D. M. Lewis

Megakles and Eretria

MEGAKLES AND ERETRIA

I am naturally delighted that Franz Willemsen (Ath.Mitt. 106, 1991, 144) has announced his adhesion to the view that Megakles (IV) son of Hippokrates (I) of Alopeke was ostracised twice and that the major part of the find of Kerameikos ostraka belongs to the 470s and not to the 480s; this was argued by me (diese Ztschr. 14, 1974, 1-4) and Peter Bicknell (Ant.Cl. 44, 1975, 172-5). This is apparently not the end of the matter, for, on December 4th 1992, at the American School of Classical Studies at Athens conference on The Archaeology of Democracy, Stefan Bremme exhibited ostraka of Kallias Kratiou Alopekethen physically joining ostraka of Megakles and others from the find. The 718 ostraka of Kallias must also move to the 470s.

Yet another argument for this date can now be added, from the new list of Kerameikos ostraka provided by Willemsen and Bremme. The three hitherto unreported ostraka for Ἀρίφρον Χϲανθίπ⟨π⟩ο (Ath.Mitt. 106, 1991, 150) can only make sense after the daeth of Xanthippos some time after 479. That Ariphron was Xanthippos's older son was argued by J.K.Davies (Athenian Propertied Families 456); it is now clear that at least three voters thought that he, and not Perikles, would be the political heir of Xanthippos.

Much now needs to be done to elucidate Athenian politics of the 470s, but I confine myself here to a point of detail. It concerns an ostrakon, Kereameikos 3469, which Willemsen publishes to support the case for a second ostracism of Megakles (Ath.Mitt. 106, 1991, 144-5 with Taf. 26.3). His text is

]ακλεϲ | [   ]οκρατοϲ | [πα]λι εχϲο | ειϲελθειϲ :
ΜΕρετρ⟨ι⟩αζε;

his paraphrase 'Megakles ist zur Wiederholen des Weges, auf dem er hereingekommen, weg- und (aus der Stadt, aus Athen) hinausgewünscht: nach Eretria, fraglos seinem Ausgangspunkt.'

That this is an ostrakon for [Μεγ]ακλêϲ | [hιππ]οκράτοϲ no one will doubt. As will be seen from the photograph, there are two associated inscriptions; as Angelos Matthaiou points out to me, it is not clear how many hands are involved. The two circles of separation followed by ΜΕρετρ⟨ι⟩αζε lie to the right of [Μεγ]ακλêϲ; the rest of the text is aligned under the name and patronymic.

Provisionally, I accept [πά]λι(ν) ἔχϲο, since the lambda is virtually certain; it is a worry that I see nothing really comparable in Threatte, Grammar of Attic Inscriptions I 636-7 for ny omitted before a vowel. I cannot, however, believe in a direct combination of ἔχϲο with εἰϲέλθειϲ, and the spacing shows that something is missing. Read

[πά]λι(ν) ἔχϲο·
[μὲ] εἰϲέλθειϲ.

We now come to the differently incised ΜΕρετρ⟨ι⟩αζε. It has long been known that one of these ostraka was supposed to have Ἐρετρ⟨ί⟩αζε on it; I have alluded to it myself (ap. A.R.Burn, Persia and the Greeks (1984 edition) 605). I had not taken the point that it would have to be a false form based on Ἀθήναζε for the more correct ῾Ερετρίανδε, but this might not be too much of a problem; there are equally difficult forms, Βήϲαζε and Μουνιχιάζε, for which see the index to The Athenian Agora XIX. What had not emerged in oral report is that the word is preceded by a perfectly clear μy, unexplained by Willemsen. We are therefore not dealing with Ἐρετρ⟨ί⟩αζε, but with μὲ ᾿ρετρίαζε, a negative imperative. I leave to others the question of whether this is prodelision or, as preferred by Threatte (op.cit. I 426, 431), crasis.

Hesychius gives us ἐρετριάζει· ϲκώπτει. ἢ παίζει. We do not know what text he is alluding to, and we need not be bound by his semantic range for the word. I have no idea what the allusion is; it could be political; it might even be sexual. I accept that [πά]λι(ν) probably is an allusion to the fact that this is a second ostracism, but I now very much doubt that Megakles is being told to go to Eretria.

Oxford   D.M.Lewis