς Ἕλλησιν ἄρξει.

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 after¹. 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):

TP. σπένδοντες εὐχόμεσθα τὴν νῦν ἡμέραν
 "Ἑλλήσιν ἄρξαι πᾶσι πολλῶν καγαθῶν,
 χῶστις προθύμως ξυλλάβοι τῶν σχοινίων....

There is, however, a similar clause in Aristides' 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 Hellenes².

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 Medes. In a note to Pax (107) is a brief reminder:

τοῦτο δὲ λέγει, ὅτι Λακεδαιμονίοις ἐβοήθουν οἱ Πέρσαι
 ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ τῷ Πελοποννησιακῷ.

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

ὁ δὲ Σμικύθης Θρακῶν βασιλεὺς. κύριον δὲ ἀντὶ τοῦ

2

Cf. Plutarch, Nicias, 9, 9: Perikles was the beginning of many evils for the Greeks. Cf. also Herodotos, V, 97, 3, for use of the phrase in a similar context.

Κύρου τοῦ Ἀρταξέρξου τοῦ Περσῶν βασιλέως, ὅς κατ' ἐκείνους τοὺς χρόνους τῆς Λυδίας πεμφθεὶς σατραπεύειν, Λακεδαιμονίοις προσθεμένοις εἰς πόλεμον τὰ πρὸς Ἀθηναίους ἐχορήγησε χρήματα.

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 Lakodaimon 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 (Hell., I, 5, 1; II, 1, 10-11).³ 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 Ranae (1463) supply a partial statement of the principles:

³

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

τὴν Περικλέους γνώμην λέγει. εἰ τὴν Ἀττικὴν ὡς πολεμίαν ἐάσουσι τέμνεσθαι, ἢ καὶ οὐ τέμνουσι, τὴν δὲ Λακωνικὴν περιπλεύσουσιν. Ἄλλως. ἐπὶ τὴν Περικλέους φέρεται γνώμην, ὅς συνεβούλευσε περιπλεῖν τὴν Πολεμίαν, μὴ μάχεσθαι δὲ τεμνομένην τῆς Ἀττικῆς. Ἄλλως. τοιαύτην γνώμην καὶ Περικλῆς συνεβούλευσεν Ἀθηναίοις Λακεδαιμονίων εἰσβαλλόντων εἰς τὴν Ἀττικὴν, μέγα βοήσας ἀπὸ τοῦ βήματος, ὡς οὐκ ἂν ἄλλως ἔσται τοῖς πράγμασι σωτηρία, εἰ μὴ τὸ κατὰ γῆν μάχεσθαι τοῦτοις ἀφέντες περιπλευσόμεθα Λακεδαίμονα πληῖται νεῶν.

There is a similar note to Ranae (1465):

καὶ τοῦτο κατὰ τὴν Περικλέους γνώμην, ὅς ἐκέλευεν Ἀθηναίοις, ἐμβαλόντων Λακεδαιμονίων εἰς τὴν Ἀττικὴν, μὴ ἐπεξιέναι, ἀλλ' εἴσω τείχους μένειν, αὐτοὺς δὲ διὰ τῶν πλοίων ἐπιέναι τῇ Λακωνικῇ. τὸν οὖν κατὰ γῆν πόρον ἀπορίαν ἡγεῖσθαι, τὸν δὲ διὰ θαλάσσης, τοῦτον ἡγεῖσθαι πόρον. ἢ καὶ οὕτως. ἓνα μὲν πόρον ἡγεῖσθαι χρημάτων, τὸ ναῦς ὡς πλείστας ἔχειν. τὸν δὲ ἄλλον ... vacat... πόρον, ὅς ἂν ἔξω τῆς γῆς ᾗ, τοῦτον ἀπορίαν νομίζειν. οἶον τὰ θεωρικά, ἢ δικαστικά, ἢ ἐκκλησιαστικά. συμβουλεύει οὖν πᾶσαν τὴν ἐν τοῦτοις γινομένην δαπάνην ταῖς ναυσὶν ἀφορίσαι. πρὸς ταύτην δὲ τὴν ἔννοιαν καὶ τὸ ἐπιφερόμενον ἀκόλυθον.

The crowded conditions of Athens, once the plan went into

effect are reported in a note to Equites (792):

ὅτι διὰ τὸν πόλεμον οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι ἐκ τῶν ἀγρῶν εἰς-
ερχόμενοι ἐν ταῖς πιθῆκαις ἢ ἐν τοῖς σπηλαίοις ὥκουν
τῇ σπάνει τῶν οἰκημάτων.

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

ἢ διὰ τὸ τοὺς ὄρνις τοῦτους μάλιστα τοῖς πύργοις ἐπι-
καθῆσθαι καὶ τοῖς τείχεσιν, εἰς οὓς οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι
ἐκᾶθεν δὲ διὰ τὸν 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 Peloponnese; 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 (Athenaion 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 Thracian Chersonese as an Athenian sphere:

Χερρόνησος τῆς Θράκης χωρίον καὶ πόλις, ὑποτελής τῶν
Ἀθηναίων, εὐφορος εἰς πυροῦ. ὄθεν καὶ ἐσιταγῶνουν 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 νικῆσαι ναυμαχίαις β' Λακεδαιμονίους στρατηγῆσας. λιτὸς δὲ οὗτος καὶ στρατιωτικός. τὸ δὲ αἶς ἔλαχεν, ἀντὶ τοῦ αἶς ὑπέμεινε Φορμίων. — φιλοπόλεμος γὰρ καὶ αὐστηρὸς ὁ Φορμίων. στιβάδας δέ, ἐπεὶ οἱ στρατιῶται χαμαικοιτοῦσιν. ἀναγράφεται δὲ ὁ Φορμίων δυοὶ ναυμαχίαις νικῆσαι Λακεδαιμονίους στρατηγῆσας. λιτὸς δὲ οὗτος καὶ στρατιωτικός. διὰ καὶ στιβάδας εἶπε Φορμίωνος....καὶ Διουθύσιος ἐν Ταξιάρχοις παρ' Εὐπόλιδι μανθάνων παρὰ τῷ Φορμίωνι. τοὺς τῶν στρατηγῶν καὶ πολέμων νόμους.... ὁ Φορμίων δὲ οὗτος Ἀθηναῖος τῷ γένει, υἱὸς Ἀσωπίου, ὃς καθαρῶς στρατηγῆσας πένης ἐγένετο. ἀτιμωθεὶς δὲ τὸ μὴ δύνασθαι τὰς ρ' μυᾶς τῆς εὐθύνης ἀποδοῦναι, ἐν ἄγρῳ διέτριβεν, ἕως Ἀκαρνᾶνες στρατηγὸν αὐτὸν ᾔτουν. ὁ δὲ οὐχ ὑπήκουσε, φάσκων μὴ ἐξεῖναι 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.

βουλόμενος λῦσαι τὴν ἀτιμίαν ἀπεμίσθωσεν αὐτὸν τῶν ῥ' μνῶν τοῦ Διονυσίου. ὥς Ἀνδροτίων ἐν γ' Ἀττικῶν. αὐτοῦ μέμνηται ὁ κωμικὸς ἐν Ἰππεῦσι 565, καὶ Νεφέλαις 804, καὶ Βαβυλωνίοις, Εὐπολὶς Ἀστρατεύτοις.... Ἄλλως. ὥς ὑπέμεινε Φορμίων. πολλάκις δὲ εἴρηται περὶ τοῦτου ὅτι ἀγαθὸς ἐγένετο στρατηγός. ἐν δὲ τοῖς Ταξι-ἀρχοῖς φέρεται ὡς ἐπίπυρος.

To Equites (562) is a gloss about his εὐτυχία in warfare and his recent triumphs:

στρατηγὸς δὲ Ἀθηναίων ναυτικώτατος ὁ Φορμίων, καὶ πολλάκις εὐτυχήσας ἐν ναυμαχίαις καὶ ἐν τῇ πρὸς Λακεδαιμονίους μάχῃ κατορθώσας νῆ' ναῦς διέφθειρεν.

Schol. Equites (563) supplies a shorter note:

ἐπεὶ νεωστὶ Ἀθηναῖοι Φορμίωνος στρατηγοῦντος περὶ ναυμαχίαν ἠνδραγάθησαν.

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

Φορμίων, στρατηγός, σφόδρα εὐδόκιμος, Ἀσωπίου υἱός. ὥς τριχώδης... ἔχων ἐκωμωδεῖτο.

Thucydides (I, 64, 2) names Phormio as son of Asopios, and among other battles reports the two in which he fought successfully 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 Aristides (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.⁶ Only Pausanias believes that Phormio was punished by ἀτιμία 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' Taxiarchs (T111; 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 Aristides 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):

ὁ Βρασιδᾶς ὁ Τέλλιδος παῖς, ὃς ἦν Λακεδαιμονίων στρατηγός. καὶ οὗτος δὲ ἀνθίστατο τῇ εἰρήνῃ. ἐτελεύτησε δὲ ἐν Θράκῃ.

Thucydides calls him the son of Tellis (II, 25, 2) and describes his campaigns until his death at Amphipolis⁷.

One of the major principles of Perikles' 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 Pylos and in Thrake and his opposition to the peace towards the end of the war see below pp. 211-213 and 215-220.

εἶπε γὰρ δρᾶμα τοὺς Βαβυλωνίους τῇ τῶν Διονυσίων ἑορτῇ,
ἥτις ἐν τῷ ἔαρι ἐπιτελεῖται, ἐν ᾧ ἔφερον τοὺς φόρους οἱ
σύμμαχοι.

The information is similar in schol. Acharnenses (504):

εἰς δὲ τὰ Διονύσια ἐτέτακτο Ἀθηναῖς 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 Decree of Kleinias⁸ and in the decree concerning the collectors of the tribute⁹.

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

ὀπίσω τοῦ νεῷ τῆς καλουμένης πολιᾶδος Ἀθηναῖς διπλοῦς
τοῖχος ἔχων θύραν, ὅπου ἦν θησαυροφυλάκιον. Ἄλλως.
ἐπεὶ τὰ χρήματα ἐν τῷ ὀπισθοδόμῳ ἀπέκειτο. μέρος δὲ
ἐστὶ τῆς ἀκροπόλεως, ἔνθα ἦν ταμιεῖον, ὀπισθεν τοῦ τῆς
Ἀθηναῖς ναοῦ. τῆς Ἀθηναῖς δηλονότι. εἰς τὴν ἀκρό-
πολιν ἀνέφερον τὰ χρήματα, κἀνταῦθα ἐφυλάττοντο, καθὰ

8

A.T.L., II, D7, lines 18-22.

9

A.T.L., II, D8, lines 10-13.

καὶ Θουκυδίδης φησὶν ἐν τῇ δευτέρᾳ [13] οὕτως "ὑπαρχόντων δὲ ἐν τῇ ἀκροπόλει αἰεὶ ποτε ἀργυρίου ἐπισήμων ἑξακισχιλίων ταλάντων· τὰ γὰρ πλεῖστα τριακοσίων ἀποδέοντα περιεγένετο, ἀφ' ὧν ἔς τε τὰ προπύλαια τῆς ἀκροπόλεως καὶ ἔς καὶ τᾶλλα οἰκοδομήματα, καὶ ἔς Ποτίδαιαν ἐπανηλώθη.

There is copious literary evidence to prove that the treasury was maintained in the opisthodomos.¹⁰ 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 opisthodomos is contained in the Decrees of Kallias, which indicate

¹⁰

The location of the opisthodomos is still the subject of much dispute.

that Athene's moneys are to be guarded in the opisthodomos¹¹. Borrowings from Athene Polias, to whom the tribute quota was dedicated, are attested epigraphically¹².

A scholion to Lysistrata (173) mentions that the treasury (of Athene Polias) contained one thousand talents¹³.

καὶ τὸ ἀργύριον τὸ ἄβυσσον ἢ παρὰ τῇ θεῷ ἐν τῇ ἀκρο-
πόλει. καὶ γὰρ ἀληθῶς ἀπέκειτο χίλια τάλαντα. ἤρξ-
αντο οὖν κινεῖν αὐτὰ ἐπὶ Καλλίου ἄρχοντος, ἐφ' οὗ
εἰσῆχθη τὸ δρᾶμα, ὥς φησὶ Φιλόχορος ἐν "Ατθίδι.

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 Athene¹⁴.

11

A.T.L., D1, lines 15-18, and D2, lines 24-25.

12

E.G., I.G., I², 324.

13

The amount is noted in both V and R.

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 τὰ 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-text¹⁵ 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 Aves (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 (A.T.L., II, p. 61: κινεῖν, τὰ ἐν δημοσί(ω) ἀποκείμενα τέλαντα.... 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 A.T.L., III, pp. 118-132; see also below, pp.

καὶ τοῦτο ἀφ' ἱστορίας ἔλαβεν. ὁ ἦρχοντο γὰρ Ἀθη-
ναῖοι κοινῇ ἐπὶ τῶν θυσιῶν ἑαυτοῖς τε καὶ Χίοις,
ἐπειδὴ ἔπεμπον οἱ Χῖοι συμμάχους εἰς Ἀθήνας, ὅτε
χρεῖα πολέμου προσῆν. καθάπερ Θεόπομπος ἐν τῷ ιβ'
τῶν Φιλιππικῶν φησιν οὕτως " οἱ δὲ πολλοὶ τοῦ ταῦτα
πράττειν ἀπεῖχον. ὥστε τὰς εὐχὰς κοινὰς καὶ περὶ ἐκ-
είνων καὶ σφῶν αὐτῶν ἐποιοῦντο, καὶ σπένδοντες ἐπὶ
ταῖς θυσίαις ταῖς δημοτελέσιν ὁμοίως ἦρχοντο τοῖς θεοῖς
Χίοις διδόναι τὰγαθὰ καὶ σφίσιν αὐτοῖς! λέγει δὲ περὶ
Χίου καὶ Εὐπολῖς ἐν Πόλεσιν....ὁ δὲ Ὑπερίδης ἐν
τῷ Δηλιακῷ καὶ ὅτι Χῖοι ἦρχοντο Ἀθηναίοις δεδῆλωκεν.

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.¹⁶ 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 materially.¹⁷ It was not until 412,

¹⁶

See A.T.L., III, p. 204; cf. Thucydides, VII, 57,

4.

¹⁷

E.g., against the Peloponnesians (Thucydides, II,
56, 2), at Sphacteria (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 Byzantium. 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 κίβδηλία in a note to Aves (158), mention war between Chios and Athens; this is clearly the revolt of 412 B.C.:

τὸν ἐκ τοῦ ἀργύρου ῥύπον. μοχθηρίαν καὶ ζηλοτυπίαν.
ἀμα δὲ ὅτι τὰ νομίσματα κίβδηλα λέγεται παρὰ τὸ ὑπὸ
Χίων δεδηληθῆσθαι. Ἄλλως. κίβδηλα ἐλέγετο νομίσματα
τὰ ὑπὸ Χίων δεδηλημένα, ἥτοι βεβλαμμένα, κατὰ τροπὴν
τοῦ χ εἰς κ. Ἀθηναῖοι γὰρ καὶ Χῖοι πρὸς ἀλλήλους
ἐμάχοντο, διὸ τὰ Χίων νομίσματα μετὰ τοῦ χ στοιχείου
Ἀθηναῖοι ἐγχαράξαντες ἀπεστρέφοντο....

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

ἀμα δὲ ὡς ἐκ πάσης προφάσεως τῶν Ἀθηναίων συνο-
φαντούντων καὶ ζημιούντων τὰς πόλεις.... ἢ μᾶλλον αὐ-
τὸς κωμωδεῖ διὰ τὸ ὑπονοεῖν αὐτοὺς ἀποστήσεσθαι 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.¹⁹ A recently discovered fragment of a decree, it is likely, specifically cites these pledges.²⁰ It may well be that the original scholiast here knew Thucydides and had in mind the unrest in Chios in 425/4.²¹

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.²²

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 Χῆοι..ποιησάμενοι μέντοι πρὸς Ἀθηναίους πίστει καὶ βεβαιότητι ἐκ τῶν δυνατῶν μηδὲν περὶ σφᾶς νεώτερον βουλεύσειν.

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

²¹ Compare the scholiasts' language with that of Thucydides (...Ἀθηναίων καὶ ὑποπτευσάντων ἐς αὐτοὺς τι νεωτεριεῖν). The tone is the same?

²² Cf. the fine paid by Samos to cover the cost of her

νησιωτικὸς δὲ ὁ τοὺς τὰς νήσους οἰκοῦντας συκοφαντῶν
καὶ εἰς δικαστήριον ἄγων.

The theme is well known from the "Old Oligarch".²³

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.²⁴ 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.v κίβδηλία and μοχθηρία) 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 κίβδηλία 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

protracted siege in 440/39; Thucydides, I, 117, 3; A.T.L., III, pp. 334-335.

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:

τοὺς Βαβυλωνίους λέγει. τοὺτους γὰρ πρὸ τῶν Ἀχαρνέων Ἀριστοφάνης ἐδίδασκεν, ἐν οἷς πολλοὺς κακῶς εἶπεν. ἐκωμῶδησε γὰρ τὰς τε κληρωτὰς καὶ χειροτουητὰς ἀρχάς, καὶ Κλέωνα, παρόντων τῶν ξένων....καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ὀργισθεὶς ὁ Κλέων ἐγράψατο αὐτὸν ἀδικίας εἰς τοὺς πολίτας, ὥς εἰς ὕβριν τοῦ δήμου καὶ τῆς βουλῆς ταῦτα πεποιηκότες. καὶ ξενίας δὲ αὐτὸν ἐγράψατο καὶ εἰς ἀγῶνα 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 Εὐθυμένης, ὁ ἄρχων, ἐφ' οὗ κατελύθη τὸ ψήφισμα τὸ περὶ τοῦ μὴ κωμῶδεῖν, γραφέν ἐπὶ Μορυχίδου. ἴσχυσε δὲ ἐκεῖνόν τε τὸν ἐνιαυτὸν καὶ δύο τοὺς ἐξῆς ἐπὶ Γλαυκῖνου τε καὶ Θεοδώρου, μεθ' οὗς Εὐθυμένους κατελύθη.

Schol. Acharnenses (1150) reports that Antimachos sought to censor comic allusions ἐξ ὀνόματος:

φασὶ γὰρ αὐτὸν γράψαι ψήφισμα ὥστε τοὺς χοροὺς μηδὲν ἐκ τῶν χορηγῶν λαμβάνειν. τὸν Ψακάδος ἔφη....ἐπειδὴ προσ-
ῆρρανε τοὺς συνομιλοῦντας διαλεγόμενος....ἐδόκει δὲ ὁ
'Αντίμαχος οὗτος ψήφισμα πεποιηκέναι, μὴ δεῖν κωμωδεῖν
ἐξ ὀνόματος. καὶ ἐπὶ τούτῳ πολλοὶ τῶν ποιητῶν οὐ προσ-
ῆλθον ληψόμενοι τὸν χορὸν, καὶ δῆλον ὅτι πολλοὶ τῶν
χορευτῶν ἐπείνων. ἐχορήγει δὲ ὁ 'Αντίμαχος τότε, ὅτε
εἰσήνεγκε τὸ ψήφισμα. οἱ δὲ λέγουσιν ὅτι ποιητῆς
ὢν καλὸς χορηγῶν ποτε μικρολόγως τοῖς χορευταῖς.

The scholiasts to Aves (1297) mention such a bill, supported by Syrakosios:

δοκεῖ δὲ καὶ ψήφισμα τεθεικέναι μὴ κωμωδεῖσθαι ὀνο-
μαστὶ τινᾶ, ὡς Φρύνιχος ἐν Μονοτρόπῳ φησί. Ψῶρ'
ἔχε Συρακόσιον. ἐπιφανῆς γὰρ αὐτῷ καὶ μέγα τύχοι.
ἀφείλετο γὰρ κωμωδεῖν οὓς ἐπεθύμουν. διδὲ πρᾶκτότερον
αὐτῷ προσφέρονται.

Morychides, Glaukinos, Theodoros and Euthymenes held archonship from 440/39 to 437/6 respectively. Antimachos and Syrakosios we cannot date before Acharnenses and neither can be placed accurately. The former's bill, however, obviously dates earlier than Acharnenses and, since Phrynichos' Mono-

tropos (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 ὁ ψαρκίς, 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 Aristo-

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 Syrakosios 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, ὅτι Λυσικλέα λέγει, ὃς προβατοπώλης ἐλέγετο.
ὃ ἐγαμήθη Ἀσπασία.

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

νευρορράφοις δὲ φησι διὰ τὸν προβατοπώλην Λυσικλέα.

Λυσικλῆς ὡς προβατοκᾶπηλος 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 Thukydides, 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 κολακείαν ἐδημηγόρει....
ἐπεὶ καὶ ὁ Κλέων ἐδόκει παρὰ τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις εὐδοκιμεῖν
διὰ τὸ πρὸς ἡδονὴν καὶ χάριν δημηγορεῖν.

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:

διαβάλλει οὖν ὡς δύσοσμον, ἄλλως τε καὶ τὴν εὐτέλειαν
δείκνυσσι τοῦ Κλέωνος, ἀφ' οἷας τύχης ὁρμώμενος ἐπρώτευσεν
τῶν Ἀθηναίων. ἔπειδ' ὁ πατήρ αὐτοῦ Κλεώνυμος ἐργαστήριον εἶχε δοῦλων βυρσοδεψῶν.

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 Ailian (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:

Θεόπομπος ἐν δεκάτῳ Φιλιππικῶν φησὶν ὅτι οἱ ἵππεῖς
ἐμίσουν αὐτῶν. προπηλακισθεῖς γὰρ ὑπ' αὐτῶν καὶ παροξυνθεῖς ἐπετέθη τῇ πολιτείᾳ, καὶ διετέλεσεν εἰς αὐτοὺς

28

E.g., Equites, 248, 262, 624, 692, 696.

καὶ μηχανώμενος. κατηγόρησε γὰρ αὐτῶν ὡς λειπο-
στρατοῦντων. διὰ τοῦτο οὖν ἐμνήσθη αὐτῶν Ἀριστοφάνης.

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

ταραξιπρόστρατον δὲ καλοῦσι τὸν Κλέωνα, τουτέστι τὸν
ταράξαντα τὸ πλῆθος τὸ ἱππικόν. τοῦτο δὲ εἶπεν, ἵνα
δόξωσιν εἰκότως αὐτῷ χαλεπαίνειν καὶ αὐτοὶ καὶ πολεμ-
εῖν. ἢ ἵνα τὸν Κλέωνα διέξῃ διὰ πάντων λυμαινόμενον τὴν
πόλιν, διαφθείροντα μὲν τὸ ἱππικόν, σφετεριζόμενον δὲ τοὺς
φόρους.

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

ἐπεὶ οὖν ὁ Κλέων ψευδῇ κατὰ τῶν ἱππέων κατηγόρησε, καὶ
ἡ βουλή πείθεσθαι ἐδόκει, ψευδατραφάξυος εἶπε πλέαν τὴν
βουλήν γεγυμέναι, διαβάλλων μὲν ὡς ψεύστην τὸν Κλέωνα,
τῆς δὲ βουλῆς καθαπτόμενος....

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

ἐξημίωθη γὰρ ὁ Κλέων πέντε τάλαντα διὰ τὸ ὑβρίζειν
τοὺς ἱππέας. παρὰ τῶν νησιωτῶν ἔλαβε πέντε τάλαντα ὁ
Κλέων, ἵνα πείσῃ τοὺς Ἀθηναίους κουφίσαι αὐτοὺς τῆς
εἰσφορᾶς. αἰσθόμενοι δὲ οἱ ἱππεῖς ἀντέλεγον καὶ
ἀπήτησαν αὐτὸν. μέμνηται Θεόπομπος.

The fine of five talents is discussed in another scholion to Acharnenses (8):

εἰς τὸ δρᾶμα οὖν τῶν ἱκπέων ἀποτείνεται. διὰ τοῦτου γὰρ φαίνεται καταδικασθεὶς ὁ Κλέων τάλαντα εἰς ἄξιον οὖν φησιν Ἑλλάδος τὸ καταδικασθῆναι τὸν 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 line²⁹ 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. Vespae (204):

τοῦτο δέ φησιν, ὡς τοῦ Κλέωνος εἰς δίκην ἐπαγαγόντος τὸν Λάχητα. στρατηγήσαι δὲ αὐτὸν φησι Δημήτριος ἐπὶ ἄρχοντος Εὐκλέους πρὸ τριῶν ἐτῶν εἰς Σικελίαν πεμφθέντα μετὰ νεῶν Λεοντίνοισι βοηθήσονται. οἱ δὲ περὶ τὸν Φιλόχορον διαδέξασθαι αὐτὸν φασὶ Σοφοκλέα καὶ Πυθόδωρον, οὓς καὶ φυγῇ ζημιωθῆναι. εἰκὸς γοῦν μετακληθῆναι αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὴν κρίσιν, ἧς νῦν ὁ κωμικὸς μνημονεύει.

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

ὡς τοῦ Λάχητος δὲ τὰ δημοσία σφετερισμένον 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 πόλεις...ἀπὸ ταύτης φησὶ τῆς πόλεως κεκλοφέναι

δέκα τάλαντα τὸν Κλέωνα, καὶ τοῦτῳ φιλονεικῶν αὐτὸν
ἀμείβεσθαι τοῖς ἴσοις, ἐπεὶ πρότερος ἐκεῖνος ἔφησεν αὐ-
τὸν σφετερίσασθαι τῆς πόλεως τάλαντα πολλὰ.

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 θυννοσκοποὺς εἰσιόντες εἰς τὸ
δίκτυον οὐ λαμβάνουσιν οἱ θύννοι, οὕτως οὐ λαμβάνουσι τὸν
Κλέωνα τῆς πόλεως ἐπιβαίνοντες οἱ τοὺς φόρους φέροντες.
....ὁνειδίζει οὖν αὐτῷ, ὅτι τὰ δημόσια νοσφίζεται χρή-
ματα....

ἐπεὶ οὖν ὁ μὲν Κλέων ἔφησε θύννους θερμοὺς καταπιεῖν....
Μιλησίους δὲ εἶπεν, ὡς τοῦ Κλέωνος τοὺς Μιλησίους τάρασ-
σουντος καὶ ἐπηρεάζοντος.

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

ὅτι τοὺς φόρους τῶν νήσων καὶ τῶν πόλεων ἀφήρπαζεν....
οὕτως καὶ ὁ Κλέων, ἐὰν τι τοῖς νησιώταις περιλειφθῇ, καὶ
τοῦτο λαμβάνει.

Two fragments of Eupolis' comedies (frgs. 290 and 291 Kock) pity the states that must pay tribute to Kleon:

ὦ καλλίστη πόλι πασῶν, ὅσας Κλέων ἐφορᾷ,
ὥς εὐδαίμων πρότερον τ' ἦσθα νῦν τε μᾶλλον ἔσει

.

ἔδει πρῶτον μὲν ὑπάρχειν πάντων ἰσηγορίαν....

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:

ἦσαν δὲ ἡλιασταὶ τὸν ἀριθμὸν 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.

χρόνον μὲν τινα δύο ὀβολοί, ὕστερον δὲ Κλέων στρατηγῆσας τριῶβολου ἐποίησε ἀκμάζοντος τοῦ πολέμου τοῦ πρὸς Λακεδαιμονίους.

Other similar notes gloss Vespae and Equites.³¹ 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 authority 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, Nicias. An important leader during the Archidamian War, Nicias was presented as one of the Paphlagonian's opponents in Equites, and appears occasionally elsewhere. He is described, briefly, in two notes. To Equites (358) is a scholion concerning his prudent nature, which was to his detractors dilatory:

δυσσιώνιστος δὲ ὁ Νικίας. ἐμφαίνει δὲ, ὅτι καὶ αὐτὸς τῶν εὐδοκιμοῦντων ἦν στρατηγός. καὶ ὁ υἱὸς Στρατίππος.

³¹

On Vespae, 242, 300; Equites, 51, 255.

ἐμνημόνευσε δὲ τοῦ Νικίου Δημοσθένης ρ. 34, ἦν δὲ
Νικηράτου παῖς.

He is also remembered in a note to Aves (639):

ὅτι βραδύς ἦν ὁ Νικίας, περὶ τὰς ἐξόδους, καὶ ὡς δια-
βαλλόντες, οὐχὶ προνοητικὸς ἦν, ἀλλ' ἀμελητής. τινὲς
δὲ φασὶ διὰ τὸ προνοητοῦν καὶ μὴ προπετὲς 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 (Nicias, 2, 5) commemorates Nicias' 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, Nicias, 2, 2; cf. Aristotle ρ. 162) 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, Nicias was the cause of much good for Athens (Plutarch, Nicias, 9, 9; Lysias ρ. 187).

The scholiasts to Equites (609) report one of Nicias' early successes as a campaigner, the attack on Kenchreai in Corinthia:

Ἄλλως. ὅτι οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι ἐστράτευσαν ἐπὶ Κορινθον καὶ περὶ Κεγχρέας ἐνίκησαν Νικίου στρατηγούντος τοῦ Νικηράτου, σὺν ἱππεῦσι σ' καὶ ὀπλίταις καὶ ναυσί.

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 Korinth, which, surely, had been the chief cause of the war and led to such campaigns as Nikias waged against Kenchreal, is mentioned by the scholiasts to Nubes (710):

Ἰσως μὲν ὅτι κατ' ἐκεῖνον τὸν καιρὸν ἐπέκειντο αὐτοῖς οἱ Κορίνθιοι.... ἅμα δὲ διὰ τὸν πόλεμον καὶ ὅτι ἐχθροὶ ἦσαν Ἀθηναίων οἱ Κορίνθιοι.... ἐπειδὴ οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι καὶ οἱ Κορίνθιοι κατ' ἐκεῖνο καιροῦ πόλεμον εἶχον καὶ οἱ Κορίνθιοι τὰ τῆς Ἀττικῆς ἐδῆουν.

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 ὑποδόμησαν Μεγαρεῦσι τὰ ἀπὸ τῆς πόλεως ἐς Νίσαιαν καὶ ἐφρούρουν αὐτοί. καὶ Κορινθίοις μὲν οὐχ ἥμισυ ἀπὸ τοῦδε τὸ σφοδρὸν μῖσος ἤρξατο πρῶτον ἐς Ἀθηναίους γενέσθαι. (I, 103, 4)

In their accounts of the causes and subsequent history of the war Plutarch (Pericles, 29-34) and Diodoros (e.g., 12, 36) thoroughly implicate Korinth and emphasise the ill feeling between the two states³²

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 vigourously in the Korinthia in 424 (Thucydides, IV, 42-45) the majority of Korinthian forces were arrayed against him there. The scholiasts' 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:

ὡς καὶ τοῦτων βαρέως φερόντων ὅτι ἔκσπονδοι ἐγένοντο,
βουλομένων δὲ τὴν εἰρήνην διὰ τὸ μάλιστα πεπιέσθαι τῷ
λιμῷ καὶ τῷ πολέμῳ.

32

Cf. also, Thucydides' numerous references, e.g.,
I, 108, 5; 114, 1; 124, 3.

πάνν γὰρ καὶ διαπρυσίως ἐμισοῦντο ὑπὸ τῶν Ἀθηναίων δι' ὃν εἰρήκαμεν τρόπον.

καὶ ἐπεθύμουν μὲν τῆς εἰρήνης, διὰ δὲ τοὺς Ἀθηναίους ἀνεβάλλοντο αὐτήν, ὥς φησι Θουκυδίδης.

λιμῶνται αὐτοὺς λέγει, ἐπειδὴ ὅτε μὲν εἰρήνη ἦν, εἰσέρχοντο εἰς τὴν Ἀττικὴν καὶ ἀπεστρέφοντο διὰ τὸ πωλεῖν καὶ συναλλάσσειν· νῦν δὲ πολέμου ὄντος ἐφοβοῦντο εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν Ἀττικὴν καὶ ἀγοράσαι ὧν ἔχρηζον· ἐξ αὐτῶν γὰρ ἐγένετο ἡ αἰτία τοῦ πολέμου. ἐξ Ἀττικῆς δὲ ὠνοῦντο τὰς τροφὰς διὰ τὸ καὶ πλησιάζειν αὐτῇ, καὶ διὰ τὸ ὀλίγην παντάπασιν ἔχειν χώραν τὴν γεωργουμένην. εἰκὸς οὖν ἦν τοὺς Ἀθηναίους ἐπεξιόντας αὐτοῖς κωλύειν τὴν παρ' αὐτοῖς γῆν γεωργεῖν. ἢ ὅτι εἰς πολιορκίαν κἀτέστησαν αὐτοὺς οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι τὴν Νισαίαν 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 [T24]). 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, Nicias, 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 (Diodoros, 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

coup. In the commentary to Equites are several notes about the incident. Equites, 55, is glossed with a description of the battle from the beginning:

"Ἄλλως. τοῦτο ἀφ' ἱστορίας τέθεικεν, ἧς μέμνηται καὶ Θουκυδίδης [4, 28]. ἔχει δὲ οὕτως. Δημοσθένης στρατηγὸς Ἀθηναίων, ἀποσταλὲς εἰς Σικελίαν διὰ τὸν αὐτόθι πόλεμον, παραπλέων τὴν Πύλον καὶ τὴν Σφακτηρίαν δυνάμει προλαβὼν, τριακοσίους εἵληπεν αἰχμαλώτους, καὶ ἐδήλωσεν Ἀθηναίοις τί βοῦλονται περὶ τούτων γενέσθαι. ἄλλων δὲ ἄλλα λεγόντων, Κλέων ἀναστὰς ἐπηγγείλατο ἡμερῶν ἀριθμὸν προσθεῖς, εἴσω ἐκείνων ἄξειν αὐτοὺς, ὥς γέλωτα πολὺν κατ' αὐτοῦ γενέσθαι. ἀγαγὼν δὲ αὐτοὺς ὥς ἰδίαν πρᾶξιν κατορθώσας ἐπεσεμνύνετο.... ἔνταῦθα οὖν ὁ Δημοσθένης ἀπόβασιν ποιησάμενος σὺν ὀλίγοις, ἐξετείχισε τὸ χωρίον, καὶ κατέστησε φρούριον. βοηθησάντων δὲ τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων διὰ τάχους Βρασίδου στρατηγοῦντος, αὐτὸς τε ὁ Βρασίδας ἀπέβαλε τὴν ἀσπίδα καὶ πολλοὶ τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων ἀπέθανον ἐν τῇ μάχῃ. ἔνιοι δὲ κατέφυγον καταπονόμενοι εἰς τὴν κατ' ἀντικρὺ νησίδα τὴν Σφακτηρίαν. καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ Δημοσθένης μετεπέμψατο ἀπὸ τῶν Ἀθηναίων, ὥς ἂν πλείονι δυνάμει χρησάμενος τοὺς ἄνδρας ἐκπολιορκοίῃ. ὁ οὖν Κλέων γνοὺς ὅτι ὑπὸ τῆς ἀνάγκης καὶ λιμοῦ καὶ δίψους οὐχ οἷοί τε ἔσονται πλείοσιν ἀντέχειν ἡμέραις, ἐπεὶ καὶ τοῦτο ἡγγελλον οἱ ἀπὸ τοῦ στρατοπέδου ἀφικνούμενοι, παρελθὼν εἰς τὸν δῆμον, εἰ λάβοι δύναμιν, ὥς αἰτεῖ Δημοσθένης, ἐπηγγείλατο ἐντὸς εἴκοσιν ἡμερῶν παραστήσειν τοὺς

πολιορκουμένους. καὶ οὕτω διεκπλεύσας καὶ τοὺς Λακε-
δαίμονας λαβών, ἔδοξεν αὐτοῖς κατορθοῦν τὸ τοῦ Δημοσ-
θένους ὁ Κλέων.

Kleon's attack on the competence of the other strategoi is mentioned in a scholion to Equites (7):

τοῦτο δὲ εἶπεν, ἐπεὶ διαβάλλων ὁ Κλέων τοὺς ἄλλους
στρατηγοὺς καὶ προσκρούων τῷ δήμῳ εἰς ἑαυτὸν βλέπειν
τοὺς Ἀθηναίους ἐποίησε.

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

τοῦτο δέ, ἵνα δείξῃ ὡς Δημοσθένους, οὐ τοῦ Κλέωνος τὸ
κατόρθωμα....ταῦτα δὲ λέγει διὰ τὰ ἐν Πύλῳ, ἃ Δημοσ-
θένης μὲν προήνυσεν, οὗτος δὲ ἰδιοποιήσατο.³⁴

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

καὶ πάλιν ἥξουσι τῆς εἰρήνης δεδομένοι τυχεῖν οἱ Λακεδαι-
μόνιοι, ἐὰν ἀσφαλῶς κατέχωμεν τὴν πόλιν....καὶ διὰ τοὺς
ληφθέντας τριακοσίους ἐν Σφακτηρίᾳ, καὶ διὰ τὸ ἐπιτείχισμα
ὅπερ Ἀθηναῖοι κατέστησαν ἐν Πύλῳ, καὶ ὅτι ληφθείσης αὐτῆς
περὶ εἰρήνης πρῶτοι Λακεδαιμόνιοι πρὸς Ἀθηναίους ἐπρέσ-
βευσαν.

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 scholion to Nubes (186):

Πύλος, χωρίον τῆς Λακωνικῆς, ἔνθα Κλέων στρατηγήσας τοὺς τριακοσίους τούτους αἰχμαλώτους ἀπὸ Σφακτηρίας ἔλαβεν. εἰκὼς οὖν τούτους καὶ διὰ τὸν τοῦ αἰχμαλωτισμοῦ φόβον καὶ διὰ τὸ πολλαῖς μὲν ἡμέραις πεπολιορκῆσθαι ἐν ἐρήμῳ νήσῳ καὶ ἀφ' ἧς οὐδὲν τῶν ἐπιτηδείων ἦν λαβεῖν, πολλῶν δὲ καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἄλωσιν συγκεκλειῖσθαι χρόνῳ δεδεμένους ἐν ξύλῳ, ὠχροὺς τε καὶ ἰσχυροὺς καὶ δυσειδεῖς γεγυῖναι. ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι τρεῖς ἐπωνυμίας εἶχεν ὁ τόπος, Πύλος, Κορυφάσιον, Σφακτηρία. Ἄλλως. Πύλος, νήσος πλησίον Πελοποννήσου. ταύτην ἐν τῷ Πελοποννησιακῷ πολέμῳ Λάχης προκατασχών, ὁ τῶν Ἀθηναίων στρατηγὸς, φρούριον ὠκοδόμησεν. ὅθεν ἐξορμώμενος τὴν παραλίαν ἐδῆον τῆς Λακωνικῆς. Λακεδαιμόνιοι γοῦν καταλῦσαι τὸ φρούριον θέλοντες, ἐπέπλευσαν τῇ νήσῳ καὶ παραστησάμενοι ἄνδρας ἑπτακοσίους ἐντὸς τοῦ φρουρίου κατέλιπον. Ἀθηναῖοι οὖν ἔπεμψαν πολλὴν τινα στρατιὰν κατὰ τῶν ἀνδρῶν τούτων μετὰ Κλέωνος στρατηγοῦ. ἐλθὼν οὖν ὁ Κλέων μετὰ τῆς στρατιᾶς καὶ πλεῖστον χρόνον τούτους πολιορκήσας, ὕστερον παρεστήσατο καὶ αἰχμαλώτους λαβὼν Ἀθήναζε ἡγάγεν, οἳ διὰ τε τὸν πολλὸν λιμόν, ὃν ὑπέστησαν διὰ τῆς πολιορκίας, καὶ διὰ τὸ κατακλεισθῆναι Ἀθηνησιν εἰς εἰρκτὴν πάνυ ὠχροὶ 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 (Nicias, 7) has nothing new. The wretched condition of the Spartans besieged on Sphacteria, 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 reveived the glory because he timed his arrival so well (Plutarch, Nicias, 8, 1). The Athenians, who had considered his promise mad (μανιῶδης), 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).³⁵ 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

 35

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:

ἄλλως τε δὲ καὶ ἀφ' ἱστορίας τοῦτο φασί. καὶ γὰρ πρὸ
δύο ἐτῶν τῆς διδασκαλίας τούτου τοῦ δράματος, Λακεδαιμο-
νίων περὶ εἰρήνης πρεσβευσαμένων ὁ Κλέων ἀπήλασε τοὺς
πρέσβεις.

