


UC-NRLF




QB 734 108




746
F786





p. 259
p. 321
p. 351





Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2008 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

TWENTIETH CENTURY TEXT-BOOKS


CLASSICAL SECTION

EDITED BY

JOHN H. WRIGHT,
BERNADOTTE PERRIN,
ANDREW F. WEST,

HARVARD UNIVERSITY
YALE UNIVERSITY
PRINCETON UNIVERSITY





HOMER.

Ideal bust in the museum at Naples.


TWENTIETH CENTURY TEXT-BOOKS

A HISTORY OF ANCIENT GREEK LITERATURE

BY

HAROLD N. FOWLER, Ph. D.

PROFESSOR IN THE COLLEGE FOR WOMEN OF
WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY



NEW YORK
D. APPLETON AND COMPANY

1902

746
3786

COPYRIGHT, 1902
BY D. APPLETON AND COMPANY

GENERAL

Published February, 1902

THE
D. APPLETON AND COMPANY
NEW YORK

PA3054
F7
1902
MAIN

P R E F A C E

THIS book is intended primarily for use in secondary schools and colleges, but may perhaps be of some interest to the general reading public. Its readers are therefore likely to be of various ages and to differ widely in their previous training. So far as the general reading public is concerned, since each person will use the book as he thinks best, no advice from me is required ; but a few words concerning its use in schools and colleges may not be out of place.

The book contains little or nothing which should not be familiar to every educated man and woman. The college student should therefore be expected to use it all, though more time should of course be spent in the study of the chapters on the greatest writers than in learning about the authors of less importance. The pupil in the secondary school, however, may not always have the time to pay any attention to the less important Greek authors. It may therefore be in many instances desirable to stop the classroom use of the book at the end of the Attic period, adding only enough from the later parts to make the pupils acquainted with Theocritus, Callimachus, Apollonius Rhodius (especially if the pupils have read or are to read Virgil), Polybius, Plutarch, and Lucian. In the case of immature pupils, it may be well to omit the chapter on the Homeric Question, and even the chapters on the early prose writers.

Far the greater part of the book is taken up with the history of Greek literature before the Alexandrian period.

This is desirable, because the works of the Alexandrian and Roman times are lost for the most part and never possessed the literary importance of the great writings of the earlier days. On the other hand, the writings of the later times are too important to be altogether overlooked. Roman literature was most powerfully influenced by Alexandrian literature, and has in turn exerted a most powerful influence upon the literature of all later times. A summary account of Alexandrian and Græco-Roman literature is therefore included in this book, in the belief that our students should not be allowed to forget that Greek life and thought continued to influence the world long after the political independence of Greece came to an end. For a somewhat similar reason—to call attention to the influence of Greek thought, Greek education, and Greek writers upon the progress of Christianity—an account of some of the Christian writers has been included.

In the preparation of the book I have made the greatest use of the *Histoire de la Littérature Grecque*, by the brothers Alfred and Maurice Croiset. The *Manuel d'Histoire de la Littérature Grecque*, by the same authors, has also been of great service. The *Geschichte der Griechischen Litteratur*, by Wilhelm Christ, has been especially valuable for the statistical information it contains. All the other general works cited in the Bibliographical Appendix have been consulted, as well as numerous books and special articles not there mentioned. The judgments expressed in regard to the merits and peculiarities of individual writers are based upon my own reading of their works, but the manner of expression has been much influenced by what other historians of Greek literature have said. In the spelling of proper names I have tried to follow the example of the best English writers, and have therefore adopted in most instances the Latin spelling.

The Bibliographical Appendix will, I hope, be found useful. It is by no means exhaustive, but may serve as a guide

to those who have not access to libraries. The purpose of the Chronological Appendix is not so much to serve as a finding-list of dates as to show at a glance what authors were living and working at any given time. In the general index the names of all Greek writers mentioned in the book are to be found, together with references to numerous topics and to some of the more important mythological and historical persons. The pronunciation of proper names is marked in the index.

My thanks are due to Professor Perrin and Professor Wright for many valuable suggestions made before the manuscript was sent to the printer, and for patient care in reading the proof and suggesting needed changes.

HAROLD N. FOWLER.

CLEVELAND, OHIO.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I.—INTRODUCTION	1
II.—THE HOMERIC POEMS	10
III.—THE HOMERIC QUESTION	23
IV.—THE EPIC CYCLE—SPORTIVE POEMS—THE HOMERIC HYMNS	35
V.—HESIOD—DIDACTIC AND GENEALOGICAL POEMS	49
VI.—LYRIC POETRY—ELEGIAC POETRY	58
VII.—IAMBIC POETRY—BEAST-FABLES	79
VIII.—GREEK MUSIC—MONODIC AND CHORAL POETRY	87
IX.—CHORAL LYRIC POETRY	105
X.—CHORAL LYRIC POETRY (CONTINUED)	119
XI.—CHORAL LYRIC POETRY—PINDAR	129
XII.—RELIGIOUS, ORACULAR, AND MYSTIC POETRY	140
XIII.—THE BEGINNINGS OF PROSE LITERATURE—THE EARLY PHILOSOPHERS	147
XIV.—THE LOGOGRAPHERS	165
XV.—HERODOTUS	170
XVI.—ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE DRAMA	179
XVII.—ÆSCHYLUS	189
XVIII.—SOPHOCLES	202
XIX.—EURIPIDES	219
XX.—MINOR TRAGIC POETS	241
XXI.—THE OLD COMEDY—ARISTOPHANES	247
XXII.—COMEDY AFTER THE FIFTH CENTURY	259
XXIII.—EPIC AND LYRIC POETRY OF THE ATTIC PERIOD	267
XXIV.—ATTIC PROSE—THUCYDIDES	271
XXV.—XENOPHON AND OTHER HISTORIANS	279

CHAPTER	PAGE
XXVI.—ATTIC PHILOSOPHY—THE SOPHISTS—SOCRATES AND HIS FOLLOWERS	291
XXVII.—PLATO—THE OLD ACADEMY	303
XXVIII.—ARISTOTLE—THE PERIPATETICS	313
XXIX.—ATTIC ORATORS	322
XXX.—ISOCRATES	333
XXXI.—DEMOSTHENES	340
XXXII.—ÆSCHINES AND OTHER ORATORS	349
XXXIII.—PHILOSOPHY IN THE ALEXANDRIAN PERIOD	357
XXXIV.—RHETORIC AND HISTORY IN THE ALEXANDRIAN PERIOD	369
XXXV.—ALEXANDRIAN POETRY	381
XXXVI.—THE TRANSITION TO THE ROMAN PERIOD	400
XXXVII.—FROM AUGUSTUS TO DOMITIAN	406
XXXVIII.—PHILOSOPHY IN THE SECOND CENTURY	415
XXXIX.—HISTORY—THE LATER SOPHISTS	424
XL.—THE NOVEL—POETRY—SCIENCE—PHILOSOPHY—CHRISTIAN WRITERS	438
XLI.—FROM CONSTANTINE TO JUSTINIAN	448
APPENDIX I.—BIBLIOGRAPHY	462
APPENDIX II.—CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE	480
INDEX	487

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

	FACING PAGE
HOMER, Ideal Bust in the Naples Museum	<i>Frontispiece</i>
ANACREON, from a Statue in the Ny-Carlsberg Museum at Copenhagen	101
SOPHOCLES, Statue in the Lateran Museum, Rome	202
PLATO, Bust in the Vatican Museum, Rome	303
DEMOSTHENES, Statue in the Vatican Museum, Rome	340
THE EMPEROR JULIAN, Bust on the top of the Cathedral at Acerenza	451



BOOK I

THE EARLY PERIOD

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Importance of Greek literature—The Greek language—Divisions and periods—Character of the periods—The dialects—Preservation of works of literature—Sources of information—The earliest poetry—The Muses—Mythical poets: Orpheus, Linus, Musæus, Eumolpus, Pamphus, Olen—Helicon, Delos, Delphi.

ANCIENT Greek literature is one of the most precious parts of our inheritance from past time, and has had a most powerful influence upon modern literature, modern thought, and, in general, modern civilization. This is due not merely to the fact that Greek literature is the earliest well-developed literature we know, but still more to its inherent excellence and its beauty of form as well as of content, which have brought it about that for two thousand years literary expression has been cast in Greek moulds, even when the writers have been themselves unconscious of that fact. The history of this literature can therefore hardly fail to interest all who are interested in modern civilization, whether they are able to read the Greek language or not.

The Greeks, or Hellenes, as they called themselves, spoke a language belonging to the great Aryan or Indo-European family to which all the Germanic languages, including English, also belong. English is therefore akin to Greek,

but the kinship is not close, and though we can see that many English words are related to Greek words, still the

differences between the two languages are on the whole more striking than the resemblances.

The Greek language.

For one thing, Greek is a highly inflected language, showing the relations between words by means of terminations and other changes of form, while English shows such relations for the most part by means of prepositions and other words invented for the purpose, and by a more or less fixed order of the words in the sentence. In addition to inflectional forms, the Greeks also employed prepositions and the like, and their language abounds with particles to express different varieties of emphasis and of relations between words and sentences. Greek is therefore an unusually flexible and expressive language, wonderfully well adapted for the development of logical thought, poetic imagery, and literary form. These characteristics existed in the language even before any real literature came into being, but grew stronger with the growth of literature.

Greek literature has been continuous from very early times until the present, but as a matter of convenience it is divided into three chief divisions: 1. The ancient literature, from the beginning to 529 A. D., when the Emperor Justinian ordered the schools of heathen philosophy to be closed. 2. The middle or Byzantine literature, from 529 A. D. to 1453, when Constantinople was captured by the Turks. 3. The modern literature, from the capture of Constantinople in 1453 to the present time. These dates are given only for the sake of convenience, for some writers before 529 A. D. show the characteristics of the Byzantine period, and the beginnings of the modern literature are to be traced for nearly a century before 1453, and in like manner some writers of these periods exhibit the characteristics of the period before. But exact dates serve to fix in the mind the times when the character of the literature was changing

and to connect the changes in literature with the contemporaneous changes in the circumstances of life and thought.

The ancient literature is the only one of the three divisions with which we have to do here. This we may again divide into three periods, each of which runs into the next with no sharp dividing line, though the main charac-

**Periods of
ancient**

**Greek litera-
ture.**

teristics of each are clear and distinct: 1. The early period, from about the tenth century to the end of the sixth century B. C. 2. The Attic period, the fifth and fourth centuries B. C. 3. The period of literary decadence, from the beginning of the third century B. C. to 529 A. D. The last period is further subdivided into Alexandrian literature, lasting from about 300 B. C. to the conquest of Greece by the Romans in 146 B. C., or, better, until the establishment of the Roman Empire in 31 B. C., and Græco-Roman literature, from 31 B. C. to 529 A. D.

Each of these periods is distinguished not only by chronological sequence, but by the character of its productions and the dialect or dialects in which those productions

**Literary
character of
the periods.**

are composed. So the early period sees the growth and development of epic poetry, at first in the Æolic dialect, later in Ionic, and of lyric poetry, chiefly in the Doric and Æolic dialects. Prose writing, in Ionic Greek, also begins in this period. The Attic period is the time when the great seat of literary activity was Athens. In this period dramatic poetry, both tragic and comic, reaches its height, and prose literature is developed in history, philosophy, and oratory. After this brilliant period the Greeks almost cease to produce works of original creative genius, and literature becomes for the most part either learned or imitative. The prose writers collect the doctrines of their predecessors, write comments on earlier works or compose learned scientific treatises, while the poets copy more or less laboriously the style and forms of expression of the great masters of earlier days.

The prose writing of this period is in great measure a continuation or development of the styles which originated in the Attic period, and the dialect used is the Attic dialect with some modifications.

The Æolic dialect, spoken in Thessaly, in Bœotia, on the island of Lesbos, and in the Æolic cities of Asia Minor, retained some of the early forms of the Greek language longer than did the other dialects. It never attained high development as a literary tongue except in lyric poetry. The Doric dialect, spoken in Doris, most of the Peloponnesus, nearly all the Sicilian colonies, and many cities in Asia Minor and elsewhere, was more primitive than the others in its sounds, just as the Æolic was in its forms. A peculiarity of Doric Greek was its liking for the broad *a* sound. Ionic Greek, on the other hand, the dialect of the Ionic colonies of Asia Minor, most of the islands of the Ægean Sea, and various cities in other regions, preferred the close *e* to the *a* sound. This dialect was more elegant than either Æolic or Doric. It was the dialect of the developed epic poetry, of elegiac verse, and of the earliest prose. Attic Greek is a variety of the Ionic dialect with some of the characteristics of the Doric. In its highest development, in the fifth and fourth centuries B. C., it was one of the most perfect instruments for the expression of human thought ever known. The influence of Attic literature was so great that the Attic dialect, with some modifications, spread all over the Greek world, and, under the name of "the Common Dialect," became the literary language of the last period of ancient Greek literature.

Of the vast body of Greek literature which once existed only a comparatively small part has been preserved. The *Iliad* and *Odyssey* make us acquainted with the early epic poetry at its best, and the loss of the great number of epics is therefore less to be regretted, interesting as they would be if they had been preserved; but of the early lyric poetry much

Imperfect
preservation
of Greek lit-
erature.

less is extant than of epic poetry, some of the most famous poets being represented only by a few detached fragments of verse. The earliest attempts to write prose have also been lost. The works of the great writers of the Attic period are better preserved than are the earlier writings, but the second- and third-class writers are hardly known to us at all, and of the works of the greatest poets of the fifth century only a small part (though perhaps the best part) has been handed down through the lapse of centuries. Many writings of the period of literary decadence have been preserved, but a much greater number has been lost. The survival of the works of the earlier periods is due chiefly to the Alexandrian and later scholars, who made a selection of the masterpieces of Greek literature, choosing them from the great number of works existing in their day.

It results from the imperfect preservation of Greek literature that our knowledge of its history must be somewhat fragmentary. Some writers are known to us by their

Sources of our information. works, about whose lives we have no trustworthy information, while facts are recorded about the lives of others whose works have perished.

In general, our knowledge comes from the works of the authors themselves, from references to them in the works of their contemporaries, from accounts of their lives and works written in later times, and from notes, called *scholia*, written in ancient editions of their works.¹ Comparatively few authors are mentioned by their contemporaries, so that most of our information is derived from the works of the

Information from the authors' own works. authors themselves or from "lives" and commentaries written centuries after their death. Few Greek authors wrote with the intention of recording the facts of their own lives; hence the information we derive from their works has to be gathered from casual remarks which show that the writer was

¹ Occasionally an author is mentioned in an inscription, but seldom in such a way as to give much information.

present on such and such an occasion, or had visited such and such a place, or the like. What information we can glean in this way is valuable, for we obtain it at first hand and can be sure that it has not been falsified in any way, but it is very fragmentary. On the other hand, the existing biographies of Greek authors are all of late date. Their

Biographies. writers must have derived their information from previous writers, and these were perhaps dependent upon others still earlier. Whether such a biography is trustworthy or not depends upon the source from which its author derives his information and upon his own conscientiousness in recording the information he has derived. In most cases it is possible to find out by careful study both the source from which a biography is derived and the character of its writer. The existing biographies are by no means of equal value, some being in the main trustworthy records, while others are mere myths. So, too, the scholia are of very unequal value. Some of them seem

Scholia. to be mere guesses or careless remarks of late writers who really had no trustworthy information, while others give in abbreviated form the content of statements by careful and well-informed writers, perhaps even contemporaries of the person whose life, works, or character is being described. It is only by combining the facts learned from these various sources and by studying them in connection with the extant works of the ancient authors that we are able to compose a history of Greek literature, and it is evident that there must be some gaps in our knowledge and some details in regard to which the opinions of scholars still differ. Our information is, however, amply sufficient to enable us to trace in the main the development of Greek literature in historical times, and to form a correct judgment of the value and character of the different authors and their works. We are chiefly concerned with the extant works and their authors, though the works which have been partly or even entirely lost can not be altogether neglected.

The history of Greek literature begins, in the strictest sense, with Homer. But it is evident that the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*—long and elaborate works—are not the beginnings of literature. Of their predecessors we know little, but that little is important because it helps to explain the existence of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*.

**Iliad and
Odyssey not
the begin-
nings of
literature.**

Every primitive people has some sort of music to which songs are sung. Such songs, rude and irregular though they may be, are the beginnings of lyric poetry, and from them also epic poetry is developed by the growth of the narrative element. When the Greek tribes entered Greece they must have brought with them songs of various kinds, though we can not tell what the stage of their development was in those early times. But the traditions that lived on and are imperfectly recorded in later times tell us of two principal forms of early poetry, one of which developed into lyric poetry at a later time, while the other was the parent of the epic. To the first class belong the *threnos*, or lament for the dead, with its constant wailing refrain of "ai, ai"; the marriage song, invoking Hymenæus and calling down blessings on the wedded pair; the glad pæan of victory, sung after the battle, at the feast, or on the march, and doubtless some other popular songs, such as those sung at the festivals of the springtime and the vintage. The second class consisted of more formal and sedate songs, of hymns to the gods, and chants of battle, adventure, and prowess.

The birthplace of the Muses, daughters of Zeus, teachers of song to mortals, was, according to the popular tradition, in Pieria, on the northern slopes of Mount Olympus, in Thessaly. From this region a colony of Pierians moved south and settled about Mount Helicon, bringing the worship of the Muses with them. This tradition seems to hide a grain of truth.

**The Pierian
Muses.**

It seems that the Greeks did, at some time long before the beginnings of literary history, receive hymns and minstrels from the north, and it is certain that there was a school of poetry about Mount Helicon, in Bœotia. But the Greeks themselves knew little or nothing of the poets of those early days, and the names they have handed down to us are not to be regarded as historical, but only as mythical personifications of poetry and song. Two of these, Orpheus and Linus, are represented as Thracians, sons of the Muse Calliope. The name of Linus is probably derived from the refrain of an ancient song of mourning, *ailinos* (*αἰλινος*), which the Greeks explained as "alas for Linus," and accounted for by the story of Linus and his sad death. So Orpheus, sometimes called the brother of Linus, is an entirely mythical character, though a considerable body of not very early poetry was falsely ascribed to him. Musæus, about whom contradictory stories were told, but who was regarded as the son or the pupil of Orpheus, was connected with the sacred rites at Eleusis, in Attica, and his son (or father) Eumolpus was regarded as the ancestor of the Attic family of the Eumolpidæ. But Musæus himself is as mythical as Orpheus. Another utterly vague and probably mythical poet is Pamphus, who was supposed to have introduced or fixed the religious tradition in Attica and the neighboring part of Bœotia.

But it was not alone from the north that music and poetry entered Greece. One of the famous mythical singers was Olen, from Lycia, in Asia Minor, who was said to be the author of hymns sung to Apollo at Delos, and the Delians claimed that his songs and some other ancient hymns sung at Delos in Apollo's honor were among the earliest Greek poems. They also claimed that Olen was the inventor of the epic hexameter verse, a distinction which the Delphians claimed for the first Pythia at Delphi, Phemonoë. The hexameter verse,

**Mythical
poets.**

Olen.

like most other verses, was not the invention of any one person, but was a natural growth. The fact, however, that the Delphians claimed that it was invented by their priestess

The Delphic school. shows that there was an early school of poetry at Delphi. Here, according to the story, the

Cretan Chrysothemis contended for the prize in song, and after him Philammon of Thrace, and after him his son Thamyras. These are all mythical personages, but the story of their contests at Delphi is an indication that the northern and eastern schools of song met and joined forces on the slopes of Parnassus.

The names assigned to the earliest singers of hymns in Greece are mythical, and all their songs are lost; but it is evident that they had great influence upon the poetry of the first great epoch of Greek literature, the time when the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* were composed, as well as upon the slightly later poems ascribed to Hesiod and his school.

CHAPTER II

THE HOMERIC POEMS

The greatness of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*—Greek myths—The story of the Trojan War—The story of the *Iliad*—The story of the *Odyssey*—Differences and resemblances of the two poems—Homeric style and composition—Narrative and description—Similes—Dialogue—Characters—Women in Homer—Nausicaa.

GREEK literature begins for us with the Homeric poems, the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. There were other earlier poems, not only the hymns of which we have spoken, but epic poems also; but these have disappeared, leaving the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* alone in their grandeur. For more than two thousand years these two have stood as the highest and most perfect examples of epic poetry. It is only by minute investigation and ingenious combination of evidence that scholars have been able to acquire some real knowledge of the date and manner of composition of these immortal works, but the works themselves have served as a constant source of inspiration to countless generations of scholars, poets, and artists.

The *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* have for their subjects different parts of the story of the Trojan War. This was a tale of the ancient heroes in whom the Greeks believed as firmly as they believed in their gods. Indeed, why should they not? For the heroes were sons or descendants of gods, and at the same time ancestors of the noblest Greek families. Many stories were told of them. Some of these probably had real historical founda-

tion, others were new embodiments of ancient nature myths or folk-lore, and still others contained historical and mythical elements combined and made one through poetical imagination. But whatever the origin of these stories, the Greeks accepted them for many centuries as the truth.

Of all these tales, the story of the Trojan War is of the greatest interest to us, because it furnishes the subject-matter of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. The story is made up of various elements, and some parts of it are known to us only from the works of late writers. Briefly told, it is as follows :

Zeus was in love with the beautiful sea-goddess Thetis and wished to marry her, but he was told that the son of Thetis was fated to be mightier than his father, and thereupon he decided that Thetis must marry a mortal man. Peleus, a chieftain of Phthiotis, a part of what was afterward Thessaly, was chosen as her husband. **The wedding of Peleus and Thetis.** The wedding was a splendid festival, and all the gods and goddesses were invited except Eris, goddess of strife. She was angry at being left out, and spitefully threw among the assembled goddesses a golden apple with the inscription "For the fairest." At once Hera, Athena, and Aphrodite claimed the apple, and their quarrel bade fair to cause serious strife among the gods, but they finally agreed to submit the case to the judgment of Paris, son of Priam, king of Troy or Ilium. Each of the goddesses offered Paris a reward if he would decide that she was the fairest and should have the golden apple. **The judgment of Paris.** Aphrodite promised him the most beautiful woman in the world for his wife, and he adjudged her the prize. Now the most beautiful of women was Helen, daughter of Tyndareüs and wife of Menelaus, king of Sparta. With the help of Aphrodite, Paris carried Helen away to Troy. But before her marriage with Menelaus, Helen had had many suitors, and it

had been agreed among them that if any wrong should be done to her or to her husband on her account they would all join in avenging it. So when Paris had carried Helen away, Tyndareüs and Menelaus called upon the Greek chiefs to keep their promise. A great host came together and sailed against Troy under the command of Agamemnon, king of Mycenæ, brother of Menelaus. In this host were

The Greek heroes.

many famous heroes, the wise Nestor, from Pylos in Triphylia; Odysseus (or Ulysses, as the Romans called him), from Ithaca; Achil-

les, the son of Peleus and Thetis; the mighty Ajax from Salamis, the son of Telamon; Ajax, the son of Oïleus; and many more. For nine long years these warriors endured the toils of war about the walls of Troy, but they were unable to take the city, in spite of the fact that the Trojans were kept most of the time penned up within their walls. The forces on the two sides were nearly equal, but there was one warrior among the Greeks whom even Hector, the bravest and mightiest of the Trojans, could not meet on equal terms in the field. This hero was Achilles. His courage and skill in fighting kept the Trojans from attacking the camp of the Greeks and made the Greeks hope that the city would soon fall into their hands. So matters stood until the tenth year of the war.

But in the tenth year of the war Achilles was terribly affronted by King Agamemnon, who took away from him a captive maiden, Briseïs. This is the point at

The story of the Iliad.

which the *Iliad* begins, telling of "the wrath of Peleus's son Achilles, the baneful wrath,

which entailed countless woes upon the Achæans, and sent many mighty souls of heroes to Hades." Achilles withdrew in anger to his tent, and abstained from the war. Encouraged by his absence, Hector, followed by the other Trojans, came out boldly from the city, and in spite of the valor of Ajax, Menelaus, Diomedes, and other Greek chiefs, pressed

forward, and was on the point of setting fire to the Greek ships. But Patroclus, the bosom friend of Achilles, borrowed that hero's armor and rushed into the fray. At first the Trojans were dismayed, thinking Achilles himself had returned to the field, but soon Patroclus was slain by Hector. Achilles was plunged into the deepest grief, but determined to avenge his friend's death. His mother, Thetis, obtained a superb suit of armor from the god of metal work, Hephæstus, and Achilles mounted his chariot and went forth to battle. At last he met Hector, who fled at his approach. But Achilles chased him on foot about the walls of Troy, and killed him, taking his body back with him to his tent, where he mourned for Patroclus. Guided by the god Hermes, the aged Priam entered the Grecian camp and begged his son's body from the victor for burial. The *Iliad* closes with the burial of Hector.

After the death of Hector the war still went on, and Achilles was killed with an arrow by Paris, aided by Apollo; but at last the Greeks devised a plan by which they took the city. They made a great wooden horse, within which some of the bravest chiefs concealed themselves, whereupon the rest of the army sailed away to the neighboring island of Tenedos. The Trojans came out after their long confinement within the walls, wondered at the great horse, and finally, persuaded by the false statements of a Greek who had been left behind, made a breach in the wall and drew it into the city. In the night the enclosed warriors came out, the rest of the army returned from Tenedos, and the city was taken, sacked, and burned. Many of the inhabitants were killed, some escaped, and others were carried off as prisoners by the Greeks.

The return of the Greeks.

After the destruction of Troy the Greeks set out for home in their ships. Some of the chiefs reached Greece without mishap, but others were driven in various directions by the winds, in accordance with the com-

mands of the gods. Among these none was so famous as Odysseus, whose adventures are the subject of the *Odyssey*.

Leaving Troy with his twelve ships, Odysseus sailed to Ismarus, a city of the Ciconians, which he sacked with a loss of seventy-two men. Then he sailed to

The story of
the *Odyssey*.

the land of the lotus-eaters, "who eat flowery food," and thence to the land of the Cyclopes.

Here he, with twelve comrades, entered the cave of the monstrous Polyphemus, son of Poseidon, who devoured six of the men; and the others escaped only by making the Cyclops drunk and putting out his single eye. Next Odysseus and his fleet were driven to the island of Æolus, god of the winds, and through his kindness they almost reached Ithaca, for he gave Odysseus all the adverse winds tied up in a bag, so that only a favoring breeze could blow. But the sailors opened the bag while Odysseus slept, and the winds blew them back to Æolus. Next they came to the cannibal Læstrygonians, who destroyed eleven ships together with their crews. With the one remaining ship Odysseus reached the island of the sorceress Circe. She changed some of his comrades into swine, but Odysseus forced her to restore their human form, and lived with her in comfort for a year. After that he sailed to Hades, the abode of the dead, to consult the spirits. After a second and brief visit with Circe, he passed the coast of the sweetly singing sirens, avoided the clashing rocks and the whirlpool Charybdis, but lost six men snatched from the ship by the monster Scylla. On the island of Thrinacia his comrades killed and ate the sacred cattle of the sun-god, in punishment for which their ship was wrecked and all except Odysseus himself were drowned. He clung to a fragment of the vessel, and, after floating for nine days, reached the island of Ogygia, "a sea-girt isle, where is the middle of the sea." Here dwelt Calypso, a fair-haired goddess, who loved him and cared for him for seven years. But Odysseus always longed for his home and his dear wife

Penelope, and at last, by the command of Zeus, Calypso sent him on a raft to journey homeward. Poseidon wrecked the raft, but a kind sea-goddess, Ino, saved Odysseus, and he came in safety to Scheria, the land of the Phæacians. Here Athena caused him to meet Nausicaa, the lovely daughter of King Alcinous. She showed him the way to the palace, where he was kindly received. After a brief and pleasant visit at the house of Alcinous, in the course of which he related his previous adventures, Odysseus was carried home to Ithaca in a Phæacian ship.

Here his long absence of twenty years had brought trouble to his wife Penelope and their son Telemachus.

Affairs in Ithaca. Assuming that Odysseus was dead, many nobles of Ithaca and the neighboring regions had become suitors for the hand of Penelope, and had taken possession of the palace of Odysseus, where they feasted and consumed his substance. Penelope could not drive them away, nor could she make up her mind to accept any one of them as her husband, while Telemachus was still too young to cope with so many. When Odysseus reached Ithaca, Telemachus had just returned from a journey to Pylos and Sparta, whither he had gone to ask Nestor and Menelaus for news of his long-absent father. This journey was undertaken by the advice of Athena, who accompanied the young man in the shape of Mentor, a faithful friend of Odysseus. On his way home Telemachus had escaped an ambush of the suitors who plotted his death. Odysseus met his son at the house of the swineherd Eumæus. Here they plotted the destruction of the suitors, and presently carried out their design, with the aid of Athena and a few faithful servants. Odysseus was restored to his wife and his property, and though the relatives of the slain suitors threatened vengeance, peace was made by "Pallas Athena, daughter of ægis-bearing Zeus, who likened herself to Mentor in form and voice." Herewith ends the *Odyssey*.

The plots of the Homeric poems are enlivened, rather than interrupted, by numerous episodes, which, while not always helping to carry the story along toward its conclusion, constantly throw light upon the life of the Homeric times, the circumstances or characters of the heroes, or the ideals and mental habits of the poet. These episodes do therefore really help to make the narrative live and move, because they seem to place the reader in the midst of the life of the persons of the story.

The *Iliad* is a poem of battle, of fierce conflicts between heroes who meet each other hand to hand. Although Achilles is accepted as the greatest of warriors, that fact is often lost sight of in the description of the deeds of other chieftains, so that no single person is constantly kept before the reader as the hero of the poem. The *Odyssey*, on the other hand, is a tale of adventures in distant and unknown lands, of struggles against the winds and waves, savage men, and fierce monsters. It abounds with fabulous elements, such as the tale of the Cyclops or that of the gigantic, cannibal Læstrygonians. Only at the end of the poem does Odysseus cease to contend with superhuman foes or to dwell with persons of greater than human birth, and everywhere, except in the first four books, in which the adventures of Telemachus are related, Odysseus is constantly before the reader as the "resourceful," the "much-enduring," the "man of many wiles," whose courage, endurance, and craft triumph, with the aid of Athena, over all obstacles and all opponents. Such are some of the most evident differences between the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. But their resemblances are no less striking. Both are long poems dealing only with parts of the great tale of the war against Ilium; both are in the same hexameter verse and, with slight variations about which we shall have more to say presently, in the same dialect; both represent about the same stage of civilization. In style also

Episodes.

Differences

between Iliad and Odyssey.

Resemblances

between

Iliad and Odyssey.

the two poems are very much alike. Each is, to be sure, more or less uneven, so that one part is different from another, but yet the fact remains that the similarity in style between any part of either poem and any part of the same poem or of the other is greater than the differences which can be pointed out. Such differences exist and are, as we shall see, important, but they are so far outweighed by the general similarity in thought and expression that it is possible to speak of the Homeric style as of a style common in its essentials to both poems. In this style there is a wonderful union of limpid clearness, brilliancy of

**Stylistic
qualities.**

diction, directness and vigor of expression, and nobility and dignity of language. In no other epics do we find all these qualities to so high a degree. These qualities of style, even more than the interest of the narrative and the excellence of composition, have made the Homeric poems the models for all later epic poets to imitate, and have for centuries called forth the admiration of the world.

One of the marked qualities of the Homeric style is the brilliancy and directness of the narrative, the clearness and accuracy of the description. What can be clearer or more vivid than this brief account of the beginning of a battle in the *Iliad*?¹

**Narrative and
description.**

Now the long-haired Achæans took meat hastily among the huts, and after that armed themselves. And the Trojans, too, on the other side were putting on their armor throughout the city—in number fewer, but they were eager even so to fight in battle, of stern necessity, for their children and their wives. And all the gates were opened and the folk poured out, both foot and horsemen; and a mighty din arose. And they, when as they came together they had reached one spot, clashed targes together and spears and the strength of bronze-breast-plated men; and the bossed shields pressed one another, and a mighty din arose. And there at once were heard the groaning and the boasts of men who were destroying and destroyed, and the earth flowed with blood.

¹ *Iliad*, viii, 53 ff.

Another example from the *Iliad* is the description of the pursuit of Hector by Achilles.¹

So Hector stood and pondered; but near him came Achilles, the peer of Ares, waving-crested warrior, shaking over his right shoulder his fearful spear of Pelian ash; and about him his bronze armor shone like the glare of a blazing fire or of the rising sun. And Hector, when he saw him, was seized with trembling, and no longer dared to bide there where he was, but left the gates behind him and fled in fear. And Peleus's son rushed on him, trusting in his swift feet. As a falcon on the mountains, swiftest of winged birds, swoops lightly upon a wood-pigeon, and she flies trembling away, while he, shrilly screaming close at hand, darts upon her, and his spirit urges him to seize her, so he eagerly flew straight for him, and Hector fled shuddering beneath the Trojan wall, and plied swift knees. And they sped past the watching place and the wind-tossed wild fig-tree, always out from the wall along the wagon road. And they came to the two fair flowing fountains where bubble up the two sources of the eddying Scamander. The one flows with warm water, and about it smoke rises as from a blazing fire; but the other flows forth in summer heat like hail, or cold snow, or ice formed of water. And there at the springs were broad washing places hard by, fair ones of stone, where the wives and lovely daughters of the Trojans used to wash the shining raiment in former times of peace, before the sons of the Achæans came. There they two ran past, he fleeing, and he following after—noble he who fled before, but a much nobler pursued him—swiftly, since not for a beast of sacrifice nor for an ox-hide were they striving, which are the prizes for men's fleetness of foot, but for the life of horse-taming Hector. And, as when prize-winning, swift-footed horses run very swiftly round the turning-points, and the prize that lies before them is great, either a tripod or a woman, in honor of a man who is dead, so they two whirled thrice round the city of Priam with their rapid feet.

Here the insertion of similes and description in the midst of rapid and vivid narrative is especially characteristic. Similar qualities are found also in the *Odyssey*, as in the description² of the wreck of the raft:

¹ *Iliad*, xxii, 131 ff.

² *Odyssey*, v, 313 ff., Palmer's translation.

As thus he spoke, a great wave broke on high and madly whirled his raft around; far from the raft he fell and sent the rudder flying from his hand. The mast snapped in the middle under the fearful tempest of opposing winds that struck, and far in the sea canvas and sail yard fell. The water held him long submerged; he could not rise at once after the crash of the great wave, for the clothing which divine Calypso gave him weighed him down. At length, however, he came up, spitting from out his mouth the bitter brine which plentifully trickled from his head. Yet even then, spent as he was, he did not forget his raft, but pushing on amongst the waves laid hold of her, and in her middle got a seat, and so escaped death's ending. But her the great wave drove along its current, up and down. As when in autumn Boreas drives thistle-heads along the plain, and close they cling together, so the winds drove her up and down the deep. One moment Notus tossed her on to Boreas to drive, the next would Eurus give her up to Zephyrus to chase.

The Homeric similes are justly famous for their profusion, clearness, and accuracy. So in describing the hosts of the Greeks at Troy¹ the poet says :

**Homeric
similes.**

And as the many tribes of winged birds, of geese or cranes or long-necked swans, upon the Asian mead about Caystrius' streams fly here and there rejoicing in their wings, and clamor as they settle from their flight, and the meadow resounds; so of the Greeks the many tribes poured forth from ships and tents to the Scamandrian plain, and under them the earth resounded terribly with the tread of men and horses. And they took their stand in the flowery Scamandrian plain in countless numbers, as many as are the leaves and flowers in their season. Just as the many tribes of thick flies that settle about a herdsman's shelter in the spring season, when the milk drenches the pails, so many in number did the long-haired Achæans stand against the Trojans in the plain, longing to break their ranks in sunder.

And in the lines immediately following these, the Greeks are likened to herds of goats, and their leaders to the herdsman, and among the leaders Agamemnon, "in eyes and

¹ *Iliad*, ii, 459 ff.

head like Zeus who rejoices in the thunderbolt, in girth like Ares, and in breast like Poseidon," is compared to a mighty bull among a herd of kine. So in the *Odyssey*, Odysseus is compared to a mountain-lion driven by hunger to the haunts of men,¹ he himself compares Nausicaa to a young palm-tree,² and many other similes could be cited, all apt, and most of them testifying to careful and well-trained observation.

The narrative is also enlivened by the frequent insertion of dialogue, especially in the *Iliad* (though a considerable part of the *Odyssey* also is in dialogue form), and by putting the narrative in the first person. So Books IX, X, XI, and XII of the *Odyssey* are told by Odysseus.

Besides these qualities of the narrative, the portrayal of character is of striking excellence. Achilles, the noble, impetuous warrior in the bloom of youthful beauty, who so loves his friend that he must avenge his death, even though he knows that if he slays Hector he himself must die, but who gives up the body of his hated foe for burial when the aged Priam moves him with his prayers—Achilles, the ideal of military glory, is the central figure of the *Iliad*. So Odysseus, the courageous, but prudent, mature, and calculating man, the prototype of the adventurous sailors who made the entire Mediterranean pay commercial tribute to Greek commerce at a later date, is portrayed in the *Odyssey* with a vigor and delicacy unsurpassed in later literature. It is no wonder that Achilles and Odysseus lived on through all the literary history of the Greeks, or that Alexander the Great, accepting Achilles as the hero after whose character he would gladly model his own, envied him his good fortune in having Homer as his biographer.

But Achilles and Odysseus are not the only persons whose characters stand out in clear lines. Agamemnon,

¹ *Odyssey*, vi, 130 ff.

² *Ibid.*, vi, 162 ff.

king of men, the strong, insistent, vigorous monarch and commander-in-chief; Diomedes, the bold fighter and wise counselor; Nestor, the aged adviser; Ajax, the strong and valiant bulwark of the host; Hector, the foremost fighter of the Trojan chiefs, dauntless in war, but tender and true in his domestic life; Priam, the dignified king and the bereaved father—all these are distinct and powerful figures in the *Iliad*. And in the *Odyssey* we find the courteous and gentlemanly Menelaus; the noble young Telemachus, not yet sure of himself so as to be independent in his action, but showing his father's spirit in prudent thought and valiant deed; Eumæus, the faithful steward, affectionate servitor, and sturdy helper—all so depicted that they have been for centuries familiar types.

Nor are the personalities of women neglected. In the *Iliad*, to be sure, they are not made especially prominent, but though the stress of fighting keeps women in the background, Hector's wife, Andromache, loving wife, tender mother, and gentle lady, lives in our memories,¹ and "long-robed Helen, fair among women," moves among the Trojans with a dignity befitting a "daughter of the gods." In the *Odyssey* women are more prominent. The prudent Penelope, faithful to her husband through his twenty years of absence, will live forever as the type of wifely devotion, while the slight signs of coquetry she betrays and her inability to send the suitors away with sharp and decisive words are inconsistencies which only make her character more true to life. Add to these traits her anxious solicitude for Telemachus, her housewifely care for the domestic matters under her control, her incredulity when told of the return of Odysseus, and her final joy when convinced that it is really her husband—and her personality stands before us with singular distinctness and in unusual detail. Helen, too, the gentle

Women
in Homer.

¹ *Iliad*, vi, 394 ff.

lady who presides with so much grace in the palace of Menelaus at Sparta, is a figure not to be forgotten. But Nausicaa is the most charming of the women of Homer.

Nausicaa. Little is said of her; she is a secondary character in an episode of the poem; yet who can be more delightful? Hiding in her heart her thoughts of her own marriage, she asks her father¹ to let her take the clothes to the washing: "Papa, dear, could you not have the wagon harnessed for me—the high one, with good wheels—to take my nice clothes to the river to be washed, which now are lying dirty? Surely for yourself it is but proper, when you are with the first men holding councils, that you should wear clean clothing. Five good sons, too, are here at home—two married and three merry young men still—and they are always wanting to go to the dance, wearing fresh clothes. And this is all a trouble on my mind." This is the simple speech of any girl to any father—essentially girlish. But when, after the washing and the ball play, she sees the naked and unkempt Odysseus coming toward her, she shows courage and wisdom beyond her years. Then, after Odysseus has bathed and clothed himself, he returns to Nausicaa, who says² to her maids: "A while ago he really seemed to me ill-looking, but now he is like the gods who hold the open sky. Ah, might a man like this be called my husband, having his home here and content to stay!" This is not love, but the admiration which might precede love in the young girl's heart. And her last words to Odysseus³ are full of quiet dignity: "Stranger, farewell! When you are once again in your own land, remember me, and how before all others it is to me you owe the saving of your life." Here is no word of regret, no hint that the stranger might have been more to her than he had chosen to be. Nausicaa remains a simple, unaffected girl—and a princess.

¹ *Odyssey*, vi, 57 ff., Palmer's translation.

² *Ibid.*, vi, 242 ff.

³ *Ibid.*, viii, 461 f.

CHAPTER III

THE HOMERIC QUESTION

Ancient views—F. A. Wolf—Later scholars—Inconsistencies in the *Iliad*—Inconsistencies in the *Odyssey*—The dialect—Asia Minor the home of Homeric poetry—Greek migration to Asia Minor—Origin of the original lays in northern Greece—Comparison of Homeric civilization with that of later Greece—The “Mycenæan” civilization—Date of *Iliad* and *Odyssey* about 900–700 B. C.—Personality of Homer—Alexandrian division into books.

WE have now passed in review some of the chief general characteristics of the Homeric poems, and the complex question naturally arises, “By whom, when, where, and under what circumstances were the poems composed?” This is called the Homeric question.

In early times—certainly until about the middle of the fifth century B. C.—not only the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, but also many other epic poems were ascribed to Homer. By the end of the fifth century, however—by the time of Plato and Aristotle—little or nothing in addition to these two great poems was regarded as his work, and from that time references to Homer are references to the *Iliad* or the *Odyssey*. In Alexandrian times—not far from the end of the third century B. C.—various differences and inconsistencies between the two poems were pointed out by the *chorizontes* or separatists Xenon and Hellanicus, who denied that the *Odyssey* was by Homer. Their views were, however, combated by Aristarchus, and were not generally accepted at any time. The

Views of the
ancients.

modern Homeric question is not whether the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* are by the same author, but whether either poem is by one author, and whether the name of Homer can properly be given to any person. This question involves the determination of the date and manner of composition of the poems.

The beginning of modern discussion of the authorship of the Homeric poems was made in 1795 by Friedrich August Wolf.¹ He was preparing an edition of Homer, and in order to enable himself to decide various questions connected with the text he proceeded to investigate the manner in which the poems had been handed down in ancient times. Wolf found that at the early date to which the poems were unanimously assigned, writing was unknown to the Greeks, and he believed that poems of such length could be neither composed nor transmitted without the aid of writing. Besides, inasmuch as poetry was then composed for recitation or song, there would be no object in composing poems too long for a single recitation. The obvious conclusion was that the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, as we possess them, were put together at a time when the Greeks were familiar with writing. Since, however, the poems show many signs of early origin, they must have been formed by uniting previously existing shorter songs or lays. Wolf, accepting and combining the statements of some ancient writers, believed that the lays were united by a commission appointed by Pisistratus to prepare a correct edition of Homer for recitation at the Panathenaic festival. The collection would then be the work of an Athenian commission at some time between 560 and 527 B. C. This would account for numerous peculiarities of Attic speech noticeable in the text, as well as for the interpolation of lines exalting Athens.

¹ Wolf's views were in part anticipated by the Italian Vico, whose work, however, failed to attract much attention.

The views of Wolf have been supplemented and combated by many scholars, and opinions have been, and still are, much at variance concerning the authorship of the Homeric poems. Lachmann and others have attempted to divide the *Iliad* into its component lays, marking off accurately the beginning and end of each; Grote believed that the *Iliad* was composed of a relatively long poem, the *Achilleïs*, to which other lays were added, and various modifications of his views have been advanced. Whereas the earlier discussions were chiefly devoted to the *Iliad*—Grote, for instance, believed the *Odyssey* to be the work of one man—more recent investigators have applied themselves especially to the *Odyssey*, which has been shown by Kirchhoff to be composed of several distinct strata of different origins and dates. The latest writers accept for the most part Kirchhoff's general results, contenting themselves with the correction of details. There are still, however, some who believe, though hardly without some reservations and modifications, in the unity of authorship of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. To discuss in detail the theories of all or any writers on the Homeric question would take far too long. It will be more profitable to set forth briefly what seems a reasonable view, supporting it by what argument is absolutely necessary and avoiding all needless detail.

In the *Iliad*, the catalogue of ships (Book II) is manifestly out of place. Any list of the contending forces should be unnecessary in a poem dealing with the tenth year of the war, but this list of ships—which had been for the most part rotting on the shore for ten years—is peculiarly inappropriate. The suggestion that it was originally intended as a part of a description of the gathering of the Achæans at Aulis contains much probability. In the third book Helen points out the Achæan leaders to Priam and other Trojans. Could Priam fail to know them after nearly ten years of

The views
of later
scholars.

Inconsist-
encies in
the *Iliad*.

conflict? And if they had never been visible from the walls in all that time, could Helen recognize them after her long absence from Greece? - Clearly this scene belongs in a poem dealing with the earlier part of the war. Again, the introduction designates the wrath of Achilles as the subject of the poem; but a large part of our *Iliad* has only the most distant connection with the wrath of Achilles. So the Doloneia (Book X) tells of an adventure of Odysseus and Diomedes which in no way affects the relations of Achilles and Agamemnon, but is an independent tale. Those parts of the *Iliad* in which the great deeds of various heroes are described may, to be sure, be brought into connection with Achilles on the ground that they show his greatness, since without him even such mighty warriors as Diomedes, Menelaus, and Ajax could not hold back the Trojans, but these passages read rather as if they had been composed for their own sake, perhaps with a view to pleasing some family which derived its origin from the hero whose deeds are described.

The *Odyssey*, too, shows numerous signs of composition from various elements. The council of the gods in the first book is needlessly repeated in the fifth—
Inconsist- first book is needlessly repeated in the fifth—
encies in needlessly, that is, if the reader or hearer of
the *Odyssey*. the fifth book is supposed to be acquainted
 with the first. The first four books, even though in their existing form they can never have been an independent epic, are out of all proportion as an introduction to the comparatively subordinate part played by Telemachus in the real business of the poem. In the eleventh book Odysseus visits the realm of the dead in order to consult the shade of the prophet Teiresias about his homeward voyage. But Teiresias tells him nothing that he does not already know from Circe, except that he must make a journey inland after everything is settled in Ithaca, and that he is to die a peaceful death, and these things have nothing to do with the wanderings and return of Odysseus.

The eleventh book, the language of which is less early than that of most of the *Odyssey*, was inserted merely for the sake of adding one more adventure, or it belongs—with other matter, which has been lost—to a poem dealing with the later fortunes of Odysseus. Both *Iliad* and *Odyssey* contain many other passages more or less inconsistent with each other. The evidence is cumulative, and the examples here given do not in themselves constitute a conclusive proof that neither poem is the work of one author, but they show one of the lines along which the proof is to be reached.

The dialect of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*—for, in spite of many variations, it may still be spoken of as one dialect—
 The dialect. was never the ordinary language of any place or people. It is a conventional language, used only by the poets. For the most part it is Ionic, but it contains many elements of Æolic speech, numerous Atticisms, and not a few false forms, introduced, no doubt, when the original forms were no longer understood. How is this dialect to be accounted for? The false forms need not detain us further. The Atticisms are accounted for by Wolf and his followers as a result of the revision of Homer under Pisistratus. It is, however, very doubtful if such a revision ever took place. The tradition that it did take place seems, to be sure, to go back at least as far as Dieuchidas of Megara, who wrote in the fourth century B. C., though Cicero is the earliest extant author who directly attests it, but it seems to owe its origin to the fact that the poems were recited at the Panathenaic festival, which was specially connected with Pisistratus. The Attic forms appearing in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* are the natural result of the long-continued intellectual and literary supremacy of Athens. Had some Doric city occupied her position, our Homer would be infected with Doric forms. The presence of the numerous Æolisms in Homer is most easily explained on the assumption that poems originally—at

least in their elements—Æolic were subsequently worked over into Ionic Greek. The condition of the poems indicates that this work was not done by one person nor at one time.

The language of the Homeric poems—Æolic Greek not entirely obliterated by Ionic—points to Asia Minor or some adjacent island as the place of their composition, and there are also other reasons for assigning them to that region. In the first place, the geographical knowledge displayed in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* is limited for the most part to the eastern portions of the Greek world, the west being a dim region of darkness except that in parts of the *Odyssey* some acquaintance with Italy and Sicily appears. Besides, the descriptions and imagery are for the most part Asiatic rather than European in character. Furthermore, considerations of a more general historical nature show that Asia Minor is the only region in which the Homeric poems would have been composed.

About 1000 B. C. a great movement of tribes took place in Greece—a movement extending over many years—which is known by the somewhat inadequate name of the Dorian invasion. At that time great numbers of Æolic Greeks passed over to Asia Minor, followed—or in some cases accompanied—by their Ionic kinsmen. The Greeks carried with them to Asia Minor whatever civilization they had previously possessed, and, being in close contact with the ancient nations of the East, they speedily attained a high degree of culture and luxury. In the courts of the leaders of Asiatic Greek society the Homeric poems were chanted by poets and rhapsodes, or professional reciters. That their origin was Æolic is shown not only by the Æolisms in their language, but also by the fact that all the chief heroes are of Æolic birth, with the exception of the Pylian Nestor, who is Ionian, and he may be a comparatively late addition, inasmuch as he nowhere

Asia Minor
the home of
Homeric
poetry.

Migration to
Asia Minor.

plays such a part as to affect the main action of the story. The homes of the Homeric heroes are in Thessaly and Bœotia for the most part, the ancient dwellings of the Æolians. Agamemnon, Menelaus, and Diomedes are, to be sure, assigned to the Peloponnesus, but there are indications that even this is the result of a transference, and that their real origin is to be sought farther north.

The Æolic Greeks in their early homes in the northern part of Greece possessed sagas and lays about their gods **Origin of lays** and heroes. These they carried with them in **in northern** their wanderings, adding to them uncon- **Greece.** sciously touches of local color as they went. If Agamemnon, king of men, lives in the Peloponnesus, it is because Æolians sojourned there, and some of their legends became attached to Peloponnesian soil. Afterward the great migration to Asia Minor took place. No doubt the immigrants had to overcome the armed opposition of the inhabitants of the country—opposition none the less violent and protracted because it proved to be unavailing. Later, when the Greeks were firmly established, and had grown rich and cultivated in Asia Minor, the poets not unnaturally attached early legends of mythical combats to the real deeds of their more immediate ancestors, and thus the Thessalian Achilles, the Mycenæan Agamemnon, the Argive Diomedes, and other chiefs from different parts of Greece are made to meet about the walls of Troy, there to combine in repeating deeds once performed by them or their counterparts somewhere in Bœotia against another Hector and about another Ilium—for Hector, “the Holder,” is a good Greek name, and Æneas may well be originally a hero, or even *the* hero, of the Thessalian Æneanes.¹

The civilization described in the Homeric poems is not

¹ We may go further back and find an ancient sun myth in the story of Paris and Helen, as well as many nature myths in the tales of the *Odyssey*, but such matters belong rather to comparative mythology than to Greek literature.

primitive, but is different from the civilization of classical times. In Homer the chiefs drive to battle in chariots, whereas in classical times the Greeks used cavalry, to be sure, but no chariots in war. The Homeric and later Greek civilizations compared. change may be due to the fact that the plains of Thessaly offer an opportunity for the use of chariots, which the rugged hills and narrow valleys of central and southern Greece do not. The weapons of the Homeric chiefs are of bronze, those of the later Greeks of iron. The mighty shield of Ajax—or the shield of Achilles, with its elaborate ornamentation¹—has little resemblance to the comparatively small targe of the classical period. Nor is the costume of Homer's women identical with the clothing worn in later times. The wealth ascribed by Homer to the Achæan chiefs is far in excess of anything known in later Greece (if we leave out of account the collective wealth of cities such as Athens), and the descriptions of palaces do not agree with what is known of Greek dwellings in later times. Works of art deserving especial admiration are ascribed in Homer (if not to a divine artificer) invariably to an Oriental source, which would not be possible in Greece later, at any rate, than the seventh century. The patriarchal government, too, described in the Homeric poems, although it is in some respects like the governments of some of the Greek cities in Asia Minor, is clearly in part different and earlier.

In various parts of Greece—notably at Mycenæ and Tiryns, but also in Attica, Bœotia, and Thessaly—in Crete, and at Hissarlik, in the Troad, extensive remains have been found of a civilization which must have existed before 1000 B. C. These remains agree in many respects with the descriptions contained in the Homeric poems. So the Homeric palace and the ruins of Tiryns explain each other, and Tiryns has furnished a blue glass frieze which shows what is meant by

Archæological evidence.

¹ *Iliad*, xviii, 478 ff.

the "frieze of kyanos," in the palace of Alcinous,¹ while the use of copper for ornamentation in the great tomb at Mycenæ proves that the metallic splendor of the palaces of Alcinous² and Menelaus³ is not altogether the creation of the poet's imagination. It is true that the remains of this so-called "Mycenæan civilization" do not entirely agree with what we find in Homer. So the remains show that the dead were buried, whereas the Homeric heroes were burned; the remains show an almost complete ignorance of the use of iron, whereas iron is more or less familiar in Homer; the armor discovered is not exactly what the Homeric descriptions would lead one to expect, and there are some further points of difference. The Homeric poems do not describe a civilization identical with that made known by the discoveries made at Mycenæ and elsewhere, but they do describe a civilization which is a legitimate development therefrom.

The Homeric poems are not the product of one mind nor of one time. Some parts, which had already on other grounds been regarded as the earliest, agree more closely than others with the "Mycenæan" remains, and it may not be too rash to affirm that these early portions were composed not long after the Æolian Greeks reached Asia Minor, when their recollections of their earlier homes in Greece were comparatively fresh. If the Æolian emigration took place, roughly speaking, about 1000 B. C., these earliest parts belong to the tenth century, perhaps to the first half of that century, and all the parts of the poems which ever existed in a purely Æolic form were probably finished in that form not much after 900 B. C. As the Ionic colonies increased in wealth and culture, they furnished the most profitable audiences for the traveling bards or rhapsodes, and the Æolic poems were changed so as to be understood by Ionians. The poems probably existed in Ionic form as early as the eighth

¹ *Odyssey*, vii, 87.

² *Ibid.*, vii, 84 ff.

³ *Ibid.*, iv, 72 ff.

century B. C. Even after this change had been effected additions were made in the "epic" dialect—that is, in the artificial dialect formed by the rhapsodes in adapting Æolic poems to Ionian audiences, the dialect in which Greek epic poetry continued to be written as long as it was written at all. It is difficult, if not impossible, to assign exact dates to the different parts of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, to tell whether this or that part existed independently before it was added to the rest, or was originally composed as an addition, and when and by whom the poems were finally completed in their present form. It is, however, most probable that the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* had both reached approximately their present form not far from 700 B. C., though scattered lines were added later. The *Iliad* is for the most part older than the *Odyssey*; its plot is simpler and its language earlier; its gods and heroes alike more primitive. Certain parts of the *Odyssey* are, to be sure, earlier than the latest parts of the *Iliad*, but if we regard the two poems as wholes, the *Iliad* is the older. Roughly speaking, the *Iliad* may be assigned to a time not much after 800 B. C., the *Odyssey* to about 700; but any exact dates are impossible, especially as each of the two great poems really belongs to several periods.

It is clear that our Homeric poems are the result of gradual development. Was there then any one who can be regarded as the author of the poems, any one to whom we can give the name of Homer? Certainly some one must have composed the original Æolic lays, but there is no reason to suppose that any large proportion of them was composed by the same man. Again, some one must have been instrumental in giving its final form to each of the great poems, but that the same person was concerned with both *Iliad* and *Odyssey*—not to speak of all the other poems which were once regarded as Homeric—is highly improbable, not to say impossible. It may be that there was at some time

Nothing
known of the
personality
of Homer.

a bard who so far excelled his fellows that his name alone has been preserved, and his name may have been Homer. The word ὄμηρος means "hostage," but there is no reason why it should not have been used as a proper name. If such a person ever existed, we have no means of knowing what part, if any, he had in the composition of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. Something about the poems we know, but about Homer nothing. It is needless to add that the ancient so-called biographies of Homer are utterly untrustworthy and the ancient portraits purely imaginary.

Writing was practised for ages before the Homeric times by Babylonians, Egyptians, and other peoples, and recent discoveries have shown that the people of Crete had a peculiar system of writing at least as early as the twelfth century B. C. This knowledge was probably shared by the inhabitants of other places in and near the Ægean Sea. In the *Iliad* (Book VI, line 168) "baleful signs" inscribed upon a folded tablet are mentioned, by means of which King Prætus sent a message that Bellerophon should be killed; but whether these signs were really alphabetic or only pictorial is not stated. Writing was known to the

Early knowl-
edge of
writing
among the
Greeks.

Greeks at least as early as 700 B. C.; for Archilochus, who is supposed to have lived not far from that time, speaks of a *skytale* as something perfectly familiar. Now a *skytale* was a staff on which a strip of leather was rolled for writing purposes. There is plenty of evidence that writing was familiar to the Greeks by 600 B. C., familiar in the sense that it was practised not only by professional scribes, but by others, as, for instance, the mercenary soldiers who cut their names on a statue at Abu Simbel, far up the Nile. There was, to be sure, no general reading public until the fifth century, but that is no reason why schools or individual rhapsodes should not make and possess copies of the Homeric poems long before that time. In all probability the Homeric poems were written as soon as they attained

their present length, or even before the latest additions were made. It may be possible for the human memory to retain the many verses of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, but inasmuch as writing was known at the time to which these poems must be assigned, it is natural to suppose that they were written from the beginning.

Different copies or editions of the Homeric poems must have differed considerably, for ancient quotations from the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* do not always agree with our texts. The general agreement of existing manuscripts is due in great measure to ancient editors, especially to the grammarians of Alexandria, the most important of whom, so far as Homer is concerned, was Aristarchus, about 220–150 B. C. The division into twenty-four books designated by the twenty-four letters of the Greek alphabet is also the work of the Alexandrian grammarians.

The *Iliad* and *Odyssey* are, then, not the works of one great poet, but the result of a national development. For centuries the genius of the most gifted race the world has ever known was devoted to the creation and perfecting of epic poetry. Of all the poems of those centuries the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* were alone preserved by the admiration of later times, and these have come down to us. It is not to be wondered at if we find in them, in spite of some unevenness, an excellence of workmanship, a directness of narrative, a clearness of expression, a vividness of dramatic presentation, a wealth of imagery, and a beauty of language unequalled in any other epic poems.

CHAPTER IV

THE EPIC CYCLE—SPORTIVE POEMS—THE HOMERIC HYMNS

Epic poems besides the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*—The *Homeridæ*—The Epic Cycle—The *Cypria*—The *Nostoi*—The *Telegonia*—The *Æthiopis*—The *Little Iliad*—The *Sack of Troy*—The Theban cycle—Other epics—Mock-heroic poems—The *Margites*—The *Battle of the Frogs and the Mice*—The Homeric hymns.

EPIC poetry was by no means confined to the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. There were certainly many epic poems before the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* attained their present form, and there were also many after that time. On the island of Chios there was a school or family of poets and rhapsodes called the *Homeridæ*, who regarded Homer as their founder, and who continued to tell in verse the stories of the gods and heroes. It is due to them that Homer is often said to have been born at Chios. There were also many other epic poets in various places. The works of all these poets are lost, nothing remaining to us except brief fragments preserved as quotations in the writings of later authors. The so-called *tabulæ Iliacæ* (stone tablets on which were carved, for the instruction of Roman school children, scenes from the Trojan story with references to the poems in which the scenes were described) preserve for us some titles and give us information about the contents of some of the poems. Many of the poems themselves must have been lost and forgotten at an early date, though many others were preserved as late as the time of the grammarian Proclus, who lived in the second century

after Christ. We know little of the poems and less of their authors. Many of the poems were ascribed to Homer until the progress of criticism made it evident that they were not of the same origin as the *Iliad* or the *Odyssey*, but it was then too late to discover with certainty who the real authors were. In some cases the names given by ancient writers may be correct, but it is now impossible to sift the evidence so as to reach sure conclusions. The poems which were preserved throughout the classical period appear to have owed their preservation and such popularity as they enjoyed rather to the subject-matter than to literary excellence, though some of them, which were ascribed to Homer, were probably of real poetic merit. In later times prose abstracts of these poems were made as handbooks of mythology, and such a handbook was called an *epic cycle* (or circle). In modern times, the name epic cycle has been transferred to the poems themselves, and their authors are called the *cyclic poets*.

Some of the component parts of the poems of the epic cycle are, like the component parts of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, very old; in fact, some passages in the *Odyssey* seem to refer to the contents of some of them. But the poems themselves, as they were known to the Greeks of the classical period, were doubtless all later than the *Iliad*, and probably than the *Odyssey*, and may be assigned for the most part to the seventh century B. C. Proclus says that the epic cycle told the myths of the Greeks from the union of Uranus and Gæa (Heaven and Earth), through all the tales of the gods and heroes, to the death of Odysseus at the hands of his son Telegonus. Proclus does not say that the stories about Thebes were included in the cycle, but, as the cycle embraced all tales of gods and heroes, they must have been. The *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* were included in the cycle, each in its proper place.

The Trojan part of the epic cycle began with an epic

called the *Cypria* (τὰ Κύπρια ἔπη), either because the author was born in Cyprus or because the power of the Cyprian

The Cypria. goddess Aphrodite was shown in the abduction of Helen, which was the main subject of the poem. The *Cypria* is attributed to Homer, Stasinus, Hegesias, Creophylus, and Cyprius. Evidently the author was unknown, but that the poem was of Cyprian origin is probable enough. The story begins with the plan of Zeus that the overpopulated earth should be relieved by a great war. Then follows the story of the marriage of Peleus and Thetis, the judgment of Paris (see above, page 11), the abduction of Helen and the adventures of Paris and Helen on the way to Troy, the gathering of the Greeks, their departure for Asia, and their adventures before reaching Troy, the landing at Troy, and the various events of the war up to the point at which the *Iliad* begins. Many myths not originally connected with the Trojan War were woven into this long poem of eleven books, and the whole must have been rather a collection of tales of the heroes than a work of real artistic unity. It was probably not one of the earlier poems of the cycle, and is mentioned first simply because it tells the tale of the events before the point at which the *Iliad* begins.

The second poem in the cycle was the *Iliad*, which was followed by the *Æthiopis*, in five books, attributed to Arctinus of Miletus, who is said to have lived about

The Æthi- 776 B. C. At any rate, the poem seems to be-
opis.

long to the eighth century. After the burial of Hector, the Amazons, a tribe of female warriors, come to the assistance of the Trojans, under the leadership of Penthesilea, daughter of Ares. She is killed by Achilles, who, however, allows the Trojans to bury her and the other dead. Thersites accuses Achilles of having been in love with Penthesilea, whereupon Achilles kills him with a blow of his fist, after which he sails to Lesbos to be purified of blood-guiltiness. The next ally of the Trojans was Mem-

non, son of Eos, the dawn. He was king of the Ethiopians, which fact gives the name to the poem. Achilles was warned that if he slew Memnon, his own death must follow quickly; but when Antilochus, the friend of Achilles, was slain by Memnon, Achilles in return slew Memnon, who was carried away by his mother, Eos, and made immortal by Zeus. Achilles then drove the Trojans into the city, but was himself slain by Paris. His body was with difficulty saved from the enemy. Odysseus carried it to the Greek camp, while Ajax kept the Trojans at bay. After this Antilochus was buried, and Thetis and her nymphs lamented over Achilles. His body was placed on the funeral pyre, and elaborate games were held in his honor, but the body itself was carried off by Thetis to the isle of Leuce. At the funeral games the Grecian chiefs contended for the arms of Achilles, which were to be given to the most worthy. Ajax and Odysseus were the most prominent claimants, and the arms were awarded to Odysseus. The position of Antilochus in this poem is similar to that of Patroclus in the *Iliad*, and Memnon is, in some respects, a repetition of Hector, while the funeral games in honor of Achilles are a copy of those in honor of Patroclus. It is evident that Arctinus knew the *Iliad* and imitated it.

The next poem of the cycle is the *Little Iliad*, generally ascribed to Lesches of Lesbos, though Hellanicus of

Lesbos, ascribed it to Cinætho of Sparta. Eusebius gives 660 B. C. as the date of Lesches, which is perhaps not far from the date of the poem. The *Little Iliad*, in four books, told of the strife of Ajax and Odysseus for the armor of Achilles; of the consequent madness and suicide of Ajax; of the increase of the Greek and Trojan armies by reinforcements; of the death of Paris by an arrow of Philoctetes; the death of Eurypylus at the hands of Neoptolemus, the son of Achilles; the stealing of the Palladium by Odysseus and Diomedes, and the building of the wooden horse. The poem was evi-

The Little
Iliad.

dently full of action, and it appears to have been more popular than most of the other poems of the cycle.

After the *Little Iliad* comes the *Sack of Troy* (Ἰλίου Πέρις), by Arctinus, in two books, according to Proclus.

This may really have been a separate poem not directly connected with the *Æthiopis*; but it is at least equally probable that Arctinus wrote a long poem telling the whole story of the Trojan War after the death of Hector, and that Proclus, instead of taking him as his authority for the whole story, preferred to mention the *Little Iliad*, as that was a rather popular poem, and after giving that as his authority for the part of the story between the death of Achilles and the last events of the war, returned to Arctinus for his account of the taking of the city. If this view is correct, Arctinus is to be credited with one long poem of at least ten books, instead of an *Æthiopis* in five books and a *Sack of Troy* in two books. The *Sack of Troy*, according to Proclus, told of the entrance of the wooden horse into the city after the fruitless opposition of Laocoön; of the death of Laocoön;¹ the deceit of Sinon; the burning of the city; the slaughter of the infant Astyanax, son of Hector; and the sacrifice of Polyxena, Hector's sister, at the tomb of Achilles. The story seems to have been told nearly as Virgil tells it in the second book of the *Æneid*. Indeed, it is to this poem and others of the Trojan cycle that Virgil is indebted for much of the material for the first six books of his great work.

The *Sack of Troy* was followed by the *Nostoi*, the *Returns*. Proclus attributes the *Nostoi* to Agias, of Trœzen, and the poem is said to have had five books.

In all probability there were several poems of this name, for the name is a general one, and could be applied to a collection of poems relating the adventures of the various heroes on their way home from Troy. The *Odyssey* itself tells of the *Return* of Odysseus, and there

¹ Cf. Virgil, *Æneid*, ii, 163 ff.

are several passages in it which seem to presuppose the existence of poems, or at least of stories, relating to the *Returns* of other heroes. The *Nostoi*, according to Proclus, told of the quarrel of Agamemnon and Menelaus when the Greeks were on the point of setting sail from Troy,¹ of the wanderings of Menelaus,² the journey by land of Calchas and others to Colophon, the death of the Oïlean Ajax,³ the wanderings and final return to his home of Neoptolemus, the murder of Agamemnon by Clytæmnestra and Ægisthus, the vengeance inflicted upon them by Orestes and Pylades, and the return of Menelaus.⁴ This poem also contained an account of a visit to the lower world.

The last poem of the Trojan cycle was the *Telegonia*, by Eugammon of Cyrene, who lived about 570 B. C. This was apparently not only the last in the order of the events narrated, but also the latest in date of the poems included in the cycle. It seems to have been the worst as well as the latest. It told how Odysseus went through various adventures after destroying the suitors in his house, and was finally slain in battle by Telegonus, his son by Circe. After that Telegonus took Penelope and Telemachus to Circe's isle of Ææa, where they were made immortal, and Telemachus married Circe, while Telegonus married Penelope.

Besides the poems that told the tale of the Trojan War and its heroes, there were others belonging to the epic cycle. These told the legends of Thebes; and just as the poems about the Trojan War are called the Trojan cycle, so these are called the Theban cycle. The *Thebais*, in seven thousand verses, told the story of the house of Labdacus, and especially the attack of the seven Argive chieftains upon Thebes. The poem was ascribed to Homer, but the little we know of it is enough to show that it was later than the *Iliad* or the

The Tele-
gonia.

The Theban
cycle.

¹ Cf. *Odyssey*, iii, 134 ff.

³ *Ibid.*, iv, 409 ff.

² *Ibid.*, iv, 351 ff.

⁴ *Ibid.*, iii, 262 ff.

Odyssey. The *Epigoni*, of about the same length as the *Thebais*, told of the capture of Thebes by the descendants of those who fell in the attack described in the *Thebais*. The *Thebais* may perhaps be identical with a poem called the *Driving out of Amphiaraus*, and the *Epigoni* may be identical with the *Alcmæonis*, but this is very uncertain. The *Œdipodeia* contained the story of King Œdipus in about six thousand lines. It is ascribed to the Lacedæmonian Cinæthon, whose date Eusebius gives as 760 B. C.

There were also other epic poems of early date, but probably not included in the epic cycle. The *Capture of*
 Other epics. *Echalia* told how Heracles won the beautiful Iole by taking her native town. The poem was ascribed to Homer, but also to Creophylus of Samos. The *Phocais* is said to have had its name from the fact that Homer composed it in Phocæa. It may have been identical with the *Minyas*, a poem about the capture of Orchomenus by Heracles. In this a visit to the lower world is described, in which the ferryman Charon appears. The *Danaïs* told of the pursuit and marriage of the fifty daughters of Danaus by the fifty sons of Ægyptus. Other epics mentioned are the *Titanomachia*, or *Battle of the Gods and Titans*, ascribed to Arctinus and also to Eumelus; the *Heracleia*, or tale of Heracles, and the *Heroic Theogamies*, a collection of many myths, both ascribed to Pisander of Rhodes; and the *Atthis*, or *Amazonia*, telling of the attack of the Amazons upon Attica.

Little is known of any of the lost epic poems, but they are of real importance in the history of Greek literature, because from them the great dramatists derived the plots for their plays, many lyric poets drew the stories which they introduced into their poems, artists—especially vase-painters—took the subjects of their works, and thus these epics, by giving permanent and artistic form to the myths which were current among the Greeks, furnished a large part of the subject

matter for literature and art even down to our own times. For not only the Greeks, but the Romans and later peoples, have delighted in giving new forms to the myths told in these early poems. Virgil, in the *Aeneid*, and Ovid, in the *Metamorphoses*, are the most noted examples among the Romans of this use of the material of the early Greek epics, but they do not stand alone. Among English writers, Milton, Swinburne, and William Morris are only a few of many who have taken pleasure in following in the footsteps of the Romans who drew their inspiration from the early epic poems of Greece.

All the epic poems we have been considering were connected with Homer, and most, if not all of them were actually ascribed to him as their author. He was also regarded as the author of poems of other kinds. Among these were sportive poems, or mock-heroic epics. The earliest and most famous of these was the *Margites*, which Aristotle still believed to be the work of Homer, and which he regarded as the source or germ of comedy, just as he found the source of tragedy in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. The poem has also been ascribed to Pigres, of Halicarnassus, brother of Queen Artemisia, who lived in the early part of the fifth century B. C. Margites, the hero of the poem, is a foolish young man who "knew many things, and knew them all badly," so that he got into all sorts of trouble. The *Margites* was written in heroic hexameters interspersed with iambic trimeters. It has been suggested that the iambic parts are due to Pigres, who amused himself by adding them to a poem already in existence. But the conjectures about the authorship of the *Margites* are of doubtful value. The poem was highly thought of in antiquity, and seems to have been really amusing.

The
Batrachomyomachia.

Another mock-heroic poem sometimes ascribed to Homer is the *Batrachomyomachia*, the *Battle of the Frogs and the Mice*. This has been preserved to us. It

is a parody of the Homeric epic, full of harmless fun, with no bitterness in its sarcasm. A mouse, Psycharpax (Crumb-stealer), escapes from a cat and goes to a pond to drink. There the king of the frogs, Physignathus (Puff-cheek), son of Peleus (the Muddy), asks him to come and visit his palace, and undertakes to carry him thither on his back. When they are in the midst of the water, the sudden appearance of a water-snake so frightens the frog that he dives and leaves the mouse to drown. This is seen from the bank by the mouse Leichopinax (Plate-licker), who tells the tale to the tribe, and forthwith the mice declare war. The news is sent to the frogs, who prepare for defense.

But Zeus called the gods to the starry heaven, showed them the greatness of the war, and the mighty warriors, many and great, and bearing their long spears; and sweetly smiling, asked who of the gods would aid the frogs and who the mice in their distress; and to Athena he spoke: "My daughter, wilt thou go the mice to aid? for in thy temple they aye skip about, rejoicing in the fat and food from sacrifices." So spoke the son of Cronus; and Athena answered him: "O father, never would I go as helper to the mice in their distress, since many evils they have done to me, injuring my fillets and lamps for olive-oil. But this which they did pained my soul too much. They gnawed my robe, which I did toil to weave of delicate woof, spinning a delicate thread, and holes they made therein; but the mender follows me and duns me for interest; on this account I am wroth; for I wove it by borrowing, and have not wherewithal to pay. Yet not even so do I wish to aid the frogs. For they too are lacking in firmness of spirit; but lately when I was returning from battle, fatigued with much toiling, in sore need of slumber, they did not allow me, because of their shouting, so much as a wink. And I lay sleepless with my aching head until the cock did crow. But come, gods, let us cease from aiding them, lest any one of us be wounded with a sharply pointed lance, or lest some person be struck with spear or knife; for they fight hand to hand, e'en though a god should go against them. But let us all take pleasure looking on their strife from heaven."¹

¹ *Batrachomyomachia*, 168-198.

As these lines parody the Homeric councils of the gods, so other parts of the poem make fun of the heroic combats of the *Iliad*. In the end, the frogs are defeated, and even Zeus with his thunderbolt would have been unable to stop the onset of the victorious mice. He therefore rouses against them an army of crabs, who bite their tails, and their hands and feet, and turn the points of their spears. So the mice flee, "and now the sun went down, and one day brought the ending of the war." This poem is not so important as the *Margites*, but it has been preserved, while the *Margites* has not. Like the *Margites*, it has been ascribed to Pigres, of Halicarnassus, though without sufficient reason. It appears to be Attic work, of the fifth century B. C., though even this is somewhat uncertain. A few other mock-heroic epics are known only by title.

A collection of five longer and twenty-nine shorter poems in epic dialect and metre has come down to us

under the title of *Hymns and Proœmia of Homer and the Homeridæ*. These so-called *Homeric Hymns* are not hymns at all in the

modern sense of the word, but are evidently prologues, to be recited as introductions to longer epic poems at public festivals. Such festivals were in honor of the gods, and it is therefore natural that each of these prologues is addressed to a god. They are not, however, religious in character. They were recited by rhapsodes contending for prizes at the festivals, as is seen from the last lines of a short hymn (No. 6) to Aphrodite: "Hail, goddess of the drooping lashes and sweet smile! Grant to me to gain the victory in this contest, and help on my song! But I will remember thee in another song." The first poem in the

manuscript collection is addressed to Apollo, and is evidently made up of two hymns, one to the Delian Apollo and one to the Pythian Apollo. They were intended to be sung at festivals at Delos and Delphi respectively. Of all the hymns, that to

the Delian Apollo is probably the best known. In it is found the following description of a festival at Delos:¹

But thou in Delos, Phœbus, dost most delight at heart; there are thy trailing-robed Ionians gathered with their children and their chaste wives, and they bear thee in mind and please thee with boxing and with dance and song, whenever they cause a contest to be held. One who should come to see them then when all the Ionians are assembled, would say they were immortal and ageless forever; for he would see the grace of all, and would rejoice in heart, looking upon the men and the fair-girdled dames, and on the swift ships and on their bounteous wealth. Then too—and this is a great marvel whose fame shall never die—there are the Delian maids, the servants of the One who shoots from far; when they sing first of Apollo and then again, mindful of Leto and of Artemis the archer-goddess, sing a song of men and women of old time, they charm the tribes of men. And they can imitate the voices of all men and castanets; and each would say that he himself was singing; so their song is beautifully made in harmony.

There follows a somewhat boastful assertion by the poet, that if any one asks the maids who is the best poet, they will reply “a blind man, and he dwells in rugged Chios.” This was naturally understood as a reference to Homer when these hymns were regarded as Homer’s work. The hymn is chiefly taken up with a narrative of the adventures of Leto before the birth of Apollo, and of the god’s birth at Delos.

The hymn to the Pythian Apollo (No. 2) tells how Apollo came from Olympus to Delphi and established his worship there. The various places through which he passed are mentioned, his conversation with the nymph Telphusa is given at length, his combat with Typhon, and his introduction of the Cretans as priests of his sanctuary, are narrated. This hymn appears to be an imitation of the former one, composed by a Delphian or Bœotian poet to contain the legends

Hymn to
the Pythian
Apollo.

¹ Hymn I, 146-164.

of Bœotia and Delphi, as the Delian hymn contains those of Delos. The dates of the two hymns are not far apart, and probably both were composed not far from 600 B. C.

The hymn to Hermes (No. 3) is the longest of the collection, containing five hundred and eighty lines. It tells in a familiar way the tale of the birth and adventures of the god, with apparent enjoyment of his knavery. We are told how Hermes, immediately after his birth, left his cradle and stole the cattle of Apollo, how he invented the lyre, how he was brought to trial before Zeus, and escaped by perjuring himself, and how Apollo was reconciled with him. This poem, which was probably written not long after 600 B. C., shows that at that early time the Greeks were not offended by tales which showed their gods in undignified and even disgraceful acts.

The hymn to Aphrodite (No. 4) is more Homeric in its dialect than the hymn to Hermes, but is like it in the familiar treatment of the gods. It tells of the love of Aphrodite for Anchises, and of the greatness of Æneas and his descendants. Evidently the family claiming descent from Anchises was an important one at the time and place to which the poem belongs. There is much beauty of diction and description in the poem, but its effect is diminished by the lack of dignity and moral elevation.

The hymn to Demeter is of Attic origin, as is seen from the Attic diction, as well as from the treatment of the myth, and is to be connected with some Athenian religious festival, probably at Eleusis. The poem tells how Persephone is carried off by Pluto, as she is wandering in search of flowers in the Ny-sian plain. She is especially delighted with the narcissus, which is described in glowing words. The cry of Persephone was heard by Hecate, who went with Demeter to Helios, from whom they learned that Pluto had carried off Persephone with the consent of Zeus. Angry and dis-

Hymn to
Hermes.

Hymn to
Demeter.

tressed that her daughter has been treated thus, Demeter deserts the gods to live among men. She comes to Eleusis, where the daughters of Celeus meet her and make her nurse to their brother Triptolemus. One of these daughters, Iambe, is the first to make Demeter smile since her loss. The hymn also tells of the reconciliation of Demeter with the gods, and of the agreement according to which Persephone is to dwell one-third of the year in the lower world and two-thirds with her mother and the other gods. There are many allusions to the Eleusinian mysteries, and these may cause some of the difficulties found by modern readers of the poem. There is much beauty of diction and nobility of feeling in this hymn, which is one of the best of the collection.

Of the shorter hymns, one in honor of Dionysus is at once the longest (fifty-eight lines) and the most interesting. It tells how the god was violently carried off by Tyrrhenian pirates, whom he terrified by causing grape-vines to grow twining all about the ship, and by taking upon himself the form of a lion. Finally he punished the pirates by changing them into dolphins. This scene is represented by the bas-reliefs of the beautiful choregic monument of Lysicrates at Athens. The hymn to Athena (No. 29) is thus translated by Shelley :

The shorter
hymns.

I sing the glorious Power with azure eyes,
 Athenian Pallas ! tameless, chaste, and wise,
 Tritogenia, town-preserving maid,
 Revered and mighty ; from his awful head
 Whom Jove brought forth, in warlike armor dressed,
 Golden, all radiant ! wonder strange possessed
 The everlasting gods that shape to see,
 Shaking a javelin keen, impetuously
 Rush from the crest of ægis-bearing Jove ;
 Fearfully heaven was shaken, and did move
 Beneath the might of the Cerulean-eyed ;
 Earth dreadfully resounded, far and wide ;

And, lifted from its depths, the sea swelled high
In purple billows ; the tide suddenly
Stood still, and great Hyperion's son long time
Checked his swift steeds, till where she stood sublime,
Pallas from her immortal shoulders threw
The arms divine ; wise Jove rejoiced to view.
Child of the Ægis-bearer, hail to thee !
Nor thine nor others' praise shall unremembered be.

The literary value of the Homeric hymns is by no means equal. In some of them there are great beauties, in others little to arouse admiration or interest. And their dates appear to be as various as their value. The hymn to Pan (No. 19) was written after the introduction of his worship at Athens in 490 B. C., and some of the other hymns may be still later ; but the greater part of the collection may be ascribed to the period from about 625 to 500 B. C. The hymns are really Homeric, in the sense that they are composed in the dialect of the Homeric poems, and follow the Homeric poems in diction and general style. They have, however, peculiarities of their own, and some of them show plainly the influence of the Bœotian or Hesiodic school.

CHAPTER V

HESIOD—DIDACTIC AND GENEALOGICAL POEMS

Hesiodic poetry, about 750 B. C.—Hesiod—The *Works and Days*—The *Theogony*—The *Shield of Heracles* not by Hesiod—The *Eææ*—Other Hesiodic poems—Other epic poets.

THE epic poetry we have so far considered is associated with the name of Homer, partly because all, or nearly all, the poems were ascribed by the ancients to Homer as their author, partly because they resemble the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* more or less closely in their dialect, style, and subject-matter. These two reasons are really only one, for it is the resemblance just mentioned which led the ancients to ascribe to Homer the cyclic poems, the sportive pieces, and the hymns. There is another class of epic poetry which differs from the Homeric school in style and purpose as well as subject-matter. The metre is the dactylic hexameter, as in the Homeric poems, though even in the matter of metre there are some differences, and the dialect is still the artificial "epic" dialect in which the Homeric poems were composed, but with many Æolic additions and changes, and even some variations that show Doric influence. It would be pretty clear from the language of these poems alone, even if we had no further information to guide us, that the poems of which we are now speaking were composed at a time when the Homeric poetry was already fully developed, but were not composed in Asia Minor, nor in any part of Greece where the dialect spoken was Ionic.

The Homeric
and the
Hesiodic
poems.

These poems are ascribed to Hesiod, whom the ancients believed to have been a contemporary of Homer. The development of the Hesiodic poetry is evidently later than that of the Homeric school, but much of the subject-matter of the poems is very old, and some, at least, of the poems themselves are earlier than the later works of the Homeric school. We may reasonably assume that the Hesiodic poetry was at its height in the eighth century, perhaps not far from 750 B. C. The Homeric poems were intended to be sung in the houses of the wealthy rulers of the Ionic cities, and to glorify the ancient heroes from whom those rulers traced their descent. The Hesiodic poems, on the other hand, were intended for the instruction of the people, giving precepts for the conduct of life and teaching the origin of the world, the genealogy of the gods, and the mythical history of man.

The story of Hesiod's life, as handed down to us, is derived chiefly from the works ascribed to him. His father is said to have left his home at Cyme, an Æolic town in Asia Minor, on account of poverty, and to have settled at Ascra, a small village in the territory belonging to Thespiæ, at the foot of Mount Helicon, in Bœotia. He thus returned to the old home of the Æolians. Here he lived a farmer's life, removed from the busy commerce of the coast cities of Asia Minor. Ascra is in a fertile and well-watered region, though Hesiod complains¹ that the place is "a wretched village, bad in winter, disagreeable in summer, and never good." Here Hesiod was born, here he tended his father's flocks on Mount Helicon, and here the Muses inspired him to utter verses. He afterward went to live at Naupactus, in Locris, on the Gulf of Corinth, and his dialect shows the influence of his Doric surroundings. The story ends in a half-fabulous way. Hesiod is said to have been murdered at Cenoe, in Locris, and his body thrown into the sea. There it floated, escorted

¹ *Works and Days*, 639 f.

by dolphins, until it reached Molycria, where the Locrians were celebrating a festival. The body was seen and recognized, and the murderers were speedily detected and punished. The corpse was buried at Naupactus, but was removed in later times to Orchomenus, in Bœotia. It is impossible to tell how much of this story is true. The ancients believed it, and the tomb of Hesiod was to be seen at Orchomenus. The fact that many poems of apparently different origin were ascribed to Hesiod, the story that he contended with Homer for a prize, the fabulous account of his death, and certain inconsistencies in the extant poems ascribed to him, have led many scholars to deny that he ever existed, and to assert that the name Hesiod is merely a collective designation for the writers of didactic and genealogical epics. It is hardly necessary to go so far as this, and we may believe that there was a real Hesiod who lived at Ascra and Naupactus, and who became so noted that the poems of others were ascribed to him.

Of the many poems once ascribed to Hesiod, only three are extant. The chief of these, eight hundred and twenty-eight lines in length, is called *Works and Days*, and is the earliest existing *didactic poem*—the earliest poem, that is to say, which gives instruction in any art or science. This poem gives rules and advice to farmers and sailors concerning the works which they have to do, and the days on which they should do them. It consists of three parts: first a series of admonitions addressed to the poet's brother, Perses; then the rules for farmers and sailors; and then the calendar or *Days*. These may once have been distinct poems, but, if that is the case, they have been so worked over that each now seems inseparable from the others. Certainly there have been additions and alterations in the text, but on the whole this poem seems to have come down to us in a good state of preservation. After the death of their father, Hesiod and his younger brother Perses divided his prop-

The Works
and Days.

erty, but Perses obtained the larger share by bribing the judges. Not content with his ill-gotten wealth, he threatened Hesiod with another lawsuit. This is the occasion of the poem. Hesiod begins with an invocation of the Muses, and a few lines in praise of Zeus, then explains that there are two kinds of strife—one evil, which leads to war and quarreling, the other good, leading to emulation and industry. Then he warns Perses against evil strife and lawsuits, and charges him with having bribed the judges. The hard life of mankind is ascribed to the anger of Zeus, because Prometheus stole fire and gave it to mortals, whereupon Zeus caused Hephæstus to create the first woman—Pandora, the “All-gifted,” because each of the gods gave her a gift—through whom all evil came to man, “for earth is full of evils, and the sea is full.” After this follows a description of the *five ages of man*—the age of gold, of silver, of brass, the heroic age, and the age of iron. The heroic age seems to be inserted to make room for the Homeric heroes, for it interrupts the course of human deterioration by the insertion after the violent and lawless brazen age of a race better than its predecessors, and much better than that which came after. The fifth age, that of iron, in which the poet regrets that he has been born, is to be followed by a sixth still worse. There shall be no justice nor right. Reverence and retribution shall leave the earth. Here follows the earliest animal story in Greek literature :

Thus spoke the hawk to the nightingale of the spotted throat, bearing her high among the clouds, clutched in his talons; and she, pierced by his crooked talons, begged for pity: but he sternly addressed her: “Foolish one, why do you cry? One much more mighty holds you; there you shall go where I lead you, though you be a songster; and if I wish I shall make you my meal, or let you go. But the foolish one who wishes to strive against the more powerful loses the victory, and suffers injury in addition to disgrace.”¹

¹ *Works and Days*, 203 ff.

Perses is then admonished to be just, and the poet proceeds to further advice, for "he is best of all who knows all things himself, but he again is excellent who follows the advice of one who speaks well." So Perses is advised to work: "Work, foolish Perses, the works which the gods have ordained for men." Then rules are given for the various parts of the husbandman's activity. A man should get him a house, a wife, an ox, and fitting household goods, and that without delay, for the man who delays fills no granary. The plow must be well made. At the cry of the crane the plowing should begin. The master himself should hold the plow, while a slave should follow, to "give trouble to the birds" by covering up the seed. And so the precepts are given for all the farmer's year to the gathering of the grapes in the autumn. Similar precepts for sailors follow. Then comes the calendar of the days which are for any reason the best for any purpose. "Mark well the days in order that Zeus sends, and tell them to your slaves; that the thirtieth day of the month is the best for looking over the work and allotting the rations." "On the fourth of the month bring home your bride." "One praises one day, another another, but few know." "Sometimes a day is a stepmother, sometimes a mother, therefore happy and blessed he who knows them all and labors unblamed by the immortals." The poem contains many gnomes or maxims, such as are current among country folk: "A bad neighbor is as great an evil as a good one is a blessing." "Get good measure from your neighbor, but pay him with the same good measure, and better, if you can, that afterward when you need it you may find a good supply." "Make no base gains; base gains are the same as losses." "Take your fill from the jar when it is newly opened, and at the end, but be sparing at the middle of it; thrift in the dregs is mean."

The second poem is the *Theogony*, or *Descent of the Gods*. This poem of one thousand and twenty-two lines

was universally ascribed to Hesiod by the ancients. The text is corrupt and confused, but there is no conclusive evidence that the poem is not by the author of the *Works and Days*, though it is evident that some lines here and there are later additions.

The Theogony.

The introduction tells us that the Muses came to the poet by night after dancing on Mount Helicon, and conferred upon him the gift of song, adding, "We know how to sing many false things like to the true, but we know, when we wish, how to sing true things." These words are supposed to mark the distinction between the Homeric and the Hesiodic poetry, the latter being intended not so much to please as to teach. The poet then sings of the birth and names of the Muses, and invokes their aid in this poem suggested by themselves. So he sings of the first parents, Chaos and Earth, of gloomy Tartarus, and of Eros (Love), who is "the fairest of immortal gods." From Chaos sprang Erebus (subterranean darkness) and Night; and Night brought forth Day, Heaven, Mountains, and Sea. The offspring of Earth and Heaven (Uranus) are Oceanus, the Titans, male and female, the Cyclopes, and Cronus, besides the hundred-handed giants. Cronus and Earth overthrew and mutilated Uranus, but Cronus was himself, in spite of the aid of the Titans, overthrown by his son Zeus, who thus became king of the gods. The descent of the Olympian gods is then traced, and the original poem may have ended here. In the poem as we have it, nearly sixty lines (from line 965 to the end) are given up to a list of the heroes born to men by goddesses. Besides the bare genealogy the *Theogony* contains much narrative, as, for instance, the tale of the struggle of Zeus and his helping gods against Cronus and the Titans, and the destruction of the terrible Typhœus, latest offspring of Earth and Tartarus, by the thunderbolt of Zeus. The story of the creation of Pandora as told in the *Theogony* differs somewhat from the version in the *Works and Days*. In the narrative and descriptive parts,

the *Theogony* shows not a little beauty of diction and poetic power, but its chief interest to us lies in the fact that it is the earliest known attempt to give a systematic account of the origin of the world and the gods as the Greeks conceived it. They regarded their gods as immortal, but did not believe that they had existed forever without beginning. All things, even the gods, came from Chaos, and even Chaos itself did not exist without a beginning. The *Theogony* was regarded by the Greeks as a standard authority on the matters of which it treats, and it evidently contains no new system invented by the poet, but is an attempt to systematize and bring into agreement the tales and legends, often perhaps obscure or only half understood, contained or hinted at in ancient hymns and current folk-lore. To the student of religions it is of the greatest interest.

The third poem which has come down to us under Hesiod's name, the *Shield of Heracles*, is almost certainly not by the author of the *Works and Days* or the *Theogony*, and is therefore not to be ascribed to Hesiod. It is, however, clearly the work of a poet, or poets, writing under the influence of Hesiod. Its date is not to be fixed accurately, but the poem is evidently later than the *Works and Days* or the *Theogony*, and belongs to the decline of Hesiodic poetry. About the middle of the seventh century B. C. the epic poet Pisander gives Heracles the lion's skin, bow, and club. In this poem he is armed like an ordinary warrior, a fact which makes it not improbable that the poem is earlier than Pisander's time. The poem consists of four hundred and eighty lines and tells the story of a combat between Heracles, son of Zeus, and Cycnus, son of Ares, the god of war. Heracles, accompanied by his friend and squire Iolaus, meets the robber Cycnus and his father Ares in the sacred precinct of Apollo, at Pagasæ, in Thessaly. Cycnus in his chariot bars the way, and Heracles is compelled to fight

The Shield
of Heracles.

for a passage. Cygnus is killed, and Ares escapes to Olympus. But the greater part of the poem is taken up with a description of the shield of Heracles, obviously in imitation of the description of the shield of Achilles in the eighteenth book of the *Iliad*, to which it is far inferior, not only in diction and power of description, but even more in poetic imagination. The first fifty-six lines of the poem in its present form do not belong with the rest, but are taken from another poem which was ascribed to Hesiod—the *Eœæ*.

The *Eœæ* received its name from the fact that each division began with the words ἢ οἷη, “or such as she.” It was an enumeration of mortal women who had been loved by immortals, and had become the mothers of heroes; and the author, after an invocation of the Muses, continues with the words “Such as was Alcmena,” and again, “Or such as was” another of the famous women. This was originally, it seems, an independent poem, but it was regarded as the fourth book of a *Catalogue of Women*, in four (or perhaps five) books, which told of famous women of Dorian and Æolian race. The prominent position given to women in these poems reminds us that Hesiod was said to have lived among the Dorian Locrians, among whom women were more respected than in most other parts of Greece, and that Hesiodic poetry was cultivated in Locris. Whether the title *The Great Eœæ* is a second title of the *Catalogue of Women*, or of the *Eœæ*, or whether it refers to a third poem of similar character, is not certain. There is little evidence by which to fix the date of these poems, but what there is points to the seventh century B. C. Their purpose, like that of the *Theogony*, is evidently to collect the old legends into a sort of sacred history rather than to elaborate them into beautiful poems; to teach rather than to please, though the poems probably contained beautiful passages, and may have had a severe and characteristic beauty of their own, as the *Theogony* has.

The *Eœæ*.

The *Catalogue of Women*.

Other poems ascribed to Hesiod, either because they were didactic or genealogical, or because they resembled his poems in style, are the *Ægimius*, telling of the fight of King Ægimius with the Lapithæ; the *Teachings of Cheiron*, which told of the wise centaur's precepts; the *Marriage of Ceyx*, telling of the marriage of King Ceyx at Trachis, at which Heracles was present; the *Melampodia*, relating to the seer and prophet Melampus; a poem on *Prophecy by the Flight of Birds*; and several others. All of these are now lost, and probably none of them was really by Hesiod.

With the poems which we have mentioned the epic period of Greek poetry closes. There are, to be sure, several epic poets known by name, such as *Asius*, *Pisander*, *Panyasis*, *Antimachus*, and *Chœrilus*, who wrote at various times from the seventh to the fourth century B. C. Their works are lost, with the exception of a few fragments, and they never belonged to the spontaneous development of Greek epic poetry, but were literary works, composed chiefly for a reading public, not natural growths like the genuine Homeric and Hesiodic poems. Undoubtedly some of the lost poems which were once ascribed to Homer and Hesiod belong to this later literary period, in which the poets imitated the great epics of earlier times. There was also epic poetry of the Alexandrian and even of the Roman period, but this was of a learned and artificial sort. The epic period of Greek literature is therefore properly said to end not long after 700 B. C.

Other Hesiodic poems.

The end of the epic period.

CHAPTER VI

LYRIC POETRY—ELEGIAC POETRY

Character and development of lyric poetry—Elegiac and iambic verse—Callinus, about 700 B. C.—Archilochus, about 700 B. C.—Tyrtæus, wrote between 630 and 600 B. C.—Mimnermus, about 630 B. C.—Solon, about 640–558 B. C.—Theognis, about 550 B. C.—Phocylides, about 550 B. C.—Xenophanes, about 560 B. C.—Other elegiac poets, Chilo, Pittacus, Periander, Bias, Demodocus (about 550 B. C.), Asius, Pigres.

It is an interesting fact in the history of Greek literature that each form of expression reached its height and began to decline before the next attained any marked artistic development. So it is not until **Character of epic and lyric poetry.** epic poetry begins to sink into imitation of earlier works that lyric verse becomes prominent (see page 7). Lyric poetry differs from epic poetry both in its contents and in its form. Epic poetry narrates. It tells a story, as is the case with the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, or at any rate it tells or describes what are supposed to be facts or real objects. Lyric poetry, on the other hand, is concerned not with facts, but with the feelings of the author; and whereas the author of epic poetry is kept out of sight and out of the mind of the reader or hearer, the author of lyric verse is brought prominently forward. In the period to which the Homeric poems belong the government of the Greek communities was in the hands of kings or royal families, and the men of the people were hardly regarded as individuals, but rather each one merely as a part of the

crowd. They had not begun to assert their own individuality, and did not demand nor care for poetry which expressed individual thought and feeling; nor had the poets begun to feel the need of composing such poetry. But as time went on the circumstances of life changed. There

was more trade and more travel. The people began to think more for themselves, and at the same time the government of the communities changed from monarchy to oligarchy, the rule of a small number of nobles, and there was more political unrest than there had been. This is evident in the *Works and Days*, with its reproach of bribed judges and unjust rulers. In the Hesiodic poetry there is already more reflection and more of a personal element than in the Homeric epics; but as yet the personal element is not the most important. As the people advanced in number, in political power, and in the sense of their own individual rights and feelings, they brought about the establishment of popular governments or democracies, but not without severe struggles with the nobles. Not that all the governments became democratic; far from it, but the general tendency was toward freedom of government and personal liberty of thought and action. In such a condition of things it is natural that poetry adapted to the expression of the author's own feelings and thoughts began to be cultivated.

Lyric poetry naturally differs from epic poetry in form, because it is originally intended to be sung to the accom-

paniment of the lyre (or flute), while epic poetry is to be recited, or, at most, chanted, and also because lyric poetry, expressing as it does the feelings and emotions of the author, demands a kind of verse different from that

required for sustained narrative. The Greek epic poets used the dactylic hexameter verse, which has been imitated by several poets in English. The first lines of Longfel-

Reasons for the development of lyric poetry.

The difference in form between epic and lyric poetry.

low's *Evangeline* will give an idea of the cadence of this metre :

This ¹ is the | ² forest pri | ³ meval. The | ⁴ murmuring | ⁵ pines and the | ⁶ hemlocks
 Bearded with | ¹ moss, and in | ² garments | ³ green, indis | ⁴ tinct in the | ⁵ twilight,
 Stand like | ¹ Druids of | ² old, with | ³ voices | ⁴ sad and pa | ⁵ thetic,
 Stand like | ¹ harpers | ² hoar, with | ³ beards that | ⁴ rest on their | ⁵ bosoms.

The earliest Greek lyric poets of whom we know anything adopted one of two kinds of verse, the *elegiac* and the *iambic*. The origin of the word "elegy" is obscure. It is probably not Greek at all, and may have denoted at first a dirge or mournful song accompanied by the flute; but as we find the word used it means a particular metre developed from the dactylic hexameter. A regular

**Elegiac
verse.**

hexameter is followed by a so-called pentameter, making an elegiac distich or couplet.

The pentameter is made by cutting off the last half of the third and sixth feet of the hexameter. So if we remove the word *with* from the fourth line of *Evangeline* and put *breasts* in place of *bosoms*, the third and fourth lines make an elegiac distich :

Stand like | ¹ Druids of | ² old, with | ³ voices | ⁴ sad and pa | ⁵ thetic,
 Stand like | ¹ harpers | ² hoar; | ³ beards that | ⁴ rest on their | ⁵ breasts.

The second line is called a pentameter because it contains the equivalent of five feet—two and a half feet twice over. Coleridge thus describes and illustrates the elegiac distich :

"In the hexameter rises the fountain's silvery column ;
 In the pentameter aye falling in melody back."¹

¹ Coleridge describes various metrical feet used by the ancients as follows :

— — | — — | — — |
 Trochee | trips from | long to | short ;
 From long to long in solemn sort

It is evident that the elegiac verse is derived from the hexameter, and equally evident that the iambic verse is not. The poets who used the iambic metres went directly to the popular songs and used the rhythms they found there for their poems. The word iambus (ι-α) is of uncertain derivation, but is probably connected with the verb

ιάπτω—"dart or shoot"—for the iambic metre Iambic verse. was used for the mocking, taunting verses flung back and forth by those who took part in the processions in honor of Demeter. In the Homeric *Hymn to Demeter*, the daughter of Celeus, who first brings a smile to the face of the goddess, is called Iambe, and the word iambus was said to be derived from her name. In reality, her name was doubtless invented as an explanation of the word. The commonest form of iambic metre is the trimeter, composed of three dipodies, each dipody consisting of two iambic feet. This metre is not very common in English, but was much used by the Greeks, being the regular metre for the dialogue in tragedy and comedy. The

— — | — — | — — | yet ill able
Slow Spon|dee stalks ;|strong foot !|

— — — | — — — | — — — | — — —
Ever to|come up with|Dactyl tri|syllable.

— — | — — | — — | — —
Iam|bics march|from short|to long ;—

— — — | — — — | — — — | — — —
With a leap|and a bound|the swift An|apaests throng ;
One syllable long, with one short at each side,

— — — | — — — | — — — | — — —
Amphibra|chys hastes with|a stately|stride ;—

— — — | — — — | — — — | — — —
First and last|being long,|middle short,|Amphima|cer

— — — | — — — | — — — | — — —
Strikes his thun|dering hoofs|like a proud|high-bred pa|cer.

Here each line in which the syllables are marked gives the cadence of the foot mentioned in it.

last line in the stanza of Byron's *Childe Harold* is an English iambic trimeter, as :

$\bar{\cup} \quad - \quad | \quad \bar{\cup} \quad - \quad | \quad \bar{\cup} \quad - \quad || \quad \bar{\cup} \quad - \quad | \quad \bar{\cup} \quad - \quad | \quad \bar{\cup} \quad -$
 A world | is at | our feet || as frag | ile as | our clay.

