

Andron and the Four Hundred

GEORGE PESELY

Shortly after the fall of the Four Hundred in 411, the Athenian Council of Five Hundred resolved to prosecute Archeptolemos, Onomakles, and Antiphon for treason. The motion was proposed by Andron.¹ Most scholars have identified this Andron with the father of Androtion, the fourth-century politician and Atthidographer.² For those who believe that Androtion was a major source of historical information for the Aristotelian *Athenaion Politeia*,³ Andron assumes a role of some significance as a shaper of his son's supposedly "moderate-conservative" political ideology and as a possible supplier of information about the oligarchic movements of late fifth-century Athens. This view of Androtion's political outlook has recently come under attack, notably from Phillip Harding,⁴ and I have considered elsewhere the question of whether Aristotle used Androtion's *Atthis*.⁵ Here I propose to examine three points: Was the Andron of the

¹ The text of the decree is given in ps.-Plutarch, *Life of Antiphon*, in the *Vitae Decem Oratorum* = ps.-Plut. *Mor.* 833e-f, along with the verdict (834a-b).

² E.g. H. Bloch, "Studies in Historical Literature of the Fourth Century B.C.," *HSCP*, Suppl. 1 (1940) 352; C. Hignett, *A History of the Athenian Constitution* (Oxford 1952) 12; G. E. M. de Ste. Croix, "The Character of the Athenian Empire," *Historia* 3 (1954/55) 27 n. 1; E. Ruschenbusch, "ΠΑΤΡΙΟΣ ΠΟΛΙΤΕΙΑ: Theseus, Drakon, Solon und Kleisthenes in Publizistik und Geschichtsschreibung des 5. und 4. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.," *Historia* 7 (1958) 406; E. R. Dodds (ed.), *Plato. Gorgias* (Oxford 1959) 282; L. Moscati Castelnovo, "La carriera politica dell'atthidografo Androzione," *Acme* 33 (1980) 252; M. Ostwald, *From Popular Sovereignty to the Sovereignty of Law* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London 1986) 402; M. Chambers (ed.), *Aristoteles. Staat der Athener* (Berlin 1990) 88 n. 49; H. B. Mattingly, "The Practice of Ostracism at Athens," *Antichthon* 25 (1991) 22; R. Sealey, *Demosthenes and his Time* (New York and Oxford 1993) 119. Others consider the identity likely if not certain: T. Thalheim, "Die aristotelischen Urkunden zur Geschichte der Vierhundert in Athen," *Hermes* 54 (1919) 336; F. Jacoby, *FGrH* IIIb (Suppl.) I 87; A. Andrewes, "Androtion and the Four Hundred," *PCPhS* 202 (1976) 16-17, cf. 21; P. J. Rhodes, *A Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaion Politeia* (Oxford 1981) 19; P. Harding, *Androtion and the Atthis* (Oxford 1994) 14-15.

³ This belief is very widely held; e.g. Bloch (previous note) 349 n. 3; Rhodes (previous note) 15-30; Chambers (previous note) 84-91 and "Aristotle and his Use of Sources," in *Aristote et Athènes*, ed. by M. Piérart (Paris 1993) 41-50, 52; Harding (previous note) 51-52, 95-97, 162.

⁴ "Atthis and Politeia," *Historia* 26 (1977) 148-60; Harding (above, note 2) 13-19, 51-52.

⁵ In "Did Aristotle Use Androtion's *Atthis*?" (*Klio* 76 [1994] 155-71), I argue that there is no definite evidence for Aristotle's use of Androtion's *Atthis*, and that the Oxyrhynchus Historian, not Androtion, is the most likely source for the anti-democratic coloring in the *Ath. Pol.*'s treatment of the events of 411 and 404. We know very little about Androtion's interpretation of the two oligarchical revolutions at Athens.

411/0 decree the father of Androton? What light does the Decree of Andron shed on the fall of the Four Hundred? And when was the decree adopted?

I. The Identity of Andron

The decree in ps.-Plutarch gives Andron's name without patronymic or demotic. Ps.-Plutarch cites Caecilius⁶ by name as his source; presumably Caecilius obtained the decree from a literary source. Harpokration, s.v. "Ἀνδρων, combines three pieces of information in one entry:⁷

Ἀντιφῶν ἐν τῷ πρὸς τὴν Δημοσθένους [ἀντι]γραφῆν. Ἀνδρωνά φησιν εἶναι Κρατερὸς ἐν θ' τῶν Ψηφισμάτων τὸν γράψαντα τὸ ψήφισμα τὸ περὶ Ἀντιφῶντος τοῦ ῥήτορος. ἦν δὲ εἷς τῶν ὕ' ὁ Ἀνδρων.

Antiphon in *Against the Indictment by Demosthenes*. Krateros in the 9th book of the *Decrees* says that Andron was the proposer of the decree concerning Antiphon the orator. Andron was one of the Four Hundred.

