

II

THE SOPHISTS, THEIR CONTEMPORARIES, AND PUPILS IN THE FIFTH AND FOURTH CENTURIES

THE Sophistic movement of the fifth century holds a unique position in the history of the ancient world; it never repeated itself, and, in a historical sense, one should not speak of a 'second Sophistic' in Roman times. The part it played in the early history (or prehistory) of classical scholarship was an intermediary one. The Sophists were linked with the past in so far as they developed their ideas out of hints in earlier literature; so we have always to look back to poetry as well as to philosophy and history. On the other hand, they were the first to influence by their theories not only prose writing, rhetoric, and dialectic above all, but also contemporary and later poetry; so they force us to look ahead.

The Sophists can be regarded, in a sense, as the heirs of the rhapsodes. They also came from every part of the Hellenic world and wandered through all the Greek-speaking lands; but in the age after the expulsion of the tyrants and the defeat of the Persian invader their ways quite naturally converged on Athens, the leading democratic city-state, where they could gather their best pupils around them. The Sophists explained epic and archaic poetry, combining their interpretations with linguistic observations, definitions, and classifications on the lines laid down by previous philosophers; but their interest in Homeric or lyric poetry as well as in language always had a practical purpose, 'to educate men', as Protagoras himself said in Plat. *Prot.* 317 B (= *Vors.* 80 A 5): *ὁμολογῶ σοφιστῆς¹ εἶναι καὶ παιδεύειν ἀνθρώπους*. Their aim was not to interpret poetry for its own sake or to find out grammatical rules in order to understand the structure of language. They aimed at correctness of diction and at the correct pronunciation of the right form of the right word; the great writers of the past were to be the models from which one had to

¹ The word *σοφιστής* (see *Vors.* 79) is not used here in the general sense of a skilled or wise man (Aesch. *Pr.* 944. Hdt. I 29, IV 95); Protagoras apparently is claiming to be a member of that modern professional group of teachers and educators called *σοφισταί*.

learn. In that way they became the ancestors of the virtuosi in the literary field. If scholarship were a mere artifice, they would indeed have been its pioneers;¹ for they invented and taught a number of very useful tricks and believed that such technical devices could do everything. But for this very reason they do not deserve the name of 'scholars'—they would not even have liked it. Still less should they be termed 'humanists';² Sophists concerned themselves not with the values that imbue man's conduct with 'humanitas', but with the usefulness of their doctrine or technique for the individual man, especially in political life.

Some examples, drawn from individual aspects of their activity, will be given later; we shall look at the Sophistic practice of interpretation, analysis of language, literary criticism, antiquarian lore, and polymathy.

However, there is one of their services to future scholarship on which we have to dwell a little longer; and for that reason we take it first. The very existence of scholarship depends on the book,³ and books seem to have come into common use in the course of the fifth century, particularly as the medium for Sophistic writings. Early Greek literature had to rely on oral tradition, it had to be recited and to be heard; even in the fifth and fourth centuries there was a strong reaction against the inevitable transition from the spoken to the written word; only the civilization of the third century can be called—and not without exaggeration—a 'bookish' one.⁴

This may be the right moment for having a look at 'the oriental background' against which the whole of Greek culture had arisen, in so far as it is relevant for Greek scholarship. While aware of this historical process, I am, naturally enough, rather reluctant to speak of it as I have not the slightest acquaintance with the languages concerned; so I am forced to rely on the reports and interpretations of specialists and to draw conclusions from them with due reserve.

Excavations in Mesopotamia⁵ revealed the early existence not only of

¹ P. B. R. Forbes, 'Greek Pioneers in Philology and Grammar', *Cl.R.* 47 (1933) 105 ff., gives a useful short survey of some achievements of the Sophists; but they were not 'pioneers' in scholarship in the strict sense of the word, as it is used here.

² W. Jaeger, *Paideia* I (1934) 377, 380 f.

³ The elder Pliny went even further, when he said (*h.n.* XIII 68): 'cum chartae usu maxime humanitas vitae constet, certe memoria'; hardly any Greek would have gone as far as that (see below, p. 32).

⁴ See below, p. 102.

⁵ Eduard Meyer, *Geschichte des Altertums* I 2⁵ (1926) 334 ff. (§§ 312 ff.) (in particular pp. 335 f., 340, 342 f.). A more recent survey with a new chronology and extensive bibliography is given by A. Moortgat, 'Geschichte Vorderasiens bis zum Hellenismus', in A. Scharff und A. Moortgat, *Ägypten und Vorderasien im Altertum* (München 1950) 93–535, esp. 315 ff., 471 ff.—*Handbuch der Bibliothekswissenschaft*², hg. von G. Leyh, III 1 (1955) 1–50; F. Milkau u. F. Schawe, 'Der alte Vorderorient' on libraries in Egypt and in the Near East; on writing see

archives with documents on clay tablets, but also of 'libraries' with literary texts. From about 2800 B.C., so we are told, the Sumerian-speaking inhabitants maintained record offices as well as libraries and schools in connexion with the temples of their gods. The keepers of the clay tablets who had to preserve the precious texts attached importance to the exact wording of the originals and tried to correct mistakes of the copyists; for that reason they even compiled 'glossaries' of a sort. Towards the end of the third millennium Semitic invaders from the north (the Babylonians, as they were afterwards called) adopted the Sumerian methods of preservation and also made lists containing the Sumerian words and their Accadian equivalents. In the course of the second millennium the Hittites conquered large parts of Anatolia; there are cuneiform tablets found in their capital Boğazköy showing in three parallel columns equivalent words in Hittite, Sumerian, and Accadian.¹ Similar discoveries, dating from the second half of the second millennium, were made during the excavations of Ugarit (Ras-Shamra) in northern Syria. In the seventh century B.C. much of the earlier, especially the 'Babylonian', tradition was copied for the palace-library of the great Assyrian king Assurbanipal, who was no less proud of his writing abilities than of his conquests; there are more than 20,000 tablets and fragments in the British Museum.

His learned scribes had inherited a truly refined technique and they developed it further in the descriptive notes at the end of each tablet.² Without romantic exaggeration we can say that these scribes felt a 'religious' responsibility for the correct preservation of the texts, because all of them had to be regarded as sacred in a certain sense.³ Their complicated method of 'cataloguing' was invented for the particular writing material, the clay tablets, and the lists of words from different languages were a product of the singular historical conditions of Mesopotamia and the surrounding countries. But no 'scholarship' emerged from those descriptive notes and parallel glossaries, which served only the practical needs of the archives, libraries, and schools of temples. We find much the same in other fields: the extensive oriental 'annals' did not lead to

also vol. 1² (1952) 1-105. For the use of writing in Mesopotamia see Kenyon *Books and Readers* 6 f.—On the early stimulating influence of Mesopotamian writing on Egypt see H. Frankfort, *The Birth of Civilisation in the Near East* (London 1951) 106 f.

¹ For recent excavations of clay tablets with important texts in Accadian and translation into Hittite see K. Bittel, 'Ausgrabungen in Boğazköy' (1952-7) in *Neue deutsche Ausgrabungen im Mittelmeergebiet und im vorderen Orient* (Berlin 1959) 108.

² Full details are given by C. Wendel, 'Buchbeschreibung', 2 ff.

³ Cf. E. Meyer, loc. cit. 462 f., 583 ff., 597 f. (religion and literature); C. Wendel 11 (but the kings were not gods as in Egypt).

a methodical writing of history. George Sarton¹ in his *History of Science* rightly emphasizes the importance of a controlled language for the rise of 'Babylonian science', which needed 'linguistic tools of sufficient exactitude'. But it seems to be rather misleading to speak of 'the birth of philology'² at about 3000 B.C. Sarton, however, did not try to trace a line of descent from this oriental 'philology' (by which he apparently meant some sort of linguistic studies) to early Greece. On the other hand C. Wendel, in considering how technical devices for writing and for preserving the written tradition may have reached the Ionians in Asia Minor, argues convincingly that they had come from the east, not from Egypt;³ but, in the present state of knowledge, one can do no more than hint at possibilities of contact. It is not unlikely that the Greek inhabitants of the west coast of Asia Minor and of the islands had been writing on animal skins before they used the Egyptian papyrus and continued to do so occasionally. Although there was literary evidence for the use of leather-rolls by oriental, especially Aramaic, scribes not only in Persia, but also in Mesopotamia, Phoenicia, and Palestine,⁴ actual specimens were very rare, until the Aramaic parchments of the fifth century B.C. (now in the Bodleian library) were published in 1954.⁵ The statement of Herodotus (v 58) in his much-discussed 'excursus' (regarded sometimes even as an 'interpolation') is thus fully confirmed in so far as it implied that leather-rolls had been in common use in 'barbarian' countries; consequently we are not entitled to doubt the other part of his remark about the Ionians (v 58. 3): *καὶ τὰς βύβλους διφθέρας καλέουσι ἀπὸ τοῦ παλαιοῦ οἱ Ἴωνες, ὅτι κοτὲ ἐν σπάνι βύβλων ἐχρέωντο διφθέρῃσι αἰγέγγισι τε καὶ οἰέγγισι. ἔτι δὲ καὶ τὸ κατ' ἐμὲ πολλοὶ τῶν βαρβάρων ἔς τοιαύτας διφθέρας γράφουσι.*

In the famous paragraph which precedes, Herodotus speaks about the

¹ G. Sarton, *A History of Science* (1952) 1. Ancient science through the golden age of Greece 67, with numerous references to texts and modern books on Mesopotamian excavations; see also S. N. Kramer, *From the Tablets of Sumer* (Indian Hills, Colorado 1956), ch. 24, describing a 'library catalogue' (about 50,000 Sumerian tablets in the museum in Philadelphia).

² W. von Soden, 'Leistung und Grenze sumerischer und babylonischer Wissenschaft', *Welt als Geschichte* 2 (1936) 411 ff., 509 ff., stresses the limits of that Sumerian and Accadian 'Listenphilologie' in a very learned article; but in conformity with the fashion of the thirties he can see 'true scholarship' inaugurated only by 'the nordic race'; cf. *Sitz. Ber. d. Österr. Akad.* 235 (1960) 1.

³ C. Wendel, loc. cit. 85 ff.—Kenyon 44 f.

⁴ See below, p. 20, n. 4.

⁵ Abridged and revised edition by G. R. Driver, *Aramaic Documents* (1957) 1 ff.; cf. C. H. Roberts, 'The Codex', *Proc. Brit. Acad.* 40 (1954) 172, n. 1, 182.

⁶ Cf. Ctesias, 688 *FGH* 5 (vol. III c, 450. 17 Jacoby, 1958) *ἐκ τῶν βασιλικῶν διφθέρων, ἐν αὐτῷ οἱ Πέρσαι τὰς παλαιὰς πράξεις . . . εἶχον συντεταγμένας*; however little credit Ctesias of Cnidus may deserve as a writer of Persian history, his reference to the *διφθέραι* can no longer be disregarded; see also Driver, loc. cit. and H. Hunger in *Geschichte der Textüberlieferung* 1 (1961) 30 (and 34 on the preparation of parchment, cf. below, pp. 235 f.).

'alphabet' which the Ionians received from the Phoenicians and adapted to the Greek language (v 58. 1, 2): οἱ δὲ Φοῖνικες οὗτοι οἱ σὺν Κάδμῳ ἀπικόμενοι . . . ἐσήγαγον . . . καὶ γράμματα, οὐκ ἔοντα πρὶν Ἑλλῆσι ὡς ἐμοὶ δοκέειν . . . "Ἴωνες, οἱ παραλαβόντες διδασχῆ παρὰ τῶν Φοινίκων τὰ γράμματα, μεταρρυθμίσαντές σφῶν ὀλίγα ἐχρέωντο, χρεώμενοι δὲ ἐπάτισαν, ὡσπερ καὶ τὸ δίκαιον ἔφερε ἔσαγαγόντων Φοινίκων ἐς τὴν Ἑλλάδα, Φοινικήα κεκλήσθαι. Greeks, therefore, were 'illiterate' in earlier times, as it seemed to Herodotus. But he must have known another tradition from one of his main sources, Hecataeus¹ of Miletus, with whom two other Milesian writers, Anaximander² and Dionysius,³ agreed: namely that 'before Cadmus, Danaus brought letters over' πρὸ Κάδμου Δαναὸν μετακομίσει αὐτὰ (τὰ στοιχεῖα). Danaus had sailed from Egypt (not from Phoenicia) to the Argolid: the rivalry between Egypt and the Near East in this field is apparent from the beginning and persistent up to today.⁴ Since hundreds of clay tablets, covered with writing in the so-called Linear B Script (which had been known before only from Knossos) were found near Pylos by C. W. Blegen (1939) and in other places of the Greek mainland (Mycenae, 1950, by Alan J. B. Wace), it has been obvious that Herodotus was wrong when he expressed his opinion, although very cautiously (ὡς ἐμοὶ δοκέειν), that Greece was illiterate before the introduction of the Phoenician alphabet. The tablets are said to have been written between the fifteenth and the twelfth centuries B.C., in the late Helladic or, as Furtwängler had termed it, the Mycenaean epoch (the fullest records for Pylos are from the thirteenth century).⁵ We may call it the 'Heroic age', supposing that it was the world of the heroes whose stories we read in the Homeric poems. The surviving examples of that Mycenaean writing (at the moment more than 1,000 tablets) do not go beyond 'lists of commodities and personnel'; there are no names of scribes, no check or alterations by a corrector as on the Accadian or Ugarit tablets we mentioned. The contents as well as the method are very primitive compared

¹ 1 *FGrHist* 20; see also Jacoby's notes 11-13 to the commentary on 489 *FGrHist* (1955).

² 9 *FGrHist* 3.

³ 687 *FGrHist* 1; the testimony of these three historians was put together by Apollodoros 244 *FGrHist* 165.

⁴ See above, p. 19, and about Egypt Siegfried Schott, 'Hieroglyphen, Untersuchungen zum Ursprung der Schrift', *Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur in Mainz, Abhandlungen der geistes- und sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse*, 1950, Nr. 24, pp. 63, 86, on the probable relation between hieroglyphs, Semitic scripts, and Greek alphabet; cf. p. 9.

⁵ I have not much confidence in the later dating of the Knossos Tablets by L. R. Palmer, *Mycenaeans and Minoans* (London 1961) and 'The Find-Places of the Knossos Tablets' in the book *On the Knossos Tablets* (Oxford 1963); my doubts are strengthened by the convincing arguments put forward by J. Boardman in his part of the same book 'The Date of the Knossos Tablets', where he maintains against Palmer the correctness of the earlier dating by Evans (about 250 years).

* "Corrections" do exist between TABLETS

with those of the earlier and the contemporary oriental 'libraries'. If Michael Ventris's ingenious theory of the decipherment of this syllabic script is correct,¹ we are confronted with a strange and primitive pre-Homeric 'Greek' language in a script that entails countless ambiguities. It is hardly conceivable that this clumsy script could have been used for a literary text.² However that may turn out, we know now that there is some truth in the statement of Herodotus' Milesian predecessors that Danaus anticipated Cadmus. Local writers of *Κρητικά*³ voiced the claim of the island of Crete (against Cadmus) as the place where letters had been most anciently invented, and antiquarian authors *περὶ ἐδρημάτων*⁴ registered other claimants; but all these various stories point in one direction: they dispute the priority of the 'Phoenician' alphabet and hint at another earlier Greek script; and in this respect they are only now surprisingly confirmed.

The Phoenician origin of the 'alphabet', however, as it was used in historical Greek times, has never been seriously called in question. Herodotus is by no means the earliest authority for this;⁵ some of the Milesian writers already quoted are half a century earlier, the oldest inscription of Teos (δς ἄν . . . Φοινικήα ἐκκόψει) was written soon after Mycale (479 B.C.),⁶ and even Sophocles' *Ποιμένες* can now be dated with probability to the sixties of the fifth century (463 B.C.?):⁷ 'Φοινικίους γράμμασι'.⁸ The truth of this literary tradition, which was, as we see, not limited to Herodotus, but quite common in the first half of the fifth

¹ *JHS* 73 (1953) 84-103, 'Evidence for Greek Dialect in the Mycenaean archives'.

² Even John Chadwick, Ventris's faithful collaborator, was rather reserved (*The Decipherment of Linear B* [Cambridge 1959] 130) in contrast to Alan Wace's overwhelming optimism (see *Documents in Mycenaean Greek* [Cambridge 1956], Foreword xxix).

³ Dosiades, 458 *FGrHist* 6 and Diod. v 74. 1 = 468 *FGrHist* 1 (III B 411. 13 ff.).

⁴ Scamone of Mytilene (probably early fourth century) 476 *FGrHist* 3. Fuller testimonia are given by H. Erbse, *Attizistische Lexica* (1950) 218. 28; cf. Andron of Halicarnassus, 10 *FGrHist* 9; Ephorus 70 *FGrHist* 105 and 106 called Cadmus the actual inventor, not merely the importer as Herodotus v 58, Aristotle fr. 501 R. or Zenon of Rhodes 523 *FGrHist* 1 vol. III B p. 498. 20 ff. (= Diod. v 58. 3).

