(6) *Andocides* Peri tōn Mystηρίων.

D. MacDowell’s edition of *Andocides, On the Mysteries* (Oxford 1962) is a nice piece of work which bears testimony to the author’s sagacity. It is set out clearly, it is direct in its approach to the problems it tackles—in this respect being somewhat in contrast to the well-known work of Makkink—but at the same time it is scholarly. The author’s suggestions may not always be acceptable but they are interesting to read. Some of the good features, as well as some minor flaws, of this work were discussed by R. A. Browne in a review published in the *JHS* lxxxiv (1964) 168–9.2

M. explained the readings ascribed by editors of the orators contained in the codex Crippianus to *A*², i.e. to a second corrector of the manuscript, as corrections made by the scribe himself from the archetype of our manuscript (=*A*) and that the original reading of *A* is therefore simply a copying error and of no value. It would be interesting to apply this test to other orators represented in the Crippianus. To take Lycurgus *c. Leocr.* as an example five passages come under consideration:

70 eīς τοὺς βαρβάρους ναυμαχεῖν *APr*: πρὸς τοὺς βαρβάρους ναυμαχεῖν *A*²

71 τὴν αὐτὰ δριστὴν *APr*: τὴν αὐτὰν δριστείαν *A*²

78 τοῦτον ἀποκτενεῖτε *APr*: τοῦτον οὔκ ἀποκτενεῖτε *A*²


In general there is, I think, no difficulty in accepting M.’s view: in 70 there is no indication where the corrector took the preposition πρὸς from, but probably from the archetype. In 71—whether the corrector be right or wrong—and in 80—where he is certainly wrong—the case is similar to many other cases where *A*¹ is also wrong, e.g. 60, 110 and elsewhere. In 78 oūκ very probably was in the archetype but it was overlooked, being one of the many cases where the corrector (=*A*) inserted a short word omitted by *APr* in copying. Lastly in 86 the case somewhat resembles that of 71 and 80 where though *A*² perhaps improved on *APr* still its reading leaves something to be desired. To conclude on this point, there seems to exist no

---

obstacle—as far as Lycurgus is concerned—in identifying $A^1$ with $A^2$ as M. suggests.3

Concerning spelling conventions and morphology in Andocides' text it seems to me that M. holds some 'dangerous' ideas. He writes (p. 28): 'Some nineteenth-century editors took it for granted that the diction and orthography of Andokides resembled those of later Attic orators, and emended his text to make it conform to what they believed to be “Attic usage”. This is a dangerous practice. It is not safe to assume that no changes occurred in the Attic language between the time of Andokides and the time of Demosthenes. It is not even safe to assume that Andokides was consistent with himself in such matters . . . A small but typical example of the attitude of some editors is the treatment given to ἐνεκα, ἐνεκεν, and ἑνεκα. All three forms occur in the manuscript in different places; Blass and Lipsius emended the other two to ἑνεκα throughout. But it has not yet been proved that an Attic writer in 400 could not have used ἐνεκεν or ἑνεκα, and how are we ever to learn whether these forms were current then if they were automatically removed from the texts we use as evidence?'

I agree with M. in so far as the above-mentioned forms should not be removed without the change being recorded in due place. Otherwise this kind of reasoning, though on its face-value it seems reasonable, is as a matter of fact misleading. On the one hand it places too much importance on the spelling conventions of semi-illiterate scribes and of our medieval manuscripts, whereas on the other hand no mention is made of the main evidence on which our decision in such matters should be based, namely contemporary evidence. In our case this means the inscriptions of the period concerned. ‘How are we ever to learn whether these forms were current?’ M. asks. The answer is: if we are ever to learn, that will be from contemporary evidence and certainly not from the byzantine and medieval manuscripts. To take one example: why did M. change the manuscript spelling γιν- into γινν-? His reasoning is: these [i.e. γίνεσθαι and γινόσκειν] ‘are generally thought not to have been in use in Attic prose of Andokides’s time’. This in turn means that the inscriptions of Andocides’s time were examined and a kind of usage was established which does not allow for a form γιν- to be edited in a text of that time. The same principle one feels should be applied in the case of ἐνεκα, ἐνεκεν, and ἑνεκα. M. therefore should have gone to contemporary evidence and should have drawn his

3. As regards the tradition of the text one does not find mentioned the fact that two short passages of the present speech (110.116) are given in a papyrus-fragment of the 2nd or 3rd century: Papiri Greco-Egizi, vol. 2 per cura D. Comparetti nr. 112, p. 16. See Roger A. Pack, The Greek and Roman literary texts from Greco-roman Egypt, Ann Arbor 1952, nr. 94 and G. Dalmeda, Andocide Discours, Paris 1960, p. xxxii n. 2.