This is one foot ($\bar{\cup} -$) longer than the line in English blank verse.

Although the earliest iambic verses we know were used to express satire, the metre was not limited to that use, but was employed for the expression of all sorts of personal feeling and of such thoughts as demanded more rapid and pointed expression than was furnished by the elegiac verse. Elegiac and iambic verse were composed to be sung to the accompaniment of the flute and the lyre, but the music was less important than in some other kinds of verse. These two may therefore be regarded as the least lyric of all the forms of lyric poetry. They were, however, at first sung at banquets and elsewhere—not recited, as epic poetry was at that time.¹ Of the two, elegiac poetry was the more quiet and restrained, iambic poetry more sharp and biting when satirical, and more passionate and animated at other times. Elegiac verse was employed in lamentations, in giving political and personal advice or precepts, and, in short, for the expression of the poet's thoughts and feelings on all matters. In Alexandrian times, the elegiac verse was much used in love poetry, and in this as in many other respects the Roman poets imitated the Alexandrians. Iambic verse was also used for the expression of the various thoughts and emotions, but was especially adapted to express those that called for lively or rapid utterance.

In their origin both elegiac and iambic verse were Ionic, and both retained the Ionic dialect throughout the period of their popularity. But elegiac verse was composed in

¹ Originally epic poetry had been sung to the accompaniment of the lyre, but by the time it reached its highest development the music was almost, if not entirely, given up.

various parts of the Greek world, and its dialect was affected by that of the people among whom the different poets lived. So Tyrtæus, at Sparta, composed his **Dialect of elegiac and iambic verse.** verses in Ionic Greek, but with some Doric forms, and Solon, at Athens, used a dialect which differed little from the spoken language of Attica. The Ionic dialect of this period was at any rate different from the Ionic of the Homeric poems, and was not very different from the Attic Greek of the time. Iambic verse was not so widely diffused as elegiac verse, and its dialect remained for the most part purely Ionic.

The earliest known elegiac poet is Callinus. He was an Ephesian by birth, and appears to have lived not far from **Callinus.** 700 B. C. The few extant fragments of his poems refer to the contests of his native city with the neighboring Magnesia and to the inroads of the Cimmerians. These references serve to fix his date at about 700 B. C., rather later than earlier. The most important fragment, preserved by Stobæus in his *Florilegium*, a collection of various selections compiled in the sixth century after Christ, is an exhortation to the young men to fight for their country: "How long will you lie quiet? When will you have a brave spirit, O youths? Have you no shame before our neighbors, resting so carelessly? You think you sit in peace, but war holds all the land." Then a line is lacking, perhaps several lines, and the poem goes on:

And let one hurl his javelin for the last time in death. For it is honorable and glorious for a man to fight for his country and his children and his loving wife against the foe; but death shall come whene'er the Fates have spun one's thread of life, so let him go straight on with spear advanced and bearing 'neath his shield a valiant heart, in the first rush of war. For no wise is it fated for a man to escape death, not even though he be by race sprung from the immortals. Though he escape full oft from battle and the clash of javelins, yet in his house the fate of death comes on him. But he is neither loved nor longed for by the folk; the other great and small

alike lament if evil come to him, for all the folk yearns when a brave man dies; and while he lives, he lives almost a god, for as a tower of strength they look upon him, since he does single-handed the deeds of many men.

This fragment gives some idea of the spirit of Callinus's verse. Unfortunately, it is the only fragment of any importance remaining.

About the same time as Callinus, Archilochus also composed elegiac verses. But his name is so closely associated with iambic verse that it will be best to speak of him after we have mentioned the other elegiac poets. In general, it is impossible to make perfectly accurate classifications of the poets, because most of them wrote verses of various kinds. It will therefore be most convenient to speak of each poet in the class to which his most important works would lead us to assign him.

Tyrtæus wrote elegiac war-songs at Sparta during the second Messenian War (between 630 and 600 B. C.). The story goes that the Spartans were hard pressed in the war, and sent to the oracle at Delphi for advice. The oracle told them to ask the Athenians for a leader. But the Athenians had no intention of aiding the Spartans, so they gave them a lame schoolmaster to be their general. The schoolmaster, however, stirred the courage of the troops by his martial songs so that the enemy could not withstand their charge, and thus the Spartans were victorious. This tale is doubtless an invention of the Athenians, at least in part, originating perhaps in a joke of some comic poet, but it is certain that the Spartans did call in foreign poets, so that there is no inherent improbability in the tradition that Tyrtæus was born at Aphidnæ, in Attica. On the other hand, he speaks in his poems as a Spartan, and there was an Aphidna in Laconia. The question of his birth must therefore be left undecided. His poems, of which several fragments are

extant, consist of the *Eunomia*, in elegiac verse, designed to quiet dissension and internal strife; the *Hypothekai*, or *Precepts*, elegiac poems of warlike character, and *Embatería*, songs in anapestic measure, to be sung in charging the enemy. One fragment of the *Eunomia* is as follows: "For Cronus's son himself, husband of Hera of the beautiful crown, Zeus gave this city to the sons of Heracles, with whom we left the windy Erineum and came to the broad isle of Pelops." Another is this:

Phœbus they heard and home from Pytho brought the oracles of the god and words that bring fulfilment; that rulers of the council be god-honored kings, who care for the lovely city of Sparta, and old men ancient of days; and then the common men, answering by proper laws, should utter noble words and do all just deeds, and plot no ill against this city; but victory and strength should follow the people's mass; for thus did Phœbus prophesy to the city of these things.

This shows the divine origin of the Spartan constitution, and is a fitting introduction to a poem urging the people to obey the laws. Another fragment tells how the grandfathers of those addressed fought against the Messenians for nineteen years.

A fragment of the *Hypothekai* begins thus: "For it is beautiful to die falling among the foremost fighters as a brave man fighting for his native land. But to leave one's city and fertile fields and be a beggar is most grievous of all things, wandering with one's dear mother and aged father and little children and beloved wife." Therefore, the poet goes on to say, every one should fight bravely for his country: "O youths, fight standing side by side, and make no beginning of shameful flight or fear, but make your spirit great and valiant in your breast, and have no love of life when fighting with men." He urges the young men not to desert their elders in battle, for death in battle is not beautiful in age, "but to the young all things are becoming; so long as

one has the beauteous bloom of lovely youth he is admired by men who see him, loved by women, while he lives, and beautiful when fallen in the foremost ranks." Another fragment encourages the Spartans to fight because they are of the race of Heracles, and gives the further argument that those who flee are more likely to be slain than those who fight and conquer. It also contains special precepts for the heavy-armed and light-armed men. Still another fragment expresses contempt for the coward and admiration for the brave man.

There are but two short fragments of the charging songs, both of which are here translated as nearly as possible in the metre of the original. One consists of one line: "To the front, armed sons of Sparta, to the exercise of Ares." The other is a little longer:

Embateria.

To the front, O sons of Sparta
 Rich in men, of freeborn fathers,
 With your left hand press your shield forth,
 Hurl your lance with daring spirit,
 Not sparing your life in battle;
 For 'tis not the custom at Sparta.

Tyrtæus employed elegiac verse for songs of political and warlike character. Very different was the poetry of

Mimnermus.

Mimnermus. This poet, who is also mentioned as a flute-player, was born and lived at Colophon, an Ionic city of Asia Minor. The date assigned to him is about 630 B. C. His father's name was probably Ligyastes, but nothing is known of his life. We are told that he was in love with a girl named Nanno, a flute-player, and that he dedicated a poem or a collection of poems to her; but the authority for this story, Hermesianax, is not very trustworthy, and none of the fragments of the poems of Mimnermus mentions Nanno's name. The poems sing of love in general, of pleasure and of youth, rather than of love for any particular person. Mimnermus also sang of

the war between Smyrna and King Gyges of Lydia, but it is not to such poetry that he owed his reputation. He was regarded as the father of elegiac love poetry, and his verses breathe an air of gentle, pleasure-loving melancholy. "What is life, and what pleasure is there without golden Aphrodite? May I die, when such things no more delight me," he sings, and later in the same fragment :

Ah! fair and lovely bloom the flowers of youth;
 On men and maids they beautifully smile:
 But soon comes doleful eld, who, void of ruth,
 Indifferently affects the fair and vile;
 Then cares wear out the heart: old eyes forlorn
 Scarce reckon the very sunshine to behold—
 Unloved by youths, of every maid the scorn—
 So hard a lot God lays upon the old.¹

Again he says that

we are like the leaves that grow in the time of flowery spring, when they flourish in the beams of the sun; like them we joy for a brief space in the flowers of youth, knowing by the gods' grace neither good nor evil. But the black Fates stand beside us, one with the doom of hateful age, the other bearing that of death; and quickly passes the fruit of youth, like the sun that spreads his beams upon the earth. But when the end of this season is passed then death at once is better than life.

And again, "May I without disease and hateful pains, at sixty years meet with the fate of death."

These are not the utterances of a great man, and betray a somewhat self-indulgent, effeminate character, yet they have undeniable beauty, and have been more or less directly imitated by poets of many lands and many ages.

Solon is the first of the genuine Attic poets. Even if it is true that Tyrtaeus was an Athenian by birth, his poetry was at any rate Spartan. But with Solon the Athenian spirit appears in literature with all its essential characteristics: complete harmony of body

Solon.

¹ Translated by John Addington Symonds.

and mind, lively imagination, steady reason, and strong will, correct and delicate appreciation of life and its pleasures, endurance in troubles, victorious courage in trials, breadth and suppleness of thought—which is at once practical and speculative—and with all this a natural moderation, easy and well-balanced, bold at once and prudent, a spirit which leads men to think well and speak well, without effort and without weakness. All the qualities of the different divisions of the Greek race unite and combine in the Attic genius.

Solon was an Athenian of an ancient family, descended from Codrus, the king who was said to have lost his life to save his country. Solon, the son of Execestides, was born about 640 B. C. In spite of his noble birth he was poor, and at an early age undertook to make his fortune in commerce. He went to sea, traveled, and returned a wealthy man, or at least not poor. At this time he may have been about thirty years old. He found his country in great trouble. The common people were ground down by a harsh aristocracy, there was much poverty, discontent, and civil strife. The military power of the state was sunk so low that the neighboring island of Salamis had fallen into the hands of the Megarians, and we are even told that a law had been passed forbidding any one to propose its reconquest, so profound was the feeling of discouragement. In this state of things Solon showed his power. He roused the patriotism and confidence of the citizens by his verses, reconquered Salamis, and called in the Cretan Epimenides, a holy man and a prophet, who reconciled the people with the gods by appropriate ceremonies. Athens was then able to propitiate the gods still further by taking part in the Sacred War. The wisdom and honesty of Solon were joined to great kindness and affability, and his influence and popularity increased until, in 594 B. C., he was made archon and entrusted with the highest power in the state. He then undertook reforms

for the relief of the poor from the burden of debt, which he accomplished so wisely that rich and poor alike accepted them. The story goes that he caused the Athenians to agree to keep his laws for ten years without change, and left the city to travel in foreign lands, visiting Cyprus, Asia, and Egypt. But the tales of his conversations with King Cræsus of Lydia and the Egyptian priests are probably without foundation. Solon lived to see his laws in part set aside by the usurpation of Pisistratus, but he was ever after regarded as the founder of the Athenian democracy. He died probably about 558 B. C., at the age of over eighty years.

The poems of Solon reflect the chief events of his life. They consist of elegies, iambics, and songs, but the most important and longest fragments are of the
 Solon's
 poems. elegies. There are in all about two hundred and seventy lines of his poems extant. In urging the Athenians to reconquer Salamis he says: "Would that I were a Pholegandrian or a Sicinetan instead of an Athenian, by change of country; for straightway this speech may now go among men: 'This is an Attic man, one of the Salamis deserters.'" Here he tries to rouse the pride of his countrymen by wishing he were a citizen of an insignificant island. Another fragment reads: "Let us go to lovely Salamis to fight for the island and shake off our hard disgrace." In his *Advice or Precepts to the Athenians* he says:

By the fate of Zeus and the will of the immortal gods our city shall never be destroyed, such a great-souled guardian, Pallas Athene, daughter of a mighty father, holds her hands over us; but the citizens themselves by their own folly wish to destroy the great city, yielding to love of money, and unjust is the spirit of the people's leaders, who are destined to suffer many woes for their insolence.

In speaking of his reforms he says:

To the people I gave so much power as suffices, neither taking from their honor nor giving too much; and those who had power

and were splendid in wealth, for these also I planned that they should have no disgrace; but I stood throwing a strong shield about both, and suffered neither to conquer unjustly.

Again he says, this time in iambic verse :

This testimony in the court of time the greatest mother of the Olympic gods might bear, the most excellent dark earth, from whom once I removed the boundary stones set up in many places; and she was once enslaved but now is free; and many
Political poems. to their god-founded native land of Athens I restored who had been sold, one unjustly, another justly, and some through stress of need speaking strange words, no longer uttering Attic speech, as wanderers in many places, and others here at home who had the vile spirit of slavery, trembling at their masters, I freed. These things by might, joining force and justice, I did and finished as I promised. And laws I made alike for base and noble, fitting right justice to each man. But another, a man of evil mind and fond of gain, taking the goad as I did, would not have restrained the folk, and would not have ceased, until by stirring it up he had taken out the rich milk.

Here the last words seem to mean that another man would have disturbed the people until he himself possessed the rule in the state.

A long fragment (seventy-six lines) of his *Suggestions to Himself* begins :

Glorious children of Memory and of Olympian Zeus, Pierian Muses, hear me as I pray. Grant me from the blessed gods wealth, and from all men always to have good reputation; thus to be sweet to my friends, and bitter to my enemies, to the first an object of reverence, to the second terrible to behold. And wealth I long to have; but I do not wish to possess it unjustly; certainly justice comes afterward. Now the wealth which the gods give is firmly established for a man from the lowest foundation to the top; but what men pursue through insolence, comes not in fair order, but yielding to unjust bonds follows unwillingly; and quickly ruin is mixed with it. The beginning is as from a little fire—small at first, but grievous at last; for the works of insolence abide not long for mortals. But Zeus over-

sees the end of all things, and suddenly, as a spring wind quickly scatters the clouds, a wind which, stirring the bottom of the barren sea, laying waste the fair fields on the fertile land, reaches high heaven, the seat of the gods, and makes the clear sky visible again, and the sun's might shines forth along the fertile earth, and there is nothing left of clouds to see, such is the vengeance of Zeus; but not in each case, like to a mortal man, is he swift to wrath; but any man who has a wicked heart never escapes his notice for all time, but certainly is evident at last.

There are, even among the extant fragments, many gnomic lines or maxims, as, for instance, "For satiety begets insolence, when much wealth follows," or "By the winds the sea is troubled; but if one stir it not it is the gentlest of all things," or "The mind of the immortals is utterly inscrutable to men." One of the lines attributed to his old age is this: "I grow old always learning many things." The poetry of Solon is always serene and dignified, even when it is most martial, as in the fragments about Salamis. He was undoubtedly not only one of the greatest men of his time but also one of the greatest poets.

A different character is Theognis of Megara. Like Solon, he lived in troublous times, but instead of rising above the factious strifes of his fellow citizens he took part in them and was embittered by them. He evidently belonged to the oligarchical party, for he speaks of the common people as "base" or "bad" and of the nobles as "good" or "noble." He had apparently been banished, or had found the political conditions at Megara unendurable, and was absent from his native place for some time, visiting Megara in Sicily and various other places. He speaks with abhorrence of a "tyrant," which may show that he had lived through the period when Theagenes was despot at Megara. In that case, he must have been somewhat advanced in years in 540 B. c., the date traditionally assigned for his poems. It is safe to say that he flourished about the middle of the sixth century. About

fourteen hundred lines of his poems are preserved, which can be only a part, probably a small part, of the whole. In later times the poems of Theognis were much used in the education of the young, and what we now have appears to be a collection of verses containing moral and practical precepts. These are now somewhat disconnected, and were evidently chosen from his works with regard to their contents rather than to poetic unity. These precepts are addressed for the most part to a young man named Cynrus (also called Polypaïdes, i. e., son of Polypaïs), perhaps a relative of the poet, at any rate a youth in whom he took, as he himself says, a fatherly interest. About two hundred lines, published in our editions as Book Second, are of a different character, consisting of love-songs. These are supposed by some to be the work of other poets, but they may be youthful poems of Theognis, or they may perhaps have been scattered through his poems and collected in a body at some later time, just as his moral precepts were united in what is now Book First. There are several passages in the poems of Theognis which are found also in the poems of Solon, Mimnermus, and Tyrtaeus. It is only natural that some fitting verses by other poets should have crept into a collection of precepts, but there is no reason to doubt that nearly all the verses current under his name are really by Theognis. The poet himself seems to vouch for the authenticity of those verses which contain the name of Cynrus when he says:

Cynrus, as I utter my wise thoughts let my seal be impressed upon these verses, and they will never be stolen without detection, nor will any one take something worse when the good is at hand; but thus every one will say: "They are the verses of Theognis the Megarian." But though famed among all men I can not please all these citizens. No wonder, son of Polypaïs, for not even Zeus can please all, either when he sends rain or withholds it.¹

¹ Lines 19-26.

These lines show not only that Theognis intended the name of Cynrus to be a mark of his authorship, but also that when these words were written he was already a famous poet. There is no reason to suppose that the name of Cynrus was used in the poems written before the one from which these verses are taken, and even in the later poems it can hardly have occurred in every line or every sentence. The absence of the name is therefore no indication that a passage is spurious, while its presence is evidence of genuineness.

The following passage shows the poet's aristocratic sympathies and his irritation at the progress of the people :

Cynrus, this city is a city still, but the people are different; for those who formerly knew no laws or customs, but wore the skins of goats about their loins, and lived like deer outside of this our town, they are now the noble, Polypaïdes, and those who once were noble now are base.¹

Something of the same feeling is expressed in these lines also :

Rams and asses, Cynrus, and horses we choose of good breed, and wish them to have good pedigrees; but a noble man does not hesitate to wed a base-born girl if she bring him much money, nor does a noble woman refuse to be the wife of a base but wealthy man, but she chooses the rich instead of the noble. For they honor money; and the noble weds the base-born, and the base the high-born; wealth has mixed the race. So do not wonder, Polypaïdes, that the race of the citizens deteriorates, for the bad is mixed with the good.²

The direct advice to Cynrus has to do for the most part with the practical conduct of life in what Theognis regards as the good society of Megara. "Make none of these citizens your friend from the heart, Polypaïdes, for any purpose; but seem in speech to be a friend to all, but join with none in any important matter."³ . . . "Cynrus, adapt your changing mood to all your friends, mixing in it the

¹ Lines 53-58.

² Lines 183-192.

³ Lines 61-65.

character each one has by nature. Now follow one and now be different in character. Wisdom is better than much virtue." ¹ . . . "Do not confide your business entirely even to all your friends; few of many have a faithful mind." ² . . . "You have many companions in eating and drinking, but fewer in any serious matter." ³ Such cautions as these might well be offered to a young man eager for friendship and its pleasures by a man who had experienced many of life's disappointments. Advice on the subject of friendship is given in these lines also: "Never make a bad man your friend, but always avoid him like a bad harbor." ⁴ And these: "Never give up the friend you have and seek another, persuaded by the words of evil men." ⁵ Some of the advice offered may not meet with universal approval in our times. Such advice is this: "Flatter well your enemy; but when he comes into your power, do vengeance on him, making no pretense." ⁶ Theognis councils moderation in the use of wine: "Much wine drunk is an evil; but if one drink it with understanding, it is not an evil but a blessing." ⁷ In several places he speaks of himself as a man of advanced years, and he dreads the approach of old age and death in a tone not unlike that of Mimnermus. Again he contrasts the joys of life with the long night of death, striking a note even in his day not new to Greek poetry, and since then repeated in many tongues and many ages. "I sport rejoicing in my youth," he says, "for when I have lost my life, I shall lie long dumb as a stone, and I shall leave the light of the sun, and however good I be, I shall see nothing more." ⁸ And elsewhere he sings: "I do not care to lie on a royal couch when I am dead, but may I have some good in life." ⁹

Yet more than the night of death the trials of poverty seem terrible to Theognis. "Poverty overcomes a good

¹ Lines 1071-1074.

⁴ Lines 113, 114.

⁷ Lines 509, 510.

² Lines 73, 74.

⁵ Lines 1151, 1152.

⁸ Lines 567-570.

³ Lines 115, 116.

⁶ Lines 363, 364.

⁹ Lines 1191, 1192.

man most of all things, more than old age, Cynus, or fever. To avoid it he should throw himself even into the billowy sea, and down from beetling rocks; for a man overcome by poverty can neither say nor do anything, but his tongue is fettered";¹ and, "Better is it, Cynus, for a poor man to die than to live worn by harsh poverty."² But with all his worldly wisdom Theognis does not forget what is due to the gods. "Pray to the gods; power is with the gods; without the gods naught either good or evil comes to men,"³ is the advice he gives his young friend. For himself, however, he has his doubts about the divine government of the world:

How, O king of the gods, is this just, that a man who keeps himself from unjust deeds, transgressing naught and swearing no false oath, but being just, suffers unjust misfortunes? What other man, looking on him, would thereafter honor the immortals, and with what spirit, when a wicked and violent man, who cares not for the wrath of man or god, commits his unjust deeds swollen with wealth, while the just waste away worn by harsh poverty?⁴

The apparent injustice of the lot of men troubles Theognis as it has troubled many before and since, and he has no answer to the question he has asked. Still, the tone of his poetry is on the whole healthy and courageous. He loves the world, and is glad to believe that his poems are to live in it after him. His proud confidence in the endurance of his fame is expressed in these lines:

I have given you wings, with which you will fly easily raised up over the boundless sea and all the earth; and at all feasts and banquets you will be present in the mouths of many; and to their clear-toned flutes young men in charming revels shall sing in beautiful clear songs of you; and when you go beneath the covering of the dark earth to the much-wailing realms of Hades, not even then, though dead, shall you lose your fame, but you shall be cared for by men, keeping a deathless name forever, Cynus, going about

¹ Lines 173-178.

³ Lines 171, 172.

² Lines 181, 182.

⁴ Lines 743-752.

through Greece and 'mongst the islands, passing beyond the fishy, barren sea, not borne by mortal steeds; but the glorious gifts of the violet-crowned Muses shall send you; for to all who care for them you shall be a theme of song, while earth and sun exist.¹

In spite of the fact that the extant verses of Theognis are detached selections chosen for their contents, not for their poetic value, it is evident that Theognis was really a poet. His verses run smoothly into each other, his diction is dignified without being stilted, easy without being commonplace, and his imagination lacks neither vigor nor refinement. His contemporary Phocylides of Phocylides.

Miletus appears to have been in every respect his inferior. He composed elegiac verses, but these were not intended, like those of Theognis, to be sung at banquets, but rather to be passed about in conversation or to be read. Only a few of these verses exist to-day. The poem of two hundred and thirty hexameter lines which has been handed down under the name of Phocylides is the work of an Alexandrian Jew, and is chiefly interesting on account of the mixture of Greek and Hebrew ideas it contains. Phocylides did also write hexameters, but of these little is preserved. His elegiacs consist of sentences limited to one distich; they are not connected poems, but mere gnomes or maxims neatly and concisely expressed, but without poetic worth. In several instances, the first part of the distich is taken up with the words "This also is Phocylides's." The most interesting of the extant sayings, which has been imitated by more than one later writer, is this: "This also is Phocylides's: Lerians are bad; not one, and another not so; all, except Procles—and Procles is a Lorian!"

Xenophanes of Colophon was a contemporary of Theognis and Phocylides, perhaps a little older than they. His chief importance is as a philosopher, but he also wrote elegiac

¹ Lines 237-252.

verses not connected with his philosophical theories. He led a wandering life in Sicily and Italy, where he is said to have helped to found the town of Elea. Not
Xenophanes. many fragments of his poems remain, and these, though technically good and interesting, show little poetic fervor or imagination. In one of them Xenophanes protests against the importance attached to athletics and the honors paid to victorious athletes; in another he describes the requisites for a perfect feast, beginning as follows:

For now the room is clean, and the hands of all, and the cups; and one puts twined garlands on our heads, another in a bowl brings fragrant myrrh; the mixing-bowl stands brimming with good cheer; and other wine is there which will not fail, sweet wine in jars, with odor as of flowers; and in the midst the incense breathes pure fragrance; and water is there, cool and sweet and pure.

The rest of the fragment mentions the other requisites—bread, cheese, an altar with flowers, etc.—and advises against drinking so much that one can not get home alone, besides recommending libations and prayers to the gods, and the choice of fitting and interesting subjects for conversation.

Elegiac verses are ascribed to several of the Seven Wise Men (besides Solon, who was included in the number): Chilo, of Sparta; Pittacus, of Mitylene; Periander, of Corinth; and Bias, of Priene. None of these verses now remain, and it is not improbable that they were falsely ascribed to these authors. Several other authors of elegies
Other elegiac poets. are also mentioned. One of these, Demodocus, of Leros, was a contemporary of Phocylides, and may have entered into a contest of wit with him, for a distich is ascribed to him identical with that of Phocylides about the Lerians, but with “Chians” substituted for “Lerians.” Another distich of Demodocus states that “The Milesians are not fools, but they act like fools.” Asius, of Samos, author of genealogical epics in hexameter verse, also composed elegies, but little is known of him or his poems. Pigres, of Halicarnassus, is said to have in-

serted pentameters between the lines of the *Iliad*. Many poets, best known as authors of other kinds of verse, also wrote elegies. The form of the distich makes it a natural vehicle for the expression of brief and pointed thoughts or sentiments, such as those ascribed to Phocylides, or some of those found in the poems of Solon. This quality of the distich led to its frequent use all through the classical period for inscriptions, and especially epitaphs. As such inscriptions were often strikingly apt and to the point, the word epigram, which originally meant merely inscription, has come to be applied to pungent, sententious remarks. Epigrams ascribed to many of the famous men of Greece have been handed down to us, but in many instances their authorship is doubted. In any case, such couplets, though they show one of the uses to which the elegiac distich was put, are of little importance in the history of literature.

CHAPTER VII

IAMBIC POETRY—BEAST-FABLES

The origin of iambic poetry—Archilochus, first half of the seventh century B. C.—Simonides of Amorgus, second half of the seventh century B. C.—Hipponax, latter part of the sixth century B. C.—Ananius—Solon—Beast-fables—Æsop.

As the elegiac metre arose by a modification of the epic hexameter, so the iambic rhythm arose by a modification of the natural prose utterance, for the alternation of long and short syllables is so usual in Greek that it is sometimes hard to avoid writing or speaking in a sort of rough iambs. Such a rhythm was naturally popular, and was naturally adopted in the festivals at which gibes and jokes were exchanged. The connection of iambic poetry with the festivals of Demeter is therefore not improbable (see page 61). Certainly the iambic poems partake of the nature of satiric gibes, though no longer rude in expression or without the artistic merit which distinguishes real poetry from popular songs. Iambic metres were, as has been said before (page 62), used for various purposes, and they never went out of use, but when iambic poetry as a distinct class is spoken of, that poetry is meant which had its rise with Archilochus, was cultivated for a short time, and then disappeared until it was revived by imitators in the Alexandrian period.

Of the iambic poets, Archilochus, of Paros, was the first and greatest. He belonged to an important Parian family. His father's name was Telesicles; his mother was a slave

by the name of Enipo. The dates of his birth and death are unknown, but his life was passed in the first half of the seventh century B. C. He was, then, a contemporary of Callinus, though perhaps somewhat younger than he. His verses mentioned the chief events of his life, and enabled ancient writers to transmit to us some biographical information. From them and from the extant fragments of the poems we gain the following facts: Some unknown event made Archilochus poor, and he left Paros to seek his fortune at Thasos, where he probably expected to be enriched by gold-mining. In this he was disappointed, for he succeeded in making nothing but enemies at Thasos, and presently he went to the adjacent mainland as a mercenary soldier. How long he remained a soldier of fortune or where he fought is not known, except that a fragment of one of his poems states that in a fight with a Thracian tribe he fled and threw away his shield. He must have returned to Paros, for he is said to have died in a battle between the Parians and the Naxians. How old he was at this time we do not know, but he was still young enough to bear arms. All the extant fragments of his poems and all the information we have from other sources show us Archilochus as a man in full youthful vigor. It is therefore probable that his death took place when he was not much over forty years old. At some time, we do not know when nor where, Archilochus wished to marry Neobule, daughter of Lycambes, but his suit was rejected. Thereupon his love turned to hate, and he attacked father and daughter alike with stinging verses, which made them the laughing-stock of the place. Both are said to have committed suicide. The story is probably not true, at least so far as the suicide is concerned, but it shows the power ascribed by the ancients to the satiric verse of Archilochus. He appears throughout as a bold, passionate, somewhat ungovernable nature, one who would love the excitement of battle rather than the quiet of a peaceful life. The

fact that he says he threw away his shield need not make us believe that he was cowardly, for a coward would not have been likely to become a mercenary soldier, nor would any one mention the loss of his shield who was not sure that his reputation for courage was so great that one flight would not destroy it. This confession was imitated by Alcæus and Anacreon among Greek poets, and by Horace among the Romans.

The ancients admired the poetry of Archilochus greatly, associating his name with that of Homer. It is therefore peculiarly unfortunate that his poems are almost entirely lost, for there is little in the extant fragments to justify such admiration. There is life and vigor, lightness of touch and elegance of diction, variety of sentiment and of subject, but more than this it is hard to find in the short fragments preserved to us. They consist of elegiac verses, iambic trimeters, trochaic tetrameters,¹ and other less familiar varieties of verse.

Archilochus is peculiarly hard to translate, as the charm of his diction is found in great measure in the aptness of his words and the concise and pointed manner of expression, qualities which are likely to be lost in translation. A few extracts will at least give an idea of the variety of subjects and sentiments to be found even in the unsatisfactory fragments now existing. Of himself Archilochus says: "I am a servant of Lord Enyalios [the war-god], understanding also the lovely gift of the Muses." Again he says: "In my spear my bread is kneaded, in my spear Ismaric wine, leaning on my spear I drink," words which express clearly and vividly his dependence upon his arms for his livelihood. The loss of his shield is expressed as follows: "Some one of the Sæans rejoices in my shield, which excellent arm I

¹ "Do not|lift him|from the|bracken.|Leave him|lying|where he|fell" may serve as an example of the rhythm of the trochaic tetrameter in English.

left behind a bush against my will; but I myself escaped the end of death. That shield—well, let it go; I'll get another not inferior." Several fragments are said to refer to the death of his sister's husband, who was lost in a shipwreck.

Lamentable are our woes, Pericles, nor does any one of the citizens rejoice in festivals, such is the mourning for them, nor does the city; for the wave of the much roaring sea has swallowed up such men, and we have breasts swollen with grief. But the gods have given firm endurance as a drug for incurable ills; sometimes one has these ills, sometimes another; now they have turned to us, and we lament a bleeding wound, but they will pass again to others; so straightway bear them, putting away womanish grief.

And again: "I shall not cure anything by wailing, nor do any harm by turning to enjoyments and feasts." Archilochus seems to have been quite willing to enjoy himself in various ways. In one fragment he urges some one to "go through the ship with a cup and take the covers from the hollow casks and draw the red wine from the dregs; for we can not keep sober on this watch." Of Thasos he says: "But this island stands like an ass's back, clad with rough woods; for there is no such fair and lovely place as is about the streams of Siris" [in Paros]. Evidently the poet-soldier did not like Thasos.

Neobule is mentioned in two fragments, but we learn little about her. In one Archilochus speaks of her as the youngest daughter of Lycambes, in the other he longs even to touch her hand. In some lines addressed to Lycambes, the poet says: "Father Lycambes, what is this you said? Who took away your sense, on which you used to lean? But now you're a great laughing-stock to all your fellow citizens." The hymn to Heracles was very famous throughout antiquity. It had a refrain, "Tenella kallinike," which we are told was sung as an accompaniment to the words. Probably some voices of a chorus sang the real words, while others sang "Tenella kallinike." Something similar to this is some-

times done in modern times, especially by negro choruses and college glee-clubs. The use of voices as an accompaniment is said to have been forced upon Archilochus by the failure of his flute-player to appear, but it is more probable that he found something of the sort in use among the people and adopted it. The word "tenella" appears to have no meaning of its own. "Kallinike" means "glorious victor," or "gloriously victorious." The words of the hymn, so far as they are preserved, are "Hail, Lord, Heracles, thyself and Iolaus, warriors two. Hail, Lord, Heracles."

Other iambic poets are Simonides of Amorgus, Hipponax, and Ananius. They all lacked the genius of Archilochus, and the fragments of their poems are inferior to his verses in grace and aptness of expression as well as in variety of subject.

Simonides,¹ son of Crines, was born at Samos, but emigrated to Amorgus. He is called Simonides of Amorgus to distinguish him from the later and more famous poet Simonides of Ceos. It is said that Simonides led the colony from Samos which settled Amorgus, and the date of the colonization is ordinarily said to be 693 B. C. In that case, Simonides would be older than Archilochus, which is improbable. In all probability he belongs to the second half of the seventh century, perhaps about 640 B. C. and the following years. He is said to have composed elegies, among them a history of Samos, but these are lost. Two entire iambic poems and several fragments are preserved. The longest poem (of one hundred and eighteen lines) is a satire on women. This is not personal satire or abuse, such as was employed by Archilochus, but is general in its character, and therefore more gentle. We are told by Lucian that Simonides did direct some of his poems against an individual, but no fragments of such personal

¹ The spelling Semonides was probably invented as a means of distinguishing this poet from others of the same name, especially Simonides of Ceos.

satire by him remain. If we can judge of him by what we have, we should say that he was not an adventurous soldier like Archilochus, but rather a quiet and orderly, probably a prosperous, citizen. In his poem upon women, he divides them into classes, each of which is descended from some beast—the swine, the fox, the dog, the donkey, the cat, the horse, the monkey, and the bee. Two classes only are exceptions, for the woman who is so stupid that she does not know enough to draw her chair to the fire when she is cold is said to be formed from earth, while the variable woman is sprung from the sea. Of course the woman descended from the bee is regarded as the only really desirable one. “He who gets her is lucky; for she is the only one upon whom no blame rests, but under her the property flourishes and increases. Loving, she grows old with her loving spouse, the mother of a fair and famous race.” As a whole, this poem is rather tedious, though not without some excellent passages. The different classes of women are treated with too much sameness, and one feels that the poet is making a conscious effort to be exhaustive. The other complete poem (of twenty-four lines) contains rather pessimistic expressions about human life addressed to a “boy,” perhaps the poet’s son.

Hipponax of Ephesus lived in the latter part of the sixth century. He was driven from his native town and lived at Clazomenæ. He was poor, lame, and deformed, according to some authorities, but his lameness may be a mere invention to account for his having invented the “lame” or “limping” (*scazon* or *choliambus*) iambic trimeter, a line in which the last foot is a spondee instead of an iambus. About one hundred fragments of his poems are preserved, but most of these are short and unsatisfactory. They are in various metres, though the limping iambs predominate. This is an inelegant and ungraceful, though effective, verse, which did not remain in constant use after Hipponax, but was taken up again in

Alexandrian times. Hipponax was a bitter and virulent satirist. He attacked many persons, beginning, it is said, with his own parents. He then lampooned two sculptors—Bupalus and Athenis—who he said had made an insulting portrait of him. A painter, Mimnes, is also an object of his mockery. Of these poems enough remains to show that the wit of Hipponax was coarse, but not enough to show why it was effective. Several fragments with the name of Bupalus prove the truth of the story that he was attacked by Hipponax, but teach us nothing further. A few fragments beg for clothing or complain that clothing and other things have not been given to Hipponax, and the belief in his poverty is further strengthened by these lines: "Wealth, for he is blind, came to my house not at all, saying, 'Hipponax, I give you thirty minæ of silver,' and many other things; for he is base of mind." Hipponax shows his temper in the lines: "Two happy days a woman brings a man: first when he marries her, the second when he bears her to the grave."

Ananius is little more than a name. Neither his birth-place nor his date is known, though he was probably later than Hipponax. Some of his lines end with two spondees, which may be an attempt to excel those of Hipponax in lameness. The longest extant fragment is a list of fish and viands with remarks on the season when each is best. Besides this, only four brief fragments remain.

Solon, as has been said, was a writer of iambic verse, but his elegiac poems are his chief works. In character, his iambics differ from those of Archilochus in being less virulent, and from the extant fragments of Simonides in being more interesting.

After Hipponax iambic verse ceased to be cultivated as a distinct kind of poetry, appearing only sporadically in later Greek literature. Somewhat akin to iambic poetry are the beast-fables. The originator

of this kind of satirical tale, which represents animals doing the typical deeds of men, was said to be Æsop, a foreign and deformed slave, either Thracian, Phrygian, or Ethiopian. Herodotus says he was a slave of Iadmon at Samos, in the time of King Amasis, about the middle of the sixth century. He was said to have traveled much, and to have been murdered at Delphi. Numerous tales of his adventures were current. The fables ascribed to him were transmitted orally, and there is no reason to believe that he ever committed them to writing. In fact, it is not certain that he ever existed, for the Greeks loved to ascribe the invention of everything to some definite person, and Æsop may be simply the mythical inventor of the fable. Tales ascribed to him were, however, very familiar throughout the classical period. Socrates is said to have turned one of these tales into verse, and Aristophanes speaks of it as disgraceful not to know Æsop. The tales were handed down in prose, but the earliest extant collections are in verse, by the Greek Babrius, who wrote in the first century after Christ, and the Latin writers Phædrus and Avianus. A prose collection by Demetrius of Phalerum (about 345 to 280 B. C.) has been lost. Many of the fables ascribed to Æsop are to be found in the *Panchatantra*, the *Jātakas*, and other ancient writings in India. They migrated in the mouths of the people as well as in written form to different nations, and are not the inventions of Æsop, though he may have been the first to make them popular in Europe, thereby gaining the credit of inventing them.

CHAPTER VIII

GREEK MUSIC—MONODIC AND CHORAL POETRY

Hyagnis, Marsyas, Olympus—Terpander, about 700 B. C.—The nome—Clonas, about 680 (?) B. C.—Musical modes—Melic poetry, monodic and choral—Alcæus, about 600–570 B. C.—Sappho, about 600 B. C.—Anacreon, about 540 B. C.—The Anacreontics.

THE development of Greek lyric poetry is closely connected with the development of music. The elegy probably derived its name from the Phrygian name for the flute, and in other kinds of lyric poetry the impulse toward improvement is due in great measure to the introduction of

Influence of music upon lyric poetry. new and improved instruments from Phrygia and Lydia. The early history of music is obscure, and much that the Greeks believed about it is mythical, but its influence upon

literature was so great that it can not be entirely passed over. The lyre (*cithara*) of the Homeric poets was a simple instrument, said to have had only four strings, and the flute of the same period was a simple shepherd's pipe. The Phrygians and Lydians had, however, better and more powerful instruments. The men to whom the Greeks ascribed the invention of new and better music apparently

Hyagnis, Marsyas, and Olympus. adopted these Asiatic instruments, perhaps making some improvements immediately, and certainly some improvements were made by their successors. Hyagnis and the satyr Marsyas are purely mythical. Marsyas is said to have challenged Apollo to a musical contest, in which the satyr with his

flute was defeated by the god with his lyre. This can at most mean that when the Phrygian flute was first introduced it was considered inferior to the lyre. The third name mentioned as that of an innovator in flute music is Olympus. He was probably a real person of the eighth century B. C., but just what his innovations were can hardly be determined. The airs ascribed to him were probably very early airs, the real author of which was unknown. The airs themselves are now lost, and we know little or nothing of their nature. The names of several pupils of Olympus are recorded, but we know nothing of their music. It is probable that all these early musicians composed words for their airs, but words as well as airs are lost.

The Æolian island of Lesbos, lying close to the shore of Asia Minor, plays an important part in the development of music and of lyric poetry. Here, probably at Antissa, was the birthplace of Terpander, to whom many improvements in music and poetry are ascribed. He lived apparently in the reign of King Midas II (738-695 B. C.). He was a player of the lyre, and traveled much, probably playing and singing at the festivals of Apollo, the god of the lyre. It is therefore probable that the reports of his visits to Delphi are founded upon fact. By command of an oracle he was called to Sparta to calm the spirits of the citizens in a time of domestic discord. In this he was successful, and the Spartans granted great honors to him and his descendants. He was henceforth an adopted citizen of Sparta, and his music and poetry are closely associated with that city. He is said to have invented the seven-stringed lyre, supplanting the old lyre of four strings. In all probability the seven-stringed lyre existed already, but Terpander made it known at Sparta and throughout Greece. Perhaps, too, he improved it and made it capable of more varied or more agreeable melodies. His poetry was in part—probably for the most part—in

hexameters, though one short fragment consists entirely of spondees, and many metrical innovations are ascribed to him. Among other things he is said to have improved the kind of sacred poem called the *nome*, giving it seven divisions instead of three.

The
nome.

The origin of the name *nome* is obscure, and opinions differ somewhat concerning the nature of the *nome* itself. It was, however, a sacred poem, sung in honor of a god, often the god Apollo, to the accompaniment of the lyre or the flute. Some *nomes*, perhaps the earliest, were purely instrumental, without words. How the *nome* differed from the hymn is not quite clear, but perhaps its essential feature was the division into three or—after Terpander—seven parts. *Nomes* are ascribed to Olympus and his school as well as to Terpander and other early musicians and poets, but the *nome* as a distinct kind of composition is limited to a brief period.

The most important composer of *nomes* with flute accompaniment was Clonas, a native of either Tegea, in Arcadia, or Thebes, in Bœotia. He lived apparently a little later than Terpander. He is said to have been the inventor of *nomes* to be sung to the flute, and also of processional songs called *prosodia*. The most that can probably be ascribed to him is improvement, not invention, of these classes of poems. Several other authors of *aulodic* *nomes*—that is, *nomes* accompanied by the flute—are mentioned, but their names have little meaning for us, as almost nothing is known of their works.

The Greeks composed their music not only in different keys, but also in different *modes*. These probably differed

from one another, somewhat as the minor and major keys differ in modern music, not by height or depth of pitch, but by different arrangements of the intervals between the notes. The Greeks had at least nine such modes, but the best known and most important were the Doric, Phrygian, and Lydian. The

Musical
modes.

Doric mode was supposed to have more vigor and dignity than the others, the Phrygian was more ecstatic, tending to excite the hearers beyond measure, while the Lydian was soft and enervating. The invention of the Lydian mode was ascribed to Olympus. These modes were not confined each to one kind of verse or rhythm, but the character of the poem to be sung and the mode of the music were undoubtedly intended to agree with each other. The modes therefore had some influence upon poetry, especially upon those kinds of poetry which were sung to elaborate accompaniments or in which the music was for any reason of especial importance.

Those varieties of lyric poetry in which the musical accompaniment is of great importance—those varieties, that **Melic poetry**, is to say, which are intended to be sung, not monodic and repeated, nor even simply chanted—are classed choral. together as *melic* poetry, from the Greek word *melos*, meaning *air* or *tune*.¹ This includes all lyric poetry except the elegiac and iambic poems. Melic poetry is itself divided into *monodic* and *choral* melic poetry, the first being sung by one voice, the second by a chorus.² In elegiac and iambic verse, as in the epic hexameter, the poems are written, sung, and recited continuously, with no break in the verse to mark the end of one division and the beginning of the next.³ In melic poetry each poem is divided into *strophes*, or stanzas. In monodic poetry the strophes are simple, but in choral poetry they are often long and complicated and composed in metres which seem difficult and almost confusing to us, accustomed as we are to the simple metres of modern poetry. The choral songs of the

¹ Melos originally means *limb*, *member*, and then comes to mean air or tune, perhaps because of the regular divisions of the melody.

² Of course these two classes were not absolutely distinct, for some songs intended for choruses might be sung by one voice and *vice versa*.

³ The alternation of hexameter and "pentameter" in elegiac poetry hardly causes a break in the continuous flow of the verse.

Greeks were sung by trained choruses, and were accompanied with instrumental music and with dancing. The instruments did not have the variety nor the power of modern orchestras, but the greater variety of rhythm and metre, as well as the use of the different modes, must have given to the performance of such a chorus a quality different from anything known in modern times, and perhaps not inferior in effect to the harmonies produced by our more powerful and varied instruments. To appreciate the beauty of Greek lyric poetry in its close relation to music required careful training, but music was always one of the most important parts of the education of Greek youth. It is practically impossible for us to give in English any idea of the metrical qualities of the more elaborate Greek poetry, and it requires long and careful study to appreciate them in the original Greek. Moreover, the music is lost, except as a few fragments have come down to us, and the dancing is irrevocably gone. We can therefore gain at best only an imperfect idea of the effect produced by the performance of an elaborate choral ode.

The monodic melic poetry is easier for us to understand in all its aspects. Such songs were expressions of the feelings or emotions of one person, and were to be sung by one person to the accompaniment of one instrument, usually a lyre played by the singer himself. It is natural that this poetry should be simple. As a rule, the stanzas of monodic Greek poems consist of four or five lines, each line being itself comparatively short. Most of the poems are in *logædic* verse—that is to say, in verse made up of trochees and dactyls, in which the dactyls are sung in the time of trochees. The name *logædic* means “prose-song,” and seems to imply that this kind of verse was less different from prose than other verses.

The island of Lesbos, which had been the birthplace of Terpander, was also the home of the two great melic poets

Alcæus and Sappho. It is probable that the progress of music under Terpander and his followers had something to do with the rise of monodic melic poetry at Lesbos, but how close the connection was can not be ascertained. The nome was monodic, and much of Terpander's inventive ability was applied to the perfecting of the nome. That may possibly indicate that monodic song was popular at Lesbos even before Terpander, and that Alcæus was not the first who attained merit as a poet of monodic verses, but only the first whose work was widely appreciated and preserved to posterity.

Music and song at Lesbos. Alcæus was a member of a noble family at Mytilene, in Lesbos. The exact date of his birth is unknown, but he was a contemporary of Pittacus, the wise law-giver of Mytilene, and took part in a war with Athens for the possession of Sigeium, in which he lost his shield, if his confession of cowardice is not a mere imitation of Archilochus (see p. 81). This war is not dated with certainty, but it can not have been much earlier or later than 600 B. C. It is probable that Alcæus was born some years before 600 B. C. and lived until 570 or thereabouts. In those days the noble families of Mytilene were losing their power, apparently through inner dissension, which enabled the common people to assert themselves. The common people lacked the ability to establish a permanent democracy, and their weakness gave opportunities for usurpers, or "tyrants," as the Greeks called them, to seize the chief power in the state. The tyrants were then generally put down by assassination. One of these tyrants, Melanchrus, was killed, it is said, by Pittacus and the brother of Alcæus, Antimenidas. He was soon followed, however, by another tyrant, Myrsilus. It was probably at this time that Alcæus, in common with his brother, with Sappho, and many other aristocrats, was banished from Mytilene. He traveled in various regions and was during a part of the time a soldier in the army of the Egyptian

Pharaoh, while Antimenidas entered the service of King Nebuchadnezzar of Assyria (604–562 B. C.). Myrsilus was overthrown and killed by Pittacus and the moderate party, but Alcæus was still in the opposition and was again banished with his brother.

There were several tyrants at Mytilene, but whether they came after Myrsilus or between Melanchrus and Myrsilus is not clear. At any rate, Alcæus and his brother engaged in a plot to overthrow a government which existed after the death of Myrsilus, but succeeded only in bringing things to such a pass that Pittacus was made absolute ruler of Mytilene, with the title of *Æsymnetes*, possessing quite as much power as any of the tyrants had had, and charged by the people to use his power for the suppression of faction and disorder, especially such as aimed at the establishment of the rule of the nobles. Such a government as that of Pittacus was quite as displeasing to Alcæus as the governments of the tyrants had been, and the irreconcilable aristocrat continued to live in exile and to do what he could to overthrow Pittacus. "With loud praises," he says, "the multitude made the low-born Pittacus tyrant of the factious and luckless city." After holding his office for ten years Pittacus retired to private life. Whether Alcæus returned to Mytilene at this time, or was pardoned and allowed to return by Pittacus at some earlier period, or remained in exile, is not certain. It is generally believed that he returned at the retirement of Pittacus, if not before. In one of his poems he speaks of himself as old, so that we may assume that he passed safely through the vicissitudes of his career of political strife, war, and exile, and died an old man, probably in his native place.

Alcæus was an intense partisan, a sincere patriot, but a patriot of the narrow kind, who sees the salvation of his country only in his own party, and even in the particular division of his party to which he belongs. The political poems of Solon breathe a calm and dignified spirit—the

spirit of a man above all factional strife, of a man who can gain and keep the respect and confidence of all classes by his wisdom, good judgment, and justice. The political poems of Alcæus express the spirit of faction. "Now is the time to drink, to drink with all one's might, for Myrsilus is dead,"¹ are the words in which he exults over the fall of the tyrant. His expression about Pittacus has already been quoted. Melanchrus he calls a disgrace to the city. But not all of the fragments of the political songs of Alcæus show a rancorous spirit. The longest describes the room of a warrior about to take part in the strife :

The great hall gleams with bronze; and all the room is adorned for Ares with shining helmets, down from which nod white horse-hair plumes, the glory of men's heads; and shining brazen greaves hang round on pegs, protections against mighty missiles; and new breastplates of linen; and hollow shields thrown down, and Chalcidian swords, and besides many belts and kilts. These we can not forget, since once we have entered upon this task.

This description is brilliant and exact, giving the hearer a vivid impression of the gleam of bronze and a suggestion of the warlike spirit which lends the bronze its power and its charm. Yet with all its flashing directness, this fragment seems a little theatrical, for it describes the accessories of the warrior, not the warrior himself nor the spirit within him. It may be that if we had the whole poem, of which this is a part, we should feel the martial spirit which the ancient critics admired in the poems of Alcæus, but in its present mutilated condition the fragment is excellent as vivid and terse description, but is not warlike. Another fragment describes the ship of state²

¹ Horace, *Od.* I, xxxvii, imitates the beginning of this poem, only two lines of which remain. Horace's ode celebrates the death of Cleopatra, and it is possible that the imitation of Alcæus is not confined to the first line.

² Imitated in part at least by Horace, *Od.* I, xiv. The comparison of the state with a ship seems to be original with Alcæus.

tossed by the winds; and in this again the description is clear, terse, and vivid.

Several fragments exist of the convivial songs of Alcæus. These are for the most part of the class called *scolia*, a name derived from the adjective *σκολιός*, "crooked,"

Scolia. but not yet satisfactorily explained. It is perhaps most usual to say that the songs were called "crooked" because they were sung in turn by the guests, who sang not in the order in which they sat, but in some irregular or zigzag order. One of the fragments is translated by Mr. Symonds as follows :

| The rain of Zeus descends, and from high heaven
 A storm is driven :
 And on the running water brooks the cold
 Lays icy hold :
 Then up! beat down the winter; make the fire
 Blaze high and higher ;
 Mix wine as sweet as honey of the bee
 Abundantly ;
 Then drink with comfortable wool around
 Your temples bound.
 We must not yield our hearts to woe, nor wear
 With wasting care ;
 For grief will profit us no whit, my friend,
 Nor nothing mend ;
 | But this is our best medicine, with wine fraught
 To cast out thought.

Horace imitated this poem in the ninth ode of his first book, and his eighteenth ode is also an imitation of a poem of Alcæus, of which, unfortunately, little is left. If among our comparatively few fragments there are so many which served as models for Horace, there can be no doubt that many of the odes are imitations of lost poems by Alcæus.

This imitation by Horace is the best proof we have that Alcæus was really a great poet. His style is direct and clear, and his words express his own straightforward, ardent character. But in the extant fragments there is little that

indicates a great nature or a great poet. The fragments of hymns are less satisfactory on the whole than those of the political, convivial, or love poems. Yet the universal admiration of the ancients and the imitation of Horace must not be lightly passed over. Our extant fragments number, to be sure, over one hundred and fifty, but most of these are short, and many consist of only one word. We have, therefore, no right to refuse to Alcæus the position of a great poet, because the extant fragments do not prove him

to be one. They do show great merit in some ways, as has been pointed out above, and we must imagine that among the lost poems, which amounted in all to at least ten books, were many not inferior at any rate to the best of the existing fragments. The dialect of Alcæus, as well as of Sappho, is the Æolic dialect of Lesbos. His metres are simple, and the four-lined stanza called Alcaic, much used by Horace, was first made popular, even if not actually invented, by him.

Sappho, or, as she would have called herself in her native dialect, Psappha, was a countrywoman and contemporary of Alcæus. She was probably born at Eresus, but lived habitually at Mytilene, the most important city of

Lesbos. The exact period of her life can not be determined, but she must have lived in the early part of the sixth century. Alcæus addressed a poem to her, in which he said: "Violet-tressed, chaste, sweetly smiling Sappho, I wish to say something, but shame hinders me"; to which Sappho replied: "If you had a desire for noble and good things, and your tongue did not urge you to say something bad, shame would not possess your eyes, but you would speak of what is right." But this proves only that Sappho and Alcæus were alive at the same time, not that Sappho was the younger of the two, nor even that Alcæus was seriously in love with her.

Herodotus says that Sappho was the daughter of Sca-mandronymus, and Suidas tells us that her mother's name

was Cleïs, that she was married to a wealthy citizen of Andrus, named Cercylas or Cercolas, and had a daughter named Cleïs, after her grandmother. The family of Sappho was noble, and it was probably for that reason that she was sent into banishment, in the course of which she is said to have visited Sicily. She probably returned to Lesbos when Pittacus granted amnesty to political exiles. When and how she died is unknown. According to a popular legend, she was in love with a youth named Phaon, and when her advances were repulsed, she threw herself into the sea from the Leucadian rock, on the coast of Epirus, hundreds of miles from Lesbos. The legendary character of this tale is evident. The Leucadian rock is a promontory, from which at stated times condemned criminals were thrown to their death, with special rites of expiation. In one of his poems Anacreon speaks of plunging from the Leucadian rock drunk with love. Some similar expression in one of Sappho's love-songs addressed to Phaon may have given rise to the legend that she actually destroyed herself in the way indicated. As for Phaon, we do not know whether he really existed and was beloved by Sappho, or was a mythical person like Adonis (of whom Sappho also sung), or whether Sappho merely used the name of Phaon in her poems, as other poets have addressed their sonnets to imaginary persons.

The story of Sappho's suicide, and with it perhaps the whole story of her love for Phaon, is probably an invention based upon certain expressions in her poems.

Sappho's
character.

The same origin must be assigned to the stories of her various love-affairs with Anacreon, Alcæus, and others, and also to the tales of her violent and immoral passion for some of her female friends and pupils. If all the tales are to be believed, Sappho's character was bad in the extreme. If the indications derived from her poems are to be altogether rejected, we know nothing about her personality. A middle course is here—as usual—the

best. Sappho is, more than any other Greek poet, a singer of love-songs. She sings of the joys of love and of its pains, of the beauty of young men and of maidens; she composes hymns to the goddess of love, Aphrodite, and *epithalamia* or bridal processional songs for the Lesbian brides. Her poetry is sweet, but full of fire, expressing the passion as well as the tenderness of love. It is only natural and reasonable to suppose that she who could express passion could also feel it, and that her feelings, little restrained by the customs of her time and native place, caused her to err and perhaps to commit excesses. Had she been a person of austere virtue, the contradiction between her verses and her life would have made her virtue memorable and caused it to be mentioned by later writers. But she was honored at Mytilene, and her likeness adorned the coins of her native Eresus. That seems to prove that she was not inferior to other Lesbian women in general reputation, and she certainly surpassed them all in genius.

The poems of Sappho formed in ancient times nine books. There remain for us about one hundred and seventy fragments, most of which are brief and unsatisfactory. Fortunately, two odes are preserved almost entire, one by Dionysius of Halicarnassus, the other by Longinus.¹ Besides songs, there were *epithalamia*, hymns, and perhaps elegies. Sappho's verse is passionate, but sweet, her language simple and bold, but full of refinement. The technical excellence of her verse is, so far as we can judge from the extant fragments, unsurpassed. The Sapphic stanza, so called because Sappho was said to have invented it, is charming in its simple and dignified beauty. This is the metre² of the fol-

¹ Or rather by the unknown author of a rhetorical treatise, *περὶ ὑψους*, *On Sublimity* (of literary style), attributed to Longinus.

² Translation by Prof. William Hyde Appleton. This metre is used by Horace in several odes, e. g., I, ii, x, xii, xx, xxii, xxv, xxx, xxxii, xxxviii.

lowing hymn to Aphrodite, translated so as to show the rhythm of the original :

| Throned in splendor, immortal Aphrodite!
Child of Zeus, enchantress, I implore thee,
Slay me not in this distress and anguish,
Lady of beauty.

Hither come as once before thou camest,
When from afar thou heardst my voice lamenting,
Heardst and camest, leaving thy glorious father's
Palace golden,

Yoking thy chariot. Fair the doves that bore thee ;
Swift to the darksome earth their course directing,
Waving their thick wings from the highest heaven
Down through the ether.

Quickly they came. Then thou, O blessed goddess,
All in smiling wreathed thy face immortal,
Badest me tell thee the cause of all my suffering,
Why now I called thee ;

What for my maddened heart I most was longing.
"Whom," thou criest, "dost wish that sweet Persuasion
Now win over and lead to thy love, my Sappho?
Who is it wrongs thee?"

For though now he flies, he soon shall follow,
Soon shall be giving gifts who now rejects them.
Even though now he love not, soon shall he love thee,
Even though thou wouldst not.

Come then now, dear goddess, and release me
From my anguish. All my heart's desiring
Grant thou now. Now too again as aforetime,
| Be thou my ally.

The other ode preserved entire is in the same metre as the first. It has been translated into English rhymed verse as follows :¹

¹ Translation by Ambrose Philips. This poem is imitated by Theocritus, *Idyl.* ii, 104 ff., and Catullus, *Carm.* li.

Blest as the immortal gods is he,
 The youth who fondly sits by thee,
 And hears and sees thee, all the while,
 Softly speak and sweetly smile.

'Twas this deprived my soul of rest,
 And raised such tumults in my breast;
 For, while I gazed, in transport tossed,
 My breath was gone, my voice was lost;

My bosom glowed; the subtle flame
 Ran quick through all my vital frame;
 O'er my dim eyes a darkness hung;
 My ears with hollow murmurs rung;


In dewy damps my limbs were chilled;
 My blood with gentle horrors thrilled;
 My feeble pulse forgot to play;
 I fainted, sunk, and died away.

A short, fragmentary invocation of evening is remarkable for its simplicity and sweetness :

O Evening, thou who bringest everything
 That the bright, glaring day has scattered wide,
 The sheep thou bringest, and thou bring'st the goat;
 The child thou bringest to his mother's side.

Anacreon, the third of the great writers of monodic melic verse, was born at Teos, one of the twelve cities of the Ionic confederacy of Asia Minor. His father's name was Scythinus. The date of Anacreon's birth is unknown, but the brilliant period of his life was in the second half of the sixth century. Strabo tells us that in Anacreon's time the inhabitants of Teos left their city to found Abdera, on the coast of Thrace. Herodotus says this event took place in consequence of the Persian attack upon Asia Minor under Harpagus, which was in 545 B. C. Anacreon can not have lived long at Abdera, but must soon have gone to the court of Polycrates, who was





ANACREON.

From a statue in the Ny-Carlsberg Museum, Copenhagen.

tyrant of Samos at least ten years, ending in 522 B. C. Strabo says Anacreon's poems are full of the name of Polycrates, which seems to indicate that the poet was at Samos for some years, if not throughout the entire period of the tyranny. He was at Samos when Polycrates was killed, but went soon after to Athens, where Hippias and Hipparchus had been for five years in possession of the power left them by their father, Pisistratus. Hipparchus was a lover of poetry, music, and art, and is said to have sent a galley to bring Anacreon to his court. At Athens, Anacreon was the friend not only of Hipparchus, but also of other prominent men, among them Xanthippus, the father of Pericles. Hipparchus was murdered in 514, but whether Anacreon was at Athens at the time is not known. He may have stayed at Athens even after the death of Hipparchus, for the fact that an epigram preserved under his name was intended for an offering by a Thessalian chief, Echecratides, does not prove that Anacreon went to live in Thessaly. The date of the poet's death is unknown, though as he is said to have lived to the age of eighty-five years, his death probably took place at some time after 500 B. C. An epigram attributed to Simonides mentions his tomb at Teos, but the attribution is probably not correct, and the epigram therefore proves nothing more than that at some later time it was believed that Anacreon's tomb was in his native town. The story that he was obliged to leave Teos in 494 is probably only a repetition of the story of the migration in 545.

In one or two places Anacreon speaks of having been a soldier, and he imitates Archilochus and Alcæus so far as to say that he threw away his shield, but his poems as a whole are not those of a warlike or soldierly man. He was a court poet, a lover of soft pleasures, of luxurious surroundings, good company, good food, and good wine. Archilochus was a roving warrior, fighting for no principle, to be sure, but too independent to live on the bounty of

any ruler. Alcæus was a fierce partisan in politics, a lover of liberty, at least for himself and his faction, outspoken and independent. Even Sappho, though a woman, had been forced into exile by the tyrants of her native island. But Anacreon was the friend of Polycrates and of Hipparchus. He was not too independent to be agreeable to the wealthy rulers and their friends, who gave him the comforts he loved in return for the poems which praised their acts or their characters, or at least added a delicate and refined pleasure to their banquets. In Anacreon's poetry there is no great power, but there is much grace, elegance, and brilliancy. Though several of the extant fragments are addressed to deities, there is no genuine religious feeling, but rather here, as elsewhere, a graceful, almost playful ease of expression. The impression of ease is enhanced by Anacreon's use of a simple and elegant Ionic dialect cast in verses of great variety, but for the most part short and far from complicated. His versification resembles that of Alcæus and Sappho, but he avoids the Sapphic and Alcaic stanzas. Like most of the Greek poets, Anacreon wrote elegiac verses, but these differ little in character from his odes. The charm of his poetry is inseparable from his language, but some of its qualities may be recognized even in a translation, as, for instance, of his so-called hymn to Dionysus :

The poems
of Anacreon.

O Lord, with whom the conqueror Eros and the blue-eyed nymphs and blushing Aphrodite sport, thou who wanderest on the peaks of the high mountains, I beseech thee, but do thou come propitious to me, and hearken graciously to my prayer. To Cleobulus be a good counselor, that he accept my love, O Dionysus.

Again he sings to a beloved boy :

O boy with maiden glances, maiden grace,
I yearn for thee, who heedest not my pains,
Nor knowest that as I run through life's race,
Thou art the charioteer who holds the reins.

Elsewhere he sings of the joys of wine and pleasure, and also of the troubles of old age which takes away the charm and the pleasures of youth.

Of the poems of Anacreon, which formed in the Alexandrian period five books, only about one hundred and seventy fragments are preserved, and of these many consist of but one line or less. But his light and pleasing verse was deservedly popular throughout antiquity, and called forth numerous imitations. A collection of these imitations, *Anacreontics* as they are called, is preserved in the anthology of Cephalas, dating from the eleventh century after Christ. There are about sixty pieces, each composed of a system of short verses, Ionic dimeters or catalectic iambic dimeters—i. e., dimeters lacking a syllable at the end. These are of various merit and of various dates. For many years they were regarded as the genuine work of Anacreon, and references to Anacreon in modern literature are for the most part references to these poems. It is now recognized, however, that they are very much later work in imitation of Anacreon. Some of them are really beautiful, though none shows any great power, but rather an attractive and often playful sweetness. They tell of love among roses, of Love who comes to the singer and begs for shelter on a stormy night, only to reward his host by fixing an arrow in his heart, of the pleasures of wine, of the charms of the beloved. Their general character is indicated in the lines:

You sing the Theban story,
 Some sing of Phrygian deeds;
 I sing my own destruction.
 I was not lost by steeds
 Nor arméd host nor navy;
 Another kind of lance
 Smote all my heart asunder—
 A soft eye's burning glance.

In spite of his Ionic dialect, Anacreon is properly classed with the two Lesbian poets Alcæus and Sappho, being, like them, a singer of short and simple songs to be accompanied by the lyre. This kind of monodic-poetry has found many admirers at all times, but the progress of Greek poetry led in another direction, and these three poets had no immediate successors.

CHAPTER IX

CHORAL LYRIC POETRY

Thaletas, about 660–600 B. C.—Alcman, about 650–600 B. C. or a little later—Arion, 640 (?)–570 (?) B. C.—Stesichorus, about 635–555 B. C.—Ibycus, about 590–520 B. C.

THE development of choral poetry in Greece is due in great measure to the peculiar character of Greek civic life.

Monodic poetry individual. Alcæus, Sappho, and Anacreon, as well as the elegiac poets, expressed their individual sentiments in beautiful verse, with all the grace and all the power to which each individual poet could attain. The works of these poets are charming in their sweetness, their simplicity, their straightforward honesty of workmanship, their suggestive imagery, their diction, and their versification, but they differ from the poetry of other peoples in details or in special qualities rather than in their whole nature and essence. This is because the individual is essentially the same at all times and in all places, however he may be influenced in details and in special directions by his surroundings. The individual utterances of an Alcæus or a Sappho are those of a man or a woman, and the fact that the man or woman is a Greek of Lesbos is a matter of importance, to be sure, but of secondary importance only.

But Greek choral lyric poetry is the expression not of the individual, but rather of the community. The poet whose verses are sung by the whole people of his native city as they approach the shrines of the gods, or by the

youths or maidens as they celebrate their city's festivals with sacred dances, is no longer a mere individual, but is the mouthpiece of the community and its life. The choral

Choral poetry the expression of the life of the community. poetry of the Greeks was the natural outgrowth and the most perfect literary expression of the civic life of Greece, in which every citizen was personally acquainted with every other on account of the small size of the cities, while at

the same time the life of the individual was regulated by ancient customs, inherited in most cases from mythical times, or by carefully devised and elaborate laws—a civic life in which patriotism was intense, but limited to one little city, not extended to embrace a mighty empire or a union of great states; a life in which every public act of the state affected each citizen, so that each citizen was personally interested in the celebration of every anniversary and sacred day. This close connection of private life with the life of the city had a powerful effect upon the Greek mind, giving to Greek art and to Greek literature a public, as it were, a municipal character, without depriving it of freshness or independence. But the forms of poetry which best express the strictly personal feelings of the poet are not those best adapted to the use of the community. The public ceremonies and festivals demand the sound of many voices and the rhythmic motion of many feet. There had no doubt been choral songs from early times. The bride had been escorted to her new home with song and dance, the gods had been praised by many voices chanting in unison, and more than one voice at a time had raised the lament for the dead or shouted the song of victory. But these early songs were rude, perhaps mere unmetrical chants sung to uncertain airs. They were the foundation upon which choral poetry was built up, the seed from which choral poetry sprang, not real choral poetry. With the development of music, which came at the same time with great advances toward well-ordered civic life, choral

poetry began to grow and to become the most elaborate and the most perfectly Greek variety of Greek literature.

There were various kinds of choral songs, distinguished one from another by the purpose for which they were intended and the manner in which they were performed. The *pæan* was originally a song in honor of the god Pæan (identified with Apollo) and later in honor of any god. It was performed by a chorus of men, who danced a dignified dance. It was also sung on the march before or after a battle. Another variety of pæan was sung at banquets without dancing. The *prosodion* was a processional or marching hymn, to be sung as the singers approached the temples or altars of the gods. The *hyporcheme* was similar to the pæan, but the accompanying dance was wilder and less dignified, while the music was naturally faster and probably more varied. The *parthenion* was a song for a chorus of girls, who either sang and danced themselves or danced to the singing of others. This kind of chorus was especially noted at Sparta. *Hymns* were songs in honor of gods or heroes, though the word was sometimes carelessly applied to songs in honor of men. *Encomia* were songs in honor of men, originally sung at banquets. A kind of song which attained great excellence and importance is the *epinician ode*, or song in honor of victors in the public games held at Olympia, Delphi, and elsewhere. There are numerous other names applied to subdivisions of the classes mentioned, and all were more or less modified so that they were not always clearly distinguished. All of these were performed by square or parallel choruses—that is, by choruses arranged in parallel lines. The *dithyramb* was performed by a chorus arranged in a circle—a round chorus. All the other classes were of a more or less self-contained and dignified character, the hyporcheme being perhaps the least so, but the dithyramb was violent and ecstatic. It appears to have been of Phrygian origin, and was a song in

Kinds of
choral poems.

honor of Dionysus, god of wine. It became popular in those places where grapes were cultivated and wine was made, and reached its highest development in Attica, where it led to the creation of tragedy and was at the same time practised as a distinct form of art, combining music, poetry, and dancing with dramatic elements.

The metres of these various classes of choral poetry show the greatest variety. They are, generally speaking, far less simple than those of monodic verse; the divisions, called strophes, are longer and are divided into periods and smaller divisions called sentences or cola. The feet are longer, having sometimes as many as five syllables, and the relation between the length of long and short syllables is frequently modified by lengthening or shortening the one or the other in pronunciation. It is therefore difficult for us to appreciate the metrical excellence of many of the choral odes. They were meant to be sung to music composed especially for them by the poet, and the music fixed the time or rhythm quite as much as did the natural quantity of the syllables themselves. According to Cicero, the ancients themselves were not always able to discover the metre of a choral passage, or even to distinguish it from prose, without the music.¹ But the Greeks loved the elaborate combination of music, poetry, and dancing, and some of the greatest of their poets devoted themselves, especially in the sixth and the first half of the fifth centuries, to this kind of composition. The Dorians had great influence upon the early development of choral poetry, and the Doric dialect was always associated with it, though as Athens became more and more the centre of intellectual life the Attic dialect supplanted the Doric in great measure even in choral poetry. It never, however, entirely drove out the Doric forms, even in the choral parts of the Attic tragedy.

**Choral
metres.**

¹ Cicero, *Orator*, 183.

Thaletas, the earliest Greek poet who composed lasting poems for performance by a chorus, was born in Crete, probably at Gortyna, not far from the beginning of the seventh century. He went to Sparta, perhaps by command of an oracle, about the time when the Spartans, by bringing the first Messenian War to a victorious close, had made themselves the most powerful state in the Peloponnesus. Here he introduced new metres, which he probably developed from the popular songs of Crete, instead of the dactylic hexameter, which had still prevailed in the poems of Terpander, and at the same time he organized the Spartan choruses more perfectly than had been done before. Of his poems no fragments are preserved, but his name was so great that the Cretans ascribed to him many early poems, the authors of which were unknown. His chief claim to distinction is that he introduced new measures at Sparta, thereby making them known to all Greece, and thus began the remarkable development of choral poetry. What Terpander had done for the nome, and indirectly for monodic lyric poetry in general, that Thaletas did for choral poetry. His poems were chiefly pæans and hyporchemes. Xenodamus, of Cythera, and Xenocritus, of Locri, carried on the work of Thaletas, but we know little or nothing of them except that in some of the pæans of Xenocritus the mythical part was made so important that some later critics preferred to call the poems dithyrambs rather than pæans. The poems of Thaletas were doubtless almost exclusively religious, but a more worldly element begins to invade choral poetry in the next generation.

The first important author of choral poems after Thaletas was Alcman, who lived about the middle of the seventh century, rather after 650 B. C. than before. If the words in one of the extant fragments¹ apply to the poet himself, he was born at Sardis, but his name is

¹ Frg. 24.

Greek, and if he was born at Sardis he was a Greek by race. His life was passed for the most part, at any rate, at Sparta, and it was there that he composed his poems, the most famous of which were his *parthenia*, though he also composed hymns, pæans, and other kinds of verse, among them love-songs. He lived to be an old man, for he speaks of himself as such in one of the extant fragments. His poems are in the Spartan dialect, which was generally considered somewhat rude and unmusical, but becomes in Alcman's hands capable of much grace and sweetness. Alcman's chief innovation as a musician appears to have consisted in giving greater prominence to the flute than it had enjoyed before, but he was himself a player of the lyre, and regarded the lyre as the superior instrument. In his verses he employed a variety of new metres, for the most part short lines, and he did not, like the Lesbian poets and Anacreon, repeat the same stanza in different poems, but made new combinations of verses for new poems. In this he was followed by the great choral lyrists Simonides, Pindar, and Bacchylides, and may therefore be said to have shown the way by which choral poetry was to attain to its perfection. Alcman seems to have adopted or invented the triad, consisting of a strophe and antistrophe exactly alike in metre, followed by an epode differing from the other two. This arrangement became the regular one in choral poetry. It was varied, to be sure, and was never a fixed rule, but it was so evidently excellent that it was adopted as the usual arrangement.

Thaletas is little more than a name, for not a line of his poetry is preserved. Of Alcman's works about one hundred and fifty fragments remain, most of which are short and of little value. Several consist of more than one line, and one, written on a piece of papyrus found in Egypt in 1855, is long enough to give some idea of the structure of his *parthenia*. The fragment is mutilated, but enough remains to show that the first

Alcman's
poems.

part told the story of the slaying of the sons of Hippocoön by Castor and Polydeuces. Then the poet suddenly leaves mythical ground, and turns to the praise of the Spartan maidens. How the poem ended is unknown. The mixture of mythical or religious narrative with matter of worldly interest is found also in the poems of the later great choral poets, and here, too, Alcman seems to have been the one to lead the way.

Alcman's spirit as shown in his poems seems to have been full of grace and tenderness. He loved to sing of beautiful maidens, of love, and of nature. His description of the rest and quiet of night shows at once his appreciation of nature and his liking for a telling enumeration of details:

The peaks of the mountains and the ravines are sleeping, the capes and the torrents, the leaves and all the creeping things that the black earth nourishes, the beasts of the mountains and the race of bees, and the monsters in the depths of the dark sea; the tribes of long-winged birds are asleep.

When he speaks of his failing strength he wishes he were a ceryl, the male halcyon, which was said to be carried in its old age by its mate:

No longer, O sweet-toned maiden singers with charming voices, can my limbs bear me; ah! would that I might be a ceryl, who hovers with the halcyons upon the flower of the wave with fearless heart, the purple sea-bird of spring!

Of love he sings: "Sweet love, by the will of Cypris, floods my heart once more and soothes me."

There is little in the poems of Alcman to remind us of the proverbial concise brevity of Spartan speech or the severity of Spartan manners. His style is gracious, easy, and elegant in spite of his dialect. If he lacks Pindar's majestic dignity he has a sweet simplicity all his own, and in his wealth of images and figures he is a proper precursor of Pindar.

Arion, from the Lesbian town of Methymna, is said to have been a pupil of Alcman. This indicates his date and also tells us that he spent some time at Sparta.

Arion.

His date is further fixed by the fact that his chief activity was at the court of Periander, who was tyrant of Corinth from 625 to 585 B. C. Arion is said to have traveled in Italy and Sicily, and the story goes that as he was returning with much wealth from Sicily to Greece, the sailors determined to rob and murder him. He asked to be allowed to sing one more song, and when his request was granted, he clothed himself in his flowing singer's costume, took his lyre, and sang the Orthian or the Pythian nome. Then he threw himself into the sea. But a dolphin, attracted by the music, had approached the ship, and now took Arion upon his back and carried him safely to Tænarum. Arion proceeded from Tænarum to Corinth by land, arrived before the ship, told his story, and caused his would-be murderers to be arrested and punished on their arrival. This tale is probably due to a misunderstanding of some monument representing Apollo and his sacred dolphin, but it shows Arion's reputation. The Orthian nome¹ was ascribed to Terpander, and if Arion was said to have sung it, he was thereby said to have been to some extent under the influence of Terpander, which is natural, as Arion was himself a Lesbian.

Of Arion's poems no remains are preserved, for the hymn to Poseidon and the elegiac distich ascribed to him by Ælian are evidently the works of a later period. He is said to have written *proemia*, poems like the so-called Homeric hymns, to be sung as introductions to epic recitations or the like, but his importance is due to the fact that he first made the dithyramb a form of literary poetry. The origin of the word *dithyramb* is uncertain and unexplained, but

¹ The Pythian nome is probably in this story merely another name for the Orthian nome, indicating that it was sung at Delphi.

from the time when the worship of Dionysus was introduced into Greece there were probably dances in his honor accompanied with music and song. These were without doubt rude and coarse, but it may be that they had in them a dramatic germ. Perhaps from the beginning there was some sort of responsive song, or one of the singers may have sung a solo to which the rest sang a refrain. At any rate, there must have been something about the rude, popular songs to Dionysus that distinguished them from the

other popular songs. Arion developed the dithyramb from the state of an unregulated popular song and dance to that of a performance by a trained chorus. In the Attic period the dithyrambic chorus consisted of fifty members, but whether Arion employed so many, or whether he employed any fixed number, we do not know. He arranged his chorus in a circle and caused the leader to sing in alternation with the rest or to speak to the other members of the chorus while they danced. That this imperfect dialogue contains the germ of the drama is evident, and the dithyramb is especially important because it was the parent of tragedy. The chorus of the dithyramb appeared disguised as satyrs, clad in goatskins.¹ This is said to have been an innovation of Arion, though the matter is doubtful, but at any rate this disguise is important, for in no other form of choral poetry did the performers take any unusual form or wear any unusual dress. In the dithyramb the members of the chorus were no longer themselves, but they played a part, and this is a great step toward dramatic representation. If the chorus were satyrs, followers of Dionysus, it would be natural for the poet as leader of the chorus to take the part of Dionysus himself. This is another step toward drama. In some dithyrambs myths not directly relating to Dionysus were

¹ The Greek word *tragos* means *goat*. Hence the members of the chorus clad in goatskins were called *tragoi*. Their song was called *goat-song*, *tragœdia*, tragedy.

sung, but whether this innovation was introduced by Arion or by some later poet is unknown.

Stesichorus was a citizen of Himera, in Sicily, though he may have been born in the Locrian town of Metaurus, in Italy. He lived eighty years between 640 and 550 B. C., though the exact years of his birth and death are not known. His real name was Tisias, but he was called Stesichorus, "arranger of choruses." His father's name is variously given, but there is perhaps the most evidence that he was called Euclides. When Phalaris was planning to become tyrant of Himera, Stesichorus warned the citizens, telling them the fable of the horse who, in order to be revenged upon the stag, allowed himself to be bridled by the man; but the warning was in vain, and Stesichorus is said to have been forced to leave Himera and to have died at Catana, where his tomb was shown.

The lyric poets in Sicily before Stesichorus had been Xanthus, of whom little is known, except that Stesichorus is said to have imitated him in his poem about Orestes, Xenocritus, of Locri (see page 109), and Arion, whose travels in Sicily have been mentioned already (page 112). Stesichorus was therefore not the originator of choral poetry in Sicily, but he was an innovator, especially in the matter of metres and strophes. The metres he preferred were dactylic or epitrite, the latter being formed of dactyls and trochees, apparently so arranged that the trochees were lengthened to the time of the dactyls, not the dactyls shortened to that of the trochees, as in logædic verse. Not that he used these metres exclusively, but he seems to have preferred them, and along with them other long and dignified lines, such as those composed of eight dactyls. His strophes, which were arranged in triads, were apparently longer than those of his predecessors, and therefore capable of more variety and of more sustained thought or narrative.

The poems of Stesichorus formed twenty-six books. Some of them were pæans and some were love-songs, but the greater part were hymns. It is difficult for us to distinguish between hymns and some of the other classes of religious songs, such as pæans, hyporchemes, and prosodia, but the hymns seem to have been composed with less refer-

ence to elaborate accompaniment or dance than most of the other classes, and to have been sung, as a rule, by a standing chorus to the accompaniment of the flute. Stesichorus gave great prominence to the mythical element in his hymns. In fact, the hymns must have been really epic in their narrative quality, though intended to be sung, and therefore lyric in their manner of composition. The titles of twelve hymns are preserved: the *Games in Honor of Pelias*, the *Geryoneïs*, *Cerberus*, *Cycnus*, *Scylla*, the *Europeia*, *Eriphyla*, the *Hunting of the Boar*, the *Destruction of Ilium*, *Helen*, with the *Palinode*, the *Returns*, and the *Oresteia*. In these hymns it is evident that mythical tales were told. The games at the funeral of Pelias were famous, even before Stesichorus made them more glorious by his poetry, the contests of Heracles with Geryon, Cerberus, and Cycnus, the love of Zeus for Europa, the necklace of Eriphyla, the hunt of the Calydonian boar, the destruction of Troy, the fate of Helen, the return of the heroes from Troy to their homes, and the vengeance inflicted by Orestes upon the murderers of Agamemnon, were all well known. The story of Scylla may have been less familiar, but it was not an invention of Stesichorus. When the ancients called him the most Homeric of poets, it was in part because he treated stories told in the Homeric epics. But his treatment of these themes was new, and seems to have appealed, in some instances at least, to the Sicilian and Italian Greeks, by making those parts of the ancient legends which referred to Sicily and Italy especially prominent. So Stesichorus is the first poet who is known to have told of the coming of Æneas to Italy, there-

The poems of
Stesichorus.

by paving the way for Virgil's treatment of the same story in the *Æneid*. Other myths, too, he told in a new way, and his versions were often used by later poets, especially by the dramatists, as the foundations of their works. The hymns of Stesichorus must have been pretty long, for the *Oresteia* alone formed two of the twenty-six books of his poems. Probably the titles preserved to us represent a large part of his entire work.

In his treatment of the myths, Stesichorus did not keep himself completely in the background, as an epic poet would have done, but allowed his own personality to express itself. The story is told that in his *Helen* he criticized the conduct of his heroine, and in punishment for this was stricken with blindness. Thereupon he wrote the *Palinode*, retracting his insulting language, and saying: "Not true is this tale. You did not go in the well-oared ships, nor did you come to the walls of Troy." The extant fragments of Stesichorus number less than one hundred, and the longest of these, from the *Geryoneis*, consists of only six lines:

Helius, son of Hyperion, embarked in the golden vessel, that he might cross the ocean and come to the abysses of dark night, to his mother and his virgin-wedded wife and his dear children; and with his feet the child of Zeus trod the grove shaded with laurels.

This fragment seems to refer to a belief similar to that of the Egyptians, who made the sun sail in a boat through the dark from his setting to his rising. But the few fragments give us little idea of the importance of Stesichorus. His glory was great through all antiquity. His name was placed beside that of Homer. Parts of his poems were sung at banquets, though originally intended for more serious occasions. The myths as told by him inspired dramatists and painters. But his influence upon choral poetry was especially great, for he taught the poets to clothe the ancient legends in lyric forms for elaborate choral production, and by his innovations in metres and

music, especially by his constant use of the triad, he made choral poetry a fitting means of expression for the genius of Simonides and Pindar.

Ibycus, the son of Phytius, was born at Rhegium, in Magna Græcia. It is said that his fellow citizens offered him the "tyranny" of the city, but that he refused, and went away to escape their importunities. He was one of the favorite poets at the court of Polycrates of Samos, where he was an associate of Anacreon. If the statement

Ibycus. of Suidas, that Ibycus was called to Samos by the father of Polycrates about 560 B. C., is correct, he must have been a much older man than Anacreon. He appears to have lived to old age, but as the date of his death is unknown, that of his birth can not be fixed with any accuracy. He was probably born not many years after the beginning of the sixth century. The story went that he was murdered by robbers, and that in his last moments, seeing a flock of cranes flying over him, he exclaimed, "These cranes will avenge me." Shortly after, the murderers were seated in the theatre, and one of them saw a flock of cranes passing. Turning to his companion, he said: "See, the avengers of Ibycus." The remark was overheard, the murderers were convicted and punished, and thus the "cranes of Ibycus" became a proverbial expression for the power of the gods in revealing crime.

Of the poems of Ibycus, which formed seven books, little is known. He wrote hymns in the manner of Stesichorus and on similar themes, but his favorite myths seem to have been those which dealt with love, as, for instance, the story of Zeus and Ganymede, or of Eos and Tithonus. He is spoken of as a poet of love, and has therefore been supposed to have written short love-songs, like those of Sappho or Anacreon, but without sufficient reason. His love poems were in all probability choral poems, and if he was at all influenced by Anacreon, it was only in his choice of subjects, not in his manner of treating them. His

choral poems were in some cases addressed to living persons, and are thus the first real *encomia* known. Of his style little can now be said, as the fragments of his works are few (about thirty, besides about the same number of bare references), and the longest consist of only a few lines. From the remarks of ancient writers we learn that his writing was graceful and passionate, sweet and vigorous. His metres and dialect are modeled after those of Stesichorus, though his dialect is less purely Doric, perhaps because his native Rhegium was settled in part by Æolians, perhaps because at Samos he came under the influence of the Lesbian school of poetry. The two longest fragments confirm the judgment of the ancients about the character of his poems :

The poems
of Ibycus.

In the spring the Cydonian apple-trees, watered by the river streams in the fresh garden of maidens, and the buds swelling under the shadowing vine leaves grow green; yet my love never lies down to rest, but like a north wind blazing with the lightning, leaping away from Cypris with flaming madness, stern and bold he shakes my heart from the bottom.¹

Eros once more from under his dark lashes casting a tender glance, draws me by all sorts of enticements into the inextricable snares of Cypris; truly I tremble at his approach, as a horse, formerly victor in the chariot-race, in his old age enters against his will into the contest of swift chariots.

¹ The text is doubtful at the end. I have adopted the reading given by H. W. Smyth in his *Melic Poets*.

CHAPTER X

CHORAL LYRIC POETRY (*Continued*)

Simonides of Ceos, 556–478 B. C.—Bacchylides, about 505–430 (?) B. C.

THE progress of choral poetry may be divided into three periods: The first, with Thaletas, Alcman, and Arion, is the period of the originators; the second, in which Stesichorus is the commanding figure, is the period of great technical advance; the third, with Simonides, Bacchylides, and, above all, Pindar, is the period of perfection.

Simonides was born at Iulis, on the little Ionian island of Ceos, off the coast of Attica, about 556 B. C. His father's name was Leoprepes. These facts are known from an epigram which he wrote in 476 B. C., in which he says he is eighty years old. He began to write poetry at an early age, and when about thirty years old was called to Athens by Hipparchus, where he met Lasus of Hermione and Anacreon. After the death of Hipparchus he went to Thessaly, first to Crannon and Pharsalus, the seats of the family of the Scopadæ, then to Larissa, the home of the Aleuadæ. He seems to have lived some time with the Scopadæ, for several of his poems are dedicated to them. In one of these poems he devoted much space to the praise of the Dioscuri, Castor and Polydeuces (Pollux), and when he asked for payment from the Scopadæ, they refused it, telling him to apply to the Dioscuri. Shortly after this the family of the Scopadæ was almost annihilated by the falling of the theatre in which they were seated, but Simonides was miraculously saved, and the credit of the Dioscuri as divine helpers was established.

When the Persians invaded Greece in 490 B. C., Simonides left Thessaly and went to Athens, where he composed an elegy in honor of those who fell at Marathon, his elegy winning the prize against one composed by Æschylus. At the time of the second invasion he was the friend of the leaders of the Greeks, and wrote choral poems, elegies, and epigrams in honor of the heroes of Thermopylæ and Artemisium. In 476 he was still at Athens, and at the age of eighty years won the victory in a dithyrambic contest. It was apparently after this that he went to Sicily and Italy, where he lived at the courts of Hiero of Syracuse, Theron of Acragas, Anaxilas of Rhegium, and other rulers. At Syracuse, Hiero had a brilliant court which was visited by distinguished poets, among them Simonides's nephew, Bacchylides, and Pindar. Apparently there were at Syracuse, or elsewhere, some disagreements between Pindar and Simonides and his nephew, to which some passages in Pindar's poems are supposed to refer, but how serious the troubles were can not now be determined. Simonides died at the age of eighty-nine years, probably at Syracuse, where his tomb existed.

The poems of Simonides were numerous and of various kinds—epigrams, elegies, dithyrambs, pæans, and *encomia*, with the two subdivisions of *encomia*, *epinicia*, or odes in honor of victories in the games, and *threnoi*, or mourning songs in honor of the dead. Simonides was regarded as the master of epigram, but of the eighty epigrams preserved under his name many are certainly, and many others probably, not really his. The best known is perhaps this, in honor of the Spartans who fell at Thermopylæ:

Go tell the Spartans, thou that passest by,
That here obedient to their laws we lie.¹

¹ Translated by William Lisle Bowles. Cicero, *Tusc. Disp.*, i, 101, renders the lines:

Dic, hospes, Spartæ, nos te hic vidisse iacentes,
Dum sanctis patriæ legibus obsequimur.

The epitaph of the soothsayer Megistias is also well known: "This is the tomb of the renowned Megistias, whom once the Persians slew when they had crossed the river Spercheius, a prophet, who, knowing then well the approaching fate, had not the heart to desert the leaders of Sparta." Of his other elegiac poems there are few remnants. One of these is an amplification of the Homeric line, "As is the race of leaves, such is the race of men." Of the dithyrambs of Simonides, two titles, *Memnon* and *Europa*, are all that we know. These show that he did not limit himself in this kind of poetry to the myths of Dionysus. His pæans are almost unknown. Of his hyporchemes we have only a few verses. His hymns, too, have been almost entirely lost, but we can still see that they contained mythical narrative, as did those of Stesichorus, though there is no reason to suppose that they were as long or so nearly epic in character as those of his great predecessor.

Of all the poems of Simonides, the most important, the most original, and the most celebrated were the *encomia*, including the *epinicia* and the *threnoi*, and fortunately these are the poems of which the most extensive fragments remain. Some of the hymns of Ibycus were essentially *encomia*, but Simonides brought this kind of poetry to its complete development. He it was who employed the myth to add to the brilliancy of his praise of men, associating the princes to whom his poems were dedicated with the heroes of old or even with the gods. Too little of his poems remains to show how his myths were selected or how they were treated; but much of what is most admirable in the poems of Pindar and Bacchylides is undoubtedly due to the example of Simonides. The *encomia* were written in honor of wealthy princes, and Simonides is said to be the first poet who obtained regular payment for his odes, thus putting the poet and musician on an equal footing with the painter and the sculptor. He has been charged with love of money and

even with venality, but in reality his predecessors, such as Anacreon, had received gifts from the rulers with whom they lived, and the difference between accepting gifts and receiving payment is a difference in little more than name.

The poetry of Simonides shows him to have been a man of varied talents. It is elegant, graceful, occasionally powerful, but more often touching, sweet, and pathetic. His dialect is Doric, with some Ionic and Æolic forms, due perhaps to his Ionic birth and his sojourn in Thessaly. His metres are various and skilfully employed. His strophes appear to have been shorter than those of Pindar, though longer than those of the earlier poets. In the divisions of his poems he used the triad of Alcman and Stesichorus. In intellect and character Simonides was well balanced and reasonable rather than enthusiastic and exalted. So he says :

It is hard to become a truly good man, square¹ in hands and feet and mind. Whoever is bad but not too reckless, so long as he is acquainted with justice that helps the city, is a sound man, and I shall not find fault with him; for the race of fools is endless. All things are excellent in which there is no taint of baseness. And the saying of Pittacus is not right in my eyes, though spoken by a wise man. He said, "It is hard to be noble." Only a god could compass this; for a man it is impossible not to be bad, whom resistless disaster drags down. For in prosperity every man is good, and bad in adversity. And best are those whom the gods love. Therefore I shall never set my life's happiness upon a vain empty hope, seeking for what can never be, a perfect man, of us who eat the fruit of the wide earth; and when I find one I will let you know. But I praise and approve all who do nothing base willingly; but against necessity not even the gods contend.

Something of the sweet pathos of his poetry is seen in the fragment descriptive of Danaë and the infant Perseus afloat in the chest on the sea :

¹ In the Pythagorean school the square was regarded as the perfect figure.

When in the well-carved chest she lay and the wind that blew and the troubled sea bore her along, then fear crept over her wet cheeks, and round Perseus she threw her loving arm and said: "O child, what woe is mine! But thou slumberest; in calm forgetfulness thou sleepest in the cheerless, bronze-nailed bark, wrapped in the starless night and darkling shade; and thou heedest not the thick brine of the wave that passes by above thy head, nor the roar of the wind, as thou liest in thy purple cloak, my fair-faced child! But if this terror were terrible to thee, thou wouldst turn thy tiny ear to my words. But I say, 'Sleep, child, let the sea sleep, and let our measureless woe sleep; and may some change appear, O Father Zeus, from thee! But if I pray a prayer bold beyond right, be merciful to me!'"

This passage can hardly be surpassed in its kind, and is in itself sufficient to show that the admiration of the ancients for Simonides was fully justified.

Bacchylides, the nephew and imitator of Simonides, was born on the island of Ceos, probably between 510 and 500 B. C. His father's name was Medon, and his

Bacchylides. grandfather, named Bacchylides, was an athlete. The details of his life are not well known. Plutarch says he was banished from Ceos, and went to live in the Peloponnesus. But he sent Hiero an ode from Ceos in 476 B. C., which seems to show that his banishment came late in life or was of brief duration. He probably visited the court of Hiero at Syracuse, where he may have been thrown together with his uncle Simonides and Pindar. But his three odes to Hiero were written in 476, 470, and 468 B. C. The first of these was written at Ceos, the others apparently at Delphi and Olympia, not at Syracuse. The date of his visit or his visits to Sicily can, therefore, not be determined. He may have lived until 430, but the date of his death is unknown.

The poems of Bacchylides were lost for centuries, with the exception of some inconsiderable fragments, until a papyrus containing twenty poems more or less mutilated, besides a number of fragments, was found in Egypt and brought to London, where it was published in 1897. The

original papyrus is in the British Museum. Some of the poems are long and well preserved. Bacchylides wrote hymns, dithyrambs, pæans, hyporchemes, parthenia, epinicia, love-songs, drinking-songs, and epigrams.

The poems of Bacchylides.

Of the twenty poems preserved, the first fourteen are epinicia; the others are probably all dithyrambs. Nine of the epinician odes are too short to be very instructive, because the manuscript of some of them is mutilated, while others were never more than a congratulatory greeting to the victor. But the five others have one hundred to two hundred lines each, and show clearly the construction of poems of this class. The beginning is concerned with the circumstances of the victory; then follows a myth, occupying the middle of the poem and forming by far the longest part of it, and at the end are moral reflections. The same arrangement is found in Pindar's epinicia, and may therefore be regarded as the regular one in poems of this character. Its invention may be due to Simonides, though it may be of earlier origin. Bacchylides employs the triad of strophe, antistrophe, and epode adopted by Stesichorus, and uses it so freely that he does not care to make the end of a strophe coincide with a break in the thought or even with the end of a sentence, but arranges the metrical parts of the poems with little or no attention to the natural divisions in the meaning. He uses much the same metres and dialect as Simonides, and, like Simonides, he aims at elegance and clearness, grace and charm, rather than at power and magnificence. This is true in the epinician odes, but even more evident in the other poems.

The six poems not composed in honor of victories are especially interesting because they are the only choral lyrics not epinician which have come down to us entire or

The non-epinician poems.

nearly entire. Their titles and subjects are as follows:

1. *The Sons of Antenor; The Demand for the Restitution of Helen.*—The sons of Antenor accompany

Menelaus to Troy, where they demand before the assembled Trojans that Helen be given back.

2. The title is wanting and the first part of the poem is mutilated. The poet, after an invocation to the Pythian Apollo, tells how Heracles, during a sacrifice to Zeus, receives from Deianeira the tunic poisoned with the blood of the centaur Nessus. The title may have been *Heracles*.

3. *Theseus and the Youths*.—Theseus arrives before Minos with the seven youths and seven maidens whom the Athenians sent to the Minotaur. Minos wishes to seize a maiden, Eriboea, but Theseus forbids, saying that though Minos is the son of Zeus, he is himself the son of Poseidon. Minos prays that Zeus acknowledge him as his son by sending a clap of thunder, and after this prayer has been granted throws his ring into the water, telling Theseus to prove his divine parentage by bringing it back. Theseus plunges into the water and returns with gifts which he brings from the home of Poseidon beneath the waves. The young Athenians sing a pæan.

4. *Theseus*.—A lyric dialogue between Ægeus and the chorus (or perhaps Medea), in four strophes arranged as questions and answers, in substance as follows:

Chorus. O king, why does the trumpet sound? What is happening?

King. A herald has come from the isthmus telling of a wonderful hero who has slain the mighty Sinis, the man-slaying Crommyonian sow, and the overweening Sciron.

Chorus. What man is this? Does he come with an army or alone?

King. He is a youth, hardly more than a boy, and he comes with two companions.

5. *Io*.—A lyric account of the wanderings of Io, composed for an Athenian festival.

6. *Idas*.—A much mutilated fragment of a poem composed for a Spartan festival.

It is difficult to tell to what class these poems belong.

The ancients themselves were not always able to distinguish between pæans, dithyramb, and hyporchemes in the absence of the music or of tradition, and we can not expect to be wiser in such matters than they. The poems have, however, many points of similarity, and probably they are all dithyramb. Certainly the fourth, with its dialogue between the chorus and a singer, agrees with what we know of the dithyramb in its half-dramatic character.

Among the previously known fragments of Bacchylides, one of the longest, from a pæan, praises the advantages of peace, enumerating in pleasing and elegant verse the songs at the altars, the sacrifices, the games, revels, and songs of the young, and describing the arms rusting on the walls. Another fragment, from a drinking-song, tells of the happy dreams of the drinker, how he thinks he is a king, dreams that he dwells in marble halls, and sees his ships come from Egypt laden with wealth. In these, as in the newly found poems, Bacchylides shows himself a master of easy and graceful diction, a poet of charming fancy, a perfect artist in the use of language. There is nothing obscure or difficult in his manner of expression, no struggling to utter thoughts too deep or too new for ready utterance. Everything is polished, finished, and brilliant—so brilliant and finished that if there is any lack of strength one hardly notices it. We feel, to be sure, that power is not the chief element in the poetry of Bacchylides, but we do not feel that it is lacking. One of the chief charms of his diction is the brilliant use he makes of compound words. These are for the most part adjectives, such as “tirelessly-flowing,” “seadwelling,” “bronze-walled,” and the like, though other compounds are of frequent occurrence. Many of these compounds occur nowhere in all Greek literature except in the poems of Bacchylides, and his free use of new words of this kind shows how great was the liberty accorded to a Greek poet even as late as the fifth century B. C. Pindar also uses

**Style of
Bacchylides.**

many new words, and it may be that Bacchylides merely adopted a fashion established by Pindar or perhaps by Simonides; but even in that case there is much originality and beauty in the compounds used by Bacchylides, and they add greatly to the charm of his poetry, making his descriptions more brilliantly clear, and his narrative more rapid, without any appearance of haste or lack of detail.

The longest of Bacchylides's epinicia (Ode V) celebrates the victory won at the Olympic games in 476 B. C. by Pherenicus, the horse of Hiero of Syracuse. It consists of five triads of strophe, antistrophe, and epode, two hundred lines in all. The poem begins with the praise of Hiero :

The fifth epinician ode. Fortunate ruler of Syracuse with its circling horses, thou wilt know, if any one of living mortals, the sweet-gifted glory of the violet-crowned Muses rightly. Rest thy righteously-judging mind from cares, and look hither with thy thought where thy guest-friend, the famous servant of gold-circleted Urania, with the deep-girdled Graces has woven a song and sends it from a sacred isle to your glorious city. Now he wishes, pouring a song from his breast, to praise Hiero; but cutting the deep air on high with swift, tawny wings, the eagle, messenger of wide-ruling, loud-crashing Zeus, is bold, trusting in his mighty strength; while the shrill-voiced birds shrink in fear. The heights of the great earth hold him not, nor the terrible waves of the unwearied sea; he hovers in the boundless Chaos, with the zephyrs, of fine and delicate plumage, easily distinguished for men to see.

This is the first strophe and antistrophe. In the first epode the poet turns to the victories of Pherenicus, but ends the second strophe with the words :

Blessed he to whom God grants a share of blessings and to live a life of plenty with enviable fortune; for no one of mortals is happy in all things.

This serves as an introduction to the myth; for the antistrophe begins :

They say that once the gate-o'erturning invincible son of Zeus of the bright lightning descended to the realms of slender-ankled Per-

sophone to bring to the light from Hades the sharp-toothed dog, son of unapproachable Echidna.

Then follows the story of a meeting between Heracles and Meleager in the lower world, a story not elsewhere told in Greek literature. Meleager tells Heracles the tale of the Calydonian boar and his own death. Suddenly, with the beginning of the fifth antistrophe, the poet breaks off:

White-armed Calliope, stop the well-made chariot here, sing of Zeus the son of Cronus, the Olympian leader of the gods, and Alpheus, unwearied in his flowing, and the might of Pelops, and Pisa, where the famous Phereclus, winning with his feet the victory in the race, gave glory to fair-towered Syracuse, bringing to Hiero the wreath of happiness.

The poem ends with praise of truth, a reference to Hesiod, and good wishes for Hiero.

This poem gives a good idea of the style of Bacchylides, the slight connection between the myth and the occasion of the poem in odes of this character, and also of the general arrangement of epinician odes. In the odes of Pindar the myth is sometimes more obviously connected with the subject of the poem than is the case in this instance, but not always. Pindar's transitions are occasionally even more abrupt than here. We may therefore assume that such sudden changes of subject were not only not considered strange, but were a regular part of the composition of such odes.

