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I

INTRODUCTION

The intention of this paper is to examine three plays of Aeschylus -- The Persians, The Seven Against Thebes, and The Suppliants -- to determine if they bear significant discernible marks of contemporary politics in Athens. Although in particular The Eumenides and Prometheus Bound of the same poet have also invited political interpretations, the three plays mentioned have been chosen because a connection with Themistocles, son of Neocles, has been postulated by various scholars for all of them. This purported connection serves as a focal point for dealing with the three plays. Any relation that the plays may have to Themistocles or his policy concerns the Battle of Salamis and the period after the Persian War. Unfortunately, the general history of Athens, indeed of all of Greece, for the years after the Persian War is known only in dim outline. The personal career of Themistocles over the same time blends into the mist. In particular, the dating of his ostracism and his exile is a vexed question. Of necessity, some space will be devoted to taking a stand on this issue and related matters that inevitably influence any political interpretation of the plays. In the case of The Suppliants, moreover, one of the plays itself must be pinned down as to date (composition and production). Because
of natural limitation of scope, no attempt will be made at a 
dramatic critique or literary analysis of the three plays. 
That is not to say, however, that dramatic and literary factors 
will be completely forgotten. On the contrary, they must be 
tacitly recognized if the plays are not to be twisted out of 
sense and significance as plays. Wherever someone has drawn 
political implications without due regard to the poet's intention 
as poet, it is hoped that it will not have escaped notice, but 
rather have been vigorously pointed out.
II

THE HISTORICAL AND THE THEMISTOCLEAN BACKGROUND:
DATING OF THE OSTRACISM AND THE EXILE

The Persians was produced in 472\(^1\); The Seven Against Thebes,
in 467\(^2\); and The Suppliants, in 463\(^3\). Moreover, it shall be
argued that like the two other plays The Suppliants was written,
not in the 490's as according to one recent scholar, but just
before its production. Just as all these plays come after the
Persian War, so the political connections with Themistocles
ascribed to the plays touch on the later part of his career.
Consequently, the investigator finds himself with both feet in
the turbulent brew that informs the historical soup-bowl of
the inscrutable Fifty Years. This Rabelaisian metaphor is
merely a slight adjustment of the one employed by A. W. Gomme
in his A Historical Commentary on Thucydides. In assessing
Thucydides' treatment of the interbellum period from 479
through 431, Gomme says:

> Between these limits his events float like sticks
> in water in an oblong bowl preserving their
> relative order, but none of them with a fixed
> position in relation to the ends of the bowl and
> but few of them relatively to each other. (p. 362)

To make matters even more difficult, the chronology of
Themistocles contrives to be more vertiginous than the back-
ground of general event. It superimposes, as it were, a
second accelerating frame of reference over the first. Even when one has accepted, as one must, the earlier chronological frame (archonship in 493 rather than in 463; death in 459 rather than c. 449), 4 the ostracism and exile float in uncertainty. Gomme suggests, moreover, that the chronology of Themistocles holds a key to the chronology of the period. There are many doubtful dates for important events between 477 and 465 (a fixed point) and between 465 and 445 (a second fixed point); and there is one major difficulty in each of these two periods which if resolved would lead to the solution of most of the others. In the first period that difficulty is the date of Themistocles' flight (and exile). This question along with the ostracism will be dealt with shortly after a speculative sketch of Themistocles' political fortunes after the Battle of Salamis.

The great schemer, the savior of Athens and Greece at Salamis seems not to have been able to trade on the counter of his fame for very long. It was debased like a worthless greenback. Themistocles rushed headlong into political decline. From Herodotus we learn that even in the afterglow of Salamis the Greek commanders at the Isthmus were jealous enough to vote each for himself and place Themistocles second. 5 His share of glory was bestowed, however, in a splendid welcome at Sparta. This may have set off some grumbling at home in Athens (Herodotus names only a certain obscure Timocrates as a reviler). In the space of this very same first year after
Salamis, however, Themistocles managed to turn Sparta against him. His ruse in building Athens' walls engendered resentment. Then at the meeting of the Amphictyonic League, he espoused the cause of the cities which had abstained from the anti-Persian effort or done worse and so defeated the Spartan proposals. Plutarch tells us that as a result Sparta found him obnoxious and began to advance Cimon in public favor.

Aristides seems to have been allied with Themistocles in the building of Athens' walls. In an article to be further discussed below, W. G. Forrest argues the credibility of associating Themistocles politically with both Xanthippos and Aristides. Certainly they shared democratic leanings. In the case of Xanthippus, Forrest's reasoning works back from Pericles, who later inherited Themistocles' policies, to his father and is just a guess. In the case of Aristides, he thinks the early contrast in public opinion between a wily Thucydides and a just Aristides, who admittedly was ostracized for his opposition to Themistocles' naval program (but later recalled by Themistocles' intervention), has obscured greater evidence for their agreement, such as the collaboration in the building of the walls, a coupling of the two by Aristotle, and supposed praise of both by Aeschylus. These speculations should not be given much weight. After convincing the Athenians to wall in both the Piraeus and Athens in 478, Themistocles leaves no further impress of political success. It is
Aristides alone who is associated with the formation of the Confederation of Delos and the determination of assessments. But with the beginning of the anti-Persian offensive in 477 with Athens at the head of its newly-wrought maritime league, the star of Cimon, son of Miltiades, rises and dominates the firmament. As his successes multiply and mount to their glorious culmination in Eurymedon, one must suppose that his aristocratic faction gained a fast grip on Athens. It was anti-Persian and pro-Spartan. In view of his long-standing naval bias, Themistocles must have favored the same anti-Persian policy if only as a means to the end of expanding a sea empire. Thus one should not read too much into his later flight to Persia. At the same time, with his wonted shrewdness and foresight, he seems to have espoused a staunchly anti-Spartan position as soon as the brunt of the Persian threat had been confronted and dissipated. Plutarch luridly reports that when the Greek fleet had put in at Pagasae in Thessaly after Xerxes' departure from Salamis, Themistocles proposed burning the fleet of the other Greeks in harbor. The Athenians who could not be told publicly about the scheme quaintly insisted that Aristides alone be given Themistocles' ear and judge on the matter. On learning the plan, he told the people that none could be more advantageous or more evil at the same time.

The Athenians then ordered Themistocles to abandon the idea. This anecdote, especially since we find it in Plutarch rather than Thucydides, may well invite scepticism. Still it could
be a sign of an early eclipse for Themistocles after Salamis. His anti-Spartan direction appears from his posture at the meeting of the Amphictyonic League just the year after Salamis. His activities in agitating throughout the Peloponnese from his base at Argos after his ostracism attest the continuity and resoluteness of his position.