Schol. Pax (479) quotes Thucydides twice:

καὶ ὁ Θουκυδίδης 2, 117, ἱστορεῖ, λέγων μάλιστα τῆς
εἰρήνης ἀντιποιεῖσθαι τοὺς Λακεδαιμονίους διὰ τοὺς

36

Schol. Equites, 441, 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, Diodoros and Plutarch 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 "τοὺς γὰρ δὴ ἄνδρας περὶ πλείονος ἐποιοῦντο κομίσασθαι, ἕως ὅτε ὁ Βρασίδης εὐτύχει!" καὶ ἐν ἄλλοις [5, 15], "ταῦτα οὖν ἀμφοτέροις αὐτοῖς λογιζομένοις ἐδόκει ποιητέα εἶναι ἢ ξύμβασις, καὶ οὐχ ἥττον τοῖς Λακεδαιμονίοις, ἐπιθυμία τῶν ἀνδρῶν τῶν ἐκ τῆς νῆσου κομίσασθαι. ἦσαν γὰρ οἱ Σπαρτιᾶται αὐτῶν πρῶτοί τε καὶ ὁμοίως σφίσι συγγενεῖς. ἤρξαντο μὲν οὖν καὶ εὐθὺς μετὰ τὴν ἄλωσιν αὐτῶν πράσσειν. ἀλλ' οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι μὲν οὐπω θέλοντες ἐξυφαιρουμένοις ἐπὶ τῇ ἴσῃ καταλβεσθαι, μάλιστα δὲ οἱ τῶν δεδεμένων συγγενεῖς ἐνῆγον καὶ ἐσπούδαζον, ὥς ἂν εἰρήνη γένηται!" Ἄλλως. ταῦτα οὐ μόνον διὰ τὸ κεκμηκέναι τῷ πολέμῳ, ἀλλὰ καὶ διὰ τοὺς ἐν Σφακτηρίᾳ τριακοσίου τοὺς δεδεμένους τῷ ξύλῳ τῆς ποδοκᾶκης τοῦ νῦν καλουμένου κόβου.³⁷

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

Φιλῶχορος φησιν οὕτως "Λακεδαιμόνιοι περὶ διαλύσεων ἐπεμψαν πρέσβεις πρὸς Ἀθηναίους, σπουδὰς ποιησάμενοι

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 Πύλῳ, καὶ τὰς ναῦς αὐτῶν παραδόντες οὕσας
 ξ'. Κλέωνος δὲ ἀντειπόντος ταῖς διαλύσεσι, στασιάσαι
 λέγεται τὴν ἐκκλησίαν. ἐρωτῆσαι δὲ συνέβη τὸν ἐπιστά-
 την. ἐνίκησαν δὲ οἱ πολεμεῖν βουλόμενοι! "Ἄλλως"
 μετὰ τὰ ἐν Πύλῳ. ἐπὶ Κλέωνος γὰρ πρεσβευσαμένων
 Λακεδαιμονίων, ἐστασίασαν ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, ὡς φιλόχορος
 φησι. μετὰ τὰ ἐν Πύλῳ καὶ τοὺς αἰχμαλώτους οὓς ἔλαβεν
 ὁ Κλέων, ἔπεμψαν Λακεδαιμόνιοι πρὸς Ἀθηναίους ἐπαγγελ-
 λόμενοι δώσειν τὰς τριῆρεις ἃς εἰλήφεσαν τῶν Ἀθηναίων
 ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ, ἅμα δὲ καὶ περὶ εἰρήνης καὶ σπονδῶν. ἀν-
 εῖπεν οὖν τότε Κλέων, καὶ τοῦ ἐπιστάτου τρίτον ἐρωτήσαντος
 τὴν βουλήν τί βούλεται, εἰρήνην ἢ πόλεμον, εἴλετο ἡ
 βουλή τὸν πόλεμον συνεστάναι.³⁸

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

ὅτι ὁ κωλύων παύσασθαι τὸν πόλεμον ἐστὶν ὁ Κλέων.
 ὅπερ οὖν καὶ Θουκυδίδης [5, 16] ἱστορεῖ διὰ τούτων,
 "ἐπειδὴ καὶ ἡ ἐν Ἀμφικόλῳ ἥττα τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις
 ἐγένετο, καὶ τεθνήκει Κλέων τε καὶ Βρασίδας, οἵπερ
 ἀμφότεροι μάλιστα ἠναιτεοῦντο τῇ εἰρήνῃ, ὁ μὲν, διὰ
 τὸ εὐτυχεῖν τε καὶ τιμᾶσθαι ἐκ τοῦ πολεμεῖν, ὁ δὲ γενο-

38

For other notes on the peace see schol. Pax, 638
 and 211; schol. Equites, 668 and 794.

μῆνης εὐτυχίας καταφανέστερός τε νομίζων εἶναι κακουργῶν καὶ ἀξιοπιστότερος διαβάλλων.³⁹

Kleon urged Athens to enlarge her maritime empire, according to a note to Equites (830):

ἑθαλαττοκράτουν γὰρ οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι. ὥς 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).⁴⁰

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

ἀντὶ τοῦ τοιοῦτό τι ἔλεγον. ἔαν μὲν γὰρ οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι μικρὸν ἐν τῇ μάχῃ κρατήσωσιν, εὐθέως λέγουσι, νῆ τοὺς θεοὺς, νῦν οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι δώσουσι δίκας. καὶ πάλιν ἔαν οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι νικήσωσιν, εἴτα Λακεδαιμόνιοι ἔλθωσιν εἰρήνην ποιῆσαι βουλόμενοι, εὐθέως ἀντιλέγουσιν Ἀθη-

39

Again there are several variations in the text.

40

Cf. West, Cl. Phil., XIX (1924), pp. 144-146, and

ναῖτοι, ἔξαπατῆσαι ἡμᾶς βούλονται, ἵνα ποιήσωμεν εἰρήνην,
ἐπειδὴ νικῶμεν· διὸ οὐ δεῖ πεισθῆναι ἡμᾶς.

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 Ἀρχεπολέμου ἐμνημόνευσεν. ὄγδοον γὰρ ἔτος ἔχοντας τοῦ πολέμου τούτου, ἔτι ζῶντος τοῦ Κλέωνος, ἐνιαύσιον ἐποίησαντο πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἐκεχειρίαν οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι καὶ οἱ Πελοποννήσιοι, πρεσβεῖαν πέμψαντες πρὸς ἀλλήλους. οὐ μὲν Ἀρχεπολέμου πρεσβεύοντός τινος, ἀλλὰ τῶν μὲν Λακεδαιμονίων ἦν πρεσβευτὴς Ταῦρος Ἐχετιμίδα, Ἀθηναῖος, Περικλείδα, Αἰνείας, Εὐφάμιδας, Ἀριστοδήμου, Σικωνίων δὲ Δημότιμος Ναυκράτους, Μενεκράτης Ἀμφιδώρου, Ἐπιδaurίων δὲ Ἀμφίας, Ἀθηναίων δὲ οἱ στρατηγοὶ Νικίας ὁ Νικηράτου, Ἀυτοκλῆς Τολμαίου. ἐγένετο δὲ πόλεμος ἐπὶ ὀκτωκαίδεκα ἔτη. καὶ οὕτως ἡ

πρεσβεία τοῦ Κλέωνος ζῶντος, ἡ δὲ εἰρήνη μετ' ἐνιαυτὸν ἐγένετο. εἰκὸς οὖν Ἀρχεπτολέμου μνημονεῦσαι χρησάμενον τῷ ὀνόματι, ἵνα μᾶλλον ἔξαρχον ἐπιδείξῃ τοῦ πολέμου τὸν Κλέωνα. καὶ γάρ, Ἀρχεπτολέμου εἰρήνην διδόντος, οὐκ ἐδέξατο Κλέων.

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 (Tl77) 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

ἔπειδὴ ἔκλειψις ἐγένετο σελήνης τῷ προτέρῳ, τῷ β' ἔτει ἐπὶ Στρατοκλέους βοηδρομιῶνι.

ἔκλειψις γὰρ ἡλίου ἐγένετο κατὰ τινα τύχην, Κλέωνος χειροτονουμένου.....φησὶ ὡς...ἀπειλοῦντος ἐκλείψειν, εἰ στρατηγήσει Κλέων.

41

Kleon was irregularly appointed for the campaign at Pylos (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. Vespae (210) notes:

Φιλόχορος ἐπὶ Ἰσάρχου φησὶ πρὸ ἐνιαυτοῦ Βρασίδαν ἀποστῆναι Σκιωναίους τῶν Ἀθηναίων. Ἀθηναίους δὲ φασὶ λ' τριήρεις πρότερον πέμψαντας Σκιώνην περι- τειχίσαι, ὕστερον δὲ μαθόντας ἀποστῆναι αὐτῶν, ἀποστεῖ- λαι ατρατὸν καὶ πολιορκῆσαι καὶ ἀποτειχίσαι αὐτοὺς ὡς τὸ πρότερον. ἔστι δὲ χωρίον Θράκης πολέμιον Ἀθηναί- οισ, ἣν ἐφρούρουν ἐπιεικῶς, ἣν πολιορκήσαντες ἀπετεί- χισαν.

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 Thracian 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 Andros (Thucydides, V, 4, 1).

(1924), pp. 217-222; A.J.P., XLV(1924), pp. 141-160.

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 Βρασίδης ὁ Τέλλιδος παῖς, ὃς ἦν Λακεδαιμονίων στρατηγός.
καὶ οὗτος Δέ ἀνθίστατο τῇ εἰρήνῃ. ἐτελεύτησε δὲ ἐν Θράκῃ.

καὶ γὰρ εἰς συμμαχίαν πεμφθεὶς ὁ Βρασίδης ἐπὶ Θράκην,
κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν χρόνον Κλέωνι τελευτᾷ.

ἐν Ἀμφιπόλει γὰρ τῆς Θράκης μονομαχήσαντες ὁ τε Κλέων
καὶ ὁ Βρασίδης ἀλλήλους ἀνεΐλον.

[48] Ἐρατοσθένης γὰρ ἐπὶ Θράκης τὸν θάνατον Βρασίδου
καὶ Κλέωνος ὀκτὼ μῆσι προγεγονέναι φησί. καὶ αὐτοὺς δὲ
ἐν τοῦτοις φησὶν "ἀπόλωλεν 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 σπονδὰς φησὶ γεγονέναι φιλόχορος
 πεντεκονταετῆς Ἀθηναίοις καὶ Λακεδαιμονίοις καὶ τοῖς
 συμμάχοις πλὴν Βοιωτῶν καὶ Κορινθίων καὶ Ἑλείων.

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.⁴² Athens

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:

ὥς τῶν Ἀργείων ἐπαμφοτερίζοντων μήποτε δοκοίη αὐτοῖς.
 διδὲ καὶ Φιλόχορος φησὶ πολεμοῦντας πάλιν πρὸς Κορινθίους
 προσλαμβάνεσθαι καὶ τοὺς Ἀργείους.

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

ἐπεὶ Ἀργεῖοι κατεγέλων Λακεδαιμονίων καὶ Ἀθηναίων
 ἀλλήλοις μαχομένων, ἐπεὶ περ παρ' ἀμφοτέρων λαμβάνοντες
 χρήματα ἐπολέμουν....αἰνίττεται δὲ εἰς Ἀργείους, ἐν τοῦ-
 τῳ τῷ πολέμῳ ἐπαμφοτερίζοντας· διδὲ καὶ πολλὰ ἐκωμφοῦντο.

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

ὥς τῶν Ἀργείων ἐπαμφοτερίζοντων, καὶ ἀποκλινόντων, ὁπότε
 δοκοίη αὐτοῖς, καὶ πρὸς Λακεδαιμονίους. - καὶ ὁ Φιλόχορος
 φησὶ, πολεμοποιοῦντας πάλιν τοὺς Κορινθίους προσλαμβάνεσθαι
 καὶ τοὺς Ἀργείους. ἀπεμφαίνει οὖν καὶ ταῦτα διχόθεν

tarch, Nicias, 9, 4-9.

μισθοφοροῦντες. ἤρμοτε γὰρ μᾶλλον οὕτως εἰπεῖν, ὅτι οὐ προθυμοῦνται πρὸς τὴν εἰρήνην, καὶ ταῦτα μάλιστα πάντων τρυχόμενοι ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ. μὴ τι οὖν ἐν ἴσῳ τούτων εἴρηκε, διὰ τὸ διχόθεν μισθοφορεῖν. περὶ δὲ Ἀργείων καὶ Φερε-
κράτης ἐν Αὐτομόλοις "οὗτοι γὰρ ἡμῖν οἱ κακῶς ἀπολού-
μενοι ἐπαμφοτερίζουσ' ἐμποδῶν καθήμενοι.

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 (13) points out, excerpting from Androtion:

πρὸ δὲ ἐτῶν δ' κακῶς περὶ Μαντίνειαν ἀπήλλαξαν, ὥς καὶ τοὺς στρατηγοὺς ἀποβαλεῖν Λάχητα καὶ Νικόστρατον, καθὰ καὶ Ἀνδροτίων φησὶν. Ἄλλως. ὅτι οὕτως ἔλεγον καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν τόπων, ἀντὶ τοῦ ὀρυεοπωλίων....

The separate alliance made in 420 by Athens, Argos, Mantinea and Elis bore bitter fruit for Athens. Mantinea was threatening 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). Diodoros (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:

ὅτι λυχνοπώλης ὁ Ὑπέρβολος. τινὲς δὲ φασιν αὐτὸν
Σύρον. καὶ Κρατῖνος δὲ ἐν Πυτίνῃ " Ὑπέρβολου δ' ἀπο-
εβέσας ἐν τοῖς λύχνοισι γράψον!"

A second (to Pax, 681) names his father and explains why men like Hyperbolos were honoured by the demos:

ὅτι μετὰ τὸν Κλέωνα Ὑπέρβολος ἐπολιτεύσατο. Χρέμητος
δὲ υἱὸς ἦν Ὑπέρβολος, ἀδελφὸς δὲ Χάρωνος, λυχνοπώλης,
φαῦλος τοῖς τρόποις. οὗτος μετὰ τὴν τοῦ Κλέωνος δυνασ-
τείαν διεδέξατο τὴν δημαγωγίαν. ἀπ' αὐτοῦ δὲ πρώτου
ἤρξαντο Ἀθηναῖοι φαῦλοις παραδιδόναι τὴν πόλιν καὶ
τὴν δημαγωγίαν, πρότερον δημαγωγούντων πάνυ λαμπρῶν
πολιτῶν. προεῖλετο δὲ τοῖς τοιοῦτοις ὁ δῆμος, ἀπιστῶν
διὰ πόλεμον τὸν πρὸς Ἀκεδαιμονίους τοῖς ἐνδόξοις τῶν
πολιτῶν, μὴ τὴν δημοκρατίαν καταλύσαιεν. ἐξωστρακίσθη
δὲ οὗτος, οὐ διὰ δυνάμεως φόβον καὶ ἀξιώματος, ἀλλὰ διὰ
πουνηρίαν καὶ αἰσχύνην τῆς πόλεως. ἐν Σάμῳ δὲ διατρίβων,
ὑπὸ τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἐχθρῶν ἐπιβουλευθεὶς ἀπέθανε. καὶ τὸν
νεκρὸν αὐτοῦ εἰς σάκκον βαλόντες ἔρριψαν εἰς τὸ πέλαγος.

Scholia to Nubes (554-555) speak briefly of his mother:

προσθεῖς γραῦν μεθύσῃν, τὴν δοκοῦσαν μητέρα εἶναι τοῦ
Ἵπερβόλου.

τὴν μητέρα Ἵπερβόλου. ἦν: Γραῦν.

She is noted also in schol. Thesmophoriazousae (840):

πολλάκις εἶπον ὅτι προβάλλει ὁ Ὀμηρικὸς ἐν τῷ πρὸς
Πολύβιον προτατικῷ τίς ἢ Ἵπερβόλου μήτηρ. οὐκ ἔχομεν
δὲ εἰπεῖν. εἰ δὲ χρή τὰ τοιαῦτα ζητεῖν, ζητεῖτωσαν καὶ
τὴν ἐξῆς....

Schol. Plutus (1037) mentions her:

ὅτι δὲ συμβάλλεται ἥρως τὸ ἐν Μαρικᾷ Εὐπόλιδος, οἶδα·
κακεῖ γὰρ τὴν Ἵπερβόλου μητέρα τηλία εἰκάζει τῇ πλατ-
είᾳ σανίδι.

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

ὑπὲρ τῆς πονηρίας δὲ Ἵπερβόλου εἴρηται. καὶ νῦν δὲ
ὀλίγα παραγράψομεν. Ἀνδοκίδης φησὶ τοίνυν "περὶ
Ἵπερβόλου λέγειν αἰσχύνομαι· οὗ ὁ μὲν πατὴρ ἐστιγμένος
ἔτι καὶ νῦν ἐν τῷ ἀργυροκοπεῖᾳ δουλεύει τῷ δημοσίῳ, ὥς
δὲ ξένος ὢν καὶ βάρβαρος λυχνοποιεῖ!" Θεόπομπος δὲ φησὶ
καὶ τὸν νεκρὸν αὐτοῦ καταποντωθῆναι, γράφων ὅτι "εξωστρά-

κίσαν τὸν Ὑπέρβολον ἔξ ἔτη· ὁ δὲ καταπλεύσας εἰς
Σάμον καὶ τὴν οἰκῆσιν αὐτοῦ ποιησάμενος, ἀπέθανε.
καὶ τούτου τὸν νεκρὸν εἰς ἄσκον ἀγαθόντες 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:

δι' Ὑπέρβολον. καὶ αὐτὸς γὰρ δημαγωγὸς ἦν λυχνοποιὸς
ὢν. νευρογράφους δὲ φησι διὰ τὸν προβατοπώλην Λυσικλέα.

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

τοῦτον ὡς φιλόδικον διαβάλλει συνεχῶς Ἀριστοφάνης. ἦν
δὲ στρατηγὸς Ἀθηναίων⁴³

Androtion (T28), supported by the ostraka,^{43a} says that Hyperbolos was son of Antiphanes. Ailian (T7) mentions Hyperbolos' lowly origins; the comic poets often refer to him as foreign,⁴⁴ 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). Hermippos (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 Ὑπέρβολον.

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 ζῶντος. μετὰ γὰρ τὸν ἐκείνου θάνατον ἡξιώθη.

Later he may have been elected strategos (schol. Acharnenses, 946).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 ὥς μετὰ θάνατον Κλέωνος φαίνεται γεγραφὼς τὸ δράμα, ὅπου γε τοῦ Μαρικᾶ Εὐπόλιδος μέμνηται, ὅς ἐδιδάχθη καθ' Ὑπερβόλου μετὰ τὸν Κλέωνος θάνατον.... ἐν οἷς

45

Cf. Eupolis, T110.

δὲ Εὐπόλιδος μέμνηται καὶ τῶν εἰς Ὑπέρβολον κωμῳδιῶν,
πολλῶ.

A scholion to Nubes (553) is similar:

τὸ δράμα ἐν ᾧ τὸν Ὑπέρβολον Εὐπολὶς ἐκωμῶδει Μαρικᾶς
ἐκαλεῖτο⁴⁶

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

μέχρι δὲ Ὑπερβόλου ὀστρακισμὸς προελθὼν ἐπ' αὐτοῦ
κατελύθη, μὴ ὑπακούσαντες τῷ νόμῳ διὰ τὴν ἀσθενείαν τὴν
γεγενημένην τοῖς τῶν Ἀθηναίων πράγμασιν ὕστερον.

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 Androtion (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:

46

According to schol. Nubes, 558, Plato attacked him; Hermippos also lampooned him (schol. Nubes, 559). Cf. Plato Comicus (T227).

Κλέωνα δὲ τὸν βυρσοδέψην, εἰς ὃν γέγραφε τοὺς Ἰππε-
 έας. Ὑπερβολὸν δέ, εἰς ὃν καὶ Εὐπολὶς ἔγραψε τὸν Μαρικ-
 ᾶν. ἀπώλετο δὲ περὶ τὴν Σάμον, πολεμοῦντων αὐτῷ τῶν
 Σαμίων.

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: μοχθηρὸς ἄνθρωπος. 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 Pax (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 Pax, present a no less serious picture.⁴⁸

⁴⁷

Schol. Pax, 681, is clearly taken from Thucydides.

⁴⁸

West, Cl. Phil., XIX (1924), pp. 124-146 and 201-

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 Πελοποννησιακοῖς κατὰ πάντων Μηλίων Νικίαν πέμψαντες Ἀθηναῖοι, ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ἐπολιόρκησαν αὐτούς, ὥστε λιμῶ διαφθεῖραι. τῷ δὲ πρώτῳ ἔτει Νικίας Μῆλον παρεστήσατο, οὐ μόνον μηχανῶν προσαγωγῇ, ἀλλὰ καὶ λιμῶ, διὰ τὸ ἀποστῆναι αὐτῶν, πρῶην ὑποτελῆ οὔσαν.... Μῆλος δὲ ἐστὶ πόλις Θεσσαλίας. καὶ οἱ Μῆλιοι πολιορκούμενοι ὑπὸ Ἀθηναίων λιμῶ ἐπιέσθησαν καὶ παραδεδώκασιν ἑαυτούς, ὡς Θουκυδίδης ἐν τῇ πέμπτῃ.

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.⁴⁹ 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 A.T.L., I, s.v. Μῆλιοι.

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)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 Diodoros' account (XIII, 30, 6) is almost as brief. Alkibiades' treatment of one of the Melians is reported by Andokides (4, 22-23) and Plutarch (Alcibiades, 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 Μηλιῆες (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 Μηλιῆες appear in Aristotle (T68) as a Thessalian race.

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 Thucydides⁵¹ to give a resumé of the argument:

δοκεῖ ταῦτα εἰς Ἀλκιβιάδην αἰνίττεσθαι, ὥς ποῦ φησι καὶ Θουκυδίδης ἐν τῇ Νικίου δημηγορίᾳ καὶ ἐν τῇ αὐτοῦ Ἀλκιβιάδου, τὸν μὲν Νικίαν παραινούντα τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις ποιῶν, μὴ πειθομένους αὐτῷ πόλεμον ἄρασθαι τοσοῦτον, οὕτως λέγων "εἴτε τις ἄρχειν ἄσμενος αἰρεθεὶς, παραινεῖ ἐκπλεῖν ὑμῖν ταῦτοῦ μῶλις σκοπῶν, ἄλλως τε καὶ νεώτερος ἔτι ὢν εἰς τὸ ἄρχειν, ὅπως θαυματοῦ μὲν ἀπὸ τῆς ἱπποτροφίας, διὰ πολυτέλειαν καὶ ὠφελήθη, ἐκ τῆς ἀρχῆς δὲ τούτῳ παρᾶσχητε τῷ τῆς πόλεως κινδύνῳ ἰδίᾳ ἀπολαμπρύνασθαι!" αὐτὸν δὲ τὸν Ἀλκιβιάδην, ὅτι βούλεται στρατηγεῖν μὴ ἀρνούμενον διὰ τούτων "καὶ προσήκόν μοι μᾶλλον ὥ Ἀθηναῖοι ἐτέρων ἄρχειν· ἀνάγκη γὰρ ἐντεῦθεν ἄρξασθαι, ἐπειδὴ μου Νικίας καθήψατο· καὶ ἄξιός νομίζω εἶναι!"

51

For variants from the book-text see below, pp.

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; Nicias, 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 Ἑρμοκοπίδαι ἡκρωτηρίασαν τοὺς Ἑρμᾶς, ὅτε ἐπὶ Σικελίας ἔμελλον πλεῖν πρὸ ἐτῶν τεσσάρων τῆς καθέσεως τούτου τοῦ δράματος. τὴν δὲ αἰτίαν ταύτην οἱ μὲν τοῖς περὶ Ἀλκιβιάδην προσέγραφον, ὡς Θουκυδίδης· οἱ δὲ Κορινθίοις, ὡς Φιλόχορος. μόνον δὲ φησὶν οὐ περικοπῆναι τὸν Ἀνδοκίδου Ἑρμῆν.

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

εἴη δ' ἂν τι συμπεπραχὼς τοῖς Ἑρμοκοπίδαις ὁ Πεισίφου,

τῆς αἰτίας, ὡς Φιλόχορος.

οἵτινες, ὡς Φιλόχορος φησιν, ἐπὶ Χαβρίου θάνατον τε κατεγνώσθησαν καὶ τὰ ὀνόματα αὐτῶν ἐστηλιτεύθη καὶ ἐδημεύθη, καὶ τῷ κτείνῃ κατ' ἄνδρα ἐκηρύχθη τάλαντον. "Ἄλλως. οἱ τὸν Πεισίαν ἕνα εἶναι τῶν ἐρμοκοπιδῶν, οἱ δὲ τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ. ἐτηροῦντο δὲ οὗτοι, ὅπως ἂν δοῖεν τῆς περικοπῆς τιμωρίαν.

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 Korinthians, helping a group of Athenians, were to blame, and this is the version of Philochoros, 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:

δύο εἰς νῆες παρὰ τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις ὑπηρέτιδες, ἡ Πάραλος καὶ ἡ Σαλαμινία. ὧν ἡ μὲν Σαλαμινία τοὺς ἐγκαλουμένους εἰς κρίσιν ἤγεν, ἣν ἐπ' Ἀλκιβιάδην φησὶ πεμφθῆναι Θουκυδίδης, ἡ δὲ Πάραλος τὰς θεωρίας ἀπῆγεν, τουτέστι 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. 811C) 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, Ranae, 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:

ὁ Λάμαχος οὗτος Ἀθηναίων στρατηγός, υἱὸς Ξενοφάνους, ὄν, ὅτε εἰς Σικελίαν ἔπλεον οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι, ἐχειροτόνησαν. ἦν δὲ μετὰ Ἀλκιβιάδου καὶ Νικίου, ὡς ἱστορεῖ Θουκυδίδης διὰ τῆς σ'. ἦν δὲ φιλοπόλεμος οὗτος.

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

τὸν γὰρ πατέρα μόνον οἶδα Λαμάχου, Ξενοφάντου.

ἐπαινεῖ τὸν Λάμαχον νῦν. ἤδη γὰρ ἐτεθνήκει ἐν Σικελίᾳ τετάρτῳ ἔτει πρότερον.

53

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 Alcibiades left, under escort of the Salaminia, 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 Nicias was executed after capture (Plutarch, Nicias, 18, 4; Thucydides, VI, 101, 6 and 103, 3). Only Alcibiades 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):

πρόβουλοι δὲ πρὸς τοῖσδε ἡρέθησαν ἄλλοι κ', εἰσηγησόμενοι τὰ δοκοῦντα βέλτιστα τῇ πολιτείᾳ μετὰ τὴν ἐν τῇ Σικελίᾳ συμφορὰν.

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.⁵⁵

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

πάλιν πρὸς Ἀλκιβιάδην, ἐπεὶ πρὸς Λακεδαιμονίους φυγὼν ἐγένετο τοῦ Δεκέλειαν αὐτοὺς ἐπιτειχίσαι, διὰ καὶ δοῦλον αὐτὸν καλεῖ, διὰ τὴν Κοισύραν, ἥτις δούλη ἦν....

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, κατελθὼν μὲν ἐπὶ Ἀντιγένους πρὸ ἐνιαιουτοῦ τῶν Βατράχων, διὰ δὲ τὸ πιστεῦσαι Ἀντιόχῳ τῷ κυβερνήτῃ τὸ ναυτικὸν καὶ ἡττηθῆναι ὑπὸ Λυσάνδρου δυσχερανθεὶς ὑπ' Ἀθηναίων. ἄνδρων δὲ διαφέρεται πρὸς Ξενοφῶντα περὶ τῆς καθόδου. Καλλίστρατος δὲ φησιν ὅτι οὗτος ἦν ὁ καιρὸς, καθ' ὃν ἐκὼν ἔφυγεν ὁ Ἀλκιβιάδης. ὁ δὲ Ἀρίσταρχος φησι, καθ' ὃν ἐκπεσὼν ἐν Λακεδαιμονίᾳ διατρίβων ἔπεισε Λακεδαιμονίους Ἀθηναίοις Δεκέλειαν ἐπιτειχίσαι· τελέως δὲ πταίνουσι. λέγει οὖν περὶ τῆς δευτέρας ἀποχωρήσεως, ἣν ἐκὼν ἔφυγε.... Ἀλκιβιάδης γὰρ φύσει Ἀθηναῖος ὢν ἔφυγε μὲν καὶ πρόσθεν διὰ τινὰ αἰτίαν ἐκ πόλεως, κατελθὼν δὲ ὕστερον καὶ ναύαρχος καταστὰς ἐνεπιστεύσατο τὸ ναυτικὸν Ἀντιόχῳ· οὗ καὶ ὑπὸ Λυσάνδρου ἡττηθέντος φοβηθεὶς Ἀλκιβιάδης μεταχωρεῖ πρὸς Λακεδαιμονίους, οὓς καὶ πείθει Ἀθηναίοις ἐπιτειχίσαι Δεκέλειαν. ἡ δὲ Δεκέλειαν. ἡ δὲ Δεκέλεια χώρα ἐν τῇ Ἀττικῇ, ἥς τειχισθείσης μέγας ἦν κίνδυνος Ἀθηναίοις μὴ δυναμένοις ἐξελθεῖν.

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

ταῦτα δὲ φησιν Εὐριπίδης περὶ Ἀλκιβιάδου, ὡς ὄντος αὐτοῦ τοιοῦτου. βραδέως μὲν ὠφελοῦντος τὴν πατρίδα, ταχ-

ἕως δὲ βλάπτοντος.

Thucydides treats Alkibiades' escape (VI, 61, 7) and his plan for Spartan victory (VI, 88, 9): if Dekeleia 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 Dekeleia and urged Ionia to revolt (T191). They ravaged the country, seized Dekeleia 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 Antigenes, 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)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, 48, 1-3). Alcibiades was awarded a generalship (Nepos, Alcibiades, 5-6; Justin [T163]). With a few ships and a moderate force he carried on successful operations along the Thracian coast. Later, he learned that Lysandros was at Ephesos, and with the larger part of his fleet he sailed to meet Thrasybulos 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 [T192 and T193]; Diodoros, XIII, 71; Plutarch, Lysander, 5, 1; Alcibiades, 35, 6-7).

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

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.⁵⁷

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 Κράτερός φασι ταῦτα αἰνίττεσθαι εἰς Φρύ-
νιχον τὸν Στρατωνίδου. ἑκακοηθεύσατο γὰρ πρὸς τὸν δῆμον
ἐν Σάμῳ στρατηγῶν. ὥστε ἐψηφίσατο κατ' αὐτοῦ ὁ δῆμος
δημοσίᾳ εἶναι τὰ Φρυνίχου χρήματα καὶ τῆς θεοῦ τὸ δέκα-
τον μέρος, καὶ τὴν οἰκίαν κατεσκάφθαι αὐτοῦ. καὶ ἄλλα

57

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.

πολλὰ κατ' αὐτοῦ ἔγραψεν ἐν στήλῃ χαλκῇ. καὶ ἐν Βατ-
ράχοις.

Schol. Ranae (688) also knows his fate:

"Ἄλλως. στρατηγοῦντος αὐτοῦ ἡττήθησαν Ἀθηναῖοι, καὶ
πολλοὶ αὐτῷ προσεκρούθησαν, ὡς προδόντι τὸν πόλεμον.
τινὲς δὲ τοῦτον κωμικὸν ποιητὴν λέγουσιν, ὃς κινου-
μένους τοὺς χοροὺς εἰσήγε καὶ παλαίοντας. ἐγένετο δὲ
στρατηγὸς, ἐφ' οὗ πολλοὶ ἤμαρτον τῶν στρατηγῶν καὶ
ἄτιμοι ἐγένοντο.

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 Lakeldaimon (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 rasing 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, 33, explains that the slaves who fought with Athens at Arginousai were freed:

πρὸς τοὺς χρόνους, ὅτι τῷ προτέρῳ ἔτει ἐπὶ Ἀντιγένους
περὶ Ἀργίνουσαν ἐνίκων ναυμαχία οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι συμμαχοῦντων
δοῦλων, προκακωθέντες ἄλλαις ναυμαχίαις, οὕσιν αὖ ἡλευθε-
ρώσαν· πρὸς τοῦτο οὖν χαριεντιζόμενος λέγει, ὅτι εἴπερ
ἐνεναυμαχῆκεν, καὶ ἀφείμην ἐλεύθερος. ὥστε οἰμῶζειν
ἂν ἔλεγδν σοι. ἡ δὲ Ἀργίνουσα, πόλις τῆς Αἰολίδος,
ἀντικρὺ δὲ Λέσβου κειμένη καὶ Μαλίας καλουμένης ἄκρας.

Schol. Ranae (694) repeats the information:

τοὺς συμμαχῆσαντας δοῦλους Ἑλλάνικοις φησὶν ἐλευθε-
ρωθῆναι, καὶ ἐγγραφέντας ὡς Πλαταιεῖς συμπολιτεῦσασθαι
αὐτοῖς, διεξιὼν τὰ ἐπὶ Ἀντιγένους τοῦ πρὸ Καλλίου.

A gloss to an earlier play, Nubes (6), speaks of the slaves' part at Arginousai:

πόλεμος ἦν κατ' ἐκεῖνο καιροῦ καὶ τοσοῦτον ἐδυστύχησαν Ἀθηναῖοι ὥστε μὴδὲ τὰ σώματα τῶν ἀποθανόντων ταφῆναι ἕως οὗ οἱ δοῦλοι ἐξελθόντες ἐνίκησαν τοὺς Λακεδαιμονίους περὶ Ἀργενοῦσας καὶ τὰ σώματα τῶν ἀποθανόντων ἐκόμισαν καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἡλευθερώθησαν καὶ οὐκ ἐξῆν οὐδένι τύπτειν δοῦλον....φασὶν ὡς Ἀθηναῖοι, Λακεδαιμονίοις ἐπ' Ἀργινοῦσαις ναυμαχῆσαι μέλλοντες, προεῖπον τοῖς δούλοις, ὡς εἴ τις αὐτῶν συμπαρατάξεται τῇ ναυμαχίᾳ, τιμῆς εἰς τὸ λοιπὸν ἀπολαύσειεν. βοηθησάντων οὖν τῶν δούλων, Λακεδαιμονίους ἐνίκησαν. καὶ ταῦτα μὲν τινες φάσκουσι. τὸ δ' ἀληθὲς οὕτως ἔχει. Ἀθηναίοις καὶ Λακεδαιμονίοις πόλεμος ἦν. οὐκ ἤθελον οὖν Ἀθηναῖοι τοὺς δούλους κολάζειν, εἴ τι πταίσαιεν, δεδιότες μὴ πρὸς Λακεδαιμονίους αὐτομολήσωσι. τὸ δὲ ὅτε ποτὲ μὲν μόνον χρόνον δηλοῖ, ποτὲ δὲ καὶ χρόνον καὶ αἰτίαν, ὡς ἐστὶ κἀνταῦθα.

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 Lesbos.

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, say^a Diodoros (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 Ἀργίνουσαν φησὶ ναυμαχίαν. ἦσαν γὰρ δοῦλοι τότε ναυμαχῆσαντες, περὶ οὐδενὸς ἄλλου ἢ περὶ τῶν ἰδίων κρεῶν, τουτέστι σωμάτων....περὶ τῆς ἐν Ἀργινοῦσαις ναυμαχίας, ἐν ᾗ ἐνίκων μὲν οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι, τοὺς νεκροὺς δὲ ἐκωλύθησαν ἀνελεῖσθαι ὑπὸ χειμῶνος. ἔξ οὗ καὶ τῶν δέκα στρατηγῶν ἀπώλοντο καταδικασθέντες οἱ ὑπομείναντες ἔξ. Ἄλλως. διάφοροι αἱ γραφαί. οἱ μὲν γὰρ κρεῶν, ὡς Ἀρίσταρχος φησὶν ἐπὶ τῶν σωμάτων λαμβάνεσθαι πολλάκις ὡς ποτὲ τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἐν περιστάσει γενομένων καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν ψυχῶν ἀγωνιζομένων, προσλαβεῖν τοὺς δούλους καὶ ὑστερον ἐλευθερίας ἀξιῶσαι. ἕτεροι δὲ φασιν αἰνίττεσθαι τὴν περὶ Ἀργινοῦσαν ναυμαχίαν, ἣν διὰ τοὺς νεκροὺς ἠγωνίσαντο.

Schol. Ranae (698) agrees:

ἴσως περὶ τῶν δ' στρατηγῶν λέγει τῶν σωθέντων ἐκ τῶν δέκα τῶν περὶ Ἀργένουσαν ναυμαχησάντων. κατεδικάσθησαν γὰρ αὐτοὶ μὴ ἀνελόμενοι τοὺς νεκροὺς. καὶ οἱ μὲν ἔξ ὑπομείναντες θανάτῳ ἐκολάσθησαν, οἱ δὲ λοιποὶ δ' ἔφυγον....

ἡ δὲ Ἀργίνουσα κώμη ἦν τῆς Αἰολίδος. συμβαλόντες γὰρ ἐνίκησαν Ἀθηναῖοι Λακεδαιμονίους καὶ νικήσαντες ἐπανῆλθον. ἐν δὲ τῇ ὁδῷ χειμῶνι περιπεσόντες πολλοὶ τεθνήκασιν αὐτῶν καὶ τούτους ἑάσαντες οἱ στρατηγοὶ ἐπανῆλθον οἱ ἑῷ καὶ οἱ μὲν ἔξ ἐκολάσθησαν, οἱ δὲ δ' ἔφυγον.

A list of the generals at Arginousai is given by the scholiasts to Ranae (1196), excerpting from Philochoros:

εἰς Ἑρασινίδης, τῶν περὶ Ἀργέννουσαν στρατηγησάντων δυστυχῶς. ἀπέθανε δὲ δημοσίᾳ, οὐτὸς τε καὶ οἱ ὑπομείναντες, Θράσυλλος, Περικλῆς, Λυσίας, Ἀριστοκράτης, Διομέδων, ὡς φησι Φιλδοχόρος. Δημήτριος δὲ φησι, περιττότερόν τι γενέσθαι τῷ Ἑρασινίδῃ....

Kallikratides 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 Lakedaimonian 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 ages¹ 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 Arginousai 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 Arginousai 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 Arginousai 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.² 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 Perikles the younger was one of the generals executed. Only Sokrates, son of Sophroniskos, then a bouleutes, would not condemn the officers.³

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. Aigospotamoi 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 τοὺς μετὰ Θρασυβούλου Φυλὴν καταλαβόντας καὶ νικήσαντας ἐν Πειραιεῖ τοὺς τριάκοντα Ψηφίσασθαι ἔδοξε μὴ μνησικαῆσαι καθάπαξ ἀλλήλοις μηδὲν τοὺς πολίτας. ἀλλὰ ταῦτά γε οὐκ ἐπράκτο οὐδὲ τὰ ἐπὶ τῶν τριάκοντα ἤδη ἦν, ἀλλὰ καί, ὡς Φιλόχορος φησιν, πέμπτῳ ἔτει ὕστερον τῆς Θρασυβούλου γενομένης Κριτίας ἐν Πειραιαῖ τελευτᾷ.... συνέθεντο γὰρ μετὰ τὸ μεταγαγεῖν μὴ μνησικαῆσαι.... Ἄλλως. Θρασύβουλος βουλευόμενος καταλῦσαι τοὺς λ' καταλαβὼν Φυλὴν, τόπον τινά, κάκεισε συμμάχους λαβὼν, κατέλυσε. καὶ ἐπεὶ ἀλαζονικὸν ἐφθέγγετο, ἤκουσε, μὴ μνησικαῆσης, καὶ ἐγένετο παροιμιακόν.... Φυλὴ γὰρ τόπος οὕτω καλούμενος. περὶ δὲ Θρασυβούλου εἴρηται διὰ τὸ ἐπαινεῖσθαι, ὅτι ἐκεῖ ἐφόνευσεν 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:

διδάσκαλος δὲ ἦν οὗτος, ὁ Πρόδικος, καὶ Θεραμένους τοῦ ἐπικαλουμένου κοθόρνου, ὃς τῆς τῶν τριάκοντα τυραννίδος μετέσχε. κόθορνος δὲ ἐκαλεῖτο οὗτος, ἐπεὶ καὶ τοῖς τριάκοντα συνέσπευδε καὶ τῷ πλήθει. καὶ γὰρ ὁ κόθορνος τὸ ὑπόδημα ἀμφοτέροις ἀρμόζει τοῖς ποσὶ.

To Ranae (541) is another scholion about him:

οὗτος τῶν τὰ πολιτικὰ πραττόντων. σκώπτει δὲ αὐτὸν ὡς εὐμετάβολον ὄντα καὶ πρὸς τὸν καιρὸν ἀρμόζοντα. οὗτος δὲ γέγονεν ὁ Θεραμένης διδάσκαλος Ἰσοκράτους, στρατηγὸς δὲ καὶ ὑποκριτὴν εὐμετάβλητος, Ἄγνωτος παῖς, Στειριεὺς τῶν δῆμων. τούτῳ πολλὰ μὲν καὶ ἄλλα παρανερόμηνται, δύο δὲ τὰ μέγιστα καὶ σχετλιώτατα, ἥ τε τῶν ἐν Ἀργεννοῦσιν στρατηγῶν ἀπαγωγή, ἣν αὐτὸς συνεστήσατο μετὰ Καλλιξένου, καὶ ἡ τῶν λ' ἐπὶ καταλύσει τοῦ δήμου καταστάσις. τοιγάρτοι τῆς τοῦ βίου προαιρέσεως ἐπαξίας τῆς τελευταίας ἔτυχεν. ὑπὸ γὰρ αὐτῶν τῶν λ' ἀνῆρέθη, Κριτίου κρίναντος αὐτὸν. ἔνιοι δὲ φασὶ καὶ καταφυγόμενα αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὴν

ἐστὶν ἀποσπασθῆναι. τοῦτον διὰ τὴν ποικιλίαν τοῦ ἥθους Κόθορνον ἐκάλουν, ἐπειδὴ ἑκατέρα στάσει τῇ τῶν πολιτευομένων ἐαυτὸν παρετίθει, καθομιλῶν τοῖς καιροῖς καὶ τὸ συμφέρον ἐαυτοῦ τοῦ πιστοῦ προτάσων, ἐπειδὴ καὶ ὁ Κόθορνος ἀνδράσι καὶ γυναιξὶ πρὸς πᾶς ὑποδέσεις ἀρμόττει. δοκεῖ δὲ οὗτος καὶ τὰ τρία ψηφίσασθαι ἐπιζήμια, ἢ δεσμευεσθαι ἐν τῷ ξύλῳ, ἢ πιεῖν κώνειον, ἢ ἐκφυγεῖν. δοκεῖ δὲ ἀπὸ Κέω τῆς νήσου εἶναι, οὐκ εἶναι δὲ γνήσιος, ἀλλὰ ποιητὸς υἱὸς τοῦ Ἀγνωνος. ὁ Θουκυδίδης δὲ αὐτὸν ἐπαινεῖ. Ἄλλως. ὁ Θηραμένης οὗτος ἀνὴρ πανοῦργος ἦν, καὶ πρὸς τοὺς καιροὺς μεταβαλλόμενος. Χῆοι γὰρ καὶ Κῆοι πόλεμον εἶχον πρὸς ἀλλήλους. ὅτε οὖν παρὰ Χίοις ἦν, Χῆον ἐαυτὸν ἐκάλει. ὅτε δὲ παρὰ Κίοις, Κῆον· τῇ δὲ ἀληθείᾳ Χῆος ἦν.

