

## CHARMIDES, AGARISTE AND DAMON: ANDOKIDES 1.16\*

In *De myst.* 1.11–18 (see also 1.25), Andokides reports a series of four judicial denunciations (μηνύσεις), made before the Athenians on four separate occasions in 415 B.C., concerning profanations of the Eleusinian Mysteries. After statements from the slave Andromachos and the metic Teukros, 'a third denunciation followed. The wife of Alkmaionides, who had also been the wife of Damon, a woman named Agariste, made a denunciation that in the house of Charmides beside the Olympieion, Alkibiades, Axiochos and Adeimantos celebrated mysteries. And at this denunciation all these men fled' (1.16).<sup>1</sup> A fourth denunciation was made by the slave Lydos.<sup>2</sup>

\* This paper is the result of a question put to me by Diskin Clay in Athens, in March 1989, where an initial draft of my answer to it was presented at the American School of Classical Studies. A subsequent version was delivered at the annual meeting of the American Philological Association in December 1989. I am grateful for comments received on both occasions.

The following works will be cited by author's name: J. K. Davies, *Athenian Propertied Families 600–300 B.C.* (Oxford, 1971); K. J. Dover in A. W. Gomme, A. Andrewes and K. J. Dover, *A Historical Commentary to Thucydides*, iv (Oxford, 1970); D. M. MacDowell, *Andokides On the Mysteries* (Oxford, 1962); J. L. Marr, 'Andokides' Part in the Mysteries and the Hermae Affairs 415 B.C.', *CQ* 21 (1971), 326–38; M. Ostwald, *From Popular Sovereignty to the Sovereignty of Law* (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London, 1986).

<sup>1</sup> Τρίτη μῆνυσις ἐγένετο. ἡ γυνὴ Ἀλκμεωνίδου, γενομένη δὲ καὶ Δάμωνος – Ἀγαρίστη ὄνομα αὐτῇ – αὐτὴ ἐμήνυσεν ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ τῇ Χαρμοίδου τῇ παρὰ τὸ Ὀλυμπιεῖον μυστήρια ποιεῖν Ἀλκιβιάδην καὶ Ἀξίοχον καὶ Ἀδείμαντον· καὶ ἔφυγον οὗτοι πάντες ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ μηνύσει. Unambiguous parallels at 1.13, 18, 25 and 52 make clear that φεύγειν here must mean 'to flee', and not 'to be prosecuted'. This also follows from the continued survival of all those mentioned in 1.16, in the light of 1.25. Andokides' expression is a little misleading since at the time of Agariste's denunciation Alkibiades was in Sicily; he fled only after being recalled. Accordingly, Dover (p. 280) suggested that this might be true of others on the lists. Yet given the atmosphere of hysteria and the Athenians' hasty and ill-judged executions of many of those accused (Thuc. 6.53, 60), to remain in Athens after being denounced would have been rash.

On the basis of *De myst.* 1.15 (the Council of Five Hundred, as *autokrator*, guaranteed the metic Teukros immunity in exchange for his testimony), M. H. Hansen, *Eisangelia* (Odense, 1975), pp. 77 with n. 10 and 79 n. 13, plausibly argues that Agariste made her denunciation to the Council, not to the Ekklesia. (Cf. also P. J. Rhodes, *The Athenian Boule* (Oxford, 1971), pp. 186–7.) For other activity by the Council in this affair, see *De myst.* 1.17 (the fourth denunciation), 27–8, and 61.

