

1273^b18 ff.) on the fact that Cretan cities, each dependent economically on a subjected population of *περίοικοι*, could not afford to become involved with external enemies.

26. 1. αὐτοκράτορας εἶναι - - - πράσσειν ἢ ἂν αὐτοῖς δοκῇ ἄριστα εἶναι [Ἀθηναίους]: cf. 8. 2 n. In such a formula, it is inept to delete Ἀθηναίους.

2. καταλόγους ἐποιοῦντο: the expression ἐκ καταλόγου (e.g. vii. 16. 1) and the antithesis in 43 between hoplites ἐκ καταλόγου and hoplites who are *θῆτες*, together with ὑπὲρ τὸν κατάλογον = 'past military age' in D. xiii. 4, show that there was a single κατάλογος which contained the names of all those required by virtue of their capital and age to serve as hoplites; the *κατάλογοι* now mentioned (cf. 31. 3), in which, apparently (43), 1,500 men were entered, represent a selection from the comprehensive κατάλογος (Jones, 163).

ἄρτι δ' ἀνελήφει ἡ πόλις ἑαυτήν: cf. 12. 1 n.

καὶ τοῦ ξυνεχοῦς πολέμου: i.e. the Archidamian War.

27-29. Mutilation of the Herms

EXCURSUS: THE HERMS AND THE MYSTERIES

Discussion of chapters 27-9 necessarily embraces also 60-1. The relation of the events described in these chapters to (i) the operations of war and (ii) the account given in Andokides, *De Mysterioris*, is fundamental to the chronology of 415 and relevant to the chronology of the following two years.

(i) Calendar Equations

It does not seem easy at the present time to make any statement about the Athenian calendar which is both significant and undisputed. It is certainly not possible to offer an equation between an Athenian date and a Julian date in the neighbourhood of 415 without making certain assumptions; what is important is that the assumptions made should be defensible by citation of evidence drawn from years as close to 415 as possible, and it appears to me possible to defend a certain set of equations entirely by evidence drawn from the quarter-century within which the year 415 falls.

Since the moon takes a fraction more than 29½ days to go round the earth, moon and month can be kept in step for some time by an alternation of 29-day and 30-day months; but they cannot be kept in step indefinitely by this simple alternation, and, moreover, it is evident that the Athenians could on occasion decide to intercalate a day or a series of days.

At least at one point during the years 424/3-417/16 the moon and

the month were out of step at Athens, *either* because many more than half of a succession of months had 30 days each, *or* because many more than half had 29 each, *or* because some days had been intercalated (as is demonstrable at a later period), or omitted, at irregular and unpredictable intervals. The evidence for this lack of coincidence between moon and months is Ar. *Nu.* 607 ff., where the poet felicitously represents the gods as complaining that festivals had not been held on the days on which they were expecting them by calculation *κατὰ σελήνην*.¹ We see from Th. iv. 118. 12, 119. 1 that in 424/3 14 Elaphebolion at Athens = 12 Geraistios at Sparta, and from v. 19. 1 that in 422/1 25 Elaphebolion at Athens = 27 Artemisios at Sparta. These passages of Thucydides show that on each of the two occasions *either* the Athenian *or* the Spartan calendar was out of step with the moon, and they leave open the possibility that *both* were out of step. We do not know whether *Nu.* 607-26 belongs to the original version of the play, performed in Elaphebolion 423, or to some stage of its revision. The play was never completely revised, and was never performed again; the latest datable stratum of revision (553 ff. [cf. Σ]) belongs to the period 419-417.

Precisely the same passage of Aristophanes is evidence that moon and month were normally expected to be in step; otherwise the passage has no humorous point (as it would have none in a community which used a calendar like ours). Elsewhere in the play coincidence of moon and month is taken for granted, notably in 16 ff.,

ἐγὼ δ' ἀπόλλυμαι
ὁρῶν ἄγουσαν τὴν σελήνην εἰκάδας·
οἱ γὰρ τόκοι χωροῦσιν,

taken in conjunction with 1131 ff.,

πέμπτη, τετράς, τρίτη, μετὰ ταύτην δευτέρα,
εἴθ' ἦν ἐγὼ μάλιστα πασῶν ἡμερῶν
δέδοικα καὶ πέφρικα καὶ βδελύττομαι,
εὐθὺς μετὰ ταύτην ἔσθ' ἐνὶ τε καὶ νέα,

and with 749 ff., where Strepsiades says that if he could lock up the moon in a box, so that it could rise no more, he would not have to pay any interest,

ὅτι κατὰ μῆνα τὰργύριον δανείζεται.

¹ In ii. 28 Thucydides adds *κατὰ σελήνην* to *νουμηνία* in referring to the solar eclipse of 3 Aug. 431. He thereby indicates his awareness of the possibility that moon and month could on occasion be out of step, and as he goes on to make a general comment on solar eclipses exactitude is appropriate to the context. I do not see how any more can, or why it should, be made of that passage.

We see from *IG* i². 302 (*AFD* 160 ff.; *ML* 77) that in 415/14:

- (a) 66 ff.: on Prytany II. 20 the Treasurers of Athena lent the hellenotamiai 9 talents, which the hellenotamiai gave to the athlothetai for the Panathenaia.
- (b) 73 f.: on Prytany VIII. 3 they gave 300 talents to the hellenotamiai, who gave the sum [τρεῖς ἐν Σικελίαι (?) σ]τρατιάι.
- (c) 75 f.: on Prytany VIII. 20 they gave 4 talents 2,000 drachmai to the hellenotamiai ἐς τὰ(ς) ναῦς τὰς ἐς Σ[ικελίαν]]ς τὰ χρέματα.

The sum mentioned in (b) was waiting for the Athenian force when it returned to Katane after its attack on Kentoripa (vi. 94. 4). 'At the beginning of spring' (vi. 94. 1) the force had sailed from Katane to damage Syracusan cultivation around the site of Megara and in the plain of the Terias; from this foray it returned to Katane before departing for Kentoripa. It does not sound as if the departure for Kentoripa should be dated before 1 April; the arrival of the money from Athens should therefore be dated after 1 April.

We should expect Athens to do her best to send the money off before the end of March. What we restore in (c), ἐσκομισάσα]ς or διακομισάσα]ς, depends on whether we believe (i) that the sum of 300 talents was given to the hellenotamiai in readiness for the earliest practicable sailing, that they kept it while the reinforcements due to sail with it (250 cavalymen and 30 mounted archers) were assembled, and that they received the smaller payment on Prytany VIII. 20 immediately before the sailing, or (ii) that the ships sailed immediately after Prytany VIII. 3 and had returned, in need of reimbursement for the expenses of the voyage, by Prytany VIII. 20. The second alternative implies a quick turn-round and a surprisingly large reimbursement. I therefore prefer the former alternative, assuming that the greater part of the sum paid out on Prytany VIII. 20 was intended for the generals in Sicily, as advance payment of subsistence for the reinforcements.

On this hypothesis, Prytany VIII. 3 would fall in the third week of March, Prytany VIII. 20. in the first week of April, and the arrival of the ships at Katane in the middle of April.

This would date the payment for the Panathenaia, on Prytany II. 20 of 415/14, precisely six prytanies before the first week of April 414. The Panathenaia were celebrated on 28 Hekatombaion. We should expect the payment to be made immediately before the festival, when the amount of money required was known.¹

¹ The argument of J. A. Davison, *JHS* lxxviii (1958), 31 f., who believed that the payment was made into an 'imprest account' from which provision would eventually be made for the Great Panathenaia of 414/13, seems to me invalidated by (i) Dem. xxiv. 26-9, where it is represented as plausible that

We see from *IG* i². 304B (cf. Meritt, *TAPhA* xcv [1964], 204 ff.) that in 407/6 the sequence of ten prytanies which constituted a conciliar year equalled a sequence of twelve lunar months. But it is demonstrable from the preserved figures of capital and interest in *SEG* x. 227 (= *ML* 72) that in 426/5-423/2 the average length of a conciliar year was 366 days, an approximation to a solar year (cf., most recently, Mabel Lang in *Hesperia* xxxiii [1964], 146 ff.). The equations which we shall consider below show that in the period 422/1-412/11 the conciliar year cannot have equalled either a sequence of 12 lunar months or a sequence of 13. In default of positive evidence, we should not be justified in assuming that it had a total of days completely devoid of astronomical significance. I therefore assume that it continued, in that period, to be an approximation to the solar year; but since 366 days exceed a solar year by three-quarters of a day, we must be prepared for the possibility of a sequence of conciliar years of 365 days apiece.

