

Alcibiades, Athens, and the Tyranny of Sicily (Thuc. 6.16)

David G. Smith

THUCYDIDES TELLS US that, in the winter of 416/5, the Athenians voted to send an expedition against Sicily under the command of Lamachus, Nicias, and Alcibiades (6.8.2). Five days later, the assembly met again to discuss logistics. Nicias, who opposed the expedition but had been elected to the command nevertheless, attempted to advise the Athenians one final time against the expedition. After enumerating a number of practical military difficulties in an attempt to dissuade the Athenians from sailing (6.10–11), the speech of Nicias moves on to the most pressing difficulty of all (6.12.2): the character and motivations of his fellow general and antagonist Alcibiades, who was the main proponent of the expedition. In a brief but important transition to Alcibiades' rebuttal, Thucydides in his narrator's voice expands on the sentiments he presented in Nicias' assassination of Alcibiades' character and suggests that these sentiments led to the fall of Athens (6.15).

These insinuations against Alcibiades are of the utmost gravity, and are important evidence for understanding the dynamics of the Athenian imperial democracy during the Peloponnesian War.¹ Recent scholarship has explored how

¹ Thucydides represents Athens' control of its allies after the formation of the Delian League as a tyranny, insofar as it represses the "freedom of the Greeks": see J. de Romilly, *Thucydides and Athenian Imperialism* (Oxford 1963) 123–128; V. Hunter, "Athens Tyrannis: A New Approach to Thucydides," *CJ* 69 (1973/4) 120–126; W. R. Connor, "Tyrannis Polis," in J. H. D'Arms and J. W. Eadie (eds.), *Ancient and Modern: Essays in Honor of Gerald F. Else* (Michigan 1977) 95–109; with important reviews and reappraisals by C. Tuplin, "Imperial Tyranny: Some Reflections on a Classical Greek Political

Thucydides develops thematic parallels between Athens' imperialistic policies and the misbehavior of its dashing young general in order to emphasize the tensions between democracy and tyranny in both individuals and states during wartime.² Thus, when he was singled out by Nicias as a member of the athletic elite in front of a democratic assembly, the need to successfully negotiate these tensions seems to have suggested to Alcibiades that a public-service "spin" on his shocking recent behavior, private expenditures, and athletic victories should structure his response (6.16–18) to the charges against him.³

In this article, I argue that Alcibiades' attempt in this response to attenuate Athens' *phthonos* towards him is part of a deliberate Thucydidean historiographical strategy to elicit connections between Athenian imperialism and Sicilian tyranny

Metaphor," in P. Cartledge and F. D. Harvey (eds.), *Crux: Essays in Greek History presented to G. E. M. de Ste. Croix* (Exeter 1985) 348–375, and now by the contributions in K. Morgan (ed.), *Popular Tyranny: Sovereignty and its Discontents in Ancient Greece* (Austin 2003).

² On the representations of Alcibiades and their relationship to Athens, see now esp. D. Gribble, *Alcibiades and Athens* (Oxford 1999); also S. Forde, *The Ambition to Rule: Alcibiades and the Politics of Imperialism in Thucydides* (Cornell 1989) 1–67; G. Crane, *The Blinded Eye: Thucydides and the New Written Word* (Lanham 1996) 111–146; L. Kallet, *Money and the Corrosion of Power in Thucydides: The Sicilian Expedition and its Aftermath* (Berkeley 2001) 79–82; V. Wohl, *Love among the Ruins: The Erotics of Democracy in Classical Athens* (Princeton 2002) 124–170; P. W. Ludwig, *Eros and Polis: Desire and Community in Greek Political Theory* (Cambridge 2002) 153–169; B. Warren, *Hê Polis Gar Dustokei: The Question of Alcibiades in Aristophanes' Frogs and Thucydides' History* (diss. Johns Hopkins 2002) 128–147.

³ The precise character of this negotiation has been variously interpreted. Alcibiades' speech has been characterized as, e.g.: incompatible with civic values by L. Kurke, *The Traffic in Praise: Pindar and the Poetics of Social Economy* (Cornell 1991) 170–177; a concession to civic values by S. Hornblower, *Thucydides and Pindar: Historical Narrative and the World of Epinikian Poetry* (Oxford 2004) 259–261; an elite counter-attack against egalitarianism by J. K. Davies, *Athenian Propertied Families* (Oxford 1971) xvii; an attempt to sway the masses with elite status symbols by J. Ober, *Mass and Elite in Democratic Athens* (Princeton 1989) 93; and an attempt to establish a "patron-client" relationship with the *dêmos* by P. Millett, "The Rhetoric of Reciprocity in Classical Athens," in C. Gill et al. (eds.), *Reciprocity in Ancient Greece* (Oxford 1998) 227–254, at 245.

through the use of epinician allusions. After a brief review of the *ad hominem* attacks launched against Alcibiades, I turn to an analysis of his rebuttal, arguing that it seeks to defend his athletic victories and reintegrate them into the Athenian civic community by manipulating the language and rhetorical strategies of the epinician genre. At the same time, however, Thucydides laces Alcibiades' speech in defense of his actions and personal behavior with language from the corpus of epinician poetry chosen for its tyrannical and Sicilian overtones, particularly Euripides' ode for Alcibiades and Pindar's odes for the tyrant families of Sicily. Thus, although Thucydides has Alcibiades mobilize rhetorical strategies with aplomb, I argue that the historian complicates our picture of the young general by his particular choice of references, ironically making him admit—even as he defends himself—that the most fitting self-characterization for his recent behavior leading up to this speech in favor of dominating Sicily is that of Sicilian tyranny. I conclude that this characterization, “cast in terms of moral transgression,” is intimately connected with the wider context in which it occurs: the behavior of the Athenians and their decision to launch the Sicilian expedition.⁴

That Thucydides might communicate historical information through the deployment of literary or rhetorical strategies has been, in spite of his reputation as a “scientific historian,” long acknowledged.⁵ That part of his strategic repertoire was the appropriation of techniques and tropes from his poetic prede-

⁴ Moral transgression: Kallet, *Money* 36. Cf. C. MacLeod, “Thucydides and Tragedy,” *Collected Essays* (Oxford 1983) 140–158, at 141: “Thucydides' account of the character and the motives of the Athenian attack on Sicily ... is essential to his analysis of the Athenian democracy and empire.”

⁵ E.g. Hobbes, quoting Plutarch, in D. Grene, *Thucydides, The Peloponnesian War. The Complete Hobbes Translation* (Chicago 1989) 577; H. White, *Meta-history: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-century Europe* (Baltimore 1973) 97–98; V. Hunter *Thucydides the Artful Reporter* (Toronto 1973); Connor, in *Ancient and Modern*, and *Thucydides* (Princeton 1984); and T. Rood, *Thucydides: Narrative and Explanation* (Oxford 1998), discuss the primary role played by literary and rhetorical techniques in the construction of Thucydides' history. For a recent review see E. Greenwood, *Thucydides and the Shaping of History* (London 2006) 1–26.

cessors and contemporaries is now also well understood.⁶ Hornblower has recently argued at length that a better understanding of the text of Thucydides results from acknowledging him to be a member of the same intellectual world as the epinician poet Pindar.⁷ Yet while his work covers Sicilian victors (186–201) and parts of the Sicilian expedition (327–353), it approaches the connections between Thucydides and epinician poetry in order to reveal aspects of the Greek world shared by both authors, rather than, as I do here, for the purpose of analyzing Thucydides' use of Pindar's epinician language in the service of his historiographical purposes.⁸

One might object that Thucydidean parallels with Pindar's Sicilian odes may be not only a result of "shared worlds" but also of statistical accident, since approximately one third of his odes are for Sicilians and one quarter are for Sicilian dynasts and their houses. This leaves a good chance—basically one in four—that any reference Thucydides makes to Pindar will, by default, refer to an ode written for a member of the family of Hieron of Syracuse or Theron of Acragas. However, the parallels adduced below are, for the most part (and I note where this is the case), too precise to be accidents. That is to say, most of them are not just overlaps of thought or word or image, but

⁶ E.g. F. M. Cornford, *Thucydides Mythistoricus* (London 1907); N. Marinatos, "Nicias as a Wise Adviser and Tragic Warner in Thucydides," *Philologus* 124 (1980) 305–310; MacLeod, *Collected Essays* 140–158; S. A. Frangoulidis, "A Pattern from Homer's *Odyssey* in the Sicilian Narrative of Thucydides," *QUCC* 44 (1993) 95–102; C. J. Mackie, "Homer and Thucydides: Corcyra and Sicily," *CJ* 46 (1996) 103–113; J. Allison, "Homeric Allusions at the Close of Thucydides' Sicilian Narrative," *AJP* 118 (1997) 499–516; A. V. Zadorojnyi, "Thucydides' Nicias and Homer's Agamemnon," *CQ* 48 (1998) 298–303; D. G. Smith, "Thucydides' Ignorant Athenians and the Drama of the Sicilian Expedition," *SyllClass* 15 (2004) 33–70.

