V.—The Date of the *Prometheia*

J. A. DAVISON

UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER

This paper[1] suggests that the *Prometheus Bound* was written in or soon after 457 B.C., that many of the incidents and characters in the play allude to incidents and characters in Athenian politics from 463 onwards, and that the play is a vital source for an important and misunderstood period in the history of Athens and of the sophistic movement. Suggestions are offered about Aeschylus's last years and about the life of Protagoras. A revised chronology of the period 468–445 B.C. is put forward in an appendix.

1. The Problem

External evidence for the authorship of the Prometheus trilogy is late: there is no certain reference to it[2] until Aristotle (*Poet.* 1456A.2–3) mentions it, and he does not name the author; we do not know the source from which Cicero (*Tusc. Disp.* 2.23) and later writers derived their conviction that the trilogy was by Aeschylus,

[1] Aeschylus is cited here by the numeration of Professor Gilbert Murray's edition (Oxford, 1937). The following works are cited by short title: D.-K. = H. Diels-W. Kranz, *Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*[6], 2 (Berlin, 1935); Jacoby = F. Jacoby, *Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*, 2 B (Berlin, 1929); N[2]. = A. Nauck, *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*[2] (Leipzig, 1889); *ATL* 1, *ATL* 2 = B. D. Meritt, H. T. Wade-Gery and M. F. Macgregor, *The Athenian Tribute-Lists*, 1 and 2 (Cambridge, Mass., 1939 and 1949); Jacoby *AC* = F. Jacoby, "Apollodors Chronik," *Philologische Untersuchungen* 19 (1902); Morrison = J. S. Morrison, "The Place of Protagoras in Athenian Public Life," *CQ* 35 (1941) 1–16. Other works not mentioned in the later notes which I have found helpful are: G. F. Hill, *Sources for Greek History*[2] (Oxford, 1907); A. W. Gomme, *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides* 1 (Oxford, 1945); H. T. Wade-Gery, "The Peace of Callias," *HSPh* Suppl. 1 (1940); William Wallace, "The Egyptian Expedition and the Chronology of the Decade 460–450 B.C.," *TAPhA* 67 (1936) 252–260. I did not see J. S. Morrison, "An Introductory Chapter in the History of Greek Education," *Durham Univ. Journ.* 41 (1949) 55–63, until my paper was in all essentials complete; his purpose is so different from mine that I have not found it necessary to change the views which I had already formed. I am indebted to Dr. R. Pfeiffer of Oxford for his answers to certain questions, and to Messrs. W. P. Wallace and L. E. Woodbury of University College, Toronto, Professor H. D. Westlake of the University of Manchester and Miss M. E. White of Trinity College, Toronto, for valuable criticisms and advice.

[2] None of the allusions to the *Prometheia* so far pointed out in fifth-century literature is so unambiguous as to have demonstrative value, although the number is impressive. Aristophanes does not use it in the *Frogs*, and the Prometheus-scene in the *Birds* may derive directly from Protagoras; on the other hand, it seems not to have been remarked that Aristophanes may have known the *Prometheia* by the time when he wrote the *Plutus* (compare especially *Plut.* 160–197, 510–516 with *PV* 436–506).

but considerations of style and thought have led most scholars to accept the ascription. However, even those who believe that Aeschylus composed the trilogy do not agree about the date at which he did so, since there is no external evidence for the date at which it was produced,[3] and the only *terminus ante quem* is that given by the date of Aeschylus's death (456/5, according to the *Parian Marble* — 239 A 59 Jacoby). It is therefore essential to consider the internal evidence, which has been usually accepted as giving a *terminus a quo* in the description of the great eruption of Etna (*PV* 367–371; dated by Thucydides, 3.116, to 476/5 and by the *Parian Marble*, A 52, to 479/8). Stylistic and other arguments have been invoked to show that the trilogy must have been composed late in the poet's life; but these have not produced any certainty, and some scholars (notably Wilhelm Schmid[4]) have denied that the trilogy can have been composed within Aeschylus's lifetime. The main purpose of this paper is to examine the *Prometheus Bound* afresh, in the hope of establishing more accurately the dates between which it must have been composed. To avoid prejudicing the conclusion, it will be assumed throughout the main enquiry that the author's name is unknown.

2. The *Prometheus Bound*

The play begins by describing the imprisonment of Prometheus upon a remote peak amid the Scythian deserts (1–6) by Hephaestus, assisted by Kratos and Bia, upon the orders of Zeus, who has lately superseded Cronus as ruler of the universe; Prometheus is visited by the Oceanides[5] and Oceanus, who sympathize with him, by Io (like Prometheus, a victim of the new dispensation) and by Hermes, the messenger of Zeus; at the end of the play, Prometheus and the still loyal Oceanides are engulfed in Tartarus, where Prometheus is

[3] As there is for the *Persae*, *Septem* and *Oresteia*, for example.

[4] "Der gefesselte Prometheus ist weder von Aischylos noch zu dessen Lebzeiten verfasst" — *Gesch. d. griech. Lit.* 1.2 (Munich, 1934) 193; for fuller statements of his views, see "Untersuchungen zum gefesselten Prometheus," *Tübinger Beiträge* 9 (1929) and *Gesch. d. griech. Lit.* 1.3 (Munich, 1940) 281–308. Although I agree with Professor Schmid about the presence of sophistic elements in the *Prometheus Bound*, it will be seen that I do not regard these elements as proving that the trilogy must have been written after Aeschylus's death.

[5] Hdt. 4.45.3 mentions Asiê, wife of Prometheus; in Hes. *Theog.* 359 Asiê is a daughter of Oceanus, but nothing is said of her marriage to Prometheus. In his translation of Herodotus (Oxford, 1949), J. E. Powell marks Hdt. 4.45.3–5 Λυκίην as an interpolation. See below, note 40.

to suffer worse torments. From the fragments of the other plays in the trilogy, it seems that in the second play (*The Freeing of Prometheus*) Prometheus was confronted with a chorus of Titans (Arr. *Peripl.* 19 = Aesch. frr. 190, 191 N²; Cic. *Tusc. Disp.* 2.23–25 = Aesch. fr. 193), with his mother Gê and with Heracles (*PV*, Dramatis personae; Hygin. *Poet. Astron.* 2.6 = fr. 199a), and was finally freed by Heracles; and that the third play (*Prometheus the Fire-bearer*) described the reconciliation of Prometheus with Zeus and the institution of the Attic festival in honour of Prometheus, with its famous *lampadêphoria*.

The crime ascribed to Prometheus by Kratos is the theft of fire, which Zeus had intended to be the prerogative of Hephaestus, and the communication of the secret to mortals (7–8, 82–83). Prometheus admits the charge (107–112, especially 112 ἀμπλακημάτων; 266), which even the chorus cannot palliate (259–261): at first he seems to admit the justice of his punishment (186–187) and complains only of its publicity (118, 152–159), its harshness (186, 240) and the ingratitude of Zeus (221–223); by the end of the play he has convinced himself (and most readers) that he is a victim of injustice (976, 1093). The only account in the play of what led up to Prometheus's crime is that given by Prometheus himself (199–256, 330–331, 347–372, 439–442), which is deeply coloured by Prometheus's own emotions. There was a *stasis* in Heaven, one party striving to overthrow Cronus and set Zeus upon the throne, and the other, composed of the Titans (sons of Uranus and Chthon), supporting Cronus; Prometheus, the son of Gaea-Themis, belonged at first to the Titans' party, but when they refused to listen to his excellent advice, expressed contempt for "low cunning" and said that they could easily maintain their position by force, Prometheus, warned by his mother that craft had replaced force as the essential basis of power, transferred his (and his mother's) allegiance to Zeus; he claims that it was his advice which enabled Zeus to overthrow Cronus and imprison him and the Titans in Tartarus (199–221), and he treats it as common knowledge that he had prepared the plan on which Zeus organized his new régime (439–442, 228–231). Of the older gods, all of whom might have been expected to support Cronus, Oceanus certainly (330–331) and Prometheus's brother Atlas and the earth-born Typhôs[6] probably (347–372) had

