

UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI

May 26 1951

I hereby recommend that the thesis prepared under my
supervision by Ruth Esther Allen
entitled The Mutilation of the Herms: A Study
in Athenian Politics

be accepted as fulfilling this part of the requirements for the
degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Approved by: Michael J. L. [Signature]

THE MUTILATION OF THE HERMS
A STUDY IN ATHENIAN POLITICS

A dissertation submitted to the
Graduate School of Arts and Sciences
of the University of Cincinnati
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

1951

by

Ruth E. Allen

B. A. Wooster College 1944

M. A. University of Cincinnati 1947

CINCINNATI
UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY

AUG 23 1951

UMI Number: DP15623

INFORMATION TO USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleed-through, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

UMI®

UMI Microform DP15623

Copyright 2009 by ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

ProQuest LLC
789 E. Eisenhower Parkway
PO Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. The Problem.....	1
II. The Sources.....	4
III. The Situation.....	27
IV. The Evidence.....	62
V. The Prosopography.....	85
VI. The Truth?.....	135
Bibliography and Abbreviations.....	174

CHAPTER ONE

THE PROBLEM

Since the days of Thucydides the mutilation of the Herms has been regarded, and rightly so, as an event of some consequence. The Athenians took a serious view of it. The investigation which followed was a nightmare of terror. Its impact continued to be felt for a generation. Never before or after was there such a vigorous pursuit of culprits or one which involved so many executions and imprisonments. Unfortunately our two primary sources are less than satisfactory in their treatment of the mutilation. The Thucydidean account is general. No proper names are mentioned except that of Alkibiades and the chief concern is the reactions of the Demos. Andokides has left a fuller account of the incident and of the parody of the mysteries which became a cause célèbre at the same time; he lists the names of the men who were accused by the various informers. His veracity is not always beyond question nor can he be trusted to give a complete story; he was himself suspected of having participated in the mutilation and that colours his testimony.

The historian has always met difficulty in understanding the political context of the mutilation of the Herms. The sources testify to its electrifying effect upon the populace yet give very little specific information concerning those who took part, the motivation, or what lay behind the

accusations which were lodged. Many views have been expressed: the crime was committed by a group of drunken revelers, it was the work of Alkibiades and his associates, it was the result of an oligarchic conspiracy, it was instigated by Nikias. No historian can ignore it; yet because of the paucity of the evidence and the sometimes contradictory tone of the sources it has been neglected as a special study.

Our ancient witnesses suggest that it was not alone the religious nature of the statues which aroused such indignation; rather, the act, by the thoroughness of its execution, implied the existence of an organized band of lawless and amoral vandals whose philosophy threatened to defy the Demos and all that it held sacred. In other words, it had a political connotation and hence must be studied as a political phenomenon. We must keep in mind the events which preceded it, the shades of political thinking which developed after the Peace of Nikias, the personalities which sought to control public opinion, and, finally, what followed the mutilation. In this way a reasonable explanation for the various intrigues may perhaps be found. The mutilation in itself may have been minor; the political manoeuvring which it set in motion had far-reaching consequences for Athens.

I shall attempt in this study to isolate and to scrutinize closely the activities, friends, and families of all those who are mentioned by Andokides and Plutarch in

connection with both the mutilation and parody. Only thus can the men concerned and the crimes themselves be placed in their proper contexts. Here in particular the contemporary inscriptions are of inestimable value. Among these are the records of the poletai, who sold at auction the property of the exiled. Additional fragments of these catalogues have been excavated in the Athenian Agora and remain unpublished. We may then anticipate that light will still be shed upon a murky page in Athenian history.

Full information concerning the literature cited in the notes and the editions employed will be found in the Bibliography, to which the reader is also referred for expansion of abbreviations.

CHAPTER TWO

THE SOURCES

The Thucydidean account of the period between the Peace of Nikias and the Sicilian expedition, while satisfactory for the Greek world as a whole, is meagre in regard to domestic politics at Athens. There are several reasons for this. This aspect of Athenian history was not the prime concern of the historian. In addition, Thucydides was in exile from 424 until the end of the war and was unable to exercise his shrewd powers of observation at first hand. He was compelled to rely upon the word of those who had been in Athens during these decisive years. By the time of his repatriation much which had happened behind the scenes had been forgotten, glossed over, or was known only to men in exile. He says nothing of the ostracism of Hyperbolos in 417/6¹ until VIII, 73, 3, and even then does not mention the circumstances of the ostracism. His remarks on the defacement of the Herms are general and unsatisfying. This too can be explained. The unrest which had resulted from the informations concerning the desecration was too recent and frightening to permit those who knew the truth to speak freely. Besides, thanks to the untiring efforts of his enemies, Alkibiades had been made the scapegoat. He was held responsible for the profana-

¹ For the date see below, p. 24.

tion of the mysteries and the mutilation of the Herms.² Thucydides, however, realized that there was more to the crimes than had been reported to him. He makes clear to the reader his doubt about the truth of the depositions and the guilt of those who had suffered death, imprisonment, or exile.³ He is also sceptical of Andokides' revelation and admits with resignation that no one at the time or afterward could state with assurance what was the true account.⁴ The Thucydidean narrative is a general description of the ugly mood of the populace and the opinions of the citizens but almost no names are mentioned; the usual careful analysis that we associate with Thucydidean method is absent. What he writes, of course, must be treated with respect; for here, as always, Thucydides' judgement is not to be trifled with.

Thucydides' pessimistic view of Andokides' confession is not surprising to one who reads the confused statements in the De Mysteriis and the De Reditu. The De Mysteriis deals first with the mutilation of the Herms and the profanation of the mysteries. Andokides names the informants together with those whom they accused and the legal actions which resulted. Andokides himself must have taken part in

² Thucydides, VI, 61, 1.

³ Thucydides, VI, 53, 2-3.

⁴ Thucydides, VI, 60, 2.

the plot to deface the statues, as is evident from his own words.⁵ In the De Mysteriis, however, he seems to have forgotten his earlier statement and disclaims any connection with the mutilation or the parody.⁶ The facts behind these orations and the circumstances under which they were delivered explain the contradictions.

For a short time following his confession⁷ in 415, which was made to free Athens from terror and his own family from prison, Andokides remained at Athens by virtue of the immunity he had been granted in return for his information. But this peaceful condition was not destined to last long. The decree of Isotimides was passed in the same year. By its terms anyone who had ever committed an impiety and confessed was to be refused admission to the temples of Attike and the Athenian Agora, whether he had been granted immunity or not. Andokides was compelled to leave Athens. Twice he attempted to return, once during the reign of the Four Hundred, at which time Peisandros opposed his recall,⁸ and again after the restoration of the democracy in 410.

This was the occasion for the delivery of the De

⁵ De Reditu, 15.

⁶ De Mysteriis, 29, 72.

⁷ De Mysteriis, 60-68.

⁸ De Reditu, 13-14.

Reditu.⁹ Andokides states expressly that he had been persuaded to take part in this piece of madness, i.e., the mutilation, by evil companions and that because of his participation he had been disgraced in the eyes of the gods. But at the time the rôle of reformed miscreant is to his advantage. He is suing for favour and there is no point in antagonizing his audience or insulting their intelligence by a flagrant lie. He does not try to disguise his youthful folly. As Maidment says, "Andocides had little need to describe in detail the scandal which had led to his exile; it was still only too familiar to the majority of his audience. Still less did he feel the moment suitable for any such passionate assertion of his innocence as that in which he indulged ten years later, when the facts at issue were already passing into oblivion. He therefore has no hesitation in admitting his guilt. What concerns him is his patriotic energy since 415."¹⁰ In spite of his efforts this second appeal failed.

He did not return to Athens until the general amnesty of 403. Again for a few years all was well. Soon, however, Andokides came into conflict with a group of tax-farmers headed by Agyrrhios and with Kephisios who had also

⁹ For the date of the oration see Maidment, Minor Attic Orators, I, pp. 454-458.

¹⁰ Maidment, op. cit., p. 458.

been an exile. He antagonized Kallias son of Hipponikos, a member of his family, as well. This dispute arose over a family affair and Andokides threatened suit. Kallias decided to forestall him by hailing him into court first. In his machinations he was aided by Kephisios and Agyrrhios. As was his custom, Andokides took part in the Great Eleusinia. When he returned he found that he had been charged with having taken part in a religious ceremony, an act forbidden to him by the decree of Isotimides. Kephisios was the actual informant, who had been forced into that rôle by Kallias.¹¹ These two, along with Agyrrhios, Epichares, and Meletos, hoped by this method to remove Andokides from Athens (399 B.C.).

Andokides' defence is embodied in the De Mysteriis. By 399 the details of the mutilation and the profaning of the mysteries had to some extent faded. In these circumstances it was imperative for him to deny any share in the blame, for he had to establish the fact that the decree of Isotimides did not apply to him at all. He confidently refused to admit any act of impiety or any confession of such an act. But his own behaviour in 415 when he went into exile had already belied this statement. The confession in the De Reditu and the denial in the De Mysteriis were both dictated by expediency. Obviously Andokides was a shifty charac-

¹¹ De Mysteriis, 71.

ter whose statements must be examined with the greatest care before they are accepted.

Does this mean that it is impossible to trust what he says about the defacement of the Herms? It is true that when his own safety was involved he could speak glibly on any side of the question which was to his advantage. On the other hand, there is no reason to doubt that aside from his own rôle in the desecration he told the same story in 415 on the occasion of his confession and again in 399. He had witnesses to corroborate his remarks concerning those who were involved. He could be objective about the events, the informants, the accused, and the legal actions; his own safety did not depend upon ignorance of the whole episode. The suspicion also arises that Andokides, always anxious to make use of an opportunity, might have named among the participants in the mutilation those who were his enemies. His list, it may be argued, is substantially that of Teukros, which would lend credence to his own tale. Yet it is Andokides himself who reports Teukros' list, which may not therefore be used as independent testimony to corroborate Andokides. On the other hand, Diognetos, a member of the board of enquiry at the time of Alkibiades' impeachment by Pythonikos, was in court and testified to the accuracy of Andokides' statements; and Andokides reminds his audience that his account is being confirmed. As Maidment notes, "Diognetus,

who had first-hand knowledge, had listened to the recital in silence."¹² Had there been any glaring errors Diognetos would have protested. If Andokides had intended to take this chance for revenge (in 399) it is strange that he did not include those who caused him so much trouble a short time after his confession of 415, Isotimides and those who supported his measure. Peisandros too was his enemy, as had been proved in 411; but he was not involved in Andokides' revelation.

Andokides gives no inkling of the real issue behind the informations nor does he have anything to say about the motives of the accusers. The inscriptions give reason to believe that Andokides failed to name all the men implicated or to suggest their full share in the parody and mutilation. Perhaps this is not so much from a desire to suppress the whole truth as from the necessity of omitting detail and concentrating upon his own responsibility. After all, the oration is his defense. With caution, then, the historian may use the general account of the mutilation and parody as given by Andokides. The only statement about which there remains grave doubt is that concerning Andokides' own participation.

The fourth oration which has survived among the

¹² Maidment, op. cit., p. 351, note b.

works of Andokides contains much information about the activities of Alkibiades. It purports to be a speech delivered by Phaiax upon the occasion of an impending ostracism which threatened him, Nikias, and Alkibiades. It is generally regarded as spurious. Raubitschek, however, in a recent article,¹³ prefers to see here either a speech written by Andokides for Phaiax in the hope of getting rid of Alkibiades or at least a speech which was delivered before the Assembly at some time before the Sicilian campaign. He dates it early in 415: the expedition to Melos to which the author refers occurred in the summer of 416. The Olympic games mentioned must be those of 416; there is no clear reference to Sicily. Since it was delivered on the eve of an ostracism and since the only ostracism which would fit the date is that of Hyperbolos, Raubitschek puts the ostracism of Hyperbolos in 415. Thucydides states that Hyperbolos was put to death in Samos while the Four Hundred were organizing in Athens in 412/1.¹⁴ A fragment of Theopompos reports that Hyperbolos died after being in exile for six years,¹⁵ which would make Raubitschek's date for the ostracism too late; he believes, therefore, that Theopompos is wrong.

¹³ Raubitschek, T.A.P.A., LXXIX (1948), pp. 191-210.

¹⁴ Thucydides, VIII, 73, 3.

¹⁵ Frag. 96b Jacoby.

To lend credence to his argument Raubitschek points out several likenesses between the oration and the account of Thucydides: the superior attitude of Alkibiades to his fellow citizens, the anger, fear, and subservience of the populace toward Alkibiades, the political differences between the youths and the elders, the boasts of Alkibiades, his part in the Melian affair, and the belief that he was aiming at tyranny. These parallels, he thinks, indicate that the writer of the oration and Thucydides used a common source, i.e., the contemporary attitudes of the people. But it is easily seen that these points of similarity are not decisive. Contemporary gossip was known to everyone who had any acquaintance at all with the character of Alkibiades. It was common knowledge in all quarters, for Thucydides, who was in exile at the time, wrote his account after his return, basing it on the results of his enquiries. Plutarch too mentions many of these same items. So far Raubitschek has succeeded, as he himself admits, only in showing the author's general familiarity with the period, gained perhaps from his reading of Thucydides and others.

The many errors and inconsistencies of the oration are the next object of Raubitschek's examination. The speech was purportedly delivered before a meeting of the Assembly and is a defense made to avoid ostracism. The speaker says that he, Nikias, and Alkibiades are the candidates. Such a

procedure is unknown. So far as we can determine there were no preliminary meetings of the Ekklesia before an ostracism, nor is there any evidence that the candidates for ostracism were formally named before the vote was taken, as the writer of the oration implies.¹⁶ Doubtless the citizens of Athens, among whom interest in the political welfare of their city was widespread, were fairly sure of the identity of those who were most likely to get votes, while those who had cause to fear were equally aware of their danger. The great variety of names which have been scratched on the ostraka found in the Athenian Agora in recent years is proof that there was no formal declaration of candidates for whom votes must be cast.¹⁷ The only meeting preliminary to the ostracism took place in the sixth prytany to determine whether or not an ostracism was to be held in that year.¹⁸ Apparently, then, the writer of the In Alcibiadem was unversed in the procedure of ostracism. Raubitschek attempts to explain away this difficulty by saying that the speaker does not address his audience as if it were a "formal assembly." He is pretending that the meeting has an official character, whereas it is merely a gathering without official function.

¹⁶ [Andokides], In Alcibiadem, 2.

¹⁷ Vanderpool, Hesperia, XV (1946), pp. 271-275.

¹⁸ Aristotle, Ath. Pol., 43, 5.

"We have no evidence to show that such informal meetings were held in connection with an ostracism, but meetings of this type were obviously necessary to concentrate public opinion on those few men who were likely 'candidates' for ostracism."¹⁹ Raubitschek's insistence upon the unofficial character of the audience is based on the words of the speaker who requests his hearers to be impartial judges of his statements, to preside as archons, to discourage insulting or flattering language. They are to be kindly to the speaker and listener and harsh towards the overbearing and disorderly. By giving a hearing to each of the pleaders they will be better able to make a just decision.²⁰ Raubitschek, however, to prove his point, selects only the phrase δέομαι δ' ὑμῶν τῶν λόγων ἴσους καὶ κοινούς ἡμῖν ἐπιστά-
τας γενέσθαι, καὶ πάντας ἄρχοντας περὶ τούτων καταστῆναι:
the audience is to act as if they were epistatai and archons. The speaker is pretending that they are officials. Raubitschek warns against thinking here of the rôle played by the archons and Boule at the ostracism itself when these officials guarded the ballot boxes and kept close watch to see that only qualified citizens voted.

I do not see in the language of the oration any

¹⁹ Raubitschek, op. cit., p. 197.

²⁰ [Andokides], In Alcibiadem, 7.

indication of "formality" or "informality." The passage to which Raubitschek refers is inconclusive; it is the customary plea for a fair and impartial hearing.²¹ Whether the oration was ever delivered or whether it was written later, it was intended to be a defense before an audience which is to act as judges. The passage implies that other speakers are to follow, presumably Alkibiades and Nikias. There is no evidence that a defense was ever allowed at the time of an ostracism nor that there was any designation of candidates for ostracism before the vote was taken. The reference to the archons is explained by Maidment: "The speaker is... urging his audience to regard themselves as placed in the same responsible position as the Archons and ἐπιστάτης τῶν πρυτανέων."²² But whether this is a meeting of the Assembly or only a group of citizens, Raubitschek has not clarified the speaker's statement that the contestants for the prize were he, Alkibiades, and Nikias, of whom one must be felled by the blow.²³ The words ὦν ἀναγκαῖον ἓνα τῇ συμφορᾷ περιπεσεῖν assume that a meeting had already been held

²¹ Cf. Andokides, De Mysteriis, 2; De Reditu, 6.

²² Maidment, op. cit., p. 547, note b.

²³ [Andokides], In Alcibiadem, 2: οἱ δ' ἀνταγωνιζόμενοι περὶ τῶν ἄθλων τούτων ἐσμέν ἐγὼ καὶ Ἀλκιβιάδης καὶ Νικίας, ὦν ἀναγκαῖον ἓνα τῇ συμφορᾷ περιπεσεῖν.

at which the choice of citizens for ostracism had been determined, i.e., the victim, of necessity, had to be one of the three men named. The naming had to antedate the defense by the speaker. The conclusion which is forced upon us is that the writer of the oration was ignorant of the way in which an ostracism was conducted. This could scarcely be true of any Athenian citizen in 415.

Several other errors in the oration challenge Raubitschek's ingenuity. The speaker states that Alkibiades' father-in-law was Hipponikos who died at Delion where he was a general.²⁴ Yet Thucydides reports that the general who died at the battle of Delion was Hippokrates.²⁵ Raubitschek claims that the error lies not in the name of the general but in the interpretation usually given to the phrase τελευτήσαντος Ἰππονίκου στρατηγοῦντος, i.e., Hipponikos died at Delion in the capacity of general. It means, he says, only that Hipponikos died "while commanding his troops (in whatever capacity) at Delium."²⁶ No evidence is cited nor do Liddell and Scott support this sense. The word στρατηγῶν refers to the activities of a στρατηγός, and in fifth-

²⁴ In Alcibiadem, 13: τελευτήσαντος Ἰππονίκου στρατηγοῦντος ἐπὶ Δηλίου.

²⁵ Thucydides, IV, 101, 2.

²⁶ Raubitschek, op. cit., p. 199.

century Athens a *στρατηγός* naturally connotes a member of the well-known board of magistrates. The burden of proof lies with those who would interpret *στρατηγοῦντος* in any other way. It is far more convincing to assume that the speaker confused Hipponikos and Hippokrates.

The passage which reports Alkibiades' relations with the Melian woman has also caused difficulty. Andokides, expresses horror that the very man who recommended the enslavement of the Melians bought a Melian woman and had a child by her.²⁷ The island of Melos was finally subjugated in the early autumn of 416;²⁸ Raubitschek dates the speech in the spring of 415 and the interval thus allowed is insufficient for the birth of a child. Raubitschek is forced to believe either that Alkibiades was not the father of the child or that the woman was brought to Athens some time before 416. But if either possibility is admitted the whole point of the speaker's argument is lost. He is explaining the terrible position in which Alkibiades has placed his own child: the father was the cause of the mother's enslavement. Neither of the choices agrees with the speech; it may of course be that the testimony is false, unwittingly or by design.

²⁷ In Alcibiadem, 22.

²⁸ Thucydides, V, 116, 2-4.

The orator places the responsibility for the revision of the tribute assessment upon the shoulders of Alkibiades, who with nine others almost doubled the contribution of each of the subject states.²⁹ I shall discuss this passage in greater detail in a later chapter.³⁰ It is sufficient to state here that the reassessment referred to must be that of 425 with which the name of Kleon is associated. Alkibiades was probably too young then to have been charged with political responsibility.³¹ The orator is well versed in the details of this assessment and seems to know how the tribute was collected. This knowledge was not necessarily first-hand. He might have read the text of the decree of reassessment which explains in some detail how and by whom the tribute is to be assessed and collected.³² These assessment decrees were set up on the Akropolis and remained there for many years. Krateros, who lived in the early third century, read them and published selections.³³

The text of the decree discloses, for example, that there were ten taktai, one from each phyle; [Andokides,

²⁹ In Alcibiadem, 11.

³⁰ See below, p. 34, note 18.

³¹ Cf. Thucydides, V, 43, 2 (of 421 B.C.); see below, note 18.

³² A9, in A.T.L., II, pp. 40-43.

³³ A.T.L., I, p. 203; III, pp. 9-12.

knows this. The tribute that was to result from the assessment of 425 was more than three times that of Aristides. Andokides, states that it was doubled.³⁴ It is true that individual assessments were in many cases doubled in 425; Andokides, apparently knew this. Yet the list was abnormally long, which accounts for the fact that the total was trebled. This may explain Andokides', alleged error. Or he may have been thinking in terms of actual collection, which perhaps did not much exceed double the Aristidean figure of 460 talents. But his knowledge and his errors do not prove that he was or was not in Athens in 415; they may be understood equally well by the assumption that he could read.

Raubitschek thinks that the absence of prophetic passages lends weight to his argument. He sees no reference to the Sicilian expedition in the oration and so draws the conclusion that it had not taken place when the speech was written. Yet one reads: ἐγὼ δὲ νομίζω μέγιστα κακὰ τὴν πόλιν ὑπὸ τούτου sc. Ἀλκιβιάδου, πείσεσθαι, καὶ τηλικούτων πραγμάτων εἰς τὸν λοιπὸν χρόνον αἵτιον δόξειν, ὥστε μηδὲνα τῶν προτέρων ἀδικημάτων μεμνησθαι.³⁵ If we assume for the moment that this was written after 415, what more

³⁴ In Alcibiadem, 11.

³⁵ In Alcibiadem, 24.

could we ask for by way of prophecy? Surely this passage could have been composed with a knowledge of the Sicilian expedition and the subsequent activities of Alkibiades. The author could scarcely be more specific and still preserve the illusion that the speech was delivered before the campaign.

Raubitschek concludes that the oration was actually written in 415 before the Sicilian expedition and immediately before the ostracism of Hyperbolos. Since Plutarch in his account of the ostracism mentions Phaiax, Raubitschek believes he used a source based on the speech and adduces Phaiax' part in the ostracism as described in the Nicias³⁶ on the authority of Theophrastos. Plutarch refers again to Phaiax in the Alcibiades;³⁷ some authorities, he says, claim that the agreement was made not between Alkibiades and Nikias but between Alkibiades and Phaiax. "Is it too much to deduce that these authorities included Theophrastus whom Plutarch in the biography of Nicias had credited with similar information? If so, could it be that the basis for Theophrastus' modified version of the events was his knowledge of the speech of Phaiax which had hitherto not been introduced into the evidence?...This author

³⁶ Nicias, 11, 10.

³⁷ Alcibiades, 13.

Theophrastos, modified the commonly known version of the ostracism of Hyperbolos by introducing the person of Phaeax. He made this innovation because he believed in the authenticity of the speech of Phaeax, and because he associated it, perhaps for the first time, with the ostracism of Hyperbolos."³⁸ There is no evidence to prove that Theophrastos was the first to link the name of Phaeax with the ostracism of Hyperbolos or that he based his assumption on this speech.

Other points in Raubitschek's argument could be attacked, e.g., his statement that the oration must be compared "with pamphlets like the Old Oligarch's or with speeches like those in Thucydides rather than with factual historical accounts like the main portion of Thucydides' work."³⁹ With this declaration he excuses the inconsistencies and downright errors. "What they, the pamphlets and speeches, lack in historical truth they gain fully in psychological and political insight."⁴⁰ The truth is that the cases are simply not parallel.

Enough has been said to contradict Raubitschek's argument that the oration properly belongs in 415. In

³⁸ Raubitschek, op. cit., pp. 209-210.

³⁹ Raubitschek, op. cit., p. 195.

⁴⁰ Raubitschek, op. cit., p. 195.

Alcibiadem contains glaring errors in chronology and historical facts which can be explained only if the writer had no personal acquaintance with fifth-century Athens; he must have lived considerably later. Furthermore, the bitter hostility against Alkibiades which is reflected throughout the oration is not well suited to the early months of 415. At that time Alkibiades was busily and successfully engaged in making the idea of a Sicilian campaign as attractive as possible to the Demos. He was popular enough to win strong support for his project, to gain the desired goal, to be appointed general. This popularity could not have sprung up full-grown a short time before the expedition; it was the result of a long period of conscious effort. Alkibiades' early difficulties were over, as was the threat of ostracism. He was at the height of his career. Nikias tried his best to thwart the plans of his rival, but his faction was not strong enough to force an ostracism in 415; Alkibiades was the favourite of the Demos. It is difficult to place the speech in such an atmosphere. Later, however, Alkibiades lost his prestige and had to shoulder much of the responsibility for Athens' final defeat; the speech has a fourth-century tone.

The words of [Andokides], which are purportedly to help Phaiax avoid ostracism, prove to be a poor defense. In fact, they are a long recital of Alkibiades' misdemeanours;

Nikias, who was also threatened with ostracism, is not even mentioned after section 2. In a speech of this nature one would normally expect a list of the wrongs the speaker has suffered and of the benefits he has done the state, such as we have in the De Reditu. But there are few references to the deeds of Phaiax, whom the writer may represent, perhaps because he knew so little about him.⁴¹

The trouble between Alkibiades and Phaiax is best placed at an earlier date, when Alkibiades was a political neophyte. There are indications that Phaiax was a figure of some importance in Athens about the time when the Peace of Nikias was made and that Nikias, Alkibiades, and Phaiax were at odds. Perhaps an ostracism was threatened; Alkibiades and Phaiax came to terms and the ostracism never materialized. Later writers knew that there had been a struggle and rumours of an ostracism. The only ostracism in which Alkibiades had been involved, notoriously so, was that of Hyperbolos. Thus the two events were made one.⁴² If the view is accepted, it will be realized immediately that, because of chronological difficulties, the speech could not have been delivered before the threatened ostracism. Nor

⁴¹ In Alcibiadem, 41-42; cf. 10: he will say nothing of himself but merely review the past of Alkibiades.

⁴² See further below, pp. 52-54.

could it have been delivered before the ostracism of Hyperbolos, at least by Phalax, since he was not concerned.

