

Early Greek Ethics

Edited by

DAVID CONAN WOLFSDORF

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Table of Contents

<i>Abbreviations</i>	ix
<i>Chapter Abstracts and Contributor Information</i>	xiii
<i>Introduction</i>	xxvii
David Conan Wolfsdorf	

PART I INDIVIDUALS AND TEXTS

1. The Pythagorean <i>Acusmata</i> <i>Johan C. Thom</i>	3
2. Xenophanes on the Ethics and Epistemology of Arrogance <i>Shaul Tor</i>	19
3. On the Ethical Dimension of Heraclitus' Thought <i>Mark A. Johnstone</i>	37
4. Ethics and Natural Philosophy in Empedocles <i>John Palmer</i>	54
5. The Ethical Life of a Fragment: Three Readings of Protagoras' Man Measure Statement <i>Tazuko A. van Berkel</i>	74
6. The <i>Logos</i> of Ethics in Gorgias' <i>Palamedes</i> , <i>On What is Not</i> , and <i>Helen</i> <i>Kurt Lampe</i>	110
7. Responsibility Rationalized: Action and Pollution in Antiphon's <i>Tetralogies</i> <i>Joel E. Mann</i>	132
8. Ethical and Political Thought in Antiphon's <i>Truth</i> and <i>Concord</i> <i>Mauro Bonazzi</i>	149
9. The Ethical Philosophy of the Historical Socrates <i>David Conan Wolfsdorf</i>	169
10. Prodicus on the Choice of Heracles, Language, and Religion <i>Richard Bett</i>	195
11. The Ethical Maxims of Democritus of Abdera <i>Monte Ransome Johnson</i>	211
12. The <i>Sophrosynē</i> of Critias: Aristocratic Ethics after the Thirty Tyrants <i>Alex Gottesman</i>	243

13. Anonymus Iamblichi, <i>On Excellence (Peri Aretēs)</i> : A Lost Defense of Democracy <i>Phillip Sidney Horkey</i>	262
14. On the Unity of the <i>Dissoi Logoi</i> <i>David Conan Wolfsdorf</i>	293
15. Antisthenes' Ethics <i>Susan Prince</i>	325
16. Antisthenes and Allegoresis <i>Mikolaj Domaradzki</i>	361
17. Aristippus of Cyrene <i>Voula Tsouna</i>	380
18. Self-Mastery, Piety, and Reciprocity in Xenophon's Ethics <i>David M. Johnson</i>	412
19. Ethics in Plato's Early Dialogues <i>Nicholas D. Smith</i>	432
20. <i>On Law and Justice</i> : Attributed to Archytas of Tarentum <i>Phillip Sidney Horkey and Monte Ransome Johnson</i>	455

PART II TOPICS AND FIELDS

21. Early Greek Ethnography and Human Values <i>Joseph Skinner</i>	493
22. Ethics in Early Greek Medicine <i>Paul Demont</i>	520
23. The Ethics of Afterlife in Classical Greek Thought <i>Radcliffe Edmonds III</i>	545
24. Friendship in Early Greek Ethics <i>Dimitri El Murr</i>	566
25. Justice and the Afterlife <i>Svavar Hrafn Svavarsson</i>	593
26. Music and the Soul <i>Eleonora Rocconi</i>	612
27. The Teachability of <i>Aretē</i> among the Socratics <i>Christopher Rowe</i>	629

PART III CODA

28. Diogenes of Sinope <i>William Desmond</i>	651
--	-----

29. Anaxarchus on Indifference, Happiness, and Convention	680
<i>Tim O'Keefe</i>	
30. Aristoxenus' <i>Pythagorean Precepts</i> : A Rational Pythagorean Ethics	700
<i>Carl A. Huffman</i>	
<i>Bibliography</i>	713
<i>Index</i>	753

Chapter Abstracts and Contributor Information

1. Johan C. Thom, “The Pythagorean *Acusmata*”

The collection of sayings known as *acusmata* represent some of the earliest evidence for Pythagorean teaching. The sayings are therefore potentially of extreme importance in determining the ethics and way of life of the early Pythagorean community; but their original meaning is often disputed. “The Pythagorean *Acusmata*” allows for both literal and non-literal interpretations, striving to achieve some balance between the two. The first part of the discussion is devoted to a survey of *acusmata* that have a bearing on ethics, followed by some general, tentative conclusions about the ethics of the sayings. These include that it is overly simplistic to postulate two mutually exclusive ancient approaches to the *acusmata*, that is, a literal approach and an allegorical one, or to try to distinguish between two types of ethics, an “acusmatic” ethics based on a narrow, literal interpretation, and a “mathematic” ethics based on a more open, rational interpretation.

