

UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI

June 1 1954

I hereby recommend that the thesis prepared under my supervision by Robert V. Leonardon entitled Studies in the life of Themistocles

be accepted as fulfilling this part of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Approved by:

Malcolm F. H. [Signature]



**STUDIES IN THE LIFE OF THEMISTOKLES**

**A dissertation submitted to the  
Graduate School of Arts and Sciences  
of the University of Cincinnati  
in partial fulfillment of the  
requirements for the degree of**

**DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY**

**1954**

**by**

**Robert Joseph Lenardon**

**B. A. University of British Columbia 1949**

**M. A. University of Cincinnati 1950**

**CINCINNATI  
UNIVERSITY  
LIBRARY**

UMI Number: DP15883

### INFORMATION TO USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleed-through, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

**UMI**®

---

UMI Microform DP15883

Copyright 2009 by ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

ProQuest LLC  
789 E. Eisenhower Parkway  
PO Box 1346  
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

27.9.54 case

**STUDIES IN THE LIFE OF THEMISTOKLES**

SEP 10 1954

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
	INTRODUCTION . . . . .	i
I	THE OSTRACISM AND EXILE . . . . .	1
II	THE ARCHONSHIP . . . . .	68
III	THE <u>LETTERS</u> OF "THEMISTOKLES" . . . . .	120
	BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	182

## INTRODUCTION

When I began this dissertation I intended to write a biography of Themistokles. It soon became apparent, however, that special studies of the major problems were imperative as preliminaries to the biography itself. These major problems are the value of the sources, their interrelationship and the fundamental chronology of the Themistoklean age; all are in very real dispute today. By abandoning the proposed full-scale biography in favour of a series of studies of crucial issues I should be able to work closely with the conflicting testimony, evaluate the many solutions proposed by modern scholarship and establish my own conclusions, conclusions upon which I should then be prepared to build with confidence. Thus, having constructed the framework, I should be allowed the necessary freedom for a biography that would not be burdened and hampered at every turn by detailed and subtle argument; and the special studies too would give me the intimacy with the material that is essential to the biographer.

Accordingly I present here three chapters, two of which are in the main (although not entirely) chronological; the third deals with the letters that have come down to us under the name of Themistokles. This last immediately suggests a

fourth, on the sources, the completion of which would, I venture to hope, prepare the way for a biography that would attract the interested layman, one that would merit the adjective humanistic.

The study of the sources I have postponed for the following reason. The more I examined the sources, the more I realised that the chapters here offered had to be written first. In them an evaluation of the ancient testimony forms an integral part; and my conclusions are embodied in and crucial to the establishment of a factual and chronological framework for Themistokles' life. I have not brought these conclusions under one heading; each chapter had another purpose. But the groundwork for my analysis of the sources has been laid.

The reader of these chapters may at times easily forget that I deal here with a great period in the history of mankind; the era of the Persian wars, the formative years of Athenian democracy, the prelude to the golden age of Perikles. My object has been only to seek the basis upon which a broader understanding of these years must be founded. For Themistokles' career, to be sure, this basis needs to be stated in the light of the rapid and vast extension of our knowledge of the early fifth century in recent years. And this is a time vital to the historian of ancient Athens.

Why I write 'vital' is perhaps obvious. I mention merely that the age of Themistokles was treated by two major literary figures, Herodotos and Thucydides. They both were artists as well as historians, which goes without saying to those who believe that art and history are one. In Thucydides' case, at any rate, the union is complete. And so I should direct those who wonder at the dry analysis of the following pages to Herodotos for his epic account of the Persian wars; but for an appreciation of Themistokles one must turn to Thucydides. For Thucydides looked back to the age of Perikles and saw in it the fulfillment of Athens' greatness. And, in his analysis of the factors that made this greatness possible, he understood that Perikles was the direct political heir of Themistokles. Thus, in the pages of Thucydides, Themistokles appears both as the outstanding individual that he was and also as the Athenian statesman, sharing with Perikles the attributes that were found wanting in the leaders of Athens in her decline. This is, of course, only to point out once again the peculiar ability of the classical Greek to depict the particular and the generic without sacrificing either. Plutarch, it is true, writes a biography of Themistokles, and his account is necessarily fuller and more detailed; yet, in terms of the meaning that only the skill and perception of the literary genius can convey, Thucydides tells us much more.

In conclusion a few words must be said about the form and mechanics of this study. At the beginning of each chapter I give a brief discussion of the most significant modern scholarship for the problem at hand. A chart (p. 119) embodies the conclusions of Chapters I and II; for, although the questions of the ostracism and exile and the archonship are presented as separate studies, these two chapters belong closely together. Chronologically the problem of the archonship should precede that of the ostracism and the exile. The order that I follow is in many ways arbitrary; I began my investigation with the ostracism and exile and this determined my method and dictated the order of presentation here. Chapter III is more remote; the epistles, however, do offer support to the conclusions that are reached in the previous chapters. Complete information concerning both ancient and modern sources is to be found in the Bibliography.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The abbreviations employed in the notes are resolved in the Bibliography. For Plutarch I use in general the text of Perrin in the Loeb Classical Library and I therefore cite by his sections.

CHAPTER ONE  
THE OSTRACISM AND EXILE

The chronology of Themistokles' career is intimately connected with the wider problems involved in a precise dating of the events following upon the Persian wars. Yet an examination of the entire chronological background of the Pentekontaetia (at any rate in its earlier years, which are my immediate concern) is unnecessary and even superfluous. The most recent discussion is found in the third volume of A. T. L., and I accept the conclusions of the authors as a general framework for my investigation.<sup>1</sup>

I shall confine my attention, in so far as possible, directly to the life of Themistokles. Gomme presents a concise summary of the problems along with a bibliography. His comments are, as always, pointed and stimulating and, however provocative, of extreme critical value. But he feels the impossibility of a final solution to the vexed questions of Themistoklean chronology.<sup>2</sup> It is necessary

---

<sup>1</sup> Meritt, Wade-Gery, McGregor, The Athenian Tribute Lists, III, pp. 158-180. Gomme's work too is of course invaluable (Commentary, I, pp. 389-413).

<sup>2</sup> Gomme, Commentary, I, especially pp. 261-262, 397-401, 408.

then to review the issues and to evaluate the latest contributions of scholarship in order to arrive at a chronological basis for a biography of Themistokles. The epistles, which hitherto have been almost completely ignored, will receive their due consideration. For whether or not they deserve to suffer such neglect demands inquiry; indeed, they at least afford valuable testimony in support of Thucydides.<sup>3</sup>

The crucial evidence for the dates of the ostracism and condemnation is found in Diodoros.<sup>4</sup> He narrates under a single archonship, that of Praxiergos (471/0), the career of Themistokles from the years immediately preceding his ostracism (i.e., the first charge of treason, his ostracism, his condemnation, his flight to Persia and his sojourn there until the time of his death); this date must indicate a fixed chronological point in Themistokles' life.<sup>5</sup> The question then is this: to what event does the year 471/0 refer? The dispute has been long and heated and

---

<sup>3</sup> See Chapter III below.

<sup>4</sup> Diodoros, XI, 54-60.

<sup>5</sup> Diodoros' method frequently was, I believe, to narrate an episode, or an event in a man's life, under a given year (which may be right), and then to include, under the same archonship, related events or episodes, which may in fact be far distant chronologically.

scholars, vehement in their insistence that either the ostracism or condemnation is intended, are sharply divided in their support of 471/0 for the one or the other.

Gomme's suggestion that perhaps something else (e.g., Themistokles' arrival in Persia) is meant by Diodoros does not bear analysis.<sup>6</sup> Surely we may assume that the archon-date 471/0, preserved by an Atthis or in Krateros and transmitted by Diodoros (through Ephoros), was linked with an event, the date of which was a matter of record. That this was an ostracism or an impeachment is likely. That Themistokles' arrival in Persia was thus dated is difficult to believe, particularly when we also consider the nature of the rival traditions concerning his meeting with Xerxes or Artaxerxes.<sup>7</sup> There is just the possibility that the first summons and acquittal of Themistokles, mentioned by Diodoros, are intended for 471/0. But it is hardly probable that this first impeachment, rather than the second, which was of so much more historical moment, should receive a chronological notice. Furthermore, there is no chronology for Themistokles' career that would allow 471/0 for the first trial, unless we assume, with violence to the implications of Diodoros' account and that of Plutarch, that the

---

<sup>6</sup> Commentary, I, p. 401.

<sup>7</sup> Plutarch, Themistokles, 27, 1; cf. below, p. 45.

ostracism occurred in the same year.<sup>8</sup> Another possibility is that Diodoros follows a notice synchronizing Themistokles' flight and the siege of Naxos, although this could also mean that the condemnation was placed in 471/0 as well.<sup>9</sup> Besides, fourth-century tradition (to which Diodoros must be indebted) argues against such an assumption for, as we shall see, it had Themistokles, in all probability, meeting the Athenian fleet off Thasos.<sup>10</sup> Ironically enough Diodoros could be merely dating the synoikismos of Elis; but I do not believe this, since the career of Themistokles dominates his narrative under the archon-year 471/0, even though Elis is mentioned first; and there is other evidence that links Themistokles and this year.

Gomme's remarks, too, questioning Diodoros' trustworthiness and the correctness of 471/0 for whatever event is to be dated introduce undue scepticism and a needless confusion of the issue.<sup>11</sup> Must one work on the assumption

---

<sup>8</sup> I do not believe that Diodoros was unaware of the great interval of time that he has compressed under this one archon-year.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Thucydides, I, 137, 2 and Plutarch, Themistokles, 25, 2; see below, pp. 38-40.

<sup>10</sup> See below, pp. 58-60.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Gomme, Commentary, I, pp. 53, note 4, and 408. The comments of Ure, Class. Rev., XXXVII (1923), p. 64, concerning

that Diodoros is always wrong? Indeed, his chronology can be significant when judged in connexion with other evidence. His method of narrating the occurrences of many years under one archon-date is one thing, the accuracy of this archon-date as applied to a single event by his source is another. The historical correctness of 471/0 (whether for the ostracism or the condemnation, and it must be for only the ostracism or the condemnation) is a question with which for the moment I am not concerned. The problem first is to establish the tradition preserved by Diodoros, and that there was a tradition, in the first century B.C. at any rate, connecting an event in Themistokles' life with the year 471/0 is attested by other evidence and acknowledged by Gomme.<sup>12</sup>

The argument that 471/0 is the year for the ostracism and not the impeachment runs as follows. It is evident from Aristotle,<sup>13</sup> not only that a vote of ostracism was

---

Diodoros' chronology are similarly difficult to understand.

<sup>12</sup> See below, pp.12-14. It is significant that all our other direct testimony places the condemnation in 471/0. Curiously enough, Gomme (Commentary, I, p. 408) is inclined to place the ostracism in this year, despite his attitude towards Diodoros.

<sup>13</sup> Aristotle, Ath. Pol., 22. I follow Hignett (Hist. Ath.

dated but that its date was accessible to any Atthidographer and hence to Diodoros.<sup>14</sup> Thus it is much more likely that the year of an ostracism could be ascertained than that of an impeachment, which, it is argued, need not and even did not carry any date.<sup>15</sup>

On the other hand, those who uphold 471/0 as the year of Themistokles' condemnation and flight present the following case.<sup>16</sup> The decree that was proposed by Leobotes son of

---

Const., pp. 27-30) in rejecting Aristotle as author of The Constitution of the Athenians.

<sup>14</sup> Cary, Class. Rev., XXXVI (1922), p. 162, observes that every record of ostracism enjoined that the ostracized person could not set foot ἐν τῷ Γεραιστοῦ καὶ Σκυλλαίου (Aristotle, Ath. Pol., 22, 8). This stipulation demands a fixed terminus a quo.

<sup>15</sup> This line of reasoning has been advocated by Meyer (Gesch. d. Alt., IV, 1<sup>3</sup>, pp. 486-487) and Beloch (Gr. Gesch., II, 2<sup>2</sup>, pp. 192-193), as well as by Cary (Class. Rev., XXXVI [1922], pp. 161-162). Carcopino, L'ostracisme athénien, pp. 157-161, presents a good discussion of the question with abundant bibliography (see, in particular, p. 160, note 3). His conclusions are another matter (below, p. 17).

<sup>16</sup> Highby, Erythrae Decree, pp. 81-98, is the most recent and most convincing champion of this theory. His arguments

Alkmaion to bring Themistokles to trial was preserved by Krateros.<sup>17</sup> This impeachment, in form an eisangelia, even if it did not contain an archon-date, could be fixed chronologically through the name of the secretary of the Boule that it contained. It may be that Krateros gave to the impeachment an archon-year, for apparently he wove his collection of documents into some sort of historical account.<sup>18</sup> At any rate, in the time of Ephoros either the ostracism or the condemnation, we may assume, could be dated. Other evidence is needed to decide the issue.<sup>19</sup>

---

are telling and, although in themselves not conclusive, do not merit Gomme's curt dismissal (Commentary, I, p. 401 with note 1). Cf. also Busolt, Gr. Gesch., III, 1, p. 112, note 2, and Jacoby, Apollodors Chronik, pp. 239-242.

<sup>17</sup> Krateros, frag. 11 Jacoby (no. 342); see below, p. 155, note 78. For the moment I merely reproduce Highby's reconstruction; but there is conflict in the ancient testimony.

<sup>18</sup> Highby, Erythrae Decree, pp. 83-84. We know that Krateros arranged his work chronologically; see A. T. L., I, p. 203, and III, p. 10.

<sup>19</sup> Highby, Erythrae Decree, p. 84, overstates his case: "So far is it apparent that the arguments for either identification remain equally strong with the balance somewhat tilted toward the proscription, which was beyond doubt

A passage from Cicero offers some confirmation to the arguments for 471/0 as the date of the condemnation and flight: quis clarior in Graecia Themistocle, quis potentior? qui cum imperator bello Persico servitute Graeciam libera- visset propterque invidiam in exilium expulsus esset, in- gratae patriae iniuriam non tulit, quam ferre debuit, fecit idem. quod XX annis ante apud nos fecerat Coriolanus.<sup>20</sup>

The traditional date for Coriolanus' flight to the Volscians is 491, and thus Cicero here places the flight of Themistokles in 471/0. That this is the correct interpretation of the passage there can be no serious doubt,<sup>21</sup> and Cary's objec- tion that Cicero is probably employing round numbers is not well founded.

Nepos offers more tenuous support: decessit (sc. Aristeides) autem fere post annum quartum quam Themistocles

---

published in a decree." Gomme's conclusion is more to the point: "of course the date of either event could have been and was probably recorded, like that of Hipparchos' murder, Hippias' expulsion, and the battle of Marathon."

<sup>20</sup> Cicero, de amicitia, 12, 42.

<sup>21</sup> See Highby's discussion (Erythrae Decree, pp. 84-85) and his comparison with Cicero, Brutus, 10, 41-42. Cf. Jacoby, Apollodors Chronik, p. 240. In the Brutus the Volscian war is synchronized with the battle of Marathon (490); Cicero probably follows Atticus' Liber annalis.

Athenis erat expulsus.<sup>22</sup> The last known report of Aristeides is found in Plutarch,<sup>23</sup> where he is mentioned as having attended the performance of the Seven Against Thebes in 468/7. This may have been (and Nepos probably thought that it was) the year of Aristeides' death; so Nepos dates Themistokles' flight in 471/0. Is this, however, a valid assumption? Cary's arguments in the negative are strong enough to merit consideration, although they are completely passed over by Highby.<sup>24</sup> Cary asks a series of questions. Does expulsus refer to the condemnation and flight (or to the ostracism)? How is the interval, post annum quartum, to be reckoned? Finally, is Plutarch's anecdote historical, and, if so, is 468/7 the year of Aristeides' death, for Nepos at any rate? His rejection of this evidence, however, is too sweeping: "Any conclusion drawn from the combination of Nepos and Plutarch can only be a house-that-Jack-built of hypotheses."<sup>25</sup>

---

<sup>22</sup> Aristeides, 3.

<sup>23</sup> Aristeides, 3, 4.

<sup>24</sup> Highby, Erythrae Decree, p. 86 (cf. p. 82), goes to great lengths to analyse Cicero's testimony in the de amicitia, which actually offers no real difficulty, but accepts without question the interpretation of Nepos that will lend support to his contentions.

<sup>25</sup> Cary, Class. Rev., XXXVI (1922), p. 162.

But the only intelligible interpretation of Nepos is that he too reflects the tradition that linked the year 471/0 with Themistokles' career. The real difficulty lies in determining whether it is the condemnation or the ostracism to which he refers, and thus Nepos' testimony alone cannot be used to decide the issue raised by Diodoros. Yet it does, I believe, support the contention that the condemnation and flight belong in 471/0. The difficulty in the de amicitia is exactly the same: do the words in exilium expulsus esset connote the exile (i.e., condemnation) or the ostracism? A precise interpretation would demand the former, since it was the exile that was immediately followed by flight to Persia. But there is no compelling reason to suppose that Cicero was thinking in precise terms. The best we can conclude is that Cicero dated the flight to 471/0 and that Nepos may very well have done so. Other evidence, in fact, indicates 471/0 for the exile, and this improves our confidence in this interpretation of Nepos.

A notice in the Armenian version of Eusebios under Ol. 77. 2 (471/0) states: Themêstocles in Persas fugit.<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>26</sup> Schoene, II, pp. 102-104; Eusebios himself and Hieronymos give Ol. 77.1 (472/1), and there are the variants Ol. 76.4 (473/2) and Ol. 77.2 (471/0). Eusebios also has a curious notice for Ol. 78.3 (466/5): Θεμιστοκλῆς εἰς Πέρσας φεύγει.

To consider this as an erroneous blunder for the ostracism is a worthless expedient; whatever one thinks of Eusebios' testimony, it cannot be ignored.<sup>27</sup> All in all he provides respectable company for Diodoros, Cicero, Nepos and Plutarch in any chronological argument.

Finally in this context should be mentioned the much disputed passage in „Aristotle”,<sup>28</sup> that has Themistokles at Athens working with Ephialtes in the reform of the Areiopagos during the archonship of Konon (462/1). This remarkable statement will receive further consideration,

---

διὰ τὴν Ἀθηναίων ἀνοσίαν, ὅς αἶμα ταύρου πίω τελευτᾷ.

Can this be a date for Themistokles' death (Hieronymos under the same year reads simply: Themistocles hausti tauri sanguine moritur), or is it evidence of another chronological tradition for the flight, which understands the ostracism for 471/0? It may be significant that the Armenian version, which gives 471/0 for the flight, mentions (as Hieronymos does) only Themistokles' suicide under Ol. 78.3 (466/5).

<sup>27</sup> Cf. Highby's remarks (Erythrae Decree, p. 85) against Meyer and Beloch. Carcopino's theory carries more weight (L'ostracisme athénien, pp. 158-159), and will be mentioned elsewhere (below, p. 17).

<sup>28</sup> Ath. Pol., 25.

but, if it is not to be entirely dismissed, we may here merely inquire whether or not it reflects a chronology that placed the ostracism before 471.<sup>29</sup>

Thus far I am inclined to favour 471/0 as the year of Themistokles' condemnation and flight, but the possibility of an alternate chronology which placed the ostracism in that year is by no means entirely excluded. Does other evidence corroborate the existence of two (or more) traditions, and, if so (and this is the important question), which is historically accurate?

Gomme writes as follows in this connexion: "The only argument in favour of 471-470 as the year of Themistokles' condemnation and flight, not the ostracism, is that it is supported by Cicero . . . and possible by Nepos . . . but all that that means is that there was a tradition in the first century B.C. - perhaps followed by Diodoros - that this was the year of Themistokles' flight."<sup>30</sup> He has

---

<sup>29</sup> Thus Ure, J. H. S., XLI (1921), pp. 165-178; cf. C. A. Robinson, Jr., A. J. P., LXVII (1946), pp. 265-266. On the other hand Bauer, Literarische und historische Forschungen, pp. 67-86 and 179-180, and Munro, Class. Rev., VI (1892), pp. 333-334, see the possibility of a tradition for the ostracism in 462/1. This is historically incredible. See below, pp. 116-118.

<sup>30</sup> Commentary, I, p. 401.

forgotten Eusebios, and surely the establishment of a chronological tradition even in the first century B.C. is not to be dismissed lightly, in view of the hazardous nature of the chronological evidence for Themistokles' career.

Cicero, Eusebios and probably Nepos offer an exact year for the flight. This coincides with the archon-year found in Diodoros for his narration of Themistokles' adventures. It is at least economical to think that Diodoros presents the same and not a different chronology. For this fact has not been fully appreciated: it was Themistokles' glorious achievement against the Persians in contrast with his later abandonment of Greece to seek refuge with the enemy that intrigued later writers. This is most certainly true in the case of Diodoros, to whom by comparison the ostracism would be a commonplace.<sup>31</sup> Did this consideration, then, influence Diodoros in his choice of the archon-year under which to recount Themistokles' adventures? This is pure conjecture; but the statements in Cicero, Eusebios and even Nepos are not. Finally, we must remember that Diodoros' information comes from an Atthis (in all probability through Ephoros) or perhaps ultimately from Krateros, and therefore we have transmitted by Diodoros

---

<sup>31</sup> Diodoros, XI, 58-59.

a tradition that goes back beyond the first century B.C. to at least the fourth.

There is no evidence so concrete as that found in Diodoros, Cicero, Nepos and Eusebios. The synchronisms that Thucydides offers in Themistokles' encounter off Naxos and his meeting with Artaxerxes,<sup>32</sup> or those of Plutarch (and his sources) involving Themistokles, Thasos and Xerxes,<sup>33</sup> are of a different nature, and pose problems not only in themselves but also in relation both to one another and to the evidence thus far considered. But Thucydides (and with him Charon of Lampsakos) is weighty testimony, and Plutarch cannot be ignored. As a result, the interpretation of their evidence in particular has led scholars to the belief that Diodoros' date 471/0 refers to the ostracism, with the consequent understanding of Nepos, rationalization of Eusebios and dismissal of Cicero.

Before we seek rescue in Thucydides and Plutarch, however, we must consider a piece of subsidiary evidence that has been brought to bear on the question. In the spring of 472 B.C. the Persians of Aischylos was produced in Athens. It has been argued that Themistokles could not

---

<sup>32</sup> Thucydides, I, 137; see below, p. 38.

<sup>33</sup> Plutarch, Themistokles, 25, 2, and 37, 1; see below, pp. 44-46.

have been in ostracism at the time of the presentation of a play that pays tribute to the ruse at Salamis and the man who devised it.<sup>34</sup> Such reasoning is extremely tenuous, to say the least, and Highby combats it on the ground that ostracism need not bring disgrace.<sup>35</sup>

Although we may agree with Gomme that Highby overstates his case, Gomme's observation that it is "probable" but "not certain by any means" that Themistokles was not yet ostracized at this time is difficult to understand. The qualification, on the other hand, "for Aischylos was capable of praising a man who had lately been rejected by his countrymen," I find much more to the point.<sup>36</sup> Salamis and Themistokles' great service to his state were one thing, his later fortunes another, and surely national

---

<sup>34</sup> Meyer, Gesch. d. Alt., IV, 13, p. 486 with note 2.

See Aischylos, Persae, 353-432.

<sup>35</sup> Highby, Erythrae Decree, pp. 86-87; he quotes Plutarch, Themistokles, 22, 3 and Diodoros, XI, 55, 3. Cf. Wilamowitz, Aristoteles und Athen, I, pp. 143-144 and Lehmann, Beiträge zur alten Geschichte (=Klio), II (1902), p. 345.

<sup>36</sup> Commentary, I, p. 401 with note 4; cf. p. 408. More telling is the remark (pp. 53-54, note 1) that when the Persians was presented Themistokles "was probably not . . . a man convicted of treason." But no-one wishes to place the condemnation before 471/0.

sentiment (whatever the Athenians' feelings towards ostracism) would compel the acceptance of a play that gave to Themistokles his due, regardless of his present circumstances.<sup>37</sup>

To some scholars the fact that the Persians was played in 472 B.C. has special significance, for, as all will surely admit, this was a crucial year indeed in the career of Themistokles. They are tempted, therefore, to see in the drama, with its abandonment of the traditional mythology, its glorification of contemporary history, and its reference to a contemporary statesman, a deliberate stand taken by the poet on Themistokles' behalf. Thus the question put by Carcopino, if it is not to remain as purely rhetorical, must be faced: "Assurément l'ostracisme ne souillait ses victimes d'aucun déshonneur; mais n'en étaient frappés que ceux qui avaient cessé de plaire à la grande majorité du peuple. Pourquoi Eschyle se serait-il exposé à la mécontenter?"<sup>38</sup>

---

<sup>37</sup> Highby (Erythrae Decree, p. 87) does not believe that a drama concerning Salamis could ignore Themistokles. This may, perhaps, be true, but it is well to remember Herodotos' account of the battle and especially his conception of Themistokles' rôle, in order to appreciate how the artist can vary in his interpretation and give colour to events.

<sup>38</sup> Carcopino, L'ostracisme athénien, p. 160.

Carcopino himself believes that he has avoided the difficulty by placing the ostracism in the year 472/1 and the condemnation in the winter of 471/0. But, even if this is correct, are we to think that Aischylos was totally unaware of the political hostility (however latent) towards Themistokles, which certainly must have already existed at the time of the play in 472?<sup>39</sup> And furthermore there is a serious objection to this chronology in the account of Thucydides, which demands a longer interval at Argos.<sup>40</sup>

---

<sup>39</sup> Indeed Diodoros, XI, 55, 7, and Plutarch, Themistokles, 23, 3, tell us that Themistokles had previously been brought to trial and acquitted.

<sup>40</sup> Thucydides, I, 135, 2. Cf. Plutarch, Themistokles, 23, and below, pp. 25-26, for the synchronism with Pausanias' career. Carcopino (L'ostracisme athénien, p. 159) suggests that the proximity of the dates for the ostracism and condemnation led to the confusion that is implicit in the ancient evidence. There may be something in this, But he notes in particular that Hieronymos has corrected Eusebios' date for the flight (i.e., 472/1 for 471/0), and maintains that in actual fact the year of the ostracism was intended; this is a strange kind of correction, and I am not convinced, although perhaps it is significant that there is no notice for the ostracism in the chronicles. See above, p. 10 with note 26.

Cary, however, seeks to establish a definite relationship between the composition of the Persians and the career of Themistokles: "Yet surely the most suitable moment for Aeschylus' excursion into political propaganda was when Themistocles stood within danger of ostracism but had not as yet succumbed to that danger."<sup>41</sup> Hence he would place the ostracism in March-April, 472 (the eighth prytany of the archon-year 473/2), following upon the presentation of Aischylos' drama in March.

But there is the same objection to Cary's thesis as to Carcopino's: we need a longer interval for Themistokles at Argos. And, furthermore, if the ostracism was voted before 472 (as I believe it was), would not Aischylos' tribute to the Athenian general of Salamis be all the more pertinent? Themistokles now had desperate need of support when, in all probability, the Lakedaimonians had already begun to press their charges of complicity with Pausanias.<sup>42</sup> This is the better interpretation, if indeed the Persians does hold any meaning for the career of Themistokles. Thus it is not a question of "Aeschylus' excursion into political propaganda" but a genuine expression of national pride and

---

<sup>41</sup> Cary, Class. Rev., XXXVI (1922), p. 162.

<sup>42</sup> Thucydides, I, 135, 2; Plutarch, Themistokles, 23.

Cf. below, pp. 21-27.

a burning reminder of the services of a great Athenian, who, after being expelled by his countrymen, was now about to face charges of Medism, only too readily seized upon by his political opponents, charges furthermore that were instigated by the Spartans. This interpretation of Aischylos' reference to Themistokles and Salamis does not of course deny the presence of the religious and tragic issues with which Aischylos is primarily concerned. We must never forget that the playwright was an Athenian, who had fought against the Persians and who, in all probability, was a friend of Themistokles.

All this to be sure is conjecture of a very tenuous nature indeed. Ure's remarks are worth quoting: "the Persae took first prize; but its praises of Themistokles are not very provocative. They are limited to a single speech in the second play of a tetralogy, they do not mention his name, and they emphasise his guile. The play in short throws no light on the point we wish to elucidate."<sup>43</sup> The reference to Themistokles then may be ambiguous; in fact, it has been interpreted as condemnation rather than as approbation. But if we do connect Aischylos' comment with Themistokles' career, I for my part am convinced that it reflects the indignation of the poet on the statesman's behalf.

---

<sup>43</sup> Ure, Class. Rev., XXXVII (1923), p. 64.

For it is well enough known that Greek tragedy often alludes to or reflects contemporary history, and Aischylos (in this very play) is no exception.<sup>44</sup> Ure himself cites a line in the Frogs (807) in which we are told that Aischylos did not always agree with the Athenians; later in the play he is represented as the spokesman on behalf of the banished Alkibiades. Besides, the epistles of Themistokles attest friendship between Themistokles and the playwright.<sup>45</sup> And Themistokles has other links with tragedy at crucial stages in his career.<sup>46</sup>

---

<sup>44</sup> A. T. L., III, pp. 207-208. See also, e.g., Edouard Delebecque, Euripide et la guerre du Péloponnèse (Paris, 1951), and Victor Ehrenberg, Sophocles and Pericles (Oxford, 1954).

<sup>45</sup> Epistle 1 is written to Aischylos from Argos; epistle 11 is to Ameinias (for the writer, at least, the brother of Aischylos). This is not history; but the writer evidently looked on this intimacy as credible. See below, pp. 163-164.

<sup>46</sup> In 477/6 (the archonship of Adeimantos) he was choregos for a play by Phrynichos (Plutarch, Themistokles, 5, 4), which in all probability was the Phoinissai; see Schmid and Stählin, Gesch. d. gr. Lit., I, 2, p. 174. This was (probably) at the time of the first trial mentioned by Diodoros and Plutarch (see above, p.17, note 39). Furthermore, the condemnation

It is true that the Persians cannot be used to decide the chronological issue with which we are concerned, and perhaps I have dwelt upon this play at unnecessary length. But it has been judged as a decisive piece of evidence for placing the ostracism in 471/0, or at any rate after the Dionysia of 472. The argument is unwarranted. The chronological testimony demands the date 471/0 for the flight, and a date before 472 for the ostracism. It is folly to deny this on the basis of a subjective interpretation of the Persians; and, in any case, a logical understanding of Aischylos permits an earlier date for the ostracism, and perhaps explains the guarded nature of his allusion to Themistokles' cleverness.

