

the epic tradition and the individual poet. To be sure, this tension can be recognized in places other than the expressions discussed in this paper (compare, for instance, nontraditional Homeric usages that contain no metrical faults). But metrically irregular expressions that can be replaced by regular traditional equivalents allow us to identify not only a deviation from the norm but also the very norm from which the deviation has been made. It is with their aid, therefore, that the existence of such a tension can most clearly be shown.

MARGALIT FINKELBERG
Jerusalem

WHEN WAS AESCHINES BORN?

At first glance, the answer to this question appears to be rather simple, for Aeschines himself states quite plainly in his speech against Timarchus (I. 49) that he was then forty-five years old: since the speech was delivered in 346/45 B.C., he would have been born in 391/90 or 390/89.¹ But this is not all that Aeschines says in the passage. He goes on to remind the court that many men do not look as old as their years—Misgolas among them: his youthful appearance notwithstanding, Misgolas is actually the same age as Aeschines himself, who with his gray hair would seem to be much older. This observation leads him to warn the jurors that their impression that Misgolas and Timarchus are the same age is quite mistaken. The jurors are left to draw the obvious conclusion that Timarchus is in fact younger than Misgolas. As F. Blass pointed out, however, Timarchus was a member of the Council in 361/60 and therefore must have been at least thirty in that year.² This would date Timarchus' birth to 391/90 or 390/89 at the very latest—and so to the same time as, if not earlier than, the birth of Aeschines and his coeval, Misgolas. Yet this conclusion would seem to be impossible, since Aeschines unambiguously implies that Timarchus is younger than Misgolas.

Blass did not propose a solution to this problem, which did not receive further consideration until D. M. Lewis examined it afresh in 1958.³ Lewis considered four ways of resolving the difficulty in the passage as it stands, but rejected all of them and concluded that the text must be corrupt. He proposed that πέμπτον καὶ τετρακοστόν should be emended to τέταρτον καὶ πεντηκοστόν. In support of his emendation he pointed out that according to the *Life of Aeschines* attributed to a certain Apollonius, Aeschines died during Antipater's purge (i.e., in 322) at the age of seventy-five; on that chronology he would have been born

1. For the date of the speech, see E. M. Harris, "The Date of the Trial of Timarchus," *Hermes* 113 (1985): 376–80; the trial probably took place early in the archonship of Archias (= late summer 346). For the problem involved in determining a date of birth from information about a person's age in a given archon-year, see J. K. Davies, *Athenian Propertied Families, 600–300 B.C.* (Oxford, 1971), pp. 125–26.

2. *Die attische Beredsamkeit*², vol. 3.2 (Leipzig, 1893), p. 170, drawing on Aeschin. I. 109.

3. "When Was Aeschines Born?" *CR* 8 (1958): 108. Lewis' argument was accepted by J. K. Davies, *Athenian Propertied Families*, pp. 545–46.

in either 398/97 or 397/96. Yet this still does not coincide with the date of 399/98 (or 400/399) that would result from Lewis' emendation.

This lack of strict congruity is not the only weakness in Lewis' argument; more fundamentally, his use of the *Life of Aeschines* attributed to Apollonius is in itself questionable. Each of the ancient biographies of Aeschines gives a different account of his activities after the trial of Ctesiphon in 330 and of his death, and we cannot determine which (if any) offers the correct version.⁴ That the biography attributed to Apollonius is the only one to carry an alternative form of the name of Aeschines' mother (Γλαῦκις) is not remarkable and does not prove (*pace* Lewis) that the author had access to material about Aeschines' life beyond his extant speeches and those of Demosthenes. Another explanation of this alternative version of her name is more likely. It is clear that the earlier biographers whom Apollonius read noted Demosthenes' claim (18. 129–30) that Aeschines' father had originally been a slave, named Τρόμης ("Trembler"), and that after he gained his freedom he altered his name to the more respectable Ἀτρόμητος to hide his servile background. Taking his cue from Demosthenes, one of these earlier biographers must have assumed that the name of Aeschines' mother had been similarly transformed, and he concluded that her name had originally been Γλαῦκις, which she changed to the more respectable Γλαυκοθέα after she was rescued (as Demosthenes alleges) from prostitution by the boat-swain Phormio.⁵ The name Γλαῦκις, in other words, is most likely the product of a biographer's imagination; it is not at all likely to be something found after a painstaking search through works that have not survived.⁶

