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INTRODUCTION

A study of Greek history leads ultimately to the consideration of that nation's brightest hour, the fifth century B.C. To the fame of that century, Pericles' name is forever linked and he more so than any other individual helped to create its mystique.

Several facets of Pericles' career are interesting, but one of its more important and fascinating aspects focuses upon his associates and the trouble that befell them. His circle of friends was significant and included several celebrities. Aspasia is notorious in popular literature as the female companion of Pericles. Phidias, the great artist, was his associate. Anaxagoras and Damon, whose theories fascinated and troubled the Athenians, belonged to his inner circle. Lesser known figures (at least to us, but not to the Athenians) were also friends of Pericles. Damonides, the father of Damon, counted as an intimate associate. Each of these individuals paid for his friendship with Pericles by becoming the target of his political opponents. A study of the ensuing slander and the litigation sheds light not only on the career of Pericles, but also the political intrigue of the century.
Considering the voluminous literature on the period, one might expect any topic concerning Pericles to have been exhaustively treated. This is not the case. No work in English deals with the political attacks upon Pericles' associates thoroughly or completely. Such scholarly studies as A. Schmidt's, _Perikles und sein Zeitalter_ (1877), and A. Rosenberg's "Perikles und die Parteien in Athen" (1915) have long been out of date and are inaccessible to the general reader.

Any study of these attacks is fraught with difficulties, not least of all those presented by the nature of the extant testimony. The external history of Athens is fairly well documented, but the evidence for her internal affairs is sadly lacking. Thucydides, for example, in a way not to be admired, omits completely the attacks upon Pericles' friends. We must rely on information that is meagre and fragmentary deriving from a complexing diversity of sources as the following chapters will reveal only too clearly. The historian is hard pressed in his search for factual information and his reconstruction must inevitably be tenuous and incomplete.

Each of the following chapters centers upon one of Pericles' associates and deals with the problems inherent in the literature, both ancient and modern. My
method of presentation has to a large extent been dictated by the erratic nature of the ancient testimony and the points of debate focused upon by modern scholars. My conclusion relates the biographical details that I have established to Pericles' career in particular and fifth century history in general.
CHAPTER I

ASPASIA

In a study of the personal and political attacks upon Aspasia, it is essential to begin with a survey of the extant testimony concerning her. Criticism of Aspasia, which begins in the fifth and continues in the following centuries, can be judged only in the light of the nature of our sources.

Since the date of Aspasia's birth is unknown and no record of her death is extant, it is difficult to date precisely criticism that may be contemporary. Aspasia perhaps lived beyond the close of the fifth century and, if so, the literature of the early decades of the fourth century may have been written when she was alive; but we cannot be certain.1 Aspasia's relations with Pericles,

---

1A date conjectured for the birth of Aspasia by C. Mackenzie, Pericles (London: 1937), p. 212 is c. 475 or five years earlier. He does not state the reasons for his hypothetical date, which is probably based upon the assumption that Aspasia met Pericles when she was twenty and that their union began in 453. A.E. Taylor, Philosophical Studies (London: 1934), p. 5 assumes that the Socratic dialogue of Aeschines entitled "Aspasia" discusses a notable person recently deceased. B. Ehlers, Eine Vorcloseanische Deutung des Sokratischen Eros (Munich: 1966), p. 23, dates Aeschines' dialogue c. 393-384. Therefore it is possible that Aspasia may have been alive at the beginning of the fourth century.
however, firmly place her in the latter half of the fifth century; and it seems safe to assume that the literature from these years is contemporary.

Testimony concerning Aspasia is found in the works of only four literary figures of the fifth century: Callias, Cratinus, Eupolis, and Aristophanes.² The bulk of this contemporary evidence is fragmentary, i.e., compiled from the later sources which preserve quotations from the earlier periods. The only extant contemporary piece of evidence that is complete comes from Aristophanes. Moreover, references to Aspasia in the fifth century were not essentially biographical in nature; rather they were merely pointed and isolated references, of the sort typically made about well known figures. Allusion, not biography, constitutes the basis for the information about Aspasia.

Writers of the fifth century deal primarily with criticism of Aspasia's relationship with Pericles and her position in Athenian society. Aspasia is connected intellectually and emotionally with the leading statesman of Athens, to whom she taught rhetoric.³ The reason for

²Plut. Per. 32. A contemporary Hermippus, who brought a charge of impiety against Aspasia, presumably wrote about her, but no mention of Aspasia is found in his extant fragments.

³Schol. Plato Menex. 235e.
their association is unnatural lust and the result of their intimacy is a bastard.\textsuperscript{4} Aspasia's occupation is depicted as that of a brothel-keeper, while she herself is called a whore and a shameless courtesan.\textsuperscript{5} Such references to Aspasia's occupation are unquestionably critical; and other statements of censure occur, some equally overt, others more subtly covert. Suggestively Aspasia is called Hera, Helen, Omphale, and Deianira; overtly, she is blamed for the Megarian Decree which was a major reason for outbreak of the Peloponnesian War in 431.\textsuperscript{6}

The information of the fifth century is, to say the least, meager, allusive, and obscure. But a basic caricature of Aspasia emerges. She is an exceptional woman; she is intimately connected with Pericles; and she is criticized on both counts. The references stem from the comic poets and their truthfulness (or the reliability of the caricature) must be qualified in terms of the hyperbolic nature of Old Comedy, which is a mixture of exaggeration and fact designed primarily to amuse and entertain. Facts are exaggerated and invented; ironical

\textsuperscript{4}Plut. \textit{Per.} 24-25.

\textsuperscript{5}Ibid; Aristoph. \textit{Acharn.} 526-529.

\textsuperscript{6}Aristoph. \textit{ibid}; Schol. Plato. \textit{Menex.} 235e.
situations are presented with a firmness of conviction that gives an air of verisimilitude; reality and unreality are commonly intermingled. But limits are placed on the invention of the comedian—the familiarity of the audience with the facts cannot be ignored, however fanciful the elaboration. The writer, in fact, plays upon the knowledge of his viewers. The end result, of course, is to arouse laughter.

Because familiarity with the events and people in the comedies is essential, the common ground between comedian and audience lies in the everyday life of Athens. It provides the author with his plots, characters and, most importantly, his gossip. Ridicule of the celebrities, political or otherwise, occupies an important place in such gossip, and the personal slander and invidious remarks of the comedian find their origin in the popular voice. The comedian merely expresses the sentiments freely aired in the street, and he cares little whether the details are true or false.

Such is the nature of the sources for the earliest caricature and accusations of Aspasia. The details are exaggerated, and their truth or falsity is lost. But the presentation of the burlesque has far-reaching effects, particularly in the following centuries; for Old Comedy was considered as a trustworthy source of information and,
in the words of Maurice Croiset, "a jest became a statement of fact, a caricature a portrait, a satire a document." Thus, by repeating gossip, comic writers added force and authority to it; as a result gossip was given the stature of history and a caricature etched in the boldest outline became a stereotyped and permanent portrait.

Thus the image of Aspasia created in the fifth century became the foundation for the delineation of her character in the works of subsequent literature; but the number of references concerning her greatly increased when compared to those of the fifth century. There are two types of statements about Aspasia which appear in the later literature: isolated remarks, which are not meant for biographical purposes, and biographical sketches.

The evidence for Aspasia from the literature of the fourth through the first centuries B.C. may be classified as isolated. With the exception of Plato and Xenophon, the information is fragmentary, as in the case of the contemporary data. But during the fourth century two dialogues entitled "Aspasia" appeared, which unfortunately have been lost. The dialogues were the works

---

of Antisthenes, a devoted follower of Socrates who later influenced Cynic philosophy, and Aeschines Socraticus, also a devotee of Socrates. It is difficult to ascertain the dates of these dialogues and impossible to say which came first. Several fragments of Aeschines' work exist; one fragment of Antisthenes is extant. Because of the paucity of fragments, therefore, we are unable to reconstruct these dialogues or discern their form or purpose.

But generally it is assumed that Aeschines and Antisthenes take opposite positions in regard to Aspasia, the latter unfavorable, the former favorable. It is likely that

---

8 Antisthenes' dialogue is quoted by Athenaeus (8.569 d-e); later he reports that Antisthenes slandered Xanthippus and Paralus, the two sons of Pericles (5.220e). The dialogue of Aeschines is represented by several fragments, see Ehlers, op. cit.

9 Several scholarly works exist which discuss Aeschines and Antisthenes' dialogues. The most recent on Aeschines is Ehlers, op. cit. Before the publication of Miss Ehlers' work, the more important discussions of Aeschines' "Aspasia" were: P. Natorp, "Aischines' Aspasia," Philol., 51 (1892), pp. 489-500; H. Dittmar, Aischines von Sphettos (Berlin: 1912); and A. E. Taylor, op. cit. F. Susemihl, "Die Aspasia des Antisthenes," Philol., 59 (1900), pp. 148-51 briefly discusses Antisthenes' dialogue. Both authors are treated by R. Hirzel, Der Dialog (Leipzig: 1895). All these scholars present individual and conflicting ideas concerning the reconstruction, form, and intent of each dialogue. Examples of their judgments are as follows: Aeschines' work was written to show equality of the sexes (Dittman; Taylor); to be a defense for Aspasia (Natorp); and to show eros as the means to attain political arete (Ehlers). Antisthenes' dialogue is shown to be friendly towards Aspasia (Hirzel); this thesis is refuted by Susemihl.
some of the information about Aspasia appearing in writings (particularly the Socratic) of the same time and in the later centuries comes from these dialogues; specific relationships, however, can only be conjectured.

Isolated remarks and extended biography concerning Aspasia continue in the centuries after Christ, represented by evidence from the following sources: Harpocration, Plutarch, the Suda, and various scholia. The same information, however, is repeated; indeed most of the material adds nothing new, but either a specific author is named as the source or references are vaguely disignated by such verbs as "it is agreed" or "they say." Each item of information, however, usually can be traced to its ultimate source.

---


11 Plut. Per. 24-25 employs these indefinite verbs: ὄμολογεῖται is used to show the unanimity of his predecessors concerning the origins of Aspasia; Ἐκαστὸς to show that Aspasia emulated Thargelia and that Pericles showed emotion towards Aspasia; and λέγουσι to point out the fact that Pericles courted Aspasia for her political knowledge. Although his sources are unnamed, it is likely that Diodorus Periegetes (Schol. Plato Menex. 235e) is meant by the first verb and Aeschines is probably the source for the equation of Aspasia with Thargelia (cf. Natorp, op. cit., p. 491). Antisthenes' dialogue is responsible for the scene of affection between Aspasia and Pericles. No definite source can be shown for the statement concerning Aspasia's ability in politics, but it is probably from Aeschines.
Amplification of the basic caricature of the fifth century is a conspicuous trend in the later literature. Aspasia's exceptional abilities continue to be noted in the fourth through the first centuries but her fields of competence become enlarged. For example, in addition to rhetoric, Aspasia's original forte, she becomes an expert in the realm of marriage and is credited with a specific accomplishment in rhetorical eloquence: the funeral oration delivered by Pericles in 430 B.C. Such attributes as "experienced in practical affairs", "most clever in politics", and "very keen of mind" sum up the fame of her intellect in the literature after Christ.

As her reputation for sagacity increases, the number of Aspasia's students swells to include specific persons. Along with Pericles, Socrates and Lysicles, Aspasia's male attendant after the death of Pericles in 429, study rhetoric at her feet. Xenophon and his wife

\[12\text{Alciphron Ep. 4.7; Schol. Aristoph. Acharn. 527; Athen. S. 219c; Harpocr. s.v. Aspasia; Lucian Lunuch 7; Philostr. En. 73; Plato Menex. 235c, 236a-d; Plut. Per. 24-25; Synesius Dion 15.}

\[13\text{Cicero De Iuvent. 1.31; Quin. Instit. Orat. 5.11; Xen. Oecon. 3.4; Plato Menex. 236a-d.}

\[14\text{Lucian Essays 17.}

\[15\text{Athen. S. 219c, 5.220e, 13.599a-b; Harpocr. s.v. Aspasia; Lucian Dance 25; Max. Tyr. 38.4; Plato Menex. 235e, 236a-d; Schol. Plato Menex. 235e; Plut. Per. 24-25; Xen. Mem. 2.6.}
discourse at length with her, and the report of their conversation reveals that inductive reasoning played an important role in Aspasia's method of instruction. Besides these specific students, Aspasia is said to have taught many other good speakers. Her role as teacher continues in the literature after Christ. At this time, however, Athenian women are included in Aspasia's circle, and Socrates, who earlier learned rhetoric from Aspasia, is tutored in the fields of philosophy, love (explained as philosophical pursuits) and pederasty. Also Aspasia is coupled with Diotima.

---

16Cicero De Iuvent 1.31; Quin. Instit. Orat. 5.11. It is questionable that Xenophon was old enough to have known Aspasia and have been married, see Judeich, s.v. Aspasia RE 2, 1719, "Xenophon war zu A.s Lebzeiten noch recht jung und kaum verheiratet." But, Taylor, op. cit. p. 20 argues for two marriages of Xenophon and the possibility that Aspasia did converse with Xenophon and his first wife. The value of such an argument is not clear. The fact that Aspasia's method of instruction was inductive reasoning is explainable. The quotation comes from Aeschines' dialogue which has as its central figure, Socrates. A principle of Socratic argumentation was inductive reasoning; his method was transferred to Aspasia. Diog. Laert. 2,16 mentions that the writings of Aeschines are stamped with Socratic character.

17Plut. Menex. 235e.

18Plut. Per. 24-25; Athen. 5.219c-e; Clem. Strom. 4.9.122; Syncesius Dion 15.
Socrates' instructor in the Symposium of Plato. Aspasia is still a master in rhetoric, and "it is said that Aspasia, the Milesian, moulded the tongue of Pericles after Gorgias' manner of speaking."¹⁹

For Aspasia's intimate association with Pericles, later writers begin to give more concrete reasons; and the nature of their relation is explained more precisely. In the literature before Christ the shameless lust of the fifth century is explicitly accounted for: Pericles divorces his wife, takes to wild living, becomes acquainted with Aspasia, and lavishes his property on her.²⁰ But their association is not completely promiscuous; it includes tenderness and love, for Pericles shows affection for Aspasia by kissing her when entering and leaving the house, and he sheds tears to obtain her acquittal during her trial for impiety in 430.²¹

A certain ambiguity, however, remains concerning the exact position of Aspasia in her affiliation with Pericles; and the uncertainty involves the problem surrounding the social status of Aspasia. Allusions to her brothel still persist, a brothel which now contains flute

²⁰ Athen. 12.533c.
²¹ Plut. Per. 32.1-3.
girls, whom Socrates often visits to lighten the burdens of his heart. Also, Aspasia is compared to Thargelia, a well known courtesan of Thessaly. Because of her supposed occupation, the later writers worry about Pericles' relation with Aspasia, a concern which is not limited only to the ancients; they therefore call her at one time a hetaera, at another time the wife of Pericles.

This topic continues to be discussed in the years after Christ. Reasons proffered for their union are political and erotic; Pericles seeks out Aspasia because of her political knowledge; or Pericles, intoxicated with love, associates himself with her, motivated by the

---

22 Athen. 5.220e, 8.589d-e.

23 Thargelia was a Milesian courtesan who was distinguished because of her beauty and shrewdness. She was supposed to have been married fourteen times. One of her husbands was Antiochus, a king of Thessaly, and after his death Thargelia supposedly ruled thirty years over Thessaly. During these years, she was actively engaged in trying to influence her male companions for the Persians. This woman was said to have provided Aspasia with a pattern for political activity. Mackenzie, op. cit., p. 218 sees in this comparison a possible allusion to the fact that Aspasia might have been a Persian agent. For ancient references to Thargelia, see Fiehn, s.v. "Thargelia," RE 5, A,1304. See also A. Schmidt, Perikles und sein Zeitalter (Jena: 1877), vol. I, pp. 295-297; Lucian Eunuch 7; Plut. Per. 24-25.

24 The term γυνή is used by the scholiast to Plato's Menex. 235e. It appears that he is quoting Diodorus Periegetes, but the word may be the scholiast's own; Athen. 12. 533c.
shameless lust attributed to him in the fifth century. In connection with her occupation, Aspasia is said to have filled Greece with her girls, while she carried on a trade that was neither honest or reputable and kept a house for young courtesans. Because of the unchanging insistence that Aspasia maintained a brothel and that she was connected with Pericles, different terms were used to express their relationship: lover, courtesan, and wife.

But, although doubt existed about the nature of their union, all agree that Aspasia influenced the administration of Pericles, particularly his foreign policy. The fifth century blamed Aspasia for the Megarian Decree; the fourth through the first centuries condemned her as responsible for the Samian War in 439. No new criticism of Aspasia appears in the literature after Christ, only repetitions of the existing judgments are made. The Megarian Decree, which plays a vital role in the inception of the great war between Athens and Sparta, continues to

25Plut. Per. 24-25; Athen. 8.569f.
26Plut. Per. 24-25; Athen. 8.569f.
28Athen. 8.569f; Harpocr. s.v. Aspasia.
be added to the tally of political decisions in which Aspasia had a hand. 29

Beyond these amplifications of the basic picture of Aspasia created by the comic writers, little that is new is said about her by subsequent authors. Biographical details emerge: Aspasia's home was Miletus, 30 her father's name was Axiochus, 31 and she was closely


30 The consensus of opinion among the ancients is that Aspasia is from Miletus. Only one differs, i.e., Heraclides Ponticus (Athen. 12.533d), who gives Megara. There were two men named Heraclides Ponticus in antiquity: one was a student of Plato, c. 390-310, the other a student of Didymus, who possibly lived under Claudius and Nero; see Schmidt, op. cit., pp. 289-291. Schmidt argues that the latter Heraclides was responsible for the statement concerning Megara; but his arguments are unconvincing.

31 Axiochus is twice named as the father of Aspasia Schol. Plato Menex. 235e, Plut. Per. 24-25; otherwise he is unknown. Schmidt, op. cit., p. 97 tries tentatively to identify Axiochus with the son of the elder Alcibiades, the grandfather of Alcibiades, general in 415. He suggests the identification is possible because (1) Axiochus may have been reared in Miletus after his father's exile from Athens; and (2) he was old enough to be Aspasia's father. That Schmidt's reasoning is wrong is shown by J. Kirchner, Prosopographia Attica (Berlin: 1901), 2, p. 442 where the stemma of Alcibiades' family is correctly revised in such a way as to preclude both of Schmidt's conjectures. Also see A.W. Gomme, A. Andrews, K.J. Dover, A Historical Commentary on Thucydides (Oxford: 1970), 5, pp. 49-50 for further emendations to the family tree. In summary, (1) there is no ancient evidence that Axiochus was ever in Miletus; and (2) he is too young to be the father of Aspasia.
associated with Lysicles, to whom she bore a son Poristes.\(^{32}\) But the item of singular importance amid this biographical data is the report of Plutarch concerning Aspasia's trial. A charge of impiety was made against her, and the alleged reason behind this accusation was that Aspasia acted as a panderer for Pericles. Hermippus, the comic poet, acted as prosecutor; Pericles spoke on behalf of Aspasia. The result of the trial was a vote of acquittal, although Plutarch notes that Pericles had to shed tears in order to obtain her release. The date of the attacks against her are generally placed between the years 433-430 on the evidence of Plutarch; as I shall show in my conclusion there is no reason not to accept this chronology.\(^{33}\)

This is the extent of our knowledge of Aspasia and the nature of our evidence. Our survey has revealed three facts: (1) there is a paucity of extant contemporary statements about Aspasia, and there is reason to doubt the truthfulness of the caricature presented, since the bulk of the material is from comedy; (2) later literature only

\(^{32}\) Lysicles is the politician who was said to have risen to power by becoming the protector of Aspasia after Pericles' death, see Kirchner, \textit{op. cit.}, 2, no. 9417. Also see Gomme, Andrews, Dover, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 279, n. 1 for doubt concerning the association between Lysicles and Aspasia.

\(^{33}\) \textit{Plut. Per.} 32. 1-3.
repeats former gossip, i.e., the fifth century caricature is accepted without question and handed down to posterity; and (3) accretions to her biography occur as time passes, which are for the most part additions that closely adhere to the basic portrait of her found in comic writers.

Thus it may be asked what do we actually know about Aspasia. The answer is, in my opinion, not much, including both what may be true or false. To be sure, the evidence of the fifth century comedy suggests that Aspasia was mentioned often. Other works of literature such as the dialogues of Aeschines and Antisthenes, the loss of which we can deplore, probably spoke about Aspasia at some length and in some detail, but an estimate of this grande femme can be made only from existing evidence; since it is fragmentary, so is our knowledge of Aspasia.  

Because of the paucity of information concerning Aspasia, the imaginations of scholars have been highly creative. See above (n. 23) for Mackenzie's theory concerning Aspasia as a Persian agent; cf. also his explanation (pp. 213ff.) for the reasons why Aspasia chose the life of a courtesan. Schmidt, op. cit. is equally creative; see pp. 96-98 for a wondrous explanation for the reason why Aspasia came upon her love of learning and why she came to Athens; also see his chapter entitled, "Der Gesellschaftskreis des Perikles und der Aspasia" (pp. 113-121) where every notable of Athens comes under the influence of Aspasia. Such statements are purely conjectural.

