

# Fathers and Sons: *Ecclesiazusae* 644–45

C. J. Tuplin

**A**T ECCLESIAZUSAE 635ff Blepyros raises the problem of paternity in a state in which communism extends to the sharing of women. Praxagora explains that such a system does not mean that every elderly man will be exposed to the abuse that children now direct at their fathers, because, when anyone might be the father of any (younger) person, the witnesses of such abuse can be relied upon to intervene. Blepyros continues:<sup>1</sup>

τὰ μὲν ἄλλα λέγεις οὐδὲν σκαιῶς· εἰ δὲ προσελθὼν Ἐπίκουρος  
ἦ Λευκόλοφος “πάππαν” με καλεῖ, τοῦτ’ ἤδη δεινὸν ἀκούσαι.

Who were Epikouros and Leukolophos? The scholiast comments (unhelpfully) οὗτοι αἰσχροί, and Blaydes merely quotes him. Coulon/van Daele remark “deux inconnus,” and Ussher notes “we can say nothing certain except (with the scholiast) οὗτοι αἰσχροί.” Van Leeuwen glosses αἰσχροί with the guess that Epikouros and Leukolophos had the same sort of reputation as Kleisthenes and Straton, and Cantarella similarly observes “due ignoti, forse i soliti invertiti,”<sup>2</sup> but among Aristophanic commentators known to me only Rogers has attempted more serious speculation, identifying Epikouros as the philosopher’s grandfather and Leukolophos as the son of Adeimantos Leukolophidou.<sup>3</sup> Despite the fact that he labels Adeimantos as “the traitor” (see below) Rogers evidently shares the assumption of the

<sup>1</sup> 644–45: text of R. G. Ussher, *Aristophanes Ecclesiazusae* (Oxford 1973), incorporating Reiske’s Λευκόλοφος (-λόφος R, -λόφας ΓΛ). R. Cantarella, *Aristofane: le commedie* V (Milan 1964), reverts to Λευκόλοφος without explanation.

<sup>2</sup> F. Blaydes, *Aristophanis Ecclesiazusae* (Halle 1881) 161; V. Coulon/H. van Daele, *Aristophane* V (Paris 1930) 44; Ussher (*supra* n.1) 165; J. van Leeuwen, *Aristophanis Ecclesiazusae* (Leyden 1905) 90; Cantarella (*supra* n.1) 313. Kleisthenes: *Ar. Nub.* 335, *Ach.* 117f, *Eq.* 1374, *Vesp.* 1187, *Av.* 831, *Thesm.* 235, 574ff, *Lys.* 622, 1092, *Ran.* 48, 57, 422, *Cratin.* 195 K., *Pherecr.* 135 K. Straton: *Ar. Ach.* 122, *Eq.* 1374.

<sup>3</sup> B. B. Rogers, *Aristophanes Ecclesiazusae* (London 1902) 98. J. Huber, *Zur Erklärung und Deutung von Aristophanes Ekklesiazousai* (Diss. Heidelberg 1974) 122, sticks to agnosticism: “solchen jungen Cretins (wir wissen über die beiden ersten [sc. Epikouros and Leukolophos] rein gar nichts).” H. D. Westlake, *Phoenix* 29 (1975) 116 n.33, suggests in passing that Epikouros was the *hellenotamias* of *IG I*<sup>3</sup> 376.12–13, 40, 43.

scholiast and of other commentators that what was *δεινόν* about being called 'Daddy' by Epikouros and Leukolophos was the implication that one could have fathered such undesirables. That is naturally one possibility. But the point might also be that the reputations of their fathers themselves were such that nobody would wish to be identified with them—*i.e.* that not (or not only) the evil character of Epikouros and Leukolophos is in question but (also) that of their fathers, whose identity was presumably well known to the audience.<sup>4</sup> The rarity of the name Leukolophos in Attic nomenclature tempts one to embark on further speculation.