We may now, with some anticipation, transfer our attention from the rather illusory testimony of Aischylos to the more concrete evidence of Thucydides. Our first task is to remark the synchronism of Themistokles' condemnation and flight with events in the career of Pausanias. Thucydides states:<sup>47</sup> τοῦ δὲ μηδισμοῦ τοῦ Πασανίου οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι πρέσβεις πέμψαντες παρὰ τοὺς Ἀθηναίους

---

of Phrynichos for his presentation of the Fall of Miletos has been rightly associated with Themistokles' archonship (see below, pp. 111-112).

<sup>47</sup> Thucydides, I, 135, 2.

ξυνεπητιῶντο καὶ τὸν θεμιστοκλέα, ὡς ἠῦρισκον ἐκ τῶν περὶ Πausανίαν ἐλέγχων, ἠξίουν τε τοῖς αὐτοῖς κολάζεσθαι αὐτόν. οἱ δὲ πεισθέντες (ἔτυχε γὰρ ὠστρακισμένος καὶ ἔχων δίκαιταν μὲν ἐν Ἄργει, ἐπιφοιτῶν δὲ καὶ ἐς τὴν ἄλλην Πελοπόννησον) πέμπουσι μετὰ τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων ἐτοίμων ὄντων ξυνδιώκειν ἄνδρας οἷς εἴρητο ἄγειν ὅπου ἂν περιτύχωσιν.

The chronology of Pausanias' activities in the 470's has been a debatable issue, but few today will disagree if his expulsion from Byzantium is placed in the summer of 477.<sup>48</sup> Then Pausanias settled at Kolonai in the Troad, and intrigued with the people there, until the Spartans were forced to send a herald to demand his recall.<sup>49</sup> He accepted the

---

<sup>48</sup> Thucydides, I, 131, 1. I accept the conclusions of A. T. L., III, pp. 158-160 and 175; cf. Gomme, Commentary, I, pp. 399-400, and Highby, Erythrae Decree, pp. 91-98. The seven-year tenure of Pausanias in Byzantium advocated by Beloch, Gr. Gesch., II, 2<sup>2</sup>, pp. 185-188 (cf. Lehmann, Beiträge zur alten Geschichte [=Klio], II [1902], p. 345, and Lehmann-Haupt, Klio, XVII [1921], pp. 59-73), on the basis of an emended text of Justin's epitome of Trogus, has received sufficient refutation, and I shall not repeat the arguments here.

<sup>49</sup> Thucydides, I, 131, 1; Gomme (Commentary, I, p. 397), considering the phrase οὕτω δὴ οὐκέτι ἐπέσχον, states that

summons and upon his return he was imprisoned (τὸ πρῶτον), although later he was released (ἔκειται).<sup>50</sup> Upon investigation, however, it was discovered that he was instigating trouble with the helots; still the Spartans were loath to act too hastily and only after Argilos had turned informer did they take the action that culminated in Pausanias' death.<sup>51</sup>

Diodoros relates all these events, among others, under the archonship of Adeimantos, 477/6.<sup>52</sup> This cannot be the date of Pausanias' death, and in this case it is impossible to ascertain what specifically Diodoros has in mind for this year. And it would be rash to conclude that he implies by his archon-date an early chronology for the final events of the Spartan's life.<sup>53</sup>

---

the return to Sparta occurred in 474 or at the latest 473. The former date is certainly to be preferred.

<sup>50</sup> Thucydides, I, 131, 2.

<sup>51</sup> Thucydides, I, 132-134.

<sup>52</sup> Diodoros, XI, 44-46.

<sup>53</sup> Cf. above, p.2 with note 5. Diodoros' method here in no way differs from that of his account under the archon-year 471/0. The point is not only that his narrative for 477/6 is more eclectic but also that (and this is the significant factor) we have no other evidence, as we have for 471/0, to

Yet is it possible to suppose that Thucydides' narrative covers a period of more than four or five years (i.e., 477-472)? There is circularity in an argument that interprets the chronology of Pausanias' career on the assumption that Themistokles was condemned (and not ostracized) in 471/0. But surely there is more besides; an objective reading of Thucydides' account favours a date earlier than 471, rather than later, for Pausanias' death, and it not only allows but even corroborates this interpretation. For, if the ostracism of Themistokles is placed in this year, the subsequent death of the Spartan and condemnation of the Athenian must be placed in the years following, and, chronologically, Thucydides' narrative becomes more difficult.<sup>54</sup>

---

determine the specific event that Diodoros found dated in his source. It was probably an occurrence in the life of Pausanias, perhaps his expulsion from Byzantion, or his summons from Kolonai and his trial and imprisonment or even his death; we cannot be sure.

<sup>54</sup> There is further evidence. As Gomme points out (Commentary, I, p. 399), Pausanias' trial has been placed in 467 or even 466; any chronology of either Pausanias' or Themistokles' career allows no later date than this. So late a date, however, puts too great a strain on the evidence thus

For we need as well to allow a sufficient interval for Themistokles' sojourn at Argos. Thucydides' language implies that he was there for some time;<sup>55</sup> and Plutarch is more specific when he has Pausanias intriguing with Themistokles while the latter is already in Argos.<sup>56</sup> The letters agree with Plutarch.<sup>57</sup> And Plutarch's narrative

---

far investigated. The only argument that would lend support (if we forget for a moment Themistokles' career) must be based on the assumption that Pausanias' activity among the helots is to be closely connected with the revolt of 465. This assumption is indefensible. Thucydides (I, 132, 4-5) says that the plot was not only found out but that it had as its goal Pausanias' own ends. Conspiracy with the helots was an ever-present possibility and threat; since the time of Pheidon they were potential tools for the political adventurer.

<sup>55</sup> Thucydides, I, 135, 3: ἔτυχε γὰρ ὠστρακισμένος καὶ ἔχων δίαίταν μὲν ἐν Ἄργει, ἐπιφοιτῶν δὲ καὶ ἐς τὴν ἄλλην Πελοπόννησον.

<sup>56</sup> Plutarch, Themistokles, 23; cf. de Herodoti malignitate, 5 (= Moralia, 855E).

<sup>57</sup> See below, pp. 131-132. Epistle 2 is from Argos, warning Pausanias to be cautious in his ambitions, and epistle 14 becomes a stern reprimand of his conduct. In epistle 16

is certainly not incompatible with Thucydides; in fact, it provides a logical interpretation of the latter's terse account. And it is against the thesis that the ostracism belongs as late as 471/0.<sup>58</sup>

We receive additional help from the fragment of Aristodemos, which narrates the ostracism of Themistokles, the first recall of Pausanias, the formation of the Delian League, the second recall of Pausanias and his death, in that order.<sup>59</sup> We have here then a tradition that placed

---

we learn that Themistokles has been informed of the Spartan's death. We must, as we shall see (below, pp. 58-60), be wary of elaborations found in Plutarch and our other secondary sources but not in Thucydides. I have greater faith in their testimony concerning Themistokles' activities before his flight than in the minute information they provide for his journey to Asia Minor.

<sup>58</sup> Diodoros, XI, 54 adds little to our information. His story reads like a contamination of the circumstances surrounding the second condemnation with those of the first trial. That Themistokles was implicated with Pausanias in the earlier charges as well is, in itself, not improbable, and this assumption is supported by Plutarch's account and the consequent interpretation of Thucydides.

<sup>59</sup> Aristodemos, 4-9 Jacoby (no. 104). See below, p. 148, note 65. It cannot be maintained that the letters offer any serious confirmation of so precise a chronology. Cf. further Doenges, pp. 53-55, note 13.

the ostracism of Themistokles before Pausanias' first recall. It is immediately apparent, in the face of the evidence, that this chronology is historically incredible. Furthermore, Aristodemos' chronological order suggests that his divisions are not strict, and often, in a sense, arbitrary. And, as well, his confusion of incident between Pausanias' first and second recall arouses suspicion.<sup>60</sup> It is not impossible (in fact, I think it most likely) that Themistokles' ostracism occurred before the second recall of Pausanias. The nature of our evidence does not allow certainty. We may say that to place the ostracism of Themistokles in the period between 476/5 and 471/0 receives strong support from the ancient testimony and an intelligent understanding of Pausanias' career. I should not press the synchronism more closely than this.

A glance at the events that preceded the ostracism is valuable here.<sup>61</sup> Herodotos reports how Themistokles

---

<sup>60</sup> Cf. Aristodemos, 6-9, with Thucydides, I, 131, 1; in the former the skytale is sent to Pausanias at the time of his first recall, whereas according to Thucydides the incident belongs to the summons of the Spartan from Kolonai.

<sup>61</sup> But it must only be a glance. The difficulties inherent in a reconstruction of the years following upon the Persian wars are many. At the moment I do not attempt a complete

used both trickery and force in his dealings with the islanders when the fleet was on its return from pursuit of the Persians.<sup>62</sup> Plutarch adds that it was in this way that the Athenian made himself disliked by the allies.<sup>63</sup> Later Herodotos tells how Themistokles failed to be awarded the prize of valour at the Isthmos; on the other hand, extraordinary tribute and honour were bestowed on him for his services at the hands of the Spartans.<sup>64</sup>

---

summary of the events but merely list the occurrences of particular significance in the present argument. The sequence I present must be extremely tentative, for I do not wish here to probe questions of historicity or to press the chronology. A fuller discussion belongs rather with an analysis of the political background, since it is only from this point of view that we may hope for a solution of the many and complex problems. My presentation, however, I believe to be in general correct.

<sup>62</sup> Herodotos, VIII, 111-112.

<sup>63</sup> Plutarch, Themistokles, 21, 1.

<sup>64</sup> Herodotos, VIII, 123-124. Bowra, Greek Lyric Poetry, p. 375, on the basis of Timokreon's verses, sees in the episode at the Isthmos a "definite defeat for Themistokles." Cf. below, p. 163.

The Lakedaimonians, however, were not long to be pleased with Themistokles' actions. The ruse by which he achieved the building of Athens' walls created a deep and hidden resentment among them. And this is only the year 479/8.<sup>65</sup> In this same year Themistokles gave them further cause for hatred towards him, for, at the meeting of the Amphictyonic league, all his efforts were concentrated against the Spartan proposals, which as a result were defeated. They, in revenge, pursued a policy of furthering the ambitions of Kimon.<sup>66</sup>

Plutarch also relates Themistokles' scheme to burn the Hellenic fleet at Pagasai, and how Aristeides, with the people's support, was successful in opposing the plan.<sup>67</sup> This, in all probability, belongs to the year 477,<sup>68</sup> and

---

<sup>65</sup> Thucydides, I, 90-93, and Plutarch, Themistokles, 19, 1-2. For the date see A. T. L., III, p. 175. Cf. below, p. 161.

<sup>66</sup> Plutarch, Themistokles, 20, 3-4. Flacelière, Rev. ét. anc., LV (1953), pp. 19-28, argues for the historicity of Plutarch's account, and would date the meeting in the autumn of 479 or the spring of the following year.

<sup>67</sup> Plutarch, Themistokles, 20, 1-2. For Leotychidas' expedition to Thessaly see Herodotos, VI, 72.

<sup>68</sup> Johnston, Hermathena, XLVI (1931), pp. 106-111, is convincing in his argument for this date. But the episode

we may see in Themistokles' defeat a definite indication of his fall from popular favour. From this time then Spartan resentment had occasion to seek vengeance, and Themistokles, now overshadowed politically, had to face an active opposition. Timokreon's lampoons as well, although motivated by personal animosity, gave impetus to Themistokles' unpopularity, for there is good reason to date these attacks in 478/7.<sup>69</sup>

We know for certain that Themistokles acted as choregos in the dramatic competitions of March, 477/6.<sup>70</sup> The first trial of Themistokles cannot be placed long after this date,

---

has been placed as early as 479 (Walker, C. A. H., V, p. 466).

<sup>69</sup> Plutarch, Themistokles, 21, 2-5. Bowra (Greek Lyric Poetry, pp. 375-378) finds in Timokreon's verses direct reference to Aristeides' supremacy and Themistokles' loss of influence. The restoration of the exiles, the immediate instigation of Timokreon's invective, is presumably not later than this date.

<sup>70</sup> Plutarch, Themistokles, 5, 4; cf. above, p. 20, note 46. We should note also that Themistokles was almost certainly at Olympia in 476, enjoying prestige among the Hellenes, and so was not under sentence of ostracism; cf. Plutarch, Themistokles, 17, 2, and below, pp. 63 and 157 with note 81.

if, indeed, it is not to be placed shortly before.<sup>71</sup> After his acquittal, Themistokles enjoyed a brief return to popular favour. Plutarch relates immediately before the ostracism the tiresome speeches heavy with self-praise, and the fulsome dedication of a temple to Artemis, given the epithet Aristoboule in his own honour. The former efforts, at any rate, may very well follow the acquittal, for they suggest a man who is politically extinct, left only to dwell on his former glorious services to the state.<sup>72</sup>

When we consider then the synchronism that has been established between Themistokles' career and the activities of Pausanias,<sup>73</sup> the ostracism must be placed within the period 475-472.<sup>74</sup> And further I suggest a choice between

---

<sup>71</sup> Plutarch, Themistokles, 23, 3, and Diodoros, XI, 55, 8. We cannot ascertain the Spartans' rôle in this first accusation; cf. above, p. 26, note 58. The date is perhaps after 477/6 because of involvement with Pausanias, even so early as this.

<sup>72</sup> Plutarch, Themistokles, 22; his list of the factors which made Themistokles obnoxious to the Athenians, and which, therefore, led to his ostracism, is obviously not chronological (19-22).

<sup>73</sup> See above, p. 27.

<sup>74</sup> Cf. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Aristoteles und Athen, I, pp. 143-148.

the archon-years 475/4 and 474/3. It is difficult to be more precise, but the latter date, perhaps, best accords with the evidence.

By the spring of 477 the confederacy of Delos had been created.<sup>75</sup> Aristeides and Kimon were the vigorous leaders in this new undertaking, and it is ironic that Themistokles played no part in what was in actual fact the logical fulfillment of his earlier policies. Between 477 and the ostracism our sources report nothing of political significance (with the dubious exception of the first trial) in connexion with Themistokles, and I cannot believe that the political opposition delayed removing its rival at the first opportunity. This is in part an argument from silence, but at least I should not prolong the period that this silence covers. Kimon's first strategia was in 477/6, for Eion and Skyros belong in this year. We know of Kimon's renown after Skyros; and there was time either before or after the war against Karystos for him to consolidate his position at home. Indeed, Plutarch attests the enmity of Kimon (and Alkmaion) towards Themistokles in these years.<sup>76</sup>

The first accusation of Medism had been a failure; Themistokles' prestige in the Persian wars could not so

---

<sup>75</sup> A. T. L., III, pp. 192-193.

<sup>76</sup> Plutarch, Aristeides, 25, 7.

soon be forgotten by the Athenians. But it was not too long before his enemies, confident in the success of the new confederacy, would achieve success, helped along as they were by the hostility that Themistokles created against himself. And this time they resorted to the more conventional method of ostracism. In each case, admittedly, a different issue was resolved; but his enemies and the reasons for their hostility remained essentially the same.

It is important to stress the rapidity of Themistokles' decline after Salamis. All our sources see the reasons for this in the events of the early 470's. And the epistles link the hostility that surrounded the second indictment directly to the award at the Isthmos, and to the embassy concerning the walls.<sup>77</sup> Their evidence cannot be ignored; not only do they present on the whole a consistent Thucydidean chronology,<sup>78</sup> but the Pronapes who is named along with Leobotes, the proposer of the charge of treason, has strong claims to historical reality.<sup>79</sup> Leobotes is an Alkmaionid and Pronapes too may be a member of the aristocracy.

---

<sup>77</sup> [Themistokles], epistles 11 and 8; see below, pp. 161 and 163. And in epistle 11 treason at Salamis is also one of the charges.

<sup>78</sup> See below, pp. 170-172.

<sup>79</sup> See below, p. 155.

The second charge of treason was a formidable threat. Themistokles was absent in Argos, his political opposition was strong in Athens and the Spartans were armed with evidence obtained from their investigation after Pausanias' death (at any rate such was their claim).<sup>80</sup> Themistokles saw hope only in flight. This was the year 471/0. The arguments for this date are accumulative, and the evidence taken together is overwhelming.

Yet it remains to investigate the chronology following upon the flight, and here lie the real problems. As we turn to this other evidence we meet the ever-present possibility of varying chronological traditions (a possibility that has already made itself only too apparent). For two questions always exist, the identification of these alternate chronologies, and the establishment of the one that is historically correct.

---

<sup>80</sup> It would be interesting to know more about Themistokles' activity in the Peloponnesos, his position at Argos and the political relations between Sparta and Argos at this time. Was fear an incentive to Lakedaimonian enmity against the Athenian? Cf. below, p.53, note 113. Kimon, of course, was well known as pro-Lakonian.

Thucydides recounts the flight from Argos, after telling how the Athenians joined the Lakedaimonians in pursuit of Themistokles.<sup>81</sup> He, however, being forewarned of the danger, fled to Kerkyra. The Kerkyraians, in their fear, refused to offer sanctuary but instead provided transportation across to the mainland, where Themistokles was forced to seek asylum with Admetos, king of the Molossians. Admetos, who held no friendship for the Athenian, was away at the time. Upon his return somewhat later (οὐ πολὺ ὕστερον) he was compelled to accept Themistokles' suppliance, the form of which had been wisely dictated by the king's wife.<sup>82</sup>

---

<sup>81</sup> Thucydides, I, 135-138. I paraphrase his account with the omission of no details pertinent to the chronological argument; for the interpretation of his narrative has led to a close questioning of the intervals of time involved. Cf. Plutarch, Themistokles; 24-28, Diodoros, XI, 56-57; Themistokles, Epistles 17 and 20, follows Thucydides' itinerary except for the dramatic elaboration of an untimely delay at Kyllene (see below, p. 147).

<sup>82</sup> I accept the episode in its essentials as historical. It has been rejected because of its likeness to an incident in Euripides' Telephos; but see Gomme, Commentary, I, pp. 438-439. Méautis, L'Ant. Class., XX (1951), pp. 297-304, writes an interesting analysis of incidents in Themistokles'

Not long afterwards (ὕστερον οὐ πολλῶ), when the

---

career as narrated by Thucydides and parallel stories from myth and legend as portrayed in tragedy. To him the purpose is different in each case, history or tragedy. He concludes (p. 304): "Les aventures de Thémistocle chez Admète, sur le navire, la manière dont il parvint à échapper à la coalition des deux plus fortes puissances de son temps, Athènes et Sparte, tout cela 'signifiait' quelque chose, et c'était là l'essential." That is, Thucydides' treatment of Themistokles is generic. His other remarks, however, are less good, based as they are on a complete misunderstanding of Thucydides (pp. 303-304): "Il (Thucydide) ne s'est guère soucié de savoir s'ils étaient historiquement exacts. Il n'a pas fait d'enquête sur des faits vieux de plus de cinquante ans. Il s'est contenté de rapporter les traditions qui lui permettaient d'expliquer le caractère d'un des hommes qui l'avait le plus frappé par ce qu'il y avait en lui d'intelligence élémentaire, en quelque sorte, de connaissance des hommes et des choses." These are not the methods that we find so clearly employed in the Archaeology. The greatness of Thucydides as a historian lies in the fact that for him fact, historical truth and "l'essential" are an inseparable unity. It is true that the treatment of Themistokles is generic; it is also true that the details of his career in Thucydides are as accurate as research

Athenians and the Lakedaimonians came in pursuit, Admetos refused to surrender Themistokles, but provided him with an escort to Pydna, in the territory of Alexandros, since it was his wish to go to the king (ἀλλ' ἀποστέλλει βουλόμενον), i.e., the great king. From Pydna Themistokles set sail on a merchant vessel bound for Ionia. The ship, however,

---

could make them. The attitude implied by the complete rejection of so much of our ancient evidence concerning Themistokles because of its nature demands a lengthy refutation. For it appears again and again, in Beloch's (Gr. Gesch., II, 2<sup>2</sup>, pp. 146-154) and De Sanctis' (Atthis<sup>2</sup>, p. 392) dismissal of the ruse concerning the walls (cf. above, p. 29) and in Flacelière's hesitancy to reach a decision on vital chronological issues (see below, pp. 56-57). Gomme (Commentary, I, pp. 438-440 and 267-270) has written a sound rebuttal of this extreme scepticism towards the anecdotes that constitute so much of our information concerning Themistokles. A fuller discussion of the historical method reflected by such scepticism belongs with an examination of the sources themselves. Various elements of critical analysis are involved and each piece of evidence demands individual and careful attention. What is recorded by Thucydides, at any rate, cannot be dismissed lightly, in the face of what we know of his methods.

driven off its course by a storm, encountered the Athenian fleet that was laying siege to Naxos. Themistokles, in desperation, revealed his identity to the captain, who was persuaded by threats and bribery to ride out the storm (a day and a night) nearby. And later (ὕστερον) they arrived at Ephesos. Themistokles rewarded the captain as he had promised, for later (again Thucydides uses ὕστερον) he received from Athens and Argos funds that he had left in the keeping of his friends. And then (καί), proceeding inland with a Persian from the coast, he sent ahead a letter to Artaxerxes son of Xerxes, who had lately come to the throne (νεωστὶ βασιλεύοντα). The letter ends with the wish to wait a year (ἐνιαυτὸν ἐπισχών) before explaining in person why he has come. The king agreed to his request and Themistokles, having devoted his energies to learning the Persian language and customs, when the year was ended, approached the monarch.

It is certain that Artaxerxes' accession belongs to the year 465/4.<sup>83</sup> The siege of Naxos cannot be later than 467 and the editors of A. T. L. find strong reason for placing it as early as 470. The victory of Eurymedon,

---

<sup>83</sup> Diodoros, XI, 69. See Richard A. Parker and Waldo H. Dubberstein, Babylonian Chronology 626 B.C. - A.D. 45 (Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization, XXIV, Chicago, 1942), p. 15, for the Near Eastern evidence (documentary).

they argue, was the immediate inspiration for the extraordinary honours bestowed upon Kimon and his fellow generals in 469/8.<sup>84</sup> The siege of Naxos, then, which preceded the battle of Eurymedon, must fall before 469.<sup>85</sup> The argument

---

Gomme (Commentary, I, p. 397) observes that, since Thucydides knows the date of Artaxerxes' death and of the accession of Darius II (IV, 50, 3; VIII, 58, 1), he may also have known the date of Artaxerxes' accession.

<sup>84</sup> A. T. L., III, p. 160. The evidence is found in Plutarch (Kimon, 8, 7-8), who relates that in the archonship of Apsephion the judges of the dramatic contest were not appointed as usual by lot, but instead the generals of the year were prevailed upon to fill the office. This incident follows upon a discussion of Kimon's great renown resulting from his recovery of Theseus' bones from Skyros. But that achievement belongs to 476/5. It is easier to believe that another significant event, and one much more immediate, provided the incentive for the memorable incident at the festival. Only the battle of Eurymedon satisfies the conditions.

<sup>85</sup> Thucydides, I, 98-100, following a chronological sequence, relates the taking of Eion, the subjugation of Skyros, the war with Karystos, the secession of Naxos, the campaign of Eurymedon and finally the siege and surrender of Thasos.

is not conclusive, but it is extremely attractive, particularly when we consider what has already been established for the chronology of Themistokles' career. I have set the condemnation and flight in 471/0;<sup>86</sup> Meritt, Wade-Gery and McGregor, in a different context, place the siege of Naxos "tentatively" in 470. This date is in fact what one would expect, for there is every indication of haste in Thucydides' description of Themistokles' efforts to evade his pursuers. To put it in another way, Meritt, Wade-Gery and McGregor refuse to assign the siege later than 470, and I refuse to assign the flight earlier or later than 471/0. We thus have a mutual confirmation.

If, however, we follow those who place the siege of Naxos in 467, we are beset (apart from ignoring the evidence

---

Skyros must be placed in the same archon-year as the taking of Eion, that of Phaidon, 477/6. And the beginning of the Thasian revolt marks another fixed point, midsummer 465. It remains to fill in the interval. The war with Karystos falls presumably in the period between 475 and 471. "The revolt of Naxos followed (μετὰ ταῦτα) and we tentatively assign it to 470. It could scarcely have occurred later . . ." Cf. Gomme, Commentary, I, pp. 394 and 408. See A. T. L., III, pp. 158-176, especially 160.

<sup>86</sup> See above, p. 34.

cited above) by needless problems, not the least of which is the necessity of postponing the ostracism to 471/0 and prolonging the life of Pausanias.<sup>87</sup>

We must now face the letter to Artaxerxes in Thucydides' account. It requires us, with the siege of Naxos affixed to 470, to believe that Themistokles delayed for four or five years in Asia Minor (470-465); and it is maintained that such a lengthy interval is incompatible with the narrative. That Themistokles must have spent some time on the Ionian coast is obvious from Thucydides himself: καὶ ὁ θεμιστοκλῆς ἐκεῖνόν τε ἐθεράπευσε χρημάτων δόσει (ἦλθε γὰρ αὐτῷ ὕστερον ἔκ τε Ἀθηνῶν παρὰ τῶν φίλων καὶ ἐξ Ἄργους ἃ ὑπεξέκειτο) καὶ μετὰ τῶν κάτω Περσῶν τινοὺς πορευθεὶς ἄνω ἐσπέμπει γράμματα πρὸς βασιλέα Ἀρταξέρξη τὸν Ξέρξου νεωστὶ βασιλεύοντα.<sup>88</sup> Is a five-year delay consistent with this abbreviated manner of expression?<sup>89</sup>

---

<sup>87</sup> There are two factors that suggest a late date for Naxos (and hence perhaps 471/0 for the ostracism): a synchronism of Hieron's death (467/6 in Diodoros) and the flight, or a long delay in Epiros. The former is historical fiction (see below, pp. 61-63) and the latter a tenuous argument advocated by Flacelière in a different context (see below, pp. 52-54).

<sup>88</sup> I, 137, 3.

<sup>89</sup> Flacelière (Rev. ét. anc., LV 1953, p. 8) points out

Gomme does not think so, particularly since Thucydides indicates an interval of only one year, and that after the writing of the letter to Artaxerxes.<sup>90</sup> We may perhaps add Plutarch's account to that of Thucydides, for besides the landing at Kyme (instead of Ephesos) there is the mention of Aigai;<sup>91</sup> or we may imagine, as Gomme suggests, Themistokles stopping in the satrapy of Sardis, hesitant to approach the Persian king until the death of Xerxes himself.<sup>92</sup> This

---

the closeness of the intervals implied by the use of the connectives τε . . . καί. Cf. A. T. L., III, p. 174, on the connectives in Thucydides' Pentekontaëtia (which, it is fair to remark, is a strictly chronological summary, whereas the story of Themistokles is not).

<sup>90</sup> Thucydides, I, 137, 4; cf. above, p. 38. See Gomme, Commentary, I, pp. 397-398, whose argument I summarize.

<sup>91</sup> Plutarch, Themistokles, 26.

<sup>92</sup> Gomme, Commentary, I, pp. 397-398; he adds (p. 398, note 1): "It is just possible that Theopompos' phrase . . . κλαυόμενος περὶ τὴν Ἀσίαν had reference to this phase of Themistokles' life in Asia, and not to a later one, as Plutarch says" (Themistokles, 31, 2). Thucydides tells us that Admetos provided Themistokles with an escort to Pydna because he wished to go to the king (I, 137, 1): . . . ἀλλ' ἀποστέλλει βουλόμενον ὡς βασιλέα πορευθῆναι ἐπὶ τὴν

interpretation of Thucydides' narrative and Themistokles' procedure is not impossible, and indeed it does hold a great deal of probability when all things are considered. Although it is somewhat dangerous to trust the details of later sources, they need not always represent mere colourful elaboration or a fanciful attempt to reconcile Thucydides' account.<sup>93</sup>

On the other hand Gomme suspects that perhaps Themistokles wrote to Artaxerxes before Xerxes' death, and this led to confusion on the part of Thucydides; thus he concludes: "In either case Thucydides is in error: either he thought Artaxerxes came to the throne some years before he did, or, because he was not thinking of the chronology, he omits a

---

ἑτέραν θάλασσαν περὶ ἑς Πύδουαν τὴν Ἀλεξάνδρου. The identification of βασιλέα is irrelevant, perhaps impossible. The opening words of the next sentence (I, 137, 2: ἐν ἣ ὀλκάδος τυχῶν ἀναγομένης ἐκ' Ἰωνίας ) eliminate Alexandros.

Themistokles intended to move east to Persian territory; Thucydides knew this. Themistokles eventually arrived at the court of Artaxerxes; Thucydides knew this. But we cannot say that Themistokles intended to journey direct from Greece to Sousa; as proposed above, he had good reason to await the death of Xerxes.

<sup>93</sup> Cf. above, p. 25 with note 57, and below, pp. 58-60.

long delay before Themistokles went to Susa."<sup>94</sup> The latter explanation is to be preferred when we consider the nature of the excursus. This terse account of Themistokles' career reveals other contractions of chronology, e.g., the interval between the ostracism and the condemnation, to mention only one example.<sup>95</sup> The wanderings in Asia Minor did not demand elaboration; it is not the method of Thucydides to include such detail, and, even if he did possess more information, its inclusion would be irrelevant. And we cannot ascertain what Charon of Lampsakos had to relate.<sup>96</sup> At any rate I hesitate to accuse Thucydides of error merely because he failed to be more explicit.

Thucydides, then, allows and supports the following chronology: 471/0, condemnation and flight; 470, siege of Naxos; 465/4, the letter to Artaxerxes. Reconciliation is by no means insuperable, but, whether or not Thucydides felt difficulty, writers both ancient and modern have. For further evidence makes the chronological question much more

---

<sup>94</sup> Gomme, Commentary, I, p. 398; but see note 92 above.

<sup>95</sup> Thucydides, I, 135, 3, and cf. above, pp. 21-22.

Compare also his narrative of Pausanias' life (I, 131-135) and above, pp. 22-23; or elsewhere in Book I his review of events in the Pentekontaëtia (I, 98) and above, p. 39, note 85.

<sup>96</sup> Cf. below, p. 49 with note 107.

complicated. Thucydides accords with the most reasonable interpretation of Diodoros, Cicero, Nepos and Eusebios; Plutarch, however, has some words to say on the subject, and these have led to a mistrust of Thucydides himself (or, at any rate, our manuscripts of Thucydides) and the support of an entirely different chronological scheme for the ostracism, condemnation and flight, a scheme that has been outlined throughout the preceding discussion.