The Suda entry s.v. "Ἀνδρων reads like an excerpt from Harpokration: "Andron: He was one of the Four Hundred."⁸

Krateros introduced the Decree of Andron into the literary tradition, whether by copying it from the stele (if this was still standing) or from the state archive.⁹ Caecilius probably obtained the text of the decree either from Krateros (directly or by way of an intermediate source) or from another source such as Heliodoros of Athens or another periegete.¹⁰ The authenticity of the decree is not questioned, but the repeated copying of the text between 411/0 and the earliest surviving manuscript of ps.-Plutarch (late 13th century A.D.) gives scope for possible errors in transmission.

Harpokration's source identified the Andron of the 411 decree with the Andron mentioned in Antiphon's speech, which cannot be later than the winter of 414/3.¹¹ The speech was apparently one of Antiphon's most admired,¹² but unfortunately little is known of its contents; it might have shed some interesting light both on the general Demosthenes and on Andron. There is no way to tell whether Antiphon's mention of Andron

⁶ Fr. 102 Ofenloch. On Caecilius of Calacte (Kale Akte), cf. M. Fuhrmann, *Kl. Pauly* I (1964) 988–89.

⁷ The text is that of Jacoby, *FGrH* 342 F 5a.

⁸ The same entry is found (with the numeral written out) in Bekker, *Anecdota Graeca* I 394.4.

⁹ C. Curtius, *Das Metroon in Athen als Staatsarchiv* (Progr. Gotha 1868) 22; B. Keil, "Der Perieget Heliodoros von Athen," *Hermes* 30 (1895) 220, believes that the Thirty would have destroyed the original stele.

¹⁰ C. Curtius, "Zum redner Lykurgos," *Philologus* 24 (1866) 112; B. Keil (previous note) 213–14, 219, 237; J. Penndorf, "De scribis reipublicae Atheniensium," *Leipziger Studien zur classischen Philologie* 18 (1897) 124 n. 1; F. Jacoby, *Atthis* (Oxford 1949) 208–09.

¹¹ Cf. Thuc. 7. 20. 2: Demosthenes left for Sicily early in the spring of 413.

¹² Cf. ps.-Plut. *Mor.* 833d.

was friendly, hostile, or neutral, but Andron's eagerness to prosecute Antiphon in 411 may be a result of the earlier speech: He could be taking revenge on an enemy, or, if they had earlier been friends, putting distance between himself and a man who was now regarded as a traitor. Harpokration relied on the work of earlier researchers. His source for this entry may well be the indefatigable Didymos of Alexandria, whom he cites many times. Didymos is thought to have been the first scholar to compose commentaries on the Attic orators (including Antiphon).¹³ Krateros F 17,¹⁴ concerning the related case of the condemnation of Phrynichos, which now begins "Didymos and Krateros say . . .," was probably drawn from Didymos alone, who had named Krateros as his source.

It is not certain which authority first asserted that Andron was one of the Four Hundred: perhaps Krateros, but Didymos seems the most likely. Didymos searched the Atthidographers for information, but it is quite unlikely that Androtion would have volunteered the information that his father had been a member of the Four Hundred. No lists of the Four Hundred are likely to have survived for later scrutiny, since the Decree of Patrokleides in 405 gave strict orders that such records be destroyed, including private copies.¹⁵ Unless Krateros could tell from the dates of other documents in the archives that the Four Hundred were still in session on the day of Andron's proposal, it seems that there would have been no documentary evidence for Andron's membership in the Four Hundred, and the statement that he was one of the Four Hundred is likely to be a later inference. Given the assumption in the decree that many members of the Boule were eager to pursue this prosecution, and the fact that the decree was approved, we have either a rump of the Four Hundred acting as the Boule¹⁶ or, much more likely, a new Boule formed after the collapse of the Four Hundred. The statement that Andron was a member of the Four Hundred, then, would be a false inference by a later authority: Andron will have been a member of the new Council of Five Hundred.¹⁷

We have no evidence for Andron's ideological position in the spring of 411 when the democracy was overthrown. Conceivably the lost speech of Antiphon which mentioned Andron would have provided some clues to Andron's political outlook, but that is unlikely. If we could read the speech, we would probably find nothing to suggest oligarchical leanings on

¹³ *RE* V.1 (1903) 458 (Cohn); cf. Sealey (above, note 2) 228.

¹⁴ Schol. Aristoph. *Lys.* 313.

¹⁵ And. 1. 78–79.

¹⁶ Ps.-Plut. *Mor.* 833b says that Antiphon was condemned by the Four Hundred, but surely this is simple carelessness.

¹⁷ For the Council in 411/0 consisting of 500 members as usual, cf. R. Sealey, "Constitutional Changes in Athens in 410 B.C.," *CSCA* 8 (1975) 279–82; cf. Thuc. 8. 86. 6. For the likelihood that a proposer of a decree of the Boule would be a current member of the Boule, cf. P. J. Rhodes, *The Athenian Boule* (Oxford 1972) 63; M. H. Hansen, *CP* 87 (1992) 52.