⁵ As Pearson says in his note to Soph. fr. 514.

⁶ *SIG*³ 38. 38 (W. Ruge, *RE* v A [1934] 545. 60 ff.).

⁷ *P. Oxy.* xx (1952) 2256, fr. 3. 4, hypothesis of Aeschylus' *Suppliques*; Sophocles had been second, and amongst the rather confused series of titles *Ποιμῶν* is fairly certain.

⁸ Hesych. v. 'Φοινικίους γράμμασι'. *Σοφοκλῆς Ποιμῶν* (fr. 514 P.). *ἐπεὶ δοκεῖ Κάδμος αὐτὰ ἐκ Φοινίκης (ἐν φοίνικος cod.) κεκομμένα.* From the same source (Diogenian) Ael. Dionys. (fr. 318 Schw. = p. 148. 8 Erbse) in Eust. p. 1757. 58 *Φοινικία γράμματα, ἐπεὶ φασὶ δοκεῖ Κάδμος ἀπὸ Φοινίκης αὐτὰ κομίσαι*; although the names of poet and play are omitted, the passage should be quoted in the apparatus to the Sophocles-Fragment. Mythical chronology puts Cadmus 300 years before the Trojan war; the subject of the play was events subsequent to the landing of the Greeks on the coast of the Troad. The inhabitants as well as the invaders could well have been acquainted with Phoenician letters according to that chronology (it is remarkable that epic heroes in tragedy use writing or at least speak about it).

century, can be established by a comparison of Greek inscriptions of the late eighth century B.C. with Semitic writing of this and the preceding century: similarities of letter forms show that the Phoenician model had been followed and was modified about that time.¹ From the same regions of the Near East the Ionians seem to have learned to prepare skins for writing material, and, as the Egyptian papyrus was called βύβλος in Greek,² after the city of Byblos, we may assume that it was first imported from the Phoenicians, before the foundation of Naukratis established direct contact between Egypt and Greece in the seventh century. So everything leads up to the conclusion—in the present state of our knowledge—that the introduction of letters and of papyrus dates from the early eighth or the late ninth century;³ the route⁴ may have been along the south coast of Asia Minor to Rhodes.⁵

At the very end of antiquity, Nonnus was loud in his praise of Cadmus' gifts (4. 259 ff.): ὁ πάση / Ἑλλάδι φωνήεντα καὶ ἔμφρονα δῶρα κομίζων / γλώσσης ὄργανα τεύξεν δρόμοισι, συμφυέος δέ / ἁρμονίης στοιχηδὸν ἐς ἄλγυα (vowels) σύζυγα (consonants) μείζας / γραπτὸν ἀσιγήτοιο τύπον τορνύσατο σιγῆς. But this so-called 'gift' deserves the gratitude not only of the ancient world but of a great part of mankind in all ages. The Phoenician script was neither cuneiform nor strictly syllabic; it consisted of single characters, but only for the consonants. When the Greeks adopted those letter forms they took the decisive step of using them for all

¹ G. R. Driver, *Semitic Writing* (1948) 178; J. Forsdyke, *Greece before Homer* (1956) 20 f.; T. J. Dunbabin, 'The Greeks and their Eastern Neighbours', *Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies, Suppl. Paper No. 8* (1957) 59 ff.; Dorothea Gray in John L. Myres, *Homer and his Critics* (1958) 266 ff.; A. G. Woodhead, *The Study of Greek Inscriptions* (1959) 13 f. 'Criterion of close approach' between early Greek and Phoenician letter forms; G. Klaffenbach, *Griechische Epigraphik* (Göttingen 1957) 34 f. The complete evidence up to 1960 is presented by L. H. Jeffery, 'The Local Scripts of Archaic Greece. A Study of the Origin of the Greek Alphabet and its Development from the Eighth to the Fifth Centuries B.C.', *Oxford Monographs on Classical Archaeology* (1961) 12 ff., date of introduction of the alphabet, and Addenda, p. 374.

² Hdt. v 58. 3 (above, p. 19), cf. Aesch. *Suppl.* 946 f., see below, p. 26, n. 4.

³ Wilamowitz in 1884 put the introduction of the new alphabet 'spätestens in das 10. Jahrhundert' (*Homerische Untersuchungen* 287) and he never changed his mind, see *Geschichte der griechischen Sprache* (1928) 9; A. Rehm, *Handbuch der Archäologie* I (1939) 197, says even 'the eleventh century cannot be excluded'; cf. Schwyzler, *Griechische Grammatik* I (1939) 141.

⁴ Historians, archaeologists, and epigraphists are inclined to accept this hypothesis, see especially Miss Jeffery pp. 5 ff. (place of introduction), and Addenda p. 374. Perhaps the formidable God 'Kumarbi' of a Hurrian epic came the same way to influence Hesiod's Kronos story: see U. Hölscher, *Hermes* 81 (1953) 405 f.; Dunbabin 56 f.

⁵ One should not overlook the ancient local tradition in Ῥοδιακά that Cadmus sailed from Phoenicia via the island of Rhodes to Greece: Zenon of Rhodes 523 *FGHHist* I (= Diod. v 58. 2, 3) Κάδμος ὁ Ἀγίνορος . . . κατέπλευσεν εἰς τὴν Ῥοδίαν . . . καὶ τὴν Λυδῖαν Ἀθηναίων ἐτίμησεν ἀναθήμασιν, ἐν οἷς ἦν χαλκοῦς λέβης . . . οὗτος δ' εἶχεν ἐπιγραφὴν Φοινικικοῖς γράμμασιν, ἃ φασιν πρῶτον ἐκ Φοινίκης εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα κομισθῆναι; cf. Polyzelus of Rhodes 521 *FGHHist* I.

the 'elements' of their language, which they called στοιχεῖα,¹ vowels as well as consonants. Now for the first time the quantity of the syllables and especially the structure of the quantitative verse could be displayed. A true alphabet² had come into being. It was one of the great creations of the Greek genius; as it can now be dated to the ninth or eighth century B.C., it belongs to the *epic age*. For these two centuries the epic poems were representative; the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* still reveal to us how the Greek genius became conscious of itself and found its own nature in that particular moment of its history. A new aspect of the world arose, the true Greek aspect. I used to emphasize in my lectures on Homer the important fact that the adaptation of the Phoenician characters and the final form of the great epic poems belong to the same age. That the alphabet 'might have been invented as a notation for Greek verse' is a rather attractive idea,³ and one wishes it could be proved; our earliest alphabetic inscriptions of the eighth century which are *not* all in verse,⁴ can hardly help. But no doubt there was a new beginning, not a simple continuity from the heroic to the epic age. It is paradoxical to use a historical evaluation of the recently discovered Mycenaean writing as a basis for conclusions about a gradual inner development of Greek civilization from the thirteenth to the ninth century.⁵ For, on the contrary, a comparison of that syllabic script on the tablets with the earliest alphabetic writing illustrates more than anything else a 'revolutionary' change, a completely new start. From this new start τὸ τέλος, the goal of

¹ H. Diels, *Elementum* (Leipzig 1899); *ibid.* p. 58. 3, the prophetic note that we shall find one day the 'old system' of writing. A. Evans had made the first announcement of its discovery in Oxford 1894.—On the term στοιχεῖα see below, p. 60 and Excursus.

² Plat. *Crat.* 431 ε τό τε ἄλφα καὶ τὸ βῆτα καὶ ἕκαστον τῶν στοιχείων; cf. Diels, *loc. cit.* 18 ff., 58 ff.; Suet. *Div. Iul.* 56. 6 *quarta elementorum littera* 'the fourth letter of the alphabet'.

³ Wade-Gery, *The Poet of the Iliad* (1952) 11–14; a different view on the date of a 'written copy' in D. L. Page, *History and the Homeric Iliad* (Berkeley 1959) 260.

⁴ *Epigrammata, Greek Inscriptions in Verse from the Beginnings to the Persian War*, by P. Friedländer and H. B. Hoffleit (Berkeley 1948) p. 7. Two important verse inscriptions of about 700 B.C. were published later: fragmentary hexameters painted on an oinochoe in Ithake, *BSA* 43 (1948) 80 ff., pl. 34, Jeffery pp. 230, 233, pl. 45. 1. 2; the unique verse graffito, three lines written in the Phoenician retrograde style, found in Ischia, *Rend. Linc.* 1955, 215 ff., pls. 1–4, Jeffery pp. 45, 235 f., 239, pl. 47. 1.

⁵ Alan J. B. Wace, *Documents in Mycenaean Greek* xxvii ff., strongly pleads for a slow evolution and speaks with scorn of the opposite 'classicistic' prejudice.—I totally disagree with the picture given by M. P. Nilsson, *Homer and Mycenae* (London 1933) 206–11, who believes in the origin of Greek epics in the 'glorious Mycenaean age' and a renascence of epics in Ionic times.—The new tablets, so far, do not contain any literary text or any hint at poetry; nevertheless, they have provoked Professor T. B. L. Webster (with whom I agree in some details), into writing *From Mycenae to Homer* (London 1958), in which he tries—unsuccessfully, but with immense erudition and bold imagination—to reconstruct songs of Mycenaean palaces. On the other hand, J. A. Notopoulos, 'Homer, Hesiod and the Achaean Heritage of oral Poetry', *Hesperia* 29 (1960) 177 ff., argues for the existence of an 'Achaean' oral *epic* poetry which survived in the mainland ('Hesiod', etc.) as well as in Ionia ('Homer', etc.).

a definitive alphabetic system, must have been reached in a fairly short time. There were minor alterations and slight improvements, but there was no 'pro-gress' any more either in Greek or in post-Greek times.¹ The alphabet was 'perfect', it had found its own nature, *ἔσχε τὴν ἑαυτοῦ φύσιν*, in the epic age. The same happened in other provinces of Greek civilization, in literature and art.

A new instrument had been created, which was, on the one hand, important for the expression of exact nuances of language in poetry and philosophy and, on the other hand, indispensable for scholarly interpretation and analysis. In this sense the adapted Phoenician characters were called 'helpers towards the λόγος' by Critias in the second half of the fifth century in an elegiac poem about various inventions of peoples and cities: *Φοίνικες δ' ἔδρον γράμματ' ἀλεξίλογα*² (*Vors.* 88 B 2. 10), 'the Phoenicians invented letters which help men to think and to speak' (*βοηθοῦντα εἰς λόγον* Eust. p. 1771. 44). In the archaic period which followed the epic age the Greeks' first aim was at beauty of script; for evidence we have only to look at the early inscriptions on stone still preserved. This tendency towards harmony and even 'geometric' norms was observed by later writers: *Πυθαγόρας αὐτῶν* (sc. τῶν γραμμάτων) *τοῦ κάλλους ἐπεμελήθη, ἐκ τῆς κατὰ γεωμετρίαν γραμμῆς ῥυθμίσεως . . . αὐτὰ γωνίας καὶ περιφερείας καὶ εὐθείας*³ (Schol. Dionys. Thr. *Gr. Gr.* III 183. 32). Archaic Greece took a pride in writing as a work of art, there is a striving for τὸ καλόν, as inscriptions show, and it can hardly be doubted that literacy was fairly widespread; but the important questions are how far first poetry and then philosophy were written down and at what time some form of commercial publication finally came into being.

The pattern of development in prehistoric Greece becomes visible only against the oriental background; so we were forced to go out of our way for a little while. Now in Greece we find no guild of scribes, no caste of priests to which knowledge of writing was restricted, no sacred books⁴ of which the transmission was their special privilege. The Greek alphabetic

¹ The best expert on 'grammatology' I. J. Gelb, *A Study of Writing* (London 1952) 239 (cf. 184) made the statement: 'In spite of the tremendous achievements of the Western civilization in so many fields of human endeavour, writing has not progressed at all since the Greek period. . . . The complex causes for this conservative attitude may very well be beyond our capacity to comprehend.' But under the aspect of τέλος and φύσις we may well be able to comprehend it (see below, p. 68).

² This ἀπαξ λεγόμενον is not only attested and explained by Eustathius, who gives a choice of three different meanings, but already quoted in the *Συναγωγὴ λέξεων χρησίμων* p. 74. 7 Bachm. and in Phot. Berol. p. 73. 3 Reitzenstein; L-S should not list it as 'dubious'.

³ A. Rehm, 'Inchriften als Kunstwerke', *Handbuch* 216. 3; Jeffery, photographs of archaic inscriptions on 72 plates.

⁴ Except perhaps for small sects of mystics.

script was accessible to everyone, and in the course of time it became the common heritage of all citizens who were able to use a pen (or a brush) and to read; the availability of writing materials in early times has been mentioned already, and especially the import of papyrus from Egypt, where it had been used as far back as the third millennium in the form of smaller or larger rolls for ritual and literary purposes. So all the necessary conditions for producing Greek books were in existence from the eighth or seventh century onwards, it seems. If we try to answer the two questions in the last paragraph, we are led to distinguish four periods. There probably was first a time of merely oral composition and oral tradition of poetry. The second stage, we assume without further proof, began with the introduction of alphabetic writing. Epic poets, heirs of an ancient oral tradition, began to put down their great compositions in this new script:¹ we still possess as the product of that creative epic age the two 'Homeric' poems. The transmission remained oral: the poets themselves and the rhapsodes that followed them recited their works to an audience; and this oral tradition was secured by the script which must have been to a certain degree under proper control. There is, so far, no evidence for book production on a large scale, for the circulation of copies, or for a reading public in the lyric age. The power of memory was unchallenged, and the tradition of poetry and early philosophy remained oral. From the history of script and book we get no support either for the legend of the Peisistratean recension of the Homeric poems or for the belief that Peisistratus and Polycrates were book collectors and founders of public libraries.

No further change is noticeable until the fifth century,² when the third period began, one in which not only oral composition, but also oral tradition, began to lose its importance. The first sign of this is the sudden appearance of frequent references to writing and reading in poetry and art from the seventies of the fifth century onwards; the image of scribe

¹ The opposite view is taken by E. R. Dodds in the very lucid chapter 'Homer as Oral Poetry' in *Fifty Years of Classical Scholarship* (Oxford 1954) 13-17; he has been completely convinced by Milman Parry's collection of formulaic material. But this only proves that Greek epic poems were the result of a long oral tradition and were destined for further oral transmission; there is no decisive argument against the composition of *Iliad* and *Odyssey* in writing. Parry's so-called 'negative check' is entirely misleading: Apollonius Rhodius followed the Hellenistic theory of variation and consciously avoided formulae, repetitions, and the like. An important part of M. Parry's priceless collection of *Serbo-Croatian Songs* has been published (1953-4); but I wonder what help they may be for Homer, however contemptuously A. B. Lord, 'The Singer of Tales', *Harvard Studies in Comparative Literature* 24 (1960), may dismiss those Homeric scholars who do not yet give full credit to Parry's revelations.

² E. G. Turner, *Athenian Books in the Fifth and Fourth Centuries B.C.* (Inaugural Lecture, London 1952).

and reader had apparently caught poetic imagination as well as the imagination of the vase painters for the first time. It can hardly be by chance that all the great poets began to use the new symbol of the written word for the mental activity of 'recollection', of *μνήμη*; this is particularly remarkable, if we remember the part which physical memory had played in the past. In Aeschylus' *Prometheus* 460 f. the god who took a pride in having invented *γραμμάτων τε συνθέσεις / μνήμην ἀπάντων, μουσομήτορ' ἐργάνην* told Io: *πλάνην φράσω / ἦν ἐγγράφου σὺ μνήμοισιν δέλτοις φρενῶν* (ibid. 788 f.);¹ Sophocles expressly repeated this image in his earliest play *Triptolemus* (about 466 B.C.).² Aeschylus was bold enough to attribute even to a god like Hades a *δελτογράφος φρήν*, *Eum.* 273–5 *μέγας γὰρ Αἴδης ἐστὶν εὐθνος βροτῶν . . . , δελτογράφω δὲ πάντ' ἐπωπῆ φρενί*. We find in Aeschylus not only this conception of divine 'tablets of the mind', but also the idea of Zeus' tablets on which men's crimes have been noted. This image reminds one of the great deities of oriental religions writing their sacred books, but Aeschylus followed the Hesiodic tradition that made *Δίκη* a *πάρεδρος* of Zeus, and entrusted her with the office of his *δελτογράφος*, as we have learned quite recently: (*Δίκη*) . . . [*γράφουσα*] *τάπλακῆματ' ἐν δέλτω Διὸς* (Aesch. *Aitnai* [?] about 470 B.C.).³ About half a century later Euripides also referred to those records: *πάδικῆματ' . . . κᾶπειτ' ἐν Διὸς δέλτου πτυχαῖς / γράφειν τῶν αὐτὰ* (*Melanippe*, probably *ἡ σοφῆ*, fr. 506 N.²). The traditional expression for writing material in tragedy remained *δέλτος*,⁴ even when one might suppose that the poet was actually speaking about literary texts written on papyrus-rolls.⁵

¹ Cf. Aesch. *Suppl.* 179 *αἰνῶ φυλάξει τὰμ' ἔπη δελτομένηας* (sc. filias). Pind. *O.* x. 2 (about 474) *ἀνάγνωτε . . . πόθι φρενὸς ἐμᾶς γέγραπται*.