4. It should be noticed that 1,86 (and at 2,13) ἐνεκα instead of $A$'s ἑνεκα is given by the apogr. (= LMZ).
conclusions from its study as the medieval manuscripts are as unreliable in the case of ἐνεκα, ἐνεκέν, and εἶνεκα as they are in the case of γνυ- and γηγυ-

Were we to follow codex A from which the text of Andocides mainly derives, we should have in the present speech thirteen examples where the form ἐνεκα is used, three where ἐνεκέν and four where εἶνεκα. There is no apparent reason why ἐνεκέν or εἶνεκα should be used, except perhaps that twice with the use of ἐνεκέν (32 ἐνεκέν ἐρχονται, 37 ἐνεκέν εἰκότως) a light hiatus is avoided. But surely this is not a good reason why it should be used unless it was already widespread in Attic prose. Now, of the two forms, εἶνεκα is out of the question as being an epic-Ionic form which occurs very rarely and then only in verse-inscriptions at this time. The first example known to me from Attic inscriptions is IG II² 1156, 58 (a. 334/3) and I take it therefore that the evidence is against the use of εἶνεκα in Andocides. When one comes to the form ἐνεκέν the picture is not any better: in the whole body of Attic inscriptions contained in IG I² not a single example occurs, including verse-inscriptions. The first genuine example known to me from the corpus occurs in the second volume of the editio minor IG II² 665, 21 (now dated a. 266/5) and outside the corpus SEG 14, 1957, nr. 58, 23 (a. 302). If the true picture is as given above then there should be no surprise if the editors of the orators remove the forms εἶνεκα and ἐνεκέν altogether from Andocides and his contemporary Lysias, not to mention other orators. To me the surprising thing is that Μ. is inconsistent with himself, for he follows the nineteenth-century editors in the case of γνυ-, γηγυ-, but not in the case of εἶνεκα and ἐνεκέν though the case is more or less the same.

A few brief comments on points touched upon by Μ. in his commentary follow:

4 δωρεά: The mss reading δωρεά would suggest either ἄντρο δωρεά(ί)ξ Lipsius Blass Fuhr or perhaps better δωρεά' i.e. δωρεά(ί)Δν Reiske Marchant Maidment; both these readings give the meaning ‘being offered as a free gift’, preferable I think to δωρεά υπάρχουσα adopted by Makkink, Dalmeyda, and Μ.

5 ἐνεκέν: cf. also Eur. Suppl. 312 το γάρ τοι συνέχον ἄνθρωπων

9 συνέχει τάν πόλιν: cf. also Eur. Suppl. 312 το γάρ τοι συνέχον ἄνθρωπων

5. For further evidence see: Kühner-Blass 2,251,10 al., Meisterhans, Gramm. d. att. Inschf., 215 f. and cf. Wyse on Isaeus 12, 1, 4. LSJ. s.v. ἐνεκα mentions two examples of ἐνεκέν IG 2, 987A, 2 = IG II² 2347 (now dated 3rd c. and not early at that), IG 2/5, 611 b 13 = IG II² 1261 (a. 302) which I could not verify; it further mentions examples in early prose: Thuc. 6,2 ήμιπορίας ἐνεκέν (apparently an imitation of the Ionic θεωρίας ἐνεκέν), X. HG. 2,1,14 σώτου ἐνεκέν, Pl. Smp. 210 ε σώ δὴ ἐνεκέν. To these should be added: X. An. 5,8,13 ἐνεκέν ἀνάξιας, Pl. Gorg. 468 a 5 ἐνεκέν τῶν ἀγαθῶν for which see Dodds ad loc., Men. 82 a 8 σω β ἐνεκέν for which see Verdenius Mnemos. 17, 1964, 269. Poetic εἶνεκα occurs in Pl. Lg. 778d, al.—It should be remembered in this connection that the spelling γνυ- for γηγυ- commences in about 300 B.C., see Meisterhans 75.