Attention must now be directed to the date of the last Athenian ostracism. I.G., I², 95 is an Attic decree in which Hyperbolos is the orator. Woodhead has argued with cogency that the document should be placed in the tenth prytany of 418/7 B.C., a date which is here accepted.⁴³ The ostracism of Hyperbolos, then, cannot be set before the spring of 416 (prytany VI, 417/6). If we now accept Theopompos' statement that Hyperbolos died in the sixth year of his exile, we arrive by inclusive counting at 412/1, a date which is supported by Thucydides.⁴⁴ The spring of 416 is an attractive date for the ostracism on other grounds. Alkibiades was doing all in his power to aid Argos; Nikias was working against him, for he realized that Athenian friendship with Argos would do much to damage the peace between Athens and Sparta which he was still hopeful of maintaining. Both men could count on support from their respective parties. The ostracism thus precedes the Melian expedition and increases the chronological difficulties encountered in the oration.

⁴³ Woodhead, Hesperia, XVIII (1949), pp. 78-83. The clinching argument is the reading of the archon's name as 'Αντιφῶντος (418/7).

⁴⁴ Thucydides, VIII, 73, 3.

The least objectionable solution is to regard In Alcibiadem as a rhetorical exercise of the fourth century which reflects the hatred felt toward Alkibiades after Athens' final humiliation. The writer is concerned only with constructing a long catalogue of Alkibiades' sins in order to make him as despicable as possible. The result is a hodgepodge of fact and fable without regard for chronological accuracy. The author chose as the setting for his work the eve of an ostracism which threatened Alkibiades, Nikias, and a third party. This man has been identified as Phaiax and, on the basis of In Alcibiadem, 41, the identification seems reasonable. The tradition that Phaiax was in some way connected with the last ostracism had already been established. The confusion about fifth-century history and institutions shows the oration to be of little value as a historical document. Although the author may have hit upon the truth here and there, the percentage of error is so high that the speech cannot be used as an independent authority.

The remaining source for the events discussed in this study is Plutarch. The masterly treatment given by Gomme leaves little to be said.⁴⁵ Gomme emphasizes that Plutarch was more interested in the men he wrote about than

⁴⁵ Gomme, Commentary, I, pp. 54-81.

in history. His aim was to show the interaction between men and events and to draw a moral conclusion. He had a wealth of material upon which to draw but he makes little effort to evaluate these sources or to distinguish among them. For example, in the Alcibiades and the Nicias he mentions Theophrastos, Thucydides, Aristotle, Plato, Aristophanes, Euripides, Eupolis, Phrynichos, and many minor writers. Plutarch also drew upon Andokides, or his sources for this period, as we have seen. His narrative is not in contradiction to that of Thucydides, which he may have used for the framework. But he seems to find the historian rather barren and as a result makes use of the poets and later epitomizers to fill out his story. He may too depend upon his own ability to conjecture details of character.⁴⁶ His chief value lies in his competence to depict the character about whom he is writing and the contemporary attitude of his subject's fellow citizens.

⁴⁶ Compare, e.g., Cimon, 11 with Thucydides, I, 99 and see the commentary in A.T.L., III, pp. 244-246.

CHAPTER THREE

THE SITUATION

In the spring of 422/1 B.C.¹ after ten weary years of war Sparta and Athens concluded the treaty known as the Peace of Nikias. But, as Thucydides points out, anyone who regarded this interval in the midst of the war as a true peace was mistaken.² For the so-called peace ushered in a period of unrest during which both sides failed to live up to the agreements that had been made. The Spartans were unable to coerce their allies into signing the treaty. As a consequence, shortly after the treaty was made Sparta independently entered into a fifty-year alliance with Athens³ under the impression that Argos would not make an alliance with Athens if a Spartan-Athenian alliance was in existence.

¹ The date is established as March, 422/1, by Thucydides, V, 19, 1: ἄρχει δὲ τῶν σπονδῶν...ἔφορος Ηλειστόλας Ἀρτεμισίου μηνὸς τετάρτη φθίνοντος, ἐν δὲ Ἀθήναις ἄρχων Ἀλκαῖος, Ἐλαφβολιῶνος μηνὸς ἕκτη φθίνοντος. Cf. V, 20, 1: αὗται αἱ σπονδαὶ ἐγένοντο τελευτῶντος τοῦ χειμῶνος ἅμα ἡρι, ἐκ Διονυσίων εὐθύς τῶν ἀστικῶν, αὐτὸδεκα ἐτῶν διελθόντων καὶ ἡμερῶν ὀλίγων παρενεγκουσῶν ἢ ὥς τὸ πρῶτον ἢ ἐσβολῇ ἢ ἐς τὴν Ἀττικὴν καὶ ἡ ἀρχὴ τοῦ πολέμου τοῦδε ἐγένετο.

² Thucydides, V, 26, 2.

³ Thucydides, V, 22-24.

The situation was complicated by Argive aspirations to power and by the kaleidoscopic shifting of the smaller states as they changed their allegiance from one side to another.

The Argives at this time were, according to Thucydides, in far better condition than any of the other Greek cities.⁴ They had not taken any part in the war and because of their neutrality they had profited materially. The Argive treaty with Sparta was on the point of expiration; war with Sparta seemed inevitable⁵ and once again the hegemony of the Peloponnese was within Argive grasp. Soon after the Peace of Nikias the Corinthians suggested to the Argives that they make known to the other Hellenic states their willingness to form alliances. This advice was soon followed. Spartan prestige had suffered during the Archidamian War and the peace which followed did nothing to halt the decline; the time was ripe for Sparta's rival to intervene in the affairs of the Greek world. In 422/1 Mantinea and her allies formed an alliance with Argos as did Korinth and Elis. A little later, in 421/00, the Boiotians too be-

⁴ Thucydides, V, 28, 2.

⁵ The Argive truce with Sparta had been made thirty years before, in 451; Thucydides, V, 14, 4. The Argives refused to renew this truce in 421; Thucydides, V, 22, 2.

came allies of Argos.

The change of ephors which occurred in the autumn of 421/⁶ at Sparta was accompanied by a change of policy. For those who succeeded the ephors under whom the peace (and alliance) had been made were not sympathetic to it, did nothing to enforce its demands, and, anxious for the support of Argos, concluded a treaty with that state. An alliance with the Boiotians, who had begun the demolition of Panakton, was made in the same year. When the Athenians heard this they were indignant with the Spartans, for they judged that they had been wronged on two accounts. First, Panakton should have been restored as it stood, and second, the Spartans, in making a separate alliance with Boiotia, had contravened the terms of the peace.

It was during this confusion in foreign affairs that Athens was torn with internal dissension. Nikias, who had engineered the peace, was in favour of friendship with Sparta. He was eager to maintain peaceful conditions in order that his city might recoup her waning resources.⁷

⁶ Thucydides, V, 36, 1.

⁷ The financial drain had been heavy during the Archidamian War. The Athenian treasury was near bankruptcy (A.T.L., III, pp. 342-344 with note 94). Andokides (De Pace, 8-9) contrasts the prosperity of the short interval of peace with

In this as in everything else he was following the example of Perikles. Thucydides⁸ gives a penetrating description of the contemporary internal situation of Athens and of Nikias' policy. Nikias was eager for the peace because so far his record had been free of disaster and he earnestly desired to preserve that reputation, to put an end to his own labours and to those of his fellow Athenians during his own lifetime, and to assure himself that in the future he would be remembered as one who had never injured the state. He was certain that only by a treaty of peace could these ends be achieved. In this one perceives the essentials of Nikias' character. As West says, "...Thucydides has managed to portray the main points in the life and character of Nikias, his fear of the demagogue Cleon, his political ambitions, his cautious moderation, his superstitious regard for inconstant Tyche, his love and loyalty to Athens, and finally his devotion to the memory of Pericles and adoption of Periclean standards of conduct."⁹ Nikias

the poverty of the war years. He reckons that 7000 talents were deposited on the Akropolis, more than 300 ships were acquired, and over 1200 talents of tribute were collected before the peace was broken. For a further discussion of this passage of Andokides see A.T.L., III, pp. 346-347.

⁸ Thucydides, V, 16, 1.

⁹ West, Class. Phil., XIX (1924), p. 227.

supported the peace not because he was a pro-Spartan or because he was a conservative or pacifist, but because he was, again to quote West, "in war and peace...a pupil of Pericles."¹⁰ He was not an oligarch, although the oligarchs, never sympathetic to the war,¹¹ rallied to his side to work for the peace. He was the leader of the conservative democracy after the death of Perikles and tried to emulate his predecessor in the framing of policies which would be advantageous to Athens; unfortunately for Athens he lacked the spark of genius which made Perikles one of the great statesmen of all time.

Early in 421, just after the signing of the peace, the name of Nikias was on every tongue. He was said to be beloved of the gods. Because of his piety he had been granted the privilege of bestowing his name upon the greatest of blessings. Nikias had given his attention to peace, Perikles to war; for the one was thought to have thrown the

¹⁰ West, op. cit., p. 228.

¹¹ Thucydides, II, 65, 2. The upper classes had sustained many varied misfortunes; in their eyes the greatest calamity of all was that they had war rather than peace. The oligarchs had a natural sympathy for Sparta, which together with the financial risks involved made them unenthusiastic for war.

Greeks into great disaster on the slightest pretext, while the other persuaded them to forget their injuries and be friends.¹² Nikias was the man of the hour. At last, after Kleon's demise, he had the opportunity to work for peace; with Brasidas dead the Spartans were willing to acknowledge once more their eagerness to put an end to hostilities.¹³ Nikias' program was supported from the beginning by the well-to-do men, the elders, and the farmers. The others he convinced by private conversations. The Spartans trusted him because of his fairness and his kindness to the prisoners taken on Sphakteria.¹⁴ His long struggle with Kleon and his constant efforts for peace came to fruition.

His uncontested primacy in the Athenian state was destined to be short-lived. It was inevitable that when relations between Athens and Sparta became strained the man who had instigated the alliance should suffer. This shadow of doubt cast upon his leadership gave the needed impetus to the anti-Spartan element at Athens. There were always those who hoped to gain more from war than the terms of the peace granted, but for a time Nikias' policy carried

¹² Plutarch, Nicias, 9, 8-9; Aristophanes, Acharnians, 526-534.

¹³ Thucydides, V, 16, 1; cf. Plutarch, Nicias, 9, 3-4.

¹⁴ Plutarch, Nicias, 9, 6.

the day and they had been forced into inactivity. This party found its leader in Alkibiades son of Kleinias. So Nikias, even though he was rid of Kleon, scarcely had a chance to set the state on the road to safety before it was engaged in war once again.

Alkibiades had been under the influence of two of the foremost men of Greece from his early youth. When his father died at the battle of Koroneia in the spring of 446,¹⁵ the son was sent to his kinsman Perikles. He was also a pupil of Sokrates. Xenophon maintains that the reason for Alkibiades' association with Sokrates was a desire to learn the secret of verbal superiority to assure him of superiority in action. When this had been learned, he deserted his teacher.¹⁶ Whatever his motive, he became a powerful speaker. Plutarch pays tribute to this talent by referring to Demosthenes, Theophrastos, and the comic poets, all of whom testify to his skill in oratory.¹⁷ But this art was a dangerous one when combined with ambition and Alkibiades seems to have learned nothing of wisdom or prudence from his tutors. During the period of ill-feeling

¹⁵ Thucydides, I, 113, 2. For the date see A.T.L., III, pp. 173-174.

¹⁶ Xenophon, Memorabilia, I, 2, 14-16.

¹⁷ Plutarch, Alcibiades, 10, 4.

between Sparta and Athens he found his opportunity to break into politics and to set himself against the favourite of the day.¹⁸ Thucydides reports that Alkibiades

¹⁸

[Andokides, (4, 11), it is true, maintains that Alkibiades was one of the board of ten taktai who revised the assessment and doubled the tribute. It is highly improbable, however, that Alkibiades had anything to do with the reassessment in 425 which raised the tribute so drastically. He would have been much too young to have had any influence in politics. Thucydides relates (V, 43, 2) that Alkibiades was very angry in 421: because of his youth (ἀνὴρ ἡλικίᾳ μὲν ἔτι τότε ὢν νέος) he had not been consulted about the treaty of peace. Writing of his entry into public life and his differences with Phaiax and Nikias, Plutarch (Alcibiades, 13, 1) calls him "still a young man" (ἔτι μετράκιον ὢν); this was probably about 420 B.C. (see below, p. 52). His father Kleinias died at Koroneia in 446 and Alkibiades fought at Poteidaia (ca. 430) and Delion (424). He was general, surely for the first time, in 420/19 (Thucydides, V, 52, 2, followed by Plutarch, Nicias, 10, 9, and Alcibiades, 15, 1). In the face of the combined testimony we must set the birth of Alkibiades about 450. Even this makes Plutarch's expression, μετράκιον, difficult, for the word connotes an age of no more than 20 or 21; see further A.T.L., III, p. 160 with note 11. The date 450, however, may be reached from the evidence of Thucydides alone.

headed the party which wanted to cancel the treaty in favour of an alliance with Argos.¹⁹ Alkibiades, as a young man interested in politics, must have been aware of the confusion engendered by the so-called peace in 421. He knew that Sparta was encountering many difficulties in trying to make her allies carry out the stipulations of the treaty. He knew about the fifty-year alliance between Athens and Sparta, which gave Sparta hope that Argos would avoid an alliance with Athens. Without Athenian help neither Argos or any other Peloponnesian city would be a serious threat to Sparta, which could not expect to maintain a war with Athens and Argos at the same time. By the alliance the Spartans' interests were protected; if the allies failed to carry out the clauses of the treaty, the Athenian quarrel (they reasoned) would be with the allies, not with them.

If Athens made an agreement with Argos, a city which was already planning to drop her alliance with Sparta, Spartan hegemony would be threatened. Sparta would be forced to protect her interests in the Peloponnese. An Athenian-Argive alliance would open up a new sphere of activity for Athens. This program was bound to appeal to the anti-Spartans in Athens and to that element which had previously

¹⁹ Thucydides, V, 43, 1-3; cf. Plutarch, Alcibiades, 14, 1-3; Nicias, 10, 4.

backed Kleon in its hopes for spectacular gains from the war and which felt cheated by the peace. If Alkibiades' advice was taken and the alliance with Argos was made there would be a chance for Athenian expansion in the direction of the Peloponnese. This would make it clear that an anti-Spartan element still existed. Here was an opportunity for Athenian intervention in the Peloponnese, an opportunity for the war-party to provoke Sparta without violating treaty or alliance; Alkibiades was quick to seize upon it. Thucydides considers that personal feeling as well was a factor. Alkibiades was offended that the treaty had been negotiated through Nikias and Laches while he had been ignored because of his youth. Then too his family had been proxenoi of the Lakedaimonians and he himself had renewed this relationship by his attentions to the prisoners from Pylos. Hurt at these personal slights he worked hard against the treaty. He told the Athenians that the Spartans had made a treaty with Athens in order that they might overthrow Argos and then proceed against Athens.²⁰ Tension had already been aroused between Sparta and Athens because of the Boiotian-Spartan alliance and the partial destruction of Panakton. Argos' sudden rise in the Peloponnese and her alliances with the Peloponnesian states made a pact with that state seem

²⁰ Thucydides, V, 43, 3.

to some Athenians a wise move. Accordingly, Alkibiades sent to the Argives telling them of the possibility of an Argive-Athenian entente. He assured them of his aid.

The Argives were not averse to an alliance with Athens and sent an embassy. At the same time (420/19) ambassadors arrived from Sparta who were well-disposed toward the Athenians. The Spartans had evidently realized that their pact with Athens was not sufficient to prevent an Argive-Athenian alliance. An Argive embassy which had been sent to Sparta a short time before Alkibiades' message came was immediately withdrawn when the Argives recognized the opportunity that was being presented to them, an alliance with a fellow democracy and a naval power which would be a great help in war. Because of Argos' volte-face, the Spartans, even the ephors who were hostile to the peace, were aware that relations with Athens must be hastily mended if possible to prevent a coalition of two potential threats to Spartan hegemony in the Peloponnese. It was the purpose of the Spartan ambassadors to forestall such a pact, to justify their Boiotian alliance, and to ask for Pylos in return for Panakton. These men assured the Boule that they had come with full powers to adjust any points at issue. This avowal disturbed Alkibiades. He was committed to the Argives and had given them every reason to believe that they would gain their ends. But if the Spartans should repeat before

the Ekklesia their statement that they were quite willing to arbitrate their differences the Argive alliance might well be rejected. Accordingly Alkibiades resorted to trickery. He promised Pylos to the Spartans if the ambassadors would keep silent about their full powers for arbitration. Such a promise made the ambassadors believe, gullible and naive as they were, that Alkibiades had much more influence with the Athenians than had Nikias. Alkibiades' purpose was to keep them from negotiating with Nikias. If the ambassadors were induced to tell a different story to the Assembly from the one they had told the Boule, their apparent lack of sincerity and their inconsistency would bring disgrace upon Nikias and the pro-Spartans, the embassy would be rejected, and all expectation of friendship with Sparta renounced. After their refusal to hear the Spartans' embassy, Alkibiades hoped, the Assembly would turn with relief to the Argive ambassadors. Argos would gain the confidence of the Athenians. The scheme worked out to Alkibiades' satisfaction. The Athenians were disgusted at the conduct of the Spartans and, at the instigation of Alkibiades, who soundly denounced the ambassadors, were ready to comply with the request of the Argives. However, an earthquake put an end to the final negotiations.

Plutarch relates that Nikias was unable to speak but was struck dumb with amazement at the statement of the

ambassadors.²¹ Nevertheless, the next day he returned to the Assembly and earnestly pleaded with the Athenians to remain on friendly terms with the Lakedaimonians. He pointed out that they ought to retain their existing prosperity as long as possible. The Spartans were in such desperate straits that any change in their fortunes could be regarded as a change for the better. He asked that an embassy be sent to Sparta, of which he would be a member, to invite the Spartans, if they were really sincere in their desire to eliminate the difficulties, to restore Panakton intact as well as Amphipolis and to abrogate the Boiotian alliance. His advice was taken; an embassy was appointed of which he was a member. The ambassadors were authorized to note the imminent alliance of Athens with Argos. But the mission was doomed to failure. The anti-Athenian party under the leadership of Xenares who was ephor in 420/19 refused to give up the Boiotian treaty. The Athenians were angry when they heard the results. At once Alkibiades brought in the Argives, and the Athenians, abandoning the program of Nikias, came to terms with them and their allies. In 420/19 the Quadruple Alliance was made between Athens on the one side and Argos, Mantinea, and Elis on the other. Alkibiades had won the first round.

²¹ Plutarch, Nicias, 10, 6.

During the period immediately following the Athenian alliance with Argos, Alkibiades was high in popular favour. It is apparent from Thucydides' narrative that he had the ear of the Demos. This alliance which he promoted, together with his strong anti-Spartan tendency, seemed to assure the Athenians of a new sphere of interest in the northern Peloponnese. There were always those who were eager to extend Athenian power. To this faction Alkibiades' program had appealed. Nikias had had his chance. His advocacy of friendship with Sparta had been made to look utterly foolish and his caution seemed pedestrian. Through the trickery of Alkibiades his prestige had suffered greatly.

In the summer of 420/19, Alkibiades was general. Still acting with the Argives and their allies, he went into the Peloponnese to settle various problems which had arisen in connection with the alliance. During the same summer the Argives made war on the Epidaurians. For, as Thucydides says, it seemed best to the Argives and Alkibiades that Epidaurus should enter the alliance.²² While the Epidaurians were calling upon their allies for help, all in vain, the Athenians invited envoys from the various cities to a conference at Mantinea. At this meeting the

²² Thucydides, V, 53.

Korinthians in no uncertain terms informed the Athenians that they had no right to call a council for peace when the Epidaurians and Argives were at war. Accordingly the Athenians induced the Argives to leave Epidauros. But even then the members of the conference could not agree and it was dissolved. Thereupon the Argives continued to prosecute their war with the Epidaurians, this time aided by one thousand Athenian hoplites under Alkibiades. The next winter (419/8) the Spartans succeeded in dispatching a garrison by sea to Epidauros. This action was protested by the Argives, who complained that the Athenians were violating the treaty when they allowed enemies of Argos to move past Athenian territory (i.e., Aigina) by sea.²³ As redress they asked the Athenians to bring the Messenians and helots from Kranioi to Pylos to annoy the Spartans. This request was granted on the advice of Alkibiades.

But in spite of all the efforts of Alkibiades the Argive alliance was of short duration. In the mid-summer of 418 the Lakedaimonians, aroused by conditions in the Peloponnese, marched against Argos. The Argives were well aware of Spartan preparations and with the Mantineians met the Peloponnesian forces under Sparta on the Argive plain. The Argives had depended upon the Athenian cavalry

²³ Cf. Thucydides, V, 53.

for aid but it had not arrived. Accordingly, just as the armies were about to join battle two Argives, apparently fearful of the outcome, on their own authority went to the Spartans and said that the Argives were ready to come to terms. Agis, the Spartan king, also on his own authority, without consulting the other magistrates made a truce. Since the Spartans had had the Argives at a disadvantage they were annoyed with Agis' action but followed him out of respect. The Peloponnesian forces soon dispersed to their own homes. The Argives too were much displeased with the truce for the battle could have been fought near their own city and with their allies. At this juncture the Athenian reinforcements arrived, one thousand hoplites and three hundred cavalry under Laches and Nikostratos.²⁴ At first the Argives felt bound by their truce with Sparta and ordered the Athenians back home. But the Argive allies per-

²⁴ Thucydides (V, 57, 1) places the Spartan march against Argos in mid-summer (τοῦ δ' ἐπιγιννομένου θέρος μεσοῦντος). A little later the Athenians arrive (V, 61, 1), after the Spartan dispersal. Alkibiades is quite clearly not a member of the board of generals (for 418/7); otherwise he would have commanded the Athenian contingent, as he had in the previous year (see above, p. 41). But he did accompany them as πρεσβευτής (V, 61, 2).

suaded them to allow the Athenians to come before the people. The Athenian spokesman was the persuasive Alkibiades. He protested that it was illegal for the Argives to make a truce without consulting the allies; the war ought to be resumed. Obviously an Argive-Spartan truce was the last thing Alkibiades wanted. It meant a weakening of the Quadruple Alliance and to carry out his program he needed every ally he could procure from the Peloponnese. He managed to convince the allies and the war continued. Orchomenos was taken. The next objective was Tegea and preparations for an assault upon this city were in progress at Mantinea.

But at Sparta Agis was unpopular for having accepted the truce and the capture of Orchomenos added fuel to Spartan wrath. When word reached the Spartans that Tegea was also likely to capitulate, a large force of Spartans and allies was sent to Mantinea (418/7). The Athenians participated in the ensuing battle and lost both their generals along with two hundred Athenian and Aiginetan troops. Argos was defeated. The day before the battle the Epidaurians had invaded Argos expecting to find it undefended. As soon as the battle of Mantinea was over, a contingent of Eleians and Athenians proceeded against Epidaurios and began to build a wall around the city. The others soon tired of the labour, but the Athenians kept at the task, finished their assignment, and left an allied garrison before they

withdrew.²⁵

After the victory of the Lakedaimonians at Mantinea, the pro-Spartans at Argos who were eager to overthrow the democracy were in a good position to persuade the people to listen to their proposals. But Alkibiades had remained in Argos and there was much discussion on both sides of the issue (winter, 418/7). Though he must have expended much effort to block the treaty between the Argives and the Spartans, he had no success. The treaty was made. A short time later (winter, 418/7) the Argives renounced their alliance with Mantinea, Elis, and Athens; the Athenians, with a little persuasion, gave up the garrison at Epidauros. This development was a blow to Alkibiades. The failure of the Athenian alliance with the cities of the Peloponnese meant death to his ambitions in that territory and a reversal of the confidence felt by the Demos in his policy. But one can certainly see his hand in the sudden rise of the popular party at Argos against the oligarchs, whom they attacked at the celebration of the Gymnopaedia. The democratic element won the day and while the oligarchs appealed in vain to the Lakedaimonians, who followed their usual custom of delay and postponement, the democrats were hoping for help from Athens. While there was no actual

²⁵ Thucydides, V, 75, 4-5.

treaty made, the Athenians sent carpenters and stone masons to help the Argives build the walls down to the sea; these would be indispensable for importing supplies should Argos be cut off by land.²⁶ When news of the Argive activities reached the Lakedaimonians they were thoroughly alarmed and sent out an expedition to Argos. The support which they had expected from the oligarchic party in the city failed to materialize and, although they razed the walls which were in the process of being built and seized Hysiai, they did not crush the populace.

These events in Argos naturally had an effect upon the Athenians. Alkibiades' sympathy lay with the Argive democrats; his inclination was to help them against Sparta. Although the Quadruple Alliance had failed he saw an opportunity to salvage his schemes for extending Athenian power into the Peloponnese by an alliance between Athens and the democratic party in Argos. Nikias, on the other hand, was hopeful of improving Athenian relations with Sparta after the disruption of the Quadruple Alliance. We may believe that he was antagonistic toward any aid to Argos. If Athens refused to interfere in this disagreement she would be showing her friendly intentions to Sparta and perhaps there was still a chance that the peace could be maintained. Nikias

²⁶ Thucydides, V, 82, 5-6.

and his supporters were strong enough to prevent a formal alliance with Argos, but Alkibiades' diplomatic skill procured material aid for his protégés. Both men had adherents; a struggle between them was inevitable.

At last, in the spring of 416,²⁷ the feud reached such a pitch that recourse to ostracism became a necessity. Alkibiades could no longer be sure that he held an uncontested place in the state. He had behind him those who wished to continue the war: the ambitious young men and the commercial interests. Nicias' policy was favoured by the elders, the wealthy farmers, and the oligarchs. Despite their strength, both had cause to fear ostracism, for their respective policies had suffered during the period between 421 and 416. To circumvent their impending misfortune the two joined their factions²⁸ and turned the vote against Hyperbolos, a demagogue who, according to Thucydides, was not a threat to the state.²⁹ Plutarch remarks that his audacity did not arise from the power he possessed but that his influence had its source in his audacity.³⁰ The comic writers constantly made him the butt of their jests; Platon (Κωμικός)

²⁷ For the date see above, p. 24, note 43.

²⁸ Plutarch, Alcibiades, 13, 7; Nicias, 11, 5.

²⁹ Thucydides, VIII, 73, 3.