Johan C. Thom is Distinguished Professor of Classics at Stellenbosch University. His research focus is the Pythagorean tradition and its reception in later antiquity. His recent publications on this subject include: “The Pythagorean *Akousmata* and Early Pythagoreanism,” in G. Cornelli, R. McKirahan, and C. Macris, eds., *On Pythagoreanism* (Berlin, 2013), 77–101; “Pythagoras (Pythagoreer),” *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum* 28 (2017), 496–522; “Sayings as ‘Lebenshilfe’: The Reception and Use of Two Pythagorean Collections,” in Christoph Riedweg, ed., *PHILOSOPHIA in der Konkurrenz von Schulen, Wissenschaften und Religionen. Zur Pluralisierung des Philosophiebegriffs in Kaiserzeit und Spätantike* (Berlin, 2017), 75–97; “Protreptic and Pythagorean Sayings: Iamblichus’s *Protrepticus*,” in O. Alieva, A. Kotzé, and S. van der Meeren, eds., *When Wisdom Calls: Philosophical Protreptic in Antiquity* (Brepols, 2018), 71–88.

2. Shaul Tor, “Xenophanes on the Ethics and Epistemology of Arrogance”

Xenophanes famously advanced certain views that found celebrated expressions in classical ethical philosophy. Most notably, his remarks on poetic depictions of gods and the social veneration of athletes echo the later criticisms of Plato’s Socrates. “Xenophanes on the Ethics and Epistemology of Arrogance” argues that the repeated echoes of Xenophanes in the words of Plato’s Socrates reflect an affinity that runs deeper than has been recognized. Xenophanes confronts us with a systematic attitude toward the ethical aspects and consequences of epistemic arrogance; in particular, he anticipates the central Platonic insight that epistemic arrogance manifests in, and leads to, ethical failure in human thought and action. Furthermore, Xenophanes—like Socrates—does not counter the arrogance he diagnoses with meek humility, but, instead, espouses a disillusioned recognition of human epistemic limitations while, at the same time, affirming the superiority of his own insight and value to human communities, partly on the basis of that very recognition.

Shaul Tor is Senior Lecturer in Ancient Philosophy in the Departments of Classics and Philosophy at King’s College, London. His research has primarily been in the areas of early Greek philosophy (with a particular focus on the relations between philosophy and religion) and ancient Pyrrhonian

skepticism. He is the author of *Mortal and Divine in Early Greek Epistemology: A Study of Hesiod, Xenophanes and Parmenides* (Cambridge, 2017); “Heraclitus on Apollo’s Signs and his Own: Contemplating Oracles and Philosophical Inquiry,” in E. Eidinow, J. Kindt, and R. Osborne, eds., *Theologies of Ancient Greek Religion* (Cambridge, 2016), 89–116; and “Sextus and Wittgenstein on the End of Justification,” *International Journal for the Study of Skepticism* 4 (2014), 81–108.

3. Mark A. Johnstone, “On the Ethical Dimension of Heraclitus’ Thought”

“On the Ethical Dimension of Heraclitus’ Thought” argues that Heraclitus was deeply and centrally interested in ethical questions, understood broadly as questions about how human beings should live. In particular, the chapter argues that Heraclitus held that wisdom is essential for living well, and that most people lack the kind of fundamental insight into the nature of reality in which wisdom consists. Topics covered include Heraclitus’ views on: the good and bad condition of the soul, the nature and sources of wisdom, the reasons why most people remain oblivious to the world in which they live, and the connections between acquiring genuine insight into reality and becoming like god.