Thucydides tells us nothing of the domestic battle lines of these years. Perhaps it should be inferred that foreign policy predominated. In any case, after all they had suffered, the Athenians must have applauded a lucrative offensive campaign against Persia and rewarded Cimon's party for its success. Themistocles might have welcomed a chance to do the same, but he never got it.

General indications then would not oppose a relatively early chronology for the ostracism and exile. An early chronology would put the exile rather than the ostracism in 471 -- an archon date, preserved by an Atthis and found also in Krateros, under which Diodorus narrates the last part of Themistocles' career from the years immediately preceding his ostracism and which must represent a matter of record, either the ostracism or the impeachment (exile).11 Forrest, however, in his virtuoso article "Themistocles and Argos" marshals a case for assigning the ostracism to 471 and the exile to 468. Since he dovetails his dates into a satisfying reconstruction of Athenian, Arcadian, and Argive history for these vexed years, one would like to corroborate his choice. Reluctantly,
however, disagreement must be voiced. Indeed, the case for placing Eurymedon in 469, as Forrest does, is good. Plutarch, after describing how Cimon brought Theseus' bones back from Skyros and gained popularity, relates another incident that the people cherished: when Sophocles competed with Aeschylus for the first time in the archonship of Apsephion (469/68), the entry of Cimon and his nine colleagues occasioned a departure from custom; and the whole board of generals was prevailed upon to sit as judges.\textsuperscript{12} The only ready explanation for such a spontaneous surge of acclaim is the prestige won at the overwhelming victory of Eurymedon.\textsuperscript{13} Forrest makes Eurymedon in 469 the bulwark of his case for dating the exile. For he inexplicably refuses to accept the connection of Themistocles' condemnation with Pausanias' death. He believes that the Spartan claims of having discovered some evidence in the investigation of Pausanias implicating Themistocles to have been trumped up and used only some years after Pausanias' death. As he sees it, Cimon, returning home intoxicated with victory on the grandest scale at Eurymedon, might have boldly claimed to have evidence against Themistocles; and the people would have been ready to believe anything. The Spartan charges would have been dredged up for the occasion.

On the contrary, there is no reason not to believe both Thucydides and Plutarch that the charges against Themistocles arose in connection with Pausanias. Indeed Plutarch mentions a similar basis for an earlier "first" trial of Themistocles
which, absent from Thucydides' account, may possibly have taken place before the ostracism. Since Pausanias was stirring revolt inside Sparta as well as plotting with the Persian king, it is easy to see how Themistocles may have responded to his overtures in a self-compromising way. Now Pausanias was expelled by the Athenians from Byzantium in 477.\textsuperscript{14} Thucydides' account of Pausanias' second recall and death is vague in its indications of time.\textsuperscript{15} Nevertheless, a disinterested reading makes it very difficult to imagine Pausanias still alive as late as 468 after Eurymedon.

Another fact in conjunction with the one just mentioned is decisive for an earlier chronology for the ostracism and exile. In his account of the exile, Thucydides mentions that in sailing from Pydna toward Asia Minor, Themistocles' boat was driven in a storm to the vicinity of the Athenian fleet blockading Naxos. By revealing his identity and promising the captain a reward, Themistocles prevailed upon him to continue directly to Ephesus.\textsuperscript{16} Earlier Thucydides narrated the revolt and reduction of Naxos as preceding Eurymedon. A date 470 would be right.\textsuperscript{17} Then given the impression of hurry in Themistocles' previous stops at Corcyra, Epirus, and Pydna, the exile could confidently be put back to 471/70, Diodorus' archon date. The ostracism might in turn be placed around 474 or 473 (especially if one wants to leave a gap after 476, when Themistocles was choregus for Phrynichus, for a possible first trial\textsuperscript{18}). This allows for synchronization with Pausanias. Also it leaves
enough time before the exile for Themistocles' stay in Argos: 10

(Thuc. 1.135)

It should perhaps be mentioned that this chronology entails a long stay in Asia Minor for Themistocles. Artaxerxes, to whom he writes a letter, does not ascend the throne until 465. Thus, Themistocles passed five obscure years in Asia Minor. On the face of it, that is not unlikely. While gathering information about Persian ways, he was perhaps waiting for Xerxes' death. Moreover, it was probably safer there than anywhere on the Greek mainland. It behooved him to lie low.

In describing the same voyage from Pydna, one reliable manuscript of Plutarch reads Thasos for Naxos and replaces Ephesus with Kyme. The most reasonable explanation is that Plutarch was trying to relate the dating more closely to Artaxerxes' accession (the Revolt of Thasos is fixed at 465), wrongly supposing Thucydides to have been careless rather than deliberate in allowing Themistocles so much time in Asia Minor.
From this foray into a dark and seductive period of history, we emerge with the contention that The Persians in 472 should be placed at least one year after the ostracism and a year before the exile. It is argued that Aeschylus intended his play to be not political propaganda with its unsavory connotations but rather an earnest reminder of the inestimable services of a fellow patriot and consummate statesman at the hour of greatest peril for Athens and all Greece. From Sparta, we may conjecture, stirrings of suspicion and malice against Themistocles were already being wafted forth to be plucked from the air in Athens by the aristocratic faction. Since from his base at Argos Themistocles was undoubtedly proselytizing against Sparta throughout the Peloponnese, the least intimation of evidence against him (especially if there had been a previous trial) must have been enthusiastically inflated. Having experienced the great man's worth at first hand, Aeschylus must have appreciated the irony and absurdity of the spiraling doom. The idea of fashioning a tragedy on the subject of the Persian War must have passed through his mind on earlier occasions. After Phrynichus staged The Phoenician Women...
in 476 (with Themistocles as choregos), he could not have avoided the thought. Certainly he could do a better job and turn to his advantage his own presence at Salamis. A vivid re-creation of Salamis, what a chance to lift the hazy veil of passing time and political distortion. Perhaps if the Athenian people could live that time again, they would regain their senses and avoid compounding the disgrace done to an unfortunate hero. Moreover, the possibility of Aeschylus' supporting Themistoclean policy should not be excluded, but in the context of only this play cannot be substantiated.