For a delightful fictitious account of correspondence between Aspasia and Pericles and Cleone, a friend in Miletus, see W.S. Landor, Pericles and Aspasia (London: 1890).
The statements which are continually repeated from the time of the fifth century may rest upon fact. They imply as their basis a few fundamental details, some of which may be true: (1) Aspasia was considered an exceptional woman, not only in her beauty and her sex, but also in her intellect; (2) she was associated with Pericles in an unusual way; and (3) she was accused of impiety but was acquitted through the intervention of Pericles. The biographical details concerning her origins and patrimony probably are true, i.e., she was from Miletus and her father's name was Axiochus.

Such a picture of Aspasia ignores, of course, the amplifications of later writers. But what faith can we place in such evidence? One may believe that whatever is found in the ancient testimony is true, but who can seriously argue for such gullibility? One could maintain that subsequent information has its origin in the lost dialogues of Aeschines and Antisthenes, or in any other lost work for that matter. But the nature of the specifics does not ring true. The same aspects of Aspasia's life are continually enlarged upon, and thus certain propensities of the ancients for invention are revealed which strongly indicate the manner by which the additions to the basic evidence came about.
Several tendencies may be observed at work in the development of the pertinent literature, which are in essence analogous. First there is an obvious attempt to attribute to Aspasia the achievements of her students. Celebrated as a rhetorician and as mentor of Pericles, Aspasia finally becomes the creator of the funeral oration recorded by Thucydides. Secondly, the ancients are prone to make inferences about Aspasia which to them seem reasonable. Thus Aspasia's intellectual range is extended from a knowledge of rhetoric to marriage and politics. For example, Aspasia is Pericles' teacher of rhetoric, the logic for the invention perhaps being that she must have been a great influence on the leading statesman, who was, of course, deeply involved in politics. The predictable connection is made: Aspasia becomes competent in politics. Likewise, her wisdom in marital relations may be explained by the fact that she was experienced with men. Similar too are the reasons for the expansion of Aspasia's student body; the meagerness of the evidence, and the desire to elaborate upon what little evidence there was, inspired such inferences.

Authors subsequent to the fifth century show an inclination to allow evidence from other literary testimony to color their judgment of Aspasia. Aeschines probably connected Aspasia with Socrates in his treatment;
later Socratic dialogues also show this association, as is illustrated in the *Menexenus* of Plato. There Socrates is taught rhetoric by Aspasia. Later, her influence over Socrates is extended to include philosophy and erotic subjects, and therefore she is continually associated with Diotima. The theme of Plato's *Symposium* is a philosophical discussion on the Platonic view of *eros* with its overtones of homosexuality, in which Diotima is the one who leads Socrates to the true definition of love. It was easy to link Aspasia with Diotima as the fictional tradition grew.

Finally the intent of an author may influence one's verdict of the validity of his testimony. The statement that Aspasia wrote the epitaphios of Pericles is found in the *Menexenus* of Plato (235a-d) and taken at face value seems reliable enough. When considered in connection with a wider view of Plato's purpose (about which there is no consensus of opinion, either ancient or modern) the attribution becomes much more dubious.

---

35 Plato's *Menexenus* was written c. 386; see P. Huby, "The *Menexenus* of Plato Reconsidered," *Phronesis*, 1-2 (1957), p. 107. Since Aeschines' dialogue was written between 393-384 (n. 1 above), it probably precedes the Platonic dialogue, but we cannot be sure.
Some ancients considered the dialogue serious, and Dionysius of Halicarnassus says that Plato appeared to be placing himself alongside of Thucydides.\textsuperscript{36} Plutarch, however, indicates that the dialogue might have been written in jest; and indeed Plato seems to imply as much, for at the end of the work Menexenus offers his congratulations for the funeral oration to Aspasia or whoever spoke it.\textsuperscript{37} Today different reasons are given for the composition of the dialogue. Wilamowitz sees it as an attempt on Plato's part to compete with the rhetors of his day; Kahn gives the dialogue protreptic purposes; Huby thinks that it was a pamphlet meant to stir the conscience of the Athenians in 386; and Taylor makes the work a satire on the patriotic oratory of the fifth and fourth centuries.\textsuperscript{38}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{36}Dion. Hal. Περὶ Δημοσθένους 30.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{37}μετὰ παιδιάς τὰ πρῶτα γεγραμμένα, "in a sportive vein"; see also Plato Menex. 249e. Note that Plato does not use the feminine but uses ὃ εἶπόν. See L. Meridier, \textit{Menexenus} (Paris: 1956), p. 78.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{38}Huby, op. cit., p. 104; 113; H. Kahn, "Plato's Funeral Oration: The Motive of the Menexenus," \textit{CP}, 58 (1963), p. 225; and Taylor, op. cit., p. 22. Another theory put forward by Huby (p. 109, n. 4) is that Plato is attempting to imitate Pericles in rivalry with Thucydides, but he admits that this theory is very conjectural.
\end{flushright}
Thus according to both ancient and modern critics the Menexenus may be taken literally and seriously and Aspasia may be rightly held responsible for the composition of the funeral oration; or the dialogue may be considered at least in part a mere jest. I prefer the latter view. The beginning of the dialogue is humorous. There Socrates and Menexenus discuss oratory, and the exchange between them reveals a mockery of orators and a discussion of the practice of embellishing funeral orations (234c-235c). Socrates reflects the humor attending this conversation when he says that after hearing a funeral oration he did not come down to earth for days (235c). It is amidst the banter between Socrates and Menexenus that the mention of Aspasia occurs (235e). Also she is associated in the same breath with a teacher of music, Connus (236a), who is generally linked with children. Irony may be intended in the connection of a teacher of rhetoric and a mediocre teacher of music. Thus the mockery of orators is continued, and the motive behind the mention of Aspasia is made clear. I cannot believe

---

39 Compare the role of Connus in Plato's Euthy. 272c, 295d, where he is considered a teacher of music for children.

40 Meridier, op. cit., p. 79
that the authorship of the funeral oration can be seriously ascribed to Aspasia.

Hostile criticism pervades the core of the literature concerning Aspasia. As we have seen, reproof of Aspasia, direct or indirect, is both personal and political. In the fifth century, censure of Aspasia stems obviously from the daily gossip in Athens. What are the reasons for this gossip? To attempt to find an answer involves a look at the conventional position of women in Athens and a detailed examination of the relationship between Pericles and Aspasia.

One of the dominant reasons for the criticism of Aspasia was her intellectual acumen, for which every generation that mentions her gives her credit. Outward manifestations of feminine genius, however, were unusual in Athens. A woman's lot in life was to take second place to her male counterpart; just what this second place was is a subject of great debate.\(^4^1\) Fifth-century literature gives some insight into the status expected of women. According to the testimony of Sophocles' Ajax (293) and Antigone (61, 578), Thucydides' History (2.45), and Aristophanes' Lysistrata (514ff.), a woman should

(1) be silent, (2) remember that she is a woman,
(3) stay at home, and (4) be devoted to her husband and family. Later, Xenophon (Oec. 7.5) declares that a girl up to the age of fifteen should be trained to see and hear as little as possible and ask as few questions as possible; the hope was that such qualities learned as a child would extend into her adult life. A woman's position, however, was neither degraded or miserable. The world outside her home may have enslaved her, but doubtless within the walls of her home she was the mistress and influenced her companion, husband or otherwise, in a way perhaps not unlike that portrayed in the Lysistrata. Geoffrey Woodhead assumes that women indirectly influenced the Athenian males in their rejection of Alcibiades. Moreover, because only a few women gain notoriety in Athens, namely Elpinice and Aspasia, it should not be supposed that women did not think or express themselves. In fact, there may have been a growing emancipation of women in the fifth century; but even if this is the case Aspasia and Elpinice must still have been exceptional. A woman

---


43 Elpinice was the sister of Cimon and supposedly influenced Pericles' decision to recall Cimon from exile; see Plut. Per. 28.
did not make public declamations and appearances; these were considered a breach of propriety, and such transgressions caused talk, particularly in male circles. Herodotus, who describes the review of Xerxes' troops and gives a compendium of the Persian commanders at Dorsicus, gives credence to this view. He refuses to give a list of the subordinate officers but one, and his reason is as follows: 'There is no need for me to mention all the other subordinate officers, but there is one name which I cannot omit—that is Artemisia. It seems to me a strange and interesting thing that she—a woman (italics are mine)—should have taken part in the campaign against Greece.'

To judge from the reports concerning Aspasia's genius, Aspasia is elevated from the ordinary. She taught and, in fact, she taught the **homme d'état**. This caused talk, and it was only a matter of time until the comic writers included such gossip in their plays.

A second reason for the excoriation of Aspasia, which far outweighs her reported intellectual ability, is her link with Pericles; to state the obvious, ultimately

---

this is the primary reason for the interest in her found in the ancient literature. The pages of history are filled with the names of first ladies; Cleopatra, Messalina, and Agrippina in antiquity; in more recent times, Josephine, Martha Washington, and Mary Lincoln. Their fame, like that of Aspasia, is intimately connected with the leading men of their era. We have seen how criticism of Aspasia was generally accompanied by the mention of Pericles or his policies. That the ancients did not even bother to record her death is indicative of the importance of Pericles in their relationship; he is the key to the understanding of the censure of Aspasia.

Criticism of first ladies is often made because of a reaction of the public towards a piece of legislature which was passed by her husband, and Aspasia is no exception. The passage of a bill by Pericles on the domestic front lies at the basis of much of the hostility towards her.

45 Compare Eleanor Roosevelt's support for the A.Y.C. (American Youth Congress) and the criticism it brought her. See R. Black, Eleanor Roosevelt (New York: 1940), pp. 222-244.

46 This conclusion will be confirmed by an inquiry into the citizenship law of 451/50; the date at which the relationship between Aspasia and Pericles began; the nature of the criticism directed at Aspasia; and the date at which such reproof started.
In 451/50 Pericles passed a law which attempted to define the concept of citizenship. The exact nature of the law is unfortunately very obscure. The basic ancient evidence is provided by Aristotle (Ath. Pol. 26.4) who states that "in the archonship of Antidotus, in consequence of the increasing number of citizens, it was decreed, on a motion of Pericles, that a person should not have the rights of citizenship unless both of his parents had been citizens." Others, notably Plutarch, Aelian, and the Suda, merely record the inception of the law but provide no further information. Thus a great deal of debate rages about the reason for the law and the mechanics and the extent of its operation.

Before the establishment of the citizenship law, presumably intermarriage with members of the other states was possible; this is particularly true among the aristocrats, and examples of notables participating in such

---


48 Aelian NH 6.10; 13.24; the Suda, s.v. δημοσοίτους Plut. Per. 37.5.

49 Of all the literature existing on the subject of Pericles' law of 451/50, F. Jacoby, Die Fragmenten der Griechischen Historiker (Leiden: 1950), part 3 B, 1, pp. 471-482 is the only one which attempts to discuss thoroughly the mechanics of the law.
marriages are very numerous. Although we are acquainted with the marriages only in the ruling class, there is no reason to assume a different practice and different attitudes among the other classes in Athens.

The law of 451/50 reflects a change in this attitude of tolerance, for the law *per se* was directed against the children from the marriages of Athenians with foreign women. After the passage of the law, if such a union occurred, the resulting children were called bastards and had no political rights.

Pericles' restriction of citizenship surely was met with opposition but none of the discussion, either public or private, has come down to us. It is inconceivable that his political opponents kept silent about the law. Criticism must have been general and widespread, and these feelings of opposition and concern found their voice in the gossip of the street, gossip which certainly questioned Pericles' motives and scrutinized his actions immediately before and after 451/50. Unfortunately for Pericles, his involvement with Aspasia, a Milesian, began this time.

---

50 Cylon married the daughter of the tyrant of Megara (Thucy.1.126.3); Pisistratis married an Argive (Hdt. 5.94); Themistocles' mother was an Acarnanian (Plut. Them. 1). The Alcmaeonidae are connected by marriage with the lords of Sicyon; the Philaidae with the Cypselids.
To determine the terminus post quem for the liaison between Aspasia and Pericles, Callias, the son of Pericles' first wife, must be considered. The known facts about Callias are few: (1) he was born before his mother married Pericles, and his father's name was Hipponicus (Plut. Per. 24.5); (2) he was elected general at Athens in 391 (Xen. Hell. 5.13); and (3) he was a member of an Athenian embassy to Sparta in 371 (Xen. Hell. 6.3.2.3). Accepting as a fact that generals were elected in Athens between the ages of forty and thirty, Callias' date of birth may be placed tentatively between the years 431-421. But these dates are not acceptable for two reasons. First, Callias is criticised in Eupolis' Colaces for his luxury and his riotous way of living. The date of this play is fixed in 421. Eupolis would hardly denounce a baby or a ten-year-old child for his luxury and fast life. Secondly, Callias is associated with Xanthippus and Paralus, Pericles' two sons and his half-brothers (Plato

51 Kirchner, op. cit., 1, no. 7826.

52 Gomme, Andrews, Dover, op. cit., 5, p. 13 for the ancient evidence concerning the election of generals in Athens.

53 Max. Tyr. 20.8, "Callias...was caricatured by Eupolis at the Dionysia for being the prey of flatterers at his dinner parties, where the prize consisted of cups, courtesans, and other low and slavish pleasures." See J.M. Edmonds, The Fragments of Greek Comedy (Leiden: 1957), 1, pp. 369-381.
Protag. 315a). Both died in the plague of 430, and both were young men. Xanthippus in fact was married (Plut. Per. 36.1-3). Since Callias was born earlier he must be older than either of them and therefore the dates between 431-421 are completely out of the question.

That Callias was born before 450 is confirmed by the date of birth for Xanthippus, who died in the plague of 430 while still a young man. The question is, of course, how young he was when he died. The only clue is that Xanthippus was married. But there was no formal law in Athens governing the minimum age of marriage. Hesiod recommended that a man be thirty before he marry (Works 696-98); fourth-century philosophers advocated acceptance of Hesiod's age limit. Men, however, never married before they reached legal puberty, i.e., at the age of eighteen, and generally they preferred to wait until after they finished the two years ephebia. Therefore the limits for marriage at the earliest in Athens


56 Flacelière, op. cit., pp. 59-60. See also W.K. Lacey, The Family in Classical Greece (New York: 1968), pp. 106-07; Lacey, however, accepts the age of thirty as the normal age for marriage of males in Athens.
are from twenty to thirty which, if applied to the facts known about Xanthippus, puts his birth between 460 and 450. Just how far above 450 is a matter of speculation. Allowing that Xanthippus was born at 450 at the latest, the birth of Callias probably occurred two or three years later; this allows time for Pericles' first wife to divorce Hipponicus and marry Pericles. Busolt places Callias' birth at circa 452, and he is probably not far off the mark.57

If born at this time Callias would have been sixty-one when general in 391 and eighty-one when an ambassador in 371. These ages are rather old for service to the state, but not impossible. Compare Sophocles who offered his services to Athens at the age of fifty-three, fifty-six, and seventy-eight.58

The terminus ante quem is revealed by the same means of calculation. Pericles the Younger, the son of

57G. Busolt, Griechische Geschichte (Gotha: 1897), 3, p. 504, n.2. Busolt assumes that Pericles' first wife divorced Hipponicus around 453. "Dass ist gewiss richtig, denn einerseits kann nicht viel vor 452 geboren sein.... Anderseits Xanthippos...muss also spätestens um 450 geboren worden sein."

58Sophocles was Hellenotamias at age 53, IG 12.202; he served at Samos with Pericles at the age of 56, Plut. Per. 8, Androtion frg. 38 FGrH, Strabo 14.1.18; at the age of 78 he was Πρόδουλος to deal with the crisis after the Sicilian disaster, Arist. Rhet. 318. These ages for Sophocles are computed by accepting c. 496 as the birth of Sophocles.
Aspasia and Pericles, served as Hellenotamias in 410/09 and as general at the battle of Arginusae in 406/05, after which he was condemned to death by the Athenians. The Younger Pericles could have been born around 446 and 436; the latter date, however, may be excluded. It is reported in Plutarch that by special decree of the Athenian assembly Pericles the Younger was given his citizenship after the plague in 430. The age of Pericles' son is not given, but such honor was not granted to Athenians until they reached their eighteenth year. The silence of Plutarch on the matter of his age suggests that the illegitimate son of Aspasia and Pericles was at the age of legal puberty. Since the act mentioned by Plutarch was a special dispensation, he surely would not have overlooked the interesting fact that the Younger Pericles was under age. Plutarch's love for anecdote was too great. Therefore, it may be assumed that the Younger Pericles was around the age of eighteen when he became a citizen and was born somewhere between 447 and 445.

---

59 IG 2.304; Xen. Hell. 1.5.16; Diod. Sic. 13. 74.1. For the evidence concerning Pericles the Younger, see Kirchner, op. cit., 2, no. 11812.

60 Plut. Per. 37.5.

61 Busolt, op. cit., p. 509. n.2 places the birth of the Younger Pericles "nicht später als 440/39...etwa auf 445."
Hence, we can pinpoint the time in which Aspasia and Pericles began their relationship to the period between 453 and 447-445. Most scholars place their union after 451/50, assuming that Pericles would not sponsor a law which restricted marriage with foreigners and, at the same time, be involved with a Milesian, a situation which flaunted the spirit if not the letter of his own law. In addition, there is a theory that imagines Aspasia to have met Pericles through an intermediary Hippodamus, the architect from Miletus who designed the Piraeus for Pericles. Hippodamus was in Athens around 450-448; thus the meeting of Pericles and Aspasia is put between 449 and 445.62

It is only tenuous conjecture to suppose that Aspasia met Pericles by the help of Hippodamus. The birth of Pericles the Younger, however, shows that Aspasia and Pericles were living together in the early 440's. But they may have lived together some years previously. Pericles and his first wife separated by mutual consent and immediately afterwards Péicles associated himself with Aspasia on a permanent basis. It seems not too far-fetched

that the mutual consent had a cause: perhaps it was Aspasia. The exact date for the separation of Pericles from his first wife cannot be precisely known, but it falls probably somewhere between the years 451-447. It is clear that Aspasia began her relationship with Pericles well within the memory of the citizenship law of 451/50. Considering the temperament of Pericles' opponents and the obvious opportunity afforded by his personal life, there can be little doubt that the criticism of Aspasia is a reflection of the impact of the definition of citizenship upon the Athenians. And, as fate would have it, an occasion for the outward expression of hostility towards the statesman and his lady came in 445. At this time a supply of grain was donated to Athens by a Libyan prince, and the gift was to be divided among citizens of the city. But before the dole was made, a survey of the lists of citizens was drawn up, presumably to insure that only legitimate Athenians would have a share in the good fortune. A large number of people were withdrawn from the lists, although there is

---

63 M. Delacourt, Pericles (Paris: 1940), pp. 76-77 postulates that Aspasia and Pericles met around 453 "mais il ne pouvait l'épouser..."; also see Homo, op. cit., pp. 78-79.

64 Plut. Per. 37.4; Philochorus frg. 119, FGrH; schol. Aristoph. Wasps. 718.
a discrepancy in the figures which are found in the tradition. Surely the criteria used to prove citizenship were the conditions laid down in the law of 451/50. The scrutiny of 445 is viewed by most scholars as an application of Pericles' definition of citizenship; the question debated is whether the revision of the lists in 445 was the first application of the law. Certainly the existence of such a law would be driven home both to legitimate Athenians and to imposters who were at that time disfranchised. The varied reactions of the public became a source from which the comedians drew their jokes.

Personal slander of Aspasia was used to denounce Pericles' citizenship law. Cratinus, to describe Aspasia, used παλακτί a common word which denoted any woman who lived with a man with γυναῖκα, the legal contract of

---


marriage between a man and a woman in Athens.\textsuperscript{67} It is a social rather than a legal conception. A courtesan could be a slave kept for sexual pleasure or a free woman cohabiting in an informal union with a man who kept her in place of a wife.\textsuperscript{68} Such practices were common in Athens. But forgetting the technical explanation of the term and the popularity of such women in Athens, strong condemnation of Aspasia is meant by calling her a courtesan, particularly since the juxtaposition of καταμυγοσύνη and κόνωπις in the fragment shows the intenseness with which it was made: "unnatural lust" and "shameless" imply bitterness that Pericles would associate himself with Aspasia after the passage of the law in 451/50.\textsuperscript{69}

Aristophanes later recalls this bitterness when he calls Aspasia a strumpet, and his reference to


\textsuperscript{68}Wolff, op. cit., pp. 70-75 in discussing the informal union which existed between a male and a courtesan in Athens perhaps describes the type of union that existed between Aspasia and Pericles.

\textsuperscript{69}Plut. Per. 24-25. The last word κόνωπις "dog-eyed" is a comic perversion of κυάνωπις "dark-eyed" and carries with it a meaning of disrespect. Cf. Homer, Il. 3.180; Od. 4.145.
Aspasia's brothel is probably based on the criticism of Pericles' citizenship law.\textsuperscript{70} Also, as popularity of Pericles diminished towards the end of the 430's and the critics of his policies mounted force, the idea that Aspasia was a panderer for Pericles was presented to the public, a great part of whom were ready to accept the condemnation.\textsuperscript{71} The result of this sentiment was perhaps indictment of Aspasia on a charge of impiety, a charge which finds its origin in the years of criticism concerning the citizenship law. Since Pericles passed this bill and immediately violated it, his opponents probably argued that his nature was proven immoral and that his lust for women was clearly shown.