⁷ Hornblower, *Thucydides and Pindar*.

⁸ I dissent, *pace* Hornblower, from his conclusions about the role played by Pindar's vision of Sicily in Thucydides' narrative: e.g. that "Thucydides and Pindar generally agree that the Sicilian tyrants were big spenders and that they founded and destroyed cities, but by Thucydides' time their day was past and he had no call to expand on their achievements in detail" (188), and that the Olympic Games of 420 B.C. are "the clearest example of *Thucydides Pindaricus*" (273).

vocabulary and phraseology specifically developed by both Pindar and Thucydides—each in his own way and for his own reasons, but nevertheless by both authors—to refer exclusively to a particular intersection of people and ideas and hence deliberately to that intersection and no other. So, in addition to building on Hornblower’s expansive demonstration of Thucydides’ familiarity with the corpus of Pindaric poetry, it will be seen that the passages compared below meet the remaining criteria identified by Hinds for a conscious allusion: specific linguistic responsiveness, susceptibility to interpretation, and collective security.⁹ From this I make three methodological assertions which exert an effect throughout what follows: (1) Thucydides, but also Euripides and Aristophanes, as readers and/or auditors of Pindar’s poetry, were able to recognize the semantic fields which the latter was manipulating; (2) as writers, they were able to reconfigure Pindaric intertexts to suit their own agendas of political characterization; and (3) their audiences, alert to the agendas of political characterization that appeared on stage and in other public discourses, were meant to draw extra-textual signification from the associations thereby produced.

1. Alcibiades and the Tyranny of Athens

Within Thucydides’ account of the debate over the Sicilian expedition there are three judgments on Alcibiades. First (6.12.2) is that of Nicias, who attacks Alcibiades’ character and thus represents the doubts of the minority in the Athenian assembly and the reasons for not attacking Sicily. Second (6.15.2–4) is that of Thucydides, who interjects a rare comment in his own voice on the underlying motivations for the Athenian attitudes towards Alcibiades represented by Nicias’ attack.¹⁰

⁹ S. Hinds, *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry* (Oxford 1998) 28.

¹⁰ Cf. Rood, *Narrative and Explanation* 13: “it is more profitable to attend at a local level to his [Thucydides’] control of access to characters’ thoughts and perceptions (his ‘focalizing technique’);” Kallet, *Money* 36: “Thucydides preconditions a negative reading of Alcibiades’ speech ... through both repetition (his endorsement of Nicias’ charges) and the location of a higher narrative authority, his own, immediately preceding the speech.”

Third (6.16.1–6), Thucydides presents Alcibiades making a judgment on his own character, which is, on the surface at least, a response both to the charges laid against him in Nicias' speech and to the wider concerns implied in Thucydides' interjection. I review the first two briefly in order to show how presenting separate points of view is part of Thucydides' historiographical strategy for representing the tensions in the Athenian attitude regarding Alcibiades' recent behavior in the context of the Sicilian expedition and, therefore, for explaining the types of constraints and pressures to which Alcibiades' speech must respond.

The essence of Nicias' invective is that Alcibiades is both too young for the command and eager for the expedition for all the wrong reasons (6.12.2):¹¹

εἴ τε τις ἄρχειν ἄσμενος αἰρεθεὶς παραινεί ὑμῖν ἐκπλεῖν, τὸ ἑαυτοῦ μόνον σκοπῶν, ἄλλως τε καὶ νεώτερος ὢν ἔτι ἐς τὸ ἄρχειν, ὅπως θαυμασθῆ μὲν ἀπὸ τῆς ἵπποτροφίας, διὰ δὲ πολυτέλειαν καὶ ὠφελήθη τι ἐκ τῆς ἀρχῆς, μηδὲ τούτῳ ἐμπαράσχητε τῷ τῆς πόλεως κινδύνῳ ἴδια ἐλλαμπρύνεσθαι, νομίσατε δὲ τοὺς τοιούτους τὰ μὲν δημόσια ἀδικεῖν, τὰ δὲ ἴδια ἀναλοῦν, καὶ τὸ πρᾶγμα μέγα εἶναι καὶ μὴ οἶον νεωτέρῳ βουλευσασθαί τε καὶ ὀξέως μεταχειρίσασθαι.

If someone here, pleased at being chosen to command, advises you to sail, looking out only for his own interests—especially since he is still too young for the command—so that he can be admired for his equestrian pursuits while on the other hand he can gain some advantage from the command to redress his great expenditures, do not empower this man to be privately glorified at the risk of the city, but rather consider that such people harm the public interest while they waste their private funds. This expedition is too large, and not the type of affair for one who is too young to give counsel on and take rashly in hand.

He insinuates that Alcibiades' indulgent private tastes disclose his inability to properly manage public affairs, and—worse—that the young general hoped to use the expedition to Sicily as a way of increasing his private fortunes and financing his ex-

¹¹ Otherwise unqualified numbers in this paper are references to the revised OCT of Thucydides by Jones and Powell. All translations are my own unless otherwise noted.

pensive aristocratic lifestyle.¹² Thucydides, in his narrator's voice, before relating Alcibiades' reply, says that Alcibiades desired to undertake command of the Sicilian expedition in order to bring himself, personally, wealth and honor (6.15.2). He goes on to say (3–4):

ὄν γὰρ ἐν ἀξιώματι ὑπὸ τῶν ἀστών, ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις μείζουσιν ἢ κατὰ τὴν ὑπάρχουσαν οὐσίαν ἐχρήτο ἕς τε τὰς ἵπποτροφίας καὶ τὰς ἄλλας δαπάνας· ὅπερ καὶ καθεῖλεν ὕστερον τὴν τῶν Ἀθηναίων πόλιν οὐχ ἥμιστά· φοβηθέντες γὰρ αὐτοῦ οἱ πολλοὶ τὸ μέγεθος τῆς τε κατὰ τὸ ἑαυτοῦ σῶμα παρανομίας ἕς τὴν δίαιταν καὶ τῆς διανοίας ὣν καθ' ἕνα ἕκαστον ἐν ὅτῳ γίγνοιτο ἔπρασσαν, ὡς τυραννίδος ἐπιθυμοῦντι πολέμοι καθέστασαν.

For although he was held in high esteem by his fellow citizens, he had desires for equestrian pursuits and other expenses that were greater than his fortune allowed. This is the very thing, not least of all, that later brought down the city of the Athenians. For the populace—fearful of the extent both of the lawlessness he displayed though his body and of his intention in each and every thing that he did—became hostile to him, since they thought he desired a tyranny.

Yet, for all this, the speech of Nicias and the judgment of Thucydides are focused on one particularly alarming recent event in Alcibiades' life, which the latter's speech acknowledges by addressing it before making any mention of Sicily or the expedition itself: in 416, Alcibiades exceeded the accomplishments of any Hellene ever in the chariot-race at Olympia, entering seven teams and taking three of at least the first four places. Horse-raising, chariot-racing, and other avenues of conspicuous expenditure (cf. τὰς ἄλλας δαπάνας) had such a close and lengthy association with elite identity that by the end of the fifth century in Athens they had started to become almost indicative of tyrannical aspirations.¹³ Expenditure on this type of

¹² Kallet, *Money* 34, calls this an accusation “intended to foster unease in the reader about the role of private wealth in public contexts.”