Certainly, though, the inevitability of reflecting the pride and glory of the Athenians in Persian eyes could only have recommended the project the more. Through praise of the best in the Athenians, Aeschylus might hope to shame them into being magnanimous towards one who deserved no less. There is no denying that the figure of Xerxes and the concepts of hybris and ate inform the dramatic content of the play. Without these, the play would not have been a shadow of what it is. The argument is simply that consideration of Themistocles' plight most likely influenced Aeschylus to write the play when he did and to give it the exact form that it has.

An article by Franz Stoessel, "Aeschylus as Political Thinker," provides a point of departure for this discussion. The argument is one-track, devoted at all cost to making Aeschylus politically minded in all his extant plays. By way of introduction, however, he makes a valid point, though
typically he overstated it. If a poet wanted to perform a tragedy, he had first to apply for a chorus from the archon in charge of the festival, who could grant or refuse the request. Thus the state and its officials determined whether or not a poet could perform a drama, whether or not he could appear publicly as a poet at all. Consequently dramatic art was subject to the struggle of political forces and itself part of the struggle. We may grant this in theory and still doubt its general practice. Plutarch's story of Cimon's extraordinary stint as judge and the victory of the fledgling Sophocles over Aeschylus, taken in conjunction with Aeschylus' comeback the following year with *The Seven Against Thebes* with Pericles as choregos, suggests that at least in exceptional cases politics may have had a backstage role.

To buttress his case for the essential relationship of political thought and tragic form, Stoessel irresponsibly affirms that in the early days of the development of Greek tragedy "a considerable portion" of dramas dealt with themes of contemporary history. He offers no evidence for this reckless statement; that such efforts were experimental and that the type was gradually discarded seems better to accommodate the facts. Stoessel reconstructs *The Phoenician Women* of Phrynichus and uses it at once as a model and a foil for his discussion of *The Persians*. He insists on a secondary chorus of Persian councillors and a messenger scene in the middle of the play announcing the defeat of the
Battle of Mycale. The results of Salamis, he says, were presupposed at the very beginning of the play. Stoessl contends that Phrynichus chose this moment for the action of the play to draw public attention to the two Greek victories at Salamis and Mycale, thus excluding even a mention of Plataea. Since these two victories were due to the Greek fleet and the policies of the great builder of the Athenian fleet, Themistocles, who was himself the choregos of this performance, the conclusion is that Phrynichus intended a glorification of Themistocles and his policies. Certainly this may well have been the case, especially in view of the evidence for a similar espousal of Themistocles in his Sack of Miletus eighteen years earlier when Themistocles was archon, but the confident marshalling of weak evidence provides an instructive example of what to avoid in such argument. Tragic poets need not, and often enough did not, pay strict attention to details of time or probability where dramatic effect suggested otherwise. Phrynichus could have had a messenger from Plataea arrive in the course of the same play with a messenger from Mycale. Indeed, since Mycale occurred a few days after Plataea and the difference in the distances from Plataea to Susa and from Mycale to Susa was not so very great, even probability would not have been violently strained.

Even further, the theory that the messenger speech is about Mycale rests solely on the fact that a mutilated three-line fragment indicates trochaic tetrameter and Ionic forms.
The messenger, it is inferred, must be an Ionian who fought on the Persian side at Mycale.\textsuperscript{21}

Aeschylus undoubtedly wrote The Persians with an eye to Phrynichus' The Phoenician Women. In the old Persian noblemen, Aeschylus may be borrowing the secondary chorus of Phrynichus' play for use as his only chorus. Having the play to themselves with no chorus of weeping women, they would provide more scope for utterances beyond mere lamentation, including political matters. Having said this, Stoessl makes the eccentric claim that Aeschylus separates his one chorus into two halves to represent the opposing political tendencies of the Persian people. He asserts that from the very beginning of the play two diametrically different parties oppose each other according to the following divisions: whole chorus, lines 1-7; half-chorus B, 8-15; half-chorus A, 15-58; B, 59-64; A, 65-92; B, 93-101; A, 102-113; B, 114-139. One is a confident war party; the other, a fearful peace party. These are said to represent two principal types of human characters and tendencies which are present in every community, every state, every people, and which in time of war participate in a particularly acute struggle. Now not only has no one else noted this chorus breakdown, but clearly opposing attitudes do not consistently follow the shape of the alleged divisions. Even if that minimum requirement had been fulfilled, one would still be inclined to be skeptical because of the very uneven distribution of lines.
Thus on Stoessl's dubious reading, Aeschylus, starting from his personal experience in the concrete and special case of the war against the Greeks, forms his chorus of Persian noblemen in such a universal and convincing manner that the knowledge of political forces and their struggle, once drawn from the concrete, may be applied to every time and every political situation. To be sure, one may agree that Aeschylus sketched an adumbration of such diverging viewpoints, but certainly he did not systematically fill in the outline. Besides, it seems far more likely that his purpose in this subtle oscillation is dramatic. He must limn Persian wealth, luxury, and confidence linked with a heritage of conquest. Yet from the outset he wants to set reverberating a premonition of the impending doom. These two necessities he effectively weaves into the first chorus. With the appearance of Atossa and the telling of her dream, the foreboding moves as it were from half-disguise in the prelude to a full presence in the first movement.

Stoessl also affirms that the military conflict between Persia and Greece is made the object of rational knowledge by the poet. Here too, he says, the poet wants to find out the law of historic development. Two great battles of the Persian War are decisive for his view of the historical meaning of this conflict: the two battles fought within European Greek territory -- the defeat of the Persian fleet at Salamis and the disaster of the Persian army at Plataea. Thus the
wickedness of crossing the sea from Asia to Europe is avenged; for Aeschylus sees a violation of the divine law -- in this crossing of natural boundaries. Besides emphasizing this moral aspect, the spirit of Darius also points out the logistic impossibilities. Thus Aeschylus deems the crossing of the sea to have been a wicked violation of divine law and at the same time a political mistake. Stoessel then supposes that just as the Persians must not cross the sea and interfere in the politics of European Greece, Aeschylus would, perhaps for the sake of symmetry, likewise insist that the Greeks must not fight the Persians on the Asiatic side of the sea. This fundamental political concept, the argument goes, accounts for the fact that Aeschylus excludes the very possibility of mentioning the only one of the three great battles which was fought in Asia Minor, the Battle of Mycale. Aeschylus then supports a foreign policy of Athens which would be restricted to Europe. This viewpoint coincides with that of Themistocles, who changed his foreign policy very quickly after the Battle of Salamis. He and the democratic faction opposed Sparta and were anxious for a peace with Persia. Cimon and the conservatives were advocates of just the opposite line. Result: Aeschylus is supporting the politics of Themistocles and his democratic party. The obvious reference to him in the messenger's speech serves as corroborative evidence.

