C.W. Fornara in a recent article 1) put forward a new interesting interpretation of Thuc. 6.59.4. 2) According to Fornara ‘these words must mean “those of the Alcmeonids who were in exile”’; and therefore ‘to [Thucydides], not all but only some [Fornara’s italics] of the Alcmeonids had gone into exile during the Peisistratid tyranny’. Fornara goes on: ‘surely the implied antithesis to “those who were in exile” is “those who were not”. We are obliged to assume, with an author like Thucydides, that his qualification intends some significant distinction’.

This interpretation, if accepted, could throw new light on the political situation in Athens during the last years of the Peisistratid tyranny, and may in fact lead to a new assessment of the rôle of at least part of that chameleon clan, the Alcmeonidai, in Peisistratid Athens 3).

K. J. Dover 4) proposed a completely different interpretation of the passage, which was rejected by Fornara, mainly on linguistic grounds (and especially because of Dover’s failure to furnish parallels from Thucydides to support his view) 5): ‘not “those of the Alkméonidai who were in exile”, but “among the exiles, the Alkméonidai”’.

2) Thuc. 6.59.4: τυραννεύσας δὲ ἐτη τρία Ἰππίας ἐτι Ἀθηναίων καὶ πανοδείς ἐν τοῖς τετάρτην ὑπὸ Λακεδαιμονίων καὶ Ἀλκμέωνιδών τῶν φευρόντων ἑξώρει κτλ.
3) I have dealt with this subject in passing in a paper delivered to the Annual Convention of the Classical Association of Canada, May, 1971, and am currently preparing a more thorough discussion of this complex question. Prof. Fornara too has indicated that he would ‘discuss elsewhere’ (l.c. 295) the implications of his interpretation.
5) Fornara incidentally too fails to show that Thucydides would have indeed used this grammatical figure, if he had wished that his words should be taken the way Fornara does.

To prove – or disprove – an interpretation on the basis of parallel grammatical figures – or their absence – admittedly poses a tedious task, since there are only word concordances, but no concordances of grammatical figures.

6) Gomme, Andrewes, Dover (n. 4) 336. In an addendum (l.c. 487) Dover cautiously replies to Fornara’s article by noting that ‘on the analogy of 31.3, τοῖς δραμάις τῶν ναυτῶν καὶ ταῖς ὑπηρεσίαις, it would seem that “the Alkméonidai among the exiles” is linguistically possible’.
I should like to illustrate the philological situation first by the following trivial experiment (the preposition ὑπὸ is replaced by a preposition demanding a case other than the genitive):

(a) σὲν Λακεδαιμονίος καὶ Ἀλκμεωνίδαις τοῖς φεύγονσι;
(b) σὲν Λακεδαιμονίος καὶ Ἀλκμεωνίδαις τῶν φεύγοντων;
(c) σὲν Λακεδαιμονίος καὶ Ἀλκμεωνίδῶν τοῖς φεύγονσι?.

It is obviously example (b) which illuminates Dover's interpretation of the passage. But it is indeed difficult to see why Thucydides should have chosen a partitive genitive, in order to say 'the Alkmeonidai among the exiles'. The partitive genitive designates the sum from which a part has been removed. It may be argued that exiles by definition form only a part, and that this is also reflected by Thucydides' use of φευγάδες and φευγοντες with the partitive genitive of the undivided group).

Furthermore, the historical implications of Dover's translation are, to say the least, puzzling: there were in addition to the Alkmeonidai other exiles, but these exiles did not participate in the expulsion of Hippias which was brought about only by the Lakedaimonians and 'the Alkmeonidai among the exiles'.

Possibility (c), a partitive genitive Ἀλκμεωνίδῶν specifying who these exiles were, was advanced by Classen and Steup. This seems to be the position taken by Fornara too. Classen-

7) Other possibilities, e.g. σὲν Λακεδαιμονίων καὶ Ἀλκμεωνίδων τοῖς φεύγονσι, need not be mentioned because of the obvious nonsense that would result as soon as we try to re-transform the whole passage into Thucydides' text.