Lewis was correct to assume that Aeschines probably was not lying about his own age; but nothing prevents us from thinking that he was being deceptive in another respect. To begin with, we should note how important Misgolas' age is to Aeschines' case against Timarchus. Aeschines is accusing Timarchus of prostitution and claims that Misgolas paid him for his favors. For the charge to be plausible, Timarchus must be younger than Misgolas, since it was customary in homosexual relationships in classical Athens for an older man to pursue a younger man.⁷ Thus, Aeschines' charge that Timarchus sold his favors to Misgolas would not have appeared plausible if Timarchus was the same age as, or older than, Misgolas.

Let us suppose the following. Aeschines, Misgolas, and Timarchus were all the same age (Timarchus may have even been slightly older than the other two), but Aeschines was completely gray-haired, as he himself tells us. Aeschines wished to create the impression that Misgolas was older than Timarchus, so that his charge of prostitution against Timarchus would appear credible. He therefore said that

4. For a collection of the evidence, see A. Schaefer, *Demosthenes und seine Zeit*², vol. 3 (Leipzig, 1887), p. 292, nn. 1 and 2. On the information about Aeschines' death provided by Apollonius Schaefer commented: "die ganze Stelle ist so absurd, dass nichts daraus zu entnehmen ist."

5. Cf. Schaefer, *ibid.*, 1:224 (who did not, however, specifically attribute the invention of the name to the ancient biographers).

6. Such a search would be contrary to the methods of the ancient biographers of literary men; for a study of their habits, see M. R. Lefkowitz, *The Lives of the Poets* (Baltimore, 1981).

7. K. J. Dover, *Greek Homosexuality* (Cambridge, Mass., 1978), pp. 85–88; see also the useful collection of references to representations in vase-paintings compiled by M. Golden, "Slavery and Homosexuality at Athens," *Phoenix* 38 (1984): 321–24. That this custom also obtained in homosexual relationships involving prostitutes is indicated by Aeschin. 1. 95 (when Timarchus was past his prime, he had a difficult time finding clients).

although Misgolas seemed to be Timarchus' age, he was really his own (i.e., Aeschines') age. The jury, seeing Aeschines' gray hair, was to conclude that since Misgolas was the same age as Aeschines—who with his gray hair looked much older than Timarchus—Misgolas must also have been older than Timarchus.

One might object that this deception could easily have been exposed by the defense, who only needed to add what Aeschines had deliberately omitted—that Timarchus was in fact the same age as (or slightly older than) Misgolas. But such an objection forgets that prosecutors in classical Athens did not hesitate to assert or imply all manner of things about their opponents, even when the assertions could easily be refuted. We need only compare Demosthenes' charge (19. 150–64) that Aeschines had deliberately delayed the swearing of the oaths for the Peace of Philocrates in order to enable Philip to subdue Cersebleptes. To refute this charge, Aeschines only needed to have the clerk of the court read out the date of Cersebleptes' capitulation to Philip—as indeed he did (2. 91–92), thereby proving that the delay had had no effect on the fate of Cersebleptes.

The solution that I have proposed has an important advantage over an emendation that provides Aeschines with an earlier date of birth: it is more consistent with what we know about Aeschines' military service. Aeschines tells us (2. 168) that on his first military campaign he saw action with Alcibiades, who was leading Athenian troops to help the Phliasiens. This campaign took place in 366.⁸ If Aeschines was born in 391/90 or 390/89, he would have gone on his first campaign at the age of twenty-four, around four years after completing his service as ephebe, which began after his eighteenth birthday and lasted two years.⁹ On the other hand, if he was born in 398 or earlier, he would have been thirty-two or older when he went on his first campaign. An interval of four or five years between the completion of his service as ephebe and his first military campaign is not surprising, but an interval of twelve or more years strains credibility, especially when we know that the period from 378 to 366 was by no means peaceful.¹⁰ Such a long interval becomes even less credible when we recall that the younger age-classes were called up far more frequently than the older age-classes, which were summoned only in emergencies.¹¹ Had Aeschines managed to evade military service for such a long period by means of various excuses and schemes, Demosthenes would certainly have pounced on this dereliction of duty in his speeches against his rival,¹² and it is hard to believe that a general like Phocion would have come forward to testify for a draft-dodger.¹³