55
13 M. writes Διογένην and Ἀριστομένη rightly perhaps, but his reasoning is not satisfactory: 'it is not certain that emendation is demanded, since the variation may as easily be due to the original author of the list as to a later copyist. There certainly seems no need to deny that -ήν, as well as -η, was already in use at this period; Jebb even admits Πολυνείκην in S. Ant. 198, written a quarter of a century before the denunciation of 415'. Now, what Jebb admits or does not admit on this point is of little significance to us and though M. is probably right in accepting the acc. -ήν (cf. Kühner-Blass 1,512 (§139) f.) one feels that he ought to have done so after a careful consideration of the only available evidence, namely that of the inscriptions. In these there are early examples not mentioned by Kühner-Blass, e.g. IG 1445 (a.446/5), 8 [Δεμόκριτος, ib. 30 Α]ιχνήν, ib. 35 Φαντοκλείνυν. See also Meisterhans, Gramm. d. att. Inschr., 136.13.

15 αὐτοκράτορ: IG 15 91/2, 9 συναιγογῆς δὲ τὸ λογιστὸν ἐβολὲ αὐτοκράτορ ἔστο (c.a. 434).

27 ὅπερ τῆς βουλῆς: The suggestion that the Council would distribute among themselves the 10,000 drachmas seems too unlikely to believe. Emendation of the text is, I think, imperative. See also Marchant ad loc. and Albini in Maia 9, 1957, 154–6.

47 Ὑφήνος ὁ δραχμαῦς: the participle is hard to translate and Wilhelm suggested to read Φρ. ὁ Ὀρχησάμενος which was accepted by Makkink and Maidment. Dalmeyda translates 'l'ancien danseur' and M. 'Phrynichos, who used to be a dancer'. This use of the aorist participle is noteworthy; see Kühner-Gerth 1,200 n.8 and cf. also Diog. L. 5,35 δεύτερος (sc. Ἀριστοτέλης) ὁ πολληθεῖσαμενος Ἀθήνης. The point as regards the meaning of these participles is believed to be that the action denoted by the participle ceased some (considerable?) time before that of the speaker or the time to which the writer refers, e.g. Thuc. 6,54.6 Πεισίστρατος ὁ Ἰππίου τοῦ τυραννεύσαντος υἱὸς (= 'son of H. who was a tyrant') or Suda s.v. Φρύνιχος (i) ... μαθητής Θεσπίδος τοῦ πρώτου τήν τραγικήν εἰσενέχαντος (= 'who was the first to introduce tragedy'), etc. Nearly always this participle approaches in meaning the agent noun, cf. the well-known ὁ δράμας (like δεδρακώς) = ὁ δράστης, ὁ ἄλογος = ὁ κατάδικος, etc., but here it is not clear whether ὁ δραχμαῦς practically equals ὁ δραχμης.

61 ἐξήλεγξα can, I think, stand; ἐξήλεγξα τὰ γενόμενα possibly means 'I proved the story as related to be incorrect and furnished the true version

6. A good example occurs in Κύλλων Ἀθηναῖος ὁ ἐπιθέμενος τυραννίδι (= 'who attempted to become a tyrant') but the reference was lost in my notes and I was unable to find out the text from which it comes.
instead', i.e. ἐξελέγχων is here used with a pregnant meaning. For similar cases besides Thuc. 3,64,4 and cases like Dttb. Syll. 3 417,5 ἐξήλεγξαν τοὺς ἱεροσυλήκτας cf. also Demosth. 23,66 ἐντοθά μόνον οὖθες πάποτε οὗτοι φέροντο ἄλοις οὔτε διώκων ἤττηθες ἐξήλεγξεν (= 'showed') ὡς ἁδίκως ἐδικάσθη τὰ κριθέντα.

68 ὁρῶν τοῦ ἴλιου τὸ φῶς; cf. also Lyc. fr. 77 Bl. τολμᾶς ζήν καί τὸ τοῦ ἴλιου φῶς ὅρῶν, mentioned also by Makkink.

