Koisyra and Megakles, the Son of Hippokrates
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KOISYRA is linked to Megakles and the Athenian Alcmaeonidai in scholia to Aristophanes’ comedies, from which we learn the following, sometimes quite contradictory, information about her: (1) the name is Eretrian/she was from Eretria; (2) the name/she was synonymous with nobility, wealth, luxurious living, and “thinking big” (μέγα φρονεῖν), a phrase regularly used to indicate an arrogant, even tyrannical temperament; (3) she was a slave and a runaway slave; (4) she was the mother of “Megakles”; (5) she was the wife of “Alkmaion”; (6) she was married to Peisistratos “when he attempted to rule as tyrant” (Σ Nub. 48). The seemingly precise Σ Nub. 46, ὁ πρῶτος Μεγακλῆς Κοισύρας ἤν υἱός, adds further confusion.

In his study of the testimonia concerning this intriguing woman, T. L. Shear, Jr, discerned no less than three Koisyrai, all related to an Alcmaeonid Megakles. Koisyra I, an Eretrian, was the wife of Alkmaion, the beneficiary of Kroisos’ largesse and

1 I presume that testimonia about Koisyra in the Suda and Hesychios (infra) mostly paraphrase Aristophanic scholia, extant and otherwise; cf. U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Aristoteles und Athen I (Berlin 1893) 111 n.20.
2 Σ Nub. 46, 48; Suda s.v. ἐγκεκοιμησμένην. That the name is called Eretrian suggests that the scholiasts or, more likely, their primary sources the comic poets, cited more than one Koisyra, but that the earliest Koisyra was Eretrian in fact. It does not necessarily mean, however, that more than one Koisyra was from Eretria: indeed, taken literally, Σ Ach. 614 indicates that a Koisyra was born at Athens (see infra).
3 Σ Ach. 614; Σ Nub. 46, cf. 48 (and Tzetzes ad locc.), 800; Suda. On the connotations of μέγα φρονεῖν see LSJ s.v. φρονεῖω II.2.b.
4 Σ Nub. 64, 800; Pax 450.
5 Σ Ach. 614, Σ Nub. 46 and Tzetzes, 64; Hesych. s.v. ἐγκεκοιμησμένην. Σ Nub. 800 is anomalous in reporting Koisyra as wife or daughter of Megakles, and this is almost certainly erroneous (see infra at n.40).
KOISYRA AND MEGAKLES

the father of the "first Megakles" (II). This Megakles, who flourished during the second quarter of the sixth century, acted as kingmaker for the Athenians, first establishing Peisistratos as tyrant and then deposing him for the insult to his daughter (Hdt. 1.61.1f). Only his fame, Shear believed, could account for the epithet πρώτος in the scholion. Koisyra II, an Athenian, was the daughter of this Megakles and the namesake of her Eretrian mother: it was she (unnamed by Herodotus) who was misused sexually by Peisistratos. Finally, Koisyra III was the wife and cousin of Megakles Hippokratous, the ostracised of 486, and the mother of the younger Megakles (V) with whom the comedy of Aristophanes is much concerned.

J. K. Davies, however, dismissed Shear's three Koisyrai, pointing out that the "first Megakles" of the scholion ought to be the first named in Nub. 46, i.e., Megakles (V) Megakleous, Aristophanes' contemporary comedic mark. The one and only Koisyra was married to Megakles, the son of Hippokrates. Davies' economization is attractive, since the scholia, which are similarly worded and contain the same general information, more plausibly refer to fewer Koisyrai than to many and rather specifically to the mother of the "first Megakles."