Bacchylides remained a much-read poet throughout the classical period, and was greatly admired in Alexandrian times. Now that we have recovered so large a part of his works (though a much larger part is probably lost), we can understand the admiration felt in antiquity for his sparkling, brilliant, and beautiful verse, his picturesque language, his imagination, and his technical perfection. In power of mind and originality of thought Bacchylides is, however, inferior to Pindar.

CHAPTER XI

CHORAL LYRIC POETRY—PINDAR

Pindar, 521–441 B. C.—Lesser choral poets.

PINDAR, the son of Daiphantes and Cleodice, was born at Cynoscephalæ, a village near Thebes, in Bœotia. He belonged to the ancient and noble family of Pindar. the Ægidæ, and was naturally an aristocrat in his sympathies. How the Theban Ægidæ were related to the Ægidæ at Sparta is not known, but there was probably some connection, and it is therefore probable that the Bœotian Pindar had some Dorian blood in his veins. He was born, according to the best evidence, in the spring of 521 B. C., and was therefore older than Bacchylides. He turned to lyric poetry at an early age, under the instruction of the flute-player Scopelinus, and the poetesses Corinna and Myrto. He is also said to have been a pupil of Lasus of Hermione, and to have had some connection with Apollodorus and Simonides. Many stories were told about his early days—for instance, that as he was sleeping, bees came and settled on his lips.

The first certain fact in his literary career is the composition of his tenth Pythian ode in 501 B. C., when he was only twenty years of age. The Pythian games were among the most important games of Greece, and this ode is written for a member of the powerful Thessalian house of the Aleuadæ. It is evident, then, that Pindar attained great reputation at an early age, even though there may have been some special

connection with Delphi which led to the choice of him as poet of the games celebrated there. Several of the other early poems are in honor of Pythian victories.

Pindar was only thirty years old when the Persians first invaded Greece, and but a little over forty at the time of the battle of Salamis. The position of Thebes, the greatest Greek city which favored the Persians, was such as to deprive a Theban poet of the opportunity offered by the stirring times for patriotic songs. Pindar was at any rate not a man of action, not a politician, but his convictions may well have been on the side of his native town, and the story that he encouraged his fellow citizens in their course is probably true. Later, when the Persians had been driven back, largely through the energy and self-sacrifice of Athens, Pindar recognized and praised Athenian greatness, though the story that he was fined by the Thebans for so doing is doubtless an invention, and Pindar, like other poets after the Persian wars, speaks with patriotic pride of Plataea and Salamis.

In the years following the retreat of the Persians, Pindar was at the height of his fame, composing odes for the great princes of all parts of the Greek world: Hiero of Syracuse, Theron of Acragas, Arcesilas of Cyrene, Chromius of Acragas, and others. His presence in person was not necessary for the public performance of his poems, and the fact that he composed an ode for a ruler of Cyrene or Syracuse does not show that he traveled to those places. But that he did travel is certain, and he probably made many voyages, including a journey to the court of Hiero at Syracuse, apparently after 476 B. C. He had been invited to Syracuse by Hiero before, but had refused, giving as his reason, "I wish to live for myself, not for others"; but in the end he yielded, and may have spent some years in Sicily, or he may have made the voyage several times. It is not so certain that he vis-

Pindar's
political
views.

Pindar's
travels.

ited Arcesilas at Cyrene, though he may have done so, and he may also have visited a Macedonian king, Alexander I, son of Amyntas. This Alexander I was an ancestor of Alexander the Great, who spared Pindar's house in the destruction of Thebes, on account of the relations between his ancestor and the poet.

The latest poem of Pindar which can be accurately dated is the eighth Pythian ode, written for an Eginetan in 449 B. C. He died at the age of eighty years—that is, in 441—at Argos. Pindar was married, but of his family life nothing is known. His son, Daïphantes, was at one time chosen to be *daphnephorus*, “laurel-bearer,” at a festival of Apollo at Thebes, and Pindar composed a hymn to be sung by a choir of girls in the procession.

Pindar was a famous poet during his life, being employed by the wealthy and powerful men of all parts of the Greek world. His only real rivals were Simonides and Bacchylides, who were also, as we have seen, employed by numerous and widely scattered patrons. Almost immediately after his death Pindar seems to be quoted as a classic author, and yet he was never a thoroughly popular poet, however much his poetry was admired by the rich, the cultured, and the learned. His poems were very

Pindar's
poems.

numerous, and were divided into seventeen books: Hymns (1), pæans (1), dithyramb (2), prosodia (2), parthenia (3), hyporchemes (2), encomia (1), threnoi (1), epinicia (4). Some scolia of his are quoted, which may perhaps have been included among the encomia. Of all this poetry about a quarter remains: the four books of epinicia, divided, according to the place where the victory celebrated in each was won, into Olympian, Pythian, Nemean, and Isthmian odes, and about three hundred fragments, some of which are of considerable length—in fact, one or two of the so-called fragments may be complete short poems.

The epinicia were the most popular of the poems of

Pindar in antiquity, and it is fortunate that these are preserved. Their relative popularity is probably due, however, to the popular interest in the games rather than to anything in the character of the poems themselves, for Pindar is aristocratic in his sympathies, praising rich and noble patrons; he seems to prefer obscure myths rather than those which the people knew and loved, his language is high-sounding and magnificent rather than simple and direct, his changes of subject are so abrupt that the hearer is likely to lose the connection of thought (if any really exists), and his religious sentiments are often such as would appeal neither to the superstitious common people nor to the enlightened pupils of the philosophers who were at that time beginning to influence the more progressive minds.

The public games were among the most important institutions of Greece. Almost every city had at least one festival at which musical or athletic contests were held in honor of some god, and many of these festivals were elaborate and brilliant. But the most important were the Olympic, Pythian, Nemean, and Isthmian games, celebrated at Olympia, Delphi, Nemea, and Corinth. Any one who could prove his claim to be called a Greek was permitted to take part in these contests, and contestants came from all parts of the Greek world. Powerful rulers, like Hiero of Syracuse, or wealthy individuals, like Megacles of Athens, sent their horses and chariots; Milo the wrestler came from Croton in Italy, and far-off Cyrene was represented by the chariot of Arcesilas. Each contestant appeared as the representative of his city, and local patriotism demanded that each representative be equipped and supported with all the splendor the city could afford. From the various cities came, besides the contestants, accredited committees to take part in the sacred rites and to join in the worship of Zeus, Apollo, or Poseidon, and the brilliancy of the occasion drew to the spot thousands of spectators from far and near.

The presence of the multitude attracted a great concourse of those who had anything to show or to sell. Merchants exposed their wares, historians read their manuscripts, philosophers set forth their doctrines, dancers exhibited their grace, poets and musicians, even when they did not take part in the musical contests, found ample opportunity to display their talents before a sufficient audience. These great gatherings were the most spectacular events with which the Greeks were acquainted, and at the same time they were religious festivals hallowed by associations and traditions reaching back into the distant haze of the mythical childhood of the Greek race. It is no wonder, then, that the victor in the games at Olympia or Delphi was received by a deputation of his fellow citizens when he reached his native town, or that a breach in the walls was made that he might enter the city by a way befitting his newly won greatness. It is true that in Pindar's time the philosophers were beginning to protest against the undue honors paid to victorious athletes or horse owners, but their words were lost among the plaudits of the people. The great games were the greatest and most glorious festivals of Greece, and it was right that their victors should be praised by the greatest masters of music and verse. The popular love of the games and admiration for the victors account in great part for the comparative popularity of the epinician odes, and the religious character and national importance of the games account for the serious, dignified, and lofty character of the poems. These qualities belong to the epinician odes of Bacchylides also, but they are less prominent there than in the poems of Pindar. The style of Bacchylides is smoother, and his language clearer, his new words are simpler in composition and meaning, his thought less weighty and less difficult of expression, but serious dignity is no less a quality of his epinician odes than of Pindar's. The occasion demanded seriousness, and an undignified epini-

cian ode would be as improper as one which should not make mention of the festival or the victor. The shorter odes were in some instances performed immediately after the victory; the longer and more elaborate were intended for performance after the victor reached his own city.

The personal character of Pindar does not appear very clearly in his poems, but some traits are visible. He was a religious man, with a religion rather of good works and outward observance than of faith, though his good taste would have kept him from any disrespectful remarks about the gods even if he had had no religious reverence for them. In politics he was aristocratic and conservative, but his political utterances are perhaps somewhat affected by the fact that his patrons were for the most part aristocrats, either nobles of oligarchical cities or "tyrants." He was apparently impatient of all rivalry, whether his rivals were Simonides and Bacchylides, whom he compared to two screaming ravens, or the philosophers whose teachings were beginning to compete with the utterances of the poets for public attention. He was not, in one sense, a patriotic poet, in so far as he did not try to fire the courage of the Greeks against the foreign invader; but he was proud to refer to the great deeds of those who drove back the Persian hosts, and the persistence with which he pleads for right and justice in his poems should serve to protect him from the charge of lack of patriotism.

In his epinician odes Pindar "usually starts from the mythical splendors of the victor's family or city, selects such points in their history as have some practical bearing upon the present circumstances of his hearers, and insists upon the importance of inborn qualities and high traditions. Such a line of argument was, of course, peculiarly meant for aristocrats. He then passes to the victor's family, enumerates any prizes gained by his relations, and ends with some sort of sum-

Pindar's
character.

Pindar's
poems.

mary or moral reflection.”¹ This plan is, however, greatly varied, and sometimes almost lost sight of. There is no great difference between the poems written for the different festivals, although the Olympic odes are, on the whole, somewhat the most magnificent, as the festival at Olympia was more magnificent than any other, and the Pythian odes are more learned, perhaps because Pindar had some personal connection with the Delphic priesthood, and knew more of the myths and early history of the place. Pindar’s dialect is much the same as that of Simonides and Bacchylides, the modified Doric, which had become the regular dialect of choral poetry, nor do his metres differ essentially from those of his contemporaries, except that in metre, as in language, Pindar is more difficult and complicated than Bacchylides.

The first Olympic ode is dedicated to Hiero, and celebrates the same victory (in 476 B. C.) by Pherenicus in honor of which Bacchylides composed his fifth epinician. Pindar begins :²

Best is Water of all, and Gold as a flaming fire in the night
shineth eminent amid lordly wealth; but if of prizes in the games
thou art fain, O my soul, to tell, then, as for no
The first bright star more quickening than the sun must thou
Olympic. search in the void firmament by day, so neither shall
we find any games greater than the Olympic whereof to utter our
voice: for hence cometh the glorious hymn and entereth into the
minds of the skilled in song, so that they celebrate the son of Cronus,
when to the rich and happy hearth of Hiero they are come; for he
wieldeth the sceptre of justice in Sicily of many flocks, culling the
choice fruits of all kinds of excellence: and with the flower of music
is he made splendid, even such strains as we sing blithely at the
table of a friend.

Then the poet mentions the victory of Pherenicus, won at Pisan Olympia, where Pelops raced with CEnomaüs for

¹ Mahaffy, *Greek Classical Literature*, I, i, p. 244.

² Translation by Ernest Myers.

the possession of Hippodamia, and goes on to tell the story of Pelops, who was buried at Olympia, and now "from afar off he beholdeth the glory of the Olympian games." The poem ends with a prayer for the happiness of Hiero, and the hope that the poet may celebrate other victories for him. The closing words are :

Of many kinds is the greatness of men; but the highest is to be achieved by kings. Look not thou for more than this. May it be thine to walk loftily all thy life, and mine to be the friend of winners in the games, winning honor for my art among Hellenes everywhere.

This poem may be taken as a fair example of Pindar's composition. Other poems give perhaps better examples of some of the details of his style. So, at the beginning of the first Pythian ode, the lines on the power of music, more especially the description of the eagle of Zeus, are of great beauty :

O golden lyre, thou common treasure of Apollo and the Muses violet-tressed, thou whom the dancer's step, prelude of festal mirth, obeyeth and the singers heed thy bidding, what time with quivering strings thou utterest preamble of choir-leading overture—lo, even the sworded lightning or immortal fire thou quenchest, and on the sceptre of Zeus his eagle sleepeth, slackening his swift wings either side, the king of birds, for a dark mist thou hast distilled on his arched head, a gentle seal upon his eyes, and he in slumber heaveth his supple back, spell-bound beneath thy throbs.¹

This eagle is as beautiful in its own way as the eagle of the fifth ode of Bacchylides. Elsewhere² Pindar compares himself to the eagle, saying, "His art is true who of his nature hath knowledge; they who have but learnt, strong in the multitude of words, are but as crows that chatter vain things in strife against the divine bird of Zeus." We are told by the scholiast that Simonides and Bacchylides are meant

¹ Translation by Ernest Myers.

² *Olymp.*, ii, 86 ff. Translation by Ernest Myers.

by the chattering crows, and certainly their poems, when compared with those of Pindar, do seem less original and more the product of training. So little remains of the work of Simonides, however, that we can not tell how much Pindar owes to him, and in some instances it seems that Bacchylides, though younger, is imitated by Pindar. Probably each poet made use of any invention of the other which pleased him, but of the three, Pindar had the most original mind.

The quality most admired in Pindar's poetry is its magnificence. His words are weighty and dignified, even to the extent of obscurity, being full of meaning which is not always clear on account of the newness of the compounds employed. His imagery is unusual, his description shows keen observation, and his power of concise expression and

hidden allusion is as remarkable as is the ability shown by Bacchylides in detailed and pleasing enumeration. Pindar is harder than Bacchylides to read. He may be compared with Browning, while the ease and smoothness of Bacchylides remind one of Tennyson; but in making such a comparison we must remember that the poems of Pindar are as carefully elaborated in metre and arrangement as those of Bacchylides. There is nothing in them which even remotely resembles careless writing. Pindar abounds in new words and new constructions, and is often quoted by grammarians on that account. Perhaps, too, his interesting grammatical qualities may have something to do with the preservation of so large a part of his works. But for us he is of the greatest interest as showing the height to which Greek choral poetry attained, its magnificent and brilliant power, its elaborate technical finish, its moral and ethical quality, and its beauty of thought and expression.

The period of Simonides, Pindar, and Bacchylides is the greatest period of Greek lyric poetry. Contemporary with these three were many others, some of whom are known to us by name, and even by some fragments.

Lasus of Hermione flourished in the second part of the sixth century. He was one of the poets invited to Athens by Hipparchus, and is said to have been one of Pindar's teachers. His hymn to Demeter was celebrated, and he composed various kinds of choral poems. But his fame rested chiefly on his dithyrambs. He seems to have introduced the dithyrambic contest at Athens, and he made important improvements in the dithyramb itself.

Lasus of
Hermione.

Timocreon of Rhodes was a poet of much vigor, if we may judge from the few fragments left us. He is known chiefly on account of his hatred for Themistocles, a fact which fixes his date early in the fifth century B. C.¹ His scolia were his best-known poems.

Timocreon of
Rhodes.

Tynnichus of Chalcis, author of a pæan highly praised by Plato; Lamprocles of Athens, an author of dithyrambs and of a hymn to Athena; Apollodorus and Agathocles, said to have been teachers of Pindar; and Cydias, a composer of songs of love, belong to this period, but are little or nothing more than names to us.

Tynnichus,
Lamprocles,
Apollodorus,
Agathocles,
Cydias.

The four poetesses, Corinna and Myrtis of Bœotia, Tellesilla of Argos, and Praxilla of Sicyon, are also of this period. The most famous was Corinna, born at Thebes or, as some said, at Tanagra. She was older than Pindar, and is said to have contended successfully with him for prizes in poetry. In his youth Pindar is said to have composed a hymn in which there was no myth. Corinna criticized him sharply, and the young poet's next hymn contained too much myth, whereupon Corinna told him to "sow by the handful, not with the whole sack." Of her poems we know little, but they seem to have enjoyed considerable reputation. Her dialect is said to have

Corinna.

¹ See Plutarch, *Themistocles*, chap. xxi.

been Bœotian, and this is confirmed by the few extant fragments. To what classes of poems her works belonged can not now be determined. It is evident, however, that she liked to tell the legends of Bœotia.

Myrto, or Myrtis, of Anthedon, is said to have contended unsuccessfully with Pindar. Corinna, in one of the fragments, says: "I blame the sweet singer Myrtis, that being a woman she once entered into strife with Pindar."

Telesilla of Argos is cited for mythical narratives contained in her poems. She is better known for her courage and patriotism displayed in a war between Argos and Sparta (494 B. C.).

Praxilla of Sicyon composed heroic dithyrambs, the titles of two of which, *Achilles* and *Adonis*, are preserved.

She also composed songs to be sung at banquets. Only five fragments of her poems are preserved, and these amount to but nine lines in all.

Choral poems are ascribed to a few other poets, but little is known of them.

CHAPTER XII

RELIGIOUS, ORACULAR, AND MYSTIC POETRY

The Delphic oracle—The sibyls—Bacis—Epimenides, about 600 B. C.—Mysteries—Orphic poems—Onomacritus, about 515 B. C.—Musæus—Abaris and Aristeas, sixth century B. C.

THE poetry so far discussed, lyric as well as epic, has something of a religious character in so far as the narrative is usually derived from the myths of the gods and heroes, while the poems themselves are, in many cases at least, composed for public festivals in honor of the gods. But alongside of this poetry were other expressions of religious thought and feeling, less important from a literary point of view, but interesting in themselves and not without influence upon literature. These are the oracles, the mysteries, the Orphic writings, and other mystic and prophetic verses.

The oracle at Dodona was one of the most famous, but none of its recorded utterances possesses any literary importance. Two, in hexameter verse, are attributed to early times, but are probably spurious. The oracle at Delphi was not so old as that at Dodona, which is mentioned in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*; at any rate, its importance dates from a later time; but for centuries it was the greatest oracle of the Greek world, the source from which information about the future was sought by Greeks from Asia, Sicily, and Africa, as well as by kings of half-barbarian lands, such as Cræsus of Lydia. The Delphic oracle had replies for all questions,

The Delphic
oracle.

whether a king or people consulted the god about the outcome of a war, or a private person wished to know what course of conduct would be most advantageous in his business or family affairs. Its utterances were therefore of very unequal worth, some being carefully considered expressions on matters of state, others merely ambiguous jingles which could be interpreted after the event in accordance with circumstances. Most of these utterances were in hexameter or iambic verse, but as the use of prose in literature increased, the oracle also expressed itself in prose. If we had a complete collection of the responses of the Delphic oracle we could gain from them much information about the thoughts and interests of the Greeks, but the few extant specimens serve only to show the general conservative and timid policy of the oracle, and have little literary or other interest.

Another kind of prophecy, not connected, as was that of the oracles, with temples, was that of the sibyls. The oldest sibyl known to tradition was called **The sibyls.** Herophile, and was said to be the daughter of Zeus and one of the daughters of Poseidon. A second sibyl of the same name was supposed to have lived before the Trojan War, and some of her prophecies relating to the events of that war were current. Her birthplace was said to be Mount Ida, in the Troad, and she was supposed to be the daughter of an Idæan nymph and a mortal. She was called "the Erythræan sibyl" on account of the red earth (the Greek word *erythros* means *red*) of Marpessus, where she spent most of her life and died. She was said to have traveled in various regions, to have visited Claros, Colophon, Delos, and Delphi. The sibylline oracles spread among the Greek colonies, and the number of sibyls increased with the increase in the number of the prophecies. There was a Libyan sibyl, a Cumæan sibyl, of Cumæ in Italy, and several others. These personages are entirely mythical, but oracles ascribed to them were current in the

fifth century B. C. and later. The earliest probably belong to the sixth century B. C. The story of the sibylline books at Rome, which were supposed to be the work of the Cumæan sibyl, is familiar enough. At a later time the Jews of Alexandria published under the name of *Sibylline Oracles* a sort of metrical history of the world, which is chiefly interesting as showing how much the Alexandrian Jews of the first centuries after Christ were influenced by classical forms of expression. The sibylline oracles of the sixth and fifth centuries before Christ have disappeared utterly.

Another class of prophets were the chresmologists or givers of oracles not connected with temples. The most

famous mythical members of this class are
Bacis. Musæus (see page 8) and Bacis. The latter was said to be a native of Bœotia, Arcadia, or Attica, and several of his prophecies relating to the Persian War are reported by Herodotus. They seem, however, to have been composed after the events to which they refer. In style they resemble the elegiac verses of the sixth or early fifth century. Several other chresmologists are known by name, and some, at least, of these are historical personages. One

of the most important was Epimenides, of
Epimenides. Cnossus in Crete, who was called to Athens by Solon to purify the city after the murder of Cylon (page 68). Several works were ascribed to him—a collection of oracles, a theogony, a treatise on sacrifices, a collection of purificatory songs or formulæ, and even some prose works, including a treatise on the Cretan constitution. Most of these works are certainly spurious, but the theogony, with its account of the birth of the world from an egg, may have been genuine, and there is no reason to doubt that Epimenides was the author of purificatory songs and of oracles, although those which went under his name in the fifth century and later may have been spurious.

The purificatory songs of Epimenides are a symptom of a kind of religious feeling which was no longer satisfied by

the ordinary mythology. Mankind desires to believe in a righteous government of the universe, but in the stories of Greek mythology the gods reward or punish their personal friends or enemies rather than those who really deserve reward or punishment. Mankind desires to believe in a future life where the good are rewarded even if the wicked may not be punished. But the abode of the departed depicted in the *Odyssey* is a realm of shadows, where there is no happiness possible, a realm where existence is so unsatisfactory that the ghost of Achilles declares,¹ "Better to be the hireling of a stranger, and serve a man of mean estate whose living is but small, than be ruler over all these dead and gone." Men also wish for some rules of conduct or some magic formulæ by which they may be enabled to reach the happy home reserved for the blessed after death. Nothing of this sort was furnished by the religion of Greece as expressed in the public worship or the received mythology. But all these desires were more or less completely satisfied by the mysteries.


The mysteries, secret forms of worship to which only the initiated were admitted, were numerous in Greece, and were derived from different sources. The three most important were the mysteries of the Cabiri, at Samothrace, those of Dionysus Zagreus, celebrated by the Orphic sect, and the Eleusinian mysteries, celebrated in honor of Demeter, Persephone, and Iacchus, at Eleusis. The mysteries of the Cabiri have left no appreciable traces in literature, but the Orphic sect, becoming united with the followers of Pythagoras, exercised a great influence upon Greek thought and indirectly upon Greek literature. Orpheus himself (see page 8) is a purely mythical character, as is also his follower Musæus (see page 8). Under the name of Orpheus a considerable body of poetry was current, none of which appears to have been older than the sixth century B. C., while much of

¹ *Odyssey*, xi, 489 ff.

it is far later. Only a few fragments of the earlier of these Orphic poems are extant, and they possess little literary interest, while the later poems (hymns or epics) are of value only because they show how the mystic Orphic sect continued to exist until about the time of Christ.

Besides the poems attributed to Orpheus himself, there were other Orphic poems attributed to writers of historical times. The most important Orphic writer was **Onomacritus and other Orphic poets.** Onomacritus of Athens, who is said to have been one of the commission appointed by Hipparchus to edit the Homeric poems. He is said to have written *Oracles* and *Initiations*, and a *Titanography* and a *Theogony* are also ascribed to him. He is supposed to have inserted these as forgeries in his collection of the poems of Orpheus and to have taken similar liberties with the poems of Musæus and even of Homer. Other Orphic poets are Orpheus of Croton and Zopyrus of Heraclea. The latter was the author of a poem called the *Crater*, or *Mixing-Bowl*, in which the mixture of elements from which the world was formed was probably compared to the mixture of wine and water in the bowl. Other poems, *Sacred Discourses*, in twenty-four books, a *Descent of Orpheus to Hades*, a *Net*, and a *Peplus* or *Robe*, were attributed to the Pythagoreans Cercops, Herodicus of Perinthus, and Brontinus of Metapontum. These undoubtedly contained the doctrines of Pythagoras mingled with those of the Orphic sect. Pherecydes of Syros, son of Babys, who lived in the middle of the sixth century B. C., wrote a prose theogony evidently much colored with Orphic doctrine. The mythical Linus (see page 8) was regarded as the author of many poems of Orphic Pythagorean character, and some verses have been preserved under his name. They seem to be derived from a theogony, and as they show the influence of Heraclitus (see page 155) and Empedocles (see page 159), they can not be earlier than the fifth century.

The titles of the Orphic poems mentioned above show in part at least what their contents were. They told of the



origin of the world, gave precepts for purifications required by the rules of the sect, prescribed the manner of life and the special ceremonies which would lead to holiness and to

The Orphic sect.

life beyond the grave. The ideas of the Orphics were in part mystic and in part philosophical, and they also attached much importance to

special observances. So the initiated ate raw flesh at a sacred banquet in memory of the *passion* (i. e., the suffering) of their god Zagreus, but at other times abstained from eating meat; wore only white garments, and conformed to certain other rules of the *Orphic life*. When they died they were buried in a linen shroud. The mystic character of the teaching of Pythagoras and the rules he prescribed for his followers made it easy and natural for Pythagorean and Orphic believers to unite and for their doctrines to become confused.

The Eleusinian mysteries were in honor of Demeter and Persephone (usually called Cora when spoken of in connection with Eleusis), and Iacchus, who was afterward confounded with Dionysus Zagreus. The

The Eleusinian mysteries.

initiation comprised two degrees: the Lesser

Mysteries, celebrated every February at the hill of Agræ, near the Ilissus, and the Greater Mysteries, celebrated in September at Eleusis. Before the Lesser Mysteries was a purification, the nature of which is unknown. Then came the real initiation, apparently consisting of the communication of sacred formulæ, the revealing of the secret names of the gods, and the teaching of sacred legends, which prepared the initiated to understand the sights of the Greater Mysteries. At these there seems to have been little or no teaching, but rather direct contemplation of the ceremonies. For ten or twelve days the initiated fasted, drank of the sacred drink of barley and water, ate bread from the sacred basket, heard or repeated consecrated formulæ, and gazed at the silent pantomimic representation of the sorrows of Demeter and Persephone, which may have served as an in-

direct presentment of the trials of human life. That any clear doctrine of immortality was taught in the Eleusinian mysteries is not certain, for their secret has been well kept, but that they profoundly influenced the minds of the initiated is beyond question.

The great mythical poet of the Eleusinian mysteries was Musæus (see page 8). The poems attributed to him are
Musæus. *Oracles, Remedies for Diseases, Initiations, Purifications, a Theogony, and Hymns, especially a Hymn to Demeter.* Of all these only a few verses are preserved. As some of these works are mentioned by writers of the fifth century B. C., they were probably composed as early as the sixth century.

The religious movement which developed the great importance of the mysteries and mystic sects in the sixth century had its influence also upon the general public, whether initiated or not, and traces of this influence are visible in the works of the poets and philosophers of the sixth and fifth centuries. The half-mythical
Abaris, Aristæas. *Abaris, who is said to have written a poem on Apollo among the Hyperboreans, and Aristæas of Proconnesus, who wrote a history of the fabulous one-eyed Arimaspians, both belong to the sixth century, and both wrote, if Abaris wrote at all, poems of mystic character.* Other poets whose works are not mystical show traces of the influence of the mystic religious movement of the times, and for this reason, although the mystic poems of the sixth century are lost, and the extant fragments show no great literary excellence, the development of the mysteries and of mysticism can not be passed by in silence.

CHAPTER XIII

THE BEGINNINGS OF PROSE LITERATURE—THE EARLY PHILOSOPHERS

Late development of prose—The Seven Wise Men—Pherecydes of Syros, about 550 B. C.—Cadmus of Miletus, early sixth century B. C.—Thales, 624 (?)–547 (?) B. C.—Anaximander, 611 to about 545 B. C.—Anaximenes, about 560 B. C.—Pythagoras, second half of the sixth century B. C.—Xenophanes, about 600–500 B. C.—Heraclitus, born about 540 B. C.—Parmenides, born about 515 B. C.—Empedocles, about 492–432 B. C.—Leucippus, first half of the fifth century B. C.—Anaxagoras, 500–428 B. C.—Diogenes of Apollonia, about 450 B. C.—Democritus, 460 (?)–360 B. C.—Philolaus, middle of the fifth century B. C.—Archytas, middle of the fifth century B. C.—Hippocrates, about 430 B. C.

FOR various reasons Greek prose literature developed much later than poetry. In the first place, poetry can attain to a considerable degree of excellence without the aid of writing, and it can be handed down by tradition, can be sung and recited, for generations before reading and writing become common accomplishments. There can be no doubt that poems were thus handed down among the Greeks before the introduction of writing and during the long period when writing was known, to be sure, but was the accomplishment of comparatively few, and reading was a matter of such difficulty that literature had to be cast in rhythmical form to appeal to the ear and memory of the people. So the habit of associating the poetic form with all literature grew up and hindered the growth of prose. Moreover, the subject-matter of early Greek literature, the myths of the gods and he-

roes, the feelings of the poet, encouragement to do battle, praise of the dead or of victors in the games, lends itself readily to expression in epic or lyric verse. There were, to be sure, lists of various kinds kept in the temples, and there were also laws engraved upon stone or bronze tablets at an early date, but these are not literature. Prose literature could only arise when, as civilization advanced, men's minds grew more reflective, and writers wished to express collected facts and deductions drawn from such facts or speculations based upon them. This stage was reached in Greece in the sixth century B. C., the period in which the beginnings of historical and philosophical prose were made.

Prose literature did not arise without previous indications of the state of mind to which its origin was due. Several of the earliest philosophers and scientists wrote in verse, thereby showing the power which the poetical form of expression still held over men's minds; while on the other hand the new interest in the realities of life found

an expression in the sayings attributed to the Seven Wise Men. The list of the seven is not given in the same form by all the ancient authorities,¹ but four names are always included: those of Thales, Bias, Pittacus, and Solon. These men are distinguished as men of affairs, practical men, of clear and sound judgment. To them are attributed various maxims, some of which were graven upon the walls of the temple at Delphi, maxims of practical wisdom, such as "Know thyself," and "Nothing too much." The Seven Wise Men of any of the lists which have come down to us were not strictly contemporaries, and the stories of their meeting in friendly association are fabrications of a later time (probably of the fifth century B. C.), but there is in them this ele-

¹ Plato, *Protagoras*, p. 343 A, mentions Thales, Pittacus, Bias, Solon, Cleobulus, Myson, and Chilon. The names of Periander of Corinth, the Scythian Anacharsis, Epimenides of Crete, and some others are sometimes given instead of those of Cleobulus, Myson, and Chilon.

ment of truth, that at the beginning of the sixth century, the time to which the Seven Wise Men are assigned, there was in Greece an awakening of the practical and investigating spirit, which had much to do with the origin of prose literature. Whether the fables of Æsop were written in prose as early as the sixth century is doubtful (see page 86).

Whether history or philosophy took the lead in the creation of prose literature can not now be determined in the absence of exact dates as well as of accurate information

about the contents of some of the lost works. Pherecydes of Syros, who was classed among the philosophers, was really neither an historian nor a philosopher, but a mystic (see page 144). The few fragments of his writing, the title of which appears to have been *Heptamychos* (*The Sevenfold Cavern*, or something of the sort), show that his prose was much affected by the poetic style. His claim to be the first writer of Greek prose

Cadmus
of Miletus.

is opposed by that of Cadmus of Miletus, who is said to have written a work on the *Founding of Miletus*, or perhaps on Ionia in general. No fragments of his work exist in the original form, and it is even somewhat doubtful whether he himself ever existed. If it is true that he explained the inundations of the Nile as the result of the melting of the snow on the mountains of central Africa, he showed the rational and scientific spirit which was awakening in his time—the early sixth century B. C. But whether the first prose writer was an historian or a philosopher matters little. It is well to keep the two classes of writers distinct, and as some of the earlier philosophers wrote in verse it is natural to speak of them before the historians.

The word “philosopher” means “lover of wisdom,” and was invented by Pythagoras to apply to himself and others who devoted themselves to study and investigation. Before the invention of this word such men were called *sophoi*, “wise men,” or *sophists*, “men versed in wisdom,” and these

words continued in common use long after the days of Pythagoras. The Greek philosophers did not confine their studies to one kind of investigation, but the wisdom they sought was as various as the powers of their own minds. We shall find them therefore studying things which belong in modern times in the domain of physical science or of statecraft rather than in that of philosophy, but we shall also see that at any one time the chief attention of most philosophers was devoted to some one problem or series of problems, the stages in the development of philosophy being marked by the rise of new problems when those that formerly engrossed attention have been solved or found insoluble. The history of Greek philosophy is a large subject, which can not be properly treated in a handbook of the history of Greek literature; but the works of the philosophers belong to literature and can not be understood as literary productions without some knowledge of their contents. It will therefore be necessary to devote some space to the doctrines of the early philosophers, especially as those doctrines influenced to a greater or less extent the writings of contemporary and later authors. But as the works of the early philosophers have disappeared, leaving only a few fragments quoted by later writers, it will be possible to treat them briefly.

The problem which chiefly interested the earliest Greek philosophers was the same which had interested some of the still earlier poets—the origin of the universe. Hesiod and other poets had assumed that the universe existed before the gods, but was at first mere chaos; that then one god after another came into being, and that in the end the world was regulated by these gods. This mythical account of the world's origin was no longer satisfactory in the sixth century, and the philosophers tried to discover a more rational explanation of things. In some details the systems of some of the early Greek thinkers resemble what we know of the beliefs of

The Greek philosophers.

The origin of the universe.

the Egyptians or the Assyrians, but even if some details were suggested to the Greeks by other nations, the progress of Greek philosophy is so regular and so logical that it must be regarded as in all important matters original, not imitated or imported. Greek philosophy began in Ionia, a region more open to Oriental influence than was European Greece, but Ionia was in the sixth century further advanced in civilization than European Greece, and was the natural starting-point for the new development.

The first of the philosophers was Thales of Miletus. He is said to have lived from 624 to 547 B. C., but the dates are uncertain, and it is best to say simply that he

Thales.

flourished in the first half of the sixth century. He belonged to a noble family of Theban origin, which traced its ancestry back to the Phœnician companions of Cadmus. He traveled in Egypt, where he learned arithmetic, geometry, and astronomy. On his return he seems to have paid some attention to public affairs, but his chief fame was as a philosopher and man of science. He is said to have foreseen that there was to be an abundant harvest of olives, and to have bought up all the oil-presses, thus showing how easily he could have made himself rich had he desired to do so. He is also said to have predicted an eclipse. His explanation of the origin of the universe was that all things came from water or moisture, and he is said to have represented the earth as floating on the water. As Thales appears to have written nothing, his doctrines are known only by imperfect tradition through the works of his successors.

The first philosopher to express his doctrines in writing was Anaximander of Miletus. He was born in 611 B. C., and was living in 547, but the date of his death

Anaximander.

is unknown. He is said to have led a Milesian colony to Apollonia. His philosophical work, probably entitled *On Nature*, appears to have been written in his old age. He regarded the Infinite ($\tau\acute{o}\ \acute{\alpha}\pi\epsilon\iota\rho\omicron\nu$) as the original

substance of all things. This was eternal and ageless, and embraced all the worlds and heavens. From these arose by separation all existing things, and to these they returned in accordance with necessity, "paying the penalty for their injustice." Anaximander was a scientist, and invented a *gnomon* for astronomical observations, made a globe and a map of the world. There are a few fragments of Anaximander's writing, and as even these may not be preserved to us in his exact words, little can be said of his style except that he wrote in the Ionic dialect and used some poetic expressions.

Anaximenes of Miletus was later than Anaximander, but how much later can not be stated exactly. He may

Anaximenes. have been merely a somewhat younger contemporary. At any rate, he lived in the first half or the middle of the sixth century B. C. He regarded air as the original substance, and thought all things arose from this by condensation and rarefaction. Not a line of his work *On Nature* exists, and all we know of his style is that he wrote a pure Ionic dialect.

Pythagoras of Samos, son of Mnesarchus, is said to have been a pupil of Pherecydes of Syros. The dates of his

Pythagoras. birth and death are unknown, but his activity belongs to the second half of the sixth century, and he died before 500 B. C. He is said to have traveled much, but some of his journeys seem to have been invented to account for the fancied resemblances between his doctrines and the beliefs of Oriental peoples. In middle life he left Samos, perhaps banished by Polycrates, and went to Croton, in Magna Græcia, where he founded a school or sect, which became so powerful at Croton and Sybaris that it established an aristocratic government of its own. This was destroyed by a revolution toward the end of the sixth century, and the followers of Pythagoras were dispersed. Pythagoras himself was probably already dead. The dispersion of his disciples did not put an end to his school,

which was continued in the fifth century by Philolaus and Archytas, and his teachings, more or less modified by the Orphic doctrines, exercised great influence for many years. Pythagoras must have been a man of great personal power, and the impression he made upon his disciples is shown by the story that he was a son of Apollo, and that he received his wisdom from the Delphic oracle. His disciples were subjected to fixed rules of conduct.¹ Every hour of the day had its duty, meals were taken in common and were of simple character, frequent examinations of the conscience were prescribed. In these respects the Pythagorean sect resembled the Orphic sect, and in some measure the monks of Christian times.

Many points of the teachings of Pythagoras are obscure, partly because he left no writings, and partly on account of confusion with Orphic doctrines. His philosophical theory starts with the belief that the fundamental essence of all things is number. Apparently he failed to perceive that number is not a substance but a mere abstraction; but his mistake is excusable at a time when thought on such subjects was still new. He associated certain moral qualities with number in a way which now seems absurd; so, for instance, he thought the number four corresponded to justice. But we must remember that the relations of number to tangible things and to ideas must have seemed wonderful in an age when arithmetic and geometry were in their infancy. Pythagoras was an investigator in the realm of mathematics, and it is not to be wondered at if his philosophical theories were affected by his mathematical studies. How the doctrine of number was combined with the belief in the transmigration of souls (metempsychosis), which Pythagoras taught, we do not know, nor do we know what the nature of the soul or of deity was supposed to be ac-

¹ The late poem called the *Golden Verses*, falsely ascribed to Pythagoras himself, gives some idea of these rules.

ording to his teaching, but that reverence for the gods was inculcated is certain.

Xenophanes of Colophon, son of Orthomenes, died not much before nor much after 500 B. C., and as he says he wrote verses at the age of ninety-two years, he must have been born not far from 600 B. C. When the town of Elea, in Lucania, was founded by Phocæans fleeing from the Persians, about 544 B. C., Xenophanes took part in the colonization and must have spent some years there, for it was there that his school of philosophy (the Eleatic school) had its seat. As has been said above (page 77), Xenophanes was a great traveler. He was not only a philosopher, but a poet, and his philosophical work *On Nature* was in hexameter verse. Of his style something has been said above, and the few fragments of the philosophical work differ in metre rather than in style from the elegiac poems. As a philosopher Xenophanes laid great stress upon the uncertainty of human knowledge. He believed that the origin of all things is Being, one and immovable. How the sensible universe arose from this immovable Being is not clear. He believed that God is one, though he sometimes spoke of "the gods" in the plural:

One God there is among gods and men the greatest, neither in form nor mind like mortals. . . . But mortals think the gods are born like themselves and have their senses and voice and form.

Elsewhere he says that if cattle and lions and horses could make pictures and statues they would represent the gods as cattle, lions, and horses. He also accuses Homer and Hesiod of ascribing to the gods all sorts of evil deeds rife among men.

Xenophanes, while asserting the immovable unity of Being, seems not to have gone so far as to deny reality to change. But if Being is one and immovable, the changing phenomena of the world are apparently impossible. From

the opposition between immovable Being and change arose the opposing doctrines of Heraclitus and Parmenides.

Heraclitus, son of Blyson, was born at Ephesus, not far from 540 B. C. He belonged to a noble family, but lived in

Heraclitus. retirement, refusing to take part in the government of the city. Popular tradition declared that he wept at all things, opposing him to the laughing philosopher, Democritus. His philosophy does, indeed, show the vanity of human life, and is to that extent sad. This philosophy was expounded in a work sometimes called *On Nature* and sometimes *The Muses*, in three parts, treating respectively of the universe, political and moral science, and theology. Heraclitus regarded the senses as untrustworthy and said that we should follow reason. This teaches that the apparent variety of phenomena is an illusion. All things are one. But this *one* is not fixed and immovable, as Xenophanes taught, but is itself mobility. All things flow, and nothing remains. Change is the essence of the world. Fire changes to water, water to earth, and earth again to fire. So all apparent oppositions become a harmony. He did, to be sure, regard fire as the primal element, perhaps because it is the most mobile. As fire becomes less pure it grows moist, tending toward water. God, he thought, was a perfect soul, of pure fire. The human soul differed from the divine soul only in degree, not in essence. It was, he thought, a divine soul in a condition of death, as the divine soul was a human soul in a condition of immortality. As the human soul is an imperfect fire, or a dry and refined air, it is our duty to keep it as dry as possible. After death the driest and most fire-like souls become gods or heroes, while those which have become damp pass into an inferior condition. Above the gods and human beings alike Heraclitus places the supreme law of change, which he calls Justice, Time, or Zeus. The views of Heraclitus were new and hard to understand. They were expressed in concise and vigorous

prose, which the ancients found difficult of comprehension—so difficult that they spoke of Heraclitus as “the obscure.” So far as we are able to judge from about one hundred and forty brief fragments preserved as quotations in the works of other writers, his reputation for obscurity is derived rather from the difficulty of his thought than from real obscurity of expression. His prose is not thoroughly artistic, but is terse and vigorous.

Parmenides of Elea, in southern Italy, was born perhaps as early as 540 B. C., but more probably about 515 B. C., of

Parmenides. a rich and noble family. In his old age he is

said to have visited Athens and to have talked with the then youthful Socrates. He is the direct successor of Xenophanes in the Eleatic school of philosophy, and may have been his personal pupil. He is said to have been influenced also by two Pythagoreans, Aminias and Diochætes. Like Xenophanes, he expressed his philosophy in hexameter verse. His poem was divided into three parts: first, a mythical introduction, then an exposition of the things of truth, and last of the things of opinion. The introduction (thirty-two lines) and about one hundred and twenty-five lines of the doctrinal parts are preserved. He declared that Being alone exists and that change, which implies Not-being, is only apparent. Being alone belongs to the truth, while all phenomena of change are things of opinion. Being is one and immovable, indivisible, without beginning or end. Its form is that of a sphere. These verities are known only through reason, while phenomena are subject merely to conjecture. He accounted for phenomena by the assumption of two principles, Light and Darkness, which are attracted to each other by Love. The details of this part of his system are not well enough preserved to be clear. His doctrine of Being is that of Xenophanes carried to its logical conclusion, which makes the reality of change impossible. In style, Parmenides joins great argumentative ability and power of logical

reasoning with real poetic fire. He is the first philosopher to argue in support of his views, and at the same time he is more of a poet than most of the philosophers who wrote in verse. His doctrines were further elaborated by his successors Zeno of Elea and Melissus of Samos, but these men, although important in the history of philosophy, are of little importance in the history of literature. We need only remark that Zeno developed *dialectic*, that is, the practise of logical argument, beyond the point reached by Parmenides.

The introduction of the poem of Parmenides begins as follows:¹

The steeds which bear me, and have brought me to the bounds of my desire, since they drew and carried me into the way renowned of Her who leads the wise man to all knowledge—on that road I journeyed, on that road they bore me, those steeds of thought that whirl the car along. But maidens showed the way, sun-born maids, who left the halls of gloom and brought us to the light, withdrawing with their fingers from their brows the veils.

The chariot proceeds to the palace of wisdom, of which Justice holds the keys. The poet is received by the goddess of wisdom, who promises to teach him the things of truth and the things of opinion, and the remainder of the poem is in the form of a lecture by the goddess. The mythical form is well conceived and well carried out, and if the poem seems to some modern critics frigid or even dull, it is partly because the allegorical symbolism which was an interesting novelty in the early fifth century B. C. has lost its interest in our times.

The systems of Heraclitus and Parmenides had put in the clearest light the opposition between the constant change of phenomena and the constant fixity of Being. If anything is, it can not become something else without ceasing to be what it is. Change involves the reality of Not-

¹ Symonds's translation.

being. But how can Not-being exist? Apparently the two systems can not be reconciled; and yet the world as it is can not be satisfactorily explained by either system alone. At about the same time Empedocles, Leucippus, Anaxagoras, and Diogenes of Apollonia undertook the reconciliation of the two. All of these men were born in the early part of the fifth century, but the exact dates of their births and the order in which their works followed each other are not certainly known.

Empedocles of Acragas (Agrigentum) was born about 492 B. C. He was younger than Anaxagoras, but was earlier than he as an author. He was of noble birth, was wealthy, and of great personal beauty and dignity. He studied the works of the earlier philosophers, and was also an adept in medicine and in magic. When the city of Selinus was troubled with an epidemic, he drained the neighboring marshes and restored the citizens to health. He was then worshiped as a god by the Selinuntines, and accepted this worship as his due. He used to dress in long and gorgeous robes, and walked about shod with sandals of brass. And this was not mere theatrical display or effrontery on his part. His mind was deeply imbued with mysticism, and he believed in an intimate relationship between the human and the divine, with the result that he really believed himself to be a god, or something very near it. About his death, which took place when he was sixty years old, there were various stories. According to one, he disappeared mysteriously after a violent storm, being transferred to dwell among the gods; according to another, he threw himself into the crater of Mount Etna, which cast up one of his brazen sandals.

Empedocles wrote *Poems of Purification*, to free men's souls from the burden of sin; a long poem, probably in three books, *On Nature*, setting forth his philosophical doctrine; a poem on *Medicine*, and various other less important poems. In all there were several thousand lines, of which about

four hundred and fifty are preserved. All these works were in hexameter verse. The system of Empedocles was a combination of those of the Eleatic school and Heraclitus, with some features of Pythagorean doctrine. He assumed four elements, fire, air, water, and earth, which he considered immutable and eternal, like the One or Being of the Eleatics, and accounted for change by the mixture of these four, which he thought were united and separated by Love and Strife or Discord. The four elements were originally massed together in the form of a sphere. This sphere is maintained by Love, while Strife tends constantly to destroy it. The struggle is to continue forever, Strife destroying the sphere and Love forming it anew. This is the explanation of all change. The details of this system were carefully elaborated, but need not detain us. He believed in the transmigration of souls, and in other respects, as in the general tone of piety pervading his doctrine, he shows the influence of Pythagoras. His gods were not eternal, but very long lived. He regarded man as a god in exile.

The poetry of Empedocles is brilliant, full of enthusiasm, graceful, and ingenious in expression. He argues less than Parmenides, but has the gift of expressing his thoughts clearly and accurately. Clearness is for him the first requisite. "For twice and three times one must say what is good" is one of his expressions; but his own style is such that he does not often need to repeat. His doctrine of the nature of things begins with these words:

A double saying I will utter; for at one time One grows into being from many, and again many come to be from One. Twofold is the birth of mortal things, twofold their destruction; for the union of all brings forth and destroys the one, and the other is broken and scattered when they are again sundered; and these never cease continually changing, sometimes uniting through Love, all in one, at other times being borne each apart through the hatred of Strife.

The beginning of the introduction of the poem *On Nature* states his view of the connection between the gods and mortal beings, which is followed by the doctrine of metempsychosis :

It is a thing of necessity and an ancient decree of gods, eternal, sealed with mighty oaths, whenever any one through crime has defiled his limbs with murder, or rashly sinning has become forsworn (one of the spirits who possess long life), for thrice ten thousand years he wanders far from the blessed ones, becoming in that time all sorts of mortal beings, passing through the toilsome paths of life, as I now am an exile and a wanderer from the gods, yielding to mad Strife. . . . For I already have been a youth and a maid and a bush and a bird and a mute fish in the sea.

Leucippus, a contemporary of Empedocles and Anaxagoras, was a native of Miletus, or of Elea, and is said to have been a pupil of Parmenides. He believed
Leucippus. that matter was composed of an infinite number of particles so small that they could not be divided, which he called atoms. The different forms of matter were made by different arrangements of atoms. Alongside of the atoms and matter formed of atoms he assumed also empty space or a void. No writings of Leucippus are preserved—in fact, it is not certain that he ever wrote anything. His doctrine was elaborated by Democritus and later was adopted by Epicurus.

Anaxagoras of Clazomenæ was born in 500 B. C. About 464 he went to Athens, where he became the friend of
Anaxagoras. Pericles. In 434 or 433 he was banished from Athens on a charge of impiety, and went to Lampsacus, where he died in 428. Several works were ascribed to him, but his chief work, *On Nature*, is the only one of which fragments are preserved. Anaxagoras believed that matter was composed of an infinite number of particles, infinitely small and always capable of division. These particles are not all of the same material, like the atoms of Leucippus, nor of four elements, such as Empedocles as-

sumed, but each has its own qualities. There are gold particles, stone particles, bone particles, etc. All these are arranged by Mind or Intellect. This is the great innovation of Anaxagoras. He clearly divides mind from matter. In the beginning all things were, he thought, an indistinguishable mass, until Mind arranged and grouped the particles so as to form the visible world. He believed that the moon was inhabited, and that the sun was somewhat larger than the Peloponnesus. He was not only a metaphysician, but also a man of science. He perceived that eclipses of the sun are caused by the moon, which comes between the sun and the earth. His views of life seem to have been high and noble, but he published no system of ethics. His style is clear and vigorous, but without great variety, cool, passionless, concise, and sententious. Though only seventeen fragments are preserved, they are long enough to give us a pretty good idea of his style :

All things were together, infinite in number and smallness; for the smallness was infinite. And when all things were together nothing was clear on account of smallness; for air and ether encompassed all things, both being infinite, for these are most largely present in all things, both in respect to the number of particles and to volume.

Everything contains particles of every kind, the Mind alone being pure and unmixed :

All the other things contain a share of everything, but Mind is infinite and self-sufficient and is not mixed with anything, but is absolutely alone by itself. For if it were not by itself, but were mixed with anything else, it would have a share of all things if it were mixed with any; for in everything there is a share of everything, as I have said before; and the things mixed with it would hinder it, so that it would not control anything, as it does now that it is alone by itself. For it is the lightest of all things, and the purest, and it has all knowledge about all things and has the greatest power.

The great defect in the teaching of Anaxagoras is that he apparently failed to attribute to Mind any continued

and repeated influence on the world. Mind caused the particles to be arranged in the beginning, and started the world on its course of life, but after that had no further influence.

Diogenes of Apollonia, who was somewhat younger than Anaxagoras, went back to the doctrine of Anaximenes and regarded air as the original substance. His doctrine is of little importance, but he wrote clear and simple prose, and is for this reason to be mentioned. "In beginning every discourse it seems to me to be necessary to make the starting-point free from ambiguity and the language simple and dignified" are the opening words of his book, and the fragments preserved show that he followed the rule thus laid down. His life extends far into the second half of the fifth century, and chronologically he belongs to the Attic period of Greek literature. His doctrine, however, and his use of the Ionic dialect place him among the earlier philosophers.

Democritus of Abdera also belongs chronologically to the Attic period. He was born about 460, and died at a very great age—over one hundred years according to some writers, not far from 360 B. C. He was often called "the laughing philosopher," as Heraclitus was called "the weeping philosopher." He traveled extensively, observing nature and talking with learned men. He was at Athens, where he seems to have aroused little interest, for his studies were not in line with the teachings of the sophists or of Socrates. His works, written in Ionic Greek, were numerous, relating to all branches of philosophy. Only scattered fragments have been preserved. He accepted and developed the doctrine of Leucippus, that the world consisted of atoms and void space, the difference between things being caused by the different arrangement and qualities of atoms. The soul, he thought, was a fire animating the body. There were no real gods, but there might be souls finer than those of men, which would be nearly equivalent to

gods. In morals, he taught that happiness should be sought, but by moderation of the desires, not by indulgence. In many points his atomic theory of the universe resembles modern scientific theories.

At about the time when Democritus was developing the doctrines of Leucippus, a group of Pythagoreans in Magna Græcia revived and developed the doctrines of **Philolaus and Archytas.** Pythagoras. It will be enough to mention Philolaus and Archytas of Tarentum. Philolaus is said to be the earliest writer among the Pythagoreans. He traveled much, and spent some time at Thebes, where Simmias and Cebes, afterward devoted to Socrates, were his pupils. His book *On Nature*, written in Doric Greek, was an exposition of Pythagorean doctrine. Archytas was a noted man at Tarentum, distinguished as a general, and for his practical wisdom and morality. Numerous works on philosophy and mathematics were attributed to him, but of these, as of the work of Philolaus, only fragments exist. An ode of Horace¹ informs us that Archytas was drowned in a shipwreck on the Apulian coast.

The study of medicine is related to the physical researches of the Ionic philosophers, and the literature pertaining to it may therefore be mentioned here. Every temple of Asclepius had its attendant physicians, who practised surgery, faith cure, and such empirical treatment as they knew. One of the most famous temples of Asclepius was at Cos, and here it was that **Hippocrates.** the most famous physician of the fifth century B. C., was born. He was an Asclepiad—that is, he belonged to the family of hereditary priests or ministers of Asclepius. The date of his birth is unknown, but he seems to have flourished in the early years of the Peloponnesian War. He is said to have died at Larisa, in Thessaly, at an advanced age. A collection of sixty-two works of various

¹ *Odes*, i, 28.

length has been handed down under his name, but the works themselves are evidently of different dates, for the most part later than Hippocrates, though some may be earlier. Whether any of the extant works is the work of Hippocrates himself is uncertain. They are written in Ionic Greek, and show that the early physicians were careful observers and usually sensible practitioners, though their theories were often absurd. After Hippocrates, his son-in-law, Polybius, his grandsons and great-grandsons, are said to have continued the Coan school of medicine.

CHAPTER XIV

THE LOGOGRAPHERS

Cadmus of Miletus, about 550 B. C.—Acusilaus, second half of the sixth century B. C.—Scylax, toward 500 B. C.—Hecataeus, 540 (?)—470 (?) B. C.—Pherecydes of Leros, about 500 B. C.—Charon, about 500 B. C.—Xanthus, about 500—450 B. C.—Hellanicus, about 450 B. C.—Antiochus, about 450 B. C.—Other logographers—Stesimbrotus, about 425 B. C.

THE earliest writers of history are usually called *logographers*, a word which primarily means *writers of prose*. The words *history* and *historian* are first applied to Herodotus and his work. The logographers had, as a rule, little or no appreciation of history as a whole, or of any great movements in history, but wrote annals of various cities, with special attention to the early myths and legends. Some of them also described places and countries. Little is known of most of them, and few fragments of their works are preserved.

Cadmus of Miletus is the earliest known logographer, and so little is known of him that his very existence has been doubted. He appears to have lived about the middle of the sixth century B. C., and a work entitled *The Founding of Miletus* is ascribed to him. He is for us little more than a name.

Somewhat more is known of Acusilaus. He was born at the little town of Argos in Bœotia, and lived in the second half of the sixth century. He was a sort of prose Hesiod, and wrote a work entitled *Genealogies*, in several books. He began with the primeval Chaos, told of the origin of the gods, and passed on to the

heroes. At what point his work ended is unknown. He inserted many local myths in his work, and is referred to by later writers when they discuss the origin of such legends.

Scylax, of Caryanda, in Caria, was an admiral in the service of Darius about the end of the sixth century. He

Scylax. was sent by Darius to explore the coast of the Indian Ocean, and wrote a *Periplus*, or description of that coast. His work was lost at an early date, and the *Periplus* preserved under his name is a work of the fourth century B. C.

Hecataeus of Miletus is the most important of the logographers. He was born about 540 B. C., of a noble family, which claimed descent from the gods. His **Hecataeus.** father's name was Hegesander. At the beginning of the Ionic revolt Hecataeus advised the Ionians against the war with Persia, and after their first reverses he urged them to fortify the island of Leros as a base of operations. In both cases his advice was rejected, but after their final defeat he interceded for them with the satrap Artaphernes. He wrote two works, *Genealogies* and a *Description of the Earth*. The *Genealogies*, in at least four books, began with the story of Deucalion and the flood, and continued with the tale of the heroes. This is mythology, not history. Yet Hecataeus exercised some critical judgment even in this work, the opening words of which are :

Hecataeus of Miletus speaks thus: "I write these things as they seem to me to be true; for the stories of the Greeks are many and ridiculous, as it seems to me."

The extant fragments do not, however, show clearly how he made the myths less "ridiculous" than those who had told them before him. The *Description of the Earth* consisted of two books, *Europe* and *Asia*. More than three hundred fragments, for the most part very brief, exist of a work attributed to Hecataeus, but their authenticity has been doubted. They are, however, probably for the most part

authentic, but they are so brief as to give us little idea of the style of the *Description*. In this work Hecataeus embodied the observations he had made in Egypt, Persia, Pontus, Thrace, and the Greek world, for he traveled in all these regions, probably between 516 and 500 B. C. His style is said to have been clear and simple, but less attractive than that of Herodotus. His language was pure Ionic, not mixed, as was that of Herodotus, with epic and other elements. We are also told that he sometimes, when speaking of a person, put himself in the attitude of that person and quoted his words directly, as when he writes :

Ceyx being troubled at this, immediately told the Heraclidæ, his descendants, to leave the country: "For I am not able to help you; therefore that you may not be yourselves destroyed, and injure me also, go away to another people."

The work of Hecataeus was much used by Herodotus, and was doubtless of great value in adding to the knowledge which the Greeks possessed of the world about them. It seems also to have been important as a specimen of Ionic narrative prose, a kind of literature of which the work of Herodotus is now our only remaining example. In the sixth century Ionic writers were numerous and influential, and many of them were from Miletus. With the destruction of Miletus in 494 B. C., the centre of Ionic life was removed from Asia. Athens speedily became the intellectual capital of the Greek world, and all prose writing became, under Athenian influence, rhetorical. Fortunately for us, Herodotus, though he lived after the destruction of Miletus, wrote in the narrative Ionic style, a style which, but for the destruction of Miletus, might have continued in use alongside of the more rhetorical prose of Athens.

Three logographers slightly later than Hecataeus are Pherecydes of Leros (often confused with Pherecydes of Syros), Charon of Lampsacus, and Xanthus of Lydia.

Pherecydes wrote *Genealogies*, of which about one hundred fragments are preserved. It was similar to the work of Acusilaus, dry genealogies and mythological tales. The style is simple, the sentences short and disconnected, the dialect Ionic with some Attic expressions, which may be due to the author's stay at Athens, where he lived so long that he is sometimes spoken of as an Athenian. Charon wrote several books, *Persica*, *Hellenica* (histories of Persia and Greece), *Foundations* (accounts of the founding of various cities), and *Annals of Lampsacus*. In these there were many mythological stories and other tales. The style of Charon resembles that of Pherecydes of Leros. Xanthus is said to have been older than Herodotus, but he lived to about the middle of the fifth century. Xanthus wrote *Lydiaca*, a history of Lydia, or rather a collection of stories about Lydia, mythological and other tales mingled with observations on the languages and the physical geography of various regions. The extant fragments hardly permit us to judge of his style.

Hellanicus of Mytilene and Antiochus of Syracuse were contemporaries of Herodotus, though the dates of their birth and death are unknown. Hellanicus mentions the battle of Arginusæ in one of his works, and must therefore have lived at least until 406 B. C. He wrote mythological narratives, many of which are referred to by title, as *Phoronis*, *Atlantis*, and the like. Whether these were grouped together under one general title or not we do not know. Other works were annals, probably in great part mythical, of various places; the *Troica* and *Persica* appear to have been accounts of the Trojan and Persian wars; the *Victors at the Carnean Games* was a chronological list, probably with notes on events not directly connected with the games; while the *Hiereiæ*, or *Priestesses*, is a history of Greece, arranged chronologically and dated by the years of the priestesses at the Heræum at Argos, and

the *Atthis*, or *Attic History*, is a similar work, in which the dates are given by the list of the Athenian archons. The *Atthis* appears to have been a continuation of the *Hiereia* after the Argive temple of Hera was burned in 423 B. C., a time when it was natural to employ the names of the Athenian archons to fix dates in Greek history, as Athens was at the height of her power. The accuracy of Hellanicus is attacked by Thucydides, perhaps deservedly; but the fact that he wrote the history of his own times, not merely the legendary history of the distant past, and that he paid attention to chronology, makes him a figure of importance. Of his style the extant fragments, which for the most part are not quoted exactly, give us no idea.

Antiochus of Syracuse wrote a history of Sicily to the confederation of Sicilian cities in 424 B. C., which was used by Thucydides in compiling his account of Sicilian affairs. A similar history had been written before by Hippys of Rhegium, who lived at the time of the Persian wars. Antiochus also wrote a series of accounts of the foundations of the Italian cities, in which the name of Rome appeared for the first time in Greek literature. Too little remains of his writings to give any idea of his style.

Several other logographers are known by name, and the titles of some of their works are preserved, but if they had any literary importance we are no longer able to recognize it. Stesimbrotus of Thasos, who wrote a literary work on Homer and a political pamphlet on Themistocles, Thucydides (the politician), and Pericles, deserves mention because his pamphlet was used by the historian Ephorus, and through him by Plutarch, in his *Lives* of Themistocles and Pericles. He had a liking for scandal, and his statements can not always be accepted as true. Among the logographers there was none who compared with Hecataeus in importance or literary ability. He was the greatest prose writer before Herodotus.

Other
logographers.

CHAPTER XV

HERODOTUS

Herodotus, about 484 to about 425 B. C.—Ctesias, about 400 B. C.

HERODOTUS, who is called the father of history, was born about 484 and lived until after the beginning of the Peloponnesian War, perhaps until about 425 B. C. His parents, Lyxes and Dryo or Rhoio, belonged to prominent families in his native city of Halicarnassus. He is said to have been a nephew of Panyasis (see page 57), perhaps because he showed the familiarity with the works of the poets which would be expected in a near relative of the chief poet and literary man of Halicarnassus. At the time of Herodotus's birth Halicarnassus was subject to the Carian queen Artemisia. In a revolt against Lygdamis, one of her successors, Panyasis lost his life, and Herodotus, at that time little more than twenty years of age, was obliged to retire to Samos. He was soon enabled to return to Halicarnassus, but new difficulties arose, and he left his native city almost immediately. There is a story that he was at Athens in 446, where he read part of his history in public, and received a reward of ten talents (about \$10,000) from the state. The latter part of this story is so improbable as to throw doubt upon the whole. In 444 B. C. he took part in the founding of Thurii, in Italy, and is therefore sometimes called a Thurian. He probably died at Thurii, and if his tomb was really shown at Athens it must have been a cenotaph or empty monument. He-

Herodotus traveled extensively, and embodied in his history the results of his observation in various countries. He visited the Greek cities of Asia Minor, Thrace, and Pontus, went to Babylon and Susa, traveled up the Nile in Egypt, and made the voyage to Cyrene, in addition to living for some time at Athens and taking part in the founding of Thurii. At what time of his life these journeys were undertaken can not be determined with certainty, but they were probably finished for the most part before the founding of Thurii, in 444 B. C. It appears, however, that Herodotus returned to Athens at least once after he went to Thurii, for he mentions the Propylæa at Athens, a building which was not finished until about 431 B. C.

Herodotus has left us a history of the Persian wars in nine books, which are named after the nine Muses. This division was not made by Herodotus himself, and probably dates from Alexandrian times, when it was the fashion to divide the long works of earlier authors into books or rolls of about equal length. Herodotus himself, in referring from one part of his work to another, never uses the word "book," but refers to the subject treated, as, for instance, "in my account of Libyan affairs." The entire work was not written at once, but at different times, and the various parts do not seem to have been composed in the order in which they were finally arranged, but they were revised and made into one connected work before the final publication. It is held by some scholars that the work was never completed as Herodotus intended; for it closes with the capture of Sestos in 477 B. C., and yet it is thought that the battle of the Eurymedon would have been a more fitting end. It is, however, possible that Herodotus thought differently, for after the capture of Sestos the Greeks were no longer defending themselves against Persian aggression, but were themselves the aggressors. Herodotus refers to an "account of Assyrian affairs" which we seek in vain in his history. This may

perhaps have been an independent work, but it is more probable that he intended to insert it in the great history and failed to do so. But, even though we believe that the history as we have it is not completed as Herodotus intended, it is still the most complete, most carefully planned, and most artistically composed history known before Thucydides.

The main subject of the great work of Herodotus is the invasion of Greece by the Persians, first under Darius, and then under Xerxes; but five of the nine books are devoted to events that led up to the first invasion, the account of which is enlivened by numerous digressions. After a few preliminary remarks comes the history of Crœsus, with an account of the previous history of Lydia and of the Greek cities; then follows the story of the struggle of Crœsus against Cyrus, with further information about Greek history; the end of the history of Cyrus, including the conquest of Ionia; the capture of Babylon, with a digression concerning Babylon, and the war of the Persians with the Massagetæ. The history of the Persians is then continued by an account of the conquest of Egypt by Cambyses, which includes a long digression concerning Egypt. This is followed by the war in Scythia and a digression concerning the Scythians, after which comes the revolt of Ionia, followed by the invasion of Greece under Darius, and finally by the invasion under Xerxes.

The great difference between Herodotus and the logographers is in the choice of subject. The logographers wrote of the foundings of cities and the genealogies of heroes. Their subjects were for the most part mythological. Herodotus chose the story of the wars of the Greeks with the Persians, which took place in his own lifetime. When the logographers descended to recent times, their works were still genealogical or annalistic—that is, they

**Contents of
the work.**

**The difference
between
Herodotus
and his
predecessors.**

consisted of lists of names in chronological order, with accounts of events regarded by themselves. Herodotus tells of the great struggle of the Greeks and the Persians, and all events are regarded in their connection with that struggle. This already shows a different point of view.

Moreover, Herodotus is the first who tried to write scientific history. He calls his work *history*, which means *investigation*. He tried to find out the truth and to distinguish it from what was untrue or doubtful. He made mistakes, of course, for his scientific knowledge was deficient and he was more credulous than a later investigator would have been; but his honesty of purpose shines forth from every page of his work. He does not avoid mythological tales, but these are accessories, not the main part of his history, and they were the only accounts of remote periods available. Other marvelous stories are introduced, but these are also mere accessories, and when Herodotus tells them without qualification it is because he has no means of proving that they are not true. He tries to find out and tell the truth, as well as the current stories, and is thereby distinguished from his predecessors, whose main purpose was to tell in prose the current legends.

Herodotus has four sources of information, between which he distinguishes clearly. "Up to this point," he says (Book II, 99), "it is from my own observation and opinion and research that I tell these things, but from this point I proceed to give the accounts of the Egyptians as I heard them; but something of my own observation is added to them." Many things Herodotus saw himself in his travels, and these he describes as he saw them, giving us the impressions he received. He was not a trained observer, but he was a man of sense who kept his eyes open. His description of what he saw is not always accurate, but is as nearly accurate as could be expected. Other things he found out by research, by reading the works of his predecessors, such as Hecataeus

The sources
of his infor-
mation.

and Hellenicus, by examining the inscriptions and monuments in the Greek temples, and by questioning eye-witnesses of events. In regard to some other matters, where no direct evidence was forthcoming, he had to trust to his own common sense or opinion. This would be especially the case when conflicting accounts of the same event existed. Concerning the past history of foreign peoples, he was obliged to accept the account given him by the best informed natives, the priests or professional guides, for he could not read Egyptian, Assyrian, or Persian. But when he depends upon such sources for his information he warns us distinctly of the fact, as in the passage cited above. He even takes pains to warn us against accepting implicitly all the stories he tells at second hand. "It is my duty to tell what is told me," he says,¹ "but it is not my duty to believe it absolutely, and let this remark apply to the whole of my work."

Although Herodotus was for a long time at Athens at a period when the doctrines of the sophists were, as we shall see, undermining the ancient belief in the gods and when argumentative and oratorical composition was gaining in popularity at the expense of simple narrative, he retained his belief in the old Homeric gods and wrote in a style which may almost be called epic prose. In the midst of the Attic development of the fifth century Herodotus is

Simplicity of his religion. Ionic and primitive. He has a philosophy of history, but it is a simple religious philosophy.

The faults of men, especially pride, bring punishment, and the sins of the fathers are visited upon the children :

Do you see how God strikes with his thunderbolt the greatest creatures and does not allow them to exalt themselves, while the small ones trouble him not at all? And do you see how his shafts always strike the tallest houses and trees? For God loves to put down all things that exalt themselves.²

¹ VII, 152.

² VII, 10, 5.

The gods and fate watch over the actions and fortunes of men, and history is but the expression of the divine law. The will of the gods is expressed to men by oracles and portents, none of which is too wonderful for Herodotus to believe in, the only reason for his disbelief in some instances being the fact that he heard of the sign or wonder on what he considers poor authority. Homer and Hesiod he regards as the founders of men's knowledge of the gods, and his religious belief is founded upon Homer and Hesiod, though enlarged and deepened by the teaching of the mysteries.

In the beginning of his work Herodotus declares his purpose in writing it: "That human events may not become obliterated by time, and that the great and wonderful deeds performed by Greeks and barbarians may not lose their glory." So his history is an account of the great deeds of men, much as the Homeric poems are accounts of the great deeds of the heroes. His purpose is not to write a book which shall be useful to posterity so much as to record in an interesting way the glorious deeds of his countrymen and others. Whatever is not directly connected with such deeds is to be regarded as a digression. But Herodotus was a great traveler, a man interested in many things, one who was willing to receive and impart information on many subjects. The digressions in his work are therefore numerous and interesting. His main theme is the Persian invasion of Greece, but he is in no hurry to reach it, nor, when he has reached it, to finish it, though the movement in the last books is somewhat more rapid than in the earlier ones. His narrative moves along with an easy flow, stopping and turning aside whenever an interesting subject for a digression occurs, but returning to its regular course after the digression and proceeding with simple directness. The style of Herodotus is in harmony with his manner of composition. His narrative is simple and straightforward. His sentences

are not involved or obscure. Sometimes they are long, but then they consist of clauses arranged in succession and connected by simple particles like "and" or "but." The periodical sentence, such as it is found in Thucydides and later writers, is foreign to Herodotus. His sentences resemble rather those of a modern English writer than those of the later more rhetorical classical authors. It belongs to the simplicity of his style that Herodotus seldom employs the form of indirect quotation. He inserts many imaginary conversations in his work, but these are all given as if in the actual words of the speakers, not reported in the third person. His style is picturesque and interesting, but seldom rises to eloquence. At times he is grave and almost stately in expression, but more often naive and simple. He employs Homeric phrases to add dignity to his expression much as biblical phrases are used by modern authors. The general impression produced by his style is that of simplicity and straightforwardness with utter freedom from affectation. His dialect is Ionic, with occasional admixture of Homeric and other elements, and his work marks the highest development of Ionic prose.

Some idea of Herodotus's style may be obtained from a translation of part of his digression about the Scythians (Book IV, 11), a passage which serves also as a specimen of the numerous digressions which he allowed himself and of the almost childlike faith with which he accepted stories of past times and distant lands :

There is also another story, as follows, to which I myself incline : that the nomadic Scythians, living in Asia, when they were hard pressed in war by the Massagetæ, crossed the river Araxes and went away to the country of Cimmeria (for the country which the Scythians now inhabit is said to have belonged in ancient times to the Cimmerians), and that the Cimmerians, when the Scythians came against them took counsel, since a great army was coming against them, and their opinions were divided, both being vehement, but

that of the chiefs being better; for the opinion of the common people was that it was best to go away and that it was not worth while to put themselves in danger for the sake of mere soil; but that of the chiefs was to fight to the last gasp for their country against the invaders. Now neither was the people willing to yield to the chiefs nor the chiefs to the people; so the former decided to go away without fighting and give up the land to the invaders; but the chiefs determined to die and be laid in their own land and not to join the people in flight, considering all the blessings they had enjoyed and all the evils they must expect to encounter as fugitives from their country. And when they had thus determined they divided and made themselves equal in number and fought with each other. And when they had all been slain by one another, the people of the Cimmerians buried them by the river Tyras (and their tomb is still visible), and when they had buried them then they made their migration from the country. And the Scythians came and took the land which was empty.

Herodotus belongs chronologically to the Attic period, but in dialect, style, and manner of thought he is the natural successor of the logographers. He is filled with admiration for the greatness of Athens, but is little affected by the new intellectual activity of that brilliant centre of Greek life and thought. His mind was under the influence of the poets of old, and among his Athenian contemporaries the tragedians Æschylus and Sophocles appealed to him far more than did the sophists and orators of the day. He marks at once the beginning of critical historical writing and of really artistic prose, but at the same time he is the last important writer of Ionic prose and the last writer whose prose is free from the influence of dialectics and oratory. The charm of his style is great, but it lacks the incisive vigor of Thucydides and the fiery eloquence of Demosthenes.

Ctesias of Cnidus, born in the second half of the fifth century B. C., was by profession a physician. He fell into the hands of the Persians as a prisoner of war, and became

court physician at Susa, where he remained seventeen years. He was present as the physician of King Artaxerxes at the battle of Cunaxa in 401. He was held in great honor, and had access to the royal archives, which he used in composing his works. He wrote on historical, geographical, and medical subjects, his most celebrated works being the *Persica*, or *History of Persia*, and the *Indica*, or *Description of India*. Only fragments of these works remain. His style is said by ancient writers to have been pleasing and clear, though somewhat prolix. He had ample sources of information, and his books were therefore valuable, but he was not always careful or even truthful in his statements. His works were full of petty antagonism to Herodotus, and, like him, he belongs in spirit to the period before the great influence of Athens in spite of his comparatively late date.

BOOK II

THE ATTIC PERIOD

CHAPTER XVI

ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE DRAMA

Athens in the fifth century—Rise of drama from the dithyramb—Thespis, about 550 B. C.—Chœrilus, about 550 to about 480 B. C.—Pratinas, about 500 B. C.—Phrynichus, about 540–476 B. C.—Festivals of Dionysus at Athens—The drama supported by the state—The chorus—The poet and the actors—Payments and prizes—The theatre—Divisions of Greek plays.

IN the sixth century B. C. Athens was already one of the most important cities of Greece, and we have seen that under Pisistratus and his sons, Anacreon, Simonides, and other foreign poets were attracted thither. In the fifth century, especially after the foundation of the confederacy of Delos, Athens was politically the most prominent of the

Athens in the fifth century. Greek states, and at the same time the chief centre of intellectual and artistic life. The citadel was adorned with beautiful buildings and monuments of all kinds; artists, poets, philosophers, and sophists were eager to practise their crafts and professions in the city whose commerce and manufactures attracted hosts of foreign traders and whose great wealth was increased by the tribute of her allies. The festivals of the gods became brilliant and splendid as never before. Wealthy, powerful, and cosmopolitan Athens was the natural patron of all the liberal arts, and her people, alert,

vigorous, self-confident, and at the same time filled with love of beauty and appreciation of all kinds of artistic and literary excellence, were ready not only to receive and adapt the best that other parts of Greece could offer, but also to produce from among themselves the greatest artists, poets, orators, and thinkers of the ancient world. The Athenians believed that their race had inhabited Attica from time immemorial, but they knew that the original stock had received additions from various Greek tribes. It was a mixed race, though in the main Ionic, and its speech, Ionic for the most part, was so modified that it was understood in all parts of the Greek world, and became in the end the common language, at least for literary purposes, of the whole Greek race. Under these circumstances it is natural that Attic literature in the fifth century was of the greatest importance.

Of all the literary movements of the fifth century the development of the Attic drama is the most important.

The beginnings of drama. But the beginnings of drama belong in earlier times and must be discussed briefly before the work of the great dramatists of the fifth century can be understood. The drama is of Attic origin, but is a development from the rustic songs of Dionysus which were common to all parts of Greece under the name of dithyrambs. We have seen (page 113) that Arion developed the dithyramb into an artistic form. Whether the drama arose from the dithyramb as presented by Arion or from its more primitive form is uncertain, but as the dithyramb continued in vogue in Athens after the rise of the drama, the latter alternative is more probable. At any rate, there were in the Attic villages choral songs in honor of Dionysus, and the leader of the chorus probably took the part of a messenger from the god, and told stories or myths pertaining to the trials and sufferings which the god endured on earth. The choral songs were then for the most part wailings and lamentations for those sufferings.

Similar songs combined with narrative by the leader of the chorus were sung at other places in honor of other gods or heroes, as at Sicyon in honor of Adrastus. At first the words of the leader were no doubt merely improvised, and the songs of the chorus were traditional, with little variety or originality. Such festivals appear to have been especially common among Doric Greeks, and hence the Dorians claimed to be the inventors of tragedy. The chorus at these festivals appeared disguised as satyrs, the followers of Dionysus, who were half man and half goat, and from the word *tragos*, "goat," the name "tragedy" is derived. As tragedy developed into a serious branch of literature, the chorus of satyrs was replaced by a chorus appropriate to the plot of each play, but the "satyr drama," a kind of mythical burlesque, which was performed at the end of a series of three tragedies, retained, as a rule, the chorus of satyrs.

Thespis, of the deme of Icaria, in Attica, is said to have been the inventor of tragedy. This seems to mean that

about the middle of the sixth century B. C.
Thespis. Thespis separated the leader of the chorus more distinctly from the others than had been done before, and perhaps made him actually impersonate the god Dionysus and recite verses not simply narrative, but demanding a response from the chorus. All that is certain is that Thespis brought dramatic action into the dithyramb, though only to a limited extent. The new kind of dithyramb found favor and was introduced into the city festivals of Athens in 534 B. C., when Pisistratus was ruler. Horace¹ says that Thespis traveled about in a cart, giving performances in various places, and that the faces of the performers were smeared with the dregs of wine. Other writers attribute to him the invention of the prologue and the introduction of narrative, which is the same

¹ *Ars Poetica*, 275 ff.

thing as the introduction of the actor. He is also said to have invented the mask used by all tragic actors. Probably some of the inventions attributed to Thespis were made before his day, and others may have been made by his contemporaries. We have no means of knowing in detail what is to be attributed to him, nor can we even fix his date exactly. We only know that he lived about the middle of the sixth century B. C.

Chœrilus of Athens is said to have competed for the prize in tragedy for the first time in the sixty-fourth Olympiad (524–521 B. C.), and also in the seventy-fourth (484–481 B. C.). He was apparently a

Chœrilus. prolific author, but none of his many plays has been preserved. Pratinas of Phlius competed with Chœrilus and Æschylus in the seventieth Olympiad (500–497 B. C.). He was less prolific than Chœrilus, and of his fifty

Pratinas. plays thirty-two are said to have been satyr dramas. The satyr dramas of Pratinas and his son Aristias were regarded as second to those of Æschylus alone. Further than this we know only the titles of one or two plays by Pratinas, and a few fragments of his lyric poems are preserved, which show him to have been a poet of no little grace and charm. Phrynichus of Athens, son of

Phrynichus. Polyphradmon, was the third and greatest tragic poet who succeeded Thespis and preceded Æschylus. His first victory in tragic competition is assigned to the sixty-seventh Olympiad (512–509 B. C.). His *Capture of Miletus* was probably produced soon after Miletus was taken by the Persians, in 494, and his *Phœnicians*, which probably celebrated the battle of Salamis, appears to belong to the year 476 B. C. At that time the poet was already old. The date of his death, which took place in Sicily, is unknown. The titles of nine of his tragedies are known, but few fragments are preserved, and from these we gain little information. It is noticeable that two of his tragedies take their subjects from contemporary events.

With very few exceptions (these two and the *Persians* of Æschylus) the subjects of Greek tragedies are mythical. According to Herodotus, the performance of the *Capture of Miletus* filled the Athenians with such grief that they fined the author a thousand drachmas and forbade the production of similar dramas. Phrynichus is said to have made female parts prominent in his plays, but he was not the first to introduce female characters. The works of Chœrilus, Pratinas, and Phrynichus were undoubtedly for the most part lyric, the actor being of less importance than the chorus. The same is true, though to a less degree, of the tragedies of Æschylus. Greek tragedy was developed from lyric poetry and retained to the end its lyric character alongside of its dramatic action. This fact and the fact that the performance of tragedies was an act of worship must always be borne in mind, for Greek tragedy was in form and spirit essentially different from modern tragedy, and the difference is due chiefly to the prevailing influence of religion and of lyric poetry.

Before proceeding to the discussion of the works of Æschylus, the greatest innovator and most original genius among the Greek tragic poets, it is well to devote a few words to the circumstances under which Greek tragedies were performed. Tragedy originated and was developed at Athens, and although it soon spread throughout the whole Greek world, our information concerning it is derived almost entirely from Athens. It is therefore with the circumstances surrounding it at Athens that we have to deal.

There were in the city of Athens two annual festivals at which dramatic performances were given—the Lenæan festival in January, and the City (or Greater) Dionysia in March. To these should be added the Lesser (or Rural) Dionysia, celebrated in the various demes of Attica in December. Some of these rural festivals were rural only in name and were of considerable importance. Such was, for instance, the festival at the

Dionysiac
festivals.

Piræus. It seems, however, that new tragedies were seldom, if ever, performed outside of the city. At first the Lenæan festival seems to have been at least as important as the Greater Dionysia in March, but it became for a time so much less important that it was not celebrated with the performance of new tragedies. Soon, however, the number of tragedies offered became so great that new pieces were performed at the Lenæa and the Greater Dionysia alike.

At public festivals in honor of the gods the Greeks loved to introduce contests or competitions for prizes. So at the festivals of Dionysus, tragedies were performed in competition. Though such contests were introduced in the sixth century, we know little of them until the time of Æschylus and Sophocles. The following description applies therefore especially to the fifth century. The chief superintendence of the greater Dionysia was in the hands of the first archon (Archon Eponymus), that of the Lenæa in those of the second archon (King Archon), and in the demes the demarchs were in charge. From

The chorus. these magistrates each poet who was admitted to the competition received a chorus. The chorus was thus furnished by the state, but it really received payment, costumes, and training at the expense of the *choregus*, a wealthy man to whom the duty of providing for the chorus was assigned. The *choregi* vied with each other in providing lavishly for the worship of the god and the entertainment of the people. The number of poets who competed at the greater Dionysia was probably three, each of whom had to offer three tragedies and a satyr drama. Such a series of four pieces is called a *tetralogy*, and the three tragedies without the satyr drama are spoken of as a *trilogy*. Æschylus is said to have introduced the system of competing with tetralogies, and to have combined with it the rule that the four pieces must be connected in subject. Certainly some of his tetralogies were thus connected, but others were

formed of four plays on different subjects. It is said that Sophocles competed with single plays, but this may mean merely that the plays forming his tetralogies were not connected. The tragic chorus, like that of the dithyramb, consisted originally of fifty persons, but this number was divided among the four pieces of the tetralogy, so that the chorus in any one piece numbered only twelve until Sophocles increased the number to fifteen.

The poet received the chorus not in his capacity as poet, but as *chorodidascaulus*, or trainer of the chorus, and the archon did not care officially whether the play submitted to him was written by the person who asked for a chorus or not. Originally the poet really did train the chorus, and took the actor's part himself, but after the introduction by Æschylus of a second actor the poet was unable to take both actors' parts, and acting began to become a profession. Sophocles introduced a third actor, and from this time acting became more and more professional, and the poets ceased to act in their own tragedies. There were never more than three actors in Greek tragedies, but several parts could be taken by one actor, and there were frequently supernumeraries who did not speak but served as companions, servants, or followers of the chief personages.

The poets as well as the actors were paid by the state, the amount of the payment varying at different times, and probably also depending upon the reputation of the recipient. A prize was assigned to the successful poet, and in the fourth century the chief actor (protagonist) also received a prize. What the value of these prizes was we do not know. Undoubtedly the honor was the chief consideration, as the competitors received payment for their labors irrespective of the prizes. The prizes were awarded by a jury chosen by lot from a list prepared by the senate and the *choregi* interested. The successful *choregus* was rewarded only by the honor of the

The poet and
the actors.

Payments
and prizes.

victory, in memory of which he set up an inscription in a public place.

In the earliest times the tragic performances took place in any convenient open space near the temple or sacred place of Dionysus, for the choral songs and the single actor needed no elaborate preparations.

The primitive theatre.

The actor did, however, need a tent in which he could change his costume, and it was natural to put the tent close to the place where the chorus sang and danced. This interfered with the view from one side, and the audience therefore grouped itself not in a circle, but in a semi-circle or a larger arc. But the performance could not be seen well except by those in the front row of spectators if all were on the same level, and therefore the spectators arranged themselves on the slope of a hill overlooking the dancing place, which was called the *orchestra*. Then, since the slope did not curve about the circular orchestra, wooden seats were built out at right and left. Then in the place of the tent a wooden structure was erected, which was still called the *scene* (the Greek word *skene* means *tent*). The theatre now consisted of a circular *orchestra*, at one side of which was a long *scene*, while from all the other sides rose tiers of seats. This was the early form of the theatre, and it remained the same except in details as long as tragedies in the manner of Æschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides continued to be presented.

The great Dionysiac theatre at Athens, the earliest stone theatre in the city, was not built until the fourth century, when the great days of Attic tragedy were passed, nor are there anywhere remains of any theatre of the fifth century. Probably, however, the theatres of the fourth century merely transferred to stone the forms of the wooden structures of the earlier time, and therefore the ruins of stone theatres help to give an idea of what the earlier buildings were. The *orchestra* kept its circular form, and the *scene*

The theatre in the fifth century.

remained as it had been, but in front of the *scene* was placed the *proscenium*, with a row of columns forming a background to the orchestra, and at the right and left were the *parascenia*, wings of the scene building which projected toward the seats and the orchestra. Between the *parascenia* and the seats were the *parodoi*, or entrances, through which the chorus came into the orchestra and the spectators reached the seats. There were also doors, sometimes as many as three, in the *proscenium*, through which actors who did not come in by the *parodoi* might enter. The chorus, twelve—later fifteen—in number, arranged in three rows of four or five or in four or five rows of three, sang and danced about the altar of Dionysus, which stood in the middle of the orchestra. The actors, who were distinguished from the chorus by more gorgeous robes, high head coverings, and buskins with soles so thick as to increase considerably the stature of the wearer, also appeared in front of the *proscenium*. Whether they acted in the orchestra on the same level as the chorus or upon a raised platform in the fifth century is not absolutely certain, but the arguments in favor of the platform are not convincing. Even if there was a platform, it can not have been very high, for the actors had evidently free intercourse with the chorus. In Hellenistic times and later, when the chorus had lost its importance, the actors appeared upon a high stage, but in the fifth century this was not the case.

The scenery varied little. As a rule, the *proscenium*, with its columns and openings between them, served as the background, representing a palace or a temple.

Scenery and contrivances.

There was, probably even in the fifth century, a second story from which gods could be made to appear by means of a machine, which is not clearly described. Partial changes of scenery were accomplished by means of *periacti*, triangular prisms with different pictures painted on the three sides. These could be revolved, thus showing different views to the spectators. There was also

a machine called the *ekkyklema*, by means of which the interior of a temple or house could be shown to the spectators, or persons could be brought out from the house into view. There seems to have been a curtain which could hide part of the orchestra from the audience until the play began. This may, however, belong to later times.

The subjects of Greek tragedies were almost invariably mythological. The audience, therefore, knew the main lines of the plot beforehand, though the tragic poets did not hesitate to change details of the myths for dramatic purposes. The "three unities" were observed in almost all cases: unity of place—that is, there was no change of scene; unity of time—that is, the action of the play was supposed to take place in one day; unity of action—that is, the whole course of the play was consistent and continuous. The unities were, however, treated with some freedom.

The part of a Greek play which precedes the entrance of the chorus is called the *prologue*. In it the circumstances and, so far as is necessary, the plot are made clear to the audience. The entrance song of the chorus is the *parodos*. Songs sung by the chorus after its entrance are called *stasima*. The parts of a play between the *stasima* are called *episodes*. These correspond roughly to the acts of a modern drama, and each *stasimon* may be regarded as a musical interlude separating two acts, though originally the musical portions were much more important than the acts themselves. The part of the play after the last *stasimon* is called the *exodus*. By means of the *stasima* the play is divided into four or five acts. Lyric songs sung as solos by an actor are called *monodies*, and a lyric dialogue between the chorus and an actor is called a *commos*. The *monody* and the *commos* are not necessary parts of a play, some plays consisting only of spoken dialogue and choral songs.

CHAPTER XVII

ÆSCHYLUS

Æschylus, 525–456 B. C.—Life and works—Analysis of extant plays.

THE permanent features of Greek tragedy were fixed by the first great tragic poet, Æschylus. He was the son of

Euphorion, of a noble family of Eleusis, and Æschylus.

was born at Eleusis in 525 B. C. He died in Sicily in 456 B. C. A poetic legend narrates that once, when the young Æschylus had fallen asleep in a vineyard, the god Dionysus appeared to him and told him to compose tragedies. In obedience to the divine behest he began his poetic career while still a youth, and continued to write tragedies throughout his life. His first recorded public appearance in a tragic contest was, however, in the seventieth Olympiad, 500–497 B. C., when he competed with Pratinas and Chœrilus. His first victory was won in 484 B. C., when he was forty years of age, and he is said to have won the prize twenty-eight times in all. During the Persian wars he fought at Marathon and Salamis, and the courage he showed at Marathon was recorded on his tombstone. About 474 B. C. he went to Sicily to visit the court of Hiero. Three reasons have been assigned for his departure from Athens. He is said to have been angry because the epigram of Simonides in honor of those who fell at Marathon was preferred to his own, or because the tragic prize was given to Sophocles. But the first of these events took place in 489 B. C., and the second in 468, so that neither can have affected his action in 474. The third

reason given, that he was charged with profaning the mysteries, can not be disproved, except by the fact that he afterward returned to Athens. The real reason was without doubt his own fame, which led Hiero to desire his presence. In 472 he was again in Athens, where he brought out the *Persians*. He died in the neighborhood of Gela, in Sicily, in 456 B. C., but how long he had been in Sicily at that time is unknown.

Born at Eleusis, the seat of the Eleusinian mysteries, Æschylus was surrounded from the beginning by an atmosphere of religion, which had its effect upon his character, as shown in his poetry. The period in which he lived was, moreover, a time of peculiar religious fervor, especially at Athens. In his youth came the Ionic revolt and the sack of Sardis by Asiatic Greeks assisted by Athenians and Eretrians, which brought the hosts of Persia against Greece. When he was thirty-five years old he stood with ten thousand Athenians and one thousand Platæans opposed to the great army sent by Darius, and took part in a victory which would have been impossible without the aid of the gods, who gave the Greeks active assistance. Ten years later the innumerable hosts of Xerxes were shattered and destroyed at Salamis. Here, too, the gods showed their power unmistakably, punishing by the hands of the Greeks the overweening pride of the Persian king. Such events as these awoke in the Athenians of the time a spirit of patriotic and religious exaltation which finds its highest expression in the poetry of Æschylus. The gods are ever present in his tragedies, punishing the evil deeds of men, avenging the crimes of the fathers upon the children, and especially bringing to naught those who sin through pride. The subjects of all the plays of Æschylus are mythological save one, and that one is *The Persians*, in which the punishment of the pride of the Persians is portrayed. Among the myths Æschylus chose those in which the power of the gods and of fate is

most evident. Of seventy (or, according to Suidas, ninety) tragedies which he wrote, only seven have been preserved, though the titles of many others are known, and a considerable body of fragments exists. The seven extant plays, in the probable chronological order of their composition, are *The Suppliants*, *The Persians*, *The Seven against Thebes*, *The Prometheus Bound*, *The Agamemnon*, *The Choëphori*, and *The Eumenides*, the last three of which form the only extant trilogy, and are spoken of collectively as *The Agamemnon Trilogy* or *The Oresteia*.

The earliest play is *The Suppliants*, but its exact date is unknown. The structure of the play is extremely simple, two actors only are employed, and the second actor appears but twice. Dialogue is sparingly used, and more than half the play is choral, the dialogue being for the most part between a single actor and the chorus, which consists of fifty persons, as it represents the fifty daughters of Danaus. The scene is laid near Argos, by the seashore. The fifty daughters of Danaus, who have fled from Egypt to avoid marriage with their cousins, enter, led by their father. They take their places about the altars of the gods and chant a prayer. Then follows a short conversation between the maidens and their father. The king of Argos then appears, and the maidens implore his assistance. A long dialogue follows, in which the king's doubts are overcome by the earnest entreaties of the suppliants, and he promises to protect them. Danaus then comes forward and thanks the king, who sends him with some attendants to the city to offer prayers, and presently follows to call an assembly of the Argives. During the presence of the king Danaus is a silent spectator until the last, when he addresses him in thanks. A slight change would have made his presence altogether unnecessary. The chorus, left alone by the king's departure, sing a long hymn to Zeus. Then Danaus returns with the news that the people of Argos have agreed to protect

The Suppliants.

them. This is followed by a song of thanksgiving. Danaus then sees the ship of the fifty sons of Ægyptus, and after pointing it out to his daughters in an excited speech, goes to give the alarm. A choral song of lamentation follows. Then there enters a herald from the ship, who orders the maidens to follow him. His rough and overbearing words are met by piteous appeals for mercy. Now the king appears and a violent debate takes place between him and the herald. This is the only important dialogue in the play, the only one which could not easily be eliminated. The herald is finally discomfited and goes off to the ship. The king also goes away, and the chorus sings a short song. Then Danaus comes to lead his daughters to the city, and all leave the theatre with prayers for their protectors and themselves.

Throughout this play there is little or nothing which a modern playwright would call dramatic action. The plot is so simple as hardly to deserve the name of plot at all—the maidens enter, ask for protection, receive the promise they desire, and are actually protected, though there is no conflict between protectors and pursuers except in words. The chief interest centres in the chorus, the actors being quite subordinate. All this shows how near *The Suppliants* stands to the primitive drama of Thespis. But in dignity and force of expression and in lyric beauty this play is far from primitive, and the serious, exalted religious feeling of Æschylus is as evident here as in the later dramas. In the first ode the chorus prays :¹

May God good issue give!
 And yet the will of Zeus is hard to scan:
 Through all it darkly gleams,
 E'en though in darkness and the gloom of chance
 For us poor mortals wrapt.
 Safe, by no fall tripped up,

¹ *Suppliants*, 78 ff., Plumptre's translation.

The full-wrought deed decreed by brow of Zeus;
 For dark with shadows stretch
 The pathways of the counsels of his heart,
 And difficult to see.
 And from high-towering hopes he hurleth down
 To utter doom the heir of mortal birth;
 Yet sets he in array
 No forces violent;
 All that gods work is effortless and calm:
 Seated on holiest throne,
 Thence, though we know not how,
 He works his perfect will.

And again in a later ode :¹

Oh king of kings! and blest
 Above all blessed ones,
 And power most mighty of the mightiest!
 O Zeus of high estate!
 Hear thou and grant our prayer!

The Suppliants belonged to a trilogy and was followed by *The Danaïdes*, a play treating of the marriage of the daughters of Danaus and the sons of Ægyptus. This may have been followed by *The Makers of the Bridal Chamber*, or *The Suppliants* may itself have followed *The Egyptians*. These matters are uncertain, and are of comparatively little importance. The play, with its simplicity and grandeur, shows what Æschylus could accomplish even before he had learned to make full use of the second actor.

The Persians was produced at Athens in 472 B. C., as the second of four plays, *Phineus*, *The Persians*, *Glaucus*, and *Prometheus*, the last of which was a satyr drama. There seems to have been no connection of subject between these plays. *The Persians* was repeated, possibly with some changes, at Syracuse at the request of Hiero. This is the only historical tragedy, the only tragedy the subject of which is not mythical, that has come

¹ *Suppliants*, 507 ff., Plumptre's translation.

down to us, and in this recent history is treated so as to make it seem as remote as the ancient myths. The subject is the defeat of the Persians under Xerxes, especially the battle of Salamis, which took place at the very doors of the Athenians only eight years before the performance of the play. But the scene is laid at the Persian capital of Susa; the chorus consists of elderly Persian nobles; the actors represent Atossa, the mother of Xerxes; the ghost of Darius, Xerxes's father; a messenger who tells of the destruction of the Persian forces, and finally Xerxes himself. Everything is removed away from Greece, and the great battle, far from being represented before the eyes of the spectators, is told by a Persian to Persians. Not a single Greek is mentioned by name in the entire play. At the beginning, the chorus enters, describing the vast host now absent in Greece; then Queen Atossa, disturbed by dreams, asks the chorus about the Greeks and the absent Persian host, and receives information, which is interrupted by the arrival of the messenger to tell of the defeat. The description of the battle of Salamis is wonderful in its clearness and its poetic beauty. After lamentations by the chorus Atossa prepares to invoke the shade of the dead Darius, to whom the chorus sings an invocation. The ghost appears and declares that the defeat of the host was foreordained as a punishment for excessive pride, and he tells of the further misfortunes of the Persians after the battle of Salamis. His disappearance is followed by a mourning song of the chorus. Presently Xerxes arrives, and the remainder of the play consists of laments by Xerxes and the chorus.

Here, as in *The Suppliants*, the structure of the play is simple. There are no complications requiring disentangling, no surprises prepared for the audience. From the beginning the end is not only known by all the Greek hearers, but also half predicted by the forebodings of Atossa and the chorus. The chorus itself, though not so

important as in *The Suppliants*, is still indispensable to the progress of the play, and far more than half the time of performance must have been occupied by the choral songs. The second actor is more necessary here than in *The Suppliants*, and the play shows as a whole more advanced dramatic art.

The Seven against Thebes was produced in 467 B. C., five years after *The Persians*. It was the third play of a trilogy, the *Laius* and the *Œdipus* being the titles of the other two. The title of the satyr drama was the *Sphinx*. In the *Laius* the origin of the curse which rested on the house of Laius is explained. Laius had been told by the Delphic oracle that "if he died without offspring he would preserve the city"; but he disregarded the warning and begot a son, Œdipus, whom he exposed as an infant on Mount Cithæron. The child was saved, however, and grew to manhood. He unwittingly slew his father and became king of Thebes, marrying his mother. In the *Œdipus* he discovers who his wife is, and, driven by horror at the discovery, puts out his eyes, uttering a curse upon his two sons, Eteocles and Polynices, that "they, with spear in hand, should some day share their father's wealth." In *The Seven* the curse is fulfilled. Polynices has been banished from Thebes by Eteocles, who rules alone. But Polynices has gone to Argos and collected an army led by six chiefs besides himself, and now the army is at the gates. The first part of the play is taken up with forebodings and prayers by the chorus of Theban maidens, who are rebuked by Eteocles. A messenger enters and describes with great spirit and in minute detail the hostile chiefs, one of whom is stationed against each of the seven city gates. Eteocles had previously appointed six Theban warriors, with himself as the seventh, to guard the gates, and now he finds that Polynices is to be his opponent. Although the chorus tries to dissuade him, he departs for the conflict. A choral song follows. Now a messenger en-

ters, announcing the defeat of the enemy and the death of Eteocles and Polynices, each slain by his brother's hand. The chorus breaks forth into lamentation, hardly tempered by thanksgiving for the salvation of the city :

Great Zeus! and ye, O gods!
 Guardians of this our town,
 Who save in very deed
 The towers of Cadmus old,
 Shall I rejoice and shout
 Over the happy chance
 That frees our state from harm;
 Or weep that ill-starred pair,
 The war-chiefs, childless and most miserable,
 Who, true to that ill name
 Of Polynices, died in impious mood,
 Contending overmuch?
 Oh, dark, and all too true
 That curse of Œdipus and all his race!
 An evil chill is falling on my heart,
 And, like a Thyiad wild,
 Over his grave I sing a dirge of grief,
 Hearing the dead have died by evil fate,
 Each in foul bloodshed steeped;
 Ah me! Ill-omened is the spear's accord.¹

The bodies of the slain brothers are brought in, followed by the sisters, Antigone and Ismene, and a troop of mourners. The chorus joins the two sisters in lamentation. Presently a herald enters proclaiming that it is forbidden to bury the body of Polynices. Antigone declares that she will bury him, and half of the chorus takes her part, while the other half follows Ismene and the body of Eteocles from the theatre.

This play shows the chorus still prominent, but not so much an active force in the progress of events as heretofore. Eteocles is the one important personage, and his character is drawn in strong, vigorous lines. The play is

¹ *Seven*, 804 ff.

full of warlike spirit, alongside of which is the constant feeling of the weight of the curse driving Eteocles to his final doom. Two actors still suffice for all the parts, except in the last scene. Perhaps this scene, which seems to prepare the way for the *Antigone* of Sophocles, may be an addition by a later hand. It may be, however, that the part of the herald in the last scene was taken by an extra performer, who was not regarded as an actor.

The *Prometheus Bound* formed a trilogy with the *Prometheus Unbound* and the *Prometheus the Fire-Bringer*.

Prometheus Bound. The date of its production is unknown, but the structure of the play, in which the dialogue is of greater importance than in the plays hitherto considered, shows that it is later than *The Seven against Thebes*. The subject is the punishment of Prometheus for giving fire to men and raising them from their previous low condition. Prometheus is at the opening of the play fastened to a rock by Hephæstus and his helpers, Strength and Force. Here he is visited by the chorus of ocean nymphs and their father Oceanus. The latter goes away when Prometheus refuses to accept his advice and yield to the will of Zeus, but the chorus remains throughout in sympathy with Prometheus. The maiden Io, who has been beloved by Zeus, but is now changed to a heifer and driven in long wanderings, tormented by a gadfly sent by Hera, comes upon the scene, and Prometheus tells the story of her past and future wanderings, and prophesies that one of her descendants is to set him free. Prometheus is strengthened in his firm resolution to endure all the hardships Zeus may send upon him by the foreknowledge that Zeus is to contract a marriage from which is to spring a son who shall overthrow his father's power. Hermes, the messenger of Zeus, comes to order Prometheus to explain the meaning of this prophecy and to threaten him with dire punishment if he refuses. Prometheus is not moved from his resolution, and the play ends with a great storm

and earthquake, in which the rock, upon which Prometheus is bound, falls crashing upon him, and he sinks out of sight.

