

ARISTOPHANES AND THE TRIAL OF THUCYDIDES SON OF MELESIAS (*ACHARNIANS* 717)

E. K. BORTHWICK

- 705 τῷ γὰρ εἰκὸς ἄνδρα κυφόν, ἡλίκον Θουκυδίδην,
ἔξολέσθαι συμπλακέντα τῇ Σκυθῶν ἐρημίᾳ,
τῷδε τῷ Κηφισοδήμῳ, τῷ λάλῳ ξυνηγόρῳ;
ὥστ' ἐγὼ μὲν ἡλέησα κάπεμορξάμην ἰδὼν
ἄνδρα πρεσβύτην ὑπ' ἄνδρὸς τοξότου κυκώμενον
ὃς μὰ τὴν Δήμητρ', ἐκεῖνος ἦνίκ' ἦν Θουκυδίδης,
οὐδ' ἂν αὐτὴν τὴν Ἀχαιάν† ῥαδίως ἠνέσχετο,
710 ἀλλὰ κατεπάλαισε μὲν <γ> ἂν πρῶτον Εὐάθλους δέκα,
κατεβόησε δ' ἂν κεκραγὼς τοξότας τρισχίλιους,
περιετόξευσεν δ' ἂν αὐτοῦ τοῦ πατρὸς τοὺς ξυγγενεῖς.
ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ τοὺς γέροντας οὐκ ἔᾶθ' ὑπνου τυχεῖν,
ψηφίσασθε χωρὶς εἶναι τὰς γραφάς, ὅπως ἂν ᾗ
715 τῷ γέροντι μὲν γέρων καὶ νωδὸς ὁ ξυνηγόρος,
τοῖς νέοισι δ' εὐρύπρωκτος καὶ λάλος χῶ Κλεινίου.
κάξελαύνειν χρὴ τὸ λοιπόν—κἂν φύγη τις ζημιοῦν—
τὸν γέροντα τῷ γέροντι, τὸν νέον δὲ τῷ νέῳ.
- Aristophanes *Acharnians* 703–718

†709 αὐτὸν Ἀρταχαίην Borthwick

ALONG WITH A BRIEFER REFERENCE TO THE SAME OCCASION in *Wasps* 946–948, lines 703–718 of *Acharnians*—and indeed by implication the whole of the latter part of the *parabasis* from 676, since the sequel makes clear that the generalisation of the *epirrhemata* 676–691 anticipates, and is based on, the particular instance unfolded in the *antepirrhemata* 703–718—furnish us with the last glimpse we have of the curiously ill-documented career of the distinguished statesman Thucydides, son of Melesias. Even granted the political attitudes, and the “Marathonian nostalgia” consistently adopted by Aristophanes, one cannot fail to be struck by the peculiar warmth of feeling in these two places, in which he declares his indignant resentment at the treatment, at the hands of smart young whipper-snappers (whom he so detested), of Pericles’ last main political opponent, well-described in an important article by Wade-Gery (1932: 205) as “Kimon’s political heir who resisted Perikles on behalf of the Attic aristocracy.” At his trial, according to Aristophanes, Thucydides “mumbles in his old age” (ὑπὸ γῆρως μασταρύζει, *Ach.* 689), and “his jaws were suddenly paralyzed” (ἀπόπληκτος ἐξαίφνης ἐγένετο τὰς γνάθους, *Vesp.* 948). The use there of ἀπόπληκτος suggests the sort of paralyzing effect on the pathetic old man—now but “a shadow of his former self,” as pictured in *Acharnians* 706–712—which elsewhere describes the condition of someone unlucky enough to encounter street-bullies, and certain

uncanny apparitions or heroic *revenants*.¹ C. A. Faraone (1989) has argued that we find here an acknowledgement that magic spells could be applied, or be thought to have been applied by enemies, to account for someone becoming so “tongue-tied” in a court-room environment, since there is ample evidence for such *κατάδεσμοι* (*defixiones*), often using the verb *κατέχω*.²

