

XIII.—The Case against Alcibiades (Andocides IV)

A. E. RAUBITSCHKE

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

One of the most puzzling documents of the internal history of Athens during the Peloponnesian War is the speech against Alcibiades preserved among the works of Andocides. It is generally assumed that the speech is not the work of Andocides and that it was composed early in the fourth century, as part of the Alcibiades literature, much of which has come down to us. The historical material contained in the speech has been, in part, accepted by modern scholars. There remain, however, a number of questions which have either never been asked or have not been satisfactorily answered. It is the purpose of this paper to present some of these questions and to examine them without coming, perhaps, to any definite answers. Jean Hatzfeld's admirable biography of Alcibiades has given me added encouragement to re-examine the evidence so completely and so critically assembled in his book.¹

I

The authorship seemed to be settled once students agreed that the speech could not possibly have been written and delivered by Andocides himself.² The fact that the speech appears to have been attributed also to Lysias (among whose works two speeches against Alcibiades the younger are preserved) or to the Socratic Aeschines (who wrote a famous dialogue dealing with Alcibiades) may have encouraged the assumption that it is the work of an otherwise unknown pupil of a sophist. One may wonder, however, why the speech was ever attributed to Andocides. Since the speaker

¹ *Alcibiade* (Paris, 1940) 116–142; see also L. Gernet, *RPh* 57 (1931) 313–326; J. Carcopino, *L'ostracisme Athénien* (Paris, 1935) 191–251; Th. Lenschau in *RE* s.v. "Phaiax," no. 4, cols. 1534–1536; W. Peek, *Kerameikos*, III (Berlin, 1941) 78–80 (no. 149) and 101–104; O. W. Reinmuth in *RE* s.v. "Ostrakismos," cols. 1683–1684.

² See the parallel accounts in F. Blass, *Die Attische Beredsamkeit*, I² (Leipzig, 1887) 336–339 (pp. 329–331 of the first edition), and R. C. Jebb, *The Attic Orators*, I (London, 1876) 134–139. Compare, however, A. Schroff, *Zur Echtheitsfrage der vierten Rede des Andokides* (Erlangen, 1901). The ancient testimonies and the modern bibliography have been treated in these studies (see also notes 1 and 3) so adequately that it will be necessary to document my own essay but sparingly.

was evidently Phaeax, Andocides must have been thought to have composed the speech for Phaeax; and, indeed, the speech is called "a defense addressed to (or, concerning) Phaeax" (ἀπολογία πρὸς Φαίακα) in the biography of Andocides preserved under the name of Plutarch (§ 14). Since the mutilation of the herms, in which Andocides was personally involved, was perpetrated in order to prevent the sailing of the Sicilian Expedition, the leader of which was Alcibiades, one may deduce that Andocides could have shown his hostility towards Alcibiades and his plans also by writing a speech for Phaeax designed to promote the ostracism of Alcibiades. If the extant speech was not actually written by Andocides, one can understand why it should have been attributed to him.

II

The dramatic date of the speech has been used as the main argument against its authenticity. Since Alcibiades is blamed for the enslavement of the defeated Melians (§§ 22–23), and the Sicilian expedition had not begun (or is not mentioned), the speech, if not fictitious, must have been written early in 415 B.C. Yet the last ostracism, that of Hyperbolus, is said to have taken place in 417 B.C., and accordingly no ostracism could have been held two years later. One may wonder whether the author of the speech was so ignorant of the events with which he dealt that he may be credited with so conspicuous an error in chronology. In fact, the reference to the capture of Melos is not the only part of the speech which must have been written after 417 B.C. The passage dealing with Alcibiades' conduct at the Olympic Games (§§ 25–31) refers presumably to 416 B.C. (see, below, IV G). Are we to assume that the author of the speech who dealt with this episode at such length was ignorant of this fact which modern students have been able to establish? One must suppose, therefore, that the speech was written with the ostracism of 415 B.C. in mind, and that this must have been also the date of the ostracism of Hyperbolus.³ If Theopompus is credited with the statement that Hyperbolus lived in exile for six years (and was assassinated, according to Thucydides, 8.73.3, in

³ A. G. Woodhead's article "I.G., 1², 95, and the ostracism of Hyperbolus" (to be published in *Hesperia*) contains proof that Hyperbolus could not have been ostracized before 416 B.C. I am grateful to Woodhead as well as to N. Doenges, J. V. A. Fine, R.¹ Meiggs, H. W. Parke, G. Stamires, and E. Vanderpool for having examined my manuscript and for having given me the benefit of their advice and criticism.

411 B.C.), he or his copyist must either have made a mistake or have used a peculiar way of counting; see Aristophanes, *Wasps*, scholium on line 1001: ἐξωστράκισαν τὸν Ὑπέρβολον ἐξ ἑτη. If, however, quite apart from the authenticity of the speech, Hyperbolus was ostracized in 415 B.C., the circumstances of his ostracism are thrown into a new light. The conflict between Nicias and Alcibiades of which the speech tells, and their agreement to join forces against Hyperbolus, would belong immediately before the famous debate between the two men recorded by Thucydides.