Thus political, not only moral, overtones are found in the references to Aspasia's social position in Athens. The criticism aimed at her condemns the domestic policy of Pericles, doubtless begun and fostered by the political opponents of the statesman. The fact that such remarks are repeated by the comedians does not necessarily reflect condemnation on their part also; the way to get a laugh was to present what was being said on the streets.

\textsuperscript{70}Aristoph. Acharn. 526-529.
\textsuperscript{71}Plut. Per. 32.
Later generations, including our own, have forgotten the political tenor of these remarks and concentrated upon the fascinating problem of the status of Aspasia in Athens. The ancients employed several terms to describe the role of Aspasia in this relationship: lover, courtesan, and wife. Modern scholars have tried to identify the type of relation enjoyed by Pericles and Aspasia by analyzing the Greek vocabulary used to describe their liaison. But arguments from semantics prove nothing definite about Aspasia's affiliation with Pericles. Thus, not content with leaving unexplained the relationship that existed between Pericles and Aspasia and basically wanting to clear Pericles from any hint of scandal, some assume that they entered into a morganatic

72 Busolt, op. cit., pp. 505-08, n.5 concludes "Aspasia war keine ζώνη εγγυητή und συνεκκομε dem Perikles nicht κατά τούς νόμους, sie stand jedoch zu ihm in einem solchen Verhältnisse, dass sie von den Komikern als seine Hera oder Deianeira verspottet werden konnte." Mackenzie, op. cit., p. 210 analyzes the Greek used by Plutarch to denote the relationship of Pericles and Aspasia: τὴν Ἀσπασίαν λαβὼν ἔστερες διαφερόντως. He shows that λαμβάνω in the middle and not in the active is used to express marriage. στεργω implies a contented love but the qualifying adverb διαφερόντως indicates an unusual, unique relationship. Mackenzie thinks that Pericles never married Aspasia.

The verbs used elsewhere to express the relation between Pericles and Aspasia are neutral. Athenaeus used οἰκέω; Lucian used σύνειμι. Both imply cohabitation without any qualifications, i.e., legal or illegal. For a discussion of the terms used to denote marriage in Athens, see Wolff, op. cit., pp. 46-53, 65-68; Harrison, loc. cit.
marriage which Homo, in his book entitled Périclès, describes as:

... un semblable mariage, contracté avec une étrangère, était juridiquement reconnu par la loi athénienne; les enfants qui en naissaient étaient légitimes et, en cette qualité, avaient la jouissance de tous les droits civils. Une seule limitation, mais d'importance: considérés comme bâtards au point de vue politique, ils ne possédaient pas pleinement le droit de cité.\textsuperscript{73}

Such an explanation attributes to Pericles the morals of a Victorian statesman. There is no need to assume that Pericles married Aspasia; he may have lived with her without any pretext of marriage. To say that Pericles was involved in such an association does not degrade in any way the picture handed down by Thucydides: it only shows that he was human. It is best to admit that the exact status of their union cannot be determined.

The other references to Aspasia, like the references to her social life, attacked Pericles indirectly. The majority of the criticism directed towards Aspasia denounced Pericles as one who is dependent upon the judgment of a woman, i.e., Aspasia was the power behind Pericles and he was completely mesmerized by her. The fragment which speaks of their association as teacher and

\textsuperscript{73}Homo, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 77.
student is an example of this type of criticism. Although there may be a grain of truth in the representation of Aspasia as a teacher of some note, the dependency of a student on his teacher is the idea stressed.

Name-calling constitutes another means of reproof directed ultimately against Pericles. Aspasia was called Hera, Helen, Omphale, and Deianira. The name Hera implies that Pericles (like Zeus) was tending towards absolute power, and that Aspasia influenced Pericles in his aspirations. Thus "queen ruled with king", and in addition Aspasia held sway over Pericles as Hera beguiled Zeus with her sex in the fourteenth book of Homer's Iliad. As Hera altered the course of the Trojan War, so Aspasia influenced Pericles' foreign policy: she was the cause of the Megarian Decree. Later, i.e., after the fifth century, Aspasia's influence over Pericles was magnified in the literature--she caused the outbreak of the Samian War, just as she had earlier been held responsible for the Megarian Decree. This association with the Samian War, however, may be explained as reasoning

74 Schol. Plato Menex. 235e.

75 See above p. 6. In addition, Edmonds, op. cit. p. 997 conjectures that the name ῥανοδαμωνα was also used to criticize Aspasia.
from known facts to general conclusions. This war in 439 was a conflict between Miletus and Mytilene. Since Aspasia was from Miletus, the growth of the fiction is not difficult to understand: Aspasia favored the Milesians and used her powers of persuasion to cause Pericles to declare war in their favor. These accusations are illustrative of the criticism which is outwardly aimed at Aspasia, and directed towards Pericles.

The other names given to Aspasia illustrate this tendency also. To be called Helen implies that Aspasia, like Helen, was the cause of war, pestilence, and death for Athenians. The designation Omphale, the queen of Lydia whom Heracles had to serve as slave, creates the impression vividly that Pericles was the servus amoris. The name Deianira conjures up the ironical image of a faithful, trustworthy, and patient wife. The irony is immense if the statement is made with the citizenship law in mind. Moreover, to equate Aspasia with the wife of Heracles implies that Aspasia would cause or was causing the downfall of her beloved, a hope shared by many Athenians. Then too there is irony in the implied equation of Pericles with Heracles.

When such attacks upon Aspasia and Pericles began is unclear. The mentions of Aspasia occur in comic fragments which cannot be dated precisely. The Cheirons
of Cratinus, which has as its theme education, but incorporates as well attacks upon luxury and criticism of Pericles and Aspasia, is usually placed around 436-431 because of the mention of Aspasia in the fragments. Looking for a historical situation which is appropriate for the intense criticism of Aspasia and Pericles, most scholars consider the latter part of the 430's. At this time Pericles was greatly disliked and eventually dismissed from office. But the rebuke of Aspasia found in Cratinus' play suggests, I believe, an earlier date.

The criticism directed towards Aspasia is personal: "Unnatural lust bore to him Aspasia Hera, a shameless whore." The reaction of the people to Pericles' citizenship law would produce such an outcry. This criticism may not have begun immediately after the passage of the bill in 451/50; time must be given for the political opponents to organize their forces. In addition, if the bill was outwardly enacted because of the insistence of the demos, it would have won immediate acceptance. But after the scrutiny of the citizen body in 445, the time was ripe for outward criticism of Pericles; it is an excellent time for Cratinus' remark.

---

76 Edmonds, op. cit., p. 105, note d.
77 Plut. Per. 24-25.
Another play of Cratinus which probably alluded to Pericles and Aspasia, although neither is mentioned by name, is the Nemesis. Oellacher puts its production at 445; Edmonds, agreeing with Geissler, dates it to 429.\textsuperscript{78} This latter date is favored because it suits better the identification of the characters with contemporary figures in 429.\textsuperscript{79} Zeus is equated with Pericles; Nemesis, also called Leda, is Aspasia; the egg resulting from the union of Zeus and Nemesis alludes to Pericles the Younger; and Zeus foisting Helen (the issue from the egg, i.e., the Younger Pericles) on Tydareus mocks the fact that Pericles asked for citizenship for his bastard in 430. These interpretations, however, hold good for an earlier date as well, with only one slight modification. Zeus' insistence that Tyndareus care for his illegitimate


offspring may also be interpreted as the birth of Pericles the Younger to Aspasia and Pericles after the passage of the law which labeled him a bastard. The Athenians may have felt that this illegitimate child was forced on them. One fragment seems to mock this situation:

Zeus (Pericles): 'Look Leda, this is your job; come I beg. Be a good hen and sit upon this egg and hatch us a nice fine chick.'

Hence the Nemesis may have been produced around the time of the passage of the citizenship law. Godolphin, however, has pointed out that mention of Lampon found in the other fragments of the same play cannot be dated before 444/43. Therefore, I would place the production of the Nemesis at this time. The situation is perfect for this type of mockery: the scrutiny of 445 has just taken place, and therefore the public had in its mind's eye the Younger Pericles and the citizenship law of 451/50; and open attacks upon Pericles' policies have been made which resulted in the ostracism of Thucydides the son of Melesias. Cratinus based his humor on the identifications of the characters of the play with the people talked about most in 444.

---

80 Edmonds, _op. cit._, fr. 110.
81 Godolphin, _op. cit._, p. 425.
The last fragment from Old Comedy which refers to Aspasia indirectly is from Eupolis' *Demes*. Here the Younger Pericles is called a bastard. Fortunately the date of the play is established by references to the expedition to Mantinea (which puts the play after 418) and to the re-peopling of the Long Walls (an event which is dated by scholars at 413). The consensus of opinion puts the *Demes* around 412/11. At this time the citizenship law of Pericles was discussed openly and, as mentioned above, Pericles the Younger was in the public's eye: he would be elected Hellenotamias in the following year. Eupolis' remark is probably connected with these events in some way.

The limits, therefore, placed on the literary criticism of Aspasia are circa 445 to 411. The interim between these dates was filled with references to Aspasia. Plutarch says that "the comedians called her New Omphale, Deianira, and Helen." The source and date for such remarks are unknown. But the fact that Plutarch mentions

---

84 Plut. *ibid.*
comedians in an indefinite way indicates how many times Aspasia was subject to their abuse.

Within these years, Eupolis produced his *Friends* and *Prospaltians*, and Callias brought out his *Men in Fetters*; all these plays mentioned Aspasia, and they are dated to the latter half of the 430's for this reason. They may, however, be dated earlier; the late 430's are not the only time appropriate for such remarks. The only fixed date for criticism of Aspasia which can be established during these years is 425. In this year Aristophanes produced his *Acharnians* which slandered Aspasia and blamed her for the Peloponnesian War.

Literary criticism of Aspasia begins in the period when Pericles was at his height in Athens. Viewed from a historical context, political hues show in this comic presentation of Aspasia from the beginning.

---

85 Edmonds, *op. cit.*, pp. 175, 401, 409.
CHAPTER II

DAMON AND DAMONIDES

The major issue presented by the tradition concerning one associate of Pericles is the problem of his identity. A total of twelve authors, spanning the years from the fourth century B.C. to the fifth century A.D., speak of this friend of Pericles, and the majority of these refer to him as Damon. In two works, however, a certain Damonides is mentioned, whom modern historians insist upon equating with Damon. Do these two names refer to the same person, or do they indicate as ancient testimony implies, two individuals?

Testimony concerning Damonides, found in Aristotle's Athenian Constitution, reveals that he was a political advisor of Pericles and that Pericles, because of the prompting of Damonides, began the payment of jurymen in order to compete with Cimon for the affection of the Athenians.¹ A member of the deme Oa, Damonides was

¹DK 37 A 6; H. Diels, Die Fragments der Vorsokrater (Berlin: 1935) I, pp. 381-384 has collected the ancient testimonies for Damon. I shall use Diel's enumeration throughout this chapter.
afterwards ostracised at some undetermined time which Aristotle glosses by the word "later," because he was thought to be the "author of many things." Plutarch, in the ninth chapter of his Life of Pericles, repeats the same story and states that his source was Aristotle. According to these authors, then, the association of Pericles and Damonides may be placed firmly in the late 450's at which time the payment of jurymen was legislated. Beyond the evidence found in Aristotle and Plutarch, the only other mention of Damonides' name is by Stephanus, whose testimony is discussed below.

The information about Damon is extensive when compared to the two references to Damonides. Ten writers give various details concerning Damon, but all unanimously agree that Damon was a teacher of music and one of the accepted authorities on the subject during the fifth century B.C. Numbered among his students were Pericles and Socrates; Damon, in fact, is said to have associated with Pericles just as a trainer and teacher associates with athletes. Damon also was acquainted with Prodicus, a

\[2\]DK 37 A 6.

\[3\]DK 37 A 2, 4, 5, 7, 8. B 1, 2, 6, 7; Plato Axiochus 364b.

\[4\]DK 37 A 3, 5, 7; Plut. Aristid. 7.8; Nic. 6.1.
famous sophist who specialized in linguistics. In fact, Plutarch goes so far as to say that Damon was a sophist, who concealed his sophistry under the veil of music.

Damon's musical doctrine apparently taught the importance of the influence of music on laws, constitutions, and human behavior. According to this theory, which may be called the theory of musical ethos, the study of music not only affected the emotions of the student but also inculcated certain virtues such as courage, self-restraint, and justice. On a larger plane Damon insisted that changes in music were accompanied by changes in government, and Socrates declared that he firmly believed in Damon's theory.

Damon, however, was not praised for his musical genius alone; he was thought to be very versatile in other areas and particularly worthy to associate with

---

5DK 37 A 2.
6DK 37 A 4.
7DK 37 B 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8.
9DK 37 B 2, 3, 4.
10DK 37 B 9.
young men.\textsuperscript{11} Intellectually, Damon was called the most brilliant of the men of his time.\textsuperscript{12} He perhaps incorporated his theories in a work called \textit{Areopagiticon}.\textsuperscript{13}

Damon was ostracised for reasons which are varied: (1) his teaching seemed extraordinary; and (2) he, a sophist, was a "great schemer" and a "lover of tyranny."\textsuperscript{14} There is no early literary evidence for the date of Damon's ostracism; Plutarch is the only ancient authority, and he refers to the event in three different \textit{Lives}.\textsuperscript{15} A potsherd discovered in the Ceramicus, which bears the name of Damon, reinforces the ancient testimony.\textsuperscript{16}

Thus, similarities exist in the details concerning Damon and Damonides: both were associates of Pericles, both were ostracised. But in the tradition each is treated as a separate individual. Writers of antiquity never attribute musical talent to Damonides, nor is Damon

\begin{footnotes}
\item[12]DK 37 A 3.
\item[13]DK 37 A 8.
\item[14]DK 37 A 4; Plut. \textit{Aristid.} 7.8.
\item[16]A. Brueckner, "Mitteilungen aus dem Kerameikos," \textit{Ath. Mitt.}, 40 (1925), pp. 20-21, No. 50; IG 1\textsuperscript{2} 912; SEG, 10, 370; SEG, 15, 77; M. Tod, A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions (Oxford: 1946), 1, pp. 92-93.
\end{footnotes}
ever credited with the introduction of payment to juries. Moreover, there is evidence that Damon and Damonides were distinguished in antiquity. Stephanus, in his discussion of the Attic deme Oa, relates that a member of these deme was called "one from Oa" and gives as an example Damon, son of Damonides, from Oa.17 The potsherd, which provides empirical evidence for Damon's ostracism, reaffirms Stephanus's observation: the name inscribed on the sherd is Damon and, importantly, his patronymic, the son of Damonides, is attached.18 Damonides and Damon, therefore, were not merely different names applied to the same person; they were father and son.

The confusion between Damon and Damonides is modern, not ancient, in its origin. Equation of the two was first made in 1879 by Wilamowitz,19 who argued that Damon was not alive in the latter half of the fifth century because his teacher, Agathocles who also taught Pindar, belonged to the early fifth century. According

---

17DK 37 A 1.

18ΔΑΜΟΝ ΔΑΜΟΝΙΔΟ; see Brueckner, loc. cit.

to Wilamowitz, Damon flourished in the 460's and was, thus, the political advisor of Pericles, who is named as Damonides. Elaborate theories have been put forth by scholars who, along with Wilamowitz, equate Damon and Damonides. But most of these theories, like that of Wilamowitz, involve conjectural interpolations or other devious manipulations of the evidence for support. These devices are ingenious but hardly solve the problem, particularly since they cannot erase the inscription on a fifth century sherd.

In the final analysis, the arguments of Wilamowitz and his adherents (Brueckner, Martin, and Carcopino) are based on erroneous chronological premises. The insistence of the tradition that Damon was Pericles' teacher has inspired the inference that a young Pericles studied


21Wilamowitz, loc. cit., and Martin, loc. cit., wish to emend Arist. Ath. Pol. 27.4 to read "Damon, son of Damonides." Carcopino, op. cit., p. 140 supposes that the statement concerning Damonides' ostracism found in Aristotle is an interpolation. For an opposite view see A.E. Raubitschek, "Damon," Classica et Mediaevalia, 16 (1955), 83.
under an older teacher, Damon; this inference, although never openly stated in these tortured theories, stands as the basis for the coalescence of Damon and Damonides.

Such reasoning, however, does not prove true when placed on the touchstone. First, there is ambivalence among the ancients concerning Pindar's teachers. Agathocles is mentioned in the ancient vitae along with two others, Apollodorus and Lasus of Hermione. Thus it is not an indisputable fact that Agathocles was the teacher of the youthful Pindar. But if this were the case, it is certainly possible that Agathocles' career extended well into the fifth century and that Damon came under his tutelage in the early years of the fifth century. Indeed, as we shall see presently, there is a possibility that Damon did not study under Agathocles at all; and it is not impossible, although it is highly conjectural, that Pindar studied under Agathocles in c.478 when the Theban revisited Athens. Wilamowitz and his school accept the tradition that makes Agathocles the teacher of Pindar to make their equation of Damon with Damonides more convincing.

---

22 See A.B. Drachmann, Scholia Vetera in Pindari Carmina (Leipzig: 1903) for the references in the Vitae.

Another reason for doubting the placement of Damon in the formative years of Pericles is that the term "teacher" may be used erroneously with regard to Damon. Plutarch, in his Life of Pericles (4), comments on the confusion concerning the music teacher of the youthful Pericles: "the majority says that Damon was Pericles' teacher of music...but Aristotle maintains that the man learned music from Pythoclides." The "majority" to which Plutarch refers is unidentifiable. No doubt Plutarch had at his disposal texts which have been lost; but we must deal with extant statements, and a survey of those which precede Plutarch reveals no concensus.

The first to be considered is Plato Comicus, who is quoted by Plutarch to show that Damon was the teacher of Pericles and that he was criticised, as most important people in Athens were, by the comedians. Plutarch attributes the reference in the two lines h. quotes from Plato Comicus to Damon, who as the teacher of Pericles is compared to Chiron. But there is no mention of Damom in the fragment itself; and we have only Plutarch's word that the reference to Chiron is, in fact, an allusion to Damon.

Plato Comicus is a younger contemporary of Aristophanes. For this reason I place him first, but with the realization that he was also a contemporary of the philosopher, Plato. As for the date of the fragment, see Edmonds, op. cit., p. 551, note b. Edmonds dates the fragment to 399 and assigns it to the Daedalus.
But even if such an allusion is valid, it need not be taken as absolute fact. As we have seen in the chapter on Aspasia, allusions to her as a teacher of Pericles indicate that she was only associated with Pericles in an influential way. The same may very well hold true for Damon.

In the dialogues of Plato, mentions of Damon occur frequently; he is a teacher of music and responsible for certain musical theories. In one dialogue only, Alcibiades Maior (118c), does Plato associate Damon with Pericles. In discussing Pericles' education, Alcibiades says to Socrates: "It is said, Socrates, that he (Pericles) did not become wise automatically, but from association with many wise men, both Pythoclides and Anaxagoras. And now still, at his age (referring to Pericles), he is associated with Damon for the same purpose." It is obvious that Plato places both Pythoclides and Damon among the associates of Pericles; but it is most important to realize that Plato implies that Pythoclides was an earlier teacher than Damon and that Pericles is older than Damon.

Isocrates must be numbered among Plutarch's "majority," for he says that Pericles was the student of
two men, Anaxagoras and Damon. Yet the majority which is invoked by Plutarch, is elusive, and confusion concerning the teacher of Pericles and the position of Damon in the statesman's education is apparent. Plato's statement above makes Pythoccles an earlier teacher than Damon; but in Plato's Laches (180 D) Nicias speaks of Damon as a student of Agathocles, a fact noted by Wilmott. On the other hand, the scholiast on Plato's Alcibiades identifies a school of musical thought founded by Pythoccles and numbered among its adherents are Agathocles, Lamprocles, and Damon. From the wording of the scholiast's statement, Damon is the last in a series of the followers of Pythoccles: Agathocles studied with Pythoccles and taught Lamprocles, who in turn taught Damon. Obviously there are variants in the tradition concerning Damon's teacher. To judge from the confusion exhibited in the testimony concerning Damon (and in the vitae of Pindar as well) musicians of antiquity were often carelessly identified, particularly if they belonged to the same school of thought.

Damon instructed Pericles, as Isocrates testifies. But it is important to note that Isocrates does not

25DK 37 A 3.

26DK 37 A 2.
indicate Damon's age, and we need not infer that Damon was Pericles' first music teacher. Indeed Plato all but says that he was not. Pericles may have developed an appreciation for music under the guidance of Pythoclides, an interest which continued throughout his lifetime. This assumption is justified by Plutarch's statement that Pericles had "a thorough musical training."27 In his later years, Pericles followed with interest the musical theories of Damon who, once a student of the same school, nourished the musical training of their youth. Thus the two men became friends, Damon entered into the intellectual circle that surrounded Pericles, and the statesman continued his musical education as an associate of Damon. Damon's entrance into the "Scipionic circle" that surrounded Pericles was probably not difficult. Not only was he a student of the school of music in which Pericles had studied, but his father, Damonides, was a personal friend and advisor of Pericles. In time the positions of Pythoclides and Damon were interchanged, and the anachronism which Plutarch affirms was established. Plutarch, however, may have deliberately suppressed the tradition of Damon's connection with Pythoclides; his assertion that Damon hid his sophistry under the veil of music apparently stems

27DK 37 A 4.
from the tradition reflected in Plato's *Protagoras* (316e). In this dialogue, Protagoras explains his method of teaching to Socrates and says that music was the disguise used by many sophists, namely, Agathocles, Pythoclides, and many more. Judging from the statement of Plutarch, Damon may have been included in the "many more." If so Damon was associated with Pythoclides, but Plutarch, for some reason, failed to mention their association. Perhaps he wanted to correct the confusion concerning the teacher of Pericles with an unqualified conclusion: Damon was Pericles' music teacher.