77–79 The Decree of Patroclides. References, besides Andoc. 1,73 ff.: X. 'HG. 2,2,10 ff., Lys. 25,27, Aristoph. Ran. 686 ff. As regards the nature of the amnesty it would be useful to mention here the occasions when similar measures were adopted:


(ii) the amnesty before the Persian Wars: Andoc. 1,77,107 f., Arist. Ἀθη. 22,8, Decree of Themistocles from Troizen 45 ff. (= Hesperia 31,1962, 312), Nepos Arist. 1,5, Plut. Aris. 8,1, Themist. 11,1 al. Busolt-Swoboda, op. cit., 950; M. Jameson, Hesperia, 29,1960,221 ff.


77 ἐξεγράφη: Droysen emended this to ἐνεγράφη as he thought that ἐξεγράφη opposed the meaning demanded by the context. For the meaning 'write out' (= 'exscribi') see Makkink, ad loc., where he refers to [Demosth.] 48,48; 49,43; Dttb. Syll. 3 972,5 εἰς τὸ λεύκωμα ἐκχειράσον, ibid. 742,29 τοὺς ἐχειγραμμένους which, though disputed, seems to belong here. To these examples may be added the decree published in Hesperia 5, 1936,393 ff. and especially ibid. 11,1942,149, 160.

79 καὶ τὰ εἰρημένα: the conjecture of Sluiter and J. Bekker κατὰ τὰ εἰρημένα should be considered very seriously, cf. IG 1 94,10–11 κατὰ τὰ εἰρημένα (a.418/7), Arist. Ἀθη. 31,3 κατὰ τὰ γεγραμμένα (from a decree), IG 1 1241,35 κατὰ τὰ γεγραμμένα (a.300/299). Cf. also innumerable
examples from inscriptions of well-known clichés such as κατά τά πάτρια, κατά ταύτα, κατά τά πάτρια καὶ τά νόμιμα, Dttb. Syll. 9 1947,16 κατά τά ἔθιμα, etc.

— ἐξελείψαν πανταχόθεν: cf. IG II² 1,30 [Ἀπαντα ἐξελεισά]ντων οἱ νεώροι ἀπανταχόθεν.

— ἐν τῷ δήμου: ‘in public’. Because of the reading καὶ τά εἰρημένα adopted by M. and translated by ‘the names mentioned’, he gets into difficulties with the phrase ἐν τῷ δήμου ‘in the public treasury’, which he thinks impossible here. None of his propositions seems to me persuasive.


84 ἐξελινά δὲ καὶ ἱδώτη τῷ βουλομένῳ: cf. Demosth. 24,23 πρὸ δὲ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ὁ βουλομένος Ἀθηναίων ἐκτίθετο πρόσθεν τῶν ἐπώνυμων γράφεσιν τοὺς νόμους οὖς ἄν τοῦ ἱερᾶ τάτα.

85 to the references on the divine law add: S. O.T. 865 and cf. Lys. 6,10.

89 ὅπως . . . ἐνταῦθοτ: the switch from temporal expression to an expression of place referred to by M. is employed also in Modern Greek, e.g. ὅταν ἐπρόκειτο ν’ ἀρχίσῃ ν’ ἀποδίδῃ ἢ ἐπιχείρησης ἐκεῖ (= τότε) ἦταν ποτ τὴν πάθωμε.

— ἄνδρας: ‘This vocative without either ὁ or an accompanying adjective or noun (e.g. And. 2,14 ἄνδρες βουλευταί) is unusual. But a parallel instance seems to occur in Lys. 1,32, so that Blass’s insertion of ὁ may be unnecessary’. In Lys. 1,32 we have ὁ ἄνδρας М in corr., so also in Lyc. c. Leocr. 46 where ὁ is added by МZ. Many examples of likewise omitted ὁ occur, apparently deliberately, in Demosthenes’ speech On the Crown, e.g. 11.21.41. 63.76.82 al.; also in Din. 1,57.59.60.69.83.101 al. (in all these examples with proper names). The simple ἄνδρας occurs in X. An. 7,3,3 and S. Ant. 162. For another case when ὁ is omitted see Kühner-Gerth 1,48 n.4.