<sup>2</sup> In 'The Affair of the Mysteries: Democracy and the Drinking Group', *Symptotica*, ed. O. Murray (Oxford, 1991), pp. 155–8, Murray argues that 'there is no evidence whatsoever that the Mysteries were parodied: all our evidence shows that they were *performed*, that the ritual was followed accurately' (p. 155). According to Murray, Thucydides' remark that the mysteries were performed ἐφ' ὕβρει (6.28.1) implies that the performers intended 'to show contempt for the gods and for the ordinary conventions of society' (p. 158). However, both circumstantial evidence and other arguments support the standard view that the mysteries were parodied. Murray admits (p. 157) that sacrifice 'found a small place in certain types of *symposion*', as with the club named 'Kakodaimonistai', and also from evidence in Demosthenes 54 (for example, according to 54.39, as a young man Konon and his club-mates 'used to devour the food set out for Hekate, and on each occasion collected up for their dinners together the pig testicles which the Athenians used for purification on the occasion of assemblies'). For an equally striking contemporary parallel (not mentioned by Murray), Eupolis' *Baptai* (416–415) satirized Alkibiades as having led dancing imitations of the female worshippers of the Thracian ecstatic goddess Kotytos (see Testim. i–vi K.–A. V, pp. 331–3). Would Murray argue that this was not an insinuation of parody? Two fourth- or early third-century sources (also not mentioned by Murray) state explicitly that at Athens 'following the capture of Melos' Diagoras of Melos 'disparaged' the mysteries (εὐτελεῖζειν: Melanthios, *FGrHist* 326 F 3) or 'scoffed at' and 'made

Four questions have been raised about Andokides 1.16. First, two different Charmides are attested during this period: Charmides the son of Aristoteles, Andokides' cousin, who is mentioned in *De myst.* 1.48–68; and Charmides the son of Glaukon, Kritias' cousin, Plato's uncle, later one of the Thirty and then one of the Ten (Xen. *Hell.* 2.4.19), a character in several Platonic dialogues and according to Plato's *Charmides* (154–155) the greatest beauty of his day. Which, if either, of these Charmides does Andokides refer to in 1.16? Second, is the Damon mentioned by Andokides the music philosopher and adviser to Perikles, or else some other Damon? Raubitschek, Davies and MacDowell, among others, have left this question open.<sup>3</sup> Third, was Damon dead by 415, or else divorced from Agariste? And fourth, how did Agariste obtain her information?

For the first of these questions, concerning Charmides, virtually all scholars have believed that the Charmides mentioned in 1.16 was Andokides' cousin, the son of Aristoteles.<sup>4</sup> As far as I have seen, only Droysen in 1835, with no argumentation, and Aurenche in 1974, with at best a single weak argument, have identified him as the son of Glaukon.<sup>5</sup> Aurenche notes that Periktione, the sister of Charmides the son of Glaukon, married Ariston the son of Aristokles, a member of the city deme Kollytos (incidentally, these are Plato's parents), and that the Olympieion, beside the house of Charmides (*De myst.* 1.16), could have been in that deme. As an argument for identifying Charmides this is not cogent. For although some Athenians did marry within their hereditary demes and possessed property in their hereditary demes, it remains uncertain whether Charmides the son of Glaukon was a member of the deme Kollytos (as Aurenche himself notes), and marriages outside hereditary demes were of course common.<sup>6</sup>

Finally, on the identity of Charmides in *De myst.* 1.16, Dover, followed by Ostwald, is undecided.<sup>7</sup>

light of' them (διαχλευάζειν, μικρὰ ποιεῖν: Krateros, *FGrHist* 342 F 16), and was therefore forced to flee the city. In connection with the scandal of 415, as Murray acutely observed, the sources do state, simply, that various people 'performed the mysteries', and also that non-initiates could later describe different aspects of the cult celebration. However, neither point excludes the view that the mysteries were parodied. Even on Murray's assumption, it is difficult to imagine that those who wished to 'show contempt' for these rites were nonetheless careful to perform them correctly.

<sup>3</sup> A. E. Raubitschek, 'Damon', *Cl&M* 16 (1955), 79; Davies, p. 383 (citing 'numerous chronological and other problems' against identification with the music philosopher); MacDowell, p. 75 ('this may be the musician').

