

Perikles' Wife: Chronological Calculations

Robert D. Cromeey

Φ αίνεται μέντοι μάλλον έρωτική τις ή τοῦ Περικλέους ἀγάπησις γενομένη πρὸς Ἀσπασίαν. ἦν μὲν γὰρ αὐτῷ γυνή προσήκουσα μὲν κατὰ γένος, συνωκηκυῖα δ' Ἴππονίκῳ πρότερον, ἐξ οὗ Καλλιάν ἐτεκε τὸν πλούσιον· ἐτεκε δὲ καὶ παρὰ τῷ Περικλεῖ Ξάνθιππον καὶ Πάραλον. εἶτα τῆς συμβιώσεως οὐκ οὔσης αὐτοῖς ἀρεστῆς, ἐκείνην μὲν ἐτέρῳ βουλομένην συνεξέδωκεν, αὐτὸς δὲ τὴν Ἀσπασίαν λαβὼν ἔστερξε διαφερόντως (Plut. *Per.* 24).

It would seem in fact more an erotic sort of love that Perikles developed for Aspasia. For while his wife was his kinswoman, she had been wedded first to Hipponikos, from whom she bore Kallias the wealthy; and then while with Perikles she bore Xanthippos and Paralos. Afterwards when life together did not prove apt for them, then at her own wish he assisted in providing a dowry when she married another man, and he, taking up with Aspasia, loved her in quite a different fashion.

Plutarch's marital sequence for this thrice-married woman often is denied accuracy, is often accepted, both with equal insouciance due to failure to perform the necessary genealogical calculations. Yet if Plutarch's testimony ultimately cannot be proven right by independent evidence (and if that were the case, there would be no cause for dissension), one must admit the weakness of the counter-argument heretofore, to the effect that Plutarch's anonymous lady must first have wed Perikles, then Hipponikos, then someone else. This alteration of Plutarch's sequence was proposed by Beloch long ago and is maintained recently by J. K. Davies. Both Beloch and Davies offer three fundamental objections to accepting Plutarch's sequence. Each objection may be examined in turn: (1) the age of Hipponikos' daughter Hipparete when she wed the famous Alkibiades: Plutarch's testimony appears to make her too old for the match. (2) The age of Hipparete's brother Kallias III Hipponikou: according to Plutarch's marital scheme, he seems too active as a very old man. (3) The ages

of Perikles' sons: Plutarch's sequence seems to make them too young to wed.¹

(1) Hipparete's age. Beloch assumed that if this woman had in fact married Hipponikos II first, engendering both Kallias III and Hipparete I, Hipparete would be much older than her husband Alkibiades. Beloch's fundamental assumption probably is correct, that Alkibiades would not marry an older woman—despite the special and tempting circumstance that Hipparete's father, one of the fifth century's wealthiest men, pledged a huge dowry, and a further sum for the birth of a first son (Andoc. 4.13).

Beloch's calculations unfortunately are based upon a single incorrect assumption: that Hipponikos II engendered both his children (Kallias III and Hipparete) by the same wife, Plutarch's anonymous woman. Hipparete however is nowhere said to be daughter of that woman and of Hipponikos II; the product of that marriage always is said to be Kallias III alone. Hipparete naturally is called Kallias III's sister, ἀδελφή, and she still is daughter of Hipponikos. But she is his daughter by a second marriage, after Hipponikos had put away Kallias III's mother: Kallias is not Hipparete's *frater uterinus*, he is οὐκ ὁμομήτριος, not of the same mother.² W. E. Thompson has, apparently unnoticed, already alighted on this fact.³ One therefore must derive from it the necessary conclusions: (a) that the age of Hipparete at her wedding to Alkibiades III should not and cannot be calculated from the dates of the marriage of Plutarch's anonymous woman to Hipponikos; Hipparete's birth-year is unknown, but it was after that of her brother Kallias III; (b) that Hipparete was younger than Alkibiades when they wed—or at least, since this assumption is more firmly based in text and in actual marital practice than was Beloch's, it should be the preferred alternative.

(2) The age of Kallias III Hipponikou, Hipparete's half-brother, when ambassador to Sparta in 371. Kallias III went to Sparta as ambassador on an important mission in 371, and was "still alive, even if not active" in 367/6; "to recede before 450 for his birth year," says Davies (263), "becomes progressively more and more improbable for each additional year. 450 itself is as likely a date as any." Thus Davies' date for Kallias' birth makes him aged about 79 in 371 and 83 in

¹ K. J. Beloch, *Griechische Geschichte*² II.2 (Strassburg 1916) 35; J. K. DAVIES, *Athenian Propertied Families* (Oxford 1971: hereafter 'Davies') 262.