³⁰ Plutarch, Nicias, 11, 3.

said that he was unworthy of the fate he suffered, that ostracism had not been invented for men of his calibre.³¹

Carcopino agrees with this summary dismissal.³²

Plutarch tells the story of this ostracism in three of the Lives.³³ The passage in the Aristides causes no difficulty. It is a simple statement of fact: Hyperbolos was the last man to be ostracized at Athens, the victim of the machinations of Nicias and Alkibiades. In the Alcibiades and Nicias, however, two versions of the story are set forth. The first describes the worry and confusion of

³¹ Quoted by Plutarch, Nicias, 11, 7 (frag. 187 Kock).

³² Carcopino, L'ostracisme athénien, pp. 247-248: "Et il ne sera jamais qu'un démagogue sans pouvoir personnel. Il n'a d'autre arme que la parôle. Il n'a de force qu'autant que l'Assemblée l'écoute; et l'Assemblée ne l'écoute qu'autant qu'il partage ses désirs et flatte ses passions." However, the references in the comic writers show at least that he was fairly prominent in the political life of the city and this view is strengthened by I.G., I², 84 (421/0) and 95 (418/7; see above, p. 24, note 43), in which he is recorded as the orator. That is not to say that Thucydides was wrong; Hyperbolos, though active in affairs of state, was not influential enough to merit ostracism.

³³ Plutarch, Nicias, 11; Alcibiades, 13; Aristides, 7.

both men when they realized that one or the other was doomed. Plutarch clearly states that the reason for the test was the diametrically opposed political views of the two men, that it was a contest between the elders who wanted peace and the youths who favoured war. In addition, the people were disgusted with Alkibiades' excesses and annoyed with Nikias because of his aristocratic ways and his attempts to coerce the Demos into doing what was advantageous for it against its will.³⁴ The city was divided into two parties. Hyperbolos might gain by the banishment of one or the other. Accordingly he began to incite the people against both. When this became apparent to Nikias and Alkibiades they joined forces against the demagogue who found himself ostracized, much to his surprise, for he had thought that he was beyond the reach of this fate.³⁵

The second account is attributed by Plutarch to Theophrastos, who maintains that the ostracism occurred when Phaiax was striving against Alkibiades.³⁶ In the Alcibiades Plutarch describes Alkibiades' entrance into public life. He mentions two rivals, Phaiax and Nikias.³⁷ Phaiax son of

³⁴ Plutarch, Nicias, 11, 2-3.

³⁵ Plutarch, Nicias, 11, 4.

³⁶ Plutarch, Nicias, 11, 10.

³⁷ Plutarch, Alcibiades, 13, 1.

Erasistratos was one of Alkibiades' rivals and a demagogue. He is described by Eupolis as excellent at babbling but most incapable in speaking.³⁸ Plutarch attributes to him the speech against Alkibiades now known as *Andokides*, 4. According to the version in the *Alcibiades* this man was involved in the ostracism. Plutarch states that the danger existed for three men, Alkibiades, Nicias, and Phalax, and that Alkibiades and Nicias made common cause and ousted Hyperbolos. Some say, he adds, that Alkibiades persuaded Phalax and his *hetaireia* to join him against Hyperbolos.³⁹ This is probably an elaboration of the reference to Theophrastos made in the *Nicias* (11, 10) to the effect that Hyperbolos was ostracized at a time when Alkibiades was struggling against Phalax,⁴⁰ not against Nicias.

³⁸ Quoted by Plutarch, *Alcibiades*, 13, 2 (frag. 95 Kock).

³⁹ Plutarch, *Alcibiades*, 13, 8.

⁴⁰ Phalax apparently was not without importance in Athens. In addition to the passages in Plutarch (*Alcibiades*, 13; *Nicias*, 11) which have been discussed, Aristophanes mentions him (*Knights*, 1377-1380) as a σοφός who by his guile escaped death. The scholion explains that Phalax was a shrewd speaker who, though condemned to die, managed to evade the judgment. This is perhaps supported by *Andokides*, (4, 8), who says he (Phalax?) has been tried and acquitted four times.

Numerous attempts have been made to reconcile the two stories.⁴¹ Plutarch's own opinion coincides with the

Thucydides (V, 4-5) records the mission of Phaiax son of Erasistratos in 423/2 to Italy and Sicily to persuade the allies and Siciliotes to make common cause in opposition to Syracuse for her aggressive activity against Leontinoi. Although he was, on the whole, unsuccessful, he did negotiate with some cities about friendship with Athens. Diogenes Laertios (II, 63) mentions a Phaiax in connection with the generalship. Plato, (Eryxias, 392a-c) reports a conversation between Sokrates and Erasistratos, the nephew of Phaiax, who went on the journey to Sicily.

⁴¹ A summary of these views is presented by Carcopino, op. cit., pp. 196-205. His own theory is that Plutarch's source for Phaiax was Andokides. Calhoun, Athenian Clubs in Politics and Litigation, pp. 137-138, conjectures that Phaiax was the head of an oligarchic group which was acting with the moderates and that he joined the coalition of Nikias and Alkibiades at this time. Hatzfeld, Alcibiade, pp. 114-116, thinks that Phaiax was the leader of a moderate party whom Alkibiades invited to join him against Nikias; but he soon realized that Phaiax was not influential enough to assure the plan of success. So he decided to go to the other extreme. It was then that he hit upon the plan of cooperat-

first account and his reason would appear to be the fact that most writers held that view.⁴² Plutarch has often been called uncritical and perhaps he seems to be counting rather than weighing the evidence.⁴³ Here, however, his judgement is vindicated. Our sources make it quite clear that Alkibiades and Nikias were at this time the leading figures; in fact, Plutarch implies that almost everyone belonged to one side or the other. If Phaiax was the leader of a third faction, it must have been insignificant. The oligarchs were supporting Nikias, who, though no oligarch himself, was representing the conservative side. The farmers too were behind Nikias, whereas the commercials were on the side of Alkibiades. Members of the faction formerly led by Kleon might have looked to Hyperbolos as a leader, but Alkibiades' schemes with their promise of much gain were more to their taste. They were probably to be found among his adherents. There would be very few left to belong to a third party; at the time of this ostracism Phaiax could not approach the influence which Nikias or Alkibiades held. We know that Hy-

ing with Nikias against Hyperbolos who was just then in the public eye. Cf. I.G., I², 95, which, if Woodhead's argument is accepted, belongs in 418/7. See above, p. 24, note 43.

⁴² Plutarch, Nicias, 11, 10.

⁴³ Gomme, Commentary, I, pp. 74-76.

perbolos was concerned, and that, without concrete evidence, would be difficult to believe; to suppose that a second comparative nonentity was involved is incredible.

The clues to the solution of the impasse lie in Plutarch's report that Phaiax quarreled with Alkibiades early in the latter's career and in Thucydides' dispatch of Phai-ax to Sicily in 423/2; these suggest a date ca. 420 for the prominence of Phaiax, when Alkibiades was young in experience and Phaiax was still in the public eye.⁴⁴ Plutarch has contaminated two separate occasions. It is possible that during the months following the Peace of Nikias Phaiax, who was influential with the Demos, stepped into Kleon's position and began to play upon the idea of expansion toward the West;⁴⁵ no doubt he spoke to many sympathetic ears. Alki-

⁴⁴ Kock (I, p. 639) places the Symmachia of Platon Komikos about 416, arguing that its plot revolved about the intrigues of Alkibiades, Nikias, and Phaiax against Hyperbolos. But there is no internal evidence to support this date or to bring Phaiax into the play (as Cobet observed; Kock, I, p. 639). Plutarch (Alcibiades, 13, 1) couples Nikias and Phaiax as popular leaders, which shows, perhaps, that about the time of the Peace of Nikias Phaiax still commanded some attention.

⁴⁵ Erasistratos, nephew of Phaiax, who was also a member

biades, on the other hand, was eager to prosecute the war with the Spartans and his ambitions were directed toward the Peloponnese; Sicily, for the moment, did not interest him. Those who favoured expansion were thus divided into two camps. Nikias, whose sole purpose was to maintain peace with Sparta and stability at home, was opposed to both. The three leaders may have felt that there was danger of ostracism for one of them, an ostracism which, in fact, never materialized. In the face of this threat Alkibiades may have sought Phaiax as an ally against Nikias. The fundamental aims of both men were the same and a coalition would mean the union of the radicals against the conservatives. Perhaps Alkibiades promised support of an expedition to Sicily in the future in return for the immediate help of Phaiax in gaining the alliance with Argos. Later writers confused the ostracism which occurred in 416 with the one which was no more than a threat in 420: Alkibiades and Nikias were concerned on both occasions and on both occasions there was collusion. It was easy to synthesize the

of the embassy to Sicily, is made to speak in ambitious terms of the West in the Eryxias, 392c, a dialogue which has reached us among the works of Plato: εἰ μή τις ἔργον ποιησάμενος σφόδρα μεγάλῳ στόλῳ ἤξει ἐκεῖσε, οὐκ ἔστιν ὅπως ἐκείνη ἡ πόλις ἔσται ποτὲ ἡμῶν ὑποχείρια.

two situations and Plutarch represents this tradition.

With the circumvention of ostracism in 416 its usefulness came to an end. No longer was it a device to determine which policy had the confidence of the people; no longer could it be used to guarantee to the city freedom from stasis. As a result, the Athenians found that there remained two strong leaders in Athens. One was an older man, cautious in action; the other was a youth full of ambitions for himself and for the state. Because they both had strong followings and because both held positions of authority, the policy of Athens was bound to waver. There was no undisputed leader.

The danger of ostracism removed, Alkibiades again turned his attention to relations with Sparta. In the summer of 417/6 he went to Argos and seized every member of the pro-Spartan party who remained. His zeal against Sparta and so against the policy of Nikias was still intense. His conduct in Argos would assure the Demos that he was sympathetic to democracy and merciless to its enemies, the Spartans and the Lakonizers. Even though the alliance with Argos had failed, Alkibiades had hopes of keeping alive a strong anti-Spartan feeling among the Athenians. The radical democrats and those who would gain material benefits from war and from an extension of the empire were eager to see his policy put into action. Yet Alkibiades' strategy

had not brought to Athens the expected results. The battle of Mantinea had broken up the Quadruple Alliance. Argos had abandoned Athens; hopes for a sphere of interest in the northern Peloponnese were gone. Nikias must have been busy during these troubled years showing how Alkibiades' ambitions had failed, for Athens was now in a worse plight than before. She had provoked Sparta and could no longer count on allies in the Peloponnese. He could point to the concrete results of the peace⁴⁶ and assure the citizens that friendship with Sparta and indefatigable efforts to promote the peace would guarantee the permanence of these advantages.

In the same summer (417/6) the Athenians directed their attention towards a colony of the Lakedaimonians and hence a potential Spartan ally. The island of Melos had been neutral during the early days of the Peloponnesian War. It had been assessed in 425⁴⁷ although it is doubtful whether any payment was ever made. When an Athenian expedition was sent out to force the Melians into submission they became hostile and in 416, after a siege, the Athenians staged a

⁴⁶ Andokides, De Pace, 8-9.

⁴⁷ A9, I, 65 (A.T.L., II, p. 42). Cf. A.T.L., III, p. 198, note 24; Thucydides, V, 84, 2: οὐκ ἤθελον ὑπακούειν ὥσπερ οἱ ἄλλοι νησιῶται....

mass butchery of the adult males and enslaved the women and children. This deed of violence, Plutarch assures us, was chiefly the work of Alkibiades since it was he who supported the measure.⁴⁸ That is to say, if he did not initiate the vote against the Melians, he had enough influence with the Demos to persuade it of the efficacy of the move, probably on the ground that as a Lakedaimonian colony Melos would eventually enter the war on the side of Sparta. Perhaps the island's recalcitrance in the matter of paying her assessment was used as a spur to his argument. The speech against Alkibiades attributed to Andokides also states that Alkibiades favoured the action.⁴⁹ Of these sources one is late and the other of unknown authorship and date. The chief historian for the period does not mention Alkibiades by name in his account of the Melian affair.⁵⁰ However, the passage follows immediately upon his description of Alkibiades' opposition to the Spartan sympathizers at Argos. Alkibiades was a general in this year, then, and may have been present at Melos. If he was not directly responsible for the original decision to subjugate and finally to annihilate the Melians, he did in all likelihood support the

⁴⁸ Plutarch, Alcibiades, 16, 6.

⁴⁹ Andokides, 4, 22.

⁵⁰ Thucydides, V, 84-116.

measure and perhaps helped to carry it out.

The collaboration of Alkibiades and Nikias for the ostracism of Hyperbolos had as its only motive expediency. Alkibiades' part in the Melian affair was not calculated to win the friendship of Nikias and the pro-Spartan faction. After this event they again found themselves at opposite poles. The issue this time was the expedition to Sicily. When the appeal for help was made by the envoys from Egesta in the winter of 416/5 Nikias, representing the conservative element, opposed sending aid. But Alkibiades defeated him. Before the Ekklesia met he had been busy filling the minds of the people with hope so that the youths in the gymnasium and the old men in their shops would gather in groups and draw the map of Sicily and the sea around it, the harbours and those places which looked to Libya. For Sicily was to be only a beginning which would open up the wide expanses of the West.⁵¹

⁵¹ Plutarch, Nicias, 12, 1-2. Interest in the West did not originate with Alkibiades. Even in the sixth century that interest existed. Later it became more intense. The names of Themistokles' daughters, Sybaris and Italia, suggest his western aspirations. Diodoros, XII, 54, 1-2, in his account of the embassy sent from Leontinoi in 427, says that for a long time the Athenians had been coveting Sicily.

Nikias, according to Plutarch, had few to fight

Plutarch, Pericles, 20, 4, commenting on events between 454 and 448, remarks that many Athenians already were afflicted with the fatal passion for Sicily. While this may be hindsight, there is other evidence that Athens in the fifth century had ambitions in the direction of Sicily. In 425 the generals Eurymedon and Sophokles set out for Sicily (Thucydides, IV, 46, 1); in IV, 60, 1 he reports a speech of Hermokrates (425/4) who declares that the Athenians are plotting against Sicily. The final outcome of this expedition is recorded in Thucydides, IV, 65, 3. Upon their return to Athens Pythodoros and Sophokles were exiled and Eurymedon fined on the charge that when they had it in their power to subdue Sicily they had been bribed to depart. In another speech of Hermokrates to the Syracusans (415) it is maintained that an Athenian attack upon Karthage is constantly expected (Thucydides, VI, 34, 2). There is an indication in Aristophanes, Knights, 173-174 and 1303-1304 that in 424 there was in Athens a commercial group eager for the subjugation of Sicily and Karthage. The treaties with Rhegion and Leontinoi (I.G., I², 51 and 52) made ca. 448 (Meritt, Class. Quart., XL [1946], p. 91) and renewed in 433/2 give evidence once more of a desire for western expansion. During the Peloponnesian War Perikles discouraged

the battle with him and these had little influence. The well-to-do citizens were afraid of seeming to shirk the performance of liturgies, especially that of the trierarchy. Against their own convictions they kept silent. Still Nikias did not give up; even after Alkibiades had won, when the expedition had been voted and he, Alkibiades, and Lamachos had been chosen generals, he tried to deter the Demos. He made one last attempt to keep the city on the course set by Perikles some fifteen years before. He too feared that the risks involved far outweighed the advantages that might accrue. He accused Alkibiades openly of being motivated by personal ambition and begged the elders not to be ashamed of voting against the war.⁵² But Alkibiades, angry with Nikias because of this attack, rose to speak. He repeated in glowing terms the benefits and glories that would come to the city from this expedition and ended by an appeal to all to act in the manner of their ancestors, young and old together. For the second time the vote was in favour of the expedition.

The priestly families and most of those who served the gods, in small ways or great, opposed the move. Plutarch

the extension of the empire. His successor Nikias was opposed to it because of the expense and risks involved.

⁵²

Thucydides, VI, 12, 2-13, 1; cf. Plutarch, Nicias, 12.

remarks that Alkibiades soon dealt with this obstacle. He had other priests whom he employed and he quoted an ancient oracle to the effect that great glory would come to the Athenians from Sicily.⁵³ Preparations, therefore, were begun with enthusiasm. The generals were given full powers to recruit the men and supplies needed and in all matters to do what was in their judgement best for Athens. By this time the city's manpower had recovered to some extent from war and plague while the peace had provided an opportunity for monetary resources to accumulate. Andokides praises the blessings of the peace by calling attention to the 7000 talents which were deposited on the Akropolis, the 300 ships the Athenians acquired, and the more than 1200 talents of tribute collected yearly.⁵⁴

⁵³ Plutarch, Nicias, 13, 1.

⁵⁴ Andokides, De Pace, 8-9. In their discussion of the Peace of Nicias, A.T.L., III, pp. 346-358, Meritt, Wade-Gery, and McGregor maintain that Andokides' 7000 talents represented the amount which had been borrowed from the gods during the Archidamian War. When peace was signed provision was made for its repayment. On the analogy of the plan adopted in 449 they assume that an initial payment, which they compute at 1000 talents, was made and annual instalments were to be added later. They reckon the total

For the time being Nikias and his party seemed to have given up hope for a lasting peace. Once more the two parties apparently agreed to forget their differences in the face of the common effort. But early in the summer of 415 in the midst of this preparation and visible harmony there occurred an event which produced far-reaching consequences. All the stone statues of Hermes, with one significant exception, were mutilated.

available fund against which borrowings could be made after the peace until the year 414/3, i.e., the reserve fund, at ca. 5784 talents.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE EVIDENCE

1. Andokides

The defacement¹ of the Herms was regarded by many as the childish prank of drunken revelers.² On the other hand, Thucydides reports that the Demos took the matter quite seriously, as an evil omen for the expedition and a plot against the government.³ Later,⁴ after relating the story of the Peisistratids, he explains the ugly mood of the Athe-

¹ The manner in which the Herms were mutilated has sometimes been questioned. Two scholia on the Lysistrata are often cited as evidence. (1) Schol. Lysistrata, 1094: 'Ερμοκοπίδων· παρόσον οἱ 'Ερμοκοπίδαι ἡκρωτηρίασαν τοὺς 'Ερμᾶς, ὅτε ἐπὶ Σικελίας ἔμελλον πλεῖν.... (2) Schol. Lysistrata, 1099: ἄνδρες οἱ 'Ερμοκοπίδαι· ἐκδεδαρμένους, τὰ αἰδοῖα ἀνατεταμένους. However, Thucydides says, VI, 27, 1, οἱ πλεῖστοι, sc. 'Ερμαῖ, περιεκόπησαν τὰ πρόσωπα. The misconception may have arisen from a passage in the Lysistrata, especially 1093-1094: ὅπως τῶν 'Ερμοκοπιδῶν μή τις ὅμῳ ὄψεται, which merely implies that the Spartan messenger looked like a Herm.

² Plutarch, Alcibiades, 18, 7.

³ Thucydides, VI, 27, 3.

⁴ Thucydides, VI, 60, 1.

nian Demos toward those who had profaned the mysteries as based on its feeling that those who had participated were aiming at an oligarchy and tyranny. Plutarch adds that people who had never had much regard for such things were disturbed by the mutilation and by the rumours concerning the parodying of the mysteries.⁵ Before the anger and alarm of the Demos had been assuaged many prominent Athenians had been imprisoned, or exiled, or even put to death. A reward was offered to anyone who would give information about the mutilation of statues or any profaning of the mysteries, that is, anything that might be interpreted as impiety. Several came forward to tell what they knew.

One investigation led to the arrest and imprisonment of Andokides and his family. Andokides claimed to know the true story of the affair. He offered to set forth his evidence in return for immunity for himself and his family. This was granted. He probably did have some connection with the mutilation⁶ although because of the immunity he continued to live in Athens for a time. Shortly after the restoration of the democracy in 403 he was accused of violating the decree of Isotimides.⁷ His reply to this

⁵ Plutarch, Alcibiades, 18, 8.

⁶ Andokides, De Reditu, 7 and 10; Thucydides, VI, 60, 2.

⁷ Andokides, De Mysteriis, 71. See also above, p. 6.

charge is the oration known as the De Mysteriis in which he showed that he had nothing to do with profaning the mysteries and little concern with the affair of the Herms.⁸ In his defense he has given an account of the informations lodged about those who celebrated the mysteries and those who mutilated the Herms.⁹ He names the informants and the accused. I give below his story as told in the De Mysteriis.

According to Andokides, the first difficulty which occurred during the preparations for the departure of the expedition to Sicily was Pythonikos' information concerning the parody of the mysteries. The Assembly had met to give a last audience to Alkibiades, Nikias, and Lamachos; Lamachos' ship was ready to sail. Pythonikos rose and accused Alkibiades of celebrating the mysteries in a private house.¹⁰

⁸ His words in De Mysteriis, 71 (ὁ ἑσ. Ἰσοτιμίδης, μὲν γὰρ εἶπεν εἴργεσθαι τῶν ἱερῶν τοὺς ἀσεβήσαντας καὶ ὁμολογήσαντας, ἐμοὶ δὲ τούτων οὐδέτερα πεποιήται· οὔτε ἡσέβηται οὔτε ὡμολόγηται), are a flat contradiction of De Reditu, 7: εἴτε χρη εἶπεῖν νεότητί τε καὶ ἀνοίᾳ τῇ ἐμαντοῦ, εἴτε καὶ δυνάμει τῶν πεισάντων με ἐλθεῖν εἰς τοιαύτην συμφορὰν τῶν φρενῶν....

⁹ Andokides, De Mysteriis, 11-71.

¹⁰ Andokides is the sole authority for this meeting of the Ekklesia.

To support his charge he produced a witness in the person of Andromachos, a slave belonging to Archebiades son of Polemarchos; Andromachos was granted immunity and heard as soon as the Prytanes had cleared the meeting of non-initiates. Andromachos declared that the mysteries had been celebrated in Poulytion's house. Alkibiades, Nikiades, and Meletos had actually participated but many others had been present including slaves, himself, his brother Hikesios the flute player, and the slave of Meletos. The list of those involved, besides Alkibiades, Nikiades, and Meletos, included Archebiades, Archippos, Diogenes, Polystratos, Aristomenes, Oionias, and Panaitios. All of these latter save Polystratos went into voluntary exile and were sentenced to death in their absence. Polystratos was arrested and put to death.

After this investigation a metic named Teukros who had left Athens for Megara informed the Boule¹¹ that he was prepared to identify those who were implicated in the mysteries, as he himself had been a participant, and to tell what he knew about the mutilation of the Herms.

¹¹ Apparently at some stage in the proceedings the demagogue Androkles had urged the Boule to take part in the investigation; Androkles claimed the reward ὑπὲρ τῆς βουλῆς (De Mysteriis, 27).

The men whom he named fled the country: Phaidros, Gniphonides, Isonomos, Hephaistodoros, Kephisodoros, Teukros, Diognetos,¹² Smindyrides, Philokrates, Antiphon, Teisarchos, and Pantakles.

The third person to offer evidence in regard to the mysteries was Agariste the wife of Alkmeonides. According to her statement Alkibiades, Axiochos, and Adeimantos had celebrated the mysteries at the home of Charmides. As soon as this information was divulged, those named left the country.¹³

The last to make an accusation was Lydos the slave of Pherekles of Themakos, who said the mysteries had been celebrated at the house of his master. Among those present he included Leogoras the father of Andokides, Akoumenos, and Autokrator. The latter two went into exile but Leogoras was persuaded to remain in the city after his legal victory

¹² Andokides (De Mysteriis, 14) mentions Diognetos as a member of the existing committee which was investigating the impieties; this committee had been appointed after the mutilation. Peisandros and Charikles also served on the board; De Mysteriis, 36.

¹³ Andokides, De Mysteriis, 16: καὶ ἔφυγον οὗτοι πάντες ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ μηνύσει. It is highly probable that by this time Alkibiades had sailed for Sicily.

over Speusippos who had urged that the men named by Lydos be handed over to the court.¹⁴

In this way Andokides cleared himself of the accusation of having attended a mock celebration of the mysteries: he was not named by any of the informers nor had he given information about his father as his enemies had alleged.

After his discussion of the mysteries Andokides turns to the question of a reward.¹⁵ According to the narrative of Thucydides, a reward had been promised to anyone who gave information about the Herms.¹⁶ Andokides states that Pythonikos claimed a reward since he had been the first to lay charges before the Assembly. Technically, if Thucydides is correct, Pythonikos had no right to the reward; his information concerned the parody. It is possible

¹⁴ Andokides, De Mysteriis, 17. Speusippos was indicted on the ground that he had made an illegal proposal. Leogoras won his case by pleading that he had never visited Phekleas at Themakos nor had Lydos specifically said that he had taken part in the parody. See below, p. 115.

¹⁵ Kleonymos had been the orator of a decree in which 1000 drachmai were offered and later Peisandros proposed another reward of 10,000; De Mysteriis, 27.

¹⁶ Thucydides, VI, 27, 2.

that both Andokides and Thucydides are correct. The reward was originally set up for information about the hermokopidai but by the time all the informations had been lodged in connection with all the acts of impiety, the mutilation and parody became almost synonymous.¹⁷ The four informers also claimed their share and Androkles too demanded a reward.¹⁸ Finally the bulk of the money was awarded to Andromachos, the remainder to Teukros.

Now that Andokides has established to his own satisfaction his innocence concerning the mysteries, he turns to the Herms. Teukros had furnished a list of eighteen participants: Euktemon, Glaukippos, Eurymachos, Polyeuktos, Platon, Antidoros, Charippos, Theodoros, Alkisthenes, Menestratos, Eryximachos, Euphiletos, Eurydamas, Pherekles, Meletos, Timanthes, Archidamos, and Telenikos. Of this number, some went into exile and some were executed.

¹⁷ It must be remembered that the account of Andokides is not strictly chronological. He takes up the informations about the mysteries, then proceeds to the mutilation. Actually, as is clear from Thucydides and Plutarch, accusations about both were being made simultaneously.

¹⁸ This is the first mention of Androkles in Andokides' oration. His activities will be discussed in more detail below, pp. 133-134.

Peisandros and Charikles were on the committee to investigate the current wave of impiety, for they were regarded at that time as most zealous in the cause of the democracy. It was they who maintained that the whole thing was not the work of a small group but an attempt to overthrow the government. Therefore, they said, all those who were suspected must be hunted out. So at the instigation of these two men, as Andokides declares, Athens reached such a state that, when the herald gave the signal which called the Boule into the Bouleuterion, it was also the signal for men to flee the Agora, so great was the terror of arrest.