But there are "loose ends," as Davies puts it, left in the scholiasts' tradition by his treatment. How did the identifications of Koisyra as (1) the wife of Alkmaion, great-grandfather of Megakles IV, and as (2) the wife of Peisistratos intrude into the tradition after all if there was general knowledge and agreement about the wife of Megakles Hippokratous? For Davies (381), the first problem could "easily be accounted for as a misinterpretation" of Σ Nub. 46. In this case, "Megakles" was under-

8 I use Davies' enumeration here. On Alkmaion I see APF 369-71.

9 Shear omits to explain how the fame of this "first Megakles" can have occluded the celebrity of those named Megakles who lived before the son of Alkmaion—I am thinking specifically of Megakles I, who earned the agos for his genos (APF 370f)—or, especially, those who lived after him, who were famous in their own right and nearer in time to the comic poets (cf. APF 381): for while Herodotus, the ultimate source for information about the son of Alkmion for the scholia, portrays him as little more than a cynical cooperative with Peisistratos, Megakles IV, the son of Hippokrates, was the second man ostracized (with charges of luxurious living: see infra n.15), became subsequently Pythian victor in the four-horse competition at Delphi, was commemorated by Pindar (Pyth. 7 and scholia), and very probably medized at the time of the Persian War (see infra).


stood by the author of the Suda (or his source) to be the son of Alkmaion, i.e., Shear’s “first” Megakles (II), not the son of Megakles Hippokratous. But this is a tremendous act of faith, a lectio difficillima in fact: for we must accept that, while the mis-interpreter of the scholion read the remoter Megakles (cf. supra n.9) into his misinterpretation because of his familiarity with Herodotus at least, the same author completely disregarded other references to the more recent Megakles in comedies and comedic scholia (or their sources) and, more pertinently, rather precise identifications of Megakles IV and V, when all this information was right before him. Or to put it differently, the inconsistent author was, simultaneously, both ingenious and puerile in respect of the same information.¹²

The second explanation is equally harrowing. Koisyra’s marriage to Peisistratos, a problem “very much more awkward to explain,” Davies declared either a fact or, as he preferred, “an imaginative expansion of Herodotos’ account [sc. of Peisistratos’ marriage to Megakles’ daughter] in the light (a) of the known connection between the name Koisyra and Megakles’ family, and (b) of Peisistratos’ known later relationship with Eretria.” But how did Megakles’ daughter, unnamed in Herodotus, become “Koisyra,” especially if (on Davies’ assumption) the latter was widely known to have been the wife of one fifth-century Megakles (IV) and mother of another (V)? How did Peisistratos’ link with Eretria figure at all into his dealings with the Alcmaeonids? Needless to say, both explanations are not convincing.¹³

My purpose in this paper is to offer other explanations for the problems involved with the Koisyra-tradition; I take the scholia to be generally valid, not invented, and proceed on that assumption. There is, in fact, one very solid prop for assuming such validity: that there was at least one historical Koisyra, kin to Megakles Hippokratous and older than he, is proven by ostraka cast against Megakles in 486, naming him the “son of Koisyra.”¹⁴ From this evidence, it is also reasonable to assume

¹² APF 380f. Of course, if this author was more ingenious than the other sources for Koisyra/Megakles, then Davies’ other assumptions about Koisyra are overturned.


that Koisyra's reputation for extravagance and a hybristic nature, attested in the scholia, was already well established, since similar charges were levelled against Megakles in the same ostrakophoria. But, most importantly, the ostraka also accord with the information in many of the scholia that Koisyra was in fact the mother of Megakles. Thus, while the "son of Koisyra" inscriptions may have amounted to further charges of high and dangerous living, they should not be taken as gratuitously attached to Megakles as slander simply for the occasion of his ostrakophoria. Rather, these inscriptions and iteration of the mother-son relationship in the scholia make the conclusion inescapable that a famous Koisyra was the mother of Megakles IV, that she was the wife of Hippokrates Megakleous, and that her reputation for wealth and Megakles' was shared because of their affinity. The "first Megakles" of Σ Νυβ. 46 is thus identified as the second man ostracized, Pythian victor of 486 and celebrated for his victory by Pindar (Pyth. 7). Such fame as this Megakles acquired through these exploits can surely have eclipsed any attaching to the sixth-century Megakles (supra n.9) for later sources; and πρότερος can in fact amount to 'earlier' instead of 'first' (cf. LSJ s.v. πρότερος B.I.3).