On these assumptions, Prytany II. 20 of 415/14 would fall $\frac{6}{10} \times 366$ (or 365) days earlier than 4 April ± 3 , i.e. 28/9 Aug. ± 3 of 415.

On the further assumption that the payment to the athlothetai was made immediately before the festival, the Panathenaia of 415/14 are to be dated 30 Aug. ± 3 of 415.

There is only one precise equation by which this provisional conclusion can be controlled. That is 13 Skirophorion 433/2 = 27 June 432 (Diod. xii. 36. 2; *SPAW* 1904, 95 f.; Meritt, *The Athenian Calendar*, 88).

The interval from 13 Skirophorion 433/2 to 28 Hekatombaion 415/14 is:

Remaining days of Skirophorion 433/2	=	16 or 17
17 years (432/1-416/15) @ 354 days	=	6,018
n intercalated months @ 30 days	=	30n
First 28 days of 415/14	=	28
Total	=	6,062 (or 6,063) + 30n

The interval from 27 June 432 to 30 August ± 3 415 is:

Remaining days of 432	=	187
16 years (431-416) @ 365½ days	=	5,844
1 Jan. to 30 Aug. ± 3 415	=	242 ± 3
Total	=	6,273 ± 3

The value of 30n therefore lies within the limits 207 to 214. An allocation of 7 intercalated months (= 210 days) falls within these

the νομοθέται should be convened on 12 Hekatombaion to make provision for 'the Panathenaia', i.e. the ordinary Panathenaia, of 353/2 (Dion. Hal. *Ad Amm.* 4), and (ii) the fact that payment for goods is not uncommonly made after delivery.

limits, and suggests that 28 Hekatombaion 415/14 can in fact be equated with 30 August 415.

There is no other precise Athenian-Julian equation to serve as a control, but there are three other lunar-conciliar equations, two precise and one approximate, to control the conclusion that Prytany II. 20 of 415/14 fell just before 28 Hekatombaion and to indicate whether or not the allocation of seven intercalated months between Skirophorion 433/2 and Hekatombaion 415/14 is plausible.

(a) *SEG* x. 227 (= ML 72). 79: 23 Skirophorion 423/2 = Prytany X. 20 423/2.¹

Remaining days of Skirophorion 423/2 =	6 or 7
7 years (422/1-416/15) @ 354 days	= 2,478
<i>n</i> intercalated months @ 30 days	= 30 <i>n</i>
27 days of Hekatombaion 415/14	= 27
Total	= 2,511 (or 2,512) + 30 <i>n</i>
Remaining days of Prytany X 423/2 =	17
7 conciliar years (422/1-416/15) @	
366 days	= 2,562
Reduction in conciliar years for closer	
approximation to solar year	= -0 to -7
Prytany I 415/14	= 36 or 37
20 days of Prytany II 415/14	= 20
Total	= between 2,628 and 2,636

The value of 30*n* therefore lies within the limits 116 and 125. An allocation of 4 intercalated months (= 120 days) falls midway between these limits, and indicates that some of the conciliar years 422/1-416/15 had only 365 days apiece. (Cf. Meritt, *The Athenian Year*, 205.)

(b) *SEG* xiii. 21 records the sale of property of men condemned for impiety in 415. Erechtheis holds Prytany VII. The year cannot be 415/14, because in that year Erechtheis held Prytany II (*IG* i². 302 [= ML 77]. 67). It should therefore be 414/13, and *SEG* x. 229 shows that Erechtheis held Prytany VII in a year in which money was

¹ Pritchett in *AJP* lxxxv (1964), 40 f., denies the reading]δοει φ[, asserting that the first letter is not visible at all and that the fifth cannot be φ. The photograph which he publishes does not seem to me consonant with his argument (cf. Meritt, *ibid.* 412 ff.). In any case, in such a context it is hard to see what ΟΕΙ followed by part of a circular shape could be except ὀδδῆ φθίνοντος. As for Σκίροφοριῶνος, no other restoration is possible without assuming either an abnormal spelling (and for such an assumption cogent positive grounds must be adduced) or a degree of divergence between festival and conciliar equations much greater than is revealed by examination of the equations (a), (b), and (c).

paid 'for Sicily' (10 f.) and 'to Demosthenes Aphidnaios' (12 f.). In *SEG* xiii. 21 we find that 7 Gamelion and 25 Gamelion both fall within Prytany VII.

(c) According to Arist. *Ἀθ. π.* 32. 1 Prytany I. 1 411/10 was due to fall on 14 Skirophorion 412/11.

Let us see how these data cohere with the hypothesis that 27 Hekatombaion 415/14 = Prytany II. 20 415/14.

Total of days		
27 Hekatombaion 415/14	0	0 Prytany II. 20 415/14
		14
Remaining days of 415/14	327	308 to 310 End of conciliar year 415/14
1 intercalated month @ 30 days	357	
1 Gamelion 414/13	535	529 to 533 Prytany VII. 1 414/13
7 Gamelion 414/13	541	
25 Gamelion 414/13	559	565 to 570 Prytany VIII. 1 414/13
		673 to 676 End of conciliar year 414/13
End of festival year 414/13	711	1,038 to 1,042 End of conciliar year 413/12
End of festival year 413/12	1,065	
1 Skirophorion 412/11	1,390 or 1,391	1,403 to 1,408 End of conciliar year 412/11
14 Skirophorion 412/11	1,403 or 1,404	1,404 to 1,409 Prytany I. 1 411/10

Perhaps the most important item in this table is the relation between Gamelion and Prytany VII in 414/13. In relation to the proposition that the Athenians in the late fifth century intercalated miscellaneous days on such a scale that attempts to correlate festival, conciliar, and Julian dates are not a profitable use of the historian's time, *SEG* xiii. 21 is a random sample, and a particularly good sample in that it shows the situation as it was approximately halfway through a year. It tends to support the view that intercalation of miscellaneous days did not occur on a scale sufficient to deter us from the attempt to derive further equations from the few that survive. It must be remembered that whereas in the study of the early sixth century we have every reason for satisfaction if we can date an event within ten years, and in the Pentekontaetia if we can date an event within a year, in the study of the Peloponnesian War time is well spent if the margin of error in the dating of an event

can be reduced to ten days. It appears to me that the margin of error in dating the Panathenaia of 415/14, the dispatch of 300 talents in the spring of 414, and the Athenian expedition to Kentoripa is less than that.¹

One complication remains to be mentioned. *IG* i². 76 (= ML 73), a decree relating to the offerings at Eleusis, provides (line 53) for the intercalation of a second Hekatombaion in the following year. It is held by Dinsmoor (*The Archons of Athens*, 335 ff.) and Meritt (*AFD* 173) that this decree was passed in 416/15; and if that is correct it follows that there were two Hekatombaions in 415/14. In that case, then:

either the Panathenaia of 415/14 were celebrated in Hekatombaion I, Hekatombaion II is the intercalated month posited above in the discussion of *SEG* xiii. 21 and Arist. *Μθ.* π. 32. 1, and the four intercalated months posited in discussion of *SEG* x. 227. 79 all fell in the years 422/1–416/15,

or the Panathenaia of 415/14 were celebrated in Hekatombaion II, Hekatombaion I must be reckoned as one of the four intercalated months posited in discussion of *SEG* x. 227, and a month was intercalated in the first half of 414/13.

If the second of these alternatives is correct, every reference to 'Hekatombaion 415/14' on pp. 266–9 is to be understood as a reference to Hekatombaion II.

I do not find the immediate grounds for dating *IG* i². 76 to 416/15 at all impressive, and there are even, in my view, counter-indications; but the strength of the case for this dating rests on the pattern of intercalation in which it must be a coherent element, and in particular on the fact that Antiphon vi, delivered in a year in which 16 Hekatombaion = Prytany I. 1 and Erechtheis held the first prytany (§§ 11–12 ~ 44 f.), must be given a date earlier than 411 and later than the time at which the circulation of written versions of forensic speeches began. But no decision on *IG* i². 76 or Antiphon vi can affect the equations:

Panathenaia 415/14 = 30 August 415 (with the margin of error indicated above)

Dispatch of 300T = first week of April 414

¹ I am aware that in equating Prytany II. 20 of 415/14 with 29 August 415 I differ by 2 days from Meritt's table in *AFD* (176) and by 4 days from his revised table in *The Athenian Year*, 218. In view of the approximations involved in my calculations, and the uncertainty introduced into many such calculations by the possibility that some festival years may have exceeded 354 (or 384) days—through a planned excess of 30-day months and/or the intercalation of individual days—the difference does not seem to me important for the purposes with which my excursus is concerned.