It is true that modern historians have been able to draw a detailed and not altogether unconvincing picture of earlier differences between Alcibiades and Nicias concerning Athenian policy in the Peloponnesus and especially the Argive alliance (see note 1). They spoke of successes and setbacks in Alcibiades' struggle for domination, and they placed the attempted ostracism of Alcibiades in connection with either of them. Yet on closer inspection, it appears that apart from one incident (Thuc. 5.45 f.), nothing is known of internal differences in Athens. The rather imaginative descriptions of the circumstances surrounding the ostracism of Hyperbolus, whether it is dated in 418 B.C. or in 417 B.C., read like doublets of the known conflicts which immediately preceded the Sicilian expedition.

III

One may wonder whether it is accidental that several of the topics of the Nicias-Alcibiades debate in Thucydides also appear in the speech of Phaeax. This is the more remarkable since there is no reason to assume that Thucydides knew the speech or that the author of the speech had read Thucydides.

The speech characterizes Alcibiades (§ 16) as a man who "refuses to be considered equal, or but little superior to, his fellows," and Thucydides lets Alcibiades assert (6.16) that it is "only fair that a man proud of his position should refuse to be upon an equality with the rest." The public attitude towards Alcibiades is characterized both in the speech (§ 21) and by Thucydides (6.15) as being dominated by anger, fear, and subservience. Alcibiades calls attention to his splendid performances of choregies (Thuc. 6.16), and the speech contains a lengthy illustration of this boast (§§ 20-21). The political differences between the younger and the older generations are stressed both by Thucydides (6.13 and 18) and in the speech (§ 22). The Melian affair, and Alcibiades' share

in it (§§ 22–23), is mentioned by Thucydides just before the Nicias-Alcibiades debate, but the historian gave no names.

More significant, however, than these rather casual and obvious similarities is the fact that both the speech and Thucydides' account contain explicit expressions of the popular feeling that Alcibiades was aiming at tyranny. This is not surprising in the speech (§§ 24 and 27) which purports to be concerned with ostracism, but it is significant in Thucydides where there is no mention of the ostracism of Hyperbolus and of the part Alcibiades played in it. In his general characterization of Alcibiades, Thucydides reported (6.15) that the people "were hostile to him because they thought he aimed at tyranny," and again when telling of Alcibiades' recall the historian indicated that the people of Athens thought of Alcibiades as a second Pisistratus (6.53), and Thucydides took the opportunity of recalling in detail the end of the Pisistratids (6.54–59). Intentionally or not, Thucydides at this point described the public sentiment as it must have existed not only after Alcibiades' departure for Sicily but also shortly before, when he was in danger of being ostracized.⁴

The most significant link between Thucydides' account of the Nicias-Alcibiades debate and the speech is provided by the references in both documents to Alcibiades' victory in the Olympic Games of 416 B.C. Thucydides referred to it not only in general terms (6.15) and when he had Nicias speak (6.12) of a certain young man's desire "to be admired because of his horses," but also most specifically at the very beginning of Alcibiades' speech (6.16). In fact, Alcibiades makes precisely the statement, basing his claim to leadership on his Olympic victory, which the author of the speech assumed he would make (§ 25).

To sum up, several passages in Phaeax' speech and Thucydides' account of the situation in Athens just before the Sicilian Expedition agree to a remarkable extent, and this agreement may indicate either that the speech is genuine or that its author took great pains to produce a speech which would appear authentic.

IV

The various inconsistencies and blatant errors in the speech have been used to challenge not only its authenticity but also the

⁴ For a different interpretation, see L. Pearson, *AJPh* 70 (1949) 186–189.

reliability of such information which otherwise cannot be disproved. Yet there are inconsistencies and even errors in the two certainly genuine speeches of Andocides, and it should be remembered that a document like the speech of Phaeax must be compared with pamphlets like the Old Oligarch's or with speeches like those in Thucydides rather than with factual historical accounts like the main portion of Thucydides' work. If considered in this way, the question of authenticity loses some of its significance since the speech may be a pamphlet issued at the time (*ca.* 415 B.C.) and not the text of a speech actually delivered; or it may be a speech supposed to have been delivered in 415 B.C. but actually written ten or fifteen years later, just as most of the speeches in Thucydides' work are not accurate records of words actually spoken but accounts designed to convey the deeper meaning of the situation which they try to elucidate. What they lack in historical truth they gain fully in psychological and political insight. In the following paragraphs a few of the errors and inconsistencies contained in the speech may be examined in detail.