² On the term see Philo, *De spec.leg.* 3.4 (303), 'Solon's law'; schol.Ar.*Nub.* 1371; Dem. 57.20; on Kallias as *adelphos* of Hipparete, Plut. *Alc.* 8.8; Hipparete as *adelphē* of Kallias, Andoc. 4.13; daughter of Hipponikos, Isoc. 16.31, Andoc. 4.13.

³ "Athenian Marriage Patterns: Remarriage," *CSCA* 5 (1972) 213 n.18.

367. If we accept Plutarch's sequence, however, a Kallias born about 456 would be aged 85 in 371, 89 in 367. The sole objection here is general disbelief that so old a man (aged 85) could undertake a trip to Sparta, or rather that the Athenians would vote to send him, since ambassadors were appointed by show of hands and not chosen by lot. Yet there are excellent reasons, general and specific, why Kallias would be appointed to this embassy if ambulatory at all.

The general reasons may seem unpersuasive to us, but not to the Athenians. Embassies were preceded by (if they did not necessarily include) a *keryx*, 'herald'; Kallias' clan were the Kerykes, not for the Eleusinian rites alone but also in diplomacy, a point noted by others.⁴ Insofar as the word for ambassador, *presbys*, means 'old man', Kallias was well qualified. To these general reasons Xenophon with his excellent Spartan sources fortunately adds *ad hominem* explanations for Kallias' presence in 371 (*Hell.* 6.3.1–5). In Xenophon's reconstruction of his speech, Kallias informs the Spartans that he is a most apposite head for this mission because (a) he is a Spartan *proxenos* in Athens, having inherited that post from his illustrious, much-traveled grandfather; (b) the Athenians usually chose men of his family to wage war (not an idle boast: Plut. *Arist.* 5.5, Thuc. 3.91.4, Xen. *Hell.* 4.5.13) and to arrange peace (*cf.* Hdt. 7.151, Diod. 12.7). (c) The Athenians already have sent him twice to Sparta to arrange a cease-fire and a peace, and both times he was successful. (d) A priest of Demeter, he requests that the ravages of the Athenian cereal crops be ended. It matters little whether we think Kallias' reasoning is persuasive ourselves, for as Xenophon pointedly says, most of Kallias' speech is an excuse for his being there at all; although imposing, Kallias is a figure-head. Serious proposals are made later by eight other men.

Clearly Kallias was an appropriate and necessary head of the mission in 371 no matter what his age. One further piece of Kerykid chronology yet allows an older Kallias in 371: as Davies himself calculates, Kallias' grandfather Kallias II served as ambassador to distant Susa at age 81, and again to Sparta at age 84, about the same age at which his grandson is to be thought too feeble to travel the same roads. For these Kerykids were very much what Davies calls them, a family of "long-lived men" (262–63, 269).

Accordingly an argument that Kallias Hipponikou, aged 85 in 371, was too old to be selected as head of a mission to Sparta seems in-

⁴ D. J. Mosley and F. Adcock, *Diplomacy in Ancient Greece* (New York 1975) 153. The embassy generally, Mosley, "The Athenian Embassy to Sparta in 371 B.C.," *PCPhS* N.S. 8 (1962) 41–46.

substantial. This argument was the most serious objection to accepting Plutarch's testimony on our anonymous woman's marriage to Hipponikos.

(3) The ages of Xanthippos Perikleous and his brother when wed. Two out of three arguments in favor of rearranging Plutarch's testimony seem on close inspection to be quite weak. One has less success in demolishing the third argument because evidence is so slight that a case for rearranging Plutarch's sequence, or for preserving it, might be made with equal conviction. Into the balance therefore may be thrown a piece of new testimony, from Plato.⁵

According to Plutarch (*Per.* 37.3) Perikles' sons were born before 451, when he passed his citizenship law (*cf.* Arist. *Ath.Pol.* 26.4). Perikles' sons were married men when they died *ca* 430, preceding in death their father and his anonymous sister (*Per.* 16.4). One of Plutarch's principal sources on their lives was the acerbic Stesimbrotos of Thasos, who recorded—or rather narrated (*Per.* 13.11, 16.4, 36.1–3)—the story of a quarrel between Perikles and his sons over their inheritance.⁶ Their marriage and quarrel, if factual, presuppose perhaps one year's marriage for both sons before their deaths.