(ii) *The Sequence of Events in 415*

Certain relations between events are not as precise as has sometimes been assumed. The herms were mutilated during the period of preparation; whether early in the period or very shortly before the expedition was due to sail, neither Thucydides nor any other ancient source tells us. The fleet sailed *θέρους μεσοῦντος ἡδῆ* (vi. 30. 1), which means not 'at the time of the summer solstice' but 'after the middle period of the summer had begun', an expression which could be used of any date between early May and late July. Isaios vi. 14 speaks of a certain Pistoxenos who went on the expedition (fifty-two years earlier) 'in the archonship of Arimnestos', i.e., strictly speaking, before 1 Hekatombaion 415; but even if we could be sure that Isaios knew the date of departure so precisely, his evidence would not be disturbing or surprising, and, in any case, if he knew that the expedition was voted and prepared during the archonship of Arimnestos he would not be pedantic about the date of departure.

A further complication has been introduced by the celebration of the Adonia, which occurred at some stage during the preparations (Freeman, ii. 114, has no justification for saying 'the day of their sailing'). The relevant passage of Aristophanes is quoted and explained on p. 224. The date of the Adonia is disputed. 4 Munichion, suggested by Meritt (*Hesperia* iv [1935], 574 f., cf. F. R. Walton, *HTHR* xxxi [1938], 69 ff.), is acceptable only if Adonis is identified with the Eros associated with Aphrodite in the sanctuary on the north slope of the Akropolis. 19 or 20 July, on which the Adonia were celebrated by Syrians and in the eastern part of the Roman empire generally (F. Cumont, *Syria* viii [1927], 330 ff., xvi [1935], 46 ff.), implies a surprisingly late date for the departure of the expedition; and, what is more important, if the Athenians really assigned the Adonia not to a numbered day in their own festival calendar but to an event (the rising of Sirius) in the solar year, it was unusual, even unique, among Athenian festivals (cf. Cumont ap. Hatzfeld, *RÉG* 1 [1937], 302 ff.). Early autumn, suggested by Deubner, *Attische Feste*, 221, is obviously irreconcilable with Aristophanes, and Deubner in fact, by some slip of the mind, treats Aristophanes' evidence as if it had been invented by Plutarch. If the vase-painting reproduced in his plate 25. 2 represents the Adonia, either the bunch of grapes which the woman therein is carrying is an artist's symbol for fruit in general (cf. *ῶρια* --- ὅσα δρῦος ἄκρα φέρονται offered to the dead Adonis in Theocr. 15. 112) or grapes were kept throughout the winter (cf. the criticism of Deubner by A. D. Nock, *Gnomon* x [1934], 290 ff., who puts the case for a date in the spring).

We can now turn to the sequence of events presented by Thucydides and by Andokides i (*De Mysteriis*). In Thucydides the sequence is:

1. Mutilation of 'most' of the herms in one night (27. 1).
2. Rewards offered for information, and a guarantee of immunity for anyone who might incriminate himself in informing (27. 2).
3. Information from some 'metics and slaves' about (a) earlier mutilations of statues and (b) profane performances of the mysteries in private houses. Alkibiades is implicated in the latter (28. 1).
4. Decision that Alkibiades should none the less set sail with the expedition, to be recalled for trial when necessary (29. 3).
5. Departure of the expedition (30. 1).
6. Information is laid and many arrests are made (53. 2, 60. 2).
7. Some of those denounced go into exile (implied by 60. 4).
8. Confession by one of the accused, implicating others (60. 2 f.).
9. Release of this man and of those not implicated. Execution of those who have not already fled (60. 4).
10. Recall of Alkibiades to answer the accusation of profanation (53. 1, 61. 4 f.).
11. Escape of Alkibiades at Thurioi on his way home (61. 7).
12. Condemnation of Alkibiades in his absence (ibid.).

There are two events which cannot be fitted precisely into this sequence:

13. κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν τοῦτον ἐν ᾧ περὶ ταῦτα ἐθορυβοῦντο a Spartan force came as far as the Isthmos, causing a fear in Athens that there was a plot to betray the city (61. 2). If the reference of τοῦτον and ταῦτα is strict, it is to the period after the case of the herms was regarded as settled and Athenian energies were turned on to clearing up the matter of the mysteries (61. 1). Cf. MacDowell, 184.
14. κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν χρόνον Alkibiades' associates in Argos were suspected of an oligarchic plot, and hostages held by Athens on behalf of the Argive democracy were sent back to Argos for execution (61. 3).

Taken by itself, the account is straightforward and unobjectionable. It gives us a clear impression that no information was laid about the herms until after the expedition had left. The recall of Alkibiades came after the expedition had secured the allegiance of Naxos and Katane, failed to get that of Messene and Kamarina, and made a brief demonstration against Syracuse (50-2). It was followed by an operation against Hykkara, dealings with Segesta, a march across country from Hykkara to Katane, dealings with the Sikels, and an unsuccessful attack on Hybla Geleatis (62), after which τὸ θέρος ἐτελεύτα. The end of the Thucydidean θέρος is the end of October (cf. vol. iii, 706 ff.). It would be possible to estimate the minimum time required for the voyage from Athens to Rhegion

and the operations of cc. 50-2, and for those of c. 62, but quite impossible to estimate maxima; we have no basis for determining, for example, how long the fleet rested at Rhegion (44. 3), we do not know whether a period of inactivity intervened between the attack on Hybla and the end of the campaigning season, and the brevity of the narrative in 62 may well be deceptive. We must wait and see what periods are suggested by the other data, and decide then on their coherence.

Evidence independent of Thucydides is provided by Andokides i (*De Mysteriis*), and to a lesser extent by Plutarch's *Alcibiades*. One must remember that Andokides is pleading for his life (and incidentally for his reputation) sixteen years after the events which he describes. His attitude to the facts of the case is far removed from that of an objective historian; nevertheless, we are not entitled to reject his evidence unless we can show in what respects it is to his advantage to conceal or misrepresent facts, and there is an encouraging degree of coincidence between the documents incorporated in his speech, listing men denounced by various informers, and the inscriptions which record the sale of the effects of the men condemned (*SEG* xiii. 12 ff., xix. 23 ff.).

Andokides deals with the herms and the mysteries separately (11 ff. and 34 ff. respectively) and gives little explicit indication of the chronological relation between the two sequences. The essentials of his account are:

1. The expedition is ready to leave; an assembly is being held τοῖς στρατηγοῖς; Alkibiades is denounced for profaning the mysteries, and the prytaneis receive information from a slave called Andromachos (11 f.).
2. Information is given by Teukros, a metic, on the herms and the mysteries (15, 34 f., both passages with documents).
 - 3a. Information on the mysteries from Agariste (16).
 - 3b. Information on the herms from Diokleides (37 ff.).
 - 4a. Information on the mysteries from a slave called Lydos (17).
 - 4b. General alarm; the city under arms; Andokides and others arrested (45 ff.).
 - 5a. Rewards given at the Panathenaia to Andromachos and Teukros (28).
 - 5b. Andokides confesses. Release of those not implicated. Execution of Diokleides for false information. End of general alarm (65 f.).

Presumably Teukros gave his information on the herms and on the mysteries at the same time. It would not have been easy for him to justify withholding part of his information until a later date (Diokleides, as we shall see, gave a cogent reason for his own delay);

and if he did withhold it, I see no way in which it could have helped Andokides' case to conceal this fact. If, therefore, the expedition left before Teukros informed, Thucydides' *μετοίκων* (28. 1) is misleading; if it left after, his *περὶ μὲν τῶν Ἑρμῶν οὐδέν* is false. The former alternative is more easily explicable. Thucydides says in 53. 1 that the Athenian people in this matter accepted evidence from unworthy sources, arresting good men on the testimony of bad; his apparent irony in 60. 4 (*ὁ δὲ δῆμος ὁ τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἄσμενος λαβών, ὡς ᾤετο, τὸ σαφὲς κ.τ.λ.*) is an indication of his feelings. In 28. 1 he has sacrificed accuracy to indignant rhetoric (cf. p. 328 and vii. 42. 3 n.).