A

The speaker is evidently not a partisan of the radical democracy. The use of the adjective *ἀγαθός* referring to himself and to his audience should make this amply clear (§§ 1 and 2). This impression is strengthened by the speaker's frank and repeated confession that his anti-democratic attitude had resulted in four separate court actions, in which he was, however, acquitted (§§ 8 and 35-37). The dates and circumstances of these trials are not known, but attention may be called to the speaker's obscure assertion that two other men accused on the same charges had been condemned and executed (§ 37); if we knew who these men were, we could judge more accurately the policy of the speaker.⁵

The criticism of the institution of ostracism (§§ 3-6) has often been used as evidence against the authenticity of the speech. The speaker declared bluntly (§ 3) that the law of ostracism is unconstitutional since it violates the famous principle that no man should be exiled, imprisoned, or executed without due process of law. The law of ostracism did not provide for a formal accusation, nor for a formal defense, nor was there a provision in it securing the secrecy

⁵ Reference may be made to Thucydides 4.65.3, but the two men mentioned there suffered exile not death.

of the ballot. This passage has been greatly misunderstood by most commentators. First of all, the unity of the three characteristic provisions of the due process (accusation, defense, secret vote) has been destroyed by all those editors and commentators who followed Schleiermacher in deleting the third *οὔτε* and in assuming that the law of ostracism provided for a secret ballot. Yet the voting during ostracism should not be contrasted to the open show of hands in the assembly but to the secret vote cast in the courts. There was nothing secret about any part of the process of ostracism except that the marked ballots were not shown to the magistrates who watched over the voting urns. Secondly, the passage in the speech was misinterpreted to mean that the law of ostracism specifically forbade any public discussion of the issue, and the author of the speech was accordingly accused of a flagrant and intentional error. In fact, all he stated was that the law did not provide for formal accusation of defense. It cannot be doubted, however, that a certain amount of propaganda, probably oral propaganda, was necessary to produce the large vote which the law required. The speech is undoubtedly a document designed to influence public opinion against Alcibiades, or else the author of the speech pretended that his work was of this type. The real or alleged occasion of the speech was, of course, not a formal assembly meeting but rather one of those informal but highly important meetings which are common to all democracies.

The next point made by the speaker (§ 4) is also significant because it shows that he contrasted ostracism to the due process of law (and not to decisions made in the assembly). In the law courts, the jury was determined by lot and therefore could not be influenced by partisan groups. Ostracism, however, with its complete freedom of propaganda and ballot could easily come under the influence of those who could count on the loyal following of a substantial number of people. The existence of factions and political clubs is well attested for the second half of the fifth century, and their operation indeed made ostracism meaningless.

The speaker's attack upon the law of ostracism is on the whole justified, though not very convincing; he himself gave a better characterization of the institution in §§ 35-36. One must not deduce from this criticism that the speech is a forgery, nor can one learn very much from it about the provisions of the law. The influence of the clubs and factions is known from other sources, and

this influence was particularly significant on the occasion of this ostracism when the factions of Nicias and Alcibiades made common cause against Hyperbolus.

B

Closely connected with the question whether or not the speech could have been delivered is the identification of the audience to whom it may have been addressed. If the law of ostracism did not provide for a formal accusation or defense, no speech like the one under discussion could have been made during a formal meeting of the assembly. And yet, it is generally assumed that the speech was delivered (or was alleged to have been delivered) at an assembly meeting. It seems clear, however, that the speaker addressed his audience (§ 7) not as he would have spoken in a formal assembly, but that he was rather merely pretending that his meeting had an official character. It is for this reason that he calls upon his audience to act as if they were all epistatai and archons. It is improper to think here of the role played by the archons and the members of the council during the ostracism itself, for the only duties of these functionaries were to guard the ballot boxes and to see to it that only qualified citizens cast their vote. The speaker refers to the fact that there may be another speaker following him on the platform (§§ 7 and 25), and it seems clear from one of these references (§ 25) that he is thinking of Alcibiades. Is one to assume, therefore, that the speaker and Alcibiades were both addressing this meeting, or is the reference to the second speaker purely rhetorical? We have no evidence to show that such informal meetings were held in connection with an ostracism, but meetings of this type were obviously necessary to concentrate public opinion on those few men who were likely "candidates" for ostracism.

C

While the speaker's accusation of Alcibiades on the count of adultery (§ 10), stated in general terms, was admittedly unsupported by facts, his attack upon Alcibiades because of his part in the assessment of the tribute is very precise (§§ 11-12). And yet it is the only noteworthy detail of Alcibiades' life contained in the speech which the biographer Plutarch failed to mention. If Plutarch used an account of Alcibiades the author of which was familiar with the speech, one must assume that this earlier biographer or historian discarded this particular story because he knew from

other sources that Alcibiades was not the person mainly responsible for increasing the tribute assessment. Modern scholars relying on the references in the plays of Aristophanes are firmly convinced that it was Cleon and not Alcibiades who should be attacked for this particular policy. Are we to assume that the author of the speech (whether he wrote at that time or some fifteen years later) was so ignorant that he unwittingly charged Alcibiades for an act which Cleon had actually committed? Is it not more likely that he knew that Alcibiades had played a minor role in the preparation of the assessment which became so hateful to the allies, and that he held Alcibiades alone responsible simply because Cleon was dead and Alcibiades' personal political position had to be attacked? This view seems to be supported by the fact that the speaker remains silent concerning all the other actions of Alcibiades during the period of the Archidamian War and the Peace of Nicias; he does this undoubtedly for the simple reason that these actions had been on the whole very creditable.

There are, moreover, two small details which indicate that the author of the speech was well acquainted with the famous assessment of 425 B.C. In the first place, he asserted that Alcibiades was elected chairman of a board of ten assessors. The very existence of such a board of ten men and its election are nowhere else attested in ancient literature, but the facts are now known also from the assessment decree which is still preserved.⁶ Since there probably was no assessment after that of 410 B.C., the author, if he wrote ten or more years later, needed excellent information in order to cite this specific position held by Alcibiades.