At this point a certain Diokleides came forward with a claim that he knew which citizens had taken part in the mutilation. He placed their number at three hundred and asserted that he had been an eye-witness to the deed. On the night in question, he stated, he had had to go to Laureion to collect the earnings of his slave there. He arose early; the light of the full moon had deceived him about the time. When he came to the gates of the Theatre of Dionysos he saw a large number of men coming down from the Odeion into the orchestra. Frightened, he withdrew into the shadows. He saw the men gather into groups of five or ten or twenty; he recognized most of them by the moonlight. Then he continued on his journey. When he heard

about the Herms he knew that the outrage had been committed by the men he had seen. He returned to Athens where he learned about the board of inquiry and the reward. Upon seeing Euphemos, brother of Kallias son of Telokles, he gave his assurance that he would rather take money from the conspirators than from the state. Euphemos asked him to come to the house of Leogoras where he could consult Andokides and the others who were involved. As he arrived there Leogoras was on the point of leaving and addressed him as a friend; it was this warm greeting, according to Andokides, that Diokleides later distorted into evidence against Leogoras. The alleged offer of the miscreants was two talents of silver on condition that Diokleides joined them. He was to think it over and meet them at the house of Kallias, Andokides' brother-in-law, where terms were finally agreed upon. But the obligation to pay was never met and so Diokleides decided to tell the story. He claimed to have recognized forty-two men. Two of these were Mantitheos and Apsephion, who were members of the Boule. At the mention of these names, Peisandros immediately moved that all the men on the list be sent to the wheel in order that a complete roster of hermokopidai might be known before night.¹⁹ Mantitheos and Apsephion finally gained their re-

¹⁹ Andokides, De Mysteriis, 43. The decree passed in the

quest to furnish sureties and stand trial, but as soon as permission was granted they fled the country. The Boule then ordered the arrest and confinement of those named by Diokleides; among these were Andokides and his family. The board of generals was instructed to put Athens and Peiraeus under arms.

Several members of Andokides' family were imprisoned: Andokides himself, his father Leogoras, his brother-in-law Kallias, his cousins Charmides and Phrynichos son of Orchesamenos, his father's cousins Taureas and Nisaios son of Taureas, Kallias son of Alkmeon, and Kritias. Besides these Euphemos brother of Kallias son of Telokles, and Eukrates brother of Nikias the general and brother-in-law of Kallias met the same fate.

While this group was in prison Charmides persuaded Andokides to tell what he knew and in so doing to save the lives of many innocent men and free Athens from the reign of terror. For Andokides expressly states that Diokleides had made his list a long one to allow him to include any citizen.²⁰ In his information Andokides accepted the list of

archonship of Skamandrios (510/09), which forbade the examination of free citizens by torture, had first to be set aside.

²⁰ De Mysteriis, 39: τοῦθ' ὑπέθετο, δεινότατον πρᾶγμα,

Teukros with four additions: Panaitios, Chairredemos, Diakritos, and Lysistratos. He disclosed that the whole plot had been suggested by Euphiletos at a drinking party. Andokides himself did not approve the idea and succeeded in putting it off for some time. Later, however, he was thrown from a horse, broke his collar-bone and fractured his skull. When Euphiletos perceived that Andokides was unable to oppose them, he informed the others that Andokides had consented to join them to the extent of mutilating the Herm next to the shrine of Phorbas. This was Andokides' explanation for the fact that this statue, which stood near his home, was the only one which had been untouched.²¹

As soon as the other conspirators realized that Andokides was a party to the secret but had not really helped, they were angry. Meletos and Euphiletos went to him and demanded that he keep quiet. Andokides replied that the conspirators had less to fear from him than from the commission of the deed. According to Andokides, the board of inquiry was satisfied that he had told the truth. Dio-

οἶμαι, ὅπως ἐν ἐκείνῳ εἶη ὅντινα βούλοιτο Ἀθηναίων φάναι τῶν ἀνδρῶν τούτων εἶναι, ὅντινα δὲ μὴ βούλοιτο, λέγειν ὅτι οὐκ ἦν.

²¹ Andokides, De Mysteries, 62: ὁ γὰρ. Ἑρμῆς, παρὰ τὴν πατρίαν οἰκίαν τὴν ἡμετέραν....

kleides was summoned and, confronted by the evidence, admitted his deception immediately. He added that he had been forced into the situation by Alkibiades of Phegous and Amiantos of Aigina. Both these men fled; Diokleides was executed. Those who had been imprisoned upon his information, including Andokides and his relatives, were released; those who had been exiled returned.

2. Thucydides

The account of the mutilation of the Herms and the celebration of the mysteries is unusually meagre in the historian of the Peloponnesian War. Very few names are mentioned. The seriousness of the offence is specified, however, quite concretely.²² Thucydides records that various metics and slaves gave information about the mutilation of statues other than the Herms and about the celebration of the mysteries in private houses. He adds that Alkibiades was implicated, and that the charges against him were made by those who were jealous of his popularity with the people. This situation offered a perfect opportunity to get rid of the young man. So they magnified the matter by suggesting that a conspiracy against the government was the motivating force behind both these outrages. Alkibiades' previous conduct could only add weight to their

²²

The story is in Thucydides, VI, 27-29 and 60-61, 1.

innuendoes. Although Alkibiades professed his willingness to stand trial immediately, to pay the penalty if found guilty, but not to endure slanderous charges made during his absence, he was ordered to sail. The reasoning behind this, says Thucydides, was the work of his enemies. They were afraid that, if he stood trial at the moment, his popularity with the expeditionary force²³ and with the Demos might bring about his acquittal, whereas if the trial were postponed they were confident of embroiling him in a more serious charge during his absence.

In his later account Thucydides speaks of the unrest and savagery of the citizens as day after day saw more arrests; there seemed to be no end. The people were becoming convinced that both the mutilation of the Herms and the desecration of the mysteries were the outward marks of a conspiracy which was aiming at oligarchy and tyranny. It was at this time that Andokides made his confession, a confession, says Thucydides, which may or may not have been true.²⁴ Conjectures were made on both sides, for no one

²³ Thucydides, VI, 29, 3. The Argives and the Mantineians who had joined the expedition had done so chiefly out of regard for Alkibiades.

²⁴ Andokides is not mentioned by name in Thucydides' narrative, but the identification is unmistakable. See VI, 60, 2:

then or afterwards was able to state with conviction who was responsible for the offence.²⁵ Thucydides is not often so vague, so loath to express an opinion. Perhaps the explanation is that he was not present in Athens in these years and so hesitated to commit himself. Whether the confession was truthful or not, Thucydides maintains that it was a benefit to the city. The Athenians thought that they had at last learned the truth about the Herms. The accused were executed and those who fled were sentenced to death in their absence. He adds, significantly, that it was uncertain whether or not those who suffered had been punished unjustly.²⁶ At any rate, the public feeling against Alkibiades was strengthened by the admission of Andokides and the Salaminia was dispatched to bring him home to stand trial for profaning the mysteries.

3. Plutarch

The report of the mutilation of the Herms as told by Plutarch in the Alcibiades is written in terms of his interest in his subject. He apparently used Andokides very little and implies that Thucydides' narrative leaves much to

εἰς τῶν δεδεμένων, ὅσπερ ἐδόκει αἰτιώτατος εἶναι, ὑπὸ τῶν
 συνδεσµωτῶν τινὸς εἶτε ἄρα καὶ τὰ ὄντα μνηθεῖν εἶτε καὶ οὐ.

²⁵ Thucydides, VI, 60, 2.

²⁶ Thucydides, VI, 60, 5.

be desired.²⁷ The broad outline is the same as that of Thucydides but in Plutarch there is an elaboration of what went on behind the scenes at which Thucydides only hints.

The consensus of opinion, according to Plutarch, was that the act was committed by those who had designs upon the democracy.²⁸ When the defacement was under investigation, when everyone was encouraged to lodge information about any act of impiety, Androkles the demagogue, who was one of Alkibiades' bitterest enemies, brought in slaves and metics to testify that Alkibiades was guilty of mutilating other sacred images and of parodying the mysteries, and so stimulated the resentment which the people felt toward the supposed culprit.²⁹ These witnesses said that Theodoros was the Herald, Poulytion the Torchbearer, and Alkibiades

²⁷ Plutarch, Alcibiades, 18-21.

²⁸ He says that the Corinthians were blamed by some: Syracuse was their colony and by the mutilation of the Herms they hoped to deter the Athenians from the expedition entirely or at least to force a long delay. This theory, naive enough in itself, was generally unacceptable; Plutarch Alcibiades, 18, §. Cf. Schol. Aristophanes, Lysistrata, 1094, which gives Philochoros as the source for this version.

²⁹ Androkles is mentioned by Thucydides, VIII, 65, 2 as the man chiefly responsible for the exile of Alkibiades.

the High Priest when the mysteries were parodied. At first Alkibiades was at a loss to know what to do, but gaining courage from the sure support of those who were about to set out for Sicily³⁰ he offered to defend himself in a trial. But that was precisely what his enemies did not want for thus his eloquence might remove him from their grasp. To prevent this they devised a plan. Certain of the orators who hated Alkibiades but who had managed to mask their true feelings were to rise in the Ekklesia and oppose his trial on the ground that now, when the general's men and supplies were ready, it was unfair to delay his sailing by casting lots for a jury and assigning a time for the case. There would be plenty of opportunity for a trial after the war was over.³¹ Alkibiades, however, saw through their schemes. He urged that it was unfair for him to go off and leave these vague accusations behind him. He was well aware that his departure would grant his enemies every chance to work against him. His plea for a hearing was disregarded; he was ordered to sail.

It was after his departure that the outrage upon

³⁰ Plutarch, Alcibiades, 19, 4. This passage follows Thucydides but adds more detail.

³¹ Again Thucydides' account agrees in substance but is not so rich in detail.

the Herms and the flouting of the mysteries were merged: conspiracy against the existing democracy. This was in all probability the work of Androkles and the other enemies of Alkibiades. They assured the people that both infamies were the work of those who intended the overthrow of the government. Whoever was guilty of one was guilty of the other also. Plutarch, quoting Phrynichos,³² names the informers: Teukros and Diokleides. Diokleides' claim to have recognized the conspirators by the light of the moon was obviously false because, says Plutarch, there was no moon on that night. Sensible men were worried by that discrepancy; yet the arrests went on. Plutarch too recounts the great terror and confusion which the evidence of Teukros and Diokleides brought to Athens. Everyone feared for his life.

Among those imprisoned was Andokides, who was thought to be an oligarch and a foe of the government. He was suspected chiefly because the Herm near his house was

³² Phrynichos, frag. 58 Kock:

ὦ φίλταθ' Ἑρμῇ, καὶ φυλάττου, μὴ πεσῶν
 σαυτὸν παρακρούσῃ καὶ παράσχῃ διαβολῇ
 ἑτέρῳ Διοκλείδῃ βουλομένῳ κακὸν τι δρᾶν.

Ἑρμῇ: φυλάσσομαι. Τεὺκρῳ γὰρ οὐχὶ βούλομαι
 μήνυτρα δοῦναι τῷ παλαμναίῳ ξένῳ.

not molested. Plutarch avers that it was Timaio^s,³³ a fellow prisoner, who convinced Andokides of the advisability of turning state's evidence. When those accused by Andokides had been punished, the appetite of the people was whetted and they turned to the profanation of the mysteries; more particularly, they turned against Alkibiades. The Salaminia was sent to bring him home. The formal impeachment, for committing impious actions against the Eleusinian divinities, was made by Thessalos son of Kimon. Androkles had been successful in his machinations against his enemy.

By synthesizing the accounts of Andokides, Thucydides, and Plutarch we have a fairly complete story. It is true that Thucydides and Plutarch mention very few names. But they do give a clear account of the cause for the feeling against Alkibiades, how it developed and by whom it was fostered. Who were the enemies of Alkibiades? Why were they so violent in their antipathy? Perhaps by close scrutiny of those whom Andokides names it will be possible to answer these questions, to decide what shades of political thinking existed at this period, and so to explain the mutilation of the Herms and the storm which it aroused.

³³ He means Charmides; see below, p. 134.

I append a list of the men named by Andokides in his De Mysteriis and their connection with the Herms and the mysteries. Those mentioned by Plutarch are found in a parallel column. Thucydides speaks of Alkibiades alone by name.

ANDOKIDES

- I. Accusation against Alkibiades made by Pythonikos before the expedition.
- II. Informations concerning the mysteries.
 - A. List of those who profaned the mysteries given by Andromachos, slave of Archebiades.
 1. Alkibiades
 2. Andromachos, slave
 3. Archebiades
 4. Archippos
 5. Aristomenes
 6. Diogenes
 7. Hikesios, slave
 8. Meletos
 9. Nikiades
 10. Oionias

PLUTARCH

- Accusation against Alkibiades made by Androkles.
- Information about the mysteries given by slaves and metics at Androkles' instigation.
1. Alkibiades
 2. Poulytion
 3. Theodoros

11. Panaitios
12. Polystatos
13. Poulytion

B. List of those who profaned the
mysteries given by Teukros,
metic.

Teukros mentioned as
informant.

1. Antiphon
2. Diognetos
3. Gniphonides
4. Hephaistodoros
5. Isonomos
6. Kephisodoros
7. Pantakles
8. Phaidros
9. Philokrates
10. Smindyrides
11. Teisarchos
12. Teukros

C. List of those who profaned the
mysteries given by Agariste, wife
of Alkmeonides.

1. Adelmantos
2. Alkibiades
3. Axiochos
4. Charmides

D. List of those who profaned the
mysteries given by Lydos, slave
of Pherekles.

1. Akoumenos
2. Autokrator
3. Leogoras
4. Pherekles

III. Board of Inquiry.

- A. Charikles
- B. Diognetos
- C. Peisandros

IV. Rewards for information.

- A. 1000 drachmai offered by the
decree of Kleonymos.
- B. 10,000 drachmai offered by the
decree of Peisandros.
- C. Recipients.
 1. Andromachos
 2. Teukros

V. Informations concerning the mutila-
tion of the Herms.

- A. List of those who mutilated the
Herms given by Teukros.
 1. Alkisthenes
 2. Antidoros

3. Archidamos
4. Charippos
5. Eryximachos
6. Euktemon
7. Eurydamas
8. Eurymachos
9. Euphiletos
10. Glaukippos
11. Meletos
12. Menestratos
13. Pherekles
14. Platon
15. Polyeuktos
16. Telenikos
17. Theodoros
18. Timanthes.

B. List of those who mutilated the
Herms given by Diokleides.

1. Andokides
2. Apsephion
3. Charmides
4. Eukrates
5. Euphemos
6. Kallias son of Alkmeon
7. Kallias son of Telokles

- 8. Kritias
- 9. Leogoras
- 10. Mantitheos
- 11. Nisaios
- 12. Phrynichos
- 13. Taureas

C. List of those who mutilated the Herms given by Andokides (after being persuaded by Charmides to turn state's evidence).

- 1. All those accused by Teukros
- 2. Chairedemos
- 3. Diakritos
- 4. Lysistratos
- 5. Panaitios

VI. Those who, according to Diokleides, forced him to lie.

- A. Alkibiades of Phegous
- B. Amiantos of Aigina

Andokides persuaded by Timaios (i.e., Charmides) to turn state's evidence.

Impeachment against Alkibiades made by Thesalos son of Kimon.

CHAPTER FIVE
THE PROSOPOGRAPHY

An examination of the names revealed by the various informers may aid in establishing first the family affiliations and, later, the political activities and philosophical outlooks of their owners.

The desecration of the mysteries came to light, according to Andokides, with the accusation of Alkibiades by Pythonikos. The charge was impiety to the goddesses of Eleusis. The first to bring information concerning this crime was Andromachos, the slave of Archebiades. Of the slave nothing further is known. The master seems not to have been prominent in the politics of Athens. Perhaps he was the same man as the Archebiades mentioned by Lysias as the lover of Archedemos.¹ While the passage reveals nothing of the political thinking of either man, Archedemos is scorned as an intimate of the younger Alkibiades. Aristophanes speaks of him as a popular leader who argued for the arrest of the generals of Arginousai.² It is from Xenophon that we learn most about him. He too records the share taken by Archedemos in the prosecution of the generals.³ In the

¹ Lysias, 14, 27.

² Aristophanes, Frogs, 421.

³ Xenophon, Hell., I, 7, 2.

Memorabilia Sokrates recommends this demagogue to Kriton as a man who could protect him against his accusers,⁴ and, says Xenophon, ἐκ δὲ τούτου εἰς τε τῶν Κρίτωνος φίλων Ἀρχέδημος ἦν, καὶ ὑπὸ τῶν ἄλλων Κρίτωνος φίλων ἐτιμᾶτο.⁵ If Archebiades was the lover of Archedemos it would still be unsafe to assume that he entertained the same views as Archedemos, who moved in Sokratic company. Kirchner lists another man of this name who may belong in the fifth century.⁶ One of Lysias' orations, two fragments of which are extant, was entitled πρὸς Ἀρχεβιάδην,⁷ but there is nothing in the fragments which would permit a certain identification of the defendant.

The name Archippos, also on the list of Andromachos, is a common one. Kirchner enumerates 26 men of this name. Of these, 20 may be disregarded here since they lived long after the age of Alkibiades. The remaining six belong in the late fifth century. One, the father of the Aristeides who was active as a strategos along the shores of Thrace and the Hellespont in 425/4,⁸ may perhaps be dis-

⁴ Xenophon, Memorabilia, II, 9, 4-8.

⁵ Xenophon, Memorabilia, II, 9, 8.

⁶ Kirchner, P.A., I, 2301. The other three entries under Archebiades belong to a later period.

⁷ Baier and Sauppe, Orat. Att., II, p. 180.

⁸ Thucydides, IV, 50, 75; Diodoros, XII, 72, 3.

missed as too old for any active rôle in the escapades under examination in 415. The name occurs again in a fragment of Lysias⁹ which states that Archippos was an intimate friend of Lysias but reveals nothing which would allow us to assume that this is the Archippos involved in the desecration. In a fragment of Isaios¹⁰ an Archippos is involved in litigation over a kleros. Again it is impossible to say with certainty that this is or is not the Archippos of Andromachos' list. Another Archippos was a poet of old comedy who was a victor in the 91st Olympiad (416-412).¹¹ Since Andokides declares that all the men accused by Andromachos, with the sole exception of Polystratos, fled the country and were condemned to death,¹² the playwright is not the accused unless the victory was won in 416/5.¹³ Certainly, we cannot risk the identification.

⁹ Baier and Sauppe, Orat. Att., II, p. 205.

¹⁰ Baier and Sauppe, Orat. Att., II, p. 229.

¹¹ Suidas, s.v. "Αρχιππος; Kock, I, pp. 679-689; schol.

Aristophanes, Wasps, 481.

¹² Andokides, De Mysteriis, 13; while some may have returned later, it is unlikely that they did so at least before the oligarchic revolution of 411/0 B.C.

¹³ The name Archippos was, apparently, fairly common and we might expect Andokides to designate the comic poet as Komikos; it would be a tenuous argument, however.

Kirchner feels that the Archippos concerned in the mysteries is not the man who was accused by Andokides when he came back to Athens. The story is told by Lysias,¹⁴ who is prosecuting Andokides. Andokides upon his return lodged a complaint with the Archon Basileus against a certain Archippos on the ground of impiety against the Herm of his own household. Archippos insisted that the Herm in question had not been mutilated but paid a sum of money to obtain his release. In the De Mysteriis Archippos is concerned with the mysteries alone and this may have suggested to Kirchner that the two men were not identical. It remains possible, however, that we have in Lysias and Andokides two references to the same man. That Andokides does not name him in the oration as one of the hermokopidai is not deterrent to this hypothesis. Examples of Andokides' manipulation of facts to suit his own purpose have already been cited.

The name Diogenes is very common. Most of the citations in Kirchner and in the inscriptions may be disregarded because of their dates, which are either too early or too late to be pertinent to this discussion. The name has been preserved in two fragments of Lysias,¹⁵ neither

¹⁴ Lysias, 6, 11-12.

¹⁵ Baier and Sauppe, Orat. Att., II, p. 184, nos. 35, 36.

of which gives any indication that the man in question is to be identified with the Diogenes of Andromachos' list. Another Diogenes was a tragic poet,¹⁶ who, according to Suidas, flourished at the time of the downfall of the Thirty. One reference remains: a Diogenes was grammateus in 434/3.¹⁷ This could be the Diogenes implicated in the parody, but we cannot be sure.

Several of those cited by Andromachos appear on the confiscation lists of 415/4. Oionias the son of Oionochares is one;¹⁸ his name is not found elsewhere. Panaitios, who was accused by Andromachos of profaning the mysteries and later by Andokides of mutilating the Herms, also lost his property, as the confiscation lists prove.¹⁹ The others of this name catalogued by Kirchner are too late to require comment. Polystratos too was a victim of the confiscations. His name is restored by Meritt²⁰ on the basis

¹⁶ Suidas, s.v. Διογένης; Nauck, pp. 776-777.

¹⁷ I.G., I², 366, line 2.

¹⁸ I.G., I², 327, line 13, 332, line 8.

¹⁹ I.G., I², 326, line 12. The revised text of these lists is published by Meritt in Hesperia, VIII (1939), pp. 69-76.

Panaitios was a source of fun for Aristophanes; frag. 394 Kock and schol. Birds, 440. The Birds was produced in 414.

²⁰ Hesperia, VIII (1939), p. 72 with commentary on p. 74.

of the patronymic and demotic, both of which are on the stone. The full name then can be restored in I.G., I², 329 where the patronymic is partially missing and in 333 where only the demotic appears: Πολύστρατος Διοδώρου Ἀγνυ-
λῆθεν.

It had always been taken for granted that the name Nikiades, which was on the list of Andromachos, must be restored in I.G., I², 325, line 1, where the first four letters are certain and the fifth was read as an uncertain alpha. The reading was doubtless influenced by Andokides. Meritt,²¹ however, has proved that the spacing is insufficient for the name Nikiades. The doubtful letter, formerly read as alpha, is a delta and so Meritt reads Νικίδης. Since every other name on this list is mentioned by Andokides in connection with either the mysteries or the Herms, it is logical to suppose that Nikides too was implicated in one or the other or both. The absence of Nikides from Andokides does not absolve him from complicity, for Andokides, in self-protection, was not obliged to tell the complete truth. Perhaps we have here an example of his suppression. Meritt goes too far in stating that on the basis of this inscription the Nikiades of the oration must be emended to Nikides. The names need not refer to the same man. Niki-

²¹ Hesperia, VIII (1939), p. 73, photograph on p. 70 and commentary on p. 75.

ades is a common name, Nikides is more rare.²² There is always the possibility that the stonecutter made an error and inscribed Nikides for Nikiades; one would not care to build on this hypothesis. Nikides appears in the inscription among those who we know from other sources were accused of impiety in 415 and he too, in all probability, should be numbered among the alleged culprits.

Other references to Nikiades cannot be certainly identified with the man on Andromachos' list. One is on a casualty list of the late fifth century;²³ one was an epistates in 423.²⁴ The latter, says Kirchner,²⁵ may be the Nikiades who appears on a sepulchral inscription.²⁶

The name Meletos occurs first on Andromachos' list²⁷ of those who parodied the mysteries and later on Teukros' list of hermokopidai.²⁸ Kirchner has seven men of this name,

²² Lysias wrote a speech against Nikides; see also Demosthenes, 38, 23. These are the only other occurrences of the name.

²³ I.G., I², 950, I, line 35.

²⁴ Thucydides, IV, 118, 11.

²⁵ Kirchner, P.A., II, 10765.

²⁶ I.G., II², 7781/2.

²⁷ Andokides, De Mysteriis, 13.

²⁸ Andokides, De Mysteriis, 35.

of whom three are automatically excluded from this discussion because they lived much earlier or later than 421-415. The four survivors must be examined more carefully. Meletos at once recalls the accuser of Sokrates. He was the son of Meletos²⁹ and belonged to the deme Pitthos.³⁰ He is called young and unknown by Sokrates.³¹ It is not likely that a man implicated in such scandal in 415 would be called young and unknown some fifteen years later. We may assume that we are not dealing with Sokrates' accuser.

The tragic poet Meletos was also from the deme Pitthos.³² He appears in a fragment from the Gerytades of Aristophanes³³ which, says Kock, was composed about the same time as the Frogs, i.e., ca. 405.³⁴ The date, name, and deme indicate that he was the father of the Meletos who accused Sokrates. A Meletos son of Megakles from the deme

²⁹ Diogenes Laertios, II, 40.

³⁰ Plato, Euthyphro, 2b; Diogenes Laertios, II, 40.

³¹ Plato, Euthyphro, 2b. It would be perverse to deny the accuracy of such prosopographical detail in the dialogues of Plato; the historicity of the dialogues, of course, is a different and irrelevant question.

³² Diogenes Laertios, II, 40; Athenaios, XII, 551c.

³³ Frags. 149, 150 Kock.

³⁴ Kock, I, p. 427.

Alopeke appears on a confiscation list of the early fourth century.³⁵ Kirchner's stemma makes him a member of the famous Alkmeonid family.³⁶

The name Meletos is found several times in Andokides: (1) he is accused of impiety against the goddesses of Eleusis by Andromachos; (2) he is accused of mutilating the Herms by Teukros; (3) he came with Euphiletos to warn Andokides to keep silent about the mutilation;³⁷ (4) he brought charges against Andokides in 399 and is blamed by his victim for the murder of Leon under the Thirty.³⁸

Maidment has identified the latter with Leon the Salaminian³⁹ whom Sokrates refused to arrest when he was ordered to do so by the Thirty.⁴⁰ Hatzfeld argues that Meletos (4) could not have been Meletos (1), whom he identifies with Meletos (2): "Il serait inexplicable qu'Andocide, attaqué par lui et qui sait fort bien rappeler sa conduite lors du gouvernement des Trente (Andoc., I, 94), n'ait pas fait la

³⁵ I.G., II², 1579, lines 19-20.

³⁶ Kirchner, P.A., II, 9688, Megakles (I).

³⁷ Andokides, De Mysteriis, 63.

³⁸ Andokides, De Mysteriis, 94.

³⁹ Plato, Apology, 32c.