Mark A. Johnstone is Associate Professor of Philosophy at McMaster University. He specializes in ancient Greek and Roman philosophy, especially ancient ethics, political philosophy, and psychology. He is the author of “On ‘Logos’ in Heraclitus,” *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy* 47 (2014), 1–29; and of numerous articles on Plato and Aristotle in venues such as *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy*, *Phronesis*, the *British Journal for the History of Philosophy*, and the *Journal of the History of Philosophy*.

4. John Palmer, “Ethics and Natural Philosophy in Empedocles”

“Ethics and Natural Philosophy in Empedocles” demonstrates how the broad features of Plato’s naturalistic ethics are prefigured in the integration of ethics and natural philosophy in Empedocles, while at the same time emphasizing the distinctive features of Empedocles’ conception. Empedocles’ doctrine of metempsychosis, the basis for a universal prohibition against killing other living creatures and consequent imperatives for self-purification, is itself grounded in the more general idea at the heart of his cosmology that no mortal thing is either born from, or passes away into, total nothingness. The chapter explores the deep connection between the birth, destruction, and rebirth of the elements and the wandering of the *daimones* or spirits, with whom Empedocles identifies his reincarnated self, all of which are subject to the lamentable influence of cosmic Strife as well as the more positive influence of cosmic Love that he advocates.

John Palmer is Professor and Chair of Philosophy at the University of Florida. His research has focused on early Greek philosophy and Plato. His publications include *Plato’s Reception of Parmenides* (Oxford, 1999); *Parmenides and Presocratic Philosophy* (Oxford, 2009); and “The Pythagoreans and Plato,” in C. Huffman, ed., *The Cambridge History of Pythagoreanism* (Cambridge, 2014). He has recently been at work on a new translation of Diogenes Laertius, a study of the dialectic of Plato’s *Phaedo*, and, with the support of a Guggenheim Fellowship, a study of virtue and value in Plato’s ethics.

5. Tazuko A. van Berkel, “The Ethical Life of a Fragment: Three Readings of Protagoras’ Man Measure Statement”

Throughout antiquity, Protagoras’ Man Measure statement has been understood predominantly as espousing an epistemological doctrine, i.e., a doctrine about the conditions of truth and knowledge.

“The Ethical Life of a Fragment: Three Readings of Protagoras’ Man Measure Statement” adduces three ancient approaches to the Man Measure statement that evince an ethical outlook on the statement: the ethical relativist interpretation set out by Plato in his *Theaetetus*; a normative-quantitative interpretation of “measure,” found in allusions to the Man Measure statement; an axiological interpretation, featured in the biographical tradition around Protagoras and in Aristotle’s implicit polemics. The three ethical readings show the manifold ways in which an ancient source author interacts with a lost corpus author. Verbatim quotations are only one form of text reuse; paraphrases, allusions, imitations, and biographizing statements—although undertheorized in approaches to fragmentary authors—can be equally informative about early interpretations of Protagoras’ Man Measure statement.

Tazuko Angela van Berkel is Assistant Professor in Ancient Greek Language and Literature at Leiden University. Her research interests include history of ideas (ancient conceptions of friendship and reciprocity, ancient economics), ancient philosophy (Protagoras of Abdera, Eudemus of Rhodes), and Greek mathematics. She is currently preparing a monograph (*Counting and Accountability*) about the communicative function and ideological significance of the use of numbers, measures, and calculations in classical Athenian political discourse. Her publications include: *The Economics of Friendship. Conceptions of Reciprocity in Classical Greece* (Leiden, 2020); “Pericles’ Rhetoric of Number,” in S. Papiroannou, A. Serafim, K. N. Demetriou, eds., *The Ancient Art of Persuasion across Genres and Topics* (Leiden, 2020), 339–55; “Made to Measure: Protagoras’ *metron*,” in J. M. van Ophuijsen, M. van Raalte, P. Stork, eds., *Protagoras of Abdera. The Man, his Measure* (Leiden, 2013), 37–68.