*Leukolophos*. I see two possibilities here. (a) Makarios 4.46 and Append. Proverb. 3.10 record the proverb *ἡλιθιώτερον Λευκολόφου* and provide the explanation *οὗτος ἀποδόμενος τὴν οἰκίαν ἀντεποιεῖτο τοῦ φρέατος*. This plainly deserves to be mentioned in discussion of *Ecclesiazusae* 644–45,<sup>5</sup> but there is no way of demonstrating any connection with Aristophanes or indeed with early fourth-century Athens. (b) Three certainly or probably Athenian bearers of the name Leukolophos are recorded.<sup>6</sup> The first dedicated a vase found on the Acropolis,<sup>7</sup> the second was of marriageable age in the 380's (Isae. 2.3), and the third, Leukolophos of Skambonidai, is mentioned in an Imbrian inscription of 352/1 and was identified by Kirchner as a member of the family of Adeimantos Leukolophidou of Skambonidai.<sup>8</sup> Such a view seems perfectly plausible, and one might well think

<sup>4</sup> Robin Seager points out to me that if Epikouros and Leukolophos had fathers of notorious ill repute (resulting, as suggested below, from public misdeeds), identification with them might, after all, expose one to abuse by all and sundry of the sort that Blepyros fears.

<sup>5</sup> F. V. Fritzsche, *Aristophanis Ranae* (Zurich 1845) mentioned it *ad Ran.* 1513 (and *cf.* E. L. Leutsch/F. G. Schneidewin, *Corpus Pseudoepigrammatum Graecorum* I [Göttingen 1839] 417); but commentators on *Eccl.* ignore it.

<sup>6</sup> (Λ)ευκόλοφος ἐξ Σαλα[μῖνος] appears in II<sup>2</sup> 1579.8 (early IV; M. Walbank favours 402/1), but is evidently not an Athenian citizen. Pape/Benseler 791 allege an example in Anacreon, but the passage is nowadays printed Ἐρξίωνι τῷ λευκολόφῳ (*PMG* 433).

<sup>7</sup> B. Graef/E. Langlotz, *Die antiken Vasen von der Akropolis zu Athen* II (Berlin 1933) 117 no.1336: [Λευκό]λοφος ἀ[νέθεκεν]. The supplement must be accounted fairly certain; F. Bechtel, *Die historische Personennamen des Griechischen* (Halle 1917) 287, notes only two other names in -lophos, Antilophos and Pyrrolophos (but *Xen. Hell.* 1.3.13 is usually printed Πυρρόλοχος)—neither attested at Athens. That the dedicator was an Athenian is strictly uncertain, but probable enough.

<sup>8</sup> *IG* XII.8 63.13; *PA* 9063. Adeimantos' patronymic is definitely Λευκολοφίδου in *Pl. Prt.* 315E, *Xen. Hell.* 1.4.21, *IG* I<sup>2</sup> 325.28, 326.1, 328.10, Meiggs/Lewis 79.53, 116 (*cf.* *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 426.43, 106; 430.10); and Λευκολοφίδου is a certain correction in *Eup.* 210 K. In *Ar. Ran.* 1513 we have Ἀδείμαντος ὁ Λευκολόφου. Fritzsche (*supra* n.5) *ad loc.* (*cf.* H. Holden, *Onomasticon Aristophaneum* [Cambridge 1869] 780) thought that Aristophanes was hitting at Adeimantos by making him the son of the undesirable mentioned also in *Eccl.* 644–45, while Rogers, *Aristophanes Frogs* (London 1902) 229, considered that Leukolophos may have been the father's real name, Leukolophides being sometimes