8. Xen. *Hell.* 7. 2. 17–23; on this campaign, see W. E. Thompson, "Chares at Phlius," *Philologus* 127 (1983): 303–5.

9. A youth became an ephebe at the same time that he enrolled in the deme register (Lycurg. *Leoc.* 76); this occurred when he was eighteen years old: see Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 42. 1, with P. J. Rhodes, *A Commentary on the Aristotelian "Athenaion Politeia"* (Oxford, 1981), pp. 497–98.

10. Troops were sent to Thebes in 377 (Xen. *Hell.* 5. 4. 54), and in the same year a levy of 20,000 hoplites was voted (Diod. Sic. 15. 29. 7). In 377/76 Chabrias campaigned on Euboea and the islands (Diod. Sic. 15. 30. 5), and in the following year Timotheus led the fleet to Corcyra (Xen. *Hell.* 5. 4. 63–64). In 370/69 Iphicrates brought Athenian troops to aid Sparta (Diod. Sic. 15. 63, Xen. *Hell.* 6. 5. 49–52). In 368/67 Autocles took troops to aid Alexander of Pherae (Diod. Sic. 15. 71. 3), and from 368 to 364 Iphicrates attempted to retake Amphipolis (Aeschin. 2. 27, Dem. 23. 149, 151).

11. For the older men called up in emergencies, see Dem. 3. 4, Aeschin. 2. 133 (reading τεταράκοντα).

12. As he did in his speech against Meidias, 21. 163–67.

13. For Phocion testifying on behalf of Aeschines, see Aeschin. 2. 170.

Our discussion has confirmed that there is no problem with the information about his age that Aeschines gives us in his speech against Timarchus; what we should not believe is his implication that Misgolas was older than Timarchus. As a result, we can accept Aeschines' statement that he was forty-five in 346/45 and infer that he was born in either 391/90 or 390/89. This conclusion also has implications for the career of Aeschines' fellow ephebe Nausicles, about whose date of birth we know nothing save that he was an exact contemporary of Aeschines:¹⁴ his birth also should be dated to 391/90 or 390/89. But these are not the only things to be gained from an examination of the problem. I hope that the discussion of the difficulties surrounding the evidence for Aeschines' date of birth has had some value in illustrating the kind of rhetorical legerdemain an orator might employ to deceive his audience. It is precisely this sort of deception that should make us wary when we are dealing with the information provided by the Attic orators.¹⁵

EDWARD M. HARRIS

*Brooklyn College and the Graduate Center,
The City University of New York*

14. Aeschin. 2. 184; Davies, *Athenian Propertied Families*, p. 396, is thus incorrect to place his birth "in the region of 398-6."

15. An earlier version of this note formed a part of chapter 2 of my dissertation, "The Political Career of Aeschines" (Harvard, 1983). I would like to thank Professor Badian, who directed my dissertation, for several helpful suggestions; thanks are also due to the Editor for his comments.

VERGIL'S "WHITE BIRD" AND THE ALEXANDRIAN REFERENCE (G. 2. 319-20)

M. J. Harbinson has recently suggested a new identification for the white bird whose springtime appearance provides the farmer with a useful timetable for the planting of his vines (G. 2. 319-20):

optima vinetis satio, cum vere rubenti
candida venit avis longis invisa colubris.

Harbinson proposes that this bird is the short-toed eagle (*Circetus gallicus*), not the white stork (*Ciconia ciconia*) as most readers of Vergil believe. His arguments have the appearance of ornithological *auctoritas*, but none is convincing.¹

I. APPEARANCE

Circetus gallicus may have generally white underparts, although "its head and breast tend to be of a darker greyish brown"; the white stork, on the other hand, is "far from being entirely white. The primaries, secondaries, greater coverts and long scapulars are black."² In other words, neither bird fully qualifies as *candida*

1. "Virgil's 'White Bird,'" *CQ* 36 (1986): 276-78. Because of limitations of space I shall summarize Harbinson's argument; I trust that I shall do justice to its thrust.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 277.