Plutarch states: "Thucydides and Charon of Lampsakos report that since Xerxes was dead it was his son whom Themistokles encountered. But Ephoros and Deinon and Kleitarchos and Herakleides, and others as well, say that he came to Xerxes himself. Thucydides seems to be more in agreement with the chronological data, although these are by no means securely established!"<sup>97</sup>

---

<sup>97</sup> Themistokles, 27, 1-2; the text of the last clause is in doubt. I accept for the moment the reading of the Y-group of mss.: τοῖς δὲ χρονικοῖς δοκεῖ μᾶλλον ὁ Θουκυδίδης συμφέρεσθαι, καίπερ οὐδ' αὐτοῖς ἀτρέμα συνταπτομένοις. Cf. Gomme, Commentary, I, p. 398 with note 2. S has αὐτὸς . . . συντεταγμένος and Lindskog and Ziegler prefer αὐτὸς . . . συντεταραγμένος (a variation of Cobet's αὐτοῖς . . . συντεταραγμένοις). Flacelière (Rev. ét. anc., LV [1953], pp. 11-12) likes Cobet's emendation, συνταράττω

We are surprised to find Plutarch aware of chronology,<sup>98</sup> although we can find a reason for his preference for Thucydides' and Charon's accounts. For, just previous to these remarks, Plutarch quotes Thucydides as follows: "Thucydides says that, after making his way to the sea, he (Themistokles) sailed from Pydna, no-one knowing his identity until the vessel was carried by a storm to Thasos (v.l. Naxos), which was being besieged by the Athenians . . . ." <sup>99</sup> The following narrative differs from Thucydides in two respects: Plutarch does not mention the payment to the captain of the vessel,<sup>100</sup> and, which is more important, he has Themistokles land at

---

for συντάτω, with ἀρῆμα carrying, for Plutarch, the meaning "moderately" rather than "precisely" (or "securely"); this is not essentially different in meaning from the text quoted above. See below, pp. 54-55.

<sup>98</sup> Despite Flacelière's remarks (Rev. ét. anc., LV [1953], pp. 11-12); he points to Numa, 1, 1-2 and 6, Camillus, 22, 1-2, and Solon, 27, 1. But cf. Gomme (Commentary, I, pp. 54-84). Plutarch is primarily interested in moral biography, and chronology is as a rule subordinate to his scheme of things.

<sup>99</sup> Plutarch, Themistokles, 25, 2. Plutarch here follows Thucydides (I, 137, 1-2) almost literally.

<sup>100</sup> Although he does tell us (Themistokles, 25, 3) that Themistokles received funds from his friends, adding by the way the specific amount that had been confiscated by the Athenians, i.e., 100 talents according to Theopompos or 80 talents according to Theophrastos.

Kyme (not at Ephesos, as does Thucydides), and here the accounts part company. But the most surprising thing of all is that, in the passage quoted above, one of the manuscripts of Plutarch reads Θάσσοι instead of Νάξοι and this manuscript S (Seitenstettensis) is a good one.

Thus several problems are raised by this variation in the text of Plutarch. Is Θάσσοι the true reading, and, if so, is this what Plutarch found recorded by Thucydides? Then the chronological difficulty of Thucydides' account of the flight would be removed, since the siege of Thasos began in midsummer, 465, and Artaxerxes' accession, as we have seen, belongs to 465/4.<sup>101</sup> Hence too would be explained Plutarch's preference for Thucydides' and Charon's testimony concerning the meeting with Artaxerxes. Other difficulties, however, are created if we read Θάσσοι in Thucydides, for then the ostracism, sojourn at Argos and with it the intrigues of Pausanias must be placed too late, unless we resort to other less convincing interpretations of the events surrounding the flight.<sup>102</sup>

That Νάξοι is the true reading in the text of Thucydides there can be no serious doubt. All our manuscripts

---

<sup>101</sup> See above, p. 38. For the date of the revolt of Thasos see A. T. L., III, pp. 162-175.

<sup>102</sup> As does Flacelière; see below, pp. 52-54.

are in agreement and corroboration is found elsewhere. The epistles, which obviously are dependent on Thucydides, not only have Themistokles meeting the fleet off Naxos but also report the landing at Ephesos and indirectly the meeting with Artaxerxes.<sup>103</sup> Nepos too owes a debt to Thucydides when he records the same information and in fact states a deliberate preference for the meeting with Artaxerxes.<sup>104</sup> The tradition, then, concerning Themistokles and Naxos and Artaxerxes is well enough established; Aristodemos provides further confirmation and with respect

---

<sup>103</sup> See especially „Themistokles“, Epistle 20; cf. below, pp. 171-172, and A. T. L., III, p. 112, note 7. Whether the letters follow Charon as well must remain a conjecture. Perhaps, as in the case of Plutarch, they are prompted by a trust in the combined testimony of both Charon and Thucydides as opposed to later accounts. That they knew of no other tradition is improbable, in the face of their eclectic nature. We must respect too their chronological consistency, which is implied by their general adherence to the Thucydidean account even when other evidence is incorporated in the general scheme of their narrative.

<sup>104</sup> Nepos, Themistocles, 8-9. I cannot agree with Gomme (Commentary, I, p. 399, note 1) that "this does not amount to much," in this connexion at any rate.

*Notes 105*

to Artaxerxes so does a scholiast to Aristophanes.<sup>105</sup>

Thus it is specious reasoning indeed to assume that Plutarch had an earlier and more reliable text of Thucydides, for we can account for  $\Theta\acute{\alpha}\sigma\omicron\nu$  in Plutarch on other grounds, and this is the easier and, I believe, the correct approach.

I accept then  $\text{N}\acute{\alpha}\xi\omicron\nu$  for Thucydides and I consider it, along with the meeting of Artaxerxes, to be historically accurate, because of both Thucydides' authority itself<sup>106</sup> and Plutarch's remarks concerning his agreement with Charon of Lampsakos.<sup>107</sup> And we have seen that his testimony may be reconciled with our other chronological information. How then did the rival tradition concerning Thasos arise? An answer to this question carries with it a refutation of the historicity of this other version of the flight.

---

<sup>105</sup> Aristodemos, 10, 3-4 Jacoby (no. 104); Schol. Aristophanes, Equites, 84.

<sup>106</sup> There is no good reason to question it drastically for Themistokles any more than elsewhere; cf. above, p. 35, note 82, and below, p. 57, note 119.

<sup>107</sup> Flacelière (Rev. ét. anc., LV [1953], p. 11) regrets that we cannot ascertain what Charon had to say about Themistokles' meeting with the Athenian fleet. I feel secure in the conjecture that, if he did deal with the episode (cf. below, p. 55, note 116), he too had the Athenian meeting his countrymen off Naxos.

But we must return to Plutarch's text. Is Νάξου or Θάσου the genuine reading here? Flacelière's arguments for Thasos are good and in general I should agree with them.<sup>108</sup> There is, first of all, the manuscript authority of S.<sup>109</sup> Furthermore, it is significant that Plutarch differs from Thucydides in having Themistokles land at Kyme rather than at Ephesos, and he makes no mention of the change. A glance at the map will reveal that the combination of Naxos and Ephesos or, on the other hand, of Thasos and Kyme go together logically for an itinerary from Pydna to Asia Minor.<sup>110</sup> Since Plutarch chose the

---

<sup>108</sup> Flacelière, Rev. ét. anc., LV (1953), pp. 5-13. Cf. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Aristoteles und Athen, I, p. 150, who also champions Thasos for Plutarch.

<sup>109</sup> Note that the Teubner edition of Lindskog and Ziegler prints Θάσου in the text.

<sup>110</sup> Flacelière (Rev. ét. anc., LV [1953], p. 7) rightly observes: "les hasards de la navigation peuvent-ils troubler les itinéraires, mais, du moment que nous avons la preuve que la traversée de Thémistocle était racontée de deux manières différentes, on m'accordera, je pense, comme y invite la leçon du Seitenstettensis, que le doublet Thasos-Naxos devait correspondre, terme pour terme, au doublet Kymè-Éphèse."

tradition that Themistokles landed at Kyme (and not Ephesos), he probably found in the same tradition the statement that Themistokles encountered the Athenian fleet off Thasos (instead of Naxos). And the most logical explanation of Νάξον in the manuscripts of Plutarch is to see in it a correction of an original Θάσον, through the influence of Thucydides (or Charon).

But we must not slur over the fact that Plutarch writes Θουκυδίδης . . . φησιν and yet continues with the itinerary of Thasos and Kyme, as though this were what he found in Thucydides. Flacelière argues convincingly that Plutarch does not hesitate to depart from an announced model and that it is dangerous to correct Plutarch on the basis of a parallel passage unless one can be certain that he means to follow this passage in every respect.<sup>111</sup>

---

<sup>111</sup> Flacelière, Rev. ét. anc., LV (1953), pp. 7-8; see also B. C. H., LXX (1946), pp. 199-207; Plutarch, de defectu oraculorum (=Moralia, 412 A-B) recounts the anecdote that is found in Herodotos (VIII, 133-135) but differs from the historian on several points. Flacelière's case is strong, although his example is not entirely parallel, for in the Moralia Plutarch does not mention Herodotos by name. Cf. Meyer, Gesch. d. Alt., IV, 1<sup>3</sup>, pp. 492-493, note 2, who reads Νάξον in Plutarch.

It is a winning argument, particularly when we can see reasons why Plutarch made the change, for Thasos fits the chronology (and the geography as well) more readily in the immediate context than does Naxos, resolving, as it does, the difficulty of Thucydides' narrative concerning the meeting with Artaxerxes. And no-one would argue that, on the basis of Plutarch, we are to read Kyme for Ephesos in Thucydides, although Plutarch makes no mention of his deviation. Themistokles no doubt went from Naxos to Ephesos to Kyme by sea.

Flacelière's discussion continues with an explanation of how Themistokles' meeting with the fleet off Thasos presents in every respect a more reasonable framework for the flight than that found in Thucydides. The implication is of course that this, as a result, is what happened; but Flacelière cannot bring himself to state his conclusion directly. In fact, he fails to realize the problems fully, for there are two questions here: (1) what Plutarch believed to be the true chronology and itinerary for the flight and his reasons for this belief, and (2) what the chronology and itinerary were in reality.

Not only does Flacelière feel that Thucydides believed Themistokles to have written to Artaxerxes shortly after

his arrival in Asia;<sup>112</sup> he also maintains that Themistokles did not flee Argos until 466 or early in 465.<sup>113</sup> And we are to imagine, besides a lengthy stay at Argos, that his sojourn with Admetos was of longer duration than is usually believed; in fact, he argues, Themistokles remained in Epiros until 465/4, since, after Admetos had rejected the demands of the pursuers, the fugitive felt secure enough to send for his wife and children from Athens.<sup>114</sup> How very

---

<sup>112</sup> See above, p. 41 with note 89.

<sup>113</sup> Flacelière accepts without question the ostracism and the concurrent death of Pausanias in 471 or 470. He cites Beloch (Gr. Gesch., II, 2<sup>2</sup>, pp. 188-193) to show that the Spartans could not have obtained Themistokles' removal from Argos before the re-establishment of their authority in the Peloponnesos, ca. 466/5. But this is by no means certain. The battles of Tegea and Dipaia are placed in the early seventies by Wilamowitz, Meyer and Busolt (cf. Highby, Erythrae Decree, p. 87, and Gomme, Commentary, I, pp. 408-409); scholars have not found general agreement on this score. Even if there were evidence to date these events precisely, nothing cogent would be established for Themistokles' summons and his flight from Argos. Cf. above, p. 34, note 80.

<sup>114</sup> This is the version of Stesimbrotos (quoted by Plutarch, Themistokles, 24, 4). Flacelière (Rev. ét. anc., LV 1953, p.10),

tenuous these arguments are has already become manifest in the preceding discussion; Flacelière's reconstruction is impossible.

When Flacelière urges that Plutarch rejected Naxos for reasons of chronology, I agree with him. And I make this further suggestion. S reads αὐτὸς . . . συντεταγμένους, as we have seen, in the disputed section of Plutarch. Perhaps we should read αὐτὸς . . . συντεταραγμένους<sup>115</sup> with Lindskog and Ziegler; it is also S that gives Θάσον instead of Νάξον. May we then paraphrase Plutarch's reasoning as follows? Thucydides and Charon are correct; Themistokles did meet Artaxerxes (not Xerxes, as later writers would have it), but Thucydides' narrative is confused in that it demands too long an interval in Asia Minor. The itinerary

---

following Gustave Glotz (La solidarité de la famille, p. 485), finds Stesimbrotos more trustworthy than Idomeneus of Lampsakos, who is cited by a scholiast to Aristophanes, Vespae, 947, in an obviously erroneous reference to Thoukydides, son of Melesias, which actually applies to Themistokles: οἱ μέντοι Ἀθηναῖοι αὐτοῦ καὶ γένους ἀειφυγίαν κατέγνωσαν.

<sup>115</sup> See above, p. 45 with note 97. Gomme and Flacelière object to this reading, but fail to support their opinions.

involving Thasos and Kyme is right, and the deviation need not be mentioned. The encounter with Artaxerxes is historical and the other difficulties may be resolved. Thus Plutarch, and the reconstruction of his thought suits the reading αὐτοῖς . . . συνταπτομένοις, even though it suits αὐτὸς . . . συντεταραγμένους better. And, if Plutarch proceeded in this way, he did not by any means resolve all the difficulties.<sup>116</sup>

Flacelière proffers another explanation for Plutarch's choice of Kyme instead of Ephesos, and hence Thasos rather than Naxos. His source for the story of Kyme allowed the colourful details at Aigai, the incidents concerning Nikogenes and Olbios and the narrative of Themistokles' journey to Sousa.<sup>117</sup> It is ironic that Plutarch's awareness

---

<sup>116</sup> This argument perhaps suggests that Charon did not mention the encounter with the Athenian fleet; thus both Charon and Thucydides confirmed Plutarch's belief in the meeting with Artaxerxes, but Thucydides alone told of the episode off Naxos. At any rate, I do not believe that Charon is responsible for the tradition that narrated Themistokles' encounter with the fleet at Thasos. Cf. Flacelière, Rev. ét. anc., LV (1953), pp. 11-12, for an unconvincing analysis of Plutarch.

<sup>117</sup> Flacelière, Rev. ét. anc., LV (1953), pp. 12-13. Plutarch, Themistokles, 26-27. Cf. Thucydides' dry (but accurate) brevity (I, 137, 3).

should be thwarted by a fascination for the picturesque, although this would by no means be the only time that he has revealed an historical obtuseness.

Flacelière goes on to inquire who it was who originally substituted Thasos and Kyme for Naxos and Ephesos. He suggests that Stesimbrotos' composition on Thasos was used by Ephoros (who was from Kyme) in his work on Kyme, and local pride and legend contributed to the fabrication. It is curious, as Flacelière observes, that Ephoros, who upholds the meeting with Xerxes, should support as well the episode off Thasos, which is chronologically more favourable to the encounter with Artaxerxes; Thucydides, on the other hand, has Themistokles approach Artaxerxes, and records with this the events involving Naxos, which are more easily reconciled by a meeting with Xerxes.<sup>118</sup> Flacelière's

---

<sup>118</sup> Flacelière, *Rev. ét. anc.*, LV (1953), p. 14. It is of course dangerous to be too precise in an analysis of the growth of these conflicting versions. Flacelière combats the belief that Phantias of Eresos championed the tradition of Themistokles' meeting with Artaxerxes (cf. L. Bodin, *Rev. ét. gr.*, XXVIII [1915], pp. 251-281). But if Flacelière is correct, it is pertinent to note in the present context that the Artabanos whom Themistokles encounters at the palace of the king (Plutarch, *Themistokles*, 27) is, according

conclusion is that the entire episode is in the nature of an anecdote and as a result we cannot, even for Thucydides, press the chronology.<sup>119</sup> This kind of argument we have met before and a lengthy refutation belongs in another context.<sup>120</sup> The problem of sources in itself needs much further elaboration. But surely at this point there are more definite conclusions to be reached, conclusions that

---

to Diodoros (XI, 69), the murderer of Xerxes. And Artabanos was soon killed in turn by Artaxerxes after an attempt upon the latter's life. Plutarch, then, who believes that Themistokles met Artaxerxes, recounts the episode between the Athenian and Artabanos that belongs, in all probability, to the tradition of the encounter with Xerxes. It is significant that in epistle 20 we find Themistokles associated with Artabazos, and, as in Plutarch, the king is not named, directly at any rate. Cf. also [Themistokles], Epistles 8 and 12, where one might assume that Xerxes is intended.

<sup>119</sup> Flacelière, Rev. ét. anc., LV (1953), p. 14. I agree that Thucydides is less certain of events in Asia Minor (note I, 138, 1: ὡς λέγεται), and that he does not accept full responsibility for the accuracy of his information.

Cf. Gomme, Commentary, I, p. 441, and below, p. 60, note 124.

<sup>120</sup> Cf. above, p. 35, note 82.

are inevitable in the face of Flacelière's analysis and our previous discussion. And the editors of A. T. L. reveal in a note what must be the correct approach for a solution to the problems.<sup>121</sup>

The meeting with Xerxes is a later fabrication, which had as its primary aim the dramatic encounter of Themistokles with the great king who had invaded Greece; and it provided as well one expedient for lessening the chronological difficulties that were felt in Thucydides (and perhaps Charon).<sup>122</sup>

---

<sup>121</sup> A. T. L., III, p. 112, note 7: "We cannot share Jacoby's apparent suspicion that the later writers had some better evidence. What they thought incredible was that Themistokles landed at Ephesos in 470 and did not reach Sousa till 465; they therefore made him either land in Asia later . . . or reach Sousa earlier." We have seen that there were other reasons as well for this later tradition.

<sup>122</sup> Cf. Gomme, Commentary, I, p. 398. There is little doubt that Herodotos also knew of the tradition of Themistokles' encounter with Xerxes, for he states concerning the Athenian's second message to the king (VIII, 109, 5): ταῦτα ἔλεγε ἀποθήκην μέλλων ποιήσεσθαι ἐς τὸν Πέρσην, ἵνα ἦν ἄρα τί μιν καταλαμβάνη πρὸς Ἀθηναίων πάθος, ἔχη ἀποστροφῆν· τὰ περ ὧν καὶ ἐγένετο. This suggests to me another reason for the growth of the fiction. Herodotos

The episode with the fleet off Naxos, like the encounter with Artaxerxes, is an historical fact and the fiction of Thasos represents another attempt to reconstruct a more credible chronological framework. It is impossible to know whether the story of the landing at Kyme was influenced by the fabrication of Thasos, or whether it, in itself, encouraged this other version. For there are questions of geography, patriotism and drama that contributed towards the various elements of the fiction. And it is not impossible that Themistokles stopped at Kyme (although he did not first land there) while he was in Asia Minor. But these efforts failed to solve all the problems, for they ignored the chronology preceding the flight, and created in themselves other obstacles because the tradition was cumulative and various, and separate reasons prompted the elaboration of its separate parts.<sup>123</sup> We need not believe that the later

---

here obviously follows sources that are hostile to Themistokles (see How and Wells, Commentary, II, p. 272, and below, p. 98) and that coloured Themistokles' motives for his message advising Xerxes to flee. [Themistokles], Epistle 11 (see below, p. 163), states that treason at Salamis was one of the charges later brought against Themistokles

<sup>123</sup> Aristodemos, 10-11 Jacoby (no. 104), and Suidas, s.v. Κίμων, place the death of Themistokles at the time of the

writers had better evidence on these points at any rate.<sup>124</sup>

On these grounds the chronology and itinerary that I believe to be historical are as follows:

no later than 474/3	the ostracism
471/0	the condemnation and flight, the encounter off Naxos and the landing at Ephesos
465/4	Themistokles establishes his position with Artaxerxes. <sup>125</sup>

---

battle of the Eurymedon. This would demand a meeting with Xerxes. But in Aristodemos the meeting is with Artaxerxes. The combination shows what ridiculous lengths these fictions can reach. See below, p. 101, note 81.

<sup>124</sup> A reading of Plutarch's life of Themistokles suggests how many and varied were the conflicting later accounts, and even Plutarch is often sceptical. Besides, Thucydides is cautious in what he has to say concerning the events in Asia Minor (see above, p. 57, note 119) and presumably Thucydides is following Charon. What are we to think then of these later detailed narratives?

<sup>125</sup> I allow the possibility (but I do not think that it is a probability) that Themistokles had some dealings with the Persian monarchy before this date. Thucydides does not tell us what Themistokles' activities were during these years.

There are two other pieces of evidence. Stesimbrotos relates that Themistokles sailed to Sicily and offered his assistance to Hieron for a conquest of Greece, demanding in return the daughter of the tyrant in marriage.<sup>126</sup> On the basis of this statement it has been conjectured that Themistokles fled to Kerkyra with the intention of proceeding to Sicily, but, upon hearing of Hieron's death, he was forced to change his plans.<sup>127</sup> The tyrant died in 467/6,

---

Did Themistokles attempt to approach Xerxes, after his arrival at Ephesos, and was there in actual fact some association between Artabanos and Themistokles, and furthermore did the latter have any knowledge of the plot on the king's life? Or did he remain among the Greeks on the coast until Artaxerxes was established on the throne? Then there was need of a year in which to learn the Persian language and customs. At any rate, the death of Xerxes gave Themistokles his opportunity. My confidence in the later accounts is not strong enough to warrant a change of the convictions stated above (pp. 44-45). If the meeting with Xerxes is a fiction, it is impossible to isolate with any certainty accurate information that may be incorporated with the fiction; cf. above, p. 56, note 118. Thucydides' testimony must hold the field.

<sup>126</sup> Plutarch, Themistokles, 24, 4.

<sup>127</sup> Gomme, Commentary, I, p. 400, note 1, provides the

according to Diodoros.<sup>128</sup> We must understand then either a later date for Naxos or assume that the meeting of the fleet off Thasos is implied by the synchronism. In either case the flight is brought nearer chronologically to the date of Artaxerxes' accession. This argument is dubious, for the letters of [Themistokles] tell us that Themistokles was prevented from sailing to Sicily by news of the death of Gelon (and not Hieron, as modern scholars have conjectured).<sup>129</sup> The letter-writer perhaps reflects an attempt to rationalize Stesimbrotos' account, or else reproduces an earlier version of the story. Doenges, however, sees in the narrative of epistle 20 a reflection of the source followed by the Parian Marble.<sup>130</sup> Here the accession of Hieron is dated in 472/1 as opposed to other evidence that suggests an earlier year; Diodoros gives 478/7 for the death of Gelon and he receives some support (with minor

---

bibliography; see Meyer, Gesch. d. Alt., IV, 1<sup>3</sup>, p. 492, note 2, and Zimmern, Greek Commonwealth<sup>4</sup>, p. 374, note 1.

<sup>128</sup> Diodoros, XI, 66.

<sup>129</sup> [Themistokles], Epistle 20; see below, p. 137 with note 33.

<sup>130</sup> Doenges, Letters, pp. 72-75, note 45.

variations) from other testimony.<sup>131</sup> Thus the letters are consistent in their agreement with the earlier chronology, and we may see in their version of this episode support for the year 471/0 for the flight.

All this is very tenuous to be sure. Theophrastos' story of Themistokles and Hieron at Olympia must be placed in 476 and not in 472, if it is historical at all.<sup>132</sup> And 472 for the death of Gelon seems hardly credible historically. It may be that the author of epistle 20 has made a slip in the mention of Gelon's name instead of Hieron's, a blunder facilitated by the statement of epistle 7 that establishes an earlier friendship between Gelon in the west and Athens and Themistokles. This evidence allows no completely satisfactory solution. I believe that the whole incident concerning Themistokles and Sicily is fictitious.

I have no faith in this kind of evidence in the light of what has been concluded above. Plutarch at any rate does not believe Stesimbrotos' elaboration, and in fact he goes on to quote Theophrastos, showing that Hieron had definite cause for hostility towards Themistokles.<sup>133</sup> In

---

<sup>131</sup> Diodoros, XI, 38, 3.

<sup>132</sup> Plutarch, Themistokles, 25; see above, p. 30, note 46, and below, p. 157 with note 81.

<sup>133</sup> Themistokles, 25.

addition the chronology for the Deinomenids is confused;<sup>134</sup> and there is no need to see in this story an explanation of Themistokles' roundabout journey from Argos to Persia.<sup>135</sup> Thucydides gives us good reason for Themistokles' decision to flee west to Kerkyra. He expected to find refuge there, for he had once been a benefactor to the Kerkyraians.<sup>136</sup>

---

<sup>134</sup> Cf. Gomme, Commentary, I, p. 400, note 1.

<sup>135</sup> Cf. Zimmern, Greek Commonwealth<sup>4</sup>, p. 374, who finds in the episode further confirmation of Themistokles' aspirations westward; Zimmern and Meyer are not convincing to me (cf. Walker, C. A. H., V, p. 63, note 2).

<sup>136</sup> Thucydides, I, 136. As Gomme points out (Commentary, I, p. 438), εὐεργέτης is an official title of honour attested by inscriptions; a scholiast to Thucydides explains that Themistokles defended Kerkyra's neutrality in the Persian wars. Plutarch, Themistokles, 24, is more specific: Themistokles took the side of Kerkyra in a dispute with Korinth, stipulating that Korinth pay an indemnity of twenty talents, and, as well, concede Leukas to be administered as a common colony. We cannot assess the historicity of these elaborations upon Thucydides' brief explanation. Gomme is perhaps overly sceptical. Is Nepos thinking of either event when he confuses Aigina with Kerkyra in recounting Themistokles' rise to fame (Themistocles, 2)?

Only when they refused asylum and he was forced to cross to the mainland did he direct his attention towards Persia.<sup>137</sup>

Finally, we must return to the testimony of the Constitution of the Athenians, which links Themistokles with Ephialtes in the reform of the Areiopagos during the archon-year 462/1.<sup>138</sup> Ure's argument that here is reflected an historically accurate chronology of Themistokles' career is as ingenious as it is absurd.<sup>139</sup> Themistokles, it is maintained, returned to Athens in 464/3, joined Ephialtes in the attack on the Areiopagos and was compelled to flee a charge of Medism early in 462, in time to encounter the Athenian fleet completing its siege of Thasos. Corroboration of Aristotle's account is found in an argument to the Areiopagitikos of Isokrates, written, most likely, by a Christian of the sixth century. Cicero, too, suggests a return to Athens after the ostracism when he speaks of the flight and return of Themistokles (Themistocli fuga redituque);<sup>140</sup> and the passage of the de amicitia quoted

---

<sup>137</sup> Aristotle, Epistles 17 and 20, expresses the disillusionment attendant upon the Kerkyraians' ingratitude.

<sup>138</sup> Aristotle, Ath. Pol., 25. Cf. above, pp. 11-12.

<sup>139</sup> Ure, J. H. S., XLI (1921), pp. 48-178.

<sup>140</sup> Cicero, ad familiares, V, 12, 5. Ure (J. H. S., XLI [1921], pp. 176-178) objects to emendation of the passage.

above is emended to assure consistency on the part of the orator.<sup>141</sup>

Perhaps [Aristotle] did know the correct date of the ostracism as 474/3; we have, indeed, arrived at this conclusion on the basis of the other evidence. That he believed in a return as well seems incredible. C. A. Robinson presents the best explanation of how Themistokles' name appears in [Aristotle]'s text: the reform of 487/6 was confused with the later activity of Ephialtes in 462/1.<sup>142</sup> The fact of Themistokles' ostracism in 474/3 (or earlier) may have been conducive to the fabrication. But the reasons for this blunder need not detain us in this context.

Munro's thesis that there existed in antiquity two versions of the career of Themistokles, which dated events

---

Flacelière, however, observes (Rev. ét. anc., LV [1953], p. 14, note 3) that Cicero probably refers to the departure of Themistokles before Salamis and his return after the victory (cf. ad Atticum, VII, 11, 3).

<sup>141</sup> Cicero, de amicitia, 12, 42; cf. above, p. 8. XX must be changed to XXX.

<sup>142</sup> A. J. P., LXVII (1946), pp. 265-266; cf. above, pp. 11-12. Ure, J. H. S., XLI (1921), pp. 166-168, summarizes other explanations of [Aristotle]'s error.

just ten years apart, will be considered elsewhere.<sup>143</sup>

Other problems in chronology remain to be solved: the date of the archonship and, dependent upon this, the years of Themistokles' birth and death.

---

<sup>143</sup> Munro, Class. Rev., VI (1892), pp. 333-334; cf. above, p. 12, note 29, and below, pp. 116-118.

CHAPTER TWO  
THE ARCHONSHIP

The date which has been generally accepted for the archonship of Themistokles is 493/2 B.C.<sup>1</sup> But belief is by no means unanimous and the year has from time to time been seriously questioned, for there is evidence (of an indirect nature to be sure) which suggests that Themistokles' rise to power should be confined to the 480's; and Krüger long ago stood forth as the champion of 482/1 as the correct year for the archonship.<sup>2</sup> He was not alone in this view, and, with the discovery of the Constitution of the Athenians, there were those who believed that Aristotle's text offered confirmation of this theory, although the evidence remained inconclusive.<sup>3</sup> The date 482/1, however, has not gained credence generally, as I have said, and rightly so. Nevertheless, Gomme has more

---

<sup>1</sup> So Beloch, Busolt, Wade-Gery, Walker, C. A. Robinson, McGregor, Kahrstedt, Glotz, Bengtson, Wilcken, to mention only a few. It is easier, however, to note the exceptions.

<sup>2</sup> Krüger, Historisch philologische Studien, I, pp. 13-37.

<sup>3</sup> See Kenyon, Aristotle<sup>3</sup>, pp. 78-80; Sandys, Aristotle's Constitution<sup>2</sup>, pp. 95-96.

than once felt compelled to express scepticism of the traditional view, and, without daring to break completely with it, has challenged fundamentally our historical conception of the early fifth century.<sup>4</sup> And recently Flacelière has been outright in his reversion to Krüger's position in his arguments for 482/1.<sup>5</sup>

Thus the modern biographer of Themistokles must investigate the problem once again, since it is impossible for him, in easy conscience, to accept 493/2 for the archonship without a close examination of the evidence. Indeed, Flacelière and Gomme as well make such a review necessary, and, as we shall see, the ancient testimony has not yet completed its yield of information. An analysis of the chronological evidence demands with it a reconstruction of the historical background as a whole; furthermore, the problems concerning the archonship (and the dates of Themistokles' birth and death) cannot be isolated from the questions that surround the ostracism, exile, and flight. In these respects the arguments of Krüger, Flacelière and Gomme leave much to be desired; in a comprehensive study, on the other hand, lie conclusions which are, I believe, inevitable.