8) An admittedly cursory examination of books III through VI of Thucydides does not produce a striking parallel which could serve as proof for the philological probability of Dover's interpretation (but cf. n. 5).

For φευγάδες and φευγοντες with the partitive genitive, see below on possibility (c).


10) 'The partitive must yield a further qualification' (Fornara [n. 1] 294f.). Cf. however the statement made in the preceding paragraph: 'whether Ἀλκμεωνίδῶν be a partitive genitive (Classen-Steup) or τῶν φεύγοντων be a limitative apposition with Ἀλκμεωνίδῶν, these words must mean "those of the Alcmeonids who were in exile"'.

It may be noted that if τῶν φεύγοντων [were] a limitative apposition with Ἀλκμεωνίδῶν (thereby correlating to example [a] in our experiment) there is no evidence that Thucydides would have used this construction if he had wished that his words be taken the way Fornara does. On the other hand, there are examples which do not seem to support Fornara's
Steup quote 13 instances in which Thucydides ‘Völkernamen zu
φυγάδες und φεύγοντες regelmäßig im Genetiv hinzutreten
läßt’ II) – whereas there is only one exception to this usage (6.43).
Therefore our passage, ‘wo wir statt eines Ethnikons ein
Patronymikon haben’, must be explained in the same way12).

Taking this understanding of the text as their starting point,
Classen-Steup appear to arrive at a historical interpretation of the
passage which is similar to that advocated by Fornara: ‘at that
time the Alkmeonidai were not exiled one and all [the italics are
mine], as they had been in an earlier time, and were shortly after
again, as a result of their being ἔναγεὶς καὶ ἀλλιτήριοι τῆς θεοῦ’ 13).
This is circular. Since φυγάδες and φεύγοντες always appear along
with a partitive genitive, this construction cannot have a
strongly partitive meaning. In 1.113.1, Βοιωτῶν τῶν φευγόντων
(see n. 12), the emphasis has surely been put on the aspect of
exile; Thucydides here wished to talk about the action of the
‘exiled Boeotians’ – rather than about ‘those of the Boeotians who
were in exile’ (implying the antithesis ‘those who were not’).
Accordingly the obvious translation of 6.59.4, ‘Αλκμεωνίδων τῶν
φευγόντων, can only be ‘the exiled Alkmeonidai’ 14).

view: Λημνίων δὲ καὶ Ἰμβρίων τοὺς παρώντας (4.28.4); Ἀμφίπολιτῶν καὶ
Ἀθηραίων τῶν ἐκόντων (4.105.2); τῆς μὲν οὖν ἄλλης πόλει τῶν Τορινων καὶ
tοὺς Ἀθηραίων τοὺς ἐμφρονωτέσας (4.110.2). Furthermore, there are
passages in which Thucydides apparently avoids the use of this type of
grammatical figure, in order to achieve a clearly partitive meaning: ξένων
όσοι παρήσασαν (4.90.1); Ἀθηραίων οὔσι ήσαν ἐν Βοιωτοῖς αἴχμαλοτοι (5.35.5);
όσοι ξύμμαχοι παρήσασαν (6.67.2).

II) Thuc. 1.26.3, 113.2 bis, 4; 3.85.2; 4.52.2, 75.1, 76.3; 6.7.1, 3, 64.1;
7.57.8; 8.100.3. Classen-Steup (n. 9) 257.
12) Classen-Steup (n. 9) 257. Cf. the same commentary, on 1.113.1,
Βοιωτῶν τῶν φευγόντων, where Steup argues that considering Thucydides’
usage in the other cases (n. 11), here too Βοιωτῶν must be a partitive geni­
tive depending on φευγόντων (Classen on the other hand regarded this
passage as an example for the anticipation of a noun, followed by its article
and attribute, as in 1.1.1 παρασκευήν τῇ πάσῃ).
13) ‘Damals waren die Alkmeoniden nicht wie in einer früheren Zeit
und kurz darauf wiederum als ἔναγεὶς καὶ ἀλλιτήριοι τῆς θεοῦ samt und son­
ders verbannt’ (Classen-Steup [n. 9] on 6.59.4).
14) The peculiarity of the German language to allow the forming of
almost any compound facilitates translating our passage into this language,
and I should like to illustrate my understanding of the text by suggesting
the German translation ‘Exilalkmeoniden’ (this term incidentally would not
preclude the existence of ‘Exilalkmeoniden’ and ‘Nichtexilalkmeoniden’ at
the same time).