— καὶ οὖ μνησικακήσῳ τῶν πολιτῶν οὐδὲνι: cf. 81,91,79.108.109. This tag also occurs frequently in inscriptions, e.g. IG II² 111, 82 al.; Dub. Syll. 3 173,58 ὁ μνησικακήσῳ[τῶν τα[ρελπλυθότων πρὸς] Keilous ὁ[ς]ν hưởngός.


7. See also IG I p. 298b.
On its relationship to earlier and later laws see also: A. N. Oikonomides, Polemon 6,1956/7, 28–36; Hellenica 16,1959,6–13.

96 Ἀρχεῖ χρόνος: cf. also Thuc. 4,118,12. 5,19,1; Aesch. 3,62, IG I² 6,56/7 Ἀρχεῖν; cf. τὸν χρόνον τῶν σπονδῶν, IG I² 2492, Dttb. Syll. 9.3. 1097,43 χρόνος Ἀρχεῖ τῆς μυσθώσεως, etc. See also Marchant and Makkink, ad loc.

— ὀς Κλαυτάνης: this emendation, though accepted by all editors, is perhaps unnecessary. It is true that we find e.g. IG I² 51,52 ἐπὶ τῆς βουλῆς, but in IG I² 5,50 ὀς is found.

— πολέμιος τεθνάτο: cf. IG I² 10,32 f. Dttb. Syll. 9,14,10 πάσχειν ἀντὸς ὡς πολέμιος καὶ νηπιανεῖ τεθνάναι, etc.

— καὶ τὰ χρήματα αὐτοῦ δημόσια ἔστω: cf. [Plut.] 834a καὶ τὰ χρήματα δημόσια εἶναι καὶ τῆς θεοῦ τὸ ἐπιδέκατον. IG I² 43,55 καὶ τὰ/χρήμα[τα αὐ]τὸ δημόσια ἔστω καὶ τῆς ὁ[δὸ τ]ὸ ἐπιδέκατὸν (a. 378/7) etc.

97 ὁμισία δὲ Ἤθηναίως . . . δὲ δρόκος ἔστω δὲ: cf. Thuc. 5,47,8 Demosth. 59,60 Aristoph. Ran. 101. For the emendation cf. Andoc. 4.3.


98 καθάπερ Ἀρμόδιον τε καὶ Ἀριστογέτων: cf. Demosth. 20,159. As regards the privileges which their descendants received cf. also Hyper. 4,3 j. (that they should not be spoken ill of). Blass, incidentally, condemned τε καὶ (cf. Fuhr, Rh.M. 33,1878,583) but cf. IG I² 187,16 γεγονάτεν τε καὶ.

— ὁμίσιοι δὲ δρόκοι ὁμισεῖται: about these oaths cf. Thuc. 8,65 ff. 48.64 al., [Plut.] 833e.

113 περιγγάγουσιν: in support of Dobree’s conjecture παραγγάγουσιν ‘led astray’, besides A. Pers. παράγει βροτὸν εἰς ὅρκης Ἀτα (quoted by Makkink) cf. Lyc. c. Leocr. 92 οί γὰρ θεοὶ . . . τῶν πονηρῶν ἀνθρώπων τὴν διάνουσιν παραγγαίσι. It seems that the idea expressed in the two orators is identical.

122 ἀπαλλάξει δὲ Κηφίσιον: ‘send him away’? ‘remove him’? cf. Plut. Pelop. 9 and the note of Wyse on Isaeus 5,28,4; however, the reading διαλλάξει (= ‘δίαλλάσσει’, ‘reconcile’) should perhaps be considered.

130 τῶν τράπεζαν ἀνατρέψει: ‘upsets his father’s table’ (Marchant), ‘met sa banque à l’envers’ (Dalmeyda), ‘upsets his books’ a pun (Maidment); this is a curious phrase and though the general meaning seems to be that mentioned by LSJ. s.v. τράπεζα, namely a proverbial expression about a spendthrift, a note would be welcomed. Demosth. 19, 198 uses the phrase literally but here it seems to be used metaphorically.

131 δὲ ἀνατέρτερον ἐκείνου τῶν πλουτῶν: cf. A. Pers. 163 μὴ μέγας Πλοῦτος . . . ἀντρέψῃ ποδὶ ὀλβον. The metaphor seems to have originated
in the overturning of furniture, vehicles, craft and the like. The Aeschylean metaphor is very involved and presents serious difficulties (see Broadhead ad loc.); possibly it originated in the case of an animal—here we have the personified μέγας Πλοῦτος—which kicks and overtops vessels containing food, liquids (milk especially just after milking), etc.