<sup>4</sup> Scholars adopting this identification without qualification include J. Hatzfeld, *Alcibiade* (Paris, 1951), p. 174 and Davies, p. 30. Others but expressing some uncertainty include Busolt, *Griech. Gesch.* 3.2, pp. 1310–11 n. 5, Kirchner, *PA* 15510 ('videtur'), F. Sartori, *Le Eterie nella vita politica ateniese del VI e V secolo a.C.* (Rome, 1957), p. 94 ('forse'), and MacDowell, p. 76 ('presumably the son of Aristoteles... but Charmides son of Glaukon... is also possible'). In addition, Judeich, *RE* 3.2 (1899), col. 2174 s.v. 'Charmides' (the son of Glaukon), omits any reference to this incident. (In *RE* the son of Aristoteles gets no entry.)

<sup>5</sup> J. Droysen, *RhM* 3 (1835), 195 and n. 41; O. Aurenche, *Les groupes d'Alcibiade, de Leogoras et de Teucros. Remarques sur la vie politique athénienne en 415 avant J.C.* (Paris, 1974), pp. 46 and 106.

<sup>6</sup> On marriages within hereditary demes, see R. Osborne, *Demos: the Discovery of Classical Attika* (Cambridge, 1985), pp. 131–5; on owning property within hereditary demes, see *ibid.* pp. 52–63. On marriages outside the hereditary deme (but patterns of family marriages in the same outside deme), see C. A. Cox, 'Sisters, Daughters and the Deme of Marriage: a Note', *JHS* 108 (1988), 185–8 (see in particular 187–8, that Plato's sister married a man who owned land contiguous to his). On the location of Kollytos, see J. S. Traill, *The Political Organization of Attika*, *Hesperia* Suppl. 14, 1975, p. 40 and map. In Plutarch's day at least, Kollytos was a fashionable address (*De exil.* 601b).

<sup>7</sup> Dover, pp. 281 n. 8, 283, 287; Ostwald, pp. 539, 541, 545.

Four arguments, however, and three texts indicate that the Charmides in *De myst.* 1.16 was in fact the son of Glaukon.

Of the arguments, first, in *De myst.* 1.47–68 Andokides recounts in detail the night when he and many of his relatives were locked in prison as a result of Diokleides' denunciation concerning the mutilation of the Herms. He cites, at length and in direct speech, the appeal made to him by his cousin Charmides the son of Aristoteles, that if he knew anything at all he should tell it (1.49–50). Andokides represents his cousin as utterly ignorant of the events in connection with the Herms that landed him in prison; he mentions repeatedly the innocence of those imprisoned with him (1.51, 53, 58). Furthermore, he stresses that as a result of his decision to testify, he 'saved' his various relatives including his cousins, 'as they will admit' (1.68, see also 1.59). Unfortunately the chronological relationship between Agariste's denunciation in 1.16 and the events reported in 1.47–68 is uncertain. Andokides has chosen to discuss as a whole the various episodes pertaining to the profanation of the mysteries (1.11–33) before he discusses events pertaining to the mutilation of the Herms (1.34–69), and it is not always easy to correlate these two discussions. In particular, some scholars have argued that Agariste's denunciation came well after the events reported in 1.47–68,<sup>8</sup> while for example Dover (p. 274) 'sees no good reason' why Agariste's testimony should not have preceded those events. As Hansen's calculations reveal (above, n. 1, pp. 74–82), neither chronology can be ruled out. Therefore, the implications of both datings for our problem must be considered.

(1) If Agariste denounced events in the house of Charmides the son of Aristoteles and her denunciation occurred *before* Charmides' arrest as a result of Diokleides' testimony, we must conclude that Andokides' phrase in 1.16, 'all these men fled', did not include Charmides the son of Aristoteles, and therefore that Agariste did not implicate him. But how could the mysteries be performed in a person's house and he know nothing of it? (By contrast, we shall see, there is good evidence that Charmides the son of Glaukon was implicated and fled.)