² Soph. fr. 597 P. *θοῦ δ' ἐν* (Pf.: *οὐδ' ἀδ* A, *σὲ δ' ἐν* V) *φρενὸς δέλτοιαι τοὺς ἐμούς λόγους* (*θοῦ δ' ἐν δέλτοιαι*, cf. Call. fr. 75. 66 *ἐνεθήκατο δέλτοις*); cf. Aesch. *Cho.* 450, Soph. *Phil.* 1325; Eur. *Tr.* 663 *ἀναπτύξω φρένα* 'unroll my mind' (like a book).

³ *P. Oxy.* xx (1952) 2256, fr. 9a 21 ed. E. Lobel = Aesch. fr. 530 Mette; recognized by E. Fraenkel, *Eranos* 52 (1954) 64 ff., as a fragment of the festival play for Hieron's foundation of the city Aetna; cf. F. Solmsen, *The Tablets of Zeus*, *Cl. Qu.* 38 (1944) 27–30.

⁴ The only exception, so far, seems to be Aesch. *Suppl.* 946 f. *ταῦτ' οὐ πίναξιν ἐστὶν ἐγγεγραμμένα / οὐδ' ἐν πτυχαῖς βιβλῶν κατεσφραγισμένα*, a folded papyrus sheet of a sealed contract. For *δέλτος* see the references and notes above; see also Soph. *Tr.* 683, fr. 144 P., Eur. *IT* 760, [*IA*] 112. *Batrachomyomachia* 1. 3 is not our earliest evidence, but one of the many late additions, see *Herm.* 63 (1928) 319 (= *Ausgewählte Schriften*, 113). Gods were supposed to continue using the old *δέλτοι*, *διφθέραι*, *δοστρακα*, see Babr. 127 and the many proverbs collected by O. Crusius, *De Babrii aetate* (1876) 219; cf. F. Marx, *Ind. lect. Greifswald* (1892/3) vi. No conclusions about the actual use of writing material at certain times can be drawn from such passages.

⁵ Eur. *Erechth.* fr. 369. 6 f. N.² *δέλτων ἀναπτύσσοιμι γῆρυν, ἂν σοφοὶ κλέονται*; one may compare Socrates unrolling the treasures of the sages of old time in Xenoph. *Mem.* 1 6, 14: *τοὺς θεσσαυροὺς τῶν πάλαι σοφῶν ἀνδρῶν . . . ἀνελέττων*; see below, p. 28, n. 2.

If we turn from the literary field to the Attic vase painters, we do not find any pictures of 'books' on black-figured vases; scenes of the simple life of the *βάνανσοι* were their favourite subjects. Scenes of the cultivated life, in which representations of inscribed rolls find a place, appear first in the red-figured style, the work of the contemporaries of the tragic poets, from about 490 to 425 B.C. At least three of these paintings seem to be slightly earlier than the dated plays of Aeschylus.¹ On half a dozen vases, letters or words of epic or lyric poems, written across the open papyrus roll, can still be deciphered.² We see youths and schoolmasters reading the text; in the second half of the fifth century famous names like those of Sappho, Linos, Musaios are added to these figures. On a Carneol-Scarabaeus even a Sphinx is represented as reciting the famous riddle from an open book in her paws (about 460 B.C.).³ We are justified, I believe, in taking the coincidence of the literary passages and the vase-paintings as evidence of a change in the common use of books; no doubt it was a slow change, leading gradually to the fourth and final period, when a conscious method of *παράδοσις*, of literary tradition by books, became established.

We are not able to follow out the development in this period of transition step by step. There seems to be no new evidence, only a few casual allusions in Old Comedy and in Platonic dialogues, which are well known but need to be carefully reconsidered. Eupolis, Aristophanes' contemporary, mentioned, probably in the twenties of the fifth century, the place *οὐ τὰ βιβλί' ὄνια*, 'where the books are on sale'.⁴ Socrates was able to get hold of the books of Anaxagoras very quickly, when he had heard someone reading an interesting passage from one of his writings, though he was much disappointed by them.⁵ When Plato represented him in the *Apology*⁶ as referring to *Ἀναξαγόρου βιβλία τοῦ Κλαζομενίου*, Socrates mentioned the very cheap price of a drachma, at which copies could be bought by anyone in the market-place,⁷ with irony, if not with contempt.

¹ F. Winter, 'Schulunterricht auf griechischen Vasenbildern', *Bonner Jahrbücher* 123 (1916) 275–85, esp. 281 f.

² J. D. Beazley, 'Hymn to Hermes', *AJA* 52 (1948) 336 ff., discusses in detail an unpublished vase in the manner of Duris and eight other representations of inscribed rolls; the earliest one, the schoolmaster of the Panaitios-Painter, is confidently dated about 490 B.C. Three items of Beazley's list are fully treated again by Turner, *Athenian Books* (1952) 13–16, who further discusses an Athenian pyxis (no. 1241). Against the assumption of E. Pöhlmann, *Griechische Musikfragmente* (Nürnberg 1960) 83 f., that some of the signs on the open scrolls were noted melodies, see R. P. Winnington-Ingram, *Gnomon* 33 (1961) 693, who correctly takes them for poetic texts and gives three more references in note 2 (cf. ibid. 1962, 112).

³ R. Lullies, 'Die lesende Sphinx', *Festschrift f. B. Schweitzer* (Stuttgart 1954) 140 ff.

⁴ Fr. 304 K., but see the exact wording of the whole passage. On *βιβλιοθήκαι*, Poll. ix 47.

⁵ Plat. *Phaed.* 97 B (= *Vors.* 59 A 47).

⁶ Plat. *Apol.* 26 D (= *Vors.* 59 A 35).

⁷ Loc. cit. *ὁ ἐξέστην ἐνίοτε, εἰ πάνυ πολλοῦ, δραχμῆς ἐκ τῆς ὀρχήστρας πριαμένους* (-ους Diels-

Therefore the figure should not be taken too seriously;¹ but the fact that books of Anaxagoras were available to the general public in Athens² is fairly certain. There is no certainty, on the other hand, about the tradition, reported by Clement of Alexandria in his lists of 'first inventors', and often repeated, that Anaxagoras was 'the first to publish a written book'.³ The plague of bad βιβλία in Aristophanes' Cloud-cuckoo-town⁴ is a satiric counterpart to conditions in Athens towards the end of the century; at about 400 B.C. books were even exported to countries on the Black Sea.⁵ Something must have happened to stimulate book production to such a degree; the influence of the Ionian Anaxagoras, even though settled in Athens before the Peloponnesian war and enjoying Pericles' friendship, can hardly have been sufficient.

In the course of the fifth century the tragic poets, the historians, and the Sophists became the predominant figures in the literary life of Athens. Tragedies were composed for performance in the theatre of Dionysus, but were also available as 'books' afterwards. The only unmistakable evidence, however, is Dionysus' confession in Aristophanes' *Frogs* 52 f. (produced in January 405 B.C.): ἐπὶ τῆς νεῶς ἀναγιγνώσκοντί μοι / τὴν Ἄνδρομέδαν πρὸς ἑμᾶντόν 'when I was reading (Euripides') *Andromeda* (produced in 413 B.C.) to myself on board'.⁶

We may reasonably assume that the Athenians could not have taken the point of parody in the many paratragedic passages of Attic Comedy unless they had read the tragedies, as we find the god of the theatre reading the *Andromeda*. In the fourth century Aristotle even distinguished Kranz) κτλ.; ὀρχήστρα does not refer to the theatre of Dionysus, but to a part of the ἀγορά, see W. Judeich, *Topographie von Athen*² (1931) 342. 2; A. W. Pickard-Cambridge, *The Dramatic Festivals of Athens* (1953) 36. 4.

¹ As Anaxagoras had been dead for nearly thirty years, the copies may have been 'second hand'. N. Lewis, *L'Industrie du papyrus* (Thèse Paris 1914) 62 f., and Turner, *Athenian Books* 21, were puzzled when they compared the real cost of papyrus and of copying at that time with Socrates' statement.

² Athenian βιβλιοπῶλαι mentioned in old comedy: Aristomenes fr. 9 K., Theopomp. fr. 77 K., Nicoph. fr. 19. 4 K.; see also above, p. 26, n. 5.

³ Clem. Al. *Stromat.* I 78 (II pp. 50 f. St.) = *Vors.* 59 A 36 ναὶ μὴν ὄψε ποτε εἰς Ἑλλάδας ἢ τῶν λόγων παρήλθε διδασκαλία τε καὶ γραφή . . . οἱ δὲ Ἀναξαγόραν . . . πρῶτον διὰ γραφῆς ἐκδοῦναι βιβλίον ἱστοροῦσαν. Clement seems to have understood γραφή as 'writing', but the sense may have been 'drawing', if one compares *Vors.* II 6. 23 and II 11. 2 <μετὰ> διαγραφῆς Diels; the fact of the ἐκδοσις is emphasized by Th. Birt, *Die Buchrolle in der Kunst* (1907) 213, and by Stählin in *Vors.* loc. cit.; cf. E. Derenne, 'Les procès d'impieété' (below, p. 31, n. 5) 25. 3.

⁴ Aristoph. *Av.* 974 ff., 1024 ff., 1288.

⁵ Xenoph. *Anab.* VII 5. 14, in the cargoes of vessels wrecked near Salmydessus ἠδύρισκοντο . . . πολλὰ βιβλία γεγραμμένα.

⁶ Cf. Aristoph. *Ran.* 1114 βιβλίον τ' ἔχων ἕκαστος μανθάνει τὰ δεξιὰ. From the whole context of the often discussed lines 1109-18 it is obvious to me that Aristophanes meant to say there is no danger of ἀμαθία, of inexperience, or ignorance on the side of the Athenian audience; the theatre-goers are military servicemen and enlightened (σοφοί) 'readers of books, able to understand the right points'.

certain plays, which were particularly suitable for reading, from those with a purely ἀγωνιστική and ὑποκριτική λέξις, and described their poets as ἀναγνωστικοί. But it is a mistake to think that there were poets who wrote their plays only for reading.¹ There have never been such writers; plays were always composed for acting in the first place. Euripides' book-knowledge is ridiculed by Aristophanes,² and he is said to have been the owner of a whole library.³ Wilamowitz⁴ once tried to demonstrate that the texts of the tragedies were the first proper Greek 'books', βιβλία; for earlier writings he used the term ὑπομνήματα. But ὑπόμνημα never meant an independent finished writing; it may refer to notes reminding one of facts heard or seen in the past, or to notes jotted down and collected as a rough copy for a future book, or to explanatory notes to some other writing, that is, a commentary.⁵ It is quite arbitrary to call the early Ionic prose-writings, such as those of Heraclitus and Hecataeus, 'reminders'; they were more or less finished works, copied by pupils and friends, or deposited in a temple, as in the case of Heraclitus.⁶ We should not underrate the influence of tragedy on the development of the book; but so far it is not proved that the tragedians were the first writers to have their works made available as βιβλία to a wider public.

Herodotus seems to have lectured publicly, reciting here and there a single λόγος,⁷ an ἀγώνισμα ἐς τὸ παραχρήμα ἀκούειν in Thucydides' phrase, and he certainly was open to Sophistic ideas and stylistic devices.⁸ His 'history' as a whole, the first great work of Greek prose literature, was finally written down in Italy about 430 B.C. and published only posthumously. It can hardly have had any influence on the growth of the book. But when in the following generation Thucydides hoped that his historical ξυγγραφή would be a κτήμα ἐς αἰεὶ (I 22. 4), he was already thinking of his future readers. So great an increase in the spreading abroad of the written word had apparently taken place between the two generations. It is no surprise to find that in the last decade of the fifth century the local Attic tradition also, which had hitherto been oral, was fixed for the first time in a book, the Ἀττική ξυγγραφή (Thuc. I 97. 2) of

¹ The correct interpretation of Aristot. *Rhet.* III 12 p. 1413 b 12 is given by O. Crusius, *Festschrift für Th. Gomperz* (1902) 381 ff., but the wrong interpretation is repeated everywhere.

² Aristoph. *Ran.* 943, 1409.

³ Athen. I 3 A.

⁴ *Einleitung in die Tragödie* (1889) 121 ff.

⁵ References in the article of F. Bömer, 'Der Commentarius', *Herm.* 81 (1953) 215 ff., but he did not mention Wilamowitz's theory.

⁶ I fully agree in this point with Turner, *Athenian Books* 17.

⁷ Marcellin. *Vita Thuc.* 54; Paroemiogr. cod. Coisl. 157 = Append. II 35, ed. Gotting., vol. I 400 εἰς τὴν Ἡροδότου σκιάν. This late tradition, often rejected, was rightly accepted by F. Jacoby, *RE*, Suppl. II 330, and John L. Myres, *Herodotus, Father of History* (1953) 5.

⁸ F. Jacoby, *RE*, Suppl. II 500 f.

Hellanicus of Lesbos;¹ his connexion with contemporary Sophists is clearly perceptible.

It is a notable coincidence that under the archonship of Euclides (403/2 B.C.) the Ionic alphabet was officially adopted for public documents in Athens instead of the local Attic script.² If the written tradition started in Ionia, as we assumed, it is natural that Ionic characters were predominantly in use for literary purposes in other parts of Greece as well.³ In Athens their increased popularity in the second half of the fifth century may have been brought about by the itinerant Sophists who mostly came from Ionic cities; the letters described in Euripides' *Theseus* (fr. 382 N.², produced before 422 B.C.) are apparently Ionic. Occasional transcriptions of texts were necessary (and, no doubt, some mistakes were made in the process); but no general μεταχαρακτηρισμός⁴ of earlier literature took place. Quite naturally, the Ionic script became, in the course of time, the universally accepted hand both for literary texts⁵ and for documents.

There remains the question whether the Sophists⁶ can really claim to have played the decisive part in this change. One of the leading Sophists, Prodicus himself, is put on a par with a 'book' by Aristophanes, *Tagenistas* (fr. 490 K.) 'either a book or Prodicus has ruined the man', τούτου τὸν ἄνδρ' ἢ βιβλίον διέφθορεν / ἢ Πρόδικος. The alternative at least shows that pure literariness was regarded as characteristic of a Sophist; at the same time it points to the danger of Sophistic books, perhaps of books in general. From Plato's *Symposium* (117 B), of which the whole scene is staged in 416 B.C., one can infer⁷ that Prodicus' *Horai* were in circulation as a 'book' at that time; later on from a copy of this book Xenophon took the famous parable of Hercules at the crossroads (*Mem.*

¹ F. Jacoby, *Atthis* (Oxford 1949) 216 f., Index p. 431 oral tradition and *RE* VIII (1913) 107, 111, 138, Hellanicus and the Sophists.

² Theopomp. 115 *FGH Hist* 155.

³ Cf. Schol. Dionys. Thr., *Gr. Gr.* III p. 183. 20 ff. Hilg.

⁴ The theory of a universal and systematical transliteration is maintained by R. Herzog, 'Die Umschrift der älteren griechischen Literatur in das ionische Alphabet', *Programm zur Rektoratsfeier der Universität Basel* (1912), but he is not able to prove his point either by the valuable collection of so-called evidence or by his arguments. J. Irigoin, *L'histoire du texte de Pindare* (1952) 22-28 still tried to maintain the theory of μεταγραμματισμός.

⁵ Our earliest specimen seems to have been written in the third quarter of the fourth century B.C. See below, p. 102; cf. C. H. Roberts, *Greek Literary Hands 350 B.C.-A.D. 400* (1955) 1.

⁶ E. Curtius, *Wort und Schrift* (1859; reprinted in 'Alterthum und Gegenwart' 1, 1875) 262: 'Sophistik . . . da begann in Athen die Lese- und Bücherwut'. R. Harder, 'Bemerkungen zur griechischen Schriftlichkeit', *Antike* 19 (1943) 107 = *Kleine Schriften* (1960) 79 'Thukydidēs und die Sophisten führen das Schreibwesen zum endgültigen Sieg'; Turner, *Athenian Books* 16-23.

⁷ K. v. Fritz, *RE* xxiii 86 (rightly against H. Diels's note to *Vors.* 84 B 1).

