

PROLOGUE

Although Anaximander's cosmology has been the focus of much attention, his views on the origin and development of humanity have received surprisingly little attention. Most would attribute this to a lack of evidence. But evidence there is, although it is not necessarily from Peripatetic sources, which many scholars find the only valid testimony. While it is true that a certain amount of conjecture must be taken for granted when reconstructing it, this position is no more conjectural, in my view, than the myriad of opinions on how to interpret (and reconstruct) the often conflicting doxographical evidence concerning his cosmological works.

Anaximander's book was one of the first known examples of prose, and his choice of this new medium may have been an attempt to free the language of philosophy from undesirable connotations or preconceptions regarding poetry. Poetry had long been a vehicle of myth, and its rhythms and diction might, in his eyes, have hindered speculative thought. Of course, poetry as a medium for speculative thought did not disappear. Indeed, it remained the medium of preference for the so-called Italian as opposed to the Ionian school. More important, without the medium of writing in general, and without the Greek alphabet in particular, speculative thought would not have seen the light of day. Anaximander was clearly aware of this. The alphabet, however, was not a sufficient cause to account for the advent of speculative thought. The forces at play are, as we will see, extremely complex.

Before examining Anaximander's radical new theory on the origin of humanity and civilization, I give a brief analysis of the more traditional/mythical approach to the question in Greece. It must be remembered that after Anaximander articulated his naturalistic approach to how the present order of things was established, it still took many generations for the general population to come to terms with his radical new ideas. As Aristophanes clearly demonstrates in the *Clouds*, Anaximander's naturalistic explanation of thunder and lightning was still perceived by many as a blasphemy toward Zeus. And we still see Euthyphro, in the Platonic dialogue that carries his name (*Euthyphro* 23b–c), affirming a literal interpretation of the battle of the gods and other scenes in Hesiod's *Theogony*. Such persistent adherence to religious accounts should not surprise us if we consider that today many continue to take the creation story in Genesis to be literally true.

Those who adhere to a literal interpretation of Genesis are thereby committed to accepting the representation of the origins of humanity and society as coeval, so that human beings come into existence within the context of a fully functioning society. Representing society as coming into being without a real past is the norm in mythical accounts, including Hesiod's. Therefore, to fully appreciate how radical Anaximander's new ideas are with respect to

the origins of humanity and society/civilization, they must be put into perspective. This will necessitate a certain amount of digression, but the great Milesian will always be in the background. When we turn to Anaximander's own position on the origin of civilization, much of the focus will be on a reconstruction of his famous map and how it explains, in light of the doxographical and historical evidence, the real aim of his own *historia*.

According to W. A. Heidel, the aim of Anaximander's book was "to sketch the life-history of the cosmos from the moment of its emergence from infinitude to the author's own time."¹ This also is precisely what Hesiod attempted in the *Theogony*. He sought to explain how Zeus established the present order of things, natural and social. This is the aim of a cosmogonical myth in general, and Anaximander is clearly attempting to accomplish the same end. This is why he must begin with a cosmogony, and go on to an anthropogony, and end up with a politogony.² However, his approach is radically different, since his explanation is not only naturalistic, but he clearly and distinctly separates all three developments. Meanwhile, Anaximander was no armchair philosopher. He formulated his theory through investigation and discovery; he traveled extensively, notably, it will be argued, to Egypt via Naucratis. In this regard, I attempt to show that Egypt or, more precisely, the Nile Delta, was in certain respects the center of the universe, that is, the center before the shift, the shift to Miletus. I believe that there is a good deal of circumstantial evidence for this, but the argument must be read as a whole. Some of the evidence here will corroborate Martin Bernal's claims regarding the relation between Greece and Egypt, albeit for different reasons. It is all part of what one author has called "the Egyptian mirage in ancient Greece."

THE ORIGIN OF HUMANITY IN TRADITIONAL (OR MYTHICAL) THOUGHT

The Greeks had, in substance, two concurrent traditional discourses to explain the origin of humanity. They thought that man either emerged from the earth like a plant or that he was fashioned by a divine artist. Excellent examples of the first discourse are the Platonic myth of the *γηγενεῖς*, "born [*γεν-] of the earth [γη],"³ or the Theban and Athenian myths of autochthony (from *αὐτόχθων*, "born from the soil [*χθών*] itself [*αὐτός*]."⁴ The second discourse is illustrated by Hesiod with the myth of Pandora, the first "woman." She was fashioned by Hephaestus from a mixture of water and earth.⁵ In sum, what we have here is a sort of opposition between nature and artifice. The first account, however, was more prevalent than the second, due to its logical anteriority. This is nicely explained in the following passage from Socrates' speech in Plato's *Menexenus* 237e–238a:

The fact that everything that gives birth is supplied with the food its offspring needs is weighty testimony for this assertion that the earth hereabouts gave birth to these men's ancestors and ours. For by this sign it can be seen clearly whether or not a woman has really given birth: she is foisting off an infant not her own, if she does not have within her the wellsprings of its nourishments. The earth here, our mother, offers precisely this as sufficient testimony that she has brought forth humans. She first and she alone in that olden time bore food fit for humans, wheat and barley, which are the finest and best nourishment for the human race, because she really was the mother of this creature. And such testimonies are to be taken more seriously on earth's behalf than a woman's, inasmuch as earth does not mimic woman in conceiving and generating, but woman earth. (trans. Paul Ryan)

Such an argument, by analogy, is clearly very old. However, the problem is not so much to explain the origin of the "first humans" as to explain how they became the "first parents," the ancestors of the human race. After all, if the first "men" emerged from Mother Earth like plants, there also must have been a beginning to the endless cycle of reproduction, for otherwise humanity would not have been able to perpetuate itself. A man who is really a man is born from other men and not from the unknown, and man quite obviously is not born from the same, but from the other, that is, from woman. Thus numerous myths arose to overcome this contradiction between the legend and the daily reality: "Tell me your race and your homeland" says the proverbial Homeric phrase, "for you did not come from the legendary oak nor from a stone" (*Odyssey* 19.162–63; *Iliad* 22.136).⁶