⁴⁰ Maidment, op. cit., p. 410, note a.

moindre allusion à son sacrilège de 415."⁴¹ But the argument is not cogent. Andokides states that his list of the hermokopidai corresponds very closely to that of Teukros. He retains all of the eighteen names given by the metic and adds four. Meletos (2) was on Teukros' list; thus he was in effect accused by Andokides, who may have thought it unnecessary to make any further reference to Meletos' part in the mutilation. The section of the oration in which special mention is made of Andokides' accusers and to which Hatzfeld calls attention is concerned with the manner in which the accusers have broken the laws but have managed to escape punishment on the technicality that only the laws passed since the archonship of Eukleides may be applied; yet he, Andokides, is charged with breaking a law that was passed in 415.⁴² His counter-charge against Meletos is the arrest of Leon, who as a result was executed without trial; this amounted to murder.⁴³ There is no place here for bringing in the charge of impiety; it would only cloud the issue, i.e., the contrast between the legal status of Andokides

⁴¹ Hatzfeld, op. cit., p. 187, note 1.

⁴² Andokides, De Mysteriis, 92-103.

⁴³ Kephisios is accused of undertaking to be a tax-farmer and then defaulting and Epichares of holding office under the Thirty; De Mysteriis, 92, 95-100.

and that of his accusers.

On the basis of De Mysteriis, 35, the case for the identification of (4) and (2) is strengthened. After Teukros' list was read, Andokides then stated that some of these men had returned to Athens and were present in court. This may be taken as a pointed reference to Meletos (4), Andokides' accuser, present in court; after no other list is this remark made. The Meletos (2), named by Teukros may be regarded as (4), the enemy of Andokides and Leon. And it is implicit in Andokides' story that Meletos (2) and (3) are identical.

A Meletos was sent to Sparta with Kephisophon in 403 to represent the oligarchs in negotiations for peace.⁴⁴ Since the Meletos (4) who accused Andokides, betrayed Leon, and was implicated in the defacement was active under the Thirty, it is not unreasonable to identify him with the ambassador who went to Sparta in 403.

The investigation of Meletos in Andokides began with a possible four entries. These have now been reduced to two: (1) Meletos who profaned the mysteries; (2) Meletos who mutilated the Herms in 415 and in company with Euphiletos tried to intimidate Andokides, arrested Leon under the Thirty, served as ambassador to Sparta in 403, accused An-

⁴⁴ Xenophon, Hell., II, 4, 36.

dokides in 399.⁴⁵ That these at least are two individuals is sure. It will be argued below that Teukros was at some pains to separate the mutilation and the parody and thus produced two separate lists.⁴⁶ Meletos the profaner, accused by Andromachos, fled at once; it was safe enough for Teukros to name Meletos the hermokopid, for there could be no confusion of identity.⁴⁷

The other names on Andromachos' list may be dismissed with little comment. Of Poulytion, at whose house the parody took place, little is known except that he was very wealthy.⁴⁸ Aristomenes need not be identified with the comic poet who was contemporary with Aristophanes⁴⁹ nor

⁴⁵ Kirchner (P.A., II, 9825) suggests that the speech against Andokides which has been attributed to Lysias may have been written in the character of Meletos (identified above with the hermokopid). If this view is correct, then Meletos was grandson of the hierophant Diokles son of Zakoros (Lysias, 6, 54) and a Eumolpid; he was thus, probably, opposed to all that Alkibiades represented and is at home in Teukros' list. But Kirchner's proposal is not based on specific evidence.

⁴⁶ See below, pp. 150-151.

⁴⁷ Whether Meletos (1) or (2) should be identified with the Alkmeonid we cannot say.

⁴⁸ [Plato], Eryxias, 400b; Pherekrates, frag. 58 Kock.

⁴⁹ He is catalogued by Suidas (Kock, I, pp. 690-693).

need the Aristomenes who appears on a sepulchral inscription.⁵⁰
The slave Hikesios is not known elsewhere.

The second informant to supply names of those present at the parody was the metic Teukros. The name Teukros appears on a casualty list which dates from 413 and may be concerned with the Sicilian campaign,⁵¹ but nothing is known of Teukros' political affiliations and no identification can be made.

Smindyrides has left no record of his activities except the statement of Teukros that he was present when the mysteries were parodied. The names Gniphonides and Hephaistodoros are not found before the fourth century when they occur in inscriptions. Telsarchos appears as a patronymic in an inscription of the early fourth century.⁵²

Isonomos is a very rare name. It occurs only once besides the mention in Andokides. An early fourth-century sepulchral monument commemorates Archestrate, the daughter of Isonomos Kydatheneus and the wife of Kephisodoros Phlyeus.⁵³ It is tempting for two reasons to regard

⁵⁰ I.G., II², 5397. He was father of Polytimos, of whom we know nothing more.

⁵¹ Meritt, Hesperia, VII (1938), p. 89.

⁵² I.G., II², 1929, line 26.

⁵³ I.G., II², 6580.

this Isonomos as identical with the Isonomos accused by Teukros. First, the uncommon name argues for the identification; second, the name Kephisodoros like that of Isonomos is found both on the monument and in the list of Teukros. However, Kephisodoros is a common name and must be treated with caution.

Kephisodoros the comic poet won the victory at the Dionysia in 403/2.⁵⁴ The name is also found on several casualty lists, but only that of 412/1 is available for the man on Teukros' list.⁵⁵ Kephisodoros as a patronymic is common;⁵⁶ but again no identification can be made. A Kephisodoros was epistates in 412/1.⁵⁷ Kephisodoros Skambo-

⁵⁴ Suidas, s.v. Κηφισόδωρος; Athenaios, XI, 459d; Lysias, 21, 4; I.G., II², 2325, a catalogue of victories won at the Dionysia; Kock, I, pp. 800-802.

⁵⁵ I.G., I², 950, I, line 32.

⁵⁶ See I.G., II², 1929, line 22: Teisandros son of Kephisodoros of Aphidne; this Teisandros is mentioned in Plato, Gorgias, 487c as a fellow student of Kallikles, Andron, and Nausikydes. I.G., II², 7520 commemorates Sphettios son of Kephisodoros. I.G., II², 1929, line 17 lists Kephisodoros son of Panaischous of Acharne.

⁵⁷ I.G., I², 103, lines 4-5.

nides appears on the expense accounts of the Erechtheion for 409/8, 408/7, and 407/6.⁵⁸ Far more significant is Kephisodoros the metic from Peiraeus who is found on the very confiscation list in which Polystatos appears.⁵⁹ Since the metic Kephisodoros is found in the same context as Polystatos and since we know that Polystatos was involved in the desecration of the mysteries, it is possible that the Kephisodoros of Teukros' list was the metic from the Peiraeus. Either Kephisodoros the metic or Kephisodoros the son-in-law of Isonomos could reasonably be identified with the man on Teukros' list; the probabilities favour the former.⁶⁰

The Pantakles who died in 425/4⁶¹ is obviously not our man. Another Pantakles, however, seems to have enjoyed a career as a lyric poet that extended from ca. 445 to at least 420/19. I.G., I², 771, in which he is

⁵⁸ I.G., I², 373, III, lines 105-106, 374, II, lines 15-16, VII, lines 73-74.

⁵⁹ I.G., I², 329, line 14. For Polystatos see above, pp. 89-90.

⁶⁰ There are no metics, so far as we know, among the hermokopidai; nor should we expect them (see below, pp. 151-152). But a metic is at home with the profaners.

⁶¹ I.G., I², 949, line 36.

inscribed as didaskalos, dates some time after 446; again, in a text found in the Athenian Agora and dated by Meritt to ca. 440, he is didaskalos;⁶² in Antiphon, 6, 11, a speech which belongs perhaps to 419 and certainly within a year or two of that date,⁶³ he is named as didaskalos. Clearly, we are here dealing with one man, who may well be the Pantakles accused by Teukros in 415. The tentative identification may be made.

Philokrates is a common name. It is found in three casualty lists⁶⁴ and Philokrates son of Philokydes is in two catalogues of liturgies dating from the early fourth century.⁶⁵ One of the treasurers of Athena in 398/7 was Philokrates of Aphidne;⁶⁶ a general of 416/5 bore the name.⁶⁷ The sixth oration of Antiphon is concerned with the litigation between a Philokrates and a certain choregos.

⁶² Meritt, Hesperia, VIII (1939), pp. 49-50: $\epsilon\pi\alpha\nu\tau\alpha\kappa\lambda\epsilon\varsigma$
 $\epsilon\delta\acute{\iota}\delta\alpha\sigma\kappa\epsilon\varsigma$.

⁶³ Meritt, Ath. Cal., pp. 121-122; Maidment, op. cit., pp. 234-237.

⁶⁴ I.G., I², 950, II, line 82; 951, II, line 49; 958, IX, line 8.

⁶⁵ I.G., II², 1928, line 8; 1929, line 18.

⁶⁶ I.G., II², 1388, lines 4-5; 1392, line 7.

⁶⁷ Thucydides, V, 116, 3.

Maidment believes that the choregos was an oligarch who was now (ca. 419) beginning to be active. Philokrates lodged a charge of murder against the choregos. When he realized there was small chance of success, he withdrew the charge and asked for a reconciliation. But sometime later Philokrates got into trouble for the embezzlement of public funds at a time when the choregos was serving in the Boule.

Philokrates and his associates were about to be investigated and to forestall such action he again brought up the charge of murder. What the outcome of the trial was we do not know and whether this Philokrates was the man accused by Teukros cannot be certainly decided.⁶⁸ We may observe that Pantakles and a Philokrates were associated ca. 419⁶⁹ and again in 415. It is tempting, but hazardous, to identify the Philokrates of Antiphon's speech with the profaner.⁷⁰

⁶⁸ The Philokrates who was prytaneus when Diokleides testified was not the profaner; all accused by Teukros fled immediately.

⁶⁹ Pantakles was poet when the alleged murder of the choreutes, Philokrates' brother, took place.

⁷⁰ Did Philokrates obtain his information about the murder from the poet? If so, were they friends? They may both have been oligarchic; were the oligarchs active politically ca. 419 (when Alkibiades was active in the Peloponnese)? But these are questions that we cannot answer.

Diognetos the brother of Nikias was mentioned in the discussion between Sokrates and Polos in the Gorgias.⁷¹ Lysias has a great deal to say about his activities after the oligarchic revolution of 411/0.⁷² Because he was slandered by informers⁷³ he went away into exile but never fled to Dekeleia or worked against the city in any way. He held no office under the oligarchy; when Pausanias the Lakedaemonian arrived at Athens Diognetos told him of the sufferings endured by the people under the tyrannical Thirty and asked his aid, with the result that Pausanias was little disposed to accept the overtures of the Thirty and looked with favour upon the family of Diognetos. Since he was a brother of Nikias we might assume that he was a conservative. But he was not an oligarch or he would have gone to Dekeleia, the refuge of exiled oligarchs.

In a fragment of Eupolis⁷⁴ a sycophant is about to be driven out of Athens by a Just Man. The sycophant

⁷¹ Plato, Gorgias, 472a.

⁷² Lysias, 18.

⁷³ Lysias, 18, 9; this was probably after the restoration of the democracy in 411/0. Or could Lysias' expression (ὡς κακόννοι ὄντες τῷ πλῆθει ἀποστεροίμεθα τῶν ὄντων... Δι-ογνήτος διαβληθεὶς μὲν ὑπὸ τῶν συκοφαντῶν φεύγων ὥχετο) refer to his conviction and disgrace in 415 as a profaner?

⁷⁴ Powell, New Chapters in Greek Literature, Series III (1933), pp. 162-163.

confesses that he has extorted one hundred staters from a stranger by threatening to expose him as one of the profaners of the mysteries: the stranger had had barley grains on his beard and so he must have been imbibing the sacrificial drink. The informer is put in chains and the Just Man expresses the wish that Diognetos would suffer the same fate. This is an interesting side-light on the investigations and confirms the evidence of our other witnesses that many innocent men suffered on the testimony of unscrupulous citizens. More particularly, it identifies the Diognetos of the play, who is likened to the sycophant, with the Diognetos who was a member of the board of inquiry appointed to investigate the mutilation.⁷⁵

The name Diognetos is not common in fifth-century Athens. It appears on a casualty list of uncertain date⁷⁶ and in a decree of 409/8 in which Diognetos Phrearrios is the grammateus.⁷⁷ It will be argued later that the brother of Nikias, the member of the board of inquiry, and the profaner are one and the same man.

There is little doubt that the Phaidros of Teukros'

⁷⁵ Andokides, De Mysteriis, 14.

⁷⁶ I.G., I², 952, I, line 20.

⁷⁷ I.G., I², 115, lines 1, 3-4. This is not the brother of Nikias; see note 73 above.

list is the friend of Sokrates for whom one of the dialogues is named and who appears in the Protagoras and Symposium. A close tie has been established. In the Protagoras he is called Phaidros Myrrhinousios.⁷⁸ One of the confiscation lists cites φαίδρο το Πυθοκλέος, Μυρρινούσιο.⁷⁹ Since the demotic is certain and is the same as that in the Protagoras and since Phaidros appears in the account of Andokides the identification is sure. The penalty explains (but does not wholly justify) the statement in Lysias that Phaidros became poor not through any wickedness of his own (οὐ δὲ κακίαν).⁸⁰ The name Phaidros occurs also in Lysias, 32, 14, but since the demotic is absent it is impossible to say whether this is the same Phaidros.⁸¹

To identify Antiphon is not easy; it was a common name. We may set out its known owners: (1) a casualty of the late fifth century;⁸² (2) the archon of 418/7;⁸³ (3) Antiphon Kephisios, father of Epigenes and a known follower

⁷⁸ Plato, Protagoras, 315c.

⁷⁹ Meritt, Hesperia, VIII (1939), p. 73, line 63.

⁸⁰ Lysias, 19, 15, where the deme is given.

⁸¹ Lysias, 32, 14.

⁸² Raubitschek, Hesperia, XII (1943), p. 46, line 45.

⁸³ Diodoros, XII, 80, 1.

of Sokrates;⁸⁴ (4) the trierarch who perished under the Thirty,⁸⁵ whose daughter was defended by Lysias,⁸⁶ and who is identified as Antiphon son of Lysidonides by [Plutarch];⁸⁷ (5) the sophist;⁸⁸ (6) the soothsayer;⁸⁹ (7) Antiphon the orator, son of Sophilos of Rhamnous.⁹⁰ These are the only names pertinent to us;⁹¹ of these, the casualty is unlikely to be our quarry.

⁸⁴ Plato, Apology, 33e.

⁸⁵ Xenophon, Hell., II, 3, 40; cf. [Plutarch], Vit. X Orat., 833a.

⁸⁶ [Plutarch], Vit. X Orat., 833a; Baier and Sauppe, Orat. Att., II, p. 176.

⁸⁷ [Plutarch], Vit. X Orat., 833b.

⁸⁸ Xenophon, Memorabilia, I, 6, 1.

⁸⁹ Diogenes Laertios, II, 46.

⁹⁰ [Plutarch], Vit. X Orat., 832b-834b. This biography thoroughly confuses the various Antiphons. See also Kirchner, P.A., I, 1304.

⁹¹ Plato's half-brother, Antiphon son of Pyrilampes, was too young to have been concerned in the scandals of 415 B.C.; Plato, Parmenides, 126b-c (the introductory narrative is set after the death of Sokrates; Taylor, Plato, pp. 351-352); Kirchner, P.A., I, 1284 and II, 11855 with the stemma.

The sophist (5) says Xenophon, opposed Sokrates, and Kirchner,⁹² on the evidence of Diogenes Laertios,⁹³ who cites Aristotle, has identified him with the sooth-sayer (6). The orator (7) spoke (probably in 425) on behalf of Lindos and Samothrake seeking an adjustment in their assessed tributes;⁹⁴ this sympathetic attitude to the allies reminds us of the days of Kimon and Thoukydides son of Melesias. He may have supported oligarchic foreign policies. Thucydides⁹⁵ writes in flattering terms of the

⁹² P.A., I, 1278.

⁹³ II, 46: τοῦτω (sc. Σωκράτει)...ἐφιλονεῖκει... Ἀντιφῶν ὁ τερατοσκόπος.

⁹⁴ Frags. 13, 23, 25, 29, 31, 52, 55, 56 Thalheim.

⁹⁵ VIII, 68, 1-2: ὁ μέντοι ἄπαν τὸ πρᾶγμα ξυνθεὶς ὅτῳ τρόπῳ κατέστη ἐς τοῦτο καὶ ἐκ πλείστου ἐπιμεληθεὶς Ἀντιφῶν ἦν ἀνὴρ Ἀθηναίων τῶν καθ' ἑαυτὸν ἀρετῇ τε οὐδενὸς ὕστερος καὶ κράτιστος ἐνθυμηθῆναι γενόμενος καὶ ἃ γνοίη εἰπεῖν, καὶ ἐς μὲν δῆμον οὐ παριῶν οὐδ' ἐς ἄλλον ἀγῶνα ἐκοῦσιος οὐδένα, ἀλλ' ὑπόπτως τῷ πλήθει διὰ δόξαν δεινότητος διακείμενος, τοὺς μέντοι ἀγωνιζομένους καὶ ἐν δικαστηρίῳ καὶ ἐν δῆμῳ πλεῖστα εἰς ἀνὴρ, ὅστις συμβουλεύσαιτό τι, δυνάμενος ὠφελεῖν. καὶ αὐτὸς τε, ἐπειδὴ ἤ μετέστη ἡ δημοκρατία καὶ ἐς ἀγῶνας κατέστη ἡ τὰ τῶν τετρακοσίων ἐν ὑστέρῳ μεταπεσόντα ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου ἐκακοῦτο, ἄριστα φαίνεται τῶν μέχρι

Antiphon who did so much to overthrow the democracy in favour of oligarchy in 411. This man has been taken to be the sophist and the teacher of Thucydides;⁹⁶ this is a reasonable inference from Thucydides' tone. The special emphasis placed by Thucydides upon his oratorical talents suggests very strongly that sophist and orator were one; if so, that one may be considered an oligarchic bulwark.

[Plutarch]'s biography of Antiphon the orator (7) quotes the decree which condemned him to death for treason. No matter how low our opinion may be of [Plutarch], we may accept the information of the decree, which probably came from the well-known collection made by Krateros of Makedon. This decree tells us that Antiphon, Archeptolemos, and Onomakles had, while serving as envoys to Lakedaïmon, acted against Athenian interests, had sailed in an enemy ship, and had traveled by land through Dekeleia; that Antiphon and Archeptolemos, after condemnation, were to have crime and punishment inscribed on a bronze stele which was to be placed next to the decrees concerning Phrynichos. Thucydides' Antiphon was most zealous in establishing the Four

ἑμοῦ ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν τούτων αἰτιαθεῖς, ὡς συγκατέστησε, θανάτου δίκην ἀπολογησάμενος.

⁹⁶ [Plutarch], Vit. X Orat., 832e; cf. also, e.g., Finley, Thucydides, especially pp. 266, 280.

Hundred;⁹⁷ along with Phrynichos and ten others, he was dispatched by the Four Hundred to treat with the Lakedaemonians; he was charged by the democracy after the fall of the Four Hundred (and, presumably, executed).⁹⁸ But even before the collapse of the Four Hundred, Phrynichos had been assassinated;⁹⁹ after the collapse, Peisandros, Alexiades, and the oligarchic extremists fled to Dekeleia.¹⁰⁰

On the basis of this evidence we cannot refuse to identify the epigraphic with the Thucydidean Antiphon; he is son of Sophilos of Rhamnous. That sophist and orator were one is not so certain; but there is nothing to contradict the identification, which would go far towards explaining the warmth of Thucydides' sketch. That Antiphon son of Sophilos was also the soothsayer is less credible; Sokrates had many critics and the coincidence of so common a name should not be allowed to control our judgement.

The likely identification of sophist and orator, of course, does not necessarily mean that we have found the profaner of Teukros' list. But what we suspect of his political views is, to use a cautious expression, sug-

⁹⁷ VIII, 68, 1

⁹⁸ VIII, 68, 2.

⁹⁹ VIII, 92, 2.

¹⁰⁰ VIII, 98, 1.

gestive. On the other hand, the profaner was exiled in 415;¹⁰¹ and despite Plutarch's penchant for contamination, no hint that his subject was implicated in mutilation or parody is given. Furthermore, we are left with Antiphon Kephisieus (3), who is perhaps the best nominee for the profanation.¹⁰²

Agariste the wife of Alkmeonides lodged the third information; both husband and wife, obviously, were members of the Alkmeonid family. Two of the four accused by her were also of the Alkmeonidai, Alkibiades and Axiochos; these two and Adeimantos belonged to the deme Skambonidai.

Alkibiades' part in the events of 421-415 has been discussed elsewhere.¹⁰³ His general outlook may have been coloured by his early association with Sokrates and his friends. Xenophon is anxious to belittle the intimacy between Alkibiades and his famous teacher by stating that Alkibiades had a purely utilitarian motive for studying with Sokrates and that as soon as he had learned, as he

¹⁰¹ He could have been recalled; yet Thucydides seems to believe that he worked behind the scenes in Athens for a number of years and this does not describe a man who met such notoriety in 415.

¹⁰² Of the archon of 418/7 (2) nothing more can be said; he might be (1), (3), (4), (5), or (6).

¹⁰³ See above, pp. 33-61.

thought, the secret of verbal superiority he deserted the teacher.¹⁰⁴ But Xenophon was eager to clear Sokrates of any questionable associations and there is no doubt that for some time after the end of the war Alkibiades was in bad repute. The Symposium, on the other hand, closely followed by Plutarch, declares that even though Sokrates had many rivals as Alkibiades' lover he managed to conquer the youth. The words of the teacher could wring the heart of Alkibiades and bring tears to his eyes and even though he sometimes slipped away from Sokrates yet he revered Sokrates alone and despised his other lovers. Sokrates saved the younger man's life in the campaign of Potidaea and later, at the battle of Delion, Alkibiades returned the favour and covered Sokrates in the retreat.¹⁰⁵ So the association was at one time very close indeed.

Axiochos was the uncle of Alkibiades son of Kleinias and was himself the son of the elder Alkibiades.¹⁰⁶ His name appears on the confiscation tables.¹⁰⁷ According

¹⁰⁴ Xenophon, Memorabilia, I, 2, 14-16.

¹⁰⁵ Plato, Symposium, 215-222; Plutarch, Alcibiades, 6, 1 and 7, 3-6. There is no reason why we should not accept such detail as historical

¹⁰⁶ See the stemma in Kirchner, P.A., I, p. 42 under 597, Alkibiades (I).

¹⁰⁷ I.G., I², 325, line 30; 327, line 10; 328, lines 6-8;

to [Plato], he defended the generals after the battle of Arginousai.¹⁰⁸ Although the Axiochos is of the late fourth century,¹⁰⁹ it has come down to us in the manuscripts of Plato and it indicates a connection between Axiochos and Sokratic company. An Axiochos was the orator in a decree of 410/09 in praise of the people of Thracian Neapolis (near Abdera) who had helped Athens during the revolt of Thasos.¹¹⁰ If this was Axiochos son of Alkibiades he must have returned from exile.

Of Adeimantos son of Leukolophides we know considerably more. He survives in the confiscation lists of 415.¹¹¹ He returned from exile before the end of the war and as general in 407/6 he went with Alkibiades to quell a revolt in Andros.¹¹² In 406, after the battle of Arginousai,

331, line 7.

¹⁰⁸ [Plato], Axiochos, 368d-e.

¹⁰⁹ Taylor, Plato, pp. 550-552, believes that the dialogue was written to refute the teachings of the Epicureans and places it no earlier than ca. 305-300. Again, we need not deny the historicity of the detail.

¹¹⁰ I.G., I², 108, line 39.

¹¹¹ Meritt, Hesperia, VIII (1939), p. 73, line 67; also I.G., I², 327, line 4; 328, line 10.

¹¹² Xenophon, Hell., I, 4, 21.

all the generals except Konon were deposed; as replacements two men were chosen, Adeimantos and Philokles.¹¹³ In 405 Adeimantos was among the captives taken by Lysandros; he escaped execution by the Spartans but was charged by the Athenians later with having betrayed the fleet at Aigospotamoi.¹¹⁴ In the Protagoras Adeimantos is present in a group about the sophists at the debate between Protagoras and Sokrates.¹¹⁵ He was probably interested in philosophical problems and at least knew Sokrates and his friends. He may have belonged to the school of the sophists.¹¹⁶ Agariste's list is rather strikingly peopled by names that

¹¹³ Xenophon, Hell., I, 7, 1.

¹¹⁴ Xenophon, Hell., II, 1, 30 and 32. The charge is made by Lysias, 14, 38 and Pausanias, IV, 17, 3 and X, 9, 11.

¹¹⁵ Plato, Protagoras, 315e. The dramatic date is ca.

433; Taylor, Plato, p. 236.

¹¹⁶ The association with the sophists does not, of course, exclude him from intimacy with Sokrates; both Eryximachos son of Akoumenos and Phaidros Myrrhinousios are in the same company, as is Kallias son of Hipponikos in whose house Xenophon's Symposium is set and Charmides son of Glaukon (Protagoras, 315a-c); Protagoras and Prodikos stayed at the house of Kallias (Protagoras, 311a).

recall the dialogues of Plato; thus her Charmides is doubtless the friend of Sokrates and son of Glaukon who belonged to the Sokratic circle and for whom one of the dialogues was named.¹¹⁷ Another Charmides¹¹⁸ was accused by Diokleides of mutilating the Herms and was imprisoned with his cousin Andokides; following his advice Andokides lodged his information. There are ten references to the name Charmides in Kirchner, of whom only four meet the chronological requirements: Charmides son of Glaukon, Charmides son of Aristoteles, Charmides on a casualty list,¹¹⁹ and Charmides the treasurer of 420/19.¹²⁰ It may well be that Charmides

¹¹⁷ I use the terms "Sokratic circle" and "Sokraties" quite loosely to mean those who, according to the dialogues, attended the debates and lectures and who were at some time in their lives associated with Sokrates and at least exposed to his influence. The closeness of the relationship, of course, varied, as did allegiance to the ideas of Sokrates.

¹¹⁸ Charmides the profaner fled when Agariste laid her information; he is thus not to be identified with Charmides the hermokopid, son of Aristoteles.

¹¹⁹ I.G., I², 960, line 3. The use of Attic and Ionic H suggests the last quarter of the century.

¹²⁰ I.G., I², 370, line 11 (Charmides Lamptreus). This man might be son of Glaukon or son of Aristoteles.

son of Aristotle and Charmides son of Glaukon were related.