The second point concerns the charge made against Alcibiades in the speech: he is said to have doubled the tribute assessment of each member of the alliance. This statement has often been challenged as incorrect because it was misinterpreted to mean that Alcibiades was responsible for a tribute assessment the total of which was double that of Aristides. Since the assessment of Aristides is known to have been 460 talents and since the literary tradition and the epigraphical evidence plainly indicate that the assessment of 425 B.C. was about three times that much, the author of the speech is accused of flagrant ignorance. It is evident, however,

⁶ See (also for the evidence mentioned in the following paragraph) B. D. Meritt, H. T. Wade-Gery, and M. F. McGregor, *The Athenian Tribute Lists*, 1 (Cambridge 1939) and 2 (Princeton, 1949).

that the doubling of the original individual assessment figures would have resulted in a trebling of the total tribute once it is realized that the membership of the alliance had greatly increased since the time of Aristides. An examination of the assessment decree itself and of the pertinent tribute lists reveals that the average individual assessments were doubled rather than trebled. It may be asked, moreover, why the author of the speech who desired to attack Alcibiades would name a lower figure if the higher figure were not only correct but also more damaging to the reputation of Alcibiades? Finally, it should be pointed out that the author of the speech showed great independence and originality when he described the character of the famous assessment as the doubling of the individual assessments rather than the trebling of the total amount which became the standard description in our literary tradition.

Thus, the passage referring to the tribute assessment shows the author of the speech well informed in matters of Athenian administration but ill disposed towards Alcibiades.

D

The story of Alcibiades' marriage (§§ 13–15) has also been questioned in one particular detail. The speaker claims that Alcibiades' father-in-law Hipponicus fell in battle while in command at Delium in 424 B.C.; it is known, however, from Thucydides (4.101.2) that it was the general Hippocrates who was killed in action during the battle at Delium. The author of the speech is accused, therefore, of having confused the two similar sounding names. Yet the only error he may have committed is the statement that Hipponicus was general when he was killed. For there is no reason for assuming that Hipponicus did not die at Delium. Since the question whether or not Hipponicus was general when he fell is of no importance to the argument, and since it is unlikely, moreover, that Hipponicus should have served as a common soldier or cavalry man, one could easily translate the words *στρατηγούντος ἐπὶ Δηλῷ* with "while commanding his troops (in whatever capacity) at Delium."

E

The stories of Alcibiades' relationship to the painter Agatharchus, the choregus Taureas, and the woman from Melos, which occupy eight paragraphs of the speech (§§ 16–23), are summarized

by Plutarch, in the same order, in one paragraph of his *Life of Alcibiades* (16.4–5). In fact, Plutarch devoted only a sentence each to Alcibiades' dealings with Agatharchus and Taureas, and two sentences to his affair with the Melian prisoner of war. In spite of this, Plutarch, who evidently either directly or indirectly relied on the speech, changed the significance of two of the episodes. While the speaker implied that Alcibiades and Agatharchus parted as foes, Plutarch stated that Alcibiades dismissed the painter with a handsome present after having forced him to decorate his house. Similarly, in the case of the Melian woman, Plutarch reported that Alcibiades' behaviour was called by some people charitable, while the speaker (with an obscure reference to Aegisthus, derived perhaps from a tragedy well known at the time) asserted that the action of Alcibiades was more heinous than that of any villain in a tragic play. If it should become apparent that Plutarch's account (at least of the Melian episode) is more credible, one will have to conclude that the speaker was anxious to falsify the evidence, not out of ignorance but because of malice.

The story of the Melian woman is, in fact, one of the crucial passages of the speech, for if the story is true to the letter, the speech must be spurious (and with it, of course, the story itself; a good example of a Cretan syllogism). The known date of the conquest of Melos and the dramatic date of the speech (before or early in the eighth prytany of the year 416/5 B.C.) hardly allow for the required period between the conception and birth of a child. In fact, the child would have to be born such a short time before the speech was delivered that one should expect in the speech a reference to this fact. Some have assumed, therefore, that the woman was captured and bought by Alcibiades some time before the final conquest of the island, while others (with them, apparently, Plutarch and his source) maintained that Alcibiades was not the father of the child who may have been born a short time before or even after the conquest of Melos. Only this interpretation permits one to call Alcibiades' attitude charitable. Yet this interpretation is clearly contradicted by the speaker. Is it not possible that the speaker, in order to malign Alcibiades, asserted that the baby living in Alcibiades' house, the son of a Melian woman whom Alcibiades favored with his affection, was in fact Alcibiades' own son? Similarly, he claimed that Alcibiades was solely responsible for the cruel fate of the Melians, while Plutarch reported that he merely seconded

the motion of somebody else; Thucydides (5.116.4), characteristically, mentions no names at all (see also L. Rademacher, *WSI* 67 [1939] 165; P. Treves, *JHS* 63 [1943] 133, note 1).

It appears that the obvious inconsistencies of the speaker in reporting the Melian episode may again be charged to his hostility against Alcibiades rather than to his ignorance of the facts involved.