Hesiod's version of the myth of Prometheus explains the origin of the contradiction and thus the origin of the human condition. According to this myth, there was a time, long ago, when men were not yet isolated from the gods. They lived peacefully together. They sat at the same tables and ate the same food at common banquets. In this time, men lived without women. They emerged, like wheat, directly from the earth that produced them. Since birth through procreation was unknown, they knew neither old age nor death. They disappeared as youthful as in their first days and in a peace similar to sleep. If later men had to procreate to survive as a race, it is because an unfortunate incident occurred that separated them from the gods. The Prometheus story explains why this "separation" occurred. The "drama" unfolds in three acts⁷: (1) Prometheus, who is charged with distributing the food portions, defrauds the gods to the advantage of mortals/men; (2) Zeus, to avenge himself, hides his fire from men, that is, the celestial fire that men need to cook their food. Prometheus comes to their aid and again deceives Zeus by stealing fire. Indeed, without fire man cannot cook his food (and thus

feed himself), and thus he is condemned to annihilation; (3) Zeus, who is furious to see the fire in the hands of men, responds by creating woman (γυνή), that is, Pandora, who will be a primary source of human evil—albeit equally an important asset.⁸

Pandora is presented as the first spouse and as the ancestor of the female species (*Theogony* 591). With the appearance of the woman, men who originally emerged directly from the earth are no longer qualified as ἄνθρωποι (*Theogony* 586, 588–89), that is, as humans as opposed to gods. Rather, now they are qualified as ἄνδρες (*Theogony* 592), that is, males as opposed to females (*Theogony* 590–91). This is the case, because men can no longer live and reproduce without women. In sum, if the creation of the woman is the ultimate consequence of the separation of men from the gods, the paradox consists in the fact that “men” are not truly part of the human condition until they become ἄνδρες, that is, half of humanity. This version of events appears to be a purely Greek phenomenon, for in other cultures the creation of women is not distinguished from the creation of men.

Meanwhile, this explanation is not without ambiguity. Like the Oedipus myth analyzed by Lévi-Strauss, the Prometheus myth “expresses the impossibility in which a society is found when it professes to believe in the autochthony of man, and, passing from this theory, to the recognition of the fact that each of us is really born from the union of a man and a woman”(1958, 239). Indeed, how can men who are truly men and women who are truly women be born from a sexual union if one postulates that each of the sexes has a separate origin? “Are we born of only one or of two?” “Is the same born of the same or of the other?” (ibid.). In other words, must one admit that there are male seeds and female seeds? And, if yes, how from one do we get a mixing of the sexes? These are questions, of course, with which Greek philosophers, physicians, and even tragedians were constantly preoccupied.⁹ And if there is a merit to be recognized in these myths, it is certainly that it posed these questions.

Nevertheless, there were other ways to explain the relationship between the original humans and their posterity. One could either tell a story of a divine origin of humanity (e.g., Hesiod’s *Works and Days*, 108; Pindar’s *Nemean Ode* 6.1ff.) and explain the transition between the time of origins and the historical time of men through a sort of general repetition, or one could tell a story of a catastrophe that annihilated virtually all of the first humans, after which the survivors made a fresh start.

An illustration of the first case is Phoroneus, the mythical ancestor of the Argives and the first human. He is considered either as the son solely of the river Inachos or the son of Inachos and his sister Melia.¹⁰ The myth does not tell us how the son of Inachos put an end to the primordial time in which the first inhabitants of Argos were the rivers, and there is no indication that they were troubled by this question. The Argives simply were looking for an

eponymous ancestor who was both fully human and prestigious by birth (not to mention the distinction of having given birth to humanity). From this perspective, the present could find its justification in a genealogy that linked it to the distant past.

An example of the second case is offered by the first couple: Deucalion and Pyrrha. According to the legend, Deucalion was the son of Prometheus and Pyrrheia, and Pyrrha was the daughter of Epimetheus and Pandora.¹¹ A first humanity originated from this primordial couple, however, they were subsequently destroyed by the Flood (Pindar's *Olympian Ode* 9.42–53). It is uncertain who caused the Flood, but Apollodorus (1.7.2) states that it was Zeus in one of his notorious rages. Deucalion and Pyrrha, however, were warned in advance by Prometheus.¹² This warning allowed the couple to build the Greek ark (or chest: *λάρναξ*) in which to take refuge while the cataclysm wiped out the rest of humanity. When the rain finally stopped and the couple touched firm ground, Deucalion offered Zeus a sacrifice, and in return Zeus sent Hermes to grant Deucalion a wish. Deucalion desired that there once again be men (*λαοί*). As a result, a new humanity originated from the stones (*λάεζ*) that the husband and wife threw over their shoulders. When the stones touched the earth, those thrown by Deucalion became men, while those thrown by Pyrrha became women.¹³ It is only later that Deucalion and Pyrrha sired their own children, including Hellen, the ancestor of all the Greeks.

According to this myth, a new humanity was thus born or reborn from death. Indeed, not only is the Greek ark (*λάρναξ*) a source of life (or rebirth) for humanity, but it also serves as a coffin (see LSJ). This is consistent with the play on words or the etymological creation between *λάεζ* (stone) and *λαός* (people).¹⁴ Stones, seemingly inanimate objects, also are the source of life and death for men. As Pindar so pertinently observes, Deucalion and Pyrrha first gave birth to the “stone people” (*λίθινον γόνον*, *Olympian Ode* 9.45–46e; see also Apollodorus 1.7.2). Thus it is not surprising that it is without sexual union that Deucalion engenders the *ἄνδρες* and Pyrrha engenders the *γυναῖκες*, that is, the same produces the same. Subsequently, however, the couple will procreate to bring Hellen to the world. This signifies that the existence of Pyrrha as a woman is finally assured.¹⁵ The idea that many humanities succeeded each other following similar downfalls or cataclysms (floods) is certainly not absent in the new rational thought, although it insists, as we shall see, on empirical observation to explain this succession.