6. Kurt Lampe, “The Logos of Ethics in Gorgias’ *Palamedes*, *On What is Not*, and *Helen*”

While Gorgias’ surviving speeches take few positions on ethics, they can be viewed as thought experiments about the psychological, epistemological, sociological, and metaphysical presuppositions of ethical thought. “The Logos of Ethics in Gorgias’ *Palamedes*, *On What is Not*, and *Helen*” attempts to illuminate those thought experiments by taking inspiration from a range of interpretive traditions of early Greek sophistic. The chapter argues that this “metaethical” approach allows us to appreciate the ambition and subtlety of Gorgias’ longest speech, which has received little attention hitherto; moreover, it reveals one sense in which his three surviving speeches belong to a unified ongoing project.

Kurt Lampe is Senior Lecturer in Classics & Ancient History at the University of Bristol. Many of his publications concern ancient Greek and Roman and modern continental philosophy. He is the author of *The Birth of Hedonism: Cyrenaic Philosophy and Pleasure as a Way of Life* (Princeton, 2014) and the editor of two forthcoming volumes about continental philosophy’s ongoing dialogue with ancient Stoicism.

7. Joel E. Mann, “Responsibility Rationalized: Action and Pollution in Antiphon’s *Tetralogies*”

Three tetralogies attributed to Antiphon survive, and while all three depict trials for homicide, the second and third are often treated *en bloc*. Antiphon’s third tetralogy describes a case in which the defendant is accused of intentional homicide. Though commentators typically read the tetralogy as a discussion of causation as such, “Responsibility Rationalized: Action and Pollution in Antiphon’s *Tetralogies*” reconstructs it as an early attempt to deal with issues of intention and action surrounding around what twentieth-century philosophy came to call the doctrine of double effect. While

Antiphon does not articulate the doctrine, he develops a nuanced view that addresses the same concerns about responsibility for consequences that motivate its defenders.

Joel Mann is Professor of Philosophy at St. Norbert College. His research focuses primarily on sophistic influence in fifth- and fourth-century medical and legal texts, especially the Hippocratic Corpus and the works of Antiphon. His publications include: “Causation, agency, and the law in Antiphon: On some subtleties in the second Tetralogy,” *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 50 (2012), 7–19; and *Hippocrates On the Art of Medicine* (Leiden, 2012).

8. Mauro Bonazzi, “Ethical and Political Thought in Antiphon’s *Truth and Concord*”

“Ethical and Political Thoughts in Antiphon’s *Truth and Concord*” argues for a unitarian reading of Antiphon’s treatises *Truth* and *Concord*. Three concepts are significant to the discussion: nature (*physis*), law (*nomos*), and intelligence (*gnōmē*, *nous*). Antiphon’s point of departure is *physis*, which he does not regard as source of social, that is, interpersonal, or civic normativity. In the face of the absence of nature as a guide to social or civic life, *Truth* and *Concord* each entertain two distinct responses to the problem. In *Truth* Antiphon suggests, in contrast to the convictions of many contemporaries, that *nomos* is not capable of solving the problems of *physis*. In *Concord*, *gnōmē* is presented as providing a criterion for engendering good character and conducting a successful life. Even leaving aside the problem of the identity of the sophist and the oligarchic rhetor, this defense of intelligence, when combined with the attack on *nomos*, implies an antidemocratic polemic.

Mauro Bonazzi is Professor of Ancient and Medieval Philosophy at Utrecht University. He previously held visiting positions at the Universities of Bordeaux, Lille, Clermont-Ferrand, and at the École Pratique des Hautes Études in Paris. A specialist on the sophists and in the history of ancient Platonism, he has published widely, including: *À la recherche des Idées: Platonisme et philosophie hellénistique d’Antiochus à Plotin* (Paris, 2015); *Atene la città inquieta* (Turin, 2016); *Processo a Socrate* (Rome, 2018); *The Sophists* (Cambridge, 2019). He also collaborates with the Italian newspaper *Corriere della Sera*.