Now no reason is offered why Darius could not just as easily have included Mycale along with Plataea in his prophecy.
In other words, Aeschylus does not "exclude the possibility." Rather he simply chooses not to mention it. And the reason that he chooses not to mention it again is much more likely to be dramatic than political. Just as the essence of Greek victory was focalized in Salamis, the final thrust of the Persians from Greek soil was assured at Plataea. Surely Aeschylus was guided by the requirements of dramatic vividness and simplicity in not adding a third battle. Further, it might he argued that the physical manifestation of Xerxes' hybris, the crossing into Europe, has been blotted out at Plataea. Mycale was important strategically, but not symbolically in terms of Aeschylus' drama.

Now it should be obvious that Stoessel has presented a very fragile case. It shall presently be argued that Aeschylus indeed stands behind Themistocles, but in no way indulges a definite political course apart from the implications of such a personal espousal. Stoessel makes Mycale the crux. To attack the very basis of his inference, one may rightly ask, "Did Themistocles disapprove of Mycale?" Though there were no journalists around to put the question to him, the answer almost surely would have been no. He built the fleet. What could have been more desirable than to quash the regathered remnants of Salamis in a decisive battle? It was only after Mycale that the Aegean was in any way safe for Athens and Asia Minor exposed. It does not follow from his being anti-Spartan that Themistocles embraced a pro-Persian policy.
Surely he must have been as anxious as ever to win control of the sea, and that entailed pushing back Persia just as Cimon's party succeeded in doing.

No doubt Aeschylus has to some extent set off Asia against Europe. The two women in Atossa's dream are most satisfactorily explained as symbolizing this general division. 23 Nevertheless Aeschylus seems to use this scheme only as a convenient way to emphasize the hybris of Xerxes. The chorus contrasts the prudent and prosperous policy of Darius with the recklessness of his son. In doing so it, on the one hand, attributes to Darius, through the agency of his generals, conquests in the Propontis and the Aegean which are clearly non-Asian. On the other hand, it stresses that Darius himself did not cross the River Halys, which seems to be recognized as a natural limit. 24 Now it is clear that Aeschylus is here adapting history to whitewash Darius and yet is trying to keep this distortion to a minimum. Nevertheless in the distinction just made, he implicitly acknowledges the right of the Ionian Greeks to be in Asia Minor west of the Halys. In sum, then, on Stoessl's grounds, Aeschylus cannot be said to be against the Greeks' following up their mainland successes and spreading the conflict to the eastern Aegean and the shores of Asia Minor. Thus he does not indicate support of an isolationist Europe-directed foreign policy. But as has been pointed out, it is highly unlikely that Themistocles and his supporters would have held any such policy either. Finally, our dating of the
play after the ostracism agrees with these indications in so far as Aeschylus would have been less concerned about endorsing policy than about helping the man himself.

Indeed Aeschylus praises Themistocles in no uncertain terms. The centrality of the messenger speech is pertinent to Aeschylus' dramatic aims; nevertheless, it also serves to focus the attention of the audience on his unmistakable tribute to Themistocles. Just before Atossa asks the question which elicits the messenger's vivid account, the audience has been reminded of the importance of Themistoclean naval policy:

\[
\text{At.} \varepsilon \tau' \ ζυζευ' \ Αθηναίῳ \ έστιν \ \alpha' \ δρόμησις πόλις; \\
\text{Ag.} \\alphaνδρον \ γὰρ \ οὕτῳ \ έρνεις \ έστὶν \ ἄσφαλες.
\]

(lines 348-349)

Then follows the question which is more emotionally charged and suspenseful than any of the preceding exchanges:

\[
\text{άρχη \ δὲ \ ναός \ συμβολῆς \ τῆς \ θυ, \ φράσον·} \\
\text{τίνες καθήσαν, \ πότερον \ Ἑλληνες, \ μέχρις,} \\
\text{τὴν \ παῖς \ ἐμοῦ, \ πληθεῖ \ κατανύξεσας \ νεῶν;}
\]

(lines 350-352)

\textit{άρχη} in emphatic opening position separated from its is isolated as if under a spotlight. The audience might well recall that the whole success of Salamis depended on its beginning, on somehow getting the Persians to come in and fight. The phrase \textit{πληθεῖ κατανύξεσας \ νεῶν} offers a last reminder of the odds against the Greeks and the doom that would have faced them had they squared off against the Persians under neutral conditions. The description of
Salamis opens with the lines clearly referring to Themistocles:

ηρέμεν μεν, ὡ δεδομένα, τοῦ παντὸς μακοῦ
ευρείς ἀλήτωρ ὁ κακὸς ἐανῦχ ποθέν.
ἀνὴρ τὸν Ἑλλήνες ἐξ Ἀθηναίων στρατόν
ἐλθὼν ἔλεξε παιδί σοι ἐξάρη τάδε,
ὡς καὶ μελανύη γυναῖκα ἀνητεῖ κυρίας,
"Ἑλληνες οὖ μενοῖν, ἄλλα σέλικαν
ναῦν ἐπαυβορώντες ἄλλος ἄλλησε
δραμάρια κρυφάμεν ἐκεῖνα ἐκκοψαίλοισ.
ὁ δ' ἐθνὸς ὡς ἰκουσίν, οὐ ἤπνελε δόλον
"Ἑλληνες ἀνθρώποι οὐδὲ τὸν θεῶν φθάνουν,

(lines 353-362)

δόλον in line 362, however, might possibly be construed as derogatory. Yet although a Pindar could exorcize the craftiness of Odysseus in favor of the stolid simplicity of Ajax, trickiness corresponded to one part of the Greek character and was often exalted, as commonly in Odysseus and the heroes of comedy. But more than that, in this passage Aeschylus neutralizes the guile which was required to overcome numbers and a bad situation by coupling it with the action of the divine. It is said of Xerxes: οὐ ἤπνελε δόλον; "Ἑλληνες ἀνθρώποι οὐδὲ τὸν θεῶν φθάνουν (lines 361-362) The οὐδέ may be considered an equal sign. Thus we have the same duality as expressed with respect to Xerxes' hybris: ἄλλ' ὅταν σπεύδῃ τις αὐτὸς, χώθεν συνάπτεται (line 742) Man and God then join hands to achieve good as well as evil. This idea tends to sanctify Themistocles' behavior.