Obviously the story cannot end there, since there is more from the scholia to be taken together with information from other sources about mother and son. According to the author of Ath. Pol. 22.4, Megakles, the son of Hippokrates, was a συγγενής of the tyrants. Since the Alcmaeonid descendants of Megakles later admitted to such kinship (Isoc. 16.25), it cannot be seriously doubted as fact. Blood-relationship between Alcmaonids and Pisistratids cannot be accounted for by Peisistratos' abortive marriage to Megakles' daughter (whatever her name), since there was no issue; nor could it have come about if Koisyra had been wed to Peisistratos before Hippokrates, since

---


16 The point of the inscribers would have been to underscore that Megakles' suitability for ostracism—his flaw, so to speak—was inherent (cf. Thuc. 6.55.1 and the listing of Myrrhine on the stele adikias), and further to dishonor Megakles by mentioning his mother by name (cf. David Schaps, "The Woman Least Mentioned," CQ ns. 27 [1977] 323–30, esp. 327).

that would have made the charge of “blood-relation” simply slanderous: the Alcmaeonids can have rejected it and lessened the political liabilities such kinship entailed at Athens.\(^\text{18}\) If Koisyra was the mother of Megakles, she must be the link to whom or through whom such affinity to the tyrants is to be traced, for Hippokrates’ mother was Agariste of Sikyon (cf. \textit{APF} 371ff). One and the same woman can hardly have been wife of Alkmaion, wife, daughter, or sister of Peisistratos, and then wife of Hippokrates: that would be asking too much even of a noble Athenian woman. Not all the scholia can be taken literally or considered to have equal value; but in attempting to salvage all that we can of the tradition, it is still most reasonable to conclude that there was more than one Koisyra (\emph{pace} Davies).

We begin with what the scholia repeat several times and what, by the same token, seems factual enough: “Koisyra” is an Eretrian name, an historical Koisyra who came to Athens was a haughty and noble Eretrian woman. At first glance, this would be the Koisyra who married Hippokrates some time in the 520’s.\(^\text{19}\) But a marriage-arrangement between the Alkmaionidai and the Eretrian \emph{hippeis} after 546 seems not at all likely, since the \emph{hippeis}, who were firm allies of the Pisistratids at Pallene and against the Alcmaeonids, had little to gain in any way from the now thoroughly diminished Alcmaeonids, who had remained accursed and unacceptable politically even to the Athenians through the sixth century.\(^\text{20}\)

Eretrian ties to Peisistratos and his family, on the other hand, were conspicuously close from well before Pallene. After Peisistratos’ short, disastrous marriage to Megakles’ daughter, the tyrant fled from Athens to Eretria and there considered a return to Athens (Hdt. 1.61.2f). Eretria was not only safe harbor for him, but, by implication, offered him and his family the real

\(^{18}\) Xanthippos, the father of Perikles, is called an Alcmaeonid in the scholia to the Hypothesis of Aristeides, \textit{On the Four} (3.532, lines 23–26 Dindorf), but can only have been so termed because of his marriage to Agariste, the sister of Megakles (IV). Being charged an Alcmaeonid need not, however, have implied \textit{synnêvêia}.

\(^{19}\) \textit{Cf. APF} 379 on the approximate birthdate of Agariste, the sister of Megakles and the mother of Perikles.

\(^{20}\) On the Alcmaeonids and the Kylonian incident: Hdt. 5.71; Thuc. 1.126.2–12; Plut. \textit{Sol.} 12; M. Lang, “The Kylonian Conspiracy,” \textit{CP} 62 (1967) 243–49. The curse remained a political sword of Damocles, which the Spartans thought exploitable as late as the beginning of the Peloponnesian War (Thuc. 1.126.2, 127.1f).
possibility of immediate return to Attica. Dissuaded by Hippias, Peisistratos instead turned north, heading first to the Chalcidice and Eretrian concessions there, and then to Mount Pangaeon.21 There, apparently in cooperation with the Eretrians, he secured the fortune that enabled his return to Athens and the final establishment of his tyranny. Peisistratos spent some time again in Eretria marshalling his allies and mapping his attack; he was sustained on Euboia once more by the hippeis who joined him in the invasion of Attica, fought beside him at Pallene, and apparently helped to consolidate his power at Athens in the aftermath of the battle at the expense of the previously powerful Alkmaionidai.