---

<sup>4</sup> A. J. P., IXV (1944), pp. 323-324; Commentary, I, pp. 261-262.

<sup>5</sup> Rev. ét. anc., LV (1953), pp. 15-19.

Yet in many ways it is disheartening to examine once more evidence that has been sifted and weighed so many times and that, since the discovery of the Constitution of the Athenians, has remained the same. I make no attempt to offer a history of the scholarship of more than a century. Gomme and in particular Flacelière provide ready access to the most significant earlier literature. Wade-Gery offers the only recent original contribution in his ingenious interpretation of a passage in Plutarch.<sup>6</sup> And, as he has observed, Busolt's succinct note in defence of 493/2 is in some ways decisive.<sup>7</sup> Finally, Munro presents a brief but suggestive survey of the entire chronology of Themistokles' career.<sup>8</sup> His remarks, which have too often been forgotten, are penetrating and crucial to an understanding of the nature of the ancient testimony, and they do much to direct the historian to a solution.

We may now initiate our own study of the ancient writers. That 482/1 is the only year, apart from 493/2, possible for the archonship of Themistokles has been all

---

<sup>6</sup> B. S. A., XXXVII (1936-1937), pp. 262-270. See below, pp. 111-112.

<sup>7</sup> Gr. Gesch., II<sup>2</sup>, pp. 642-643, note 1; Wade-Gery, B. S. A., XXXVII (1936-1937), p. 263, note 1.

<sup>8</sup> Class. Rev., VI (1892), pp. 333-334; see below, pp. 107-108 and 116-118.

but conclusively established; the only other year available is 486/5, and there is no reason to imagine that Themistokles was archon then. Conflict in the ancient testimony exists concerning the archons of the 480's, but I regard the restoration of the archon-list made by Cadoux as definitive in the light of our present knowledge, and I point out only the ancient testimony vital to the present discussion.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> J. H. S., LXVIII (1948), pp. 116-123. Carcopino's advocacy of 481/0 for Themistokles' archonship is difficult to understand, and it cannot be maintained in the face of the evidence (Carcopino, L'ostracisme athénien, pp. 153-157; see also Clinton, Fasti Hellenici, II<sup>3</sup>, pp. xvii and 32. Kenyon, Aristotle<sup>3</sup>, pp. 76-77, discusses the problems involved in Aristotle's text). The interpretation of Aristotle (Ath. Pol., 22) necessary for such an assumption is strained to say the least; I cannot believe that 482/1 is the year of the recall of the exiles and hence that of Hypsichides' archonship. Furthermore, the scholiast to Thucydides (or for that matter Thucydides himself, see below, pp. 82 and 90) need not be made to refer to Themistokles as archon immediately before the year of Salamis. It is better to assume 483/2 (which in fact is impossible) for Themistokles' archonship on the basis of

According to Dionysios the archonship of Nikodemos belongs in 483/2.<sup>10</sup> Aristotle, however, places Nikodemos in 484/3 (by the most natural interpretation of his text), and, if his testimony be accepted, it would run counter to the chronology given elsewhere in the Constitution of the Athenians for the years 490/89 to 485/4, as well as offer conflict with Dionysios, who gives us Leostratos for 484/3.<sup>11</sup> Aristotle, must be in error, and Munro's observation that perhaps his mistake is the result of a belief that Themistokles was archon in 483/2 has some probability when the other evidence is considered.<sup>12</sup>

Aristotle, tells us that Themistokles' proposal concerning the mines at Laureion was made during the archonship of Nikodemos. This was the year 483/2, but Aristotle, imagining Themistokles' achievement as culminating in the archonship, places Nikodemos in 484/3, and thus makes room for Themistokles in 483/2. Perhaps Themistokles did hold some other office in this year (or in the year following),

---

Aristotle's testimony, for on this assumption we can at least explain Aristotle's error, although the problem may be textual.

<sup>10</sup> Dion. Hal., Ant. Rom., VIII, 83, 1.

<sup>11</sup> Ath. Pol., 22, 7-8; Dion. Hal., Ant. Rom., VIII, 77, 1.

See Cadoux, J. H. S., LXVIII (1948), p. 118.

<sup>12</sup> Class. Rev., VI (1892), p. 333.

and this too contributed to Aristotle's error.<sup>13</sup> And it may be significant that 483/2 is just ten years from 493/2, the only year for which there is direct evidence that a Themistokles was archon.<sup>14</sup>

Since Nikodemos must be placed in 483/2, the historical question is whether 482/1 or 493/2 is the year of Themistokles' archonship. There is besides another question: granting that Aristotle, erroneously placed

---

<sup>13</sup> See below, pp. 87-89. Observe also that, although Aristotle (Ath. Pol., 22, 7) tells of Themistokles' plan for the use of the funds from the mines under the archonship of Nikodemos, he anticipates his chronological scheme by at least a year (and probable more) when he goes on to mention the actual building of the triremes. And then it is stated that at this time (*ἐν τούτοις τοῖς καίροισ*, and the expression is worthy of note) Aristeides was ostracized. This presumably is in 483/2. But at this point Aristotle, resumes his main narrative, dating the recall of the exiles in the fourth year after this, i.e., in the fourth year after the archonship of Nikodemos, who for Aristotle, belongs in 484/3. See Cadoux, J. H. S., LXVIII (1948), p. 118. It is not impossible, although it is less likely, that Aristotle, places Themistokles in 482/1 (see below, pp. 75-76).

<sup>14</sup> See below, p. 80.

Themistokles in 483/2 (an historical impossibility), are we therefore compelled to allocate him to 482/1 for the very same reasons which contributed to Aristotle's error? This is more than specious argumentation. We know that Themistokles was not archon when he made his proposal concerning a naval programme against Aigina. Need he be archon in the following year (whether eponymous or not), and further must we attribute the building of the walls of the Peiraeus to this same year,<sup>15</sup> when Aristotle makes no mention of the undertaking? Thus there are several points to be noted in connexion with this chapter of the Constitution of the Athenians, and I list them now in this context at the risk of being repetitious and of anticipating arguments which are to follow.

1. Aristotle says nothing about Themistokles' archonship, nor the fortification of the Peiraeus.
2. If he believes that Themistokles was archon in 483/2, he is wrong. He may very well, as has been demonstrated, have thought of Themistokles as holding a magistracy in 483/2 and, if so, this may not have been the eponymous archonship.

---

<sup>15</sup> See below, pp. 84-85.

In fact, if Themistokles had already served as eponymous,<sup>16</sup> the presumed magistracy of 483/2 (or 482/1) could not have been an archonship at all.<sup>17</sup>

3. We attribute such an assumption to Aristotle, by implication because, as we shall see, there is other evidence which suggests that Themistokles was a magistrate in the 480's. Also we are able in this way to account for Aristotle's error concerning Nikodemos, and, although it is possible that this is merely a slip or a corruption in the text, I have little faith in such explanations.<sup>18</sup> For this reason too I do not believe

---

<sup>16</sup> He must have, at some time; see below, p. 89, note 54.

<sup>17</sup> It has been suggested that Themistokles held the archonship twice; see Kenyon, Aristotle<sup>3</sup>, p. 79, and Flacelière, Rev. ét. anc., LV (1953), p. 17, note 3. Certainly this was impossible later; Ath. Pol., 62, 3.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. Cadoux, J. H. S., LXVIII (1948), p. 118, who emends τεράρτω to τρίτω in Aristotle. But elsewhere Aristotle (22, 7) places the archonship of Nikodemos in the third year after the ostracism of Xanthippos. In all probability the ostracism of Xanthippos belongs in 485/4, but I am not

that Aristotle, understood the archonship (or magistracy) of Themistokles for the year 482/1; but this is not impossible since he does not by any means name all the archons of the 480's. It is easier, however, to explain Aristotle's mistake in the date of Nikodemos by assuming that he thought of Themistokles as archon in the year immediately following.<sup>19</sup>

4. The year 483/2 is just ten years later than 493/2, the only date for which there is direct evidence that a Themistokles was archon, as I have stated above. This is indeed a startling coincidence, for other testimony implies a similar ten-year discrepancy in the years attested for his death.<sup>20</sup> And we should remember too that it is Aristotle, who tells us that Themistokles

---

sure that Aristotle, places it in this year. He may very well understand Xanthippos' ostracism for 486/5 and thus be consistent in his dating of Nikodemos' archonship (Kenyon, Aristotle,<sup>3</sup> pp. 76-77).

<sup>19</sup> See above, p. 73 with note 13.

<sup>20</sup> See below, pp. 100-101.

was in Athens in 461, and, if we conjecture with Ure that his flight was dated in the same year (461/0), this is exactly ten years later than the true date for Themistokles' condemnation and exile.<sup>21</sup> But Aristotle's error here may be the result of an independent slip of an historical rather than a chronological nature.

5. The historical question is whether Themistokles was archon in 493/2 or 482/1, regardless of any interpretation of Aristotle. Themistokles may have held an office other than the archonship in 482/1 (or for that matter also in 483/2 and even 484/3) and hence there arises the confusion.<sup>22</sup> Aristotle's text affirms Themistokles' prominence in these years, and either he or other writers (both ancient and modern) associated this prominence with the archonship, even though by this time the office was subject to the lot.<sup>23</sup> But again it should be kept in mind that Aristotle does not state that Themistokles was archon nor

---

<sup>21</sup> See above, pp. 65-66, and below, pp. 116-118.

<sup>22</sup> See below, pp. 87-89.

<sup>23</sup> See below, pp. 81-82.

does he mention the fortification of the Peiraeus, which in other writers is associated with Themistokles' year of office.<sup>24</sup> It is an easy error to forget his earlier activity in the face of his achievement at Salamis, which stems directly from his proposal for the employment of the funds of Laureion.<sup>25</sup>

There is another piece of evidence which must be mentioned in connexion with the testimony of Aristotle, although it has been considered as independent confirmation of Themistokles' archonship in 482/1. A scholiast to Aischines comments on the name Νικοφήμου (in the phrase ἐπὶ ἄρχοντος Νικοφήμου) as follows: οὗτος ἤρξε πρὸς Θεμιστοκλέους, ἐφ' οὗ βουλευσαί τὸν Τίμαρχον. ἦν δ' ἐπὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἄρχοντος καὶ Ἡγήσανδρος τῆς θεοῦ ταμίας. καὶ κοινῇ διέκλεπτον τοῦ δημοσίου χιλίας δραχμάς, ὡς φησιν ὁ ῥήτωρ.<sup>26</sup> The archonship of Nikophemos belongs in 361/0. It has been suggested, however, that the scholiast has a

<sup>24</sup> See below, p. 86.

<sup>25</sup> See below, pp. 109-110. It may be objected that Aristotle had an archon-list and therefore in such matters he should be infallible. But he does err concerning Nikodemos, and furthermore his list of archons is far from complete.

<sup>26</sup> Schol. Aischines, 1, 109.

vague recollection of Nikodemos,<sup>27</sup> and, leaning on this fantasy, we are to believe that Themistokles must follow Nikodemos as archon in the 480's. Even if we allow for a moment that this is a valid conjecture (which it is not) there are several objections that demand expression. A Nikophemos may for all we know have been archon before Themistokles, with the latter's year of office placed in 493/2, for  $\pi\rho\acute{o}$  in the scholiast need not mean specifically the year immediately preceding;<sup>28</sup> or, if the scholiast has confused the name of Nikophemos with that of Nikodemos, he could be merely reflecting the tradition represented by  $\tau$ Aristotle, (or a natural interpretation of  $\tau$ Aristotle), and thus too would place Nikodemos in 484/3 and Themistokles in 483/2.<sup>29</sup> And this is incorrect. We could not say that

---

<sup>27</sup> It is perhaps worth noting that a variant in  $\tau$ Aristotle's text gives Nikomedes, which is almost certainly incorrect (see Cadoux, J. H. S., LXVIII [1948], p. 118, note 257).

<sup>28</sup> There are many vacancies in the archon-list before 496/5; Cadoux, J. H. S., LXVIII (1948), pp. 120-123.

<sup>29</sup> Cf. Munro, Glass. Rev., VI (1892), p. 333. The scholiast might mean only that Nikodemos was archon before the prominence of Themistokles that resulted from the building of the fleet and the victory at Salamis; this is about as reasonable as the initial assumption.

the scholiast knew independently of Themistokles in 482/1, the year following upon that of Nikodemos.

But we do not need Busolt's sensible note to realise that the scholiast makes no reference whatever to Nikodemos or the great Themistokles.<sup>30</sup> The knowledge that a Themistokles was archon in 347/6 ties the scholion securely to the mid-fourth century. It is not pertinent to our problem and should be summarily dismissed.

Dionysios tells us that a Themistokles was archon at Athens (ἄρχοντας Ἀθήνησι Θεμιστοκλέους) in the year 493/2.<sup>31</sup> It is folly to deny that the great Themistokles is intended; yet some scholars would argue that either Dionysios has made a mistake or that we must accept another Themistokles for the year 493/2.<sup>32</sup> The first alternative has little or

---

<sup>30</sup> Busolt, Gr. Gesch., II<sup>2</sup>, pp. 642-643, note 1; see also Bergk, Rhein. Mus., XXXIX (1884), pp. 612-615, and Kirchner, P. A., I, no. 6650.

<sup>31</sup> Dion. Hal., Ant. Rom., VI, 34.

<sup>32</sup> Dionysios regularly omits the patronymic and other designations in his naming of archons. His source (presumably an archon-list) was perhaps not more specific. If Dionysios does not mean the great Themistokles one might hope for a more explicit identification.

nothing to recommend it, for it is generally admitted (although sometimes reluctantly) that Dionysios is a reliable source; and the second holds even less probability since it is indeed rash (and as well a needless expedient) to invent another Themistokles for the 490's, one of whom we know nothing.<sup>33</sup>

This brings us to a major consideration in regard to the whole problem. Busolt has fully realised its importance and Gomme too understands the difficulty of a refutation.<sup>34</sup> How can we place Themistokles' archonship (whether eponymous or not) in 482/1, at the peak of his career, when that office by the reform of 487/6 had been reduced to political insignificance.<sup>35</sup> After 487/6 the

---

<sup>33</sup> The eighth letter of Themistokles, mentions an uncle Themistokles. This has (fortunately) not been seized upon. Flacelière (Rev. ét. anc., LV [1953], p. 17) does not share in Beloch's surprise that there should have been two men with the same name of political influence at this time. The positive argument is rather that there is no good reason for denying Themistokles the eponymous archonship in 493/2.

<sup>34</sup> Busolt, Gr. Gesch., II<sup>2</sup>, pp. 642-643, note 1. See also Gomme, Commentary, I, p. 261: "Krüger's view must be rejected"; he suggests that perhaps Themistokles never held the archonship (see below, p. 83).

<sup>35</sup> Aristotle, Ath. Pol., 22, 5. It is a fair inference

archonship was neither attractive nor compelling for an ambitious statesman, and furthermore there was the hazard of the lot, even if we allow for prokrisis. Are we to believe that Themistokles so conveniently became archon in the year following his proposal concerning Laureion? If such was the case, the gods did indeed look kindly upon his career and the fate of Athens.

In the context of the building of the walls after Salamis Thucydides mentions Themistokles and his previous service to the Athenian state: ὑπῆρκετο δ' αὐτοῦ πρότερον ἐπὶ τῆς ἐκείνου ἀρχῆς ἧς κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν Ἀθηναίοις ἦρξε.<sup>36</sup> A scholiast offers the commentary: ὑπῆρκετο δ' αὐτοῦ: ἀρξάμενος ἦν τοῦ ἔργου αὐτὸς ὁ θεμιστοκλῆς. ἐκείνου: τοῦ θεμιστοκλέους. κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν: κατὰ τινα ἐνιαυτὸν. ἦρξε: πρὸ τῶν Μηδικῶν ἦρξε θεμιστοκλῆς ἐνιαυτὸν. The most immediate interpretation of this brief statement in Thucydides is to see in it a reference to the year of Themistokles' archonship, or, more specifically, the eponymous archonship recorded by Dionysios. But again such a natural

---

to see Themistokles' influence in the reform. He had held the archonship previously, and this was one of the many factors which brought about this momentous change in the constitution.

<sup>36</sup> Thucydides, I, 93, 3.

assumption has been denied because of a subjective understanding of the other evidence.

Gomme suggests that Thucydides refers to some other office (e.g., ἐπιμελητῆς τῶν νεωρίων), and that this office was held year after year by Themistokles (in 483/2, possibly 484/3, 482/1, and the beginning of 481/0).<sup>37</sup> We cannot interpret Thucydides' text in this way. The scholiast certainly did not do so, and Flacelière, who favours 482/1 for the archonship, feels the strain.<sup>38</sup> We need only compare Thucydides' expression elsewhere.<sup>39</sup> Gomme here seems to operate without benefit of evidence of any kind.

---

<sup>37</sup> Gomme, Commentary, I, pp. 261-262.

<sup>38</sup> Flacelière, Rev. ét. anc., LV (1953), p. 16 with note 7; he argues convincingly that κατ'ἐνιαυτόν is equivalent in meaning to ἐνιαυσίαν (or ἐνιαύσιον; see below, note 39) and he points to Thucydides' use of καθ'ἡμέραν with the connotation of ἡμερήσιος.

<sup>39</sup> Cf. Thucydides, VI, 54, 6: καὶ ἄλλοι τε αὐτῶν ἤρξαν τὴν ἐνιαύσιον Ἀθηναίοις ἀρχὴν καὶ Πεισίστρατος . . ., where he is without doubt referring to the archonship. The verb is significant; we find here ἐνιαύσιον instead of κατ'ἐνιαυτόν because of the different demands of the construction and of the sense, i.e., others held this yearly office (by implication each for a year), namely, Peisistratos. . . . See

Gomme believes it improbable that Themistokles (whether archon in 493/2 or not) began a naval policy which was abandoned for ten years.<sup>40</sup> He notes that there is nothing in Thucydides which suggests this,<sup>41</sup> and answers the argument that the walls of the Peiraeus were obviously begun in 493/2 because of the war with Aigina by maintaining that the fortification of harbours was a novel idea (unconnected with a specific war) and a part of Themistokles' entire (later) naval policy. Furthermore, in support of his hypothesis, Gomme wonders if in 493/2 the archonship had already lost its significance; if it had, Themistokles' election to that office at this time would not have been a major political victory; hence the Athenian's rise to

---

also Pausanias, I, 1, 2: ὁ δὲ Πειραιεὺς δῆμος μὲν ἦν ἐκ παλαιοῦ, πρότερον δὲ πρὶν ἢ Θεμιστοκλῆς Ἀθηναίοις ἦρξεν, ἐπίνειον οὐκ ἦν. He too, I believe, refers to the archonship, although his is perhaps not independent testimony. See also Wade-Gery (B. S. A., XXXVII [1936-1937], p. 268), who shows that in Thucydides and elsewhere the archonship is designated by a form of the verb ἄρχω (see below, pp. 111-113).

<sup>40</sup> Commentary, I, p. 262; also A. J. P., LXV (1944), p. 323.

<sup>41</sup> There is also nothing in Thucydides to deny this; in his very brief parenthesis the historian merely gives πρότερον as an interval of time.

power should be confined to the 480's and the building of the fleet and the fortification of the Peiraius belong to the same time.

One cannot refrain from observing that it is Gomme who so often reminds us of the paucity of the evidence for the political history of this era and of the extent to which we are dependent upon conjecture. Yet there is positive evidence and it is a mistake to underestimate it; reconstruction should begin with that evidence and should retain some relationship to it. Gomme, it seems to me, has a tendency to abandon the evidence and to write his own history. Our significant knowledge amounts to this: Aristides, a leading statesman, was archon in 489/8;<sup>42</sup> the lot replaced the direct vote for the election of archons in 487/6. The conclusion is inescapable: the office did not fall into decline until after 487/6 and Gomme's fictions must be recognized for what they are. Miltiades and Marathon in all probability revealed the power of the strategoi to the politically aware.<sup>43</sup> And it is not difficult to see Themistokles' influence in the constitutional reform, when we realize his struggle for power in these years and appreciate the fact of his archonship in 493/2, an office from which he was henceforth barred.

---

<sup>42</sup> Cadoux, J. H. S., LXVIII (1948), p. 117.

<sup>43</sup> Plutarch, Themistokles, 3, 3.

Furthermore, the ancient testimony provides no direct chronological link between the fortification of the Peiraiæus and the building of the fleet. Herodotos and Aristotle, tell of the proposal concerning the funds of Laureion (483/2) but make no mention of the fortification of the Peiraiæus, and, what is more important, they do not associate Themistokles with any official position at this time; yet this might be expected at least in the case of Aristotle.<sup>44</sup> Thucydides and Pausanias, on the other hand, state that the work at the Peiraiæus was begun while Themistokles was in office and besides are silent concerning the ship-building programme in this connexion.<sup>45</sup> The distinction seems a clear one, when we remember Dionysios' testimony.<sup>46</sup> Themistokles' entire policy of fortification and the construction of a navy may have been conceived as a unit, for he was a man with vision as Thucydides testifies.<sup>47</sup> But it does not follow that they belong together in execution for Themistokles' genius was also such that he could conceive and adopt a policy dictated by the circumstances of the moment. The conjunction of the strike at Laureion and the war with

---

<sup>44</sup> Herodotos, VII, 144.

<sup>45</sup> See above, pp. 72-78.

<sup>46</sup> See above, pp. 80-81; for Eusebios see below, pp. 94-95.

<sup>47</sup> I, 138.

Aigina was the factor which made possible his proposal for a fleet (which might have been in his mind for years). The fortification of the Peiraiæus might have been begun much earlier and the most coherent reconstruction suggests emphatically that it was. The arrival of Miltiades in 493/2, the Persian threat and the land battle of Marathon account for the temporary abandonment of Themistokles' programme. He was compelled to begin anew in 489. And we can trace his steady rise to power throughout the 480's despite the silence of the ancient testimony, which is by no means complete or unanimous; and in addition the nature of the evidence concerning Themistokles allows - perhaps compels - credible reconstruction.<sup>48</sup>

I agree with Gomme, however, that Themistokles in all probability held some office during the latter years of the 480's. But the identification of the office must rest entirely upon conjecture. He may very well have been a private citizen at the time of the proposal concerning Laureion; if the ekklesia was functioning (and why not?), Themistokles might have made his proposals at a meeting of that body. Or perhaps he was a member of the Boule (another happy coincidence). Aristotle, and Plutarch attest his prominence in this and the following years, in

---

<sup>48</sup> See below, pp. 109-110 and 114-116.

connexion both with his programme and the ostracism of Aristekides.<sup>49</sup> Considering this and as well the war with Aigina (about which Themistokles was vitally concerned and which presumably was concluded at this time<sup>50</sup>), one is inclined to imagine Themistokles as strategos, at least in 482/1 and in the succeeding years. Certainly he was strategos at Salamis, and it is not impossible that he held the office at Marathon.<sup>51</sup> We know little about the strategia during the early fifth century,<sup>52</sup> but it is

---

<sup>49</sup> Ath. Pol., 22 (see above, pp. 72-73); Plutarch, Themistokles, 5, 5.

<sup>50</sup> See Andrewes, B. S. A., XXXVII (1936-1937), pp. 1-7.

<sup>51</sup> See below, pp. 92-94.

<sup>52</sup> Our sources are inadequate in their discussion of the strategia and its members, even for the crucial battles of the Persian wars. The problems involved in an understanding of the relationship between the polemarch and the strategoi at the time of Marathon as related by Herodotos are well enough known; and Aristotle, in his analysis of the constitution fails to be explicit in his account of the development of the board of generals or to appreciate the consequences of the reform of the archonship in 487/6. For the latest discussion see Hignett, Hist. Ath. Const., pp. 169-173, 175-176.

pertinent to notice how readily it is assumed that Miltiades was elected strategos after his acquittal in 493/2 and continued to hold this position up to and including the year of Marathon.<sup>53</sup> At any rate, whether or not Themistokles was strategos in the years preceding Salamis, it is to his archonship of 493/2 that Thucydides must refer.<sup>54</sup>

---

<sup>53</sup> Munro, C. A. H., IV, p. 232; Wade-Gery, B. S. A., XXXVII (1936-1937), p. 269, note 1. See Herodotos, VI, 104, 2.

Gomme (A. J. P., LXV [1944], p. 323, note 13) suggests that Miltiades became archon or polemarch after his return, only to doubt such a possibility on the ground that the archonship was already unimportant (see above, pp. 84-85).

<sup>54</sup> Gomme suggests that Themistokles may have held one of the minor archonships in 482/1, and, therefore, he was never archon eponymous. There is no need to assume this. To think that he was never archon at all (see above, pp. 80-81) also does violence to the evidence, whatever one's attitude to the passage in Aristotle, (Ath. Pol., 25, 3) that associates Themistokles with the Areiopagos; cf. above, pp. 65-66. It should be noted that Plutarch (Themistokles, 31, 1) speaks of Themistokles as ὑδάτων ἐπιστάτης; this is hardly a significant position, and it may only reflect an aspect of his supervision as archon in 493/2 (Wade-Gery, B. S. A., XXXVII [1936-1937], p. 264).

Finally, in this connexion, the scholiast's note on Thucydides' text requires comment.<sup>55</sup> First of all it should be realised that this is merely an explanation that is inherent in Thucydides' words, and we cannot argue that the scholiast knew of other evidence. Moreover, the phrase  $\pi\rho\delta\ \tau\omega\nu\ \text{Μηδικῶν}$  need not refer to the period immediately before Salamis or even to a year in the 480's;<sup>56</sup> logically, the expression could denote a time before Marathon (i.e., 493/2).

Thus, to sum up briefly, as yet we have seen no good reason to deny Dionysios' testimony that Themistokles was archon in 493/2. Although it cannot be proved conclusively that Thucydides, his scholiast and Pausanias refer to this year (rather than to his prominence in the 480's), it is at least economical to think that they do; and a coherent interpretation of the evidence lends strong support to the assumption that the fortification of the Peiraeus was begun during his archonship.<sup>57</sup> Also, as we shall see, in

---

<sup>55</sup> See above, p. 82.

<sup>56</sup> Cf. Carcopino's advocacy of 481/0 as the year of Themistokles' archonship (above, p. 71, note 9).

<sup>57</sup> Wade-Gery (B. S. A., XXXVII, 1936-1937, p. 263), on the basis of Thucydides, I, 93, 3, believes that Themistokles began his constructions at the Peiraeus in 493/2 and that

this way the conflicting nature and disturbing silences of the ancient testimony may best be explained.<sup>58</sup> Then too there is other evidence affirming Themistokles' activity in the 490's which cannot be ignored.

Most of this evidence is in Plutarch. In the Themistokles (4, 3) he tells us, on the authority of Stesimbrotos, that Themistokles carried through his naval programme despite the opposition of Miltiades. Plutarch locates this programme in the 480's; in fact, his starting-point is the building of the fleet. Plutarch's description and dating of the naval programme are sound; it is his association of Miltiades with the opposition in the 480's that is fantastic, for Miltiades was long since dead. Plutarch, of course, is blithely unaware of the chronological difficulty. Yet this is not to say that the association of Miltiades and Themistokles at any time is unhistorical; and, significantly enough, the fortification of the Peiraeus is not mentioned in this chapter.

---

he completed them in 479/8. He adds, however (p. 264): "The constructions at Peiraeus were suspended for some years, and resumed in 482." Is this date a slip for 479? We cannot have it both ways on the evidence of Thucydides. That the work at the Peiraeus was begun in 493/2, resumed in 482/1 and again in 479/8 is a plausible conjecture but a needless one, except, perhaps, in reply to Gomme (cf. above, pp. 84-87).

<sup>58</sup> See below, pp. 108-110 and 114-116.

Plutarch certainly knew of earlier activities of Themistokles. In the Aristeides (5) he relates Themistokles' rôle at Marathon in conjunction with Aristeides; it is inherent in the narrative that Themistokles was one of the strategoi, along with Miltiades and Aristeides; this is easily credible. Now strategoi did not appear overnight; they were elected on the basis of experience and reputation.

In this passage we read that the Athenians appointed ten generals in the year of Marathon, and of these Miltiades commanded the greatest esteem, and next in reputation and influence came Aristeides. Each general in turn held supreme authority for a single day, but, when Aristeides' day of command came, he relinquished it to Miltiades as an example to his fellow-generals, διδάσκων τοὺς συνάρχοντας, ὅτι τὸ πείθεσθαι καὶ ἀκολουθεῖν τοῖς εὖ φρουοῦσιν οὐκ αἰσχρὸν, ἀλλὰ σεμνὸν ἐστὶ καὶ σωτήριον. . . . χαίρειν γὰρ ἑῶν ἕκαστος ἤδη τὸ παρ' ἡμέραν ἄρχειν ἐκείνῳ προσεῖχεν. Then Plutarch goes on to relate how Themistokles and Aristeides fought brilliantly side by side in the Athenian centre, where the barbarians pressed hardest against Leontis and Antiochis, their respective tribes. The whole episode has been questioned on various grounds; indeed, Flacelière asks (Rev. ét. anc., LV [1953], p. 17,

note 6) if we can imagine Themistokles yielding to the supreme command of Miltiades. That he did seems to me to be the very crux of Plutarch's account of Aristeides' actions. For who would have been more jealous of Miltiades' glory than Themistokles? And Plutarch himself cites Themistokles' envy of Miltiades (Themistokles, 3, 3-4), to be sure when the former was young and unknown. It is only in connexion with this episode in the life of Aristeides that Plutarch knows of Themistokles at Marathon (cf. below, pp.109-110) and Herodotos is silent. Gomme<sup>59</sup> finds it noteworthy that Themistokles' presence at Marathon is reported in the Aristeides, not in the Themistokles; that is, the earlier career, including the alleged archonship of 493/2, is absent from the biographical tradition. But this is not true: even Plutarch, who contracts a long career into a few years, preserves (fortunately and casually) Stesimbrotos' categorical association of Miltiades and Themistokles, which must have occurred before 489; even Plutarch, when preoccupied with another subject, preserves the record of Themistokles' presence at Marathon, in a prominent position. What we are to gather is not that Themistokles came to the fore about 483, all the earlier references being fiction;

---

<sup>59</sup> A. J. P., LXV (1944), p. 323 with note 8; see too Commentary, I, p. 261.

but, rather, that Themistokles' career began well before Marathon, a fact which Plutarch, with his lack of critical talent, has almost - but not quite - obscured.

