ANDOCIDES' PART IN THE MYSTERIES AND HERMAE AFFAIRS 415 B.C.

1. In his recent edition of the *De Mysteriis*,[1] Mr. D. M. MacDowell has advanced the hypothesis that Andocides, contrary to the generally accepted view, was not guilty of mutilating the Hermae, but guilty of parodying the Mysteries; that, even after he had told what he knew about the former affair, he was kept in prison until, eventually, he confessed to the latter, incriminating, amongst others, his father Leogoras, to gain immunity for himself; and that finally, released and repentant, he helped his father to avoid prosecution. These conclusions are reached in an ingeniously argued series of appendices, in which the author displays a refreshing scepticism towards the evidence of Thucydides.

Nevertheless, I think that, on critical examination, the account given by Thucydides (6. 60–1) can be shown to be substantially accurate. This is, in outline, that Andocides (not directly named by Thucydides but clearly referred to in the phrase εἷς τῶν δεδεμένων ὅσπερ ἐδόκει αἰτιώτατος εἶναι) was imprisoned on information received, and, in return for a grant of immunity (ἄδεια), confessed and named his accomplices *in the mutilation of the Hermae*. He was believed, and was immediately (εὐθύς) released, together with all the other prisoners whom he had not incriminated. Thucydides does not mention Andocides at all in connection with the parodying of the Mysteries, agitation concerning which continued after the Hermae case was regarded as closed.

This is, as far as it goes, consistent with Andocides' own account in his speech *De Mysteriis* of 400 or 399 B.C.[2] He strongly denies ever having parodied the Mysteries, or having admitted doing this, or having denounced anyone else for doing it. But it must be noted that he also denies having actually defaced any Hermae statues and does not admit to receiving *any* grant of ἄδεια, nor does he expressly state that he was released immediately after giving his information about the mutilation.

I propose to re-examine the accounts given by our sources, together with MacDowell's interpretation of them (op. cit., appendices A, B, C, D, E, pp. 167–85). But before doing so it will be as well to make it clear at this point that aspersions cast *a priori* against Thucydides' competence in his account of this particular affair (6. 27–9, 53, 60–1) are unjustified. When he says that neither he nor anyone else knows the 'plain truth' (6. 60. 2), he is referring to the identity of those concerned in the acts of sacrilege, and not to public facts such as the identity of the informers, the nature of the information given, and the fate of the suspects. On these points there is no reason to believe his authority carries less weight than usual.

2. *Andocides' own account of the Mysteries affair* (De Myst. 11–33)

(*a*) It seems clear from his challenge in ch. 23 that no official written list containing his name existed at the time of the trial. Further, he clearly proves

[1] D. M. MacDowell, *Andocides On the Mysteries* (1962).

[2] MacDowell (Appendix J, pp. 204–5) following Makkink, *Andocides' Eerste Rede*, 32–5, argues, with some justification, that 400 is a more likely date for the speech than the traditional 399. I have adopted the earlier date throughout this article.

that he was not one of those denounced by Andromachos or by Teucros. It is true that he does not conclusively prove that his name had not been on Lydos' list (which had apparently not survived—no doubt because Lydos, unlike Andromachos and Teucros, had not received a public reward). He never attempts to do so, but instead concerns himself solely with what happened to his father Leogoras, who almost certainly *was* on this list of Lydos—at least in an indirect way (*De Myst.* 17). But is this 'omission' on Andocides' part really so very damaging?

If he had been on Lydos' list why had he not been brought to trial (or forced to retire into exile)? This is a crucial question. The only conceivable answer to it is (as MacDowell) that he must have anticipated any such proceedings by turning Queen's Evidence and denouncing Leogoras and others. But this answer does not remove the difficulty; it merely postpones it. For why then was Leogoras not brought to trial? (It is certain that he was not, for, as MacDowell points out, if he had been convicted he would have been executed, and if he had been acquitted Andocides would have said so.)

The solution to this problem will have to be found in the statement of Andocides (illustrating the implausibility of Lydos' accusation against his father) that Leogoras counter-attacked by prosecuting one Speusippos (who had proposed to hand him over to the law-courts) for making an illegal motion, and won his case easily (*De Myst.* 18). As a result, any further proceedings against Leogoras were abandoned.

Now we can only guess what the technicality might have been on which Leogoras apparently successfully challenged Speusippos. But the point is not important. For it is surely obvious that this whole artificial, elaborately contrived theory just does not square with the real-life circumstances of that particular time.

It is quite possible that Leogoras, after an initial victory of this kind, was never prosecuted on the rather flimsy evidence furnished by Lydos. But it is inconceivable that, if one self-confessed criminal had saved himself *only* by revealing the identity of another, a mere technical hitch could have been enough to prevent any future prosecution of either. And it is most implausible to suggest that Andocides was simply freed by the grant of ἄδεια for denouncing his father, and then was allowed actively to assist his father escape prosecution. (In any case would Andocides have been freed at all before those he denounced had been convicted?) Certainly the Athenian demos, in the highly excitable condition into which it had worked itself up at this time, would not have allowed two guilty men to escape by such legalistic jiggery-pokery.

Thus the hypothesis advanced to deal with the problem why, if Andocides was on Lydos' list, he was not brought to trial, is intenable. No other plausible explanation can be offered. It thus seems very unlikely that he was on Lydos' list. Certainly there is not a shred of evidence to show that he was.