132 As regards M.’s comment on μυών, the use of the verb λειτουργῶ in Modern Greek provides a parallel: the church official λειτουργεῖ (= ‘officiates’), but the same verb (or the periphrasis κάνει λειτουργία) is used also of the person who pays part of the ‘expenses’ of the festival mainly by presenting the special loaves (ἄρτοι), the olive-oil for the lamps, the candles etc. and participates in the rite by holding the ikon of the saint whose festival is being celebrated. Incidentally this second use of λειτουργῶ is also of pagan origin, cf. IG II² 1009,36 ἐλείτου[γ]ένεν δὲ καὶ ἐν ταῖς θυσίασις ἀπόσως εὐσεβῶς καὶ φιλο[τιμο]ς α[ς] τῆς κοσμήτης τῶν ἐρήμων (a.116/5); 1028,28 καὶ λειτουργησαν (sc. οἱ ἐρήμοι) ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ εὐτάκτως (a.100).

133 οἱ παρασυλλεγόντες: it would seem that παρά-, which originally meant ‘beside’, ‘near’ e.g. IG II² 416,5–6 καὶ ο[ἱ] ἰλλοὶ οἱ πα[λ] путешествοντες Ἀθη[ναίον] (‘those of the Athenians who happened to be there’) is here coloured also with the nuance ‘sinister’, ‘villainous’; something similar to παρα-φυλάσσω and especially to the later παρα-σύναξις.

139 ἄλλοι: I do not find M.’s suggestion against Hertlein’s emendation ἄνθρωπον convincing: ἰλλοι normally refers to human in contrast to other humans, not in contrast to gods, and in any case the two legs of the comparison or contrast must be of the same kind. On the other hand the gods are constantly contrasted to mortals, cf. e.g. Andoc. 2,15 εἶ γὰρ τοὺς θεοὺς ἔχοντα ὄνειδη οὖτοι μὲ μᾶλλον τῶν ἄνθρωπων ἐοίκασε κατελεξήσατι. Add that ἄνθρωποι is constantly abbreviated in byzantine manuscripts (i.e. ἄνων = ἄνθρωπον) and it will be realized that perhaps ἄνθρωπον should be read instead of the manuscript reading ἄλλων.

148 τὰ σώματα αὐτῶν δράν: cf. also Lyc. c. Leocr. 141 ἐν δραμαμοῖς δῶτες, καὶ δράμεται.

The way M. sometimes interprets the evidence lends itself to criticism. Two examples can be mentioned here: The first concerns the motives of Kallias in claiming the daughter of Epilykos. M. writes: ‘More questionable is his [i.e. Andocides] account of the motives of the various persons concerned. He alleges that, though the girl was claimed nominally by Kallias’s

8. Cf. Demosth. 9,69 and 19,250 ἄνετρετε καὶ κατέδυσεν (λί σχίνης τῆς πόλιν) τὸ καθ’ αὐτὸν; 18,143 ἐπαινεῖ ἄνετρετε τὰ τῶν Ἐπιλίκου (Φίλίππου); 25,29 τὰ κοινὰ δίκαι’ ἄνεκρέσσι; 25,32 ἄναπτρέσσε τῆς πόλιν; 36,58. 18,269. Hyper. 1,21,18. 4,15,3 etc. For the metaphorical use of the middle in Hellenistic literature see A. Gow on Theor. 8, 90.

son, really Kallias wanted her for himself; yet he does not explain why, in this case, Kallias did not claim her in his own name. One may, if one chooses, think up possible explanations for this procedure; but when one reads that Kallias wanted the girl because of his lust, whereas Andokides claimed her because of his generosity, the desire for explanations may well give way to sheer disbelief. It is reasonable to wonder whether Andokides was really less selfish in claiming the girl for himself than Kallias in claiming her for another, and to suspect that she possessed other attractions besides debts’ (p. 12–3).