¹³ The Alcmaeonids were one of only four families in Athens known to have raced horses before the end of the fifth century; cf. L. Scott, *Historical Commentary on Herodotus Book Six* (Leiden 2005) 520. Alcmaeonid scions, allegedly descended from the exiled sons of the horseman Nestor (Paus. 2.18.9), and starting with Cylon (Hdt. 5.71, Thuc. 1.126), seemed to have a special knack for uniting tyranny, athletic victory, and exile. The complete

lifestyle particularly is what Thucydides (ὄπερ ... οὐχ ἥμισυ) says the Athenians feared most about Alcibiades. Rosenbloom, in fact, has argued that the *ostrakophoria* of Hyperbolus described by Plutarch (*Nic.* 11, *Alc.* 13) was not only intended for Alcibiades, but took place in 415 as a direct result of his symbolic attempt at tyranny through his Olympic victories the previous year.¹⁴ Nicias, of course, does not hesitate to play on this anxiety and levels his accusations against “someone” who might be manipulating the city towards unnecessary imperialism in the service of his extravagant equestrian proclivities.¹⁵ It is with the need to defend himself against these accusations and to reconfigure the characterization of his personality in the interests of the city that Thucydides has Alcibiades take the stage and begin to speak.

list of Alcmaeonid victors is at D. G. Kyle, *Athletics in Ancient Athens* (Leiden 1987) 157–158, and for Alcmaeonid exiles see S. Forsdyke, “Exile, Ostracism, and the Athenian Democracy,” *CLAnt* 19 (2000) 232–263, and G. Anderson, “Alkmeonid ‘Homelands’, Political Exile, and the Unification of Attika,” *Historia* 49 (2000) 387–412. Ostraca calling Megacles Κυλόνεος, ἱπποτρόφος, ἱππότης, and the “son of Koisyra” (the wife of Peisistratus) make the associations even clearer; cf. D. Rosenbloom, “*Ponēroi* vs. *Chrēstoi*: The Ostracism of Hyperbolus and the Struggle for Hegemony in Athens after the Death of Perikles, Part I,” *TAPA* 134 (2004) 55–105, at 72–73; and Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 22.5. Although Herodotus 6.121–131 (also 5.62) somewhat inconsistently insists that Alcmaeonids (at least those of the Persian Wars generations?) would be the last to approve of or support autocratic government, his heterodox stance indicates a tradition which must have sat heavily upon Alcibiades when talk of his ancestors arose or was implied (as here in Thucydides). Alcibiades’ immediate family life was of little help in this regard: although his father was a patriot and a war-hero, he himself was raised in the household of Pericles, the closest thing fifth-century Athens had to a tyrant, and he married Hipparete, daughter of Hipponicus, presumably another aristocratic family of horse-breeders (see Davies, *APP* 18–21).

¹⁴ Rosenbloom, *TAPA* 134 (2004) 57.

¹⁵ As de Romilly suggests, *Thucydides* 205: “This reconstitution of the debate by Thucydides was inspired by the desire to bring out certain ideas about Athenian imperialism.” Connor, *Thucydides* 164–165, urges that we note the discrepancy between Nicias’ accusations of extravagance and ambition, and Thucydides’ that Athens threw the baby of Alcibiades’ excellence out with the bathwater of his lifestyle.

2. Alcibiades and the Tyranny of Sicily

How does Thucydides characterize Alcibiades' rebuttal to the charges levelled against him? MacLeod notes that, on the surface at least, Alcibiades' response is sound oratorical practice: a *lisis diabolés* (an attempt to wipe out the slurs of his opponent).¹⁶ But when we look beneath the surface of Alcibiades' response, we find that its rhetorical strategies seem to have been drawn from the one performance genre whose primary function was, as Kurke has argued, to defuse the negative civic consequences of excessive personal glory, especially when that glory is the result of athletic victory.¹⁷ In this section, I argue that Thucydides crafts Alcibiades' speech with the language of epinician poetry, drawing on sources from that genre particularly chosen by the historian for their implicit and explicit associations with tyranny and Sicily. I consider first Euripides' epinician ode for Alcibiades' victories in 416 (itself intertextually connected to odes for Sicilian tyrants), then the poems dedicated by Pindar to Sicilian victors, and conclude by arguing that these associations are not merely part of the epinician agenda of Euripides or the private historical musings of Thucydides, but are rather part of a general Athenian discourse about Alcibiades recognizable to the audiences of Aristophanes.

Euripides' Ode for Alcibiades

Thucydides has Alcibiades announce his victories (6.16.2): ἄρματα μὲν ἑπτὰ καθήκα, ὅσα οὐδεὶς πω ιδιώτης πρότερον, ἐνίκησα δὲ καὶ δεύτερος καὶ τέταρτος ἐγενόμην, "I entered seven chariots, a number that no private citizen had ever entered before, and I won and came in second and fourth."¹⁸

¹⁶ C. MacLeod, "Rhetoric and History (Thuc. 6.16–18)," *Collected Essays* 68–87.

¹⁷ Kurke, *Traffic in Praise*.

¹⁸ Hornblower, *Thucydides and Pindar* 58, notes that Alcibiades' otherwise irrelevant claim in Thucydides 6.16.2 that he came in not just first and second but fourth as well tells us two important things: first, that Thucydides was aware of the victories, and second, that he was aware of Euripides' ode (which claims for him first, second, and third place; see below) and the need to correct it. Plutarch cites the discrepancy between the two authors,

Euripides celebrated this one-of-a-kind accomplishment with a victory ode. It survives in two fragments, in which the use of dactylo-epitrite meter, references to family, event, and prize, and the larger rhetorical strategies all combine to root this ode firmly in the conventions of the epinician genre.¹⁹ Even with the shortness of the preserved passages and the conspicuous absence of a mythological *paradeigma*, it is reasonable to assume that Euripides was familiar to a large degree with the work of his epinician predecessors, and that certain intertextual features of his poem connect it to a carefully delimited nexus of historical and literary contexts.

The first fragment is preserved in Plutarch's *Life of Alcibiades*:²⁰

σὲ δ' ἄγαμαι ὦ Κλεινίου παῖ.
καλὸν ἄ νικά. [τὸ] κάλλιστον δ' ὃ μηδεὶς
ἄλλος Ἑλλάνων [ἔλαχε],
ἄρματι πρῶτα δρᾶμειν καὶ δεύτερα καὶ τρίτα βῆναί τ'
ἀπονητὶ Διὸς στεφθέντ' ἐλαίᾳ
κάρυκι βοᾶν παραδοῦναι.

I am amazed at you, son of Cleinias. Victory is a beautiful thing, but the most beautiful thing, which no other of the Hellenes has had, you have had, to be first and second and third in the chariot-race and to go without labor, crowned with the laurel of Zeus, to make the herald cry your name aloud.

Euripides begins by addressing his *laudandus* with the formula “O son of Cleinias.” Apart from this occurrence, the vocative *pai* + father's name, where the *pai* is the victor, is used in the

asserts that Thucydides' is the correct version, and claims that neither *idiôtês* nor *basileus* ever matched this performance (*Alc.* 11). For Alcibiades' victories elsewhere, at Nemea, Delphi, and the Great Panathenaea, see Davies, *APF* 20–21.

¹⁹ On epinician generic conventions see E. Bundy, *Studia Pindarica* (Berkeley 1962); R. Hamilton, *Epinikion. General Form in the Odes of Pindar* (The Hague 1974); K. Crotty, *Song and Action: The Victory Odes of Pindar* (Baltimore 1982); Kurke, *Traffic in Praise*; H. Mackie, *Graceful Errors: Pindar and the Performance of Praise* (Ann Arbor 2003).

²⁰ Plut. *Alc.* 11.3; Page, *PMG* 755. I use the emendations and translation of C. M. Bowra, “Euripides' Epinician for Alcibiades,” *Historia* 9 (1960) 68–79.

extant corpus of epinician odes to refer to Hieron, tyrant of Syracuse (Pind. *Pyth.* 2.18), Hieron's son-in-law and *generalissimo* Chromius (*Nem.* 1.29), Hieron's close associate Hagesias (*Ol.* 6.80), and Hagesidamus of Locri (*Ol.* 11.12), which had become Hieron's protectorate through the mediation of Chromius. This formula is used only these four times by Pindar, and not at all by Bacchylides, in this sense.²¹ In other words, whenever an epinician chorus addressed its *laudandus* directly as “*pai* of your father,” the victorious *pai* was always either Alcibiades or someone closely connected to the Deinomenid tyranny of Syracuse.²² Given the distribution of Pindaric citations and references in classical authors, there is reason to think that the tyrant odes of Sicily were known to Athenian audiences in the later fifth century, and that such an unusually restricted formula could have been recognized and manipulated by a poet of Euripides' talent.²³

²¹ When not referring to the victor himself, this vocative address is used in Pindar's epinicia only of the patronymy of gods (*Ol.* 2.12, *Ol.* 4.6, fr.144 of Zeus; *Ol.* 12.1 of Tyche; *Nem.* 7.2 of Eileithyia; *Nem.* 11.1 of Hestia) and ancestors (*Isthm.* 7.31 of Strepsiades, the dead uncle of the victor). The only appearance of vocative plural *paides* = victors + father's name is at Bacch. 5.35–36, and refers once again to the sons of Deinomenes.