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 note to Ranae (47) offers further biographical information:

ἐνθεν καὶ Θηραμένης Κόθορνος ἐλέγετο. ὅτι τοῖς καιροῖς καθομιλεῖν δύναται. ὁ δὲ Χενοφῶν ἐν Ἑλληνικοῖς ἀμφοτέροις τοῖς ποσὶν ἀρμόζειν αὐτὸν φησιν.

Plutarch (Nicias, 2, 1) quotes the attacks upon him as an alien from Keos⁴. He was nicknamed Κόθορνος because he tried

4

Paroim. Graeci, T206.

to play on both sides of the political fence (cf. Xenophon, Hell., II, 3, 47)⁵; Pollux (VII, 91) knows the name: Theramenes could fit either party at Athens just as a buskin fits either foot. The Anecdota (T87) are similar in tone.

Another of the Thirty mentioned by the scholiasts is Drakontides, whom a note to Vespae (157) remembers as a wretch and a trial-monger:

πονηρὸς οὗτος καὶ πλείστοις κατασίκαις ἐνεχόμενος,
ὥς Πλάτων Σοφισταῖς. Καλλίστρατος δὲ ἓνα τῶν λ'
φησὶν, εἰ μὴ ὁμῶνυμος. ἔστι γὰρ οὗτος ὁ τὸ περὶ
τῶν λ' ὕψισμα περὶ ὀλιγαρχίας γράψας, ὡς 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 Acharnenses (11 and 140) and a note to Thesmophoriazusae recall his frigidity and politics:

5

For his activities in 411, to which parts of schol. Ranae, 541, and Lysistrata, 490, refer, see above, pp. 241-242.

242.

Θέογνις δὲ οὗτος τραγωδίας ποιητὴς πάνυ ψυχρὸς. ἐκ τῶν τριάκοντα, ὅς καὶ Χίων ἐλέγετο.

οὗτος ὁ Θέογνις τραγωδίας ποιητὴς ψυχρὸς. κωμῶδων οὖν αὐτὸν

τραγωδίας ποιητὴς αἰσχροὺς τὸ πρόσωπον καὶ σιμὸς καὶ μικρὸς τὸ σῶμα. (Thesmophoriazusae, 170)

Lysias (T181), quoted by Harpokration (T120), notes him as one of the Tyrants; Xenophon names him as one of the Thirty (Hell., II, 3, 2).

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:

ἄνδρϊ φιλοπόλιδι καὶ παντὸς κρείττονι λόγου, διὰ τε τὰς ἐπιφανεῖς αὐτοῦ κατὰ τῶν πολεμίων νίκας καὶ διότι κατέλυσε τὴν τῶν λ' τυραννίδα. εὐπορος γὰρ ὢν καὶ ἐξ αὐτῶν ἐκπεσὼν μετὰ ταῦτα Φυλὴν καταλαβὼν καθεῖλεν αὐτοὺς....μήποτε ὁ ἀξιωματικὸς καὶ αὐθάδης.... Θρασυβουλος δὲ δημοφιλὴς...τοῦ Κολλυτέως...Θρασυβούλῳ τῷ Ἀῦκου, ἄνδρϊ φιλοπόλιδι καὶ παντὸς κρείττονι λόγου,

διότι κατέλυσε τὴν τῶν λ' τυραννίδα. "Αλλως. οἱ
 Λακεδαιμόνιοι κρατήσαντες τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἔταξαν λ' τυ-
 ράννους ἀπὸ τῆς πόλεως ἐν Ἀθήναις διατρίβειν. ὁ οὖν
 Θρασύβουλος ἐραστής ὢν τῆς δημοκρατίας κατέλαβε
 Φυλὴν τῆς Ἀττικῆς μετὰ τινων ἄλλων, μεθ' ὧν κατέλυσε
 τοὺς λ'....ὁ δὲ Θρασύβουλος εὖνους...ἀτελῆς καὶ πένης,
 πλὴν θρασύς.... ὁ δὲ Θρασύβουλος ἀνὴρ χρηστός Ἀθη-
 ναῖος¹ ὁρῶν οὖν τὴν ἑαυτοῦ πόλιν ὑπὸ τῶν τριάκοντα
 τυράννων, οὓς ἔστησαν οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι, τυραννου-
 μένην, φίλην μίαν καταλαβὼν τοὺς τυράννους λάθρα
 ἀπέκτεινεν.

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 Thrasy-
 boulos 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 Peiraeus he increased the
 number to one thousand (Hell., II, 4, 10).

The Thirty, who at once learned of Thrasyboulos¹

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 Peiraeus (Hell., 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 (Hell., II, 4, 30). The battle continued for some days (Hell., II, 4, 11-43); in the course of it, Kritias, one of the most active of the Thirty, was killed (Hell., 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 (Hell., II, 3, 14-15). The trouble grew (Hell., II, 3, 16-49) when Kritias called Theramenes a $\kappa\acute{o}\theta\omicron\pi\nu\omicron\varsigma$ 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).

7

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 oligarchs⁸ 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)⁹.

Thrasyboulos 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 Ecclesiastus (203) so call him:

οὗτος αὐθάδης καὶ δωροδόκος, ὑπερόπτης ὢν τοῦ δήμου,
ἤβουλετο 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. δωροδόκος in schol. Ecclesiazusae, 203). The scholion to Ecclesiazusae (356) is perhaps a paraphrase from Aristophanes or from one of the other comic poets:

οὗτος ἀντιλέγειν μέλλων τοῖς Λακεδαιμονίων πρέσβεσι
περὶ σπονδῶν ἐληλυθόσιν, εἶτα δωροδοκήσας, ἀρχάδας
προσεποίησατο βεβρωκέναι, καὶ μὴ δύνασθαι 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.¹⁰ 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 Ecclesiazusae (193)

10

Kirchner, P.A., I, no. 7310.

about an alliance between Lakonia and Boiotia:

περὶ δὲ τοῦ συμμαχικοῦ φιλόχορος ἱστορεῖ ὅτι πρὸ
 δύο ἐτῶν ἐγένετο συμμαχία Λακεδαιμονίων καὶ Βοιωτῶν.

The date of Ecclesiastusae 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) collaborated¹¹ against the Spartans. Perhaps Λακεδαιμονίων is a scribal error for Ἀθηναίων. ¹²

In 392/1 there was a Spartan attempt to have a general settlement (Hell., 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, Hell., 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 ἐπικρατὲς
συμμαχία κεχρῆσθαι τῇ ξενικῇ δυνάμει. ἦν δὲ καταστήσαντας
ἐν Κορίνθῳ τοὺς ξένους Κόρων ὁ Ἀθηναίων στρατηγός, καθε-
λὼν Λακεδαιμονίους, ὅπως φυλάττοι τὴν ἔφοδον αὐτῶν.

"Ἄλλως. ὥς τῶν Ἀθηναίων δι' ἑαυτῶν μὴ βουλομένων πολεμ-
εῖν πρὸς Κορινθίους διὰ τὸν κίνδυνον, μισθουμένων δὲ
ξένους εἰς τὸν πόλεμον καὶ τρεφόντων αὐτοὺς. τοῦτο δὲ
ἐν τοῖς πολλοῖς τῶν πολέμων διεπράττοντο. "Ἄλλως. ὥς
ἀεὶ ξενικὸν τι ἔχόντων Κορινθίων, καὶ οὐχ ὥς ἔνιοι κατὰ
τὸν χρόνον τοῦτον· δῆλον δὲ ἐκ τοῦ ἐν δευτέρῳ φέρεσθαι,
ὅς ἔσχατος ἐδιδάχθη ὑπ' αὐτοῦ εἰκοστῷ ἔτει ὕστερον· εἰ
μὴ, ὅπερ εἰκός, ἐκ τοῦ δευτέρου Πλούτου τοῦτο μετενήν-
εκται. ἐκεῖ γὰρ ὀρθῶς ἔχει. ἤδη γὰρ ὁ Κορινθιακὸς
πόλεμος συνέστη τρισὶν ἢ τέτρασιν ἔτεσι πρότερον τοῦ
Ἀντιπάτρου, ἐφ' οὗ ἐδιδάχθη, καὶ τὸ συμμαχικὸν ἐπανή-
θοριστο ἐν Κορίνθῳ· τὸ δὲ Λακεδαιμόνιον ἐν Σικυνῶνι.

"Ἄλλως. μετὰ τὸν πόλεμον τὸν Πελοποννησιακὸν καὶ αὐτοὶ
οἱ σύμμαχοι τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων συνεκρότησαν πόλεμον κατ'
αὐτῶν· συνέλαβον δὲ αὐτοῖς Ἀθηναῖοι, καὶ ἔσχον τὴν
Κόρινθον ὀρμητήριον, εἰς ἣν ἔπεμψαν ξενικὸν στράτευμα,
καὶ αἱτοὶ ἔτρεφον αὐτό. τοῦ δὲ στρατεύματος ἦρχεν
Ἰφικράτης ὁ στρατηγός. "Ἄλλως. τοῦτου καὶ Δημοσ-
θένους ἐν α' Φιλιππικῶν μέμνηται "ὅτι καὶ πρότερόν περ'
ἀκοῶν ξενικὸν τρέφειν ἐν Κορίνθῳ τὴν πόλιν, οὗ Πολύ-"

στρατος ἡγεῖτο καὶ Ἰφικράτης καὶ Χαβρίας καὶ ἄλλοι
 τινές, καὶ ὑμᾶς αὐτοὺς συστρατεύεσθαι· καὶ οἶδα ἀκού-
 ων ὅτι Λακεδαιμονίους παραταττόμενοι μεθ' ὑμῶν ἐνίκων
 οὗτοι οἱ ξένοι καὶ ὑμεῖς μετ' αὐτῶν! τινὲς δέ φασι
 Κορινθίοις ἀδικουμένοις ὑπὸ Λακεδαιμονίων συμμάχους
 πέμψαι Ἀθηναίους, οὓς ἔτρεφον Κορίνθιοι Λακεδαιμονίους
 ὑφορώμενοι ἐμισθοῦντό τινας τῶν Ἀθηναίων εἰς τὴν αὐτῶν
 φυλακὴν· ἢ Ἀθηναίους ἐφοβοῦντο, ἵνα μὴ ὑπ' αὐτῶν
 δουλαγωγηθεῖεν, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ξένους τινὰς ἐν Κορίνθῳ
 ἔτρεφον, ἀσφαλείας ἕνεκα.

Xenophon (Hell., IV, 4, 1) joins Athens with the Boiotians and Argives who stationed themselves in Korinth and went out to fight Lakedaimon. Androtion 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 (Hell., 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 Lakonians' 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 Agyrrios to replace him. Three scholia speak of him in no glowing terms. Schol. Ecclesiastus (102) writes of his generalship in Lesbos:

ὁ Ἀγύρριος στρατηγὸς θαλυδριώδης, ἄρξας ἐν Λέσβῳ.
καὶ τὸν μισθὸν δὲ τῶν ποιητῶν συνέτεμε, καὶ πρῶτος
ἐκκλησιαστικὸν δέδωκεν. ὁ δὲ Πρόνομος αὐλητῆς...

A scholion to Plutus (176) indicates that he was rich:

οὗτος πλούσιος ὢν πολλὰ πᾶν ἥσθιε.

To Ranae (367) is a note which credits him, or Archinos, with lowering the poets' fees:

τοῦτο εἰς Ἀρχῖνον. μήποτε δὲ καὶ εἰς Ἀγύρριον.
 μέμνηται δὲ τούτων καὶ Πλάτων ἐν Σκευαῖς καὶ Σαννυ-
 ρίων ἐν Δανάῃ. οὗτοι γὰρ προΐσταμενοι τῆς δημοσίας
 τραπέζης τὸν μισθὸν τῶν κωμῶδων ἐμείωσαν κωμωδηθέντες.

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 Dio-
 dorus (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 Eukleides 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., II,² 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, 180:

οὗτος εἰς τοσοῦτον ἤρθη τύχης, ὥστε καὶ ἐν ὄψει τοῦτω
 τὴν δαίμονα φαίνεσθαι. κατασκευάσας δὲ πύργον οὐκ
 ἀπὸ τύχης ἔφη κατασκευακέναι, ἀλλ' ἀπ' ἀνδρείας. ὀργισ-
 θεῖσα δὲ ἡ τύχη πένητα αὐτὸν ἐποίησεν. οὐκ εἶασε δὲ
 εἰπεῖν, διὰ τὸν πλοῦτον ἐγένετο, ἀλλ' ἐπήγαγε παρ'
 ὑπόνοιαν ἐμπέσοι γέ σοι. "Ἄλλως. ὁ Τιμόθεος πλού-
 σιος, ἅμα δὲ καὶ ὀλβιος ἀνὴρ, στρατηγὸς Ἀθηναίων,
 τεῖχος ἀκοδομήσας εἰς τοσοῦτον ἤρθη τύχης, ὡς τὴν
 δαίμονα φαίνεσθαι ἐν ὄψει τοῦτω. καὶ ἐν Ἀθήναις δὲ
 ἐν εἰκόσιν ἐποιοῦν αὐτὸν κοιμῶμενον οἱ ζωγράφοι, καὶ
 τὰς τύχας φεροῦσας αὐτῷ εἰς δίκτυα πόλεις καὶ πορ-
 θοῦντα αὐτὰς, αἰνιττόμενοι τὴν εὐδαιμονίαν αὐτοῦ.
 ἀλαζονευόμενος δὲ ἐπὶ τῇ εὐτυχίᾳ ὁ Τιμόθεος ἔφη μάλ-
 λον αὐτοῦ εἶναι ἢ τῆς τύχης τὰ πραττόμενα. διὸ καὶ
 ἠτύχηκεν ὕστερον, νεμεσησάσης αὐτῷ τῆς Τύχης. πολλοὶ
 δὲ Τιμόθεοι κωμωδοῦνται....ὁ Τιμόθεος στρατηγὸς Ἀθηναίων,
 ὅς εἰς τοσοῦτον ἤλθε τῆς τύχης, ὥστε οἱ ζωγράφοι,
 αἰνιττόμενοι αὐτοῦ τὴν εὐδαιμονίαν, ἐν δικτύῳ ἐζωγράφησαν
 φέρειν αὐτὸν τὰς πόλεις....ἐποίησε δὲ πύργον πολυτελέσ-
 τατον ἐν Ἀθήναις.

Lysias (19, 36) reports that he was son of Konon and a Kypri-
 ote 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 υἱός, ὃν ὁ ῥήτωρ Δημοσθένης ἔγραφεν.

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 Ἀλεξάνδρου τοῦ Μακεδόνα ἵππος

ἦν, ᾧ τελευτήσαντι τὴν Βουκεφάλειαν Ἀλέξανδρος ἔκτισεν, ἐντάφιον αὐτῷ τῆς ἀρετῆς χαρίζομενος πόλιν.

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 wounded 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 Aristophanea, licet haud paucas praebeant observationes ineptas ad poetae mentem intellegendam prorsus inutiles, tamen eis cui ipsi Aristophanis operam dant, minime neglegenda esse cuius hanc materiam paulo accuratius cognoscenti statim apparet. 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 ἱστορίων 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 ἱστορίων 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 charlatanism 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

ἰστοριῶν ἀπόδοσις 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!² Rutherford is equally vehement elsewhere in his study of the scholia Ravennatis.³

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 ἰστοριῶν ἀπόδοσις.

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 rickety 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 presentment 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 grammairien anonyme vers le IV^e-V^e siècle constitua donc le texte

4

Rutherford, Scholia Aristophanica, I, pp. xviii and xx-xxi.

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'exercèrent 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 in dem alten Sammelcodex fügte Musurus Scholien des Triklinius und einiges eigene: die auf diese Weise hergestellte Scholienmasse ist dann fort und fort wiedergedruckt und mitunter durch Neues vermehrt worden, bildet aber noch heute die Grundlage und den 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!"⁶

Studies of the textual tradition and of the scholarship of Alexandrian and later periods, then, provide the

⁶

Zacher, Jahrb. f. Cl. Phil., Suppl. XVI (1888), p. 739.

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.⁷ They have no independent historical value, of course. In three notes the scholiasts' patent wrongness is based upon a misunderstanding of the annotated passages.⁸ Sometimes a note is apparently unique in its content, but can be proved to derive from Aristophanes.⁹ 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. 98): Themistokles built the Long Walls; schol. Nubes, 213(PP. 137-138): 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 provides¹⁰

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.¹¹ Information about Hyperbolos,¹² Aspasia,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.¹⁴ A larger proportion of scholia combine brief paraphrases with

¹⁰

E.g., schol. Equites, 331(p. 195); schol. Vespae, 241(p. 199); schol. Equites, 438(pp. 199-200); schol. Lysistrata, 1141(p. 124).

¹¹

See above, pp. 195-201 and 209-220.

¹²

See above, pp. 224-229.

¹³

See above, pp. 150-152 and 160-162.

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.¹⁵

Frequently the scholiasts name and sometimes they quote their sources. Thucydides is the most popular authority.¹⁶ The scholiasts occasionally doubt the veracity of other writers; Thucydides is never suspect and at times is used to correct another's error.¹⁷ A few notes consist principally of excerpts from Thucydides; the scholiasts have merely written a few introductory words.¹⁸ Only once do the scholiasts seem to doubt Thucydides' statement. A note to Ranae¹⁹ 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!"

¹⁵

Sixty-two combine paraphrase and other material; one hundred and thirty-two ignore Aristophanes as a source.

¹⁶

Of the fifty-five notes naming him and others as sources, eighteen refer to Thucydides or quote from his work.

¹⁷

E.g., schol. Acharnenses, 145(pp. 177-178; schol. Equites, 445(pp. 71-72).

¹⁸

E.g., schol. Pax, 479(pp. 212-213); schol. Equites, 793(p. 176); schol. Pax, 450(pp. 232-233).

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 *οἱ*.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 Hippias, not Hipparchos, was tyrant; schol. Lysistrata, 619(p. 79) preserves three versions of the length of Hippias' tyranny; schol. Pax, 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.²³ 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.²⁴

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.²⁵

and "others"; schol. Vespae, 502(p. 78), from Thucydides, Aristotle and Herodotos.

23

E.g., schol. Nubes, 304(p. 100); Herodotos; schol. Lysistrata, 1153(p. 84): Aristotle; schol. Plutus, 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.

24

E.g., schol. Pax, 282 (p. 189); schol. Acharnenses, 846(p. 226); schol. Ranae, 367(p. 263).

25

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, 859(pp. 155-156); schol. Vespae,

The rest of the scholia give a single version or a number of similar accounts, each introduced by ὅλλως; 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-

41(p. 212); schol. Ranae, 1422(p. 239).

²⁶

Single accounts: e.g., schol. Equites, 1362(p. 87); schol. Acharnenses, 84(pp. 89-90); schol. Equites, 785(p. 100); schol. Lysistrata, 653(p. 109); schol. Equites, 438 (p. 157); schol. Acharnenses, 532(p. 161); schol. Lysistrata, 804(p. 179); schol. Vespae, 88(pp. 201-202); schol. Nubes, 186(p. 210). Collection by the scribes is evident in others: schol. Equites, 84(pp. 111-113); schol. Plutus, 178(pp. 127-128); schol. Equites, 1056(p. 209); schol. Plutus, 550 (pp. 254-255); schol. Aves, 147(p. 235).

²⁷

The latter, of course, may appear in any manuscript. Most common are errors made in the transcription of numbers, particularly numbers designated by letter; names also suffer in copying, the names of individuals, for some reason more than the names of places.

ably responsible for the confusion of Thermopylae and Pylos in schol. Equites, 55(p. 95), for the note which attaches Thoukydides' name to Themistokles' biography (schol. Vespae, 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 Lakedaïmon and Boiotia in the 390's (schol. Ecclesiastus, 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. Plutus, 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. Vespae, 502(p. 78); schol. Pax, 347(pp. 178-179), with which cf. schol. Equites, 562(p. 179).

a mass of lore and myth.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.³¹ At other times annotators criticise Aristophanes for some historical blunder³² or they present a personal opinion on some disputed point.³³

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).

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).

32

E.g., schol. Pax, 246 (p. 159); schol. Nubes, 558(p. 228).

33

E.g., schol. Nubes, 6 (p. 245); τὸ ἀληθές; schol. Thesmophoriazusae, 840 (p. 225) ὁ ἄλλος; 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 (Pax, 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. Pax, 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 Peiraieus; schol. Acharnenses, 1150

out possible basis in fact.³⁶ 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.³⁷

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 Hermokopidai.

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.

³⁷ Schol. Pax, 171(pp. 187-189): relations between Athens and Chios.

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 probability³⁸ they may be accepted as evidence and judged as we judge any other historical evidence.

38

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 1

TESTIMONIA

AILLIAN

T1 (Varia Historia, II, 9): Μυτιληναίους δὲ ἡβηδὸν ἀποσφάζαι καὶ τοῦτο ἐψηφίσαντο ἐσηγησαμένου Κλέωνος τοῦ Κλεαινέτου. τοὺς γε μὴν ἀλικομένους αἰχμαλώτους Σαμίῳν στίζειν κατὰ τοῦ προσώπου καὶ εἶναι τὸ στίγμα γλαῦκα καὶ τοῦτο Ἀττικὸν ψήφισμα.

T2 (Varia Historia, II, 25): τὴν ἕκτην τοῦ μηνὸς τοῦ θοαργηλιῶνος πολλῶν καὶ ἀγαθῶν αἰτίαν γενέσθαι λέγουσιν οὐ μόνον τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις ἀλλὰ καὶ ἄλλοις πολλοῖς. αὐτίκα γοῦν Σωκράτης ἐν ταύτῃ ἐγένετο, καὶ Πέρσαι δὲ ἡττήθησαν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ταύτῃ, καὶ Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ τῇ Ἀγροτέρᾳ ἀποθύουσι τὰς χιμαῖρας τὰς τριακοσίας, κατὰ τὴν εὐχὴν τοῦ Μιλτιάδου δρῶντες τοῦτο.

T3 (Varia Historia, V, 10): νηίτην στόλον Ἀθηναῖοι εἰργάζοντο ἑαυτοῖς ἀεὶ φιλοπόνως. κατὰ χρόνους δὲ τὰ μὲν κατορθοῦντες τὰ δὲ ἡττώμενοι ἀπώλεσαν τριήρεις μὲν ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ διακοσίας σὺν τοῖς πληρώμασι, περὶ Κύπρον δὲ πεντήκοντα καὶ ἑκατὸν.

T4 (Varia Historia, VI, 1): Ἀθηναῖοι κρατήσαντες Χαλκιδέων κατεκληρούχησαν αὐτῶν τὴν γῆν ἐς δισχιλίους κλήρους, τὴν Ἰππόβοτον καλουμένην χώραν, τεμένη δὲ ἀνῆκαν

τῇ Ἀθηνᾷ ἐν τῷ Ἀηλάντῳ ὀνομαζομένῳ τόπῳ, τὴν δὲ λοιπὴν ἐμίσθωσαν κατὰ τὰς στήλας τὰς πρὸς τῇ βασιλείῳ στοᾷ ἐστηκυίας, αἵπερ οὖν τὰ τῶν μισθώσεων ὑπομνήματα εἶχον. τοὺς δὲ αἰχμαλώτους ἔδησαν, καὶ οὐδὲ ἐνταῦθα ἔσβεσαν τὸν κατὰ Χαλκιδέων θυμὸν.

T5 (Varia Historia , VI, 7): ὅτε οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι τοὺς ἐκ Ταινάρου ἱκέτας παρασκουδήσαντες ἀνέστησαν καὶ ἀπέκτειναν (ἦσαν δὲ οἱ ἱκέται τῶν εἰλώτων), κατὰ μῆνιν τοῦ Ποσειδῶνος σεισμὸς ἐπιπεσὼν τῇ Σπάρτῃ τὴν πόλιν ἀνδρείοτατα κατέσεισεν, ὥς πέντε μόνας ἀπολειφθῆναι οἰκίας ἐξ ἀπάσης τῆς πόλεως.

T6 (Varia Historia , XI, 9): εἰσὶ δὲ οὗτοι, οἷον Ἀριστείδης ὁ Λυσιμάχου, ἀνὴρ πολλὰ μὲν ἐν πολέμῳ κατορθώσας, καὶ τοὺς φόρους δὲ τοῖς Ἕλλησι τάξας....

T7 (Varia Historia , XII, 43): Ὑπερβόλου δὲ καὶ Κλεοφῶντος καὶ Δημάδου, καίτοι προστατῶν γενομένων τοῦ δήμου τῶν Ἀθηναίων, οὐδεὶς ἄν εἴποι ῥαδίως τοὺς πατέρας.

T8 (Varia Historia , XII, 53): ἐμὲ δὲ οὐ λέληθεν ὅτι τῶν μεγίστων πολέμων αἱ ἀρχαὶ δοκοῦσί πως εὐκαταφρόνηται γεγενῆναι. τὸν μὲν γὰρ Περσικὸν ἐκ τῆς Μαιανδρίου τοῦ Σαμίου πρὸς Ἀθηναίους διαφορᾶς τὴν ἀρχὴν λαβεῖν φασί, τὸν γε μὴν Πελοποννήσιον διὰ τὸ κατὰ Μεγαρέων πινάκιον, τὸν δὲ ἱερὸν καλούμενον ἐκ τῆς ἐσπράξεως τῶν δικῶν τῶν Ἀμφικτυδων.

AISCHINES

T9 (2, 23): ὁ δὲ οὐδὲν ἄπρατον ἔχων μέρος τοῦ σώματος, οὐδ' ὅθεν τὴν φωνὴν προΐεται, ὡς ὦν Ἀριστείδης ὁ τοὺς φόρους τάσας τοῖς Ἕλλησιν, ἐὶ δὲ δίκαιος ἐπικαλούμενος, δυσχεραίνει καὶ καταπτύει δωροδοκίας.

T10 (2, 173): ἐν δὲ τούτῳ τῷ χρόνῳ ἐτειχίσαμεν μὲν τὸν Πειραιᾶ καὶ τὸ βόρειον τεῖχος ὥκοδομήσαμεν....

T11 (2, 175): πάλιν δὲ εἰς πόλεμον διὰ Μεγαρέας πεισθέντες καταστῆναι, καὶ τὴν χώραν τημηθῆναι προέμενοι καὶ πολλῶν ἀγαθῶν στερηθέντες, εἰρήνης ἐδεήθημεν, καὶ ἐποιησάμεθα διὰ Νικίου τοῦ Νικηράτου. καὶ πάλιν ἐν τῷ χρόνῳ τούτῳ ἑπτακισχίλια τάλαντα ἀνηνέγκαμεν εἰς τὴν ἀκρόπολιν διὰ τὴν εἰρήνην ταύτην, τριήρεις δ' ἐκτησάμεθα πλωίμους καὶ ἐντελεῖς οὐκ ἐλάττους ἢ τριακοσίας, φόρος δ' ἡμῖν κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν προσῆει πλεον ἢ χίλια καὶ διακόσια τάλαντα, καὶ Χερρόνησον καὶ Νάξον καὶ Εὐβοίαν εἵχομεν, πλείστας δ' ἀποικίας ἐν τοῖς χρόνοις τούτοις ἀπεστέλαμεν.

T12 (3. 258): Ἀριστείδην δὲ τὸν τοὺς φόρους τάσαντα τοῖς Ἕλλησιν....

SCHOLIA TO AISCHINES

T13 (1, 39): τῶν τριάκοντα, οἱ λ' τύραννοι διὰ Λακεδαιμονίων κατασταθέντες καὶ τὴν πάτριον πολιτείαν τῶν

*Αθηναίων καταλύσαντες ἐλυμήναντο τοὺς Δράκοντος καὶ Σόλωνος νόμους. ἀπολαβὼν οὖν ὁ δῆμος τὴν ἐλευθερίαν εἴλετο πολίτας κ' τοὺς ζητήσοντας καὶ ἀναγράφοντας τοὺς διεφθαρμένους τῶν νόμων. καὶ ἐψηφίσαντο καινοὺς νόμους εἰσφέρειν ἀντὶ τῶν ἀπολωλότων ἐπ' ἄρχοντος Εὐκλείδου, ὃς πρῶτος ἦρξε μετὰ τοὺς τριάκοντα. πολλὰ μέντοι καὶ δεινὰ ἔπραξαν οἱ λ'. τὸν τε γὰρ δῆμον ἐξέβαλον καὶ τῶν ἐπιφανῶν τοὺς μὲν ἐβασάνισαν, τοὺς δὲ ἐφυγάδευσαν ἀφελόμενοι τὴν οὐσίαν αὐτῶν, τοὺς δὲ ἀπέκτειναν ἀκρίτους, ὥς μὲν ἔνιοί φασιν, φ' καὶ α, ὥς δὲ Λυσίας ἐν τῷ κατὰ δοκιμασίας ἐπιλόγῃ. δισχιλίους φ'. γεγύνασι μέντοι πλείους αἰρέσει τῶν πεντήκοντα. οἳ τε γὰρ ἐν ἄστει δικαστὰς τριάκοντα ἦσαν καὶ ἐκ τῶν πλουσίων τριάκοντα ἡρέθησαν ὀβολοστάται, ὃ ἐστὶ δανεισταὶ ἐπὶ ὀβολῷ τὴν μνᾶν δανείζοντες. δεῖγμα δὲ τῆς τῶν λ' πολιτείας καὶ τόδε ἐστίν. Κριτίου γὰρ ἐνδὲς τῶν λ' ἀποθάνοντος ἐπέστησαν τῷ μνήματι.... ἄρξαντος οὖν Εὐκλείδου μετὰ τὴν τῶν λ' κατάλυσιν τὰ πρὸς αὐτῶν πραχθέντα ἄκυρα εἶναι ἐψηφίσαντο οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι. οἱ λ' τύραννοι μετὰ τὸν Πελοποννησιακὸν γενόμενον πόλεμον Ἀθήνησιν ἐπειδὴ καθήρεθσαν, Θρασυβούλου τοῦ ἀπὸ φυλῆς ἀγωνισαμένου, ψήφισμα ἐτέθη ἀμνησικακεῖν τῶν ὑπαρξάντων ἐπ' αὐτῶν.

T14 (2, 186): καὶ πάλιν, μετῆκται τὰ πλεῖστα ἐκ τῶν Ἀνδοκίδου, ἐστὶ δὲ ψευδῆ. ἡ μὲν γὰρ Νικίου εἰρήνη ἐπὶ ἄρχοντος Ἀρίστωνος ἐγένετο τῷ τετάρτῳ ἔτει τῆς ὀγδοηκοστῆς ἐνάτης Ὀλυμπιάδος. ἐν δὲ ταύτῃ οὐχ ὅτι ἐννακισχίλια

τάλαντα εἰς ἀκρόπολιν ἀνήγαγον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ προανενηνεγμένα ἐκ Δήλου μύρια πεντακισχίλια προσανάλωσαν. περὶ τῶν ἀποικιῶν δὲ ψεύδεται· οὐ γὰρ ἐπὶ τῆς Νικίου εἰρήνης ἐγένετο, ἀλλὰ πολλοῖς χρόνοις πρότερον.

T15 (3, 181): Φυλῆς, φυλὴ χωρίον τῆς Ἀττικῆς ὀχυρὸν σφόδρα, ἀπέχον τῆς πόλεως στάδια ἑκατὸν, ὥστε πολλὰς ἀφορμὰς αὐτοῖς παρέχεσθαι εἰς ἐφόδια. νοεῖται δὲ ὁ Θρασύβουλος καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ, τὴν φυλὴν καταλαβόντες ἐπὶ τῷ τὸν δῆμον φυγόντα καταγαγεῖν καὶ τὴν τῶν τριάκοντα ἀρχὴν καταλβεῖν.

AISCHYLOS

T16 (Vita Aeschylī, 12): Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ τοσοῦτον ἠγάπησαν Αἰσχύλου, ὥς ψηφίσασθαι μετὰ τὸν θάνατον αὐτοῦ τὸν βουλόμενον διδάσκειν τὰ Αἰσχύλου χορὸν λαμβάνειν....
(13): νίκας δὲ τὰς πάσας εἵληφε τρεῖσκαίδεκα· οὐκ ολίγας δὲ μετὰ τελευτὴν νίκας ἀπηνέγκατο.

ALKIPHON

T17 (Epistulae, IV, 7, 6-7): παιδεύομεν δὲ οὐ χειρὸν ἡμεῖς τοὺς νέους. ἐπεὶ σύγκρινον, εἰ βοῦλει, Ἀσπασίαν τὴν ἐταῖραν καὶ Ξωκράτην τὸν σοφιστὴν, καὶ πότερος ἀμείνους αὐτῶν ἐπαίδενσεν ἄνδρας λόγισαι· τῆς μὲν γὰρ ὄψει μαθητὴν Περικλέα, τοῦ δὲ Κριτίαν.

ANDOKIDES

T18 (1, 11): ἦν μὲν γὰρ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῖς στρατηγοῖς τοῖς εἰς Σικελίαν, Νικίᾳ καὶ Λαμάχῳ καὶ Ἀλκιβιάδῃ, καὶ τριήρης ἡ στρατηγὶς ἤδη ἐξώρμει ἡ Λαμάχου·

T19 (1, 62): αἰσθόμενός δ' Εὐφίλητος ὥς ἔχοιμι, λέγει πρὸς αὐτοὺς ὅτι πέπεισμαι ταῦτα συμποιεῖν καὶ ὁμολογήκα αὐτῷ μεθέξειν τοῦ ἔργου καὶ περικόψειν τὸν Ἑρμῆν τὸν παρὰ τὸ Φορβαντεῖον. ταῦτα δ' ἔλεγεν ἐξαπατῶν ἐκείνους· καὶ διὰ ταῦτα ὁ Ἑρμῆς ὃν ὁρᾶτε πάντες, ὁ παρὰ τὴν πατρίαν οἰκίαν τὴν ἡμετέραν, ὃν ἡ Αἰγῆς ἀνέθηκεν, οὐ περιεκδόκη μόνος τῶν Ἑρμῶν τῶν Ἀθηνησιν, ὥς ἐμοῦ τοῦτο ποιήσαντος, ὥς ἔφη πρὸς αὐτοὺς Εὐφίλητος.

T20 (1, 106): οἱ γὰρ πατέρες οἱ ὑμέτεροι γενομένων τῇ πόλει κακῶν μεγάλων, ὅτε οἱ τύραννοι μὲν εἶχον τὴν πόλιν, ὁ δὲ δῆμος ἔφευγε, νικήσαντες μαχόμενοι τοὺς τυράννους ἐπὶ Παλληνίῳ, στρατηγοῦντος Λεωγόρου τοῦ προπάππου τοῦ ἐμοῦ καὶ Χαρίου οὗ ἐκεῖνος τὴν θυγατέρα εἶχεν·...

T21 (2, 26): τὰδε γὰρ οὐ ψευσαμένῳ μοι λαθεῖν οἶδν τ' ἐστὶ τοὺς γε πρεσβυτέρους ὑμῶν, ὅτι ὁ τοῦ ἐμοῦ πατρὸς πάππος Λεωγόρας στασιάσας πρὸς τοὺς τυράννους ὑπὲρ τοῦ δήμου, ἐξδὼν αὐτῷ διαλλαχθέντι τῆς ἔχθρας καὶ γενομένῳ κηδεστῇ ἄρξαι μετ' ἐκείνων τῶν ἀνδρῶν τῆς πόλεως, εἴλετο μᾶλλον ἐκπεσεῖν μετὰ τοῦ δήμου καὶ φεύγων κακοπαθεῖν μᾶλλον ἢ προδότης αὐτοῦ καταστῆναι.

T22 (Hypothesis , 3): τοῦ Ἑλληνικοῦ μηχανο-
 μένου πολέμου, καὶ πολλὰ μὲν Ἀθηναίων κακὰ πολλὰ δὲ Λακεδαιμο-
 νίων ὑπομεινάντων καὶ τῶν ἐκατέρων συμμάχων, Ἀθηναῖοι
 πρέσβεις ἀπέστειλαν πρὸς Λακεδαιμονίους αὐτοκράτορας· ὧν
 ἐστὶ καὶ Ἀνδοκίδης. τινῶν δὲ προταθέντων παρὰ Λακεδαιμο-
 νίων, καὶ ἀποστειλάντων κακείνων ἰδίους πρέσβεις, ἔδοξεν
 ὥστε εἶσω τεσσαράκοντα ἡμερῶν ἐπιβουλεύσασθαι τὸν δῆμον
 περὶ τῆς εἰρήνης. καὶ ἐπὶ ταῦτοις Ἀνδοκίδης συμβουλεύει
 τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις καταδέξασθαι τὴν εἰρήνην. ἔστι μὲν οὖν
 συμβουλῆς τὸ εἶδος· κεφάλαιον τὸ συμφέρον. Φιλόχορος μὲν
 οὖν λέγει καὶ ἐλθεῖν τοὺς πρέσβεις ἐκ Λακεδαιμονίας, καὶ
 ἀπράκτους ἀνελθεῖν μὴ πείσαντος τοῦ Ἀνδοκίδου· ὁ δὲ
 Διονύσιος νόθον εἶναι λέγει τὸν λόγον.

T23 (3, 5): πρῶτον μὲν τὸν Πειραιᾶ ἐτειχίσαμεν
 ἐν τούτῳ τῷ χρόνῳ, εἶτα τὸ μακρὸν τεῖχος τὸ βόρειον·

T24 (3, 8-9): πάλιν δὲ διὰ Μεγαρέας πολεμήσαντες
 καὶ τὴν χώραν τμηθῆναι προέμενοι, πολλῶν ἀγαθῶν στερηθέντες
 αὐτοὶς τὴν εἰρήνην ἐποιησάμεθα, ἣν ἡμῖν Νικίας ὁ Νικηράτου
 κατηργάσατο. οἶμαι δ' ὑμᾶς ἅπαντας εἰδέναι τοῦτο, ὅτι διὰ
 ταύτην τὴν εἰρήνην ἑπτακισχίλια μὲν τάλαντα νομίσματος εἰς
 τὴν ἀκρόπολιν ἀνηνέγκαμεν, ναῦς δὲ πλείους ἢ τριακοσίας
 ἐκτησάμεθα, καὶ φόρος προσήει κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν πλεον ἢ διακόσια
 καὶ χίλια τάλαντα, καὶ Χερρόνησόν τε εἶχομεν καὶ Νᾶξον καὶ
 Εὐβοίαν πλεον ἢ τὰ δύο μέρη· τὰς τὲ ἄλλας ἀποικίας καθ'
 ἕκαστον διηγείσθαι μακρὸς ἂν εἴη λόγος.

T25 (3, 38): λαθόντες δὲ Πελοποννησίους τειχισά-
μενοι τὰ τείχη.

T26 (14, 11): πρῶτον μὲν οὖν πείσας ὑμᾶς τὸν
φόρον ταῖς πόλεσιν ἐξ ἀρχῆς τάξαι τὸν ὑπ' Ἀριστείδου πάντων
δικαιότατα τεταγμένον, αἵρεθεις ἐπὶ τούτῳ δέκατος αὐτὸς
μάλιστα διπλάσιον αὐτὸν ἐκάστοις τῶν συμμάχων ἐποίησεν,
ἐπιδείξας δ' αὐτὸν φοβερόν καὶ μέγα δυνάμενον ἰδίᾳς ἀπὸ
τῶν κοινῶν προσόδους κατασκευάσατο.

T27 (14, 32): αἰσχιστον δὲ φανήσεσθε ποιοῦντες,
εἰ τοῦτον ἀγαπᾶτε τὸν ἀπὸ τῶν ὑμετέρων χρημάτων ταῦτα
κατεργασάμενον....

ANDROTION

T28 (Jacoby , frg.42): Ὑπερβολος οὗτος, ὡς
Ἀνδροτίων φησὶν, Ἀντιφάνους ἦν Περιθοίδης, ὃν καὶ ὥστρα-
κίσθαι διὰ φανυλότητα.

APOLLONIOS RHODIOS

T29 (Scholia , I, 101-104 α): καὶ δὴ διὰ Ταινάρου
κατελθόντες καὶ ἐπὶ τινος πέτρας καθεσθέντες αὐτοὶς ἀναστῆναι
οὐ δεδύνηται. Ἡρακλῆς δὲ ὕστερον κατελθὼν διὰ τὸν Κέρβερον,
τὸν μὲν θησέα ἀπέσωσεν ὡς μὴ ἐκοντὶ κατελθόντα, τὸν δὲ Παρί-
θουν εἴασεν, ἐπειδὴ προαιρέσει ἰδίᾳ κατήλθεν.

T30 (Scholia , IV , 1750-1757): εἷς δὲ τις αὐτοῦ
τῶν ἀπογόνων Σάμος ᾤκησεν θήραν, ὃν ἀπόγονος γέγονεν

*Αριστοτέλης, ὃς τῆς περὶ Κυρήνην ἀποικίας ἡγήσατο.