(*b*) Andocides does not mention at all the formal proceedings initiated by Thessalos, son of Cimon, against Alcibiades for parodying the Mysteries in his own house together with Poulytion, Theodoros, and others (Plutarch, *Alc.* 22. 3, apparently quoting an official document).

It has thus been suggested that the person who originally provided the information on which this charge was based also included Andocides (and Leogoras) in his list. Thessalos' charge itself did not name Andocides, but this

may have been because Andocides had confessed his own guilt and that of Leogoras, and so in their case proceedings were now over and done with.

Now, first of all, it is clear that Thessalos' charge was directed specifically against Alcibiades, and belongs to the period after the Hermae investigation had been concluded, when renewed attempts were being made by his enemies to incriminate him in the Mysteries scandal (Thuc. 6. 61. 1–4).[1] Some of these enemies were of a very different type from Pythonicos, Androcles, Pisander, and other so-called 'demagogues' of the time, and their motives were primarily personal rather than political. In their case the charges against Alcibiades were made, I believe, in retaliation for Dioclides' scare story (*De Myst.* 37–43) —a story to which Dioclides had been put up by Alcibiades' friends[2] (*De Myst.* 65–6). By making allegations against several prominent members of important and influential families, it was hoped that the commission would be forced to sit on its findings and eventually allow the whole affair quietly to drop. However, thanks to Andocides' decision to tell all, the plan misfired. Dioclides revealed who was behind the story, and Alcibiades found he had made enemies whom he could scarcely afford to have.[3] It is in this context also that we must place the information given against Alcibiades by Agariste, wife of *Alcmaeonides* (*De Myst.* 16). One of those named by Dioclides had been Callias, son of *Alcmaeon* (*De Myst.* 47). Thus Agariste's information is a clear case of Alcmaeonid retaliation.

Now Andocides' family had for over a century been closely connected with the Alcmaeonids (see MacDowell, op. cit. 1–2). Furthermore, the names of several members of his own family were included in the list given by Dioclides (*De Myst.* 47). It seems reasonable to assume therefore that in this affair Andocides and his family, as was their wont, stood shoulder to shoulder with the main branch of the Alcmaeonids, and that, in consequence of Dioclides' story, if nothing else, both families were hostile to Alcibiades and his friends.

It is thus unlikely that a counter-offensive (for this is what Thessalos' charge was) against Alcibiades by the Alcmaeonids and the Philaids (Thessalos' father Cimon had married the Alcmaeonid Isodice) would have manufactured, or made use of, evidence against Alcibiades which *at the same time* incriminated Andocides and his father. This difficulty can be avoided if we assume that Andocides himself gave the information on which Thessalos' charge was based. But this, of course, is pure speculation.

Secondly, we cannot be certain that there must necessarily have been a quite separate informer with a completely separate piece of information (which Andocides has 'suppressed') behind Thessalos' charge. All three men named by Thessalos had already been named in earlier denunciations. Alcibiades and Poulytion by Andromachos for parodying the Mysteries in Poulytion's house (*De Myst.* 12–13), Theodoros by Teucros for mutilation (*De Myst.* 35). The

[1] On this point of chronology I follow MacDowell, 183–5, as against K. J. Dover in the recently published continuation of Gomme's commentary, *HCT* iv. 274 (1970).

[2] After admitting that his story was a complete fabrication, Dioclides, who could then have had no motive for lying, revealed that the instigators of it had been Alcibiades of Phegus and Amiantos of Aegina. Thereupon both fled into exile—a clear enough admission of responsibility. The former is without doubt the cousin and fellow exile of the great Alcibiades, who is referred to by Xenophon (*Hellenica* 1. 2. 13) as having been among the prisoners taken from four Syracusan ships captured by Thrasyllos in 409 after the Athenian reverse at Ephesos.

[3] See now Dover, *HCT* iv. 286–8, for a fuller analysis of this aspect of Dioclides' allegations.

Mysteries seem to have been parodied on several occasions in various houses. It is thus not impossible that, as a result of investigations into the previous denunciations and examination of those informed against, this particular combination, among several others, had emerged, and was naturally chosen in preference to any others by Thessalos as the most damning to Alcibiades; however, since the charge was not based on a separate fifth *μήνυσις*, but evolved from investigations into previous ones, and concerned only persons who had already been denounced, Andocides has not mentioned it.[1]

Thus there is no good reason to believe that Andocides' name was included in the 'information' used by Thessalos in his formal charge. It remains a possibility of course, but a remote one. Moreover, the same decisive practical objection applies as to the previous hypothesis that he was denounced by Lydos, viz. why was he never brought to trial?

3. *Andocides' imprisonment*

(*a*) Andocides' evidence about the planning and perpetration of the mutilation was clearly believed (Thuc. 6. 61. 1). Nevertheless MacDowell suggests that he was kept in prison, possibly because some suspicion still attached to himself. But how long did the Athenians intend to keep him in this position? Indefinitely? Surely not. Yet how did they expect him to win release? The whole idea has an implausible Kafkaesque flavour about it.

Further, this theory would mean that he cannot have received *ἄδεια* for his information about the mutilation. But this is a flat contradiction of Thucydides, who states both that he obtained *ἄδεια* in respect of the mutilation and that he was released *εὐθύς* as a result (6. 60. 3–4).[2]

(*b*) Andocides himself does not say that he was released from prison.