This may appear correct but the facts are slightly different:

(i) Kallias did not claim her in his own name because the son was the relative to the girl (not himself) and it was on relationship alone that any claim would have to be based;

(ii) Andocides’s claim to the girl (whatever the real motives) cannot be in any way equated or likened to that of Kallias, since (a) he was a relation of the girl (in fact the nearest relation as far as males are concerned) and he had according to the prevailing custom a religio-social duty to claim the girl, (b) in the event that Andocides was claiming her for himself, one does not see the reason why he should not admit it openly. There was nothing disreputable in such a case: he was only in his forties and hoped to acquire children, he was socially superior to the girl and being so close a relation what would have been better than marry her himself instead of looking elsewhere to find her a husband?

The second example consists of M.’s comments in a paragraph from Appendix A on why Andocides did not quote the complete list of persons denounced as participating in the profanation of the mysteries by the slave Lydos. M. thinks that if the other lists were preserved, that of Lydos should also be preserved. ‘But even if Lydos’s list’, he continues, ‘was not preserved (possibly because Lydos did not receive a reward for information, ...), it was still necessary for Andocides to show that he himself was not among those denounced by Lydos.’ The two witnesses called by Andocides to give evidence would have not been able, M. thinks, to give a complete list of those denounced by Lydos. Now, here the important point is that these two witnesses would have been able to tell the court whether Andocides had been denounced or not by Lydos. The complete list of his denunciations is not so important. But M. does not mention this and goes on: ‘In 25–26 Andokides invites certain persons, who had been denounced in the Mysteries affair, to refute him if they can. Yet he does not call them as witnesses in his favour. So presumably they were not in a position to state positively that he had not been denounced by Lydos, for if they had been he would have called them.’ But it is very well known that such invitations are a typical practice on the part of the speaker and that the people challenged or invited are not expected to give evidence. Besides the answer is given by M. himself:
'the reason why Andokides did not call them as witnesses was that he had already quoted official lists of persons denounced by these two [i.e. Andromachos and Teukros] and so did not need witnesses as well'. But all the same he concludes: 'But did Lydos's list of names survive? Andokides cannot have it both ways. If Lydos's list was available, then proof is lacking that his name had not been on it. I conclude that, as far as Andokides's evidence goes, Lydos may well have denounced him.' An unnecessary discussion leading to a misleading statement in my opinion.

On the same page (169) but in the next paragraph another such example is to be found. M. is 'doubtful whether a statement that Leogoras was asleep with his face covered during the mock Mysteries would really count as a denunciation'. But what if someone were today to find himself in some sort of revolutionary meeting and it so happened that he was caught by the police? Could he plead that he went there just by accident and that he had nothing to do with the movement? Would he not be charged for promoting the aims of that revolutionary body? Leogoras was present at the profanation of the Mysteries and therefore it is understandable that he would be charged.

Lastly in Appendix C (p. 173) M. thinks that he made a minor discovery: 'A significant fact which has not, as far as I know, been previously noticed is that none of those who were guilty of mutilation of the Hermai was called as a witness at Andokides's trial in 400. This was not because these conspirators were not available in 400... Yet Andokides did not call them.' Of course not, since (i) he wished to dissociate himself from these persons, and (ii) probably they were no longer on good terms with him, since he had given evidence against them. Therefore the less said of them in court the better.

This brief note is concluded without touching on the complicated question of the profanation of the Mysteries on which a specialist should write an extensive note where the relevant texts would be brought together. In the meantime I would like to point out a remarkable example of similar behaviour in 9th century Byzantium, when the emperor Michael III (the Drunkard), his pseudo-patriarch Gryllos and a band of rogues gave expression to their anti-religious feelings by indulging in mock-rituals of the Orthodox Church and by competing with the patriarch of Constantinople and his clergy. The chronicler known as Theophanes Continuatus (ed. Bonn) p. 243 writes: καὶ τὸ δὴ σχετιλώτατον ὅτι καὶ αὐτὰ τὰ τῆς πίστεως ἡμῶν σώμβολα χλευάζων και κερτομοῦν, ἄντιτύπους τῶν σεμνῶν ἱερέων ἐκ τῶν περὶ αὐτῶν μήλων καὶ γελοίων καταστησάμενος, μυκτηρισμὸν καὶ χλεύην ἐτίθει ταύτα καὶ γέλωτα; he then proceeds to give examples of the emperor's behaviour (pp. 244–8).
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