The play is full of vigor and of gloomy power, rendered less oppressive by the gentle grace of the maiden chorus and the almost comic caution of the old Oceanus. Zeus is made to appear as a harsh, cruel tyrant, who feels no gratitude to Prometheus for past services, and, having just succeeded in overthrowing his father, loves to show his newly won power by harshness and violence. Prometheus, on the other hand, excites our sympathy by his courageous endurance of the trouble he has brought upon himself by his kindness to man. His character dominates the entire play. The opposition between Prometheus, the hero of the play, and Zeus, the ruler of the world, for whom Æschylus shows elsewhere the greatest reverence, is left at the end of the play unabated. This must have been changed in the *Prometheus Unbound*, in which Heracles, descended from Io, frees Prometheus, who becomes reconciled with Zeus and warns him of the danger that threatens him from his intended marriage with Thetis. All this does not make the character of Zeus, as it appears in the *Prometheus Bound*, any less odious or more to be worshiped, but Æschylus appears here as elsewhere to have given the ancient myth the noblest and grandest possible expression without attempting to reconcile it in all respects with his religious belief. Whether the *Prometheus the Fire-Bringer* was the first play of the trilogy, telling of the gift of fire to men, or the last, relating to the establishment at Athens of a special worship of Prometheus, is uncertain. In its present isolated state the *Prometheus Bound* is one of the noblest expressions of mythological religion, one of the greatest and most powerful utterances of the genius of Æschylus.

The *Oresteia*, consisting of the *Agamemnon*, *Choëphori*, and *Eumenides*, with the satyr drama *Proteus*, was produced in 458 B. C., two years before the death of Æschylus.

How the contents of the *Proteus* was connected with the matter of the rest of the tetralogy is unknown. The three extant plays form the only trilogy preserved to us, and the connection between them is so close that each seems incomplete without the others. It is, however, not certain that all the trilogies of Æschylus were formed of plays so closely connected. In this trilogy the subject is the terrible story of the curse that rested on the house of Atreus. Tantalus, the grandfather of Atreus, had killed his own son and offered the flesh to the gods to eat; Pelops his son had killed the charioteer Myrtilus; Atreus himself had killed the children of his brother Thyestes and set their flesh as food before their father; and Agamemnon, son of Atreus, had sacrificed his daughter Iphigenia at Aulis to gain fair winds for the Greek fleet to sail to Troy. During his absence at Troy his wife Clytæmnestra yielded to her guilty passion for his cousin Ægisthus and with him usurped the royal power at Mycenæ. In the *Agamemnon* the long-absent king returns proudly from the capture of Troy, accompanied by a numerous retinue, including Cassandra, the inspired prophetess, daughter of Priam. He is met with gentle words by Clytæmnestra, who entices him within the palace and murders him with the help of Ægisthus. Cassandra presently shares his fate. The plot is extremely simple, all the action leading steadily to the fatal end. In the *Choëphori* Orestes, son of Agamemnon and Clytæmnestra, who was saved from death and sent out of the country at the time of his father's death by his sister Electra, returns, and with Electra's help kills Ægisthus and Clytæmnestra. According to Greek ideas of right, it was the duty of Orestes to avenge his father's murder; yet to slay one's mother is a most dreadful crime. The conflict between two duties thus lends an additional interest to the situation. There is still, however, no complication of plot, but everything leads straight to the death of Clytæmnestra and her paramour. After her death

Orestes is haunted by the Furies. The chorus, consisting of captive Trojan women, asks :

What phantoms vex thee, best beloved of sons
By thy dear sire ? Hold, fear not, victory's thine.

But Orestes replies :

These are no phantom terrors that I see :
Full clear they are my mother's vengeful hounds.

In the *Eumenides*, Orestes, pursued by the Furies, has fled to Delphi and sought shelter in the temple of Apollo. While the Furies sleep, Apollo and Hermes aid Orestes to escape to Athens. But the ghost of Clytæmnestra awakes the Furies, who pursue Orestes. At Athens, to which the scene changes, Orestes is tried before the court of the Areopagus. The Furies accuse him, Apollo appears as his advocate, and after Athena has cast her vote in favor of Orestes the votes of the judges are evenly divided. Then Athena declares Orestes acquitted. The Furies are appeased by the institution of a special Attic worship of them under the name of *Eumenides*, or Gentle Ones. In this play, while law and justice are on the side of the Furies, right and equity demand that Orestes be acquitted, and finally the scale is turned by the divine voice of Athena. The curse is thus dispelled from the house of Atreus. Through darkness, gloom, and horror the gods have led us to the light.

As is seen by these brief summaries of his extant dramas, the thoughts of Æschylus are grand and noble.

Style and language of Æschylus. His somber and powerful tragedies are full of religious feeling. Æschylus is a poet, not a philosopher, and his expressions in regard to the gods are not always consistent ; but he is always reverent, always deeply impressed with the dependence of men upon the divine will or law, whether this is regarded as the will of Zeus or as a fate to which even the gods are sub-

ject. These deep and weighty thoughts are expressed in great, sonorous words and phrases, sometimes obscure, but almost always magnificent and impressive. In his lyric parts Æschylus equals Pindar in grandeur, and is hardly inferior to him in brilliancy. Unfortunately the text of many of the choruses is so corrupt as to be almost incomprehensible. Like his contemporaries, Pindar and Bacchylides, Æschylus rejoices in new compound words, which are, in his case, composed with a view to grandeur and power rather than to mere picturesqueness or clearness. His characters are gods or mighty heroes—even the women of Æschylus are grand rather than sweet, powerful rather than tender—and their language is, even in the dialogue, far removed from the speech of every-day life. In spite of this, there is great directness and even simplicity in his dialogue, corresponding to the directness and simplicity of the action of the plays. In many cases, as, for instance, in the closing scene of the *Prometheus Bound*, Æschylus evidently paid great attention to spectacular effect, and it is doubtless not without reason that the ancients ascribed to him many innovations in the arrangement and management of the theatre. Incontestably the most original dramatic poet of Greece, Æschylus found dramatic poetry in its infancy and left it mature. He first made it really dramatic by the introduction of a second actor. In the *Oresteia* he adopts the third actor, introduced by Sophocles, but does not derive all the possible advantage therefrom. His plots are simple, without any of the complications which are made at once possible and attractive by the greater number of personages employed by Sophocles and Euripides. Grand as they are in their simplicity, the plays of Æschylus are not so perfect in detail, so delicately refined in plot, nor so wonderful in delineation of character, as those of Sophocles.

CHAPTER XVIII

SOPHOCLES

Sophocles, 497-405 B. C.—His life—His innovations—Analysis of his extant plays—His style and composition.

SOPHOCLES was born at Colonus, a village about a mile northwest of Athens, in 497 B. C., twenty-eight years after the birth of Æschylus. His father, Sophilus, was **Sophocles.** wealthy, though not of noble descent. The boy Sophocles was carefully educated, receiving instruction in music from Lamprus, a well-known teacher of the time. He excelled in personal beauty, in dancing, and in music, so that when a chorus of boys was to chant the pæan of victory after the battle of Salamis he was chosen to be the leader. The report that he "learned tragedy from Æschylus" probably means no more than that he, in common with all contemporary tragic poets, accepted the innovations introduced by Æschylus, and, in a general way, learned much from him.

The first appearance of Sophocles as a tragic poet was in 468 B. C., when he was twenty-eight years old. Æschylus, the recognized chief of his profession, was one of the competitors, and, according to the usual story, the feelings of the audience were divided between the two poets, the excitement being so great that the archon, Apsephion, appointed the ten generals, one of whom was Cimon, to act as judges of the contest, instead of choosing judges by lot in the usual way, and the generals awarded Sophocles the prize. The story may be rejected without hesitation, so far



SOPHOCLES.

Statue in the Lateran Museum, Rome.



LIBRARY
OF THE
UNIVERSITY
OF
CALIFORNIA

as the appointment of the generals as judges is concerned, but there is no doubt about the victory of Sophocles; and from this time his career was one of almost unvarying success. More than one hundred plays are ascribed to him (the most probable number being perhaps one hundred and twenty-three), and with these he won eighteen victories at the city Dionysia, besides others at the Lenæa. As each victory at the city Dionysia was won by four plays, it is evident that he was victorious with more than half his tetralogies. It is said, moreover, that he never fell below the second place, and that no other tragedian ever won more prizes than he. For over sixty years he composed a tetralogy every second year, showing no falling off in invention, imagination, dramatic skill, or poetic diction. He died in 405 B. C., more than ninety years of age, and his latest tragedy, the *Œdipus at Colonus*, was brought out after his death by his grandson.

His activity
as an author.

As a boy Sophocles saw the defeat of the Persians, in his early manhood Athens was rapidly becoming the first power in Greece, his prime is the period of the influence of Pericles, and his later years were spent amid the varying fortunes of the Peloponnesian War. In these great affairs

His political
activity.

Sophocles took his part as became an Athenian citizen. He was not a politician, but was twice elected general, once when he was sent with Pericles to put down the insurrection at Samos in 440 B. C., and again later when he was a colleague of Nicias. He was also *hellenotamias*, or treasurer of the tribute, and on more than one occasion he served as ambassador. But although he thus took part in public affairs, he never made them his chief business, but was throughout his life a poet; and it is useless to try to find political allusions in his tragedies. Many such allusions have been pointed out by modern scholars, but some have been shown by the dates of the plays and events to be impossible, while the rest are doubtful, and none is so clear as to be of any importance:

Whatever his political views were, Sophocles did not see fit to embody them in his dramas. If, as seems to be the case, the Sophocles who was one of the committee of ten in 411 B. C. was really the poet, that does not show that he belonged to the oligarchical party, but simply that he was obliged to take part in public affairs in those days of trouble at Athens.

Sophocles was also the priest of the Attic medical hero, Amynus, and when, in 420 B. C., the worship of the god of medicine, Asclepius, was introduced at Athens, Sophocles "received the god into his house and erected an altar to him," probably in the sacred precinct of Amynus, on the slope of the Acropolis. He also wrote a pæan to Asclepius, which was sung for centuries. Because he had received the god, Sophocles was after his death elevated to the rank of a hero and worshiped under the name of Dexion, "the Receiver." These facts show that Sophocles accepted and revered the popular religion, and the same reverence shows itself in his poetry. There is no trace of skepticism in his dramas, but everywhere religious faith.

Sophocles was married to Nicostrata, by whom he was the father of Iophon. Later he became the father of a son named Ariston by a Sicyonian woman named Theoris. Three other sons are mentioned, but nothing is known of them, nor is it known who was the father of Sophocles the younger, though he is known to have been the grandson of the great tragedian. Sophocles was a man of kindly and genial spirit, a pleasant companion, and a lover of good company. His life seems to have been a happy one, though the story is told that his son Iophon brought a suit against him in his old age and demanded that the care of his property be taken away from him, on the ground that he was feeble-minded. Instead of making his defense in the usual manner, Sophocles is said to have repeated to the judges portions of the *Œdipus at*

Sophocles a priest.

His sons and his later life.

Colonus, which he was then writing, and in this way to have gained all their votes.

Several innovations in the dramatic art are ascribed to Sophocles. The most important of these is the introduction of the third actor, which made the dialogue henceforth more important than the choral songs, though the latter continued to occupy nearly half the time of the performance. The second innovation consisted in enlarging the chorus from twelve to fifteen members, which doubtless occasioned some changes in its arrangement and movements. Sophocles also ceased to compose tetralogies of four plays on connected subjects, but competed at the festivals with separate plays—three tragedies and a satyr drama, to be sure, but not dealing with one myth. This, with the reduction of the length of the lyric portions of his plays, made it possible for him to make his plots less simple than those of Æschylus and to introduce more dramatic situations. It is also said that Sophocles was the first to use painted scenery to any great extent, and several minor changes in the costume of the chorus as well as in the music employed are attributed to him. All these things show that he was interested in the practical side of his profession as well as in the writing of tragedies. He even wrote a book in prose, *On the Chorus*, defending his innovations. In his early days he was himself an actor in his plays, but his weak voice compelled him to give up acting.

Only seven complete plays of Sophocles remain. These are, in the probable order of composition, the *Ajax*, the *Antigone*, the *Electra*, the *Trachiniæ*, *Œdipus the King*, the *Philoctetes*, and *Œdipus at Colonus*. The *Antigone* was performed in 442 or 441 if the story is true that Sophocles owed his election as general in 440 to the enthusiasm aroused by that play; the *Philoctetes* was brought out in 409, and the *Œdipus at Colonus* was presented in 401, four years after the author's

The extant
tragedies.

death, by the younger Sophocles. The dates of the other plays are unknown, and their probable order is determined by considerations of style and composition.

After the death of Achilles, his armor was given by the Greeks to Odysseus as the greatest surviving chieftain. Ajax, who had been the chief competitor, was angry and wished to kill not only Odysseus, but also the Atridæ, whom he regarded as responsible. But Athena darkened his mind, so that he slew the captured sheep and cattle belonging to the army, thinking that he was punishing his enemies. At this point the *Ajax* begins.

The Ajax. Athena exhibits to Odysseus the maddened Ajax, exulting in his imagined revenge. When his sense is restored to him he determines to put an end to his life, and, in spite of the care of Tecmessa and the chorus of Salaminian sailors, retires to a lonely place and falls upon his sword. This is done in the sight of the audience. Teucer, the half-brother of Ajax, wishes to bury the corpse, but is forbidden by Menelaus and Agamemnon. Finally Odysseus intervenes and persuades Agamemnon to withdraw his opposition to the burial.

This play contains many striking scenes. The farewell of Ajax to his son Eurysaces is full of tenderness, and the hero's last words before he falls upon his sword exhibit most admirably his passionate, fierce nature exalted by his terrible resolution to a height of gloomy majesty. The characters of Ajax, Odysseus, and Tecmessa are carefully drawn and excellent in their different ways. The plot is simple, everything leading up to the suicide of Ajax, but is admirably worked out, the details showing more dramatic invention than is found in the plays of Æschylus. The chorus still takes a somewhat important part in the action, and the choral parts form a larger proportion of the entire play than is the case in some of the other dramas of Sophocles. The third actor is not so skilfully used as in some of the other plays, and this is one of the reasons for

assigning the *Ajax* to a relatively early date. It is a defect that nearly a third of the play is taken up with the dispute concerning the burial, after the climax has been reached with the death of Ajax; but we must remember that the burial seemed far more important to the Greeks than it does to us, and also that the Greeks did not wish the end of a play to leave them with their spirits violently disturbed by a climax. This is evident, as every Greek tragedy has an epilogue. In this play the main action is so simple that the end is reached before the play has attained the requisite length; the discussion of the burial is therefore more protracted than seems to modern readers desirable.

In the *Antigone* the story of the house of Labdacus is taken up at the point reached in *The Seven against Thebes* (see page 196). Creon, now ruler of Thebes, has forbidden the burial of Polynices on pain of death. Antigone declares to her gentle sister Ismene her intention of disobeying the command of the king, who represents the state, and burying her brother in obedience to the eternal laws of right. She is caught in the act of burying Polynices and brought before Creon, who, after a long argument, condemns her to be immured alive in a subterranean chamber. Hæmon, Creon's son, who is betrothed to Antigone, tries unsuccessfully to persuade Creon to change his decision, then rushes off to the prison of Antigone. The seer Teiresias also tries to persuade Creon, but fails after an angry discussion ending with some dark prophecies of evil to come. But hardly has Teiresias gone when Creon yields to the representations of the chorus of Theban elders and decides to free Antigone. When he reaches the subterranean chamber he finds that Antigone has hanged herself. Hæmon, mad with grief, attempts to kill his father, and then stabs himself. When this news is brought to his mother, Eurydice, she also puts an end to her life. Creon, entering with the

The Antig-
one.

body of Hæmon, learns of his wife's death. The play ends with a *commos*, in which Creon laments his fate and the chorus replies with trite remarks.

The *Antigone* has always been one of the most popular of Greek tragedies in modern times, partly because of the introduction of the element of romantic love, but more on account of the sympathy awakened by the character and fate of Antigone. With all her firm determination and steadfastness of purpose she exhibits no unwomanly violence. She is upheld by the consciousness that she is acting in accordance with divine right, even though she is disobeying the decree of the state. This conflict of two duties is the most important feature of the plot. Almost equally important is the lesson taught by Creon's misery, that pride and stubbornness lead to ruin. The firm yet womanly character of Antigone is brought into a clear light by comparison with her sister Ismene, a gentle maid, who recognizes the obligation to bury her brother, but is unable to disobey the decree of Creon, yet who is willing to share the punishment of Antigone, even though she has not shared in her act. The delineation of character, one of the greatest qualities of Sophocles, is especially admirable in this play.

The plot of the *Electra* is substantially the same as that of the *Choëphori* of Æschylus, the slaying of Clytæmnestra and Ægisthus by Orestes and Electra. But whereas in the *Choëphori* the action advances steadily, without even any apparent obstacle, to the end, in the *Electra* various minor complications are introduced to enhance the interest of the situation. Here, too, as in the *Antigone*, two female characters are contrasted, for a timid sister, Chrysothemis, is given to the fierce, revengeful Electra, who is the central figure throughout. The tone of the play is different from that of the *Choëphori*. In the *Choëphori*, Orestes, the central figure, is filled with forebodings, and at the end he sees the Furies coming upon him to

avenge his mother's death. This leads up to the *Eumenides*, in which the guilt of Orestes is purged away, for the *Choëphori* is not an independent drama, but the second play of a trilogy. The *Electra* of Sophocles is, however, different. Being an independent drama, it must come to a satisfactory conclusion; consequently Orestes and Electra feel no misgivings. Their deed is done at the command of Apollo, and with the death of Clytæmnestra and Ægisthus the woes of the house of Atreus are at an end.

The *Trachiniæ*, named from the chorus of Trachinian maidens, is on the whole the least effective of the extant plays of Sophocles. Deianeira, the wife of Heracles, has been left with her children at

The Trachiniæ.

Trachis, where for many months she has been waiting for her husband's return. She hears that he is attacking Æchalia, and sends her son Hyllus to greet his father and find out about his plans. After Hyllus has gone, Lichas, the herald of Heracles, comes with many captives, among them the beautiful Iole, and announces that Heracles has taken Æchalia and will soon be present. Deianeira finds out that it was for love of Iole that Heracles had attacked Æchalia, and after some misgivings sends to him a garment impregnated with the poisoned blood of the centaur Nessus, which the centaur himself had told her would act as a charm to revive her husband's love for her in case he should ever prove faithless. Hyllus returns and tells with much detail how his father put on the garment and began to perform a sacrifice, when the garment clung to his body and ate his flesh with burning pains. Deianeira, on hearing this report, goes into the house and stabs herself. Presently Hyllus, who has gone back to his father, returns with Lichas and a retinue of men bearing the suffering Heracles upon a bier. Now Heracles learns of Deianeira's innocent purpose and her wretched death and perceives that his own end is near. He commands Hyllus to bear him to the top of Mount

Œta and lay him on his funeral pyre, and to marry Iole. This, Hyllus, after some demur, agrees to do.

This play is deficient in genuine dramatic action. The chief sufferer, too, Heracles, although he owes his fate to his own inconstancy, suffers for a fault not committed in sight of the audience, and therefore seems to suffer undeservedly, yet on account of the violence of his anger against Deianeira, fails to arouse our complete sympathy. Deianeira herself, who is really the central character of the drama, lacks power, and her death occurs when the play is only about two-thirds over. Moreover, the provision at the end of the play, that Hyllus shall marry Iole, who has innocently caused the death of his father and mother, is somewhat shocking to our taste. There are, however, fine narrative and descriptive passages, and the choral odes are of great beauty.

In *Œdipus the King* a pestilence is supposed to have fallen upon Thebes, to find a cure for which Creon has been sent to the oracle at Delphi. He returns and reports to King Œdipus that the land must be cleansed from blood-guiltiness by the death or banishment of those who slew King Laius. Œdipus utters a curse against the murderer. He then, at the advice of the chorus of citizens, sends for Teiresias to learn how the murderer can be found. Teiresias at first tries to withhold all information, but at last names Œdipus as the doer of the murder. Œdipus angrily refuses to believe him and declares that Creon has bribed him in the hope of obtaining the royal power. The violent and self-willed nature of Œdipus is clearly exhibited. By degrees the truth of Teiresias's words is made clear. The sole survivor of the retinue of Laius at the time of his death is sent for in the hope that he may prove that Œdipus is innocent. Meanwhile comes a messenger from Corinth saying that Polybus, whom Œdipus regarded as his father, is dead. Œdipus is relieved, for he had been told by an oracle that he should kill his father

and marry his mother. He still fears to return to Corinth lest the latter prophecy be fulfilled. The messenger, however, declares that Œdipus is not a Corinthian at all, but that he himself received him as a babe from a shepherd, one of the servants of King Laius. This shepherd is the same man who was with Laius at the time of his death. Jocasta now recognizes the truth of the oracles and the horror of her situation, and rushes into the house and kills herself. The shepherd enters, and Œdipus soon learns that he is indeed the son of Laius and Jocasta, that he has slain his father and married his mother. Mad with horror, he enters the house and puts out his own eyes. At the end of the play he asks Creon, now ruler, to banish him but to care for his two daughters. Creon declares that he must find out the will of the gods.

Œdipus, a strong-willed man, honest of purpose, but proud in the conceit of his own honesty and ability, declares that he will discover the murderer of Laius. The audience, knowing the myth, knows from the beginning that Œdipus himself is the murderer, sees the result of each action beforehand, and watches Œdipus as he unconsciously hurries himself on to his doom. What he says has a different meaning to himself and the audience. He is sure that the murderer will be found and that his own power and happiness will be increased. The audience knows that the discovery of the murderer brings ruin to Œdipus. This is one form of the *irony* of Sophocles, in which the words of the speaker convey to the audience a meaning different from that which he himself attributes to them. Nowhere is this form of irony so prominent as in this play. The other form of irony, in which the words convey different meanings to different characters in the play, is also exemplified in the *Œdipus the King*, though not so noticeably. This play furnishes also a good example of a *peripeteia*, or sudden change from happiness to misery, from power to impotence, or the reverse. Here Œdipus

the King, blessed with royal power, a beloved wife, and children born in honorable wedlock, suddenly becomes a poor blind man, murderer of his own father, himself the father of his own half brothers and sisters, and the cause of the death of her who had been both his wife and his mother. This takes place by means of an *anagnorisis* or recognition, which was frequently employed as a means of bringing the *peripeteia* to pass. For these reasons among others the *Edipus the King* is one of the most representative Greek tragedies, while the vigor of its language, the liveliness of its dialogue, the sustained interest of its action, and the beauty of its choral parts combine to make it a work of exceptional importance.

The *Philoctetes*, performed in 409 B. C., is based upon a story told in the *Little Iliad*. Philoctetes, one of the Greek chiefs, to whom Heracles had left his bow and poisoned arrows, wounded his own foot with an arrow, and the wound was so offensive that the Greeks removed him to the island of Lemnos. Learning from an oracle that Troy could not be taken without the arrows of Heracles, the Greeks sent Odysseus and (according to the *Little Iliad*) Diomedes, who brought Philoctetes back to the army, where he was cured of his wound. Sophocles presupposes that Lemnos is a deserted island and that Philoctetes has been there for ten years. The Atridæ and Odysseus are regarded by him as the authors of his banishment. Odysseus could not, therefore, appear before Philoctetes with safety, nor would he be likely to persuade him to return to the army. He therefore takes with him Neoptolemus, the young and noble son of Achilles (not Diomedes, as in the *Little Iliad*). The wily Odysseus persuades the honorable young Neoptolemus to get possession of the bow of Heracles by dissimulation, but the noble youth is so filled with pity for Philoctetes in his misery and so repentant for his own dishonorable conduct that he gives back the bow in spite of

the opposition of Odysseus. Finally Heracles appears from Olympus and commands Philoctetes to return to the army.

The interest of the play is found in the character of Philoctetes, whose terrible sufferings can not shake his resolution not to return to aid the Atridæ, and the opposition between the wily, scheming Odysseus (who has not here, as in the *Odyssey*, heroic courage) and the upright, simple-minded, honorable Neoptolemus.

In the *Œdipus at Colonus* the blind wanderer Œdipus, led by his daughter Antigone, comes to Colonus and takes

his seat in the sacred grove of the Eumenides.

The Œdipus
at Colonus.

He is told that it is a grove of "holy goddesses," and remembers that he is to die at

such a place. Ismene enters and reports an oracle that the country in which his body shall lie is to be blessed. This oracle Œdipus tells to Theseus, King of Athens, who promises to protect him. Presently Creon comes, and, after trying to persuade Œdipus to go with him, carries off Antigone and Ismene by force. Theseus and his troops pursue and bring them back. Polynices tries to induce his father to take his side in his attack upon Thebes, but gains only his curse. Finally loud thunder announces to Œdipus that his end is near. With Theseus he retires into the grove, from which a messenger returns announcing his sudden and mysterious death.

The main action of this play, the death of Œdipus, is little dramatic, yet by the introduction of Creon and Polynices variety and liveliness are attained. In the scenes with these two characters Œdipus shows his native qualities of violence, self-will, and harshness, whereby his calm dignity at the beginning and end of the play is brought into strong relief. No other Greek tragedy breathes an air of such gentleness and peace; nor does any other seem to show such love of nature or such personal attachment for any place. The aged Sophocles seems

to sing a farewell hymn in honor of his native Colonus in these lines:¹

Of all the land far famed for goodly steeds,
 Thou com'st, O stranger, to the noblest spot,
 Colonus, glistening bright,
 Where evermore, in thickets freshly green,
 The clear-voiced nightingale
 Still haunts, and pours her song,
 By purpling ivy hid,
 And the thick leafage sacred to the God,
 With all its myriad fruits,
 By mortal's foot untouched,
 By sun's hot ray unscathed,
 Sheltered from every blast;
 There wanders Dionysus evermore,
 In full, wild revelry,
 And waits upon the nymphs who nursed his youth,
 And there, beneath the gentle dews of heaven,
 The fair narcissus with its clustered bells
 Blooms ever, day by day,
 Of old the wreath of mightiest goddesses;
 And crocus golden-eyed;
 And still unslumbering flow
 Cephissus' wandering streams;
 They fail not from their springs, but evermore,
 Swift-rushing into birth,
 Over the plain they sweep,
 The land of broad, full breast,
 With clear and stainless wave;
 Nor do the Muses in their minstrel choirs,
 Hold it in light esteem,
 Nor Aphrodite with her golden reins,

The brief summaries here given show that the plots of the tragedies of Sophocles, though simple, contain more variety than is found in those of Æschylus. The action leads to one end, which is known to the audience from the

¹ *Ed. Col.*, 668 ff., Plumptre's translation.

beginning, but various complications are introduced, which keep the interest and even the curiosity of the spectator awake. The subjects are, like those of the plays of Æschylus, taken from the ancient myths as told in the epic poems, but Sophocles shows a preference for Attic myths, which Æschylus appears to have avoided. This is evident from the titles of the lost plays quite as much as from extant dramas. Æschylus exhibits in grand and dignified language the result of the decrees of fate or of the gods. Sophocles, too, exhibits the result of those decrees, but he shows them working through human character. His personages are still heroic in action and in language, but their characters are drawn in more detail than Æschylus employs, and their fate is brought upon them not so much by the direct force of divine decrees as by their own action, which is itself, however, caused by divine will acting through their characters. This adds greatly to the dramatic force of the plays. The language of Sophocles is less exalted than that of Æschylus, less removed from the language of daily life, but it is dignified and beautiful. The grandiloquence and obscurity of Æschylus are given up, but the language does not approach so nearly to that of every-day life as to seem out of place in the mouths of gods and heroes. The choral portions are as a rule shorter than in the plays of Æschylus, and the chorus takes a less direct and important part in the action of the play, being sometimes little more than a group of interested spectators. As a rule, however, the chorus joins in the action to some extent, and the choral songs are all directly connected with the subject of the play, though they do not always help materially to carry on the action. The first *stasimon* of the *Antigone* is sung when the guard, who has reported the burial of Polynices, has just gone away after being threatened with torture and death by Creon in case the doer of the deed is not discovered :

Much is there marvelous, but naught more marvelous than man. Over the foaming sea in winter's wind he goes, moving among the waves that roar around. The greatest of the gods, the everlasting and unwearied earth, he wears away, wheeling his plowshare through it year by year, forcing the mule to trace his furrow.

The flocks of nimble birds he snares and makes his prey, the herds of savage beasts, and ocean's watery spawn, with netted coils—this ever crafty man. He masters by his arts the creatures of the fields and of the hills. He brings the stiff-maned horse under his yoke, and stubborn mountain bull.

Speech, too, and wind-swift thought, and social dispositions, these he learned; how to avoid uncomfortable frosts when skies are clear, and storms when skies are foul—resourceful ever. Without resource he meets no dawning day. From death alone he shall not win release, although for fell disease he has discovered cures.

So with a subtle ingenuity of skill, beyond all reckoning, now he turns toward evil, now toward good. Honoring his country's laws and the gods' plighted justice, high in the state he stands. No state has he with whom dishonor dwells by reason of his crimes. May he not share my hearth nor think my thoughts who does such deeds of sin.

At this portentous sight I am amazed. How can I look and not confess that this is the maid Antigone? Ah, hapless one! Child of a hapless father too, of Œdipus! But what? They do not bring you here defiant of the king's decrees and caught in folly?¹

Here the might of man, the chief subject of the song, has little to do with the play, but the underlying thought of the necessity of righteousness has special bearing upon the situation. At first sight, the chorus seems to have Antigone or Polynices in mind, but (with the irony already mentioned) the reference is really to Creon. The last paragraph, although spoken by the chorus, is not a part of the ode, but serves as a transition to the dialogue which follows.

So much of the action of the Greek tragedy is supposed to take place within the palace, or at any rate out of sight of the audience, that the part of the messenger is of great

¹ *Antigone*, 332 ff., Palmer's translation.

importance. It was indeed originally second only to the part of the chorus. No tragic poet was more conscious of this importance than Sophocles, and some of his most striking passages are in the reports brought by messengers. The most remarkable report of this kind is that in the *Electra*, giving a false account of the death of Orestes. The success of Orestes in various trials of strength and skill at the Pythian games is briefly described as a preparation for the detailed description of the chariot-race. In this ten chariots competed, but eight met with accidents, leaving only an Athenian chariot to contend with that of Orestes :

Reports of
messengers.

Then the man
From Athens, skilled and wily charioteer,
Seeing the mischief, turns his steeds aside,
At anchor rides, and leaves the whirling surge
Of man and horse thus raging. Last of all,
Keeping his steeds back, waiting for the end,
Orestes came. And when he sees him left,
His only rival, then, with shaken rein,
Urging his colts, he follows, and they twain
Drove onward both together, by a head,
Now this, now that, their chariots gaining ground;
And all the other rounds in safety passed,
Upright in upright chariot still he stood,
Ill-starred one; then the left rein letting loose,
Just as his horse was turning, unawares
He strikes the farthest pillar, breaks the spokes
Right at his axle's centre, and slips down
From out his chariot, and is dragged along,
With reins dissevered. And, when thus he fell,
His colts tore headlong to the ground's mid-space;
And when the host beheld him fallen thus
From off the chariot, they bewailed him sore,
So young, so noble, so unfortunate,
Now hurled upon the ground, and now his limbs
To heaven exposing.¹

¹ *Electra*, 731 ff., Plumptre's translation.

A more brilliant description it would be hard to find in Greek literature.

Sophocles is justly regarded as the greatest of the great Greek tragic poets. He found the drama already developed by the genius of Æschylus to a high degree of beauty and power, and he carried it further by introducing the third actor and other innovations, by refining the language employed, by giving more variety to the plot, which he enriched with many fine details, and by perfecting the portrayal of character.

CHAPTER XIX

EURIPIDES

Euripides, 485–406 B. C.—His life—His innovations; the prologue; the *deus ex machina*—His political, religious, and philosophical ideas—Hatred of women—Analysis of the extant plays—Style and composition—Popularity.

THE third of the great Attic tragic poets, Euripides, was born probably in 485 B. C.¹ According to the common story, his father, Mnesarchus, or Mnesarchides, Euripides. was a small tradesman, and his mother, Cleito, sold vegetables. This story is, however, contradicted by the fact that Euripides, when a boy, was allowed to take part in the dance in honor of the Delian Apollo, a privilege granted only to boys of good birth. Apparently, then, the poet came of a good family. He received a careful education and was able to devote himself to study and poetry, which seems to show that his family was at least not poor.

It is said that when Euripides was young his father received an oracle that his son would be honored and famous and would win crowns. Therefore the boy was His youth and education. trained in athletics, which some have thought may account in part for the contempt for athletes he expresses once or twice in his tragedies. He is also

¹ This is the date given in the *Parian Marble*, a chronological inscription compiled in 264 or 263 B. C., found on the island of Paros and now in England. Another story makes his birth take place at Salamis, on the day of the battle, in 480 B. C. Æschylus fought in the battle, and Sophocles led the chorus of boys who sang the pæan of victory. The three great tragic poets are therefore brought together in a striking way. In fact, the story is too good to be accepted.

said to have practised painting, but the authority for both these statements is late, and may rest on some confusion of the poet with another man of the same name. At any rate, Euripides turned to literary pursuits at an early age, for he began to write tragedies when he was only eighteen years old, though he did not receive a chorus until 455, when he was nearly thirty. He is said to have been a pupil of Anaxagoras, and traces of that philosopher's teachings are found in his plays; but he is also said to have been taught by Protagoras, Prodicus, and Socrates, all of whom were much younger than he. In all probability Euripides, whose mind was open to receive all impressions, and whose intellect was remarkably alert, was acquainted with the doctrines of all the philosophers and sophists in Athens—in fact, some trace of nearly every doctrine known to have been taught in his day can be found in his extant plays—and he was naturally inclined to speculation on abstruse matters; but he was probably not a regular pupil of any philosophical teacher, at least not for any great length of time.

He is said to have had two wives, first Melito, and second Chœrile, daughter of Mnesilochus, both of whom are said to have been unfaithful; but the stories told of them were probably invented to explain the attacks upon women which occur in his tragedies. He had three sons: Mnesarchides, a merchant; Mnesilochus, an actor; and Euripides the younger, a tragic poet who produced some of his father's plays. In his private life Euripides was quiet and retiring. He was not, like Sophocles, a popular man in society, but loved the intimate companionship of a few friends. He was the first Athenian to own a library, and spent much time among his books. It is said that he wrote some of his plays in a cave at Salamis with a view over the sea. The only part he ever took in public affairs was that of an ambassador to Syracuse. He held the office of fire-bearer to Apollo at

His private
life.

Cape Zoster, but we do not know how important that office was.

Late in life he went to Macedonia, to the court of King Archelaus at Pella, where he died in 406 B. C. According to

His death. one story, he was devoured by the king's dogs, and according to another tale, he was torn in pieces by women; but neither story deserves credence. As he was seventy-nine (or, even if he was born in 480, seventy-four) years old, he probably died of illness and age. He was buried with great honor in Macedonia, and a cenotaph was erected for him at Athens, with the inscription, "The monument of Euripides is all Hellas, but the land of Macedon holds his bones; for there he met with the end of life. His native place was Athens, the Hellas of Hellas. He gave greatest delight to the Muses, and so receives from many men the meed of praise."

Few direct innovations are attributed to Euripides. He did not add to the number of actors, nor did he invent new stage machinery, nor, so far as we know, new costumes. And yet he was an original genius, and gave a new impulse to Greek tragedy, causing it to develop in a new way. We

Euripides and Sophocles contemporaries. must, however, remember that Euripides is not the successor but the contemporary of Sophocles, who was only twelve years his senior.

The first appearance of Sophocles as a tragic poet was in 468, and Euripides competed for the first time in 455. For nearly fifty years the two poets contended side by side for the favor of the Athenian public. It is therefore not always certain to which of the poets some minor innovation may be due, nor even that it is due to either of them, since little is known of the many other tragic poets of the time; but, just as the introduction of the third actor and the increase in the number of the chorus are ascribed to Sophocles, so Euripides may be regarded as the inventor of a new kind of prologue and of the so-called *deus ex machina* or god from the machine.

Neither of these adds to the artistic beauty of the play, but both have their uses.


The prologue of a Greek play usually consists of a conversation between two or three of the characters, so contrived as to explain to the audience indirectly the general situation. In several plays of Euripides this is preceded by another prologue, to which the name is especially applied when the plays of Euripides are under discussion. This Euripidean prologue is spoken by one person, frequently a god who is interested in the plot, and explains the situation directly, including the whole myth so far as it does not appear in the play. This is an easier and simpler way of making the audience understand the plot than the other, but it is not dramatic nor artistic. Euripides employs it sometimes, as in the *Helena*, when he is about to use a new or unfamiliar form of a well-known myth, sometimes when the myth he is employing as the basis of his plot is not very familiar, but sometimes also when the myth is familiar and appears in its usual form. In cases of the first and second sort, such a prologue is almost indispensable, but in those of the third sort it seems to be used simply because it is easier than the more dramatic prologue in dialogue form. It may be that Euripides found that the Athenian audience liked his prologues in the plays in which they were necessary, and therefore employed them in other plays, or it may be that he really found it easier to make his introductory remarks in connected form.

The *deus ex machina* appears at the end of the play to explain to the audience what is to happen after the moment at which the action of the play ends.

The *deus ex machina*. So at the end of the *Iphigenia among the Taurians*, Athena appears and decrees the voyage of Iphigenia and Orestes to Attica and the establishment of the worship of the Tauric Artemis at Brauron. Sometimes the god brings to a conclusion the action of a play which is apparently hopelessly confused.

So in the *Orestes* Apollo commands the strife to cease and makes an ending of the play possible. Heracles in the *Philoctetes* of Sophocles serves the same purpose; and the appearance of Heracles to finish the play is a proof of the influence exerted by Euripides upon his elder contemporary. As a rule, however, the *deus ex machina* is not brought in merely to disentangle an otherwise hopelessly confused plot, but rather to foretell the future and serve as an epilogue, like the last chapter in many modern novels. It can not be said that this forms an artistic dramatic ending, but the appearance of a god coming into view by means of a machine which made him seem to be floating in the air must have been at any rate striking, and his prophecies concerning the later fortunes of the characters in the play, carrying with them all the weight of his divine nature, undoubtedly gave the audience a comfortable feeling of assurance. In the *Medea* the machine, in the shape of a winged chariot, was used to withdraw Medea herself from the attack or pursuit of Jason, but this use of the machine to remove one of the persons of the play by miraculous means does not occur elsewhere. On the whole, the *deus ex machina* makes an unfavorable impression, seeming to be invented merely to gather together the loose ends of the plot and show how the fortunes of the various characters are to be arranged; but we must remember that the effect upon the spectators, who saw the glorious apparition of the god in the upper air and listened to his impressively uttered words, was not the same as the effect produced by the printed page upon the reader.

The prologue and the *deus ex machina* are the two most tangible innovations of Euripides, and neither of them is an improvement upon previous methods. But in other ways, more important though less easily defined, Euripides shows marked originality. The dramas of Æschylus and Sophocles are religious; the actions of the characters are



determined by the divine will or by fate in Æschylus and by moral or religious motives in Sophocles. The characters of Euripides are moved to action by human passions. His personages are still heroic—that is, they are derived from the ancient epics—but they are no longer superhuman in their virtues or their simplicity of character. Euripides

**Human
nature.**

shows in his plays human nature as he has observed it. His characters are Athenians of the fifth century adorned with the names and surrounded by the circumstances of mythical heroes. In this matter Euripides continues and advances far in a line of progress already begun by Sophocles; for Sophocles, as distinguished from Æschylus, makes the conduct of his personages depend upon their individual characters, which he represents vividly and clearly, and Euripides goes further in representing character by drawing it, as it were, from life and bringing before his audience the faults, virtues, inconsistencies, and passions which he has observed about him. Herein Euripides is more modern than Æschylus or Sophocles, and herein, too, he is the precursor of the later Greek comedy. In the *Antigone* of Sophocles, the love of Hæmon for Antigone leads him to commit suicide, but this is a mere episode in the play. Euripides is the only one of the three great tragic poets who made the passion of love the basis of any of his plots, and he made it under different forms the basis of the *Alcestis*, the *Medea*, and the *Hippolytus*, among the extant plays, and several of the lost plays were also dramas of love. This was an innovation in the fifth century B. C., but all later ages have joined in approving it. Still we must not forget that the poet who introduces all human passions into his plays, while he may succeed in interesting his audience more than the poet who limits his choice to grander themes, is in danger of ceasing to be a teacher of men and becoming a mere purveyor of amusement. Euripides introduced greater realism, more accurate delineation of charac-

ter, far greater play of passion, into Greek tragedy, but he lacked the deep religious element and the mighty grandeur of Æschylus and Sophocles.

Euripides represented human nature as he saw it in real life, and he loved to represent it under different forms. So, for instance, he does not spend all his care on the heroes and great personages of his dramas, but sometimes brings before us the qualities of a lesser character in some detail, as, for example, that of the poor farmer to whom Electra is supposed to be married in the *Electra*. This farmer is a man of real nobility of character, and Euripides takes pains to say, through the mouth of Orestes, that real nobility is not a matter of birth. In the same play, the introduction of the farmer's lowly dwelling as the scene of action is a picturesque innovation. Sophocles liked to introduce long and elaborate reports of messengers. Euripides also introduced such reports, but catered to the taste

Rhetorical
arguments.

of his audience by introducing more frequently than Sophocles long arguments between his characters—arguments such as the sophists of the time taught their pupils to conduct, or such as the Athenian dicast loved to listen to in the courts of law. So in the *Trojan Women* Hecuba accuses Helen, and Helen defends herself, each in a long, set speech, and Menelaus acts as judge. Such arguments are out of place in tragedies, and show that Euripides was strongly influenced by the love of rhetorical display which shows itself in the Athenian prose writing of his time.

In several passages Euripides expresses his contempt of demagogues, which shows that he understood the great danger to which the Athenian state was exposed, and some of his plays contain evident allusions to the foreign relations of Athens; the *Suppliants*, for instance, with its expressions of friendliness for the Argives and hostility to the Thebans, was composed with the events of the year 420 B. C. in mind,

Politics, phi-
losophy, and
religion.

and the *Heraclidæ* is most easily explained by assuming that its tone is due to the conditions at the beginning of the Peloponnesian War. Other plays contain less marked references to contemporary events. The philosophical and religious tenets of Euripides are not easy to distinguish, because his characters are well drawn and utter sentiments appropriate to their circumstances. Still, the idea that human life has more of sorrow than of joy is so often repeated in different forms that it may be regarded as one of his articles of belief. The changeableness of human life and the worthlessness of human knowledge are also dwelt upon. The treatment of the gods in general is such as to make it clear that the popular mythology met with little respect or belief from Euripides, and it may even be doubted whether he believed that the gods existed at all, or, at any rate, whether they cared for human beings; but the expressions put into the mouths of different characters in the plays are so contradictory that we can assert positively only that Euripides thought seriously on religious and philosophical themes, and was not a believer in oracles and divinations, nor in the popular legends of mythology.

Euripides has been called a woman-hater, and it is true that his plays contain many harsh sayings about women;

† but it is also true that no Greek poet has represented a more lovable woman than the Alcestis of Euripides. The fact is that women

were not regarded as the equals of men by the Athenians of the fifth century B. C. They were supposed to stay in the house most of the time, devoting themselves to household duties and the care of their children; and the restraint to which they were subjected probably prevented them from attaining any great height of character. Euripides, who selected love stories for his plots, naturally created many female characters, and gave them the qualities which he believed the Athenian women of his time would have exhibited under the circumstances of the plot. If many of

Hatred of
women.

his female characters are bad, it is because such characters were demanded by the plot, and if his plays contain harsh utterances about women, it is because the women in the plays are bad. When the plot demands a good woman, Euripides is able to portray her, as in the *Alcestis*, the *Heraclidæ*, and the two plays named from *Iphigenia*, but most of the plots in which women are prominent demand bad women. This is rather because Euripides wished to represent violent passions than because he wished to represent bad women out of hatred for the sex.

Euripides is said to have written ninety-two plays. There now exist under his name nineteen plays and over one thousand fragments. Of the plays, one, the *Rhesus*, is probably not by Euripides; one, the *Cyclops*, is a satyr drama, not a tragedy; and one, the *Alcestis*, though a tragedy, was performed at the end of a tetralogy in place of a satyr drama, and has some qualities peculiar to itself. The exact dates of some of the tragedies are known, and the approximate dates of the others can be assigned with more or less probability from internal evidence. When the exact date is known, it is added to the name of the play in the following list, and all the tragedies are arranged in their probable chronological order:

1. The *Alcestis* (438) was performed instead of a satyr drama, after three tragedies. Admetus, king of Pheræ, had been condemned by fate to die at a certain time, but Apollo obtained respite for him, on condition that he find some one to die in his place. His father and mother refused, but his wife, Alcestis, consented. On the day of her death Heracles comes to Pheræ and is hospitably entertained by Admetus, who, in his chivalrous regard for the duties of hospitality, conceals from him the death of Alcestis. Heracles, however, finds it out, goes to her tomb, overcomes Death in a hand to hand fight, and brings Alcestis back to her husband. The character of

Alcestis is of singular beauty, and has made the play deservedly popular. Heracles is represented as a curious mixture of hero and buffoon, who eats much and drinks until he is half tipsy, but shows also heroic courage and grateful appreciation of the hospitality of Admetus. A long argument between Admetus and his father, Pheres, on the question whether the father ought to die for the son shows Euripides's liking for rhetoric, but does not appeal to modern taste.

2. The *Medea* (431). Jason, having obtained the golden fleece through the aid of Medea, carries her off with him to Greece as his wife. After various adventures **Medea.** they come in the tenth year to Corinth. There Jason resolves to put away Medea and marry Creüsa, daughter of the king of Corinth. Medea, by means of a poisoned robe, kills Creüsa, and also her father, and slays her own children with the sword in order to pain Jason. Finally she departs in a winged chariot sent by her grandfather, the sun-god. The fierce and passionate character of Medea, distracted by the conflict between love for her children and thirst for vengeance upon Jason, makes this one of the most powerful and famous of Greek plays.

3. The *Heraclidæ*, or *Children of Heracles*, was brought out in the early years of the Peloponnesian War. After the **Heraclidæ.** death of Heracles, his enemy Eurystheus still pursues his children. Led by Iolaus, they come to Marathon. There an Argive herald tries to lead them away, but the Athenians forbid. Macaria, daughter of Heracles, gives herself to be sacrificed because an oracle demands the sacrifice of a maiden to insure the victory of the Athenians over the Argives, who come with an army to take the Heraclidæ. In the battle which takes place the Argives are defeated, and Eurystheus is taken prisoner by Iolaus, who is miraculously made young for the time. Alcmena, the mother of Heracles, demands the death of Eurystheus, who is finally given up to her. The play is interest-

ing chiefly on account of allusions to contemporary politics, though Macaria and Iolaus are attractive characters.

4. The *Hippolytus* (428). This play, the *Crowned Hippolytus*, is a revised edition of an unsuccessful play called the *Veiled Hippolytus*, which has been lost.
Hippolytus. Phædra, wife of Theseus, falls in love with her stepson Hippolytus, who rejects her offers with horror. She then kills herself, leaving a letter in which she accuses Hippolytus of having made advances to her. Theseus prays for his son's death, and Poseidon sends a monster from the sea which causes the horses of Hippolytus to take fright and kill him; but before he dies he and Theseus are reconciled by Artemis. The most interesting characters are the passionate, love-sick Phædra and her intriguing old nurse. The play is also interesting on account of remarks about the gods, which throw some light upon the religious attitude of Euripides and his audience.

5. The *Hecuba* (probably about 425). The first part of the play tells of the sacrifice of Polyxena at the tomb of Achilles, and the second of the murder of
Hecuba. Polydorus, son of Priam, by the Thracian Polymestor, who is punished by Hecuba and the other Trojan women by having his children killed and his own eyes put out. The play contains fine passages, but lacks unity, for the two parts do not really belong together. Moreover, Hecuba displays more love for rhetorical argument and philosophical speculation than is appropriate for a Trojan queen of heroic times.

6. The *Suppliants* (about 420). The Thebans had forbidden the burial of Polynices and his Argive allies, but
Suppliants. the mothers of the dead chieftains came to Eleusis and asked for aid. The Athenians under Theseus defeat the Thebans in a battle under the walls of Thebes and force them to give up the bodies, which are then burned. Evadne, wife of Capaneus, burns herself upon the funeral pyre of her husband. The plot is

slight, and the interest of the audience was kept alive by spectacular scenes, as the death of Evadne and the funeral of the chiefs. There are frequent appeals to Athenian patriotism and references to current politics.

7. The *Andromache* (a little later, apparently, than the *Suppliants*). Andromache, Hector's widow, was given to Neoptolemus at the sack of Troy. He took her home to Phthia, but wedded as his lawful wife Hermione, daughter of Menelaus. In the absence of Neoptolemus, Hermione and Menelaus wish to kill Andromache and her son Molossus, but are prevented by the aged Peleus. Menelaus withdraws, and Hermione goes away with Orestes, who causes Neoptolemus to be murdered at Delphi. At the end of the play Thetis appears and declares that Andromache is to go to the Molossian country and marry Helenus, and that Peleus is to be made a god to dwell with her in the watery halls of Nereus. The plot lacks unity, and, although in the beginning the peril of Andromache and Molossus arouses sympathy, the play is as a whole uninteresting.

8. The *Madness of Heracles*, or *Hercules Furens*, is apparently a little later than the *Andromache*. Lycus, tyrant of Thebes, takes advantage of the absence of Heracles on the last of his twelve labors to order the death of his wife and children. They are on the point of being dragged from the altar and slain when Heracles appears, saves them, and punishes Lycus. While all are rejoicing, Heracles is stricken with madness by Hera and kills his wife and children. When he returns to his senses he is overwhelmed with horror and wishes to kill himself, but Theseus appears, offers him a safe asylum at Athens, and persuades him to bear his terrible lot with fortitude. Heracles is throughout the centre of interest, and if at first sight the saving of Megara and her children from Lycus seems to have little connection with their death at the hands of Heracles, the lack of unity is only apparent, for the relief and joy caused by the

Choëphori

appearance of Heracles make the *peripeteia*, the change to a feeling of horror in the second part of the play, all the more striking. This is undoubtedly one of the strongest plays of Euripides.

9. The *Trojan Women*, or *Troades* (415), consists of a series of loosely connected scenes depicting the lot of the women captured at Troy. There is much inappropriate rhetoric, and, although the prophetic ravings of Cassandra have a certain extravagant beauty, the play as a whole lacks interest.

Trojan Women.

10. The *Electra* (probably 413) treats of the same subject as the *Choëphori* of Æschylus and the *Electra* of Sophocles. It contains some criticisms of the play of Æschylus, but none of that of Sophocles, which makes it probable that Sophocles produced his *Electra* at a later date. Euripides supposes that Electra has been given in marriage by Clytæmnestra to a poor farmer in order that her children may have no power, and the scene is at the farmer's cottage. After a plot has been formed by Electra, Orestes, and Pylades, Ægisthus is killed while engaged in a sacrifice at some distance from the city, and Clytæmnestra, having been summoned by Electra to purify her dwelling after an alleged childbirth, is killed in the house. At the end of the play Castor and Polydeuces appear, command Orestes to flee to Athens, and foretell the future of the chief personages of the play. The character of Electra is of unrelieved ferocity; in fact, no one, except the farmer, appears to advantage; yet the play contains fine passages and is admirably planned for dramatic effect.

Electra.

11. The *Helena* (412). This is a fantastic extravaganza rather than a tragedy. The real Helen never went to Troy, but was instead carried by the gods to Egypt, while a phantom shape went with Paris to Troy. After the end of the Trojan War, Menelaus, with the phantom Helen, is borne by the winds to Egypt. Here he finds the real Helen, and the phantom disappears.

Helena.

12. The *Ion*, of uncertain date, shows how Ion, the son of the god Apollo and the Athenian princess Creüsa, after being brought up in the temple of Apollo at Delphi, is given as a son to his mother and her husband Xuthus. Creüsa, believing that Ion is really the son of Xuthus, tries to kill him by poison, but is detected, and is in turn threatened with death. Finally the Pythian priestess shows the swaddling-clothes in which Creüsa had wrapped her child at his birth, mother and son recognize their relationship and are reconciled, and the glory of Ion's descendants is foretold. Xuthus, however, is not undeceived, but still believes that Ion is really his son. The play is interesting and contains many beautiful passages, but it is overloaded with mythological lore. Creüsa and Ion are unnaturally ferocious, and Xuthus is a somewhat dull and simple dupe of Apollo, Creüsa, and their son.

13. The *Iphigenia among the Taurians* was performed probably not far from 412 B. C. Iphigenia had been given up by her father, Agamemnon, to be sacrificed at Aulis, and all men thought her dead. But Artemis had removed her to the Taurian land and made her priestess of her temple, where she was obliged to sacrifice all foreigners who arrived. Orestes, pursued by the Furies after the murder of his mother, comes to the Taurian land because Apollo has commanded him to carry away the statue of Artemis from the temple. Here he and his friend Pylades are to be sacrificed, but Iphigenia, wishing to send a letter to Orestes, agrees to let one of them go as her messenger. Each wishes the life of the other to be saved, but finally the letter, addressed to Orestes, is given to Pylades to take to Greece. He delivers it at once to Orestes, which brings about the recognition of the brother and sister. They then plan the theft of the statue, and carry it out successfully, but a wind bears their ship back to land. King Thoas is about to seize them when Athena appears, tells him to let them go, and ordains the establishment of

the worship of Artemis at Brauron in Attica. The plot is original, attractive, and carefully carried out. The self-sacrificing friendship of Orestes and Pylades lends a peculiar charm to their characters, and several passages are of unusual beauty and vigor. This play is perhaps more popular with modern readers than any other.

14. The *Orestes* (408). The scene is at Argos, after the death of Clytæmnestra and Ægisthus. Orestes is tormented with madness. The Argive assembly votes that he and Electra be put to death, but the sentence is so changed that they are permitted to put an end to their own lives by the close of that day. Menelaus arrives, but after long argument with Orestes, refuses to take any active measures in his favor, and Tyndareüs, the father of Helen and Clytæmnestra, urges the punishment of Orestes and Electra. Orestes and Pylades seize Helen and attempt to kill her, but she is snatched up to dwell with the gods. They then seize Hermione, daughter of Menelaus, and threaten to kill her. When things are in this state of confusion, Apollo appears, ordains that Orestes shall marry Hermione, whom he was on the point of murdering in cold blood, that Pylades shall marry Electra, and that Menelaus shall keep Helen's dowry as a consolation for the loss of her person. The first part of this play, especially the representation of the madness of Orestes, is powerful and impressive, but the latter part is weak, disconnected, and artificial. Nevertheless, there are several scenes which must have been of great interest to an audience.

15. The *Phœnician Women*, performed probably in 407 B. C., derives its name from the chorus of Phœnician captives who are by mere chance at Thebes when Polynices and his allies attack the city. The play contains several criticisms of the *Seven against Thebes*, which treats of the same myth. Euripides represents Eteocles as a hard and selfish tyrant. Jocasta induces

The Phœnician Women.

Polynices to enter the city under safe-conduct and tries to effect a reconciliation, but in vain. Finally she goes to the scene of battle and kills herself over the bodies of her sons. The episode of Menœceus, son of Creon, who kills himself to insure the victory of the Thebans, is interesting in itself, but has little connection with the main action of the play. The blind Œdipus appears at the end of the play only to be banished by Creon.

16. The *Bacchæ*, performed for the first time after the death of the poet, was probably written in Macedonia.

The Bacchæ. King Pentheus violently opposes the worship of Dionysus, but the god comes in the form of a gentle youth to introduce it. He is captured by Pentheus's men, but persuades the king to put on female attire and go to watch the revels of the Bacchæ, his female worshippers. Pentheus is torn in pieces by the frenzied revelers, and his mother, Agave, bears his head in triumph on the end of her thyrsus, believing it to be a lion's head. The play is full of strange beauty. The wild songs of the chorus of bacchic revelers, the insults heaped by Pentheus upon the god, and the terrible punishment inflicted by the divine power, combine to make one of the most interesting and powerful of Greek tragedies.

17. The *Iphigenia at Aulis*, performed in 405 B. C., after the poet's death, and probably the latest of his plays, appears to have been left unfinished, and shows various changes and insertions. When Calchas foretold that Iphigenia must be sacrificed in order that the Greek fleet might sail from Aulis for Troy, Agamemnon sent for Clytæmnestra to bring the maiden, pretending that she was to marry Achilles. He changes his mind, however, and sends a second letter to prevent the coming of his wife and daughter, but this is intercepted by Menelaus. Clytæmnestra and Iphigenia arrive, and in spite of the opposition of Achilles, the sacrifice of the maiden is decreed. At the last she offers herself heroically to be

slain for her country. The character of Iphigenia is one of great nobility and charm, and Achilles appears as a noble, high-minded, and chivalrous youth. The characters of Agamemnon and Menelaus are well drawn. In spite of some unevenness, due in part at least to the unfinished condition in which it was left by its author, this play is of unusual interest and beauty.

18. The *Cyclops* is the only extant example of a satyr drama. Its date is unknown, but the perfection of its style and language shows that it can hardly be a work of the poet's youth. The satyr drama arose, like tragedy, from the dithyramb, and appears to have been separated from tragedy in order to preserve the old chorus of satyrs, though as time went on even the satyr drama allowed the substitution of other persons for the satyrs, and sometimes a fourth tragedy containing some elements of burlesque (e. g., the *Alcestis*) took the place of the satyr drama at the end of a tetralogy. The details of the development of the satyr drama are not well known and need not detain us. This kind of play derived its plots, like tragedy, from the ancient myths, but employed only those which permitted more or less comic treatment. The heroic personages were treated with dignity, but the satyr chorus lent the play an element of absurdity and fun. The satyr drama stood therefore between tragedy and comedy. The plot of the *Cyclops* is derived from the *Odyssey* (Book IX), but fat old Silenus and his attendant satyrs, supposed to have been shipwrecked and then captured by Polyphemus, are added to the Homeric personages. Odysseus is represented, as in the *Odyssey*, as a brave and resourceful hero, pious toward the gods and faithful to his comrades. Polyphemus is coarse and brutal, Silenus drunken and unprincipled, the satyrs wild, licentious, and cowardly—untrammelled creatures of the woods. A sylvan freshness and grace breathes through the play, the tone varying from drunken license to serious and pious

appeals, and from treachery and cruelty to poetic description, always with the utmost lightness and rapidity. Modern literature offers no parallel to this single extant example of an otherwise lost branch of poetry.

Besides the plays preserved entire, many others are known by title and by fragments, and the plots of some of these can be discerned. They add to our knowledge of the myths chosen by Euripides and of his method of treatment, and what they add confirms what is evident from the extant plays. The language of Euripides approaches more nearly the language of daily life than does that of Sophocles, but it still preserves something of tragic dignity. The style has a subtle charm which can not be reproduced in translation. In representation of human character, especially of passion, Euripides excels all other ancient writers. Medea, about to kill her children before she is forced to leave Corinth, is a perfect example of a soul torn by conflicting passions:¹

Woe! woe! why gaze your eyes on me, my darlings?
 Why smile to me the latest smile of all?
 Alas! what shall I do? Mine heart is failing
 As I behold my children's laughing eyes!
 Women [*to the chorus*], I can not! farewell, purposes
 O'erpast! I take my children from the land.
 What need to wring the father's heart with ills
 Of these, to gain myself ills twice so many?
 Not I! not I! Ye purposes, farewell!
 Yet—yet—what ails me? Would I earn derision,
 Letting my foes slip from my hands unpunished?
 I must dare this. Out on my coward mood
 That from mine heart let loose relenting words!

Euripides employed monodies or solo songs more freely than his predecessors, and the accompanying music was more artificial than had been customary before. In his

¹ *Medea*, 1040 ff.; Way's translation.

music he is said to have been aided by a certain Cephisophon, who lived in his house and was accused of improper intimacy with his wife. Of the truth of these stories we can not judge, and the music is lost to us. Yet, even without the music, some of the extant monodies are among the

Monodies. most effective and beautiful lyric poems of the world. One of the most striking, which was, we may well imagine, accompanied with brilliant music, is sung by Cassandra in the *Troades*, when she is about to be given over to Agamemnon: ¹

Up with the torch!—give it me—let me render
 Worship to Phœbus! Lo, lo, how I fling
 Wide through his temple the flash of its splendour—
 Hymen! O Marriage-god, Hymen my king!
 Happy the bridegroom who waiteth to meet me;
 Happy am I for the couch that shall greet me;
 Royal espousals to Argos I bring:
 Bridal-king, Hymen, thy glory I sing.
 Mother, thou lingerest long at thy weeping,
 Aye makest moan for my sire who hath died,
 Mourn'st our dear country with sorrow unsleeping:
 Therefore myself for mine own marriage-tide
 Kindle the firebrands, a glory outstreaming,
 Toss up the torches, a radiance far-gleaming:—
 Hymen, to thee is their brightness upleaping;
 Hekate, flash thou thy star-glitter wide,
 After thy wont when a maid is a bride.

The choral songs, too, though not the parts of his dramas to which Euripides especially owes his fame, and **Choral songs.** though they are less in extent and less closely connected with the plot than those of Sophocles, are sometimes of great beauty and originality. As an example we may take one from the *Bacchæ*: ²

¹ *Troades*, 308 ff.; Way's translation.

² *Bacchæ*, 862 ff.; Milman's translation.

Oh, when, through the long night,
 With fleet foot glancing white,
 Shall I go dancing in my revelry,
 My neck cast back and bare
 Unto the dewy air,
 Like sportive fawn in the green meadow's glee ?
 Lo, in her fear she springs
 Over th' encircling rings,
 Over the well-woven nets far off and fast ;
 While swift along her track
 The huntsman cheers his pack,
 With panting toil, and fiery storm-wind haste.
 Where down the river-bank spreads the white meadow,
 Rejoices she in the untrod solitude,
 Couches at length beneath the silent shadow
 Of the old hospitable wood.

What is wisest ? what is fairest,
 Of god's boons to men the rarest ?
 With the conscious conquering hand
 Above the foeman's head to stand.
 What is fairest still is dearest.

Slow come, but come at length,
 In their majestic strength,
 Faithful and true, the avenging deities :
 And chastening human folly,
 And the mad pride unholy,
 Of those who to the gods bow not their knees.
 For hidden still and mute,
 As glides their printless foot,
 The impious on their winding path they hound.
 For it is ill to know,
 And it is ill to do,
 Beyond the law's inexorable bound.
 'Tis but light cost in his own power sublime
 To array the godhead, whosoe'er he be ;
 And law is old, even as the oldest time,
 Nature's own unrepealed decree.

What is wisest ? what is fairest,
 Of god's boons to men the rarest ?
 With the conscious conquering hand
 Above the foeman's head to stand.
 What is fairest still is dearest.

Who hath 'scaped the turbulent sea,
 And reached the haven, happy he !
 Happy he whose toils are o'er,
 In the race of wealth and power !
 This one here, and that one there,
 Passes by, and everywhere
 Still expectant thousands over
 Thousand hopes are seen to hover.
 Some to mortals end in bliss ;
 Some have already fled away :
 Happiness alone is his
 Who happy is to-day.

During his long career Euripides won only five victories in tragic contests, and one of these was won after his death by posthumous plays brought out by his son. His plays were, however, popular even during his lifetime, if we may judge by the criticism directed against them by the comic poet Aristophanes, and after his death they attained the utmost popularity, though some critical writers considered them inferior to those of Sophocles. The large number of fragments preserved in the works of other writers is due in great measure to this popularity, but also in part to the fact that Euripides puts into the mouths of his characters many epigrammatical sentences and much speculation on moral and philosophical subjects. He was therefore often quoted by philosophical and ethical writers. In modern times his works have been alternately excessively admired and decried. The plays of Æschylus and Sophocles which have come down to us appear to have been selected in later times as masterpieces, while those of Euripides seem to have been

**Popularity
 and relative
 excellence.**

preserved, in part at least, by mere chance. Comparison between the three great tragedians on the basis of their extant works is therefore unjust to Euripides. Nevertheless, it is evident that Euripides has less grandeur, less religious inspiration, and less spontaneous lyric genius than either Æschylus or Sophocles. Yet, though he should perhaps be ranked as a poet third among the three great tragedians, he surpasses his competitors in truth to nature, in portrayal of human passions, and in variety of plots. In many passages, moreover, he rises to such beauty and brilliancy of expression as few poets of any epoch have attained.

CHAPTER XX

MINOR TRAGIC POETS

Minor tragic poets of the fifth century—Ion of Chios, about 490 to about 422 B. C.—Achæus, 484 to about 410 B. C.—Agathon, about 445 to about 400 B. C.—Tragedy in families—Polyphradmon, 467 B. C.—Aristias, son of Pratinas, about 460 B. C.—Euphorion and Bion, sons of Æschylus—Philocles, nephew of Æschylus—Morsimus, Astydamos the elder, Astydamos the younger—Iophon and Ariston, sons of Sophocles—The younger Sophocles—Carcinus the elder, Xenocles the elder, Carcinus the younger, Xenocles the younger—Critias, about 415 B. C.—Meletus, about 410 B. C.—Aristarchus of Tegea, about 430 B. C.—Neophon, about 440 B. C.—Sthenelus, about 440 B. C.—Tragedy in the fourth century—Theodectes, about 375 to 334 B. C.—Chæremon, about 350 B. C.—Heraclides of Pontus, latter part of the fourth century—Dionysius of Syracuse, tyrant 405 to 367 B. C.—Later tragedy.

ÆSCHYLUS, Sophocles, and Euripides, though by far the greatest of the tragic poets of the fifth century, were not without imitators, followers, and even rivals. Of the works of the lesser tragedians only inconsiderable fragments remain, but the works themselves must have possessed, in some cases at least, real merit of a high order, for we know that they were sometimes victorious over those of the three great tragic poets.

Ion of Chios, son of Orthomenes, came to Athens as a young man and lived there most of his life, returning only occasionally to Chios. The first of his forty tragedies appeared in 451 B. C. He was defeated by Euripides in 428, but on another occasion won the prize for dithyrambic poetry as well as tragedy. His death took place probably a little before 421. He wrote tragedies,

comedies, dithyrambs, elegies, pæans, hymns, epigrams, and scolia, besides treatises on historical and scientific subjects and a collection of *Memoirs* or *Travels*. He was an agreeable, good-tempered man, a friend of Cimon, Æschylus, and perhaps Sophocles, and somewhat fond of wine and pleasure. His writings seem to have been refined and pleasing. This can be asserted with confidence of his lyric poems, of which some considerable fragments remain, and may be assumed for his tragedies, the fragments of which are too slight to be of much value.

Achæus of Eretria, the son of Pythodorus or Pythodoridae, was born in 484 B. C. and produced his first plays in 447. He gained only one victory, though he is said to have written forty-four tragedies. He seems to have excelled in satyr dramas, in which he was said by some critics to be second only to Æschylus. His diction was graceful, but somewhat obscure.

Agathon, the son of Tisamenus of Athens, was born not much after 450 B. C. In 416 he won his first victory, and the banquet in honor of his success is famous as the scene of Plato's *Symposium*. At some time before 406 he went to Macedonia, and remained until his death at the court of Archelaus. He was remarkable for personal beauty and natural ability, but was rather effeminate and foppish. As a dramatic writer he showed some originality and introduced some novelties, being the first to compose choral odes having no connection with the plot, so that they could be inserted indifferently in any tragedy. He was also the first to write a tragedy (called *Anthos*, the *Flower*) with a purely fictitious plot, not founded upon mythology or history. His example seems to have been followed by other writers in respect to the choral odes, but in no other way does he seem to have exerted a lasting influence. His style was careful but artificial, and his verses abounded in neat epigrammatical sayings, alliterations, and plays on words.

The tragic poet was his own stage-manager, invented his own scenery, and directed the training of his chorus.

Tragedy hereditary in families. He needed, therefore, not only the ability to write tragedies but also some technical knowledge and special training. It is therefore not

unnatural that the practise of producing tragedies was to some extent hereditary in certain families. The tragic poet Phrynichus had a son, Polyphradmon, whose tetralogy on the myth of Lycurgus was produced in 467; and Aristias, son of Pratinas, was, like his father, famous for his satyr dramas.

Euphorion and Bion, sons of Æschylus, both wrote tragedies, and Euphorion won several victories by exhibiting his father's plays. A nephew of Æschylus, **The family of Æschylus.** Philocles, produced one hundred tragedies, and even defeated Sophocles when the latter exhibited his *Œdipus the King*. His plays seem, however, to

have been as a rule of no great merit. His son Morsimus was also a tragic poet of little importance. Astydamas, the son of Morsimus, began to produce tragedies in 398, and his son, the younger Astydamas, was the most successful tragic writer of the fourth century. He won his first victory in 372, and produced in all two hundred and forty plays, winning the first prize in fifteen contests.

Iophon, the son of Sophocles, was a tragic poet of some distinction. He produced fifty plays, some of them in collaboration with his father, and won several victories. Ariston, another son of Sophocles, also **The families of Sophocles and Euripides.** wrote tragedies, but without much success.

His son, the younger Sophocles, exhibited his grandfather's *Œdipus at Colonus*, and in 396 began to produce plays of his own. He is said to have won seven victories and to have written elegies as well as tragedies. Euripides also had a son, or a nephew, to whom he left his unpublished plays, and who also produced tragedies of his own.

Carcinus, a tragic poet of the time of Sophocles and Euripides, had a son, Xenocles, who also produced tragedies, and in the fourth century the younger Carcinus, son of Xenocles, was a successful and popular writer, who produced one hundred and sixty tragedies and won numerous victories. He spent a large part of his life in Syracuse at the court of the younger Dionysius. His son, the younger Xenocles, was also a tragic poet.

Among the other tragic poets of the fifth century are none who deserve more than a passing notice. Critias, the pupil of Socrates, best known as the leader of the Thirty Tyrants, was an orator of distinction, a writer of elegies, and a tragic poet. He seems to have imitated Euripides and to have inserted much philosophical reflection into his tragedies. Meletus is better known as one of the accusers of Socrates than as a tragic poet. His lyrics appear to have been coarse, and perhaps indecent. He wrote a connected tetralogy on the subject of *Œdipus*, the latest known example of such a work. Aristarchus of Tegea was a prolific author of the time of Euripides. His *Achilles* was imitated by the Roman poet Ennius and is the only tragedy not by one of the three great tragedians known to have been adapted by a Roman author. Neophon of Sicyon gave great prominence to slave characters. His *Medea* is said to have suggested the play of the same name by Euripides. Sthenelus is said to have written tragedies in the language of ordinary life. Several other tragic poets are known by name, but only as writers of little importance.

In the fourth century tragedy continued to be popular at Athens, and spread also to other cities. Most of the tragic poets, however, wherever they happened to be born, came to Athens to compete for the prize in the great contests, while others

Carcinus and his descendants.

Critias, Meletus, Aristarchus, Neophon, Sthenelus.

Tragedy in the fourth century.

merely sent their works to Athens. The subjects of tragedy were still the ancient myths, and it was difficult for any one to treat them with originality. The result was a tedious monotony, hardly improved by the introduction of rhetorical flourishes. Theodectes of Phaselis, who was born about 375 and settled in Athens at an early age, took up speech writing as his principal profession, but also composed tragedies. He competed in thirteen contests and won eight prizes. When Artemisia of Halicarnassus invited the most distinguished oratorical writers to compose speeches in honor of the memory of her husband, Mausolus, Theodectes was defeated by Theopompus, but his tragedy in honor of Maussolus gained the prize. He seems to have had some dramatic ability, but his style was too rhetorical. Chæremon, who flourished about the middle of the fourth century, was the most distinguished of a class of writers who composed tragedies to be read rather than to be acted. His diction was pleasing, his style finished and careful, though somewhat artificial. He seems to have excelled in description and to have been a lover of nature, especially of flowers. The philosopher Heraclides of Pontus, his pupil Dionysius, and other writers of the fourth century composed tragedies under the names of earlier poets, either with intent to deceive or merely as literary exercises. So the fragments preserved under the name of Thespis are due to Heraclides. Dionysius the elder, tyrant of Syracuse from 405 to 367 B. C., is the most interesting of the remaining tragic poets of the fourth century. He wrote histories and perhaps comedies, but his tragedies were his most important literary productions. They do not appear to have been very successful, though they are mentioned by later writers, and one of them gained a prize at the Lenæan festival in Athens in 367.

Tragedies continued to be written and acted in the time of Alexander the Great, who caused them to be per-

formed at his festivals, and even after the fourth century—in fact, until long after the Romans conquered Greece. Tragic performances became a regular part of various festivals in all parts of the Greek world and even in Parthia. But the vigorous growth of tragic poetry ends with the death of Euripides.

CHAPTER XXI

THE OLD COMEDY—ARISTOPHANES

The origin and development of comedy—Susarion, about 560 B. C.—Epicharmus, about 485 B. C.—Mimes—Sophron, about 440 B. C.—Pantomimes—Early Attic comedy—Chionides and Eephantides, wrote 480–450 B. C.—Mages, wrote 460–430 B. C.—Cratinus, wrote about 450–423 B. C.—Crates, 445 B. C.—Pherecrates, about 440 B. C.—Eupolis, 446–411 B. C.—Aristophanes, about 450–385 B. C.—His life, style, and composition—The extant plays—Analysis of the *Birds*.

COMEDY, like tragedy, arose from the worship of Dionysus, and was developed into a branch of literature at Athens in the fifth century. Its development was somewhat later than that of tragedy and its vigorous life continued longer. Tragedy arose from the dithyramb, which was a regular and, in part at least, a serious form of worship. Comedy, on the other hand, had its origin in the unrestrained, boisterous, and sometimes licentious fun of the processions connected with the festivals of the god of

Origin of
comedy.

wine. Whether the word *comedy* is derived from *komos*, festive procession, or from *kome*, village, is uncertain. In any case, comedy arose from the festive processions connected with the rustic worship of Dionysus. Among the Dorians such processions were popular, and those who took part in them improvised jokes and rude verses, probably at times impersonating their neighbors or others against whom the shafts of their wit were aimed. In the villages of the Megarid bacchic processions with impersonations, mimic dances, and jokes, probably of a political and satiric nature, were popu-

lar, and this so-called Megarian comedy was introduced into the neighboring Attica in the early part of the sixth century. According to one account, the first comic performances in Attica were at Icaria, the birthplace of Thespis.

This Megarian comedy had no plot, but consisted merely of detached scenes and coarse buffoonery. The words were not written, and were originally improvised by the revelers, apparently in prose. The first who composed comedies in verse was Susarion, who is called **Susarion.** the inventor of comedy. He was born at Tripodiscus, a village of the Megarid, not far from 600 B. C., for he began to be known about 575. His comedies had as yet no plot, and were not more than three or four hundred lines long. It is not even certain that they were committed to writing. The names Myllus and Mæson, sometimes supposed to be those of authors of primitive comedies, are more probably names of stock characters in the comic scenes—Myllus a man who pretends to be deaf and dumb, but who really hears everything, Mæson a fat cook. If there were any contests or competitions in comedy in Attica before the fifth century they can have been only local contests between village jesters.

Such rude beginnings of comedy as existed in the Doric states of the Peloponnesus were to be found also in Sicily, and here an important advance was made. Aristoxenus of Selinus appears to have written iambics of a comic and satiric sort about the end of the sixth century, and may in some measure have prepared the way for Phormus and Epicharmus. Of the former little is known except that Gelo entrusted to him the education of his children, but

Epicharmus. Epicharmus seems to have been a man of original genius. He was born in the island of Cos in the second half of the sixth century, but was taken as a child to Megara in Sicily. He afterward moved to Syracuse, where he gave performances in 486 B. C. He

died at the age of ninety years. His comedies, the number of which is variously given as thirty-six and fifty-two, were partly on mythological subjects, some of them perhaps derived from the Athenian satyr dramas, and partly on subjects drawn from daily life. They were written in the Sicilian dialect, and in iambic and trochaic metres. The extant fragments and the statements of later writers show that Epicharmus excelled in description, and that his comedies contained many sententious remarks. It is probably due to the philosophical character of these remarks that he acquired reputation as a philosopher. In later times he was classed as a Pythagorean, and some philosophical works were ascribed to him. His true claim to greatness rests upon the fact that he was the first to compose a real comedy, in which all the scenes formed parts of one and the same plot.

It was at Syracuse too that *mimes* were first perfected by Sophron, a contemporary of Euripides. These were prose dialogues of no great length which gave comic and satirical representations of scenes of daily life at Syracuse. The mimes of Sophron were classed as *male* and *female*, according to the sex of the persons represented. The dialect was the Syracusan Doric. Sophron was followed by his son Xenarchus. In the fourth century the *pantomime*, a sort of mythological dialogue, was developed in Sicily.

The Attic demes already had comic performances consisting of more or less detached scenes when Epicharmus invented comedies with consistent plots. This innovation was quickly seized upon, and Attic comedy developed rapidly. Tragedy had at this time its established forms, and comedy imitated these without giving up the old habit of addressing the audience directly, even at times bringing the audience into the action of the play. So all through the fifth century, at least, comedy shows traces of its composite nature, partly the old rustic buffoonery, and partly

imitation of tragedy. In outward form tragedy was pretty closely copied. Just when comedy became a recognized part of the Dionysiac festivals is not known, but it was certainly before the death of Æschylus, and probably not far from 470 B. C. Thereafter comic poets received choruses from the archon, and comedy took its place beside tragedy as a part of the public worship and recreation, but not quite as an equal, for each comic poet presented only one play, not three.

The earliest Attic comic poets known are Chionides, Ephantides, and Magnes, who are said to have been younger than Epicharmus. Chionides and Ephantides, of whom little is known, seem to have produced their comedies between 480 and 450 B. C., and Magnes was active from about 460 to 430. He gained eleven prizes, but no important fragments of his works remain. From the titles of some of his plays—the *Frogs*, the *Birds*, the *Lydians*, the *Gall-Insects*—it is evident that his choruses were sometimes dressed in fantastic costumes.

Cratinus, somewhat younger than Magnes, began to produce comedies not much before 450 B. C., and his last piece was presented in 423, shortly before his death. He won nine prizes, and left twenty-one plays. He did much to increase the importance of comedy and to fix the details of its form. Some, at least, of his comedies were political, attacking the person and policy of Pericles. His works are lost, and the extant fragments give us no idea of their excellence, which must have been considerable. Aristophanes accused him of drunkenness, and his last play, which won the prize in 423 over the *Clouds* of Aristophanes, was entitled the *Bottle*, and had for its main purpose the defense of the author against the charge of drunkenness and consequent loss of power.

Crates, at first an actor employed by Cratinus, won his first victory as a writer about 445 B. C. Fifteen titles of

plays are preserved under his name, but eight of these seem to belong to a later writer of uncertain date. The plays of

Crates, Pherecrates, Eupolis, Phrynichus, Plato. Crates seem to have been gay and merry. He is said to have been the first to introduce drunken persons. Only insignificant fragments of his works remain. He refrained from abusive personal satire, as did also his slightly younger contemporary and rival Pherecrates, who produced sixteen comedies, the most famous of which, the *Savages*, appeared in 420 B. C. Eupolis, apparently the greatest of the rivals of Aristophanes, presented his first comedy in 429 B. C., when he was only seventeen years old. He was killed in battle at the Hellespont in 411. His works were so successful that although he wrote only eleven or fourteen comedies he gained seven prizes. Phrynichus, who produced his first piece about 430, wrote at least ten comedies, the titles of which are preserved. Of his style and his wit we can not judge from the extant fragments. He died in Sicily, apparently after 405 B. C. Plato, the comic poet, not to be confounded with the philosopher, was before the public from about the middle of the Peloponnesian War until after 390. The existing fragments of his twenty-eight comedies are numerous but unsatisfactory.

The greatest comic poet of the fifth century and the only one of whose works more than unimportant fragments remain is Aristophanes, who was born about the middle of the fifth century and died soon after 388 B. C. Little is known of his life except as he refers in his comedies to his relations with his rivals and other contemporaries. He was an Athenian of the deme Kydathene, though there seems to have been some doubt about the citizenship of his father, Philippus. He composed forty or forty-four comedies, eleven of which are preserved. But before discussing these comedies it may be well to say a few words about the structure of an Attic comedy of this time. It will, however, be unnecessary to

do more than point out the differences between comedy and tragedy, remembering that in most particulars comedy imitated the tragic forms, but retained more freedom in their use. So the number of actors in comedy as in tragedy was three, but the comic poets made apparently freer use of extra persons—taken from the chorus or added at the expense of the choregus—who spoke only a few words.

The difference in form between comedy and tragedy.

The comic chorus consisted of twenty-four persons, twice the number of the tragic chorus before Sophocles, and interfered with the words and deeds of the actors more than did the chorus in tragedy. Moreover, once in nearly every comedy, and twice in some, the chorus threw off their outer garments, came forward and addressed the audience directly in the name of the poet, explaining his motives, defending him against previous attacks, declaring his political views, and reproaching the citizens individually and collectively for their folly or misconduct. This part of the play is called the *parabasis*, because the chorus “came forward” to address the audience. The chorus wore a tight-fitting, padded costume, over which was a cloak or any other garment adapted to the sort of persons the chorus was supposed to represent. In the *Wasps*, for instance, the chorus wore long stings and perhaps feelers and wings, and in the *Birds* the chorus was fitted out with wings and feathers. The masks, too, were as fantastic as the costumes, but there was probably no attempt to represent anything accurately. The fun consisted partly in ridiculous suggestiveness. The actors did not wear the high buskins and dignified costumes worn in tragedy, unless they happened to be playing a burlesque in ridicule of tragic pomp, but were dressed more nearly in the costume of the ordinary Athenian citizen, perhaps with masks intended to caricature well-known persons.

The plot is usually developed rather early in the play, and consists as a general rule of a violent conflict between two opposing parties, which attack each other with abuse,

ribald jokes, missiles, and even blows. The chorus is often divided, one-half taking each side. Presently one side or the other is victorious, and the rest of the play consists of ridiculous scenes showing the results of the victory. Just as a tragedy was divided into *episodes* by the choral songs, so a comedy was divided by the songs of the chorus, but these varied more in length as well as in form than did the tragic choral songs. The metres of comedy were many and were treated with less careful accuracy than those of tragedy. Naturally quick and lively metres were more favored than slow and dignified measures such as tragedy demanded. The old Attic comedy never belied its origin from the tipsy village procession in honor of the wine god. It was full of most exuberant, fantastic, unrestrained, even indecent wit, stopping at nothing to raise a laugh, utterly outspoken in praise or blame, and yet its coarseness is redeemed by its sparkling brilliancy, admirable originality, and sometimes poetic beauty.

The earliest play of Aristophanes—which he did not present under his own name—was the *Daitales* or *Banquetters*, performed in 427 B. C., and followed the next year by the *Babylonians*, in which he attacked Cleon with so much vigor that Callistratus, under whose name the play appeared, was brought to trial, and Aristophanes was accused of not being an Athenian citizen, a charge against which he seems to have defended himself successfully.

The eleven extant plays are, in the order of their production, as follows: 1. The *Acharnians* (425), a plea for peace with Sparta; 2, the *Knights* (424), a violent attack upon Cleon, the first play presented by Aristophanes under his own name; 3, the *Clouds* (423),¹ directed against the philosophical speculations and rhetorical teachings of the day, represented in the play by the person of Socrates; 4,

¹ The extant version of this play is incomplete and was never performed. The original version, performed in 423, is lost.

the *Wasps* (422), satirizing the demagogues and the passion for lawsuits; 5, the *Peace* (421), urging the conclusion of peace with the Spartans; 6, the *Birds* (414), satirizing, among other things, the high-flown hopes of the Athenians when they sent out the Sicilian expedition; 7, the *Lysistrata* (411), an extremely indecent play, directed against the Peloponnesian War and Euripides, and ending with the conclusion of peace between the Athenians and the Spartans; 8, the *Thesmophoriazuseæ*, or *Women at the Festival of Demeter* (411), attacking the women of Athens as well as Euripides and his innovations; 9, the *Frogs* (405), a sharp criticism of Euripides by comparison of his characters and his technical methods with those of Æschylus; 10, the *Ecclesiazuseæ* (392 or 389), satirizing the socialistic and communistic notions current among philosophers and other people at that time; 11, the *Plutus* (388),¹ criticizing the distribution of wealth in this world.

This list shows the scope of the subjects chosen by Aristophanes, but gives no idea of his manner of treatment. It is noticeable that the earlier plays are more personal and political than the later, which are directed against general tendencies and circumstances.

The most brilliant and characteristic of the existing plays of Aristophanes is the *Birds*. Two Athenians, Peithetærus (Plausible) and Euelpides (Hopeful),
The Birds. tired of the taxes, fines, and perpetual lawsuits of Athens, go to the land of the birds and summon the hoopoe from his house, which is represented in the scenery. Hoopoe appears in a most fantastic and absurd feathered costume, and describes the life of the birds in such terms that Peithetærus has a brilliant idea:

Peithetærus. Concentrate;

Bring all your birds together. Build a city.

Hoopoe. The birds! How could we build a city? Where?

¹ This is the second version of this play. An earlier version, now lost, was performed in 408.

Peith. Nonsense. You can't be serious. What a question!
Look down.

Hoo. I do.

Peith. Look up now.

Hoo. So I do.

Peith. Now turn your neck round.

Hoo. I should sprain it, though.

Peith. Come, what d'ye see?

Hoo. The clouds and sky; that's all.

Peith. Well, that we call the pole and atmosphere.

And would it not serve you birds for a metropole? ¹

He then develops his plan that the birds shall build a city in the clouds, to be called *Nephelococcygia* (Cloudecuckoo-town), where they can intercept the smoke arising from men's sacrifices to the gods, and thus rule gods and men. So Hoopoe calls his wife, the Nightingale, to summon the other birds:

Awake! Awake!
Sleep no more, my gentle mate!
With your tiny tawny bill,
Wake the tuneful echo shrill,
 On vale or hill;
Or in her airy rocky seat,
Let her listen and repeat
The tender ditty that ye tell,
 The sad lament,
 The dire event,
To luckless Itys that befell.
 Thence the strain
 Shall rise again,
 And soar amain,
Up to the lofty palace gate,
Where mighty Apollo sits in state
In Jove's abode, with his ivory lyre,
Hymning aloud to the heavenly quire;
While all the gods shall join with thee
 In a celestial symphony.²

¹ Lines 172 ff. The selections from the *Birds* are taken from Frere's translation.

² 209 ff.

A flute solo represents the Nightingale's call, and the birds come hurrying in at the summons of Hoopoe, the whole chorus of twenty-four ridiculously dressed to resemble twenty-four different birds. When they see the men, they wish to tear them to pieces, and Peithetærus and Euelpides make a barrier of their pots and pans to defend themselves. Hoopoe, however, persuades the birds to listen to Peithetærus, who first proves in comic fashion that the birds, not the gods, were in the beginning the lords of the universe, and then unfolds his plan, which is enthusiastically adopted. The two Athenians go with Hoopoe into the house to put on plumage, and the chorus, left alone, sings the parabasis, the first part of which parodies the current speculations about the origin of the world, while the second part recites the many advantages of having wings. There are in the parabasis several jokes directed against well-known men at Athens, and against the habits of the citizens.

Peithetærus and Euelpides come out dressed in their new suits of feathers and give the town its name. Then follow several scenes illustrating the difficulties of founding a colony. A priest comes to perform the rites of dedication; then a soothsayer to sell oracles; then a surveyor, Meton, equipped with his instruments; then a commissioner from Athens; and, finally, a hawker of Athenian laws for colonies. These are all disposed of in various ways by Peithetærus, who is finally so tired by the interruptions that he goes off to perform his sacrifice elsewhere. In a second parabasis the chorus comments upon various persons in Athens, and promises the judges wealth if they give the prize to the author of the play.

In the following scenes the plot is resumed. A messenger reports that the town is finished, telling how the different birds have done the various parts of the work. Then a second messenger rushes in to announce that a god has broken into the city. This proves to be the messenger goddess Iris, sent to order men to perform their customary

sacrifices. She is frightened, but saucy, and Peithetærus treats her like an impudent girl, making fun of her ridiculous costume, and sending her off to Zeus with the threat that if Zeus does not keep quiet an army of birds will attack him. Presently come people from the earth, eager for citizenship in the new city; first a young parricide, then the wretched poet and musician Cinesias, and last a sycophant, with all of whom Peithetærus carries on humorous dialogues before turning them out of town. Prometheus then comes in, disguised and with his face covered, carrying an umbrella, which he holds over his head that the gods may not recognize him when he uncovers his face. He tells Peithetærus that the barbarian gods are in revolt because they are starving, now that their sacrifices are intercepted by the birds, and that the gods are ready to sue for peace, but he advises him not to make terms unless Zeus give him the hand of "Royalty" in marriage, "a most delightful, charming girl, Jove's housekeeper, that manages his matters, serves out his thunderbolts, arranges everything." Soon Poseidon, Heracles, and a Triballian god come in as envoys from the gods. Heracles, being a notorious glutton, is bribed by Peithetærus, who cooks various dainties for him and promises him a dinner for his vote; the Triballian's language can not be understood, so it is assumed that he votes with Heracles, and so, in spite of Poseidon's determined opposition, the envoys accept the terms offered by Peithetærus. These episodes are separated and enlivened by short choral songs, and the play ends with a wedding procession. The chorus sings a hymeneal hymn, beginning :

Stand aside and clear the ground,
Spreading in a circle round
With a worthy welcoming,
To salute our noble king
In his splendour and his pride,
Coming hither, side by side,
With his happy, lovely bride.

Oh, the fair, delightful face !
 What a figure ! What a grace !
 What a presence ! What a carriage !
 What a noble, worthy marriage !
 Let the birds rejoice and sing,
 At the wedding of the king ;
 Happy to congratulate
 Such a blessing to the state.

Hymen, Hymen, ho !¹

And finally Peithetærus goes out, leading his bride and singing :

Birds of ocean and of air,
 Hither in a troop repair
 To the royal ceremony,
 Our triumphant matrimony !
 Come to us to feast and feed ye !
 Come to revel, dance, and sing !—
 Lovely creature ! Let me lead ye
 Hand in hand, and wing to wing.²

Such a brief summary as has been given fails to show the brilliant wit and sharp personal invective or satire displayed in the dialogue and the parabasis, but gives some idea of the fantastic humor and poetic inspiration of the greatest comic poet of the fifth century.

¹ 1720 ff.

² 1755 ff.

CHAPTER XXII

COMEDY AFTER THE FIFTH CENTURY

Divisions of comedy—The Middle Comedy—The *Plutus* of Aristophanes—Poets of the Middle Comedy—Antiphanes, about 404–330 B. C.—Anaxandrides, wrote from 376–348 B. C.—Alexis of Thurii, before 400 to after 300 B. C.—Eubulus and Archippus, fourth century—The *Amphitruo* of Plautus—The New Comedy—Its characters—Philemon, 361–262 B. C.—Menander, about 344–292 B. C.—The *Farmer* of Menander—Diphilus, second half of the fourth century—Apollodorus of Carystus, second half of the fourth century—Posidippus, first half of the third century.

ATTIC comedy falls naturally into three divisions: the Old Comedy, from the beginning to about 400 B. C.; the Middle Comedy, from about 400 to about 336; and the New Comedy, from about 336 to the time when comedies ceased to be original or important, about 250 B. C. The Old Comedy was, as we have seen, brilliant and full of vigor, but violent, personal, and obscene, a visible expression of the wild fantastic thoughts (often on important subjects) which surged through the brain of the half-drunken revelers inspired by the wine god Dionysus. The New Comedy was refined and polished, indecent only by allusion if at all, interesting not through wild, fantastic inventions and scenes of startling absurdity, but through carefully executed and well-conceived plots and accurate observation of real life. The Middle Comedy forms a transition from one to the other. In the Old Comedy the chorus is of the greatest importance, but long before the Middle Comedy passes into the New Comedy,

the chorus has lost its importance and is often entirely omitted.

The *Plutus* of Aristophanes, at least in its revised form, belongs already to the Middle Comedy. Its purpose is no longer abusive satire, but merely amusement. **The *Plutus* of Aristophanes.** Plutus, the god of wealth, is supposed to be blind, which accounts for the unjust distribution of wealth and poverty. In the play he gains the power of sight, and poverty is at last banished from the earth. The chorus has but little to say, there is no parabasis, and there are no regular choral songs. As was the case in the Old Comedy, a large part of the play is taken up with scenes having no effect upon the development of the plot, but merely showing some of the results of the action finished in the early part of the play—in the *Plutus*, the new complications arising from the new distribution of wealth.

The reason for the change from the Old to the Middle and from the Middle to the New Comedy is the change in the taste of the Athenians. Perhaps the poverty resulting from the Peloponnesian War may have made the expense of a well-trained chorus of twenty-four persons hard to bear, and perhaps a law forbidding direct attacks upon living persons may have aided to change the tone of comedy, but the real reason for the change was the change in the public taste. **Character of the Middle Comedy.** In the Middle Comedy the subjects chosen were often mythological, reminding us of the early comedies of Epicharmus, and were often derived from every-day life. But the extant fragments are so few and brief that we can gain no accurate idea of the treatment of the plots. The fixed, conventional characters which appear in the New Comedy—parasites, boors, braggarts, slaves, lovers, mistresses, and old men—were present in the Middle Comedy, and were probably borrowed in the first place from Epicharmus. Personalities were not wanting in the Middle Comedy, but

they took the form of innuendo and satire rather than of such open abuse as was dear to Aristophanes. The Middle Comedy, following the example set by Euripides in his tragedies, tried to represent human character as it is, giving up the fantastic unreality of the Old Comedy, but really fine character drawing was not developed until the New Comedy came into being.

Seventy-five poets and six hundred and seventeen plays are said to have belonged to the Middle Comedy, but of all these little is known. Antiphanes, not an Athenian by birth, was born shortly before 400 B. c. and appeared as a comic poet at Athens before 380. He is said to have written two hundred and sixty or even three hundred and sixty-five comedies and to have won thirteen victories. Fragments of over two hundred pieces are preserved, belonging especially to scenes of hospitality, but containing also some pointed and witty remarks. Antiphanes died at the age of seventy-four years, not far from 330 B. c. He was therefore the contemporary of Demosthenes, Plato, and Isocrates, and his life extended through the entire period of the Middle Comedy.

Anaxandrides of Camirus in Rhodes, or Colophon in Asia Minor, a comic and dithyrambic poet, won his first prize in comedy at Athens in 376 B. c. He also took part in the dramatic exhibition given by Philip of Macedon in celebration of his capture of Olynthus in 348 B. c. He composed sixty-five plays and gained ten victories.

Alexis, born at Thurii, in Italy, but a naturalized citizen of Athens, was the greatest poet of the Middle Comedy, as his nephew and pupil, Menander, was the greatest of the New Comedy. Born before 400 B. c., he lived through the entire fourth century, and died at the age of one hundred and six years, leaving to posterity two hundred and forty-five plays. The titles of many of these show that they belonged to the Middle

Comedy, though the last part of his long life belongs to the period of the New Comedy. Some of his plays were parodies, others were satires directed against philosophers, and in others love-affairs formed the basis of the plot. He made the part of the parasite of great importance, and is even said to have invented it. Other poets of the Middle

Comedy were Eubulus and Archippus. The **Eubulus and Archippus.** *Amphitryon* of Archippus may have been the original of the *Amphitruo* of Plautus. Of the other poets of the Middle Comedy whose names are known little or nothing is known except the names.

The best idea of the Middle Comedy may perhaps be derived from the *Amphitruo* of the Roman poet Plautus, a **The Amphitruo of Plautus.** travesty of a mythological subject, in which the confusion between Zeus and Amphitryon and their two servants gives rise to many amusing scenes.

The New Comedy continues into the Alexandrian period, but begins in the Attic period and is a direct development from the Middle Comedy. It draws **The New Comedy.** its plots from ordinary life, and the subject is almost always love. The Roman comic poets, Plautus and Terence, translated and adapted for their Roman audiences the plays of the New Comedy, and it is from their Latin plays that we derive our most complete information about Greek comedy after 336 B. C. A prologue, somewhat in the manner of Euripides, forms the customary opening of the piece and gives any necessary explanation of the plot. A common plot is based upon a love-affair between a young man and a girl supposed to be a slave. The girl has a mistress and the young man has a father. To these characters are added a maid servant, a parasite, the servant of the young man, his father's servant, frequently an old man with whom the father talks over his affairs, and perhaps a second couple of a young man and a girl. Various complications arise to hinder the course of

the young couple's love, but at last the girl is found to be of free birth and is given to her lover. This plot, simple in its outlines, is capable of almost infinite variety in details, and the conversations between the characters may be made interesting by witty repartee, sage or absurd remarks, and comic gestures. The establishment of the identity of the young girl gives an opportunity for a scene of recognition in the manner of Euripides. There are also other plots made use of by the writers of the New Comedy, but the one just described is the most usual. The plays are interesting less on account of strong or striking characters than by reason of the observation of every-day life displayed and the natural sequence of events, to which must be added the wit and humor of the conversations. In adapting Greek plays the Roman writers frequently combined scenes from two or possibly more dramas. We may therefore assume that the plays of the New Comedy were a little simpler than those of Plautus and Terence.

Many poets of the New Comedy are known to us by name, but so little is known of them that most of them can be passed over in silence. Among them all, two, Philemon and Menander, were placed above the rest by their contemporaries.

Philemon was born in 361 B. C. at Soli, in Cilicia, or, according to another account, at Syracuse, in Sicily. His first comedy appeared at Athens about 330.

Philemon. He is said to have passed some time at the court of Ptolemy in Egypt, but he died at the Piræus, where he was living when Antigonus besieged Athens in 262. He was then ninety-nine years old. He wrote in all ninety or ninety-seven plays, sixty of which are known to us by title and by some fragments, while other fragments can not now be ascribed to definite plays. He was the chief rival of Menander, and even gained several victories over him. His plays were translated or adapted by the Roman writers Plautus and Cæcilius, and among the Roman plays derived

from him are the *Mercator*, *Trinummus*, and *Mostellaria* of Plautus. He seems to have excelled in comic incidents and in humorous speeches rather than in the invention of clearly distinguished and carefully drawn characters.

Menander, the chief of the New Comedy, was born at Athens a little before 340 B. C. His parents were wealthy people of the Attic deme Cephisia, named Diopeithes and Hegesistrata. He was a nephew of the comic poet Alexis, from whom he received his first lessons in the art of comic composition, while his philosophical views are said to have been derived from Theophrastus and Epicurus. His first play was performed in 322 or 321 B. C., about a year after the death of Alexander the Great. The political troubles of Greece seem not to have affected Menander's gay disposition nor his easy and careless mode of life. Ptolemy Soter tried to induce him to come to Alexandria, but he preferred to stay at Athens, or rather the Piræus. He was a handsome man and careful of his dress and appearance, but a diligent author, for he composed one hundred and eight comedies in about thirty years. He died at Athens at the age of fifty-two, about 292 B. C. After his death his superiority over his rivals was universally conceded, but he is said to have gained only eight victories, being more than once defeated by Philemon. He was, however, conscious of his own superiority, and meeting Philemon one day after a defeat he said, "Please, Philemon, be good enough to tell me, when you win a victory over me, don't you blush at it?"

Menander's works are known to us, aside from Roman adaptations,¹ by numerous fragments, the longest of which, from the *Farmer*, was first published in 1897 from a papyrus manuscript in Geneva. The fragment is too short to give a complete idea of the plot, but it is evident that a love-affair between a

¹ The *Bacchides*, *Stichus*, and perhaps *Pænulus* of Plautus and the *Andria*, *Adelphoe*, *Eunuchus*, and *Hautontimorumenos* of Terence.

young Athenian and a girl whom he has known at Corinth is an important part of it. Arrangements have been made in the young man's absence for his marriage with his half-sister, which puts him in a cruel dilemma, but in some way an accident to a certain Cleænetus brings about a change. The accident is reported to a woman named Myrrhine by a slave named Davus, in the presence of another woman, Philinna:

(Enter Davus, from the country.)

Dav. No one tills a more righteous land than ours, I trow. See, it yields of its own accord myrtle, ivy, laurel, . . . all these flowers, and if you sow anything else, it gives a just and fair return, not in excess, but measure for measure. Here, Syrus, take into the house all this load I am carrying. It is all for the wedding. Good day, Myrrhine!

Myrrh. Good day!

Dav. As I saw, honourable and respected lady, how you stand, I want to give you a taste of some good news—or rather some approaching good fortune if the gods will—and to be the first bearer of it. Cleænetus, on whose estate your boy is working, while digging in the vineyard the other day, made a fine, big gash in his leg.

Myrrh. Oh, dear!

Dav. Courage, and hear me out. When the old man's wound was three days old a tumour broke out, he had an attack of fever, and was very ill indeed.

Phil. Oh, confound you! Is that the good news you have come to tell us?

Myrrh. Hush, mother!