Of course he does not. He is concerned above all in chs. 51–9 to stress his selfless and public-spirited attitude. To have *explicitly* mentioned that he procured his own release by informing would have struck a jarring note in the context. So this particular *argumentum ex silentio* has little value. There are several indications in his account (cf. chs. 57–9) that he *was* released, and Charmides' reported appeal (ch. 50) certainly assumes he will be—*πρῶτον μὲν σεαυτὸν σῶσον κτλ.*

(*c*) Andocides, according to MacDowell, claims to have been in prison only one night before telling the council what he knew about the mutilation. On the other hand Plutarch's account (Plut. *Alc.* 21) implies a longer period of imprisonment before his release (as indeed does Thucydides'). MacDowell,

[1] Perhaps Poulytion was the 'source' of Thessalos' indictment? It is very strange that his name does not appear in the list cited by Andocides (*De Myst.* 13) of those denounced by Andromachos for parodying the Mysteries in Poulytion's own house. Did he secure his own future by offering additional information which was then used by Thessalos?

[2] And also a contradiction of the words of the prosecutor whose speech *Against Andocides* has come down to us as Lysias 6. It must be admitted that this religious fanatic is not a very reliable authority, but he is one to which MacDowell attaches some importance elsewhere. It thus seems fair to cite *Ag. And.* 35–6: *φησὶ γὰρ ἀγαθὰ μεγάλα ποιῆσαι τὴν πόλιν μηνύσας καὶ ἀπαλλάξας δέους καὶ ταραχῆς τῆς τότε* (a clear reference to *De Myst.* 68—Andocides' description of the beneficial effect on the city produced by his information about the *Hermae* affair). *τίς δὲ τῶν μεγάλων κακῶν αἴτιος ἐγένετο; οὐκ αὐτὸς ποιήσας ἃ ἐποίησεν; εἶτα τῶν μὲν ἀγαθῶν δεῖ τούτῳ χάριν εἰδέναι, ὅτι ἐμήνυσε, μισθὸν ὑμῶν αὐτῷ διδόντων τὴν ἄδειαν . . .*

therefore, concludes that Andocides remained in prison *after* giving this information and was eventually released only when he gave information about the Mysteries.

But Andocides, though he implies the duration of only one night before talking to the council (cf. ch. 48), never actually states that this was the case (cf. ch. 60). In fact it was probably a longer period, a fact which Andocides does not wish to admit because he has deliberately confused the chronology in this part of his speech. He has claimed that certain Athenian defensive measures, taken in a great panic, *and lasting for the duration of one night*, were contemporaneous with the wave of arrests which followed the story of Dioclides. In fact these measures were actually taken somewhat later, as can be seen from Thucydides' account (6. 61. 2) (MacDowell accepts this point). Andocides' intention is to exaggerate the beneficial effects on the whole city of his own information. It is because he has distorted the chronology that his narrative seems to suggest that he went to the *βούλη* on the day following his arrest.

MacDowell attempts to support the theory of a continued imprisonment by the words of one of Andocides' accusers at his trial, *Against Andocides* ([Lysias] 6. 23), who claims he was in prison 'nearly a year'. I shall deal more fully with this source in section 6. At this point it will be sufficient to point out that even MacDowell admits that his phrase *ἐγγὺς ἐνιαυτόν* is an exaggeration—and so it is.

There seems then to be no basis here for the theory that Andocides was kept in prison even *after* his information about the Hermae.

(*d*) Plutarch (*Alc.* 21) says Andocides was persuaded to give information by a certain Timaios, whereas Andocides himself says it was his cousin Charmides. Therefore, it is concluded, the sources refer to two separate occasions.

But Plutarch clearly places the incident in the context of the Hermae information and not some later occasion. In fact in this chapter he seems to be closely following the account of Thucydides. Thucydides, although giving the incident a certain prominence, does not identify the acquaintance. He merely says that Andocides was persuaded to inform *ὑπὸ τῶν ξυνδεσμωτῶν τινός*. At this point Plutarch has obviously gone to another source in order to give the character a name[1] (cf. *Alc.* 20. 4 for precisely this procedure).

We do not, of course, have to resort to the supposition—which would indeed be unjustified—that Plutarch has written Timaios *by mistake* for Charmides. He merely found this name in the source to which he turned to supply a name for Thucydides' *τινός*.

As can be seen from Thucydides, the incident was regarded as an interesting one, and so was likely to be mentioned by other historians, who might also have had more interest than Thucydides in biographical details. At the same time Thucydides' silence over the actual name will have allowed a wide scope for the canvassing of claims. Andocides himself speaks of *ἀντιβολούντων δὲ τῶν ἄλλων καὶ ἱκετεύοντος ἑνὸς ἑκάστου* after Charmides' appeal. What more likely than that Timaios was involved in all this himself, and so became one of the

[1] Plutarch *Alc.* 21. 2 says that Timaios was *ἔνδοξον μὲν οὐχ ὁμοίως ἐκείνῳ* (i.e. *Ἀνδοκίδῃ*). That this is a 'genealogical' detail is confirmed by a remark in the section immediately preceding (21. 1): *Ἀνδοκίδης . . . ὃν Ἑλλάνικος ὁ συγγραφεὺς εἰς τοὺς Ὀδυσσέως ἀπογόνους ἀνήγαγεν*. Such information was characteristic of Hellanicos and it is obvious that the detail about Timaios' social standing likewise derives from him. Thus Plutarch's source for the identity of Andocides' fellow prisoner was probably Hellanicos.

candidates for the role of 'the persuader', and that this version became one of the traditions?