Finally, an indirect, but perhaps valid sign of Aeschylus'
political sympathies after Salamis may be discerned in the pair of strophes of the chorus (lines 584-596). These express the fear of insurrection or, as it seems, the actual fact of insurrection among the subjugated people of the Persian empire. Stoessel maintains that here is another instance of Aeschylus' raising the political from the particular to the general; that is, formulating a general law of political history. This can be true without taking the edge off the particular. Broadhead interprets the use of the present tense in these lines as a prophetic future. That may well be. Still it is present tense to the ear and must have drawn the audience's attention. No sooner is Salamis won than the Ionian Greeks have revolted. Aeschylus seems to be saying that the opening up of Asia Minor achieved in the course of the 70's by Cimon and the aristocrats was already implicit in the results of Salamis. In other words, Themistocles was as much responsible as the son of Miltiades, who in a way was only mopping up. Indeed, we can imagine, Themistocles would have been ready to do the mopping up himself had the demos given him command.
IV

THE SUPPLIANTS

A political interpretation of The Suppliants that involves Themistocles is far less apparent than in The Persians. In his treatment of the play, Stoessl once more finds the generic behind the particular. Pelasgus represents the highest executive officer of a state with an ideal democratic constitution. The herald is the official emissary of the Egyptian state. Moreover, the whole action of the tragedy appears in all its phases as the result of a continual and permanent struggle of opposing forces just as historical and political events do. Now such observations are relatively obvious and not very helpful. More than that, Stoessl wrote his article before the hypothesis of the play was discovered and shown to support a much later performance date (probably spring, 463) than most scholars had suspected. He dated the play not in the 490's, as those who stressed its archaic form had done, but approximately four years before The Persians, at the same time or just after Phrynichus' The Phoenician Women. On the basis of the meagre fragments, he thinks that The Phoenician Women of 476 used only one actor. If Aeschylus had already introduced the innovation of two actors which appears in The Suppliants, Phrynichus, he reasons a little
too complacently, would have followed his lead and adopted the new feature for his play. In accordance with his dating, Stoessl feels that in The Suppliants Aeschylus is supporting the policy of Themistocles favoring an alliance with Argos against Sparta. Since Argos seems by that time to have regained much of her strength and soon, together with Tegeda and a democratic league of other Arcadian cities and Elis, would challenge Sparta's hegemony in the Peloponnese and since Themistocles was to take refuge there after being ostracized, it is inherently likely that such a policy was in the air. The mere plausibility of this explanation, however, must give way to the hard facts of the date of the play.

One might think that knowing that the play was produced in 463 would greatly reduce the possibilities for political speculation. Yet in an ingenious article, "The Danaid Tetralogy of Aeschylus", Diamantopoulos argues that The Suppliants, along with the rest of the trilogy, The Egyptians and The Danaidae, and the satyr play Amymone (the last three of which remain in only a few fragments), though not produced until 463, was written during the late 490's. In particular he insists that the tetralogy was written in the wake of the Battle of Sepeia (494), in which King Cleomenes of Sparta overwhelmed the Argives and drastically crippled their manpower for a whole generation. As a direct result of that battle, the constitution of Argos was reformed in a democratic direction.
Herodotus and Aristotle, our two sources for that change, appear to disagree over its nature. Herodotus says that the Argive slaves took over and governed until the next generation of true Argives. While agreeing that power in Argos passed into new hands after Sepeia, Aristotle insists that it was some of the perioeci around Argos who were the beneficiaries. In his article Forrest cogently takes the side of Aristotle. As a member of the international aristocracy, Herodotus must have had friends among the sons of the slain in Argos. From these he learned of the rule of the "slaves". It is likely then that the "novi homines", the perioeci, were characterized as δόλωτες as an expression of political propaganda. In Forrest's view, there were two political groups in Argos before 494, an aristocratic group in power and a democratic group who favored or were prepared to accept synoecism. Similarly there were two groups in perioecic towns, a democratic group who favored synoecism and their opponents who preferred independence. The defeat of 494 brought the democrats to power in Argos, and with them partial synoecism. The democratic group with the inclusion of important citizens from perioecic cities was given the nickname δόλωτες.

Diamantopoulos regards the tetralogy as a Themistoclean view of politics. Although the historical sources bear no witness to any approach by Athens to Argos in the 490's, Diamantopoulos insists that Themistocles' group in Athens had every reason to approach Argos and an absolute need of a
slogan by which it could oppose the foreign policy of other political groups. While Themistocles was archon (493/2) and thus in control of the Dionysian theatre, he arranged with Phrynichus to have *The Sack of Milatus* written and substituted for one of his other plays that spring. At the same time Aeschylus undertook to write the whole Danaid tetralogy as a full policy declaration of the democratic group to which Themistocles belonged and as a defense of the new Argive democracy. Naturally enough he did not finish in time for the spring Dionysia in 492. Unfortunately, Themistocles' group gave way to the followers of Miltiades by the next year; and perhaps a treaty of friendship with Sparta was then contracted. Under such conditions the archon could not give a chorus and choregus for the production of a work asserting the political line of the anti-Laconian front. Consequently, the Danaid tetralogy was not presented. The friendship for Argos expressed in *The Suppliants* made it impossible for the play to be produced in the succeeding years when, as a consequence of the pro-Persian policy of Argos, the relations between Athens and Argos were strained. So it was not until the late 460's, when the sentiment for a rapprochement with Argos arose which resulted in the alliance of 462/1, that the long-delayed tetralogy found a climate congenial to its hearing.

Why does Diamantopoulos resort to such a seemingly far-fetched explanation? He feels that the view that the tetralogy was written, as one would expect, just before it was first
staged in 463 does not satisfactorily take into account what he sees as the two main "themes" and four "topics" of the play. While that view makes sense of the theme of the friendship of Athens with Argos (1), he says that it disregards the other, the suppliant theme (2). Also it shows some "misapprehension" of the topics through which the Argos theme is presented. The four topics, numbered consecutively with the two themes, are as follows: (3) the seniority of Argos over Sparta; (4) the consequences of the defeat of Argos at Sepeia (494); (5) pre-Dorian Argos; (6) Argive democratic institutions.

Accepting Diamantopoulos' framework of two themes and four topics that delineate the political aspect of The Suppliants, Forrest feels that 1, 2, and 6 are more relevant in 463 than 493, that 3 is equally relevant in both periods, that 4 is rather less relevant in 463 (but by no means out of place), while the relevance of 5 escapes him for both 493 and 463. He does not elaborate. Since we entirely agree with his judgment, we shall briefly substantiate it.