The record of Pisistratid-Eretrian association adds up to rather extraordinary cooperation and becomes even more conspicuous because it flourished most in Peisistratos' darkest hours. Very close relations are implied and a dynastic marriage between Peisistratos and the most influential of Eretrian noble houses would explain much. Such marriages were common enough during the Archaic period and provided substantial military and financial advantages to complement the prestige they seem to have offered both parties. In fact, the best examples involve Athenians aiming at tyranny: Kylon's marriage to Theagenes' daughter obtained for him an armed force of Megarians for his attempted coup, while Peisistratos' to Megakles' daughter bought him the latter's assent to tyrannical rule; Theagenes, through the goodwill of Kylon and his heirs, could secure Salamis and his northeastern frontier, while Megakles' spoiled marriage-alliance with Peisistratos was aimed, on his part, at procuring the succession for the Alcmaeonid's descendants.22 Of course, Megakles himself had allied with Kleisthenes, tyrant of Sicyon, through Agariste: (Hdt. 6.126.2–131.2). Peisistratos surely knew the advantages of his marriage-arrangement with Timonassa, the daughter of Gorgilos of Argos, for it got for him the support of 1,000 Argive fighters at Pallene.23 Eretria's enduring and generous military and (obviously)


22 On Kylon and Theagenes: Thuc. 1.126.3ff; R. P. Legon, Megara. The Political History of a Greek City-State to 336 B.C. (Ithaca 1981) 93ff (cf. also supra n.20); on Megakles and Peisistratos: Hdt. 1.60.

23 Hdt. 1.61.4; Ath.Pol. 17.4.
financial support for Peisistratos is understandable, if predicated upon dynastic marriage. The logical candidate for the link is Koisyra, a noble and haughty Eretrian woman who was married to Peisistratos “when he attempted to rule as tyrant” (Σ. Nub. 48), i.e., before 546 when he became tyrant again. 24 As Peisistratos had obtained military assistance from Argos because of his earlier marriage to Timonassa, as Hippias would later obtain diplomatic aid from Hippoklos of Lampsakos through the marriage of his daughter Archedike to Aiantides (Thuc. 6.59.3f), so did the old tyrant secure the arms and aid of the Eretrian hippeis through his marriage to Koisyra (I). I should think that it was this Koisyra, born and bred in an Eretrian noble house and then married to Peisistratos, who established the reputation for extravagance and μέγα φρονεῖν attaching to the name.

If this assumption is correct, then it is also reasonable to assume that the marriage produced issue, necessary cement for the alliance—we compare Peisistratos’ refusal to procreate with Megakles’ daughter and its result—and one of these was a maiden appropriately named Koisyra (II) after her mother. 25 When that maiden came of age, she too became useful as part of a marriage-arrangement, the political benefits of which the Pisistratids were apparently always quite well aware. To forge better—but still politically innocuous—relations with the diminished but still influential clan of the Alkmaionidai, Koisyra (II), whose offspring would have no hope whatsoever of succession, was married to Hippokrates after 530 (but before 520). 26 The arrangement can be seen as simply another facet of Peisistratos’ conciliatory policy toward Athenian aristocrats, consistent with his inclusion of members of leading families in at least the outward appearances of power and privilege by means of existing offices: Koisyra’s marriage to Hippokrates amounted to dynastic intermarriage on a lesser scale. 27 This link also helps to explain better how the Pisistratids, while including others in the archonships, were “always able to keep one of their own in office” (Thuc. 6.54.6).