So Themistokles was prominent in the 490's, when Miltiades was his ally (or, perhaps, his opponent); and he was again (or still) prominent in the late 480's, when Aristides was his rival.

The political alliance of Themistokles and Miltiades in 493/2 was for the moment expedient to both;<sup>60</sup> but Themistokles, the novus homo, was to play a subordinate rôle to that of the aristocrat Miltiades. Not only was Themistokles' naval programme in the Peiraiæus suspended but also the renown of Marathon led to Miltiades' fame and, for the moment, the relative eclipse of his ally. Themistokles' envy had always existed but remained latent before Marathon, for the chief bond (and there were others) in this unnatural alliance was a burning hostility against the foreign enemy, Persia. If there were ten generals elected in the year of Marathon, Themistokles surely was one of them.

Finally there is the testimony of Eusebios. The Armenian version notes under the year 496/5 (Ol. 71, 1):

---

<sup>60</sup> See below, pp. 114-115 with note 105.

Piraeus munitus est a Themistocle. The margin of error is negligible; the significant fact is that the fortification of the Peiraeus is placed in the 490's.<sup>61</sup>

When we turn to the other side of the question the evidence favouring 482/1 for the archonship is neither so direct nor so compelling.<sup>62</sup> There is a statement in Plutarch that Themistokles was still young at the time of Marathon (*νέος ὄν ἔτι*).<sup>63</sup> But I am sceptical of any attempt to press the meaning of *νέος* (or for that matter similar terms of age) in Plutarch or any other Greek author. Themistokles might have been about 33 in 490, if we assume that he was just 30 in 493/2, the year of his archonship. Besides, we may recall that Plutarch thinks of Themistokles as a man reaching his prime in the 480's.

In this connexion we move to Plutarch's account of the relationship of Themistokles and Kimon at Olympia:  
*εἰς δ' Ὀλυμπίαν ἐλθὼν καὶ διαμιλλώμενος τῷ Κίμωνι περὶ  
 δεῖπνα καὶ σκηναῖς καὶ τὴν ἄλλην λαμπρότητα καὶ παρασκευήν,*

---

<sup>61</sup> Eusebios (Schoene, II, p. 100).

<sup>62</sup> And it is equally tenuous, of course, for confining Themistokles' rise to power to the 480's, apart from the problem of the archonship.

<sup>63</sup> Plutarch, Themistokles, 3, 3.

οὐκ ἤρεσκε τοῖς Ἕλλησιν. ἐκείνῳ μὲν γὰρ ὄντι νέῳ καὶ ἀπ' οἰκίας μεγάλης ᾤοντο δεῖν τὰ τοιαῦτα συγχωρεῖν· ὁ δὲ μήπω γνῶριμος γεγυῶς, ἀλλὰ δοκῶν ἐξ οὐχ ὑπαρχόντων καὶ παρ' ἀξίαν ἐπαίρεσθαι προσωφλίσκανεν ἀλαζουεῖαν.<sup>64</sup> Chronologically, this passage is difficult to place. The only year that fits Plutarch's conception of Themistokles' career (he was μήπω γνῶριμος) and our own conception of Kimon's<sup>65</sup> is 484.<sup>66</sup> The rivalry of the two great men, however, is at least suspicious, as such meetings often are elsewhere.<sup>67</sup> Most likely the episode is fictitious. Yet there is one clause that yields a true ring: οὐκ ἤρεσκε τοῖς Ἕλλησιν. It takes us at once to the years after Salamis, when Themistokles had lost favour among the Hellenes and was in conflict with Kimon, and therefore indicates 476. For other reasons, we are secure in our

---

<sup>64</sup> Themistokles, 5, 3.

<sup>65</sup> Kimon's first strategia, when he was about 30 (but not much more), was in 477/6; A. T. L., III, pp. 159-160.

<sup>66</sup> 488, I suppose, is not absolutely impossible. But Kimon was about 19 and must have been preoccupied with domestic troubles (this was probably the year of Miltiades' death).

<sup>67</sup> See below, pp. 101, note 81, and 108.

belief that Themistokles actually was at Olympia in this year.<sup>68</sup> It is true that Themistokles could have visited Olympia more than once; still, our already aroused suspicions plus the evidence of Themistokles' reputation in the 490's (when μήπω γνώριμος could not apply after 493/2) force the conclusion that this episode in Plutarch, for chronological purposes certainly, must be discarded.

Plutarch is not alone in placing Themistokles' floruit in the 480's. Herodotos too, in telling of the proposal concerning Laureion in the years before Salamis, remarks of Themistokles: ἐς πρώτους νεωστὶ παριών.<sup>69</sup> But this has often been convincingly explained as a reference to Themistokles' political victory and prominence after the ostracism of Aristeides.<sup>70</sup> That Herodotos ignores Themistokles'

---

<sup>68</sup> See above, pp. 30 and 63, and below, p. 157 with note 81.

<sup>69</sup> VII, 143, 1.

<sup>70</sup> Cf. Flacelière, Rev. ét. anc., LV (1953), p. 17 with note 5, who misunderstands the problem. It is not a question whether Herodotos is more trustworthy than Dionysios for Themistokles' career. Rather, it is what does Herodotos mean? I agree with Flacelière, however, that Herodotos does not here refer to the fact that Themistokles was a novus homo. Herodotos merely states that Themistokles had recently come to the front with the proposal concerning the fleet; he

earlier activity is not surprising. He minimizes or fails to realise Themistokles' achievement at every turn. And recognition in Herodotos' eyes comes only when it is inevitable. This was due, it is true, in a large part if not entirely to the political bias of his sources.<sup>71</sup> Also, he need not be responsible for Themistokles' earlier career, both because of the nature of his account, and because of the equivocal aspect of Themistokles' success until the proposal concerning the funds from Laureion and the confirmatory victory of Salamis; and, we may add, the completion of the fortifications.

Gomme<sup>72</sup> casts doubt upon the association of Themistokles with the fortification of the Peiraeus in 493/2 by quoting Philochoros<sup>73</sup> (as preserved by Harpokration) on the herm at the Peiraeus (πρὸς τῇ πυλίδι Ἑρμῆς): Ἀθηναίων ἀρξάμενων τειχίζειν τὸν Πειραιᾶ, οἱ ἦ ἄρχοντες τοῦτου ἀναθέντες ἐπέγραψαν·

Ἄρξάμενοι πρῶτοι τειχίζειν οἷδ' ἀνέθηκαν  
βουλῆς καὶ δήμου δόγμασι πειθόμενοι.<sup>74</sup>

---

he might have added that this was not the first time that Themistokles had appeared in politics.

<sup>71</sup> See Bauer, Themistokles, pp. 15-28; How and Wells, Commentary, I, pp. 42-43.

<sup>72</sup> Commentary, I, p. 262.

<sup>73</sup> Frag. 40 Jacoby (no. 328).

<sup>74</sup> This should not be confused with the herm in the agora

Gomme's comments reveal a weakness in method: "but no mention is made of Themistokles (the names of the dedicators, οἷδε, will have followed the verses), which is surprising, for if he was eponymos, he should have headed the list - some record of a dedication connected with so famous a name and so famous a policy we should have expected to reach us." Since the names have not come down to us, and Harpokration's interest in the dedication was presumably other than historical, conjecture seems futile. Indeed, the inscription could

---

(ἀγοραῖος Ἑρμῆς), also mentioned by Philochoros, frag. 31 Jacoby: οὕτως ἐλέγετο [ὄντος], καὶ ἀφίδρυτο Κέβριδος ἄρχοντος. It had been argued by Böckh (see Krüger, Historisch philologische Studien, I, pp. 23-24) that ἀγοραῖος Ἑρμῆς was the proper term for the πρὸς τῇ πυλίδι Ἑρμῆς and that these were in actual fact one and the same statue; cf. also Bergk, Rhein. Mus., XXXIX (1884), pp. 615-617. Hence it was believed that the archon's name Kebris (which dates the herm in the agora) should be emended to Hybrilides (491/0), and thus further support would be given for Themistokles' archonship in 493/2. Such an identification of the two herms, however, is impossible; cf. Demosthenes, 47, 26, and Pausanias, I, 15, 1; see also Judeich, Topographie<sup>2</sup>, p. 152, and Vanderpool, Hesperia, XVIII (1949), pp. 131 and 136. For Kebris and the date of his archonship see Cadoux, J. H. S., LXVIII (1948), p. 119 with note 263.

refer to the year 395/4, which is the date given by Jacoby. Gomme's argument from silence is tenuous.

The date of Themistokles' death has been considered vital to a solution of the problems which surround the archonship. In fact, Flacelière uses the evidence of Plutarch regarding Themistokles' suicide as the initial basis for his refutation of 493/2 as Themistokles' year of office.<sup>75</sup> We shall therefore turn our attention to the closing years of Themistokles' life. In his biography of Themistokles, Plutarch implies that his death occurred in 459.<sup>76</sup> His account, however, is on the whole vague, for as the narrative proceeds affairs in Egypt are elaborated, and the suicide of Themistokles is juxtaposed after the glorious achievements of Kimon. Thus 449 seems rather to be Plutarch's date for the suicide, and such an understanding is borne out more definitely in the Kimon, where the year of Themistokles' death must be placed in the time of Kimon's last expedition.<sup>77</sup> Flacelière sees no contradiction in the testimony of Plutarch and argues that the correct date for Themistokles' suicide is 449.<sup>78</sup>

---

<sup>75</sup> Flacelière, Rev. ét. anc., LV (1953), pp. 15-16.

<sup>76</sup> Themistokles, 31, 3-5; this section begins: ὧς δ'

Αἴγυπτός τε ἀφισταμένη βοηθούστων Ἀθηναίων . . . . For the chronology see A. T. L., III, pp. 177-178.

<sup>77</sup> Plutarch, Kimon, 18, 4-6.

<sup>78</sup> Flacelière, Rev. ét. anc., LV (1953), p. 16.

But Plutarch is far from clear, and the point is well taken by Gomme that his account not only is confused but also places a suspicious emphasis upon the contrast between the fallen Themistokles and the triumphant Kimon.<sup>79</sup> Busolt has long since remarked that, if Themistokles was called upon to meet the Persian king's demands for help against Greece, these demands were surely made in 459, at the time of Inaros' revolt.<sup>80</sup> Let us then allow for the moment two dates for the death of Themistokles, 459 and 449. The former in itself is the more probable historically. Neither is impossible on the basis of Plutarch, and, although his testimony lends stronger support to the latter, we can see the reasons for his error.<sup>81</sup>

---

<sup>79</sup> Commentary, I, p. 444, note 2. Cf. Plutarch's treatment of Themistokles and Kimon at Olympia; above, pp. 95-97.

<sup>80</sup> Busolt, Gr. Gesch., III<sup>1</sup>, p. 139, note 4.

<sup>81</sup> Doenges, Letters, p. 97, note 78, distinguishes three different versions of the story of the suicide by bull's blood according to the respective campaigns that Themistokles was supposed to lead. Diodoros, XI, 58, 2, places the campaign in the reign of Xerxes; Aristodemos (11, 2 Jacoby, no. 140,) and Suidas, s. v. Kimon, identify the conflict as that of Eurymedon, and Plutarch, as we have seen, links Themistokles' death with the war in Egypt and the career of Kimon. Doenges

Plutarch (Themistokles, 31, 5) also tells us that

---

maintains that the account of Aristodemos reflects the story basic to these different versions. Diodoros (and in all probability Ephoros) knew that the battle of Eurymedon belonged to the reign of Xerxes, and, in the belief that Themistokles died then, he related that the Athenian fled to Xerxes (and not Artaxerxes). But other considerations (above, pp. 58-60) perhaps influenced the fabrication of this version of Themistokles' flight; furthermore, Diodoros says nothing about Eurymedon in this connexion. In Doenges' view Plutarch has incorrectly identified Kimon with the campaign of 460 and thus reveals that he has attempted to correct the basic account of Aristodemos. Plutarch knew that Themistokles met Artaxerxes; therefore he placed Themistokles' death at the time of the first expedition of the Greeks against the Persians after Artaxerxes' accession. But surely Plutarch (in the Kimon at any rate) connects Themistokles' death with the last expedition of Kimon, in 450/49; and it is the contrast between Kimon and Themistokles that is the dominant motive for this synchronism. Such a motive too perhaps led to the tradition concerning Eurymedon and Themistokles' death. The question whether Themistokles met Xerxes or Artaxerxes also has a bearing on the problem, but there were other

Themistokles lived for sixty-five years. We must assume that Themistokles had to be 30 to hold the archonship;<sup>82</sup> thus, if he died in 449 after a life of sixty-five years,

---

more immediate influences in this regard, i.e., the date of the ostracism and whether Themistokles encountered the fleet off Naxos or Thasos. It is rash indeed to attempt to unravel the various elements and stages in the transmission of these conflicting accounts. The chronology which connected Themistokles' death with Kimon's campaign at Eurymedon is obviously false. The problem in Plutarch remains whether he intends 459 (which is surely right) or 449 (which is attractive to Plutarch) as the year of Themistokles' death. Finally it should be noted that 'Themistokles,'s Epistle 20 provides no evidence for the date of the death; in this letter Themistokles' suicide is merely foreshadowed. We cannot say that the letters followed a source which placed Themistokles' suicide at the time of Eurymedon; the letter-writer could be merely reflecting Thucydides' narrative. See below, p. 136 . Doenges' treatment of Aristodemos is thoroughly uncritical.

<sup>82</sup> At any rate this is the age-qualification for members of the Boule (including the generals and archons) in the constitutional reforms of 411/0 ('Aristotle', Ath. Pol., 30 and 31).

the archonship cannot be placed in 493/2; but this is Plutarch, after all, and Plutarch thought of a floruit in the 480's. The year 482/1 or 483/2<sup>83</sup> would fit this chronology. If, however, Themistokles' death is set in 459, the earlier year (493/2) is permissible and the fit is just as neat.<sup>84</sup> In the face of the evidence attesting 493/2 for the archonship, and considering as well the nature of Plutarch's account of the suicide, I should certainly not adopt 449 as the date of death and on this ground deny 493/2 for the archonship. As we proceed it will become evident that 449 for Themistokles' death is historically incredible.

When we read the testimony of Thucydides, scepticism of Plutarch's narrative is confirmed, for Thucydides states:<sup>85</sup>

---

<sup>83</sup> I.e., Themistokles was archon suo anno; the knowledge or assumption of this might help to explain Aristotle's error (see above, pp. 76-77).

<sup>84</sup> In either case Themistokles would have been about 30. This accords well with Plutarch's indications of his youthful ambition (see above, p. 93). And, as Wade-Gery points out (B. S. A., XXXVII, 1936-1937, p. 263, note 1), Aristeides, and probably others (at least in the time of the tyranny), held the archonship at the earliest possible age.

<sup>85</sup> I, 138, 4.

νοσήσας δὲ τελευτᾷ τὸν βίον· λέγουσι δὲ τινες καὶ ἐκούσιον  
 φαρμάκῳ ἀποθανεῖν αὐτόν, ἀδύνατον νομίσαντα εἶναι ἐπιτελέσαι  
 βασιλεῖ ᾧ ὑπέσχετο. Munro observes: "While preferring the  
 former explanation he does not seem to consider the latter  
 impossible."<sup>86</sup> But surely Thucydides' words imply a refuta-  
 tion of the popular story of the suicide,<sup>87</sup> and, if we  
 accept his denial of its accuracy, what remains that is  
 credible in Plutarch's account? Yet I do not believe that  
 459 is far wrong for the year of Themistokles' death, and  
 to assume 65 years as the length of his life does no violence  
 to historical probability nor to the evidence considered as  
 a whole.<sup>88</sup>

---

<sup>86</sup> Munro, Class. Rev., VI (1892), p. 334.

<sup>87</sup> Cf. also Aristophanes, Equites, 83-84; Diodoros, XI,  
 58, 2: ἔνιοι δὲ τῶν συγγραφέων φασὶ . . . .

<sup>88</sup> Jacoby, Apollodoros Chronik, pp. 241-242, thinks he  
 understands how the figure 65 appears in the tradition.  
 He maintains that Eusebios notes the suicide under Ol.  
 78, 2 (467/6), and this year, according to Jacoby, was  
 the date of Eurymedon (for the connexion between Themis-  
 tokles' suicide and the battle of Eurymedon see above, p. 101,  
 note 81). Hence Apollodoros, since he knew of the archon-  
 ship in 493/2, placed Themistokles' akme (at 40 years of  
 age) at the same time, and thus arrived at 65 for the

According to Plutarch, most of the years of Themistokles' life were spent in political leadership.<sup>89</sup> As we have seen, Themistokles arrived in Asia in 469 and consolidated his position with Artaxerxes in 464, and, if we place his death in 459, he will have spent ten years (five or six of these with prestige) in exile. As Gomme points out, assuming the death for 449, and 465 as the latest date for the flight by any chronology (except that of the Ath. Pol. as interpreted by Ure<sup>90</sup>), one can scarcely believe that Themistokles spent such a long period of a relatively short life outside Greece.<sup>91</sup> Nor may we overlook the years spent outside Athens after the ostracism and before the exile.

---

length of his life. Gomme's rebuttal is a good one (Commentary, I, p. 445); I add that we should read Ol. 78, 3 (466/5) in the chronicle for this notice, and also that Eusebios (although not Hieronymos and the Armenian version) comments on Themistokles' flight to Persia, as well as on his suicide, under this year (see above, p.10,note26). Thus here we may have reflected a chronological tradition for the date of his exile alone and not of his death.

<sup>89</sup> Themistokles, 31, 5: . . . πέντε πρὸς τοῖς ἐξήκοντα βεβιωκῶς ἔτη καὶ τὰ πλεῖστα τούτων ἐν πολιτείαις καὶ ἡγεμονίαις.

<sup>90</sup> See above, pp. 65-66.

<sup>91</sup> Gomme, Commentary, I, p. 444.

Thus, with 493/2 for the archonship, to accept 524 and 459 as approximately correct for the terminal dates of Themistokles' life best accords with the evidence, regardless of whether or not one believes in the suicide.<sup>92</sup>

Munro in his discussion of the chronological problems connected with Themistokles' career has astutely observed that there are four facts which have a crucial bearing upon the question: "(a) it was known or granted that Themistocles died at the age of 65, (b) it was known or (probably rightly) assumed that he was archon suo anno, (c) the two Persian

---

<sup>92</sup> The coincidence between the date of Themistokles' death and the revolt in Egypt may have been conducive to the fabrication. It is, indeed, a good story, providing not only a dramatic end to the great statesman's life, but also (and this is more important) a fervent assurance of his genuine patriotism. Fühner, Rhein. Mus., XCI (1942), 193-199, shows that suicide by means of poisoned bull's blood was not rare among the Persians, Greeks and Romans. This, of course, proves nothing except that the story in itself is credible. Flacelière (Rev. ét. anc., LV [1953], p. 15 with note 1) has faith in this version of Themistokles' death. I myself accept the more prosaic testimony of Thucydides.

invasions were just ten years apart, (d) the two Egyptian expeditions were also ten years apart."<sup>93</sup> Thus, to isolate for the moment the chronology of the archonship and the death, Munro finds in the ancient testimony evidence for both 493/2 and 483/2 as the year of the archonship, and 459 and 449 as the year of the death. He is unable, however, to decide which of the alternate chronologies is correct.

To Munro's observations should be added others which have become evident in the preceding discussion. The year 483/2 is indirectly attested, and, although Aristotle, perhaps implies this date for Themistokles' office, it is incorrect, and we must take into account rather 482/1 as a possibility for the eponymous archonship. There is, on the other hand, direct testimony for 493/2 and, as well, good reason to attribute the beginning of the fortification of the Peiraeus to this same year. Furthermore, the later date for the death allows a dramatic contrast between the glory of Kimon and the desperation of Themistokles. It is difficult then (in fact impossible) not to believe that the earlier chronology is the historically correct. And finally on the basis of a logical interpretation of the evidence we may detect a curious parallel in the events of Themistokles' life during the 490's and the 480's.

---

<sup>93</sup> Munro, Class. Rev., VI (1892), p. 334.

Themistokles as archon in 493/2 began the fortification of the Peiraiæus. The return of Miltiades, however, led to the eclipse of Themistokles, for at Marathon it was Miltiades and Kallimachos and others who achieved glory. Just ten years after his archonship Themistokles again becomes prominent (in the sources) with his proposal concerning Laureion and the building of a fleet, and he gains as well unchallenged supremacy after the ostracism of Aristides. Salamis was Themistokles' victory, and in the following years his programme of fortification could be fulfilled. The very attractiveness of the later chronology, as Munro points out, tells against it.<sup>94</sup> The emphasis in the ancient testimony falls quite naturally upon Themistokles' achievement in the 480's. Herodotos' silence concerning his earlier career is certainly understandable.<sup>95</sup> And, by the time of Aristotle, Themistokles' activity has been confined by the implications of silence solely to the decade after Marathon to such an extent that the archonship may very well have been transplanted to this period. Plutarch is caught between the rival traditions of an earlier and later chronology; he succumbs to the latter (although not completely) because his biography

---

<sup>94</sup> Munro, Class. Rev., VI (1892), p. 334.

<sup>95</sup> See above, pp. 97-98.

readily focuses upon the year of Salamis, and because his interest is primarily not chronological.

Presumably our sources knew little more in connexion with Themistokles' archonship than the fact that the work at the Peiraeus was begun in that year. Certainly they leave much to be desired in their analysis of party-politics in the early years of the fifth century and in their accounts of the major figures who dominated the scene; and even Aristotle, is no exception. It is not surprising that Themistokles' earlier career was forgotten or chronologically obscured by contamination with his later activity. The isolated notice of Dionysios, entirely removed from a biographical interest, is especially significant and credible and as well permits of a coherent explanation of all the other evidence, which would otherwise be unintelligible.<sup>96</sup>

---

<sup>96</sup> Perhaps it might be argued that Themistokles' renown in the 480's led to the fabrication of his prominence in the 490's. The ancient testimony, however, and in particular that of Dionysios, does not allow such an assumption; the tendency is to obscure the earlier activity. The appearance of Themistokles in connexion with Aristeides at Marathon (see above, pp. 92-94) smacks of fabrication; but, as we have seen, there is no need to regard the episode as entirely fictitious.

Once we have firmly assigned Themistokles' archonship to 493/2 we can proceed to reconstruct events before the battle of Marathon, and in the process of such reconstruction we acquire further support for the belief that Themistokles was archon at this date. On the testimony of Herodotos we hear of two significant trials in the year 493.<sup>97</sup> Phrynichos was condemned for the presentation of his play, The Fall of Miletos, and Miltiades, who fled from the Chersonesos in the face of the Persian menace, was tried and acquitted in Athens on the charge of tyranny. Wade-Gery<sup>98</sup> sees in a passage of Plutarch reference to both these events and as well to the archonship of Themistokles. Plutarch's words<sup>99</sup> are: πρὸς τὸν εἰπόντα καλῶς αὐτὸν ἄρξειν Ἀθηναίων, ἄνπερ ἴσος ἦ καὶ κοινὸς ἅπασιν. "Μηδέποτε," εἰπεῖν, "εἰς τοῦτου ἐγὼ καθίσαμι τὸν θρόνον, ἐν ᾧ πλεον οὐδὲν ἔξουσιν οἱ φίλοι παρ' ἐμοὶ τῶν ἀλλοτρίων." The verbal phrase καλῶς ἄρξειν is significant; Wade-Gery cites several parallels in Plutarch and elsewhere, showing that this expression may very well refer to the archonship. Phrynichos had been condemned early in 493. Themistokles, with this in mind and looking to the imminent trial of Miltiades, says (according to

---

<sup>97</sup> VI, 21 and 104.

<sup>98</sup> B. S. A., XXXVII (1936-1937), pp. 269-270.

<sup>99</sup> Aristeides, 2, 4.

Wade-Gery's paraphrase of his meaning) in his campaign for the archonship of 493/2 that as archon he will not only be fair but he will see to it that this time the right side wins. The remark is presumable an invention close after the event.

Whatever we may think of the details in Wade-Gery's reconstruction it is pertinent for our purposes to note that Plutarch may preserve a reference to the archonship; and furthermore this passage occurs in the early part of the life of Aristeides. When we turn to the Themistokles the implications of this section perhaps receive some confirmation. Here we are told an anecdote concerning Themistokles and Simonides of Keios: ὥστε κού καὶ πρὸς Σιμονίδην τὸν Κεῖου εἰπεῖν, αἰτούμενόν τι τῶν οὐ μετρίων παρ' αὐτοῦ στρατηγοῦντος, ὡς οὐτ' ἐκεῖνος ἂν γένοιτο ποιητῆς ἀγαθοῦ ἄδων παρὰ μέλος οὐτ' αὐτὸς ἀστεῖος ἄρχων παρὰ νόμον χαριζόμενος.<sup>100</sup> If we isolate Themistokles' reply, this too reads like a reference to the archonship, and again it occurs towards the beginning of the biography where the emphasis is upon his early career, although it is true that here too the information is eclectic and events later in time are inserted. The reply is the reply of a genuine magistrate, ἄρχων. Plutarch also adds in his own words

---

<sup>100</sup> Plutarch, Themistokles, 5, 4.

that Themistokles was strategos at the time of the incident, or at any rate this is the natural interpretation of the expression, παρ' αὐτοῦ στρατηγοῦντος. Is it compulsory to assume that the year of Salamis is referred to? I do not find it surprising that Plutarch's report of this story may be confused. At any rate the section ends with the obviously elliptical expression: αὐξόμενος δὲ καὶ τοῖς πολλοῖς ἀρέσκων τέλος κατεστασίασε καὶ μετέστησεν ἔξοστραμισθέντα τὸν Ἀριστείδην.<sup>101</sup> The echo of the archonship (οὐτ' αὐτὸς ἀστεῖος ἄρχων) is obscured by association with Themistokles' rôle at Salamis, or perhaps (significantly enough) with his prominence as strategos in the 480's.<sup>102</sup>

Gomme is disturbed by the strange disappearance of the archonship in the biographical tradition and he is at a loss for an explanation.<sup>103</sup> In view of the conclusions reached above this is a difficult statement. Certainly

---

<sup>101</sup> Themistokles, 5, 5.

<sup>102</sup> As I have conjectured above, pp. 87-89, it may be relevant to note that Plutarch in this passage (Themistokles, 5,4) refers to Themistokles' functions as judge (κριτὴν ἀσφαλῆ περὶ τὰ συμβόλαια παρέχων ἑαυτόν), functions that Wade-Gery (B. S. A., XXXVII [1936-1937], pp. 265-267) combines with his office as archon.

<sup>103</sup> Gomme, Commentary, I, p. 261; cf. A. J. P., LXV (1944), pp. 323-324.

we do have evidence of the archonship, and, even if Gomme means by the biographical tradition Plutarch, or more specifically Plutarch's biography of Themistokles, his assertions are not strictly accurate. It is true that nowhere is it stated directly that Themistokles was archon in the 480's and it is upon this period that our sources dwell. But the obvious explanation is that Themistokles never held this office at this time. Thus we can account for the nature of the testimony. The solution does not lie in denying the evidence for 493/2, and maintaining that Themistokles became archon after the imposition of the lot, or in arguing that he never attained the archonship at all. As we have already seen, the probability that Themistokles was elected to the eponymous archonship is overwhelming; and we may readily conjecture his influence in the introduction of the lot for an office that he could not hold a second time.

With the acceptance of 493/2 for the archonship, we can appreciate Themistokles' influence in Miltiades' acquittal, and understand the alliance of these two men in their policy towards Persia, and in the face of a formidable Alkmaionid opposition. Themistokles' part was or became secondary. His naval policy in the Peiraeus was temporarily abandoned,<sup>104</sup> and Marathon was in many

---

<sup>104</sup> But we should note Miltiades' Parian expedition in

ways Miltiades' victory, although Themistokles certainly may have been one of the strategoi in this year. We can trace Themistokles' second (and more significant) rise to power in the 480's, despite the silence of the sources in this respect. After Aristeides' archonship in 489/8 there follow the ostracisms of Hipparchos and Megakles, and, in this later year (487/6), the reform of the constitution that made the archonship subject to the lot. It is easy to detect Themistokles' hand. Finally the ostracism of Aristeides, the strike in the mines at Laureion and the threat of Aigina saw the fulfillment of his ambition in these and the succeeding years. And indeed Themistokles' prominence should be associated with the strategia in the period before Salamis and most certainly in the year of that battle.<sup>105</sup>

---

490 or 489; see Walker, C. A. H., IV, pp. 252-253.

<sup>105</sup> For a reconstruction of Athenian foreign and domestic policy between 510 and 480 see McGregor, Harv. Stud. Class. Phil., Suppl. Vol. I (1940), pp. 71-95; cf. also C. A. Robinson, A. J. P., LX (1939), pp. 232-237, and Walker, C. A. H., IV, especially pp. 265-267. They differ fundamentally in their interpretation of party-politics, motives and alliances during the late sixth and early fifth centuries at Athens. See too the comments of Gomme, A. J. P., LXV

Gomme calls much of the reconstruction of the history of the late sixth and early fifth centuries a likely enough story; he does not deny it outright in its general outline nor does he attempt to provide another story in its place. It should be recognised that any reconstruction of this period must be based in a large part upon conjecture with or without a dominating Themistokles. But it is legitimate (if indeed not compulsory) to assume in any reconstruction Themistokles' archonship in 493/2 and along with it the beginning of the fortification of the Peiraeus. Finally, everyone must allow for Themistokles' continued influence in the 480's, even though our sources have little to say of his further activity until 484/3.

Flacelière's arguments in support of Krüger's theory that Themistokles was archon in 482/1 have little to recommend them. To champion the worse rather than the better historical case has long since lost its novelty and remains only perverse.

In conclusion we must look once more at Munro's thesis of consistent alternate chronologies for Themistokles'

---

(1944), pp. 321-331. I am primarily interested, in this context, in establishing a common basis of fact upon which historical reconstruction and interpretation must be founded.

career, just ten years apart.<sup>106</sup> His scheme is as follows (the date in brackets receives no specific confirmation in the ancient testimony):

	A	B
(1) Themistokles' archonship . . . . .	493	483
(2) His ostracism . . . . .	471	461
(3) His flight from Argos . . . . .	467	[457]
(4) His death . . . . .	459	449

There are, however, difficulties. The year 461 for the ostracism suggests an unnecessary confusion with the career of Kimon, although we have identified an erroneous synchronism between events in the lives of these two Athenians elsewhere.<sup>107</sup> We have seen that the flight was dated (correctly) in 471, and, on Ure's analysis of the Constitution of the Athenians, [Aristotle], may have understood the flight<sup>108</sup> to have occurred just ten years later, in 461/0. Thus we also arrive at 474/3 and 464/3 as possible rival years for the ostracism. I am sceptical, however, of any consistency in the ancient testimony along these lines. The early and late dates for the archonship and death are contingent upon one another. Within the general

<sup>106</sup> Class. Rev., VI (1892), pp. 333-334; cf. above, pp. 66-67.