Thucydides' statement in 61. 1, 'now that they thought they had the truth about the herms, they were all the more convinced that the profanation of the mysteries was Alkibiades' doing' must not be taken to mean that no serious inquiry was pursued into the profanation until after Andokides' confession. I see no good reason why the information of Agariste and Lydos (items 3a and 4a in Andokides' sequence) should not have preceded that of Diokleides (MacDowell, 183 f., places them much later), and no reason why the *Salaminia* should not have been sent off to bring Alkibiades home very soon after Andokides' confession.

The following indications of time may be extracted from Andokides:

1. The first information about the mysteries was given *immediately* before the expedition was due to sail.
2. Andromachos and Teukros received their rewards at the Panathenaia. One would not expect any rewards to be paid until the guilt of the men denounced was established by trial or 'confessed' by flight. I therefore assume that the *Salaminia* returned to Athens before the Panathenaia. (Note that Alkibiades was not the only person recalled from Sicily; there were others with him, some accused of profaning the mysteries and others of mutilating the herms [53. 1].)
3. Diokleides alleged that he recognized the mutilators by the light of a full moon (And. i. 38). According to Plu. *Alc.* 20. 8 the mutilation actually occurred on the last night of a lunar period (*ἐνὸς καὶ νέας*). If both Andokides and Plutarch are right, Diokleides in fabricating his story made a fundamental mistake about the state of the moon on the night of the mutilation. Is this credible? No one, in designing a story about the recognition of people at night—a story which, if disbelieved, may cost him his life—can fail to satisfy himself of the plausibility of the narrative on the issue which is crucial, the means of recognition. Diokleides did not, after all, make up his story on the spur of the moment; when it was eventually questioned, he revealed that he had been put up to it by Alkibiades Phegusios and Amiantos of Aigina (65). Now the mention of the full moon in Andokides' account of Diokleides' information (38) has a simple

purpose: it explains why he was up and about at that hour of the night. He had to go to Laureion; *ἀναστὰς δὲ πρὸ ψευθεῖς τῆς ὥρας βαδίζειν εἶναι δὲ πανσέληνον*. Although Andokides discredits Diokleides and endorses the confession of fraud which brought the informer to execution (65 f.), he nowhere mentions or implies any fatal flaw or inconsistency in the story itself or any consideration, other than his own more circumstantial story, which led to the discovery of its falsehood.

According to Plu. *Alc.* 20. 6 'Thucydides did not name the informers, but others name Diokleides and Teukros' (there follow two quotations from the comic poet Phrynichos). 'Yet those who laid information made no certain or reliable revelation. One of them (*εἷς δ' αὐτῶν*), on being asked how he recognized the faces of the mutilators, answered "by the light of the moon". He was totally discredited, *ἐνὸς καὶ νέας οὔσης ὅτε ταῦτ' ἔδρατο*.' It looks as if Plutarch's source did not name Diokleides as the man caught out. We may wonder whether the story of the blunder originally referred to the mutilation of the herms at all, and suspicion is strengthened by Diod. xiii. 2. 3 f.: 'It came about that the herms were mutilated. . . . A private citizen came to the Council and said that *τῇ νομηνίᾳ*, in the middle of the night, he had seen some men going into the house of a metic, and Alkibiades among them. Being asked by the Council how, since it was night, he recognized their faces, he said he had seen them by the light of the moon. So this man convicted himself of false accusation' (sc. because he had himself spoken of *νομηνία*) 'and was disbelieved.' Neither Plutarch nor Diodoros suggests that the informer who blundered was taken seriously for long or did any harm. In Diodoros' account there is no significant point of contact with Diokleides at all. The presence of Alkibiades and the importance of his going into a house show that the anecdote originally referred not to the herms but to the mysteries, and as such it is consistent and acceptable. Its source, I suggest, was a fourth-century orator illustrating by examples from the past (cf. Antiphon v. 59 f., D. xxi. 58 ff., 182 f.) an argument about the unreliability of informers. The mistake of Diodoros' source, perhaps under the influence of the mention of the moon in Andokides, was to detach the anecdote from the less spectacular impiety and attach it to the one which assumed a more conspicuous role in tradition (cf. p. 280), and Plutarch perpetuated the mistake. Once the mistake had been made, the statement that the herms were mutilated on a night when there was no moon followed from it.¹

I therefore conclude (cf. *CR* N.S. xv [1965], 247 ff.) that the herms were mutilated under a full moon—useful, in any case, for an operation

¹ Grote, vi. 35 n. 1, rejected the testimony of Plutarch and Diodoros on the moon but still insisted that they were speaking of Diokleides.

on such a scale in an unlit ancient city. Assuming, as above, a high degree of coincidence between moon and month, the possible dates for the mutilation are (± 2 in each case) 25 April, 25 May, 23 June, and 23 July.

4. Diokleides affirmed that shortly after he had witnessed the mutilation he was approached by Euphemos, one of the men concerned, and he asked Euphemos for money. Euphemos and some associates promised to give him two talents *εἰς τὸν εἰσιόντα* (*ἐπιόντα* cj. Emperius) *μῆνα*, but they failed to do so; therefore he was now informing against them (And. i. 38 ff.). It is possible that *ὁ εἰσιὼν μῆν* might mean 'the month now beginning' or 'the month which has just begun' (cf. Hdt. vi. 59: 'when a king dies and another comes to the throne, *οὗτος ὁ εἰσιὼν* [i.e. the *next* king] releases any Spartiate who is a public debtor') but to Andokides' Athenian hearers the words *εἰς τὸν εἰσιόντα μῆνα* would most naturally mean 'in the next month'; cf. *IG* i². 94 (of 418/17), where *ἐπὶ τῆς βολῆς τῆς ἐοῦσῆς* (31 f.) is distinguished from *ἐπὶ τῆς βολῆς* (21), and *Ἀθ. π.* 31. 2 *τοὺς δὲ αἰρεθέντας ἀρχειν τὸν εἰσιόντα ἐνιαυτόν* (~ 32. 1). Since it was necessary for Diokleides' story that the period in which he was promised payment should have elapsed, and the mutilation occurred on the night of a full moon, we must posit an interval of one and a half months between the mutilation and his information.

Now, if Diokleides informed at the beginning of Hekatombaion, the time left for the arrest of Andokides and his friends, the confession of Andokides, the dispatch of the *Salaminia* to Sicily and its return with the news that Alkibiades had escaped at Thurioi, all before the Panathenaia (28 Hekatombaion), is very short, though not impossibly short. If we are to make sure of allowing enough time for these events, we must put Diokleides' information at the beginning of Skirophorion, and construct this scheme:

c. 16 Munichion	c. 25 May	Mutilation of the herms.
Beginning of Thargelion	Early June	Departure of the expedition.
1 Skirophorion	6 July	Information of Diokleides.
End of Skirophorion	Early August	Alkibiades leaves Katane.
28 Hekatombaion	2 September	Rewards given to informers.

This allows two months for the voyage from Athens to Sicily, the pause at Rhegion and the operations of cc. 50-2, and two and a half months, from mid-August to the end of October, for the operations of c. 62.

(iii) *Politics and Prosopography*

The following list includes all those known to have been denounced for complicity in the impieties of 415. H = denounced for mutilation

of herms; M = denounced for profanation of mysteries; A = Andokides i; S₁ = *SEG* xiii; S₂ = *SEG* xix.