Although the first person verbs of ἡλέησα κάπεμορξάμην ἰδών (706) are put in the mouth of the old Acharnians, themselves contemporaries of Thucydides,³ one feels strongly that this is an eye-witness account by Aristophanes himself of the recent trial of a man whose earlier career and *persona* he could hardly have known except by hearsay until Thucydides’ return to Athens, aged around about seventy, from his ten-year ostracism which lasted from 444/3 to 434/3, when the comic poet (assuming a birth date of 445 or a little earlier) was just growing up. Nevertheless, one might reasonably wonder whether a slight, but persistent, tradition which links the families of both Aristophanes and Thucydides with the island of Aegina, detested by Pericles as “the eye-sore of Piraeus” (Plut. *Per.* 8), where Thucydides is even said to have spent his years of ostracism, might have contributed something to Aristophanes’ partiality for the more conservative opponent of Periclean radicalism, and the inheritor of the Cimonian preference for *rapprochement* with Sparta, which in his plays from *Acharnians* to *Lysistrata* the poet also resolutely demonstrates. Aristophanes’ own, or his family’s, connection with property in Aegina seems necessary to explain the flippant reference in *Acharnians* 653–654, and—if true—the potential motivation for Cleon’s having argued a *γραφὴ ξενίας* against him in revenge for the attack on him in *Babylonians* of 426.⁴ The scholion on these lines declares him to have been a κληροῦχος there,

¹Cf. Ar. *Av.* 1490–93; Ath. 461c; Men. *Dysc.* 311–313; Hdt. 1.167. It is interesting that schol. *Av.* 1487 cites the proverbial Σκυθῶν ἐρμιά, which also appears in the Thucydides passage of *Ach.* 704.

²As in schol. *Vesp.* 947 (ὥσπερ ἐγκατεχομένην ἔσχε την γλῶτταν), in explanation of Thucydides’ sudden paralysis. For *κατέχω* of a successful speaker “spell-binding” an audience, see Ar. *Eccl.* 434; Isoc. 12.229; Plut. *Dem.* 29; cf. Hippocles’ triumph in Hdt. 6.129. The medical writers use the verb and its cognates of various forms of paralysis: e.g., Hipp. *Epid.* 5.50: ἀναυδος ἦν . . . γλῶσσα κατείγετο; Gal. *Therap.* 13 (10 p. 931): καταφορὰς βαθείας ἐργάζεται δις ὀνομάζουσιν ἀποπληξίας καὶ κάρους καὶ κατοχάς; id. *Def.* 19 p. 414: κατοχός ἐστιν ἀναισθησία τῆς ψυχῆς μετὰ πῆξιν τοῦ παντός σώματος.

³He was probably born about 500, and so not—any more than elderly Acharnians in 425—literally a *Marathonomachos*. But Aristophanes naturally always prefers to dwell on that heroic occasion rather than the Salamis events a decade later, in which he more probably participated. I count ten references to the Marathon battle in Aristophanes, against one only to Salamis.

⁴Another attack by Cleon on Aristophanes is mentioned at *Vesp.* 1284–91. There has, of course, long been a controversy as to whether the allusion in the *parabasis* of the *Acharnians* to the poet and Aegina refers to Aristophanes or to his διδάσκαλος Callistratus. But it seems to me that Figueira (1991: 79–93 and 101–103), in his careful analysis of the poet’s Aeginetan connections, is right to distinguish clearly the roles of the διδάσκαλος of 628 and the ποιητής of 633, 644, 649, 654. (In 644 ποιητὴν τὸν ἄριστον, could the adjective even suggest the beginning of Aristophanes’ actual name?) The two conflicting views were put forward by MacDowell 1982 and Bowie 1982, the former (the

presumably after the expulsion of the native population and reallocations of 431, and the historian Theogenes, who wrote περὶ Αἰγίνης, stated that Aristophanes “was allotted land in Aegina” (κατεκλήρωσε τὴν Αἴγινα; (schol. Pl. *Ap.* 19c = *FGrH* 200 F2). The *Life of Aristophanes* actually declares his father Philippus to be Aeginetan, adding that Aristophanes “spent a lot of time there” (πλεῖστον χρόνον τὰς διατριβὰς ποιεῖσθαι αὐτόθι, 5); and indeed the earliest attested holder of the name Aristophanes happens to occur in an earlier Aeginetan generation—the father of the victorious pancratiast of Pindar *Nemean* 3.20. Van Leeuwen (1898) surmised that a joke in Telecleides fr. 46 K.-A about “a man from Aegina with a boil for a countenance” might allude to Aristophanes and his notorious early baldness (see *Ar. Eq.* 550; *Nub.* 541; *Pax* 767; *Eup.* fr. 78).