[6] The author of the *Prometheus Bound* calls him Τυφώς (370), Τυφῶνα (354); the accusative recalls Hesiod's Τυφάονα (*Theog.* 306). The dramatist describes Typhôs's

joined Zeus along with Prometheus; but Zeus's treatment of them after his victory had shown that distrust of friends which Prometheus (like Otanes — Hdt. 3.80.4) regards as characteristic of an autocrat (224–225): Oceanus had gone back to his traditional post at the ends of the earth (284), where he was so out of touch with later developments on Olympus that he believed himself still to have enough influence with Zeus to procure Prometheus's release (325–326, 338–339) — whereas he was really lucky not to be in serious trouble himself owing to his constant and audacious collaboration with Prometheus (330–331, especially πάντων, τετολμηκώς); Atlas had been given a task which he could not lay down, and which kept him far from the seat of government (347–50); Typhôs had rebelled against Zeus and been blasted by a thunderbolt (351–372); only Prometheus had retained his place as Zeus's unofficial adviser. Zeus then proposed the destruction of humanity and the creation of a new race in its stead (231–233) — presumably the destruction was to be brought about by the change in the physical conditions of life on earth which followed the fall of Cronus, and against which mankind had no defence of their own. Prometheus claims that he alone opposed this plan (234) and, in his love and pity for mortals, took steps to frustrate it by communicating to them the secret of fire (the source of many τέχναι), whereby mortals received hope of survival instead of the certainty of death (235–9, 248, 250, 252, 254). Through his "excessive affection for mortals" (Prometheus's own phrase — 123, echoed by the chorus — 543–544) Prometheus had deliberately incurred his punishment (101–3, 266), which could end only when Zeus so willed (257–258, 375–376) or when the fates and dire necessity forced Zeus (511–525) either to summon Prometheus to help him avert impending overthrow (167–177) or to abdicate before the more powerful deity whom (as Prometheus claims that he and his mother alone know) he was fated to beget if he made the imprudent marriage which he was already planning.[7]

revolt and punishment in terms which suggest that, unlike Hesiod, he identified the parentless Typhaon, father of Orthos and other monsters (*Theog.* 306–325), with Typhoeus, born to Gaea after the fall of the Titans and apparently destroyed at once by Zeus (*Theog.* 820–870). Since in the *Prometheia* Gaea is the mother of Prometheus and is distinguished from Chthon, mother of the Titans, the dramatist gives no details of Typhôs's birth (he merely calls him γηγενῆ — 351); he may however have somehow combined Hesiod's descriptions of Typhoeus and of Prometheus's brother, Menoetius.

[7] A plain allusion to the story told by Pindar in *Isth.* 8.29–52. See F. Solmsen, *op. cit.* (below, note 8) 128, note 18.

The oldest version of the story is that given by Hesiod in the *Theogony* (the *stasis* in Heaven 617–731, the crimes of Prometheus 507–616, Typhaon 306, Typhoeus 820–870, Kratos and Bia 385–388) and in the *Works and Days* (Prometheus 42–104, the five ages and destruction of the successive races 109–201); the chief difference between the Hesiodic version and that given in the *Prometheus Bound* is that Hesiod says nothing of any connection between Prometheus and the *stasis*. Minor variations occur in the genealogies: in the *Theogony*, Prometheus is the son of Iapetus and the Oceanid Clymene (508); Gaea is the wife of Uranus and mother of the Titans, including Iapetus, Themis and Cronus (the youngest of the family) (133–137); Prometheus has three brothers — Atlas, Menoetius (who suffers a fate very like that of Typhoeus — 514–516) and Epimetheus (507–511; *Works and Days* 84–88). The author of the *Prometheus Bound* appears to combine Hesiod's Typhaon and Typhoeus (above, note 6), and he says nothing of Menoetius or Epimetheus, or of the important episodes of Pandora and the tricking of Zeus over sacrifices.[8]

The association of Prometheus with the *stasis* upon Olympus seems to have been first made in the *Prometheus Bound*, and therefore concentrates interest upon the character ascribed to Prometheus in the play. In Hesiod, he is little better than a common thief and trickster — a typical pioneers' hero: in the play, he is something much more important. His enemies (Kratos in 62, Hermes in 944) call him σοφιστής, and Prometheus's claim that he had made men intelligent instead of infantile (443–444) and his catalogue of the σοφίσματα (459), μηχανήματα (469) and τέχναι (477, 506) which men had learned from him (450–468, 477–506) show that the word is used here (apparently for the first time in our surviving texts[9])

[8] This paragraph was already written before I had seen Professor F. Solmsen's full discussion in *Hesiod and Aeschylus, Cornell StClPh* 30 (1949), 124–177. I differ so radically from Professor Solmsen about the theology of the *Prometheus Bound* that I feel it legitimate to leave my own argument in its original form. Other peculiarities of the Aeschylean version of the Prometheus myth are discussed by C. B. Gulick, "The Attic Prometheus," *HSPh* 10 (1899) 103–114.

[9] In the sense "poet," it occurs first in Pind. *Isth.* 5.28 (after 480, but apparently before 476), and is used also by Aeschylus (Ath. 14.632c = fr. 314 N². — play unknown), by Sophocles in the *Aletes* (Stob. 3.8 = fr. 101 Pearson; Bergk and Hense regarded the *Aletes* as late — Pearson 1.62), and by Cratinus in the *Archilochi* (Clem. Alex. *Strom.* 1.23 = fr. 2 Kock; Schmid dates the play "not long after Cimon's death" — *Gesch. d. griech. Lit.* 1.4.78, note 5). Herodotus applies the word in its later sense to Solon and others (probably the rest of the Seven — 1.29) and to Pythagoras (4.95).

in the sense "teacher of *σοφία*," where *σοφία* implies, as in Aristotle's definition (*Eth. Nic.* 1141A.12), *ἀρετὴ τέχνης*.[10] Even Kratos admits Prometheus's ingenuity and resourcefulness (59); even the chorus deplore his obstinate individualism (*ἰδίᾳ γνώμᾳ* 543, *αὐθαδίαν* 1037, where they apply to Prometheus charges already levelled at Zeus, their own *ἰδίοις νόμοις κρατύνων* of 403 and Prometheus's *αὐθάδη φρονῶν* of 907), and Oceanus counsels him[11] to try to understand himself,[12] to learn new ways suited to the new conditions (309–310), to be humble (*ταπεινός* 320, which Prometheus in his turn applies to Zeus — 908) and to discipline his tongue (327–329). Prometheus disclaims *αὐθαδία* (437); but the chorus pay no attention to this, and Hermes later says, almost as Oceanus had done in 318–319, that Prometheus has brought his troubles on himself *αὐθαδίσμασιν* (964) and that he has not yet learned self-discipline (982); he compares Prometheus to a new-yoked colt fighting against the reins (1009–1010), and ends by counselling him against *αὐθαδία* (1034). Hermes's condemnation of *αὐθαδία* is not wholehearted; he says that "for the man who does not think rightly (*καλῶς*), *αὐθαδία* taken by itself is worse than powerless" (1012–1013); characteristically, he begs the whole question by not defining *καλῶς*, but Prometheus does not take up this point, and we are left with Hermes's definition, which helps to explain why Kratos, who resembles Hermes in his obedience to Zeus, can boast of his own *αὐθαδία* (79). Again, since Prometheus, disregarding even his own advice to himself to be patient (103–105, 375–376), calls down a hideous curse upon his enemies (864), expresses contempt for Zeus (especially 958) and enmity for all the gods (975), and finally bursts out into wild defiance of the power of Zeus, it is not surprising that Hermes should end by advising him to take thought and not value *αὐθαδία* above *εὐβουλία* (1034–1035), a piece of advice which the chorus at once repeat, with the wounding addition that Prometheus should lay aside *αὐθαδία* and hunt for *wise* *εὐβουλία* (1037–1038); they have already explained that for them wisdom consists in submission to Adrasteia (936).

If the foregoing interpretation of the *Prometheus Bound* is justified, it can hardly be argued that the purpose of the trilogy was

[10] For earlier uses of *σοφία*, *σοφίζεσθαι*, see W. Nestle, *Platon IV Protagoras*[7] (Berlin and Leipzig, 1931) 1–3, and the summary of my paper on "Pindar's Conception of Poetry" in *Proc. Class. Assoc. England and Wales* 33 (1936) 39.

[11] In 307–8 he repeats almost word for word Prometheus's own phrase from 204.

[12] Note that in 309 he says *γίγνωσκε*, and not *γνῶθι, σαυτόν*.

to exalt Prometheus at the expense of Zeus, any more than that *Paradise Lost* can have been intended to exalt Satan. Prometheus is a sinner, and his sin is pride in his own mental powers, which has led him to defy the divine ordering of the world in the name of the ultimate importance of the individual intelligence. Unlike Prometheus, the chorus recognize that the world is under Zeus's government, and that this government is a ἁρμονία (551), in spite of the apparent harshness of the new dispensation, which is represented by the brutality of Kratos, the arrogance, sophistry and *Schadenfreude*[13] of Hermes, the risks run by Oceanus and the chorus, and the penalties inflicted upon sinners like Prometheus and Io; though Io is a self-confessed sinner (578[14]), and her wanderings are often represented as caused by Hera's jealousy (591–592, 600–601, 703–704), Zeus is responsible for all that happens under his government (he alone is a free agent, not subject to any εἰθύνη — 49, 323), and therefore Io's sufferings are sometimes ascribed directly to him (577–579, 759). The only defence for Kratos and Hermes is that they are loyal to their master (and that is perhaps only because their own wishes happen to lie that way — they are really as αἰθάδεις as Prometheus), but against them we can set the compassion of Hephaestus (39, 45, 66) and his refusal to be influenced by Kratos's attempts to arouse his professional jealousy against Prometheus (7–8, 37–38). Io recognizes that her sufferings are a discipline (585–586); and in any case her wanderings are a pre-requisite of her union with Zeus in Egypt, from which will descend Heracles, the devoted servant of Zeus in the cause of man and the destined rescuer of Prometheus. Prometheus is not only a thief and a double traitor, but by Athenian standards a blasphemer (compare his invocation of the powers of nature, 188–191, with Euripides's prayer in the *Frogs*, 892–893); he admits that he is the enemy of Zeus and of all the gods who enter his court (120–122), and his only claims to consideration are his own divinity (e.g. 92), of which he has as far as possible stripped himself, and his services to mankind, by which he has frustrated the plans of Zeus. Rightly regarded, his sufferings, no less than Io's, are a discipline and the expression of a higher purpose than his great, but still limited, intelligence

[13] Note the almost loving particularity of his references to Prometheus's future sufferings (1015–1029).