The fourth century had its own notions on the proper *akmai* at which to breed eugenically, visible in the works of Xenophon (*Mem.* 4.4.19–33), Plato (*Resp.* 461c, *Leg.* 838A–C, 924E), Menander (*Aspis* 267, 305–15), and Aristotle (*e.g.* *Pol.* 1334b30–1336a2). Although these opinions are themselves derived from the works of physicians and natural philosophers (Arist. *Pol.* 1335a40), and these in turn affected by popular socio-economic currents, popular prejudice supposed that the proper physical *akme* of the male at marriage and procreation is *ca* 30–35 years of age (a physical peak merely; mental prime comes later); and there were good reasons why a woman must be younger.⁷ In actual practice however there were variations from this rule of thumb, depending upon incentive. Davies recalls (268) that Kallias III's son Hipponikos III “was probably aged between 20 and 25” when he intended to claim in court (*ἐπιδικάζεσθαι*, Andoc. 1.120) one of the daughters of Epilykos. Is there evidence that Perikles' sons married earlier than was customary?

⁵ The ‘Springhouse Decree’ (*IG* I² 54) cannot be dated and “no conclusion with regard to the matrimonial status of Perikles' sons or the birth of grandsons may legitimately be based on this text”: A. G. Woodhead, “The Date of the Springhouse Decree,” *ArchCl* 25/26 (1973/4) 757. *Cf.* Davies 457, Thompson (*supra* n.3) 213 n.18.

⁶ Stesimbrotos' vicious narrative may be alleviated by considering Kresilas' portrait-bust of Perikles as dedicated by his son Xanthippos: A. Raubitschek, “Zur Perikles-statue des Kresilas,” *ArchCl* 25/26 (1973/4) 620–21.

⁷ Discussion in “Sokrates' Myrto,” *GrazBeitr* 9 (1980) 57–67.

In *Protagoras* Plato presents a *mis en scène* that appears to depict Kallias III as eldest, Xanthippos and Paralos as next oldest, and Alkibiades III as youngest of Protagoras' auditors.⁸ Plato's chronology thus would reflect Plutarch's; it would even prove that Plutarch was correct. But Plato's whimsy with historical evidence in *Protagoras* was noticed long ago, by Athenaios (or one of his *personae*). Whatever his sources, Athenaios' criticisms strike home (218–19). They are that: (a) the dramatic date of *Protagoras* must be before 430 because Plato uses Xanthippos and Paralos as actors (although with nothing to say), and they died in 430. (b) Hippias of Elis also is present in Kallias' house, together with τῶν ξένων πολῖται τε αὐτοῦ (315C), "of the strangers present, some fellow-citizens of his," an improbable presence (supposes Athenaios) were Athens then warring with Sparta and her allies, including Elis. Athenaios, who has looked, cannot find in his books a period of truce allowing Hippias to visit Athens. (c) Kallias' father Hipponikos II apparently is newly dead (315D), an event occurring shortly before the presentation of Eupolis' *Kolakes* of 422/1 where, says Athenaios, Kallias was shown beginning to squander his father's property. (d) Again, it is Protagoras' second visit to Athens (310E); Athenaios calculates this arrival as happening between 425 and 421, and finally selects the late 420's for the dramatic date of *Protagoras*.

But parallel to this chronological confusion, Plato constructs a curiously precise genealogical reckoning. The poet Agathon appears as νέον τι ἔτι μειράκιον . . . παιδικὰ Πανσανίου, "a young man still something of a boy . . . Pausanias' plaything" (315D–E). Sokrates' friend Hippokrates Apollodorou was ἔτι γὰρ παῖς, "still a boy," when Protagoras first visited Athens (310E), so that when Sokrates remarks that he and Hippokrates are ἡμεῖς γὰρ ἔτι νέοι, "still young men," even Plato must intend irony in contrasting Sokrates with Protagoras, since in 432 Sokrates was aged 37, in 420 49 (314B). Xanthippos Perikleous walks on one side of Protagoras, on the other walks Καλλίας ὁ Ἰππονίκου καὶ ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ ὁ ὁμομήτριος Πάραλος ὁ Περικλέους, "Kallias son of Hipponikos and his brother by the same mother Paralos son of Perikles" (314E). Xanthippos and Paralos are νέοι, νεανίσκοι, ἡλικιωῶται, 'coevals' of the sculptor Polykleitos' sons (328D, 319E, 328C). They are ἄφετοι, like 'sacred cattle' browsing on education aimlessly wherever they find it (320A).⁹ Sokrates

⁸ P. Bicknell, without discussion, notes also that passages of *Prt.* like 314C–315A suggest that Plutarch was correctly informed: *Studies in Athenian Politics and Genealogy* (*Historia Einzelschr.* 19 [1972]) 77 n.3.