THE ORIGIN OF ANIMALS AND HUMANITY ACCORDING TO ANAXIMANDER

What was Anaximander's position on the origin of humanity? The explanation that Anaximander gives us of the origin of humanity and of the other

living beings (not mentioned by the poets and/or in mythical accounts) is, as in the case of his cosmology, the first naturalistic explanation in this domain. As one might expect, his explanation is entirely consistent with his cosmological system. Indeed, the same natural processes are at work (DK 12A27). Living beings emerge from a sort of primeval moisture or slime (ἐξ ὑγροῦ), which is activated by the heat of the sun after the initial formation of the universe.¹⁶ In sum, life results from the action of the hot and the dry on the cold and the wet. Now although Anaximander clearly believed in a “spontaneous generation,” he did not believe, as did the poets, that humanity and other animal species emerged “whole” from the earth. Indeed, there is an astonishing consistency to his account. According to Aetius (12A30), Anaximander argued that the first animals (τὰ πρῶτα ζῷα) that arose from primeval humidity (ἐν ὑγρῷ) were enclosed (or surrounded, περιεχόμενα) in a thorny bark (φλοιοῖς ἀκανθώδεσι),¹⁷ but that after they grew older and matured, they emerged (ἀποβαίνειν) on dry land, shed their thorny coverings, and in a short time after (ἐπ’ ὀλίγον χρόνον) began a modified form of existence (μεταβιῶναι), that is, adapted to their new environment.¹⁸ Although it is clear that “all” living creatures arose from the primeval humidity,¹⁹ Aetius clearly is referring to potential land animals in his doxography (12A30). It is therefore unclear if Anaximander thought that all living creatures were originally covered in “thorny bark”(φλοιοῖς ἀκανθώδεσι) or only the first potential “land animals.” Nor is it clear why Anaximander thought that the first land animals were initially covered this way. The first thing that comes to mind is that it afforded them some sort of protection. But protection from what? Conche conjectures protection from some sort of marine animal such as carnivorous fish.²⁰ However, if Anaximander believed that all marine animals once had thorny encasements, even the carnivorous fish would have been protected in a similar way. Indeed, Conche’s conjecture presupposes that various species of animals already coexisted in the primeval marine environment (we may assume that Anaximander believed that the first creatures were nourished by the primeval slime). Yet it is unclear (although commentators tend to take it for granted) whether Anaximander thought that the various “potential” land animal species already had different “forms” when they inhabited the “marine environment.” What seems certain from the doxographical evidence is that as some of these “thorny” creatures matured, they somehow “migrated” to dry land. And once on dry land, the thorny skin was shed at some point, and shortly after this their mode of living was modified accordingly. Of course, it was only after the heat of the sun had evaporated enough of the moisture for dry land to appear that the marine animals could in fact migrate to it (which means that they were not immobile). In sum, the evidence suggests (contra Barnes) that Anaximander recognized a connection between his hypothesis of a drying earth and his zoogonical theories.²¹ Clearly

the climatic conditions were behind the numerous changes or modifications in animals, even though the animals themselves had to adapt, that is, transform, to adapt to their new environment (a point Plato was happy to endorse in *Laos* 6.782a–c). Thus there is no doubt that the doxographical evidence suggests that Anaximander defended a doctrine of the transformation of species rather than the immutability of species, although there is nothing to suggest that he also argued (or even suggested) that the transformation was (or would be) ongoing in a manner even reminiscent of Empedocles, let alone Lamarck or Darwin.

What about the human species? The doxographies suggest that, according to Anaximander, humans did not undergo a transformation completely similar to that of other animal species. Pseudo-Plutarch states that Anaximander believed that in the beginning the human species (ἄνθρωπος) must have been born from living things (or creatures) of another species (ἐξ ἀλλοειδῶν ζώων), because humans are the only animals in need of prolonged nursing after birth, otherwise they would not have survived.²² Hippolytus is more precise. He says that, for Anaximander, humans (ἄνθρωπον) were originally similar to (παρὰλήσιον) another creature, namely, a fish (ἰχθύι).²³ Censorius confirms this and explains the reasoning behind it. He says that the Milesian believed that humans initially were formed inside of fish or creatures resembling fish (*pisces seu picibus simillima animalia*). When the human embryos reached puberty (and thus were capable of reproduction), the fishlike animals broke open and men and women (*viros mulieresque*) who were capable of nourishing themselves emerged.²⁴ Plutarch, for his part, corroborates at least part of Censorius' doxography.²⁵ He also states that, according to Anaximander, humans first were born in fish and nourished like dogfish sharks (ἐν ἰχθύσιν ἐγγενέσθαι τὸ πρῶτον ἄνθρώπους ἀποφαίνεται καὶ τραφέντας, ὥσπερ οἱ γαλεοί), and that it was only after they were capable of looking after themselves that they came out (ἐκβῆναι) and took to the land (γῆς λαβέσθαι).

Some remarks are in order here. According to the doxographical evidence, Anaximander believed that the human species evolved in a distinctive way, compared to the other animal species. Three doxographies mention that Anaximander thought that the human species evolved in a way different from other animal species (Plutarch, Censorius, and Pseudo-Plutarch), and three doxographies mention a relation with fish in this context (Hippolytus, Censorius, and Pseudo-Plutarch). The general reasoning behind the former is that human infants need their parents to care for them for a long period of time, whereas other newborn animals can quickly look after themselves.²⁶ This is Pseudo-Plutarch's understanding, and it is confirmed in a sense by both Censorius and Plutarch. Pseudo-Plutarch, for his part, does not mention fish, but only that humans originated (ἐγγενέσθαι) from creatures of a different

kind (ἐξ ἄλλοειδῶν ζώων), although he clearly has aquatic animals in mind, since *all* land animals have an aquatic origin. Hippolytus confirms a relation between humans and fish, although he says only that the human species was originally similar to (παραπλήσιον) fish.²⁷ But what does this mean? If we did not have any other doxographical evidence, we simply would say that humans had a marine existence before transforming into land animals. However, Censorius is much more explicit. He says that Anaximander thought that humans were first formed in fish or fishlike creatures. Censorius accounts for the way Anaximander perceived this. Originally the primordial sea (or the primeval slime) must have secreted (after being acted on by the heat of the sun) different kinds of embryonic life-forms, albeit not necessarily at the same time.²⁸ Some of these embryos evolved into fish or fishlike creatures; others evolved into land animals. Human embryos, on Censorius' account, were, at some point, somehow swallowed by fish or fishlike creatures but were able to survive like parasites. The human embryos were able, in time, to mature inside of these creatures. When they did reach maturity, the fishlike creature erupted, and men *and* women who were already able to fend for themselves emerged and, one would presume, were able to procreate. Since we can assume from Censorius' account that human beings immediately took to dry land after emerging from the fishlike creatures, it follows either that evolution was rapid or that human embryos were secreted by the sea at a later stage. Plutarch appears to confirm Censorius' account when he states that Anaximander (unlike the Syrians, who attributed a common parentage to fish and humans) declares not only that humans and fish are from the same element, as the Syrians do, but also that humans were first born in fish (ἐν ἰχθύσιν ἐγενέσθαι τὸ πρῶτον ἀνθρώπους). Indeed, he concurs with Censorius that humans also were nourished in fish. What Plutarch adds is the type of fish in which this occurred: the smooth dogfish (γαλεοί), which is, like all sharks, a placental animal that gives birth to live young.²⁹