[14] I take τί ποτε (577) as governing ἐνέζευξας (578); this seems to me much more likely than the alternative view that it governs ἁμαρτοῦσαν (578).

can grasp. Only when he has learned self-discipline will it be possible for his great intellect and indomitable courage to be put profitably to work in the service of the great community ruled by Zeus, which embraces both gods and men.

The theme of the Prometheus trilogy, then, appears to be the conflict of the human intelligence (which, in the arrogance of its new-found powers, denies that there is any authority higher than itself in the universe, and claims the right to examine everything, to attempt everything and to express final conclusions about everything) against the divine government of the universe, personified by Zeus, who orders all things in Heaven and on earth for a purpose which the human intelligence cannot grasp unaided, and whose apparent cruelties are in reality instruments for the accomplishment of his "large and loving purposes." In this conflict, the author of the *Prometheus Bound*, though fully conscious of the sufferings of individuals and of the potentially good qualities displayed by Prometheus, makes plain by the whole plan of the play his own faith in the goodness of God and his detestation of Prometheus's pride and indiscipline.

3. Prometheus and Protagoras

Can we connect Prometheus, the atheistic sophist, the friend and teacher of mankind, who deserted his old associates and assisted in forming a new government, which he then opposed in the name of humanity, thereby incurring harsh and humiliating punishment, with any historical character? Most sophists were suspected of atheism, and more than one is said to have been driven from Athens on that account; of these, Protagoras, who according to Philostratus (*Vit. Soph.* 1.10.4 = 80 A 2 D.-K.[15]) was the first to charge fees for his teaching, and who is said to have been banished from Athens for the impiety of his book *On the Gods* (Cic. *N.D.* 1.64 = A 23; Diog. Laert. 9.51, 54 = A 1), was notorious for his claim that the individual human intellect is the highest court of appeal in the universe, succinctly expressed in his own words: "Of all things the measure is man, of the existence of what is and of the non-existence of what is not" (Plat. *Theaet.* 151E, Sext. Emp. *Adv. Math.* 7.60 = B 1). The earliest extended account of Protagoras is that given

[15] Henceforward references to D.-K.'s section on Protagoras (80) are given by letter and number alone.

by Plato in the dialogue named after him;[16] Protagoras there confirms that he is a σοφιστής (317C), but claims (in words which suggest that he regarded himself as the first of the kind) to be a sophist of a different stamp from poets like Homer, Hesiod and Simonides, experts on ritual and prophecy like the followers of Musaeus and Orpheus, teachers of physical culture like Iccus and Herodicus, and musicians like Agathocles and Pythocleides (316D–317A). The subject which he claims to teach is εὐβουλία about private and public affairs alike (318E–319A), he uses the verb προμηθεῖν (316C), and he tells a myth about Prometheus in support of his proposition that unless all men have a share of political *aretê* no state can exist (320C–323A).[17] The key-word here is plainly εὐβουλία,[18] which is twice thrown in Prometheus's teeth in the *Prometheus Bound* (1035, 1038) and is used also by Aristophanes's Prometheus (*Birds* 1539). It seems therefore that the Prometheus of the trilogy is perhaps in some sense to be connected with Protagoras.

Any theory of the chronology of Protagoras's life[19] must satisfy the following conditions: (1) he must have been old enough to be

[16] The doubts about the dramatic date of this dialogue, already familiar to Athenaeus (5.218B–D, 11.505F), cannot disprove its claim to be a reliable source for the character and opinions of Protagoras, especially as Plato includes his own uncle Charmides (315A) and Charmides's cousin Critias (316A) among the auditors, but they do make it impossible to use the dialogue with any confidence as evidence for actual events in Protagoras's life. I accept the view of Morrison, that the reference to Pherecrates's *Agrioi* is to be taken as an anachronism, and that the dramatic date of the dialogue should be put *circa* 433.

[17] The first part of the myth, down to the imparting of fire to men (320C–322A), is quite different from the story put in Prometheus's mouth by the dramatist, but the second part agrees more closely with the first account in the play (e.g. 253–254), where knowledge of fire is the teacher of the other τέχναι. Later in the play, Prometheus seems to claim that he taught men the various τέχναι directly. These divergences prove nothing: for Prometheus in the play to be connected with Protagoras, it is essential to suppose that the sophist's views on Prometheus were already common knowledge in Athens when the play was composed; and even if Plato gives an accurate report of what Protagoras was saying *circa* 433, there had been plenty of time by then for Protagoras to have changed his μῦθος very considerably from what it had been in the dramatist's time.

[18] Morrison, 15, regards its use in Eur. *Suppl.* 151 as evidence of Protagorean influence. The adjective εὔβουλος is found in Theogn. 329 (couplet addressed to Cyrnus), Pind. *Ol.* 13.8 (of 464) and Bacchyl. 15(14).37; the noun is first used in Aesch. *Pers.* 749; the remark of the chorus about "wise εὐβουλία" may be illustrated by Hdt. 8.110.1; before Salamis, Themistocles was thought σοφός, but after it he was revealed as truly σοφός τε καὶ εὔβουλος.

[19] The most recent discussions are those of Morrison, 1–7, and Kathleen Freeman, *The Pre-Socratic Philosophers* (Oxford, 1946) 343–346. Neither is adequate, and I hope to publish a full re-examination of the evidence elsewhere.

Socrates's father (Plat. *Protag.* 317c); (2) he must have been still παῖς, but not too young to have been of interest to the *magi* as a pupil, in 480/79 (Philostr. *Vit. Soph.* 1.10.1 = A 2);[20] (3) he must have been alive and in Athens in 421 (Eupolis, *Kolakes*, ap. Ath. 5.218b); (4) he must have been in the neighbourhood of seventy and have been a practising sophist for at least forty years when he died (Plat. *Meno* 91d–e). A further requirement seems to be given by Apollodorus (*Chronica*, ap. Diog. Laert. 9.56 = A 1, 244 F 71 Jacoby) that his *acmê* fell in the 84th Olympiad (444–1, narrowed down to 444/3 by Euseb. *Chron. Arm.* — Jacoby *AC* 268), but it is not necessary to conclude from this that he was exactly forty in 444/3, since that was the year in which he performed his most important public action, by drafting the constitution for Thurii (Heracl. Pont. περὶ νόμων, ap. Diog. Laert. 9.50 = A 1); all the probabilities of the case suggest that legislation is a task for men well over forty. It therefore seems possible to hold that Protagoras was born considerably before 484/3, and probably rather before 490 (perhaps in 492 or 491), and that he began his career as a sophist before 460 (perhaps in 464 or 463) and died in or very soon after 421.

Of more importance for the present enquiry is the question of Protagoras's impiety, and especially of the punishment said to have been inflicted on him at Athens for it. All our authorities (Cic. *N.D.* 1.63 = A 23; Diog. Laert. 9.51, 54 = A 1; Philostr. *Vit. Soph.* 1.10.3 = A 2; Sext. Emp. *Adv. Math.* 9.55–56 = A 12) agree that the grounds for attack were provided by Protagoras's book *On the Gods* (Diog. Laert. 9.51 = B 4 gives the fullest version

[20] Only the date is important for my present purpose. D.-K. 255.20 note, following (without acknowledgment) Jacoby *AC* 266, dismiss the story as a fabrication by Dinon, whose *Persica* is said to have given great prominence to the *magi*, and whom Diogenes quotes for the name of Protagoras's father. If the story does come from Dinon, it is odd that Diogenes himself (9.34 = 68 A 1 D.-K.) tells it of Democritus, quoting Herodotus as his authority. D.-K. 81.13 note, refer to Hdt. 8.120 (Abderite hospitality to the defeated Xerxes and his gratitude, where neither Democritus nor his father is mentioned) and 7.109 (Xerxes's passage through Abdera on his way to Greece). The tale cannot originally have had anything to do with Democritus, who was not born until about 460 (Freeman, *op. cit.*, 289); but since Morrison, 12–13, has shown that the notorious Persian debate (Hdt. 3.80–83) contains many Protagorean elements, it may be suggested that Protagoras claimed to have heard of it from his alleged Persian teachers — it does not follow that Protagoras was ever actually taught by Persians; he may have made the story up for his own aggrandisement — and that this accounts for Herodotus's otherwise inexplicable confidence that the debate really happened (3:80.1). If this explanation is accepted, it throws an interesting light on the attitude of Diogenes or his sources to their authorities.

of its opening words), but there is disagreement about the procedure followed in the attack. Philostratus (*loc. cit.*) gives two versions: some said that he was tried and condemned, and others that there was no trial but that a *psêphisma* was passed against him. Diogenes Laertius (9.54) follows the first version; he gives the name of the prosecutor as Pythodorus son of Polyzelus, one of the Four Hundred or (according to Aristotle — fr. 67 Rose) as Euathlus. Since Euathlus was the hero of the famous dilemma about Protagoras's fee (Diog. Laert. 9.56 = A 1; Apul. *Flor.* 18 = A 4), it is probable that Diogenes or his source has misrepresented Aristotle (cf. the case of Herodotus, above note 20); and we need not doubt that the otherwise unknown Pythodorus[21] did actually prosecute Protagoras[22] on a charge of impiety. Sextus Empiricus (*loc. cit.*) tells us that Protagoras was condemned to death, and that it was while trying to escape that he came to grief at sea and was drowned; Philostratus (*loc. cit.*) adds that he was "island-hopping" in a small boat in an attempt to escape observation by Athenian cruisers. Pythodorus's accusation must therefore have been brought shortly before Protagoras's death, i.e. perhaps in or very soon after 421.