Dav. Then, when he needed a friend's care, the servants and slaves cried with one accord, "It is all over with him. We can do nothing but raise a long lament." But your son, as though he thought Cleænetus was his own father, lifted him up, anointed him, rubbed him, washed his wound, brought him food, comforted him about the serious character of his case, indeed, he has restored him to life by his devotion.¹

Davus goes on to tell how the old man became interested in the boy's affairs, and is presently coming to marry some

¹ Translated by Grenfell and Hunt.

one whom he speaks of as "the girl." The fun of the scene lies chiefly in the manner of the announcement of good news which begins with the tale of the accident to the old man. Incidentally, Davus refers ironically to the barrenness of Attic farms, which produce just as much as one sows in them, but no more. For such humor, as well as for delicate character drawing and well-conceived plots, Menander was famous. His plays contained also many remarks of a sententious or philosophical character, which led to their being frequently quoted. So, in the *Farmer*, we read :

A poor man, Gorgias, is despised, even though what he says is very just; for he is supposed to talk for this thing only, gain; and a man with a seedy coat is called a sycophant, even though he happen to have been wronged.

A contemporary of Menander was Diphilus of Sinope, to whom one hundred comedies were ascribed. The *Casina* of Plautus is a translation of one of these. He continued to produce travesties of mythological subjects, and in general seems to have retained something of the character of the Middle Comedy.

Apollodorus of Carystus was the author of the originals of the *Phormio* and the *Hecyra* of Terence, from which we gain a high opinion of his ability. Posidippus of Cassandrea, in Macedonia, belongs to the early part of the third century. His plays are said to have been imitated by Roman writers. Throughout the third century, and even later, comedies continued to be written and performed at Athens and elsewhere, but none of them enjoyed any lasting reputation.

CHAPTER XXIII

EPIC AND LYRIC POETRY OF THE ATTIC PERIOD

Epic poetry—Panyasis, 470 B. C.—Antimachus, 404 B. C.—Chœrilus of Samos, about 480–400 B. C.—Elegiac verse—Evenus of Paros, born 460 B. C.—Critias, about 415 B. C.—Satirical poems—Hegemon, about 500 B. C.—Eubœus of Parium, about 325 B. C.—Sophocles's pæan—Aristotle's Hymn to Virtue—Dithyrambs and nomes—Melanippides, born about 520 B. C.—Melanippides the younger, about 460 B. C.—Cinesias, about 420 B. C.—Phrynus of Mytilene, 412 B. C.—Timotheus of Miletus, 447–357 B. C.—Philoxenus of Cythera, 435–380 B. C.—Writers of occasional poems.

THE poetic genius of the Greeks found its chief expression throughout the Attic period in the drama. Nevertheless, other forms of poetry, though no longer of the greatest importance, were not entirely neglected. The other kinds of poetry. epic and lyric poems of this period were of little merit in comparison with those of earlier times, and the extant fragments are relatively few and brief. They may therefore be passed over with a few brief remarks.

Panyasis of Halicarnassus, son of Polyarchus, and perhaps the uncle or cousin of Herodotus, has already been mentioned (see page 170). He was a contemporary of Sophocles, and became known about 470 B. C. His *Heracleia* Epic poetry. told all the deeds of Heracles in fourteen books aggregating nine thousand lines, imitating the language of the old Homeric epics. Antimachus, born at Claros, but afterward a citizen of Colophon, was at the height of his activity at the end of the Peloponnesian War, in 404 B. C. Following the example of Panyasis, he wrote a mythological epic called the *Thebais*, which was much admired. He

was also the author of a long poem in elegiac verse entitled *Lyde*, in honor of his deceased wife, Lyde. This poem was full of mythology. Antimachus was an enthusiastic student of Homer as well as an imitator of Homeric verse. Chœrilus of Samos also belongs to the latter part of the fifth century, though his birth was probably before 480 B. C. He wrote a history of the Persian Wars in hexameters. In 404 B. C. he was at Samos, and the Spartan Lysander paid him much attention, probably wishing his deeds to be celebrated in an epic, a wish which was not gratified. King Archelaus of Macedon soon after called him to his court, where he is said to have died.

Elegiac verse was written by almost every one who had any literary ability, but there were some poets whose chief activity was as writers of elegies. Evenus of Paros, born in 460 B. C., wrote elegiac verses for recitation at banquets. They seem to have been graceful and pleasing and to have contained moral maxims and proverbs. He died early in the third century. Critias, the leader of the Thirty Tyrants, composed elegies under the title of *Republics*, apparently a collection of poems on various subjects, especially the habits and customs of the Greeks. He also wrote some occasional poems. There were several writers of satirical poems and parodies, among whom Hermippus, the comic poet, should be mentioned. Hegemon of Thasos, a contemporary of Cratinus, wrote a mock epic, called the *Gigantomachia*, or Battle of the Gods and Giants, and in the fourth century Eubœus of Parium wrote parodies of Homer which seem to have been especially popular in Sicily. The cynic philosopher Crates of Thebes, whose prime was about 325 B. C., wrote satirical iambics as well as parodies in elegiac and hexameter verse. Scolia, pœans, and hymns were of course constantly wanted and constantly supplied. Sophocles wrote a pœan to Asclepius, and one of the famous hymns of the fourth century was the *Hymn to Virtue*, written about 345 B. C. by the

Elegies,
iambics, and
miscellaneous
poems.

philosopher Aristotle. But the most important lyrics of this period were the dithyrambs and nomes.

Dithyrambic performances were given at Athens after the development of the drama as before, but the music

became more important than the words, the sound than the sense. Melanippides the elder, a contemporary of Pindar, born at Melos about

520 B. C., began this movement by substituting musical interludes for the antistrophes of the dithyrambs. His

grandson Melanippides the younger, who died at the court of the Macedonian king Perdiccas in the time of the Peloponnesian War, made further innovations. Fragments of

his *Danaïdes*, *Marsyas*, and *Persephone* are preserved. Cinesias of Athens, son of the musician Meles, is ridiculed

by Aristophanes and blamed by other and more serious writers for innovations in the dithyramb which tended to

make its words less important than the music and dancing. The nome passed through changes similar to those of the

dithyramb. The chief innovator in this branch was Phrynis of Mytilene, who won the prize at the Panathenaic festival in 412 B. C. He appears to have made changes in

music and perhaps in versification, but none of his work is preserved. Timotheus of Miletus was born in 447 and

died in 357 B. C. He passed from city to city competing for the prizes of poetry. He composed nomes for lyre accompaniment, forming eighteen or nineteen books aggregating

eight thousand lines, sixty-seven proœmia, twenty-one hymns, eighteen dithyrambs, and various other less important poems. His nomes were especially famous, but as they

were sung by a chorus, they probably differed little from dithyrambs. He is said to have made music more effeminate, but the same thing is said of nearly all the poets of

this period, and we can not tell what it means. His great reputation shows that his poems had merits which the existing fragments, without the musical accompaniment, do

not allow us to appreciate. The same may be said of his

chief rival, Philoxenus of Cythera, who was born in 435 and died at Ephesus in 380 B. C. He was a child when the inhabitants of Cythera were reduced to slavery by the Lacedæmonians, and was bought first by a Lacedæmonian, then by the Athenian Melanippides, from whom he learned the art of poetry. In the height of his fame he was called to Syracuse by Dionysius the elder, but was for some reason obliged to flee to Tarentum, where he wrote the *Cyclops* to insult the tyrant. He composed twenty-four dithyrambs and numerous other poems.

Other poets of the Attic period were Cydias, Telestes, Polyidus, and Castorion. To these should be added the names of many who wrote lyric poetry not as a profession, but in the intervals of other occupations—such are Timocreon of Rhodes, Ion of Chios, Diagoras of Melos, Sophocles, Cercidas of Megalopolis, and Socrates, and the list could be almost indefinitely extended. But enough has been said to show that poetry in all its forms continued to be cultivated throughout the Attic period.

CHAPTER XXIV

ATTIC PROSE—THUCYDIDES

Rhetoric—*The State of the Athenians*—Thucydides, about 465 to about 400 B. C.—His life—His history of the Peloponnesian War—His truth and accuracy—His style and composition.

THE fifth century, which witnessed the development of the drama, saw also the rise of Attic prose. In all its Rhetorical forms this was much influenced by oratory and element in rhetoric, so that it may almost be said to have Attic prose. developed from the speeches delivered before the popular assembly and the Heliastic courts, and the earliest great work of Attic prose, the history of Thucydides, shows on every page the influence of the orator and rhetorician Antiphon; but that we may treat each branch of prose literature consecutively, it may be best to postpone the discussion of Antiphon until after the historical and philosophical writings of the Attic period have been discussed.

The earliest example of Attic prose is apparently an essay on *The State of the Athenians*, preserved among the writings of Xenophon, but certainly not by The essay on The State of the Athenians. him. Perhaps it is the work of Critias; certainly it was written not far from 425 B. C. The style is already clear and lucid. It shows the influence of rhetoric in the balancing of sentences, but it also reminds one of the Socratic dialogues. The writer was evidently trained in public speaking, but rather in practical pleading than in theoretical rhetoric. He was

an aristocrat, and criticizes the government of Athens with great severity and not without a certain dry humor.

The great prose work of the fifth century is the history of the Peloponnesian War by Thucydides, son of Olorus, of

Thucydides. the Attic deme of Halimus. He was descended from Olorus, a Thracian chief, whose daughter, Hegesipyle, was the wife of Miltiades, and in addition to this distinguished relationship he was connected with the family of Pisistratus. The date of his birth is unknown. He says at the beginning of his work :¹ "Thucydides, an Athenian, wrote the history of the war in which the Peloponnesians and the Athenians fought against one another. He began to write when they first took up arms, believing that it would be great and memorable above any previous war." And again he says, speaking of the war :² "I lived through the whole of it, and was of mature years and judgment, and I took great pains to make out the exact truth." He was made general in 424 B. C., and must therefore have been at least thirty years old at that time, but his expressions about himself seem to imply that he was thirty or forty years old when the war began. His birth may therefore be placed between 470 and 460 B. C. The date of his death is also unknown, but he lived as late as 403 and died before 396. His tomb was shown in the family burial place of Cimon. The following details of his life are known : In 430 or 429 he was attacked by the plague ; in 424 he was made general and put in command of the fleet operating on the coast of Thrace, but owing to his failure to prevent the capture of Amphipolis was accused of treason. After this he lived in banishment until he was recalled in 403, spending his time in part at least among the Peloponnesians, and in this way gathering material for his history. Whether he spent any considerable part of the time on his estates at Scapte Hyle, in Thrace, is doubtful, as that region was under Athenian rule. According

¹ I, 1; Jowett's translation.

² V, 26; Jowett's translation.

to one account he was murdered immediately after his return to Athens, while another authority says that he died in Thrace.

The only work of Thucydides is the history of the Peloponnesian War, and that was never completed, but breaks off in the middle of the year 411 B. C., although it is evident that some parts of it were written after the close of the war. The last of the eight books into which the work was

The history not finished. divided by the Alexandrian editors is evidently not finished, and some other parts of the work, especially in the fifth book, never received the last careful revision of the author, who must have died in the midst of his labors. No part of the work was finished and published before the end of the Peloponnesian War, but Thucydides collected his material as promptly as possible, and worked much of it up into a connected narrative long before the war was over, leaving only the final revision to be made after the close of the war, and the greater part of the work as it has come down to us received this final revision. How much material for the history of the last years of the war had been collected when Thucydides died we do not know.

Thucydides differs from his predecessors in the choice of his subject, for he is the first historian to write the history of events which he himself has seen. In

The character of the history. a brief introduction (Book I, 1-21) he tells of the early history of Greece, partly to show why

the Peloponnesian War seems to him most important; he gives (Book I, 89-118) an admirable account of the history of Athens during the fifty years since the Persian wars, which is necessary as an explanation of the causes of the Peloponnesian War; he describes the realm of the Odrysians in Thrace (Book II, 96-101); and makes us acquainted with the position and previous history of Sicily (Book VI, 1-5); but these can hardly be called digressions, as they are necessary for the proper understanding of the history.

Almost the only real digression in the entire work is a criticism of the accounts of the murder of Hipparchus by Harmodius and Aristogiton given by his predecessors (Book VI, 54-57). His work is a history of the Peloponnesian War, paying little attention to anything except military events and such political matters as affected the course of the war. The events of the war are narrated in chronological order, each year being divided into winter and summer. Thucydides set himself a definite task, and from this he was not to be diverted. In opposition to Herodotus and his other predecessors, who had written histories of mythical times or distant peoples, or had enlivened their works by inserting digressions and tales of all sorts, Thucydides composed his work to be "an everlasting possession, not a prize composition which is heard and forgotten." His critical insight is remarkable, and his impartiality wonderful. We feel, to be sure, that he is an Athenian, and generally sympathizes with Athens, but we feel also that his statements of fact are not affected by his sympathies.

Truth and accuracy were the main objects sought by Thucydides, and he spared no pains to attain them :

Of the events of the war I have not ventured to speak from any chance information, nor according to any notion of my own ; I have described nothing but what I either saw myself, or learned from others, of whom I made the most careful and particular enquiry. The task was a laborious one, because eye-witnesses of the same occurrences gave different accounts of them, as they remembered or were interested in the actions of one side or the other. And very likely the strictly historical character of my narrative may be disappointing to the ear. But if he who desires to have before his eyes a true picture of the events which have happened, and of the like events which may be expected to happen hereafter in the order of human things, shall pronounce what I have written to be useful, then I shall be satisfied. My history is an everlasting possession, not a prize composition which is heard and forgotten.¹

¹ I, 22; Jowett's translation.

There is no reason to doubt the truth and good faith of the author of these words. He may have made mistakes, but if he did so it was not through carelessness nor dishonesty, but because accurate information was not to be had. Yet he was not contented with the mere collec-

tion and arrangement of material. His work was to be a work of literary art. Hence it is that we find a careful balancing of phrases one against another, and a minute care in the distribution of emphasis, which seems to us sometimes to interfere with the straightforward simplicity of the narrative style; hence comes the choice of words and forms certainly not usual in the Attic speech of the time, as well as the careful distinctions between synonyms. In all these matters Thucydides shows that he had been trained in the school of the rhetoricians Gorgias, Antiphon, and Prodicus, and also that their training fitted in with his natural mode of thought. Even without literary training, Thucydides would have expressed himself tersely and pointedly, bringing certain words into high relief by opposing them to certain other words, and the training he had received only strengthened his natural tendency.

The style of Thucydides is, in the parts of his work which were finished before his death, the powerful and expressive style natural to a man of his serious and vigorous mind, but at the same time it is consciously elaborated in accordance with the teachings in vogue at Athens about the time when banishment removed the great historian from contact with the intellectual life of his native city. As a rule he is clear and concise, but sometimes the pressure of ideas involves him in a long and obscure sentence, and sometimes the desire for brevity causes him to condense into one phrase thoughts which could be more clearly expressed in two, and even to transgress the ordinary rules of grammar. Some of the peculiarities of his style as we find it in our

Artistic purpose.

Style and composition.

editions may be due to the mistakes of copyists, for our manuscripts contain many errors, but such mistakes can account for only a small proportion of them. A clear and vigorous thinker, impressed with the importance of his subject and eager to extend his own feeling to his readers, Thucydides is, in spite of his rhetorical training, a pioneer in the composition of Attic prose, and as such he is deficient in the smoothness and charm which distinguish his successors, but in dignity and power of expression he is unsurpassed. His evident influence upon Demosthenes, the greatest of ancient orators, is a sufficient indication of his power as a writer.

Like Herodotus, Thucydides inserts speeches in his narrative, but these are not, as are those of Herodotus, mere inventions inserted to add liveliness to the story, like the speeches of the Homeric heroes. Thucydides says:

The speeches in Thucydides. As to the speeches, which were made either before or during the war, it was hard for me, and for others who reported them to me, to recollect the exact words. I have therefore put into the mouth of each speaker the sentiments proper to the occasion, expressed as I thought he would be likely to express them, while at the same time I endeavoured, as nearly as I could, to give the general purport of what was actually said.¹

These speeches are among the most brilliant parts of the whole work. In them is summed up briefly and vividly the entire case for or against the line of conduct pursued by one of the Greek states, or the feelings of an entire population are expressed through the mouth of some one speaker. The masterly treatment of Thucydides makes them not mere adornments, but explanations of the narrative, by means of which the causes of public acts and events are understood. In the hands of later writers, speeches inserted in historical narrative tend to obscure the facts,

¹ I, 22; Jowett's translation.

but the speeches of Thucydides add at once to the interest and the clearness of the story. Aside from the speeches, the only interruptions in the narrative are documents, such as treaties, and dialogues between Melians and the Athenians,¹ Archidamus and the Plataeans,² and the Ambraciot herald and the soldiers of Demosthenes.³ The documents are copied from official records and do not affect our estimate of Thucydides as author or historian, except in so far as they put before us some of the material he employed. The dialogues belong substantially in the same category as the speeches, serving to explain the circumstances and the state of mind which led to the subsequent actions.

Thucydides is a realist and describes things as accurately as he can, giving little or no play to his fancy. He is, like others of his time, interested in human character, and pauses occasionally to give his estimate of the qualities of one or another of the prominent men whom he mentions. His personal judgments, however, are given only when they are necessary—that is, when the facts he has narrated do not bring the characters of the men clearly before the reader. So, for instance, after he has told how the Athenian expedition to Sicily failed in utter ruin, owing in great measure to the defects of the general-in-chief Nicias, and how Nicias himself was put to death, he adds: “Of all the Greeks of my time he least deserved to meet with so miserable an end, for he lived in the constant performance of what was considered virtue.”⁴ This we should not have known from the narrative, and it is necessary if we are to judge Nicias correctly.

Thucydides is the greatest of Greek historians. No other ever collected facts with so much care, and no other ever recounted them with so much power. That his sympathies are with Athens is evident, as are his aristocratic

¹ V, 85-113.² II, 71-74.³ III, 113.⁴ VII, 86.

feelings and his admiration for Pericles, inconsistent as these sentiments may seem when viewed in the light of the politics of the day; but no feelings of his own are allowed to interfere with the impartiality of his history. Himself a practical soldier, he describes military movements with remarkable accuracy, failing only in matters of topography, in which accuracy is hard to attain. Rapid and concise in narrative, accurate and clear in description, profound and logical in his exposition of causes, brilliant and vigorous in his rhetoric, devoted with all the power of a sincere and critical mind to the discovery of truth, Thucydides is at once the originator of the philosophy of history and the greatest of Greek historians. Although his style lacks the smoothness that appealed to most readers in the fourth century, his work was edited and commented on by the Alexandrine critics, he was justly admired in the days of the Roman Empire, and has been still more highly appreciated in modern times. Except in matters of detail, the criticisms which some scholars have directed against him have ended in establishing his reputation more firmly than ever.

CHAPTER XXV

XENOPHON AND OTHER HISTORIANS

Xenophon, about 430 to about 354 B. C.—His life and works—His literary qualities—Philistus, about 430–356 B. C.—Ephorus, first half of the fourth century to about 320 B. C.—Theopompus, about 380(?)—Writers of *Atthides*—Philochorus, about 306–260 B. C.—Æneas Tacticus, about 350 B. C.

XENOPHON, who has sometimes been classed among the philosophers as well as among the historians, but who is rather to be regarded as an essayist, is better known to us as a man than almost any other Greek writer. He was the son of Gryllus and Diodora and belonged to a well-to-do family of the Attic deme of Erchia. A story that Socrates saved his life at the battle of Delium in 424 B. C., which has caused some scholars to think that he was born about 445 B. C., is undoubtedly a fiction. Xenophon himself (*Anabasis*, III, 1) says that in 401 B. C. he hesitated because of his youth to assume the command of the Greeks whose generals had been murdered by the Persians. We happen to know that one of the murdered generals was only thirty years old, from which it appears that Xenophon can hardly have been older. Elsewhere, too, he speaks of his youth. We may therefore assume that he was born not far from 430 B. C. He received a good education and became at an early age a follower of Socrates, whose influence lasted throughout his life. In 401 B. C. the young Persian prince Cyrus was preparing an expedition to dethrone his elder brother, Artaxerxes II, and was

gathering a force of over ten thousand Greek mercenaries. Xenophon, at that time a young man eager for adventure and experience, accepted the invitation of his friend Proxenus, a Bœotian, to join the expedition as an independent volunteer, neither officer nor private soldier.

The story of this expedition is told by Xenophon in the *Anabasis*, in seven books. The title means *March up* from

The Anabasis. the seacoast to the interior, but after the second book the work describes the retreat of the ten

thousand Greeks from the heart of the Persian Empire to the coast, for Cyrus was killed in September, 401 B. C., in a battle at Cunaxa, near Babylon, and the Greeks, deserted by their allies, were left, a little band of ten thousand in the midst of a vast empire of enemies, and were obliged to force their way to the sea. Five of the Greek leaders were treacherously murdered soon after the death of Cyrus, and the Greeks were in the greatest danger. Then Xenophon, moved by a dream, called the remaining leaders together and encouraged them by a practical and courageous speech. New generals were chosen, Xenophon among them, and the next day the retreat began. Followed and harassed by the Persian troops, the Greeks marched up the course of the Tigris into the country of the Carduchi (Kurds), warlike highlanders, who opposed their passage by rolling stones down upon them as they struggled through the mountain passes, then forced their way through Armenia, until at last, in February, 400 B. C., after some five months of constant marching and fighting, they saw before them the waters of the Black Sea, and with the glad shout, "The sea! the sea!" burst into tears of joy, for now they knew that nothing could keep them from their native land and kindred. Against the will of the Persians, a small force of Greeks had marched for months through Persian territory, showing how vastly superior they were to the Asiatics, and how weak the Persian Empire really was. In two days the Greeks reached Trapezus, a Greek colony,

and sacrificed thank-offerings to Zeus the Preserver and Heracles the Guide. From Trapezus, Xenophon led his force, still 8,600 strong, to Byzantium, and thence, after a service of two months under the Thracian prince Seuthes, to Pergamum, in the Trôad, where they joined the army of the Lacedæmonian Thimbron, who was fighting against the Persian satraps Tissaphernes and Pharnabazus.

There Xenophon left them and returned to Greece, probably to Athens; but soon his adventurous spirit sent him to the field again, and in 396 B. C. he joined **His later life.** the army of King Agesilaus of Sparta, who was put in charge of the war against the Persians. When Agesilaus was recalled to Greece by the alliance of Thebes and Athens against Sparta, Xenophon accompanied him, and was present at the battle of Coronea in 394 B. C. Immediately after this, if not before, he was banished from Athens, and went to live at Scillus, near Olympia, in the territory of Elis, on an estate given him by the Spartans. Here he lived as a rich country gentleman, with his wife, Philesia, and his sons, Gryllus and Diodorus, passing his time in hunting, entertaining his friends, and writing. His estate was large, containing woods, in which he hunted with his friends and neighbors, and beside a little stream was a temple of the Ephesian Artemis, which he had built and maintained in performance of a vow. All this he himself describes in the fifth book of the *Anabasis* (V, 3, 8-13). In 371 Scillus was ravaged by the Eleans, then at war with the Spartans, and Xenophon withdrew to Corinth. At some time, probably in 365, the decree of banishment against him was rescinded, and he probably returned to Athens. In 362 his sons, Diodorus and Gryllus, were among the Athenian cavalry at the battle of Mantinea, and Gryllus was killed fighting bravely. The date of Xenophon's death is unknown, but it was probably about 354 B. C.

The *Anabasis* was first published under the name of Themistogenes, a Syracusan, and appears to have been

written in part to show that Xenophon was the real hero of the retreat of the ten thousand. It seems that at least one other account of the matter existed in which Xenophon did not figure prominently, and it was to correct this account for his own benefit that he wrote the *Anabasis*.

The purpose of the *Anabasis*. Naturally, such a work would carry more conviction if it appeared under another name. Apparently, however, nobody was deceived, for the *Anabasis* was known through all antiquity as Xenophon's work. Books I and II are merely diaries of the events of the march, ending with the account of the battle of Cunaxa, the situation of the Greeks, and the murder of the generals, with brief and pointed descriptions of the characters of the murdered men. After this point Xenophon himself becomes prominent, and continues to occupy the foreground in the narrative. It may be, therefore, that the first two books were written before the others, and before Xenophon thought it necessary to defend his reputation.

Besides the *Anabasis*, Xenophon's chief historical work is the *Hellenica*, a history of Greece in seven books, beginning at the point where the narrative of Thucydides breaks off, after the battle of Cynossema in 411, and ending with the battle of Mantinea in 362 B. C. The opening words are: "But after this, not many days later, Thymochares came from Athens with a few ships, and the Lacedæmonians and Athenians fought another naval battle, and the Lacedæmonians were victorious under the leadership of Agesandrides." The work is evidently closely attached to that of Thucydides as a continuation. Through the first two books something of the style of Thucydides is preserved, though without his brilliancy and vigor, and the tone of impartiality so noticeable in Thucydides is also to be observed here; but the remaining five books are written in a less accurate and simple style, and show constantly the author's strong prejudice in

favor of the Spartans and his excessive admiration of Agesilaus, feelings which cause him to do scant justice to other peoples and other leaders, and even to give little prominence to Epaminondas, the real hero of this period. So he tells of the revolution at Thebes without mentioning Pelopidas, and in his account of the first invasion of the Peloponnesus by the Thebans he does not speak of the founding of Megalopolis and the restoration of Messene by Epaminondas. These differences between the first two books and the rest make it probable that the former, which continue the history of Thucydides to the end of the Peloponnesian War in 403 B. C., were written by Xenophon with the aid of the notes and other material left by Thucydides, and were composed not far from 400 B. C., either before Xenophon joined the expedition of Cyrus or in the interval between his return from that adventure and his second departure for Asia. The remaining books were written at Scillus and after he was driven away from there. The *Hellenica* is our only connected account of Greek history between 411 and 362 B. C., and is therefore valuable. As a work of literature, however, it is not interesting, for the style is rather dull, and the speeches and dialogues introduced in imitation of Thucydides are sometimes prosy.

The *Agesilaus* is a pamphlet in praise of Agesilaus, written after his death in 361 B. C. "I know," it begins, "that it is not easy to write praise worthy of the excellence and reputation of Agesilaus, but, nevertheless, I must try. For it would not be well if because a man was perfectly excellent he should on that account not obtain even inferior praises." The deeds of Agesilaus are recounted, and for that reason this work is often classed as historical. It is, however, rather a laudatory essay than history. The praise is somewhat overdone, and the style is high-flown, though smooth. Several passages of the *Hellenica* appear also in the *Agesilaus*, which

The
Agesilaus.

may indicate that the *Hellenica* had not yet appeared when the *Agésilau*s was published.

The *Cyropædia*, or "Education of Cyrus," is not so much history as a description of an ideal monarchy. It describes

The
Cyropædia. in eight books the education, life, and character of Cyrus the Elder, the founder of the Persian Empire, and ends with his dying advice to his sons and counselors. Cyrus is represented not as the real Cyrus was, but as Xenophon thought a king ought to be, a wise, self-restrained, brave, and moderate man, with the moral and ethical principles of Socrates joined to the personal qualities of Xenophon's favorite hero, Agésilau

s, and with some traits drawn from the younger Cyrus, whom Xenophon had known in 401 B. C. In like manner the description of Persian customs, though based upon what the Greeks really knew of them, is imaginary in its details, many of which are derived from the Spartan institutions which Xenophon admired. Many anecdotes are inserted in the work, some of which, like the following, show the strong influence of Socrates :

A big boy who had a small tunic stripped a little boy who had a large tunic, put upon him his own small tunic and clothed himself in the large one. Now I, acting as judge between them, decided that it was better for both that each have the tunic that fitted him. Hereupon the teacher flogged me, saying that when I was judge of what fitted, I ought to do as I had done, but when I had to judge whose the tunic was, he said this was the point I ought to regard, what was just possession; whether one who has taken a thing by force should keep it, or he should possess it who made or bought it; and since, he said, that which is lawful is just, but that which is unlawful is violent, he ordained that the judge should always cast his vote according to law.¹

The story of the Assyrian prince Abradates and his beautiful wife, Panthea, who urged him to be faithful to Cyrus, sent him forth to battle clad in splendid armor which

¹ 1. *Cyrop.*, i, 3, 17.

she herself had given him, and after his death in battle killed herself upon his body, is beautiful in itself and remarkable as the first love story in any European language.

The *Memorabilia*, or "Recollections of Socrates," in four books, was written to defend Socrates against the accusation of impiety or immorality, and at the same time to record the impression made by him upon Xenophon, apparently with the purpose of showing that Plato's representation of the master was not correct at all points. The Socrates of Xenophon is less delicate in his irony than the Socrates of Plato, and the anecdotes told of him are chiefly concerned with his views and advice on practical matters. Xenophon evidently appreciated Socrates as a practical adviser rather than as a philosopher, and it is this which gives the work its chief interest, for it shows Socrates from the point of view of a practical man.

The *Apology*, or "Defense of Socrates at his Trial," is supposed by some scholars to be a late work, not by Xenophon, but there is little reason to doubt its genuineness. It was probably intended as a sort of sequel to the *Memorabilia*. It is a short essay, giving the substance of the speech of Socrates, with interruptions by the audience and short dialogues with Meletus, the chief accuser, and laying special stress upon the feeling of Socrates that death was for him a blessing, not an evil.

The *Symposium*, or "Banquet," describes a feast given by Callias in honor of Autolycus, who has just won a victory at the Panathenaic festival. Socrates proposes that each guest shall speak in praise of the art he practises, and the most important part of the whole consists of a discourse by Socrates on love; but the other discourses are interesting, and the whole essay is pleasing, though greatly inferior to Plato's work of the same name.

The *Œconomicus*, or essay "On Domestic Economy," also has Socrates as the central character. He tells how an Athenian husband, called Ischomachus, described to him the proper way to manage his family and estate. He tells how he educated his young wife in housekeeping and in character, and how he treated his slaves. The work is attractive, and gives us a high opinion of Xenophon as a husband and master, for Ischomachus is evidently Xenophon's ideal head of a household.

Other works of Xenophon are the *Hiero*, an imaginary conversation between Hiero II, tyrant of Syracuse, and the poet Simonides, in which Hiero praises the advantages of private life and Simonides describes the good a ruler can do; *The State of the Lacedæmonians*, a description of the Lacedæmonian constitution, praising especially the military training of the citizens by the state; *The Revenues*, dealing with the revenues of Athens, and showing how they may be increased by bringing in greater numbers of resident aliens to pay taxes, and by working the silver mines of Laurium more effectively; *On Horsemanship*, an interesting essay, telling about the choice and care of horses, the methods of hardening their feet (for the Greeks used no horseshoes), and the art of mounting and riding; *The Hipparchicus*, a book of advice to cavalry officers, telling how to secure good discipline in the troop, either for war or for show in processions; and *On Hunting*, telling about hunting nets, the breeds and the care of dogs, and various kinds of hunting, and describing in especial detail the hunting of hares with dogs.

Xenophon is neither a historian nor a philosopher, but rather an essayist, the first of his kind. In character he was simple and honest, with a thorough appreciation of his own good qualities, but too straightforward and honorable to be disagreeably conceited. His language is Attic, though he uses some expressions not found in the works of other

Attic writers. These expressions may have been adopted during his long absence from Attica, or they may be retained from his early days in the country; for Xenophon was brought up in the country, though in Attica, and did not as a child learn the latest forms of city speech. His style is generally smooth, clear, and plain, but it lacks vigor and variety. His writings are interesting, but one does not care to read them continuously. In short, Xenophon is not a great genius, but a good example of a cultivated, practical Athenian gentleman, and his writings are what we might expect from such a person. All his works have come down to us, and are interesting collectively because they show the range of his interests as well as his intellectual and moral qualities.

Three other historians of this period deserve mention, though their works have been lost, for later writers refer to

Philistus. them and repeat their statements. The least important of these is Philistus of Syracuse.

He was born not far from 430 B. C., of a wealthy family, and used his wealth to aid Dionysius I in establishing his power at Syracuse in 405. In 385 he was exiled because his marriage did not please the tyrant, and went to Magna Græcia, where he wrote most of his works. After he was recalled to Syracuse by Dionysius II, about 368, he opposed the influence of Dion and Plato and caused them to be exiled. When Dion took Syracuse from Dionysius, Philistus became general under the latter, and, being taken prisoner in a naval battle, was put to death in 356 B. C. His works were a *History of Sicily*, from the earliest times to Dionysius I, in seven books, a history of Dionysius I, in four books, and two books on Dionysius II. He imitated Thucydides in style, but lacked his force and vigor. He had a taste for legends, and was wanting in the scientific spirit and impartiality which distinguish Thucydides. His love and admiration for the tyrants of Syracuse, and even for tyranny in general, were evident in his work.

Ephorus, born at Cyme, in Æolia, in the first half of the fourth century, came to Athens and studied under the orator, rhetorician, and teacher Isocrates. He is said to have tried without much success to become an orator, and to have written a treatise on style; but his reputation is due to his great history of the ancient world from the return of the Heraclidæ to the siege of Perinthus by Philip in 340 B. C. The work consisted of thirty books, each with a preface. Ephorus was still living after Alexander came to the throne, but he died without having completed his history, the last book of which was finished and published by his son Demophilus.

The history of Ephorus, though primarily a history of Greece, treated also of Persia, Carthage, and other countries, and was, even more than that of Herodotus, a universal history. In his treatment of early times Ephorus removed from the legends all that was miraculous or marvelous and regarded the rest as historical. He laid down the excellent rule that a detailed account, though of great value when concerned with recent events, is to be distrusted in matters of very ancient history, because an accurate knowledge of details is in such cases improbable, and therefore the details given are likely to be imaginary. This rule did not, however, prevent him from inventing details. In the more recent parts of the history he showed care and study. He read the works of his predecessors, and even examined original documents; but he had a taste for stories and anecdotes, and does not seem to have distinguished carefully between those authorities who were trustworthy and those who were not. He also lacked understanding of political motives and of military affairs. His statements were therefore not always to be trusted. The speeches inserted in his work were attractive as speeches, but did not add to the value of the history. In style his work was careful and elegant, but lacked vigor. Only fragments of the history of Ephorus

remain, but the history of Diodorus Siculus (see page 407) contains much material derived from Ephorus.

Theopompus, son of Damasistratus, was born at Chios about 380 B. C. When he was a child his father was banished, and Theopompus and his brother Cau-
Theopompus. calus grew up in exile. Their father was rich, however, and gave them a good education. About 360 Theopompus became a pupil of Isocrates, and like Ephorus turned his attention to oratory. This art he practised with great success for many years. His speech in honor of Mausolus won the prize at Halicarnassus. He traveled about, giving lessons in all the chief cities of Greece, and in this way became acquainted with many places, many men, and many political details. He was a friend of the kings of Macedon, and was restored to his native land by Alexander at the age of fifty-five years. After Alexander's death he was expelled from Chios and went first to Ephesus, then to several other cities, and finally to Egypt. The date and place of his death are unknown.

The entire works of Theopompus amounted, as he himself said, to seventy thousand lines. About one-eighth of the whole was oratorical, the rest historical.
Works of The historical works were an *Abridgment of*
Theopompus. *Herodotus, a History of Greece, and the Philippica.* The first probably offered little interest; the second, which told in twelve books the history of Greece from 410 to 393 B. C., covering part of the same ground as Xenophon's *Hellenica*, has left few traces in later literature; the third, which told the history of Greece from 362 B. C. (the year with which Xenophon's *Hellenica* ends) to the death of Philip in 336, was an important work. The title shows that Theopompus understood that Philip was the central figure in the history of Greece at this time. Like Ephorus, he inserted many digressions and episodes, descriptions of customs, anecdotes, and even fables. He was interested in the motives of men's actions, and found that they were

usually bad. Hence he is criticized for defaming the characters of the kings and statesmen of whom he writes. His political sense seems to have been superior to that of Ephorus, but, like Ephorus, he was deficient in knowledge of military affairs. He was learned and industrious in collecting material, and seems to have been impartial, but his desire for effect in writing interfered somewhat with his trustworthiness. Isocrates said that Ephorus needed the spur and Theopompus the bit. This seems to mean that Theopompus was the more active and vigorous of the two, and what is left of his works shows an energetic and sometimes impassioned style.

To this period belong also three writers of *Atthides*, or works on Attic history and archæology, Clitodemus, Androtion, and Phanodemus. Their works were probably similar to those of Hellanicus but less comprehensive. They were followed by other writers of *Atthides* in the third century, the most important of whom was Philochorus, about 306 to 260 B. C., a careful investigator, often cited by later writers. Æneas, called Æneas Tacticus, was the author of an extant treatise on the defense of towns, taken from a larger work on strategy written about the middle of the fourth century. The dialect is Attic, and the work contains interesting personal recollections. Perhaps the author is the Æneas of Stympalus mentioned by Xenophon.

CHAPTER XXVI

ATTIC PHILOSOPHY—THE SOPHISTS—SOCRATES AND HIS FOLLOWERS

The beginnings of oratory—Corax and Tisias, about 460 B. C.—The Sophists—Protagoras, about 485 to about 415 B. C.—Gorgias, about 485 to about 380 B. C.—Prodicus, about 450 B. C.—Hippias, about 430 B. C.—Polus, about 430 B. C.—Stesimbrotus, about 425 B. C.—Antiphon, about 480–411 B. C.—Tendencies of the teaching of the sophists—Socrates, 469–399 B. C.—His life and character—His view of science—The dialectic method—His religion—Virtue the result of knowledge—Æschines, about 400 B. C.—Euclides, about 400 B. C.—The Megarian School—Stilpo, about 380–300 B. C.—Phædo, about 400 B. C.—Aristippus, about 410 B. C.—The Cyrenaic School—Antisthenes, about 400 B. C.—The Cynic School.

THE founder of Attic philosophy is Socrates. But Socrates can not be understood without some knowledge of the sophists, the professional teachers of the later fifth century, who combined in their instruction philosophy, rhetoric, and practical oratory. The beginnings of systematic instruction in oratory are therefore inseparable from the other teachings of the sophists to which the philosophy of Socrates is closely related, though the relation is rather one of contrast than of likeness.

From the earliest times the Greeks were a race of ready speakers. In the Homeric poems Nestor and Odysseus are honored for their eloquence; and much later Themistocles, and after him Pericles controlled the Athenians by their power of speech. But such oratory, however excellent it

may be, does not belong to literature, for it is not permanent, but passes away with the speaker. Oratory as a branch of literature does not begin until systematic instruction in oratory begins. The first oratorical instruction known among the Greeks was at Syracuse, the great Sicilian city, which for years seemed to be the equal or even the superior of Athens in wealth, power, and culture. Here the expulsion of the tyrants in 465 B. C. was followed by many lawsuits for the recovery of property, and the practise of speaking in court developed the theory of legal argument. This theory was set forth by Corax and his pupil Tisias, both of Syracuse. They taught that the object of rhetoric is probability; for the purpose of a speaker in court is not to establish the truth, but to make his argument appear probable to the judges. Morality has really nothing to do with this theory, for the same process of argument is needed to make the truth appear probable and to give an air of probability to falsehood. Corax and Tisias laid down rules for the arrangement of ideas so that they could be easily grasped; they distinguished the introduction from the discussion, and probably from the narrative, and taught their pupils to bring forward arguments in proper order. They do not seem to have tried to teach literary style. Their influence might have been slight if they had not coincided in date with the rise of the sophists.

The word "sophist," designated originally any one interested in wisdom of any kind. Pindar uses it to denote a poet. In the middle of the fifth century it meant a man who pursued wisdom, and especially one who made that pursuit his profession, in other words a teacher. It was not until the fourth century that "sophist" was a term of reproach. The word is now used chiefly to designate a group of men belonging to the fifth century B. C., who taught in various cities of Greece, especially at Athens, receiving pay for their instruction. They

thought that the researches of the earlier philosophers into the origin and management of the world were useless, first because we never can know these things, and then because they would do us no good if we did know them. They therefore undertook to teach not the secrets of the universe, but practical efficiency. Now almost everywhere in Greece in the second half of the fifth century, but especially at Athens, practical efficiency was more or less identical with the ability to sway the minds of the courts and the popular assemblies. A large part of the teaching of the sophists was therefore devoted to rhetoric and the art of persuasion, and they claimed to teach their pupils to make, as Protagoras said, "the weaker argument stronger." The number of sophists at the time of the Peloponnesian War was considerable, and they played an important part in the intellectual life of the time. They possess, however, as a class, no great literary importance, and it will be necessary to mention only a few of them.

The earliest in date is Protagoras, born at Abdera, about 485 B. C. He studied the philosophy of Heraclitus, but at about the age of thirty years began to travel as a sophist. His reputation became so great that he received one hundred minæ (about \$2,000) for a course of lectures. When about seventy years old, he was obliged to leave Athens, which had been his home for some years, on account of a charge of impiety, and was lost in a shipwreck on his way to Sicily. His writings, composed in the Ionic dialect, were numerous. The most important were a treatise called *Truth*, in which he set forth his skeptical philosophy, and a rhetorical text-book, the title of which is uncertain. Protagoras declared that "man is the measure of all things"; in other words, that there is no real truth, but that the universe is only the sum of men's ideas about it. He said that he did not know whether the gods exist or not, and in general his mental attitude was one of extreme skepticism. But with all that, he was per-

sonally of excellent character. In his rhetorical work, besides giving rules for arguments and the like, he made a beginning of logic and of grammar, distinguishing the gender of nouns and some of the tenses of verbs.

Gorgias of Leontini, in Sicily, was born about 485, and died, over one hundred years old, about 380 B. C. He is

Gorgias. said to have been a pupil of Empedocles and

Tisias. In 427 he was sent to Athens as an ambassador from his native town, but is not known to have performed any other public duty. At Athens, where he spent much time, he had great success as a sophist, and his works were written in the Attic dialect. But he traveled about Greece, and was highly esteemed at Larisa, in Thessaly, after his reputation had begun to decline at Athens. He made much money, which he spent freely on fine clothes and ostentation; but his habits were temperate, and he preserved his vigor to the last. He wrote a work *On Nature or on That which is Not*, some technical writings on rhetoric, and a number of orations, some of which were no doubt really delivered on festival occasions or at funerals, while others were written for practise or as specimens of his art. His teachings and example exercised great influence upon the literary style of contemporary and later writers. As a philosopher, Gorgias was as skeptical as Protagoras. He said, "Nothing exists, and if it exists it can not be known by man, and if it can be known it can not be expressed." Obviously, then, he thought time spent in the search for real truth was wasted.

Gorgias was more an orator than Protagoras, and taught not only argumentation and arrangement of ideas, but

Style of Gorgias. style, the art of arranging words and sentences with a view to pleasing the ear of the hearer.

He wrote in Attic Greek, but not the language of every-day life, for he used some poetic and archaic words to lend dignity to his composition. He was very careful in his choice of words and his arrangement of phrases. He

liked to balance his sentences so as to oppose one to another, and he took care to have his clauses end in similar sounds, as well as to give them the same number of syllables. All this gives his prose a certain dignity and finish, but leaves it monotonous and artificial. Of the works of Gorgias nothing is left except fragments of orations and two entire speeches, one a defense of Helen, the other supposed to be delivered by Palamedes when accused of treason by Odysseus. The authenticity of these speeches is doubted by many scholars, but they have the qualities ascribed by the ancients to Gorgias, and serve to give a good idea of his literary style.

Other sophists of less importance are Prodicus, Hippias, and Polus, all of whom, as well as Protagoras and Gorgias, figure in Plato's dialogues. Prodicus, born at Iulis, in Ceos, was younger than Protagoras, but perhaps a little older than Socrates. He came to Athens frequently as envoy. His reputation was great, and he earned much money as a teacher of morals and rhetorical style. He preached the current morality of the day, political and domestic virtues, and was apparently not philosophical nor scientific, but sensible and practical. In his rhetorical teaching he laid great stress upon the exact meanings of words and the distinctions between synonyms. Hippias, from Elis, was born about 470 B. C. He laid claim to universal knowledge, and discoursed upon all subjects with equal facility and shallowness. In addition to this he made his own clothes and shoes. Polus, a pupil of Gorgias, wrote a work on rhetoric, in which he recommended various ornaments of speech, and his own language was adorned with figures, epigrams, and the like.

Stesimbrotus. Stesimbrotus of Thasos, whose historical work has been mentioned before, was a sophist in so far as he gave lessons for pay, but he occupied himself little with rhetoric and less with philosophy, preferring to comment on Homer, probably with the purpose of

finding moral teachings hidden in the verses of the great epics. Several works are cited by ancient authors under the name of Antiphon—a treatise *On Truth*, one *On Concord*, and one called *Politicus*. The first was a general work on nature and philosophy; the second a plea for peace and concord, on the ground that human life is not too happy at best, and should therefore not be made less so by useless quarrels; the third a treatise on morals, especially as affecting the life of man in the state or city. Whether these works are to be ascribed to the orator Antiphon or to a sophist of the same name is uncertain. The fragments show a subtle and vigorous mind, and are written in a style such as the orator Antiphon might have used in writing treatises. At any rate, the three treatises belong clearly to the time of the sophists, whether they are the work of the orator Antiphon or not.

The general tendency of the doctrines of the sophists was skeptical, and at the same time unscientific. Their pupils, whose faith in the gods was undermined, might be expected to lose the foundation of morals, and the same result was even more likely to be reached through their teaching that persuasion, plausibility, the appearance of truth, rather than truth itself, is to be sought by the orator. The general effect of the sophistical teaching was therefore bad, though many of the sophists were personally honest and honorable men, whose example counteracted in a measure the tendencies of their teaching.

Socrates, one of the most remarkable men who ever lived, resembled the sophists in believing that the origin of the universe, the causes of natural phenomena, and the like are not the proper objects of study, and in turning his attention to the pursuit of practical efficiency; but he differed from them in seeking practical efficiency not in the ability to persuade the people or the judges, but in virtue, which he regarded as a result of knowledge. He was not a writer, but his

Socrates and
the sophists.

influence upon literature was greater than that of any man of his time, and he can not be disregarded in any history of Greek literature.

Socrates, the son of a sculptor, Sophroniscus, and a midwife, Phænarete, was born at Athens in 469 B. C. His parents were poor, but their son learned to read, to write, and to know the works of the poets, as did other young Athenians. As a youth he practised his father's art, though the group of the Graces ascribed to him, which Pausanias mentions at the entrance to the Acropolis at Athens, was probably not his work. But sculpture interested him less than philosophy. In his early manhood Heraclitus and Parmenides were old men or had recently died, Anaxagoras and Zeno were in their prime, and Protagoras, Gorgias, and Prodicus were gaining great reputations. The intellectual movement of the time took possession of Socrates, and though his poverty prevented his being a regular pupil of any sophist, he knew the substance of their teaching through conversation with them or their pupils and through reading. His life was for the most part uneventful. Like every Athenian, he was a soldier when the state needed him. At the siege of Potidæa (432-429) he endured the hardships of the Thracian winter without a murmur,

Life of Socrates. showed the highest courage, and saved the life of the wounded Alcibiades. At Delium also (424) his courage was conspicuous. He abstained from public life, believing that it would interfere with his search for truth and involve him in needless enmities. But in 406 he was serving his turn as presiding officer in the assembly when it was proposed that the generals in command at the battle of the Arginusæ be judged collectively, not, as the law directed, one at a time. Socrates refused to put the question to vote, though he knew his opposition endangered his life. Again, a few years later, the Thirty Tyrants ordered him, with four others, to arrest a certain

His courage.

Leon illegally. Socrates alone refused, though his refusal would have cost him his life if the oligarchy had not been overturned. He was married to Xanthippe, who seems to have been a woman of quick and unrestrained temper, to be sure, but not the unmitigated vixen she has been supposed to be. Of his three sons, one, Lamprocles, was a youth at the time of his father's death, the two others children. In 399 B. C., soon after the overthrow of the Thirty and the restoration of the democracy, Meletus, Anytus, and Lycon accused Socrates of introducing new divinities and of corrupting the young. After a remarkable trial, he

His death. was condemned to death, in April or May; but the day after the trial the sacred trireme sailed for Delos on its annual mission of worship, and since during its absence no execution could take place, Socrates spent a month in prison before drinking the fatal hemlock.

While agreeing with the sophists that the study of nature and of the origin of all things as pursued by the earlier philosophers was useless, Socrates did not conclude, like Protagoras, that man is the measure of all things, nor, like Gorgias, that truth or reality must remain unknown. He believed that human knowledge is limited by human needs, and that utility to man is the proper end

The proper object of science. and purpose of human knowledge. He therefore accepted geometry, astronomy, and the other sciences as legitimate objects of study

in so far as they are useful to the surveyor, the sailor, and others, and in the same way he regarded all useful arts and trades as legitimate parts, though humble parts, of science. But all these things he considered secondary. The science which in his eyes was of real importance is that which enables a man to live happily and honorably in the community, that which tends to make a man a perfect citizen, possessing political, moral, and intellectual virtue as understood by the Athenians of the fifth century. Herein he

agreed with the sophists. For him, as for them, the one great science is moral science.

But the difference between Socrates and the sophists is that for the sophists moral science consists of words; it is rhetoric or argumentative ability. Prodicus, to be sure, spoke of virtue, justice, and truth, but he did not define them nor distinguish them clearly from their opposites, having no real scientific knowledge of them, through lack of any method in studying them. Socrates developed the *dialectic* method—that is, the method of analyzing ideas by conversation, by questions and answers, and thus reaching accurate definitions. In continuous speech obscurities and even contradictions may pass unnoticed. The purpose of dialectic is to discover and do away with these. At each step the two speakers make sure that they understand each other exactly, that there is no obscurity or contradiction in their thought. By this means Socrates examines the statements of the sophists, lays bare their contradictions, and shows that they do not understand what they say. By the same method of careful analysis he supplies true and accurate ideas in place of the false or vague. Dialectic examines similar things and compares them, thus attaining to the knowledge of their general character. It defines and classifies them. By induction it advances from particular examples to the definition of general terms and creates science properly so called.

The science of Socrates is above all the science of moral things, for these are in his eyes the most important and useful to men, but he does not exclude the practical arts; on the contrary, he liked to talk with men of all professions about their professional affairs. He believed, however, that the gods reserved to themselves some secrets which they revealed to men at their pleasure; in other words, that there are some things which can not be made the objects of scientific knowledge. He himself received

The dialectic method.

inspirations from the gods, and these inspirations collectively are what is meant when reference is made to the "daemon of Socrates." The expression is misleading, for Socrates does not seem to have believed that a peculiar individual spirit spoke to him, but rather that he had intuitions sent by the deity to warn him against any mistake he might be on the point of making.

One of the most important of the moral questions examined by Socrates is the relation between the good and the beautiful. He shows that the useful, the good, and the beautiful are one; that in the world of morals virtue alone is advantageous, and that it is consequently foolish to do wrong. Virtue is therefore the result of knowledge.

From the orderly arrangement and conduct of natural phenomena, and of the world in general, Socrates argues that things must exist for a purpose, and hence reaches the conclusion that the world is governed by an intelligent Providence. He speaks sometimes of the gods, sometimes of God, and seems to have regarded the individual gods as manifestations of one divine being. He probably believed in a life after death, but without being able to prove it.

Religion, morals, and scientific method were closely united in Socrates's mind. He could not think of one without the others, and he made it the object of his life to pursue his method and discover the truth. To this end he refrained from public life, and passed his time in questioning his fellow citizens and forcing them to give strict account of their words and opinions. He believed that he had a mission from the gods to examine others and force them to examine themselves. When on trial for his life, he might have been acquitted if he had been willing to give up his pursuit of truth, his cross-examination of himself and others; but he felt that life without such examination was not worth living. After his condemnation, he spent his

time in prison conversing in his usual way with his friends, and refused to escape when the opportunity was offered.

The influence of Socrates and his philosophy can hardly be overestimated, for almost all philosophical religion and moral science owes its origin to him; and his literary influence is hardly less important. His conversations impressed his hearers most vividly. From them arose the dialogues of Plato, and from these again all the literary dialogues of later times; and it is due to Socrates that Attic prose, which under the influence of the sophists was becoming ornate, artificial, and stilted, was led back to that natural simplicity which is the height of art.

Socrates disclaimed the title of teacher, for he said the only thing he knew was that he knew nothing. He therefore did not teach, but brought to light the truth hidden in the minds of his hearers, as a midwife assists in the birth of children. His hearers he called not pupils, but friends or companions. They were, like himself, seekers after truth, and since he taught them nothing, he received no pay from them. But although he thus gave no regular instruction, his influence upon those about him was greater than that of any other teacher, and among his companions, who were really his pupils, were several who exercised the greatest influence upon subsequent Greek thought. By far the greatest of these was Plato; but several founded schools of philosophy, others show his influence in their writings, while still others were content to live with him and join in his conversations without making for themselves names in the history of literature.


Æschines of Sphettus wrote Socratic dialogues, which were said to render the manner of Socrates with great accuracy, but not even fragments remain sufficient to give us an idea of their quality. Euclides of Megara founded the Megarian school of philosophy. He had been a disciple of the Eleatic school before coming into contact with Socrates, and in his teach-

**Influence of
Socrates.**

**Pupils of
Socrates.**

ing he combined the Eleatic doctrine of Being and the One with the Socratic doctrine of the Good; of his works, which were in the form of dialogues, nothing remains. Of the later leaders of the Megarian school, Stilpo (about 380–300 B. C.), whose ethics resembled those of the Cynics, but whose chief strength was in argument, attained some distinction. Of the nine dialogues ascribed to him nothing remains. Phædo of Elis also wrote dialogues. After the death of Socrates he founded a school at Elis, which was removed to Eretria by Menedemus early in the third century. Antisthenes of Athens, a pupil of Gorgias before he attached himself to Socrates, was the founder of the Cynic school, which received its name from the gymnasium Cynosarges, where Antisthenes taught. He developed the Cynic doctrine that science based on general ideas is vain, and that practical virtue or wisdom, and with it happiness, consists in freedom from all needs and desires. His doctrine was expressed in some forty philosophical works, many of which were dialogues. He also wrote commentaries on Homer and sophistical discourses. Two of these latter, but of doubtful authenticity, are preserved—speeches of Ajax and Odysseus in support of their claims to the armor of Achilles. These are of little interest; but the ancients regarded Antisthenes as an eloquent and able writer. Aristippus of Cyrene was the founder of the Cyrenaic school which sought the highest good in pleasure. He agreed with Antisthenes in confining his researches to virtue and the best life, rejecting the pursuit of knowledge; he sought virtue, however, not in freedom from desires, but in their gratification. His doctrine was expressed in dialogues, of which little is known. Xenophon, who has been classed among historians, and Isocrates, who will be discussed among the orators, were also pupils of Socrates. But the greatest of all, the one who entered most fully into the mind of the master, and developed from his teaching the most perfect system, was Plato.





PLATO.

Bust in the Vatican Museum, Rome.

CHAPTER XXVII

PLATO—THE OLD ACADEMY

Plato, 427 (?) to 347 B. C.—Plato's life—His writings—His doctrines—Theory of ideas—Other doctrines—The dialogues; their style, characters, and composition—Myths—Plato's influence—The Academy—Speusippus, about 393–339 B. C.—Xenocrates, (?) –314 B. C.—Polemo, about 350–270 B. C.—Crates, about 340–260 (?) B. C.—Crantor, about 335 to about 275 B. C.

PLATO, son of Ariston and Perictione of the Attic deme Collytus, was born in May (Thargelion 7) of one of the early years of the Peloponnesian War, probably 427 B. C. His father claimed to be descended from Codrus, the last king of Athens, and his mother was a cousin of Critias, the prominent politician and author (see page 244). Plato had two brothers, Adimantus and Glaucon, a sister Potone, whose son Speusippus inherited Plato's property and became the head of his school after his death, and a half-brother, Antiphon. His own real name is said to have been, like that of his grandfather, Aristocles, until his gymnastic teacher called him Plato on account of the breadth of his shoulders. His early education was careful, and included music, poetry, and gymnastics as well as lessons from Cratylus, a disciple of Heraclitus. At the age of twenty he met Socrates, and for some eight years, until 399 B. C., was one of his most faithful followers. At the time of the death of Socrates, Plato was ill and could not be present. He regarded his own philosophy as derived from that of Socrates, who is therefore the chief personage in his dialogues. After the death of Socrates, Plato went

to Euclides at Megara, then traveled for ten or twelve years, going to Cyrene, Italy, and Egypt. At Cyrene he met the mathematician Theodorus, in Italy the Pythagoreans Archytas and Timæus, and in Egypt he felt the mysterious influence of a very old and very religious civilization. When he was about forty years old he was invited to the court of Dionysius I, tyrant of Syracuse. Dion, brother-in-law of Dionysius, was a man of excellent intentions, and hoped that Plato would lead the tyrant in the paths of virtue. But the experiment was not successful. Plato was driven away from Syracuse, and returned to Athens. It is even said that he was sold into slavery and had to be redeemed by a friend. Unlike Socrates, who had conversed wherever he happened to be, Plato met his friends and pupils regularly at the same place—the grove called the Academy, because it was sacred to the hero Academus. Here he taught and conversed during the last forty years of his life. Twice his teaching was interrupted by voyages to Sicily, in 367 and 361, for Dion hoped that Plato might succeed better with Dionysius II than he had done with Dionysius I, but Plato seems to have returned to Athens without accomplishing much. He died in 347 B. C., in his eighty-first year, leaving his house and property to his nephew Speusippus, who in turn bequeathed them to his pupils, thus making Plato's house the permanent home of the academic school.

The writings preserved under the name of Plato comprise forty-two dialogues, thirteen letters, and some definitions. Of all these, about thirty dialogues are actually by Plato. We have therefore ample material by which to judge of his doctrine and style. It seems, too, that none of his works has been lost since ancient times. A discussion of his philosophy would be out of place in a history of literature, but some of its chief features should be mentioned.

Plato's
writings.

As a philosopher, Plato continues the teachings of Socrates, and carries them further. He retains the dialectic method and the religious and moral doctrine of his master, but adds a complete system of metaphysics. Like Socrates, he analyzes and defines the general notions existing in the human mind, such as the good, the beautiful, courage, justice, and pleasure. But Socrates thought the general idea was merely a conception in the human mind, without any separate existence of his own; while Plato believed that ideas have an independent existence and that all that we perceive is only a copy, more or less imperfect, of the eternal ideas. For instance, we obtain by dialectic and definition a conception of courage.

The doctrine of ideas.

Corresponding to this there is in the world of ideas a real and perfect courage, of which our conception is only a copy. Similarly there is a perfect statesman, a perfect chair, perfect justice, all existing as realities in a world of ideas. And it is only the world of ideas which has real existence; for all earthly things are but copies of the eternal ideas, and have only an apparent existence. They stand in the same relation to ideas as a picture of a table to a table. This is the Platonic theory of ideas. The one idea, most perfect of all, which embraces all the rest, is the idea of Good.

Science consists in the knowledge of ideas as revealed to pure reason without the illusions of the senses. The senses give us only opinions, as variable and uncertain as the objects that produce them.

Other doctrines.

Only reason, rising up to ideas by means of dialectic, attains to real science. Dialectic leads the mind by degrees from the sensible appearance to the corresponding idea, then to a higher idea, and so on until it reaches the highest and most perfect, the idea of good. Outside of dialectic there is no science. Plato seems, however, to believe, as Socrates did, that there are some secrets of the gods not accessible to dialectic, not the objects of knowl-

edge, but only of faith or belief. He does attempt a dialectic proof of the immortality of the soul, but in describing the life after death he adopts the form of a myth, showing clearly that he lays no claim to accurate knowledge about it. This form he occasionally adopts when his subject seems to him ill adapted to dialectic treatment, and in his myths are embodied some of the most beautiful parts of his works.

Plato cares little for the natural sciences, considering moral science, the practical science of life in the community, the most important object of study. The human soul is likened to a chariot with two horses driven by a charioteer. The charioteer is the intellect, the horses passion and desire. Justice is attained when these three are in harmony, the intellect governing the other two. So in the ideal state, which Plato describes in the *Republic*, there are

The soul and the state. three classes—that of the magistrates, who govern the state; the guardians, who serve as soldiers and protect it; and the artisans, merchants, and laborers, who support it; and perfect government exists when the three classes are in harmony. The human mind is capable of knowledge of ideas only because in a previous state of existence it has seen the ideas themselves. Before entering upon earthly life it has forgotten what it has seen, but education has power to recall the ideas to its memory. This is the doctrine of recollection.

Plato's doctrines are expressed in dialogues composed with the most consummate skill and written in a style incomparable for grace, delicacy, and simplicity.

The dialogues.

These dialogues vary greatly in length, from the *Crito*, covering only a few pages, to the *Republic* and the *Laws*, with ten and twelve books respectively. They vary also in importance, some being charming and half playful discussions of minor points, interesting to us chiefly for the light they throw upon Athenian life in Plato's time, while others are serious and weighty, de-

voted to the explanation of the most important doctrines. Most of the dialogues are named from one of the characters who take part in them, as the *Cratylus*, *Gorgias*, *Protagoras*, and *Lysis*, while others, the *Politicus*, *Republic*, and *Laws*, derive their titles from their subjects. The *Symposium* or "Banquet" is named from the scene described, and the *Apology* or "Defense of Socrates" is a more or less imaginary reproduction of the speeches made by Socrates at his trial. The dates of the dialogues and the order of their composition have given rise to much discussion, but no general agreement has been reached, though the *Apology* is supposed by most scholars to have been written not long after the death of Socrates, and the *Laws* is known to be a late work, finished after Plato's death by one of his pupils.

In many of the dialogues the circumstances and the scene of the conversation are described with much detail, in others they are briefly sketched, while in some cases there is hardly any indication of the place or manner in which the speakers meet. So, too, some of the dialogues are conducted throughout with the strictest dialectic method, with all the minute care and even dryness which the method involves, while others are easy and charming. In most of them there are passages of difficult and exact reasoning side by side with specimens of easy and delightful conversation and description. Plato is not only a dialectician; he is a consummate literary artist. His works are full of reminiscences of Homer and the other poets, of beautiful imagery, which needs only metre to be lyric poetry, and of delicate humor such as is found only in the most perfect comedy.

The persons introduced are often real characters, as Protagoras, Gorgias, Polus, Hippias, and Prodicus, all of whom are so depicted that they seem to live and speak before the eyes of the reader; sometimes they are rather types of intelligent, beautiful Athenian youths, like Charmides or Lysis; or

Scenes of the dialogues.

Persons of the dialogues.

again they are the intimate friends and followers of Socrates, such as Phædo, Chærephon, Simmias and Cebes, or Crito, the old friend who wished to enable Socrates to escape from prison. All these speak from the living page of Plato and make us seem to enter into the life of ancient Athens more intimately even than do the comedies of Aristophanes. And among them all Socrates stands forth as the central figure; sometimes the real Socrates, with his sharp dialectic, his penetrating irony, and his lofty spirit, at other times an idealized Socrates, raised aloft on the wings of metaphysical speculation to the highest flights of imagery and inspired thought. It is still Socrates, but it is even more Plato.

The style of Plato is as various as the persons of his dialogues, for each person speaks in accordance with his character. In fact, his imitations of Gorgias and Lysias give us examples of the style of those two writers almost as perfect as if they had themselves composed them. Yet even in the conversational parts of the dialogues Plato does not always imitate closely the style of another, and his own style appears in all except small parts of his works. He writes simply and easily, without any of the pompous ornament of rhetoric. His language is the language of every-day life, ennobled only by his exquisite good taste. Common things he calls by their common names, and his many poetical words and expressions are used as they were used in the conversation of cultivated Athenians of his day; for every educated man knew the poets, and the slightest reference to Homer or Pindar was understood by every one. Plato uses no technical expressions to make his work seem scientific. He aims at clearness and avoids all words his readers may not understand. His phrases are sometimes short and sometimes long, but always simple. He does not even avoid slight grammatical incorrectness, such as is common in conversation. When he is raised by enthusiasm above the

conversational tone he does not become oratorical, but rather poetic and lyric. His most distinguishing quality as a writer is grace, which never leaves him either in the simplest talk or in the highest flights of poetic fancy.

The beginning of the *Phædrus* is a good example of simple conversational style and also of the easy and natural manner in which some of the dialogues are introduced. There are only two characters, Socrates and *Phædrus*:¹

Socrates. My dear *Phædrus*, whence come you, and whither are you going?

Phædrus. I have come from *Lysias*, the son of *Cephalus*, and I am going to take a walk outside the wall, for I have been sitting with him the whole morning; and our common friend *Acumenus* tells me that it is much more refreshing to walk in the open air than to be shut up in a cloister.

Soc. There he is right. *Lysias*, then, I suppose, was in the town?

Phædr. Yes, he was staying with *Epicrates*, here at the house of *Morychus*; that house which is near the temple of Olympian *Zeus*.

Soc. And how did he entertain you? Can I be wrong in thinking that *Lysias* gave you a feast of discourse?

Phædr. You shall hear, if you can spare time to accompany me.

Soc. And should I not deem the conversation of you and *Lysias* "a thing of higher import," as I may say in the words of *Pindar*, "than any business"?

Phædr. Will you go on?

Soc. And will you go on with the narration?

Phædrus then says that *Lysias* delivered a discourse on a question of love, and that he, *Phædrus*, has been studying it and will try to tell *Socrates* the substance of it. *Socrates* banteringly accuses him of having learned it by heart and being eager to repeat it:

Phædr. I see that you will not let me off until I speak in some fashion or other; verily, therefore, my best plan is to speak as I best can.

¹ Jowett's translation.

Soc. A very true remark, that of yours.

Phædr. I will do as I say; but believe me, Socrates, I did not learn the very words—Oh, no; nevertheless, I have a general notion of what he said; and will give you a summary of the points in which the lover differed from the non-lover. Let me begin at the beginning.

Soc. Yes, my sweet one; but you must first of all show what you have in your left hand under your cloak, for that roll, as I suspect, is the actual discourse. Now, much as I love you, I would not have you suppose that I am going to have your memory exercised at my expense, if you have Lysias himself here.

Socrates and Phædrus then go and sit down under a plane-tree, and before the roll is read they talk about the story that Boreas carried off the nymph Ori-
 thyia from that very spot.

The myth
of Er.

One of the most famous of Plato's myths is the story of the Armenian Er, who died and came to life again after having seen what befell the souls of the dead :¹

He said that when his soul left the body he went on a journey with a great company, and that they came to a mysterious place where there were two openings in the earth; they were near together, and over against them there were two other openings in the heaven above. In the intermediate space there were judges seated, who commanded the just, after they had given judgment on them and had bound their sentences in front of them, to ascend by the heavenly way on the right hand; and in like manner the unjust were bidden by them to descend by the lower way on the left hand; these also bore the symbols of their deeds, but fastened on their backs. He drew near, and they told him that he was to be the messenger who would carry the report of the other world to men, and they bade him hear and see all that was to be heard and seen in that place. Then he beheld and saw on one side the souls departing at either opening of heaven and earth when sentence had been given on them; and at the two other openings other souls, some ascending out of the earth dusty and worn with travel, some descending out of heaven clean and bright. And arriving ever and anon, they seemed to have come from a long journey, and they went forth

¹ *Republic*, x, p. 614 b and following; Jowett's translation.

with gladness into the meadow, where they encamped as at a festival; and those who knew one another embraced and conversed, the souls which came from earth curiously enquiring about the things above, and the souls which came from heaven, about the things beneath. And they told one another of what had happened by the way, those from below weeping and sorrowing at the remembrance of the things which they had endured and seen in their journey beneath the earth (now the journey lasted a thousand years), while those from above were describing heavenly delights and visions of inconceivable beauty. The story, Glaucon, would take too long to tell; but the sum was this: He said that for every wrong which they had done to any one they suffered tenfold—that is to say, once in every hundred years—the thousand years answering to the hundred years which are reckoned as the life of man.

The whole myth of Er is far too long to be quoted here. It gives in detail Plato's views of the life after death, with the rewards of the good and the punishments of the wicked, tells how the souls contemplate the ideas existing in their purity, not such copies of them as we see and know on earth, and how each soul, before returning to earthly life, is made to forget what it has seen, so that earthly men need the discipline of philosophy to make them recollect the truth. But even the brief extract here given may show the vivid imagination and the clear descriptive power of Plato.

It would be almost impossible to overestimate Plato's influence upon subsequent thought. The description of the ideal state, in the *Republic*, has given rise to many imitations, the most famous of which is More's *Utopia*, and the discussion of the immortality of the soul, in the *Phædo*, is the earliest known attempt to establish upon a scientific basis the doctrine of a future life. Plato's conception of man as a social or political being is Attic, but his idealism and his striving after the absolute belong to all mankind, and even prepare the way in a measure for Christianity. His intellectual faith is very different from the religion of the heart, from Christian

Plato's
influence.

charity and humility, yet some of his expressions sound almost like Christian teachings, and his works did not fail to influence the thoughts of the great teachers of Christianity. As a literary artist he reigns supreme in the realm of dialogue. He is said to have had predecessors, Alexamenus of Teos and Zeno of Elea, and he had many successors, but none of them all attained his power, variety, and grace.

After Plato's death his disciples continued to meet in the garden of the Academy, and the "Academy" became an organized school, with a chosen leader or "scholarch." Speusippus, Plato's nephew and heir, was the first, followed in order by Xenocrates, Polemo, and Crates. These together form the "Old Academy." As philosophers they followed Plato, modifying his teachings by giving up some points and by adopting some things from other schools. In general, they were not very important either as philosophers or as writers. Speusippus (about 393 to 339 B. C.) wrote dialogues which seem to have been, to judge by the fragments, pleasing and graceful in style. He substituted the ten fundamental ideas or pairs of Pythagoras (finite and infinite, odd and even, male and female, etc.) for the Platonic ideas, which are infinite in number. Xenocrates of Chalcedon became scholarch in 339, and died in 314 B. C. He wrote treatises and some poems. The fragments show the influence of Pythagoras. Polemo and Crates appear to have been preachers of morals rather than writers. Crantor, born at Soli, in Cilicia, about 335 B. C., was a pupil of Polemo, but died before his master. He wrote a number of works in prose and verse, the most celebrated of which was a treatise *On Sorrow*, a sort of consolation or encouragement to those in grief, from which later writers quote freely. But the real inheritor of Plato's greatness was an independent pupil, the founder of a new school, Aristotle.

**The Old
Academy.**

CHAPTER XXVIII

ARISTOTLE—THE PERIPATETICS

Aristotle, 384–322 B. C.—The life and times of Aristotle—His works—Preservation and publication of his works—His theories—Logic, Rhetoric, Poetics—Ethics—The *Politics*—Works on natural science—Metaphysics—Aristotle as a writer—The Peripatetic School—Theophrastus, about 372–287 B. C.—Eudemus, about 320 B. C.—Strato, (?) to about 270 B. C.—Lycon, 300–226 B. C.—Ariston, about 275 B. C.—Hieronymus of Rhodes, about 275 B. C.—Critolaus, about 240–157 (?) B. C.—Clearchus, about 300 B. C.

ARISTOTLE was born in 384 B. C. at Stagira, a Greek colony in Macedonia. His father, Nicomachus, was the physician of King Amyntas II, and a man of some wealth. In 367, after his father's death, Aristotle went to Athens, where he studied at first under Isocrates, but became a pupil of Plato after 365, when Plato returned from Sicily. For eighteen years he was a member of Plato's school, and, in spite of his intellectual independence, no one was a more ardent admirer of the master than he. After Plato's death, in 347, he went with Xenocrates to Atarneus, in Mysia, where their fellow pupil Hermias was ruler. Here Aristotle married Pythias, the niece or sister of Hermias. When Hermias was overthrown, in 344, Aristotle went to Mytilene and then to Athens. In 342 he was called to the Macedonian court to undertake the education of the young Alexander, and he remained here until the beginning of Alexander's expedition to Asia, in 335. Aristotle had great influence with his royal pupil, who became much interested in Homer and in

Life of
Aristotle.

matters of science. For ten years after teacher and pupil had left Macedonia, Alexander continued to aid in Aristotle's researches by sending him large sums of money as well as rare animals and other scientific curiosities. In 335 Aristotle went to Athens and opened his school at the "Lyceum," one of the gymnasiums of the city. His school was therefore called the "Lyceum," or, from his custom of giving instruction while walking about, the "Peripatetic" School. Here he taught rhetoric as well as philosophy with great success. His instruction was given in the form of lectures and of conversation, and his pupils were at the same time his friends, taking part in social banquets such as had been customary at the Academy when Aristotle himself was one of Plato's pupils. The death of Alexander made life at Athens dangerous for his friends, and Aristotle was accused of impiety and obliged to leave the city. He retired to Chalcis, in Eubœa, where he died of disease in the following year (322 B. C.).

Aristotle lived at the time when the separate independence of the Greek cities, with its intensity, narrowness in some respects, and fervent local patriotism, was giving way to the Macedonian empire, which carried a modified Hellenism to distant regions.

**Times of
Aristotle.**

After Aristotle Greek prose was written in the "common dialect" known to all who spoke Greek in the wide realm over which Greek culture was carried by the Macedonian conquest; but Aristotle still writes Attic Greek, though with some slight indications of what the common dialect is to be. Though still Attic in his training and his feeling, Aristotle is already beginning to be cosmopolitan. As a thinker and teacher he is the final and complete embodiment of the old classical life and thought. His works embrace what was known by the Greeks when Greece was merged in the broader life of empires, and his influence upon later generations was in part the result of the greatness of the Macedonian empire which arose during his life.

That empire was divided among the successors of Alexander, and they were overcome by Rome. The Roman greatness was followed by barbarian incursions and the confusion of the Middle Ages. But Aristotle's fame lived on, and Dante, the great poet of the end of the Middle Ages, calls him "the master of those who know."

Aristotle's works were more numerous and more various than those of any previous writer. He composed some poems, speeches, and letters which may be disregarded, and his other works may be divided into three classes: First, dialogues, in the manner of Plato, intended to interest and instruct even those who were not deeply interested in philosophy; second, learned collections of materials upon which theoretical speculations could be based; and third, philosophical and scientific treatises. Of the dialogues only fourteen titles and some few fragments remain. It is evident that they treated of philosophical subjects for the most part, though one at least, the *Gryllus*, was on rhetoric. The style of these dialogues was much admired; but we can now judge of it only by what other writers tell us, not by our own knowledge. The second class of works was very numerous. Aristotle's interest was not confined to one class of phenomena, but embraced the whole world of Nature and of human history. He studied the constitutions of one hundred and fifty-eight Greek and foreign cities, and published a treatise on each of them; he made a list of Pythian victors who had been successful in the games at Delphi; he wrote *Didascalix*—lists of theatrical performances at Athens containing the names of the dramas, the authors, choregi, prizes, etc.; he made a summary of previous works on oratory so excellent that, according to Cicero, nobody any longer read the originals; and many other works containing information on all sorts of subjects were attributed to him.

The vast number of these works makes it evident that they can not all have been written entirely by Aristotle,

but were probably written at his suggestion by his pupils, with more or less help from him. Just how much of the work was his own can not be determined, and the proportion was probably not the same in the different treatises. Of all these works but one, the *Constitution of Athens*, is preserved. A papyrus manuscript of this was found in Egypt, and first published in 1891. It consists of two parts: First, the history of constitutional changes at Athens; and second, a description of the constitution as it existed at the time (328 to 325 B. C.). The first part is almost entirely preserved, but the second is much mutilated. All the other extant works of Aristotle, nearly fifty in number, belong to the class of philosophical treatises.

According to a story told on good authority, Aristotle left at his death a great number of unpublished manuscripts to his pupil Theophrastus, who died in 287, leaving them to Neleus of Skepsis. At Skepsis they were hidden in a vault and neglected until, in the second century B. C., they were bought by Apellicon of Teos and taken to Athens. In 78 B. C. Sulla took Athens and sent the manuscripts to Rome, where they were published by the grammarian Tyrranion and the philosopher Andronicus of Rhodes. These are the works preserved to us, the *Constitution of Athens* alone being of a different class. Some of these are apparently little more than the unfinished notes for Aristotle's lectures, while others seem to have been intended for publication in something like their present form. Probably all of these works were supplemented and emended by the first publishers, and later editors no doubt made further changes. Nevertheless, one master mind is present through them all. These works seem to have been intended not for the general public, but for Aristotle's inner circle of pupils. Such works the ancients called *esoteric* or *acroamatic*; the works intended for more general reading

were called *exoteric*, and consisted of the lost dialogues and collections of historical and scientific facts and the like. The extant works enable us to judge of Aristotle's vast knowledge and of his philosophy far better than of his style.

Aristotle, like Plato, believes that science has to do with general ideas, but he does not agree with Plato in giving to **Some of Aristotle's theories.** ideas an independent existence. He thinks ideas exist only in and through phenomena. Nor does he subordinate all other ideas to the idea of Good, as Plato does. He regards the art of dialectic, which Plato considers the only scientific method, as insufficient because it teaches only what is probable, not what is necessarily true. Real knowledge can be based only on facts, and therefore Aristotle was indefatigable in collecting facts of all sorts. On the basis of these facts he founded his theories, and from his observations he tried to discover the nature of everything that exists. He had a theory for each branch of science, defining what was the subject-matter and what the principles of each; and his works treat, or were to treat, of nearly everything of which mankind had any knowledge in his day.

The method of knowledge is taught in a group of writings called the *Organon*, or "instrument" of reasoning, which have to do with logic, and comprise the **Logic,** *Categories, On Expression, the Analytics,* and **Rhetoric,** *the Topics,* in connection with which **the Poetics.** *Rhetoric* is treated scientifically as a proper means of instruction and persuasion. Aristotle, proceeding from the dialectic of Socrates and Plato, advanced to logic—from the practise of reasoning to a scientific theory of its processes. He does not call it "logic," but "analytic." He invented the syllogism, and worked out the analysis of the deductive process of reasoning, the process which leads from a general to a particular statement: for instance, All men are mortal; I am a man; therefore I am mortal. The inductive process, leading from the particular to the general, he

did not establish so perfectly. Aristotle's logic was the most original part of his philosophical system, and has remained until our own times the universally acknowledged theory of correct reasoning. The *Poetics* contains a theory of epic and tragic poetry as varieties of imitation, with much information about the beginnings of tragedy. The works on comedy and other kinds of poetry were apparently never written, though Aristotle intended to write them.

The *Nicomachian Ethics* is the title of Aristotle's work on ethics, perhaps because it was edited by his son Nicomachus. The *Eudemean Ethics* is not the work

Aristotle's
ethics.

of Aristotle, but of his pupil Eudemus; but Books V, VI, and VII of the *Nicomachian*

Ethics are probably borrowed from the *Eudemean Ethics*, being inserted by an editor to fill the gap between Book IV and Book VIII, a gap which may be caused by the loss of part of the original manuscript; though it is quite as likely that Aristotle wrote Books I to IV and then Books VIII to X, expecting to write the intervening books at some later time, but never carried out his intention. The *Great Ethics*, by some later member of the school, covers much the same ground. The end of all action, Aristotle teaches, is happiness; and man's happiness consists in the good of the soul—that is, in virtue or moral and intellectual perfection. Moral virtue is not inborn; nor is it, as Plato thought, a direct result of knowledge. It is a habit of the soul, acquired by the exercise of free will in repeating the same kind of action. Each particular virtue is a mean between two extremes, as courage is between cowardice on the one hand and rashness on the other. The most perfect happiness Aristotle finds in the proper activity of the reason, the divine part of the soul.

The Greeks found it difficult to conceive of man otherwise than as a member of a community or state, and Aristotle is the first who treated of ethics apart from politics. Yet he too regarded ethics as only a branch of politics.

“Man,” he said, “is a social creature,” and he discusses his relation to the state and the different kinds of governments in the *Politics*. He describes Monarchy, Aristocracy and a Constitutional Government, and the three corruptions of these, Tyranny, Oligarchy, and Democracy. His remarks on these and on revolutions are of great interest, showing much historical knowledge and political insight. His ideal state is a community of some twenty thousand citizens, each of whom is to be educated by the state, and to be a landowner of moderate wealth, so that he shall be free from all cares except those of state. Each citizen is to have a share in the government, and no citizen is to be an artisan or tradesman. Slavery he regards as necessary in order that the citizens may be at leisure; but the proper foundation of slavery he finds in a natural superiority of the master to the slave. Plato, in his ideal republic, did away with the family and with private property, making everything belong to the state, but Aristotle regards the family as the basis of society. His ideal state is not, like Plato’s, a sort of military convent, but rather a combination of the good points of various forms of government known to the Greeks. In his *Politics* as in his *Ethics* Aristotle finds that excellence is a mean between two extremes.

In his books on natural science Aristotle treats of the world and its parts, the heavenly bodies, and various astronomical phenomena, and also of life and living things. Every living thing has a soul, since it has a principle of life and growth, and the soul, which he speaks of as the “form” of that “matter” which we call the body, can not exist independently of the body; but since man alone has a reasoning soul, there is evidently something in his soul not to be found in the souls of plants or animals, and this something, the Reason, is divine. When the body (and with it the soul as its principle of life) dies, the reason departs and returns to God.

Works on
natural
science.

Other books treat of animals, their habits and peculiarities, and are the first of the long series of works on natural history. About five hundred species are mentioned by Aristotle. The *Metaphysics*, so called merely because the editor placed it after (*meta*) the *Physics*, is concerned with what Aristotle called the "First Philosophy," the discussion of the origin and nature of knowledge and existence. This work appears to be put together from notes left behind by Aristotle at his death.

As a thinker Aristotle has had an immense and abiding influence, and many of the expressions still used in philosophy and in some other branches of science are derived from him. Of his qualities as a writer we can hardly judge, as his dialogues, in which his literary qualities seem to have been shown to the best advantage, have been lost. His *Hymn to Virtue*, addressed to Hermias, is a poem of some merit, but hardly a great work. In the *Constitution of Athens* the style is clear and simple, but not remarkable for beauty. In the other works the style varies, and probably many of its peculiarities are due to the ancient editors. There are many technical expressions, and the language is often hard to understand. Still, the expressions are those of a man who loves conciseness and accuracy, who aims at precision rather than at beauty. Only rarely does there seem to be any conscious care for style or literary effect, but in some passages, which were probably more completely prepared for publication than the rest, there is a certain austere eloquence. But Aristotle's greatness and his influence upon the world rest not upon his stylistic qualities, but upon the

The Peripatetic School.

vast extent of his knowledge and the originality and depth of his thought.

The school of Aristotle—the Peripatetic School—followed in the steps of the master, eagerly investigating natural phenomena, historical subjects, and all other matters open to human knowledge. The first schol-

arch was Theophrastus, from Eresus in Lesbos. He was born about 372 and died in 287 B. C., leaving his property to the school, which thus obtained, like the Academy, a permanent home. He was a prolific writer on

**Theo-
phrastus.**

philosophy, natural history, and rhetoric. Of over two hundred works there now remain,

besides fragments, two complete treatises, *Researches on Plants*, in nine books, and *Causes of Plants*, in six books, and a brief treatise called the *Characters*, which seems in its present form to be an abbreviated edition of a larger work. The *Researches on Plants* is for the most part a description of a great number of species, chiefly the result of personal observation. The *Causes of Plants* is an attempt to account for the differences between species. Both works give, in simple style, a great deal of interesting information. The *Characters* describes thirty-one different kinds of men, as the talkative man, the flatterer, etc., whose characters seem to be drawn rather from the comedies of Menander than from life. Theophrastus exercised great influence during his life, and was by far the most important of the fol-

**Other Peri-
patetics.**

lowers of Aristotle. Other early Peripatetics were Eudemus of Rhodes, chiefly occupied with the history of doctrines, and Strato of Lampsacus,

the second scholarch of the school (from 287-269 B. C.), who was a physicist. Strato's successor was Lycon, scholarch from 269-225 B. C., who was in turn succeeded by Ariston of Ceos, who seems to have written a history of the school. Critolaus of Phaselis succeeded Ariston. Hieronymus of Rhodes, a contemporary of Lycon, seems to have been a voluminous and superficial writer. Clearchus of Soli is said to have been a pupil of Aristotle, but is probably of a somewhat later time. He was the author of biographies of philosophers. Several writers who did not devote themselves to philosophy were trained in the Peripatetic School, and we shall meet with them in their proper places.

CHAPTER XXIX

ATTIC ORATORS

Antiphon, about 480-411 B. C.—Antiphon's works of different classes—Andocides, about 445 to after 391 B. C.—Lysias, born between 450 and 440, died about 380 B. C.—Orations, style, and composition of Lysias—Isæus, about 410-350 (?) B. C.

THE earliest Attic orator any part of whose works has been preserved is Antiphon, the son of Sophilus, of the deme of Rhamnus. He was born about 480 B. C., and was therefore a little younger than Gorgias (see page 294). Of his life little is known except its ending. He was one of the leading spirits of the conspiracy of the Four Hundred, though he kept himself as far as he could in the background, and when the democracy was restored in 411 B. C. he was accused of treason and put to death. He was, says Thucydides (viii, 68), "a man inferior in merit to none of his contemporaries, and abler than any to invent plans and to say what he thought. He did not come forward in the assembly, nor, if he could avoid it, in any other public arena. To the multitude, who were suspicious of his great abilities, he was an object of dislike; but there was no man who could do more for any who consulted him, whether their business lay in the courts of justice or in the assembly. And when the Four Hundred were overthrown and exposed to the vengeance of the people, and he, being accused of taking part in the plot, had to speak in their behalf, his defense

Life of
Antiphon.

was undoubtedly the best ever made by any man tried on a capital charge down to my time."

Numerous works passed in antiquity under the name of Antiphon, works intended for oratorical instruction, speeches, and three treatises, *On Concord*, *On Truth*, and *Politicus* (see page 296). The most important works of the first class were the collection of *Introductions and Perorations* and the *Tetralogies*. The former is lost, but its contents are evident from the title. A speech in court consists of an introduction, a narrative, a discussion or argument based upon the narrative, and a peroration. The narrative and the discussion are as various as the cases to be argued, but the introductions and perorations may conform more to rules. From the time of Antiphon the introduction regularly contained remarks about the inexperience and lack of ability of the speaker, and the peroration also consisted more or less of stock phrases. So much is this the case that the introductions of several extant orations by different authors are almost identical. The collection of *Introductions and Perorations* was, then, intended to teach Antiphon's pupils how to begin and end their speeches acceptably, and its precepts were followed by many of the forensic orators of Athens.

The *Tetralogies*, three of which are preserved, are groups of four speeches arranged in this order: accusation, defense, reply of the accuser, reply of the defendant. These are evidently not real speeches, but are intended as examples for instruction. Like the real speeches of Antiphon preserved to us, they all have to do with cases of homicide. The reason for this is undoubtedly that Antiphon's works were arranged by the editors according to subjects, and the chapter or book containing speeches on homicide happens to be preserved, perhaps because it was the most famous. In the same way the extant speeches of Isæus all relate to wills and inherit-

Antiphon's
works.

The Tetralo-
gies.

ance. In the *Tetralogies* Antiphon gives examples of arguments applied to special imaginary cases, with appeals to the prejudices and feelings of the jury. He shows great good sense and judgment. His language is that of daily life, but is so managed as to be exact, clear, and vigorous. Synonyms are carefully distinguished, and antitheses are common, especially the opposition of appearance and reality. Three real speeches by Antiphon are preserved to us, the most important and interesting of which is *On the Murder of Herodes*. A citizen of Mytilene was traveling with Herodes, who disappeared at Methymna. The Mytilenean is accused of having murdered his companion, and the speech is his defense. Here the style is less concise than in the *Tetralogies*, there is much narrative, and much time is taken up with testimony; but with these differences, the speech resembles the *Tetralogies*, embodying in a real plea before the court the same principles of argument and arrangement exhibited in the fictitious speeches invented as examples. Antiphon's style is powerful and concise, but lacks grace. He attains vigor in argument and directness in narrative, but leaves the impression of some stiffness, almost of harshness. His influence upon Thucydides was great, and it is from him that the great historian derives much of the vigor and terseness of his style as well as his love of antitheses and balanced phrases.

Andocides, the next in order of the Attic orators, was neither a teacher of oratory nor a professional speech writer, but pleaded only those cases in which he was personally interested. He was born at Athens of a distinguished family, and as a young man spent his time, with other young aristocrats, in pleasure, political intrigue, and intercourse with the sophists. About 420 he was suspected of having profaned the mysteries, and after the mutilation of the Hermaë, in 415, he was arrested and imprisoned. He escaped death

Life of
Andocides.

by informing against others, but found it advisable to go into voluntary exile. He traveled about on various business, and succeeded in making a good deal of money. Twice, in 411 and 408, he tried, without success, to be restored to his native city. It was in 408 that he delivered the speech *On His Return*. In 403, when a general amnesty was decreed, he returned to Athens, and took an active part in politics as a partizan of the democracy, to which he had before been opposed. But in 399 he was accused of impiety, and his speech *On the Mysteries* is his reply to his accusers. He was acquitted, and in 391 was one of the envoys charged with the negotiation of a treaty with Sparta. The speech *On the Peace* is concerned with this matter. The negotiation was unsuccessful, and, according to one account, Andocides was banished once more. After this no more is known of him.

His adventurous and troubled life gave Andocides little leisure for writing. Four speeches have come down to us under his name, one of which, *Against Alcibiades*, is spurious. The ancients knew only two other speeches by him. Of the three extant genuine speeches, the earliest, *On His Return*, imitates the style of Antiphon, and the latest, *On the Peace*, is neither vigorous in thought nor clear in composition. The speech *On the Mysteries* is interesting on account of the information it gives about the mysterious mutilation of the Hermæ, though it is doubtful if this information is entirely trustworthy. The narrative parts of the speech are lively and picturesque, the arguments are skillful, and the style easy and natural, though somewhat careless. Andocides has here given up all imitation of Antiphon, and advanced far along the road to the simplicity and grace which characterize the speeches of Lysias; but Andocides is not, like Lysias, a great literary artist. His life shows that he lacked stability and strength of character, and his speeches show that he was without the mental vigor that belongs to

Speeches of
Andocides.

all great orators, and the conscientious love of careful work which alone can produce perfect oratory.

Lysias was, unlike Andocides, a professional writer of speeches, or logographer. He was born, probably, at Athens, between 450 and 440 B. C., though not of Athenian parentage. His father, Cephalus, was a rich Syracusan manufacturer of armor, who transferred his factory, at the suggestion of Pericles, from Syracuse to Athens, about 450 B. C., and settled in a house in the Piræus. Cephalus, though a mere metic, or resident alien, not an Athenian citizen, was the friend and companion of the chief men of the state, beloved and respected by all. In Plato's *Republic*, the scene of which is laid at his house, he appears as a cultivated, wise, and amiable old man. Lysias and his two brothers, Polemarchus and Euthydemus, grew up, therefore, among most favorable surroundings. About 425, when he was some fifteen years old, Lysias went with his brothers to Thurii, in Magna Græcia. Here he is said to have studied rhetoric under Tisias of Syracuse, while Polemarchus devoted himself to philosophy. After the disastrous failure of the Athenian expedition against Sicily, in 413, life in Sicily and Magna Græcia was no longer agreeable for friends of Athens. Lysias and his brothers returned to Athens and carried on the business established by their father, at the same time pursuing their favorite studies. At this time Lysias began to teach rhetoric and to write speeches.

In 404 B. C. the Thirty arrested Lysias and Polemarchus and confiscated their large property. Lysias managed to escape, but Polemarchus was put to death. Lysias returned to the city in 403 with Thrasybulus, who caused him to be made a citizen of Athens in recognition of his generous contributions to the popular party in the struggle against the Thirty. Lysias immediately made use of the citizenship to bring suit against Eratosthenes, one of the Thirty, for the murder of Pole-

marchus. The speech *Against Eratosthenes*, the only speech ever delivered in public by Lysias himself, is exceptionally fine, though whether it led to the condemnation of Eratosthenes or not is uncertain. Soon after the delivery of this speech, Lysias was again reduced to the position of a metic, because of some illegality in the decree conferring the citizenship upon him.

He remained at Athens, however, and devoted himself to writing speeches. As a metic he could not speak in person before the assembly or the courts, but he made it his profession to compose speeches for others. Since the politicians of Athens were themselves orators of more or less ability, they naturally composed their own speeches; the speeches of Lysias are therefore, for the most part, written for delivery before the courts of law. According to the Athenian law, the parties to a suit must plead their cases in person (though an advocate might be called in to help), which gave a good speaker a great advantage. To offset this, those who had not great confidence in their own oratory went to a logographer and had their speeches written for them. The logographer must, in order to be successful, keep his own personality as much as possible out of sight, and compose a speech appropriate to the character and position of his client. In this Lysias was eminently successful, showing great ability in adapting his words to different characters and occasions. At the time of his death, which took place about 380 B. C., he was the greatest logographer of Athens.

More than four hundred speeches, about half of which were regarded by good judges as genuine, were current in ancient times under the name of Lysias. Of all these we now have a little more than thirty orations, more than half of which are defective.

These are all speeches for delivery in court except two fragments—one of a political speech composed in 403 as a protest against the limitation of the democracy, the other of

Lysias as a
writer of
speeches.

Speeches of
Lysias.

a public address delivered in 388 B. C. at Olympia, in which the Greeks are exhorted to combine against the tyrants, and to begin by overthrowing Dionysius of Syracuse. These two fragments are short, and add little to our knowledge of Lysias, except that the Olympic address shows that in composing an oration of that sort Lysias could not escape the influence of Isocrates.

The most famous oration of Lysias is that which he delivered himself against Eratosthenes. In the introduction

Against Eratosthenes. Lysias speaks of the magnitude of his wrongs, the close connection between the public interest and his own, his inexperience in law courts, and his confidence in the judges. These are the common-places of introductions, which each orator varied according to his ability. The narrative part of the speech follows. This is a marvel of clearness, brevity, and subtle persuasiveness. The orator makes his hearers see just how things were done, and makes it impossible to believe that they could have happened in any way other than that which he describes. Everything is simple, vivid, and natural, with here and there a touch of irony, and at the end a rapid summary of outrages, well calculated to intensify in the minds of the judges the feelings of pity for the accuser and hatred of the Thirty, already aroused by the previous narrative. The discussion or argument is simple and brief, but vigorous, quick, and sharp, even though taken up in great part with a criticism of the character of Theramenes, to whose moderate wing of the oligarchical party Eratosthenes claimed to belong. The peroration opposes the injustice of the Thirty to the justice of the democracy, attacks the defenders of Eratosthenes, appeals to all political parties, now united in love of justice and liberty, and ends with the eloquent and impressive words :

But I do not wish to tell what would have happened, since I can not tell the things that these men did ; for that were the task not of one accuser, but of many. Nevertheless, there has been no lack

of zeal on my part in behalf of the sacred shrines, some of which these men sold, and others they entered and defiled; in behalf of the city, which they made small; in behalf of the shipyards, which they destroyed; and in behalf of the slain, for whom, since you could not protect them when living, I call upon you to fight after their death. And I fancy that they are listening to us and will know you as you cast your votes, thinking that all of you who vote to acquit these men are condemning them to death, and that those who exact the penalty from these men have done vengeance for them. I will cease my accusation. You have heard, you have seen, you have suffered, the case is in your hands. Judge.

In this oration Lysias shows his ability in clear and smooth narrative, telling argument, and graceful simplicity of expression. He even rises to something like impassioned eloquence, though for the real fire of impassioned words we must wait until the coming of Demosthenes. In the time of Lysias passion was not considered good taste, and if we feel a lack of emotion in the speech against Eratosthenes, it is in part, at least, because the time was not yet come for the display of strong personal feeling in oratory. But in this speech we have before us Lysias speaking in his own person, and we get an idea of his refined taste, good feeling, and self-restraint. In his other speeches we see how he was able to portray the character of others.

This ability to adapt his speeches to his clients was one of the chief reasons for his success as a logographer. It appears nowhere to greater advantage than in the speech *For the Invalid*, delivered by a poor man who received an obol a day from the city for his support on the ground that he could not support himself. Some one had proposed that this small pension be withdrawn, alleging that the man had a trade by which he could support himself; that he was not physically incapable of work, since he could mount a horse; and that he was a violent and disagreeable fellow at best. The invalid engaged Lysias to write a speech for him, and this Lysias

Style and
composition
of Lysias's
speeches.

The speech
For the
Invalid.

did in delightful fashion, with delicate humor, such as even the poor man must have felt was fitting when the case involved so small a sum :

My accuser says it is not right for me to receive money from the state; for I am able-bodied, and have a trade such that I can live without this gratuity. And he adduces as proofs for my able-bodiedness that I ride horseback, and for my prosperity in my trade that I am able to associate with men who have money to spend. Now my prosperity from my trade and the manner of my life in general I think you all know, but, nevertheless, I will tell you briefly. My father left me nothing as an inheritance, and it is less than three years since my mother died and I have not had to support her, and I have not yet any children to care for me. And the trade I have is one which can earn little, which I carry on with difficulty myself, and I have not yet found any one to buy me out.

This passage, taken from near the beginning of the speech, gives some idea of its general tone. In other speeches Lysias assumes the character of other more important persons engaged in greater legal struggles, and everywhere he makes his words suit the speaker and the occasion. His style is always simple and straightforward, his language that of every-day life, the parts of the speeches well-balanced, and each part carefully composed; but all is done with the art that conceals art, producing the effect of perfect ease, and the style is slightly modified to adapt itself to each special case. It is not to be wondered at that Lysias was the model for all other logographers to imitate.

Isæus was also a logographer by profession. He was born at Athens, according to some authors; at Chalcis, according to others. He certainly spent nearly all his life at Athens, where he refrained from public life and devoted himself to writing speeches. He was a younger contemporary of Lysias. The earliest of his extant speeches which can be dated belongs to the year 389, the latest to 353 B. C. There is no good reason to

doubt the truth of the statement that he was the teacher of Demosthenes, though the story that some of the orations ascribed to Demosthenes are really the work of Isæus is false.

The ancients had some fifty speeches by Isæus, not counting those falsely ascribed to him, and several rhetorical works. Of the latter nothing is left, and of the speeches we have only twelve, all of which relate to wills and inheritances. These were evidently one part of an edition of his speeches arranged by subjects. These speeches offer less variety than those of Lysias, and are for that reason far less interesting. They discuss many minute points of Attic testamentary law, and are important for the student of legal matters. Their lack of variety is due not simply to their similarity in subject, but in part also to the fact that Isæus is less interested than Lysias in descriptive narrative and more devoted to argument and dialectics. His style resembles that of Lysias in clearness, precision, brevity of statement, purity of language, and elegance of expression, so that even the ancients found it hard to distinguish between the works of the two authors; but Isæus lacks something of the graceful ease of Lysias, and has, on the other hand, a vigor and fiery earnestness which Lysias has not. In his arguments Lysias leaves details to the understanding or imagination of the hearers, while Isæus explains everything carefully. In the extant speeches this is often necessary, but ancient critics seem to have found the same peculiarity in speeches not concerned with will cases.

Among the extant speeches one of the most interesting is that *On the Heritage of Ciron*. The speaker is the son of the deceased Ciron's daughter. Ciron had died, leaving no son, and his daughter, the mother of the speaker, had died since. Ciron's estate was claimed by his nephew, the son of his brother, on the ground that since inheritance goes in the male line,

Speeches of
Isæus.

The Heritage
of Ciron.

the son of a brother has more right than the son of a daughter. He seems to have asserted besides that the speaker was not Ciron's grandson at all. So the speech has to establish the fact of the relationship, and also to argue for the rights of the daughter's son against the nephew. On both these points Isæus shows his mastery of clear and vigorous statement, clever argument, and precise thought. That he should have been chosen as teacher by the young Demosthenes is not to be wondered at.

But before we reach Demosthenes, the greatest of political orators, we must turn to the great master of epideictic oratory, the oratory of public addresses on great occasions, which seeks not to win a lawsuit nor to gain votes for a definite policy, but to inculcate general policies, teach general ideas, ennoble and educate the hearers, or under other circumstances praise the dead or even the living. The master of this kind of oratory is Isocrates.

CHAPTER XXX

ISOCRATES

Isocrates, 436-338 B. C.—Life of Isocrates—His forensic speeches and letters—His political views—His philosophy—His style—His works—Alcidamas, about 425 B. C.

ISOCRATES was born in 436 B. C., in the Attic deme of Erchia, where Xenophon was born some five or six years later. His father, Theodorus, was a wealthy flute manufacturer, and Isocrates received a good education. Most of the prominent sophists of the period are mentioned as his teachers, and there is no reason to doubt that he received lessons from several of them. He owed much to the teachings of Socrates, though he did not devote himself to speculative philosophy. The Peloponnesian War destroyed his father's wealth, and Isocrates had to support himself. He went to Thessaly and studied under Gorgias; then he returned to Athens and took up the profession of a logographer. For ten or twelve years, from about 402 to 390, he composed speeches for others to deliver in court, by which he gained his livelihood and a great reputation. But the small matters of private rights and wrongs which the logographer had to treat seemed to him mean and petty. Besides, the logographer had to hide his own personality behind that of his client, and did not himself receive the praises of the people. Isocrates preferred general ideas, great subjects, praise, and glory. He might have turned to active political life and to speaking in the popular assembly; but his voice

was weak, and his personal timidity so great that he felt himself debarred from public life. He turned therefore to epideictic eloquence and the teaching of rhetoric. For fifty years, beginning about 390 B. C., he was the most distinguished teacher of rhetoric and the greatest epideictic orator of Athens. If he really taught at Chios, it was probably only for a short time before he opened his school at Athens. His orations were composed to be read, not to be actually spoken, and served a twofold purpose, being at once models of style and composition for the use of his pupils and pamphlets which circulated among the public, spreading abroad the opinions and the reputation of their author.