(2) If Agariste's denunciation came after the events narrated in 1.47–68 and the Charmides mentioned in 1.16 did flee into exile, nonetheless *in his speech* Andokides mentioned the involvement of this Charmides in profaning the mysteries (1.16) before he narrated the prison scene. Accordingly, it is reasonable to ask whether in 1.49–50 he would have particularly chosen to quote in detail the appeal of his cousin Charmides, if he had just reminded his audience that this cousin had been involved in profaning the mysteries and had to flee Athens.<sup>9</sup> Would he have emphasized that his relatives (including Charmides the son of Aristoteles) were 'saved' as a result of his testimony, if (to use Charmides' own words in 1.49) his cousin had 'convicted himself of sacrilege by fleeing'?

Therefore, on either chronology the identification of Charmides in 1.16 as the son of Glaukon is supported.

As my second argument for identifying the son of Glaukon in *De myst.* 1.16, when Andokides names those who were denounced by Diokleides for mutilating the Herms, he specifies in full detail the family relationship between himself and Charmides the son of Aristoteles: 'That is a cousin of mine; his mother and my father were brother and sister' (1.47); 'Charmides, a cousin of my own age and brought up with me in my own home since boyhood' (1.48). By contrast, in 1.16 he says nothing

<sup>8</sup> See, e.g., MacDowell, pp. 182–5; Marr, p. 328.

<sup>9</sup> In Plutarch's version of this incident (*Alc.* 21), the appeal to Andokides in prison is made by a friend named Timaios. However, this probably reflects someone's attempt to provide a name for Thucydides' *τινός* (6.60.2), in ignorance of Andokides' account (see Marr, p. 330).

of any family relationship but instead describes the location of Charmides' house. MacDowell (p. 76) suggests that in 1.16 Andokides obscured the family relationship lest he be linked with a religious offender. This suggestion, however, is inconsistent with Andokides' full description of his relationship with that same religious offender – if he was the son of Aristoteles – in 1.47–8. In addition, if nothing happened to Charmides the son of Aristoteles after Agariste's testimony and this man was Andokides' cousin, why should Andokides have mentioned him at all in 1.16? Charmides' house would have been an irrelevant detail. Its mention could only prejudice Andokides' subsequent assertions of his cousin's innocence.

Third, in 399 Andokides' audience would most easily have assumed that the Charmides mentioned without further identification in 1.16 was the famous Charmides, the son of Glaukon, the great beauty turned brutal tyrant in 404. By contrast, Andokides' cousin is now and presumably was then obscure. He is known only from Andokides' speech, and Andokides identifies him only by personal relationship. If Andokides refers to Charmides the son of Aristoteles in 1.16, his meaning would have been both incomprehensible to his audience, and immediately misunderstood.

Finally, fourth, Charmides the son of Glaukon was well known not only as an associate of the sophists (and of Sokrates), but also as a friend of the three men mentioned in *De myst.* 1.16. In the opening scene of Plato's *Protagoras*, he is present along with Alkibiades and Adeimantos. According to Xenophon (*Smp.* 4.25) and [Plato] *Axiochos* 364a, he was the lover of Kleinias the son of Axiochos. Furthermore, as a record of members of the Sokratic circle a fragmentary fifth-century inscription found on the site of Plato's Academy (χαρμ[ιδης] ἀρισ[τον] ἀξι[οχος] κριτον) must refer to the son of Glaukon: and here he is associated with Axiochos.<sup>10</sup> It is therefore perfectly credible that profanations of traditional ritual by Alkibiades, Adeimantos and Axiochos should have occurred in this man's house. There is no obvious reason why Alkibiades and his friends should have parodied mysteries in the son of Aristoteles' house.