On the other hand, Cicero (*loc. cit.*) says: Protagoras . . . Atheniensium iussu urbe atque agro est exterminatus librique eius in contione combusti; this is perhaps the source of Eusebius's remark (*Chron. Hier.* Ol. 84 = A 4): cuius libros decreto publico Athenienses combusserunt. Philostratus agrees with Cicero about the penalty (πάσης γῆς ὑπὸ Ἀθηναίων ἠλάθη). There is therefore a contradiction about the penalty, as well as about the procedure; and there appears to be a further contradiction about the date. Diogenes Laertius tells us (9.54 = A 1) that the book *On the Gods* was the first of Protagoras's works to be published in Athens, and he adds that various accounts were current about the circumstances of this publication: the book was read, according to some (perhaps including Satyrus) in Euripides's house, according to others in the house of Megacleides, and according to others again in the Lyceum,

[21] There is no conclusive evidence identifying him with any of the contemporary Pythodori (e.g. those named by Thucydides).

[22] Mr. Woodbury drew my attention to Plato's silence about any attack on Protagoras or any other sophist in *Meno* 89E–92B; this silence is hard to explain in the light of the circumstantial stories about Protagoras here discussed, to say nothing of the decree of Diopeithes (Plut. *Per.* 32 — it is clear that Plutarch or his source had seen the text of the decree, perhaps in Craterus); it may perhaps be suggested that Plato was not anxious to detract from the apparent uniqueness of Socrates's case.

the reader being Archagoras son of Theodotus, a pupil of the sophist's (both Megacleides and Archagoras are unknown). Elsewhere (9.52 = A.1) Diogenes tells us that all copies of the book in circulation were called in by proclamation and burned in the *agora*.

The simplest way to reconcile these conflicting accounts is to suggest that there were two attacks on Protagoras:[23] as a result of the first he was banished by a ψήφισμα (as an Abderite, Protagoras would have no constitutional protection against a ψήφισμα ἐπ' ἀνδρί), which also ordered the burning of his book; in the second he was formally accused by Pythodorus and condemned to death. That the decree is not to be identified with that of Diopeithes (above, note 23) is proved by the fact that Diopeithes's decree mentioned no one by name, whereas the decree against Protagoras must have mentioned him, his book, and perhaps other persons,[24] by name; besides, Protagoras is nowhere mentioned as having been affected by the decree of Diopeithes. The date of the decree against Protagoras cannot be determined on the evidence so far discussed, but the fact that his book *On the Gods* is said to have been the first of his works to be published in Athens suggests that the decree may have been passed quite early in his career as a sophist.[25]

[23] A similar explanation may be given of the two irreconcilable stories about the condemnation of Anaxagoras given by Diog. Laert. 2.12 = 59 A 1 D.-K., on the authority of Sotion and Satyrus respectively. Here there seem to have been two trials, the earlier (with Thucydides, son of Melesias, as prosecutor) almost certainly before 453/2, when Socrates began to associate with Archelaus (Porphyr. ap. Cyril. *in Iul.* 6.186 D., Io Chius ap. Diog. Laert. 2.23 = 60 A 3 D.-K.; that Anaxagoras was not in Athens at this period is made almost certain by the evidence that Socrates owed all his knowledge of Anaxagoras's views to his books — Plat. *Phaed.* 97B, 98B; cf. *Apol.* 26D), and the later (with Cleon as prosecutor) after the decree of Diopeithes (Plut. *Per.* 32), i.e. most probably in 433/2 (H. T. Wade-Gery, *JHS* 52 [1932] 220; the date 430 implied by D.-K.'s extract from Diod. 12.39 — 59 A 17 — is shown to be wrong by the context from which the extract is taken). Both Anaxagoras (Plut. *Per.* 7) and Protagoras (Heracl. Pont., *loc. cit.*) re-appear in Athens in 444/3; perhaps there was an amnesty after the Thirty Years' Peace (cf. Ar. *Acharn.* 194–200 for the atmosphere created by thirty-year treaties). A. B. Drachmann, *Atheism in Pagan Antiquity* (London and Copenhagen, 1922), deals at some length with the attacks on Anaxagoras (25–30) and Protagoras (39–42), but does not discuss the chronological problems involved.

[24] Where else could the undistinguished names of Megacleides and Archagoras have come from?

[25] The stories about Anaxagoras (above, note 23) suggest the middle fifties as a *terminus ante quem*.

4. The *Prometheus Bound* and Athenian History

The suggestion that the Prometheus of the trilogy may have some connection with Protagoras, and the possibilities that Protagoras first came to Athens in the sixties and that he was expelled from the city quite early in his career, seem to allow the further hypothesis that the events described in the *Prometheus Bound* may bear some relation to the historical events which preceded the first banishment of Protagoras. Whatever dates we accept for Protagoras's life, the only *stasis* at Athens within his lifetime in which a conservative régime was overthrown by a *coup d'état* was the revolution of 463–1 (for the chronology, see the Appendix, below, 91), in which a coalition headed by Ephialtes and Pericles (Arist. *Pol.* 1274A.7) deprived the Areopagus of its political powers, reversed the policy of Athens towards the other Greek states, and secured the ostracism of Cimon. Plutarch (*Cim.* 10) represents Cimon's lavish generosity as surpassing the *philanthrôpia* of those legendary Attic benefactors of mankind who gave men "the seed of nourishment and spring waters **** and the kindling of fire," and as having "in some sense brought back into daily life the community of goods which, according to the myths, prevailed in the time of Cronus." It may be suggested, therefore, that in the *Prometheus Bound* Cronus is in some sense to be connected with Cimon, and the Titans (sons of Chthon) with the Athenian conservatives (mostly Eupatrids, and therefore *autochthones*). The relations between Prometheus and the Titans before the *stasis* in Heaven will then give some reason for supposing that Protagoras was at first attracted to Cimon by his *philanthrôpia;* in his professional capacity, Protagoras would naturally associate with those who had the time to attend his lectures and the means to pay his fees, and who must have been mostly supporters of Cimon. As the Titans refused to listen to Prometheus's politic advice and preferred to maintain their position by force, driving Prometheus, his mother Gaea-Themis, Oceanus and perhaps Atlas and Typhôs to side with Zeus, so (it may be suggested) the violence of the Athenian conservatives (expressed in their readiness to help Sparta against the Helots, in the brutal suppression of Thasos and in their preparations to resist plans for domestic reform) and their unteachability disgusted Protagoras and even some conservative Athenians. It seems that Protagoras, in the belief that the democrats would be more congenial associates for one with his belief in the importance of the

individual human being and with his sense of natural justice (perhaps symbolized in the trilogy by Gaea-Themis), transferred his allegiance to them, and that certain conservatives followed his example. Our information does not allow us to identify definitely any of these dissident conservatives; but it is possible that Ephialtes, who first appears as a leader of the opposition to Cimon's policy of aid to Sparta (Plut. *Cim.* 16, with its echo of conservative opposition to Cimon in Critias's remark about the sacrifice of Athenian interests involved[26]), and who is classed with Cimon and Thucydides as an ἀγαθός (Plut. *Mor.* 802C) and represented as second only to Aristeides as a pattern of poverty and justice (Ael. *V.H.* 2.43, 11.9, 13.39), belonged to this group,[27] and that others may yet be found among the generals sent to the Levant and Egypt between 459 and 457.

As Zeus, advised by Prometheus and helped by Oceanus and the others, overthrew Cronus and the Titans, who were then immured in Tartarus, so the coalition headed by Ephialtes and Pericles defeated the conservatives, reformed the Areopagus (463–1) and ostracized Cimon (461).[28] Our authorities suggest that one of the first actions of the new régime was to prepare for the revival of the war with Persia, dormant since Cimon's victory at the Eurymedon in 468. Two motives may be suggested for this: the resumption of a policy identified in the public mind with Cimon and the conservatives may have been the price exacted by the dissident conservatives for supporting the reform of the Areopagus, the alliance with Argos and Thessaly, and the ostracism of Cimon; and the grievances of the allies could best be met by renewing the war which they were still being taxed to support. Operations were at first on a small scale (the expeditions to the Levant of Pericles

[26] Critias must not be taken to have approved these criticisms himself.