Moreover, Aristophanes’ choice of the name Dicaeopolis for the hero of his play (a role which he may have taken himself)⁵ also seems to me important (as has often been remarked before), given that the only other attested use of this word is an adjective applied to the island of Aegina by Pindar in *Pythian* 8.22.⁶ I take the implication of the name to refer to his speaking out for “justice concerning the city,” which is the claim he makes at 498–501, and the “justice” theme then runs through the whole play—see 317, 561–562, 645, 655, 661—and reappears in later plays (for example, *Eq.* 510, *Ran.* 686, and *Pl.* 568: περὶ τὸν δῆμον καὶ τὴν πόλιν δίκαιοι). Pindar’s ode opens with an invocation of φιλόφρον Ἥσυχία, daughter of Δίκη, and the adjective δικαιοπόλις is used of Aegina in proximity to the *Charites*. I am reminded of how Aristophanes celebrates his newly-founded Bird city (*Av.* 1319–22), where dwell the Graces in the company of ἀγανόφρων Ἥσυχία. This ode of Pindar was doubtless much admired by patriotic Aeginetans, and known to Aristophanes, especially if he himself had connections with the island. A few lines earlier in *Acharnians* 637–639 he had quoted an even more famous tribute of Pindar to Athens as “city of the violet crown.”

Pythian 8 is an ode dateable to 446, shortly before the conflict between Pericles and Thucydides came to a head with the latter’s ostracism, and the Aeginetan connection of Thucydides’ family is even better attested than that of Aristophanes, from Pindar’s generous tributes to his father Melesias as a successful trainer of Aeginetan wrestlers in *Olympian* 8 and *Nemean* 4 and 6 (also the possible implications of *Nemean* 5.49). Aristophanes’ use of wrestling terms here in *Acharnians* (συμπλακέντα, 704; κατεπάλαισε, 710) has been seen

most prominent advocate of Callistratus) repeating his interpretation in revised form in MacDowell 1995: 27–45. Figueira cites a range of opinions of adherents of one side or the other, to which add Carawan 1990: 138, n. 3; Hubbard 1991: 227–230. For older views of the long controversy, see Starkie 1909: 247–248.

⁵ As suggested by Starkie 1909: 84, on line 377.

⁶ Cf. Pind. *Nem.* 4.12, where Aegina is a beacon light of Justice for all, and *Ol.* 8.21–24, where Themis is said to be particularly revered in Aegina—an ode which, incidentally, is one which praises Thucydides’ father, the wrestling trainer Melesias.

as apt for Thucydides' own inheritance of his father's skills (see Pl. *Meno* 94c; Plut. *Per.* 8, 11; *Mor.* 802c).⁷ For what he might have been like "in his prime" (ἥνίκ' ἦν Θουκυδίδης 708), I might mention my emendation of the pointless αὐτὴν τὴν Ἀχαΐαν of 709 to αὐτὸν Ἀρταχάην.⁸ Thucydides would in those days have out-wrestled, out-shot, and out-shouted even the loud-voiced giant slave-driver of Xerxes' army, Artachaies (Hdt. 7.117), to say nothing of the Athenian youngsters at his later trial. The statements in *Life of Thucydides* 7, and Marcellinus' life of the historian (24), that Thucydides spent his years of exile in Aegina are generally supposed to refer *not* to the historian, but to the son of Melesias, and would be perfectly natural in his years of ostracism immediately preceding Pericles' expulsion of the local inhabitants.