The last to make accusations regarding the parody was Lydos the slave of Pherekles. This is the Pherekles who was accused by Teukros of mutilating the Herms. Kirchner enters two men of this name from the fifth century, of whom one is the master of Lydos; Andokides gives his demotic as Themakeus. The second identification Kirchner has based on a reading which appears as follows in line 8 of I.G., I², 325 (record of the poletai, 415 B.C.): Φερεκλέος τῷ Φι,.....Σκαμβονίδου. That is, one Pherekles was registered in Themakos and one in Skambonidai. Meritt, however, has corrected the reading: Φερεκλέος τῷ Φερεν,ικα---Θεμακίος.¹²¹ The words περὶ ἀμφότερα (line 45 in Meritt's text) show that Pherekles was found guilty on two counts: this is precisely what the literary sources tell us, for Pherekles was accused by Teukros of mutilating the Herms and by Lydos of profaning the mysteries. Profaner and mutilator are thus one man.

An Akoumenos is known as a companion of Phaidros.¹²² He was a physician and the father of Eryximachos, whom I

¹²¹ Meritt, Hesperia, VIII (1939), p. 73 with commentary on p. 75.

¹²² Plato, Phaedrus, 227a, 268a; see also Xenophon, Memorabilia, III, 13, 2.

shall have occasion to discuss later. Both moved in Sokratic circles (see note 117 above).¹²³

Leogoras was the father of Andokides and most of our information about him comes from the son. Lydos, according to Andokides, accused Leogoras of being present at the parody but added that he was asleep with his head wrapped in his cloak. Since Lydos' information was given before the Boule Speusippos at once demanded the trial of the offenders. Leogoras protested his inclusion since, he said, he had never been near Themakos and since Lydos had not accused him of taking an active part in the parody. Leogoras then brought action against Speusippos for making an illegal proposal. This case had to be settled before the trial of those charged with having desecrated the mysteries could proceed. Leogoras obtained a favourable verdict and Andokides managed to restrain him from going into voluntary exile. Leogoras was also implicated in the mutilation by the testimony of Diokleides, a feeble attempt, says Andokides, to involve Leogoras.¹²⁴ Andokides' enemies had accused him of informing against his father in the affair of the mysteries; he maintains that the charge was false.

¹²³ Plato, Phaedrus, 227a, where Phaidros says to Sokrates,

τῷ δὲ σὺ καὶ ἐμῷ ἐταίρῳ περὶ θόμῃν ἄκουμένῳ.

¹²⁴ See above, pp. 66-67.

From these passages it is evident that Leogoras and Andokides had powerful enemies. They were well-known men and Leogoras must have had a fair amount of influence to gain the victory over Speusippos.¹²⁵

Of Autokrator nothing further is known.

There were three informations concerning the mutilation of the Herms. The first was given by Teukros who had already lodged information about the mysteries.¹²⁶ He listed eighteen men who had participated in the defamation. Of these names we know nothing more of five: Antidoros, Eurydamas, Eurymachos, Charippos, and Archidamos. The first two occur only here, the others are unique in this generation.

An Alkisthenes was the father of Demosthenes, the well-known general.¹²⁷ It is not likely that he was the hermokopid although both may have belonged to the same family. The name Glaukippos appears on a fifth-century casualty list¹²⁸ and a Glaukippos was archon in 410/09.¹²⁹

125

The comic poets have given Leogoras an unsavoury reputation; schol. Aristophanes, Clouds, 109; Platon Komikos, frag. 106 Kock; Aristophanes, Wasps, 1269; Eupolis, frag. 44 Kock.

126

See above, pp. 97-109.

127

I.G., I², 324, line 18.

128

I.G., I², 955, line 6.

129

I.G., I², 108, lines 5-6; 109, lines 6-7; 110, line 5;

The name Platon is not uncommon but there are only two known examples in this period. Plato of Aphidne is the registrar of confiscated property in a document which belongs to the first half of the fourth century.¹³⁰ The other is Platon Komikos who, according to Suidas,¹³¹ was active when Aristophanes, Eupolis, and the other writers of old comedy were in their prime. Even without this testimony there could be no doubt about his floruit; the titles of his works tell their own story: e.g. Peisandros, Hyperbolos, and Symmachia.¹³² The Platon cited by Teukros was exiled and Platon Komikos produced the Sophistai in 411.¹³³ This is not conclusive, however, for he could have returned under the Four Hundred. And the name is very rare.

The only contemporary Telenikos was father of Teleas, secretary of the tamiai in 416/5 and 415/4.¹³⁴ A

112, line 1; 304, line 1. I.G., II², 142 refers to an earlier decree passed when Glaukippos was archon. Cf. Lysias, 21, l.

¹³⁰ Meritt, Hesperia, V (1936), p. 392; see also Notopoulos, Class. Phil., XXXIV (1939), p. 144.

¹³¹ Suidas, s.v. Πλάτων; Kock, I, pp. 601-667. I.G., II², 2325, line 63 makes Platon a victor at the Dionysia in 415/4.

¹³² See above, p. 52, note 44.

¹³³ Kock, I, p. 636.

¹³⁴ I.G., I², 246, line 174; 247, line 193; 270, lines 132-133; 271, line 147; 302, line 52.

fragment of Antiphon deals with the prosecution of a Poly-euktos, but the date and circumstances are unknown and identification is impossible.¹³⁵

Euktemon may be the archon of 408/7 whose magistracy was marked by the passage of numerous decrees.¹³⁶ Thucydides says that a Euktemon was one of the generals sent to Samos in 412/1.¹³⁷ The Euktemon implicated in the mutilation is probably not to be identified with either of the above. Accused by both Teukros and Andokides he surely could not have been elected general three years later. We cannot be quite so certain of the archon; nevertheless, the most economical interpretation is to identify general with archon.

Euphiletos, according to Andokides,¹³⁸ was the originator of the plot to mutilate the Herms. He made the suggestion at a drinking party. Later it was Euphiletos and Meletos¹³⁹ who came to see Andokides and warned him to be quiet about the perpetrators of the crime. Euphiletos is identified as son of Timotheos of Kydathene by the records

¹³⁵ Antiphon, frag. 47 Thalheim.

¹³⁶ I.g., I², 118, line 5; 119, lines 4-5; 120, line 6;

121, line 2; 313, line 1; 374, line 1; 398, line 2.

¹³⁷ Thucydides, VIII, 30, 1.

¹³⁸ De Mysteriis, 61.

¹³⁹ See above, pp. 91-96.

of the poletai.¹⁴⁰ The Euphiletos Kephisios who is named as epistates at the Eleusinia in the archonship of Euktemon, i.e., 408/7,¹⁴¹ is not to be identified with the hermokopid who was in all likelihood in exile. For the same reason he is certainly not the Euphiletos of the casualty list of 412/1.¹⁴² Lysias wrote an oration on behalf of a certain Euphiletos who murdered Eratosthenes.¹⁴³ There is nothing to indicate whether this was the man indicted by Teukros.

Kirchner admits only three men by the name Eryximachos; two of these are anachronisms in our investigation, the other is the hermokopid and, to Kirchner, the Eryximachos of the Platonic dialogues. His speech in the Symposium reflects his profession, medicine.¹⁴⁴ He is discovered in the group surrounding Hippias of Elis at the time of the dialogue between Sokrates and Protagoras¹⁴⁵ and he is designated as the friend of Phaidros.¹⁴⁶ His father

¹⁴⁰ I.G., I², 325, line 4; 328, line 14.

¹⁴¹ I.G., I², 313, line 3.

¹⁴² I.G., I², 950, I, line 40.

¹⁴³ Lysias, 1, 16.

¹⁴⁴ Plato, Symposium, 176b, 186a-188e.

¹⁴⁵ Plato, Protagoras, 315c.

¹⁴⁶ Plato, Phaedrus, 268a.

Akoumenos was also a physician and known to the Sokratics.¹⁴⁷

The Theodoros accused by Teukros of mutilating
th Herms may be the man reported in Plutarch as the Herald
at the celebration of the mysteries at Poulytion's house.¹⁴⁸
According to Diogenes Laertios, there were twenty men of
this name known in antiquity.¹⁴⁹ Kirchner lists more than
four times that number. Most of these can be excluded chro-
nologically. One fell in battle in 412/1 B.C. and so is
not the hermokopid.¹⁵⁰ A Theodoros is named in an early fourth-
century catalogue of $\lambda\epsilon\iota\tau\upsilon\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha$.¹⁵¹ Others occur on se-
pulchral monuments of the early fourth century.¹⁵² Plu-
tarch, tells us that Theodoros Erchieus was Isokrates'
father.¹⁵³ The orator also had a brother of that name.¹⁵⁴

¹⁴⁷ See above, pp. 114-115.

¹⁴⁸ Plutarch, Alcibiades, 19, 2.

¹⁴⁹ Diogenes Laertios, II, 103-104.

¹⁵⁰ I.G., I², 950, I, lines 68, 70.

¹⁵¹ I.G., II², 1928, line 6.

¹⁵² I.G., II², 6326/7, Theodoros son of Phalanthos Kerameus;
6335, Myrrhine daughter of Theodoros Kerameus; 7717, Theo-
doros son of Antimachos Phrearrhios; 5667, Theodoros son of
Mnesarchos Anaphlystios; 7823, Theodoros.

¹⁵³ Plutarch, Vit. X Orat., 836e.

¹⁵⁴ Plutarch, Vit. X Orat., 838c.

Prokles, one of the generals in 427/6, was the son of Theodoros.¹⁵⁵ This is probably not Teukros' Theodoros, for by 415 the father of the general should have been close to seventy. A Theodoros was hierophant in 411 and opposed the recall of Alkibiades.¹⁵⁶ We may take it as certain that a profaner of the mysteries would not have served as hierophant in 411. It is conceivable, however, that the hierophant was the hermokopid; it is also conceivable that hermokopid and profaner were one, in which case the hierophant should be absolved of all connection with the events of 415 B.C. Or we may have here three individuals.

Menestratos son of Menestratos was a treasurer of Athena in 407/6.¹⁵⁷ A building inscription of the 440's records a Menestratos as a treasurer.¹⁵⁸ Another Menestratos was the orator of a fifth-century (third quarter?) decree concerning the accounts of the deme of Ikaria.¹⁵⁹ The name also appears twice in a catalogue of the prytaneis of Leontis.¹⁶⁰ An ostrakon of unknown date bears the name

¹⁵⁵ Thucydides, III, 91, 1; 98, 5.

¹⁵⁶ Plutarch, Alcibiades, 33, 3.

¹⁵⁷ I.G., I², 255, line 325.

¹⁵⁸ I.G., I², 358, line 18.

¹⁵⁹ I.G., I², 187, line 2.

¹⁶⁰ I.G., II², 1742, lines 111 and 112. (Menestratos Koloneus). The inscription belongs to the first half of the fourth century.

Menestratos.¹⁶¹ Lysias speaks of the activities of a Menestratos who got into difficulty under the Thirty.¹⁶² A certain Agoratos informed against him and he was then imprisoned. He was later pardoned before the Ekklesia held at Mounichia; he turned informer and caused many deaths. Finally, after the downfall of the Thirty, he was executed. One of the lost works of Lysias had the title πρὸς Μενέστρατον.¹⁶³ It is impossible to decide whether one of these men is to be identified with the man on Teukros' list.

The name Timanthes is found on an interesting document which dates very soon after 411/0 (lines 16-19).¹⁶⁴ Little remains of the first fourteen lines (frags. d and e), heavily restored though they are in the Corpus. Lines 15-25 (frags. a, b, and c) need little in the way of supplement. Polykles, Peraieus, and Aristoboulos¹⁶⁵ are dispatched post-haste to cooperate with and advise the generals in the Hellespont. Next comes the order for publication of the decree. Then, before Polykles, Peraieus, and their compani-

161 I.G., I², 915.

162 Lysias, 13, 55.

163 Baier and Sauppe, Orat. Att., II, p. 196.

164 I.G., I², 106.

165 If Hiller's restoration of lines 6-7 is valid they are metics; the name Peraieus suggests a metic.

ons are invited to dinner in the prytaneion, we find the clause: τὰ δὲ περὶ Τιμάνθος γεγραμμένα, ἐν πόλει ἐκ-
 κολαφσάντων ἡοι ταμίαι ἡοι τῆς θεᾶς ἐκ τῆς στέλες. Context
 seems lacking and we know nothing of Timanthes or his ac-
 tivities; he had apparently been convicted of some crime.
 Elsewhere only Andokides preserves the name. Its rarity
 tempts one to identify the Timanthes of the inscription
 with the Timanthes accused by Teukros and Andokides. We
 might conjecture that Timanthes was convicted as a hermo-
 kopid, that the names of those judged guilty were published
 on the Akropolis, and that Timanthes later established his
 innocence or made amends, whereupon the tamiai of Athena
 were ordered to expunge his name from the stele. But the
 inscription needs more study at first hand.

In the general distress which followed the infor-
 mation laid by Teukros Diokleides came forward prepared to
 name three hundred men who, he said, took part in the de-
 famation. Diokleides is not a common name and the only
 contemporary Diokleides, on a casualty list,¹⁶⁶ is not the
 informer, who was put to death after Andokides' revela-
 tion.¹⁶⁷

Among those whom Diokleides denounced were Ando-

¹⁶⁶ I.G., I², 950, III, line 168.

¹⁶⁷ Andokides, De Mysteriis, 66.

kides and many of his relatives. His father Leogoras has already been discussed as has his cousin Charmides. Another kinsman, Nisaios, is otherwise unknown.

Taureas, cousin of Andokides, according to Andokides, and Plutarch had his ears boxed by Alkibiades at a choregic festival.¹⁶⁸ Only one other Taureas is listed by Kirchner, the professional trainer who kept a wrestling school which was often visited by Sokrates;¹⁶⁹ he might be Andokides' cousin.

The two sons of Telokles, Kallias and Euphemos, also cousins of Andokides, were victims of Diokleides, as was another relative, Kallias son of Alkmeon. Kallias was a popular name in the fifth century. Since we have the patronymics of both these men, the field is narrowed to some extent. Kallias son of Telokles was a gymnasiarch, as an early fourth-century inscription informs us.¹⁷⁰ Several dedications bear the name Kallias.¹⁷¹ The archons

¹⁶⁸ Andokides, 4, 20; Plutarch, Alcibiades, 16, 5.

¹⁶⁹ Plato, Charmides, 153a: ἤκομεν τῇ προτεραίᾳ ἐσπέρας ἐκ Ποτειδαίας ἀπὸ τοῦ στρατοπέδου, οἷον δὲ διὰ χρόνον ἀφικ-
μένος ἀσμένως ἦα ἐπὶ τὰς συνήθεις διατριβὰς. καὶ δὴ καὶ
εἰς τὴν Ταυρέου παλαίστραν...εἰσῆλθον....

¹⁷⁰ I.G., II², 3018, line 1.

¹⁷¹ I.G., I², 419, 608, 820.

of 412/1 and 406/5 were Kallias Skambonides¹⁷² and Kallias Angelethen.¹⁷³ Kallias Euonymus was treasurer of Athena in 410/09.¹⁷⁴ A Kallias is orator of I.G., I², 25 (ca. 420 B.C.). It is impossible to be sure whether one of these men was Kallias son of Alkmeon. All one can say of him is that he had family connections with Andokides and also with the Alkmeonidai. The name Kallias appears twice on a late fifth-century casualty list.¹⁷⁵

A Euphemos was archon in 417/6.¹⁷⁶ A Euphemos Kollyteus was a treasurer of Athena in 421/0.¹⁷⁷ Lysias composed an oration against a certain Euphemos; only the title remains.¹⁷⁸ Euphemos was also the name of an Athenian ambassador who was sent to Kamarina in the winter of 415/4.¹⁷⁹ Any one of these might have been the son of Telokles.

¹⁷² I.G., I², 103, line 5; 255, line 329; p. 296, line 34.

¹⁷³ I.G., I², 124, line 4.

¹⁷⁴ I.G., I², 304, line 26.

¹⁷⁵ Meritt, Hesperia, VII (1938), p. 89, V, line 222; Raubitschek, Hesperia, XII (1943), p. 43, line 66 (Kallias of Pandionis).

¹⁷⁶ I.G., I², 96, line 2; 302, line 23; 370, line 18.

¹⁷⁷ I.G., I², 264, lines 57-58; 280, lines 72-73; 281, line 93.

¹⁷⁸ Baiter and Sauppe, Orat. Att., II, p. 188.

¹⁷⁹ Thucydides, VI, 75, 4; 81, 1.

Another cousin of Andokides, Kritias, needs no introduction to any student of Greek history. Xenophon and Plato associate him, during his youth, with Sokrates, an association which is not surprising in the light of his family ties with Plato. He was present at the dialogue between Protagoras and Sokrates in the company of Alkibiades.¹⁸⁰ The Charmides pictures him as a rather insipid aristocrat, proud of his family's nobility. Xenophon, much concerned in the Memorabilia to show that Sokrates was not guilty of corrupting the youth, dismisses Kritias and Alkibiades, who were often used as examples to prove this charge, by saying that it was after they left Sokrates that they became corrupt. They had used Sokrates only to further their own personal ambitions. He speaks of the hostility which Sokrates aroused in Kritias by his rebukes concerning the relations between Kritias and Euthydemos. Kritias satisfied this enmity when he became one of the Thirty, for Sokrates was ordered to stop teaching and conversing with the young men.¹⁸¹ A passage in Xenophon

¹⁸⁰ Plato, Protagoras, 316a.

¹⁸¹ Memorabilia, I, 2, 31-38. For the family connection between Kritias the oligarch and the Kritias of the Timaeus see Stephans, Critias, Life and Literary Remains, pp. 3-9 with a stemma on p. 8; see also Kirchner, P.A., I, pp.

suggests that Kritias was oligarchic in sympathy much earlier: ἐπεὶ δὲ αὐτὸς μὲν προπετής ἦν ἐπὶ τὸ πολλοὺς ἀποκτείνειν, ὅτε καὶ φυγῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου.¹⁸² The exile should probably be placed in 410 at the time of the democratic restoration, which might mean that Kritias was one of the Four Hundred. While the statements of Kritias in the Platonic dialogues are conservative and without colour or individuality, Xenophon has shown his ruthless and unforgiving nature. In the Hellenica his harshness toward the populace in general and his greed and ambition become clear. Even personal friendship is sacrificed in a most despicable fashion.¹⁸³ His scorn for the Demos is reflected in his admiration for Sparta, the evidence for which is seen in the fragments of his writings. He extols the Spartan temperance¹⁸⁴ and regards the Spartan polity as the best possible of governments.¹⁸⁵ As Ollier points out, this admiration for Sparta is not surprising in Kritias in view of his aristocratic milieu and his family. He adds, "L'enseignement

62-63, s.v. Andokides III (828). On his relations with Sokrates see Stephans, pp. 10-12.

¹⁸² Hell., II, 3, 15 (of 404 B.C.).

¹⁸³ Xenophon, Hell., II, 3, 16-34.

¹⁸⁴ Frag. 6 Diels.

¹⁸⁵ Xenophon, Hell., II, 3, 34.

de Socrate, dont Critias fut l'élève, n'était pas fait, de son côté, comme on le verra, pour l'en détourner."¹⁸⁶ He is quick to urge that Kritias' extreme and impassioned oligarchical tendencies were not the fault of his more gentle teacher.

Another victim of Diokleides was Eukrates the brother of Nikias. He might be the general of 412/1.¹⁸⁷ Lysias says that after Aegospotamoi Eukrates was elected general and although he was invited to take part in the oligarchy refused.¹⁸⁸ So, like Nikias, he must have been conservative enough to make the oligarchs hope for his support, but democratic enough to deny his help to those who destroyed the democracy.

Two members of the Boule were accused by Diokleides. The name Apsephion son of Apsithyllos is preserved on a Delian inscription as a member of the Athenian Amphytyonic Council in 410/09.¹⁸⁹ It is possible that Mantitheos was the man who was taken prisoner in Karia by Tissaphernes in 411/0 and who a short time later escaped with Alkibiades

¹⁸⁶ Ollier, Le Mirage Spartiate, p. 170.

¹⁸⁷ Aristophanes, Lysistrata, 103 (where it is implied that Eukrates was general).

¹⁸⁸ Lysias, 18, 4-5.

¹⁸⁹ Homolle, B.C.H., VIII (1884), p. 283, line 5.

to Klazomenai.¹⁹⁰ In 408 he was sent as an ambassador to the Great King¹⁹¹ and in the following year was left along with Diodoros by the Athenian generals to guard the Athenian holdings in the Hellespont; Alkibiades and the other generals returned home.¹⁹² The name itself is suggestive of a priestly family.

Phrynichos son of Orchesamenos, cousin of Andokides, is not known in any other connection.

When Andokides was persuaded to turn state's evidence he declared that, in addition to those named by Teukros, four men were guilty. Panaitios had appeared as a profaner on the list of Andromachos.¹⁹³ The name Diakritos is found in a mid fourth-century catalogue of Akamantids,¹⁹⁴ which may be too late for us, and on an early fourth-century dedication to the gods of healing.¹⁹⁵ Chairedemos son of Elpios is inscribed on a confiscation list of 415.¹⁹⁶ Two fifth-century casualty lists bear the name

¹⁹⁰ Xenophon, Hell., I, 1, 10.

¹⁹¹ Xenophon, Hell., I, 3, 13.

¹⁹² Diodoros, XIII, 68, 2.

¹⁹³ See above, p. 89.

¹⁹⁴ I.G., II², 2397, line 6.

¹⁹⁵ I.G., II², 4359, line 2.

¹⁹⁶ I.G., I², 332, lines 6-7.

Chairedemos.¹⁹⁷ Lysistratos must remain a mystery; the name is not rare but cannot be related to the circumstances of 415. Hatzfeld notes: "Pour Lysistratos, comme l'a bien fait remarquer Kahrstedt (s.v. dans R E), on ne saurait admettre que condamné en 415, il soit revenu en 411 et qu'il ait pu avoir une activité politique dès ce moment (Aristoph., Lys., 1105)."¹⁹⁸

Following Andokides' revelation Diokleides freely admitted his deception but put the responsibility upon two men, Amiantos of Aigina and Alkibiades of Phegous. The former is unknown. The latter appears in the records of the *poletai*.¹⁹⁹

Several others are connected with the parody and mutilation in the Andokidean account. Of the accuser of Alkibiades, Pythonikos, nothing is known.²⁰⁰ The board of inquiry which was to investigate the wave of impieties was composed of Diognetos,²⁰¹ Peisandros, and Charikles. Charikles and Peisandros, says Andokides, were regarded at the

¹⁹⁷ I.G., I², 956, line 10; 957, line 3.

¹⁹⁸ Hatzfeld, op. cit., p. 187, note 1.

¹⁹⁹ I.G., I², 332, lines 2-3.

²⁰⁰ He is probably not the Pythonikos of Athenaios, V, 220f; the other entries in Kirchner are too late.

²⁰¹ See above, pp. 102-103.

time of the investigation as fervent democrats.²⁰² Charikles son of Apollodoros, in the spring of 413, was sent around the Peloponnese with thirty ships.²⁰³ Later he joined forces with Demosthenes and fortified Kythera.²⁰⁴ He identified himself with the oligarchy of 411 and was one of the Thirty Tyrants.²⁰⁵ Many sources testify to the activities of Peisandros. The comic poets and others make fun of his cowardice.²⁰⁶ Although in 415 he was considered a firm democrat, his claim to fame rests upon his part in the overthrow of the democracy. He was convinced of the futility of attempting to wage war against Sparta without the help of Tissaphernes. But first Alkibiades had to be reconciled with Athens and a new government established, a government which, he assured his opponents, could easily revert to democracy later. He also was to establish oligarchies in the allied cities on his way from Samos to Athens. When Phrynichos opposed the recall of Alkibiades he was deposed

²⁰² De Mysteriis, 36.

²⁰³ Thucydides, VII, 20, 1.

²⁰⁴ Thucydides, VII, 26, 3.

²⁰⁵ Xenophon, Hell., II, 3, 2; Memorabilia, I, 2, 31; An-
dokides, De Mysteriis, 101.

²⁰⁶ Eupolis, frag. 31 Kock; schol. Aristophanes, Birds,
1556; Peace, 394 with schol.; Xenophon, Symposium, II, 14.

through a false charge by Peisandros. At the deposition of the Four Hundred, Peisandros went secretly to Dekeleia.²⁰⁷ It was Peisandros who in 415 sponsored a decree offering a reward of 10,000 drachmai for information regarding all the impieties. This followed the decree of Kleonymos which had offered 1,000 drachmai.

The name Kleonymos appears as the orator in the following decrees: (1) A.T.L., II, D4²⁰⁸ (relations with Methone, 426/5); (2) A.T.L., II, D8 (collectors of tribute, 426/5); I.G., II², 71²⁰⁹ (honorary, 426/5); Hesperia, XIV (1945), pp. 115-117 (relations with Chios, 425/4); Hesperia, Suppl. VIII (1949), pp. 134-147 (430/29, restored). The probabilities are that we are dealing here with a single Kleonymos. He was in all likelihood still active in 415 and (with his penchant for making motions) proposed the reward. Aristophanes makes a slighting remark about him in the Knights,²¹⁰ where κερνύς has usually been translated to portray Kleonymos' great voracity. Meritt, how-

²⁰⁷ Thucydides, VIII, 49, 53-54, 56, 64-68, 98.

²⁰⁸ See also A.T.L., III, pp. 133-137.

²⁰⁹ For the text see Weston, A.J.P., LXI (1940), pp. 347-351; she believes that I.G., II², 38 is a part of the same document.

²¹⁰ Aristophanes, Knights, 955-958 (424 B.C.).

ever, thinks the word may also mean that he had "a disposition to have his mouth constantly open in making speeches."²¹¹

Plutarch's narrative contains few proper names and few divergencies from the account of Andokides. Plutarch states that the accusation against Alkibiades was made by Androkles and that it was at his instigation that the slaves and metics gave their information. Androkles was ridiculed by Aristophanes and other comic poets. He is called a slave, a beggar, and a rascal who has become wicked with his newly-won riches.²¹² When Peisandros and his companions came to Athens from Samos to set up the oligarchy, they found that some of the Athenians of oligarchic persuasion had put Androkles to death because he was a prominent member of the popular party. He had done much to bring about Alkibiades' exile and so the oligarchs thought his death would gratify Alkibiades whom they wished to recall to Athens as a friend.²¹³ Plutarch shows clearly the hatred for Alkibiades which Androkles stirred up. He was active too after Alkibiades' departure for Sicily for

²¹¹ Hesperia, XIV (1945), p. 117.