In addition to these four arguments, three texts help to identify the Charmides of *De myst.* 1.16. First, in a conversation in Xen. *Smp.* 4.31, Charmides the son of Glaukon commends his transition from wealth to poverty. He sleeps very much better, he says, 'since I am now deprived of my foreign possessions, reap none of the harvests from my Attic properties, and my household furniture has been sold'.<sup>11</sup> In a brief note to his edition of the *Symposium*, Ollier suggested that 'la ruine de Charmide – comme celle de nombreux Athéniens – est sans doute un résultat de la guerre du Péloponnèse, et notamment du ravage de l'Attique par l'ennemi. Charmide a été réduit à vendre son mobilier'.<sup>12</sup> The main difficulty with this suggestion, however, is that Athenians were not generally deprived of their foreign possessions until after 404, whereas the dramatic date of the *Symposium* is 421 and Charmides the son of Glaukon died in 403. On the other hand, we know from various sources, including the so-called Attic Stelai, that those who fled Athens in 415 as a result of

<sup>10</sup> For the friendship of Sokrates and Charmides the son of Glaukon, see Pl. *Smp.* 222 and Charmides. According to Xen. *Smp.* 3.7, Sokrates persuaded Charmides to enter politics; according to 4.32, Charmides' association with Sokrates is said to have damaged his (Charmides') reputation. For the Academy inscription see H. G. G. Payne, *JHS* 54 (1934), 188–9 = *SEG* 13 (1956), 28.

<sup>11</sup> νῦν δ' ἐπειδὴ τῶν ὑπερορίων στέρομαι καὶ τὰ ἐγγεῖα οὐ καρποῦμαι καὶ τὰ ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας πέπραται, ἡδέως μὲν καθεύδω ἐκτεταμένος... I hope elsewhere to explore the implications of this passage for the confiscation of property of those implicated in the profanations of 415.

<sup>12</sup> See F. Ollier, *Xénophon Banquet* (Budé, Paris, 1961), p. 115 (in reference to p. 57 line 21).

sacrilege subsequently had their property, including furniture, confiscated and sold by the state.<sup>13</sup> As Davies says (p. 331), Charmides' remarks in the *Symposium* 'can hardly be anything but a reference to the calamity of 414'. But Xenophon, Davies continues, 'has committed an interesting double confusion'. For 'the dramatic date of the *Symposium* is 421, and the Charmides who was convicted in 414 was not Kritias' cousin but his homonym, son of Aristoteles'. On the contrary, to judge from Andokides, Charmides the son of Aristoteles appears not to have been convicted in 414, as we have seen. And if we forgive Xenophon (as we do Plato, although possibly for different reasons) a slight chronological error in dramatic setting – we must do this in any case, regardless of which Charmides he meant – his testimony fits perfectly with Andokides'. That is, Charmides the son of Glaukon was implicated in the events of 415 and escaped into exile. Therefore, Andokides' phrase 'all these men fled' does include Charmides; Charmides did know what was transpiring in his house one night in 415; and Andokides had no reason not to mention this.

A second passage, unnoticed in this connection, helps to confirm these conclusions and also identifies Andokides' Damon. In the opening scene of [Plato] *Axiochos* (written probably in the late second or the first century B.C.<sup>14</sup>), Sokrates is walking near the Ilissos when he hears his name called. 'When I turned around to see from where this came, I saw Kleinias the son of Axiochos running toward Kallirhoe with Damon the musician and Charmides the son of Glaukon'. The parallel with Andokides 1.16 is striking. In a single sentence the *Axiochos* scene includes Kleinias the son of Axiochos, Charmides the son of Glaukon, and Damon, at a place near Kallirhoe; Axiochos himself is later a main character in the dialogue. Andokides in a single sentence had mentioned Axiochos, Charmides, Damon's wife (who spilled the beans on them) and also Charmides' house beside the Olympieion, which was near Kallirhoe.<sup>15</sup> The *Axiochos* passage is especially significant in that it is fiction. When the author of that text came to compose a dramatic setting for his dialogue, his ready grouping of Damon, Charmides the son of Glaukon, Kleinias the son of Axiochos, and Axiochos himself, suggests that the association of these men was well known. This supports the identification of Charmides in Andokides 1.16 as the son of Glaukon, and confirms the identity of Andokides' Damon as the music philosopher.