It is surely too much of a coincidence that Andocides should first have been persuaded by Charmides to tell all about the Hermae affair, and then, months later, 'persuaded' in exactly similar circumstances by Timaios to do the same thing about the Mysteries.

This is a version contained in none of our sources and a good example of the perils of source reconciliation at all costs.

(*e*) Plutarch, *Alcibiades* 21. 4:

> οὓς δ' ὠνόμασε πάντες πλὴν τῶν φυγόντων ἀπώλοντο. καὶ πίστεως ἕνεκα προσέθηκεν αὐτοῖς οἰκέτας ἰδίους ὁ Ἀνδοκίδης.

So Plutarch ends his account of how Andocides was persuaded by Timaios to denounce his accomplices.

However, Andocides has a somewhat different story (*De Myst.* 64 ff.):

> ὡς οὖν ἦν ταῦτ' ἀληθῆ τόν τε παῖδα τὸν ἐμὸν παρέδωκα βασανίσαι, ὅτι ἔκαμνον καὶ οὐδ' ἀνιστάμην ἐκ τῆς κλίνης, καὶ τὰς θεραπαίνας ἔλαβον οἱ πρυτάνεις, ὅθεν ὁρμώμενοι ταῦτ' ἐποίουν ἐκεῖνοι.

This 'discrepancy' is used by MacDowell to show that Plutarch has got an account which really refers to a different occasion.

But in fact Plutarch is following a source who has merely made a mistake, based on ἔλαβον of Andocides' own account. That this is the ultimate source can be seen from Plutarch's πίστεως ἕνεκα, which is obviously a rendering of ὡς οὖν ἦν ταῦτ' ἀληθῆ. Now Andocides meant that these servants were 'taken into custody' by the prytaneis to be questioned as to the identity of the conspirators who left the house—their answers would show that he himself was not among them. But since λαμβάνειν commonly means 'arrest as a criminal' Plutarch's source has assumed they were arrested *because Andocides informed against them.* This is just a mistake.

4. *Andocides and the mutilation of the Herms*

The wider political aspects of this singular episode in Athenian history constitute a separate subject in themselves. In a brief Appendix to this paper I have outlined certain objections to the traditional view that the purpose of the mutilation was to stop the fleet sailing to Sicily. On the more immediate and relevant subject of the degree of Andocides' personal involvement MacDowell's reconstruction, 173–4, seems to me to be basically correct. But, although Andocides probably did not actually mutilate any image with his own hand, that he did not was a mere accident, and his 'innocence' was very much a technicality. In the following respects he was guilty:

(*a*) He was a member of Euphiletos' club and had made oligarchic propaganda for it (*De Myst.* 61; Plut. *Them.* 32; Suidas s.v. σκάνδιξ; schol. Ar. *Wasps* 1007).
(*b*) He had been fully aware that this outrage was being planned (*De Myst.* 61).
(*c*) He had agreed to share in the crime and fully intended to do so (see MacDowell, Appendix C, 173–4).
(*d*) He had maintained silence about the affair afterwards, despite the fact

that the sacrilege was generally regarded as portending an attempted oligarchic revolution on the part of the group concerned (*De Myst.* 64; Thuc. 6. 27. 3).

Now, in the highly disturbed and panic-stricken atmosphere of Athens after the acts of sacrilege, to have chosen to face a *trial* in which one intended to plead not guilty to mutilating the Hermae, while at the same time admitting all these damaging facts, would have been plain suicide.

Thus when Andocides decided to make a clean breast of things he must have realized that for his own security a grant of ἄδεια was essential, even if he had not actually set his hand to a herm's face or phallus.[1]

That this was precisely the position in which he found himself is indicated by the words of Thucydides (6. 60. 3), speaking of the associate in prison:

> λέγων δὲ ἔπεισε αὐτὸν ὡς χρή, εἰ μὴ καὶ δέδρακεν, αὐτόν τε ἄδειαν ποιησάμενον σῶσαι καὶ τὴν πόλιν τῆς παρούσης ὑποψίας παῦσαι.

The conditional clause here does not mean 'even if he had not done anything', but '(even) if he had not *actually done* any mutilating'. This interpretation is confirmed by Plutarch, *Alc.* 21. 3:

> ὁμολογήσαντι γὰρ ἄδειαν εἶναι κατὰ ψήφισμα τοῦ δήμου, τὰ δὲ τῆς κρίσεως ἄδηλα πᾶσι, τοῖς δὲ δυνατοῖς φοβερώτατα. βέλτιον δὲ σωθῆναι ψευδόμενον ἢ μετὰ τῆς αὐτῆς αἰτίας ἀποθανεῖν ἀδόξως . . .

In normal circumstances, of course, no one would have been so foolish as to confess to a crime which strictly speaking he had not committed. But circumstances were now far from normal, and Andocides was undeniably deeply implicated in this affair. In his position he dared not face a trial. His security could only be guaranteed if he obtained ἄδεια. Yet it may have been the case that to be sure of securing ἄδεια he had to make a *full* admission of guilt. If this entailed admitting (untruly) an *act* of mutilation as well as the intention to do so and all the other incriminating details, which *were* undoubtedly true, it would surely have seemed a price worth paying for a man in his position.