This fish, according to Plutarch (*On the Cleverness of Animals* 982c; *On Affection for Offspring* 494c), has a number of fascinating qualities, including viviparous reproduction, nursing of the young within their own bodies, and extruding the young and taking them back again.³⁰ It is because humans were cared for inside of sharks that they were (eventually) able to look after themselves and then (τηνικαῦτα) come forth (ἐκβῆναι) and take to dry land (γῆς λαβέσθαι). Of course, Plutarch does not state that the dogfish ruptures, as Censorius notes, after humans reach their maturity inside. The important point to retain with regard to the testimonia of Censorius and Plutarch is that Anaximander was genuinely concerned with accounting for the origin of humans based on the fact that, unlike other land animals, they would be unable to survive as a species without some initial help from Mother Nature. Plutarch and Censorius may be just conjecturing on the source of their own

information.³¹ However, based on the testimonia, it seems safe to say that Anaximander argued that in the beginning, the human species was born from a different animal species that was capable of nourishing humans until they could support themselves.³² We do not know, according to Anaximander, at what moment, or under what influence, the embryo becomes male or female, or when humans begin to procreate. Yet one thing is certain, namely, *man* no longer has the temporal and logical priority over *woman* that he possessed in the mythical accounts of the Greeks. Moreover, this is the first rational/naturalistic account of the origin of humanity of which we are aware.

Before reconstructing and examining Anaximander's account of the development of society, I recall how this development was perceived before the advent of speculative thought.

THE ORIGIN OF SOCIETY ACCORDING TO MYTHICAL ACCOUNTS

For ancient peoples, society comes into existence without a real past, in the sense that it only reflects the result of a series of events that took place *in illo tempore*, that is, before the "chronological" time of the people who narrate the myth. Not only did these events unfold in a time and under conditions that were very different from those experienced by the society narrating the myth, but they also were due to the intervention of supernatural beings. It is for these reasons that the members of archaic society considered their social structure as defined once and for all.

In general, a cosmogonical myth is a traditional explanation of how the world order (natural and social) originated for the social group. The world order is seen as the result of the intervention of supernatural beings in another world in a remote past that is different from the one in which the social group lives. The world order generally is understood in terms of the "social reality" of the other world. This "social reality" is perceived as the outcome of a series of conflicts and/or agreements between gods. It is a sort of mirror in which the society narrating the myth observes itself and measures its stability, and the fact that this tradition is "performed" by the community only enhances its persuasive power.

Ironically, the Homeric tradition has not bequeathed us a cosmogonical myth strictly speaking, although it is clear that the social reality of Homeric society, in particular the heroic aspect, is a mirror of divine or Olympian society, which in turn mirrors the society (albeit with some confusion) in which the community narrating the tradition resides. While the epics are not without a good deal of historical authenticity (even a rationalist such as Thucydides believed in the Trojan War), the poems represent an age in which deities intervened openly in human life, in a way that later they did not. Not

surprisingly, the deities are portrayed as anthropomorphic beings who not only behave like humans but who actually speak and interact with them. They love, feel anger, suffer, and are mutually related as husbands and wives, parents and children. In sum, the deities are portrayed as persons and not abstractions. Nor is their sexual activity confined to themselves; the heroes are demigods, because one of their parents (or grandparents) is divine. The struggles of the heroes, therefore, move their divine parents to action.

Since what distinguishes one god from another is, as for the heroes, their $\mu\omicron\iota\rho\alpha$ of $\tau\iota\mu\acute{\eta}$ (portions of honor)³³, and since respect for this is the essence of social order, it should be no surprise that human/heroic society and divine society are perceived as having a similar sociopolitical structure in Homer. Just as the deities assemble and sit in council in Olympus,³⁴ so do the heroes/humans assemble and sit in council.³⁵ Just as Zeus is considered king of the gods,³⁶ so Agammon is king of men.³⁷

Hesiod, for his part, did bequeath a cosmogonical account. Indeed, his *Theogony* is a perfect example of a cosmogonical myth. It provides us with an early account of how the world order in which the Greeks lived originated. It describes the origin of the world and of the gods and events that led to the establishment of the present order. It explains how Zeus, after a series of sociopolitical power struggles, defeated his enemies and distributed, as the new ruler, the $\mu\omicron\iota\rho\alpha$ of $\tau\iota\mu\acute{\alpha}$ among the gods.³⁸ The *Theogony* thus explains the origin of the organizational structure and code of values of the gods (and by extension the heroes and humans), which we see in action in Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey*.

As Gregory Nagy correctly notes, "the narrative structure of epic, as is the case with myth and mythopoeic thinking in general, frame a value system that sustains and in fact educates a given society" (1982, 43). It may be difficult to determine to what degree Hesiod's *Theogony* is his own creation. There is no doubt, however, that it would have been performed (and thus ritualized, so to speak) before an audience. Further, there is no doubt that it was addressed to an "aristocratic elite," and that it was meant to enhance their value system—a Homeric and thus "conservative" value system, at least by current standards. It is conservative because Hesiod is (or seems to be) advocating a sociopolitical model in which the so-called βασιλείς or kings are the representatives of Zeus here on earth, and in which their word is analogous to the word of Zeus and should thus be obeyed. Of course, it appears that as long as the kings do not make unfair judgments, Hesiod would (or so it seems) have no problem with this "conservative" value system. However, *Works and Days* presents a very different position.

If oral literature, tradition, and myth are a sort of mirror in which the society observes itself and measures its proper stability, then Hesiod's *Works and Days* is a wake-up call. While it does contain several traditional myths

that convey messages that the social group could have considered as having been transmitted by its ancestors, in many respects it is advocating a new type of social reform, a new type of general ἀρετή.

SOME REFLECTIONS ON THE EVOLUTION OF THE *POLIS* BEFORE ANAXIMANDER

In *Works and Days* as in *Theogony*, the kings are again at center stage; however, the description offered by Hesiod in the former is radically different from the latter. The story of the hawk and the nightingale (235–45) makes it clear that the kings have a considerable, if not an absolute, amount of power over their subjects, which they have no qualms about applying. Hesiod appears of the opinion, as are most of us, that “absolute power” corrupts. The kings embody ὕβρις or violence, that is, the Homeric principle that might, or pure self-interest, is right, as opposed to justice. Without justice, Hesiod believes that people will devour themselves like wild animals, that there will be a sort of Hobbesian state of nature—not unlike what preceded the reign of Zeus. However, Hesiod is not easily intimidated, as the story of the hawk and nightingale may leave one to believe.