From the above discussion it becomes evident that the reasons, based solely on student-teacher relationship, for assigning Damon to the early fifth century are less certain than Wilamowicz supposed. His argument, when scrutinized closely, cannot stand. Recent scholarship has tried to bring Damon down into the latter half of the fifth century, a position more in line with the tradition. Beloch argues that Damon was alive during the Peloponnesian War and that he was younger, not older, than Pericles. In his article "Damon," A.E. Raubitschek, using the dramatic settings of Plato's dialogues as the

---

28 K.J. Beloch, *Griechische Geschichte* (Strasburg: 1914), 2, p. 373, n.1. Beloch assumes that Damon and Damonides are separate individuals.
basis of his argument, has shown that the activity of Damon in Athens spans the last thirty years of the fifth century. Therefore, there is no need to put Damon in the formative years of Pericles' education; above all, there is no need to assume that Damon and Damonides are one, a modern assertion which flies in the face of all the cogent ancient testimony.

Damonides and Damon then were separate and distinct individuals and both again according to the ancient evidence were ostracised. These ostracisms have also been questioned by modern historians. The evidence for them, as we have seen is meagre. Aristotle and Plutarch are the only authors who mention the ostracisms and there is the ostracon bearing the name "Damon son of Damonides." This evidence has been variously interpreted. Some scholars equate Damon and Damonides and note Plutarch's remark that his evidence for Damonides' ostracism came from Aristotle. Thus, they insist that Plutarch interpolated Aristotle's statement and created a separate person, Damon, who was ostracised; the argument is that the single ostracon indicates nothing more than that one Athenian at some time thought that Damon should be

29 Raubitschek, op. cit., pp. 79-81.
30 DK 37 A 6; see above, n. 16.
ostracised. 31 Otherstreat Damon and Damonides as different people and place their faith in the reality of Damon's ostracism, which they would date in the late 430's. Aristotle then is mistaken when he states Damonides was ostracised, and ὄστερον in Aristotle reveals that he was thinking about Damon's ostracism and falsely appended it to the career of Damonides. 32

In my opinion, both arguments are unconvincing. The first is based on the erroneous assumption that Damon and Damonides are one and the same; a theory I have already disproven. It is true that only one ostracon exists, but it is not the only evidence for Damon's ostracism. Raubitschek's assumption (representative of the argument of the second group) that Aristotle's use of ὄστερον disproves Damonides' ostracism is questionable. By using the adverb, Aristotle only indicates that Damonides was ostracised at some time after the passage of the law which gave payment to juries; he is not necessarily telescoping events. There were two men, Damon and Damonides, and both were ostracised.


32 Raubitschek, op. cit., pp. 81-83.
There are no precise dates given for the attacks on Damon and Damonides. Aristotle's testimony, however, suggests a possible time for Damonides' ostracism. He mentions that Damonides had a hand in the striking reform that initiated the system of payment for judicial service. The precise date for this measure is uncertain, but 451 is generally accepted by historians. Since Aristotle suggests that Damonides' ostracism occurred after the enactment of this law, the action may be placed after 451. The following years down to 444 were difficult ones for Pericles. We have noted that his other constitutional reform, the citizenship law, met with criticism and that Aspasia was particularly maligned because of it. Also, Pericles' use of allied money to beautify Athens was resisted by the opponents of Pericles led by Thucydides, son of Melesias; this criticism certainly had been voiced by 447 when the Parthenon was begun. An attack on Damonides would fit well into this troubled period. The legislation suggested by Damonides meant the assumption of the principle of equal opportunity for all. In effect, the law allowed the majority of the citizen body

---

to take an active part in the work of administration. Such privileges, previously the birthright of aristocrats, would meet disfavor from that quarter; and in the melee of political opponents of the mid 440's, Damonides certainly would be a prime target for those wishing to protest Pericles' policies. Damonides' platform would be particularly obnoxious to Thucydides, son of Melesias, who may very well have had a hand in his downfall. Thus, Damonides' ostracism may perhaps be placed between c.447- and c.445, just before the elimination of Thucydides.

I have stated that the activity of Damon in Athens belongs to the last thirty years of the fifth century. Raubitschek, using indirect evidence, has shown that Damon's ostracism occurred in the late 430's; and I concur with his judgment. Mention of Damon appears in the Platonic dialogues Alcibiades Maior and Laches, whose dramatic dates are c. 430 and c.420 respectively. Other mentions of Damon by Plato are in dramatic settings later than 420. According to Raubitschek, Damon could have been ostracised c. 430 and returned to Athens c. 420. Moreover, a passage from Pseudo-Xenophon possibly refers to the ostracism of Damon. The writer says, "the people have driven the practice of music out of fashion in

34Raubitschek, loc. cit.
Athens, ostensively on moral grounds...."35 Damon's method of teaching music, i.e. music had political significance, was one of the reasons for his ostracism. The downfall of Damon could signify the end of music and thus be the reason behind the above remark. Unfortunately, the date for the pamphlet is not certain. All that can be known about the work is that (1) the author was perhaps an Athenian, who wrote in wartime; and (2) the pamphlet was composed when the Athenian navy was unmolested and her empire intact.36 Such conditions suit anytime between 431 and 413. There is no reason why the work could not have been written in the late 430's.

Certainly Damon's ostracism fits well into the context of the late 430's. The opposition to Pericles is strong: Cleon openly challenges Pericles' policies; Thucydides, son of Melesias, had returned and prosecuted Anaxagoras (as I shall show in Chapter 3). I should like to believe that he even went so far as to attack Damon the son of his former enemy, Damonides.

35 Pseudo-Xen. 1.13; Raubitschek, ibid.
CHAPTER III

ANAXAGORAS

A great deal of the ancient information concerning Anaxagoras' life is contradictory, but not all the particulars are discordant.\(^1\) It is best that we look at the general unanimity of the ancient writers before we discuss the areas of their disagreement. This will provide the essential background for my more immediate political concerns involving Anaxagoras and Pericles. My objectives are: (1) to show that Anaxagoras was an associate of Pericles the statesman, not of the youthful Pericles; and (2) to date the trial of Anaxagoras in the years just prior to the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War.

Anaxagoras was a native of Clazomenae\(^2\) in Asia Minor and his father's name was Hegesibulus,\(^3\) although

---

\(^1\)H. Diels, Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker (Berlin: 1935), 2, pp. 5-44; hereafter referred to as DK 59.

\(^2\)The majority of the ancient writers concur on the birthplace of Anaxagoras; see DK 59 A 1, 6, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 15, 21, 29, 34a, 41, 42, 43, 46.

\(^3\)DK 59 A 1, 6, 2, 3, 6, 36, 41, 42.
an isolated piece of evidence gives the name as Hubulus. Born into a prosperous family, Anaxagoras inherited wealth and property which he eventually spurned in order to pursue the study of nature. Once when an inquisitive person, who wondered about Anaxagoras' rejection of public affairs, asked why he did not care for his fatherland, Anaxagoras pointed to the sky and said, "My fatherland concerns me greatly." Such an incident, of course, is anecdotal; however, since Plato and Aristotle refer to Anaxagoras' lack of interest in practical matters, W.C.K. Guthrie maintains that "clearly there was factual foundation for the character of typical unworldly philosopher which he assumes in the later writers." 

Anaxagoras' vocation was the study of nature, an inclination which he asserted that he acquired at an early age. His recorded teachings show that he was true to his calling: such subjects as the construction of the...
universe, the causes of winds, thunder, lightning, and earthquakes reveal a great interest in the things of nature.\(^9\)

Many ancient writers considered Anaxagoras a student of Anaximenes;\(^{10}\) but, in all probability, the latter died before Anaxagoras was born.\(^{11}\) Therefore, it is more likely that Anaxagoras revived the philosophical spirit of the Milesian school of which Anaximenes was a prominent member. Hence, Anaxagoras in a sense may be called the student of Anaximenes. In accordance with the Milesian spirit which sought rational explanations of the universe, Anaxagoras advocated "the mind" as the rational element which set all in order.\(^{12}\) For this reason he was nicknamed "Nous" by his contemporaries.\(^{13}\)

\(^9\)DK 59 A 1.8-9; B 1-22.

\(^{10}\)DK 59 A 1.6, 2, 3, 7, 41.


\(^{12}\)DK 59 B.9, 11, 12, 13, 14.

\(^{13}\)DK 59 A 1.6, 2, 24; Zeller, op. cit., p. 327, n. 4 suggests that the term "Nous" was not necessarily one of respect or recognition.
Between the years 468-464 (the date is disputed by the tradition) a meteorite fell in the vicinity of Aegospotami, an event supposedly predicted by Anaxagoras. He also predicted an eclipse of the sun in c.462. It can be doubted that Anaxagoras foretold the fall of the meteorite. The prediction is probably a particularization of his general theory that the sun and stars were heavy bodies held aloft by force. It was natural to expect that occasionally part of them would fall. But because Anaxagoras is linked with both events for centuries later, the reputation and the fame of the philosopher are evident.

Diogenes Laertius (2.1) mentions Anaxagoras as among those philosophers who wrote only a single treatise. This work (Physica) according to Diogenes was composed "attractively and in a dignified manner." From Plato we learn that Anaxagoras' book was popular among the Athenians and that it retailed for a drachma in the theater. The subject matter of the work dealt with such

---

14DK 59 A 1.10, 6, 11, 12.

15DK 59 A 18.


17DK 59 A 1.6, 1.11, 37.

18Plato Apology 26d (DK 59 A 35).
topics as the light and shadows of the moon;\textsuperscript{19} therefore, it probably incorporated Anaxagoras' views on the first principles and his cosmology. Simplicius (sixth century A.D.) quoted several passages from Anaxagoras' treatise. But his quotations, which include the opening words, seem to be all from the first book.\textsuperscript{20} Whether Simplicius possessed the entire work is unknown.

Other writings by Anaxagoras are mentioned in the tradition. Plutarch asserts that Anaxagoras, while in prison, wrote about the squaring of the circle.\textsuperscript{21} Vitruvius speaks of a work concerning scene-painting and perspective.\textsuperscript{22} Since such remarks are in opposition to Diogenes' assertion that Anaxagoras was the author of a single treatise, the existence of these works are matters for debate. Burnet assumes that Anaxagoras beguiled his time in prison by attempting to square the circle in the dust on the floor. He regards the treatise mentioned by Vitruvius as "most improbable."\textsuperscript{23} Guthrie, however, maintains that a work on perspective and scene-painting

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{19}DK 59 A 18.
\item \textsuperscript{20}DK 59 B 1, 4.
\item \textsuperscript{21}DK 59 A 38.
\item \textsuperscript{22}DK 59 A 39.
\item \textsuperscript{23}Burnet, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 257.
\end{itemize}
by Anaxagoras is plausible.\(^2\) It is doubtful that any agreement will be reached concerning the existence of these works.

Anaxagoras left Asia Minor and settled in Athens (to be discussed at greater length later in this chapter). During his residence in Athens, Anaxagoras attracted many prominent men. Themistocles perhaps studied with Anaxagoras.\(^2\) He became an associate of Pericles, and he was considered his teacher.\(^2\) Euripides also was named as a follower of Anaxagoras. Certain fragments of the tragedian reveal his debt to the philosopher; for example, a fragment from the Phaethon speaks of the sun as a "golden clod."\(^2\) Alexander Aetolus, an elegaic poet and librarian at the court of Ptolemy Philadelphus (c. 280 B.C.), refers to the austere personality of Euripides as a direct result of his association with Anaxagoras.\(^2\) Archelaus, the teacher of Socrates, was a student of Anaxagoras.

\(^2\)Plut. Them. 2.4.
\(^2\)DK 59 A 1.13, 15, 17, 20, 32.
\(^2\)DK 59 A 1.10, 4a, 7, 20, 21, 33.
\(^2\)DK 59 A 21.
\(^2\)DK 59 A 5, 7, 26, 62.
The inference to be drawn from such acquaintances is that Anaxagoras was a well-known figure in Athens. A story, recorded by Plutarch, reveals that his rational explanations became commonplace and subject to anecdotes. A ram with one horn was brought before Pericles. Lampon, a seer of the Athenians, interpreted the single horn as an indication that one political party would prove supreme in the struggle between Pericles and Thucydides, son of Melesias. Anaxagoras, however, split open the head of the ram and showed that the single horn was the result of the abnormal shape of the brain. In addition, as we have already observed, Anaxagoras' book _Physica_ was popular among the Athenians.

Anaxagoras did not enjoy complete acceptance in Athens. The tradition speaks of enemies, both personal and political. Anaxagoras' teachings were innovative and, no doubt, became a major reason for the enmity towards him. We hear of a quarrel between a certain Sosibius (otherwise unknown) and Anaxagoras. The reason behind this hostility can only be conjectured, but probably Anaxagoras' teachings stand as its cause. Anaxagoras was perhaps satirized by the comedians for his beliefs, and

---

30Plut. Per. 6.2-3 (DK 59 A 16).
31DK 59 A 25.
eventually his "new doctrines concerning things above" brought him to trial on a charge of impiety and/or medism.\textsuperscript{32} His friendship with Pericles proved strong enough to gain his acquittal. Anaxagoras left his adopted home and returned to Asia Minor, settling at Lampsacus, a colony of Miletus on the Hellespont. There he founded a school, received honors from the inhabitants, and according to tradition died either by his own hand or by starvation.\textsuperscript{33}

As seen from the foregoing discussion, the ancients considered Anaxagoras: (1) a native of Clazomenae; (2) a philosopher who spurned practical affairs for the study of nature; (3) an author of some note; (4) a resident of Athens who associated with prominent Athenians; and (5) an object of attack by his enemies, resulting in his escape to Lampsacus. Such is the unanimity of the tradition. But concerning an exact chronology of his life, there is little agreement among the ancient writers.

The dates of Anaxagoras' birth and death are vague. Diogenes Laertius (2.7) reports three accounts. (1) Anaxagoras is said to have been twenty years old at the time of Xerxes' invasion (480) and to have lived seventy-two

\textsuperscript{32}DK 59 A 1.12-14, 17, 22; see below, pp. 91-92.

\textsuperscript{33}DK 59 A 1.14-15, 3, 23, 24, 42.13.
years. (2) According to Apollodorus, Anaxagoras was born in 01. 70 (500-497) and died in 01. 78 (468). Eusebius likewise thought that his dates were c.500-460.  
(3) According to Demetrius of Phalerum, Anaxagoras began to philosophize in Athens, where he lived thirty years, at age twenty when Callias was archon (456). Moreover, Anaxagoras may have been born in the late sixth century. Diogenes says that Democritus was forty years younger than Anaxagoras, and Diodorus records Democritus' death in 01. 94 at the age of ninety. This scheme would put Anaxagoras' birth at c.534/3 and his death at c.463/2.  

To the satisfaction of most scholars, however, the question concerning the span of Anaxagoras' life has become a dead issue. Diogenes' muddled testimony has been clarified. The date of death for Anaxagoras ascribed to Apollodorus is generally considered erroneously preserved in the text; the date should be 01. 88, 78 being merely a slip of the pen and caused by the

34DK 59 A 4.
35Diog. Laert. 9.34.
36Diod. Sic. 26.11.
mention of 01. 70 as the date of birth. This change, which puts the death of Anaxagoras at 428, not 468, agrees with the assertion that Anaxagoras lived seventy-two years. Eusebius' dates are explained as a confusion of Anaxagoras' death and his acme.

In addition, scholars agree that Apollodorus' information harmonizes with that of Demetrius of Phalerum, although the reconciliation of their accounts is involved because of certain particulars mentioned by Demetrius, i.e., that Anaxagoras was twenty in 456 and that he was in Athens at this time. Since it is impossible to be twenty in 480 and in 456, it is suggested that Callias has been confused with his namesake Calliades: Callias was archon of Athens in 456, but the archon for 480 was Calliades, and Callias is the shortened form of Calliades. But if one accepts 480 as the date intended by Demetrius, the statement "he began to philosophize in Athens" must be explained. Did Demetrius mean that Anaxagoras started a school at Athens in 480? Such an

38 Diels, ibid., p. 28; Jacoby, ibid., p. 244.


40 Diels, ibid.; Jacoby, ibid., p. 244, n.1.

41 Ibid.
assumption is weak for two reasons. (1) If one accepts the tradition that a man had to be approximately forty years of age to establish a school, then Anaxagoras was too young in 480. (2) Since 480 was the year that Xerxes sacked Athens, it is unlikely that Anaxagoras, perhaps a Persian conscript, would have decided on Athens as his place of residence. Therefore, in all probability, Demetrius' statement refers not to Anaxagoras' appearance as a teacher, but to his decision to take up philosophical pursuits. The words "in Athens" originally belonged to the prepositional phrase "during the archonship of Callias" and were transposed by the excerptor of the passage found in Diogenes. If this is the case, Demetrius and Apollodorus are in agreement: Anaxagoras was born c.500, turned his attention to philosophy c.480 (at Miletus, not Athens), and died in c.428.

The argument that Anaxagoras' birth should be placed in the late sixth century runs as follows. A combination of the testimonies of Diogenes and Diodorus is used to prove that Anaxagoras was born in late sixth

---

42 Burnet, op. cit., p. 254.
43 Diels, op. cit., p. 20; Jacoby, op. cit., pp. 245-246.
44 Ibid.
century, i.e., Diogenes says that Anaxagoras was forty years older than Democritus, who, according to Diodorus, died in 01. 94 at age 90. As noted above, if Anaxagoras was born in c.534/3 and lived seventy-two years, his death would occur c.462. Zeller has shown the folly of such a belief. His cogent and reasonably argued criticism makes Apollodorus the better authority for Anaxagoras' date of birth. There is no need to repeat his rebuttal in toto, but one point should be noted. Diodorus, who does not give a birth date directly, fixes Anaxagoras' trial in the late 430's; consequently, it would seem that he placed the birth of Anaxagoras at the beginning of the fifth or the very end of the sixth century, and not earlier.

Although a general consensus exists concerning the longevity of Anaxagoras, the opposite is true for what may be conveniently be called his "Athenian sojourn." As Demetrius reports, Anaxagoras stayed in Athens for

---

45 Zeller, op. cit., p. 231, n.5.

46 To counter this position, it has been argued that old charges against Anaxagoras were revived when Phidias was brought to trial. Why should old charges be revived? There is no evidence that such was the case, and Zeller, ibid., has shown that the charges against Anaxagoras were new, not relics from the past. Moreover, there would be no benefit for accusers of Phidias to renew old charges. If Anaxagoras had been dead at least three decades, surely his trial would have no bearing on a trial in the 430's.
thirty years. The figure, no doubt, is deduced from Demetrius' assumptions about Anaxagoras' arrival and departure; it is a "round number," but one accepted by all scholars.

The chronological difficulties become apparent when the prosecution which led to Anaxagoras' departure from Athens is considered. With respect to his trial, Diogenes knew of several versions. The strongest evidence, reported by Diodorus, Plutarch, and Sotion, is that the trial occurred just before the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War.47 Sotion, in fact, names Cleon as the prosecutor. Thus Anaxagoras' arrival in Athens may be placed at c.463. But another prosecutor, Thucydides son of Melesias, is mentioned by Satyrus.48 It is therefore conceivable that Anaxagoras' trial took place before Thucydides' ostracism (444) and that Anaxagoras began his Athenian sojourn thirty years prior to that date. According to Stesimbrotus,49 Anaxagoras associated with

47DK 59 A 1.12-14, 17, 22.
48Ibid.
49Stesimbrotus in Plut. Them. 2.4.
Themistocles; Anaxagoras perhaps came to Athens before 474/73, at which time Themistocles was ostracised.\footnote{The date for Themistocles' ostracism is much debated. I accept the conclusions of R.J. Lenardon, "The Chronology of Themistocles' Ostracism and Exile," \textit{Historia}, 8 (1959), pp. 45-48.}

Because of the lack of a precise date for Anaxagoras' trial, modern scholars have devised several theories, based on what each author considers the necessary implications of our sources. G.F. Unger\footnote{G.F. Unger, "Die Zeitverhältnisse des Anaxagoras und Empedokles," \textit{Philol.}, 4 (1884) Suppl., pp. 511-550.} assumes the span of Anaxagoras' life to be from c.533 to c.462. Therefore, he places Anaxagoras in Athens at 494 (after the fall of Miletus) where he taught thirty years. His most famous students were Themistocles, Pericles, and Euripides. Anaxagoras published his book in 466 and, thereupon, was indicted for medism and impiety c.465. Acquitted through the efforts of his pupil Pericles, who had just begun his political career, he left for Lampsacus where he died in c.462.