F

If the speech was written many years after the event to which it purports to refer, it might reveal the knowledge of certain happenings which took place after this event but were so closely connected with it that mention of them must have been tempting to the author. Even Thucydides, intentionally or unconsciously, did not avoid such "prophetic" passages, and careful students have accordingly "dated" many of his speeches after the fall of Athens in 403 B.C. Considering this circumstance, it is surprising that the author of the speech almost entirely refrained from referring to the future or from showing that he was aware of what happened to Athens and to Alcibiades after 415 B.C.

The first passage to be mentioned in this connection is to be found in the discussion of the increase in the tribute assessment (§ 12). "The hostility of the allies," said the speaker, "will show itself clearly as soon as we and the Lacedaemonians become engaged in naval warfare." The presumption is, of course, that the allies would then desert Athens and join the enemy who up to that time had not dared to enter the Athenian home waters of the Aegean. It is true that many of the allies revolted after the Sicilian expedition, and that the Lacedaemonians manned a fleet and pursued the naval warfare so vigorously that they ultimately won the war by virtually destroying the Athenian navy. Yet the increase in the tribute assessment had little to do with the revolt of the allies, and at best one may assume that the author's knowledge of the Ionian War could have influenced his statement quoted above. There is, however, a distinct possibility that Isocrates referred to this passage of the speech when he stated (xvi, 10) that Alcibiades was accused of having caused the revolt of the islands (see, below, G).

Another passage in the speech is of a similar nature. In § 24, the speaker asserted that "the city will experience the greatest calamities from this man (Alcibiades), and he will be held responsible in the future for such deeds that nobody will remember his

former villainies." This statement may be taken to refer to Alcibiades' treason or perhaps to his implication in the profanation of the Mysteries. Yet one is surprised that the author of the speech, if he really knew what happened after the spring of 415 B.C., did not refer more specifically to some of the misdeeds with which Alcibiades was charged in later years.

The conclusion cannot be avoided that the author of the speech either did not have any knowledge of the events which followed the dramatic date of his speech (simply, because the speech was written early in 415 B.C.), or that he was careful not to reveal such knowledge too clearly, more careful, in fact, than Thucydides. In spite of his oratory and dramatic technique, the author of the speech did not employ dramatic irony at all.

G

The long passage devoted to Alcibiades' behaviour during the Olympic Games (§§ 25–32) contains several problems which are not without bearing upon the understanding of the speech as a whole. The Diomedes episode (§§ 26–28) is also known from other sources. Alcibiades' son was sued early in the fourth century by a certain Teisias who claimed five talents for having been cheated out of a team of horses by Alcibiades, almost twenty years earlier. The speech of Isocrates (xvi) in defense of the younger Alcibiades shows that the controversy had not died down, but that in fact it encouraged renewed attacks against the character and life of the great Alcibiades. This may be used as evidence that the speech of Phaeax was actually composed at that later time. Yet the man who sued the younger Alcibiades was Teisias and not Diomedes. Scholars have tried in vain to reconcile this difference which Plutarch had already found perplexing (*Alcibiades* 12.3). Whatever the answer may be, so much is clear, that the author of the speech knew nothing of Teisias, a very peculiar fact if he wrote at the time when Teisias filed his suit, and if his pamphlet was designed to discredit the memory of the older Alcibiades, that is, to obtain the same result as the accusation of Teisias. Another interesting deduction which may be drawn from the suit of Teisias concerns the date of the Olympic Games to which reference was made in the suit. If Alcibiades had entered the Olympic Games in 424 B.C. or even in 420 B.C. (both dates are made unlikely by other considerations), one would expect Diomedes to bring in his suit shortly after the

incriminating action. Yet there was hardly time after the Games of 416 B.C. to introduce a legal action against Alcibiades, who was general at the time, was re-elected early in 415 B.C., and left Athens that very summer. Obviously, no suit could be initiated in this matter until Alcibiades' son had come of age. This consideration could be used as supporting evidence for the assumption that the Olympic Games in question were those of 416 B.C.