Hesiod directly challenges the kings of Thespies with an astonishing amount of “free speech.” The fact that the poem would have been “performed” extensively throughout the Greek world only enhances this point. The kings are unequivocally characterized as “greedy” and their verdicts as “corrupt.” On three occasions in *Works and Days*, he describes them as “bribe-eating” (δωροφάγοι, 39, 221, 264) and characterizes their sentences (δίκαι) as crooked or unjust (σκολιαί) (221, 250, 262). The kings also are contrasted with the δῆμος or people (261).

In *Theogony*, receiving gifts in exchange for delivering judgments is a right of a mediator or king, and Hesiod painted there a rather flattering picture of the custom. In *Works and Days*, Hesiod clearly is vexed by the system of gifts. He doubts that the verdict or δίκη will be straight, and he suggests that he has firsthand knowledge of this. Clearly, the lords appear more interested in the gift than the sentence, and consequently they appear, at least from Hesiod’s perspective, to announce a settlement so that the litigants will surely return. In sum, the nobles are likely to be the only ones who profit from this system. In Hesiod’s eyes, it must be replaced at any cost, for clearly it has a “legal force.” What is worse, they see their δίκη as a question of τιμή (honor). Hesiod appears to be advocating nothing short of dispensing with the kings, for they embody and indeed endorse the destructive *eris* (competition or struggle). In fact, Hesiod appears convinced that the people will pay for the arrogance of the nobles unless δίκη (justice/right) rather than

τιμή becomes the central virtue (see Murray 1993, 61). This is clear from his paradigm of the two cities in *Works and Days*: the city of δίκη and the city of ὕβρις or hubris (225–47). Hubris is responsible for famine, poverty, plague, and so on (240ff.). However, Hesiod contends at 217–18 that δίκη eventually will triumph over ὕβρις. Δίκη will punish greedy men (220–23). The fact that Hesiod employs δίκη twenty-one times from line 213 to 285 is indicative of its importance. Hesiod appears to see justice as a “method of procedure” and appears to try to objectify the notion. The fact that Δίκη is personified and becomes the protector of society reinforces this conviction. With the elimination of the kings or nobles, what remains—if not a call for a written code of laws?³⁹

THE EMERGENCE OF THE *POLIS* AND THE INVENTION OF POLITICS

The codification of law is just one of several interrelated events associated with the emergence during the archaic period of a uniquely Greek phenomenon: the *polis* or city-state. The πόλις was a small, independent, and self-governing community in which all major activity, political, religious, and social, was concentrated in one specific point, the ἀγορά or public gathering place at the center of the city. Now what is at the origin of the *agora*? According to Vernant, even though it appears for the first time in the Greek colonies, its essence goes back to the old warriors’ assembly, which took place in a circle and where each man could speak freely on the condition that he entered the circle and placed himself ἐν μέσῳ, that is, at the *center*.⁴⁰ It is this assembly of equals that was to become, after a series of economic and social transformations, the *agora* of the city where all of the citizens (although initially only the aristocracy) could debate and discuss, in common, the affairs of the community. In the final analysis, the *agora* is the circular and centered space that permitted all of the citizens to affirm themselves as ἴσοι, equals, and ὅμοιοι, peers, and to enter with one another into a relation of identity, symmetry, and reciprocity. In sum, they form a united cosmos.

No particular factor can qualify as a “sufficient” cause for the rise of the *polis*, but certainly one very important factor was the absence of a rigidly hierarchical communal structure that was religiously sanctioned. However, the rediscovery of the Orient, trade, the technology of writing, colonization, military innovation, the institution of tyranny and, of course, the codification of law, were also contributing factors. Since these interrelated factors explain in many respects the impetus behind Anaximander’s *historia* or investigation, I think that it is important to give a brief overview of these connecting factors by a transition from Hesiod to Anaximander.

There is a consensus that Hesiod's poetic activity falls somewhere between 750 and 650 B.C. This is precisely the period during which writing became widespread in Greece. Indeed, it has been argued that Hesiod himself may have composed with the aide of writing. What is certain is that written law occurs shortly after the advent of writing.⁴¹ The laws of Zaleukus in Locri and of Charondas in Catana date around 675 B.C.E., and there is an extant law from Dreros on Crete inscribed in stone that dates from around the same time (650 B.C.E.).⁴² The *first* laws of Gortyn, another city on Crete (in fact, the first to yield a complete code), also date from around 650 B.C.E. At Locri and Catana in Western Greece, Zaleukus and Charondas already were trying to fix the penalty for each offense, and in doing so it appears that they were trying to unify a judicial system and save the citizens from the fluctuations of the sentences, that is, the arbitrariness of the judges/nobles. The main purpose of the extant law from Dreros is to define the limits of authority, in particular, the *kosmos* or chief magistrate, in the city (*polis*).⁴³ The Gortyn code, for its part, clearly implies that the magistrate is bound by the letter of the law.

Now the colonies of Locri and Catana were founded in around 673 and 720, respectively (see Boardman 1999, 184, 169–70). This suggests that in the case of Locri, the colonists went there with the expressed wish of establishing a *polis* or city-state in which the power would not be limited to nobles. In the case of Catana, on the other hand, given that it was founded by the aristocratic-dominated state of Chalcis in Euboea, the colonists must have established a law code after no longer tolerating the exported mentality of the founding city: *τιμή* and thus *δίκη* for some, but not for others.

But why, we may ask, did the Greeks begin to set up colonies? The origin of colonization is of course complex. Evidence exists that the first colonies were set up as trading posts, and the first to have done this appear to have been the Euboeans. Al Mina at the mouth of the Orontes river in Northern Syria was settled by the Euboeans (or at least employed as a trading post) as early as 825 B.C.E. It has been suggested that metals were the main item the traders were looking for, as well as Phoenician-manufactured goods such as dyed cloth and worked gold, silver, ivory and bronze (see Boardman 1999, 46; Dillon and Garland 1994, 18). Moreover, given that the alphabet was borrowed from the Phoenicians, it probably was here or in a similar location and situation that the Greek alphabet was invented. Indeed, there is good evidence that the Euboeans, who were only a short distance from where Hesiod grew up, were among the first to employ the alphabet for a variety of purposes, including literary.⁴⁴ The Euboeans also were the first to settle in the West. They established a trading post at Pithekoussai in Italy early in the eighth century, and again the archaeological evidence implies that it was an interest in metal rather than agriculture that was behind its establishment.