A.E. Taylor, in his article, "On the Date of the Trial of Anaxagoras," assumes the dates for Anaxagoras' life to be 500-428.\footnote{A.E. Taylor, \textit{CQ}, 11 (1917), pp. 81-87.} He interprets Demetrius' statement
that Anaxagoras began to philosophize in Athens at the age of twenty as proof that Anaxagoras came to Athens in 480. Accepting the argument that the archon Callias is mistaken for Calliades, Taylor considers the other suggestions of Diels as a forced exegesis. The presupposition of Diogenes' passage, Taylor argues, is that the thirty years spent by Anaxagoras in Athens were the years from 480-450. Assuming that Thucydides' prosecution of Anaxagoras happened prior to Thucydides' ostracism, Taylor fixes the trial and acquittal of Anaxagoras c.450; he believes that Anaxagoras established his school at Lamp-sacus during the last two decades of his life.53

Davison also gives Anaxagoras' dates as 500-428.54 But he places the arrival of Anaxagoras in Athens between the years 477-468. The unique element of Davison's reconstruction is that Anaxagoras' thirty years in Athens are

53Taylor, ibid., p. 84, argues that if Anaxagoras left Athens just before the Peloponnesian War, he did not have time to establish his school in Lamp-sacus; as Taylor says, "A city does not erect statues, strike coins, and grant regular annual holidays to its schoolboys in honor or a stranger who merely passes the last months of his life within its walls." But if Anaxagoras left Athens c.433 and died c.428, he had time enough to set up a school. In addition, no one says that Anaxagoras died immediately after his arrival at Lamp-sacus, as Taylor intimates. Besides, there is no evidence that the Lamp-sacans ever minted coins in honor of Anaxagoras. Perhaps Taylor has confused Lamp-sacus with Clazomenae where the coins had a portrait of Anaxagoras on them, see DK 59 A 27.

54See above, n. 39.
not considered as continuous years. He believes that Thucydides attacked Anaxagoras in the early period of Pericles' career and, therefore, postulates a trial in 456/55. But Davison does not dismiss the tradition that places Anaxagoras in Athens during the 430's. He assumes that Anaxagoras left Athens only to return in 445/44, when a general amnesty in favor of Anaxagoras occurred. Anaxagoras stayed in Athens until c.433, was tried a second time by Cleon, and was forced to leave Athens.

Finally, there is the "orthodox" reconstruction, championed by Diels and Jacoby and accepted by the majority. Based on the statements of Diogones, the birth of Anaxagoras is put at 500. He lived and taught in Athens from c.463 until c.433, at which time he was accused and sentenced to death. Having been rescued by his friend Pericles, he departed to Lampsacus where he died in 428.

There is no need to discuss the theory of Unger.

55Sec above, n. 37.

56The arguments of Unger which do not reappear in the articles of Taylor and Davison are as follows: (1) Unger, op. cit., p. 534, assumes that Empedocles was born in 520 and, using a statement of Arist. (Met. A3, 964a 11) that Empedocles was born after Anaxagoras, places Anaxagoras' birth at 534/33. But that the birth of Empedocles occurred at 520 is not certain; see Kirk and Raven, op. cit., pp. 320-321: "Empedocles' precise dates are impossible to determine....In the absence of any reliable and decisive evidence, there are no grounds for more than the
at length. Zeller has shown that the predating of Anaxagoras to c.533 is untenable. If this attitude is accepted, Unger's detailed arguments for the placement of Anaxagoras in Athens between the years 494-465 may be summarily dismissed. I shall deal with points made by Unger only as far as they reappear in the hypotheses of Taylor and Davison, whose reconstructions, in my opinion, cannot replace the traditional view of Diels and Jacoby.

As one inspects the theses of Taylor and Davison, four major suppositions appear in their refutation of Diels and Jacoby. (1) Stesimbrotus' statement that Themistocles was the student of Anaxagoras is accepted. Since Themistocles was ostracised in the late 470's, very tentative conclusion that Empedocles' floruit must have been somewhere around the middle of the century (i.e., fifth)." (2) The tradition that Anaxagoras was a student of Anaximenes is accepted by Unger, op. cit., p. 534-536. This opinion, however, enjoys no universal acceptance (see above n.8). (3) Unger, op. cit., p. 547 assumes that Diogenes 2.7 refers, not to Xerxes' invasion of Greece, but to the invasion of Europe made by Darius in c.514/13. There is to my knowledge no textual problem involving the name "Xerxes" and, in my opinion, Unger has arbitrarily rejected the text and substituted an alternate name to make his theory more acceptable.

57I do not want to minimize any of the points made by these scholars; however, I feel that the four presuppositions which I shall discuss are the cornerstones of their arguments. For a complete refutation of Taylor, see E. Dercenne, Les Proces d'Impiete (Liege: 1930), pp. 31-34.
Anaxagoras appeared in Athens prior to Themistocles' departure.  

(2) Both Taylor and Davison predicate their theories on the belief that Anaxagoras was the teacher of Pericles in the literal sense. In other words, Anaxagoras did not come to Athens and associate with a mature Pericles but their relationship was that of student-teacher and occurred when Pericles was a youth. (3) The failure of Plato to bring Anaxagoras and Socrates into personal contact within the discussion of Socrates' early education is interpreted to mean that Anaxagoras was not in Athens when Socrates was a young man, i.e., after 450. (4) Both scholars assume that the attack of Thucydides on Anaxagoras took place when Pericles was struggling for political supremacy in Athens. By accepting these assumptions as the necessary implications of the sources, Anaxagoras' arrival in Athens at c.463 and the strong tradition which places his trial in the late 430's is rejected or manipulated to fit the various interpretations. These points, however, although cogently argued by their adherents, can be questioned, if not refuted.

The relationship of Themistocles and Anaxagoras is debatable. Evidence for their meeting is found in

---

58 Although Taylor does not mention the relationship between Themistocles and Anaxagoras, his thesis leads one to believe that he would accept their meeting as valid.
Plutarch (Themistocles 2.4), who quotes from the lost work of Stesimbrotus, a native of Thasos. About the time of the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War Stesimbrotus published a pamphlet on Themistocles, Thucydides (son of Melesias), and Pericles, in which there was also much said about Cimon. Several fragments of Stesimbrotus' work exist, but all we know of it is based on the citations preserved by Plutarch and Athenaeus. Judging from these fragments, direct or indirect, Stesimbrotus' pamphlet had a decisively political character and was a defamatory tract, filled with invective and scandalous gossip. Themistocles and Pericles were viciously attacked. Such an attack is not surprising; as a Thasian, Stesimbrotus naturally would dislike Themistocles, the founder of the Athenian navy, and Pericles, the promoter of the Athenian empire. Cimon and Thucydides, as rivals and opponents of Pericles, were undoubtedly treated with less malevolence.

As a work of invective, Stesimbrotus' pamphlet can hardly be considered a legitimate source for history and biography. As Perrin says, "its chief historical value lies in the glimpses which it gives into the depth of

59Athen. 13.589d; Plut. Cim. 4.4; 14.4; Per. 13.11, 26.2, 36.6; Them. 2.4.

60See Jacoby FGrH, 2 B Text, pp. 515ff., n. 107; 2 B Commentary, pp. 345ff.
partisan rancor at the time when the life of Pericles was
drawing to a close."\textsuperscript{61} But the hesitation to accept
Stesimbrotus as a trustworthy source is not modern:
Plutarch himself was averse to accepting the pamphlet
as evidence. It was Stesimbrotus' work which aroused the
complaint of Plutarch that "the research of their contem­
poraries into men's deeds and lives, partly through envi­
uous hatred and partly through flattery, defiles and dis­
torts the truth."\textsuperscript{62} And, in fact, Plutarch openly ques­
tioned the validity of Stesimbrotus' statement which
connected Themistocles and Anaxagoras:

\begin{quote}
Stesimbrotus says that Themistocles was a
student of Anaxagoras, and that he studied
natural philosophy under Melissus, but he is
careless in his chronology; for Melissus
commanded the Samians in the siege by Peri­
cles, who was much younger than Themistocles
and with whom Anaxagoras was intimate.\textsuperscript{63}
\end{quote}

Plutarch corrects Stesimbrotus, making Themistocles a
student of Mnesiphilus. If Plutarch counts Stesimbrotus
as untrustworthy, should we not do the same?

\textsuperscript{61}Plutarch, \textit{Life of Pericles}, ed. B. Perrin (New
York: 1910), p. 36. See also W. Schmid and O. Stahlin,
\textit{Geschichte der Griechischen Literatur} (Munchen: 1934), 2,
pp. 676-678; A.S. Osley, "Greek Biography before Plutarch,"

\textsuperscript{62}Plut. \textit{Per.} 13.11.

\textsuperscript{63}Plut. \textit{Them.} 2.4. Diog. Laert. 1.24 and Plut.
\textit{Per.} 26 tell us virtually all we know of the life of
Melissus; see Kirk and Raven, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 541-542.
Taylor and Davison, however, accept Stesimbrotus' association of Themistocles and Anaxagoras. But if Stesimbrotus is correct, the meeting of these men does not have to take place in Athens. Zeller postulates that Themistocles and Anaxagoras may have come into contact (and probably no more than that) in Asia Minor. Themistocles went to Asia Minor in 471 and wandered about for five years before he went to the court of Artaxerxes. It is possible, although highly conjectural, that Themistocles traveled to Clazomenae and met Anaxagoras there. But this suggestion is perhaps too inventive. It is best to assume Stesimbrotus' assertion to be groundless or invented with some ulterior purpose in mind. Since his pamphlet appeared in the late 430's and attacks the morals of Pericles, it is possible that Stesimbrotus attributed Pericles' moral decline to his association with Anaxagoras. Further, Pericles represented democracy, which in the eyes of the conservative Stesimbrotus had, no doubt, suffered the same deterioration. To give his judgment a wider context, Stesimbrotus perhaps anachronistically also joined

---

64 Zeller, op. cit., p. 325, n.5. But I do not accept Zeller's dates for Themistocles' stay in Asia Minor, i.e., 474-470; see below n.65.

Themistocles (Pericles' predecessor) with Anaxagoras to show that this moral decline had already begun much earlier in the fifth century.

The assertion that Anaxagoras taught an adolescent Pericles stems mainly from two ancient sources, Plato and Isocrates. Plato lists the area of Pericles' education which Anaxagoras influenced: he taught him rhetorical technique. Isocrates states that Anaxagoras and Damon were the teachers of Pericles. Taylor, assuming that Isocrates' statement is valid and that one can only formulate rhetorical techniques during one's youthful years, places Anaxagoras in Athens at 480, at which time Pericles was a teenager. Burnet, in his *Early Greek Philosophy*, adheres to Taylor's thesis and says:

This clearly means that Perikles associated with Anaxagoras before he became a prominent politician. So too Isokrates says that Perikles was the student of two 'sophists,' Anaxagoras and Damon. There can be no doubt [italics are mine] that the teaching of Damon belongs to the youth of Perikles, and it is to be inferred that the same is true of that of Anaxagoras.

In my previous chapter, I cast doubt on Isocrates' testimony. The inference that Damon was the teacher of a youthful Pericles is dubious and, in fact, Plato makes

66*Plato Phaed.* 296e; *Isocr.* 25.235.
Damon an associate of a mature, not youthful, Pericles. In opposition to Burnet, the same holds true for Anaxagoras. He was not the only teacher of Pericles, and there is no need to place Anaxagoras in Athens during Pericles' formative years. Anaxagoras came to Athens, joined the intellectual circle surrounding Pericles and, in the company of Aspasia and Damon, influenced the statesman. I find completely subjective the argument that Pericles was unable to acquire rhetorical techniques, or develop them at a mature time of life. Who can say at what point in life one acquires knowledge or characteristics such as that mentioned in the Phaedrus? Pericles could have developed such a tendency under the tutelage of a previous teacher, only to have it refined under Anaxagoras at a later time. If Anaxagoras appeared in Athens c.463, he could in fact (as Burnet would have it) associate with Pericles before his ascendancy to political power; it was not until 460 that Pericles became the homme d'etat.

That Plato consistently conveys the impression that Anaxagoras was an important figure in Athens before 450, but not after that date, is an assumption based on the Phaedo (97b). Within this dialogue Socrates says that in his youth he became interested in the study of

---

68 Plato Alcib. 1.118c.
nature and that, after hearing someone reading Anaxagoras' book, he was drawn to Anaxagoras' teachings and read the book for himself. The work, however, failed to impress Socrates, who dismissed its author as one who made no use of intelligence. Taylor asserts that Socrates, after his rejection of Anaxagoras, finally settled on the doctrine known as the Theory of Ideas. The date at which Socrates formulated this doctrine, in Taylor's estimation, is revealed by the Parmenides of Plato. This work, which presents a Socrates "full of his doctrine of εἶδος," is set dramatically at 450. In other words, by this time, Socrates had formulated the Theory of Ideas to which he was led after his reading of Anaxagoras' book though not through personal contact with Anaxagoras. Taylor assumes that Plato was careful about chronological possibilities and, thus, concludes that Plato thought that Anaxagoras had already written his book, been tried, and disappeared from Athens by 450. If Anaxagoras was in Athens, Taylor implies, why should Socrates content himself with only reading Anaxagoras' book?

But such arguments, although very ingenious, hardly offer proof that Anaxagoras was not in Athens after 450. The hypothesis that the Theory of Ideas is the work of

---

69Taylor, op. cit., p. 64.
Socrates, not of Plato, is a debated point. The extent of Socratic influence on Plato, what parts and aspects of Platonic thought are Socratic, and how much of the Platonic Socrates is Plato, continue to be the subjects of investigation and conjecture. The judgment of scholars, however, generally has eliminated Socrates as the inventor or discoverer of this theory. If this is the case, Taylor's thesis may be rejected, even if the dramatic setting of the Parmenides is 450. Moreover, it is a tenuous inference that Anaxagoras and Socrates did not know each other. Plato was under no compulsion to bring Socrates and Anaxagoras into a personal connection, although his dialogues may strive for chronological accuracy. Arguments from silence do not prove that Anaxagoras was absent from Athens after 450.

Similarly one is not compelled to believe that Thucydides, son of Melesias, prosecuted Anaxagoras before 444, the date of Thucydides' ostracism. It is possible to harmonize Satyrus' account, which makes Thucydides the prosecutor of Anaxagoras, with the chronology established by Diels and Jacoby. Satyrus, as interpreted by Taylor and Davison, imagined that Thucydides attacked Anaxagoras

---

around 450, for the charge is not only impiety but medism; the latter charge appears obsolete in 433, but not c.450 among political opponents of the Peace with Persia, which became a fact in 449. One alternative, in lieu of accepting the placement of Anaxagoras' trial at or before 450, is to reject Satyrus' evidence, as Zeller does. But Wade-Gery postulates a later date for Thucydides' prosecution of Anaxagoras. According to Wade-Gery, Thucydides returned to Athens after completing his ten years of forced exile. Upon his return he made himself felt by renewing his opposition to Pericles, i.e., by attacking Anaxagoras. There is no serious opposition to Wade-Gery's suggestion, although it must be admitted that there is no ancient evidence for Thucydides' return. It was not unusual for Athenians, who were ostracised, to return home. Carcopino in fact, asserts that those who were ostracised never stayed away the full ten years; and the evidence for Cimon's return is proof enough that restoration to Athens was not believed to be impossible. Satyrus does not date the prosecution and his silence is not enough to confirm an early date for Anaxagoras' trial.

---

The charge of medism in 433 is troublesome, but, as Wade-Gery states, "I am not sure that this really indicates more than that Thucydides' politics in 433 were old-fashioned—that he had forgotten nothing and learnt nothing...." Also, such a charge may have been made for no other reason than to recall that epoch of suspected medism of the Alceamonidae, the family to which Pericles, the protector of Anaxagoras, belonged. If so, it undoubtedly would have given weight and force to the demand of the Spartans in 432 that bade the Athenians to "drive out the curse." Moreover, a renewal on the part of Thucydides of his opposition to Pericles is completely in keeping with the former's previous policy. As Cimon's heir, Thucydides struggled with Pericles for political supremacy only to meet with defeat in 444. It cannot be only coincidence that an outbreak of malicious litigation directed at Pericles' associates occurred around the time that Thucydides could have returned to Athens. It is very possible that Thucydides' return was the impetus behind such attacks.

---

73 Wade-Gery, op. cit., p. 220.
74 Hdt. 6.120. Even though the Alcmaeonidae may have been innocent, the renewal of the charge would have effectively opened old sores.
75 Thuc. 1.126.
The preceding discussion has stated the negative case for rejecting a date in the 450's for Anaxagoras' trial. To reiterate: (1) The validity of Stesimbrotus' assertion that Themistocles and Anaxagoras were associates may be questioned: (2) Pericles' association with Anaxagoras did not occur when the statesman was a young man; (3) Plato's statement about Socrates' education does not prove the absence of Anaxagoras from Athens after 450; and (4) Thucydides' prosecution of Anaxagoras did not necessarily take place in the mid-fifth century, but probably happened in 433. In sum, all the exempla produced by scholars who favor an early date for the trial do not stand up on close examination.

Rejection, however, of Taylor and Davison does not rest solely on negative arguments; positive reasons may also be marshalled for the acceptance of the chronology established by Diels and Jacoby. The decree of Diopeithes which launched the attack on Anaxagoras cannot be moved back to 450 without difficulty. Diopeithes was a soothsayer and chresmologist, similar to the famous Lampon. He was the object of the barbs of the comedians during the 420's and was generally characterized as a charlatan, a seer who fabricated predictions and sold

76I am following Derenne, op. cit., pp. 34-38.
them to the public. Famed as an orator, Diopeithes in 430/29 was a promotor of a decree in favor of the inhabitants of Methone. Near the end of the fifth century, Diopeithes left Athens (for unknown reasons) and went to Sparta, where after the death of Agis in 397 he was consulted on the choice for the successor to the Spartan throne. Since the known activity of Diopeithes firmly belongs to the latter half of the fifth century, it is probable that his decree belongs to the years just before the war, as Plutarch reports. Diopeithes in 450 was probably too young to formulate a decree of such importance.

Another reason to place Anaxagoras’ trial c.433/30 is the mention of Cleon as one of the prosecutors. The reports that Thucydides and Cleon both acted in this capacity are not mutually exclusive. That more than one prosecutor for a single trial was possible is proved by

---

77 Aristoph. *Knights* 1085; *Wasps* 380; *Birds* 988. These plays were produced between 424-414.


79 Plut. Ages. 3; Lys. 22. For the identification of Diopeithes with the seer at Sparta, see Swoboda, s.v. "Diopeithes," *RE* 5-1, col. 1046-47.
the trial of Socrates. An attack by Cleon fits well into a chronology which puts Anaxagoras' trial in the late 430's. Cleon makes his first appearance as a politician c.432/31 when he attacked Pericles' war plan and again in 430 as the prosecutor of Pericles. From the picture we get from Thucydides (the historian) and Aristophanes, Cleon was an opportunist par excellence.

It is not hard to imagine that a year or so before his attack on Pericles' war policy, Cleon seized the moment, created by Thucydides' return, to prosecute Anaxagoras as a means to enhance his surge into the political limelight. He chose, like Thucydides and the aristocrats, to attack Pericles indirectly, i.e., by attacking Anaxagoras. Plutarch (Per. 32.1) makes clear the political nature of the attack when he states that Deopeithes by his bill against Anaxagoras directed suspicion against Pericles.

---

80 Plato Apology 36a; Socrates was accused by Anytus, Meletus, and Lycon. Thucydides represented the aristocratic party and Cleon the radical democratic party, but they have in common the desire to ruin Pericles' control in Athens.

81 Plut. Per. 33.7; 35.4.

82 Thuc. 2.20; 3.26; 4.21. Aristoph. Knights passim. Although A.E. Woodhead, "Thucydides' Portrait of Cleon," Mnemosyne 15 (1960), pp. 289-317, tries to clear Cleon's name from slander; it is difficult to believe that Cleon was not an opportunist.
The anecdotal story preserved by Plutarch (Per. 6.2-3) which mentions the natural explanation of Anaxagoras concerning the ram with one horn, implies that Anaxagoras was in Athens after 450. The affair, indirectly dated by Plutarch, happened a few years before the ostracism of Thucydides. Davison, using Plutarch's testimony, puts Anaxagoras in Athens at 445/44, but he argues that Anaxagoras returned to Athens after his trial in 456/55 when an amnesty in his favor occurred. Davison admits that there is no evidence for such an amnesty. Rather than create an amnesty, as Davison is forced to do, it is better to assume that Anaxagoras was in Athens in 445 because he had never left the city.

Plato, in the Cratylus (409A), dated dramatically between 430-428, mentions the theories of Anaxagoras concerning the moon as "that which Anaxagoras spoke recently." Taylor's argument that Plato was careful of chronological possibility, is much more cogent in this context. Plato's use of the adverb νεωρτί indicates that Anaxagoras was possibly in Athens during the 430's. If Anaxagoras had departed from Athens at or before 450, it is difficult to explain Plato's statement.