Andron's part; even Peisander was considered a zealous democrat before 411.¹⁸ Thucydides observes that among those who joined in the movement to limit the government were men no one would have expected to favor oligarchy.¹⁹ Perhaps Andron was one of those initially attracted by the proposal to limit the government to five thousand, before the *coup* of the Four Hundred, but we have no evidence in his case. If Andron was a known enemy of Antiphon, we would not expect to find him among the Four Hundred, whatever his thoughts on the Athenian constitution. Clearly Andron took an active role in politics after the fall of the Four Hundred, during the period of the Five Thousand, but his actions at that time may be explained equally well on grounds of policy, personality, or ideology.

Two fourth-century literary sources provide information about Androtion's father Andron: Demosthenes, in the course of attacking Androtion, makes statements about Androtion's father in two speeches (*Against Androtion* [22] and *Against Timokrates* [24]); Plato mentions an Andron, son of Androtion, in two dialogues, who can hardly be anyone other than Androtion's father.

Demosthenes repeatedly asserts that Androtion's father had been imprisoned as a state debtor and had never paid his debt, but had escaped from prison by running away, once adding the detail that he had danced his way out at the procession of the Dionysia.²⁰ The story of Andron's imprisonment may be sheer fabrication, or it may be merely exaggerated; such assertions in an Attic orator are best not taken at face value. Demosthenes charges Androtion with having prostituted himself in his youth,²¹ and scorns his father for giving him such an upbringing.²² It may be legitimate to conclude from this that Andron lived to see his son grown or nearly so.²³

¹⁸ And. 1. 36.

¹⁹ 8. 66. 5.

²⁰ 22. 33–34, 56, 68; 24. 125.

²¹ 22. 21–24, 29, 32, 53, 58, 78; 24. 126, 165, 186.

²² 22. 58.

²³ Since Demosthenes 22. 66 (cf. 24. 173) speaks of Androtion's having been involved in politics for more than thirty years, his public career began no later than 385. (For the date of Demosth. 22, cf. R. Sealey, *REG* 68 [1955] 89–90, 117, and *Demosthenes* [above, note 2] 127.) Probably this means not mere eligibility to attend the *Ekklesia* but something more, such as taking an active part in speeches and proposals in the assembly, for which we should expect an age higher than twenty. In the late fourth century, orators were expected to have legitimate children (Din. *Demosth.* 71). Demosthenes was near his thirtieth birthday when he gave his first speech to the assembly on a question of public policy, *On the Symmories* (14), in 355/4 or 354/3 B.C. (cf. R. Sealey, *REG* 68 [1955] 117, *CR* 7 [1957] 197, and *Demosthenes* [above, note 2] 126–28, cf. 246–48; F. Kiechle, s.v. "Demosthenes (2)," *Kl. Pauly* I [1964] 1484). Androtion is *epistates*, therefore at least thirty years old (cf. Xen. *Mem.* 1. 2. 35; Rhodes [above, note 17] 194–95) in *IG* II² 61, but unfortunately this decree is not firmly dated; cf. W. Larfeld, *Handbuch der griechischen Epigraphik* II (1898–1902) 76; D. M. Lewis, "Notes on Attic Inscriptions," *BSA* 49 (1954) 34. (The story that Plato was shouted down from the *bema* on account of his youth, when he was at least 27 years old [Justus of Tiberias *FGrH* 734 F 1 = Diog. Laert. 2. 41], is *ben trovato*.) The last activity recorded for Androtion is his writing the *Athis* while in exile in Megara (Plut. *Mor.* 605c–d = *FGrH* 324 T 14), after 344/3; he could

Demosthenes fails to insinuate that Andron had an oligarchic past. Had Andron been a member of the Four Hundred, this could hardly have been forgotten by his political opponents, nor would Demosthenes have had any reason to refrain from dredging up this old matter. Demosthenes' silence should not call into question the identity of Andron the decree-proposer with Andron the father of Androtion, but rather the accuracy of the tradition that Andron was a member of the Four Hundred.

Plato introduces Andron, the son of Androtion, in the *Protagoras* (which has an apparent dramatic date of ca. 433)²⁴ and in the *Gorgias* (which lacks a consistent dramatic date).²⁵ In both cases he has a non-speaking part, one of many Athenians added as part of the background to Socrates' conversations; this must be the same man as the father of Androtion, who was a well-known politician when Plato was producing these dialogues. The *Protagoras* has Andron as an adult, so his year of birth must not be later than the mid-450s, and could be somewhat earlier. In the *Protagoras* we find him in the house of Kallias, the son of Hipponikos, one of a group questioning Hippias about astronomy (315c). In the *Gorgias* (487c) he is one of four members of a "fellowship of wisdom," along with Kallikles Acharneus (*PA* 7927), Teisandros Aphidnaios (*PA* 13459), and Nausikydes Cholargeus (*PA* 10571); since these three are even less well attested than Andron himself, they do not reveal much about his political ties. Kallikles is a formidable figure in this dialogue,²⁶ but not certainly mentioned elsewhere; he is portrayed as an active politician who is privately scornful of the masses, and perhaps Andron is supposed to have shared these views.

