Agora ostrakon P. 9945 as restored by A. Raubitschek offers a less than complimentary opinion of the hero of Plataea. Describing the victim of the ostrakophoria of 483/2 as 'Αριστέραιδεν τὸν Δάφνιδος διέλεψεν, the inscription is generally interpreted as accusing Aristeides of pro-Persian sympathies. P.J. Bicknell, in the course of an examination of the role of Aristeides in the Marathon campaign, has affirmed the traditional interpretation of the ostrakon and links Aristeides with the medising policy pursued by the Alkmeonidai in 490. Furthermore, Bicknell regards Agora ostrakon P. 5978, which describes Aristeides as ['hoς τὸ]ς ηυκέτας ἀπέσωσεν, as a clear reference to the sacrilege of the Alkmeonidai in the suppression of the Kylonian conspiracy and as confirmation that the hetairos of Kleisthenes had not changed his political allegiances.

Bicknell goes on to suggest that Aristeides and his tribal contingent from Antiochis were left on the Marathon battlefield to guard the booty because the loyalty of the strategos was suspect. By not returning immediately to Athens they would be denied the opportunity of betraying the city to the Persians. In my view, however, Aristeides' stewardship of the booty after the battle by no means convicts him of traitorous intentions or leanings. Certainly, if the tribesmen of Antiochis did not return to the city, two other demotai of Alopeke, both known medisers, would have been forced to remain with Aristeides and the plunder. Megakles Hippokratous was an Alkmeonid who was ostracised for his associations with the family of Hippias who guided the Persians to Marathon, while Kallias Kratiou, a leading candidate in an early ostrakophoria if not the victim of 486/5, is described as 'the Mede' on four Kerameikos ostraka and caricatured in Persian garb on a fifth. But if the aim of the exercise was to frustrate the threat to the security of the city posed by the medisers and friends of the tyrants among the Athenian aristocracy, we are compelled to explain why two other pro-Persian sympathisers, neither of them tribesmen of Antiochis, were permitted to return to Athens with the other nine tribes. Hipparchos Charmou of Kollytos, the ostracism victim of 488/7, was συγγενής of Peisistratos, while Kallixenos Aristonymou, the Alkmeonid from Xypete, was dubbed ὁ προδότης by one voter in an ostrakophoria of the 480's.

Bicknell's case for Aristeides' medism would appear to be considerably strengthened by the inscription on Agora ostrakon P. 9945. I am, however, not convinced that the now canonical restoration is the correct one and I offer the following two restorations as further possibilities, neither of which lends any further support to the extraordinary charge of medism laid against Aristeides.
I.

'Αριστείδης | τὸν Δαμάσιον | ἄδελφόν

The Damasias referred to is, of course, Damasias ὁ δεύτερος, the eponymous archon of 582/1 who illegally remained in office for two years and two months and when deposed was replaced by a junta of ten archons who held power until the end of 580/79.\(^{15}\)

Plutarch records that Aristeides sponsored legislation that would enable all classes of Athenian citizens to be eligible for the archonship.\(^{16}\) Hignett,\(^{17}\) however, regards this piece of information as a fiction on the grounds that the zeugitai only became eligible for the archonship in 457/6.\(^{18}\) But Hignett overlooks the fact that Plutarch merely wrote γράφει γῆφησια κοινῆν εἶναι τὴν πολιτείαν and the verb γράφω by no means implies that the proposed legislation was actually enacted.

A far more serious difficulty exists in the chronology of the legislation since Plutarch places Aristeides’ proposal after the battle of Platea, while Agora ostrakon P. 9945 was found in a sealed deposit containing potsherds ballots from an ostrakophoria of the 480’s.\(^{19}\) Many possibilities exist. Plutarch could simply be wrong on the timing of Aristeides’ proposed legislation, not an unknown phenomenon, in which case it would perhaps belong to the year 487/6 as an unsuccessful rider to the enactment which brought about election by lot for the archonship.\(^{20}\) Or, perhaps, Aristeides made two unsuccessful attempts to open the magistracy to all citizens, once in 487/6 and again after Platea.\(^{21}\) Even if we accept Plutarch’s chronology as it stands, it should be remembered that many authorities have seen the legislation which instituted sortition for the archonship as the work of Aristeides.\(^{22}\) In either case, the intention of the voter who inscribed Agora ostrakon P. 9945 is clear. Damasias was remembered chiefly because of his failure to observe constitutional niceties as archon. To describe Aristeides as his brother was to do no more than express bleak disapproval of the part he played in initiating or supporting legislation concerning the magistracy. If this legislation also aimed at broadening the franchise of those eligible for the office, the criticism could scarcely have been more pertinent.

When Damasias was finally removed, the eponymous archonship was handed over to a commission of ten for the remainder of 480/79.\(^{22}\) This commission comprised five εὐπατρίδαι, three ἄγροικοι, and two δημιουργοὶ;\(^{23}\) in other words, representatives from all classes of Athenian citizens.

II.

[Καλλίξενος | 'Αριστονύμοι | τὸν Δάμαδος | ἄδελφον]

The intended victim, Kallixenos Aristonymou of Xypete, a perennial favourite with the voters, has his name recorded on over 260 ostraka cast at various ostrakophoriai of the 480’s. Stamires and Vanderpool\(^{24}\) have quite properly identified Kallixenos as an Alkmeonid on the evidence of his patronymic as well
as the restored gentilician on ostrakon Inv. No. 15,799. They also drew attention
to another ostrakon25 which describes Kallixenos as ho προδότης, an epithet
which accords well with the usual accusations of medism and disloyalty cast
against the Alkmeonidai. It was noted that a passage from the orator
Lykourgos,26 on any reasonable interpretation, suggests that the term
προδότης and the charge of προδοσία were political slogans in the 480’s.
More recently, Bicknell27 has even identified Kallixenos as the man who flashed
the shield signal to the Persians after Marathon.28
My proposed restoration of Kallixenos’ name on Agora ostrakon P. 9945 is
simply further confirmation of Kallixenos’ medism, a political aberration which
was not the exclusive property of the Alkmeonidai from Alopeke.
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