(1) The theme of the friendship of Athens for Argos. Diamantopoulos argues from the context of the urgent problems of external policy created by the supplication in the play. The impending threat of foreign invasion pervades the dramatic action. In the 460's Argos and Athens were expanding and presently engaged in a strong offensive alliance. Hence a date in the 490's after Sepeia and before Marathon would be more appropriate. What Diamantopoulos fails to consider is
that the external threat present in the play can be satisfactorily explained in solely dramatic terms. Aeschylus is simply advocating an alliance, not striving to convey the taste and color of foreign policy as well. He has a story that he must adhere to.

As Diamantopoulos admits, the historical sources maintain a unanimous silence with respect to any Athenian approach to Argos in the late 490's. More than that, the weakness of Argos after Sapeia, with no prospect of a quick recovery, must have been apparent to any political observer. It is difficult to imagine a statesman of Themistocles' extraordinary astuteness placing his hopes in Argos at that time even if only for the purpose of a political slogan. Further, Athens was an official member of the Peloponnesian League. By way of contrast, in the late 460's, when the defeat at Drabescus must have eroded Cimon's popularity and the helot revolt was endangering Sparta, a mood for turning towards Argos began to set in. It eventually bore fruit in the alliance of 462/1.

(2) The suppliant theme. Diamantopoulos mentions that on the basis of the supplication theme Focke had dated The Suppliants not long after the embassy of Aristogoras to Athens. The subject of the protection of suppliants corresponds to problems which arose in Athens as a consequence of this embassy. The poet's insistence on the conscientiousness of the supporter, on the fact that he acted out of the highest motive of reverence, on the fact that the voting demos was
responsible, and lastly his insistence on the finality of the "psephisma" which the leader was compelled to respect is fully understandable in 493 as justifying the policy of the democratic group of non-appeasers in the face of the accusation that through aid to the Ionians they had exposed Athens to Persian reprisals. Again Diamantopoulos is stressing incidentals at the expense of the main fact. The embassy of Aristagoras is simply not a very close parallel to the supplication of the Danaids. Mainly, he is not seeking protection for himself on Attic soil. Instead we suggest that the refuge of Themistocles in Argos, which not fortuitously is the setting of the play, provides a much more likely analogue. It will be argued later that the play may be looking back to the ostracism of Themistocles by way of looking forward to encourage an alliance with Argos.

(6) Argive democratic institutions. The Danaids' supplication sets in motion a democratic political mechanism, the working of which runs through the play. The highest organ of the executive power brings the question before the demos. The demos votes for the granting of asylum. When the Egyptian herald tries to carry off the Danaids, the highest organ of the executive power acts on the decision of the demos. No opportunity is missed to emphasize the final authority (τέλος) of the demos and the absolute validity of its "psephisma" (601,603,739,965). Aeschylus certainly did not find even a hint, let alone a complete statement, of
a democratic framework in the epic Danais. Diamantopoulos affirms also that the democratic framework serves no dramatic interest. Here one may interject in opposition that the need to win the demos as well as Pelasgus adds suspense and creates a complication necessary for giving length to this fairly static play. But in any case, the emphasis on democracy should bear some greater significance. Diamantopoulos wants, of course, to see that significance in terms of the 490's. In Argos after 494 the insistence on the authority of the demos would certainly serve the interests of the Argive democrats and give moral support to the new constitution (perhaps a performance of The Suppliants was to be held there as well as in Athens). In Athens, as a result of the Cleisthenic reforms of 508/7, the public would have been intensely interested in the question of the competence of the demos and the highest organ of the executive authority, the archon. Presumably that question would have been topical until the reforms of 487, when the office of archon was abased through selection by lot.

A clever hypothesis, to be sure, but hardly necessary. Certainly Aeschylus is going out of his way to emphasize democracy as such in Argos, though in keeping with history he feels that he must retain the traditional king. The question of competence then arises inevitably and may be regarded as subordinate. While it is true that democracy in Argos stood most in need of endorsement at its inception after
494, it has been shown that indicating such approval in Athens in the late 490's would have served no realizable political purpose. On the other hand, in the late 460's Aeschylus could well have intended to emphasize the democratic nature of the Argive regime in order to press for a policy of rapprochement. In his article Forrest underlines the uncertainty of Argive history after Sepeia. But he shows the possibility that after an aristocratic reaction conjectured to occur just before the Battle of Dipasa, the δοῦλοι again came into power by the winter of 464, or at any rate the Ἐνεγγυοι (the aristocratic faction centered around the sons of the slain at Sepeia) were forced at that time to reverse their policy completely and adopt the line followed by their opponents.

(3) The seniority of Argos. This refers to the greater antiquity of the Argive royal line as compared to the dual dynasties of her enemy Sparta. In the Prometheus Bound of the same poet, the exchange between Io and Prometheus brings out that Hypermnestra would follow in the fifth generation and Heracles in the thirteenth. Without accounting for the putative second play of the trilogy, The Egyptians, Diamantopoulos feels that the references in the Prometheus Bound are allusions to the structure of the Danaid trilogy. The period from Io to Hypermnestra falls into the compass of The Suppliants; that from Hypermnestra to Heracles in The Danaids. It is to be noted that the Spartan dynasties do not even go back to Heracles. The founders, Eurysthenes and Procles, fall in the
Diamantopoulos rashly asserts that this seniority claim of Argos would have been significant only before 481 (when negotiations between Argos and Sparta for joining against Persia broke down). The leadership of the Peloponnesian states was at stake. In rebuttal, one might question how much respect Argos would have commanded right after Sphacteria. Also one might question how much really depended on such claims. A pedigree is always worth a point in terms of snobbery but not much more. It could have been flaunted in 463 just as readily as in 493.