²¹² Aristophanes, Wasps, 1187 with schol.; frag. 570 Kock; Ekphantides, frag. 4 Kock; Telekleides, frag. 15 Kock; Kratinos, frags. 458, 263, 208 Kock.

²¹³ Thucydides, VIII, 65, 2.

it was only then that the parody and mutilation were put into the same category.²¹⁴

Plutarch's account bears two more names which are not found in Andokides. He says that it was Timaios, an extremely daring man but not the equal of Andokides, who persuaded Andokides to turn state's evidence.²¹⁵ This man is not to be identified with the Timaios of the Platonic dialogue, who was an Epizephyrian Locrian from South Italy.²¹⁶ Plutarch, obviously, has made a mistake; his Timaios must be Charmides, who, we know from Andokides, persuaded the latter to give evidence. That both gave their names to Platonic dialogues explains the error.

According to Plutarch, Alkibiades was impeached by Thessalos son of Kimon. Kimon's pro-Spartanism and oligarchic sympathies are plain to the reader of Thucydides and Plutarch. His son may have inherited these sympathies.

²¹⁴ Plutarch, Alcibiades, 20, 5.

²¹⁵ Plutarch, Alcibiades, 21, 6.

²¹⁶ Plato, Timaeus, 20a. Kirchner has no other fifth-century Timaios.

CHAPTER SIX

THE TRUTH?

The evidence has been set out in its entirety; the personalities have been isolated in so far as isolation is feasible; the prosopographical possibilities, often many, have been laid before the reader. Yet no comprehensive solution to all the problems comes at once to mind. For the fact is that intrigue during these exciting months was rife and our testimony, if not contradictory, is, for one reason or another, incomplete. This is due in part to the toll exacted by the intervening years and in part to the bias or interest of the witnesses themselves. Nevertheless the layman who would understand the temper of the Athenian people just before the Sicilian expedition is eager, and the historian is obligated, to sift what evidence is available, to organize it, to reconstruct events and motives, and to give names to the actors. The sequence of events is not disputed; it is the motives and the identities that blur the image across the years. Perhaps it is not the passage of time which is wholly responsible for the distortion: Thucydides himself tells us that the truth was never satisfactorily revealed.¹

¹ Thucydides, VI, 60, 2: τὸ δὲ σαφὲς οὐδεὶς οὔτε τότε οὔτε ὕστερον ἔχει εἰπεῖν περὶ τῶν δρασάντων τὸ ἔργον.

In reconstruction of this type the historian begins with the evidence; that evidence allows convincing or probable or possible conclusions. But when the evidence is vague or, perhaps, absent altogether as specific data, the historian is justified in formulating his judgements on the basis of the general tone of the sources and the impressions that they make upon him. This may lead to the writing of what is sometimes called historical fiction. The historian calls it conjecture or historical instinct (or imagination). And, providing that the reader is clearly warned, this is a defensible, even a desirable, kind of argument. For it is the historian's duty to interpret on the basis of his knowledge and experience. Of this kind of conjecture this chapter will contain its share; and the reader is hereby warned.

The expedition to Sicily was about to sail. Preparations had been made. Everything was in readiness. The generals had been chosen, the fleet fitted out. Yet mingled with the excitement and the firm anticipations of the people there was a feeling of foreboding, of tenseness. Alkibiades had convinced the Demos of the sure success of this venture and had painted a rosy picture of the advantages that would accrue to the city; he had been elected strategos. But his situation was more precarious than he perhaps cared to admit. The wisdom of his move had been questioned by Nikias

who, while he had lost much of his earlier popularity, still voiced the sentiments of the conservative element of the citizens, a group which was little disposed to look upon any scheme headed by Alkibiades with favour.

Alkibiades' pranks during his youth had been shocking, to say the least. His arrogance and headstrong temperament had made many enemies. The family of Hipponikos had every reason to resent the young noble, for he had struck Hipponikos himself, treated the daughter of the house, to whom he was married, with every sort of indignity, and cheated the family of a large sum of money. Kallias, Hipponikos' son, had so feared him that he willed his house and property to the Demos if he should die without legal heirs.² This Kallias was also a member of one of the sacred families, the Kerykes,³ and had served as dadouchos or torch-bearer in the Eleusinian procession.⁴ He was not only a conservative but a member of the priestly class as well. This faction too had reason to fear and hate Alkibiades for his impudence. His abuse of the processional vessels used in the Olympic festival and other such acts were not

² Plutarch, Alcibiades, 8, 2-4.

³ Andokides, De Mysteriis, 116.

⁴ Xenophon, Hell., VI, 3, 3.

calculated to endear him to the priests.⁵ Plutarch states that the priests were opposed to the Sicilian campaign.⁶ Besides their own natural hostility they were probably goaded by men like Stilbides, the companion of Nikias, who was a soothsayer. It was Stilbides who as an expert in his field could free Nikias from most of his superstitions.⁷

In addition to the conservatives, some of the priests, and the sacred families, Alkibiades had another strong opponent in Sokrates. Even though the early association of these two men had been a pleasant one, Sokrates with his love of law and order could not approve the lawless course of his younger contemporary. He was wise enough to see that Athens was taking a great risk and he had no hope that the city would profit.⁸ This opinion he communicated to his intimate friends.⁹ Certainly there were many of his

⁵ Plutarch, Alcibiades, 12, 3; Andokides, 4, 29.

⁶ Plutarch, Nicias, 13, 1.

⁷ Plutarch, Nicias, 23, 7.

⁸ Plutarch, Alcibiades, 17, 5: Σωκράτη μέντοι τὸν φιλόσοφον...οὐδὲν ἐλπίζει τῇ πόλει χρηστὸν ἀπὸ τῆς στρατείας ἐκείνης λέγουσιν.

⁹ Plutarch, Nicias, 13, 9: Σωκράτει δὲ τῷ σοφῷ τὸ δαιμόνιον οἷς εἰώθει συμβόλοις χρησάμενον πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐμήνυσε κάκεινα, τὸν ἔκπλουν ἐπ' ὀλέθρῳ τῆς πόλεως πραττόμενον. ὁ

circle who were only too glad to listen to sentiments of this kind, for example, Kallias son of Hipponikos¹⁰ and Taureas, who was an acquaintance of the Sokratics, member of a wealthy conservative family,¹¹ and who had rueful memories of a choregic contest with Alkibiades in which he had suffered physical violence.¹² So far Alkibiades' enemies have been those on his own social plane. But there were others among the lower classes. Androkles, a demagogue, proved to be influential against the eupatrid; in fact, says Thucydides, it was Androkles who was responsible for the exile of Alkibiades.¹³ Perhaps Androkles had been a poli-

δὲ τοῖς συνήθεσι καὶ φίλοις ἔφρασε, καὶ διῆλθεν εἰς πολλοὺς ὁ λόγος. A man like Sokrates might very well have commanded no little political influence.

¹⁰ The Symposium of Xenophon is set at the house of the wealthy Kallias in the Peiraeus; Symposium, I, 2.

¹¹ Andokides, De Mysteriis, 47.

¹² Plutarch, Alcibiades, 16, 5.

¹³ VIII, 65, 2. Thucydides here, I think, bases his statement on the probable fact that it was Androkles who first put the two crimes, the parody and the mutilation, into the same category; he was the actual instrument. It was ultimately the oligarchs who were responsible for the banishment; cf. Isocrates, 16, 4. Thessalos son of Kimon made

tical colleague of Hyperbolos when the collusion and ostracism occurred; both bear the stamp of self-made men. If this is true, Androkles' hatred and fear of Alkibiades are understandable.¹⁴

Despite this array of hostility, Alkibiades had one very powerful weapon: he had public sentiment behind him. Nikias, who still cherished his friendship with Sparta and his policy of no expansion, could make no counter-move openly. He was one of the generals appointed to the expedition; how could he bring action against a fellow-general? The priests had done their best with all the unfavourable omens at their disposal but Alkibiades had thwarted their oracles by counter-oracles mouthed by soothsayers in his employ, and, declares Plutarch, no signs could deter the people from the expedition.¹⁵ The wealthy conserva-

the formal impeachment. However, neither the oligarchs nor Thessalos could carry out their schemes until public opinion had been changed. This change was brought about chiefly by Androkles.

¹⁴ It may be argued that he had as much reason to hate Nikias. This may be true; but Alkibiades, demagogue himself, represented the greater threat to men like Hyperbolos and Androkles.

¹⁵ Plutarch, Nicias, 13, 2-3.

tives hesitated to question the advisability of the policy, for they would be accused of shirking their duty, the outfitting of the fleet and fighting men.¹⁶ Civic pride too was a deterrent to any opposition. The preparations were almost complete; some of the allied forces were already on the way. The Argives and Mantineians made no secret of the fact that they had joined the expedition only because of Alkibiades.¹⁷ Yet Nikias clung to hope.

At this moment, on the very eve of the departure for Sicily, the Herms in the city were all, in a single night, mutilated. This was more than vandalism and it came as a shock to the entire citizenry. The perpetrators were unknown, but, since all the statues (save one) had suffered the same fate, it could not be dismissed as a mere youthful prank committed on the spur of the moment; this was the organized and concerted work of a single group. The ill-feeling among the political factions was high and had been for some time. The ostracism a year before and the recent struggle between Nikias and Alkibiades were vivid in the memory of the Demos. Everyone was tense. Only a whisper was necessary to start rumours flying. In such a context, an act of widespread vandalism, which at another time might have entailed no political significance

¹⁶ Plutarch, Nicias, 12, 3.

¹⁷ Thucydides, VI, 29, 3.

or consequence, became in the public mind the symptom of an organized conspiracy against the state.¹⁸ Those behind the crime, or conspiracy, remained unidentified. But such a serious view was taken that a committee of investigation was appointed and rewards offered for any information leading to the apprehension of the criminals. Kleonymos moved that a reward of 1,000 drachmai be given and Peisandros (the agent of Alkibiades) later offered 10,000. This is an indication of the part Peisandros was to play in the later developments. As subsequent discussion will show, Peisandros was anxious above all to keep Alkibiades' name out of the affair. He realized that the mutilation could not fail to strike many sooner or later as exactly the type of prank Alkibiades would enjoy. He had perhaps been assured that Alkibiades had had no part in the deed; if he were accused it would endanger the Sicilian venture and might well ruin its author. Hence it was to Peisandros' interest to find the real culprits.

The popular hysteria occasioned by the defacement of the Herms did not escape Nikias. Here was his opportunity. If the groups hostile to Alkibiades could be persuaded to combine their forces, there was a chance of implicating

¹⁸ Thucydides, VI, 27, 3: καὶ τὸ πρᾶγμα μείζονος ἐλάβανον.

him in the situation and hence in litigation. The Sicilian campaign would then have to be postponed until he stood trial. By that time his power over the public might be broken and the whole scheme could be tabled. Besides, there was already considerable talk about other impieties.¹⁹ Nicias probably realized that Alkibiades was not likely to have participated in the mutilation of the Herms. But he did know about a parody of the mysteries which had taken place sometime before in which Alkibiades had had a part. He might have been told by his brother, Diognetos, who was said to have been present, or by some of his conservative friends. At any rate, it was exactly what he needed. If the people could develop such terror over a mutilation by unknown culprits, how much more horrified would they be over a like crime and how merciless would they be to the perpetrators who, in this case, were known? The story would outrage the feelings of the conservatives, the sacred families of the Eumolpidae and Kerykes, and all of the citizens, especially those who were initiates. The whole

¹⁹ Thucydides, VI, 27, 2: καὶ τοὺς δρᾶσαντας ἦδει οὐδείς, ἀλλὰ μεγάλοις μηνύτροις δημοσίᾳ οὗτοί τε ἐζητοῦντο καὶ προσέτι ἐψηφίσαντο, καὶ εἴ τις ἄλλο τι οἶδεν ἀσέβημα γεγενημένον, μηνύειν ἀδεῶς τὸν βουλόμενον καὶ ἀστῶν καὶ ξένων καὶ δούλων.

thing had to be handled with care. No prominent Athenians must appear.²⁰ So Pythonikos, otherwise unknown, was persuaded by some means to voice the accusation at the meeting of the Assembly which was to give final audience to the generals. This set off the chain of events which led to the exile and death of many. To Nikias, Alkibiades was a menace to the state. If he was not guilty of mutilating the Herms, he was certainly guilty of parodying the mysteries; between the two crimes there was little difference in degree. So Nikias need have no trouble with his conscience; whether he sought the advice of Sokrates²¹ we cannot say. There are times when the statesman is forced to play the politician. This was one of them; another had been just before the ostracism of Hyperbolos. The impression of Nikias given by Thucydides is of an able and patriotic Athenian.²² There is nothing in the present incident that need dispel that impression.

Pythonikos made the accusation that Alkibiades

²⁰ Compare the list of Andromachos, Pythonikos' witness, with those of Agariste and Teukros; see above, pp. 85-123.

²¹ See note 9 above.

²² Cf. VII, 86, 5: ἥκιστα δὲ ἄξιός ὢν τῶν γε ἐπ' ἐμοῦ Ἑλλήνων ἐς τοῦτο δυστυχίας ἀφικέσθαι διὰ τὴν πᾶσαν ἐς ἀρετὴν νενομισμένην ἐπιτήδευσιν.

had taken part in a parody of the mysteries at the house of Poulytion. Alkibiades vigorously denied this at first but a witness was produced, in the person of a slave Andromachos, who supplied a list of men who were present at this celebration. Among the names on this list was Archippos, who, I think, was the Archippos later accused by Andokides of mutilating the Herm of his (Archippos') own household.²³ He is conceivably the friend of Lysias; perhaps he too was a metic. The parody of the mysteries seemed to have attracted several slaves and metics. Teukros, who later gave information about the mysteries at which he said he had been present, was a metic. There is evidence that Kephisodoros, named by Teukros, was a metic.²⁴ Hence as a metic Archippos would be quite suitable to the list of profaners. If the identification of the profaner Archippos with the hermokopid later accused by Andokides is correct we have one man implicated in the two crimes, which are in this way related to one another. It will become obvious that Peisandros, acting for Alkibiades, tried to keep the two incidents separate. Conversely, it was to the interest of Alkibiades' enemies to link them and therefore to involve Alkibiades in both. They could prove the one

²³ See above, p. 88.

²⁴ See above, p. 99.

charge; the other could be dealt with by suggestion. Nikias was aware of this.

The list supplied by Andromachos, significantly enough, contains, so far as we know, members of no aristocratic or influential families except Alkibiades and perhaps Meletos.²⁵ Diognetos' name, which appears later, is not on this list. But if Andromachos, the witness of Pythonikos, was representing the interests of Nikias, then he would not name the brother of his principal. Teukros was under no such inhibitions and we may assume that his Diognetos is the brother of Nikias; he is also, in all probability, the member of the board of inquiry. In all likelihood, Andromachos' information had been carefully edited so as to give no offence to the oligarchs and conservatives, the element which Nikias expected to back him.²⁶

The accusation and testimony probably had the desired effect: there was much consternation over the revelation of Pythonikos. The oligarchs were as delighted over the result as Nikias. Their aim, however, was to get Alkibiades out of Athens as quickly as possible. His hold upon the Demos and his anti-Spartan policies were causing them much difficulty. The thought that Alkibiades might

²⁵ This Meletos is not the mutilator; see above, pp. 95-96.

²⁶ See above, pp. 136-138.

become the scapegoat for the mutilation pleased them. If they could play upon the idea that Alkibiades was behind both crimes, they could get rid of an enemy and continue their own political operations. It was to their advantage to send him off to Syracuse before he could make a defense. In this way they could work unhampered at the task of convincing the people that he was the instigator of both impieties.²⁷ Nikias, on the other hand, had hoped that Alkibiades would be forced to stay and stand trial; hence the expedition would be delayed. Once he had instigated the accusation of Pythonikos, he sat back to await results, results which did not come out as he expected.

All seemed to be going according to schedule. Alkibiades was at first alarmed. When he realized, however, that the armed forces were behind him, he willingly offered, even insisted, that he be allowed to defend himself publicly. He was fully cognizant of the extent to which his reputation could be damaged if he were not present to defend himself. It was not hard for his astute mind to see through the pretended altruism of the orators who insisted before the Ekklesia that it was not fair to delay a general once the armament and allies had been assembled; when the war was

²⁷ Plutarch, Alcibiades, 20, 5.

over he could be tried, the laws would not change.²⁸ This turn of events must have dismayed Nikias as much as Alkibiades. From that point on everything was out of Nikias' control. His plan had backfired. He had placed a powerful weapon in the hands of the oligarchs. As yet a conspiracy that was specifically oligarchic had not been mentioned and the oligarchs preferred to stay in the background. Nikias, who still had a great deal of influence, had done more for them than he realized; their chances of remaining anonymous for a greater length of time had increased.

Instead of compelling Alkibiades to stand trial, the Demos sent the expedition out as planned and Nikias had to leave the scene of action. This development we should ascribe to the oligarchs. They knew that if matters came to a head at that time there was a good chance that Alkibiades would escape. They had to have time to change public sentiment and to emphasize the connection of Alkibiades with both parody and mutilation, which then could be called the results of a conspiracy aiming at tyranny. His activities in the past lent themselves to such innuendo.²⁹ It was for this purpose that Androkles was employed. He played upon

²⁸ Plutarch, Alcibiades, 19, 5-6.

²⁹ Plutarch, Alcibiades, 16, 1; Thucydides, VI, 53, 3-59 (digression on the Peisistratids).

the bitterness that developed toward Alkibiades and, says Thucydides, was responsible more than anyone else for his exile.³⁰ He was a man of the people and as such could reach the Demos more easily than could the aristocratic oligarchs.

The friends of Alkibiades were not idle. They were aware that Androkles and his backers were busily engaged in blackening Alkibiades' character. Some action had to be taken quickly. The damage was done as far as the mysteries were concerned; a witness had already testified to the part played by Alkibiades in the parody. But there was still a chance that he could be saved from indictment for the mutilation. To divert the popular mind from Alkibiades and the "tyrannical conspiracy," his friends had to focus attention upon the hermokopidai and a possible conspiracy of the oligarchs. So they produced another informer, the metic Teukros. According to Andokides, Teukros had retired quietly to Megara and from there offered to tell what he knew about both cases.³¹ He had himself participated in the parody and was probably in the pay of Alkibiades' friends, specifically Peisandros.³² The latter was

³⁰ See above, note 13.

³¹ De Mysteriis, 15.

³² Peisandros, it will be recalled, was the man who worked so hard for the return of Alkibiades (Thucydides, VIII, 49; 53,1; 54, 3), who even suggested a change of government in

on the board of inquiry and so had some control over these examinations.

Teukros supplied two lists, one of profaners and one of hermokopidai. He, or, perhaps more accurately, those of Alkibiades' friends who persuaded him to give the information, were determined to show that there was absolutely no connection between the parody and defacement; we therefore find no overlapping.³³ Teukros seems to have given a correct list of the hermokopidai. At least, after his accusation all the men who had been named fled from the country. Andokides confirmed his testimony a little later. This is not to say that Teukros presented the whole truth; there were omissions in his information, which after all had a partisan origin.³⁴ But the fact that Alkibiades' enemies

order that it might be accomplished; for the negotiations of Alkibiades and his part in the establishment of the oligarchy see Uhlfelder, Alkibiades and Stasis, pp. 68-69. His conduct in 415 is completely consistent with his later activities. He was not an oligarch but a follower of Alkibiades.

³³ Teukros names Euphiletos and Pherekles as hermokopidai but omits them from his list of profaners, yet we know (Hesperia, VIII [1939], p. 73, lines 39-40, 44-45) that they were convicted of both crimes.

³⁴ See below, pp. 165-166.

continued to focus attention on Alkibiades and the parody proclaims their guilt. Teukros was eager to prove that Alkibiades had nothing to do with either crime and to draw attention to the oligarchs. A close scrutiny of the names on his list reveals that many were enemies of Alkibiades and some at least, we may infer, were oligarchs (hence the oligarchic alarm). Alkibiades' name (of course) does not appear at all.

The evidence certainly indicates that there were oligarchs concerned in the mutilation of the Herms and that the oligarchic "elder statesmen" knew it. This is not to say that the crime was the outcome of an oligarchic plot to overthrow the democracy; such a view would be naive. But we must remember that we have the advantage of historical perspective, whereas the Athenians of 415 were at such short range that the image was thrown out of all proportion; the current political hysteria did not help them.

At first sight, the mutilation brings to mind the undergraduate "rag"; and this, in all probability, is just what it was. We have the word of Andokides that Euphiletos made the original proposal at a drinking party. We may develop this logically by supposing that a group of young bloods, members of the oligarchic clubs, allowed their high spirits to get the better of them and made a systematic tour of the Herms. The escapade as planned had no political

significance. Nor had Alkibiades anything to do with it.

Unfortunately, this was a bad time for jokes on such a scale and the public outcry horrified no one more than it did the older oligarchs, who had been active politically for some years. This interpretation accounts for their anxiety to shift the investigation to other impieties. And oligarchic guilt accounts also for the fact that all of those named as *hermokopidai* by Teukros left Athens at once; Teukros, who was working for Alkibiades, was of course interested in exposing the oligarchs.

One other group with common interests is well enough represented in the various lists to arouse our suspicions, namely, the associates or acquaintances of Sokrates. We can scarcely doubt that Sokratiks³⁵ shared in the mutilation; if the interpretation of the mutilation outlined above is right, then there were Sokratiks who were also members of oligarchic clubs; many of these clubs were actively interested in a change of government at Athens. I do not imply that the Sokratic circle was a kind of oligarchic club; but we may find it worth while to glance at Sokrates' political sympathies³⁶ and to ask if he might

³⁵ For the meaning of this term see above, p. 113, note 117.

³⁶ There is some reason to believe that Sokrates was not unimportant politically; see above, p. 138 with note 9.

have exerted some influence, consciously or unconsciously, upon his listeners.³⁷

There can be no doubt that Sokrates had much to say in favour of the polity of the Lakedaimonians. Even when one grants that the reported words of Sokrates reflect the views of his devoted biographers, Plato and Xenophon, nevertheless, as Ollier so reasonably states, "on peut admettre sans peine que Platon ou Xénophon aient chargé leur maître d'exprimer leurs propres sympathies pour Lacédémone, mais on ne saurait croire qu'ils aient créé de toutes pièces un Socrate laconisant."³⁸ Sokrates probably sympathized with the Spartan way of life: Aristophanes underlines his Lakonic manner of dressing³⁹ and his simple clothing exhibited his disdain for the elegant luxury of his own Athens. But there is more explicit evidence of his esteem for Sparta. His own respect for the law naturally caused him to admire a city in which the law had to be obeyed. He comments that Sparta would have been just like any other Greek state had not Lykourgos established such a

³⁷ We may note in passing that Sokrates was charged in 399 with having corrupted the youth; is this an echo of the political manoeuvres of 420-410?

³⁸ Ollier, op. cit., p. 210.

³⁹ Aristophanes, Birds, 1280-1283.

firm obedience to the law.⁴⁰ When young Perikles questioned him about the degeneration of the Athenians and how they could recover their old virtue, his reply was that they must go back to the way of life of their ancestors or else imitate those who were at the time preeminent. By taking care to observe their customs the Athenians might become as good or possibly better. He does not specifically name the Lakedaimonians but his reference is clear, especially in the light of Perikles' observation that Athens will take a long time to reach perfection for the Athenians will never show the Lakedaimonian respect for age.⁴¹ In the Crito too this admiration for the Spartan type of eunomia is made very clear.⁴² Nor can it be claimed that Sokrates' warmth toward Sparta was inherited, as it might have been in an aristocratic family.

Sokrates was no friend of the Athenian democracy.

⁴⁰ Xenophon, Memorabilia, IV, 4, 15. Andrewes, Class. Quart., XXXII (1938), pp. 89-102, argues convincingly that eunomia was a condition of the state in which the citizens obeyed the law, not a condition of the state in which the laws were good.

⁴¹ Xenophon, Memorabilia, III, 5, 14-15.

⁴² Plato, Crito, 52e; where Sokrates reports what the laws said to him: οὐ δὲ οὔτε Λακεδαιμόνα προηροῦ οὔτε Κόρητιν, ἀς δὴ ἐκάστοτε φῆς εὐνομεῖσθαι. The adverb is striking.

On the other hand, he had no love for the oligarchy when it was in power. His admiration for Sparta was that of the philosopher for a simple, well-ordered existence, which he idealized. His associates could not always distinguish Sokrates' respect for the simplicity and obedience for which oligarchic Sparta stood from their own desire for an oligarchy, the type of government which, in their opinion, fostered the simplicity and obedience so admired by their master. The motives of those who were attracted to Sokratic discussions were varied. So were their intellects. Many of the young men were from wealthy, aristocratic families. Some had a natural bent toward oligarchy. Sokrates' lakonizing gave them a lofty motive for their natural inclination. They were fired with a missionary zeal to give to Athens the "good life" and that could only be accomplished by setting up an oligarchy. So they were easy prey for the more cunning members of the circle, men like Kritias who were concerned only with self-aggrandizement. Kritias' later activities prove that he was an oligarch.⁴³ He probably found it to his advantage to identify himself with the Sokratics for a time; he could, under cover, so to speak, carry on his oligarchic operations in comparative safety. Here he may have found many who could be won over

⁴³ See above, pp. 126-128.

from a passive admiration of Sparta to an active participation in a conspiracy to change the existing government. Sokrates unwittingly had given the oligarchs a cover and also plenty of raw material.

Of Teukros' profaners, Phaidros certainly and Antiphon, if he is Antiphon Kephisios,⁴⁴ were followers of Sokrates. Among Teukros' hermokopidai was Eryximachos, another friend of Sokrates.⁴⁵ Agariste names four profaners: Alkibiades, Adeimantos, Axiochos, Charmides. All were Sokratics.⁴⁶ When we turn to Lydos we find Akoumenos,⁴⁷ another Sokratic, accused of the profanation. Taureas and Kritias, among Diokleides' hermokopidai, again bring us to Sokrates.

Peisandros, after the information of Teukros, declared that the mutilation was the work of a large band of conspirators and that the inquiries must proceed without abatement until all were apprehended. This was the beginning of a period which the citizens must have shuddered to recall for years afterward. No one was safe from arrest. Many innocent citizens were imprisoned. It was a perfect

⁴⁴ See above, pp. 104-105.

⁴⁵ See above, pp. 119-120.

⁴⁶ See above, pp. 109-114.