The pupils of Isocrates were many and famous. Among them were orators such as Isæus, Hyperides, and Lysurgus; historians, like Ephorus and Theopompus; and statesmen, like Timotheus, the son of Conon.

The school of
Isocrates.

The regular course in the school lasted three or four years, and the charge for tuition was a thousand drachmas (about \$200, or £40), which sufficed to make Isocrates a rich man. He gave instruction in what he called "philosophy"; not the physical speculations of the early philosophers, nor the ethical speculations of Socrates and Plato, but a more concrete and practical object of study—the art of rhetoric as applied to great political subjects. This he regarded as the proper preparation for a successful and useful public life. In his later years he was one of the most noted men of Greece. He was on terms of greater or less intimacy with the two Cypriote kings Evagoras and Nicocles of Salamis, with Archidamus of Sparta, Jason of Pheræ, and Philip of Macedon. He lived to the extraordinary age of ninety-eight years, and his ability to work continued to the end. He is said to have committed suicide after the battle of Chæronea, in 338 B. C., through despair at the ruin of his hopes for Greece. The reason given is undoubtedly wrong, for Isocrates regarded

Philip as the natural leader of a great Greek expedition against Persia. Isocrates married late, and adopted Apha-reus, his wife's son by a previous marriage. This Apha-reus was an orator and tragic poet of some reputation.

The works of Isocrates preserved to us are six speeches in legal cases, fifteen didactic and epideictic orations, and nine letters. Of the letters, one at least (the Forensic speeches and ninth) is a forgery, and some of the orations letters. are mutilated. We have, however, by far the greater part of what the ancient critics regarded as his genuine work. The letters show much the same qualities as the orations, except that they are shorter and less elaborate. The legal or forensic speeches, belonging as they do to the author's early years, show at times the influence of Gorgias, at times some of the qualities of Lysias. Their language is, like that of the speeches of Lysias, pure Attic and well chosen, and they remind one of Lysias in their general air of candor and honesty, but they betray a peculiar liking for generalities and care in the arrangement of ideas. These speeches are excellent, though not equal to those of Lysias; but the importance of Isocrates is due not to these but to the essays in oratorical form, the epideictic speeches. Some of these, the *Busiris* and the *Encomium on Helen*, are written merely for display, to show the beauties of style, and at the same time to show that speeches on mythological subjects could have some practical value; one, the *Evagoras*, is a typical encomium, in praise of a deceased monarch; two, *Against the Sophists* and *On the Antidosis*, are in defense of the author and his "philosophy"; but the greater number, and the most important orations, have to do with politics, either the internal politics of Greece or the relations of Greece and Persia.

Isocrates saw that the independent life of the Greek cities was degenerating. The people would no longer serve in the army, but the states supported armies of hired soldiers, who were irregularly paid, and sometimes deserted a

poor paymaster for a better, sometimes turned to plunder and rapine. The rich were growing richer, and the one effort of the poor was to gain some of the wealth of the rich, or at least contrive in some way to live without labor. Population, though not increasing, was excessive, now that commerce was less flourishing than in earlier times. All these evils Isocrates thought could be removed, or at any rate diminished, if the Greeks would give up their petty wars among themselves and unite in an invasion of Persia. For years he hoped that Athens would take the lead in this great movement, but his hopes were not fulfilled. At various times he hoped great things from Dionysius I of Syracuse, Jason of Pheræ, Archidamus of Sparta, and Philip of Macedon. He had not the fiery, intense patriotism of Demosthenes, who could say that a struggle for freedom, even though ending in disaster, was better than submission to Philip; but he believed that prosperity, happiness, and greatness could be gained for Greece only by united action under one leader, and was willing to let Philip be the Agamemnon to lead the united forces of Hellas against the barbarian East. The honesty of his purpose was never questioned, and it was never suggested that he had been bribed by Philip, no matter how widely his political advice differed from the course advocated by Demosthenes. Isocrates was not a practical politician, but his theories were not mere dreams, and he foresaw more clearly than his contemporaries that the Greek cities must give up their independence and submit to the rule, or at least to the leadership, of one man.

The so-called "philosophy" of Isocrates consisted of what he regarded as practical knowledge. Grammar, mathematics, natural phenomena, music, history, and the like are necessary preparations for further study, but are not in themselves proper subjects of long-continued investigation. The truly

**Political
views.**

**The phi-
losophy of
Isocrates.**

cultured man needs them, but only as the healthy man needs gymnastics, as preliminary exercise to fit him for the work of life. This work Isocrates finds in political and practical activity. He agrees with Plato, so far as the sciences just mentioned are concerned, but does not, like Plato, believe that the philosopher's highest activity is the search for truth, but rather that he should benefit the world by directing public policy in accordance with wise general principles. The ethics adopted by Isocrates are those of tradition and common practise. His religion, too, is that of the people about him, and though he speaks with reverence of the gods, it is evident that his belief is not vital. From all this it is clear that he was not a philosopher in the sense in which we use the word, and if he called himself a philosopher, it is because the meaning of the word was not yet fixed. We should call him rather an essayist and teacher of prose style.

The style of Gorgias and Antiphon was dignified and austere, seeking effect by the choice of poetic or archaic words, and by opposing one word to another, by verbal antithesis; the style of Lysias was plain and simple, with all its liveliness and natural grace; but that of Isocrates is artistic and elaborate. His periods are often long, and always carefully composed, consisting of one main idea about which several lesser thoughts are grouped. But with all their length, these periods are never obscure, and the words and phrases are so arranged as to strike upon the ear with a pleasing and dignified rhythm. He uses the words of every-day life, and uses them in their ordinary sense, but he arranges them in clauses carefully devised to be of the same length, or to have words of similar sound in the corresponding places, or he balances his clauses by antithesis. The effect of all this is to give his prose grandeur and musical sweetness, but at the same time to make it a little monotonous. The effect of artificiality is increased by the careful avoid-

The style of
Isocrates.

ance of hiatus—that is, by the arrangement of words so that no word ending with a vowel shall be followed by a word beginning with a vowel. This gives a smoothness to the prose of Isocrates, which is found in that of none of his predecessors.

The style of Isocrates can not be adequately illustrated by selections, nor rendered in translation. Its chief features have just been mentioned. There is a difference in style between the *Panegyricus*, of 380, and the *Panathenai-cus*, of 339 B. C., but the difference is in details and in the degree to which one peculiarity or another is carried, not in general qualities. The general qualities mentioned belong to all the orations (or essays in oratorical style) from first to last. The influence of Isocrates upon the standard of Greek prose writing was great and lasting. Through the schools of rhetoric his style was passed on to the Romans, and was adopted by Cicero as the foundation of his own. Cicero has in turn served as a model to later generations, and thus Isocrates has influenced literature even to our own time.

The first of the great works of Isocrates is the *Panegyricus* (380 B. C.), one of his most beautiful orations, in which he glorifies Athens and urges that she be the leader in a war of all Greece against Persia. The *Plataicus*, probably written soon after the capture of Plataea by the Thebans in 373 B. C., describes to the Athenians the misfortunes of the vanquished and shows the injustice of the victors. The oration *On the Peace* (357 or 355) opposes the war party at Athens, and urges just and conciliatory behavior toward the allies. The *Areopagiticus* (about 355) recommends a return to the old constitution of Athens, which made the Areopagus the guiding power in the state. In the speech *On the Antidosis*, or *Exchange of Properties* (354), Isocrates gives a general account of his life and a defense of his “philosophy,” or system of education founded upon literary rhetoric. A

Works of
Isocrates.

certain Lysimachus brought suit against Isocrates to force him to exchange properties with him or to undertake a *choregia*. This was a regular legal method for compelling rich men to do their duty. The speech of Isocrates was not delivered in court, but published after the trial, in which Isocrates seems to have been defeated. In the *Philippus* (346) Isocrates urges Philip to lead the Greeks against Persia. The last great oration, the *Panathenaicus*, returns to the praise of Athens, and at the same time defends the methods and educational theories of the author. The other orations are of less importance.

A rival of Isocrates, of some importance in his day, was Alcidamas, from Elea, in Æolis, a pupil of Gorgias. His only extant speech, *On the Sophists*, finds fault with Isocrates for training writers rather than speakers. In another speech, on the affairs of Messenia, he said: "God set all men free; nature has made no one a slave."

CHAPTER XXXI

DEMOSTHENES

Demosthenes, 384-322 B. C.—His birth and early life—Early speeches—Political law suits—Political career—The oration *On the Crown*—His last years—His death—Private speeches—Style and composition—Wisdom of his political course.

It was not until toward the middle of the fourth century that political oratory became a part of literature. Before that time there had been great and influential public speakers, but their speeches had not been written before delivery, still less published afterward. Even in the days of Demosthenes there were still orators, such as Phocion and Demades, whose speeches were not written; but, as a rule, the orators of this time were writers as well as speakers. This was in part due to the fact that writing was now an easy and natural aid in composition, but probably more to the desire of the orators, now that the rise of Philip gave a new greatness to politics, to publish their words as writings, and thus appeal to a larger public than could listen to their speech.

The greatest of all Greek orators, ^{perhaps} if not even the greatest orator of the world, Demosthenes, son of Demosthenes, was born in the deme of Pæania in 384 B. C., the same year which saw the birth of Aristotle at Stagira. The elder

Demosthenes was a manufacturer of arms and also of couches. The orator's mother, Cleobule, was the daughter of an Athenian, named Gylon, and a Scythian woman. At the age of seven years Demosthenes lost his father, who left a will providing that

Early life of Demosthenes.



DEMOSTHENES.

Statue in the Vatican Museum, Rome.



LIBRARY
OF THE
UNIVERSITY
OF
CALIFORNIA

Aphobus, Demophon, and Therippides should have the care of his property and be guardians of his son, that Aphobus should marry his widow, and Demophon his daughter, then a child of five years of age. The three men took possession of the property, but carried out none of the other provisions of the will. When Demosthenes reached his majority, in 366 B. C., at the age of eighteen, the estate, originally about \$15,000, or £3,000, had been almost entirely squandered. He immediately began legal proceedings against his guardians, but brought only one suit to trial, a suit against Aphobus for ten talents (\$10,000, or £2,000). He spent three years in preparation for this suit, studying especially with Isæus, and when the trial took place, in 363, he obtained a judgment in his favor, delivering on this occasion the two speeches *Against Aphobus*. He did not, however, obtain his property nor the damages, for when he tried to seize a piece of land belonging to Aphobus, Onetor, brother-in-law of Aphobus, claimed that the land was his own, having been taken as security for the dowry of his sister. In the suit arising from this incident Demosthenes delivered his two speeches *Against Onetor*. Whether he won the suit or not is uncertain, but he does not seem to have received much money, for he turned to speech writing to support himself, and continued to exercise this profession at least until 345. It was an excellent preparation for political life, to which Demosthenes was attracted by nature. He is said to have tried public political speaking while still young and to have failed through weakness of voice, poor enunciation, and feeble action. An old actor, Satyrus, comforted him by saying that his speech resembled that of Pericles. Demosthenes then, according to the story, practised speaking with pebbles in his mouth to train himself in careful enunciation, declaimed on the seashore, while the waves roared about him, to strengthen his voice, and shut himself up in a cave to work without interruption. These tales have probably little foundation, but it is

certain that he must have worked hard, studying the works of poets, orators, and historians, though we need not believe the tale that he copied the history of Thucydides eight times with his own hand.

Four speeches in political lawsuits—*Against Androtion* (355), *Leptines* (354), *Timocrates* (352), and *Aristocrates* (352), and three public speeches in the assembly, *On the Symmories*, or navy boards (354), *For the Megalopolitans* (352), and *For the Rhodians* (351)—show that Demosthenes was gaining reputation as a speaker and a man of action. He was now ready for the great struggle which was to end only with his life, the struggle to maintain the power and independence of Athens against the Macedonians. His political prominence was shown in an unpleasant way at the Dionysiac festival in the spring of 350 B. C., when Midias, a rich man of the peace party, struck him in the face. Demosthenes was choregus, and the offense was therefore a very serious one. Demosthenes immediately procured a vote of the assembly condemning the action of Midias and prepared for legal action, but the suit was compromised by a payment of damages. The reason for this may be that just at this time the parties to which Demosthenes and Midias belonged were temporarily reconciled. The powerful speech *Against Midias* was never delivered.

The political career of Demosthenes may be divided into three periods: from 351 to 340 B. C., when he is the chief of the Opposition, the peace party being in power; from 340 to 338 B. C., when the war party, with Demosthenes at its head, directs the affairs of the state; and the time after 338 B. C., when the battle of Chæronea has put an end to the Athenian power and Demosthenes has to defend himself against the attacks of his political enemies. To the first period belong the nine speeches against Philip, which fall into two groups. To the first group belong the *First Philippic* (351 B. C.), in

which he urges that a force of citizen soldiers, not mere mercenaries, be sent to check Philip's operations in Thrace, and the three *Olynthiacs* (349-348 B. C.), in which he exhorts the Athenians to aid the city of Olynthus, the head of a confederacy of thirty-two towns, which Philip finally destroyed in 348 B. C. The speeches of the second group are directed against Philip after he had (in 346 B. C.) been admitted to the Amphictyonic Council and had thus become an enemy in Greece itself, no longer a foreign foe. To this group belong the speech *On the Peace* (346), the *Second Philippic* (344), the *False Legation* (343), in which he accuses Æschines of treasonable conduct while on an embassy to Philip, *On the Chersonnese* (341), and the *Third Philippic* (341). In these speeches he discloses the plans of Philip and shows how he is advancing to the conquest of Greece. At the end he succeeded in bringing Byzantium back to the Athenian alliance and in forming an alliance between Athens and Thebes. The allies met the Macedonians at Chæronea in 338 B. C., and were defeated. Demosthenes retreated with the other Athenian survivors to Athens; yet in spite of the defeat the Athenians honored Demosthenes by choosing him to deliver the funeral oration over the dead.

In 336 B. C. Ctesiphon proposed that Demosthenes be honored by the gift of a golden wreath from the city. The orator Æschines, who was a political opponent of Demosthenes and had been for years in the pay of Philip, opposed the proposal on legal grounds. For various reasons the trial was postponed until 330 B. C. Then Demosthenes delivered his speech *On the Crown*, a splendid defense of his whole political career and the greatest oration of all antiquity. His advice had led Athens to defeat, but honorable defeat. Had the party of "peace at any price" had its way, Athens would still have been overcome, and would have lost her honor with her freedom. Demosthenes could not regret his course of

The oration
On the Crown.

action, "for," he said, "if what was to happen had been plain to all, and all had known it beforehand, not even then ought the city to have abandoned this course, if she had any regard for her glory or our ancestors or future ages." And Athens was not false to her glorious past, for Demosthenes won his case, and Æschines did not receive even a fifth part of the votes of the dicasts.

In 335 B. c., after the death of Philip, Alexander took and destroyed Thebes. He then demanded that ten Athenian orators, among them Demosthenes, Lycurgus, and Hyperides, be delivered up to him, and they were saved only by the intervention of Demades, a partizan of Alexander. In 324 B. c. Harpalus, left in charge by Alexander at Babylon, rifled his master's treasury and came, with five thousand talents and six thousand men, to Athens. The men were not admitted to the city; Harpalus himself was imprisoned, and the money was entrusted to a commission of which Demosthenes was a member. Harpalus escaped, and when the money was counted much of it was missing. Demosthenes was accused of embezzlement, found guilty by the Areopagus, and banished. Whether he was really guilty or not can never be known, but the fact that he was recalled from banishment after Alexander's death, in 323, and was enthusiastically received by the Athenians, may indicate that his condemnation was due to political causes. Since Alexander was dead, the Greek cities rose against the Macedonians, but Antipater defeated them in the battle of Crannon. Demosthenes fled from Athens and took refuge in the temple of Poseidon at Calauria, where, on the 12th of October, 322 B. c., he took poison to avoid falling into the hands of the Macedonians. Aristotle died in the autumn of the same year.

Thirty-two private speeches have come down to us under the name of Demosthenes, but of these only eleven are probably genuine. They show the same qualities which

Demosthenes and Aristotle

made Demosthenes a great political leader—firm grasp of facts, accurate knowledge of details, clearness of narrative and description, cogency of argument, and honest sincerity of purpose. There is not the easy grace of

The private
speeches.

Lysias, nor does Demosthenes hide his own nature so completely behind that of his client; nevertheless these speeches must have had great influence upon the dicasts. They are the speeches of a great orator, and it is not strange that Demosthenes was a successful logographer. But it is in his political speeches that his genius finds full play. In these his ability as a narrator enables him to bring before his hearers, step by step, the progress of Philip, or perhaps the misconduct of Æschines; his knowledge of details permits him to give an account of the resources of Athens and the best means of increasing

Style and
composition.

them, his clearness and force in argument make his conclusions almost irresistible, and his evident earnestness adds to all he says the weight of a serious and well-grounded conviction. And all these qualities are enhanced by the rhythmic cadence of his sentences and the vigorous and animated beauty of his style. He does not, like Gorgias or Antiphon, employ an unvarying series of antitheses, but neither does he avoid antithesis where it is effective. He employs all kinds of figures of speech and of thought. His vocabulary is that of ordinary life, but he knows how to use poetic words or allusions when his speech soars above the ordinary level. He sometimes adds vividness to his argumentation or narrative by introducing an imaginary conversation or a series of questions. An example of this is in the *First Philippic*:¹

When then, men of Athens, when will you do what you ought? When what takes place? "When, by Zeus, there is some pressure of necessity." But what ought you to think of what is now happening? for I think that to free men the greatest pressure is shame for what is going on. Or do you wish, tell me, to go about and ask

¹ *Philippic I*, p. 43, 10.

each other, "Is there anything new?" For what could be newer than that a man of Macedon is defeating the Athenians in war, and directing the affairs of the Greeks? "Is Philip dead?" "No, by Zeus, but he is ill." But what difference does it make to you? for if anything happens to him, you will quickly make another Philip, if this is the way in which you attend to things. For he has not grown great so much by his own strength as by your carelessness.

Even in a translation something of the vividness, the rapidity, and the fiery passion of the orator appears. The most famous passage of descriptive narrative is in the oration *On the Crown*:¹

It was evening, and some one came and reported to the prytanes that Elatea had been taken. And after this they rose in the midst of their dinner and drove out those in the booths in the market place and set fire to the wickerwork, and others sent for the generals and called the trumpeter; and the city was full of tumult. And the next day at daybreak the prytanes called the senate to the senate-house, and you went to the assembly, and before the senate had transacted its business and passed a vote, the whole people was sitting there.

Here the greatest simplicity leads to the greatest vividness.

A passage from the *Fourth Philippic* may serve as an example of vehemence of statement and also of boldness and lucidity of argument:

But there are some who before they have heard the arguments about matters are accustomed to ask at once, "Well, then, what's to be done?" Not that when they have heard it they may do it (for then they would be the most excellent of men), but that they may get rid of the speaker. But, nevertheless, I must tell what's to be done. First, men of Athens, you must recognize this surely in your hearts, that Philip is making war and has broken the peace, and is evil disposed and hostile to the state and the foundation of the state, and I will add also to the gods in the state (and may they

¹ *On the Crown*, p. 284, 169.

destroy him !), but also that he is making war upon and plotting against nothing more than the constitution, and that there is nothing in the world that he regards more than how he can destroy it.

Argumentative style. And this, in a way, he is now doing of necessity. For consider; he wishes to rule, and he has found you his only opponents therein. He has been doing wrong for a long time, and he is himself most perfectly conscious of that fact; for it is by means of your possessions of which he is able to make use that he possesses all the rest firmly; for if he were to give up Amphipolis and Potidæa, he could not even stay safely in Macedonia. Both things then he knows, that he is himself plotting against you and that you know it. And believing that you are sensible, he thinks that you hate him justly. But besides these things which are so important, he knows perfectly well that even if he become master of all the rest, he can not hold anything surely so long as you have a democratic government, but if any reverse happen to him (and many things might happen to a man), all that is now kept down by force will come and take refuge with you.¹

In his legal speeches Demosthenes follows the usual arrangement: introduction, narrative, argument, and peroration; but even in these speeches he shows originality in the form of the different parts and through them all returns constantly to his main point. This quality is more marked in the political speeches, in which the traditional form had not been so firmly fixed by his predecessors. With persistent energy Demosthenes returns again and again to the main subject of each speech, inserting argument in his narration by means of a sudden question, or perhaps only by an ironical allusion, exhorting, rebuking, appealing to feelings of pride and shame, of patriotism and profit. His are not the stately, elaborate, carefully balanced periods of Isocrates, which become oppressive by their very elegance; his sentences are long or short, combined in periods or isolated, as the varying emotions of the orator demand one or the other form of utterance. In fact, variety is the most striking quality of

Variety in style.

¹ *Philippic IV*, p. 134, 11-13.

his style, the second being vehemence. Demosthenes hardly ever appeals to the tenderer emotions, as love and pity, but he arouses all the sterner emotions as no one had ever done before, and his argumentation, exact and convincing, forces the intellect of his hearers to support their emotions. There is no doubt that the orations as we now have them were edited for publication and are not in the form in which they were delivered, but the qualities we see in them are the same which his contemporaries ascribed to the spoken orations of Demosthenes. Editing doubtless changed some details, but the substance and the general form of the orations is substantially such as aroused and convinced the Athenian audience.

Struggling against great odds, Demosthenes aroused the Athenians against the Macedonian power and held them to their purpose even to the last. It may be that his patriotism was narrow, that the world gained by the overthrow of Greek independence and the consequent spread of Greek civilization, which was carried by the Macedonians even to distant India, but it is certain that without his heroic struggle the world would be poorer. Not only has his eloquence served as a model for later ages, but the courage with which he inspired the Athenians, leading them to fight for their ideal of patriotism in an age when material advantage was more than ever before the mainspring of men's action, will make his name revered wherever a weaker people is struggling against an overwhelming alien force.

CHAPTER XXXII

ÆSCHINES AND OTHER ORATORS

Æschines, 390 to after 330 B. c.—Hyperides, 389–322 B. c.—Lycurgus, about 390–324 B. c.—Dinarchus, before 342 to after 292 B. c.—Phocion, about 400–317 B. c.—Demades, about 385–319 B. c.—Demetrius of Phalerum, about 350 to about 280 B. c.

DEMOSTHENES is without doubt the greatest of Greek orators. But in his own day he had competitors for the public ear, some of whom supported his political views, while others opposed them. Among his opponents the most important is Æschines. He was born at Athens in 390 or 389 B. c., and was therefore five or six years older than Demosthenes. His father, Atrometus, was a poor schoolmaster according to Demosthenes, but Æschines himself claims to belong to a family of good position, though not of wealth. His mother's name was Glaucothea. He had two brothers, Aphobetus and Philochares, both of whom held important public positions. Æschines served with credit in the army, and was, before entering upon public life, a tragic actor and a clerk of the assembly. Demosthenes describes his utter failure as an actor, but nothing is less trustworthy than the testimony of Demosthenes about Æschines. Personal attacks upon political or legal opponents were ordinary parts of Athenian speeches, and Demosthenes shows in his attacks upon Æschines not only great power of invective but also great imagination. Æschines had a fine voice and good figure, and it is likely enough that he was at least a fair actor. In his boyhood

his education was probably not very careful, owing to the poverty of the family, and his career as an actor may account in part for his ability as an orator.

Æschines first became prominent in politics after the fall of Olynthus, in 348 B. C., when he proposed that embassies be sent about to form an alliance of all Greeks against Philip. Two years later he was, in common with Demosthenes, eager for peace and took part in two embassies to Philip. Demosthenes charges that from this time he was in Philip's pay. Possibly Æschines saw that resistance to the Macedonian power was sure to end in defeat. He may have honestly believed that peace and friendship with Philip was best for Athens, but if he did, it is probable that he allowed himself to be paid for doing what he believed to be best. He was accused of treason by Timarchus in 346, and in 345 delivered his speech *Against Timarchus*, in which he shows that Timarchus leads such a vicious life as to be disqualified from speaking in the assembly. In 343 the speech *On the Embassy*, in reply to that of Demosthenes on the same subject (called *The False Legation*), resulted in his acquittal. He was the most important orator of the Macedonian party and delivered many speeches in the course of his political career, but these speeches were probably never written. He was able to speak without writing his orations, and seems to have prepared for publication only those which defend his own character and political conduct. Only three orations have come down to us, the two already mentioned and the speech *Against Ctesiphon* (330 B. C.), to which Demosthenes's oration *On the Crown* is the reply. These are probably the only speeches Æschines ever wrote, and these were no doubt more or less changed after they were delivered. The suit against Ctesiphon was lost by Æschines. He did not even obtain one fifth of the votes, was fined one thousand drachmas, and deprived of the right to bring any similar suit. Hereupon

he left Athens and is said to have established a school of oratory at Rhodes, but of his subsequent life nothing is known.

As an orator Æschines is inferior to Demosthenes in the power that comes from earnest convictions and nobility of nature. He is hardly if at all inferior to him in narrative, but in argument he falls far below him.

Style of Æschines. His power of expression, his command of language, is remarkable. Like Demosthenes, he employs all the figures of speech and of thought. He does not so often as Demosthenes gain emphasis by repeating the same idea in different words, nor does he so often introduce the form of dialogue. He appeals to all the emotions, especially to those that cluster round the family hearth, but his lack of moral depth makes him unable to arouse great and exalted enthusiasm. A great orator and master of style he certainly was, but not, like Demosthenes, at the same time a great man.

Hyperides. Hyperides, son of Glaucippus, of the deme of Collytus, was born 389 B. C. He became a pupil of Isocrates and took up the profession of a logographer, though he appears to have belonged to a wealthy family. He was diligent in his business, but at the same time fond of luxury and pleasure. He made his appearance in public life as early as 360 B. C., and became one of the most important orators of the anti-Macedonian party. He struggled side by side with Demosthenes against Philip, and the two orators were not divided in their political views until toward the middle of the reign of Alexander. Demosthenes then believed that it was useless to bring down upon Athens the wrath of the Macedonians, but Hyperides was still outspoken in his desire for war. When Harpalus came with his men and money Hyperides wished to rise with his aid against Alexander, and he was among the most prominent accusers of Demosthenes after the flight of Harpalus. During the exile of Demosthenes, Hyperides was the leader

of the anti-Macedonian party at Athens, and in the Lamian War he was chosen to speak the funeral oration over those who fell at Lamia. After the battle of Crannon he was obliged to flee from Athens, was captured, handed over to Antipater, tortured and put to death in 322 B. C.

The ancients had seventy-seven speeches ascribed to Hyperides, fifty-two of which were regarded by the critics as genuine. Only fragments of these were known in modern times until, at different times in the nineteenth century, Egyptian papyrus manuscripts were found containing six orations in more or less perfect preservation. These are: *For Lycophron* (about 350 B. C.), *Against Philippides* (about 335), *For Euxenippus* (about 330), *Against Athenogenes* (about 325), *Against Demosthenes in the Affair of Harpalus* (324), and the *Funeral Oration* in honor of the Athenians who fell at Lamia (323). The best preserved are the speeches *Against Athenogenes* and *For Euxenippus*, which exhibit Hyperides as a writer of speeches for others. His political speeches were probably not written, or, at any rate, not published. The *Funeral Oration* shows his ability in the composition of an elaborate public address.

The ancient critics praised the grace of Hyperides, as distinguished from the power of Demosthenes. Yet Hyperides does not lack power, but combines it with grace, as he joins wit to passion and elegance to simplicity. Some of the ancients ranked him as an orator even above Demosthenes, but the best critics of ancient and modern times agree in placing Demosthenes before all his rivals. In the speech *Against Demosthenes* Hyperides shows at times a vehemence second only to that of Demosthenes himself, but his most perfect work seems to have been done in speeches on rather unimportant subjects, in which more or less humor is appropriate. Such is the speech *Against Athenogenes*, a perfumer who cheated a young man to whom he sold his factory and his

Works of
Hyperides.

Style of
Hyperides.

slaves. The example of his eloquence best known in modern times is the concluding passage of the *Funeral Oration*:

Hard it is, perhaps, to comfort those who are in such troubles; for mourning is not laid to rest by speech nor by law, but each man's nature and his friendship for the dead fixes the bounds of his grieving. And yet we must be of good courage and diminish our grief as far as possible, and remember not only the death of those who are gone, but also the valor they have left behind them. For if their fortune deserves mourning, their deeds deserve great praises. And if they had no share of mortal old age, they have attained ageless glory and been fortunate in all things. For as to those of them who have died childless, the praises of the Greeks will be their immortal children. And for those who have left children, the goodwill of their country will be established as their children's guardian. And besides this, if death is like never having been born, they have escaped from diseases and grief and the other casualties of mortal life; but if there is consciousness in Hades and care from the divinity, as we are told, it is natural that those who defended the honors of the gods when they were attacked should meet with the divinity's most tender care.

Lycurgus was born about 390 B. C., the son of Lycophon, of the noble family of the Butadæ. He was a pupil of Isocrates, and, it is said, of Plato. His wealth made it unnecessary for him to write speeches for others. He belonged to the anti-Macedonian party of Demosthenes and Hyperides, but his chief activity was in administration of government finances. From 338 to 326 B. C. he managed the finances of the state either in his own name as secretary of the treasury or through others whom he caused to be elected to that office. He accomplished many reforms and put the treasury upon a firm basis. Of his fifteen speeches two were in his own defense, the rest against men who had either stolen from the treasury or acted treasonably in some way. Only one speech is preserved to us, that *Against Leocrates*, a man who deserted at the battle of Chæroneæ, and only returned to Athens in 331, when he hoped his conduct would have been forgotten.

Lycurgus found him out and brought a charge against him. The chief interest of the speech lies in its high tone of moral indignation. The reasoning is sharp, but not always correct, and the orator is evidently inspired by a lofty, patriotic indignation. The style is vigorous, but lacks grace in spite of the harmonious phrases which show the pupil of Isocrates. The uncompromising character of Lycurgus made him enemies, and after his death (in 324 B. C.) his children were put in prison on account of an alleged deficit in his accounts. In an extant fragment of his speech in their defense Hyperides says: "What will those say of him who pass by his tomb? 'This man lived righteously, and when put in charge of the finances he found means, and he built the theatre, the music-hall, the docks, and he constructed triremes and harbors. This man our city deprived of civic rights, and his children she imprisoned.'"

A prominent logographer of this period was Dinarchus, son of Sostratus, of Corinth, who came to Athens about 342 B. C. Being a foreigner he could take no **Dinarchus.** direct part in politics, but wrote speeches for others. Many such speeches were attributed to him, but only three are preserved, all of which are concerned with the Harpalus affair. The first of these, *Against Demosthenes*, is more interesting than the two *Against Aristogiton* and *Against Philocles*. Dinarchus appears in these speeches as an imitator of Demosthenes, influenced also by the other orators of his own and the preceding generation. In his later years Dinarchus had great political influence. In 307, when Demetrius Poliorcetes restored to power the democratic party, which had been kept down under Demetrius of Phalerum, Dinarchus was condemned to death. He retired to Chalcis in Eubœa, and only returned in 292 through the influence of Theophrastus. The date of his death is unknown.

Phocion, best known as a general and statesman, was also an orator of distinction. His family belonged to the

middle class, but in his personal bearing and political sympathies he was an aristocrat. He was dissatisfied with the democracy of Athens, and resembled Xenophon in his admiration for Sparta—rather an ideal Sparta, **Phocion.** however, than the real Sparta of his time. In spite of his disapproval of the democracy he served his country all his life, being chosen general no less than forty-five times. As an orator he was constantly in favor of peace, though his life was passed for the most part in war. His language was dignified, trenchant, and vigorous, and his words had additional weight on account of his high character. He did not hesitate to tell the people disagreeable truths, but even that failed to make him unpopular. Of his speeches only scattered fragments are preserved. They show his liking for brief and sententious utterance, his fearlessness, and his somewhat rough humor. Phocion was a partizan of Philip and Alexander, and under their reigns was able to be of service to Athens. Under Antipater he accepted the limited aristocracy and lived in safety; but Polysperchon suspected him, delivered him over to the anger of the democracy, which was temporarily revived, and thus brought about his death. He drank the hemlock in 317 B. C. He was then over eighty years of age.

One of the most important orators of the Macedonian party was Demades. He was, however, not really a professional orator, and no speeches by him are preserved. **Demades.** He probably delivered them without writing them, and for that matter without much preparation, for he was a witty, clever man with a gift for public speaking. Some fragmentary sayings of his are preserved, but nothing which gives any idea of his oratory. Several other orators of this period are known by name, and speeches are preserved under the name of Demosthenes, which belong to some of his contemporaries; but it is useless for us to do more than try to remember that the few

works preserved to us are only a small part of the speeches actually delivered in the time of Demosthenes.

The last of the Attic orators is Demetrius of Phalerum, who was less an orator than a statesman and man of letters.

Demetrius of
Phalerum.

He was born about the middle of the fourth century at Phalerum, a few miles from Athens.

His father had been a slave, but had become a citizen and a man of wealth. Demetrius was carefully educated, was the pupil, and became the friend, of Theophrastus. He was a partizan of the Macedonians, and, under Cassander, was ruler of Athens for ten years (317-307 B. C.). He was driven out by Demetrius Poliorcetes, and went to Egypt, where he is said to have suggested to Ptolemy Soter the foundation of the library at Alexandria. He died about 280 B. C., leaving numerous writings—historical, political, and learned—in addition to his speeches. Of all these only scattered fragments remain. Demetrius is himself hardly to be classed as one of the Attic orators, for his spirit is rather that of the Alexandrian period. After his time eloquence was no longer exercised in politics at Athens, for Athenian politics had ceased to have any importance, and the brilliant simplicity which Attic oratory had attained under Demosthenes and his contemporaries passed away. Henceforth Greek eloquence was an artificial product of the schools, no longer the living offspring of national life.

BOOK III

THE ALEXANDRIAN PERIOD

CHAPTER XXXIII

PHILOSOPHY IN THE ALEXANDRIAN PERIOD

Hellenistic civilization—The common dialect—Centres of culture—Athens—Alexandria—Pergamum and other centres—Vast quantity of literature—Schools of philosophy—The Cynics—Diogenes of Sinope, (?)—323 B. c.—Crates of Thebes, about 315 B. c.—Bion of Borysthenis, about 280 B. c.—Menippus, about 280 B. c.—The Stoics—Zeno, about 336 to about 264 B. c.—Cleanthes, 331–232 B. c.—Chrysippus, about 280 to about 205 B. c.—Other Stoics—The Stoic doctrines—Epicurus, 342–270 B. c.—The Epicurean doctrines—Skepticism—Pyrrho, about 360 to about 270 B. c.—Timon, about 315 to about 225 B. c.—The Middle and New Academy—Arcesilas of Pitane, about 315–241 B. c.—Carneades, about 215–129 B. c.

THE conquests of Alexander made a great change in Greece. For more than a century and a half—ever since the Persian invasions—Athens had been the centre of Greek life and thought, even when she had not been politically the most powerful Greek city. Now the Athenian power was broken, and not the Athenian power alone, but the less important power of every other Greek state was swallowed up in a vast empire. Alexander and his successors spread Greek civilization to distant regions, and founded Greek cities in the midst of foreign populations. These cities were centres of Greek thought and Greek literature, though the Greek influence was for the most

Changes
caused by the
reign of
Alexander.

part superficial, not affecting even the entire population of the cities, and hardly felt beyond the city walls. Alexandria, Antioch, Tarsus, and Pergamum all became centres of the new Greek civilization—Hellenistic civilization as it is called, to distinguish it from the Hellenic civilization of the days when Greece was free. The literature of Greece during the period of Greek independence had developed with the city and its people, reflecting the thoughts and conditions of the citizens. It had been a popular literature, addressed to the people, understood by the people, and (but for the traditional use of certain dialects for certain kinds of poetry) composed in the language of the people. In the Alexandrian period the independent life of the cities has ceased. Literature is no longer an expression of the progress of the people, and ceases to appeal to the masses. The writers no longer address the whole body of their own fellow citizens, but scholars, poets, and historians write for the cultivated class of the whole Greek reading world. As a result of this, there are no longer marked local differences in style or language (though Syracusan writers retain their Doric dialect), for all writers are alike familiar with the works of their predecessors and with the teachings of Isocrates, while the long predominance of Athens had made Attic Greek the language of cultivated people.

But Attic Greek before Alexander was impregnated with the delicacy, clearness, and brilliancy of the Attic genius. Now it was written by men not of Attic birth, and often not even Greek by descent, living, perhaps, where the greater part of the population understood no Greek at all. Naturally the language lost much of its finer qualities. The "common dialect," as the literary

The "common dialect."

Greek of this period is called, is Attic Greek with the addition of numerous technical expressions, the loss of some of the finer grammatical distinctions, and some minor changes in spelling and pronun-

ciation. In themselves these differences are slight, but they suffice to change the language from a natural, living expression of the thoughts and feelings of an active and progressive people to an artificial means of intercourse between cultivated persons, often far apart and living under very different conditions. Alexandrian literature is learned and cosmopolitan—a literature not of the people, but of the school, the study, and the library, written by scholars for one another and for the cultivated circles of the courts and cities.

At Athens the language of literature was still in great measure the language of the people; but the people had ceased to be interested in literature as it had been when the great works of Athenian poets, historians, and orators were a part of the vigorous life of an independent city. There were still the old festivals, with their musical and literary performances, and the New Comedy is still Attic. The schools of philosophy also lived on at Athens, the Academy and the Lyceum continuing the traditions of Plato and Aristotle. Yet even at Athens the change since the days of Greek independence was great.

Of the new centres of literature Alexandria was the greatest. Fifty years after its foundation by Alexander the new city had more than three hundred thousand inhabitants, and was the greatest city known to the Greeks. Here Egyptians, Orientals, and Greeks came together in the greatest commercial centre of the ancient world. The Ptolemies, the Greek rulers of Egypt, were cultivated and ambitious. They adorned their capital with Greek buildings, and wished to make it the centre of Greek civilization. Ptolemy Soter began to collect books, which he is said to have put under the care of Demetrius of Phalerum. But Ptolemy Philadelphus, the son of Ptolemy Soter, really founded the literary greatness of Alexandria by establishing the Museum, a vast group of buildings, with halls and gardens, in which were collec-

tions of all sorts for the use of students, as well as lecture-rooms and other needed equipment. Here the great Alexandrian Library was housed—a library which is said to have contained seven hundred thousand volumes when it was burned in 47 B. C., after Cæsar's entrance to the city. A second library, in the Serapeum, contained some fifty thousand volumes, probably duplicates of some of those in the Museum. The great library was under the charge of a librarian, assisted, no doubt, by a numerous staff. The librarians added to the usefulness of the library by catalogues, commentaries, new editions, and all sorts of literary and grammatical studies. They were learned men of note—first Zenodotus, then Callimachus, Eratosthenes, Apollonius of Rhodes, Aristophanes of Byzantium, and Aristarchus.

—Next to Alexandria, Pergamum was the greatest literary centre. Her wealthy kings were not contented with adorning their city with brilliant works of architecture and sculpture. They founded also a rich library, which, though smaller than that at Alexandria, was great enough to attract to Pergamum a number of important literary men, scholars, and philosophers. Antioch also had a famous library and learned librarians. The best known of these is Euphorion of Chalcis, who came to Antioch in the third century under Antiochus III. Syracuse, under Hiero II, was a literary centre of some importance, and produced the greatest poet and the greatest mathematician of this period, Theocritus and Archimedes. There were other less important centres: Cos, famed for the poet Philetas; Rhodes, with its school of rhetoric; Tarsus, a city in Cilicia, where philosophy and learning were much in vogue; and Soli, near Tarsus, the birthplace of the Peripatetic Clearchus and the Stoic Chrysippus.

In all Greek cities, wherever situated, and even in cities where only a small part of the population knew Greek, literary work was carried on. Never had there been so much Greek written, and never since the Homeric times

had there been so few great writers. The names of many writers of the Alexandrian period are preserved, but the works of only a few, and even these are for the most part of secondary interest. There are gems of poetry and expressions of high thoughts to be found in Alexandrian literature, but they are rare. This period will therefore be treated more briefly than the earlier times. The centres of literary activity are many, and all branches of literature are cultivated at the same time; so that a chronological or local division of our subject is impossible, while the treatment of each branch of literature by itself separates writers who worked side by side. Such difficulties have been met in the treatment of the earlier periods, but they now become more noticeable.

We have already traced the progress of tragic (see page 245) and comic (see pages 261 ff.) poetry through the Alexandrian period; for tragedy and comedy were of Attic origin, and continued to develop at Athens. They were therefore naturally treated in their whole course in connection with Attic literature. Philosophy, too, continued to have its chief seat at Athens. The "Old Academy"—Speusippus, Xenocrates, Polemo, Crates, and Crantor—united the doctrines of Plato with those of Aristotle and Pythagoras, or wrote attractively on subjects of moral interest (see page 312). The Peripatetic School or Lyceum, headed successively by Theophrastus, Strato, Lycon, Ariston, and Critolaus, accepted the metaphysics of Aristotle without change, but devoted itself, for the most part at least, to historical and scientific research (see page 321). The Cyrenaic School of Aristippus (see page 302), which regarded pleasure as the chief good, was represented during this period by Theodorus the "atheist" and Hegesias, both of whom spent part of their lives at Alexandria, and a few others. The Megarian School of Euclides is continued by Stilpo (see page 302).

Vast quantity
of literature.

Tragedy and
comedy.

Schools of
philosophy.

The Cynic School (see page 302) of Antisthenes was continued by Diogenes of Sinope, who spent most of his life in Athens, and died as an old man at Corinth in 323 B. C. Antisthenes had denied that pleasure, wealth, and the like are really desirable. Diogenes, acting in accordance with his master's teaching, dressed in a ragged cloak, lived in a cask, and possessed only a staff and a wallet. His chief pupil was Crates of Thebes, whose rich and beautiful wife, Hipparchia, followed him in his wandering beggar's life. Crates taught for the most part at Athens, and is distinguished as the first teacher of Zeno. Bion of Borysthenis was another noted Cynic. Originally a slave, he was set free and made rich by the will of his master. He went to Athens, and studied at first in the Academy, but soon went over to the Cynics. He was a man of noted humor and biting wit. Menippus of Gadara, in Coele-Syria, who lived in the latter part of the fourth and the first part of the third century B. C., was a Phœnician slave. He came to Sinope, was set free, and became rich by money-lending. Finally he lost his fortune and killed himself. The works ascribed to him were satires and satiric parodies. The novelty of his writing consisted in combining prose and verse in an amusing and burlesque manner, in which he was imitated by the Roman Varro. Lucian, the brilliant satirist and sophist of the second century after Christ, introduces Menippus in several of his essays; and it is probably from these that we can derive the best idea of his qualities, his bold satire and caustic wit.

The Stoic School was founded by Zeno of Citium, in Cyprus, a Phœnician colony, in which the Greek civilization was not native, but at best only naturalized. Zeno was born about 336 B. C. At the age of twenty-two he went to Athens on business, became acquainted with the Cynic Crates, and gave up business for philosophy. He soon left Crates for Stilpo the Megarian, then became a pupil of the Academician

The Stoics.
Zeno.

Polemo. He also studied the works of earlier philosophers, especially of Heraclitus, whose doctrines were to be accepted almost entirely by the Stoic School. After some twenty years of study Zeno established a school of his own. He met his disciples in the Painted Porch, the *Stoa Poikile*, which gave the name to the Stoic School. For thirty or forty years he taught and wrote. He died at the age of seventy-two. Of his works, *On the Whole*, *On the Nature of Man*, *On the Emotions*, etc., only fragments are left. He despised rhetoric and the art of style, and prided himself upon conciseness and brevity.

Zeno's most distinguished pupil and his successor as head of the Stoic School was Cleanthes of Assos, in Mysia.

Cleanthes. He was born in 331 B. C., and was as a young man an athlete. At the age of forty-four he came to Athens, where he attended the lectures of Zeno in the intervals of the manual labor by which he had to earn his living. When Zeno died (about 264 B. C.) Cleanthes was chosen head of the school. His works were numerous, but only fragments remain. He even wrote poems, and a fragment of his *Hymn to Zeus* shows that he was skilled in the use of language and could write dignified, harmonious verse. He is said to have been slow of thought rather than brilliant. He starved himself to death in 232 B. C., at the age of ninety-nine years. The successor of Cleanthes was

Chrysippus. Chrysippus, born about 280 B. C., at Soli, in Cilicia. He was a pupil of Cleanthes, and perhaps also of the philosophers of the Academy. He wrote seven hundred and fifty works, of which only brief fragments remain. Chrysippus was not a literary artist, but the loss of his works is to be regretted on account of their importance for the history of philosophy, and also because he quoted most profusely from earlier writers. His importance to the Stoic School was expressed in the line, "If Chrysippus had not been, the Stoa would not be." He died in the 143d Olympiad, 209-205 B. C. Other Stoics

of the third century are Persæus of Citium, Dionysius of Heraclea, Sphærus of the Bosphorus, Herillus of Carthage, and Ariston of Chios. It is noticeable that none of these (and the same is true of all the other noted Stoics of this period) is an Athenian, while several are, like Zeno himself, from places inhabited by Semitic peoples.

The Stoic doctrine, as developed by the early leaders of the school, is already complex, but is clear in its main outlines. It has three parts: logic, the science of the conditions requisite for the attainment of knowledge, including grammar and rhetoric as well as psychology; physics, the science of nature; and ethics, the science of morals. The system is derived in great part from Heraclitus. The world; or the Whole, is governed by fixed laws, which are the expression of the divine thought, the world-soul. The human soul is only a part of the divine soul, and in general the individual exists only in and through the Whole or universe. In the human soul reason is the directing power, for reason alone can comprehend general laws and make individual conduct conform to them. Happiness is attainable only by living in complete accord with the laws of nature as perceived by reason. This complete accord is called virtue, and the wise man considers virtue the only good. All other things are indifferent. Duty is the source of all happiness. The wise man, filled with these ideas, strives after perfect serenity, without which there can be no happiness. The Stoics therefore sought happiness in the soul, disregarding all material things.

The Epicurean School held beliefs in many respects the exact opposites of those of the Stoics. Its founder, Epicurus, born in 342 B. C., was an Athenian, but was brought up at Samos, where his father lived as a *cleruch*. In his early manhood he taught school, spending his spare time in reading. The account of the gods and the origin of the world in the *Theogony* of Hesiod

appeared to him absurd, while the theory of Democritus (see page 162) delighted him. He developed his own system by the time he was thirty years old, taught it at Lampsacus and Mytilene for some four years, and returned in 306 B. C. to Athens, where he bought a garden in which he conversed with his friends and pupils. The garden of Epicurus soon became a rival of the Academy, the Lyceum, and the Stoa. Epicurus died in 270 B. C., leaving behind him a flourishing school and many writings, of which there remain only two long philosophic letters and a summary of the chief Epicurean doctrines. The style of Epicurus was concise, full of technical expressions, and without care for beauty. He was not speculative by nature, and did not encourage independent speculation in his pupils. His teachings were of a practical character, and his followers were expected to accept them as a whole.

The Epicurean system, like the Stoic, consists of logic, physics, and ethics. The logic or *canon* of Epicurus declares that all knowledge is derived through the senses. The universe is therefore composed of objects which can be perceived by the senses. Such are the atoms of Democritus, and Epicurus adopted the theory of Democritus that all things consist of atoms grouped in different ways. The different groupings are explained by Epicurus as the result of chance, in direct opposition to the Stoic theory of fixed laws. There is, according to Epicurus, no Providence or ruling power. He does not deny the existence of the gods, but regards them as similar to men, only living at ease, without care for anything. The soul he regards as a delicate and refined substance which permeates the body. The purpose of ethics, or moral science, is the attainment of happiness. Since all knowledge is derived through the senses, happiness, which is the chief end of life, can be obtained only through sensations; and since the fear of the gods has been removed, all man has to do to attain

happiness is to supply himself with pleasant sensations. This is the doctrine of pleasure as the chief good. But Epicurus showed that many so-called pleasures end in pain, and that wisdom consists in choosing those pleasures which bring real and lasting content. He was, like the better men among his followers, a man of moderate and temperate life; but his doctrine, since it does away with all duty, naturally leads to the irrational pursuit of sensual pleasures.

The many and conflicting dogmas of the philosophical schools, both old and new, naturally led to the question.

“Are any of these dogmas true?” And this again to the further question, “Can we know the truth?” The doubt expressed in these questions was developed into a system of skepticism by Pyrrho of Elis. He was born about 360 and died about 270 B. C. In early life he was a painter, then turned to the study of the philosophy of Democritus. He accompanied his teacher, Anaxarchus, to Asia, following Alexander’s army, then returned to Greece, where for thirty or forty years he taught the principles of skepticism. For him, as for the other ancient philosophers, happiness was the chief good. He found that this was not to be gained through the reason and duty of the Stoics nor the sensation and pleasure of Epicurus. Truth he found was impossible of attainment. True happiness therefore consisted in not troubling oneself about what one can not know, but in suspending judgment. Pyrrho himself wrote nothing; but one of his pupils, Timon of Phlius, was a writer of merit.

He was born toward the end of the fourth century B. C., and lived ninety years. He is said to have been at first a dancer, then to have studied under Stilpo, and finally to have adopted the views of Pyrrho. He seems to have traveled about in various cities, giving lectures and recitals. His writings, both in prose and verse, were numerous. Of his prose works we know

Skepticism.
Pyrrho.

Timon.

nothing. His poems were various, but one of the most famous was called *Silli* or *Satires*. In this the different philosophical systems are cleverly ridiculed. The scene appears to be in the lower world, and the philosophers are introduced in person. About one hundred and forty lines of this poem are preserved. The school of Pyrrho ceased to exist independently after Timon, but his doctrine exerted considerable influence, especially upon the Academy.

The "Middle" and "New" Academy are influenced by the teachings of the Stoics and of Pyrrho. Their most important members are Arcesilas of Pitane, in Æolis (about 315–241 B. C.), who was scholarch about 260, and Carneades of Cyrene (about 215–129 B. C.), who was scholarch about a century later. The other Academicians of this period may be passed over. In doctrine the New Academy differed from the Middle Academy only in details, but both differ from the Old Academy in one important point. Plato taught that absolute knowledge is attainable; but knowledge was for him inseparable from the theory of ideas. His successors modified and virtually discarded the theory of ideas, leaving no firm foundation for the theory of knowledge. Arcesilas, in combating the dogmatism of the Stoics, employed arguments derived from Pyrrho, and arrived at the conclusion that the wise man must renounce absolute knowledge and be contented with probability. The doctrine of probability was perfected by Carneades, and remained a regular part of the Academic teaching. Arcesilas was powerful in discussion and argument, and as much loved by his friends as he was hated by his enemies. Carneades had, besides great argumentative ability, unusual gifts as an orator. In 156 B. C. he was sent by the Athenians as ambassador to Rome to argue a case before the Senate against the Sicyonians. He took advantage of the opportunity to give private exhibitions, and shocked the Romans

The Middle
and New

Academy.

Arcesilas and
Carneades.

by proving the existence of justice one day and disproving it the next. Such a performance shows how far the Academy had departed from the teachings of Plato. It continued, however, to exert considerable influence, and appealed especially to men of moderate and conservative tendencies. Cicero considered himself a follower of the New Academy.

CHAPTER XXXIV

RHETORIC AND HISTORY IN THE ALEXANDRIAN PERIOD

Rhetoric—Hegesias, about 250 B. C.—Hermagoras, about 150 B. C.—Apollodorus, about 102 to about 20 B. C.—Theodorus of Gadara, about 33 B. C.—Memoirs—Ptolemy, 367–283 B. C.—Pyrrhus, 323 (?)–272 B. C.—Hannibal, 247–183 B. C.—Aratus of Sicyon, 271–213 B. C.—Collections of material—Craterus, 321 to about 265 B. C.—Philochorus, about 335–261 B. C.—Demetrius of Skepsis, born about 210 B. C.—Bæton and Diognetus, about 325 B. C.—Amyntas, about 325 B. C.—Eumenes and Diodotus, about 320 B. C.—Sosibius, about 315 B. C.—Istrus, about 260 B. C.—Berosus, about 280 B. C.—Manetho, about 250 B. C.—Idomeneus, about 290 B. C.—Dicæarchus, early third century B. C.—History—Histories of Alexander (Aristobulus, Chares of Mytilene, Onesicritus, Clitarchus, Anaximenes, Hegesias, Callisthenes)—Hieronymus of Cardia, about 365 to about 260 B. C.—General history—Diyllus, about 300 B. C.—Duris, about 340 to about 260 B. C.—Demochares, about 350 to after 289 B. C.—Timæus, about 345 to about 250 B. C.—Geography—Nearchus, about 320 B. C.—Megasthenes, about 300 B. C.—Pytheas, 300 B. C.—Timosthenes, about 300 B. C.—Agatharchides, about 165 B. C.—Polemo the Periegete, about 180 B. C.—Eratosthenes, 276–195 B. C.—Hipparchus, about 150 B. C.—Theophrastus, about 372–287 B. C.—Aristoxenus, about 325 B. C.—Heraclides of Pontus, about 330 B. C.—Antigonus of Carystus, about 290 to (?) B. C.—Sotion, about 185 B. C.—Grammar and philology—Zenodotus, about 325–260 B. C.—Calimachus, about 310 to about 240 B. C.—Aristophanes of Byzantium, about 262 to about 185 B. C.—Aristarchus, about 215 to about 143 B. C.—Crates of Mallus, about 165 B. C.—Mathematics and physics—Euclides, about 300 B. C.—Aristarchus of Samos, about 280 B. C.—Archimedes, 287–212 B. C.—Apollonius of Perge, about 200 B. C.—Medicine, etc.—Herophilus, about 290 B. C.—Erasistratus, about 290 B. C.—Romances—Hecataeus, about 300 B. C.—Euhemerus, about 300 B. C.—Imitations—Jewish-Greek writings—The Septuagint—Aristobulus, about 175 B. C.

DURING the Alexandrian period, which was being for the most part a period of learned research and imitation, oratory

did not flourish. There were, of course, many speeches delivered, but they are not preserved, nor were they, in all probability, worth preserving. Rhetoric continued

to be taught, and some knowledge of rhetoric was an essential of a liberal education; it was, however, no longer of especial importance.

The only rhetorician of any great literary consequence is Hegesias of Magnesia, near Mount Sipylus, who lived about the middle of the third century B. C. He wrote orations of various kinds, a history of Alexander, and perhaps other historical works. He is important as the founder of the "Asian" school of rhetoric, remarkable for odd arrangements of words, striking figures, and all sorts of ornamentation in composition, by which the lack of ideas was to be covered up. This school exercised great influence upon writers of the latter part of the third and nearly the whole of the second century. Some of the later teachers belonging to it are Hermagoras of Temnos, Apollodorus of Pergamum, and Theodorus of Gadara, who are known to us chiefly through Latin writers, but whose influence was evidently considerable.

History is more important than rhetoric in this period, though the literary value of the works produced was probably slight. No historical work of this period is preserved entire, and few fragments remain in their original form.

For the most part, the historians lacked knowledge of political and military matters, and wrote history to display their rhetoric or their learning. A few generals and public men wrote memoirs of historical importance, in which they undoubtedly displayed an intimate knowledge of events. Their works seem, however, to have been inferior as works of literature. The most important of these

was Ptolemy, son of Lagus, who became King of Egypt and was surnamed Soter. He wrote a *History of Alexander.* Pyrrhus, King of Epirus, wrote *Memoirs,* which would be valuable to us if they had been

preserved; Aratus of Sicyon, general of the Achæan League, also wrote *Memoirs* in thirty books, said to have been more valuable for their truthfulness than for their style; and Hannibal, the great Carthaginian general, also wrote Greek works of an historical nature, probably memoirs.

Other works of historical character were many and various. Some were mere collections of material. Aristotle had encouraged compilations of this kind, and in the third and second centuries they were very numerous. The

Collections of material. Macedonian Craterus, son of one of Alexander's generals, made a *Collection of the Decrees of the Athenian People*, the historian Philochorus a *Collection of Attic Inscriptions*, others wrote on games, on sacrifices, on festivals, and composed notes and made collections relating to all sorts of special topics. At the beginning of the second century Demetrius of Skepsis compiled a great work in thirteen books, entitled *Catalogue of the Trojans*, from which later writers derived much information about the antiquities of the Troad.

Another class of works, consisting of chronicles, was very numerous. Bæton and Diognetus, the official measurers in Alexander's army, wrote on the *Marches*

Chronicles. *of Alexander*; Amyntas wrote *Marches in Asia*;
Chronology. Eumenes and Diodotus edited the official *Journals of Alexander*; *Chronology* was treated by Sosibius; and

the great geographer Eratosthènes wrote *On Chronography*, a criticism of the chronological writings of his predecessors, with theories and rules for the guidance of others. Local chronicles were numerous, the most important being the *Atthides* or *Chronicles of Attica*. The most celebrated writers of *Atthides* were Philochorus, a soothsayer by pro-

Philochorus. fession, who wrote in the early part of the third century, and Istrus, a somewhat later writer, whose *Collection of Atthides* contained the statements of all his predecessors from Hellanicus down, and was the chief

source from which later writers derived their information about Attic antiquities.

Other writers narrated the history of foreign lands. The most important among these were Berosus and Manetho. **Berosus and Manetho.** Berosus was a Babylonian, but wrote his *History of Babylonia* in Greek. He was a priest of Bel, and was living in Alexander's time. His history was, however, dedicated to Antiochus Soter, and was probably written about 280 B. C. It was in three books, beginning with the creation. Berosus was evidently acquainted with the ancient records of the Babylonians, and the fragments of his writings preserved to us are of considerable value. Manetho was an Egyptian priest at Heliopolis, who wrote a *History of Egypt* about 250 B. C., probably at the command of Ptolemy II. The work is lost, but the fragments of it preserved by later writers are the foundation of our knowledge of ancient Egyptian chronology.

Political biography is represented by a work on *The Demagogues of Athens*, by Idomeneus of Lampsacus, a pupil of Epicurus, written probably before 250 B. C. About the same time the Peripatetic philosopher Dicæarchus, who was especially noted as a geographer, attempted to give a general view of Greek civilization in his *Life of Greece*, and described life at Sparta in his treatise *On the Spartan Laws*.

History properly so called, the connected narrative of great events, was written by a great number of writers, whose works have perished and of whose lives and characters we know little or nothing. Some few names are worth remembering, because the works of this period were used by later writers, and have in this way served as the real source of our knowledge of this epoch.

Alexander's triumphal march to India opened new regions to the Greeks, and impressed their imagination with the wonderful power of the king who could make those distant lands his own. The history of Alexander was written

over and over again in the latter part of the fourth and the whole of the third century. Aristobulus, who had been with Alexander, Chares of Mytilene, Alexander's chamberlain, Onesicritus, who accompanied the expedition and was chief pilot of the fleet of Nearchus on its voyage from the Indus to the Euphrates, Clitarchus, Anaximenes of Lampsacus, Hegesias of Magnesia, and Callisthenes, the nephew of Aristotle, whom Alexander caused to be put to death, are only a few of the more important historians of Alexander. Of their works but few fragments remain, not enough as a rule to give us an idea of their personalities or literary styles.

After Alexander, the "Diadochi," or successors of Alexander, and Pyrrhus of Epirus, were popular subjects for historians. The best-known writer of this group is Hieronymus of Cardia, whose *History of the Diadochi* began with Alexander's funeral in 323 B. C., and was continued in his *History of the Epigoni* (including Pyrrhus) to the year 272. Other historians, such as Philinus and Sosylus, told the story of Italy down to the first Punic War.

The general history of Greece, including that of Sicily, was the subject of numerous works. Diyllus of Athens continued the history of Ephorus in his *History of Greece and Sicily*, in twenty-seven books, ending with the death of Cassander in 297 B. C. Demochares, pupil of Theophrastus and in his later life tyrant of Samos, wrote a general history beginning after the battle of Leuctra and continuing at least to 281 B. C. He also wrote a history of Samos, a life of Agathocles, tyrant of Syracuse, and treatises on literary and other subjects. Demochares, nephew of Demosthenes, wrote a history of Athens in his own times. Phylarchus, in the second half of the third century, wrote a history in twenty-eight books, continuing the work of Duris from 272 to 220 B. C.

But the most important historian of this period, until

we come to Polybius in the second century, was Timæus of Tauromenium, in Sicily. He lived from about 345 to about

250 B. C. His father, Andromachus, was the founder and ruler of Tauromenium. Timæus was driven from Tauromenium by Agathocles, and passed fifty years at Athens, after which he spent the last ten years of his life in Sicily, probably at Syracuse, where Hiero II was in power. His chief works were a *History of Sicily* and a *History of Pyrrhus*. The first, which began with the earliest times, and ended with the fall of Agathocles in 289 B. C., was continued by the second to the year 272. Timæus was a man of immense learning and wide reading. All that his predecessors had written was known to him, and he also made use of inscriptions and other official records. He was especially careful about chronology, and was the first to reduce all the dates of Greek history to one system, that of Olympiads, which was adopted by all his successors. He was, however, unacquainted with public affairs, nor did he travel to make himself familiar with historic sites, but derived his information entirely from written sources. His views were therefore sometimes incorrect. He seems to have known no moderation in praise or blame of the characters of whom he wrote, but he exalted some beyond measure and blamed others so severely as to draw down upon himself the censure of Polybius and others. This was in great measure due to his love of rhetoric, for he wrote in the "Asian" style, after the manner of Hegesias, and exaggerated praise and blame gave a good opportunity for exaggerated rhetorical ornament. His literary taste was evidently bad, and the fact that he was much admired shows how low the taste of the time had fallen. Nevertheless, his works contained a vast amount of information, some of which has come down to us through Diodorus and others.

Geography, as well as history, received a new impulse from the expedition of Alexander and the extension of Greek commerce. New regions were described, and the

descriptions included accounts of the inhabitants, their manners, customs, legends, and even past history. At the

Geography. same time regions already known were more carefully described than before. The progress of science led also to truer notions about the earth as a whole, to the determination of latitudes, and in general to what may be called the mathematical part of geography. Among writers of the geography of distant lands are Nearchus, an admiral of Alexander who described in his *Periplus* his voyage down the Indus and along the coast of the Indian Ocean to the mouth of the Euphrates; Megasthenes, who was sent several times to India by Seleucus Nicator and published the results of his observation in a work called *Indica*; and Pytheas of Marseilles, who sailed along the Atlantic coast from the Straits of Gibraltar to the British Islands, and wrote a book entitled *On the Ocean*. Others described more accurately regions already known. Timosthenes, an admiral of Ptolemy II (Philadelphus), wrote of the harbors of the Mediterranean, Dicæarchus published *Measurements of the Mountains of the Peloponnesus*, and in the first half of the second century B. C. Agatharchides of Cnidus compiled a great work in fifty-nine books *On Europe and Asia*. Nothing more than fragments remains of any of these works.

A special class, hardly to be called geographers, are the *Periegetæ*, or guides, who described and explained for travelers the objects of interest in important cities. The most

Periegetæ. distinguished of these was Polemo of Ilium, who traveled about in the first half of the
Polemo. third century and wrote numerous books, many, though not all, of which were guide-books. The most important perhaps were his book *On the Acropolis at Athens*, one *On the Sacred Road* from Athens to Eleusis, and one *On the Treasures at Delphi*. Later writers, like Plutarch and Pausanias, made use of his works, which are now lost.

One of the most learned men of the third century was

Eratosthenes of Cyrene. He was born about 275 B. C., studied in Cyrene, then under Callimachus at Alexandria, then at Athens under Ariston and Arcesilas.

Eratosthenes. About 235 he was called to Alexandria by Ptolemy III (Euergetes), where he became head of the Alexandrian Library at the death of Callimachus. He died about 195 B. C. His most important work was his *Geography*, in three books. He first reviewed the commonly accepted theories and showed that they were false, declaring among other things that facts concerning geography were not to be sought in the Homeric poems. In the second book he promulgated his own views, showed that the earth is spherical, studied latitudes and longitudes, tried to determine the circumference of the earth, which he thought was 250,000 stadia (about 31,250 miles), and discussed the relative positions of different countries and the reports of explorers. In the third book he gave a sketch of the political geography of his time. The whole work was accompanied by a map, and was undoubtedly the first scientific geography. Eratosthenes made mistakes, some of which were corrected by Hipparchus of Nicæa in the second century B. C., but his work was as a whole the greatest work on geography before modern times. He also wrote many other works. His *Chronography* has already been mentioned (page 371), and his other writings showed his ability as philosopher, grammarian, philologist, and even poet. He was without doubt one of the ablest and most learned men of his age.

The history of philosophy, literature, and art occupied a considerable number of writers. Aristotle had made it his practise in treating of any subject to begin by mentioning the works of his predecessors. His pupil Theophrastus wrote books on the Opinions of the Philosophers. Biographies of poets were written by Aristoxenus of Tarentum, a pupil of Theophrastus, who also composed various other works,

History of
philosophy,
literature,
and art.

including the *Elements of Harmony*, three books of which remain to us, and the *Elements of Rhythm*, of which we have some fragments. Heraclides of Pontus, a pupil of Plato and afterward of Aristotle, wrote on morals, physics, grammar, music, rhetoric, and history. Among these works were some on the history of philosophy and literature. Chameleon of Pontus, a contemporary of Heraclides, published many books on classical writers and their works. Antigonus of Carystus, who was born about 290 B. C., was called

Antigonus of Carystus. to Pergamum by King Attalus I (241-197 B. C.). He wrote, among other things, biographies of contemporary philosophers and a historical work on sculpture and painting. These important works are lost, and the only book preserved to us under his name is a rather ill-composed collection of mythological tales and strange natural phenomena. Sotion of Alexandria

Sotion. composed in the first half of the second century B. C. a work in thirteen books on the *Succession of Philosophers*, or the history of the philosophical schools and doctrines, from which we derive much information through Diogenes of Laerte.

Grammar and philology naturally interested the learned men of this period, who not only had great libraries at hand, but were obliged, as librarians, to care for the publication of correct texts and serviceable commentaries. The number of these writers is so great that only a few of the greater names can be mentioned. Zenodotus of Ephesus (about

Zenodotus. 325-260 B. C.) became the first librarian-in-chief of the Alexandrian Library about 285. His edition of the *Iliad and Odyssey* was the first critical edition founded upon methodical study and comparison of the different manuscripts. Callimachus of Cyrene, who succeeded

Callimachus. Zenodotus as librarian, is famous as a poet, but was also the author of many learned works, among them *Tables of those who Excelled in each Branch of Learning*

and of their Works, a vast work in one hundred and twenty books, in which the volumes in the library were catalogued and classified, and the life of each author was given, with a critical commentary on his works. Eratosthenes wrote *On the Old Comedy*. **Aristophanes of Byzantium** (about 262–185 B. C.) a pupil of Callimachus, became chief librarian at Alexandria at the age of sixty-two. He completed the *Tables* of Callimachus, wrote on grammar and literature, on the precise meanings of words, on proverbs, and other kindred subjects, and edited, with introductions and notes, a great number of authors, including Homer, Hesiod, the chief lyric, comic, and tragic poets, and Plato. He was a man of great learning and real ability.

Aristarchus of Samothrace (about 215–143) was a pupil of Aristophanes, and his successor as librarian. He is known chiefly for his editions of Homer, Hesiod, Alcæus, Pindar, and several tragedies of Æschylus. He also wrote a great number of commentaries on classical works. Of all the Alexandrian critics he is the best known. The scholia in the existing manuscripts of ancient authors are often derived from the learned notes of Aristarchus. **Crates of Mallus**, in Cilicia, was a contemporary of Aristarchus. He was called

to Pergamum by Attalus II, and became the most important representative of the Pergamene school of learning. He catalogued the books of the Pergamene Library, and published editions of Homer, Hesiod, and other poets. Aristarchus and Aristophanes explained many grammatical forms by *analogy*, or likeness, but Crates preferred to lay stress on *anomaly*, or contrast. He was also a Stoic philosopher, and seems to have been interested in mathematics and astronomy.

Mathematics and natural science made great progress in the Alexandrian period. **Euclid (Euclides)**, who lived at Alexandria under Ptolemy I, about 300 B. C., was a distinguished mathematician, whose *Elements of Geometry*, in

thirteen books, is the original of all subsequent text-books of geometry. Aristarchus of Samos (about 280 B. c.), was the first to declare that the earth moves round the sun. Archimedes of Syracuse (287-212 B. c.) was famous as an engineer, and by his inventions delayed the capture of the city by the Romans. When at last the city fell he lost his life. Several of his works on mathematics are preserved, and one on hydrostatics (*On Floating Bodies*) exists in a Latin translation. Apollonius of Perge, in Pamphylia, who lived at Alexandria and Pergamum about 200 B. c., was famous as a mathematician and astronomer, and other less important scientists were numerous.

In the third century two physicians, Herophilus of Chalcedon, and Erasistratus of Elis, established schools of medicine. The followers of Herophilus remained true to the doctrines of Hippocrates, while Erasistratus and his followers were innovators. Other physicians belonged to neither of these schools. They all seem to have pursued the study of anatomy zealously. Numerous works on various subjects of little literary interest, and often of no scientific value, swell the total of the technical literature of this period. Such are books on hunting, on stones, on farming, and the like.

Some of the historians of Alexander allowed their imagination free play in the description of far-off lands and strange peoples and events. Other writers of this epoch went still further, and composed romances with little or no historical truth. Hecataeus of Abdera. Euhemerus. Hecataeus of Teos, or Abdera, who lived at Alexandria about 300 B. c., wrote two romances under the guise of history, entitled *On the Hyperboreans* and *On Egypt*, in which he expressed his philosophic, religious, and moral fancies. Unfortunately, Diodorus regarded the book on Egypt as historical, and used it as a source for

information about the country. Euhemerus, of Messana, in Sicily, a contemporary of Hecataeus, wrote a book entitled *The Sacred Inscription*. He pretended to have read on an altar at Panara, the capital of Panchaia, an inscription recording the deeds of Uranus, Cronus, and Zeus, from which it was clear that they had once been men. He went on to develop his theory that all gods were once kings or great men. The book was full of all sorts of fantastic details, most of which were by no means necessary for the support of the theory. There were undoubtedly, even at this early time, romances composed merely to amuse the reader, but they have disappeared entirely.

To this period belong many of the works falsely ascribed to earlier writers, such as Orpheus, Hecataeus of Miletus, Phocylides, and the sibyls. Some of these show signs of **Imitations.** Jewish influence, and it is certain that Alexandria had a large Jewish population which **Jewish-Greek** spoke and wrote Greek. This is the time when **writings.** the Greek version of the Old Testament, the Septuagint, was written. In the first part of the second century a certain Aristobulus, living at Alexandria, wrote an *Explanation of the Law of Moses*, to prove to the pagans that their philosophy was of Hebrew origin.

CHAPTER XXXV

ALEXANDRIAN POETRY

Elegiac poetry—Philetas, about 340 to about 285 B. C.—His followers (Hermesianax, about 285 B. C., Phanocles, about 300 B. C., Alexander of Ætolia, about 275 B. C.)—Eratosthenes, born 276 B. C.—Parthenius, about 75 B. C.—Various lyrics—Asclepiades, about 300 B. C.—Simmias, about 280 B. C.—Posidippus, about 260 B. C.—Hedylus, about 260 B. C.—Anyte, about 260 B. C.—Leonidas of Tarentum, about 285 B. C.—The Anthology—Antipater of Sidon, about 120 B. C.—Dioscorides, about 230 B. C.—Alcæus of Messene, about 210 B. C.—Meleager, about 90 or 80 B. C.—Farces—Sotades, about 280 B. C.—Rhinthon, about 300 B. C.—Herodas, about 275 B. C.—Theocritus, about 300 to about 245 B. C.—His idylls—His style—Bion, about 260 B. C.—Moschus, about 175 B. C.—Callimachus, about 310 to about 240 B. C.—Aratus of Soli, about 315 to about 240 B. C.—Nicander, about 160 B. C.—Apollonius of Rhodes, about 295 to about 215 B. C.—Euphorion, 276–187 B. C.—Rhianus, about 240 B. C.—Lycophron, about 290 B. C.—Isyllus, about 280 B. C.—Delphic pæans, about 100 B. C.

THE somewhat dry enumeration of prose writers in the last chapter was necessary to give an idea of the great number of learned works produced in the Alexandrian period. Among the authors already mentioned some wrote poetry as well as prose, and even among those poets who were not also prose writers there was often as much learning as genuine poetic inspiration. Their poetry was written to be read, and to be read by the same educated public to which the prose literature was addressed. The New Comedy was written for the stage, but the comic poets were almost confined to Athens; other forms of poetry were now seldom employed in public

Alexandrian
poetry.

festivals. A natural result was that the elaborate odes and dithyrambs, like those of Pindar or Bacchylides, which depended for their effect in great measure upon music and dancing, were no longer cultivated, but poetry was confined chiefly to elegies, short epics, epigrams, idylls, and mimes.

Nor did the individual poets now confine their production to one or two kinds of poetry. The metres employed were generally simple, and each poet could write indifferently in all the different classes of poetry. Nevertheless, each poet owes his reputation as a rule to one kind of poetry, and a classification by the kind of composition will therefore be advisable, even though it may lead to some confusion of chronology.

Elegiac poetry, which had in earlier times been employed for the expression of martial and patriotic sentiments, was in Alexandrian times almost exclusively devoted to love; indeed, love poems of various kinds were much in vogue.

Elegiac poetry. The earliest poet of amorous elegiacs was Philetas of Cos. He was born about 340 B. C., and **Philetas.** was called to Alexandria by Ptolemy I (Soter)

to be the tutor of his son. After some years at Alexandria he returned to Cos. He wrote several learned treatises, for he was a grammarian as well as a poet; love poems in elegiac verse addressed to his mistress Bittis; two collections of short poems, probably in great part epigrams; and two longer poems, one in elegiac verse entitled *Demeter*, and one in hexameters, entitled *Hermes*. He owed his great fame for the most part to his amorous elegies, in which he embodied much mythological lore along with his

Hermesianax.

Phanocles.

Alexander.

Eratosthenes.

Parthenius.

expressions of sentiment. Very little of his poems remains. He seems to have expressed delicate sentiment in exquisitely finished verse. **Theocritus** speaks of him with admiration, and

the Roman Propertius regards him as a great master of elegiac poetry. His chief pupils and imitators were Hermesianax of Colophon, Phanocles, and Alexander

of Ætolia. Somewhat later Eratosthenes wrote a mythological elegiac poem, *Erigone*, and in the early part of the first century B. C. Parthenius of Nicæa wrote mythological elegies. These are lost, but a prose work by Parthenius, *The Sufferings of Love*, is preserved—a series of legendary love stories, usually ending with the death or metamorphosis of the chief characters.

The religious poetry of this period had been almost entirely lost, though several poets to whom hymns were ascribed were known by name, until some poems engraved on stone were found in the later years of the nineteenth century. The first of these, found at Epidaurus, is by Isyllus, who flourished about 280 B. C. His poem consists in part of trochaic tetrameters, in part of dactylic hexameters, and contains also a pæan to Apollo and Asclepius in more complicated Ionic metre, in which the story of the birth of Asclepius is narrated. The simpler parts of the poem tell how the poet caused a procession to be conducted and prayers offered to Apollo and Asclepius. The poem has little literary merit, but is interesting as a specimen of the art of an otherwise unknown Epidaurian poet and also because it contains a complete pæan, a kind of poem otherwise little known. Two other pæans, one of which is nearly complete and both of which have the musical notation written above the words, were found at Delphi. They celebrate the deeds of

Delphic
pæans.

Apollo. Both were written not far from 100 B. C. The author of the less complete of the two is named Aristonous. These poems show

that there must have been a considerable number of hymns in honor of the gods composed in the Alexandrian period, but they give us no very high conception of their literary quality.

Asclepiades of Samos, a contemporary of Philetas, wrote poems of various kinds, especially lyrics, which were probably love-songs in imitation of Alcæus and Sappho. The

greater and lesser Asclepiadean stanzas, which Horace used, derived their name from him, though he did not invent, but merely perfected them. He was especially

Asclepiades.
Epigrams.

noted for his epigrams, and the eighteen specimens preserved under his name in the *Palatine Anthology* show that he deserved his reputation. Less

distinguished epigrammatists are Simmias, Posidippus, and

Simmias.
Posidippus.
Hedylus.
Anyte.
Leonidas.

Hedylus, several of whose epigrams are preserved in the *Anthology*. Several women also

wrote epigrams, among whom Anyte of Tegea, in Arcadia, may be mentioned. Leonidas of

Tarentum, younger than Philetas, but still be-

longing to the first half of the third century B. C., was a wandering beggar, whom the Muses loved and who consoled himself by writing epigrams and dreaming of his future fame.

About one hundred of his epigrams are preserved. They belong to all classes: epitaphs, inscriptions on statues, sacred offerings, and portraits of poets or artists, as well as expressions of philosophical and moral sentiments.

Epigrams were popular among the poets throughout the Alexandrian period, and even later. Some forty poets

The An-
thology.

of epigrams are known by name and by specimens of their poems. They have as a rule a

pretty talent for versification, but lack originality. The best known among them are Dioscorides,

Meleager.

Alcæus of Messene, Antipater of Sidon, and above all Meleager of Gadara in Syria. Meleager flourished

in the early part of the first century B. C. and became a Cynic like his fellow citizen Menippus (see page 362), whom he imitated in some satiric writings. He was also the author of a work on the *Opinions of Philosophers*;

but his reputation rests upon his epigrams, which, though not always in perfectly good taste, are frequently charming in their delicacy and simplicity. An example of his sentiment is the following: ¹

¹ *Anthologia Palatina*, xii, 53. Translated by Andrew Lang.

O gentle ships that skim the seas,
 And cleave the strait where Helle fell,
 Catch in your sails the northern breeze,
 And speed to Cos where she doth dwell,
 My love, and see you greet her well !
 And if she looks across the blue,
 Speak, gentle ships, and tell her true—
 "He comes, for love hath brought him back,
 No sailor, on the landward tack."

If thus, O gentle ships, ye do,
 Then may ye win the fairest gales,
 And swifter speed across the blue,
 While Zeus breathes friendly on your sails.

Meleager collected and published, along with his own epigrams, a selection of short poems by about forty Greek poets, from the seventh century to his own time. This collection, which he called the *Garland*, was very popular, and the example set by Meleager was followed by later collectors. It is thus due to him that many short poems have escaped destruction, being preserved in anthologies, the best known and most important of which is the *Anthologia Palatina*.

The elegies and epigrams were delicate, exquisitely finished, sentimental verses. Alongside of these other poems were composed characterized by accurate observation of life, satirical wit and humor, and often gross indecency. They were evidently literary imitations of the rude farces and mocking verses of the people.

Sotades. of Maronea, in Crete, lived under the first Ptolemies and wrote satires full of personalities and indecency. In one of these he attacked Ptolemy II (Philadelphus), who caused him to be sewed in a sack and drowned. About the same time Rhinthon of Tarentum imitated in writing the popular farces of the Greeks of lower Italy. Of the works of Sotades and Rhinthon little remains, but a papyrus manuscript discovered in Egypt

and first published in 1891 shows how the mime, which had been popular in Syracuse in the fifth century B. C. (see page 249, Sophron), was revived by Herodas (or Herondas).

Herodas. This writer, whose birthplace is unknown, probably flourished in the first part of the third century. Of his mimes seven and fragments of an eighth are extant, written in choliambic verse and Ionic dialect. From these we learn what a Greek mime was—a satiric dialogue, portraying contemporary customs and foibles. One of them depicts a visit of some ladies to a shoe-shop. It begins :

“Cerdo, I’m bringing these friends of mine to you to see if you have any good work worthy of your skill to show.” “Not in vain, Metro, thank you. Won’t you bring out a table for these ladies, Drimylus? Oh, I say, are you asleep again? Pistus, hit him over the snout till he gets all the sleep knocked out of him.”

The ladies presently sit down, the shoemaker shows his wares, and they chaffer with each other until finally a sale is made and the ladies go away amid the thanks of the shoemaker, whom we can almost see bowing them politely from his door. The other mimes are equally lively presentations of talks between friends or acquaintances, for the most part women. They are occasionally rather indecent, but are undeniably clever, showing accurate observation and a keen sense of humor.

A fragment of papyrus found in Egypt and first published in 1896¹ contains part of what may have been a mime. Only about thirty lines are well preserved, written in verse similar to that of the choral parts in tragedies, especially those of Euripides. A woman deserted by her lover is speaking, and her words disclose real passion and tenderness, as well as jealousy of her rival. Apparently the words were to be

The Grenfell papyrus.

¹Grenfell, *An Alexandrian Erotic Fragment and other Greek Papyri chiefly Ptolemaic*, Oxford, 1896.

accompanied by some action, as the woman seems to come to the house where her faithless lover is feasting and speak to him in the last lines. The date of the composition is probably the third or early second century B. C. The name of the author is unknown, but he was evidently a writer of more than ordinary literary skill and delicacy of feeling, who employed the language of common life, and treated his subject with great realism.

The delicacy, sentiment, and finished workmanship of elegies and epigrams are joined with the realism of the satiric verses and mimes in the works of Theocritus. We have, besides some epigrams, thirty poems under his name, five of which are spurious, which are called "idylls." The Greek word from which "idyll" is derived means simply "little picture," or "small descriptive poem," but is applied especially to pastoral poems because of the importance of such poems among the idylls of Theocritus.

His idylls are, however, by no means all pastoral, nor are they all alike in composition. There are among them love-songs, mimes almost in the manner of Herodas, pastoral poems partly in dialogue, like mimes, but including songs as well, and short epics on mythological subjects. The poems are written for the most part in hexameters and elegiacs and in the Doric dialect of Sicily; but Theocritus sometimes uses the Ionic dialect when the style of the poem demands it.

Of the life of Theocritus little is known. He was born, probably at Syracuse, a little before 300 B. C. His parents were Praxagoras and Philinna. It was probably while he was still a young man that he spent some time at Cos, where he came under the influence of Philetas and knew Asclepiades of Samos, Aratus, and the physician Nicias of Miletus. He was also for a time at the court of Ptolemy II (Philadelphus) at Alexandria; but whether he remained there until his death or

**Life of
Theocritus.**

returned to Sicily is unknown, though it is not improbable that he was attracted to the court of Hiero II at his native Syracuse. His poetry certainly breathes for the most part the fresh, clear air of the Sicilian hillsides, not the atmosphere of the Alexandrian court. The date of his death is uncertain—perhaps about 245 B. C.

Of all the Alexandrian poets Theocritus is the most original. While others imitated the works of earlier times or portrayed with realistic accuracy the manners and customs of those about them, Theocritus appealed to nature for his inspiration.

Pastoral
idylls.

In reading his pastorals we seem to feel the soft Sicilian breeze and the warm Sicilian sun, to see about us the verdure-clad hills, and to take part in the happy life of the rustic shepherds. The love of nature is evident in Greek literature from the beginning to the end; but nowhere does it appear so clearly as in Theocritus, and nowhere is it more delightful. Whatever interest attaches to his other idylls, the pastoral poems are his greatest works. In these he is still unsurpassed, though Virgil and a host of lesser imitators have tried to rival him.

The style of Theocritus defies translation and baffles description. It is polished with all the fineness of Alexandrian culture, and at the same time simple

Style of
Theocritus.

and unaffected; it is highly artificial, as the style of a court poet who writes of rustic shepherds can not fail to be, yet full of natural grace and charm. Mythological allusions abound in Theocritus; but they do not seem to be there to show the poet's learning, but rather because the Greek mind turns to mythology as the natural form for its poetic fancies. With all the learning which he evidently possesses, Theocritus is still able to retain his personality and natural qualities. He has, too, great dramatic ability, and presents the persons of his dialogues with the most perfect realism. The Syracusan women at the festival at Alexandria in the fifteenth idyll

are as natural and as free from conventional features as the characters in the mimes of Herodas. In fact, the fifteenth idyll, as well as several of the others, is really a mime.

The scene of the fifteenth idyll is laid at Alexandria. Two Syracusan women staying at Alexandria agreed to go at the feast of Adonis to the palace of King Ptolemy Philadelphus, to see the image of Adonis, which Queen Arsinoë had decorated with great magnificence, and to hear a hymn which was to be recited before the image by a celebrated performer. Gorgo, one of the women, goes by appointment to the house of her friend Praxinoë, where the dialogue begins: ¹

Gorgo. Is Praxinoë at home ?

Praxinoë. My dear Gorgo, at last ! Yes, here I am. Eunoë, find a chair—get a cushion for it.

Gorgo. It will do beautifully as it is.

Praxinoë. Do sit down.

Gorgo. Oh, this gad-about spirit ! I could hardly get to you, Praxinoë, through all the crowd and all the carriages. Nothing but heavy boots, nothing but men in uniform. And what a journey it is ! My dear child, you really live too far off.

Praxinoë. It is all that insane husband of mine. He has chosen to come out here to the end of the world and take a hole of a place—for a house it is not—on purpose that you and I might not be neighbors. He is always just the same; anything to quarrel with one ! anything for spite !

Gorgo. My dear, don't talk so of your husband before the little fellow. Just see how astonished he looks at you. Never mind, Zopyrio, my pet, she is not talking about papa.

Praxinoë. Good heavens ! The child does really understand.

Gorgo. Pretty papa !

Praxinoë. That pretty papa of his the other day (though I told him beforehand to mind what he was about), when I sent him to a shop to buy soap and rouge, brought me home salt instead; stupid, great, big, interminable animal !

¹ Translation by Matthew Arnold, in his essay on *Pagan and Mediæval Religious Sentiment*.

Gorgo. Mine is just the fellow to him. . . . But never mind now, get on your things and let us be off to the palace to see the Adonis. I hear the queen's decorations are something splendid.

After a few more words and a series of orders given by Praxinoë to her maid, the two friends, with their maids, set out. They find the streets filled with a moving, pushing crowd. After much effort, and some animated conversation with an old woman and two men, they reach the palace and are swept in with the crowd. They admire the decorations, and then become silent to listen to the hymn, which begins as follows :

Mistress, who loveth the haunts of Golgi, and Idalium, and high-peaked Eryx, Aphrodite that playeth with gold ! how have the delicate-footed Hours, after twelve months, brought thy Adonis back to thee from the ever-flowing Acheron ! Tardiest of the immortals are the boon Hours, but all mankind wait their approach with longing, for they ever bring something with them. O Cypris, Dione's child ! thou didst change—so is the story among men—Berenice from mortal to immortal, by dropping ambrosia into her fair bosom ; and in gratitude to thee for this, O thou of many names and many temples ! Berenice's daughter, Arsinoë, lovely Helen's living counterpart, makes much of Adonis with all kinds of braveries.

The gifts to Adonis are then enumerated, and the hymn proceeds :

Now Cypris, good-night, we leave thee with thy bridegroom ; but to-morrow morning, with the earliest dew, we will one and all bear him forth to where the waves splash upon the sea-strand, and letting loose our locks, and letting fall our robes, with bosoms bare, we will set up this, our melodious strain :—

Beloved Adonis, alone of the demigods (so men say) thou art permitted to visit both us and Acheron ! This lot had neither Agamemnon, nor the mighty moon-struck hero Ajax, nor Hector the first-born of Hecuba's twenty children, nor Patroclus, nor Pyrrhus who came home from Troy, nor those yet earlier Lapithæ and the sons of Deucalion, nor the Pelasgians, the root of Argos and of Pelops' isle. Be gracious to us now, loved Adonis, and be favor-

able to us for the year to come! Dear to us hast thou been at this coming, dear to us shalt thou be when thou comest again.

After the hymn Gorgo praises the luck of the woman who has such a voice, then hurries to go home to prepare dinner for her cross husband, turning at last to say "Adieu, precious Adonis, and may you find us all well when you come next year!"

The liveliness of the dialogue in this idyll is unsurpassed; and the hymn, beautiful in itself, is interesting as a specimen of the hymns written and sung at Alexandria.

The first
idyll.

Of all the idylls the first is the most charming.

The characters are Thyrsis and a goatherd. Thyrsis begins:¹

Sweet are the whispers of yon pine that makes
Low music o'er the spring, and, goatherd, sweet
Thy piping; second thou to Pan alone.
Is his the hornéd ram? then thine the goat.
Is his the goat? to thee shall fall the kid;
And toothsome is the flesh of un milked kids.

The goatherd replies, praising the songs of the shepherd Thyrsis. Thyrsis asks him to play on his pipe, but he refuses, saying he dares not pipe at noon for fear of Pan. In his turn he asks Thyrsis to sing him the song of Daphnis' woes, promising him as a reward a goat with two kids and a carven bowl, which he describes in great detail. Then Thyrsis sings:

Begin, sweet maids, begin the woodland song.
The voice of Thyrsis, Ætna's Thyrsis, I.
Where were ye, Nymphs, oh where, when Daphnis pined?
In fair Peneüs' or in Pindus' glens?
For great Anapus' stream was not your haunt,
Nor Ætna's cliff, nor Acis' sacred rill.

Begin, sweet maids, begin the woodland song.
O'er him the wolves, the jackals howled o'er him;
The lion in the oak-copse mourned his death.

¹ Calverley's translation.

Begin, sweet maids, begin the woodland song.
 The kine and oxen stood around his feet,
 The heifers and the calves wailed all for him.

Begin, sweet maids, begin the woodland song.
 First from the mountains Hermes came, and said,
 "Daphnis, who frets thee? Lad, whom lov'st thou so?"
 Begin, sweet maids, begin the woodland song.

Then come the herdsmen, the god Priapus, and Aphrodite. Daphnis curses her for causing his woe, then bids farewell to beasts and hill and stream, and last of all to Pan. Then the refrain changes:

Forget, sweet maids, forget your woodland song.
 "Come, king of song, o'er this my pipe, compact
 With wax and honey-breathing, arch thy lip:
 For surely am I torn from life by love."

Forget, sweet maids, forget your woodland song.
 "From thicket now and thorn let violets spring,
 Now let white lilies drape the juniper,
 And pines grow figs, and nature all go wrong;
 For Daphnis dies. Let deer pursue the hounds,
 And mountain owls outsing the nightingale."

Forget, sweet maids, forget your woodland song.
 So spake he, and he never spake again.
 Fair Aphrodite would have raised his head;
 But all his thread was spun. So down the stream
 Went Daphnis: closed the waters o'er a head
 Dear to the Nine, of Nymphs not unbeloved.

Forget, sweet maids, forget your woodland strain.

After a few words of compliment and farewell, Thyrsis and the goatherd separate.

Other idylls of Theocritus are as interesting as the first, but none so beautiful.

The two chief imitators of Theocritus, aside from the unknown authors of the poems falsely ascribed to Theocritus himself, are Bion and Moschus. Bion of Smyrna was a contemporary of Theocritus. He seems to have lived at Syracuse and to have

died of poison. Seventeen poems, some of them fragmentary, are preserved under his name. The most important of these is the *Lament for Adonis*, modeled upon the song at the end of the fifteenth idyll of Theocritus, with some features of the lament for Daphnis in the first idyll. Bion seems in general to have been a skillful and pleasing poet, chiefly of love-poems. Moschus of Syracuse was a friend of Aristarchus, and lived therefore in the first half of the second century B. C. His most celebrated poem (which some scholars declare is not his at all) is a *Lament for Bion*, a close imitation of Bion's *Lament for Adonis*. His other poems (seven idylls and three epigrams) stand in no close relation to the idylls of Theocritus. The longest of them are the *Europa* and the *Megara*, the first of which is an account of the carrying off of Europa by Zeus in the form of a bull, the second a conversation between Megara, the wife of Heracles, and his mother Alcmene. The poems of Bion and Moschus are pleasing, but by no means great. Of the two, Bion is the better poet.

—Theocritus is a poet of real feeling and natural grace, though living in an age of artificiality. But there were

Learned
poetry.

other poets of great reputation who lacked these qualities and produced poems deficient in passion and inspiration, learned and finished, sometimes even stilted, rather than natural or graceful. The chief of these are Callimachus, Aratus, Apollonius of Rhodes, and Lycophron.

Callimachus of Cyrene, the son of Battus and Mesatma, was born not far from 310 B. C. He studied at first at Cyrene, then at Athens, and was for a time a schoolmaster in a suburb of Alexandria, called Eleusis. At the death of Zenodotus he was made librarian, and remained in charge of the library until his death, about 240 B. C. He was the great scholar and literary authority of his times, admired and venerated by a numerous circle of followers. Apollonius dared to disagree with him, main-

taining that long epics in the manner of Homer were still to be desired, while Callimachus taught that shorter poems were more desirable and that "a great book is a great evil." As a result of this literary quarrel, in which both parties descended to personalities, Apollonius was at last forced to withdraw to Rhodes. The learned prose works of Callimachus were probably in his own day considered more important than his poems, but their importance to us is considerably less. Some of them have already been mentioned (see page 377). His poetic works were of all kinds: tragedies, comedies, satyr dramas, various lyric poems, elegies, epigrams, and one epic, the *Hecale*. The longest of his poems was a collection of elegies entitled *Causes* or *Origins*, in which the origins of various families, religious rites, cities, and customs were explained. This work enjoyed a great reputation, but has been almost entirely lost. We now possess six hymns, seventy-three epigrams, some of them of great beauty, and some fragments of the *Hecale*, in addition to the Latin translation by Catullus of a poem entitled *The Lock of Berenice*.

Five hymns are addressed to Zeus, Apollo, Artemis, Delos, Demeter, and one is "On the Bath of Pallas." All are in hexameters except the last, which is in elegiacs. The first four are in Ionic, the last two in Doric dialect. The verse is written with the greatest care and perfection, and there is no confusion of thought. The words employed are sometimes intentionally obscure, but that is because Callimachus shows his learning by using obsolete or rare words, not because his vocabulary is deficient. Many myths are mentioned that have no immediate connection with the matter in hand, and this gives Callimachus an opportunity to show his learning in another field. That he writes his hymns with no real religious feeling is plain from the care he takes to compare the gods with his master Ptolemy Philadelphus, and to bring in references to political events, and even to his quarrel with Apollonius. The *Lock of*

Berenice is a clever piece of court flattery. Queen Berenice, when her husband departed for a war, consecrated a lock of hair to Aphrodite. The lock disappeared from the temple, and the astronomer Conon, happening just at that time to discover a new constellation, declared that Berenice's hair had been set among the stars. Callimachus represents the lock of hair wishing it had not been severed from Berenice's head. The *Hecale* was a short epic telling how an old woman named Hecale entertained Theseus at her house. The adventures of Theseus are woven into the story, which was written to show Apollonius what a modern epic ought to be. So much of the poetry of Callimachus is lost that our judgment of him may not be perfectly just. He was immensely admired by his contemporaries and by the Romans of the Augustan age, though there were some critics who denied his greatness. On the whole he seems to have lacked the inspiration of genius, but to have had great ability in versification and great versatility. He neither rose to the greatest heights of poetry nor fell below the level of good literary production.

Aratus, the chief of Alexandrian didactic poets, was born at Soli, in Cilicia, about 315 B. C., and died at Pella, in Macedonia, not long before 240 B. C. His father, Athenodorus, was a distinguished citizen, and Aratus received a good education at Soli, at Cos, where he knew Philetas and his circle, and at Athens, where he studied under the Peripatetic Praxiphanes before passing over to Zeno and the Stoic School. About 276 he accepted an invitation to the court of Antigonus Gonatas at Pella, whence he went to the court of Antiochus I in 274. He afterward returned to Pella, where he died. He was a friend of many of the important literary men of his age, including Theocritus, Callimachus, and Alexander of Ætolia, and his own works were numerous and various. His chief work, the one to which he owes his reputation, bears the title

**Didactic
poetry.**

Aratus.

Phænomena. It is a handbook of astronomy in 1154 hexameter verses, based upon the prose treatises of Eudoxus of Cnidus, a contemporary of Plato. The greater part (lines 1-732) describes the chief stars and constellations, and tells the myths connected with them. The rest (lines 733-1154) treats of the signs by which the weather may be foretold. The verses are smooth, though filled with Homeric phrases. There is a lack of poetic fire, which is natural, when the subject of the poem is considered, but the description is clear and simple. The myths connected with the stars were by no means all invented by Aratus, but he is the first who systematically assigned great numbers of demigods each to a particular star or constellation. His work was popular throughout antiquity, was frequently edited, was translated into Latin by Cicero and others, and continued to be read until the seventh century after Christ. Of his other works we know comparatively little. The learned

Eratosthenes.
Nicander.

Eratosthenes (see page 376) wrote an astronomical poem called *Hermes*, and in the middle of the second century B. C. Nicander of Colo-

phon wrote a number of more or less scientific works, among them two didactic poems on the bites of animals and cures for poisons. He was regarded as the greatest of Alexandrian didactic poets after Aratus.

Callimachus maintained that the day for long epic poems was passed, that the writing of such poems could be nothing but profitless imitation of Homer.

Apollonius of Rhodes.

The chief opponent of this view was Apollonius of Rhodes, who was born at Alexandria

(or at Naucratis), but is called "the Rhodian," because he lived at Rhodes after his quarrel with Callimachus. Whether he was really a pupil of Callimachus is somewhat doubtful. It is also uncertain whether he returned to Alexandria and was made head of the library after the death of Eratosthenes. His life extended from about 295 to about 215 B. C. He wrote a number of learned works,

but was better known as a poet than as a scholar, and his most famous work, the *Argonautica*, an epic poem in four books, is preserved to us entire.

The *Argonautica* tells the story of the expedition of Jason and his companions to Colchis in quest of the golden fleece. The first two books contain the narrative of the assembling of the Argonauts and their voyage to Colchis; the third and fourth describe the seizure of the golden fleece by the aid of Medea, and the return to Argos. The whole is enlivened and enriched by the insertion of many episodes and combats. The choice of subject was a happy one, for the story is interesting, and had not been treated by a great epic poet. Apollonius was ambitious to be the Homer of his time, to write a long epic after the model of the *Iliad* or the *Odyssey*, but at the same time to appeal to the taste of the period. In this he was eminently successful. He imitated the *Iliad*, and still more the *Odyssey*, in his narrative of adventures and combats, his catalogue of heroes, and his frequent dramatic introduction of dialogue. His love for the marvelous is a common Alexandrian trait, but the *Odyssey* also contains many marvelous tales; this element may therefore be the result of imitation as well as of originality. But Apollonius shows real originality in his psychological analysis, his elaborate description of the progress of passion and emotion in the human heart. This is most clearly seen in the account of Medea's love for Jason, her hesitation and mental torment in the third book. Her love is brought about in true Alexandrian fashion by an arrow of the god Eros, who is sent to Colchis for the purpose by his mother, Aphrodite, but the growth and progress of her passion is portrayed with such realism and human feeling that we forget its conventional mythological origin. It is from this book that Virgil derives his description of the love of Dido in the *Æneid*. A translation of a few lines may give some idea

The Argonau-
tica.

of the vivid imagination and descriptive power of Apollonius:

Then night spread her shadows o'er the earth; and on the sea the sailors from their ships gazed on Helice and the stars of Orion; and wayfarer and watchman at the gate longed now for sleep; and slumber wrapped even the mother by her children dead; no barking of the dogs was any more heard in the town, nor sound of voices; silence held the darkling shades. But to Medea sweet sleep did not come. . . . And many things her heart within her breast suggested; and as a beam of sunlight in a house quivers reflected from water newly poured into a caldron or basin, and with quick turning flashes here and there, so quivered in the maiden's breast her heart. . . . And now she planned to give him the drugs to sooth the bulls, now not to give them; then to die herself; then not to die herself nor give the drugs, but quietly to bear her wretched fate. Then she sat up and pondered, and cried out: "O wretched me! now whither shall I turn in troubles; in all ways my mind is at a loss; and for my pain there is no cure; it burns unceasingly. Would that I had died by Artemis' swift arrows ere I saw him!"¹

At last her decision is reached and she exclaims:

"Farewell, modesty; farewell, glory of my life! Let him be saved uninjured by my aid, then let him go where his heart bids him."

In most of his work Apollonius is little more than a skillful and learned imitator of Homer, but in his description of human passion he rises to heights which few poets have reached.

Of the other epic poets few require any mention. Euphorion of Chalcis in Eubœa, born in 276 B. C., was librarian of Antiochus the Great from 224 to 187. He wrote a number of mythological epics in an obscure style, overloaded with rare words and uncommon expressions. His poems were, however, read and to some extent imitated by several Roman poets, including Propertius and Ovid. Rhianus of Crete

Euphorion.
Rhianus.

¹ *Argonautica*, iii, 743 ff.

was a philologist and poet who wrote in the second half of the third century. He made an edition of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, and wrote a number of epics, the best known of which is the *Messeniacæ*, containing stories from the history of Messenia. From this source Pausanias, in the second century after Christ, derived much of what he tells about Messenian history.