Moreover, Pithekoussai provides the first datable evidence for the alphabet and its early literary use in the form of a Homeric line inscribed on a cup (c. 750–700) (Boardman 1999, 168). Meanwhile, it appears that the search for metals and luxury goods was to satisfy the aristocracy of Euboea. We know that the two chief cities, Chalcis and Eretria, on the island of Euboea were ruled by aristocratic communities that became engaged in the so-called Lelantine war (c. 730–710). The war (of which Hesiod was well aware) was fought for possession of the rich, arable Lelantine plain. According to Thucydides (1.15.3), the war was exceptional, for it divided Greece into two rival camps (including Miletus on the side of Eretria and Corinth on the side of Chalcis). As Murray notes, the Lelantine war marked the end of an era, because it was the last war fought in the old style between leading proponents of that style. Of course, trade was not the only reason for colonization.⁴⁵ Other reasons, and some would argue the primary ones, were land hunger, famine, and political unrest. And in most cases, all three probably were connected.⁴⁶ Thus according to Murray (1993, 110), evidence exists of a large surge in population growth in the eighth century, and this explains why land was the chief colonizing factor. Since the traditional Greek custom of inheritance was to divide the land equally between all of the sons, the only way to avoid acute social problems (and famine) was to organize settlement abroad—generally on knowledge brought back by traders (111). The fact that Sparta conquered and colonized its neighbors in the early seventh century must be seen in this light (*ibid.*).

The colonists almost always retained strong ties with the mother city, and each city had at least one founder (οἰκιστής) who acted as a leader and who generally was from an aristocratic background (see Jeffrey 1976, 56–57). His responsibilities included dividing the land into farms and setting aside land for sanctuaries. Distribution would be by lot and on fair and equal terms. Thus the first colonists could see themselves as a sort of landed aristocracy.⁴⁷ Indeed, the first colonists often acquired privileges that the second wave to the same location would not. Thus at Syracuse the first colonists were known as *Gamoroi*, “those who shared the land.” The first colonists generally were composed of small groups of 200 or less. This explains why some cities were able to found several colonies within a single generation (Miletus being a prime example). In order to be effective against, at times, far larger numbers of hostile locals, one would assume that all men were of fighting age and equipped accordingly (i.e., with heavy armor). This also would reinforce the conviction that all of the founding colonists should have an equal voice in political/community decisions.

Around the same time that law codes were being devised, another Greek institution of revolutionary proportion arrived on the scene: the hoplite phalanx. Hoplites were heavy-armed soldiers (including helmet, corslet, greave,

solid front round shield, and thrusting spear and sword) who fought in tight formation in ranks that often were four to eight deep. It thus replaced the individual champions of the Homeric tradition. Although order, discipline, and courage were now the essential qualities of the fighting force—for breaking ranks could be devastating—the more hoplites, the more effective the force would be. The rise of the hoplite phalanx usually is dated to around the mid-seventh century B.C.E., although there is evidence for the invention of hoplite tactics around 700 B.C.E.⁴⁸ Indeed, the first colonists already may have surmised something akin to this for mutual protection. What is certain is that to create a force of several hundred (and eventually thousands) heavy-armed hoplites necessitated both a large supply of metal and enough wealth and expertise to be able to acquire and produce the heavy armor. As noted above, the search for metal was one of the main catalysts behind the creation of trading posts and eventually colonization. And since Odysseus makes it clear that the activity of a sea-faring merchant was not an activity of high social status (*Odyssey* 8.159), then while the aristocrats themselves may have initiated the impetus to trade and explore, they were not directly involved. Merchants and traders were thus in a position to acquire a good deal of profit (and thus wealth) in return for a great deal of risk in procuring the goods that the aristocrats coveted, in particular, metal to create their weapons, armor, and luxury goods.

In the *Odyssey* (17.383–38), Homer mentions itinerant craftsmen in the service of a noble clientele. Now there is clear evidence that foreign craftsmen were offered opportunity for migration, in particular, Phoenician metalworkers (Burkert 1992, 23; Murray 1993, 82; Boardman 1999, 56–62). It also is clear that Greek craftsmen were quick to adopt the techniques and create their own masterpieces—albeit with strong orientaling motives (Burkert 1992, 16). In Hesiod's *Works and Days* (24–26), he attests to the spirit of independence and competition that reigned in the Greek workshops.⁴⁹ Moreover, the passage suggests, on the one hand, that already in this period, the *δημιουργοί* had begun their sedentarization and grouping in urban centers close to the merchants, shipowners, and other nonagricultural workers. On the other hand, it suggests that the demystification of technical ability (in Homer, any technical skill is the result of divine inspiration) also was underway. In sum, Hesiod's famous passage strongly suggests that there is already a new spirit of secular competition at work.

At the beginning of the seventh century, if not earlier, it is thus clear that there were numerous city-states with a strong well-to-do nonaristocratic component. It also is clear that this nonagricultural component was a primary source of wealth for the city-state. At what point did this new group of wealthy individuals demand equality with their aristocratic counterparts? According to Aristotle (*Politics* 4.1297b), a shift in political power (and

constitutional organization) occurred after the hoplites began to dominate military organization. Since the aristocrats needed more heavily armed men to stave off intruders (or, one would assume, to invade the territory of others and/or to create an effective alliance with others), anyone who could afford the equipment required to be a hoplite became a member of this new military organization. Since the hoplites represented a new development of community consciousness (their respective safety depended on the steadfastness of the next comrade in line), it was only a matter of time before the nonaristocrats demanded equality, that is, certain rights to which only the aristocrats had been hitherto entitled. The first hoplite constitution of which we are aware is Sparta, which was initiated by the great lawgiver, Lycurgus, in the early seventh century. At the same time he laid down the rules for a system of military training, he reformed Sparta's social structure and produced a constitution that guaranteed to all Spartans some form of political equality; they thus called themselves *homoioi*, "peers" or "those alike" (Xenophon, *Hellenica* 3.3.5; Aristotle, *Politics* 1306b30; Murray 1993, 157–80). Leaving aside the infamous relation between the Spartans and the helots, it appears that the aristocrats ceded equality with little violence. In Corinth, on the other hand, it appears that the process was quite different. As Thucydides notes (1.13), Corinth benefited enormously from its geographical position both for North-South land trade and East-West sea trade. Unsurprisingly, Corinth became the center of the Orientalizing movement, adapting a number of Oriental customs, and it was the first city to manufacture successfully high-end pottery on a mass scale for exportation.⁵⁰