Unfortunately we are ignorant of the date and occasion of Thucydides' trial, and the penalties demanded, or exacted, by his prosecutors.⁹ It seems that, old though he already was on his return, he may have hoped to resume his opposition to Pericles. To quote Wade-Gery (1932: 215), "He had come back in 433, to form once again the nucleus for any movement against Perikles: whom indeed he survived, and found his successors, Alkibiades and company, more merciless." Although there are well-known chronological problems, this was probably the period when opposition was taking the form of indirect attacks on Pericles' intimates and associates—Aspasia, Damon, Pheidias, and Anaxagoras. The decree of impeachment by Diopieithes directed against "those not believing in things divine" (τοὺς τὰ θεῖα μὴ νομίζοντας) is generally supposed to be dateable to ca 433, and according to Satyrus (quoted in Diog. Laert. 2.12), Thucydides was an instigator of this attack (ἀντιπολιτευομένου τῷ Περικλεῖ). This is not the place to enter in detail the old controversy about the dates of the trials of Anaxagoras and Pheidias,¹⁰ but, as regards the statement of the scholion on Aristophanes *Peace* 605 that Pheidias' death took place "in the archonship of Scythodorus" (ἐπὶ Σκυθοδώρου), it has been generally assumed that this unattested name ("hardly a name at all," Jacoby *FGrH* 3 Suppl. 2, 328) is a simple error for Πυθοδώρου, archon in 432/1. Such a corruption is, however, curious, and I suggest that the scholiast, or his source, has simply taken seriously the deliberate perversion of this magistrate's name somewhere in comedy. Quite apart from the general fondness of the comic poets for this type

⁷ At *Ran.* 729 Aristophanes characterises the καλοὶ καγαθοί as those nurtured in the wrestling grounds.

⁸ Borthwick 1970; Sommerstein (1980: 102–103) finds the emendation "very tempting," while Henderson (1998: 142–143) reads it in his text. I am scarcely convinced, however, by the idea of Macurdy (1942) that the wrestling image in Soph. *OT* 863–910 could allude to the renewed hostility of Pericles and Thucydides after his return from exile, at the period usually associated with the production of that play.

⁹ MacDowell (1971: 255, on *Vesp.* 947) thinks that Thucydides "had held some office and was convicted of financial misconduct."

¹⁰ For a recent bibliography of the former, see Podlecki 1987: endnote E; 1998: 31–34; for the latter, in addition to Wade-Gery 1932, see Adcock 1927, and the long discussion of evidence of Philochorus in Jacoby *FGrH* 3 suppl. 2, 388–401.

of humour involving play on names or patronymics—for example, Callias, son of Hippobinos (more likely Hippokinon as proposed by Sternbach) for Hipponikos in *Frogs* 429—racial allegations against prominent people, especially politicians, are ubiquitous. Hipponicus himself was dubbed “Scythian” in Cratinus 492 K.-A. and in the present *Acharnians* scene a few lines earlier (707–712) Euathlus, the accuser of Thucydides, is insulted with the proverbial Σκυθῶν ἐρημία, along with his father and kinsmen and compared to the real Scythian archers of Athens.¹¹ Hyperbolus’ nickname Maricas in Eupolis and Aristophanes may have had racial as well as sexual overtones,¹² and the dramatist Acestor (Ar. *Av.* 31, etc.) was sarcastically called by the barbarian, and especially Scythian (Hdt. 7.64), word Sacas. Of course, a century later, the pejorative “Scythian” was used by Aeschines of Demosthenes—λογογράφος καὶ Σκύθης (2.180). Other perversions of proper names in Aristophanes after the fashion of “Scythodorus” are Κολακώνυμος for Cleonymus (*Wasps* 592), Βυρσίνη for Myrsine (*Eq.* 449), and of course Labes and Kuon for Laches and Cleon in the trial scene of *Wasps* 836–842.