		<i>Charge and Informer</i>	<i>Result</i>
Adeimantos, son of Leukolophides, Skambonides	M	Agariste A 16	Fled ¹ A 16; S ₁ 17. 17, 53, 116, 131, 174, 178; 21. 10, 24
Akumenos	M	Lydos A 18	Fled ¹ A 18
Alkibiades, son of Kleinias, Skambonides	M ²	Andromachos A 11 ff. (cf. Th.)	Fled ¹ A 13, 16 (+ Th.)
	M ²	Agariste A 16	
Alkibiades Phegusios ³		False information A 65	Fled ¹ A 65; S ₁ 19. 3 f.
Alkisthenes	H	Teukros A 35	Fled or executed ⁴ A 35, 52, 67
Amiantos of Aigina		False information A 65	Fled ¹ A 65
Andokides, son of Leogoras, Kydathenaieus	H ⁵	Diokleides; himself A 40, 48, 61 (cf. Th.)	Pardoned Th.; cf. A. 48 ff.
Antidoros	H	Teukros A 35, 52	Fled or executed ⁴ A 35, 52, 67
Antiphon	M	Teukros A 15	Fled ¹ A 15
Apsephion	H	Diokleides A 43	Fled but returned A 44, 66
Archebiades	M	Andromachos A 13	Fled ¹ A 13
Archidamos	H	Teukros A 35	Fled or executed ⁴ A 35, 52, 67
Archippos ⁶	M	Andromachos A 13	Fled ¹ A 13
Aristomenes ⁶	M	Andromachos A 13	Fled ¹ A 13
Autokrator	M	Lydos A 18	Fled ¹ A 18
Axiokhos, son of Alkibiades, ⁷ Skambonides	M	Agariste A 16	Fled ¹ A 16; S ₂ 24. 11; 25. 13
Chairedemos, son of Elpias (-os?), Ach[	H	Andokides A 52, 67	Fled ¹ A 59, 68; S ₁ 19. 7 f.
Charippos	H	Teukros A 35	Fled or executed ⁴ A 35, 52, 67
Charmides ⁸	M	Agariste A 16	Fled ¹ A 16

EXCURSUS

	<i>Charge and Informer</i>	<i>Result</i>
Charmides, son of Aristoteles	H Diokleides A 47 f.	Released A 66
Diakritos	H Andokides A 52, 67	Fled ¹ A 59, 68
Diogenes	M Andromachos A 13	Fled ¹ A 13
Diognetos	M Teukros A 15	Fled ¹ A 15
Eryximachos ⁹	H Teukros A 35	Fled or executed ⁴ A 35, 52, 67
Eukrates, son of Nikeratos, Kydantides	H Diokleides A 47	Released A 66
Euktemon	H Teukros A 35	Fled or executed ⁴ A 35, 52
Euphemos, son of Telokles ¹⁰	H Diokleides A 40, 47	Released A 66
Euphiletos, son of Timotheos, Kydathenaieus	H Teukros A 35	Fled or executed ⁴ A 35, 52, 67; S ₁ 17. 88;
	H Andokides A 56, 61 ff.	21. 14
	M ¹¹ ? S ₁ locc. citt.	
Eurydamas ¹²	H Teukros A 35	Fled or executed ⁴ A 35, 52, 67
Eurymachos, son of Eukleides	H Teukros A 35	Fled or executed ⁴ A 35, 52, 67; S ₁ 13. 183
Glaukippos	H Teukros A 35	Fled or executed ⁴ A 35, 52, 67
Gnipphonides	M Teukros A 15	Fled ¹ A 15
Hephaistodoros	M Teukros A 15	Fled ¹ A 15; S ₁ 12. 10
Isonomos	M Teukros A 15	Fled ¹ A 15
Kallias, son of Alkmeon	H Diokleides A 47	Released A 66
Kallias, son of Telokles ¹⁰	H Diokleides A 42, cf. 47	Released A 66
Kephisodoros, metoikos in Peiraieus ⁶	M Teukros A 15	Fled ¹ A 15; S ₁ 12. 33
Kritias	H Diokleides A 47	Released A 66
Leogoras	M Lydos A 17, 19	Escaped prosecution ¹³ A 17
	H Diokleides A 47	Released A 66, cf. And. ii. 7 f.

THE HERMS AND THE MYSTERIES

	<i>Charge and Informer</i>	<i>Result</i>
Lysistratos	H Andokides A 52, 67	Fled ¹ A 59, 68
Mantitheos	H Diokleides A 43	Fled, but returned A 44, 66
Meletos ¹⁴	M Andromachos A 12 f.	Fled ¹ A 13, cf. 35, 52, 67
	H Teukros A 35	
Menestratos	H Teukros A 35	Fled or executed ⁴ A 35, 52, 67
Nikides, ¹⁵ son of Phoinikides, Meliteus	M Andromachos A 13	Fled ¹ A 13; S ₁ 13. 172, 176; 15. 17 f.; 17. 85 f., 167
Nisaios, son of Taureas	H Diokleides A 47	Released A 66
Oionias, ¹⁶ son of Oionochares, Ateneus	M Andromachos A 13	Fled ¹ A 13; S ₁ 13. 177, 179; 14. 311; 19. 8 f.; 21. 33
Panaitios (1)	M Andromachos A 13	Fled ¹ A 13
Panaitios (2) ¹⁷	H Andokides A 52, 67	Fled ¹ A 59, 68; S ₁ 13. 170 f. ¹⁸
Pantakles	M Teukros A 15	Fled ¹ A 15
Phaidros, son of Pythokles, Myrrhinusios	M Teukros A 15	Fled ¹ A 15; S ₁ 13. 188 f.; 15. 2(?) ; 17. 112
Pherekles, ¹⁹ son of Pherenikaos, Themakeus	M Lydos A 17; S ₁ 17. 93 f.	Fled or executed ⁴ A 35, 52; S ₁ loc. cit.
	H Teukros A 35; S ₁ loc. cit.	
Philokrates	M Teukros A 15	Fled ¹ A 15
Phrynichos, son of Orchestamenos ²⁰	H Diokleides A 47	Released A 66
Platon	H Teukros A 35	Fled or executed ⁴ A 35, 52, 67
Polyeuktos	H Teukros A 35	Fled or executed ⁴ A 35, 52, 67
Polystratos, son of Didoros, Ankylethen	M Andromachos A 13	Executed A 13; S ₁ 12. 26 f.; 13. 180 f.; 15. 5 f.; 17. 75
Pulytion	M ²¹ Andromachos A 12, 14	Fled ¹ A 13
	M (Thessalos) ²² Plu. <i>Alc.</i> 19. 2 f., 22. 4	

	<i>Charge and Informer</i>	<i>Result</i>
Smindyrides	M Teukros A 15	Fled ¹ A 15
Taureas	H Diokleides A 47	Released A 66
Teisarchos	M Teukros A 15	Fled ¹ A 15
Telenikos	H Teukros A 35	Fled or executed ⁴ A 35, 52, 67
Teukros, metoikos	M Teukros A 15	Pardoned A 15
Theodoros Phegaieus	M (Thessalos) ²³ Plu. <i>Alc.</i> 19. 2 f., 22. 4	Fled or executed ⁴ A 35, 52, 67
	H Teukros A 35	
Timaio	H Diokleides? Plu. <i>Alc.</i> 21. 4 ²⁴	Released? (cf. A 66)
Timanthes	H Teukros A 35	Fled or executed ⁴ A 35, 52, 67
---, son of Diodoros, Eiteiaios		Fled or executed ⁴ S ₁ 17. 12 f.
---, Anagyrasios		Fled or executed ⁴ S ₁ 19. 1 f.
---, Phegusios ²⁵		Fled or executed ⁴ S ₁ 19. 3 f.
Various others ²⁶	M Lydos A 17	Fled or executed ⁴
Twenty-eight others ²⁷	H Diokleides A 43	Released A 66

Notes

1. Since Alkibiades did not flee immediately after his denunciation, but only when recalled from Sicily, the same may be true of many others whom Andokides describes as fleeing in consequence of denunciation; cf. Th. vi. 53. 1.

2. Andokides' narrative, separating the mutilation from the profanation, makes it clear that Alkibiades was not accused of mutilating herms, and Thucydides was plainly aware of this; cf. vi. 53. 1 n., 61. 1. The only link between Alkibiades and the herms in Thucydides is vi. 28. 2 ἐβόων ὡς --- οὐδὲν εἶη αὐτῶν ὅτι οὐ μετ' ἐκείνου ἐπράχθη, i.e. Alkibiades was suspected vaguely of being 'behind' or in sympathy with the mutilation. Plutarch preserves the distinction in *Alc.* 19. 1 and even emphasizes it in saying (20. 5) τοῖς περὶ τοὺς Ἑρμῶς ὑβρίσμασι καὶ τὰ μυστικὰ συμπλεκόντων. This nicety was foreign to popular tradition, which associated the spectacular person with the spectacular act (cf. D. lviii. 67, where the fortification of Eetioneia in 411 is attributed to

Kritias). Lys. xiv. 41 οἱ μὲν πολλοὶ αὐτῶν ἡταιρήκασιν --- οἱ δὲ μυστήρια πεποιήκασιν καὶ τοὺς Ἑρμῶς περικεκόφασιν refers to the class of people to which, he says, Alkibiades and his family belonged, rather than to Alkibiades individually; but in the middle of the fourth century we find in D. xxi. 147 the bald statement (sc. Ἀλκιβιάδης) τοὺς Ἑρμῶς περιέκοπτεν. This confusion is fully established in Diod. xiii. 2. 3 f., 5. 1, and is a major cause of chronological difficulties (cf. p. 275). Pausanias Atticista, fr. 72 Erbse, s.v. Ἑρμοκοπίδαι, may speak for the grammarians: 'They say that Alkibiades did this in collaboration with the Corinthians.'