²² I am indebted to the perspicacious skepticism of those who commented on this paper in earlier drafts for many vigorous tests of this proposal. Certainly many examples of the formula exist in tragedy and epic and elsewhere, but not in epinician poetry. Epinician appearances of *pais* and other cases with the stem *paid-* + father's name do not disprove my claim about the reserved use of the vocative. Neither was this variety of patronymic address at all unusual in contemporary Greek practice—indeed, Aristophanes (*Ach.* 716), Critias (fr.4 D.-K.), and [Plato] (*Alc.* 103A1, 105D2) all refer to Alcibiades in this way. The closest cases (e.g., Pind *Ol.* 12.13, frs. 120.2, 94b.66, and Bacch. fr.20B.17) nevertheless fail to meet the stated criteria: vocative *pai* = victor + name of father, in an epinician context.

²³ For knowledge of Pindar and associations with Sicily in fifth-century Athens, see J. Irigoin, *Histoire du texte de Pindare* (Paris 1952) 14–16; N. Luraghi, “La tirannide siceliota nell'Archaiologia di Tucidide,” *QS* 42 (1995) 35–63; A. Bagordo, *Reminiszenzen früher Lyrik bei den attischen Tragikern* (Munich 2003) 166–218; and Smith, *SyllClass* 15 (2004) 33–70. According to S. Harrell, “King or Private Citizen: Fifth-century Sicilian Tyrants at Olympia and Delphi,” *Mnemosyne* 55 (2002) 439–464, Sicilian tyrants, and Gelon and Hieron in particular, had a twofold strategy for presenting

Two of Euripides' four original Pindaric contexts for the use of the *pai* of X formula to refer to Syracusan tyranny are also taken over in turn by Thucydides in constructing Alcibiades' rebuttal. In *Pythian* 2 Pindar addressed Hieron of Aetna in his capacity as the savior of Locri in its confrontation with Rhegium.²⁴ There, the safety of the city depended solely on the *dunamis* of the *pai* of X (*Pyth.* 2.18–20):²⁵

σὲ δ', ὦ Δεινομένειε παῖ, Ζεφυρία πρὸ δόμων
 Λοκρὶς παρθένος ἀπύει, πολεμίων καμάτων ἐξ ἀμαχάνων
 διὰ τεὰν δύναμιν δρακεῖσ' ἀσφαλές.

But you, O Deinomenes' son, the Locrian maiden of the west
 calls upon before her halls, seemingly secure from the des-
 perately defeated enemy thanks to your power.

themselves to the wider Greek world. While they were apparently called *basileus* freely in epinician and direct address (Pind. *Ol.* 1.23, *Pyth.* 1.60, 3.70; Hdt. 7.161 and cf. 7.159), their dedications in panhellenic sanctuaries make no reference to office or title whatsoever; cf. S. I. Oost, "The Tyrant Kings of Syracuse," *CP* 71 (1976) 224–236. In fact, what is striking in the language of the inscriptions accompanying dedicatory offerings (whether epinician or military) made by Gelon and Hieron is that they consistently refer to themselves as "son of Deinomenes." This is true of the charioteer dedicated at Olympia by Gelon in 488 (*Syll.*³ 33), each of the three helmets dedicated at Olympia by Hieron for his victory over the Etruscan navy at Cumae in 474 (M./L. 29, *SEG* XXIII 253, XXXIII 328), and perhaps most famously on the golden tripods at Delphi celebrating (at least initially) Syracusan victory over Carthage in 480 (*Syll.*³ 34a, 35c). Although in each of these six cases the phrase is *ho Deinomeneos*, what is important is that Gelon and Hieron were known throughout the Greek world, and especially in the context of chariot victories at Olympia, as the sons of Deinomenes.

²⁴ For this episode, generally dated to 477, see E. A. Freeman, *The History of Sicily from the Earliest Times* II (Oxford 1891) 240–241; H. Lloyd-Jones, "Modern Interpretation of Pindar: The Second Pythian and Seventh Nemean Odes," *JHS* 93 (1973) 109–137, at 117–127; T. Gantz, "Pindar's Second Pythian: The Myth of Ixion," *Hermes* 106 (1978) 14–26; C. Carey, *A Commentary on Five Odes of Pindar* (New York 1981) 21–23; and B. Currie, *Pindar and the Cult of Heroes* (Oxford 2005) 258–264.

²⁵ The Locrians had good reason to be thankful to Hieron: *cum Rheginorum tyranni Leophronis bello Locenses premerentur, voverunt, si victores forent, ut die festo Veneris virgines suas prostituerent* (Just. 21.3.2). See J. Redfield, *The Locrian Maidens: Love and Death in Greek Italy* (Princeton 2003) 411–416; Currie, *Pindar* 262–275.

In *Nemean* 1 Pindar's advice for the *pai* of X dwelt first on the relationship between strength and action and then on the proper use of wealth—not hidden away but rather employed for public gain (*Nem.* 1.26–32):

πράσσει γὰρ ἔργῳ μὲν σθένος,
 βουλαῖσι δὲ φρήν, ἐσσόμενον προῖδεν
 συγγενὲς οἷς ἔπεται.
 Ἀγησιδάμου παῖ, σέο δ' ἀμφὶ τρόπῳ
 τῶν τε καὶ τῶν χρήσιες.
 οὐκ ἔραμαι πολὺν ἐν μεγάρῳ πλοῦτον κατακρύψαις ἔχειν,
 ἀλλ' ἐόντων εὐ τε παθεῖν καὶ ἀκούσαι φίλοις ἐξαρκέων.

For strength manifests itself through action, and wisdom through counsels, for those who have the natural ability to foresee the future. But, son of Hagesidamus, you enjoy the use of both of these things in your character. I do not desire to keep great wealth hidden away in a palace, but to be successful with what I have and to have a good reputation for being generous with my friends.

By aligning these two Pindaric *pai* contexts with Thucydides' characterization of Alcibiades in Book 6, we can see how both the historian and Euripides may be manipulating the same Pindaric passages.²⁶ *Pythian* 2 becomes appropriate for Alcibiades when Thucydides has him extol his own *dunamis* in the context of aiding Athens. The *dunamis* of Hieron which was so useful in protecting the Locrians is refigured now for Alcibiades as the *dunamis* of Athens in his capacity as public upholder of the city's international reputation at Olympia (6.16.2): οἱ γὰρ Ἕλληνες καὶ ὑπὲρ δύναμιν μείζω ἡμῶν τὴν πόλιν ἐνόμισαν τῷ ἐμῷ διαπρεπεῖ τῆς Ὀλυμπιάζε θεωρίας, πρότερον ἐλπίζοντες αὐτὴν καταπεπολεμηθεῖν, "For the Greeks considered our city to be greater than its actual power because of the magnificence of my mission to the Olympian games, even though they previously thought it worn out with war." Notice as well the repetition from Pindar of the sentiment of a city worn out by war:

²⁶ Although Thucydides had initially introduced Nicias, Alcibiades, and Lamachus together by their simple patronymics in 6.8.2, he introduces Nicias' speech in 6.8.4 without the patronymic but Alcibiades' in 6.15.2 by stating again—unnecessarily and therefore markedly—that he is *Kleiniou*.

πολεμίων καμάτων ἐξ ἀμαχάνων and καταπεπολεμησθαι. Similarly in *Nemean* 1, the sentiment expressed in the *pai* of X verses was that strength (σθένος) manifests itself (πράσσει) through action (ἔργῳ). The sentiment in Pindar is borrowed by Thucydides who, although choosing different words, has Alcibiades express virtually the same idea later in the same sentence as above (6.16.2): “strength (δύναμις) is deduced (ὑπονοεῖται) through action (ἐκ δὲ τοῦ δρωμένου).” Furthermore, Pindar’s claim in *Nemean* 1, that he does not wish to keep his wealth hidden away but prefers to spend it publicly in such a way that he earns praise and benefits his friends, parallels Alcibiades’ self-characterization of his extravagant spending practices in his next sentence: καὶ οὐκ ἄχρηστος ἦδ’ ἡ ἄνοια, ὅς ἂν τοῖς ἰδίῳις τέλεσι μὴ ἑαυτὸν μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν πόλιν ὠφελῆ, “For this is no useless folly, whoever in his private expenditures aids not only himself but the city as well” (6.16.3).²⁷ Thucydides has characterized Alcibiades by having him condense the same two Pindaric intertexts indicated by Euripides’ geopolitically specific vocative formula into a defense of his lifestyle and its usefulness to the state.