H

One of the most remarkable passages of the speech deals with several former victims of ostracism, among them two ancestors of Alcibiades himself (§§ 32-34). It has been pointed out by others that our knowledge concerning the ostracisms of Megacles and of Alcibiades the elder is based almost exclusively on this speech. In fact, our witnesses for these ostracisms are the ostraka of Megacles and Alcibiades found in excavations during the past sixty-five years, the text of Aristotle's treatise on the Constitution of Athens (22.5, where only the ostracism of Megacles is mentioned), and a passage in Lysias (xiv, 39) which seems to be derived from the speech of Phaeax (§ 34). The text of Lysias is corrupt at this point: 'Ἀλκιβιάδην μὲν τὸν πρόπαππον αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸν πρὸς μητρὸς Μεγακλέα οἱ ὑμέτεροι πρόγονοι δις ἀμφοτέρους ἐξωστράκισαν. The speech simply stated: ὁ τῆς μητρὸς πατὴρ Μεγακλῆς καὶ ὁ πάππος Ἀλκιβιάδης ἐξωστρακίσθησαν ἀμφοτέρω. Since Lysias referred to the younger Alcibiades he had to add one generation to the relationship as defined in the speech. Referring to the elder Alcibiades he changed πάππος to πρόπαππος, but no such easy solution was possible in the case of Megacles who was the father of the mother of (the younger) Alcibiades' father. The text of Gernet and Bizos (Paris, 1943) τὸν πρὸς μητρὸς <πάππον> Μεγακλέα is impossible because Megacles was not the maternal grandfather of the younger Alcibiades. The text of Lamb (London, 1943) τὸν πατὸς πρὸς μητρὸς <πάππον> Μεγακλέα is historically correct but it requires the addition of <πατὸς> (not indicated as such by the editor) and <πάππον>, and it conceals (as does the text of the French editors) the obvious fact that both men were great-grandfathers of the younger Alcibiades. What Lysias may have meant to say was τὸν πρὸς μητρὸς πατὸς (πρόπαππον) Μεγακλέα, meaning "Megacles, the great-grandfather on the side of his father's mother." And, indeed, the repetition of πρόπαππον may have been unnecessary, and Lysias' text may be emended to read Ἀλκιβιάδην

μὲν τὸν πρόπαππον καὶ τὸν πρὸς μητρός <πατρός> Μεγακλέα. The repeated sequence of ΠΡΟΣ, ΤΡΟΣ, ΤΡΟΣ may easily have caused the omission of πατρός. A comparison of the versions of Lysias and of the speech of Phaeax seems to indicate that Lysias adapted the words of the speech to suit the status of Alcibiades the younger. Thus, were it not for comparatively recent and accidental discoveries, the passage in the speech would be our only evidence for these events. The text of Lysias, moreover, has misled editors and commentators into assuming that the orator said that the Athenians "ostracized both twice." This is, indeed, a literal translation of what Lysias said, but it does not mean that the Athenians "ostracized each of them twice." Peculiar though the expression may be, it can only be an attempt to say that ostracism was employed two times against members of Alcibiades' family, and that both grandfathers were thus affected. The words may be translated: "your ancestors (the Athenians) applied the law of ostracism on two (separate) occasions and (thus) ostracized both (these men)." It is, therefore, not only unnecessary but even faulty to insert the word *δὲ* in the text of the Phaeax speech, where it could only mean that both men were simultaneously ostracized two times.

Although today nobody would doubt the reliability of the speaker's statement on the ostracisms of Megacles and Alcibiades the elder, the ostracism of Callias the son of Didymias (mentioned in § 32) was questioned until several ostraka bearing his name were found in the Agora Excavations; see Reinmuth's article mentioned in note 1. Callias was another Athenian who brought home an Olympic victory, and it is fitting that the speaker should compare the fate of this famous athlete who was ostracized with that of Alcibiades who won a similar victory and for whose ostracism the speaker was pleading. Unfortunately, we do not know either the date or the occasion of Callias' ostracism. It is hard to believe that it took place after 443 B.C., the year of Thucydides' ostracism and of the beginning of Pericles' "principlate."

The most peculiar part of the passage concerns the ostracism of Cimon (§ 33). While all other sources emphasize the political character of Cimon's ostracism, the speaker asserts that Cimon was exiled as a protest against his lawlessness consisting in his illicit relationship with his sister Elpinice.⁷ In order to understand this

⁷ See also Suidas, s.v. *Κίμων* no. 1621.

extraordinary statement we must consider the context in which it occurs. The speaker links the ostracism of Cimon, as he did in the case of Callias, with the fact that Cimon (as well as his father Miltiades) was victorious at the Olympic Games, thus avoiding any mention of Cimon's position as general and politician. It is known, moreover, that in Athens, as in modern democracies, political opponents often commented upon the private life of their adversaries. Pericles as well as Alcibiades are excellent examples of this rule, and Cimon was no exception to it. In fact, Plutarch mentioned Cimon's relationship with his sister not only in a lengthy passage (*Cimon* 4.5-7), but emphasized it again (15.3) when he discussed public sentiment at the time of the ostracism. The author of the speech therefore repeated a piece of gossip which was current in Athens. He did this in order to show, not very convincingly, to be sure, that other distinguished men had been ostracized because of their moral depravity.

I

From the points examined so far it appears that most of the critics were right in maintaining that the speech contains both errors of fact and historical inconsistencies and misinterpretations. And yet these objections do not allow us to state that Andocides could not have been the author of the speech, that it was not composed in 415 B.C. in the name of (or by) Phaeax, that it was not actually delivered or issued as a pamphlet, or, finally, that it was not written years later but with the full knowledge of the situation which it described. It may be compared with pamphlets like the Old Oligarch's, with speeches like those in Thucydides, and with a highly trustworthy but idealized document like Plato's *Apology*.

V

The most puzzling aspect of the speech is not the information which it contains but the facts which the author did not mention; this comment applies whether the speech was composed in 415 B.C. or early in the fourth century.