Callimachus and others used their poetry as a means of showing their learning both in the matter of mythology and in the selection of unusual words and phrases. The same tendency, carried to its uttermost limit, is seen in the *Alexandra* of Lycophron. **Lycophron.** This learned poet was born at Chalcis in Eubœa about 325 B. C. He was the son of Socles and adopted son of Lycus of Rhegium. His life was spent at Chalcis, Athens, and Alexandria. His works were for the most part tragedies on various subjects from the earliest tales of the heroes to the most recent history. He also, when employed in the Alexandrian Library, wrote a prose treatise, *On Comedy*. But his only extant work is the *Alexandra*, in fourteen hundred and seventy-four iambic trimeters. It has the form of a messenger's report in a tragedy. A slave, apparently, reports to Priam the obscure prophecies of his inspired daughter Alexandra, ordinarily called Cassandra. These prophecies extend down to the Alexandrian epoch. They are almost unintelligible, for Lycophron evidently prided himself upon his ability to write incomprehensible verse. To this fact is due the reputation of the poem, for it became a favorite subject of philological and literary criticism and interpretation. The versification is skillful, but the poem is so artificial and obscure as to be almost without interest except as an example of the faults of Alexandrianism.

CHAPTER XXXVI

THE TRANSITION TO THE ROMAN PERIOD

Polybius, about 210 to about 120 B. C.—His works—His qualities as an historian—His style and composition—Later historians—Apollodorus, about 150 B. C.—Alexander Polyhistor, about 105 to after 40 B. C.—Grammarians—Dionysius Thrax, about 125 B. C.—Didymus of Alexandria, about 30 B. C.—Philosophers—Panætius, about 185 to about 110 B. C.—Hecato, about 120 B. C.—Posidonius, about 135 to about 51 B. C.

THE latter part of the Alexandrian period was the time when Rome, already mistress of Italy, was extending her power to Greece, which became a Roman province in 146 B. C., and to the eastern regions of the Hellenic world. Attalus III bequeathed his kingdom of Pergamum to the Roman senate in 133 B. C.; and finally, in 31 B. C., Egypt became a Roman province, and the whole civilized world was Roman. These great changes had their influence upon literature—an influence which began even before the year 146 and continued without interruption after that date. No fixed line separates the Alexandrian from the Roman period of Greek literature; but the time from about the middle of the second century to the conquest of Egypt is a time of transition in which some writers are really Alexandrian, while others belong rather to the following period. The most important writer of this transitional period is the historian Polybius—the greatest of Greek historians, with the possible exception of Thucydides.

Polybius was born at Megalopolis, in Arcadia, about 210

B. C. His father, Lycortas, was a friend of Philopœmen, and succeeded him as general of the Achæan League in 183. To Polybius was given the honor of escorting the ashes of the dead Philopœmen to their last

Polybius. resting-place at his native Megalopolis. In 190
His life. and 189 B. C. he had taken part in the campaign

of King Eumenes of Pergamum against the Galatians in Asia Minor. In 181 he was chosen to accompany his father

on an embassy to Alexandria. During the struggle of Macedonia against Rome (171-168) Polybius favored neutrality,

though he inclined toward Rome as early as 169, when he was hipparch in the army of the Achæan League. After

the defeat of Perseus, King of Macedonia, Polybius was one of the thousand noble Achæans sent to Rome as hostages

in 167. Here he was filled with admiration for the Romans, their government, their energy, and their power, and hence-

forth he was a firm supporter of the Roman rule. He was intimate with the family of Æmilius Paulus, especially with

his sons Fabius and Scipio, and obtained permission to live at Rome instead of being quartered in some obscure Italian

town, as were most of his fellow hostages. He was even allowed to accompany his friend Scipio on his journeys,

and to undertake some journeys of his own to visit scenes of historic interest. In 150 B. C. he was allowed to return

home with the other hostages, but visited Rome at least twice after that time. He was with Scipio at the fall of Carthage

in 146. In the somewhat complicated negotiations between Rome and the various cities of Greece he was the agent,

official or confidential, sometimes of one and sometimes of the other party, and many cities showed their gratitude by

setting up his statue in the market-place. He died at Megalopolis at the age of eighty-two—not far, therefore,

from 120 B. C.—as the result of a fall from his horse.

The chief work of Polybius was his *History* in forty books. He also wrote a separate work on *Philopœmen* and some *Commentaries on Military Tactics*. The other works

ascribed to him are probably parts of his *History*. In this great work he told the history of the world in the seventy-five years from the beginning of the second Punic War to

the fall of Corinth (221–146 B. C.). The first two books form the introduction, and contain the history of Rome and Carthage from 266 to 221 B. C. The remainder is the history of the rise and development of the rule of Rome over the civilized world. Of the entire work only a relatively small part is preserved. The first five books exist entire, carrying the narrative to the battle of Cannæ; long extracts from the next thirteen books are preserved, but of the last twenty-two we have only fragments varying in length and importance.

Polybius, like Ephorus, undertook to write a history of the known world, but, unlike Ephorus, he grouped his narrative about a central idea, the greatness and growth of Rome. Polybius sees in the course of history one line of progress, toward a universal Roman Empire. Like Timæus,

he uses the books of earlier writers, and searches out the truth in archives and inscriptions, but he is not content with the knowledge derived from written sources. He was himself a statesman and a man of affairs, and he appreciated fully the importance to the historian of a first-hand knowledge of military actions, public men, topography, and geography. He was a great traveler at different times of his life, and knew by personal observation most of the lands and places where the events narrated in his history took place. Several books of his work were devoted in whole or in great part to geography.

Like Thucydides, Polybius intended his history to be not a mere delight to the ear, but a work of permanent value. He believes that events follow each other in sequence of cause and effect, and his main purpose is to find the causes of events, that his readers may learn what to avoid and what to desire. But while Thucydides lets the events speak for themselves, keeping himself carefully in the background,

Polybius constantly brings himself and his opinions before the reader. His interest is entirely in the political and military side of history, with no care for what is now called social science. He does not believe that the gods influence human affairs except in the form of chance or fortune, and he thinks the wise man should so act as to leave to chance as small a share in the progress of events as possible. He accepts to a great extent the philosophical doctrines of the Stoics, perhaps because he was influenced by the Stoic Panætius, whom he knew in Rome, but he does not accept them in their entirety. He is too much a practical man to govern himself by any philosophical theory. And it is especially the practical side of his history on which he prides himself. His work is to be "pragmatic," that is, devoted to the accurate study and exposition of the things which form the subject-matter of history, politics, and war; and these things are to be so studied as to be useful.

The style of Polybius is clear, but somewhat prolix; he cares little for literary elegance, except in the one point of avoiding hiatus; his tone is always serious, because seriousness befits the dignity of his purpose. There are few traces of imagination and hardly a gleam of humor. Polybius narrates without dramatic power, and interrupts his narrative by disquisitions and discussions conducted without variety or imagination. He is far from being a literary artist, but as an historian he occupies a position of honor because of his industrious search for information, his love of truth, his remarkable impartiality, his personal acquaintance with affairs, and his unusual breadth of view.

The historians who follow Polybius merit little attention. They had not his power, and their works are lost. Apollodorus of Athens, who lived at Pergamum under Attalus II, wrote a metrical *Chronicle* (*Chronica*), giving the sequence of events from the Trojan War to the year 144 B. C. He was also the author of several other works, including a

treatise *On the Gods*, and has been wrongly regarded as the author of a mythological handbook bearing his name, which was really composed some centuries later. **Later historians.** Alexander of Miletus, called Polyhistor, was a prisoner of war at Rome under Sulla, and released by Lentulus. He compiled learned works on various subjects, including philosophy, manners and customs of the Jews, and strange phenomena. Of other historians of this period it is needless to speak.

Apollodorus. **Alexander Polyhistor.** **Dionysius the Thracian.** Dionysius the Thracian, a pupil of Aristarchus, was born at Alexandria, of Thracian parents, somewhat before the middle of the second century B. C. He deserves mention because he was the first to write a complete grammar. His *Grammar* was used, commented, enlarged, and abbreviated for centuries, and still exists. His pupil, Tyrannion, is known especially for his work in connection with the unpublished writings of Aristotle which Sulla brought to Rome. A famous philologist of the first century B. C. was Didymus of Alexandria, who wrote countless learned works. Much of the material contained in the scholia written in manuscripts of classic texts is due to him. He died in the reign of Augustus, who is said to have been his pupil.

The two most interesting philosophers of the transition period are Panætius of Rhodes and Posidonius of Apamea, in Syria. Panætius was born not far from 190 B. C., and studied under several of the Stoic philosophers of the time. He went to Rome, perhaps about 140 B. C., where he was intimate with Scipio and knew Polybius. He was a liberal Stoic, and his philosophy was well adapted to Roman taste. Some of his works were much used by Cicero in compiling his own philosophical treatises. Hecato, a pupil of Panætius, also wrote moral treatises which were used by Cicero and Seneca. Posidonius seems to have been born about 135 B. C. He was a pupil of Panætius. He was a noted scientist, and under-

took long journeys for scientific purposes. He was also a philosopher, philologist, geographer, and historian. Like Panætius, he was a friend of the noted Romans of his time, and was influential in advancing the cause of liberal Stoicism at Rome. His works, like those of his master, were much used by Cicero. He died at the age of eighty-four, about 51 B. C.

The names of Scipio, Sulla, and Cicero, which have already occurred, show that Rome is beginning to be the home of Greek literature.

BOOK IV

GREEK LITERATURE UNDER THE ROMAN EMPIRE

CHAPTER XXXVII

FROM AUGUSTUS TO DOMITIAN

Divisions of Græco-Roman literature—History—Diodorus Siculus, about 90 to after 21 B. C.—His importance—Dionysius of Halicarnassus, 20 B. C.—His history of Rome—His rhetorical works—Cæcilius, about 20 B. C.—The treatise *On the Sublime*—Strabo, about 60 B. C. to about 20 A. D.—His works and literary character—Josephus, 37 to at least 94 A. D.—His works—Philosophy—Sextius and Sotion, about the beginning of the Christian era—Areius Didymus, early first century after Christ—The Tablet of Cebes—Cornutus, 65 A. D.—Musonius, 65 A. D.—Philo the Jew, about 30 A. D.

THE period from the middle of the second century B. C. to the establishment of the empire by Augustus (31 B. C.) is, in literary as in other matters, a period of transition.

Divisions of
the period
from
Augustus to
Justinian.

Greek literature after the establishment of the empire falls naturally into three chronological divisions: from Augustus to Domitian, 31 B. C. to 96 A. D.; from Nerva to the beginning of the reign of Constantine, 96 to 323 A. D.; from Constantine to Justinian, 323 to 527 A. D., though the dates are not to be regarded as marking sharp lines of division. The first period was peculiarly barren. Political events occupied men's thoughts, and the Greeks, who might at other periods have become important in literature, if any

such there were, turned their attention to such writing as interested the Romans—that is, to practical matters, history, and philosophy. There was little literary art. The second period is marked by a revival of Greek literature, though poetry was little cultivated. The third period brings the rise of Christianity and the end of ancient literature.

History, philosophy, grammar, and criticism are the subjects of most of the Greek literature of the earlier empire.

The first historian of this period is Diodorus, born about 90 B. C., at Agyrium, in Sicily, and usually called Diodorus Siculus. His great work was a *Library (Bibliotheca) of History*, the result of thirty years of diligent labor, published about 30 B. C. This

was a history of the world from the earliest times to Cæsar's conquest of Gaul, in forty books. The first six books were devoted to the mythical period before the Trojan War. Of these we now have the first five and some fragments of the sixth. The next eleven books contained the history of the time between the Trojan War and the death of Alexander. Seven of these are extant, embracing the period from 480 to 323 B. C. The last twenty-three books carried the account from the death of Alexander to the conquest of Gaul. Of these only three books remain, relating to the years from 323 to 302 B. C. Of the forty books of the work fifteen are preserved.

‡ The work is of great importance, because it is now the only source from which we can derive information concerning the history of several important periods.

Importance and qualities of his work. Diodorus compiled his history with immense diligence from the works of earlier historians, especially Ephorus, Theopompus, and Timæus, and since those earlier works are now lost for the most part, the compilation of Diodorus is invaluable to the historian. It contains the history not only of Greece, but of other countries as well, and mentions not only political events, but

also such matters as the births and deaths of poets and artists. Dates are carefully given by Olympiads, Athenian archons, and Roman consuls, and in the comparatively few cases in which false dates are given the fault is undoubtedly not that of Diodorus himself, but of the earlier writer from whom he derives his information, for his great weakness as an historian lies in his lack of critical power and independent judgment. He wished and intended to write a great history, and succeeded in making a useful compilation, doubly useful to us now that the sources from which he drew his information have disappeared.

His style is somewhat monotonous, and full of abstract, vague words, as is the style of most of his contemporaries.

He has, however, the great merit of clearness, and he avoids the error of introducing numerous oratorical harangues, an error into which many Greek historians fell.

Dionysius of Halicarnassus, in Asia Minor, came to Rome in the year 30 B. C., and remained there for twenty-two years, in intimate relations with the cultivated aristocrats of the capital, such as Rufus Melitius and Ælius Tubero. During this time he learned Latin, taught rhetoric and Greek literature, and wrote his *Roman Archæology*, as well as a number of treatises on subjects connected with his teaching. Whether he left Rome after twenty-two years or not is unknown.

The *Roman Archæology* was a history of Rome from the beginning to the breaking out of the first Punic War (264 B. C.). It consisted of twenty books, the first eleven of which, ending with the overthrow of the decemvirs in 449 B. C., are preserved, while of the other nine books we have only extracts and fragments. Dionysius pays great attention to the origin of Roman institutions, both political and religious, but he tries to make his account agree with what he saw about him at Rome in his own time. He therefore fails frequently

His style.

Dionysius of Halicarnassus.

The history of Rome.

to give correct information. Still he consulted the best authorities, not only Greek historians, such as Polybius and Timæus, but more especially Roman writers, such as Cato, Fabius Maximus, Valerius Antias, and others, and his work possesses great value to us, though it must be used with caution. He is not a critical historian; but rather a rhetor writing history. He cares at least as much for rhetorical display as for historical accuracy, and his presentation of facts and events is further influenced by his theory that history should be used to inculcate piety and morality. His style has little merit. It is correct but monotonous, for even the numerous speeches introduced differ little from the narrative parts, except in being composed in the first and second persons instead of the third. In spite of the time and labor expended upon the history, Dionysius was primarily a teacher of rhetoric, and the history is a series of specimens of what he regards as good writing.

In his rhetorical works Dionysius is seen to better advantage, though here also he makes it clear that he is not a great writer or thinker. The works preserved to us are: *Studies on the Ancient Orators*, of which only the first parts, treating of Lysias, Isocrates, and Isæus, are preserved; *On Dinarchus*, an appendix to the *Studies on the Ancient Orators*; treatises *On the Arrangement of Words*, *On Demosthenes's Power in Speaking*, and *On the Character of Thucydides*, besides two *Letters to Ammæus* (on the chronology of the orations of Demosthenes and on peculiarities of Thucydides), and a *Letter to Gnæus Pompey*, containing, with other matter, criticisms of Plato. In these Dionysius shows great familiarity with the authors treated, and in most respects excellent judgment. He evidently lacks originality, which makes his works all the more valuable to us, as they have preserved for us the teachings of the learned schools of Alexandria and Pergamum, rather than the independent opinion of one man. He opposes the practises of the Asian school of rhet-

**Rhetorical
works.**

oric, and goes back to the Attic writers for models of style. He evidently exercised great influence, and his influence seems on the whole to have been for the good of the literature of his times. Another writer on rhetoric was Cæcilius of Calacte, a pupil of the Pergamene rhetor Apollodorus. His works, which encouraged the pursuit of rhetoric at

The treatise

On the

Sublime.

Rome and the study of the Attic orators, have disappeared. An important rhetorical work, which probably belongs to this period, is the treatise *On the Sublime*, falsely attributed to Longinus. This is a critical work, full of examples drawn from the authors treated, and showing sound critical judgment and good literary taste.

Strabo of Amasea, in Pontus, who lived from about 60 B. C. to about 20 A. D., came to Rome in 29 B. C., visiting Corinth and the Cyclades on the way, went in 24 B. C. to

Strabo.

Egypt and up the Nile to Philæ with the expedition under Ælius Gallus, stayed for some time at Alexandria, and returned to Rome in 20 B. C. His other journeys, which were extensive, were probably undertaken after this time. He seems to have lived in Asia during the latter part of the reign of Augustus.

His first work, published not many years after his arrival in Rome, was a history of the period from 146 to about 27 B. C., a continuation of the history of Polybius. In this

His works.

lost work he tried to put important matters in a prominent light, not to furnish mere annals. The same desire to emphasize what is important is evident in his *Geography*, a work in seventeen books, almost entirely preserved, and of great importance. Strabo regards the Mediterranean Sea as the centre of the world, as it was, so far as the Greeks and Romans were concerned, and treats Italy, Greece, and Asia Minor in more detail than other regions. He intends his work to be of practical value, and gives much information about the formation of the different countries and the crops or minerals they produce, as

well as about the peoples and their customs. He relies not merely upon his own observation but also upon the works of earlier geographers, and in his treatment of some regions, for instance India, he draws all his information from earlier writers. In telling of the peoples of the various regions and cities he introduces much historical information. Much Homeric criticism is also introduced, but this is not so out of place as it seems at first sight, for the earlier geographers had regarded the Homeric poems as a chief source of geographical knowledge, and Strabo seeks to derive knowledge from all available sources. Nor does he accept without criticism the statements of previous geographers, but tries conscientiously to learn and write the truth. Even when he is wrong it is often not for lack of trying to be right, but either because correct information was not to be had or because he is led astray by the desire to be exact in matters where exactness was not attainable. In general, his statements are based upon the best information accessible at that time.

As a work of literature the *Geography* is without originality except in the general treatment of the subject. The narrative is clear but dry; descriptions are brief and omit all picturesque elements. The style is rather monotonous; it is merely the ordinary prose of the time, lacking those qualities which lend grace and interest. In short, the value and interest of the work are in the subject treated, not the manner of treatment.

The only remaining historian of this period whose work is of any literary interest is the Jew Flavius Josephus, who was born at Jerusalem in 37 A. D. and lived at least until 94 A. D. He had been compelled against his will to take part in the Jewish revolt in 66 A. D. and to fight against the Romans, was taken prisoner, and from that time was under the patronage of Vespasian, Titus, and Domitian. His last years were spent at Rome,

Literary
character.

Josephus.

but the date of his death is unknown. His chief work is the *Jewish War*, in seven books, written at the suggestion of Vespasian, and containing the history of the war begun under Nero and finished by Titus with the fall of Jerusalem in 70 A. D. The work was written in the author's native language and translated into Greek with the aid of skilled assistants. In this Josephus tells for the most part what he had himself seen and experienced. At first an officer in the Jewish army and afterward an eye-witness of the progress of the war, he had ample opportunity to know his subject. He is, however, not always strictly accurate, partly because of his desire to be agreeable to his imperial protectors, and partly on account of the prejudices in which he, a member of a priestly Jewish family, had been brought up. Nevertheless the history is well planned and is rich in details relating to Jewish customs as well as to the progress of the war. Some rhetorical ornaments detract from the general effect of earnestness and sobriety, but do not seriously affect the value of the work. The style is careful and correct. Evidently the translators were well trained rather than talented. A much longer work is the *Jewish Archæology*, in twenty books. This was published in 94 A. D. and contains the history of the Jews from the creation to the year 66 A. D. The first part is derived entirely from the Old Testament and has no independent value. The last seven books, containing the history of Herod the Great and his successors, are of great historical interest. The other extant works, such as the egotistical *Life of Josephus* and the books *Against Apion*, who had made charges against the Jews, are of little interest. Josephus wrote, or intended to write, several works on philosophical subjects, but of these nothing is left.

Philosophy was much cultivated in the first century after Christ, but little philosophical literature was produced.

Even before this time, as early as the beginning of the first century B. C., there was a revival of Pythagorean doctrine.

Philosophy in the first century. This probably began at Alexandria, but soon spread to Rome, and its effect is seen in some of Cicero's writings. Numerous works ascribed to various writers were current besides anonymous collections of maxims and comparisons. The *Golden Verses* attributed to Pythagoras himself belong to this period. Various fragments are preserved from writings by Sextius, of the time of Augustus and Tiberius; Sotion, who was one of Seneca's teachers; Areius Didymus, who wrote under Nero, and others. The best known Pythagorean writing of this time is the *Tablet of Cebes*, a short allegorical composition describing an imaginary tablet representing the life of man. The explanation of the tablet consists of moral teachings, half Pythagorean and half Stoic. The date of this work is uncertain, but it may probably be assigned to the first century after Christ. Stoic philosophy had been introduced at Rome by Panætius and continued to be taught there by many famous teachers. They were, however, for the most part lecturers rather than writers. Lucius Annæus Cornutus, who was banished from Rome by Nero, left a work on *Greek Theology*, based upon earlier Stoic works and containing allegorical and etymological explanations of myths, and the lectures of Gaius Musonius Rufus, who was banished at the same time, were written down by a pupil and are partially preserved in the *Florilegium* of Stobæus. Fragments of writings by Musonius are preserved by other writers also. He taught the moral doctrines of the Stoics, with little attention to their physical theories. Cornutus is perhaps best known as the teacher of the satirist Persius, and Musonius as the teacher of Epictetus.

But the only philosopher of literary importance in this time is Philo, an Alexandrian Jew, born about 20 B. C. In 39 A. D. he was sent on a mission to Rome to plead the

cause of the Jews before Caligula; but the rest of his life, the duration of which is unknown, was spent in quiet at Alexandria. His numerous writings, most of which are preserved, are philosophical and religious. He is a devout Jew, with firm faith in the Bible, but he interprets its words allegorically, with the result that he finds in the Bible the doctrines of Plato with modifications tending toward mysticism. The cardinal point of his teaching is the doctrine of the Word (Logos). He believes in a God far removed from all material existence; and an emanation from God, the Word, which is the means of communication between God and his creatures. The moral teaching which Philo adds to this theological doctrine is in the main Stoic, but is full of mystic enthusiasm. Certain passages relating to the grace of God and the lofty aspirations of the human soul seem almost Christian. Philo's style is easy, fluent, and even graceful. He imitates Plato to some extent in style as well as in doctrine, but lacks Plato's wonderful dramatic ability.

Little poetry of any interest was written in Greek at this time. Some epigrams are graceful and attractive, but there is no poet whose name we need remember.

CHAPTER XXXVIII

PHILOSOPHY IN THE SECOND CENTURY

Revival of Greek literature in the second and third centuries—The new philosophical tendency—Epictetus, about 50 to about 120 A. D.—Dio Chrysostom, about 40 to after 112 A. D.—Plutarch, before 50 to about 125 A. D.—Plutarch's life and character—The parallel lives—Plutarch's morals—His style—Marcus Aurelius, 121–180 A. D.

DURING the second and third centuries after Christ there was a marked revival of Greek literature, caused in part at least by the established peace of the Roman Empire and aided by the favor and support of the emperors and other great men of Rome. In the Alexandrian period and the first part of the Roman period Greek literature was for the most part either learned or imitative, with little creative originality. In the period from Nerva to Constantine there is more originality, though there is also much imitation of the classics. One difference between the earlier authors and the writers of this Roman time is important. The great classic authors wrote for the limited public of some one independent Greek city, and the Alexandrians for a limited public of learned Greeks in different cities; but the writers of the second and third centuries after Christ write for Romans as well as for Greeks, and appeal to their readers as men—not as scholars. All men of the civilized world were now alike subjects of the Roman Empire, and this community of political station helped to do away with previous divi-

The revival of Greek literature in the second and third centuries.

sions and give men a broader view of the substantial brotherhood of men. So there is a new spirit in literature. Old models are still imitated, but in a new way. The period really begins before the end of the first century, and is so long that it will be best to take up the different authors not in chronological order nor strictly according to their subjects, but rather in groups, to avoid too great confusion.

Philosophy was, as we have seen, chiefly concerned with ethics, even from the time of Plato, and this interest in the moral teachings of philosophy continued throughout the Alexandrian and Roman periods. The philosophers of the first part of the Roman period were moral teachers, and this is still their character in the time with which we are now concerned. But the new spirit of humanity is especially noticeable in the new philosophical teaching.

The first of the great moralists of this time is Epictetus. He was born a slave at Hieropolis, in Phrygia, about 50 A. D., and was taken to Rome. There his master, Epictetus. Epaphroditus, caused him to be educated and gave him his freedom. His teacher in philosophy was Musonius Rufus. In 94 A. D. Epictetus was expelled from Italy with the other philosophers by Domitian, and went to Nicopolis, in Epirus, where a great number of enthusiastic pupils gathered about him. His life seems to have lasted at least until the accession of Hadrian in 117 A. D.; perhaps until 125. One of his pupils was the historian Arrian, who took down in writing the words of the master; for Epictetus, like Socrates, wrote nothing. Arrian afterward made an abbreviated edition of his record, which he called a *Manual*. Both the *Conversations of Epictetus* and the *Manual of Epictetus* have come down to us. The teaching is moral, founded on the doctrines of the Stoics which made self-restraint the source of all virtue. His chief rule of conduct was "endure and refrain." But he gave new

life to the Stoic doctrines by his sense of the brotherhood of mankind, and his ethical teachings were closely connected with the belief in the existence of an all-wise and loving God, to whom the soul of man is nearly related. Epictetus was evidently an interesting personality. He taught his beliefs without any attempt to soften them or make them agreeable to his hearers, and sometimes his expressions seem too positive and even harsh. Nevertheless, the moral force which he shows has been a source of inspiration to many a reader, and must have impressed still more strongly those who heard and knew the man himself.

A very different teacher of nearly the same moral doctrine is Dio of Prusa, in Bithynia, called Dio Chrysostom (the Golden-mouthed) by his admirers on account of his eloquence. Born of a distinguished family at Prusa, about 40 A. D., he devoted himself to rhetoric, which was growing fashionable in his youth, and soon became a much-admired rhetor or sophist, as public lecturers were called at that time. Under Vespasian he was called to Rome, but was banished from Italy and Bithynia by Domitian. This was a hard blow. The fact that he was suspected and banished by the emperor probably put a stop to his success as a public speaker, and therewith to a great part of his income. In comparative poverty he wandered for fourteen years in Greece and elsewhere, going as far as Olbia, on the Black Sea. During this period he, who had previously attacked the philosophers in public speeches, now became himself a philosopher; and when he once more returned to his native Prusa, in 96 A. D., after the death of Domitian, he taught the moral doctrines of the Stoics, somewhat modified by those of the Peripatetics, Academicians, and Pythagoreans—that is, the serious moral doctrines in vogue among the teachers of the time. He taught not only at Prusa, but in other cities—even at Rome, where he lectured before the

Dio
Chrysostom.

Emperor Trajan. How long he lived is unknown, but he was certainly alive in 112 A. D.

Dio's writings were many. His *History of the Getæ* and his *Letters* are lost, as are many of his orations; but eighty orations are still preserved, though some are **Dio's works.** incomplete. These fall naturally into three divisions: *Sophistic Addresses*, *Political Speeches*, and *Moral Lectures*. The first class deals with trivial subjects, for instance, an argument to prove *That Troy was not Taken*, or literary matters, for example, *On Homer*, and belongs without doubt to Dio's earlier years; the second consists of addresses to various Greek cities, urging them to put away their petty rivalries and to institute various reforms; the third contains Dio's moral teachings. These and the second class belong to the time after his banishment. The political orations are interesting for the light they throw upon the circumstances of the Greek communities of the time, but the real originality of the author is best seen in the moral lectures. In these he popularizes the moral teachings of the philosophers, setting forth their doctrines with all the power of earnest conviction, aided by remarkable command of language and wide reading in the literature of the past. Like the sophists of the time, he traveled from city to city, lecturing in public halls and theatres, attracting the people by his eloquence. Unlike the sophists, he felt that he had a mission, and his eloquence had the ring of sincerity. His style is easy, graceful, and pleasing, with not a little fancy and humor. It is the best manner of the sophists of the time, varied and made more impressive by the real earnestness, serious purpose, and lofty enthusiasm underlying it.

Probably no single Greek author has exercised a greater influence upon later times than Plutarch. He was born in the little town of Chæronea, in Bœotia, probably somewhat before 50 A. D. His father was a man of wealth and culture, belonging to a much-respected family. The young Plutarch

therefore had a good education at home, and when he reached the proper age was sent to Athens, where he studied under Ammonius, a teacher belonging to the Platonic school. How long he was at Athens we do not know, but the teachings of Ammonius seem to have had a lasting influence upon him, for he remained through life a Platonist. Like the other Platonists, or Academicians, of his time, he was an eclectic, taking from the teachings of different schools of philosophy what seemed to him reasonable; but at the same time he regarded himself as a follower of Plato, and liked to support his views by arguments drawn from Plato's works. These works he studied with great diligence, as is shown by the fact that he wrote several treatises on points of Plato's doctrine.

On his return from Athens Plutarch soon became a prominent man at Chæronea, for he was still young when he was sent as a delegate to address the pro-consul. He traveled in various regions at different times, going once to Alexandria, twice at least, though probably not until comparatively late in life, to Rome, and perhaps also to Sardis, in Asia Minor. He married Timoxena, the daughter of a man of some local importance, and had four sons and a daughter. Two sons, apparently the eldest and the youngest, died while mere boys, and the daughter died at two years of age. At the time of her death Plutarch was away from home, and first heard of his loss at Tanagra. Thereupon he wrote his wife a kind and affectionate letter, calling to mind the lovable qualities of the dead child, and urging his wife to preserve the dignity and moderation in her grief which had characterized her in other circumstances, reminding her that she was even now better off than if the child had not been born, for she had at least the pleasure of sweet memories. He adds that the soul does not die, but is set free from the body by what we call

death. If, however, the soul has, during its earthly life, become too much interested in the things of the body, it will not remain free, but will enter a body again, as a bird, though set free, returns to its cage. This idea is in part derived from Plato, but some of the details may belong to the doctrines of the mysteries of Dionysus, into which Plutarch and his wife were initiated.

Plutarch was a pious and religious man. He was a priest and agonothetes (manager of sacred games) at Delphi, and was also connected in some way with the Delphic oracle. He was a firm believer in oracles and other forms of divination, and wrote a treatise on the question *Why the Oracles Cease to Give Answers*, and another on the question *Wherefore the Pythian Priestess now Ceases to Deliver her Oracles in Verse*, both of which are interesting for the light they throw upon the condition of the oracles in the first century after Christ, as well as on account of the interest attaching to Plutarch's opinions. His views concerning a supreme God, a number of lesser deities, and a greater number of inferior spirits or demons, are only in part peculiar to him, and were shared by other followers of the Platonic school.

The greater part of his life Plutarch spent at Chæronea, a kindly, genial, and much-respected citizen. He held various town offices, was apparently Bœotarch, and we are even told that Trajan conferred upon him consular rank. Thus he grew old in well-deserved honor. He died not far from 125 A. D.

Plutarch was not a great genius. He was a wealthy country gentleman, with a conscientious desire to do his duty in the world, a profound respect and hearty admiration for the great Greeks of earlier times, though quite contented to live under the rule of Rome. He felt that educated and wealthy men like himself ought not to withdraw from public life, and so he accepted offices in his native town—a town so

His piety.

**His offices;
his death.**

**General
character.**

small that he did not wish to leave it "lest it become still smaller." When he was at Rome he lectured on various ethical topics, and some of his published treatises are doubtless little more than fair copies of his lectures. Besides lecturing, he also gave private advice on matters of daily conduct. People consulted him about their conscientious doubts much as one consults a physician about a physical malady. He was probably consulted in the same way at Chæronea, though by fewer patients. In that small town he had ample leisure for writing.

He is best known as the author of *Parallel Lives of Greeks and Romans*. Forty-six of these *Lives* have come down to us. They are arranged in pairs, one Greek and one Roman, and each pair of lives is followed by a comparison of the two characters.

In addition to these there are four detached *Lives* —of Artaxerxes, Aratus, Galba, and Otho. In these biographies Plutarch shows great diligence in reading the works of previous authors, but little or no original research and little historical insight. He loves anecdotes, and takes them where he finds them, with not quite enough regard for the trustworthiness of his authority. He wishes, too, to make biography point a moral; and perhaps cares less for historical accuracy than for ethical teaching. Nevertheless, the biographies are full of valuable historical information, for Plutarch could draw from all the historians whose works are now lost, and they are interesting besides.

Plutarch's other works are miscellaneous essays and treatises, popularly known as Plutarch's *Morals*, though not by any means all of them are directly concerned with morality.

A selection from the titles of these essays gives some idea of the scope of his interests: *A Discourse Concerning the Training of Children, Concerning the Cure of Anger, Of Bashfulness, Of Superstition or Indiscreet Devotion, Concerning the Virtues of Women, How a Young Man ought to Hear Poems, That*

it is not Possible to Live Pleasurably According to the Doctrine of Epicurus, Of Brotherly Love, Symposiacs (table-talk on various subjects), *Concerning such whom God is Slow to Punish, Whether an Old Man Ought to Meddle in State Affairs*. It is evident from these titles—and these are but a few taken from the long list of essays—that Plutarch's interests were varied. They were, however, chiefly ethical and antiquarian.

Plutarch's style is much the same in the *Lives* and the *Morals*, though some of the essays among the *Morals* are less carefully written than others or than the *Lives*. He writes in an easy, unaffected, simple fashion, making his meaning clear without apparent effort. Not only is he fond of anecdotes, but he loves also to embellish his essays with quotations from the poets. These quotations are more numerous in the *Morals* than in the *Lives*, and seem to have been taken, at least in the *Morals*, chiefly from a book or books of extracts, rather than directly from the early poets. Yet it is evident that Plutarch was widely read in Greek literature. The great influence which Plutarch has exercised is due not to any deep historical research or original philosophical speculation, but to the interesting way in which he brings before us the great men of Greece and Rome and the views on ethical matters held by educated men about the end of the first century after Christ.

The Emperor Marcus Aurelius must be briefly mentioned in our account of philosophical writing during this time. The details of his life are to be found in any history of Rome. Born at Rome in 121 A. D., he was adopted by Antoninus Pius in 138, and after the death of Antoninus Pius was emperor from 161 to 180. He was taught by the best teachers in rhetoric and philosophy, and was especially attracted by the latter study. His *Letters*, written in Latin, do not concern us here, nor are they so important as his *Thoughts*,

Plutarch's
style.

Marcus
Aurelius.

a series of rules for conduct, ethical maxims, and moral reflections written in Greek by the emperor in the midst of his cares and anxieties to comfort, encourage, and strengthen himself. The doctrines are purely Stoic; but the Stoicism of Marcus Aurelius is, like that of Epictetus, more a religion than a theory. The little volume (divided in our editions into twelve short books) is full of a simple faith in the good government of the world. It reveals to us a good man who appreciates all the benefits he has received, is free from vanity and all uncharitableness, severe only to himself. The moral doctrines of Stoicism resemble those of Christianity, and the Stoic's belief in Providence has something of the character of Christian faith. Nowhere do these qualities of Stoicism appear so clearly as in the *Thoughts* of Marcus Aurelius. This little book has been a source of spiritual strength and comfort to pagans and Christians alike. It is written with no care for stylistic excellence, but the sincerity of feeling and grand simplicity of thought give to the style a peculiar energy and vigor.

CHAPTER XXXIX

HISTORY—THE LATER SOPHISTS

History—Arrian, about 95 to about 175 A. D.—Appian, about 95 to about 175 A. D.—Dio Cassius, about 155 to about 240 A. D.—Herodian, between 165 and 255 A. D.—Various writers—Pausanias, before 130 to at least 175 A. D.—Diogenes Laertius, probably about 225 A. D.—The *Library* attributed to Apollodorus—Polyænus, about 150 A. D.—Antoninus Liberalis, about 150 A. D.—Oratory—The later Sophists—Maximus Tyrius, about 185 A. D.—Ælius Aristides, 129–189 A. D.—Lucian, about 120 to about 190 A. D.—Lucian's works—His style and manner of writing—Aleiphron, probably about 175 A. D.—Philostratus I, about 200 A. D.—Philostratus II, about 230 A. D.—Philostratus III, about 290 A. D.—Ælian, about 230 A. D.—Athenæus, born between 161 and 180 A. D.

AMONG the historians who wrote in the second and third centuries after Christ, only a few require even brief mention. The first of these is Arrian (Flavius Arrian. Arrianus) from Nicomedia, in Bithynia. His life extends approximately from 95 to 175 A. D. As a young man he was an admiring pupil of Epictetus, whose conversations he published (see page 416). He held several public offices, was *consul suffectus* under Hadrian in the year 130, and for six years (131–137) was governor of Cappadocia as *legatus Augusti pro prætore*. He afterward retired from public life and lived at Athens, which was at that time no longer a great centre of active life, but a seat of learning. Here he was archon in 147 A. D., and somewhat later one of the prytanes. He loved to be likened to Xenophon and to be called a second Xenophon. He had attached himself to Epictetus as Xenophon did to

Socrates, had then engaged in active military life, and had finally retired to a life of literary leisure. His chief work, the *Anabasis of Alexander*, derives its name from Xenophon's *Anabasis*, which it imitates in style and in the number (seven) of books. It contains a history of Alexander the Great from the beginning of his reign to his death, not merely an account of his expedition against the Persians. It is written in a simple, pleasant style, like that of Xenophon. It is not a profound work based on new researches, but gives in readable form the substance of the more reasonable earlier histories of Alexander, especially those of Ptolemy and Aristobulus. Arrian wrote several other historical works: a *History of the Successors of Alexander*, in ten books; a *History of Bithynia*, in eight books; and a *History of the Parthian War* under Hadrian, in seventeen books, all of which are lost. A small part of his *History of the Alans* (a Scythian tribe) is preserved, as are a geographical work on *India*, a *Periplus of the Black Sea*, a treatise *On Tactics*, and one *On Hunting*. The *Periplus of the Red Sea* ascribed to Arrian is by a later writer. Arrian's other works seem to have been of little importance.

A contemporary of Arrian is Appian, of whose life we know but little except that he was born at Alexandria, became prominent there, and went to Rome, where he occupied an official position under Hadrian and Antoninus, who made him procurator. His whole life probably lies between 95 and 175 A. D. The autobiography which he wrote is lost. His one great work was a *History of Rome* in twenty-four books. The arrangement was not strictly chronological, but by topics. The story of the relations of Rome with each foreign people was told by itself, and the internal affairs of Rome were treated separately. The arrangement of the topics was, on the whole, chronological; for instance, the Samnite wars (Book III) came before the wars with the Gauls (Book IV)

Appian.

or the conquest of Sicily (Book V); but the method of division, which in the hands of a great historian might be satisfactory, is in Appian's hands a source of confusion. Of the entire work only Books VI, VII, and VIII (the wars in Spain, the second Punic War, and the wars in Africa) and Books XI to XVII (the wars with the Syrians, Parthians, and Mithridates, and the beginning of the civil wars) are preserved, in addition to scattered fragments. Appian's work is important on account of its contents, for he follows some authorities whose works are lost, and furnishes us valuable information, but as a work of literature it is inferior to Arrian's writings. Still, his style is simple and unaffected, and though it lacks vigor and variety is not dry nor dull.

Dio Cassius (Cassius Dio Cocceianus) was, like Arrian and Dio Chrysostom, his grandfather on the mother's side, a Bithynian. His father was a distinguished man, governor of Dalmatia and Cilicia under Marcus Aurelius. Dio Cassius. Dio was born at Nicæa, in Bithynia, about 155 A. D. In 180 he went to Rome, where he became prætor in 193. In 218, under Macrinus, he was sent to regulate the affairs of Pergamum and other parts of Asia Minor. Under Alexander Severus he was consul and governor of Africa, about 224; afterward governor of Dalmatia and Upper Pannonia. In 229 he was consul for the second time, soon after which he withdrew to Bithynia. His death occurred probably before 240 A. D.

Dio was an able, energetic man, well acquainted with the conduct of affairs of state. Thus prepared, he undertook to write the *History of Rome*. For ten years (200-210) he collected his materials, and in the next twelve (211-223) he finished the first seventy-two books, to the death of Septimius Severus (211 A. D.). The remaining eight books were written later, and were more summary in their treatment. The whole work, in eighty books, extended from the time of Æneas to Dio's second consulship in 229

A. D. Twenty-five books (XXXVI to LX) are extant, covering the period from 68 B. C. to 47 A. D. Fragments of the other books exist, and their contents are known from an abstract made by the monk Xiphilinus in the eleventh century. The history of Zonaras, written in the twelfth century, also contains much that is taken from Dio Cassius.

Dio used the works of his predecessors, both Latin and Greek, with care and diligence, but he did not investigate for himself the original documents. He tried to be accurate in his chronology and geography, and to be free from prejudice. In the last-mentioned attempt he was not altogether successful. His mind does not seem to be broad enough to grasp the causes of great events or the characters of great men. Yet with all his defects he produced a history which is on the whole reasonably accurate. His style is clear, pure, though not strictly Attic, and simple; somewhat monotonous, and lacking in vigor, but dignified and euphonious.

Herodian, author of a *History of the Empire after Marcus Aurelius*, lived in Italy and occupied some public offices, but we do not know what they were. His life falls between the years 165 and 255 A. D., but we know neither date nor place of his birth and death. His history covers fifty-nine years, from the death of Marcus Aurelius to the accession of Gordianus III (180-228 A. D.). His interest is chiefly in the persons and acts of the emperors, their characters and opinions, and the characters and opinions of their advisers. He relies for his information less upon previous writers than upon his own recollections, and for this reason his work is more interesting than that of Dio. His accuracy is sometimes doubtful, but he is our chief authority for the history of an important and agitated period, and is therefore of some importance. His style is less monotonous than Dio's, but somewhat artificial and rhetorical.

Several authors belong to this time whose works are

without literary merit, but are important on account of their contents. Among these is Pausanias. He was born probably at Magnesia, near Mount Sipylus, in Asia Minor; at some time before 130 A. D., and lived at least until 175. His *Guide to Greece*, in ten books, was written apparently between 143 and 175 A. D. Pausanias traveled about Greece, visited the most interesting places, and described the monuments which seemed to him most worthy of description. He gives a great deal of historical and mythological information, which he derives for the most part from previous writers. In all probability he consulted previous writers for many of his statements about works of art, even when he had himself seen the works in question. His *Guide*, though written in a loose, awkward, and even intentionally obscure style, is of immense value to students of antiquity, being a description of Greece in the second century after Christ, written by a man whose chief interest was in the monuments of earlier times, many of which were still to be seen.

Another important work is the collection of *Lives of the Philosophers*, by Diogenes of Laerte (Diogenes Laertius), a man of whose life we know nothing, but who seems to have lived in the early part of the third century after Christ. He wrote sketches of the lives of all the leading philosophers of the various sects, enlivening the brief biographies with anecdotes, and adding a list of the works of each philosopher. The book is entirely devoid of literary merit, is written without due care for chronology or any kind of accuracy, but is, notwithstanding, indispensable, since it is our chief source of information concerning the lives and works of the Greek philosophers.

**Diogenes
Laertius.**

**The Library
of Apollo-
dorus.**

The *Library (Bibliotheca)* of Apollodorus, wrongly ascribed to the Apollodorus of the second century B. C. (see page 404), apparently belongs to the second or third century after Christ. It is a dry compilation of gene-

alogies of the gods and heroes. It is quite unreadable, but is useful for reference, and, since the unknown writer derived his information from earlier literary sources, it sometimes sheds a ray of light on the history of literature.

The *Stratagems*, by the Macedonian Polyænus, is a collection in eight books of stories of stratagems. The stories

Polyænus.

are taken from history, though without much criticism of the trustworthiness of the source

from which one or another is derived, and therefore give occasionally some useful historical information, chiefly on

**Antoninus
Liberalis.**

Greek history, as the author seems to have known comparatively little of the history of

Rome. A collection of tales of a different kind is the *Metamorphoses*, by an unknown writer, Antoninus Liberalis.

The art of public speaking has always been practised by the Greeks from the earliest times to the present; but ora-

**Oratory from
the fourth
century B. C.
to the second
century after
Christ.**

tory has not always taken literary form. From the time of Alexander until the second century

after Christ there were pleas in lawsuits, arguments for and against this or that municipal

improvement or foreign policy, public addresses of various kinds; but all this speaking has left

hardly a trace in literature. The reason probably is that the important questions of state policy were settled by a

few great rulers, not by the public assemblies of independent cities, and orators who spoke on less important matters

thought it hardly worth while to publish their speeches. Throughout this period there were also lectures on fanciful and philosophical subjects, and these lectures were no

doubt composed with a view to pleasing the audience by their eloquence; but these have disappeared, and their loss

is not to be regretted, for they were probably products of the "Asian" school of oratory, full of rhetorical ornaments

but empty of ideas.

With the peace of the Roman Empire, oratory becomes

more important in the Greek cities of Asia Minor. These cities were wealthy, with a large number of men of leisure and a populace fond of any sort of entertainment. They possessed freedom of local self-government, and were jealous one of another. The rhetorical period. The Sophists public lecture developed in these cities toward the end of the first century after Christ, and along with it went the practise of elaborate speaking on municipal and public matters. There was serious study of the good rhetorical traditions of earlier times, and also much empty show of ornate speech. The speakers were called sophists, and in so far as they endeavored to charm their audiences by their words on general topics they resembled the sophists of the fifth century B. C. Some of the sophists of the second and third centuries after Christ had great reputations. They spoke on all sorts of subjects, often without previous preparation. In fact, the sophist would sometimes offer to speak on any subject suggested by his audience, relying upon his skillful use of commonplaces to hide his lack of thoughts. The study of the works of earlier orators might sometimes lead to serious thought, and did lead to a return to something like the simplicity of the style of the great Attic period, yet the orations of the sophists of the second and third centuries after Christ lack the power that comes from earnestness, and the reputations of the sophists themselves were for the most part ephemeral. Since most of their works have disappeared, it will not be necessary to mention many of them, but they were important in their day, when rich cities supported flourishing schools of oratory, and strove to attract the famous sophists, and emperors founded chairs of eloquence and philosophy for them to occupy. After 176 B. C. Athens is almost more a university than a city, thanks to the endowment of professorships by Marcus Aurelius. The second century is the time when the sophists were most numerous and influential, but their activity continued even into the

fifth century, and some of the great preachers of the Christian Church were influenced by them.

It is not necessary to mention any of these late sophists except those whose works are preserved and are of some interest. Among them is Dio Chrysostom, who has been mentioned as a philosophical orator and moral teacher. A far less serious sophist who is sometimes classed among philosophers is Maximus of Tyre (Cassius Maximus Tyrius), who lived under the Emperor Commodus (180-192 A. D.). His extant writings consist of forty-one popular lectures on philosophical, moral, and religious subjects. His philosophy is an eclectic Platonism, his discussion of every subject is superficial, and his style is full of mannerisms. He inserts quotations from Homer and other poets in and out of season, employs sometimes as many as six or eight synonyms to express one idea, and reminds one of Gorgias by the artificial symmetry of his sentences.

Somewhat more interesting, though equally lacking in serious thoughtfulness, is the popular orator Ælius Aristides. His life extended from 129 to 189 A. D. He was born at Hadriani, in Mysia, the son of a wealthy father, studied under two of the most famous sophists of the period, Aristocles at Pergamum and Herodes Atticus at Athens, and traveled in various parts of the empire. He lived for the most part at Smyrna. He was a teacher of rhetoric as well as a public speaker, but his reputation was due to his speeches, fifty-five of which are preserved. These are not all real speeches, some of them being open letters intended to be read, but they have the form of speeches. Some are concerned with the affairs of the time, others with historical questions and subjects interesting solely on account of the manner of treatment. The *Sacred Discourses*, telling how Aristides was cured by the god Asclepius of a disease which afflicted him for some seventeen years, give an interesting view

of the superstitions belonging to faith-cure by means of dreams. The most celebrated orations are *Against Plato in Defense of the Four*, a defense of Themistocles, Miltiades, Pericles, and Cimon, whom Plato criticizes in the *Gorgias*; the *Panathenaic*, in praise of Athens; two speeches *Against Plato on Rhetoric*, in which rhetoric is defended; and the *Praise of Rome*. Aristides tries to imitate Demosthenes, but is without the earnestness which makes Demosthenes great. His speeches are carefully written, his arguments are subtle and ingenious, his knowledge of history is great and skillfully used. Yet his style is sometimes difficult and obscure, partly on account of his very ingenuity. Oratory, as he conceived it, is merely an exercise of skill on the part of the orator, and a pastime for the hearer.

Of all the later sophists, the greatest and most original, the only one who belongs among the great writers of the

Lucian.

world, is a man so different from the other sophists that he is often separated from them and put in a class by himself, the brilliant, witty, humorous satirist, Lucian of Samosata. He was born at Samosata, the

capital of Commagene, in Syria, about 120 A. D. His parents were poor, and apprenticed the boy to his uncle, a sculptor, because they thought he had displayed some talent in modeling wax, and also because a literary education was expensive. But on the first day of his apprenticeship Lucian spoiled a piece of marble, and got a whipping. That decided him to give up sculpture and turn to literature. He attended schools at Samosata, and later in Ionia, and became a sophist, perhaps after a brief career as an advocate. He lectured in various cities in Greece, Macedonia, and Italy, was settled for a while in one of the cities of southern Gaul, then returned, about 160 A. D., to Samosata, before taking up his residence with all his family at Athens in 165 A. D. Here he lived for some twenty years, when, after a period of travel, he accepted from the em-

peror a judicial appointment in Egypt. After this he is heard of no more. His death took place not far from 190 A. D.

Lucian's native tongue was not Greek, but no writer of his day has such perfect command of the Greek language. He does not try to be strictly Attic in speech, and yet he comes nearer the delicacy and charm of Attic diction than any other late author. During the early part of his career he was a sophist, like others of the profession, and traveled about delivering speeches and lectures on various subjects. Even at this time it is probable that his wit and humor were evident in his speeches, but none of the extant works can be ascribed with certainty to this period. Before he settled at Athens he gave up the composition of elaborate addresses in the manner of the sophists, and henceforth devoted himself to satiric dialogues, pamphlets, and essays. These he apparently read to an audience before publishing them, retaining in this way something of the position of a sophist; but he was thoroughly disgusted with the hollow sham of the sophist's profession, and delighted in nothing more than in exposing its emptiness.

The works handed down to us under his name number eighty-two; but about thirty of these are spurious, leaving about fifty which may be considered authentic. These are all short pieces, and most of them are in dialogue form.

The authenticity of the two little farces *Gout-tragedy* and *Swiftfoot* and of the epigrams has been doubted. Some of the pieces are declamations or speeches, others are rather open letters; but whatever their form, all are satirical articles called forth by events of the day, by some chance conversation with some friend, by something Lucian happened to see or to read. They are not the results of long and careful study, but spontaneous utterances, like the editorials of a modern newspaper. In them Lucian shows his clear appreciation of the vain pretenses of the philosophers, the absurd superstition of

Lucian's
works.

the vulgar, the ostentation of the rich, the fawning flattery of the poor, the inconsistencies and absurdities of the myths, the lying propensities of the historians, the wild vagaries of the romancers, and all the many follies of his age. He had been a sophist, and had seen the hollowness of that profession; he knew the doctrines and lives of the philosophers, and had no respect for them; the popular beliefs about the gods seemed to him ridiculous. Against all these he directed the shafts of his satire, not merely because they were convenient targets, but because he considered it his duty to attack falsehood and insincerity wherever he could. His attacks are made with graceful ease and cynical honesty, showing the follies and charlatantry of the age in a pitilessly clear light. To this extent Lucian is a moral teacher. Unfortunately, he has nothing to offer in exchange for the philosophy and the religion he attacks. He is himself without belief in anything except common sense and a vague feeling of propriety, and, therefore, with all his love of truth he has no great truth to preach, but only the hatred of falsehood.

The best known of Lucian's works are, perhaps, the *Dialogues of the Dead*, the scene of which is laid in the lower world; the *Dialogues of the Gods*, short conversations between the gods, so contrived as to show how little they deserved reverence; and the letter *On the Death of Peregrinus*, an account of the life and death of a certain Peregrinus, who so loved to make himself conspicuous that he finally burned himself alive at the Olympic festival. But many of the other dialogues and essays are almost, if not quite, as well known. The *True History*, one of the longest of Lucian's works, describes a voyage to the moon and the sun, with many absurd episodes, like the battle between the Sunites and the Moonites, fought on a field of netting stretched between sun and moon. This inspired in modern times the tales of Baron Munchausen and Swift's *Gulliver's Travels*. Lucian wrote it as a satire on the extravagant

romances of his own times. The *Alexander* is a satirical biography of Alexander of Abonouteichus, who established an oracle in Pontus in the time of Marcus Aurelius, and gained such a reputation that people came even from Rome to consult him. The *Sale of Lives* is an auction in which Zeus acts as proprietor and Hermes as auctioneer, and the wares for sale are the famous philosophers, with the modes of life resulting from their teachings.

But it would be useless to make a list of Lucian's writings. His greatness lies in his originality, his genuine hatred of all that is false or pretentious, his quick perceptions, and his biting humor—all expressed in a peculiarly attractive style. This style is apparently spontaneous, and yet is founded upon imitation of the Attic writers, especially of Plato; but the imitation is unconscious. Lucian's education consisted in great part of reading the classics, and their language had become quite as much a part of his nature as had the Greek of his own time. Possibly the fact that Greek was not his native language made it easier for him to write a purer style than many of his contemporaries. His mind was full of the great works of earlier times, and his own works contain countless direct and indirect references to them. These references are so skillfully introduced that they please us when we recognize them, but do not force themselves upon us in such a way as to make us feel our ignorance when we fail to understand them. There is much in Lucian's manner of writing that recalls the New Comedy. He probably had precursors in the art of prose satire—for instance, Menippus (see page 362), whom he introduces in his dialogues—but the freshness and delicacy of his wit and the charm of his style are all his own.

Alciphron, an imitator and probably younger contemporary of Lucian, is known to us by a collection of one hundred and eighteen letters, in five books. Imaginary letters were one of the forms of the sophistic writing of

the time. Alciphron's letters, written in the names of men and women of all classes, describe scenes similar to those of the New Comedy. The time and place are the **Alciphron.** fourth century B. C. and Athens. The language is elegant, the style easy and attractive, and the description of life and customs is interesting. Alciphron is, however, in all respects inferior to Lucian.

Works by three sophists named Philostratus are preserved. The eldest of the three, Flavius Philostratus, was, according to Suidas, an Athenian, who flourished under Septimius Severus (193–211 A. D.), and taught at Athens and Rome. He wrote a

The Philostrati. *Life of Apollonius of Tyana* and *Lives of the Sophists*. The first work, written at the suggestion of the Empress Julia Domna, is a pretentious biography of a Pythagorean impostor and wonder-man of the first century after Christ, and is interesting chiefly because it shows how readily the people allowed themselves to be imposed upon. The *Lives of the Sophists*—brief sketches of sophists and orators—are of some value, because they are derived from letters and other sources now lost, including the personal recollections of the writer. They show no critical faculty, and their style is not remarkable. A treatise *On Gymnastics* and some *Letters* by the same author may be passed over. The second Philostratus, son-in-law of the first, is called a Lemnian. He taught at Athens. When he was twenty-four years old the Emperor Caracalla, who reigned from 211 to 217, granted him freedom from taxation. His birth was, therefore, not far from 190 A. D. His *Heroicus* is a dialogue between a vintner living in the Chersonnese and a Phœnician stranger. The vintner tells how the hero Protesilaus has appeared to him and given him much information about the ancient heroes. The work is based upon the old cyclic poems, and contains some interesting information about the ancient legends. The *Pictures*, by the same author, are descriptions of sixty-four pictures which the author

says he saw in a portico at Naples. Whether any or all of the pictures really existed is uncertain, but the descriptions are ingenious, clever essays, with considerable liveliness and good taste, in spite of some affectation. The third Philostratus, grandson of the second, wrote, toward the end of the third century, a second series of *Pictures*, much inferior to the first. Descriptions of ten works of statuary, by an unknown Callistratus, are generally published with the *Pictures*.

Ælian (Claudius Ælianus), born at Præneste, near Rome, was a contemporary of the Lemnian Philostratus.

His extant works are the *Nature of Animals*, the *Various History*, and the *Rustic Letters*. The *Rustic Letters* contain some situations from comedies transferred to epistolary form, and the other works contain a great array of facts, or what are supposed to be facts, accompanied by many anecdotes and much moralizing. The style aims at elegance and attains insipidity.

A collection of facts far more heterogeneous than those contained in Ælian's works is the *Deipnosophistæ* (Dinner-sophists) of Athenæus of Naucratis, in Egypt.

Of this writer we know only the place of his birth and that he was born under Marcus Aurelius (161-180 A. D.). His work, in fifteen books, is a curious assemblage of information on cooking, literature, art, history, and other matters, with no literary merit whatsoever, but valuable on account of the curious information and numerous quotations it contains.

CHAPTER XL

THE NOVEL—POETRY—SCIENCE—PHILOSOPHY— CHRISTIAN WRITERS

The Greek novel—Antonius Diogenes, first century after Christ—
Iamblichus, about 170 A. D.—Xenophon of Ephesus, about 200 A. D.—
Heliodorus, third century—Chariton, third century—Longus, second
century (?)—Poetry—Dionysius the Periegete, second century—Oppian,
about 138–168 A. D.—Babrius, early second century—Grammar and rhet-
oric—Apollonius Dyscolus, about 150 A. D.—Herodian, about 175 A. D.
—Phrynichus, late second century—Pollux, end of the second century
—Harpocration, end of the second century—Hermogenes of Tarsus,
about 170 A. D.—Apsines, first half of the third century—Menander of
Laodicea, about 200 A. D.—Longinus, about 220–273 A. D.—Science—
Claudius Ptolemy, about 140 A. D.—Galen, 131–201 A. D.—Philosophy—
Sextus Empiricus, about 180 A. D.—Neoplatonism—Plotinus, 204–270
A. D.—Porphyry, 233 to about 304 A. D.—Christian writers—Quadratus,
about 100 A. D.—Aristides of Athens, second century—Justin Martyr,
about 100 to about 165 A. D.—Other apologists—Doctors of the Church
—Clement of Alexandria, about 160 to about 215 A. D.—Origen, 185–254
A. D.—Other Christian writers.

AN interesting product of the teachings of the sophists
of this period is the novel, the love story in prose. In itself
the Greek novel is rather uninteresting, but it
The novel. deserves a few words as the earliest known form
of what has since developed into one of the most important
branches of literature. The sentiment of love played, as
has been said before, an important part in Alexandrian
poetry. Love elegies and epigrams were many and love-
scenes were made prominent in epics. The love passages
in history and mythology were also more dwelt upon than

in earlier times. At the same time the historians began to embellish their histories (especially those of Alexander) with marvelous and fantastic tales. It was therefore only natural that the sophists, when they wished to suggest to their pupils subjects for composition, should suggest strange situations which might lead to love-affairs. From such origins arose a series of novels full of impossible situations, strange reverses of fortune, wonderful recognitions and adventures, with no real delineation of character and little stylistic merit.

The earliest novels known to us—though there are traces of others somewhat earlier—date from the first cen-

Antonius Di-
ogenes, Iam-
blichus, Xen-
ophon of
Ephesus.

tury after Christ, and these are known only through summaries, as the originals are lost.

At that time Antonius Diogenes wrote *The Wonders Beyond Thule*, in twenty-four books, a rambling tale of the wonderful adventures of a pair of lovers and their friends in various parts of the known world, in Hades, and elsewhere. The *Babyloniaca*, written between 166 and 180 A. D. by a Hellenized Syrian, Iamblichus, told of a series of adventures that befell the beautiful Sinonis and her beloved husband, Rhodanes, on account of the love of Garmus, the widowed king of Babylon, for Sinonis. In the end Rhodanes, after having been crucified by Garmus, won his wife and became king of Babylon. There seems to have been some attempt to represent character in this novel. The *Ephesian Tales*, written in the third century after Christ by Xenophon of Ephesus and preserved to us entire, tell in five books the adventures of the beautiful Habrocomes of Ephesus and his fair bride, Anthea, who are separated soon after their marriage, are captured by various pirates and others, and travel about the world with varying fortunes, until they are finally reunited at Rhodes.

Heliodorus of Emesa, in Phœnicia, wrote in the third century after Christ the longest and most important of the

novels of this kind, *The Ethiopian Tale of Theagenes and Chariclea*.

Heliodorus. The infant daughter of an Ethiopian king is carried to Greece, grows up, and falls in love with Theagenes, who is equally in love with her. They pass through many adventures, are several times captured by pirates and exposed to all sorts of dangers, but at last Chariclea's identity is disclosed to her father, Theagenes distinguishes himself before the eyes of the king, and the lovers are married. Some of the persons of this tale are fairly well drawn, and style and composition are agree-

able; but the general character of the story is the same as that of its predecessors. To about the same time belong the much inferior tale of *Chæreas and Callirrhoë*, by Chariton, and probably the *Story of Apollonius of Tyre*, which is preserved only in a Latin translation. The *Adventures of Leucippe and Clitophon*, by Achilles Tattius, seems to belong to the fourth or fifth century.

The pastoral novel *Daphnis and Chloë* was written by Longus, who seems to have been a Samian. His date may be as early as the second century, but is uncertain.

Daphnis and Chloë. Two children, Daphnis and Chloë, were exposed to die in the woods, but were brought up by shepherds. They fall in love with each other, are at last found to be the children of wealthy parents, are married, and return to their beloved pastures to live a happy, idyllic life. In some respects this story may be likened to a pastoral idyll in prose. The style is simple and attractive, and the description of manners and customs good. Some of the situations are, however, devised with too great ingenuity and the moral tone of the story is occasionally low.

There is little poetry of interest in the second and third centuries. Epigrams and other forms of light verse continued to be written, but were not important, while epic poetry was insignificant and dramatic poetry was not written at all. There were numerous didactic poems, some of

which are preserved, among them some geographies in verse, such as the *Guide of the Inhabited World*, by Dionysius the Periegete; also medical and botanical poems. Among all the poets of the time only Oppian and Babrius seem worth mentioning. Oppian, from Cilicia, wrote a poem *On Fishing*, not long before 180 A. D., in five books. It is not really poetry, but gives descriptions and rules for fishing which have some elegance of expression. An inferior poem *On Hunting* is probably the work of a later Oppian. Babrius wrote fables in choliambic verse. The fables are for the most part the ancient beast stories attributed to Æsop, current in prose versions in the mouth of the people; some few Babrius seems to have invented. The date of Babrius is not known, but he appears to belong to the second century after Christ. He tells his fables simply and writes verses skillfully, but has little imagination and no high order of literary merit.

A few grammarians and writers on rhetoric belonging to the second and third centuries should be mentioned, though their works are hardly to be classed as literature. Apollonius, called Dyscolus on account of his bad temper, of Alexandria, belongs to the latter part of the second century, was a theoretical grammarian, and may be called one of the founders of syntax. His son and pupil, Herodian, continued his work. Both exercised great influence on the subsequent study of grammar. Several scholars of this time were collectors and explainers of words. These lexicographers were for the most part Atticists—that is, men who wished to preserve the words in use at Athens in the fifth and fourth centuries B. C., while others were antiquarians. Phrynichus wrote a lost dictionary called *Sophistic Preparation*, dedicated to the Emperor Commodus (180–192 A. D.). His *Choice of Attic Words and Phrases* is extant. Julius Pollux, appointed professor of sophistics at Athens under Commodus,

wrote an *Onomasticon*, a dictionary giving the proper Attic names for things, with numerous references and various information. This is preserved only in abstract. The extant *Lexicon of the Ten Attic Orators*, by Harpocration of Alexandria, seems to belong to the same period. Writers on theoretical rhetoric are: Hermogenes of Tarsus, in the second half of the second century; Apsines of Gadara, in the first half of the third century; Menander of Laodicea, at about the same time; and Cassius Longinus, born about 220 A. D., and put to death in 273 for having supported the rebellion of Queen Zenobia of Palmyra against the Emperor Aurelian. The valuable treatise *On the Sublime* (see page 410) is wrongly ascribed to him, but his great reputation was probably deserved.

While the sophists were attracting great audiences with superficial discourses on all sorts of subjects, men of more scientific spirit were carrying on investigations and committing their results to writing. The names of most of these men may be passed over in silence; but two, Ptolemy and Galen, must be mentioned. Claudius Ptolemæus of Alexandria was born early in the second century, and was living under Marcus Aurelius (161–180 A. D.). He was a distinguished mathematician, astronomer, and geographer. His *Astronomy*—translated into Arabic, and from that language into Latin—exercised great influence in the middle ages under the name of *Almagest*. A long treatise on astrology, which has been supposed to be the work of a later writer, is probably by Ptolemy. His *Geography* is valuable for its information concerning trade routes and means of communication between different parts of the Roman Empire. Several other works are either lost or only partially preserved. The science of medicine furnished several writers; but the only one of great importance is Claudius Galenus, son of Nico of Pergamum. He was born in 131 A. D., studied at Pergamum, Smyrna, Corinth, and Alexandria, and went to Rome in 163, where he lived

most of the time until his death, in 201. He was eminent as a practising physician, as a lecturer, and as a writer. His principal works are on medicine, and offer a complete course of instruction. His other writings treat of logic, ethics, philosophy, and even grammar. Though not a brilliant man, Galen is sensible and learned.

The old schools of philosophy had, by the third century after Christ, fallen into decay. They existed in name, but the differences between them were traditional rather than real, except in so far as the practises of the Cynics appealed to the less refined natures and the Platonists tended more and more to a sort of half Pythagorean mysticism. None of the followers of the old schools is of any literary importance. Only one writer, Sextus—called Sextus Empiricus, because

Sextus Empiricus. he was a physician of the empiric school—deserves mention. His extant works—*Pyrrhonian Sketches*, containing the main doctrines of Pyrrho, the founder of the Skeptic School, and *Sceptica*, in which the skeptic doctrines are supported in detail—furnish us with much information concerning the views of various philosophers. The editions divide the *Sceptica* into five books *Against the Mathematicians* and five *Against the Dogmatics*.

An event of real importance in the history of philosophy was the rise of Neoplatonism. The founder of the new doctrine was Plotinus (204–270 A. D.), a Greek from Nicopolis, in Egypt. He was a pupil of Ammonius Saccas, at Alexandria, who is sometimes called the founder of Neoplatonism because Plotinus derived from him the germs of his doctrine. In 243 A. D. Plotinus joined the expedition of Gordianus against the Persians in the hope of learning the wisdom of the Magi, but returned in 244, and from that time taught at Rome. He died in 270 A. D. at the country-seat of his pupil Zethus, in Campania. His doctrines were published by his pupil Porphyry in the form of *Enneads*—six groups, of

nine treatises each. They treat of ethics, the origin and government of the world, the soul, reason, the nature of being—in short, of all the great questions of philosophy, and contain a complete exposition of the new doctrine.

This doctrine purports to be merely an explanation and development of the teachings of Plato, but contains ele-

Neoplatonic doctrine. elements derived from Aristotle, Pythagoras, the Stoics, and other sects, in addition to the thoughts of Plotinus himself. God is conceived of as absolutely pure, as far removed as possible from matter and the world of appearances in which we live. The real object of philosophy is to raise man as nearly as possible to God by freeing him from the encumbrances of matter. The world arose by the separation of parts of the divine soul and their association with matter. The human soul is a part of the divine soul, but rendered impure by contamination with matter. Its proper end is to free itself and return to the divine soul, and this it may hope to do through philosophy. Such a philosophy is really a religion, full of mysticism, and leading naturally to ascetic practises and pure lives. The language in which it is expressed by Plotinus is obscure and difficult, but his thoughts are high and noble. He is a sincere and impassioned preacher of what he holds to be the truth, inspired by a fervent love of the true and the good.

The philosophy, or rather religion, of Neoplatonism is the latest, and in some respects the most complete, expression of purely Hellenic thought on philosophical and religious subjects. It is in the form of Neoplatonism that the old Hellenic spirit makes its last stand against the rising tide of Christianity. Porphyry, the chief pupil of Plotinus, was also one of the defenders of the old faith against the new. He was born at Tyre in 233 A. D. and studied grammar and rhetoric under Longinus at Athens. In 262 he went to Rome, and soon became an enthusiastic pupil of Plotinus. His death took place

Porphyry. tide of Christianity. Porphyry, the chief pupil of Plotinus, was also one of the defenders of the old faith against the new. He was born at Tyre in 233 A. D. and studied grammar and rhetoric under Longinus at Athens. In 262 he went to Rome, and soon became an enthusiastic pupil of Plotinus. His death took place

not far from 304 A. D. His works were many—on philosophy, history, mathematics, grammar, and other subjects. Among his extant works are the *Life of Plotinus*, a treatise on *Abstinence from Meat*, a hortatory *Letter to Marcella* (his wife), *Homeric Investigations*, and an allegorical treatise *On the Cave of the Nymphs in the Odyssey*. His argument *Against the Christians*, in fifteen books, which called forth replies from several of the fathers of the Church, is lost, as are many of his other works. Porphyry was a diligent writer, a man of good ability, who was able to learn and remember many things. His writing is simpler than that of Plotinus, whose obscure statements he sometimes makes clear, but his literary skill is not great.

In the second century, Christian writers make their appearance in Greek literature. Before that time, the Christian writings, even when written in Greek, have no relation to Greek literature, being simple narratives, letters, and the like, composed with no reference to literary quality, though often possessing the charm of simplicity and sometimes originality of expression. But in so far as they belong to the history of any literature other than that of the Christian Church they belong to the history of Jewish literature. In the second century, when Christianity became more prominent and aroused against itself the anger of the pagans, its more learned members found it necessary to defend their faith, and they did this by means of the arts of argument which they had learned in pagan schools; for these early defenders of Christianity—*apologists*, as they are called—were for the most part converted pagans who had been trained in the schools of philosophy. Among the early apologists are Quadratus, whose *Apology* addressed to the Emperor Hadrian is lost, and Aristides of Athens, who wrote an extant *Apology* to Antoninus Pius, but they may be passed over. Justin Martyr is more important. He was born of pagan parents at Flavia Neapolis, in Samaria, about

Christian
writers.

100 A. D., and was converted to Christianity in 123. He went to Rome, where he seems to have had a school of Christianity. He died a martyr between 163

**Justin
Martyr.**

and 167. His two *Apologies*, addressed to Marcus Antoninus, date from about 150 A. D. In

his *Dialogue with the Jew Tryphon* he refutes some of the views of Christianity held by the Jews and informs us about his own education. The other writings attributed to Justin are of doubtful authenticity. His writing is careless and occasionally obscure, but sometimes rises to eloquence. He

is regarded as the chief among the apologists.

**Other
apologists.**

After him Tatian, Athenagoras, Theophilus of Antioch, Ariston, Miltiades, and Irenæus continued the defense of Christianity, but without adding anything of great literary importance.

The writings of the apologists were little more than letters or addresses in defense of Christianity. In the third century Christian writings become more extensive, learned, and elaborate. The apologists are succeeded by the *doctors*

**The doctors
of the Church.
Clement of
Alexandria.**

or teachers. The first of these is Clement of Alexandria, who was born, perhaps in Greece, about 160 A. D., but settled at Alexandria about 180, and began to teach there about 190. In

202 or 203 he left Alexandria to escape the persecution under Septimius Severus, and seems to have spent the rest of his life in wandering. He died not far from 215 A. D. His extant writings are an *Exhortation to the Greeks*, urging the acceptance of Christianity; the *Pedagogue*, containing the main points of Christian moral teaching; and the *Carpets (Stromateis)*, containing the chief doctrines of Christianity in connection with passages of the Old and New Testaments. He tries to show that Greek philosophy is younger than that of other peoples, and that the best part of it is derived from the Jews. He quotes much from Greek writers, often from those whose works are now lost. He is the first who uses Greek philosophical arguments

in defense of Christianity. He was followed by Origen, his pupil and his successor as a teacher at Alexandria.

Origen was the greatest and most learned of the doctors of the Church. He was born at Alexandria of Christian parents in 185, and studied under Clement, whom he succeeded upon his departure from

Origen.

Alexandria. Here he taught at least until 216. The later years of his life were occupied with journeys and teaching in many places, and he died at Tyre in 254 A. D. His writings were very numerous and are in part preserved. They consist chiefly of *Commentaries* on the Old and New Testaments and of *Homilies* or sermons. He also edited the Bible in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin. He made great use of allegory in explaining the Scriptures, and did more even than Clement to spread the ideas of Greek philosophers, especially of Plato, abroad in the Christian schools. He shows at the same time remarkable breadth of view. His book *Against the So-called True Argument of Celsus* is a reply to arguments against Christianity brought forward by Celsus, an Epicurean philosopher of the second century after Christ, and shows qualities similar to those of his other works. His literary merit is not great, whatever his

Other

**Christian
writers.**

importance in the history of Christian thought.

The same may be said of his contemporary

Hippolytus, of the somewhat older Methodius of Tyre, of Pamphilus of Cæsarea, and of the chronicle writer Julius Africanus. Christian literature was as yet undeveloped.

CHAPTER XLI

FROM CONSTANTINE TO JUSTINIAN

Decline of Greek literature—Schools of oratory—Himerius, about 315–386 A. D.—Libanius, 314–393 A. D.—Themistius, about 330 to about 390 A. D.—Julian the Apostate, 331–363 A. D.—Choricus, about 430 A. D.—Achilles Tatius, fifth century (?)—Lexicographers—Orion, about 425 A. D.—Hesychius, fifth century (?)—Orus, fifth century (?)—Suidas, tenth century—Photius, second half of the ninth century—Stobæus, sixth century (?)—Historians—Eunapius, about 346 to about 414 A. D.—Zozimus, about 500 A. D.—Procopius, before 500 to after 562 A. D.—Stephanus of Byzantium, fifth century (?)—Neoplatonism—Iamblichus, about 280 to about 350 A. D.—Hypatia, killed in 415 A. D.—Synesius, about 370–413 B. C.—Nestorius, fourth century—Plutarch, about 350–431 A. D.—Syrianus, about 435 A. D.—Proclus, about 410–485 A. D.—Poetry—Quintus Smyrnæus, fourth century (?)—Nonnus, fourth century—Tryphiodorus, fifth century—Musæus, fifth century—Orphic poems—Sibylline oracles—The Anthology—Christian writers—Athanasius, about 295–373 A. D.—Basil of Cæsarea, about 330–379 A. D.—Gregory Nazianzene, about 338 to about 390 A. D.—Gregory of Nyssa, after 330 to 394 A. D.—St. John Chrysostom, about 345–407 A. D.—Eusebius, about 265–340 A. D.—Evagrius, 536 to about 600 A. D.—Cyril, 412–444 A. D.—Theodoret, fifth century—Conclusion.

THE period of two centuries from Constantine to Justinian is the last period of ancient Greek literature—a period of decline, which may be passed over rapidly. The art and learning of the sophists, as well as the philosophical and ethical speculations of the Neoplatonists, faded away and became absorbed by Christianity; and Christian eloquence, after a brief period of brilliancy, sank into obscurity; history was

written with little success, so far as its literary value is concerned, while poetry is represented only by artificial, imitative epics and some of the light verses of the Anthology.

The schools of the sophists had been less flourishing in the last years of the third and first years of the fourth century than in the time immediately before, chiefly on account of the political disorders of the empire. But with the new order of things under Constantine came new opportunities for the exercise of studied eloquence. Schools of oratory flourished in all the chief cities, training young men to occupy government offices. The teachers in these schools enjoyed great reputations at the time, and their oratory was much admired. Something of their lives and qualities may be learned from the *Lives of the Sophists*, by Eunapius, but it will be enough for us to mention a few whose principal works are preserved.

Schools of oratory. Himerius was born about 315 A. D. at Prusa, in Bithynia, but lived nearly all his life at Athens, where he had many pupils, among them the Christian orators Basil of Cæsarea and Gregory of Nazianzus. He took no part in public life, and all his speeches were either for use in his teaching or for delivery on special occasions, such as the arrival of a new governor or the visit of the orator to a new city. Twenty-four orations are preserved entire, besides fragments of others. They show a great lack of thoughts, but care in execution. They are full of reminiscences of the poets, and preserve to us a number of interesting fragments. The style is musical and poetic, but without vigor.

Himerius. Libanius of Antioch, who lived from 314 to 393 A. D., is the most important sophist of the time. He was educated at Antioch and Athens, and taught at Constantinople, Nicomedia, and, from 354 until his death, at Antioch. He was one of the most important per-

Libanius.

sons in the whole Levant, partly on account of his own ability, partly through the favor of the emperors, especially Julian the Apostate. He delivered public speeches on all occasions, addressed written orations to generals, governors, and emperors, and carried on a vast correspondence, from which 1,607 letters remain, addressed to all sorts of persons, including Christian bishops and scholars. His other extant writings are numerous. Many of them are school exercises, among which his *Life of Demosthenes* and *Arguments of Demosthenic orations* should be classed; but the most interesting are sixty-eight orations and lectures of various kinds, dealing in general either with ethical problems or, more frequently, with the events of the day. These last are the most interesting, for they disclose the rivalries of schools, the life of the great cities of the eastern empire, the inner workings of the imperial government, and even to some extent the characters of the emperors. The misfortune of Libanius is his genuine attachment to the ancient religion at a time when Christianity was in the ascendant. He did not understand the new religion, and regarded it as a foe to civilization, although he had friends among the Christians. The decline of classical studies troubled and pained him, and led him to vain complaints. But his talent as a rhetorical writer is incontestable, though it was too highly rated by his contemporaries. He is too fond of details, lacks the passionate vigor of the great orator, and is sometimes obscure; but he has imagination, ingenuity, and often indubitable sincerity.

Themistius, who lived from about 330 to about 390 A. D., was born in Paphlagonia, and taught at Constantinople from about 350 until his death. He took part
Themistius. in public affairs, was often sent as ambassador, was senator, held several offices, and was made prefect of the city in 384 by Theodosius. He delivered addresses in various cities, and was the chief orator of Constantinople, envied by some, to be sure, but honored by all, both Chris-



THE EMPEROR JULIAN.

Bust on the Cathedral at Acerenza.

tians and pagans. His extant works consist of *Paraphrases* on Aristotle's physics, analytics, and psychology, and thirty-four orations relating to events of his time. His sentiments are noble, and his orations, though they seem finished rather than impassioned, are not without dignity, and even eloquence.

The Emperor Julian (the Apostate) belongs, as a writer, to the school of the sophists. He was born in 331 A. D., was long an object of suspicion on account of his nearness to the throne, was raised to the rank of Cæsar by Constantius, became emperor in 361, and lost his life in a campaign against the Persians in 363. He was brought up as a Christian, but came under the influence of Libanius and embraced the old religion. He studied philosophy at Athens for a time, and was a Neoplatonist in faith. His extant writings consist of eight orations, eighty-four letters, some of which are spurious, a sort of satire called *Symposium* or *Cæsars*, and a few specimens of verse. The three books *Against the Christians* and his *Commentaries* on his war in Gaul are lost. His earliest speeches, in honor of Constantius and Eusebia, show little more than ability to imitate the classic models, but his later works show much humor of a satirical nature and great vigor of thought. His style has been said to show some resemblance to that of Lucian. Julian, who died at the age of thirty-two, and whose life afforded little opportunity for serious literary work, was nevertheless one of the most important writers of his century.

After the fourth century the ancient learning declined more and more. In the fifth century the school of Gaza, the chief representative of which is Choricus, acquired a reputation which lasted into the sixth century, but the extant addresses by Choricus have little value and merely show that he was well educated in the ancient classics. Editions of ancient works and commentaries upon them continued to be published, but these

are of no literary importance. The novelist Achilles Tatius seems to belong to this period, and other works similar to his were written. There were also collections of spurious letters of little interest. Somewhat more important are the works of a few lexicographers, among whom Orion of Thebes, in Egypt, who lived about 425, and Hesychius of Alexandria, who seems to belong to the fifth century, should be mentioned. Orion's *Etymological Lexicon* is lost, but served, with a similar work by Orus, as the basis of various mediæval lexica, such as the *Etymologicum Magnum*. The *Lexicon* of Hesychius is especially important because it preserves a great number of rare words. Two much later lexica may be mentioned here, because they are based upon works of this time and earlier, that of Suidas, compiled in the tenth century, which contains much valuable information on many subjects, including the history of literature, and that of Photius, who was patriarch of Constantinople from 858 to 867 and 878 to 886 A. D. In his *Lexicon* Photius uses good early sources; in another book, the *Bibliotheca*, he gives the contents of two hundred and eighty books, most of which are now lost. Along with the lexica mention should be made of the *Anthologium* of John of Stobi, in Macedonia, called Stobæus. This work, in four books, was compiled apparently in the sixth century, and contains selections from ancient writers in prose and verse. It has preserved to us much that would otherwise have been lost. The first two books are usually called the *Eclogæ*, the last two the *Florilegium*.

The historians of this time are rhetorical, pretentious chroniclers or panegyrists of the emperors. Most of them can be passed over. Eunapius of Sardis, who lived from about 346 to about 414 A. D., wrote a chronicle of the time from 270 to 404. His style is flowery, and his partiality for the Emperor Julian is marked. The work is only partially pre-

**Lexica, Ori-
on, Orus, He-
sychius, Sui-
das, Photius.**

Stobæus.

**Historians.
Eunapius,
Zozimus, Pro-
copius.**

served. He also wrote twenty-three *Lives of Philosophers and Sophists*, biographies of the chief Neoplatonists and of some of the sophists of his time. Zozimus, in the early sixth century, wrote a history of the empire to the capture of Rome by Alaric, in 410 A. D. His work lacks breadth of view and impartiality, but shows that he was careful in acquiring information and tried to write true history. The style is clear and not tedious, as is much of the writing of the time. Zozimus is the chief source of information about the history of the fourth century. Procopius of Cæsarea, in Palestine, was a man of much distinction in the sixth century, and held important offices under Justinian. His works are the *History of the Wars of Justinian* against the Persians, Vandals, and Goths, which he finished in 554 A. D.; a treatise *On Buildings* erected under Justinian; and his *Secret History*. The great work on Justinian's wars and the far less important one on his buildings are accounts of the emperor's doings written by an imperial official and partake of the nature of panegyrics. Procopius had his revenge in the *Secret History*, which is full of attacks upon Justinian, Theodora, Belisarius, and Antonina, not invented by Procopius, but derived from current talk. The three works taken together may give us a pretty correct idea of the history of the time. Procopius, though classed as a pagan writer, is really neither pagan nor Christian, but a skeptic, who is at the same time superstitious. His style is Attic, with many later elements, and also shows an attempt to imitate Herodotus.

After the historians one geographer is worth a word, Stephanus of Byzantium, who lived probably in the fifth century. He wrote a great geographical work, which is preserved only in a much abridged form. But even this is important for the information it contains.

Philosophy, which had attained a new importance through Plotinus and Porphyry, continued to live only in

the form of Neoplatonism, and Neoplatonism tended more and more toward mystic theology. In Syria Neoplatonism flourished in the early part of the fourth century, its chief representative being Iamblichus, who was born about 280 A. D. His extant works relate to Pythagoras and his doctrines, and exhibit a spirit of exalted mysticism. His lost *Chaldean Theology* was doubtless of a similar character. The Syrian school disappears in the fourth century. In the fifth century several philosophers and mathematicians acquired great reputation at Alexandria. Among them was one woman, Hypatia, who was killed by a mob in 415 A. D. on account of her alleged hostility to Christianity. A pupil of Hypatia was Synesius of Cyrene, who became a Christian bishop. He was born about 370 A. D., traveled, studied philosophy at Alexandria, and returned to his native Cyrene, where he had great estates. Even before he had declared his conversion to Christianity he was elected Bishop of Ptolemaïs. He accepted the office and filled it with courage and ability until his death in 413 A. D. His extant writings are: *Letters*, *Sermons* or *Homilies*, some *Orations* after the manner of the sophists, among them one *In Praise of Baldness*, an interesting literary essay called *Dio*, and ten *Hymns*. Some of these were written before his conversion, others after, but all show much the same qualities of dignity, gravity, and poetic coloring, except that in the more familiar writings dignity is supplanted by a lighter elegance. Whether Christian or pagan, Synesius was filled with the mysticism of the Neoplatonists. The Alexandrian school of Neoplatonism continued to exist into the sixth century, but without producing any writer or thinker of importance.

At Athens Neoplatonism flourished at the end of the fourth and beginning of the fifth century under Nestorius, Plutarch, and Syrianus, who were followed by Proclus, the last great representative of the school. He was born at

Constantinople about 410 and taught at Athens from about 438 until his death in 485 A. D. Like the other Neoplatonists of the time, he was a mystic enthusiast, but he was also a man of great learning and great power of organization. His remaining works are *Commentaries* on some of Plato's dialogues, several philosophical treatises, and six *Hymns*. He reduced the Neoplatonic doctrines to fixed rules, thereby perfecting the organization of the sect, but at the same time limiting its further progress. His literary merit is slight. After his time the school gradually fell into decay. In 529 A. D. Justinian closed the schools at Athens and expelled the philosophers. They retired to Persia, and although they returned and continued the traditions of the school for a century longer, their efforts were in vain. Heathen philosophy had seen its day, and what remained of Neoplatonism was swallowed up in Byzantine theology.

After the second century only two kinds of poetry—epic and lyric—show any life. The epic poems are little more than imitations of earlier works. Quintus of Smyrna (Quintus Smyrnæus), of whom little is known, but who probably belongs to the fourth century, wrote a poem called *Continuation of Homer (Posthomerica)*, in which he tells the events at Troy from the death of Hector to the departure of the Greeks. His verse is correct, his story well told, his descriptions good, and his similes sometimes fine, but there is a complete lack of poetic inspiration. A more talented poet is Nonnus, from Panopolis, in Egypt, who seems to belong to the end of the fourth century. He wrote an epic in forty-eight books, called *Dionysiaca*, in which he told the fantastic story of the march of Dionysus to India—a story which had arisen from the march of Alexander the Great, and had been adorned with all sorts of wonderful episodes. Nonnus

shows great imaginative power, inventive ability, and skill in the use of language. He is sometimes obscure, and the rules of versification which he introduced hamper his freedom of expression and make his verse monotonous, though without diminishing its sweetness. In his later years Nonnus became a Christian and made a metrical paraphrase of the gospel of St. John. Nonnus found several imitators, chief among whom are Tryphiodorus, who wrote a dull poem in six hundred and ninety-one lines on *The Sack of Troy*, and Coluthus of Nicopolis, in Egypt, the author of an insignificant epic, *The Rape of Helen*. The metrical love story of *Hero and Leander*, by Musæus, is an imitation of Nonnus only in form.

The Orphic poems which have come down to us are chiefly products of this period, though the strain of mysticism to which they owe their origin can be traced back to the sixth century B. C. Among these the *Orphic Argonautica* and some others are epic in form, while others are hymns. All are more interesting for their remarkable and obscure expressions than for literary merit. Somewhat the same character belongs to the *Sibylline Oracles*, though these are clearly the products of Alexandrian Jews, while the Orphic poems are purely Greek in origin.

Lyric poetry appears under the empire in the form of epigrams and short songs, some of which are of real beauty. Even in the sixth century, Agathias, Macedonius, Paul the Silentiary, and others were writers of elegant and attractive little poems. Several of their productions are contained in the *Palatine Anthology*, a collection of epigrams called *Palatine* because the manuscript containing it formerly belonged to the Palatine Library at Heidelberg. The original collection was made in the tenth century by Constantinus Cephalas, and additions were made by the monk Planudes in the fourteenth century. In this *Anthology* several ear-

lier collections, such as the *Garland* of Meleager and the *Cycle* of Agathias, are contained. The *Anacreontics* (see page 103) should also be mentioned at this point, for they date from all periods of the empire.

The real vigor of Greek literature at this time appears only in Christian literature, especially in Christian eloquence, yet this has its place rather in a history of Christian thought than in that of Greek literature. Only a few words will therefore be devoted to the great preachers and other writers of this time.

Christian literature.

Athanasius of Alexandria was born about 295 and became bishop in 328 A. D. From that time until his death, in 373, his life was passed in the thick of theological controversy. Three times he was driven from his see and three times he returned. His active, strenuous life was passed in the service of orthodoxy, in behalf of which his addresses were written. His dialectic is clear and powerful, his language simple and unassuming, though, like many early Christian writers, he uses biblical and Hellenic expressions side by side without really combining them. With Athanasius Christian eloquence is powerful and vigorous, but without grace and elegance. These qualities are added by the orators of the second half of the century.

Athanasius.

Basil of Cæsarea, in Cappadocia, called Basil the Great, was born about 331 A. D. He studied at Cæsarea, Constantinople, and Athens. From 359 to 364 he traveled in Syria and Egypt, studying the forms of monasticism, which he introduced into Pontus. In 364 he became a priest, and in 370 Bishop of Cæsarea. As head of the Church in Cappadocia and imperial governor of Pontus he lived a life of fatigues and dangers for eight years. His death took place in 379 A. D. During his last years, after the death of Athanasius, he was the chief defender of orthodoxy in the East. The most interesting

Basil.

of his writings are his *Sermons* and his *Letters*. His *Hexameron*, on the six days of the creation, and his advice to the young *On the Reading of Profane Writers*, are especially admired. His spirit is sincere, religious, and enthusiastic, and also generous, just, and kindly. He employs his intimate knowledge of Greek literature and philosophy in the service of Christianity with the greatest skill. His style is simple, but elevated, with unconscious imitation of ancient models.

Gregory of Nazianzus was also a Cappadocian, and a warm friend of Basil. He was born about 338 A. D., studied at Cæsarea, in Palestine, and Egypt; then at Athens. At the request of his father, Bishop of Nazianzus, he became a priest in 361. In 371 he was made Bishop of Sasima, and in 374 succeeded his father as Bishop of Nazianzus. In 379 he was called to Constantinople to combat the Arian heresy, and was nominated for the metropolitan see in 381. His election was contested and he withdrew to Nazianzus, where he relinquished his bishopric in 383 and withdrew to the country, where he died about 390. His works are *Addresses*, *Letters*, and *Poems*. The *Addresses* belong to the years of his active life, the *Letters* and *Poems* to his last years of retirement. His nature was meditative and delicate, and his poems have a certain charm, though they are not the works of a great poet. As an orator Gregory is less simple than Basil, showing more apparent effort to produce effect. With all that, his sincerity and earnestness are evident. These qualities, joined with imagination and learning, make him one of the greatest of Christian orators. Inferior to Basil and Gregory of Nazianzus is Basil's brother, Gregory, Bishop of Nyssa, whose importance is rather as a theologian than as a writer or speaker.

The greatest of all the orators of this period is St. John Chrysostom, who was born at Antioch about 345 A. D., was

educated in philosophy and rhetoric, became priest, Bishop of Antioch, and Metropolitan of Constantinople, was banished, restored, and carried off by force into exile, to die at last at Comana, in Cappadocia, in 407 A. D.

**St. John
Chrysostom.**

The details of his life belong to the history of his times and the history of the Church. His numerous works consist of treatises, speeches, and letters. In these he shows himself a moral teacher and an orator rather than a theologian. In his addresses he points out frankly and fearlessly the faults and vices of the times, argues in reply to all possible excuses, and shows the emptiness of counter-arguments. From him we get much information about the luxurious life, the passion for pleasure, and the selfishness of the people; the irreverence and carelessness of the churchgoers; the sluggishness of some of the clergy of the time; and his works would be valuable for this reason even if they had no literary value. But his eloquence is admirable. His argumentation is close and exact, his proofs straightforward and simple. His manner is sometimes grave and dignified, sometimes more intimate and conversational, occasionally even satirical, and withal his speeches are filled with Christian love and charity. It may be said that his style tends to be diffuse, but it is natural and easy, lacking something of the studied perfection of the classic orators, but also entirely free from the affectations of the later sophists.

After Chrysostom, Christian eloquence is more practised than ever before, but it shows no real progress, and by the end of the fifth century it disappears.

Of Christian writers not oratorical the most important is Eusebius. He was born in Palestine about 265 A. D. He was Bishop of Cæsarea from 313 until his death in 340, and

Eusebius.

was thus drawn into the controversies of the time. His chief works are historical and apologetic. His *Chronicles*, in two books, gave a brief sketch of the history of the world, with comparison of dates in Jewish

and pagan history. Only fragments of this are preserved in Greek, but a Latin translation by St. Jerome, and Armenian and Syrian versions exist, by means of which this work, of the greatest importance for the knowledge of ancient chronology, has been handed down to us. The *Church History*, in ten books, gives the history of Christianity to the year 323. The treatment is dry and the style uninteresting, but the idea of writing a history of Christianity was a new one, and the work is valuable on account of the information it contains. The *Gospel Preparation* and the *Gospel Demonstration* are apologetic works, distinguished less for exactness of argument or critical faculty than for diligence in collecting great numbers of extracts from ancient writers and for a certain breadth of view.

After Eusebius Church history was little cultivated for a time, while apologetic and controversial writings were numerous. In the fifth century several Church histories were written, but they hardly deserve mention in a history of Greek literature. The last who deserves the name of historian is Evagrius of Epiphania, in Syria, who lived from 536 to about 600 A. D., and wrote a *History of the Church* to the year 594. The latest controversial writer of note is Cyril of Alexandria, Bishop of Alexandria from 412 to 444 A. D., whose numerous writings in defense of orthodoxy are more interesting to the theologian than to the student of literature. His *Defense of Christianity against Julian* shows him as an adept in argumentation, ingenious, skilful, and honest, though violent and even abusive. The last of the great doctors of the Church was Theodoret, Bishop of Cyrrhus, in northern Syria, from 423 to 458. He was distinguished as an orator and also wrote an *Ecclesiastical History*, but his fame was due chiefly to his controversial and apologetic works. Among these is the *Demonstration of Christian Truth according to Greek Philosophy*, in which he compares the views of the Greek schools on philosophical questions

with those of the Christians. He is not an original thinker, but expresses the traditional views clearly. After Theodoret Greek theology shows little life.

The long life of ancient Greek literature came to an end in the sixth century. Much even of the literature of the time between Constantine and Justinian stands in no close relation to the literature of the great classical period, and after Justinian the Byzantine period ensues—a period of great historical interest and importance, but not distinguished for its literary productions. Byzantine literature is voluminous, but not great. In spirit as well as in form it is far removed from the literature of ancient Greece. We may therefore properly close our account of ancient Greek literature with the time of Justinian.

APPENDIX I

BIBLIOGRAPHY

[This is not intended to be an exhaustive bibliography, but is merely an attempt to refer the student to the best and most available sources of information. Books in foreign languages and editions with notes in foreign languages are mentioned only in exceptional cases and for special reasons. Further bibliographical information is to be found in the larger histories of Greek literature, in Engelmann's *Bibliotheca Scriptorum Classicorum*, the monthly lists in the *Classical Review*, and the *Guide to the Choice of Classical Books*, by J. B. Mayor, London, 1879, D. Nutt; with its New Supplement, 1896.]

GENERAL WORKS

- K. O. Müller and J. W. Donaldson.** A History of the Literature of Ancient Greece [vol. i, Müller; vols. ii and iii, Donaldson], London, 1858, Longmans.
- William Mure.** A Critical History of the Language and Literature of Ancient Greece [epic and lyric poetry, and history as far as Xenophon], London, 1850-'57, Longmans.
- J. P. Mahaffy.** A History of Classical Greek Literature, London, 3d ed. 1890-'91, Macmillan, 2 vols. in 4.
- R. C. Jebb.** A Primer of Greek Literature, American Book Company [originally Appletons', 1878].
- F. B. Jevons.** A History of Greek Literature from the Earliest Period to the Death of Demosthenes, London, 2d ed. 1889. Griffin.
- Gilbert Murray.** A History of Ancient Greek Literature, London and New York, 1897.
- Edward Capps.** From Homer to Theocritus, Cleveland, 1900, the Chautauqua Press; enlarged ed., New York, 1901, Scribners.
- A. and M. Croiset.** Histoire de la Littérature Grecque, Paris, 1887-'99, 5 vols. [The best work on the subject.]

- A. and M. Croiset.** Manuel d'Histoire de la Littérature Grecque, Paris, 1901. [An admirable work in one vol.]
- T. Bergk.** Griechische Literaturgeschichte, Berlin, 1872-'87. [Especially good on the poets.]
- W. v. Christ.** Geschichte der griechischen Literatur bis auf die Zeit Justinians, Munich, 3d ed., 1898, Beck.
- R. Nicolai.** Griechische Literaturgeschichte, Magdeburg, 1873-'78, 3 vols.
- F. Susemihl.** Geschichte der griechischen Literatur in der Alexandrinerzeit, Leipzig, 1891-'92, Teubner, 2 vols.
- S. H. Butcher.** Some Aspects of the Greek Genius, London, 1894, Macmillan.
- J. A. Symonds.** Studies of the Greek Poets, London, 3d ed. 1893, Black, 2 vols.
- R. C. Jebb.** The Growth and Influence of Classical Greek Poetry, Boston, 1893, Houghton, Mifflin & Co.; also London, 1893, Macmillan.
- R. C. Jebb.** Attic Orators from Antiphon to Isæos, London, 1893, Macmillan, 2 vols.
- L. Campbell.** A Guide to Greek Tragedy for English Readers, New York, 1891, Putnam's; London, Percival.
- A. E. Haigh.** The Tragic Drama of the Greeks, Oxford, 1896, Clarendon Press.
- E. Rohde.** Der griechische Roman und seine Vorläufer, Leipzig, 1876, 2d ed. 1900, Breitkopf und Härtel.
- E. Zeller.** Die Philosophie der Griechen. Translated under separate titles: The Presocratic Schools, tr. by *Alleyne*, 1882, 2 vols.; Socrates and the Socratic Schools, tr. *Reichel*, 3d ed. 1885; Plato and the Older Academy, tr. *Alleyne* and *Goodwin*, new ed. 1888; Aristotle and the Peripatetics, tr. *Muirhead*, 1896; Stoics, Epicureans, and Sceptics, tr. *Reichel*, revised ed. 1880; Eclecticism, tr. *Alleyne*, 1883, London, Longmans.
- E. Zeller.** Outlines of the History of Greek Philosophy, tr. *Alleyne* and *Abbott*, London, 1886, Longmans; New York, Holt.
- Th. Gomperz.** Greek Thinkers, vol. i, New York, 1901, Scribners; vols. ii and iii to be translated from the German and published later.

A useful series of books called "Ancient Classics for English Readers" contains Homer's *Iliad*, by *W. L. Collins*; Homer's *Odyssey*, by *W. L. Collins*; Herodotus, by *G. C. Swayne*; Æschylus, by *R. S. Copleston*; Xenophon, by *Sir Alexander Grant*; Sophocles, by *C. W. Collins*; Euripides, by *W. B. Donne*; Aristophanes, by *W. L. Collins*; Hesiod and Theognis, by *James Davies*; Lucian, by *W. L. Collins*; Plato, by *W. L. Collins*; and Greek Anthology, by *Lord Neaves*. These are not translations, but essays illustrated by extracts. Published in America by the J. B. Lippincott Co.

COLLECTIONS

[A few of the collections referred to below. These contain the extant works and fragments of works of authors whose writings have been, in part at least, lost.]

- T. Bergk.** *Poetae Lyrici Græci*, ed. 4, Leipzig, 1878-'82, 3 vols.
A fifth edition, revised by Schroeder, has now (1901) begun to appear.
- G. Kinkel.** *Epicorum Græcorum Fragmenta*, vol. i, Leipzig, 1877.
- A. Nauck.** *Tragicorum Græcorum Fragmenta*, Leipzig, 2d ed., 1889.
- G. Kaibel.** *Fragmenta Comicoꝝ Græcorum*, vol. i, part i, Berlin, 1899.
- Th. Kock.** *Fragmenta Comicoꝝ Atticoꝝ*, Leipzig, 1880-'88, Teubner.
- A. Meineke.** *Fragmenta Comicoꝝ Græcorum*, Berlin, 1847, Reimer (editio minor, 2 parts).
- R. Hercher.** *Scriptores Erotici*, Leipzig, 1858-'59, 2 vols.
- C. Müller** (and **Th. Müller** and **V. Langlois**). *Fragmenta Historicorum Græcorum*, Paris, 1841-'70, 5 vols.
- F. G. A. Mullach.** *Fragmenta Philosophoꝝ Græcorum*, Paris, 1860-'81, 3 vols.

[Many other collections of fragments and scattered writings exist, the titles of which are to be found in larger bibliographies.]

EDITIONS AND TRANSLATIONS

ACHILLES TATIUS. Text in *Scriptores Erotici*, ed. Hercher, vol. i, Leipzig, 1858, Teubner series.

Translation. See ROMANCES.

ACUSILAUS. Text in *Fragmenta Historicorum Græcorum*.

ÆLIAN. Text. Hercher, Paris, 1858; Leipzig, 1864.

ÆNEAS TACTICUS. Text. Hercher, Berlin, 1870; Hug, Leipzig, 1874, Teubner series.

ÆSCHINES. Text. Weidner, Berlin, 1872; Blass, Leipzig, 1896, Teubner series.

Translation of the speech against Ctesiphon: *Biddle* (The Two Orations On the Crown), Philadelphia, 1881, Lippincott.

ÆSCHYLUS. Text. Weil, Leipzig, 1885; Wecklein-Vitelli, Berlin, 1885.

Annotated edition. F. A. Paley, London, 1887, Whittaker & Co.

Translation. (Verse) E. H. Plumptre, London and New York, Routledge; (Prose) Lewis Campbell, London, Kegan Paul, Trench & Co.

ÆSOP. Text. Halm, Leipzig, Teubner series.

Translation. Samuel Croxell, Boston and New York, 1863, London, 2d ed. 1869.

Thomas James, Philadelphia and New York, Appletons; also many others.

Caxton's Æsop is republished with a valuable introduction by J. Jacobs, London, 1889, D. Nutt & Co.