24 Apparently this was originally suggested by Heinze, De rebus Eretrien­sium 29 ( Toeppfer [supra n.14]).
25 Cf. APF 371f on Agariste, daughter of Agariste of Sikyon; Shear (supra n.7) 103. Cf. also W. Ribbeck, ed., Die Acharner des Aristophanes (Leipzig 1864) 231 on two Koisyrai.
26 Cf. APF 379.
27 Cf. Andoc. 2.26 on those who reconciled with Peisistratos after Pallene and became related to the tyrants.
The Alcmaeonids and the Pisistratids were certainly close politically by the mid-520's, as the Athenian archon list (M./L. 6) shows: Hippias and Kleisthenes, the uncle of Hippokrates, were archons *eponymoi* in consecutive years (526/5 and 525/4). The political closeness of the Alkmaionidai to and indeed their kinship with the Pisistratids—Alcmaeonid protestations of miso-tyrannism (Hdt. 6.123.1) notwithstanding—are made more understandable by the marriage of Hippokrates the brother of Kleisthenes to Koisyra the daughter of Peisistratos; again both the *sugyénéia* of Megakles the son of Hippokrates to the tyrants is explained along with charges of extravagance and high living, tantamount to a tyrannical disposition, which were attached to Megakles on ostraka and which can thus be traced through his mother to his maternal grandmother and grandfather.\(^{28}\) Suspicions of treasonous cooperation with Hippias and the Persians at Marathon and after were certainly enhanced by this kinship, and the failure of the Athenians to forget this alleged Alcmaeonid collaboration surely accounts at least partially for diminution of the family’s political fortunes after the Persian Wars.\(^{29}\)

Two problems remain: (1) how can we account for Koisyra as the wife of Alkmaion (*Suda*), who is identified as the father of Megakles the kingmaker? I suggest that ‘Αλκμαίονος is a corruption or misunderstanding of ‘Αλκμαίων[δ]ου or, ultimately, of ‘Αλκμεών[δ]ου: cf. Μεγακλής Ἰπποκράτους ‘Αλκμαίων[δ]ου.\(^{30}\) Koisyra was not the “wife of Alkmaion (=Alkmeon),” but the “wife of (an) Alkmaion[δ] (=Alkmeon[δ]).”

(2) Why are Megakles and Koisyra called *douloi* in many of the scholia?\(^{31}\) Obviously neither was a slave in fact; both were noble and apparently very wealthy. Either the status of the two changed so that they actually became slaves, or the charges are really without substance and slanderous in nature. Davies (*APF* 381) suggests that “the alternatives of escape or enslavement which faced the Eretrians in 490 (Hdt. vi. 101) offer a back-

\(^{28}\) Cf. Alcmaeonid admission of affinity in Isoc. 16.25; on the similarity of Perikles to Peisistratos who would thus have been Perikles’ great-grandfather, cf. Plut. *Per.* 7.1f, cf. 16.1, 39.5; cf. also Lavelle (*supra* n.17) 135; W. G. Forrest, “Themistokles and Argos,” *CQ* *NS*.10 (1960) 233.


\(^{31}\) Σ *Pax* 450, *Nub.* 46; Koisyra is called δούλη in *Nub.* 64 and δρακέτης (‘runaway slave’) in *Nub.* 800 (but cf. *supra* n.5 and n.40 *infra*).
ground in terms of which the ridiculing of Koisyra and Megakles (V) as runaway slaves ... becomes all too intelligible."

In my view, this statement raises more questions than it settles: did Koisyra and Megakles somehow make their way from Athens to Eretria and, when it fell, were they transported to inner Asia by the Persians? Did they actually then become slaves, and subsequently escape from the Persians, thus becoming ‘runaways’? Or were they Persian collaborators who were among the few to remain in Eretria after the city was destroyed and were called slaves by their enemies? Or were they simply termed slaves because of what had happened at Eretria?

A better path of enquiry might be to seek why these two nobles should be called slaves by Athenians, taking doulos in the context of their known connections and actions. When Megakles was ostracized in early 486, he left Athens and then obtained his victory in the four-horse chariot race at Delphi later the same year. His exile from Athens was apparently bitter for him, for Pindar in his epinikion for the occasion (Pyth. 7.17–20) laments the phthonos lately attaching to the noble Megakles and his lament squares with charges of extravagance found on ostraka cast against Megakles by disapproving Athenians. Pindar’s attempt at consolation suggests that Megakles had been humiliated by his ostracism at the hands of the Athenians.