II 1. 21-34 = *Vors.* 84 B 2). Xenophon also records an interview of Socrates with a certain Euthydemus, called ὁ καλός (*Mem.* IV 2. 1 ff.), who had a remarkable collection of books of poets as well as of 'Sophists' (ποιητῶν τε καὶ σοφιστῶν τῶν εὐδοκιμωτάτων).¹ As professional teachers, the Sophists had to give book texts of the great poets (*Plat. Protog.* 325 E) to their pupils, but they started also to distribute copies of their own writings as παραδείγματα, models,² and to write practical textbooks.³ Oral instruction, though still most important,⁴ was no longer sufficient for their special purpose (*Plat. Phaedr.* 228 A). If there is any truth in the tradition⁵ that Protagoras' books were collected from their owners and burned on the agora when he was accused of atheism (about 416/15 B.C.?), an established trade and distribution of books among the Athenian public at that time must be assumed. This may still have been on a small scale; the discussions about the problem, even about the danger, of this new habit were mainly concerned with Sophistic writings. We find an example of this in Aristophanes' sneer at Prodicus; his point of view was merely ethical. A more general philosophical opposition arose from the side of Socrates⁶ and Plato; it is voiced again and again from the early dialogue *Protagoras* to the late *Phaedrus*.⁷ Two points in these much discussed passages⁸ are relevant to our purpose. In the first place the immediate target for the attacks was the Sophists, their exaggerated respect

¹ Cf. Isocr. 2 (ad Nicocl.) 13 μήτε τῶν ποιητῶν τῶν εὐδοκιμούντων μήτε τῶν σοφιστῶν μηδενὸς οἴου δεῖν ἀπειρωσ ἔχειν; both Xenophon and Isocrates refer to contemporary writers, not to the σοφοί of old.

² Cf. Marrou 54. For references to such sample speeches put into writing see W. Steidle, 'Redekunst und Bildung bei Isokrates', *Herm.* 80 (1952) 271. 5. On the preference for the written word by Isocrates in the line of the Sophists, *ibid.* 279, 292, 296.

³ *Plat. Phaedr.* 266 D καὶ μάλα πον συχνά . . . τὰ γ' ἐν τοῖς βιβλίοις τοῖς περὶ λόγων τέχνης γεγραμμένοις; cf. M. Fuhrmann, *Das systematische Lehrbuch* (1960) 123 f.; see also below, p. 76, n. 5.

⁴ Protagoras and Prodicus used to read manuscripts to their pupils (*Diog. L.* IX 50, cf. 54 = *Vors.* 80 A 1). Hippias repeatedly read his *Τρωικός* to the Spartans and Athenians (*Plat. Hipp. mai.* 286 BC = *Vors.* 86 A 9). See also Diels, *NJb* 25 (1910) 11: 'Da die Sophistik . . . den mündlichen Unterricht durch eine Unzahl praktischer Handbücher und Broschüren eindringlicher und nachhaltiger gestaltete' (italics are mine); this may be a little exaggerated.

⁵ *Vors.* 80 A 1 τὰ βιβλία αὐτοῦ κατέκαυσαν ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ ὑπὸ κήρυκι ἀναλεξάμενοι παρ' ἐκάστου τῶν κερτημένον, *ibid.* A 3, 4, 23; cf. E. Derenne, 'Les Procès d'impiété', *Bibliothèque de la Fac. de Philos. et des Lettres, Univ. de Liège*, 45 (1930) 55; against J. Burnet, *Greek Philosophy* I (1924) 112, and his followers see E. R. Dodds, *The Greeks and the Irrational* (Berkeley 1951) 189 and n. 66, p. 201, who gives a correct interpretation of *Plat. Men.* 91 E about Protagoras and the whole background for 'prosecutions of intellectuals on religious grounds'.

⁶ Cf. Xenoph. *Mem.* IV 2. 9.

⁷ *Plat. Prot.* 329 A, esp. *Phaedr.* 274 B ff.; cf. *Epist.* II 314 C, VII 341 B ff.

⁸ On the attitude to books and on the problem of the spoken and the written word there is a lucid chapter in P. Friedländer, *Platon*, I² (1954) 114 ff. with bibliography p. 334 (English translation, New York 1958, bibliography pp. 356 f.); III² (1960) 220 f. on the passage in *Phaedr.* with n. 33, p. 469. See also the general remarks by E. R. Curtius, *Europäische Kultur und lateinisches Mittelalter* (Bern 1948) 304 ff., esp. 306 f. 'Das Buch als Symbol'.

for the written word, and their own preference for the use of books. Such an attitude, it was argued, propagated by influential teachers, was bound to weaken or even to destroy physical memory (*μνήμη*), on which the oral tradition of the past was based, and in the end would be a threat to true philosophy, which needs the personal intercourse of the dialectician to plant the living word in the soul of the listener. The second point may have been still more important for the future. The Socratic and Platonic arguments are the expression of a general, deeply rooted Greek aversion against the written word; they strengthened this instinctive mistrust in later 'literary' ages also and thus helped to promote sober 'criticism'. The Greek spirit never became inclined to accept a tradition simply because it was written down in books. The question was asked whether it was genuine or false, and the desire remained alive to restore the original 'spoken' word of the ancient author when it was obscured or corrupted by a long literary transmission. If books were a danger to the human mind, the threat was at least diminished by Plato's struggle against them; no real 'tyranny' of the book¹ ever established itself among the Greeks, as it did in the oriental or in the medieval world.

It remains true that their contribution to the development of the book was one general service the Sophists did for Greek civilization as a whole and for future scholarship in particular. We now turn to their individual achievements in the field of learning, and discuss a few representative specimens. For our purpose, the most important part of their activity was the 'interpretation' of early poetry. But was this really a true *ἐρμηνεία τῶν ποιητῶν*? The only substantial specimen which still survives is the explanation of a monostrophic lyric poem of Simonides by Protagoras in Plato's dialogue (*Prot.* 339 A ff. = *Vors.* 80 A 25).² There can hardly be any doubt that the choice of this particular poem to Scopas on the idea of the *ἀνήρ ἀγαθός*³ was intentional, and it is often said that there existed

¹ When Turner, *Athenian Books* 23, finishes his excellent lecture with the flourish: 'By the first thirty years of the fourth century books have established themselves, and their tyranny lies ahead', I part company with him. E. Curtius was right when he stated in his festival speech *Wort und Schrift* (1859) (= *Alterthum und Gegenwart* 1 255) 'immer blieb . . . eine Stimmung zurück, welche sich gegen die Herrschaft des Buchstabens sträubte'. The custom of reciting poetry and artistic prose remained alive up to the end of antiquity, see E. Rohde, *Der griechische Roman*³ (1914) 327 ff.; see also Wilamowitz, *Die hellenistische Dichtung* 1 (1924) 98. 118, about 'Buchpoesie', and 'Rezitationspoesie'.

² Cf. Themist. *or.* 23, p. 350. 20 Dind. *Πρωταγόρας . . . τὰ Σιμωνίδου τε καὶ ἄλλων ποιήματα ἐξηγουμένους*; a reference to this passage of Themistius (which Schneidewin, *Simonidis Cei fragmenta* (1835) 16, rightly regards as derived from Plato's dialogue) is missing in *Vors.* 80 A and in M. Untersteiner, *Sofisti, Testimonianze e Frammenti* 1 (1949) 2 A.

³ We are concerned only with Protagoras' way of expounding the Simonidean text, not with the problems of this text itself; E. Diehl, *Anth. lyr. Gr.* 11² (1942) 77 ff. Simonid. fr. 4 (= fr. 5 Bergk) with bibliography; D. L. Page, *Poetae Melici Graeci* (Oxford 1962) 282 f.,

a sort of spiritual relationship between Simonides and the early Sophists. I was rather sceptical about this conception of Simonides as a 'proto-Sophist', as this fragment seemed to be unique; but there is now a close parallel to the Scopas poem in a recently published Simonidean fragment dealing with *καλόν, αἰσχρόν, ἀρετά, ἐσθλός*.¹ The whole Platonic passage would be of little or no value, if it contained a mere caricature² of the Sophist's teaching. As a matter of fact, there is no lack of the usual Socratic irony, but at the same time Plato, who always felt a genuine respect for Protagoras, draws an essentially adequate picture of his procedure. Protagoras is scrutinizing a well-known work of probably the most famous poet of his generation (Simonides died in about 468 B.C., Protagoras was born in about 490 B.C.); how clever to discover just there an obvious contradiction (339 B *ἐναντία λέγει αὐτὸς αὐτῷ ὁ ποιητής*). This kind of critical examination of the poet's single words and their proper meaning (for example *ἔμμεναι* and *γενέσθαι*) is in the Sophist's view the most important mental training; it is necessary for a young man to be trained in this way because it helps him to become himself *περὶ ἐπῶν δευόν*.

In a similar way Protagoras discovered an incorrect use of the form of the command (*μῆνιν ἄειδε, θεά*) instead of the wish in the first line of the *Iliad* (*Vors.* 80 A 29; also 80 A 30 on Homer *Φ* 240);³ the straightforward quotation of this by Aristotle (*Poet.* 19. 1456 b 15) confirms in a way the assumption that Plato in the passage about the Simonidean poem does not ridicule Protagoras as long as the great Sophist himself is speaking. On the other hand, when Socrates in his extensive refutation of Protagoras' arguments gives a series of interpretations in detail and an explanation of the whole (341 E *διανοεῖσθαι*, 344 B *τὸν τύπον αὐτοῦ τὸν ὄλον καὶ τὴν βούλησιν*), Plato indulges in a sort of sparkling parody of the

Simonid. fr. 37 (an improved text). Further discussions are referred to by P. Friedländer, *Platon* 11² (1957) 18–21; 279, n. 18. The only paper which concentrates on the *interpretation* of the poem in the Platonic dialogue by Protagoras and Socrates is that of H. Gundert, 'Die Simonides-Interpretation in Platons Protagoras', *Festschrift O. Regenbogen* (Heidelberg 1952) 71–93; and only Gundert came to the astonishing conclusion that Plato seems to have been unable to grasp the 'archaic' style of the poem, and to have been unaware of the mistakes he made in its interpretation (p. 92. 34 'Die zentralen Mißverständnisse blieben ihm selbst verborgen', cf. p. 82).

¹ Simonid. fr. 36 Page (= *P.Oxy.* 2432). I am tempted to conjecture that the lost subject to l. 1 *τὸ τ]ε καλὸν κρίνει τὸ τ' αἰσχρόν* was *καίρος*; *καίρος* very often occurs in discussions of such ethical notions in Sophistic writing and in later tragedy; see Fr. trag. adesp. 26, p. 844 N.² in *Δισσοὶ λόγοι* (*Vors.* 90. 2. 19) and Wilamowitz, *Sappho und Simonides* (1913) 178. 1; M. Untersteiner, *The Sophists* (1954) 367, Index v. *καίρος*.

² This expression is still used by J. W. H. Atkins, *Literary criticism in Antiquity* 1 (1952) 42.

³ On Homeric studies in the fifth century B.C. see the useful collection of evidence in H. Sengenbusch, *Dissertatio Homerica*, first printed in *Homeri carmina*, ed. Dindorf (1855/6) 111 f.

Sophistic 'method'. Socrates (*Prot.* 340 A ff.) is represented as borrowing from another prominent member of that circle, Prodicus, who was a fellow countryman of the Cean poet Simonides and the first authority on 'synonyms'; Prodicus is appealed to for a sharp distinction between the senses of ἔμμεναι and γενέσθαι which Protagoras had denied, and for the absurd identity of χαλεπόν and κακόν (341 A). In order to save a wise man like Simonides from sinning against reason, Socrates finally has recourse to the most violent transpositions of an adverb (ὑπερβατόν δεῖ θεῖναι ἐν τῷ ἄσματι τὸ ἀλαθέως, 343 E) and of an adjective (ἐκῶν, 345 E, 346 E); later grammarians and rhetoricians derived the name of the figure 'hyperbaton' from this passage.

It will hardly be possible to discern the real image of Sophistic interpretation through these malicious and amusing Socratic distortions; but if we catch a likeness of the 'historic' Protagoras at the beginning of his own discussion (339 A ff.), that passage is quite sufficient to show that he was not aiming at the true reading and meaning of the Simonidean text; the criticism of wording and sense in which he displays his own superiority is regarded as useful for the discipline of the mind of his pupils. It is this educational value which the Platonic Socrates most emphatically denies at the end (347 c ff.). One cannot question the ancient poet himself and discuss his poems with him (cf. also *Hipp. min.* 365 D), but only talk about a given literary text; such attempts do not lead to the truth, but result in arbitrary opinions. Behind this sceptical attitude to the Sophistic interpreters of the written word, there is in this early dialogue the first sign of Plato's distrust of poetry itself as a source of true wisdom of which we shall hear more later on.¹

It is very likely that Protagoras' contemporaries and followers in the next generation practised a similar kind of interpretation;² there are hints in Plato's *Protagoras* as regards Prodicus and Hippias,³ but no clear evidence. When Callicles (*Plat. Gorg.* 484 B)⁴ in his speech about 'the law of nature' (νόμον . . . τὸν τῆς φύσεως 483 E) refers to a passage of a Pindaric poem (fr. 169 Sn.) he is by no means interested in explaining the text. On the contrary, he quotes the saying about the νόμος βασιλεύς⁵

¹ See below, pp. 58 f.

² Basilios Tsirimbas, *Die Stellung der Sophistik zur Poesie im V. und IV. Jahrhundert bis zu Sokrates* (Diss. München 1936) 53 ff.

³ Cf. *Vors.* 86 B dub. about 'prosody' in B 15, Ψ 328.

⁴ See E. R. Dodds, *Plato: Gorgias* (Oxford 1959) 270 ff.—*P. Oxy.* 2450 (published 1961) fr. 1, col. II starts with l. 6 of the Platonic quotation, but it may still be of some help; the numerous references to Pindar's lines are given in extenso by A. Turyn, *Pindari Carm.* (1948) fr. 187.

⁵ M. Gigante, *Nóμος βασιλεύς* (1956) 146 ff. 'Ippia e Callicle, interpreti di Pindaro'.

to show that Pindar's νόμος is the same 'right of the stronger' which he, Callicles himself, championed in his long ῥήσις; and whatever Pindar's view was, he could never have agreed with Callicles. Hippias (*Plat. Protag.* 337 D), in a short reference to Pindar's line, apparently took νόμος in a quite different way as 'convention'.¹ Critias (*Plat. Charm.* 163 B) used a half-line of Hesiod *Op.* 311 ἔργον δ' οὐδὲν ὄνειδος to support his argument, when he wanted to work out the difference between ἐργάζεσθαι, πράττειν, and ποιεῖν in the manner of Prodicus.²

One might suspect that in explaining Homer the Sophists, as educationalists, would have been inclined to follow the 'allegorical' line, which began with Theagenes in the later sixth century. But there seems to have been only one philosopher in the middle of the fifth century whom we may label with confidence an allegorist, a pupil of Anaxagoras,³ not a Sophist, Metrodorus of Lampsacus (*Vors.* 61). He extended 'physical' explanation from the gods to the heroes Ἀγαμέμνονα . . . αἰθέρα, Ἀχιλλέα ἥλιον . . . Ἐκτορα σελήνην κτλ. (61 A 4,⁴ cf. 2 and 3 πάντα εἰς ἀλληγορίαν μετάγων); there is also one reference to a grammatical question (61 A 5 τὸ 'πλεῖον' δύο σημαίνειν φησί), exactly as in the case of Theagenes. In Plato's *Ion* 530 c Metrodorus is associated with Stesimbrotus of Thasos and a certain Glaucón, otherwise not known; the 'rhapsode' Ion claims 'to speak so beautifully about Homer, as neither Metrodorus nor Stesimbrotus nor Glaucón nor anyone else could do' (*FGrHist* 107 T 3). As nothing is said about allegory, we must not infer from this passage that Stesimbrotus used the same method as Metrodorus;⁵ in the fragments of his book on Homer (F 21–25) there is not the slightest trace of allegorical interpretation. He is quoted in our Scholia to the *Iliad* about Nestor's cup and about the division of the universe between the three sons of Kronos; furthermore, he is mentioned as one who wrote, later than Theagenes and before Antimachus of Colophon, who is attested to have

¹ See also Hdt. III 38.

² *Vors.* 84 A 18, registered under the name of Prodicus; it should be said that Critias is the speaker. Cf. *Charm.* 163 D; Xenoph. *Mem.* I 2. 56.

³ Diog. L. II 11 (*Vors.* 59 A 1 and 61 A 2). Even if we could trust Favorinus' statement about Anaxagoras (δοκεῖ δὲ πρῶτος τὴν Ὀμήρου ποιήσασθαι ἀποφῆναι εἶναι περὶ ἀρετῆς καὶ δικαιοσύνης), it would not mean that he explained Homeric poetry as moral allegory (as many people seem to believe including Sandys, *Hist.* 13 30), but that he first made known its ethical tendency; in that respect he would have been a predecessor of Aristophanes, see below, pp. 47 f.