As a third text supporting these conclusions, in *Republic* 400, 424c (and see further 399a–c) Plato's brother Glaukon, also a nephew of Charmides the son of Glaukon and himself a musician, talks with Sokrates about Damon's musical theories. Both Sokrates and Glaukon express their firm agreement with Damon's views. Thus we find two relatives of Charmides the son of Glaukon (Plato and his brother) associated with Damon ὁ μουσικός.

<sup>13</sup> See *De myst.* 1.51 (the guilty were executed and their properties confiscated), Philoch. *FGrHist* 328 F 134, Plu. *Alc.* 22, Poll. 10.97, and (for the Attic Stelai) W. K. Pritchett, *Hesperia* 22 (1953), 225–99 (= *SEG* 13.12–22), with minor corrections and supplements, *Hesperia* 30 (1961), 23–9 (= *SEG* 19.23), now = *IG* i<sup>3</sup>.421–30. Unfortunately, extant fragments of the Stelai mention Alkibiades, Axiochos and Adeimantos, but no Charmides.

<sup>14</sup> On the date of the *Axiochos* (which echoes Stoic, Cynic and Epicurean views as well as Plato), see J. Chevalier, *Etude critique du dialogue pseudo-platonicien l'Axiochos*, (Paris, 1915), *passim*; J. Souilhé, ed., *Platon* vol. 13.3 (Budé: Paris, 1930), pp. 132–6, accepted by Ostwald, p. 542; D. Tarrant, *CQ* 32 (1938), 170 (= *Der historischer Sokrates*, ed. A. Patzer, 'Wege der Forsch.' 585, Darmstadt, 1987, p. 265); M. Isnardi Parente, 'Un discorso consolatorio del "Corpus platonicum"', *Riv. crit. di stor. d. filos.* 16 (1965), 33–47; J. P. Hershbell, *Pseudo-Plato, Axiochos* (Scholars Press, Chico, CA, 1981), pp. 10–21.

<sup>15</sup> On the locations of Kallirhoe and the Olympieion, see (conveniently) J. Travlos, *Pictorial Dictionary of Ancient Athens* (New York, 1971), pp. 204, 402.

Therefore, on the basis of four arguments and three texts, we may conclude that in *De myst.* 1.16, Charmides is the son of Glaukon, and Damon is the music philosopher. (And therefore, *if* the Olympieion was in Kollytos and Kollytos was Charmides' ancestral deme, Periktione did marry within her deme, and we have gained another example of this phenomenon.)

Finally, Andokides' reference to Agariste 'the wife of Alkmaionides, who had also been the wife of Damon', has raised the questions of whether Damon was dead by 415 or else been divorced, and how Agariste obtained her information. Murray writes, 'how Agariste, as a respectable woman, had gained knowledge of what went on in the *andron* of a house not even her own, and therefore how much she actually knew, are interesting questions' (above, n. 2, p. 154). If Agariste was of Alkmaionid parentage (as seems virtually certain in the light of her Alkmaionid-sounding name and subsequent marriage to Alkmaionides), MacDowell (p. 75) suggested that she may have learned of the sacrilege through Alkibiades, whose mother was also Alkmaionid.<sup>16</sup> 'It would otherwise be surprising that an Athenian woman should know about the secret activities of three men not related to her in the house of a fourth also apparently unrelated.' Of course there are many other such possibilities, none provable.<sup>17</sup> Andokides himself, however, may point to an alternative explanation. That is, given Damon's well-known friendships with Charmides the son of Glaukon and Kleinias the son of Axiochos (as we now can see), the mention (in 399) of Agariste's former husband in a context that includes Charmides and Axiochos may not be regarded as extraneous biographical filler about an obscure philosopher of music, but intended to imply that the source of Agariste's information was Damon. I add that there is no good reason to doubt that Damon was alive in 415. He appears to have been very active philosophically during the 420s; for what it is worth, he is represented as someone to consult in Plato's *Republic*, with a dramatic date of between 421 and 412.<sup>18</sup> If this is right, then according to Andokides, Agariste acted on information received not from her father's family but from her husband, to whom she was therefore still married.