[27] Aristotle (*Ath. Pol.* 25.1, 28.2) makes him a προστάτης τοῦ δήμου; but the first of these passages connects Ephialtes's attacks on the Areopagus with Themistocles, and both (together with all later references to Ephialtes as a δημαγωγός) are explicable as inferences from his recorded actions in 463–1, and throw no light on his previous career.

[28] The part played by Pericles is uncertain; his first στρατηγία probably fell in 463/2, just after his prosecution of Cimon (Plut. *Cim.* 14, *Per.* 10; *Ath. Pol.* 27.1); the original legislation against the Areopagus stood in the names of Ephialtes and Archestratus (*Ath. Pol.* 35.2), but Pericles played some part in the reform (*Ath. Pol.* 27.1), and he may have put up the otherwise unknown Archestratus to represent him (cf. Plut. *Per.* 7); perhaps he was away from Athens on military service (Plut. *Cim.* 13; below, 91). In the *Politics* (1274A.7), at all events, Aristotle puts down the curtailing of the Areopagus to Ephialtes and Pericles.

with fifty ships and of Ephialtes with thirty, recorded in Plut. *Cim.* 13, seem to belong to this phase), and major operations were delayed (perhaps partly by the need for fleet training and partly by the appeal from Megara) until 459, when 200 ships were sent to Cyprus, whence they were diverted to Egypt (Thuc. 1.104), but not before there had been some fighting in Cyprus (*IG* 1^2:929, which gives no indication of the scale of the fighting in Cyprus). No direct allusion to these operations can be found in the *Prometheus Bound*, unless the pitiable sufferings of Cilician Typhôs should be so understood — and there is an alternative explanation for Typhôs, to which we may now return.

After the Olympian *coup d'état*, Prometheus tells us, Zeus became suspicious of his allies; these suspicions, it appears, led to the virtual exile of Atlas and to the revolt and destruction of Typhôs; Oceanus was included in them, but he escaped overt action because of his remoteness from the seat of government. At Athens, the only record of any mishap to any of the revolutionaries was the murder of Ephialtes by some person or persons still unknown or unnameable many years later (Antiph. *Caed. Herod.* 68[29]), although Aristotle (*Ath. Pol.* 25.4) names Aristodicus of Tanagra as the actual murderer, and Idomeneus of Lampsacus[30] recorded dark suspicions that Pericles himself was responsible, the motive being his jealousy of Ephialtes (Plut. *Per.* 10). These suspicions may derive from an application of the Cassian question "cui bono fuerit?" to the fact that after Ephialtes's death Pericles appears as the unquestioned leader of the democratic party; his readiness to perform unjustifiable acts εἰς τὸ δέον (Ar. *Clouds* 859) was later notorious, and although Plutarch treats the suspicions against him as manifestly ridiculous the tale of Typhôs in the *Prometheus Bound* does seem to suggest that they were shared (and perhaps originated) by the person from whom the dramatist derived his information.

The great expedition to Cyprus in 459 had several advantages from Pericles's point of view: (1) it enabled the government to conciliate the allies, the dissident conservatives, and even to some extent the Cimonians; (2) it provided paid employment for a large section of the ναυτικὸς ὄχλος; (3) it gave moderate leaders, who might

[29] K. J. Maidment, *Minor Attic Orators*, 1.148 (Loeb Classical Library), dates the speech "not much earlier or much later than 415."

[30] A friend and younger contemporary of Epicurus; his works apparently included one *On Demagogues;* lived from *circa* 325 to after 270 (F. Jacoby in *RE*, s.v. "Idomeneus" 5).

be inclined to cause trouble on the home front if they stayed in Athens, a chance of honourable employment abroad in the execution of a policy with which they agreed (though we may be sure that Pericles did not repeat the mistake made by Polycrates in 525 — Hdt. 3.44.2–45.1 — but made sure that enough of his loyal supporters went with the fleet to prevent its being used in a *coup d'état* against him). Two other advantages which the expedition might have had did not in fact accrue: the renewal of the war against Persia might have allayed Spartan suspicion of Athens, which had been quickened by the alliance with Argos and Thessaly, but the Athenian response to the appeal from Megara and the outbreak of the first Peloponnesian War nullified this advantage; and the conversion of the expedition to Cyprus into an operation in support of the Egyptian insurgents perhaps entailed the abandonment of a scheme for alleviating the over-population of Attica by expelling Phoenicians from Cyprus and replacing them with Athenian settlers. The problem of feeding the population of Attica would of course have become less acute if the expedition to Egypt had succeeded.

The quarrel between Prometheus and Zeus, which led to Prometheus's deliberate betrayal of government secrets to mortals (compare the action of Aristophanes's Prometheus — *Birds* 1494–1552), is said by Prometheus to have arisen over Zeus's plan to destroy humanity and create a new race in its stead. Given Protagoras's beliefs about the dignity of man, a plan to expel the Phoenicians from their almost immemorial homes in Cyprus (involving the ἀνδραποδισμός appropriate to war with barbarians) and to replace them with Athenians might well have caused disagreement between him and Pericles, but there are two reasons for thinking that this was not the cause of a breach between Pericles and Protagoras: so far as we know, no such plan was ever put into execution, and it is hard to see how Protagoras could have warned the intended victims. It seems most likely that the quarrel occurred later, when the growing strain of conducting war both in Greece against the Peloponnesian League and overseas against the Persians, and above all the disaster at Tanagra (458),[31] not only

[31] Tactically, Tanagra may have been a drawn battle, but strategically it was a victory for the Lacedaemonians, who thereby secured an unimpeded retreat to the Peloponnese — the only thing about which, according to Thucydides (1.107.3), they were seriously concerned. What they were doing at Tanagra at all remains to be discovered. Mr. Wallace has suggested to me that their presence there is most prob-

endangered the coalition at Athens (since the moderates, who were mainly small landowners and farmers of the hoplite class, bore the brunt of the army's casualties and ran the risk of having their farms ravaged) but shook the loyalty of the allies, who may well have lost heavily at Tanagra[32] and were more exposed than Athens to a Persian counter-stroke.

Pericles met the crisis after Tanagra with appropriate counter-measures: just over two months after the battle, the Boeotians were crushed at Oenophyta (cf. Pind. *Isth.* 7), and the long walls to Peiraeus and Phalerum were pushed to completion. These solved the immediate military problems, but the possibility of a Peloponnesian invasion of Attica in the spring of 457 was a serious one, and the off-season of 458–7 seems to have been devoted to strengthening Athens to meet the danger.[33] At home, the most obvious need was unity, implying the recall of Cimon, the gallantry of whose kinsmen and friends at Tanagra had caused a popular revulsion of feeling in his favour; but there were certain precautions to be taken. An agreement was made with Cimon's friends that, if he were recalled, he should have the command against Persia, leaving Pericles in undisputed control on the home front; to counteract Cimon's wealth and generosity, it seems, pay was now instituted for the law-courts; the zeugites were conciliated by their admission to be candidates for the archonships (and a zeugite became eponymous archon for 457/6); and finally, it may be suggested, Protagoras (whose activities in 463–1 had made him *persona ingratissima* with the Cimonians) was to be expelled from Athens. Cimon on his side agreed to exert his influence at Sparta to bring about peace. In the outside world, an alliance was concluded with Segesta (*IG* 1^2.19 is now securely dated to 458/7[34]) and a mission may have been despatched to negotiate for other western alliances (below, 87 f.). It seems that Pericles's first measure to keep the allies steady may have been the despatch of garrisons to exposed cities (e.g. Erythrae

ably to be connected with internal Boeotian politics. Casualties on both sides were heavy, but the measures which Athens certainly took to repair the situation clearly show that the result was regarded there as a disaster.

[32] The shield dedicated by the Spartans at Olympia after the battle named Argives, Athenians and Ionians, in that order (Paus. 5.10.4, partially confirmed by *IGA* 26a).

[33] For the evidence, see the appendix (below, 91 f.).

[34] A. E. Raubitschek, *TAPhA* 75 (1944) 10, note 3; A. G. Woodhead, *Hesperia* 17 (1948) 58 and Plate I.

and Miletus[35]), but it is unlikely that this was the only plan in his mind, although there is no evidence of any overt action against disaffected allies at this time.

It seems that a pretext for the expulsion of Protagoras was found in the impiety of his book *On the Gods*, which may have been published some time before (though the character ascribed to Prometheus in the play makes it by no means impossible that Protagoras should have chosen this very moment for an act of rash defiance). This enabled Pericles to stir up an outburst of the religious intolerance endemic in Athens, which resulted in the decree expelling Protagoras and ordering the burning of his book. Protagoras, it seems, was unceremoniously escorted to the Peiraeus by members of the Eleven (his description of their behaviour perhaps provided material for the character of that typical member of the political police, Kratos), and put aboard an outward bound ship amid the jeers of the populace. Pericles then proposed the decree for the recall of Cimon, and secured its passage.