⁴ On new combinations and readings of Pap. Herculan. 1081 and 1676 see J. Heidmann, *Der Pap. 1676 der Herculan. Bibliothek* (Diss. Bonn 1937) 6 f. and F. Sbordone, 'Un nuovo libro della Poetica di Filodemo', *Atti dell'Accad. Pontaniana*, n.s. IX (1960) 252 f.

⁵ This traditional mistake is particularly stressed by W. Schmid, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur* I 2 (1934) 678, and worked out by F. Buffière, *Les Mythes d'Homère et la pensée grecque* (Paris 1956) 132–6 'L'exégèse allégorique avant les Stoiciens'.

been his pupil, not only on Homer's poetry but also on his life and date. If this is correct, Stesimbrotus leads us to a very remarkable figure in the history of poetry and learning, of whom we shall hear later on, Antimachus of Colophon.¹

At the moment, however, we have to look back to the Sophists. If it were true that Antisthenes had taken over the allegorical interpretation of Homer from Metrodorus,² we should at last have found a Sophistic allegorist. Antisthenes³ was a pupil of Gorgias and influenced also by Prodicus, before he joined the circle of Socrates. We have a long list of titles of books by him on Homeric subjects (Diog. L. VI 17. 18), especially on the *Odyssey*, of which some quotations are preserved in our Scholia; there seems to have been even one book *Περὶ Ὀμήρου ἐξηγητῶν*.⁴ So he was apparently much concerned with Homer and his interpretation; if we can trust Dio Chrysostom (*or.* 53. 5 *Περὶ Ὀμήρου*), Antisthenes was the first to make the distinction between 'seeming' and 'truth' in the Homeric poems (ὅτι τὰ μὲν δόξῃ, τὰ δ' ἀληθείᾳ εἴρηται τῷ ποιητῇ) which was later so often employed to explain contradictions. Such an explanation was necessary, because Homer was to Antisthenes an authority for moral doctrines; he paid no attention either to hidden meanings⁵ or to the

¹ See below, pp. 93 f. Antimach. ed. B. Wyss (1936) test. 9 and fr. 129; cf. Callim. fr. 452. F. Jacoby in his commentary on Stesimbrotus, II D p. 343. 22, rightly accepts Suidas' testimony about Antimachus (rejected by Wyss, loc. cit., p. iv), and says about Stesimbrotus: 'Von Beruf Rhapsode und im Sinne der Zeit auch Homerphilologe' and p. 349. 17 'verwendet alle Mittel der damaligen Philologie'. We had better avoid the term 'Philologie' for this period.

² W. Schmid *Geschichte d. griech. Lit.* I I (1929) 131, I 2 (1934) 679; Konrad Müller, 'Allegorische Dichtererklärung', *RE*, Suppl. IV (1924) 17; J. Geffcken, 'Entwicklung und Wesen des griechischen Kommentars', *Herm.* 67 (1932) 399 'unerfreuliche Allegoristik'; he even attributes to Antisthenes 'the first real commentary on a writer', namely on Heraclitus, but the Antisthenes who commented on Heraclitus (Diog. L. IX 15 = *Vors.* 22 A I. 15) has been identified long ago as one of the other three Ἀντισθένης mentioned by Diog. L. VI 19, the Ἡρακλείτειος: Wissowa, *RE* I 2537. 36; cf. F. Dümmler, *Antisthenica* (1882) 16 ff.; his acute observations in Ch. 2, 'De Homeri sapientia', are partly misleading, esp. p. 24. The right line was taken by D. B. Monro, *Homer's Odyssey XIII-XXIV* (1901) 412 in his survey of ancient Homeric criticism; J. Tate in two articles on allegorism (see above, p. 10, n. 5) and finally in his vigorous polemics against R. Höistadt corroborated the statement that 'Antisthenes was not an allegorist' *Eranos* 51 (1953) 14-22 with detailed arguments. So F. Buffière (1956) did not repeat the old mistake, as he did in the case of Stesimbrotus (above, p. 35, n. 5).

³ There is no recent collection of testimonia and fragmenta: Antisthenis *Fragmenta*, ed. Aug. Guil. Winckelmann, Zürich 1842, reprinted in Mullach's *F. Philos. Gr.* II (1881), 261 ff.; rhetorical fragments in *Art. script.* ed. L. Radermacher (1951) B XIX; see also H. Sengebusch, *Diss. Hom.* (1855/6) 115 ff. about his Homeric studies. See Addenda.

⁴ Schol. α I, ε 211 = η 257, ι 106, 525 (critical text in Schrader, Porphyr. *Quaest. Hom. in Od.* 1890); Diog. L. VI 17 *περὶ ἐξηγητῶν, περὶ Ὀμήρου* codd., corr. Krische, see Schrader, Porphyr. *Quaest. Hom. ad Il.* (1880) Proleg. p. 386.

⁵ The *ironical* remark about ὑπόνοιαι in the conversation of Antisthenes, Niceratus, and Socrates (Xenoph. *Symp.* III 6) is not made by Antisthenes, but by Socrates when he comments on the ignorance and folly of the rhapsodes who do not know the 'undersenses'.

literal sense. When he discussed *πολύτροπος* (α I)¹ at some length, he was not attempting to understand the proem of the *Odyssey* but to define the general ethical meaning of the compound by which the figure of Odysseus is characterized; Odysseus' experience in all manner (*τρόποι*) of words is to him much superior to the brutal strength of Ajax (see also his fictitious orations *Αἴας* and *Ὀδυσσεύς*).² The main point, however, is this: 'the investigation of words is the beginning of education', ἀρχὴ παιδείσεως ἢ τῶν ὀνομάτων ἐπίσκεψις.³ As far as we know the leading Sophists and their immediate descendants like Antisthenes, none of them may be counted as an allegorist. This is significant for the whole movement and not unimportant for the future. Furthermore, the answer to our question at the beginning of this section must be in the negative: no true ἐρμηνεία τῶν ποιητῶν did exist. The Sophistic explanations of poetry foreshadow the growth of a special field of inquiry, the analysis of language; the final object is rhetorical or educational, not literary.

No wonder, therefore, that the Sophists became more efficient in this sphere than in any other one. Protagoras seems to have led the way with his concept of ὀρθοέπεια;⁴ he possibly dealt with 'correctness of diction' in his famous book called *Ἀλήθεια* 'Truth'. Homer was criticized for commanding the Muse instead of praying to her, as we have seen in the remarks about 'interpretation'. For Protagoras had established the rule that four classes of sentences are to be distinguished: 'Wish (prayer), question, answer, command', διειλέ τε τὸν λόγον πρῶτος εἰς τέτταρα: εὐχωλήν, ἐρώτησιν, ἀπόκρισιν, ἐντολήν . . . οὗς καὶ πυθμένας εἶπε λόγων, 'which he called also bases ('fundamental principles' L-S) of speeches'.⁵

¹ See above, p. 4; cf. Hippias in Plat. *Hipp. min.* 364 c, 365 b?

² *Art. script.* B XIX II. 12 Raderm. Antisthenes followed the vulgate version of the epic cycle (Bethe, *Homer* II pp. 165 f. and 170 f.) that Ajax carried the body of Achilles. But there seems to have been another early version, preserved by *Ov. met.* XIII 284 ff. and Schol. ε 310, in which Odysseus carried the body; this is not an 'error' of the scholiast, *pace* Bethe who omitted Ovid's testimony. The existence of a different version is confirmed by a fragment of early epic hexameters *P. Oxy.* xxx ed. E. Lobel (1964) 2510. 13 and 21 in which Odysseus does the carrying of the corpse.

³ *Art. script.* B XIX 6; cf. C. J. Classen, 'Sprachliche Deutung' *Zetemata* 22 (1959) 173-6, on Antisthenes' interpretation of ὀνόματα (with bibliography 173. 6); see also F. Mehmel, *Antike und Abendland* IV (1954) 34 f.

⁴ See *Excursus*.

⁵ Diog. L. IX 53 f. = *Vors.* 80 A I = *Art. script.* B III 10. 11. This division into four 'bases' is confirmed by Quintil. *inst.* III 4. 10: Protagoran . . . qui interrogandi, respondendi, mandandi, precandi . . . partes solas putat (= *Art. script.* B III 12; not in *Vors.*). οἱ δὲ εἰς ἑννά in our text of Diog. L. IX 54 (*Vors.* II⁵ p. 254, 14 f.) does not mean that others *said* that Protagoras made a division into seven classes; it means that others *made* an alternative division, and we know from the passage in Quintilian just quoted that Anaximenes did so (*Art. script.* B III 12 and XXXVI 9). It is a rather disturbing 'Parenthesis' in the text of Diog. L.—Alcidamas (see below, pp. 50 f.) divided sentences into four classes, using other names (B XXXI 8 and 9).

When a poet is thinking of a prayer to the Muse, he ought to employ the appropriate expression, and not the expression for the command: *Μῆνιν ἄειδε, θεά*. In the proem of the *Iliad* the poet is guilty also of an incorrect use of gender. The sense of words like *μῆνις* 'wrath' or *πήληξ* 'helmet' is clearly masculine; *Μῆνιν . . . οὐλομένην*, instead of *οὐλόμενον*, therefore was regarded by Protagoras as an incorrectness of construction;¹ he was apparently the first to divide *τὰ γένη τῶν ὀνομάτων* into Males, Females, and Things, *ἄρρενα καὶ θήλεα καὶ σκεύη*,² and to demand a strict observance of this division in the use of gender and ending of words. The comic poets readily made fun of such a novel doctrine of the correctness of gender. There is no doubt that Socrates in Aristophanes' *Clouds* (658 ff.)³ reproduces the essence of Protagoras' teaching, when he starts with the characteristic words: *δεῖ σε . . . μανθάνειν . . . ἄτ' ἐστὶν ὀρθῶς ἄρρενα*. The perplexed pupil is instructed not to use *ἀλεκτρυῶν* for the 'hen', but *ἀλεκτρύαινα* (666), because this would be the correct feminine form for a female animal, and not to say *τὴν κάρδοπον*, but *τὴν καρδόπην* (678), as a word cannot have a masculine termination, if it is feminine. *Ἀλεκτρύαινα* as well as *καρδόπη* are inventions of the comic poet (cf. also *Clouds* 681 ff. and 847 ff.), but there are important new observations and discussions behind these playful lines.

We cannot go any further. The assumption that Protagoras was also the first to draw a distinction between the tenses of the verb is a rather unfortunate one; we have no special reference or quotation as we had in all the previous cases, beyond the short remark in Diog. L. ix 52 *καὶ πρῶτος μέρη χρόνου⁴ διάρρισε καὶ καιροῦ δύναμιν ἐξέθετο*, 'he first distinguished and defined (?) parts of time and set forth the importance of *καιρός*'. Whatever these mysterious words mean, they do not speak either of the 'verb' (never mentioned in the tradition about Protagoras) or the 'tenses'. Even in Plato *χρόνος* never means 'tense', but always 'time'.⁵ The context in which the remark appears is more or less concerned with rhetoric,⁶ and *καιρός* seems to point in the same direction. But another possibility is suggested by a few passages in later philosophical and

¹ Aristot. *Soph. El.* 14 p. 173 b 17 *σολοικισμός* (= *Vors.* 80 A 28 = *Art. script.* B III 7).

² Aristot. *Rhet.* III 5 p. 1407 b 6 (= *Vors.* 80 A 27 = *Art. script.* B 6).

³ *Vors.* 80 c 3 = *Art. script.* B III 8 with Radermacher's notes.—Aristoph. *Nub.* 658 ff. are delightfully explained in every detail by J. Wackernagel, *Vorlesungen über Syntax* II (1924) 1–5.

⁴ *Vors.* 80 A 1. M. Untersteiner, *I sofisti* I (1949) 19 'tempi del verbo'; W. Schmid, *Gr. Lit. Gesch.* I 3 (1940), 23, 11 'Tempora', etc.; C. P. Gunning, *De Sophistis Graeciae praeceptoribus* (Diss. Utrecht 1915) 112, 3, gives more bibliographical references; he himself proposes a rather trivial interpretation (a fixed time-table for his lectures) which is, strangely enough, mentioned by Diels-Kranz in their note ad loc.

⁵ See below, p. 77.

⁶ See Radermacher's note to *Art. script.* B III 24.

grammatical literature, such as Sextus Empiricus, *P.H.* III 144 (I, p. 173. 2 Mutschmann–Mau) *ὁ τε χρόνος λέγεται τριμερῆς εἶναι*, 'time is said to be divided into three parts', past, present, future.¹ If Protagoras² actually reflected on such a division of *χρόνος* in general, this might have led to the later distinction of the (seven) so-called tenses, just as he possibly paved the way for the later doctrine of four moods by his four species of sentences.

From the few incoherent fragments,³ some of them perhaps not even genuine, no plausible reconstruction of a true 'theory' of *ὀρθόπεια* is possible. We had better look back to Plato, *Prot.* 339 A, from which we started; there we are told the real aim of all these endeavours which are comprehensively termed *εὐπέπεια*. If one has learned to distinguish which words and sentences are correctly (*ὀρθῶς*) formed and which not, one will be able to acquire eloquence, which is the chief part of education (*παιδείσεως μέγιστον μέρος*).

Nearly all the better-known Sophists after Protagoras made their own contributions in the linguistic field. The representative figure became Prodicus of Ceos; he was the coeval of Socrates (born 469 B.C.) and about twenty years younger than Protagoras.⁴ Apparently using the formula of his great predecessor, Prodicus declared *πρῶτον γάρ, ὡς φησι Προδίκος, περὶ ὀνομάτων ὀρθότητος μαθεῖν δεῖ* (Plat. *Euthyd.* 277 E),⁵ and Socrates said *παρὰ Προδίκου εἰδέναι τὴν ἀλήθειαν περὶ ὀνομάτων ὀρθότητος* (*Crat.* 384 B); it was for this declamation on 'the correctness of words' that he charged his listeners the unusual fee of fifty drachmai (*ἡ πεντηκοντάδραχμος ἐπίδειξις*).⁶ The same rare expression *ὀρθότης* is used only once and

¹ Cf. the passage about *τὰ χρονικά ἐπιρρήματα* Ap. *Dysc. de adv.* p. 123. 21 Schn. *τὰ μέντοι οὐ διαρίζοντα τὸν χρόνον, κοινὴν δὲ παράτασιν δηλοῦντα τοῦ παντός χρόνον* (sc. *vñv, ἦδη*); Schol. Dionys. *Thr.*, *Gr. Gr.* III 59 and 97 Hilg. (to § 19 Uhlig), esp. 97. 12 ff. *τὰ χρονικά ἐπιρρήματα ἢ καθολικὸν χρόνον δηλοῖ ἢ μερικόν . . . 19 f. τὰ καιροῦ παραστατικά, τουτέστι τὰ ὑποτομῆν χρόνου δηλοῦντα* (*σήμερον, χθές, αὔριον*).

² Diog. L. very liberally credited Protagoras with 'first inventions'; he or his source clearly changed Plato's *Euthydem.* 286 c, *οἱ ἀμφὶ Πρωταγόραν . . . καὶ οἱ ἐτι παλαιότεροι, into οὗτος πρῶτος διελέκται*. So we should not take *πρῶτος διάρρισε* too seriously.

³ It is of no use to apply a much later term (see below, p. 202) to his efforts and call him an 'analogue' or to say that, in the universal dispute between *φύσις* and *νόμος*, language was to Protagoras a product of human convention (Burnet), or of nature (Gunning); the clear antithesis does not seem to have been fixed before Hippias (below, pp. 53, 63) in the next generation (see also *Excursus* to p. 37).—There is a charmingly written paper by G. Murray, *The Beginnings of Grammar* (1931), repr. in *Greek Studies* (1946) 171–91, but not quite reliable in all its details.

⁴ K. v. Fritz, 'Prodikos', *RE* xxiii (1957) 85 ff. The beautiful and enthusiastic paper of F. G. Welcker, 'Prodikos von Keos, Vorgänger von Sokrates', first published in *Rh.M.* 1832 and 1836, reprinted with Addenda in *Kleine Schriften* II (1845) 393–541 is still worth reading; on Prodicus' study of language see esp. 452 ff.

⁵ *Vors.* 84 A 16 = *Art. script.* B VIII 10 with Radermacher's note.