⁹ Perhaps a term anticipating their deaths, since it is used also of those who have been dedicated to the gods, like Euripides' Ion (*Ion* 822, *Plut. Mor.* 768B).

remarks that neither son of Perikles has inherited his father's *arete* (319E, cf. *Meno* 94B). Protagoras answers that it is unfair to judge them, there is still hope: *νέοι γάρ* (328D). Plato's words mirror the judgement found among Protagoras' own works, for according to Plutarch, Protagoras wrote that Perikles' sons died "when they were youthful and fair," *τῶν γὰρ υἱέων νεηγιῶν ὄντων καὶ καλῶν* (*Mor.* 118E: DK 80F9), and in composing *Protagoras* Plato, despite his remarkable gift for *mimesis*, probably helped himself generously to quotations or paraphrases of Protagoras' true *opera*.

For Kallias III, Plato gives no precise term to describe his age. It must be deduced more approximately. To house his philosophers, Kallias has just cleared out his father's treasury (315D, doubtless artistically symbolic rather than real), is newly embarked on constructing this "prytaneion of wisdom," as Hippias of Elis generously calls it (337D), and is a mature head-of-house. Alkibiades is shown as much younger. Although Sokrates still may be hunting Alkibiades' fleeting *ώρα*, although Alkibiades may still be *καλός*, nevertheless he is *ἀνὴρ ἔτι, ἀνὴρ μέντοι*, "yet a man, a true man," because his beard has just come in (309A). And although Plato assumes that Alkibiades and his brother Kleinias IV have been Perikles' wards for some time (320A), if Alkibiades were born by 449, by 432 he would be 17, in 420 an overripe 30 (Athenaios notes these difficulties in a general way, 219F–220A).

So then, although Plato's genealogical details appear curiously precise, nevertheless in laying out the scene of *Protagoras* he twice blunders chronologically. He assumes that Kallias is head-of-house by 430. He also describes the occasion as Protagoras' second visit to Athens. But perhaps it is in genealogy rather than in chronology that Plato the historian may be taken more seriously, for one's general impression from *Protagoras* is that Plato himself thought Kallias III eldest, Perikles' sons younger, and Alkibiades III youngest in respect to one another. These were members of an upper class with whom Plato was intimate, and whatever the date of *Protagoras*' composition, Kallias III lived long into Plato's prime.

To summarize: Hipparete was not the daughter of Perikles' wife and her age therefore is inconsequential for dating the marriages of that woman, or for verifying Plutarch's chronology. Kallias III Hipponikou may have lived amply long to be selected as ambassador to Sparta in 371 at age 85; there were excellent reasons for sending Kallias to Sparta, and his own grandfather provides an almost exact chronological parallel in the ambassadorship. Xanthippos' and Paralos' ages when they wed are uncertain; but Kallias III (as Plato appears to

depict him) seems older than his half-brothers, a quotation ascribed to Protagoras appearing to support Plato's evaluation. All this follows the scheme of Plutarch's marital sequence at *Pericles* 24.5 better than it fits a rearrangement of that sequence.

Plutarch's evidence is acceptable, then, if one allows the following chronology. Kallias III Hipponikou II was born *ca* 457; his mother, Plutarch's anonymous woman, then divorcing Hipponikos married Perikles *ca* 455/4 (456/5 in any case is Davies' date for her transfer from a first husband to second); her first son by her second known marriage, Xanthippos, was born *ca* 454/3, making him at least 23 at his death.¹⁰

Merely in chronological outline there seems little here to cause unease, and this anonymous woman's discomfort in bearing so many children in such regular succession easily is paralleled in other societies as well as the Athenian. An objection may be raised at this point, that Perikles' late age at marriage makes Plutarch's chronology unlikely: if born about 494 he would be 39 or 40 at the time of his first marriage.¹¹ That it was in fact his first marriage is shown by the names of his sons, since it was customary to name a first son after his grandfather (Xanthippos); a second was named for oneself, but Perikles, sacrificing self-interest, gave his second son instead the democratic, political name Paralos, 'patron saint' of sailors, son of Poseidon, but perhaps really honoring the reconquest of the Hellespontine and Asian *paralia* achieved *ca* 551.¹² Therefore no 'Perikles' from a previous marriage seems possible, dead as an infant.