3. See n. 25.

4. The inscriptions do not reveal which of the men whose property was sold were dead and which were in exile.

5. Lys. vi. 51 explicitly accuses him also of profaning the mysteries, but this is not easily reconcilable with And. and with Th. vi. 60. 2 f.

6. Archippos, Aristomenes, and Kephisodoros may be the comic poets of those names (MacDowell, 211); naturally men of comic talent would be in demand for mock-celebrations of the mysteries. Archippos' first victory fell 'in the 91st Olympiad' (Suda, s.v.), i.e. 416/15. Aristomenes was active in 439/8 and 389/8, but none of the known titles can be dated during the period 425/4-395/4. Kephisodoros produced a play in 403/2 (Lys. xxi. 4, where the MS. has 'Kephisodotos', not known as the name of a comic poet). The man denounced in 415 was a metic, but many metics were made citizens after the democratic restoration.

7. This Alkibiades was the grandfather of 'our' Alkibiades; cf. 50. 1 n., v. 43. 2 n.

8. We are not given the patronymic of the Charmides involved in Agariste's denunciation, and, whoever he was, it is not absolutely certain that he was denounced; Agariste only said that a profanation took place at his house. If she did denounce him, and if he was the son of Aristoteles, he fled about the same time as Alkibiades and after being released from the prison to which Diokleides' false allegation had brought him.

9. *Εὐρυξίμαχον* cod. And.; corr. Stephanus; cf. *PA* 5186-8 and below (p. 284) on Akumenos and Eryximachos.

10. *Τηλεκλέους* cod. And., cf. *Τηλεκλείδης*: *Τηλο-* Kirchner; cf. *PA* 13580-4.

11. S₁ 17. 19, 21. 13, say that Euphiletos was condemned 'on both charges'.

12. *Εὐρυμάδαντα* cod. And., a name nowhere attested; corr. apographa.

13. Lydos alleged that Leogoras had been present, but asleep, at a profanation in the house of Pherekles. Speusippos, a member of the council, proposed that all those denounced by Lydos should be tried at once. Leogoras brought and won an action *παρὰ νόμων* against Speusippos.

14. On the men called Meletos, cf. MacDowell, 208 ff. It is not necessary to posit more than one of them in the denunciations. Denounced by Andromachos, Meletos may have remained in Athens (just as Alkibiades remained with the fleet) and fled only when denounced by Teukros for complicity in the mutilation.

15. *Νικιάδην* cod. And.; but the inscriptions record a *Νικίδης*, and this is probably the same person.
16. *Ἰωνίαν* cod. And.; probably an error for the *Οἰωνίας* of the inscriptions.
17. There must be two Panaitioi, for it is essential to Andokides' argument that he should reduce to a minimum the number of men for whose exile his own information was responsible; if the Panaitios whom he denounced had already been denounced by Andromachos and so almost inevitably doomed to execution or exile, Andokides would not have failed to mention the fact.
18. We do not know to which Panaitios the inscription refers.
19. We are concerned with only one Pherekles; S₁ 17. 94 classifies him as guilty 'on both charges'—which shows, incidentally, that his slave, Lydos, did denounce his own master, though A 17 does not make that clear.
20. *Φρύνιχος ὁ ὀρχησάμενος* cod. And.; -μενοῦ Wilhelm.
21. Although Andromachos said that the profanation had taken place in Pulytion's house, the name of Pulytion is absent from the list in A 13. See, however, n. 22.
22. Plutarch quotes the *εἰσαγγελία* of Alkibiades, Pulytion, and Theodoros—i.e. the charge on which they were actually tried in absence—as standing in the name of Thessalos, not in the name of Andromachos' master Pythonikos.
23. Cf. n. 22.
24. Plutarch gives Timaios, whom Andokides does not mention, the role which A 48 gives to Charmides.
25. This may be the man who put Diokleides up to his story; cf. n. 3.
26. ἀπογράφει τοὺς τε ἄλλους καὶ τὸν πατέρα κ.τ.λ., says A 17, and no complete list of those denounced by Lydos is given.
27. Diokleides denounced forty-two men, according to A 43; 'forty' in A 47 presumably implies 'apart from myself and my father'.

Despite Thucydides' discouraging statement (60. 2, cf. 60. 4 f., 61. 1) that 'no one from that day to this has been able to say who really committed the mutilation', which shows that he was not satisfied by Andokides' confession, a fresh attempt to discover who committed the impieties of 415, and why, is profitable. Three essential points are:

(i) Diokleides' information was false, as he confessed; upon this point, it is not easily conceivable that Andokides, even sixteen years after the event, could have hoped to deceive a jury. The question here is to discover whether any political bond unites the men whom Diokleides denounced.

(ii) We have no reason to believe that any of the other denunciations described by Andokides were false. No doubt the prevailing feeling in 415 encouraged people to pay off old scores by incriminating personal enemies; no doubt Andokides, in peril of death, may not have told the whole truth either in 415 or in 399. Nevertheless, we

have no grounds for saying of any of the individuals denounced 'this man was innocent'.

(iii) Only a small proportion of the men denounced can be identified with individuals known to us from other sources. Some of them bear quite common names; of the rest, plausible identifications do not necessarily tell us anything about political associations.¹

Mysteries. Athenian society in the late fifth century embraced a wide variety of opinions on the existence and nature of the gods, on the value and efficacy of ritual, and on the extent to which supernatural beings could take a joke. Alkibiades and his friends are not likely to have cherished simple piety; parody of the mysteries at a private entertainment could no doubt be exceedingly funny; and no more need be said on the question whether, or why, the mysteries were parodied. A good parallel from our own history is provided by George Selwyn's parody of the communion service at Oxford in 1745 (S. P. Kerr, *George Selwyn and his Times* [London, 1909], pp. 37 ff.).

The identifiable participants in the profanations are connected, directly or through intermediaries, with Alkibiades: his relation Axiochos, his friend Adeimantos (whose fortunes were so closely linked with his in later years), a certain Archebiades who may be the lover of Alkibiades' son (Lys. xiv. 27), and others who were at least on the periphery, and in some cases near the centre, of the 'Socratic circle', namely Phaidros (cf. Pl. *Phdr.* 224 a, *Smp.* 176 d, *Prt.* 315 c, and Lys. xix. 15) and Akumenos. Akumenos (the name is very rare) appears in Plato as father of the doctor Eryximachos, who plays a prominent part in the *Symposium* and was also a friend of Phaidros (*Phdr.* 268 a). Charmides, if he is not the same man as Charmides the son of Aristoteles, could be the son of Glaukon, cousin of Kritias and uncle of Plato.

The prosecution represented a curious alliance of forces which illuminates the nature of the enmities which Alkibiades provoked (cf. viii. 53. 2). The moving spirit among the demagogues, 'those who thought that Alkibiades stood in the way of their secure leadership of the Assembly' (28. 2), was Androkles (viii. 65. 2), a member of the council (And. i. 27) in 416/15 and in 411 τοῦ δήμου μάλιστα πρo-εστῶτα (Th. *ibid.*), whom Plu. *Alc.* 19. 1 represents as 'producing' (προήγαγε) the 'metics and slaves' of Th. vi. 28. 1. The *εἰσαγγελία*, however, stood in the name of Thessalos, son of Kimon (Plu. *Alc.* 19. 3, 22. 4), whose standpoint one would expect to be profoundly different from that of Androkles. Peisandros, who raised to 10,000

¹ I am grateful to the University of Cincinnati for permission to read an unpublished doctoral dissertation by Ruth Allen, 'The Mutilation of the Herms'. I have made use of some of Miss Allen's prosopographical researches, but have ignored probable or possible identifications of individuals whose political alignment is unknown.

drachmai the reward offered for information (And. i. 27), is presumably the opportunist whom we know from book viii.

Hermes. Hardly any of the men denounced by Teukros and Andokides are identifiable, but their most interesting aspect is their overlap with the profaners of the mysteries. Euphiletos and Pherekles were guilty of both offences, and so were 'Meletos' and 'Theodoros', assuming that each of them is one person. Teukros, who confessed to profanation, was evidently close enough to the mutilators to denounce many of them. Eryximachos may be the son of Akumenos, though mutilating statues seems an unlikely prank for a man who is represented in the *Symposium* (of which the 'dramatic date', for what it is worth, is 416; cf. *Smp.* 173 a ~ Ath. 217 a) as a doctor of some standing, and I suspect that Eryximachos the mutilator was in fact a nephew or cousin of Akumenos. Andokides' father was alleged to have been present in a house during a profanation, but successfully denied his presence (And. i. 22).