---

83 Davison, op. cit., p. 42.

There is, therefore, no reason to put Anaxagoras in Athens and to place his trial and his subsequent flight to Lampsacus in the mid-fifth century. The presuppositions on which such a chronology rests are insecurely based, and, most importantly, fly in the face of strong evidence that Anaxagoras stayed in Athens until the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War. The chronology established by Diels and Jacoby need not be abandoned. Anaxagoras, born c.500, turned his attention to philosophy in 480, at the age of twenty. At the termination of his studies, a period of twenty years (a traditional interval), when Athens more and more was becoming the intellectual center of the world, Anaxagoras transferred his residence there, c.463. What attracted Anaxagoras to Athens can only be conjectured. He lived and worked there for thirty years, as Demetrius reports. Because of the novelty of his teachings and, most importantly, his association with Pericles, Anaxagoras became the target of attack of both those who disliked his scholarship and those who sought to undermine Pericles' control of Athens. Thus Anaxagoras was brought to trial c.433/30 at a time when the Athenians began to question seriously Pericles' policies. Nevertheless Pericles was able to win the acquittal of Anaxagoras against the pressure of their enemies.
CHAPTER IV

PHIDIAS

The judgment of Quintilian and Cicero preserved in their brief observations on Greek art was that ancient art reached its acme in the works of Phidias. One could say that Phidias was the Artist of the ancients, just as Homer was the Poet and Demosthenes was the Orator. But success in any field brings with it grave dangers. In this case, Phidias was no exception. His fame provided enemies of both him and his sponsor Pericles with the opportunity for attack. It is my purpose in this chapter to examine the tradition surrounding the trial of Phidias and to attempt to assign it a date. Since Phidias was a friend of Pericles, the scope of the discussion must necessarily broaden and touch upon their relationship and upon the political overtones of the charge against Phidias.

There is little biographical information about Phidias. He was an Athenian; his father, otherwise unknown,

---

1Quint. Inst. Orat. 12.10. 1-10; Cicero Orat. 8-9.
was a certain Charmides. Apparently Phidias was married and his descendants are mentioned by Pausanias. A brother, Panaenus, is praised by the ancients for his ability as a painter.

The date of Phidias' birth is unknown. Since Pliny places Phidias at the beginning of his chronological list of bronzeworkers under 01. 83 (meant to signify Phidias' flourit), the conjectured date c.510-500 is as accurate an estimation as any; certainly Phidias was born somewhere near the beginning of the fifth century. The date for Phidias' death is connected with his trial and will be considered later.

For the identification of Phidias' teachers we have two traditions. The scholiast on Aristophanes Frogs 504 mentions Ageladas (spelled Hageladas in Pliny); the other

---

2 Paus. 5. 10, 2.
3 Paus. 5. 14, 15.
4 Paus. 5. 11.6 mentions Panaenus as the artist who did the "Battle of Marathon" in the Stoa Poecile; see also Pl. NH 35.54-58, where in a discussion on the chronology of Greek painting Pliny tells us that Panaenus painted the inside of the shield of Athena at Elis; Pl. NH 34.177 also mentions the Marathon painting.
teacher was Hegias according to the account of Dio Chrysostomus. Opinions of scholars differ as to the validity of these traditions, it is possible that Hegias was the only mentor of Phidias.

When Phidias embarked upon his career is unknown; but he must have become recognized as a talented artist by the seventies and sixties of the fifth century, since his earliest known works belong to these decades. A group at Delphi, composed of gods and heroes (among whom Miltiades was included) was perhaps the first major commission of Phidias and is dated by Richter to c.465. Following the group at Delphi, Phidias was given the important task of creating a bronze Athena at Athens to commemorate the defeat of the Persians at Marathon. This statue, commonly called the Athena Promachos, has been dated between 460 and 450. At some time in his early

---

6 Dio Chrys., Orat. 55.1.282; Pl. NH 34.10-55.
7 Morgan, op. cit. p. 313, 333 states that both Ageladas and Hegias were teachers of Phidias; on the other hand, Siereking, ibid., denies this and considers Hegias his only teacher.
9 Paus. 1.28.1.
career, Phidias created a gold and ivory statue of Athena at Pallene in Achaea and another Athena at Plataea. Clearly, such artistic endeavors bespeak the fame and reputation of Phidias in the early part of the fifth century.

Great acclaim awaited Phidias in the ensuing years. Tradition cites several works of Phidias (most of which are unfortunately merely names), and art historians date these to the latter half of the fifth century. But two creations of this era are considered Phidias' major works, both by ancient and modern scholars. Quintilian praised Phidias' ability to visualize and give form to the sublime qualities of the gods; the supreme examples given by Quintilian of this achievement were Phidias' Athena Parthenos and Zeus at Olympia. Quintilian says:

Phidias is credited with being more skillful at making images of the gods than of men, and in working in ivory he is thought to be far beyond any rival and would be so even if he had made nothing besides the Athena in Athens and his Olympian Zeus in Elis; the beauty of which seems to have added something to traditional religion;

11Paus. 7.27.2; 9.4.1.

12For a complete list of the works of Phidias in the latter part of the fifth century see Richter, op. cit., pp. 225-230.
to such an extent is the majesty of the work equal to the majesty of the god.\textsuperscript{13}

Unfortunately, the Athena and Zeus of Phidias have not lasted as long as their fame; both were destroyed in antiquity. But descriptions of them handed down by an ancient writers make it possible for us to concur with Quintilian.\textsuperscript{14} Both statues were chryselephantine, both were large. The Athena stood about forty feet in height, but she is small in comparison to the Zeus, a seated figure who was seven times life size and occupied the full height of the temple at Olympia. Representations of the Athena, all of Roman date, exist today; the Olympian Zeus is even less well represented. Images of this statue are found on Hadrian's coins and show the head and enthroned figure of the god.\textsuperscript{15} But these portraits hardly offer evidence for the majesty of which Quintilian speaks.

\textsuperscript{13}Quin. Institu. Orat. 12.10.9.

\textsuperscript{14}For descriptions of these statues see Paus. 1.24.5; 5.11.1; Pl. NH 34.5.4; 36.8. For other information about them see Richter, op. cit., pp. 215-220.

\textsuperscript{15}For images of Athena Parthenos, see D.M. Robinson, "Two Corinthian Copies of the Head of the Athena Parthenos" AJA, 15 (1911), p. 449. A discussion concerning Hadrian's coins may be found in Richter, op. cit., pp. 219-220 and J. Liegle, Der Zeus des Phidias (Berlin: 1952). Also, G.M.A. Richter, "The Pheidian Zeus at Olympia," Hesp., 35 (1966), pp. 166-170 presents evidence that a new representation of the Zeus has been found.
The Periclean rebuilding of Athens began in 449 and continued for the next fifteen years. Several edifices were constructed: the Odeium of Pericles, the Parthenon, and the Propylaea. Phidias was chosen the general overseer of this important project; and, under his guiding hand, Athens became the flower of Hellas. His position as manager resulted undoubtedly from his fame as an artist, but Phidias had something else in his favor: he was the friend of Pericles. At what point in Phidias' career the bond between the two men was established can only be conjectured; it is probable, however, that after their meeting Phidias joined the intellectual circle of the statesman. As Anaxagoras was the philosopher and Damon the musician in this group, so Phidias was the artist closely associated with Pericles.

Phidias was not directly responsible for the buildings mentioned above; as Plutarch says, "the several works had great architects and artists besides." What duties were required of Phidias in his position as

---

17 Ibid.
18 Ibid.
19 Ibid.
overseer can only be guessed. Among other things, he probably was the liaison between the architects and Pericles; perhaps Phidias dictated the order of architecture to be used in the remaking of Athens. Phidias was, however, in charge of all artists and artisans; his major concern was the construction of the cult image, the chryselephantine Athena, destined for the Parthenon. This statue, completed in 439, was dedicated in the following year. Whether Phidias directed the execution of the sculptures of the Parthenon pediments and friezes is a debated issue, and we shall return to this point.

The chronology of Phidias becomes obscure after the completion of the Athena Parthenos; and the tradition, dating from the fifth century B.C. to beyond Roman times, consists of relatively few witnesses. To facilitate matters, I shall give these pertinent testimonies in their entirety and in chronological order.

---


21 Plut. Per. 12.

22 See below, p. 109-10.
(1) Aristophanes, a contemporary of Phidias, in his *Peace* 603-613 (produced in 421) simply alludes to certain misfortunes of the artist. In the play, Hermes answers the chorus, who had just asked the reason for the disappearance of Peace, in the following way:

> Phidias, having acted badly, began the mischief. Then Pericles, fearing that he might share the blame, dreading your natures and ferocious tempers, before he himself suffered some calamity, set the city on fire. Taking the small spark of the Megarian Decree, he blew up this war so that all Hellas, both those there and here, cried in the smoke.

(2) The Atthiodographer Philochorus (fourth century B.C.), compiled an *Atthis* in seventeen books, the fourth book of which dealt with the Periclean Age. Only fragments of this work are extant; but one, preserved by the scholiast on the *Peace* 603, contains information about Phidias:

> Philochorus writing of the archonship of Pythodorus says as follows: The gold image of Athena was set up in the great temple and had a weight of forty-four talents; Pericles was in charge and Phidias made it. And Phidias, after he made it, was tried for having embezzled some of the ivory destined for the scales. Having fled to Elis, it is said that he undertook to build the Olympian Zeus and, after having made it, was put to death by the Elians.

> About the archonship of Skythodorus, who came seven years later, he said that the Megarians, saying that they were excluded unjustly from the Athenians
markets and harbors, complained to the Spartans about the Athenians. For the Athenians decreed these things (Pericles advocating this action), blaming the Megarians for working the land which belonged to the gods.

Some say that when Phidias the sculptor defrauded the city and was banished, Pericles, afraid because of his participation in the preparation of the statue and his knowledge of the embezzlement, proposed the Megarian Decree and brought on the war in order that, with the Athenians occupied with the war, he would not have to submit to an audit. But the suspicion against Pericles seems groundless, since the affairs concerning Phidias took place seven years before the outbreak of the war. Phidias, as Philochorus says, having built the statue of Athena in the archonship of Pythodorus, stole the gold from the snakes of the chryselephantine Athena, an act for which he was punished by exile. And being in Elis and having received the commission for the Olympian Zeus from the Elians, he was killed after being condemned for embezzlement by them.23

(3) Diodorus Siculus, a contemporary of Cicero, describes the causes of the Peloponnesian War in book 12 of his History and speaks of Phidias. The account of Diodorus is based on that of Ephorus (fourth century B.C.), an older contemporary of Philochorus:

The statue of Athena was a work of Phidias, and Pericles, son of Xanthippus, had been appointed overseer of the undertaking. But some of the assistants of Phidias, who had been prevailed upon by Pericles' enemies, took seats as suppliants at the altar of

---

23 Jacoby, FGrH 3-B, Suppl., F 121.
the gods; and when they were called upon to explain their actions, they exclaimed that they would show that Phidias had possession of a large amount of sacred funds with the contrivance and association of Pericles, the overseer. Consequently, when the assembly convened to consider the affair, the enemies of Pericles persuaded the people to arrest Phidias and lodged a charge against Pericles himself of stealing sacred property.24

(4) Plutarch (first and second centuries A.D.) gives the following account of Phidias in his Life of Pericles 31-32:

Phidias the sculptor was the contractor for the great statue, as has been said and being a friend of Pericles and acquiring great influence with him, made enemies through the jealousy which he excited. Others, by means of Phidias, were testing the people to see what sort of judge it would be for Pericles; these, after persuading a certain Menon, one of Phidias' fellow-workers, sat him as a suppliant in the agora; and Menon demanded impunity for information and accusation against Phidias. When the people accepted the man and the prosecution took place in the assembly, embezzlements were not proven. For Phidias, on the advice of Pericles, from the very beginning had worked and cast the gold on the statue so that it would be possible to prove the weight to those who took the gold from the image; and Pericles, at that time, ordered the accusers to do just that.

But the reputation of his works brought jealous hatred upon Phidias and especially because he, fashioning the battle of the Amazons on the shield, carved out a certain figure of a bald, old man, in his own likeness,

holding a stone in both hands. Also he inserted a very fine likeness of Pericles fighting with an Amazon. But Phidias cunningly had made the attitude of the hands, which hold a spear in front of the face of Pericles, because he wanted to conceal the resemblance which is plain to see from either side. Therefore Phidias, having been led to jail, died there of sickness, but some say of poison which the enemies of Pericles, in order to slander the statesman, provided. And to the informer, Menon, on a motion of Glycon, the people gave immunity from taxation and ordered the generals to provide for the safety of the man.

(5) Aristodemus (fourth or fifth centuries A.D.) compiled a history of Greece and, from the fragments extant, included at least the period from 480-431 B.C. Listing the causes of the Peloponnesian War, Aristodemus mentions Phidias:

Great causes are being offered for the war, but the charge against Pericles is foremost. They say that the Athenians prepared the ivory Athena and appointed Pericles as overseer and Phidias as artist. Phidias was caught stealing; Pericles, having taken caution that he not be called for an audit and wanting to avoid condemnation, conducted this war after proposing the Megarian Decree. And the poet of the old comedians confirm these things, writing thus (Aristophanes Peace 603-611 and Acharnians 524-534 follows).25

(6) The lexicon, the Suda (composed about the

end of the tenth century A.D.) gives this information concerning Phidias:

Phidias was the sculptor who made the image of the ivory Athena. And Pericles, having been appointed over the expenses, stole fifty talents and, in order that he might not give an account, stirred up the war.²⁶

Such is the information concerning the activity of Phidias after the completion of the Athena Parthenos; our knowledge is meagre, but several details appear so often that they may be considered as standard. (1) Phidias completed the statue and was accused of either mis-handling funds or an irreligious act. (2) Pericles, as overseer of the work, was apparently implicated; and the trial of Phidias offered an opportunity to the enemies of the statesman to attack. (3) The machinations of Phidias' accusers are preserved. One or several collaborators of Phidias seated themselves as suppliants at an altar in the Agora and, under pressure from Pericles' political opponents and in exchange for a promise of impunity, asserted that they were in a position to expose Phidias' theft. The assembly favorably received the denunciation and Phidias was jailed. Legal protection was granted to Menon. (4) The fate of Phidias after his imprisonment is given. Plutarch asserts that Phidias died

²⁶Suda s.v. Phidias.
in jail, but Philochorus says that he left Athens and died in Elis at the hands of the inhabitants there. Although these details are not given fully by each writer, they may be considered all that is known about Phidias' last years.

If our sources are in agreement on the general details, they nevertheless diverge on three points: (1) the exact fate of the artist; (2) the precise motive of the accusation; and (3) the date of the trial. At present, the reason for the trial may be omitted from further discussion; this point will be taken up at the conclusion of this chapter.

But before we turn our attention to the date of Phidias' trial, brief consideration should be given to the end of Phidias' life and the dates of his Athena Parthenos and Zeus at Olympia. As the sources indicate, tradition is all at sea. Plutarch's story was that Phidias died in jail in Athens after his arrest and the completion of the Athena. Philochorus, however, says that Phidias died in Elis after the Zeus was finished. Since these stories are conflicting, other avenues must be found to establish their truth or falsehood. Fortunately, such means exist. The date for the Athena is well established; the accounting lists for the statue give evidence that the work was completed c.439/38, a date
which is confirmed by Eusebius. Philochorus' account can be made to agree. The German excavations at Olympia have shown that the workshop of Phidias was constructed during the mid 430's. Among the artifacts discovered in the debris was a cup which bears the inscription, "I belong to Phidias:" and the style of the drinking mug suggests a date c.435. Moreover, the excavations strongly indicate that the actual work on the Zeus may have extended well down into the 420's. Therefore, it appears that the Zeus followed the Athena and that Phidias worked in Elis after he worked in Athens, perhaps until sometime in the late 420's.


In view of this evidence, Plutarch's account of the death of Phidias is unbelievable. Phidias did not die in jail in the late 430's. But in defence of Plutarch it should be noted that he nowhere mentions the Zeus of Phidias, and it is only a modern inference that he considered that Athena Parthenos was the final work of Phidias. \textsuperscript{31} Plutarch was primarily concerned with the trial and its causes (chief among which was Phidias' work on the Athena) and not the number or chronology of Phidias' artistic endeavors. It is possible, therefore, that Plutarch assumed knowledge of the correct sequence of these major works and telescoped events for the sake of his narrative.

Moreover, Philochorus' account, although it preserves the correct sequence for the Athena and Zeus, is not above suspicion. His narrative is similar to that of Plutarch; in both versions Phidias died under a charge of embezzlement, but at different places. Philochorus' account is viewed by most scholars as a mere doublet of an Athenian story, although some insist that Plutarch

\textsuperscript{31}Richter, \textit{Sculpture}, p. 223.
transferred the locale from Elis to Athens.32

Aristophanes' remark in the Peace concerning Phidias may be of some value. The play, produced in 421, perhaps makes reference to a current event; thus Phidias may have died under scandalous circumstances around this time. This is only conjecture, but so are most arguments that have been brought into play. It is best to admit that the date of Phidias' death cannot be determined and that it became the subject for invention and embroidery of later writers faced with an inadequate tradition.

When the litigation involving Phidias occurred has long been an issue, both for ancient and modern writers alike. The ancient testimony neatly divides itself into two groups, each presenting a different date for the legal action. One, conveniently called the "Aristophanes group" by Jacoby, to which belong (besides Aristophanes) Diodorus, Plutarch, Aristodemus, and the Suda,33 has in common two points: (1) Phidias' trial


33Jacoby, ibid., pp. 486-87.
was a major cause for the Peloponnesian War; and (2) the lawsuit belongs in the years just prior to the outbreak of the war, somewhere between 433-430.

The other group consists of one ancient writer only: Philochorus; and he disagrees with the Aristophanes group on both counts. According to Philochorus, the trial of Phidias happened approximately seven years before the start of the war, and the litigation was not a factor in Pericles' decision for war. To establish the date of the trial given by Philochorus involves some changes in the manuscript quoted above. The archons' names are corrupt. The scholiast on Aristophanes apparently looked up the trial of Phidias and the Megarian Decree in Philochorus and found the events under two different archons who in the manuscript are called Pythodorus and Skythodorus. In Pythodorus' archonship, Philochorus placed the completion of the Athena Parthenos,

\[34\text{Ibid.}\]

\[35\text{The corrupt archon names were first noted by J. Palmerius, Exercitationes in Ant. Graecos (1668), pp. 746-717. I did not have access to Palmerius but found his explanation quoted by F. Dübner, Scholia Graeca in Aristophanem (Paris: 1883), p. 472. Palmerius' corrections have won universal acceptance. K.J. Beloch, Griechische Geschichte (Srassburg: 1914), 2, pp. 295-296, n. 2, however, suggests that the scholiast used a corrupt archon list; but Jacoby, op. cit., F 123 shows that the same scholiast mentions Pythodorus as archon in 432/31, which shows that he had the correct archon list.}\]
Phidias' trial, the artist's flight from Athens to Elis and further vicissitudes of his life. Under Skythodorus, he places the quarrel between Megara and Athens and Megara's complaint to Sparta about the unjust decree. Philochorus does not precisely date the passage of this decree, but the fragment suggests that it was in effect when Skythodorus was archon. Importantly, the scholiast has noted an interval of seven years between Skythodorus and Pythodorus.

The latter was archon in 432/31 and, according to Thucydides' History, enactment of the Megarian Decree took place during his term of office. Skythodorus occurs nowhere in the archon lists. The entry, therefore, concerning the Megarian Decree should be listed under Pythodorus. If this is the case, since the interval between the two archons is seven years, reckoning inclusively, the events given under Pythodorus actually happened when Theodorus was archon, 438/37. This date is in line with the other evidence concerning the

36 Thuc. 2.1. Here Pythodorus is mentioned as having still four months of his archonship left in 431. The date of the Megarian Decree, c.432, is generally accepted; see Adcock, CAH, 5, p. 476.

37 Hill, op. cit., p. 398.

38 Ibid.
completion of the Athena Parthenos.  

"It is annoying," says Jacoby, "that the archon names are corrupt...the alternatives are slight and certain." Philochorus, therefore, dated Phidias' trial c.438.

Thus two possible dates for Phidias' trial emerge from the ancient evidence. The majority of scholars accept the dates put forward by the Aristophanes group and, for this reason, they have earned the epithet "traditional." But a minority, recently championed by Jacoby, have questioned the traditional dating of the trial and insist that Philochorus' account has more authority than the other witnesses.

Ingenious arguments support both dates given by the ancient writers and represent many disciplines. Art historians discuss the Phidian influence on other Greek artists in an attempt to verify Philochorus' date. On the other hand, archaeologists, using the discoveries

---

40Jacoby, op. cit., p. 486.
41It would be impossible to list all scholars who have considered the question at Phidias' trial. For a partial list, covering the years from 1867-1897, see Busolt, Griechische Geschichte (Gotha: 1897), 3, p. 457, n.1 Busolt summarizes each entry. A more recent bibliography can be found in Donnay, "La Date du Procès de Phidias," L'Ant. Class., 37 (1968), p. 19, n. 1; 27, n.27.
At Olympia, confirm the traditional date. Among the plethora of theories, however, one stands foremost: analysis of the literary tradition. Adherents of Philochorus condemn the traditional date because it is based on fifth century comedy. Suggesting that Aristophanes erroneously connected Phidias' trial with the Megarian Decree and the outbreak of the war, they condemn others who agree with Aristophanes and are unable to distinguish gossip from history. Supporters of the traditional date take an opposite position. Therefore, a re-examination of the literary tradition is in order. First, consideration will be given to the Aristophanes Group, then the discussion will center itself on the fragment of Philochorus.