That there is more behind this story than can be gathered from the later authorities is suggested by the account given by Prometheus of his quarrel with Zeus, and by the story of Thucydides's prosecution of Anaxagoras (above, note 23). What Pericles's ultimate plans for disciplining the allies were, we can judge only by what he did when it became clear that the Egyptian expedition was faced with disaster (late summer, 454—below, 92): his actions then included the transfer of the League treasury to Athens, with the consequent suppression or emasculation of the *synedrion* (that it still met is suggested by the statement that the Samians proposed the transfer — Plut. *Arist.* 25), the remodelling of constitutions (e.g. Erythrae 453/*2*, Miletus 450/49), and the revival of the Peisistratid policy of cleruchies (with the difference that these were now to be sent to allied territory, and perhaps on a scale which would help to remedy the over-population of Attica). The *Prometheus Bound* suggests that the scheme for expropriating the allies, at least, was already in Pericles's mind in 458/7, that he

[35] The Erythrae decree (*IG* 1^2.10, 11, 12/13a = *ATL* 2, D.10) is now dated 453/2 (*ATL* 2.54 — reasons to be given in *ATL* 3); the Miletus decree (*IG* 1^2.22 = *ATL* 2, D.11) is securely dated 450/49 (J. H. Oliver, *TAPhA* 66 [1935] 177–198); in both cases the garrison was already there when the decree was passed. This note is based on information collected by Mr. A. S. Nease, of the School of Graduate Studies in the University of Toronto. For a different interpretation, see R. Meiggs, *JHS* 63 (1943) 25–27.

mentioned it to Protagoras and others, that Protagoras's arguments against the scheme had no effect on Pericles's determination, and that Protagoras finally revealed the scheme to some at least of the intended victims, whom he advised on the best means of frustrating the scheme (perhaps by drafting speeches for them to make in the *synedrion*). This, it seems, and not the plan for the recall of Cimon, was Protagoras's own explanation of his expulsion from Athens; but the alliance with Cimon seems to be hinted at in Prometheus's remarks about Zeus's plans for an imprudent marriage.[36] The story about the first trial of Anaxagoras suggests that Protagoras may have been charged with medism as well as with impiety; but there is no evidence for this except the possibility that Thucydides's attack on Anaxagoras was an imitation *mutatis mutandis*[37] of Pericles's action against Protagoras, with the intention of increasing the vexation caused to Pericles.

So far, I suggest, the course of events described in the *Prometheus Bound* corresponds surprisingly closely with what we know from other sources, or can reasonably conjecture, about the course of events at Athens between 463 and the early part of 457, when Protagoras seems to have been expelled. After this point, we have to depend upon Prometheus's guesses about the duration of his punishment and the manner of his release; the person who will release him is certain — Heracles, at once an Argive and a Theban (cf. Plut. *Mor.* 857E–F), the remote descendant of a union between Zeus and the Argive Io which is to take place in Egypt. Soon after his expulsion, it seems, Protagoras was saying that he would be rescued by someone loyal to Pericles, but sharing his own views about service to mankind, who was to come out of Egypt; perhaps a general with the expedition there may be meant (Charitimides — Ctes. 32 Müller — is the only one whose name we know, but we know nothing else about him). There may be some further allusion in the Argive-Theban connection implied by the mention of Heracles, or even in his association with the Dorians in general and especially with Sparta, which may mean that Protagoras was still expecting a victory for Athens and her allies in Egypt, followed by

[36] Perhaps Protagoras also originated the stories about Elpinice and Pericles (Antisth. ap. Ath. 13.589D).

[37] With Anaxagoras protected by Pericles, Thucydides would have little hope of carrying a decree for his expulsion through the assembly; legal action offered better prospects of success, since fewer votes had to be gained and the voting was secret.

a general peace. Since it was apparently not until 456 that the Persians set any serious measures for the recovery of Egypt on foot, and not until 454 that disaster became likely (below, 92), we have therefore some justification for arguing that the latest possible date for the composition of the *Prometheia* is the first half of 454; the *terminus a quo* must be the expulsion of Protagoras from Athens, probably early in 457. We have also some additional reason for holding that Protagoras was born well before 484/3 (above, 75), if he played the important part suggested above in the events of 463–1 and later years.

5. Protagoras and the *Prometheus Bound*

From this examination, it seems that not long after 458 and certainly before the middle of 454 an Athenian dramatist was inspired to compose a trilogy on the story of Prometheus, having as its central theme the rebellion of the human intellect against the divine government of the universe. Though he took the main lines of the story from Hesiod, he made a major innovation in it by connecting Prometheus with the fall of Cronus. He based the character of Prometheus upon that of Protagoras, and into the first play of the trilogy (composed perhaps in the second half of 457) he wove many parallels with recent history, showing an "inside" knowledge which can hardly have come from anyone but Pericles or Protagoras. The fact that most of the references in the play to Zeus and his "understrappers" (942, 983) are hostile may suggest that Protagoras must have been the source of the information — but some at least of these references are necessary dramatically, to state the case (such as it is) for Prometheus. Better evidence for the conclusion that Protagoras provided the poet's "briefing" on recent history is to be found in the suggested allusion to the dangers of Pericles's alliance with Cimon (907–910) and in the extremely unflattering portrait which the play draws of Prometheus: uncontrolled in thought and speech and action, conceited, blasphemous, revengeful, long-winded, inconsistent, and hideously muddled in his lectures on geography, Prometheus is surely drawn from the life by someone who had had an opportunity of studying Protagoras's reactions to his ignominious expulsion from Athens, and who knew his style as a lecturer. Perhaps the picture is drawn somewhat larger than life, appropriately to the superhuman setting of the play; but the conceit, the long-windedness and the lack of

intellectual discipline meet us again in Plato's Protagoras (for the other bad qualities there is no occasion in Plato's dialogue, and by the dramatic date of the *Protagoras* years of success could have mellowed the sophist into what we find him in Plato, even if in 457 he was the bitter hater portrayed in the *Prometheus Bound*). The suggestion that Protagoras provided the information about recent events used in the *Prometheia* may make it easier to believe that the story of Typhôs contains a hint of Pericles's responsibility for the murder of Ephialtes; it is just the kind of thing that this Protagoras would say. We may perhaps read into Hephaestus's reluctance to pillory a "kinsman god" (14–15), his appeal to "kinship and acquaintance" (39) and his curse upon his "mastery of hand" (45) an expression of the poet's unwillingness to make his former associate a gazing-stock for the Athenians; but for all his unwillingness he wrote his plays, as a true dramatist must when inspired with a theme worthy of his powers.[38]

The conjectured meeting between Protagoras and the author of the *Prometheia* must have taken place very soon after the expulsion of the sophist from Athens, and can hardly have taken place within the territories of Athens and her allies, or of the Peloponnesian League; the most likely place is Sicily or Magna Graecia (we know that Protagoras was in Sicily later — Plat. *Hipp. Maj.* 282D–E — , and he was perhaps trying to reach Sicily when he died). What the dramatist was doing there must be considered later (below, 87 f.); it is clear that Protagoras and he were well acquainted, and that he was a good listener; but his admiration for Protagoras's ability and courage did not blind him to Protagoras's faults — he had no sympathy with Protagoras's agnosticism, and he was convinced that Pericles's policy, however rough it might at times appear, was more in accordance with the political and moral needs of the day than Protagoras's arrogant and undisciplined humanism. So the trilogy was conceived and written . . . and no more is heard of it until Aristotle, more than a century later, mentions it familiarly along with the *Phorcides* (also ascribed to Aeschylus in later times; the earliest mention of the author's name seems to be Ps. Eratosth.

[38] Perhaps the obedience of Hephaestus to the will of Zeus means that the dramatist also felt that his duty to Pericles required him to write the play. The connection of the poet with Hephaestus gives more point to the references to fire; until Protagoras set up as a specialist in the effective use of language (Diog. Laert. 9.52–54 = A 1; the Protagorean technical term *πυθμένες* appears, though in a different sense, in *PV* 1046), that *τέχνη* had been reserved for the poets, the *σοφισταί par excellence* (above, note 9).

Catast. 22 = Aesch. fr. 262 N².), but without giving the author's name (*Poet.* 1456A.2–3). This absence of any evidence that the trilogy was known in Athens in the fifth century suggests that it was not produced there within half a century after it was composed.[39] That the author not only felt impelled to write the trilogy, but also meant it to be produced, has already been suggested; it seems that, when the work was done, he either changed his mind or was somehow prevented from carrying out his intention; the trilogy was preserved, but by the time its allusions to deadly political secrets had become unintelligible or innocuous it was perhaps too old-fashioned to obtain a chorus as a new tragedy. It is therefore possible that the *Prometheia* was first produced as an "old" tragedy in the fourth century.[40]

6. Aeschylus

For those who already believe that the style and thought of the *Prometheus Bound* are unmistakeably Aeschylean, the identity of the dramatist needs no proof, and the *terminus ante quem* for the completion of the trilogy is fixed at 456/5, in which year the sixty-nine year old dramatist died at Gela in the third year of a visit to Sicily (*Marm. Par.* 239 A 59 Jacoby, *Vit. Aesch.* 10–11). The *Life* confuses this visit with that paid by Aeschylus to Sicily in 474, when he produced the *Aetnaean Women* at Hiero's newly founded colony of Aetna; Plutarch (*Cim.* 7) connects it with Aeschylus's dudgeon at finding the young Sophocles preferred to him at the competitions which immediately followed the victory at the Eurymedon (468). We have therefore evidence of two (and perhaps three) visits by Aeschylus to Sicily, and of his death there in 456/5, though we need not be expected to swallow the tale of the eagle and the tortoise (below, note 41). The last visit, it seems, began in 458/7, and it is tempting to suggest that Aeschylus, who knew Sicily better than most of his contemporaries at Athens and whose prestige had been enhanced by

[39] Some confirmation of this may be found in the fact that we do not know the name of the satyr-play which should have completed the tetralogy (Aeschylus's satyric *Prometheus*, which can only be the Πυρκαεύς, is definitely known to have belonged to the tetralogy of 472).