The creators of this economic prosperity were a group of aristocratic nobles called the Bacchiads, an exclusive group that coveted its power and forbade marriage outside of its γένος. In 657, the Bacchiads were expelled by force by Cypselus with the help of the army.⁵¹ He set up one of the first recorded tyrannies, which generally is dated from 657 to 628. Cypselus was followed by his son, Periander (c. 628–586).⁵² There can be no doubt that a number of factors led to the fall of the Bacchiads, including their exclusiveness, the emergence of a wealthy middle class, the new sense of equality in the Western colonies and, of course, the advent of the hoplite army (initiated, at least in part, because of border wars with Megara). Cypselus is described as a mild tyrant who was very much liked by the people. Indeed, it is said that Cypselus revised and codified the cities' laws, thus rescuing them from the arbitrary interpretation of his Bacchaid predecessors, and he employed the term δικαίωσει to express the fact that Corinth had now been given justice (Forrest 1986, 22; Grant 1988, 84).

Numerous theories account for the rise of tyranny. What is certain is that tyrannies arose for a variety of reasons. According to Aristotle (*Politics* 5.1310b), the facts of history show that the majority of early tyrants were leaders of the

δῆμος. At least initially, it seems that the popular leaders came from the aristocracy, and that it was therefore a “popular form” of government set up against the aristocracy (Murray 1993, 139). Of course, the δῆμος would have been powerless without the hoplites. This also may explain why tyrants were later replaced by hoplite-dominated governments.

Tyranny, of course, was not always a fact of life before the codification of law. There was an attempt at tyranny at Athens in 630 by an aristocrat, Cylon. However, he had little, if any, popular support. The reply to this, however, was the famous law code by Draco in 620. This suggests that already there was strong discontent in Athens. However, Draco’s laws did little to curb the infighting, which explains why Solon (c. 640–560) was elected as archon and arbitrator in 594 (Jeffrey 1977, 90). Solon could have made himself tyrant, but he preferred to persuade the two sides, the people and those who had the power, to agree to a fair compromise (the lawgiver in his role as arbitrator). While those who had the power kept their property, the people were given the dignity that was their due, including the cancellation of all debts and the abolition of enslavement for debt. All Athenians also were now divided into four classes that were determined by “wealth” and to each of these corresponded their share of political power (to the top classes went the top offices, to the lowest, only membership in the assembly). Clearly, wealth rather than birth was the criterion for political honor, and Solon himself noted that agriculture, trade, technology, and even the “intelligentsia” (poets, seers, and doctors) were acceptable ways of acquiring wealth (fragment 13.43–17). This explains why two craftsmen were among the ten archons appointed in 580 B.C.E. (Murray 1993, 199). Moreover, Solon appealed to no other power than his own sense of what was just: “I wrote down the laws alike for base and noble, fitting straight judgements to each” (frag 36.18–20 = 24d).⁵³ Solon presents the benefits and sanctions of law as human, and since the laws were written down, it meant that they were available for all to see. Also, since the laws were composed in poetic form, they could be easily memorized and thus recited in public both by Solon and others (Murray 1993, 182–83; Naddaf 2000, 347–49). Much of Solon’s political reforms did, however, fail, and there was a period of unrest that lasted until Peisistratus successfully seized power as a tyrant in 546. But ironically it was during the Peisistratus tyranny that Athenians enjoyed a period of stability and great prosperity manifested in the construction of public works and the creation of national festivals and games, and thus a developed sense of national unity, local pride, and individual dignity. Nonetheless, when tyranny did end in 510, there would be no return to the old-style politics. The stage was now set for the truly democratic institutions of Cleisthenes in which the people would have a share of everything.

What about Miletus, the birthplace of Anaximander? Miletus was founded around 1050 B.C.E. by Neleus, the youngest son of Athenian King Codrus

(Herodotus 1.47; 5.65; 9.97).⁵⁴ Neleus and his men killed the natives (Carians) and took their women as wives (Herodotus 1.146; Huxley 1966, 32). We know that the Milesians were quite involved in the famous Lelantine war (c. 730–680).⁵⁵ They sided with Eretria against Chalcis, something the Eretrians never forgot (Herodotus 5.99). It may have been at Al Mina (see above) that the Milesians first became involved in the Euboean rivalry. Given that the Lelantine war was fought essentially between aristocrats, this strongly suggests that the Neleids were still firmly in control at the time.⁵⁶ However, there is some evidence that it was around the time of the Lelantine war that the kingship in Miletus ended. It is associated with a struggle between two Neleids: Leodamus and Amphitres.⁵⁷ Both were engaged in wars at the time: Amphitres against Melos and Leodamus against Carystus in southern Euboea. This suggests that it was actually Leodamus who led the Milesians forces during the Lelantine war (Huxley 1966, 50; Jeffrey 1977, 210). Amphitres meanwhile lost his campaign, while Leodamus won. Nevertheless, Amphitres later murdered Leodamus and seized power by force. But the exiled sons and friends of Leodamus returned, and when the two sides clashed, the sons of Leodamus were victorious and killed Amphitres. The tyranny of Amphitres was thus short lived. Indeed, after peace was restored, it seems that the δῆμος or citizens elected a lawgiver (αἰσομνήτης) or a “temporary dictator” called Epimenes. He was given the power to put to death the sons of Amphitres (and their allies) and seize their property. Although the election of Epimenes effectively ended Neleid kingship in Miletus, the Neleids remained, of course, a powerful group, a sort of aristocratic oligarchy.⁵⁸ It is possible that they continued to dominate the political scene at Miletus until their power was effectively curtailed by Thrasybulus around 630 B.C.E. Why this date? Pseudo-Skymnos (*Geographical Description* 986–97) says that Sinope was refounded by exiles from Miletus, and scholars date this around 630 B.C.E.⁵⁹ I suggest that the exiles were Neleid aristocrats who met the same fate as their Corinthian counterparts, the Bacchids. This may explain the close friendship between Periander and Thrasybulus. Indeed, the way Thrasybulus seized power is somewhat analogous to the way Cypselus did: both were initially in a position of authority within their respective oligarchies. In the case of Thrasybulus, Aristotle is quite explicit. One reason oligarchies were initially capable of producing tyrants, he says, was because they gave to one official supreme authority over all other offices. He cites as an example Miletus with its prytanis (or president) and states that this is how Thrasybulus became tyrant (*Politics* 5. 1305a16–18; Jeffrey 1977, 210; Huxley 1966, 50–51; Gorman 2001, 99–101). Since Thrasybulus obviously needed the support of the army and the people to become a tyrant, the prytanis must have included the office of *polemarchos* or military leader.⁶⁰