That Plato recalls Andron as worth remembering in his dialogues, among the young Athenians interested in the studies of the sophists, suggests his identity with the Andron of 411, since many of those active in the events of 411 and 404 show up in similar philosophical contexts. It is not possible to determine this with absolute certainty, but the odds strongly favor identifying the father of Androtion with the decree-proposer of 411.

Andron's deme, Gargettos, was revealed by *IG* II² 212, an inscription of 347/6 B.C. which mentions Androtion Andronos Gargettios. That Plato refers to Andron in both dialogues by his patronymic need not imply that there was another notable Andron of Gargettos in the same period,²⁷ but

have been in his 70s or even 80s at that time. His birth should be placed somewhere in the range 425 to 410 B.C.

²⁴ Cf. W. K. C. Guthrie, *A History of Greek Philosophy* IV (Cambridge 1975) 214. For difficulties with the dramatic date of this dialogue, see N. O'Sullivan, "Pericles and Protagoras," *G&R* 42 (1995) 19.

²⁵ 503c, mentioning Perikles as recently dead, indicates a dramatic date of 429 or soon after, but 473e-74a appears to refer to the Arginousai trial of 406 as "last year." (A. Martin, *AC* 62 [1993] 457, challenges the common view that 473e-74a is an allusion to the Arginousai trial.)

²⁶ On Kallikles see W. K. C. Guthrie, *A History of Greek Philosophy* III (Cambridge 1969) 101-07, IV (1975) 289-94; Ostwald (above, note 2) 245-50; Dodds (above, note 2) 387-91.

²⁷ Pace Mattingly, *Antichthon* 25 (1991) 22.

may reflect the fourth-century fame of his son. It would be hard to demonstrate that Plato's choice of patronymic or demotic to identify Athenians depended in each case on whether a particular man had a contemporary namesake in the same deme.

Phillip Harding has recently put forward²⁸ another possibility for the Andron who is reported as a member of the Four Hundred and/or as prosecutor of Antiphon, without committing himself to this solution: an Andron the son of Androkles, also of Gargettos ("Ἄνδρον Ἄνδροκλέος Γαργέτιος), whose name has been found on six ostraka.²⁹ The ostraka have not been published, so any conclusions drawn from them can only be tentative. They were found in the great Kerameikos deposit uncovered in 1966–68 by the German Archaeological Institute. This deposit does not seem to include any ostraka from the ostracism of Hyperbolos, and relatively few from the ostracism of Thoukydides the son of Melesias; the bulk of the ostraka are from early ostrakophoria in the 480s.³⁰ It may be that the Andron ostraka can be placed more firmly by letter forms, style of decoration, or joins to other ostraka, but this evidence is not yet available. Given the names and the demotics, it is reasonable to suppose that Andron the son of Androkles is related to Andron the son of Androtion, and if we knew when the ostraka were cast against him that might lend greater plausibility to one relationship over other possibilities. If the ostraka are early, this Andron may easily be the grandfather of the Andron of 411. If the ostraka date to the occasion when Thoukydides was ostracized,³¹ then he could be an uncle, a first cousin, or a first cousin once removed.³²

One other Athenian Andron is on record who may have been old enough in 411 to have proposed a measure in the Boule, Andron Elaiousios (PA 922). This man is named in the Hekatompedon inventory of 398/7 as having dedicated two gold drachmas.³³ There is no evidence that he was an active politician.

²⁸ Harding (above, note 2) 15.

²⁹ See now F. Willemsen and S. Brenne, "Verzeichnis der Kerameikos-Ostraka," *MDAI(A)* 106 (1991) 149, superseding earlier reports giving a smaller number of ostraka.

³⁰ R. Thomsen, *The Origin of Ostracism* (Copenhagen 1972) 93.

³¹ Mattingly, *Antichthon* 25 (1991) 21–22, assigns the ostraka cast against Andron Androkleous Gargettos to the occasion of the ostracism of Thoukydides the son of Melesias (which he places in 438). Mattingly believes that Plato uses the patronymic when referring to Andron Androtionos because of the need to distinguish him from a contemporary namesake with the same demotic. Mattingly has seen the ostraka but does not say whether he has additional reasons for placing the ostraka with Andron's name in this period.

³² That is, Andron Androkleous may have been a first cousin to Androtion (PA 914), the grandfather of the Attidographer.