Beyond the collective security of the vocative patronymic with *pai*, there is a second reason to think that Pindar’s odes for Sicilian tyrants may have been part of Euripides’ strategy for characterizing Alcibiades. Kurke notes that Pindar’s epinician poetry works on two different registers when it comes to involving the polis and its citizens in the *megaloprepeia* of the victor:²⁸

For victors who are *idiotai*, the poet subtly and skillfully includes the whole community both in the victory itself and in the poem that commemorates it ... Conversely, for those victors who are tyrants, the poet applies a rhetoric of extremeness which suits the preeminent position and gestures of his patrons. Thus we might note that the “superlative vaunt” which “assert[s] the superiority of the subject over all others,” occurs most frequently

²⁷ The poet is speaking of himself, but the scholia correctly interpret the line as advice meant for the *laudandus*: “what he wants to praise Chromius for, he brings out in himself.” The gloss of the underlying sentiment given a few lines later—εὐεργετικὸς γίνου—is what Alcibiades is claiming to have done.

²⁸ Kurke, *Traffic in Praise* 224.

in the epinikia composed for tyrants.

In other words, the genre has different strategies for presenting the victor as either part of a community of private citizens (by involving their community in their victory) or as a tyrant who lives beyond the concerns of the community (by emphasizing the unique nature of his accomplishment). It may therefore be legitimate to read backwards, as it were, to infer something of the victor's status—at least in the imagination of his *laudator*—from the strategies used to represent him.

In the case of Euripides' epinician for Alcibiades, it is important that even the two short fragments that are known preserve a significant vacillation between both strategies. Reporting the second in a different context, Plutarch says: ὁ μὲν γράψας τὸ ἐπὶ τῇ νίκῃ τῆς Ὀλυμπίαςιν ἵπποδρομίας εἰς Ἀλκιβιάδην ἐγκώμιον, εἴτ' Εὐριπίδης ὡς ὁ πολλὸς κρατεῖ λόγος, εἶθ' ἕτερός τις ἦν, ὃ Σόσσιε Σενεκίων, φησὶ χρῆναι τῷ εὐδαίμονι πρῶτον ὑπάρξαι τὰν πόλιν εὐδόκιμον, "The one who wrote the encomium for Alcibiades' victory at the Olympian horserace—whether it was Euripides, as most say, or someone else—says that a famous city is the first thing a blessed man must have" (*Dem.* 1 = *PMG* 756). Bowra argues convincingly for the authenticity of this passage and suggests that "the original words were something like χρῆν εὐδαίμονι πρῶτον ὑπάρξαι τὰν πόλιν εὐδόκιμον."²⁹ Yet while conservative texts (e.g. Ziegler's) include only τὰν πόλιν εὐδόκιμον in the quotation, even this short phrase may be all that is needed to suggest that Euripides' ode did include a concern that the blessedness of Alcibiades as victor depended to some degree on his inclusion in the Athenian community—the strategy of presenting him, on the one hand, with Thucydides (6.16.2), as an *idiôtês*.³⁰

²⁹ Bowra, *Historia* 9 (1960) 68–69, explains Plutarch's waffling as a result of the literary tradition's knowledge of Euripides' mixed feelings about Alcibiades; the quotation is from p.78. Page, *PMG* 756, follows Ziegler's text but notes the uncertainty as to whether the words εὐδαίμονι πρῶτον ὑπάρξαι should be attributed to Euripides.

³⁰ Thucydides has Alcibiades mirror this concern when he has him argue (6.16.2, 5) that his problematic actions and extravagant expenditures as a private citizen both in his liturgies at Athens and at the Olympic games bring aid to the power and reputation of the city. On this, see below.

Complicating this, on the other hand, Euripides' ode also employs the "superlative vaunt" reserved for the presentation of tyrants: τὸ κάλλιστον δ', ὃ μηδεὶς ἄλλος Ἑλλάνων ἔλαχες, "the most beautiful thing, which no other Hellene has achieved, you have achieved."³¹ Furthermore, Euripides' particular choice of words here is closest in the language of the epinician corpus to none other than Pindar's praise of Hieron: τλάμονι ψυχῆ παρέμειν', ἀνίχ' εὐρίσκοντο θεῶν παλάμαις τιμάν / οἶαν οὔτις Ἑλλάνων δρέπει πλούτου στεφάνωμ' ἀγέρωχον, Hieron "held his ground with steadfast heart, when with the help of the gods [the Deinomenids] found honor, the proud crown of wealth, such as no other Hellene has" (*Pyth.* 1.48–50). Herodotus also had reserved this claim to the superlative in Greek affairs for Hieron's brother and Deinomenid predecessor, the tyrant Gelon: τὰ δὲ Γέλωνος πρήγματα μεγάλα ἐλέγετο εἶναι, οὐδαμῶν Ἑλληνικῶν τῶν οὐ πολλὸν μέζω, "And the affairs of Gelon were said to be great, greater by far than any of the Greeks" (7.145).³² Thus, when Thucydides has Alcibiades express a superlative vaunt about his accomplishment as a private citizen (ὄσα οὐδεὶς πω ιδιώτης πρότερον, 6.16.2), he is following Euripides' lead in undercutting his claim to being an *idiôtês* by having him do so.³³ According to the strategies of

³¹ Further context for Euripides' sincerity in praising Alcibiades: see his criticism of athletics in the *Autolykus* of 420 (fr.282 *TrGF*) and the discussion in D. Sutton, *The Greek Satyr Play* (Meisenheim 1980) 59–61. Cf. Kyle, *Athletics* 130–131, who finds it odd that a former wrestler would satirize athletes, and B. Biliński, *L'Agonistica sportiva nella Grecia antica* (Rome 1961) 72–73, who finds it odd that an "avversario dell'agonistica vecchia" would have written a victory ode for an aristocrat.

³² Rosenbloom, *TAPA* 134 (2004) 74, notes Herodotus' association of tyranny with military victories "so great that they exceeded society's ordinary capacity for compensation"—thus Pausanias also, who "won the most beautiful victory of all" (9.64.1), "had the desire to become tyrant of Hellas" (5.32).

³³ W. H. Race, *The "Vaunt" in Pindar* (diss. Stanford 1973), defines the superlative vaunt as generally consisting of a negative, indefinite pronoun, and comparative adjective/adverb. The superlative vaunt occurs elsewhere: e.g., for Hieron, *Bacch.* 3.63–66 (superlative in sending gold to Delphi), fr. 20C.21–23 (superlative in his time of life), *Pind. Pyth.* 1.48–50 (superlative in honor), *Pyth.* 2.58–61 (superlative in wealth and honor to any man in the

Pindaric epinician, therefore, both Euripides' poem (even in the meager fragments available for our inspection) and Thucydides 6.16 deploy a language of representation that characterizes Alcibiades as both *idiôtês* and Sicilian tyrant, depicting the son of Cleinias as slipping between those two positions in the brief moment between his unprecedented chariot victories at Olympia and his superlative (προθυμότετα, Thuc. 6.15.2) support for launching the Sicilian expedition.

Pindar's Odes for Sicilian Tyrants

Thucydides' appropriation of Pindaric contexts to characterize Alcibiades incorporates, as does Euripides' ode, a tension between epinician rhetorical strategies for private citizens and those reserved for Sicilian dynasts. This tension is further manifested in Thucydides' manipulation of three issues regarding the accusations and insinuations against Alcibiades: whether he can successfully redistribute the rewards of fame and benefit into a balanced reciprocity between the city of Athens and himself as victor; whether his *hippotrophia* is a positive or negative characteristic; and whether the city of Athens will benefit from having him as a benefactor. In each case, the epinician intertexts he relies on to achieve his goals are laced with allusions to Pindar's odes for Sicilian victors.

