

to restore the text by conjecture, and wrote tentatively "ὡς: λίαν? ὡς ἐτόμως". His considerations are, as very often, *bahnbrechend*. Even before examining his attempts, I had come to the conclusion that in the ὡς μίαν there must hide an adverb, parallel with Plato's ἤδη¹⁵): there is, I think, very little doubt about that. Now, the cows carved in the cold stone are almost alive: the correct text should therefore be ὡς χλιαρῶς πάσας ἔμπνοα δερκομένας. Confusion between λ and μ, as well as between ρ and ν is frequent, and the disappearance of the χ is easily explained if we consider that the group χλ was often written λ (a stroke crossing the left stalk of the λ). Χλιαρός (cf. LSJ, s. v.) was used with reference to the warmth emanating from living beings¹⁶). Of course the poet's insistence on the smallness of the gem (βραχύς, βραχύ) is intended not to emphasize the fact that the cows were closely packed, but rather to stress the carver's skill in obtaining figures true to life in spite of the size of the stone.

King's College,
Cambridge, England

Giuseppe Giangrande

LEOGORAS AT ENNEA HODOI

The scholiast on Aischines 2.31 gives a list of Athenian defeats at Ennea Hodoi (later Amphipolis) in Thrace:

Ἐννέα ὁδῶν ἠτύχησαν Ἀθηναῖοι ἐννάκις περὶ τὰς Ἐννέα καλουμένας ὁδοῦς . . . τὰ δὲ ἀτυχήματα ἐγένοντο τάδε· τὸ πρῶτον μὲν Λυσιστράτου καὶ Λυκούργου καὶ Κρατίνου στρατευόντων ἐπ' Ἡϊόνα τὴν ἐπὶ Στρυμόνι διεφθάρησαν ὑπὸ Θρακῶν, εἰληφότες Ἡϊόνα, ἐπὶ ἄρχοντος Ἀθήνησι Φαίδωνος· δεύτερον οἱ μετὰ Λεωγόρου κληροῦχοι ἐπὶ Λυσικράτους . . .

Lysikrates was archon in 453/2. In this mention of Leogoras and Lysikrates it has generally been thought (e. g. by Meritt, Wade-Gery, and McGregor, *The Athenian Tribute Lists* iii: 170) that either the scholiast is confused or his text corrupt, and that the reference is to the defeat of Leagros at Drabeskos (or Daton) in the archonship of Lysitheos (465/4),

15) Headlam would read ὡσεὶ δὴ, but ἤδη (cf. the identical evolution in the English *actually*) means, here, *really*: cf. LSJ, s. v. I, 4.

16) The adverb χλιαρῶς (γλῆρως) is attested, whereas λιαρῶς is not.

or possibly of Lysanias (466/5) or Lysistratos (467/6). (This defeat is mentioned by Hdt. 9.75, Th. 1.100.3 and 4.102.2, Isok. 8.86, Diod. 11.70.5 and 12.68.2, and Paus. 1.29.4—5.) But A. E. Raubitschek, in *Rheinisches Museum* xcvi (1955) 261 note 8, maintains that the scholiast's statement should be accepted at face-value, and that we should believe that some Athenian klerouchs were defeated at Ennea Hodoi in 453/2, and that their leader was Leogoras, father of Andokides the orator.

I believe that Raubitschek is wrong. But so much else in his paper may win general acceptance that his mistake in this note deserves detailed refutation.

In the first place, there are two reasons why Leogoras, the father of Andokides, cannot be concerned.

1. His age is not known. But he was certainly still alive in 415 (And. *On the Mysteries*), and probably in 410 (if that is the date of Eupolis 44). His father Andokides was a strategos as late as 441/0 (Androtion fr. 38). His son Andokides is usually thought (from And. 2.7 and [Lys.] 6.46, disregarding [Plu.] *Life of Andokides* 15) not to have been born until about 440. So Leogoras can hardly have been born before 480, and is not likely to have been old enough to be the leader of a klerouchy in 453/2.

2. In the scholiast's text, *οἱ μετὰ Λεωγόρου κληροῦχοι* has no verb. The verb to be understood must be *διεφθάρησαν*, from the previous part of the sentence. This seems to imply that Leogoras, along with the other klerouchs, was killed. Yet the father of Andokides was still alive years afterwards.

It is of course possible that the father of Andokides was not the only Leogoras alive at that time. The orator's great-grandfather, if not already dead, must have been too old to lead klerouchs in 453/2 (for And. 1.106 tells us that he fought against the Peisistratids). There is another shadowy figure who might be invoked — the father of the Drakontides whose name Stahl restored in Th. 1.51.4; however, Jacoby (*F. Gr. Hist. commentary* on 323 a F 24) has cast doubt on his existence. But it is unnecessary to call on him; there are two more reasons for believing that no klerouchy (or colony; one cannot be sure that the scholiast uses *κληροῦχοι* precisely) or defeat took place at all at Ennea Hodoi in 453/2.

1. The scholiast is giving a list of all the Athenian defeats at Ennea Hodoi. Yet he does not mention the defeat of Leagros.

This defeat was remembered later as one of the greatest disasters in the whole of the fifth century, and 10,000 of the Athenians and their allies were thought to have been killed (Isok. 8. 86). It is incredible that the scholiast (or his authority) should either have been ignorant of it (although not ignorant of the less important expedition from Eion in 476/5, not mentioned by Thucydides) or have thought it too trivial to mention. It is almost as hard to believe (as Raubitschek suggests) that he omitted it on the ground that the battle occurred not at Ennea Hodoi itself but at Drabeskos, a few miles further inland; for it is clear that the defeat at Drabeskos compelled the abandonment of Ennea Hodoi.

2. Thucydides 4. 102. 2—3 gives a list of attempts to found colonies on the site of Amphipolis: first that of Aristagoras; then, 32 years later, the colonists who were destroyed at Drabeskos; and then, in the 29th year after that, the foundation of Amphipolis by Hagnon. He does not record an attempt in 453/2. His references to the Pentekontaetia are notoriously incomplete; yet in a dated list of this sort it would be strange to omit an Athenian attempt to found a colony while including the attempt of Aristagoras. (The fact that he does omit the expedition from Eion to Ennea Hodoi in 476/5 is irrelevant, since there is no evidence that the purpose of this expedition was to found a colony.)

Each of these objections taken by itself might be not quite conclusive. But together they seem to me overwhelming. The scholiast's statement cannot be correct; Leogoras has been confused with Leagros and Lysikrates with one of the other archons beginning with Lys-. A mistake of this kind could be made only by a person with some knowledge of Athenian history, and so is more likely to be due to the scholiast himself (or his authority) than to a later copyist. To get two names wrong in one sentence is a mark of gross carelessness, and not everyone will agree with Gomme (*Commentary on Thucydides* i. 391) that this scholiast is 'a good source'.

University
of Manchester

Douglas MacDowell