[40] The references to Prometheus in Herodotus (above, note 5) do not prove that Herodotus knew the trilogy; there is no evidence that the trilogy mentioned Asiê (*PV* 735 speaks against the possibility). Probably the marriage of Prometheus and Asiê was mentioned in a lost Hesiodic poem.

his production of the *Oresteia* in 458 (Arg. *Agam.*), was made a member (and perhaps leader) of a diplomatic mission to Sicily which either negotiated, or resulted from, the alliance with Segesta in that year (above, 82). Aeschylus had first been associated with Pericles in 472, when Pericles as *chorêgos* and Aeschylus as *didaskalos* had won the first prize for tragedy (*IG* 2^2.2318.9) with a tetralogy which included the *Persians* and a satyric play about Prometheus (Arg. *Pers.*), and the *Oresteia* makes plain Aeschylus's approval of the alliance with Argos (*Eum.* 287–298, with its clear allusion to the Egyptian expedition) and the reform of the Areopagus. Those who have hitherto rejected the ascription of the *Prometheia* to Aeschylus may fairly be asked to reconsider the question in the light of the arguments set out above; if those arguments are sound, it has now been proved that the trilogy can have been written in Aeschylus's lifetime and (I believe) that the conception and theme are truly Aeschylean.

If, as I believe, Aeschylus wrote the *Prometheia* in Sicily after a meeting with Protagoras, which must have taken place between 458/7 and 456/5, and probably in 457, it is easy to see that the poet's death was the cause which prevented him from producing the trilogy, which, on this theory, he can have completed only a short while before he died. The *Life* (12) says that on receiving the news of his death the Athenians decreed that anyone wishing to produce τὰ Αἰσχύλου was to receive a chorus automatically; but if my interpretation of the political background of the *Prometheus Bound* is correct, it is understandable that the poet's heir and friends may not have been prepared to run the risk of producing the *Prometheia* during the lifetime of Pericles — it may be thought to speak well for their courage and judgment that they preserved the trilogy at all.[41]

[41] The connection of Zeus in the trilogy with Pericles prompts the conjecture that the οὐράνιον βέλος against which an oracle is said to have warned Aeschylus (*Vit.* 10) and the eagle mentioned in his epitaph (*Vit.* 17) may have had something to do with Pericles, and that the story of the tortoise may have been invented to conceal the murder of Aeschylus by someone who could be regarded as Pericles's emissary (perhaps a junior member of the mission who had read, or heard a reading of, the *Prometheus Bound* and concluded that it was meant as an attack on Pericles; did he also recognize himself in Aeschylus's picture of Hermes?). But this may well seem the sort of suggestion which could occur only to the ill-regulated mind of a confirmed reader of detective stories, intoxicated by the familiar drug of a death in mysterious circumstances involving the use of a blunt instrument.

7. Conclusion

It is not absolutely indispensable to the argument of this paper that Prometheus should be identified with Protagoras, if another sophist can be found who satisfies all the conditions, and some of the minor identifications could perhaps be rejected without destroying the main argument; but the connection of the *stasis* in Heaven with the Athenian revolution of 463–1, of Cronus and the Titans with Cimon and the conservatives, of Zeus with Pericles and of Prometheus with a sophist active in Athens from 463 at the latest, expelled from Athens in 458/7 after a quarrel with Pericles, and expecting something which is to come out of Egypt to ensure his rehabilitation, are vital to the main conclusions of this paper. These are that the *Prometheus Bound* was composed between the end of 458 and the middle of 454 (and most probably in the latter part of 457), and that the play is a vital source for the history of Athens between 463 and 457 and for the beginnings of the sophistic movement. If these conclusions are rejected, the suggested meeting between the dramatist and the sophist and the explanation put forward for the conjectured non-production of the trilogy in Athens in the fifth century also fall to the ground; and if Aeschylus did not write the trilogy there is no basis for the suggestion that the dramatist and the sophist met in Sicily, or for my tentative explanation of the story about Aeschylus's death (note 41). On the other hand, the reason suggested for Aeschylus's last visit to Sicily, the suggestion that Protagoras was born before 490, the conjecture that the *Prometheia* had not been produced or published in Athens by the end of the fifth century, and the appendix which follows this paper are independent of my interpretation of the trilogy.

The scarcity of reliable evidence about the period here discussed has compelled frequent recourse to conjecture; if this needs defence, it may be urged that in all scholarship, and especially perhaps in Classical scholarship, "those who refuse to go beyond the fact rarely get as far as fact."[42] I have tried at all times to keep a clear distinction between conjecture and statements based on evidence. "Sometimes one conjectures right, and sometimes one conjectures

[42] Dr. Hughlings Jackson, quoted by Professor Geoffrey Jefferson of Manchester in the broadcast version of his Lister Oration, "The Mind of Mechanical Man" (*Listener*, 22 Sept. 1949, 479–483).

wrong";[43] to which of these categories my conjectures belong can be determined only by those who will study afresh the ancient evidence bearing upon the problems which I have tried to solve. It is to their judgment that this paper is now submitted.

Appendix: The Chronology of the Period 468–445 B.C.

The table which follows is offered not as a complete reconstruction of the history of the period from the Eurymedon to the Thirty Years' Peace, but only as a general guide to the way in which I believe that the ancient evidence for that period should be interpreted. I have carried it down to 445, to show that no violence to the epigraphic evidence is entailed either by accepting the uncontradicted statements of our sources about the recall of Cimon after Tanagra or by assuming that the Five Years' Peace was concluded in 453 and that negotiations for the Peace of Callias began in 452. The table obeys two main principles: (1) the acceptance of Thucydides's account of the period (1.100–115.1) as the paramount authority, to be departed from only when it appears to contradict itself; (2) the rejection of all the absolute dates and most of the details supplied by Diodorus. The framework of relative dates provided by Thucydides has been connected with absolute dates wherever the other authorities make this possible; elsewhere, reasonable allowances have been made for the probable duration of the various episodes. Finally, the gaps in Thucydides's account have been filled in, so far as seemed necessary, from the various sources quoted in the table.

To save space, the names of Thucydides, Aristotle and Plutarch have been omitted except where the omission would produce ambiguity, and Thucydides's Book I is quoted by chapter and section only. Brackets in the "Year" column denote alternative dates; hyphened numbers (e.g. 463–2) refer to the off-season separating the campaigning seasons of the two years given.

Year	*Events and authorities*
468	Eurymedon (100.1 — before City Dionysia, *Marm. Par.* 56; *Cim.* 8).
467(6)	Cimon in the Chersonese (*Cim.* 14).
465	(1) Revolt of Thasos — naval battle — siege begun (100.2). Very early in the year, cf. 101.3. (2) (Almost simultaneous with 1) Foundation of Ennea Hodoi, followed by disaster at Drabescus (100.3–4).
465–4	Thasian appeal to Sparta, frustrated by Spartan delays, earthquake and Helot-Perioecic revolt (101.1–2). Earthquake 464/3, Paus. 4.24.5; fourth year of Archidamus, *Cim.* 16: Archidamus died between 428/7 and 427/6, 3.1.1; 3.89.1; having reigned forty-two years, Diod. 11.48; 12.35.
463	(1) Thasos submits in the third year of the siege (101.3) to Cimon (*Cim.* 14). First record of tenfold tribute from Thasos is in 444/3 — *ATL* 1.282. (2) Cimon returns to Athens, and is accused at his *euthunai* by Pericles (*Ath. Pol.* 27.1) and others (*Per.* 10), but acquitted (*Cim.* 14), thanks perhaps to Elpinice (*Per.* 10). First important action of Pericles (*Ath. Pol.* 27.1).

[43] Frank Churchill in *Emma*, Ch. 10 (Jane Austen, *Novels* ed. R. W. Chapman [Oxford, 1933] 4[3].242).