Alcibiades' opening words immediately begin to reconfigure the accusations against him. The phrase ὠφελῆθη τι had appeared in Nicias' speech to refer to Alcibiades' supposed personal advantage in seeking the generalship of the expedition: καὶ ὠφελῆθη τι ἐκ τῆς ἀρχῆς, "to make some profit from the command" (6.12.2). Thucydides' judgment (using the same verb in his own narrative historian's voice) makes clear that this advantage was personal and at least partially pecuniary: τὰ ἴδια ἅμα εὐτυχίσας χρήμασι τε καὶ δόξῃ ὠφελήσειν, "if successful, to increase his personal interests with both money and glory" (6.15.2). But when Alcibiades is given a chance to defend him-

past). For Theron, Pind. *Ol.* 2.93–95 (superlative in unstinting benefactions in 100 years). For others, Bacch. 8.22–25 (the *laudandus* and contest are tentatively restored as Liparion of Ceos at Nemea, superlative in having won three victories in the shortest time), Pind. *Nem.* 6.24–26 (the family of Alcidas at Aegina, superlative in boxing).

self, Thucydides has him begin by saying: ὦν γὰρ πέρι ἐπιβόη-
 τός εἰμι, τοῖς μὲν προγόνοις μου καὶ ἐμοὶ δόξαν φέρει ταῦτα, τῇ
 δὲ πατρίδι καὶ ὠφελίαν, “The things for which I am infamous
 bring glory to me and to my ancestors, and assistance to the
 city” (6.16.1).³⁴ These opening words cleverly appropriate the
 immediately preceding negative, personal, pecuniary use of the
ôphel- root to refer rather to the benefit he does for the state (τῇ
 δὲ πατρίδι καὶ ὠφελίαν), while reserving the profit-free term
doxa for himself and his family (τοῖς μὲν προγόνοις μου καὶ ἐμοὶ
 δόξαν φέρει). Crane, who argues that Thucydides has done his
 best to marginalize the importance of family to the dynamic
 between individuals and states, notes that the only *progonoi* as-
 sociated with an individual Athenian are those of Alcibiades,
 whereas the phrase δόξαν φέρει forms a particularly apt web of
 significance in odes for the chariot victories of the Deinomenid
 house at Syracuse.³⁵ In *Pythian* 1 Pindar associated the *doxa* that
 attends good fortune not with the reputation of the victor
 himself but that of his city and its future: ὁ δὲ λόγος / ταύταις
 ἐπὶ συντυχίαις δόξαν φέρει / λοιπὸν ἔσσεσθαι στεφάνοισί νιν
 ἵπποις τε κλυτάν / καὶ σὺν εὐφώνοις θαλίαις ὄνυμαστάν, “This
 account brings glory to present good fortune, that the city in
 the future will be famous for crowns and horses and its name
 honored with tuneful festivities” (*Pyth.* 1.35–38). And in *Nemean*
 9 a contrast was made between the noble character of horse-
 breeders and those who seek reputation for the sake of profit:
 ἐντί τοι φίλιπποι τ’ αὐτόθι καὶ κτεάνων ψυχᾶς ἔχοντες κρέσ-
 σονας / ἄνδρες. ἄπιστον ἔειπ’ αἰδῶς γὰρ ὑπὸ κρύφα κέρδει
 κλέπεται, / ἃ φέρει δόξαν, “In that place there are men who
 are horse-lovers and who have souls stronger than their posses-
 sions. I say the incredible, for the respect that brings reputation
 is stolen in secret by desire for profit” (*Nem.* 9.32–34). Thus,
 Alcibiades’ noble attempt to convince Athens that they will
 share in the material benefit of his victories, while he and his
 ancestors garner only fame, is deeply entangled with the epi-

³⁴ Bowra, *Historia* 9 (1960) 68, notes the frequency of the epinician sentiment that victory in the games brings glory to the victor’s country: *Pind. Ol.* 4.15, 8.20, *Pyth.* 1.31, 9.92, *Nem.* 3.83, 9.12; *Bacch.* 2.9, 6.16, 8.70.

³⁵ Crane, *Blinded Eye* 108.

nician rhetoric used for Sicilian tyrants.

Furthermore, the Pindaric gnome about reputation being diminished by lust for profit is all the more ironic since, as mentioned above, Thucydides has accused Alcibiades of similar personal profit-mongering, both in the mouth of Nicias (6.12.2) and in his own words (6.15.3):

ἑαυτοῦ μόνον σκοπῶν ... ὅπως θαυματοῦ μὲν ἀπὸ τῆς ἵππο-
τροφίας, διὰ δὲ πολυτέλειαν καὶ ὠφελήθητι ἐκ τῆς ἀρχῆς
looking out only for himself ... how he can be admired for his
equestrian pursuits and gain some profit from the command to
cover his expenditures

ὦν γὰρ ἐν ἀξιώματι ὑπὸ τῶν ἀστών, ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις μείζουσιν ἢ
κατὰ τὴν ὑπάρχουσαν οὐσίαν ἐχρήτο ἕξ τε τὰς ἵπποτροφίας καὶ
τὰς ἄλλας δαπάνας

Being held in high esteem by his fellow citizens, he had a desire
for equestrian pursuits and other expenses greater than the
means at his disposal

In these two expressions of doubt about the pecuniary motives of Alcibiades, Thucydides uses the word *hippotrophia*, marked not only by its associations with panhellenic aristocracy in general and Sicilian tyranny in particular (as on the coins of Syracuse and its protectorates) but also by the fact that the historian uses this word only in these two places, and only in reference to Alcibiades.³⁶ Significantly, the only time Pindar used the word was in *Isthmian* 2, for a chariot victory by Xenocrates, brother of Theron the tyrant of Acragas: αἰδοῖος μὲν ἦν ἀστοῖς ὀμλεῖν, / ἵπποτροφίας τε νομίζων ἐν Πανελλάνων νόμῳ, “He was respectful in his associations with the townsfolk, and practiced equestrian pursuits in the Panhellenic tradition” (*Isthm.* 2.37–38).³⁷ The τε suggests that Xenocrates is

³⁶ For contemporary Athenian attitudes toward *hippotrophia* see Kyle, *Athletics* 136–137, and Rosenbloom, *TAPA* 134 (2004) 71–78.

³⁷ Although the exact word is not used, the language of *Ol.* 4.14–16 also recalls the sentiment that Alcibiades is trying to address, where hippotrophy (τροφᾶς ἵππων) is “directed through pure consideration towards the Peace that loves a city (φιλόπολιν).” The only fifth-century authors who use the term *philopolis* are those featuring here: Pindar, [Eur.] (*Rhes.* 158, of Dolon), Aristophanes (*Lys.* 545–548), and Thucydides (2.60.5, of Pericles, and 6.92.4, of Alcibiades). W. R. Connor, *The New Politicians of Fifth-Century*

to be admired for both things; and, like him, Alcibiades also practices *hippotrophia* and Thucydides suggests that he has a good reputation about town.³⁸ There is an important difference, though, in that Xenocrates' *hippotrophia* is described positively as being "in Panhellenic style," while Alcibiades' is said to be "beyond the means at his disposal." Alcibiades' response to this is that his expenditures are, in fact, worthy since—in the manner of Pindar's claims about Xenocrates—they benefit not only himself but also the reputation of the city on the international scene: τοῖς μὲν ἀστοῖς φθονεῖται φύσει, πρὸς δὲ τοὺς ξένους καὶ αὕτη ἰσχὺς φαίνεται. καὶ οὐκ ἄχρηστος ἦδ' ἡ ἄνοια, ὅς ἂν τοῖς ἰδίῳις τέλεσι μὴ ἑαυτὸν μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν πόλιν ὠφελῆ, "These things naturally cause jealousy among my fellow citizens, but seem like strength itself to foreigners; and it is no useless folly when someone aids not only himself but also his city by his private expenditures" (6.16.3). But such spending has domestic consequences: Alcibiades may have been well-liked, but that did not stop his fellow Athenians from intuiting that his profligacy could lead to political danger.

At the climax of this section of his speech (6.16.5), Thucydides has Alcibiades discuss how the very reputation he had won for himself will pass on to the city in the time of his descendants. Athens will boast that he has been neither a lawbreaker nor a stranger to his countrymen:

οἶδα δὲ τοὺς τοιοῦτους, καὶ ὅσοι ἔν τινος λαμπρότητι προέσχον,
 ἐν μὲν τῷ καθ' αὐτοὺς βίῳ λυπηροὺς ὄντας ... καταλιπόντας,
 καὶ ἤς ἂν ὡσι πατρίδος, ταύτη αὐχῆσιν ὡς οὐ περὶ ἀλλοτριῶν
 οὐδ' ἀμαρτόντων, ἀλλ' ὡς περὶ σφετέρων τε καὶ καλὰ πρα-
 ξάντων.

Athens (Princeton 1971) 102–103, says that the term acquired political significance only in Thucydides, whereas J. Price, *Thucydides and Internal War* (Cambridge 2001) 260, notes that Pericles uses it normatively and Alcibiades in a distorted manner.

³⁸ Of course, the opening and the general tone of *Isthmian* 2 should not be considered alien to the context of Alcibiades' rhetoric: when speaking to a victor on the topic of *hippotrophia*, Pindar praises a time long ago when such aristocratic discourses were not sullied by pecuniary concerns. On the poem see L. Woodbury, "Pindar and the Mercenary Muse: *Isthm.* 2.1–13," *TAPA* 99 (1968) 527–542.