Of course, for a proud man mistreated, vengeance is a ubiquitous wraith. Expelled from his city and left unprotected, Megakles would have found natural refuge among his relatives and fellow exiles, the Peisistratidai. Such appears to have been the course followed by Hipparchos, the son of Charmos, the first man ostracized and another relative of the tyrants. Sometime before 480, Hipparchos was convicted of prodosia, and he along with other διττήριοι καὶ προδόται ("sinners and traitors") was proscribed upon a bronze stele set up on the Athenian Acropolis. The former term, it must be noted, was especially attached by the Athenians to the Alcmaeonids for their rôle in the sacrilegious slaughter of Kylonians in the late seventh century, a slaughter for which Megakles’ great-great-

---

32 Ath.Pol. 22.4; APF 451; Rhodes (supra n.21) 271f.
grandfather was held especially responsible. In view of Marathon, of Athenian reaction to alleged Alcmaeonid treachery at the time of the battle and afterward (Hdt. 6.121), of deep fears of further treachery attested by inscriptions found upon other ostraka cast during the 480's, and of the impending Persian invasion at the end of the decade, the likeliest causes for Hipparchos' conviction were his defection to the Pisistratids and to the Persians after his ostracism and his subsequent failure to return to Athens when the exiles were recalled. This is no new idea. Prime facie, it is also reasonable to conclude that the maligned and humiliated Megakles followed the lead of his kinsman Hipparchos, and was convicted and proscribed with him for the same reasons. This, too, is not a new idea.

There is, however, other evidence to indicate Megakles' Medism after his ostracism. First, a scholion to Ar. Ach. 614 mentions the son of Koisyra among other prodotai. In view of the circumstances, the mention of Megakles here can hardly be fortuitous. Second, the description of Megakles Hippokratous as a doulos further underscores the likelihood of his Medism. Subjects of the Persian King, noble or base, destitute or wealthy, were all his douloi as he constantly reminded them, and they themselves. The term doulos applied especially to the Greek subjects of the Great King by Greeks who hated the Persians—viz. the Athenians—amounted to derision aimed at those who chose servitude to the barbarian Mede over freedom. That Megakles was so derided (perhaps mostly in comedy after his public condemnation) supports the belief that he deserted Athens and threw in with the city’s enemies. By extension of insult to Megakles, Koisyra his mother was also called δούλη, and it is very possible that the exceptional designa-

---

34 See supra n.20; on ἀλλήλων, Ar. Eq. 445f with schol.; cf. E. Maetznner, ed., Lycurgi Oratio in Leocratem (Berlin 1826) 279f; cf. also M./L. p.42; Rhodes (supra n.21) 276f; and more recently, R. Merkelbach, "Nochmals das Xanthippos-Ostrakon," ZPE 62 (1986) 57–62. Contra Merkelbach, Xanthippos was identified as an Alkmeneid (see supra n.18).

35 Cf. G. Busolt, Griechische Geschichte II (Gotha 1895) 660f n.1; Mattingly (supra n.14) 282f.

36 Mattingly (supra n.14) 282f.

37 P.Oxy. VI 856.61f; cf. Shear (supra n.7) 101 n.7.

38 Cf. M./L. 12 (the letter of Dareios to Gadatas); cf. Hdt. 5.49.2; 6.11.2, 44.1; 7.8.3, 11.4; 8.100.3, 102.2; 9.48.2 (on Greek douloi of the Persian King); 1.89.1, 114.5, 129.4, 210.2; 3.140.5; 7.9.2, 39.1, 96.2, 135.3; 8.102.3 (on Persian douloi of the Persian King); cf. also 5.49.3, 8.101.3, and passim.

39 Cf. Hdt. 1.120.5, 5.49.2, 6.11.2.
tion of her as δραπέτης appears as an embellishment to intensify the pejoration inherent in δοῦλος. 40

On the evidence, Megakles is more than implicated in a charge of Medism. His affinity to the Pisistratids and the indignity of his ostracism must have influenced his course of action after he was driven from Athens; the destruction of Alcmaeonid political fortunes, in the male line, for some time after 480 gauges the gravity of Megakles' actions and Athenian reaction to them. 41
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41 Cf. APF 381.