The passage from Aristophanes' Peace is the first extant mention of Phidias' troubles. The comedian does


43Jacoby, op. cit., pp. 488-41; Adcock, CAH, 5, p. 479.
not speak of a trial or the fate of the artist, undoubtedly because he thought the subject familiar to his audience. But Aristophanes considers the misfortune of Phidias as having great impact on Pericles. The allusion certainly implies that Pericles sought a means to avoid any scrutiny by the people. Aristophanes portrays Pericles' Megarian Decree as a direct result of Phidias' calamity and the means by which Pericles escaped his dilemma.

Reasons for Aristophanes' remark can only be conjectured. The recent death of Phidias may have caused the comedian's lampoon. Gomme, however, sees a special point to such criticism in 421. Cleon had been charged with prolonging the war to hide his misdoings, and Thucydides tells that the people said that Cleon was only following in the footsteps of his master, Pericles. In any case, Aristophanes is trying to show the causes of the Peloponnesian War, and he reflects popular opinion which considered the Megarian Decree as the major cause. Furthermore Aristophanes postulates as a reason for the

---


45 Thuc. 5. 16. 1.

46 Gomme, op. cit., 1, pp. 447-450. It is generally accepted that Thuc. 1. 67.4 is an attempt to show that the Megarian Decree was not the major reason for the war.
decree the misfortune of Phidias. In the _Acharnians_, however, produced in 428, Aristophanes has it that Aspasia brought about the decree. This inconsistency causes doubt about the validity of Aristophanes' statement that Phidias' trial is to be linked to the Megarian Decree. In truth, the causal relationship given by Aristophanes can be discounted as comic intention. Perhaps the audience reacted something like Trygeus who replied to Hermes' account, "I did not know that!"

Once established by Aristophanes, however, the relationship of Phidias' trial to the Megarian Decree continues in the following centuries. In Book 12, after describing the conflict between Corinth and Corcyra, Diodorus reaches the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War, which he dated in the archonship of Euthydemus (431). Here he pauses to describe the causes of the war. His account begins with the transfer of the Delian treasury to Athens in 454. Pericles controlled the money and later (an indeterminate amount of time according to Diodorus) feared an audit. Alcibiades tried to alleviate

47 Aristoph. _Acham._ 524.

Pericles' fear with the suggestion that the statesman seek a means to circumvent the forthcoming scrutiny; the result was that Pericles seriously began to consider war as a means to carry out this advice. 49

Following this introduction, Diodorus does not immediately proceed to the outbreaks of the conflict; but he adds, in a disconnected fashion, other information concerning Pericles' uneasy position in Athens. Diodorus mentions that Phidias and Anaxagoras were tried as a means to further discredit Pericles and, at this point, Pericles resolved to embroil Athens in a great war. 50

Next, presupposing, but not explaining, the existence of the Megarian Decree, Diodorus describes how Pericles advised the people to accept Sparta's threat of hostilities and encouraged them with a review of resources, both military and financial. Diodorus concludes with the remark that Pericles persuaded the people with his eloquence, and quotes from Aristophanes Peace 605, in an obvious attempt to give validity to the narrative. 51

The chapters of Diodorus confirm a tradition concerning the trial of Phidias that goes back at least to

49 Diod. Sic. 38.
50 Ibid. 39. 1-3.
51 Ibid. 39. 4-5; 40.
the fourth century, for Diodorus expressly says that he is following the account of Ephorus, the fourth century historian. Apparently Ephorus provided no absolute dates and considered the reasons leading up to the war to be the result of a development of uncertain duration. He gives the fear of an audit as a specific cause for Pericles' dilemma, which Aristophanes had only ridiculed and not explained. This fear, further compounded by the accusations against Phidias and Anaxagoras, forced Pericles' decision for war.

Ephorus places the trial of Phidias in close connection with the Megarian Decree and hints vaguely at the possibility of a causal relation between the two events. Although Ephorus gives no precise date for the Megarian Decree, he implies that it was used by Pericles to carry out his resolution. The placement of Phidias' trial before the mention of the Megarian Decree shows a logic of sequence of events and great dependance upon Aristophanes. Like many later historians, Ephorus considered Aristophanes a trustworthy source for history, and he accepted the comedian's judgment that the trial of Phidias had special importance in the internal politics of Athens before the Peloponnesian War. If the excerpt from

52Ibid. 41.1. 
Aristophanes' *Peace* at the conclusion of Diodorus' survey was part of Ephorus' original version, proof for his dependance on Aristophanes is preserved.

In chapters 29 through 33 of *Pericles*, Plutarch discusses the causes of the Peloponnesian War and gives special emphasis to the Megarian Decree. Plutarch says that Pericles alone was held responsible for the war because of his adamant stand in favor of the decree. The reasons for Pericles' position, given by Plutarch, are as follows: (1) some thought that Pericles had the best interest of Athens in mind; (2) others attributed his actions to arrogance; and (3) Pericles feared the outcome of Phidias' trial. These reasons, and in particular the last, which Plutarch labels as "the worst with the greatest number of witnesses," caused Pericles to kindle the war and blow it into flames. 53

The influence of Aristophanes' embroideries are evident in Plutarch's account. The biographer, however, does not accept a causal relationship between Phidias' trial and the Megarian Decree; he says, rather, that Phidias' misfortune caused Pericles' refusal to rescind the Decree. But the fact that the mention of the psephisma and the trial are closely related shows the

53 Plut. Per. 31.2.
continuance and popularity of Aristophanes' presentation in Roman times.

Aristodemus and the Suda repeat the slander of Aristophanes, but the total tradition also has affected them. Aristodemus mentions the completion of the Athena Parthenos, the theft of Phidias, and the fear of Pericles which resulted in the passage of the Megarian Decree. The Suda gives the additional information that Pericles stole fifty talents. 54

Thus, Aristophanes' creation of a causal relationship between Phidias' trial and the Megarian Decree and the outbreak of war found a permanent place in the later reconstruction of these crucial years at Athens. The members of the Aristophanes group may be criticised for accepting comic exaggeration as historic fact. But can their testimonies be completely invalidated for this reason? We must ask first whether the Aristophanes group based its chronology on that of the comic poet.

Aristophanes apparently considered the troubles of Phidias as roughly coincidental with the years before the outbreak of the war, but his chronology may be

---

54 It appears that the Suda has confused traditions at this point. The Athena Parthenos supposedly was made from forty to fifty talents of gold. The lexicographer perhaps transferred this amount to the tradition which spoke of Pericles' theft.
questioned. If poetic license permits a false connection between Phidias and the Megarian Decree, it would also allow a confusion of chronology. If Phidias was tried in the late 430's or earlier, his trial would only be a memory in 421. Aristophanes wished to recall a past event; he did not necessarily care whether he adhered to exact chronology, i.e., Aristophanes might have telescoped a trial of 438 to the late 430's. On the other hand, it is possible that the comedian would not invent such an association if Phidias' trial had not occurred shortly before the fatal psephisma. A choice between these alternatives must be based largely upon personal conviction; and, in my opinion, Aristophanes' general chronology is correct. Comic exaggeration hides the truth, but it does not preclude the possibility of latent truth in Aristophanes' account. I can see no comic value in changing the time of Phidias' trial.

We may assume that Diodorus' chronology came from Ephorus, but we cannot precisely say what sources Ephorus used. His account of these years shows few divergencies from the history of Thucydides and the differences that

55 See H. Block's review of Jacoby, FGrH 3 B in Gnomon, 31 (1959), p. 446.

exist often result from Diodorus' abridgement. Ephorus surely consulted Thucydides; but it is a fact that Thucydides did not indulge in reporting scandalous gossip, and this is particularly true when Pericles was involved. Therefore Ephorus had to draw upon other sources. Barber thinks that Ephorus drew from the political propaganda of the opponents of Pericles current before the Peloponnesian War. Certainly some of his sources bore an anti-Periclean stamp, but whatever his sources, Ephorus did not confine his research to Aristophanes. The comedian, as far as the extant comedies are concerned, only mentions Phidias and Aspasia in connection with Pericles; Ephorus, on the other hand, speaks of the trial of Anaxagoras. It is probable that Aristophanes knew of Anaxagoras' trial, but if he ever mentioned it cannot be determined. As the evidence stands, one cannot agree that Ephorus derived his chronology from Aristophanes alone.

59 Barber, ibid., pp. 110-112.
60 Jacoby, op. cit., p. 490, suggest Stesimbrotus as a source for Ephorus.
61 Ibid.
The relationship of the trials given by Ephorus has been criticised by Barber, who says that Ephorus "neglected to verify the dates of the prosecutions of Pericles' friends." Barber's statement, however, is based on modern theories concerning the trial of Anaxagoras, i.e., A.E. Taylor, who places the philosopher's trial "with reasonable certainty" in the late 450's. The reasonable certainty of which Barber speaks is anything but certain. I have argued that Anaxagoras was tried somewhere between 433 and 430, and if these dates are correct, we may perhaps admit that Ephorus was right on his chronology, but wrong in his theory of the causes of the war. There may be truth in Jacoby's assertion that "he (Ephorus) was the first historian to collect this gossip, which was perhaps not entirely gossip." 

When Plutarch came to the chronology of Phidias' trial, he, like Ephorus, did not confine himself to Aristophanes. Certain details preserved by Plutarch give evidence that Ephorus was especially useful; but because Plutarch enlarges the details, it is safe to assume that Plutarch used many sources. In general, we may say that Plutarch created his version from the traditional

---

62 Barber, op. cit., p. 109.
63 Jacoby, ibid.
material, which for the fifth century means Herodotus and Thucydides supplemented and modified by later writers. 

One source used by Plutarch was extremely helpful in establishing chronology. Craterus the Macedonian, who flourished in the early part of the third century B.C., distinguished himself as a careful compiler of original historical documents bearing on the history of Athens, which probably dealt only with the fifth century B.C. Craterus was in effect an ancient Tod. The contents of Craterus' work included a complete text of Athenian popular decrees, judgments of the courts, and comments and a kind of text accompanied them. The sources of Craterus are unknown, but his work was not derived from Athenian comedy. Whether every decree in Craterus' collection was authentic cannot be determined; in general his work was considered of the highest value, and it was cited with respect by scholiasts and

---

64 Plutarch cites by name in his Pericles twenty-two authors, but alludes indirectly to several others. For an alphabetical list of authors cited by Plutarch in the Pericles, see B. Perrin, Pericles (New York: 1910), p. 65.


67 Jacoby, ibid., col. 1618.
Plutarch made extensive use of Craterus' work, often quoting him directly or using material furnished by him without mentioning his name. Jacoby, however, doubts that Plutarch used Craterus directly and believes that Plutarch reproduced decrees indirectly from Hellenistic biography. But his argument is not wholly convincing. In Cimon 13.5 and Aristides 26, Plutarch suggests that he is quoting directly from Craterus' work and there is no good reason to doubt that he had first hand knowledge of this list of decrees.

In reconstructing the post-war years in Athens, Plutarch cites the decrees of Diopeithes, of Dracontides, and of Glycon. These are roughly dated between 433-430 and one is expressly tied to the trial of Phidias.

---

68 Plut. Cim. 13. 4-5 mentions that the Peace of Callias was copied by Craterus. "Theopompus (F 154)... said that the inscription at Athens which contained its terms could not be genuine because it was written in the Ionic alphabet, which was not officially established at Athens till 403 B.C. Most modern scholars, however, agree that Theopompus was wrong." See Gomme, op. cit., p. 332. For the opposite view, see Walker, CAtt, 5, 469-71.


70 Chambers, op. cit., pp. 131-132.

71 I have argued in a previous chapter that the decree of Diopeithes belongs between 433-430. The decree of Dracontides is connected with trial of Pericles in 430, see Gomme, op. cit., 2, p. 137. Also see Chambers, ibid.
Plutarch says that Menon, the informer against Phidias, received protection on the motion of Glycon. It is highly probable that Plutarch found this decree dated in the late 430's by Craterus. If this is so, Plutarch's chronology, although replete with the details drawn from other traditions, is based on good evidence.

My survey thus far has established two facts concerning the Aristophanes group. (1) Aristophanes' portrayal of Phidias' trial as a cause of the Peloponnesian War was accepted as fact and favorably received by later writers. (2) The chronological setting of the lawsuit involving Phidias was placed by Ephorus and Plutarch independently of Aristophanes. Ephorus connects the misfortune of Phidias with those of Anaxagoras, who was tried in the late 430's; Plutarch, on the other hand, using Craterus' decrees, puts Phidias' trial just before the outbreak of the war. Attention must now be given to the fragment of Philochorus to see if his chronology is more trustworthy.

It has been noted that the fragment of Philochorus is open to suspicion; the names of the archons are

---

72 Pareti, op. cit., p. 274, n. 5 has shown that Glycon should be equated with Glaucon, general in 439/38 and 433. See Kirchner, s.v. "Glaukon," RE 7, col. 1402.

73 Busolt, op. cit. pp. 460-466, n. 2.
corrupt, and the death of Phidias as given by the historian may be questioned; moreover it contains very little information from Philochorus' 
*rarely*. Consisting of comments by two scholiasts, the fragment is subdivided into two parts, only the first of which contains statements from Philochorus which may have been abridged by the scholiast. The latter section is generally considered a worthless paraphrase of the first.

Although the nature of the fragment is questionable, one fact emerges clearly in the blunt testimony of the second scholiast: "the suspicion against Pericles seems groundless, since the affairs concerning Phidias took place seven years before the outbreak of war." In other words, the scholiast who followed Philochorus rejected the years 433/30 for Phidias' trial and did not accept Aristophanes' causal relationship between the trial and the war. On the basis of the scholiast's judgment, it can be assumed that Philochorus shared this belief also.

---

74 Jacoby, *FGrH*, 3-B Suppl., p. 486.

75 Block, *op. cit.*, p. 497. Recently O. Lendle, "Philochoerus über den Prozess des Phidias," *Hermes*, 33 (1955), pp. 284-303 has tried to completely revolutionize F 121 in all its parts. According to Lendle, the second scholiast to Peace 605 is the main text of the fragment. His proof, however, is generally not accepted. See Donnay, *op. cit.*, pp. 20-21, n. 4.

76 See above, p. 105.
Many details given by Philochorus are correct. The date of the completion of the Athena Parthenos and the sequence of Phidias' major works are accurately preserved. But his date for the artist's trial is not so certain. It may be that Philochorus, as Gomme states, "in the absence of what he considered direct evidence, only inferred that since the completion of the Athena Parthenos was in 438/37, the charge of peculation was brought then; and, since the Olympian Zeus was made later, that the punishment must have been exile." 77 The Atheniographer perhaps appended to the completion of the Athena Parthenos events of Phidias' life without dating them. 78 Moreover, we must remember that it was Philochorus' proclivity to make alterations in traditional stories. He mistrusted any sensational or scandalous story, and, what is more important, he was highly biased in favor of Athens. 79 Lionell Pearson points this out: "he (Philochorus) indulged his patriotic bias in favor of Athens not by argument but by altering the story." 80 Two good examples may be cited. Philochorus recasts the Herodotean account

77 Gomme, op. cit., 2, p. 186.
78 Frickenhaus, op. cit., p. 348.
concerning the rebuilding of the temple at Delphi. The temple burned in 548 and, in Herodotus' story, the Alcmaeonidae rebuilt it. During their stay at Delphi, the Alcmaeonidae supposedly bribed the Priestess to tell any Spartans who came to consult the oracle that it was their duty to liberate Athens from the Pisistratidae. Such a story apparently was objectionable to Philochorus because it was insulting to the Priestess and to the Alcmaeonidae, and he exonerates both, i.e. there was no bribe at all. In another fragment, Philochorus asserts that it was the Corinthians, not Alcibiades, who were responsible for the mutilation of the Herm in 415. The historicity of these alterations is debatable, but in general they may be rightly viewed as dubious.

One factor should be noted about the alterations: they have a motive in common. In both changes Philochorus tries to erase insults directed towards the Alcmaeonidae, the family of Pericles. If Philochorus was consistent in his bias, is it too much to suggest that faced with another slander of the Alcmaeonidae Philochorus tried to clear Pericles' name by altering a tradition which linked

---

81 Hdt. 5. 61-65; Jacoby, op. cit., F 115.
82 Thuc. 5. 27-29.
83 Jacoby, ibid., p. 113.
the statesman with the peculation of Phidias?

Thus Philochorus' pro-Periclean bias is revealed in the chronology that he established for the trial of Phidias. By placing the trial c.438 instead of c.433/30 he clears Pericles of the charge of enacting the Megarian decree and plunging Athens into war because of his immediate fear of an audit stemming directly from Phidias' embezzlement. Philochorus knew that the Athena Parthenos was completed in 438 and that probably the funds committed to the project were subject to audit. Therefore he concludes that the trial took place at that time. Since this chronology contradicts that of all the other evidence and is probably based solely upon inference motivated by prejudice we have every right to be dubious.

Therefore, Philochorus' chronology is as questionable as that of the Aristophanes group. Since, as I have tried to suggest, the tradition chronology is better documented, Philochorus is to be rejected. It would be wrong to reject the accounts of Ephorus and Plutarch (solely on the assumption that they repeat the slander of Aristophanes) in favor of an author whose habit was to alter tradition on personal grounds. There is a strong probability that Phidias' trial did occur somewhere between 433 and 430, and that Aristophanes may have done nothing more than falsely connect two events
which happened around the same time.

Two final remarks strengthen my suggestion. Jacoby insists that Phidias' trial had no political overtones, but I cannot accept his conclusion. The entire tradition speaks against such a view. Ancient writers stress that Phidias was the friend of Pericles, and all say that Pericles was connected with the Athena Parthenos as overseer. The tradition insists that the charge against Phidias was ultimately directed at Pericles. Jacoby argues that the wording of Philochorus implies that Pericles was not involved in the trial of Phidias. But this argument is weak because it depends upon an excerpt taken from the Atthis of Philochorus which Jacoby himself admits may be abridged. The tradition that the enemies of Pericles used Phidias to disgrace and politically harm the statesman is too strong to be denied.

If the accusation against Phidias was related to the political opposition to Pericles, it is difficult not to accept Diodorus' remark that Pericles was actually accused of complicity or, at least, of negligence regarding the funds used by Phidias. If a date may be

---

84 Ibid., p. 490, 494.
85 Ibid.
86 See above, n. 74.
established for this attack on Pericles, a relative date for Phidias' trial can be offered.

There was only one trial of Pericles, that of the late summer of 430, when he was fined.\textsuperscript{87} Plutarch, in his narrative of the events of that year, does not suggest that a charge of embezzlement was brought against Pericles. The fine and displacement from office happened because of Pericles' war policy.\textsuperscript{88} But both Plato and Plutarch (as well as Diodorus) maintain that Pericles was, at some time, charged with embezzlement.\textsuperscript{89} Therefore, we may conjecture that this charge was probably related to an attack on Pericles other than the one in 430.\textsuperscript{90}

There are no direct means to establish when Pericles was accused of embezzlement. The Athena Parthenos was finished c.438; and it is likely that the funds were audited at this time, since the excess gold and ivory were transferred to the building accounts of

\textsuperscript{87}Gomme, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 187.

\textsuperscript{88}Plut., \textit{Per.} 35.

\textsuperscript{89}Plato \textit{Gorg.} 516a; Plut. \textit{Per.} 32. 1-3.

\textsuperscript{90}Donnay, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 33-35 tries to place this charge c.438. His argument, however, is weak and untenable. Donnay wants to date the decree of Dracontides c. 438, but his idea enjoys little acceptance. See above, n. 71.
the temple itself. But if such is the case, as far as we know, Pericles was not threatened. His position in the state at this time was strong and, if the question came up about Phidias in that year, Pericles could have overpowered his opponents. Moreover, Plato says that this accusation happened at the end of Pericles' life. Plutarch, if his chronology is at all accurate, puts the charge of embezzlement c.432. These dates preclude a charge against Pericles in 438. Pericles did not die until 429 and to try to make the testimonies of Plato and Plutarch applicable to the early 430's would be difficult. A reason for the delay in bringing charges against both Phidias and Pericles is not hard to imagine. Perhaps the statesman's opponents recognized his strength in 438 and delayed their attack until an opportune moment, which came with the threat of hostilities and with the return of Thucydides, son of Melesias c.433. In a political struggle, it would be good strategy to charge the leading statesman with supposed crimes committed seven years before at a time when the people looked disfavorably upon his leadership. The accusation of embezzlement

91 W.B. Dinsmoor, "Attic Building Accounts," AJA, 17 (1913), pp. 70-71. IG I² 339-353, particularly IG I² 347, dated to 439/38, mentions gold from the statue.
against Pericles must be linked to the charges against Phidias and his trial we have placed in the period 433/30. It is unlikely that Pericles himself was charged in court.

Finally, the sculptures of the Parthenon look as if they represent Phidias' style. Not all scholars give credit to Phidias for the art work on the temple and, indeed, this question is a hotly debated one among art historians.⁹² In my opinion, it would be strange for Phidias to leave to underlings the designing of the second most important features in the decoration of Athena's great temple. Phidias' first duty was the Athena Parthenos, but certainly he would have watched over carefully the work on the temple itself. Since the temple was not completed until c.434, Phidias probably was in or had access to Athens until the late 430's. Although it has been proven that Phidias was in Elis after 438, it does not necessarily follow that Phidias had abandoned Athens completely. He may have worked simultaneously on both the Parthenon and the cult image at Olympia.⁹³ A date, therefore, for Phidias' trial in the late 430's

---

⁹²Donnay, op. cit., pp. 31-32 rejects the idea that Phidias worked on sculptures of Parthenon. For the opposite view, see Richter, op. cit., p. 230, n. 127.