I know that men such as this, however many have excelled in some thing, are in their own lifetimes vexing to others ... and, to whatever country is their home, they bestow the ability to boast—not about foreigners or criminals, but rather about men who are its own citizens and the doers of fine deeds.

Alcibiades' use of the word *allotrios* shares a context similar to its appearance in *Pythian* 1, where Pindar used it twice.³⁹ First, like Alcibiades, Pindar was concerned that the reward for Hieron's chariot victory pass on to his descendants: Μοῖσα, καὶ πᾶρ Δεινομένει κελαδήσαι πίθεό / μοι ποιανὴν τεθρίππων χάρμα δ' οὐκ ἀλλότριον νικαφορία πατέρος, "Muse, even at the side of Deinomenes I bid you sing the reward for the four-horse chariot; for the victory of the father is no *allotriion* delight" (*Pyth.* 1.58–59). Later in the same poem, the same word made another marked appearance: it refers, as Alcibiades did when declaring that his actions τοῖς μὲν ἀστοῖς φθονεῖται φύσει (6.16.3), to the jealousy of fellow citizens at the successes of others: ἀστών δ' ἀκοὰ κρύφιον θυμὸν βαρύνει μάλιστ' ἔσλοῖσιν ἐπ' ἀλλοτριόις, "For the secret heart of the townfolk is weighed down most of all at the successes of *allotrioi*" (*Pyth.* 1.84). Nowhere else but in this ode for Hieron did Pindar use *allotrios* so directly, just as Alcibiades does, to refer to the reputation won by chariot victors.⁴⁰ And yet, whereas Thucydides has had Alcibiades do the right thing, so to speak, in cleverly borrowing these Pindaric motifs—the reputation gained by the descendants of chariot victors and the jealousy of the *astoi* towards them—to counter the accusations of Nicias, he also apparently makes him overlook the irony of the precise source for these Pindaric sentiments, for each of his defenses comes from an ode to a member of a Sicilian tyrannical family.

Alcibiades as Hieron in Aristophanes

Before turning to the historiographical ramifications of this

³⁹ R. C. Stoddart, *Pindar and Greek Family Law* (New York 1990) 8–14, discusses the use of Pindar's concept of *allotrioi* by Athenian orators. For Thucydides' use of the word and semantically related terms see Crane, *Blinded Eye* 141.

⁴⁰ In addition to *Pyth.* 1.59 and 84, Pindar uses the word at *Ol.* 10.89; *Pyth.* 11.27; *Nem.* 1.54, 3.30; *Isthm.* 1.15; frs.42.1, 52h.12, 72.1.

characterization, how can we increase certainty that these connections between Alcibiades and the dynasts of Sicily are not restricted to the imaginations of Thucydides and Euripides? Confirmation could be sought in contexts that are less deliberately encomiastic than Euripides' epinician ode and less restrictedly private than Thucydides' history. That the wider Athenian public was aware of the connections evidenced by Euripides and Thucydides is perhaps most explicitly confirmed by passages in Aristophanes' *Birds* which invite a comparison between Euripides' praise of Alcibiades and Pindar's praise of Hieron. It is important to recall that *Birds* was composed in the immediate aftermath of Alcibiades' victories at Olympia and his speech in favor of the Sicilian expedition, and was produced in the middle of the expedition itself at the Dionysia of 414. At the time of the production Alcibiades was a fugitive from Athens, having pleaded before the Spartans only weeks earlier using language laden in Thucydides (6.88–92) with many of the same Sicilian *topoi* as he had used in Athens.⁴¹

At line 904 in the *Birds* a nameless *poiētēs* arrives to compose a poem in honor of Cloudcuckooland's foundation, tossing out a few verses by way of introduction and quoting Homer (κατὰ τὸν Ὅμηρον, 910, 914) all along. When he finally announces his intention to perform encomiastic songs in honor of the city's foundation, he promises them à la Simonides (κατὰ τὰ Σιμωνίδου, 919), and yet the three sets of verses he spouts are quite pointedly a spoof on Pindar's *hyporchema* in praise of Hieron's foundation of Aetna:⁴²

ἀλλά τις ὠκεία Μουσάων φάτις / οἶάπερ ἵππων ἀμαρυγὰ. / σὺ δὲ
πάτερ, κτίστορ Αἴτνας, / ζαθέων ἱερῶν ὁμώνυμε, / δὸς ἐμὶν ὅ τι
περ / τεῶ κεφαλᾷ θέλεις / πρόφρων δόμεν
But there is some swift voice of the Muses, like the flashing of

⁴¹ Smith, *SyllClass* 15 (2004) 51.

⁴² Luraghi, *QS* 42 (1995) 35–63, proposes that these passages in the *Birds* should be read with the passing references to the power of Sicilian tyrants in Thucydides' *Archaeology* (1.14.2, 1.17, 1.18.1), all of which could only have had significance for his late fifth-century Athenian readers if they had internalized an understanding of the power which these tyrants had held, and which manifest themselves here as reflecting fear of Alcibiades becoming a tyrant on the eve of the Sicilian expedition.

horses. But you, father, founder of Aetna, namesake of holy rites, give to me whatever you with your head wish graciously to give (924–931)

τόδε μὲν οὐκ ἀέκουσα φίλα / Μούσα δῶρον δέχεται· / τὺ δὲ τεῶ
φρενὶ μάθε Πινδάρειον ἔπος.

Not unwillingly does the dear Muse accept this gift. Learn then this Pindaric poem in your heart. (936–939)

νομάδεσσι γὰρ ἐν Σκύθαις / ἀλάται στρατῶν / ὃς ὑφαντοδόνη-
τον ἔσθος οὐ πέπαται. / Ἀκλεῆς δ' ἔβα σπολὰς ἄνευ χιτῶνος. /
ξύνες ὅ τοι λέγω. (941–945)

He among the Scythian nomads who does not own a garment woven by the shuttle wanders away from his people. A jacket without a tunic goes without glory. Understand what I say to you.

The first fragment of Pindar's *hyporchema* quoted below (fr. 105a and known from other sources: schol. *Nem.* 7.1, schol. *Pyth.* 2.69) is clearly Aristophanes' target in the first passage above, which establishes an explicit connection between the praise-poet and the tyrant Hieron.⁴³ That the second passage above is a Pindaric parody is revealed by the *poiētēs* himself. That the model for the third passage is also Pindar's praise of Hieron's Aetna is indicated not only by the *Birds*' scholia but also by its clear, albeit patchwork, relationship to the opening of 105a and the majority of 105b:

σύνες ὅ τοι λέγω, / ζαθέων ἱερῶν ἐπώνυμε / πάτερ, κτίστορ
Αἴτνας.

Understand what I say to you, namesake of holy rites, father, founder of Aetna. (fr.105a)

νομάδεσσι γὰρ ἐν Σκύθαις ἀλάται στρατῶν, / ὃς ἀμαξοφόρητον
οἶκον οὐ πέπαται, / ἀκλεῆς δ' ἔβα.

The man among the Scythians who does not have a wagon-borne home wanders away from his people, going without glory. (fr.105b)

Not only was this scene of parody plain enough to be recognized at the time of the Sicilian expedition, but it apparently even became famous as a parody *per se*: Phaedrus, in a prae-

⁴³ Aristophanes' parody of Hieron's foundation of Aetna is discussed by C. Dougherty, *The Poetics of Colonization: From City to Text in Archaic Greece* (Oxford 1993) 83–98.

teritic request to Socrates not to “force him to trade vulgar jibes the way they do in comedy,” completes the thought with five comic lines, one of which is σύνεξ ὁ τοι λέγω (Pl. *Phdr.* 236D). Socrates quotes the same line in *Meno* (76D), there attributing it all the way back to Pindar.⁴⁴

But in spite of the repeated and obvious references to Pindar, he is not the man being mocked here by Aristophanes, or at least not primarily.⁴⁵ Luraghi, Kyle, and Vickers all suggest that the nameless *poiêtês* being presented by Aristophanes in 414 is not so much a mockery of Pindar himself as a mockery of Euripides in his recent Pindaric role as encomiast of Alcibiades.⁴⁶ This is because, having first rhapsodized Homer and then Simonides (an epinician poet with a reputation for being buyable), Aristophanes’ *poiêtês* is most noteworthy for his shabby clothes (a feature of Euripidean characterization) and his long hair (a noteworthy aspect of Euripides’ physical appearance).⁴⁷ The choice of Pindaric intertexts from Hieron’s

⁴⁴ Irigoien, *Histoire* 13–16, discusses citations of Pindar in Aristophanes and claims that the three poems cited in his plays must have come from a text edition of Pindar used in Athenian education from 450–420; on the presence of fr.105 in this edition, “La faveur portée à l’*Hyperchorème* de Hiéron témoigne de la célébrité dont jouissaient les tyrans de Sicile” (16). On the status of this line as a proverb, see E. Des Places, *Pindare et Platon* (Paris 1949) 175–177, and Luraghi, *QS* 42 (1995) 61 n.63.