<sup>107</sup> See above, pp. 101-103, note 81.

<sup>108</sup> For the argument see above, pp. 65-66.

framework allowed by these alternate chronologies, two other major considerations influence the dating of the ostracism and the exile: whether Themistokles encountered the fleet off Naxos or Thasos and whether he met Xerxes or Artaxerxes upon his arrival in Persia. To press the question of varying chronologies further seems futile. The establishment of the historical chronology is the important goal, along with an understanding of the ancient testimony.

I submit on the next page a chronology for Themistokles' career and I add many of the events mentioned or implied in the ancient testimony which have a direct bearing upon an understanding of his life. It is on this chronological and factual basis that I should attempt a biography of the great statesman.

<u>ca.</u>	524	Birth of Themistokles
	493	Condemnation of Phrynichos
	493/2	Archonship of Themistokles Beginning of fortification of Peiraeus Return of Miltiades; his trial and acquittal
	492	Election of Miltiades to <u>strategia</u>
	490/89	Marathon; Themistokles, Aristides, and Miltiades <u>strategoi</u>
	489	Expedition of Miltiades to Paros
	489/8	Archonship of Aristides
	488/7	Ostracism of Hipparchos
	487/6	Ostracism of Megakles Archonship subject to lot
	485/4	Ostracism of Xanthippos
	483/2	Archonship of Nikodemos Ostracism of Aristides Proposal of Themistokles concerning income from Laureion Themistokles <u>strategos</u>
	480/79	Battles of Artemision and Salamis Themistokles <u>strategos</u>
	479/8	Resumption of fortification
	477	Expulsion of Pausanias from Byzantion
	477/6	Phrynichos' <u>Phoinissai</u> ; Themistokles <u>choregos</u>
<u>ca.</u>	476	First trial of Themistokles and acquittal
no later than	474/3	Ostracism of Themistokles
	471/0	Condemnation and flight of Themistokles Encounter with fleet off Naxos Landing at Ephesos
	465/4	Letter of Themistokles to Artaxerxes
	460/59	Revolt of Inaros
<u>ca.</u>	459	Death of Themistokles

CHAPTER THREE  
THE LETTERS OF "THEMISTOKLES"

The dispute concerning the authenticity of the letters which have come down to us under the name of Themistokles has long been over. Bentley presents the first attack against their genuineness and there is no one today who would question his conclusion that these epistles are the work of a late author.<sup>1</sup> Even a cursory reading reveals their absurd sophistries, inconsistencies and fallacies, and arouses wonder that their authenticity could ever have been a matter for controversy. In the nineteenth century, however, the debate had not yet cooled, and Habich is compelled to provide an ardent defense of Bentley's position.<sup>2</sup> Ribbeck too lends his support to the arguments of both

---

<sup>1</sup> Richard Bentley, A Dissertation upon the Epistles of Phalaris, Themistocles, Socrates, Euripides, and Others; and the Fables of Aesop, in Reflections upon Ancient and Modern Learning (second edition, London, 1697), by William Wotton. Evidently, scepticism had been expressed even before this time.

<sup>2</sup> Heinrich Theodor Habich, De epistolis Themistoclis (Gotha, 1849). We find a notable list of scholars divided on the question.

Bentley and Habich in the face of further opposition.<sup>3</sup> For Niessing the genuineness of the letters is no longer a problem; he writes a modern and detailed analysis, attempting on the basis of style and content to ascertain their nature and authorship in relation to other late epistolary writing.<sup>4</sup>

The letters, twenty-one in number, are found in a single manuscript, Palatinus 398, of the ninth century. A history of this manuscript is given by Westermann, who is responsible for the text of the epistles as we know it.<sup>5</sup> He offers also a discussion of the editio princeps

---

<sup>3</sup> Rhein. Mus., XVII (1862), pp. 202-215.

<sup>4</sup> Wilhelm Niessing, De Themistoclis epistulis (Diss., Freiburg, 1929). In his preface Niessing briefly reviews the work which had been done on various collections of epistles up to his time and sums up his purpose as follows (p. 3): . . . in plurimis epistularum collectionibus nobis traditis, num spuriae sint, non iam dubitabitur, quaeretur iam . . . de vi propria ac natura illorum operum nonnunquam singularium, studebitur, quomodo et quo consilio singula ficta sint, perspicere. Eodem mihi quoque tendenti Themistoclis epistularum collectionem, ut parvam ita minime simplicem, percontari propositum est.

<sup>5</sup> Westermann, Berichte über die Verhandlungen . . . Leipzig, I, 5 (1849), pp. 215-244. See also Diller, Minor Greek Geographers, pp. 3-10.

of Caryophilus, Archbishop of Iconium, showing that our manuscript and that (formerly in the Vatican) used by Caryophilus are the same,<sup>6</sup> and he traces the successive stages in the elucidation of the text to his own day.<sup>7</sup>

Westermann restores the order of the epistles to that of the manuscript, which had been violated by previous editors, and he is followed by Hercher, who adopts his text.<sup>8</sup>

Jackson has most recently contributed to the establishment of the text, prefacing his labours by some noteworthy remarks concerning the difficulties involved: "The transmission throughout the ages of the twenty-one epistles of Themistocles is one of the ambiguous benefits conferred on Greek literature . . . . the text may still hold its own with the worst in existence . . . . At one end of the scale are transparent uncial corruptions, reproduced with slavish and exemplary fidelity; at the other is the patchwork of a corrector whose activities must often have quenched the last glimmer of truth. Between are all the vagaries of

---

<sup>6</sup> Jo. Matthaeus Caryophilus, Themistoclis epistolae (Rome, 1626).

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Habich, op. cit., who offers some textual criticism.

<sup>8</sup> Rudolf Hercher, Epistolographi Graeci (Paris, 1873), pp. 741-762. Cf. A. Westermann, Themistoclis epistolae (3 parts, Leipzig, 1858-1859).

the incompetent or careless copyist, and, superadded, the lumbering, contorted diction of a writer who may have been what he will, but can no more than the Pseudo-Phalaris have been Greek."<sup>9</sup> I follow Hercher's text, keeping in mind the emendations of Jackson.<sup>10</sup>

My interest lies in the historicity of the letters. Do they provide any significant information for the life of Themistokles? The epistles purport to belong to the years of ostracism and exile. Their content suggests that here we may find evidence towards the solution of two major problems, the circumstances surrounding the ostracism and exile and their chronology. Inevitably, some attention must be paid to the sources employed by the epistolographer.

---

<sup>9</sup> Class. Quart., XIX (1925), p. 167. He presents a concise and severe criticism of preceding work expended on the text. His own studies are continued in Class. Quart., XX (1926), pp. 27-35.

<sup>10</sup> Niessing, op. cit. (in note 4 above), with much of whose analysis I shall be concerned, does the same. The most recent discussion of the letters is by Norman A. Doenges, The Letters of Themistokles: A Survey (Diss., Princeton, 1953); see below, pp. 174-181.

The letters call for attention in the face of recent study. In the third volume of The Athenian Tribute Lists we find some provocative observations on the testimony of the 20th letter: "Themistokles' adventures were probably first narrated by Charon of Lampsakos, and next by Thucydides, and these two agree, against the later writers, that the king whom Themistokles encountered was Artaxerxes, Xerxes being dead. In this particular our author follows Charon and Thucydides, and it is at least likely that he used Charon to supplement Thucydides."<sup>11</sup> This conjecture poses several questions, as the authors of A. T. L. are well aware. Do the letters consistently reflect Thucydides? Were there other sources used, and if so can they be identified? And, more specifically, did the author (or authors) of these epistles draw upon Charon of Lampsakos, thus providing valuable evidence for the crucial problems mentioned above?

Scholars since the time of Bentley have devoted themselves to the problem of the sources reflected in the letters,

---

<sup>11</sup> Meritt, Wade-Gery, McGregor, A. T. L., III, p. 112. The immediate context deals with the problem of Kleophantos and Lampsakos, and the validity of the letter-writer's statement that Themistokles freed Lampsakos and remitted its tribute. See below, p. 143.

but only in so far as this type of research gave weight to arguments against their authenticity. With the work of Niessing, however, we reach a significant advance in study along these lines. Since Niessing's views may be presumed to hold the field at this moment, and since, in my judgment, his methods and conclusions are often open to serious objections, I shall devote a major section of this chapter to a critical evaluation of Niessing's work. This will also provide opportunity for brief descriptions of the letters' contents and for appreciation of their nature. A word of warning is apt: my own goal is historical and what I seek primarily is reliable historical evidence.

Niessing's approach to the letters is fundamentally literary. His analysis of their sources employs only one of the criteria (although a very important one) for distinguishing series among the epistles and illustrating the characteristics which link these letters to other types of epistolary writing, in particular that of either Phalaris or Chion.<sup>12</sup> Thus he is not interested in the historicity of the letters in itself, although his conclusions have significant implications for the historian. As a result of his study of their content and style, Niessing believes that the epistles are the work of two or more authors, a

---

<sup>12</sup> Cf. p.121 with note 4 above.

belief which complicates any application of their information by the historian. For, in his opinion, the author of one series drew almost entirely from Thucydides, adding to his narrative details of imaginative invention. The remaining letters, which reflect a multitude of sources, present a greater problem. They may be the work of more than one author, and Niessing's analysis suggests that they are, for among them a second series is distinguished, which is less clearly defined than the first. And finally there are those which fall in neither group.

On page 127 I give for the reader's convenience an arbitrarily constructed chart in which I label each letter according to its placement in a series by Niessing; I add a brief notation of the content and I name the addressee. This should enable the argument to be followed more easily.

The first series (Series A in the chart: epistles 1-3, 14-20), which may be considered as the framework for the body of epistles, is isolated by the conflict which it presents with other letters. In epistles 3 and 18 Themistokles bears testimony to Aristeides' zeal on his behalf despite their former enmity; in epistles 4, 8, 9 and 12 Aristeides is his bitter enemy throughout his misfortunes. And there is a reference in epistle 18 to Polygnotos' warning that Themistokles should flee from Argos, which clearly refers back to epistle 3.

<u>Epistle</u>	<u>Written to</u>	<u>Series (Niessing)</u>	<u>Subject</u>
1	Aischylos	A	Themistokles goes to Argos
2	Pausanias	A	He warns Pausanias
3	Polygnotos	A	He flees to Kerkyra
4	Habronichos	C (?)	He complains of Spartan and Athenian hostility
5	Temenidas	B	Themistokles and Admetos
6	Philostephanos	C	Themistokles' financial difficulties
7	Philostephanos	C	
8	Leagros	B	Themistokles laments his fate
9	Kallias	C	His reply to Kallias
10	Habronichos	B	En route to the king
11	Ameinias	C (?)	He names his enemies at Athens
12	Aristeides	B	He defends himself, reviles Aristeides
13	Polygnotos	D	He laments his fate
14	Pausanias	A	He reproaches Pausanias
15	Autolykos	A	He reprimands Autolykos
16	Alketas	A	He reviews Pausanias' career
17	Nikias and Meleagros	A	He is denied refuge at Kerkyra
18	Aristeides	A	He explains his flight
19	Antagoras	A	He upbraids his Athe- nian friends
20	Polygnotos	A	His flight from Argos
21	Temenidas	B (?)	He seeks his property from Greece

Epistles 1-3, 17 and 20 present a continuous narrative. Epistle 1 tells how Themistokles, after his ostracism, is persuaded by his friends to go to Argos. The Argives urge him to become their strategos, and this theme is continued in epistle 2, where he expresses his unwillingness to accept office. Epistle 3 deals with Polygnotos' warning and Themistokles' flight from Argos, and in epistle 17 he has arrived at Kerkyra. Epistle 17 finds a further link with epistle 1 through the names of Nikias and Meleagros. Epistle 20 affirms and elaborates epistle 17 in its account of Themistokles' stay at Kyllene and his journey to Kerkyra, mentioning once more the attitude of the Kerkyraians, who refused to harbour Themistokles despite their debt of gratitude to him. And this lengthy epistle continues with an account of his fortunes in Asia Minor and in particular his relations with the great king.

But epistle 5 (as well as 4, 8, 9, and 12) cannot be by the author of epistles 1-3, 17 and 20. For in this letter we are told that, after Themistokles has arrived among the Molossians, Admetos is away for eight or nine days. Furthermore, no mention is made of the Athenians and Lakedaimonians in pursuit. According to epistle 20, on the other hand, the ambassadors arrive on the day after Themistokles, and Admetos is not only there, but even sends the pursuers away with the statement that Themistokles'

suppliancy cannot be violated. How different an attitude from that of the Admetos of epistle 5, who, through his fear of Athens and Sparta, dismisses his suppliant. Then, according to epistle 5, Themistokles boards a ship of Alexandros of Makedon, which, strangely enough, is sailing for Pydna and Asia,<sup>13</sup> whereas in epistle 20 he goes first

---

<sup>13</sup> It does not seem rash to question the reading of the manuscript at this point, in view of what Jackson has to say about the condition of the text; see pp.122-123 above. Doenges (op. cit., pp. 16-18) finds no conflict between epistles 5 and 20. Epistle 5 reads: πέμψειν δ' ὅπη σώσομαι ὑπέσχετο καὶ πέπομφεν. Ἄλεξάνδρου γὰρ τοῦ Μακεδόνοσ ἐπέβην ὀλκάδι. εἰς Πύδναν τὰ νῦν ὤρμητο ἢ ναῦσ ἐκεῖθεν δὲ ἐπίδοξοσ ἦν εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν καταίρειν. Doenges maintains that ὤρμητο is pluperfect in a perfective relation to the epistolary imperfect ἦν of the succeeding clause. τὰ νῦν shows that the action of the verb ὤρμητο has been completed in the present. Thus the ship has already come to Pydna and there Themistokles embarks for Asia Minor; epistles 5 and 20 complement one another. This may be the case, but such an interpretation is not compulsory. The passage could mean that Themistokles boarded a vessel of Alexandros which has now set sail for Pydna, from where it is expected to go to Asia. Doenges admits this but appeals to common sense,

to Pydna and from there sets sail.<sup>14</sup> Niessing further observes that epistle 5 not only lacks any immediate connexion with the narrative of Series A but also presents differences in style.<sup>15</sup>

---

epistle 20, and the probability of ὀρμᾶω having the connotation of "come" rather than its primary meaning of "start out, set off." I am not convinced that Doenges is right, for I am not sure, as he is, that all the epistles are by the same hand, or, even if they are, that they must therefore be reconciled with one another at all costs.

<sup>14</sup> Similarly Thucydides, I, 137, 1-2.

<sup>15</sup> Niessing, op. cit., pp. 17-18. Epistle 21, however, like epistle 5, is written to Temenidas, an Argive, who is unknown, although the family of the Temenidai has a mythological antiquity in Argos. Epistle 21 has little relation to the rest of the letters; it is a brief exhortation by Themistokles to send to him some precious objects. There is a reference to Admetos and a curious allusion to a fear of Korinth. Niessing concludes that epistles 5 and 21 may be by the same hand and belong to another collection from which they were taken and ineptly inserted in our manuscript.

After these exclusions, Niessing proceeds positively to attribute other letters to the author of epistles 1-3, 17 and 20. Epistle 14 is linked to epistle 2. Both are written to Pausanias and deal with his affairs. In the one (2) Themistokles warns the Spartan to be wary of his (Pausanias') activities, in the other (14) these warnings have become harsh admonitions against his conduct. Epistle 16 continues the history of Pausanias and also finds a connexion with epistle 15 through the name of Autolykos. Epistles 18 and 19 go together on the basis of content, but epistle 18 has a link with epistle 3, as we have seen,<sup>16</sup> and epistle 19 belongs with epistle 15, since both are written to Autolykos. Finally, epistle 16 contains the latter's name.

Thus a series (A) comprising epistles 1-3 and 14-20 is to be ascribed to one and the same man. This series observes chronology, although epistles 14 and 16, strictly speaking, belong between epistles 2 and 3. But epistles 14 and 16 are peculiar in that they fill out the time of Themistokles' stay at Argos but do not continue his story. Rather they provide a minor history of Pausanias' career, with no particular emphasis upon chronology. Indeed, epistles 2 and 3 follow closely one on the other and

---

<sup>16</sup> Above, p. 126.

present a swift and dramatic narrative of Themistokles' arrival at Argos, his sojourn there and his flight to Kerkyra. And epistles 14 and 16, written (purportedly) at Argos, contain an elaboration of the minor action concerning Pausanias, dealt with in epistle 2. Epistles 17 and 20 record a continuous account of Themistokles' journey, but 18 (except in its latter part) and 19 do not advance the narration of his travels, although they are inserted in their proper chronological place in the series.<sup>17</sup> The difference in character, I should maintain, between epistles 18 and 19 (and, to a lesser extent, epistles 2, 14 and 16) and the rest of Series A is significant.<sup>18</sup>

We may now focus our attention upon Niessing's Series A. Several questions concerning the validity of his classification easily suggest themselves. Is he justified in assuming that conflict among the letters implies a difference in authorship, and on this ground, among others, secluding a group from the rest? The nature of this epistolary exercise does not exclude the possibility that the letter-writer may assume different attitudes without too much worry about

---

<sup>17</sup> Niessing, op. cit., pp. 19-20, says that Series A resembles the letters of Chion in its disposition of the epistles. See below, pp. 176-177, note 122.

<sup>18</sup> See below, pp. 145-147.

consistency. Thus the contradictory reports of Themistokles' relationship with Aristeides<sup>19</sup> do not offer an absolute criterion for authorship any more than they reflect a difference of source. The writer of Series A certainly knows of the former enmity between Themistokles and Aristeides. There is a real difficulty in epistle 19 of which Niessing does not seem to be aware, despite his criterion of consistency. Here Aristeides is Themistokles' rival, although the hostility is expressed in general terms.<sup>20</sup> Consider also that epistle 2, written to Pausanias

---

<sup>19</sup> See above, p. 126. I note that Themistokles learns of Aristeides' zeal on his behalf only after his ostracism (cf. epistle 3).

<sup>20</sup> Cf. Niessing, *op. cit.*, p. 34; and below, pp. 159-160. In epistle 19 Themistokles accuses his friends Antagoras and Autolykos of inconstancy. I understand the puzzling words Ἀριστείδης δ' ἡμῖν Ἀνταγόρας γέγρονε καὶ Ἀριστείδης Ἀυτόλυκος as follows: "Antagoras has become Aristeides to me (*i.e.*, my opponent) and so has Autolykos." The sentence is difficult; in its context it cannot mean that Aristeides has now changed places with Antagoras and Autolykos (*i.e.*, become Themistokles' friend).

in a friendly spirit of warning, contrasts sharply with the open hostility of epistles 14 and 16, although Themistokles' varying attitudes may be reconciled. Niessing's case for a different hand is stronger for epistle 5 (to which epistle 21 is bound), where conflict with other letters is more specific and more detailed.<sup>21</sup>

There are further problems, which for the moment need only be suggested. Does the fact that a letter bears no intimate connexion with Series A demand the conclusion that it is not by the same author? We have only to consider how different is the nature of epistles 18 and 19 (as well as of epistle 2) from the narrative of the other letters in Series A.<sup>22</sup> For Series A does have links with other epistles in the collection. Epistle 13 (not in Series A), like epistle 3, is to Polygnotos, and epistle 11 (not in Series A) mentions an Aischylos who must be the Aischylos to whom epistle 1 is written. Epistles 6, 7 and 8<sup>23</sup> (not in Series A) have Themistokles at Ephesos, in agreement with epistle 20.<sup>24</sup> But Niessing has other

---

<sup>21</sup> Cf. above, p. 130 with note 15. Niessing asserts as well a stylistic distinction.

<sup>22</sup> Cf. above, p. 132, and below, pp. 145-147.

<sup>23</sup> For epistle 8 see above, p. 126.

<sup>24</sup> See below, pp. 167-168. Niessing, op. cit., p. 50 with

criteria for distinguishing Series A and we had better return to his arguments.

Niessing recognizes that the author of Series A drew from Thucydides for his epistolary narrative.<sup>25</sup> Although there are additions to Thucydides' account, the stories and elaborations found in later authors are notably lacking.<sup>26</sup> The letter-writer's embroidery is peculiar to himself, and the details which he provides (particularly in the abundance of specific names) are not found in Thucydides or in any other writer dealing with Themistokles' fortunes. All that Thucydides (I, 135-138) tells us is used by the author of

---

note 15, suggests that the author or authors of epistles 13, 6 and 7 have known Series A. Because of their peculiar argument and because they reflect sources other than Thucydides, he maintains that they are the work of a different hand.

<sup>25</sup> Thucydides, I, 135-138, for the career of Themistokles; I, 95, 3-6 and 128, 3-134 for the minor episode of Pausanias.

<sup>26</sup> For Themistokles Niessing mentions Diodoros, XI, 54, 3-58; Nepos, Themistocles; Polyainos, Strategemata, I, 30; Plutarch, Themistokles, 24, 4 (quoting Stesimbrotos) and 27, 5 (quoting Phantias and Eratosthenes); for Pausanias Diodoros, XI, 45, 6; Nepos, Pausanias, 5, 3.

Series A and therefore Niessing concludes: unde pro certo habere licet epistularum harum auctorem ex uno Thucydide hausisse, cetera deprompsisse ex ipsius ingenio.<sup>27</sup>

A footnote provides a mild qualification.<sup>28</sup> Niessing admits that some elements of a tradition other than that of Thucydides may be identified but for him they are not clear enough to warrant the assumption that the author drew directly from this tradition itself; rather, he was affected by a vague memory. He notes three indications of these other sources. There is an ominous foreshadowing of suicide at the end of epistle 20, which in its details concerning the great king's plans for an invasion of Greece finds its parallel in Plutarch.<sup>29</sup> Second, the liberal attitude of Aristeides towards Themistokles after the

---

<sup>27</sup> Niessing, op. cit., p. 22.

<sup>28</sup> Niessing, op. cit., p. 21, note 1: nonnullis quidem locis reliquae traditionis quaedam memoria scriptoris animum subisse potest videri, quamquam haud manifesta minimeque idonea, quae eum ex illa traditione ipsa hausisse comprobet.

<sup>29</sup> Plutarch, Themistokles, 31, 3-5. Cf. Thucydides I, 138, 4: although mention is made of the rival account of Themistokles' death (by suicide), there is nothing said about the circumstances that allegedly instigated it.

latter's ostracism is attested by epistles 3 and 18. Plutarch too tells us that Aristeides took no advantage of Themistokles when he was accused in absentia.<sup>30</sup> But the letter-writer elaborates this theme,<sup>31</sup> and in epistle 3 we learn of Aristeides' zeal on Themistokles' behalf and in epistle 18 we are told that the former has ardently fought for the latter's interests. The third indication is in epistle 20, which states that Themistokles' plans to go to Sicily had to be abandoned upon news of Gelon's death. Plutarch, on the other hand, quotes Stesimbrotos as saying that Themistokles actually went to Sicily and sought to win the daughter of Hieron in marriage.<sup>32</sup> Plutarch cannot accept this story; neither, I imagine, could the letter-writer. But he resorted to a compromise, although it is not impossible that he had other evidence.<sup>33</sup>

---

<sup>30</sup> Plutarch, Aristeides, 25, 7.

<sup>31</sup> Characteristically enough (cf. pp. 139-141).

It is improbable that he had other reliable information.

<sup>32</sup> Plutarch, Themistokles, 24, 4-25, 1.

<sup>33</sup> The chronological difficulties have been discussed elsewhere; see above, pp. 61-65. In epistle 7, it is instructive to learn that Gelon once provided a gift of grain for Athens; this seems to offer confirmation of the friendship between Themistokles and Gelon implied in epistle 20.

Niessing, it is true, cites these three echoes in Series A of a tradition that is not in Thucydides; but his list is incomplete, his emphasis is too weak, and, as a result, his conclusions<sup>34</sup> are not valid. The author of Series A is well aware of the enmity of Aristides and Themistokles,<sup>35</sup> and, although this knowledge may be considered as merely general information, it does not appear in Thucydides.<sup>36</sup> The reference in epistle 18 to Themistokles' fear of being summoned before a dikasterion of the Hellenes is found also in Plutarch and Diodoros.<sup>37</sup> This too is neither the creative invention of the letter-writer nor taken from Thucydides. That the author of Series A used Thucydides or a source within the tradition represented by Thucydides as the basis for his account there can be no doubt.<sup>38</sup> But he did not use Thucydides alone.

---

<sup>34</sup> That the author of Series A draws from Thucydides alone, that he invents what is not in Thucydides, and that letters containing evidence attested by others than Thucydides are by a different hand; see above, pp. 128-130 and 135-136.

<sup>35</sup> See especially epistles 18 and 19.

<sup>36</sup> See also above, p. 133.

<sup>37</sup> Plutarch, Themistokles, 23, 4; Diodoros, XI, 55, 4-6. Plutarch's mention of Themistokles' defence in writing suggests the inspiration for epistles 2 and 14.

<sup>38</sup> At any rate in the case of epistles 1-3 and 14, 16, 17 and 20.

The perceptive reader will already have sighted another obstacle. Are we to dismiss as fiction anything in Series A that is not in Thucydides or any other source? Niessing would do this and we must therefore examine his justification.

Niessing finds in Series A elements of what he terms the fabula romanensis.<sup>39</sup> These elements are identified by an analysis of how the author has used his principal source. His elaborations upon the narrative of Thucydides are motivated by a delight in the rhetorical and dramatic. He loses no opportunity to exploit the antithetical in any situation, and the drama that he creates (feeble and trite as it often may be) strives to attain an air of credibility through details of time and place or the specific mention of characters involved.

Epistle 1 tells how Themistokles, who after his ostracism is on his way to Delphi, meets with three friends, Nikias, Meleagros and Eukrates, and is persuaded to go with them to Argos. Indeed Neokles, Themistokles' father, had once sojourned there, and the Argives urge Themistokles himself

---

<sup>39</sup> Niessing, op. cit., pp. 23-34. I summarize the characteristics that he distinguishes. These romantic traits find their best parallel in the epistles of Chion.

to assume power in their city. There is no trace of this episode elsewhere and to Niessing it is a romantic fiction prompted only by Thucydides' brief statement that Themistokles went to Argos after his ostracism.<sup>40</sup>

Epistle 2 provides an excellent example of antithesis and paradox. Themistokles tells Pausanias of the insistent kindness of the Argives as contrasted with the ingratitude of the Athenians: the latter expel him for his desire to rule while the former try to force him to be their leader. In epistle 3 Themistokles expresses his gratitude to Polygnotos for the warning to flee. The author has elaborated Thucydides' brief προαποθόμενος<sup>41</sup> into a definite message from a friend who must be named. Thus epistles 1-3 achieve a dramatic structure by the implied contraction of the chronology,<sup>42</sup> which results from Themistokles' need to flee the Argives' compulsion upon him to rule and the sudden arrival of the message that the Athenians and Lakedaimonians are in pursuit.<sup>43</sup>

---

<sup>40</sup> Thucydides, I, 135, 3. The absurd sophistry of the dialogue between Themistokles and his friends has often been pointed out. Niessing, *op. cit.*, p. 32, compares it to the inane rhetoric of Phalaris' epistles.

<sup>41</sup> Thucydides, I, 136, 1.

<sup>42</sup> Cf. Thucydides, I, 135, 3.

<sup>43</sup> Cf. above, p. 128.

In epistle 17 we are told of Themistokles' delay at Kyllene, and it is not until the fourth day that he can again set sail for Kerkyra. The description of the storm in both epistles 17 and 20 is, according to Niessing, common in the fabula romanensis.<sup>44</sup>

Epistle 20 offers many characteristic examples of the letter-writer's technique. We may compare his narration of the reception given to Themistokles among the Molossians with the account of Thucydides. Admetos' wife is not even mentioned and in place of her directions<sup>45</sup> we find the briefest statement concerning the nature of Themistokles' suppliance. Upon the arrival of the ambassadors, however, a splendid opportunity is presented for the introduction of speeches,<sup>46</sup> and Admetos gives an ardent reply to the accusations against his guest. In Themistokles' journey to Pydna we again see the desire to introduce more persons on the scene, and, in the little drama off Naxos, it is a certain Diopethes who attempts to save Themistokles from discovery by his countrymen.<sup>47</sup>

---

<sup>44</sup> Niessing, op. cit., p. 23, cites in particular epistle 4 of Chion.

<sup>45</sup> Thucydides, I, 136, 2-4.

<sup>46</sup> Cf. Thucydides, I, 137, 1.

<sup>47</sup> Cf. Thucydides, I, 137, 2.

As epistle 20 continues, further elaborations are evident. Themistokles arrives at Ephesos and encounters the guards who have been stationed in Karia by Artabazos. He is brought by them to Phrygia, where Artabazos himself is lavish in his efforts to help Themistokles prepare for his journey to the great king. Niessing regards this entire episode as a fabrication of the letter-writer, and it is true that it is not to be found in Thucydides.<sup>48</sup> And further, although Thucydides tells us that Magnesia, Lampsakos and Myous were given to Themistokles,<sup>49</sup> he makes no mention of the honours bestowed by the Persians as listed in epistle 20, where we are told that even Artabazos was held in less esteem than Themistokles. Niessing asks why the latter should replace his Persian friend and concludes that the story concerning Artabazos is haud apte ad fidem

---

<sup>48</sup> Niessing, op. cit., pp. 24-25, refers to Thucydides, I, 137, 3 (μετὰ τῶν κάτω Περσῶν τινὸς) as its inspiration, and adds (p. 25, note 2), quamquam apud alios scriptores nonnullae eiusmodi res extant. Are we to compare Plutarch, Themistokles, 26? The authors of A. T. L., III, p. 112 with note 5, have no doubt that Artabazos is taken from Thucydides, I, 129, 1 and 3, and 132, 5; the author of epistle 20, however, is wrong to imagine him as satrap of Sardis as well as Daskyleion.