To revert now to the *parabasis* of *Acharnians*, although the general meaning of 717–718 is clear enough, the precise textual reading and sense of the former line seems not to have been satisfactorily resolved. In the words καὶ ξελαύνειν χρὴ τὸ λοιπόν . . . τὸν νέον δὲ τῷ νέῳ, Aristophanes is adapting a familiar proverb (the equivalent of our “one fire drives out another” or “set a thief to catch a thief”), of which the basic attested form is perhaps ἦλῶ τὸν ἥλον ἐκκρούειν (Luc. *Philops.* 9, etc.), but which appears also with ἐξελαύνειν in an elaborately extended parody in Antiphon fr. 293: οἶνῳ τὸν οἶνον ἐξελαύνειν, κτλ, and an allusion to it in Plutarch *Moralia* 127f.¹³ Aristophanes uses ἐξελαύνειν, because this verb can be the equivalent of ἐξοστρακίζειν, the earlier fate of Thucydides.¹⁴ In addition, there is a similarity to another proverbial line (the two are actually compared in the citation in Diog. Laert. 5.16 of the more familiar first half of the line), of which the full form is: ἦλιξ ἥλικα τέρπε, γέρων δέ τε τέρπε γέροντα.

As to καὶν φύγη τις ζημιούῃ of 717, in his 1980 edition, Sommerstein takes this to mean “if they are charged”—i.e., taking the verb φεύγειν in the sense “to be a defendant in a court of law” (commonest in the participle ὁ φεύγων), which Paley had considered but rejected in his 1876 edition. LSJ s.v. φεύγω includes the passage in the sense of “shirk” or “avoid,” which is unconvincing. Another meaning which could somehow be elicited from the received text is “in future the old should expel¹⁵ the old, the young the young, and, if the person

¹¹ Cf. also Ar. fr. 424 K.-A. (*Holkades*).

¹² On Maricas, see Cassio 1985 and Morgan 1986.

¹³ Cf. Aristaen. *Ep.* 1.25: σιδηρὸς ἐλαυνέσθω σιδήρῳ; Synes. *Ep.* 45: πάτταλοι παττάλοις ἐκκρούονται. Shakespeare (*Cor.* 4.7.54) combines the proverbs—“one fire drives out one fire; one nail, one nail.”

¹⁴ For this form, see Andoc. 4.5 and 40; for the ἀπο- compound, see Plut. *Per.* 10; for the simple verb, see Plut. *Alc.* 13.

¹⁵ The verb is hardly likely to mean “harass in the courts,” as Bothe (1845: 1, 74) proposed, citing Dem. 36.52: ἐλαύνεις, διώκεις, συκοφαντεῖς.

is (already) in exile, should ζημιῶν him,” and the assumption in the latter verb would be that an additional penalty, such as a fine, should be imposed on him *in absentia*, though one would expect some additional explanatory dative such as χρήμασι, or sequestration of property in Athens. This would, however, be contrary to the recognised treatment of ostracized persons, whose property remained intact for them to regain on their return, it being thought sufficient that in the intervening years (usually ten) their political power and personal following had been suitably curtailed. The distinction is in fact clearly set out in the scholion on *Wasps* 947 (the *other* passage about Thucydides’ trial): διαφέρει γὰρ φυγὴ ὀστρακισμοῦ, καθὼ τῶν μὲν φευγόντων αἱ οὐσίαι δημεύονται, τῶν δὲ ὀστρακισμῷ μεταστάντων οὐκέτι κύριος ὁ δῆμος. Similarly, Aristotle (*Pol.* 1288a25) distinguishes φυγαδεύειν and ὀστρακίζειν in legal severity.

Various emendations of the verb φύγη have been proposed—ῥφή or ἄλφ (keeping τις by Blaydes (1887), σφάλη by van Leeuwen (1901), or τύχητε (without τις) by Rennie (1909) (*sc.* ζημιούντες, and implying some financial penalty), but these have little transcriptional plausibility. But, as Paley pointed out (1876), the evidence of the scholia clearly shows that φύγη was taken to be *not* the verb of the ἐάν clause, but the dative of the noun, φυγῇ—κἄν ἐξελαύνειν δέη κἄν φυγῇ ζημιῶν—which of course involves the suppression of the rather weak τις. But his proposal to change the final word to ζημιοῖ, to provide a verb for τις, produces a rather tortuous sense: “and if one were to punish someone with exile, the old should punish etc.” (καὶ, ἅν τις ζημιοῖ τινα φυγῇ, [χρὴ ζημιῶν] τὸν γέροντα, κτλ.). Paley was however perhaps right to see the relevance of the addition to a (temporary) ostracism of a (more permanent) banishment and exile, sometimes termed ἀειφυγία. The dative of the penalty with ζημιῶν or ζημιοῦσθαι is of course ubiquitous.¹⁶