I should not pass in silence the fact that in the Bude edition of L.Bo­
din and J. de Romilly (vol. 4, third edition, 1963) the passage has been
In this context it is legitimate to raise the question how else Thucydides should have expressed this simple fact, considering that – in his personal usage at least – ἐνέγοντος had to be construed with a genitive. Or to approach the problem from the opposite side: would Thucydides indeed have used this construction, if he had intended to say what Fornara thinks he said.

The most consequential argument however lies in the fact that there is not the slightest indication that Thucydides’ words are polemical, as far as the exile of the Alkmeonidai is concerned. This is all the more conspicuous by reason of the fact that Thucydides otherwise appears to take pains to make it clear where he intends to be polemical. At the outset of the entire digression 6.54–59 he leaves no doubt about the polemical character of his account, as well as what his main points are: it was Hippias who held the actual political power; heroic patriotism was not the real cause of the tyrannicide.15) If it had been the intention of Thucydides to rectify the tradition about the exile of the Alkmeonidai represented or reflected by Herodotos’ statements,16) it is most surprising that he did not tell us so. It is even more surprising that he should have been clumsy enough not to choose an expression which unmistakably conveys the idea of the antithesis between ‘those of the Alkmeonidai who were in exile’ and ‘those who were not’.

Since the interpretation ‘those of the Alkmeonidai who were in exile’ (antithetical to ‘those who were not’) cannot be upheld, we are compelled to draw the inevitable conclusion that Thucydides does not transmit a version about the exile of the Alkmeonidai which contradicts Herodotos (n. 16). It is thus impossible to detect a conflict of Thucydides vs. Herodotos from the wording of Thuc. 6.59.417).
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translated as ‘par les Lacédémoniens et les Alcméonides bannis’ [my italics]. The Loeb translation reads ‘by the Lacedaemonians and the exiled Alcmeonidai’ [my italics].


16) Hdt. 1.64; 5.62; 6.123.

17) To digress briefly into history, we should remind ourselves that most of the accepted dogmata concerning Athenian internal politics in the second half of the sixth century do not do justice to the intricacy of the
problem. The truth appears to lie somewhere between Berve's 'Einzelpersönlichkeit' (cf. e.g. H. Berve, Miltiades, Hermes Einzelschriften, 2, 1937; id. Die Tyrannis bei den Griechen, Munich 1967) and the more conventional conceptions of party politics (cf. e.g. Walker, CAH 4, 167ff.; Munro, CAH 4, 230ff.; Robinson, AJP 60, 1939, 232ff.; McGregor, HSPh Suppl. 1, 1940, 71ff.; Gomme, AJP 65, 1944, 321ff. [= More essays in Greek history and literature, 1962, 19ff.]). It has become necessary to reconsider these views on the basis of a thorough reexamination of our few and problematical sources (I have dealt with some aspects of the relationship Philaidai-Peisistratidai-Alkmeonidai in Miltiades-Forschungen, Vienna 1968, 50ff. [cf. E. Will, RPh 44, 1970, 314ff.; N. G. L. Hammond, CR 85 (N. S. 21), 1971, 141ff.; cf. n. 3). In this context the fact that Fornara has drawn our attention to the undeniably strong possibility of some members of the Alkmeonidai clan remaining in Athens through 511/10 (cf. P. J. Bicknell, Historia 19, 1970, 130f.) should be honoured as a welcome contribution.

I am grateful to Dr. E. F. Bloedow (Ottawa) for valuable criticism, and to Mr A. Franklin for reading an earlier version of this paper.
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SICCO POLENTON
UND EIN ANGEBLICHER BRIEFWECHSEL
ZWISCHEN SENeca UND NERO


2) S. 482/5 Ullman; vgl. ebd. XIV. XIXf.