Finally – the question must be asked – why did Agariste testify? Unlike the earlier and later declarations by metics and slaves, this public denunciation by a woman from a family of the highest social position against others equally blue-blooded, must have been one of the most sensational events in an uncommonly sensational year.<sup>19</sup>

<sup>16</sup> Ostwald, p. 538 rightly challenges Aurenche's suggestion (above, n. 5, p. 46 and n. 2) that Agariste herself participated in the sacrilege. That Agariste was Alkmaionid has been accepted since Thirlwall (3.388). See more recently Davies, pp. 382–3.

<sup>17</sup> Thus for example, if Axiochos' mother was in fact Aspasia's sister (see, persuasively, P. J. Bicknell, 'Axiochos Alkibiadou, Aspasia and Aspasio', *AC* 51 (1982), 240–50), Agariste and Axiochos' family would share an Alkmaionid connection through Perikles' sons by Aspasia, since Perikles was Alkmaionid on his mother's side.

<sup>18</sup> For Damon's activities in the later 420s, see Pl. *Lch.*, with a dramatic date between 424 and 418 (see e.g. A. E. Taylor, *Plato: the Man and his Work* (New York, 1927), p. 58) where he is represented as the teacher of Nikias (197d, 199e–200b) and Nikeratos (180c–d), as a 'good friend' of Sokrates (197d, cf. 180c–d), and 'frequent associate of Prodikos' (197d). In addition, in 423, in *Clouds* 649–51, Aristophanes appears to allude to Damon's metrical teachings, as Wilamowitz (*Griechische Verskunst* (Berlin, 1921), p. 59) and many others have argued. On the dramatic date of the *Republic* see K. J. Dover, *Lysias and the Corpus Lysiacum* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1968), pp. 29–32, 42.

<sup>19</sup> Women were forbidden to testify except in cases of treason, sacrilege, the theft of public funds, and by the procedure of *menusis*: see A. R. W. Harrison, *The Law of Athens*, i: *The Family and Property* (Oxford, 1968), p. 171, J. H. Lipsius, *Das attische Recht und Rechtsverfahren*, i (Leipzig, 1905), pp. 208–11. It is possible that other offences could also be the subject of *menusis*: our information is derived only from individual cases.

Of course we shall never know why Agariste decided to testify. However, at least four different factors can reasonably be hypothesized as contributing to that decision. Exploring these possibilities may help to clarify a complex situation. First, her public explanation was presumably that of civic duty: in the city's interests she had to tell what she knew. The validity of this factor is encouraged by the fact that she was testifying against Alkibiades, whose mother Deinomache was an Alkmaionid, and also by her personal courage. For if she was not believed she would have been executed (cf. *De myst.* 1.20). That by 408 the Athenians had decided that her testimony was false and Alkibiades, Axiochos and Adeimantos all returned to Athens,<sup>20</sup> need not be important, since that decision was presumably a political one. However, a second factor argues against any great idealism on Agariste's part. It has long been suggested that Agariste's attack was directed against Alkibiades, possibly (on one chronology) as a reaction against Diokleides' allegations which may have struck at Alkibiades' enemies.<sup>21</sup> In the case of Agariste, this is supported by the close association with Alkibiades of all three men whom she denounced, and also by the likelihood that more than three or four men were involved in the particular incident which she revealed. (Presumably they at least had an audience: cf. *De myst.* 1.12.) Axiochos was Alkibiades' uncle and accused by Lysias (F 4 Thal. = Ath. 534f–535a) of accompanying his nephew's debauches at Abydos. (Over the course of a generation, the mistress he shared with Alkibiades produced a daughter with whom, when she grew up, they both used to make love – each in turn announcing that she must be the daughter of the other!) Later charged with betraying the fleet (Xen. *Hell.* 2.1.32), Adeimantos was *strategos* with Alkibiades in 407, at Andros (ibid. 1.4.21–2), and was subsequently linked with him in 405 (Lys. 14.38). Finally, Charmides the son of Glaukon, as we have seen, was the lover of Kleinias the son of Axiochos, Alkibiades' cousin. In connection with Alkibiades, it might also be considered whether Agariste was acting on behalf of her husband, since Damon is said to have been (whatever exactly this means) the 'teacher' of Nikias and his son Nikeratos (Pl. *Laches* 180c–d, 197d, 199e–200b), and Nikias of course opposed Alkibiades' Sicilian venture. (Nikias' brother Eukrates had also been implicated by Diokleides: *De myst.* 1.47, 66.) Against this possibility, however, at least two of the men implicated by Agariste we have seen to be Damon's friends. There is also no reason to think that Damon's relationship with Nikias was of any great significance.

