

ANAXAGORAS AND ATHENS

LEONARD WOODBURY

CONCERNING THE DATES of Anaxagoras' stay in Athens and the nature of his trial and exile our richest source of information is Diogenes Laertius (2.7), who provides, from authorities mostly of Hellenistic date, two versions of a story of the philosopher's trial in addition to a miscellany of chronological statements. It is usual to compare the relative merits of the sources of the differing versions (e.g., Sotion as opposed to Satyrus), to accept the version of the preferred source, and then to apply this as a key to the unlocking of Diogenes' chronological information.

The outcome of this procedure has been to accept a date ca 433, or sometimes a few years earlier, for the trial, with confirmation in Plutarch's account, and to combine this with Diagoras' statement that Anaxagoras was thirty years in Athens. Other information is then accommodated to this frame. A more complex and hypothetical course is to divide the thirty years into two sojourns, each ended by one of our two trials, with an unknown amnesty intervening. No less radical is recourse to textual conjecture, whereby the period of thirty years is reduced to twenty.

Because of the manifest improbabilities that attach to this procedure, with its several variations, a different method of enquiry has been adopted here. The earliest evidence, that of Plato and Stesimbrotus, is considered first and found to be concordant in a higher degree than the more detailed, later sources. The evidence indicates, it is argued, that Anaxagoras was not present in Athens after about the middle of the century and that, in his absence, Athenian gossip made him the mentor of the great renegade, Themistocles.

From this beginning we turn to the sources of Diogenes and to Plutarch. It is found that the anecdotal version of the trial preserved by Satyrus is in itself more credible than that presented by Sotion and others, and is chronologically more compatible with the earlier evidence. Both Satyrus and the two earlier sources indicate that Anaxagoras left Athens ca 450 and that his trial took place *in absentia* not long afterwards.

Finally, there is some speculation on the relations between Anaxagoras and Themistocles, both before and after their respective exiles, the date of Themistocles' death, and the nature of the reception that Athens gave to the new philosophy imported from Ionia.

When Socrates stood upon his trial at Athens in 399, he questioned his

In citing fragments of Anaxagoras and other relevant texts references are given to the original sources, with the equivalent Diels-Kranz numbers appended.

accuser Meletus, according to the Platonic *Apology of Socrates*, concerning his own belief in the divinity of sun and moon. When his antagonist replied that Socrates believed that the one was stone and the other earth, the defendant asked indignantly, "Do you suppose that you are accusing Anaxagoras? Are you so contemptuous of the literacy of the jury as to suppose that they do not know that the books of Anaxagoras of Clazomenae are full of these doctrines?" (26d [= 59A35]). Socrates went on to ask whether it is to be believed that the young come to him to learn something that every one could purchase for a drachma at most from a stall in the orchestra.

Two points become very plain in Plato's dramatic presentation of the scene. First, the accusation of atheism brought against the "meteorologists" is evidently a stock charge (cf. 18b, 23d) in this form. Secondly, although many of the jurors must have been elderly men, possessed of long memories, Socrates does not follow the usual practice of appealing directly to their experience, but sends them instead to a book for confirmation. Though Anaxagoras' name and some of his doctrines were then familiar in Athens, direct memory of him had quite disappeared in the city.

Next we turn to the testimony of the *Hippias Major*. If the dialogue is not by Plato himself, it is a product of the fourth century, so that its evidence is relevant when it ranges Anaxagoras at the end of a tradition of the "ancients" (παλαιοί) that began with Pittacus, Bias, and the Milesians (281c). A little later (283a) Anaxagoras is contrasted, as one of the "ancients," with "men of the present day," such as Hippias. This gives us a perspective from a much earlier date than that offered by the *Apology*, for Hippias himself is probably to be thought of as active in Athens from the late 430s and the dramatic date of the dialogue is from the next decade. At that time, Anaxagoras, if he had been long absent from the city, would have passed among Athenians as one of the "ancients," though without necessary implication that he was long dead, or even dead at all. We infer that by the beginning of the war, though Anaxagoras was known in Athens, he was probably not a familiar figure there.

At *Cratylus* 409a (= 59A76) there is a comment on the etymology of the word σελήνη ("moon"), in which the recent theory of Anaxagoras (δ' ἐκεῖνος νέωστι ἔλεγεν), that the moon derives its light from the sun, is said to have been long anticipated, as proved by the etymology of the alternative form of the word, σελαναία. The chronological implication of νέωστι is difficult to fix, for the word has a double reference, both to the antiquity of the doctrine implied in the etymology and to the dramatic date of the dialogue. The latter is uncertain, for, if the use of the imperfect ἔλεγεν at 385e of Protagoras implies that the sophist was then dead, the date must be later than ca 420, but A. E. Taylor suggests tentatively a

date early in the Archidamian war,¹ and the former is as old as the form *σελαναία* or the doctrine itself, which the doxographers attributed to Thales and his school (Plut. *De plac. phil.* 2.27 [= 358 *Dox.Gr.*]). The best that we can do is to conceive of a date that is, in relation to the war, recent, and in relation to the origins of the word and the doctrine, modern. In general, the phrasing is too loose for chronological precision concerning the pronouncement of Anaxagoras' explanation, and, in particular, it does nothing to exclude a date even a whole generation before the war. Above all, the passage, no matter what date it implies for the saying, fails to tell us where Anaxagoras was thought to have pronounced it. If he published it in his book, it is relevant to remember that the work was already available to the youthful Socrates, as will next appear.

The view offered by the *Phaedo* is the most impressive, for there Socrates, in offering what has been called his "intellectual biography," says that he first learned of the teaching of Anaxagoras when he was young (*νέος*), apparently after some study of physics, by hearing someone read from his book, which he was later to read for himself (97a–c). Given the conditions of intellectual society at Athens at about the middle of the century, the narrow range of use commonly accorded to books, and the normal practice of Socrates elsewhere, this procedure must imply that Anaxagoras himself was not available for instruction or consultation. Someone else—one guesses Archelaus—was carrying on lecture-readings. As has been pointed out by A. E. Taylor, in an important, but generally-unheeded, article published on this question more than sixty years ago,² "Anaxagoras is the only first-rate figure among the 'wits' of Athenian society in the Periclean age whom Plato never represents Socrates as meeting. He is quite familiar with Protagoras and Hippias, and highly admired by Parmenides and Zeno, but, although so much impressed by the Anaxagorean doctrine of *νοῦς*, he appears never to have exchanged a

¹A. E. Taylor, *Plato: The Man and his Work* (New York 1936) 76–77.

²"On the Date of the Trial of Anaxagoras," *CQ* 11 (1917) 81–87, followed, e.g., by J. Burnet, *Platonism* (Berkeley 1928) 33, by F. E. Adcock in *CAH* 5.478, and by M. Schofield, *An Essay on Anaxagoras* (Cambridge 1980) 33–35. It is true that Taylor's argument here assumes the validity of the now-discredited Taylor-Burnet hypothesis concerning the value of the Platonic dialogues as historical evidence. But rejection of the hypothesis need not necessarily entail the repudiation of the dialogues as historical evidence. Thus, W. K. C. Guthrie, *A History of Greek Philosophy* (Cambridge 1962–1981) 3.422 writes concerning *Phaedo* 96a ff.: "Plato uses this narrative for his own purposes, but it would be strange indeed if it had no basis in fact." See also R. Hackforth, *Plato's Phaedo* (Cambridge 1955) 128, to similar effect. Nevertheless, Taylor's arguments in favour of Anaxagoras' departure from Athens ca 450 seem generally to be dismissed: see, e.g., E. Derenne, *Les procès d'impiété in Bibl. de la Fac. de Philos. et Lettres de l'Univ. de Liège* fasc. 45 (Liège 1930) 30–38; Guthrie, *History* 3.351; J. Mansfeld, "The Chronology of Anaxagoras' Athenian Period and the Date of his Trial," *Mnemosyne* ser. 4, 32 (1979) 39–60 (Part I), 33 (1980) 17–95 (Part II), especially II. 88.