<sup>49</sup> Thucydides, I, 138, 5.

composita.<sup>50</sup> He adds, however, that it does fit well with the letter-writer's zeal in extolling the virtues of his hero. But how can we be sure that this whole story, whatever its historical validity, is the mere fabrication of the author of epistle 20?

There is another statement in the same letter that bears the stamp of authenticity, one that may very well be from some source, although it is not recorded by Thucydides. We are told that Themistokles freed Lampsakos and remitted its heavy tribute.<sup>51</sup> Niessing places no faith in this remark and he observes, not without justice, that it is quite in the manner of the letter-writer to depict Themistokles, the lover of his fatherland, as the liberator of a Greek city.<sup>52</sup> But Niessing's thesis is that the author of Series A drew from Thucydides alone and we have already seen that the assumption is untenable.<sup>53</sup> It is not impossible that epistle 20 reflects another source. Whether this source was Charon of Lampsakos is another question.<sup>54</sup>

---

<sup>50</sup> Op. cit., p. 25.

<sup>51</sup> Cf. above, p. 124 with note 11.

<sup>52</sup> Niessing, op. cit., p. 26.

<sup>53</sup> See above, pp. 138-139.

<sup>54</sup> Cf. A. T. L., III, pp. 112-113.

There are many more examples that could be given to illustrate the techniques of this epistolary writing. The account of Themistokles' journey to the king shows a typical delight in the description of nature, reminiscent of the kind of romantic colouring we have already seen in the mention of the storm in epistle 17 and elsewhere in epistle 20.<sup>55</sup> Once again the chronology is contracted,<sup>56</sup> and the dramatic arrival of Themistokles at the doors of Artaxerxes' palace<sup>57</sup> sets the scene for a rhetorical exchange between the Athenian and the king of the Persians.

Niessing concludes that the letter-writer's concern is not with the mere transmission of factual information but rather with the bold invention of the new and the singular that will adorn his narrative and extol his hero.<sup>58</sup> In this lies the epistolary art that characterizes these letters of Themistokles, and the letters of Chion and that is so very much akin to the fabula romanensis.

---

<sup>55</sup> See above, pp. 139-142.

<sup>56</sup> Cf. Thucydides, I, 137, 3-138, 2.

<sup>57</sup> Although he is not named, it is Artaxerxes (as in Thucydides, I, 137, 3), and not Xerxes; see A. T. L., III, p. 112, note 7.

<sup>58</sup> Niessing, op. cit., pp. 25, 26-27 and 29.

It is noteworthy, however, that among the epistles of this 'romantic' series (Series A) is a distinct group of letters that are far different in spirit, bearing marked similarities not to the epistles of Chion but to the epistles of Phalaris.<sup>59</sup> The letters dealing with Pausanias' fortunes (epistles 2, 14 and 16) offer a closer analogy to this latter type of epistolary writing, although here too Thucydides is followed with the usual detailed elaborations.<sup>60</sup> But they present a striking contrast to the predominantly narrative aspect of the other letters in Series A, for in them Themistokles is depicted in his relationship with his friends. It is epistles 15, 18 and 19, however, which best illustrate the type which is so predominant among the letters of Phalaris. Epistle 18 is to Aristeides, whom fortune has made Themistokles' friend; and epistles 15 and 19 offer examples of the two most popular facets of this epistolary class, the admonition and castigation of associates.<sup>61</sup> In the one, Autolykos

---

<sup>59</sup> Niessing, *op. cit.*, pp. 31-34. We have already noticed this to some extent in epistle 1 (see above, pp. 139-140).

<sup>60</sup> See epistle 16 in particular: Themistokles at Argos has been informed by a helot of all the circumstances surrounding Pausanias' death.

<sup>61</sup> Niessing, *op. cit.*, p. 34: . . . admonitionem . . . castigationem amici (sive amicorum); eiusmodi res in

is chided for pretending to Themistokles, merely to console the statesman in his plight, that the Athenians had repented of their actions towards him; in the other, Antagoras and Autolykos are reprimanded for not keeping their promise to fight Aristeides but instead being won over by him.

Thus the diverse character of the epistles which comprise Series A suggests that the criterion of style does not offer a valid basis for distinction in authorship. For it is Niessing's argument that epistles 1-3 and 14-20 are by one and the same man. We have seen too that this series does not reflect Thucydides alone; epistles 15, 18 and 19 reveal almost no connexion with the account of Thucydides, and so differ from the narrative of the other letters in Series A.<sup>62</sup> This suggests to me that the letter-writer followed Thucydides for the framework of Themistokles' travels, *i.e.*, the itinerary and the chronology, but he could turn elsewhere. This is not too difficult to understand. Thucydides writes a concise yet complete summary of the flight, and for the epistolary author there could be

---

Phalaridea collectione per sescentas permutaciones occurrere hic monere longum est.

<sup>62</sup> Cf. p. 132 above; epistle 18 at any rate shows conclusively that the author used a source other than Thucydides.

no conflict about details in the account.<sup>63</sup> But epistles such as 15, 18 and 19 demand some other source. Thus Niessing's criterion for the isolation of the 'romantic' series, namely, that the author of this series followed no other source than Thucydides, is also invalid.

There remains one other query before we leave Series A: are the details that cannot be attributed to any of our authorities all pure invention? Niessing's analysis has shown how prone the letter-writer is to fabricate; but his stories rest on a core of fact and it is possible to recognize the nature of his fiction. Since he did use a source or sources other than Thucydides one may well wonder about several of his statements. Is Neokles' relationship with Argos inserted merely to provide motivation for Themistokles' experience in epistle 1? The itinerary of Thucydides is followed faithfully in Series A except for the mention of Kyllene; is this a clever addition to lend excitement to the story by the introduction of a storm and Themistokles' consequent delay in his escape from his pursuers? Epistle

---

<sup>63</sup> Cf. Plutarch, Themistokles, 25-27. Another possibility is that the letter-writer followed a source within the Thucydidean tradition and this explains the similarities between his account and that of Thucydides as well as his additions to the latter; see below, pp. 178-181.

20 embraces details concerning Artabazos and, what is more important, Lampsakos. Whether or not any of this additional information comes from Charon of Lampsakos is impossible to decide, although there may be evidence in the other epistles, outside Series A. We can say that perhaps the letter writer consulted Thucydides, and most certainly that he knew of the tradition (in many if not all of its aspects) that Thucydides represents; it is not an inevitable inference that he also knew Charon,<sup>64</sup> whether directly or indirectly from some source other than Thucydides. The latter case in particular is not impossible, especially when we consider how eclectic is the information reflected in the entire body of epistles.<sup>65</sup> Lastly, the names in Series A are not

---

<sup>64</sup> A. T. L., III, p. 112, is perhaps too confident.

<sup>65</sup> See below, pp. 171-173. Doenges (Letters, notes 7-9 on pp. 47-51) observes that in epistles 2, 14 and 16 Pausanias' movements in the Hellespont are narrated, and furthermore that his headquarters are at Kolonai in the Troad (and not at Byzantion, as Doenges would expect); cf. Thucydides, I, 128-131. Pausanias is also said to have designs on Ionia. The presence of Artabazos' men at Ephesos (epistle 20; see above, p. 142, note 48) perhaps corresponds with this shift in the centre of Pausanias' activities. Do the letters, then, asks Doenges, reflect a source with Hellespontine bias,

all pure invention. The Aischylos to whom epistle 1 is

---

namely, Charon of Lampsakos? As Doenges admits, this is a bold identification. Besides, I wonder if the narrative of the epistles should be interpreted along strict chronological lines (contrast Doenges, Letters, note 13 on pp. 53-55). It is true that in epistle 2 the circumstances surrounding Pausanias' activity imply that this is the period before his first recall (478 B.C.). But we do know (from Thucydides) that when Pausanias again returned to Asia Minor and was expelled from Byzantion he fled to Kolonai in the Troad. A reasonable understanding of the epistolary narrative is to believe that we have here a contamination of the Spartan's operations before the second recall (date unknown), in addition to some rhetorical exaggeration that I do not find surprising. Epistles 14 and 16, which continue Pausanias' story to the time of his death, bear this out, for they provide little indication of the various stages in Pausanias' career in Asia Minor as distinguished by Thucydides. It is true that the fragment of Aristodemos, 4-9 (Jacoby, no. 104), relates the ostracism of Themistokles, the first recall of Pausanias, the formation of the Delian League, the second recall of Pausanias and his death in that order; but that we are to understand this order as historical is ridiculous. For the parallels between Aristodemos' account and that of the letters see below, pp. 180-181. Cf. above, p. 101, note 81.

addressed is not only real, he is without any doubt the dramatist; his name is a link with epistle 11.<sup>66</sup>

There are other names in Series A that smack of authenticity. Doenges has prepared a detailed prosopography of all the names in the letters.<sup>67</sup> I summarize here his observations concerning those persons who appear in Series A but who are unconnected by other ancient testimony with Themistokles' life. The Diopeithes of epistle 20 possesses a good Athenian name, and Polygnotos of epistles 3, 18 and 20 is intended, in all probability, as the famous painter, although there are difficulties in this identification; he is also addressed in epistle 13. Autolykos of epistles 15, 16 and 19 bears a name which is attested elsewhere and Alketas (to whom epistle 16 is addressed) is common, but Antagoras of epistle 19 is unknown, even though the genos of the Antagoridai is not; Doenges, however, has faith in his genuineness, believing that these three names were found together in the letter-writer's source. Of Themistokles' Argive friends we know that Nikias

---

<sup>66</sup> Cf. above, p. 134. If epistle 11 and epistle 1 are by different writers, the one may have known the other and borrowed Aischylos for himself; but this conjecture is unnecessary and improbable (but cf. below, p. 168, note 106).

<sup>67</sup> Doenges, Letters, pp. 104-146; see below, pp. 178-179.

(epistles 1, 17 and 20) was a common name at Argos, and that Eukrates (epistle 1) too is found both at Argos and, of course, at Athens; consequently Doenges has trust in the Meleagros of epistles 1, 17 and 20 as at least not the mere fabrication of the writer, although the name is unique (if we except Homer). The Spartan Mnastoridas of epistle 14 who reports Pausanias' activities in the Troad to the Spartans receives no confirmation from a prosopographical study; Mnaster, however, was the name of a month in Messene, and Mnastoridas too may come from some historical source.

I am not at all surprised that these names appear credible in themselves. This is a part of the epistolary technique, and we shall see it again when we examine the other letters. Some or all of these men may come from a source; some (and I think of Aischylos in particular) may be rightly associated with Themistokles' career; but we should, I believe, allow for the personality and the individuality of the letter-writer, whatever the nature of his sources or his source. At any rate one may be very suspicious indeed of the historicity of his narrative with respect to much of the detailed and unique information that he provides.<sup>68</sup>

---

<sup>68</sup> Cf. below, pp. 169-173.

We now leave Series A and turn to the other letters. Niessing's classification of these is more tenuous, as he himself admits,<sup>69</sup> for it depends to a great extent (and sometimes entirely) upon the subjective criterion of style. According to Niessing these letters belong to another collection, or rather to other collections of epistolary writing.<sup>70</sup> Those which could be inserted within the framework provided by the 'romantic' series were added despite the conflict in details which some of them embody. The attempt to distinguish authorship among these epistles is of course difficult, if not impossible, although distinctions are inherent in Niessing's arguments.

Among epistles 4-13 a second series is identified comprising epistles 5, 8, 10 and 12;<sup>71</sup> this I shall call

---

<sup>69</sup> Niessing, op. cit., pp. 35-56.

<sup>70</sup> Niessing, op. cit., p. 50: veri simile mihi videtur illas epistulas ex alia epistularum collectione vel potius ex aliis collectionibus depromptas postea seriei nostrae adiectas esse.

<sup>71</sup> Niessing, op. cit., p. 54; epistle 21 finds its place in our manuscript because it, like epistle 5, bears the singular name of Temenidas (see above, p.130, note 15). But, because of its peculiar nature, epistle 21 seems to stand apart from the others, although it may conceivably belong to Series B.

Series B. Epistles 6, 7 and 9 perhaps form another group (Series C), in which it is remotely possible that epistles 4 and 11 (Series C ? ) should be included. Epistle 13, in isolation, I have labelled D.

Niessing finds that the letters of Series B lack the free light touch of invention that creates the dramatic narration characterizing Series A as akin to the letters of Chion and the historia romanensis. Rather, Series B, for the most part, merely transmits elements of tradition with little imaginative elaboration, and, when elaboration does occur, it is marked by an absurd rhetoric worthy of Phalaris' epistles.<sup>72</sup>

The epistles of Series B are not closely connected, but they do offer similarities with one another in diction and expression. Epistle 5, having related Themistokles' encounter with Admetos, tells us that he is on his way to Pydna and Asia.<sup>73</sup> In epistle 8 he is at Ephesos and we hear of his plans to go to the king, who is not named.

---

<sup>72</sup> This is nothing new; like epistles 1, 2, 15, 18 and 19 of Series A, epistles 10 and 12 in particular bear the stamp of Phalaris. Series C also shares in this characteristic.

<sup>73</sup> Cf. above, p. 129 with note 13.

Epistle 10, which is brief and which expresses Themistokles' thanks to Habronichos for receiving the news of his bold undertaking<sup>74</sup> with such equanimity, looks back to epistle 8: both are filled with his hesitancy and shame at being compelled to turn for help to the enemy of his country. Epistle 12 is written after Themistokles has established relations with the king.

Epistle 8 is one of the most provocative and elusive of the letters, dealing as it does with the period of the prosecution of Themistokles. It is difficult: not only is the text corrupt but the circumstances surrounding the events, as understood by the letter-writer, are virtually unknown. Themistokles writes to Leagros, who, along with others of his associates, swore that he was not involved in the betrayal of the Greeks. Leobates, Lysandros and Pronapes now court the Athenian demos, for these men too took the oath that Aristeides, Phaidrias, Tisinikos and Alkmeonides demanded. Themistokles reviles his friends who are safe in Athens while he, who was not even given the opportunity to swear his loyalty, now must turn to the king of the Persians.<sup>75</sup>

---

<sup>74</sup> I.e., that he is on his way to the king (although this is not directly stated).

<sup>75</sup> Jackson, Class. Quart., XIX (1925), pp. 175-176, and XX (1926), pp. 27-28; cf. Niessing, op. cit., pp. 40-42.

The material of this letter is, as far as we can ascertain, drawn from historical sources. Leagros son of Glaukon is mentioned by Herodotos, although not in connexion with Themistokles.<sup>76</sup> Leobotes Agryleus was,<sup>77</sup> according to Plutarch, the man who brought the indictment of treason against Themistokles.<sup>78</sup> Niessing feels, therefore, that Lysandros Skambonides and Pronapes (ms. κρινύκης) Prasieus are not rash inventions.<sup>79</sup> Phaidrias is a common name, but Tisinikos of the manuscript is unique. Niessing also essays an explanation of how the name Alkmeonides

---

<sup>76</sup> Herodotos, IX, 75; he is general with Sophanes. See also Raubitschek, Hesperia, VIII (1939), pp. 160-164.

<sup>77</sup> The manuscript reads λεώτης . . . ἀρχιεύς.

<sup>78</sup> Plutarch, Themistokles, 23: Λεωβώτης ὁ Ἀλκμαίωνος Ἀγρυλῆθεν (variants are ἀλκμαίωνος and ἀγρυλῆθεν). Cf. de exsilio, 15 (Moralia, 605 E): Λεωβάτης. This information presumably comes from Krateros; see Krech, de Crateri ψηφισμάτων συναγωγῆ, pp. 55-56. See above, p. 7, note 17.

<sup>79</sup> Niessing, op. cit., p. 42, note 8; cf. Wilamowitz, Aristoteles und Athen, I, p. 144, note 37. A Pronapes, colleague of Lakedaimonios, appears as hipparchos in I. G., I<sup>2</sup>, 400 (see Gomme, Commentary, I, pp. 328, note 1, and 437-438). For an attempt to identify our Pronapes with the son of Pronapides see Raubitschek, Hesperia, VIII (1939), pp. 158-160.

appears in the text.<sup>80</sup> I add that Neokles is also mentioned in this letter, and an uncle Themistokles.

---

<sup>80</sup> Niessing, op. cit., p. 42; he writes Alkmaionides for Alkmeonides (and Tisinnikos for Tisinikos). In Plutarch (see note 78 above) Leobotes is the son of Alkmaion. Probably the letter-writer did not realise this fact (Niessing argues) and as a result considered Alkmaionides a proper name and not a patronymic, as his omission of the article suggests. It is a curious confusion, particularly since the name Leobotes must also have appeared in his source. Perhaps it is wiser to question the manuscript. But the name Alkmeonides is not unknown; and ostraka found in the Athenian agora identify an Alkmeonides son of Alkmeon. For his place in the stemma of the Alkmaionid family see Vanderpool, *Hesperia*, XV (1946), pp. 274-275. Doenges, op. cit., pp. 113-116, believes that the Alkmeonides of epistle 8 is the brother of Leobotes and the grandson of the Alkmeonides of the ostraka. This is not impossible. Plutarch (Aristeides, 25, 7) names Alkmaion and Kimon as Themistokles' enemies; I am not convinced (as is Doenges) that we should understand Alkmeonides for Alkmaion in Plutarch's text, and that here we have another tradition (reflected as well by the letter-writer), which does not know of Leobotes as the man who brought the indictment of treason against Themistokles.

That the Greeks rose upon the entrance of Themistokles at the Olympian games is recorded by Pausanias.<sup>81</sup> And the statement that Themistokles won the epithet Pythios is worthy of belief, although this is not told elsewhere. Very probably the circumstances surrounding the oath of loyalty, and the oath itself, have some basis in fact.

Thus Niessing concludes that the writer of epistle 8 relied upon history for the framework of his narrative in an effort to give a true picture of Themistokles.<sup>82</sup> In marked contrast are the rhetorical exaggerations of Chion, Phalaris and the 'romantic' series.

---

<sup>81</sup> VIII, 50, 3; cf. Plutarch, Themistokles, 17, 2. The Olympiad may very well be the 76th, celebrated in 476, and it was perhaps at this time that Themistokles prevented Hieron's horses from competing (Plutarch, Themistokles, 25, 1), as Doenges has suggested (Letters, pp. 101-102, note 81).

<sup>82</sup> It is better to say that he followed tradition. I do not believe that he had a critical approach towards his source or his sources. His object was only to give authenticity to his account.

I find it impossible to make such a clear distinction. The writer of Series A seeks the basis of his narrative in tradition (a tradition represented not only by Thucydides) and his imaginative elaboration can be as sane as and very similar to that of the writer of epistle 8.<sup>83</sup> When we turn to the other letters of Series B, Niessing's thesis finds little support.

Epistle 5 is very short but it contains a multitude of names which are not found in any other source. Themistokles encounters Kratesipolis and Stratolaos among the Molossians, and, upon Admetos' return in eight or nine days, he holds the child Arybbas at the hearth. The details are reminiscent of the 'romantic' series. But, in this case, are we to have faith in the authenticity of its minute information, whatever the source? Niessing does not raise the question.<sup>84</sup>

---

<sup>83</sup> The author of epistle 8 has Themistokles at Ephesos in agreement with Thucydides and the 'romantic' series. Cf. Thucydides, I, 137, 2-4 with the latter part of epistle 8: both tell of Themistokles' correspondence with the king, although in the letter the king is not named.

<sup>84</sup> Cf. above, p. 153. Plutarch, Themistokles, 24, 3, gives Phthia, not Kratesipolis, as Admetos' wife. Doenges, Letters, pp. 106-110, however, not only finds the names

Then, too, epistles 10 and 12, which also belong to Series B, are not far different from epistles 15, 18 and 19 of Series A.<sup>85</sup> Epistle 10, written to Habronichos, is imaginative enough. Themistokles, as he rides to the court of the king, thanks his friend for receiving the news of his great and terrible venture with impartiality. And epistle 12 heaps contumely on Aristeides, who is accused of reviling Themistokles among the Athenians for his good fortune with the Persians. Significantly enough for our argument, Niessing calls this an ἐπιστολή ὀνειδιστική and finds its parallel in the epistles of Phalaris.<sup>86</sup> We may note that epistle 18 (of Series A) also is to Aristeides.

The differences between Series A and Series B can be accounted for by the variety of their subject-matter. Dissimilar topics demand dissimilar treatment, especially for the imaginative writer, although he is influenced too

---

in epistle 5 credible, but he also believes in their historical association with Themistokles. I remain sceptical. That Arybbas (or Arybas or Arymbas) appears elsewhere as a genuine Epirot name is not surprising, for we have indeed become familiar with the epistolary technique. Cf. below, pp. 178-179.

<sup>85</sup> Cf. above, pp. 145-146.

<sup>86</sup> Niessing, op. cit., p. 45.

no doubt by the diverse nature of the source or the sources followed.<sup>87</sup> We cannot reject in Series A all details which are not confirmed by our sources, any more than we can accept all details in Series B merely because so many of them, as in epistle 8, are ratified (whether by chance or not) by extant testimony. And if the writer does preserve a tradition, we should still face the responsibility of assaying its value as history.

Epistle 4 is excluded by Niessing from Series B with some hesitation, his final criterion being that it lacks the characteristic diction. He admits though that epistles 4 and 8 have much in common. They are both written to Habronichos and they both abound in details which are found in other authors. Yet Niessing's statement that in these letters one seeks in vain for the fictions so prevalent in the 'romantic' series needs modification in the light of what I have demonstrated. Series B, along with epistles 4 and 11 (Series C ? ) and 13 (D), belong to a type of ἐπιστολή φιλική and represent an attempt to reveal the mind of Themistokles the man. Epistle 4 in particular is akin in spirit to letters modelled on those of Cicero, as Niessing himself perceives.

---

<sup>87</sup> Cf. above, pp. 146-147.

This letter, like epistle 8, is of extreme interest to the historian both in its factual details and in its references to the circumstances accompanying Themistokles' indictment. Themistokles tells Habronichos how the Athenians and Lakedaimonians have come to Argos in pursuit of him. He complains of the treachery of the Athenians for whom he has done so much, particularly since it is a treachery instigated by the Spartans. And he explains why the Spartans are hostile to him. He (Themistokles) and Habronichos and Aristides<sup>88</sup> were colleagues in the embassy which tricked the Lakedaimonians at the time of the building of the walls. Now Aristides conspires with the angry Spartans against him. Themistokles entrusts his wealth and family to Habronichos as well as to Sikinnos, the pedagogue of his son Kleophantos. Habronichos too and his family need protection, for Habronichos' son is to become Themistokles' son-in-law. Finally, the Lakedaimonians are not going to be allowed to use Themistokles as a means of polluting his city despite the precedents of Kylon and Pausanias.

There is random information in this letter. The embassy and the trick may come from Thucydides.<sup>89</sup> Thucydides

---

<sup>88</sup> Aristides is not named but is the subject of a punning reference spoken by Kallaischros; there is, however, trouble in the manuscript.

<sup>89</sup> Thucydides, I, 91, 3; note the mention of Habronichos. Cf. Herodotos, VIII, 21.

may well be the source for much of the other material in epistle 4: the mention of the slowness of the ephors, the Kylonian conspiracy and the bronze statues of Pausanias.<sup>90</sup> Kleophantos, Themistokles' son, is mentioned by Plutarch,<sup>91</sup> who names as well Sikinnos the pedagogue.<sup>92</sup>

As in the case of epistle 8, Niessing praises the letter-writer's sense of history for his remarks about the fickle character of the Athenians and their credulity of the accusations against Themistokles, which were alleged by the Spartans to counteract the notoriety of Pausanias' crimes. He wonders too about the source of Kallaischros' remark and asks if this Kallaischros is the father of Kritias the tyrant.<sup>93</sup> I should myself be unwilling to call the author of epistle 4 an historian.

---

<sup>90</sup> Thucydides, I, 131-134, 126-127 and 134, 4. Niessing finds an indication that Thucydides was followed in a similarity of diction (i.e., χαλκοῖ ἀνδριάντες); this is surely very slight. This probable dependence on Thucydides (or a source within the tradition represented by Thucydides) is reminiscent of Series A.

<sup>91</sup> Themistokles, 32, 1; also Plato, Meno, 93d.

<sup>92</sup> Themistokles, 12, 3; also Herodotos, VIII, 75.

<sup>93</sup> Niessing, op. cit., p. 39, citing Kroll, P. W., R. E., s. v. Kallaischros. See also Kirchner, P. A., I, no. 7758. This identification is attractive.

If epistle 4 is by the author of epistle 8, and there is no valid argument against such a supposition, epistles 11 and 13 follow easily as works by the same hand, for they are very similar in character.<sup>94</sup>

Epistle 11 is to Ameinias son of Euphorion, who was trierarchos under Themistokles in the war against the Persians. Themistokles urges Ameinias, whose brother Kynegeiros (brother of Aischylos) won renown at Marathon, not to desert him.<sup>95</sup> He reminds Ameinias that it was for his sake that he offended the Greeks and fell into disfavour among them. Diodoros tells us that after the war the Lakadaimonians saw to it that the prize of valour went to Aigina and to Ameinias to prevent the Athenians from gaining too much glory.<sup>96</sup> The version of this episode found in epistle 11 is unique, and Niessing considers it a fiction. According to the letter-writer, Themistokles supported Ameinias as the recipient of the award, and thus incurred even greater hostility among his enemies; this reasoning has a specious subtlety. The letter also informs us that Themistokles was later charged with having committed treason at Salamis.<sup>97</sup>

---

<sup>94</sup> Contrast Niessing in the chart on p. 127 above.

<sup>95</sup> For the names see Kirchner, *P. A.*, I, nos. 442, 683, 8944.

<sup>96</sup> Diodoros, XI, 27, 2; cf. Herodotos, VIII, 93, and Plutarch, *Themistokles*, 17.

<sup>97</sup> For the significance of these charges see above, pp. 32-34.

Niessing is inclined to believe that the many names (supposedly of Themistokles' accusers) found in this letter are authentic.<sup>98</sup> Alkibiades may be the grandfather of the notorious Alkibiades; Stratippos is found elsewhere; and Lakratides (if this emendation is correct) was archon early in the fifth century.<sup>99</sup> The other names, Hermokles, Dorkon and Molon (there is, however, trouble in the manuscript), as well as Aristeides of Aigina, are unknown. Epistle 11 has a link with epistle 1 in the name of Aischylos.

Epistle 13 too finds a connexion with the 'romantic' series for it (like epistles 3 and 20) is written to Polygnotos. Niessing judges this to be the best composed of all the letters.<sup>100</sup> Themistokles replies to his friend

---

<sup>98</sup> Once again he is much more ready to believe in the genuineness of the tradition found in the epistles outside Series A, the 'romantic' series.' I do not appreciate the distinction; but cf. below, pp. 169-170.

<sup>99</sup> See Kirchner, P. A., I, no. 597 (Alkibiades), and II, nos. 12921-12923 (Stratippos, although the evidence is confined to the fourth century). Lakratides' archonship belongs to one of the unoccupied years from 521/0 to 497/6; see Cadoux, J. H. S., LXVIII (1948), p. 119.

<sup>100</sup> He compares epistle 13 to a class of epistolary writing called ἠθοποιία or προσωποποιία by the ancients;

who has told him to bear his exile  $\gamma\epsilon\nu\nu\alpha\acute{\iota}\omega\varsigma$ . One is reminded of Cicero, for in this epistle Themistokles sounds very Roman in his laments over the loss of his fatherland, on behalf of which he in his courage and bravery has done so much. The letter has little information for the historian, although it does provide Themistokles with a defense of his actions and a plea for his innocence.<sup>101</sup> We can agree with

---

op. cit., p. 37, note 1. Epistles 1-3 of Demosthenes and the Heroides of Ovid are other examples.

<sup>101</sup> A Megakles, however, is mentioned as a friend of Themistokles. Doenges, Letters, pp. 113-116, has identified this Megakles as the son of Hippokrates of Alopeke, who was ostracized in 487/6; see Vanderpool, Hesperia, XV (1946), pp. 271 and 275. This may be the case, but we should remember that Themistokles was, in all probability, responsible for the ostracism of Megakles (see above, p. 115); in epistle 13 the two men are friendly to one another. Doenges also looks back to epistle 8 (see above, p. 156, note 80) and observes that we are to assume that Alkmeonides was Themistokles' enemy and Leobotes and Megakles were his friends at the time of his (Themistokles') ostracism; thus we must not consider the Alkmaionidai as a tightly knit group with a concerted political policy. It should be noted, however, that Leobotes in epistle 8 has already

Niessing's judgement that this epistle does stand out amidst the general mediocrity and rhetorical absurdity of so many of the others.

On the other hand, epistles 6 and 7 (which belong together on the basis of their content) of Series C present a fabricated argument worthy of composition by Phalaris.<sup>102</sup> They are written to Philostephanos, Themistokles' banker, who is a Korinthian.<sup>103</sup> In epistle 6 Tibios, the servant of a certain Meidon, was sent by his master to obtain seventy minai of Themistokles' money from Philostephanos. The banker, according to Tibios, who has informed Themistokles at Ephesos of the whole proceedings, replied that he owed Themistokles nothing, although he would be willing to make a loan. Themistokles is sorely grieved to hear this, since Philostephanos in actual fact owes him seventy talents.

---

acquiesced with Themistokles' enemies. I am more than hesitant to accept such subtle distinctions. We can be certain of little more than that the Alkmaionidai (in particular Leobotes) were hostile to Themistokles; this is confirmed by other testimony.

<sup>102</sup> Niessing, *op. cit.*, pp. 47-48, analyses the many antitheses evident in this rhetorical game.

<sup>103</sup> Cf. the reference to Korinth in epistle 21 (see above, p. 130, note 15).

In epistle 7 we learn that Menyllos (a Chalkidian who once brought into the Beiraius a grain-ship from Gelon of Syracuse)<sup>104</sup> has arrived at Ephesos on the last day of Boedromion with Philostephanos' reply. Themistokles is relieved to learn that Tibios is a liar. The details are reminiscent of Series A, and Thucydides may provide the inspiration for the whole episode.<sup>105</sup>

Niessing admits that epistles 6 and 7 might belong to Series A, since they too have Themistokles at Ephesos. He denies the attribution because of the peculiar argument of these two letters and because he believes Meidon and Menyllos come from some tradition, whereas Series A reflects Thucydides alone. The latter assumption is false, as we have seen, and the denial of the attribution has no real

---

<sup>104</sup> There is an echo of epistle 20 in this mention of Gelon (cf. above, p. 137 with note 33).