Aside from the more glaring omissions which must be discussed separately, there is a great deal of incidental information preserved in Plutarch's biography of Alcibiades but absent from the speech. Pericles and Socrates, who were so closely connected with Alcibiades, are not even mentioned in the speech. Are we to assume

that the author of the speech was ignorant of all the episodes in which Socrates or Pericles was linked with Alcibiades, episodes which must have formed the major portion of the so-called Socratic Alcibiades legend? Does this omission indicate that the speech was composed before any of the Socratic Alcibiades literature was published or had become known? Or were these episodes so favorable to Alcibiades that the author of the speech ignored them deliberately? Yet, in other instances, he turned a favorable story into an indictment.

It is also evident that the author of the speech made no use of Antiphon's attack upon Alcibiades. At least, there is no mention in the speech of the lurid details from this pamphlet reported in Plutarch's biography of Alcibiades (3) and in Athenaeus (12.525B). The date of Antiphon's pamphlet is unknown, but if it is genuine it must belong to 415 B.C. or to one of the preceding years.

Of greater significance, however, is the omission in the speech of all mention of Alcibiades' activity as a politician and as a general. It is true that much of it was most creditable to Alcibiades, but the story of his duplicity towards the Lacedaemonian ambassadors (told by Thucydides, 5.45-46, and Plutarch, *Alcibiades* 14.6-9) could have been used to good advantage by the author of the speech. If Alcibiades' public record seemed so unassailable to the speaker that he preferred to ignore it altogether, this can only mean that he was either unaware of what happened after the dramatic date of the speech or that he was so clever as to put himself completely into the situation which he tried to recreate; even Thucydides failed often in this respect.

If the author of the speech knew what happened only a few weeks after the supposed date of the speech, how could he have avoided making reference to such incriminating evidence as the profanation of the Mysteries for which Alcibiades was held responsible? Even if this act of impiety did not become public knowledge until weeks later, the actions themselves must have taken place over a longer period of time, and it would have been tempting to the author of the speech to let the speaker pretend knowledge of them or at least hint at such knowledge. Yet there is not a word in the speech suggesting such a design on the part of its author.

The most astonishing omission, however, concerns the Sicilian Expedition, the main topic of conversation during the early months of 415 B.C. The other omissions noticed so far could be explained

by the assumption that the speech was actually authentic and that its author had no knowledge of any of the events which were to follow. This explanation does not hold for the lack of any mention of the Sicilian Expedition in the speech, because we know from Thucydides and Plutarch that conditions in Sicily engaged Athenian interests throughout the winter of 416/5 B.C., and it is certain that the Athenians dispatched a delegation to Segesta late in 416 B.C., thus a considerable time before the dramatic date of the speech. On the other hand, the delegation probably returned after that date, and thus the final decision had not yet been made. It must be remembered, moreover, that the election of generals followed (perhaps only by hours) the final vote of ostracism, and that the ostracism of Alcibiades would have eliminated him as a candidate for the generalship. It would also have ruined the whole plan of the Sicilian Expedition which was championed by Alcibiades. Thus it would have accomplished more simply the very same thing which had to be carried out later by such devious means as the mutilation of the herms and the denunciation of Alcibiades for profanation of the Mysteries. Considering the general popularity of the aggressive policy of Alcibiades, it would have been but wise for any enemy of his to avoid altogether the subject of foreign policy, although in truth foreign policy was the decisive issue. This holds true for the speech of Phaeax as well as for the various attacks against Alcibiades just before and just after the departure of the fleet for Sicily.

Whatever one may think of the various mistakes and omissions to be found in the speech, the complete lack of any reference to foreign policy in general and to the Sicilian Expedition in particular can only have been deliberate. This consideration confirms our convictions that the speech must be either authentic or else must have been written by an extremely careful and well-informed man.

VI

There remains but one topic which has been purposely avoided in the preceding discussion, the ostracism of Hyperbolus. It provides the necessary link between the speech of Phaeax and the historical narrative of the events which took place early in the year 415 B.C. First of all, it must be pointed out that the speech contains no reference to Hyperbolus; in fact, the speaker stated very clearly at the beginning (§ 2) that the electorate had to choose between Alcibiades, Nicias, and himself. This may be another

indication of the authenticity of the speech or of the care with which the author tried to recreate the situation. Quite obviously, the speech belongs to that period between the sixth and eighth prytanies of the year 416/5 B.C. when Alcibiades was opposed by Nicias, and before he and Nicias joined forces against Hyperbolus (see, above, II). We are not primarily concerned here with examining this agreement between Alcibiades and Nicias which resulted not only in the ostracism of Hyperbolus but also in the election as generals of both Nicias and Alcibiades, and in their joint preparation of the Sicilian Expedition. It is clear, however, that the juxtaposition of the ostracism of Hyperbolus and the Sicilian Expedition adds considerably to our understanding of Athenian policy at that time. It also relieves Thucydides from the charge of having completely ignored the ostracism of Hyperbolus. For what really mattered was not the disappearance of this popular demagogue but the peculiar association and disagreement between the two leading military men, Nicias and Alcibiades. This complex situation, however, was very cleverly described by Thucydides in the prologue to the Sicilian Expedition itself (6.8–26).