Naturally in the *De Mysteriis* Andocides never admits he received ἄδεια for his information about the Hermae affair (or, for that matter, for anything else), since the immediate reaction in the minds of the jury to such an admission would have been inevitable—that he *must* have been 'guilty' (*without qualification*), and that he must have made a full confession of guilt. But that is precisely the impression which, for obvious reasons, he is at pains to avoid creating throughout this speech.

[1] Thucydides (6. 27. 1) says of the herms that περιεκόπησαν τὰ πρόσωπα, whereas Ar. *Lysistrata* 1094 indicates that, as we might expect of such objects, the phalli had been the prime targets of the mutilators.

Professor K. J. Dover in his edition of Thucydides Book 6, p. 37, has pointed out that the word πρόσωπα cannot possibly give the sense 'phalli' in such a context but that, at the same time, it is not plausible to suggest that Thucydides is being prudish.

Thus we must assume, with Dover, that the mutilators damaged the faces as well as, or instead of, the phalli of some of the herms (perhaps those which had already lost their phalli through everyday wear and tear), and that Thucydides specified this aspect because it was regarded as a more serious sacrilege. The first of these conclusions is perhaps supported by *Ag. And.* 15.

5. *The evidence of the* De Reditu

In his *De Reditu* (perhaps 408 B.C.)[1] Andocides in several places uses language which implies that he had been guilty of impiety in 415 and that he had admitted it.

It is MacDowell's view (p. 174) that Andocides never makes it clear in that speech whether he is referring to the Mysteries or the Hermae. But a close examination of the passages concerned suggests a different conclusion.

(*a*) And. 2. 6 *μεγάλη . . . καὶ τὸ ἐξαμαρτεῖν δυσπραξία ἐστί κ.τ.λ.* The precise reference of this phrase cannot be determined.

(*b*) And. 2. 7–8 *ὃς εἰς τοσοῦτον ἦλθον δυσδαιμονίας εἴτε χρὴ εἰπεῖν νεότητί τε καὶ ἀνοίᾳ τῇ ἐμαυτοῦ κ.τ.λ.* This section surely refers to the information he gave about the mutilation. Note the presentation of the alternatives which were open to him, one of which was that 'I would save my father by informing'. The same situation precisely is presented in *De Mysteriis* 59 ff.—the considerations which led him to give information *about the mutilation*. The following phrase *εἴτε καὶ δυνάμει τῶν πεισάντων με ἐλθεῖν εἰς τοιαύτην συμφορὰν τῶν φρενῶν* surely alludes to the fellow members of his *ἑταίρεια*, and their plan of mutilation as described in *De Myst.* 60 ff.

Further, in chapter 8 he clearly refers to the panic at the time of Dioclides' story (*De Myst.* 36), and to the beneficial effects of his own information (cf. *De Myst.* 66) *about the mutilation*. It was the clearing up of *this* affair which occasioned immense relief, as Thucydides 6. 60. 4–5 testifies.

On the same theme he continues *ταῦτα τοίνυν ὥστε μὲν γενέσθαι τοιαῦτα* (i.e. the panic) *πολλοστὸν δή τι ἐγὼ μέρος τῆς αἰτίας ηὑρέθην ἔχων, ὥστε μέντοι παυθῆναι ἐγὼ εἷς ὢν μόνος αἴτιος.*

It seems clear, then, that in chapters 7–8 Andocides is talking about the information he gave in the Hermae affair, and the words he uses strongly imply a confession of guilt in this matter.

(*c*) And. 2. 10 *παρανοίᾳ τῇ ἐμαυτοῦ κ.τ.λ.*—reference indeterminate.

(*d*) And. 2. 15 *εἰς γὰρ τοὺς θεοὺς ἔχοντα ὀνείδη κ.τ.λ.*—reference indeterminate.

Thus it would appear that in the *De Reditu*, which was delivered within eight years of the events of 415, Andocides uses words which do imply a confession of guilt in regard to the Hermae affair, whereas there are no clear references to any possible guilt in the matter of the Mysteries.

[1] The date of this speech must be more than just a few months later than the battle of Cyzicos (April 410) in view of the reference to that battle in chapter 12 as *ἐν τῷ τότε χρόνῳ*, but probably before autumn 408, when complete control of the Black Sea corn route was finally regained by the capture of Byzantium (Xen. *Hel.* 1. 3. 18–22).

It is true that Andocides would in any case make out that the arrival of corn ships from Cyprus was a great benefit to Athens even if it were not. But I cannot believe that he could have committed the psychological error of making so much of this 'benefit' if he were speaking at a time just *after* free access to the Black Sea corn areas had been at last restored after three difficult years.

I can see no reason to follow the suggestion of Schmid (which MacDowell, op. cit. 5, finds 'attractive') that the speech must have followed the recall of Alcibiades to Athens in 407. Although both men were exiled directly or indirectly as a result of impiety committed in 415 there is no indication that their subsequent fortunes were connected, especially as there is reason to believe their relations with each other were less than cordial in this period (cf. *De Myst.* 65–6 and above, p. 328). However, whether it belongs to 408 or 407, the important point about the *De Reditu* is that it is some years closer in time to the events of 415 than the *De Mysteriis* and for that very reason an important source document.

6. *The speech* Against Andocides[1]

(*a*) *The affair of the servant* (*Ag. And.* 21–4; cf. also *Life of And.* 4).