that our third Leukolophos was precisely Adeimantos' son, as Rogers supposed.<sup>9</sup> If this is so, the undesirability of being identified with *this* Leukolophos' father is clear enough. Already a target for comic attack in Eupolis' *Poleis* (210 K.), Adeimantos was later accused of desecration of the Mysteries and forced into exile, with consequent loss of property.<sup>10</sup> Alkibiades' return to favour had a like effect on Adeimantos' fortunes, and he became a *strategos* only to be deposed after Notion.<sup>11</sup> He was re-elected in the aftermath of Arginousai (Xen. *Hell.* 1.7.1), but Aristophanes regarded him as a danger to the state (*Ran.* 1513), and he was ultimately identified as (one of) the traitor(s) allegedly responsible for the Athenian defeat at Aigospotamoi.<sup>12</sup> Continuing disputes about Alkibiades in the 390's<sup>13</sup> will have kept the issue of treachery at Aigospotamoi before the public mind, and Demosthenes reports (19.191) that Konon actually prosecuted Adeimantos in this connection in 393. The matter would therefore have been fairly topical at the time of *Ecclesiazusae*,<sup>14</sup> and if the point of Aristophanes' joke was that nobody would wish to be associated with Leukolophos' father Adeimantos, the audience ought to have had no trouble in understanding it.

*Epikouros*. This (unlike Leukolophos) was not a particularly rare name in classical and early Hellenistic Athens,<sup>15</sup> and identification of

---

used instead to distinguish him from *his* father (Adeimantos' grandfather)—which does not seem very probable. Pace Rogers, *Εὐβούλων* in Lys. 19.28 (*codd.*) for *Εὐβουλίδου* (archon of 394/3) and disagreements over Euripides' patronymic as between *Μνησαρχίδου* (*Vita Eurip.* [V], *CIG* 6052, *Suda* s.v.) and *Μνησάρχου* (*Vita Eurip.* [WH, cf. A], *CIG* 6051, *Suda* s.v.) do not prove that simple and *-ίδης* forms were used interchangeably of the same individual. *Λευκολόφου* in Ar. *Ran.* is surely *metri causa*. However, there is no reason why Adeimantos Leukolophidou should not have named a son simply Leukolophos. Another Leukolophides, in *IG* I<sup>2</sup> 599 (VI), is identified by Raubitschek, *DAA* p.113, as an ascendant of Adeimantos.

<sup>9</sup> Nor need he be distinct from the man in Isae. 2.3.

<sup>10</sup> *Andoc.* 1.16 and inscriptions cited *supra* n.8. His fellow-celebrants were also fellow-demesmen, Alkibiades and Axiochos.

<sup>11</sup> Xen. *Hell.* 1.4.21, Diod. 13.69.3, Nep. *Alc.* 7.1.

<sup>12</sup> Xen. *Hell.* 2.1.30f, Lys. 14.38, Dem. 19.191, Paus. 4.17.3, 10.9.11. Cf. also Lys. 2.58 (but K. J. Dover, *JHS* 80 [1960] 72, identifies the *ἡγεμών* there as Konon).

<sup>13</sup> Cf. Lys. 14, Isoc. 16 (noting the implication of 16.2 that attacks on the younger Alkibiades were common).

<sup>14</sup> Generally reckoned as either 392 or 391: cf. K. J. Beloch, *Griechische Geschichte*<sup>2</sup> III.2 (Berlin/Leipzig 1923) 226; S. Accame, *Ricerche intorno alla guerra corinzia* (Naples 1951) 112, 125; R. J. Seager, *JHS* 87 (1967) 107 n.110; P. Funke, *Homonoia und Arche* (Wiesbaden 1980) 168f.

<sup>15</sup> Eight Epikouroi appear to be recorded: (1) Raubitschek *DAA* 67 [*SEG* XIV 12D. 67: VI B.C.]; (2) father of Paches Epikourou (Thuc. 3.18.3); (3) Epikouros of Kopros, *hellenotamias* in (?) 409/8 (*supra* n.3); (4) Epikouros of Oinoe (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2393.13: second half IV); (5) Plut. *Phoc.* 38; (6) Epikouros Epitelous Rhamnousios (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 389 [*SEG* XXI 354], 649, B. D. Meritt, *Hesperia* 7 [1938] no. 17: late III/early II); (7) Epikouros