Now there is a curiosity in the scholion on *Wasps* 947 referring to the ostracism of Thucydides son of Melesias, in that, after distinguishing ostracism and banishment, in the sentence already quoted, the note goes on:

ὅτι δὲ ὁ Ἀθηναίων δῆμος ἀειφυγίαν αὐτοῦ καταγνοὺς ἐδήμευσε τὴν οὐσίαν, καὶ πρὸς Ἀρταξέρξην ἦκε φεύγων, σαφὲς ποιεῖ Ἰδομενεὺς διὰ τοῦ Β’ τὸν τρόπον τοῦτον, “οἱ μέντοι Ἀθηναῖοι αὐτοῦ καὶ γένους ἀειφυγίαν κατέγνωσαν προδίδοντος τὴν Ἑλλάδα καὶ αὐτοῦ ἡ οὐσία ἐδημεύθη.”

That the Athenian people, having condemned him to permanent exile, sequestered his property, and he came in flight to Artaxerxes, Idomeneus makes clear in his second book the following way, “But the Athenians condemned him and his family to permanent exile for betraying Hellas, and his property was sequestered.”

Some confusion in the mind of the writer is evident in the further observation “and so he was condemned, then ostracized” (καὶ οὕτω κατεδικάσθη, εἴτα

¹⁶ Examples with φυγῇ including Eur. *Med.* 453, *Hipp.* 1043, schol. *ib.* 34; Thuc. 4.65, 8.21; Dem. 21.43; schol. Ar. *Vesp.* 240 and *Pax* 605, 606 (these last referring to Pheidias and Pericles respectively at about this same period).

ἐξωστρακίσθη), since clearly the trial of Thucydides at issue in *Wasps*, as in *Acharnians*, did not *result* in his ostracism, but happened later on an entirely new occasion.¹⁷ Obviously the references to “he came fleeing to Artaxerxes” and “betraying Hellas” in this part of the scholion, quoting Idomeneus (*FGrH* 338 F1), have come from an account *not* of Thucydides, but Themistocles,¹⁸ whose ostracism and refuge at the Persian court are recorded in Thucydides (1.135–138). According to Plutarch (*Them.* 25), in his absence from Athens, attempts to sequester his property were partially frustrated by friends who secretly transferred some of it to him in Asia.

The possibility of an initial ostracism leading subsequently to an *additional* penalty of permanent exile suggests to me that exactly this sequence of events could be achieved in *Acharnians* 717–718 by reading: καὶ ξελαύνειν χρὴ τὸ λοιπόν, καὶ φυγῇ πιζημιούν / τὸν γέροντα τῷ γέροντι, τὸν νέον δὲ τῷ νέῳ (“In future, one must expel, and punish further with exile, the old by means of the old, and the young by means of the young”). Once φυγῇ has been misinterpreted as aorist subjunctive of the verb, καὶ would necessarily have become καῶν, and, with failure to spot the prodelision of ἐπι, πι could very well have been read as τις to provide a subject. Prodelision is fairly common in Aristophanes—according to the computations of Platnauer (1960) one in every forty-three lines, with η or η before ε the commonest of all. From Todd’s index (1932), I reckon twenty-two prodelisions of simple ἐπί, and a further twenty-six in words beginning with ἐπι- of which thirteen are compound verbal forms. Nevertheless scribes probably do not find them easily identifiable, and failure to recognise them has led to corruption in a number of places, even in the better manuscripts R and V: for example, *Vesp.* 853: ὅτι ὑπελαθόμην (V) for ὅτι ἡ πῖλαθόμην; *Ecll.* 1111: ἄνω πιθῆναι (R) for ἄνω πιθεῖναι; *Pax* 866: βάς (some later mss) for πῖβάς; *Av.* 1033: ἡδ’ ἐπισκόπους (RU) for ἡδὴ πῖσκόπους; *Ecll.* 40: αὐτοῦ λαβών (many mss) for αὐτοῦ ἴλαβον (Velsen); *Lys.* 197: μὴ το χ[(fourth-century papyrus, Πι in Henderson) for μὴ ἴχιεῖν. In this last, and earliest, example, the letters πι following the elided vowel were taken to be monosyllable starting with τ, as I have suggested above.