³³ *JG II*² 1388.69; E. L. Hicks (ed.), *The Collection of Ancient Greek Inscriptions in the British Museum: Part I. Attika* (Oxford 1874) no. 29. Two gold drachmas would equal 24 silver drachmas in value. (On the gold coins of Athens, cf. P. Gardner, *A History of Ancient Coinage 700–300 B.C.* [Oxford 1918] 290–95.) The deme Elaious is believed to have been located near Eleusis, in the coastal trittys of Hippothontis (cf. R. Löper, "Die Trittysen und Demen Attikas," *MDAI(A)* 17 [1892] 416, 419; J. S. Traill, *Demos and Trittys* [Toronto 1986] 138).

II. The Prescript of the Decree of Andron and the Fall of the Four Hundred

Ps.-Plutarch gives the prescript of the Decree of Andron as follows:

ἔδοξε τῇ βουλῇ μιᾷ καὶ εἰκοστῇ τῆς πρυτανείας, Δημόνικος Ἀλωπεκῆθεν ἐγραμμάτευε· Φιλόστρατος Πελληνεύς ἐπιστάται, Ἄνδρων εἶπε κτλ.

It was decreed by the Boule on the 21st day of the prytany, Demonikos Alopekethen was secretary, Philostratos Pelleneus was *epistates*, Andron proposed . . .

There are two apparent irregularities in the prescript: the dating by the day of a prytany, which is unparalleled in decrees of this period³⁴ (although found in financial records) and which should be accompanied by the number of the prytany and the name of the prytanizing tribe, and the demotic of the *epistates*. Since there was no deme Pellene, John Taylor's emendation of the demotic to "Palleneus"³⁵ has been generally followed, but it presents a problem, since in that case the tribe holding the prytany would be Antiochis. The *epistates* would naturally come from the tribe in prytany, while in normal fifth-century practice the secretary would be from a different tribe,³⁶ but Alopeke was also a deme of Antiochis. If Pallene is the deme of the *epistates*, it is not clear why the rules were disregarded at this time. C. Schäfer proposed emending Pelleneus to Paianieus; Paiania was in a different tribe, Pandionis, and thus avoids the irregularity.³⁷ In fact, an inscription of 408/7 mentions a Philostratos Paianieus, one of the stonemasons paid for work on the Erechtheion.³⁸ If Taylor's emendation is correct, his Philostratos Palleneus (PA 14741) is not directly attested otherwise, but he could be the grandfather of a Philostratos Palleneus (PA 14742) of the late fourth century.³⁹

³⁴ G. F. Schömann, *De comitiis Atheniensium* (Greifswald 1819) 131 n. 9; cf. A. S. Henry, *The Prescripts of Athenian Decrees*, Mnemosyne Suppl. 49 (Leiden 1977) 27.

³⁵ In his *Lysiae Vita of 1739*, accessible in J. J. Reiske (ed.), *Oratores Graecorum VI* (Leipzig 1772) 120 n. 34.

³⁶ Rhodes (above, note 17) 134–35.

³⁷ *De scribis senatus populique Atheniensium* (diss. Greifswald 1878) 17–18. If at some point the demotic was abbreviated, as Schäfer suggests, the origin of the corruption would be even easier to understand. Schäfer's emendation is favored by Penndorf (above, note 10).

³⁸ *IG* I³ 476.228–29, 312–13.

³⁹ *IG* II² 410. Possibly the names Philotades and Philostratos alternated in this family: The patronymic Philostratou would be the right length to complete the reading Philotades Phi[lostratou Palle]neus in *IG* II² 136 (354/3 B.C.). See the proposed stemma in PA II 390. A Philotades Palleneus (PA 14926) who could be the father of Taylor's Philostratos Palleneus and the grandfather of the Philotades of 354/3 was Hellenotamias early in the Peloponnesian War (*IG* I³ 281.4, dated to 430/29 in *IG* but to 426/5 by Mattingly, "The Athenian Coinage Decree," *Historia* 10 [1961] 166–68 and "The Tribute Quota Lists from 430 to 425 B.C.," *CQ* 28 [1978] 83, 85).

As C. G. Lowe argues, the manuscripts of the *Vitae Decem Oratorum* go back to an archetype of the ninth century which was "extremely corrupt."⁴⁰ The precise wording of the text is therefore less secure than if we had the original inscribed version. In the oldest surviving manuscript of this portion of the *Moralia*, Ambr. C 126 inf. (gr. 859), copied in 1294 or 1295,⁴¹ and in the later manuscripts there are a number of misspelled words in the Decree of Andron: In addition to Πελληγεύς, we also find Ὀνομαλέα for Ὀνομακλέα in the prescript, and Ἀρχιφῶντα for Ἀντιφῶντα in the body of the decree.