⁴⁵ While no extant comparanda exist for the fourth song (*Av.* 950–953), given the context there is no reason not to believe it is also Pindaric parody. On the continuity and constitution of these Pindaric fragments in relation to *Pyth.* 2.67–71, see B. Gentili, “Pindarica III. La *Pitica* 2 e il carne iporchematico di Castore,” *QUCC* 69 (1992) 49–55.

⁴⁶ Luraghi, *QS* 42 (1995) 61–62; Kyle, *Athletics* 131 n.29; M. Vickers, “Alcibiades on Stage: Aristophanes’ *Birds*,” *Historia* 38 (1989) 267–299, at 290. M. Vickers, *Pericles on Stage: Political Comedy in Aristophanes’ Early Plays* (Austin 1997) 161–163, makes a case for an understanding of Alcibiades underlying Pisthetaerus and—following B. R. Katz, “The *Birds* of Aristophanes and Politics,” *Athenaeum* 54 (1976) 353–381—for the generals of the Sicilian expedition underlying the divine embassy (*Pericles* xxvii–xxxiii); cf. M. Munn, *The Mother of the Gods, Athens, and the Tyranny of Asia. A Study of Sovereignty in Ancient Religion* (California 2006) 323–324. On Alcibiades in Aristophanes generally, see R. F. Moorten, Jr., “Aristophanes on Alcibiades,” *GRBS* 29 (1988) 345–359.

⁴⁷ N. Dunbar, *Aristophanes’ Birds* (Oxford 1995) 521, discusses other

foundation of Aetna makes the following analogy fairly clear to the audience of the *Birds*: Euripides is to Alcibiades as Pindar was to Hieron. The analogy between Euripides and Pindar is only a passing nod at poetic criticism; making an analogy between Alcibiades and Hieron, however, is precisely the kind of political commentary which we should rightly expect from Athenian comedy during the Sicilian expedition, particularly given Alcibiades' flight from command in Sicily to refuge in oligarchic Sparta in defiance of the Athenian *dēmos*. Jokes of this kind on the public stages of Athens during the Sicilian expedition show that Thucydides' interpretation of these matters is only one part of a wider contemporary Athenian association of Alcibiades' relationship with the tyrants of Sicily.

3. Alcibiades, Athens, and the Tyranny of Sicily

What, then, is the historiographical effect of Thucydides' characterization of Alcibiades as a Sicilian tyrant *redivivus*? Thucydides has already made it clear that Alcibiades is the most eager exponent of invading Sicily: ἐνήγε δὲ προθυμώτατα τὴν στρατείαν Ἀλκιβιάδης ὁ Κλεινίου (6.15.2).⁴⁸ But Alcibiades is emblematic of a larger syndrome. As Warren notes, Alcibiades is, on the model of Plato's *Republic*, metonymous for the city of Athens as a whole.⁴⁹ His character and motivations reflect those of the Athenian Empire and the causes of the Pelopon-

options. Note that the poet mentions horses, perhaps an allusion to chariot-racing, at 926. On Simonides see Woodbury, *TAPA* 99 (1968), esp. 535 n.11. G. M. A. Richter, *Portraits of the Greeks*, rev. R. R. R. Smith (Oxford 1984) 123, summarizes Euripides' appearance, as determined by the extant evidence of portraiture, as "the hair sparse on the forehead, long at the sides (covering the ears) and at the back"; the remaining evidence, such as it is, is discussed by Vickers, *Historia* 38 (1989) 291.

⁴⁸ An echo of Euripides' use of the patronymic, or meeting Thucydides' general criteria for the inclusion of patronymics (e.g., the person held important offices): see G. T. Griffith, "Some Habits of Thucydides when Introducing Persons," *PCPhS* 187 (1961) 21–33. The verb ἐνήγε is used elsewhere only of "Cleon son of Cleanetus" when rejecting the Spartan peace offer during the siege of Sphacteria (4.21); see Connor, *Thucydides* 164 n.16, citing de Romilly.

⁴⁹ Warren, *Hē Polis Gar Dustokei* 128–147; I am grateful to Professor Warren for these references.

nesian War, and yet they are brought into sharpest relief through parallels made in conjunction with the Sicilian expedition.⁵⁰ For example, he wants *chrēmata* (6.15.2) just as the Athenians want (Segestan) *chrēmata* (6.8.2); the Athenians' tragic desire for the expedition and its folly (6.24.2) correspond to Alcibiades' desire for horseracing and its folly (6.15.2); the size, display of power, and expenditure of the Athenians on the expedition (6.30.1–31.1) echo the size, display of power, and expenditure of Alcibiades at Olympia (6.16.1–3).⁵¹ In fact, the expedition is even called ὄψεως λαμπρότητι περιβόητος (6.31.6), the same verbal combination of being βόητος for the λαμπρότης of appearance that Alcibiades uses to describe the personal effect of his Olympic victories (6.16.1–5).⁵² The most outstanding example of Alcibiades' *hippotrophia* as a metonym for Athens' imperialism sits at the very core of his epinician strategy, stating that just as his personal ambition at Olympia reflects on the greater glory of Athens (6.16.2), so will his personal ambition in leading the Sicilian expedition also be for the good of the city (6.17.1).⁵³ It is little wonder, then, that his

⁵⁰ J. V. Morrison, "A Key Topos in Thucydides: The Comparison of Cities and Individuals," *AJP* 115 (1994) 525–541, and B. Jordan, "The Sicilian Expedition was a Potemkin Fleet," *CQ* 50 (2000) 63–79, discuss these and other parallels.

⁵¹ The analogy between Alcibiades' behavior at Olympia and Athens' motivations towards their Segestan allies is, according to another branch of the tradition, crystal clear: Plutarch (*Alc.* 13) says that Phaeax (the ambassador to Sicily of Thuc. 5.4–5) wrote a speech "Against Alcibiades," in which he accuses him of having used all the city's gold and silver utensils as his own at Olympia, the same action taken by the Segestans at Thuc. 6.46. This may very well be the speech now attributed to pseudo-Andocides, or if this speech is very late, it may be dependent on Plutarch or a common source: M. Edwards, *Greek Orators IV Andocides* (Warminster 1995) 135–136.

⁵² *Lamprotês* was a characteristic of the Alcmaeonids even before the original Alcmaeon, according to Hdt. 6.125: "The Alcmaeonidae were *lamproi* among the Athenians even before, and after Alcmaeon's and especially Megacles' time they became extremely *lamproi*." Kallet, *Money* 64, and Macleod, *Collected Essays* 71, also note the connection between Nicias' ἐλλ-λαμπρόνεσθαι (6.12.2) and Alcibiades' λαμπρόνομα (6.16.3).

⁵³ Warren, *Hê Polis Gar Dustokei* 146, and Kallet, *Money* 63–64, focus on excessive expenditure as a key theme linking Alcibiades and Athens.

speech began with the claim that he, more than others, is suited to rule: καὶ προσήκει μοι μᾶλλον ἑτέρων, ὦ Ἀθηναῖοι, ἄρχειν (6.16.1).⁵⁴ By connecting the series of overlapping analogies, we come full circle to the conclusion that Athens has internalized a desire to possess Sicily to the point where not only her representative leader but also, by analogy, the *dêmos* itself have become identified with the tyranny of the very place they seek to subdue.⁵⁵

January, 2009

Dept. of Classics
San Francisco State Univ.
San Francisco, CA 94132
dgsmith@sfsu.edu

⁵⁴ Forde, *Ambition to Rule* 78, notes Alcibiades' programmatic frankness: "Alcibiades speaks sweepingly of 'rule' (*archê*) rather than 'generalship' (*stratêgia*)."

⁵⁵ That Sicily was mostly democratic in 415 is irrelevant, since it was the earlier tyrannies rather than the contemporary democracies that held sway over the Athenian conception of Sicily at that time: cf. Luraghi, *QS* 42 (1995) 35–63.