Aristophanes' Epikouros with one of the other attested bearers of the name merely on grounds of homonymity might well be accounted statistically unjustified. Since, however, none of the attested Epikouroi is known to have been alive in the late 390's, that particular question does not arise. We need another line of approach, and one may be available. Granted that a case can be made for identifying Leukolophos as the son of a disgraced *strategos*, one might search for an Epikouros who would fall into the same category: and the papponymic tendency of Greek nomenclature permits one to postulate just such a person, *viz.* an Epikouros Pachetos, son of the Paches Epikourou who was sent to deal with the Mytilenean revolt in 428/7 (Thuc. 3.18.3 etc.). Paches' involvement in the successful suppression of what the Athenians judged to be a serious threat (*cf.* Thuc. 3.3.1) ought to have won him high repute. But Plutarch reports that the subsequent public examination of his conduct when in office resulted in condemnation (to death?) and that Paches' reaction was to commit suicide in open court (*Arist.* 26, *Nic.* 6). Plutarch does not identify his alleged crime(s), but Agathias in the sixth century knew a tradition that Paches had had his evil way with two Mytilenean women whose husbands he had caused to be killed.<sup>16</sup> If there is truth in these stories (and the doubts which have been cast on their historicity<sup>17</sup> do not seem sufficiently strong to compel scepticism), a hypothetical Epikouros Pachetos was not someone with whose father any sensible person would wish to be identified. The most serious problem about explaining *Ecclesiazusae* 644–45 along these lines is the length of time

---

the philosopher; (8) Epikouros of (?) Eleusis (*Athenian Agora* XV 43.179: 335/4). A very much later Athenian Epikouros appears in *Hesperia* 41 (1972) 71 l.116 (II A.D.).

<sup>16</sup> *Anth.Pal.* 7.164; G. Viansino, *Agazio Scolastico: Epigrammi* (Milan 1967) no. 28. This need not, of course, have been the whole story.

<sup>17</sup> Westlake (*supra* n.3) 107–16 argues that (1) suicide was not a common Greek practice, (2) the case of Paches ought therefore to have attracted more comment, if not in Thucydides then in fourth-century and Hellenistic authors, (3) an Athenian jury would hardly have taken cognizance of the actions alleged by Agathias, which would have been “unlikely to arouse much reprobation.” In Westlake's view Agathias' story is quite spurious and the alleged suicide represents misunderstanding of a joke in Old Comedy. But (1) the circumstance that suicide was more common in political circles in Plutarch's day does not prove that Paches might not have so acted (especially if faced with the death penalty); (2) the story *was* in sources used by Plutarch (and ultimately perhaps Agathias)—how many surviving attestations does Westlake expect? (3) Agathias may be selecting one matter that was held against Paches, not necessarily the principal or formal charge (which might indeed, as Westlake suggests, have concerned his failure to destroy Alkidas' fleet). It is obviously impossible to feel quite unconcerned about Agathias' late date (although A. W. Gomme, *Historical Commentary on Thucydides* II [Oxford 1956] 332, was prepared to accept his testimony). But his story, even if invented, presupposes Paches' ὀλοή κήρ (Agathias' words).

that had elapsed since 427 (a problem that does not arise with Leukolophos Adeimantou). Was the Paches affair keenly enough remembered for the joke to work?