Another decree in the *Vitae Decem Oratorum* (*Mor.* 851f-52e) shows the danger of putting excessive faith in the preserved text of the prescript. Fragments of this decree have been discovered on stone (*IG* II² 457). Ps.-Plutarch's text of this decree has a prytany-date, imperfectly preserved,⁴² but there is none on the stone, which is perfectly legible at this point. This suggests that the texts found in ps.-Plutarch may have been copied from the archive, not from stelai, and the prytany-dates may be part of a system for finding a particular record in the archive; the discrepancy between the manuscript texts of the decrees and normal epigraphical practice may be meaningless.⁴³ That said, the number 21 in the prescript of the Decree of Andron *may* still be correct, although there is no way to be sure. At any rate, the dating is incomplete, since the name of the tribe and the number of the prytany are missing.⁴⁴

Thucydides is our fullest and generally our most reliable source for the events of 411. For the fall of the Four Hundred, Thucydides gives us sufficient detail to permit us to draw certain conclusions. From his account it is clear that the Four Hundred were abruptly removed from power following the disastrous naval battle off Eretria and the revolt of Euboeia,⁴⁵ and that Peisander, Alexikles, and other leaders of the Four Hundred saved themselves by fleeing to Dekeleia.⁴⁶ Events moved rapidly in this period, and men like Theramenes were eager to have their viewpoint officially established, that the men who had been negotiating at Sparta had been plotting to betray Eetioneia. Andron's decree must be placed precisely in.

⁴⁰ "The Text-Tradition of pseudo-Plutarch's *Vitae Decem Oratorum*," *University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature* 9.4 (Urbana 1924) 427 (= diss. Illinois [1924] 23).

⁴¹ For the date, see A. Turyn, *Dated Greek Manuscripts of the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries in the Libraries of Italy I* (Urbana 1972) 81-83. The manuscript was copied for and partly by Maximus Planudes. The *Vitae Decem Oratorum* (63) is found on fol. 348^r-55^v of this manuscript (cf. Lowe [previous note] 423), copied by an unknown scribe whom Turyn calls scribe G; an example of his handwriting is provided by plate 65.

⁴² For attempts to emend the defective text, see Schömann (above, note 34) 134 n. 19; M. H. E. Meier, *Commentatio de Vita Lycurgi quae Plutarcho adscribitur et de Lycurgi orationum reliquiis* (Halle 1847) lxxxiii.

⁴³ Cf. Curtius, *Philologus* 24 (1866) 112-13.

⁴⁴ Cf. Hignett (above, note 2) 378; Sealey, *CSCA* 8 (1975) 286.

⁴⁵ 8. 97. 1.

⁴⁶ 8. 98. 1.

this period, in the immediate aftermath of the collapse of the regime of the Four Hundred. Whatever his motives, Andron was clearly working in cooperation with Theramenes. His proposal refers to “the men whom the generals denounce for sailing on an enemy ship and for passing through Dekeleia while going on embassy to Sparta for the purpose of harming the city and the army of the Athenians.”⁴⁷ Theramenes was one of the generals⁴⁸ and had been most conspicuous among those accusing the men going on embassies of plotting against the city.⁴⁹ Later Theramenes could be seen as responsible for the deaths of those found guilty.⁵⁰ Unfortunately for Theramenes’ reputation, the chief sources are personally hostile to him—Thucydides, Lysias, and Xenophon’s Kritias—and want to give him no credit for saving Athens. Nevertheless, Theramenes may have genuinely believed that there was a plot to betray the Peiraeus to the Spartans, and more generally that those going on embassies to Sparta were harming the city by so doing. It is even easier to believe that men like Andron were honestly convinced by Theramenes’ accusations against Archeptolemos, Onomakles, and Antiphon. Whatever the truth of the matter, this became the officially accepted version in Athens: Phrynichos and his associates had plotted to betray the city.

Those in charge of the city after the collapse of the Four Hundred took no chances: Not only did they try Phrynichos posthumously for treason, but anyone who spoke in the dead man’s defense was liable to the same penalties.⁵¹ The verdict in the cases of Archeptolemos and Antiphon, once they were arrested, was a foregone conclusion. Andron’s decree set the trial for the next day.⁵² In a celebrated passage Thucydides praises Antiphon’s defense speech as the best one ever made by a person facing the death penalty.⁵³ There is nothing in Thucydides’ words which proves that he had seen a written version of the speech; his remark could be based on reports he had received. The admiration Antiphon evoked may have had less to do with the actual wording of his defense speech than with his demeanor and defiant courage when his condemnation was predetermined. Certainly Antiphon had very little time to write out a speech; perhaps a friend in the audience made notes of his arguments at the time or soon afterwards. Aristotle has an anecdote about Agathon telling Antiphon how much he admired the speech,⁵⁴ but that does not guarantee that Aristotle had seen a

⁴⁷ Ps.-Plut. *Mor.* 833e–f.

⁴⁸ Thuc. 8. 92. 9.

⁴⁹ Thuc. 8. 89. 2; 90. 3; 91. 1, 2; 92. 3; 94. 1.

⁵⁰ Lysias 12. 67; Xen. *Hell.* 2. 3. 32, cf. 2. 3. 46.

⁵¹ Lycurg. *Leocr.* 114–15. The stele recording the condemnation of Phrynichos is mentioned in Caecilius fr. 102 Ofenloch (ps.-Plut. *Mor.* 833f) and Krateros F 17 (schol. Aristoph. *Lys.* 313).