T31 (Scholia , IV, 1760-1764 α):καὶ ὠνομάσθη θήρα ἀπὸ σοῦ, ὃ νῖε Δύτεσίωνος θήρα, ἐκεῖ σοῦ ἀπὸ Σπάρτης ἀποικίαν ποιήσαντος καὶ μέναντος. (1764 δ): ἀπὸ Εὐφήμου γενόμενος καὶ αὐτὸς εἰς Λιβύην τὴν ἀποικίαν ἡγάγετο *Αριστοτέλης.

APOSTOLIS

T32 (132, 104): ἐς κδρακας, Βοιωτοῖς ὁ θεὸς ἔχρησεν, ὅπου ἂν λευκοὶ κδρακες ὀφθῶσιν, ἐκεῖ κατοικεῖν. περὶ δὲ τὸν Παγασιτικὸν κδλπον ὑπὸ παίδων ἀμάκων γυνωθέντας κδρακας ἰδόντας περιπετομένους τοῦ *Απόλλωνος ὤκησε χωρίον Κδρακας. ὕστερον δὲ Αἰολεῖς ἐκβαλόντες αὐτοὺς, τοὺς φυγαδευομένους εἰς αὐτὸ ἔπεμψαν. οἱ δὲ τοῦ ζῆου ἀναιδοῦς καὶ δυσσιωνιστικοῦ ὄντος.

T33 (139, 141): λυκδποδες, οὕτως ἐκάλουν τοὺς τῶν τυράννων δορυφόρους, ὅτι διὰ παντὸς εἶχον τοὺς πόδας λεύκων δέρμασι κεκαλυμμένους ἢ διὰ τὸ ἔχειν ἐπὶ τὴν ἀσπίδα ἐπίσημον λεύκον.

APULEIUS

T34 (Metamorphoseon, VI, 18): Lacedaemo Achaiae nobilis civitas non longe sita est: huius conterminam devlis abditam locis quaere Taenarum. inibi spiraculum Ditis, et per portas hiantes monstratur iter invium, cuius te limine transmeato simul commiseris, iam canale directo perges ad ipsam

h₂Orci regiam.

ARCHEMACHOS

T35 (Frg. 1 Jacoby): 'Αρχέμαχος δ' ἐν τῇ τρίτῃ Εὐβοικῶν "Βοιωτῶν" φησὶν "τῶν τὴν Ἀρναίαν κατοικησάντων οἱ μὴ ἀπάραντες εἰς τὴν Βοιωτίαν ἀλλ' ἐμφιλοχωρήσαντες παρέδωκαν ἑαυτοὺς τοῖς Θεσσαλοῖς δουλεύειν καθ' ὁμολογίας, ἐφ' ᾧ οὔτε ἐξάξουσιν αὐτοὺς ἐκ τῆς χώρας οὔτε ἀποκτενοῦσιν, αὐτοὶ δὲ τὴν χώραν αὐτοῖς ἐργαζόμενοι τὰς συντάξεις ἀποδύσουσιν. οὗτοι οὖν οἱ κατὰ τὰς ὁμολογίας καταμείναντες καὶ παραδόντες ἑαυτοὺς ἐκλήθησαν τότε μὲν μενέσται, νῦν δὲ πενέσται· καὶ πολλοὶ τῶν κυρίων ἑαυτῶν εἰσιν εὐπορώτεροι!"

ARISTEIDES

T36 (13, 160 = Dindorf, I, p. 262): ἔτι δὲ νεῶν τοσοῦτων καὶ βελῶν καὶ σκευῶν καὶ τεχνῶν καὶ συμμάχων καὶ πάσης ὥς ἔπος εἰπεῖν τῆς κατασκευῆς μεθεστηκυίας, ὥσπερ ἄρτι τῆς πάσης Σικελίας οἰκίζομένης, κεκενωμένης μὲν τῆς ἀκροπόλεως ταλάντων ὀλίγου δεῖν μυρίων....

T37 (46, 118 = Dindorf, II, p. 159): δημοτικὸς δὲ ὢν τῇ προαιρέσει καὶ πράττων ὑπὲρ τοῦ πλήθους ἐναντία θουκυδίδῃ πλεῖστον τῆς ἀγοραίου προπετείας καὶ κομψότητος ἀποσχεῖν.

T38 (46, 122 = Dindorf, II, p. 163): ἀλλ' ἐν ἱστορίᾳ καὶ διηγῆσαι τάλῃθες ἀπλῶς οὕτως παραδιδούς, ὥσπερ ὅταν περὶ τῆς Πελοποννησίων εἰσβολῆς, ἥ τινος ἄλλου τῶν ἐφ'

αὐτοῦ διηγῆται. εἰ μὲν τοίνυν ἡμφισβητεῖτο τῷ Θουκυδίδῃ περὶ τούτων, ἄλλος ἂν ἦν λόγος.

T39 (46, 149 = Dindorf, II, p. 199): οὔτε γὰρ τοὺς φόρους Περικλῆς εἰς ἄπειρόν ἐστιν ὁ ἐξαγαγών, ἀλλὰ καὶ ταύτης τῆς ἀμετρίας, ὃ φίλη Σώκρατες, εἰ ζητοίης τὸν αἴτιον, τὸν ἐταῖρον εὐρήσεις τὸν σεαυτοῦ. ἐκεῖνος γάρ ἐστιν ὁ πρὸς τοσοῦτον προαγαγών τοὺς φόρους, ὅσον οὐδὲ βουλομένοις φέρειν ἐξῆν....

T40 (46, 149 = Dindorf, II, p. 200): ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ τοὺς ἄνδρας τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων εἶχον Ἀθηναῖοι καὶ Πύλον, οὐδὲν ἂν αὐτοὺς πλέον ζητῆσαι, ἀλλ' εὐθὺς ἐλευθέρως ἂν ταῦτ' ἀποδόντας ποιῆσαι τοῖς "Ελλήσι κοινὴν εἰρήνην. οὐδὲ γὰρ αὐτὸν τὸν πόλεμον πλεονεξίας ἕνεκα αὐτοῖς προελέσθαι συνεβούλευσεν, ἀλλὰ τοῦ μὴ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων ἀποστῆναι. ἀρχὴν δ' ἐκεῖνός γε οὐδ' ἡξίου γίγνεσθαι πόλεμον, ἀλλὰ δίκῃ διαλύεσθαι περὶ τῶν διαφόρων.

T41 (Schol. 13, 142, 18 = Dindorf, III, p. 184): τοῖς ἐν Πύλαις ἀτυχοῦσιν ἄνευ τῆς πόλεως, ἀπορία, πῶς τῇ ἐν Πύλαις ἀτυχίᾳ φυλακτήριον ἢ πόλις τοῖς "Ελλήσι γέγυνε. καὶ φάμεν ὅτι τοῦτο λέγει διὰ τὸ Λακεδαιμονίους εἶναι τοὺς ἀτυχήσαντας, καὶ οὐκ Ἀθηναίους, ἢ ὕστερον νικήσειν ἔμελλον. εἰ γὰρ τότε ἡτύχουν, οὐκ ἂν ἂ ὕστερον κατάρθωσαν ἔπραξαν, κατακλασθέντες τῷ φόβῳ.

T42 (Schol. 13, 142, 19 = Dindorf, III, p. 184): ταῖς τοῦ θεοῦ μαντείαις, διπλοῖ ἦσαν οἱ χρησμοί. διδοίη Τροτο-

γενίη ξύλινον τεῖχος εὐρύβοπα Ζεὺς. ὁ δὲ Ἑλλήνων ἀπώλειαν
ἐθέσπιζε τὴν Ἀθηναίων μετὰ τῶν βαρβάρων παράταξιν. διτταὶ
ἦσαν αἱ μαντεῖαι· αἱ μὲν διὰ τὸ ξύλινον τεῖχος, αἱ δὲ, ὅτι
ἀπολοῦνται τέκνα γυναικῶν παρὰ Σαλαμῖνα.

T43 (Schol. 13, 143,4=Dindorf, III, p. 185): τῷ
τοῦς Ἑλλήνας κατασχεῖν, εἰς τὸ μὴ φυγεῖν· μετὰ γὰρ τὸ
νικῆσαι ἐπ' Ἀρτεμισίῳ δραπετεῦειν ἠβούλοντο, καὶ διεκώλυσεν
ὁ Θεμιστοκλῆς.

T44 (Schol. 13,143,5=Dindorf, III, pp.185-186): τοῖς
ἀπ' Ἐλευσίνος φάσμασι, Δίκαιος καὶ Δημάρατος, Ἀθηναῖοι
ὄντες, καὶ πάλαι φυγάδες ἐκ τῇν πόλεως, ὄντες παρὰ Ξέρξη
γενομένης τῆς συμπλοκῆς, καὶ κονιορτοῦ ἀρθέντος εἰς ἄερα
ἐξ Ἐλευσίνος, ἔφησαν τῷ Βασιλεῖ ὡς καθ' ὧν ἂν ὁ κονιορτὸς
πέσοι ἡττηθήσονται. πέπτωκε κατὰ Περσικῶν τριήρων, καὶ
σκεδασθεῖς ἐν αὐταῖς εἰς φόβον ἐνῆκε τὸν βασιλέα ὧν ὕστερον
ἔμελλον πείσεσθαι. ἐν δὲ τῇ τοῦ κονιορτοῦ ἄρσει, καὶ ὅσοι
τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἦσαν μεμνημένοι, ἤκουσαν φωνῆς τινος ἐκ
δαίμονος τινος, ἀφανῶς λεχθείσης, ὡς παρέσονται τῇ ναυμαχίᾳ
Περσεφόνη καὶ Δημήτηρ. μελλούσης τῆς ναυμαχίας γίνεσθαι
κονιορτὸς ἐγένετο ἀπὸ Ἐλευσίνος. τοῦτον ἑωρακότες Δίκαιος
καὶ Δημάρατος, φυγάδες ὄντες καὶ μένοντες παρὰ Ξέρξη, ἔφησαν
τῷ Βασιλεῖ, καθ' ὧν ἂν ἔλθῃ ὁ κονιορτὸς οὗτος, πάντως
ἐκεῖνοι ἡττῶνται. ἦθε κατὰ Περσικῶν τριήρων, καὶ διεσκεδ-
άσθη ἐν αὐταῖς. καὶ τεκμήριον τοῦ μέλλειν νικᾶσθαι τὸν
βασιλέα γέγονε τοῦτο. ἦσαν δὲ καὶ ἀκούσαντες οἱ τῶν

Ἀθηναίων μεμνημένοι ἀφανῶς καὶ ἀπροόπτως ἐκ δαίμονος
 τινος τὸ ἐπίφθεγμα τὸ λεγόμενον ἐν τοῖς Ἐλευσινίοις.
 καὶ ἐκ τούτου ἐστοχάσαντο Ἀθηναῖοι, ὥς βοηθοῦση αὐτῇ
 Περσεφόνη καὶ Δημήτηρ. τοῖς ἀπ' Ἐλευσίνος δὲ φάσμασι,
 τοῖς παραδόξοις θεάμασι.

T45 (Schol. 46,118,13=Dindorf, III,p.446):

ὁ Κίμων....οἱ δὲ ὀλίγοι γαμβρὸν ὄντα Θουκυδίδην τὸν
 Μελισίου τοῦ Κίμωνος ἐπεσπάσαντο, σκυλακώδη ὄντα καὶ
 ὀλιγαρχικόν.

T46 (Schol. 46,118,14=Dindorf, III,p.446):

πρῶτων ὑπὲρ τοῦ πλήθους ἐναντία Θουκυδίδη, οὐ τὸν συγγραφέα
 Θουκυδίδην φησὶν ἀλλὰ ἄλλον τινά, ὃς ποτε Ἀθηναῖοι τὰ πολι-
 τικὰ ἐπιτρέψαντες ἐπεΐθοντο πάντες, ἅτε εὐθυνουμένης τῆς
 πόλεως. ἐναντία δὲ φησιν, ἦτοι φανερώς τὰ αὐτά. αὖξει δὲ
 τὸν Θουκυδίδην, ἵνα πλέον αὐξήσῃ τὸν Περικλῆ, ὅτι καὶ πρὸς
 τοῦτον ἀντιπολιτευόμενος ἀπεῖχε τὴν πρὸς τὸν δῆμον κολα-
 κείαν.....τούτου δὲ τοῦ Θουκυδίδου καὶ ὁ συγγραφεὺς μέμνηται,
 λέγων " ἃ μετὰ τοῦ Θουκυδίδου καὶ Ἀγνωνος."

T47 (Schol. 46,175,14=Dindorf, III,p.569):

Ὡς περ Λύσανδρον τὸν ἐν Αἰγὸς ποταμοῖς, Λύσανδρος, ναύαρχος ὢν
 Λακεδαιμονίων, ἐν Αἰγὸς ποταμοῖς (τοῦτο δὲ τὸ χωρίον ἐν
 τῷ Ἑλλησπόντῳ τῆς Θράκης) νικήσας τοὺς Ἀθηναίους, ὥς λέγει
 Ξενοφῶν, δεκαδαρχίας καθίστη ἐν ταῖς πόλεσι, θέλων ὀλιγαρχίαν
 ποιῆσαι. καὶ ἐντεῦθεν στάσεις καὶ θόρυβοι ἐγένοντο ἐν ταῖς
 πόλεσι.

T48 (Schol.46,175,17=Dindorf,III,p.570): πολλῶν καὶ μεγάλων κακῶν αὐτὸν τοῖς Ἕλλησιν ἄρξαντα, διὰ τὰς μεταβολὰς τῶν πολιτειῶν αἰνίττεται ὅτι δεκαδαρχίας καταστήσας ἐζήτει μεταβαλεῖν τὰς πολιτείας. διὸ μὴ ἀνεχομένων στάσεις ἐγίνοντο.

T49 (Schol.46,212,3=Dindorf,III,p.645): ὅτι τὴν θάλασσαν τῆς γῆς προετίμησεν ὁ Θεμιστοκλῆς, φησὶν δ' Ἀριστείδης ὅτι, ὥσπερ προειδὼς ὁ θεὸς τὰς μελλούσας παρὰ Πλάτωνος γίνεσθαι ἐπιτιμήσεις....

T50 (Schol.46,213,18=Dindorf,III,p.648): τοῦτον λέγουσιν νῆδον Δῆμητρος εἶναι, τὸν δὲ αὐτὸν καὶ Διδύσσον· ἄλλοι δὲ παῖδα Διουῦσον. ἡ δὲ ἱστορία τοιαύτη· λέγουσιν ὅτι καταλιπὼν τὸ τέμενος ἐπεθύμησε κοινωνῆσαι τῆς ναυμαχίας· ὅτε γὰρ ἔμελλεν ἡ ναυμαχία γίνεσθαι, φονὴ τις ἐδόθη ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἰάκχου, καὶ οἱ μὲν μεμνημένοι ἤκουσαν, οἱ δὲ ἀμύητοι ᾗσθοντο· τῷ δὲ καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἑλευσῖνος ὥσπερ κονιορτὸν ἐλθεῖν ἐπὶ τὴν Σαλαμῖνα ἐνομίσθη, ὅτι ἡ Δημήτηρ καὶ ἡ κόρη ἦλθον συμμαχῆσαι τοῖς Ἕλλησιν.

ARISTODEMOS

T51 (Frag. 1, 5=Jacoby, II A, p.494) (5) διασημότερον δὲ ἠγωνίσαντο τῇ ναυμαχίᾳ καὶ ἠρίστευσεν Ἀμεινίας, τῶν δὲ βαρβάρων γυνὴ Ἀλικαρνασίς τὸ γένος, ὄνομα δὲ Ἀρτεμισία, ἣ τις διωκομένης τῆς νεῶς αὐτῆς καὶ κινδυνεύουσα ἀπολέσθαι τὴν ἔμπροσθεν ναῦν ἰδίαν οὖσαν ἐβύθισεν· ὁ δὲ Ἀμεινίας δόξας

σύμμαχον εἶναι τῶν Ἑλλήνων, ἀπετράπη τοῦ διώκειν. ὁ δὲ
 Ξέρξης θεασάμενος τὸ γενόμενον εἶπεν. "οἱ μὲν ἄνδρες μοι
 γυναῖκες γεγόνασιν, αἱ δὲ γυναῖκες ἄνδρες." (7) ἥττη-
 θέντων δὲ τῶν βαρβάρων καὶ φυγόντων οἱ Ἕλληνες ἐβούλοντο
 λυεῖν τὸ ἐπὶ τοῦ Ἑλλησπόντου ζεῦγμα καὶ καταλαμβάνεσθαι
 Ξέρξην ἐν τῇ Ἑλλάδι. Θεμιστοκλῆς δὲ οὐκ οἶδμενος ἀσφαλὲς
 εἶναι οὐδὲ τοῦτο, δεδοικὼς μήποτε, ἔαν ἀπογυῶσι τὴν σωτη-
 ρίαν οἱ βάρβαροι, φιλοκινδυνώτερον ἀγωνίσονται ἐξ ὑπο-
 στροφῆς, ἀντέπρασσε. κεκυρωμένων δὲ οὐδὲν ἰσχύων ἔπεμψε
 κρύφα Ξέρξῃ δηλῶν ὅτι μέλλουσιν οἱ Ἕλληνες λυεῖν τὸ ζεῦγμα.
 ὁ δὲ φοβηθεὶς ἔφευγεν. (8) ἐν δὲ τῇ ναυμαχίᾳ τῇ περὶ Σαλα-
 μῖνα καὶ οἱ θεοὶ συνεμάχησαν τοῖς Ἕλλησιν.

T52 (Frag. 5, 1=Jacoby, II A, p. 497): κατὰ
 δὲ τοῦτον τὸν χρόνον Ἀθηναῖοι,...ἐβουλευοντο τειχίζειν αὐτήν,
 οἱ δὲ Λακεδαιμόνιοι οὐκ ἐπέτρεπον αὐτοῖς...τὸ δὲ ἀληθὲς
 φθονοῦντες καὶ μὴ βουλόμενοι πάλιν αὐξηθῆναι. οὗς Θεμιστο-
 κλῆς συνέσει διαφέρων κατεστρατήτησεν, ἀκριβῶς γιγνώσκων
 αὐτῶν τὸν φθόνον.

T53 (Frag. 6, 1=Jacoby, II A, p. 497): ὁ
 δὲ Θεμιστοκλῆς διὰ τὴν ὑπερβάλλουσαν σύνεσιν καὶ ἀρετὴν φθονη-
 θεὶς ἐξεδιώχθη ὑπὸ τῶν Ἀθηναίων....

T54 (Frag. 7, 1=Jacoby, II A, p. 498): ἐν
 δὲ τούτῳ οἱ Ἕλληνες ἀφιστάμενοι ἀπὸ τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων διὰ
 τὸ πικρῶς τυραννεῖσθαι ὑπὸ τοῦ Πανσανίου προσετίθεντο τοῖς
 Ἀθηναίοις φόρους λαμβάνοντες αὐξεσθαι. ναῦς τε γὰρ

κατεσκεύαζον καὶ κοινὸν τῶν Ἑλληνικῶν χρημάτων θησαυροφυλάκιον ἐποιήσαντο ἐν Δήλῳ, ὕστερον δὲτάλαντα ἐκ τῆς Δήλου τὰ συναχθέντα μετεκδόμισαν εἰς τὰς Ἀθήνας καὶ κατέθεντο ἐντὸς ἐν ἀκροπόλει.

T55 (Frag. 10, 1=Jacoby, II A, p. 499):

Λακεδαιμόνιοι δὲ, ἐπειδὴ τὰ τοῦ Πausανίου ἐπονειδίστως ἐκεχωρήκει, τοὺς Ἀθηναίους ἐπειθὸν λέγοντες ἐν ταῖς Πausανίου ἐπιστολαῖς κοινῶν εὐρηκέναι τῆς προδοσίας θεμιστοκλέα....

(3) ὁ δὲ θεμιστοκλῆς οὐκ ἔχων ὅπου ὑποστρέψει ἐπὶ τὴν Περσίδα ἔπλει.... (4) καὶ Ξέρην μὲν οὐ κατέλαβε ζῶντα, Ἀρταξέρην δὲ τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ. ᾧ οὐκ ἐνεφανίσθη ἀλλὰ διατρίψας ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ μαθὼν τὴν Περσικὴν γλῶσσαν, τότε παρεγένετο πρὸς τὸν Ἀρταξέρην, καὶ ὑπέμνησεν αὐτὸν τῶν εὐεργεσιῶν...εἰς τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ Ξέρην, λέγων καὶ τῆς σωτηρίας αὐτῷ γεγενῆσθαι αἷτιος, ὑποδείξας λύσοντας τοὺς Ἕλληνας τὸ ζεῦγμα. ὑπέσχετο δέ, εἰ λάβοι στρατὸν παρ' αὐτοῦ, χειρῶσθαι τοὺς Ἕλληνας. (5) ὁ δὲ Ἀρταξέρης... ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ στρατὸν καὶ τρεῖς πόλεις... Μαγνησίαν μὲν εἰς σῆτον, Λάμψακον δὲ εἰς οἶνον, Μυθῦντα δὲ εἰς ὄψον. λαβὼν δὲ θεμιστοκλῆς καὶ παραγενόμενος εἰς Μαγνησίαν...οὐχ ἡγησάμενος δεῖν πολεμεῖν τοῖς ὁμοφύλοις. θύων δὲ τῇ Λευκοφρύνῃ Ἀρτέμιδι, σφαττομένου ταύρου ὑποσχὼν φιᾶλην καὶ πληρώσας αἵματος ἔπειν καὶ ἐτελεύτησεν.

T56 (Frag. 11, 33=Jacoby, II A, p. 500):

ἔπλευσαν δὲ καὶ κατὰ Κύπρον καὶ ἐπ' Αἴγυπτον. ἐβασίλευσε

δὲ τῆς Αἰγύπτου Ἰναρος υἱὸς Ψαμμητίχου ὃς ἀποστὰς Ἀρταξ-
έρξου βοηθοὺς ἐπηγάγετο αὐτῷ τοὺς Ἀθηναίους, οἵτινες
ἔχοντες σὺ νηῦς ἐπολέμησαν ἐπὶ ἔτη ἕξ τοῖς βαρβάροις. (4)
μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα Μεγάβυζος ὁ Ζωπύρου καταπεμφθεὶς ὑπὸ Ἀρταξ-
έρξου, ὠρμημένων τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἐν τῇ καλουμένῃ Προσωπίτιδι
νῆσῳ ἐπὶ τινος ποταμοῦ, ἐκτρέπει τὸ βεῖθρον τοῦ ποταμοῦ
ἐποίησέ τε τὰς νηῦς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἀπολειφθῆναι.

T57 (Frg. 12, 2 = Jacoby, II A, p. 501): παρα-
ταξάμενοι δὲ πάλιν ἐν Οἶνοφύτοις, στρατηγοῦντος αὐτῶν Τολ-
μίδου καὶ Μυρωνίδου, ἐνίκησαν Βοιωτοὺς καὶ κατέσχον Βοιωτίαν.

T58 (Frg. 14 = Jacoby, II A, p. 501): μετὰ
δὲ ταῦτα Ἑλληνικὸς πόλεμος ἐγένετο ἐξ αἰτίας τοιαύτης.
Λακεδαιμόνιοι ἀφελόμενοι Φωκέων τὸ ἐν Δελφοῖς ἱερὸν παρέ-
δωσαν Λοκροῖς, καὶ ὕστερον Ἀθηναῖοι ἀφελόμενοι αὐτοὺς ἀπέ-
δωσαν πάλιν τοῖς Φωκεῦσιν.

T59 (Frg. 15, 4 = Jacoby, II A, p. 502): τῷ
τεσσαρεσκαιδεκάτῳ δὲ ἔτει Ἀθηναῖοι Σάμον πολιορκήσαντες
εἴλον, στρατηγοῦντος αὐτῶν Περικλέους καὶ Σοφοκλέους. ἐν
δὲ ταύτῳ ἔτει οὕτω λύνονται αἱ τῶν λ' ἐτῶν σπονδαί, καὶ
ἐνίσταται ὁ Πελοποννησιακὸς πόλεμος.

T60 (Frg. 16, 1 = Jacoby, II A, p. 502): αἰτίαι
δὲ καὶ πλείονες φέρονται περὶ τοῦ πολέμου· πρώτη δὲ ἡ κατὰ
Περικλέα. φασὶ γὰρ ὅτι τῶν Ἀθηναίων κατασκευαζόντων τὴν
ἐλεφαντίνην Ἀθηνᾶν καὶ ἀποδειξάντων ἐργεπιστάτην τὸν Πери-
κλέα, τεχνίτην δὲ Φειδίαν, αἰδόντος τοῦ Φειδίου ἐπὶ νοσησμοῦ

εὐλαβηθεῖς ὁ Περικλῆς μὴ καὶ αὐτὸς εὐθύνας ἀπαιτηθῇ, βουλόμενος ἐκκλίνειν τὰς κρίσεις ἐπολιτεύσατο τὸν πόλεμον τούτου, γράψας τὸ κατὰ Μεγαρέων ψήφισμα.... (4) φασὶ δὲ ὅτι τοῦ Περικλέους σκεπτομένου περὶ τῆς ἀποδόσεως τῶν λόγων ὑπὲρ τῆς ἐργεπιστασίας Ἀλκιβιάδης ὁ Κλεινίου, ἐπιτροπερόμενος ὑπ' αὐτοῦ εἶπεν· "μὴ σκέπτου πῶς ἀποδῶς τοὺς λόγους Ἀθηναίοις, ἀλλὰ πῶς μὴ ἀποδῶς!"

ARISTOTLE

T61 (ΠΟΛΙΤΕΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΑΙΩΝ, 24, 2): περσθέντες δὲ ταῦτα καὶ λαβόντες τὴν ἀρχὴν τοῖς [τε] συμμάχοις δεσποτικωτέρως ἐχρῶντο, πλην Χίων καὶ Λεσβίων καὶ Σαμίων· τούτους δὲ φύλακας εἶχον τῆς ἀρχῆς ἔωντες τὰς τε πολιτείας παρ' αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἄρχειν ὧν ἔτυχον ἄρχοντες.

T62 (ΠΟΛΙΤΕΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΑΙΩΝ, 28): ἕως μὲν οὖν Περικλῆς προειστήκει τοῦ δήμου, βελτίω τὰ κατὰ τὴν πολιτείαν ἦν, τελευτήσαντος δὲ Περικλέους πολὺ χείρω. πρῶτον γὰρ τότε προστάτην ἔλαβεν ὁ δῆμος οὐκ εὐδοκимоῦντα παρὰ τοῖς ἐπιεικέσιν· ἐν δὲ τοῖς πρότερον χρόνοις αἰεὶ διετέλουν οἱ ἐπιεικεῖς δημαγωγοῦντες....εἴτα Περικλῆς μὲν τοῦ δήμου, Θουκυδίδης δὲ τῶν ἐτέρων, κηδεστής ὦν Κίμωνος. Περικλέους δὲ τελευτήσαντος, τῶν μὲν ἐπιφανῶν προειστήκει Νικίας ὁ ἐν Σικελίᾳ τελευτήσας, τοῦ δὲ δήμου Κλέων ὁ Κλεαινέτου, ὃς δοκεῖ μάλιστα διαφθεῖραι τὸν δῆμον ταῖς ὁρμαῖς, καὶ πρῶτος ἐπὶ τοῦ βήματος ἀνέκ-
ραγε καὶ ἐλοιδορήσατο, καὶ περιζωσάμενος ἐδημηγόρησε, τῶν ἄλλων

ἐν κόσμῳ λεγόντων. εἴτα μετὰ τούτους τῶν μὲν ἐτέρων θηρα-
 μένης ὁ Ἄγνωνος, τοῦ δὲ δήμου Κλεοφῶν ὁ λυροποιός, ὃς καὶ
 τὴν διωβελίαν ἐπόρισε πρῶτος· καὶ χρόνον μὲν τινα διεδίδου,
 μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα κατέλυσε Καλλικράτης Παιανιεύς, πρῶτος ὑπο-
 σχόμενος ἐπιθήσειν πρὸς τοῖν δυοῖν ὀβολοῖν ἄλλον ὀβολόν....
 εἴωθεν γὰρ ἂν ἐξαπατηθῇ τὸ πλῆθος, ὕστερον μισεῖν τοὺς τι
 προαγαγόντας ποιεῖν αὐτοὺς τῶν μὴ καλῶς ἐχόντων. ἀπὸ δὲ
 Κλεοφῶντος ἤδη διεδέχοντο συνεχῶς τὴν δημαγωγίαν οἱ μάλιστα
 βουλόμενοι θρασύνεσθαι καὶ χαρίζεσθαι τοῖς πολλοῖς πρὸς τὸ
 παραντίκα βλέποντες. δοκοῦσι δὲ βέλτιστοι γεγυέναι τῶν
 Ἀθηνησι πολιτευσαμένων μετὰ τοὺς ἀρχαίους Νικίας καὶ
 Θουκυδίδης καὶ Θηραμένης. καὶ περὶ μὲν Νικίου καὶ Θουκυ-
 δίδου πάντες σχεδὸν ὁμολογοῦσιν ἄνδρας γεγυέναι οὐ μόνον
 καλοὺς καὶ ἀγαθοὺς, ἀλλὰ καὶ πολιτικοὺς καὶ τῇ πόλει πάσῃ
 πατρικῶς χρωμένους, περὶ δὲ Θηραμένους, διὰ τὸ συμβῆναι
 κατ' αὐτὸν ταραχώδεις τὰς πολιτείας, ἀμφισβήτησις τῆς κρί-
 σεώς ἐστίν. δοκεῖ μὲν τοῖς μὴ παρέργως ἀποφαινομένοις, οὐχ
 ὥσπερ αὐτὸν διαβάλλουσι πάσας τὰς πολιτείας καταλύειν, ἀλλὰ
 πάσας προάγειν ἕως μηδὲν παρανομοῖεν, ὥς δυνάμενος πολιτεῦ-
 εσθαι κατὰ πάσας, ὅπερ ἐστὶν ἔργον ἀγαθοῦ πολίτου, παρα-
 νομοῦσαις δὲ οὐ συγχωρῶν, ἀλλ' ἀπεχθανόμενος.

Τ63 (ΠΟΛΙΤΕΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΑΙΩΝ, 29, 2): ἦν δὲ τὸ ψήφισμα
 τὸ Πυθοδώρου τοιούδε· τὸν δῆμον ἐλέσθαι μετὰ τῶν προὔπαρ-
 χόντων δέκα προβούλων ἄλλους εἴκοσι ἐκ τῶν ὑπὲρ τετταράκοντα
 ἔτη γεγονότων, οἵτινες ὁμόσαντες ἢ μὴν συγγράφειν ἢ ἂν

ἡγῶνται βέλτιστα εἶναι τῇ πόλει, συγγράψουσι....

T64 (ΠΟΛΙΤΕΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΑΙΩΝ, 34, 2-3): τῷ γὰρ ὕστερον ἔτει, ἐπ' Ἀλεξίου ἄρχοντος, ἡτύχησαν τὴν ἐν Αἶγος ποταμοῖς ναυμαχίαν, ἐξ ἧς συνέβη κύριον γενόμενον τῆς πόλεως Λυσάνδρου, καταστήσαι τοὺς τριάκοντα τρόπῳ τοιῷδε.... οἱ μὲν δημοτικοὶ διασώζειν ἐπειρῶντο τὸν δῆμον, τῶν δὲ γνωρίμων οἱ μὲν ἐν ταῖς ἐταιρείαις ὄντες, καὶ τῶν φυγάντων οἱ μετὰ τὴν εἰρήνην κατελθόντες, ὀλιγαρχίας ἐπεθύμουν, οἱ δ' ἐν ἐταιρείᾳ μὲν οὐδεμιᾷ συγκαθεστῶτες... Ἀρχῖνος καὶ Ἄνυτος καὶ Κλειτοφῶν καὶ Φορμίσσιος καὶ ἕτεροι πολλοί, προειστήκει δὲ μάλιστα Θηραμένης. Λυσάνδρου δὲ προσθεμέμον τοῖς ὀλιγαρχικοῖς, καταπλαγεὶς ὁ δῆμος ἠναυκάσθη χειροτονεῖν τὴν ὀλιγαρχίαν. ἔγραψε δὲ τὸ ψήφισμα Δρακοντίδης Ἀφιδναῖος.

T65 (ΠΟΛΙΤΕΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΑΙΩΝ, 37, 1): ἤδη δὲ τοῦ χειμῶνος ἐνεστῶτος, καταλαβόντος θρασυβόλου μετὰ τῶν φυγάντων φυλήν, καὶ κατὰ τὴν στρατιὰν ἣν ἐξήγαγον οἱ τριάκοντα κακῶς ἀποχωρήσαντες....

T66 (ΠΟΛΙΤΕΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΑΙΩΝ, 41, 3): ὅπως προσιστῇται τὸ πλῆθος πρὸς τὴν ἐπικύρωσιν τῆς χειροτονίας, πρῶτον μὲν Ἀγύρριος ὀβολὸν ἐπόρισεν, μετὰ δὲ τοῦτου Ἡρακλείδης ὁ Κλαζομένιος ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐπικαλούμενος διώβολον, πάλιν δ' Ἀγύρριος τριώβολον.

T67 (ΠΟΛΙΤΕΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΑΙΩΝ, frg. 9): τοὺς μετὰ Κύλωνος διὰ τὴν τυραννίδα ἐπὶ τὸν βωμὸν τῆς θεοῦ πεφεγότας οἱ περὶ Μεγακλέα ἀπέκτειναν. - καὶ τοὺς δράσαντες ὡς ἐναγεῖς ἤλαυνον.

T68 (Politica, 1297 b 14): ἐν Μαλιεῦσι δὲ ἡ μὲν πολιτεία ἦν ἐκ τούτων, τὰς δὲ ἀρχὰς ἡροῦντο ἐκ τῶν στρατενομένων.

T69 (Politica, 1311 a 34): οἶον ἡ μὲν τῶν Πεισιστρατιδῶν διὰ τὸ προπηλακίσει μὲν τὴν Ἀρμόδιου ἀδελφὴν ἐπηρεᾶσαι ὁ δὲ Ἀρμόδιον (ὁ μὲν γὰρ Ἀρμόδιος διὰ τὴν ἀδελφὴν, ὁ δὲ Ἀριστογείτων διὰ τὸν Ἀρμόδιον)....

T70 (Politica, 1315 b 21): φασὶ δὲ καὶ Πεισίστρατον ὑπομεῖναι ποτε προσκληθέντα δίκην εἰς Ἀρείου πάγον.

T71 (Politica, 1315 b 30): δις γὰρ ἔφυγε Πεισίστρατος τυραννῶν· ὥστ' ἐν ἔτεσι τριάκοντα καὶ τρισὶν ἑπτακαίδεκα ἔτη τούτων ἐτυράννησεν, ὀκτωκαίδεκα δὲ οἱ παῖδες, ὥστε τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο ἔτη τριάκοντα καὶ πέντε.

T72 (Ars Rhetorica, 1419 a): ... οἶον Περικλῆς Λάμπωνα ἐπήρετο περὶ τῆς τελετῆς τῶν τῆς σωτείρας ἱερῶν, εἰπόντος δὲ ὅτι οὐχ οἶδον τε ἀτέλεστον ἀκοῦειν.... οἶον Σοφοκλῆς ἐρωτώμενος ὑπὸ Πεισάνδρου εἰ ἔδοξεν αὐτῷ ὥσπερ καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις προβούλοις, καταστήσαι τοὺς τετρακοσίους....

ARRIAN

T73 (Anabasis, IV, 10, 3): τὸν δὲ ἀποκρίνασθαι Ἀρμόδιον καὶ Ἀριστογείτονα, ὅτι τὸν ἕτερον τοῦ τυράννου ἐκτεῖναν καὶ τυραννίδα ὅτι κατέλυσαν.

T74 (Anabasis, V, 14, 4): καὶ γὰρ καὶ ἀφικέσθαι ξὺν μείζονι δυνάμει τὸν Πῶρον παῖδα, καὶ αὐτόν τε Ἀλέξανδρον τρωθῆναι πρὸς αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸν Ἴππον αὐτοῦ ἀποθανεῖν τὸν Βουκεφάλαν, φίλτατον Ἀλεξάνδρῳ ὄντα τὸν Ἴππον, καὶ τοῦτον τρωθέντα ὑπὸ τοῦ παιδὸς τοῦ Πῶρου.

T75 (Anabasis, V, 19, 4): καὶ τὴν μὲν Νίκαιαν τῆς νίκης τῆς κατ' Ἰνδῶν ἐπώνυμον ὠνόμασε, τὴν δὲ Βουκεφάλαν ἐς τοῦ Ἴππου τοῦ Βουκεφάλα τὴν μνήμην, ὃς ἀπέθανεν αὐτοῦ, οὐ βληθεὶς πρὸς οὐδενός. ἀλλὰ ὑπὸ καύματος τε καὶ ἡλικίας (ἦν γὰρ ἀμφὶ τὰ τριάκοντα ἔτη)....

ATHENAIOS

T76 (I, 29 f): ὅτι Θεμιστοκλῆς ὑπὸ βασιλέως ἔλαβε δωρεὰν τὴν Λάμψακον εἰς οἶνον, Μαγνησίαν δ' εἰς ἄρτον, Μυοῦντα δ' εἰς ὄψον, Περικώτην δὲ καὶ τὴν Παλαίσκηψιν εἰς στρωμνὴν καὶ ἱματισμόν. ἐκέλευσε δὲ τοῦτω στολὴν φορεῖν βαρβαρικὴν, ὥς καὶ Δημαράτῳ, δοῦς τὰ πρότερον ὑπάρχοντα, καὶ στολὴν Γάμβρειον προσθεὶς ἐφ' ᾧτε μηκέτι ἑλληνικὸν ἱμάτιον περιβάλλεται.

T77 (IV, 171 a): βούλεσθε δῆτ' ἐγὼ φράσω τίς εἰμ' ἐγώ; ἡ τῶν προτενθῶν Δορπία καλουμένη.

T78 (V, 218 a): οὗτος ἐστὶν ὁ διαψηφισμὸς ὁ γενόμενος κατὰ τῶν περὶ Ἑρασινίδην στρατηγῶν, ὅτι τοὺς ἐν Ἀργινοῦσσαις ἐν τῇ ναυμαχίᾳ ἀπολομένους οὐκ ἀνείλουντο. ἐγένετο δὲ ἡ ναυμαχία ἐπὶ ἄρχοντος Καλλίου, τῆς Περικλέους τελευταίας ὕστερον ἔτεσιν εἴκοσι καὶ τέτταρσιν.

T79 (V, 220 b): ὁ δὲ Καλλίας αὐτοῦ περιέχει
τὴν τοῦ Καλλίου πρὸς τὸν πατέρα διαφορὰν καὶ τὴν Προδίκου
καὶ Ἀναξαγόρου τῶν σοφιστῶν διαμώκησιν. λέγει γὰρ ὡς ὁ μὲν
Πρόδικος θηραμένην μαθητὴν ἀπετέλεσεν

T80 (VI, 264 a-b): Θετταλῶν δὲ λεγόντων
πενέστας τοὺς μὴ γούψ δούλους, διὰ πολέμου δ' ἡλικότας,
Θεόπομπος ὁ κωμικὸς ἀποχρησάμενος τῇ φωνῇ φησί
δεσπότου πενέστου ῥυσθὰ βουλευτήρια.

Φιλοκράτης δ' ἐν δευτέρῳ Θετταλικῶν, εἰ γυήσια τὰ συγ-
γράμματα, καλεῖσθαι φησι τοὺς πενέστας καὶ Θετταλικέτας.
Ἀρχέμαχος δ' ἐν τῇ τρίτῃ Εὐβοϊκῶν " Βοιωτῶν, φησὶν τῶν τὴν
Ἀρναίαν κατοικησάντων οἱ μὴ ἀπάραντες εἰς τὴν Βοιωτίαν ἀλλ'
ἐμφιλοχωρήσαντες παρέδωκαν ἑαυτοὺς τοῖς Θετταλοῖς δουλεύειν
καθ' ὁμολογίας, ἐφ' ᾧ οὔτε ἐξάξουσιν αὐτοὺς ἐκ τῆς χώρας
οὔτε ἀποκτεινοῦσιν, αὐτοὶ δὲ τὴν χώραν αὐτοῖς ἐργαζόμενοι
τὰς συντάξεις ἀποδώσουσιν. οὔτοι οὖν οἱ κατὰ τὰς ὁμολογίας
καταμείναντες καὶ παραδόντες ἑαυτοὺς ἐκλήθησαν τότε μὲν
μενέσται νῦν δὲ πενέσται. καὶ πολλοὶ τῶν κυρίων ἑαυτῶν
εἰσὶν εὐπορώτεροι." καὶ Εὐριπίδης δ' ἐν Φρίξῳ λάτριας
αὐτοὺς ὀνομάζει διὰ τούτων

λάτριας πενέστης ἄμδς ἀρχαίων δόμων.

T81 (VI, 265 b-c): ὡς ἱστορεῖ Θεόπομπος ἐν τῇ
ἐβδόμῃ καὶ δεκάτῃ τῶν ἱστοριῶν " Χῆοι πρῶτοι τῶν Ἑλλήνων
μετὰ Θετταλοὺς καὶ Λακεδαιμονίους ἐχρήσαντο δούλοις, τὴν
μέντοι κτῆσιν αὐτῶν οὐ τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον ἐκείνοις...
Λακεδαιμόνιοι μὲν γὰρ καὶ Θετταλοὶ φανήσονται κατασκευασάμενοι

τὴν δουλείαν ἐκ τῶν Ἑλλήνων τῶν οἰκόντων πρότερον τὴν χώραν ἣν ἐκεῖνοι νῦν ἔχουσιν, οἱ μὲν Ἀχαιῶν θετταλοὶ δὲ Περραιβῶν καὶ Μαγνήτων, καὶ προσηγόρευσαν τοὺς καταδουλωθέντας οἱ μὲν εἴλωτας οἱ δὲ πενέστας."