This objection is countered strongly by Perikles' known devotion to public service and his apparently calculating intention in marrying. Plutarch says both that Perikles took a close-fisted, exacting care of his finances, assigning a talented slave to be his estate's accountant (16.3–5); and that Perikles only exceptionally allowed family matters to distract him from public business (7.4). Both statements are meant to illustrate Perikles' efficient self-discipline in serving the commonweal.

¹⁰ "Hipparete's mother exchanged husbands *c.* 455," Davies 263.

¹¹ For the date of Perikles' birth see Davies 457.

¹² There are alternatives for the derivation of his name, but add to Jacoby's citation of sources (*ad FGrHist* 328F47–48 n.7) schol.Dem. 21.171 (Dind.), that the *Paralos* "sailed to the Paralia, that is the Asian and Hellespontine. For it was dispatched to the allies if the Athenians wished to command something," and schol. Aeschin. 3.162, that the ship was named for residents of the Attic *paralia* who manned it. It is curious to be named so directly for a hero (the proper anthroponym would be Paralios, *cf.* Kirchner *PA* 11611), but parallels perhaps exist: in the first century B.C. [Π]άραλος in the catalogue *IG* II² 1959.6, and in the fourth Πάραλος of *Hesperia* 19 (1950) 28 no.4.

For his marriage seems similarly purposed to reduce family life to its necessary minimum, if considered in light of contemporary Athenian attitudes toward 'marriage' (our word: the Greeks had no word for marriage, Arist. *Pol.* 1253b10, *ἀνώνυμον γὰρ ἢ γυναικὸς καὶ ἀνδρὸς σύζευξις*). It may appear banal to point out that marriages are meant to produce children, but since there were other sexual outlets available, some also producing children, the structural purpose of full marriage in Athenian society needs emphasis: it was the most unassailable way of shifting about within society property and family cults, a civic and religious responsibility for Perikles and any citizen. One reason why this full marriage lacked a name is that it was a trial marriage until a child was born, and vocabulary of ritual bears this out, since a woman was an *arotos*, 'field', her father by a handshake (the probable meaning of the term *ἐγγύη*) lending her over for use but not ownership to her husband in a terminology used also for agricultural implements.¹³ The birth of a child, presumably meaning a male, meant that provisions of the contract were fulfilled, both her father and her husband achieving transmission of cult and property, since her son eventually succeeded to his share of her father's property. Two sons insured such stability, and if one married a kinswoman, property complexities were reduced to a minimum by keeping them within the (extended) family. The 'marriage', having achieved its purpose, was no longer trial and could, in fact, be dispensed with, both partners able to divorce.

These general considerations all seem to typify Perikles' marriage. He married a kinswoman (any first cousin would do), in a union uncomfortable to both. She produced two sons. She left Perikles on her own initiative to wed again. Securing her dowry's return and her remarriage were the legal responsibility of her nearest kinsman; according to Plutarch, Perikles helped endower her, probably here meaning that he generously added something to the original dowry she had brought with her and which had never properly 'belonged' to him.

¹³ *πάντην γνησίων παιδων ἐπ' ἀρότῳ σοι δίδωμι* (*vel sim.*), say fathers-in-law to grooms in Menander (*Pk.* 1013; *cf. Dys.* 842, *Sam.* 726 Sandbach); on child-making as a woman's work, J.-P. Vernant, *Mythe et pensée chez les Grecs* I (Paris 1974) 140–41; general terminology, H. J. Wolff, "Marriage Law and Family Organization in Ancient Athens," *Traditio* 2 (1944) 42–65, with A. R. W. Harrison, *The Law of Athens* I (Oxford 1968) 32 n.1. 'Trial marriage' is exemplified in other societies, but for Athens see the suggestions of W. K. Lacey, "Aspects of Greek Marriage," *AULLA, Proceedings and Papers, 13th Congr.* (1970) 59–60; *The Family in Classical Greece* (Ithaca 1968) 198; and Dem. 19.122, Xen. *Mem.* 2.2.4, Pl. *Resp.* 457ff; the tragedy of a childless woman, Isae. 2.7–9, 7.26.