We have seen how, because of a certain similarity, the *Wasps* scholia confused the fate of Thucydides with that of Themistocles. In the *Gorgias* (516d), Plato distinguishes Themistocles’ ostracism and banishment into permanent exile as follows: “and they treated Themistocles in exactly the same way (*sc.* ostracized him) and punished him additionally with exile” (καὶ Θεμιστοκλέα ταῦτα ταῦτα ἐποίησαν [*sc.* ἐξωστράκισαν] καὶ φυγῇ προσεζημίωσαν). With the reading that I propose in *Acharnians* 717, φυγῇ πῖζημιούν will have precisely the

¹⁷ This sequence of events might, however, refer to another *earlier* trial of Thucydides, preceding his ostracism, if it is the son of Melesias actually meant in the anonymous *Life* of the historian 7, stating that on leaving Sybaris and returning to Athens “on trial for confounding the jury court, he was convicted” (συγχύσεως δικαστηρίου φεύγων ἐάλω) (so Wade-Gery 1932: 222).

¹⁸ Idomeneus was author of a biography of Themistocles (Ath. 533d and 576c).

same meaning as Plato's φυγῇ προσεζημίωσαν, the addition later of the *second* penalty of total exile, since verbal compounds in ἐπι- and προσ- are so often interchangeable in such a sense. Both these verbs find only one other citation in LSJ (Xen. *Hell.* 5.2.22 and Isoc. 1.33 respectively), although one might add to the former the near equivalent χρησόμεθα ἐπιζημίους in a letter of Philip quoted in Demosthenes 18.157; and in fact τὰ ἐπιζήμια, ἐπιζημίωμα, ἐπιζημίωσις occur frequently within the area of legal penalties (usually financial) in both literary and inscriptional sources.¹⁹

The intrusion of the Themistocles reference in the middle of the note on the trial of Thucydides in the Aristophanic scholia suggests that the comparability of their fates had been observed, that is, a statutory period of ostracism and a subsequent sentence of permanent banishment and exile. If this was what befell Thucydides, son of Melesias, at the hands of Euathlus, supported, it would appear, by the young Alcibiades (son of Cleinias, 716)—enjoying himself of course, in so humiliating, along with his chattering confrères, his late guardian's old bête noir—it would go some way to explain the surprising silence in our surviving literary sources, after *Acharnians* and *Wasps*, about the once distinguished statesman, as, old, tongue-tied, and perhaps toothless, he fades into silence from the pages of Athenian history.

9 CORRENNIE DRIVE

EDINBURGH EH10 6EQ

SCOTLAND

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adcock, F. E. 1927. "The Attacks on the Friends of Pericles," in *CAH* V: 477–480.

Blaydes, F. H. M. ed. 1887. *Aristophanes. Comoediae*. Halle.

Borthwick, E. K. 1970. "Aristophanes' *Acharnians* 709: An Old Crux and a New Solution," *BICS* 17: 107–110.

Bothe, F. H. ed. 1845. *Aristophanis Comoediae*². Leipzig.