word with Anaxagoras. This must mean that Plato thought of Anaxagoras as having already written his book and disappeared from Athens at a date when Socrates was still quite young.”³

So extensive and representative is the evidence provided by the dialogues of Plato for the intellectual life of Athens in the second half of the fifth century that his silence concerning the presence of Anaxagoras during those years must carry unusual weight. In this case the implications of his silence receive unexpected confirmation from an even earlier source. Plutarch, near the beginning of his *Life of Themistocles* (*Them.* 2), quotes Stesimbrotus of Thasos as reporting that Themistocles had been a pupil of Anaxagoras.⁴ This statement may seem unlikely on chronological grounds, as Plutarch goes on to say, if the teacher-pupil relationship is taken to be one of older-younger, for Themistocles was considerably older than Anaxagoras and an improbable “pupil” of this kind during his mature years, when the Ionian physicist arrived in Athens.⁵ But Stesimbrotus’ claim is revealing nevertheless. It was presumably made after he went to Athens from his native Thasos,⁶ and it must reflect Athenian understanding as he found it. It is not easy to believe that it can have been made boldly in this form and with that implication of ages in the presence of Anaxagoras, and it seems to project a memory of a period, ending with the ostracism of ca 470, when Themistocles was a power in Athens and Anaxagoras had only recently arrived.

The year of Xerxes’ invasion must have seen, in addition to other disturbances, a very considerable *diaspora* of Ionians, and it would be easy for later historians and chronologists, who were concerned with the transplantation of philosophy from Ionia to Athens, to connect with that

³If Anaxagoras mentioned, and did not “predict,” as our source says (Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* 2.149–150 [= 59A11]), the fall of the meteorite at Aigos Potamoi, his book appeared later than ca 467, when the stone is said to have fallen to earth; but the opposite inference is possible, for the fall of the meteorite may have been held to confirm the published theory of the philosopher, in which case the book is earlier than 467. Cf. D. J. Furley in *New Essays on Plato and the Pre-Socratics*, ed. R. A. Shiner and J. King-Farlow (Guelph 1976) 77 and Schofield (above, note 2) 34. On the other hand, the story in the *Phaedo* gives a lower limit by stating that the book was used in Athens about the middle of the century or a little later. In favour of a later date (ca 440), see Mansfeld (above, note 2) II. 89–95.

⁴The intellectual powers of Themistocles are praised by Herodotus (8.124), Thucydides (1.138.3), and by later sources: see A. J. Podlecki, *The Life of Themistocles* (Montreal and London 1975) 74 and 79. Plato appears to reflect the common estimate in *Meno* 97b–e, but to disclose his own doubts in *Gorg.* 455b–e, 503c, and 516d–e.

⁵Podlecki (*Life* 57) believes that Stesimbrotus has confused Themistocles with Pericles, and rejects, in *Phoenix* 34 (1980) 76, the connection between Themistocles and Anaxagoras that is accepted by J. Papastavrou, *Themistokles, Die Geschichte einer Titanen und seinen Zeit* (Darmstadt 1978).

⁶Between 440 and 435 is the date tentatively proposed by F. Schachermeyr in *SBVienna philos.-hist. Kl.* 247.5 (1965) 13 for Stesimbrotus’ arrival in Athens.

mass-movement the individual migration of Anaxagoras, who was generally agreed to have been responsible for the introduction of philosophy into the city (Clem. Alex. *Strom.* 1.63 and Ps.-Gal. *Hist. Phil.* 3 [= 59A7]). This combination was readily supported by Stesimbrotus' report of the relationship between the philosopher and Themistocles in the city, and it may have been supported by other information as well. We, for our part, may wonder in what sense Anaxagoras was actually Themistocles' teacher, whether the practice and teaching of philosophy could have begun while the army of Xerxes remained in Greece, and whether Anaxagoras can have arrived in Athens as a fully-qualified philosopher at the age of twenty. But our doubts must be directed at the details and implications of the information preserved to us by the tradition rather than at the tradition itself. We have no sufficient reason to doubt that Anaxagoras was believed in the fifth century to have been present and intellectually active in Athens during the 470s, before the exile of Themistocles, to have reached Athens with a sufficient grounding in Ionian physics to serve as the basis of his philosophy, and to have arrived there (according to the best calculation of the time) at the age of twenty in the year of Themistocles' epoch-making achievement. We cannot indeed prove that this account is true, but we have no means of constructing a better account, nor justification for rejecting this one.

But the form in which the story casts the relation between the two appears to be a convenient anecdotalist's fiction, concerning events of an earlier generation, without reference to the testimony of Anaxagoras himself.⁷ Stesimbrotus in the fifth century,⁸ like Plato in the fourth, gives the impression of an Athens from which Anaxagoras was absent. That impression is strengthened by the uncharacteristic silence of the poets of the Old Comedy with regard to Anaxagoras.

The chronological probability of a teacher-pupil relationship is much greater, as Plutarch (*Them.* 2) does not fail to point out, in another and much better-attested tradition, that Pericles was Anaxagoras' pupil, for Pericles' birth fell soon after the beginning of the century and considerably later than Themistocles'. But even here the "pupil" was probably almost as old as his "teacher." The tradition was certainly known in the fourth century, as it occurs both in Plato (*Phaedr.* 269e [= 59A15]) and in Isocrates (*Antid.* 235 [= 59A15]); it seems to have been in Ephorus

⁷That the teachers of Themistocles became a subject for discussion we see from Xen. *Mem.* 4.2.2, and it has been suggested by G. B. Kerferd in *CR* 64 (1950) 9 that Thucydides, at 1.138.3, is rejecting Stesimbrotus' story about the instruction given Themistocles by Anaxagoras. The suggestion is approved by H. D. Westlake in *CQ* n.s. 5 (1955) 65, note 3, but rejected by A. W. Gomme, *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides* 1 (Oxford 1945) 442.

⁸Stesimbrotus is thought to have published his work soon after Pericles' death: see Westlake in *CQ* n.s. 5 (1955) 64.

as well,⁹ if he is the source of Diodorus (Diod. Sic. 12.39 [= 59A17]), as he appears to be.¹⁰

With one exception, we find little that is circumstantial in what we are told of the relationship. Plato, whose account is fullest, attributes to the influence of Anaxagoras the intellectual content of Pericles' mental culture.¹¹ But his account, which appears to speak with uncharacteristic respect of Ionian meteorology, appears also to betray an irony of tone, as if he were gravely reading into the relationship the only intellectual value that Anaxagoras could, in his judgment, contribute to it. If this impression is justified, Plato knew little more than we ourselves know or can reasonably guess.

The inference, that this kind of statement may signify no more than an intellectual influence or affinity, receives some confirmation from a consideration of a parallel relationship of which our sources speak from the third century on, that between Anaxagoras and Euripides.¹² The influence of the philosopher has been discovered in a number of passages from the poet, most clearly in imitations of Anaxagoras' notorious meteorological atheism in the *Phaethon* of ca 420 and the *Orestes* of 408.¹³ The passages are evidently commonplaces and the dates fall long after every one supposes that Anaxagoras had left Athens. The poet, it seems likely, was the philosopher's "pupil" only in a Pickwickian sense.

The familiar cry, that the moon was earth and the sun, a red-hot stone, was, as Socrates said, a common coin of abuse in Athenian society. We can catch the echoes of its notoriety by noting its frequent occurrences in our surviving texts.¹⁴ It seems probable that this tradition had its literary origin in Anaxagoras' book, in which he adduced the great meteorite that fell at Aigos Potamoi¹⁵ ca 467/6 (Plin. *Nat. Hist.* 2.149–150 [= 59A11]) as evidence that the heavens were made of stone (Diog. Laert. 2.8, 10, 12 [= 59A1]). This was thereafter known as the shocking impiety of Anaxagoras,¹⁶ and anyone who repeated it was likely to be

⁹See also Hermippus fr. 30 Wehrli and Sotion ap. Diog. Laert. 2.12 (= 59A1).