⁵² Ps.-Plut. *Mor.* 833f.

⁵³ 8. 68. 2.

⁵⁴ *EE* 3. 1232b4–9.

text of the speech. Much later there was a text in existence which purported to be Antiphon's defense: Ps.-Plutarch seems to refer to it,⁵⁵ and there are several brief citations in Harpokration. Since 1907 some papyrus fragments have generally been regarded as belonging to the speech,⁵⁶ but they are very meager and the identification is not universally accepted.⁵⁷ Caecilius judged 25 of the speeches attributed to Antiphon spurious;⁵⁸ we have very little evidence to judge the authenticity of the defense speech.

III. The Date of the Decree of Andron

The prescript dates the Decree of Andron to the 21st day of an unspecified prytany. Given the eagerness of those in charge of the city after the fall of the Four Hundred to brand Phrynichos and his associates as traitors for their negotiations with Sparta, it is extremely unlikely that some of the men who took part in the embassies could have stayed peaceably in Athens for 21 days before any action was taken against them: The prytany mentioned in the prescript could not have begun after the collapse of the Four Hundred.⁵⁹ Either the Four Hundred had continued to use prytanies, or the Five Thousand when they took charge calculated where in the prytany year they should now be.⁶⁰ In either case, if the reading "the 21st day" is correct, the prytany in question is most likely the second of 411/0, to fit our other information about the Four Hundred.

Aristotle says that Mnasilochos was archon for two months in the year of Theopompos' archonship.⁶¹ Clearly Mnasilochos was one of those who fled, and his name was so distasteful afterwards that the Five Thousand found a new archon for the rest of the year. Nevertheless they could not ignore Mnasilochos because documents had been created already with his

⁵⁵ *Mor.* 833d.

⁵⁶ Published by J. Nicole as *L'Apologie d'Antiphon* (Geneva and Basel 1907), and subsequently printed among the fragments of Antiphon in the Teubner, Budé, and Loeb editions.

⁵⁷ The attribution is rejected by G. Pasquali, "Antifonte?" *Studi storici per l'antichità classica* 1 (1908) 46–57; K. J. Beloch, *Griechische Geschichte* II.1² (Strasbourg 1914) 392 n. 1; P. Roussel, "La prétendue défense d'Antiphon," *REA* 27 (1925) 5–10.

⁵⁸ Fr. 100 Ofenloch = ps.-Plut. *Mor.* 833c.

⁵⁹ Contrary to the view of M. H. Jameson, "Sophocles and the Four Hundred," *Historia* 20 (1971) 553, which is accepted by Andrewes, *HCT* V 197, and by D. Kagan, *The Fall of the Athenian Empire* (Ithaca and London 1987) 209.

⁶⁰ According to Thuc. 8. 70. 1, when the Four Hundred took control, they selected prytanies by lot from among their members. It is possible, therefore, that the normal sequence of prytanies had continued. The Four Hundred later diverged considerably from democratic practices, as Thucydides says in the same passage, but it is not known whether this applies specifically to the system of prytanies. One inscription from the latter part of the rule of the Four Hundred (*IG* I³ 373) is dated by the lunar calendar, Hekatombaion 22, where we would expect dating by the prytany calendar, but it may be going too far to conclude from a single inscription that the Four Hundred had abandoned the use of prytanies. There are inscriptions which omit the information about the prytany when the system of prytanies was in force.

⁶¹ *Ath. Pol.* 33. 1.

name used for dating. Evidently his name was inscribed on the archon list with the notation δῖμηνον. Aristotle's information tells us that the Four Hundred must have fallen during Metageitnion, the second month of the year.⁶² There were (astronomical) new moons on June 23 (about 2:18 P.M.), July 23 (about 5:11 A.M.), and August 21 (about 9:30 P.M.),⁶³ with the lunar crescent probably visible on the evenings of June 24, July 24, and August 23.⁶⁴ The second month of 411/0 would then have begun either about July 25 or about August 24; July is more likely on general grounds⁶⁵ and fits more easily the chronological indications of Thucydides' narrative.

After finishing the story of the fall of the Four Hundred, Thucydides returns to the course of the war in the Hellespont, and then to the activities of Alkibiades. During the time that the Four Hundred were being overthrown, Alkibiades was on a mission to Phaselis and Kaunos.⁶⁶ He returned to Samos, manned additional ships, and proceeded to Halikarnassos and Kos to collect money, and then came back to Samos.⁶⁷ Of this second return to Samos, Thucydides notes that fall was approaching; the term he uses (μετόπωρον) points to mid-September.⁶⁸ To allow time for Alkibiades' mission to Halikarnassos and Kos, and for the events in the Hellespont recounted in 8. 99–107, the fall of the Four Hundred cannot be later than August, and could be earlier. Combining this with Aristotle's information that Mnasilochos was reckoned as archon for two months, we may conclude that the second month of 411/0, the month in which the Four Hundred fell, embraced late July and most of August. The prytany date in the decree of Andron is reckoned differently, on the basis of the 366-day

⁶² G. Busolt, *Griechische Geschichte* III.2 (Gotha 1904) 1508 n. 3.

⁶³ These times are calculated from the table of new moons in F. K. Ginzel, *Handbuch der mathematischen und technischen Chronologie* I (Leipzig 1906) 553 (reprinted in E. J. Bickerman, *The Chronology of the Ancient World* [Ithaca 1968] 117), allowing a difference between Greenwich time and Athens time of 1 hour 35 minutes. Ginzel's figures are in hundredths of a day, so the results can be accurate only to within 7.2 minutes.

⁶⁴ From the observations made at Athens from 1859 to 1880 by Dr. Julius Schmidt, reported in A. Mommsen, *Chronologie* (Leipzig 1883) 69–80, it appears that the crescent is usually visible at Athens during the twilight which falls between 26.5 and 50.5 hours after astronomical new moon. Dr. Schmidt never observed the crescent at Athens at an age of less than 26.5 hours, but saw it 51 of 58 times between 26.5 hours and 50.5 hours. As of 1989, the youngest well-documented naked-eye sighting of the new moon was 14 hours and 51 minutes after the astronomical new moon, under exceptionally favorable circumstances (see *Sky and Telescope* 78 [1989] 322–23).

⁶⁵ For the relationship between the summer solstice and the beginning of the Athenian lunar year (i.e. Hekatombaion 1), cf. W. K. Pritchett, *The Choiseul Marble* (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1970) 39–44, 93, 95.

⁶⁶ Thuc. 8. 108. 1.

⁶⁷ 8. 108. 2.

⁶⁸ On the meaning of μετόπωρον, cf. Busolt (above, note 62) 1508 n. 3; Gomme, *HCT* III 706–09; W. K. Pritchett and B. L. van der Waerden, "Thucydidean Time-Reckoning and Euctemon's Seasonal Calendar," *BCH* 85 (1961) 39.

prytany calendar.⁶⁹ Possibly this began for this year on Skirophorion 14,⁷⁰ which would put the 21st day of the second prytany in the vicinity of August 5.

IV. Conclusion: The Place of Andron in the Events of 411 B.C.

There is every reason to accept the usual view, that the Andron who proposed the decree against Archeptolemos, Onomakles, and Antiphon in 411 is the same as Andron of Gargettos, the father of Androtion. The Andron from the same deme whose name has been found on six ostraka belongs to an earlier time but may be a relative, perhaps his grandfather. The Decree of Andron belongs in the immediate aftermath of the fall of the Four Hundred, probably towards the end of July or early in August 411. Andron was not a member of the Four Hundred but rather a member of the Five Hundred constituted as the Boule after the collapse of the Four Hundred. Possibly ideology helped shape his course of action in 411; perhaps he believed in limiting the government to 5,000, but unfortunately we have no way of determining whether that was the case. His attack on Antiphon may not have been primarily ideological in motive, but based on practical considerations (belief in the accusations of treason, or at least in the need to establish such treason as the official truth) or personal (to gain revenge for earlier attacks or to dissociate himself from Antiphon).

Louis Gernet wisely points out that it is difficult to know how to judge Antiphon from this distance;⁷¹ the same is true of Antiphon's accusers. They may have sincerely believed that they had thwarted the betrayal of their city and were properly punishing traitors, and they may have been right. The Decree of Andron—the oldest substantial piece of evidence bearing on the fall of the Four Hundred—provides us with the public rationale of those who attacked Antiphon and his associates. We should make the most of this document.⁷²

Austin Peay State University

⁶⁹ For the length of the prytany year at this time, cf. W. K. Pritchett and O. Neugebauer, *The Calendars of Athens* (Cambridge, MA 1947) 95–97; Pritchett (above, note 65) 34, 96–97; A. E. Samuel, *Greek and Roman Chronology* (Munich 1972) 62–63.

⁷⁰ It is not clear how Aristotle's source discovered this date. It may be correct (cf. Pritchett [above, note 65] 105 n. 5), but if so it was calculated afterwards. I follow L. van der Ploeg (*Theramenes en zijn Tijd* [diss. Utrecht 1948] 77) in rejecting Aristotle's dates of Thargelion 14 and Thargelion 22 (*Ath. Pol.* 32. 1), because of their incompatibility with the narrative of Thucydides (8. 63. 3), but the question of when the Four Hundred began their rule is not directly relevant here. I would assign Polystratos' eight days' service as registrar of the Five Thousand (ps.-Lysias 20. 13–14) to the final days of the Four Hundred, following the promise reported in Thuc. 8. 93. 2.

⁷¹ In the introduction to his edition of Antiphon (Paris 1923) 3.

⁷² I would like to thank Mortimer Chambers, Raphael Sealey, and the two anonymous readers for helpful criticism of this paper.