We do not know what, if anything, Thrasybulus promised the people and the army for their support. He may have promised them a share in govern-

ment, as Cypselus had done,⁶¹ and may have divided up the estates of the exiles. Again, like Cypselus, he may have revised and codified the existing laws, thus ending the arbitrary interpretations of the Neleids. Was it Thrasybulus who initiated a sense of *isonomia* or “equal rights” in Miletus, something that was already more widespread in their colonies! It seems that Thrasybulus is clearly a much more important figure in the history of the great city than is usually recognized. Murray may be right to contend that at the end of the seventh century, Thrasybulus “brought Miletus to the height of her power” (Murray 1993, 138; see also A. Andrewes 1956, 118). This did not occur before Miletus was confronted with the formidable power of its Lydian neighbor. However, if Miletus was able to thwart its powerful neighbor, it is because it already possessed a strong army and, more important, a mighty navy. This in turn suggests, indeed corroborates, that Miletus was an economic powerhouse even before Thrasybulus seized power.

Between the eighth and sixth centuries, Miletus established numerous colonies, particularly in the area of the Black Sea (see Boardman 1999, 238ff.). Pliny states that Miletus was responsible for setting up over ninety colonies (*Natural History* 5.31.112; see also Strabo 14.1.6). Although the search for land was certainly a motive, it seems that trade was the primary factor. Of course, colonization is not a necessary condition for trade. Given the proximity of Miletus to its eastern neighbors (e.g., it was less than 100 kilometers from Sardes, the capital of Lydia), trade with the interior by caravan also could be profitable and of course dangerous.

Around 687 B.C.E., Gyges, a member of the Lydian family of the Mermnadae, overthrew the last Heraclid king of Lydia, Candaules, and married his wife, Toudo (Herodotus 1.12). Shortly after this, Gyges (whose reign is described by his contemporary, poet-soldier Archilochus, as a tyranny) attacked Miletus and other Ionian cities (Herodotus 1.15). Although he sacked Colophon, he was unsuccessful against Miletus, which must have been sufficiently rich and menacing at the time to warrant an attack. Herodotus contends that this was the only attack on Miletus by Gyges, who was killed in a battle against the invading Cimmerians around 652.

It seems that the relation between the Lydians and the Milesians was somewhat ambiguous. Gyges allowed the Milesians to establish a colony at Abydus on the Troad (Strabo 590). Of course, it may have been established as a mercenary colony to help thwart the invading Cimmerians (Huxley 1966, 63); it certainly had a strategic location at the head of the Hellespont. It seems that the Ionians quickly gained a reputation as mercenaries. Herodotus (2.154) informs us that it was bronze-clad Ionian (including Milesian) and Carian mercenary soldiers who helped the first Psammetichus (664–610) win back his throne in Egypt. It has been conjectured that they may have been sent by Gyges, who joined Psammetichus in opposition to the Assyrians

(Huxley 1966, 72). These mercenaries were later rewarded with strips of land in Egypt (Herodotus 2.154). In any event, this means that Greeks were in Egypt by 664 B.C.E., and they wasted little time establishing a thriving trade with Egypt. Herodotus (4.152) mentions the Samian merchant, Kolaios, who was sailing to Egypt (c. 638) on one of his regular runs when he was blown off course.

Gyges meanwhile was succeeded by his son, Ardys, who also invaded Miletus—albeit again unsuccessfully—after the Cimmerians retreated, around 640 (Herodotus 1.15; Huxley 1966, 75). Herodotus seems to imply that Ardys' invasion was short lived, although his reign lasted for some time (c. 652–629).⁶² If Miletus was able to resist the invasions and threats of Gyges, Ardys, and the Cimmerians, it was because it had both a powerful fleet and a formidable army of hoplites that constituted, for the most part (in addition to landowners), a wealthy class of merchants, shipowners, craftsmen, and the like that continued to grow and prosper during this period. Ardys, meanwhile, was succeeded by his son, Sadyattes (c. 629–617). Sadyattes renewed the war against the Ionians and, in particular, Miletus. Herodotus (1.17–19) informs us that the territory of Miletus was ravaged for eleven consecutive years: six during the reign of Sadyattes and five during the reign of his son, Alyattes (c. 617–560), that is, 623–612. Each year the Lydians would systematically destroy the harvest.⁶³ However, Miletus was well fortified, and it also controlled the seas; grain could thus be imported from Egypt and elsewhere. Consequently, the Lydian strategy failed. This occurred when Miletus was under the tyranny of Thrasybulus (Herodotus 1.17–22). When Thrasybulus did come to an agreement with Alyattes, the terms were very favorable to Miletus. Indeed, they became friends and allies, and Miletus, contrary to many of the other rival Ionian cities on the coast, maintained its independence.

The relation with Egypt must have been equally comfortable. Herodotus (1921, 2.159) states that Egyptian pharaoh Neco (610–595) offered the armor he wore in his Syrian campaign to Apollo at Didyma in Milesia about 608 (Boardman 1999, 115). This suggests that Thrasybulus and Neco may have been allies. Indeed, if the famous trading post at Naukratis in the Nile Delta was founded around 620, then it also would have been under Thrasybulus that the Milesians first settled there (see below). All of this adds force to Murray's contention that Thrasybulus "brought Miletus to the height of her power" (1993, 138).

Was Thrasybulus an enlightened despot or a ruthless dictator? Herodotus (5.92) contends that an initially mild Periander of Corinth began his ruthlessness after seeking and receiving advice from Thrasybulus.⁶⁴ To the question, what was the safest way to ensure control of affairs and best govern the city?, the reply was to remove, from time to time, the preeminent citizens! Aristotle reverses this and states that Thrasybulus sought the advice from