¹⁰Cf. Diod. Sic. 12.38.1 and 41.1; also the Platonic *Alcib.* 118c and *Ep.* 2.311a; [Demosth.] 61.1414; Cic. *Brut.* 44; and *De or.* 3.138; Diog. Laert. 2.13 (= 59A1).

¹¹See also Plut. *Per.* 4 (= 59A15). But, for a more favourable interpretation of Plato's assessment of Anaxagoras, see D. Babut in *REG* 91 (1978) 60 ff.

¹²See Alex. Aet. fr. 7 Powell (= 59A21), Diog. Sic. 1.7.7 (= 59A62), and Guthrie, *History* 2.323–325.

¹³Eur. fr. 783 Nauck² and *Or.* 982 ff. For a discussion of passages relevant to the relation between Anaxagoras and Euripides, see Guthrie, *History* 2.323–325 and G. Arrighetti (ed.), *Satiro: Vita di Euripide* (Pisa 1964) 106.

¹⁴Plato, *Apol.* 26d (= 59A35), Xen. *Mem.* 4.7.7 (= 59A62), Sotion ap. Diog. Laert. 2.12 (= 59A1), Plut. *De superst.* 10: 169f, and later texts in fr. 59A2, 19, 20a, 42.6.

¹⁵See Guthrie, *History* 2.302–304, M. L. West, "Anaxagoras and the Meteorite of 467 B.C.," *Journ. of Brit. Astron. Ass.* (1960) 368–369, and Mansfeld (above, notes 2 and 3) II.89–95

¹⁶Passages like Eur. fr. 913 Nauck² (= 59A20) and Plato, *Apol.* 18c and *Laws* 12.967a

called an "Anaxagorean," whether he ever sat under that philosopher or not, as surely as the terms "natural selection" and "survival of the fittest" would have branded one a "Darwinian" in Britain or America during the decades that followed the publication of *The Origin of Species*. Doubtless in both cases there were those who sought and those who avoided the title, but all who used the words must have known that they invited it.

If Pericles' relation, like that of Euripides, to Anaxagoras was of this kind, we can learn from it little of chronological, or indeed of social, interest.¹⁷ What we can see is how readily it can combine with stories illustrating public attacks on heterodox opinions, such as the traditions concerning the Athenian trials for impiety. This combination is visible in Ephorus, if he is Diodorus' source, and in a cluster of texts from the third and second centuries that are cited by Diogenes Laertius (2.12-14 [= 59A1]), as well as in Plutarch and in other sources. It is in this context that we sometimes find the implication, which runs counter to the evidence thus far surveyed, that Anaxagoras was in Athens late in the life of Pericles.

This version, which assumes a very late date for the trial of Anaxagoras, was found, after the Ephorus that we infer from Diodorus, in the *Lives* of Hermippus and in the *Miscellanies* of Hieronymus of Rhodes in the third century, in Sotion's *Successions of the Philosophers* in the next century, as well as in Plutarch's *Life of Pericles* and *Life of Nicias*, and other, later sources.¹⁸

It tells of the trial, and sometimes of the imprisonment, of Anaxagoras. Pericles is involved, often as his pupil, sometimes as the real target of the attack. By his efforts Anaxagoras escapes death, being acquitted, or fined and exiled, or extricated from the prison. His methods include a public confession of his relation with his teacher, an open appeal to pity for the prisoner's weakened physical condition, or (by implication) a practised

show that interest in meteorology was likely to be construed in Athens as evidence of atheism.

¹⁷If more is implied, the tradition is evidence for the early presence of Anaxagoras in Athens, when Pericles was young: see Taylor in *CQ* 11 (1917) 83.

¹⁸Hermippus fr. 30 Wehrli, Hieronymus fr. 41 Wehrli, Plut. *Per.* 32 and *Nic.* 23 (= 59A17 and 18), Diod. Sic. 12.23-39 (= 59A17, 18). The notice of Anaxagoras provided by Apollodorus in his *Chronica* is fully discussed by Mansfeld (above, note 2), with ample discussion of Diogenes' authorities in 1.19 ff. L. Parmentier, *Euripide et Anaxagore* in *Mém. de L'Acad. Roy. des Sc. des Lettres et des Beaux-Arts de Belgique* 47 (1893) 13-25, found in two passages of Euripides' *Medea* of 431 (214-224 and 292-301) allusions to the condemnation of Anaxagoras. Though the verses may reflect the experience of Euripides as an intellectual in Athens, they appear to contain nothing that plainly or strongly suggests the presence of Anaxagoras. Similarly with the claim (Parmentier 37-38) that Anaxagoras is the reference of Eur. *Alc.* 903 ff. (= 59A33) of 438: cf. the remarks of A. M. Dale in her edition of the play (Oxford 1954) 117.

skill in getting things done. Twice the story serves as a setting for anecdotes which illustrate the adroitness of Pericles rather than any characteristic of Anaxagoras, and which present Anaxagoras, in a complementary way, as a discomfited weakling.¹⁹ The evidence certainly suggests that the very general teacher-pupil relationship has been brought under the influence of the biography of Pericles, which it is used to support and illustrate. With this interpretation in mind, we are not surprised to find, in Sotion and Plutarch (*Per.* 32 [= 59A17]), mention of the use of anti-meteorological public prejudice as a means of political attack on Pericles, of the passage of the decree of Diopieithes against irreligious meteorology at about the beginning of the war, and of the first moves of Cleon's political career, in opposition to Pericles. All of this gives us detailed information concerning a crisis in the last stages of Pericles' political life,²⁰ but it gives us no direct testimony concerning Anaxagoras himself.²¹ Everything that this tradition has to say about him might very well be an elaboration of the simple teacher-pupil relationship, which has no such implication for the presence of Anaxagoras in Athens at about the beginning of the war, after Cleon had begun to become prominent in politics there.

Diogenes Laertius (2.12 [= 59A1]), knows another version of the trial of Anaxagoras,²² which he found in the *Lives* of Satyrus, also of the third

¹⁹By contrast, the biography of Anaxagoras presents him as exceptionally dignified: Alcidas ap. Diog. Laert. 8.56 and 59A13, 15, 33; on Satyrus' characterisation of Anaxagoras, see below, 304.

²⁰The decree of Diopieithes, which is connected with the attack on Anaxagoras by Plutarch, *Per.* 32.2 and 5 (= 59A17) is dated by F. E. Adcock, in *CAH* 5.478, at 430, and by H. T. Wade-Gery, in his *Essays in Greek History* (Oxford 1958) 258–260, just before the beginning of the war; the latter believes (258) that Thucydides, son of Melesias, returned from his exile in 433 and then “made himself felt” by his prosecution of Anaxagoras; but cf. G. Donnay in *AC* 37 (1968) 29. Mansfeld (above, note 2) II argues extensively for 438/7 as the date of Diopieithes' decree and for 437/6 as the date of Anaxagoras' trial. For this date see also F. J. Frost in *Historia* 13 (1964) 398 and D. Kagan, *The Outbreak of the Peloponnesian War* (Ithaca 1969) 194 ff., 199–200. On the decree, see also Derenne (above, note 2) 19–24.

²¹The decree of Diopieithes, so far as we know, made no mention of Anaxagoras but merely provided for the prosecution of the irreligious and teachers of meteorology (Plut. *Per.* 32 [= 59A17]). It is not difficult to suppose that “Anaxagorean” doctrines, as currently known in Athens, were included in the ban, but the decree requires no presumption that Anaxagoras was present at the date of its promulgation. Wade-Gery commented shrewdly in *JHS* 52 (1932) 220–221, “indeed if Plutarch is wrong in dating Anaxagoras' trial about 433, his error is that he wrongly connects it with Diopieithes' decree.”