The literary tradition concerning the ostracism of Hyperbolus is based on three fragments, one each of Androtion, Theopompus, and Philochorus, and on Plutarch's account in the biographies of Nicias and Alcibiades. Androtion merely stated that Hyperbolus was ostracized because of his bad character, and this inadequate information is repeated by Philochorus; it may be derived from passages like that of the comic poet Plato quoted by Plutarch (*Alcibiades* 13.5; see also W. Schmid, *Philologus* 93 [1939] 415–416). Theopompus is credited with the information that Hyperbolus lived in exile for six years; he also added some sordid details about the death of Hyperbolus. It seems that he was more interested in what happened to Hyperbolus after his ostracism than in the ostracism itself. It is evident that little can be learned from these fragments about the ostracism of Hyperbolus.

Plutarch's account needs a more careful analysis in order to determine to what extent either he or his source knew or used the speech of Phaeax. In the biography of Nicias (11), which was composed before that of Alcibiades, there is a lengthy account of the hostility between Nicias and Alcibiades which culminated in the fight over the ostracism. The story is told immediately before the Sicilian Expedition, thus lending some support to the assump-

tion that the two events followed each other in short order. The general characterization of Alcibiades (11.2) agrees not only with that given in the speech but also with the account of Thucydides (see, above, III). The name of Phaeax is not mentioned except at the very end (11.7), perhaps as an afterthought possibly written after the more detailed account in the biography of Alcibiades. In this supplementary note, Plutarch called his reader's attention to the fact that Theophrastus asserted that it was Phaeax and not Nicias who opposed Alcibiades. Could it be that Theophrastus knew and commented on the speech of Phaeax, and that all he said was that Phaeax opposed Alcibiades openly as shown by the speech which he delivered against Alcibiades? It appears, therefore, that Plutarch's account in the biography of Nicias was written without reference to the speech of Phaeax, except for the final paragraph which should be considered together with the author's account of the same affair in his biography of Alcibiades.

It has been often emphasized that Plutarch or the source which he used for his biography of Alcibiades relied upon the biographical information contained in the speech of Phaeax. The only noticeable exception is the story of Alcibiades' part in the tribute assessment; see, above, IV C. At the same time, it appears that Plutarch could not have used the speech exclusively since there are certain differences between the two accounts which can be most easily explained by the assumption that Plutarch had before him a source which was based on the speech but did not follow it in every detail. This source may have been less unfavorable to Alcibiades than the speech, and it may have elaborated certain episodes, perhaps by drawing upon other information. This impression is confirmed by an examination of that chapter of Plutarch's biography of Alcibiades (13) which deals specifically with the ostracism of Hyperbolus.

The accounts of the agreement between Nicias and Alcibiades and of the subsequent ostracism of Hyperbolus are told in much the same way as in the biography of Nicias, except that Plutarch stated that the ostracism involved three men (13.4). It is evident that these three men were Nicias, Alcibiades, and Phaeax, since the first two paragraphs (13.1-2) mention Phaeax in addition to Nicias and Alcibiades, and at the end of the chapter (13.4) Plutarch reported that some authorities claim that the agreement was made not between Alcibiades and Nicias but between Alcibiades and Phaeax. Is it too much to deduce that these authorities included Theo-

phrastus whom Plutarch in the biography of Nicias had credited with similar information? If so, could it be that the basis for Theophrastus' modified version of the events was his knowledge of the speech of Phaeax which had hitherto not been introduced into the evidence? This assumption would reveal the source of Plutarch's account of the controversy between Phaeax and Alcibiades (13.1-2), for it is evident that this passage merely explains in detail the statement attributed to Theophrastus in Plutarch's biography of Nicias (11.7). Actually, Plutarch or even his source did not offer much information about Phaeax. His father's name was Erasistratus, he was a young man of about Alcibiades' age, ridiculed for his babbling oratory by the comic poet Eupolis. It is at this point (13.2) that Plutarch referred to a certain speech of Phaeax in which a story about Alcibiades was told which actually occurs in a somewhat different form in the preserved speech (§ 29). The introductory sentence has been considered corrupt and accordingly has been amended: *φέρεται δὲ καὶ λόγος τις κατ' Ἀλκιβιάδου καὶ Φαίακος γεγραμμένος*. . . . Editors have challenged the second *καὶ* and changed it to *ὑπὸ* or *ὑπέρ* or left it out altogether changing the following name *Φαίακος* to *Φαίακι*. Would it not be simpler to assume that the original text read *φέρεται δὲ καὶ Φαίακος λόγος τις κατ' Ἀλκιβιάδου γεγραμμένος* and that the words *καὶ Φαίακος* were omitted, re-inserted, and ultimately misplaced? Whatever may be the original form of the sentence, it seems clear that Plutarch repeated (perhaps not literally) from his source without knowing that he also owed other material to the same document.

The conclusion which one is tempted to draw is this. All three passages in which Plutarch mentioned the name of Phaeax drew upon the same authority, probably Theophrastus; see H. Bloch, *HSPh*, Suppl. vol. I (1940) 355, note 1. This author modified the commonly known version of the ostracism of Hyperbolus by introducing the person of Phaeax. He made this innovation because he believed in the authenticity of the speech of Phaeax, and because he associated it, perhaps for the first time, with the ostracism of Hyperbolus.