⁶ *Vors.* 84 A 11 (cf. 12) = *Art. script.* B VIII 6; cf. below, p. 62.

with some emphasis by Aristophanes, when the language of Euripides' prologues is being tested τῶν σῶν προλόγων τῆς ὀρθότητος τῶν ἐπῶν (*Ran.* 1181).¹ In the two lines of the prologue of Euripides' *Antigone* (fr. 157 sq. N.²) two words are rejected by Aeschylus in the *Frogs* (1182 ff.) as not properly describing Oedipus' fate ἦν . . . εὐτυχής² and εἶτ' ἐγένετο ἀθλιώτατος, on the ground that he was unfortunate from the very beginning. The criticism here is not of the *form* of words (as in the 'Protagorean' passage of the *Clouds* 658 ff.), but of their meaning. So it is very likely that we get a glimpse of Prodicus³ in these lines of the *Frogs*; the remark about ἦν-ἐγένετο even reminds us of the heated debate about the distinction of εἶναι and γίνεσθαι in Plato's *Protagoras* (340 B ff.), where Socrates finally appeals to Prodicus. He was the acknowledged authority on the differentiation of kindred terms; all the direct references in Plato and Aristotle (*Vors.* 84 A 13-19) are in complete harmony with Aristophanes' hint in the *Frogs*. Even if there is a slight ironical exaggeration in Plato's picture of Prodicus' teaching, there can be no doubt that he in particular liked to deal with two or three different words which seemed to have the same sense (not called 'synonyms' before Aristotle, below, p. 78); his aim was to show the error in this assumption. The precise meaning of ἀμφισβητεῖν and ἐρίζειν, of εὐφραίνεσθαι and ἡδεσθαι, of βούλεσθαι and ἐπιθυμεῖν, of ποιεῖν, πράττειν, ἐργάζεσθαι was by no means the same to Prodicus; by a subtle discrimination between them, called διαίρεσις,⁴ he instructed his pupils 'about the correct use of the words', περὶ ὀνομάτων ὀρθότητος (which should not be confused with Protagoras' purely 'formal' ὀρθοπέπεια).

It has been said⁵ that Prodicus intentionally neglected etymological arguments for his task of διαίρεσις. But in his book *Περὶ φύσεως ἀνθρώπου*, quoted by Galen,⁶ he objected to the use of φλέγμα for 'mucus' (phlegm) in medical literature precisely from the etymological point of view; as it is derived from φλέγω 'burn, inflame', it must mean 'inflammation' and the

¹ For metrical reasons he said ἐπῶν instead of ὀνομάτων, which would hardly fit into the iambic trimeter together with the decisive term ὀρθότητος and with προλόγων.

² Modern editors keep the wrong variant reading, εὐδαίμων, in spite of the protest of Nauck, *TGF* (1889), Add. p. xxv, and Wilamowitz, *Aischylos-Interpretationen* (1914) 81. 1.

³ L. Spengel, *Συναγωγή τεχνῶν* (1828) 41, first compared *Ran.* 1181 with the references by Plato to Prodicus; but he confused the issue in so far as he identified the ὀρθότητος ὀνομάτων of Prodicus with Protagoras' ὀρθοπέπεια and was followed by others.

⁴ *Vors.* 84 A 17-19; see also Plat. *Prot.* 358 A τὴν δὲ Προδικίου τοῦδε διαίρεσιν τῶν ὀνομάτων παραιτοῦμαι, *ibid.* 341 C, and Radermacher's notes on *Art. script.* B VIII 10 and 11.—A complete list of Prodicus' synonyms is given by Hermann Mayer, *Prodikos von Keos und die Anfänge der Synonymik* (Diss. München 1913) 22 ff.

⁵ W. Schmid, *Gr. Lit. Gesch.* I 3 (1940), 46. 8.

⁶ *Vors.* 84 B 4; Galen himself wrote three books *Περὶ ὀνομάτων ὀρθότητος*.

like; for a humour (mucus, 'phlegm' still, in spite of Prodicus' protest, current in English) one should say βλέννα. Even if one finds such considerations rather pedantic, one has to admit that they have no longer the playful character of previous centuries; they are not philosophical¹ speculations either, but sober and new reflections on problems of language. By dwelling on precise distinctions of meaning, Prodicus was led to an awareness of the different usage in different parts of the country; in the course of the explanation of Simonides' poem, he utters the curious opinion that Pittacus was not able τὰ ὀνόματα . . . ὀρθῶς διαμεῖν ἄτε Λέσβιος ὦν καὶ ἐν φωνῇ βαρβάρῳ τεθραμμένος (Plat. *Prot.* 341 C, cf. 346 D), 'as a Lesbian and grown up in a foreign idiom he could not correctly differentiate the words'. In his *Cratylus* Plato seems to be reproducing similar Sophistic discussions from a source of the fifth century about ξενικά ὀνόματα,² when he refers to Aeolic or Doric words as 'alien', that is, different from the familiar Attic form.³ Herodotus,⁴ whether influenced by his contemporaries like Prodicus or not, was able to observe acutely subtle differences between the languages of four Ionic cities (I 142), and travelling through so many foreign countries he made use of such observations on language for his historical conclusions. But he aimed at *ιστορίη*, not at formal knowledge and rhetorical practice, as the Sophists did. It was their work, and especially that of Prodicus, which apparently stimulated future studies⁵ in the field of γλώσσαι, as the first glossaries were called in the third century. It is hardly surprising that in Aristophanes⁶ gibes it is Prodicus' name that turns up as the alternative to a book: ἡ βιβλίον . . . ἡ Πρόδικος. He was an essentially literary man, even if we can trust the tradition about his political mission from his native island to Athens; it was a lucky hit of Plutarch's to combine this amiable Sophist and the leading scholar-poet of about 300 B.C., Philitas, as typical valetudinarians from their early years: Πρόδικον τὸν σοφιστὴν ἢ Φιλίταν τὸν ποιητὴν . . . νέους μὲν, ἰσχνούς δὲ καὶ νοσώδεις καὶ τὰ πολλὰ

¹ There were also rather wild 'etymological' speculations current in the circle of the so-called Heracliteans, see K. Reinhardt, *Parmenides* (1916) 241 f.

² In pre-Hellenistic times διαλεκτικά means 'dialectics', not 'dialect'; ξενικά is the usual term for non-Attic, see below, pp. 62, 79.

³ *Cratyl.* 401 C Attic οὐσίαν, others ἐσσίαν, ὠσίαν; 409 A Doric ἄλιον, Attic ἡλιον; 434 C ἡμεῖς μὲν φάμεν 'σκληρότης', Ἑρετριεῖς δὲ 'σκληροτήρ'. More examples are given by K. Latte, 'Glossographika', *Philol.* 80 (1925) 158 ff., who thinks of an Ionic Heraclitean as Plato's source.

⁴ On Herodotus and Hecataeus see H. Diels, 'Die Anfänge der Philologie bei den Griechen' *NJb* 25 (1910) 14 ff.; cf. below, p. 45, n. 1.

⁵ On the immediate influence on Antisthenes' concept of ὀνομάτων ἐπίσκεψις see above, p. 36; cf. also Democritus' γλώσσαι and ὀνομαστικῶν [*sic*] *Vors.* 68 B 26 (below, p. 42).—For later writers περὶ συνωνύμων see Schmid-Stählin, *Gr. Lit. Gesch.* II 2⁶ (1924) 1080.

⁶ Fr. 490 K. and for his *Ωραι as a circulating 'book' see above, p. 30.

κλωπετεῖς δι' ἀρρωστίαν ὄντας (*an seni* 15, p. 791 E).¹ The picture of Prodicus as a weakling seems to be taken over from Plato (*Prot.* 315 D), but it might have been originally derived from a contemporary comic poet, as it was certainly the new comedy that made fun of Philitas' frailty.

One of the foremost Ionic philosophers in the second half of the fifth century, Democritus, was a native of Abdera like Protagoras and a coeval of Prodicus and Socrates (about 465—about 370 B.C.); a great traveller, he said of himself: 'I came to Athens—and no one recognized me.'² Plato never mentions Democritus, though he tells us so much about his contemporaries. Amongst his writings, which covered nearly every field of knowledge, there was a small section called *Μουσικά* in Thrasyllus' catalogue,³ after ἠθικά, φυσικά, etc. Aristotle again and again refers to Democritus' views on physics or ethics, but never to this literary section. Its title and those of the individual works, *Περὶ ῥυθμῶν καὶ ἀρμονίας*, *Περὶ ποιήσιος*, κτλ., are derived from the *Πίνακες*⁴ of the Alexandrian library and preserved only in Diogenes Laertius; none of the few later writers who quoted a Democritean saying on poetry, language, or criticism attributed it to one of these books; the attributions of the respective fragments in our modern collections are made according to the subjects of the sayings and are therefore quite arbitrary. We cannot even be certain that genuine Democritean expressions were used for the headings. Democritus' knowledge of the 'philosophy' of his fellow townsman Protagoras is attested by his polemics against it (68 A 114, B 156); so we should very much like to know if Democritus borrowed from him the important term ὀρθοέπεια:⁵ *Περὶ Ὀμήρου ἢ ὀρθοεπέης καὶ γλωσσέων* (68 A 33, XI 1 = B 20 a). The wording of this title suggests a distinction between a 'straight' epic diction and the obsolete words needing explanation; this would be no startling novelty, as the correctness of Homer's use of the Greek language and the difficulty of his rare vocables were discussed at least from the sixth century on.⁶ In his admiration of Homer's divine genius and inspired poetry he is on the side of Theagenes and the rhapsodes against Xenophanes and Heraclitus; but in conformity with his Sophistic contemporaries he seems to have abstained from allegorical

¹ Not mentioned in *Vors.* or in *Art. script.*; cf. *Philetæ Cœi reliquiae*, ed. G. Kuchenmüller (Diss. Berlin 1927) test. 14, cf. test. 15 a–b, 16 and p. 22; see below, p. 91.

² *Vors.* 68 B 116; Demetr. Phal. fr. 93, Wehrli, *Die Schule des Aristoteles* 4 (1949) 64, on Democritus and Athens.

³ *Vors.* 68 A 33, x and xi; B 15 c–26 a. ('Philologische Schriften.')

⁴ O. Regenbogen, v. Πίναξ, *RE* xx (1950) 1441 f.

⁵ See above, p. 37, and *Excursus* on ὀρθοέπεια.

⁶ See above, pp. 11 f.

explanations.¹ Democritus was an ingenious innovator² of philosophical language himself; he must have had an intimate knowledge of earlier poetry and prose and an open mind also for general questions of language. To judge from our scanty evidence, he hardly went beyond the steps made by the great Sophists, and I am inclined to suspect that in this field the impulse came from their side. But while the Sophists used to concentrate on individual problems,³ Democritus' universal spirit apparently considered all of them⁴ in turn. He was not really concerned with either the interpretation of Homer or rhetorical training in the service of education, but with his own philosophical doctrines. So he was pleased to detect an epic line in which his own identification of νοῦς and ψυχή was anticipated, as Aristotle reported (68 A 101); his general linguistic⁵ theory (68 B 26, a badly corrupted passage of Proclus) may well have been connected with his concept of the origin and development of civilization as expressed in his principal work on Physics, the *Μικρὸς διάκοσμος*.⁶ Surely there is no reason to say that Democritus foreshadowed Alexandrian scholarship or even to proclaim him as the 'Altmeister unserer Wissenschaft', as his most fervent admirer did.⁷

When we now turn to questions of literary criticism, we should expect to discover in the Sophists a new attitude to epic poetry. In the sixth century the activity of the rhapsodes was very lively, and it continued into the fifth century.⁸ It looks as if all or most of the narrative epics were regarded as the works of one poet, called Homer. The earliest writer of elegiacs that we know, Callinus of Ephesus, in the first half of the seventh century ascribed to him even the epics on the Theban wars;⁹ in the popular story-books of the sixth century about the life of Homer and about his contest with Hesiod he is the maker of a remarkable number of poems, mainly on the Trojan war, but also on *The Afterborn*, the *Ἐπίγονοι* in the Theban wars, and on the *Taking of Oechalia*. At the same time

¹ In this point I agree with R. Philippson, *Democritea* I. 'D. als Homerausleger', *Herm.* 64 (1929) 166 ff.

² K. v. Fritz, *Philosophie und sprachlicher Ausdruck bei Demokrit, Plato und Aristoteles* (New York 1938) 24 ff.

³ On Protagoras see above, p. 42, on Prodicus p. 41, n. 5, on Hippias p. 53, n. 5.

⁴ Cf. Aristot. *de gen. et corr.* 315 a 34 εἰκε . . . περὶ ἀπάντων φροντίσαι (68 A 35).

⁵ Cf. below, p. 59, n. 2 (Plat. *Crat.*) and p. 79, n. 2 (Aristotle).

⁶ 68 B 4 c ff.; Diels should not have followed K. Reinhardt in printing the whole of Diod. 17 and 18 as excerpts from Democritus; but we cannot go into the details of the endless dispute. On the objections to Reinhardt, 'Hekataios von Abdera und Demokritos', *Herm.* 47 (1912) 492 ff. = *Vermächtnis der Antike* (1960) 114 ff., see G. Pfligersdorffer, 'Studien zu Posidonios', *Sitz. Ber. Österr. Akad., Phil.-hist. Kl.* 232 (1950) 5. Abh., 100 ff.

⁷ H. Diels, first in the year 1880, repeated in 1899 and 1910, see *NJb* 25 (1910) 9.

⁸ See above, pp. 11 ff. and 35.

⁹ Callin. fr. 6 B.4 (= Paus. ix 9. 5), see E. Bethe, *Thebanische Heldenlieder* (1891) 147.

Theagenes wrote about Homer's life and poetry,¹ but we do not know how far he connected all these epics with him. In the great competitions at the Panathenaic festival not only our two preserved epic poems were recited, but many others in proper order. Similarly, in the fifth century Aeschylus' famous saying that his tragedies are 'slices from the great banquets of Homer'² refers to the mass of epic narrative poems, and the same is meant by the writer who described³ Sophocles, the *φιλόμηρος*, as 'delighting in the epic cycle', from which he derived most of his plots, as Euripides did after him. Who finally started to examine that enormously rich epic production and to differentiate between the single poems and their respective poets?

If we consult Wilamowitz, who made the most penetrating inquiries into this problem as a whole,⁴ we meet a number of highflown concepts: 'Das fünfte Jahrhundert beschränkt wesentlich *aus künstlerischem Urteil* (the italics are mine) seinen [Homer's] Nachlass auf Ilias, Odyssee und Margites.' But, in fact, there is no evidence to be found of the 'higher criticism' to which he refers, or the 'examination of poetical value', or the 'essentially artistic judgement'.⁵ The only author whose critical observations we can still read is Herodotus, who simply noticed (II 116) the discrepancy between the account of Paris' and Helen's route from Sparta to Troy in the *Cypria* (fr. 12 Allen = fr. 10 Bethe) and that in the *Iliad* (Z 289 ff.) and consequently denied Homer's authorship of the *Cypria*; speaking of the Hyperboreans in Homer's *Epigoni* (IV 32) he cautiously added 'if Homer⁶ really made this epic poem' (*Epig.* fr. 3 Allen). The historian asks if the tradition of epic poetry is trustworthy; a strictly logical discussion of Helen's story (II 113-20) discovers contradictions and leads to the conclusion that the Iliadic tale about Helen in Troy was wrong and that the Egyptians knew better. There is no comparison of the literary qualities of different epics in order to separate the best poems

¹ See above, p. 11.

² Athen. VIII 347 E = test. 47, Aesch. ed. Wilamowitz 1914, p. 16 *τεμάχη τῶν Ὀμήρου μεγάλων δέπνων*.

³ Athen. VII 277 E = test. ad l. 94 *Vitae*, Soph. *El.* ed. Tahn-Michaelis³ (1882) 20 *ἐχαυρε . . . τῷ ἐπικῷ κύκλῳ*. The term *κύκλος* was obviously still being applied to the complete cycle of epic, that is Homeric, poems by the 'Eristics' whom Aristotle refuted (see below, p. 73).

⁴ U. v. Wilamowitz, *Homeric Untersuchungen* (1884), ch. II 4, pp. 328 ff. 'Der epische Cyclus', esp. pp. 352 f., 366 f. Cf. E. Schwartz, *Die Odyssee* (1924) 154, and T. W. Allen, *Homer, Origins and Transmission* (1924) 51, 75.

⁵ *Die Ilias und Homer* (1916) 365; cf. *Platon* I (1919) 71 (about the fifth century): 'Auch die höhere Kritik, die Prüfung der Gedichte auf ihren Wert [italics are mine] und ihr Alter wagt sich hervor und hat den Erfolg, daß dem Homer alle heroischen Epen außer Ilias und Odyssee abgesprochen werden.' Cf. H. Diels, *NJb* 1910, 13.

⁶ Cf. *Certamen Homeri et Hesiodi* 15 p. 43. 1 Wil. *Vitae Hom.* = Allen, *Hom.* v p. 235, l. 260 *Ἐπιγόνους . . . φασὶ γὰρ τινες καὶ ταῦτα Ὀμήρου εἶναι*.

from the rest.¹ In vain we look round for more. Wilamowitz's reference² to Stesimbrotus and Hippias of Thasos, not repeated in this connexion in his later books, does not help. We had occasion to mention the fragments of Stesimbrotus' book on Homer when we spoke of allegorism; he did not deal with 'formal offences' in different epic poems, but only with the contents of some passages of the *Iliad*. Hippias³ proposed two readings in *B* 15 and in *Ψ* 328 as solutions (*λύσεις*) of rather odd textual problems quoted only by Aristotle;⁴ there is no reason why he should be assigned to the fifth century, and he obviously did not concern himself with relations of epic poems to each other.