²²No ancient source speaks of more than one trial, on general grounds it is unlikely that Anaxagoras had to undergo this ordeal twice, and in particular, the circumstantial details of the two stories appear to be irreconcilable, so that it appears necessary to choose between the alternative versions. Jacoby indeed (*FGrHist* 3b.2.167, note 29) carried doubt to the point of thinking it “arguable that things never went so far as an

century. Once again there is a circumstantial description of the occasion, but this is very different from the one given by Sotion and the rest. The prosecutor is Thucydides, the son of Melesias, the charge is Medism as well as impiety, and Anaxagoras is condemned to death *in absentia*. The story has something in common with another that is told by Plutarch in his *Life of Pericles* (6 [= 59A16]) about a dispute between Anaxagoras and the seer Lampon concerning the prodigy of a single-horned ram. Lampon recognised this prodigy as a sign of the resolution of the political rivalry between Pericles and Thucydides, in favour of Pericles, from whose estate the ram had come. Anaxagoras, on the other hand, by dissecting the skull, was able to indicate the nature of the growth by which the horn had been produced. On the occasion of the confrontation, Plutarch says, Anaxagoras won much admiration by his explanation, but the situation was reversed not much later, when Thucydides fell from power and Pericles rose to his ascendancy. The climax of the story must be the ostracism of Thucydides, ca 443, which freed Pericles of his principal opponent in politics. It is likely enough that Plutarch, if he is not following Satyrus himself, is using his source, and the date assumed for the trial by the latter must also be the period a little before ca 443, a decade or two decades earlier than the occasion alleged for the other trial. The story illustrates very well the ambiguities that many Athenians perceived in the doctrine of Anaxagoras and the connection that was made by them between this doctrine and the political fortunes of Pericles. It therefore provides an explanatory background for Satyrus' account of the prosecution of Anaxagoras by Thucydides, the son of Melesias, Pericles' political rival.

Satyrus' story, like the versions of the other story told by Hermippus and Hieronymus, provides the setting of an anecdote. This time, however,

accusation," and more recently K. J. Dover, *Talanta* 7 (1975) 27–32, has expressed strong doubts about the trial. However, see J. A. Davison in *CQ* n.s. 3 (1953) 39–45, who constructs a life that includes two such trials, one ca 456/5, the other ca 433–430; he is followed, e.g., by Guthrie, *History* 2.322–323 and by R. Meiggs, *The Athenian Empire* (Oxford 1972) 435–436. But Davison must assume that there was an amnesty, otherwise unknown, ca 445/4, that the thirty years in Athens reported by Diogenes Laertius (2.7 [= 59A1]) from Demetrius of Phaleron do not imply an uninterrupted residence in the city during that period, and that Anaxagoras, in spite of his enduring memory in Lampsacus (Diog. Laert. 2.14 [= 59A1]), had only a very few years in that city in which to establish his position there. Cf. Mansfeld (above, note 2) I.54–55, 87. The hypothesis of two trials is defended by Meiggs, 283–284, 435–436, evidently on the ground that Plutarch says (*Per.* 32.2) and Diodorus implies (12.39.2) that the decree of Diopieithes, just before the outbreak of the war, was aimed at Anaxagoras. But assaults on the popular version of "Anaxagorean" doctrine and on those alleged to hold it seem to have been commonplace at Athens and prove nothing for Anaxagoras' presence in the city, as is shown by the charges discussed by Socrates in the Platonic *Apology* (18b, 23d, 26d).

the story illustrates a characteristic, not of Pericles, but of Anaxagoras, whom it presents in a favourable, instead of an unfavourable, light. For he is praised because of the fortitude with which he bore the news of his own condemnation and the death of his sons.²³ This time the historical setting is made to serve the purposes of the biography of Anaxagoras, rather than *vice versa*, as in the other version.

It is noticeable that in this variant we are not told that Pericles is the true object of the attack, nor that he was active in defending or in extricating Anaxagoras. It must be important also that here alone we are told that the latter was condemned to death *in absentia*. It is true that it is said in one or two other sources that Pericles contrived to get Anaxagoras out, but no one says that the latter was then condemned in his absence, and the repeated theme of Pericles' activity shows that Anaxagoras was thought in the stories that contain it to have been tried in person and to have risked his life at the beginning of the war. In Satyrus' story, on the other hand, the anecdote that follows makes its point more clearly if Anaxagoras is thought of as hearing for the first time in some refuge abroad of the course and outcome of his trial at Athens than if he is only receiving confirmation of the verdict that he has just fled in order to escape. The first situation might clearly illustrate his fortitude in adversity, whereas the other might very well come as a relief from anxiety and as a corroboration of his decision. The favourable point of the anecdote, the inactivity of Pericles, and the absence of the accused when verdict and sentence were pronounced are unlikely to be only accidental variants. Together they suggest, with some force, that, in the period (say) of the 440s, Anaxagoras was assumed to be absent from Athens. We remember that this is the approximate time when, according to Plato, Socrates was "young" and could discover the doctrine of Anaxagoras only by attending the readings of his disciple or by perusing his book.

Perhaps the most striking feature of Satyrus' version is his assertion that the charge laid against Anaxagoras included Medism as well as impiety. This detail cannot be derived, like so much else in some versions, from the teacher-pupil relationship with Pericles and must have a different origin. The most likely explanation appears to be that it comes from what passed in the fifth century for the biography of Anaxagoras.²⁴ Charges of

²³Cf. also the version in the *Suda* 1.1981 Adler s.v. Anaxagoras (= 59A3).

²⁴Cf. however, Derenne (above, note 2) 29–30, who suggests, after A. Schmidt, that the charge was an attack on the alleged "Medism" of the Alcmaeonidae and the reluctance of Pericles and his friends to press on with the Persian war. This interpretation appears to postulate a greater prominence for Pericles in the affair than the anecdote, as related by Satyrus, exhibits, and to be more appropriate to Sotion's Periclean cycle, which does not mention Medism, than to Satyrus' Anaxagorean counterpart, which does.

collaboration with the Persian invader must have been common during the wars and in their aftermath, and may have hung on, here and there, in later generations, somewhat like our own use of "quisling" or "collaborator." As late as 425 or 424 "Medism" was still a popular joke in Aristophanes (*Acharn.* 61 ff., *Equit.* 478) but it is unlikely on general grounds to have survived as a serious and general public calumny after the death of the generation that fought in 480 and 479 and after the end of hostilities with Persia.²⁵ It is improbable that it was invented at some much later date in order to give circumstantial detail to a report of a trial that was said to have been conducted at or near 450. Its oddity in its context constitutes its claim to be authentic, and this detail gives strong reinforcement to the case in favour of giving preference to the version offered by Satyrus.

It is not in fact incredible that Thucydides may have believed that he had grounds for the charge of Medism. Stesimbrotus, it appears, heard in Athens, at about this time, that Themistocles had been the pupil of Anaxagoras as well as of Melissus of Samos. But Themistocles, after his exile ca 470, had, as everyone knew (Thuc. 1.135 ff.), gone over to the Persians,²⁶ and his flagrant "Medism" may well have become a reproach to his reputed teacher as well,²⁷ while Melissus, after his prominent part in the revolt of Samos of 440, must have appeared in Athenian

²⁵See Meiggs (above, note 22) 436, who writes: "A date in the late fifties would seem to suit the climate in Athens better for a charge of Medism, perhaps just after Cimon's death when Pericles was thinking of peace and Thucydides was trying to step into Cimon's political leadership." But the Athenians continued into the next century (Isocr. *Paneg.* 157) their practice of beginning meetings of the Assembly with formal curses on any citizen who proposed dealings with the Persians. C. Diano in *Anthemion. Scritti di archeologia e di antichità classiche in onore di Carlo Anti* (Florence 1955) 246 thinks of a much later date, the oligarchic revolution of 411 (cf. Aristoph. *Thesm.* 337 and 365) and a posthumous controversy over Anaxagoreanism.