⁹³Lippold, op. cit., p. 155.
allows one to assume that Phidias directed the art work on the Parthenon. Moreover, the Callias decrees are generally dated to 434/33; and as Harrison suggests, "if the opening lines of the second Callias decree are correctly restored, provision for the completion of the pedimental sculptures is given in a decree which specifies very narrowly the way in which sacred monies may be used. This is the kind of thing one might expect to follow or immediately proceed the uproar over Phidias' handling of accounts."\(^5\)

The accusation against Phidias came after the completion of the chryselephantine Athena. We are told that his crime had something to do with the statue, but the precise reason for the accusation is obscure. As we have seen, Aristophanes, a contemporary of Phidias, is silent on the subject. Fourth century historians, Ephorus and Philochorus, give embezzlement as the reason for Phidias' trial but do not agree about the object stolen. Ephorus says that Phidias took sacred goods; Philochorus, however, emphatically asserts that Phidias


\(^{95}\)IG I² 91-92; Harrison, op. cit., p. 110.
took ivory. Plutarch gives an entirely different reason from those of Ephorus and Philochorus. The tradition from which Plutarch took his details spoke of embezzlement of gold. Plutarch rejects that tradition and suggests that Phidias was tried for impiety because he carved images of himself and Pericles on the shield of Athena. Obviously, ancient writers were desperately searching for the charge behind the accusation.

Plutarch's assertion has rightly been condemned as fiction by Harrison, who proves that his shield originated in Athenian comedy. Therefore, scholars have given preference to the report that Phidias was guilty of peculation and to Philochorus' account. Confirmation of Philochorus is supposedly found in the accounting lists of the Athena Parthenos. Extant fragments of these accounts, recorded each year by the overseers of the project, list expenditures for the statue. The weight of the gold purchased each year is given but only a unitary price for the ivory. Scholars speculate that the records suggest that the amount of gold was better known than the amount of ivory; and, therefore,

---

96 Harrison, op. cit., p. 132.
97 Donnay, "Les Comptes de L'Athena," p. 78 (see above, n. 27).
98 IG I2 354-362.
that Phidias was in a better position to steal ivory than gold.

I see no reason to be so precise concerning the object of Phidias' theft. Philochorus is only one of several authorities dealing with the subject; his judgment is only one among many. Philochorus selected ivory; but since Plutarch speaks of embezzlement of gold, it can be assumed that he found this charge in the tradition. But it is in no way certain that such a tradition arose after Philochorus or that it represents a shift from ivory to gold by later writers. As has been noted, Philochorus transferred the date of Phidias' trial from the late 430's to c.438. Philochorus may have again changed the tradition.

The accounting lists hardly confirm Philochorus. These lists are extremely fragmentary, and the lack of precision concerning ivory in them may be justified by the fact that ivory was perhaps purchased by bulk, not by weight.

Finally, the acceptance of Philochorus' statement is based on the assumption that the weight of the gold was known and that it would be checked if the need arose. The statue's unique construction, i.e., removable gold

\[99\text{Donnay, loc. cit.}\]
plates on a wooden core, made weighing the gold possible. But it is unlikely that, after the completion of the statue, the Athenians ever tampered with the gold. Thucydides, in his list of the resources available to the Athenians at the outbreak of the war, mentions among several items the gold on the statue.\textsuperscript{100} But as Gomme states, "so far as we know, and in this case our ignorance is practically decisive, the Athenians did not make use of this considerable gold reserve, even in the closing stage of the war, nor, when one might think it would be an even greater temptation, in the difficult first years of the peace: neither the Thirty nor the restored democracy proposed it."\textsuperscript{101} In other words, the statue probably stood inviolate from the moment of its completion until the end of the war. The crises of war did not tempt the Athenians to tamper with the statue. Would a charge of embezzlement involving gold directed at its creator be a different matter?

Moreover, the amount of the gold used on the statue varies in the tradition. Thucydides says forty talents were used in its construction. Philochorus, however, gives forty-four talents; Diodorus says fifty, and this

\textsuperscript{100}Thuc. 13.5.

\textsuperscript{101}Gomme, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 25.
probably came from Ephorus. These discrepancies indicate that the exact amount of gold was perhaps not known and that somewhere between forty and fifty talents were incorporated into the statue.

Therefore, the modern acceptance of Philochorus' statement cannot be justified. If the opponents sought a reason to accuse Phidias of peculation, they did not need to base their claim on ivory alone: the amount of gold was generally known and, once that statue was inside the temple, there was little possibility of removing the plates to check their weight. We may hazard a guess that the accusers of Phidias realized this and rested their attack on an allegation of reasonable possibility. To call Phidias a thief was in fact to call Pericles one. The intent was to shake the public's confidence in their leader.
CONCLUSION

To judge from the derisive comments of Pseudo-Xenophon, Athenians were preoccupied with litigation. Complaining about legislative delays in Athens, the writer says:

It is impossible...to transact business with the Boule or Assembly:...For how could it be possible in a city...where they have to settle private and public cases and audits in numbers greater than all the rest of mankind put together...and it is necessary to judge a man who did not repair his ship or erected a building on state property. In addition to these cases, judgment must be made concerning choruses...four hundred triarchs are appointed every year...beyond these actions, magistrates are scrutinized and judged, and orphans are examined. All these things must be done every year. From time to time, it is necessary to judge those who have neglected their duties and whatever other injustices suddenly take place, whether extraordinary cases of outrage or impiety. A whole string of others I omit....

Aristophanes also is never weary of jesting about Athenian proclivity to litigation. Hermes, in the Peace, says, "You Athenians...do nothing but try cases." And Euepides, in the Birds, observes that "grasshoppers chirp upon the

---

1 Pseudo-Xen. 3. 1-4.
2 Aristoph. Peace 505.
bough a month or two, but our Athenians chirp over their lawsuits their whole life long."\(^3\)

Such remarks, although admittedly exaggerated, reveal that litigation was an integral part of Athenian life. Pseudo-Xenophon suggests the multifarious nature of the cases brought before the courts and, indeed, contemptuously says, "Let any man name a single matter that does not have to be passed on...."\(^4\) In view of these comments, it can be assumed that litigation was a popular means to settle differences of any kind in Athens. Bonner accurately describes the Athenians as a "nation of lawyers."\(^5\)

Taking into consideration the Athenian preoccupation with litigation, it is not surprising that the courts were the recognized medium of attack for which political antagonism was chiefly responsible. Plato recognized this function of the courts as entirely normal. In the Republic, the cycle which begins with democracy and ends in tyranny leads first to "impeachments and judgments of one another. And the prospective tyrant acting as the protector of the people and having the mob

\(^3\)Aristoph. Birds 39-41.

\(^4\)Pseudo-Xen. 3.6.

at his disposal is not restrained from shedding the blood of kinsmen; by the favorite method of false accusation he brings them to court and murders them.\textsuperscript{6}

Several examples may be produced to prove that the courts became the arena for the settlement of political differences. Miltiades, whose strategy won the day at Marathon, was tried on a capital charge by Xanthippus. Themistocles was discredited after Salamis. Cimon was accused by Pericles of receiving bribes from Alexander of Macedon. The condemnation of Alcibiades was the result of political intrigue and attack. It is not surprising, therefore, that Aristophanes would parody this use of the courts in his comedies. Cleon, in hot debate with Sausage-Seller, shouts, "I'll drag you before the people so that you may give me justice;" to which the Sausage-Seller laughingly retorts, "and I'll drag you there and slander you more.\textsuperscript{7} Obviously, accusation and indictment were the stock-in-trade of the clever politician who wanted to harass, embarrass, and attack his opponent.

This use of the Athenian courts is specifically applicable to the attacks on Pericles' friends. We have

\textsuperscript{6}Plato Rep. 8.565c.

\textsuperscript{7}Aristoph. Knights 710-711.
noted Plutarch's remarks that Phidias and Anaxagoras were accused as a means to test Pericles' strength and popularity among the Athenians. The attacks upon Aspasia, Damonides, and Damon fall into the same category. The political nature of these attacks is universally accepted. We need to examine more closely how they functioned as political attacks and the effect they had on Pericles' career.

But first of all we may ask: Did all these attacks actually take place? The reality of the trials of Anaxagoras and Phidias is self-evident. No one challenges their historicity; the question of chronology, however, is hotly disputed. The solution I have offered runs as follows: Anaxagoras was accused of impiety and medism and prosecuted by Thucydides and Cleon sometime between 433-430; Phidias was tried for embezzlement when certain co-workers supposedly furnished evidence against him. Like Anaxagoras, Phidias was tried between 433-430.  

I have already argued that Damonides and Damon were distinct individuals, each of whom was ostracised. The dates proposed are: Damonides's ostracism c.447-445, Damon's ostracism c.433-430. 

---

8See above, chapters 3 and 4, pp. 81-96, 115-141.
9See above, chapter 2, pp. 60-64.
The lawsuit against Aspasia offers more difficulties because details in the sources are few. The allegation was that she acted as a procuress for Pericles and, therefore, was tried for impiety. Hermippus, the comic poet, prossectued Aspasia; Pericles led the defense on her behalf. Aspasia was acquitted after Pericles shed tears before the jury.  

The only indication of the date for this action is given by Plutarch whose authority is generally accepted. He places it about the same time "as the trials of Phidias and Anaxagoras." Aspasia was probably attacked in the late 430's, but that she was actually brought into court is questionable.

It is possible that Aspasia was tried for impiety. Nothing prevents Hermippus from being the prosecutor. There were no public prosecutors in Athens and any man could act in this capacity. Women could face litigation in Athens; but if they were tried, their κύριοι had to defend them. A foreign woman had to have a προστάτης

---

10 See above, chapter 1, pp. 16-17.


speak in her behalf. Aspasia was a Milesian, had no political rights, and was very dear to Pericles. Therefore, Pericles could have acted in the capacity of προστάτης and defended her. If so, Aspasia was acquitted as our sources indicate.

But the nature of the evidence indicates that her trial was possibly fabricated from the slander and hyperbole of fifth century comedy. A comic poet, Hermippus, led the attack. A tearful Pericles before a jury on behalf of a procuress befits the stage more than actual life. Aristophanes ridiculed Aspasia's "house" in the Acharnians. In view of these details, it is not unlikely that later writers mistranslated jokes into reality.

Thus it can be concluded that Anaxagoras and Phidias were tried; Damon and his father, Damosides, were ostracised; and Aspasia was viciously slandered but perhaps not brought to court. Also, a chronology has been established: Damosides' downfall belongs to the mid-440's, and the others were attacked in the late 430's, but we cannot be precise about the sequence of events. The litigations concerning Phidias and Anaxagoras were in close proximity, and the troubles of Aspasia took place "about the same time." Whether the ostracism of Damon

13 Ibid.
occurred before or after these attacks is indeterminable. One fact, however, emerges very clearly. The opponents of Pericles tended to wait for the right time to attack, i.e., they deferred their action until Pericles' policies were seriously scrutinized. Phidias' trial best exemplifies this strategy. The artist finished the Athena Parthenos in 438, but he was not tried until seven years later.

There is no doubt that those who attacked the friends of Pericles were also his political opponents. Thucydides, son of Milesias (along with Cleon) prosecuted Anaxagoras, after a certain Diopeithes introduced a bill attacking those thought to be irreligious. We know that opponents of Pericles used the trial of Phidias to test the people's loyalty. I see no reason not to imagine Thucydides at work (indirectly, if not directly) in this case too. Ostracism, a device with decisive political overtones, caused the downfall of Damon and Damonides and I have suggested in Chapter 2 that Thucydides was responsible. These attacks against Pericles' associates most probably are to be connected with two crucial periods in the lives of both Thucydides and Pericles (447-445 and 433-430). In the conflict preceding Thucydides' ostracism (444) Damonides was attacked; after Thucydides' return, Anaxagoras, Phidias, Damon and Aspasia became victims.
Politicians who attacked adversaries in the courts could count upon assistance from other enemies of the defendant, i.e., a concerted attack was probable. The trial of Anaxagoras provides a splendid example. Thucydides represented the aristocratic, conservative element, but Cleon championed the radical democrats who disliked Pericles. Also, it is obvious that political prosecutions were entrusted to agents, and actions initiated by others were exploited. For example, Diopeithes' decree was used to attack Anaxagoras, and the accusations made by Phidias' co-workers served as an incitement against Pericles. Finally, it is clear that litigation was not the only means of attacking Pericles indirectly. Ostracism, like the political trials, was occasionally used against his associates as a means of harassing him.

It has been established that the prosecutions of Pericles' friends happened at crucial periods in his career. We have noted the opposition and the method of their attacks. Now the various accusations must be considered in the attempt to discern how they aided Pericles' opponents.

Thucydides, the historian, brilliantly analysed the character of Pericles and concluded that by means of foresight, integrity and intelligence, he won the respect of the people and what was nominally a democracy was really
the rule of one man. \(^\text{14}\) Plutarch notes that Pericles' "single and continuous rule and sway in the annual gener-alship" lasted fifteen years. \(^\text{15}\) We need not doubt that Pericles was the most important politician in Athens and that the qualities listed by Thucydides enabled Pericles to lead the Athenians. On the other hand, we must assume that Pericles recognized that he was not sure of a lasting and unshaken rule; he certainly realized that his position depended upon the people of Athens. According to Aristotle, Damonides suggested the payment of jurymen to Pericles to counterbalance the popularity of Cimon. This story may be apocryphal, but at least it points out a basic truth applicable not only to Athenian democracy but all democracies: Pericles, like all politicians, needed the friendship of the demos, which in part explains his respect for them.

But it is just as certain that opponents recognized this fact also. One of the best ways to destroy Pericles was to win away or drive away his friends, i.e., the citizen body. Basically, such is the motivation behind the attacks on his friends. Therefore we must assess

\(^\text{14}\)Thuc. 2.65.  
\(^\text{15}\)Plut. Per. 16.
each accusation in these terms. As we shall see, a
certain logic emerges from these attacks.

A trial involving Aspasia probably never took
place. But we can speculate that the scurrility of the
comedians reflects an attitude commonly held. Stress was
given to Aspasia's atypical feminine role in Athens. The
Athenian tradition that a good woman should neither be
seen nor heard was violated by Aspasia. In a masculine
society, many men would not sympathize with a liberated
woman. Thus, political opponents could underline such
ideas with the intent of causing a gap between Pericles
and the voters.

Anaxagoras was charged with irreligion and the basis of the accusation was that he advocated new beliefs
concerning the sun, i.e., that the sun was a fiery mass,
not a divine being. Such a charge is not surprising.
Among intellectuals Anaxagoras' theories would be accepted, but the general public in Athens doubtless regarded his doctrines as irreligious. The opponents of Pericles must have recognized the possibilities afforded by Anaxagoras' teachings. And it appears that they went to some trouble to use Anaxagoras' friendship with Pericles for their cause. It is not known what particular offenses

---

16See above, chapter 3, pp. 71-72.
were comprised under the name *asebia* in the fifth century Athens. But certainly in order to make him liable to prosecution, a special decree was necessary to provide a definition of impiety, i.e., the decree of Diopeithes. The latter was a soothsayer, a religious fanatic who would recognize that Anaxagoras seriously compromised the art of divination. He apparently had good personal reasons to introduce a decree which struck at those "who did not believe in religion and taught new doctrines concerning things above." But the accusation against Anaxagoras had wider ramifications. Anaxagoras was also confronted with the charge that he intrigued with Persia. Such a charge would be loaded with emotion considering the past history between the two nations, and, of course, the implications are political. It is not too difficult to believe Plutarch's assertion that the attack against Anaxagoras was directed as well against Pericles. The trial was yet another attempt to discredit Pericles in the eyes of the people. The accusers placed their hope of removing Pericles from the political arena by arousing the religious sensibilities of the populace. Another member of Pericles' intellectual circle is discredited.

---

I have paced the trial of Phidias in the years 433-430. The nature of the charge against Phidias and its implications for Pericles have been discussed at length in Chapter 4. I need only summarize here. Phidias could have embezzled ivory or gold, but we cannot be sure. We may definitely assume, however, that the accusation of theft against Phidias was in fact an accusation against the integrity of Pericles. Once again the faith of the people in their leader is challenged. That Phidias depicted Pericles and himself on Athena's shield is probably fiction.

We have noted that the use of ostracism to attack Damonides and Damon indicates the political nature of their downfall. Different reasons, however, for their demise are given by the ancient writers. Aristotle says that Damonides was ostracised because he was the instigator of "many things" in behalf of Pericles. Included in the "many things" was Damonides' recommendation to Pericles that juries receive pay for their service. Therefore, it is probable that Damonides' ostracism is to be connected with the constitutional reform of Pericles. This criticism surely originated from the opponents of Pericles and was intended to test his legislation. But since the law benefited the majority of citizens, it is surprising that the ostracism occurred. But we do not
know what other activities of Damonides may be intended by Aristotle's remark. At any rate, condemnation of Damonides certainly was intended as condemnation of Pericles and his democratic policies.

In the case of Damon, Plutarch gives several reasons for the ostracism: Damon's teaching seemed extraordinary; he was a great schemer; and he was a lover of tyranny. It has been noted that Damon was a musician who stressed the place of music in the state, taught the importance of music on laws, constitutions, and the behavior of man, and stressed that changes in musical styles indicated changes in government. Such doctrines must have been novel to the average citizen who considered them as "extraordinary." Damon, therefore, was branded as a schemer. In essence, his ostracism is another attack against an intellectual, as in the case of Anaxagoras. Plutarch's observation that Damon was a lover of tyranny seems particularly pertinent; surely this is a reflection of his support of Pericles, who in the eyes of many was the tyrant of Athens.

A variety of charges, therefore, were made against the associates of Pericles. In every case, the accusations are directly linked with politics. The indictments had a basis of fact, i.e., they were allegations of reasonable possibility, but the truth or falsity of the
charge matters little. The motivation was to move public sentiment against Pericles. A way to discredit and embarrass him was to produce outward grievances directed at his friends. Particularly striking is the attempt to capitalize upon the rift between the intellectual, amoral circle of Pericles and the average religious and political mores of the demos. A false logic operated in every case: Aspasia, Anaxagoras, Damonides, Damon and Phidias were guilty of certain charges; Pericles was a friend of these; therefore Pericles was guilty too. It is obvious that in fifth century politics, as in modern, guilt by association proved to be a strong weapon.

Calhoun states about political prosecutions that "success depended not upon the justice of the charge but upon political strength...." Any assessment of the effect of these attacks on Pericles' position can only be determined in the light of their results. Pericles' stature and influence seem to have been diminished little by these attacks in the 440's. Damonides' ostracism must be viewed as victory for the opposition, but it was a Pyrrhic victory. Spurred on by success, Thucydides, son of Melesias, directly confronted Pericles and lost. Confidence in Pericles' policies was shaken in the mid-440's,

\(^{18}\text{Calhoun, op. cit., p. 100.}\)
but the ostracism of Thucydides indicates Pericles' control was not destroyed.

In the late 430's, the opposition repeated its tactics; again they met with partial success: Damon was ostracised. Anaxagoras, for example, was fined and removed from Athens, but Pericles maintained his position. Not everyone would accept this conclusion because the ancient writers give different testimonies about the result of Anaxagoras' trial. One detail, however, wins universal acceptance: Pericles played a major role in his defense. Anaxagoras was probably put in prison for preventive detention before his trial and, because of Pericles' intervention, he was eventually sentenced with a fine of five talents. Anaxagoras may have been ordered to leave Athens; but Pericles, knowing the real reason for the attack on the aging philosopher, could have advised Anaxagoras to quit the city.

Nor is the situation different with Phidias. Assailed by Pericles' political opponents, Phidias was probably jailed as a preventive measure. But what

19Diog. Laert. 2. 12-14 gives a full discussion of Anaxagoras' trial which indicates the deplorable state of the tradition even in antiquity. Derenne, op. cit., pp. 38-41 has analysed the conflicting evidence and offered the conclusion which I have stated above.

20Derenne, op. cit., p. 40, n. 1.
happened after Phidias was jailed is hopelessly lost in the foggy tradition. As was shown, archaeological discoveries at Olympia reveal that Phidias definitely worked in Elis until perhaps the end of the 420's. Therefore Plutarch's assertion that Phidias died in jail must be wrong. In the light of Derenne's conclusions concerning the result of Anaxagoras' trial, it seems more likely that Phidias was acquitted, probably due to the prestige and influence of Pericles. We cannot determine whether Phidias was sent from Athens or chose to leave voluntarily. I doubt that Phidias was exiled, as Philo­chorus states; he probably left Athens to finish his work at Elis begun some seven years previously. If Pericles was actually charged with embezzlement himself, he was never brought to trial.

Therefore, we may conclude that the outcomes of the trials of Anaxagoras and Phidias indicate the political strength of Pericles in the late 430's. He maintained the upper hand, but the attacks were soon to take their toll. In the summer of 430 he was fined and dismissed from office. His dismissal was the result of dislike of his war policy, stemming from the very personal response of the people to the suffering that was

\[21\text{See above, Chapter 4, pp. 103-08.}\]
wrought. Yet, we must imagine that the recent political attacks were not forgotten and helped influence the citizens' reaction against Pericles. But it was Pericles' war and they soon realized that they could not get along without him and reinstated him to his former position. Pericles emerged in a sense triumphant shortly before his death.
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