T82 (XIII, 569f - 570a): καὶ Ἀσπασία δὲ ἡ Σωκρατικὴ ἐνεπορεύετο πλήθῃ καλῶν γυναικῶν, καὶ ἐπλήθυνεν ἀπὸ τῶν ταύτης ἐταιρίδων ἡ Ἑλλάς, ὥς καὶ ὁ χαρίεις Ἀριστοφάνης παρασημαίνεται λέγων τὸν Πελοποννησιακὸν πόλεμον, ὅτι Περικλῆς διὰ τὸν Ἀσπασίας ἔρωτα καὶ τὰς ἀρπασθείσας ἀπ' αὐτῆς θεραπαίνας ὑπὸ Μεγαρέων τὸ δεινὸν ἀνερρίπισε πόρνην δὲ Σιμαίθαν ἰδόντες Μεγάραδε νεανῖαι κλέπτουσι μεθυσκοδότταβοι.

T83 (XIII, 577b): ὁ δὲ Τιμόθεος καὶ σκωπτόμενός ποτε ὅτι τοιαύτης εἴη μητρός, καὶ χάριν γε αὐτῇ, φησὶν, οἶδα, ὅτι δι' αὐτὴν Κόνωνός εἰμι υἱός.

T84 (XIII, 589e): ἐν τῷ ἐπιγραφομένῳ περὶ Θεμιστοκλέους καὶ Θουκυδίδου καὶ Περικλέους. Ἀντισθένης δὲ ὁ Σωκρατικὸς ἐρασθέντα φησὶν αὐτὸν Ἀσπασίας δις τῆς ἡμέρας εἰσιόντα καὶ ἐξιόντα ἀπ' αὐτῆς ἀσπάζεσθαι τὴν ἄνθρωπον, καὶ φευγούσης ποτὲ αὐτῆς γραφὴν ἀσεβείας λέγων ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς πλείονα ἐδάκρυσεν ἢ ὅτε ὑπὲρ τοῦ βίου καὶ τῆς οὐσίας ἐκινδύνευσε.

T85 (I, 403, 29) : Ἀνθεμόκριτος: Ἀθηναῖος
 μὲν ἦν κήρυξ, ἀπεσφάγη δὲ ὑπὸ Μεγαρέων, ἀπαγορεύων αὐτοῖς
 τὴν ἱερὰν ὀργάδα μὴ ἐργάζεσθαι.

T86 (I, 219, 8) : Βάραθρον: πάγη τὰ μὲν ἄνω ἰσχ-
 ὄνσα ἰσχυρά πως, τὰ δὲ κάτω ὑπόχαννα, ὥστε τὸν ἐπιβάντα
 καταδῦναι. Ἀθήνησι δὲ ἦν ὄρυγμά τι ἐν Κεῖριαδῶν δήμῳ τῆς
 Οἰνηΐδος φυλῆς, εἰς ὃ τοὺς ἐπὶ θανάτῳ καταγνωσθέντας ἐν-
 ἐβαλλον, ὥπερ οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι εἰς τὸν Κεᾶδαν ἐνέβαλλον.

T87 (I, 100, 1) : Θηραμένης: τὴν κλητικὴν.
 Φιλιππίδης Κοθόρνοισ.

CURTIUS RUFUS

T88 (Historia Alexandri, IX, 3, 23): oppida qu-
 que duo condidit: quorum alterum Nicaeam appellavit, alterum
 Bucephala, equi, quem amiserat, memoriae ac nomini dedicans
 urbem. Elephantis deinde et impedimentis terra sequi iussis
 secundo amne defluxit quadraginta ferme stadia singulis die-
 bus procedens, ut opportunis locis exponi subinde copiae
 possent.

DEMOSTHENES

T89 (4, 23-24) : πολίτας δὲ παρεῖναι καὶ
 συμπλεῖν διὰ ταῦτα κελεύω, ὅτι καὶ πρότερόν ποτ' ἀκούω
 ξενικὸν τρέφειν ἐν Κορίνθῳ τὴν πόλιν, οὗ Πολύστρατος
 ἡγεῖτο καὶ Ἰφικράτης καὶ Χαβρίας καὶ ἄλλοι τινές, καὶ

αὐτοὺς ὑμᾶς συστρατεύεσθαι· καὶ οἶδ' ἀκούων ὅτι Λακεδαιμονίους παραταττόμενοι μεθ' ὑμῶν ἐνίκων αὐτοὶ οἱ ξένοι καὶ ὑμεῖς μετ' ἐκείνων.

T90 (19, 280): τοῦτων οὕτως ἔχοντων ὑμεῖς ἐκείνων τῶν ἀνδρῶν ὄντες, οἱ δὲ καὶ τινὲς αὐτῶν ἔτι ζῶντες, ὑπομενεῖτε τὸν μὲν εὐεργέτην τοῦ δήμου καὶ τὸν ἐκ Πειραιῶς, Ἐπικράτην, ἐκπεσεῖν καὶ κολασθῆναι, καὶ πάλιν πρῶην θρασύβουλον ἐκεῖνον τὸν θρασύβουλον τοῦ δημοτικοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἀπὸ φυλῆς καταγαγόντος τὸν δῆμον.....

T91 (20, 73): γυνοίη δ' ἂν τις, εἰ παραθείη πῶς Θεμιστοκλῆς ὁ τῶν καθ' ἑαυτὸν ἀπάντων ἀνδρῶν ἐνδοξότατος ταῦτ' οὗτ' ἐποίησεν. λέγεται τοίνυν ἐκεῖνος τειχίζειν εἰπὼν τοῖς πολίταις, κἂν ἀφικνηταί τις ἐκ Λακεδαιμόνος, κατέχειν κελεύσας, οἴχεσθαι πρεσβέων αὐτὸς ὡς τοὺς Λακεδαιμονίους, λόγων δὲ γιγνομένων ἐκεῖ, καὶ τινων ἀπαγγελλόντων ὡς Ἀθηναῖοι τειχίζουσιν, ἀρνεῖσθαι καὶ πρέσβεις πέμπειν σκεψομένους κελεύειν, ἐπειδὴ δ' οὐκ ἦκον οὗτοι, πέμπειν ἑτέρους παραινεῖν. καὶ πάντες ἴσως ἀκηκόαθ' ὃν τρόπον ἐξαπατῆσαι λέγεται.

T92 (21, 10): καὶ τοῖς ἐν ἄστει Διουνσίοις ἡ πομπή καὶ οἱ παῖδες καὶ ὁ κῶμος καὶ οἱ κωμῶδοι καὶ οἱ τραγῶδοι.....

T93 (22, 71): ὅπότ' ἄλλο τι πράττων καὶ χρήματα κινῶν ἱερά,...

T94 (23, 91): γέγραφε γὰρ ἔάν τις ἀποκτείνῃ Χαρίδημον, ἀγῶγίμος ἔστω, ἔάν δέ τις ἀφέληται ἡ πόλις ἡ

ιδιώτης, ἔκσπονδος ἔστω, οὐκ ἔαν μὴ παράσχη εἰς κρίσιν τὸν ἀφαιρεθέντα, ἀλλ' ὅλως εὐθύς.

T95 (23, 205): ἐκεῖνοι θεμιστοκλέα λαβόντες μεῖζον αὐτῶν ἀξιοῦντα φρονεῖν ἐξήλασαν ἐκ τῆς πόλεως καὶ μηδισμὸν κατέγνωσαν.

T96 (24, 134): ἀλλὰ μετ' Εὐκλείδην ἄρχοντ', ὃ ἄνδρες δικασταί, πρῶτον μὲν θρεαύβουλον τὸν Κολλυτέα πάντες μέμνησθε δις δεθέντα καὶ κριθέντ' ἀμφοτέρας τὰς κρίσεις ἐν τῷ δήμῳ· καίτοι τῶν ἐκ Πειραιῶς καὶ ἀπὸ φυλῆς οὗτος ἦν.... ἔπειτα Ἀγύρριον τὸν Κολλυτέα, ἄνδρα καὶ χρηστὸν καὶ δημοτικὸν καὶ περὶ τὸ πλῆθος τὸ ὑμέτερον πολλὰ σπουδάζοντα.

T97 (24, 179): καὶ χρήματα κινῶν ἱερά, ὧν ἓνι' οὐδ' ἐπὶ τῆς ἡμετέρας γενεᾶς ἀνετέθη, μὴ προσγραψάμενος τὴν αὐτὴν φυλακὴν ἥνπερ ἐπὶ τῶν εἰσφορῶν φαίνει....

T98 (27, 7): εἰς γὰρ τὴν συμμορίαν ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ συνετάξαντο κατὰ τὰς πέντε καὶ εἴκοσι μυᾶς πεντακοσίας δραχμὰς εἰσφέρειν, ὅσονπερ Τιμόθεος ὁ Κόνωνος καὶ οἱ τὰ μέγιστα κεκτημένοι τιμήματ' εἰσέφερον.

T99 (Hypothesis ad Demosthenem, 23, 618): περὶ τοῦτου [Χαριδήμου] ψήφισμα ἔγραψεν Ἀριστοκράτης ἐν τῇ βουλῇ τοιοῦτον· ἔαν τις ἀποκτείνῃ Χαρίδημον, ἀγώγιμος ἔστω ἐξ ἀπάσης τῆς Ἀθηναίων συμμαχίδος.... (619-620): καὶ συμβουλευσάντος τοῦ Χαριδήμου δοῦναι κοινῇ τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις τὴν Χερρόνησον ἐπέιθησαν οἱ βασιλεῖς καὶ δεδώκασιν. τοῦτο γινόντες οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι τὸν Χαρίδημον ἐστεφάνωσαν

ὡς εὐεργέτην αὐτῶν χρυσῷ στεφάνῳ, καὶ θετὸν πολίτην αὐτὸν ἐποιήσαντο....οὗτος Εὐθυκλῆς, λαβὼν παρὰ τοῦ Δημοσθένους τὸν λόγον, χρυσίου παρασχών, κατηγορεῖ τοῦ Ἀριστοκράτους.

SCHOLIA TO DEMOSTHENES

T101 (Dindorf, 3, 36, 10): πρὸ τοῦ Φιλίππου Τιμόθεος ἦν ἔξω τυγχάνων ἐν τῇ Θράκῃ καὶ ἐκεῖ ἐκτῆσατο χωρία, ἅπερ νῦν εἴληφε Φίλιππος, Πύδναν καὶ Ποτίδαιαν καὶ τὰς ἄλλας. ἄγαν γὰρ εὐτυχῆς ὁ Τιμόθεος, ὥστε προσιέναι τὰς πόλεις αὐτῷ καὶ τοὺς ζωγράφους κοιμῶμενον γράφειν αὐτὸν καὶ Τύχας αὐτῷ τὰς πόλεις προσφερούσας.

T102 (Dindorf, 13, 170, 6): τὸν οπισθοδόμον, οἶκος ὀπισθεν τοῦ νεῶ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς, ἐν ᾧ ἀπετίθεντο τὰ χρήματα, ἣ ἐν τῇ ἀκροπόλει τόπος, ἐνθα τὸ δημόσιον ἀργύριον ἀπέκειτο καὶ ὁ φόρος.

T103 (Dindorf, 21, 570, 3): αὕτη γὰρ ἀπεστέλλετο πρὸς τοὺς συμμάχους ἢ Πάραλος, εἴ τι βοῦλοῖντο σημαίνειν οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι. ἦσαν δὲ τὸ μὲν πρῶτον ἱερὰ δύο τριήρεις, ἣ τε Σαλαμίνια, ἣν καὶ Δηλίαν ἐκάλουν, καὶ ἣ Πάραλος.

T104 (Dindorf, 24, 743, 1): οἱ μὲν φασὶν ὅτι ἔκλεψαν ἀπὸ τῶν χρημάτων αὐτοῖ, οἱ δ' ὅτι τὰ χρήματα τῆς πόλεως κείμενα ἐν τῷ ὀπισθοδόμῳ καλουμένῳ τισὶ δανεῖσαι τραπεζίταις τοὺς ταμίας....ἦν δὲ ὀπισθοδόμος τὸ ὀπισθεν τῆς θεοῦ, ὅπου ἦν καὶ τὰ χρήματα. ἰστέον ὅτι χρήματα καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἱερῶν τῶν θεῶν καὶ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ἔκειτο ἐν τινι οἰκῇματι ὀπίσω τῆς ἀκροπόλεως, τῷ καλουμένῳ ὀπισθοδόμῳ, καὶ ἦσαν τινες

τεταγμένοι ταμίαι ἐπὶ τῇ φυλακῇ τούτων....ἔδοξεν οὖν αὐτοῖς ἐμπρῆσαι τὸν ὀπισθόδομον, ἵνα δόξη τὰ χρήματα ὑπὸ τοῦ πυρὸς ἀναλωθῆναι καὶ μὴ ὑπ' αὐτῶν.

[DEMOSTHENES]

T105 (Blass, 12, 4): Μεγαρέων γοῦν Ἀνθεμόκριτον ἀνελόντων εἰς τοῦτ' ἐλήλυθεν ὁ δῆμος, ὥστε μυστηρίων μὲν εἶργον αὐτοῦς, ὑπομνήματα δὲ τῆς ἀδικίας ἔστησαν ἀνδριᾶντα πρὸ τῶν πυλῶν.

DINARCHUS

T106 (1, 37): ὦν τοὺς μὲν ἀρχαίους ἐκείνους μακρὸν ἂν εἴη λέγειν, Ἀριστείδην καὶ Θεμιστοκλέα, τοὺς ὀρθώσαντας τὰ τείχη τῆς πόλεως καὶ τοὺς φόρους εἰς ἀκρόπολιν ἀνανεγκόντας παρ' ἐκόντων καὶ βουλομένων τῶν Ἑλλήνων....

DIO CASSIUS

T107 (ΡΩΜΑΪΚΗ ΙΣΤΟΡΙΑ, LII, 35, 2): τοῖς μὲν γὰρ ἄλλοις κόσμον ἢ παρὰ σοῦ τιμὴ φέρει, σοὶ δ' αὐτῷ μείζον μὲν τῶν ὑπαρχόντων οὐδὲν ἂν δοθείη, ὑποψία δ' ἂν κιβδηλίας πολλὴ προσγένοιτο.

DIONYSIOS OF HALIKARNASSOS

T108 (Ant. Rom., II, 9, 2): ἐκάλουν δὲ Ἀθηναῖοι μὲν θῆτας τοὺς πελάτας ἐπὶ τῆς λατρείας, θετταλοὶ δὲ πενέστας....

ETYMOLOGICON MAGNUM

T109 (361, 31): ἐπὶ Λειψυδρίῳ μάχῃ, χωρίων ὑπὲρ τῆς Πάρθηνος, ὃ ἐτείχισαν οἱ φυγάδες τῶν τυράννων, ὧν οἱ Ἀλκμαϊονίδαι προεστήκεισαν· ἐκπολιορκηθέντων δ' αὐτῶν ὑπὸ τῶν περὶ Πεισιστράτου, σκολιδὸν εἰς αὐτοὺς ἦδετο,

αἶ' αἶ' Λειψύδριον προδωσέταιρον·

οἷους ἄνδρας ἀπώλεσας μάχεσθαι

ἀγαθοὺς τε καὶ αὐπατρίδας....

(699, 14): Πάραλος, ἱερὰ τριήρης, ὥσπερ καὶ Σαλαμινία καὶ Ἀντιγονίς.... πρὸς ὑπηρεσίαν τῶν ἀναγκαίων ἐπιτήδειος. αὗται δὲ ἐπὶ ατραπητοὺς ἐπέμποντο, καὶ τοιαύτας τινὰς χρείας.

EUPOLIS

T110 (Frg. 192 Kock):

πεπέρακεν μὲν ὃ περσέπτολις ἦδη Μαρικᾶς

T111 (Frg. 250 Kock):

ΦΟΡΜ. οὐκ οὖν περιγράψεις ὅσον ἐναριστᾶν κύκλον;

ΔΙΟΝ. τί δ' ἔστιν; εἰς ὥμιλλαν ἀριστήσομεν;

ἢ κόψομεν τὴν μᾶζαν ὥσπερ ὄρτυγα;

T112 (Frg. 251 Kock):

ἀντὶ ποικίλου

πιναρδὸν ἔχοντ' ἄλουτίᾳ κᾶρα τε καὶ

τρίβωνα

T113 (Frg. 252 Kock):

ὅτ' ἦν μέντοι νεώτερος, κρόκης

πέντε στατήρας εἶχε, ναὶ μὰ τὸν Δία.

B. νῦν δὲ ῥύπου γε δύο τάλαντα ῥαδίως.

T114 (Frg. 317, Kock):

κατ'ἀντιβολίαν δέκα τάλαντ'ἀπετισάμην.

EURIPIDES

T115 (ΑΛΚΗΣΤΙΔ, 'Υπόθεσις): ἐδιδάχθη ἐπὶ

Γλαυκίνου ἄρχοντος τὸ λ.

HARPOKRATION

T116 ('Απατούρια): Δημοσθένης ἐν τῷ πρὸς Βοιωτῶν. ἐορτὴ ἐστὶ παρ' Ἀθηναίοις, ἣν ἄγουσι Πυανεψιδῶνι ἐφ' ἡμέρας δ', ὥς φασιν οἱ τὰ περὶ ἐορτῶν γράψαντες. πόθεν δ' ἐκλήθη ἄλλοι τε πολλοὶ εἰρήκασι καὶ Ἐφορος ἐν β', ὥς διὰ τὴν ὑπὲρ τῶν ὀρίων ἀπάτην γενομένην, ὅτι Ἀθηναίων πολεμοῦντων πρὸς Βοιωτοὺς ὑπὲρ τῆς Μελαΐδας χώρας Μέλανθος ὁ τῶν Ἀθηναίων βασιλεὺς Ξάνθου τὸν Θηβαίων μονομαχῶν ἀπατήσας ἀπέκτεινεν.

T117 ('Αργινοῦσαι): νῆσοι κείμεναι ἔναντι τῆς Λέσβου, ἀπὸ Ἀργίνου τινός.

T118 ('Ασπασία): Λυσίας ἐν τῷ πρὸς Αἰσχίνην τὸν Σοκρατικὸν οὗ διάλογος ἐπιγραφόμενος Ἀσπασία. μνημονεύουσι δ' αὐτῆς πολλάκις καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι Σοκρατικοὶ καὶ Πλάτων ἐν τῷ Μενεξένῳ τὸν Σωκράτην παρ' αὐτῆς φησὶ μαθεῖν τὰ πολιτικά. ἦν δὲ τὸ μὲν γένος Μιλησία, δεινὴ δὲ περὶ λόγους. Περικλέους δὲ φασιν αὐτὴν διδάσκαλόν τε ἅμα καὶ ἐρωμένην εἶναι.

δοκεῖ δὲ δυοῖν πολέμων αἰτία γεγονέναι, τοῦ τε Σαμιακοῦ καὶ τοῦ Πελοποννησιακοῦ, ὥς ἔστι μαθεῖν παρὰ τε Δοῦριδος τοῦ Σαμίου καὶ Θεοφράστου ἐκ τοῦ δ' τῶν Πολιτικῶν καὶ ἐκ τῶν Ἀριστοφάνους Ἀχαρνέων. δοκεῖ δὲ καὶ ἐξ αὐτῆς ἔσχη-
κέναι ὁ Περικλῆς τὸν ὁμῶνυμον αὐτῷ Περικλέα τὸν νόθον, ὥς ἐμφαίνει καὶ Εὐπολὶς ἐν τοῖς Δήμοις. Λυσικλεῖ δὲ τῷ δημα-
γωγῷ συνοικήσασα Πορίστην ἔσχευ, ὥς ὁ Σωκρατικὸς Αἰσχίνης φησὶν.

T119 (Βάραθρον): ὄρυγμα εἰς ὃ τοὺς ἐπὶ θανάτῳ κατακρίτους ἐνέβαλλον. Δημοσθένης δὲ ἐν Φιλιππικοῖς οὐ κυρίως αὐτὸ λέγει, ἀλλ' ἐκ μεταφορᾶς, οἶον ἐν τῷ ὀλέθρῳ.

T120 (Θέογνις): Λυσίας ἐν τῷ κατ' Ἐρατοσθένους. οὗτος εἷς ἦν τῶν παρ' Ἀθηναίοις λ' τυράννων, καθά φασιν ἄλλοι τε καὶ Ξενοφῶν ἐν β' Ἑλληνικῶν. τοῦ δὲ ποιητοῦ Θεόγνιδος μνημονεύει Ἰσοκράτης ἐν ταῖς πρὸς Νικοκλέα ὑπο-
θήκαις· οὗτος δ' ἦν Μεγαρεὺς, ἀπὸ τῶν πρὸς τῇ Ἀττικῇ Μεγάρων· αὐτὸς γάρ φησιν ὁ ποιητὴς

ἦλθον μὲν γὰρ ἔγωγε καὶ εἰς Σικελίην ποτε γαῖαν.
ὧ μὴ ἐποστήσας Πλάτων ἐν α' Νόμων τῶν ἐν Σικελίᾳ Μεγαρέων
πολίτην ἔφασκεν. κατηκολούθησαν δὲ τῷ Πλάτῳ οὐκ ὀλίγοι.

T121 (Θερμοπύλαι): Ἰσοκράτης Πανηγυρικῷ. ἔνιοι μὲν τὴν πόλιν ταύτην Πύλας καλοῦσι· φιλέας δὲ φησιν ἐν γῆς περιόδῳ Θερμοπύλας κληθῆναι, ἐπεὶ ἐκεῖ ἡ Ἀθηναῖα θερμὰ λουτρὰ τῷ Ἡρακλεῖ ἐποίησε.

T122 (Θηραμένης): Λυσίας ἐν τῷ κατ' Ἐρατοσθένους

ὅς ἀνῆρέθῃ κατηγορήσαντος αὐτοῦ Κριτίου ἐπὶ τῶν λ'.

T123 (Ἰκποδάμεια): Δημοσθένης ἐν τῷ πρὸς Τιμόθεον ἀγορὰν φησιν εἶναι ἐν Πειραιεῖ καλουμένην Ἰκποδάμειαν ἀπὸ Ἰκποδάμου Μιλησίου ἀρχιτέκτονος τοῦ οἰκοδομησαμένου τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις τὸν Πειραιᾶ.

T124 (Ναυκραρικᾶ): Δημοσθένης ἐν τῷ κατὰ Τιμοκράτους. μήποτε βέλτιον φέρεται ἐν τοῖς Ἀττικιανοῖς Ναυκρατικᾶ, ἢ ἂν ἀπὸ Ναυκρατιτικοῦ πλοίου ἢ Ναυκρατιτῶν ἐμπλεόντων....ναυκράρους γὰρ τὸ παλαιὸν τοὺς ἄρχοντας ἔλεγον, ὥς καὶ ἐν τῇ ε' Ἡρόδοτος δηλοῖ. Ἀριστοτέλης δ' ἐν Ἀθηναίων πολιτείᾳ φησὶ "κατέστησαν δὲ δημάρχους τὴν αὐτὴν ἔχοντας ἐπιμέλειαν τοῖς πρότερον ναυκράροις."

T125 (Πολύστρατος): ἄλλος δ' ἂν εἴη Πολύστρατος οὗ Δημοσθένης μνημονεύει ἐν Φιλιππικοῖς, λέγων αὐτὸν ποτε ἐν Κορίνθῳ ξενικὸν τρέφειν....παρὰ μηδενὶ γάρ φησιν ὁ Δίδυμος εὗρηκέναι τὸν Πολύστρατον ἡγησάμενον τοῦ ἐν Κορίνθῳ ξενικοῦ. τὸν Πολύτροπον μὲν οὖν ἐν τῇ σ' τῶν Ἑλληνικῶν Ξενοφῶντος εὗρον· ἀλλ' οὔτε τὸ ξενικὸν τοῦτο ἔφησεν ὁ Ξενοφῶν τρέφεσθαι ὑπ' Ἀθηναίων οὔτε αὐτὸς Ἀθηναῖος ἦν ὁ Πολύτροπος.

T126 (Ταμίαι): Ἰσαῖος ἐν τινι τῶν κληρικῶν. ἀρχὴ τις παρ' Ἀθηναίοις ἦν οἱ ταμίαι, ἰ' τὸν ἀριθμόν. παραλαμβάνουσι δ' οὗτοι τό τε ἄγαλμα τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς καὶ τὰς Νίκας καὶ τὸν ἄλλον κόσμον καὶ τὰ χρήματα ἐναντίον τῆς βουλῆς, ὥς φησιν Ἀριστοτέλης ἐν Ἀθηναίων πολιτείᾳ....

HEKATAIOS

T127 (Frg. 163 = Jacoby, I, p. 28): Χερρό-
 νησος· πόλις ἐν τῇ κατὰ Κνίδου χερρονήσῳ.... ἔστι β πόλις
 ἐν τῇ Θράκη Χερρόνησος, περὶ ἧς Ἑκαταῖος ἐν Εὐρώπῃ·" ἐν
 δ' αὐτοῖσι πόλις Χερρόνησος ἐν τῷ ἰσθμῷ τῆς χερρονήσου." καὶ
 τὸν πολίτην Χερρονήσιδν φησι· " Ἀψινθίοισι πρὸς μεσημβρίαν
 ὁμουρέουσι Χερρονήσιοι".

HERAKLEIDES PONTIKOS

T128(Frg. 4 = Müller, II, p. 208): τοὺς μετὰ
 Κύλωνος διὰ τὴν τυραννίδα ἐπὶ τὸν βωμὸν τῆς θεοῦ πεφευγότας
 οἱ περὶ Μεγακλέα ἀπέκτειναν· καὶ τοὺς δράσαντας ὡς ἐναγεῖς
 ἤλαυνον.

T129(Frg. 6 = Müller, II, p. 208): Πεισίστρατος
 τριάκοντα καὶ τρία ἔτη τυραννήσας, γηράσας ἀπέθανεν.
 "Ἰππαρχος ὁ υἱὸς Πεισιστράτου παιδιώδης ἦν καὶ ἐρωτικὸς καὶ
 φιλόμουσος· Θεσσαλὸς δὲ νεώτερος·· καὶ θρασύς. τοῦτον
 τυραννοῦντα μὴ δυνηθέντες ἀνελεῖν, "Ἰππαρχον ἀπέκτειναν
 τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ. "Ἰππίας δὲ πικρότερον ἐτυράννει.

HESYCHIOS

T130(Βάπτος): βασιλεὺς, τύραννος. Λίβυες:
 τραυλόφωνος, ἰσχυρόφωνος.

T131(Βάπτου σίλφου): παροιμία ἐπὶ τῶν τὰς
 ὑπερβαλλούσας τιμὰς εὐρισκομένων. Μετενῆνται δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ
 Κυρηναίου ἐνὶ τῶν Βαπτιαδῶν μεταδοῦναι ἑξαίρετον τὸ σίλ-

φίου, ὃ ἐκτετίμηται παρ' αὐτοῖς, ὥστε καὶ ἐν τῷ νομίσματι
ὅπου μὲν Ἄμμωνα, ὅπου δὲ σίλφιον ἐγκεχαράχθαι.

T132 (Βουκέφαλος): Ἴππος ἐγκεχαραγμένον ἔχων
τοῖς ἰσχύοις βοῦκρανον. καὶ ὁ Ἀλεξάνδρου Ἴππος, ἀφ' οὗ
πόλιν ἐν Ἰνδοῖς κτίσαι λέγεται.

T133 (Διάσια): ἐορτὴ Ἀθήνησι. καὶ σκυθρωποὺς
ἀπὸ τῆς ἐορτῆς ἦν ἐπετέλουν μετὰ τινος στυγνότητος θύοντες.

T134 (Διϊπόλεια): ἐορτὴ Ἀθήνησιν, ἀπὸ τοῦ Πολιεῖ
Διὶ θύειν Ἀθηναίους, εἰς μνήμην τοῦ πελάγους καὶ τοῦ βοός.

T135 (δορπία): ἡ τῶν ἀπατουρίων πρώτη ἡμέρα οὕτω
καλεῖται.

T136 (θής): δοῦλος, μισθωτός, παράσιτος. ἡ ὁ
τὴν μερητικὴν ἐργαζόμενος παρὰ Ἀθηναίοις.

T137 (θητεύει): δουλεύει ἐπὶ μισθῷ.

T138 (θηῆτας): μισθωτοὺς.

T139 (θουριομάντεις): τοὺς περὶ Λάμπωνα. φασὶν
γὰρ εἰς Σύβαριν τὴν ἀποικίαν Λάμπωνα ἀγαγεῖν· τινὲς δέ....
μάντιν ὄντα.

T140 (κατωνάκη): ἱμάτιον, ἔχον ἐκ τῶν κάτω μερῶν
νάκος προσεῤῥαμμένον, ὃ ἐστὶ μελωτή. δοκοῦσι δὲ τοῦτο
ἀμφιέσασθαι Ἀθηναῖοι τῶν περὶ Πεισίστρατον τυράννων ἐπαναγ-
κασάντων, ἵνα ὑπὸ εὐτελείας μὴ κατιώσιν εἰς τὸ ἄστυ οἱ
πολιταί.

T141 (Λειψύδριον): χωρίου τι ὑπὲρ Πάρνηθος, ὃ
ἐτείχισεν Ἀλκμαίων.

T132 (λιμῶ Μηλίῳ): παροιμία, ἐπεὶ Ἀθηναῖοι
ἐκῆκωσαν Μηλίους πολιορκοῦντες λιμῶ. ὥς θουκυδίδης.

T133 (πενέσται): οἱ μὴ γόνυ δοῦλοι, οἵτινες
εἰργάζονται τὴν γῆν. τινὲς δὲ οἱ εἴλωτες. τινὲς δὲ
λάτρεις. ἢ ἐργάζεται πένητες ἢ ὑπήκοοι.

T134 (Σαλαμίνιος): μία τῶν ἱερῶν νεῶν.

T135 (ταιναρίας): παρὰ Λακεδαιμονίοις ἑορτὴ Ποσει-
δῶνος· καὶ ἐν αὐτῇ Ταιναρισταί. Ταίναρον γὰρ πεδίου
Λακωνικῆς.

HIPPOKRATES

T136 (ΠΕΡΙ ΑΡΘΡΩΝ ΕΜΒΟΛΗΨ, 78): καὶ γὰρ ἀνδρα-
γαθικώτερον τοῦτο καὶ τεχνικώτερον, ὅστις μὴ ἐπιθυμεῖ δημο-
ειδέος κιβδηλίας.

INSCRIPTIONS

T137 (I.G., I², 609; text of Fraenkel, Eranos, XLIX
(1951), p. 63):

Καλίμαχος πολέμαρχος Ἀθηναίων τὸν ἀγῶνα
τὸν Μαραθονόθεν ἡῖελεν ὃν ὄλξεσε θόριος Ἄρης,
παισὶν Ἀθηναίων μνέμεν πένθος τε λιπόντα.

T138 (I.G., II², 1006, 26-29): παραγενόμενοι δὲ ἐπὶ τὸ
ἐν Μαραθῶνι πολυάνδρειον ἐστεφάνωσάν τε καὶ ἐνήγισαν τοῖς
κατὰ πόλεμον τελευτήσασιν ὑπὲρ τῆς ἐλευθερίας, παρεγγέροντο,
ὅς καὶ εἰς τὸ Ἀμφιάραον καὶ ἰστόρησαν τὴν γεγυῖαν ἐκ

παλαιῶν χρόνων ὑπὸ τῶν πατέρων τοῦ ἱεροῦ κυριεῖαν καὶ
 θύσαντες ἀπῆλθον αὐθημερὶ, εἰς τὴν ἑαυτῶν χώραν·
 ἀνέπλευσαν δὲ καὶ, ἐπὶ τρόπαιον καὶ ἔθυσαν τῷ Διὶ τῷ
 Τροπαίῳ καὶ τῇ πομπῇ τῶν μεγάλων θεῶν ἐποίησαντο τῶν
 πλοίων τὴν ἄμιλλαν·

T139 (I.G., I², 887): α) ἐμπορίου, καὶ ποδῶ
 ἥρος. β) ἐμπορίο καὶ ποδῶ ἥρος.

T140 (I.G., I², 890): α) πορθμείου, ἥροιο
 ἥρος. β) πορθμείον ἥροιο ἥρος.

T141 (I.G., I², 293, 13): παρὰ ταμιῶν ἐπὶ Τιμο-
 κλέος ἄρχοντος....

T142 (I.G., I², 293, 6-7): Ἀθηναῖσι ἀνέλο-
 σαν ἐπὶ Μορυχίδο ἄρχοντος ἐς τὸν, πρὸς Σαμίους πόλεμον·

T143 (I.G., I², 86, 2-4): ῥσπονδῆς ἐποιέσαντο
 ἑκατὸν Ἀθηναῖοι ἔτε καὶ Ἀργεῖοι καὶ Μαντινῆς καὶ Ἐλεῖοι,
 πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἡγυῖον σφῶν αὐτῶν καὶ τῶν συμμαχῶν ἢ ὄν ἄρχοι
 ἑκάτεροι ἀδόλος καὶ ἀβλαβῆς καὶ, κατὰ γέν καὶ κατὰ θάλατταν.

ISOKRATES

T144 (4, 86): ἀποβαίντων γὰρ αὐτῶν βάρβαροι, εἰς
 τὴν Ἀττικὴν οἱ μὲν οὐ περιέμειναν τοὺς συμμαχοὺς, ἀλλὰ τὸν
 κοινὸν πόλεμον ἴδιον ποιησάμενοι πρὸς τοὺς ἀπάσης τῆς
 Ἑλλάδος καταφρονήσαντες ἀπῆντων τὴν οἰκείαν δύναμιν ἔχοντες,
 ὀλίγοι πρὸς πολλὰς μυριάδας, ὥσπερ ἐν ἀλλοτρίαις ψυχαῖς
 μέλλοντες κινδυνεύειν, οἱ δ' οὐκ ἔφθασαν πυθόμενοι τὸν περὶ

τὴν Ἀττικὴν πόλεμον καὶ πάντων τῶν ἄλλων ἀμελήσαντες
ἦκου ἡμῖν ἀμυνούντες, τοσαύτην ποιησάμενοι σπουδῇ, ὅσην
περ ἂν τῆς αὐτῶν χώρας κορθουμένης.

T145 (4, 87): τοὺς μὲν γὰρ ἡμετέρους προγόνους
φασὶ τῆς αὐτῆς ἡμέρας πυθέσθαι τε τὴν ἀπὸ βασιν τῶν βαρβάρων
καὶ βοηθήσαντας ἐπὶ τοὺς ὅρους τῆς χώρας μάχῃ νικήσαντας
τρόπαιον στήσαι τῶν πολεμίων, τοὺς δ' ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις καὶ
τοσαύταις νυξὶ διακόσια καὶ χίλια στάδια διελθεῖν στρατο-
πέδῳ κορευομένους.

T146 (4, 90): οἱ δ' ἡμέτεροι πατέρες ἐπ' Ἀρτε-
μίσιον, ἐξήκοντα τριήρεις πληρώσαντες πρὸς ἅπαν τὸ τῶν πολεμ-
ίων ναυτικόν.

T147 (4, 100): μετὰ δὲ ταῦτ' ἤδη τινὲς ἡμῶν κατη-
γοροῦσιν, ὥς ἐπειδὴ τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς θαλάττης παρελάβομεν, πολ-
λῶν κακῶν αἵτιοι τοῖς Ἕλλησι κατέστημεν, καὶ τὸν τε Μηλίων
ἀνδραποδισμόν καὶ τὸν Σκιωναίων ὄλεθρον ἐν τούτοις τοῖς λόγοις
ἡμῖν προφέρουσιν.

T148 (8, 86): εἰς Αἴγυπτον μὲν γε διακόσιαι πλεθ-
σαςι τριήρεις αὐτοῖς τοῖς πληρώμασι διεφθάρησαν, περὶ δὲ
Κύπρον πεντήκοντα καὶ ἑκατὸν.

T149 (12, 51-52): οἱ δ' ἡμέτεροι Θεμιστοκλέα τὸν
ὁμολογουμένως ἅπασιν αἵτιον εἶναι δόξαντα καὶ τοῦ τὴν
ναυμαχίαν γευέσθαι κατὰ τρόπον καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀπάντων τῶν ἐν
ἐκείνῳ τῷ χρόνῳ κατορθωθέντων. τεκμήριον δὲ μέγιστον·
ἀφελόμενοι γὰρ Λακεδαιμονίους τὴν ἡγεμονίαν οἱ συγκινδυνεύ-

σαντες τοῖς ἡμετέροις παρέδωσαν. καίτοι τίνας ἂν τις κρι-
τας ἱκανωτέρους ποιήσαιτο καὶ πιστοτέρους τῶν τότε πραχθέν-
των ἢ τοὺς ἐν αὐτοῖς τοῖς ἀγῶσι παραγενομένους;

T150 (12, 63): καὶ μάλιστα διατρίψειν περὶ τὰ
Μηλίων πάθη καὶ Σκιωναίων...οἰομένους ταῖς κατηγορίαις
ταύταις καταρρυπανεῖν τὰς τῆς πόλεως εὐεργεσίας τὰς ὀλίγῃ
πρότερον εἰρημένας.

T151 (12, 89): τοῖς γὰρ ὀνειδίζουσιν ἡμῶν τῇ
πόλει τὰς Μηλίων καὶ τὰς τῶν τοιούτων πολυχυίων συμφορὰς
ἀντέλεγον....

T152 (14, 27-28): γενομένον δὲ τοῦ Κορινθιακοῦ
πολέμου διὰ τὴν ὕβριν τὴν τούτων, καὶ Λακεδαιμονίων μὲν ἐπ'
αὐτοὺς στρατευσάντων, δι' ὑμᾶς δὲ σωθέντες...ἄλλ' ἐπειδὴ
διελύεσθε τὸν πόλεμον, ἀπολιπόντες ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν Λακεδαιμον-
ίων συμμαχίαν εἰσῆλθον. καὶ Χῖοι μὲν καὶ Μυτιληναῖοι καὶ
Βυζάντιοι συμπάρεμειναν....

T153 (15, 63): ἔστι δὲ τὰ μὲν ἐν ἀρχῇ λεγόμενα
περὶ τῆς εἰρήνης τῆς πρὸς Χίους καὶ Ῥοδίους καὶ Βυζαντίους....

T154 (15, 113): τὸ δὲ τελευταῖον Ποτείδαιαν, εἰς
ἣν ἡ πόλις τετρακόσια καὶ δισχίλια τάλαντα τὸ πρότερον ἀνῆ-
λωσε, ταύτην εἴλεν ἀπὸ τῶν χρημάτων ὧν αὐτὸς ἐπόρισε καὶ τῶν
συντάξεων τῶν ἀπὸ Θράκης· καὶ προσέτι Χαλκιδέας ἅπαντας
κατεπολέμησεν.

T155 (15, 307): τίς δ' ἦν ὁ μετ' ἐκεῖνον τοὺς Ἑλλη-
νας ἐλευθερώσας καὶ τοὺς προγόνους ἐπὶ τὴν ἡγεμονίαν καὶ τὴν

δυναστείαν, ἣν ἔσχον, προαγαῶν, ἔτι δὲ τὴν φύσιν τὴν τοῦ Πειραιῶς κατιδὼν καὶ τὸ τεῖχος ἀκόντων Λακεδαιμονίων τῇ πόλει περιβαλὼν, τίς δ' ὁ μετὰ τοῦτου ἀργυρίου καὶ χρυσοῦ τὴν ἀκρόπολιν ἐμπλήσας καὶ τοὺς οἴκους τοὺς ἰδίους μεστοὺς πολλῆς εὐδαιμονίας καὶ πλοῦτου ποιήσας.

T156 (16, 25-26): συγγενεῖς γὰρ τοῖς Ἀλκμαιουίδαι, ὄντες Πεισιστράτου καὶ πρὶν εἰς τὴν ἀρχὴν καταστῆναι μάλιστα αὐτῷ χρώμενοι τῶν πολιτῶν, οὐκ ἠξίωσαν μετασχεῖν τῆς ἐκείνου τυραννίδος, ἀλλ' εἶλοντο φυγεῖν μᾶλλον ἢ τοὺς πολίτας ἰδεῖν δουλεύοντας. τετταράκοντα δ' ἔτη τῆς στάσεως γενομένης ὑπὸ μὲν τῶν τυράννων τοσοῦτ' μᾶλλον τῶν ἄλλων ἐμισθῆθησαν, ὥσθ' ὁπότε τὰ κείνων κρατήσκειν, οὐ μόνον τὰς οἰκίας αὐτῶν κατέσκαπτον ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς τάφους ἀνῶρυττον....καὶ τὸ τελευταῖον Ἀλκιβιάδης καὶ Κλεισθένης...στρατηγῆσαντες τῆς φυγῆς κατήγαγον τὸν δῆμον καὶ τοὺς τυράννους ἐξέβαλον....κατέστησαν ἐκείνην τὴν δημοκρατίαν.