²⁶Earlier Themistocles may have exposed himself to accusations of Medism, if he offered a defence of the Medising cities before the Amphictionic Council (Plut. *Them.* 20.3-4). For an attack on Herodotus' unfavourable judgment of Themistocles and his "Medism," see D. Gillis, *Collaboration with the Persians* (Wiesbaden 1979 [*Historia Einzelschr.* 34]) 54 ff., and for the most recent discussion of "Medism" by Themistocles, and by others during the 460s, see N. Robertson, "Timocreon and Themistocles," *AJP* 101 (1980) 61-78.

²⁷The tendency of Stesimbrotus' report seems to be exposed by his making Themistocles a pupil, not only of Anaxagoras, the irreligious Ionian, but also of Melissus, a leader of the Samian rebellion, who was thus an enemy in war as well as an Ionian. This latter story seems likely to have had its origin in the period after Pericles' suppression of the Samian revolt of 440-439, and if so, it was not directed at Pericles but at "Ionians" and "Medisers." (It may have attached itself to the earlier Anaxagorean anecdote by the familiar "snow-balling" effect of gossip.) Satyrus' version of the trial of Anaxagoras, which makes Pericles inactive on the scene, is consistent with this alignment and may thus derive from Stesimbrotus.

eyes a representative of Ionian disaffection, and very possibly of Persian sympathies.

This judgment seems to be reflected also in our chronological tradition. Diogenes Laertius (2.7 [= 59A1]) reports that Anaxagoras is said to have been twenty years old at the time of Xerxes' invasion and appears to tell us further that he began the practice of philosophy at Athens in the archonship of Callias or Calliades (i.e., in 480),²⁸ as was recorded by Demetrius of Phaleron in his *Register of Archons* (fr. 150 Wehrli). The mention of his age at the time of Xerxes' invasion is notably circumstantial and seems unlikely to be the result of a chronologist's combination or calculation, for the age of twenty has no regular function in a chronologist's Life. It seems more probable that Anaxagoras in his book answered the question that Xenophanes (B22) had posed for an earlier generation of Ionian exiles, "How old were you when the Mede came?" This statement of his age in 480, if combined with Stesimbrotus' report that he had taught Themistocles, might be taken to show that he was present in Athens teaching philosophy in the 470s.²⁹ Demetrius might

²⁸The text of Diogenes gives Callias (456) as archon at this time, but this name is generally altered, or understood, to signify Calliades (480), rightly I believe: see Taylor (above, note 2) 82, note 1, Diano (above, note 25) 236, note 2, and Mansfeld (above, note 2) I.52, note 49. But Mansfeld I.55, 64 accepts 456 as Apollodorus' date for Anaxagoras' arrival and argues that the year served multiple functions in the chronologist's scheme (*début* of Euripides, death of Aeschylus, *akme* of Sophocles, etc.). But this judgment leads to an impossible result when it is combined with the 30-year sojourn at Athens, for then Anaxagoras must have been in the city until about 426/5, after the agreed date of his death. Mansfeld therefore alters the text by conjecturing ἐτῶν εἴκοσιν (ἐκεῖ διατρίβων, thus reducing the length of the stay to 20 years and advancing the departure to about 436/5 (Cf. II.88). καὶ φασιν, which follows immediately, is then taken to introduce an alternative residence of 30 years, which is mentioned but not accepted by Apollodorus. The move is ingenious but unconvincing. It is easier to understand "Callias" as a reference to the archon of 480, for if that is done, the difficulties fall away without recourse to textual surgery.

Diels, followed by Zeller, Jacoby, Derenne, and others, proposed to take Ἀθήνησιν with the succeeding ἐπὶ Καλλίου rather than with the preceding ἤρξατο φιλοσοφείν: see Mansfeld I.47–51, 60 for a fuller discussion and a persuasive rejection of the interpretation. That φιλοσοφείν need not mean "to study philosophy," but may mean equally well "to teach philosophy" is shown by Mansfeld I.51–53. But the phrase seems vague, and may be so deliberately, if the purpose of its original author was to date the introduction of philosophy into Athens (as may be suggested by Diogenes' next point, the length of the philosopher's sojourn in the city), and not the beginning of Anaxagoras' study or teaching (as it is usually understood). To be sure, if Anaxagoras introduced philosophy into the city, it is implied that he did not begin his study there. The order required by Diels' construction is extraordinary and the sense that it yields deprives the 30-year Athenian sojourn, to which Diogenes next turns, of its necessary starting-point. The meaning appears to be: "he introduced the practice of philosophy at Athens." Cf. Mansfeld (above, note 2) II.94, note 345.

²⁹J. Beloch, *Griechische Geschichte*² 2.2 (Strassburg 1916) 9 had conjectured that Themistocles attracted Anaxagoras and Melissus (Stesimbr. 107 *FGrHist* F1) to his

then have summarised this combination by reporting that Anaxagoras began teaching philosophy at Athens in the epoch-year of his alleged pupil, Themistocles. This year would then be taken to mark a turning-point in the history of philosophy when philosophy first moved from Ionia to Athens. If so, this is the reference of Diogenes' words, which have given scholars much trouble: ἤρξατο φιλοσοφεῖν Ἀθήνησιν ἐπὶ Καλλίου ἐτῶν εἴκοσιν ὧν.

Any one who had gone so far might then infer that Anaxagoras had arrived in Athens in 480, under Persian auspices or as part of a suspect Ionian *diaspora*,³⁰ and had there become the master of a most notorious "Mediser." It cannot have been difficult at Athens during the generation that followed the great invasion to arouse prejudice against Ionians³¹ on political, as well as on moral, social, and theological grounds.³² The son of Melesias, as a spokesman for traditional Athenian views, may well very have shared this prejudice and so produced the double charge against Anaxagoras. If Pericles was already known as an Anaxagorean, soft on irreligion and the barbarians, Thucydides may also have found in the accusations a handy stick with which to beat his political rival. The chronological conclusions of Demetrius, and ultimately of Apollodorus, are likely to have been founded on fifth-century understanding of the career of Anaxagoras.³³

If we press the search for a fifth-century source, we come at once upon Stesimbrotus, who is often used in other connections by Plutarch. He

retreat in Magnesia and took up the study of philosophy only in his old age. This idea runs counter to the implication of the view argued here and had generally received little credence. It has, however, been recently revived by F. Schachermeyr, "Stesimbrotos und seine Schrift über die Staatsmänner" (above, note 6) 13–14, by K. Meister in *Historia* 27 (1978) 283, and by Papastavrou (above, note 5). Jacoby in *FGrHist* 2D. 345 dismisses the late dating as "unmethodisch." Cf., however, F. J. Frost in *Historia* 13 (1964) 396–399, who wishes to postpone Anaxagoras' clash with Athenian society until the 430s, when, as he envisages the situation, there was a fight, not with the conservatives, but with the radicals led by Cleon, and by implication rejects an earlier imbroglio over Themistocles. Mansfeld (above, note 2) II, following the tradition that connects the attack on Anaxagoras with attacks on Pheidias, Aspasia, and Pericles, seeks to date the accusation of the philosopher by that of the sculptor, which he puts at 438/7.

³⁰Podlecki, *Life* (above, note 4) 29 and 37 contrasts the pro-Ionian and anti-Spartan policy of Themistocles with the anti-Persian "Aegean policy" of the conservatives.

³¹For expressions of prejudice concerning Ionians, see Hdt. 1.143, 4.142, 5.69, Ar. *Thesm.* 163.

³²An indication of suspicions about Medism, on whatever grounds they were held, is provided by the occurrence of the name of one Callias, son of Cratius, of Alopece on 760 ostraca from the Cerameicus, which is graced on 11 examples by the addition of the epithet, "the Mede." See Podlecki, *Life* (above, note 4) 9, 193.