¹⁹Wilamowitz (1893: 2.196) considered ἐπιζημίωσις in Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 45.1 to mean *Zusatzstrafe*, but in his recent commentary Rhodes (1981: 540) sees "no special shade of meaning imported by the prefix." Certainly the sense of "additional" is usually valid in προστίμ-ησις, -άω, e.g., Dem. 24.114, as well as the use of προσζημιούν in Plato quoted above. A number of verbs of legal terminology compounded with ἐπι- tend to have a "consequent" or "subsequent" sense, e.g., ἐπικυρόω (Dem. 15.34; Xen. *An.* 3.2.32; Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 32.1, 37.1: contrast simple κυρόω elsewhere, e.g., 30.1), ἐπικρίνω (Plut. *Lyc.* 6.3), ἐπιχειροτονέω (Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 37.1), ἐπιψηφίζω (*Ath. Pol.* 29.4), ἐπιδιώκω (Is. fr. 157), ἐπεξεορκίζω (Polyb. 15.25.11), ἐπιπράττομαι (Suda s.v.), ἐποφείλω φόρους (Thuc. 8.5—cf. ἐπιφορά "additional payment of φόρος," *IG* I² 205). I note also that ἐκφυγεῖν occurs as the third of the ἐπιζήμια of the so-called τὰ τρία Θηραμένους in schol. Ar. *Ran.* 541; Hsch. s.v. τρία; Suda s.v. δεξιός, while the latter, s.v. τῶν τριῶν κακῶν ἕν, along with Hsch. s.v. τῶν τριῶν ἕν and Photius, terms the three penalties προστιμήματα, where again the προσ- compound denotes "additional," as in Ael. *VH* 14.7: φυγῆς προστίμησιν.

- Bowie, A. M. 1982. "The Parabasis in Aristophanes' *Acharnians*," *CQ* n.s. 32: 27–40.
- Carawan, E. M. 1990. "The Five Talents Cleon Coughed Up (Schol. Ar. *Ach.* 6)," *CQ* n.s. 40: 137–147.
- Cassio, A. C. 1985. "Old Persian *Marika*, Eupolis *Marikas* and Aristophanes *Knights*," *CQ* n.s. 35: 38–42.
- De Ste Croix, G. E. M. 1972. *The Origins of the Peloponnesian War*. London.
- Faraone, C. A. 1989. "An Accusation of Magic in Classical Athens," *TAPA* 119: 149–160.
- Figueira, T. J. 1991. *Athens and Aegina in the Age of Imperial Colonization*. Baltimore and London.
- Henderson, J. ed. 1998. *Aristophanes: Acharnians, Knights*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Hubbard, T. K. 1991. *The Mask of Comedy: Aristophanes and the Intertextual Parabasis*. Ithaca, New York.
- MacDowell, D. M. ed. 1971. *Aristophanes Wasps*. Oxford.
- 1982. "Aristophanes and Kallistratos," *CQ* n.s. 32: 21–40.
- 1995. *Aristophanes and Athens: An Introduction to the Plays*. Oxford.
- Macurdy, C. H. 1942. "References to Thucydides, Son of Melesias, and to Perikles in Soph. *OT* 863–910," *CP* 37: 307–310.
- Morgan, J. D. 1986. "Μαρικᾶς," *CQ* n.s. 36: 529–531.
- Paley, F. A. 1876. *The Acharnians of Aristophanes*. Cambridge and London.
- Platnauer, M. 1960. "Prodelision in Greek Drama," *CQ* n.s. 10: 140–144.
- Podlecki, A. J. 1987. *Plutarch Life of Pericles: A Companion to the Penguin Translation*. Bristol.
- 1998. *Perikles and His Circle*. London.
- Rennie, W. 1909. *The Acharnians of Aristophanes*. London.
- Rhodes, P. J. 1981. *A Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaion Politeia*. Oxford.
- Sommerstein, A. H. ed. 1980. *The Comedies of Aristophanes 1: The Acharnians*. London.
- Starkie, W. J. M. 1909. *The Acharnians of Aristophanes*. London.
- Todd, O. J. 1932. *Index Aristophaneus*. Cambridge (repr. Hildesheim 1962).
- Van Leeuwen, J. 1898. *Prolegomena ad Aristophanem*. Leiden.
- 1901. *Aristophanis Acharnenses*. Leiden.
- von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. 1893. *Aristoteles und Athen*. 2 vols. Berlin.
- Wade-Gery, H. T. 1932. "Thucydides the son of Melesias," *JHS* 52: 205–227.