T157 (16, 29): καὶ πρῶτον μὲν, ὅτε Φορμίων ἐξήγαγεν ἐπὶ Θράκης χιλίους Ἀθηναίων, ἐπιλεξάμενος τοὺς ἀρίστους, μετὰ τούτων στρατευσάμενος τοιοῦτος ἦν ἐν τοῖς κινδύνοις ὥστε στεφανωθῆναι καὶ πανοπλίαν λαβεῖν παρὰ τοῦ στρατηγοῦ.

T158 (18, 23): καὶ μὴν οὐδὲ τὰδ' αὐτὸν λέληθεν, ὅτι Θρασίβουλος καὶ ἄλλοι μέγιστον μὲν δυνάμενοι τῶν ἐν τῇ πόλει, πολλῶν δ' ἀπεστερημένοι χρημάτων, εἰδότες θε τοὺς ἀπογράψαντας, ὅμως οὐ τολμῶσιν αὐτοῖς δίκας λαγχάνειν....

JUSTIN

Tl59 (II, 12, 13-15): adventate igitur Xerxe consulentibus Delphis oraculum responsum fuerat, salutem muris ligneis tuerentur. Themistocles navium praesidium demonstratum ratus persuadet omnibus, patriam municipales esse, non moenia, civitatemque non in aedificiis, sed in civibus positam; melius itaque salutem navibus quam urbi commissuros; huius sententiae etiam deum auctorem esse. probato consilio coniuges liberosque cum pretiosissimis rebus abditis insulis relicta urbe demandant; ipsi naves armati conscendunt.

Tl60 (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 cerneret.

Tl61 (III, 6, 4-6): hanc rem Athenienses graviter ferentes pecuniam, quae erat in stipendium Persiei belli ab universa Graecia conlata, a Delo Athenas transferunt, ne deficientibus a fide societatis Lacedaemoniis praedae ac rapinae esset. Sed nec Lacedaemonii quiescere, qui cum Messeniorum bello occupati essent, Peloponnenses inmisere, qui bellum Atheniensibus facerent.

Tl62 (III, 6, 6-8): Parvae 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 revocatur duxque classi constituitur.

T164 (V, 9, 6-7): erat inter exules Thrasybulus, vir strenuus et domi nobilis, qui audendum aliquid pro patria et pro salute communi etiam cum periculo ratus, adunatis exulibus castellum Phylen Atticorum 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):

ἐκ δὲ σε Θήρης

οὐλος Ἀριστοτέλης Ἀσβυστίδι πάρθετο γαίῃ....

T167 (Schol. Hymn., II, 65): ἔφρασε Βάττω, λέγεται ὅτι οὗτος ὁ Βάττος ἄφωνος ἦν. ἀπῆλθεν οὖν εἰς τὸ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος ἱερὸν ἐπὶ τῷ τὸν θεὸν ἐρωτῆσαι περὶ τῆς φωνῆς. ὁ δὲ ἔχρησεν αὐτῷ οὐκέτι περὶ φωνῆς, ἀλλὰ περὶ

μετοικίας. καὶ ὁ Βάττος πεισθεὶς τῷ χρησμῷ ἦλθεν εἰς τὴν Λιβύην. λέγεται δὲ εἶναι πολλοὺς λέοντας ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ χώρᾳ. ἐπιδημήσας οὖν ὁ Βάττος καὶ λέοντα αἰφνιδίως θεασάμενος τῇ τοῦ φόβου ἀνάγκῃ βιασθεὶς φθέγγασθαι διέρρηξε τὴν φλέβα ἣτις τὴν ἐκείνου φωνὴν ἐπεῖχε, καὶ οὕτω φωνήεις ἐγένετο καὶ τὴν Κυρήνην ἔκτισεν, ὅθεν ἐστὶν ὁ Καλλίμαχος.

T168 (Schol. Hymn., II, 76): οὗλος Ἀριστοτέλης, ὁ αὐτὸς καὶ Βάττος λέγεται.... καὶ γὰρ ὁ δοθεὶς αὐτῷ χρησμός τοῦτο παρεμφαίνει· "Βάττ', ἐπὶ φωνὴν ἦλθες· ἄναξ δὲ σε φοῖβος ἀνώγει εἰς Λιβύην ἐλθεῖν μηλοτρόφου οἰκιστῆρα!" Ἀσβυστίδα δὲ τὴν λευκὴν λέγει παρὰ τὴν ἄσβεστον. τοιαύτη γὰρ ἡ Λιβύη λευκόγειος.

KLEI(TO)DEMOS

T169 (Frg. 15 = Jacoby, IIIB, p. 55): καὶ τὴν καταγαγοῦσαν δὲ Πεισίστρατον ἐπὶ τὴν τυραννίδα, ὥς Ἀθηναῖς πειραν εἶδος ἔχουσιν, καλῆν φησι γεγονέναι, ἣτις καὶ τῇ θεῷ εἵκαστο τὴν μορφήν. στεφανόπωλις δ' ἦν καὶ αὐτὴν ἐξέδωκε πρὸς γάμον κοινωνίαν ὁ Πεισίστρατος Ἰππάρχῳ τῷ υἱῷ, ὥς Κλείδημος ἱστορεῖ ἐν τῇ Νόστων· "ἐξέδωκεν δὲ καὶ Ἰππάρχῳ τῷ υἱεῖ τὴν παραιβατήσασαν αὐτῷ γυναῖκα Φύην τὴν Σωκράτους θυγατέρα. καὶ Χάρμου τοῦ πολεμαρχήσαντος θυγατέρα Μυρρίνην ἔλαβεν Ἰππίαί περικαλλεστάτην οὖσαν τῷ μετ' αὐτὸν τυραννεύσαντι. συνέβη δὲ (ὥς φησι) τὸν Χάρμον ἐραστὴν τοῦ Ἰππίου γενέσθαι καὶ τὸν πρὸς Ἀκαδημίας Ἔρωτα

ἰδρῶσασθαι πρῶτον, ἐφ' οὗ ἐπιγέγραπται· "Ποικιλομήχαν"
 "Ἐρως, σοὶ τόνδ' ἰδρῶσατο βωμόν Χάρμος ἐπὶ σκιεροῖς τέρμασι
 γυμνασίου".

KRATINOS

T170 (Frg. 57 Kock):

Λάμπωνα, τὸν οὐ βροτῶν

ψῆφος δύναται φλεγυρὰ δείπνου φίλων ἀπείργειν.

T171 (Frg. 62 Kock): Κρατῖνος ἐν Δραπέτισιν ἐπὶ
 Λάμπωνος. τὸν αὐτὸν ἀγύρτην καὶ κυβηλιστὴν εἶπεν, οἶονεὶ
 θύτην καὶ μάντιν....Κρατῖνος Λάμπωνα τὸν μάντιν ὥς ἀγύρτην
 καὶ θύτην.

KTESIAS

T172 (ΠΕΡΣΙΚΩΝ ΕΚΛΟΓΑΙ, 18): Δᾶτις δὲ ἐπανιδὺν ἐκ
 Πόντου, καὶ τοῦ Μηδικοῦ στόλου ἡγούμενος, ἐπύρθει νῆσους καὶ
 τῆν Ἑλλάδα. ἐν Μαραθῶνι δὲ Μιλτιάδης ὑπαντιάζει, καὶ νικᾷ
 τοὺς βαρβάρους, καὶ πίπτει καὶ αὐτὸς Δᾶτις. καὶ οὐδὲ τὸ
 σῶμα Πέρσαις αἰτησάμενοις ἐδόθη.

T173 (ΠΕΡΣΙΚΩΝ ΕΚΛΟΓΑΙ, 32): ἀφίσταται Αἴγυπτος,
 Ἰνᾶρου καὶ Λυβίου ἀνδρὸς καὶ ἑτέρου Αἰγυπτίου τὴν ἀπόστασιν
 μελετήσαντος. καὶ εὐτρεπίζεται τὰ πρὸς πόλεμον. πέμπουσι
 καὶ Ἀθηναῖοι, αἰτησάμενον αὐτοῦ, τεσσαράκοντα νῆας. καὶ
 μελετᾷ αὐτὸς Ἀρτοξέρξης ἐκστρατεῦσαι. καὶ τῶν φίλων οὐ
 συμβουλευόντων, πέμπει Ἀχαιμενίδην τὸν ἀδελφόν, τεσσαράκοντα
 μὲν μυριάδας ἐπαγόμενον στράτευμα πεζικόν, νῆας δὲ π'....ἐνίκησεν

"Ιναρος καὶ κατὰ θάλασσαν, Χαριτιμίδου εὐδοκιμήσαντος,
ὅς τῶν ἐξ Ἀθηνῶν τεσσαράκοντα νηῶν ἐχρημάτιζε ναύαρχος·

T174 (ΠΕΡΣΙΚΩΝ ΕΚΛΟΓΑΙ, 33): εἴτα πέμπεται κατὰ
Ἰνᾶρου Μεγάβυζος, ἐπαγόμενος ἄλλο στράτευμα πρὸς τῷ
ὕπολειφθέντι, μυριάδας εἴκοσι.... γίνεται οὖν μάχη κρατερὰ,
καὶ πίπτουσιν ἀμφοτέρωθεν πολλοί, πλείους δὲ Αἰγύπτιοι. καὶ
βάλλει Μεγάβυζος εἰς τὸν μηρὸν Ἰναρον, καὶ τρέπεται· καὶ
νικῶσι Πέρσαι κατακράτος· φεύγει δὲ πρὸς τὴν Βύβλον Ἰναρος,
(πόλις ἰσχυρὰ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ αὕτη) καὶ οἱ Ἕλληνες δὲ μετ' αὐτοῦ....

T175 (ΠΕΡΣΙΚΩΝ ΕΚΛΟΓΑΙ, 35): καὶ ἐξάγεται τέλος τῇ
στρατιᾷ ὡς Ἰναρος καὶ οἱ Ἕλληνες οὐδὲν κακὸν πείσονται.

LUCAN

T176 (Schol., Pharsalia, IX, 36): Taenaron umbris,
hic enim ingressus est inferni, ut Vergilius "Taenarias etiam
fauces a. n. D."

LUCIAN

T177 (Schol., Timon, 30): Κλέωνι, Κλέων δημα-
γωγὸς ἦν Ἀθηναίων προστὰς αὐτῶν ἑπτὰ ἔτη, πρῶτος δημηγορῶν
ἀνέκραγεν ἐπὶ βήματος καὶ ἐλοιδορήσατο, θρασὺς ὢν καὶ οὕτως,
ὥστε, καθὼς Θεόπομπος ἱστορεῖ, συνελθλυθῶτων Ἀθηναίων
παρελθεῖν εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν στέφανον ἔχοντα καὶ κελεῦσαι
αὐτοὺς ἀναβαλέσθαι τὸν σύλλογον - τυγχάνειν γὰρ αὐτὸν

θύοντα καὶ ξένους ἐστιᾶν μέλλοντα — καὶ διαλῦσαι τὴν ἐκκλησίαν. δωροδόκος δὲ εἰς ὑπερβολὴν ὑπῆρχε καὶ τοῦτο δηλοῖ αὐτοῦ ἡ γραφεῖσα ἀπ' αὐτοῦ Μυτιληναίοις ἐπιστολή. ὕστερον δὲ Μυτιλήνης ἀλούσης ὑπὸ Πάχητος τοῦ στρατηγοῦ τὴν μὲν ἔμπροσθεν ἡμέραν συμπεῖσαι τὸν δῆμον, ὥς χρὴ Λεσβίων ἀπάντων πλὴν Μηθυμναίων τοὺς μὲν ἡβῶντας ἀποκτεῖναι, παῖδας δὲ καὶ γυναῖκας ἀνδραποδίσασθαι, καὶ τὸ ψήφισμα τοῦτο ἀποστεῖλαι ἐπὶ τῆς Παράλου. τῆς δὲ νυκτὸς τῆς ἐπιούσης ἐλθόντων ὥς αὐτὸν τῶν ἐπιδημούντων Ἀθηνησι Λεσβίων καὶ δέκα ταλάντοις αὐτὸν ἀργυρίου μετελθόντων μεταπεῖσαι πάλιν τὸν δῆμον καὶ τριήρη ἄλλην ἀποστεῖλαι ἀναιροῦσαν τὸ ψήφισμα. οὕτω Θουκυδίδης [3, 36]. ἐπέστη δὲ καὶ τῇ πρὸς Λακεδαιμονίους εἰρήνῃ, ὥς Φιλόχορος καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης προσθεὶς ἄρχοντα Εὐθύνον. Ἀριστοτέλης δὲ ἐν Πολιτείᾳ [28, 3] καὶ περιζωσάμενον αὐτὸν λέγει δημηγορῆσαι, εἰς τὴν θρασύτητα αὐτοῦ ἀποσκώπτων. τὰ δὲ ὑπὸ [τὴν ὄψιν] ἦν ἀργαλέος καὶ μάλιστα τὰς ὀφρῦς, ὥς Κρατῖνος Σεριφίοις. εἶχε δὲ καὶ φωνὴν μεγάλην. Ἀριστοφάνης Σφηξίν [36] ἐπ' αὐτοῦ

"ἔχουσα φωνὴν ἐμπερημένην ὕδς."

Βυρσοδέψην δὲ αὐτὸν λέγεσθαι Ἰδομενεὺς ἦτοι ὥς βυρσοδέψου υἱὸν ἢ ὥς αὐτοῦ ἔτι παιδὸς τὸ ἐπιτήδευμα μεταχειρισμένου. ἐκωμωδεῖτο δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ μανίᾳ, ὥς Κρατῖνος Σεριφίοις. ἐξέπλευσε δὲ καὶ στρατηγὸς ἐπ' Ἀμφίπολιν, [ἔνθα καὶ ἐ]τελεύτα νικηθεὶς ὑπὸ βρασίδου ἐπὶ ἄρχοντος Ἀμεινίου.

[LUCIAN]

T178 (Amor., 30): τάχα δ' οὐδὲ Περικλῆς οὕτως
 ἂν Ἀσπασία συνηγόρησεν.

LYKOURGOS

T179 (ΚΑΤΑ ΛΕΩΚΡΑΤΟΥΣ, 112): Φρυνίχου γὰρ ἀπο-
 σφαγέντος νύκτωρ παρὰ τὴν κρήνην τὴν ἐν τοῖς οἰσούοις ὑπὸ
 Ἀπολλοδώρου καὶ Θρασυβούλου, καὶ τούτων ληφθέντων καὶ εἰς
 τὸ δεσμοτήριον ἀποτεθέντων ὑπὸ τῶν τοῦ Φρυνίχου φίλων, αἰσ-
 θόμενος ὁ δῆμος τὸ γεγονός τοὺς τε εἰρχθέντας ἐξήγαγε, καὶ
 βασάνων γενομένων τὸ πρᾶγμα ἀνέκρινε, καὶ ζητῶν εὔρε τὸν
 μὲν Φρυνίχον προδιδόντα τὴν πόλιν, τοὺς δ' ἀποκτείναντας
 αὐτὸν ἀδίκως εἰρχθέντας. (113): καὶ ψηφίζεται ὁ δῆμος
 Κριτίου εἰπόντος, τὸν μὲν νεκρὸν κρίνειν προδοσίας, κἂν
 δόξη προδότης ὢν ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ τεθάφθαι, τὰ γε ὅσα αὐτοῦ ἀνο-
 ρύξαι καὶ ἐξορίσαι ἔξω τῆς Ἀττικῆς, ὅπως ἂν μὴ κέηται ἐν
 τῇ χώρᾳ μηδὲ τὰ ὅσα τοῦ τὴν χώραν καὶ τὴν πόλιν προδιδόντος.

LYSIAS

T180 (2, 21): ὁ γὰρ τῆς Ἀσίας βασιλεὺς... ἐλπί-
 ζων καὶ τὴν Εὐρώπην δουλώσεσθαι, ἔστειλε πεντήκοντα μυριά-
 δας στρατίαν.... ἀπέβησαν εἰς Μαραθῶνα, νομίσαντες οὕτως ἂν
 ἐρημοτάτους εἶναι συμμάχων [τοὺς Ἕλληνας]....

T181 (12, 6): Θεόγνις γὰρ καὶ Πείσων ἔλεγον ἐν
 τοῖς τριάκοντα περὶ τῶν μετοίκων... τινὲς τῇ πολιτείᾳ ἀχθόμενοι.

T182 (12, 63): καίτοι σφόδρ' ἂν αὐτὸν οἶμαι μετὰ θεμιστοκλέους πολυτενόμενον προσποιεῖσθαι πράττειν ὅπως οἰκοδομηθήσεται τὰ τεῖχη, ὅποτε καὶ μετὰ θηραμένους ὅπως καθαιρεθήσεται.... ὁ μὲν γὰρ Λακεδαιμονίων ἀκόντων ᾧκοδόμησεν αὐτὰ, οὗτος δὲ τοὺς πολίτας ἐξαπατήσας καθεῖλε.

T183 (12, 65): ὅς πρῶτον μὲν τῆς προτέρας ὀλιγαρχίας αἰτιώτατος ἐγένετο, πείσας ὑμᾶς τὴν ἐπὶ τῶν τετρακοσίων πολιτείαν ἐλέσθαι. καὶ ὁ μὲν πατὴρ αὐτοῦ τῶν προβούλων ὧν ταῦτ' ἔπραττεν....

T184 (12, 73): ἄναστὰς δὲ θηραμένης ἐκέλευσεν ὑμᾶς τριάκοντα ἀνδράσιν ἐπιτρέψαι τὴν πόλιν καὶ τῇ πολιτείᾳ χρῆσθαι ἣν Δρακοντίδης ἀπέβαινε.

T185 (14, 30): καὶ ταῦθ' ὕδς ὧν Ἀλκιβιάδου, ὅς ἔπεισε μὲν Δεκέλειαν Λακεδαιμονίους ἐπιτειχίσαι, ἐπὶ δὲ τὰς νήσους ἀποστήσων ἔπλευσε, διδάσκαλος δὲ τῶν τῆς πόλεως κακῶν ἐγένετο, πλεονάκεις δὲ μετὰ τῶν ἐχθρῶν ἐπὶ τὴν πατρίδα ἐστρατεύσατο ἢ μετὰ τῶν πολιτῶν ἐπ' ἐκείνους.

T186 (14, 36): οὔτε Χίους οὐς ἀπέστησε πάλιν φίλους ποιῆσαι, οὔτε ἄλλο οὐδὲν ἀγαθὸν ὑμᾶς ἐργάσασθαι.

T187 (18, 2): πανταχοῦ φανήσεται πολλῶν μὲν καὶ ἀγαθῶν αἵτιος τῇ πόλει γεγεννημένος, πλεῖστα δὲ καὶ μέγιστα κακὰ τοὺς πολεμίους εἰργασμένος.

T188 (32, 15): φοιτᾶν δὲ καὶ σῖτον αὐτοῖς ἐκ Χερρονήσου καθ' ἕκαστον ἐνιαυτόν.

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 appareretur, prius
quam classis exiret, accidit ut una nocte omnes Hermae, qui in
oppido erant Athenis, decerentur praeter unum, qui ante ianuam
erat Andocidi...

T191 (Alcibiades, 4, 7): itaque huius consilio
Lacedaemonii cum Perse rege amicitiam fecerunt, dein Deceseam
in Attica munierunt praesidioque ibi perpetuo posito in obsidione
Athenas tenuerunt.

T192 (Alcibiades, 7, 1): haec Alcibiadi laetitia non
nimis fuit diuturna. nam cum ei omnes essent honores decreti
totaque res publica domi bellique tradita, ut unius 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 remgesserat,
in invidiam recidit...

T193 (Alcibiades, 7, 3): timebatur 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 repellerent, si forte bellum renovare conarentur, ad classes aedificandas exercitusque comparandos quantum pecuniae quaeque civitas daret, Aristides delectus est qui constitueret, eiusque arbitrio quadringena et sexagena talenta quotannis Delum sunt collata: id enim commune aerarium esse voluerunt. quae omnis pecunia postero tempore Athenas translata est.

T196 (Conon, 2, 4): qui posteaquam domum a suis civibus revocatus est, quod Boesti et Athenienses Lacedaemoniis bellum indixerant, Conon nihilo 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 Atheniensibus....inde ad Atticam accesserunt ac suas copias in campum Marathona deduxerunt.

T198 (Themistocles, 5, 1): nam Themistocles, verens ne bellare perseveraret, certiores eum fecit id agi, ut pons, quem ille in Hellesponto fecerat, dissolveretur ac reditu in Asiam excluderetur, idque ei persuasit.

T199 (Themistocles, 9, 1): scio plerosque ita scripsisse, Themistoclem Xerxe regnante in Asiam transisse. sed ego potissimum Thucydidi credo, quod et aetate proximus de iis, 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 multis modis apud plerosque scriptum est, sed nos eundem potissimum Thucydidem auctorem probamus, qui illum ait Magnesiae morbo mortuum neque negat fuisse famam, venenum sua sponte sumpsisse, cum se, quae regi de Graecia opprimenda pollicitus esset, praestare posse desperaret. idem ossa eius clam in Attica ab amicis sepulta, quoniam legibus non concederetur, quod proditiōis esset damnatus, memoriae prodidit.

T201 (Thrasybulus, 1, 5): nam cum triginta tyranni praepositi a Lacedaemoniis servitute 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

T206 (946 = Gaisford, p. 118): χῖος παραστὰς Κῶν οὐκ ἔστι λέγειν: ἀπὸ ἀστραγάλων παρωδήθη ἡ παροιμία· καὶ ἐπὶ θηραμένους, ἐπεὶ ἐδόκει Χῖος εἶναι.

PHEREKRATES

T207 (Frg. 151 Kock):

τοῖς δέκα ταλάντοις προστιθεῖς, ἔφη,
ἄλλ' ἅττα πεντήκοντα.

PHILOCHOROS

T208 (Frg. 30 = Jacoby, III B, pp. 107-108):

μόνος δὲ Ὑπέρβολος ἐκ τῶν ἀδόξων ἐξωστρακίσθη διὰ μοχθη-
ρίαν τρόπων, οὐ δι' ὑποψίαν τυραννίδος· μετὰ τοῦτον δὲ
κατελύθη τὸ ἔθος, ἀρξάμενον νομοθετήσαντος Κλεισθένους,
ὅτε τοὺς τυράννους κατέλυσεν, ὅπως συνεκβάλῃ καὶ τοὺς
φίλους αὐτῶν.

T209 (Frg. 150 = Jacoby, III B, p. 142): ξενι-

κὸν ἐν Κορίνθῳ....συνεστήσατο δ' αὐτὸ πρῶτον Κόνων, παρέλαβε
δ' αὐτὸ Ἰφικράτης ὕστερον καὶ Χαβρίας· ᾧ χρησάμενοι τὴν
Λακεδαιμονίων μῶραν κατέκοψαν, στρατηγοῦντος αὐτοῖς Ἰφι-
κράτους καὶ Καλλίου, καθὰ φησιν Ἀνδροτίων τε καὶ Φιλό-
χορος.

PHOTIOS

T210 (Ἑρετρικὸς κατάλογος): ἐπὶ Διφίλου ἄρχοντος

ἔγραψαν ψήφισμα τοὺς ὀμήρους κατολέξαι ἐξ Ἑρετριατῶν
πλουσιωτάτων.

T211 (Θουριθμάντεις): τοὺς περὶ Λάμπωνα· τὴν γὰρ

εἰς Σύβαριν ἀποικίαν οἱ μὲν Λάμπωνι ἀνατιθέασιν· οἱ δὲ
Ξενοκρίτῳ· οἱ δὲ τῷ Χαλκιδεῖ Διονυσίῳ....οἱ δὲ Πλησίπῳ
Ἀθηναίῳ.

T212 (Λακκόπλουτον): Ξέρξην ἡττηθέντα ἐν τῇ

περὶ Σαλαμῖνι ναυμαχίᾳ φεύγειν ἐξ Ἀθηνῶν.

T213 (Λυκόποδας): Ἀριστοφάνης Λυσιστράτῃ· τοὺς

πρὸς Ἰππίαν ἀγωνισαμένους ἐπὶ Λειψυδρίῳ, ὥς γεφυαίους·
ἔλαθον γὰρ τοὺς δορυφόρους τῶν τυράννων διὰ τὸ κατειλεῖσθαι
δέρμασι τοὺς πόδας, καὶ λυκόποδας εἶναι· ἢ διὰ τὸ λύκον
ἔχειν ἐπίσημον ἐπὶ ταῖς ἀσπίσιν ἀπὸ Διουνυσίου πρώτου.

T214 (Ὀπισθόδομος): Δημοσθένης ἐν τῷ περὶ Συντάξ-
εως· ἀνέωξαν δὴπον πρῶτην τινὲς τὸν ὀπισθόδομον· ἐκαλεῖτο δὲ
οὕτως ὁ ὀπισθεν τοῦ νεῷ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς οἶκος, ἐν ᾧ ἀπετίθεντο
τὰ χρήματα.

T215 (Πύλαι): Πύλαι μὲν καλοῦνται αἱ Θερμοπύλαι·
ἐκλήθησαν δὲ οὕτως, διὰ τὸ στευὴν εἶναι ταύτην εἴσοδον ἀπὸ
Θετταλίας εἰς τὴν Φωκίδα πορευομένοις·

T216 (Πάραλος καὶ Σαλαμινία, ρρ. 675-676): ταύτας
τὰς τριήρεις εἶχον διὰ παντὸς πρὸς τὰς ἐπειγούσας ὑπηρεσίας
ἐφ' αἷς καὶ ταμίαι τινὲς ἐχειροτονοῦντο· ἐχρῶντο δὲ αὐτοῖς,
εἰ δέοι στρατηγὸν μεταπέμψασθαι κριθησόμενον, ὥσπερ Ἀλκι-
βιάδην·

PINDAR

T217 (Pythian, IV, 5-6): Ἀπόλλωνος τυχόντος ἱέρα
χρῆσεν οἰκιστῆρα Βάττον καρποφόρου Λιβύας,...

T218 (Pythian, IV, 10): ἐβδόμα καὶ σὺν δεκάτῃ γενεᾷ θή-
ραιον....

T219 (Pythian, IV, 43-45): εἰ γὰρ οἷ-
κοι νιν βάλε παρ χθόνιον Ἄϊδα στόμα,
Ταίναρον εἰς ἱερὰν Εὐφάμος ἐλθὼν,

υἱὸς ἱππάρχου Ποσειδάωνος ἄναξ,

T220 (Pythian, V, 55-56):

ὁ Βάττου δ' ἔπεται παλαι-

δε ὄλβος ἔμπαν τὰ καὶ τὰ νέμων,
πύργος ἄστεος ὄμμα τε φαεινότετον
ξένοισι.

T221 (Pythian, V, 87-88):

τοὺς Ἀριστοτέλης ἄγαγε ναυσὶ θοαῖς
ἁλὸς βαθεῖαν κέλευθον ἀνοίγων.

T222 (Pythian, V, 93-95):

ἔνθα πρυ-

μνοῖς ἀγορᾶς ἐπὶ δίχα κεῖται θανῶν·

μάκαρ μὲν ἀνδρῶν μέτα

ἔναιεν, ἥρως δ' ἔπειτα λαοσεβής.

T223 (Schol. Pythian, IV, 76):

εἰ γὰρ οἴκοι νιν
βάλε: εἰ γάρ δὴ αὐτήν, τὴν βῶλον, ἐν τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ οἴκοις
ἤγαγε παρὰ τὸ χθόνιον τοῦ Ἄιδου στόμα εἰς τὴν ἱερὰν Ταίνα-
ρον παραγεγονῶς, ἐκ δὲ τούτου εἰς Λακεδαίμονα ἐλθὼν, ὁ τοῦ
ἱππικοῦ Ποσειδῶνος υἱός. Ταίναρος δὲ πόλις Λακωνικῇ, ἐν ᾗ
καὶ πύλη ἐστὶν εἰς Ἄιδου.

PLATO

T224 (Laws, 776c):

ἐλάττω δὲ ἢ τε Ἑρακλεωτῶν
δουλεία τῆς τῶν Μαριανδυνῶν καταδουλώσεως ἔριν ἂν ἔχοι, τὸ
Θετταλῶν τ' αὖ πενεστινὸν ἔθνος...

T225 (Schol. Symposium, 208a): χρόνῳ δὲ ὕστερον γενομένης τοῖς Βοιωτοῖς ἀμφισβητήσεως πρὸς Ἀθηναίους, ὥς μὲν τινες, περὶ Οἰνόης καὶ Πανάκτου, ὥς δὲ τινες, περὶ Μελαινῶν, καὶ τῶν Βοιωτῶν ἀξιούτων τοὺς βασιλέας προκινδυνεῦσαι· περὶ τῆς χώρας εἰς μονομαχίαν καταστάντες, Ξάνθιος μὲν ὁ τῶν Βοιωτῶν βασιλεὺς ὑποδέχεται, θυμοίτης δὲ ὁ τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἀρνεῖται, λέγων τῷ βουλομένῳ μονομαχεῖν τῆς ἀρχῆς παραχωρεῖν. Μελάνθος δὲ ὑποστὰς τὸν κίνδυνον ἐπὶ τὸ βασιλεῦσαι τῶν Ἀθηναίων αὐτὸν καὶ τοῖς ἐξ αὐτοῦ, ὀπλισάμενος προΐει, καὶ πλησίον τοῦ Ξανθίου γενόμενος εἶπεν " ἀδικεῖς, ὦ Ξάνθιε, σὺν ἐτέρῳ ἐπ' ἐμὲ ἦκων καὶ οὐ μόνος, ὥς ὡμολόγητο." Ξάνθιος δὲ ταῦτα ἀκούσας μετεστράφη, θεῶσασθαι βουλόμενος εἴ τις αὐτῷ ἐπόμενος εἴη· καὶ μεταστραφέντα βαλὼν αὐτὸν ἀπέκτεινεν, καὶ βασιλεὺς τῆς Ἀττικῆς ἐγένετο. ὅθεν τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις κρατήσας τῆς χώρας ἔδοξεν ἑορτὴν ἄγειν, ἣν πάλαι μὲν Ἀπατηνῶρια ὕστερον δὲ Ἀπατοῦρια ἐκάλουν ὥς ἀπὸ τῆς γενομένης ἀπάτης.

T226 (Schol. Timaeus, 21b): Ἀπατοῦρια ἑορτὴ Ἀθηναίων εἰς Διόνυσον, ἐκ τοῦδε· Μελάνθιος ἀντὶ θυμοίτου τοῦ βασιλέως Ἀθηναίων Ξανθίῳ μονομαχῶν τῷ Βοιωτῷ ἀπατήσκειν αὐτὸν εἰπών· "παρὰ τὴν ὁμολογίαν, ὦ Ξάνθιε, δεύτερος ἦκεις." τοῦ δὲ Ξανθίου ἐπιστραφέντος ἴν' ἴδοι τὸν δεύτερον, αὐτὸν μὲν μηδὲνα ἰδεῖν, Μελάνθιον δὲ τοῦτον ἐξ ἐπιδρομῆς ἀνελεῖν, καὶ οὕτως ἐξ ἀπάτης νικῆσαι Ἀθηναίους, ὑπὲρ Οἰνόης πολεμοῦντας Βοιωτοῖς. ἑώρταζον δὲ ἡμέρας τρεῖς, ὧν ἡ α' ἐκαλεῖτο ἀνάρρυσις· τὰ γὰρ θύματα λέγεται ἀναρρύματα παρὰ τὸ

ἄνω ἐρυόμενα θύεσθαι· καὶ γὰρ ἐν ταύτῃ πολλὰ ἐθύετο· ἡ δὲ β' δορπία, καθ' ἣν εὐωχίαι καὶ δεῖπνα πολλά, ἡ δὲ γ' κουρεῶτις· ἐν ταύτῃ γὰρ τοὺς κούρους ἐνέγραφον εἰς τοὺς φράτερας, τριετείς ἢ τετραετείς ὄντας. ἐν ᾗ καὶ τῶν παίδων οἱ ἐντρεχέστεροι ποιήματα ἅττα ᾗδον, τὰ τῶν παλαιῶν ῥαψωδοῦντες.

PLATO COMICUS

T227 (Frgs. 166-167 Kock):

εὐτυχεῖς, ὦ δέσποτα.

B. τί δ' ἔστι; A. βουλευεῖν ὀλίγου "λαχες πάνυ.

ἀτὰρ οὐ λαχὼν ὅμως ἔλαχες, ἦν νοῦν ἔχης.

B. πῶς ἦν ἔχω νοῦν; A. ὅτι πουηρῷ καὶ ξένῳ ἐπέλαχες ἀνδρί, οὐδέπω γὰρ ἐλευθέρῳ.

.

B. ἄπερρ'· ἐγὼ δ' ὅμῃν τὸ πράγμα δὴ φράσω·

'Υπερβόλῳ βουλῆς γάρ, ἄνδρες, ἐπέλαχον.

T228 (Frg. 169 Kock):

καὶ τοσοῦτον εὐερίας ἀπολέλαυχ' Ὑπερβολος,
ὥστε ἀθλιώτατός ἐστι.

T229 (Frg. 185 Kock):

λαβοῦ λαβοῦ τῆς χειρὸς ὡς τάχιστα μου·

μέλλω στρατηγὸν χειροτονεῖν Ἀγύρριον.

προσίσταται μου πρὸς τὸ βῆμα μαρτίλη

POLYAINOS

T230 (I, 19): ΜΕΛΑΝΘΟΣ: Ἀθηναίων στρατηγὸς ἦν Μέλανθος, Βοιωτῶν Ξάνθος. ἐπολέμουν Μελαινῶν πέρι· Μελαιναὶ χωρίον μεθόριον Ἀττικῆς καὶ Βοιωτίας. ὁ θεὸς ἔχρησε·

τῷ ξάνθῳ τεύξας ὁ μέλας φόνον ἔσχε Μελάινας. τοῦ λογίου τὸ ἔργον ἀποβαίνει τῇδε. οἱ στρατηγοὶ μονομαχοῦσι τῆς νίκης πέρι, καὶ συνιδόντων ὁ Μέλανθος ἔφη "καὶ μὴν ἀδικεῖς δεύτερος ἰὼν ἐπὶ τὴν μάχην!" ὁ Ξάνθος ἐπεστράφη τὸν δεύτερον ὀψόμενος καὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ Μελάνθου τῷ ξυστῷ διελαθεὶς ἀνῆρέθη. Ἀθηναῖοι τῷ στρατηγῇ τῆς ἀπάτης νικήσαντες ἐτήσιον ἑορτὴν κατεστήσαντο, ἣν γε δὴ κληῖζουσιν Ἀπατούρια.

T231 (I, 21, 3): ΠΕΙΣΙΣΤΡΑΤΟΣ: Πεισίστρατος Μεγακλεῖ διεπολιτεύετο, καὶ ἦν ὁ Μεγακλῆς ὑπὲρ τῶν πλουσίων τεταγμένος, ὁ δὲ Πεισίστρατος ὑπὲρ τῶν πενήτων.... ὁ δὲ δῆμος... ἐς φυλακὴν τοῦ σώματος ἔδωκαν αὐτῷ τριακοσίους φύλακας, οἷς κορυνηφόροις χρησάμενος αὐτὸς τε τύραννος Ἀθηναίων ἐγένετο καὶ τοῖς παισὶ τὴν τυραννίδα κατέλιπεν.

T232 (I, 30, 1): ΘΕΜΙΣΤΟΚΛΗΣ: Ἀθηναίοις ὁ θεὸς ἔχρησεν

ὃ θείῃ Σαλαμῖς, ἀπολεῖς δὲ σὺ τέκνα γυναικῶν. Θεμιστοκλῆς Ἀθηναίων τὸ λόγιον δεδιδὼν "τᾷ γε τῶν πολεμίων," ἔφη· "οὐ γὰρ ἂν θείην τὴν Σαλαμῖνα ὁ θεὸς ἀνηγόρευσεν, εἰ ἔμελλεν ἀπολλύειν τὰ τέκνα τῶν Ἑλλήνων." τοῦτο λεχθεὶς θάρσος Ἀθηναίοις ἔδωκε, καὶ ἡ νίκη τὴν ἐξήγησιν ἐπιστώσατο.

T233 (I, 30, 4): οἱ Ἕλληνες νικήσαντες ἐν Σαλα-

μῦνι βουλευονται πλεῖν ἐφ' Ἑλλησποντον καὶ τὸ ζευγμα λῦειν,
 ἵνα βασιλεὺς μὴ φύγῃ. Θεμιστοκλῆς ἀντιβουλεύεται λέγων
 "βασιλεὺς ἀποληφθεὶς ἀναμαχεῖται τάχα· πολλάκις δὲ ἀπδνοῖα
 δίδωσιν, ὅσα μὴ ἔδωκεν ἀνδρεία!" πέμπει δὴ πάλιν ὥς βασιλέα
 εὐνοῦχον ἄλλον Ἀρσάκην οὕτωςι προαγορεύοντα· εἰ μὴ φύγοι
 διὰ τάχους, ἡ γέφυρα τοῦ Ἑλλησπόντου διαλύεται. βασιλεὺς
 ἔδεισε καὶ φθάσας τὸ Ἑλληνικὸν διέβη τὸ ζευγμα καὶ φυγῶν
 ὤχετο· Θεμιστοκλῆς δὲ τοῖς Ἑλλήσιν ἐφύλαξε τὴν νίκην
 ἀκίνδυνον.

T234 (I, 39, 1): NIKIAS: Νικίας, ἐπιπλεύσας τῇ
 Κορινθίᾳ νύκτωρ, ἔνθα ὁ Σολύγης λόφος, ἀποβιβάσας Ἀθηναίων
 ὀπλίτας χιλίους καὶ ἄλλους ἀλλαχῇ λοχῆσαι τάξας ἀπέπλευσεν·
 ἐπεὶ δὲ ὑπὸ γαζεν ἔως, πάλιν αὖ φανερώς ἐπέπλευσεν. οἱ μὲν
 Κορίνθιοι σπουδῇ ἐκβοηθοῦντες ἔθεον, κωλύσοντας ἀκβαίνειν·
 οἱ δὲ ἐν ταῖς ἐνέδραις ἐξανιστάμενοι τοὺς πλείστους αὐτῶν
 διέφθειραν.

POLYZELOS

T235 (Frg. 5 Kock): Πολύζηλος δὲ ἐν τῷ Δημο-
 τυνδάρει φερεται αὐτὸν (Ὑπερβολον) εἶναι εἰς τὸ βάρβαρον
 σκώπτων φησί.

QUINTILIAN

T236 (X, 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 (Ἀρτεμίσιον): πόλις Οἰνῶτρων ἐν μεσογαίῳ,
Ἑκαταῖος Εὐρώπῃ....ἔστι καὶ πόλις Εὐβοίας.

T238 (Σαλαμίς): ἡ πρὸς τῇ Ἀττικῇ νῆσος καὶ πόλις.
ὁ πολίτης Σαλαμίνιος καὶ Σαλαμινία.

T239 (Τετραπόλις τῆς Ἀττικῆς): ἔχουσα δήμους καὶ
πόλεις τέτταρας, Οἰνόην Προβάλινθον Τρικόρυνθον Μαραθῶνα.
Ἀνδροτίων δὲ Τετραπόλιδος φησι διὰ τοῦ δ. αὕτη πρότερον
ἐκαλεῖτο Ὑττηνία.

S(O)UIDAS

T240 (Ἀνεΐλεν): Ἀθηναίοις δὲ ὁ θεὸς τὰ μὲν πρῶτα
χρωμένοις ανεΐλε φεύγειν. λιπαροῦσι δὲ ἔχρησε. τεῖχος Τριτο-
γενεῖ ξύλινον διδοῖ εὐρύβοπα Ζεὺς μοῦνον ἀπόρθητον τελέθειν,
τὸ θὲ τέκνα τ' ὀνήσει. μηδὲ σὺ γ' ἱπποσύνην τε μένειν καὶ
πεζὸν ἰδὺντα πολλὸν ἀπ' ἡπείρου στρατὸν ἦσυχος, ἀλλ' ὑπο-
χωρεῖν νῶτον ἀπιστρέψας. ἐπὶ τοί ποτε κἀντίος ἔσση. ὦ θεία
Σαλαμίς, ἀπολεῖς δὲ σὺ τέκνα γυναικῶν ἥπου σκιδναμένης Δημή-
τερος ἢ συνιοῦσης. ταῦτα ἐξηγήσατο Θεμιστοκλῆς ὁ Νεοκλέους,
ὅς δι' ἐλευθεριότητα ἀπεκηρύχθη, τεῖχος μὲν ξύλινον τὰς ναῦς
εἰπὼν. τὴν δὲ Σαλαμῖνα θείαν οὐκ ἂν ὀνομάσειν τὸν θεόν, εἰ

τὰ τέκνα τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἔμελλον ἀπολέσειν. συνεβόλευσε δὲ περὶ τὴν Σολαμίνα ναυμαχῆσαι, καὶ σοφὸς ἐκλήθη διὰ τοῦτο καὶ στρατηγὸς ἀπεδείχθη

T241 (Ἀέσπασε): οἱ δὲ Σπαρτιάται ἐκάθηντο τοῦ θεοῦ ἱκέται ἐς Ταΐναρον καὶ ἦτον σωτηρίαν. οἱ δὲ ἀέσπασαν ἀφειδῶς καὶ μάλα ἀπέκτειναν αὐτούς.

T242 (Ἀρτεμισία): αὕτη ἠρίστευσε κατὰ Περσῶν· δι' ἣν εἶπεν ὁ βασιλεὺς, ὥς οἱ ἄνδρες γυναῖκες γεγόνασιν, αἱ δὲ γυναῖκες ἄνδρες.

T243 (Βάραθρον): τόπος βαθύς, ὅπου οἱ κακοῦργοι ἐμβάλλονται Ἀθήνησι καὶ οἱ ἐπὶ θανάτῳ.