⁴⁷ See above, pp. 114-115.

opportunity to get rid of personal and political enemies. But the friends of Alkibiades had succeeded for a time in silencing his enemies. The general was now on his way to Sicily. The oligarchs were busy, using every means at their command, trying to convince the Demos that Alkibiades, since he was guilty of profaning the mysteries, also was behind the mutilation, which was an indication of a tyrannical conspiracy. Peisandros was occupied with hunting down oligarchs. He insisted that the mutilation was the work of oligarchic conspirators.

During these days of charge and counter-charge the public bewilderment increased. The mysteries and mutilation were considered together and simultaneously there were those who talked of a tyrant's coup d'état while others openly feared an oligarchic revolution; thinking was muddled. This state of mind recalls a curious expression used by Thucydides to describe the attitude of the Athenians: "they thought that all that had been done was part of an oligarchical and tyrannical conspiracy."⁴⁸ We should expect the connective ἢ; what we have is καί. It is by definition impossible for a political conspiracy to be at once oligarchic and tyrannical; it must be one or the other. Thucy-

⁴⁸ Thucydides, VI, 60, 1: καὶ πάντα αὐτοῖς ἐδόκει ἐπὶ ζυγῷ νομοσίᾳ ὀλιγαρχικῇ καὶ τυραννικῇ πεπραχθαι.

dides knew this; is he not here subtly depicting the distance the Athenians have traveled from the sound bases of logic and clear judgement?

Those who were hostile to Alkibiades were not at all pleased at this state of affairs. Amid the general confusion Alkibiades was sharing attention with too many others and it was quite possible that after Teukros' information he would escape censure completely. His enemies were eager to bring him to the fore again. This task was undertaken by Agariste, whose name proclaims her family. Formerly the wife of Damon (Perikles' music teacher), who had been ostracised for his sympathetic attitude toward tyranny,⁴⁹ she was now married to Alkmeonides. She had family ties with Leogoras, the father of Andokides, whose cousin was Kallias son of Alkmeon. Through the family of Leogoras she was very distantly related to Nikias, for another cousin of Leogoras, Kallias son of Telokles, was the brother-in-law of Eukrates, the brother of Nikias. She may have realized that certain members of these families were implicated in some way in the mutilation. What is quite manifest is that she was determined to re-establish the importance of the parody and Alkibiades' part in it. All the men on her list, Alkibiades, Axiochos his uncle, Adeimantos,

⁴⁹ Plutarch, Pericles, 4, 2-3.

whose later activities proclaimed his oligarchic leanings,⁵⁰ and Charmides son of Glaukon were frequenters of the Sokratic gatherings. On the basis of these names, it looks as though Agariste's particular target is Alkibiades; the others are his close friends, and what we know of them does not make it easy to believe that they were staunch supporters of democracy. Now Alkibiades represented, politically, all that Perikles, his kinsman, did not. We may therefore believe that Agariste, politically, was a Periklean and, true to earlier Alkmeonid tradition, a good democrat. She was, then, not a direct agent of the oligarchs even though she was rendering them a service at an opportune moment. We see again how different groups could cooperate, deliberately or otherwise, in the attack on Alkibiades. Agariste added to the charge of tyranny leveled against Alkibiades.

This emphasis upon Alkibiades' rôle in the parody had to be played down again by Peisandros. So another witness was produced, the slave Lydos, whose testimony concerning the profanation incriminated his master Pherekles who had been named by Teukros as a hermokopid. Eryximachos had been cited as a hermokopid by Teukros; his father Akoumenos was denounced as a profaner by Lydos. Alkibiades was not mentioned; once more his friends had tried to turn at-

50

See above, pp. 111-112.

tention from their protégé. Lydos' information was calculated to recall the hermokopidai of Teukros; it is significant that there is now some overlapping. If the oligarchs are determined to link the two crimes, very well: the friends of Alkibiades will link them and show that some one other than Alkibiades, preferably the oligarchs, are responsible for both.

It was in this testimony that the family of Andokides was first implicated in the sacrilege. Lydos accused Leogoras on very slim evidence of witnessing the celebration of the mysteries. The family of Leogoras had connections with Nikias as well as with the Alkmeonidai. Nikias had departed for Sicily and so could not come to the rescue of his relatives. Diognetos (probably his brother) was on the board of inquiry but could do little if he were opposed by Charikles and Peisandros; besides, he had already been implicated in the mysteries, on the information of Teukros. The Alkmeonidai had incurred the hatred of Alkibiades' friends because of Agariste's testimony. Many of Alkibiades' enemies were members of Leogoras' family, e.g., Kallias son of Hipponikos and Taureas. The family was wealthy and aristocratic; it may have been oligarchic and was in any case an easy mark.

As soon as Lydos had given his information, one

of the bouleutai, Speusippos,⁵¹ suggested that these men be handed over to the proper court immediately. Unfortunately for the cause of Alkibiades the plan did not work out. Leogoras still had enough political influence to forestall Speusippos. Following this litigation Leogoras contemplated flight from Athens, probably not because he was guilty but because he realized the strength of his enemies and was certain that they were not going to allow him to escape so easily. In this suspicion he was quite correct.

The investigation by this time had reached alarming proportions. There must have been other informations laid of which we now know little; but both Thucydides and Plutarch speak of those who testified to the mutilation of other images.⁵² The Herms and the mysteries, however, retained their primary importance. Teukros' information, strengthened by the testimony of Lydos, had fostered the idea of a large conspiracy; Agariste and others had insisted that Alkibiades and a few of his friends were responsible. The confused Demos was not at all clear about its enemy.

51

He may have been an elder kinsman of Plato's nephew, Speusippos son of Eurymedon of Myrrhinous; Diogenes Laertios, III, 43 and IV, 1.

52

Thucydides, VI, 28, 1; Plutarch, Alcibiades, 19, 1.

Was it oligarchy or tyranny? Into the midst of this uncertainty Peisandros and his colleagues dealt what they hoped would be the final blow to crush the oligarchic partisans and clear Alkibiades' name. Peisandros' former assertion that the mutilation was the work of a large band of miscreants was confirmed when Diokleides came forward with his story of three hundred conspirators. Of these he named forty-two.

A good many of these forty-two were family connections of Andokides and Leogoras. In Diokleides we must see another henchman of Alkibiades' friends. He admitted later that he had lied but blamed Alkibiades of Phegous (a relative of Alkibiades son of Kleinias) and Amiantos for inducing him to tell the story. Peisandros, a bitter enemy of Andokides, must too have been one of those who bribed him. It was Peisandros who opposed Andokides' plea to return from exile in 411, probably because he feared that Andokides would oppose the recall of Alkibiades. This dislike may have originated earlier. Andokides belonged to a wealthy, aristocratic family and may have been of the Kerykes.⁵³ Leogoras' successful escape from Speusippos had

⁵³ Kallias son of Hipponikos was a member of the Kerykes; Andokides, De Mysteriis, 116. For the relationship between Kallias and Andokides see the stemma in Maidment, op. cit., p. 334.

also enraged the opposition. Perhaps Leogoras' victory was impressive enough to clear him before the Demos from any suspicion. In any case, the friends of Alkibiades were eager to embroil him and his family in the mutilation. It may be the case of Leogoras and his family to which Thucydides refers when he states that on the evidence of bad men the Demos imprisoned excellent citizens,⁵⁴ and, later, that many noteworthy men were imprisoned.⁵⁵

Diokleides' whole story would have sounded very suspicious to the people had they been in a reasonable state of mind. But their judgement was so clouded that they were eager to apprehend anyone whose name was mentioned in connection with an event which had caused so much terror. Diokleides had named only a small portion of those who were, according to his account, guilty of the mutilation. As Andokides says, he gave the number three hundred in order that he might have the opportunity to say of any citizen he chose that he was or was not an offender.⁵⁶ Peisandros and his colleagues could get rid of any one who showed himself to be an opponent of Alkibiades or his friends simply by adding him to Diokleides' list. There were 258 vacancies.

⁵⁴ Thucydides, VI, 53, 2.

⁵⁵ Thucydides, VI, 60, 2.

⁵⁶ Andokides, De Mysteriis, 39.

Among Diokleides' hermokopidai are two members of the Boule, Apsephion and Mantitheos; possibly they had shown hostility to Alkibiades in their official position. We may note too that Eukrates, brother of Nikias and brother-in-law of Kallias son of Telokles, is on the list. Here Diokleides strikes at Nikias as well as at the family of Andokides (Kallias was Andokides' brother-in-law). Nikias, of course, was not an oligarch; but he was the bitter opponent of Alkibiades. Again, the circumstances produced surprising combinations. All the men indicted by Diokleides were imprisoned except Apsephion and Mantitheos who had fled.

While in prison Andokides was persuaded by Charmides to expose the real culprits. Andokides' testimony named the eighteen of Teukros' list and four others. In his original statement he must have admitted having had some part in the escapade. Thucydides relates that he confessed to his own participation and that of the others in the affair of the Herms.⁵⁷ He himself hints later that he had been implicated in the mutilation.⁵⁸ The four names added were Panaitios, Chairedemos, Diakritos, and Lysistras-

⁵⁷ Thucydides, VI, 60, 4; he does not name Andokides but the identification is clear.

⁵⁸ Andokides, De Reditu, 7; see above, pp. 8-9.

tos.

Why had these men not been named by Teukros, who, apparently, had accurate knowledge of the criminals. Panaitios had already appeared on the list of Andromachos as a profaner and Teukros did not want to link the parody and the mutilation. So he had omitted Panaitios. A complete roster of the thirteen names⁵⁹ inscribed on stone by the poletai in 415/4 reveals that ten are known profaners; the exceptions are Chairedemos, Alkibiades of Phegous, and Nikides (about whom there is a question⁶⁰). Have we, in these records, first of all a list of profaners? If so, the words *περὶ ἀμφοτέρω* (if we understand them correctly) designate those profaners who had also been convicted as *hermokopidai* by the time the stone was erected. Panaitios and Chairedemos, who appear in the records without *περὶ ἀμφοτέρω*, were charged as *hermokopidai* by Andokides. This may be a reflection of the lapse of time between their indictment as profaners (Panaitios by Andromachos) and their citation by Andokides as *hermokopidai*. If there is justification for the argument, then we have in Panaitios and Chairedemos

⁵⁹ Euphiletos, Pherekles, Phaidros, Adeimantos, Axiochos, Panaitios, Oionios, Polystратos, Kephisodoros, Alkibiades, Alkibiades of Phegous, Chairedemos, Nikides.

⁶⁰ See above, pp. 90-91.

two hermokopidai who had been passed over by Teukros; may we go further and assume that all four of Andokides' additional names (Panaitios, Chairredemos, Diakritos, Lysistratos) were deliberately omitted by Teukros from his hermokopidai because he knew that they were profaners? Finally, Alkibiades of Phegous, who urged Diokleides to reveal the identities of the hermokopidai, becomes a profaner.

With the testimony of Andokides and the admission of perjury on the part of Diokleides, Andokides' account ends. Diokleides' victims were freed, Diokleides was executed, the twenty-two men named by Teukros and Andokides were held responsible for the mutilation. The Demos was satisfied that at last justice had been meted out to the guilty. The city sighed with relief. The friends of Alkibiades could afford to be pleased; they had, temporarily at least, halted the attack on Alkibiades.

But this was not to be the end. The mutilation was settled; there remained the parody. The oligarchs, rather than admit defeat, were quick to take advantage of a situation which had earlier threatened to destroy them as an influential group. The danger which had confronted them because of the desecration of the Herms was past. There would be no more investigations and they were secure. They could devote all their attention to the parody. So they contrived to insinuate that both outrages were the result

of conspiracy. Alkibiades had taken part in one, therefore he was a conspirator. The Athenians at last had the truth about the Herms, why should they not finish the task by the punishment of the conspirator whom they had allowed to escape? These sentiments were spread by those who had attacked him before he sailed, Androkles and the other orators who were urged on by the oligarchs.⁶¹ Fortune seemed to be working for the oligarchs now. The people were doubly convinced of the truth of these innuendoes in the light of current events. It happened that, while Athens was in such a turmoil over the mutilation and profanation, a small number of Lakedaimonians had come up to the Isthmus. Their real business, declares Thucydides, was with the Boiotians, but the Demos was convinced that they had come at the instigation of Alkibiades and that if the oligarchic conspirators had not been given their just due the city would have been betrayed to these Lakedaimonians.⁶² Such reasoning shows how befogged the judgement of the Athenians had become. They did not stop to think that the names revealed in the testimony made collusion between Alkibiades and the oligarchs an improbability and they were unaware of the intrigues which had led to the various informations. The

⁶¹ Thucydides, VI, 61, 1.

⁶² Thucydides, VI, 61, 1-2.

oligarchs had done their work well. At Argos too there were rumours of a conspiracy. The friends of Alkibiades were suspected of a plot against the democracy. Thus Alkibiades, who had in the first place incurred suspicion as a potential tyrant, has been converted into an oligarch among the citizens by the tools of the oligarchs themselves, who were careful to remain behind the scenes.

It was Thessalos son of Kimon who actually put the motion which impeached Alkibiades for impiety to the Eleusinian goddesses. He came from a pro-Spartan family, and rare indeed was the Spartan sympathizer who was not an oligarch as well. Thessalos, however, was free from any stigma; neither he nor any of his family had been connected in any way with the recent unpleasantness, so far as we know, and it was safe for him to come into the open with the impeachment. There can be no doubt that the blame for Alkibiades' exile attaches itself to the oligarchic faction.

The hostility of these political groups can be traced in the activities of the next few years. By 411 the oligarchs were strong enough to make an overt attempt to destroy the democracy. One of their first acts was to make overtures to Alkibiades in order to secure the friendship of Tissaphernes. Nothing was said at this first parley about Alkibiades' return.⁶³ Yet Thucydides reports that

63

Thucydides, VIII, 48, 1.

when these envoys returned to Samos from Alkibiades to set the conspiracy in motion they imposed two conditions that must be met before the friendship and wealth of Tissaphernes and the King would be accessible; Alkibiades must be recalled and the government must be changed.⁶⁴ Surely one can discern here the fine hand of Peisandros and his associates. Peisandros had soon realized the futility of his hopes for Alkibiades' recall under the democracy. Now he decided to capitalize on the situation. Athens needed money to carry on the war. Tissaphernes could supply that money. He was fond of Alkibiades; he also preferred to deal with non-democratic governments. So Peisandros, once the bitter enemy of the oligarchs, swung his support to their cause. He was a clever man, not overburdened with scruples. As long as Alkibiades was on the side of the democracy and as long as that democracy favoured the schemes of Alkibiades, for just so long was Peisandros a fervent democrat. When the Demos turned on Alkibiades, and when Peisandros realized that an oligarchy would allow him to carry out his plans, he became just as fervent an oligarch. He was an influential man and he agreed to join the conspiracy, to bring his friends to the support of the oligarchs, if they in turn agreed to press for the recall of Alkibiades.

⁶⁴ Thucydides, VIII, 48, 2.

Peisandros was completely devoid of political convictions. He was loyal to the form of government which was at the moment most useful to him and to Alkibiades.

Peisandros and the oligarchs did not accomplish their purpose without opposition. Phrynichos, who was general at this time, warned the people that Alkibiades was no more interested in an oligarchy than a democracy; his only object was to secure his recall.⁶⁵ He began an intrigue against Alkibiades with the Spartan general. But his plan failed to materialize. Alkibiades learned of the plot and informed his friends at Samos of Phrynichos' treachery. Peisandros, meanwhile, was on his way to Athens to propose the recall of Alkibiades and the installation of an oligarchy. After some discussion he won his point. However, he did not dare to leave Athens without attempting to cripple the power of Phrynichos, who, in his official position, could do much harm to Alkibiades' cause. Peisandros, therefore, managed the deposition of Phrynichos on a false charge, alleging that he had betrayed Iasos and Amorges. The real reason, says Thucydides, was that Phrynichos did not favour the negotiations with Alkibiades.⁶⁶

Another group which was unfavourable to the return

⁶⁵ Thucydides, VIII, 48, 4.

⁶⁶ Thucydides, VIII, 54, 3.

of Alkibiades was the Eumolpidae and Kerykes. They protested that it would be an outrage to restore a man who had defied the laws and violated the mysteries. Peisandros then took each one of these objectors aside and convinced them that there was no hope for Athens unless the King could be persuaded to join the Athenians. This could be accomplished only through an oligarchy and Alkibiades.⁶⁷ By his logic he conquered their objections.

The oligarchic faction itself did not seem to be entirely convinced that Alkibiades had to be recalled if the plan was to succeed. Thucydides remarks that the oligarchic Athenians at Samos agreed among themselves that since Alkibiades could not see eye to eye with them they would leave him alone, for he was not a suitable person to bring into an oligarchy.⁶⁸ Phrynichos too, we are told, was very eager for an oligarchy. He knew that Alkibiades was aware of all his intrigues and was sure that Alkibiades would never be recalled by an oligarchic government.⁶⁹ There is also the testimony of the younger Alkibiades that there was friction between his father and the oligarchs. He states that Alkibiades the elder was a vigorous opponent

⁶⁷ Thucydides, VIII, 53, 2-3.

⁶⁸ Thucydides, VIII, 63, 4.

⁶⁹ Thucydides, VIII, 68, 3.

of the Four Hundred and thought that there was little they could do to overthrow the democracy until they removed him. He adds that it was this oligarchic element that combined the charges of profanation of the mysteries and conspiracy against the democracy, brought an impeachment, and forced Alkibiades to return from the Sicilian expedition.⁷⁰ Of course, the young man was eager to clear his father's name and perhaps his statement that Alkibiades was strongly opposed to the oligarchy should be accepted with caution. If it had been to his advantage to deal with an oligarchy, he would not have hesitated. He was deterred by his relations with Tissaphernes which, we find, were not so amicable as they might have been.⁷¹ Once allowance has been made for some exaggeration, however, there is no reason to doubt the son's declaration that it was the men who caused his father's exile who caused the downfall of the democracy. The hostility which began when Alkibiades gained popularity with the Demos never waned.

Peisandros had succeeded in winning the oligarchs and the Eumolpidae and Kerykes to his proposal that Alkibiades be returned to Athens. He had rendered Phrynichos harmless. There yet remained one powerful enemy. It was

⁷⁰ Isokrates, 16, 5-8.

⁷¹ Thucydides, VIII, 56, 2.

not until the revolution of 411 was almost an accomplished fact that Androkles, who had done so much to mold public opinion, was put to death to gratify Alkibiades.⁷² This measure too was no doubt instigated by Peisandros.

The sequel to the parody and mutilation is ample evidence that the various factions retained their grudges through the years. The issue was not the safety and well-being of Athens, but the advancement of the political parties. The revolution of 411 and the advent of the Thirty in 404 are proof that the oligarchs were not intimidated by the punishment of the hermokopidai. They were ready to regard their casualties as the results of a conflict which could be defined as a civil war. But not only had the oligarchs and the friends of Alkibiades suffered; Athens herself was the recipient of the most grievous wound. From the time of the conflict until Alkibiades disappeared from the scene the men who could have done much for the state refused to use what talents they possessed for any purpose but revenge or personal advancement. In the very centre of all this plotting and conspiracy was Alkibiades, who had become himself a major political issue. There was no Nikias who was willing to forget personal animosities when the existence of the city hung in the balance.

⁷²

Thucydides, VIII, 65, 2.

BIBLIOGRAPHY AND ABBREVIATIONS

A.J.P. = American Journal of Philology.

Andokides, edited by F. Blass (fourth edition, revised by C. Fuhr, Leipzig, 1913).

Andokides, translated by K. J. Maidment in Minor Attic Orators, I (The Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge, Mass., and London, 1941).

Andrewes, A., "Eunomia," Class. Quart., XXXII (1938), pp. 89-102.

Antiphon, edited by T. Thalheim (Leipzig, 1914).

Aristophanes, edited by F. W. Hall and W. M. Geldart (2 vols., Oxford, 1906-1907).

Aristophanes, Scholia, edited by Fr. Dübner (Paris, 1842).

Aristotle, Πολιτεία Ἀθηναίων, edited by H. Oppermann (Leipzig, 1928).

Athenaios, translated by Charles Burton Gulick (The Loeb Classical Library, 7 vols., London and New York, 1927-1941).

A.T.L. = The Athenian Tribute Lists.

Baiter, G., and Sauppe, H., Oratores Attici (2 vols., Zürich, 1839-1850).

B.C.H. = Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique.

Beloch, Karl Julius, Griechische Geschichte, II, 1 (second edition, Strassburg, 1914).

- Busolt, Georg, Griechische Geschichte, III, 2 (Gotha, 1904).
- Calhoun, George Miller, Athenian Clubs in Politics and Litigation (Bulletin of the University of Texas, no. 262, Humanistic Series, no. 14, Austin, 1913).
- Carcopino, Jérôme, L'ostracisme athénien (Paris, 1935).
- Class. Phil. = Classical Philology.
- Class. Quart. = The Classical Quarterly.
- Demosthenes, edited by S. H. Butcher (3 vols., Oxford, 1903-1931).
- Diels, Hermann, Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker, II (third edition, Berlin, 1912).
- Diodoros, edited by F. Vogel and C. Fischer (5 vols., Leipzig, 1888-1906).
- Diogenes Laertios, translated by R. D. Hicks (The Loeb Classical Library, 2 vols., London and New York, 1925).
- Dübner, Fr., Scholia Graeca in Aristophanem (Paris, 1842).
- Ekphantides, edited by T. Kock, I, pp. 9-10.
- Eupolis, edited by T. Kock, I, pp. 258-369.
- Ferguson, William Scott, "Orgeonika," Hesperia, Suppl. VIII (1949), pp. 130-163.
- Freeman, Kathleen, Ancilla to the Pre-Socratic Philosophers (Cambridge, Mass., 1948).
- Gomme, A. W., A Historical Commentary on Thucydides, I (Oxford, 1945).
- Grote, George, A History of Greece; from the Earliest Period to the Close of the Generation Contemporary with Alexander the Great (10 vols., London, 1888).

- Hatzfeld, Jean, Alcibiade (Paris, 1940).
- Homolle, Th., "Documents nouveaux sur l'amphictyonie Attico-Délienne," B.C.H., VIII (1884), pp. 282-327.
- I.G., I² = Inscriptiones Graecae, I, editio minor, edited by F. Hiller von Gaertringen (Berlin, 1924).
- I.G., II² = Inscriptiones Graecae, II-III, editio minor, edited by J. Kirchner (Berlin, from 1913).
- Isokrates, edited by F. Blass (second edition, revised by G. E. Benseler, 2 vols., Leipzig, 1902).
- Jacoby, Felix, Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker (Berlin, from 1923).
- Kirchner, J., Prosopographia Attica (2 vols., Leipzig, 1901-1903).
- Kock, T., Comicorum Atticorum Fragmenta (3 vols., Leipzig, 1880-1888).
- Kratinos, edited by T. Kock, I, pp. 11-144.
- Kritias, edited by H. Diels, II, pp. 308-329.
- Lysias, edited by T. Thalheim (second edition, Leipzig, 1913).
- Meritt, Benjamin D., "Attic Inscriptions of the Fifth Century," Hesperia, XIV (1945), pp. 115-119.
- Meritt, Benjamin D., "Greek Inscriptions," Hesperia, V (1936), pp. 390-393.
- Meritt, Benjamin D., "Greek Inscriptions," Hesperia, VII (1938), pp. 82-91.

- Meritt, Benjamin D., "Greek Inscriptions," Hesperia, VIII (1939), pp. 69-76.
- Meritt, B. D., "The Athenian Alliances with Rhegion and Leontinoi," Class. Quart., XL (1946), pp. 85-91.
- Meritt, Benjamin Dean, The Athenian Calendar in the Fifth Century (Cambridge, Mass., 1928).
- Meritt, Benjamin Dean, Wade-Gery, H. T., McGregor, Malcolm Francis, The Athenian Tribute Lists, I (Cambridge, Mass., 1939), II and III (Princeton, 1949-1950).
- Nauck, A., Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta (Leipzig, 1889).
- Notopoulos, James A., "The Name of Plato," Class. Phil., XXXIV (1939), pp. 135-145.
- Ollier, F., Le Mirage Spartiate (Paris, 1933).
- Pausanias, edited by F. Spiro (3 vols., Leipzig, 1903).
- Pherekrates, edited by T. Kock, I, pp. 145-209.
- Phrynichos, edited by T. Kock, I, pp. 369-391.
- Plato, edited by J. Burnet (5 vols., Oxford, 1903-1910).
- Platon Komikos, edited by T. Kock, I, pp. 601-667.
- Plutarch, Moralia, edited by C. Hubert, W. Nachstädt, W. R. Paton, M. Pohlenz, W. Sieveking, I. Wegehaupt, J. B. Titchener (Leipzig, from 1925).
- Plutarch, Vitae Parallelae, edited by C. Lindskog and K. Ziegler (3 vols., Leipzig, 1914-1935).
- Powell, J. U., New Chapters in the History of Greek Literature, Third Series (Oxford, 1933).

- Raubitschek, Antony E., "Greek Inscriptions," Hesperia, XII (1943), pp. 37-48.
- Raubitschek, A. E., "The Case against Alcibiades (Andocides IV)," T.A.P.A., LXXIX (1948), pp. 191-210.
- Stephans, Dorothy, Critias, Life and Literary Remains (Diss., Cincinnati, 1939).
- Suidas, edited by A. Adler (1 vol. in 5 parts, Leipzig, 1928-1938).
- T.A.P.A. = Transactions of the American Philological Association.
- Taylor, A. E., Plato, the Man and His Work (London, 1926).
- Telekleides, edited by T. Kock, I, pp. 209-224.
- Theopompos, edited by F. Jacoby, Frag. gr. Hist., IIB, no. 115.
- Thucydides, edited by H. Stuart Jones (revised by J. E. Powell, 2 vols., Oxford, 1942).
- Uhlfelder, Myra L., Alkibiades and Stasis (Thesis, Cincinnati, 1946).
- Vanderpool, Eugene, "The Rectangular Rock-cut Shaft," Hesperia, XV (1946), pp. 271-275.
- West, Allen B., "Pericles' Political Heirs," Class. Phil., XIX (1924), pp. 124-146; 201-228.
- Weston, Eleanor, "New Datings for Some Attic Honorary Decrees," A.J.P., LXI (1940), pp. 345-357.

Woodhead, A. G., "I.G., I², 95, and the Ostracism of Hyperbolus," Hesperia, XVIII (1949), pp. 78-83.

Xenophon, edited by E. C. Marchant (5 vols., Oxford, 1900-1920).