(4) The consequences of the defeat of Argos at Sphacteria. The argument is twofold. The first part relates to the prayer (625-709) of the Danaids for Argos upon their learning of the favorable vote of the assembly. Diamantopoulos maintains that a prominent position is given to the invocations for the safety of the Argives, the avoidance of calamities of war, the birth of new soldiers and citizens, while those relating to the furnishing of material benefits are very limited. He agrees with Mazon who in his edition of Aeschylus concludes from this emphasis that the drama refers to conditions in Argos after the defeat at Sphacteria. The second part of the argument relates to the main theme of the tetralogy, forced marriage. In line 865 of the Prometheus Bound παλατίνης ἰμερός, desire for children, is offered as the motive for Hypermnestra's disobedience in not killing her husband. Since it seems likely that she was acquitted in the trial in The Danaids and
since she gave Argos its dynasty through her marriage, she
served as an example to Argive women of the benefits of accepting
a forced marriage in order to bear children for the state.
The resistance and submission of woman to the fate of marriage
is also the main theme of the satyr play Amymone. From an
account of the play given by Apollodorus (2.1.4), we learn
that Amymone, like Hypermnestra, reluctant at first, then
finally accepting this fate, also became a cause of great
benefit to Argos, conferring on it through her marriage a
precious source of natural wealth, the springs at Lerna,
revealed to her by Poseidon. There is no doubt that this
theme was historically topical under the conditions after
Sepeia. In correcting Herodotus along the lines of Aristotle,
Plutarch tells us:

"Επανορθούμενοι βε τὴν ὀλιγανδρίαν οὐχ
ὡς Ἡρμόδοτος ἱστορεῖ, τοῖς δοῦλοις,
ἀλλὰ τῶν περιεχόμενων πολιτικῶν
τοὺς ἀριστούς, συνήκῳ τὰς γυναικὰς
(De mulierum virtutibus 4)

Many marriages with men whom they did not wish to marry must
have been urged upon Argive women by the state in order to
repair the city's losses. Consequently, the examples of
Hypermnestra and Amymone were eminently relevant.

When all this has been said, these reminders of conditions
after Sepeia would not have been out of place in the late 460's.
The lines of political cleavage were still those created by
Sepeia, δοῦλοι and Ἐπίγουοι. In the first place, the
prayer of the Danaids, which in fact lays more stress on the calamities of war than the birth of new soldiers and citizens, may be merely the poet's way of deploring the effects of Sepeia and hoping, since Argos was now fully recovered and capable of being a strong ally, that no further misfortune was in store. The poet's emphasis on the benefits of forced marriage may be regarded as an oblique way of sanctioning the δούλοι and their sons and the contributions that they made to Argos, not least the democratic framework that they moulded.

In sum, there is every reason to suppose that The Suppliant and the whole Danaid tetralogy was composed in the year or so immediately preceding its performance in the spring of 463.

It was conjectured earlier that the supplication of the Danaids may have been meant to recall Themistocles' refuge in Argos. In his article "Eschyle et Themistocle," many years before the hypothesis of The Suppliant was discovered, Cavignac had suggested the close resemblance of the position of the Danaids in The Suppliant to that of Themistocles at the time of his ostracism and exile. Specifically he believed that Aeschylus applauds the refusal of the Argives to extradite Themistocles. The implication is that the Spartans asked for Themistocles to be handed over at the time that the charges connected with Pausanias arose. In Thucydides' sketchy account, however, it seems that Themistocles did not wait for the Spartan mission to arrive: προσσωθομένος, he left for Corcyra on his own initiative. Forrest embraces
Cavaignac's idea, but thinks, perhaps more reasonably, that the play reflects Argos' dilemma over whether to accept the suppliant in the first place at the time of his ostracism. To do so may have been risking war with Sparta and perhaps Cimonian Athens as well. Forrest poses to himself the question why in 463 Aeschylus should look back to 471/70 to an episode that reflected defeated political hopes. He answers, of course, in terms of the changing political climate after Drabescus and the earthquake and helot revolt of Sparta. Looking back to a time when an alliance with Argos should have been made, Aeschylus looks forward to finally realizing it and to ending the ill-advised honeymoon with Sparta. It must be remembered, however, that our dating of the ostracism moves Forrest's 471/70 date back to c. 473. Further, to make explicit what Forrest implies, it is probable that Themistocles was then beginning to press a pro-Argive policy just before he was forced to find asylum in Argos. So by the mere fact of alluding to Themistocles' refuge, Aeschylus revives in his audience the memory of the policy that was then rejected by Athens along with its proponent.

This relation of the play to Themistocles appears plausible, but unfortunately finds no incontrovertible, explicit support in the text itself. It may perhaps be usefully pointed out that Danaos as the custodian of his daughters could have been taken as an analogue for Themistocles himself. It is Danaos who will personally appeal to the demos. Moreover, as he is about to do so, he is momentarily considered apart from his
It could be that Aeschylus felt that to be more obvious would be unnecessary or unbecoming in view of the political slant of the whole play. The fact that The Suppliants won the first prize may be an indication of the temper of Athens and its dawning awareness of its past mistakes.
V

THE SEVEN AGAINST THEBES

The Seven Against Thebes stands out without disguise as a political play. The attempts to connect it with the contemporary politics of the Athens of Aeschylus, however, have been singularly unconvincing. Consequently, the play merits and receives only a summary treatment here.

To no one's surprise Stoessl sees in the play a general political problem fundamental to all peoples and states, especially Greek city states, which always has relevance—the relations between the government and the opposition. The problem has been pushed to its extreme form as a struggle between a government which has violated the constitution and the opposition which has emigrated and relies not merely on insurrection, but rather on the help of a foreign army for the invasion of its own country. In this dilemma Aeschylus offers no solution, no clear decision between right and wrong. Both brothers know that they lie under their father's curse, which in a way is the extension of their grandfather's oracle; and yet both are ready to die. It is the natural, tragic struggle between two illegalities.

Stoessl wants to see Themistocles in the figure of Polynices. Like Polynices, Themistocles had gone to Argos.
(upon being ostracized from Athens). Like Polyneices, he represented the opposition to the ruling government of his mother city. Cimon and his conservative pro-Spartan party had won the victory in Athens. In Argos Themistocles continued his anti-Spartan anti-conservative policy. Stoessl does not bother to account for the expedition against Thebes. One is to assume that it is metaphorical, not meant to mirror a historical fact, but just a means of passing judgment. And that judgment divides the responsibility and guilt. Aeschylus here is above party; he comments on the destructiveness built into Greek politics. He is political thinker before political partisan. Nevertheless, he still sympathizes with Themistocles and his politics on the grounds, one can only infer, that Eteocles' refutation of the right of Polyneices lacks the power to convince.