As a third possible factor influencing Agariste's decision to testify, the ancient charge of Alkmaionid sacrilege had recently been revived (Thuc. 1.27.1, Plu. *Per.* 33.1), and the family might have thought it important to demonstrate its piety and decisively to distance itself from Alkibiades' offence. Therefore, perhaps, it was important that Agariste testify, and not her husband Damon. The accusation of Alkmaionid disloyalty to Athens after 507 (Hdt. 5.73, 6.121–2), from which the family never recovered politically (Davies, p. 381), could have played a similar role, since Alkibiades was accused of plotting to overthrow the government (Plu. *Alc.* 20.3). As we have seen, all four of these men at least later were judged to be unsavoury characters, and disloyal to the democracy.

Finally, a fourth factor is supported by the facts that Damon himself did not testify, that in a capital case Agariste denounced several friends of her husband quite possibly

<sup>20</sup> For sources, see Dover (above, n. 18), p. 32. The date of Charmides' return is uncertain.

<sup>21</sup> See Hatzfeld (above, n. 4), pp. 193–4, Marr, p. 328 (who also stresses that Agariste's was an Alkmaionid attack: Diokleides had denounced Kallias the son of Alkmaion, *De myst.* 1.47), cf. Dover, pp. 286–8 (wisely cautious about the dangers of prosopographical approaches to Athenian politics).

by means of information which she had obtained from him, and that she subsequently appears with a new husband. These points suggest that Agariste may not have been especially happy with Damon. If so – we may speculate – her use of Damon's information against a group of his particular pals will have precipitated the marriage's collapse, and Agariste's flight back into the bosom of her Alkmaionid family.<sup>22</sup>

*The Johns Hopkins University*

ROBERT W. WALLACE

<sup>22</sup> Agariste's marriage to a kinsman, Alkmaionides, of course, need reflect nothing more than standard Attic provisions in the case of unmarried women. If for example Damon died without leaving a son or heir, or without (on his deathbed) giving his widow to a new husband, Agariste would return to her own *oikos*, where her *kurios* could marry her to anyone he wished, including various relatives. For a different example, if Agariste's father died leaving no legitimate heir and Agariste had no son, she could have been forced to divorce Damon and, as *epikleros*, be claimed in marriage by one of her male relatives, in a predetermined order based on relations to her deceased father. For details see Harrison (above, n. 19), pp. 21–4, and D. M. MacDowell, *The Law in Classical Athens* (Ithaca, N.Y., and London, 1978), pp. 95–6. It may be pertinent to add that in Athens both divorce and remarriage were common: see W. Thompson, *CSCA* 5 (1972), 211–25, esp. 218–19 (our example from Andokides is on p. 212).