To this extent the Athenians were right in believing that the same people, or at least the same section of society, were concerned with both impieties. Peisandros again appears as a zealous *ζητητής*, together with Charikles (possibly the man who later became one of the thirty tyrants), and it is to these two that Andokides (i. 36) attributes the portentous judgement that the mutilation was part of a wide conspiracy to subvert the democracy.

It is not at first easy to see why such impieties should have been taken as evidence of a political conspiracy. Thucydides' statement that they were so taken is supported by a detail in Diokleides' story: Euphemos, in trying to buy Diokleides' silence (And. i. 42), assures him 'If we secure what we wish, you will be one of us.' The following considerations are relevant:

(i) Since it was believed by many (cf. *Oedipus Tyrannus*) that when the gods were offended by the action of one member of a community they might punish the whole community if it failed to discover the guilty man, a group which wanted the Sicilian expedition to fail or to be cancelled might commit an impiety in the hope that popular morale would be affected by fear of divine punishment (and with the confidence of agnostics that no gods would punish *them*). This popular attitude would be particularly important on the eve of an overseas expedition because of the belief that it was perilous to sail on the same ship as a man who had offended gods (cf. A. *Th.* 602 ff., E. *El.* 1354 f., X. *Cyr.* viii. 1. 25, [Lys.] vi. 19, And. i. 137 ff., and—on the mechanism of 'infection'—Ant. ii. a. 10). Such an interpretation of the mutilation is implied by the story which attributed it to Corinthians (Philochoros F 133, Kratippos F 3), a story of which there is no hint in Thucydides or Andokides. Inside Athens there may have been some men who would have welcomed the failure of

an enterprise which seemed likely to increase the revenues at the disposal of the democracy and its power and ideological influence in the Greek world; such were the men who in 411 were prepared to negotiate for peace at the cost of Athens' walls and fleet. There were certainly men—Nikias was one of them—who would have welcomed the cancellation of the enterprise on strategic grounds and the employment of Athenian resources and energies nearer home. Yet 27. 3 τοῦ ἔκπλου οἰωνὸς ἐδόκει εἶναι καὶ ξυνωμοσίᾳ ἅμα -- γεγενῆσθαι does not say that it was thought that the mutilation was deliberately designed to affect the expedition; and if such an idea was entertained it is remarkable that a different crime committed by the most ambitious and persuasive proponent of the expedition should so easily be represented as done μετὰ τοῦ αὐτοῦ λόγου. It should also be noted that fear of divine displeasure did not in fact make the Athenians postpone the departure of the expedition until they should discover who had mutilated the herms.

(ii) It was not entirely a strange idea that a revolutionary conspiracy should advertise itself by mutilating statues. The more spectacular the crime, the stronger the impression of the numbers, power, and ubiquity of the conspirators; and when their chosen moment comes, the uncommitted individual may hesitate to act against them for fear that they have a majority on their side (cf. viii. 66. 2).

(iii) νόμος covers both the 'constitution' and traditional religious observances, and παρανομία can describe the contravention of either. This fact forges the essential link between impiety and political conspiracy (cf. Grote, vi. 7 f.). Alkibiades was a notorious example of those who conduct themselves as if they were above the law (for the anecdotal accumulated from his own time onwards cf. And. iv. 10 ff. and Plu. *Alc. passim*, and for the kind of conduct which could be stigmatized as παρανομία cf. Lys. iii. 10. 5 ff.). The impieties prompted in the Athenians the thought that a whole section of their society had demonstrated the will to do as it pleased and, if not resisted, would have demonstrated also the power to do so. The terms in which Andokides and others attacked Alkibiades will not have been very different from those in which D. xxi. 208 ff. attacks the class with which Meidias is identified, and the popular association of treason with contempt for custom (the linking idea is the pursuit of self-interest) is illustrated by Isoc. xx. 10: 'we have twice been deprived of our liberty' (sc. in 411 and 404) 'not by men tainted with other vices, but διὰ τοὺς καταφρονούντας τῶν νόμων καὶ βουλομένους τοῖς μὲν πολέμοις δουλεῦν τοὺς δὲ πολίτας ὑβρίζειν'.

Evidently statues could be mutilated 'by young men in drunken sport' (28. 1); superstition was not strong enough to protect gods from the ordinary vandalism by which young people are sometimes impelled to assert anonymous power. The mutilation of all the herms

in Athens may have been no more than an unusually grandiose and spectacular piece of vandalism of a kind which appeals to some people at a certain stage of drunkenness. Andokides is silent on the question of motive (i. 61): 'Euphiletos put the proposal to us while we were drinking.' A little more detail is provided by his statement (i. 67) *εἰσηγησαμένῳ Εὐφιλῆτι πίστω τῶν ἐν ἀνθρώποις ἀπιστοτάτην, κ.τ.λ.*, which suggests that he was a member of a club whose members guaranteed their loyalty to each other by concerting a crime for which each could (in theory) be denounced by the others if he were subsequently disloyal. Such a club might have purposes which we could call 'political'; that is, in addition to drinking too much, enjoying each other's company, and congratulating themselves on their own importance, the members might support each other by money and advocacy in political life.¹ Some such clubs—not all—could become important centres of conspiracy once a genuinely revolutionary situation had arisen, as they did in 411 (viii. 54. 4 and 65. 2), but it does not follow that any of them in normal times, or all of them even in abnormal times, would seriously initiate or even welcome an oligarchic revolution. It is noteworthy that even in 415, according to Plu. *Alc.* 18. 8 (though Plutarch may be drawing an inference from Thucydides' 'other mutilations'; cf. Hatzfeld, 168 n. 2), some people dismissed the mutilation of the herms as the vandalism of ἀκόλαστοι young men.

Diokleides' Denunciations. If the profaners were Alkibiades and his friends and did what they did for fun, and if the mutilators were a club of silly young men whose desire for public notice landed them in more trouble than they had bargained for, we might expect the false allegations of Diokleides to be something much more serious, the deliberate political exploitation of the situation which had been created. It is possible to argue that their purpose was to hit back at the enemies of Alkibiades (cf. Hatzfeld, 193 f.), among whom we may classify, for reasons of varying cogency, several of the identifiable victims.

First, one of the two instigators of the denunciation was named by Diokleides as Alkibiades Phegusios; unless he is the 'nephew and fellow exile' of the great Alkibiades, captured and executed for treason in 408 (X. *HG* i. 2. 13), he is not otherwise known, but his name is significant in so far as (according to Th. viii. 6. 3) it was a Spartan name which entered the family of Kleinias at an early date through friendship with a Spartan family.

¹ If the lost work *πρὸς τοὺς ἑταίρους* (Plu. *Them.* 32. 4) is genuine, Andokides was oligarchic in sympathy, and if fr. 5 (Blass) comes from this work it was composed before the summer of 415; but it does not seem to have been known to the author of *Vit. X Or.* ([Plu.] *Mor.* 835 a), whose usual fault is to lump too much together.

Secondly, among the victims, Eukrates was a brother of Nikias (no doubt an allegation that Nikias himself mutilated statues at night would have strained the credulity of the Athenians even in their most suspicious mood); Taureas (whose son Nisaïos was also denounced) was probably the man of that rare name whom Alkibiades had insulted publicly (And. iv. 20 f., D. xxi. 147, Plu. *Alc.* 16. 5); while Charmides was a son of Aristoteles, and the Aristoteles who was later one of the thirty tyrants belonged (X. *HG* ii. 3. 46) to that section of the oligarchs of 411 which was opposed to the return of Alkibiades (cf. the attribution of *Ἀλκιβιάδου λοιδόρια* to Antiphon, who shared with Aristoteles a willingness to sacrifice the empire rather than recall Alkibiades [Th. viii. 68. 3, 90. 1 f., 91. 3, and 97. 3]).

If Kritias was the notorious son of Kallaischros we encounter a very different alignment, for that Kritias in a later year (fr. 3) was the proposer of the decree recalling Alkibiades.