Year	*Events and authorities*
	(3) Spartan appeal to Athens (102.1 — note ἐμηκύνετο); opposed by Ephialtes (*Cim.* 16), Cimon carries decree for help and takes troops to Ithome (102.1). First appeal (*Cim.* 16).
463–2	Ephialtes begins his campaign against the Areopagus — prosecutions of individual members (*Ath. Pol.* 25.2).
462	(1) Second appeal from Sparta (*Cim.* 16); Cimon goes again to Ithome, taking shipping to nearest port (ἐξέπλευσέ ποι — *Cim.* 15)(?). There seems no need to posit an unattested expedition to Cyprus. (2) Pericles takes 50 ships to the Levant (*Cim.* 13)(?). See on (6) below. (3) Ephialtes and Archestratus carry laws against the Areopagus (*Ath. Pol.* 35.2). Probably soon after Hecatombaeôn 1. (4) Athenians sent home from Ithome (103.2). (5) Athens denounces her alliance with Sparta, and makes alliances with Argos and Thessaly (102.4). Thuc. here completes the story of Ithome — out of chronological order (cf. Egypt, below). (6) Ephialtes takes 30 ships to the Levant (*Cim.* 13)(?). This expedition, and that of Pericles (2 above), perhaps combined reconnaissance, training and collection of money for the coming war.
462–1	Cimon's campaign for repeal of the legislation against the Areopagus (*Cim.* 15).
461	(1) Ostracism of Cimon (*Cim.* 17). (2)(?) Murder of Ephialtes (*Ath. Pol.* 25.4, 26.2). Latest possible date, and then only on the assumption that *Ath. Pol.* 26.2 has carelessly confused Mnesitheides's year (457/6) with the year in which his selection was made possible by the admission of zeugites to the draw for archonships. (3) Pericles completes the reform of the Areopagus (*Ath. Pol.* 27.1)(?). Cf. *Pol.* 1274A.7. (4) Megara appeals to Athens — garrisons sent — long walls to Nisaea built (103.4).
460	Training of fleet for war with Persia (?). No major operations recorded since Thasos.
460–59	Inaros revolts (104.1).
459	(1) Athenian expedition to Cyprus*, diverted to Egypt*; siege of *Leucon teichos* formed (104.2); raid on Phoenicia*. (2) Halieis*; Cecryphaleia; Aegina*; Myronides in the Megarid* (105–6). **IG* 1^2.929 — same order.
459–8	Long walls to Peiraeus and Phalerum begun (107.1).
458	(1) Phocians attack Doris; Lacedaemonian expedition to Central Greece; disloyal invitations from Athens; Tanagra (107.2–108.1). Athenian ships not yet stationed in the Corinthian Gulf, cf. 107.3 περιπλεύσαντες(?). (2) Sixty-two days after Tanagra, campaign of Oenophyta begun (108.2–3).
458–7	(1) Long walls finished (108.3). (2) Arrangements for Cimon's recall — "Compact of Elpinice" (*Per.* 10, Antisth. ap. Ath. 13.589D). (3) Zeugites admitted to draw for archonships (*Ath. Pol.* 26.2). (4) Pay for jurymen (*Ath. Pol.* 27.4, *Cim.* 15)(?). May be earlier. (5) Diplomatic mission to Sicily (?). Alliance with Segesta (*IG* 1^2.19); Aeschylus to Sicily (*Vit. Aesch.* 10). (6) Garrisons sent to allied cities (e.g. Erythrae, Miletus)(?). Already there when the constitutional decrees were passed in 453/2 and 450/49. (7) Protagoras frustrates further measures against the allies (?) (*PV*?).

Year	*Events and authorities*
	(8) Protagoras expelled from Athens (?) (*PV*?).
	(9) Pericles carries the decree recalling Cimon (Theop. ap. Schol. Aristid. 3.528 Dindorf = 115 F 88 Jacoby; *Cim.* 17; *Per.* 10; Andoc. 3.3?). Cimon does not necessarily return at once.
457	(1) Surrender of Aegina (108.4). Cf. *IG* 1^2.18 (J. J. E. Hondius, *Novae Inscriptiones Atticae* [Leyden, 1925] 3–6).
	(2) Tolmides's raids on the Peloponnese (108.5). Returns overland from Pegae (?), cf. 107.3, 111.2.
	(3) Athenians in control of Egypt (109.2). Seems to imply that *Leucon teichos* had now fallen.
	(4) Persian gold fails to bring about a Peloponnesian invasion of Attica (109.2–3). Cimon at work in Sparta (?). Thuc. here completes the story of the Egyptian expedition — out of chronological order (cf. Ithome).
	(5) Cimon negotiates a truce with Sparta (*Cim.* 18; *Per.* 10; Andoc. 3.3?)(?). Corinth not included (?), cf. 103.4, 111.2–3.
	(6) Unsuccessful Athenian operations in Thessaly (111.1). Attempted revenge for Thessalian treachery at Tanagra (107.7)(?).
457/6	First zeugite archon — Mnesitheides (*Ath. Pol.* 26.2; Diod. 11.81).
456	(1) Pericles at Sicyon and Oeniadae (111.2–3). Uses ships from Pegae (111.2), perhaps left by Tolmides (108.5). Takes Naupactus (103.3)(?), cf. Paus. 4.25.1.
	(2) Elaborate Persian preparations for the recovery of Egypt (Diod. 11.75).
455	(1) Ithome surrenders in the tenth year — Athenians settle the survivors at Naupactus, recently taken from the Ozolian Locrians (103.1–3).
	(2) Megabyzus in Egypt — hard fighting (109.3–4). First attack by a comic writer on Pericles (Cratinus, *Nemesis*) (Schmid, *Gesch. d. gr. Lit.* 1.4 [Munich, 1946] 69, 72).
454	(1) Megabyzus takes Memphis and finally shuts up the Greeks in Prosopitis, where he besieges them (109.4). Late summer.
	(2) Persian threat to the Aegean, with ships released from Egypt (?). See next entry.
	(3) League treasury transferred to Athens (Diod. 12.38, cf. *ATL* 2, List 1).
453	Three years after Oeniadae, Five Years' Peace (112.1). Negotiated by Cimon(?). On five-year treaties in general, cf. Ar. *Acharn.* 188–190.
453–2	(1)(?) Megabyzus storms Prosopitis after 18 months' siege (109.4) and six years' Greek campaigning in Egypt (110.1). At the low Nile.
	(2)(?) Constitution of Erythrae remodelled (*ATL* 2, D 10 — 453/2).
	(3)(?) Heavy tribute payments by Carian cities (*ATL* 2, List 2 and page 5).
452	(1) Persian "mopping-up" in Egypt leaves Amyrtaeus independent in the delta (110.2–3).
	(2) More than half the Athenian ships sent out to Egypt as reliefs destroyed (110.4). Sent out before news of Megabyzus's victory reached Athens — presumably as soon as navigation reopened.
	(3) Cimon's expedition to Cyprus: sixty ships sent to support Amyrtaeus, rest besiege Citium (112.3). Not long after Prosopitis (Diod. 12.3).
	(4)(?) Peace offers from Persia, leading ultimately to the Peace of Callias (Diod. 12.3, Hdt. 7.151?). Should perhaps follow Salamis (next entry); we have only Diod.'s word for putting them here. For delays in negotiations with Persia cf. Ar. *Acharn.* 65–99, especially 90; there must have been something real for Ar. to exaggerate.

Year	*Events and authorities*
	(5) Death of Cimon and famine in the camp before Citium lead to Athenian withdrawal from Cyprus and Egypt; double victory at Salamis on the return voyage (112.4).
451	(1) Sacred War (112.5).
	(2) Argos, having obtained Persian re-assurances (Hdt. 7.151)(?), makes thirty years' peace with Sparta (Thuc. 5.14.4).
451/50(?)	Peace of Callias. Perhaps 450/49.
450/49	(1)(?) Constitution of Miletus remodelled (*ATL* 2, D 11).
	(2) Congress decree (*Per.* 17 = *ATL* 2, D 12).
	(3) Papyrus ("Reserve") decree (Anon. Argent. in Dem. 22.13 = *ATL* 2, D 13).
449/8	No tribute collected (*ATL* 2, 13 note).
	Decree of Clearchus ("Monetary decree") (*ATL* 2, D 14).
448	Five Years' Peace expires.
448/7	Tribute again collected (*ATL* 2, List 7).
447	(1) Boeotian exiles recapture Orchomenus and Chaeroneia; Athenians andrapodize and garrison Chaeroneia, but are defeated by the Boeotians and Euboean exiles at Coroneia (113.1–2).
	(2) Athenians evacuate Boeotia (113.3–4).
447/6	Building of Parthenon etc. begun (e.g. Anon. Argent. in Dem. 22.13).
446	(1) Revolt of Euboea; Athenian operations there interrupted by revolt of Megara and consequent danger of Peloponnesian invasion (114.1).
	(2) Short Peloponnesian invasion of Attica (114.2).
446/5	Euboea reconquered (114.3). Treaties with Eretria (*ATL* 2, D 16) and Chalcis (*ATL* 2, D 17).
445	Thirty Years' Peace (115.1, 2.2.1).

ADDENDUM

Since my article was accepted for publication, I have seen T. Dohrn's suggestion (*Symbola Coloniensia* [Cologne, 1949] 78–79) that the Athenian citizen cavalry was reorganized in or about 457 B.C. It seems that this reform is most naturally understood as one of the measures taken by Pericles to restore the situation after Tanagra (see above, 82 and 91); the disloyalty of the Thessalian cavalry in that battle (Thuc. 1.107.7) must have emphasized Athens's need for a body of cavalry on whose fidelity her generals could rely.