T244 (Βάττον σίλφιον): ἐπὶ τῶν σπανίους τιμὰς λαμβανόντων. οἱ γὰρ Κυρηναῖοι ἐπὶ τῶν Βάττων ἐξαίρετον ἔδωσαν τὸ σίλφιον, καὶ τοῦ νομίσματος ἐπὶ μὲν θανέρον Ἀμμωνα, ἐπὶ δὲ θατέρου σίλφιον ἐτύπωσαν. οἱ δὲ ἐπὶ Λιβύης Ἀμπελιῶται εἰς Δελφοὺς ἀνέθεσαν καυλὸν σιλφίου.

T245 (Βρασίδης, ὁ Τέλλιδος): Λακεδαιμονίων στρατηγός, Μεθώνην ἀποστᾶσαν πρὸς Ἀθηναίους πολεμήσας ἀνεκαλέσατο. ἠρίστευσε θὲ καὶ περὶ Πύλον στρατηγῶν, ἐπὶ τοῦτοις σπονδαὶ ἐγένοντο ἐνιαύσιοι, ὥς Ἀθηναῖοι λβεῖν ἤρξαντο. περὶ δὲ Ἀμφίπολιν καὶ Θράκην εὐδοκιμοῦντα αὐτὸν οἰκιστὴν ἀντὶ Ἀγνώου ἐπεγράψαντο. ὁ δὲ πόλεμος ὁ μέχρι τῆς Βρασίδα καὶ Κλέωνος τελευταίης ἔτη ἐπέσχεν δέκα. ἐκλήθη δὲ Ἀρχιδάμιος.

T246 (Δᾶτις): Δᾶτις καὶ Ἀρταφέρνης, Περσῶν καθηγεμόνες μετὰ τὴν καθάρεισιν Μαρδωνίου ἀπέστειλαν εἰς τὴν

Ἑλλάδα, καταπειράσοντας τὰς πόλεις καὶ γῆν καὶ ὕδωρ αἰτή-
 σοντες. οἱ δὲ νησιῶται πάντες ἔδωκαν. Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ βαρέως
 ἐνεγκόντες τοὺς πρέσβευτὰς ἐξεκήρυκσαν.

T247 (Θερμοπύλαι): τόπος Ἀθήνησι οὕτω καλεόμενος
 ὑπὸ τῶν πλεόνων Ἑλλήνων, ὑπὸ δὲ τῶν ἐπιχωρίων περιοίκων
 Πύλαι.

T248 (Θηραμένης): Ἀθηναῖος, ῥήτωρ, μαθητὴς
 Προδίκου τοῦ Κεῖου· ὃς ἐπεκαλεῖτο Κόθορνος. μελέτας ῥητορι-
 κάς· καὶ ἄλλα τινά.

T249 (Θηραμένης): Κεῖος, σοφιστής.

T250 (Ἰππίας): οὗτος τῆς εἰς Ἀθηναίους ὀργῆς καὶ
 τῆς ὕστερον ὀμότητος προίσχετο αἰτίαν τὸν Ἰππαρχον φησὶ
 θάνατον. καὶ πικρὸς ἐκ τούτων δεσπότης κάτω τοῦ χρόνου γενό-
 μενος ὅμως οὐκ ἀπώνητο· ἤλασαν γοῦν οἱ Κεκροπίδαι αὐτόν. ὁ
 δὲ ἐκπεσὼν τῆς πατρίδος ἐπήγετο τοὺς Πέρσας συμμάχους....ἴων
 μὲν οὖν ὅδε Ἰππίας ἐπὶ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ πατρίδα σὺν τοῖς Πέρσαις
 καὶ ἐκπλήττων τοὺς βαρβάρους μέγα ἔπταρε....ἐπεὶ δὲ ἡττή-
 θησαν οἱ βάρβαροι, φεύγων αὐθις αἰς Αἴμνον ἀφικνεῖται καὶ
 κάμνει νόσφ....Ἀθηναίων στρατηγός. οὗτος Δαρεῖον παροξ-
 ύνας ἐπὶ τοὺς Ἀθηναίους στρατεῦσαι καὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα, διὰ
 Ἰνταφέρνους καὶ Δάτιδος σατραπῶν καὶ λ' μυριάδων στρατοῦ,
 καὶ αὐτὸς σὺν αὐτοῖς κατῆει γηραιὸς ἤδη ὢν. καὶ ἐλθόντες
 ἐσαγήνευσαν μὲν Ἑρέτριαν καὶ τοὺς ληφθέντας τῷ βασιλεῖ
 ἔστειλαν....ἐντεῦθεν ἐπὶ Μαραθῶνα ἦλθον. Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ ὑπὸ
 Μιλτιάδῃ στρατηγούμενοι τῷ Κίμωνος τοῖς βαρβάροις ἐπολέμ-

ησαν. ἀνάλουν δὲ ἐπὶ συμμαχίᾳ καὶ Λακεδαιμονίους διὰ Φιλίπ-
 πίδου τοῦ ἡμεροδρόμου, ὅς τοὺς χιλίους καὶ πεντακοσίους
 σταδίους ἤνυσε διὰ μιᾶς νυκτός. καὶ ὅτι ὁ νόμος οὐκ εἶα
 στρατεύειν αὐτοὺς πρὸ πανσελήνου, καὶ παρητήσαντο.... οἱ
 δὲ Ἀθηναῖοι, συμβουλευσάντος ἑνός, ἦσαν γὰρ δέκα, περι-
 μεῖναι τοὺς Λακεδαιμονίους, Μιλτιάδου δὲ παραινούντος ἐξ-
 ιέναι καὶ Καλλιμάχου, ἐξῆλθον αὐτοὶ μὲν ὄντες ἄθ, Πλαται-
 ῆας ἔχοντες, α. Καὶ ἐν αὐτῇ φασὶ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐνίκησαν. ἐν
 τούτοις Καλλίμαχος ἐπὶ δορπάτων εἰστήκει νεκρός, Πολύ-
 ζηλος δὲ πηρωθείς, ὡς φάσμα θεασάμενος τῷ πώγωνι κρύπτων
 τὴν ἀσπίδα...ἐμάχετο ὡς ὀρῶν, καὶ διέκρινε τῇ φωνῇ τοὺς
 ἰδίους καὶ τοὺς πολεμίους.

T251 (Πενέσται): οἱ παρὰ Θεσσαλῶν μὴ γόνυ
 δοῦλοι, ὑπὸ τῶν ὑπὸ Αἴμονος ἐν Ἄρυνι νικηθέντων Βοιωτῶν,
 οὐ φυγόντων τὴν παρ' αὐτῶν δουλείαν, ἀλλὰ μεινάντων μέχρι
 τῆς τρίτης γενεᾶς, φιληδοῦντων ἐπὶ τῇ χώρᾳ. παρέδοσαν δὲ
 αὐτοὺς ἐφ' ὅρκῳ, ἐπὶ τῷ μήτε παθεῖν τι ἐργαζόμενοι, μήτε
 ἐκβῆναι ἀπὸ τῆς χώρας. καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ μεῖναι Μενέσται καλού-
 μενοι ὕστερον Πενέσται μετωνομάσθησαν, παραφθαρέντος τοῦ
 χαρακτήρος. οὓς ἐν Λακεδαίμονι καλοῦσιν Εἴλωτας, τούτους
 Θετταλοὶ Πενέστας λέγουσι. χρῶνται δὲ τῷ ὀνόματι καὶ
 Θετταλοὶ καὶ Λακεδαιμόνιοι ἐπὶ τῶν κρατηθέντων ἐν τῷ πολ-
 ἔμῳ καὶ δουλευόντων τοῖς κερρατηκόσι.

T252 (Εὐθύνας): ὅψι τῆς ἐλεφαντίνης Ἀθηνᾶς, ἣν Φειδίᾱς ἐποίησεν, ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀναλώμασι ταχθεῖς ὁ Περικλῆς καὶ νοσοφισάμενος ν' τάλαντα, ἵνα μὴ δῶ τὰς εὐθύνας, τὸν πόλεμον ἐκίνησεν.

SCHOLIA TO THEOKRITOS

T253 (Idyll., 16, 35): πενέσται, θεόπομπός φησι τοὺς δουλεύοντας τῶν ἐλευθέρων Πενέστας καλεῖσθαι παρὰ Θεσσαλοῖς, ὡς παρὰ Λακεδαιμονίοις Εἴλωτας. — ... ἤγουν τροφήν 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 Lacedaimoniam classem deleuerant, tristem sententiam tulerat. forte tunc eius potestatis Socrates, cuius arbitrio plebei scita ordinarentur, indignum iudicans 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 Themistocles, qui maximarum rerum cura districtus, omnium tamen civium suorum nomina memoria comprehendit per summamque iniquitatem patria pulsus et ad Xerxem, quem paulo ante devicerat, confugere coactus,*

prius 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 (Georg., 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): Λιμῶ Μηλίῳ, παροιμία· ἐπεὶ Ἀθηναῖοι ἐκάκωσαν Μηλίους πολιορκοῦντες ἐν λιμῶ, ὡς Θουκυδίδης ἐν τῇ Ε΄.

T258 (V, 80, Gaisford): Πάλαι ποτ' ἦσαν ἄλκιμοι Μιλήσιοι, φασὶ τοὺς Κῆρας πολεμουμένους ὑπὸ Δαρείου τοῦ Πέρσου, κατὰ τινα παλαιὰν μαντείαν εἰρημένην αὐτοῖς τοὺς ἄλκιμωτάτους προσθέσθαι συμμάχους, ἐλθεῖν εἰς Βραγχίδας, καὶ τὸν ἐκεῖ θεὸν ἐρωτῆσαι, εἰ Μιλησίους πρόσθοιεντο συμμάχους· τὸν δὲ ἀποκρίνασθαι,

πάλαι ποτ' ἦσαν ἄλκιμοι Μιλήσιοι.

οὗτος δὲ στίχος εἴρηται τὸ πρότερον παρὰ Ἀνακρέοντι, ὃς ἤκμασε μάλιστα κατὰ Κῦρον τὸν Πέρσην. τρίτος δὲ ἐστὶν ἀπὸ Κῦρον Δαρεῖος.

APPENDIX 2

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.¹ 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.²

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 ἐναγείς by other writers, ἀλιτήριοι 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 moneys of Athene; schol. Pax, 681(above, p. 224) explains, in terms that both paraphrase and copy Thucydides, the reason for Hyperbolos' ostracism.

or ὡς θούρυδιόν (sometimes to support other accounts³, twice to refute some other version⁴). Once, in a note without citation, the scholiasts prefer a version other than Thucydides'.⁵ In several scholia Thucydides alone is cited without reference to other versions.⁶

3

E.g., schol. Ranae, 541 (above, pp. 251-252); schol. Vespae, 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. Pax, 990 (Thucydides II, 19, 2; 20, 1-5 and 21, 2); schol. Pax, 270 (Thucydides, V, 16, 1); schol. Pax, 242 (Thucydides, VII, 18 and VIII, 95); schol. Ranae, 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. Pax, 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 Pax, 212 uses Thucydides' opening phrase (I, 1, 1) to prove that the historian blamed the Peloponnesians for starting the war. Schol. Acharnenses, 1 compares the introduction of Thucydides' history (I, 1, 2) to the beginning of Acharnenses 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. Nubes, 984 in V (pp. 69-70 above)

I, 63

omittit

διὰ τὸ ἀβροδίαιτον

ἐν ἔρσει

ἐνερσει

κρωβύλων

κρώβυλον

The omission is perhaps due to careless transcription. ἐν ἔρσει or ἐνερσει 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 ἔρσει; according to Powell, in the Praefatio of the Oxford text of Thucydides (p. iii): lectiō codicum CGM fere semper praestet...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.
 κρωβύλων 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

Μεγάβυζος

πολλῆς στρατιᾶς

στρατιᾶς πολλῆς

ἤλασε

ἐξήλασε

Both Megabazos and Megabyzos were Persians, active at the
 time of the Egyptian revolt, and their names were so simi-
 lar 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. 1178-1179 above)

II, 23, 3

ναῦς νζ'

ἑπτὰ καὶ τεσσαρά-

κοντα ναῦς

No conclusion can be drawn from errors in numbers.

Schol. Plutus, 1193 in R and V

II, 13, 3

(pp. 182-183 above)

αἰεὶ πότε

ἔτι τότε

περιεγένετο

μύρια ἐγένετο

ἐπανηλώθη

ἀπανηλώθη

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 Meritt, 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. Pax, 479 in V (pp. 212-213 above)

V, 15

μὲν οὐπω θέλοντες ἐξυφαιρου-
μένοις

οὐπως ἤθελον, εὖ
φερόμενοι

The scholiasts' reading οὐπω is contained also in codices Monacensis (G) and Palatinus (E) of Thucydides. The meaningless ἐξυφαιρομένοις 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

ἕως ὅτε

ὥς ἔτι

ἕως is used interchangeably with ὥς in late Greek; ἕως 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 Thucydides, or, again, a scribe who copied mechanically.

Schol. Equites, 793 in R and V (p. 176)

V, 16

ἐπειδὴ καὶ

ἐπειδὴ δὲ καὶ

ἐγένετο

ἐγγένητο

τεθνήκει

ἐτεθνήκει

ἀμφοτέροι

ἀμφοτέρωθεν

εὐτυχίας

ἡσυχίας

τε νομίζων εἶναι

νομίζων ἂν εἶναι

ἀξιοπιστότερος

ἀπιστότερος

Most of the variants are mere errors: omission of δὲ, use of the more familiar ἐγένετο (by lectio facillior), omission of the augment, use of the familiar ἀμφοτέροι with a resulting slight change in the meaning of the passage; εὐτυχίας is probably a transfer from εὐτυχεῖν a few words earlier in the line; ἂν may have been omitted because of similarity of

ending in νομίζων ἄν; ἀξιοπιστότερος ("plausible") does not fit the context of the passage. Again the fault is apparently scribal.

Schol. Pax, 450 in V (p. 232 above)

VI, 12

ἐκπλεῖν ὑμῖν

ὑμῖν ἐκπλεῖν

ταύτου μόλις

τὸ ἐαυτοῦ μόνον

ἔτι ὦν

ὦν ἔτι

διὰ πολυτέλειαν

διὰ δὲ πολυτέλειαν

ὠφεληθῇ

ὠφεληθῇ τι

ἀρχῆς δὲ

ἀρχῆς μηδέ

παράσχητε

ἐμπαράσχητε

ἀπολαμπρύνεσθαι

ἐλλαμπρύνεσθαι

ἔτι ὦν is also in codices ABEF of Thucydides. Omission and error may account for διὰ πολυτέλειαν, ἐκπλεῖν ὑμῖν, ὠφεληθῇ, ἀρχῆς δὲ, παρὰσχητε. μόλις is meaningless here; ἀπολαμπρύνεσθαι ("to become famous") for ἐλλαμπρύνεσθαι ("to be splendid", "to boast oneself") is an easy mistake.

Schol. Pax, 450 in V (p. 232)

VI, 16

προσῆκον

προσῆκει

μᾶλλον...ἐτέρων

μᾶλλον ἐτέρων

ἄξιος

ἄξιος ἅμα

προσῆκον may be a misreading with resultant change of the passage copied. The omission of ἅμα is careless. Perhaps the copyist inserted ἐτέρων haphazardly when he found that

it had been omitted.

Schol. Plutus, 469 in V

III, 3, 3

καὶ εἰ μὲν

καὶ ἦν μὲν

This may be a "correction."

Schol. Acharnenses, 1 in V

I, 1, 2

αὕτη δὴ μεγίστη

αὕτη μεγίστη δὴ

The displacement stems from the homoeteleuton.

Schol. Acharnenses, 394 in V

I, 79, 2

πολεμητέα τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις
εἶναι

τοὺς Ἀθηναίους ἤδη
καὶ πολεμητέα εἶναι ἐν
τάχει

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 iudice.

INDICES

1. Index of Scholia Cited
2. Index of Proper Names

INDEX OF SCHOLIA CITED

(This index lists all scholia treated in this study. The entry Acharnenses, 701: 13, 52, 74-76 means that schol. Acharnenses, 701, is discussed on pp. 13, 52, 74-76.)

Acharnenses

1: 355, 360
 6: 197, 274, 278
 8: 198, 274
 10: 136-137
 11: 253-254
 12: 353
 67: 190
 84: 89-90, 91, 279
 140: 253-254
 145: 177-178, 276, 354
 146: 64-69, 86, 281
 234: 77
 270: 236, 354
 378: 181-182, 190, 283
 394: 360
 504: 182
 510: 132-133, 301
 524: 160-161
 527-528: 150, 160, 162
 532: 161, 166, 279

548: 145
 624: 162
 654: 9
 846: 226, 227, 278
 1150: 191, 274, 282-283
 1158: 235
 1297: 191

Equites

7: 209, 274
 22: 14
 44: 196
 51: 202
 55: 95-97, 208-209, 280
 84: 111-113, 116, 117, 120, 279, 281, 283, 354
 132: 193
 226: 196-197
 237-238: 140-141, 280, 282
 247: 197
 248: 196
 255: 202

262:	177, 196, 274	781:	90, 91
313:	200	785:	99-100, 279
331:	195, 202, 275	786:	80
358:	202-203, 278	792:	176
361:	200	793:	176, 214, 276, 358
392:	209	794:	214, 216
411:	212	814:	103-104, 278
238:	199-200, 275, 279	815:	104-105, 109
445:	71-74, 276, 353	816:	105
449:	75-76, 79, 80, 280	819:	110
469:	209, 211	830:	215
487:	14	886:	98, 105, 274
562:	179, 280, 356	963:	17
563:	179, 180, 275	969:	150, 151-152, 173-174
580:	14	996:	196
609:	203-204	1034:	200, 226
624:	196	1040:	98-99
630:	197, 274	1056:	209, 279
660:	93-94, 278	1066:	209
668:	209, 214	1129:	17
692:	196	1150:	14, 17
703:	209	1185:	14
739:	193-194, 226-227	1220:	17,
742:	209	1225:	212
762:	353	1256:	17
765:	193-194	1331:	70
766:	212	1362:	87, 279

Vespa

41: 212, 278-279
 88: 201-202, 279
 157: 8, 253, 279
 204: 199
 210: 218
 213: 8
 217: 138
 234: 14
 240: 11
 241: 199, 275
 242: 202
 283: 153-155
 300: 202
 352: 10
 502: 78-80, 81, 83, 277,
 278, 280-282, 284
 544: 9
 604: 8
 610: 14
 672: 10
 675: 8
 715: 139
 718: 146-147, 281
 722: 8
 804: 8
 884: 10

947: 113-114, 142-143,
 277, 280, 281-282

968: 9

1007: 225-226, 228, 229

1223: 74-75

1238: 10

1271: 49-52, 281

1272-1273: 49-52, 281

1282: 15

Nubes

6: 244-245

23: 2265-2266, 2282

133: 52-55, 281

186: 210, 2279

213: 137-138, 274

304: 100, 278

332: 148-149, 278

361: 251

541: 14

553: 228

554: 225

558: 228, 281

559: 228

581: 217

591: 227-228, 281

624: 227

710: 204
 859: 155-156, 157, 164,
 278
 967: 8
 984: 69-70, 355
 986: 90, 91, 280
 1007: 8
 1065: 226
 1150: 8

Pax

48: 219
 62: 14
 70: 14
 107: 173
 153: 14
 171: 187-188, 283
 211: 214
 212: 355
 214: 215-216
 219: 209
 242: 354
 246: 159, 161, 281, 282
 270: 354
 282: 181, 219, 275, 278,
 354

283: 219
 284: 219
 289: 88-89, 90, 91, 278
 344: 8
 347: 178-179, 277, 280
 363: 9, 14
 415: 14
 435: 172
 450: 232, 276, 359-360,
 451: 238
 466: 220
 475-476: 221
 477: 221-222, 278
 479: 212-213, 276, 357,
 358
 481: 205
 482: 282, 354
 483: 166, 205
 502: 160, 162
 605: 163-164, 282
 606: 164
 609: 160, 162
 638: 214
 681: 2224-225, 229, 353
 692: 224, 226

758: 9
 778: 14
 890: 65
 925: 14
 1039: 24
 1060: 8
 1126: 8, 14
 1150: 14
 1165: 8
 1353: 15

Aves

13: 278
 126: 265
 147: 235, 279, 354
 158: 187, 189
 186: 230, 354
 283: 9
 348: 11
 436: 8
 484: 127, 129, 130, 274,
 356
 521: 149
 530: 8, 17
 556: 9, 134-136, 277,
 354
 557: 11
 766: 233-234, 282-283

877: 12, 14
 880: 277-278, 185-186
 933: 8
 997: 8
 1057-1058: 38
 1075: 9
 1101-1127: 38
 1204: 235:
 1242: 9, 14
 1297: 9
 1337: 8
 1342: 8
 1378: 8
 1403: 9
 1422: 188-189
 1541: 11
 1569: 11, 354
 1620: 8

Lysistrata

151: 275
 173: 184, 353
 273: 85-86
 285: 92-93, 95
 313: 242-243, 277, 280
 421: 238
 490: 253
 619: 78-79, 81-82, 277, 354

632: 80, 81
 651-653: 109-110
 653: 279
 665: 81-82
 671: 101-102
 675: 280
 801: 131-132, 282
 804: 179, 279
 1094: 233, 234, 354
 1137: 124, 126,
 1138: 122-123, 126
 1141: 124, 275
 1142-1144: 124, 125
 1152: 84-85
 1153: 83-84, 278
 1251: 97-98, 275

Thesmophoriazusae

170: 253-254
 840: 14, 225, 236, 281
 841: 236, 237
 1175: 14

Ranae

33: 244
 47: 252, 256, 278
 55: 11
 78: 11
 92: 8

153: 8
 184: 11
 191: 246
 204: 235
 222: 14
 223: 11
 270: 8
 294: 10
 308: 11
 341: 251-252, 253, 256
 357: 14
 367: 262-263, 278
 420: 14
 501: 14
 520: 12
 541: 354
 567: 8
 569: 228-229
 574: 87
 588: 8
 611: 11
 688: 243, 246-247
 694: 8, 244
 790-791: 8
 791: 14
 826-828: 8, 14
 849: 11, 14
 926: 14

963: 14
 770: 11
 990: 11
 1028: 10
 1124: 14
 1196: 11, 247, 249
 1248: 9
 1270: 11, 14

1276: 11

1282: 11

1284: 11

1294: 14

1264: 14

1265: 14

1331: 11

1338: 14

1344: 11

1422: 239, 240-241, 242,
 279

1427: 239-241

1437: 14

1437-1441: 9

1465: 175

1563: 174-175

Ecclesiastusae

102: 262, 275

193: 258-259, 280

203: 257, 258

303: 132, 282

356: 258

Plutus

72: 353

103: 14

173: 260-261, 275, 277, 281

176: 262

178: 127, 128, 129, 147,
 280

179: 8

180: 264

385: 8, 9

431: 87-88, 281

445: 353

469: 360

550: 254-255, 279

604: 53

718: 8

925: 55-60

1002: 61-64, 278, 282

1037: 9, 225

1111: 8

1146: 250, 254, 256, 257, 282

1193: 182-183, 185, 357, 360,
 361

INDEX 2

INDEX OF PROPER NAMES

(This index lists all persons and places to which reference is made in this work.)

Achaimenes, 129
Acharnenses, 25, 27, 30, 37
Adcock (in C.A.H.), 169
Agyrrios, 262-263
Aigospotamoi, 242, 250, 258
Ailian, 93-94, 110, 128, 133, 139, 161, 196, 226
Aischines, 108, 110, 138, 161, 183, 201,
Aischines, Scholia to, 256, 257
Aischylos, 136-137
Akropolis, 71, 84-86, 155-156, 183
Aldine edition of Aristophanes, 3, 21, 44
Aldus, 272
Alexander the Great, 265-266
Alexandria, 7, 8, 10, 13, 16
Alkibiades, 161, 165, 228, 231, 232-233, 235, 238-242, 243,
248, 254
Alkiphron, 151
Alkmaionidai, 82-83, 84, 85, 132
Allen, 25-26
Amasis, 130, 147
Ambrakia, 63

- Ambrosianus, Codex (Am), 27-28, 44
- Ambrosianus, Codex (M), 28-29, 30, 32-33, 37, 40-42, 44, 46,
47
- Ameinias (archon 423/2), 49
- Ammonios, 7, 9-10
- Amphipolis, 181, 214, 219
- Anarrusis, 65-67
- Anaxagoras, 152
- Anchimolios, 83-84
- Andokides, 77, 106, 108, 138, 161, 183, 201, 206, 225, 234,
237, 258, 259,
- Andokides, Scholia to, 220
- [Andokides], 110, 201, 231, 234
- Andropompos, 67-68
- Androtion, 77, 143, 179, 223, 226, 228, 261
- Anecdota (Bekker), 66-67, 88, 167, 253
- Anthemokritos, 166-167, 168
- Antigenes (archon 407/6), 239, 241, 244
- Antimachos, 191-192, 193
- Antiochos, 239, 241
- Antiphanes, 226
- Apatouria, 64-69
- Apion, 13, 16
- Apollodoros of Tarsos, 11, 12
- Apollodoros, 165-166
- Apollonios Dyskolos, 7, 12, 14

- Apollonios Rhodios, 7
 Apollonios Rhodios, Scholia to, 59, 133
 Apollonios, Son of Chairis, 10
 Apostolis, 53, 82, 110, 145, 227
 Apuleius, 133
 Archedemides (archon 464/3), 133
 Archemachos, 50-52
 Archeptolemos, 216-217
 Archidamos (of Sparta), 125
 Archinos, 262-263
 Arginousai, 244-251, 256, 258
 Arginousai, Generals at, 247-249
 Argos, 113, 220-223, 259
 Aristarchos, 7, 9, 11, 246
 Aristekides, 109-110
 Aristides, Aelius, 101, 143, 151, 173
 Aristides, Scholia to, 101, 143, 151, 173
 Aristodemos, 101-102, 106, 108, 111, 113, 115, 116-117,
 119, 128, 135, 155, 162, 165
 Aristogeiton, 80-81
 Aristokrates, 265
 Ariston (archon 421/0)
 Aristophanes, 1, 2, 6, 10, 12-13, 15, 18, 19, 22, 26, 33,
 37, 39, 43, 49, 74, 82, 85, 87, 95, 96, 98, 101, 107,
 109, 120, 121, 123, 125, 129, 130-131, 137, 157, 162,
 167, 168, 171, 173, 181, 189, 190, 192-193, 195, 196,

- 207, 212, 215, 222, 224, 226-227, 229, 236, 248, 258,
263, 265, 267, 273, 274, 276, 282, 284, 361
- Aristoteles of Thera, 56-60
- Aristotle, 37, 50, 52, 56, 67, 73, 74-77, 78, 79, 82-83,
84, 85, 86, 105, 120, 123-124, 143, 145, 176, 186,
196, 198, 202-203, 229, 231, 238, 240, 243, 253, 256,
277, 278
- Arkesilaos of Kyrene, 58
- Arne (Arnaia), 50, 53-55
- Arrian, 81, 266
- Artaphernes, 88-89, 90 (Artabazos)
- Artaxerxes, 111-113, 114-117, 118, 128-129, 174
- Artemisia, 101-103
- Artemision, 95, 97
- Artemon, 154
- Asklepiades of Myrleia, 11
- Aspasia, 150-154, 160, 169, 193-194, 275
- Astyochos, 243
- Atheniaos, 13, 17, 70, 81, 116, 150, 151, 162, 250, 252
- Athene Parthenos, 155-156, 162-166
- Athene Polias, 71, 73
- Athenian Tribute Lists (Meritt, Wade-Gery, McGregor), 109,
110, 116, 121, 124-125, 133, 138, 139, 140, 141-142,
117, 182, 184-185, 189, 201, 230
- Athens, 2, 65-66, 67-69, 69-70, 71-72, 76, 84, 86, 87, 89,
90, 91, 97, 98, 101, 103-104, 106, 108, 112-113, 117,

120-121, 122, 123, 124, 125-126, 127-131, 132, 134-
 136, 136-142, 146-147, 148, 151-154, 155-157, 159,
 163-164, 166-167, 168, 172, 175-176, 179, 181-182,
 185-188, 189, 192, 195-196, 204-206, 207, 208-210,
 213-216, 218, 220-224, 227, 229, 230-232, 234-235,
 237, 239-240, 241, 243, 244-245, 246-247, 249, 253,
 255, 257-261, 262, 264

Aubretton, 20, 43

Augustus, 12

Aves, 27-31, 47

Bachmann, 4

van Bamberg, 41

Battos of Kyrene, 55-60

Bekker, 25

Bessarion, Cardinal, 25

Blegen, 55

Boiotia, 50-55, 65, 67, 69, 86, 132, 134-136, 220-221, 222,
 256, 259

Bongiovanni, 25

Boudreaux, 7, 9, 10, 11, 13, 15, 17, 48, 270-271

Boukephalos, 265-266

Bradeen, 141

Brasidas, 142, 181, 207, 208-209, 213-215, 216-220

Broholm, 60

Brunck, Edition of Aristophanes, 46

Buenger, 42

Byzantion, 19, 29, 31-36, 42-45, 167, 187

Carthage, 227

Cary, 41

Cassius Dio, 189

Cauer, 54

Chabrias, 261-262

Chairis, 7, 9

Chalkidike, 140-142

Chalkis, 137-142, 158

Charinos, 166, 168, 169

Chersonese, 177

Chios, 154, 185-188, 252, 254

Cicero, 247

Coislinianus, Codex, 36, 45

Comparetti, 39

Cook, 130

Cornford, 168

Coulon, 29

Cremonensis, Codex 12229 L 6 28, 36-37

Dareios, 62, 87, 88, 89, 90, 127, 129-130

Datis, 88-89, 90, 91

Dekeleia, 238-240

Delos, 109, 121, 123, 183

Delphoi, 56-60, 84, 134-136

- Demetrios Ixion, 11
- Demetrios of Phaleron, 199
- Demon, 61-64
- Demosthenes, 105, 114, 182, 185, 203, 257, 260-261, 263, 265,
- Demosthenes, Scholia to, 183, 265
- [Demosthenes], 168
- Demosthenes (Athenian General), 208-209, 211, 212
- Diasia, 69, 71, 73-74
- Didymos, 12-13, 16, 17, 18
- Dieterich, 137
- Diipoleia, 69, 74
- Dinarchus, 105, 110
- Dindorf, Edition of the Scholia to Aristophanes, 46-47
- Diodoros, 58, 63-64, 90-91, 94, 97, 99, 101, 106, 110-111,
 113-115, 118-119, 122, 125, 126, 128, 132, 138, 149,
 154, 158-159, 161, 165, 174, 176-177, 180, 205, 207,
 211, 217-220, 222-223, 231, 233, 237, 240, 241, 245,
 249, 255-257.
- Diodoros the Periegete, 120-121
- Diodotos, 198
- Dionysios of Halikarnassos, 51
- Dobree, Edition of Aristophanes, 46
- Dorians in Aiolic Greece, 53-54
- Dorpeia, 65-67
- Douris of Samos, 155
- Drakontides, 253

- Ecclesiastusae, 25, 30, 248
 Egesta, 232
 Egypt, 127-131, 146, 147
 Eleusis, 85-86, 166
 Elis, 163-164, 220-223
 Epeiros, 54
 Ephesos, 102-103
 Ephialtes, 95-96
 Ephoros, 114, 155-157, 165
Equites, 27-28, 30, 48, 227, 229
 Eratosthenes, 7, 53, 78, 134, 219
 Eretria, 137-138, 139, 140-142
 Estensis, Codex III D 8, 44
Etymologicum Magnum, 17-18, 235
 Eubolia, 97, 137-142, 168, ~~231~~, 240
 Eukleides (archon 404/3), 141, 263
 Eukles (archon 427/6), 142, 199
 Euphronios, 7-9, 28
 Eupolis, 156, 178-180, 186, 201, 225-229
 Euripides, 239
 Eusebios, 68

 Fraenkel, 93

 Gardner, 117, 155
 Giuntine Edition of Aristophanes, 45, 272

Gomme, 54, 70, 108-109, 132, 139, 144-145, 155, 167-168,
172, 285

Grain Market in Peiraeus, 145-146

Grenfell, 37-38

Grin(n)os of Thera, 57-58

Gudeman, 17

Halikarnassos, 102

Hammond, 54

Harmodios, 80-82

Harpokration, 72, 88, 96, 145, 150, 162, 183, 194, 236, 245,
254, 257, 261, 266

Head, 117

Hegesistratos, 79

Heliodoros, 15

Hellanikos, 244

Helots, 50-51, 81, 124, 225, 126, 132

Hense, 15

Hephaisteion, 15, 33

Herakleides Pontikos, 70, 83

Hermai, 233-234

Hermippos, 220, 228

Herodian, 12, 14, 16

Herodotos, 54, 55, 57, 59, 60, 62-64, 66-67, 69, 72-79, 82-
83, 84, 85, 86, 88, 91, 92-94, 96-97, 99, 100-102, 110,
116, 122, 128, 129-131, 141, 173, 231

Hestiaia, 97, 137, 139

Hesychios, 13, 51, 59, 60, 66, 74, 81, 114, 117, 119, 133,
149, 231, 236

Hill, 133, 144

Hipparchos, 75-81

Hippias, 75-85

Hippodamos, 146

Hippokrates, 189

Holzinger, 20, 21, 44

Hopfner, 20, 43

Housman, 24

How, 72, 95, 130

Hunt, 37-38

Hyperbolos, 223-229, 232, 275

Hyperides, 186

Hypomnemata, 9

van Ijzeren, 22

Inaros, 127-131

Inscriptions, 93, 139, 145-146, 184, 188, 263

Invernizi, 24

Iophon, 79

Iphikrates, 260-262

Irenaios, 17

Isagoras, 86

Isokrates, 91, 93, 97, 105-106, 122, 128, 158, 231, 251-252,
257

Ithome, 125-126, 128, 133

Justin, 58, 91, 92, 94, 99, 101, 102, 106, 128, 241, 256,
257

Kaerst, 54

Kallias (general at Poteidaia), 158

Kallias, Decrees of, 183-184

Kallikratidas, 247

Kallimachos (polemarch at Marathon), 93-95

Kallimachos, Scholia to, 58

Kallistratos, 7-9, 239, 253

Karia, 61-64

Kelainai (deme), 65, 67-69

Keos, 252

Kimon, 124-125, 132, 142

Kirchner, 144, 258

Kleainetos, 196

Kleinias, Decree of, 182

Kleisthenes of Athens, 86

Kleisthenes of Sikyon, 81

Kleistodemos, 76

Kleomenes, 69, 74, 84-85, 86

Kleon, 143, 190, 192, 193, 195-202, 208-220, 223, 224, 227,
229, 232, 275

Kleonymos, 192

Kodros, 67-68

Körte, 37

- Konon, 249, 261-262, 264-265
 Korinth, 86, 157, 167, 168, 174, 187, 203-205, 220-221, 222,
 223, 234, 256, 259, 260-261, 262
 Koster, 20, 32, 36
 Koureotis, 65-67
 Krateros, 86, 152, 243
 Krates of Athens, 10
 Krates of Mallos, 10, 11
 Kratinos, 150, 224, 227
 Kritias, 250, 251, 256-257
 Ktesias, 129
 Küster, Edition of Aristophanes, 45
 Kylon, 71-74
 Kyrene, 55-60
 Kyros, 174

 Labraunda, 62-64
 Laches, 199, 210, 223
 Lakedaimon, 79, 89, 92, 95, 103-104, 112, 122, 124, 126,
 132-134, 134-136, 155-156, 159, 162-163, 172, 178-179,
 198, 202, 207, 208-209, 210-211, 212-214, 216-217, 219,
 220, 222, 224, 238, 239-240, 243, 245, 246-247, 255,
 258, 259-262
 Lamachos, 233-234, 236-237
 Lampon, 148-150
 Lampsakos, 112-113, 116-117
 Laurentainus, Codex (Γ), 29-32, 42-44, 46

Laurentianus, Codex (Θ), 31-32, 40-44, 46
 van Leeuwen, 23
 Leidensis Vossianus, Codex, 30-31
 Leipsydrion, 77, 82-83
 Leonidas, 95-97
 Lesbos, 186, 198, 200, 244, 263-263
 Libanius, 265
 Libya, 55, 57-60
 Lippold, 54
 Lokris, 135
 Long Walls, 105, 107-109, 176, 250
 Lucan, Scholia to, 133-134
 Lucian, 151
 Lucian, Scholia to, 183, 198, 200, 217, 219
 Lydia, 174
 Lykophron, 7, 28
 Lykourgos, 74
 Lysandros, 174, 241, 249-250
 Lysias, 91, 105, 108, 177, 192, 203, 238, 240, 253, 254,
 259, 264-265
 Lysikles, 193-194, 226
 Lysimachides(archon 445/4), 146-147
Lysistrata, 24, 25, 29, 30, 38, 44, 45, 248

 Magister, Thomas, 20-21, 27, 31, 33-36, 43, 44, 45, 48
 Magnesia, 111-113, 118-119
 Magnesia (in Persia), 112-113, 116-117
 Naxos, 95-96, 107, 101

Makedon, 95-96, 138, 141
 Mantinea, 221-222
 Marathon, 88-89, 90-95
 Marathon, Tetrapolis of, 92-93, 95
 Marmor Parium, 53
 Martin, 23-24
 Martinus, Cyrillus, 23
 Megabazos, 127-128, 129-131
 Megabyzos, 130-131
 Megakles, 71-74, 76, 83
 Megara, 153-170, 204-205, 206-207, 220
 Meiners, 3-4, 259
 Mela, Pomponius, 133
 Melanthos, 65, 67-69
 Melesippos (of Sparta), 172-173
 Melos, 230-231
 Memphis, 127, 130-131
 Mende, 142
 Meritt, 201 (see also Athenian Tribute Lists)
 Meyer, 60
 Miletos, 61-64, 153-155, 200
 Miltiades, 90-91, 94-95
 Morychides, 190-192
 Moschopoulos, Manuel, 20, 34, 37, 43
 Musurus, Marcus, 44, 272
 Myous, 112-113, 116-117

Myres, 54

Myronides, 131-132

Myrrhine, 75-76

Mytilene, 154, 187, 198, 215, 245

McGregor (see Athenian Tribute Lists)

Nepos, 91-92, 94, 99, 106, 111, 113, 115, 116-117, 119-120,
122, 240, 241, 242, 255, 256-257

Nicole, 165-166

Nikias, 169, 202-204, 205, 206, 212, 220, 223, 228, 230,
232-233

Nikostratos, 223

Novati, 18, 36, 37

Nubes, 27-29, 31, 34-36, 48

Oinophyta, 132

Olympia, 71, 162-166

Pagasetic Gulf, 52-55

Palaiskepsos, 112, 116-117

Palamedes, 17

Pallene (deme), 77

Papyri, 37-39

Paralos, 235-236

Parisinus, Codex (A), 27-29, 30, 32-33, 37, 40-42, 43, 47

Parisinus, Codex (F), 34

- Parisinus Q Regius, Codex, 34-36
 Parisinus, Codex, Supplementum, 32-33
 Pasquali, 41
 Pausanias (of Sparta), 112-114
 Pausanias, 60, 67-68, 73, 86, 92, 93, 97, 102, 106, 110,
 120-121, 125, 132-133, 141, 166-167, 255
Pax, 30, 229
 Peiraeus, 104-105, 106-108, 120, 145-146, 148, 250, 255-256
 Peisandros, 238, 241, 243
 Peisias, 233-234
 Peisistratos, 74-77, 152
 Peisistratos, Sons of, 75-86
 Peloponnesian War, First, 131-134
 Penestai, 49-52
 Pergamon, 10-12, 16
 Perikles, 107-108, 132, 137-138, 140, 142-145, 146-148, 150-
 157, 159-170, 174-175, 176, 194-195, 202-203, 220
 Perkote, 112, 116-117
 Persia, 61-64, 88, 92, 95-96, 111-118, 127-131, 148, 153-155,
 173-174
 Phaeinos, 17
 Phantias of Eresos, 117
 Pheidias, 152, 162-166
 Pherekrates, 156, 222
 Philochoros, 122-123, 125, 134-136, 137, 146-148, 163-164,
 184, 199, 213, 218, 221, 228, 233, 234, 247, 250, 259,
 261.