³³On possible sources of Satyrus' story in the Attic historians, see A. E. Raubitschek in *Phoenix* 14 (1960) 84.

wrote a work *On Themistocles, Thucydides, and Pericles*, and must therefore have found the anecdotes on these three statesmen, if he knew them, entirely appropriate to his purpose.³⁴ That he knew the version preserved for us by Satyrus, if he knew any version, is made probable by his recording of the association between Themistocles and Anaxagoras, for this has the best claim to being the ground of the accusation of Medism that is specified in this version. If Stesimbrotus is our source, it is to be presumed that he reported what he heard on the subject when he went to Athens, probably not long after the date of the trial. The version of Sotion, on this view, belongs to a second cycle of anecdotes that was created when the familiar story was transferred to a new setting in the last years of Pericles' life.³⁵ The decree of Diopieithes and the conflict between Pericles and Cleon have been drawn into the cycle, although they have no place in the original story, as preserved by Satyrus and others.

On the hypothesis presented here, the stories embody versions of events that were believed at Athens in the fifth century, and it is an accident that these are transmitted to us by sources such as Satyrus and (hypothetically) Stesimbrotus. Nothing depends, in such a case, upon the reputation of these writers for reliability of judgment. We should be justified in dismissing out of hand anything reported by the two only if we could maintain that they never, even accidentally, transmitted any report that was true. But to do so would be to assume a stranger state of affairs than the one that this principle was devised in order to attack.

If we turn now to consider what was known or believed on these subjects in Athens at about the middle of the century, the later career

³⁴Meiggs (above, note 22) 16–17 writes: "It is possible that Thucydides was the hero of Stesimbrotus' tract, the man who stood for fair play for the allies against Athenian exploitation." This contrasts with Stesimbrotus' unfavourable view of Themistocles and Pericles: see Westlake in *CQ* n.s. 5 (1955) 65 and Meister (above, note 29) 287–288. Even if Meiggs' speculation is right, Stesimbrotus' prejudice in favour of Thucydides did not prevent him from reporting stories that were anti-Ionian in tendency.

³⁵If Ephorus is the source of the late date of the trial (see above, 301), it seems relevant to observe that it is characteristic of his methods to draw together, under a single year, a number of occurrences drawn from a longer period. Thus Diodorus (11.54–59), presumably following Ephorus, describes, under the year 471/0, a series of events in the life of Themistocles beginning with his trial at Athens and ending with his death at Magnesia several years later. But a tendency, discoverable in Diodorus, to create doublets of single incidents described by Thucydides is said by Meiggs (above, note 22) 12, to be the work of Diodorus himself, and not that of his source, Ephorus. Ephorus apart, another possible source is the story, reported by Satyrus, that Cleon prosecuted Euripides for impiety: see Arrighetti (above, note 13) 63. For Euripides was widely regarded as an Anaxagorean, and a confusion of the two, the impious pupil with the teacher of impiety, was possible, if not likely. One may find a comparable mix-up in the *Vita Euripidis*, ap. *POxy* 1176, which appears able to confuse the poet with Themistocles to the extent of stating that he emigrated to Magnesia, where he was given the status of *proxenos*.

and ultimate fate of Themistocles himself become highly relevant. The dating of the events of his last years is by no means clear, but the general profile is sufficiently known for the present purpose. After his ostracism from Athens ca 470, he was, like Anaxagoras, condemned *in absentia*, on a charge of treason (Thuc. 1.138.6; Plut. *Them.* 23.1; Medism at Thuc. 1.135.2 and Timocr. fr. 729 *PMG*), and from his refuge in Argos he fled first to Molossia, and then to Asia under the Persian domination. According to Thucydides (1.137.3) he then appealed to Artaxerxes, who had recently ascended the throne, and the date of this accession is fixed by the oriental evidence at ca 465–464. When a year later (Thuc. 1.138.2), after study of the Persian language, he presented himself at court, the King heaped honours and wealth upon him, granting him the city of Magnesia on the Maeander as his “bread,” and those of Lampsacus and Myus as his “wine” and his “fish.”³⁶ Plutarch (*Them.* 31.3) states that he resided at Magnesia and we know from him (32.4) as well as from Thucydides that a notable tomb was erected there after his death.³⁷ He appears to have lived the life of a Persian grandee and certainly issued his own coinage at Magnesia. By these grants the King, it is to be understood, conveyed to him the income that he himself derived from taxation of these places, and Thucydides says that Magnesia brought in fifty talents a year. By contrast, we may recall, the total value of Themistocles’ Athenian estate was put at eighty talents by Theophrastus (ap. Plut. *Them.* 25.3) and at one hundred talents by Theopompus (*FGrHist* 115 F 86). As seen from Athens, the figure of the great Mediser must have appeared larger than life, like the images projected in Victorian England by the Viceroy of India or in post-war America by the Supreme Commander of the allied forces of occupation in Japan.

The date of his death is uncertain, but Plutarch (*Cim.* 18.6–7; cf. *Them.* 31.4–6) synchronises it, in a general way, with two events a decade apart, the Egyptian revolt of ca 460 (Thuc. 1.104) and Cimon’s campaign against Cyprus of ca 450 (Thuc. 1.112).³⁸ Plutarch also says

³⁶Other cities are added by later sources: Percote and Palaescepsis by Phainias of Eresus, fr. 28 Wehrli and Neanthes of Cyzicus, *FGrHist* 84 Ff. 2b, 17a and Gambreion by Athenaeus 1.29–30.

³⁷Plutarch (*Them.* 32.3) says that Phrasicles, Themistocles’ nephew, sailed to Magnesia after his uncle’s death, married one of his daughters, and became guardian of another daughter. The story implies that Themistocles’ daughters survived him in Magnesia.

³⁸The most recent authorities prefer a date in the early 450s. J. K. Davies, *Athenian Propertied Families* 600–300 B.C. (Oxford 1971) 215, has ca 459; R. J. Lenardon, *The Saga of Themistocles* (London 1978) 199–200, while preferring ca 459, allows also ca 449; Podlecki, *Life* (above, note 4) 199, gives ca 459–455. F. J. Frost, *Plutarch’s Themistocles* (Princeton 1980) 70–71, 228, gives ca 460. See also Frost 35–36 for discussion, with bibliography, of the two ancient chronologies of the life of Themistocles, with a ten-year discrepancy between them.

(*Them.* 31.3) that Themistocles was permitted to enjoy his amenities in Magnesia "for a long time" and the stories told about him then and of the building of his tomb after his death combine to suggest an extended residence in the place.³⁹ It then becomes a nice matter to judge whether the four years that must have elapsed between the date of his reception at court and that of the Egyptian revolt can have been sufficient to occupy this space. On general grounds it does not seem very likely to have been sufficient.

The question is complicated by the fact that, according to the Athenian tribute lists, Lampsacus paid tribute in 452 and probably in 450, and Myus in 451.⁴⁰ A. W. Gomme inferred that the King's gift of the income from these cities was only an "empty show," since he publicly conferred something that was not in his power to bestow.⁴¹ But we do not know how regularly the tribute was paid nor how exclusive the allegiances of the Greek cities of the Hellespont were at this time.⁴² Even if we knew that Lampsacus paid tribute to the Delian League at the relevant date, we should not thereby be debarred from believing in a Persian tribute as well. In these circumstances a coincidence that comes to hand has considerable force, for we have epigraphic and literary evidence that the memory of Themistocles and his son, Cleophantus, was venerated at Lampsacus in later ages.⁴³ It is hard to dismiss this, with Gomme, as without value as evidence of Themistocles' powers in the place, and the King, for his part, could not have sustained the desired image of the royal bounty, if his cheques were known to be non-negotiable. It seems only prudent to conclude that Themistocles in fact enjoyed the Persian revenues derived from Lampsacus and established a real, and not merely a nominal, relationship with that city, in spite of his residence at Magnesia.⁴⁴ Certainly, he was not altogether confined to life in that place, for Thucydides (1.137.5) has him come ashore at Ephesus, Plutarch speaks

³⁹See Taylor in *CQ* 11 (1917) 85–87 and compare the qualifications made by Guthrie, *History* 2.269, note 1.