Was the occasion here referred to the same as that described in *De Myst.* 64? MacDowell (Appendix D) is confident that it was, and thus concludes that

[1] This speech purports to be that of one of Andocides' prosecutors at the time of his trial, but its authenticity is not wholly beyond dispute. The speaker is suspiciously well acquainted with what Andocides is going to say (cf. 13, 34, 35, 37, 42, 43). Hence it has been concluded that it was actually composed some time after the trial and circulated as a pamphlet by Andocides' enemies.

There are, however, some indications in favour of its authenticity: (*a*) And. *De Myst.* 137–9 seems to allude directly to one particular argument in this speech (19–20). (*b*) In chapter 43 the speaker anticipates that Andocides will argue that if he is condemned nobody will ever again be willing to be a μηνυτής. But Andocides in fact does not employ this argument. (*c*) The speech concentrates exclusively on the religious aspect of the affair. This is consistent with the division which was customarily made when there were several prosecutors, whereas we might expect a *post eventum* pamphlet to be more wide-ranging.

Whether the speech is authentic or not it is clear that it was written for, if not by, a religious zealot. If the speech is authentic it must have been delivered either by Meletos, Epichares, or Agyrrhios (cf. *De Myst.* 92–5, 132–3), but not by Cephisios (cf. ch. 42). At chapter 54 the speaker says that his grandfather was Diocles son of Zacoros, the Hierophant. It seems likely then that his family belonged to the Eumolpidae, the hereditary priesthood of the Mysteries. This will account for his concentration on the religious aspect (cf. Thuc. 8. 53. 2 for Eumolpid opposition to the return of Alcibiades in 411).

From what Andocides says of Epichares (*De Myst.* 95–102), it seems unlikely, even allowing for some exaggeration in his account, that a man of his character and reputation would have been selected to concentrate on the religious and moral aspects of the case.

The possibility that Agyrrhios was the author of the speech has not commended itself to editors (cf. MacDowell, op. cit. 14, K. J. Dover, *Lysias and the Corpus Lysiacum*, 78). Presumably it has been thought impossible that an able and influential politician like Agyrrhios (cf. Ar. *Eccl.* 102–4) could have been such a blind bigot as the man who delivered this speech evidently was. This, however, is hardly a conclusive argument. It is worth noting that Andocides does not charge Agyrrhios with any serious crime—it is thus a safe inference that he had not committed any.

If we can believe Andocides (*De Myst.* 94) Meletos had at least one serious crime to his account—under the Thirty he had arrested Leon of Salamis, who was then executed without trial.

Now one of the accusers of Socrates at his trial in 399 was also called Meletos, and it is clear from what is said about him by Plato (*Ap.* 26 cd, 27 c, *Euthyphro* 2 c) that he was regarded as a champion of traditional religious ideas.

There is thus a strong temptation to accept the identification: prosecutor of Andocides = speaker of Lysias 6 = prosecutor of Socrates.

There is some slight confirmation of this in the fact that Socrates' accuser Meletos came from the deme of Pitthos (Pl. *Euthphr.* 2 b) and we hear of a Diocles of Pitthos, trierarch in 377/6 (Isaeus 8. 19; Dem. 21. 62). Diocles was also the name of the grandfather of the speaker of Lysias 6.

On the other hand there are difficulties in this identification. Socrates himself had been ordered to share in the arrest of Leon of Salamis but had refused (Pl. *Ap.* 32 c) and MacDowell (op. cit. 209) has objected that Socrates' colleague in 404 could not have been unknown to him in 399 (cf. Pl. *Euthphr.* 2 b).

Dover (op. cit. 80) has shown that this particular objection is not strong, being based on a misinterpretation of what Socrates says in *Euthphr.* 2 b. But it remains odd that in his account of his behaviour in the Leon affair Socrates should have ignored the golden opportunity afforded him of mentioning the fact that his principal accuser had himself actually executed the very orders which Socrates had refused.

However, the phraseology employed by Andocides in making his allegation against his Meletos (ὡς ὑμεῖς ἅπαντες ἴστε) arouses suspicion (cf. Dem. 40. 53 and Dover, op. cit. 80), and it may well be the case that Meletos' part in the Leon affair was considerably less clear-cut than Andocides would have us believe.

Andocides is lying in *De Myst.* 64 when he says *ὡς οὖν ἦν ταῦτ' ἀληθῆ τόν τε παῖδα τὸν ἐμὸν παρέδωκα βασανίσαι.* On the other hand it is only fair to point out that there are serious difficulties in this prosecutor's account, difficulties which are not easily explained away.

The prosecutor speaks of Andocides' being brought before a *δικαστήριον*, whereas Andocides himself says he went before the *βούλη*—naturally enough, since the council was the investigating body. And why should Andocides at this point have been referred to a *law-court*? He was giving information, not standing trial. It is true that Dioclides was referred to a law-court after first being heard by the council (*De Myst.* 66), but this was precisely because he *was* sent for trial (where he was condemned to death).[1]

Further, the passage of *Ag. And.* seems to refer to an occasion when Andocides, as a defendant in a trial, had the option of suggesting an alternative penalty to that of imprisonment (demanded by his prosecutors?) in the event of his not producing his slave—*ῥᾷον ἡγήσατο δεσμοῦ τιμήσασθαι ἢ ἀργυρίου*—i.e. although, if he had pleaded guilty and suggested a fine, that would have been acceptable to the court, he did not do so, but preferred to pretend that he was confident of producing the slave (and thus of being acquitted?).