Philokrates, 50
 Philostratos, 136-137
 Phokis, 134-136
 Phormio, 158, 178-180, 212
 Photios, 13, 96, 101, 146, 149, 183, 236
 Phrynichos, 191-192, 242-244
 Phya, 76
 Phylai, 254-256
 Pieske, 136
 Pindar, 56-57, 59-60, 133
 Pindar, Scholia to, 133-134
 Plataia, 91-92, 124, 172, 174, 244
 Platia, 57
 Plato, 50, 92, 253
 Plato, Scholia to, 66-67
 [Plato], 150
 Plato Comicus, 226, 228, 263
 Platonios, 33
 Pliny the Elder, 245
 Plutarch, 73-75, 88, 91, 95, 97-98, 99, 101, 106-108, 110,
 113-117, 119, 120-122, 125, 132, 135, 138, 143, 144,
 147-148, 149-152, 156, 161, 162, 165-166, 168-169, 173-
 174, 176, 192, 194, 202-203, 205-206, 211, 220-221, 228,
 231, 233, 234, 235, 237, 240-242, 247, 249, 252, 264-
 265, 266
 [Plutarch], 92-93, 97, 102, 159, 162, 234, 253, 265
Plutus, 27-28, 31-32, 34, 36, 43, 248

- Pollux, 81, 253
 Polyainos, 67, 99, 101, 107, 116, 204
 Polykrates, 61, 63
 Polystratos, 260-262
 Polyzelos, 226
 Porphyrogennitos, Konstantinos, 19
 Porter, 126
 Poteidaia, 157-158, 183, 199-200
 Priscian, 14
 Prodikos, 251-252
 Psammetichos, 146-147
 Pylos, 95-96, 181, 205, 209, 210, 211-212, 214
 Pythodoros, 199, 250

 Quain, 1
 Quintilian, 137
 Quintus Curtius Rufus, 266

 Radin, 193
 Raubitschek, 139
 Ravennas, Codex, 23-25, 27, 29, 30-33, 37-39, 40-42, 44-47,
 105, 109, 129, 184, 185, 213, 242, Appendix 2 passim
 Renkema, 267
 Rhodes, 187
 Rome, 12
 Rupprecht, 53
 Rutherford, 12, 47-48, 268-270

Sacred War (449-447 B.C.), 134-136
 Sadokos, 177-178
 Salaminia, 235-238
 Salamis, 95, 98-102, 115
 Samos, 152-155, 167, 186, 188-189, 192, 224, 226, 228-229,
 235, 243, 250
 Sannyrios, 263
 Satyros, 143
 Schauenberg, 13
 Schnee, 13, 16, 18, 41-42
 Schneider, 13
 Seleukos, 14, 16
 Shear, 226
 Sicily, 193, 199, 208, 232-233, 235, 237-238
 Sikyon, 260-262
 Sitalkes, 177-178
 Skellios, Son of, 39
 Skione, 142, 158, 218
 Sokrates, 249, 256
 Sophokles, 199, 238
 Sparta, 50, 83-84, 91-92, 95-96, 105, 106, 107-108, 114, 118-
 119, 123-126, 131-134, 173-174, 176, 211-212, 216, 220,
 222-223, 231, 238, 240, 249, 257, 259
 Sphakteria, 126, 186, 208-209, 210, 212-213, 216
 Starkie, 167, 189, 193-194, 198
 Stephanos of Byzantion, 95, 97, 101
 Strabo, 63-64, 92, 94, 95, 116, 133-134, 149, 231, 245, 266

Stratokles, 217-218
 Suetonius, 14
 Suidas, 13, 19, 39-40, 44, 47, 51-52, 54, 59-60, 66, 74, 88,
 90-92, 94, 96, 99, 101, 117, 119, 133, 135, 151-152, 166,
 169, 219, 252
 Symmachos, 16-17, 37, 113, 120
 Syrakosios, 191-193

 Tainaron, 132-134
 Tanagra, 126
 Tegea, 222
 Telephos of Pergamon, 17
 Thasos, 123-124
 Theagenes of Megara, 71
 Themistokles, 98-101, 103-108, 110-121, 198
 ,Themistokles,, 117
 Theodoros, 164
 Theognis, 253-254
 Theokritos, Scholia to, 58
 Theophrastos, 156-157
 Theopompos, 134, 138, 141, 143, 186, 196-198, 225
 Thera, 55-60
 Theramenes, 39, 248, 252-252, 253, 256
 Thermopylai, 95-97
Thesmophoriazusae, 25, 45, 248
 Thessaly, 50-52, 52-55, 84-85, 95-96, 136, 230-231
 Thompson, 111

Thoukydides Gargettios, 144

Thoukydides, Son of Melesias, 113-114, 142-145, 148, 194

Thoukydides Thettalos, 144-145

Thourioi, 143-150, 238

Thrake, 52, 55, 141, 142, 144, 158, 173, 177-178, 181, 212,
218-220, 241-242

Thrasyboulos, 241, 248, 250, 254-256, 257-258, 262

Thucydides, 53, 55, 69-70, 72-74, 76, 78-79, 80, 82-83, 86,
97, 99, 101, 103-104, 106, 107, 109, 110, 111, 113, 114,
115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 125, 126, 127,
128, 130, 131-132, 133, 134, 135, 137, 138, 140, 141,
142, 144, 145, 154, 155, 157, 158, 161, 162, 167, 168,
169, 170, 172, 174, 176, 177, 178, 179-180, 181, 183-
187, 188, 189, 194, 195, 196, 198, 199, 202, 203, 204,
205, 206, 207, 208, 211, 212-213, 214, 215, 216, 217,
218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 229, 230-231, 232, 233,
234, 235, 237, 238, 241, 252, 276, 277, 278, 283, 353-
362 passim

Thucydides, Scholia to, 166

Timotheos, 264-265

Timosthenes (archon 478/7), 110

Tiberius, 14

Timachidas, 11

Timokles (archon 441/0), 153-154

Tod, 257, 259

Torone, 218

Triklinios, Demetrios, 20-21, 27, 31, 33-36, 43-45, 48, 272

Tryphon, 12

Tzetzes, 10, 20, 31-32, 35, 43, 45, 48

Urbinas, Codex (U), 32, 44-45

Ursinus, Fulvius, 33

Valerius Maximus, 115, 249-250

Vanderpool, 111, 144

Vaticanus, Codex, 33-34, 35, 36

Venetus, Codex, 15, 17, 25-26, 27, 29-35, 37-42, 45, 46-47,

105, 109, 129, 184, 185, 213, 242, Appendix 2 passim

Vespaë, 27-28, 30, 229

Wade-Gery, 143-144, 148 (see also Athenian Tribute Lists)

Weil, 38

Wells, 72, 95, 130

West, 194, 201, 215-217, 229

White, 7, 10, 12, 17-19, 32, 43, 44-45, 47-48, 131

Wilamowitz-Möllendorf, 17

Wüst, 37

Xanthos, 65-69

Xenophon, 88, 94, 126, 150-151, 174, 235, 239, 241-242, 245,

249-259, 261-263, 265

[Xenophon], 189, 192

Xerxes, 95-97, 101-103, 111-113, 127-130

Zacher, 31-35, 41-43, 45, 47-48, 272

Zanetti, 25

Zenobios, 63, 231

Zenodotos, 7

Zuntz, 18-19, 39, 41

Zuretti, 36, 44

BIBLIOGRAPHY AND ABBREVIATIONS

A.J.P. = American Journal of Philology

Ailian = Claudii Aeliani Varia Historia,..., ex recognitione
Rudolphi Hercheri (Vol. II of the Teubner edition, Leipzig, 1866).

Aelius Aristides = See Aristides

Aischines = Aeschinis Orationes, post Fr. Frankium curavit
Fridericus Blass (second edition, Leipzig, 1908).

Aischines, Scholia = Scholia Graeca in Aeschinem et Isocratem...,
edidit Gulielmus Dindorfius (Oxford, 1852).

Aischylos = Aeschylī Septem quae supersunt Tragoediae, recensuit
Gilbertus Murray (Oxford, 1937).

Alkiphron = Alciphronis Rhetoris Epistularum libri IV, edidit
M.A. Schepers (Leipzig, 1905).

Allen, T.W., "Miscellanea", Class. Quart., XXXIII (1929), pp.
28-31.

Allen, T.W., "On the Composition of Some Greek Manuscripts", J.
Phil., XXII (1894), pp. 157-183.

Andokides = Andocidis Orationes, edidit Fridericus Blass
(fourth edition, revised by C. Fuhr, Leipzig, 1913).

[Andokides] = Pseudo-Andokides, published in Blass' edition
of Andokides.

Androtion = Edited by Jacoby, Frag. Gr. Hist., III B, no.
324, pp. 60-77.

Antiphon = Antiphontis Orationes et Fragmenta, post Fridericum Blass edidit Theodorus Thalheim (Leipzig, 1914).

Apollonios Rhodios, Scholia = Scholia in Apollonium Rhodium Vetera, recensuit Carolus Wendel (Auctarium Wiedmannianum, IV, Berlin, 1935).

Apostolis = See Rupprecht, Karl

Apuleius = Apulei Platonici Madaurensis Metamorphoseon Libri XI, iterum edidit Rudolfus Helm (Leipzig, 1913).

Archemachos = Edited by Jacoby, Frag. Gr. Hist., III B, no. 424, pp. 319-322.

Archiv für Papyrusforschung und verwandte Gebiete, herausgegeben von Ulrich Wilcken, II (Leipzig, 1903).

Aristeides = Aristides, ex recensione Gulielmi Dindorfii (3 vols., with scholia in Vol. III, Leipzig, 1829).

Aristeides, Frommel = Scholia in Aelii Aristidis Sophistae Orationes Panathenaicam et Platonicas, edidit Gulielmus Frommel (Frankfort am Main, 1826).

Aristodemos = Edited by Jacoby, Frag. Gr. Hist., II A, no. 104, pp. 493-503.

Aristophanes = Aristophanis Comoediae, recognoverunt... F.W. Hall-W.M. Geldart (2 vols., Oxford, 1906-1907).

Aristophanes, Scholia = Scholia Graeca in Aristophanem..., edidit Fr. Dübner (Paris, 1877).

Aristophanis Comoediae Undecim cum Scholiis, Codex Ravennas 137, 4, A, phototypice editus, praefatus est J. van

Leeuwen (Leyden, 1904).

Aristotle = Aristotelis Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία quantum edidit
Fridericus Blass (Leipzig, 1908).

Aristotle = Aristotelis Politica, recognovit Otto Immisch
(Leipzig, 1909).

Aristotle = Ars Rhetorica, iterum edidit Dr. Adolphus Roemer
(Leipzig, 1923).

Aristotle = Aristotelis quae feruntur Oeconomica, recensuit
Franciscus Susemihl (Leipzig, 1888).

Arrian = Flavii Arriani quae exstant omnia, edidit A.G. Roos,
Vol. I, Alexandri Anabasis (Leipzig, 1907).

Athenaios = Athenaei Naucratis Dipnosophistarum libri XV,
recensuit Georgius Kaibel (3 vols., Leipzig, 1923-1925).

A.T.L. = The Athenian Tribute Lists

Auberton, Robert, Démétrius Triclinius et les Recensions
Médiévales de Sophocle (Paris, 1949).

Augsberger, J., "Die Aristophanesscholien und der Codex
Venetus A", Sitzungsberichte der kaiserlichen Akademie
der Wissenschaften zu München, philosophische-philo-
logische Classe, Band I, Heft 3(1877), pp. 254-263.

Augsberger, J., Die Scholien zu Aristophanes Fröschen im
Codex Venetus A (München, 1886).

- B.S.A. = The Annual of the British School at Athens
- B. ph. Woch = See Ph. Woch.
- Bekker, Anecdota = Immanuelis Bekkeri Anecdota Graeca (Vols. I-III, Berlin, 1814-1821).
- van Bamberg, Alexis, De Ravennate et Veneto Aristophanis Codicibus (Dissertation, Bonn, 1865).
- van Bamberg, A., Exercitationes Criticae in Aristophanis Plutum novae (Gotha, 1885).
- Blau, A., De Aristarchi Discipulis (Dissertation, Jena, 1883).
- Elegen, Carl w., "Pre-classical Greece - a Survey", B.S.A., XLVI (1951), pp. 16-24.
- Bloemers, Johan Hendrik Frederik, Observationes Criticae in Scholia ad Aristophanis Ranas (Dissertation, Utrecht, 1904).
- Blum, G., "Les Commentaires sur la Double Rédaction des Nuées", Le Musée Belge, XIX*XXIV (1920), pp. 104-111.
- Boudreaux, Pierre, "Origine et Formation du Recueil des Scolies Anciennes d'Aristophane", Rév. Phil., nouvelle série, XL (1916), pp. 113-124.
- Boudreaux, Pierre, Le Texte d'Aristophane et ses Commentateurs, Bibliothèque des Écoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, CXIV (Paris, 1919).
- Boutens, P.C., Exercitationes Criticae in Scholia ad Aristophanis Acharnenses (Utrecht, 1899).

Bradeen, Donald W., A History of Chalkis to 338 B.C. (Dissertation, Cincinnati, 1947).

Broholm, s.v. Kyrene, P.W., R.E., XXIII (Stuttgart, 1924), pp. 150-169.

Bünger, G., Aristophanis Ranarum apud Suidam Reliquias (Freiburg, 1881).

Buenger, George, De Aristophanis Equitum Lysistratae Thesmophoriazusarum apud Suidam Reliquiis (Dissertation, Strasbourg, 1878).

Bursian's Jahresbericht = Bursian's Jahresbericht über die Fortschritte der classischen Altertumswissenschaft.

C.A.H. = The Cambridge Ancient History, Vol. V, edited by J.B. Bury, S.A. Cook, and F. E. Adcock (Cambridge, 1935).

Callimachus = see Kallimachos.

Cary, Earnest, "The Manuscript Tradition of the Acharnenses" Harv. Stud. Class. Phil., XVIII (1907), pp. 157-211.

Cassius Dio = Dionis Cassii Cocceiani Historia Romana..., iterum recensuit Ioannes Helber (3 vols., Leipzig, 1928).

Cauer, F., s.v. Boiotia, P.W., R.E. V (Stuttgart, 1897), pp. 637-663.

Cicero = M. Tulli Ciceronis De Officiis, edidit C. Atzert (Leipzig, 1932).

- Clark, W.G., "On the History of the Ravenna Manuscript of Aristophanes", J. Phil., III (1871), pp. 152-161.
- Class. J. = The Classical Journal
- Class. Phil. = Classical Philology
- Class. Quart. = The Classical Quarterly
- Class. Rev. = The Classical Review
- Class. W. = The Classical Weekly
- Clausen, F. De Scholiis Veteribus in Aves Aristophanis Compositis (Dissertation, Kiel, 1881).
- Comparetti, Papiri Greco-egizii = Papiri Greco-egizii pubblicati dalla R. Accademia dei Lincei sotto la Direzione di D. Comparetti e G. Vitelli (3 Vols., Milano, 1905-1915).
- Cook, R.M., "Amasis and the Greeks in Egypt", J.H.S., LVII (1937), pp. 227-238.
- Cornford, Francis MacDonald, Thucydides Mythistoricus (London, 1907).
- Coulon, V., Essai sur la Méthode de la Critique Conjecturale Appliquée au Texte d'Aristophane (Paris, 1933)
- Coulon, V., Quaestiones Criticae in Aristophanis Fabulas (Dissertation, Strasbourgi, 1897).
- Coulon, V., "Über den Ambrosianus des Aristophanes", Hermes, XLV (1910), pp. 418-447.
- Crusius, O., "Zu den Aristophanesscholien und Paroemiographen", Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie und Pädagogik, CXXXVII (1888), pp. 472-473.

Ctesias = See Ktesias

Q. Curtius Rufus = Q. Curti Rufi Historiarum Alexandri Magni Macedonis libri qui supersunt, iterum recensuit Edmundus Hedicke (Leipzig, 1928).

Decharme, P., Les Scolies d'Aristophane et la Bibliothèque d'Apollodore (Paris, 1884).

Deinarchos = Dinarchi Orationes..., iterum edidit Fridericus Blass (Leipzig, 1888).

Demon = Edited by Jacoby, Frag. Gr. Hist., III B, no. 327, pp. 87-98.

Demosthenes = Demosthenis Orationes (3 vols., Oxford, 1903-1931), Vols. I and II, part 1, edited by H.S. Butcher, Vols. II, part 2, and III by W. Rennie.

[Demosthenes] = Pseudo-Demosthenes, in the Butcher-Rennie edition of Demosthenes.

Demosthenes, Scholia = Demosthenes ex recensione Gulielmi Dindorfii (9 vols. with scholia in Vols. VIII and IX, Oxford, 1851).

Diodoros = Diodori Bibliotheca Historica (5 vols., Leipzig, 1888-1906), Vols. I-III edited by Fr. Vogel, Vols. IV-V by C.T. Fischer.

Dionysios of Halikarnassos = Dionysi Halicarnasensis Antiquitatum Romanarum quae supersunt, edidit Carolus Jacoby (4 vols., Leipzig, 1885-1905).

Ehrenberg, V., "The Foundation of Thurii," A.J.P., LXIX (1948),
pp. 149-171.

Elliott, R., review of White, The Scholia on the Aves of
Aristophanes, in Class. Rev., XXX (1916), pp. 74-80.

Ephoros = Edited by Jacoby, Frag. Gr. Hist., II A, no. 70,
pp. 37-109.

Etymologicum Magnum = Etymologicon Magnum..., ad codd. mss.
recensuit et notis variorum instruxit Thomas Gaisford
(Oxford, 1848).

Eupolis = Edited by Kock, Comicorum Atticorum Fragmenta, I
(Leipzig, 1880), pp. 258-369.

Euripides = Euripidis Fabulae, recognovit... Gilbertus Murray
(3 vols., Oxford, 1902-1913).

Eusebios = Eusebi Chronicorum libri duo, edidit Alfred Schoene
(Berlin, 1875).

Facsimile of the Codex Venetus Marcianus 474, edited by John
Williams White, with an introduction by T.W. Allen
(Boston, 1902).

Fraenkel, Eduard, "A Marathon Epigram," Eranos, XLIX (1951),
pp. 63-64.

Gaisford, Paroemiographi = Paroemiographi Graeci..., edidit
Thomas Gaisford (Oxford, 1836).

Gardner, P., "Coinage of the Athenian Empire," J.H.S., XXXIII
(1913), pp. 147-188.

- Geissler, P., review of Boudreaux, Le Texte d'Aristophane et ses Commentateurs, in Gn., II (1926), pp. 213-218.
- Geissler, P., review of Koster, Scholia in Aristophanis Plutum et Nubes, in Gn., V (1929), pp. 98-100.
- Gn. = Gnomon, kritische Zeitschrift für die gesamte klassische Altertumswissenschaft.
- Gomme, Arnold W., A Historical Commentary on Thucydides, Vol. I, Introduction and Commentary on Book I (Oxford, 1945).
- Grenfell, Bernard P., "The Value of Papyri for the Textual Criticism of Extant Greek Authors", J.H.S., XXXIX (1919), pp. 16-36.
- Gudeman, Alfred, Grundriss der Geschichte der klassischen Philologie (Leipzig, 1907).
- Hammond, N.G.L., "Prehistoric Epirus and the Dorian Invasion", B.S.A., XXXII (1931-1932), pp. 131-180.
- Harpokration = Harpocrationis Lexicon in Decem Oratores Atticos, ex recensione Gulielmi Dindorfii (2 vols., Oxford, 1853).
- Harv. Stud. Class. Phil. = Harvard Studies in Classical Philology.
- Head, Barclay V., Historia Numorum (second edition, Oxford, 1911).
- Hekataios = Edited by Jacoby, Frag. Gr. Hist., I, no. 1, pp. 1-47.

Hense, O.,, Heliodoreische Untersuchungen (Leipzig, 1870).

Herakleides Pontikos = Edited by Müller, F.H.G., II, pp.
197-224.

Hercher, Epistolographi Graeci = Epistolographi Graeci, recensuit recognovit Rudolphus Hercher (Paris, 1873).

Herodotos = Herodoti Historiae, recognovit...Carolus Hude,
third edition (2 vols., Oxford, 1947).

Hesychios = Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon, post Ioannem Albertum recensuit Mauricus Schmidt (5 vols., Jena, 1858-1868).

Hill, G.F., Sources = Sources for Greek History between the Persian and Peloponnesian Wars, collected and arranged by G.F. Hill, a new edition by R. Meiggs and A. Andrews (Oxford, 1951).

Hippokrates = Hippocratis Opera quae feruntur Omnia, recensuit Hugo Kuehlewein (2 vols., Leipzig, 1902).

von Holzinger, Karl, "Die Aristophaneshandschriften der Wiener Hofbibliothek. Ein Beitrag zur Systematik der Aristophaneshandschriften" I. "Die Busbeckschen Aristophaneshandschriften" (Sitzungsber. Ak. Wien., CLXVII [1911], IV Abhandlung); II. "Die Aristophaneshandschriften des Augurellus, Sambucus, Windhaag und andere" (Sitzungsber. Ak. Wien., CLXIX [1913], IV Abhandlung).

von Holzinger, Karl, "Beiträge zur Kenntnis der Venetusscholien zu Aristophanes", W.S., V (1883), pp. 205-223.

- von Holzinger, C.R., "Beiträge zur Kenntniss der Ravennaschollen zu Aristophanes", W.S., IV (1882), pp. 1-32.
- von Holzinger, Karl, "Kritische Bemerkungen zu den spätbyzantinischen Aristophanesscholien", Charisteria Alois Rzach zum achtzigsten Geburtstag dargebracht (Reichenberg, 1930), pp. 58-86.
- von Holzinger, Karl, "Vorstudien zur Beurteilung der Erklärertätigkeit des Demetrios Triklinios zu den Komödien des Aristophanes", Sitzungsber. Ak. Wien., CCXVII (1939), IV Abhandlung.
- Hommel, H., review of White and Cary, "Collations of the Manuscripts of Aristophanes' Vespae" and "Collations of the Manuscripts of Aristophanes' Aves", in Ph. Woch., XLIII (1923), pp. 577-581.
- Hopfner, Theodor, "Thomas Magister, Demetrios Triklinios, Manuel Moschopulos", Sitzungsber. Ak. Wien, CLXXII (1913), III Abhandlung.
- How, W.W and Wells, J., A Commentary on Herodotos (2 vols., Oxford, 1912).
- Hunt, Arthur S. and Grenfell, Bernard P., "Some Classical Fragments from Hermopolis", Mélanges Nicole, Recueil de Mémoires de Philologie Classique et d'Archéologie Offerts à Jules Nicole (Geneva, 1905), pp. 211-223.

I.G., I² = Inscriptiones Graecae, Vol. I (Editio Minor, Berlin, 1924), Inscriptiones Atticae Euclidis anno anteriores, edited by F. Hiller von Gaertringen.

I.G., II² = Inscriptiones Graecae, Vols. II-III (editio minor, Berlin, from 1913), Inscriptiones Atticae Euclidis anno posteriores, edited by Johannes Kirchner.

Isokrates = Isocratæ Orationes, Gustav Eduard Benseles (2 vols., second edition, edited by Fr. Blass, Leipzig, 1910-1913).

J.H.S. = The Journal of Hellenic Studies

J. Phil. = The Journal of Philology

Jacoby, Felix, Atthis, the Local Chronicles of Ancient Athens (Oxford, 1949).

Jacoby, Frag. Gr. Hist. = Felix Jacoby, Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker (Berlin, from 1923).

Jacoby, Felix, Das Marmor Parium (Berlin, 1904).

van Jjzeren, Johannes, De Vitiis Quibusdam Principum Codicum Aristophaneorum (Dissertation, Amsterdam, 1899).

Justin = M. Iuniani Justini Epitoma Historiarum Philippicarum Pompei Trogi..., post Franciscum Ruehl edidit Otto Seel (Leipzig, 1935).

Kaehler, Otto, "Über cod. Parisinus A und cod. Florentinus Δ der Wolken des Aristophanes", appendix in Die Wolken des Aristophanes, erklärt von W.S. Teuffel (Leipzig,

1887), pp. 202-206.

Kaerst, s.v. Epeiros, P.W., R.E., X (Stuttgart, 1905), pp. 2718-2731.

Kallimachos = Callimachi Hymni editio in usum academicum iuxta quartam Wilamowitzianam iterata (Florence, 1948).

Kallimachos, Scholia = Callimachea, edidit Otto Schneider (2 vols. with scholia in Vol. I, Leipzig, 1870).

Keil, Bruno, "De Avium Aristophaneae Folio Rescripto", Hermes, XXVI (1891), pp. 128-136.

Keil, Bruno, "Ioannis Tzetzae Scholiorum in Aristophanem Prolegomena", Rh. Mus., VI (1848), pp. 108 and 243.

Kirchner, P.A. = Johannes Kirchner, Prosopographia Attica (2 vols., Berlin, 1901-1903).

Kleidemos = Edited by Jacoby, Frag. Gr. Hist., III B, no. 323, pp. 51-60.

Kock = Theodor Kock, Comicorum Atticorum Fragmenta (3 vols., Leipzig, 1880-1888).

Körte, Alfred, "Bericht über die Literatur zur griechischen Komödie aus der Jahren 1902-1909", Bursian's Jahresbericht, CLII (1911), pp. 218-312.

Koster, W.J.W., "Quaestiones Criticae ad Scholia Aristophanea Pertinentes", Mn., LX (1933), pp. 113-134.

Koster, W.J.W., Scholia in Aristophanis Plutum et Nubes Vetera, Thomae Magistri, Demetrii Triclinii nec non Anonyma Recentiora partim inedita (Leyden, 1927).

- Kratinos = Edited by Kock, Comicorum Atticorum Fragmenta, I, (Leipzig, 1880), pp. 11-144.
- Kraus, W., "Testimonia Aristophanica cum Scholiorum Lectionibus", Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien, Philosophische-historische Klasse, Denkschriften, LXX (1931), II Abhandlung.
- Ktesias = Ctesiae Cnidii Operum Reliquiae fragmenta collegit Johannes Christianus Felix Baehr (Frankfort am Main, 1824).
- Kühne, K., De Codicibus qui Aristophanis Ecclesiazusas et Lysistratam Exhibent (Dissertation, Halle, 1886).
- Leo, Frederic, Quaestiones Aristopaneae (Dissertation, Bonn, 1873).
- Lippold, G., s.v. Thessalia, P.W., R.E., series 2, XI (Stuttgart, 1936), pp. 70-143.
- Lockwood, J.F., "The London Manuscripts of Aristophanes", Class. Rev., LI (1937), pp. 164-166.
- Lucan, Scholia = Adnotationes siper Lucanum..., edidit Ioannes Endt (Leipzig, 1909).
- Lucian = Luciani Samosatensis opera, edidit Nils Nilen (2 vols. in 3, Leipzig, 1906-1923).
- Lucian, Scholia = Scholia in Lucianum, edidit Hugo Rabe (Leipzig, 1906).
- Ludwig, Carl, "Pluti Aristophaneae utram Recensionem veteres grammatici dixerint priorem", Commentationes Philologiae

Ienenses, IV (Leipzig, 1890), pp. 65-132.

Lykourgos = Lycurgi Oratio in Leocratem, post Carolum Scheibe adiectis...fragmentis, edidit Fridericus Blass (Leipzig, 1899).

Lysias = Lysiae Orationes, recognovit...Carolus Hude (Oxford, 1913).

Marmor Parium = Das Marmor Parium, edited by Felix Jacoby (Berlin, 1904)

Martin, Albert, Les Scolies du Manuscrit d'Aristophane a Ravenne, Etude et Collation, Bibliothèque des Ecoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, XXVII (1882).

Martin, A., review of Rutherford, Scholia Aristophanica, in Rév. Phil., nouvelle série, XXVIII (1904), pp. 78-80.

Meiners, William, Quaestiones ad Scholia Aristophanea Historica Pertinentes (Dissertation, Halle, 1890), pp. 219-403.

Mela = Pomponii Melae de Chorographia libri tres, recognovit Carolus Frick (Leipzig, 1880).

Meritt, Benjamin D., "Attic Inscriptions of the Fifth Century", Hesperia, XIV (1945), pp. 61-133.

Meritt, Benjamin Dean and West, Allen Brown, The Athenian Assessment of 425 B.C. (University of Michigan Studies, Humanistic Series, XXXIII, Ann Arbor, 1934).

Meritt, Benjamin Dean, Wade-Gery, H.T., McGregor, Malcolm Francis, The Athenian Tribute Lists, I (Cambridge,

Mass., 1939), II and III (Princeton, 1949 and 1950).

Müller, F.H.G. = C. Müller, Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum
(5 vols., Paris, 1878-1885); Vol. 5, Part 2, edited by
Victor Langlois, T. Müller joint editor of Vol. I.

Meyer, Ed., s.v. Battos, P.W., R.E., V (Stuttgart, 1897) pp.
147-148.

Mn. = Mnemosyne

Myres, John Linton, Who Were The Greeks? (Berkeley, 1930).

Navarre, Oct., review of Boudreaux, Le Texte d'Aristophane et
ses Commentateurs, in Rév. Et. Anc., XXII (1920), pp.
219-225.

Nepos = Cornelius Nepos, post Carolum Halmium recognovit
Alfredus Fleckeisen (Leipzig, 1919).

Nicole, J., Le Procès de Phidias dans les Chroniques d'Apol-
lodore (Geneva, 1910).

Novati, Francesco, "Delle Nubi di Aristofane secondo un
codice Cremonese(1)", Riv. di Fil., VI (1878), pp. 499-
509.

Novati, Francesco, "Delle Nubi di Aristofane secondo un
codice Cremonese(2)", Riv. di Fil., VIII (1880), pp.
226-268.

Novati, F., "Index Fabularum Aristophanis ex codice Ambrosi-
ano L 39 sup.", Hermes, XIV (1879), pp. 461-464.

P. Oxy. = The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, edited with translations and notes by Bernard P. Grenfell and Arthur S. Hunt (London, from 1898).

Pasquali, G., Storia della Tradizione e Critica del Testo di Aristofane (Florence, 1934).

P.W., R.E. = Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft. Neue Bearbeitung (Stuttgart, from 1894); edited by Georg Wissowa (1894-1910, Vols. I-VI, I), Wilhelm Kroll (from 1910), Kurt Witte (1914-1923, Zweite Reihe [R-Z], Vols. I-II), and Karl Mittelhaus (from 1927, Zweite Reihe from Vol. III, I); six supplements, one by Georg Wissowa (1903), the rest by Wilhelm Kroll.

Pausanias = Pausaniae Graeciae Descriptio, recognovit Fr. Spiro (3 vols., Leipzig, 1903).

Pherekrates = Edited by Kock, Comicorum Atticorum Fragmenta, I (Leipzig, 1880), pp. 145-209.

Philochoros = Edited by Jacoby, Frag. Gr. Hist., III B, no. 328, pp. 97-160.

Ph. Woch. = Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift, published with this title 1881 - 1920, thereafter as Philologische Wochenschrift.

Philostratos = Flavii Philostrati Opera, edidit C.L. Kayser (2 vols., Leipzig, 1870).

Photios = Φωτίου τοῦ πατριάρχου Δέξεων συναγωγή,...

- descripsit Ricardus Porsonus (2 vols., London, 1822).
- Pieske, s.v. Krisa, P.W., R.E., XXII (Stuttgart, 1922), pp. 1887-1892.
- Pindar = Pindari Carmina cum fragmentis selectis, tertium edit Otto Schroeder (Leipzig, 1930).
- Pindar, Scholia = Scholia Vetera in Pindari Carmina, recensuit A.B. Drackmann (2 vols., Leipzig, 1903).
- Platnauer, M., "Aristophanea", A.J.P., LXVII (1946), pp. 262-265.
- Plato = Platonis Dialogi secundum Thrasylli Tetralogias Dispositi, ex recognitione Carolis Friderici Hermannii (6 vols., Leipzig, 1920-1927).
- Plato, Scholia = Scholia Platonica, ediderunt Fredericus de Forest Allen, Ioannes Burnet, Carolus Pomeroy Parker, edidit Guilielmus Chase Greene (Philological Monographs published by the American Philological Association, VIII, Haverford, 1938).
- Plato Comicus = Edited by Kock, Comicorum Atticorum Fragmenta, I (Leipzig, 1880), pp. 601-667.
- Plutarch = Plutarchi Vitae Parallelae, recognoverunt C. Lindskog et K. Ziegler (3 vols. in 6 parts, Leipzig, 1914-1935).
- Plutarch = Plutarchi Moralia, recensuerunt...C. Hubert, N. Nachstädt, W.R. Paton, M. Pohlenz, W. Sieveking, I. Wegehaupt, J.B. Titchener (Leipzig, from 1925).
- [Plutarch, = Pseudo-Plutarch, published in the Moralia.

- Polak, J., "De Aristophanis codice Ravennate," Museum, XI (1904), pp. 282-292.
- Polyainos = Polyaeni Strategematon libri octo, ex recensione Eduardi Woelfflin, iterum recensuit...Ioannes Melber (Leipzig, 1887).
- Polyzelos = Edited by Jacoby, Frag. Gr. Hist., III B, no. 521, pp. 492-494.
- Porter, W.H., "The Antecedents of the Spartan Revolution", Hermathena, XLIX (1935), pp. 1-15.
- Quain, Edward A., "The Medieval Accessus ad Auctores," Traditio, III (1945), pp. 215-265.
- Quintilian = M. Fabi Quintiliani Institutionis Oratoriae libri XII, edidit Ludovicus Radermacher (2 vols., Leipzig, 1935).
- Rabe, H., review of von Holzinger, "Die Aristophaneshandschriften der Wiener Hofbibliothek," in Ph. Woch., XXXIV (1914), pp. 97-99.
- Radermacher, Ludwig, "Zum Prolog der Eipήνη," W.S., XLIII (1924), pp. 105-115.
- Radin, Max, "Freedom of Speech in Ancient Athens," A.J.P., XLVIII (1927), pp. 215-230.
- Raubitchek, Antony E., "Greek Inscriptions," Hesperia, XII (1943), pp. 12-96.

- Reitzenstein, R., "Aus der Strasburger Papyrussammlung",
Hermes, XXXV (1900), pp. 602-604.
- Renkema, Margaret Gertrude Frouwin, Studia Critica in Scholia ad Aristophanis Aves (Dissertation, Utrecht, 1911).
- Rév. Ét. Anc. = Révue des Études Anciennes
- Rév. Ét. Gr. = Révue des Études Grecques
- Rév. Phil. = Révue de Philologie de Literature et d'Histoire Anciennes
- Rh. Mus. = Rhenisches Museum für Philologie
- Riv. di Fil. = Rivista di Filologia e di Instruzione classica
- Roemer, Adolph, Studien zu Aristophanes und den alten Erklärern desselben, I (Leipzig, 1902).
- Rupprecht, Karl, "Apostolis, Eudem und Suidas", Philologus, Supplementband XV (1922), pp. 1-162.
- Rutherford, William G., Scholia Aristophanica (3 vols., Vol. III titled A Chapter in the History of Annotation, London, 1896-1905).
- Schauenburg, A., De Symmachi in Aristophanis Interpretatione Subsidiis (Dissertation, Halle, 1881).
- Schepers, M.A. and van Ijzeren, J., "Scholia Vetera ad Aristophanis Equitum vss. 1-20", Sertum Nabericum, collectum a philologis Batavis ad celebrandum diem natalem (Leiden, 1908), pp. 345-360.
- Schnee, Rudolph, "Aristophanesscholien im codex Ambrosianus", Zeitschrift für die Österreichischen Gymnasien, XXXV (1904), pp. 302-337.

(1884), pp. 805-813.

Schnee, Rudolph, De Aristophanis Codicibus Capita Duo,
(Dissertation, Halle, 1876).

Schnee, Rudolph, De Aristophanis Manuscriptis quibus Ranae
et Aves traduntur (Hamburg, 1886).

Schnee, R., Ein Beitrag zur Kritik der Aristophanesscholien
(Berlin, 1879).

Schneider, Otto, De Veterum in Aristophanem Scholiorum Fontibus (Stralsund, 1838).

Servius = See Vergil, Scholia

Sitzungsber. Ak. Wien = Sitzungsberichte der Akademie der

Wissenschaften in Wien, philosophisch-historische Klasse

Starkie, W.J.M., The Acharnians of Aristophanes (London, 1909).

Starkie, W.J.M., The Wasps of Aristophanes (London, 1897).

Stein, Gustav, Scholia in Aristophanis Lysistratam edidit
prolegomena de fontibus scholiorum scripsit (Göttingen,
1891).

Stephanos = Stephani Byzantii Ethnicorum quae supersunt, ex
recensione Augusti Meinekii (Vol. I, Berlin, 1849).

Strabo = Strabonis Geographica, recognovit Augustus Meinecke
(3 vols., Leipzig, 1921).

Stud. ital. Fil. = Studi italiani di Filologia Classica

Süss, Wilhelm, Die Frösche des Aristophanes mit ausgewählten
antiken Scholien (Bonn, 1911).

- Suidas = Suidae Lexicon, edidit Ada Adler (Vol. I, in 5 parts, of Lexicographi Graeci, Leipzig, 1928-1938).
- [Themistokles, = Edited by Hercher, Epistolographi Graeci, pp. 741-762.
- Theokritos, Scholia = Scholia in Theocritum vetera, recensuit Carolus Wendel... (Leipzig, 1914).
- Theopompos = Edited by Jacoby, Frag. Gr. Hist., II B, no. 115, pp. 526-617.
- Thompson, Homer, "The Tholos of Athens and its Predecessors", Hesperia, Supplement IV (1940).
- Thucydides = Thucydidis Historiae, recognovit...Henricus Stuart Jones, apparatus criticum correxit et auxit Johannes Enoch Powell (2 vols., Oxford, 1942).
- Tod, Marcus N., A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions, Vol. II (Oxford, 1948).
- Valerius Maximus = Valerii Maximi factorum et dictorum memorabilium libri novem..., iterum recensuit Carolus Kempf (Leipzig, 1888).
- Vanderpool, Eugene, "Some Ostraka from the Athenian Agora", Hesperia, Supplement VIII (1949), pp. 394-413.
- Vanderpool, Eugene, "The Rectangular Rock-cut Shaft", Hesperia, XV (1946), pp. 265-336.

von Velsen, Friedr. A., "Kritik und Interpretationen des Aristophanes", Philologus, XXIV (1866), pp. 124-152.

von Velsen, Friedr. A., "Mittheilungen aus einer Tzetzes-Handschrift vom Plutus des Aristophanes", Philologus, XXXV (1876), pp. 696-703.

Vergil, Scholia = Servii Grammatici quae feruntur in Vergilii Carmina Commentarii, recensuerunt Georgius Thilo et Hermannus Hagen (3 vols., Vol. III in 2 parts, Leipzig, 1902).

W.S. = Wiener Studien

Wade-Gery, H.T. = "Thucydides the son of Melesias", J.H.S., LII (1932), pp. 205-233.

Weil, H., "Sur un Parchemin Grec de Provenance Egyptienne", Rév. Phil., Nouvelle Série, VI (1882), pp. 179-185.

West, Allan B., "Pericles' Political Heirs", Class. Phil., XIX (1924), pp. 124-146 and 201-228.

West, Allen B., "Notes on Certain Athenian Generals of the Year 424-3", A.J.P., XLV (1924), pp. 141-160.

White, John Williams, The Scholia on the Aves of Aristophanes, (Boston, 1914).

White, John Williams and Cary, Earnest, "Collations of the Manuscripts of Aristophanes' Aves", Harv. Stud. Class. Phil., XXIX (1918), pp. 77-131.

White, John Williams and Cary, Earnest, "Collations of the

- Manuscripts of Aristophanes' Vespae," Harv. Stud. Class. Phil., XXX (1919), pp. 1-35.
- White, John Williams, "The Manuscripts of Aristophanes," Class. Phil., I (1906), pp. 1-20 and 255-278.
- White, John Williams, "Tzetzes' Notes on the Aves of Aristophanes in Codex Urbinas 141," Harv. Stud. Class. Phil., XII (1901), pp. 69-109.
- White, John Williams, "Notes on the Scholia to the Aves," Class. Rev., IX (1904), pp. 436-441.
- von Wilamowitz-Möllendorf, Ulrich, Euripides Herakles (Berlin, 1895).
- von Wilamowitz-Möllendorf, Ulrich and Schubart, W., Griechische Dichterfragmente, Berliner Klassikertext, V (2 vols., Berlin, 1907).
- Wüst, Ernst, "Bericht über die Literatur zur Griechischen Komödie von 1914-1921," Bursian's Jahresbericht, CXCIV (1923), pp. 95-192.
- Wüst, E., review of Kraus, Testimonia Aristophanea cum scholiorum lectionibus, in Ph. Woch., LVIII (1931), pp. 337-341.
- Xenophon, Hell. = Xenophon, Hellenica; in Vol. I of the Oxford edition.
- Xenophon = Xenophontis opera omnia, recognovit E.O. Marchant (5 vols., Oxford, 1900-1920).

[Xenophon, = Pseudo - Xenophon, Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία; in Vol. V of the Oxford edition.

Zacher, Konrad, "Die Handschriften und Classen der Aristophanesscholien," Jahrbucher für Classische Philologie, Supplementband, XVI (1888), pp. 502-739.

Zacher, K., "Herwerdens Aristophanescollationem," Philologus, LXI, Neue Folge XV (1902), pp. 447-454.

Zacher, K., "Parerga zu Aristophanes," Philologus, Supplementband, VII (1899), pp. 437-453.

Zacher, K., "Die Scholien zu Aristophanes Lysistrata im cod. Leidensis," B. Ph. Woch., XIV (1894), pp. 347-351 and 379-383.

Zacher, K., "Die Schreibung der Aristophanesscholien im cod. Venetus 474," Philologus, XLI (1882), pp. 11-53.

Zacher, K., review of Stein, Scholia in Aristophanis Lysistratam, in B. Ph. Woch., XIII (1893), pp. 1601-1608.

Zenobios = Edited by Gaisford, Paroemiographi Graeci, pp. 328-392.

Zuntz, Gregor, "Die Aristophanesscholien der Papyri," Byzantion, XIII (1938), pp. 631-690.

Zuntz, Gregor, "Die Aristophanesscholien der Papyri," Byzantion, XIV (1939), pp. 546-614.

Zuretti, C.O., Analecta Aristophanea (Turin, 1892).

Zuretti, C.O., "Scolii al Pluto ed alle Rane di Aristofane

dal codice Veneto 472 e dal codice Cremonese 12229

L, 6, 28", Riv. di Fil., XVIII (1890), pp. 405 and 485.

Zuretti, C.O., "Scolii a Plauto ed alle Rane di Aristofane

dal codice Veneto 472 e dal codice Cremonese 12229 L,

6, 28", Riv. di Fil., XIX (1891), pp. 99-126.