The position of Andokides and his family is obscure. Andokides belonged to the same club as Eryximachos, and his father Leogoras could at least be accused of presence in the house of Pulytion when the mysteries were parodied. On the other side stands the evidence of the speech against Alkibiades (And. iv) attributed to Andokides. No one believes that Andokides delivered this speech on the occasion to which it refers—the speaker envisages, at the beginning of 415, an ostracism which must result in the departure of himself or Nikias or Alkibiades—and the historical obstacles to the supposition that anyone actually composed it in 415 seem to me insuperable (cf. A. R. Burn, *CQ* N.S. iv [1954], 138 ff.; A. E. Raubitschek, *TAPhA* lxxix [1948], 191 ff., attempts to explain away the difficulties one by one, but their cumulative force is too much for any such attempt). The speech is therefore a piece of historical fiction, and as such may well belong to the fourth century and even to Andokides himself; a parallel is provided by the 'Speech of Nikias to his Syracusan captors', which Theophrastos, to the disgust of Dionysios (*Lys.* 14), attributed to Lysias. It is by no means improbable that an early fourth-century author should distort the nature of ostracism; the famous story of the last ostracism, at which, after it had been taken for granted that either Nikias or Alkibiades would be ostracized, Hyperbolos fell victim because the adherents of the two protagonists combined against him (Plu. *Alc.* 13. 4 f.), will have provided the idea for the speech. But who is the imagined speaker? Someone in antiquity thought it was Phaiax (Plu. *Alc.* 13. 3; is this the origin of the statement in *Vit. X Or.* 835 a that Andokides composed a 'Defence against Phaiax'?), presumably because the speaker says that he has been on an embassy to Sicily and Italy (41), and Phaiax's mission to the West was well known from Th. v. 4 f.; this identification produced in turn a variant version of the story of the ostracism

of Hyperbolos (Plu. *Alc.* 13. 8). An equally plausible identification is Leogoras, who, like the speaker (*ibid.*), had been on an embassy to Macedonia (*IG* 12. 57 [= ML 65]. 51, cf. And. ii. 11). The possibility that Andokides wrote the fictitious speech early in the fourth century and cast his distinguished father in the role of an opponent of Alkibiades has interesting implications for the political alignments of 415.

Since political prosopography is a type of study which requires a higher degree of caution than any other historical field, it is right to emphasize the extent to which the hypothesis that Diokleides' allegations were intended as a blow against the enemies of Alkibiades rests upon assumptions. To reduce even further the temptation to believe that kinsmen and acquaintances consistently support each other's policies, it should be noted that in Pl. *Prt.* 315 c–316 a we find Alkibiades, Adeimantos, and Eryximachos in the house of Kallias, son of Hipponikos, a member of the *Κήρυκες* and a man who strenuously opposed the recall of Alkibiades in 411 (Th. viii. 53. 2) and was a prosecutor of Andokides in 399 (And. i. 112 ff.); that Peisandros, politically close to Aristoteles in 411 (Th. viii. 98. 1), wanted drastic and immediate action against the men denounced by Diokleides (And. i. 43) and in 411 tried to dispose of Andokides (And. ii. 14); and that Phaidros, together with Sokrates and members of Plato's family, was a friend of Kephalos and his intransigently democratic sons Polemarchos and Lysias (Pl. *Phdr.* 227 c, *R.* 327 b, 328 b), as was also Nikias' son Nikeratos (*R.* 327 c).

27. 1. εἰσὶ δὲ κατὰ τὸ ἐπιχώριον, ἡ τετράγωνος ἐργασία, πολλοί, κ.τ.λ.: 'they are numerous, according to the custom of the country—the (sc. well-known) four-cornered pattern . . .' The Athenians were credited with the invention of that form of herm which consisted of a pillar, square in section, topped by a head and ornamented by an erect phallos (Hdt. ii. 51. 1 f., Paus. iv. 33. 4). For the whole history of this art-form, cf. R. Lullies, *Die Typen der griechischen Herme* (Königsberg, 1931), and Nilsson, *Geschichte der griechischen Religion*, 12. 190 ff.; *CVA* Denmark iii. pl. 139. 2 is an excellent illustration of a sculptor making a herm. The fact that the compiler of the Patmos Scholia explained *Ἑρμαὶ λίθινοι* as *τετράγωνος ἐργασία* does not mean that the latter words (del. Bauer) were absent from his text of Thucydides; cf. Steup (p. 263) and Dover, *CR* n.s. v (1955), 134 ff. For *ἐργασία* = 'style' or 'type' cf. *IG* ii2. 244. 55, 1666. 39 ff.

περικόπησαν τὰ πρόσωπα: the obvious way to mutilate a herm is to knock off its phallos, and Ar. *Lys.* 1094, where men who enter *ἐστυκότες* are warned 'Mind the Hermokopidai don't see you!', shows (as Hudson saw) that this in fact was done. If *πρόσωπα* means, as it normally means, 'faces', it might seem that Thucydides in an

anxiety to avoid *αἰσχρολογία* (cf. the coy periphrasis for *αἰδοῖα* in X. *Hier.* 1. 4) is falsifying the facts, and falsifying them unnecessarily, as he need not have specified the exact nature of the mutilation. *πρόσωπον* = 'façade' in Pl. *P.* 6. 14 and E. *Ion* 189 does not help, for Thucydides could hardly have used the ordinary word for 'face' to mean a part of a statue other than its face. The natural explanation is that the mutilators damaged the face of every herm and the phallos where there was one to damage (cf. Σ^M ~ Paus. Att. fr. 72 Erbse: *τοὺς τραχήλους καὶ τὰ αἰδοῖα*); there is some reason to think (Lullies, *op. cit.* 46; cf. Herter, *RE* xix. 1690) that by the end of the fifth century herms without erect phalloi were coming into fashion, and it may be that the mutilation of the god's face was felt to be a more serious sacrilege than knocking off a feature of old-fashioned crudity.

2. *μηνύειν ἄδεως τὸν βουλόμενον:* the language is documentary; *ἄδεως* = 'with *ἄδεια*', a guarantee of immunity from prosecution (e.g. *IG* 12. 92. 16), and for *τὸν βουλόμενον* cf. doc. ap. And. i. 84.

3. *ἐπὶ ξυνωμοσίᾳ - - - δήμου καταλύσεως γεγενῆσθαι:* *ἐπὶ c. dat.*, as often, has the sense 'in furtherance of . . .', 'with . . . in mind', almost 'as an expression of . . .', and the genitives are objective, cf. A. *Ch.* 978 *ξυνώμοσαν θάνατον*, Ar. *Lys.* 1007 *τὸ πρᾶγμα - - - ξυνομώματα*.

28. 2. *ἐμποδὼν ὄντι σφίσι μὴ αὐτοῖς τοῦ δήμου βεβαίως προεστάναι:* Thucydides consistently represents Athenian political life as a competition for *προστασία*; cf. ii. 65. 11, where (silent on the competition of the 440s from which Perikles emerged as victor) he refers to the 'decisions taken after the departure of the expedition' as made *κατὰ τὰς ἰδίας διαβολὰς περὶ τῆς τοῦ δήμου προστασίας*, and viii. 89. 3, where the weakness of the Four Hundred is seen to be the *ἰδία φιλοτιμία* characteristic of oligarchies, in which all the participants *ἀξιοῦσιν - - - πολὺ πρῶτος αὐτὸς ἕκαστος εἶναι*. Here there is an important difference, in that Thucydides treats Alkibiades' enemies as a group ('preventing them from leading the people themselves'); Alkibiades was a giant, and men who were potentially rivals of one another combined to overthrow him.

οὐ δημοτικὴν παρανομίαν: *δημοτικός* describes not only the political allegiance of a man (e.g. And. ii. 26) but also, on occasion, his treatment of his fellow citizens as equals; so X. *Mem.* i. 2. 60 describes Sokrates as *δημοτικὸς καὶ φιλάνθρωπος*.

29. 1. *ἐτοῖμος ἦν - - - κρίνεσθαι εἴ τι τούτων εἰργασμένος ἦν - - - εἰ μὲν τούτων τι εἰργαστο, - - - ἄρχειν:* if it is permissible to transpose these words into *oratio recta*, they will be: *ἐτοῖμός εἰμι κρίνεσθαι εἴ τι τούτων εἰργασμαι* ('to be tried, to discover whether I have committed any of these acts'), *καὶ εἰ μὲν τούτων τι εἰργασμαι* ('and if I

A
HISTORICAL COMMENTARY
ON
THUCYDIDES

BY
A. W. GOMME
A. ANDREWES
AND
K. J. DOVER

VOLUME IV
Books V 25—VII

OXFORD
AT THE CLARENDON PRESS
1970