AGATHIAS. See ANTHOLOGY.

ALCÆUS. Text in Bergk, *Poetae Lyrici Græci*; Smyth, Greek Melic Poets, London and New York, 1900, Macmillan.

ALCIDAMAS. Text in Bekker's *ORATORES ATTICI*, v, 673-679, and in Blass's *ANTIPHON*.

ALCMAN. Text in Bergk, *Poetae Lyrici Græci*; Smyth, Greek Melic Poets.

ALEXANDER POLYHISTOR. Text in *Fragm. Hist. Gr.*, iii, 206-244.

ALEXIS. Text. Kock, *Fragm. Comic. Att.*, ii, 297-408; Meineke, *Fragm. Comic. Gr.*, i, 374 ff.

- ALCIPHRON. Text. *Wagner*, Leipzig, 1878; *Meineke*, Leipzig, 1853.
- ANACREON. Text in *Bergk*, *Poetae Lyrici Græci*; *Smyth*, Greek Melic Poets.
- ANACREONTICS. Text in *Anthologia Palatina*.
- ANAXAGORAS. Text in *Fragmenta Philosophorum Græcorum*.
- ANAXIMANDER. Text in *Fragm. Philos. Græc.*
- ANAXIMENES. Text in *Fragm. Philos. Græc.*
- ANDOCIDES. Text. *Blass*, Leipzig, 1880, Teubner series; *Lipsius*, Leipzig, 1888.
- ANTHOLOGY. Text. *Anthologia Palatina*, *Dübner*, vol. i, 1871, vol. ii, 1888; *Cougny*, vol. iii, 1890, Paris; *Stadtmueller*, Leipzig, Teubner series, 2 vols.; *Mackail*, *Select Epigrams from the Greek Anthology*, London, 1900, Longmans (text, introduction, translation, and notes).
Translations. (Selections, verse) edited by *Graham R. Tomson* (Mrs. R. M. Watson), London, 1889, Scott; (selections, prose, with metrical versions by various authors) *George Burges*, London, Bohn; (selections, verse) "From the Garden of Hellas," *Lilla Cabot Perry*, New York, 1891, United States Book Company.
- ANTIOCHUS of Syracuse. Text. *Fragm. Hist. Gr.*, i, 181-184.
- ANTIPATER of Thessalonica. Text in *Anthologia Palatina*.
- ANTIPHON. Text. *Blass*, Leipzig, 1881, Teubner series (Antiphon, Gorgias, Antisthenes, and Alcidas).
- ANTISTHENES (philosopher). See ANTIPHON; also *Fragm. Philos. Græc.*, ii, 274-294.
- ANTONINUS (Marcus Aurelius). Text. *Stich*, Leipzig, 1882, and many others.
Translations. *Jeremy Collier*, revised by *Alice Zimmern*, London, 1887, W. Scott; *George Long*, Boston, 1863; *Gerald H. Rendall*, London and New York, 1898, Macmillan.
General work, *Paul Barron Watson*, *Marcus Aurelius Antoninus*, New York, 1884, Harpers.
- ANTONINUS LIBERALIS. Text. *Martini*, *Mythographi Græci*, vol. ii, Leipzig, 1896, Teubner series.
- ANTONIUS DIOGENES. Text in *Hercher*, *Scriptores Erotici*.
- APOLLODORUS. Text. *Fragm. Hist. Græc.*, i, 428-469.
- (APOLLODORUS) Bibliotheca, *Heyne*, Göttingen, 1782, 2d ed., 1803, 4 vols. *Wagner*, *Mythogr. Græc.*, vol. i, Leipzig, 1884.

- APOLLONIUS DYSCOLUS. *Schneider* and *Uhlig*, in *Corpus Grammaticorum Græcorum*.
- APOLLONIUS RHODIUS. Text. *Merkel*, Leipzig, 1854, Teubner series.
 Translation. *Preston*, Dublin, 1803, 3 vols.
 (Prose) *Coleridge*, London, Bell.
- APPIAN. Text. *Mendelssohn*, Leipzig, Teubner series, 2 vols.
 Translation. *Horace White*, London and New York, 1899, Macmillan, 2 vols.
- ARATUS of Soli. Text. *Maass*, Berlin, 1893.
 Translation. *E. Poste*, London, 1880, Macmillan.
- ARATUS of Sicyon. Text. *Fragm. Hist. Græc.*, iii, 21-23.
- ARCHILOCHUS. Text in *Bergk*, *Poetae Lyrici Græci*.
- ARCHIMEDES. Text. *Heiberg*, Leipzig, 1880, Teubner series, 3 vols.
- ARISTIDES (ÆLIUS). Text. *Dindorf*, Leipzig, 1829, 3 vols.
- ARISTIPPUS. Text. *Fragm. Philos. Græc.*, ii, 405-418; *Epistolographi Græci* (Hercher).
- ARISTONICUS of Alexandria. Text. *Friedländer*, Göttingen, 1853; *Carnuth*, Leipzig, 1869.
- ARISTOPHANES. Text. *Meineke*, Leipzig, 1860; *Blaydes*, Halle, 1880-'93, 12 vols., with scholia and Latin notes; *Bekker*, London, 1829, 5 vols., with Latin translation and scholia.
 There are many annotated editions of separate plays.
 Translation. (Prose) *W. J. Hickie*, London, Bohn, 2 vols.
 (Verse) The Acharnians, The Knights, and The Birds, by *Frere*, in *Morley's Universal Library*, New York.
- ARISTOPHANES of Byzantium. Text. *Nauck*, Halle, 1848.
- ARISTOTLE. Text. The Berlin edition, 5 vols., 4to, 1831-'70; the Didot edition, 5 vols., Paris, 1848-'74; the Teubner edition, Leipzig, not yet completed. The special editions of separate works are numerous.
 Translations. *Thomas Taylor*, London, 1812, 9 vols.; *R. W. Browne* (Nicomachean Ethics), *E. Walford* (Politics and Economics), *J. H. McMahon* (Metaphysics), *E. Cresswell* (History of Animals), *O. F. Owen* (Organon, 2 vols.), *Anonymous* (Rhetoric and Poetics) in Bohn's Classical Library, 7 vols.; Ethics, *J. E. C. Welldon*, London and New York, 1892, Macmillan; Ethics, *Robert Williams*, London, 1869, Longmans, Green & Co.; Ethics (Moral Philoso-

phy), *W. M. Hatch*, London, 1879, Murray; On the Parts of Animals, *W. Ogle*, London, 1882, Kegan Paul, Trench & Co.

General work on Aristotle: *George Grote*, Aristotle, London, 1872, Murray.

The Constitution of Athens. Text. *Kenyon*, London, 1891 (facsimile); *Kaibel* and *Wilamowitz-Möllendorff*, Leipzig, 2d ed., 1891; *Blass*, Leipzig, 1892, Teubner series.

Annotated edition, *Sandys*, London, 1893, Macmillan.

ARRIAN. Text. *Dübner* and *Müller*, Paris, 1848.

Scripta minora, *Hercher* and *Eberhard*, Leipzig, 1885, Teubner series.

Anabasis, with English notes, *Moberly*, London, Longmans, Green & Co.

Translation. Anabasis and Indica, *Chinnock*, Bohn's Classical Library, London, 1893, Bell.

ASCLEPIADES. Text in *Anthologia Palatina*.

ATHANASIIUS. Text. *Migne*, Cursus Completus Patrologiae, vols. xxv-xxviii.

ATHENÆUS. Text. *Kaibel*, Leipzig, 1887-'90, 3 vols., Teubner series.

Translation. *C. D. Yonge*, Bohn's Classical Library, 3 vols., London, Bell.

MARCUS AURELIUS. See ANTONINUS.

BABRIUS. Text, with Dissertations, Notes, and Lexicon, *Rutherford*, London, Macmillan, 1883.

Translation. (Verse) *James Davis*, London, 1860, Lockwood & Co.

BACCHYLIDES. Text, with notes, *Kenyon*, London, 1897.

Translation. (Prose) *E. Poste*, London and New York, 1898, Macmillan.

BATRACHOMYOMACHIA. Text. *Ludwich*, Leipzig, 1896.

BEROSUS. Text. *Fragm. Hist. Græc.*, ii, 495-510.

BION. See THEOCRITUS; also HESIOD.

CÆCILIIUS. Text. *Burckhardt*, Basel, 1863.

CALLIMACHUS. Text. *Schneider*, Leipzig, 1870-'73, 2 vols.; *Meineke*, Berlin, 1861; *Wilamowitz-Möllendorff*, Berlin, 1882.

Translation. See HESIOD.

CALLINUS. Text in *Bergk*, Poetae Lyrici Græci; *Smyth*, Melic Poets.

- CALLISTRATUS. See PHILOSTRATUS.
- CASSIUS. See DIO.
- CEBES. Text. *Praechter*, Leipzig, 1893, Teubner series.
Annotated edition, *Jerram*, Oxford, 1878.
- CLEANTHES. See ZENO.
- CORINNA. Text in *Bergk*, *Poetae Lyrici Græci*.
- CHORICIUS. Text. *Boissonade*, Paris, 1846.
- CHRISTODORUS. Text in *Anthologia Palatina*.
- CHRYSIPPUS. Text and comments. *Gercke*, Leipzig, 1885.
- CHRYSOSTOM. See DIO and JOHN.
- CLEMENT of Alexandria. Text. *Dindorf*, Oxford, 1869, 4 vols.
- CRATES. Text in *Meineke*, *Fragmenta Comicorum Græcorum*,
and *Kock*, *Fragmenta Comicorum Atticorum*.
- CRATINUS. Text in *Meineke*, *Fragmenta Comicorum Græco-*
rum, and *Kock*, *Fragmenta Comicorum Atticorum*.
- CTESIAS. Text. *Gilmore*, London, 1888, Macmillan.
- CYCLIC POETS. See EPIC CYCLE.
- DEMADES. See DINARCHUS.
- DEMETRIUS of Phalerum. Text. *Spengel*, *Rhetores Græci*, iii,
259-328; *Hercher*, *Epistolographi Græci*, pp. 1-6; *Fragm.*
Hist. Græc., ii, 362-369.
- DEMETRIUS of Skepsis. Text. *Gaede*, Greifswald, 1880.
- DEMOCHARES. Text. *Fragm. Hist. Græc.*, ii, 445-449.
- DEMOCRITUS. Text. *Fragm. Philos. Græc.*, i, 340-382.
- DEMOSTHENES. Text. *Blass*, Leipzig, 1885-'89, 3 vols., Teub-
ner series.
Annotated edition, *Robert Whiston*, London, 1859-'68, 2
vols. Many annotated editions of separate orations.
Translation. *C. R. Kennedy*, Bohn's and Harper's Clas-
sical Libraries, 5 vols.
- DICÆARCHUS. Text. *Fragm. Hist. Græc.*, ii, 225-253. *Geo-*
graphi Græci Minores, i, 97-110 and 238-243.
- DINARCHUS. Text. *Blass* (with fragments of Demades), Leip-
zig, 1888, Teubner series.
- DIO CASSIUS. Text. *Melber*, Leipzig, Teubner series, 5 vols.;
Boissevain, Berlin.
- DIO CHRYSOSTOM. Crit. text. *v. Arnim*, Berlin, 1893, 2 vols.
- DIODORUS SICULUS. Text. *Dindorf* and *Vogel*, Leipzig, Teub-
ner series, 5 vols.
Translation. *Booth*, London, 1814.

- DIOGENES LAERTIUS. Text. *Cobet*, Paris, 1850; *Holtze*, Leipzig, 1833, Tauchnitz.
 Translation, *C. D. Yonge*, in Bohn's Classical Library, London, Bell.
- DIONYSIUS of Halicarnassus. Text. *Reiske*, Leipzig, 1774-'77, reproduced by *Mai*, Leipzig, 1823, Tauchnitz, 16mo, 6 vols.
 Roman History. Text. *Kiessling*, Leipzig, 1860-'70, Teubner; *Jacoby*, Leipzig, 1889-, Teubner series. The grammatical and critical works are contained in the editions of *Reiske* and *Mai*, and several have appeared in separate editions. Vol. i, edited by *Usener* and *Rademacher*, appeared in 1899, Leipzig, Teubner series.
 The Three Literary Letters. Text, with English translations, etc. *W. Rhys Roberts*, Cambridge and London, 1901.
- DIONYSIUS THRAX. Text. *Uhlig*, Leipzig, 1883.
- DIOSCORIDES. Text in *Anthologia Palatina*.
- DIIYLLUS. Text. *Fragm. Hist. Græc.*, ii, 360 f., and iii, 198.
- DURIS. Text. *Fragm. Hist. Græc.*, ii, 466-488.
- EMPEDOCLES. Text. *Fragm. Philos. Græc.*, i, 1-14.
- EPHORUS. Text. *Fragm. Hist. Græc.*, i, 234-277; iv, 641 f.
- EPIC CYCLE. Text in *Epicorum Græcorum Fragmenta* (ed. *Kinkel*), Leipzig, 1877, Teubner series.
 Discussion and translations. *W. C. Lawton*, The Successors of Homer, New York, 1898, Macmillan.
- EPICHARMUS. Text. *Fragm. Philos. Græc.*, i, 135-147.
- EPICTETUS. Text. *H. Schenkl*, Leipzig, 1894.
 Translation. *T. W. Higginson*, Boston, 1890 (2d ed.), Little, Brown & Co., 2 vols.; *George Long*, London, 1891, Bell, 2 vols.
 Encheiridion (with selections from other writings), *T. W. Rolleston*, London, 1888, W. Scott.
- EPICURUS. Text of fragments with Latin notes. *H. Usener*, Leipzig, 1887.
- ERATOSTHENES. Text. Geographical Fragments, *H. Berger*, Leipzig, 1880; Poems, *Hiller*, Leipzig, 1872; Catasterismi, *C. Robert*, Berlin, 1878; *Olivieri*, in *Mythographi Græci*, iii, 1, Leipzig, 1897, Teubner series.
- EUCLID. Crit. text and Latin translation. *Heiberg* and *Menge*, Leipzig, 1883-'96, 7 vols, Teubner series.

- EURIPIDES. Text. *Nauck*, Leipzig, 3 vols., Teubner series.
 Annotated edition. *F. A. Paley*, London, 1860-'74.
 Translation. (Verse) *Arthur S. Way*, London and New York, 1894-'98, Macmillan, 3 vols.; *W. C. Lawton* ("Three Dramas of Euripides"—*Alcestis*, *Medea*, *Hippolytus*), Boston, 1889, Houghton, Mifflin & Co.
- EUSEBIUS. Text. *Chronica*, *Schöne*, Berlin, 1875.
 Præparatio Evangelica, Demonstratio Evangelica, Historia Ecclesiastica, *Dindorf*, Leipzig, 1867-'71, 4 vols., Teubner series.
 Scripta Historica, *Heinichen*, Leipzig, 1868-'70, 3 vols.
- GALEN. Text. *Kühn in Medici Græci*, vols. i-xx.
 De Placitis Hippocratis et Platonis, *Iwan Müller*, Leipzig, 1874.
 Scripta Minora, *Marquardt, Müller, Helmreich*, appearing in the Teubner series, Leipzig.
 Protreptici quæ supersunt, *Kaibel*, Berlin, 1894.
- GORGAS. See ANTIPHON.
- GREGORY NAZIANZENE. Text. *Migne, Cursus Completus Patrologiae*, vols. xxxv-xxxviii.
 Translation. See JULIAN the Emperor.
- HARPOCRATION. Text. *Dindorf*, Oxford, 1853, 2 vols.
- HECATÆUS of Miletus. Text. *Fragm. Hist. Græc.*, i, 1-31.
- HECATÆUS of Teos or Abdera. Text. *Fragm. Hist. Græc.*, ii, 384-396.
- HELIODORUS. Text in *Scriptores Erotici*, ed. *Hirschig* and others, Paris, 1856, Didot.
 Translation. *T. Underdowne*, London, 1895, D. Nutt. See ROMANCES.
- HELLANICUS. Text. *Fragm. Hist. Græc.*, i, 45-69; iv, 629-637.
- HERACLIDES PONTICUS. Text. *Fragm. Hist. Græc.*, ii, 199-224.
- HERACLITUS. Text. *Bywater*, Oxford, 1877.
- HERODAS. See HERONDAS.
- HERODIAN, the grammarian. Text. *Lentz*, Leipzig, 1867, 3 vols.
- HERODIAN, the historian. Crit. text. *Mendelssohn*, Leipzig, 1883.
 Translation. *J. Hart*, London, 1749.
- HERODOTUS. Text. *Stein*, Berlin, 1884.
 Crit. text. *Stein*, Berlin, 1869-'72; *Holder*, 1886, 2 vols.
 Annotated edition. *J. W. Blakesley*, London, 1854, Bell (New York, 1861), 2 vols.; with German notes, *Stein*, Ber-

lin, 5th ed., 1883. Numerous annotated editions of separate parts.

Translation. *George Rawlinson*, London, Murray (New York, D. Appleton and Company), 4 vols. ; *G. C. Macaulay*, London and New York, 1890, Macmillan, 2 vols. ; *Henry Cary*, London, Bohn's Classical Library ; New York, Harper's Classical Library.

HERONDAS. Text. *Kenyon*, London, 1891 (facsimile, 1892) ; *Crusius*, Leipzig, 1894, Teubner series.

Translation in *J. A. Symonds*, *Studies of the Greek Poets*, 3d ed. (1893).

HESIOD. Text. *Koehly* and *Kinkel*, Leipzig, 1870 ; *Koehly*, Leipzig, Teubner series.

Annotated edition. *F. A. Paley*, London, 1861.

Translation. *C. A. Elton*, London, 1815 (also in 1 vol. with Bion and Moschus, Sappho and Musæus by *F. Fawkes*, and Lycophron by *Viscount Royston*, London, 1832) ; *J. Banks* (also Callimachus and Theognis), prose, together with metrical versions of Hesiod by *Elton*, Callimachus by *Tytler*, and Theognis by *Frere*, London, Bell. Bohn's Classical Library.

HESYCHIUS. Text. *M. Schmidt*, Jena, 1858-'68, 4 vols. Small ed., 1867, 1 vol. 4to.

HIPPONAX. Text. *Welcker*, Göttingen, 1817 ; *M. Lachmann*, Choliambica Poesis Græcorum, Berlin, 1845, and *Rossignol*, Fragments des Choliambographes grecs et latins, Paris, 1849.

HOMER. Text. *Monro*, Oxford, 1896.

Crit. text. *Van Leeuwen* and *da Costa*, Leyden, 1897, 2d ed., 4 vols. ; *Cauer*, Leipzig, 1887, 1891, 4 vols. ; *Nauck*, Berlin, 1877, 2 vols.

Iliad, *W. Leaf*, London, 1895, Macmillan.

Odyssey, *A. Ludwich*, Leipzig, 1889, Teubner, 2 vols.

Annotated editions, Iliad, *Leaf*, London, 1886-'88, Macmillan, 2 vols. (vol. i of the second edition is now [1902] out) ; *Monro*, Oxford, 1894, 2 vols.

Odyssey, *Merry*, Oxford, 1887-'88, 2 vols.

With German notes, both Iliad and Odyssey, by *Ameis* and *Henze*, Leipzig. Many annotated editions of parts of the poems exist.

Translations. (Verse) *Pope*, *Bryant*.

(Prose) *Iliad*, *Leaf*, *Lang*, and *Myers*, London, 1883, Macmillan.

Odyssey, *Butcher* and *Lang*, London, 1879, Macmillan; *Palmer*, Boston, 1891, Houghton, Mifflin & Co.

General. *R. C. Jebb*, Introduction to Homer, London and New York, 1892; *W. Leaf*, Companion to the *Iliad*, London and New York, 1892.

Grammar. *Monro*, Grammar of the Homeric Dialect, 2d ed., Oxford, 1891; *Seymour*, Introduction to the Language and Verse of Homer, Boston, 1892, Ginn & Co.

HOMERIC HYMNS. Text. *Gemoll*, Leipzig, 1886, Teubner; *Abel*, Leipzig, 1886, with the Epigrams and *Batrachomyomachia*.

HYPERIDES. Text. *Blass*, Leipzig, 1894, Teubner series; Against Athenogenes and Philippides, with notes and translation, *Kenyon*, London, 1893, Bell.

IBYCUS. Text in *Bergk*, *Poetae Lyrici Græci*.

ION of Chios. Text. *Fragm. Hist. Græc.*, ii, 44-51; cf. *Tragicorum Græcorum Fragm.* (*Nauck*), and *Bergk*, *Poetae Lyrici Græci*, vol. ii.

ISÆUS. Text. *Buermann*, Berlin, 1883; *Scheibe*, Leipzig, Teubner series.

ISOCRATES. Text. *Benseler* and *Blass*, Leipzig, 1882, Teubner series, 2 vols.

Translation. *J. H. Freese*, vol. i, London, 1894, Bell.

See *LYSIAS*.

ISYLLUS. Text, with commentary in German. *Wilamowitz-Möllendorff*, 1886.

JOHN CHRYSOSTOM. Text. *Migne*, *Cursus Completus Patrologiae*, vols. xlvii-liv.

JULIAN the Emperor. Text. *Hertlein*, Leipzig, 1876, Teubner series; *Neumann*, Leipzig, 1880 (anti-Christian works).

Translation. *C. W. King*, London. In *Bohn's Classical Library* (contains Gregory Nazianzene's Two *Invectives* and *Libanius' Monody*, with *Julian's Theosophical Works*).

JUSTIN MARTYR. Text. *I. C. Th. de Otto*, Jena, 1875-'77 (vols. i-iv of *Corpus Apologetarum Christianorum Sæculi Secundi*); Apology (with notes), *B. L. Gildersleeve*, New York, 1877, Harpers.

LAERTIUS DIOGENES. See *DIOGENES LAERTIUS*.

LIBANIUS. Text. *Reiske*, Altenburg, 1784-'97, 4 vols.

- LONGINUS (so called). . De Sublimitate. Crit. text. *Jahn* and *Vahlen*, Bonn, 1887.
 Text, translation, and notes. *W. Rhys Roberts*, Cambridge, 1899, Univ. Press.
 Translation. *H. L. Havell*, London and New York, 1890, Macmillan.
- LONGUS. Text. *Hercher*, *Scriptores Erotici*, vol. i.
 Translation. (The Elizabethan version edited) *Jacobs*, London, 1890, D. Nutt.
- LUCIAN. Crit. text. *Sommerbrodt*, Berlin, 1886-'93, Weidmann.
 Text. *Jacobitz*, Leipzig, Teubner series.
 Translation. Six Dialogues, *Irwin*, London, 1894, Methuen; Dialogues of the Gods, the Sea-gods, and the Dead, *H. Williams*, London, Bell, Bohn's Classical Library.
- LYCOPHRON. Text. *Kinkel*, Leipzig, 1880, Teubner series.
 Text, with German translation and notes. *V. Holzinger*, Leipzig, 1895.
 Translation. See HESIOD.
- LYCURGUS. Text. *Thalheim*, Berlin, 1880.
- LYSIAS. Crit. text. *Cobet*, Amsterdam, 1882, 2 vols.
Scheibe, Leipzig, 1874, Teubner series.
 Annotated editions of selected orations are numerous.
- MANETHO. Text. *Fragm. Hist. Græc.*, ii, 511-616.
- MARCUS AURELIUS. See ANTONINUS.
- MAXIMUS TYRIUS. Text. *Reiske*, Leipzig, 1774; *Dübner*, Paris, 1840.
 Translation. *Thomas Taylor*, London, 1804, 2 vols.
- MELEAGER. Text in *Anthologia Palatina*.
- MENANDER. Text. *Kock*, *Fragm. Comior. Att.*, iii.
 The Georgos (Farmer), *Grenfell and Hunt*, Oxford, 1898.
- MIMNERMUS. Text, *Bergk*, *Poetae Lyrici Græci*, in vol. ii (also in several collections of selected poems).
- MOSCHUS. See THEOCRITUS.
- MUSÆUS. Text. *Dilthey*, Bonn, 1874.
 Translation. See HESIOD.
- MUSONIUS. Text and discussion. *Peerlkamp*, Haarlem, 1822; *O. Hense*, Leipzig, 1901.
- NONNUS. Text. *Koehler*, Leipzig, 1857-'58, Teubner series, 2 vols.
- ORACULA SIBYLLINA. Text. *Rzach*, Vienna, 1891.

- ORPHIC POEMS (so called). Text. *Abel*, Leipzig, 1888.
- PANÆTIUS (and HECATO). Text of the fragments with discussion. *Fowler*, Bonn, 1885.
- PARMENIDES. Text (with German translation). *Diels*, Berlin, 1897; also in *Fragm. Philos. Græc.*, i, 114-130.
- PAUL the SILENTIARY. Text in *Anthologia Palatina*.
- PAUSANIAS. Text. *Schubart*, Leipzig, 1853-'54, Teubner series, 2 vols.
 Crit. text with German notes. *Hitzig and Blümner*. Only vol. i, parts 1, 2, and vol. ii, part 1, have appeared, 1896-, Berlin, Calvary.
 Translation. *J. G. Frazer*, London and New York, 1898, Macmillan, 6 vols. (vol. i translation, vols. ii-v notes, vol. vi indexes and addenda).
- PHERECYDES of Syros. Text. *Fragm. Hist. Græc.*, i, 70-99; iv, 637-639 (confused with Pherecydes of Leros).
- PHILEMON. Text in *Meineke*, *Fragm. Comic. Græc.*, and *Kock*, *Fragm. Comic. Attic*.
- PHILO JUDÆUS. Text. *Mangey*, London, 1742, 2 vols.; *Pfeiffer*, Erlangen, 1795, 5 vols.
 Crit. text. *Cohn and Wendland*, Berlin, 1895, of which only the first vols. have appeared. Several editions of separate works exist.
 Translation. *C. D. Yonge*, London, Bell. Bohn's Ecclesiastical Library.
- PHILOCHORUS. Text. *Fragm. Hist. Græc.*, i, 384-417.
- PHILOSTRATUS. Crit. text. *Kayser*, Leipzig, 1870-'71, Teubner series, 2 vols.; *Benndorf*, *Schenkl*, and *Reisch*, Leipzig, 1893 and 1901, Teubner series.
 Translation. Life of Apollonius of Tyana, *E. Berwick*, London, 1809.
- PHOCYLIDES (so called). Text in *Bergk*, *Poetae Lyrici Græci*.
- PHOTIUS. Text. *Porson*, London, 1822, 2 vols.; *Naber*, Leyden, 1866, 2 vols.
- PHRYNICHUS the grammarian. Text with Introd. and Comm., *Rutherford*, London, 1881.
- PHRYNICHUS the tragic poet. Text in *Nauck*, *Tragic. Græc. Fraggm.*
- PHRYNICHUS the comic poet. Text in *Kock*, *Fragm. Comic. Attic.*, and *Meineke*, *Fragm. Comic. Græc.*

- PINDAR. Crit. text. *Bergk*, Poetae Lyrici Græci, vol. i; *Christ*, Leipzig, 2d ed., 1896, Teubner series; *Christ*, with Latin introduction and notes, Leipzig, 1896, Teubner.
Annotated editions, *Fennell*, Cambridge, 1893, 2 vols.
Olympian and Pythian, *Gildersleeve*, New York, 1885, Harpers.
Nemean, *Bury*, London and New York, 1890, Macmillan.
Isthmian, *Bury*, London and New York, 1890, Macmillan.
Translation. (Prose) *Ernest Myers*, London and New York, Macmillan; *D. W. Turner* (together with the metrical version by *A. Moore*), London, Bell. Bohn's Classical Library; (Verse) *Francis Cary*, London, 1833.
- PLATO. Crit. text. *Hermann-Wohlrab*, Leipzig, 1877-'89, Teubner series, 6 vols.; *M. Schanz*, Leipzig, 1875-; not yet complete.
Annotated editions of separate works are numerous.
Translation. *B. Jowett*, Oxford, 3d ed., 1892, Clarendon Press, 5 vols.
- PLATO the comic poet. Text in *Meineke*, Fragm. Comic. Græc., and *Kock*, Fragm. Comic. Attic.
- PLOTINUS. Text. *Volkmann*, Leipzig, 1883.
Translation. *Thomas Taylor*, London, Bell. Bohn's Philosophical Library (Select Works).
- PLUTARCH. Text. Lives, *Sintenis*, Leipzig, 1839-'46 (reprinted with corrections later), Teubner series, 5 vols.
Morals. Crit. text. *Bernadakis*, Leipzig, 1888-'95, Teubner series, 6 vols.
Annotated editions of selected lives are numerous.
Translation. Lives, *A. H. Clough*, London, 1859, Sampson, Low & Co., Boston, 1859, 5 vols., 1880, 1 vol., Little, Brown & Co.; *A. Stewart* and *G. Long*, London, Bell. Bohn's Standard Library, 4 vols.; Morals, *W. W. Goodwin*, Boston, 1878, Little, Brown & Co., 5 vols.; *C. W. King* and *A. R. Shilleto*, London, 1888, Bell. Bohn's Classical Library, 2 vols.
- POLLUX. Text. *Dindorf*, Leipzig, 1824, 5 vols.; *Bekker*, Berlin, 1846.
- POLYÆNUS. Text. *Wölfflin-Melber*, Leipzig, 1887, Teubner series.

POLYBIUS. Crit. text. *Büttner-Wobst*, Leipzig, 1882-'89, Teubner series, 5 vols.; *Hultsch*, Berlin, 2d ed., 1888, Weidmann, 4 vols.

Translation. *Shuckburgh*, London and New York, 1889, Macmillan, 2 vols.

PORPHYRIUS. Text. (*Opuscula Selecta*) *Nauck*, Leipzig, ed. 2, 1886, Teubner series.

POSIDONIUS. Text of the fragments with discussion. *Bake*, Leyden, 1810; Text. *Fragm. Hist. Græc.*, iii, 245-296.

PRAXILLA. Text in *Bergk*, *Poetae Lyrici Græci*, iii, 566-568.

PROCLUS. Text. *Cousin*, Paris, 1820-'27, 6 vols.

Translation. *Thomas Taylor*, London, 1816, 1820, 4 vols.

PTOLEMY the astronomer and geographer. Text. *C. Müller*, Paris, Didot (in preparation; to contain the geography; other works have appeared separately).

PYTHAGORAS (works ascribed to him). Text. *Fragm. Philos. Græc.*, i, 193-199, 485 ff.; ii, 1 ff.; iii, 1 ff.; *Elter*, *Gnomica fasc.*, i, ii, Leipzig, 1892.

QUINTUS SMYRNÆUS. Text. *Zimmermann*, Leipzig, 1891, Teubner series.

ROMANCES. Text. *Hercher*, *Scriptores Erotici*, Leipzig, 1858, 1859, Teubner series; *Hirschig*, *Boissonade*, and others, Paris, 1856, Didot.

Translation. *Thomas Underdowne*, London, 1895, D. Nutt.

SAPPHO. Text in *Bergk*, *Poetae Lyrici Græci*; *Smyth*, *Greek Melic Poets*.

Text and translation. *H. J. Wharton*, London, 1887, D. Nutt.

SOPHOCLES. Text. *Jebb*, Cambridge, 1896; *Dindorf-Mekler*, Leipzig, 1885, Teubner series.

Annotated editions. *R. C. Jebb*, Cambridge, 1887-'96, 7 vols. (with English translation); *Campbell* and *Abbott*, Oxford, 1886, 2 vols. Many excellent annotated editions of single plays exist.

Translations. (Verse) *E. H. Plumptre*, London, 1865 (New York, Routledge); *Whitelaw*, London, 1883, Rivington's; *L. Campbell*, London, 1883, Paul; *Sir G. Young*, London, Bell; (Prose) *R. C. Jebb*, in his edition; The Oxford translation in Bohn's and Harper's Classical Libraries.

- SOPHRON. Text in *Kaibel*, *Fragm. Comic. Græc.*
- SPEUSIPPUS. Text. *Fragm. Philos. Græc.*, iii, 75-99.
- STEPHANUS of Byzantium. Text. *Dindorf*, Leipzig, 1824; *Westermann*, Leipzig, 1839; *Meineke*, Berlin, 1849.
- STESICHORUS. Text in *Bergk*, *Poetae Lyrici Græci*.
- STESIMBROTUS. Text. *Fragm. Hist. Græc.*, ii, 52-58.
- STOBÆUS. Crit. text. *Wachsmuth and Hense*, Berlin, 1884-'94.
- STRABO. Text. *Meineke*, Leipzig, 1852-'53, Teubner series, 3 vols.
 Translation. *Falconer and Hamilton*, London, Bell, Bohn's Classical Library, 3 vols.
- SUIDAS. Text. *Bekker*, Berlin, 1854.
- SYNESIUS. Text. *Migne*, *Curs. Complet. Patrolog.*, vol. lxi.
- TELESILLA. Text (fragments) in *Bergk*, *Poetae Lyrici Græci*.
- THEOCRITUS. Crit. text. *Ziegler*, Tübingen, 3d ed., 1879.
 With BION and MOSCHUS, *Meineke*, Berlin, 3d ed., 1856.
 Annotated edition. *Snow (Kynaston)*, Oxford, 5th ed., 1892.
 Translation. (Prose) *A. Lang*, London, 1889, Macmillan (contains also BION and MOSCHUS); *J. Banks*, THEOCRITUS, BION, MOSCHUS, and TYRTÆUS, with metrical versions by *J. M. Chapman*, London, Bell, Bohn's Classical Library; (Verse) *C. S. Calverley*, Cambridge, 1869, also in Calverley's collected works, London, 1901, Bell.
- THEOGNIS. Text. *Sitzler*, Heidelberg, 1880.
 Translation. See HESIOD.
- THEOPHRASTUS. Text. *Wimmer*, Leipzig, 1862, Teubner series, and Paris, 1866.
 Text, German translation and notes by the *Philologische Gesellschaft*, Leipzig, 1897, Teubner.
 Text and translation. *R. C. Jebb*, *The Characters of Theophrastus*, London, 1870, Macmillan.
- THEOPOMPUS. Text. *Fragm. Hist. Græc.*, i, 278-333, iv, 643-645.
- THUCYDIDES. Crit. text with Latin notes. *Poppo-Stahl*, Leipzig, 1875-'89, 4 vols.
 With German notes, *Classen-Steup*, Berlin, 1882-'92, 8 parts.
 Editions of separate books are numerous.

Translation. *B. Jowett*, Oxford, 1881, Clarendon Press, 2 vols. (Boston, 1883, D. Lothrop & Co., 1 vol.).

TIMÆUS. Text. *Fragm. Hist. Græc.*, i, 193-233; iv, 640 f.

TYRTÆUS. Text in *Bergk*, *Poetae Lyrici Græci*.

Translation. See THEOCRITUS.

XANTHUS. Text. *Fragm. Hist. Græc.*, i, 34-44.

XENOCRATES. Text. *Fragm. Philos. Græc.*, iii, 114-130.

Text with comment. *Heinze*, Leipzig, 1892, Teubner.

XENOPHON. Text. *Sauppe*, Leipzig, 1865-'66, 5 vols.

Annotated editions of separate works and parts of works are numerous.

Translation. *H. G. Dakyns*, London, 1890-'94, Macmillan, 3 vols.; *The Art of Horsemanship* (with notes), *M. H. Morgan*, Boston, 1893, Little, Brown & Co.

ZENO and CLEANTHES. Fragments. Text and comment. *Pearson*, Cambridge, 1891.

ZOSIMUS. Text. *Bekker*, in *Scriptores Hist. Byzant.*, 1837.

Crit. text. *Mendelssohn*, Leipzig, 1887, Teubner.

APPENDIX II

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE

[When two dates are given they designate the birth and death of the author or authors named in the same line. When one date is given it designates a time when the activity of the author or authors was probably at its height. Interrogation points denote uncertainty.]

B. C.

900-700.	The Homeric poems.
776 (?).	Arctinus.
760 (?).	Cinæthon.
About 750 (?).	Hesiod.
About 700.	Callinus, Archilochus, Terpander.
700-600.	Most of the poems of the Epic Cycle.
700-600.	Creophylus, Cyprius, Stasinus, Agias, Eumelus, Pisander.
About 680 (?).	Clonas.
About 660-about 600.	Thaletas.
660 (?).	Lesches.
About 650-about 600.	Alcman.
640 (?).	Simonides of Amorgus.
About 630.	Tyrtæus, Mimnermus.
640 (?)-558 (?).	Solon.
640 (?)-570 (?).	Arion.
About 635-about 555.	Stesichorus.
About 625-about 500.	The Homeric hymns.
624 (?)-547.	Thales.
611-545 (?).	Anaximander.
About 600.	Alcæus, Sappho, Epimenides.
About 600-500.	Xenophanes.
Sixth century.	Abaris, Aristæas.
About 590-about 520.	Ibycus.
570 (?).	Eugammon, Cadmus of Miletus.
About 560.	Anaximenes, Susarion.
556-478.	Simonides of Ceos.
About 550 (?).	Asius of Samos.
About 550.	Theognis, Demodocus, Pherecydes of Syros, Thespis.
About 550-about 480.	Chœrilus (tragic).
Second half of sixth century.	Pythagoras.

B. C.

- About 540.
 About 540-(?).
 About 540-476.
 About 535.
 About 525.
 525-456.
 521-441.
 About 520-(?).
 About 515-(?).
 About 515.
 505 (?)—430 (?).
 About 500.
 About 500—about 450.
 500-428.
 497-405.
 492 (?)—432 (?).
 About 490 (?)—422.
 About 485.
 485-405.
 About 485—about 415.
 About 485—about 380.
 484 (?)—425 (?).
 484 (?)—410 (?).
 About 480-411.
 About 480-450.
 About 480-400.
 About 480.
 470.
 469-390.
 467.
 About 465—about 400.
 About 460.
 460 (?)—360.
 About 460-(?).
 460-430.
 First half of fifth cen-
 tury.
 About 450.
 450-423.
 About 450-385.
 447-357.
 About 445.
 446-411.
 About 445-380.
 About 445-400.
 Hipponax, Anacreon.
 Heraclitus.
 Phrynichus.
 Phocylides.
 Ananias, Lasus, Agathocles, Apollodorus
 (lyric poet), Corinna.
 Æschylus.
 Pindar.
 Melanippides.
 Parmenides.
 Onomacritus.
 Bacchylides.
 Charon of Lampsacus, Cydias, Hegemon,
 Lamprocles, Myrto, Pherecydes of Leros,
 Pratinas, Praxilla, Tynnichus.
 Xanthus.
 Anaxagoras.
 Sophocles.
 Empedocles.
 Ion of Chios.
 Epicharmus.
 Euripides.
 Protagoras.
 Gorgias.
 Herodotus.
 Achæus of Eretria.
 Antiphon.
 Chionides and Ephantides produced come-
 dies.
 Chœrilus of Samos.
 Pigres, Timocreon.
 Panyasis.
 Socrates.
 Polyphradmon.
 Thucydides.
 Aristias, Melanippides the younger, Corax,
 Tisias.
 Democritus.
 Evenus of Paros.
 Magnes produced comedies.
 Leucippus.
 Antiochus of Syracuse, Archytas, Diogenes
 of Apollonia, Hellanicus, Philolaus, Prod-
 icus.
 Cratinus produced comedies.
 Aristophanes.
 Timotheus of Miletus.
 Crates, the comic poet.
 Eupolis.
 Lysias.
 Agathon.

B. C.

About 440.

436-338.

435-380.

About 430.

About 430-about 356.

About 430-about 354.

About 427-347.

About 425.

About 420.

About 415.

412.

About 410.

410 (?) - 350 (?).

405-367.

About 404-330.

Before 400-after 300.

About 400.

About 400-317.

About 393-339.

About 390-324.

About 390-after 330.

389-322.

About 385-319.

384-322.

About 380.

About 380-300.

About 380-(?)

(?) - about 320.

376-348.

About 375.

About 375-334.

About 372-287.

367-283.

About 365-260.

361-262.

About 360.

About 360-about 270

About 350.

About 350-about 280.

About 350-after 289.

Neophon (tragic poet), Sthenelus (tragic poet), Sophron (mimes), Pherecrates (comic poet).

Isocrates.

Philoxenus of Cythera.

Aristarchus of Tegea (tragic), Carcinus I (tragic), Hippocrates, Hippias of Elis, Polus.

Philistus.

Xenophon.

Plato.

Alcidamas, Bion and Euphorion (sons of Æschylus), Philocles, Stesimbrotus.

Cynesias.

Critias.

Phrynus of Mytilene.

Aristippus, Meletus (tragic), Xenarchus (mimes).

Isæus.

Dionysius the elder was tyrant at Syracuse (tragic).

Antiphanes (comic).

Alexis (comic).

Æschines (Socratic), Antisthenes, Ctesias, Euclides of Megara, Iophon and Ariston (sons of Sophocles), Morsimus (tragic), Phædo, Xenocles I (tragic).

Phocion.

Speusippus.

Lycurgus.

Æschines (orator).

Hyperides.

Demades.

Aristotle, Demosthenes.

Astydamas I (tragic).

Stilpo.

Theopompus.

Ephorus.

Anaxandrides produced comedies.

Sophocles the younger, Carcinus II (tragic).

Theodectes (tragic).

Theophrastus.

Ptolemy I.

Hieronymus of Cardia.

Philemon.

Astydamas II (tragic).

Pyrrho.

Æneas Tacticus, Archippus (comic), Chæremón (tragic), Eubulus (comic), Xenocles II (tragic).

Demetrius of Phalerum.

Demochares.

B. C.

About 345—about 250.

About 344—292.

Before 342—after 292.

342—270.

About 340—about 285.

About 340—260 (?).

About 340—about 260.

About 336—about 264.

About 335—about 275 (?).

About 335—261.

331—232.

About 330.

About 325.

About 325—260.

(?)—323.

323 (?)—272.

321—about 265.

About 320.

About 315.

About 315—about 240.

About 315—241.

About 315—about 225.

(?)—314.

About 310.

About 310—240.

About 300.

First half of third century.

About 295—about 215.

About 290.

287—212.

About 285.

About 280.

About 280—205.

276—195.

276—187.

About 275.

271—213.

(?)—about 270.

About 262—185.

About 260.

Timæus.

Menander.

Dinarchus.

Epicurus.

Philetas.

Crates.

Duris of Samos.

Zeno.

Crantor.

Philochorus.

Cleanthes.

Apollodorus of Carystus, Diphilus (comic),
Heraclides of Pontus.

Aristoxenus, Amyntas, Bæton and Diogne-
tus, Eubæus of Parium.

Zenodotus.

Diogenes of Sinope.

Pyrrhus of Epirus.

Craterus.

Eumenes and Diodotus, Eudemus, Near-
chus.

Sosibius.

Aratus of Soli.

Arcesilas of Pitane.

Timon of Phlius.

Xenocrates.

Theodorus the Atheist.

Callimachus.

Clearchus of Soli, Asclepiades, Diyllus, Eu-
hemerus, Euclid, Hecataeus (romancer),
Hegesias (Cyrenaic), Megasthenes, Phano-
cles, Pytheas, Rhinthon, Timosthenes.

Dicæarchus, Posidippus.

Apollonius Rhodius.

Antigonus of Carystus, Erasistratus, He-
rophilus, Idomeneus, Lycophron.

Archimedes.

Hermesianax, Leonidas of Tarentum.

Aristarchus of Samos, Berosus (?), Bion of
Borysthenis, Menippus (?), Simmias (?),
Sotades, Isyllus of Epidaurus.

Chrysippus.

Eratosthenes.

Euphorion.

Alexander of Ætolia, Ariston, Hieronymus
of Rhodes, Herodas.

Aratus of Sicyon.

Strato.

Aristophanes of Byzantium.

Ariston of Chios, Bion of Smyrna, Anyte,
Dionysius of Heraclea, Hedyllus, Herillus,
Istrus, Persæus, Posidippus.

B. C.

About 250.
 247-183.
 240 (?)—157 (?).
 About 240.
 About 230.
 About 215—about 143.
 About 215—about 129.
 About 210—about 120.
 About 210—(?).
 About 210.
 About 200.
 About 185.
 About 185—about 110.
 About 180.
 About 175.
 About 165.
 Before 161—after 126.
 About 160.
 About 150.

About 135—about 51.
 About 125.
 About 120.
 About 105—after 40.
 About 102—about 20.
 About 95.
 About 90—after 21.
 About 90 or 80.
 About 60—20 A. D.
 About 33
 About 30
 About 20

A. D.

About 1.
 Early first century.
 37—at least 94.
 About 40—after 112.
 Before 50—about 125.
 50.
 About 50—120.
 65.
 About 95—about 175.
 About 100.
 About 100—165.
 Early second century.
 Second century.
 About 120—about 190.
 121-180.
 129-189.
 Before 130—at least 175.

Hegesias (rhetorician), Manetho.
 Hannibal.
 Critolaus of Phaselis.
 Rhianus.
 Dioscorides.
 Aristarchus.
 Carneades.
 Polybius.
 Demetrius of Skepsis.
 Alcæus of Messene.
 Apollonius of Perge.
 Sotion.
 Panætius.
 Polemo the Periegete.
 Aristobulus, Moschus.
 Agatharchides, Crates of Mallus.
 Hipparchus of Nicæa.
 Nicander.
 Hermagoras, Hipparchus, Apollodorus of Athens.
 Posidonius.
 Dionysius Thrax.
 Antipater of Sidon, Hecato.
 Alexander Polyhistor.
 Apollodorus of Pergamum.
 Parthenius.
 Diodorus Siculus.
 Meleager.
 Strabo.
 Theodorus of Gadara.
 Didymus of Alexandria.
 Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Cæcilius.

Sextius, Sotion.
 Areius Didymus.
 Josephus.
 Dio Chrysostom.
 Plutarch.
 Philo Judæus.
 Epictetus.
 Cornutus, Musonius.
 Arrian, Appian.
 Quadratus (apologist).
 Justin Martyr.
 Babrius.
 Aristides of Athens (apologist), Dionysius the Periegete, Longus.
 Lucian.
 Marcus Aurelius.
 Ælius Aristides.
 Pausanias the Periegete.

A. D.

- 131-201.
 About 138-168.
 About 140.
 About 150.
 About 155-240.
 About 160-about 215.
 Between 161 and 180.
 Between 165 and 255.
 About 170.
 About 180 (?).
 About 185.
 185-254.
 Late second century.
 About 200.
 First half of third century.
 Third century.
 204-270.
 About 225 (?).
 About 230.
 233-304.
 About 265-340.
 About 280-about 350.
 About 290.
 About 295-373.
 Fourth century.
 314-393.
 About 315-386.
 About 330-379.
 About 330-about 390.
 After 330-394.
 331-336.
 About 338-about 390.
 About 345-407.
 About 350-431.
 About 370-413.
 Fifth century.
 About 410-485.
 412-444.
 415.
 About 425.
 About 435.
 Before 500-after 562.
 About 500.
 Sixth century.
 About 536-about 600.
 Second half of ninth century.
- Galen.
 Oppian.
 Claudius Ptolemy.
 Antoninus Liberalis, Apollonius Dyscolus,
 Polyænus.
 Dio Cassius.
 Clement of Alexandria.
 Athenæus born.
 Herodian (historian).
 Iamblichus (novelist).
 Sextus Empiricus, Herodian (grammarian).
 Maximus Tyrius.
 Origen.
 Harpocration, Phrynichus, Pollux.
 Philostratus I, Xenophon of Ephesus.
 Apsines.
 Chariton, Heliodorus.
 Plotinus.
 Diogenes Laertius.
 Ælian, Philostratus II.
 Porphyry.
 Eusebius.
 Iamblichus (Neoplatonist).
 Philostratus III.
 Athanasius.
 Nestorius, Nonnus, Quintus Smyrnæus (?).
 Libanius.
 Himerius.
 Basil of Cæsarea.
 Themistius.
 Gregory of Nyssa.
 Julian the Apostate.
 Gregory Nazianzene.
 St. John Chrysostom.
 Plutarch (Neoplatonist).
 Synesius.
 Achilles Tattius, Hesychius, Musæus, Orus,
 Stephanus of Byzantium, Theodoret,
 Tryphiodorus.
 Proclus.
 Cyril.
 Hypatia killed.
 Choricus, Orion.
 Syrianus.
 Procopius.
 Zosimus.
 Stobæus.
 Evagrius.
 Photius.



INDEX

[This index contains the names of all Greek authors mentioned in the book, and in addition the names of some historical and mythological personages and some cities. Reference is also made to numerous special topics. When several references are given, the most important stands first. The pronunciation of proper names is indicated. The titles of works are in *Italics*.]

- Ab'aris, half-mythical mystic poet, 146.
- Academy, 304; 362; 365; 417; 419;
 Old Academy, 312; 361; 367; Mid-
 dle Academy, 367; New Academy,
 367 f.
- Achæ'us, tragic poet, 242.
- Achar'nians* of Aristophanes, 253.
- Achil'es, Greek hero in the Trojan
 War, 12 f.; 18; 20; 30; 37; 38; 39.
- Achil'es Ta'tius, novelist, 440; 452.
- Actors, 185; in the plays of Æschylus,
 191; 195; in those of Sophocles, 205.
- Acusila'us, logographer, 165; 168.
- Ægi'dæ, at Thebes and Sparta, 129.
- Ægim'ius*, ascribed to Hesiod, 57.
- Ægyp'tus, mythical hero, 41.
- Æ'lian, collector of facts and anecdotes,
 437.
- Æ'lius Aristi'des, sophist of the second
 century after Christ, 431 f.
- Æne'as Tac'ticus, writer on military
 affairs, 290.
- Æne'id* of Virgil, 39; 42; 116.
- Æolic dialect, 4.
- Æs'chines, orator, 349-351; 343; 344;
 345.
- Æs'chines of Sphettus, Socratic phi-
 losopher, 301.
- Æs'chylus, tragic poet, 189-201; 177;
 181; 182; 183; 202; 214; 215; 218;
- 224; 231; 240; 241; 242; 243; 250;
 378.
- Æ'sop, inventor of beast-fables, 86;
 149; 441.
- Æthi'opis*, epic poem, 37.
- Agamem'non, leader of the Greeks, 12;
 21; 40.
- Agamem'non* of Æschylus, 198 f.; 191.
- Agathar'chides, geographer, 375.
- Aga'thias, poet of the sixth century
 after Christ, 456; 457.
- Agath'ocles, lyric poet, 138.
- Agath'ocles, tyrant of Syracuse, 373 f.
- Ag'athon, tragic poet, 242.
- Agesila'us, King of Sparta, 281; 283.
- Agesila'us* of Xenophon, 283.
- A'gias, epic poet, 39.
- A'jax, mythical hero, 12; 21; 38.
- A'jax* of Sophocles, 206 f.
- Alcæ'us, lyric poet, 92-96; 81; 101
 102; 104; 105; 378; 383.
- Alcæ'us of Messe'nè, poet of the An-
 thology, 384.
- Alces'tis* of Euripides, 227 f.
- Alcid'amas, rival of Isocrates, 339.
- Al'ciphron, satirist, 435 f.
- Alcmæ'onis*, epic poem, 41.
- Alc'man, lyric poet, 109-111; 119; 121.
- Alexam'enus of Te'os, writer of dia-
 logues, 312.

- Alexan'der the Great, 313 f.; 344; 351; 355; 366; 372 f.; 374; 375; 455; changes caused by his reign, 357 f.; histories of Alexander, 373; 425; 439.
- Alexan'der of Æto'lia, elegiac poet, 382; 395.
- Alexan'der Polyhis'tor, 404.
- Alexandria, 359; 356; 358.
- Alexandrian critics, 34; 278; 377 f.
- Alexandrian Library, 359 f.; 356.
- Alexandrian literature; its general qualities, 359.
- Alexandrian poetry, 381-399.
- Alex'is, comic poet, 261 f.
- Almagest*, translation of Ptolemy's *Astronomy*, 442.
- Amazo'nia*, epic poem, 41.
- Amazons, 37.
- Ammo'nus, teacher of Plutarch, 419.
- Ammo'nus Sac'cas, teacher of Plotinus, 443.
- Amphiara'üs*, *Driving out of*, epic poem, 41.
- Amphit'ruo* of Plautus, 262.
- Amy'n'tas, author of *Marches in Asia*, 371.
- Amy'nus, medical hero, 204.
- Anabasis* of Xenophon, 280; 282.
- Anachar'sis, one of the Seven Wise Men, 148.
- Anac'reon, lyric poet, 100-104; 81; 97; 105; 110; 117.
- Anacreontics*, 103; 457.
- Ana'nus, iambic poet, 85; 83.
- Anaxag'oras, philosopher, 160 f.; 158; 161; 297.
- Anaxan'drides, comic poet, 261.
- Anaxar'chus, teacher of Pyrrho, 366.
- Anax'ilas, tyrant of Rhegium, 120.
- Anaximan'der, Ionic philosopher, 151 f.
- Anaxim'enes, historian of Alexander, 373.
- Anaxim'enes, Ionic philosopher, 152; 162.
- Andoc'ides, orator, 324 ff.
- Androm'achè* of Euripides, 230.
- Androm'achè*, wife of Hector, 21.
- Androni'cus of Rhodes, publisher of Aristotle's works, 316.
- Androt'ion, writer on Attic history, 290.
- Ante'nor*, *Sons of*, poem by Bacchylides, 124.
- Anthology, 456 f.; 103; 384; 449.
- Antig'onè* of Sophocles, 207 f.; 224.
- Antig'onus of Carys'tus, prose writer of Per'gamum, 377.
- Antig'onus Gona'tas, Macedonian king, 375.
- Antim'achus, epic poet, 57.
- Antim'achus, epic poet of the fifth century, 267.
- An'tioch, a centre of Hellenistic civilization, 360; 358.
- Antiochus of Syracuse, logographer, 169; 168.
- Antiochus I, king of Syria, 395.
- Antip'ater, Macedonian regent, 344; 355.
- Antip'ater of Sidon, poet of the Anthology, 384.
- Antiph'anes, comic poet, 261.
- An'tiphon, orator, 322 ff.; 271; 325; 337; 345.
- An'tiphon, sophist, 296.
- Antis'thenes, founder of the Cynic School of philosophy, 302; 362.
- Antoni'nus Libera'lis, writer of tales, 429.
- Antoni'nus (M. Aure'lius), emperor, ethical writer, 422 f.
- Anto'nus Diog'enes, novelist, 439.
- An'ytè, poetess, 384.
- Aph'obus, guardian of Demosthenes, 341.
- Aphrodi'tè, Homeric hymn to, 46; hymn to, by Sappho, 99.
- Apollodo'rus, historian, 403 f.
- Apollodo'rus, lyric poet, 138; 129.
- Apollodo'rus of Carystus, comic poet, 266.
- Apollodo'rus of Pergamum, rhetorician, 370; 409.

- Apollodo'rus, the *Library* falsely ascribed to him, 428; 404.
 Apollo'nus Dys'colus, grammarian, 441.
 Apollo'nus of Per'gè, mathematician and astronomer, 379.
 Apollo'nus of Rhodes, Alexandrian epic poet, 396-398; 393; librarian, 360.
 Apologists, 445 f.
 Ap'pian, historian, 425 f.
 Ap'sines, rhetorician, 442.
 Ara'tus of Sicyon, wrote memoirs, 371.
 Ara'tus of Soli, 395 f.; 387; 393.
 Arce'silas of Cyre'nè, 130; 132.
 Arce'silas of Pit'anè, Academic philosopher, 367; 376.
 Archida'mus, king at Sparta, 334; 336.
 Archil'ochus, iambic and elegiac poet, 79-83; 64; 92; 101.
 Archime'des, mathematician, 379; 360.
 Archip'pus, comic poet, 262.
 Archy'tas, Pythagorean philosopher, 163; 153; 304.
 Areti'nus, epic poet, 37; 38; 39.
 Arei'us Did'yimus, philosopher, 413.
 Ari'on, lyric poet, who developed the dithyramb, 112 f.; 114; 119.
 Aristar'chus of Sa'mos, physicist, 379.
 Aristar'chus of Sam'othrace, Alexandrian librarian and scholar, 378; 23; 34; 360; 393; 404.
 Aristar'chus of Teg'ea, tragic poet, 244.
 Aris'teas, mystic poet, 146.
 Aris'tias, son of Prati'nas, tragic poet, 182; 243.
 Aristi'des of Athens, Christian writer, 445.
 Aristip'pus, founder of the Cyrenaic school of philosophy, 302; 361.
 Aristobu'lus, historian of Alexander, 373; 425.
 Aristobu'lus, Jewish-Greek writer, 380.
 Aris'tocles, sophist of the second century after Christ, 431.
 Aris'ton, apologist, 446.
 Aris'ton of Chios, Stoic, 364.
 Aris'ton, Peripatetic, 321; 361; 376.
 Aris'ton, tragic poet, son of Sophocles, 204; 243.
 Ariston'o'us, author of a pæan, 383.
 Aristoph'anes, comic poet, 251-258; 86; 250; 260; 261; 269.
 Aristoph'anes of Byzan'tium, Alexandrian librarian and scholar, 378; 360.
 Ar'istotle, philosopher, 313-320; 42; 312; 340; 344; 361; 371; 373; 376; 377; 444; preservation of his works, 316; 404; 451; *Hymn to Virtue*, 268; 320.
 Aristox'enus of Seli'nus, author of iam-bics of a comic nature, 248.
 Aristox'enus of Taren'tum, Alexandrian prose writer, 376.
 Ar'rian, historian, 424 f.; 416.
 Asclepi'ades, lyric poet, 383 f.; 387.
 Asclepi'us, faith cure and medicine practised in his temples, 163; received at Athens by Sophocles, 204.
 Asia Minor, the home of Homeric poetry, 28.
 Asian style of rhetoric, 370; 374; 409.
 A'sius, epic poet, 57.
 Astyd'amas the elder, tragic poet, 243.
 Astyd'amas the younger, tragic poet, 243.
 Athana'sius, Bishop, Christian orator and writer, 457.
 Athenæ'us, author of *Deipnosophistæ*, 437.
 Athenag'oras, apologist, 446.
 Ath'ens in the fifth century B. C., 179 f.; in the Alexandrian period, 359; 361.
 At'talus I, king of Pergamum, 377.
 At'talus II, king of Pergamum, 378.
 At'talus III, king of Pergamum, 400.
 Attic dialect, 4; 108; 358.
 Attic orators, 322-356.
 Attic prose, 271 ff.
At'thides, 290; 371.
At'this, epic poem, 41.
 Avia'nus, Latin writer, 86.

- Ba'brius, writer of fables, 441; 86.
Babylonians of Aristophanes, 253.
Bac'chæ of Euripides, 234; 237.
 Bacchyl'ides, lyric poet, 123-128; 110;
 119; 120; 121; 129; 131; 133; 135;
 136; 137; 201; 382.
 Ba'cis, prophet and collector of oracles,
 142.
 Bæ'ton, wrote a chronicle, 371.
Banqueters of Aristophanes, 253.
 Bas'il of Cæsare'a, Christian orator,
 457 f.; 449.
Batrachomyomach'ia (*Battle of the
 Frogs and the Mice*), mock epic, 42-
 44.
Battle of the Gods and Titans, epic
 poem, 41.
 Beast-fables, 85 f.
 Bero'sus, historian of Babylon, 372.
 Bi'as, one of the Seven Wise Men, 148.
 Biographies, 6; 376.
 Bi'on, imitator of Theocritus, 392 f.
 Bi'on of Borys'thenis, Cynic, 362.
 Bi'on, son of Æschylus, tragic poet,
 243.
Birds of Aristophanes, 254-258; 252;
 253.
 Bronti'nus, Pythagorean poet, 144.
 Browning, 137.

 Cad'mus of Mile'tus, early prose
 writer, 165; 149.
 Cæcil'ius of Calac'tè, rhetorician, 410.
 — Callim'achus, poet, 393-395; 396;
 scholar, 377; 376; 378; 394; libra-
 rian, 360; 393.
 Calli'nus, elegiac poet, 63 f.
 Callis'thenes, historian of Alexander,
 373.
 Callis'tratus, author of descriptions of
 statues, 437.
Capture of Æcha'lia, epic poem, 41.
 Carci'nus the elder, tragic poet, 244.
 Carci'nus the younger, tragic poet,
 244.
 Carne'ades of Cyre'nè, Academic
 philosopher, 367.
 Cassan'der, Macedonian ruler, 356; 373.
 Casto'rion, lyric poet, 270.
Catalogue of Women, Hesiodic poem,
 56.
 Ca'to, Latin writer, used by Dionysius
 of Halicarnassus, 409.
 Catul'us, Latin poet, 394.
 Ce'bes, pupil of Philolaüs and Soc-
 rates, 163; 308; *Tablet of Cebes*,
 413.
 Cel'sus, late Epicurean philosopher,
 447.
 Ceph'alas, compiler of an anthology,
 103.
 Cer'cidas of Megalopolis, lyric poet,
 270.
 Cer'cops, a Pythagorean, 144.
 Chære'mon, tragic poet and orator,
 245.
 Chære'ophon, follower of Socrates,
 308.
 Chærone'a, battle of, 342; 334; 343;
 353.
 Chame'leon, Alexandrian prose writer,
 377.
 Character in Euripides, 236; 224.
 Characters of the New Comedy, 262.
Characters of Theophrastus, 321.
 Cha'res of Mytile'nè, historian of
 Alexander, 373.
 Char'iton, novelist, 440.
 Cha'ron of Lamp'sacus, logographer,
 168; 167.
 Chi'lon, one of the Seven Wise Men,
 148.
 Chion'ides, early comic poet, 250.
Choëph'ori of Æschylus, 199 f.; 191;
 198; 208; 209; 231.
 Chœ'rillus of Samos, epic poetry of the
 fifth century, 268.
 Chœ'rillus, tragic poet, 182 f.; 189.
 Choral lyric poetry, 105-139; defined,
 90.
 Chore'gus, 184.
 Choric'ius, late sophist, 451.
 Chorus in tragedy, 184 f.; 183; en-
 larged by Sophocles, 205.

- Choruscs of Æschylus, 191 f.; 201; 215; of Sophocles, 215; of Euripides, 237 ff.
- Christian writers, 445-447; 457-461.
- Chro'mius of Ac'ragas, 130.
- Chrysip'pus, Stoic, 363; 360.
- Chrysoth'emis, early poet, 9.
- Cic'ero, 27; 108; 368; 404 f.
- Cinæ'thon, epic poet, 38; 111.
- Cine'sias, musician and dithyrambic poet, 269.
- Clean'thes, Stoic, 368.
- Clear'chus, Peripatetic, 321; 360.
- Clem'ent, of Alexandria, Christian writer, 446 f.
- Cleobu'lus, one of the Seven Wise Men, 148.
- Clitar'chus, historian of Alexander, 373.
- Clitode'mus, writer on Attic history, 290.
- Clo'nas, musician and lyric poet, 89.
- Clouds* of Aristophanes, 253.
- Colu'thus, late epic poet, 456.
- Comedy, 247-266; its origin, 247; differences between it and tragedy, 252; Old Comedy, 250-259; Middle Comedy, 259-262; New Comedy, 262-266; 259; 381.
- Common dialect, 358 f.; 314.
- Constitution of Athens*, by Aristotle, 316; 320.
- Co'rax, Sicilian rhetorician, 292.
- Corin'na, lyric poetess, 138; 129.
- Cornu'tus (Lu'cius Annæ'us), philosopher, 413.
- Cos, school of medicine, 163 f.; of poetry, 360; 382; 387; 395.
- Cran'non, battle of, in 322 B. C., 344; 352.
- Cran'tor, Academic philosopher, 312; 361.
- Crate'rus, collected decrees, 371.
- Cra'tes, Academic philosopher, 312; 361.
- Cra'tes, comic poet, 251.
- Cra'tes of Mallus, critic and Stoic philosopher at Pergamum, 378.
- Cra'tes of Thebes, Cynic, 362; author of satires and parodies, 268.
- Crati'nus, comic poet, 250; 268.
- Crat'y'lus, teacher of Plato, 303.
- Creoph'y'lus, epic poet, 37; 41; 57.
- Crit'ias, leader of the Thirty Tyrants, tragic poet, 244; elegiac poet, 268; perhaps author of the *State of the Athenians*, 271; 303.
- Cri'to, friend of Socrates, 307; 308.
- Critola'us of Phase'lis, Peripatetic, 321; 361.
- Cte'sias, historian, 177 f.
- Ctes'iphon, proposed a crown for Demosthenes, 348; 350.
- Cyclops* of Euripides, 235.
- Cy'dias, lyric poet, 188; 270.
- Cyn'ic school of philosophy, 302; 362; 443.
- Cyp'ria*, epic poem, 37.
- Cyp'rias, epic poet, 37.
- Cyrena'ic School of philosophy, 302; 361.
- Cyr'il, Bishop, theological writer, 460.
- Cyropædi'a* of Xenophon, 284 f.
- Da'itales* of Aristophanes, 253.
- Dan'aïs*, epic poem, 41.
- Dan'atus, mythical hero, 41; 191 ff.
- Delphic oracle, 140; 153; 420; Delphic pæans, 383; Delphic school of poetry, 9.
- Dema'des, orator, 340; 344.
- Deme'trius of Phale'rum, orator, statesman, and man of letters, 356; 86; 354; 359.
- Deme'trius Polioree'tes, Macedonian, 354; 356.
- Deme'trius of Skep'sis, wrote on antiquities of the Troad, 371.
- Democh'ares, historian, 373.
- Democ'ritus, philosopher, 162 f.; 155; 160; 163; 365; 366.
- Demod'ocus, elegiac poet, 77.
- De'mophon, guardian of Demosthenes, 341.

- Demos'thenes, orator, 340-348; 177; 261; 276; 329; 332; 336; 350; 351; 352; 353; 354; 355; 356; 373; 409; 432; 450.
 Deus ex machina, 222 f.
 Dex'ion, name given to Sophocles, 204.
 Diad'ochi, successors of Alexander, 373.
 Diag'oras of Melos, lyric poet, 270.
 Dialect, 4; of Homer, 27; epic, 32; of Hesiod, 49; of elegiac and iambic verse, 63; of Pindar, 135; of Aristotle, 314; common, 358 f.; 314.
 Dialectic, 299.
 Dialogues, of Plato, 306 f.; of Lucian, 434.
 Dicear'chus, geographer and historian, 372; 375.
 Did'yimus (Arei'us), philosopher, 413.
 Did'yimus, grammarian, 404.
 Dieu'chidas of Megara, 27.
 Dinar'chus, orator, 354; 409.
 Di'o Cas'sius, historian, 426 f.
 Di'o Chrys'ostom, philosopher, 417 f.; 431.
 Diodo'rus, son of Xen'ophon, 281.
 Diodo'rus Sic'ulus, historian, 407 f.; 289; 374; 379.
 Diod'otus, edited Alexander's Journals, 371.
 Diog'enes of Apollo'nia, philosopher, 162; 158.
 Diog'enes Laërtius, writer of Lives of Philosophers, 428; 377.
 Diog'enes of Sino'pè, Cynic, 362.
 Diogne'tus, chronicle writer, 371.
 Di'on, friend of Plato, 287; 304.
 Dionysiac festivals at Athens, 183 f.
 Dionys'ius of Halicarnas'sus, historian and rhetorician, 408 f.; 98.
 Dionys'ius of Heracle'a, Stoic, 364.
 Dionys'ius, pupil of Heracli'des of Pontus, writer of tragedies under false names, 245.
 Dionys'ius the elder, tyrant of Syracuse, tragic poet, 245; 304; 336.
 Dionys'ius the Periegete, 441.
 Dionys'ius Thrax, grammarian, 404.
 Dionys'ius II, of Syracuse, 287; 304.
 Diony'sus, worshipped with dithyrambs, 113.
 Dioscor'ides, poet of the Anthology, 384.
 Diph'ilus, comic poet, 266.
 Dith'yramb, 107; 113; 120; 126; 131; 180; 269, 382.
 Divisions of comedy, 259.
 Divisions of Greek plays, 188.
 Diyl'us, historian, 373.
 Doctors of the Church, 446 f.
 Dodo'na, oracle, 140.
 Doric dialect, 4; 108; 135.
 Drama, its origin and development, 179-188.
 Du'ris of Sa'mos, historian, 373.
 Earliest poetry, 7.
Ecclesiastu'sæ of Aristophanes, 254.
 Ephan'tides, early comic poet, 250.
 Eleatic school of philosophy, 154; 159; 301; 302.
Elec'tra of Sophocles, 208 f.; 231.
Elec'tra of Euripides, 231; 225.
 Elegiac poetry, 60; 63-78; 80; of the Attic period, 268; of the Alexandrian period, 382 f.
 Emped'oocles, philosopher, 158-160; 144; 294.
 Encomia, 107; 120; 121; 131; 133.
 En'nius, Latin poet, 244.
Eæ'æ, Hesiodic poems, 56; *Great Eæ'æ*, 56.
 Eph'orus, historian, 288 ff.; 169; 334; 373; 402; 407.
 Epic Cycle, 35-42.
 Epic poetry of the Attic period, 267 f.
 Epichar'mus, early comic poet, 248 f.
 Epicte'tus, philosopher and ethical teacher, 416 f.; 413; 423; 424.
 Epie'u'rus, founder of the Epicurean School of philosophy, 364 ff.; 160; 372; Epicurean doctrines, 365 f.
 Epideictic oratory, 332; 334.
Epig'oni, epic poem, 41.

- Epigrams, 78; 383 f.; in the second and third centuries after Christ, 440.
- Epimen'ides, religious poet and giver of oracles, 142; 68; 148.
- Epinician odes, 107; 120; 121; 133; 134 ff.
- Erasis'tratus, physician, 379.
- Eratos'thenes, Athenian accused by Lysias, 327 ff.
- Eratos'thenes, librarian, man of learning, and poet, 376; 360; 371; 378; 383; 396.
- Ethics of Aristotle, 318; of Epicurus, 365.
- Etymologicum Mag'num*, 452.
- Eubœ'us of Parium, writer of parodies, 268.
- Eubul'us, comic poet, 262.
- Eucl'ides, founder of the Megarian school of philosophy, 301; 304; 361.
- Eucl'ides, mathematician, 378.
- Eude'mus, Peripatetic, 321; 318.
- Eugam'mon, epic poet, 40.
- Euhe'merus, romancer, 380.
- Eume'lus, epic poet, 41.
- Eu'menes, edited Alexander's Journals, 371.
- Eumen'ides* of Æschylus, 200; 191; 198; 209.
- Euna'pius, late historian and biographer, 452 f.; 449.
- Euphor'ion of Chalcis, librarian at Antioch, 360; author of mythological epics, 398.
- Euphor'ion, son of Æschylus, tragic poet, 243.
- Eu'polis, comic poet, 251.
- Eurip'ides, tragic poet, 219-240; 201; 249.
- Euse'b'ius, historian and Christian apologist, 459 f.; 41.
- Evag'oras, Cypriote king, 334.
- Evag'rius, Church historian, 460.
- Eve'nus of Paros, elegiac poet, 268.
- Fa'b'ius Max'imus, Latin historian, 409.
- Farces, 385.
- Farmer* of Menander, 264 ff.
- Frogs* of Aristophanes, 254.
- Ga'len, physician, 442 f.
- Games at Olym'pia, Cor'inth, Del'phi, Nem'ea, etc., 132 f.
- Geographers, 375.
- Gor'gias, sophist, 294; 295; 297; 298; 307; 308; 333; 335; 337; 339; 345; 431.
- Græco-Roman literature, its divisions, 406 f.
- Grammar and grammarians, 377; 441.
- Greek literature, its importance, 1; divisions, 2; periods, 3; preservation, 5; decline, 448 ff.
- Greg'ory Nazian'zene, Christian writer, 458; 449.
- Greg'ory of Nys'sa, Christian writer, 458.
- Grenfell papyrus, 386 f.
- Grote, views on Homer, 25.
- Gryl'lus, son of Xenophon, 281.
- Han'nibal, wrote memoirs, 371.
- Har'palus, took money from Alexander and came to Athens, 344; 351.
- Harpocra'tion, compiler of a lexicon, 442.
- Hecatæ'us of Abde'ra or Te'os, romancer, 379 f.
- Hecatæ'us of Mile'tus, logographer, 166 f.; 169; 173; 380.
- Hec'ato, Stoic philosopher, 404.
- Hec'tor, Trojan hero, 12; 13; 18; 21; 29; 39.
- Hec'uba* of Euripides, 229.
- Hed'y'lus, lyric poet, 384.
- Hege'mon, writer of a mock epic, 268.
- Hege'sias, Cyrenaic philosopher, 361.
- Hege'sias, epic poet, 37.
- Hege'sias, rhetorician, 370; 373; 374.
- Helen, 11; 12; 15; 25; 37.
- Hel'ena* of Euripides, 231; 222.
- Heliodo'rus, novelist, 439 f.
- Hellani'cus, Alexandrian critic, 23.

- Hellani'cus, logographer, 168 f.; 38; 174; 290; 371.
- Helle'nica* of Xenophon, 282 f.
- Hellenistic centres of culture, 360; 358.
- Hellenistic civilization, 357 ff.
- Heraclei'a*, epic poem, 41.
- Her'acles*, poem by Bacchylides, 125.
- Heracli'dæ* of Euripides, 228 f.; 227.
- Heracli'des of Pontus, philosopher and tragic poet, 377; author of the fragments preserved under the name of Thespis, 245.
- Heracli'tus, philosopher, 155 f.; 144; 157; 159; 162; 293; 297; 303; 363; 364.
- Her'cules Fu'rens* of Euripides, 230.
- Heril'lus of Carthage, Stoic, 364.
- Hermag'oras, rhetorician, 370.
- Hermesi'onax, elegiac poet, 382.
- Hermip'pus, comic and satirical poet, 268.
- Hermog'enes of Tar'sus, rhetorician, 442.
- Herod'as (Heron'das), poet of mimes, 386; 389.
- Herod'es At'ticus, sophist of the second century after Christ, 431.
- Herod'dian, grammarian, 441.
- Herod'dian, historian, 427.
- Herod'icus, a Pythagorean poet, 144.
- Herod'otus, historian, 171-177; 86; 96; 142; 165; 167; 168; 169; 178; 183; 267; 274; 276; 453.
- Heroic Theogamies*, epic poem, 41.
- Heroph'ilus, physician, 379.
- He'siod, 49-57; 9; 150; 165; 175; 378.
- Hesyeh'i'us, lexicographer, 452.
- Hi'ero, tyrant of Syracuse, 120; 123; 127; 130; 132; 135; 189; 190.
- Hi'ero II of Syracuse, 360; 374; 388.
- Hieron'y'mus of Car'dia, historian, 373.
- Hieron'y'mus of Rhodes, Peripatetic, 321.
- Hime'rius, late sophist, 449.
- Hippar'chus, geographer, 376.
- Hippar'chus, son of Pisis'tratus, 101, 138.
- Hip'pias of Elis, sophist, 295; 307.
- Hip'pias, son of Pisis'tratus, 101.
- Hippoc'rates, physician, 163 f.; 379.
- Hippol'y'tus, Christian writer, 447.
- Hippol'y'tus* of Eurip'ides, 229.
- Hippo'nax, choliambic poet, 84 f.
- History, first use of the word, 165.
- Ho'mer, 10-34; 7; 35; 36; 37; 40; 41; 42; 45; 49; 50; 57; 81; 116; 175; 268; 302; 308; 313; 378; 418; 431; Homeric Hymns, 44-48; the Homeric question, 23-34; Homeric civilization, 30.
- Hor'ace, 81; 95; 96; 163; 181.
- Hyag'nis, mythical musician, 87.
- Hymns, 107; 121; 131; 268; 383; 394 f.
- Hypa'tia, Neoplatonist, 454.
- Hyper'i'des, orator, 351-353; 334; 344; 354.
- Hyporcheme, 107; 121; 126; 131.
- Iambic poetry, 79-85.
- Iam'blichus, Neoplatonist, 454.
- Iam'blichus, novelist, 439.
- Ib'y'cus, lyric poet, 117 f.; 121.
- I'das*, poem by Bacchylides, 125.
- Ideas, Plato's theory of, 305.
- Idom'eneus, writer of biographies of Athenian demagogues, 372.
- Idylls, 387 ff.
- Iliad*, 10 ff.; 40; 42; 44; 140; 377; 399.
- Imitations of earlier writings, 380.
- Innovations of Euripides, 221 ff.
- I'o*, poem by Bacchylides, 125.
- I'on of Chi'os, tragic poet, 241; lyric poet, 270.
- I'on* of Euripides, 232.
- Ionic dialect, 4.
- I'ophon, tragic poet, son of Sophocles, 243; 204.
- Iphige'nia among the Taurians*, by Euripides, 232; 222.
- Iphige'nia at Aulis*, by Euripides, 234.

- Irenæus, apologist, 446.
 Isæus, orator, 330-332; 323; 334; 409.
 Isocrates, essayist, rhetorician, and teacher, 261; 288; 289; 290; 302; 332; 333-339; 347; 351; 353; 409.
 Is'trus, compiler of *Atthides*, 371.
 Isyllus, Epidaurian writer of a pæan, 383.

 Ja'son, King of Phe'ræ, 334; 336.
 Jewish writings, 142.
 John Chrys'ostom, Saint, Christian orator, 458 f.
 Jose'phus, historian, 411 f.
 Ju'lian the Apostate, emperor and author, 451; 450; 452.
 Ju'lius Africa'nus, Christian chronicle writer, 447.
 Jus'tin Martyr, Christian writer, 445 f.

 Kirchhoff, views on Homer, 25.
Knights of Aristophanes, 253.

 Lachmann, views on Homer, 25.
 Lamian War, 352.
 Laoc'oön, 39.
 La'sus of Hermi'one, lyric poet, 138; 129.
 Leoc'rates, deserter at Chærone'a, 353.
 Leon'idas of Tarentum, lyric poet, 384.
 Les'ches, epic poet, 38.
 Leucip'pus, philosopher, 160; 158; 162; 163.
 Lexicons, 441; 452.
 Liba'nus, late sophist, 449 f.
 Library at Alexandria, 356.
 Li'nus, mythical poet, 8; 144.
Little Iliad, epic poem, 38; 212.
 Logic of Aristotle, 317.
 Logographers, early prose writers of history, 165-169; 172; 177; speech writers, 326; 327; 333; 345; 351; 354.
 Longi'nus, rhetorician, 442; 98; 409; 444.
 Long'us, novelist, 440.
 Lu'cian, satirist, 432-435; 362; 451.

 Lyce'um, 314; 361; 365.
 Ly'con, Peripatetic, 361.
 Ly'cophron, learned poet, 399; 393.
 Lycu'rgus, orator, 353 f.; 334; 344.
 Lyric poetry, 58-139; its character, 58; its development, 59; its metres, 59 ff.; of the Attic period, 268 ff.; of the sixth century after Christ, 456.
 Lys'ias, orator, 326 ff.; 308; 325; 335; 345; 409.
Lysis'trata of Aristophanes, 254.

 Macedo'nus, poet of the sixth century after Christ, 456.
Madness of Her'acles, by Euripides, 230.
 Mæ'son, a character in Megarian comedy, 248.
 Mag'nes, comic poet, 250.
 Man'etho, historian of Egypt, 372.
 Marcus Aurelius, emperor, ethical writer, 422 f.; 430; 437.
Margi'tes, mock epic, 42, 44.
Marriage of Ce'yx, poem ascribed to Hesiod, 57.
 Mar'syas, mythical musician, 87.
 Max'imus Tyr'ius, sophist of the second century after Christ, 431.
Mede'a of Euripides, 228; 223.
 Medicine, 163 f.; in the Alexandrian period, 379; in the second century after Christ, 442.
 Meg'acles, a wealthy Athenian, 132.
 Megarian school of philosophy, 302; 361; 362.
 Megas'thenes, geographer, 375.
Melampod'ia, poem ascribed to Hesiod, 57.
 Melanip'pides, dithyrambic poet, 269; 270.
 Melanip'pides the younger, dithyrambic poet, 269.
 Mele'ager, poet of the Anthology, 384 f.; 457.
 Me'les, musician, 269.
 Mele'tus, accuser of Socrates, tragic poet, 244.

- Melic poetry, 90-138; defined, 90.
 Melis'sus, follower of Parmenides, 157.
 Memoirs, 370 f.
Memorabilia of Xenophon, 285.
 Menan'der, comic poet, 264 ff.; 261; 263; 321.
 Menan'der of Laodice'a, rhetorician, 442.
 Menede'mus, philosopher, 302.
 Menip'pus, Cynic, 362; 384; 435.
 Messengers' reports in Sophocles, 216 f.; 225; in Euripides, 225.
 Metaphysics of Aristotle, 320.
 Metho'dius, Christian writer, 447.
 Middle Academy, 367.
 Middle Comedy, 259-262.
 Mile'tus, its destruction in 494 B. C., 167.
 Mi'lo of Cro'ton, a wrestler, 132.
 Milti'ades, apologist, 446.
 Mimes, 386 f.
 Mimner'mus, elegiac poet, 66 f.; 72.
Min'yas, epic poem, 41.
 Modes in music, 89 f.
 Monodic poetry, 90-104; 105; defined, 90; metres and stanzas, 91.
 Monodies of Euripides, 237.
 Mor'simus, tragic poet, 243.
 Mos'chus, imitator of Theocritus, 392 f.
 Musæ'us, mythical poet, 146 f.; 142; 143; 144.
 Musæ'us, poet of the fifth century after Christ, 456.
 Muses, 7.
 Music, 87-91; at Lesbos, 92.
 Musical modes, 89 f.
 Muso'nus, Stoic philosopher, 413; 416.
 Myl'lus, a character in Megarian comedy, 248.
 Myr'silus of Mytile'nè, 92; 93; 94.
 Myr'to (Myr'tis) lyric poetess, 139; 129; 138.
 My'son, one of the Seven Wise Men, 148.
 Mysteries, of Eleusis, Samothrace, etc., 143; 145 f.
 Mythical poets, 8.
 Nausic'aa, a character in the *Odyssey*, 15; 22.
 Near'chus, pilot and historian of Alexander, 373; geographer, 375.
 Ne'leus of Skepsis, 316.
 Ne'o-phron, tragic poet, 244.
 Neoplatonism, 443 ff.; 448; 451; 453; 454 f.
 Nesto'rius, Neoplatonist, 454.
 New Comedy, 259 ff.
 Nican'der, Alexandrian didactic poet, 396.
 Nic'ias, physician, 387.
 Ni'coeles, King of Salamis, in Cyprus, 334.
 Nome, a kind of lyric poem, 89; 109; 269.
 Non'nus, late poet, author of *Dionys'iaca*, 455 f.
Nos'toi, epic poem, 39.
 Novels, 438 f.
 Odys'seus, 12 ff.; 22; 38; 39; 40.
Od'yssey, 10 ff.; 14 f.; 41, 42; 140; 143; 377; 399.
Edipodei'a, epic poem, 41.
Æ'dipus at Colo'nus, by Sophocles, 213 f.
Æ'dipus the King, by Sophocles, 210 ff.
 O'len, mythical poet, 8.
 Olym'pus, early musician, 88; 89; 90.
 Olyn'thus, city destroyed by Philip, 343; 350.
 Onesic'ritus, historian of Alexander, 373.
 Onomac'ritus, Orphic poet, 144.
 Op'pian, didactic poet, wrote *On Fishing*, 441.
 Oratory, its beginnings, 291 f.; Attic, 322-356; from the fourth century B. C. to the second century after Christ, 429; in the second century after Christ, 430 ff.; in the fourth century after Christ, 449 ff.; Christian oratory, 455 ff.; 457 ff.
Oreste'i'a of Æschylus, 198 ff.; 191; 201.

- Ores'tes, son of Agamemnon, 40.
Ores'tes of Euripides, 233; 223.
 Or'igen, Christian writer, 447.
 Ori'on, lexicographer, 452.
 Or'pheus, mythical poet, 8; 143 f.; 380.
 Or'pheus of Cro'ton, mystic poet, 144.
Orphic Argonau'tica, 456.
 Orphic sect, 143; 144 f.; 153.
 O'rus, lexicographer, 452.
 Ov'id, Latin poet, 42; 398.
- Pæans, 107; 126; 131; 268; 383; at Delphi and at Epidaurus, 383.
 Pam'philus, Christian writer, 447.
 Pam'phus, mythical poet, 8.
 Panæ'tius, Stoic philosopher, 404 f.; 403; 413.
 Pantomimes, 249.
 Panya'sis, poet and man of letters, 267; 57; 170.
Parian marble, chronological inscription, 219, note.
 Par'is, son of Priam, 11; 12; 37; 38.
 Parmen'ides of Ele'a, philosopher, 156 f.; 155; 159; 160; 297.
 Parthenion, 107; 110'; 131.
 Parthe'nus, elegiac poet and prose writer, 383.
 Paul the Silentary, poet of the Anthology, 456.
 Pausa'nias, periegete, 428; 375; 399.
 Payment of poets and actors, 185.
Peace of Aristophanes, 254.
 Pe'leus; his marriage to The'tis, 11; 37.
 Peloponnesian War, its history by Thucydides, 273-278.
 Penel'opè, wife of Odysseus, 15; 21; 40.
 Penthesilè'a, Queen of the Amazons, 37.
 Per'gamum, a seat of Hellenistic culture, 360; 358.
 Perian'der, tyrant of Corinth, one of the Seven Wise Men, 148.
 Per'icles, of Athens, 160; 169.
 Peripatet'ic School of philosophy, 320 f., 314; 361; 417.
- Peripetei'a, change of fortune in tragedy, 211; 231.
 Persæ'us, Stoic, 364.
Persians of Æschylus, 193 ff.; 191.
 Per'sius, Latin satirist, 413.
 Phæ'do, pupil of Socrates, 302; 308.
 Phæ'drus, Latin writer, 86.
 Phan'ocles, elegiac poet, 382.
 Phanode'mus, writer on Attic history, 290.
 Pha'on, said to have been loved by Sappho, 97.
 Phemon'oë, Delphic priestess, 8.
 Pherec'rates, comic poet, 251.
 Pherecy'des of Le'ros, writer of genealogies, 167 f.
 Pherecy'des of Sy'ros, early prose writer, 149; 144; 152; 167.
 Philam'mon, early poet, 9.
 Phile'mon, comic poet, 263 f.
 Phile'tas, elegiac poet, 382; 360; 383; 384.
 Phil'i'nus, historian of Italy, 373.
 Phil'ip of Macedon, 342 ff.; 334; 336; 339; 350; 351; 355.
Philippics of Demosthenes, 342 f.
 Philis'tus, historian, 287.
 Phi'lo the Jew, philosopher, 413 f.
 Philoch'orus, historian, 371; 290.
 Phil'ocles, tragic poet, 243.
Philoctetes of Sophocles, 212 f.; 223.
 Philola'üs, Pythagorean philosopher, 163; 153.
 Philosopher, meaning of the word, 149; early philosophers, 150-163.
 Philosophy, its tendency in the second century after Christ, 416; in the third century after Christ, 443 f.; schools at Athens closed by Justinian, 455.
 Philos'tratus, three writers of the name, 436 f.
 Philox'enus, lyric poet of the fifth century B. C., 270.
Phoca'is, epic poem, 41.
 Pho'cion, general and orator, 354 f.; 340.

- Phocyl'ides, elegiac poet, 76; 77; 78; 380.
- Phœnician Women* of Euripides, 233 f.
- Phor'mus, Sicilian comic poet, 248.
- Pho'tius, lexicographer, 452.
- Phryn'ichus, comic poet, 251.
- Phryn'ichus, grammarian, 441.
- Phryn'ichus, tragic poet, 182 f.; 243.
- Phry'nis, poet of nomes, in the fifth century B. C., 269.
- Phylar'chus, historian, 373.
- Pi'gres, epic poet, 42; 44; 77.
- Pin'dar, lyric poet, 129-137; 110; 111; 117; 119; 120; 121; 122; 123; 126; 127; 138; 139; 201; 269; 308; 378; 382.
- Pisan'der, epic poet, 41; 57.
- Pisis'tratus, tyrant of Athens, said to have caused the Homeric poems to be edited, 24; 27; ruler when Thespis began to develop tragedy, 181.
- Pit'tacus of Mytilenè, 92 f.; 97; 148.
- Planu'des, added to the Anthology, 456.
- Platæ'a, taken by the Thebans in 373 B. C., 338.
- Pla'to, comic poet, 251.
- Pla'to, philosopher, 303-312; 261; 287; 301; 302; 313; 314; 317; 334; 337; 353; 361; 367; 368; 377; 378; 409; 416; 419; 432; 435; 443; 444; 447; 455.
- Plau'tus, Latin comic poet, 262; 263; 264; 266.
- Plot'inus, Neoplatonist, 443 f.; 453.
- Plu'tarch, essayist, historian, and philosopher, 418-422; 169; 375.
- Plu'tarch, Neoplatonist, 454.
- Plu'tus* of Aristophanes, 260; 254.
- Poetics* of Aristotle, 318.
- Poetry from Augustus to Domitian, 414; from Domitian to Constantine, 440 f.; late poetry, 455 f.
- Pol'emo, Academic philosopher, 312; 361; 363.
- Pol'emo, periegete, 375.
- Politics* of Aristotle, 319.
- Pol'lux, compiler of a lexicon, 441 f.
- Po'lus, sophist, 295; 307.
- Polyæ'nus, writer on stratagems, 429.
- Polyb'ius, historian, 400-403; 374.
- Polyb'ius, son-in-law of Hippoc'rates, 164.
- Polyc'rates, tyrant of Samos, 100; 101; 117; 152.
- Poly'idus, lyric poet, 270.
- Polyphrad'mon, tragic poet, 243.
- Polysper'chon, Macedonian ruler, 355.
- Por'phyry, Neoplatonist, 444 f.; 443; 453.
- Posidip'pus, comic poet, 266.
- Posidip'pus, lyric poet, 384.
- Posido'nus, Stoic philosopher and learned man, 404 f.
- Prati'nas, tragic poet, 182 f.; 189; 243.
- Praxil'la, lyric poetess, 139; 138.
- Praxiph'anes, Peripatetic, 395.
- Prizes for dramatic contests, 185 f.
- Pro'clus, grammarian, 36; 39.
- Pro'clus, Neoplatonist, 454 f. 36; 39.
- Proco'pius, late historian, 453.
- Prod'icus, sophist, 295; 297; 299; 307.
- Prologue in tragedy, 188; in Euripides, 222.
- Prome'theus of Æschylus, 197 f.; 191; 201.
- Proper'tius, Roman elegiac poet, 382.
- Prophecy by the Flight of Birds*, poem ascribed to Hesiod, 57.
- Prose literature, reasons for its late development, 147 f.
- Prosodion, 107; 131.
- Protag'oras, sophist, 293; 294; 295; 297; 298; 307.
- Ptol'emy I, So'ter, historian of Alexander, 370; 356; 359; 378; 425.
- Ptol'emy II, Philadel'phus, 359; 375; 387; 389.
- Ptol'emy III, Euer'getes, 376.
- Ptol'emy (Clau'dius Ptolemæ'us), mathematician, astronomer, and geographer, 442.
- Pyr'rho, skeptic, 366 f.; 443.
- Pyr'rhus of Epi'rus, 370; 373.


- Pythag'oras, philosopher, 152-154; 143; 145; 149; 150; 159; 163; 361; 444; 454; Pythagorean doctrines in the first century after Christ, 413; the *Golden Verses*, 413; mysticism in the third century, 443.
- Pythagore'ans, 144; 152 f.; 163; 304; 417.
- Pyth'eas, voyager and geographer, 375.
- Quadra'tus, Christian writer, 445.
- Quin'tus Smyrnæ'us, late epic poet, author of *Posthomer'ica*, 455.
- Religious, oracular, and mystic poetry, 140-146.
- Returns of the Heroes*, epic poem, 39.
- Revival of Greek literature in the second century after Christ, 415 f.
- Rhetoric, in the Attic period, 271; 292; in the Alexandrian period, 370.
- Rhetoric* of Aristotle, 317.
- Rhetorical arguments in Euripides, 225.
- Rhia'nus, philologist and poet, 398 f.
- Rhin'thon, writer of farces, 385.
- Rhodes, school of rhetoric, 360.
- Romances, in the Alexandrian period, 379 f.
- Sack of Troy*, epic poem, 39.
- Sap'pho, lyric poetess, 96-100; 92; 102; 104; 105; 117; 383.
- Satirical poems, 268.
- Satyr drama, 235; 181.
- Scholia, 6; 378; 404.
- Scientific works of Aristotle, 319.
- Scolia, lyric poems, 95; 268.
- Scopeli'nus, flute-player, teacher of Pindar, 129.
- Sey'lax, early prose writer, 166.
- Sen'eca, Latin writer, 404; 413.
- Septuagint*, 380.
- Seven against Thebes* of Æschylus, 195 ff.; 191; 207.
- Seven Wise Men, 148 f.; 77.
- Sex'tius, philosopher of the time of Augustus and Tiberius, 413.
- Sex'tus Empir'icus, philosopher, 443.
- Shield of Her'acles*, Hesiodic poem, 55.
- Sib'yls, 141 f.; 380; *Sibylline Oracles*, 456.
- Sim'mias, lyric poet, 384.
- Sim'mias, pupil of Philolaus and Socrates, 163; 308.
- Simon'ides of Amorgus, iambic poet, 83 f.
- Simon'ides of Ceos, lyric poet, 119-123; 83; 110; 117; 124; 127; 129; 131; 136; 137.
- Skepticism, 366 f.; 443.
- Soc'rates, 296-301; 86; 244; 270; 279; 285 f.; 291; 303; 304; 305; 307; 308; 309; 310; 317; 334; 416; 425; ridiculed in the *Clouds* of Aristophanes, 253.
- So'li, city in Cilicia, 360.
- So'lon, statesman and poet, 67-71; 72; 77; 78; 93; 142; 148.
- Sophists, 292-296; 299; meaning of the word, 149; 292; sophists of the Roman period, 430 ff.; 442; 448 ff.
- Soph'ocles, tragic poet, 202-218; 177; 189; 201; 221; 224; 225; 231; 240; 241; 242; 243; 244; 252; 268; 270.
- Soph'ocles the younger, 243; 204.
- So'phron, writer of mimes, 249.
- Sosib'ius, writer on chronology, 371.
- So'sylus, historian of Italy, 373.
- So'tades, writer of farces, 385.
- So'tion, Alexandrian writer on the history of philosophy, 377.
- So'tion, philosopher, 413.
- Sources of information about Greek literature, 5 f.
- Speusip'us, Plato's nephew, philosopher, 312; 303.
- Sphæ'rus of the Bosphorus, Stoic, 364.
- Stasi'nus, epic poet, 37.
- State of the Athenians*, not by Xenophon, perhaps by Critias, 271.
- Steph'anus of Byzant'ium, writer of a book containing geographical and historical information, 453.


- Stesich'orus, lyric poet, 114-117; 118; 119; 121; 124.
- Stesim'brotus of Tha'sos, logographer and sophist, 169; 295.
- Sthen'elus, tragic poet, 244.
- Stil'po, Megarian philosopher, 302; 361; 362; 366.
- Stobæ'us, compiler of an *Anthologium*, 452; 63; 413.
- Sto'ic School of philosophy, 362 ff.; 403; 404; 405; 413 f.; 416; 417; 444; (Stoa, 363; 365); Stoic doctrines, 364; 423.
- Stra'bo, historian and geographer, 410 f.
- Stra'to, Peripatetic, 321; 361.
- Stro'phè defined, 90.
- Sublime, Treatise on the*, attributed to Longi'nus, 410; 98; 442.
- Su'idás, compiler of a lexicon, 452; 96; 117.
- Suppliants* of Æschylus, 191 ff.; 194.
- Suppliants* of Euripides, 229 f.; 225.
- Susar'ion, early comic poet, 248.
- Syne'sius, Neoplatonist and Christian, 454.
- Syr'acuse, 120; early comedies performed, 248 f.; mimes, 249; importance, 292; in the Alexandrian period, 360.
- Syria'nus, Neoplatonist, 454.
- Tar'sus, a seat of culture, 360; 358.
- Ta'tian, apologist, 446.
- Teachings of Chei'ron*, poem ascribed to Hesiod, 57.
- Telego'nia*, epic poem, 40.
- Telem'achus, son of Odysseus, 15; 21; 40.
- Telesil'la, lyric poetess, 139; 138.
- Teles'tes, lyric poet, 270.
- Tennyson, 137.
- Ter'ence, Latin comic poet, 262; 263; 266.
- Terpan'der, musician and poet of nomes, 88 f.; 92; 109.
- Tha'les, philosopher, 151; one of the Seven Wise Men, 148.
- Thale'tas, lyric poet, 109; 110; 119.
- Tham'yris, early poet, 9.
- Theatre, 186 ff.
- Theba'is*, early epic, 41.
- Theban cycle of epics, 40.
- Themis'tius, late sophist, 450 f.
- Themistog'enes, nominal author of Xenophon's *Anabasis*, 281.
- Theoc'ritus, poet of idylls, 387-393; 360; 382; 395.
- Theodec'tes, tragic poet, 245.
- Theod'oret, Doctor of the Church, 460 f.
- Theodo'rus, mathematician, 304.
- Theodo'rus of Gad'ara, rhetorician, 370.
- Theodo'rus, the atheist, Cyrenaic philosopher, 361.
- Theog'nis, elegiac poet, 71-76.
- Theog'ony*, of Hesiod, 54 f.
- Theoph'ilus of An'tioch, apologist, 446.
- Theophrastus, Peripatetic, 321; 316; 354; 361; 373; 376.
- Theopom'pus, historian and rhetorician, 289 f.; 245; 334; 407.
- Therip'ides, guardian of Demosthenes, 341.
- The'ron, tyrant of Ac'ragas, 120; 130.
- The'seus*, poem by Bacchylides, 125.
- The'seus and the Youths*, poem by Bacchylides, 125.
- Thesmophoriazusa* of Aristophanes, 254.
- Thes'pis, early tragic poet, 181 f.; 248; existing fragments really by Herac'lides, 245.
- Thirty Tyrants at Athens, 326; 328.
- Thre'nos, mourning song, 120; 121; 131.
- Thucyd'ides, historian, 271-278; 169; 176; 177; 282; 283; 287; 322; 324; 342; 400; 402; 409.
- Timæ'us, historian, 374; 402; 407; 409.


- Timæ'us, Pythagorean, 304.
 Timar'chus, accused Æschines of treason, 350.
 Timoc'reon of Rhodes, lyric poet, 138 ; 270.
 Ti'mon, skeptic, 366 f.
 Timos'thenes, admiral and geographer, 375.
 Timo'theüs, Athenian statesman, 334.
 Timo'theüs of Miletus, lyric poet of the fifth century b. c., 269.
 Ti'sias, real name of Stesichorus, 114.
 Ti'sias, Sicilian rhetorician, 292.
Titanomach'ia, epic poem, 41.
Trachin'ia of Sophocles, 209 f.
 Tragedy, its origin, 180 f. ; derivation of the word, 181 ; in the sixth and fifth centuries b. c., 181-244 ; tragedy in families, 243 ; in the fourth century b. c., 244 f. ; 243 ; after the fourth century b. c., 245 f. ; 361.
 Transition from the Alexandrian to the Roman period, 400 ff.
Tro'ades or *Trojan Women*, by Euripides, 231 ; 225.
 Trojan War, 11 ff. ; 37.
 Tryphiodo'rus, late poet, 456.
 Tyn'nichus, lyric poet, 138.
 Tyrran'ion, grammarian, publisher of Aristotle's works, 316 ; 404.
 Tyrta'us, elegiac poet, 64-66 ; 67 ; 72.
- Unities in the drama, 188.
 Universe, theories concerning its origin, 150 ff.
- Vale'rius An'tias, Latin historian, 409.
 Var'ro, Roman writer, 362.
- Vico, Italian scholar, 24.
 Vir'gil, 39, 42 ; 116 ; 388.
- Wasps* of Aristophanes, 252.
 Wolf, F. A., views on Homer, 24.
 Women in Homer, 21 ff. ; in Euripides, 226.
Works and Days, by Hesiod, 51-53.
 Writing in early times, 33.
- Xan'thus, lyric poet, 114.
 Xan'thus of Lydia, logographer, 168 ; 167.
 Xenar'chus, author of mimes, 249.
 Xen'ocles the elder, tragic poet, 244.
 Xen'ocles the younger, tragic poet, 244.
 Xenoc'rates, Academic philosopher, 312 ; 313.
 Xenoc'ritus of Locri, lyric poet, 109 ; 114.
 Xenoda'mus, lyric poet, 109.
 Xe'non, Alexandrian critic, 23.
 Xenoph'anes, poet and Eleatic philosopher, 154 ; 77 ; 155 ; 156.
 Xen'oophon, essayist and historian, 271 ; 279-287 ; 289 ; 290 ; 302 ; 333 ; 355.
 Xen'oophon of Ephesus, novelist, 439.
 Xiphili'nus, made an abstract of the history of Dio Cassius, 427.
- Ze'no of Cit'ium, founder of the Stoic School, 362 f.
 Ze'no of Ele'a, follower of Parmenides, 157 ; 297 ; 312.
 Zenod'otus, learned Alexandrian, 377 ; 360 ; 393.
 Zona'ras, historian of the twelfth century after Christ, 427.
 Zo'pyrus, Orphic poet, 144.
 Zo'simus, late historian, 453.


THE END











101647
London.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY

