

# **Athenian Political Voluntary Exiles, 650 - 322 B.C.**

**Maxine Frances Flavel**  
**B.A., M. Litt. (UNE)**

*A dissertation presented to the School of History, Philosophy and Politics of Macquarie University, to complete the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, 1994.*

*I hereby certify that this thesis has not been presented for any higher degree to any other university or tertiary institution.*

**M F Flavel, Sydney 1994**

*For my husband  
Geoff Flavel  
te amo*

### *Acknowledgements*

*I wish to express my gratitude to Dr David Phillips of Macquarie University for his patient and constructive supervision of the preparation of this work. Most especially I am grateful for his understanding that the people who strode the Athenian political stage so long ago are not so distant from ourselves, with families and properties and worries which echo in the late twentieth century and make the study of Athenian history of the classical period as valuable today as it has ever been. His enthusiasm for these Athenians reflects my own.*

*For help in improving the final draft, I wish to thank my friend Marie Watson who generously applied her time and expertise to the proof-reading, and any errors which remain are entirely my own.*

*I am most grateful to my family and friends who have patiently endured "the thesis" interrupting normal activities for almost eight years, and no words can express what the support and encouragement of my husband has meant to the completion of this work.*

*M F Flavel  
Sydney 1994*

# Contents

<b>Volume I</b>		Pages 1 - 235
<b>Volume II</b>		Page 236
<b>Synopsis</b>		7
<b>1.0</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	9
	<b>1.1 purpose, scope, chronological limits, previous studies</b>	9
	<b>1.2 methodology</b>	17
<b>2.0</b>	<b>Voluntary Exiles</b>	
	<b>Biographical Studies</b>	
	Adeimantos, son of Leukolophides <i>PA</i> 202	53
	Aischines <i>PA</i> 341	157
	Aischines, son of Atrometos <i>PA</i> 354	312
	Akoumenos <i>PA</i> 477	70
	Alexikles <i>PA</i> 535	164
	Alkibiades of Phegous <i>PA</i> 599 = 601	111
	Alkibiades son of Kleinias <i>PA</i> 600	117
	Alkisthenes <i>PA</i> 638	91
	Amiantos <i>PA</i> ?metic	71
	Andokides son of Leogoras <i>PA</i> 828	134
	Androtion son of Andron <i>PA</i> 913 = 915	288
	Antidoros <i>PA</i> 1022	92
	Antiphon <i>PA</i> 1279	72
	Antiphon <i>PA</i> 1281	285
	Anytos son of Anthemios <i>PA</i> 1324	210
	Apsephion <i>PA</i> 2806	54
	Archebiades <i>PA</i> 2300	73
	Archedemos <i>PA</i> 2326	181
	Archidamos <i>PA</i> 2482	93
	Archinos <i>PA</i> 2526	219
	Archippos <i>PA</i> 2541	74
	Aristarchos son of Moschos <i>PA</i> 1656	281
	Aristogeiton son of Kydimachos <i>PA</i> 1775	277
	Aristogenes <i>PA</i> 1781	169
	Aristomenes <i>PA</i> 1993	75
	Aristonikos <i>PA</i> 2028	339
	Aristoteles ?son of Timokrates <i>PA</i> 2057 = 2055	156
	Atrometos <i>PA</i> 2681	224
	Autokrator <i>PA</i> 2745	76
	Axiochos son of Alkibiades <i>PA</i> 1330	55
	Chairedemos son of Elpios <i>PA</i> 15120	56
	Chairephon <i>PA</i> 15203	216
	Chairion son of Kledik[os] <i>PA</i> 15282	31

Chares son of Theochares <i>PA</i> 15292	296
Charikles son of Apollodoros <i>PA</i> 15407	147
Charippos <i>PA</i> 15464	94
Charmides son of Aristoteles <i>PA</i> 15510	57
Demosthenes son of Demosthenes <i>PA</i> 3597	324
Diakritos <i>PA</i> 3746	58
Diogenes <i>PA</i> 3803	77
Diognetos son of Nikeratos <i>PA</i> 3863 = 3851	59
Epikrates ?son of Philodemos <i>PA</i> 4859	238
Eryximachos ?son of Akoumenos <i>PA</i> 5187	95
Euboulides ?son of Epikleides <i>PA</i> 5325	243
Euktemon <i>PA</i> 5871	96
Euphiletos son of Timotheos <i>PA</i> 6071	97
Eurydamas <i>PA</i> 5962	98
Eurymachos <i>PA</i> 5971	99
Glaukippos <i>PA</i> 2978	100
Gniphonides <i>PA</i> 3058	78
Gylon <i>PA</i> 3098	141
Hephaistodoros <i>PA</i> 6563	79
Himeraios son of Phanostratos <i>PA</i> 7578	337
Hipparchos son of Charmos <i>PA</i> 7600	37
Hypereides son of Glaukippos <i>PA</i> 13912	338
Isonomos <i>PA</i> 7719	80
Kallimedon son of Kallikratos <i>PA</i> 8032	38
Kallippos son of Philon <i>PA</i> 8065	258
Kallistratos son of Kallikrates <i>PA</i> 8157	245
Kallixenos <i>PA</i> 8042	176
Konon son of Timotheos <i>PA</i> 8707	190
Kratinos <i>PA</i> 8757a	242
Kydimachos <i>PA</i> 8930	264
Kylon <i>PA</i> 8943	20
Leogoras son of Andokides <i>PA</i> 9074	33
Leokrates <i>PA</i> 9083	305
Leosthenes <i>PA</i> 9141	250
Lykiskos <i>PA</i> 9213	182
Lysistratos <i>PA</i> 9596	60
Mantitheos <i>PA</i> 9670	61
Meletos <i>PA</i> 9825	81
Menekles <i>PA</i> 9905	183
Menestratos <i>PA</i> 9993	101
Nikides son of Phoinikides <i>PA</i> 10763	82
Nikomachos <i>PA</i> 10933 = 10934	206
Nikophemos <i>PA</i> 11066	202
Oionias son of Oionocharos <i>PA</i> 11370	83
Onomakles <i>PA</i> 11476	153
Panaitios <i>PA</i> 11567	62
Pantakles <i>PA</i> 11584	84
Peisandros <i>PA</i> 11770	160
Phaidros son of Pythokles <i>PA</i> 13950 = 13960	63



	Pheidias son of Charmides <i>PA</i> 14149	42
	Pherekles son of Ph[ren]ika[ios] <i>PA</i> 14191 = 14194	102
	Philokrates <i>PA</i> 14573	85
	Philokrates son of Pythodoros <i>PA</i> 14599	291
	Philon son of Kallippos <i>PA</i> 14825	253
	Platon <i>PA</i> 11846	103
	Polyeuktos <i>PA</i> 11923	104
	Poulytion <i>PA</i> 12154	86
	Protomachos <i>PA</i> 12318	170
	Pytheas <i>PA</i> 12342	333
	Smindyrides <i>PA</i> 12800	87
	Solon son of Exekestides <i>PA</i> 12806	24
	Teisarchos <i>PA</i> 13466	88
	Telenikos <i>PA</i> 13502	105
	Theodoros <i>PA</i> 6826 = 6907	106
	Theotimos <i>PA</i> 7055	255
	Timanthes <i>PA</i> 13607	107
	Timokrates <i>PA</i> 13748	184
	Timomachos <i>PA</i> 13797	287
	Timotheos son of Konon <i>PA</i> 13700	270
	Xenophon son of Gryllos <i>PA</i> 11307	228
	(The Hermokopidai)	48-140
	(The Arginousai Affair)	168-189
	(The Embassy to Sparta)	236-244
<b>3.0</b>	<b>Conclusions</b>	343
	<b>3.1 Voluntary Exile and the Law</b>	344
	<b>3.2 Destinations</b>	355
	<b>3.3 Voluntary Exile and the Generals</b>	361
	<b>3.4 Survival in Exile</b>	366
	<b>3.5 Family and Religion</b>	381
	<b>3.6 Return and Recall</b>	393
<b>4.0</b>	<b>Appendices:</b>	403
	A Exclusions: Problems and Doubtful Cases	404
	B Isokrates xix: Useful Parallels for Voluntary Exile	416
	C Plutarch <i>Moralia</i> 599 - 607 'On Exile'	418

<b>5.0</b>	<b>Tables</b>	420
1	Voluntary Athenian Political Exiles - Alphabetical	421
2	Voluntary Athenian Political Exiles - Chronological	428
3	All Athenian Political Exiles - Alphabetical	435
4	Voluntary Athenian Political Exiles - Sentences <i>in absentia</i>	444
5	Survival and Voluntary Athenian Political Exiles	450
6	Voluntary Exiles - Dates and Destinations	457
7	Dates of Ostracisms - Certain and Disputed	459
8	Chronological List of <i>Strategoí</i> as Voluntary Exiles	461
9	Chronological List of Athenian Voluntary Political Exiles - Return and Recall	463
10	Voluntary Athenian Political Exiles - Family in Exile	469
<b>6.0</b>	<b>Bibliography</b>	472
	<b>6.1 Abbreviations</b>	472
	<b>6.2 Citations</b>	474
	<b>6.3 Bibliography</b>	476

# SYNOPSIS

No significant work on exiles has been undertaken since Balogh<sup>1</sup> in 1943, and the extent of the scholarship in the fifty years since that work has provided sufficient new material to make a study of at least the Athenian exiles, a worthwhile and revealing project.

This study covers the period from the 600s BC to the death of Alexander of Macedon (Alexander the Great) in 322. The study has two main objectives, the first being to identify and catalogue those Athenians whose exiles were politically based or motivated, and who chose to flee from Athens or stay away from Athens, that is to proceed voluntarily into exile. The second objective is to recognise such decisions in their human context, rather than purely in the political or historical sense. To this end the study seeks to identify how such decisions to abandon their homes and city affected these people personally. This aspect canvasses questions of destination of exiles, how they survived, what happened to their families, and what conditions prevailed to effect return to Athens or recall by Athens.

The study provides a prosopographical table, with biographical studies of these more than one hundred Athenians who abandoned Athens. The conclusions drawn from the extant evidence have been grouped in summary chapters. These cover aspects of the law as it affected exiles; destinations and the observable trend away from the mainland and 'old Greece' as the period progressed; how exiles survived, and the importance of *xenia* relationships, mercenary

1. Balogh, (1943) **Political Refugees in Ancient Greece From the Period of the Tyrants to Alexander the Great**

service and commerce, and the noticeable shift towards 'self-help' amongst the *kaloi k'agathoi*, replacing international relationships which defied current political realities; family, religion and relationships, and the problems of inheritance, property and assets show the destructive forces which work upon a community; the surprising resilience of individuals faced with the loss of their social framework; and the opportunities for return to Athens. This last aspect of the study illustrates the determination of the *demos* throughout the period to retain and jealously guard the franchise, to the extent that some returnees were only able to do so with the assistance of foreign arms.

Although the details of the exile of most individuals are relatively paltry, overall there has been enough evidence which has survived in the literary and epigraphical traditions to produce a picture of the political factors at work within Athens which made life in Athens no longer a viable option for those in this study.

## INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Purpose, Scope, Chronological Limits, Previous Studies

This thesis is a prosopographical study of a special group of Athenian political exiles of the seventh, sixth, fifth and fourth centuries B.C. This group of exiles is distinguished by the **voluntary** nature of their exile: they **chose** to absent themselves from Athens for reasons which were directly and sometimes indirectly political.

Banishment took many forms in Athens in the classical period, and in this context voluntary exile is differentiated from other forms because it is self-banishment, as opposed to other forms based on political, and even on non-political imperatives. Avoidance of trials is also a common theme among voluntary exiles. Often those who chose to absent themselves from Athens for political reasons subsequently suffered a confirmation of their status as exiles through the legal process. **Table 4** relies heavily on the work of Hansen<sup>1</sup> to provide details of those individuals within the present study who suffered this fate.

Banishment normally means a punishment which is suffered by an individual, and was one of the forms of punishment for criminal and civil acts against the state or against individuals.

Ostracism was also a form of banishment, but one lacking odium since perversely it conferred upon the banished person the status of success as a political notable.<sup>2</sup> Generally ostracism is

1. Hansen (1974; 1975; 1976)

2. Plut. *Aristides* 7.3-4

distinct from banishment also because the person suffered no loss of property, it was not *atimia* and ostracism generally had a specific time limit, legally ten years with anything less due to early recall. Significantly, according to Plutarch, ostracism fell into disrepute when it was applied to Hyperbolos<sup>3</sup> (PA 13910), who was considered to have been beneath the political status of the former recipients of this sentence. *Atimia* was a form of internal banishment, usually resulting from an inability to pay fines owing to the state. It was a loss of citizenship rights which should have precluded the *atimos* from partaking in the political and religious life of the *polis*.<sup>4</sup> *Atimia*, with its attendant anguish for the recipient, often resulted in voluntary (external) exile, for example this path was chosen by Aischines (PA 354 Entry 97). Significantly, *atimoi* had a pressing reason which influenced their decisions to stay or to leave Athens, namely the danger that they faced when in a state of *atimia*, that is fear of attack and preservation of their personal safety.

Only Athenian citizens are included in this study. The term *Athenian* is restricted to those who held Athenian citizenship, whatever its definition at the time the individual lived.<sup>5</sup>

Excluded are those who voluntarily left Athens as part of an expedition to settle a new colony; those who were absent from Athens for an extended period for business or commercial reasons; those who formed part of an authorised garrison.

3. Plut. *Aristides* 7.3-4, *Nikias* 11; Thuc. VIII.73.3

4. Hansen (1991: p99)

5. Sealey (1987: pp5-31) provides a most useful examination of Athenian citizenship, which this work has adopted as the standard for the topic. See most recently P B Manville (1990), *The Origins of Citizenship in Ancient Athens*, Princeton.

Included are those whose voluntary exile resulted in absence from Athens for any political reason, including politically motivated absences where the Athenian state had not specifically stipulated exile as a punishment. This last category includes generals who felt it wiser not to come home after defeat, or even victory. Of course potential attacks on generals after their return could have been made not only by political enemies (if any) but by those motivated by personal revenge for loved ones killed in the defeat, or by personal animosity. However, in most cases in this study the motivations can be attributed to political factors which provide the motivation to leave or to stay away.

The voluntary category of exiles also includes those who had no overt reason for leaving for an extended period, but whose motives are suspected of being political. Further, it includes those whose exile was for non-political crimes, but whose prosecution was politically-based, rather than criminally-based.

In Classical Greece the *polis*, the essential community within whose context social values must be considered, provided its members with many of the opportunities and resources that made life worth living; men felt that their *polis* alone provided sufficient protection against oppression, crime and war to make a tolerable life possible, and that essential elements of a good, or a civilized, life were best grounded in such a context.<sup>6</sup>

6. Fisher (1976: p1). See also Carter (1986:p1)

Fisher's statement of what it meant to be a member of a society such as that at Athens during the classical period contains the elements of the challenge implicit in this study: in this context why would the decision be made to voluntarily forsake the community which "made life worth living"? This decision was not made only by prominent individuals with networks of family and friends. It also encompassed those of lesser rank for whom the accidents of time have not provided a voice in the surviving evidence. The objective of this work is not just to catalogue voluntary political exiles, but where evidence is available, to examine their attitudes to their absences from Athens, its public and private life; how these exiles lived away from Athens; how they maintained themselves; where they went and how they got there; what happened to their families; if they came back, to what, and under what conditions.

Although the bulk of the material for voluntary exiles comes from the period from the sixth century until the death of Alexander in 322 BC, there is one extant example from the seventh century, that of Kylon (*PA* 8943 Entry 1): he has been included for completeness.

Many apparent cases of voluntary exile do not stand a closer examination, or their inclusion poses difficulties with definitions of voluntary exile. For example, the difficulties with sources for the voluntary exiles according to the parameters adopted in this study is highlighted by the case of Demosthenes (*PA* 3585) son of Alkisthenes. He perhaps should be included in the main body of the study because of the testimony of Thucydides<sup>7</sup> that he fell into the category of voluntary exile. His case however demonstrates that even the contemporary evidence is not always to be relied upon. The accepted view is directly challenged by presentation of an alternative view of Thucydides' own narrative in the case of the son of Alkisthenes. Cases such

7. Thuc. III.98.5



as Demonsthenes, and others who are doubtful voluntary exiles are dealt with in Appendix A *Exclusions: Problems and Doubtful Cases*. Peisistratos and Isagoras are two cases in point, where the sources suggest that they were voluntary exiles. However, the factional and regional politics in Athens meant that both, and especially Peisistratos, had little choice on the occasion described in Hdt. I.60.1, but to flee from Athens.

Solon (*PA* 12806, Entry 2) son of Exekestides, is included because there is sufficient doubt concerning his motives for travel overseas to suggest that a valid view of this journey places it firmly in the category of voluntary exile with a political motivation. Again a review of the acknowledged evidence is warranted in the light of the recognition of voluntary exiles as a distinct group of Athenians.

There is very little scholarship on the subject of exile generally: Phillips' work on ostracism represents the most recent comprehensive study of this type of exile.<sup>8</sup> The principal work on exiles *per se* is that of Balogh, completed in 1943.<sup>9</sup> This work is now fifty years old and therefore takes no account of the scholarship of those intervening years and that is one of the reasons that the time is ripe to revisit exiles. Balogh himself admitted in his Preface the difficulties he encountered in attempting a full study of his topic due to the limitations placed on his scholarship by the Second World War.<sup>10</sup> His study of exiles also is not prosopographical. It is geographically diverse, attempting to cover exiles from the whole of Greece, and draws

8. Phillips, (1982) 'Athenian Ostracism' *Hellenika*

9. Balogh (1943)

10. Balogh (1943: px)

generalisations from that coverage which closer inspection reveals to be inappropriate.<sup>11</sup>

Importantly, Balogh drew parallels, reflected in the title of his study, with modern political refugees. This is anachronistic, not only on the basis of terminology but because the *concept* of the modern refugee, whilst acknowledging the etymological root relationship to *phugein* that Balogh has made, would be anathema to an Athenian of the period under review.<sup>12</sup>

Other studies mention exiles in passing or as part of a wider concept. Specifically, Hansen notes meticulously the exiles both voluntary, and those subsequently endorsed through the Athenian judicial system by sentence of death *in absentia*, or permanent exile.<sup>13</sup> However, Hansen's concentration is not on exiles *per se*, either voluntary or otherwise: his is a series of studies of the forms of action at Athenian law. Hofstetter<sup>14</sup> provides a fund of knowledge of the destinations of prominent Athenians whom it is known from other sources voluntarily absented themselves from Athens: yet his study is not meant to be a study of exiles but a study of the relationships between Persians and Greeks (including Athenians).

11. Balogh (1943: p44) equates oligarchies with Sparta and democracies with Athens. This facile arrangement is too general and has been succinctly demolished by Hornblower (1991: pp15-31), who has detailed the complex relationships and politico-social forces at work notwithstanding the apparent alignment of the opposing sides in the Peloponnesian War and generally.
12. Balogh (1943: pp1-2) provides a complete discussion of the full range of terminology which has been applied to describe exiles during the period from Kylon to the death of Alexander.
13. Hansen (1974, 1975, 1976)
14. Hofstetter (1978)

Herman's study<sup>15</sup> of the relationships between individuals who crossed political and cultural boundaries has provided an invaluable insight into some of the options open to those who chose to leave behind all that life in the Athenian *polis* meant. Herman's concept of *xenia* relationships and ritualised friendships has formed a valuable framework for consideration of the decision-making processes and of the survival questions faced by voluntary exiles, which a study such as this provokes. Equally Walbank's study<sup>16</sup> of *proxenoi* demonstrates that the period was not as politically simplistic as the geographical boundaries would suggest: the interrelationships at the highest levels of society and politics played a significant part in the tendencies towards one choice or another for voluntary exiles. Walbank, however, is also not concerned directly with exiles, and certainly not with voluntary ones.

Works such as that of Hatzfeld<sup>17</sup> and subsequently of Ellis<sup>18</sup> on the life of Alkibiades (*PA* 600, Entry 55) exemplify the other major type of study of, in this case a double, voluntary exile. However, the focus of works such as these is on the totality and the historical context of the subject, in the case of Hatzfeld and Ellis, that of Alkibiades. Although his periods in exile are treated in as great a wealth of detail as is available and his are acknowledged as exiles which Alkibiades himself chose on both occasions, the examination of those exiles is taken from a

15. Herman (1987)

16. Walbank (1978)

17. Hatzfeld (1951)

18. Ellis (1989)

standpoint different to that of this study. Generally his relationships *at Athens*, his life as *an Athenian* and his aspirations *as an Athenian* are the perspectives of the authors. In this study an attempt is made to examine only the life of Alkibiades out of his Athenian context, in terms of his options *without* Athens: that is, from the viewpoint of his two exiles and his options as an exile.

It is reasonable to state that other recent scholarship has mentioned exiles, voluntary and otherwise, merely in passing. This is by no means a censorious statement, simply a fact.

However, works such as Davies' *Athenian Propertied Families*<sup>19</sup> provide (albeit unintentionally in terms of this study) data which can be utilised to ascertain aspects of the exile's life away from Athens, such as the means for their survival; family relationships which provide clues to aspects of the subject's exile; access to funds, income and physical property; and incidental details which together assist in building a picture of the physical conditions encountered by exiles, and how they might have managed.

Phillips has concentrated on ostracism. Other than his work, there is no recent scholarship which concentrates on Athenian exiles of any other type nor indeed the question of exiles generally in pre-Hellenistic Greece. Due to the inadequacies of Balogh and the paucity of scholarship specifically dedicated to exiles generally, this study is designed take up the challenge by adding a small measure to the understanding of exiles through a study of those who turned their backs on all that had previously held the meaning, indeed defined the meaning, of their lives.

19. Davies (1971)

Isokrates xix (*Aigenetikos*) is examined in Appendix B, together with Plutarch *Moralia* 599-607 'On Exile' (Appendix C). These have been included because of their usefulness in providing some insights into the understanding of the experience of exile.

## 1.2 Methodology

The surviving evidence from literary and epigraphical sources forms the basis for this work. In citing modern scholarship my practice has been to refer to more recent works except where significant points are made by earlier writers.

The work is presented in biographical studies, each of which is preceeded by a summary table. In presenting information in these entry summaries, it is hoped that they will serve to show

- (a) what is known and not known to demonstrate the extent and implication of the many gaps in our knowledge; and
- (b) the necessity of carefully indicating the limited data upon which generalisations must necessarily be based.

The prosopographical material is arranged chronologically by date of exile and is also collated chronologically in **Table 2** to provide ease of reference. **Table 1** provides an alphabetical list of voluntary political exiles, and **Table 3** provides an alphabetical list of *all* political exiles during the period, including those expelled or ostracised. This present study of individual voluntary exiles has also been arranged chronologically. This method of arrangement serves a specific purpose of its own, namely to document **change** over time, especially in areas such as *xenia* relationships, and in survival methods in exile. Some exiles are grouped together because they had a single catalyst, as in the case of those associated with the Arginousai affair, and those associated with the mutilation of the Hermai and the profanation of the Mysteries are

treated as a group in the main because there is little information on the majority of voluntary exiles stemming from this cause. Where there is, for example Alkibiades III, the entries are provided separately.

Those persons who went into exile more than once have all their exiles treated at the date of their first exile, and cross-referenced in the appropriate place for the second exiles, noted with *bis*. From the study of voluntary exiles a series of themes emerged, and these are explored as chapters and sub-sections of chapters at the conclusion of the biographical studies.

Generally only the period of exile of the individual and its proximate cause have been considered. In the case of better known individuals, such as Alkibiades III (*PA* 600 Entry 55) and Konon (*PA* 8707 Entry 71), there exists a relative wealth of material and traditions upon which to draw. Sadly, in many other cases the exiles remain shadowy, some surprisingly so - the two absconding generals after Arginousai spring to mind in this category.<sup>20</sup> Where no specific evidence exists for a given aspect of voluntary exile, a contemporary or nearly contemporary example from a non-voluntary category has been used as a parallel to provide relative probability for some actions which are otherwise merely assumptions.

The themes which have emerged and which are treated in the biographical details of each entry where evidence permits, have been incorporated into chapters and sub-sections of chapters. These themes include the exile of *strategoí*, families and religion, the law and exiles, survival in exile, to *philopolis*, and conditions of recall or return. Regrettably, these themes have raised more questions than this work can answer conclusively.

20. Aristogenes (*PA* 1781 Entry 64) and Protomachos (*PA* 12318 Entry 65).

The identification of a sub-group of exiles generally, the voluntary exile, – political and Athenian – does, however, provide the starting point for a re-examination of attitudes to Athenian life and lifestyle and what it meant to be Athenian through the attempt of this work to delineate what life was like outside that "Athenian-ness", and the causes which would force a person to choose exile over "the opportunities and resources that made life worth living".<sup>21</sup>

21. Fisher (1976: p1)

**ENTRY No: 1**

**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Kylon

**Patronymic:** n.k.

**Deme:** n.a.

**Tritty:** n.a.

**Tribe:** n.k.

**Genos:** n.k.

**PA No:** 8943

**Date of Death:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** n.k.

**Wealth:** Probable, because he was a victor at Olympia.

**Magistracies:** n.k.

**B. EXILE**

**Reason:** Unsuccessful coup attempt.

Probable ( *Ath Pol* F8 (Loeb)Thuc. I.126.10)

**Hetairoi:** n.k.

**Date:** 632

**Conditions:** n.a.

**Term:** n.k. but probably life

**Xenoi:** n.k.

**Destination:** n.k. probably Megara

**Attitude to Exile:** n.k.

**Family Exile:** At least his brother; ?wife already there.

**Return Conditions:** n.k.

**Return Date:** n.k. if at all.

**Recall Date:** n.k.

**C. SOURCES**

**Literary:**

Hdt. V.71

Thuc. I.126.10

*Ath Pol* F8 (Loeb)

**D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

Calhoun (1964: p13)

Andrewes (1971: p84)

Sealey (1976: p99, p114)

Rhodes (1981: pp79-84)

Stanton (1990: pp17-26)



## KYLON

Although technically outside the period of this study, the apparently voluntary exile of Kylon<sup>1</sup> (*PA* 8943) belongs with the random seventh century attempts to control the Akropolis through use of external force<sup>2</sup>.

Kylon's exile is probable because it is attested by both Thucydides<sup>3</sup> and Aristotle.<sup>4</sup> Yet these are relatively late sources in terms of the events they describe. Whilst Herodotos<sup>5</sup> also fits that description, his particular interest in these affairs suggests that his statement that those involved were all killed precludes the possibility that Kylon and his brother escaped, and that there was no exile as the other sources state.

Yet all three sources agree on the circumstances, namely that Kylon and his supporters attempted to establish control of Athens by a military coup aimed (initially successfully) at

1. Rhodes (1981: p79-84) - dated because of Kylon's Olympic victories to 632; Balogh (1943: pp5-8, p89n13). *HCT I* p428f suggests 632 as one of three options, the others being 628 or 624. As Gomme points out (p428) a date in the 550s which Beloch and De Sanctis favour, is most unlikely principally because an event so close to the Peisistratid era would have a strong associated tradition. Legon (1981: pp93-94) feels that Theagenes was in power in Megara by 640 so a date of 632 for Kylon's attempt would be appropriate, since Theagenes would have consolidated his rule by then.
2. The comparison with Peisistratos (*PA* 11793) and Isagoras (*PA* 7680) is hard to avoid.
3. Thuc. I.126.10; *Ath Pol* F8 (Loeb); Schol. Ar. *Knights* 445; Rhodes (1981: pp79-84).
4. Stanton (1990: pp17-26 with notes) provides a full discussion and notes the contradictions within the sources.
5. Hdt. V.71; cf Schol. Ar. *Knights* 445 which mentions Kylon's escape but not that of his brother.

seizing the Akropolis, the seat of Athenian government at this time. They did this through the force of arms supplied by Kylon's father-in-law, Theagenes, the then tyrant of Megara.

The attempt was not without support, though Calhoun is correct in pointing out the apparent anachronism of Herodotos in using the term *hetairoi* to describe those who actually joined Kylon on the Akropolis.<sup>6</sup> However, Calhoun provides no evidence for his statement that Kylon had a "very considerable" following, aside from his intimates.<sup>7</sup> What he did have, and where the sources agree, was external help.<sup>8</sup>

If it is accepted that Kylon did escape the besieged Akropolis, he did so with the connivance of either those inside (in the hope of a future resurrection of their plan?) or Theagenes, using his strong political and military position to persuade those outside.

It can safely be assumed that Kylon, like all his contemporaries who played politics at this

6. Calhoun (1913: p13). According to Sealey (1976: p114) the coup was based in clan power struggles; cf p99 and the reference to unification.

7. Calhoun (1913: p13)

8. That is, Theagenes of Megara.

level, had ample wealth to do so<sup>9</sup>. However, this wealth would not have served him once he had escaped, if he did escape.<sup>10</sup> So his well-being (and that of his unnamed brother) would have been dependent in exile upon Kylon's father-in-law,<sup>11</sup> and whilst we have no evidence of their destination (if indeed they escaped at all), it is reasonable to assume that Kylon and his sibling repaired to Megara.

It is important to note that our knowledge of Kylon's attempt at tyranny is recounted by all three sources in the light of the future reactions to the Alkmeonidai. Political though the motives may have been (and thus his exile, if it occurred at all, can be classified as political), still Andrewes<sup>12</sup> makes the point that this was an internecine, aristocratic play, and thus it seems the widespread following (alleged by Calhoun)<sup>13</sup> may have been confined to those *hetairoi* (sic) and Theagenes.

9. Sealey (1976: p99) suggests that Kylon's wealth and power base were in Western Attika, and that some measure of opposition to the effects of unification may also have prompted the attempt.
10. There is no evidence for or against confiscation of assets, yet the obliteration of his supporters suggests that the 'escape' was hurried and that the assets must have been abandoned.
11. Like most of his class, Kylon may have had extensive *xenia* relationships and, therefore, some choices of destination. Herman (1987: p150)
12. Andrewes (1971: p84)
13. Calhoun (1913: p13)

**ENTRY No: 2**

**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Solon

**Patronymic:** son of Exekestides

**Deme:** n.a.

**Tritty:** n.a.

**Tribe:** n.k.

**Genos:** n.k.

**PA No:** 12806; W Aly RE 3A (1929) p946f (1)

**Date of Death:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** n.k.

**Magistracies:** AO 2752

**Wealth:** Middle class, according to *Ath Pol* 5.3. APF p490, pp323-324.

?*strategos* 600 (Plut. *Solon* 8ff);  
*archon* 594/3; *nomothetes* 594 (*Ath Pol* 5ff;  
Plut. *Solon* 12ff)

**B. EXILE**

**Reason:** Due to political opposition to, or lack of sympathy with his reforms.

Certain *Ath Pol* 2.1-2; Hdt 1.29;  
Plut. *Solon* 25

**Conditions:** n.a.

**Date:** Disputed, but probably 572/1

**Xenoi:** ?Croesos

**Term:** 10 years

**Hetairoi:** n.e.

**Destination:** Egypt, Lydia

**Attitude to Exile:** Given the travelogue is true, favourable.

**Family Exile:** ?a son remained in Athens

**Return Conditions:** n.a.

**Return Date:** Disputed, see notes

**Recall Date:** n.a.

### **C. SOURCES**

Solon frag. 7,15 (Loeb)  
Hdt. I.29  
Ar. *Clouds* 1187  
Plato *Timaeus* 21  
*Ath Pol* 11.1-2; 15.2  
Diod. I.79.4  
Plut. *Solon* 3; 16; 25-31

### **D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

Hignett, *Hist. Athen. Const.* p320  
Andrewes (1974: p84)  
Sealey (1976: pp107-113)  
Ehrenberg (1981: pp63-64)  
Rhodes (1981: pp169-171, pp207-208)  
Wallace (1983: p81f)  
Stanton (1990: p50n2, p84n6)

SOLON

Solon (*PA* 12806) voluntarily absented himself from Athens for 10 years, according to Herodotos,<sup>1</sup> because he wanted the Athenians to adapt to his new legislation and they had sworn that they would not repeal it without his consent. Therefore, he apparently determined not to be available to give that consent.

Plutarch<sup>2</sup>, following Aristotle<sup>3</sup>, agrees that he voluntarily absented himself for ten years, but he shades the reason differently from Herodotos, allowing that Solon wished to avoid becoming involved in arguments and arbitration of the reforms and laws he had put in place.

Plutarch<sup>4</sup> states that Solon returned to Athens in time to arbitrate privately (and unsuccessfully) between the factions of the Plain, the Shore and the Hill, whose disputes led to the first tyranny of Peisistratos (*PA* 11793) in 561/0.

1. Hdt. I.29 with Stanton (1990: p49n2)
2. Plut. *Solon* 25
3. *Ath Pol* 11. 1-2; Rhodes (1981: pp169-171, pp180-181)
4. Plut. *Solon* 29; cf Rhodes (1981: p170) who suggests that Solon may not have returned at all.

It is known that Solon was opposed to the tyranny of Peisistratos both before and after the event.<sup>5</sup> Following the arguments of Sealey, who allows up to a year between Solon's arrival home and Peisistratos' assumption of sole power, Solon departed Athens 572/1. Therefore, his reforms and legislation took place in the period before 572/1. Sealey<sup>6</sup> believes that the reforms took place in the decade 580-570, which appears to fit the evidence and is not disputed by Stanton.<sup>7</sup> both agree that there is no reason to suppose that Solon achieved his reforms during his archon year, 594/3.

However, the evidence of Diodoros<sup>8</sup> suggests that the travels undertaken by Solon to Egypt *resulted* in laws framed by Solon with a basis in Egyptian law, for example the law relating to declaration of income. However, Plutarch<sup>9</sup>, on the authority of Theophrastos, attributes this law not to Solon, but to Peisistratos. And, as Andrewes<sup>10</sup> has recognised, Solon had *already* published his views in verse concerning agrarian reform *before* he was made archon in 594/3.

Plato<sup>11</sup> stated that Kritias (*PA* 8790) the elder had stated that Solon abandoned poetry upon his return from Egypt because of the need to deal with the class struggles and evils he found in Athenian society. Yet this passage does not stipulate what evils and what struggles, and

5. *Ath Pol* 14.2; Rhodes (1981: pp201-202)
6. Sealey (1976: p122)
7. Stanton (1990: p50n5)
8. Diod. I.79.4 *seisachtheia*; also I.77.5 regarding the laws on income.
9. Plut. *Solon* 31
10. Andrewes (1974: p84)
11. Plato *Timaeus* 21

could equally apply to the conflicts between the parties of the Hill, Shore and Plain of the 560s.

In any case, the absence from Athens must have come after the laws and reforms because Philokypros and Croesos would hardly have invited a middle-class, ship-owning Athenian nonentity to visit: they both invited the man later regarded throughout Greece as one of the Seven Wise Men.<sup>12</sup> It is reasonable that Solon attained this position only after many years as a law-giver.

The duration of the exile was intended by Solon to be ten years.<sup>13</sup> It is curious that Solon is reported only by Plutarch to have sought leave of the Athenian people to absent himself for this period.<sup>14</sup> Whilst confirming that the exile was self-imposed, if taken at face value the phrase tends to negate the incidental evidence that frequently suggests Solon was less than popular with the bulk of his contemporaries. Aristotle<sup>15</sup> stated "...when he had the opportunity to reduce one of the two parties to subjection and so to be tyrant of the city, he incurred the enmity of both..." Plutarch<sup>16</sup> indicates dissatisfaction with Solon's land/debt policy across the

12. Plut. *Solon* 26-27; Hdt. I.29; Plato *Protagoras* 342e-343: the tradition is continued in Paus. X.24.1.

13. Hdt. I.29; *Ath Pol* 11. 1

14. Plut. *Solon* 25

15. *Ath Pol* 11. 2; Rhodes (1981: pp170-171)

16. Plut. *Solon* 16



political spectrum. There appears to have been sufficient discontent for Solon himself to remark that "In great affairs you cannot please all parties."<sup>17</sup>

Solon's political affiliations remain obscure. It is necessary to be careful of the assertion of Aristophanes<sup>18</sup> that "Old Solon was a friend of the people" is anachronistic, especially when taken out of context. Plutarch<sup>19</sup> asserted that Solon was a champion of the poor, on the evidence of fragment 15 of Solon's poems. It is significant that by 561/0 the poor had a new champion in Peisistratos.<sup>20</sup>

It is, therefore, unwise to assume that Solon's self-imposed exile was undertaken purely for the altruistic motives attributed to him by Aristotle, Plutarch, and by Herodotos. Though the exile may have been voluntary, there is evidence to suggest that Solon was forced to remove himself from Athens for his own safety, rather than for his sanity, as the sources try to suggest.

17. Solon frag. 7 (Loeb)

18. *Ar. Clouds* 1187; however, Sinclair (1988: p16) accepts the tradition and classification in terms of a group including Kleisthenes (*PA* 8526), Xanthippos (*PA* 11169), Themistokles (*PA* 6669), Ephialtes (*PA* 6157) and Perikles (*PA* 11811).

19. *Plut. Solon* 3 supported by *Ath Pol* 2.2

20. *Plut. Solon* 29

We have little evidence for Solon's immediate family<sup>21</sup>, but if he was not a widower, he may have taken his family<sup>22</sup> on a journey which he supposed would last ten years. Presumably as the guest of the rulers of Cyprus and Lydia he would have been maintained in style. In any case, he is described as "being by birth and reputation of the first rank (*ton proton*), but by wealth and position belonged to the middle class (*ton meson*)."<sup>23</sup> It is therefore safe to conclude that Solon had sufficient means to sustain himself during his exile, especially as he was able to engage in trade.

21. Plut. *Solon* 6: late, anecdotal evidence of a son for Solon, however this incident represents Solon's son as being at home in Athens. Since the occasion is a visit to Thales of Miletos, it may not have occurred as part of Solon's ten years exile, and so his son could have accompanied him into exile.
22. Plut. *Solon* 6.
23. *Ath Pol* 5.3; Rhodes (1981: pp123-124); Davies *APF* (pp322 - 324;., pp334-335)

**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Chairion

**Patronymic:** son of Kledik[os]

**Deme:** n.a.

**Tribe:** n.k.

**Trittys:** n.a.

**PA No:** 15258

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** n.k.

**Date of Death:** n.k.

**Magistracies:** AO 600. *Tamias* in 550. IG I<sup>3</sup> 590

**Wealth:** Before exile was *tamias* of Athena, so was of the *pentakosiomedimnoi*. APF p13

**B. EXILE**

Possible only (IG xii.9.296 with APF p13) though he did die in Eretria.

**Reason:** ?opposition to tyranny of the Peisistratidai.

**Date:** ?546

**Term:** n.k. but died in Eretria.

**Conditions:** n.a.

**Destination:** ?Eretria

**Hetairoi:** ?Alkmeonidai generally as he was probably related to this family.

**Family Exile:** n.k.

**Attitude to Exile:** n.k.

**Return Date:** did not return.

**Return Conditions:** n.a.

**Recall Date:** n.a.

**C. SOURCES**

**Literary:** n.a.

**Epigraphical:** IG xii.9.296  
DAA 364 no. 330  
DAA 10 no. 6

**D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

Davies, APF p13

## CHAIRION

The inclusion of Chairion in this study rests on some tenuous assumptions which follow Davies' assertion that Chairion died **in exile** in Eretria.<sup>1</sup> Even if his death did occur in Eretria, there is little to suggest that he was in exile and especially as a voluntary exile. To further compound the uncertainties, Davies has identified the Chairion who was buried in Eretria<sup>2</sup> with the Chairion whose son made a dedication to him on the Akropolis,<sup>3</sup> and with the *tamias* of Athena<sup>4</sup> of c.550. Finally Davies<sup>5</sup> makes the connection of Chairion with the forebears of Alkibiades (III) (*PA* 600 Entry 55).

If Davies is correct in his assertions, it is reasonable to assume that the exile was related to the Peisistratid tyranny, and the Alkmeonid connections also indicate that Chairion may have been one of those who departed Athens during that period. As a *tamias*, Chairion would have belonged to the highest property class, the *pentakosiomedimnoi*. Wealth and status meant that Chairion almost certainly had *xenoi* outside Attika, a safe assumption for his class in this period. If the exile occurred, and if it was voluntary because of the rise of Peisistratos, then a *xenia* relationship with an unknown Eretrian is possible. It is equally probable that Chairion owned estates there, and died whilst visiting them. Since the foundations of Davies' structure are very insecure, all this entry can suggest is that his claims may be possible or they may be merely speculation.

1. *APF* p13
2. *IG* xii.9, 296
3. *DAA* 10 no.6
4. *DAA* 364 no.330
5. *APF* p14

**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Leogoras (I)

**Patronymic:** son of Andokides (I)

**Deme:** n.a.

**Tribe:** n.k.

**Trittyes:** n.a.

**PA No:** 9074; E Obst RE 12 (1924) col.1999f (1)

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** n.k.

**Date of Death:** n.k.

**Magistracies:** AO 1782  
?strategos in 511/10

**Wealth:** Before exile was member of *pentakosiomedimnoi*, so perhaps restored after the tyranny. APF p341, pp27-28.

**B. EXILE**

Certain (Andok. ii.26)

**Reason:** Opposition to tyranny of the Peisistratidai.

**Date:** ?546

**Term:** Perhaps up to thirty years

**Conditions:** n.a.

**Destination:** n.k. possibly Sparta

**Hetairoi:** ?Alkmeonidai generally

**Family Exile:** Probable

**Attitude to Exile:** n.k.

**Return Date:** 511/10

**Return Conditions:** Expulsion of Hippias (PA 7605)

**Recall Date:** n.a.

**C. SOURCES**

**Literary:**  
Andok. i.106; ii.26

**Epigraphical:** IG i<sup>2</sup> 393.4

**D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

MacDowell (1962: p1)  
Broadbent (1968: pp240-339 esp. pp243-251 with stemma: table ix)  
Davies, APF pp27-28

## LEOGORAS

The only source for the exile of Leogoras (*PA* 9074) is the orator Andokides (IV) (*PA* 828 Entry 56), who states that his father's grandfather, Leogoras, went into exile rather than live in Athens under a tyrant.<sup>1</sup> The problem with the source is that Andokides had a strong vested interest in claiming a long association of his family with the democracy, as Davies has noted.<sup>2</sup>

That reservation notwithstanding, it appears from the rather bald account to hand that Leogoras (perhaps with the Alkmaeonidai)<sup>3</sup> and other like-minded Athenians, left Athens for an unstated destination. Andokides related that Leogoras was a general at the time of the overthrow and was present in that capacity at the battle of Pallene, which was a significant event in the final fall of the *tyrannos*.<sup>4</sup>

1. Andok. ii.26; as a purported Alkmeonid, Leogoras belongs to the group whom Herodotos (I.6.4) claimed had left Attika (or perhaps been banished).
2. *APF* p27; Thomas (1989: pp139-144)
3. MacDowell (1962: p1)
4. Andok. i.106

There is no suggestion of ouster,<sup>5</sup> and although Andokides referred to Leogoras as *strategos*, it is likely that he was describing the status of Leogoras at the battle of Pallene, rather than as an elected general forced by conscience into exile. Develin however, whilst rejecting a generalship for Leogoras, believes that the reference of Andokides is more likely to be to the events of 511/10.<sup>6</sup>

Given the nature of the voluntary removal of Leogoras from Athens in line with his political conscience, it is probable that his family joined him in his preferred destination. He married the daughter of Charias (*PA* 15322), his co-general at the battle of Pallene, which implies that the relationship may have existed or been established during the exile of both men.<sup>7</sup> His family was wealthy, as Leogoras' father, Andokides (I) had been *tamias* in 550, a post for which at that time it was necessary to belong to the property class *pentakosiomedimnoi*.<sup>8</sup> Sustenance may have been portable, but was not necessary as members of that class maintained strong *xenia* relationships throughout post-Archaic and pre-Classical Greece. The prominence of the family of Leogoras and the consequent connections which flowed from such prominence, would have ensured that during his time in exile he was comfortably provided.

5. Though we would not expect this from Andokides, since it is in his interests to suggest that at no stage would his ancestor have tolerated life under a tyrant. Cf. *Ath Pol* 19.1, which gives a probable cause in the increasingly harsh rule of Hippias after the murder of his brother.
6. Develin (*AO* p48)
7. Andok. i.106
8. *IG* i<sup>3</sup> 510; Arist. *Politics* 1274a 15f, *Ath Pol* 8.1

The date of the exile is not stated, and it is difficult to ascertain. His exile may have been made as a relatively young man, as Davies seems to be implying,<sup>9</sup> in which case a date as early as 546 may be appropriate. Alternatively, he may have chosen to leave Athens in order to participate in the challenge being mounted to Hippias' (*PA* 7605) increasingly harsh rule.<sup>10</sup> If the latter is the case, the duration of the exile could have been as little as a few months.

9. *APF* p28; cf *Hdt.* I.64.3

10. *Ath Pol* 19.1



## A. PERSONAL

**Name:** Hipparchos (II)

**Patronymic:** son of Charmos

**Deme:** ?Kollytos <sup>1</sup>

**Tribe:** II Aigeis

**Trittys:** City

**PA No:** 7600

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** c.530

**Date of Death:** n.k.

**Magistracies:** AO 1408

Archon 496/5 (Dion. Hal. AR 6.1.1)

**Wealth:** APF p244, pp451-452.

## B. EXILE

Certain (Lyk. Leok.117-118)

**Reason:** friend of the tyrants.

?son-in-law of Hippias (PA 7605)

(APF p451)

**Date:** after 478/7

**Term:** n.k.

**Destination:** n.k.

**Xenoi:** n.k.

**Hetairoi:** ?Hippias (PA 7605)

**Family Exile:** Likely, as his ?wife was a daughter of the tyrant Hippias.

**Attitude to Exile:** n.k.

**Return Date:** n.k.

**Return Conditions:** n.k.

**Recall Date:** n.k.

## C. SOURCES

**Literary:**

*Ath Pol* 22.3-4

Androt. *FGrH* 324 F6

Plut. *Nikias* 11.6

*Solon* 1.7

Kleidemios *FGrH* 323 F15

Dion. Hal. vi.

Lyk. *Leok* 117-118

**Epigraphical:**

E Vanderpool *Hesperia*

15 (1946) 271f, nos. 4

& 10. Plates XXV & XXVI

1. Develin AO p54, noting the contradiction between *Ath Pol* 22.4 and Plut *Nikias* 11.6, suggests that Cholargos is a possibility, although Kollytos is generally accepted.

#### **D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

Cadoux (1948: p116)  
Davies *APF* p451  
Hansen (1975: p69 no.3)  
Phillips (1982: pp21-43)

## HIPPARCHOS

It is for his second exile that Hipparchos (*PA* 7600) is included, and his first exile, which was not voluntary, has a bearing on the reasons why his second is probable. Hipparchos was the first Athenian to be ostracised in 488/7 under a law, supposedly instituted by Kleisthenes, which allowed Athenians to remove from Attika those whom they felt to be a danger to the state.<sup>1</sup> The apparent reason for the ostracism was that Hipparchos was a friend of the tyrants (i.e. the Peistratidai). Although the ostensible reason for Kleisthenes' actions was fear for the safety of the reformed constitution which he had instituted, it is unlikely that he personally waited almost twenty years before either introducing ostracism, or first putting it into practice.<sup>2</sup> Yet it provided a safeguard for the state, should the need arise. However, as mentioned above, the inclusion of Hipparchos in this study is based on a second and later, voluntary exile, perhaps not unassociated with the political undercurrents of the first enforced absence from Athens.

Given that the last tyrant, Hippias (*PA* 7605), had died at Marathon,<sup>3</sup> the charge which resulted in the ostracism decree against Hipparchos appears superficial. However, in the period between the two Persian invasions, which included the political struggles which saw Themistokles (*PA* 6669) emerge the victor, it is probable that the initiative for the ostracism

1. *Ath Pol* 22.3-4; 11; Androtion *FGrH* 324 F6; Phillips (1982: p27; p37 n40); Sealey (1976: p202); Sealey (1987: pp85-86)
2. *Ath Pol* 22.3-4; 6. Rhodes (1981: p270) feels that ostracism was unlikely to have been devised specifically for use against Hipparchos or other Peisistratidai. cf Phillips (1982: pp23-24)
3. Cicero *Letters To Atticus* ix.10.3

came from him. That he had reason to suppose it would be successful is given support from sources which connect Hipparchos with the family of Hippias,<sup>4</sup> and Davies has concluded that in all probability, Hippias was the maternal grandfather of Hipparchos.<sup>5</sup> It is likely that the charge of aiming at tyranny would be politically effective, since Hipparchos could be supposed to have been an aspirant to the cloak of his grandfather.<sup>6</sup>

Although Plutarch states<sup>7</sup> that all political exiles (including those ostracised) were recalled to face the danger of the second Persian invasion, it appears unlikely that Hipparchos was among them, given the reason for his exile, and therefore it is probable that he served out the full ten year period in exile. The destination is unknown, though as a member of a prominent family, he would have had *xenoi* in other states; and wealth in Attika to sustain him during the exile, since those ostracised were able to enjoy the support of their resources within Attika whilst in exile.

4. *Ath Pol* 22.3-4; Kleidemos *FGrH* 323 F15

5. *APF* p451

6. Hipparchos had been *eponymos archon* in 496/5: for the significance of this see Sealey (1976: p183)

7. *Plut. Arist* 8.1

Given the family relationships with the Peisistradai, it is probable that his family accompanied him into exile, as they too would have been deemed undesirables.

A second, probably permanent voluntary exile is posed for Hipparchos, in the period between his return and 460, based on the evidence of Lykourgos.<sup>8</sup> The charge was treason, and he apparently fled rather than face a trial, and was condemned *in absentia*. Whilst the evidence is a single, relatively late source, if he was still strongly associated with the tyrants, and was involved in potential *stasis* as a leading citizen, then the circumstances could have evolved which included this charge of treason. There is insufficient evidence to confirm the circumstances with the same assurance given them by Hansen.<sup>9</sup>

8. Lyk. *Leok* 117-118

9. Hansen (1975: p69 no.3)

**ENTRY No: 6**

**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Pheidias

**Patronymic:** son of Charmides

**Deme:** n.k.

**Tribe:** n.k.

**Trittys:** n.k.

**PA No:** 14149

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** n.k.

**Date of Death:** ?432/1 if no exile.

**Magistracies:** n.k.

**Wealth:** no direct evidence, but he was renowned as a sculptor, so he would at least have had high income-earning potential. Not in *APF*.

**B. EXILE**

Probable. Two conflicting sources:  
Plut. *Per* 31-32 cf  
Philochoros *FGrH* 328 F121

**Reason:** Possibly fled to escape prosecution for embezzlement, this charge being part of a political attack on Perikles (*PA* 11811).

**Date:** ?438/7

**Term:** n.k. If he went, he probably did not return.

**Conditions:** n.a.

**Destination:** Elis, if at all.

**Xenoi:** n.k.

**Hetairoi:** Perikles

**Family Exile:** n.k. If he had time family may have gone with him.

**Attitude to Exile:** n.k.

**Return Date:** n.k.

**Return Conditions:** n.k.

**Recall Date:** n.k.

## **C. SOURCES**

### ***Literary:***

*Ar. Peace* 605; 616  
*Ath Pol* 27.4  
Philochoros *FGrH* 328 F121  
Diod. XII.39.1-2  
Plut. *Per* 31-32

### ***Epigraphical:*** n.k.

## **D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

Frost (1964a: p70, p72n19)  
Frost (1964b: pp394-395, p395n36)  
Ostwald (1986: pp192-194)  
Bauman (1991: pp35-44, esp. p42)

## PHEIDIAS

All the extant sources agree that Pheidias (PA 14149) was under the patronage of Perikles (PA 11811), and was engaged to sculpt the statue of Athena which was to adorn the Parthenon. Perikles was in overall charge of the job. According to Plutarch<sup>1</sup> and Aristotle,<sup>2</sup> the political opponents of Perikles undertook a systematic political campaign against Perikles by attacking his associates. As a result of this campaign Pheidias found himself facing a trial for embezzlement of sacred funds in the form of gold for use in the adornment of the statue. This supposed embezzlement was claimed to have occurred in collusion with Perikles.

It is not clear whether Pheidias actually faced trial, was found guilty and suffered imprisonment. It appears that he was confined pending trial. Plutarch<sup>3</sup> states that he died in prison at this time, either from an illness or from poisoning. Diodoros<sup>4</sup> states that the enemies of Perikles persuaded the *ekklesia* to arrest Pheidias. However, he does not say if the arrest actually took place, and he does not record any further details. Nor does he

1. Plut. *Per* 31-32
2. *Ath Pol* 27.2-4; cf Ostwald (1986: p192 n53) who does not agree that there was organised opposition to Perikles, yet contradicts himself by making a strong case for a move to try Perikles on the Akropolis rather than before a constituted jury, so that the religious overtones and implications of stealing from the goddess could be more productive. This implies that there was a concerted political attack on Perikles which was following a predetermined strategy, one which was countered by Perikles' *hetairos* Hagnon; Connor (1971: p69). In any case organised opposition is implied by the measures Perikles took to fight back and retain his influence.
3. Plut. *Per* 32
4. Diod. XII.39.2



mention any flight of Pheidias from Athens. The scholiast to Aristophanes' *Peace* quotes Philochoros<sup>5</sup> to the effect that Pheidias fled Athens rather than face trial, and that he went to Elis and subsequently made the giant statue of Zeus at Olympia.

The problem with the statement of Philochoros is that the temple at Olympia was commenced 468 and completed nine years later.<sup>6</sup> Yet an attack on Perikles cannot be dated this early, since the joke in Aristophanes' *Peace* relies on Pheidias and other associates being subjects of the attack on Perikles, which Perikles then diverted by starting the Peloponnesian War.<sup>7</sup> That is, the joke would not work if the incident had occurred more than twenty years earlier. However, this does not mean that the Philochoros fragment is incorrect. It is possible that the building of the temple and the commissioning of a statue of Zeus are unrelated. The Eleans, with a famous sculptor in their midst, may have commissioned the statue much later than the construction of the temple.

5. Philochoros *FGrH* 328 F121 commentary: *FGrH* IIIb Suppl. pp484-496

6. P. Levi (1979: Vol.2 p222 n85)

7. *Ar. Peace* 605; 616

There is a difficulty also with Plutarch's account of the incident. Perikles, on Plutarch's admission, challenged the charge and invited the Athenians to take the gold plates off the statue and weigh them, to ascertain if any gold was missing.<sup>8</sup> Perikles, with his very prominent *hetairoi*, notably Hagnon (*PA* 171), fought off all the other charges and aspersions at this time,<sup>9</sup> so there is no reason to presume that he allowed Pheidias and the serious charge which affected both of them, to go to the extent of allowing Pheidias to languish in prison with the matter unresolved. However, Plutarch also stated that Perikles did not do so well over the incident of Pheidias' trial,<sup>10</sup> so it is possible that Perikles' enemies had at least one victory against him at this time, that being Pheidias. It is equally possible that the scholiast of the *Peace* got it wrong, or misunderstood Philochoros, so that the exile remains a possibility only. Frost,<sup>11</sup> on the other hand, demonstrates that the date of the incident is 438/7, and cites not only the evidence of Philochoros, via the scholiast to *Peace* 605, which is to be preferred to the unsubstantiated source of Plutarch. He also can rely on the excavations of Pheidias' workshop at Olympia,<sup>12</sup> which revealed pottery in the context 435/420, indicating that Pheidias was operating in Olympia in this period.

8. Plut. *Per* 31

9. Plut. *Per* 32

10. *loc cit*

11. Frost (1964a: p72n19); on the problem of the date see also Develin *AO* p94.

12. Frost (1964b: p395n36)

Bauman<sup>13</sup> fails to challenge Frost effectively, merely asserting that Aristophanes is to be believed over the scholiast to the *Peace* 605 passage. Bauman's assertion that Pheidias was tried on the eve of the war appears to be a make-weight for the need to support that a trial and conviction did in fact occur.

On balance, Frost's interpretation appears firm and the voluntary exile of Pheidias to Olympia is more likely than that it did not occur at all, and it occurred in 438/7.

13. Bauman (1990: p42; pp35–44 for the whole trial sequence)

## The Hermokopidai

### Entries 7 to 56

#### Notes:

- (1) the term Hermokopidai is used as a convenient collective reference for those accused of mutilation of the Hermai or profanation of the Mysteries (or both).
- (2) includes Alkibiades (III) - Entry 55: both his exiles are dealt with at this point, although the second is unrelated to the events of 415. The same treatment is given to Andokides - Entry 56, although his second exile is related to his embassy to Sparta and not to the incidents associated with his *asebeia*.
- (3) some are individual entries (numbers 54, 55 and 56). The remainder are dealt with in two ways:
- (i) either as a group since there are no details available beyond the fact that they fled rather than face the consequences of the accusations of either mutilation of the Hermai or profanation of the Mysteries, or both;
  - (ii) or, where there are additional details from which some conclusions may be drawn.

#### References:

Evidence of exiles for the Hermokopidai is cited in **Table 2** Entries 7 to 56 Column *Exiles*, and to individual Entries 7 to 56 in the first section of this study.

## Exiles Associated with the Mutilation of the Hermai and Accusations of Profanation of the Mysteries in 415

Dover, MacDowell and Ostwald provide detailed analyses of the events of 415 known collectively as the mutilation of the Hermai and the profanation of the Mysteries, and which were described by Thucydides and Andokides, albeit from different perspectives.<sup>1</sup> The following therefore is a brief summary to provide a background to the voluntary exiles or supposed exiles of at least fifty named individuals,<sup>2</sup> and probably countless members of their families who went with them. Almost certainly, neither Andokides nor Thucydides named all those involved, or knew them all by name.

On the eve of the departure for Sicily of the largest armada which Athens had ever assembled,<sup>3</sup> dawn revealed to the Athenians the sight of almost all the Hermai in the city damaged, most irreparably.<sup>4</sup> This sacrilege was considered by many as an omen reflecting upon the future success of the Sicilian expedition, others felt that the fleet should not set sail, still others recognised the hands of licentious and/or high spirited youth were the perpetrators of this *asebeia*.<sup>5</sup>

1. Andokides i: *Peri ton Mysterion* with MacDowell (1962) text and commentary; Thuc. VI. 27-29 with Dover *HCT* vol iv pp265-289; Ostwald (1986: pp553-549): *asebeia*. For the date and timing of the events: Dover *HCT* vol. iv pp265-276 - he concludes (p276) that the mutilation of the Hermai occurred on either 25 April, 25 May, 23 June or 23 July.
2. Entries 9-58 inclusively.
3. Thuc. VI.31.2
4. Thuc. VI.27, *HCT* vol. iv p288
5. Thuc. VI.28, *HCT* vol. iv p289. Ostwald (1986: pp533-534) believes that religion was closely aligned with the democratic state at Athens, and that *asebeia* was an attack on the State itself, explaining in part the fervour with which the perpetrators were hunted. He makes the connection between *asebeia* and *prodosia* (including the conspiracy theory) despite his own admission that the charges were always couched as impiety, and that no one was in fact denounced for conspiracy to subvert the democracy.

While the fleet sailed with all its commanders, one of them, Alkibiades (*PA* 600 Entry 55) was rumoured to have been party to the Hermai sacrilege. Prior to sailing, Alkibiades had tried to have the matter settled in court, proclaiming his innocence - a claim which was never tested since he was never formally accused in court of the mutilations. Unable or unwilling to test Alkibiades' popularity as proposer of the Sicilian expedition which was to bring wealth and power to Athens and its people, Alkibiades' enemies were forced to let him and his associates sail with the armada.<sup>6</sup>

In the interim the investigations which were undertaken with vigour by specially appointed officers, among whom were Charikles (*PA* 15407 Entry 58) and Peisandros (*PA* 11770 Entry 62),<sup>7</sup> provided accusations and counter-accusations which also revealed another form of *asebeia*. Apparently, it was the practice of some Athenians to enliven their *symposia* at each other's houses with parodies of the rites associated with the Mysteries at Eleusis.<sup>8</sup> For the investigators this was much more promising water in which to fish for evidence to bring Alkibiades undone, and it is probable that he was in fact guilty of profanation, as were many of his close associates.<sup>9</sup>

The political factionalism in the period prior to the proposal of the Sicilian expedition had led to concerted efforts by his enemies to effect the removal of Alkibiades, and there is little doubt that Alkibiades was the principal target of at least some of the accusations and counter-claims

6. Thuc. VI.29 - 30.1 with *HCT* vol. iv p289f; Plut. *Alk* 19

7. *Zetetai*. Andok. i.36 describes Peisandros (*PA* 11770 Entry 62) and Charikles (*PA* 15407 Entry 58) as democrats at this time: MacDowell (1962: p87)

8. Thuc. VI.28.1

9. See discussion: Entry 55

related to these two sacrilegious events.<sup>10</sup> Even in this scenario the destruction or damage of the Hermai appears to have been an ambitious act, and is possibly more difficult to tie back to the political antagonism towards Alkibiades - the event may have been unrelated and accidentally provided the catalyst for the more specific attack. In fact who did mutilate the Hermai is in no way established.

The outcome of the trials, accusations and counter-accusations was that many Athenians, both citizens and metics, were indicted with one or both charges, and were either executed or fled before their trials, with the exception of Andokides (*PA* 828 Entry 56), who pleaded guilty and turned State's evidence in return for immunity. The property of those implicated was confiscated and sold. Unlike Andokides, the others who were not exonerated by his testimony fall into four categories, namely those whose fate is not certain and who are possible voluntary exiles only; those whose voluntary exile is the only fact known about them; those about whom there is sufficient extant evidence can be grouped together; and those the details of whose exiles are sufficient for them to warrant a separate entry in these biographical notes. Although

10. Thuc. VI.60-61. For example, the machinations which resulted in the ostracism of Hyperbolos (*PA* 13910) in 416/5 were part of the continuing attacks directed against Alkibiades: Plut. *Nik* 11, *Alk* 13. Woodhead (1949:p83), who agrees that Alkibiades was the main target and dates the ostracism to early spring 416; *HCT* vol. iv p287 on the ostracism and the association with factionalism at this time. Ostwald (1986: p541) believes in the conspiracy theory (*cf* *HCT* vol. iv p283 - the "Alkibiades as target" theory), and is at pains to point out that aside from a few of those denounced at this time, most are young, wealthy intellectuals and a large percentage are associated with Sokrates. Although he appears to succeed in his argument for conspiracy overall, those who do not fit into his age bracket are among the main players in the group associated with Alkibiades, and hence Ostwald's approach appears too forced.

not all of the individuals in these four groups are identifiable as associates of Alkibiades, the months of investigations during 415/4 provided opportunities for many political scores to be settled and whilst no doubt many were guilty of the charges made against them, others may have fled from other political consequences which time has not preserved.<sup>11</sup>

11. Dover *HCT* vol. iv p282 feels that the prevailing mood in Athens as a result of the investigations encouraged people to pay off old scores, and at p 285 he notes the curious array of political opposites such as Androkles and the oligarchs, Charikles and Peisandros. Andok. i.36 agrees, describing the terror engendered by investigators such as Charikles and Peisandros, who apparently pursued their duties as *zetetai* relentlessly. For confiscated property sales: *IG* i<sup>3</sup> 421-430, and Fornara (1983: pp170-175), ML 79.



**ENTRY No: 7**

**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Adeimantos

**Deme:** Skambonidai

**Tribe:** IV Leontis

**PA No:** 202

**Date of Birth:** n.k.

**Magistracies:** AO 31

**Strategos** 407/6, 406/5, 405/4

**Patronymic:** son of Leukolophides

**Tritty:** City

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Death:** n.k.

**Wealth:** not in *APF* but most likely to have been wealthy as part of the group of friends or family of Alkibiades III (*PA* 600).

**B. EXILE**

Certain (*Andok.* i.16)

**Date:** 415 or 414/3

**Term:** 6-7 years maximum

**Destination:** n.k.

**Family Exile:** n.k.

**Return Date:** 407/6 (*Xen. Hell* I.4.21)

**Recall Date:** n.k.

**Reason:** Denounced for profanation of the Mysteries

**Hetairoi:** Alkibiades III (*PA* 600)

**Conditions:** n.a.

**Xenoi:** n.k. but probable in one of his class

**Attitude to Exile:** n.k.

**Return Conditions:** n.k. -  
?returned with Alkibiades?

**C. SOURCES**

**Literary:**

*Andok.* i.16

**Epigraphical:**

*IG* i<sup>3</sup> 426.10ff, 43ff, 105-106, 140f,  
185-190

*IG* i<sup>3</sup> 430.10-14, 27

**D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

*HCT* vol. iv pp271-288, especially p277 and p283

Hansen (1975: p77 no.13)

**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Apsephion

**Patronymic:** n.k.

**Deme:** n.k.

**Tribe:** n.k.

**Trittys:** n.k.

**PA No:** 2806

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** n.k.

**Date of Death:** n.k.

**Magistracies:** AO 288 bouleutes (Andok. i.43)

**Wealth:** n.k.

**B. EXILE**

Certain (Andok. i.43, 44, 46)

**Reason:** Denounced for mutilation of the Hermai

**Date:** ?415

**Hetairoi:** n.k.

**Term:** n.k.

**Conditions:** n.a.

**Destination:** n.k.

**Xenoi:** n.k.

**Family Exile:** n.k.

**Attitude to Exile:** n.k.

**Return Date:** late 414 or 413/12

**Return Conditions:** exonerated when Diokleides revealed as perjurer.

**Recall Date:** n.a.

**C. SOURCES**

**Literary:**  
Andok. i.43, 44, 66

**Epigraphical:** n.e.

**D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

HCT vol. iv pp271-288, especially p277

**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Axiochos

**Patronymic:** son of Alkibiades I

**Deme:** Skambonidai

**Tribe:** IV Leontis

**Trittys:** City

**PA No:** 1330

**Genos:** Eupatridai

**Date of Birth:** n.k.

**Date of Death:** n.k.

**Magistracies:** AO 525 bouleutes IG I<sup>3</sup> 101.48f

**Wealth:** APF pp16-17

**B. EXILE**

Certain (Andok. i.16)

**Reason:** Denounced for profanation of the Mysteries

**Date:** 415 or 414/3

**Hetairoi:** Alkibiades III (PA 600)  
(Axiochos was his uncle but also a boon companion)

**Term:** ?4 years. Death sentence commuted to exile.  
(Thuc. VI.61.7)

**Conditions:** n.a.

**Destination:** n.k.

**Xenoi:** n.k.

**Family Exile:** n.k.

**Attitude to Exile:** n.k.

**Return Date:** ? 411

**Return Conditions:** n.k.

**Recall Date:** (IG I<sup>3</sup> 101 = ML 89 line 48) 407/6 or 408/7 ?with Alkibiades III

**C. SOURCES**

**Literary:**

Thuc. VI.61.7

Andok. i.16

**Epigraphical:**

IG i<sup>3</sup> 424.10ff; 426.109; 430.5-9,  
25, 33ff. SEG xiii, 12-22;  
xix, 23-5; Pritchett *Hesperia* 22  
(1953) p263 stele IV lines 10-11;  
p279 stele VII line 62; p287 stele X  
lines 6-9, 30-32

**D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

HCT IV pp271-288, especially p277

Hansen (1975: pp77-78 no.20)

Davies APF pp16-17

Bicknell (1982: pp248-249)

**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Chairedemos

**Patronymic:** son of Elpios

**Deme:** ? Ach[erdous]

**Tribe:** n.k. [?VIII Hippothontis]

**Trittys:** n.k. [? Inland]

**PA No:** 15120

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** n.k.

**Date of Death:** n.k.

**Magistracies:** n.k.

**Wealth:** not in APF

**B. EXILE**

Certain (Andok. i.52, 59, 67. 68)

**Reason:** Denounced for mutilation of the Hermai.

**Date:** 415 or 414/3

**Hetairoi:** n.k.

**Term:** n.k.

**Conditions:** n.a.

**Destination:** n.k.

**Xenoi:** n.k.

**Family Exile:** n.k.

**Attitude to Exile:** n.k.

**Return Date:** before 400 (Andok. i.53)

**Return Conditions:** n.k.

**Recall Date:** n.a.

**C. SOURCES**

**Literary:**

Andok. i.52, 53, 59, 67, 68

**Epigraphical:**

IG i<sup>3</sup> 421-430; SEG xiii. 12-22

**D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

HCT vol. iv pp271-288, especially p277

Hansen (1975: p79 no.46)

MacDowell (1962: p72; p173)

**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Charmides

**Patronymic:** son of Aristoteles\*

**Deme:** n.k.

**Tribe:** n.k.

**Tritty:** n.k.

**PA No:** 15510

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** n.k.

**Date of Death:** n.k.

**Magistracies:** n.k.

**Wealth:** n.k.

**B. EXILE**

Certain  
Andok. i.16, 47f, 66

**Reason:** Denounced for allowing the use of his house for profanation of the Mysteries. Found not guilty of mutilation of the Hermai.

**Date:** 414/3

**Hetairoi:** Alkibiades III (PA 600)

**Term:** n.k.

**Conditions:** n.a.

**Destination:** n.k.

**Xenoi:** n.k.

**Family Exile:** n.k.

**Attitude to Exile:** n.k.

**Return Date:** n.k.

**Return Conditions:** n.k.

**Recall Date:** n.k.

**C. SOURCES**

**Literary:**  
Andok. i.16, 47f, 66

**Epigraphical:** n.e.

**D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

HCT vol. iv pp271-288, especially p277-278 and p281n8  
Hansen (1975: p77 no.21)

\* Dover HCT p281n8 does not wish to identify the man who fled from the profanation charge with the man released after the discredit of Diokleides, but there is no need to separate the two.

**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Diakritos

**Patronymic:** n.k.

**Deme:** n.k.

**Tribe:** n.k.

**Trittys:** n.k.

**PA No:** 3746

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** n.k.

**Date of Death:** n.k.

**Magistracies:** n.k.

**Wealth:** n.k. not in *APF*

**B. EXILE**

Certain (Andok. i.52-53, 59, 67, 68)

**Reason:** Denounced for mutilation of the Hermai.

**Date:** 415 or 414/3

**Hetairoi:** n.k.

**Term:** n.k.

**Conditions:** n.a.

**Destination:** n.k.

**Xenoi:** n.k.

**Family Exile:** n.k.

**Attitude to Exile:** n.k.

**Return Date:** by 400 (Andok. i.53)

**Return Conditions:** n.k.

**Recall Date:** n.k.

**C. SOURCES**

**Literary:**

Andok. i.52-53, 59, 67, 68

**Epigraphical:** n.e.

**D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

*HCT* vol. iv pp271-288, especially p278

Hansen (1975: p79 no.48)

**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Diognetos

**Patronymic:** ?son of Nikeratos\*

**Deme:** [?Kydantidai]

**Tribe:** [?II Aigeis]

**Trittys:** [?Inland]

**PA No:** 3863 = 3851

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** n.k.

**Date of Death:** n.k.

**Magistracies:** AO 863 zezetes (Andok. i.14.36)

**Wealth:** APF p405 - liturgical.

**B. EXILE**

Certain (Andok. ?i.14, i.15)

**Reason:** Denounced for profanation of the Mysteries

**Date:** 415 or 414/3

**Hetairoi:** n.k.

**Term:** n.k.

**Conditions:** n.a.

**Destination:** n.k.

**Xenoi:** n.k.

**Family Exile:** n.k.

**Attitude to Exile:** n.k.

**Return Date:** n.k.

**Return Conditions:** n.k.

**Recall Date:** n.k.

**C. SOURCES**

**Literary:**

Andok.i.14, 15; Lys. xviii.9

**Epigraphical:** n.e.

**D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

HCT vol. iv pp271-288, especially p278

MacDowell (1962: p74)

Davies APF p405

Hansen (1975 p77 no. 23 = PA 3851)

\* Edmonds (1957: p357n6) identifies Diognetos as the brother of Nikias (PA 10808) although it is tenuous, as Edmonds admits that he would be in his late 50s or early 60s in 411. The crux is the identification of Diognetos in Eupolis F122 lines 15-16 as a 'Young Scoundrel'. Edmonds is plausible if not convincing. MacDowell (1962: p74) agrees with Edmonds. Davies (APF p405) is more cautious, and Ostwald (1986: p538) rejects the connection outright. With the support of Lys. xviii.9, it appears most likely that this Diognetos was the brother of Nikias.

**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Lysistratos

**Patronymic:** n.k.

**Deme:** n.k.

**Tribe:** n.k.

**Trittys:** n.k.

**PA No:** 9596 (cf 9611, 9630 for possible identifications)\* **Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** n.k.

**Date of Death:** n.k.

**Magistracies:** n.k.

**Wealth:** not in *APF*

**B. EXILE**

Certain (Andok. i.52, 59, 67, 68)

**Reason:** Denounced for mutilation of the Hermai.

**Date:** 415 or 414/3

**Hetairoi:** n.k.

**Term:** n.k.

**Conditions:** n.a.

**Destination:** n.k.

**Xenoi:** n.k.

**Family Exile:** n.k.

**Attitude to Exile:** n.k.

**Return Date:** by 400 (Andok. i.53)

**Return Conditions:** n.k.

**Recall Date:** n.k.

**C. SOURCES**

**Literary:**

Andok. i.52, 53, 59, 67, 68

**Epigraphical:** n.e.

**D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

*HCT* vol. iv pp271-288, especially p279

MacDowell (1962: p99-100)

Hansen (1975: p79 no.54)

\* MacDowell (1962: pp99 -100) sees a possible identification with *PA* 9630, Lysistratos of Cholargos, who was satirised in old comedy.



**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Mantitheos

**Patronymic:** n.k.

**Deme:** n.k.

**Tribe:** n.k.

**Trittys:** n.k.

**PA No:** 9670

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** n.k.

**Date of Death:** n.k.

**Magistracies:** AO 1909 Envoy 409/8 (Xen Hell I.3.13)  
Officer (Develin's terminology) 408/7 (Diod. XIII.68.2)  
Bouleutes 415 (Andok. i.43)

**Wealth:** n.k.

**B. EXILE**

Certain (Andok. i.43, 44, 46)

**Reason:** Denounced for mutilation of the Hermai.

**Date:** 415

**Hetairoi:** n.k.

**Term:** n.k.

**Conditions:** n.a.

**Destination:** n.k.

**Xenoi:** n.k.

**Family Exile:** n.k.

**Attitude to Exile:** n.k.

**Return Date:** after 414 but before 413/2

**Return Conditions:** revelations that Diokleides had lied in denouncing him.

**Recall Date:** n.a.

**C. SOURCES**

**Literary:**  
Andok. i.43, 44, 66

**Epigraphical:** n.e.

**D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

HCT vol. iv pp271-288, especially p279

**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Panaitios\*

**Patronymic:** n.k.

**Deme:** n.k.

**Tribe:** n.k.

**Trittys:** n.k.

**PA No:** 11567

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** n.k.

**Date of Death:** n.k.

**Magistracies:** n.k.

**Wealth:** Spence no. 137 although identity is not sure.

**B. EXILE**

Certain (Andok. i.13, 52, 53, 59, 67, 68)

**Reason:** Denounced for mutilation of the Hermai and profanation of the Mysteries.

**Date:** 415 or 414/3

**Hetairoi:** n.k.

**Term:** n.k.

**Conditions:** n.a.

**Destination:** n.k.

**Xenoi:** n.k.

**Family Exile:** n.k.

**Attitude to Exile:** n.k.

**Return Date:** before 400 (Andok. i.53)

**Return Conditions:** n.k.

**Recall Date:** n.k.

**C. SOURCES**

**Literary:**

Andok. i.13, 52, 53, 59, 67, 68

**Epigraphical:**

IG i<sup>3</sup> 422.204ff, SEG xiii 12-22

**D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

HCT vol. iv pp271-288, especially p279 and p282n17, n18

Hansen (1975 p77 no.32 and p39 no.56)

MacDowell (1962: p62)

\* Dover (HCT vol. iv p282n17, n18), and Hansen (1975 p77 no.32 and p39 no.56) identify two separate people, but there is no reason to suppose that one person could not have been accused of both charges. cf Meletos (PA 9825 Entry 29).

**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Phaidros

**Patronymic:** son of Pythokles

**Deme:** Myrrhinous

**Tribe:** III Pandionis

**Trittys:** Coast

**PA No:** 13960 = 13950

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** n.k.

**Date of Death:** by 393

**Magistracies:** n.k.

**Wealth:** n.k.

**B. EXILE**

Certain (Andok. i.15)

**Reason:** Denounced for profanation of the Mysteries.

**Date:** 415 or 414/3

**Hetairoi:** n.k.

**Term:** n.k.

**Conditions:** n.a.

**Destination:** n.k.

**Xenoi:** n.k.

**Family Exile:** n.k.

**Attitude to Exile:** n.k.

**Return Date:** n.k.

**Return Conditions:** n.k.

**Recall Date:** n.k.

**C. SOURCES**

**Literary:**

Andok. i.15

Plato *Protagoras* 315c

Plato *Symposium* 176d

**Epigraphical:**

IG i<sup>3</sup> 422.229ff, 426.103ff,

Pritchett *Hesperia*

22 (1953) p249 stele II lines 188ff,

p268 stele VI lines 112-115

**D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

Hatzfeld (1939: pp313-318)

*HCT* vol. iv pp271-288, especially p279

Hansen (1975: p77 no.34)

ADEIMANTOS, APSEPHION, AXIOCHOS, CHAIREDAMOS, CHARMIDES,  
DIAKRITOS, DIOGNETOS, LYSISTRATOS, MANTITHEOS, PANAITIOS, PHAIDROS

All these Hermokopidai differ from those in the first two categories since not only were they in voluntary exile, there are more details regarding their exiles, including evidence of return to Athens. Significantly, there are no details of families in exile with them because they had stayed away, as Adeimantos (*PA* 202) probably did, so that the question of family members fleeing with them did not arise. There is little if any evidence for survival options, although those on the Sicilian expedition may have followed the example of Alkibiades of Phegous (*PA* 601 Entry 54) and become mercenaries.

Adeimantos (*PA* 202 Entry 7) was the friend of Alkibiades (*PA* 600 Entry 55), from the same deme, and possibly even a relative. According to Andokides he had been denounced for taking part in profanation of the Mysteries with Alkibiades, Axiochos (*PA* 1330 Entry 9) and presumably Charmides (*PA* 15510 Entry 11) since this event took place in his house.<sup>1</sup>

According to Andokides, they had fled immediately they were denounced, but this passage includes Alkibiades in the flight and he was not an exile as the result of this denunciation specifically. He had sailed as one of the *strategoí* in charge of the Sicilian expedition and was recalled to face charges - only then did he flee.<sup>2</sup> It is most probable that both Axiochos and

Adeimantos were on the expedition with him, and determined to remain

1. Andok. i.16; MacDowell (1962: p76). Ostwald (1986: p545); Dover *HCT* vol. iv p281 n8 says that it is not clear that Charmides was in fact even denounced, although in the climate of the time it is unlikely that he would have escaped notice.
2. Thuc. VI. 53.1. MacDowell (1962: p76) agrees, and Andokides appears to have telescoped events, understandable writing at a distance of sixteen years, and given the number of people involved. Dover *HCT* vol. iv p274, *sv* p280 n1 for the probability of the others accompanying Alkibiades to Sicily and thence into exile - including Adeimantos.

away once their activities had been exposed. If they were not on the Sicilian expedition, as close associates of Alkibiades it is unlikely that they or Charmides would have remained in Athens in the climate which prevailed during and in the aftermath of the mutilation of the Hermai and the problems Alkibiades had trying to clear himself so that he could set sail at all.

Adeimantos was back in Athens before 406/5 since he was appointed a general in the wake of the execution of the Arginousai generals;<sup>3</sup> he was also one of the ten *strategoi* at Aigospotamoi, and survived though captured by Lysander and being suspected of treachery at that battle.<sup>4</sup> He had needed to be back in Athens for a sufficient time to re-establish his voting base to have obtained election to this office. Therefore, it is probable that he returned in 408/7 with Alkibiades.<sup>5</sup> Nothing further is heard of Adeimantos after the defeat of Athens.

Axiochos, who was Alkibiades' uncle but also a companion so perhaps nearer his age than that of his brother Kleinias,<sup>6</sup> had his death sentence commuted to exile (*in absentia*).<sup>7</sup> He too was apparently pardoned<sup>8</sup> with Alkibiades since he appeared as a defender of the Arginousai generals in 406,<sup>9</sup> and proposed a decree for Neapolis in Thrace around this time.<sup>10</sup>

3. Xen *Hell* I.7.1; Fornara (1971: p69) follows Xen. *Hell*. I.4.21 that Adeimantos was a *strategos* in 407/06, which means that, unless Xenophon has got it wrong, Adeimantos was definitely part of the group pardoned with Alkibiades. His appointment was thus solely because of his association with Alkibiades - he may not have needed to rebuild a political base prior to election.

4. Xen *Hell* II.1.30-32; Lys. xiv.38

5. MacDowell (1962: p76)

6. Plato *Euthyd* 275a, 271b. Dover *HCT* vol. iv p281 n6: the father of Axiochos was the grandfather of Alkibiades (*PA* 600). Ostwald (1986: p542) says Axiochos was about fifty in 415 and was wealthy.

7. Hansen (1975: pp77-78 no20)

8. MacDowell (1962: p76)

9. [Plato] *Axiochos* 368e-369a.

10. *IG* i<sup>3</sup> 101

Charmides, a cousin of Andokides,<sup>11</sup> was apparently cleared after the exposure of the perjury of Diokleides.<sup>12</sup> If he had already fled as Andokides claimed, there is no detail concerning his exile or his fate, although Andokides at I.66 suggests that those of his relatives who were in exile were recalled and those in prison were released. It is not known which description fits Charmides, although the earlier statement that he had fled, despite its internal contradictions, does suggest that a recall is more likely. There is no evidence either way despite the supposed conversation related at Andokides I.48-50.

Apsephion (*PA* 2806 Entry 8) and Mantitheos (*PA* 9670 Entry 15) had been denounced by Diokleides to the Council and were apparently present during the denunciation, seeking sanctuary at the altar in the bouleuterion.<sup>13</sup> They were granted sureties to appear and answer the charges, however they both absconded<sup>14</sup> - MacDowell thinks to either Boeotia or Megara<sup>15</sup> - in consequence abandoning those who had provided surety for their persons. Once Diokleides was exposed as a perjurer,<sup>16</sup> it was presumably safe for Apsephion and Mantitheos to return to Athens, along with those of Andokides' relatives who were also involved in Diokleides' deception.<sup>17</sup>

11. MacDowell (1962: p76) follows Kirchner (1901-2: p433 no. 15510) that Charmides was the son of Aristoteles, but he raises the possibility of the son of Glaukon as an alternative, a possibility also considered by Dover *HCT* p283.

12. Andok. i.47f, 66

13. Andok. i.43

14. Andok. i.44

15. MacDowell (1962: p94) - Andokides (i.44) states that both men went to the enemies, of Athens presumably (*eis tous polemious*)

16. Andok. i.66

17. Mantitheos is identified by MacDowell (1962: p92) as the associate of Alkibiades (*PA* 600 Entry 55) if he is the same man who was with Alkibiades in 411-408: e.g. Xen. *Hell* I.1.10..

Andokides himself denounced Chairedemos (*PA* 15120 Entry 10), Diakritos (*PA* 3746 Entry 12), Lysistratos (*PA* 9596 Entry 14) and Panaitios (*PA* 11567 Entry 16), who he insists were in fact guilty of mutilation of the Hermai, and whose exiles he claims as being his doing.<sup>18</sup> It is not clear from the text that these four were voluntary exiles who fled from the consequences of their acts, or whether they were exiled by the state. However, it is more likely, since others were executed,<sup>19</sup> that they fled when it became apparent that they had not escaped because Diokleides had not mentioned them in his denunciations. According to Andokides, all four were back in Athens, totally rehabilitated to society,<sup>20</sup> but the means of their return is difficult to ascertain. They may have been exonerated in the aftermath of the perjury of Diokleides, although not denounced by him; part of the retinue of Alkibiades who returned in 408/7; part of the general amnesty of 404 imposed by the Spartans; or recalled under the decree of Patrokleides in 405. It is clear, however, that they were re-established in Athens by 400 when Andokides made his speech.

The exile of Diognetos (*PA* 3863 Entry 13) falls more properly into the first category of Hermokopidai in this study, among those who may or may not have fled after denunciation by Teukros.<sup>21</sup> He has been included here because apparently he was a brother of Nikias

18. Andok. i.67-68: *outoi men ephugon di eme, homologo*. Ostwald (1986: p546) notes that Lysistratos was associated with oligarchs and was an hetairos of Andokides (*PA* 828 Entry 56).

19. Andok. i.52

20. Andok. i.53

21. Andok. i.15; Ostwald (1986: p544) estimates that Diognetos was about thirty-five years old in 415, wealthy and not friendly to the democracy, and he (p538) rejects any association with Nikias. MacDowell (1962: p74) has no doubts that Diognetos is the brother of Nikias, and Davies *APF* pp404-405 admits that it is more likely that he is the brother of Nikias, although Davies is not as categorical as MacDowell. It is highly unlikely that Diognetos the Hermokopides of Andok. i.15 is the same man as the *zetetes* of Andok. i.14. On the evidence of Lys. xviii.9 it appears that the Diognetos included in the Hermokopidai is the brother of Nikias and Eukrates, although Davies points out (*APF* p405) that the exile referred to by Lysias could relate to this period or to his having been a member of the Four Hundred.

(PA 10808), whose piety was a byword,<sup>22</sup> and more importantly, who had just been appointed as one of the three commanders of the Sicilian expedition.<sup>23</sup> It is doubtful that Diognetos was in any sense a boon companion of Alkibiades, especially since he was probably many years older at this time (cf n.21). However, Nikias was on record as opposing the expedition from the beginning, and being a political opponent of Alkibiades.<sup>24</sup> Whilst there was no obligation on brothers to share each other's political friends and enemies, *if* there was a plot to discredit Alkibiades, and *if* the mutilation of the Hermai was part of such a plot, then Diognetos may have allowed himself to become involved to achieve a successful outcome of the plot. Diognetos apparently kept himself aloof from his city's enemies during his exile,<sup>25</sup> and he returned to Athens in 404 or earlier as he was present in time to seek leniency for Athens when Sparta was finally victorious.<sup>26</sup>

Teukros also denounced Phaidros (PA 13960 Entry 17) for mutilation of the Hermai, and Phaidros fled rather than face a trial.<sup>27</sup> He was a young, aristocratic member of Sokrates' circle,<sup>28</sup> and presumably was wealthy before his property was confiscated.<sup>29</sup> The guilt of those

22. Plut. *Nikias* 4.1. Dover *HCT* vol. iv p287

23. Thuc. VI.8

24. Thuc. VI. 8f, 61.4. Dover *HCT* vol. iv p283 has recognised that there is a connection back to Alkibiades from those denounced for the Mysteries, at least. Note *HCT* vol. iv p288: political affiliations could run counter to family alliances.

25. Lys. xviii.9 with MacDowell (1962: pp74-75)

26. Lys. xviii.10-11, although Diognetos was pleading for his own kin, as much as for Athenians generally.

27. Andok. i.15 with MacDowell (1962: p74)

28. Plato *Protagoras* 315c; Ostwald (1986: pp544-545)

29. Lys. xxxii.14: his home had been occupied by Diogeiton during the exile; MacDowell (1962: p174).



denounced by Teukros is not proven, although it would have been difficult for one of the socio-political profile of Phaidros to have convinced Athenians that he had not committed *asebeia*. Notwithstanding the difficulty which Andokides had in returning to Athens, he had admitted the crime: there is no evidence that Phaidros did so, and he may have returned under the amnesty which prevailed in 404 or later in 403/2 if his guilt was a measure of his political association with the Socratics and Alkibiades rather than a conviction by the Athenians that he had mutilated the Hermai.

**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Akoumenos

**Patronymic:** n.k.

**Deme:** n.k.

**Tribe:** n.k.

**Tritty:** n.k.

**PA No:** 477 = 478

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** n.k.

**Date of Death:** n.k.

**Magistracies:** n.k.

**Wealth:** APF p463

**B. EXILE**

Certain (Andok.i.18)

**Reason:** Denounced for  
profanation of the Mysteries

**Date:** 415 or 414/3

**Hetairoi:** Akoumenos is  
associated through his son  
Eryximachos with the Socratic  
circle. Plato *Phaidros* 268a

**Term:** n.k.

**Conditions:** n.a.

**Destination:** n.k.

**Xenoi:** n.k.

**Family Exile:** n.k.

**Attitude to Exile:** n.k.

**Return Date:** n.k.

**Return Conditions:** n.k.

**Recall Date:** n.k.

**C. SOURCES**

**Literary:**  
Andok.i.18

**Epigraphical:** n.e.

**D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

*HCT* vol. iv pp271-288, especially p277 and p283

Davies *APF* p463

Hansen (1975: p77 no14 = *PA* 478)

**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Amiantos

**Patronymic:** n.k.

**Deme:** n.k. referred to as *ex Aigines* (Andok. i.65)

**Tribe:** n.k.

**Trittyts:** n.k.

**PA No:** ? perhaps not "Athenian" though Aigina was incorporated into Athens' holdings at this time. (cf Thuc. II.27)

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** n.k.

**Date of Death:** n.k.

**Magistracies:** n.k.

**Wealth:** n.k.

**B. EXILE**

Certain (Andok. i.65)

**Reason:** Denounced for mutilation of the Hermai.

**Date:** 415, not later as he had fled before the false denunciation of Diokleides was revealed.

**Hetairoi:** n.k.

**Term:** n.k.

**Conditions:** n.a.

**Destination:** n.k.

**Xenoi:** n.k.

**Family Exile:** n.k.

**Attitude to Exile:** n.k.

**Return Date:** n.k.

**Return Conditions:** n.k.

**Recall Date:** n.k.

**C. SOURCES**

**Literary:**

Thuc. II.27

Andok. i.65

**Epigraphical:** n.e.

**D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

HCT vol. iv. pp271-288, especially p277

MacDowell (1962: p104)

**A. PERSONAL**

*Name:* Antiphon

*Patronymic:* n.k.

*Deme:* n.k.

*Tribe:* n.k.

*Tritty:* n.k.

*PA No:* 1279

*Genos:* n.k.

*Date of Birth:* n.k.

*Date of Death:* n.k.

*Magistracies:* n.k.

*Wealth:* n.k.

**B. EXILE**

Certain (Andok. i.15)

*Reason:* Denounced for  
Profanation of the Mysteries

*Date:* 415 or 414/3

*Hetairoi:* n.k.

*Term:* n.k.

*Conditions:* n.a.

*Destination:* n.k.

*Xenoi:* n.k.

*Family Exile:* n.k.

*Attitude to Exile:* n.k.

*Return Date:* n.k.

*Return Conditions:* n.k.

*Recall Date:* n.k.

**C. SOURCES**

*Literary:*  
Andok. i.15

*Epigraphical:* n.e.

**D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

HCT vol. iv pp271-288, especially p277  
Hansen (1975: p77 no.15)

**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Archebiades

**Patronymic:** n.k.

**Deme:** n.k.

**Tribe:** n.k.

**Tritty:** n.k.

**PA No:** 2300

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** n.k.

**Date of Death:** n.k.

**Magistracies:** n.k.

**Wealth:** n.k.

**B. EXILE**

Certain (Andok. i.13)

**Reason:** Denounced for profanation of the Mysteries

**Date:** 415 or 414/3

**Hetairoi:** ?Alkibiades III (PA 600)

**Term:** n.k.

**Conditions:** n.a.

**Destination:** n.k.

**Xenoi:** n.k.

**Family Exile:** n.k.

**Attitude to Exile:** n.k.

**Return Date:** n.k.

**Return Conditions:** n.k.

**Recall Date:** n.k.

**C. SOURCES**

**Literary:**

Andok. i.13

Lys. xiv.27

**Epigraphical:** n.e.

**D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

HCT vol. iv pp271-288, especially p277

**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Archippos

**Patronymic:** n.k.

**Deme:** n.k.

**Tribe:** n.k.

**Tritty:** n.k.

**PA No:** 2541

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** n.k.

**Date of Death:** n.k.

**Magistracies:** n.k.

**Wealth:** n.k.

**B. EXILE**

Certain (Andok. i.13)

**Reason:** Denounced for profanation  
of the Mysteries

**Date:** 415 or 414/3

**Hetairoi:** n.k.

**Term:** n.k.

**Conditions:** n.a.

**Destination:** n.k.

**Xenoi:** n.k.

**Family Exile:** n.k.

**Attitude to Exile:** n.k.

**Return Date:** n.k.

**Return Conditions:** n.k.

**Recall Date:** n.k.

**C. SOURCES**

**Literary:**

Andok. i.13

Suda sv Archippos

**Epigraphical:** n.e.

**D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

HCT vol. iv pp271-288, especially p277 and p281n6

Hansen (1975: p77 no.17)

**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Aristomenes

**Patronymic:** n.k.

**Deme:** n.k.

**Tribe:** n.k.

**Tritty:** n.k.

**PA No:** 1993

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** n.k.

**Date of Death:** n.k.

**Magistracies:** n.k.

**Wealth:** n.k.

**B. EXILE**

Certain (Andok. i.13)

**Reason:** Denounced for profanation  
of the Mysteries

**Date:** 415 or 414/3

**Hetairoi:** n.k.

**Term:** n.k.

**Conditions:** n.a.

**Destination:** n.k.

**Xenoi:** n.k.

**Family Exile:** n.k.

**Attitude to Exile:** n.k.

**Return Date:** n.k.

**Return Conditions:** n.k.

**Recall Date:** n.k.

**C. SOURCES**

**Literary:**

Andok. i.13

Suda sv Aristomenes

**Epigraphical:** n.e.

**D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

HCT vol. iv pp271-288, especially p277 and p281n6

Hansen (1975: p77 no.18)

**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Autokrator

**Patronymic:** n.k.

**Deme:** n.k.

**Tribe:** n.k.

**Trittys:** n.k.

**PA No:** 2745

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** n.k.

**Date of Death:** n.k.

**Magistracies:** n.k.

**Wealth:** n.k.

**B. EXILE**

Certain (Andok. i.18)

**Reason:** Denounced for profanation  
of the Mysteries

**Date:** 415 or 414/3

**Hetairoi:** n.k.

**Term:** n.k.

**Conditions:** n.a.

**Destination:** n.k.

**Xenoi:** n.k.

**Family Exile:** n.k.

**Attitude to Exile:** n.k.

**Return Date:** n.k.

**Return Conditions:** n.k.

**Recall Date:** n.k.

**C. SOURCES**

**Literary:**  
Andok. i.18

**Epigraphical:** n.e.

**D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

HCT vol. iv pp271-288, especially p277  
Hansen (1975: p77 no.19)



**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Diogenes

**Patronymic:** n.k.

**Deme:** n.k.

**Tribe:** n.k.

**Tritty:** n.k.

**PA No:** 3803

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** n.k.

**Date of Death:** n.k.

**Magistracies:** n.k.

**Wealth:** n.k.

**B. EXILE**

Certain (Andok. i.13)

**Reason:** Denounced for profanation  
of the Mysteries

**Date:** 415 or 414/3

**Hetairoi:** n.k.

**Term:** n.k.

**Conditions:** n.a.

**Destination:** n.k.

**Xenoi:** n.k.

**Family Exile:** n.k.

**Attitude to Exile:** n.k.

**Return Date:** n.k.

**Return Conditions:** n.k.

**Recall Date:** n.k.

**C. SOURCES**

**Literary:**  
Andok. i.13

**Epigraphical:** n.e.

**D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

HCT vol. iv pp271-288, especially p278  
Hansen (1975: p77 no.22)

**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Gniphonides

**Patronymic:** n.k.

**Deme:** n.k.

**Tribe:** n.k.

**Trittys:** n.k.

**PA No:** 3058

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** n.k.

**Date of Death:** n.k.

**Magistracies:** n.k.

**Wealth:** n.k.

**B. EXILE**

Certain (Andok. i.15)

**Reason:** Denounced for profanation of the Mysteries.

**Date:** 415 or 414/3

**Hetairoi:** n.k.

**Term:** n.k.

**Conditions:** n.a.

**Destination:** n.k.

**Xenoi:** n.k.

**Family Exile:** n.k.

**Attitude to Exile:** n.k.

**Return Date:** n.k.

**Return Conditions:** n.k.

**Recall Date:** n.k.

**C. SOURCES**

**Literary:**  
Andok. i.15

**Epigraphical:** n.e.

**D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

HCT vol. iv pp271-288, especially p278  
Hansen (1975: p77 no.25)

**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Hephaistodoros

**Patronymic:** n.k.

**Deme:** n.k.

**Tribe:** n.k.

**Trittys:** n.k.

**PA No:** 6563

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** n.k.

**Date of Death:** n.k.

**Magistracies:** n.k.

**Wealth:** n.k.

**B. EXILE**

Certain (Andok. i.15)

**Reason:** Denounced for profanation of the Mysteries.

**Date:** 415 or 414/3

**Hetairoi:** n.k.

**Term:** n.k.

**Conditions:** n.a.

**Destination:** n.k.

**Xenoi:** n.k.

**Family Exile:** n.k.

**Attitude to Exile:** n.k.

**Return Date:** n.k.

**Return Conditions:** n.k.

**Recall Date:** n.k.

**C. SOURCES**

**Literary:**  
Andok. i.15

**Epigraphical:**  
IG i<sup>3</sup> 421.10-11

**D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

HCT vol. iv pp271-288, especially p278  
Hansen (1975: p77 no.26)

**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Isonomos

**Patronymic:** n.k.

**Deme:** n.k.

**Tribe:** n.k.

**Tritty:** n.k.

**PA No:** 7719

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** n.k.

**Date of Death:** n.k.

**Magistracies:** n.k.

**Wealth:** n.k.

**B. EXILE**

Certain (Andok. i.15)

**Reason:** Denounced for profanation of the Mysteries.

**Date:** 415 or 414/3

**Hetairoi:** n.k.

**Term:** n.k.

**Conditions:** n.a.

**Destination:** n.k.

**Xenoi:** n.k.

**Family Exile:** n.k.

**Attitude to Exile:** n.k.

**Return Date:** n.k.

**Return Conditions:** n.k.

**Recall Date:** n.k.

**C. SOURCES**

**Literary:**  
Andok. i.15

**Epigraphical:** n.e.

**D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

*HCT* vol. iv pp271-288, especially p278  
Hansen (1975: p77 no.27)

**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Meletos\*

**Patronymic:** n.k.

**Deme:** n.k.

**Tribe:** n.k.

**Trittys:** n.k.

**PA No:** 9825\*

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** n.k.

**Date of Death:** n.k.

**Magistracies:** AO 1951 Envoy 404/3 (Xen. *Hell* II.4.36) **Wealth:** n.k.

**B. EXILE**

Certain (Andok. i.12, 13, 35, 53, 67)

**Reason:** Denounced for mutilation of the Hermai and profanation of the Mysteries.

**Date:** 415 or 414/3 (see HCT p281n14)

**Hetairoi:** n.k.

**Term:** n.k.

**Conditions:** n.a.

**Destination:** n.k.

**Xenoi:** n.k.

**Family Exile:** n.k.

**Attitude to Exile:** n.k.

**Return Date:** n.k.

**Return Conditions:** n.k.

**Recall Date:** n.k.

**C. SOURCES**

**Literary:**

Andok. i.12, 13, 35, 52, 53, 67

**Epigraphical:** n.e.

**D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

HCT vol. iv pp271-288, especially p279 and p281n14

MacDowell (1962: pp208-210)

Hansen (1975: p77 no.29)

\* The identity of Meletos has prompted much speculation: MacDowell (1962: Appendix M, pp208-210). H Blumenthal (1973: p169f); Aurenche (1974: pp62-64); Ostwald (1986: p495 n141).

**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Nikides (Nikiades)\*

**Patronymic:** son of Phoinikides

**Deme:** Melite

**Tribe:** VII Kekropis

**Trittys:** City

**PA No:** 10763

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** n.k.

**Date of Death:** n.k.

**Magistracies:** n.k.

**Wealth:** APF p408

**B. EXILE**

Certain (Andok. i.13)

**Reason:** Denounced for profanation of the Mysteries

**Date:** 415 or 414/3

**Hetairoi:** n.k.

**Term:** n.k.

**Conditions:** n.a.

**Destination:** n.k.

**Xenoi:** n.k.

**Family Exile:** n.k.

**Attitude to Exile:** n.k.

**Return Date:** n.k.

**Return Conditions:** n.k.

**Recall Date:** n.k.

**C. SOURCES**

**Literary:**

Andok. i.13

**Epigraphical:**

IG i<sup>3</sup> 422.210, 424.17ff, 426.178;  
esp. refer Pritchett *Hesperia* 22  
(1953) p249 stele II line 177; p263  
stele IV line 17; p268 stele VI lines  
85-86, 167

**D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

\* *HCT* vol. iv pp271-288, especially p279 sv p282n15 for identification of Nikides and Nikiades as the same person. The codex of Andokides has Nikiades but the stelai record Nikides. MacDowell does not elaborate on the identity question.

MacDowell (1962: pp71-72)

Davies *APF* p408

Hansen (1975: p77 no.30)

**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Oionias

**Patronymic:** son of Oionochares

**Deme:** Atene

**Tribe:** X Antiochis

**Trittys:** Coast

**PA No:** 11370

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** n.k.

**Date of Death:** n.k.

**Magistracies:** n.k.

**Wealth:** APF p419

**B. EXILE**

Certain (Andok. i.12-13)

**Reason:** Denounced for profanation of the Mysteries.

**Date:** 415 or 414/3

**Hetairoi:** n.k.

**Term:** n.k.

**Conditions:** n.a.

**Destination:** n.k.

**Xenoi:** n.k.

**Family Exile:** n.k.

**Attitude to Exile:** n.k.

**Return Date:** n.k.

**Return Conditions:** n.k.

**Recall Date:** n.k.

**C. SOURCES**

**Literary:**

Andok. i.12-13

**Epigraphical:**

IG i<sup>3</sup> 422.215ff, 375ff, 430.36ff,  
Pritchett *Hesperia*  
22 (1953) p286 stele VIII lines 8-9;  
p249 stele II lines 177ff, 311ff;  
p287 stele X line 33; cf next entry

**D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

*HCT IV* pp271-288, especially p279

Hansen (1975: p77 no.31)

**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Pantakles

**Patronymic:** n.k.

**Deme:** n.k.

**Tribe:** n.k.

**Trittys:** n.k.

**PA No:** 11584

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** n.k.

**Date of Death:** n.k.

**Magistracies:** n.k.

**Wealth:** n.k.

**B. EXILE**

Certain (Andok. i.15)

**Reason:** Denounced for profanation of the Mysteries.

**Date:** 415 or 414/3

**Hetairoi:** n.k.

**Term:** n.k.

**Conditions:** n.a.

**Destination:** n.k.

**Xenoi:** n.k.

**Family Exile:** n.k.

**Attitude to Exile:** n.k.

**Return Date:** n.k.

**Return Conditions:** n.k.

**Recall Date:** n.k.

**C. SOURCES**

**Literary:**  
Andok. i.15

**Epigraphical:** n.e.

**D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

HCT vol. iv pp271-288, especially p279  
Hansen (1975: p77 no.33)



**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Philokrates

**Patronymic:** n.k.

**Deme:** n.k.

**Tribe:** n.k.

**Trittys:** n.k.

**PA No:** 14573

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** n.k.

**Date of Death:** n.k.

**Magistracies:** n.k.

**Wealth:** n.k.

**B. EXILE**

Certain (Andok. i.15)

**Reason:** Denounced for profanation of the Mysteries.

**Date:** 415 or 414/3

**Hetairoi:** n.k.

**Term:** n.k.

**Conditions:** n.a.

**Destination:** n.k.

**Xenoi:** n.k.

**Family Exile:** n.k.

**Attitude to Exile:** n.k.

**Return Date:** n.k.

**Return Conditions:** n.k.

**Recall Date:** n.k.

**C. SOURCES**

**Literary:**

Andok. i.15

**Epigraphical:** n.e.

**D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

HCT vol.vi pp271-288, especially p279

Hansen (1975: p77 no.36)

**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Poulytion

**Patronymic:** n.k.

**Deme:** n.k.

**Tribe:** n.k.

**Trittys:** n.k.

**PA No:** 12154

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** n.k.

**Date of Death:** n.k.

**Magistracies:** n.k.

**Wealth:** n.k.

**B. EXILE**

Certain (Andok. i.12, 13, 14)

**Reason:** Denounced for profanation of the Mysteries.

**Date:** 415 or 414/3

**Hetairoi:** n.k.

**Term:** n.k.

**Conditions:** n.a.

**Destination:** n.k.

**Xenoi:** n.k.

**Family Exile:** n.k.

**Attitude to Exile:** n.k.

**Return Date:** n.k.

**Return Conditions:** n.k.

**Recall Date:** n.k.

**C. SOURCES**

**Literary:**

Andok. i.12, 13, 14

Plut. *Alk* 19.2f. 22.4

**Epigraphical:** n.e.

**D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

*HCT* vol. iv pp271-288, especially p279

Hansen (1975: p77 no. 38)

**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Smindyrides

**Patronymic:** n.k.

**Deme:** n.k.

**Tribe:** n.k.

**Trittys:** n.k.

**PA No:** 12800

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** n.k.

**Date of Death:** n.k.

**Magistracies:** n.k.

**Wealth:** n.k.

**B. EXILE**

Certain (Andok. i.15)

**Reason:** Denounced for profanation of the Mysteries.

**Date:** 415 or 414/3

**Hetairoi:** n.k.

**Term:** n.k.

**Conditions:** n.a.

**Destination:** n.k.

**Xenoi:** n.k.

**Family Exile:** n.k.

**Attitude to Exile:** n.k.

**Return Date:** n.k.

**Return Conditions:** n.k.

**Recall Date:** n.k.

**C. SOURCES**

**Literary:**  
Andok. i.15

**Epigraphical:** n.e.

**D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

HCT vol. iv pp271-288, especially p280  
Hansen (1975: p77 no. 39)

**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Teisarchos

**Patronymic:** n.k.

**Deme:** n.k. [?Pallene]

**Tribe:** n.k.[? X Antiochis]

**Tritty:** n.k. [? Inland]

**PA No:** 13466 [?13467]

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** n.k.

**Date of Death:** n.k.

**Magistracies:** n.k.

**Wealth:** n.k.

**B. EXILE**

Certain (Andok. i.15)

**Reason:** Denounced for profanation of the Mysteries.

**Date:** 415 or 414/3

**Hetairoi:** n.k.

**Term:** n.k.

**Conditions:** n.a.

**Destination:** n.k.

**Xenoi:** n.k.

**Family Exile:** n.k.

**Attitude to Exile:** n.k.

**Return Date:** n.k.

**Return Conditions:** n.k.

**Recall Date:** n.k.

**C. SOURCES**

**Literary:**  
Andok. i.15

**Epigraphical:** n.e.

**D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

*HCT* vol. iv pp271-288, especially p280  
Hansen (1975: p77 no. 40)

*Entry Nos* 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23  
24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29  
30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36

AKOUMENOS, AMIANTOS, ANTIPHON, ARCHEBIADES, ARCHIPPOS,  
ARISTOMENES, AUTOKRATOR, DIOGENES, GNIPHONIDES, HEPHAISTODOROS,  
ISONOMOS, MELETOS, NIKIDES, OIONIAS, PANTAKLES, PHILOKRATES,  
POULYTION, SMINDYRIDES, TEISARCHOS

The common factors which unite this group of Hermokopidai are that they certainly fled into exile, and that beyond this there are almost no details of their exiles or returns (if at all). A common feature of most of these entries is the attempt to associate them with Alkibiades (*PA* 600 Entry 55). Some were accused of profaning the Mysteries in Poulytion's house;<sup>1</sup> others were associated with the overall denunciation of Alkibiades since the ordering of Andokides' narration ties them into this scenario without mentioning him by name - again all fled into exile.<sup>2</sup>

Akoumenos and Autokrator fled after being accused by a slave of Pherekles (*PA* 14191 Entry 48) of profanation of the Mysteries at the latter's house.<sup>3</sup> Akoumenos was a member of the Socratic circle and presumably was associated in that way with Alkibiades at the least.<sup>4</sup>

1. Andok. i.12-13: Archebiades, Archippos, Aristomenes, Diogenes, Nikides, Oionias, Meletos and of course Poulytion by association since it was his house where this occurred, and where Alkibiades was said to have been present. Andokides notes that all these men fled and were sentenced to death *in absentia*. MacDowell (1962: pp69-72) including the evidence of confiscation of property from the stelai. sv *HCT* vol. iv pp277-280. Lysias XIV.27 mentions an Archebiades as a lover of the son of Alkibiades, although there is no reason necessarily to connect this man with the exile, but if he is the same man then a return may have been effected. The passage is confused and it is not clear if the younger Alkibiades is in fact in Athens at the time of the events which Lysias relates.
2. Andok. i.15 mentions Antiphon, Gniphonides, Hephaistodoros, Isonomos, Philokrates, Smindyrides, Teisarchos.
3. Andok. i.18. MacDowell (1962: p77) - Akoumenos.
4. Plato *Phaidros* 268a.

A problem arises with the exile of Amiantos, whom Andokides indicates fled with Alkibiades of Phegous (*PA* 601 Entry 54).<sup>5</sup> However, this Alkibiades almost certainly was in the group with Alkibiades (*PA* 600 Entry 55) in Sicily and fled from there, and so either Amiantos was with him and Andokides has interposed a fiction for dramatic effect; or Amiantos fled from Athens alone. The presence of either or both men in Athens would have no effect on the announcement of perjury made by Diokleides, which is the point of Andokides i.65.

Casson<sup>6</sup> points out that Oionias (*PA* 11370 Entry 31) was typical of those "upper class" Athenians associated with the events of 415 in that he had land in Euboea, and apparently followed a pattern of owning parcels of land overseas.<sup>7</sup>

There are no other details of these exiles,<sup>8</sup> whether they had time to take their families, or how they survived. However, despite the years that had passed between Andokides' speech and the events he described, the support for Thucydides' contention<sup>9</sup> that these events were directed against Alkibiades is consistent. Therefore, their exiles, despite the proximate cause, were definitely political and voluntary in nature, although the importance of religious sensibilities amongst the prosecutors should not be discounted.

5. Andok. i.65 with MacDowell (1962: p104): MacDowell believes that Alkibiades of Phegous was with Alkibiades III in exile. He notes also that Amiantos was an Athenian since Aigina had been part of Athens since 431, a point obviously overlooked by Kirchner, since Amiantos does not have a *PA* listing.

6. Casson (1976: pp31-32)

7. Casson (1976: p33 and n12)

8. The identity of Meletos has prompted much speculation: MacDowell (1962: Appendix M, pp208-210). Blumenthal (1973: p169f); Aurenche (1974: pp62-64); Ostwald (1986: p495 n141)

9. Thuc. VI. 60-61

**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Alkisthenes

**Patronymic:** n.k.

**Deme:** n.k.

**Tribe:** n.k.

**Tritty:** n.k.

**PA No:** 638

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** n.k.

**Date of Death:** n.k.

**Magistracies:** n.k.

**Wealth:** n.k.

**B. EXILE**

Not certain - may have been executed.  
(Andok. i.35, 52, 67)

**Reason:** Mutilation of the Hermai

**Date:** 415 or 414/3

**Hetairoi:** n.k.

**Term:** n.k.

**Conditions:** n.a.

**Destination:** n.k.

**Xenoi:** n.k.

**Family Exile:** n.k.

**Attitude to Exile:** n.k.

**Return Date:** n.k.

**Return Conditions:** n.k.

**Recall Date:** n.k.

**C. SOURCES**

**Literary:**  
Andok. i.35, 52, 67

**Epigraphical:** n.e.

**D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

HCT vol. iv pp271-288, especially p277 and p281n4  
Hansen (1975: p79 no.43)

**ENTRY No:** 38

**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Antidoros

**Patronymic:** n.k.

**Deme:** n.k.

**Tribe:** n.k.

**Trittys:** n.k.

**PA No:** 1022

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** n.k.

**Date of Death:** n.k.

**Magistracies:** n.k.

**Wealth:** n.k.

**B. EXILE**

Not certain - may have been executed.  
(Andok. i.35, 53, 67)

**Reason:** Denounced for mutilation  
of the Hermai

**Date:** 415 or 414/3

**Hetairoi:** n.k.

**Term:** n.k.

**Conditions:** n.a.

**Destination:** n.k.

**Xenoi:** n.k.

**Family Exile:** n.k.

**Attitude to Exile:** n.k.

**Return Date:** n.k.

**Return Conditions:** n.k.

**Recall Date:** n.k.

**C. SOURCES**

**Literary:**  
Andok. i.35, 52, 67

**Epigraphical:** n.e.

**D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

HCT vol. iv pp271-288, especially p277 and p281n4  
Hansen (1975: p79 no. 44)



**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Archidamos

**Patronymic:** n.k.

**Deme:** n.k.

**Tribe:** n.k.

**Tritty:** n.k.

**PA No:** 2482

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** n.k.

**Date of Death:** n.k.

**Magistracies:** n.k.

**Wealth:** n.k.

**B. EXILE**

Not certain - may have been executed.  
(Andok. i.35, 52, 67)

**Reason:** Denounced for mutilation  
of the Hermai

**Date:** 415 or 414/3

**Hetairoi:** n.k.

**Term:** n.k.

**Conditions:** n.a.

**Destination:** n.k.

**Xenoi:** n.k.

**Family Exile:** n.k.

**Attitude to Exile:** n.k.

**Return Date:** n.k.

**Return Conditions:** n.k.

**Recall Date:** n.a.

**C. SOURCES**

**Literary:**  
Andok. i.35, 52, 67

**Epigraphical:** n.e.

**D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

*HCT* vol. iv pp271-288, especially p277 and p281n4  
Hansen (1975: p79 no.45)

**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Charippos

**Patronymic:** n.k.

**Deme:** n.k.

**Tribe:** n.k.

**Tritty:** n.k.

**PA No:** 15464

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** n.k.

**Date of Death:** n.k.

**Magistracies:** n.k.

**Wealth:** n.k.

**B. EXILE**

Not certain - may have been executed.  
(Andok. i.35, 52, 67)

**Reason:** Denounced for mutilation  
of the Hermai.

**Date:** 415 or 414/3

**Hetairoi:** n.k.

**Term:** n.k.

**Conditions:** n.a.

**Destination:** n.k.

**Xenoi:** n.k.

**Family Exile:** n.k.

**Attitude to Exile:** n.k.

**Return Date:** n.k.

**Return Conditions:** n.k.

**Recall Date:** n.k.

**C. SOURCES**

**Literary:**  
Andok. i.35, 52, 67

**Epigraphical:** n.e.

**D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

*HCT* vol. iv pp271-288, especially p277  
Hansen (1975: p79 no.47)

**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Eryximachos

**Patronymic:** \*son of Akoumenos

**Deme:** n.k.

**Tribe:** n.k.

**Tritty:** n.k.

**PA No:** 5187

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** n.k.

**Date of Death:** n.k.

**Magistracies:** n.k.

**Wealth:** n.k.

**B. EXILE**

Not certain - may have been executed.  
(Andok. i.35, 52, 67)

**Reason:** Denounced for mutilation  
of the Hermai.

**Date:** 415 or 414/3

**Hetairoi:** n.k.

**Term:** n.k.

**Conditions:** n.a.

**Destination:** n.k.

**Xenoi:** n.k.

**Family Exile:** n.k.

**Attitude to Exile:** n.k.

**Return Date:** n.k.

**Return Conditions:** n.k.

**Recall Date:** n.k.

**C. SOURCES**

**Literary:**  
Andok. i.35, 52, 67

**Epigraphical:** n.e.

**D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

HCT vol. iv pp271-288, especially p278, p281n9, p284

Hansen (1975: p79 no.49)

- \* Dover (HCT p284): this man is not the son of Akoumenos, but rather a cousin or nephew on the basis that not only was it an unlikely act for a doctor of some note (this itself is a rather modern attitude to the medical profession), but also because the son of Akoumenos was represented in the *Symposium* of Plato, whose dramatic date is 416. This is a more important point than Dover places credence upon.

**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Euktemon

**Patronymic:** n.k.

**Deme:** n.k.

**Tribe:** n.k.

**Tritty:** n.k.

**PA No:** 5781

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** n.k.

**Date of Death:** n.k.

**Magistracies:** n.k.

**Wealth:** n.k.

**B. EXILE**

Not certain - may have been executed.  
(Andok. i.35, 52)

**Reason:** Denounced for mutilation  
of the Hermai.

**Date:** 415 or 414/3

**Hetairoi:** n.k.

**Term:** n.k.

**Conditions:** n.a.

**Destination:** n.k.

**Xenoi:** n.k.

**Family Exile:** n.k.

**Attitude to Exile:** n.k.

**Return Date:** n.k.

**Return Conditions:** n.k.

**Recall Date:** n.k.

**C. SOURCES**

**Literary:**  
Andok. i.35, 52

**Epigraphical:** n.e.

**D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

HCT vol. iv pp271-288, especially p278  
Hansen (1975: p79 no.50)

**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Euphiletos

**Patronymic:** son of Timotheos

**Deme:** Kydathenaion

**Tribe:** III Pandionis

**Trittys:** City

**PA No:** 6071

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** n.k.

**Date of Death:** n.k.

**Magistracies:** n.k.

**Wealth:** n.k.

**B. EXILE**

Not certain - may have been executed.  
(Andok. i.35, 52, 56, 61, 67)

**Reason:** Denounced for mutilation  
of the Hermai and profanation of  
the Mysteries.

**Date:** 415 or 414/3

**Hetairoi:** n.k.

**Term:** n.k.

**Destination:** n.k.

**Xenoi:** n.k.

**Family Exile:** n.k.

**Attitude to Exile:** n.k.

**Return Date:** n.k.

**Return Conditions:** n.k.

**Recall Date:** n.k.

**C. SOURCES**

**Literary:**  
Andok. i.35, 52, 56, 61, 67

**Epigraphical:**  
IG i<sup>3</sup> 426.78f, 430.14ff

**D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

HCT vol. iv pp271-288, especially p278  
Hansen (1975: p77 no.24)

**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Eurydamos

**Patronymic:** n.k.

**Deme:** n.k.

**Tribe:** n.k.

**Tritty:** n.k.

**PA No:** 5962

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** n.k.

**Date of Death:** n.k.

**Magistracies:** n.k.

**Wealth:** n.k.

**B. EXILE**

Not certain - may have been executed.  
(Andok. i.35, 52, 67)

**Reason:** Denounced for mutilation  
of the Hermai.

**Date:** 415 or 414/3

**Hetairoi:** n.k.

**Term:** n.k.

**Conditions:** n.a.

**Destination:** n.k.

**Xenoi:** n.k.

**Family Exile:** n.k.

**Attitude to Exile:** n.k.

**Return Date:** n.k.

**Return Conditions:** n.k.

**Recall Date:** n.k.

**C. SOURCES**

**Literary:**  
Andok. i.35, 52, 67

**Epigraphical:** n.e.

**D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

*HCT* vol. iv pp271-288, especially p278 and p281n12  
Hansen (1975: p79 no.51)

**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Eurymachos

**Patronymic:** son of [Eu]

**Deme:** n.k.

**Tribe:** n.k.

**Trittys:** n.k.

**PA No:** 5971

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** n.k.

**Date of Death:** n.k.

**Magistracies:** n.k.

**Wealth:** n.k.

**B. EXILE**

Not certain - may have been executed.  
(Andok. i.35, 52, 67)

**Reason:** Denounced for mutilation  
of the Hermai.

**Date:** 415 or 414/3

**Hetairoi:** n.k.

**Term:** n.k.

**Conditions:** n.a.

**Destination:** n.k.

**Xenoi:** n.k.

**Family Exile:** n.k.

**Attitude to Exile:** n.k.

**Return Date:** n.k.

**Return Conditions:** n.k.

**Recall Date:** n.k.

**C. SOURCES**

**Literary:**  
Andok. i.35, 52, 67

**Epigraphical:**  
IG i<sup>3</sup> 422.223ff

**D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

HCT vol. iv pp271-288, especially p278  
Hansen (1975: p79 no.52)

**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Glaukippos

**Patronymic:** n.k.

**Deme:** n.k.

**Tribe:** n.k.

**Tritty:** n.k.

**PA No:** 2978

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** n.k.

**Date of Death:** n.k.

**Magistracies:** n.k.

**Wealth:** n.k.

**B. EXILE**

Not certain - may have been executed.  
(Andok. i.35, 52, 67)

**Reason:** Denounced for mutilation  
of the Hermai.

**Date:** 415 or 414/3

**Hetairoi:** n.k.

**Term:** n.k.

**Conditions:** n.a.

**Destination:** n.k.

**Xenoi:** n.k.

**Family Exile:** n.k.

**Attitude to Exile:** n.k.

**Return Date:** n.k.

**Return Conditions:** n.k.

**Recall Date:** n.k.

**C. SOURCES**

**Literary:**  
Andok. i.35, 52, 67

**Epigraphical:** n.e.

**D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

*HCT* vol. iv pp271-288, especially p278  
Hansen (1975: p79 no.53)



**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Menestratos

**Patronymic:** n.k.

**Deme:** n.k.

**Tribe:** n.k.

**Trittys:** n.k.

**PA No:** 9993

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** n.k.

**Date of Death:** n.k.

**Magistracies:** n.k.

**Wealth:** n.k.

**B. EXILE**

Not certain - may have been executed.  
(Andok. i.35, 52, 67)

**Reason:** Denounced for mutilation  
of the Hermai.

**Date:** 415 or 414/3

**Hetairoi:** n.k.

**Term:** n.k.

**Conditions:** n.a.

**Destination:** n.k.

**Xenoi:** n.k.

**Family Exile:** n.k.

**Attitude to Exile:** n.k.

**Return Date:** n.k.

**Return Conditions:** n.k.

**Recall Date:** n.k.

**C. SOURCES**

**Literary:**  
Andok. i.35, 52, 67

**Epigraphical:** n.e.

**D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

*HCT* vol. iv pp271-288, especially p279  
Hansen (1975: p79 no.55)

**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Pherekles

**Patronymic:** son of  
Phe[ren]ika[ios]

**Deme:** Themakos

**Tribe:** I Erechtheis

**Trittys:** City

**PA No:** 14191 = 14194

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** n.k.

**Date of Death:** n.k.

**Magistracies:** n.k.

**Wealth:** n.k.

**B. EXILE**

Not certain - may have been executed.  
(Andok. i.17, 34-36)

**Reason:** Denounced for mutilation  
of the Hermai and profanation of  
the Mysteries.

**Date:** 415 or 414/3

**Hetairoi:** n.k.

**Term:** n.k.

**Conditions:** n.a.

**Destination:** n.k.

**Xenoi:** n.k.

**Family Exile:** n.k.

**Attitude to Exile:** n.k.

**Return Date:** n.k.

**Return Conditions:** n.k.

**Recall Date:** n.k.

**C. SOURCES**

**Literary:**

Thuc. VI.27-28; 60-61  
Andok. i.17, 34-36  
Plut. *Alk* 18.6-8; 20-21

**Epigraphical:**

*IG* i<sup>3</sup> 426.80-101;

**D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

*HCT* vol. iv pp271-288, especially p279 and p 282n19  
MacDowell (1962: p72)  
Hansen (1975: p71 no.35; p78 no.35)  
Ostwald (1986: pp538-540)

**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Platon

**Patronymic:** n.k.

**Deme:** n.k.

**Tribe:** n.k.

**Trittys:** n.k.

**PA No:** 11846

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** n.k.

**Date of Death:** n.k.

**Magistracies:** n.k.

**Wealth:** n.k.

**B. EXILE**

Not certain - may have been executed.  
(Andok. i.35, 52, 67)

**Reason:** Denounced for mutilation  
of the Hermai.

**Date:** 415 or 414/3

**Hetairoi:** n.k.

**Term:** n.k.

**Conditions:** n.a.

**Destination:** n.k.

**Xenoi:** n.k.

**Family Exile:** n.k.

**Attitude to Exile:** n.k.

**Return Date:** n.k.

**Return Conditions:** n.k.

**Recall Date:** n.k.

**C. SOURCES**

**Literary:**  
Andok. i.35, 52, 67

**Epigraphical:** n.e.

**D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

*HCT* vol. iv pp271-288, especially p279  
Hansen (1975: p79 no.57)

**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Polyeuktos

**Patronymic:** n.k.

**Deme:** n.k.

**Tribe:** n.k.

**Tritty:** n.k.

**PA No:** 11923

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** n.k.

**Date of Death:** n.k.

**Magistracies:** n.k.

**Wealth:** n.k.

**B. EXILE**

Not certain - may have been executed.  
(Andok. i.35, 52, 67)

**Reason:** Denounced for mutilation  
of the Hermai.

**Date:** 415 or 414/3

**Hetairoi:** n.k.

**Term:** n.k.

**Conditions:** n.a.

**Destination:** n.k.

**Xenoi:** n.k.

**Family Exile:** n.k.

**Attitude to Exile:** n.k.

**Return Date:** n.k.

**Return Conditions:** n.k.

**Recall Date:** n.k.

**C. SOURCES**

**Literary:**  
Andok. i.35, 52, 67

**Epigraphical:** n.e.

**D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

HCT vol. iv pp271-288, especially p279  
Hansen (1975: p79 no.58)

**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Telenikos

**Patronymic:** n.k.

**Deme:** n.k.

**Tribe:** n.k.

**Trittys:** n.k.

**PA No:** 13502

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** n.k.

**Date of Death:** n.k.

**Magistracies:** n.k.

**Wealth:** n.k.

**B. EXILE**

Not certain - may have been executed.  
(Andok. i. 35, 52, 67)

**Reason:** Denounced for mutilation  
of the Hermai.

**Date:** 415 or 414/3

**Hetairoi:** n.k.

**Term:** n.k.

**Conditions:** n.a.

**Destination:** n.k.

**Xenoi:** n.k.

**Family Exile:** n.k.

**Attitude to Exile:** n.k.

**Return Date:** n.k.

**Return Conditions:** n.k.

**Recall Date:** n.k.

**C. SOURCES**

**Literary:**  
Andok. i.35, 52, 67

**Epigraphical:** n.e.

**D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

HCT vol. iv pp271-288, especially p280  
Hansen (1975: p79 no.59)

**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Theodoros

**Patronymic:** n.k.

**Deme:** Phegous

**Tribe:** I Erechtheis

**Trittys:** ?Inland

**PA No:** 6826 = 6907

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** n.k.

**Date of Death:** n.k.

**Magistracies:** n.k.

**Wealth:** n.k.

**B. EXILE**

Not certain - may have been executed.  
(Andok. i.35, 52, 67)

**Reason:** Denounced for mutilation  
of the Hermai and profanation of  
the Mysteries.

**Date:** 415 or 414/3

**Hetairoi:** n.k.

**Term:** n.k.

**Conditions:** n.a.

**Destination:** n.k.

**Xenoi:** n.k.

**Family Exile:** n.k.

**Attitude to Exile:** n.k.

**Return Date:** n.k.

**Return Conditions:** n.k.

**Recall Date:** n.k.

**C. SOURCES**

**Literary:**  
Andok. i.35, 52, 67  
Plut. *Alk* 19.2f, 22.4

**Epigraphical:** n.e.

**D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

*HCT* vol. iv pp271-288, especially p280  
Hansen (1975: p77 no.41)

**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Timanthes\*

**Patronymic:** n.k.

**Deme:** n.k.

**Tribe:** n.k.

**Tritty:** n.k.

**PA No:** 13607\*

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** n.k.

**Date of Death:** n.k.

**Magistracies:** n.k.

**Wealth:** n.k.

**B. EXILE**

Not certain - may have been executed. \*  
(Andok. i.35, 52, 67)

**Reason:** Denounced for mutilation  
of the Hermai.

**Date:** 415 or 414/3

**Hetairoi:** n.k.

**Term:** n.k.

**Conditions:** n.a.

**Destination:** n.k.

**Xenoi:** n.k.

**Family Exile:** n.k.

**Attitude to Exile:** n.k.

**Return Date:** n.k.

**Return Conditions:** n.k.

**Recall Date:** n.k.

**C. SOURCES**

**Literary:**  
Andok. i.35, 52, 67

**Epigraphical:** n.e.

**D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

*HCT* vol. iv pp271-288, especially p280  
Hansen (1975: p79 no.60)

\* MacDowell (1962: p86) with reference to *IG* i<sup>3</sup> 106 lines 21-23, which implies that a Timanthes was pardoned. He may be the same person; cf Walbank (1978: p432). Note also Mitchell (1980: p43), who argues that Timanthes was a metic, which is not impossible - *vide* Teukros.

*Entry Nos* 37, 38, 39, 40, 41  
42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48  
49, 50, 51, 52, 53

ALKISTHENES, ANTIDOROS, ARCHIDAMOS, CHARIPPOS, ERYXIMACHOS,  
EUKTEMON, EUPHILETOS, EURYDAMAS, EURYMACHOS, GLAUKIPPOS,  
MENESTRATOS, PHEREKLES, PLATON, POLYEUKTOS, TELENIKOS,  
THEODOROS, TIMANTHES

These seventeen are included in this study because they may have been voluntary political exiles who fled from trials for mutilation of the Hermai or profanation of the Mysteries. On the other hand they may have been executed before having an opportunity to flee. Although their fate is unknown, their inclusion is warranted since so many others charged in a similar way were able to escape, and the possibility exists that these may have done so too.

That the exiles are not certain is because Andokides I.34-35 names eighteen people who had been denounced by Teukros - the seventeen above, together with Meletos (*PA* 9825 Entry 29) whose exile is certain.<sup>1</sup> However, Andokides states that some fled and others were executed.<sup>2</sup> He goes on to say that some had returned (that is, by the date of *Peri ton Mysterion* in 400), but he does not name the returnees, or those previously executed. Andokides i.52 and I.67 are equally vague about who was executed and who was able to flee, although i.51 and i.61-63 indicate that in Andokides' view at least, Euphiletos (*PA* 6071 Entry 43) was guilty whether he stayed and died or had fled.<sup>3</sup>

1. Andok. i.13. MacDowell (1962: pp208-210)

2. Plut. *Alk* 21

3. MacDowell (1962: p5 n9 and pp204-205)



Theodoros (*PA* 6826 Entry 52) was a friend or at least some form of associate of Alkibiades (*PA* 600 Entry 55) since he is mentioned jointly with Alkibiades as accused in the impeachment action brought by Thessalos (*PA* 7208).<sup>4</sup> Whether this meant that he was in Sicily with Alkibiades is uncertain, and it could be that he was one of the (?few) associates whom the investigators could lay their hands on, because he had remained in Athens. Pherekles (*PA* 14191 Entry 48), in whose house profanation of the Mysteries apparently occurred,<sup>5</sup> and who presumably was visited by Alkibiades at one of the dinner parties associated with these events, may also have been a friend. The same speculation regarding Theodoros can be applied to Pherekles. If Eryimachos is identical with the participant in the battle of Aigospotamoi, he may have avoided the death penalty by voluntary exile.<sup>6</sup>

Mitchel<sup>7</sup> believes that Timanthes may have been a metic, and the supposition is not unreasonable, considering the association of Teukros with the notables of Athens at this period: socialising with aristocratic citizens was not unknown, as Mitchel points out. However, since Andokides is silent on the status of Timanthes,<sup>8</sup> whilst noting that Teukros was a metic, it is preferred that Timanthes be regarded as an Athenian citizen until some more positive evidence to the contrary emerges.

4. Plut. *Alk* 22.4

5. Andok. i.17 with MacDowell (1962: p76)

6. Rylands Papyrus 3.489

7. Mitchel (1980: p43)

8. Andok. i.15

Beyond these shadowy associations and the lack of clarity in the pertinent passages of Andokides, there is no other extant evidence of the lives and fates of these seventeen men. Some went into voluntary exile, some did not, and who did which remains a mystery.

**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Alkibiades of Phegous

**Patronymic:** [--]ou

**Deme:** Phegous

**Tribe:** I Erechtheis

**Trittys:** ?Inland

**PA No:** 601 = ?599 (APF p22)

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** n.k.

**Date of Death:** ? 410/9 (Xen. *Hell* I.2.13)

**Magistracies:** n.k.

**Wealth:** Held some property in Oropos. (APF p22, p17)

**B. EXILE**

Certain (Xen. *Hell* I.2.13)

**Reason:** Associated with the profanation trials.

**Date:** c. 415

**Conditions:** n.a.

**Term:** Did not return.

**Hetairoi:** Amiantos of Aigina (Andok. i.65), Alkibiades III (PA 600)

**Destination:** ?Syracuse; Samos

**Xenoi:** n.k.

**Family Exile:** n.k.

**Attitude to Exile:** n.k.

**Return Date:** n.a.

**Return Conditions:** n.a.

**Recall Date:** n.a.

**C. SOURCES**

**Literary:**

**Epigraphical:**

Thuc. VI.27-29; 60-61

Xen. *Hell* I.2.13

Andok. i.65

WK Pritchett in *Hesperia* 22

(1953) 286, Stele VIII lines 3-7 =

IG I<sup>3</sup> 428.3-4

#### **D. *SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY***

Andrewes (1953: p4 n11)

MacDowell (1962: p104)

Davies, *APF* p17

Bicknell (1971: pp96-100)

McCoy (1977: pp264-289)

ALKIBIADES OF PHEGOUS

Alkibiades (*PA* 601 = ?599) of Phegous was a cousin of the general Alkibiades (III) (*PA* 600),<sup>1</sup> and appears on a list of persons whose property was confiscated after being found guilty of the mutilation of the Hermai in 415.<sup>2</sup> However, Andokides states<sup>3</sup> that Alkibiades of Phegous was responsible, together with Amiantos of Aigina, for inciting Diokleides (*PA* 3973) to lie about the names of persons involved with the profanation of the Mysteries. Since the inquiry into this matter took place after the actual mutilation of the Hermai, but in conjunction with it,<sup>4</sup> there appears to be some confusion concerning the reason for the exile of Alkibiades of Phegous. He is supposed to have been instrumental in arranging for Diokleides to give what was found to be false evidence, though according to Andokides, we only have the word of Diokleides that he did so.

Xenophon states<sup>5</sup> that Alkibiades of Phegous went into exile with his cousin, Alkibiades (III),

1. *Xen. Hell* I.2.13. ...*anepsion kai symphugada*... Harpokration (sv Alkibiades ) refers to *Alkibiadou xenos* but I prefer *anepsion*. cf *HCT* IV p277, p286.
2. MacDowell (1962: p71)
3. *Andok.* i.65
4. *Thuc.* VI.27; Dover *HCT* IV pp264- 288: the "inquiry" as such appears (p272) to be an ongoing affair, up to the recall of Alkibiades.
5. *Xen. Hell* I.2.13

and in the context of the narrative, Xenophon means the first, not the second, exile of the latter.<sup>6</sup> Therefore, Alkibiades of Phegous must have left with the Sicilian expedition and thus been one of those subject to the recall order, mentioned by Thucydides,<sup>7</sup> in order to have gone into exile with his cousin. This is likely because the party of Alkibiades (III) escaped in the region of Thurii, close to Sicily.<sup>8</sup> In Xenophon's narrative, Thrasylos (*PA* 7333)<sup>9</sup> captured prisoners from the Syracusan ships, and put to death Alkibiades of Phegous alone among those captured, the rest being sent back to Athens. This means that having made good their escape at Thurii, the party could have split up. Given that his cousin went straightaway to the enemy at Sparta,<sup>10</sup> there is no reason to doubt that Alkibiades of Phegous would have had any qualms about going over to the enemy at Syracuse. Thence a few years later via service in the Syracusan navy, he met his fate at the hands of Thrasylos in the Ionian War.

Moreover, under the terms of the convictions of the Hermokopidai, their property was confiscated, and they were condemned to death, those who had made good their escape being condemned *in absentia*.<sup>11</sup> It was therefore a reasonable and legal action for Thrasylos<sup>12</sup> to have taken in summarily executing Alkibiades of Phegous.

6. That is, 415/4 and not after Notion.

7. Thuc. VI.61

8. *loc cit*

9. Xen. *Hell* I.2.13

10. Thuc. VI.61

11. MacDowell (1962: p71)

12. Andrewes (1953: p4)

There are two problems with this scenario. The first is that if Alkibiades of Phegous was in fact part of his cousin's grand expedition to Sicily, he could not have been on hand in Athens to persuade Diokleides to lie about those involved in both the mutilation and the profanation. However, since Andokides, and thus his audience, only had Diokleides' word that such persuasion was in fact brought to bear upon him, and if he had lied once, why not again, especially if the subject of the allegation was already absent from Athens? It is generally agreed that the motivation for the whole episode is an attack upon Alkibiades (III), and he too appears on the list of Hermokopidai: the circumstances which suit Alkibiades (III) will also suit Alkibiades of Phegous, provided it is accepted that Diokleides' statements are correctly regarded as suspect.<sup>13</sup>

The second problem is more difficult, though not insurmountable: namely, that as Andrewes has pointed out,<sup>14</sup> it is unlikely Thrasylos would eliminate the cousin of the general with whom he was just about to join forces in the Hellespont. Andrewes indeed has a good case. However, he has demonstrated very well the enmity which existed between Thrasylos and Alkibiades (III),<sup>15</sup> and having just lost a battle, when his rival continued to be successful, it may just have been the sort of action such enmity would provoke. In any event, there is sufficient time lapse, using Andrewes' own timing of the Ionian War, for Thrasylos to have been unaware of the fact that he was about to be ordered to join Alkibiades (III) and support him in the Hellespont.

13. Bauman (1990: p62-66) believes that Androkles was behind the whole prosecution, and that fear of *katalysis tou demou* was a real and significant threat, as Alkibiades (III) was known not to care what type of government was in operation, and those involved were generally not of a radical democrat caste.
14. Andrewes (1953: p4 n11)
15. Andrewes (1953: p4); Krentz (1989: p115) points out that, notwithstanding the point made by Andrewes, Alkibiades of Phegous "could be considered a traitor" at this point. He goes on to hypothesise that Alkibiades (III) may have been glad to be rid of the embarrassment of this cousin.

In summary, the exile of Alkibiades of Phegous probably arose out of his association with his cousin, and from there to the conviction for mutilation of the Hermai, and/or profanation of the Mysteries, or both. The exile took the form of a voluntary departure from the Sicilian expedition, initially in company with Alkibiades (III), and subsequently Alkibiades of Phegous defected to Syracuse.

It is known that Alkibiades of Phegous had possessed land at Oropos,<sup>16</sup> and presumably had other resources, yet it is unlikely that he would have been able to gain access to any of them, especially in Attika and its immediate environs. In order to sustain himself, he took service with the Syracusan navy, and served there until he was captured as one of the defeated Syracusan force in the vicinity of Lesbos, and he died at the order, if not the hand, of Thrasylos. This explanation of the exile and end of Alkibiades of Phegous appears to fit the existing direct sources better than the third-hand account of a confessed perjurer.

16. *IG I<sup>3</sup>* 428.3-4: Pritchett (1971-1991: p286). In any case, the Oropos assets were confiscated.



**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Alkibiades III

**Patronymic:** son of Kleinias

**Deme:** Skambonidai

**Tribe:** IV Leontis

**Trittys:** City

**PA No:** 600; *RE* 1 (1894) J Toepffer p1515f

**Genos:** ?Eupatrid (Sealey 1976: p117)

**Date of Birth:** c. 450

**Date of Death:** c. 404/3 in Phrygia

**Magistracies:** *AO* 84 *strategos* 420–415; 411/10; 410/9–407; *taktes* 425; Envoy 418.

**Wealth:** Inherited large estates; married Hipparete for wealth. *APF* pp9–22. *Spence* no. 10.

**B. EXILE**

Certain - twice: Thuc. VI.53.1; 61, Xen. *Hell* I.5.17

**Reason:** Firstly to escape consequences of charge of profanation of the Mysteries; secondly, to escape the consequences of the failure at Notion.

**Date:** 415/4 and again in 407

**Term:** 4 years; permanent.

**Conditions:** n.a.

**Destination:** Sparta/Persia; Thrace/Persia.

**Hetairoi:** Sokrates (*PA* 13101), Axiochos\* (*PA* 1330), Alkibiades II\*\* (*PA* 591), Pherekles (*PA* 14195), Poulytion (metic), Antiochos (*PA* 1099), Hipponikos (*PA* 7659) *inter alia*.

\* His paternal uncle, who appears however to have been more of a boon companion.

\*\* A cousin and also part of the group around him.

**Xenoi:** Endios of Sparta;  
Tissaphernes of Persia;  
Apollodoros of Selymbria;  
Chalkideus of Sparta; Seuthes of  
Thrace; (?)Pharnabazos of  
Persia; unnamed *xenoi* in Miletos,  
Mantineia, Argos, Ephesos, Chios,  
Ceramic Gulf (Caria).

**Proxenos:** by inheritance for  
Sparta.

**Family Exile:** Wife dead by 415,  
in Athens throughout. Son hostage in Athens for  
his father.

**Return Date:** Acted as Athens' general  
from base in Samos from late 411,  
then returned physically to Athens  
once only, in 407. Did not return thereafter.

**Recall Date:** 411/410

**Attitude to Exile:** Appeared to  
want to return to Athens after first  
exile, but only when safe, and only  
as a leading player in its politics.

### **C. SOURCES**

**Literary:**

Thuc. VI.29; 61.1-4; 88  
Xen. *Hell* I.5.16-18;  
Diod. XIII.74.1

**Epigraphical:** *IG* i<sup>3</sup> 421.12ff,  
424.27ff

### **D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

Calhoun (1913: p18, p25)  
Hatzfeld (1951: p293)  
Sealey (1976: pp372-375)  
Herman (1987: p36, p151, p153n95, p181)  
Ellis (1989: p49, p61, p83, p121n86)

ALKIBIADES

The immediate cause of the first exile of Alkibiades (*PA* 600) was his unwillingness to face a charge of profanation of the Mysteries of Eleusis. This charge was formally instigated by his political enemies whilst he was out of Athens,<sup>1</sup> acting as one of a trio of supreme commanders of the Athenian expedition to Sicily in 415.<sup>2</sup> In effect, the rumours and allegations were made prior to Alkibiades' departure, and despite his attempts to have the matter formally tried before he undertook his command to Sicily he was obliged to leave with the question of his guilt unresolved.<sup>3</sup>

As the prime exponent of the popular move to expand Athenian interests in the West via this Sicilian expedition, Alkibiades in 416/5 was a prominent political force in Athens. Although he had enemies, including Nikias (*PA* 10808) and the conservatives,<sup>4</sup> some of whom had oligarchic tendencies, and Androkles and the radical democrats,<sup>5</sup> it is unlikely that he would

1. Thuc. VI.61.1 *HCT* IV p338
2. Thuc. VI.8.2; *HCT* IV pp223-224 for the collegiate nature of the command.
3. Thuc. VI.29.1f.
4. Thuc. VI.61.4; cf Bauman's point (1990: p66) that Androkles was behind the prosecution of Alkibiades as he feared that there was in fact an oligarchic uprising in the wind.
5. Ellis (1989: p49). Thuc. VI.29 appears to support this view. cf *HCT* IV pp288: Dover believes that the composition of the friends and enemies of Alkibiades was more fluid, referring specifically to the inconsistency between the visit of Alkibiades *et al*, to the house of Kallias son of Hipponikos, (Plato, *Protagoras* 315c-316a) and the latter's strong resistance to the recall of Alkibiades (Thuc. VIII.53.2). However, *HCT* IV p283: "The prosecution represented a curious alliance of forces which illuminates the nature of the enmities which Alkibiades provoked ...The moving spirit among the demagogues...was Androkles...The *eisangelia* , however, stood in the name of Thessalos, son of Kimon...whose standpoint one would expect to be profoundly different from that of Androkles."

have been convicted of the charge.<sup>6</sup> The expedition was anticipated to bring untold wealth and glory to Athens and its prime sponsor would have been unlikely to suffer.

The event which was causing much anxiety in Athens was the mutilation of the Hermai throughout the city almost on the eve of the departure of the fleet.<sup>7</sup> Attempts to tie Alkibiades into this affair led to allegations relating to sacrilegious practices conducted at private dinner parties, which Alkibiades was supposed to have attended.<sup>8</sup> These became known as the profanation of the Mysteries and it was on this charge, and not for the mutilation of the Hermai, that Alkibiades was subsequently formally charged. He was apparently never charged in relation to the Hermai.

From his initial eagerness to have the charges made and defeated prior to his departure, Alkibiades had a significant change of heart by 414 and opted instead to go into exile.<sup>9</sup> Two factors account for this *volte face*. First, the expedition to Sicily was not going well. The presumed wealth of the allies there,<sup>10</sup> and the reputedly widespread support for Athens,<sup>11</sup> both

6. This is probably true although Alkibiades was unable to muster enough support to have the trial before his departure for Sicily, probably because the expedition was so popular.
7. Thuc. VI.27. The profanation of the Mysteries was viewed as a serious case of *asebeia* by some elements of Athenian society, but as Dover points out (*HCT* IV p283) there was a wide variety of opinions on the existence and nature of the gods and other issues of religion generally. Notwithstanding this, Athenians and Greeks generally viewed offences against the cult, that is against the rites and practices, as a crime because it upset the 'bargain' struck between gods and the city for the latter's protection. That is, do the right things at the right time in observances and the gods will keep their side of the contract to protect the city, harvest or whatever. Ostwald (1986: p528) Mikalson (1983: p96).
8. Thuc. VI.28; Andok. i.15-18; Plut. *Alk* 22.4; specifically mimicry of the sacred rites of Eleusis.
9. Thuc. VI.61
10. Thuc. VI.46.2f (with *HCT* IV pp312-313) regarding the mistaken assumptions made by Athenians concerning wealth in a society in relation to wealth of a shrine maintained by that society); cf Thuc. VI.22
11. Thuc. VI.4.4

failed to materialise once the armada arrived at the island. In addition little was achieved during the months which followed the arrival of the Athenians. No doubt word of this situation and the apparent stalemate had reached Athens. The expedition may not have appeared to be so popular once its arch exponent was no longer present to maintain support levels.

Secondly, the charge against Alkibiades had now been brought into the courts, most probably by Androkles (*PA* 870) and his *hetairoi*,<sup>12</sup> although Ellis feels that the radical oligarchs would also benefit from removing Alkibiades.<sup>13</sup> Some of the *hetairoi* of Alkibiades had travelled to Sicily with him and so a portion of the political clout of Alkibiades, represented by these *hetairoi*, was in Sicily and thus not available to his cause in Athens.<sup>14</sup>

Ellis<sup>15</sup> has made a strong case that Alkibiades was very probably guilty of the charge, which would have helped him to decide not to face the court in the changed political and military circumstances. Thus, when the State ship the *Salamina* was sent to bring Alkibiades back for

12. Thuc. VIII.65.2; *HCT* V p161: Thucydides does not name the enemies of Alkibiades although he knows them; Plut. *Alk* 19.1-3

13. Ellis (1989: p49)

14. For example Adeimantos (*PA* 202 Entry 7); (Krentz, 1989: p115): Xen. *Hell* I.2.13

15. Ellis (1989: p61)

trial, apparently he at first went willingly.<sup>16</sup> It is difficult to understand why the *Salaminia* did not take Alkibiades into direct custody. He remained on his ship, surrounded by his supporters and crew, and this fully equipped fighting ship was escorted back towards Athens. Although Alkibiades, unlike Konon (*PA* 8707 Entry 71),<sup>17</sup> did not utilise the ship itself for a getaway, he had privacy and leisure to devise alternatives to returning to Athens. It was during this time that a plan was made. A combination of a well-executed escape plan, the ineptitude of the crew of the *Salaminia*, and wealth which permitted a merchant ship to be hired at Thurii, allowed Alkibiades and his cousin Alkibiades of Phegous (*PA* 601 Entry 54) at least to get away.<sup>18</sup>

Alkibiades was tried and condemned to death *in absentia*. His property was confiscated and the priestesses and priests were instructed to publicly curse him.<sup>19</sup> The property mentioned in the stelai erected to record the transactions of property confiscated from those found guilty of sacrilege was not extensive in Alkibiades' case<sup>20</sup> when compared to the wealth which he was reputed to have inherited,<sup>21</sup> and to have obtained by dowry from his wife, Hipparete.<sup>22</sup>

16. Thuc. VI.53.1; VI.61

17. Xen. *Hell* II.1.29: see Krentz (1989: p179) for the possible relationships between Konon and Evagoras.

18. Thuc. VI.61

19. Plut. *Alk* 22.5. Diod. XIII.69.2 - the Eumolpidai arranged to have the curses cast in stone and thrown into the sea. Balogh (1943: p21f, p30) speaks of "outlawry", but this again appears to be an anachronistic term.

20. *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 421

21. *APF* p19

22. Plut. *Alk* 8.3-4; [Andok.] iv.14

She had died by the time Alkibiades fled to Sparta,<sup>23</sup> his son and daughter presumably returning to the house of her brother, Kallias (*PA* 7826), or to a relative of Alkibiades who had not been associated with the disgrace or with the charge of profanation. Euryptolemos (*PA* 5985) perhaps fulfilled this role for the infant children of Alkibiades.<sup>24</sup>

From Thurii Alkibiades sailed to Cyllene in Elis,<sup>25</sup> and thence made his way to Sparta, possibly going first to Argos.<sup>26</sup> The claim of Nepos<sup>27</sup> that Alkibiades went initially via Thebes appears less unlikely than Ellis suggests,<sup>28</sup> since it was not necessarily the case that Alkibiades had decided to go to Sparta *from the first*. The case Ellis expounds has weight in terms of choices open to Alkibiades if he wished to obtain his ultimate recall to Athens (and that appears a valid assumption of his motives based on subsequent behaviour). Ellis states<sup>29</sup> that it was not possible to approach Persia as an independent at this time as it was *de facto*, if not *de jure*, an ally of Sparta. Other neutral states were not available - a valid contention since by 414/3 most of the Greek states and those on the periphery of the Greek world were ranged on the side of either Sparta or Athens. Ellis' position is that Alkibiades had no real choice.

23. Plut. *Alk* 8.6

24. Alkibiades' cousin - apparently not stigmatised by this association as he remained in Athens to greet Alkibiades on his return from exile in 407. Cf Adeimantos (*PA* 202 Entry 7), perhaps a cousin, certainly a boon companion, who was charged with profanation of the Mysteries and went into voluntary exile in 415/4 and was back by 407/6.

25. Thuc. VI.88; *HCT IV* p360 - if Elis had been brought back under Spartan control by 413, then "If so, Alkibiades went direct to enemy territory; contrast the apologia of Isok. xviii.9 ... contending that Alkibiades had gone first to Argos but 'was compelled to take refuge in Sparta' when Athens demanded that Argos should surrender him." Cf Bauman (1990: p67) on the trial of Protagoras and the connection between Thurii, Protagoras and Alkibiades.

26. Isok. XVI.9; Plut. *Alk* 23.1

27. Nepos *Alc* IV.4

28. Ellis (1989: p121 n86)

29. Ellis (1989: p65)

In fact Alkibiades may have been embarrassed by an excess of choice, since he had and maintained "an unusually high number of *xenoi*."<sup>30</sup> With unrest in Argos at that time, and no recorded *xenos* in Thebes, Sparta afforded to Alkibiades the closest, relatively sure reception. Endios, his close friend and *xenos*, was by this time one of the most powerful members of the Spartan government, being one of the five *ephors*.<sup>31</sup> Whilst Endios may have supported him in material terms as required by the rules governing *xenia* relationships, Alkibiades apparently felt obliged to enter fully into the spirit of the Spartan ethos. Not only did he actively participate in debates concerning how best to counter Athenian interests,<sup>32</sup> he also adopted Spartan diet and mode of dress and appearance.<sup>33</sup>

As reported by Thucydides, the attitude of Alkibiades to his enforced exile appears bitter, but principally against those who caused his downfall, rather than against Athens itself.<sup>34</sup> His attempts to damage the cause of Athens were designed to overthrow his enemies who had instigated the charges against him, rather than to overthrow his country's constitution or to oversee the loss of its empire. On a later occasion Phrynichos (*PA* 15011) remarked that Alkibiades did not care what form of government was in power so long as it recalled him.<sup>35</sup> He implied that Alkibiades would do what was necessary, that is, go to any

30. Herman (1987: p36).

31. Thuc. VIII.6.2 with *HCT V* p19; Herman (1987: pp147-151)

32. Thuc. VI.89-92; *HCT IV* pp361-366; cf Pusey (1940: pp216-217) who challenges the traditional view of "patriotism" (itself a modern concept relative to the period of this study).

33. Plut. *Alk* 23.3-6; cf Athenaeus 12.534b-535c

34. Thuc. VI.89; *HCT IV* p362: Thucydides at VI.89.5 may be referring to the anti-Spartan mood of the 460s at Athens.

35. Thuc. VIII.48.4. Dover (*HCT V* p108) suggests that Thucydides agreed with the judgement of Phrynichos. Cf Pusey (1940: p230).



lengths, to secure his return and the downfall of his personal enemies. Alkibiades' sojourn in Sparta suggests that Phrynichos was essentially correct in his judgment.

It is unclear how Alkibiades spent the two years in Sparta, although he contrived to make a bitter enemy of King Agis, for personal and/or political reasons.<sup>36</sup> After apparently outstaying his welcome in Sparta itself,<sup>37</sup> Alkibiades contrived to get himself appointed to a Spartan contingent which proceeded to Asia to the court of the Persian satrap Tissaphernes.<sup>38</sup>

Thucydides appears to indicate that Alkibiades subsequently ingratiated himself with Tissaphernes and thus acquired a protector both against those Spartans who had decided he had outlived his usefulness, and against those who sought his death.<sup>39</sup> In fact Herman is probably correct in listing amongst the *xenoi* of Alkibiades this same Tissaphernes.<sup>40</sup> From his arrival at the court of this Persian satrap, Alkibiades was taken straight into the counsels of Tissaphernes and was treated as an honoured friend. Alkibiades adopted the manners and customs of the Persians, as he did those of the Spartans before.<sup>41</sup> This was not necessarily an ingratiating tactic but indicates equally that there was little choice: at the best of times the fare and accommodation in Sparta was meagre by the standards of the ancient world, and sartorial accoutrements were unavailable.

36. Plut. *Alk* 23.7-9; 24.3; *HCT V* pp94-95 places this in the summer of 412.

37. However his relationship with Endios remained intact: Herman (1987: p149).

38. Thuc. VIII.45.1

39. Thuc. VIII.45.1

40. Herman (1987: p181)

41. Plut. *Alk* 23.4

What was available in terms of sustenance was what he received, albeit generously. The same applied to the court of Tissaphernes.

The case for Tissaphernes as a *xenos* of Alkibiades is stronger when it is known that his maternal family traditionally had been reputed to have strong pro-Persian links.<sup>42</sup> Equally, Alkibiades may not have inherited a *xenia* relationship, but may have sought it himself and forged it during the years of the Peace of Nikias when he was seeking means to assert himself politically. He had tried at this period to reinstate the *proxenia* relationship with Sparta.<sup>43</sup> He was known to have visited Ephesos during this time also,<sup>44</sup> and may equally have commenced negotiations for a *xenia* relationship with the satrap whilst in close proximity and whilst far away from the eyes of his political enemies. A *xenia* relationship between the two explains the willingness of Tissaphernes not only to listen and to act upon the advice of Alkibiades, but also to countenance his machinations with the Athenians at Samos.

The role of Tissaphernes in the reinstatement of Alkibiades has not been recognised from this viewpoint, but is apparent in the collusion of the satrap with Astyochos and Alkibiades against Phrynichos.<sup>45</sup>

42. Hdt. VI.123, a claim which is almost certainly untrue.

43. Thuc. V.43.2: Dover (*HCT IV* p49) dates the renunciation of the Spartan proxeny by Alkibiades' ancestor to 462.

44. Plut. *Alk* 8.6

45. Thuc. VIII. 50.4-5; *HCT V* p119; cf Bloedow (1991: p25) who feels that Phrynichos succeeded in undermining Alkibiades with Tissaphernes. The subsequent actions of both *xenoi* provide a serious challenge to Bloedow's view - in fact it was Tissaphernes who aided Alkibiades, in the face of the charges of Phrynichos.

In addition Tissaphernes did nothing to correct the totally misleading statements of Alkibiades in regard to the Phoenician fleet, which was a strong factor in obtaining the recall of Alkibiades to the generalship of the Athenians from Samos.<sup>46</sup> In fact the machinations in 412/11 described in detail by Thucydides<sup>47</sup> had resulted not only in the recall of Alkibiades but also in the destruction of his enemies by the oligarchs who seized power and were in turn deposed. Alkibiades could not have wanted a better result for his ambitions and for the protection of the interests of his *xenos* Tissaphernes. Despite the outward appearances that Alkibiades was falling out of favour, or that Tissaphernes was apparently listening to him but in fact doing nothing, the results were exactly what was wanted. Alkibiades' subsequent actions after obtaining command of the fleet at Samos indicate that he was not merely pretending to be, but was in fact, intimate with Tissaphernes. He travelled to Tissaphernes at Aspendos;<sup>48</sup> thence he tidied up the fortifications on Kos,<sup>49</sup> gathered money from Halikarnassos and sailed north.<sup>50</sup> That is, he sailed the Athenian fleet *away* from the satrapy of his friend Tissaphernes.

46. Thuc. VIII.50.5; *HCT V* pp119, 271

47. Thuc. VIII.78.1

48. Thuc. VIII.45-82

49. Thuc. VIII.88.1, 108. *HCT V* p294 : the language used is "...not quite logical, but intelligible..." It seems that Thucydides recognised the significance of Alkibiades' movements.

50. Thuc. VIII.108.1. *HCT V* p355 feels that Alkibiades' power and influence with Tissaphernes was exaggerated, because that is what Thucydides wanted his readers to believe. However, the reverse is equally plausible, given Thucydides' uneven treatment of history generally. Cf Westlake (1973: p215).

The incident of his "arrest" by Tissaphernes was claimed by Alkibiades to be a blind: he stated that Tissaphernes had sent him to Sardis and thence had set him free.<sup>51</sup> Ellis states that this was a last attempt to revenge himself upon Tissaphernes by Alkibiades.<sup>52</sup> Why could it not be the truth? Instead of a hostile act by Tissaphernes it would have been a face-saving act by one friend towards another to cover the lack of Persian aid, no longer available because of the King's desire to abet the Spartan cause exclusively.<sup>53</sup> Alkibiades could equally have been telling the unvarnished truth that the escapade was a ruse and that Tissaphernes arranged the whole event.

Although Alkibiades was a persuasive orator and a strikingly handsome man with a personable manner,<sup>54</sup> he would never have survived this first exile without the protection and active assistance of his powerful *xenoi*, Endios and then Tissaphernes. The forces which had combined against Alkibiades were formidable and sustained. Not only did he survive this

51. Xen. *Hell* I.1.9-10; Plut. *Alk* 28.2: Plutarch himself attributes this incident to a desire on the part of Alkibiades to embarrass Tissaphernes as a form of revenge, and scholars have never questioned this attribution. Alkibiades himself does not say that he was trying to harm Tissaphernes. If the motive supplied by Plutarch a few hundred years after the event is removed, the facts can stand the alternative interpretation. Krentz (1989: p95) believes such support from Tissaphernes to Alkibiades was at the very least possible.

52. Ellis (1989: p83) merely follows Plutarch.

53. Thuc. VIII.58f: the treaty with Sparta marked the end of any hopes of aid from the King which the Athenians could still have harboured. Tissaphernes was providing a "cover" for Alkibiades to save his position in Athens.

54. Plut. *Alk* 1-2

period, he emerged the victor in 410 and his enemies *on all sides* were in retreat, the Spartans militarily and the radical democrats and oligarchs in Athens politically.<sup>55</sup> After a successful military year in 408, even the stelae recording the curses against him were thrown in the sea.<sup>56</sup>

The second exile in 407/6 was markedly different and the essence of that difference was the attitude of Alkibiades himself. Although he had reached the summit of his career in the intervening years, the nature of the war had changed. The Sicilian expedition had drained the resources of Athens and despite a strong attempt at recovery, given impetus by the efforts and successes of Alkibiades himself,<sup>57</sup> Athens was being worn down. At the same time as this process was gaining momentum, Sparta had created a navy and had obtained an admiral equal to the task of defeating the Athenians, Lysander.<sup>58</sup> An increasing amount of the time of the Athenian commanders was engaged in the search for money in the form of tribute or booty to fund the operations of their fleet. To add to the woes of the Athenians, Sparta and Persia were attempting to forge a lasting alliance.

55. For Alkibiades' use of *epitadeioi* in this process of reinstatement to Athenian political life see Herman (1987: p151).

56. Diod. XIII.69.2; Sealey (1976: p374): Alkibiades knew the political value of display and arranged protection with himself at the head of the troop to escort the procession to Eleusis; the charge of *asebeia* arising from the profanation of the Mysteries was finally put to rest.

57. Kagan (1987: p2); cf Bloedow (1991: pp26-27), who downplays the contribution of Alkibiades at Abydos, Chalcedon, Sylymbria and Byzantium in contrast to Ellis (1989: p88)

58. Xen. *Hell* I.5.1; Krentz (1989: p134)

On one such foray to obtain funds for the fleet, Alkibiades had left his command with a subordinate under instructions not to engage Lysander.<sup>59</sup> This order was not obeyed and up to fifteen Athenian ships were lost.<sup>60</sup> Alkibiades was also accused of attacking an ally of Athens at this time, as well as being in touch with Pharnabazos. The latter two charges are difficult to prove since one is based on confusion concerning Caria and Cyme;<sup>61</sup> the other is based on political accusations from generals who were jealous of the success of Alkibiades.<sup>62</sup>

Significantly, Alkibiades was not sentenced to exile as a result of the loss of Notion: at the next elections he merely failed to be re-elected as *strategos*.<sup>63</sup> At Samos he was relieved of his command by Konon.<sup>64</sup> Xenophon says that he took one trireme, crewed by mercenaries and followers, and sailed to his stronghold in the Chersonese.<sup>65</sup> Given his experiences in 414, it is probable that he actually owned the trireme and that it was not merely appropriated from the Athenian fleet. It is almost certain that he was paymaster of this group.

59. Xen. *Hell* I.5.11; Krentz (1989: pp138-143); Bruce, on the basis of Alkibiades' visit to Klazomenai, [*Hell* Oxy. III. 40, IV with Bruce (1967: pp35-39)] dates the battle of Notion to autumn 407 or spring 406.
60. Xen. *Hell* I.5.14; Krentz (1989: p140)
61. Plut. *Lysander* 5.1; *Alk.* 35.5; Nepos *Alc* VII.1-2; Diod. XIII.71.1; 73.3-5; Hatzfeld (1951: pp313-315)
62. Diod. XIII.73.6; Hatzfeld (1951: p315) on the role of Thrasyboulos of Kollytos in stirring up Athenian feelings against Alkibiades.
63. Xen. *Hell* I.5.16-18; Diod. XIII.74; cf Krentz (1989: pp142) who believes that Xenophon is merely protecting Alkibiades by glossing over the elections at this time, cf Demosthenes son of Alkisthenes (*PA* 3585) and the election of 425/4. Nepos *Alc* 7.3 and Plut *Lys* 5, say he was deposed from office.
64. Xen. *Hell* I.5.18; Krentz (1989: p143) believes that Konon "clearly" arrived after the departure of Alkibiades, however the text does not necessarily render such an occurrence so obvious.
65. Xen. *Hell* I.5.17

In contrast with his reactions to his first exile, when he fought back against his political enemies, Alkibiades seems to have resigned himself to the fact that he was not going to return home safely to Athens a second time. He chose to enter this voluntary exile in a castle fortress in Thrace.<sup>66</sup> Although there is no evidence that he did not always own castles in Thrace,<sup>67</sup> it is more likely that this consummate user of his *xenoi* had established an escape route in the years from 410 to 407.

The details of the second exile are sketchy but it appears that Alkibiades sustained himself and his mercenaries by brigandage for about a year after Notion.<sup>68</sup> A curious incident occurred when Alkibiades apparently attempted to intervene in the disposition of the fleet of the Athenians at Aigospotamoi and was soundly rebuffed.<sup>69</sup> This could perhaps be interpreted as an attempt to regain his position with the Athenians. It seems unlikely, however, because Alkibiades had no real reason to expect so swift a reversal of the political situation at home<sup>70</sup>. It was more likely to have been the result of a brilliant military strategist being unable to stomach the sight of such blatant folly.

66. There is no record of any charges being laid against him (cf 415/4). In reality the atmosphere was politically rather than legally dangerous to Alkibiades.

67. Nepos *Alc* VII.4: "Id ille ut audivit, domum reverti noluit et se Pactyen contulit ibique tria castella communiit." does not indicate previous possession, nor does it refute such ownership.

68. Nepos *Alc* VII.4-5

69. Xen. *Hell* II.1.25-26; Krentz (1989: p176) believes that in fact Alkibiades would not have been interested in descending for a transparent cause, and that in fact, he intervened to offer the support of local Thracian troops, albeit without success.

70. Xen. *Hell* I.4.17: Alkibiades was being blamed by some at this time for all the ills befalling the Athenians.

His welcome in Thrace having been worn out by piracy and attacks on his neighbours, Alkibiades sought an alternative source of sustenance from an association with the Persian satrap, Pharnabazos. He appears to have had a relationship which could be described as that of *xenos* since Pharnabazos would have been well aware that Alkibiades was of little use to him *vis-à-vis* the Athenians. Yet this worthy provided Alkibiades with a revenue of fifty talents per annum from the town of Grynion in Phrygia.<sup>71</sup> This was an inordinately large sum and Nepos has undoubtedly exaggerated. However, Alkibiades probably received sustenance from the satrap sufficient to permit a reasonable living standard.

It appears that Alkibiades had formed a liaison with a woman called Timandra,<sup>72</sup> and he had at least some followers with him in Phrygia.<sup>73</sup> Some sources recount that Alkibiades formed a plan to seek favour from the Persian king directly by apprising him of the conspiracy of his brother Cyrus to revolt.<sup>74</sup> It was suggested that he was trying to cut out Pharnabazos and

71. Nepos *Alc* IX.3. Herman (1987: p153 and n.95, Appendix C) believes that Alkibiades and Pharnabazos had a "well-entrenched" connection - a *xenia* relationship.

72. Paus. II.2.5; Nepos *Alc* X.6 does not name her.

73. Nepos *Alc* X.5 mentions a man from Arkadia staying with Alkibiades.

74. Diod. XIV.11.2



that the satrap thus ordered his murder.<sup>75</sup> Alternatively it is suggested that the Athenian oligarchs (the Thirty Tyrants) sought his removal as an embarrassment in their dealings with Sparta and Persia.<sup>76</sup> The Spartans themselves, and especially Agis, may have required the death of Alkibiades. The cause of his death was apparently assassination when in Phrygia, but the assassins and the motive have not yet been conclusively identified.

The two voluntary exiles of Alkibiades illustrate the extraordinary opportunities available for survival and relative prosperity open to those persons who had inherited or acquired *xenoi* and cultivated the relationships. Through these relationships opportunities apparently were open even to those who had nothing with which to barter, as was the case of Alkibiades in his interaction with Pharnabazos.

75. Nepos *Alc* 10..4: it seems unlikely however, despite the urgings of Lysander.

76. Nepos *Alc* 10.1-2

## A. PERSONAL

**Name:** Andokides (IV)

**Patronymic:** son of Leogoras

**Deme:** Kydathenaion

**Tribe:** III Pandionis

**Trittys:** City

**PA No:** 828; E Obst *RE* 12 (1924) col 1999

**Genos:** n.k. ? Kephallidai\*

**Date of Birth:** c. 440

**Date of Death:** n.k.

**Magistracies:** *AO* 139 *tamias* 401/0 (Andok. i.132) envoy 392/1 (Philochoros *FGrH* 328 F149a)

**Wealth:** *APF* p27; ?*tamias* in c.399. *Spence* no.14.

## B. EXILE

Certain: four times  
(*Lys.* vi.31, 46, 48, Philochoros *FGrH* 328 F149a)

**Reason:** exiles 1-3 related to the decree of Isotimides in 414 - a form of *atimia* for *asebeia* - life made difficult for him in Athens due to his unpopularity. Exile 4 was related to his role as ambassador to Sparta.

**Date:** 414; 411/10; ?405; 392/1

**Term:** 3-4 years; 4 years; 5 years; life.

**Hetairoi:** Meletos (*PA* 9825), Euphiletos (*PA* 6071)

**Conditions:** n.a.

**Destination:** 1 = Cyprus; 2 = Macedon, Samos; 3 = Sicily, Italy, Elis, Thessaly, Hellespont, Ionia, Cyprus; 4 = n.k. but ?Cyprus

**Xenoi:** ?unnamed in Cyprus; ?unnamed close to the king in Macedon.

**Family Exile:** n.k. but probable, if he married.

**Attitude to Exile:** unsettled - his attempts to return clearly indicate that he was unhappy abroad.

**Return Date:** 411; c. 405; 403; did not return.

**Return Conditions:** by 403 he felt that the decree of Patrokleides applied to override the decree of Isotimides of 414, taken together with the general amnesty.

\* Broadbent (1968: pp243-251)

***Recall Date:*** n.a.

## **C. SOURCES**

### ***Literary:***

Andok. i.132-134; 144; 2.11  
Lys.vi.31, 46, 48  
Philochoros *FGrH* 328 F149a  
Dem. xix.277-280  
Plut. *Mor* 834d - 835b

### ***Epigraphical:*** n.e.

## **D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

MacDowell (1962: pp1-18, 162)  
Calhoun (1964: p24)  
Davies *APF* pp27-31  
Broadbent (1968: pp240-339, esp. pp243-251 with stemma: table ix)  
Hansen (1975: p87 n70)  
Loening (1987: pp140-144)

## ANDOKIDES IV

Andokides (*PA* 828) belonged to a distinguished Athenian family - his grandfather was a *strategos*<sup>1</sup>, and his lineage could be traced back at least to the time of the Peisistratids<sup>2</sup>, and it had a tradition of service to the cause of democracy of which Andokides was keen to remind the Athenians in defence of his own actions.<sup>3</sup>

Notwithstanding his claims of affiliation with the democracy, Andokides was an *hetairos* of Meletos (*PA* 9825 Entry 29) and Euphiletos (*PA* 6071 Entry 43)<sup>4</sup>, an association with distinctly non-democratic overtones. With his *hetairoi*, Andokides took part in at least the profanation of the Mysteries in or before 415, and was denounced and imprisoned. Andokides turned State's evidence and agreed to testify against those others also involved, in return for a guarantee of immunity from prosecution (*adeia*).<sup>5</sup>

In 415/4 the decree of Isotimides was passed, which barred those guilty of impiety from the civic and religious life of Athens - a form of *atimia*. Since Andokides had admitted to the charge of profanation and thus had committed *asebeia*, he was included in the terms of the decree. The animosity towards him was sufficiently strong that Andokides decided to leave Athens.<sup>6</sup> His destination was Cyprus, to which he returned twice more in later years. The

1. Aisch. ii.31; *IG* i<sup>2</sup> 393.4. Plut. *Alk* 21.1; *Mor* 834d - the lineage is claimed to have descent from Hermes. Balogh (1943: pp32f). See also Broadbent (1968: pp243-251 with stemma: table ix). See Develin *AO* p48, who doubts that Leogoras was a general.
2. See Entry 4.
3. Andok. i.106; ii.26
4. Andok. i.63
5. Plut. *Mor* 834e; Lys vi.23
6. Lys. vi.25-26

inescapable assumption is that he (and probably his family) had a close *xenia* relationship with an unknown person in Cyprus.<sup>7</sup>

Although not specifically mentioned, his family may have accompanied him since it was in every sense a voluntary exile, although it is not known to what extent the odium which attached to his person, also extended to his family. As MacDowell points out,<sup>8</sup> his father was still alive at this time, although Andokides' house was occupied by Kleophon.<sup>9</sup> If his family had remained in Athens, and his friends had earlier escaped into exile and scattered, this would explain the desire of Andokides to return to Athens as soon as practicable. He decided that he would need to buy his way back into favour, and used his family's connections with Macedon's royal house (another *xenia* relationship) to acquire timber for Athenian shipbuilding, together with other items in short supply.<sup>10</sup> In 411 he transported his offerings to the fleet at Samos then returned to Athens. However, at this time the oligarchs had taken control in Athens. The actions of Andokides were construed as hostile to them and he was imprisoned on the orders of Peisandros (*PA* 11770 Entry 62).<sup>11</sup> Although released at the restoration of the democracy in 410, Andokides found himself still out of favour and he was forced to leave Athens again and return to Cyprus.<sup>12</sup>

7. Herman (1987: pp169-170)

8. MacDowell (1962: p2)

9. Andok. i.146, MacDowell (1962: p164)

10. Andok. ii.11-12: oar spars, corn and bronze.

11. Andok. ii.13-15; Lys. vi.27

12. Lys. vi.28

His attempt to return in 405 failed as he could not convince the Athenians that he was worthy of return despite the services he had done for the Athenians. The third exile, in 405, led Andokides to Sicily and Italy, Elis, Thessaly, the Hellespont and Ionia, before again arriving in Cyprus.<sup>13</sup> These wanderings bespeak a restlessness which led Andokides to again attempt a return in 403/2, probably under the auspices of the decree of Patrokleides. He was accepted into the community and took active roles in the political and social life of Athens. In 400/399 he was prosecuted by Kephisios for impiety, since the decree of Isotimides was claimed not to have been rescinded by the general reconciliation of 403/2.<sup>14</sup> Andokides successfully defended himself from this charge, which was apparently instigated by his personal (that is, as opposed to political) enemy, Kallias.<sup>15</sup>

Andokides continued his successful political and social life at Athens, and in 392/1 was appointed as one of four ambassadors to Sparta.<sup>16</sup> Andokides' final exile resulted from this mission, since the peace negotiated with Sparta was unacceptable to the Athenians. The ambassadors were accused of taking bribes and with misconduct of their mission.<sup>17</sup> The ambassadors all fled before their trials could take place, and were sentenced to death *in absentia*.<sup>18</sup>

13. Lys. vi.6-7

14. Lys. vi.37, 42; MacDowell (1962: pp10-11). See also Loening (1987: pp140-144).

15. The context of Andok. i, with MacDowell (1962)

16. Philochoros 328 F149a

17. Dem. xix.277-279

18. Hansen (1975: p87 no 70)

Although the destination of this final exile of Andokides is unknown, it is presumed to be Cyprus, as he had found refuge there twice before. His aristocratic lineage, the evidence that he had been offered an estate in Cyprus for his upkeep, and his continued return to the island, all indicate strongly the presence of a *xenos* in Cyprus.<sup>19</sup> Although he appeared during his first exile to have offended the king of Kition,<sup>20</sup> he seemed to have confidence in his welcome there in subsequent exile periods. This too indicates the presence of a *xenos*, as even kings recognised the obligations under this form of ritualised friendship. Andokides may also have had *xenia* relationships in Macedon<sup>21</sup> and in Elis,<sup>22</sup> Thessaly and elsewhere in Ionia, which allowed him to move around the Mediterranean and Aegean, outside the reach of Athens, and at the same time to sustain himself (and possibly a family) during his voluntary exiles.

On the other hand there is a tradition that Davies accepts<sup>23</sup> that Andokides spent his exiles engaged in trade and commerce, and made himself wealthy in the process. This would account for his widespread travels and for his ability to undertake considerable liturgies in the period between his return and his last exile.<sup>24</sup> Access to wealth would enable him to make the purchases which he obtained from Macedon in timber and from Cyprus in corn, to send to the Athenians. In addition, he was absent during each exile for periods of time which were

19. Herman (1987: pp169-170) following Lys. vi.48; Andok. i.4 with MacDowell (1962: p5)

20. Lys. vi 26

21. Herman (1987: p88)

22. Plut. *Mor* 835a

23. *APF* p31; Lys. vi.48

24. Andok. i.132-134; Plut. *Mor* 835b

sufficiently long to provide for the establishment and conduct of trading relationships.<sup>25</sup> It is probable that Andokides survived his exiles by a combination of trade and using his *xenia* relationships. This is part of the pattern which emerged in the late fifth century as the older *xenia* relationships across international boundaries gave way to forms of self-reliance such as trade, mercenary service and establishment of estates in far-flung outposts as a hedge for their future usefulness.

25. Lys. vi.20 indicates that Andokides was a ship-owner for the purposes of trade during his exile.



**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Gylon

**Patronymic:** n.k.

**Deme:** Kerameis

**Tribe:** V Akamantis

**Tritty:** City

**PA No:** 3098; T Thalheim, *RE* 5 (1905) p169ff (6)

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** n.k.

**Date of Death:** n.k. but in Athens

**Magistracies:** AO 1314 *phrouarchos* (Aisch. iii.171)

**Wealth:** Through his wife (Aisch. iii.172) *APF* p92;pp121-122

**B. EXILE**

Certain. Aisch. iii.171-172

**Reason:** Betrayal of Nymphaion to Satyros

**Date:** 410-405

**Term:** Probably stayed away for at least five years

**Conditions:** Condemned to death *in absentia*

**Hetairoi:** n.k.

**Destination:** Court of Satyros at Pantikaieion

**Xenoi:** n.k.

**Family Exile:** No. He married in exile and sent his daughters to Athens.

**Attitude to Exile:** Can be implied that he wanted to come home because he had lobbied to have his sentence commuted to a fine.

**Return Date:** late 400s or late 380s depending upon which tradition is followed.

**Return Conditions:** Death sentence commuted to a fine.

**Recall Date:** n.a.

### **C. SOURCES**

#### ***Literary:***

Dem. xxviii.1-3;  
Aisch. iii.171-172;  
Plut. *Dem* 4.2  
[Plut] *Mor* 844a

#### ***Epigraphical:*** n.e.

### **D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

*ATL* Vol.1, pp527-528  
Davies *APF* p121  
Hansen (1975: p83 no. 64)

GYLON

The exile of Gylon (*PA* 3098) is certain, and was voluntary, in that he stayed away from Athens after having betrayed a colony, Nymphaion, to the tyrant Satyros of Pantikapeion.<sup>1</sup> Since Gylon was phrourarch in charge of the garrison at the colony, he would have been well aware that he would face a charge of treason and prudently chose to remain in the Bosphoros. He was probably condemned to death *in absentia*.<sup>2</sup>

The date of the incident is uncertain, and is probably 405/4, since it could have been occasioned by the defeat at Aigospotamoi.<sup>3</sup> The source for the incident is Aischines (*PA* 354),<sup>4</sup> and forms part of an attack on his political opponent, Demosthenes (*PA* 3597), whose grandfather was Gylon. Despite this, Demosthenes does not refute the charge of the betrayal, so it is securely attested.

However, Demosthenes<sup>5</sup> proves that his grandfather's fine had been paid before his death,

1. Aisch. iii.171; however, Plut. *Dem* 4.2 says he was banished: ...*prodosias pheugontos ex asteos*...
2. Hansen (1975: p83 no. 64)
3. *ATL* Vol. 1 p527
4. Aisch. iii.171-2
5. Dem. xxviii.1-3

which implies that the death sentence was commuted to a fine, allowing for Gylon's return to Athens. Aischines states that he had married a wealthy 'Scythian', and that his daughters were sent to Athens and married prominent citizens.<sup>6</sup> It can be concluded that Gylon's wife was probably Athenian and Aischines was being spiteful.<sup>7</sup> Further, the condemnation of Gylon in no way affected the status of his children. For, if this had been the case, it is doubtful that Demosthenes' father would have married Kleoboule, despite the wealth he thus accessed, as he would have automatically disenfranchised his offspring. His son Demosthenes, the orator, participated in Athenian political life unchallenged on his right to do so, thus proving his citizenship and that of his parents.

For his maintenance during exile, Gylon received from the tyrant Satyros the area known as Kepoi ('the Gardens'), a Milesian colony.<sup>8</sup> Thus his exile was not fraught with difficulties of survival, and his marriage to a wealthy woman facilitated his support during the period in exile.

Davies<sup>9</sup> believes that Gylon had not returned to Athens by the time of the marriage of his

6. Aisch. iii.172: such abuse of the parents of one's opponents was commonplace in the practice of politics of this period.

7. *APF* p122

8. Aisch. iii.171

9. *APF* p122

daughters though he gives no support for this view. Further he maintains that Gylon probably did not return at all, since there was no provision for Kleoboule to return to her father's house at the death of her husband. However, this could mean that Gylon was dead at that time; or only that he was not Kleoboule's *kyrios*. Although the evidence for a return to Athens is circumstantial, being the payment of his fine, it is probable that he did return, especially as the general amnesty of 403/2 would have applied to him, if his "crime" had occurred as a direct result of Aigospotamoi. Otherwise, why bother having the sentence commuted to a fine - he had sufficient means of support to have remained safely in exile.

In summary, it appears that Gylon betrayed Nymphaion in 405/4 to Satyros of Pantikapeion;<sup>10</sup> that the latter gave him sustenance in the form of income from Keroi; that he married a wealthy local woman, of Athenian descent; and that he sent his daughters back to Athens before he himself returned. His return was facilitated by the general amnesty of 403, but the actual return was conditional upon the commuting of his death sentence to a fine. The date

10. According to Davies (*APF* p121), Mittelhaus has established this.

of his return would presumably have been after his children were of marriageable age, that is some fifteen years after the birth of the younger, so a *terminus ante quem* would be 385/4. Since his sons-in-law inherited his wealth,<sup>11</sup> the *quid pro quo* may have been that the families of the grooms or the grooms themselves, arranged for the commuting of Gylon's sentence. Whilst this is unsupported, it is more in keeping with the known facts than the assumption of a permanent exile for Gylon.

Gylon almost certainly handed Nymphaion over to Satyros as a direct result of Aigospotamoi,<sup>12</sup> thus his actions were mostly political. He was unable to return to Athens, except under threat of death as a commander of Athenian forces, in Lysander's ferocious aftermath to that battle. Handing Nymphaion to Satyros may even have been a measure designed to preserve the colony from Spartan hands. Although this was technically a treasonable act, with the disintegration of Athens politically as well as militarily, the choices for Gylon were limited.

11. Dem. xviii.1-3

12. There is perhaps a suggestion that Gylon was party to a larger act of treachery against Athens at this time - Xen. *Hell* II.1.32; Plut. *Lys* 11; *Alk* 37. Cf Krentz (1989: p180) who felt that the case for treason has not been proved and that " [I]n fact no general need have committed treason."

**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Charikles

**Patronymic:** son of Apollodoros

**Deme:** n.k.

**Tribe:** VI Oineis<sup>1</sup>

**Tritty:** n.k.

**PA No:** 15407

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** n.k.

**Date of Death:** n.k.

**Magistracies:** AO: 644 zetetes 415 (Andok. i.14.36)  
strategos 414/13 (Thuc. VII.20.1)

**Wealth:** probable - APF pp502-3,  
p572

**B. EXILE**

Certain (Lys. xiii.73-74)

**Reason:** Fall of the Four Hundred

**Date:** 411/410

**Term:** Maximum 7 years

**Conditions:** n.a.

**Hetairoi:** Peisandros (PA 11770),  
Teisias (PA 13479), Kritias (PA  
8792)

**Destination:** ?Spartan territory

**Xenoi:** n.k.

**Family Exile:** n.k.

**Attitude to Exile:** n.k.

**Return Date:** 404/3

**Return Conditions:** Voluntary,  
after the fall of Athens

**Recall Date:** n.a.

1. But see also Develin AO p184.

## **C. SOURCES**

### ***Literary:***

Telecleides F41

Thuc. VII.20

Xen. *Mem* I.2.31

*Hell* II.3.2

Andok. i.36; 101

Lys. vii.55; xii.55; xiii.73-74

Isok. xvi.42

Arist. *Politics* 1305b.24f

Diod. XIII.9

Plut. *Nikias* 4

### ***Epigraphical:* n.e.**

## **D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

MacDowell (1962: p87)

Davies *APF* pp502-503

Krentz (1982: p55)



## CHARIKLES

We are indebted to the lucidity of Davies and MacDowell<sup>1</sup> for the present understanding of the exile of Charikles (*PA* 15407), which is attested by Isokrates.<sup>2</sup> However, Isokrates does not state the date or the circumstances, and it is from the statements of Lysias that we can ascertain them. He states that the majority of the Four Hundred who formed the oligarchic revolutionary government at Athens 411/10 escaped into exile at the fall of that regime.<sup>3</sup> He goes on to suggest that Charikles went into exile in company with Peisandros (*PA* 11770 Entry 62).<sup>4</sup> The pointer to the date as being 411/10 rather than later is that Isokrates also states that Charikles returned to Athens to do further harm to the city.<sup>5</sup> Given his prominence amongst the Thirty Tyrants in 404/3, he could hardly have returned after that era, and so the return is most probable in the period pre-404/3.<sup>6</sup>

The exile must be presumed to have been voluntary as the general impression from Xenophon is one of haste. Had his brother-in-law Teisias (*PA* 14379)<sup>7</sup> not also been a member of the

1. *APF* p502; MacDowell (1962: p87)
2. *Isok.* xvi.42
3. *Lys.* xiii.73
4. *Lys.* xiii.74
5. *Isok.* xvi.42
6. *Xen. Hell* II.3.2; *Arist. Politics* 1305b.
7. *Isok.* xvi.42

Four Hundred, then a more planned family departure could be proposed.

We have no direct evidence concerning the way in which Charikles was sustained during his exile, though it is relatively certain that he was a man of means in Athens prior to the advent of the Four Hundred. Firstly, his brother-in-law Teisias (*PA* 13479) was apparently quite wealthy, even after a long war,<sup>8</sup> and Charikles was himself *strategos* in 414/13,<sup>9</sup> a post that even then required the leisure provided by wealth to ensure effective participation.<sup>10</sup> Notwithstanding the circumstantial nature of the evidence, it is more than likely that Charikles was a man of means, if only because of his connection with Teisias, and thus Alkibiades (*PA* 600) and his set.<sup>11</sup>

The wealth of Charikles is irrelevant to his exile if considered in isolation, assuming that those members of the Four Hundred had fled Athens somewhat hurriedly, unless, like Alkibiades after 415,<sup>12</sup> they had provided themselves with a means of survival outside the reach of the

8. *APF* p502: Teisias could afford to pay 5 or 8 talents for his horses for Olympia in 416.

9. Thuc. VII.20.1; *HCT IV* p396

10. [Xen] 1-3; Lamachos (*PA* 8981) was an oddity at this time - a poor general (Plut. *Nikias* 15.1), although even so, such poverty could only have been relative.

11. Isok. xvi.46

12. Xen. *Hell* II.1.25: Alkibiades had provided himself with a safe haven.

Athenian political and military machine. Given that those involved did not anticipate the failure which rapidly overtook the Four Hundred, there is no reason to suppose that either Charikles or his colleagues made any such arrangements. This means that whatever wealth and/or family he possessed were probably left behind, providing another motive for his eventual return, and impetus for the vigour with which it was accomplished.

There is no direct evidence to show the destination for the exile of Charikles, but it was probably Sparta or one of the Peloponnesian allies. This can be supposed firstly because prominent figures in Athens were traditionally predisposed to flee to the enemy;<sup>13</sup> secondly, because, as Carter has demonstrated,<sup>14</sup> the prominent classes in Athens were more 'international', that is, they had *xenia* relationships of long standing which often confused their loyalties, but more importantly, provided a safe haven in times of need. There is no evidence to suggest that Charikles had such a relationship with a Spartan specifically, but Sparta (or one of its close allies) is a possible destination, given the fact that, although Xenophon reports that the *ekklesia* voted for the government of the Thirty Tyrants, Lysander

13. For example: Hippias (PA 7605), Themistokles (PA 6669), Alkibiades III (PA 600) (his first exile).

14. Carter (1986: p46). See also note 18: 'Sparta' really means some surrounding territory over which Sparta had the ability to provide the equivalent of sinecures as it is generally accepted that only Spartans themselves occupied the actual site of Sparta in Lakonia. An example is Xenophon (PA 11307, Entry 78), settled by the Spartans at Skillos in Elis.

and his forces were on hand to ensure that the right outcome ensued.<sup>15</sup> His participation in the Four Hundred would provide some credentials acceptable to Lysander, were they enough to counteract the fact that this man was unusual because he had been a prominent democrat.<sup>16</sup> Most importantly, in 414/13 he had held the most senior office in the political hierarchy, that of *strategos*, elected by the radical democracy as one of its favourite sons.<sup>17</sup> It is more probable that the committed oligarch of 404/3 acquired his attitudes and his credentials as an exile in Sparta.<sup>18</sup>

There is no evidence of the fate of Charikles, whether he died in the fighting which saw the eventual restoration of the democracy,<sup>19</sup> or managed to escape to another life; nor is there further evidence on his exile, nor the fate of his family and possessions.

15. Xen. *Hell* II.3.2: Krentz (1989: p190) demonstrates that Lysander used threats to ensure the normal democratic formula was applied which disguised the fact that the *demos* "did not agree readily".
16. Andok. i.36: in 415 Charikles had been one of the prosecutors of those standing trial for profanation of the Mysteries and mutilation of the Hermai. This does not necessarily presuppose a democratic political outlook, however the *strategia* tend to support this view. Or, it may imply a religious conservatism or piety. cf Plut. *Nikias* 304) See also note 17.
17. It is not unreasonable to assume that Charikles, if he was one of the *hetairoi* of Alkibiades, was "elected on the ticket". Yet he was given considerable command imperatives (Thuc. VII.20), which suggests that he possessed sound military, and also political skills.
18. Or, like Xenophon (*PA* 11307 Entry 78), Charikles may have been provided for in an allied territory in the Peloponnese.
19. Since he was a military man, it is probable that he was among the fighters rather than the quitters, and may have died in that role; there is no evidence to determine his eventual fate.

**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Onomakles

**Patronymic:** n.k.

**Deme:** n.k.

**Tribe:** ?VII Kekropis

**Trittyes:** n.k.

**PA No:** 11476

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** n.k.

**Date of Death:** n.k.

**Magistracies:** AO 2211 *strategos* 412 (Thuc. VIII.25ff, 30.2) Envoy 411 (Plut. *Mor* 832f-833a; 833e-834c)

**Wealth:** n.k. but probable until exile

**B. EXILE**

Certain (Plut. *Mor* 833e-f, 834a)

**Reason:** Fall of the Four Hundred

**Date:** 410

**Term:** maximum 7 years

**Conditions:** n.a.

**Destination:** n.k.

**Xenoi:** n.k.

**Hetairoi:** n.k.

**Family Exile:** n.k.

**Attitude to Exile:** n.k.

**Return Date:** ?404/3

**Return Conditions:** return of exiles as a condition of the peace with Sparta.

**Recall Date:** n.a.

**C. SOURCES**

**Literary:**

Thuc. VIII.25.1; 30

Lys. xiii.74

Xen. *Hell* II.3.2

Plut. *Mor* 833e-f, 834a

**Epigraphical:** IG I<sup>3</sup> 472 18

**D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

Hansen (1975: pp114f)

Krentz (1982: p51, pp53-55)

## ONOMAKLES

Onomakles was a member of the oligarchic revolutionary government of the Four Hundred. Along with a number of others he was charged with treason for his part in an embassy which the Four Hundred sent to Sparta to sue for peace.<sup>1</sup> Onomakles escaped from Athens prior to his trial and although his whereabouts in exile are not documented, it is probable that he gravitated towards Lakonia or a Spartan ally. His colleagues on the embassy, Antiphon (*PA* 1304) and Archeptolemos (*PA* 2384), were found guilty and executed. Their property was confiscated, their houses destroyed and burial in Attika was refused. In addition, their descendants suffered hereditary *atimia*.<sup>2</sup> By his flight it is reasonable to assume, as Hansen<sup>3</sup> does, that Onomakles was declared guilty *in absentia*, and his property and heirs were treated similarly to those of his colleagues.

This particularly severe sentence was a probable cause for Onomakles to embrace wholeheartedly the extreme oligarchic position which had its result in the rise of the Thirty at Athens, of which he was a member.

1. Plut. *Mor* 833f; Hansen (1975: p113 no.137)
2. Plut. *Mor* 834a
3. Hansen (1975: p114)

Krentz<sup>4</sup> believes that Onomakles was politically active before 411, and his voluntary political exile in the face of the fall of the Four Hundred attests to a keen sense of the prevailing mood of the *demos*. At the fall of Athens, Onomakles took advantage of the requirement of the Spartans that Athens take back her exiles.<sup>5</sup> He returned to Athens to be among the instigators of the regime of the Thirty.

During his exile, Onomakles probably had little option in terms of destination, unless he also owned property beyond the reach of the Athenians to provide him with an income. More probably, as a politically astute and militarily experienced<sup>6</sup> operative of oligarchic inclination, he may have become part of the command, or at least the retinue of Lysander.<sup>7</sup> Certainly, his rank as *strategos* would be appropriate for earning his way, although *xenia* relationships are not precluded.

After their downfall, the Thirty were excluded from the general decree of amnesty,<sup>8</sup> and Onomakles may have been killed in the fighting or again escaped into a second, final exile. Nothing is known of the fate of the family of Onomakles either during his exile, or when he returned to Athens so briefly in 404/3.

4. Krentz (1982: p55)

5. Xen. *Hell* II.2.20, 23

6. Thuc. VIII.24 1-2: Onomakles was *strategos* in 412/11, a position in the democracy which required considerable political standing in addition to military prowess and experience.

7. As was, for example, Aristoteles (*PA* 2057 Entry 60): Xen. *Hell* II.2.18

8. *Ath Pol* 39.6

## A. PERSONAL

**Name:** Aristoteles<sup>1</sup>

**Patronymic:** ?son of Timokrates

**Deme:** n.k.

**Tribe:** X Antiochis

**Tritty:** n.k.

**PA No:** 2057 = 2055

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** n.k.

**Date of Death:** n.k.

**Magistracies:** n.k.

**Wealth:** n.k.

## B. EXILE

Certain (Lys. xiii.43-46, Xen. *Hell* I.2.18, 3.46)

**Reason:** fall of the Four Hundred

**Date:** 411/10 (Xen. *Hell* II.2.18)

**Hetairoi:** ?Peisandros (PA 11770)  
Pythodoros (PA 12412)

**Term:** 7 years

**Conditions:** n.a.

**Destination:** Lakonia and with Lysander

**Xenoi:** ?Lysander

**Family Exile:** n.k.

**Attitude to Exile:** n.k.

**Return Date:** 404/3

**Return Conditions:** return of exiles  
demanded by Lysander.

**Recall Date:** n.k.

## C. SOURCES

**Literary:**

Lys. xiii.43-46

Xen. *Hell* II.2.18, 3.46

**Epigraphical:** n.e.

## D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

Krentz (1982: pp51-55; 87, 136)

1. Krentz (p51) puts Aristoteles in tribe X Antiochis, and there is some confusion concerning his patronymic. Krentz suggests that he is the son of Timokrates, in which case he may have been *strategos* in 431 as well as *strategos* under the Four Hundred in 411. He was also *nauarchos* in 426/5. See Develin *AO* pp118, 127 and 160.



**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Aischines

**Patronymic:** n.k.

**Deme:** n.k.

**Tribe:** ?VII Kekropis

**Tritty's:** n.k.

**PA No:** 341

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** n.k.

**Date of Death:** n.k.

**Magistracies:** AO 49

**Wealth:** n.k. APF p6 he is not  
PA 343 who was liturgical.

**B. EXILE**

Certain (Xen. *Hell* II.3.2, 3.13)

**Reason:** Fall of the Four Hundred

**Date:** 411/10 (Xen. *Hell* II.3.13)

**Hetairoi:** ?Aristoteles (PA 2057)

**Term:** ?7 years

**Conditions:** n.a.

**Destination:** ?Lakonia and with Lysander

**Xenoi:** ?Lysander

**Family Exile:** n.k.

**Attitude to Exile:** n.k.

**Return Date:** 404/3

**Return Conditions:** return of exiles  
demanded by Lysander.

**Recall Date:** n.a.

**C. SOURCES**

**Literary:**  
Xen. *Hell* II.3.2; 3.13

**Epigraphical:** n.e.

**D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

Krentz (1982: p51, p87, p136)

ARISTOTELES, AISCHINES

Aristoteles (*PA* 2057 = 2055) was a member of the oligarchic regime, the Four Hundred,<sup>1</sup> although he had been active politically prior to 411/10.<sup>2</sup> At the fall of the Four Hundred he, together with other extreme oligarchs such as Peisandros (*PA* 11770 Entry 62), fled from Athens. He eventually found his way to the Spartans. How Aristoteles spent his years in exile from 411/10 to 404/3 remains a mystery, but in 404/3 he was apparently part of the command of Lysander at the defeat of Athens.<sup>3</sup> If Aristoteles was the son of Timokrates then he was a general in 426,<sup>4</sup> and a military background would be of use to him in the service of Lysander. It is probable that his property was confiscated in 411/0 and therefore he would have relied on *xenia* relationships which he undoubtedly had in oligarchic Sparta, possibly even with Lysander himself. Alternatively he may have obtained access to any of his property not immediately controlled by, or able to be accessed by Athens.

He was sent by Lysander to Sparta from the post-defeat siege of the city of Athens<sup>5</sup> to assist the process of obtaining a settlement of the siege with Theramenes (*PA* 7234). As a condition of the end of hostilities against Athens, Lysander required not only that the city's walls be torn

1. Krentz (1982: p55)

2. *loc cit*

3. *Xen. Hell* II.2.18

4. *SEG* 21.72 with Krentz (1982: p52)

5. *Xen. Hell* II.2.18, II.3.13

down,<sup>6</sup> *inter alia* he required the return of all political exiles.<sup>7</sup> Aristoteles was able to return under this amnesty, and became active politically almost immediately as part of the new arrangements which disposed of the democracy and established the limited oligarchy of the Thirty.<sup>8</sup>

After their downfall, the Thirty were excluded from the decree of reconciliation known by the name of the eponymous archon Eukleides.<sup>9</sup> Although it is reasonable to assume that some of the Thirty escaped from Eleusis and went into permanent exile, the fate of Aristoteles is not known and he may have been among those who died in the fighting around Peiraeus.

Aischines (*PA* 341) is known only by his membership of the Thirty<sup>10</sup> and by the fact that he was with Aristoteles when they were both attached to the command of Lysander.<sup>11</sup> Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that Aischines was also one of the oligarchs who fled Athens at the fall of the Four Hundred and that the facts which pertain to Aristoteles also apply generally to Aischines. There is no other extant detail concerning his exile, or of his life prior to the regime of the Thirty, of which he was one and in whose atrocities he undoubtedly took part.<sup>12</sup>

6. *Xen. Hell* II.2.20, 23

7. *Xen Hell* II.2.20, 23

8. *Xen. Hell* II.3.2-3; *Ath Pol* 34.3; *Hist.Athen. Const.* pp284-298

9. *Ath Pol* 39.6

10. *Xen. Hell* II.3.2

11. *Xen. Hell* II.3.13

12. *Lys.* xiii.43-46

## A. PERSONAL

**Name:** Peisandros

**Patronymic:** n.k.

**Deme:** Acharnai

**Tribe:** VI Oineis

**Trittys:** Inland

**PA No:** 11770

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** n.k.

**Date of Death:** n.k.

**Magistracies:** AO 2281 zetetes 415 (Andok. i.14.36)  
envoy 412 (Thuc. VIII.49)

**Wealth:** Probable, although not in  
APF

## B. EXILE

Certain (Thuc. VIII.98.1)

**Reason:** Fled after fall of the  
Four Hundred

**Date:** 410

**Term:** Probably life

**Conditions:** n.k.

**Destination:** ?Sparta via Dekeleia, then Persia

**Xenoi:** n.k.

**Hetairoi:** Antiphon (PA 1279),  
Charikles (PA 15407)

**Family Exile:** n.k.

**Attitude to Exile:** n.k.

**Return Date:** n.k.

**Return Conditions:** n.k.

**Recall Date:** n.k.

## C. SOURCES

**Literary:**

**Epigraphical:** n.e.

Thuc. VIII.98.1

Ar. *Peace* 395; *Birds* 1556; *Lys* 498ff

Xen. *Hell* I.2.4; I.3.22

Andok. i.27; 36; 43; ii.13-15

*Ath Pol* 32.2

Nepos *Alc* 5.3

Plut. *Alk* 26.1

#### **D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

*HCT V* pp116-117; p340

Woodhead (1954: pp131-146)

MacDowell (1962 p80, p138, p190)

Bloedow (1973: pp34-37)

Hofstetter (1978: p146 no. 248)

Rhodes (1981: pp407-409)

PEISANDROS

As one of the leading figures in the oligarchic revolution of 411, Peisandros (*PA* 11770) fled from Athens to the Spartan fort at Dekeleia<sup>1</sup> in the company of Alexikles (*PA* 535) and other leaders of the regime, when the attempt at oligarchy failed in 410. One reason for their flight was fear of reprisals by the restored democracy, since the regime had been repressive and responsible for the deaths of many democrat opponents.<sup>2</sup>

Peisandros was apparently wealthy prior to his flight, as his lands were sold by the restored democracy in his absence.<sup>3</sup> Yet his flight probably precluded arrangements for his sustenance in exile, as he made his way eventually to Persia,<sup>4</sup> and was there after the end of the War, so it is presumed that he survived in exile by military service as a mercenary. This is likely since Nepos states that Peisandros was at one time *strategos*,<sup>5</sup> so he possessed the necessary military credentials.

1. Thuc. VIII.98.1; *HCT V* p340 for Alexikles and Peisandros.
2. For example Androkles (*PA* 870), Thuc. VIII.65.2f. Sealey (1976: p360) on the use of the *hetaireiai* as instruments of fear and to orchestrate change.
3. Lys. vii.4
4. Hofstetter (1978: p146)
5. Nepos *Alc* 5.3 uses the term *praetor*.

There is no indication of the fate of the family of Peisandros, although it is possible that he may have had time to arrange their hasty departure. There is no evidence to suggest that Peisandros went from Dekeleia to Sparta, and he may have chosen to go directly to Persia, since he had been at least acquainted with Tissaphernes in the previous year.<sup>6</sup>

He is not mentioned as one of the Thirty Tyrants who returned to Athens after the defeat, unlike his revolutionary colleague Charikles (*PA* 15407 Entry 58).<sup>7</sup> His fate is thus unknown, but since he was in Persia in 394,<sup>8</sup> it is presumed that he never returned to Athens.

6. Thuc. VIII.56.1f

7. Xen. *Hell* II.3.2; Krentz (1982: p51)

8. Hofstetter (1978: p146)

**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Alexikles

**Patronymic:** n.k.

**Deme:** n.k.

**Tribe:** n.k.

**Trittys:** n.k.

**PA No:** 535

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** n.k.

**Date of Death:** n.k.

**Magistracies:** AO 75 strategos in 411 (Thuc.VIII.92.4)

**Wealth:** n.k.

**B. EXILE**

Certain (Thuc.VIII.98.1)

**Reason:** Fall of the Four Hundred

**Date:** 410

**Term:** n.k. may not have come back.

**Conditions:** n.a.

**Destination:** Dekeleia, initially (Thuc. VIII.98.1)

**Hetairoi:** Peisandros (PA 11770)

**Xenoi:** n.k.

**Family Exile:** n.k.

**Attitude to Exile:** n.k.

**Return Date:** n.k.

**Return Conditions:** n.k.

**Recall Date:** n.k.

**C. SOURCES**

**Literary:**

**Epigraphical:** n.k.

Thuc. VIII.92.4; 93.1; 98.1  
Lyk. Leok 115

**D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

HCT V p311



ALEXIKLES

See Entry 62 (Peisandros *PA*11770) for the reasons which led to this exile. Other than the fact that Alexikles was a general under the oligarchy, and that he fled with Peisandros at the fall of the Four Hundred,<sup>1</sup> nothing else is known of him.

Lykourgos mentions that an Alexikles was killed by the *demos* for attempting to defend Phrynichos (*PA* 15011), and was refused burial in Attika as a result.<sup>2</sup> However, in the light of the evidence of Thucydides regarding his exile, it appears that this passage is from a less reliable source: the names of the protagonists and the facts themselves are doubtful.<sup>3</sup>

Though Thucydides states that Alexikles was temporarily in the hands of the militia towards the end of the revolution, he was subsequently released.<sup>4</sup> There are no other extant details of the length of his exile, or of his family, and certainly no indication of his eventual

1. Thuc. VIII.92.4; 98.1-2

2. Lyk. *Leok* 115

3. *HCT* V p311

4. Thuc. VIII.93.1; *HCT* V p340 commentary on 98.1-2

destination. Alexikles is, however, a definite voluntary political exile, this occasioned by his role in the oligarchy. His initial destination was the Spartan encampment at Dekeleia, which was the most easily accessible haven at this time for those of a non-democratic persuasion.<sup>5</sup>

5. Thuc. VIII.98.1. *HCT V* p340 discounts Lyk. *Leok* 115 that Alexikles was executed.

ALKIBIADES III

**The Arginousai Affair**  
**Entries 64 - 70**

**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Aristogenes

**Patronymic:** n.k.

**Deme:** n.k.

**Tribe:** n.k.

**Trittys:** n.k.

**PA No:** 1781

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** n.k.

**Date of Death:** n.k.

**Magistracies:** AO 398 strategos 406/5  
(Xen. *Hell* I.5.16)

**Wealth:** n.k.

**B. EXILE**

Certain (Xen. *Hell* I.7.2; Diod. XIII.101.5)

**Reason:** Fear of retribution after  
Arginousai

**Date:** 406/5

**Term:** n.k.

**Conditions:** n.a.

**Destination:** n.k.

**Hetairoi:** ?Alkibiades III (PA 600)

**Xenoi:** n.k.

**Family Exile:** Probably not, due to  
circumstances

**Attitude to Exile:** n.k.

**Return Date:** n.k.

**Return Conditions:** n.k.

**Recall Date:** n.k.

**C. SOURCES**

**Literary:**

**Epigraphical:** n.e.

Xen. *Hell* I.5.16, I.7.2  
Diod. XIII.101.5

**D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

Andrewes (1974: pp112-122)  
Hansen (1975: p84 no.66)  
Roberts (1982: p65, pp178-179)  
Sinclair (1988: pp169-172)

**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Protomachos

**Patronymic:** n.k.

**Deme:** n.k.

**Tribe:** n.k.

**Trittys:** n.k.

**PA No:** 12318 [ ? = 12321 ]\*

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** n.k.

**Date of Death:** n.k.

**Magistracies:** AO 2634 strategos 406/5  
(Xen. *Hell* I.5.16)

**Wealth:** n.k.

**B. EXILE**

Certain (Xen. *Hell* I.7.2; Diod. XIII.101.5)

**Reason:** Fear of retribution after  
Arginousai

**Date:** 406/5

**Term:** n.k.

**Conditions:** n.a.

**Hetairoi:** n.k. ?Alkibiades III (PA  
600)

**Destination:** n.k.

**Xenoi:** n.k.

**Family Exile:** Probably not, due  
to circumstances.

**Attitude to Exile:** n.k.

**Return Date:** n.k.\*

**Return Conditions:** n.k.\*

**Recall Date:** n.k.

**C. SOURCES**

**Literary:**

**Epigraphical:** n.e.

Xen. *Hell* I.7.2  
Diod. XIII.101.5

\* If he is the same man as PA 12321, he was possibly a trierarch at Aigospotamoi. Cf *APF* p480; *IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 1951 line 313.

#### **D. *SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY***

Andrewes (1974: pp112-122)

Hansen (1975: p84 no.66)

Roberts (1982: p65, pp178-179)

Sinclair (1988: p101, pp169-172)

ARISTOGENES, PROTOMACHOS

That Aristogenes (*PA* 1781) and Protomachos (*PA* 12318) were voluntary exiles is not disputed, since they deliberately failed to return after the battle of Arginousai, as is attested by Xenophon<sup>1</sup>, Diodoros<sup>2</sup>, and Aristotle.<sup>3</sup>

There is little knowledge of either of these generals other than their names and the fact that they were elected *strategoi*. There are no extant records of their political or military experiences, or of their families either before or after their exiles. Nor is there any evidence of their destinations in exile, if or when they returned, or were recalled.<sup>4</sup>

They do not appear on any subsequent lists of *strategoi*, at the time of Athens' final desperate need, but an argument from silence does not militate against a recall, given the attested repentance of the *demos*, after the colleagues of these two had been executed. Such a recall, however, is more likely after the restoration of the democracy and the decree of Patrokleides in 403/2.

1. Xen. *Hell* 1.7.2; Krentz (1989: p159)
2. Diod. XIII.101.5 probably used *Hell Oxy* as his source - McKechnie and Kern (1988: p8)
3. *Ath Pol* 34.1, Rhodes (1981: p423)
4. If Protomachos is the same person as *PA* 12321, then he was possibly a trierarch at Aigospotamoi: cf *APF* p480 and *IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 1951 line 313.



What is known is that they failed to return after the victory at Arginousai. Following Andrewes,<sup>5</sup> Xenophon's account endows these two with an unusual foresight not shared by their peers. Therefore, it is probable that Andrewes' reconstruction, which follows Diodoros and *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia*,<sup>6</sup> suggests that the timing of events is the significant factor, that is, that the recall of the generals to face trial was *after* preliminary stirrings in Athens. The *demos* decided some time after the events of the battle to hold an investigation by way of a trial.<sup>7</sup>

Whilst this is speculative, the decision to return or go elsewhere is more plausibly made, not in the glow of a victory, but after the fact of the losses sustained and the stirrings of the other generals and Theramenes (*PA* 7234) had become evident. After all, these two were *strategoi*, and thus principals in the state, so that their political intelligence would not have been meagre. Although they must have been militarily experienced in order to have gained the office of *strategos*, at this time it was still well founded in political standing.

5. Andrewes (1974: pp112-122): for a discussion of Xenophon's contribution (and bias) in the account of the Arginousai trial it is important to note that Krentz (1989: pp158-160) has identified the glossing over of the more complex interplay of the *politics* of the situation and the importance of the timing of the events from the end of the sea battle to the execution of the generals (and beyond).
6. Andrewes (1974: p120)
7. Andrewes (1974: p113): note 4 above p241, and Entry 67, Archedemos, who apparently had time to prosecute one of the retiring generals - Erasinides (*PA* 5021) - for misappropriation of funds, before the main events of the trial. Bauman (1990: p70).

Therefore it was not a lucky chance that guided Aristogenes and Protomachos to stay away, but rather a knowledge that they would not have survived a trial. Although proved right by events, there must have been a stronger basis for their actions, because as Andrewes has pointed out,<sup>8</sup> at first the case went in favour of the generals. However, this hypothesis of foreknowledge is also in doubt when Aristotle's account is considered, as he states that in the engagement "... *tous d' ep allotrias neos sothentas* ..." <sup>9</sup>

There are major problems with this evidence provided by Aristotle. Statements of the incident in this source are wrong, and the whole complex event is not treated as an incident in itself. The only correct statement in the account is that "two generals" (names not given) failed to return. They could not have left *with* Konon (*PA* 8707) (the only other general of that year to escape unscathed) because he was not present.<sup>10</sup> Is it just possible that they left in "ships not their own" - the Loeb translation (p99) - meaning that they defected to the Spartans? Given the inaccuracy of the sources in almost all other details of Arginousai and its aftermath, it is still possible to combine the non-return of Aristogenes and Protomachos with this passage of Aristotle, although it more probably means "were preserved in a strange ship", and they could have been plucked from the water and thus *sothentas* probably means preserved in the

8. Andrewes (1974: p117); Diod. XIII.101.4

9. *Ath Pol* 34.1; Rhodes (1981: p423) does not offer a view on the meaning of *allotrias neos*.

10. Xen. *Hell* I.6.16: Konon was blockaded in Mytilene and only came on the scene after the enemy had fled (Xen. *Hell* I.6.38). [Krentz (1989: p149f; p158)] Note: Aristotle in the *Ath Pol* account ignores this because he states that *all* the generals, in context meaning all eight, were condemned, excluding Konon and the one who died on the day.

immediate sense of the battle itself. This means that they may have returned to Athens, and subsequently took their leave as the political climate heated up. The other references do, however, seem to imply that these two generals actually failed to return.<sup>11</sup>

Diodoros' words, "fearing the wrath of the many", suggests that Aristogenes and Protomachos had good cause not to return, not necessarily because they were culpable in terms of their behaviour in battle *per se*, but because they were associates of Alkibiades (*PA* 600),<sup>12</sup> who had been deposed immediately prior to Arginousai; and/or that they may have been sufficiently compromised by such an association, even only in their own view, that they felt no chance of justice for themselves *then*, even prior to the trial of their colleagues.

Without further concrete evidence of these matters, we have to rely on the extant statements to note that Aristogenes and Protomachos were voluntary political exiles.<sup>13</sup>

11. However, see note 4 above p241: Protomachos may have returned or have been recalled.

12. Krentz (1989: p159)

13. Political exiles, because they feared the consequences at Athens, not because of their presumed guilt, or their speculative associations: that is, they still qualify as political exiles, regardless of their motives, and the extant sources all agree on the basic fact of their exile.

**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Kallixenos

**Patronymic:** n.k.

**Deme:** n.k.

**Tribe:** n.k.

**Trittys:** n.k.

**PA No:** 8042

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** n.k.

**Date of Death:** ?403/2  
(Xen. *Hell* I.7.35)

**Magistracies:** AO 1573  
bouleutes, 406 (Xen. *Hell* I.7.8)

**Wealth:** n.k.

**B. EXILE**

Certain (Xen. *Hell* I.7.35; Diod. XIII.103)

**Reason:** Fear of outcome of the trial for his part in the condemnation of the Arginousai generals.

**Date:** 406/5

**Term:** Either did not return, or 3 years, following Xenophon

**Conditions:** n.a.

**Destination:** ?Dekeleia (Diod. XIII.103) or ?Peiraieus (Xen. *Hell* I.7.35)

**Xenoi:** n.k.

**Hetairoi:** Lykiskos (PA 9213)

**Family Exile:** Not likely given the circumstances of escape

**Attitude to Exile:** n.k.

**Return Date:** If at all, 403/2.

**Return Conditions:** ?came back with the democrats from Peiraieus.

**Recall Date:** n.a.

## **C. SOURCES**

### ***Literary:***

Xen. *Hell* I.7.8-35  
*Ath Pol* 39.6  
Athenaeus v.218a  
Diod. XIII.101-103

***Epigraphical:*** n.e.

## **D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

Andrewes (1974: pp112-122)  
Roberts (1982: pp65-68, p164)

KALLIXENOS

The exile is certain, and voluntary, since Kallixenos (*PA* 8042) escaped from custody rather than face his trial for deceiving the people over the matter of the execution of the Arginousai generals. The manner of his escape is not really to be doubted, as the disturbances in which Kleophon (*PA* 8638) met his death<sup>1</sup> imply sufficient *stasis* for prison breakout to occur<sup>2</sup>.

The destination for which Kallixenos made is a matter of debate, and the accounts of Xenophon and Diodoros differ. It is probable that the latter is correct in stating that Kallixenos fled to the Spartans at Dekeleia because it appears that Kallixenos was not a democrat, but rather an *hetairos* of Theramenes (*PA* 7234) (or just recruited as one), from Xenophon's own account. He was approached and persuaded (*epeisan*)<sup>3</sup> to assist those around Theramenes (*hoi peri...*), since he was a member of the *boule* at that time.

1. Xen. *Hell* I.7.35: Krentz (1989: p169) for a discussion of 'deceiving the people' and Kallixenos; Sealey (1987: p86).
2. Diod. XIII.103
3. Not bribed.

Therefore it is more likely, due to the non-democrat leanings of Theramenes, that his friend Kallixenos would flee to the only safe haven available *at that time*, that is, Dekeleia. It should be remembered that both accounts have Kallixenos fleeing from a democrat prison, and in 406/5, not later after the defeat of Athens. A flight to join the democrats at Phyle or Peiraieus is not chronologically possible, though Xenophon does not exactly say that he so fled. It is possible that Kallixenos may have had a change of heart and belatedly joined the democrats to return to the city from Peiraieus with them. Of course, this was not likely if he had gone to Dekeleia initially, nor if he was an *hetairos* of Theramenes, for which the evidence is more certain.

It is also unlikely that Kallixenos returned to Athens with the victorious democrats and then starved to death because no one liked him, unless he *had* in fact conspired with the Spartans, and was repudiated by all. Yet if this was so, how did he become part of the Peiraieus group? There is no direct evidence for the family of Kallixenos, or for his associations other than that provided by Xenophon, who stated that Kallixenos had guarantors<sup>4</sup> for his pre-trial surety. Given all that occurred in the period between the death of the generals in 406 and the *stasis* and subsequent defeat of Athens, it seems improbable that this one person would be singled out for opprobrium and thus starvation, particularly when we take into account the obligations of guarantors and more importantly, the general amnesty of 403,<sup>5</sup> the terms of which would have included Kallixenos.

4. Albeit guarantors who placed him in confinement, but this could have been for his own safety: Andrewes (1974: p121) has established that the revulsion of feeling over the execution of the generals was immediate. Krentz (1989: p169) alludes to the use of *tachu* by Diod. (XIII. 103.1) meaning "quickly" and the difficulty of precision in such terms.

5. *Ath Pol* 39.6, Rhodes (1981: p469)

Andrewes<sup>6</sup> has demonstrated satisfactorily that Xenophon's account of the whole episode is biased against the democracy. For his interpretation of events, Xenophon needed to portray Kallixenos as a democrat making an unprovoked attack against innocent men. If Kallixenos did return to Athens, and if he was allowed to starve to death, it is more likely to have been because he was associated with Theramenes, who was initially a member of the oligarchy<sup>7</sup>, and a failed negotiator with Sparta on behalf of the democracy<sup>8</sup>.

Therefore, the only conclusion which satisfies probability is that Xenophon's account of the exile of Kallixenos is incorrect, and that Kallixenos fled to the enemy at Dekeleia and did not return to Athens.

6. Andrewes (1974: p113), a position with which Krentz agrees (1989: p158ff).
7. *Xen. Hell* II.3.15: note that Xenophon consistently tries to win over the reader to the essential moderation and best intentions of Theramenes. See Xenophon Entry 78.
8. *Xen. Hell* II.2.16f, *sv* Lys. xiii.9-14. For a full discussion of the role of Theramenes and his contributions (or lack thereof): Krentz (1989: p185f).



**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Archedemos

**Patronymic:** n.k.

**Deme:** Pelekes

**Tribe:** IV Leontis

**Tritty:** Inland

**PA No:** 2326

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** n.k.

**Date of Death:** n.k.

**Magistracies:** AO 300, logistes 406 (Xen. *Hell.* I.7.2);  
? envoy in 378/7 (Aisch. iii.138f)

**Wealth:** Known to be relatively poor. Xen. *Mem* II.9.4-8. Not in APF.

**B. EXILE**

Possible (?Xen. *Hell* I.7.35)

**Reason:** ?Fear of outcome of the trial for his part in the condemnation of the Arginousai generals.

**Date:** 406/5

**Conditions:** n.a.

**Term:** n.k.

**Xenoi:** n.k.

**Destination :** ?Dekeleia

**Family Exile:** Not likely, given escape from prison.

**Attitude to Exile:** n.k.

**Hetairoi:** Kriton (PA 8823)  
(Xen. *Mem* II.9.4-8)

**Return Date:** n.k.

**Return Conditions:** n.k.

**Recall Date:** n.k.

**C. SOURCES**

**Literary:**

Ar. *Frogs* 420-425

Lys. xiv.25

Xen. *Hell* I.7.1-35

*Mem* II.9.4-8

Diod. XIII.103

**Epigraphical:** n.e.

**D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

Andrewes (1974: pp112-122)

Roberts (1982: pp65-66)

**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Lykiskos

**Patronymic:** n.k.

**Deme:** n.k.

**Tribe:** n.k.

**Trittys:** n.k.

**PA No:** 9213

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** n.k.

**Date of Death:** n.k.

**Magistracies:** AO 1821 *bouleutes* (Xen. *Hell.* I.7.2)

**Wealth:** n.k.

**B. EXILE**

Possible. (Xen. *Hell.* I.7.35)

**Reason:** ?Fear of aftermath of the trial of the Arginousai generals.

**Date:** 406/5

**Hetairoi:** Kallixenos (PA 8042)

**Term:** n.k.

**Conditions:** n.a.

**Destination :** ?Dekeleia

**Xenoi:** n.k.

**Family Exile:** Not likely, given escape from prison.

**Attitude to Exile:** n.k.

**Return Date:** n.k.

**Return Conditions:** n.k.

**Recall Date:** n.k.

**C. SOURCES**

**Literary:**

**Epigraphical:** n.e.

Xen. *Hell.* I.7.8-35

Diod. XIII.103

**D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

Andrewes (1974: pp112-122)

Roberts (1982: pp67-68, p164)

**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Menekles

**Patronymic:** n.k.

**Deme:** n.k.

**Tribe:** n.k.

**Trittys:** n.k.

**PA No:** 9905

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** n.k.

**Date of Death:** n.k.

**Magistracies:** n.k.

**Wealth:** n.k.

**B. EXILE**

Possible (Xen. *Hell* I.7.35)

**Reason:** ?Fear of outcome of his committal for trial for his part in the condemnation of the Arginousai generals.

**Date:** 406/5

**Term:** n.k.

**Conditions:** n.a.

**Destination:** ?Dekeleia

**Xenoi:** n.k.

**Family Exile:** Not likely, given escape from prison.

**Attitude to Exile:** n.k.

**Return Date:** n.k.

**Return Conditions:** n.k.

**Recall Date:** n.k.

**C. SOURCES**

**Literary:**

**Epigraphical:** n.e.

Xen. *Hell* I.7.8-35

Diod. XIII.103

**D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

Andrewes (1974: pp112-122)

Roberts (1982: p68, p155)

**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Timokrates

**Patronymic:** n.k.

**Deme:** n.k.

**Tribe:** n.k.

**Trittyts:** n.k.

**PA No:** 13748

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** n.k.

**Date of Death:** n.k.

**Magistracies:** AO 3084 bouleutes (Xen. Hell. I.7.2)

**Wealth:** n.k..

**B. EXILE**

Possible (Xen. Hell I.7.35)

**Reason:** ?Fear of outcome of his committal for trial for his part in the condemnation of the Arginousai generals.

**Date:** 406/5

**Term:** n.k.

**Conditions:** n.k.

**Destination:** ?Dekeleia

**Xenoi:** n.k.

**Family Exile:** Not likely, given escape from prison.

**Attitude to Exile:** n.k.

**Return Date:** n.k.

**Return Conditions:** n.k.

**Recall Date:** n.k.

**C. SOURCES**

**Literary:**

**Epigraphical:** n.e.

Xen. Hell I.7.8-35

Diod. XIII.103

**D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

Andrewes (1974: pp112-122)

Roberts (1982: p65)

ARCHEDEMOS, LYKISKOS, MENEKLES, TIMOKRATES

According to Xenophon, Archedemos (*PA* 2326) was responsible for the prosecution of one of the returning generals, Erasinides (*PA* 5021), after the battle of Arginousai.<sup>1</sup> The charge was one of irregularity in Erasinides' accounting of the funds entrusted to him for conduct of his forces, and this prosecution was successful, resulting in the imprisonment of Erasinides.<sup>2</sup>

Xenophon goes on to say that Archedemos then charged Erasinides with misconduct as general.<sup>3</sup> It is this second charge which has led Archedemos to be linked as one of the persecutors of the generals, as the account of Xenophon reads. It is possible that for his own ends Xenophon has telescoped these events to give precisely that impression, in order to present the democracy as being guilty of an unprovoked attack on the generals. Andrewes has established that this was generally Xenophon's aim, and Krentz<sup>4</sup> adds that many of the defenders of the generals at the trial were associated in some way with Alkibiades (*PA* 600 Entry 55), and he feels that these "personal ties" may also have influenced Xenophon.

1. Xen. *Hell* I.7.2

2. *loc cit*

3. *loc cit*

4. Andrewes (1974: p113); Krentz (1989: p159)

By Xenophon's own account, Archedemos was the leading politician of his day, and this is supported by Aristophanes,<sup>5</sup> although there is no foundation in his comic attempt to cast doubt on the citizenship status of Archedemos: he would not have been able to participate in the *ekklesia*, let alone hold office, had he not been a citizen.<sup>6</sup>

Lysias xiv.25 establishes that he was at least known to Alkibiades (*PA* 600); and Xen. *Mem* II.9.4 establishes that he was an *hetairos* of one Kriton (*PA* 8823). However, there is no evident connection with Theramenes (*PA* 7234) or his group, and nothing to indicate that his first prosecution of Erasinides was anything other than part of his duties as a member of the board in control of the two-obol relief fund. Indeed, it may have been as a result of investigations concerning this prosecution that Archedemos was led to initiate the prosecution of Erasinides for misconduct as general, and not necessarily for the Athenian losses sustained in the storm after the battle at Arginousai. Xenophon has grouped these events into a short chapter to suggest that they were all part of the same action. He meant to give the impression

5. *Ar. Frogs* 420-425

6. Xenophon states that he was in control of the two-obol relief fund: *Hell* I.7.2; Krentz (1989: p160) suggests that he was a prominent politician a decade earlier.

that the attack on the generals was a concerted one by the democrats, yet one of the participants, Kallixenos (*PA* 8042 Entry 66), was almost certainly not a democrat.<sup>7</sup>

Andrewes has demonstrated that revulsion against the execution of the generals was immediate.<sup>8</sup> And Xenophon states that there were four others who escaped with Kallixenos.<sup>9</sup> Since there are only four people named by Xenophon in his account of the trial as being against the generals, it is possible that it was these four who escaped with Kallixenos. Archedemos was thus one of them.

Diodoros states<sup>10</sup> that Kallixenos and some others escaped by digging out of the prison where they had been kept pending trial for deceiving the people. Though he does not mention anyone by name, his account gives circumstantial support to the idea that Archedemos may have been one of Xenophon's escapees.

Whilst it is most probable that Kallixenos went to Dekeleia, as Diodoros states, for the

7. Sealey (1987: p86)

8. Andrewes (1974: p121)

9. *Xen. Hell* I.7.35

10. *Diod. XIII.103*; Krentz (1989: p169) suggests that Kallixenos was in a public prison, following Diodoros, despite the mention of sureties in Xenophon, which tends to indicate some sort of bail.

reasons given in Entry 66, it is by no means certain that the others did so too. However, whilst it is probable because Dekeleia represented the only proximate safe haven for anyone escaping from Athens at that time, it appears a strange destination for a leading democrat such as Archedemos, and the only conclusion to be reached is that his destination is not as secure a probability as that of others in the escaping party.

For the above reasons, the exile of Archedemos would be classed as voluntary, although it is by no means certain that it occurred at all, especially since Archedemos was a popular political figure of his day, and Xenophon may be misleading us as to his involvement in the prosecution of the generals as a group, and in their execution.

Lykiskos (*PA* 9213) also took part in the proceedings which led to the condemnation and execution of the generals who returned from the successful defeat of the Spartans at Arginousai. Roberts<sup>11</sup> contends that Lykiskos was a democrat, and if she is correct then Lykiskos, together with Kallixenos, was a victim of Theramenes and his "Alkibiadist" friends. However, the evidence of a concerted attack of some origin - what Roberts would consider a conspiracy - is still strong and it appears that indeed Bauman's thesis of the "ultimate madness"<sup>12</sup> could be even more than he contends. Lykiskos' part in the proceedings was to lead the 'mob' call that the people could do whatever they wanted and to threaten

11. Roberts (1982: p164)

12. Bauman (1990: p69)



Euryptolemos (*PA* 5985) and those others who had doubts about the legality of the proceedings.<sup>13</sup> It is probable that Lykiskos was one of the four who escaped with Kallixenos.

Menekles' (*PA* 9905) part in the proceedings was to raise an objection to the proposal of Euryptolemos for a separate trial for each general.<sup>14</sup> He did this on the premise of an objection under oath<sup>15</sup>, and he was apparently questioning the legality of the proposal. For the same reasons as apply to Lykiskos and Archedemos, Menekles probably was another of the four who escaped with Kallixenos.

Timokrates (*PA* 13748) initiated the proceedings which led to the condemnation and execution of the generals. His part in the proceedings was direct, in that he was the proposer of the motion to imprison all the generals in connection with the events of the battle and its aftermath.<sup>16</sup> If anyone did retrieve his personal situation by digging out of an Athenian prison, Timokrates was the most likely to be one of the four who constituted the escape party.

13. Xen. *Hell* I.7.13

14. Xen. *Hell*. I.7.34; Euryptolemos was probably a cousin of Alkibiades III (*PA* 600), as Xenophon I.4.19 states, and the identity is established at Xen *Hell* I.7.12: this passage identifies the *opposer* of Kallixenos as the son of Peisianax. However, if this is the case Roberts (1982: p164) is not well served with her argument that the trial of the generals was a conspiracy of Alkibiades' friends orchestrated by Theramenes.

15. *hypomnymai* - to interpose by oath; to swear in bar of further proceedings. Krentz (1989: p168): "...either Menekles swore that he would indict Euryptolemos [(*PA* 5985)] for an unconstitutional proposal, with the result that Euryptolemos withdrew his motion, or, more likely, Menekles swore that the *prytaneis* had falsified the vote and demanded a recount..."

16. Xen. *Hell* I.7.3: Krentz (1989: p160) appears to suggest that Timokrates in fact merely asked that the assembly determine what to do next, rather than proposing a trial. Presumably, on this interpretation, Timokrates would be less blameworthy, but it appears to be a difficult position to sustain, given Krentz' own translation: "When Timokrates said that the others must also be imprisoned and handed over to the people, the Council imprisoned them."

**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Konon (II)

**Patronymic:** son of Timotheos (I)

**Deme:** Anaphlystos

**Tribe:** X Antiochis

**Trittys:** Coast

**PA No:** 8707

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** Not later than 444

**Date of Death:** ?388 in Cyprus

**Magistracies:** AO 1686 *nauarchos* 414/3; *strategos* 411/10; 407/6; 406/5; 405/4; envoy 393

**Wealth:** ?earned in exile - 40 talents; family formerly wealthy in Athens. *APF* p321, pp506-511.

**B. EXILE**

Certain (Xen. *Hell* II.1.29)

**Reason:** Defeat of the Athenian fleet at Aigospotamoi

**Date:** 404

**Term:** Away from Athens for ten years if he returned at all.

**Conditions:** n.a.

**Destination:** Cyprus

**Xenoi:** ?Evagoras of Cyprus

**Hetairoi:** Aristophanes (*PA* 2082), Nikophemos (*PA* 11066) (Dem. liv.17)

**Family Exile:** ?his son Timotheos, but perhaps later

**Attitude to Exile:** Although he thrived, he maintained strong loyalty to Athens.

**Return Date:** not earlier than late 393 if at all

**Return Conditions:** n.a.

**Recall Date:** n.a.

## **C. SOURCES**

### ***Literary:***

*Hell Oxy* 15.1-3

Lys. xix.36

Xen. *Hell* I.6.16-19; 7.1-34; II.1.29; IV.3.11, 8.1-3, 8.7-9

Dem. xx.68-70, Dem. liv.17

Isok. iv.142, 154; v.62-64; ix.51f

Nepos *Conon* 1.2

Diod. XIII.77-79.7; 106.6

Paus. III. 1.2; VI.3.16

### ***Epigraphical:* n.e.**

## **D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

Parke (1933: p51)

Davies *APF* pp506-508

Sealey (1976: pp392-393)

Walbank (1978: p487)

Herman (1987: p105)

Sinclair (1988: p78)

McKechnie and Kern (1988 p20)

Krentz (1989: pp149-151, p179)

KONON

After the defeat of the Athenians by the Spartans in the naval battle of Aigospotamoi in 404, there were only nine Athenian ships remaining in any condition to leave the scene of the battle. One of these, the state ship *Paralos*, returned to Athens with news of the disaster. Nine of the ten generals were either dead or taken prisoner.<sup>1</sup> Leadership of the forces in the remaining Athenian ships fell to Konon (*PA* 8707), who had a clear choice of returning to Athens or removing himself to a safe haven. He chose the latter course, and sailed to Cyprus and successfully sought sanctuary with his friend, Evagoras the ruler of Cyprus. The other seven ships presumably opted to join him, given the chaos and panic in the aftermath of the defeat. It is possible to make a case for Konon that he left the scene to regroup and to find ways in which Athens could yet be saved. Konon may have initially intended to go to Evagoras seeking help for Athens.<sup>2</sup>

Certainly his subsequent career with the Persians, fighting against the Spartans, was of more use to Athens than anything he could have done with eight ships against the victorious Spartan fleet immediately after Aigospotamoi.

1. Xen. *Hell* II.1.29
2. Xen. *Hell* II.1.29; Krentz (1989: p179) appears to be supportive of this broad view when he indicates that Konon demonstrated foresight in acting to hamper any possible pursuit by Lysandros. Equally it is possible that Konon's initial intention was to go to Evagoras for assistance, which later events rendered impractical. cf Isok.ix.52

It is more probable, however, that Konon remembered the aftermath of the battle of Arginousai<sup>3</sup> and the wrath of the *demos* against the generals after what was a victory, as Diodoros states.<sup>4</sup> How much more likely it would be that the *demos* would turn, in its panic and despair, against the only surviving general after the loss of a battle which even Konon must have realised would result in the potential destruction of Athens and her citizens.

Konon had emerged politically unscathed after Arginousai, mostly because he had not been there. However, the reason he was not there was that he had carelessly allowed himself, with his fleet of Athenian ships, to be bottled up in the harbour at Mytilene.<sup>5</sup> That fact, if remembered by the *demos* and coupled with the defeat at Aigospotamoi, would have made it very likely that Konon would be tried and executed if he returned home.<sup>6</sup> Demosthenes

3. Xen. *Hell* I.7.1-34; McKechnie and Kern (1988: p20)
4. Diod. XIII.106.6. Lysander's intentions were not immediately apparent to the remaining Athenians in the aftermath of the battle, and the choice to return home would have been considered a legitimate one.
5. Xen. *Hell* I.6.16-19: Krentz (1989: pp149-151) says that the account of Diodoros (XIII.77-79.7) is complementary to that of Xenophon, but he acknowledges that Konon and the Athenians had "pursued too far", in consequence of which they were bottled up in the harbour by the Peloponnesians.
6. It is reasonable to state with hindsight that Konon remained consistently loyal to the *demos*; and that there may have been some treasonous (that is, anti-democratic and *ipso facto* anti-Konon) activity at Aigospotamoi (Xen. *Hell* II.1.32; Plut. *Lys* 11; *Alk* 37. Cf Krentz (1989: p180) who felt that the case for treason had not been proved); the realities of the political and the military situations meant that the sanest move at this time of instability was that which Konon took, away from Athens to Evagoras the *friend of the demos* (*JG* I<sup>3</sup>.113)

highlights the importance of Konon's *hetairoi* to his career, yet he was essentially neutral politically during the previous ten years,<sup>7</sup> though his *strategiai* were achieved under the democracy.<sup>8</sup> Konon could anticipate that, after the defeat in which he was a participant, his supporters would not be in the ascendancy, and also that the Spartan victors would follow their normal practice and install an oligarchic government once Athens was finally broken, which they did in fact do. Konon's subsequent anti-Spartan activities may have been opportunistic or may have derived from deeply held democratic principles. In any case Konon was not assured of a warmer welcome under a Spartan-backed regime than that which he could anticipate from a bitter and despairing democracy at Athens.

Konon was an experienced general, which in Athens at this time also meant being politically astute: once the outcome of Aigospotamoi became apparent he really had little choice but to leave Athens to its fate and take his chances in exile.

7. Dem. xx.68-70; Hatzfeld (1951: p293) makes a good case for Konon's perceived neutrality in the 407/6 choice of generals to accompany Alkibiades (*PA* 600): "...trois personages neutres, semble-t-il, au point de vue politique" and this view makes considerable sense in the light of Konon's subsequent career, rather than the view that Alkibiades chose his own cronies. That is, Konon was not an *hetairos* of Alkibiades.
8. Konon was *strategos* in 414/3 (Thuc. VII.31.4); 411/10 (Diod. XIII.48.6); 407/6 (Xen. *Hell* I.4.10); 406/5 (Fornara 1971: p70); 405/4 (Xen. *Hell* II.1.28)

Konon's choice of destination is interesting. Evagoras was friendly towards Athens, as his possible assistance in 411/10 in the matter of the Four Hundred attests.<sup>9</sup> He may even have received his grant of Athenian citizenship at that time, as Isokrates implies.<sup>10</sup> Konon was *strategos* during two of the intervening years and his operations would almost certainly have brought him into the region of Cyprus during this period. Therefore, his friendship with Evagoras probably pre-dated Aigospotamoi. If this is so his relationship with Evagoras could be described as a *xenia* relationship, and Konon may also have been the *proxenos* of Evagoras at Athens. Such circumstances show Konon as being farsighted in arranging a safe haven for himself. This does not mean that he foresaw the defeat of Athens, merely that he took sensible precautions in the light of the fates of six of the Arginousai generals,<sup>11</sup> and of Alkibiades, in recent memory. *Stratego*i at Athens had real prestige and power, but the position was fraught with dangers, not all of them on the battlefield.<sup>12</sup>

9. IG.I<sup>3</sup> 113. Walbank (1978: p487), dates this decree 411/10; cf Herman (1987: p105), who says the decree is a reward for Evagoras' efforts for Athens with Konon. Whilst on balance the evidence favours Herman, he does not really argue his case for this date, and most put it in 407, that is before either Arginousai or Aigospotamoi: Osborne (1982: vol.II, pp21-24). See also Costa (1974: pp45-46).
10. Isok. ix.51f: see Hirsch (1985: p58), who believes that Isokrates' account of Konon and Evagoras with Persia and against Sparta is slanted to emphasise that they were really helping Athens, rather than harming Sparta. Hirsch points out further (p167 n44) that Konon was a patron of Isokrates and that his son was a student of Isokrates.
11. Xen. *Hell* I.7.1-34
12. Thuc. VI.60-61; Xen. *Hell* I.5.16-17; Sinclair (1988: pp134-162) on the hazards of leadership.

After his death Konon enjoyed the widespread admiration of his countrymen for his loyalty to Athens, his provision for the rebuilding of the Long Walls, and his pursuit of victory over Sparta, his city's enemy, whilst in the service of the Persian king.<sup>13</sup> However, his actions immediately after the battle of Aigospotamoi show that Konon had more practical matters on his mind, and his motivation appears to be survival rather than altruism. He sailed with his small flotilla first to Abarnis, on the promontory of Lampsakos, where he seized some of Lysander's stores, before sailing on to Cyprus.<sup>14</sup> (Nepos is undoubtedly wrong in his claim that Konon went first to the Persians, and he is obviously confusing Aigospotamoi with Arginousai when he says that Konon was not present at the battle.)<sup>15</sup>

Konon's immediate need was to find a means of supporting himself and his crews. A trireme carried approximately 200 crew<sup>16</sup>, so Konon needed to support nine ships' companies, probably almost two thousand men. Although Konon's family appears to have been among the wealthier

13. For example, Isok. IX.51. As Sinclair points out (1988: p78) he was the first since the tyrannicides to have a statue in his honour placed in the Agora.

14. Xen. *Hell* II.1.29

15. Nepos *Conon* 1.2

16. Morrison and Coates (1987: pp107-115) demonstrate that a trireme carried a complement of 200 including oarsmen, combat troops and other specialists such as a helmsman and a shipwright. Morrison and Williams (1968: p123, pp254-271); Nelson (1973: p23); Humble (1980: pp 143-144).



group in Athenian society,<sup>17</sup> the vagaries of the long war, and now the defeat of Athens, would mean that Konon had no means of accessing any of his wealth that remained. Indeed Isokrates says that at this time Konon had no resources other than his skills.<sup>18</sup> Lysias<sup>19</sup> says that at his death Konon's estate was worth almost 40 talents, so unless it was highly portable, this substance was probably derived from the years of service with Evagoras and with the Persian King.

Though Evagoras might have been expected to support Konon himself in the terms of *xenia*, such support would not necessarily be extended to the whole flotilla.<sup>20</sup> Diodoros<sup>21</sup> states that Konon had friendly relations with Evagoras, yet he does not use the term *xenos*. Isokrates<sup>22</sup> gives the impression, though he does not state outright, that Konon and Evagoras first met when Konon arrived with his nine ships. However, there is a case for links between the two before 405/4. Regardless of the duration of their friendship, mercenary service with Evagoras would provide a suitable solution for all concerned.

17. *APF* pp506-508

18. Isok. v.63

19. Lys. xix.36

20. Herman (1987: pp121-2) on the nature of *boetheiai*. Costa (1974: p45) notes that Evagoras had a policy of encouraging the migration of both Asian and mainland Greeks to Salamis because of their skills and artistry, as well as their military prowess, so Konon and his flotilla would have been welcome in any case, under such a policy.

21. Diod. XIII.106.6

22. Isok. ix.51; Herman (1987: p105) implies a relatively long-standing relationship in his description of the friendship between the two men.

There was no immediate opportunity for Konon's family to join him in exile. His son, Timotheos (II) (*PA* 13700) may have been with Konon when he was in Samos and Ephesos in 394, given that statues were erected honouring both father and son.<sup>23</sup> If Timotheos was old enough he may have been at Aigospotamoi, but it is equally likely that he was able to join his father at a later date. There is no mention of Konon's wife or any other children they may have had. Davies<sup>24</sup> assumes his wife had died, since Lysias<sup>25</sup> states that Konon left a wife and son in Cyprus. This need not be so, since Konon's failure to return to Athens after Aigospotamoi could equally have led to his wife's return to her family. Konon, on the other hand, at this time would have had no knowledge that he would ever be able to return to Athens, and appears to have taken all the necessary steps to begin a new life. That Timotheos was on good terms with his father<sup>26</sup> perhaps suggests that his mother had, in fact, died before Aigospotamoi.

23. Paus. VI.3.16

24. *APF* p508

25. Lys. xix.36

26. Lys. xix.36; *APF* p508

From various sources it is possible to track some of Konon's life in exile, and it appears that he was hugely successful as a mercenary, both in military and in financial terms. We do not have evidence for the years after Aigospotamoi until the Spartans crossed into Asia in 396, though he probably married again in these years. Konon was either in the service of Evagoras until he joined the Persians in opposing the Spartans,<sup>27</sup> or in Persian service almost from the beginning. We do know that he was regarded highly throughout the region as a commander and personally, even if Isokrates' language is a little flowery.<sup>28</sup> At the beginning of 395 he was at least implicated in the revolution at Rhodes, most likely supported by Evagoras.<sup>29</sup>

Konon had been *strategos* stationed at Naupaktos<sup>30</sup> in 411/0. With the expulsion of the Messenians from Naupaktos Konon employed them in 395 as mercenaries and as a bodyguard for himself whilst in Persian service.<sup>31</sup>

27. Isok. v.62

28. Isok. iv.142

29. Isok. v.63; *Hell Oxy* 15.1-3.

30. Thuc. VII.31.4, *HCT IV* p411 notes that this is the earliest extant reference to Konon.

31. *Hell Oxy* 15.3; Sealey (1976: pp392-393) for an efficient account of the operation undertaken by these troops.

In 394 Konon was the commander of the Greek mercenaries who defeated the Spartans at the battle of Knidos, which broke forever the power of Sparta in the Aegean.<sup>32</sup> With the Persian satrap Pharnabazos, Konon proceeded to ravage the coast of Lakonia itself.<sup>33</sup> He then cruised the Ionian coast and "liberated" the cities there. Statues were erected to him at Ephesos and at Samos. The people of Erythrae granted him citizenship.<sup>34</sup>

In 394/3 the Persians gave him forty ships and he was dispatched to Sestos.<sup>35</sup> At the same time the Persians were persuaded by Konon to provide fifty talents towards the rebuilding of the Long Walls at Athens.<sup>36</sup> Although there is no reason to doubt Konon's loyalty to Athens in general, nor the enthusiasm for that city exhibited by Evagoras, it was always prudent if one intended returning home in such circumstances to pave the way with some form of largesse. The victor of Knidos was still the vanquished of Aigospotamoi.

32. Xen. *Hell* IV.3.11; Plut. *Ages* 27.2

33. Isok. v.64.

34. Paus. VI.3.16; *SEG* 126

35. Xen. *Hell* IV.8.1-3

36. Xen. *Hell* IV.8.8-9; cf *IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 1656-1657

In 393/2 Konon sailed through the Aegean to the Isthmos and established a bridgehead to ensure that the Spartans stayed in the Peloponnese, though it is doubtful that Konon remained there for any time.<sup>37</sup> Though he was close to Athens at this time, it is not known that he actually ever returned to the city, despite the statues erected to him and to Timotheos about this time.<sup>38</sup> In 393/2 he may also have been an ambassador, along with other Athenians, to Tiribadzos, but this is problematical.<sup>39</sup> Lysias<sup>40</sup> says Timotheos acted as his father's agent at Athens in 390, so Konon may have found it more profitable to continue his mercenary service and his new home life established in Cyprus.

By 389 both the Athenians and Evagoras were at war with Persia. Therefore, despite the doubtful quality of the source, Nepos<sup>41</sup> may be correct in asserting that the Persians seized Konon and had him killed in early 388, since Isokrates supports Nepos<sup>42</sup> in this detail. However, Nepos himself states that Deinon thinks that Konon escaped.<sup>43</sup> The evidence is not strong for either case and the manner of his death remains uncertain. By 388 he would have been in his mid to late fifties at least, and a non-violent end is equally possible.

37. Xen. *Hell* IV.8.7; Parke (1933: p51)

38. Paus. III.1.2

39. Develin *AO* pp211-212

40. Lys. xix.36

41. Nepos *Conon* 9.3-4

42. Isok. iv.154

43. Nepos *Conon* 9.4; Costa (1974: pp52-53) believes that Konon was arrested in 392/1 in line with a reversal in Persian policy and that he was either released or he escaped, and died shortly after his escape. This is more likely than the Nepos scenario, but the dating remains a difficulty and a date of death closer to 388 is more likely, since an earlier date would not have gone unremarked if it was proximate to his incarceration.

**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Nikophemos

**Patronymic:** n.k.

**Deme:** n.k.

**Tribe:** n.k.

**Trittys:** n.k.

**PA No:** 11066; HE Stier *RE* 17 (1936) p510 (2)

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** n.k.

**Date of Death:** 390 or 389

**Magistracies:** ?405

**Wealth:** Extent disputed - *APF* p412, pp201-202 cf *Lys.* xix

**B. EXILE**

Certain

**Reason:** Left with Konon after Aigospotamoi

**Date:** 404

**Term:** 10 years

**Conditions:** n.a.

**Destination:** Cyprus

**Xenoi:** ?Evagoras of Cyprus

**Hetairoi:** Konon (*PA* 8707),  
?Agyrrhios (*PA* 179)

**Family Exile:** Son stayed in Athens

**Attitude to Exile:** Appeared to thrive.

**Return Date:** Before 390

**Return Conditions:** n.k.

**Recall Date:** n.a.

**C. SOURCES**

**Literary:**

*Lys.* xix; *Hell Oxy* 15.I; *Isok.* ix.51f  
*Xen. Hell* II.1.29; IV.8.8

**Epigraphical:** n.e.

**D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

Hofstetter (1978: p138)

See also references for Konon, Entry 71

## NIKOPHEMOS

It is not clear whether Nikophemos (*PA* 11066) was a commander of one of the few ships which survived the disaster at Aigospotamoi, or if he was serving on the vessel of his close friend and *strategos*, Konon (*PA* 8707). If he had command of his own vessel, perhaps as a trierarch, then his decision to escape with Konon to Cyprus and the protection of Evagoras renders his exile voluntary, since only the *Paralos* returned to Athens. It was presumably open to the other ships to follow suit.<sup>1</sup>

Nikophemos found acceptance in his own right with Evagoras and with the Persian satrap Pharnabazos. He served Evagoras, then Pharnabazos, with sufficient distinction to be rewarded, perhaps at the instigation of Konon, with the governorship of Kythera.<sup>2</sup>

It is nowhere stated specifically that the family of Nikophemos remained in Athens. However, his son, Aristophanes (*PA* 2082) was probably trapped with the rest of the Athenians in the blockade which Lysander imposed after the defeat. This son was probably adult at the time

1. Xen *Hell* II.1.29. See Entry71 and notes: the reasons for Konon's withdrawal to Cyprus applied equally to his friend Nikophemos, who would undoubtedly have shared Konon's fate, regardless of the justice of the situation.
2. Xen *Hell* IV.8.8; presumably Nikophemos shared in the benefits which accrued to all who served Evagoras: Isok. ix.51. See also Costa (1974: p45): Nikophemos would have benefitted from the policy of Evagoras which encouraged Asian and mainland Greeks to settle in Salamis.

of his father's exile, since he married not later than 394,<sup>3</sup> more tellingly, he was ambassador to Dionysios<sup>4</sup> at Syracuse, a post for which maturity was a prerequisite.

Given the total defeat of Athens, it is probable that Nikophemos, like Konon, resolved to start his life again, without at that time any prospect of returning home. Whether Aristophanes' mother was still alive is a moot point, given the son's age. However, Nikophemos married in Cyprus and had a daughter.<sup>5</sup> He may have been free to do so, or his liaison may have been bigamous, although this is unlikely as the speaker of *Lysias* xix would have mentioned the fact in order to deflect criticisms from his own father towards Nikophemos. Aristophanes was on good terms with his father so he apparently did not object to the new family, suggesting therefore that his mother was probably dead.

Apparently Nikophemos abandoned any wealth he may have possessed in Athens by the act of exile, and what there was may have been confiscated by the Thirty, since Aristophanes'

3. *Lys.* xix.9: allowing for one pregnancy per year, and the execution of their father in 390, as the least time available, then the oldest of the three small children of Aristophanes could have been born no later than 393, so a marriage in 394/3 is the latest date. *Lys.* xix. 21-23 and Costa (1974: p54) - Aristophanes was instrumental in bringing ships from Athens to Evagoras' aid in 391.
4. *Lys.* xix.19
5. *Lys.* xix.36; 45



brother-in-law speaks of the way in which the son of Nikophemos built up his possessions virtually from nothing.<sup>6</sup>

However, it is apparent that Nikophemos prospered from his years in foreign service, even if not to the extent of the forty talents amassed by his friend Konon. He appears to have supported himself by mercenary service, then as military governor of Kythera.<sup>7</sup>

At some time after the success of Konon at Knidos in 394, Nikophemos returned to Athens, presumably capitalising on the favourable climate the victory created for Konon and his associates, though it is by no means certain that Konon himself ever actually returned. Mindful of the debt he doubtless felt was owed to Evagoras, Nikophemos promoted an expedition to assist the Cypriote leader against Persia in 390.<sup>8</sup> It is unclear what caused the Athenian *demos* to be dissatisfied with this venture, but both Nikophemos and his son were recalled, executed and their property confiscated.<sup>9</sup>

6. Lys. xix.28f

7. Xen *Hell* IV.8.8: *...kai Nikophemon Athenaion harmosten en tois Kutherois...*

8. Costa (1974: p51)

9. Lys. xix.7; 31-32. The cause of the dissatisfaction is never stated, but it is probable that Nikophemos and his son were caught in the conflicting loyalties involved in the circumstances of the Spartan/Persian/Athenian situation described by Xenophon *Hell* IV.8.24. Cf Roberts (1982: pp95-96)

**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Nikomachos

**Patronymic:** n.k.

**Deme:** n.k.

**Tribe:** n.k.

**Tritty:** n.k.

**PA No:** 10933 = 10934 (Kirchner)

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** n.k.

**Date of Death:** n.k.

**Magistracies:** AO 2140, nomogrammateus is the term meant by Lys. xxx.15  
*anagrapheus* 411/10 - 405; 403-400.

**Wealth:** Probably not, described as hypogrammateus, a type of under-clerk. Lys. xxx.28. Not in *APF*.

**B. EXILE**

Certain (Lys. xxx.15)

**Reason:** Because of his codifying of the laws under the democracy: the Thirty objected.

**Date:** 404/3

**Conditions:** n.k.

**Term:** 1-2 years

**Xenoi:** n.k.

**Destination:** ?Phyle; Peiraieus.

**Hetairoi:** n.k.

**Family Exile:** n.k.

**Attitude to Exile:** n.k.

**Return Date:** 403/2

**Return Conditions:** As one of the victorious democrats.

**Recall Date:** n.a.

**C. SOURCES**

**Literary:**

Lys. xxx.15-16; 20-28  
Ar. *Frogs* 1505-4: may not be the same man.

**D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

McDowell (1978: pp46-48)

NIKOMACHOS

The source for the exile of Nikomachos (*PA* 10933 = 10934) is Lysias.<sup>1</sup> According to him, Nikomachos was appointed by the democracy to codify the laws of Solon, and later to do the same for those of Drakon. Whilst it is apparent that Lysias was hostile to Nikomachos, his narrative does give some reliable factual data.

Firstly, Nikomachos was in exile with the democrats<sup>2</sup>, though it is not certain that he was a voluntary exile who fled to Phyle via Thebes at the outset of the rule of the Thirty. He was a *nomogrammateus*,<sup>3</sup> that is an official appointed by the people to codify the laws. In the ordinary course of events, this would have been a regular magistracy. However, given the politically sensitive nature of the change of government, it would have been in the best interests of the Thirty to get rid of anyone who had a real and current knowledge of the laws. Therefore, if Nikomachos was politically astute, he would have fled at the outset. Indeed, Lysias uses the word *ephugen*, implying that the flight from Athens was an active decision of

1. Lys. xxx.15-16

2. *loc cit*

3. *loc cit*

Nikomachos. However, it is not useful to refine too much upon the language of Lysias when taken in context. Alternatively, there is equal cause to suppose that he could have been banished by the Thirty. In any event he shared exile with, and presumably returned to Athens with, the victorious democrats from Peiraeus, a fact which Lysias attests, albeit grudgingly.

Nothing else is known of the exile of Nikomachos, but it is certain that Lysias has distorted his portrait of him as a fraud: he all but admits at xxx.2 that Nikomachos passed his *euthyne*, when he asserts that Nikomachos continued in office for some time after the original brief. It is unlikely that the *demos* would have permitted such an extraordinary occurrence without sanction<sup>4</sup>, especially in the rather particular atmosphere of the restored democracy. However, this passage could also refer to a previous magistracy as Aristophanes<sup>5</sup> describes a Nikomachos as part of a revenue-raising group, though there is no evidence that this is the same person as the exile.

4. MacDowell (1978: p46)

5. Ar. *Frogs* 1505-6 = *PA* 10934

It is not apparent how Nikomachos supported himself in exile, and it cannot be assumed by Lysias' use of the term *hypogrammateus*<sup>6</sup> that Nikomachos was in fact a sort of 'under-clerk', that is, one of menial position. This is a term of disparagement used by Lysias in the context of his speech, and it is very doubtful that such a position as *nomogrammateus* would be a lesser magistracy. However, it cannot be deduced from the position which Nikomachos held if he was wealthy or otherwise.

If he fled, then his family may not have had time to organise to flee with him. There is no evidence to suggest what happened to them. As to Nikomachos' destination in exile and indeed that of all who fled voluntarily from the Thirty, if the interpretation of Lysias xii.95, 97 supported by Plutarch *Lysandros* 27 is correct, then it is almost certain that none of them were allowed to go to any member state of the Peloponnesian League in the terms of the Spartan decree. The passages of Lysias and Plutarch determine that Sparta had specifically prohibited Peloponnesian League states from giving sanctuary to anyone fleeing from the Thirty.

Notwithstanding such a prohibition, it appears that even immediately after the cessation of the main hostilities, Thebes at least and probably Corinth were sufficiently disenchanted with Sparta that they ignored this prohibition.<sup>7</sup>

6. Lys. xxx.28

7. See Archinos (*PA* 2526 Entry 76), Chairephon (*PA* 15203 Entry 775), Anytos (*PA* 1324 Entry 774), who were all made welcome by Thebes; Atrometos (*PA* 2681 Entry 77).

**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Anytos

**Deme:** Euonymon

**Tribe:** I Erechtheis

**PA No:** 1324; W Judeich, *RE* I (1894) p2656 (3)

**Date of Birth:** before 451

**Magistracies:** *AO* 265, *strategos* 409; ?403/2 (Diod. XIII.64.6)

**B. EXILE**

Certain (Xen. *Hell* II.3.42)

**Date:** 404/3

**Term:** 1 to 2 years

**Destination:** ?Thebes initially, then Phyle.

**Family Exile:** Possible

**Return Date:** 403/2

**Patronymic:** son of Anthemion

**Tritty:** City

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Death:** n.k. but  
?Them. XX.239c

**Wealth:** large income from  
tannery (Xen. *Apol* 29); *APF*  
pp40-41

**Reason:** He was a leading  
politician opposed to the Thirty.

**Conditions:** n.k.

**Xenoi:** Menon son of  
Alexidemos - Thessalian aristocrat  
(Plato *Meno* 90b)

**Attitude to Exile:** n.k. probably  
hostile.

**Hetairoi:** Theramenes (*PA* 7234),  
Archinos (*PA* 2526),  
Kleitophon (*PA* 8546), Phormisios  
(*PA* 14945) (*Ath Pol* 34.3)  
?Alkibiades (*PA* 600) (Plut. *Alk* 4;  
Athen. xiii.534), Thrasyboulos  
(*PA* 7305), Aisimos (*PA* 311)  
(*Hell.Oxy.*II.2)

**Return Conditions:** A leader of  
the victorious party from Peiraieus.

### **C. SOURCES**

#### ***Literary:***

*Hell. Oxy.* II.2

Xen. *Apol* 29; Xen. *Hell* II.3.42

Plato *Meno* 90b

*Ath Pol* 34.3

Theopompos *FGrH* 115 F57

Diog. Laert. 2.43

Them. xx.239c

Diod. XIII.64.6

Plut. *Alk* 4

Athen. xii.534

#### ***Epigraphical:*** n.e.

### **D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

MacDowell (1962: p166)

Davies *APF* p41

Krentz (1982: p72)

## ANYTOS

The exile of Anytos (*PA* 1324) in the wake of the assumption of power by the Thirty at Athens is certain,<sup>1</sup> and it is possible that there was a second exile.<sup>2</sup> The latter exile is presumed to have occurred as a result of the prosecution of Sokrates (*PA* 13101). Anytos was one of the prosecutors,<sup>3</sup> and it is asserted by Diogenes Laertius<sup>4</sup> and Themistios,<sup>5</sup> that Anytos was banished in the general remorse felt at Sokrates' death. He supposedly went to Herakleia, and was not well received there, and may even have been killed. However, *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia* I.2 is evidence for an Anytos in Athens in 396/5; and Lysias states<sup>6</sup> that an Anytos held the office of *sitophylaktes* in 388/7. However, there is no direct evidence to connect the Anytos of these latter two sources with the Anytos who was in exile under the Thirty. The second exile remains a possibility only, and may not have been voluntary.

Xenophon<sup>7</sup> states that Anytos was banished by the Thirty (*phugadeuein*), which implies that he was not a voluntary exile, fleeing from repression. However, Xenophon presents this

1. Xen. *Hell* II.3.42
2. Diog. II.43
3. *loc cit*
4. *loc cit*
5. Them. XX.239c
6. Lys. xxii.8
7. Xen. *Hell* II.3.42



evidence in the form of a speech of Theramenes (*PA* 7234), and asserts that he was banished together with Thrasyboulos (*PA* 7310) and Alkibiades (*PA* 600). There is a difficulty here, since the latter was in exile prior to the ascent of the Thirty to power.<sup>8</sup>

Because of the confusion caused by the Xenophon reference, it is at least equally probable that Anytos fled, rather than being banished, since he is described as being one of the leaders of the group in exile, in terms which suggest he is equal to Thrasyboulos.<sup>9</sup> *Ath Pol* 34.3 suggests that he was at first a moderate associated with Theramenes in the period immediately after the defeat of Athens.<sup>10</sup> However, Isokrates<sup>11</sup> states that Anytos was robbed of large sums of money by the Thirty, so there is at least one motive for Anytos to flee from Athens voluntarily. It is known that Anytos was wealthy: aside from the accusation of wholesale bribery of an entire jury,<sup>12</sup> he had also inherited a tannery and a cobblery.<sup>13</sup> Therefore there is supporting evidence for hostility to the Thirty, given Isokrates' assertion.

8. Xen. *Hell* I.5.16

9. Xen. *Hell* II.3.44

10. *Hell Oxy* II.2 with Bruce (1967: p57): Anytos was a democrat, although not as extreme as Kephalos (*PA* 8277) or Epikrates (*PA* 4859 Entry 79).

11. Isok. xviii.23

12. *Ath Pol* 27.5; cf [Xen] *Ath Pol* 3.7

13. Xen. *Apol* 29; Theopompos *FGrH* 115 F57

Anytos took a leading role in the fight against the Thirty. Lysias<sup>14</sup> described him as a general at Phyle. In addition, he had extensive *hetairoi*, including Archinos (*PA* 2526), Kleitophon (*PA* 8546) and Phormisios (*PA* 14945), as well as Theramenes (*PA* 7234).<sup>15</sup> The association with Thrasyboulos (*PA* 7305) may have been formed later, at Phyle. Anytos was at least well acquainted with Alkibiades (*PA* 600),<sup>16</sup> and Athenaeus asserts that they were lovers,<sup>17</sup> though in Alkibiades' case that does not necessarily mean much in terms of establishment of political *hetairoi*. Andokides (*PA* 828) is certainly numbered amongst the *hetairoi* of Anytos.<sup>18</sup>

It appears that Anytos was politically eminent, with a generalship in 409/8, as well as being wealthy. He was evidently hostile to the Thirty, if not at first, then certainly after the death of his *hetairos* Theramenes.<sup>19</sup> Therefore, he had reason to flee, and he would also have been an important obstacle to the Thirty. If there was a formal banishment, then it is possible that the family of Anytos were allowed to depart with him. Of course, his wealth would have remained in Athens. On the other hand, it is probable that Anytos chose to flee Athens at the death of Theramenes,

14. Lys. xiii.78: ...*strategon de Anytos*..., *AO* p225

15. *Ath Pol* 34.3

16. Plut. *Alk.*4

17. Athen. XII.534

18. Andok. i.150

19. *Ath Pol* 34.3

especially as the Thirty were murdering wealthy people for their assets regardless of their political persuasion.<sup>20</sup> It suited Xenophon to assert that the Thirty had banished Anytos, in terms of the context of the speech of Theramenes. However, it need not have been a proactive move from the Thirty. Anytos had the means and connections to leave while he still was able to, and probably did so. It is, therefore, not possible to define the exile of Anytos as voluntary with absolute certainty, but it seems more likely than banishment.

Lysias xii.95 and 97 appear to imply that Sparta forbade any of the states in the Peloponnesian League from admitting people who fled from the Thirty, and if Anytos went to Theban territory, it appears that Thebes ignored the Spartan edict.<sup>21</sup>

20. Xen. *Hell* II.4.1

21. Cf Archinos (*PA* 2526 Entry 776), Chairephon (*PA* 15203 Entry 75), and Atrometos (*PA* 2681 Entry 77) where Corinth also appeared to ignore the edict; *Ath Pol* 35.3-4.

**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Chairephon

**Patronymic:** n.k.

**Deme:** Sphettos

**Tribe:** V Akamantis

**Trittyys:** Inland

**PA No:** 15203

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** n.k.

**Date of Death:** Between 403 and 399

**Magistracies:** n.k.

**Wealth:** Probable - most of the men around Sokrates were wealthy. However, not in *APF*.

**B. EXILE**

Certain (Plato *Apol* 21a)

**Reason:** Fled from the Thirty Tyrants.

**Date:** 404

**Term:** Not more than one year

**Conditions:** n.a.

**Destination:** ?Phyle

**Xenoi:** n.k.

**Hetairoi:** Sokrates (*PA* 13101), ?Hermogenes, (?*PA*) Simmias (*PA* 12664), Kebes (?*PA*), Phaidondas (?*PA*).

**Family Exile:** Possibly his brother Chairekrates.

**Attitude to Exile:** Viewed as temporary only, since he joined the move to overthrow the Thirty.

**Return Date:** 403

**Return Conditions:** n.a.

**Recall Date:** n.a.

## ***C. SOURCES***

### ***Literary:***

Xen. *Mem* I.2.47-48; Xen. *Mem* II.3.1

*Apol* XIV

Ar. *Clouds* 104

Kratinos F202

Eupolis F165, 239

Plato *Apol* 21a

### ***Epigraphical:*** n.e.

CHAIREPHON

Chairephon (*PA* 15203) was a sufficiently committed democrat to have cause to flee from Athens during the tyranny of the Thirty.<sup>1</sup> Plato states that Chairephon shared the exile of the people, which suggests that he was part of the core group which overthrew the Thirty.<sup>2</sup> It is probable that he was at Phyle and subsequently returned with Thrasyboulos. No other details of his exile are available.<sup>3</sup>

That his exile was voluntary is certain, and that it is political was highly probable since Chairephon was of sufficient stature within the democracy to attract the attention not only of Aristophanes, but also of Kratinos and Eupolis.<sup>4</sup> His association with Sokrates may have been the immediate cause of such attention, but Aristophanes had a penchant for tilting at the demagogues of his day, and the language of the *Clouds* passages suggests that Chairephon was one of these.<sup>5</sup> Therefore he would have been a natural target of the Thirty.

1. Plato *Apol* 21a

2. *loc cit*

3. See entry 77 note 21, with Lysias xii.95, 97 and *Ath Pol* 35.3-4

4. Ar. *Clouds* 104; 144; 156; 503-4; 831; 1465; *Birds* 1296: Chairephon is called a vampire; *Wasps* 1411; Kratinos F202; Eupolis F165, 238.

5. Ar. *Clouds* 104; 1465.

**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Archinos

**Patronymic:** n.k.

**Deme:** Koile

**Tribe:** VIII Hippothontis

**Trittys:** City

**PA No:** 2526

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** n.k.

**Date of Death:** n.k.

**Magistracies:** AO 347 ?multiple *strategiai*  
(Dem. xxiv.135) with Develin AO p225

**Wealth:** n.k.

**B. EXILE**

Certain (Dem. xxiv.135; Aisch. ii.176)

**Reason:** Escape from the Thirty  
because he was a prominent  
moderate democrat.

**Date:** 404/3

**Term:** 1 - 2 years

**Conditions:** n.a.

**Destination:** Thebes

**Hetairoi:** Theramenes (PA 7234),  
Anytos (PA 1324),  
Kleitophon (PA 8546),  
Phormisios (PA 14945),  
Thrasyboulos (PA 7305) (Aisch.  
i.194-5)

**Family Exile:** Probably, as they survived.

**Return Date:** 403/2

**Return Conditons:** Led victorious  
democrats from Phyle.

**Recall Date:** n.a.

### **C. SOURCES**

#### ***Literary:***

Ar. *Frogs* 367

Kratippos *FGrH* 64 T2

Plato *Com.* F133

Plato *Menexenos* 234b

*Ath Pol* 34.3

Aisch. ii.176; iii.187-190,194-195

Isok. xviii.2

Dem. xxiv.135; *Ep* iii.19

Plut. *Mor* 575f, 835f.

***Epigraphical:*** n.e.

### **D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

Rhodes (1981: pp427-435)

Krentz (1982: p72)



## ARCHINOS

The direct cause of the exile of Archinos (*PA* 2526) was the rule of the Thirty Tyrants in Athens which followed the Spartan victory. Immediately prior to the defeat of Athens, Archinos was a public figure of some note,<sup>1</sup> and this is also attested by Aristophanes' jibe in 405.<sup>2</sup> He was apparently a moderate who supported Theramenes (*PA* 7234), together with Anytos (*PA* 1324), Kleitophon (*PA* 8546) and Phormisios (*PA* 14945).<sup>3</sup> After the return to democracy, Archinos played a significant role in the political life of Athens.<sup>4</sup>

Although apparently a supporter of Theramenes, his name is not mentioned at all in Xenophon's account of the events leading to Theramenes' murder, whilst others such as Thrasyboulos (*PA* 7305) are noted as being exiled by the Thirty.<sup>5</sup> This may mean that Archinos had not yet left Athens. However, the murder of Theramenes by the tyrants would have been a strong stimulus for Archinos to flee the city. Yet his appearance as a leader of those from Phyle<sup>6</sup> suggests that he left relatively early in the regime of the Tyrants, possibly before Theramenes' death.

1. Plato *Menexenos* 234b: that he would be considered as a candidate for delivery of the annual *epitaphios* is proof of his prominence. *AO* p225
2. Ar. *Frogs* 367; sv Plato *Com* F133
3. *Ath Pol* 34.3; Rhodes (1981: p420, pp431-3, pp474-5)
4. Plut. *Mor* 835f; Aisch. ii.176; Dem. xxiv.135; *Ath Pol* 40.2; Sinclair (1988: pp26-27)
5. Xen. *Hell* II.3.42
6. Dem. xxiv.135; Aisch. ii.176

Kratippos spoke of Archinos as one of the seventy from Phyle,<sup>7</sup> which means that he had fled to Thebes to join those who subsequently mounted the attack against the regime of the Thirty. Archinos was referred to later by Demosthenes and by Aischines as the leader of the insurgents.<sup>8</sup> Given the consensus of these two normally mutually hostile sources, it is possible that the author of *Athenaion Politeia* has got his facts a little confused. Far from being a moderate, and a possible supporter of Theramenes, which implies that Archinos remained in the city until the commencement of the reign of terror, it is more probable that he was initially opposed to the alteration in the constitution, and fled at the outset. His later prominence<sup>9</sup> indicates that the Thirty would not have dealt kindly with so obvious a democrat, and thus it is concluded that he was a voluntary exile.

As Archinos was *tamias* before the exile<sup>10</sup> he was relatively wealthy, since it was the practice

7. Kratippos *FGrH* 64 T 2.25; it appears that Thebes ignored the edict implied in Lysias xii. 95, 97 that members of the Peloponnesian League were not to take in those fleeing from the Thirty; see also *Ath Pol* 35.3-4.
8. Dem. xxiv.135; Aisch. ii.176
9. Dein. I.72-7
10. Plato Com F133

in Athens that treasurers were drawn from the richest classes,<sup>11</sup> in theory to avoid the temptation for treasurers to help themselves to the public money they handled. We do not know how the property of Archinos fared in the tyrants' hands, but presumably it would have been confiscated. So Archinos, like the others at Thebes, would have survived his exile dependent upon the aid of his hosts and of those still in Athens, such as Lysias, who supplied surreptitiously what succour they could to the exiles.

There is no direct evidence that the family of Archinos went with him, although the fact that he left of his own volition meant that he could have arranged for his family to leave too. Whilst it is difficult to see the operations from Phyle, being basically guerilla tactics, as conducive to a large train, it is equally hard to imagine the family of so prominent a democrat politician being left unmolested in Athens; and it is doubtful that he would have left them to be held as hostages against his future behaviour. It is concluded on the balance of probabilities that, having sufficient time and opportunity, the family of Archinos, as with other prominent politicians of the democracy,<sup>12</sup> left the city with him.

11. *Ath Pol* 47.1 with Rhodes (1981: p391, pp549-550)

12. For example, Atrometos (*PA* 2681 Entry 77) and his wife, who fled to Corinth.

**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Atrometos

**Patronymic:** n.k.

**Deme:** Kothokidai

**Tribe:** VI Oineis

**Trittys:** Coast

**PA No:** 2681

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** 437/6 (Aisch. ii.147)

**Date of Death:** 342/1 (Aisch. iii.191)

**Magistracies:** n.k.

**Wealth:** Lost property in the Peloponnesian War - had to work as a mercenary and later as a teacher. *APF* p74, pp544-545

**B. EXILE**

Certain (Aisch. ii.7-8; 147-8)

**Reason:** Fled from the Thirty, so he was presumably a fairly prominent democrat and possibly wealthy.

**Date:** 404/3

**Term:** 1 - 2 years, because he took part in the return of the democrats.

**Conditions:** n.k.

**Destination:** Corinth (Aisch. ii.148)

**Xenoi:** Presumably he had friends in Corinth.

**Family Exile:** His wife shared in his exile in Corinth. (Aisch. ii.148)

**Attitude to Exile:** n.k.

**Return Date:** 403/2

**Return Conditions:** n.a.

**Recall Date:** n.a.

### **C. SOURCES**

#### ***Literary:***

***Epigraphical:*** n.e.

Aisch. ii.78; 147-8; 179; iii.191

Dem. xviii.129-130; xix.249 does provide incidental support for Aischines' account of his father's life, but should be largely discounted.

[Plut] *Mor* 840a

### **D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

Davies *APF* p74, pp 544-545

## ATROMETOS

The exile of Atrometos (*PA* 2681) is curious for two reasons: why it occurred, and why Atrometos chose Corinth as the exile destination for himself and his new wife Glaukothea.

Aischines stated<sup>1</sup> that his father was exiled by the Thirty, and this presumes that he was either wealthy and/or a democrat of some standing. However, Aischines also stated that his father lost his property in the course of the Peloponnesian War.<sup>2</sup> Whilst it became the practice of the Thirty to banish or execute wealthy persons without pretext in order to gain their wealth or to prevent them becoming a rallying point for opposition,<sup>3</sup> the relatively poor and otherwise unknown Atrometos apparently does not fit into either category.

1. Aisch. ii.78; 147; ii.148 - Glaukothea went with him into exile.
2. Aisch. ii.147
3. Xen. *Hell* II.3.14; 17; *Ath Pol* 35.4

It is difficult to argue from silence, but the fact that Atrometos was apparently in need of a haven under the Thirty, and that he chose Corinth, indicates that he had sufficiently prominent connections, even though he was not prominent in his own right, to have at least one *xenia* relationship in Corinth. Since it is known that Atrometos was in need of funds, and that after the fall of the Thirty he had to work first as a mercenary in Asia, then as a schoolteacher in Athens,<sup>4</sup> survival in Corinth would need guest-friendship support.

Atrometos is described as returning to Athens as part of the restoration of the democracy,<sup>5</sup> and this implies that he was part of the returning forces from Peiraieus. However, we have no direct evidence that this was the case, and he may have returned to Athens after the restoration, especially as his destination in exile was Corinth, not Thebes. During the fourth century, it was fashionable to claim affinity with the restorers of the democracy, and Aischines may be telescoping events to allow an element of the glory for his father. On the other hand, if Atrometos was one of the band of restorers of the democracy, this is additional support for his political prominence in the period immediately prior to 404/3.

4. Aisch. ii.78; 147; Dem. xix.249; *APF* pp544-545. See Hornblower's *phthonos* thesis (1991: p15ff) that Corinth was in the habit of being the "friend" of Athens when the neighbours of either were enemies. The recent Peloponnesian War outcome may have reminded Corinth that Athens, or at least some of its citizens, were worthy of protection. In the case of Atrometos Corinth, as a member of the Peloponnesian League, would appear to have ignored the Spartan prohibition on granting sanctuary to those fleeing the Thirty (Lysias xii.95, 97 confirmed by Plut. *Lysandros* 27)

5. Aisch. ii.78; 147-8

**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Xenophon

**Patronymic:** son of Gryllos

**Deme:** Erchia

**Tribe:** II Aigeis

**Tritys:** Inland

**PA No:** 11307

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** c.432

**Date of Death:** c.352/1

**Magistracies:** n.a.

**Wealth:** Probably moderate wealth whilst he remained in Athens. *Spence* no. 192 - Xenophon was in the cavalry under the Thirty. Comfortable in exile after his return from Asia.

**B. EXILE**

Certain

**Reason:** Political disaffection following the fall of the Thirty.

**Date:** between 403 and 400

**Xenoi:** Proxenos the Boeotian

**Term:** He never returned permanently to Athens

**Conditions:** n.a.

**Destination:** Persia, Sparta per Skillos (Elis), Corinth

**Hetairoi:** n.k. but ?Sokrates

**Family Exile:** Wife/sons with him

**Attitude to Exile:** After Persia, favourable - he did not feel he was exiled, but at home with Sparta.

**Return Date:** Did not return

**Return Conditions:** n.a.

**Recall Date:** n.k. but he was eligible to return under the terms of the King's Peace of 386.

**C. SOURCES**

**Literary:**

Xen. *Anab* III.4-7

Diog. Laert. II.48-59

Paus. V.vi.5

**Epigraphical:** n.e.



#### **D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

Parke (1933: pp24-41)

Anderson (1974: pp148-149, pp164-165, pp172-181)

Higgins (1977: pp21-29, pp66-67, p76ff)

Hofstetter (1978: p.189-190 no.335)

Rahn (1981: pp103-119)

Tuplin (1987: pp59-68)

## XENOPHON

At first glance the decision of Xenophon (*PA* 11307) to leave Athens appears to be no more than a young and restless man's desire for action which the end of the Peloponnesian War had frustrated. Accepting the offer of his friend Proxenos the Boeotian to join up with the mercenary forces of the rebellious Persian Cyrus<sup>1</sup> sounded like a solution to such a problem for Xenophon, who was not yet thirty.<sup>2</sup> Indeed, Xenophon ignored the warning implicit in the words of his mentor, Sokrates, and consulted Delphi not on whether to go with Proxenos, but rather which gods to sacrifice to in order that the venture be successful.<sup>3</sup>

As Rahn<sup>4</sup> has established, a close reading of the text of the *Hellenika*, especially his account of the Thirty (II.3.23, II.4.2), reveals that Xenophon was initially a supporter of the Thirty, or at least of the moderate Theramenes. Although he deplored the violence of the regime after the death of Theramenes, as a member of the *hippeis* class, he stayed and fought on the side of the regime against the democratic forces which were ultimately successful.

Although the armistice and the decree of reconciliation ensured that there were officially no recriminations against the majority of the vanquished, and indeed some were included in the new government of reconciliation, Xenophon was not among them due to his age and probably his political leanings. His prospects in Athens were not encouraging, and his relations with

1. Xen. *Anab* 1.1.11, 3.1.4
2. Xen. *Anab* 3.1.25, 3.2.37
3. Xen. *Anab* 3.1.14f; Fontenrose (1978: p248 no11 - in 401)
4. Rahn (1981: p103)

Sokrates were a further hindrance as he would be associated in the minds of the *demos* with those other young men, such as Alkibiades (*PA* 600), of the Socratic circle whose careers hardly recommended confidence in Xenophon. Politically, in Athens Xenophon had minimal prospects and the decision to seek fame and fortune as a mercenary was at least in part a response to the lack of prospects and the political doldrums attached to a young man with all the baggage of association with the Thirty to carry if he stayed. His departure with Proxenos is thus a form of voluntary political exile. The restored democracy was also distasteful to Xenophon, and although it apparently did not reach the absurdities of the radical democracy such as effected the condemnation of the Arginousai generals, and of which Xenophon wrote, there was nothing to assure those who had been there in 406 that it would not become more of the same.

Xenophon joined the army of the rebellious Cyrus and after its defeat at Cunaxa late in 401, he took a leading role in the return to the coast - the courageous and fraught journey of the Ten Thousand.<sup>5</sup> The hardships they faced and the coherence of the group generally, although somewhat reduced in numbers by the time they got to the Aegean, made this Cyrean troop a formidable fighting force. Dangerous to be left to wander unassigned, and not fully trusted by the Greeks of Asia or of the mainland (although nominally aligned with the Spartans), Xenophon was probably making the best of the situation when he arranged for the army to enter the service of Seuthes, the Odrysian prince, in 400.<sup>6</sup>

5. This is the subject of the *Anabasis* or 'march up country'.

6. Xen. *Anab* 7.2.16-7.3.14

In 399 he entered the service of Thibron and subsequently of Derkylidas, the Spartan commanders entrusted with keeping in check the designs of the Persian satraps in Asia Minor.<sup>7</sup> During this period of service he was paid by the Spartans as a mercenary. In 396 the Spartan king Agesilaos took over command of the whole of the army, including the Cyrean group. In the subsequent reorganisation, Xenophon was relieved of the command, probably because Agesilaos wanted to integrate the group into the regular army,<sup>8</sup> and thus disband a potential source of discord (and probably excessive brigandage). This move was not a reflection on Xenophon as a commander, as he quickly became the trusted advisor and confidant of the Spartan king, a friendship which lasted until Agesilaos' death.

From early 395 Xenophon was with Agesilaos and he went also to Ephesos to respond to the Delphic command to honour Artemis and Apollo, as he promised when he first left Athens.<sup>9</sup> Ephesos was Artemis' city. In 394 Agesilaos was recalled to Sparta and Xenophon went with him, and was present at the battle of Koronea, although Rahn makes a reasonable case that Xenophon did not take part in the actual fighting.<sup>10</sup> After the battle, it is possible that Xenophon accompanied Agesilaos to Delphi and fulfilled that part of his early promise to honour Apollo, curiously by dedicating an offering in the Treasury of the Athenians.<sup>11</sup> Despite his voluntary exile from Athens, he clearly felt himself to be an Athenian.

7. Xen. *Hell* III.13-6; Diod. XIV.37

8. Xen. *Hell* III.4.20

9. Xenophon may even have made the sacrifices before he went with Proxenos to Cyrus.

10. Rahn (1981: pp107-8)

11. Xen. *Hell* iv.3.21; Ages 1.34; Plut. *Ages*. 19.3; Diod. XIV.84.2

Xenophon subsequently returned to Sparta with Agesilaos, who advised Xenophon to send for his two sons, Diodoros and Gryllos, and bring them up in the Spartan tradition.<sup>12</sup> Xenophon had married Philesia some time after 401, and she accompanied her sons to join Xenophon in the Peloponnese. The Spartans had rewarded him firstly with a *proxeny*, which was later swapped for an estate at Skillos in Elis.<sup>13</sup> Rahn believes<sup>14</sup> that this was because as a *proxenos*, Xenophon could not be an exile from his native city. This is the foundation for his case for dating the official sentence of exile of Xenophon by the Athenians to 392, that is after Xenophon had returned to Sparta with Agesilaos. His case has further support in that it is unlikely that the Athenians would have countenanced an offering in their Treasury at Delphi by an outlaw who was openly consorting with the enemy of Koronea.

Against Rahn, the date of 399 for the official sentence of exile is supported by both Anderson<sup>15</sup> and Higgins.<sup>16</sup> Anderson believes that Xenophon was sentenced not just because of the official charge of joining Cyrus, the enemy of the Athenians, but also because he was consorting with the Spartans and gaining some standing as a soldier in their service by 399.<sup>17</sup> Although not yet officially at war with Athens, Sparta was increasingly unpopular in the Greece of the decade post- Peloponnesian War.

12. Plut. *Ages* 20.2

13. Diog. Laert. II.51-52

14. Rahn (1981: p108); Tuplin (1987: p67) believes that this was a special Spartan *proxeny*, not dependent upon the *proxenos* being at, for example, Athens in Xenophon's case. That is, he believes it to have been more in the nature of an honorific.

15. Anderson (1974: p149)

16. Higgins (1977: p22f)

17. Anderson (1974: p149)

Added to what Anderson calls "Laconism", Xenophon was a follower of Sokrates, and Anderson believes that the charge was brought on at the time of the execution of Sokrates in 399.<sup>18</sup> Higgins<sup>19</sup> rejects the "Laconism" charge as being unlikely in 399, but his reading of *Anabasis* VII.7.57, combined with Xenophon's unfortunate association with the Thirty and with Sokrates, has led him to date the sentence to 399.<sup>20</sup> He believes that the charge was not association with Cyrus, as Persia was still the enemy in 399, or association with the Spartans since Athens was part of the Spartan hegemony in 399.<sup>21</sup>

Rahn's case for dating the dedicatory offering by Xenophon to 394 is based on the premise that Xenophon would have accompanied Agesilaos to Delphi. In fact, Xenophon's offering at Delphi could have been made at any time and not necessarily personally. Because the offering was made in the name of Proxenos too, and he had died in Asia, it is probable that it was done earlier, when his friend's death was more recent. If it is assumed that Xenophon made the offering *as an Athenian* at their Treasury it was made before his sentence of exile and there need not be any connection with Agesilaos. After the exile sentence was remitted, probably in 370, is long after the events for Xenophon to have waited to dedicate his offering.<sup>22</sup> Tuplin uses arguments of language<sup>23</sup> and probable cause<sup>24</sup> convincingly to determine that Xenophon's exile must be dated to late 395/4 or early 394/3.

18. Anderson (1974: p149)

19. Higgins (1977: p23)

20. Higgins (1977: p24)

21. Higgins (1977: p22)

22. Tuplin (1987: pp64-65) dismisses the length of time elapsed as irrelevant in this type of offering.

23. Tuplin (1987: pp60-65)

24. Tuplin (1987: pp66-68): notably Laconism and association with Cyrus.

Xenophon no longer needed his mercenary skills to survive and support his family, as he settled on the estate at Skillos and appeared to prosper. He made a dedicatory offering at Olympia, which was close to Skillos,<sup>22</sup> and he probably commenced his writing at Skillos.

The Theban victory at Leuctra in 371, which devastated the Spartans, forced Xenophon to flee from Skillos, and he and his sons (presumably with Philesia) found sanctuary at Corinth.<sup>23</sup> The next year the Athenians cancelled Xenophon's sentence of exile<sup>24</sup> and he was free to return to Athens. However, as Anderson points out,<sup>25</sup> his property and any assets would have been confiscated and sold at the time the sentence of exile was passed, so there was little reason for him to return, although Anderson believes that he did go back to Athens occasionally.

Xenophon spent his last years writing, and according to Athenaeus he visited Sicily,<sup>26</sup> although Anderson<sup>27</sup> doubts the validity of this story. His sons fought (and Gryllos died) at the Battle of Mantinea. According to Pausanias, Xenophon eventually regained his estate in Skillos<sup>28</sup> and died there and not at Corinth. The date of his death must be after 356 because he mentions events in the Third Sacred War<sup>29</sup> so he was probably in his eighties when he died.

22. Anderson (1974: p172)

23. Diog. Laert. II.53

24. Diog. Laert. II.59; Develin AO pp231 and 297 opts for a recall date in the 360's but gives no supporting argument.

25. Anderson (1974: p192)

26. Athenaeus 10.427

26. Anderson (1974: p193)

28. Paus. V.6.6.

29. Anderson (1974: p193)

## The Embassy to Sparta

Entries 56 *bis*, 79, 80 and 81



***Entry No: 56 bis***

**ANDOKIDES IV**

**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Epikrates

**Patronymic:** ?son of Philodemos

**Deme:** Kephisia

**Tribe:** I Erechtheis

**Tritty:** Inland

**PA No:** 4859; J Kirchner *RE* 6 (1909) p119 (3)

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** not after 426

**Date of Death:** n.k.

**Magistracies:** *AO* 1042. Envoy 394/5 (Plato Com. F119 Edmonds); 392/1 (Dem. xix.277)

**Wealth:** n.k. but probable: *APF* p181.

**B. EXILE**

Certain (Philochoros *FGrH* 328 F149)

**Reason:** Fled before trial for misconduct on an embassy to Sparta.

**Date:** 392/1

**Term:** n.k.

**Conditions:** n.k.

**Destination:** ?Persia

**Hetairoi:** Kephalos (*PA* 8277) (*Hell Oxy* 1.2; 2.2)

**Family Exile:** n.k.

**Attitude to Exile:** n.k.

**Return Date:** ?possible

**Return Conditions:** n.k.

**Recall Date:** n.a.

**C. SOURCES**

**Literary:**

*Plato Com* F119; *Ar. Ekk1* 71  
Dem. xix.277-280; Philochoros *FGrH* 328 F149;  
Paus. III.9.8;

**Epigraphical:** *IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 6444

**D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

Bruce (1967: p5, pp56-59)  
Davies *APF* p181  
Hansen (1975: pp87-88 no.69)  
Thomas (1989: p112)

## EPIKRATES

Epikrates (*PA* 4859) was a democrat politician who had risen to prominence in Athens after the end of the Peloponnesian War. He had been of the party which had returned from Peiraieus in 403 to restore the democracy.<sup>1</sup> His first exile was thus occasioned by the Thirty, but it is not clear if he fled or was banished. This group from Peiraieus had achieved the status almost of national heroes, and political ascendancy was thus for them a relatively easy matter to achieve in the decade which followed.

Epikrates was elected as an ambassador to the Persian king, in 396/5,<sup>2</sup> or 394. Upon his return he was accused and acquitted of taking bribes from the Persians. There had been a previous suggestion of bribe-taking in relation to Persian money,<sup>3</sup> and this "tradition" may account for the subsequent readiness of the Athenians to believe that Epikrates took bribes from the Spartans.<sup>4</sup>

1. Dem. xix. 277. His notice by Ar. *Ekkl* 71 and Plato Com F119 attests to his political prominence in the decade after the War. *Hell Oxy* II.2: Epikrates and one Kephalos (*PA* 8277) were actively and consistently anti-Spartan. Bruce (1967: pp56-59) for the policies of Epikrates and Kephalos. Cf Roberts (1982: pp90-92)
2. It is probable that there were two embassies, since Paus. III. 9.8 refers to the earlier date, and the embassy with Phormisios (*PA* 14945) is almost certainly 394/3.
3. This interpretation follows *APF* p181, although it is not clear from Lysias xxvii. 1-4 exactly who or what occasioned the accusations, nor indeed if this is the Epikrates subsequently in exile. Bruce (1967: p5) associates the taking of Persian gold with the policies of Epikrates and Kephalos, following *Hell Oxy* II.2
4. Paus. III.9.8

In 392/1 Epikrates was again elected as an ambassador, this time to Sparta, together with Andokides (*PA* 828 Entry 56), Kratinos (*PA* 8757a Entry 80), and Euboulides (*PA* 5325 Entry 81).<sup>5</sup> Upon their return the ambassadors were charged with misconduct in relation to the terms of their appointment, and with taking bribes.<sup>6</sup> Epikrates fled Athens before the matter came to trial and was condemned to death *in absentia*.<sup>7</sup>

There is no extant detail on the second exile of Epikrates, although it is possible that he fled to Persia, where he may have previously established some relationship with the Persian court, since he and fellow ambassador of 394, Phormisios (*PA* 14945), were accused of receiving largesse from the King. There is no basis for Davies' assumption that Epikrates was initially poor, and established wealth through receipt of gifts from foreign governments.<sup>8</sup> Nor is there evidence concerning the fate of his family, but if the gravestone<sup>9</sup> dated to the early fourth century is that of Epikrates, it is evidence that he had friends and/or family who worked for his return to Athens. It is fair to suggest that a return would have been effected

5. Philochoros, *FGrH* 328 F149

6. Sinclair (1988: p184) feels that although the charge was probably true, Epikrates was already anti-Spartan.

7. Philochoros, *FGrH* 328 F149

8. *APF* p181; Thomas (1989: p112): acting as an ambassador was a matter of significant financial outlay and the state contributed little. One would have to be wealthy to begin the process.

9. *IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 6444

only after the Athenians had achieved a resolution of their relationship with Sparta. This means for example, that Epikrates could have been "forgiven" after the peace in 387/6, when he would still have been only about fifty years old. Unfortunately the name Epikrates is relatively common in Athens, and there is no patronymic, so the identity of the person under the gravestone is not certain.

**A. PERSONAL**

*Name:* Kratinos

*Patronymic:* n.k.

*Deme:* Sphetos

*Tribe:* V Akamantis

*Tritty:* Inland

*PA No:* 8757a

*Genos:* n.k.

*Date of Birth:* n.k.

*Date of Death:* n.k.

*Magistracies:* AO 1702 Envoy 392/1  
(Philochoros *FGrH* 328, F149a)

*Wealth:* probable but not in *APF*

**B. EXILE**

Certain (Philochoros *FGrH* 328, F149a)

*Reason:* Fled from trial for failed  
embassy to Sparta.

*Date:* 392/1

*Conditions:* n.a.

*Term:* n.k.

*Xenoi:* n.k.

*Destination:* n.k.

*Hetairoi:* n.k.

*Family Exile:* n.k.

*Attitude to Exile:* n.k.

*Return Date:* n.k.

*Return Conditions:* n.k.

*Recall Date:* n.k.

**C. SOURCES**

*Literary:*  
Philochoros *FGrH* 328, F149a  
Dem. xix.277 - 280  
[Plut.] 835a

*Epigraphical:* n.e.

**D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

Hansen (1975: p87 no. 71)

**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Euboulides

**Patronymic:** ?son of Epikleides

**Deme:** Eleusis

**Tribe:** VIII Hippothontis

**Tritty:** Coast

**PA No:** 5325

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** n.k.

**Date of Death:** n.k.

**Magistracies:** AO 1105, Archon 394 (Diod. XIV.85.1) Envoy 392/1 (Philochoros *FGrH* 328, F149a) **Wealth:** probable but not in *APF*.

**B. EXILE**

Certain (Philochoros *FGrH* 328, F149a)

**Reason:** Fled from trial for failed embassy to Sparta.

**Date:** 392/1

**Term:** n.k.

**Conditions:** n.k.

**Destination:** n.k.

**Xenoi:** n.k.

**Family Exile:** n.k.

**Attitude to Exile:** n.k.

**Return Date:** n.k.

**Return Conditions:** n.k.

**Recall Date:** n.k.

**C. SOURCES**

**Literary:**

**Epigraphical:** n.e.

Philochoros *FGrH* 328 F149a  
Dem. xix.277 - 280  
[Plut.] 835a

**D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

Hansen (1975: p87 no.72)

### KRATINOS, EUBOULIDES

Although Demosthenes<sup>1</sup> and Plutarch<sup>2</sup> do not mention Kratinos (*PA* 8757a) and Euboulides (*PA* 5325) as the two ambassadors who accompanied Andokides (*PA* 828 Entry 56) and Epikrates (*PA* 4859 Entry 79) on the embassy to Sparta, they are named by Philochoros.<sup>3</sup> Like their fellow ambassadors, Kratinos and Euboulides were charged in 392/1 with misconduct on their mission, since the demos regarded the peace negotiated with the Spartans by the ambassadors to be inadequate. All the ambassadors were also charged with taking bribes, and these two along with their colleagues, fled before their trial.<sup>4</sup>

We have no further details on Kratinos and Euboulides, and there is no basis to speculate that they went to Sparta for assistance in their exile. Nothing can be deduced from the supposed conduct of Epikrates<sup>5</sup> nor from that of Andokides,<sup>6</sup> both of whom had had opportunities to set up safe havens in the event of an unfavourable political climate at Athens. Unfortunately Philochoros does nothing more than note their names.

1. Dem. xix.277f
2. Plut. *Mor* 835a
3. Philochoros *FGrH* 328 F149
4. Dem. xix.277-280; Hansen (1975: pp86-87 nos. 71 and 72)
5. Entry 79
6. Entry 56



**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Kallistratos

**Patronymic:** son of Kallikrates

**Deme:** Aphidna

**Tribe:** IX Aiantis

**Tritty:** Inland

**PA No:** 8157 H Swoboda *RE* 10 (1919)  
p1647(1); p1730f(1)

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** Not later than 415 (*APF* p278)

**Date of Death:** Executed in  
Athens ?355 (Sinclair 1988: p157)

**Magistracies:** *AO* 1564, *strategos* 378, 373  
? *strategos* in 372/1; *epistates* 374;  
Envoy in 372

**Wealth:** Probable *APF* pp277-282

**B. EXILE**

Certain (*Hyp.* iv.1-2)

**Reason:** Alleged he made  
proposals contrary to the people's  
interest.

**Date:** 361

**Term:** Not certain - several years.

**Conditions:** n.a. - condemned to  
death *in absentia*.

**Destination:** Methone

**Hetairoi:** Kallippos (*PA* 8065),  
Timomachos (*PA* 13797),  
?Iphikrates (*PA* 7737), ?Chabrias  
(*PA* 15086) (Sinclair 1988:  
pp139-140), Stephanos (*PA* 12887)  
[Dem] lix 26-27.

**Family Exile:** n.k. but probably not.

**Attitude to Exile:** Keen to  
return.

**Return Date:** n.k.

**Return Conditions:** Without  
reprieve.

**Recall Date:** n.a.

### **C. SOURCES**

#### ***Literary:***

Xen. *Hell* VI.2.39

Hyp. iv. 1-2

Lyk. i.93

Dem. l.46f, 48

#### ***Epigraphical:* n.e.**

### **D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

Davies *APF* pp277-282

Hansen (1976: p123)

Fontenrose (1978: p250 no.H18; p5)

Hammond and Griffith (1979: p199, pp235-236)

Sinclair (1988: pp46-47; pp163-168)

# KALLISTRATOS

Kallistratos (*PA* 8157) was condemned to death *in absentia*, having been found guilty of a charge of making proposals contrary to the interests of the Athenian people.<sup>1</sup> Hansen has suggested that he was also accused of having taken bribes, although there is no evidence of this.<sup>2</sup> With or without bribery thrown in for good measure, as it often was<sup>3</sup>, in Athenian terms this charge was employed against politicians of prominence by their political opponents. It usually succeeded if events were going against Athens in any area and a connection, however tenuous, could be made between the target opponent and a previous speech or decree on the subject. The fact that the same *ekklesia* had voted to reject/accept a proposal at the time was conveniently forgotten.<sup>4</sup>

There are no extant details of the case against Kallistratos. However, it is significant that it must have been serious since he was in fact condemned twice.<sup>5</sup> Kallistratos was a prominent politician,<sup>6</sup> and a former *strategos*.<sup>7</sup> He numbered amongst his *hetairoi* Kallippos (*PA* 8065 Entry 86) and his kinsman by marriage Timomachos (*PA* 13797 Entry 88). At the time of

1. Hyp. iv.1-2; Harvey (1985: pp76 -113) discusses the nature of bribery at Athens, and deduces from Hypereides and the extant cases, that bribery was a shameful act with dire penalties, only if the receiver of the bribe has taken it to act against the interests of the state. According to the conclusions of Harvey, other forms of bribery do not attract the odium associated with bribery to act against the interests of Athens. Sinclair (1988: pp163-168) gives a succinct account of the career of Kallistratos.
2. Hansen (1975: p94 no.87)
3. For example, Epikrates (*PA* 4859 Entry 79), Philokrates (*PA* 14599 Entry 94).
4. Thuc. II 60, 64
5. Dem. I.48
6. Dem. xix.297; Sealey (1976: pp415-416, p425); cf Roberts (1982: pp90-92) and Sealey (1956: pp178-203)
7. Xen. *Hell* VI.2.39

charges being formulated against Kallistratos, Timomachos was *strategos*<sup>8</sup> and he was in the region of Thasos immediately after Kallistratos fled. Therefore, the decision of Kallistratos to flee could be ascribed to the realisation that he could not muster sufficient support to ensure he survived the charges.<sup>9</sup>

Kallistratos fled to Methone in Macedon and from there arranged to be transported across to Thasos to Timomachos. In fact Timomachos ordered Kallippos to transport Kallistratos whilst he was in exile, itself a crime at Athens.<sup>10</sup> Kallistratos remained in exile for an unspecified period, and Hansen suggests several years, though without evidence.<sup>11</sup> There is some evidence of his means of sustenance, although not whether his family was with him: they are not mentioned as being in the party that went to Thasos. Any wealth which Kallistratos left in Athens would undoubtedly have been confiscated, although he probably had some time to arrange his affairs.<sup>12</sup>

8. Dem. xxxvi.53; I.48

9. Sealey (1976: p431) ascribes the fall of Kallistratos in part to the rise of his enemy Timotheos (PA 13700). Hornblower (1991: pp229-230) is perhaps more accurate when he suggests that Kallistratos was charged because of his anti-Theban policies, which had resulted in the loss of Oropos, Euboia and of an opportunity to regain Amphipolis. Hornblower had previously noted (p134) the obsession of the Athenians with Amphipolis, describing it as out of proportion, despite the fact that its economic value was high. That would make sense of Hypereides' belief that the charge was one of acting against the best interests of the people – see note 1.

10. Schol. Aisch. I.31

11. Hansen (1976: p123)

12. Sinclair (1988: p46f and p212) notes his aptitude in financial matters as a political asset. It follows that this was a personal advantage: see note 12 below p293.

It appears that Kallistratos found employ in Macedon as a financial advisor: he is credited with reorganising the harbour dues.<sup>13</sup> He was also involved with Thasos in the establishment of a colony.<sup>14</sup>

Despite surviving, Kallistratos apparently chafed at his exile as he arranged to consult the god at Delphi to determine his return to Athens.<sup>15</sup> This in itself is a measure of either the standing of Kallistratos or his wealth in exile, since it was difficult for individuals to consult the Pythia, and the cost of the journey to Delphi and the various offerings prior to the consultation was high.<sup>16</sup>

The advice of the god was that he would be dealt with fairly by the laws if he returned to Athens. This incident indicates that the power of the oracle at Delphi at this time was undiminished, since Kallistratos immediately returned to Athens without taking the precaution to secure a reprieve or at least a safe passage.<sup>17</sup> He was subsequently removed from the sanctuary of the Altar of the Twelve Gods and summarily executed.<sup>18</sup>

13. [Arist] Dec.2.22; Hammond and Griffith (1979: p199) describe Kallistratos as a "skilled financier". Although the terminology may be anachronistic, Kallistratos had marketable skills.
14. Isok. viii.24; Hammond and Griffith (1979: p235-236) for the view that Kallistratos was acting largely for self-serving purposes in his dealings in the north.
15. Lyk. i. 93; cf Pusey (1940: p215 and pp217f) who downgrades the notion of *to philopoli* to that of faction, and fails to mention the motivations of a Kallistratos in his strenuous exertions to come home. Whilst he is doubtless correct in his assertions that what are essentially modern concepts of patriotism do not apply to Athens in the period under review, there is little justification to downgrade family and religious associations, common heritage and language as powerful magnets for those whom Pusey himself describes (pp222-223) as "...trying in exile to encompass their return..." *sv* Connor (1971: pp102-103)
16. Fontenrose (1978: p250 no.H18; p5)
17. Kallistratos was too experienced to have relied solely on Delphi, yet what he failed to take into account was the disintegration of his support base at Athens. Sinclair (1988: p168) shows that the alliances had shifted and Kallistratos was out of the picture.
18. Lyk. i. 93

**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Leosthenes

**Patronymic:** n.k.

**Deme:** Kephale

**Tribe:** V Akamantis

**Trittys:** Coast

**PA No:** 9141; F Geyer *RE* 12 (1925) p2059f (1)

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** Not later than 390/1

**Date of Death:** n.k.

**Magistracies:** *AO* 1801, *strategos* 361/0 (*Aisch.* ii.124, *Hyp.* iv.1, *Diod.* XIV.95.2f)

**Wealth:** *APF* pp342-344

**B. EXILE**

Certain (*Hyp.* iv. 1-2)

**Reason:** Loss of battle to Alexander of Pherae - chose to stay away.

**Date:** 361/0

**Term:** Probably did not return

**Conditions:** Condemned to death and forfeited his property

**Destination:** Macedon

**Hetairoi:** n.k. perhaps Demosthenes (*PA* 3597)

**Family Exile:** Unlikely

**Attitude to Exile:** n.k.

**Return Date:** n.k.

**Return Conditions:** n.k.

**Recall Date:** n.a.

**C. SOURCES**

**Literary:**

**Epigraphical:** n.e.

*Aisch.* ii.21 with schol.; 124  
*Hyp.* iv.1-2  
*Diod.* XV.95

**D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

Hansen (1975: p95 n88)

LEOSTHENES (I)

Leosthenes (*PA* 9141) of Kephale was *strategos* in 361/0 when he failed to protect Peparethos against Alexander, tyrant of Pherae. The result was the loss of five Athenian triremes as well as loss of strategic position in northern waters.<sup>1</sup>

Leosthenes was apparently an accomplished politician,<sup>2</sup> since he accurately read the Athenian mood at the defeat by Alexander. It is not clear if he returned home and then fled, as seems to be implied by Hypereides,<sup>3</sup> or if he failed to return. It would not have been difficult for him to have guessed what the future held for him, since there had been ample precedents in the years since Arginousai. Hypereides is certainly clear that he did not await the trial at which he was impeached on a charge of treason because he had lost to Alexander.<sup>4</sup>

Remarks of Aischines indicate that Leosthenes found refuge and probably employment in

1. Diod. XV.95.1-3; Roberts (1982: pp73-75)
2. Aisch. ii.124
3. Hyp. iv.1-2
4. Hansen (1975: p95 no88) says he was apparently, though not certainly, impeached by Aristophon of Azenia (*PA* 2108). There had been a rash of such trials in the period as Athens failed in her foreign policy objectives in the north.

Macedon.<sup>5</sup> Had he returned home after Peparethos he may have had time to arrange for his family to accompany him, though nothing is known of them. On balance it is unlikely that he came home since one result of his trial was confiscation of property,<sup>6</sup> which indicates that he was not able to make arrangements to dispose of those of his assets accessible to the *demos* in order to provide sustenance during exile. The point is that there must have been enough assets to warrant confiscation as part of the sentence imposed upon Leosthenes.<sup>7</sup>

There is no further information about Leosthenes,<sup>8</sup> though it is unlikely that he ever returned to Athens. Whilst in context Aischines is being sarcastic about Demosthenes, he has perhaps inadvertently stated the preconditions which would need to apply for Leosthenes to return, namely the return of Amphipolis. Since that did not occur, and since hostility to Philip continued almost totally unabated until Philip's death where Amphipolis was concerned, Leosthenes remained an exile.<sup>9</sup>

5. Aisch. ii.21 with schol.

6. Hansen (1975: p95 no. 88)

7. It was not an automatic concomitant of such impeachment actions.

8. The Leosthenes mentioned by Pausanias (I.25.5) and by Hypereides in the Epitaphios (VI.6) is not the same person: Leosthenes was anti-Macedonian and would have been at least 70 years old at the beginning of the exploits mentioned by Hypereides. cf *APF* p342

9. Aisch. ii.21; Bosworth (1988: p15) for the ongoing irritation between Philip and the Athenians over Amphipolis. Hornblower (1991: p134) notes the obsession of the Athenians with Amphipolis.



**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Philon

**Patronymic:** Kallippos

**Deme:** Aixone

**Tribe:** VII Kekropis

**Trittys:** Coast

**PA No:** 14825

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** n.k.

**Date of Death:** n.k.

**Magistracies:** AO 2450 strategos 361/0 (Hyp iv.1)

**Wealth:** APF pp274-275

**B. EXILE**

Certain (Hyp. iv. 1-2)

**Reason:** Fled to avoid treason trial.

**Date:** 360/59

**Term:** n.k.

**Conditions:** n.k.

**Destination:** n.k.

**Xenoi:** n.k.

**Hetairoi:** n.k.

**Family Exile:** n.k.

**Attitude to Exile:** n.k.

**Return Date:** n.k.

**Return Conditions:** n.k.

**Recall Date:** n.k.

**C. SOURCES**

**Literary:**

**Epigraphical:** n.e.

Hyp. iv. 1-2

**D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

Davies APF pp274-275

Hansen (1975: p95 no.89)

PHILON

Philon (PA 14825) was charged with treason (*prodosia*),<sup>1</sup> presumably related to his command as *strategos* and probably that command was in the north. A number of Athenian commanders suffered a similar fate between 363 and 359, when failure in the north ran counter to the preoccupation of the *ekklesia* with regaining Amphipolis, and with the growing power of Macedon.

Apparently Philon felt that his chances of being acquitted were negligible and he chose to flee into exile rather than face the trial.<sup>2</sup> This could have been because he was guilty of the charges and therefore a common criminal; or the fact that as he was a *strategos*, with a power base in Athens,<sup>3</sup> means that the attack on him was probably political.

There is nothing else known of the exile of Philon, and it is too speculative to suggest a destination, what happened to his family, and any other questions related to voluntary exiles in his position.<sup>4</sup>

1. Hyp. iv.1; cf Roberts (1982: pp210-211, n97); *APF* p274
2. Hyp. iv.2
3. Although not such an important factor in the election of strategoi in the fourth century, candidates for the post must necessarily have had some public profile.
4. Refer to Table 8.

**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Theotimos

**Patronymic:** n.k.

**Deme:** n.k.

**Tribe:** n.k.

**Trittys:** n.k.

**PA No:** 7055

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** not later than 391/0

**Date of Death:** n.k.

**Magistracies:** AO 2975, *strategos* in 361/0 or 360/59  
(Hyp. iv.1)

**Wealth:** n.k.

**B. EXILE**

Certain (Hyp.iv.1-2)

**Reason:** Impeached on a charge of  
losing Sestos ?to Kotys.

**Date:** 360/59

**Term:** n.k.

**Conditions:** n.a.

**Destination:** n.k.

**Hetairoi:** Konon (PA 8707) (Dem.  
liv.77)

**Family Exile:** n.k.

**Attitude to Exile:** n.k.

**Return Date:** n.k.

**Return Conditions:** n.k.

**Recall Date:** n.k.

**C. SOURCES**

**Literary:** Hyp. iv.1-2  
Dem. liv.77

**Epigraphical:** n.e.

**D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

Hansen (1975: p98 no.94)

## THEOTIMOS

Theotimos (*PA* 7055) was *strategos* in either 361/0 or 360/59.<sup>1</sup> He was apparently the general in charge of the military activity which resulted in the loss of Sestos.<sup>2</sup> There is no current knowledge of this military encounter, whether the loss was in fact the fault of Theotimos or indeed whether he was in a position to influence the outcome at all.

In time-honoured Athenian fashion, he was duly charged with treason,<sup>3</sup> the presumption being that he either wilted in the face of opposition, or was bribed to throw the battle.

Unlike some of his more cautious predecessors, Theotimos appears to have returned to Athens, as he subsequently fled before his trial.<sup>4</sup> His lack of perspicacity indicates that perhaps he felt he had not erred in the matter of Sestos, in which according to Hyperides<sup>5</sup> he was in good company.

1. Hyp. iv.1 must indicate that Theotimos was *strategos*. That does not mean that Hansen (1975: p98 no.94) is correct that he was also commander-in-chief. Roberts (1982: p209 n87)
2. Hyp. iv.1. See Entry no. 83 n.4)
3. Hyp. iv.1
4. *loc cit*
5. *loc cit*. Equally he may not have returned at all, as appears to be the case with Leosthenes (Entry no. 83).

His destination and means of support are not known and there are no details of his family. His military career to this date<sup>6</sup> would have stood Theotimos in good stead, as he could have found work relatively easily as a mercenary.

Nothing available suggests that Theotimos was guilty or otherwise of the charge laid against him (whatever its detail). Precedents set in the previous one hundred years suggest that he was innocent of the charge, if he did at first return home after Sestos.<sup>7</sup> Also, having ascertained the political atmosphere and the need for a scapegoat, he then voluntarily left Athens, perhaps even before the trial was announced. There may have been time to realise some assets and to make provision for his family, however short that time may have been. Theotimos is not heard of again in the extant sources.

6. He had after all attained the rank of *strategos*.

7. Cf the six *stratego*i who returned to Athens after Arginousai.

**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Kallippos (II)

**Patronymic:** son of Philon

**Deme:** Aixone

**Tribe:** VII Kekropis

**Tritty:** Coast

**PA No.** 8065; F Stahelin *RE* 10 (1919) p1664f 91)

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** 390

**Date of Death:** 351/0

**Magistracies:** *AO*:1549 and p268 ?*strategos* 361/0 -  
Develin discounts this magistracy. (Dem. 1.46ff)

**Wealth:** n.k. before exile.  
Assumed after 357 in Sicily with  
Dion. However a liturgy as  
*trierarch* 366/5 so probably wealthy  
in Athens too. *APF* pp274-275

**B. EXILE**

Certain (Dem. xxxvi.53)

**Reason:** Prosecuted by  
Apollodoros for treason.

**Date:** 357

**Method:** Fled before his trial

**Term:** Self imposed for life

**Conditions:** n.a.

**Destination:** Syracuse

**Hetairoi:** Kallistratos (*PA* 8157),  
?Timotheos (*PA* 13700),  
Timomachos (*PA* 13797)

**Xenoi:** Dion of Syracuse

**Family Exile:** n.k.

**Attitude to Exile:** Appeared to  
flourish.

**Return Date:** No evidence for return

**Return Conditions:** n.a.

**Recall Date:** n.a.

### **C. SOURCES**

#### ***Literary:***

Plato *Ep* vii.333e

Dem. xxxvi.53

[Dem.] i.46-52

Hyp. iv.1-2

Diod. XVI.31.7, 45.9

Plut. *Dion* 54-58.7

***Epigraphical:*** *IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 1609 line 96

*IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 5433 lines 1-3

### **D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

Davies *APF* pp 274-275

Hansen (1975: p97 no.92)

KALLIPOS (II)

Kallippos (*PA* 8065) left Athens for Sicily probably in 357,<sup>1</sup> although "fled" would perhaps be an appropriate description, since he faced a politically motivated prosecution for treason<sup>2</sup> which, in the prevailing climate, he would not have survived.

Kallippos was born not later than 390 according to Davies,<sup>3</sup> since he was *strategos* in 361/0. There is no evidence to suggest that this was his first generalship.<sup>4</sup> The fact that he was a *trierarch*<sup>5</sup> in 366/5 is of no significance for the establishment of his birth date.

At the time of Kallippos' exile in 357, the Athenian political scene was divided into two broad groups, those who unreservedly opposed the emerging power of Philip of Macedon and those who were in favour of some accommodation with Philip. In addition, Kallistratos (*PA* 8157 Entry 82) son of Kallikrates had been condemned to death *in absentia* in 362/1<sup>6</sup> for making

1. Davies, citing Berve: *APF* p275
2. Hansen (1975: p97 no.92)
3. *APF* p 275
4. *AO* p268: Develin calls him a ship commander, not a *strategos*.
5. *IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 1609 line 96
6. *Hyp.* iv.1



proposals contrary to Athenian interests. This meant, translated into the idiom of the times, that he was opposed to whatever measures and policies were advocated by those whose political views did not match his own. Kallippos was his *hetairos*<sup>7</sup> and it follows that he was probably of the same (unknown) convictions. Timomachos (*PA* 13797, Entry 88) may also have shared Kallippos' views: it was he who ordered Kallippos to transport Kallistratos from Methone to Thasos.<sup>8</sup>

As a former *strategos*, despite the fact that fourth century military leaders owed less to politics than to military prowess as a general rule, Kallippos was a person of high political profile. His prosecution for treason by Apollodoros (*PA* 1411),<sup>9</sup> who was firmly in the anti-Philip camp by 357 if not continuously, relates directly to the friendship of Kallippos with Kallistratos. The group most opposed to Philip's increasing influence in Greek affairs, which included not only Apollodoros but Demosthenes (*PA* 3597 Entry 99), was in the comparative ascendancy at this time. Kallippos rightly read the political situation and like so many others in his situation, as Hypereides pointed out,<sup>10</sup> he left before his trial could commence.

7. [Dem.] 1.46-52

8. Hansen (1975: p97 no.92); cf *APF* p280, *AO* p268. See also Entry 82.

9. Dem. xxxvi.53; Roberts (1982: pp76-77)

10. Hyp. iv.1-2

According to Davies,<sup>11</sup> Kallippos actually left Athens in company with Dion, tyrant of Syracuse, with whom probably he enjoyed a *xenia* relationship, and certainly friendship.<sup>12</sup> Kallippos had two sons, Proxenos (*PA* 12266) and Philon (*PA* 14826),<sup>13</sup> but it is not known if they accompanied their father or remained in Athens. It seems likely that they would have remained since the circumstances of their father's presumed hasty departure and their relative youth perhaps precluded accompanying him into exile.

Plutarch also attests that Kallippos was a great friend of Dion and that he was held in trust by him.<sup>14</sup> He lived well in Sicily as one of Dion's captains of mercenary troops,<sup>15</sup> a somewhat misleadingly innocent name for what in reality was virtually a second-in-command to Dion.

Kallippos was not content to remain in his secondary role and, according to Plutarch, conspired to murder his benefactor Dion, and to assume control of Syracuse. Apparently he immediately sought to consolidate his position with a military showing, and was himself murdered by one of

11. Again following Berve: *APF* p275

12. Plato *Ep* vii.333e

13. *IG* ii<sup>2</sup>5433 lines 1-3: this is not the Philon (*PA* 14825) who is Entry 84.

14. Plut. *Dion* 54- 57.7

15. Plut. *Timoleon and Aemilius* 2.6

the co-conspirators in the murder of Dion.<sup>16</sup>

Kallippos was probably an inherently second-rate persona in the overall scheme of Athenian and Greek affairs at this time. However, his voluntary exile is important because it exhibits three elements of exile coming together. By the fourth century it is noted that military prowess will always earn one sustenance at least. In the case of Kallippos it is aligned with the tendency for definite "party" affiliations relative to foreign policy, to affect one's political and personal survival, a particularly fourth century trait. In addition, the *xenia* relationship emerged as a factor, at least for Kallippos, with strong echoes of the fifth century, not usual in the fourth century.

16. Plut. *Dion* 57.7

## A. PERSONAL

**Name:** Kydimachos

**Patronymic:** n.k.

**Deme:** n.k.

**Tribe:** n.k.

**Tritty:** n.k.

**PA No:** 8930

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** n.k.

**Date of Death:** n.k.

**Magistracies:** n.k.

**Wealth:** n.k.

## B. EXILE

Certain, but may not be voluntary.  
(Dein.ii.8, 18)

**Reason:** Fled from Athens as a pauper - may have been politically based because of his son, Aristogeiton (PA 1775, Entry 90)

**Date:** ?mid-350s

**Term:** n.k.

**Conditions:** n.a.

**Destination:** Eretria in Euboea ([Dem]xxv.54, 65,77)

**Xenoi:** n.k.

**Hetairoi:** n.k.

**Family Exile:** not his son and probably no one as he died alone without anyone to see to his burial.

**Attitude to Exile:** n.k.

**Return Date:** n.a.

**Return Conditions:** n.a.

**Recall Date:** n.a.

## C. SOURCES

**Literary:**  
[Dem] xxv.54, 65, 77  
Dein. ii.8, 18

**Epigraphical:** n.e.

## D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

Worthington (1992: pp295-296)

### KYDIMACHOS

Both Deinarchos<sup>1</sup> and pseudo-Demosthenes<sup>2</sup> state that Kydimachos (*PA* 8930) fled from Athens, and he went to Eretria in Euboea. Although the date is less securely attested, Worthington<sup>3</sup> believes that 338 is the most likely date.

Kydimachos was certainly a voluntary exile, but that his was a politically motivated flight is less certain. It is believed that he would have been declared *atimos*, having failed to pay a fine to the state. His fine and subsequent *atimia* may be tenuously attributed to political motives since his son<sup>4</sup> was politically active, and Kydimachos and his fate apparently were well known to the audience of both ancient sources. Being *atimos* could result in feelings of alienation sufficiently strong to make continued residence in Athens unpalatable and the victim could choose to leave.<sup>5</sup> However, in the case of Kydimachos the sources suggest that he was in flight from the death penalty when he left Athens. This is an unusual response to the inability to pay a fine, and suggests that a crime against the state may have been perpetrated by Kydimachos.<sup>6</sup> Although not conclusive these separate factors taken together suggest that whatever the crime from which Kydimachos fled it involved politics.

1. Dein ii.8, 18

2. [Dem] xxv.54, 65, 77

3. Worthington (1992: pp295-296)

4. Aristogeiton (*PA* 1775 Entry 90)

5. For example, Aischines (*PA* 354 Entry 97)

6. Dein. ii.8. Death penalties were usually reserved for such crimes, with homicide, for example, being punished by banishment and/or monetary reparations to the relatives of the deceased.

There is no suggestion that Kydimachos lived long in Eretria, and he died there a pauper, without sustenance or support from his son. Being so close to Attika, Eretria was an unusual destination for Kydimachos to choose, given the death sentence hanging over his head. The options are that he had a *xenos* there, or owned property there (less likely since he died poor and friendless, if Deinarchos is right and not merely making Aristogeiton look as black as possible.) Or, he may have died in Eretria on his way to a safer, more remote destination. There are no other details of the exile of Kydimachos, and his voluntary political exile is only cautiously affirmed.

**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Timomachos

**Patronymic:** n.k.

**Deme:** Acharnai

**Tribe:** VI Oineis

**Tritty:** Inland

**PA No:** 13797

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** n.k.

**Date of Death:** n.k.

**Magistracies:** AO 3097 strategos 367 (Xen. Hell 7.1.41f); 361/0 (Dem. XIX.180)

**Wealth:** APF p280

**B. EXILE**

Certain (Hyp.iii.1)

**Reason:** fled from trial for embezzlement related to his failure in the north, or for treason in helping Kallistratos (PA 8157).

**Date:** between 363 and 359

**Term:** n.k. but probably did not return.

**Conditions:** n.a.

**Destination:** n.k.

**Xenoi:** n.k.

**Hetairoi:** Kallistratos PA 8157), ?Kallippos (PA 8065) ?Hegesandros (PA 6307)

**Family Exile:** n.k.

**Attitude to Exile:** n.k.

**Return Date:** n.k.

**Return Conditions:** n.k.

**Recall Date:** n.a.

**C. SOURCES**

**Literary:**

Hyp. iii.1

Dem. i.14, 46-52, xix.180, xxxvi.53

[Dem] I.48

Aischines i.56 with schol.

**Epigraphical:** n.e.

**D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

Davies APF p280

Hansen (1975: p96 no. 91)

TIMOMACHOS

Hypereides states that Timomachos (PA 13797) was one of five Athenians impeached by the *demos* and that he fled before his trial.<sup>1</sup> The probable cause was a military failure in the north in 361/0, said to be betrayal of the Thracian Chersonese to Kotys.<sup>2</sup> Athenian politics at this time were determined by a fixation on the north and on Macedon's rising power. However, Demosthenes suggests that Timomachos was brought down by his *tamias* on the northern excursion, Hegesandros (PA 6307), who was charged with embezzlement.<sup>3</sup>

In addition, Timomachos was responsible for ordering one of his commanders, Kallippos (PA 8065, Entry 86) to collect Kallistratos (PA 8157, Entry 82) from Methone and to convey him to Timomachos on Thasos.<sup>4</sup> This was a criminal act and the order was apparently brought to the attention of the *demos*, and this too must have diminished the chances of Timomachos being cleared of the main treason charge. Like his confrères mentioned by Hypereides,<sup>5</sup> and able to refer to more than a century of harsh treatment by the *demos* of generals perceived to have failed, Timomachos chose to flee before his trial, and he was condemned *in absentia*.<sup>6</sup>

1. Hyp. iv.1; Roberts (1982: pp111-112)
2. Dem. xix.180, cf schol. Aischines I.56
3. Contrary to Hansen (1975: p96) Timomachos was not himself charged with embezzlement, although the association with Hegesandros was probably damaging.
4. Dem. i.46-52. Timomachos was married to the daughter of Kallistratos: [Dem] 1.48. Sinclair (1988: p173-4) feels that the decision of Timomachos to stay away from Athens was prudent since the assistance he gave to his father-in-law was illegal.
5. Hyp. iv.1 - the others include Theotimos (PA 7055 Entry 85), Leosthenes (PA 9141 Entry 83), Kallistratos (PA 815 Entry 82) and Philon (PA 14825 Entry 84).
6. Schol. Aisch. I.56



Although it is not known where Timomachos went in exile, or if he returned, it is possible that he joined his father-in-law Kallistratos in Thasos or in Macedon.<sup>7</sup> As a prominent and experienced *strategos*, he would be able to hire out his services as a mercenary, as many Athenian exiles of his rank supported themselves in exile in this manner.

It was established<sup>8</sup> that Kallistratos had left Athens but probably in enough time to attend to his affairs; his family probably went with him and may have included the wife of Timomachos. Since he fled from Athens, Timomachos may have been joining his wife and her father. There is no evidence to support this contention and it remains a possibility only. Nor is there any evidence for a return to Athens, although Timomachos may have been eligible under Alexander's exiles decree despite being a very old man, if he was alive in the 320s. It is more likely that he died in exile.

7. Hammond and Griffith (1979: p199); Isok. viii.24.

8. See Entry 82.

**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Timotheos (II)

**Patronymic:** son of Konon (II)

**Deme:** Anaphlystos

**Tribe:** X Antiochis

**Tritty:** Coast

**PA No:** 13700

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** n.k. but before 409/8

**Date of Death:** 354/3

**Magistracies:** AO 3112

**Strategos** 378, 376-373

367-363, 360, 356

**Wealth:** Probably considerable from sources external to Athens: fined 100 talents, so some expectation he could pay. Inherited 17 talents from Konon although he was bankrupted by a trial in 373/2, so relatively poor in 356/5.

**B. EXILE**

Certain (Dein. i.14, iii.17)

**Reason:** ?*atimia* after trial for loss at Embata - could not pay fine.

**Date:** 356/5

**Hetairoi:** Iphikrates (PA 7737)

**Term:** n.k. but died soon after he left Athens

**Conditions:** n.a.

**Destination:** Chalkis

**Xenoi:** Jason of Pherae (Nepos *Tim* 4.2-3); ?Evagoras of Cyprus

**Family Exile:** n.k. daughter married to Iphikrates' son Menestheus, and his son Konon appears to have stayed in Athens.

**Attitude to Exile:** n.k.

**Return Date:** did not return.

**Return Conditions:** n.a.

**Recall Date:** n.a.

## C. SOURCES

### *Literary:*

Lys. xix, 34-40  
Dem. liv.7, 44, 39  
Isok. xv.108-112, 124-5, 129  
Dein. i.14, iii.17  
Theopompos *FGrH* 115 F105  
Diod. XVI.21.4  
Nepos *Tim* 1-5, *Chabrias* 3.4  
Plut. *Mor* 605f  
Paus. I.29.3

### *Epigraphical:* n.e.

## D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

Davies *APF* pp508-510  
Hansen (1975: p101 no.101)  
Hofstetter (1978: pp186-187 no.329)  
Worthington (1992: pp148-156)

## TIMOTHEOS (II)

In the first half of the fourth century it was still common for a successful general to be also a *prostates tou demou* and Timotheos, the son of the (by then) illustrious Konon (PA 8707 Entry 71), victor at Knidos, was both by the time of his trial in 356/5.

In his political capacity by 356/5 Timotheos was part of a group of *hetairoi* which included Iphikrates (PA 7737) and Menestheus (PA 9988).<sup>1</sup> Interestingly, Iphikrates had been co-prosecutor of Timotheos in 373/2<sup>2</sup>, a trial which had left Timotheos almost bankrupt.<sup>3</sup> Later Timotheos married his daughter to the son of Iphikrates, Menestheus.<sup>4</sup> Some time in the intervening years, probably in 362, Iphikrates made this political alliance with Timotheos.<sup>5</sup>

In 356/5 these three men were the *strategoi* sent to relieve Chares (PA 15295 Entry 95) in the eastern Aegean.<sup>6</sup> As they advised caution against the reputedly devil-may-care attitude of Chares when they arrived,<sup>7</sup> Chares was forestalled in his attempt to rein in the allied revolt

1. His daughter's father-in-law and his son-in-law respectively.
2. [Dem] xlix.9; Hansen (1975: p91 no.80)
3. Davies *APF* pp509-510
4. [Dem] xlix.66; *APF* p509
5. Worthington (1992: pp155-156)
6. Diod.XVI.21.1 with Nepos *Tim* 3.1-4
7. See Entry 95 n1 and n2

through the battle of Embata. Chares wrote to Athens that the three colleagues had taken a bribe from Chios and Rhodes. They were suspended and recalled, and eventually charged with taking a bribe, which was in effect a charge of treason, *prodosia*.<sup>8</sup>

Iphikrates and Menestheus were acquitted, but Timotheos was found guilty and fined one hundred talents.<sup>9</sup> He fled to Chalkis where he died some time later, Worthington suggests two to three years later.<sup>10</sup> It appears that the trial was a staged affair to ensure that he was removed from the political scene at Athens.<sup>11</sup> Apparently the removal of the main or central person in a group of *hetairoi* resulted in the break up of the group,<sup>12</sup> and the objective of the action against Timotheos was to remove him, or to remove the subsidiary targets if the attempt missed the main man.<sup>13</sup>

8. Diod. XVI.21.4; Dein. i.14 and iii.17 with Roberts (1982: pp45-49) and Worthington (1992: pp 148-156)

9. Dein. i.14; Isok. xv.129

10. Nepos *Tim* 3.5; Worthington (1992: p154)

11. Worthington (1992: pp154-156)

12. However a direct attack was fraught with difficulty if the target was very powerful. Then the alternative of attack on associates (see also note 13) became a viable alternative. For example, cf the attacks on the associates of Perikles (Pheidias *PA* 14149 Entry 6), and those of Demosthenes (Aristarchos *PA* 1656 Entry 91).

13. That is, Iphikrates and/or Menestheus.

The opposition to Timotheos apparently was led by Chares and Aristophon (*PA* 2108),<sup>14</sup> although it is difficult to assess whether this group was formed purely because of the frustration of Chares over Embata, or whether it was a more permanent alliance. Even these could be transient affairs, as the career of Iphikrates demonstrates. In any case, the motives leading to the prosecution of Timotheos were certainly political, even if Chares was merely trying to ensure that he was himself covered over the disappointing result of the battle of Embata. Both Chares and Timotheos were well aware of the fate of generals such as Leosthenes (*PA* 9141 Entry 83), Theotimos (*PA* 7055 Entry 85) and Philon (*PA* 14825 Entry 84). They had been held accountable *inter alia* in the previous five to seven years<sup>15</sup> for losses sustained in pursuit of the unrealistic goals of the Athenian *ekklesia*, which was in effect attempting to turn back the clock and to maintain a second Athenian empire in the face of the changed circumstances of the middle years of the fourth century.

As Worthington points out,<sup>16</sup> Timotheos was brought to trial and penalised a number of times over his career, despite his services to Athens. Although he had been acquitted at the trial of 373/2 it had left him bankrupt, and as Davies pointed out,<sup>17</sup> though Timotheos had earned money in the pay of the Persians and had inherited seventeen talents from his father Konon (*PA* 8707 Entry 71), he was not wealthy, due primarily to the penalties and the costs associated

14. Dein. i.14, iii.17; Plut *Mor* 605f. Hansen (1975: p101 no.101)

15. Timotheos himself presumably survived such an attack in 360 over his command at Amphipolis. Dem. xxxvi.53. Hansen (1975: p97 no. 93)

16. Worthington (1992: p155)

17. *APF* pp509-510; cf Roberts (1982: pp40-45)

with defending himself throughout his career. However he was liturgical, being trierarch in 370/69.<sup>18</sup>

Timotheos and his father Konon were on good terms and had operated together before the latter's death in 388.<sup>19</sup> Timotheos had learned the lesson from his father that a bolt-hole or refuge was essential if one chose a military and political career in Athens. Konon had cultivated Evagoras of Cyprus,<sup>20</sup> and it was to some presumably safe haven in Chalkis that Timotheos fled before his trial in 356/5. What is surprising is the destination which he chose, since Chalkis is not far from Athens and even in this period of failing Athenian fortunes, Euboea generally, and Chalkis as the crossing point from Attika, would still render Timotheos relatively accessible to his enemies. Because of this proximity, it is equally probable that Timotheos died there en route to a farther destination<sup>21</sup> and that Worthington,<sup>22</sup> who follows Nepos, is wrong to assert that Timotheos remained there for two to three years before his death. He would have been at least fifty-five years old at the time of his removal from Athens,<sup>23</sup> a relatively advanced age for those times, so that his death would be unremarkable.

18. *IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 1609 103

19. See Konon (*PA* 8707 Entry 71)

20. *loc cit*

21. Theopompos (*FGrH* 115 F105) stated that Timotheos preferred Lesbos, and he was perhaps making his way there when death overtook him.

22. Worthington (1992: p154)

23. Davies (*APF* p507) believes he was born no later than 409.

On the other hand, his son Konon had remained in Athens and was able to pay his father's fine, which had been commuted from one hundred to ten talents.<sup>24</sup> A destination close to his family would be a reasonable choice, and he may have been relatively safe provided he refrained from entering Attika itself. His failure to pay his fine meant that he would be *atimos*, and unable to partake in Athenian politics or religion. Accordingly, to have succeeded in removing Timotheos from their immediate sphere may have been enough for Chares and Aristophon.

If he did not die on Chalkis immediately he arrived there, there is no evidence of how he survived. Parallel cases such as Leokrates (*PA* 9083 Entry 96), Demosthenes (*PA* 3597 Entry 99), and even Themistokles (*PA* 6668) more than a century earlier, suggest that family and friends were able to provide material assistance to exiles, usually by smuggling out money and more portable assets. His political ally Iphikrates and his son-in-law Menestheus were acquitted of the charges laid against Timotheos,<sup>25</sup> and were in a position to be of some assistance, as was his son Konon, who had the means to pay eventually his father's fine of ten talents, in which case the choice of Chalkis, proximate to some means of support, is understandable. Unfortunately there are no other details of the exile of Timotheos, a bitter end to a long career of service to Athens.<sup>26</sup>

24.     *Nepos Tim* 4.1

25.     *loc cit*

26.     Worthington (1992: p155) for the perils of holding office in Athens.



**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Aristogeiton

**Patronymic:** son of Kydimachos

**Deme:** n.k.

**Tribe:** n.k.

**Tritty:** n.k.

**PA No:** 1775

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** n.k.

**Date of Death:** n.k.

**Magistracies:** AO 397 bouletes 325 (Dein. 2.13)

**Wealth:** n.k.

**B. EXILE**

Certain (Dem. xxv.56)

**Reason:** n.k.

**Date:** 350/49

**Term:** n.k.

**Conditions:** n.a.

**Destination:** Megara

**Hetairoi:** n.k.

**Family Exile:** n.k.

**Attitude to Exile:** n.k.

**Return Date:** n.k.

**Return Conditions:** n.a.

**Recall Date:** n.a.

**C. SOURCES**

**Literary:**

**Epigraphical:** n.e.

Dem. xxv.56; 60-1; 67

**D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

Hansen (1976: p134 no.19)

ARISTOGEITON

The exile of Aristogeiton (*PA* 1775) 350/49 is included in this work because it was almost certainly politically based. He was apparently found guilty of an unknown charge and imprisoned, if not for the offence itself, then as Hansen suggests because he could not pay the fine.<sup>1</sup> Aristogeiton subsequently escaped from prison and fled to Megara.<sup>2</sup>

His inclusion is also interesting because his case is another instance of the relative ease with which it was apparently possible to remove oneself from Athenian prisons.<sup>3</sup> That he was a political exile is not conclusive, although several clues indicate that he may not have been an ordinary miscreant.<sup>4</sup> First, though it was apparently easy to escape from an Attic prison, the task still required assistance of some kind.<sup>5</sup> It is thus presumed that his *hetairoi* (including any family members he had left)<sup>6</sup> assisted in achieving his personal liberty.

1. Hansen (1976: p134 no.19)
2. Dem. xxv.56
3. See Demosthenes (*PA* 3597 Entry 99) for example.
4. *Suda sv = Rhetor kai sykophantes Aristogeiton*
5. Aside from the breakout, there would be money required for bribing guards; food, funds and transport; and safe cover out of the city, at the least. Harvey (1985: p90), and Plato *Crito* 43c-46b, for the attempt of Sokrates' friends to arrange his escape from prison.
6. Dein. ii.8 says Aristogeiton's father had died in poverty in exile. Nothing else is known of his family or circumstances.

Secondly, Aristogeiton's father Kydimachos (*PA* 8930 Entry 87) was condemned to death and had fled to Euboea earlier.<sup>7</sup> In an age where most crimes, including murder in some cases, could be dealt with by way of compensation and/or imprisonment, the death penalty was reserved for severe political crimes. If this is true for his father Kydimachos, then Aristogeiton belonged to a political family.

Perhaps most telling is the language used by both Deinarchos and Demosthenes<sup>8</sup>; as Aristogeiton was subject to an almost unprecedented degree of acrimony and venom. It is curious that in the forensic and political speeches of the latter half of the fourth century especially, the vehemence of the language was often in direct proportion to the power of the victim and the threat that the victim represented to the accuser. It appears from two sources<sup>9</sup> that Aristogeiton was in fact politically active in the assembly as both an orator and a sycophant. The latter activity would account for the acrimony of Deinarchos and Demosthenes directed towards him. Hypereides of Kollytos (*PA* 13912 Entry 102) also had grounds for anger against Aristogeiton, as after Chaeronea in 338 Aristogeiton had prosecuted Hypereides for unconstitutionally proposing a decree that rights of citizenship be granted to metics and slaves, and that amnesty be granted to exiles, *atimoi* and persons disenfranchised and struck off the citizen roll.<sup>10</sup> Regardless of the correctness or otherwise of the prosecution, Hypereides had no cause to feel kind towards Aristogeiton at least after 338.

7. Dein. ii.8

8. Especially Dem. xxv.56; 60-1; 67

9. Plut. *Phok* 10; Suda sv = *Rhetor kai sykophantes Aristogeiton*

10. Hansen (1974: pp36-37 no. 27 with references in note 2); Roberts (1982: p156)

If Aristogeiton, like Timarchos,<sup>11</sup> was the victim of a political attack aimed either at himself or a more powerful *hetairos* (?Aischines), then the charge itself could be totally unrelated to politics, a feature common to both the fifth and fourth centuries.<sup>12</sup>

11. Aisch. i.106-7; 169

12. Pheidias (*PA* 14149 Entry 6) was an apparent victim of his friendship with Perikles (*PA* 11811) in the fifth century, as was Aristarchos (*PA* 1656 Entry 91) in his friendship with Demosthenes in the fourth century.

**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Aristarchos

**Patronymic:** son of Moschos

**Deme:** n.k.

**Tribe:** n.k.

**Trittys:** n.k.

**PA No:** 1656

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** n.k.

**Date of Death:** n.k.

**Magistracies:** n.k.

**Wealth:** Originally at least 3 talents.

**B. EXILE**

Certain (Aisch. ii. 148)

**Reason:** Ostensibly the murder of Nikophemos, but related to his association with Demosthenes (PA 3597).

**Date:** 348/7

**Term:** n.k.

**Conditions:** n.k.

**Destination:** n.k.

**Hetairoi:** Demosthenes (PA 3597)

**Family Exile:** n.k.

**Attitude to Exile:** n.k. but apparently experienced some discomfort.

**Return Date:** n.k.

**Return Conditions:** n.k.

**Recall Date:** n.a.

**C. SOURCES**

**Literary:**

Dem. xxi.116f, xxi.104  
Aisch. i.171-2; ii.148; ii.166  
Dein. i.30; 47

**Epigraphical:** n.e.

**D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

Hansen (1976: p135)

ARISTARCHOS

The exile of Aristarchos (*PA* 1656) 348/47 resulted from his decision not to remain in Athens for his trial on a charge of murdering one Nikophemos (*PA* 11067) of Aphidna.<sup>1</sup> However, his case is included in this work as a voluntary exile of a political nature because of his association with Demosthenes (*PA* 3597 Entry 99), an association which Demosthenes does not dispute.<sup>2</sup> Further, this exile sheds some light on the material circumstances of voluntary exile.

Aristarchos was apparently relatively young and politically inexperienced. Aischines had tried to paint the picture of Demosthenes taking advantage of a simple country lad, befriending him in order to persuade Aristarchos to commit the murder of one of Demosthenes' political opponents.<sup>3</sup> However, the attempt of Aischines failed not just because Demosthenes himself admitted that the relationship existed, but because it was he who was originally charged with the murder, and when his political opponent (Meidias of Anagyrus) (*PA* 9719) failed to make the charge stick against Demosthenes, Meidias pinned it to Demosthenes' younger associate.<sup>4</sup>

1. Aisch. ii.148
2. Dem. xxi.116; Worthington (1990: p330) goes further and accepts that Demosthenes was a friend of Aristarchos.
3. Aisch. i.171-2. Dein. i. 40 appears to agree with Aischines.
4. Dem. xxi.104; cf Dem. xxi.116 with Worthington (1990: p339)

In particular, Aischines missed the point that, not long before the charge arose, Aristarchos had cast himself in the guise of *raisonneur* between Demosthenes and Meidias, albeit without success.<sup>5</sup> Such a role is totally incompatible with the rustic *idiotes* painted by Aischines. It is highly probable that Aristarchos was the subsidiary target when the shot missed Demosthenes. In this, his case parallels that of Timarchos (*PA* 13636). The banishment of Timarchos in 346 is illustrative of the same political fallout associated with the fickleness of the *ekklesia* when dealing with *prostatai tou demou*.<sup>6</sup>

Whether in fact Aristarchos did or did not kill Nikophemos (and there is no evidence either way), he did not await the verdict of the court and left Athens in some haste. Aischines is not necessarily to be believed when he states that Demosthenes misappropriated three talents which Aristarchos had left with Demosthenes to cover Aristarchos' support whilst in exile.<sup>7</sup>

Of course, Demosthenes may have done just that. On the other hand, this statement may be sheer malice, in keeping with the intent of the rest of the passage. It is equally probable that there was a sum of three talents, that Aristarchos gave it to Demosthenes to invest to provide income for Aristarchos himself whilst he was absent until the matter could be sorted out or faded away in the light of other events.

5. Dem. xxi.117; Worthington (1990: p34): *diallagon* is translated as 'reconciliation'.

6. Aisch. i.169; Dem. vi.19-27; 30; xix. 261. The pattern appears to be to attack a close associate if there is the probability of success, or if there is the likelihood of failure to secure the fall of the main opponent.

7. Aisch. ii.166

Regardless of the truth of the allegations, the exile of Aristarchos is important because it reveals one of the mechanics of political exile: how the matter was arranged so that flight was not fraught with too much danger. And as a corollary (if it is accepted that Aristarchos was a political target) there is a strong suggestion that the mechanism of the relationship between *hetairoi* took care of "friends in need" who had done whatever was required, be it murder of political foes or merely "taking the rap".

Aischines had stated that the money was for the support of Aristarchos during his exile. The most probable interpretation is that the funds were the property of Aristarchos. Yet following the thought in the previous paragraph, there is no doubt that the cohesive power of *hetairoi* was important. It is assumed that the support and mutual benefit were certainly altruistic, but they were also practical,<sup>8</sup> being sufficiently pragmatic to have included some "escape fund" should the need arise. This is speculation, but so is that of Aischines. The fates of the widow of Moschos, of her other children (if any), and indeed of Aristarchos himself are without any further elucidation in surviving evidence.

8. Connor (1971: p37) - ways in which *hetairoi* help each other are illustrated by the story of the exile of Themistokles (Plut. *Them* 25): his friends transferred some of his wealth to him in exile in Asia.



**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Antiphon

**Patronymic:** n.k.

**Deme:** n.k.

**Tribe:** n.k.

**Trittys:** n.k.

**PA No:** 1281

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** n.k.

**Date of Death:** after 346

**Magistracies:** n.k.

**Wealth:** n.k.

**B. EXILE**

Certain (Dem. xviii.132-134)

**Reason:** Loss of citizenship.

**Date:** 346

**Term:** 73 years

**Conditions:** n.a.

**Destination:** ?Macedon

**Hetairoi:** Perhaps Aischines (PA 354)

**Family Exile:** n.k.

**Attitude to Exile:** Probably unhappy.

**Return Date:** 7343

**Return Conditions:** n.k.

**Recall Date:** n.a.

**C. SOURCES**

**Literary:**

**Epigraphical:** n.e.

Dem. xviii.132-134

**D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

Hansen (1976: p136 no24 )

ANTIPHON

Antiphon (*PA* 1281) is included in this study because he left Athens voluntarily after losing his citizenship rights in a purge of the rolls in 346.<sup>1</sup> With the anti-Macedon faction apparently in the ascendancy at this time, the purge was most probably politically orientated.<sup>2</sup>

The only source for the exile of Antiphon is the hostile Demosthenes (*PA* 3597 Entry 99).<sup>3</sup> His short, rather sparse account, is directed in fact against Aischines (*PA* 354) rather than Antiphon specifically. It emerges that Aischines had attempted to defend Antiphon against the charges of arson laid by Demosthenes. It may be presumed that Aischines was an *hetairos* of Antiphon, not merely in a client relationship, since Demosthenes suggests that Antiphon was acting on instructions from Philip of Macedon, and Demosthenes was consistent in his accusations of pro-Philip bias on the part of Aischines. Demosthenes was trying to bracket the two in the pro-Macedon, and hence, in his opinion, in the anti-Athenian camp.

It is probable that the loss of citizenship (*atimia*) suffered by Antiphon was in itself sufficient for him to find life too burdensome within Athens, and he departed. If he was associated with Aischines, then more pressing considerations of personal safety may have rendered absence from Attika desirable in the short term.

1. Dem. xviii.132-134
2. Cf Aristogeiton's (*PA* 1775 Entry 90) attempts to refuse restoral of citizenship to those who had been disenfranchised in 346: Hansen (1974: pp36-37 no.27); Roberts (1982: p156)
3. The passage attempts to play up the part of Demosthenes as defender of the state and to show Aischines as a friend of traitors.

Antiphon returned<sup>4</sup> probably about 343, from Macedon if Demosthenes is correct, though this could well be spite. It appears that he may have had his rights restored, or thought that he had a strong chance to do so. Aischines apparently thought that at the time of Antiphon's arrest for arson, he was a citizen. He attacked Demosthenes for his arbitrary treatment of a citizen.

Antiphon was initially acquitted of the charge, but on appeal to the Council of the Areopagos he was tried, tortured and executed. Since only non-citizens could be cross-examined under torture, it appears that the authorities either did not scruple to break their own laws, or Antiphon was not considered a citizen.

There is no evidence extant to suggest where Antiphon actually spent his years away from Athens, or how he lived.<sup>5</sup> It is known that he left after the *diapsephisis*, probably for safety reasons allied to his political associations. His return was a serious miscalculation either of the political scene or the enmity of the anti-Macedonian faction, or both. Otherwise he seriously misunderstood the extent and duration of his *atimia*.<sup>6</sup>

4. Hansen (1976: p136 no24)

5. Ellis (1976: p128) appears to credit the claim that, if not guilty of the charges made by Demosthenes, Antiphon had spent the time in exile in Macedon.

6. *Atimia* meant loss of citizenship *per se*, loss of the rights which were associated with citizenship.

**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Androtion

**Patronymic:** son of Andron

**Deme:** Gargettos

**Tribe:** II Aigeis

**Trittys:** Inland

**PA No:** 913 = 915 J Kirchner *RE* 1 (1894) p2159 (2)

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** n.k.

**Date of Death:** after 343

**Magistracies:** AO 159

**Wealth:** APF p33

**B. EXILE**

Certain (Plut *Mor* 605d)

**Reason:** trial for proposal of an illegal decree (*graphe paranomon*).

**Date:** 344/3

**Xenoi:** ?unnamed in Megara.

**Term:** n.k. probably did not return.

**Conditions:** n.a.

**Destination:** Megara

**Hetairoi:** n.k. ?Glauketes (*PA* 2946), ?Melanopos (*PA* 9788)

**Family Exile:** n.k.

**Attitude to Exile:** n.k. but settled down to writing his *Atthis*.

**Return Date:** n.k.

**Return Conditions:** n.k.

**Recall Date:** n.a.

**C. SOURCES**

**Literary:** Plut. *Mor* 605d  
*FGrH* 324 T13  
Dem. xxii. 66f; 173

**Epigraphical:** n.e.

**D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

Pearson (1942 rptd 1975: pp78-79)  
Jacoby (1949: p78)  
Davies *APF* p33  
Hansen (1974: p32 no12)  
Harding (1976: pp186-200)

ANDROTION

According to Plutarch,<sup>1</sup> Androtion (PA 913 = 915) wrote his *Atthis* whilst in exile in Megara, which presupposes that he had the leisure to do so, but no details have survived of his life in exile other than this one fact.

The source for the exile of Androtion is the hostile Demosthenes, who noted that Androtion was politically active for the thirty years prior to his exile in 344.<sup>2</sup> He had been charged with making a proposal of an honour to an outgoing council of which he was a member, when that council had in fact, failed to fulfil its obligations during its term of office.<sup>3</sup> This meant that his proposal fell under the provision of *graphe paranomon*.<sup>4</sup> Euktemon (PA 5784) and Diodoros (PA 3919) with Demosthenes (PA 3597) pounced on the opportunity to remove their enemy Androtion from the political scene. It is not known if he was found guilty of the charge and was exiled by the *demos*, or if he was found to be guilty of the lesser charge of being a prostitute and therefore *atimos*. He was also charged with embezzlement relating to religious donations of melted gold. These charges would have rendered him liable to the death penalty.<sup>5</sup>

1. Plut. *Mor* 605d
2. Dem. xxii vs *Androtion*; xxii.66; Pearson (1942: p78) convincingly dates the exile to not earlier than 344. See also Harding (1976: pp191-192) for dates related to the charges.
3. Dem. xxii.8-9
4. Hansen (1974: p32 no.12)
5. *ibid*.

On balance it appears most likely that Androtion fled to avoid facing his punishment, rather than that he was acquitted, since he managed to reach Megara and remained there to write his history.<sup>6</sup> Plutarch makes the point that Androtion was a victim of factional struggles,<sup>7</sup> and it appears that he was politically an oligarch with reactionary tendencies.<sup>8</sup> Had he been found guilty he would not have survived, and at this time a verdict of innocent applied to Androtion the oligarchic enemy of Demosthenes and Euktemon is most unlikely.

Other than his probable voluntary status, the political nature of his exile, and that it occurred when he was of advanced years, the only fact which can be stated with relative certainty is that he went to Megara. Although near to Athens, in the later fourth century Megara was no longer really threatened by Athens. It provided Androtion with a viable site for composition of the *Atthis* which was close to his sources, and probably to any family and friends in Athens who were able to commute to him, or communicate with him. It was presumably by means of and with the aid of friends that Androtion was able to sustain himself during the remainder of his life. There is no suggestion that he returned to Athens, and since Demosthenes and his faction remained in a position of strength throughout the 340s, the oligarchs would not have had a firm place in Athenian politics.<sup>9</sup>

6. Jacoby (1949: p1)

7. Plut. *Mor* 605d: "... *Androtion Athenaios en Megarois ton patriidon ekpesontes katastasiasanton*..."

8. Jacoby (1913: p90f)

9. See Entry 99. See also Harding (1976: pp186-200) for the political allegiance of Androtion.

**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Philokrates

**Patronymic:** son of Pythodoros

**Deme:** Hagnous

**Tribe:** V Akamantis

**Trittys:** Inland

**PA No:** 14599

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** n.k.

**Date of Death:** n.k.

**Magistracies:** AO 2434 Envoy 347 (Dem. xviii.17-21, Hyp. iv.29, Aisch. ii.8)

**Wealth:** n.k. - probable if he was a paid agent of Philip. Property confiscated.

**B. EXILE**

Certain (Aisch. ii.8)

**Reason:** charged with wrongly advising the people.

**Date:** 344/3

**Conditions:** n.k.

**Term:** n.k. but probably for life

**Hetairoi:** Euboulos (PA 5369);  
?Aischines (PA 354) (Dem. xix.23.4)

**Destination:** n.k. ?Macedon

**Attitude to Exile:** n.k.

**Family Exile:** n.k.

**Return Conditions:** n.k.

**Return Date:** n.k.

**Recall Date:** n.a.

**C. SOURCES**

**Literary:**

**Epigraphical:** n.k.

Hyp. iv.29; Aisch. ii.8; 162, iii.73f, 79f  
Dem. iv *passim*

**D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

Hansen (1975: p102)  
Ellis (1976: pp106ff, p148)  
Sealey (1976: p477)  
Cawkwell (1978: p98, pp122-123)  
Hammond & Griffith (1979: p337)  
Harvey (1985: pp94-95)

## PHILOKRATES

Philokrates (*PA* 14599) was a victim of the political aftermath of the establishment of the alliance between Athens and Philip of Macedon which ironically became known as the Peace of Philokrates.<sup>1</sup>

A supporter of Euboulos (*PA* 5369), Philokrates belonged to that group of Athenians, including Aischines (*PA* 354) most of the time, who recognised the fact of the power, in political and military terms, that Philip had acquired.<sup>2</sup> They further realised that Athens would not win against Philip in any conflict and in short, they felt the best course was an accommodation with Philip and a universal peace throughout Greece.<sup>3</sup> When Philip too expressed a desire for peace with Athens and an alliance, the Athenians sent a total of three embassies to him during 346 of which Philokrates was a member. He subsequently made the proposal which the *ekklesia* adopted as the basis for a treaty with Philip.

Ironically Demosthenes (*PA* 3597 Entry 99), though a bitter and life-long opponent of Philip

1. This does not imply that Philokrates was a "principal negotiator" or that the treaty was so named immediately. Rather, since the treaty came into disrepute in Athens relatively soon after it was signed and its proposer condemned, it is perhaps even sarcastic; cf Ellis (1976: p125), who describes Philokrates as the engineer of the Peace, and Demosthenes as the man most responsible for its fall into disrepute.
2. Cawkwell (1978: p91) believes that Philokrates was already a prominent politician by the time of the destruction of Olynthos (348/7)
3. Isok. v.29.106-115, 154. Ellis (1976: pp106ff) suggests that the peace process was engineered by Philip and by events external to Athens, so that both Philokrates and Demosthenes really had little choice but to follow.



and of Macedonian ambitions, failed to actively oppose the peace treaty when the vote was being taken.<sup>4</sup> Yet hardly had the "ink dried" than Demosthenes instituted a campaign of prosecutions of his colleagues on the embassies to Philip.<sup>5</sup> Demosthenes and Hypereides (*PA* 13912 Entry 102) acted together, so Philokrates was accused and a trial scheduled. The charges amounted to an accusation that Philokrates failed to advise the Athenians in their best interests at the time of the preparation of the treaty.<sup>6</sup> This failure was strongly attributed to the fact that Philip had successfully bribed Philokrates over a period of years to act against the Athenian interests, or rather in Philip's interests.

Demosthenes and Hypereides accused Philokrates of being in the pay of Philip, but these two men were generally hostile to the group to which Philokrates belonged. It is more telling that Aischines implies that the bribery of Philokrates by Philip was a fact.<sup>7</sup> On balance it appears that there is some justice in this part of the accusation. Therefore it is not surprising that on being impeached, Philokrates chose to flee rather than face trial since the peace which had

4. Aisch. iii.79f claims that Demosthenes was in fact a co-author of the treaty. See Sinclair (1988: p184) on the purpose and uses of bribes in this context.
5. Dem. xviii.17,21; vii.24-25. Hyp. iv.29-30; Sealey (1976: p477); Ellis (1976: p111, p148): Philokrates was the only envoy to advise the people of the unpalatable terms which Philip wanted.
6. Aisch. iii.79; Hammond and Griffith (1979: p337) agree; cf Cawkwell (1978: pp122-123), who sees the bribery accusation as a mandatory part of charges of this kind. Harvey (1985: p76f): bribery when acting against the interests of the state appears to fit the case of Philokrates.
7. Aisch. iii.79; Harvey (1985: p106) says it was customary for Macedonian kings to bestow gifts on visiting ambassadors, and the largesse which Philokrates apparently received may have fallen into this category.

been relatively unpopular at its inception was now distinctly out of favour.<sup>8</sup> Everyone associated with it was under attack or attempting to dissociate himself from it.<sup>9</sup>

Though it is assumed that Philokrates was relatively wealthy since he had the leisure to participate actively in Athenian political life, and to absent himself from Athens for considerable stretches of time; what property he had was confiscated upon his conviction.<sup>10</sup> *In absentia* he had originally received the death sentence, which was converted to exile, presumably for life. Like many other exiles faced with charges and possible conviction who took this course, Philokrates may have had time to retrieve some of his more portable property and make arrangements for his family.<sup>11</sup>

Given acceptance of the assumption of his guilt in the matter of the bribes received, his destination was probably Macedon and Philip's court. That Macedon was his destination is supported by the fact that a prominent Athenian politician may have been of considerable use as an advisor to Philip, and thus Philokrates could have derived at least a retainer for his

8. Sealey (1976: pp454-461) shows that, regardless of whether one follows Cawkwell (1978: p456) or himself, Athens was in a no-win situation, outmanoeuvred by its own intransigence and machinations. Whatever happened would have been unsatisfactory to Athens as she had set herself unrealistic goals. Broadly, Athens was irrelevant in the wider context of Macedonian affairs. Ellis (1976: p148) reflects that Philokrates' high profile in obtaining consent to the Peace meant that even among the other envoys, he was least likely to defend himself successfully.

9. Cawkwell (1978: pp92-94) for those who in his view were able to defend their roles, much as Aischines did.

10. Theopompos *FGrH* 115 F164-6; Harvey (1985: p95): the penalties for accepting bribes were especially harsh, including a tenfold fine, and one could be condemned to death, as Philokrates was after he had fled.

11. See chapter **Family and Religion** - p402.

personal upkeep. Certainly other politicians who were pro-Macedon found a safe haven there.<sup>12</sup>

There is no record of military service for him, which would have provided evidence of the potential to earn a living as a mercenary. Nor do we have any record of *xenia* relationships which may have assisted him. Even if he was not guilty of taking bribes from Philip, commonsense would suggest to Philokrates that his warmest and most profitable welcome would be at Philip's court.

12. See Kallimedon (PA 8032 Entry 98) and Pytheas (PA 12342 Entry 100)

**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Chares

**Patronymic:** son of Theochares

**Deme:** Angele

**Tribe:** III Pandionis

**Trittys:** Coast

**PA No:** 15292; J Kirchner *RE* 3(1899) col 21258 (3)

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** not later than 399

**Date of Death:** n.k. probably in Sigeum

**Magistracies:** *AO* 610, *strategos* 367/6, 361 358-353, ?352, 349-347; 343, 341-339, 338

**Wealth:** ? in Athens. Certainly acquired in mercenary activities and as ruler of Sigeum. *APF* pp568-569

**B. EXILE**

Certain (Arrian *Anab* 3.2.6f)

**Reason:** Alexander charged Chares *inter alia* with anti-Macedonian activities.

**Date:** 338

**Term:** n.k. probably never returned

**Conditions:** n.a.

**Destination:** Mytilene, thence Sigeum

**Xenoi:** n.k.

**Hetairoi:** Kephisophon (*PA* 8410), Demosthenes (*PA* 3597), Hypereides (*PA* 13912), Aristophon (*PA* 2108) (Sealey 1976: p441)

**Family Exile:** n.k.

**Attitude to Exile:** Appeared to flourish

**Return Date:** n.k. if ever

**Return Conditions:** n.k.

**Recall Date:** n.a.

## **C. SOURCES**

### ***Literary:***

***Epigraphical:*** n.e.

Dem. viii.30-31; xix.332; xxiii.173

Dem. *Ep* iii.31

[Dem] lviii.38

Aisch. ii.71-73, 90-91

Diod. XVI.21.3, 33.4, 75.3, 85.2-7, 88.1

Nepos *Chabrias* 3.4

Plut. *Phokion* 16.4

*Mor* 788d, 848e

Hesychios *FGrH* 390, 29-30

Arrian *Anab* I.10.4f, 3.2.6f

## **D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

Parke (1933: pp74-75)

Davies *APF* pp568-569

Sealey (1976: p441)

Roberts (1982: pp69-78, p165, p208n78)

## CHARES

The career and the exile of Chares (*PA* 15292) provide a strong illustration of the contradictory nature of extant sources. Unfortunately these sources provide only a tantalisingly brief glimpse of one of the most colourful of Athens' generals in the fourth century.

Chares has received a very poor press from ancient sources such as Diodoros, who stated that he was no better than any average soldier in terms of the qualities required of a general.<sup>1</sup> Parke sums up the attitude of ancient writers hostile to Chares: "he had the brute strength of Chabrias (*PA* 15086) mixed with the arrogance of Iphikrates (*PA* 7736). What he lacked in ingenuity he made up for with insincerity. His self-indulgence was notorious; though mostly exercised abroad..."<sup>2</sup>

In reality, the career of Chares was rather successful on the whole, despite some stumbles up to Chaeroneia.<sup>3</sup> He was appointed year after year to lead Athenian troops and mercenaries in

1. Diod.XVI.85.7; Aisch.ii.70f; Plut. *Mor* 187c-188: all thought little of Chares as a person or as a general. Aischines is especially vitriolic at II.71-73. Cawkwell (1978: p136) refers to Chares as "the notorious general" but does not support his statement, suggesting uncritical acceptance of the ancient sources.
2. Parke (1933: p74)
3. Dem. xix.332 (although Chares was his friend); Nepos *Chabrias* III.4; see also appendix at the end of this entry for a summary of Chares' military activities.

diverse campaigns from 367/6 to his final appointment as one of the *strategoi* at Chaeroneia.<sup>4</sup>

Generally in the second half of the fourth century it was not as necessary to be politically successful in order to hold military commands as it had been in the fifth century.<sup>5</sup> However, Chares counted Demosthenes (*PA* 3597 Entry 99) amongst his *hetairoi*, or at least as one of his defenders if only because Aischines (*PA* 354 Entry 97) had attacked Chares over the Cersobleptes affair.<sup>6</sup> Tiresome as it must have been for the Athenians at times, it appears that anything which Aischines favoured was automatically opposed by Demosthenes. This does not mean that Chares was not in fact in the anti-Macedonian camp, given that he had spent a large percentage of his career opposing the expansion of Philip. Indeed his exile was precipitated in part by the demand from Alexander that the Athenians surrender to him those of their prominent politicians and generals who were anti-Macedonian: Chares was named among them.<sup>7</sup>

Chares, together with Lysikles (*PA* 9422), led the Athenian forces in the decisive battle which

4. Diod. XV.75.3. Chares had won two battles as *strategos* in 367/6; he was by Diodoros' own evidence appointed *strategos* in 356/5 (XVI.21.3) and in 353/2 (XVI.33.4). Develin (*AO* p450) lists at least seventeen certain and two possible *strategiai* for Chares.

5. Hornblower (1991: p124) for a discussion of the degree of specialisation which had developed by the second half of the fourth century.

6. Aisch.ii.90-91; 11.71-73: Kephisophon (*PA* 8410) is a friend of Chares; Plut. *Mor* 848e: Hypereides (*PA* 13912) was also an *hetairos* of Chares. So Chares was obviously actively political; cf Sinclair (1988: p45). Cawkwell (1978: p154) considered that Chares was of the military breed that "stick to war".

7. Arrian *Anab* 1.10.4ff

largely determined Athens' fate - the battle of Chaeroneia in 338.<sup>8</sup> The Macedonian forces soundly defeated the Athenians and their allies, and this battle meant the death of Athenian independence, despite the leniency of Philip, which gave to Athens the illusion of freedom to act for some time afterwards.

Given the long history of Athenian treatment of defeated generals which Chares was able to contemplate, it is not surprising that he chose to remove himself to Mytilene, thence to Sigeum, rather than return to Athens.<sup>9</sup> This was a wise choice, considering that Chares' colleague at Chaeroneia, Lysikles, did return to Athens and was summarily executed.<sup>10</sup>

Whilst it is possible to piece together the not unsuccessful military career of Chares,<sup>11</sup> his exile is a more tantalising prospect. It is known that he went first to Mytilene and appeared to be in control there not very long after Chaeroneia, probably no later than 335.<sup>12</sup> The options appear to be that he presented himself to the Persian satrap as a mercenary leader and was engaged to subdue Mytilene; or perhaps he was appointed as a military governor. Alternatively, he had fled the battlefield at Chaeroneia not alone, but with a body of survivors who welded themselves into a troop for hire.

8. Diod. XVI.85.2

9. Arrian *Anab* 3.2.6f - more so because he was not able to assess what the Athenian reaction would be to the demands of Alexander.

10. Diod. XVI.88.1; cf Roberts (1982: pp77-78, 165), who believes that Chares had a history of self-preservation, and may have had a role in the impeachment of Lysikles.

11. See appendix to this entry.

12. Arrian *Anab* 3.2.6



A fourth possibility is that Chares and this troop took Mytilene by force and were subsequently expelled and thence moved on to Sigeum. Certainly Chares gave up his rule of Mytilene to Alexander's envoys,<sup>13</sup> though force is not explicitly stated. It is pertinent that all four scenarios were possibilities in the fluid political landscape in the years immediately after Chaeroneia.

Chares settled at Sigeum and appeared to be the ruler, though there is no evidence to suggest that he was *tyrannos* in the technical sense. It was from his position in Sigeum that he derived his livelihood and sustenance. There is no evidence for any *xenia* relationships between Chares and others in the region. However, he had operated in the area extensively in the preceding twenty years<sup>14</sup> and had ample opportunity to make plans for an escape if needed, including setting up relationships following the manner of Konon (*PA* 8707 Entry 71) with Evagoras. Indeed, Nepos states that this is what Chares had done.<sup>15</sup>

13. Arrian *Anab* 3.2.6

14. See appendix to this entry.

15. Nepos *Chabrias* 3.4

There is no evidence to suggest whether the lady known as Demalis, with whom Chares was at Byzantium during his exile, was or was not his legal wife.<sup>16</sup> It appears unlikely that he would have had an opportunity to remove his wife and family in the chaos after Chaeroneia, and indeed shortly afterwards it became illegal to do so.<sup>17</sup> As is known from the life of Konon, new families and relationships were relatively easily acquired once the decision not to return to Athens had been made.

Perhaps the most unusual aspect of the exile of Chares is the incident of the "gold crown". Arrian states that Chares, on behalf of Sigeum, presented Alexander with a gold crown 332.<sup>18</sup> Given that Chares was one of those whose person was demanded by Alexander in 338 after Chaeroneia, and given that Chares was removed from Mytilene in 335 (at Alexander's behest), it is surprising that Chares himself presented the golden crown. The only explanation is that Chares held Sigeum only so long as Alexander chose that he should. In other words, Chares was doing homage for the power he held at Sigeum. It may have been cat and mouse between

16. Hesychios *FGrH* 390 F29-30

17. Lyk. i.42-44: apparently there were many in Athens who felt that the Macedonians, savouring their victory at Chaironeia, would move forward to the city and finally eliminate the troublesome Athenians. The measure outlined by Lykourgos was designed to ensure that Athens was able to defend itself by locking the population and remaining resources in to the last stand, should it come to that. The measure was doubtless necessary when it became apparent that Leokrates (*PA* 9083 Entry 96) was not the only person to flee the city.

18. Arrian *Anab* 3.2.11f

Alexander and Chares, however it appears that the animosity was sufficiently subdued for Chares to die of either disease or old age.<sup>19</sup> There is no evidence for his death, but it is unlikely that Plutarch is correct that Chares was the commander of a mercenary force at Tainaron in 322/1.<sup>20</sup> He would have been at least seventy five years old.<sup>21</sup> Despite his affinity with all military activity, that was an advanced (though admittedly not unprecedented) age. Plutarch is either in error, or has confused an otherwise undocumented activity from Chares' earlier career.

19. *Dem. Ep* iii.31

20. *Plut. Mor* 848e, Develin *AO* p413

21. *APF* p569

## Appendix

Despite the generally unfavourable press Chares has received from ancient authors, the following details from the mixed career of Chares may suggest why the Athenians continued to re-elect him almost continuously until the defeat at Chaeroneia.

- |         |  |
|---------|--|
| 367/6   | First recorded election as <i>strategos</i> (Diod. XV.75.3)  |
| 358     | Chares supported oligarchs in Kerkyra and Athens lost interests and influence there. (Diod.XV.95; Dem.i.4)   |
| 353     | Recaptured Neapolis from Philip (Polyainos <i>Strat</i> 4.2.22)  |
| 353/2   | Commanded mercenary forces for Athens; captured Sestos, settled clereuchs in Chersonese, and concluded agreement with Thracian kings. (Dem. xxiii.173; [Dem] lviii.38; cf Aisch ii.71-73, 90-91).  |
| 357-355 | Chares campaigned successfully in the Social War. The defeat suffered was when Chares was not in command. Chares withdrew the remnants of the army from there to the Hellespont. (Diod. XVI.21f)   |
| 356     | Against Byzantium he held on with 60 ships, and was defeated at Embata [(against the advice of Timotheos ( <i>PA</i> 13700)]and Iphikrates ( <i>PA</i> 7736)). Lost the war at sea. (Diod. XV.95)  |
| 355     | Chares and Athenian mercenary forces joined the satrap Artabazos and won a victory. (Diod. XVI 33.4f)  |
| 352     | Chares failed to get his fleet embarked on time and so lost opportunity for victory against Philip. (Diod. XVI.35.5f)  |
| 340     | Chares with forty ships was sent to relieve Byzantium, but the city did not trust him, and would not admit him. However he secured the Hellespont and his presence assisted in frustrating Philip's attempt to take the city. (Diod. XVI.77.2) |
| 338     | Chares, at the head of 10,000 mercenaries, was sent to hold the pass from Amphissa to Kytinion. He fell for a Macedonian ruse and lost the pass. (Polyainos <i>Strat</i> 4.2.8; Aisch. III.46f).   |
| 338     | Defeated with his colleague Lysikles ( <i>PA</i> 9422) at Chaeroneia. (Diod. XVI.85.2ff)   |

**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Leokrates

**Patronymic:** n.k.

**Deme:** n.k.

**Tribe:** n.k.

**Trittys:** n.k.

**PA No:** 9083

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** n.k.

**Date of Death:** n.k.

**Magistracies:** n.k.

**Wealth:** At least one talent.  
Although not in *APF* he was  
a shipowner and/or  
slave owner: Lyk i.17-18.

**B. EXILE**

Certain (Lyk. i.17-18, 55)

**Reason:** ?pro-Macedon in the light  
of the defeat at Chaeroneia.

**Date:** 338/7

**Term:** Total 8 years

**Conditions:** n.a.

**Destination:** Rhodes, Megara

**Xenoi:** Unnamed person in  
Megara

**Family Exile:** Mistress and slaves  
only; his sisters and their husbands  
remained in Athens

**Hetairoi:** Unnamed but important

**Attitude to Exile:** n.k.

**Return Date:** 331/0

**Return Conditions:** n.a.

**Recall Date:** n.a.

**C. SOURCES**

**Literary:**

Aisch. iii.252

Lyk. i.17-18, 55

**Epigraphical:** n.e.

**D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

de Ste. Croix (1972: pp234f and n7)

Bosworth (1988: p208)

LEOKRATES

Leokrates (*PA* 9083) had voluntarily removed from Athens himself, his slaves and his mistress, using a merchant vessel which he either owned or had hired.<sup>1</sup> The timing of his voluntary exile from Athens,<sup>2</sup> in the wake of the defeat at Chaeroneia when it was thought that the city faced imminent destruction, eventually brought forth the accusation of cowardice against him.

Indeed the exile of Leokrates may be considered only in that light, but there are some tantalising hints that Leokrates was not the selfish blacksmith whom Lykourgos described,<sup>3</sup> but in fact a more influential politician. Although the evidence is scant and derived more from what is missing than from what Lykourgos has argued, there is sufficient of it to warrant the inclusion of Leokrates in this study.

Firstly Lykourgos states<sup>4</sup> that Leokrates was a smith, which ordinarily would indicate that he was possibly not of sufficient rank to be actively political. However, it is probable that

1. Lyk. i.17-18, 55; Balogh (1943: pp35f)
2. Lyk. i.42-44
3. Lyk. i.58 ... *ho chalkotypos*...
4. *loc cit*

Lykourgos is being derogatory in the manner of Aristophanes (calling Kleon a tanner),<sup>5</sup> since he later asserts that the relatives of Leokrates managed to realise one talent for his assets.<sup>6</sup> This would have been a depressed figure since it was a forced sale, and the ordinary realisable amount could have been as much as double that figure. Whilst this would not have been sufficient to place Leokrates in the forefront of a timocracy, it would enable him to take part actively in the politics of the day.

Secondly, Lykourgos attests<sup>7</sup> that Leokrates possessed *hetairoi*, and he is implying friendship. It is possible that he belonged to a political grouping which had aligned itself against Macedon, and feared reprisals, although Lykourgos himself belonged to that grouping. Yet his prosecution of Leokrates still makes sense if Lykourgos felt that Leokrates had betrayed those of their common *hetairoi* who had stayed in the face of the danger. Alternatively Leokrates may have belonged to the group which favoured appeasement of the Macedonians, in which case he would not have felt safe in Athens in the turmoil following Chaeroneia.

5. See the discussion in de Ste. Croix (1972: pp234f and n7) of exaggerations and inventions in Athenian literature. See Bosworth (1988: pp214-215), for a discussion of Lykourgos' prosecution techniques.
6. Lyk. i.22-23
7. Lyk. i.135: ... *dia ten pros autous philian*... He also refers to these people as advocates in the technical sense, so their status is currently inconclusive, but the balance of evidence suggests some type of *hetairoi*.

The point is tenuous in either case, since Lykourgos contradicts himself shortly after when he states that those speaking up for Leokrates at his trial were in fact paid orators<sup>8</sup> and not friends or relatives. The question of the political nature of the exile of Leokrates is unresolved,<sup>9</sup> although the fact that Leokrates apparently abandoned his interest in the two-obol tax,<sup>10</sup> a source of income, tends to suggest that mere cowardice was not the motive. Everyone in Athens at this time must have been terrified of the repercussions of years of abusing Philip. Anyone who had helped to bring the expected wrath of Philip down upon them would have been *persona non grata* in Athens.

Whatever the political nature of the exile, the details provide an insight into how other attested voluntary political exiles may have operated, and therefore his case is useful to this study.

Leokrates apparently bundled his mistress, slaves and some possessions into a ship and headed to Rhodes,<sup>11</sup> where he claimed to have been engaged in trade.<sup>12</sup> This statement is rightly doubted by Lykourgos since he was not in a necessarily trade-orientated business, and he had not previously been a merchant.<sup>13</sup> It may also be doubted since he stayed in Rhodes for almost

8. Lyk. i.138

9. Lyk. i.15-16 suggests that Leokrates was someone whose opinions were noteworthy. Lyk. i.14 suggests that Leokrates was well known in Greece.

10. Lyk. i.19

11. Lyk. i.55

12. *loc cit*

13. Lyk. i.58, although he would have been dependent upon metal imports if he was a "smith" or rather if he owned a metal working establishment.



three years before moving to Megara.<sup>14</sup> It is more probable that this destination was attractive to Leokrates (as it was to be to Aischines) because it was diametrically opposed to Athens geographically and politically. It was sufficiently far away from the Athenians and from Philip.

There is no direct evidence for Leokrates' life in Rhodes, although he took slaves with him and these may have been skilled metal workers. Equally they may have been for his personal use, but were an equally valuable source of portable wealth as a tradable commodity. Rhodes was a principal slave market throughout the period. Lykourgos appears to imply that Leokrates was expelled from there,<sup>15</sup> and thence went to Megara. It is suggested here that the reason may have been more pragmatic, namely a shortage of funds.

The choice of Megara is understandable if Leokrates was short of money and needed to return to the vicinity of Athens to contact his sisters and brothers-in-law to arrange access to any of his assets left in the city.<sup>16</sup> It was also sufficiently close to Athens for him to be able to ascertain the likely political reception which awaited him on his return home. Most importantly, however, Lykourgos states that Leokrates had a unnamed *xenos* in Megara, whom Lykourgos refers to as a *prostates*.<sup>17</sup> The availability of a sponsor, a military situation less threatening in the area than it had been three years earlier, and the closeness of Megara to

14. Lyk. i.17 says that Leokrates left after Chaeroneia, and returned eight years later (Lyk. i.45). Since he was in Megara for five years (Lyk. i.56) then he must have been in Rhodes for three years. However Lyk. i.58 states that he was away for six years, so the stay in Rhodes may have been no more than one year.

15. Lyk. i.21

16. Lyk. i.22-23

17. Lyk. i.145 ... *kai oikesas en Megarous epi prostatou*; de Ste. Croix (1972: p253) demonstrates the precedent for non-Megarians to conduct trade - effectively to have metic status in Megara.

Athens, all explain the choice of destination. Leokrates apparently took with him to Rhodes his mistress Irenis, and her maids.<sup>18</sup> No other family members were mentioned as having accompanied him, and it is probable that he did not have a wife or children at this time.

It is also possible that Lykourgos is being spiteful by describing Irenis as his mistress, and she may have been his wife since Lykourgos had been trying to create an impression of Leokrates as self-indulgent. He was also trying to create the impression that the actions of Leokrates had been more heinous than those of Autolykos (*PA* 2746).<sup>19</sup> Later, when his sisters' husbands arranged the sale of his house and other assets and forwarded the proceeds to him in Megara, there is no mention of other relatives making the transition, or indeed being involved in the transaction at all. His father was dead,<sup>20</sup> and presumably also his mother.

Leokrates appeared to prosper in Megara as a grain merchant,<sup>21</sup> and he had made the decision to settle there permanently, if the transfer of his household goods is an indication.<sup>22</sup> With the sponsorship of a *prostates*, and with a good living, it is difficult to determine why Leokrates took the unusual decision to return to Athens. The only plausible explanation is that he did not recognise that he was in any danger, having been absent from the political scene for eight

18. Lyk. i.17; 55

19. Lyk. i.53; see also note 5 above p334.

20. Lyk. i.136 cf i.97. It is more probable that Leokrates' father was dead and that Lykourgos is speaking metaphorically in the earlier passage.

21. Lyk. i.26-27

22. Lyk. i.25-26; 56

years, and because the dangers present in 338/7 were not relevant in 331/0. Aischines, who attested that Leokrates was subsequently acquitted of the charges laid by Lykourgos,<sup>23</sup> fails to enlighten on this point, and Lykourgos would not do so without perhaps weakening his own position. It is probable that Leokrates was visiting Athens privately as a quasi-Megarian for trade purposes, when an old animosity revealed itself in the form of the arch-conservative Lykourgos, who prosecuted him under the law of 338.<sup>24</sup> On the other hand, there appears to be no solid foundation for Bosworth's claim<sup>25</sup> that Lykourgos prosecuted Leokrates in order to access his wealth, since it is reasonably certain from Leokrates' actions that he had abandoned Athens permanently and his wealth, family religious icons and portables were no longer centred there.

The subsequent life of Leokrates is unknown, but it is probable that he returned to Megara rather than remain in the uncertain climate in Athens, where Lykourgos continued in the ascendancy.

23. Aisch. iii.252

24. Lyk. i.90. Leokrates claimed that he did not know he had broken any laws, if in fact he had done so.

25. Bosworth (1988: pp207-208) offers no evidence that Lykourgos took a year to bring Leokrates to trial.

**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Aischines

**Patronymic:** son of Atrometos

**Deme:** Kothokidai

**Tribe:** VI Oineis

**Trittys:** Coast

**PA No:** 354; T Thelheim *RE* I(1894) col 1050f (15)

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** 390

**Date of Death:** 315 in exile  
perhaps in Samos

**Magistracies:** *AO* 51, *pylogoras* 340, envoy 347, 346, 338; *hypogrammateus* (date uncertain) (*Dem.* xix.249)

**Wealth:** *APF* p6, pp543-547

**B. EXILE**

Certain (*Plut. Dem.* 24.2-3)

**Reason:** Loss of citizen rights.

**Date:** 330/29

**Term:** Did not return

**Conditions:** n.a.

**Destination:** Rhodes thence Samos

**Hetairoi:** Euboulos (*PA* 5369) (Sealey 1976: p456),  
Phokion (*PA* 15076), Aristophon  
(*PA* 2108)

**Family Exile:** Probable

**Attitude to Exile:** n.k.

**Return Date:** n.a.

**Return Conditions:** n.a.

**Recall Date:** n.a.

**C. SOURCES**

**Literary:**

Aisch. ii.78; 147; iii.11-12 cf *Dem.* xviii. 12-13; 21; 162;  
xix. 249; 265; 290-291; 304; 337; *Plut. Dem.* 24.2-3

**Epigraphical:** n.e.

**D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

Perlman (1967: pp161-163)  
Davies *APF* p6, pp543-547  
Hansen (1974: p38)  
Sealey (1976: p456)  
Cawkwell (1978: p94)  
Bosworth (1988: p205, pp213-214)

## AISCHINES

Although Aischines (*PA* 354) voluntarily chose to live away from Athens, his motives were political, as was the underlying cause of his voluntary exile in Rhodes.

The proximate cause was his inability to pay a fine imposed as a result of an unsuccessful *graphe paranomon* against Ktesiphon (*PA* 8894). Briefly, Aischines could not pay the fine and suffered the normal penalty of *atimia*, or loss of his civic rights.<sup>1</sup> Unable or unwilling to live in Athens without taking part in the public life of a politician which he had led for some twenty years, Aischines apparently made arrangements to leave Athens with his family, possibly including also his brother Aphobetos (*PA* 2775 *Appendix A*).<sup>2</sup>

Aischines was part of the group of Athenian politicians, led by Aristophon (*PA* 2108) and Euboulos (*PA* 5369) and including Phokion (*PA* 15076), who were not necessarily pro-Macedonian but rather more strongly for Athenian safety.<sup>3</sup>

1. Hansen (1974: p38)
2. There is no direct evidence that Aphobetos left Athens, although he was prominent politically (a former Envoy to Persia - Hofstetter 1978: p178f) and is not heard of again from the time of Aischines' withdrawal.
3. Dem. xviii.21; 162; xix. 290-291; 304; Sealey (1976: p470). At p456 Sealey describes the support of Aischines for the proposal of Euboulos. Cawkwell (1978: p94): "Aeschines had become the champion of maintaining the Peace of Philocrates..."

In the politics of the day that meant ranging oneself against the anti-Macedonian camp including Demosthenes (*PA* 3597 Entry 99), Hypereides (*PA* 13912 Entry 102), Timarchos (*PA* 13636), Himeraios (*PA* 7578 Entry 101) and Ktesiphon (*PA* 8894).<sup>4</sup>

After the defeat of Athens by Philip at Chaeroneia in 338, Demosthenes was placed in charge of repairing the ruined walls of the city, of securing the grain supply and also of the Theoric Fund.<sup>5</sup> These appointments were made at a time when it was thought by the extremist anti-Macedonians such as Hypereides that Chaeroneia was only a battle lost, and that there was a war still able to be won. As a result of the efforts of Demosthenes, Athens was tolerably able to continue its routine affairs, although the patience of the Macedonians with Athens contributed much to this status.<sup>6</sup> Ktesiphon proposed in 336 that Demosthenes be honoured with a crown for his efforts on the city's behalf. Aischines immediately brought a charge of making an illegal proposal against Ktesiphon.<sup>7</sup> For reasons which are not known the trial of this charge was delayed for some years. If the political star of Demosthenes was ascendant in

4. However, see Demosthenes Entry 99, note 6. The *personal* animosity between Demosthenes and Aischines was consistent throughout their political lives, Sealey (1976: p471)

5. Plut. *Mor* 846a; Bosworth (1988: p205) suggests that the Theoric Fund was the largest receptacle of public funds, and notes that this was so despite legislation enacted soon after Demosthenes' service as theoric commissioner, which restricted the Fund somewhat in a move which Bosworth feels might be aimed at Demosthenes. Cf Aisch. iii.25 with Bosworth (*loc cit*).

6. Plut. *Dem* 22.4

7. Aisch. iii.14: in 338/7 Demosthenes was still a public official at the time Ktesiphon made his proposal. Bosworth (1988: pp213-214).

336 and the timing of the charge was poor, then Aischines should still have won on the technicality, notwithstanding the fickleness of Athenian jurors in the treatment of their own precedents.

By 330 any hope of Athens resurrecting her past predominance, or even true autonomy, was slipping away. Trials such as that proposed for Ktesiphon were really "show trials" for the judgement of the policies of prominent politicians. Aischines may have felt now Athens was so down, as a result of the policies of Demosthenes or more especially of the "radicals" such as Hypereides, that a large blow struck at Demosthenes through Ktesiphon was within reach. His political misjudgement<sup>8</sup> was his apparent failure to recognise that the Athenians may have realised they could not achieve a resurrection of the past, but that did not mean that they had not believed in the dream. Nor were they about to abandon the man who above all almost made the dream a reality. Aischines not only lost a prosecution he should technically have won on the charge itself, he failed to obtain even one-fifth of the vote.<sup>9</sup> This total misjudgement of the mood of the Athenians and the political realities resulted in the imposition of a fine of one thousand drachmae, which Aischines could not pay. His citizen-rights were withdrawn pending payment.<sup>10</sup>

8. Sealey (1976: p486, p488) believes that Aischines was also outmanoeuvred by Philip in 340/39; perhaps the naivety of Aischines was not an isolated occurrence but a political character trait of the man.

9. *Plut. Dem* 24.2

10. Hansen (1974: p38)

The decision of Aischines to turn his back on Athens was undoubtedly precipitated by this enforced withdrawal from public life, and the disillusionment he felt at the directions of Athenian politics, which clearly ignored the reality of the entrenched Macedonian power in all areas of Greece, especially in former areas of Athenian influence.

However, financial considerations were also important in the decision. The forebears of Aischines had been wealthy but his father lost most of his assets in the upheavals attendant upon the Peloponnesian War and then the rule of the Thirty Tyrants.<sup>11</sup> Although some restitution was apparently available, for his father Atrometos (*PA* 2681 Entry 77) this must have been negligible since he was forced to earn a living as a teacher.<sup>12</sup> Aischines himself must have improved his position in order to have taken part in public life, since the assumption of a public role had attendant expenses.<sup>13</sup> However, it is apparent that Aischines must have been reliant to some extent on his civic rights to support himself, perhaps with access to the law courts, though no details are known. He had not made a great success as an actor, and was

11. Aisch. ii. 78; 147. See Entry 78.

12. Dem. xix.249

13. Perlman (1967: pp161-163); cf *APF* p543



probably supporting himself as a teacher of rhetoric.<sup>14</sup>

A fine of one thousand drachmae was not a particularly large sum<sup>15</sup> and his inability to pay suggests that Aischines was not among the very wealthy. If loss of civic rights through political mismanagement resulted in loss of earning potential, then the decision of Aischines to resettle away from Athens also had financial overtones. Therefore, he moved with his family to Rhodes. He established himself as a *rhetor*,<sup>16</sup> from which it is assumed he made a sufficient living for himself and his kin. The choice of Rhodes was significant, since the formerly democratic island had turned away from the exploitative Athens after the Social War. Rhodes in 330/329 was oligarchic, but was also commencing the process by which the island became one of the great artistic centres of the Hellenistic period. For a disenchanted politician whose teaching skills would be in demand, this island almost diametrically opposed to Athens geographically, artistically and politically, was a logical destination for Aischines.

At some time prior to his death in 315 at the age of about seventy-five, Aischines had moved possibly to Samos.<sup>17</sup> There are no other details extant of his life in Rhodes or of his decision to move from Rhodes to Samos or another Ionian city.

14. Dem. xix. 249; 265; 337. Plut. *Mor* 840a

15. Demosthenes was fined 50 talents for his part in the Harpalos affair. If Dem. xviii.12-13 is accurate and Aischines had inherited money from relatives, his embassies and public expenses would still have allowed his relative poverty to be genuine.

16. Plut. *Dem* 24.3

17. Plut. *Dem* 24.3 merely says he went to Ionia after Rhodes: *...kai peri Rodon kai Ionian...*

**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Kallimedon

**Patronymic:** son of Kallikratos

**Deme:** Kollytos

**Tribe:** II Aigeis

**Tritty's:** City

**PA No:** 8032; H Swoboda *RE* 20 (1919) col 1647f  
(1) (2)

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** n.k.

**Date of Death:** n.k.

**Magistracies:** n.k.

**Wealth:** Owned silver mines at  
Thorikos; *APF* p273, p279

**B. EXILE**

Certain (Plut. *Dem* 27.1-2; [Aisch.] *Ep* xiii.8)

**Reason:** Unknown - probably fled  
after involvement with Megarian  
exiles.

**Date:** 324

**Term:** n.k.

**Conditions:** n.a.

**Destination:** Beroia, Macedon

**Hetairoi:** Pythcas (*PA* 12342)

**Family Exile:** n.k. but unlikely

**Attitude to Exile:** n.k.

**Return Date:** n.k.

**Return Conditions:** n.k.

**Recall Date:** n.a.

**C. SOURCES**

**Literary:**

**Epigraphical:**

[Aisch] *Ep* xiii.8

*IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 1587, line 12

Dein. i.94-95

Plut. *Dem* 27.1-2

**D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

Crosby (1950: p204)

Davies *APF* p273, p279

Bosworth (1988: p220ff)

Worthington (1992: pp263-265)

KALLIMEDON

The exile of Kallimedon (*PA* 8032) is attested by two sources. Plutarch asserts that he fled<sup>1</sup> Athens in company with Pytheas (*PA* 12342 Entry 100) to join the pro-Macedon cause of Antipater, whilst Antipater was besieged in Lamia. He is said to have toured the Greek cities of the southern area with Pytheas, trying to get them to resist a call to revolt against Macedon. Letters attributed to Aischines state that Kallimedon spent his exile (duration not stated) in Beroia in Central Macedonia.<sup>2</sup> At this point the two statements are not necessarily compatible.

Kallimedon was apparently a wealthy politician. He has been identified as the leaseholder of silver mines at Thorikos,<sup>3</sup> which is the presumed source of the personal wealth which allowed him to participate actively in Athenian politics. Crosby<sup>4</sup> has hypothesised that these leaseholders of Athens would naturally have been anti-Macedon, since any wealth from the mines would be sacrificed to the Macedonians, should they succeed in controlling Athens. As Davies has pointed out,<sup>5</sup> the pro-Macedonian stance of Kallimedon is in contrast to what is otherwise a logical conclusion drawn by Crosby.

1. *Plut. Dem* 27.2
2. [Aisch] *Ep* xii.8
3. *IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 1587, line 12; Crosby (1950: p204)
4. Crosby (1950: p204)
5. *APF* p279

Further, Crosby has dated the evidence of Kallimedon's ownership of the mining lease in Thorikos to 320/19.<sup>6</sup> Had he been involved with the pro-Macedonian cause in 323/2 to the extent claimed by Plutarch,<sup>7</sup> whilst Antipater was trapped in Lamia and Demosthenes (*PA* 3597 Entry 99) was leading the politics at Athens, his ownership would have almost certainly been forfeited. At this point Leosthenes (*PA* 9142) had Antipater bottled up<sup>8</sup> with no hope of relief and the mood of the Athenians, sensing victory, would have been strongly against any Macedonian sympathisers. It is therefore probable that Kallimedon did not acquire the mining rights until after the fall of the Athenian democracy and the ascendancy of Macedon in Athenian affairs in 322/1. In that case, the source of his wealth up till and including his exile is not known, unless the mines were in fact restored to him (implying previous ownership) after the fall of Athens.

The fact of the exile is dependent upon two conflicting statements, namely that Kallimedon left Athens hastily with Pytheas, when it was feared that Antipater would succumb at Lamia.<sup>9</sup> This scenario presupposes that the two were afraid to be still in Athens, and apparently associated with Antipater, should Athens defeat Macedon. The two not only fled Athens, but also went, according to Plutarch,<sup>10</sup> not to Beroia as exiles, but to the southern Greek states to urge the formerly peaceful allies of Macedon to remain true to the arrangements which were in force at the death of Alexander.

6. Crosby (1950: p204f)

7. *Plut. Dem* 27.2

8. *Plut. Dem* 27.1

9. *Plut. Dem* 27.2

10. *Plut. Dem* 27.2

The conclusion appears to hinge upon the events of 325 and the Megarian exile question.

Kallimedon was indicted by Demosthenes for aiding and abetting the oligarchic exiles from Megara.<sup>11</sup> Although the charge was never tested in court,<sup>12</sup> it serves to illustrate that Kallimedon was at the very least not a committed democrat. That there was no proof of this charge does not mean that Kallimedon was innocent. By 325 Demosthenes was too wily and too experienced a politician to waste his time on trivial or vexatious charges.

The only scenario which fits the extant evidence is that Kallimedon left Athens voluntarily *after* this charge was made. Given his oligarchic leanings (which presumes the charge of Demosthenes was true, itself likely given Kallimedon's pro-Macedonian stance later in the Lamian war), it would have been in Kallimedon's best interests to leave the city whilst the matter was on the backburner. As a pro-Macedonian, Kallimedon would have been able to spend his exile in Macedon, and if this scenario is valid, then Beroia makes sense.<sup>13</sup> There is no need to get into the tortuous reasoning of Davies<sup>14</sup> regarding possible family holdings, since Beroia is very well into the hinterland of Macedon and nowhere near Methone. Neither is it necessary that Kallimedon should require an "excuse" or pre-arrangement for his sojourn in Macedon based on ancient ties.

11. Dein. i.94; Worthington (1992: p264-265) refers to Kallimedon (p265) as "...apparently a known Macedonian sympathizer..." although he acknowledges that this assumption rests somewhat on the fact that Kallimedon joined Antipater after Alexander's death, but that this fact did not make him pro-Macedonian before 323.
12. Dein. i.95: Demosthenes withdrew the charge, though Worthington (1992: p265) does not offer support for his contention that he would not have done so unless bribed.
13. Bosworth (1988: p211) doubts that there was in fact a pro- and anti-Macedonian division in Athens, and of course it was a more sophisticated alignment politically than that. However, his contention that there was no real pro-Macedonian faction at all is undermined by his statement that only Kallimedon and Pytheas are known. Why should they be the only two who were at least in favour of continuance of peace? The argument from silence is effectively disproved by the very fact that Pytheas and Kallimedon were pro-Macedonian.
14. *APF* p279

If then Kallimedon was in Beroia in 325/4, how did he return to Athens to be able to flee the city again during the Lamian War? The answer is that Kallimedon is a beneficiary of the restoration decree of Alexander in 324/3.<sup>15</sup> He would have been eligible for repatriation under the sponsorship of Alexander's exile restoration scheme. The death of Alexander then intervened and the opportunists gained a strong following.

When it subsequently appeared that the anti-Macedonian forces would prevail (immediate evidence for which being the blockade of Antipater in Lamia without obvious means of relief), then a person in Kallimedon's position, and with his known political leanings, would naturally have left Athens post-haste to try at best to neutralise the situation in those Greek states which were being courted to desert the Macedonian hegemony. While not necessarily a second voluntary exile from Athens, rather an ambassadorial junket for Macedon, this trip of Kallimedon provided a fortuitous absence from Athens.

Of course, Antipater eventually prevailed, and in Athens all those politically opposed to Macedon, including Demosthenes, were dead or in exile themselves. Under the now benevolent eye of Macedon, its supporters would be in a position to avail themselves of property such as lucrative silver mines, without fear of the ancient equivalent of nationalisation. This accords with Crosby's dating of the leasehold to 320/19, that is a first acquisition at this time, rather than a restoration. It could have been a reward for 'loyal and faithful service' rather than a restoration.

15. Dein. i.94

There are no details of Kallimedon's exile in Beroia. We do not know if he left with or without family,<sup>16</sup> merely that it is probable that he voluntarily absented himself from Athens for political reasons. MacKechnie<sup>17</sup> has demonstrated that Macedon had a policy of settling people well within her borders for strategic reasons, and Beroia (which is safely away from the coast) at this time may have afforded the means for Macedon to reward a loyal supporter who needed sustenance.

The second "exile" was also politically motivated, and perhaps more panicked than the first, and so it is unlikely that elaborate plans for removal of any family would have been made. Sustenance whilst he and Pytheas toured the Greek cities is also unexplained, although we do know that they engaged in a form of ambassadorial conduct on behalf of the Macedonians. The strength of *xenia* relationships appears to have been diluted by the third quarter of the fourth century, but it is probable that these two pro-oligarchs found sufficient remnants in the Peloponnese to provide sustenance during the few months they would have been on the move before Antipater prevailed.

16. *APF* p279 makes the point that Kallimedon 's sons apparently did not share their father's views. However, identifications are not sufficiently secure to labour the point.

17. McKechnie (1989: p204f)

**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Demosthenes

**Patronymic:** son of Demosthenes

**Deme:** Paiania

**Tribe:** III Pandionis

**Tritty:** Inland

**PA No:** 3597; T Thalheim RE 5 (1905) coll169ff (6)

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** 385/4

**Date of Death:** 322/21 by suicide in exile at Caleuria

**Magistracies:** AO 795, *theorikos*; *sitones* 338; *teichopoios* 337; *heiropoios* 347; *pylagoras* 343; Envoy 347/6, 344/3, 341, 339/8, 335; *kategoros* 325.

**Wealth:** APF pp113-139, especially pp122-139

**B. EXILE**

Certain - In 323 fled from prison; (Plut. *Dem* 26.2) again in 322/1 fled from Antipater (Plut. *Mor* 846f-847b; *Dem* 29)

**Reason:** In 323 because of political nature of his conviction; again after final victory of Macedon.

**Date:** 323; 322/1

**Term:** 1 year; ?months only - died in second exile

**Conditions:** n.a.

**Destination:** Troezen, Aigina, thence Caleuria; Caleuria

**Hetairoi:** Hypereides (*PA* 13912) (though not later); Timarchos (*PA* 13636); Aristarchos (*PA* 1656), Apollodoros (*PA* 1411), Ktesiphon (*PA* 8893), ?Aristonikos (*PA* 2028).

**Family Exile:** n.k.

**Attitude to Exile:** Distressed and not able to accept life outside Athens

**Return Date:** 322; did not return

**Return Conditions:** To pay fine imposed and to organise altar for festival of Zeus

**Recall Date:** 322



## **C. SOURCES**

### ***Literary:***

Aisch. i.169; iii.159, 212

Plut. *Dem* 26.2, 29

*Phok* 22; 23.4

*Mor* 846f-847b

Diod. XVIII.99; XIX.68; XX.46

### ***Epigraphical:*** n.e.

## **D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

Pickard-Cambridge (1914: p393, p415, pp428-429, p456)

Cloché (1959: pp203-204)

Badian (1961: pp43ff)

Jaeger (1963: p60)

Davies *APF* pp113-139

Hansen (1975: p103 no.110)

Cawkwell (1978: p19, p22)

Worthington (1992: *sv Demosthenes*)

## DEMOSTHENES

The first exile of Demosthenes (*PA* 3597) was accomplished by his escape from prison.<sup>1</sup> He had been accused and convicted of accepting twenty talents of the treasure confiscated from the erstwhile treasurer of Alexander at Byzantium, Harpalos. At this distance it is impossible from the extant evidence to determine whether Demosthenes was or was not guilty of theft.<sup>2</sup> Demosthenes had agreed to accept the verdict of the Council of the Areopagos,<sup>3</sup> which had been set the task of investigating the disappearance of part of the treasure of Alexander that Harpalos had stolen and brought intact to Athens, presumably as a sweetbait to ensure asylum there.

In fact, the guilt or innocence of Demosthenes on the theft charge does not alter the fact that the condemnation was politically motivated. Nor was this the first time his opponents had attacked Demosthenes using charges not relevant to the political desire to remove him from

1. Diod. XVII.108; Plut. *Dem* 25; *Phok* 22. Worthington (1986: p69 and n47) dates the trial of Demosthenes in mid-March, followed by a week or so in prison, so he went into exile in late March or the beginning of April, 323; Badian (1961: p42)
2. Cloché (1959: p203) suggests that his enemies had finally found something which would stick, after several attempts earlier had failed. Bosworth (1987: p216), while not accusing Demosthenes of bribery outright, does point out that his early opposition to Harpalos, remaining in Athens was dropped and the inference is that it was dropped somewhat abruptly. He suggests (p218) that Demosthenes may have actually received the twenty talents although the timing of his receipt of such funds would determine whether Demosthenes was bribed to allow Harpalos to remain in Athens, or whether the receipt of the funds was part of the scheme to allow Harpalos to escape from custody later. Badian (1961: pp34-35 and n146) seems to opt for Demosthenes' guilt, despite his protestations at p36.
3. According to Plut. *Dem* 26, it was Demosthenes himself who proposed that the matter be handled by the Council of the Areopagos.

Athens, preferably permanently. One attack involved an accusation of cowardice at the battle of Chaeroneia;<sup>4</sup> his political position was attacked somewhat more successfully through the prosecution of his close associate, Timarchos (PA13636).<sup>5</sup>

There are three indicators of this ultimately successful attempt to remove Demosthenes from the political scene at Athens. Firstly, Demosthenes was not tried in open court, where his supporters may have been able to obtain an acquittal.<sup>6</sup> Demosthenes had throughout his long public career been a consistent advocate of an anti-Macedon stance by Athens.<sup>7</sup> This was echoed within Athens by a group who believed in the value systems of the fifth century, maintaining that Athens was the rightful leader of the Greeks, or at the very least a great, free and independent city.<sup>8</sup>

4. Aisch. iii. 159, although most had fled from the battlefield towards home, so the charge was probably not true. Ellis (1976: p200) accepts the cowardice charge and feels that Demosthenes had himself elected to the commission for the food supply so he could remove himself from Athens for a while.
5. Aisch. i. 169; Dem. xix.2; 283-86; 241. Aristarchos (PA 1656 Entry 91)
6. Hansen (1975: p103 no.110)
7. It is recognised that the Athenian political scene was more complex than a pro- or anti-Macedonian situation, as Sealey indicates (1976: p470). However, despite some compromise evident at the time of the Peace of Philokrates, Demosthenes was consistently anti-Macedonian; cf Sealey (1976: p471). Hammond and Griffith (1979: p621) refer to Demosthenes, Lykourgos (PA 9251) and Hypereides (PA 13912 Entry 102) as "the irreconcilables", that is, to Philip, Macedon and the realities of the change in the power structure in Greece. Badian (1961: p39) disagrees, and paints a picture of a complex series of responses which, if true, attest to a more pragmatic approach. The difficulty is that his notion of Demosthenes' political responses is based on his belief that Athenian politicians such as Hypereides and Demades (PA 3263), and significantly Demosthenes, had acquired for themselves "protectors" in the Macedonian court (p34). Unfortunately the concept of Demades as a "protégé" (p34) of Antipater stretches credibility.
8. Dem. ii - the Second Phillipic - is an example of the calumny of which Philip was continually accused. Relations between Athens and Philip: Sealey (1976: pp469-489)

Secondly, Aristogeiton (*PA* 1775) was also accused and was acquitted on the same evidence which convicted Demosthenes, and which was never made public.<sup>9</sup> If this situation is correct, then the prosecution of Demosthenes was politically motivated and probably had little to do with whether he actually stole the money, or whether he had been bribed.

The third consideration is the instigator of the charges against Demosthenes, one Pytheas (*PA* 12342). Though little is known of his stance at the time of the charges, it is significant that he joined Antipater<sup>10</sup> after Alexander's death and fought at the siege of Lamia in the following year. Clearly, unless he had a sudden change of heart, he was already in the pro-Macedon camp politically in 323.

Regardless of the merits or otherwise of the criminal case against Demosthenes, he was fined fifty talents. Since he was not able to pay such a significant sum, he was cast into prison until he could pay.<sup>11</sup>

Aischines<sup>12</sup> suggests that Demosthenes was always ready for flight, with funds and an exit

9. Dem. *Ep* ii. 15-16; Bosworth (1987: pp219-220) points out that Demades was also convicted, and while the amount of his fine is not recorded, he apparently had the wherewithal to pay it and remain in Athens, which suggests that he was an hitherto unrecognised timocrat. More probably the fine was less than that of Demosthenes - another indicator that the episode was politically contrived. Bosworth appears to be following Badian (1961: p35) uncritically, as it is Badian who insists that Demades fled into exile because he could not pay a fine which was yet to be imposed. However, Badian asserts that Dinarchos is evidence of the flight of Demades and must be accepted, notwithstanding that he gives us no reason to do so, and that this source does not mention Demades by name. See Appendix A for the exclusion of Demades from the list of voluntary exiles.
10. Plut. *Dem* 27
11. Plut. *Dem* 26. Badian (1961: p42) for the chronology of the trial and the delayed delivery of the verdict.
12. Aisch. iii.212

route established. Although it is necessary to treat this statement sceptically, since Aischines and Demosthenes were political opponents, it does appear to have some basis in fact. Whilst this is not the place to consider the relative ineffectiveness of Athenian prisons as secure detention centres, it is apparent that Demosthenes contrived to escape with relative ease.<sup>13</sup>

Demosthenes made his way, extraordinarily with the financial assistance of his enemies if Plutarch is to be believed,<sup>14</sup> firstly to Aigina, thence to Troezen and subsequently to Caleuria. Demosthenes exhibited varying emotions during the period of exile, at first railing against his fate in being forced to leave his beloved Athens as a result of the activities of his political enemies.<sup>15</sup> In his letters to Athens at the period the tone is self-pitying and whining. However, the death of Alexander galvanised Demosthenes as nothing else could. Instead of languishing he became a vigorous envoy of those advocating an uprising against Macedonian rule, apparently travelling throughout the Peloponnese and into Arcadia to espouse the cause.<sup>16</sup>

At home the climate of opinion had again turned. The pro- and anti-Macedonian groups had always been finely balanced within Athens, and it was now felt that Athens had a strong chance

13. Plut. *Dem* 26.2. No details are related of the means of escape. It appears to be a case of some outside assistance coupled with the general laxity of the system. Plut. *Mor* 846c suggests that Demosthenes did not await the trial, although this should be discounted since Demosthenes had every expectation of winning, following the result of the trial of Aristogeiton, from the same evidence.

14. Plut. *Dem* 26.3-4

15. Suda *sv* Pytheas; Plut. *Dem* 27.3-4

16. Diod. XVIII.18; Plut. *Phok* 23.4

to regain her former political ascendancy, or at least real autonomy.<sup>17</sup> Demosthenes was required at home, as he never ceased to remind his fellow citizens, a position with which the majority came to concur - they set in train his recall. In order to return he had to obey the law and pay the debt of fifty talents to the state. Since he was in exile because he had not been able to pay in the first place, his return was contrived by the demand that he must decorate the altar of Zeus and he was awarded fifty talents with which to carry out what was apparently a smaller task.<sup>18</sup> His recall had been proposed by a relative, Demon (*PA* 3736). Significantly, a trireme was sent to Aigina to collect him, and his arrival was the occasion of an official welcoming party, including archons and priests.<sup>19</sup> So Demosthenes returned to lead the Athenians' political efforts to overthrow Macedonian domination.

Despite his lamentations to the contrary, Demosthenes' time in exile does not appear to have been spent in physical suffering, nor was he in any apparent danger, despite being domiciled relatively close to Athens. His location was hardly a secret, and he apparently enjoyed visits from associates.<sup>20</sup> Mail was able to pass at least to Athens, and probably sustenance was carried to Demosthenes, together with political briefings. It must be assumed that his enemies lacked the political will or necessary ascendancy to have him removed permanently. As

17. *Plut. Dem* 27.8

18. *Plut. Dem* 27.6-7

19. *Plut. Dem* 26.7

20. *loc cit*

Pickard-Cambridge has pointed out, the fact that Hypereides (*PA* 13912 Entry 102) joined the prosecution of Demosthenes indicates that even his friends wanted to be rid of him.<sup>21</sup> Once he was out of Athens, it was probably assumed that he would no longer be involved in Athenian politics. This perhaps explains the ease with which he was able to escape to exile, and also the assistance given by his enemies: he was thought to be too old and irrelevant to warrant the killing. And so it might have been, had Alexander not died in Babylon.<sup>22</sup>

Initially the uprising against Macedonia had some military success, with Antipater being besieged in the fortress of Lamia.<sup>23</sup> Inevitably, with reinforcements from Asia and defections within the allied forces, the Macedonians prevailed. Antipater demanded the surrender of those who had led the revolt.<sup>24</sup> The anti-Macedonian party at Athens was totally routed, with Demades (*PA* 3263) and Phokion (*PA* 15076) placed in charge of the city's political institutions.<sup>25</sup> Death sentences were passed on Hypereides and Demosthenes, among others.<sup>26</sup> The anti-Macedonians, including Demosthenes, had fled the city, and Antipater caused them to be tracked down and killed. Demosthenes was located at the sanctuary of Poseidon on Caleuria. Cornered in 322/1 by Antipater's soldiers, he took poison and died.<sup>27</sup>

21. Pickard-Cambridge (1914: p462); Plut. *Dem* 26; Badian (1961: p39 and n170) believed that the political profile of Demosthenes, if coupled with secret dealings outside Athenian official circles, would arouse the anger of his political opponents, and those honest men in Athens who went by the book in their expectations of the dealings of officials.

22. Arr. *Anab* VII.27-28

23. Diod. XVIII.9

24. Diod. XIX.48; XX.46

25. Plut. *Dem* 28.2

26. Plut. *Dem* 28.2

27. Plut. *Dem* 29; *Mor* 846f-847b contains a more lurid account of his death.

This second exile appears to have been a hectic and probably ill-prepared flight by comparison with the first. Significantly, Demosthenes had returned to Caleuria, and it is reasonable to assume that he had resources there to sustain his exile, either pre-arranged or left over from his previous stay. He could have fled there simply because, when frightened, most people will tend towards the familiar for at least the illusion of safety. It is difficult to suggest how Demosthenes sustained himself, and we have no evidence to determine which of his family and friends were with him in his flight to Caleuria during either exile. It appears that the exile lasted only a matter of one or two months before he was discovered, and his death followed.



**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Pytheas

**Patronymic:** n.k.

**Deme:** n.k.

**Tribe:** n.k.

**Trittys:** n.k.

**PA No:** 12342

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** n.k.

**Date of Death:** n.k.

**Magistracies:** AO 2655, *kategoros* 324  
(Plut. *Mor* 846c)

**Wealth:** Probable since he was  
able to pay 5 talent fine. Not in  
*APF*.

**B. EXILE**

Certain (Suda sv Pytheas)

**Reason:** *Atimos* and opposition to  
Demosthenes.

**Date:** 323/2

**Term:** ?one or two years only

**Conditions:** n.a.

**Destination:** Macedon

**Hetairoi:** Hypereides (*PA* 13912),  
Himeraios (*PA* 7578),  
Patrokles (?*PA*)

**Family Exile:** n.k.

**Attitude to Exile:** ? not  
favourable.

**Return Date:** ?321 or 320

**Return Conditions:** n.k.

**Recall Date:** n.a.

**C. SOURCES**

**Literary:**  
Plut. *Mor* 846c  
Dem. *Ep* iii.29-30  
Harp. *Pytheas* - Frag. II  
Suda sv Pytheas

**Epigraphical:** n.k.

**D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

Hansen (1976: p143 no.33)

## PYTHEAS

It can confidently be asserted that the exile of Pytheas (PA 12342) was politically based, albeit indirectly. Pytheas had been tried, convicted and imprisoned on an unspecified charge, which Hansen thinks may have been that Pytheas was behaving as an *epitimos* although he was *atimos*.<sup>1</sup> Since he had readily paid a fine of five talents in a previous action,<sup>2</sup> he was presumably not without resources and wealth, so it is unlikely that he was *atimos* as a state debtor. It is not possible to determine what the charge was, yet one can be reasonably confident that the charge would have been motivated by the desire of Demosthenes to pay back those responsible for an exile which he found most distasteful.<sup>3</sup> Pytheas, together with Hypereides (PA 13912 Entry 102) and others, had been responsible for the conviction of Demosthenes over the Harpalos affair.<sup>4</sup> In late 323/2 Demosthenes had returned to Athens,<sup>5</sup> and it is probably more than coincidence that Pytheas was charged and convicted at this time.

Pytheas was imprisoned, either as the punishment, or less likely, because he could not pay the fine. He escaped from prison, and fled to Macedon.<sup>6</sup> We have no details of the escape, nor who assisted him. Pytheas is yet another example of the relative ease with which people could break out of Athenian prisons, almost at will.

1. Hansen (1976: p143 no33).
2. Dem. Ep iii.20
3. See Entry 99.
4. Plut. Mor 846c: strange political bedfellows which illustrates that politics at the time was not as clearcut as pro- or anti- Macedonian factions. Badian (1961: pp34-37) on the tense political situation in the months prior to the death of Alexander.
5. See Entry 99.
6. Suda sv Pytheas: ...*phugon te Athenethen ek tou desmoteriou dia ophlena eis Makedonian elthen, eita epanke palin.*

His involvement in the prosecution of Demosthenes in 323 may be read as an indication that he was, at the least, neutral on the topic of Macedon. However, it is likely that Pytheas was more strongly in the pro-Macedonian camp in Athenian politics, since his destination in exile was Macedon. The impression is reinforced by the fact that his stay in Macedon was relatively short,<sup>7</sup> and it appears that Pytheas may have returned in 321 under the umbrella of Antipater's dispositions in Athens.

There is no evidence extant for the nature of Pytheas' sojourn in Macedon, in terms of sustenance or family involvement. As a politician, Pytheas' usefulness to Macedon depended upon the part he could play in reversing the tide of sentiment against Macedon and its predominance in Greek affairs. Since Pytheas was in fact a prison escapee, and *atimos* too if Hansen is correct, his usefulness was perhaps limited. Therefore it is most likely that he had established some form of escape plan involving an (unknown) Macedonian. By the last quarter of the fourth century, politicians including Pytheas had before them many examples of the wisdom of preparing for a "worst case" scenario. A politician who was as prominent as Pytheas appears to have been, with a track record of prosecutions and fines, a predisposition to the pro-Macedonian party, and with some means at his disposal, would almost certainly have had alternative arrangements in place, should they have been required.<sup>8</sup>

7. Suda sv Pytheas: however, the phrase *eita epaneke palin* is not conclusive.

8. Note the association of Pytheas with Kallimedon (PA 8032 Entry 98), alleged by Plut. *Dem* 27.2.

***ENTRY No. 99 bis***

**DEMOSTHENES**

**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Himeraios (II)

**Patronymic:** son of Phanostratos

**Deme:** Phaleron

**Tribe:** IX Aiantis

**Trittys:** City

**PA No:** 7578; H Beare/K Schoch *RE* Suppl. 4  
(1924) col.743

**Genos:** n.k.

**Date of Birth:** c.360 (*APF* p108)

**Date of Death:** c.322/1

**Magistracies:** *AO* 1406, *kategoros* 324 (Plut *Mor* 846c) **Wealth:** *APF* p244, also p108

**B. EXILE**

Certain (Plut. *Dem* 27.2-4; *Mor* 846f)

**Reason:** Fled after defeat of Athens and demand of Antipater for surrender of all anti-Macedonian orators.

**Date:** 322

**Conditions:** n.a.

**Term:** ?several months before capture

**Hetairoi:** ?Hypereides (*PA* 13912),  
?Demosthenes (*PA* 3597)

**Destination:** Aigina

**Attitude to Exile:** n.k.

**Family Exile:** n.k. but unlikely

**Return Conditions:** n.a.

**Return Date:** Did not return

**Recall Date:** n.a.

**C. SOURCES**

**Literary:**

**Epigraphical:** n.e.

Plut. *Dem* 27.2-4; *Mor* 846c; 846e - 847

**D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

Refer to Entry 99 for general references to those involved with Demosthenes.

**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Hypereides

**Patronymic:** son of Glaukippos

**Deme:** Kollytos

**Tribe:** II Aigeis

**Trittys:** City

**PA No:** 13912

**Date of Birth:** n.k.

**Date of Death:** 322/1

**Magistracies:** AO 1437 syndikos 344 (Dem. xviii.134)  
kategoras 324 (Plut. Mor 836c)

**Wealth:** APF 517ff

**B. EXILE**

Certain (Plut. Dem 27.2-4; Mor 846f)

**Reason:** Fled after defeat of Athens and demand of Antipater for surrender of all anti-Macedonian orators.

**Date:** 322/1

**Term:** ?several months before capture

**Conditions:** n.a.

**Destination:** Aigina

**Hetairoi:** ?Himeraios (PA 7578),  
?Demosthenes (PA 3597)

**Family Exile:** n.k. but unlikely

**Attitude to Exile:** n.k.

**Return Date:** Did not return

**Return Conditions:** n.a.

**Recall Date:** n.a.

**C. SOURCES**

**Literary:**

**Epigraphical:** n.e.

Plut. Dem 27.2-4; Mor 846c, 846e - 847

**D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

Refer to Entry 99 for general references to those involved with Demosthenes.

**A. PERSONAL**

**Name:** Aristonikos

**Patronymic:** n.k.

**Deme:** Marathon

**Tribe:** IX Aiantis

**Trittys:** Coastal

**PA No:** 2028

**Date of Birth:** n.k.

**Date of Death:** 322/1

**Magistracies:** n.k.

**Wealth:** n.k. not in *APF*.

**B. EXILE**

Certain (Plut. *Dem* 27.2-4; *Mor* 846f)

**Reason:** Fled after defeat of Athens and demand of Antipater for surrender of all anti-Macedonian orators.

**Date:** 322/1

**Term:** ?several months before capture

**Conditions:** n.a.

**Destination:** Aigina

**Hetairoi:** ?Himeraios (*PA* 7578),  
?Hypereides (*PA* 13912)  
?Demosthenes (*PA* 3597)

**Family Exile:** n.k. but unlikely

**Attitude to Exile:** n.k.

**Return Date:** Did not return

**Return Conditions:** n.a.

**Recall Date:** n.a.

**C. SOURCES**

**Literary:**  
Plut. *Dem* 27.2-4; *Mor* 846c, 846e - 847

**Epigraphical:** *IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 1623 Bb lines 282-283; *IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 1631 b 169; *IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 1632 b 190

**D. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY**

Refer to Entry 99 for general references to those involved with Demosthenes.

HIMERAIOS, HYPEREIDES, ARISTONIKOS

Himeraios (*PA* 7578) was the son of Phanostratos and brother of the man who became leader of the Athenian state after the fall of the democracy, Demetrios of Phaleron (*PA* 3455).<sup>1</sup>

Himeraios as a politician appears to belong to the group surrounding Hypereides (*PA* 13912). Although Demosthenes generally opposed Macedonian power, the foreign affairs agenda of Demosthenes was too slow-paced for Hypereides. Himeraios joined Hypereides in the prosecution of Demosthenes over the Harpalos affair.<sup>2</sup> This prosecution, which was successful, was designed perhaps to get Demosthenes out of the way after the defeat at Chaeroneia had left the Athenians in a mood for a compromise with Philip.<sup>3</sup>

The involvement of Himeraios in the prosecution probably meant that he was thus numbered amongst, and identified irrevocably with, those consistently opposed to Macedon, and determined to continue extremist opposition at all costs. In this light Himeraios stood no chance of being

1. Following Davies' identification, *APF* p108
2. *Plut. Mor* 846c
3. See *Appendix A: Aphobetos*.



missed when Antipater threatened to besiege Athens if *hoi rhetores* were not surrendered.<sup>4</sup>

Demosthenes was included in the broad sweep that this definition encompassed.<sup>5</sup> Whilst

Demosthenes may have pointed to internal affairs in Athens to demonstrate that he had, on

occasion, espoused the Macedonian position,<sup>6</sup> no such claim could be made for the "extremist"

politicians who apparently included Himeraios.

It is clear that, unlike the previous demand for surrender of politicians which was refused, the

Athenians were no longer disposed to risk the wrath of the Macedonians which they had so far

been spared. Demades (*PA* 3263) initiated a decree of compliance with the request of

Antipater.<sup>7</sup> From the scant sources available, it appears that those affected by the edict had

already fled, since the orators had been condemned to death *in absentia*.

4. Plut. *Mor* 846e

5. Plut. *Mor* 846e

6. For example, Demosthenes broadly accepted the status quo after Chaeroneia, whilst Hypereides and his friends wanted to continue the war. Demosthenes was earlier a non-opposer at least, of the Peace of Philokrates.

7. Plut. *Dem* 27.2-4. Demades was probably seeking to cover his political back.

Himeraios, together with Hypereides and Aristonikos (*PA* 2028), fled to the temple of Aiachos in Aigina. They were pursued there by the equivalent of a modern "bounty hunter". In violation of the sanctuary, they were seized, taken to Antipater, and subsequently executed.<sup>8</sup>

The exile of Himeraios is short on details, but it appears to have been hasty and desperate, since he chose somewhere still very close to Athens, or at least only managed to get that far. There is no evidence of a pre-prepared escape route used by Himeraios, unlike Demosthenes, who had had some practice. It is probable that none of the anti-Macedonians had felt the city would give them up, a belief they were entitled to hold on past performance.

Himeraios is included in this work because his voluntary exile demonstrates two salient aspects of the decisions open to those who suddenly, and often without justification, found themselves outside the system. Firstly, though voluntarily absencing oneself from Athens (exile) was often the option of prominent politicians when their opponents were in the ascendancy, this time the Athenian opposition was not so strident. However, the threat of the immediate use of outside force completely overthrew the underlying relatively stable system of democratic process which had formed throughout the fourth century in terms of the internal politics of Athens.<sup>9</sup>

Secondly, as Plutarch makes Demosthenes say,<sup>10</sup> in the face of the determination of the 'barbarian' Macedonians, the traditional safety of the temples could no longer be relied upon. Sanctuary within the protective walls of gods and goddesses was no longer available to voluntary exiles.

8. Plut. *Dem* 27.2-4; *Mor* 846f

9. There had been no attempt to form oligarchic governments in the fourth century in the manner of the fifth century

10. Plut. *Mor* 846f - 847

## **3.0 Conclusions**

### 3.1 Voluntary Exile and the Law

Of the occurrences of voluntary exile documented in this study, sixty-five occurred when the subjects of political or politically motivated trials failed to *remain* to face trial where formal charges had been laid or were being formulated for likely court action. A further eight failed to return to face almost certain trial, and eight escaped from prison either before their trials or when the verdict had been given.

It is likely that others, such as Aristoteles (*PA* 2057 Entry 60) and Aischines (*PA* 341 Entry 61), together with Charikles (*PA* 15407 Entry 58), fled at the fall of the Four Hundred<sup>1</sup> on the probably valid supposition that a charge of treason or similar would be laid if they attempted to brave it out at Athens. Similarly in the next century, the number of generals who failed to return after losses in the North,<sup>2</sup> points to a full understanding on the part of the upper echelons of Athenian politics and the military that no excuses or mitigations would be entertained by the *demos* when its ambitions were frustrated or its power apparently slighted.

The numbers of voluntary political exiles who fled or remained away in consequence of legal actions against them in the fifth century are greater than those of the fourth century.<sup>3</sup> However forty-nine of the fifty-eight were associated with the trials in 415/414 of those accused of the

1. Lys.xii.43-46; Xen. *Hell* II.2.18, II.3.46; Xen. *Hell* II.3.2, II.3.13; Lys. xiii.73-74

2. Hyp. vi.1-2: Timomachos (*PA* 13797 Entry 88), Leosthenes (*PA* 9141 Entry 83), Kallistratos (*PA* 8157 Entry 82), Philon (*PA* 14825 Entry 84), Theotimos (*PA* 7055 Entry 85)

3. Refer to Table 4

mutilation of the Hermai and the profanation of the Mysteries, or both. The wholesale exodus of those claimed to have been involved says more about their probable guilt than that there was a stronger trend in the fifth century for this type of flight than in the fourth century. The quantum may be only a matter of historical survival of evidence.

Whilst the period of the *pentekontaetia* is relatively poorly documented in the surviving evidence, the operation of the system of ostracism<sup>4</sup> in the fifth century appears to have had benefit other than its more overt attempt to contain *stasis* within the *poleis*. There was apparently a concentration on the conflicting policies rather than on the failure of individuals, and the operation of ostracism served as a directional signpost for policies in the immediate future. Victims of ostracism did not feel totally dispossessed and had access to means of support, a fixed term of exile and no real odium attached to being the loser in the policy stakes.

The lapse of ostracism in the late fifth century was perhaps partly because its use had turned once again from policies to people, and the ostracism of Hyperbolos (*PA* 13910) in 416<sup>5</sup> was the epitome of the failure of this law to contain *stasis* and set policy. The move to litigation against individuals for political gain was undoubtedly strengthened by the failures experienced

4. Phillips (1982: p21)

5. Thuc. VIII.73.3; Plut. *Alk* 13

by Athens in Sicily and eventually the loss of the Peloponnesian War. "Someone" must be at fault for all that befell the Athenians, and the confusion felt by Athenians in the last decade of the century allowed the all too human trait of seeking someone to blame to become the predominant response to failure, and sometimes even to success, such as the Arginousai trial in 406 demonstrated.<sup>6</sup>

The shift between the fifth and the fourth centuries turned then from ostracism and policy issues to personal attacks and more directed litigation against individuals. Amongst the cases in this study, the most common forms of action were *eisangelia* (or impeachment),<sup>7</sup> usually for *prodosia*, and the more politically manipulative *graphe paranomon*.<sup>8</sup> The basis for these forms of action was the presupposition of a crime or action against the state, including embezzlement, sacrilege and bribery (either as donor or recipient). Interestingly, bribery was in itself not considered to be such a shameful occurrence, but bribery to act, or resulting in actions, against the interests of the Athenians, as interpreted by the *demos*, was a heinous crime.<sup>9</sup>

The theoretical basis for the operations of these forms of action was that the *polis* was regarded as the focus of the highest form of human co-existence.<sup>10</sup> It was supposed to ensure

6. Xen. *Hell* I.7.1-35; Diod. XIII.101; Andrewes (1974: pp112-133); Roberts (1982: pp178-179); Sinclair (1989: pp169-172)

7. Following Hansen (1975) sixty-three of those in this study were impeached.

8. Androtion (*PA* 913 Entry 93) and Aischines (*PA* 354 Entry 97) are identified by Hansen (1974: p32 no.12, p38)

9. Harvey (1985: p78ff)

10. *politeia*: see the discussion in Ehrenberg (1974: pp38ff)

safety for all, and its existence operated on and interacted with all facets of the individual's existence. The *polis* literally gave life and the meaning of life to its citizens and those who depended upon them.<sup>11</sup> The public religion of the *polis* was focussed upon performing the right rituals in the right order at the right time to propitiate the gods who in turn would treat favourably the *polis* which observed the ritual of their cults.<sup>12</sup>

Any action which might jeopardise any aspect of the *polis* was regarded as a major crime and the perpetrator was pursued with considerable vigour. In the late sixth and most of the fifth centuries troublemakers or those perceived as being capable of causing division within the *polis* were expelled by it.<sup>13</sup>

In theory this cohesion of society based on consensus was admirable, but in practice as early as the ostracism of Thucydides (*PA* 7268),<sup>14</sup> and certainly by the ostracism of Hyperbolos (*PA* 13910),<sup>15</sup> the mechanism of ostracism, and indeed the operations of the laws generally, had taken on a distinctly political and vindictive role. This was to prove continually costly to the *demos* in terms of skills lost. The wholesale execution of the Arginousai generals in 406<sup>16</sup> clearly demonstrates that this self-destructive behaviour of the Athenian democracy

11. Perikles' *Epitaphios* (Thuc. II.34-46) gives expression to this relationship; Loraux (1986: p17). On the civic ideology of Athenian citizenship, see Loraux (1986: pp35-37; pp98-108 and especially p102 and pp104-106).

12. Parker (1983: p10)

13. For example, expulsion of the Peisistratids (Hdt. 5.62-5.65); the resolution of the conflict between Kleisthenes and Isagoras by the use of force (Hdt. 5.72.2-4); the introduction of the process of ostracism (*Ath Pol* 22.1, 22.3-8).

14. Plut. *Per* 14.2

15. Thuc. VIII.73.3; Plut *Alk* 13

16. Xen. *Hell* I.7.34-35

operated on an ever-increasing sense of panic that not even a morale-boosting victory could assuage. By creating polarisation within the Athenian *polis*, which took its final form in the years of Demosthenes' (*PA* 3597 Entry 99) and Hypereides' (*PA* 13912 Entry 102) radical hostility to Philip and later to Alexander of Macedon,<sup>17</sup> the power of Athens was finally and forever broken.

Merely fleeing from prosecution or staying away did not nullify the legal action taken against voluntary exiles. In fact it appears to have almost certainly guaranteed a guilty verdict to whatever charges were contemplated or laid. Of the more than one hundred voluntary exiles there are ninety-five in this study whose sentences are known or can be reliably inferred.<sup>18</sup> Sixty-two were condemned to death *in absentia* and a further twenty-one are strongly presumed to have attracted the same verdict. In addition, sixty-two suffered the loss of those of their assets and property which could be accessed by the state and which were confiscated by it. The most detailed evidence of the confiscation of property, of which the extent of the process was detailed and the accounting complex, is the *stelae* which establish the disposition of the possessions, including real estate and slaves, of those convicted of mutilation of the Hermai and profanation of the Mysteries.<sup>19</sup> The confiscation process was not confined to the radical democracy, and included confiscation of the assets of those democrats who fled into exile during the reign of the Thirty, such as Anytos (*PA* 1324 Entry 74) and Atrometos (*PA* 2681 Entry 77).

17. Hammond and Griffith (1979: p621) refer to them, together with Lykourgos as the 'irreconcilables'.

18. Refer to Table 4.

19. *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 421-430



Of the sixty-two who were sentenced to death *in absentia* (with or without confiscation of property), fifty had their sentences subsequently commuted to banishment (formal exile). Prominent amongst this group were Alkibiades (*PA* 600 Entry 55) and his friend Adeimantos (*PA* 202 Entry 7). It is not clear why this procedure was adopted, other than to suggest that it allowed for eventual recall of the exiles, which of course a death sentence could not necessarily achieve even if not carried out. Indeed, under the decree of reconciliation many did return,<sup>20</sup> although both Alkibiades and Adeimantos, for example, had returned earlier than the post-Thirty decree of 403/2.<sup>21</sup>

Gylon (*PA* 3098 Entry 57) was able to commute his sentence to a fine, apparently through the effective lobbying of his sons-in-law.<sup>22</sup> As Phormion (*PA* 14958 *Appendix A*) had before him,<sup>23</sup> Demosthenes (*PA* 3597 Entry 99), some ninety years later, had his sentence converted to performance of a state service, to enable his recall in the period after Alexander's death when hopes of an Athenian revival swept the anti-Macedonians such as Demosthenes back into the ascendancy in the *demos*.<sup>24</sup>

20. See chapter 'Return and Recall'

21. Alkibiades (*PA* 600 Entry 55) in 407 - Xen. *Hell* I.4.13f; Adeimantos (*PA* 202 Entry 7) a general at Aigospotamoi in 405 - Xen. *Hell* II.1.32

22. Dem. xviii.1-3

23. Paus. I.23.10

24. Plut. *Dem* 27.8

The politicisation of the principal legal processes is strongly suspected in the ostracism of Thucydides, son of Melesias,<sup>25</sup> and took a more concrete form in the attacks on Perikles through his associates.<sup>26</sup> This process led to the voluntary exile of Pheidias and charges against Perikles' mistress Aspasia, and later to attacks on those of oligarchic sympathies who had been associated in some way with Sokrates (*PA* 13101), including a number of the Hermokopidai, Peisandros (*PA* 11770 Entry 62), Xenophon (*PA* 11307 Entry 78) and, of course, Alkibiades,<sup>27</sup> although in no instance was this Socratic association the main charge against those people. The political target was the prominent politician or personality since the *hetaireia* normally existed and functioned around that individual.<sup>28</sup> Eliminating the main political target through convictions in the courts would usually result in the disintegration of the group. If sufficient votes could not reasonably be achieved against him, then eliminating one or more of his associates was a good second option, aimed at weakening the power of the main target. This tactic of using the legal process to attack political opponents was employed skillfully in the fourth century, as the case of Aristarchos (*PA* 1656 Entry 91) attests. He was obviously the secondary target, and Demosthenes (*PA* 3597 Entry 99) was the main target of the politically-based actions which led to the charge of murder against Aristarchos. The main shot missed Demosthenes, but Aristarchos was not so fortunate.

25. Philochoros *FGrH* 328 F120

26. Plut. *Per* 14.2; *Ath Pol* 27.2-4.; Pheidias (*PA* 14149 Entry 6 note 2)

27. Diog. Laert. II.43

28. See Aristarchos (*PA* 1656 Entry 91); Worthington (1990: pp330 - 339)

Demosthenes himself was a victim of the politicisation of legal process, when he was convicted of corruption on the same evidence upon which Aristogeiton (*PA* 1775 Entry 90) was acquitted.<sup>29</sup> It appears that, although the forensic speeches which have survived demonstrate a significant tendency to quote from past events and cases, the law of precedent was not necessarily binding in practice upon Athenian juries and not operable in Athenian jurisprudence in the manner understood by modern legal institutions.

One of the major causes of voluntary exile was the effect of *atimia* upon those whose life was actively political. *Atimia* resulted in loss of citizenship and all that citizenship implied, including loss of the right to enter temples and take part in the religious life of the *poleis*, and loss of the right to partake in the political processes, including holding office and taking part in debates in the *ekklesia*.<sup>30</sup> *Atimia* might be a sentence in itself, such as that imposed on Onomakles (*PA* 11476 Entry 59), which also included all his heirs and successors. More commonly, *atimia* resulted from the imposition of a fine of a magnitude which the recipient could not pay. Being thus indebted to the state meant that, at least until the fine was paid, citizenship rights were suspended, that is, *atimia* resulted. Many of the crimes which resulted in fines were not necessarily political, but the trials were instigated for political reasons. That of Aischines (*PA* 354 Entry 97), for example, was instigated by opponents who seized the opportunity of his political bumbling to secure a conviction. The fine was automatic<sup>31</sup> when Aischines made a

29. Bosworth (1988: pp219-220)

30. See Aischines (*PA* 354 Entry 97), Androtion (*PA* 913 Entry 93, Kallistratos (*PA* 8157 Entry 82). Hansen (1991: p99). Gernet (1968: p247) who contrasts *atimia* as a civil form of disgrace, with the older *apotypanismos* which was a cruel form of execution for criminals and traitors, among others.

31. See Hansen (1975: pp114f)

miscalculation of the political mood of the Athenians and brought a grossly under-supported *graphe paranomon* against Ktesiphon (PA 8894). The actual case related to a procedural deficiency which Aischines charged had occurred some six years beforehand. He failed to obtain the necessary votes of the jury and he was unable to pay the consequent fine. His loss of citizenship resulted not only in the isolation of Aischines from the normality of his life in the *polis*, but also from the source of his livelihood, although as a non-citizen he could have continued as a *logographos*. His case, like those of Andokides (PA 828 Entry 56), Timotheos (PA 13700 Entry 85) and Antiphon (PA 1281 Entry 92), demonstrates the despair felt by victims of *atimia* who circulate on the periphery of a life that had formerly held meaning in, and gave definition to, their existence. The decision to remove oneself from the daily reminders of what had been lost often resulted in voluntary exile.

Another feature of the Athenian legal system was the comparative ease with which escape could be effected from Athenian prisons. Here the operations of the prisoner's *hetaireia* had most effect, as the case of Sokrates (PA 13101) and the offer of his friends to achieve his escape demonstrated.<sup>32</sup> Demosthenes (PA 3597 Entry 99) decided after a week in prison serving his sentence that the life was intolerable, and he was assisted to leave Athens – probably even sped on his way – by his political opponents.<sup>33</sup> Bribery of guards was probably

32. Plato *Crito* 43c - 46b

33. Plut. *Dem* 26.3-4

the most effective means of securing release. The operations of *hetairoi* probably included some form of emergency funding procedures to ensure that an *hetairos* was looked after, not only in terms of bribery to secure prison release but also to provide funds for those *hetairoi* who were forced to flee. Aischines remarked<sup>34</sup> on the probability that Demosthenes misappropriated the funds set aside to sustain Aristarchos, his *hetairos*, during the latter's exile, which points to some informal practice being in place for this purpose of aiding political friends in need.

It was possible to be released on the surety of three others (equivalent to the modern bail system),<sup>35</sup> and presumably some of the exiles, details of whose flight from Athens are not known, took advantage of the system to leave before or during their trials. Again, unless relatives were involved, it is probable that the obligations of the *hetaireia* system provided friends willing to act in this capacity by giving surety for a political colleague. Unfortunately there is no evidence to determine what happened to those providing surety when the bailee absconded. So many exiles fled before trial that there appears that there were some serious deficiencies in the surety system, and that the equivalent of "remand in custody" was relatively ineffective against a determined escapee with resources.

34. Aisch. ii.166

35. Xen. *Hell* 1.7.35

This study of voluntary political Athenian exiles reaches the principal conclusion that it was the increased politicisation of legal processes during the late fifth and the fourth centuries that resulted in many victims of the process either developing sufficient cynicism such that they stayed away on often slim pretexts, and even after military victories;<sup>36</sup> and, placing such little confidence in the fickleness of the juries and the operations of the law, that they fled rather than expect justice at their trials. Ironically, the legal system in this period actually provided the catalyst for most of the voluntary political exiles without Athenians having appeared to recognise and deplore its failure to act to protect all citizens from injustices.

This lack of remorse suggests that Athenians were satisfied with the status quo as a means of handling *stasis*, whatever its effects on the individuals concerned. Indeed during most of the fourth century to the final victory of Antipater, there were no revolutions or political upheavals threatening to the survival of the democracy, such as those that plagued the fifth century and culminated in the Four Hundred and in the Thirty.

36. Aristogenes (PA 1781 Entry 64) and Protomachos (PA 12318 Entry 65) are the most obvious examples.

### 3.2 Destinations

The known or probable destinations of forty-nine voluntary political exiles are illustrated in **Table 6**. For the remaining sixty there is no evidence to suggest where they went, but the discussion of survival methods in the chapter of this work entitled "**Survival In Exile**" demonstrates that destinations were strongly related to the methods of survival adopted by the exiles during the period away from Athens. From that discussion, and from what is known about the destinations of those for whom evidence is available, some broad trends are discernible.

From **Table 6** it is apparent that earliest voluntary political exiles tended to gravitate towards what Hornblower<sup>1</sup> has described as "Old Greece". There is a large gap in the extant examples of voluntary political exiles from 499 to 430s, and this is reflected in **Table 6**. Ordinarily it would be reasonable to assume that this is merely a reflection of the survival of evidence concerning exiles. However **Table 7** demonstrates that in fact, during this period the operation of the ostracism process appears to have filled the gap. In this context the ostracism of Hyperbolos is, as Plutarch has rightly stated<sup>2</sup>, an anomaly and not merely the final instance in a continuously applied process during the whole of the fifth century. Hyperbolos was in fact part of the later tradition of 'playing the man rather than the ball', and his ostracism was thus not a means for determining policy direction. Read together, **Tables 6** and **7** demonstrate among other things, that the politicisation of the legal process referred to in the previous chapter can be charted chronologically.

1. Hornblower (1991: p174)

2. Plut. *Nikias* 10

However, the main purpose of **Table 6** is to chart where the exiles in fact did find refuge. The middle period of the Peloponnesian War is the watershed between the popularity of the "Old" versus the "New" Greek states and **Table 6** reflects the changing social and political mores. The traditional ties of *xenia* relationships increasingly became unreliable as loyalties developed which placed the needs of individuals and their states before those ties, and thus transcended the archaic ordering of "international" relationships.<sup>3</sup>

The Peloponnesian War had also undermined the presumed political orientation of the states of "Old Greece". Oligarchic Sparta had amongst its allies during the War some democratic regimes,<sup>4</sup> and the Athenians had been able to draw on the forces of its oligarchic subject allies.<sup>5</sup> With hindsight, the events of 404/3 and the Thirty tend to suggest that many of those of the Four Hundred who had fled in 411/10 most probably made their way to Sparta, for example Onomakles (*PA* 11476 Entry 59). Aristoteles (*PA* 2057 Entry 60) and Aischines (*PA* 341 Entry 61) definitely did so. However, it was not because of the political orientation of the Spartans, although no doubt congenial, but rather because the enemy of the Athenians was the only opportunity available unless one was prepared to leave "Old Greece" entirely, as did Peisandros (*PA* 11770 Entry 62) to make a new life in Persia, or go to somewhere equally remote from the long reach of the Athenian empire and the rapidly changing theatres of the war, where exiles could find themselves overtaken by events associated with the hostilities.

3. Herman (1987: pp164-165)

4. For example, Mantinea and Elis

5. Mytilene and the lesser cities of Lesbos. Cf de Ste. Croix (1981: p288, p296), where he maintains that Athens traditionally upheld democracies and Sparta oligarchies. Athens, however, appears to have upheld whatever regime suited Athens, and overall the situation is not as simplistic as de Ste. Croix makes out, when he refers to Sparta as "... the great supporter of oligarchy and the propertied classes." (p296)



The exiles of Alkibiades (*PA* 600 Entry 55) demonstrate the transition from the older world to the new. Albeit under some stress to flee in 414, Alkibiades had the choice of several destinations, including Thuri, Elis, Thebes, Sparta and possibly Argos. Significantly, all were part of what Hornblower<sup>6</sup> has described as "Old Greece", and all choices were available on the basis of *xenia* relationships. By the time of Alkibiades' second exile in 407/6 the fortunes of the War had depleted Athens' strength significantly, the Spartans and their allies were increasing their hold on the Aegean, and the choices of 414 were no longer valid for Alkibiades. In the years between 414 and 406, with the unreliability of *xenoi*, often through no fault of theirs, he had recognised the need for self-help. He had established a stronghold in Thrace for himself, outside the mainstream of Athenian activity and away from Spartan influence and his Spartan *xenos* Endios. The exiles of Alkibiades demonstrate this watershed between "Old Greece" and "New Greece", and whilst some exiles after 407 retained their preference for "Old Greece", generally the trend to self-help replaced ritualised friendships such as *xenia* relationships as a means of support for exiles, and thus there was a move geographically away from the area where the older form prevailed. Konon (*PA* 8707 Entry 71) and his friend Nikophemos (*PA* 11066 Entry 72), probably viewing the outcome of the Arginousai trial in 406/5, had made a secure escape route should it be required, by establishing relations with Evagoras of Cyprus.<sup>7</sup>

6. Hornblower (1991: p174)

7. Hornblower (1991: p19) suggests that it was possible for Athenians to develop friendships with non-Greeks without damaging their "Greekness", Evagoras had possibly been made a citizen of Athens before this: (*IG* I<sup>3</sup> 113).

Alkibiades of Phegous (*PA* 601 Entry 54), the relative of Alkibiades (III), had found refuge and employment in the West, in Syracuse, as did Andokides (*PA* 828 Entry 56), in Italy as well as Sicily. During the fourth century, *xenia* relationships were completely subservient to the need for employment, which in fact became the main imperative after safety for political exiles in this period. The rise of mercenaries and mercenary service provided further impetus to the trend towards the "New Greece" with its emerging powers like Rhodes and Syracuse as real rivals to the traditional *polis* in "Old Greece". Persian service, especially during the period of the campaigns of Alexander in the East, accounted for many thousands of Greeks,<sup>8</sup> as did the squabbles amongst Persian satraps and rebellious nobles. Xenophon (*PA* 11307 Entry 78) found such service for the rebellious Cyrus, although not all such mercenaries were exiles. Soldiers such as Timomachos (*PA* 3097 Entry 88) and Chares (*PA* 15292 Entry 95), and skilled bureaucrats such as Kallistratos (*PA* 8157 Entry 82) found their specialised skills in demand in the emerging states like Macedon.<sup>9</sup>

Although the trend away from "Old Greece" is marked, **Table 6** demonstrates that there were throughout the late fifth and the fourth centuries exiles who on the surface appear to have chosen destinations in more traditional areas such as Aigina, Megara, Thebes and Euboea. However, the common element in these destinations is that they are all relatively close to Athens, and the exiles who chose them were in desperate and/or hasty flight from Athens.

8. Badian (1961: pp27ff); Hofstetter (1978: p*x*)

9. Hammond & Griffith (1979: p199); Sinclair (1988: p46f and p212)

Another factor may have been the edict of Sparta implied by Lysias xii.95 and 97 that no state in the Peloponnesian League could admit anyone fleeing from the Thirty, so that the trend evident for the late fifth century may be skewed by this edict, which affected countless otherwise unidentified Athenians.<sup>10</sup>

Generally the sources record where the exiles fled to initially, and it does not mean in most cases that they remained there. This most certainly was the case with Kallixenos (*PA* 8042 Entry 66) and the four who escaped prison with him and fled to Dekeleia.<sup>11</sup> They were fleeing from prison to safety from the wrath of the democracy, and the closest safe haven was the Spartan-occupied fort at Dekeleia.

In the same way, the increasing coolness in relations between Sparta and Thebes<sup>12</sup> after the fall of Athens provided fleeing democrats such as Anytos (*PA* 1324 Entry 74) and Archinos (*PA* 2526 Entry 76) with a refuge at Thebes, as much as it did for their banished compatriots like Thrasyboulos (*PA* 7310). At the same time, the decision of Atrometos (*PA* 2681 Entry 77) to flee with his new wife to Corinth may indicate a similar political receptivity to Athenians as that which prevailed in Thebes, or alternatively Atrometos may have renewed inherited *xenia* links which had lapsed through the War. Choice of a particular destination could also be affected by a desire to be well-placed for an attempt to return home, or for a variety of factors other than the existence of *xenia* relationships.

10. *Ath Pol* 35.3-4. Moderate oligarch opponents of the Thirty and the Three Thousand were not only being subjected to attacks on their persons and property at Athens (cf *Ath Pol* 35.4) but also being denied sanctuary with *xenoi* in states which were members of the Peloponnesian League, where some may otherwise have gone (cf Lys. xii.95, 97; Plut. *Lysandros* 27)

11. Archedemos (*PA* 2326 Entry 67), Lykiskos (*PA* 9213 Entry 68), Menekles (*PA* 9905 Entry 69), Timokrates (*PA* 13748 Entry 70).

12. Krentz (1982: pp17-18)

Demosthenes (*PA* 3597 Entry 99) fled from Athens twice<sup>13</sup> and both times ended up in Caleuria having effected his escape through the closest friendly route, Aigina. So a combination of proximity of the refuge and enmity or at least political neutrality vis-à-vis the regime from which one was fleeing, appear to be the main determinants of the choice of destination when urgent flight was necessary. This necessity tended to make "Old Greece" at least the first staging post for exile, but the trend towards the outer perimeters of the classical Greek world as destinations for voluntary political exiles was firm from at least 415 onwards.

Those who became *atimoi* did not always retreat into external exile, to either the new or old world. Some stayed in Athens and suffered the ignominy of life without political and social rights. To others the option was open to withdraw to remote parts of Attika, to retire literally, as did Phormion (*Appendix A*), probably in 428/27. Withdrawal from participation in political and social life was not only a consequence of becoming *atimos*, nor did it mean necessarily a physical removal from Athens, as Carter<sup>14</sup> has noted that the phenomenon of *apragmosyne*, which he calls quietism, also involved non-participation to a large degree in the politics of the day. The difference, however, is that there was no choice in the case of *atimia* in terms of participation in the full political rights of the citizen - that is, circumstance rather than conviction elicited the withdrawal, and of course those who chose to withdraw did not lose their political rights.

13. In 323 and 321.

14. Carter (1986: pp45-51)

### 3.3 Voluntary Exile and the Generals

With the twenty-three Athenians<sup>1</sup> in this study who had held the office of *strategos*, the voluntary exile of only seven of them could be directly attributed to their office or their performance in that role. These were Aristogenes (*PA* 1781 Entry 64), Protomachos (*PA* 12318 Entry 65), Leosthenes (*PA* 9141 Entry 83), Philon (*PA* 14825 Entry 84), Theotimos (*PA* 7055 Entry 85), Timomachos (*PA* 13797 Entry 88) and Chares (*PA* 15292 Entry 95). In all these instances, the decision to enter voluntary exile was taken because either they had lost a strategic advantage (or failed to take one) or were perceived by the *demos* to have failed in their command. Some fled from facing a trial for treason, others failed to return. The exile, however, was directly related to the immediate command.<sup>2</sup>

Konon's (*PA* 8707 Entry 71) decision to sail to Cyprus after Aigospotamoi cannot be considered in the same category, since he was not fleeing from Athens but rather from Lysander. His son Timotheos (*PA* 13700 Entry 89) went into voluntary exile as a result more of his political position than because he had been too cautious at Embata. In the same way, Alkibiades (*PA* 600 Entry 55) went into exile twice as a result, not of his generalship, but for reasons much more related to his political and social persona. Although the phrourarchos Gylon (*PA* 3098 Entry 57) actively suborned his command, there is strong reason to suspect that he was acting as a consequence of the outcome at Aigospotamoi and that, like Konon, he had little alternative, especially if Nymphaion was to be preserved.

1. See Table 8

2. The exception is Demosthenes son of Alkisthenes (*PA* 3585 Appendix A) who, contrary to Thucydides III.98 5, did not "stay away" fearing the people's wrath at the outcome of his command.

The other voluntary exiles who had been generals went into exile as a result of political rather than military pressures. Some were caught up in the scandals of the mutilation of the Hermai and the profanation of the Mysteries and the association with Alkibiades (III), notably Adeimantos (*PA* 202 Entry 7).<sup>3</sup> Others, such as Charikles (*PA* 15407 Entry 58), fled into exile at the fall of the oligarchic regime, the Four Hundred,<sup>4</sup> of which they were part; or fled from the oligarchic regime of the Thirty, as Anytos (*PA* 1324 Entry 74) did.

Pritchett<sup>5</sup> believes that the overwhelming majority of trials of generals were concerned with military failure. He says that military incompetence or a major defeat would mostly result in a general being brought to trial. However, the evidence of voluntary exiles in **Table 8** more strongly suggests that the trials of generals were predominantly politically motivated, rather than concerned with military failure, even if that was used as a pretext. Indeed, purely military defeats were not punished uniformly, as the case of Simonides (*PA* 12713) (general in 426) in Thrace in the same period demonstrated. Notwithstanding some initial success, he was forced out of Eion with considerable loss. However, Simonides does not appear to have been punished for the failure of this action in the all-important north.<sup>6</sup> In 406, Diomedon lost ten of the twelve ships in his command. Yet far from being punished, Diomedon retained his command and fought at Arginousai.<sup>7</sup>

3. Adeimantos was one of the ten generals at Aigospotamoi, and his exile was earlier, in 414.
4. For example, Onomakles (*PA* 11476 Entry 59), Aristoteles (*PA* 2057 Entry 60), Aischines (*PA* 341 Entry 61), Peisandros (*PA* 11770 Entry 62) and Alexikles (*PA* 535 Entry 63). There were doubtless others who fled, whose names have not survived.
5. Pritchett (1974: Vol.2, p24); Pritchett may have some indirect support from Sinclair (1988: p157) who notes that more *eisangelia* actions were brought against *strategoï* than anyone else.
6. Thuc. IV.7
7. Xen. *Hell* I.6.23; 34f

On the other hand, Athens had brought to trial, banished or executed a large number of generals over the period of this study, and any aspiring *strategos* would have before him the examples from Miltiades (*PA* 10212 and general in 490)<sup>8</sup> onwards of those predecessors in the job who had suffered punishment as the victims of political machinations. In fact, there was very little in the way of certainty of application of the law, as the Arginousai generals found to their cost.<sup>9</sup> This uncertainty meant that the politically volatile and fickle Athenian *ekklesia* and the courts decided one's fate arbitrarily.<sup>10</sup> The decision by generals to flee or to stay away is more understandable in the light of the political nature of trials.

The chapter **Survival in Voluntary Exile** examines the option open to those with a superior military background to become mercenaries, especially in the fourth century. Even before the end of the Peloponnesian War, metics and mercenaries were being utilised by Athens, and increasingly in the ships of her fleet as numbers of citizen rowers diminished. However, it is reasonable to assert that until later in the War, most of the crews of Athenian triremes were Athenians.<sup>11</sup> An unusual feature of the fifth century voluntary exiles Alkibiades III and Konon was that the crews of their vessels chose to accompany them into voluntary exile. The crew of

8. Note his fate after the Parian expedition: *Hdt.* 6.1.35

9. Andrewes (1974: pp112-122); Roberts (1982: pp126ff).

10. Chares' (*PA* 15292 Entry 95) colleague Leosthenes was summarily executed when he returned to Athens after the loss to Philip at Chaironeia in 338. Chares' decision not to return to Athens proved to be wise, since the anger and fear of Philip's next moves led to a backlash against the perceived culprit, without regard to the superiority of Philip's army and his generalship.

11. In the mid and late fifth century, Athens never had enough citizens to man the fleet of 200-200 ships, so the crews were either citizens or metics or a combination of both. Jordan (1975: pp198-199): because of casualties in the Peloponnesian War, the use of mercenaries increased, especially in the fourth century. Jordan notes that the distinction between mercenaries and citizens/metics who served their city for small compensation, and those serving for pay as mercenaries, became blurred. So, mercenaries were not just foreigners but also Athenians. For both Alkibiades and Konon the crews with which they left the scene were probably constituted predominantly of Athenians, both citizens and metics.

Alkibiades' vessel which aided and abetted his escape in 414 must have numbered close to two hundred men,<sup>12</sup> mostly Athenians (albeit with some outsiders). Although the number of men who followed Konon in his decision to make for Cyprus after Aigospotamoi may have been made up of more outsiders than Athenians by 404,<sup>13</sup> significantly those crews did not demand a run for Athens, and cast their fate in with Konon. There is no extant information concerning punishment of rank and file combatants by Athenians, in the same manner as officers, who were subject to, among other things, *euthynai*. Roberts<sup>14</sup> believes in fact that there was no punishment or accountability for the troops. Although this may be an accident of survival, it is unlikely that the scope of any undertaking to incorporate the rank and file into the fate of the general would be possible in Athens in the same manner. In fact, fear of punishment would relate only to real military failures directly, and since most trials were political in nature, these troops would have remained largely untouched.<sup>15</sup> Therefore, their decisions to follow their generals rather than the home government in the case of Alkibiades, or to return home in the case of Konon, demonstrates that as early as 414 loyalty to the commander was in some cases at least as strong as loyalty to Athens. However, despite Kagan's arguments concerning the power of returned troops in the *ekklesia*, it was not possible for a commander to be guaranteed that they would provide the numbers required to affect any trial that might be held. The

12. Morrison and Coates (1987: pp107-115) demonstrate that a trireme carried a complement of 200 including oarsmen, combat troops and other specialists such as a helmsman and a shipwright. Morrison and Williams (1968: p123, pp254-271); Nelson (1973: p23); Humble (1980: pp 143-144).

13. Hornblower (1991: p162f)

14. Roberts (1982: p177)

15. See Kagan (1981: p165) for the role played by veterans in the *ekklesia*.



decision to stay away would have been based on such considerations; the decision to flee before trial would have been based on an assessment of the possibilities of obtaining the numbers, and having decided that, with or without loyal comrades-in-arms, those numbers were insufficient to overcome a concerted political attack.<sup>16</sup>

Hornblower has noted that whilst the later fourth century generals tended to specialise within the command structure, they also had much more autonomy. He notes that Chabrias (*PA* 15086) and his forces appeared to be free to engage in external assignments as early as 380/79.<sup>17</sup> In the mid-350s Chares (*PA* 15292 Entry 95) hired himself and his forces out to the Persian satrap Artabazos, because he and the fleet were short of money to continue their official operations.<sup>18</sup> Therefore, the move into fulltime mercenary service if things went awry in Athenian matters was not a major step for fourth century exiles, who appeared to move into and out of mercenary service as circumstances demanded, as the case of Chares indicates. The trend in the fourth century towards a more pragmatic approach to doing what was necessary to survive – the self-help approach examined in the next chapter – is evident in those Athenian voluntary political exiles who were generals, as much as it is in their non-exiled contemporaries.

16. Sinclair (1988: p173) notes that many generals opted to go into exile and that this did not prove either the vindictiveness of the *demos*, or the guilt of the individual.

17. Hornblower (1991: p125); *Isok.* iv.140

18. *Diod.* XVI.22

### 3.4 Survival in Exile

Thus exile, wandering and temporary settlement were likely to be followed sooner or later by absorption into a new community as metics. Finally, and significantly, even rich people became poor when they lost their citizenship ... poverty (caused by exile) led to loss of social position: advantages of birth ceased to be worth much and the value of guest friendship depended on the conscience of one's foreign friends.

*P McKechnie (1989: p19)*

For sixty-five of the entries in this study there is no extant evidence of the methods which they employed to survive in exile.<sup>1</sup> This number is somewhat disproportionate in terms of the total number of entries since forty-six of these were Hermokopidai. It is possible to speculate that, given the wholesale confiscation and disposal of their assets,<sup>2</sup> the Hermokopidai survived by some means which did not rely on support from home-based close relatives. Of the other nineteen nothing is known.

With those forty-three exiles for whom evidence has survived, it would be foolhardy to project their experiences onto the other sixty-five entries as assumptions gleaned from such a small base over two and a half centuries. Nevertheless, some indicators emerge, most notably that the use of *xenia* relationships was constant throughout this period. In the earliest entries, such as Kylon (*PA* 8943 Entry 1) and possibly also Chairion (*PA* 15282 Entry 3), Leogoras (*PA* 9074 Entry 4) and Hipparchos (*PA* 7600 Entry 5), the traditional relationship where the *xenos* provided a safe haven, shelter and sustenance as well as protection and often even dowries for one's offspring,<sup>3</sup> was the readily accessible means of survival in exile. In Kylon's case,

1. See **Table 5** - Chronological table of survival methods of voluntary exiles. See also Appendix B, Isokrates xix; and Appendix C - Plutarch *Mor* 601f - On Exile.
2. For example, Alkibiades (*PA* 600 Entry 55): *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 428. 3-4
3. Herman (1987: p22, p26ff). However, as Polyneices notes in Euripides' *The Phoenician Women* 400-410, his father's friends and guest friends failed to help him, even though he was highborn, and so sometimes he went hungry despite having people around him with ties to him and his family.

ties of marriage accentuated the relationship with Theagenes of Megara.<sup>4</sup>

Although the sample of voluntary exiles who relied on *xenia* relationships up to and including the first exile of Alkibiades (*PA* 600 Entry 55) in 414 is small, parallels with other Athenians having been banished and living outside Attika, tend to suggest that this was a reliable means of survival for the nobility.<sup>5</sup> Notable examples include Peisistratos (*PA* 11793), Hippias (*PA* 7605), Themistokles (*PA* 6669) and Kallias (*PA* 7823).<sup>6</sup> Members of this socio-economic group within Athenian society retained at least until the third quarter of the fifth century *xenia* relationships which could be relied upon for survival. In the case of Themistokles, his Persian *xenos* provided an extensive estate for his maintenance.<sup>7</sup>

However, *xenia* relationships changed for Athenians with the Periklean law of 451/0, whereby loss of citizenship resulted from intermarriage with non-Athenians, and one's offspring were not considered to be Athenian citizens unless both parents were Athenian.<sup>8</sup> Therefore, one of the aspects which could pertain to strengthen the bonds of traditional *xenia* relationships was not available to the generation of Athenians who took part in the Peloponnesian War. Indeed, by the middle of the Peloponnesian War, reliance on traditional ties of ritualised friendship was

4. Herman (1987: p16f): features of *xenia* shared with kinship.

5. *Xenia* relationships were in fact a real asset and a recognition of power and status: Herman (1987: p34ff).

6. Thuc. I.135.3; Plut. *Them* 22-23; Diod. XI.55.1-3; Hdt. I.60.1, 61.2, V.62-65.5; [Andok] 4.32

7. Plut. *Them* 31.1-3. No parallel exists with Xenophon (*PA* 11307 Entry 78), who received his estate at Skillos in return for services to the Spartan state, rather than as part of a traditional *xenia* relationship.

8. *Ath Pol* 26.3; Plut. *Per* 37

a severely declining option for would-be voluntary exiles. The reason appears to have been the rise of what is best described as a form of nationalism which transcended the older, international ties as the War polarised Greeks and those on the periphery of the Greek world, like the Persians and Syracusans. In short, if you weren't with the Athenians, you were against them and with their enemies, the Spartans and their allies. There was little room and less opportunity for maintaining relationships across political and military boundaries, and this trend took firm hold after the failure of the peace of Nikias, which had all but collapsed by 415.

The period which saw the two exiles of Alkibiades (*PA* 600 Entry 55) provides the watershed. Like most aristocratic families in Athens, that of Alkibiades had a network of relationships with families and individuals throughout old Greece.<sup>9</sup> Faced with the need to remove himself into exile in 414, Alkibiades had relied on the relationship which had passed from generation to generation between the family of Endios of Sparta and his own,<sup>10</sup> though that was perhaps not the only choice open to him.

However, by 407 self-help had become the watchword of those who determined upon exile or had it thrust upon them. For Alkibiades this took the form of a fortress in Thrace,<sup>11</sup> where he and his retainers were safe from the weakened Athens and from Spartan marauders. Alkibiades may have already owned this property before 407, but it is probable that he established it

9. Herman (1987: p36) remarks on the large number of *xenoi* of Alkibiades.

10. Thuc. VIII.6.2; *HCT* p19; Herman (1987: pp147-151)

11. Xen. *Hell* I.5.16-18; Diod. XIII.74

there himself since it would have formed part of the assets which the Athenians were able to access for sale in 414.<sup>12</sup> The deterioration in Athenian fortunes was fortuitous as regards the location - Thrace - however the determination to have a bolt-hole, and indeed the need for such a haven, was recognised by Alkibiades himself. Having a safe haven was only part of the problem of survival, and Alkibiades may have used his retinue to mount attacks on his neighbours; in short, a form of piracy probably provided his main revenue stream in this Thracian period.<sup>13</sup>

During this seven-year period between the two exiles of Alkibiades a number of voluntary exiles fled Athens as a direct result of the failure of the oligarchic regime, the Four Hundred. The likelihood is that some made for Sparta and/or its allied *poleis*. Among these are probably Charikles (*PA* 15407 Entry 58), Aristoteles (*PA* 2057 Entry 60) and Aischines (*PA* 341 Entry 61). However, describing their possible survival strategy as reliant on a *xenia* relationship is somewhat to overstate the case as there is no evidence that they in fact maintained or inherited any form of traditional *xenia* connections. It appears more likely from the destination of these men that Sparta was a political rather than a true *xenia*-related choice. As in a *xenia* relationship, they could at least expect to find sympathetic treatment in the aftermath of the

12. At the very least, Alkibiades would have had no enjoyment of it, since Athens' reach still extended Thraceward in 414.

13. Nepos *Alc* VII.4-5

attempts by the Four Hundred to make peace with Sparta,<sup>14</sup> including a safe haven and a chance to reassess their options. However, at least Aischines and Aristoteles were actively engaged in military affairs on the Spartan side during their exile,<sup>15</sup> and this indicates that the refuge offered by Sparta and its allies may have had strings attached, namely that these Athenian oligarchs had to work for their refuge. It is probable, though not provable, that by the period under review, even Sparta was not prepared to use precious resources to support failed oligarchs, however sympathetic they may have been to these Athenians' cause. It is perhaps more reasonable to suggest that these three Athenians, together with unnamed colleagues, chose the path of self-help rather than *xenia* assistance for survival in exile, and saw service with Athens' enemies as a viable alternative source of sustenance.

The move to self-help which became apparent in this period did not preclude *xenia* connections, but these *xenia* relationships themselves tended to have been of relatively recent establishment for self-help purposes, such as that of Konon (*PA* 8707 Entry 71) with Evagoras of Cyprus. Or, even if of an hereditary nature, as those of Andokides (*PA* 828 Entry 56) may be assumed to have been, they were exploited only in the sense of providing access to alternative means of survival, rather than to rely directly on them for support. Although the listing in **Table 5** shows Andokides as having relied upon his *xenoi* for

14. Thuc. VIII.70.2; 71.3

15. Xen. *Hell* II.2.18, 3.13

assistance, he apparently merely utilised the relationships as a form of entrée into the raw materials markets from which his trading activities - the source of his sustenance as well as his political hopes in exile - were derived.<sup>16</sup>

Friendship, alliance, expediency - whatever name may be chosen, this new type of *xenoi*-assisted survival in exile has a feature during the late fifth and the fourth centuries which was not notable earlier in the history of such relationships. Allied to the rise of the self-help imperatives of the period, there is a strong sense of *quid pro quo*, that is, assistance is offered or sustenance given to repay services rendered or which will be rendered. There appears no longer to be a sense of obligation to assist *xenoi* regardless, that is, the assistance now has a price. It is nowhere stated explicitly, but the survival mechanisms of the voluntary exiles from 410 exhibit this aspect clearly. Gylon (PA 3098 Entry 57) received an estate from Satyros for his upkeep after surrendering Nymphaion to that tyrant. On the same lines years later, Xenophon (PA 11307 Entry 78) received an estate in Skillos for the upkeep of himself and his family, payment for services rendered to the Spartan government. Konon (PA 8707 Entry 71) had established a relationship with Evagoras of Cyprus to ensure that he had an escape route, which he used after Aigospotamoi. However, in return for the safety offered by Evagoras, Konon, Nikophemos (PA 11066 Entry 72) and the Athenian ships and crews with them entered immediately into the service of Evagoras. To be fair to Evagoras, it was unreasonable to expect him to provide sustenance for the full complement of at least eight Athenian triremes, and not a sound policy to have a desperate, "backs-to-the-wall" fleet (albeit small in

16. Andok. II.11-12

number) of experienced Athenian warships in the neighbourhood. Better to employ them gainfully rather than have them resort to piracy, or offer themselves elsewhere, possibly to an enemy, in order to survive.

In the extremely fluid political atmosphere after the fall of Athens and the installation of the Thirty Tyrants at Athens, some variations of the expected alliances related to nationality did occur. Those democrats such as Nikomachos (*PA* 10933 Entry 73), Anytos (*PA* 1324 Entry 74), Chairephon (*PA* 15203 Entry 75) and Archinos (*PA* 2526 Entry 76), who had fled from the Thirty in 404/3, had gathered in, of all places, Thebes or its environs. It is reasonable to assume that either they, or those who had been banished such as Thrasyboulos (*PA* 7310), had connections in Thebes sufficiently well placed to gain entry for these Athenians, whom the Thebans had so recently been determined to exterminate.<sup>17</sup> Again there is a suggestion of something Thebes needed, and it was in fact some form of counter-balance to the overwhelming power of Sparta in the locality between the Isthmos and Thebes.<sup>18</sup> Athens in anti-Spartan hands held strong appeal, and so in return for providing a means of survival in exile, the Thebans encouraged the return of the democrats and were prepared to facilitate that eventuality. The factionalism of Theban politics during this period aided the Athenian exiles at least as much as the Theban fear of Spartan pretensions.<sup>19</sup>

17. Xen. *Hell* II.2.19-20

18. Hornblower (1991: pp181-187) discusses in detail the disaffection of her allies from Sparta.

19. *Hell Oxy* xvi.1-2; xvii.1-2; Hamilton (1979: pp145-146, and especially pp147-151 regarding disenchantment with Sparta generally).



Atrometos (*PA* 2681 Entry 77), who fled from the Thirty and took his new wife to Corinth, may also fall into the category of one who could "be useful" to the Corinthians, as they had also latterly desired the destruction of Athens and its inhabitants.<sup>20</sup> It is also probable that, as with the relationship between Xenophon (*PA* 11307 Entry 78) and Proxenos of Boeotia, Atrometos had a friend or *xenos* in Corinth, and their relationship had survived the hostilities to allow the Korinthian to provide a safe haven for Atrometos. However, such a relationship would doubtless require the sanction of the Corinthian government in the light of their previous pronouncements against Athens. As Atrometos was of some importance in Athens prior to the advent of the Thirty,<sup>21</sup> it is reasonable to conclude that the Corinthians, like their Theban counterparts, were prepared to seek some counterweight to Sparta, and encouraging Athenians who would have influence in future Athenian governments, such as Atrometos would have been presumed to have, provided the Corinthians with an investment in the preservation of their own interests at Athens.

During the fourth century almost every prominent politician endured accusations that he was on the payroll of Athens' enemies.<sup>22</sup> At this distance and because of the nature of the sources making the accusations, it is difficult to ascertain the veracity of such charges.

20. *Xen. Hell* II.2.19-20

21. See Entry 77 n4 with Hornblower (1991: p15ff)

22. Harvey (1985: p78)

However, it is possible to determine that the stance which one took relative to Macedon and the rise of Philip often provided politicians of the second half of the century with a possible haven in Macedon, should one be required. Philokrates (*PA* 14599 Entry 94) almost certainly, and Kallimedon (*PA* 8032 Entry 98) definitely found refuge and employment in Macedon, the latter having displayed a consistently conciliatory tone towards Philip. The flight of Pytheas (*PA* 13242 Entry 100) to Macedon was precipitated by the death of Alexander and the return to power at Athens of Demosthenes and other anti-Macedonian politicians. Although the precise nature of his connection with Macedon is not attested, it was obviously strong and his welcome there was assured. When Antipater took control of Athens in the following year, Pytheas was reinstated in Athens by him. These cases attest that the concept of payment for services to the benefactor was a strong factor in the pseudo-*xenia* relationships which constituted a source of survival in exile for fourth century politicians as well as for those political and military figures from the last period of the fifth century. The sense of *quid pro quo* is strong.<sup>23</sup>

The exile of Kallippos (*PA* 8065 Entry 86) epitomises the altered nature of the dependency upon *xenoi* and the self-help motif which had become apparent some sixty years earlier in response to the Peloponnesian War. Kallippos had fled from Athens to exile under the protection of his friend and probable *xenos*, Dion, tyrant of Syracuse. Despite the friendship, or perhaps because of it, Kallippos served Dion as a commander and in reality as second-in-command to the tyrant.

23. Harvey (1985: pp106-107): Persian and Macedonian kings commonly conferred gifts on ambassadors and to cement guest-friendships. According to Harvey, such gifts implied some form of reciprocity, such as supporting Philip's policies with their home governments, which was in fact not so far removed from outright bribery.

The means of survival, and indeed in the case of Kallippos, of aggrandisement were provided by his *xenos*, and his mercenary service was the repayment. The traditional bounds of *xenia* relationships doubtless precluded the slaying of one *xenos* by another. So, as Kallippos slew his benefactor, either he was patently immoral and suffered no qualms concerning his usurpation of Dion's power, or traditional *xenia* relationships had all but disintegrated under the harsher economic, social and political conditions of the fourth century.

From the second phase of the Peloponnesian War, altered social, political and economic<sup>24</sup> conditions especially contributed to the provision of alternative means of survival for voluntary exiles, most especially those with some form of military expertise, and their opportunities multiplied if they had a group of fellow exiles on hand to form the nucleus of a standing army. The rise of mercenaries in the fourth century has been well documented.<sup>25</sup> Eleven definitely, and possibly another eight of the Athenian voluntary exiles in this study,<sup>26</sup> used mercenary service to survive in the short term, and for some such as Xenophon (*PA* 11307 Entry 78), Konon (*PA* 8707 Entry 71), Nikophemos (*PA* 11066 Entry 72), as well as Kallippos, new lives were built around service in the armies and fleets of erstwhile enemies.<sup>27</sup> Indeed,

24. Finley (1985: p174) details some of the struggles of Athens to maintain finances and (pp169-170) food supplies during the fourth century, noting the loss of empire as a contributing factor. Hornblower (1991: pp172-175) notes the general decline in living standards and personal wealth levels.

25. For example, Parke *Greek Mercenary Soldiers from Earliest Times to the Battle of Ipsus* (1933), with the discussion in Hornblower (1991: p162ff). Sinclair (1988: p169): military commanders survived best if they were successful and it helped to be able, experienced with a reputation. However, as McKechnie (1989: p2) points out, Greek soldiers were in demand because of the equipment and training. He describes mercenary service as the "most accessible" means of survival in exile (p79). The step from mercenary to pirate was not a large one (pp101-104).

26. See Table 5.

27. Xenophon served with Sparta and in her interests, and was at least present of the Battle of Koroneia in 394, not long in real terms after the end of the Peloponnesian War; Konon and Nikophemos fought with the Persians; and earlier, Alkibiades of Phegous (*PA* 601 Entry 54) had fought as a mercenary with Syracuse against Athens.

Chares (*PA* 15292 Entry 95), who was regarded by ancient sources as at best an indifferent military performer,<sup>28</sup> managed not only to overcome the antipathy of Alexander, but to thrive as tyrant of Sigeum, apparently with Alexander's blessing.<sup>29</sup> His success in exile was based firmly on his mercenary military strength, which was grounded in a group of those Athenians and their allies who had fled following the defeat at Chaeroneia, and became initially, for all intents and purposes, a band of brigands.

Although the use of mercenaries is more noticeable in the fourth century, as a means of keeping body and soul together it served some fifth century Athenian voluntary exiles as well, notably Alkibiades of Phegous (*PA* 601 Entry 54)<sup>30</sup> These too belonged to the beginning of the period when the self-help motif for exiles, both voluntary and banished, became evident. Less than a decade later, Aristogenes and Protomachos doubtless followed suit, setting another precedent<sup>31</sup> perhaps for both Konon and Nikophemos. This pattern was well established, therefore, amongst those of military inclination by the time their fourth century counterparts sought a reliable method of upkeep in exile.

28. Diod. XVI.85.7; Aisch. ii.71-73; Plut. *Mor* 187c-188

29. Arrian *Anab* 3.2.6f, 3.2.11f, after Alexander had initially required that Chares be surrendered to him. Hornblower (1991: p30): "In practice determined (or desperate) individuals could carve out a niche for themselves much as Chares did at Sigeum, using and often at the head of, forces formed from those similarly displaced persons who appear regularly in fourth century annals."

30. He fought as a mercenary with the Syracusans against Athens.

31. In any case, the experience of their less fortunate colleagues had established another type of precedent, which later strategoi took into account when assessing their options to return home, to flee or to stay away.

However, for those without a military background, or at least without one of sufficient stature to ensure employment somewhere, the options<sup>32</sup> appear to be commodity trading, or gaining employment as a recognised specialist of some sort. Into the latter category fall Pheidias (*PA* 14149 Entry 6) in the fifth century and Kallistratos (*PA* 8157 Entry 82). The international reputation of Pheidias would have ensured that if necessary he was able to obtain commissions for his sculptures from other Greek cities in addition to the Eleans. The increasing specialisation required in the government of Athens had made political prominence dependent to a large extent upon the ability of the politician to master some aspect of the machinery of government.<sup>33</sup> Kallistratos specialised in financial matters, and in exile gained what in modern terms would be contract consultancy work in Thasos and other parts of northern Greece, undertaking special projects of a financial nature.<sup>34</sup> Due to the relative poverty of his family, Aischines (*PA* 354 Entry 97) had established himself as a teacher prior to his more prominent role as a politician. In exile at Rhodes, and possibly before his death in Samos, Aischines used his skills to earn a living for himself and his family as a teacher of, among other things, rhetoric. Although Androtion (*PA* 913 Entry 94) appeared to have the assistance of a *xenos*, who aided him to establish himself at Megara with leisure to write his *Atthis*, it is equally possible that he too could have earned a living as a teacher. (This would almost certainly be the means of survival for the philosopher Protagoras, for example, although his desirability as an influence amongst those interested in philosophy in other Greek *poleis* may have been undermined

32. Regardless of the existence or otherwise of *xenoi*.

33. Hornblower (1991: p156) refers to the trend as an "age of professionalism in general", that is, across the spectrum of social, military, political and economic life.

34. For example, he is credited with reorganising harbour dues, and establishment of a colony in conjunction with the Thasians.

somewhat by his alleged atheism and flirtations with impiety.<sup>35)</sup>

Although Solon (*PA* 12806 Entry 2) was an invited guest in both Cyprus and Lydia, he had originally intended his self-imposed exile to last ten years.<sup>36</sup> The tradition was that he proposed to finance this exile by means of trade,<sup>37</sup> and presumably that meant that he had a merchant ship laden with commodities to exchange at markets around the Aegean, though the nature of the goods involved cannot be determined.<sup>38</sup> Much later, in the fourth century, Leokrates (*PA* 9083 Entry 96) took the same path of commodity trading to finance his exile, although it is not known whether the slaves he took with him were merely for his personal household use or were part of the consignment of commodities to be traded. His original destination of Rhodes, by this time a recognised international slave-market, suggests that he had intended to finance at least the initial part of his exile using the slaves as collateral for exchange. His move to Megara, which in the classical period<sup>39</sup> was the ancient equivalent of the modern entrepôt, suggests that Leokrates had been successful in his trading ventures, although the exact nature of the commodities remains unknown.

Although the commodity trading of Andokides (*PA* 828 Entry 56) was selective, with the goods chosen specifically with an eye to aiding the Athenian war effort in an attempt to curry

35. Diog. Laert. ix.52

36. Hdt. I.29; Stanton (1990: p49n2)

37. *Ath Pol* 11.1-2

38. The reference in *Ath Pol* 11. 1-2 is too vague to establish any trading parameters.

39. de Ste. Croix (1972: p264) makes the point that there is little evidence for Megarians as traders, rather that the position of the Megarid between and close to large markets at Athens and Corinth, meant that others used Megara and its port of Nisaea, as a trading post.

sufficient favour with the *demos* to effect a recall and reinstatement of his political rights, the type of goods – timber for making oar-spars, corn and bronze – demonstrates what was possible in commodity trading, and what types of goods Leokrates may have been able to trade.

Regardless of the means employed by Athenian voluntary exiles, and indeed non-voluntary ones too, survival meant operating in another political unit, that is, these former Athenian citizens, some of them used to wielding considerable political power at home, were metics once outside Attika. Although it may not be legitimate to transpose the experiences of Athenian metics to metics in other Greek states, many parallels would have occurred. Most notably of course, whether one was the valued *xenos* of a particular non-Athenian, or a mercenary or trader on the make, citizenship and participation in political activities were almost certainly precluded.<sup>40</sup> The case of Alkibiades (III) taking part in a debate at Sparta<sup>41</sup> is an exception, and even then his participation may have been limited to specific occasions where his knowledge of Athens was utilised, by invitation.

Leokrates settled in Megara under the auspices of an unnamed *prostates*,<sup>42</sup> that is, in this context, a type of sponsor or protector, though what types of undertakings the *prostates* had

40. de Ste. Croix (1981: pp95-96)

41. Thuc. VI. 89-92

42. Lyk. i.145

to give is not recorded. However, by and large, metics in most Greek cities paid taxes (in Athens, at a higher rate than citizens), may not universally have been permitted to own real property,<sup>43</sup> contributed to the overall economic well-being of the *polis*, and appeared to be left alone to pursue their activities in relative peace. Although evidence is scant for other states, internment in time of hostilities does not appear to have occurred unless there was specific evidence against an individual. Throughout the period of this study, the conditions applying to metics, in conjunction with the trend towards self-help from the late fifth century onwards, therefore facilitated rather than hindered the attempts of voluntary political exiles to make a living in exile.<sup>44</sup>

Self-help could take the form of prior arrangements to lodge assets in other *poleis*: Isokrates xix.18 - part of the *Aiginetikos* - provides some insights into this practice, although the context is not Athenian.<sup>45</sup>

43. Finley (1985: p48, p60, pp162-164); McKechnie (1989: p178-191) - a comprehensive survey of trading by outsiders in Greek cities. At pp16-29 McKechnie surveys exiles and the need for exiles to generate income, coincidental with the rising numbers of metics over the period of this study.

44. Whitehead (1977: p75-76): in Athens a *xenos* became a *metoikos* by registration in a deme; he paid poll tax and other financial obligations. Perhaps like Leokrates in Megara, a sponsor of some sort was necessary to promote registration in the deme.

45. See Appendix B p416



### 3.5 Family and Religion

Many Athenian voluntary political exiles in this study did not have the opportunity to provide for their families to accompany them into exile, though Xenophon (*PA* 11307 Entry 78) was able to send for his wife and young sons to join him.<sup>1</sup> He appears to be the exception, since there is no parallel case amongst either the voluntary exiles or those exiled or banished generally. Some had assumed a voluntary exile by not returning to Athens at all, such as Aristogenes (*PA* 1781 Entry 64) and Protomachos (*PA* 12318 Entry 65) after Arginousai, and Konon (*PA* 8707 Entry 71) and Nikophemos (*PA* 11066 Entry 72) after Aigospotamoi. Of the first two, nothing further is known, although the general revulsion of feeling over the condemnation of their colleagues<sup>2</sup> may have provided an opportunity for their return, although unlikely; or some form of dispensation may have been available for their families to be with them.

Konon's son Timotheos (*PA* 13700 Entry 89) may have been a member of the Athenian forces at Aigospotamoi, since he was an adult; he may even have served on his father's ship. He was definitely with Konon later in the latter's exile,<sup>3</sup> and as Davies<sup>4</sup> has pointed out, he was apparently on good terms with his father, acting as Konon's agent in Athens from time to time. His mother was probably dead by this time, and there is no knowledge of any other Athenian family members, though Konon's new life in Cyprus produced more offspring.<sup>5</sup> Although there

1. Presumably before Xenophon was officially exiled, probably in 392: Rahn (1981: p108)

2. Andrewes (1974: p121)

3. Paus. VI.3.16 - Samos and Ephesos honoured both father and son.

4. *APF* p508

5. Lys. xiv.36

is no certain evidence, it is more probable that Timotheos was at Aigospotamoi, simply because Lysander's blockade of Athens,<sup>6</sup> and the general confusion of the defeated city meant that getting away would have been difficult, even if Timotheos had known where Konon went and what his intentions were. This is borne out by the case of Konon's friend Nikophemos, whose son Aristophanes (*PA* 2082) remained at Athens,<sup>7</sup> perhaps because of his age, although he was probably an adult too<sup>8</sup> at this time; it is more likely that he was unable to leave the city because of the activities of the Spartans.

In contrast with those who stayed away, those who fled Athens into voluntary exile appear to fall into two broad categories. First, those who literally fled in fear of their lives or as part of an escape from prison. For this group there was little opportunity for them to take family and assets with them, due to the haste and secrecy with which the exile needed to be accomplished. Into this category fell those who fled from prison with Kallixenos (*PA* 8042 Entry 66),<sup>9</sup> and those such as Hypereides (*PA* 13912 Entry 102), Himeraios (*PA* 7578 Entry 101) and Aristonikos (*PA* 2028 Entry 103), who were forced to flee before the vengeance of Antipater.<sup>10</sup> In these cases, the opportunity to make arrangements to take any form of retinue was virtually non-existent. An exception is Demosthenes (*PA* 3597 Entry 99), who was actually assisted into exile by his enemies, who facilitated matters for him after his prison escape,<sup>11</sup> and it is

6. Xen. *Hell* II.2.9-10: the land route was blocked by the Spartans under their king Pausanias.

7. Lys. xix.28f

8. Lys. xix.9: Aristophanes was executed in 390 and he had left three children, so he was an adult in or close to 405.

9. Archedemos (*PA* 2326 Entry 67), Lykiskos (*PA* 9213 Entry 68), Menekles (*PA* 9905 Entry 69) and Timokrates (*PA* 13748 Entry 70)

10. Plut. *Dem* 27.2-4; *Mor* 846e-f.

11. Plut. *Dem*. 26.3-4

possible that his family could have been included in the arrangements. His attitude to his exile is such that his homesickness may have included longing for his family too, although this is not stated specifically.<sup>12</sup>

The second category is more complex, since it is uncertain how premeditated was the decision to go into exile rather than remain in the political situation which faced them. Totally premeditated actions such as those of Aischines (*PA* 354 Entry 97) allowed time for the exile to arrange to "sell up" and take his family with him.<sup>13</sup> Solon (*PA* 12086 Entry 2) also had the time to plan his ten years' exile and thus the opportunity to take his family with him.<sup>14</sup> Although the hostile Lykourgos paints a picture of the departure of Leokrates (*PA* 9083 Entry 96) as clandestine, this exile was sufficiently organised that he was able to plan his flight to include portable assets such as slaves and a ship, as well as a mistress.<sup>15</sup> Aristarchos (*PA* 1656 Entry 91), though facing a murder charge, had time to arrange a fund of three talents and appoint an administrator,<sup>16</sup> so presumably he also had time to arrange for any family who wished to accompany him to do so. It was certainly possible to arrange for the placement of assets with *xenoi* in other *poleis*.<sup>17</sup>

Of those in this category who fled from the regime of the Thirty, Atrometos (*PA* 2681 Entry 77) definitely took his new wife with him,<sup>18</sup> and it appears that the family of Archinos (*PA*

12. Plut. *Dem* 26.3-4

13. Plut. *Dem* 24.3 does not mention family specifically, but since the move was planned there is a strong likelihood that his family went too, especially as the move was to be permanent.

14. Solon apparently had a son - Plut. *Solon* 6; Hdt. I.29 and *Ath Pol* 11.1

15. Lyk. i.17, 55

16. Aisch.ii.166

17. Isok. xix.18

18. Aisch. ii.148

2526 Entry 76) also went into exile, since they survived the regime. From the viewpoint of those who went into exile in 404, and who had no benefit of hindsight, the events from the loss of the war at Aigospotamoi to the desperation of the siege of Lysander, and the installation of the Thirty, their decisions to remove themselves from an intolerable regime and become exiles, would have been regarded as permanent or at least without much hope of return. The terror instigated by the regime, including murder and property seizures<sup>19</sup> and the totalitarian nature of the political system,<sup>20</sup> meant that those with anyone and anything left to them, would not leave them behind for what would have been regarded as forever. If Atrometos and Archinos are a guide, then those others who fled the regime also took their families and any available portable assets with them.

In contrast, those involved in the mutilation and profanation accusations in 415 at first glance apparently had some time to plan their withdrawals from Athens, since the investigations took several months and the denunciations were not immediately forthcoming in all cases. Yet the list of property confiscated,<sup>21</sup> in some cases extensive, as a result of the condemnations of these Hermokopidai<sup>22</sup> suggests that departure of those still in Athens was hasty and that there was in fact little opportunity to arrange affairs. Although Andokides (*PA* 828 Entry 56) was an exception in this group, since he obtained immunity from condemnation by assisting the

19. *Ath Pol* 37.2 with Krentz (1982: pp78-79 and n30)

20. Krentz (1982: pp57-68) describes the systematic dismantling of the constitution, the bodyguards, the summary "justice", which are the hallmarks of totalitarianism: Popper (1966: Vol. I p86f) - features of totalitarianism include the strict division of the classes; the identification of the fate of the state with that of the ruling class; monopoly of military virtues and training, carrying arms and receiving education; censorship of intellectual activities, and so on; all features of the rule of the Thirty which justify the term totalitarian for that regime.

21. Pritchett (1953: pp225-299); (1961: pp23-29)

22. This blanket term is a convenient reference to those who were denounced for mutilation of the Hermai or profanation of the Mysteries or both. Cf Ostwald (1986) who uses the collective *aseibountes*.

authorities with their inquiry, the others appear to have been genuinely unprepared for their denunciation or the vehemence and zeal of the prosecutions. A hasty departure more akin to those mentioned previously, who were in fact fleeing from the city, is the likely scenario, and it thus probably precluded arrangements for family.

Most of exiles in this study were politically or socially prominent or both. Marriages, like that of Timotheos' daughter with Iphikrates' son,<sup>23</sup> were generally alliances which were made to cement political affiliations or to avert hostile coalitions.<sup>24</sup> Speculation and assumptions about the feelings of those involved in typical Athenian family units in these circumstances is futile, yet the presumption which could be derived from the cases of Konon and Nikophemos, that those who stayed away did so without pain or regret, would be a shallow reading of a complex situation, compounded by Athens' defeat and Spartan behaviour subsequently, together with misapplied hindsight. In fact there are so few examples where the fate of the family is known, or may be guessed at, that only parallels from Athenian domestic and legal arrangements may shed some light on the fate of the families of exiles who remained in Athens.

Athenian women and children led sheltered lives and women generally were confined to the household precincts, except for special religious festivals, although recent scholarship tends to play down the seclusion aspect and emphasise separation.<sup>25</sup> No Athenian woman of the rank of

23. [Dem] xlix.6; *APF* p509

24. Although, for example, Lysias XIX.12-18 is an indication of the complexity of motives for marriage arrangements; Fisher (1976: p7ff); Lefkowitz & Fant (1982: pp11-30). However the dependence of women upon the *kurios* was such that their fate was directly governed by that of the *kurios*.

25. Fisher (1976: pp11-12); Parke (1977: pp82-88); Burkert (1985: pp230, pp242-246) - *thesmophoria*; For a discussion of the family and the seclusion of women see Gould (1980: pp38f), Cohen (1989: pp3-15) and Just (1989: *passim*).

those who were wives and mothers of the prominent political exiles in this study functioned as an independent unit. She had always to belong to a *kyrios*, that is a male member of her family. When married, this was her husband, and before and after marriage her *kyrios* would be her father, brother, uncle or some other close male relative.<sup>26</sup> In the case of a divorce, the woman complete with her dowry became subject once more to her male relative as her *kyrios*.<sup>27</sup> Her children, unless adults, would be part of her charge, but they were the responsibility of their father in the first instance. Children were the other major reason for marriages, the inheritance of property being high on the list of considerations of Athenians. Elaborate rules governed ownership of property,<sup>28</sup> and inheritance to ensure the maintenance of the household and the power and prestige that accompanied it. In fact, such maintenance was part of what Athenians considered their highest duties, together with religious observances to their parents, ancestors and the gods of the household.<sup>29</sup>

For Athenian women, uprooted from the quiet and certainty of the domestic routine of their sheltered existence, flight from Athens towards an uncertain existence in what must have been conceived by them as an alien and frightening landscape was undoubtedly an ordeal, as it would have been for their children too. Yet, like Xenophon's wife Philesia and their children Diodoros and Gryllos, these families probably learned to adapt.<sup>30</sup>

26. Fisher (1976: p7)

27. Fisher (1976: p9); Fox (1985: pp223-224). Sealey (1988: p24) - women derived their social and legal status from their men, that is, from father or brother before marriage, from husbands after marriage.

28. Fox (1985: pp209-232) studies trends and relationship implications in Athenian and other inheritance laws.

29. Isaïos 7.30; Dem. xliii.75. *Ath Pol* 55.3 with Sinclair (1988: p50)

30. *Plut. Ages* 20.2. cf *Lys.* xix.33 for an instance of what happened if a women had to remain in Athens.

The situation of those women who remained in Athens when their spouses failed to return home, or fled without them, is more complex. Such a woman would have had an uncertain legal status until that of her husband as her *kyrios* was determined. In the case of those whose husbands were condemned to death *in absentia*, and whose property was confiscated,<sup>31</sup> such confiscation presumably could not include the dowry of the wives since that remained their property (or at least that of their male relatives as a type of trust or bond). However, the rapaciousness of the Thirty probably meant that there was little discrimination in this regard, and the wives of prominent democrats may have suffered the loss of their dowries in the general appropriation of their husbands' estates.

The sentence of hereditary *atimia* was another blow aimed at their husbands which struck the wives<sup>32</sup> as well as their children, and presumably complicated the role of the male relative who assumed the status of *kyrios* to a woman in this situation, since he would have to take responsibility for, and include in his household, her children who were no longer citizens.

Since Hipparete was already dead by 415, Alkibiades' cousin Euryptolemos (*PA* 5985) may have undertaken the role of guardian of their infant children, who remained in Athens

31. See Table 4

32. Not necessarily that the wives themselves were also *atimoi*, but Parker (1983: p205) notes that whatever the legal status of the children of *atimoi* who have been made *atimos* because of pollution, there were social means whereby those children of a polluted parent were made to also feel unclean. If this situation is analogous to that of the parent in exile and subsequently condemned, then the children and the wives would be similarly affected. Parker notes that the marriage prospects of the offspring of the unclean one were severely affected, so the same may be said of the children of exiles who had chosen life away from Athens. Sealey (1988: p15): women were not members of *deme* or *phratry*, their citizenship relied on their ability to produce children who were citizens.

throughout the exiles of their father, in lieu of a *kyrios* of Hipparete doing so. Similarly, the wives of Konon and Nikophemos were probably dead by 405, yet their children were adults and so the situation did not arise.

Once a determination of the status of their husbands had been made through some form of condemnation *in absentia*, it is presumed that those wives and families who had stayed in Athens or were left there were able to be formally separated and returned to the protection of a male relative. The legal situation of wives and children of generals and others who stayed away in voluntary exile such as Aristogenes and Protomachos or Chares (*PA* 15292 Entry 95) would have been precarious, since the uncertainty which surrounded the status of those men must have continued for some time. Although Chares made another life for himself as ruler of Sigeum, as a prominent Athenian politician and especially a general, he was almost certainly married, as the two absconding Arginousai generals were also.

If they were alive the wives of these generals were literally abandoned, although they would not have realised this for some time, nor would the Athenian *polis* generally. Unfortunately there is no evidence of the mechanism by which the Athenians handled this situation, and the most likely scenario is that some form of guardianship by relatives will have automatically occurred if and until a general returned from battle or his tour of duty in normal circumstances, and that this guardianship or overseer role for the household of a general (and indeed other serving personnel) pertained until it became irrefutably clear that the man had gone into voluntary exile.



The relationship of the exile to his family, especially his parents and the duties owed to them, brings the decision of the voluntary exile to quit Athens or to stay away into the realm of religion at its most personal level.<sup>33</sup> The poignant words of Polyneices<sup>34</sup> that loss of country is the greatest ill, and that no words can do it justice is an apt reminder of what was suffered by the exile, and that the loss of one's *patris* encompassed not just a physical removal from the familiar, not only the loss of property and status, not only loss of that participation in political life which gave life its worth. One's *patris* encompassed the spiritual well-being of the individual, especially at the grassroots level of day-to-day piety and belief systems. All Athenians understood the contract inherent in state religion, that the right observances at the right time consistently and in a generous spirit would ensure that the gods and goddesses of the Athenian pantheon would adhere to their side of the bargain and keep Athens safe.<sup>35</sup>

To what extent individual Athenians believed literally in such formalised rituals is difficult to gauge, from the obsessively devout Nikias (*PA* 10808),<sup>36</sup> to the punctilious Xenophon<sup>37</sup>

33. The duty extended to the dead as well as live parents: Isok. ii.12-13, Xen. *Oeconomicus* II.8; Mikalson (1983: pp97-98). Note the condemnation of Aristogeiton (*PA* 1775 Entry 90) for allowing his father Kydimachos (*PA* 8930 Entry 87) to die alone and in poverty with no one to bury him.

34. Plut. *Mor* 599d-e:

– *ti to steresthai patridos; e kakon mega;*  
– *megiston ergo d' esti meizon h logo'*

See also Appendix C.

35. Burkert (1985: p8); Mikalson (1983: p53), sv p89 - cults and sharing the rituals as a group. As Dover *HCT IV* p283 has noted, there was a wide variety of opinions in Athens concerning the nature and even the existence of the gods. However, the observances in due order were still important both in private rituals and as part of the social contract.

36. Plut. *Nikias* 4.1

37. Xenophon (*PA* 11307 Entry 78) appears more punctilious than deeply devout in the keeping of his vows made at Delphi before he set out with Proxenos to join Cyrus. Hornblower (1991: p177) refers to Xenophon as superstitious, but this describes Xenophon in a somewhat derogatory terminology: if he was superstitious then this was not a failing but something which he shared with a majority of his fellows of all classes.

through the spectrum to the profane Alkibiades<sup>38</sup> although Alkibiades was true to his own form in wringing the most political mileage out of a spectacular about-face by providing the armed escort to the Mysteries at Eleusis in 407.<sup>39</sup>

Mercenary service, and the generally less stable political circumstances of Greece in the fourth century, resulted in unprecedented movement of people throughout the Greek world and, importantly, beyond it. New religious orientations were brought to Athens, and in general these were not replacements for the gods of the main pantheon, rather they were more personal deities who coincided with the rise in the speculations concerning death, afterlife and some definition of soul.<sup>40</sup> Exiles who felt the need to practice the formal rituals of the state pantheon could do so outside the Athenian *polis*, as Xenophon did when making his promised offering to Artemis, being able to do so at Ephesos.<sup>41</sup>

Although taking part in the Mysteries at Eleusis was a profound religious and social experience,<sup>42</sup> not all prominent Athenians were initiates and they could presumably do without this experience. For those exiles for whom loss of opportunity to partake in this more personal religion and its annual rites was a personal tragedy, exile provided a plethora of opportunities

38 Alkibiades was almost certainly guilty of profaning the Mysteries.

39. Xen. *Hell* I.4. 20

40. Burkert (1987: pp12-29); for the mercenary perspective, Hornblower (1991: p178): Greeks were brought into contact with such new religious cults as that of Bendis (introduced into Athens in the fifth century). Garland (1992: pp111-114)

41. Xen. *Anab* V.iii.4-13

42. Burkert (1987: pp89-94); Parke (1977: pp56-62) on initiation into the Eleusinian Mysteries.

to explore and find satisfaction in the worship of other mother earth deities and more esoteric expressions of piety.<sup>43</sup>

However, there was one area in which the exile had voluntarily separated himself from meaningful participation, and this was the participation in the local and family cults which could not be duplicated elsewhere. This also meant being unable to perform the duty of care to his parents and ancestors and their burial sites.<sup>44</sup> The most profound punishment meted out to Athenians included refusal of burial in Attika, and/or the bones of one's ancestors could be dug up and cast out of Attika.<sup>45</sup> Although the extent to which Athenians participated generally in religion or believed in an afterlife and their souls' immortality is not easily ascertained, the deprivation of the right to participate in Athenian popular religion was sorely felt.<sup>46</sup> Thus Aristogeiton (*PA* 1775 Entry 90) is reviled for allowing his father Kydimachos (*PA* 8930 Entry 87) to die a pauper without anyone to bury him properly; the revulsion felt towards Andokides (*PA* 828 Entry 56) for his *asebeia* resulted in his continual attempts to return to Athens being thwarted. Most tellingly, Leokrates (*PA* 9083 Entry 96) arranged for his ancestral shrine items and relics to be transported to him in Megara in order that he could continue to take the proper measures towards his ancestors and his household gods in his new

43. Hornblower (1991: p179) suggests Isis and Ammon; Burkert (1985: p281): *kaberoi* and Samothrace, an example of one of the alternatives open to exiles generally.

44. Burkert (1985: pp190-203); Kurtz and Boardman (1971: p147): burial of the dead, and the annual rites which were owed to the dead, must be observed, and importantly be observed by the right hands, that is, one could not perform the obligations owed to ancestors by proxy. Mikalson (1983: p96): it was as impious not to make the traditional sacrifices as to make them in the wrong manner.

45. Kurtz & Boardman (1971: p143); Parker (1983: pp46-47)

46. Burkert (1985: p225): "The living religious practice of the Greeks is concentrated on the festivals, *heortai*, which interpret and articulate everyday life." The Athenians had a large number of state festivals, however, it was the local cults with which Athenians most identified, and which could not be replicated outside Attika. Indeed most could not be transplanted at all as they were associated with specific places or natural phenomena.

home. These localised and personal expressions of piety played a major part in the daily life of Athenians,<sup>47</sup> and the need to come home to be buried was equally strong, as the punishment which denied burial in Attika attests. The family and friends of Themistokles (*PA* 6669) in fact smuggled his remains into Attika and buried them in a secret location,<sup>48</sup> to thwart such an edict, and presumably both they and Themistokles felt the matter to be so important that such a risk needed to be taken.

For all exiles, the issues of family, religion, property and inheritance were complex and interlocking, and deeply personal, so that any decision to go into exile voluntarily would have been heartbreaking for all but the most venal. It is difficult to assess the emotional impact of separation from ancestors, which may even have been a form of *miasma* - a type of pollution derived from abandonment of their dead<sup>49</sup>. From this study, it is apparent that there are more than political issues at stake and that family and religion also provide a clue to a deeper pain at being separated from "all that made life worth living"<sup>50</sup> which is *kakon megiston*.<sup>51</sup>

47. Sinclair (1988: p52): on the role of the deme in the vitality of Athenian life which underpinned the willingness and ability of Athenians to accept the wider roles in society. Mikalson (1983: p83): "Religion was a significant part of the identity and function of these (ie tribe, deme, phratry, genos and family) and most other Athenian social and political groups." Hornblower (1991: p176) believes that individual Greeks were pious and often primitively superstitious, and that their religion was not an empty formal ritual but a living focus of their lives.

48. Plut. *Them* 32.2, although Plutarch discounts this story.

49. Parker (1983: pp2-4)

50. Fisher (1976: p1)

51. Plut. *Mor* 599 d-e

### 3.6 Return and Recall

If there was one place to which a Greek exile would be ready to go and where (given adequate protection) he would stay, it was his own city.

*E Badian (1961: p30)*

Many voluntary exiles, having made the often agonised decision to remove themselves from Athens when the political situation became too difficult, went on with their lives, and rarely looked back. Aischines (*PA* 354 Entry 97) and Xenophon (*PA* 11307 Entry 78) spring readily to mind, as does Konon (*PA* 8707 Entry 71), although his continuing support of, and practical assistance to his own city perhaps indicate that he was able to look back, without, so far as is known, ever wanting to return himself.

For others, however, the desire to go home was an ever-present anxiety. Yet the Athenians guarded the rights of re-entry jealously, since banishment was the penultimate sanction in their armoury for the preservation of their society and its structures. Of the individuals in this study, the decision of sixty-three of them to go into exile was confirmed *post factum* by condemnation to death *in absentia*, or permanent banishment.<sup>1</sup> Of those, fifty had their death sentences commuted to permanent exile, and of course their property had been confiscated, another practical impediment to the dream of rehabilitation. Others, such as Gylon (*PA* 3098 Entry 57), had their sentences commuted to fines or performance of some state service for which they were remunerated sufficiently to pay the fines outstanding. This latter facility was possibly provided for Phormion (*PA* 14958 *Appendix A*), and definitely for Demosthenes (*PA* 3597 Entry 99). Presumably payment of outstanding money facilitated a return.

1. Refer to **Table 9** for the return/recall status of voluntary exiles. See **Table 4** for penalties.

As mentioned above, and especially from the mid-fifth century onwards, the Athenian state reserved to itself the right to determine who returned to the *polis* and under what conditions, regardless of which party had taken the decision to leave in the first place. The purpose of such control can best be described as maintenance of the status quo, by ensuring that disruptive or dangerous elements are kept away, lessening the chances for *stasis*. That is not to say that the process was not overtly political with personal enmity always a factor in Athenian political manoeuvres. In some measure ostracism had provided the mechanism up till its failure in 416 when the unstable Alkibiades (*PA* 600 Entry 55) was able to turn the process against Hyperbolos (*PA* 13910).<sup>2</sup> Thereafter, during the period of this study, there were four instances only where the Athenians agreed to or were forced to acquiesce in the wholesale return of exiles, voluntary or otherwise. Many of those individuals in this study probably took advantage of these "amnesties" to return.

The first of these amnesties was the decree of Patrokleides in 405.<sup>3</sup> This decree was in a sense forced upon the Athenians by the circumstances of the defeat at Aigospotamoi, but it had the result of restoring rights to *atimoi* who had in some way defaulted the state or were outside its overt protection. Presumably those who had left Athens, such as Andokides (*PA* 828 Entry 56) were able to return if they fell into the categories which the decree covered.

2. Plut. *Nikias* 11, *Alk* 13 with Phillips (1982: p28 and n48)

3. Andok. i.71-79 with MacDowell (1962: pp105-119)

Andokides is the most prominent claimant to coverage by this amnesty, but he had been condemned for *asebeia* by his own confession.<sup>4</sup> In his final attempt to return to Athens in 400/399, the court eventually agreed with him that he was not covered by the provisions of the decree of Isotimides<sup>5</sup> since the decree of Patrokleides had overridden it. Andokides was therefore able to claim and receive back his citizen-rights. It was not, however, that simple initially, when Andokides had tried to return in 405,<sup>6</sup> because of the *miasma* associated with his guilt. As Rhodes notes,<sup>7</sup> the pollution did not disappear just because a murderer was pardoned, so presumably the pollution attached to Andokides for his sacrilege was sufficient for his *atimia* to be confirmed. The difference between the situation in 405 and that in 400 was the intervening amnesty which allowed the return of those exiles who had stayed away, fled and/or had been subsequently confirmed in their sentences.<sup>8</sup>

Whilst the decree of Patrokleides had been designed to pull all Athenians together in the face of the defeat and the forthcoming retribution expected from Lysander, the ultimate triumph of the Spartans imposed among other humiliating conditions of the peace one that required

4. Andok. i.48ff; 60-61

5. Andok. i.71 with Hignett, *Hist. Athen. Const.* (1975 ed: pp302-303)

6. Lys. vi.6-7

7. Rhodes (1981: p468). Cf Parker (1983: pp46-47)

8. Andokides had received a pardon for his crime in return for informing on his associates: Plut. *Mor* 834e; Lys. vi.23. However, he was still *atimos* and a subsequent rehabilitation with restoration of rights would not remove the pollution sufficiently for Athens to feel confident to take him in. In this context Andokides too required something more than the decree of Patrokleides to rely upon, and sought that in the amnesty of 404. Andok. i.80 notes that neither the Athenians' psephismata nor the decree of Patrokleides allowed the return of exiles. Loening (1987: pp140-144) on the amnesty and Andokides.

Athens to take back all her exiles.<sup>9</sup> Back to Athens came many of those who had fled at the fall of the Four Hundred,<sup>10</sup> including those who formed the nucleus of the soon-to-be-installed Thirty Tyrants.<sup>11</sup> Many of those who returned in 404 under the watchful eye of the Spartan harmost were those whom the decree of Patrokleides had specifically excluded, because they posed a soon-to-be realised threat to the established order, including Kritias (PA 8792), and the hated Onomakles (PA 11476 Entry 59), who had had his voluntary exile confirmed by a sentence of death *in absentia*, confiscation of property, hereditary *atimia* and refusal of burial in Attika. Such a threat was he felt to be to the established order that the Athenians had "thrown the book at him". Now he was back. Given the vast gap between Onomakles and those who had condemned him, his is a case which exactly fulfils the conditions of Badian's observation at the beginning of this chapter:

[I]f there was one place to which a Greek exile would be ready to go and where (given adequate protection) he would stay, it was his own city.<sup>12</sup>

Others who took advantage of the Spartan military presence to re-establish themselves were Charikles (PA 15407 Entry 58), Aristoteles (PA 2057 Entry 60), and Aischines (PA 341 Entry 61). Many of these returned exiles had property confiscated, and most had been away for at least seven years, so that establishment of their *oikoi* would have been difficult. It is supposed that the Spartans ensured that these supporters of their victory were suitably recompensed, although those who subsequently joined the Thirty Tyrants took care of expanding their assets

9. Xen. *Hell* II.2.20; Lys. xiii.14. See the discussion in Krentz (1982: pp28-43) on the peace negotiations.
10. Interestingly Peisandros (PA 11770 Entry 62), who had been a principal of the Four Hundred, did not return, presumably because he had found an alternative life, perhaps in Persia: Hofstetter (1978: p146).
11. Xen. *Hell* II.3.2 with Krentz (1982: p51)
12. Badian (1961: p30); cf Pusey (1940: pp217-218): coming home meant returning to associations of deep personal significance, including family, religion and *hetairoi*, rather than an overriding sense of patriotism in the nationalistic sense.



through confiscation of the assets of condemned democrats or of those who had fled.<sup>13</sup>

The shortlived reign of the Thirty Tyrants saw a large number of Athenians exiled, and many voluntarily move into exile rather than live with the repression of this regime.<sup>14</sup> The return of the democrats was accomplished under arms and led initially to a sort of truce, whereby Athens and Eleusis were deemed to be separate states and the Thirty retired to the latter.<sup>15</sup> A number of democrats who followed in the wake of Thrasyboulos (*PA* 7310) ventured back to Athens at this time, including Atrometos (*PA* 2681 Entry 77) and Nikomachos (*PA* 10933 Entry 73). In a short time this duality arrangement fell apart and the Thirty were totally vanquished.<sup>16</sup> It was at this point that the enormity of the social problems which prevailed led to what can be termed the general amnesty of 403/2, which aimed at nothing short of a total reconciliation of all elements of the Athenian *polis*.<sup>17</sup> It was quickly recognised that not all of those who remained in the city at the advent of the Thirty and who had fought on the side of the Thirty were as culpable as the Tyrants themselves. There was also the difficulty of what to do with these fellow Athenians, many of whom were doubtless related to those on opposite sides of the political fence. For example, Xenophon (*PA* 11307 Entry 78) fell into this category. It was realised that only a total reconciliation would suffice to ensure an end to *stasis*, and most

13. Lys. xii.4-22, describes the cold-bloodedly deliberate policies of the Thirty and how they were accomplished. Krentz (1982: p63ff).

14. Nikomachos (*PA* 10933 Entry 73), Anytos (*PA* 1324 Entry 74), Chairephon (*PA* 15203 Entry 75), Archinos (*PA* 2526 Entry 76) and Atrometos (*PA* 2681 Entry 77) all left voluntarily, and Atrometos had suffered significant predations of his property by the Thirty, adding impetus to his decision to quit Athens.

15. *Ath Pol* 38.1 and 39.1-2; Xen. *Hell* II.4.38

16. Xen. *Hell* II.4.43. *Ath Pol* 40.4

17. The full provision of the general amnesty is given in *Ath Pol* 39.1-6 with Rhodes (1981: p466f). Loening (1987: pp13-17) sees the amnesty as one continuous act instigated under the auspices of Pausanias, and although technically correct, the reconciliation after the final fall of the Thirty at Eleusis should be regarded as a separate action of the treaty's application.

importantly, the end of external interference, especially from Sparta. This general amnesty allowed many, such as Andokides mentioned above, to realise their hopes of returning home, provided that the necessary protection was available. And it appeared that such guarantees were available, and the Athenians were determined to make the amnesty work. The role of Archinos (*PA* 2526 Entry 76) attests to the decisive actions taken when some tried to abuse the amnesty.<sup>18</sup>

It was a little short of eighty years later that the Athenians were again involved in an "amnesty", although one definitely not of their choosing. In 324/3 Alexander decreed that the Greeks had to take back their exiles (excluding murderers and such other undesirables, presumably).<sup>19</sup> This decree resulted from Alexander's dealings with his vanquished enemies' satrapal armies and his Greek mercenaries.<sup>20</sup> Fearing uprisings and mutiny, he had disbanded most of his vast standing armies, who were armed and disaffected wanderers with nothing to lose and little hope, especially since Alexander had a virtual monopoly as an employer of troops. As Badian points out,<sup>21</sup> Alexander realised he had created an unstable and almost insoluble social and political situation, which he acted quickly to dispel by requiring the return of all exiles, including the troops and also the previously loyal supporters in cities whom he had deposed in what has been termed by Badian the reign of terror.

18. *Ath Pol* 40.2-4; Leoning (1987: p29)

19. Dein. i.94

20. Badian (1961: pp25-28)

21. Badian (1961: pp28-29)

Although aimed at these armies and disaffected ex-puppet rulers, the exiles decree also caught in its net every political exile who had been a promoter of *stasis* within his *polis*, or who had been expelled by an opposing faction. It also included voluntary exiles who had fled or stayed away when the political risks were too high. Athens of course was affected, and at least Kallimedon (*PA* 8032 Entry 98) and probably Pytheas (*PA* 12342 Entry 100) effected a rehabilitation under this exiles decree.

There were thus four "amnesties" at Athens during the period of this study which permitted exiles, including voluntary exiles, to return home: the decree of Patrokleides in 405, the enforced acceptance of exiles by Lysander and the Spartans in 404, the general amnesty of 403/2, and the enforced return known as the exiles decree of Alexander in 324/3. There had been some precedent for amnesty in the recall in the spring 480 of those who had been ostracised, in the face of the Persian threat.<sup>22</sup>

As mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, on the whole the Athenians made it difficult for those who had turned their backs on Athens to return. However, from time to time the *demos* underwent change of heart concerning specific individuals. In these cases two methods were employed to pave the way for the return of the forgiven one. Firstly, the *demos* was able to rescind motions of banishment, death sentences and so on, and to propose motions of recall.

22. *Ath Pol* 22.8; Plut. *Aristides* 8.1, *Them* 11.1; *ML* 23 lines 44–47.

The most famous example of this is the case of the return of Alkibiades (*PA* 600 Entry 55) in 407.<sup>23</sup> Not all of Alkibiades' friends had been with him in Sicily, and his cousin Eurypolemos<sup>24</sup> (*PA* 5985) was in Athens throughout Alkibiades' first exile. Other connections were also working for his recall, and his military victories for Athens would have assisted the process. Apparently Kritias (*PA* 8792) proposed the motion of recall in 411/10,<sup>25</sup> which was passed and Alkibiades was subsequently warmly welcomed to Athens. Even the *stelae* recording the curses against him were thrown in the sea.<sup>26</sup>

Despite the apparently warm welcome, Alkibiades was probably sufficiently astute to insist that his closest associates be reinstated with him, and this is apparently what happened, since both Adeimantos (*PA* 202 Entry 7)<sup>27</sup> and Alkibiades' uncle Axiochos (*PA* 1330 Entry 9)<sup>28</sup> were present at Athens from this time forth.

The second method available to the Athenians to effect the recall of voluntary exiles involved providing a mechanism which obeyed the laws and was seen to do so, but which also provided a way out of the dilemma which faced an exile wishing to return. The mechanism involved

23. Plut. *Alk* 32.1 ascribed to Alkibiades a strong desire to return home, albeit motivated by vanity. The return is described by Xen. *Hell* I.4.13-21. Cf Pusey (1940: pp216-217) and what *to philopoli* meant to Alkibiades; Connor (1971: pp102-103).
24. Xen. *Hell* I.3.19
25. Plut. *Alk* 33.1
26. Diod. XIII.69.2
27. Xen *Hell* I.7.1; Fornara (1971: p69) follows Xen. *Hell* I.4.21 that Adeimantos was a *strategos* in 407/06 which means that, unless Xenophon has got it wrong, Adeimantos was definitely part of the group pardoned with Alkibiades.
28. MacDowell (1962: p76); [Plato] *Axiochos* 368e-369a; *IG* i<sup>2</sup> 108.39: Axiochos was politically active from 406 at least.

those exiles who had left Athens because of their inability to pay fines owing to the state. The assembly voted that certain work had to be completed, that the person whose return was desired was to undertake the work, and that funds amounting to at least the amount owed by the exile to the state, were voted to pay for the work to be done. In this manner both Phormion (*PA 14958 Appendix A*) and Demosthenes (*PA 3597 Entry 99*) were successfully recalled when the *demos* decided it wanted them home. Although there are no other extant examples, this was an efficient method of satisfying all the proprieties and achieving the desired outcome.

There was also the somewhat dubious option of returning home under arms, and that would have been conditional upon successfully ousting one's opponents. Leogoras (*PA 9074 Entry 4*) did so, as did those who returned from exile to overthrow the Thirty Tyrants in 403, including Anytos (*PA 1324 Entry 74*) and Archinos (*PA 2526 Entry 76*). On the whole Athens during the period of this study was generally free from such insistent returnees.

Kallistratos (*PA 8157 Entry 82*), apparently despairing of ever being recalled, or asked to do some state service to facilitate his return, and with no amnesty in the offing, determined to effect his return by appeal to a "higher authority".<sup>28</sup> This appeal to Delphi indicates that the shrine was still considered sufficiently powerful that Athens would take account of its pronouncements, had it ordered that city to take back even one of its exiles. Unfortunately there are no other examples of appeals to such a source and the actions taken by the targeted

28. Lyk. i.93. His appeal to Delphi resulted in an ambiguous answer which ultimately caused his execution at Athens - the oracle had informed him that he would be treated according to the laws at Athens, and the Athenians apparently felt that they had the situation covered by Kallistratos' previous sentence of death.

*polis*, but given the general reluctance of Athens to abandon its prerogatives, such an appeal would probably be consistently unsuccessful in outcome.

The case of Kallistratos and the difficulties of return or recall generally make the decision of Athenians in this study to voluntarily leave all that made life worth living even more poignant.

## **Appendices**

### **Exclusions: Problems and Doubtful Cases**

Some Athenians who at first glance are apparently voluntary political exiles have been rejected from inclusion in this study because closer examination reveals that the preconditions for determination as a "voluntary" are not present. Into this category falls Peisistratos (*PA* 11793), who whilst definitely in exile, was effectively expelled through the combined efforts of his factional enemies.<sup>1</sup> The element of choice was not available to him, and therefore the decision to retire into exile twice was not a matter of expediency so much as one of compulsion.

Similarly, on the surface the son of Peisistratos, Hippias (*PA* 7605) appears to have opted for retreat into exile rather than to stay and fight for his political position. However, the fact that his children were being held hostage provided Hippias with the proverbial offer he could not refuse, so that no real element of choice was involved.<sup>2</sup>

Similarly, Bicknell<sup>3</sup> has assisted the explosion of the myth that the Alkmeonidai opted for wholesale exodus from Athens rather than live under the tyranny. He points out that there is no doubt that the Kleisthenes of *SEG* X.352 - the eponymous archon of 525/4 - is the famous Kleisthenes who headed the Alkmeonidai. Bicknell points out, using Isokrates 16.25f, that Herodotos had rewritten history to the extent that in fact, the Alkmeonidai had collaborated

1. Hdt. I.60.1; 61.2; Stanton (1990: pp91-102)

2. Hdt. V.62.- 65.5 with Stanton (1990: pp130-132 with notes 1-13)

3. Bicknell (1970: p128): cf Kinzl (1976: p311)



with the tyranny on the first return of Peisistratos.<sup>4</sup> Merritt<sup>5</sup> had come to similar conclusions much earlier. Of course, if the Alkmeonidai were expelled wholesale from Attika by the Peisistratidai (twice)<sup>6</sup> then they were not voluntary exiles. As an Alkmeonid, Kleisthenes himself falls into the same category as his family generally.

The antagonist of Kleisthenes, Isagoras (*PA* 7680) apparently left Athens under safe conduct with the army of Kleomenes of Sparta.<sup>7</sup> Athenian politics were conducted during the sixth century generally on the basis of struggles between the great families of the Athenian aristocracy, the Alkmeonidai, the Philaidai and latterly the Peisistratidai. Matters were conducted in such way that one or possibly two families combined in uneasy alliance, to dominate, and then they forced the other(s) out of Athens.<sup>8</sup> Power seesawed in this manner and it was this situation which led to the failure of the pretensions of Isagoras. Like Peisistratos twice before him, there was no opportunity for Isagoras to remain - his side had lost and his exit was a total rout for all its dignified pretensions of safe conduct. The element of choice was not available to Isagoras.

4. Bicknell (1970: p129)

5. Merritt (1939: p61): Eliot and MacGregor (1960: p37)

6. Elliott and MacGregor (1960: p35)

7. Hdt. V.74

8. Stanton (1990: pp138-145)

Pausanias states<sup>9</sup> that Phormion, one of Athens' most successful generals, was fined by the Athenians although the circumstances which led to the fine are not related. Phormion apparently could not pay the fine (or possibly did not wish to do so), and chose to retire to Paiania in the *mesogeia*. According to Pausanias the Athenians subsequently wanted Phormion to assume the *strategia* again, and so they arranged for his fine to be paid.

Phormion was last assuredly attested as *strategos* in 429/8<sup>10</sup> and he had been in office for a number of years before that.<sup>11</sup> So, if this story of Pausanias is correct then the incident must have occurred in 428/7 at the earliest.

If Phormion was unable to pay the sate fine imposed upon him, he would have automatically been made *atimos*, and would have been ineligible to hold the generalship. To that extent, if he was sought after for that office, then his full citizenship status had to be restored. Releasing him from his debt to the State would accomplish the circumstances in which his full rights could be restored.

9. Paus. I.23.10

10. Thuc. II.88.1

11. Fornara (1971: pp52-55)

According to Pausanias, Phormion **chose** to retire to Paiania and the probable explanation of this self-imposed exile is that as an *atimos*, Phormion found his position untenable in Athens where he could not engage in his profession, nor in politics. He also could not participate in religious activities nor frequent temples and other sacred places. Being *atimos* did not necessarily mean that exile or self-exile automatically followed, the more prominent the *atimoi*, the more they seem to have desired a total withdrawal from their previous habitats.<sup>12</sup>

Whilst there are other examples of the Athenians arranging methods of paying the fines of those who were unable to do so,<sup>13</sup> there are some other problems with this exile. Phormion's demotic cannot be proved to be Paiania by this tale as the logic is circular. Secondly, if he did retire to Paiania, that does not mean that his demotic is proved, only that he held property there to which to retire, and he perhaps did not even own it himself, given that he was unable to pay his fine. For instance in 431/0 Hagnon from the tribe Pandionis was *strategos*,<sup>14</sup> which means that if Phormion was from Paiania, then that tribe had two generals in the same year or one of them was not from Pandionis.

Presumably, since Phormion apparently chose to retire to this remote area of Attika those of his family who were still residing with him accompanied their *kyrios*. From the extant evidence he appears not to have taken the opportunity offered by the payment of his fine to return to public life, as he is nowhere mentioned again. However, an argument from silence in this instance is unwise, since the whole incident is perhaps apocryphal.

12. E.g. Aischines (*PA* 354, entry 102). See Carter (1986: pp44-51): *apragmosyne* - withdrawal, that is, in the sense of quietism. In other words, if Phormion was unable to participate fully, he would withdraw fully, although *apragmosyne* has a more substantial element of choice through conviction rather than through circumstances one could not change.
13. E.g. Demosthenes (*PA* 3597, entry no. 103)
14. Thuc. II.58.1; Fornara (1971: p53) cf Hignett, *Hist. Athen. Const.* pp351-352

Demosthenes (*PA* 3585) has to be included in this Appendix since Thucydides states categorically that he failed to return home because he feared the retribution of the *demos* for his failure in Aitolia.<sup>15</sup> This means, in terms of the definitions used in this study, that Demosthenes may be classed as a voluntary exile during 427/6, on the statement of Thucydides.

However, there are many reasons to suppose that Demosthenes was nothing of the sort, and in fact that no such situation actually arose. Admittedly the case for Demosthenes having political enemies at home is given some support by the Antiphon fragment which indicates that Antiphon indicted Demosthenes via a *graphe paranomon* in about 415.<sup>16</sup> The dating is uncertain and it may have been earlier, but there are no other details of the charge. In any case, in fifth century Athens to attain the position of *strategos*, it was common to have political as well as military skills.<sup>17</sup> It is probable that for all his continuing popular support, Demosthenes

15. Thuc. III.98.5: *..Demosthenes de peri Naupakton kai ta choria tauta hypeleiphthe tois pepragmenois phoboumenos tous Athenaious*. Sealey (1976: p336) makes a strong case that Demosthenes did not really fail, and the final political outcome was settled after Demosthenes left the vicinity. Cf *HCT III* p408: Gomme refers to Demosthenes as "almost self-condemned" which is an uncritical acceptance of Thucydides.

16. Antiphon F3; F13 (Loeb)

17. [Xen.] I.1-3; Sinclair (1988: p46); cf Hansen (1974: p28 no.2)

would have made enemies of men such as Antiphon (*PA* 1279), who was clearly not a democrat.<sup>18</sup>

Roberts<sup>19</sup> has argued that the Athenians had every right to be angry with Demosthenes after his loss. Yet this argument can be diluted somewhat for two reasons. First, Demosthenes was almost certainly a democrat<sup>20</sup>, and this would have produced natural enemies in the person of Antiphon and his ilk, whether he had been defeated or not. Second, and more important, Demosthenes was not that far away. If he could land a messenger anywhere north of Pagae (close to Attika), or in Phokis (which was friendly to Athens at the time) he could have had instructions from Athens to proceed with the Aitolian campaign within a week of its first being mooted. He was in the area, he had time to make plans and preparations (taking at least a few days), and he marched overland. As Thucydides himself points out, the plan involved the protection of Naupaktos,<sup>21</sup> so it is highly probable that there was time to consult the home government, given the definite priority that protection of Naupaktos had for the Athenians. Sinclair<sup>22</sup> makes the point that in matters of detail, as well as policy, the *ekklesia* retained the decision-making for itself.

18. Thuc. VIII.68.1-3

19. Roberts (1982: p216 n66)

20. His almost continuous re-election during the years of the democracy is a strong indicator of his political affiliations. See note 9.

21. Thuc. III.94-96. *HCT III* p.426ff on the topography of the campaign, and generally.

22. Sinclair (1988: p82)

As there appears to have been time to receive instructions, then Roberts is wrong to this extent at least: Demosthenes was not acting arbitrarily, and the subsequent defeat alone was not the problem. Admittedly it is known that Demosthenes was not re-elected as *strategos* for the subsequent campaign year, if Fornara's list of ten generals is accurate for 426/5.<sup>23</sup> Yet he was re-elected for the year after that, and possibly for all the years to his death in 413/2.<sup>24</sup> It is also reasonable that a general who had just been defeated, however popular, would not be re-elected immediately, not if the antipathy of Antiphon had been already in play by the 420s; nor if the *demos* was acting true to form in failing to admit its part in the defeat.

The account of Thucydides III. 94-95 is difficult to credit since no Athenian general had the capacity to take such sweeping policy decisions without reference to the home government unless specifically appointed as *hegemon autokrator* as was Alkibiades was in 408/7.

Furthermore, Demosthenes had a colleague, Prokles (*PA* 12206), for the whole period.<sup>25</sup> It is not credible that he, too, blithely courted such dire consequences as the *demos* was wont to mete out.

23. Fornara (1971: pp87-88); cf Develin *AO* p127, who excludes Demosthenes for this year. Sealey (1976: pp330-331) says he had no official position, but this is unlikely given his subsequent actions.

24. Fornara (1971: pp56-65): Demosthenes was general in 425/4; 424/3; 418/17; 414/3; and 413/12, the year of his death. Yet we only have between one and six names for all the other years, so it seems probable that Demosthenes was elected almost continually, especially as, notwithstanding Kleon (*PA* 8674), it was well-known at Athens that Demosthenes was the victor at Pylos. (Ar. *Knights* 54; 742), Sealey (1976: p353)

25. Thuc. III.98.5. cf *HCT III* p426 - the powers of generals in the field.

The most telling evidence that Demosthenes had nothing to fear from home, despite Thucydides, is his actions after the defeat. Far from slinking off to the enemy, or to a neutral or safe haven as did so many of those who stayed away in fear of retribution, Demosthenes remained in the vicinity of Naupaktos.<sup>26</sup> Further, a man as high-ranking as Demosthenes, if in fear of his life, did not remain in an Athenian outpost of such military importance at all; and, what of the remaining portion of his command? It seems unreasonable that Demosthenes retired to Naupaktos as a solo act.

This point is borne out by the fact that, although no longer *strategos*, according to Thucydides' own narrative, Demosthenes managed to raise an army of allies to defend Naupaktos (successfully) when it was attacked. He then led the allied army against Ambracia (successfully).<sup>27</sup> Thucydides uses phrases about the allies being unwilling to take the advice of Demosthenes "and the Athenians".<sup>28</sup> These pointers indicate that, far from being out of favour, Demosthenes had some sort of official capacity at this time.

26. Thuc. III.91.1; 98.4-5; *HCT III* p407f

27. Thuc. III.102.3f; 107-114. *HCT III* p419f

28. Thuc. III.113.6: *...Athenaiois kai Demosthenei peithomonoi epelthein,...*

Finally, prior to his capture of Pylos, whilst he was still *idios* according to Thucydides,<sup>29</sup> that is supposedly an ordinary citizen, albeit a *strategos*-elect,<sup>30</sup> he was empowered by the home government to make what use he chose of a fleet which had been sent out on a completely different task.<sup>31</sup>

Clearly again, Thucydides' own narrative belies his conclusions.<sup>32</sup> Demosthenes' actual status may be difficult to define prior to his assumption of his generalship in 425/4. His prior and subsequent careers confirm that he was no physical coward; and this also confirms that he remained popular with the *demos*. So Demosthenes cannot be claimed as a voluntary exile, despite Thucydides' statement to the contrary. It was, however, necessary to include Demosthenes in this study to examine the contention of Thucydides that Demosthenes was a voluntary political exile.<sup>33</sup>

29. Thuc. III.105.3. *HCT III* p417: Gomme believes that *strategesanta* means that Demosthenes was not re-elected the next year, rather than being deprived of his command. Cf Fornara (n16 below).
30. Fornara (1971: p57); cf *HCT III* p417; *HCT III* pp437-8: Gomme believes that Demosthenes in fact was not elected for 425 and indeed may not have stood for election, but his conclusions are almost certainly faulty, in terms of Thucydides' narrative.
31. Thuc. IV.2.4 with *HCT III* p438: the objective was Sicily, but with several tasks to perform en route.
32. Westlake's argument (1973:p215) that Thucydides' technique for writing his history is subjective rather than prejudiced is splitting hairs. In suggesting that Thucydides' main criterion was relevance to the war (p218) he continues to refine the point - even Westlake conceded at this point that "... his own conception of the war, ... was not everyone's conception of it."
33. Thucydides makes a similar and totally unfounded claim for Nikias (*PA* 10808) son of Nikeratos in Sicily, (Thuc. VII.48.2-4) which is belied by Thucydides' narrative of the Sicilian campaign itself, and also by the fact that Nikias was at the time in command of a relatively intact expeditionary force in the field. There was no question of his fear of return as Nikias had never acknowledged that he would ultimately lose, despite his recognition of extreme difficulties with logistics. (Thuc. VII.10-15; VII.47: the various options for the remaining forces were outlined by Demosthenes). Besides, retreat was difficult without the fleet.



There is an exile attested for Kritias (*PA* 8792) probably in 411/10,<sup>34</sup> although the circumstances and the date have not been established. He apparently spent the time in Thessaly but there is no evidence to suggest that, just because he was later a member of the Thirty, his earlier exile was political, although Bicknell<sup>35</sup> has no doubt that it was Kleophon who brought about Kritias' exile shortly before Arginousai. There is also no evidence to suggest that his exile was voluntary, so Kritias has been included in the list of political exiles generally (**Table 3**) because it is unlikely that, given his later political career, his conflict with the arch-democrat Kleophon was anything other than political, whatever the pretext. However, the inclusion of Kritias as a *voluntary* political exile remains unjustified, most especially on the evidence of Xenophon.<sup>36</sup>

Badian<sup>37</sup> insists on the exile of Demades (*PA* 3263), on the evidence of Deinarchos, who does not name him specifically as an exile.<sup>38</sup> Badian feels that Demades had decided upon exile in the fear that he would be fined and would not be able to pay the sum involved. Then he is supposed to have been convicted and returned to pay the fine, the sum presumably being within his pocket.<sup>39</sup> If such an exile did occur it could arguably be termed voluntary and

34. He was apparently an *hetairos* or at least associate of some sort of Alkibiades (*PA* 600 Entry 55): Plut. *Alk* 33.1; Krentz suggests that his encounter with Kleophon can be associated with this relationship, from Alkibiades' loss of favour in 406, the date that according to Xen. *Hell* II.3.15 he was banished by the democracy: *kai phugon hypo tou demou*.

35. Bicknell (1971: p99)

36. Unlike that of other members of the Thirty, such as Onomakles (*PA* 11476 Entry 59), whose exile was related directly to participation in the Four Hundred and then the consequences of the fallout from that regime's failure. Xen. *Hell* II.3.15

37. Badian (1961: p35 and n144)

38. Dein. i.89; Worthington (1992: p260) has doubts about the way in which Demades was involved; Dein. i. 104-105. Worthington (1992: p275) believes that Demades did flee, although offering no firm evidence to support this contention, despite relying to an extent upon Dein. ii. 15: there are no "voluntary political" criteria to allow inclusion of Demades. cf Worthington (1992: pp302-303).

39. Badian (1961: p35 and n146)

probably political, given that it would parallel that of Demosthenes (*PA* 3597 Entry 99). However, the problem with this "exile" is the manner of the supposed return of Demades. Regardless of the political or otherwise nature of the circumstances, when one defied the *demos* and fled into exile, especially before hearing the verdict, the cases of Andokides (*PA* 828 Entry 56), Kallistratos (*PA* 8157 Entry 82) and Leokrates (*PA* 9083 Entry 96) suggest that it was not possible to return of one's own volition. A reprieve of some sort was required, either a pardon, amnesty, or some fiction to permit re-entry<sup>40</sup> without incurring the death penalty. There is no reference to such an arrangement, and *if* Demades paid a fine, it could equally have been paid if he had never left. There is no suggestion of *atimia*, and Badian<sup>41</sup> himself notes that Demades was back in Athens almost immediately after his supposed flight - suggesting strongly that in fact, he had never left.

There is no direct evidence to suggest that Aphobetos (*PA* 2775) accompanied his older brother Aischines<sup>42</sup> (*PA* 354 Entry 97) into exile in Rhodes after Aischines had suffered *atimia* in 330/29. Aischines had been humiliated in the process of a political trial, and his attendant failure to pay the fine imposed had resulted in the loss of citizen rights. This was sufficiently galling to Aischines for him to choose to live at Rhodes, at that time a city state considerably distant from Athens.

40. Such as that arranged for Demosthenes - Plut. *Dem* 27.6-7.

41. Badian (1961: p35)

42. Plut. *Dem* 24.3

Aphobetos was the youngest of the sons of Atrometos (*PA* 2681 Entry 77),<sup>43</sup> who had himself suffered exile for his political beliefs.<sup>44</sup> Despite a relatively obscure beginning to his public life, being an *hypogrammateus*, Aphobetos later attained an ambassadorship to Persia, and was a revenue administrator for Athens.<sup>45</sup>

Aphobetos is included in this Appendix because of his extremely close political association with his brother Aischines, attested by both the hostile Demosthenes as well as Aischines himself.<sup>46</sup>

This meant that Aphobetos may have been strongly affected by the political fate of his brother. Significantly, Aphobetos is not heard of again from the time of the *atimia* of Aischines. It is therefore probable that the family which went into exile with Aischines included his brother Aphobetos. While there is no direct evidence for this supposition, Aphobetos is included in this study because family members could be directly affected, both politically and socially, by the actions of their relatives. In his case, although the accidents of time may account for the lack of a reference to Aphobetos in any official capacity after the *atimia* of Aischines, it is equally probable that he is no longer heard from because his magisterial aspirations may have been dashed through the close political association with his brother.

43. Aisch. ii.149

44. Entry 78

45. Dem. xix.237-238; Aisch. ii.149; Hofstetter (1978: p17f); *APF* p545; Develin AO no. 271 with pp297 and 350.

46. Dem. xix.237-38; 285: Aphobetos, together with Aischines probably prosecuted Demosthenes' ally, Timarchos (*PA* 13636); Aisch. ii.94.

### **A Note on Isokrates xix - Useful Parallels for Voluntary Exiles**

This forensic speech, known as the *Aegineticus*, was composed by Isokrates probably not long after 394. Although the protagonists are Siphnians and not Athenians, and although the court in which the case was presented was in Aigina and not Athens, yet it provides some insights into the practicalities of exile from which useful parallels may be drawn for Athenian exiles, especially those who fled rather hastily from the city.

At xix.18 the speaker explains the mechanism of lodging funds with *xenoi* in other cities (in this case in Paros) against the time when flight might be necessary, and in the case of the speaker this became a reality with the ascendancy of the democrat exiles who returned to Siphnos after Sparta's defeat at Knidos in 394. That there were also *xenoi* in Melos and Troezen (xix.21-22) means that those who had to flee were offered some choice of destination, dependent upon the political circumstances which prevailed at any given time in one or more of the targeted city-states.

Although at xix.20 there is evidence for the conveyance not only of family members but also the estate – *kai ten metera kai ten adelphen kai ten ousian hapasan* – it is probable that there is no contradiction with xix.18, but rather that the estate refers to the portable assets, since the hasty departure would not allow for disposal of property and other fixed assets. The precaution of having funds deposited outside Siphnos in the event of a hasty departure reflects the steps taken by Alkibiades (*PA* 600 Entry 55) in maintaining a large number of *xenoi*, and also in

providing a place of haven should the need arise, as it did for him in 407.<sup>1</sup> Other *kaloi k'agathoi* who were actively engaged in politics, or even just because of their membership of the upper classes, presumably took similar steps.

The speaker of the *Aegineticus* had good reasons for presenting his case in emotive terms, yet when he tells of the anguish of being in exile and living amongst strangers and the pain of the death of both his mother and his sister on foreign soil, the emotion comes through as genuine (xix.22-23). At xix.27 he speaks of the isolation of exile, and the words he chose – *kai ten eremian ten hemeteran auton* – strongly convey a sense of being deserted or bereft in a less than comfortable environment. It is reasonable to project such feelings onto Athenian exiles generally, and to understand the anxiety of a Kallistratos (*PA* 8157 Entry 82) or the fretting of a Demosthenes (*PA* 8597 Entry 99), to return home.

There is no extant evidence for the Athenian voluntary exiles making arrangements for the protection of their *oikos* and the provision of a *kyrios* for their women and children such as those made by Thrasylochos prior to his death (xix. 34-35). However, if there was sufficient time once the decision to flee was made and before it was executed, it may be that arrangements similar to those made by Thrasylochos would have been put in place. Interestingly, whatever arrangements were made, apparently they were recognised throughout Greece (xix.50-51).

1. Herman (1987: p36) see entry 12 generally.

**Plutarch *Moralia* 599 - 607: On Exile**

This essay in Plutarch's *Moralia* attempts to argue the proposition that exile of itself is not necessarily a bad thing, in that allegiance to place is not a sound basis for measuring one's position. In other words, Plutarch advocates rather more than making the best of a bad lot if one is in exile, but in fact that the question of exile itself is relative (599d-e).<sup>1</sup> There is no doubt that for certain individuals, such as Nikophemos (*PA* 11066 Entry 72) and Konon (*PA* 8707 Entry 71) to an extent, and certainly Kallippos (*PA* 8065 Entry 86), exile represented opportunity rather than a time of looking back with longing. However, Andokides (*PA* 828 Entry 56) and Kallistratos (*PA* 8157 Entry 82) provide a contrary example, which is still prevalent as late as the time of Demosthenes (*PA* 3597 Entry 99), and is echoed in this aching of Polyneices for his home and all that it represented.

To a large extent this essay of Plutarch is an exhortation to a friend to be of good cheer, and tends to some forced allusions, most notably at 604d-605b: there were practical and commercial reasons why these teachers and philosophers and historians chose to go abroad to reside at the courts of benefactors. This passage is self-condemning in that there is no suggestion that men such as Euripides, Aischylos and Herodotos of Halicarnassos were abandoning their native cities by so doing, and the conscious decisions were made in the relative certainty of being able to return when they chose to do so. The parallel with exile, voluntary or otherwise, is not valid.

1. The comparison of Polyneices with Alkman concerning loss of country.

At 605c, Plutarch attempts to make capital of the voluntary nature of men such as Thucydides in retiring to write his history, at the same time ignoring the fact that this worthy in Plutarch's narration had, by his own admission, been banished for losing Amphipolis.<sup>2</sup> That he, like Androtion (*PA* 913 Entry 93), chose to pursue a literary career to make the most of his exile does not negate the real issue that *place* was more than geography to Athenians.

In equating exile with loss of *place*, and downgrading the sentiments of those who mourned such a loss, Plutarch has failed to take into account the social and religious significance and importance of such things as the rituals due annually to one's ancestors, the importance of an *oikos* and one's *hetairoi* to the definition of self, not to mention membership of a *genos*, *phyle* and *phratry*.<sup>3</sup> Though this passage may shed some light on how to pass the time in exile, and retains the impression of an exhortation to be of good cheer, Plutarch appears to have provided a somewhat shallow treatment of the real concerns of exiles, and his treatment of the topic is not borne out by the examples in this study.

2. Thuc. V.26

3. Burkert (1985: pp190-203); Kurtz and Boardman (1971: p147); Mikalson (1983: p96); Pusey (1940: p217)

## 5.0 Tables

<b>Table 1</b>	Voluntary Athenian Political Exiles - Alphabetical
<b>Table 2</b>	Voluntary Athenian Political Exiles - Chronological
<b>Table 3</b>	All Athenian Political Exiles - Alphabetical
<b>Table 4</b>	Voluntary Athenian Political Exiles - Sentences <i>in absentia</i>
<b>Table 5</b>	Survival and the Voluntary Athenian Political Exiles
<b>Table 6</b>	Voluntary Exiles : Dates and Destinations
<b>Table 7</b>	Dates of Ostracisms: Certain and Disputed
<b>Table 8</b>	Chronological List of <i>Strategoi</i> as Voluntary Exiles
<b>Table 9</b>	Chronological List of Athenian Voluntary Political Exiles: Return and Recall
<b>Table 10</b>	Voluntary Athenian Political Exiles: Family in Exile



**Table 1**  
**Voluntary Athenian Political Exiles - Alphabetical**

## Voluntary Athenian Political Exiles - Alphabetical

Table 1

<i>Name</i>	<i>Patronymic</i>	<i>Deme</i>	<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Tritty</i>	<i>PA No.</i>	<i>AO No.</i>	<i>Exile</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Destination</i>	<i>Entry</i>	<i>Return</i>
Adeimantos	son of Leukolophides	Skambonidai	IV Leontis	City	202	31	Andok. i.16	415		7	407/6
Aischines			?VII Kekropis		341	49	Xen. <i>Hell</i> II.3.2, 3.13	411/10	?Lakonia	61	404/3
Aischines	son of Atrometos	Kothokidai	VI Oineis	Coast	354	51	Plut. <i>Dem</i> 24.2-3	330/29	Rhodes, thence Samos	97	No
Akoumenos					477		Andok. i.18	415		18	n.k.
Alexikles					535	75	Thuc. VIII.98.1	410	?Dekeleia	63	n.k.
Alkibiades	[--]ou	Phegous	I Erechtheis	?Inland	599=601		Xen. <i>Hell</i> I.2.13	415	?Syracuse, Samos	54	No
Alkibiades III	son of Kleinias	Skambonidai	IV Leontis	City	600	84	Thuc. VI.53.1; 61 Xen. <i>Hell</i> I.5.17	415 407	Sparta/Persia Thrace/Persia	55	407/6 No
Alkisthenes					638		Andok. i.35, 52, 67	415		37	n.k.
Amiantos		Aigina			??		Andok. i.65	415		19	n.k.
Andokides IV	son of Leogoras	Kydathenaion	III Pandionis	City	828	139	Lys. vi.25-26; 28; 6-7; Philochoros <i>FGH</i> 328 F149a	414 411/10 405 392/1	Cyprus; Macedon, Samos; Sicily, Italy, Elis, Thessaly, Hellas, Pont, Ionia, Cyprus; ?Cyprus	56	411 405 403 No
Androtion	son of Andron	Gargettios	II Aigeis	Inland	913 = 915	159	Plut. <i>Mor</i> 605d	344/3	Megara	93	n.k.
Antidoros					1022		Andok. i.35, 53, 67	415		38	n.k.
Antiphon					1279		Andok. i.15	415		20	n.k.
Antiphon					1281		Dem. xviii.132-134	346	?Macedon	92	?393

<i>Name</i>	<i>Patronymic</i>	<i>Deme</i>	<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Trittys</i>	<i>PA No.</i>	<i>AO No.</i>	<i>Exile</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Destination</i>	<i>Entry</i>	<i>Return</i>
Anytos	son of Anthemios	Euonymon	I Erechtheis	City	1324	265	Xen. <i>Hell</i> II.3.42	404/3	?Thebes, then Phyle	74	403/2
Apsephion					2806	288	Andok. i.43, 44, 46	415		8	c413
Archebiades					2300		Andok. i.13	415		21	n.k.
Archedemos		Pelekes	IV Leontis	Inland	2326	300	? Xen. <i>Hell</i> I.7.35	406/5	?Dekeleia	67	n.k.
Archidamos					2482		Andok. i.35, 53, 67	415		39	n.k.
Archinos		Koile	VIII Hippothontis	City	2526	347	Dem. xxiv.135 Aisch. ii.176	404/3	Thebes	76	403/2
Archippos					2541		Andok. i.13	415		22	n.k.
Aristarchos	son of Moschos				1656		Aisch. ii.148	348/7		91	n.k.
Aristogeiton	son of Kydimachos				1775	397	Dem. xxv.56	350/49	Megara	90	n.k.
Aristogenes					1781	398	Xen. <i>Hell</i> I.7.2 Diod.XIII.101.5	406/5		64	n.k.
Aristomenes					1993		Andok. i.13	415		23	n.k.
Aristonikos		Marathon	IX Aiantis	Coast	2028		Plut. <i>Dem</i> 27.2-4; <i>Mor</i> 846f	322/1	Aigina	103	No
Aristoteles	?son of Timokrates		X Antiochis		2057=2055		Lys. xii. 43-46, Xen. <i>Hell</i> II.2.18, 3.46	411/10		60	404/3
Atrometos		Kothokidai	VI Oineis	Coast	2681		Aisch. ii.78, 147-8	404/3	Korinth	77	404/3
Autokrator					2745		Andok. i.18	415		24	n.k.
Axiochos	son of Alkibiades	Skambonidai	IV Leontis	City	1330	525	Andok. i.16	415		9	411
Chairedemos	son of Elpios	Ax[			15120		Andok. i.52, 59, 67, 68	415		10	Before 400
Chairephon		Sphettos	V Akamantis	Inland	15203		Plato <i>Apol</i> 21a	404	?Phyle	75	403
Chairion	son of Kledik[os]				15258	600	IG xii.9.296 with APF p13	?415	?Eretria	3	No

<i>Name</i>	<i>Patronymic</i>	<i>Deme</i>	<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Trittyes</i>	<i>PA No.</i>	<i>AO No.</i>	<i>Exile</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Destination</i>	<i>Entry</i>	<i>Return</i>
Chares	son of Theochares	Angele	III Pandionis	Coast	15292	610	Arrian <i>Anab</i> 3.2.6f	338	Mytilene, thence Sigeum	95	n.k.
Charikles	son of Apollodoros	Oineidos	VI Oineis	Coast	15407	644	Lys.xiii.73-74	411/10	?Sparta	58	404/3
Charippos					15464		Andok. i.35, 52, 67	415		40	n.k.
Charmides	son of Aristoteles				15510		Andok. i.16, 47f, 66	415		11	n.k.
Demosthenes	son of Demosthenes	Paiania	III Pandionis	Inland	3597	795	Plut. <i>Dem</i> 26.2  Plut. <i>Dem</i> 29 <i>Mor</i> 846f-847b	323  322/1	Troezen, Aigina, Caleuria; Caleuria	99	322 No
Diakritos					3746		Andok. i.52, 59, 67, 68	415		12	Before 400
Diogenes					3803		Andok. i.13	415		25	n.k.
Diognetos	son of Nikeratos	Kydantidai	II Aigeis	Inland	3863 = 3851	863	Andok. i.14, 15	415		13	n.k.
Epikrates	?son of Philodemos	Kephisia	I Erechtheis	Inland	4859	1042	Philochoros <i>FGrH</i> 328 F149	392/1	?Persia	79	n.k.
Eryximachos	?son of Akoumenos				5187		Andok. i.35, 52, 67	415		41	n.k.
Euboulides	?son of Epikleides	Eleusis	VIII Hippothontis	Coast	5325	1105	Philochoros <i>FGrH</i> 328 F149	392/1		81	n.k.
Euktemon					5871		Andok. i.35, 52	415		42	n.k.
Euphiletos	son of Timotheos	Kydathenaion	III Pandionis	City	6071		Andok. i.35, 52, 56, 61, 67	415		43	n.k.
Eurydamos					5962		Andok. i.35, 52, 67	415		44	n.k.
Eurymachos	son of [Eu				5971		Andok. i.35, 52, 67	415		45	n.k.
Glaukippos					2978		Andok. i.35, 52, 67	415		46	n.k.
Gnipphonides					3058		Andok. i.15	415		26	n.k.

<i>Name</i>	<i>Patronymic</i>	<i>Deme</i>	<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Trittys</i>	<i>PA No.</i>	<i>AO No.</i>	<i>Exile</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Destination</i>	<i>Entry</i>	<i>Return</i>
Gylon		Kerameis	V Akamantis	City	3098	1314	Aisch. iii.171f	410-405	Pantikapeion	57	400-380
Hephaistodoros					6563		Andok. i.15	415		27	n.k.
Himeraios II	son of Phanostratos	Phaleron	IX Aiantis	City	7578	1406	Plut. <i>Dem</i> 27.2-4 <i>Mor</i> 846f	322/1	Aigina	101	No
Hipparchos II	son of Charmos	Kollytos	II Aigeis	City	7600	1408	<i>Ath Pol</i> 22.4 <i>Lyk. Leok</i> 117-118	after 478/7		5	n.k.
Hyperides	son of Glaukippos	Kollytos	II Aigeis	City	13912	1437	Plut. <i>Dem</i> 27.2-4; <i>Mor</i> 846f	322/1	Aigina	102	No
Isonomos					7719		Andok. i.15	415		28	n.k.
Kallimedon	son of Kallikratos	Kollytos	II Aigeis	City	8032		Plut. <i>Dem</i> 27.2 [Aisch] <i>Ep</i> xiii.8	324	Beroia, Macedon	98	n.k.
Kallippos	son of Philon	Aixone	VII Kekropis	Coast	8065	1549	Dem. xxxvi.53	357	Syracuse	86	No
Kallistratos	son of Kallikrates	Aphidna	IX Aiantis	Inland	8157	1564	Hyp. iv.1-2	361	Methone	82	n.k.
Kallixenos					8042	1573	Xen. <i>Hell</i> I.7.35 Diod. XIII.103	406/5	?Dekeleia, or ?Peiraieus	66	?403/2
Konon II	son of Timotheos	Anaphlystos	X Antiochis	Coast	8707	1686	Xen. <i>Hell</i> II.1.29	404	Cyprus	71	?393
Kratinos		Sphettos	V Akamantis	Inland	8757a	1702	Philochoros <i>FGrH</i> 328, F149a	392/1		80	n.k.
Kydimachos					8930		Dein. ii.8, 18	mid 350s	Euboea	87	No
Kylon					8943		Hdt. V.71, Thuc. I.126.10 <i>Ath Pol</i> F8 (Loeb)	632	?Megara	1	n.k.
Leogoras	son of Andokides I				9074	1782	Andok. ii.26	?546	?Sparta	4	511/0
Leokrates					9083		Lyk. i.17-18,55	338/7	Rhodes, Megara	96	331/0
Leosthenes		Kephale	V Akamantis	Coast	9141	1801	Hyp. iv.1-2	361/0	Macedon	83	n.k.

<i>Name</i>	<i>Patronymic</i>	<i>Deme</i>	<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Trittys</i>	<i>PA No.</i>	<i>AO No.</i>	<i>Exile</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Destination</i>	<i>Entry</i>	<i>Return</i>
Lykiskos					9213	1821	?Xen. <i>Hell</i> I.7.35	406/5	?Dekeleia	68	n.k.
Lysistratos					9596		Andok. i.52, 59, 67, 68	415		14	Before 400
Mantitheos					9670	1909	Andok. i.43, 44, 46	415		15	413
Meletos					9825	1951	Andok. i.12, 13, 35, 53, 67	415		29	n.k.
Menekles					9905		Xen. <i>Hell</i> I.7.35	406/5	?Dekeleia	69	n.k.
Menestratos					9993		Andok. i.35, 52, 67	415		47	n.k.
Nikides (Nikiades)	son of Phoinikides	Melite	VII Kekropis	City	10763		Andok. i.13	415		30	n.k.
Nikomachos					10933 = 10934	2140	Lys.xxx.15-16, 20f	404/3	?Phyle, Peiraieus	73	403/2
Nikophemos					11066		Xen. <i>Hell</i> II.1.29	404	Cyprus	72	Pre-390
Oionias	son of Oionocharos	Atene	X Antiochis	Coast	11370		Andok. i.12-13	415		31	n.k.
Onomakles			? VII Kekropis		11476	2211	Plut. <i>Mor</i> 833e-f; 834a with Hansen (1975: pp114f)	410		59	404/3
Panaitios					11567		Andok. i.13, 52, 53, 59, 67, 68	415		16	Before 400
Pantakles					11584		Andok. i.15	415		32	n.k.
Peisandros		Acharnai	VI Oineis	Inland	11770	2281	Thuc. VIII.98.1	410	?Dekeleia, then Persia	62	n.k.
Phaidros	son of Pythokles	Myrrhinous	III Pandionis	Coast	13950 = 13960		Andok. i.15	415	n.k.	17	n.k.
Pheidias	son of Charmides				14149		?Plut. <i>Per</i> 31-32 ?Philochoros <i>FGrH</i> 328 F121	?433/2	Elis	6	No

<i>Name</i>	<i>Patronymic</i>	<i>Deme</i>	<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Trittys</i>	<i>PA No.</i>	<i>AO No.</i>	<i>Exile</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Destination</i>	<i>Entry</i>	<i>Return</i>
Pherekles	son of Ph[ren]ika[ios]	Themakos	I Erechtheis	City	14191		Andok. i.17, 34-36	415		48	n.k.
Philokrates					14573		Andok. i.15	415		33	n.k.
Philokrates	son of Pythodoros	Hagnous	V Akamantis	Inland	14599	2434	Aisch. ii.8	344/3	?Macedon	94	n.k.
Philon	son of Kallipos	Aixone	VII Kekropis	Coast	14825	2450	Hyp. iv.1-2	360/59		84	n.k.
Platon					11846		Andok. i.35, 52, 67	415		49	n.k.
Polyeuktos					11923		Andok. i.35, 52, 67	415		50	n.k.
Poulytion					12154		Andok. i.12, 13, 14	415		34	n.k.
Protomachos					12318	2634	Xen <i>Hell</i> I.7.2 Diod.XIII.101.5	406/5		65	n.k.
Pytheas					12342	2655	Suidas <i>sv</i> Pytheas	323/2	Macedon	100	?321/0
Smindyrides					12800		Andok. i.15	415		35	n.k.
Solon	son of Exekestides				12806	2752	<i>Ath Pol</i> 11.1-2 Hdt. I.29, Plut. <i>Solon</i> 25	?after 570	Egypt, Lydia	2	560s
Teisarchos		?Pallene	?X Antiochis	?Inland	13466		Andok. i.15	415		36	n.k.
Telenikos					13502		Andok. i.35, 52, 67	415		51	n.k.
Theodoros		Phegous	I Erechtheis	?Inland	6826 = 6907		Andok. i.35, 52, 67	415		52	n.k.
Theotimos					7055	2975	Hyp. iv.1-2	360/59		85	n.k.
Timanthes					13607		Andok. i.35, 52, 67	415		53	n.k.
Timokrates					13748	3084	Xen. <i>Hell</i> I.7.35	406/5	?Dekeleia	70	n.k.
Timomachos		Archarnai	VI Oineis	Inland	13797	3097	Hyp. iii.1-2	363-359	n.k.	88	n.k.
Timotheos II	son of Konon II	Anaphlystos	X Antiochos	Coast	13700	3112	Dein. i.14, iii.17	356/5	Chalkis	89	No
Xenophon	son of Gryllos	Erchia	II Aigeis	Inland	11307		Xen. <i>Anab</i> I.1.11, III.1.4; Diog. Laert. II.51-52	403 - 400	Persia, Sparta, Korinth	78	n.k.

## **Table 2**

### **Voluntary Athenian Political Exiles - Chronological**



## Chronological List of Voluntary Athenian Political Exiles

Table 2

Entry No.	Name	Patronymic	Deme	Tribe	Trittys	PA No.	AO No.	Exile	Date	Destination
1	Kylon					8943		Hdt. V.71, Thuc. I.126.10 <i>Ath Pol</i> F8 (Loeb)	632	?Megara
2	Solon	son of Exekestides				12806	2752	<i>Ath Pol</i> 11.1-2 Hdt. I.29 Plut. <i>Solon</i> 25	?after 570	Egypt, Lydia
3	Chairion	son of Kledik[os]				15258	600	<i>IG</i> xii.9.296 with <i>APF</i> p13	?546	
4	Leogoras I	son of Andokides				9074	1782	Andok. ii.26	?546	?Sparta
5	Hipparchos II	son of Charmos	Kollytos	II Aigeis	City	7600	1408	Lyk. <i>Leok</i> 117-118	478/7	
6	Pheidias	son of Charmides				14149		?Plut. <i>Per</i> 31-32 cf ?Philochoros <i>FGrH</i> 328 F121	?433/2	Elis
7	Adeimantos	son of Leukolophides	Skambonidai	IV Leontis	City	202	31	Andok. i.16	415	
18	Akoumenos					477		Andok. i.18	415	
54	Alkibiades	[--]ou	Phegous	I Erechtheis	?Inland	601 = 599		Xen. <i>Hell</i> I.2.13	415	?Syracuse, Samos
55	Alkibiades III	son of Kleinias	Skambonidai	IV Leontis	City	600	84	Thuc. VI.53.1; 61	415/4	Sparta/Persia
37	Alkisthenes					638		Andok. i.35, 52, 67	415	
19	Amiantos		Aigina			?		Andok. i.65	415	
38	Antidoros					1022		Andok. i.35, 52, 67	415	
20	Antiphon					1279		Andok. i.15	415	
8	Apsephion					2806	288	Andok. i.43, 44, 46	415	
21	Archebiades					2300		Andok. i.13	415	

<i>Entry No.</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Patronymic</i>	<i>Deme</i>	<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Tritty</i>	<i>PA No.</i>	<i>AO No.</i>	<i>Exile</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Destination</i>
39	Archidamos					2482		Andok. i.35, 52, 67	415	
22	Archippos					2541		Andok. i.13	415	
23	Aristomenes					1993		Andok. i.13	415	
24	Autokrator					2745		Andok. i.18	415	
9	Axiochos	son of Alkibiades	Skambonidai	IV Leontis	City	1330	525	Andok. i.16	415	
10	Chairedemos	son of Elpios	Ax[			15120		Andok. i.52, 53, 59, 67, 68	415	
40	Charippos					15464		Andok. i.35, 52, 67	415	
11	Charmides	son of Aristoteles				15510		Andok. i.16, 47f, 66	414/3	
12	Diakritos					3746		Andok. i.52, 59, 67, 68	415	
25	Diogenes					3803		Andok. i.13	415	
13	Diognetos	son of Nikeratos	Kydantidai	II Aigeis	Inland	3863 = 3851	863	Andok. i.14, 15	415	
41	Eryximachos	?son of Akoumenos				5187		Andok. i.35, 52, 67	415	
42	Euktemon					5781		Andok. i. 35, 52	415	
43	Euphiletos	son of Timotheos	Kydathenaion	III Pandionis	City	6071		Andok. i.35, 52, 56, 61, 67	415	
44	Eurydamas					5962		Andok. i.35, 52, 67	415	
45	Eurymachos	son of [Eu				5971		Andok. i.35, 52, 67	415	
46	Glaukippos					2978		Andok. i.35, 52, 67	415	
26	Gniphonides					3058		Andok. i.15	415	
27	Hephaistodoros					6563		Andok. i.15	415	

<i>Entry No.</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Patronymic</i>	<i>Deme</i>	<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Trittys</i>	<i>PA No.</i>	<i>AO No.</i>	<i>Exile</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Destination</i>
28	Isonomos					7719		Andok. i.15	415	
14	Lysistratos					9596		Andok. i.52, 53, 59, 67, 68	415	
15	Mantitheos					9670	1909	Andok. i.43, 44, 46	415	
29	Meletos					9825	1951	Andok. i.12, 13, 35, 52, 67	415	
47	Menestratos					9993		Andok. i.35, 52, 67	415	
30	Nikides (Nikiades)	son of Phoinikides	Melite	VII Kekropis	City	10763		Andok. i.13	415	
31	Oionias	son of Oionocharos	Atene	X Antiochis	Coast	11370		Andok. i. 12-13	415	
16	Panaitios					11567		Andok. i.13 52, 53, 59, 67, 68	415	
32	Pantakles					11584		Andok. i.15	415	
17	Phaidros	son of Pythokles	Myrrhinous	III Pandionis	Coast	13960 = 13950		Andok. i.15	415	
48	Pherekles	son of Ph[ren]ika[ios]	Themakos	I Erechteis	City	14191 = 14194		Andok. i.17, 34-36	415	
33	Philokrates					14573		Andok. i.15	415	
49	Platon					11846		Andok. i.35, 52, 67	415	
50	Polyeuktos					11923		Andok. i.35, 52, 67	415	
34	Poulytion					12154		Andok. i.12-14	415	
35	Smindyrides					12800		Andok. i.15	415	
36	Teisarchos		?Pallene	?X Antiochis	?Inland	13466		Andok. i.15	415	
51	Telenikos					13502		Andok. i.35, 52, 67	415	
52	Theodoros		Phegous	I Erechtheis	?Inland	6826 = 6907		Andok. i.35, 52, 67	415	

<i>Entry No.</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Patronymic</i>	<i>Deme</i>	<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Trittys</i>	<i>PA No.</i>	<i>AO No.</i>	<i>Exile</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Destination</i>
53	Timanthes					13607		Andok. i.35, 52, 67	415	
56	Andokides IV	son of Leogoras	Kydathenaion	III Pandionis	City	828	139	Lys.vi.25-26; 28; 6-7; Philochoros <i>FGrH</i> 328 F149a	414 411/10 405 392/1	Cyprus; Macedon, Samos; Sicily, Italy, Elis, Thessaly, Hellespont, Ionia, Cyprus; ?Cyprus
57	Gylon		Kerameis	V Akamantis	City	3098	1314	Aisch. iii.171f	410-405	Pantikapeion
58	Charikles	son of Apollodoros	Oineidos	VI Oineis	Coast	15407	644	Lys.xiii.73-74	411/10	?Sparta
59	Onomakles			?VII Kekropis		11476	2211	Plut. <i>Mor</i> 833e-f, 834a with Hansen (1975: pp114f)	410	
60	Aristoteles	?son of Timokrates		X Antiochis		2057 =2055		Lys.xii.43-46, Xen. <i>Hell</i> II.2.18, 3.46	411/10	?Lakonia with Lysander
61	Aischines			? VII Kekropis		341	49	Xen. <i>Hell</i> II.3.2, 3.13	411/10	?Lakonia with Lysander
62	Peisandros		Acharnai	VI Oineis	Inland	11770	2281	Thuc. VIII.98.1	410	?Dekeleia, then Persia
63	Alexikles					535	75	Thuc. VIII.98.1	410	Dekeleia
64	Aristogenes					1781	398	Xen. <i>Hell</i> I.7.2 Diod.XIII.101.5	406/5	
65	Protomachos					12318	2634	Xen <i>Hell</i> I.7.2 Diod.XIII.101.5	406/5	
66	Kallixenos					8042	1573	Xen. <i>Hell</i> I.7.35 Diod. XIII.103	406/5	?Dekeleia, or ?Peiraieus
67	Archedemos		Pelekes	IV Leontis	Inland	2326	300	? Xen. <i>Hell</i> I.7.35	406/5	?Dekeleia
68	Lykiskos					9213	1821	?Xen. <i>Hell</i> I.7.35	406/5	?Dekeleia
69	Menekles					9905		Xen. <i>Hell</i> I.7.35	406/5	?Dekeleia

<i>Entry No.</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Patronymic</i>	<i>Deme</i>	<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Trittys</i>	<i>PA No.</i>	<i>AO No.</i>	<i>Exile</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Destination</i>
70	Timokrates					13748	3084	Xen. <i>Hell</i> I.7.35	406/5	?Dekeleia
71	Konon II	son of Timotheos I	Anaphlystos	X Antiochis	Coast	8707	1686	Xen. <i>Hell</i> II.1.29	404	Cyprus
72	Nikophemos					11066		Xen. <i>Hell</i> II.1.29	404	Cyprus
73	Nikomachos					10933 =10934	2140	Lys.xxx.15-16; 20f	404/3	?Phyle, Piraeus
74	Anytos	son of Anthemios	Euonymon	I Erechtheis	City	1324	265	Xen. <i>Hell</i> II.3.42	404/3	?Thebes, then Phyle
75	Chairephon		Sphettos	V Akamantis	Inland	15203		Plato <i>Apol</i> 21a	404	?Phyle
76	Archinos		Koile	VIII Hippothontis	City	2526	347	Dem. xxiv.135 Aisch. ii.176	4043	Thebes
77	Atrometos		Kothokidai	VI Oineis	Coast	2681		Aisch. ii.78, 147-8	404/3	Korinth
78	Xenophon	son of Gryllos	Erchia	II Aigeis	Inland	11307		Xen. <i>Anab</i> I.1.11, III.1.4; Diog. Laert. II.51-52	403 - 400	Persia/Sparta
79	Epikrates	?son of Philodemos	Kephisia	I Erechtheis	Inland	4859	1042	Philochoros <i>FGrH</i> 328 F149	392/1	?Persia
80	Kratinos		Sphettos	V Akamantis	Inland	8757a	1702	Philochoros <i>FGrH</i> 328 F149a	392/1	
81	Euboulides	?son of Epikleides	Eleusis	VIII Hippothontis	Coast	5325	1105	Philochoros <i>FGrH</i> 328 F149a	392/1	
82	Kallistratos	son of Kallikrates	Aphidna	IX Aiantis	Inland	8157	1564	Hyp. iv.1-2	361	Methone
83	Leosthenes		Kephale	V Akamantis	Coast	9141	1801	Hyp. iv.1-2	361/60	Macedon
84	Philon	son of Kallipos	Aixone	VII Kekropis	Coast	14825	2450	Hyp. iv.1-2	360/59	
85	Theotimos					7055	2975	Hyp. iv.1-2	360/59	
86	Kallipos II	son of Philon	Aixone	VII Kekropis	Coast	8065	1549	Dem. xxxvi.53	357	Syracuse
87	Kydimachos					8930		Dein. II.8, 18	mid-350s	Euboea

<i>Entry No.</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Patronymic</i>	<i>Deme</i>	<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Trittys</i>	<i>PA No.</i>	<i>AO No.</i>	<i>Exile</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Destination</i>
88	Timomachos		Archarnai	VI Oineis	Inland	13797	3097	Hyp.iii.1-2	363-359	n.k.
89	Timotheos II	son of Konon II	Anaphlystos	X Antiochis	Coast	13700	3112	Dein. i.14, iii.17	356/5	Chalkis
90	Aristogeiton	son of Kydimachos				1775	397	Dem. xxv.56	350/49	Megara
91	Aristarchos	son of Moschos				1656		Aisch. ii.148	348/7	
92	Antiphon					1281		Dem. xviii.132-134	346	?Macedon
93	Androtion	son of Andron	Gargettios	II Aigeis	Inland	913=915	159	Plut <i>Mor</i> 605d	344/3	Megara
94	Philokrates	son of Pythodoros	Hagnous	V Akamantis	Inland	14599	2434	Aisch. ii.8	344/3	?Macedon
95	Chares	son of Theochares	Angele	III Pandionis	Coast	15292	610	Arrian <i>Anab</i> 3.2.6f	338	Mytilene, thence Sigeum
96	Leokrates					9083		Lyk i.17-18,55	338/7	Rhodes, Megara
97	Aischines	son of Atrometos	Kothokidai	VI Oineis	Coast	354	51	Plut. <i>Dem</i> 24.2-3	330/29	Rhodes
98	Kallimedon	son of Kallikratos	Kollytos	II Aigeis	City	8032		Plut. <i>Dem</i> 27.1-2 [Aisch] <i>Ep</i> xiii.8	324	Beroia, Macedon
99	Demosthenes	son of Demosthenes	Paiania	III Pandionis	Inland	3597	795	Plut. <i>Dem</i> 26.2	323	Troezen, Aigina, Caleuria
100	Pytheas					12342	2655	Suidas <i>sv</i> Pytheas	323/2	Macedon
101	Himeraios II	son of Phanostratos	Phaleron	IX Aiantis	City	7578	1406	Plut. <i>Dem</i> 27.2-4 <i>Mor</i> 846f	322/1	Aigina
102	Hyperides	son of Glaukippon	Kollytos	II Aigeis	City	13912	1437	Plut. <i>Dem</i> 27.2-4 <i>Mor</i> 846f	322/1	Aigina
103	Aristonikos		Marathon	IX Aiantis	Coast	2028		Plut. <i>Dem</i> 27.2-4 <i>Mor</i> 846f	322/1	Aigina

### **Table 3**

#### **All Athenian Political Exiles - Alphabetical**

### All Athenian Political Exiles - Alphabetical

Table 3

<i>Name</i>	<i>Patronymic</i>	<i>Deme</i>	<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Trittys</i>	<i>PA No.</i>	<i>AO No.</i>	<i>Exile</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Destination</i>	<i>Entry</i>
Adeimantos	son of Leukolophides	Skambonidai	IV Leontis	City	202	31	Andok. i.16	415		7
Aischines			?VII Kekropis	Inland	341	49	Xen. <i>Hell</i> II.3.2, 3.13	411/10	?Lakonia and with Lysander	61
Aischines	son of Atrometos	Kothokidai	VI Oineis	Coast	354	51	Plut. <i>Dem</i> 24.2-3	330/29	Rhodes, thence Samos	97
Akoumenos					477		Andok. i.18	415		18
Alexikles					535	75	Thuc. VIII.98.1	410	Dekeleia	63
Alkibiades	[--]ou	Phegous	I Erechtheis	?Inland	601 = ?599		Xen. <i>Hell</i> I.2.13	415	?Syracuse, Samos	54
Alkibiades II	son of Kleinias	Skambonidai	IV Leontis	City	597	83	Lys. xiv.39; [And]iv.34	461/0		n.a.
Alkibiades III	son of Kleinias	Skambonidai	IV Leontis	City	600	84	Thuc. VI.53.1;61 Xen. <i>Hell</i> I.5.17	415 407	Sparta/Persia Thrace/Persia	55
Alkibiades IV	son of Alkibiades	Skambonidai	IV Leontis	City	598		Isok. xvi.45-46; Lys. xiv.39f	404/3		n.a
Alkisthenes					638		Andok. i.35, 52,67	415		37
Amiantos		Aigina			?Athenian		Andok. i.65	415		19
Andokides IV	son of Leogoras	Kydathenaion	III Pandionis	City	828	139	Lys. vi.25-26; 28; 6-7; Philochoros <i>FGrH</i> 328 F149a	414 411/10 405 392/1	Cyprus; Macedon, Samos; Sicily, Italy, Elis, Thessaly, Hellespont, Ionia, Cyprus; ?Cyprus	56



<i>Name</i>	<i>Patronymic</i>	<i>Deme</i>	<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Trittys</i>	<i>PA No.</i>	<i>AO No.</i>	<i>Exile</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Destination</i>	<i>Entry</i>
Androtion	son of Andron	Gargettios	II Aigeis	Inland	913 = 915	159	Plut. <i>Mor</i> 605d	344/3	Megara	93
Antidoros					1022		Andok. i.35, 53, 67	415		38
Antiphon					1279		Andok. i.15	415		20
Antiphon					1281		Dem. xviii.132-134	346	?Macedon	92
Anytos	son of Anthemios	Euonymon	I Erechtheis	City	1324	265	Xen. <i>Hell</i> II.3.42	404/3	?Thebes, then Phyle	74
Apsephion					2806	288	Andok. i.43, 44, 46	415		8
Archebiades					2300		Andok. i.13	415		21
Archedemos		Pelekes	IV Leontis	Inland	2326	300	? Xen. <i>Hell</i> I.7.35	406/5	?Dekeleia	67
Archidamos					2582		Andok. i.35, 53, 67	415		39
Archinos		Koile	VIII Hippothontis	City	2526	347	Dem. xxiv.135 Aisch. ii.176	404/3	Thebes	76
Archippos					2541		Andok. i.13	415		22
Aristarchos	son of Moschos				1656		Aisch. ii.148	348/7		91
Aristeides	son of Lysimachos	Alopeke	X Antiochis	City	1695	371	Hdt. VIII.79.1; <i>Ath Pol</i> 22.7; Plut. <i>Them</i> 5.5, <i>Arist</i> 7, 25.7	483/2		n.a.
Aristogeiton	son of Kydimachos				1775	397	Dem. xxv.56	350/49	Megara	90
Aristogenes					1781	398	Xen. <i>Hell</i> I.7.2 Diod. XIII.101.5	406/5		64
Aristodemos		Bate	I Aigeis	City	1812	390	Plut. <i>Mor</i> 41a-b	?411/10		n.a.
Aristomenes					1993		Andok. i.13	415		23
Aristonikos		Marathon	IX Aiantis	Coast	2028		Plut. <i>Dem</i> 27.2-4; <i>Mor</i> 846f	322/1	Aigina	103

<i>Name</i>	<i>Patronymic</i>	<i>Deme</i>	<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Trittys</i>	<i>PA No.</i>	<i>AO No.</i>	<i>Exile</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Destination</i>	<i>Entry</i>
Aristoteles	?son of Timokrates		X Antiochis		2057 = 2055		Lys. xii. 43-46, Xen. <i>Hell</i> II.2.18, 3.46	411/10		60
Atrometos		Kothokidai	VI Oineis	Coast	2681		Aisch. ii.78, 147-8	404/3	Korinth	77
Autokrator					2745		Andok. i.18	415		24
Axiochos	son of Alkibiades	Skambonidai	IV Leontis	City	1330	525	Andok. i.16	415		9
Chairedemos	son of Elpios	Ax[			15120		Andok. i.52, 59, 67, 68	415		10
Chairephon		Sphettos	V Akamantis	Inland	15203		Plato <i>Apol</i> 21a	404	?Phyle	75
Chairion	son of Kledik[os]				15258	600	<i>IG</i> xii.9.296 with <i>APF</i> p13	?546	Eretria	3
Charippos					15464		Andok. i.35, 52, 67	415		40
Charidemos	son of [Phil]oxenos	Archarnai	VI Oineis	Inland	15380	637	Arrian I.10.6	336/5	Persia	n.a.
Chares	son of Theochares	Angele	III Pandionis	Coast	15292	610	Arrian <i>Anab</i> 3.2.6f	338	Mytilene, thence Sigeum	95
Charikles	son of Apollodoros	Oineidos	VI Oineis	Coast	15407	644	Lys.xiiiI.73-74	411/10	?Sparta	58
Charmides	son of Aristoteles				15510		Andok. i.16, 47f, 66	415 - 413		11
Damon	son of Damonides	?Oe	?VI Oineis	?Coast	3143		<i>Ath Pol</i> 27.4; Plut. <i>Arist</i> 1.7-8, <i>Per</i> 4.1-2, <i>Nik</i> 6.1	440s		n.a.
Demosthenes	son of Demosthenes	Paiania	III Pandionis	Inland	3597	795	Plut. <i>Dem</i> 26.2  Plut. <i>Dem</i> 29 <i>Mor</i> 846f-847b	323  322/1	Troezen, Aigina, Caleuria; Caleuria	99
Diakritos					3746		Andok. i. 52, 59, 67, 68	415		12
Diogenes					3803		Andok. i.13	415		25

<i>Name</i>	<i>Patronymic</i>	<i>Deme</i>	<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Trittys</i>	<i>PA No.</i>	<i>AO No.</i>	<i>Exile</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Destination</i>	<i>Entry</i>
Diognetos	son of Nikeratos	Kydantidai	II Aigeis	Inland	3863 = 3851	863	Andok. i.15	415		13
Epikrates	?son of Philodemos	Kephisia	I Erechtheis	Inland	4859	1042	Philochoros <i>FGH</i> 328 F149	392/1	?Persia	79
Eryximachos					5187		Andok. i.35, 52, 67	415		41
Euboulides	son of Epikleides	Eleusis	VIII Hipponthontis	Coast	5325	1105	Philochoros <i>FGH</i> 328 F149	392/1		81
Euktemon					5781		Andok. i.35, 52	415		42
Eurydamos					5962		Andok. i.35, 52, 67	415		44
Eurymachos	son of [Eu				5971		Andok. i.35, 52, 67	415		45
Euphiletos	son of Timotheos	Kydathenaion	III Pandionis	City	6071		Andok. i.35, 52, 56, 61, 67	415		43
Glaukippos					2978		Andok. i.35, 52, 67	415		46
Gniphonides					3058		Andok. i.15	415		26
Gylon		Kerameis	V Akamantis	City	3098	1314	Aisch. iii.171f	410-405	Pantikapeion	57
Hephaistodoros					6563		Andok. ii.15	415		27
Himeraios II	son of Phanostratos	Phaleron	IX Aiantis	City	7578	1406	Plut. <i>Dem</i> 27.2-4 <i>Mor</i> 846f	322	Aigina	101
Hipparchos II	son of Charmos	Kollytos	II Aigeis	City	7600	1408	<i>Ath Pol</i> 22.4 <i>Lyk. Leok</i> 117-118	488/7 478/7		5
Hippias	son of Peisistratos				7605	1410	Hdt. V.62-65.5	511/10	Sigeum	n.a.
Hyperbolos	son of Antiphanos	Perithoidai	VI Oineis	City	13910	1436	Plut. <i>Nik</i> 11, <i>Alk</i> 13	417/6 or 416/5	Samos	n.a.
Hyperides	son of Glaukippos	Kollytos	II Aegeis	City	13912	1437	Plut. <i>Dem</i> 27.2-4; <i>Mor</i> 846f	322/1	Aigina	102
Isagoras	son of Teisandros				7680	1450	Hdt. V.74	508	?Sparta	n.a.
Isonomos					7719		Andok. i.15	415		28

<i>Name</i>	<i>Patronymic</i>	<i>Deme</i>	<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Trittys</i>	<i>PA No.</i>	<i>AO No.</i>	<i>Exile</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Destination</i>	<i>Entry</i>
Kallias	son of Didymos				7823		[Andok] iv.32	440s		n.a.
Kallimedon	son of Kallikratos	Kollytos	II Aigeis	City	8032		Plut. <i>Dem</i> 27.1-2 [Aisch] <i>Ep</i> xiii.8	324	Beroia, Macedon	98
Kallipos II	son of Philon	Aixone	VII Kekropis	Coast	8065	1549	Hyp. iv.1-2	357	Syracuse	86
Kallixenos	son of Aristonymous	Xypete	VII Kekropis	City	8040		Phillips (1982: p28 E2.1, n50)	484/3		n.a.
Kallixenos					8042	1573	Diod. XIII.103 Xen. <i>Hell</i> I.7.35	406/5	?Dekeleia, or ?Peiraieus	66
Kallistratos	son of Kallikrates	Aphidna	IX Aiantis	Inland	8157	1564	Hyp. iv.1-2	361	Methone	82
Kimon (I)	son of Stesagoras				8426		Hdt. VI.103	536		n.a.
Kimon (II)	son of Miltiades	Lakiadai	VI Oineis	City	8429	1619	Plut <i>Kim</i> 17.2, <i>Per</i> 9.4; Andok.iii.1.3	462/1		n.a.
Kleisthenes	son of Megakles	Alopeke	X Antiochis	City	8526	1640	Hdt.V.72.1	524/3		n.a.
Konon II	son of Timotheos I	Anaphlystos	X Antiochis	Coast	8707	1686	Xen. <i>Hell</i> II.1.29	404	Cyprus	71
Kratinos		Sphettos	V Akamantis	Inland	8757a	1702	Philochoros <i>FGRH</i> 328 F149a	392/1		80
Kritias	son of Kallaischros				8792	1709	Xen. <i>Hell</i> II.3.36	?408/7	Thessaly	n.a.
Kydimachos					8930		Dein. ii.8, 18	mid 350s	Euboea	87
Kylon					8943		Thuc. I.126.10 <i>Ath Pol</i> F8 (Loeb)	632	?Megara	1
Leogoras I	son of Andokides I				9074	1782	Andok. ii.26	?546	?Sparta	4
Leokrates					9083		Lyk .i.17-18,55	338/7	Rhodes, Megara	96
Leosthenes		Kephale	V Akamantis	Coast	9141	1801	Hyp.iv.1-2	361/0	Macedon	83
Lykiskos					9213	1821	?Xen. <i>Hell</i> I.7.35	406/5	?Dekeleia	68

<i>Name</i>	<i>Patronymic</i>	<i>Deme</i>	<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Trittys</i>	<i>PA No.</i>	<i>AO No.</i>	<i>Exile</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Destination</i>	<i>Entry</i>
Lykon		Thorikos	V Akamantis	Coast	9271 = 9267		Diog. Laert. II.38, 43; Plato <i>Apol</i> 23e with schol, 36a	after 399		n.a.
Lysistratos					9596		Andok. i.52, 59, 67, 68	415		14
Mantitheos					9670	1909	Andok. i.43, 44, 46	415		15
Megakles	son of Hippokrates	Alopeke	X Antiochos	City	9695	1917	<i>Ath Pol</i> 22.5	487/6		n.a.
Meletos					9825	1951	Andok. i.12, 13, 35, 53, 67	415		29
Menekles					9905		Xen. <i>Hell</i> 1.7.35	406/5	?Dekeleia	69
Menestratos					9993		Andok. i.35, 52, 67	415		47
Menon	Menekleides	Gargettos	II Aigeis	Inland	?10066	1990	Hesychios <i>sv</i> <i>Menonidai</i>	?470s - 450s		n.a.
Nikides (Nikiades)	son of Phoinikides	Melite	VII Kekropis	City	10763		Andok. i.13	415		30
Nikomachos					10933 =10934	2140	Lys.xxx.15	404/3	?Phyle, Peiraieus	73
Nikophemos					11066		Xen. <i>Hell</i> II.1.29	404	Cyprus	72
Oionias	son of Oionocharos	Atene	X Antiochis	Coast	11370		Andok. i.12-13, 19.8	415		31
Onomakles			? VII Kekropis		11476	2211	Plut. <i>Mor</i> 833e-f, 834a with Hansen (1975: pp114f)	410		59
Panaitios					11567		Andok. i.13, 52, 59, 67, 68	415		16
Pantakles					11584		Andok. i.15	415		32
Peisandros		Acharnai	VI Oineis	Inland	11770	2281	Thuc. VIII.98.1	410	Dekeleia, Persia	62

<i>Name</i>	<i>Patronymic</i>	<i>Deme</i>	<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Trittys</i>	<i>PA No.</i>	<i>AO No.</i>	<i>Exile</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Destination</i>	<i>Entry</i>
Peisistratos	son of Hippokrates				11793	2286	Hdt I.60.1; I.61.2	563-561/0 556	?; Eretria	n.a.
Phaidros	son of Pythokles	Myrrhinous	III Pandionis	Coast	13960 = 13950		Andok. i.15	415		17
Pheidias	son of Charmides				14149		?Plut. <i>Per</i> 31-32 ?Philochoros <i>FGRH</i> 328 F121	?433/3	Elis	6
Pherekles	son of Ph[ren]ika[ios]	Themakos	I Erechtheis	City	14191 = 14194		Andok. i.17, 34-36	415		48
Philokrates					14573		Andok. i.15	415		33
Philokrates	son of Pythodoros	Hagnous	V Akamantis	Inland	14599	2434	Aisch. ii.8	344/3	?Macedon	94
Philon	son of Kallipos	Aixone	VII Kekropis	Coast	14825	2450	Hyp. iv.1-2	360/59		84
Platon					11846		Andok. i.35, 52. 67	415		49
Polyeuktos					11923		Andok. i.35, 52, 67	415		50
Poulytion					12154		Andok. i.12-24	415		34
Protomachos					12318	2634	Xen <i>Hell</i> I.7.2 Diod.XIII.101.5	406/5		65
Pytheas					12342	2655	Suidas sv Pytheas	323/2	Macedon	100
Smindyrides					12800		Andok. i.15	415		35
Solon	son of Exekestides				12806	2752	<i>Ath Pol</i> 11.1-2 Hdt.I.29 Plut. <i>Solon</i> 25	disputed, after 570	Egypt, Lydia	2
Teisarchos		?Pallene	?X Antiochis	?Inland	13466		Andok. i.15	415		36
Telenikos					13502		Andok. i.35, 52, 67	415		51
Themistokles	son of Neokles	Phrearrhoi	IV Leontis	Coast	6669	2901	Thuc. I.135.3; Plut. <i>Them</i> 22-23; Diod. XI.55.1-3	474-471/0	Persia	n.a.

<i>Name</i>	<i>Patronymic</i>	<i>Deme</i>	<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Tritty</i>	<i>PA No.</i>	<i>AO No.</i>	<i>Exile</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Destination</i>	<i>Entry</i>
Theodoros		Phegous	I Erechtheis	?Inland	6826=6907		Andok. i.35, 52, 67	,415		52
Theotimos					7055	2975	Hyp. iv.1-2	360/59		85
Thucydides	son of Melesias	Alopeke	X Antiochos	City	7268	3028	<i>FGrH</i> 324 F37; <i>FGrH</i> 115 F91; <i>FGrH</i> 328 F120; Plut. <i>Per</i> 14.2, 16.3	444/3		n.a.
Thucydides	son of Oloros	Halimous	IV Leontis	City	7267	3052	Thuc. V.26	424/3	?Thrace	n.a.
Thrasyboulos	son of Lykos	Steiria	III Pandionis	Coast	7310	3033	Xen. <i>Hell</i> II.3.42	404/3	Thebes, Phyle	n.a.
Timanthes					13607		Andok. i.35, 52, 67	,415		53
Timokrates					13748	3084	Xen. <i>Hell</i> I.7.35	406/5	?Dekeleia	70
Timomachos		Archarnai	VI Oineis	Inland	13797	3097	Hyp. iii.1-2	,363-359	n.k.	88
Timotheos	son of Konon II	Anaphlystos	X Antiochos	Coast	13700	3112	Dein. i.14, iii.17	356/5	Chalkis	89
Xanthippos	son of Aripbron	Cholargos	V Akamantis	City	11169	3128	<i>Ath Pol</i> 22.6	485/4		n.a.
Xenophon	son of Gryllos	Erchia	II Aigeis	Inland	11307		Xen. <i>Anab</i> I.1.11, III.1.4; Diog. Laert. II.51-52	,403- 400	Persia, Sparta, Korinth	79

## **Table 4**

**Voluntary Athenian Political Exiles - Sentences *in absentia***



## Voluntary Athenian Political Exiles - Sentences *in absentia*

Table 4

<i>Name</i>	<i>Patronymic</i>	<i>PA No./ Entry No</i>	<i>AO No.</i>	<i>Sentences in absentia</i>
Adeimantos	son of Leukolophides	202 7	31	death <i>in absentia</i> , commuted to exile, confiscation of property
Aischines		341 97	49	presumed death <i>in absentia</i>
Akoumenos		477 = 478 18		death <i>in absentia</i> , commuted to exile, confiscation of property
Alexikles		535 63	75	presumed death <i>in absentia</i>
Alkibiades	[--]ou	601 = ?599 54		death <i>in absentia</i> , commuted to exile, confiscation of property
Alkibiades III	son of Kleinias	600 55	84	death <i>in absentia</i> , commuted to exile, confiscation of property
Alkisthenes		638 37		death <i>in absentia</i> , commuted to exile, confiscation of property
Amiantos		?? 19		death <i>in absentia</i> , commuted to exile, confiscation of property
Andokides IV	son of Leogoras	828 56	139	death <i>in absentia</i>
Antidoros		1022 38		death <i>in absentia</i> , commuted to exile, confiscation of property
Antiphon		1279 20		death <i>in absentia</i> , commuted to exile, confiscation of property
Antiphon		1281 92		death <i>in absentia</i> , commuted to exile, confiscation of property
Anytos	son of Anthemios	1324 74	265	?confiscation of property by the Thirty
Apsephion		2806 8	288	death <i>in absentia</i> , commuted to exile, confiscation of property
Archebiades		2300 21		death <i>in absentia</i> , commuted to exile, confiscation of property
Archedemos		2326 67	300	presumed death <i>in absentia</i>
Archidamos		2482 39		death <i>in absentia</i> , commuted to exile, confiscation of property
Archinos		2526 76	347	Presumed death <i>in absentia</i>
Archippos		2541 22		death <i>in absentia</i> , commuted to exile, confiscation of property
Aristogenes		1781 64	398	death <i>in absentia</i>

<i>Name</i>	<i>Patronymic</i>	<i>PA No./ Entry No</i>	<i>AO No.</i>	<i>Sentences in absentia</i>
Aristomenes		1993 23		death <i>in absentia</i> , commuted to exile, confiscation of property
Aristoteles	?son of Timokrates	2057 = 2055 60		presumed death <i>in absentia</i>
Atrometos		2681 77		confiscation of property by the Thirty
Autokrator		2745 24		death <i>in absentia</i> , commuted to exile, confiscation of property
Axiochos	son of Alkibiades	1330 9	525	death <i>in absentia</i> , commuted to exile, confiscation of property
Chairedemos	son of Elpios	15120 10		death <i>in absentia</i> , commuted to exile, confiscation of property
Chairephon		15203 75		presumed death <i>in absentia</i>
Charippos		15464 40		death <i>in absentia</i> , commuted to exile, confiscation of property
Chares	son of Theochares	15292 95	610	?confiscation of property, later reinstated
Charikles	son of Apollodoros	15407 58	644	presumed death <i>in absentia</i>
Charmides	son of Aristoteles	15510 11		death <i>in absentia</i> , commuted to exile, confiscation of property
Demosthenes	son of Demosthenes	3597 99	795	commuted to state service to enable his recall
Diakritos		3746 12		death <i>in absentia</i> , commuted to exile, confiscation of property
Diogenes		3803 25		death <i>in absentia</i> , commuted to exile, confiscation of property
Diognetos	son of Nikeratos	3863 = 3851 13	863	death <i>in absentia</i> , commuted to exile, confiscation of property
Epikrates	?son of Philodemos	4859 79	1042	death <i>in absentia</i>
Eryximachos	son of Akoumenos	5187 41		death <i>in absentia</i> , commuted to exile, confiscation of property
Eubolides	son of Epikleides	5325 81	1105	death <i>in absentia</i>
Euktemon		5871 42		death <i>in absentia</i> , commuted to exile, confiscation of property
Euphiletos	son of Timotheos	6071 43		death <i>in absentia</i> , commuted to exile, confiscation of property
Eurydamos		5962 44		death <i>in absentia</i> , commuted to exile, confiscation of property
Eurymachos	son of [Eu]	5971 45		death <i>in absentia</i> , commuted to exile, confiscation of property

<i>Name</i>	<i>Patronymic</i>	<i>PA No / Entry No.</i>	<i>AO No.</i>	<i>Sentences in absentia</i>
Gniphonides		3058 26		death <i>in absentia</i> , commuted to exile, confiscation of property
Gylon		3098 57	1314	death <i>in absentia</i> , commuted to a fine
Hephaistodoros		6563 27		death <i>in absentia</i> , commuted to exile, confiscation of property
Himeraios II	son of Phanostratos	7578 101	1406	?death <i>in absentia</i>
Hipparchos II	son of Charmos	7600 5	1408	death <i>in absentia</i>
Isonomos		7719 28		death <i>in absentia</i> , commuted to exile, confiscation of property
Kallimedon	son of Kallikratos	8032 98		presumed death <i>in absentia</i>
Kallipos II	son of Philon	8065 86	1549	presumed death <i>in absentia</i>
Kallistratos	son of Kallikrates	8157 82	1564	presumed death <i>in absentia</i>
Kallixenos		8042 66	1573	presumed death <i>in absentia</i>
Kratinos		8757a 80	1702	death <i>in absentia</i>
Konon II	son of Timotheos	8707 71	1686	?confiscation of property
Leogoras	son of Andokides	9074 4	1782	?confiscation of property
Leokrates		9083 96		presumed death <i>in absentia</i>
Leosthenes		9141 83	1801	death <i>in absentia</i> , confiscation of property
Lykiskos		9213	1821	presumed death <i>in absentia</i>
Lysistratos		9596 68		death <i>in absentia</i> , commuted to exile, confiscation of property
Mantitheos		9670 15	1909	death <i>in absentia</i> , commuted to exile, confiscation of property
Meletos		9825 29	1951	death <i>in absentia</i> , commuted to exile, confiscation of property
Menekles		9905 69		presumed death <i>in absentia</i>
Menestratos		9993 47		death <i>in absentia</i> , commuted to exile, confiscation of property
Nikides (Nikiades)	son of Phoinikides	10763 30		death <i>in absentia</i> , commuted to exile, confiscation of property
Nikomachos		10933 =10934 73	2140	?confiscation of property

<i>Name</i>	<i>Patronymic</i>	<i>PA No.</i>	<i>AO No.</i>	<i>Sentences in absentia</i>
Nikophemos		11066 72		?confiscation of property
Oionias	son of Oionocharos	11370 31		death <i>in absentia</i> , commuted to exile, confiscation of property
Onomakles		11476 59	2211	death <i>in absentia</i> , confiscation of property, hereditary <i>atimia</i> , no burial in Attika
Panaitios		11567 16		death <i>in absentia</i> , commuted to exile, confiscation of property
Pantakles		11584 32		death <i>in absentia</i> , commuted to exile, confiscation of property
Peisandros		11770 62	2281	presumed death <i>in absentia</i>
Phaidros	son of Pythekles	13960 = 13950 17		death <i>in absentia</i> , commuted to exile, confiscation of property
Pheidias	son of Charmides	14149 6		presumed death <i>in absentia</i> or at least confiscation of property
Pherekles	son of Ph[ren]ika[ios]	14191 = 14194 48		death <i>in absentia</i> , commuted to exile, confiscation of property
Philokrates		14573 33		death <i>in absentia</i> , commuted to exile, confiscation of property
Philokrates	son of Pythodoros	14599 94	2434	death <i>in absentia</i> , confiscation of property
Philon	son of Kallipos	14825 84	2450	presumed death <i>in absentia</i>
Platon		11846 49		death <i>in absentia</i> , commuted to exile, confiscation of property
Polyeuktos		11923 50		death <i>in absentia</i> , commuted to exile, confiscation of property
Poulytion		12154 34		death <i>in absentia</i> , commuted to exile, confiscation of property
Protomachos		12318 65	2634	death <i>in absentia</i>
Pytheas		12342 100	2655	presumed death <i>in absentia</i>
Smindyrides		12800 35		death <i>in absentia</i> , commuted to exile, confiscation of property
Teisarchos		13466 36		death <i>in absentia</i> , commuted to exile, confiscation of property
Telenikos		13502 31		death <i>in absentia</i> , commuted to exile, confiscation of property
Theodoros		6826 = 6907 52		death <i>in absentia</i> , commuted to exile, confiscation of property
Theotimos		7055 85	2975	?death <i>in absentia</i>

<i>Name</i>	<i>Patronymic</i>	<i>PA No.</i>	<i>AO No.</i>	<i>Sentences in absentia</i>
Timanthes		13607 53		death <i>in absentia</i> commuted to exile, confiscation of property
Timokrates		13748 70	3084	presumed death <i>in absentia</i>
Timomachos		13797 88	3097	death <i>in absentia</i>
Timotheos II	son of Konon II	13700 89	3112	?confiscation of property
Xenophon	son of Gryllos	11307 78		sentence of exile <i>in absentia</i>

**Table 5**

**Survival and Voluntary Athenian Political Exiles - Chronological**

<i>Entry No.</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>PA No.</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Destination</i>	<i>Xenoi Assistance</i>	<i>Mercenary Service</i>	<i>Trade</i>	<i>Outside Holdings</i>	<i>Other or Not Known</i>
1	Kylon	8943	632	?Megara	√				
2	Solon	12806	after 570	Egypt, Lydia			√		√
3	Chairion	15258	?546	Eretria	?√			?√	
4	Leogoras I	9074	?546	?Sparta	?√				
5	Hipparchos II	7600	478/7		?√				
6	Pheidias	14149	?433/3	Elis			√		
7	Adeimantos	202	415			?√			
18	Akoumenos	477 = 478	415						√
54	Alkibiades	601 = 599	415	?Syracuse, Samos		√			
55	Alkibiades III	600	415/4	Sparta/Persia	√	√		√	
37	Alkisthenes	638	415						√
19	Amiantos	?	415						√
38	Antidoros	1022	415						√
20	Antiphon	1279	415						√
8	Apsephion	2806	?415						√
21	Archebiades	2300	415						√

<i>Entry No.</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>PA No.</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Destination</i>	<i>Xenoi Assistance</i>	<i>Mercenary Service</i>	<i>Trade</i>	<i>Outside Holdings</i>	<i>Other or N. Known</i>
39	Archidamos	2482	.415						√
22	Archippos	2541	.415						√
23	Aristomenes	1993	.415						√
24	Autokrator	2745	.415						√
9	Axiochos	1330	.415						√
10	Chairedemos	15120	.415						√
40	Charippos	15464	.415						√
11	Charmides	15510	.415 - 413						√
12	Diakritos	3746	.415						√
25	Diogenes	3803	.415						√
13	Diognetos	3863 = 3851	.415						√
41	Eryximachos	5187	.415						√
42	Euktemon	5781	.415						√
43	Euphiletos	6071	.415						√
44	Eurydamos	5962	.415						√
45	Eurymachos	5971	.415						√
46	Glaukippos	2978	.415						√
26	Gniphonides	3058	.415						√
27	Hephaistodoros	6563	.415						√



<i>Entry No.</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>PA No.</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Destination</i>	<i>Xenoi Assistance</i>	<i>Mercenary Service</i>	<i>Trade</i>	<i>Outside Holdings</i>	<i>Other or Not Known</i>
28	Isonomos	7719	415						√
14	Lysistratos	9596	415						√
15	Mantitheos	9670	415						√
29	Meletos	9825	415						√
47	Menestratos	9993	415						√
30	Nikides (Nikiades)	10763	415						√
31	Oionias	11370	415						√
16	Panaitios	11567	415						√
32	Pantakles	11584	415						√
17	Phaidros	13960 = 13950	415						√
48	Pherekles	14191 = 14194	415						√
33	Philokrates	14573	415						√
49	Platon	11846	415						√
50	Polyeuktos	11923	415						√
34	Poulytion	12154	415						√
35	Smindyrides	12800	415						√
36	Teisarchos	13466	415						√
51	Telenikos	13502	415						√
52	Theodoros	6826 = 6907	415						√
53	Timanthes	13607	415						√

<i>Entry No.</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>PA No.</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Destination</i>	<i>Xenoi Assistance</i>	<i>Mercenary Service</i>	<i>Trade</i>	<i>Outside Holdings</i>	<i>Other or N. Known</i>
56	Andokides IV	828	414 411/10 405 392/1	Cyprus; Macedon, Samos; Sicily, Italy, Elis, Thessaly, Hellespont, Ionia, Cyprus; ?Cyprus	√		√		
57	Gylon	3098	410-405	Pantikapeion	√				
58	Charikles	15407	411/10	?Sparta	√				
59	Onomakles	11476	410						√
60	Aristoteles	2057 = 2055	411/10	?Lakonia and with Lysander		√			
61	Aischines	341	411/10	?Lakonia and with Lysander		√			
62	Peisandros	11770	410	Dekeleia/Persia		√			
63	Alexikles	535	410	Dekeleia/?Persia		√			
64	Aristogenes	1781	406/5			?√			
65	Protomachos	12318	406/5			?√			
66	Kallixenos	8042	406/5	?Dekeleia, or ?Peiraieus					√
67	Archedemos	2326	406/5	?Dekeleia					√
68	Lykiskos	9213	406/5	?Dekeleia					√
69	Menekles	9905	406/5	?Dekeleia					√
70	Timokrates	13748	406/5	?Dekeleia					√
71	Konon	8707	404	Cyprus		√			
72	Nikophemos	11066	404	Cyprus		√			

<i>Entry No.</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>PA No.</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Destination</i>	<i>Xenoi Assistance</i>	<i>Mercenary Service</i>	<i>Trade</i>	<i>Outside Holdings</i>	<i>Other or N. Known</i>
73	Nikomachos	10933 =10934	404/3	?Phyle, Peiraieus					√
74	Anytos	1324	404/3	?Thebes, then Phyle	?√				
75	Chairephon	15203	404	?Phyle					√
76	Archinos	2526	404/3	Thebes	?√				
77	Atrometos	2681	404/3	Korinth	√				
78	Xenophon	11307	403-400	Persia, Sparta, Korinth	√	√			
79	Epikrates	4859	392/1	?Persia	√				
80	Kratinos	8757a	392/1						√
81	Euboulides	5325	392/1						√
82	Kallistratos	8157	361	Methone			√		
83	Leosthenes	9141	361/60	Macedon		?√			
84	Philon	14825	360/59			?√			
85	Theotimos	7055	360/59			?√			
86	Kallipos	8065	357	Syracuse	√	√			
87	Kydimachos	8930	?mid-350s	Euboea					√
88	Timomachos	13797	363-359			?√			
89	Timotheos II	13700	356/5	Chalkis		?√			
90	Aristogeiton	1775	350/49	Megara					√

<i>Entry No.</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>PA No.</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Destination</i>	<i>Xenoi Assistance</i>	<i>Mercenary Service</i>	<i>Trade</i>	<i>Outside Holdings</i>	<i>Other or N. Known</i>
91	Aristarchos	1656	348/7					?√	√
92	Antiphon	1281	346	?Macedon					√
93	Androtion	913=915	344/3	Megara	√				
94	Philokrates	14599	344/3	?Macedon	√				
95	Chares	15292	338	Mytilene, thence Sigeum		√			
96	Leokrates	9083	338/7	Rhodes, Megara	√		√		
97	Aischines	354	330/29	Rhodes/?thence Samos			√		
98	Kallimedon	8032	324	Beroia, Macedon	√				
99	Demosthenes	3597	323	Troezen, Aigina, Caleuria	?√				
100	Pytheas	12342	323/2	Macedon	√				
101	Himeraios II	7578	322	Aigina					√
102	Hyperides	13912	322/1	Aigina					√
103	Aristonikos	2028	322/1	Aigina					√

**Table 6**  
**Voluntary Exiles: Dates and Destinations**

Table 6  
Destination

Voluntary Exiles: Dates and Destination (Where known or Probable)

Korinth											x	x							
Caleuria																			xx
Aigina																			xxx
Troezen																			x
Thrace											x								
Sparta	x									x	xx	x							
											xx								
Megara	x																x	x	x
Phyle											xxx								
Thebes											xx								
Lydia	x																		
Elis								x			x	x							
Thessaly											x								
Attika/Dekelia																			
Chalkis/Euboea	x															x			
Samos										x	x								
Sigeum																		x	
Hellespont											x								
Mytilene																			
Rhodes																		x	x
Persia										x	x	x	x	x					
Methone																x			
Macedon											x				x		xx		x x
Cyprus										x	xx								
Egypt	x																		
Thurii																			
Syracuse										x	x					x			
Pantikareoin										x									
Period	600	499	489	479	469	459	449	439	429	419	409	399	389	379	369	359	349	339	329
	500	490	480	470	460	450	440	430	420	410	400	390	380	370	360	350	340	330	320

## **Table 7**

**Dates of Ostracisms: Certain and Disputed**

Table 7

Dates of Ostracisms: Certain and Disputed<sup>1</sup>

Ostracismoi

Hipparchos			x																
Megakles			x																
?Friend of Tyrants			x																
Xanthippos			x																
Aristides			x																
Themistokles				x															
Kimon					x														
Thucydides							x												
Hyperbolos									x										
Kallixenos			x																
Megakles				x															
Alkibiades				x															
Alkibiades					x														
Menon						x													
Kallias							x												
Damon							x												
Period	600	499	489	479	469	459	449	439	429	419	409	399	389	379	369	359	349	339	329
	500	490	480	470	460	450	440	430	420	410	400	390	380	370	360	350	340	330	320

1. Following the findings of Phillips (1982: pp27-28)



## **Table 8**

### **Chronological List of *Strategoi* as Voluntary Exiles**

## 462Chronological List of *Strategoi* as Voluntary Exiles

Table 8

<i>Entry No.</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Patronymic</i>	<i>PA No.</i>	<i>AO No.</i>
4	Leogoras	son of Andokides I	9074	1782
7	Adeimantos	son of Leukolophides	202	31
55	Alkibiades III	son of Kleinias	600	84
57	Gylon		3098	1314
58	Charikles	son of Apollodoros	15407	644
59	Onomakles		11476	2211
60	Aristoteles	?son of Timokrates	2057 = 2055	
62	Peisandros		11770	2281
63	Alexikles		535	75
64	Aristogenes		1781	398
65	Protomachos		12318	2634
71	Konon II	son of Timotheos I	8707	1686
74	Anytos	son of Anthemios	1324	265
82	Kallistratos	son of Kallikrates	8157	1564
83	Leosthenes		9141	1801
84	Philon	son of Kallipos	14825	2450
85	Theotimos		7055	2975
86	Kallipos II	son of Philon	8065	1549
88	Timomachos		13797	3097
89	Timotheos II	son of Konon II	13700	3112
95	Chares	son of Theochares	15292	610

## **Table 9**

### **Chronological List of Voluntary Athenian Political Exiles - Return and Recall**

# Chronological List of Athenian Voluntary Political Exiles: Return and Recall

Table 9

<i>Returned/Recalled</i>	<i>Never Returned</i>	<i>Not Known/Not Likely</i>
	Kylon <i>PA</i> 8943 Entry 1	
?Solon <i>PA</i> 12806 Entry 2		
	Chairion <i>PA</i> 15258 Entry 3	
Leogoras I <i>PA</i> 9074 Entry 4		
		Hipparchos II <i>PA</i> 7600 Entry 5
	Pheidias <i>PA</i> 14149 Entry 6	
Adeimantos <i>PA</i> 202 Entry 7		
		Akoumenos <i>PA</i> 477 Entry 18
	Alkibiades <i>PA</i> 599 = 601 Entry 54	
Alkibiades (III) <i>PA</i> 600 Entry 55		
		Alkisthenes <i>PA</i> 638 Entry 37
		Amiantos ? <i>PA</i> Entry 19
		Antidoros <i>PA</i> 1022 Entry 38
		Antiphon <i>PA</i> 1279 Entry 20
Apsephion <i>PA</i> 2806 Entry 8		
		Archebiades <i>PA</i> 2300 Entry 21
		Archidamos <i>PA</i> 2482 Entry 39
		Archippos <i>PA</i> 2541 Entry 22
		Aristomenes <i>PA</i> 1993 Entry 23
		Autokrator <i>PA</i> 2745 Entry 24
Axiochos <i>PA</i> 1330 Entry 9		

<i>Returned/Recalled</i>	<i>Never Returned</i>	<i>Not Known/Not Likely</i>
Chairedemos <i>PA</i> 15120 Entry 10		
		Charippos <i>PA</i> 15464 Entry 40
		Charmides <i>PA</i> 15510 Entry 11
Diakritos <i>PA</i> 3746 Entry 12		
		Diogenes <i>PA</i> 3803 Entry 25
		Diognetos <i>PA</i> 3863 = 3851 Entry 13
		Eryximachos <i>PA</i> 5187 Entry 41
		Euktemon <i>PA</i> 5781 Entry 42
		Euphiletos <i>PA</i> 6071 Entry 43
		Eurydamas <i>PA</i> 5962 Entry 44
		Eurymachos <i>PA</i> 5971 Entry 45
		Glaukippos <i>PA</i> 2978 Entry 46
		Gniphonides <i>PA</i> 3058 Entry 26
		Hephaistodoros <i>PA</i> 6563 Entry 27
		Isonomos <i>PA</i> 7719 Entry 28
Lysistratos <i>PA</i> 9596 Entry 14		
Mantitheos <i>PA</i> 9670 Entry 15		
		Meletos <i>PA</i> 9825 Entry 29
		Menestratos <i>PA</i> 9993 Entry 47
		Nikides <i>PA</i> 10763 Entry 30
		Oionias <i>PA</i> 11370 Entry 31

<i>Returned/Recalled</i>	<i>Never Returned</i>	<i>Not Known/Not Likely</i>
Panaitios <i>PA</i> 11567 Entry 16		
		Pantakles <i>PA</i> 11584 Entry 32
		Phaidros <i>PA</i> 13960 = 13950 Entry 17
		Pherekles <i>PA</i> 14191 = 14194 Entry 48
		Philokrates <i>PA</i> 14573 Entry 33
		Platon <i>PA</i> 11846 Entry 49
		Polyeuktos <i>PA</i> 11923 Entry 50
		Poulytion <i>PA</i> 12154 Entry 34
		Smindyrides <i>PA</i> 12800 Entry 35
		Teisarchos <i>PA</i> 13466 Entry 36
		Telenikos <i>PA</i> 13502 Entry 51
		Theodoros <i>PA</i> 6826 = 6907 Entry 52
		Timanthes <i>PA</i> 13607 Entry 53
Andokides IV <i>PA</i> 828 Entry 56		
Gylon <i>PA</i> 3098 Entry 57		
Charikles <i>PA</i> 15407 Entry 58		
Onomakles <i>PA</i> 11476 Entry 59		
Aristoteles <i>PA</i> 2057 = 2055 Entry 60		
Aischines <i>PA</i> 341 Entry 61		
	Peisandros <i>PA</i> 11770 Entry 62	
		Alexikles <i>PA</i> 535 Entry 63
		Aristogenes <i>PA</i> 1781 Entry 64

<i><b>Returned/Recalled</b></i>	<i><b>Never Returned</b></i>	<i><b>Not Known/Not Likely</b></i>
		Protomachos <i>PA</i> 12318 Entry 65
?Kallixenos <i>PA</i> 8042 Entry 66		
		Archedemos <i>PA</i> 2326 Entry 67
		Lykiskos <i>PA</i> 9213 Entry 68
		Menekles <i>PA</i> 9905 Entry 69
		Timokrates <i>PA</i> 13748 Entry 70
? Konon II <i>PA</i> 8707 Entry 71		
? Nikophemos <i>PA</i> 11066 Entry 72		
Nikomachos <i>PA</i> 10933 Entry 73		
Anytos <i>PA</i> 1324 Entry 74		
Chairephon <i>PA</i> 15203 Entry 75		
Archinos <i>PA</i> 2526 Entry 76		
Atrometos <i>PA</i> 2681 Entry 77		
	Xenophon <i>PA</i> 11307 Entry 78	
		Epikrates <i>PA</i> 4859 Entry 79
		Kratinos <i>PA</i> 8757a Entry 80
		Euboulides <i>PA</i> 5325 Entry 81
Kallistratos <i>PA</i> 8157 Entry 82		
		Leosthenes <i>PA</i> 9141 Entry 83
		Philon <i>PA</i> 14825 Entry 84
		Theotimos <i>PA</i> 7055 Entry 85
	Kallipos II <i>PA</i> 8065 Entry 86	

<i>Returned/Recalled</i>	<i>Never Returned</i>	<i>Not Known/Not Likely</i>
	Kydimachos <i>PA</i> 8930 Entry 87	
		Timomachos <i>PA</i> 13797 Entry 88
	Timotheos II <i>PA</i> 13700 Entry 89	
		Aristogeiton <i>PA</i> 1775 Entry 90
		Aristarchos <i>PA</i> 1656 Entry 91
Antiphon <i>PA</i> 1281 Entry 92		
		Androtion <i>PA</i> 913 = 915 Entry 93
		Philokrates <i>PA</i> 14599 Entry 94
	Chares <i>PA</i> 15292 Entry 95	
Leokrates <i>PA</i> 9083 Entry 96		
	Aischines <i>PA</i> 354 Entry 97	
		Kallimedes <i>PA</i> 8032 Entry 98
Demosthenes <i>PA</i> 3597 Entry 99		
Pytheas <i>PA</i> 12342 Entry 100		
	Himeraios II <i>PA</i> 7578 Entry 101	
	Hyperides <i>PA</i> 13912 Entry 102	
	Aristonikos <i>PA</i> 2028 Entry 103	



## **Table 10**

### **Voluntary Athenian Political Exiles - Family in Exile**

## Voluntary Athenian Political Exiles

### Family in Exile

*Table 10*

<i>Entry No.</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>PA No.</i>	<i>Comment</i>
1	Kylon	8943	Possibly his brother escaped with him. His wife was probably already in Megara.
2	Solon	12806	There is a late tradition of a son for Solon, and the orderly departure suggests that his family would accompany him.
4	Leogoras	9074	Probable, if his exile was an unhurried affair.
5	Hipparchos	7600	Likely, as his wife was a ?daughter of Hippias. If she was still alive or he was still married to her (a political liability), then she would have not returned after the ostracism. No details of his or their offspring relative to his second exile.
55	Alkibiades III	600	His wife was dead before the first exile, and his son remained in Athens throughout both exiles of Alkibiades.
56	Andokides IV	828	Possible if he was married.
71	Konon II	8707	His son Timotheos met his father in exile, and could have accompanied him if he was at Aigospotomai. Konon's wife was probably dead by 405.
72	Nikophemos	11066	His son stayed in Athens. His wife was probably dead by 405. If not she remained with her son.
75	Chairephon	15203	?His brother Chairekrates may have been at Phyle with him.
76	Archinos	2526	Probable that his family left Athens with him since they survived the Thirty.
77	Atrometos	2681	Took his new bride with him into exile at Korinth.
78	Xenophon	11307	Sent for his sons (and presumably his wife) to join him in exile.
96	Leokrates	9083	Took his mistress and slaves, his sisters stayed in Athens with their husbands. His parents were dead, and he may not have married.
97	Aischines	354	Very likely that his immediate family accompanied him to Rhodes. His brother may also have left with him. See 102 below

## 6.0 BIBLIOGRAPHY

### 6.1 Abbreviations

<i>AJA</i>	<i>American Journal of Archaeology</i>
<i>AJPh</i>	<i>American Journal of Philology</i>
<i>AO</i>	<b>Athenian Officials</b> , R Develin, Cambridge (1989)
<i>APF</i>	<b>Athenian Propertied Families</b> , J K Davies, Oxford (1971)
<i>Ath Pol</i>	<b>Athenaion Politeia</b> , attributed to Aristotle
<i>ATL</i>	<b>The Athenian Tribute Lists</b> , 4 vols., B D Meritt, H T Wade-Gery & M F McGregor, Cambridge (Mass.) i, Princeton ii-iv, (1939-1953)
<i>BSA</i>	<i>Annual of the British School at Athens</i>
<i>CAH</i>	<i>The Cambridge Ancient History</i>
<i>CJ</i>	<i>Classical Journal</i>
<i>C Phil</i>	<i>Classical Philology</i>
<i>CQ</i>	<i>Classical Quarterly</i>
<i>CR</i>	<i>Classical Review</i>
<i>CRUX</i>	<b>Crux, Essays in Greek History</b> , Cartledge PA & Harvey FD (eds) London (1985)
<i>DAA</i>	<b>Dedications from the Athenian Acropolis</b> , Raubitschek AE, Cambridge Massachussetts (1949)
<i>FGrH</i>	<b>Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker</b> , F Jacoby, Leyden & Berlin (1968)
<i>GRBS</i>	<i>Greek, Roman &amp; Byzantine Studies</i>
<i>G&amp;R</i>	<i>Greece &amp; Rome</i>

Hignett, <i>Hist. Athen. Const.</i>	<b>A History of the Athenian Constitution to the end of the Fifth Century B.C.</b> C Hignett, Oxford (1952)
<i>HCT</i>	<b>An Historical Commentary On Thucydides</b> 5 vols., A W Gomme, A Andrewes & K J Dover, Oxford (1945-1981)
<i>Hell Oxy</i>	<b>Hellenica Oxyrhynchia</b> ed. with translation & commentary by P R McKenchie and S J Kern (1988)
<i>IG</i>	<b>Inscriptiones Graecae:</b> all references are to either the editio altera [ $I^2$ = Vol.1; $II^2$ = Vol. II/III] or to editio tertia [ $I^3$ = Vol.1]
<i>JHS</i>	<i>Journal of Hellenic Studies</i>
<i>Loeb</i>	Loeb Classical Library
<i>LSJ</i> <sup>9</sup>	<b>A Greek-English Lexicon</b> (Revised ed.), H G Liddell, R Scott & H S Jones, Oxford (1968)
<i>ML</i>	<b>A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the end of the Fifth Century B.C.</b> , R Meiggs & D M Lewis, Oxford (1969)
n.a.	not applicable
n.e.	not extant
n.k.	not known
<i>OCD</i> <sup>2</sup>	<b>The Oxford Classical Dictionary</b> (2nd ed.), N G L Hammond & H H Scullard (eds), Oxford (1970)
<i>PA</i>	<b>Prosopographia Attica</b> , 2 vols., J Kirchner, Berlin (1901-2)
<i>RE</i>	<b>Real Encyclopädie der Klassischen Altertumswissenschaft</b> , A Pauly, G Wissowa, W Kroll, Stuttgart (1893-)

<i>SEG</i>	Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum
<i>Spence</i>	<b>The Cavalry of Classical Greece, A Social and Military History with Particular Reference to Athens, I G Spence, Oxford (1993)</b>
<i>TAPhA</i>	<i>Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association</i>
Tod	<b>A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions, M L Tod, Oxford (1948)</b>

## 6.2 Citations

Modern scholarship is cited using the author-date (Harvard) system. Ancient authors and texts are abbreviated according to the practice of *OCD*<sup>2</sup>. They are cited according to the standard conventions for the numbering of books, chapters and sections. Generally all names are transliterated rather than using Latinised forms; more common usages such as "Thucydides", remain in traditional form. All references to classical authors are to the Loeb Classical Library editions unless otherwise stated. The McKechnie and Kern text with translation has been the source for references to **Hellenica Oxyrhynchia**.<sup>1</sup>

Periodicals are abbreviated in accordance with the list of abbreviations in *L'Année philologique*.

References to Develin's **Athenian Officials** (1989), abbreviated as *AO*, are to the inventory numbers in his index I. Where magistracies are mentioned, if it is a single magistracy, the source will be added. Key source references have been added in brackets, other than for multiple generalships..

The *APF* criteria for wealth have been expanded to include horse-ownership, using Spence (1993). Citations of *Spence* followed by a number are to the inventory numbers in his appendix 5: A prosopography of Athenian Hippeis 500-300.

For prosopographical details of *deme* and *trittys* for each entry this work follows Traill (1975).<sup>2</sup>

1. McKechnie P & Kern S, eds & trans (1988) **Hellenica Oxyrhynchia** Warminster.
2. Traill's 1986 work *Demes and Trittys* (Toronto) was not used because most of his reassignment of deme affiliations are controversial. On deme affiliations, D Whitehead (1986) *The Demes of Attica* (Princeton) follows Traill (1975).

### **6.3 Bibliography**

- Adcock F & Mosley D J (1975) **Diplomacy In Ancient Greece** London
- Adkins A W H (1960) **Merit and Responsibility: A Study in Greek Values** Oxford
- Adkins A W H (1972) **Moral Values and Political Values In Ancient Greece** London
- Anderson J K (1974) **Xenophon** London
- Andrewes A (1953) 'The Generals in the Hellespont' *JHS* 73 pp2-9
- Andrewes A (1967) **Greek Society** London
- Andrewes A (1971) **The Greek Tyrants** London
- Andrewes A (1974) 'The Arginousai Trial' *Phoenix* 28 pp112-122
- Andronicos M (1988) **Delphi** Athens
- Aurenche O (1974) **Les groupes d'Alcibiade, de Léogoras et de Teucros. Remarques sur la vie politique athénienne en 415 avant J.C.** Paris
- Badian E (1961) 'Harpalus' *JHS* 81 pp16-43
- Badian E (ed) (1966) **Ancient Society and Institutions**, Oxford
- Balogh E (1943) **Political Refugees in Ancient Greece from the Period of the Tyrants to Alexander the Great** Johannesburg
- Barkan I (1979) **Capital Punishment in Ancient Athens**, New York
- Barker E (1918) **Greek Political Theory. Plato and his Predecessors** London
- Bauman R A (1990) **Political Trials in Ancient Greece**, London

- Bicknell P J (1970) 'The Exile of the Alkmeonidai during the Peisistratid Tyranny' *Historia* 19 pp128-131
- Bicknell P J (1971) **Studies in Athenian Politics and Genealogy**, *Historia Einzelschriften* Heft 19, Wiesbaden
- Bloedow E F (1973) **Alcibiades Reexamined**, *Historia Einzelschriften* Heft 21, Wiesbaden
- Bloedow E F (1991) 'Alcibiades: A review article' *AHB* 5 pp17-29
- Blumenthal H (1973) 'Meletos the accuser of Andocides and Meletos the accuser of Socrates: one man or two?' *Philologus* 117 pp169-178
- Bonner R J (1933) **Aspects of Athenian Democracy** New York
- Bonner R J & Smith G (1930-1938) **The Administration of Justice from Homer to Aristotle**, Chicago
- Bosworth A B (1988) **Conquest and Empire. The Reign of Alexander the Great**, Cambridge
- Bowra C M (1957) **The Greek Experience**, New York
- Broadbent M (1968) **Studies in Greek Genealogy**, Leiden
- Bruce I A F (1967) **An Historical Commentary on the Hellenica Oxyrhynchia**, Cambridge
- Burkert W (1985) **Greek Religion**, (trans. J Raffan) Cambridge, Massachusetts
- Burkert W (1987) **Ancient Mystery Cults**, Cambridge Massachusetts
- Burn A R (1970) **History of Greece** London
- Bury J B & Meiggs R (1975) **History of Greece** (4th ed), London



- Bury, J B Cook, S A  
Adcock, F E (eds)
- Cadoux T J (1948)
- Calhoun G M (1913 rpt 1964)
- Carter L B (1986)
- Cartledge P A & Harvey F D (eds) (1985)
- Casson L (1976)
- Cawkwell G (1978)
- Chroust A H (1954)
- Cloch   P (1959)
- Cohen D (1989)
- Connor W R (1971)
- Costa E A (1974)
- Crosby M (1950)
- Currie H MacL (1973)
- Davies J K (1971)
- Davies J K (1978)
- CAMBRIDGE ANCIENT HISTORY**  
Vols. V, V<sup>2</sup> & VI, Cambridge (rep. 1958)
- 'The Athenian Archons from Kreon to  
Hypsichides' *JHS* 68 pp70-119
- Athenian Clubs in Politics and Litigation,**  
Austin
- The Quiet Athenian** Oxford
- Crux. Essays in Greek History** London
- 'The Athenian Upper Class and  
New Comedy' *TAPA* 106 pp29-59
- Philip of Macedon** London
- 'Treason and Politics in Ancient  
Greece' *JHS* 15 pp280-288
- Demosthenes et la fin de la  
d  mocratie ath  nienne,** Paris
- 'Seclusion, Separation and the Status of  
Women in Classical Athens' *GR*<sup>2</sup> 36 pp3-15
- The New Politicians of Fifth-Century  
Athens,** New Jersey
- 'Evagoras I and the Persians, CA. 411 to 391  
B.C.' *Historia* 23 pp40-56
- 'The Leases of the Laurion Mines'  
*Hesperia* 19 p204
- The Individual and the State,** London
- Athenian Propertied Families  
600-300, B.C.,** Oxford
- Democracy and Classical Greece,** Glasgow

- Develin R (1985) 'Herodotus and the Alkmeonids' in J W Eadie and J Ober (eds) **The Craft of the Ancient Historian: Essays in Honour of Chester G Starr**, Lanham, pp125-139
- Develin R (1989) **Athenian Officials, 684-321 B.C.** Cambridge
- de Ste. Croix G E M (1972 rpt 1989) **Origins of the Peloponnesian War**, London
- de Ste. Croix G E M (1981 rpt 1983) **The Class Struggle in the Ancient World** London
- Dodds E R (1951) **The Greeks and the Irrational**, Berkeley
- Dover K J (1968) **Lysias and the Corpus Lysiacum**, Berkeley
- Dover K J (1976) 'The Freedom of the Intellectual in Greek Society' *Talanta* 7 pp25-54
- Dover K J (1980) **The Greeks**, London
- Edmonds J M (1957, 1959) **The Fragments of Attic Comedy Vols I & II**, Leiden
- Ehrenberg V (1969 rpt 1974) **The Greek State** (2nd ed), London
- Ehrenberg V (1973 rpt 1981) **From Solon to Socrates** (2nd ed), London
- Ehrhardt C (1970) 'Xenophon and Diodorus on Aegospotomi' *Phoenix* 24 pp225-228
- Ellis J R (1976) **Philip II and Macedonian Imperialism**, London
- Ellis J R & Milns R D (1970) **The Spectre of Philip**, Sydney
- Ellis W M (1989) **Alcibiades**, New York
- Ferguson J & Chisholm K (eds) (1978) **Political and Social Life in the Great Age of Athens**, London
- Finley J H (1963) **Thucydides**, Ann Arbor
- Finley M I (1983) **Politics in the Ancient World**, Cambridge
- Finley M I (1985) **The Ancient Economy** (2nd ed), London

- Fisher N R E (1976) **Social Values in Classical Athens**, London
- Fontenrose J (1978) **The Delphic Oracle, its Responses and Operations with a Catalogue of Responses**, Berkeley
- Fornara C W (1971) **The Athenian Board of Generals from 501 to 401**, *Historia Einzelschriften* Heft 16, Wiesbaden
- Fornara C W (1983) **Archaic Times to the end of the Peloponnesian War** (2nd ed.), Cambridge
- Fowler W W (1952) **The City-State of the Greeks and Romans**, London
- Freeman K (1926) **The Work and Life of Solon**, Cardiff
- French A (1971) **The Athenian Half-Century**, Sydney
- Frost F J (1964a) 'Perikles and Dracontides' *JHS* 84 pp69-72
- Frost F J (1964b) 'Perikles, Thucydides, son of Melesias, and Athenian Politics before the War' *Historia* 13 pp385-399
- Fustel de Coulanges N (1864) **The Ancient City: A Study on the Religion, Laws, and Institutions of Greece and Rome**, Baltimore
- Garland R **Introducing New Gods, The Politics of Athenian Religion**, London
- Gernet L (1968) **The Anthropology of Ancient Greece** (trans. Hamilton, S J & Nagy, B), Paris
- Glitz G (1929) **The Greek City and its Institutions**, London
- Gomme A W, Andrewes A & Dover K J (1945-1981) **An Historical Commentary on Thucydides**, 5 vols. Oxford
- Gould J (1980) 'Law, Custom and Myth: Aspects of the Social Position of Women in Classical Athens', *JHS* 100 pp 38-59
- Hamilton C D (1979) **Sparta's Bitter Victories, Politics and Diplomacy in the Corinthian War**, Ithaca

- Hammond N G L & Griffith, G T (1979) **A History of Macedon, Volume II 550-336 BC**, Oxford
- Hansen M H (1974) **Graphe Paranomon: the Sovereignty of the People's court in Athens in the fourth century B.C. and the public action against unconstitutional proposals**, Odense
- Hansen M H (1975) **Eisangelia: the Sovereignty of the People's court in Athens in the fourth century B.C. and the impeachment of generals and politicians**, Odense
- Hansen M H (1976) **Apagoge, endeixis and ephesis against kakourgoi, atimoi and pheugontes - a study in the Athenian administration of justice in the fourth century B.C.**, Odense
- Hansen M H (1991) **The Athenian Democracy in the Age of Demosthenes** (trans. J A Crook), Oxford
- Harding P (1976) 'Androtion's Political Career' *Historia* 25 pp186-200
- Harvey F D (1985) 'Dona Ferentes: Some Aspects of Bribery in Greek Politics' in Cartledge and Harvey (eds) **Crux, Essays in Greek History**, London pp76-117
- Hatzfeld J (1931) 'Alcibiade et les élections des stratèges athéniens en 406' *REA* 33 pp109-116
- Hatzfeld J (1951) **Alcibiade. Etude sur l'histoire d'Athènes a la fin du V<sup>e</sup> siècle**, Paris
- Henderson B W (1927) **The Great War Between Athens and Sparta**, rpt 1973, New York
- Herman G (1987) **Ritualised Friendship and the Greek City**, Cambridge
- Higgins W E (1977) **Xenophon the Athenian. The Problem of the Individual and the Society of the Polis**, Albany New York

- Hignett C (1952) **A History of the Athenian Constitution to the end of the Fifth Century B.C., Oxford**
- Hirsch S W (1985) **The Friendship of the Barbarians. Xenophon and the Persian Empire, Hanover and London**
- Hofstetter J (1978) **Die griechen in Persien, Prosopographie der griechen in persischen Reich vor Alexander, Berlin**
- Hornblower S (1991) **The Greek World 479-323BC (revised ed), London**
- Humble R (1980) **Warfare in the Ancient World, London**
- Jacoby F (1949) **Atthis: The Local Chronicles of Ancient Athens, Oxford**
- Jaeger W (1945) **Paideia: the Ideals of Greek Culture Vol. 1 (2nd ed), (trans. G Highet), New York**
- Jaeger W (1963) **Demosthenes. The Origin and Growth of his Policy, New York**
- Jones A H M (1957) **Athenian Democracy, Oxford**
- Jones J W (1956) **The Law and Legal Theory of the Greeks, Oxford**
- Jordan B (1975) **The Athenian Navy in the Classical Period. A Study of Athenian Naval Administration and Military Organization in the Fifth and Fourth Centuries B.C., Berkeley, Los Angeles, London**
- Just R (1989) **Women in Athenian Law and Life, London**
- Kagan D (1969) **The Outbreak of the Peloponnesian War, Ithaca**
- Kagan D (1974) **The Archidamian War, Ithaca**

- Kagan D (1981) **The Peace of Nicias and the Sicilian Expedition, Ithaca**
- Kagan D (1987) **The Fall of the Athenian Empire, Ithaca**
- Kinzl K H (1976) 'Notes on the Exile of the Alkmeonidai' *Rh Mus* 119 pp311-314
- Kitto H D F (1957) **The Greeks, London**
- Krentz P (1982) **The Thirty at Athens, Ithaca**
- Krentz P (1989) **Xenophon: Hellenika I-II.3.10, Warminster**
- Kurtz D C & Boardman J (1971) **Greek Burial Customs, London**
- Lacey W K (1968) **The Family in Classical Greece, London**
- Lane Fox RL (1985) 'Aspects of Inheritance in the Greek World' in Cartledge and Harvey (eds) **Crux, Essays in Greek History, London pp208-232**
- Lefkowitz M R & Fant M B (1982) **Women's Life in Greece & Rome. A source book in translation, London and Baltimore**
- Legon R P (1981) **Megara. The Political History of a Greek City-State to 336 B.C., Ithaca**
- Lenschau T (1941) 'Phrynichos' *RE* 20 pp907-11
- Levi P (1971) **Pausanias' Guide to Greece, 2 Vols, London**
- Lewis D M (1961) 'Double Representation in the Strategia' *JHS* 81 pp118-128
- Liddell H G, Scott R & Jones H S (1968) **A Greek-English Lexicon (revised ed.), Oxford**
- Lloyd-Jones H (ed) (1962) **The Greeks, Cleveland**

- Loening T C (1987) **The Reconciliation Agreement of 403/402 B.C. in Athens, its Content and Application**, Stuttgart
- Lofberg J O (1979) **Sycophancy in Athens**, New York
- Loraux N (1986) **The Invention of Athens. The Funeral Oration in the Classical City**, trans A Sheridan, Cambridge (Mass)
- Losada L (1972) **The Fifth Column in the Peloponnesian War**, Amsterdam
- MacDowell D M (1962) **Andokides On The Mysteries**, Oxford
- MacDowell D M (1963) **Athenian Homicide Law in the Age of the Orators**, Manchester
- MacDowell D M (1978) **The Law in Classical Athens** London
- MacDowell D M (1990) **Demosthenes Against Meidias (Oration 21)**, edited with translation and commentary, Oxford
- McCoy W J (1977) 'Thrasyllus' *AJP* 98 pp264-289
- McGregor M F (1965) 'The genius of Alcibiades' *Phoenix* 19 pp27-46
- McGregor M F & Eliot C W J (1960) 'Kleisthenes: Eponymous Archon 525/4 B.C.' *Phoenix* 14 pp27-35
- McKechnie P (1989) **Outsiders in the Greek Cities in the Fourth Century BC**, London
- McKechnie P & Kern S, eds & trans (1988) **Hellenica Oxyrhynchia**, Warminster
- Manville P B (1990) **The Origins of Citizenship in Ancient Athens**, Princeton.
- Meiggs R (1972) **The Athenian Empire**, Oxford
- Meiggs R & Lewis D (1969) **A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions**, Oxford
- Meritt B D, Wade Gery H T & McGregor M F (1939-53) **The Athenian Tribute Lists**, 4 Vols. Cambridge (Mass) i; Princeton ii - iv

- Meritt B D (1959) 'Greek Inscriptions' *Hesperia* 8 pp48-90
- Mikalson J D (1983) **Athenian Popular Religion**, London
- Mitchel F W (1980) 'Timanthes the Metic and the Hermokopidai' *Ancient World* 3 p43
- Moore J M , trans (1975) **Aristotle and Xenophon on Democracy and Oligarchy**, London
- Morrison J S & Coates J F (1986 rpt 1987) **The Athenian Trireme; a History and Reconstruction of an Ancient Greek Warship**, Cambridge
- Morrison J S & Williams R T (1968) **Greek Oared Ships 900-322 BC**, Cambridge
- Myers J L (1927) **The Political Ideas of the Greeks**, New York
- Nelson R B (1973) **Warfleets of Antiquity**, Sussex
- Nilsson M P (1948) **Greek Piety**, Oxford
- Omerod H A (1924) **Piracy in the Ancient World**, Liverpool
- Osborne M J (1981-83) **Naturalization in Athens**, 4 Vols., Brussels
- Ostwald M (1955) 'Athenian Legislation against Tyranny and Subversion' *TAPA* 86 pp103-128
- Ostwald M (1986) **From Popular Sovereignty to the Sovereignty of the Law. Law, Society, and Politics in Fifth-Century Athens**, Los Angeles
- Parke H W (1933) **Greek Mercenary Soldiers from the Earliest Times to the Battle of Ipsus**, Oxford
- Parke H W (1977) **Festivals of the Athenians**, London
- Parker R C T (1983) **Miasma. Pollution and Purification in Early Greek Religion** Oxford
- Parker R C T (1985) 'Greek States and Oracles' in Cartledge and Harvey (eds) **Crux, Essays in Greek History**, London pp298-326



- Pearson L (1942 rpt 1975) **The Local Historians of Attica**, Westport
- Perlman S (1967) 'Political Leadership in Athens in the Fourth Century B.C.' *Rivista di Studi Antichi*, XXII pp161-163
- Phillips D J (1982) 'Athenian Ostracism' in **Hellenika, Essays on Greek Politics and History**, ed G R Horsley, North Ryde pp 21-43
- Pickard-Cambridge A W (1914) **Demosthenes and the Last Days of Greek Freedom**, New York
- Popper K R (1966) **The Open Society and Its Enemies** (5th ed), 2 Vols., London
- Pritchett W K (1971-91) **The Greek State at War**, 5 Vols. Berkeley
- Pritchett W K (1953; 1961) 'The Attic Stelai' *Hesperia* 22 pp225-299; *Hesperia* 30 pp23-29
- Pusey N M (1940) 'Alcibiades and το φιλόπολι' *HSCP* 51 pp215-31
- Rahn P J (1981) 'The Date of Xenophon's Exile' in **Classical Contributions, Studies in honour of Malcolm Francis McGregor**, (eds. G S Shrimpton and D J McCargar), New York
- Raubitschek A E (1949) **Dedications from the Athenian Acropolis**, Cambridge (Mass)
- Rhodes P J (1972) **The Athenian Boule**, Oxford
- Rhodes P J (1981) **A Commentary on the Aristotelian *Athenaion Politeia***, Oxford
- Rhodes P J (1984) 'What Alcibiades Did or What Happened to Him' Inaugural Lecture, University of Durham, November
- Roberts J T (1982) **Accountability in Athenian Government**, Wisconsin
- Rodewald C (1975) **Democracy: Ideas and Realities**, London

- Roisman J (1984-86) 'The Image of the Political Exile in Archaic Greece' *Ancient Society* 15-17 pp23-32
- Russell D A (1972) **Plutarch**. London
- Seager R (1967) 'Alcibiades and the charge of aiming at tyranny' *Historia* 16 pp6-18
- Sealey R (1956) 'Callistratos of Aphidna and his contemporaries' *Historia* 5 pp178-203
- Sealey R (1976) **A History of the Greek City States 700-338BC**, Berkeley
- Sealey R (1987) **The Athenian Republic, Democracy or the Rule of Law?** Pennsylvania
- Sealey R (1988) **Women and Law in Classical Athens**, Berkeley
- Sinclair R K (1988) **Democracy and Participation in Athens**, Cambridge
- Spence I G (1993) **The Cavalry of Classical Greece, A Social and Military History with Particular Reference to Athens**, Oxford
- Stanton G R (1990) **Athenian Politics 800-500 BC**, London
- Starr C G (1974) **Political Intelligence in Classical Greece**, Batavia
- Szegedy-Maszak A (1981) **The Nomoi of Theophrastus**, New York
- Thomas R (1989) **Oral Tradition and Written Records in Classical Athens**, Cambridge
- Thomsen (1972) **The Origin of Ostracism. A Synthesis**, Copenhagen
- Tod M N (1968) **A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions**, Oxford

- Traill J S (1975) **The Political Organisation of Attica. A Study of demes, trittyes, and phylai, and their representation in the Athenian Council**, Princeton, American School of Classical Studies at Athens
- Tuplin C J (1987) 'Xenophon's exile again' in M Whitby, P Hardie, and Mary Whitby eds. **Homo Viator: Classical Essays for John Bramble**, Bristol pp59-68
- Walbank F W (1951) 'The Problem of Greek Nationality' *Phoenix* 5 pp41-60
- Walbank M B (1978) **Athenian Proxeny of the Fifth Century B.C.**, Toronto
- Wallace R.W (1983) 'The Date of Solon's Reforms' *AJAH* 8 pp81-95
- Westlake H D (1938) 'Alcibiades, Agis and Spartan Policy' *JHS* 58 pp31-40
- Westlake H D (1968) **Individuals in Thucydides**, Cambridge
- Westlake H D (1973/74) 'The Subjectivity of Thucydides: His Treatment of the Four Hundred at Athens' **Bulletin of the John Rylands Library** 56; 193-218; reprinted in **Studies in Thucydides and Greek History**, Bristol 1989, pp 181-200
- Whitehead D (1977) **The Ideology of the Athenian Metic**, Cambridge
- Woodhead A G (1949) 'IG I<sup>2</sup> 95 and the Ostracism of Hyperbolus' *Hesperia* 19 pp78-83
- Woodhead A G (1954) 'Peisander' *AJP* 75 pp131-146
- Woodhead A G (1970) **Thucydides on the Nature of Power**, Massachussetts
- Worthington I (1984) 'The First Flight of Harpalus Reconsidered' *Greece & Rome* Vol. 31 No. 2 pp161-169
- Worthington I (1986) 'The Chronology of the Harpalos Affair' *Symbolae Osloenses* 61 pp63-76

Worthington I (1992)

**A Historical Commentary on Dinarchus.  
Rhetoric and Conspiracy in later  
Fourth-Century Athens, Ann Arbor**

Zimmern A (1931)

**The Greek Commonwealth, Politics and  
Economics in Fifth-Century Athens (5th  
ed) Oxford**