The matter is one about which we can scarcely be sure, but the circumstance that Thucydides says nothing of Paches' sad end certainly does not prove that it lacked notoriety, any more than it proves that Paches did not come to a sad end.<sup>18</sup> If the suicide story is true (and for that we are not dependent on Agathias) the event ought to have remained well lodged in public recollection: for an Athenian general actually to die for his failings was rare enough; for him to do so in public and by his own hand was (presumably) unexampled. It ought to have been a *cause célèbre*. Again the context of Paches' death, the Mytilenean revolt, was something of which Athenians should have retained keen memories, not just because it had seemed to pose a major threat but more especially because it had nearly resulted in the same sort of brutal treatment later meted out to Melos, Skione, and Torone, cases that were not forgotten in the context of argument about the Athenian Empire.<sup>19</sup> The story of Paches was not part of some squalid little side-issue in the war but of an incident of central importance at the time and (we may guess) in retrospect—and the later 390's, it need hardly be added, was a time for reflection about an Empire whose reacquisition was an aim uniting most Athenians.<sup>20</sup> Finally, there is Plutarch's presentation of the Paches story. In *Aristeides* 26 he argues that Aristeides cannot ever have been condemned for bribery because one could find no mention of such a case alongside other notorious examples of the Athenian *demos* inflicting unjust punishment on leading men (τὰ πλημμεληθέντα τῷ δήμῳ), viz. the exile of Themistokles, the imprisonment of Miltiades, the fining of Perikles, and the condemnation that provoked Paches' suicide. All that the writers who spoke of such things said about Aristeides was that he was ostracized. In *Nicias* 6 Plutarch speaks of the Athenian tendency to be suspicious of δεινότης and to attack the φρόνημα and δόξα of prominent men, a tendency exemplified by Perikles' fine, Damon's ostracism, public distrust of Antiphon, and most of all (μάλιστα δὴ) the suicide of Paches. Whatever

<sup>18</sup> Even the sceptical Westlake accepts this: (*supra* n.3) 113. Thucydides had a certain interest in the phenomenon of generals visited with unjust punishment by the *demos* (*cf.* 2.65.1f, 70.4, 4.65.3–4, 7.48.4); but if he had thought that Paches was a guilty party he would have had no brief for him. (Plutarch's sources, of course, thought him innocent: see *infra*.) But we may as well admit that Thucydides' silence cannot be explained.

<sup>19</sup> *Cf.* Isoc. 4.100, 109, 12.62f; Xen. *Hell.* 2.2.3.

<sup>20</sup> See Seager and Funke (*supra* n.14).

one makes of Paches' implied innocence,<sup>21</sup> it is evident that his fate was notorious enough to become a stock *exemplum*.<sup>22</sup> It must have appeared in historical sources now otherwise lost, and may well have appeared in Old Comedy,<sup>23</sup> and I see no reason why this literary interest should not have reflected a popular knowledge of the affair sufficient to ensure that Epikouros Pachetos (if he existed at all) would not easily be dissociated from the sins of his father. Naturally, nothing prevents one from supposing that Epikouros had recently drawn attention to himself in his own right in some (now irrecoverable) fashion.<sup>24</sup> Aristophanes' joke need not have suggested itself solely because paternity happened to be a topic that arose naturally from the plot of *Ecclesiazusae*.

My thesis, therefore, is that Epikouros and Leukolophos were the sons of two Athenian *stratego*i of ill repute. It is obviously not susceptible of proof. The striking coincidence that the pair, mentioned by Aristophanes without further identification, bear names that can be easily related to notable victims of public anger might be dismissed as accidental. But one need make no apology for asserting that it is not.

THE UNIVERSITY OF LIVERPOOL  
 May, 1982

<sup>21</sup> This need only reflect a particular partisan view (so Gomme). Antiphon was hardly totally 'innocent' from the point of view of the Athenian *demos*.

<sup>22</sup> Westlake observes that Plutarch enlarges upon the Paches case in both passages; he concludes that the suicide story was an importation from some source other than those that quoted Paches' fate as an *exemplum*: (*supra* n.3) 115f. That Plutarch explains what happened to Paches *might* indicate that the case was less well known in his own time but says nothing about the early fourth century. However, we may equally well suppose that Plutarch is simply stressing the particularly gruesome fate of Paches (which is the climactic item in both lists).

<sup>23</sup> Antiphon and Damon, the other less than obviously 'major' figures in Plutarch's lists, appeared in comedy (*cf.* Plato Com. 103 K.; Ar. *Vesp.* 1270, 1301; Plut. *Per.* 4).

<sup>24</sup> The same, of course, may be true of Leukolophos. His father's trial would provide a pertinent context.