At first it may be unexpected and somehow disappointing that in the age of the Sophists no distinct traces can be found of that *κρίσις ποιημάτων*, which was to be regarded as 'the finest flower of scholarship'⁵ in the best Hellenistic times. On second thoughts, however, we may find this result in harmony with the general line we took that the Sophists should not be regarded as 'pioneers of scholarship'. The study of epic poetry only subserved their rhetorical and educational aspirations.

The foremost stylist was the Sicilian Gorgias from Leontini, and he had also an inclination to theorize on stylistic problems.⁶ Born at the beginning of the fifth century and thus coeval of Protagoras, he is said to have reached the age of 105 or even 109 years; but his first visit to Athens was paid only in 427 B.C., after Protagoras and Prodicus had started their activity there. The final object of their teaching was, as we have pointed out, to educate (*παιδεύειν*) each pupil by making him *περὶ ἐπῶν δεινόν* (*Prot.* 338 D); if Gorgias shifted the *whole* emphasis on to the rhetorical training, according to Plato's statement (*Meno* 95 C *δεινὸς λέγειν, Gorg.*

¹ H. Diels, *NJb.* 25 (1910) 13, considerably over-estimated the merits of Herodotus ('der zuerst . . . mit Glück den echten und den unechten Homer abzugrenzen suchte . . . die höchste Stufe der philologischen Kritik . . . im V. Jahrhundert', etc.).

² *Hom. Untersuch.* 366; after mentioning Herodotus' passage on the disagreement of *Iliad* and *Cypria* in a point of subject-matter he continues: 'Formelle Anstöße muß selbst die kindliche Philologie der Thasier Stesimbrotus und Hippias genommen haben.' On Stesimbrotus see above, p. 35.

³ F. A. Wolf, *Prolegomena ad Homerum* (1795) CLXVIII. 'Hippias, acumine artibus Loyolae digno' owes his modern fame to the whole page which F. A. Wolf dedicated to him in his small volume.

⁴ Aristot. *Poet.* 25 p. 1461 a 22 and *Soph. El.* 4 p. 166 b 1 ff.; on the details of these two passages see the commentaries on the *Poetics*; on *λύσεις* and *λυτικοί* see below, pp. 69 ff.

⁵ Dionys. Thr. I p. 6. 2 Uhl. *κρίσις ποιημάτων, ὃ δὴ κάλλιστόν ἐστι πάντων τῶν ἐν τῇ τέχνῃ*.

⁶ *Vors.* 82 AB; *Art. script.* B VII. One would not expect to find a book of his entitled *Ὀνομαστικόν*, though it is ascribed to *Γοργία τῷ σοφιστῇ* by Poll. IX praef. and quoted I 145 (*ἐπιβολος* = *ἔμβολος* 'peg', not in L-S under *ἐπιβολος*); cf. C. Wendel, *RE* XVIII (1939) 507. There is no reference to this *Ὀνομαστικόν* by Diels-Kranz or Radermacher; it should have been mentioned under *Dubia* or *Falsa*. Gorgias the Athenian *FGrHist* 351 who wrote *Περὶ ἐταίρων* might be the author; see below, p. 208, n. 6.

459 c ff.), and did not expressly claim to be an educationalist, we may still regard him as belonging to the wider circle of the Sophistic movement.¹

The two rhetorical *παίγνια* of Gorgias preserved to us, the *Praise of Helen* (Vors. 82 B 11² = *Art. script.* B VII 39) and the *Defence of Palamedes* (B 11 a = B VII 44), reveal his eagerness to create a new prose-style, rivalling the poetry of the past, and thus show himself a worthy disciple of his fellow countryman, the poet Empedocles.³ The Homeric Scholia contain at least *one* example showing how he took over one antithesis from a line of the *Iliad* and amplified it by a second one: Δ 450 ἔνθα δ' ἄμ' οἰμωγή τε καὶ εὐχολή πέλεν ἀνδρῶν; Schol. T *Γοργίας* ἀνεμίλογοντο δὲ λιταῖς ἀπειλαῖ καὶ εὐχαῖς οἰμωγαῖ (B 27 = B VII 43), quoted perhaps from one of his lost model-speeches.⁴ Somewhere he referred to Homer as a descendant of Musaeus (B 25), not of Orpheus. The themes of his declamations, originally epic subjects, had been recently treated by all the Attic tragedians, and Gorgias' artistic prose is much more indebted to them than to earlier poetry. But beyond stylistic devices Gorgias seems to have had a quite new and personal interest in the tragic drama. No pronouncements either of the other Sophists or of Herodotus or Democritus are extant about the great contemporary Attic poetry; only Gorgias, speaking about Aeschylus, called one of his plays, the *Seven against Thebes* 'full of Ares', μεστόν Ἄρεως (B 24).⁵ The same phrase occurs in Aristophanes' *Frogs* 1021 δράμα ποιήσας Ἄρεως μεστόν.—ποῖον; —τοῦς Ἐπι' ἐπὶ Θήβας, where it is spoken by Aeschylus himself to Dionysus. Chronologically, it is just possible that Gorgias, who survived the end of the fifth century by about ten years, took the words out of the comedy, produced in 405.⁶ But apparently in Plutarch's Peripatetic source of the fourth century Gorgias was said to have coined the felicitous phrase; if we accept this tradition (as we are bound to do in such cases), Aristophanes must have borrowed the expression from Gorgias. It is also much more plausible that the Aristophanic Aeschylus used a famous phrase favourable to himself than that Gorgias quoted Aristophanes verbatim. It is quite legitimate to raise the further question whether Aristophanes owes anything else in his literary statements or judgements

¹ On this question and the position of Gorgias see E. R. Dodds, *Plato: Gorgias* 6–10.

² Cf. *Gorgiae Helena*, recogn. et interpretatus est O. Immisch (*Kleine Texte für Vorlesungen und Übungen* 158 [1927]), with a very useful commentary.

³ Vors. 31 A I § 58; see also above, p. 14.

⁴ B 17 = B VII 19 and B 14 = B VII 1.

⁵ See *Excursus*.

⁶ This view was vigorously championed by O. Immisch, 29 f.; but see Radermacher's review, *Philol. Wochenschrift* 1928, 5 ff.

to Gorgias or to other contemporary Sophists. But the result of learned investigations¹ and clever combinations does not amount to more than the probability that the words and ideas in the gigantic contest between Aeschylus and Euripides are not entirely Aristophanes' own inventions. We have noticed *one* point of contact with Gorgias in *Frogs* 1021. Apart from this characterization of a single tragedy, some casual statements of Gorgias on tragic art and on poetic art in general and its relation to artistic prose are preserved, but they have no manifest parallels in Aristophanes' comedies. In Plutarch (*de glor. Ath.* 5, p. 348 c, cf. *de aud. poet.* p. 15 d) Gorgias is quoted as saying: ἡ τραγωδία . . . παρασχούσα τοῖς μύθοις καὶ τοῖς πάθεσιν ἀπάτην, ὡς *Γοργίας* (Vors. 82 B 23) φησίν, ἦν (ἦν 15 d: ἦν 348 c) ὁ τ' ἀπατήσας δικαιότερος τοῦ μὴ ἀπατήσαντος (cf. *Δισσοὶ λόγοι* 3. 10, Vors. 90, II, p. 411. 1) καὶ ὁ ἀπατηθεὶς σοφώτερος τοῦ μὴ ἀπατηθέντος, 'tragedy . . . by (the display of) myths and passions has caused a deceit such that he who deceives is juster than he who does not and the deceived is wiser than the one who is not deceived'. This may be a serious, not an ironical, remark on art producing 'illusions'. When Euripides charges Aeschylus, ὡς ἦν ἀλαζῶν καὶ φέναξ οἷοις τε τοὺς θεατὰς / ἐξηπάτα (Aristoph. *Ran.* 909), he simply means that his adversary is an impostor and liar who cheats his audience; such a reproach (of ψεῦδος) is characteristic of literary polemics and parodies from early times, not a comic distortion of a supposed Sophistic 'doctrine' of illusionism. In this case, there is no relation between Gorgias and Aristophanes.

We have observed that poetry itself paved the way to its understanding, and poets naturally were the competent critics of poetry; this particularly applies to dramatic criticism.² It is one of the important topics of Old Comedy from its beginning,³ and Aristophanes is to be regarded as the greatest heir of this tradition. We have been able to use some single lines of Aristophanes in order to find out with their help how the Sophists started to interpret early poetry or to reflect on language; it is likely that

¹ M. Pohlenz, 'Die Anfänge der griechischen Poetik', *NGG* 1920, Phil.-hist. Klasse, 142–78 = *Kleine Schriften* II (1965) 436 ff., tried to prove that Aristophanes used a theoretical book of Gorgias, which contained a syncretism of Aeschylus and Euripides. Even if this conclusion cannot be accepted, the article offers a valuable collection of relevant passages from the fourth and fifth centuries and started a very lively discussion. Wilamowitz, Radermacher, W. Kranz, M. Untersteiner (*The Sophists*, Engl. transl. 1954, with a useful bibliography 192 f.), W. Schadewaldt, E. Fraenkel, and others took part in it; Pohlenz, *Herm.* 84 (1956) 72 f. = *Kl. Schr.* II 585 f., quite amiably retracted a good deal of his own overstatements.

² Regarding the judges who made the decision in dramatic contests, A. Pickard-Cambridge, *The Dramatic Festivals of Athens* (1953) 98, dryly remarks: 'That there was any demand for critical capacity seems unlikely.' So these κριταὶ do not concern us.

³ A. E. Roggwiller, *Dichter und Dichtung in der attischen Komödie* (Diss. Zürich 1926), collected the material rather inadequately (see E. Wüst, *Philol. Wochenschr.* 1927, 1137 ff.); W. Schmid, *Gesch. d. griech. Lit.* I 4 (1946) 11, 13, 21, 209, etc.

Aristophanes adopted more topics from contemporary discussions than the single phrase of Gorgias on Aeschylus, but we should not take the risk of transferring his literary judgements by mere conjecture back to one or other of the Sophists. He had his own ideas and his own creative language; and it is just in this aesthetic field that expressions apparently coined by Aristophanes were taken up by the poets of the third century.¹ Fundamentally, his attitude to poetry was opposed to that of the Sophists; he regarded the earlier poetry as the most important part of the *ἀρχαία παιδεία*. Greek poetry was quite naturally 'ethical' from epic times onwards; it was only in the great crisis towards the end of the fifth century that a consciousness arose of this innate ethical tendency as a problem.² The documentary evidence for the new reflection on it is given by Aristophanes, especially in the *Frogs*, where the great poets of the past, represented by Aeschylus, are approved as the moral leaders of their people, while contemporary poets, represented by Euripides, or 'philosophers', like Socrates and the Sophists, are condemned as destroyers of morals.

In the course of his declamation on Helen Gorgias stresses again the importance of the *ἀπάτη*, the 'deception', which every *λόγος* (speech), whether in verse or prose, is able to produce (*Hel.* 8. 10 and probably 11). Then he calls poetry in general a 'speech in verse', *τὴν ποιήσιν ἀπασαν καὶ νομίζω καὶ ὀνομάζω λόγον ἔχοντα μέτρον* (*Hel.* 9), which sounds like depreciating it in the interest of rhetoric; but, on the other hand, he goes on to describe the extremely powerful effect of this 'metrical composition' on the listeners, *ἧς τοὺς ἀκούοντας εἰσήλθε καὶ φρίκη περίφοβος καὶ ἔλεος πολυδάκρυς καὶ πόθος φιλοπενθῆς κτλ.*, 'shuddering in great fear and tearful wailing and yearning for grief'. One is, of course, inclined to confine these words to tragedy, as Aristotle did in the *Poetics*,³ but Gorgias certainly meant to include epic and lyric poetry as well, if we can trust the text of our two manuscripts. I am not sure that it is not even implied for the first time that oratory, the pure and simple word without music or metre, can be equally effective. For Gorgias started this part of his

¹ See below, pp. 137 f.

² Cf. *DLZ* 1935, 2134 and my whole review of W. Jaeger, *Paideia* I (1934); see also *Die griechische Dichtung und die griechische Kultur* (1932) 18.

³ See Pohlenz, loc. cit. 167 ff., and especially W. Schadewaldt, 'Furcht und Mitleid?' *Herm.* 83 (1955) 129 ff., 144, 158, 165 = *Hellas und Hesperien* (1960) 346 ff., who provides the most detailed and convincing interpretation of the relevant terms *φόβος* (*φρίκη*) and *ἔλεος*; cf. also H. Flashar, 'Die Lehre von der Wirkung der Dichtung in der griechischen Poetik', *Herm.* 84 (1956) 18 ff.: he scrutinized the Corpus Hippocraticum in order to show that *φόβος* and *ἔλεος* with all the somatic symptoms mentioned by Gorgias have their origin in the literature on medical science. On Aristotle see below, p. 75.

declamation with the solemn proposition (*Hel.* 8) *λόγος δυνάστης¹ μέγας ἐστίν*, 'logos is a mighty ruler . . . it has the power to stop fear and to remove grief and to effect joy and to increase lamenting', *δύναται γὰρ καὶ φόβον παῖσαι καὶ λύπην ἀφελεῖν καὶ χαρὰν ἐνεργάσασθαι καὶ ἔλεον ἐπαυξῆσαι*. This sounds like a hymn in prose² on a divine power; indeed the logos is said to 'accomplish works most divine', *θειότατα ἔργα ἀποτελεῖ*. Such sentences are a true specimen of Gorgias' style, but they can hardly be regarded as traces of a doctrine on poetics. Single striking formulae, like that of *φρίκη* and *ἔλεος*, were adapted to later theories, as Aristophanes selected that on the *Seven*. It was Gorgias' main ambition to teach his pupils the technical devices of his grand new style; but the formal perfection ought to have the emotional effects on the hearers which he described. Gorgias' efforts have often been subjected to ridicule in ancient³ and modern⁴ times; this is easier than to try to reach a balanced judgement on them. The artificialities and empty phrases of the virtuoso may be boring or even repellent, particularly to the philosophic mind; but we still feel a genuine *φιλία*, a love for the *λόγος*, as the moving power behind them. This seems to have 'enchanted' his contemporaries and to have exerted a lasting influence.⁵ Such a stimulus cannot be entirely disregarded in a history of *φιλολογία*.

Of Gorgias' many pupils the most distinguished were Isocrates and Alcidamas, two different, even contrasting figures. Like his master, Isocrates⁶ (436–338 B.C.) has not been a favourite either with philosophers or scholars; but nobody can deny him his true love and mastery of language. He brought his own oratorical skill to perfection and succeeded in teaching the following generations of the fourth century; as a pedagogical genius he may be compared with Melancthon. In spite of his polemical speech 'against the Sophists', *κατὰ τῶν σοφιστῶν* (*or.* 13), in which he attacks the false claims of his rivals, he represents the 'literariness' of the whole movement at its height. Following Gorgias, he too wrote a 'hymn' to the *λόγος*.⁷ In contrast to Gorgias, however, his *λόγος*

¹ Pohlenz, loc. cit. 174 ff., M. Untersteiner, *The Sophists* (1954), pp. 107, 114. J. W. H. Atkins, *Literary Criticism in Antiquity* I (1934, reprinted 1952) 18.

² About 2,000 years later in 1444 Lorenzo Valla opened his *Elegantiae Latini Sermonis* with a similar fervent hymn on the Latin language.

³ *Auctor Peri ὕψους* 3. 2 τὸ οἰδοῦν, μειρακιῶδες, ψυχρόν, κακόζηλον κτλ.

⁴ J. D. Denniston, *Greek Prose Style* (1952) 10 ff., 'the influence was, I believe, wholly bad'.

⁵ E. Norden, *Die antike Kunstprosa* I (1898) 63–79, 'Gorgias und seine Schule'; pp. 15 ff. 'Die Begründung der attischen Kunstprosa'.

⁶ *Art. script.* v xxiv Radermacher (1951). Marrou 79–91; I have always found W. Jaeger's judgement on Isocrates (*Paideia* III 199–225, esp. 222 f.) well balanced, and disagree with Marrou on this point. W. Steidle, *Herm.* 80 (1952), 257 ff., esp. 274 ff., 296.