L. A. Post, in his article "The Seven Against Thebes As Propaganda For Pericles," at least presents a full-rounded interpretation which respects the integrity of the play. He recognizes that Eteocles stands out as the dominating character and therefore must lie at the center of any reading of the play, regardless of its nature. Stoessl substantially ignores Eteocles, probably because he would have difficulty accounting for him. Logically if he is to represent the party in power which has managed to drive out the opposition identified as Themistocles, Eteocles can only be Cimon. But in that case it is next to impossible to believe that Aeschylus would have
portrayed such a noble Eteocles, a Hector-like upholder of his city who prays:

\[ Ό 

\[ Ζε\v{\eta} 

\[ τε 

\[ κα\v{\iota} 

\[ Ειρ\v{\sigma}νη 

\[ πατρ\v{\rho}ς 

\[ θεοι, 

\[ Ἄρα 

\[ εὐγένειαν 

\[ θεοι, 

\[ μὴ 

\[ μοι 

\[ πόλιν 

\[ χαρὴν 

\[ πανδέκτου 

\[ Ἑλλάδος 

\[ εὔδαμυσην 

\[ δήλωτον 

\[ θεόγονον 

\[ χέουσαν 

\[ καὶ 

\[ δήμους 

\[ εὔεστοὺς. 

(lines 69-73)

Not only has Aeschylus' sympathy for Themistocles and democracy been seen in the first two plays studied, but also it should be remembered that The Seven Against Thebes was produced the very year after Cimon and his fellow generals had bestowed the prize on the neophyte Sophocles in preference to Aeschylus.

Post boldly argues that Eteocles stands for Pericles. He notes that Aeschylus could have depicted Eteocles as an ambitious usurper intoxicated by a dream of tyranny, but instead he chose to exalt him in displaying the supreme self-sacrifice of a patriot. Aeschylus intends to emphasize the moral that a man personally under a curse may by unusual ability and utmost devotion save his city from being implicated in his own destruction. And if one asks who would benefit by the application of this moral, the answer is Pericles. At the same time, Post accepts the identification of Themistocles with Polyneices. Themistocles was rumored, he says, to be the destined leader of a Persian force against his own city.

The objection to seeing Pericles in Eteocles is clear. Principally, it is too early. Pericles did not succeed to
undisputed leadership until 461, after the murder of Ephialtes. It may well be that with Themistocles' exile and Aristides' death probably soon after, Pericles had begun his political ascent by the time the play was being written. Nevertheless, his democratic policies could not have been effective in the wake of Cimon's victory at Eurymedon. It was probably not before Oribasus and the helot revolt that he could have made his presence felt. Consequently, in 468 the poet would not have envisaged him in the guise of absolute ruler of Thebes, nor would the audience have recognized him as such in 467. Moreover, the importance of the curse is inflated. Pericles' father, Xanthippus, may not have been an Alcmeonid himself, but like Peisistratus and Cimon only married into the family. In any case, the curse was something conveniently remembered later by his enemies when he acquired such unique power, not something constantly in the minds of the people.

As for Themistocles, Stoessel may have been beguiled by an improper chronology. The exile, it was argued, seems to us to belong to 471/70. The trial and condemnation must fall in the same space of time whether or not we suppose that Themistocles waited to hear the verdict. Wrongly assuming that the trial was later, just at the time that Aeschylus wrote The Seven Against Thebes (c. 468), Stoessel concluded that Themistocles would have been on everyone's mind. For his part, Post reads into Plutarch rumors of a Persian invasion led by Themistocles. If any such obsession overtook Athens, it would likely have been
at the time of the trial and flight (471/70) or after word of Themistocles' letter to Artaxerxes had leaked out (c. 465).

The Seven Against Thebes, however, was almost certainly written in the lull between those two times; and Themistocles was quietly hiding in Asia Minor. Still the dating is sufficiently proximate that one cannot categorically deny the identification of Themistocles with Polyneices. The resulting difficulty in accounting for Eteocles, as mentioned above, would, however, weigh heavily against it.

In all, the Theban cycle was an inherently fascinating theme for drama. One should not feel required to believe that Aeschylus could not refrain from using it as a platform for holding forth on topical concerns.
VI

CONCLUSION

On the basis of the three plays with which we have been concerned, it emerges that Aeschylus was sympathetic to Themistocles and democracy. Nevertheless, he has the good sense and spirit of reverence not to weigh down his plays with pronouncements, however veiled, on the ephemeral issues of everyday politics. In *The Persians* the praise of Themistocles after his ostracism is explicit because it was most likely prompted by a deep personal sense of civic shame. He could not keep from writing it. Still it is entirely subordinated to the great acting out of the cycle of *hybris*, *ate*, and *nemesis*. *The Suppliants* bears an immediate political message, but one of general, momentous scope. But because the poet refuses to compromise in any way the timelessness of his story, one may even doubt any such political intention. Finally, in *The Seven Against Thebes* it appears that no ready equation with the politics of the time can be safely ventured.

The polis left its stamp on every aspect of Greek life and culture. Drama was certainly no exception. Accordingly most Greek plays may be regarded as political in the broad sense. From these pages, however, it is perhaps not too rash
to infer that it was very rare for a poet like Aeschylus to pass over from the sacredness of this general plane -- the classical -- to the profanity of the more specific.
FOOTNOTES

1. The date is given in the hypothesis with the information that Aeschylus was victorious.

2. The date of the first production is given in the hypothesis. Aeschylus was first with Laius, Cadipus, The Seven Against Thebes, and Oedipus.

3. A hypothesis to the Danaid tetralogy was recently discovered (Oxy. Pap. 20 1952 2256, fragment 3). It indicates that the production probably took place in the year of Archelaides (spring, 463); cf. Lesky, Hermes 82 (1954) 1-13.

4. Lenard, Historia 5 (1956) 401-419.


6. Thuc. 1.90-93.


8. Thuc. 1.90-93; according to Diodorus 11.41-43, however, both Aristides and Xanthippus were chosen to assist because they were opponents of Themistocles.


15. Thuc. 1.131-134.

16. Thuc. 1.137.


18. Lenard, Historia 8 (1959) 34.

21 Marx, Rh. M. 77 (1928) 355-360.

22 The Persians 790-800.

23 The Persians 181-196.

24 The Persians 852-907.


26 Aristotle, Politics 1303 a 6.

27 Hdt. 8.131.

28 Thuc. 1.136.

29 War with Sparta was imminent. Themistocles may even have been instrumental in arranging the partnership of Argos and the Arcadian League. Contra Forrest, one may want to move back the Battle of Tegea to c. 473 in accordance with our back-dating of Themistocles' ostracism. Incidentally, that is the traditional conjectured date which Forrest abandons.

30 The Seven Against Thebes 653-671.

31 Forest, C. Q. 10 (1960) 233.

32 Plutarch, Them. 23.
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