But this situation bears little resemblance to anything we know of in which Andocides was involved in 415. It is true that the prosecutor appears to connect this imprisonment with that which we know Andocides underwent as a result of Dioclides' story. But the latter was imprisonment on suspicion, whereas the former appears to have been a specific punishment.

Furthermore, whatever this righteously indignant prosecutor might have us believe, Andocides was certainly not mad. He cannot possibly have *known* his slave was dead when he made the offer. So this allegation at least is clearly false, as is also the statement that he remained in prison *ἐγγὺς ἐνιαυτόν* (see section 3*c*). It is clear that the passage *Ag. And.* 21–4 is confused and at least partially sheer invention. It cannot be used with any confidence as the basis for an accurate reconstruction, except where there is independent corroborative evidence.

It remains a possibility that Andocides is lying when he says (*De Myst.* 64) *τόν τε παῖδα τὸν ἐμὸν παρέδωκα βασανίσαι.* But his motive cannot have been fear that, otherwise, doubt would have been cast on his whole story. For, as he claims, and as we know from Thucydides, his story *was* accepted by the authorities at the time.

(*b*) *Ag. And.* 51 accuses Andocides both of parodying the Mysteries (he describes with pious horror how he dressed up in the central part of the hierophant), and of mutilating the Hermae, and then alleges that he has admitted it, *ὡμολόγησε δὲ οὗτος ποιῆσαι.* But it is not clear whether this phrase refers to *both* acts of sacrilege, or merely to the last mentioned one, i.e. the mutilation.

The ambiguity is probably deliberate. Now, *if* there is any substance in this allegation it must mean either that Andocides had confessed to mutilating the Hermae or that he had confessed to a part in both scandals. But the passage can in no way support the hypothesis that he confessed about the *Mysteries* alone.

[1] Certain offences in Athens were not always as precisely defined as twentieth-century liberals would like. The Athenian concept of 'treason' was a somewhat elastic one. It included 'deceiving the people' as well as 'overthrowing the people' (cf. Dem. 20. 135), and it is not unnatural that, in view of its widespread harmful *public* effects, Dioclides' 'perjury' (which is strictly all it was) was regarded as a capital offence.

But how much substance in fact is there in these assertions? As they are, unsupported by other evidence, they are valueless. To determine their worth we must return to our other sources.

7. *The anti-Andocides tradition* (Ag. And., Life of And., *Tzetzes*, Historia 49)

The emergence and survival of a greatly distorted version was facilitated by the particular circumstances of the period.

It is, of course, a well-known fact that in the fifth century B.C. historical knowledge was still very much a matter of oral tradition and/or memory.[1] Of course public records existed, but they were concerned with laws, decrees, votes of honours, rewards, and punishments. Many of the events of 415 were not that sort of thing at all.

In the fifteen years which had intervened the Athenians had undergone the most momentous setbacks and changes—the defeat in Sicily, an oligarchic revolution, total defeat and loss of empire, a tyrannical oligarchy backed by Spartan arms, its overthrow by force, and, on top of all this, a complete revision of the laws. After all this it must have been hard for the ordinary Athenian to remember the precise details of the murky and confused happenings in 415 before the Sicilian expedition set sail.

Still, in 400, certain 'facts' were generally remembered:

(*a*) that Andocides, his father Leogoras, and other relatives had been denounced for impiety and imprisoned (actually as a result of Dioclides' story);

(*b*) that, as a result of being denounced for impiety (actually in parodying the Mysteries), Leogoras had been concerned in a court case resulting therefrom—(actually as a prosecutor of Speusippos, who had proposed he should be handed over to the courts);

(*c*) that Andocides had saved himself by denouncing his closest friends (actually the members of his ἑταιρεία who had planned and committed the act of mutilation).

A conflation of these three imprecise 'facts' by the prosecution and Andocides' personal enemies produced the anti-Andocides version, i.e. that he was guilty of 'impiety' (apparently in both affairs), and that after being denounced he received ἄδεια for informing against his 'nearest and dearest', including his father (though this last is nowhere alleged in the surviving parts of *Ag. And.*).

The process of conflation can be clearly seen in *Ag. And.* 21–4, where Andocides' 'relatives' and 'friends' are lumped together indiscriminately as though they were the same group:

> καὶ ἐμήνυσε δεδεμένος κατὰ τῶν αὐτοῦ συγγενῶν καὶ φίλων ἀδείας δοθείσης αὐτῷ . . . μηνύων κατὰ τῶν ἑαυτοῦ φίλων . . . ἐπειδὴ ἀπεκτονὼς ἦν οὓς αὐτὸς ἔφη περὶ πλείστου ποιεῖσθαι . . .

In fact Andocides' relatives and his ἑταῖροι are two quite distinct groups of people involved in different events, as can be seen from several passages in the *De Mysteriis*, particularly ch. 49, where Charmides is reported as saying οἷς γὰρ ἐχρῶ καὶ οἷς συνῆσθα ἄνευ ἡμῶν τῶν συγγενῶν. So much for the anti-Andocides

[1] It is possible that at the time of Andocides' trial some sections of Thucydides' history (e.g. books six and seven) were available in a 'published' form. But even so they could hardly yet have had much influence on the general public.

case in 400. It should not be necessary to point out that the preservation of the anti-Andocides tradition in two such sources as the *Life* and Tzetzes in no way implies that 'the ancient world did not find Andocides' denials convincing'.