⁴⁰See *ATL* List 4.iv.5, 2.v.16.

⁴¹(Above, note 7) 1.292.

⁴²Cf. the implication of Hdt. 6.42.2 with the discussion of G. E. M. de Ste. Croix, *The Origins of the Peloponnesian War* (Ithaca 1972) 310, who rejects simultaneous payment to both sides. See also Frost (above, note 38) 219–222.

⁴³H. G. Lolling in *AthMitt* 6 (1881) 103–105. Cf. also Diog. Laert. 2.14–15 (= 59A1). Earlier evidence for honours offered to Anaxagoras at Lampsacus is provided by Alcidas, the pupil of Gorgias, ap. Arist. *Rhet.* 1398b10 (= 59A23): καὶ Λαμψακηνοὶ Ἀναξαγόραν ξένον ὄντα ἔθαψαν καὶ τιμῶσι ἔτι καὶ νῦν. See also Mansfeld (above, note 2) II.85–87.

⁴⁴See L. I. Highby, *The Erythrae Decree* in *Klio* Beiheft 36 (1936) 46–49, who argues, on the basis of Lolling's inscription and *Them. Ep.* 20 p. 761 Hercher, for a connection between Anaxagoras and Lampsacus. The argument is approved by *ATL* 3.111–113 and by Meiggs (above, note 22) 53 and note 3.

(*Them.* 26.1) of him at Cyme and Aegae on his arrival in Anatolia, and Theopompus (*FGrHist* 115 F 87) said that he "wandered throughout Asia," against Plutarch's emphasis on his residence at Magnesia.

It is worthy of note that the local inscription, which is from the late third century, records an annual festival in honour of the father, at which special privileges were accorded to the son and his descendants. This suggests strongly that these were variously honoured for some signal benefaction to the city. A late source gives welcome support, for an epistle attributed to Themistocles states that the writer remitted the tribute with which he had been endowed by the King.⁴⁵ This statement is compatible with our other evidence concerning Themistocles' position at this time and we may infer that it was the remission by Themistocles, for whatever reason, of the payment of the Persian tribute that was commemorated by the grateful citizens of Lampsacus in our recorded festival.⁴⁶ The commemoration of the son along with the father is best explained on the supposition that Cleophantus acted in Lampsacus as Themistocles' deputy.⁴⁷ If this is correct, Themistocles exercised a visible presence in Lampsacus and did not merely enjoy its revenues from afar.

⁴⁵*Them. Ep.* 20 p. 761 Hercher: καὶ Λάμψακον μὲν ἡλευθέρωσα καὶ πολλῶ φόρῳ βαρυνομένην ἅπαντος ἀφῆκα. Highby (above, note 42) 46 conjectures, after Wilamowitz and E. Meyer, that the source was Charon of Lampsacus, who was said to be a predecessor of Herodotus. On Charon, see R. J. Lenardon, "Charon, Thucydides, and 'Themistokles'," *Phoenix* 15 (1961) 28–40, especially 39, and M. Moggi, "Autori greci di Persiká. II. Carone di Lampsaco," *ASNP* ser. 3, vol. 7 (1977) 1–26, especially 20–21.

⁴⁶N. A. Doenges, *The Letters of Themistocles: A Survey* (diss. Princeton 1953) 94–95; known to me from Podlecki, *Life* (above, note 4) 129–133, and 206, note 6, considers but rejects another possible service by Cleophantus, that he was recalled to Athens (cf. Plato *Meno* 93d and U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Aristoteles und Athen* 1 [Berlin 1893] 147, note 44) because he was responsible for the entrance of Lampsacus into the Delian league. But, though the Platonic text may suggest that Cleophantus (as Doenges argues) did not live out his life in exile, we have no external confirmation of the suggestion, and it would be still more unlikely, if the attempt were to be made, to connect this conjecture with the Lampsacene festival, by conceiving that the citizens of Lampsacus celebrated at that time their inclusion in the league. We do not know when Cleophantus would have returned to Athens. It has been put to me by a friendly critic that Athens would not have permitted the authority, or even the presence, of Themistocles in Lampsacus. But the argument proves too much, for it might be used almost equally well against the presence in that city of Anaxagoras, who was *persona non grata* to Athens just as Themistocles was, but we know that the philosopher passed there the last years of his life.

⁴⁷Lolling (above, note 41) 48 had inferred that Cleophantus and his family resided in Lampsacus and Doenges (above, note 46) suggested that Cleophantus governed Lampsacus on his father's behalf. The authors of *ATL* 3.111 hold that it is "virtually certain" that the festival was instituted in the lifetime of Cleophantus but after the death of Themistocles. But it seems on general grounds at least equally possible that the institution was made by the resident representative of the absent magnate on the occasion of the munificent gift that it commemorates. Certainly, such a festival must have been in

It is a striking, though apparently little-noticed, parallel that Anaxagoras, who was said by Stesimbrotus to be the teacher of Themistocles and was, according to Satyrus and perhaps to Stesimbrotus as well, condemned *in absentia* for Medism, removed himself from Athens precisely to Lampsacus, where he became so well-established that honours were afterwards offered at his tomb, school-children celebrated an annual holiday in his memory, and he seems to have left followers, such as Metrodorus, behind him. So striking indeed is the parallel that it must seem prudent to recognise the likelihood that we have here two aspects of a single story,⁴⁸ which exhibits the Athenian perception of the Medism of Themistocles and of Anaxagoras, his Ionian mentor. Both, it appears, became the objects of political and judicial attacks and were held by some to illustrate, by their defections to the Persians, the instability and worthlessness of their culture and character.

The common features of the story must be taken to imply that Anaxagoras, when he left Athens for Lampsacus, showed his true colours by renewing his old association with Themistocles.⁴⁹ For, if it is true, as has been suggested here, that his association with the great Mediser was the cause of the accusation that was brought against him, and if Themistocles appeared to Athenians to be exalted in oriental splendour, it is not difficult to imagine that Anaxagoras' withdrawal to place himself under the patronage of Themistocles at Lampsacus may have set off an explosion in Athens that resulted in his prosecution *in absentia*.

This need not imply that Themistocles had his residence in that place, but it is naturally taken to mean that his influence was felt there and that

keeping with what we may take to be Themistocles' ideas of *μεγαλοπρέπεια* and *φιλοτιμία*, which are likely to have spared him any feelings of embarrassment over this celebration. What is more, after Themistocles' death it is questionable what authority or power Cleophantus may have retained in the city. But the writers of *ATL* hold both that the King had no power in Lampsacus at the time of his gift to Themistocles and that, after Themistocles' death, Cleophantus was able to win the continuing gratitude of the Lampsacenes by waiving the rights in the city that he derived from the royal bounty. The conclusion, though approved by Davies (above, note 37) 218, does not commend itself.

⁴⁸It is tempting to imagine that Charon of Lampsacus is the source of the story (cf. above, note 45). We know, from Plut. *Them.* 27.1, that Charon mentioned the Persian exile of Themistocles. The case for Charon as the source used by Thucydides for his excursus on Pausanias and Themistocles is stated by Westlake in *CQ* n.s. 27 (1977) 107–110. On Anaxagoras at Lampsacus, see Mansfeld (above, note 2) II. 86–87.