<sup>105</sup> Cf. Thucydides, I, 137, 3. Doenges (Letters, pp. 82-83, note 64) believes that epistles 6 and 7 alone of the entire body of letters are mere epistolary inventions of the incidents and of the personages; he notes that the names are common or stereotyped, and, indeed, Meidon and Pamphilos (who is mentioned in epistle 7) occur often in new comedy. Cf. below, pp. 178-179.

validity.<sup>106</sup> There are no conclusive objections to assigning epistles 6, 7, 11, 13 and even 8 to the author of Series A.<sup>107</sup>

Only epistle 9 (Series C) remains. This too resembles the letters of Phalaris in its antithetical style and in its diction.<sup>108</sup> Its content is based upon the story of how Kallias, who was called λακκόπλουτος by the comic writers, gained his extraordinary wealth. He is said to have found in a trench at Marathon rich treasures abandoned by the Persians.<sup>109</sup> Kallias, according to our letter, has accused the Athenians of rashly bestowing high office on unworthy men such as Themistokles. Epistle 9 is Themistokles' reply. We are reminded how varied is the information of the epistolographer and how petty the substance of his themes can be.

---

<sup>106</sup> Niessing, op. cit., p. 50 with note 15. He suggests that the author of epistles 6 and 7 (and epistle 13) knew Series A.

<sup>107</sup> Cf. above, pp. 132-138.

<sup>108</sup> Niessing, op. cit., p. 45.

<sup>109</sup> See Plutarch, Aristeides, 5; also schol. Aristophanes, Nubes, 64, and Suidas, s. v. λακκόπλουτον. This is Kallias son of Hipponikos, of Alopeke, and husband of Kimon's sister Elpinike; see Kirchner, P. A., I, no. 7825, and A. T. L., III, p. 276.

Such is the character of the twenty-one letters that have come down to us under the name of Themistokles. They vary considerably in their stylistic merit, in their themes and in the abundant and random information that they transmit. They all, however, justify and extol the character and the actions of their hero, and, although they may represent a farraginous excerpting from various collections or a loose compilation by several hands, these letters must, for all practical purposes, be considered as a single unit.<sup>110</sup> Niessing's elaborate classification contains too many uncertainties and fallacies to provide any sound basis of procedure for the historian. We cannot say that one group from among the letters is by an author who used Thucydides alone, and that all other details to be found in this group are imaginative fiction. Nor can we say that another series represents a more conscientious transmission of an historical tradition.<sup>111</sup> We must consider each letter and each item of information within it in connexion with

---

<sup>110</sup> Compare Diodoros' remarks (XI, 58-59) concerning the lengthy controversy that was waged over the interpretation of Themistokles' career.

<sup>111</sup> Too much of the vast body of writing that dealt with Themistokles and his period is lost to make such a conclusion valid. That more details in one letter than in another

the other evidence. In the last analysis it is a question of historical probability and of a precise comprehension of the letter-writer's method.

Yet Niessing's analysis illustrates important aspects of the epistolographer's methods and these merit serious attention. His art (if it may so be called) consists of providing a novel treatment of accepted traditions and his cleverness avoids violation of the bounds set by those traditions; only thus will his epistles retain an air of credibility and authenticity. Thus imagination and research (at least to some extent) are inherent in the letter-writer's technique. Once we have realized his characteristics we can appreciate the history that he reflects. It is possible with the aid of the other evidence to distinguish, for example, the fiction of epistles 6 and 7 from the obviously historical basis for epistles 4 and 8; in the latter, I believe, is retained a genuine reflection of a credible source, and the names and circumstances narrated in connexion with the ostracism and exile earn careful consideration as belonging to the realm of history. And this brings us to our initial questions.<sup>112</sup>

---

are confirmed in extant sources is often a matter of chance. That the author (or authors) drew upon this wealth of tradition (both good and bad) makes us hopeful but cautious.

<sup>112</sup> See above, p. 124.

We cannot say with certainty that the letters reflect Charon of Lampsakos; and, although this is a possibility, the assumption is dangerous.<sup>113</sup> But they do follow Thucydides, or a source within the tradition that we know through Thucydides, and in this respect their most important contribution lies in the support that they offer independently to his chronology. That Thucydides may have been the chief source for the epistles that deal with Themistokles' travels is not surprising and reasons for such a choice are easy to find.<sup>114</sup> When the letter-writer acquires his information elsewhere, he remains within (*i.e.*, his other source remains within) Thucydides' chronological and geographical framework. Or, if the letter-writer himself adapted his information to fit Thucydides - which is conceivable -, then at least Thucydides' version was regarded by him as credible.<sup>115</sup>

Thus in epistle 20 Themistokles meets the Athenian fleet off Naxos, lands at Ephesos and finally encounters Artaxerxes. This is significant in the face of the author's

---

<sup>113</sup> Only epistle 20 lends any real support to the conjecture; see above, p. 143.

<sup>114</sup> See pp. 146-147 above.

<sup>115</sup> There is no reason to assume that he did not know of conflicting versions (cf. Plutarch, Themistokles, 27). See also above, pp. 58-60 and 124.

fondness for contracting his chronology for the sake of dramatic effect.<sup>116</sup> But it is more significant that in other letters, in which Thucydides could not have been a major source and in which events other than Themistokles' itinerary (as narrated by Thucydides) provide the epistolary topic, Themistokles is still placed in Ephesos.<sup>117</sup> I do not think that the letter-writer was particularly aware of chronology; he was concerned, however, with the credibility of his narrative.

We look once more to epistles 4 and 8, which have an important bearing on the problems underlying the ostracism and indictment. They both perhaps reflect a multitude of sources (either directly or indirectly) and yet they both adhere to the Thucydidean chronology. The earlier rather than the later date for Themistokles' flight is assumed, for the letter-writer connects the accusation against Themistokles with his alleged treason at Salamis and with his activity concerning the building of the walls and the award of the prize of valour to Ameinias. These may very well be only conjectures, but they are not without grounds, and they agree with our chronological convictions based upon other evidence. Furthermore, in epistle 16 Themistokles

---

<sup>116</sup> See pp. 139-141 above.

<sup>117</sup> I.e., epistles 7, 8 and 13.

learns of Pausanias' death after he has gone to Argos, and in fact the synchronism given by the letters between the events of the two careers assumes an early date for the ostracism.

In conclusion, a word must be said about the date of these letters. Only Suidas mentions their existence, and he provides no clue to the time of their composition.<sup>118</sup> Niessing has done a valuable service in pointing out the intimate relationship of the letters with other epistolary writing, in particular that of Phalaris and Chion.<sup>119</sup> He does not, however, conjecture a date. Bentley's study of

---

<sup>118</sup> Suidas, s.v. Θεμιστοκλῆς. Surprisingly, he calls the epistles φρονήματος γεμούσας. The hypothesis to Ailius Aristeides' Panathenaikos (Dindorf, p. 737) is irrelevant ("Themistokles spoke without copy"); Habich, op. cit. (note 2 above), p. 3, misinterprets this. Plutarch's statement (Themistokles, 23, 4) that Themistokles at Argos composed a written defence suggests only motivation for the letter-writer; cf. above, p. 138, note 13.

<sup>119</sup> Niessing convincingly refutes the theory that our letters belong to the work of the philosophical schools (op. cit., pp. 4-12). His conclusion (p. 12) is as follows: nihil omnino doctrinae Cynicae vel Stoicae, nihil denique argumenti vere philosophici in his epistulis agnosco.

the epistles of Phalaris suggests, perhaps, that these belong to a time about 200 A.D.<sup>120</sup> Obens in his investigation of the letters of Sokrates and the Sokratics places them in the second century after Christ.<sup>121</sup> Thus it may be safe to assign our epistles to this period when such writing was the fashion. Certainly they are not foreign to the spirit of that age.

Since the completion of the foregoing section, I have had the opportunity, through the kindness of Professor A. E. Raubitschek, of consulting the recent doctoral dissertation of Norman A. Doenges, The Letters of Themistocles: A Survey (Princeton, 1953). I have made some minor revisions in my text in the light of his detailed study, but I have not felt the necessity for any extensive rewriting. I give here a summary of his conclusions.

---

<sup>120</sup> Richard Bentley, A Dissertation upon the Epistles of Phalaris (1699), in The Works of Richard Bentley, edited by Alexander Dyce (2 vols., London, 1836).

<sup>121</sup> Wilhelm Obens, Qua aetate Socratis et Socraticorum epistulae, quae dicuntur, scriptae sint (Diss., Westphalia, 1912), p. 79. These epistles do provide parallels with our letters.

Doenges (pp. 1-23) is convinced that the epistles are the work of a single author. To him the letters tell a continuous narrative of Themistokles' ostracism, flight and residence in Asia Minor; this story is consistent and written in a conscious epistolary form and design. Thus apparent conflict in details is to be accounted for by the differences in emphasis demanded by the immediate subject rather than by a variant version of an incident reflecting a change of source. For example, epistles 5 and 20 in their accounts of Themistokles at the home of Admetos are to be considered as complementary to one another; in epistle 5 the motive of fear on the part of Admetos accords with the emphasis upon Themistokles' supplication, while in epistle 20 the motive of piety dominates the narrative, for piety here is the reason for Admetos' behaviour. Similarly the varying attitudes towards Aristeides grow immediately out of the subject-matter, as do other supposed contradictions. The differences in style among the epistles correspond to differences in the nature of the letters, *i.e.*, some are predominantly narrative, others deliberative or reflective; yet antithesis, repetition and the clipped style are characteristic of the whole collection.

The arrangement of the letters is conscious, motivated not by chronology but by the desire to tell Themistokles' story as dramatically and effectively as possible. The

order of the letters may be explained by the relation of each to the one which precedes or follows, and interlocking references are provided for the whole system; epistles 1-5 are predominantly narrative, epistles 6-7 form a separate unit dealing with Themistokles' finances, epistles 8-13 are arranged in pairs (the first of each pair is written from Asia and presents an aspect of Themistokles' flight, the second, from Argos, comments and reflects on past achievements in contrast to present misfortunes) and finally epistles 17-21 balance 1-5 and round off the entire collection.

Many of the characteristics discerned by Doenges have already become evident in my discussion. I have no crucial objection to looking upon these epistles as the composition of one man; as I have urged, for practical purposes the historian is forced to work under this assumption. But there are difficulties in dogmatism, and I am far from confident that to believe literally in a single authorship is continuously defensible on the basis of evidence. For, if the letters represent a kind of historical novelette or short story to delight and inform, as Doenges maintains, their artistic construction (if one assumes a deliberate pattern for the whole) must be considered a dismal failure.<sup>122</sup>

---

<sup>122</sup> Doenges cites (p. 23) the letters of Chion as interpreted by Ingemar Düring, Chion of Heraclea, A Novel in

The differences in fact as well as outlook between epistles 5 and 20 seem curious indeed if the narratives are intended to be complementary. Epistles 1-5 and 14-20 (Series A) form a convincing unit; the relation of the others (except in most general terms) remains far from immediately apparent, and Doenges' interpretation of epistles 8-13 is strained,

---

Letters (Gothenburg, 1951). But the letters of Chion do not possess the problems inherent in a similar understanding of the epistles of Themistokles. The former by comparison are of some literary merit, and there is no question here of a single author or his design. Düring's introductory remarks (p. 7) are pertinent: "In epistolary literature the letters of Chion of Heraclea hold a unique position as the only extant example of a novel in letters. The seventeen letters of this collection form together a coherent whole well thought-out and carefully elaborated . . . . There are widely different types of letters, and behind the various collections lurk motives of quite different character. Each collection must be treated as a separate problem, though of course its connection with the epistolary literature as a whole must not be set aside." For a general survey of the field of epistolary writing see Sykutris, P. W., R. E., s.v. Epistolographie.

to say the least. And epistle 21 as the conclusion of a literary exercise I find incomprehensible, however inept or obtuse we may consider its author. Possible explanations are that epistle 21 is out of place in our manuscript, or that the entire body of epistles as originally conceived has not come down to us, or finally, as Niessing has maintained, that we have represented here more than one series. If these letters are by one man, he has been unsuccessful in the construction of an epistolary narrative as a whole. But this is to assume, of course, that such a narrative was his object. As has frequently been pointed out, many (if not all) of the collections of letters that have come down to us should not be considered as attempted forgeries but rather as clever types of literary production, and often, as well, as exercises of the schools. The latter explanation, at any rate, tells against a single authorship.

Once Doenges is convinced that the letters are the work of one man, he looks for the source of the information that they contain. His prosopography is detailed and invaluable. His conclusions are as follows. Of the fifty-five names listed, twenty-five are of known historical personages, some eighteen are of doubtful authenticity and four (occurring in epistles 6 and 7, letters of a kind commonplace in invented collections) are most certainly fictitious. Doenges has faith that all the names (except those of epistles 6 and

7) are drawn from an historical source. I remain less sure, for I feel that Doenges does not make sufficient allowance for the demands and conventions of the epistolary technique, which has become so clearly evident from our analysis. Once the exception is made for epistles 6 and 7, it is difficult not to be suspicious of the other letters, for many are in spirit akin to the fabricated narrative of 6 and 7.

Thus Doenges would identify a single source for the composer of the epistles, namely, an Atthis, perhaps that of Hellanikos, although we have no evidence for such a precise identification. An Atthis would account for much of the letter-writer's information, in particular his detailed account in epistles 4 and 8 of the circumstances and persons involved in Themistokles' ostracism and condemnation. Doenges, however, must conjecture Charon of Lampsakos as Hellanikos' source for the narration of the flight; in this way the similarities between the account of Thucydides and that of the letters are to be explained, for presumably Thucydides followed Charon.

I do not, however, believe that it is compulsory to seek one source (and one source alone), nor am I confident that the epistolographer did not know Thucydides. Thucydides may very well have been followed for the narration of the flight; differences from and additions to his account may

be attributed both to the letter-writer's imagination and to various sources, which provided as well the subjects of his other epistles. At any rate we cannot say that all his information comes from an Atthis and that therefore it is in itself historically credible. We must distinguish first of all the fiction peculiar to himself and then evaluate the elements of the traditions which he reflects. That the epistolary writer knew an Atthid tradition (and I purposely speak in the most general terms) I have little doubt, for I believe that much of what he tells us in connexion with the ostracism and flight is worthy of serious consideration by the historian. Thus my attitude towards the historicity of the letters remains essentially the same as I have stated above (pp.169-173).

Doenges' analysis of sources (pp. 147-185) is detailed and involved, and any summary would fail to do it justice. He has performed a valuable service in pointing out the similarities between the account of Aristodemos and that of the epistles; and it is by comparison of the fragment of Aristodemos with a scholion to Aristophanes<sup>123</sup> that he conjectures a common source for all three, namely, the Atthis of Hellanikos. Of this we cannot be sure. Many of the elements of the tradition that Doenges would assign to Hellanikos are, it is obvious, historically false.<sup>124</sup> The writers of

---

<sup>123</sup> Schol. Aristophanes, Equites, 84.

<sup>124</sup> Cf. above, pp. 26-27, 101-103, note 81 and 148-149, note 65.

the fourth century wrote of Themistokles' encounter with the Athenian fleet off Thasos and his meeting with Xerxes; Charon of Lampsakos and Thucydides, on the other hand, recounted Themistokles' dealings with Artaxerxes, and Thucydides (if not Charon) told of Themistokles and the fleet at Naxos. With this (and as well an early chronology) the letters agree; in some respects so do Aristodemos, a scholiast to Aristophanes and Nepos.

Finally it should be noted that Doenges too (pp. 24-33) would place the composition of the epistles in the second century after Christ. His chief criterion is a good one, that of style and language.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### ANCIENT SOURCES

- Aillios Aristeides, edited by Wilhelm Dindorf (3 vols.,  
with scholia in Vol. III, Leipzig, 1829)
- Aischines, edited by Friedrich Blass (second edition,  
Leipzig, Teubner, 1908)
- Aischines, Scholia, as in Scholia Graeca in Aeschinem et  
Isocratem, edited by Wilhelm Dindorf (Oxford, 1852)
- Aischylos, edited by Arthur Sidgwick (Oxford, 1902)
- Aristodemos, no. 104 in Felix Jacoby, Die Fragmente der  
griechischen Historiker, II A (Berlin, 1926), pp.  
493-503
- Aristophanes, edited by F. W. Hall and W. M. Geldart (2  
vols., Oxford, 1906-1907)
- Aristophanes, Scholia, as in Scholia Graeca in Aristophanem,  
edited by Fr. Dübner (Paris, 1842)
- Aristotle, Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία, edited by Hans Oppermann  
(Leipzig, Teubner, 1928)

- Cicero, de amicitia, edited by K. Simbeck in M. Tulli Ciceronis scripta quae manserunt omnia, Fasc. 47 (Leipzig, Teubner, 1917)
- Cicero, Brutus, edited by P. Reis in M. Tulli Ciceronis scripta quae manserunt omnia, Fasc. 4 (Leipzig, Teubner, 1934)
- Cicero, Letters, as in The Correspondence of M. Tullius Cicero, edited by Robert Yelverton Tyrrell and Louis Claude Purser (7 vols., Vol. I in third edition, and Vols. II-VI in second edition, Dublin and London, 1901-1933)
- Demosthenes, edited by S. H. Butcher and W. Rennie (3 vols., Oxford, 1903-1931), Vols. I and II, Part 1, edited by S. H. Butcher, Vols. II, Part 2, and III by W. Rennie
- Diodoros, edited by Friedrich Vogel and Curt Theodor Fischer (5 vols., Leipzig, Teubner, 1888-1906), Vols. I-III edited by Friedrich Vogel, Vols. IV-V by Curt Theodor Fischer
- Dionysios of Halikarnassos, Antiquitates Romanae, edited by Karl Jacoby (4 vols., Leipzig, Teubner, 1885-1905)
- Eusebios, as in Eusebi Chronicorum Libri Duo, edited by Alfred Schoene (2 vols., Berlin, 1866-1875)

- Herodotos, edited by Karl Hude (2 vols., third edition, Oxford, 1927)
- Justin, edited by Otto Seel (Leipzig, Teubner, 1935)
- Krateros, no. 342 in Felix Jacoby, Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker, III B (Leyden, 1950), pp. 199-205
- Das Marmor Parium, edited by Felix Jacoby (Berlin, 1904)
- Nepos, edited by Alfred Fleckeisen (Leipzig, Teubner, 1919)
- Pausanias, edited by Friedrich Spiro (3 vols., Leipzig, Teubner, 1903)
- Philochoros, no. 328 in Felix Jacoby, Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker, III B (Leyden, 1950), pp. 97-160
- Plato, edited by John Burnet (5 vols., Oxford, 1899-1906)
- Plutarch, Lives, translated by Bernadotte Perrin (Loeb Classical Library, 11 vols., London and New York, 1914-1926)
- Plutarch, Vitae Parallelae, edited by Cl. Lindskog and K. Ziegler (4 vols., Leipzig, Teubner, 1914-1939)
- Plutarch, Moralia, edited by C. Hubert, W. Nachstädt, W. R. Paton, M. Pohlenz, W. Sieveking, I. Wegehaupt, J. B. Titchener (Leipzig, Teubner, from 1925)

- Polyainos, Strategemata, edited by Edward Woelfflin and Johann Melber (Leipzig, Teubner, 1887)
- Suidas, edited by Ada Adler, in Lexicographi Graeci, I (5 vols., Leipzig, Teubner, 1928-1938)
- Thucydides, edited by Henry Stuart Jones, revised by J. E. Powell (2 vols., Oxford, 1942)
- Thucydides, Scholia, as in Scholia in Thucydidem, edited by Karl Hude (Leipzig, Teubner, 1927)

#### MODERN SOURCES

- Andrewes, A., "Athens and Aegina, 510-480 B.C.," The Annual of the British School at Athens, XXXVII (1936-1937), pp. 1-7
- Bauer, Adolf, Literarische und historische Forschungen in Aristoteles 'Αθηναίων Πολιτεία (Munich, 1891)
- Bauer, Adolf, Themistokles, Studien und Beiträge zur griechischen Historiographie und Quellenkunde (Merseburg, 1881)
- Beloch, Karl Julius, Griechische Geschichte (2 vols., second edition, Strassburg, 1912-1927)

Bengtson, Hermann, Griechische Geschichte von den Anfängen bis in die römische Kaiserzeit (in Iwan von Müller's ,Walter Otto's, Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft, III, 4, Munich, 1950)

Bentley, Richard, A Dissertation upon the Epistles of Phalaris, Themistocles, Socrates, Euripides, and Others; and the Fables of Aesop, in Reflections upon Ancient and Modern Learning (second edition, London, 1697), by William Wotton

Bentley, Richard, A Dissertation upon the Epistles of Phalaris (1699), in The Works of Richard Bentley, edited by Alexander Dyce (2 vols., London, 1836)

Bergk, Th., "Ueber die  $\tau\alpha\mu\acute{\iota}\alpha\iota$  und das Archontenjahr des Themistokles," Rheinisches Museum für Philologie, XXXIX (1884), pp. 607-619

Bodin, L., "Histoire et biographie, Phantias d'Érèse," Revue des études grecques, XXVIII (1915), pp. 251-281

Bowra, C. M., Greek Lyric Poetry (Oxford, 1936)

Busolt, Georg, Griechische Geschichte bis zur Schlacht bei Chaeroneia (3 vols., second edition, Gotha, 1893-1904)

Cadoux, T. J., "The Athenian Archons from Kreon to Hypsichides," The Journal of Hellenic Studies, LXVIII (1948), pp. 70-123

- Carcopino, Jérôme, L'ostracisme athénien (Paris, 1935)
- Cary, M., "When was Themistocles ostracised?" The Classical Review, XXXVI (1922), pp. 161-162
- Caryophilus, Matthaeus Jo., Themistoclis epistulae (Rome, 1626)
- Cavaignac, E., "Eschyle et Thémistocle," Revue de philologie, XLV (1921), pp. 102-106
- Clinton, Henry Fynes, Fasti Hellenici (3 vols., Vol. III in second edition, Vol. II in third edition, Oxford, 1834-1851)
- Delebecque, Édouard, Euripide et la guerre du Péloponnèse (Paris, 1951)
- De Sanctis, Gaetano, Ἀρχαία, Storia della repubblica ateniese dalle origini alla età di Pericle (second edition, Turin, 1912)
- Diller, Aubrey, The Tradition of the Minor Greek Geographers (Philological Monographs of the American Philological Association, XIV, Lancaster, Pa., and Oxford, 1952)
- Doenges, Norman A., The Letters of Themistokles: A Survey (Dissertation, Princeton, 1953)

- Düring, Ingemar, Chion of Heraclea, A Novel in Letters  
(Acta universitatis Gotoburgensis, LVII, Gothenburg,  
1951)
- Ehrenberg, Victor, Sophocles and Pericles (Oxford, 1954)
- Flacelière, R., "Plutarque et les oracles béotiens (de defectu oraculorum, ch. 5: Moralia 412 AB)," Bulletin de correspondance hellénique, LXX (1946), pp. 199-207
- Flacelière, R., "Sur quelques points obscurs de la vie de Thémistocle," Revue des études anciennes, LV (1953), pp. 5-28
- Fühner, Hermann, "Der Tod des Themistokles, ein Selbstmord durch Stierblut," Rheinisches Museum für Philologie, XCI (1942), pp. 193-199
- Glötz, Gustave, and Cohen, Robert, Histoire grecque (Histoire ancienne, II), II, La Grèce au V<sup>e</sup> siècle (Paris, 1929)
- Glötz, Gustave, La solidarité de la famille dans le droit criminel en Grèce (Paris, 1904)
- Gomme, A. W., A Historical Commentary on Thucydides, I, Introduction and Commentary on Book I (Oxford, 1945)
- Gomme, A. W., "Athenian Notes," American Journal of Philology, LXV (1944), pp. 321-339

Habich, Heinrich Theodor, De epistolis Themistoclis (Gotha, 1849)

Hercher, Rudolf, Epistolographi Graeci (Paris, 1873)

Highby, Leo Ingemann, The Erythrae Decree, Contributions to the Early History of the Delian League and the Peloponnesian Confederacy (Klio, Beiheft. XXXVI, Leipzig, 1936)

Hignett, C., A History of the Athenian Constitution to the End of the Fifth Century B.C. (Oxford, 1952)

How, W. W., and Wells, J., A Commentary on Herodotus (2 vols., Oxford, 1912)

Jackson, J., "The Text of the Epistles of Themistocles," The Classical Quarterly, XIX (1925), pp. 167-176

Jackson, J., "The Text of the Epistles of Themistocles" (continued), The Classical Quarterly, XX (1926), pp. 27-35

Jacoby, Felix, Apollodors Chronik (Philologische Untersuchungen, XVI, Berlin, 1902)

Jacoby, Felix, Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker (Berlin and Leyden, from 1923)

- Johnston, J., "Chronological Note on the Expedition of Leotychidas to Thessaly," Hermathena, XLVI (1931), pp. 106-111
- Judeich, Walther, Topographie von Athen (in Iwan von Müller's Walter Otto's, Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft, III, 2, 2, second edition, Munich, 1931)
- Kahrstedt, U., s.v. Themistokles, in Pauly-Wissowa, Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft, Zweite Reihe, V (1934), pp. 1686-1697
- Kenyon, F. G., 'Αθηναίων Πολιτεία: Aristotle on the Constitution of Athens (third edition, London and Oxford, 1892)
- Kirchner, Johannes, Prosopographia Attica (2 vols., Berlin, 1901-1903)
- Krech, Paul, de Crateri ψηφισμάτων συναγωγῆ et de locis aliquot Plutarchi ex ea petitis (Diss. inaug. Berolinensis, Greifswald, 1888)
- Kroll, W., s.v. Kallaischros, in Pauly-Wissowa, Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft, XX (1919), p. 1609
- Krüger, K. W., Historisch philologische Studien (2 vols., Berlin, 1836-1851)

Lehmann, C. F., "Pausanias', des Spartaners, Todesjahr,"  
Beiträge zur alten Geschichte (=Klio), II (1902),  
 pp. 345-346

Lehmann-Haupt, C. F., "Pausanias, Heros Ktistes von Byzanz.  
 Mit einer Beigabe: Der Sturz des Pausanias, des Themis-  
 tokles und des Leotychidas," Klio, XVII (1921), pp.  
 59-73

Méautis, Georges, "Thucydide et Thémistocle," L'antiquité  
 classique, XX (1951), pp. 297-304

Meritt, Benjamin Dean, Wade-Gery, H. T., McGregor, Malcolm  
 Francis, The Athenian Tribute Lists (4 vols., Cambridge,  
 Mass., and Princeton, 1939-1953)

Meyer, Eduard, Geschichte des Alterthums (5 vols., Vol. I  
 in fourth edition, Vols. II and III in second edition,  
 Vols. IV and V in third edition, Stuttgart and Berlin,  
 1921-1939)

McGregor, Malcolm F., "The Pro-Persian Party at Athens from  
 510 to 480 B.C.," Harvard Studies in Classical Philology,  
 Suppl. Vol. I (1940), pp. 71-95

Munro, J. A. R., and Walker, E. M., "Marathon," in The  
 Cambridge Ancient History, IV (Cambridge, 1926), pp.  
 229-267

- Munro, J. Arthur R., "The Chronology of Themistocles' Career," The Classical Review, VI (1892), pp. 333-334
- Niessing, Wilhelm, De Themistoclis epistulis (Dissertation, Freiburg, 1929)
- Obens, Wilhelm, Qua aetate Socratis et Socraticorum epistulae, quae dicuntur, scriptae sint (Dissertation, Westphalia, 1912)
- Parker, Richard A., and Dubberstein, Waldo H., Babylonian Chronology 626 B.C. - A.D. 45 (Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization, XXIV, Chicago, 1942)
- Raubitschek, A. E., "Leagros," Hesperia, VIII (1939), pp. 155-164
- Ribbeck, W., "Bentley und die Briefe des Themistokles," Rheinisches Museum für Philologie, XVII (1862), pp. 202-215
- Robinson, C. A., Jr., "The Date of Themistocles' Ostracism," American Journal of Philology, LXVII (1946), pp. 265-266
- Robinson, C. A., Jr., "The Struggle for Power at Athens," American Journal of Philology, LX (1939), pp. 232-237

- Sandys, John Edwin, Ἀριστοτέλους Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία,  
Aristotle's Constitution of Athens (second edition,  
London, 1912)
- Schmid, Wilhelm, and Stählin, Otto, Geschichte der griechischen Literatur, I, 2, Die griechische Literatur in der Zeit der attischen Hegemonie vor dem Eingreifen der Sophistik (in Iwan von Müller's, Walter Otto's, Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft, VII, 1, 2, Munich, 1934)
- Sykutris, J., s.v. Epistolographie, in Pauly-Wissowa, Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft, Suppl. Vol. V (1931), pp. 186-220
- Ure, P. N., "When was Themistokles last in Athens?" The Journal of Hellenic Studies, XLI (1921), pp. 165-178
- Ure, P. N., "Themistocles, Aeschylus, and Diodorus," The Classical Review, XXXVII (1923), p. 64
- Vanderpool, Eugene, "The Rectangular Rock-cut Shaft," Hesperia, XV (1946), pp. 265-336
- Vanderpool, Eugene, "The Route of Pausanias in the Athenian Agora," Hesperia, XVIII (1949), pp. 128-137

- Wade-Gery, H. T., "Themistokles' Archonship," The Annual of the British School at Athens, XXXVII (1936-1937), pp. 263-270
- Walker, E. M., "Athens: the Reform of Cleisthenes," in The Cambridge Ancient History, IV (Cambridge, 1926), pp. 137-172
- Walker, E. M., "The Chronology of the Pentecontaetia," in The Cambridge Ancient History, V (Cambridge, 1927), pp. 465-469
- Walker, E. M., "The Confederacy of Delos, 478-463 B.C.," in The Cambridge Ancient History, V (Cambridge, 1927), pp. 33-67
- Westermann, Anton, "Beiträge zur Kritik der angeblichen Briefe des Themistokles," Berichte über die Verhandlungen der königlich sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig, Phil.-Hist. Klasse, I, 5 (1849), pp. 215-244
- Westermann, Anton, Themistoclis epistolae, published in three parts, each as a Program (Leipzig, 1858-1859)
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Ulrich von, Aristoteles und Athen (2 vols., Berlin, 1893)

Wilcken, Ulrich, Griechische Geschichte im Rahmen der  
Altertumsgeschichte (second edition, Munich and  
Berlin, 1926)

Zimmern, Alfred, The Greek Commonwealth (fourth edition,  
Oxford, 1924)