8. *Conclusion*

To conclude, Andocides may really have been guilty of parodying the Mysteries. We do not know and never will know. But a critical examination of our sources reveals that there is no good evidence for the hypothesis that Andocides was officially denounced for parodying the Mysteries, or that he denounced himself or his father for doing so. In fact there seems to be no reason why we should not accept Thucydides' account of the scandals of 415 and their consequences as being accurate as far as it goes, and, for Andocides and the Mysteries, his own account in *De Mysteriis* as substantially truthful.

Appendix

It is no part of this paper to deal with the vexed question of the political purpose, if any, behind the mutilation of the Hermae. Suffice it to say that the traditional view (adopted by MacDowell, Appendix G, pp. 192–3) that the intention was to stop the Athenian fleet sailing to Sicily appears to me to be untenable, for the following reasons:

(*a*) Andocides (*De Myst.* 67) refers to the act as a *πίστιν . . . ἀπιστοτάτην*. As such, as many commentators have pointed out, it must have been designed to guarantee the loyalty of the members of Euphiletos' *ἑταιρεία* through the shared guilt of a serious public crime. But loyalty apropos of what? Clearly there is no point in contracting a *πίστις* unless something further is envisaged for the future.

The assassination of Hyperbolos by Samian and Athenian oligarchs in 411 illustrates this point. The words of Thucydides describing the incident, *καὶ Ὑπέρβολόν . . . ἀποκτείνουσι μετὰ Χαρμίνου . . . καί τινων τῶν παρὰ σφίσιν Ἀθηναίων, πίστιν διδόντες αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἄλλα μετ' αὐτῶν τοιαῦτα ξυνέπραξαν, τοῖς τε πλέοσιν ὥρμηντο ἐπιτίθεσθαι* (8. 73. 3), make it quite clear that the contraction of a *πίστις* in this political sense is merely a prelude to some further, more sweeping, act of illegality (i.e., in this case, oligarchic revolution).

Naturally, if the crime which constituted the *πίστις* could itself advance the interests of the group concerned, then so much the better. Such, no doubt, was the case with Hyperbolos' murder. But this was not the only, or even the main, aim.

(*b*) The timing of the act does not suggest it was designed to stop the expedition departing. The herms were mutilated some time during the period of preparation,[1] but no source states that it was on the eve of departure. Indeed Thucydides' vagueness (6. 27. 1. *ἐν δὲ τούτῳ*) tells strongly against such an assumption. But the eve of departure would have been by far the most

[1] Dover, in his most valuable excursus on the Herms and the Mysteries, *HCT* iv. 264–88, concludes (274–6), rightly in my view, that the herms were, *pace* Plutarch, *Alc.* 20. 5, and MacDowell, 187–8, mutilated under a full moon. The dating schemes for 415 of both Dover, *HCT* iv. 271–6, and Meritt/MacDowell, 186–9, posit at least a fortnight between the mutilation and the departure of the expedition.

effective and telling moment, psychologically, if such had been the mutilators' purpose.

(*c*) The chances of such a plan succeeding were remote in the extreme. There was absolutely no reason to believe that an action of this kind would cause the Athenians to give up for good something they had set their hearts upon (Thuc. 6. 24. 2–4), especially when preparations on a vast scale were already under way. As a matter of fact the thought of abandoning the expedition does not seem to have occurred at all to the demos.[1] Public feeling was far too strongly in favour of it to be changed by such hit-or-miss methods.

(*d*) The postulated motive in itself is an improbable one. It is indeed likely that there were certain mildly oligarchic groups in Athens who wanted 'peace at any price' with Sparta. But the Sicilian expedition was not technically a breach of the peace of 421. And, even if these people feared that the expedition would *eventually* lead to involvement with Sparta, they must also have realized that its abandonment would not alter one jot the basic situation in Greece itself, in which a renewal of hostilities at any time was very much on the cards whether there was a Sicilian expedition or not. The act of mutilation was a very risky one for all concerned in it. It is hard to believe that anyone would have regarded the mere *preservation* of the uneasy *status quo* as being worth such risks. Indeed Euphiletos, Meletos, and their friends would personally have gained nothing at all. Such selflessness is most uncharacteristic of fifth-century Athenian politics. Internally, too, the only political casualty of an abandonment of the expedition would have been Alcibiades, not the 'power of the demagogues' or the democratic constitution. That would have remained as strongly entrenched as ever.

[1] This point has recently been emphasized by Dover, *HCT* iv. 285, who, without coming to any hard and fast conclusions, appears to favour the view that the mutilation was not in fact politically motivated at all. This was not, however, the view which the Athenian demos took of the affair (Thuc. 6. 27–8, 60). Of course it has long been customary for historians, taking their cue from Thucydides, to belittle the political sagacity of the demos, which, on this subject, ἐφοβεῖτο αἰεὶ καὶ πάντα ὑπόπτως ἐλάμβανεν (6. 53. 3). But there are some slight indications that, on this occasion at least, it might actually have been right (cf. And. *De Myst.* 41–2, 45, Thuc. 6. 61. 2).

University College of Wales, Aberystwyth J. L. MARR