⁷ *Isocr. or.* 3, *Nicochl.* 5–9 = *Art. script.* v xxiv 41. 3, repeated almost verbatim in *or.* 15, *Antidos.* 253–7.

of a celebrated beauty who was married to fourteen men. There must have been the utmost variety in subject-matter if we take into account all the other surviving short references to mythology, geography, history, and especially to early poets and philosophers. Hippias (B 8) observed that the word *τύραννος* was not introduced into the Greek language before the time of Archilochus; Homer called even the worst despot *βασιλεύς*. Hippias made parallel excerpts from the poets of old (B 6), Orpheus, Musaeus, Hesiod, Homer; it is noteworthy that we find exactly the same sequence in Aristophanes (*Ran.* 1030 ff.), in Plato (*Apol.* 41 A; without Hesiod *Ion* 536 B), and even in Hermesianax (fr. 7. 16 ff. Powell). It is quite likely that he added a similar collection of parallel passages from the earliest philosophers, in which Thales¹ continued the line of the four poets just mentioned. The *᾽Ολυμπιονικῶν ἀναγραφή* was not a chronicle but a list of names with only a few necessary remarks; so, I think, it is hardly correct to call his literary collections the beginning of a 'history' of literature and philosophy.² Instead, the proper form of all the antiquarian writings of Hippias and his contemporaries seems to have been the catalogue, the list, the *πίναξ*.³ The Sophist was in need of this knowledge as orator and teacher; as in other fields, it was not a scholarly interest in the customs of life in former ages or even in the 'history of culture', but the practical requirements of his calling, that inspired his efforts.⁴

We have put the study of antiquities first, because it was particularly characteristic of Hippias; but as a genuine polymath⁵ he incorporated into his educational programme not only all literary knowledge, but also elementary scientific subjects. Independently, it seems, of any Pythagorean tradition, he listed together astronomy, geometry, arithmetic, and 'music',⁶ a combination of sciences that had a long and varied history until finally Boëthius⁷ gave it the name *quadrivium*, nearly a thousand years after Hippias.⁸ Hippias' own interests were by no means limited to

¹ See B 7 and B. Snell, 'Die Nachrichten über die Lehren des Thales und die Anfänge der griechischen Philosophie- und Literaturgeschichte', *Philol.* 96 (1944) 170 ff.; cf. F. Jacoby, *FGrHist* 1² (1957) p. 542 Nachträge zum Kommentar 6 F 4 and G. B. Kerferd, 'Plato and Hippias', *Proceed. Class. Association* 60 (1963) 35 f.

² See above, n. 1.

³ O. Regenbogen, *Πίναξ RE* xx (1950) 1412 f.

⁴ See above, pp. 17, 45.

⁵ Xenoph. *Mem.* iv 4. 6 = *Vors.* 86 A 14 διὰ τὸ πολυμαθῆς εἶναι; Cic. *de or.* iii 127 (not in *Vors.* 86). On the changing reputation of the *πολυμαθῆς* see below, p. 138, n. 1.

⁶ Plat. *Hipp. mai.* 285 BC (= *Vors.* 86 A 11) and *Prot.* 318 E with reference to Hippias. H. I. Marrou, 371, n. 12, believes that *μουσική* means 'acoustics' in this passage.

⁷ Boëth. *Instit. arithm.* p. 5. 6 Friedlein.

⁸ P. Merlan, *From Platonism to Neoplatonism* (1953; 2nd ed. 1961) 78 ff. 'The origin of the Quadrivium'; see also A. Cornel. Celsus ed. F. Marx, *Corp. Medic. Lat.* 1 (1915), VIII-XIII, on names, number, order of the *artes* from the Sophists to Boëthius. Cf. below, p. 253.

four or to seven subjects, and he was not the inventor of the seven liberal arts. He was not a serious philosopher or political theorist, but as he was always eager to startle his audience by some novelty, he managed to give a new turn to the contemporary discussion of 'physis and nomos'; at least, in Plato's *Protagoras*¹ it was Hippias who first used the antithetic formula *φύσει—νόμῳ* in the sense 'by nature'—'by convention', a formula which became almost classical. In his studies of language he accepted, like others, Protagoras' concept of *ὀρθοέπεια*; he took part in the lively debates² on the epic poems (B 9), on Homeric Heroes (A 9, B 5), on the life of the poet Homer (B 18). One field, so far avoided by other Sophists, was entered by Hippias alone. Questions of rhythmics and metrics had been the concern of the musicians, possibly of Lasus of Hermione³ towards the end of the sixth century, certainly of the Athenian Damon,⁴ the teacher of Pericles; Hippias seems to have been the first 'literary' man, not a musician, to treat language together with music, distinguishing 'the value of letters and syllables and rhythms and scales' *περὶ τε γραμμάτων δυνάμεως καὶ συλλαβῶν καὶ ῥυθμῶν καὶ ἀρμονιῶν*.⁵ From single sounds he went on to several letters taken together, that is to syllables⁶ and their quantities, then to certain sequences of long and short syllables, to rhythms, and finally to 'harmonics'.⁷ The traditional Greek unity of word and 'music' was still maintained, but the emphasis may have been shifted from 'music' to language;⁸ the end of this important development came in the second half of the fourth century, when we find poetical diction and metre⁹ treated in complete isolation from rhythmics. The part played by Hippias and perhaps other Sophists in the period of transition is hardly noticed by modern scholars. A versatile Sophist like

¹ Plat. *Prot.* 337 C (= *Vors.* 86 C 1), see above, pp. 35, 39, n. 3.

² See above, pp. 36, 43 ff.

³ W. Schmid, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur*, I 1 (1929) 544 ff. Lasus is said to have caught Onomacritus at the court of the Pisistratides forging oracles of Musaeus (*Hdt.* vii 6 = *Vors.* 2 B 20a).

⁴ *Vors.* 37 esp. B 9; Aristoph. *Nub.* 638 ff.; Wilamowitz, *Griechische Verskunst* (1921) 59 ff., and *Platon* I (1919) 71; W. Schmid op. cit. I 2 (1934) 731 ff.

⁵ Plat. *Hipp. mai.* 285 D = *Vors.* 86 A 11, cf. above, p. 52, n. 6. See also Plat. *Hipp. min.* 368 D = *Vors.* 86 A 12 καὶ περὶ ῥυθμῶν καὶ ἀρμονιῶν καὶ γραμμάτων ὀρθότητος; *Cratyl.* 424 C, *Phileb.* 18 B ff. Cf. Democr. above, pp. 42 f.

⁶ Cf. Aesch. *Sept.* 468 *γραμματῶν ἐν συλλαβαῖς*.

⁷ *ἀρμονία* usually means the different 'tunings' (Plat. *Rep.* iii 398 D ff., and on this passage Inobel Henderson, 'Ancient Greek Music', *New Oxford History of Music* I (1957) 384 f.); I can see no reason why it should be understood in the passage on Hippias as 'melodic line', 'pitch-accent' (as it apparently has to be taken in *Δισσοὶ λόγοι* 5. 11 = *Vors.* II 413. 14, see H. Gomperz, *Sophistik und Rhetorik* (1912) 71, 148).

⁸ It was about the same time towards the end of the fifth century that Glaucus of Rhegium wrote *Περὶ τῶν ἀρχαίων ποιητῶν καὶ μουσικῶν* (see F. Jacoby, *RE* vii 1417 ff.) without separating 'musicians' and 'poets' of old times, as it seems.

⁹ See below, p. 76 (Aristotle).

Hippias was almost bound to write verses of his own also: epics, tragedies, dithyrambs (A 12); a lament in elegiacs on the drowned Messenian boy choir (B 1 *ἐλεγεία* . . . *ἐποίησεν*) may remind us of Archilochus' elegy on the drowned Parians.¹

As Hippias claimed competence in so many fields, so do the Satyrs in a play which Sophocles² apparently produced late in his life; in the well-preserved fragment³ they recommend themselves to a king (Oineus?) as suitors of his daughter because they have not only all the desirable abilities in games and contests in poetry, music, and dancing,⁴ but also the most useful knowledge in various branches of science and scholarship. It is a charming and humorous picture, not a malicious travesty, of exactly that universalism which Sophists like Hippias used to display.

We find the same combination of antiquarian lore with poetry in Critias (about 460–403 B.C.),⁵ so that we may group him with Hippias. He is said to have been a pupil of Gorgias (*Vors.* 88 A 17) and certainly was for some time an associate of Socrates (*ibid.* A 4); but when he finally tried to put Sophistic ideas on the 'right of the stronger'⁶ into practice, he met an early death as 'tyrannorum dux' at the battle of Munichia (A 12). Strong aristocratic prejudices are patent in his writings on literature. In an unknown work in prose (B 44) he utterly condemned the self-revelations of the lowborn Archilochus, but he celebrated in an epic poem the 'sweet' Anacreon, once a friend of one of Critias' own noble ancestors⁷ and a 'weaver of songs' for the pleasures of high society; the ten hexameters (B 1 = fr. 8 D.³) may be a part of a longer poem on the lives and works of a number of poets, starting perhaps from Homer as the son of a river-god (B 50). So we rightly place Critias beside Alcidas and

¹ Fr. 7 D.³ and *P.Oxy.* 2356.

² I confidently attribute *P.Oxy.* 1083, fr. 1 (reprinted in D. L. Page, *Greek Literary Papyri* 1 [1942], no. 31 and in *Satyrographorum Graec. fragmenta*, ed. V. Steffen (2nd ed. 1952) 258) to Sophocles. v. 13 *ἐψευσμένα* occurs twice in Sophocles, *O.R.* 461 and fr. 577 P., but there is no perfect passive either in Aeschylus or Euripides. This is the decisive passage. Furthermore, the future *ἐξερῶ* is found twelve times in Sophocles (nine times perfect and aorist) not in Aeschylus, and only twice in Euripides, but in different phrases. The anaphora v. 9 ff. was noticed as possibly Sophoclean by Hunt in *P.Oxy.* VIII p. 61; cf. also P. Maas, *Berlin. Philol. Wochenschrift* 32 (1912) 1427–9. A number of new fragments, written by the same hand and published in *P.Oxy.* xxxvii (1962) as no. 2453 by E. G. Turner, strengthen the case for Sophocles.

³ The other more than thirty small fragments written by the same scribe may belong to other plays (and even to other poets).

⁴ Cf. Soph. *Amphitruos* fr. 121 P. satyrs dancing the letters.

⁵ *Vors.* 88; poetical fragments also in *Anth. Lyr. Gr.* ed. Diehl fasc. 1³ (1949) 94 ff.; new complete edition with commentary by A. Battagazzore in *Sofisti*, ed. M. Untersteiner iv (1962) 214–363.

⁶ See above p. 35.

⁷ See A. E. Taylor, *A Commentary on Plato's Timaeus* (1928) 23 ff.

Hippias. In his elegiacs he produced a catalogue of inventors (B 2 = fr. 1 D.³), Greek as well as foreign, from which we have already quoted¹ the invention of the alphabet by the Phoenicians, an epoch-making event in the history of mankind and particularly in the history of scholarship. Other elegiacs deal with customs, inventions, or even constitutions in different parts of Greece and show his open preference of Sparta as a model (B 6 = fr. 4 D.³) His special interest in inventions and his taste for collecting learned material are completely in the tradition of the Sophists; so is his educational aim (see also B 9 = fr. 7 D.³). As we know his considerable poetical faculties from the fragments of his tragedies and satyr-plays (B 10–29), we are not surprised that he was the only Sophist who also put some of his learned material into verse, in order to make it perhaps more attractive for the reader. Critias, as writer of 'antiquarian' elegiacs and 'literary' epics, holds an important position in the middle between the *poetae philosophi* of the past and the *poetae docti* of the future, being himself neither a philosopher nor a scholar. Some contemporary writers, Euenus (*Art. script.* B xx), Licymnius (*ibid.* B xvi), Agathon (*TGF* p. 763 N.²), more familiar to us as poets of elegiacs, dithyrambs, tragedies, were in close relation to the Sophistic movement. What is left to us of Greek literature confirms that it went through a time of uneasiness and crisis at about 400 B.C.²

We said above (p. 16) that in a certain sense the Sophists can be regarded as heirs of the early rhapsodes. Now the rhapsodes, still reciting and interpreting³ the traditional poetry at the end of the fifth century, survived the crisis. They had quite naturally become pupils of the Sophists. Socrates in Plato's *Ion*⁴ complained that the clever, 'divinely inspired' rhapsode had neither *τέχνη* nor *ἐπιστήμη*, neither 'art' nor 'knowledge' (536 c *οὐ γὰρ τέχνη οὐδ' ἐπιστήμη περὶ Ὀμήρου λέγεις ἃ λέγεις*, cf. *ibid.* 532 c). The same reproach was made against the Sophists in general, although for a quite different reason. Their various activities in the literary field were based only on observation and practical experience. There can be no doubt about their own efficiency and their kindling of sparks in other minds. They made a decisive contribution to the development of the book on which the rise and further existence of

¹ See above, p. 24; cf. A. Kleingünther, *Πρώτος Ἐδερής, Philol. Suppl. Bd. 26. 1* (1933) 145.

² See also the new relation of *λόγος* to *μουσική* above, p. 53.

³ Plat. *Ion* 530 c (*τὸν γὰρ ῥαψωδὸν ἐρμηγέα δεῖ τοῦ ποιητοῦ τῆς διανοίας γίνεσθαι τοῖς ἀκούουσι*); see also above, p. 35.

⁴ If I say 'Plato's *Ion*', I mean that the ideas and arguments of this much disputed dialogue are genuinely Platonic; a critical review of the dispute is given by H. Flashar, *Der Dialog Ion als Zeugniss platonischer Philosophie* (Berlin 1958) 1–16.

scholarship depended. They awakened and maintained a new interest in early poetry, even if interpretation meant no more to them than mental training. Rhetorical virtuosity was the immediate result of their analysis of language and their 'critical' study of literature. Nevertheless, their genuine love of language was not without stimulating influence on generations who started more serious researches. Finally, if they had to accumulate wide erudition for their own performances and the instruction of pupils, such collections turned out sometimes to be suggestive for later studies. But all their endeavours, considerable as they were, had a more or less casual and arbitrary character; even the mathematics they taught apparently remained on an empirical level.

III

THE MASTERS OF PHILOSOPHY IN ATHENS: SOCRATES, PLATO, ARISTOTLE

THE Sophists did not proceed from the way of *ἐμπειρία* to a conscious method, to a *τέχνη*, an 'art' which combined practical skill and theoretical knowledge. Scholarship, as we stated at the very beginning, is such a *τέχνη*. The failure of the Sophists to achieve this aroused the Socratic-Platonic criticism and opposition.¹ But it was not the general polemics, the various arguments against the Sophists, or minor readjustments by Plato that were decisive; what did matter was the completely new approach, namely the eager desire to acquire *τέχνη*, 'art', to gain 'genuine knowledge based on reason' (*ἐπιστήμη*), to try to reach the Truth (*τῆς ἀληθείας* . . . *πέριαν Prot.* 348 A, cf. *Phaedr.* 270 A f., *Meno passim*). This went far beyond Protagoras' vague doctrine of 'correctness', which was characteristic of the Sophistic mind. The rigorous Platonic demand for full mastery of the subject, for clear definitions and sober proofs, made it possible for the first time to lay a truly scientific foundation in every field of intellectual activity; it determined the whole future of scholarship as well as of science. We do not have to deal with science, and, as in the strict Platonic sense *ἐπιστήμη* refers to exact sciences, especially mathematics, and then to ethics (the knowledge of the *ἀγαθόν*),² we confine ourselves to

¹ Plat. *Phaedr.* 270 B *μη τριβῆ μόνον καὶ ἐμπειρία, ἀλλὰ τέχνη*, cf. *Gorg.* 463 B, 465 A. An exact definition is given by Aristot. *Metaphys.* A I p. 981 a 5 *γίνεσθαι δὲ τέχνη, ὅταν ἐκ πολλῶν τῆς ἐμπειρίας ἐνοσημάτων μία καθ' ὅλου γένηται περὶ τῶν ὁμοίων ὑπόληψις* 'Art arises when from many notions of experience there comes a single universal judgement', W. D. Ross, *Arist. Metaph.* I (1924) 114, translation. On the Platonic character of this chapter and its relation to the treatment in the *Protrepticus* see W. Jaeger, *Aristoteles* (1923) 68 ff. = Engl. transl. by R. Robinson (2nd ed. 1948) 68 ff. (*τέχνη* and *ἐπιστήμη* are not distinguished by Aristotle in this chapter, but see *Anal. post.* 100 a 9). I. Düring, *Aristotle's Protrepticus* (1961) 242 agrees with Jaeger and Ross. It cannot be proved and it is not likely that Plato used a sort of 'formula' coined in Hippocratic circles, see K. Deichgräber, *Die griechische Empirikerschule* (1930) 273. 1. This negative statement is confirmed by F. Heinemann, 'Eine vorplatonische Theorie der *τέχνη*', *Mus. Helv.* 18 (1961) 105 ff., who thoroughly scrutinized early Sophistic and medical writings; the novelty of the Socratic-Platonic differentiation between *ἐμπειρία* and *τέχνη* becomes quite evident.

² K. v. Fritz, 'Der Beginn universalwissenschaftlicher Bestrebungen und der Primat der Griechen', *Studium Generale* XIV (1961) 618 f., on this particular problem; on the meaning of *ἐπιστήμη* 610 ff.