Perikles' marriage thus seems another example of serving state before self: his obligation to the state of transmitting cult and property without state intervention was accomplished with dispatch. Only years later he took an interest in the Milesian *hetaira* Aspasia, and after taking Kleinias and Alkibiades as wards into his house in 447, elevated Aspasia about the same time to the rank of *pallake*, a legal union because it was defined by law as outside any property considerations whatever—dowry, inheritance of any kind for anyone.¹⁴ His growing sons could only approve his consideration of their rights as heirs, and it was only after their deaths and shortly before his own, about 429, that upon Perikles' pleas the *demos* allowed his *nothos* by Aspasia to enter Perikles' phratry, become a full citizen, and at that point to assume the name 'Perikles' (Plut. *Per.* 37.5); if born about 447, he would at age 18 in 429 be ready to enter upon his duty as an ephebe.

Viewed in such a light, Perikles' tardiness in marriage fits Plutarch's calculations easily enough; and the kinswoman he took was already of proven fertility (even excepting Hipparete as not her child), a valuable adjunct to a house like Perikles', until then scant of heirs.

But if it is only by indirect means that Plutarch's chronology may be justified, perhaps nevertheless it is a constructive step to have indicated the weakness of previous arguments against it. Granted, Plutarch himself sometimes seems arbitrary in his decision whether to accept or reject the chronological evidence. Witness his insouciance in accepting as truth the legend that Solon met Kroisos: not only is the meeting attested by many authors (although clearly Solon wrote nothing about it himself), but, Plutarch continues, it also suits Solon's *ethos*, his loftiness, and his wisdom.

¹⁴ Aspasia, *pallake* in 447: although the son of a *pallake* necessarily was a *nothos* (it remains uncertain whether *nothoi* were citizens: summary of discussion in P. J. Rhodes, "Bastards as Athenian Citizens," *CQ* n.s. 28 [1978] 89–92), it is natural to suppose that Perikles II was born after his father's citizenship law of 451, as Davies does (458). It also is logical to assume that Perikles II was born after his father's divorce. Perikles' wife therefore bore his sons between 454 and 451. Davies presents circumstantial evidence that "Perikles' divorce from his wife happened at least five years before his relationship with Aspasia began," evidence perhaps untroubled by Davies' decision (263, 457) to place Perikles' divorce in 455. In 447/6 when their father died at Koroneia, Alkibiades and his brother Kleinias became wards of Perikles and his brother Ariphron; they lived in Perikles' house (Pl. *Pr.* 320A), presumably without their mother Deinomache but with Perikles' sons. There was sufficient room for scandal (*cf.* Antisthenes at Ath. 220D) that 447 was an appropriate moment for Perikles to regularize his relationship with the *hetaira* Aspasia by making her his *pallake*, a reasonably respectable union (by definition a *pallake* lived with her protector). Small property considerations in *pallakia* were admitted: Harrison (*supra* n.13) 14.

212 PERIKLES' WIFE: CHRONOLOGICAL CALCULATIONS

Nor does it seem right to me to forsake it for certain so-called chronological tables which thousands are emending to this very day and cannot reconcile in their internal contradictions into any single argument (*Sol.* 27.1).

It is, however, unwise from a few arbitrary decisions in controversial matters to censure Plutarch for chronological negligence generally. He often is aware that there are severe problems, knows where to go for guidance, and his trustworthiness in the routine narration of Perikles' wife's marital sequence may be contrasted favorably with his censure, for chronological errors in quite routine matters, of the writings of Stesimbrotos (*Per.* 10.6, 26.1, 35.4; *Them.* 2.3, 24.5) and Idomeneus (*Arist.* 10.8). Hypotheses built about such a 'reconstruction' of Plutarch's note at *Perikles* 24.5 accordingly will need revision.¹⁵

VIRGINIA COMMONWEALTH UNIVERSITY
July, 1982

¹⁵ *E.g.*, the birth-year of Kallias III, the 'impossible' chronology by which Deino-mache might become Perikles' wife, and certain Alkmeonid chronology: Davies 263, 18, 379. Davies' work long will remain a standard reference, and such corrections naturally will occur.