⁴⁹It may be that Anaxagoras' choice of a refuge inflamed another Athenian prejudice. The tyrant Hippias had arranged a dynastic marriage between one of his daughters and the son of the tyrant of Lampsacus, and he himself withdrew to Sigeum after 510. The region may have appeared to some Athenian eyes as tainted with tyranny as well as with Medism. On the "Medism" of Hippias at Lampsacus, see J. Holladay in *G&R* 25 (1978) 177–178 and Frost (above, note 38) 222.

he was capable of taking the philosopher under his protection, as he must have been if Cleophantus acted in that city, as has been conjectured, on his father's behalf. This appears to imply in turn that Themistocles was taken to be still alive at the time of Anaxagoras' removal,⁵⁰ for the public prejudice to which Thucydides' charge of Medism was addressed is best accounted for if the philosopher had recently been seen to take refuge under the protection of the great Mediser in the east. But if he was dead, he could not have been dead long, for his influence in the place is unlikely to have persisted, and the Athenian perception of the city as Medist would have grown dim.

If, however, Themistocles had died so long as some ten years before Anaxagoras found refuge in Lampsacus and under the protection of his son, the impact of such an occurrence upon public opinion at Athens is likely, on the present argument, to have been much less, because Anaxagoras' association with Themistocles must in those circumstances have appeared less immediate and distinct. Indeed, we know that after his death Themistocles' reputation in Athens was to improve rapidly, for we learn from Thucydides (1.74.1) that Athenian envoys to Sparta were able, in 432, to boast of him without embarrassment as one of the glories of their city. But the prosecution on a charge of Medism brought against Anaxagoras in his absence appears to imply that the Medism of Themistocles, his alleged pupil, was still a hot issue in Athens at the middle of the century or just a little later.

If Diogenes, and ultimately Demetrius, dated the beginning of Anaxagoras' sojourn at 480, and if the tradition gave him thirty years in that city (Diog. Laert. 2.7 [= 59A1]), his departure was dated ca 450.⁵¹ This date then combines well with the later date implied by Plutarch's synchronism for the date of Themistocles' death, as the story of his trial on a charge of Medism brought by a conservative politician may seem to be appropriate to public opinion at Athens on the eve of Cimon's last, great blow against the Persians. The coincidence is evident. We must wonder whether it can be the result of chance alone. If it is not, and if the tradition that we are investigating made this combination, then the exile of Anaxagoras to Lampsacus was taken by it to be the last known event of the life of Themistocles. The combination has advantages both for the biography of Themistocles and for that of Anaxagoras, for on the one

⁵⁰But Persian bounty to Medisers might be inherited, as seems to have been the case with Gongylus, the Eretrian turn-coat, and his sons (Xen. *Hell.* 3.1.6). Note also the case of Procles, the son of Demaratus, at *Anab.* 2.1.3.

⁵¹The later doxographic tradition, in constructing a philosophic succession from Anaxagoras to Archelaus to Socrates, appears to have conceived of Archelaus succeeding Anaxagoras in Athens at about the middle of the century, when Socrates, at the age of "about seventeen," began his association with the new representative of the school. See my discussion of the evidence in *Phoenix* 25 (1971) 305-309.

hand it provides a new argument for use in determining the date of the statesman's death, while on the other it makes more comprehensible the attacks on Medism launched by Thucydides in the 440s, by showing that he aimed, not only at events of the 470s, two or three decades earlier, but also and more immediately at a notorious and recent occurrence.⁵²

According to Plutarch (*Them.* 31.5) Themistocles lived for sixty-five years. This date, if combined with the proposed date of death, gives the date of birth as ca 515, which Gomme conceded, on general principles, was "not impossible." We do not, however, know how this number was calculated, nor that it was used by the tradition with which we are dealing. What we can say is that, if the date of birth in 515 is relevant here, then this tradition is less likely to have taken 493/2, when Themistocles would have been about twenty-two years old, to be the date of Themistocles' archonship, as Dionysius of Halicarnassus says it was (*Rom. Ant.* 6.34.1).⁵³ The tradition accommodates better the report of Herodotus (7.143.1), who introduces Themistocles to his narrative by saying that he had "recently come to the front" in 481, for on this scheme he was

⁵²It is relevant to notice here that Athens was proceeding against Medisers at Erythrae and Miletus shortly before 450: see Meiggs (above, note 22) 112–116. Also that Epicrates, who had spirited the family of Themistocles out of Athens to join him in exile, suffered a prosecution by Cimon and was condemned to death, according to Stesimbrotus, *FGrHist* 107 F 3 (ap. Plut. *Them.* 24.6). The trial is dated as possibly 450 by H. T. Wade-Gery in *Hesperia* 14 (1945) 222, note 22 and in *ATL* 3.112, but in the early 460s by Davies (above, note 37) 218, note 1. On the late dating, it is possible to conceive of Thucydides' attack on Anaxagoras as part of a flare-up of anti-Themistoclean feelings in Athens. But public prejudice against Themistocles at Athens was to diminish greatly, presumably after the date of his death, if we can judge from a passage such as Thuc. 1.74.1, from which we learn that the Athenians boasted of him at Sparta in 432 as one of the glories of their city. Frost (above, note 38) 9, 11, 229 inclines to date the rehabilitation of Themistocles' reputation at Athens at an earlier date, in the 440s or even in the 450s.

⁵³For the most recent discussions of the date of the archonship, see J. W. Cole in *AC* 47 (1978) 38, note 3. Frost (above, note 38) 70–71, arguing in support of Dionysius' date, casts suspicion on "the data provided by Plutarch for dating purposes, including his statement that Themistocles lived sixty-five years," but he is nevertheless willing (cf. 228) to use Plutarch's life of 65 years in combination with the archonship of 493/2 in order to achieve a life-span of ca 525–460. Plutarch's testimony in this matter, it appears, is not easily dismissed. An argument in favour of 515–450 as Plutarch's dates for the life is provided by R. Flacelière in *REA* 55 (1953) 15–19. Frost (73–75) argues further that the archonship was no more than "a proving ground for young men of promise" and that Herodotus did not regard archons as "among the *πρώτοι*." But, in regard to an anecdote about Themistocles' early displays of ambition (Plut. *Them.* 5), Frost (88) seeks to refute the story by stating that in 492, after laying down the archonship, Themistocles could not have been *μήπω γνώριμος γεγονώς*, as the anecdote says that he was. One might suppose, also, that a Greek sentence which declared that *οἱ ἄρχοντες* were not among the *πρώτοι* must have been heavily stressed, or ironic, or degenerate.

close to thirty-five years of age in that year. It deserves a more serious consideration from those who calculate our dates for the life of Themistocles.

In any case, the tradition studied here, if it is correctly reconstructed, reflects a tendency of conservative politics at Athens at about the middle of the century. If we give credence to the anecdote, we see the son of Melesias making political use of what must have been a deep, popular prejudice against the irreligious, the Ionians, and those who sought or accepted an accommodation with the Persian power. Pericles appears in the picture, as the leader of another party, but we are not told what was his part or his stake in these proceedings. Later the anecdote was to be recast in a new cycle to illustrate a different political situation, in which Pericles had to fight for his life. The continuity of the story, like the general probabilities of the situation, appear to make it likely that in the earlier situation also the attack was not thought to favour his own political position. As for Anaxagoras himself, his situation appears to have been controversial and perilous. Though accepted by some members of the intellectual *élite*, such as Themistocles and Pericles, he is seen to be embroiled in a tangle of political, social, and religious prejudices that made his position in Athens precarious and insecure.⁶⁴ In the early decades of the fifth century, before Athens had become "the school of Greece," he was able to introduce philosophy into the city for the first time, but, though it took root in a few fertile corners, its growth, as things appear here, was fitful and uncertain.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, TORONTO

⁶⁴It is possible to read into the sobriquet *νοῦς* that was popularly given to Anaxagoras (Plut. *Per.* 4.6 [= 59A15]) not only a mocking echo of his own principle, but also an ironical acknowledgement of his public image. Cf. Alcidas ap. Diog. Laert. 8.56. Plut. *Nic.* 23 has a good comment, made in connection with Anaxagoras, on the precarious public status of Ionian physical philosophy at Athens in the fifth century, but we do not know on what evidence it is based.