9. David Conan Wolfsdorf, “The Ethical Philosophy of the Historical Socrates”

“The Ethical Philosophy of the Historical Socrates” attempts to determine the basic ethical philosophical commitments of the historical Socrates. The method employed is to canvas prevailing ethical philosophical commitments among the Socratics, which can also be non-anachronistically imputed to a philosopher of a prior generation. The discussion specifically focuses on Socrates’ conception of his philosophical enterprise, including its scope, whether it was (explicitly) eudaimonistic, whether Socrates explicitly spoke of the *psychē*, his conception of the nature and role of knowledge in living well, and his methodological commitments, including his concern with definition and argumentation.

David Conan Wolfsdorf is Professor of Philosophy at Temple University. His research focuses on the historical, especially ancient Greek, and theoretical foundations of value theory and philosophical psychology. He is the author of *Trials of Reason: Plato and the Crafting of Philosophy* (Oxford, 2008); *Pleasure in Ancient Greek Philosophy* (Cambridge, 2013); and *On Goodness* (Oxford, 2019); as well as numerous articles and chapters on ancient Greek philosophy.

10. Richard Bett, “Prodicus on the Choice of Heracles, Language, and Religion”

“Prodicus on the Choice of Heracles, Language, and Religion” begins with an examination of Plato’s portrait of Prodicus in his *Protagoras*, and a few biographical details. It then addresses three main points for which Prodicus is generally known: (1) he told a story about Heracles’ choice between Virtue and Vice; (2) he paid much attention to fine distinctions among terms that most people would regard as synonymous; and (3) he offered explanations of the origins of religious belief that resulted in his being labeled an atheist. On the first, the story is read (as Xenophon, our source, read it) as an argument in favor of virtue, and in some ways as a forerunner of Aristotle’s approach to ethics. On the second, it is argued that ethical terminology was an important dimension of his linguistic interests. By contrast, the third does not appear to have been seen by Prodicus himself as having ethical significance.

Richard Bett is Professor of Philosophy at Johns Hopkins University, with a secondary appointment in Classics. His scholarly work has focused especially on the ancient Greek skeptics, but also includes several essays on the Sophists. He is the author of *Pyrrho, his Antecedents, and his Legacy* (Oxford, 2000) and several translations of the works of Sextus Empiricus. His most recent book is a collection of his essays entitled *How to be a Pyrrhonist* (Cambridge, 2019).

11. Monte Ransome Johnson, “The Ethical Maxims of Democritus of Abdera”

Democritus of Abdera, best known as a cosmologist and the founder of atomism, wrote more on ethics than anyone before Plato. His work *Peri euthumiēs* (*On Contentment*) was extremely influential on the later development of teleological and intellectualist ethics, eudaimonism, hedonism, therapeutic ethics, and positive psychology. The loss of his works, however, and the transmission of his fragments in collections of maxims (*gnōmai*), has obscured the extent of his contribution to the history of systematic ethics and influence on later philosophy, especially in the Hellenistic age. “The Ethical Maxims of Democritus of Abdera” reviews the evidence basis for Democritus’ ethics, discusses the rhetorical and logical aspects of his maxims, attempts to synthesize the fragments into an overall interpretation, and offers a summary of some of the more influential aspects of his ethics.

Monte Ransome Johnson is Associate Professor of Philosophy at the University of California, San Diego, where he is also Director of the Classical Studies Program. He is the author of *Aristotle on Teleology* (Oxford, 2008) and of articles on Democritus, Aristotle, and Lucretius, including recent articles in *The Cambridge Companion to Lucretius*, *The Cambridge Companion to Aristotle’s Nicomachean Ethics*, *The Cambridge Companion to Aristotle’s Biology*, and *The Cambridge Companion to Ancient Greek and Roman Science*. He is currently working on a book on the influence of Democritus on Hellenistic ethics.

12. Alex Gottesman, “The *Sophrosynē* of Critias: Aristocratic Ethics after the Thirty Tyrants”

“The *Sophrosynē* of Critias: Aristocratic Ethics after the Thirty Tyrants” looks at the fragments of Critias and his reception in the works of Xenophon and Plato. In dealing with Critias, both Xenophon and Plato touch on the topic of *sophrosynē*, suggesting that it was of special interest to Critias and relevant to his memory. For Critias, the concept refers to a set of behaviors, demeanors,

and dispositions that were the cornerstone of elite self-presentation and of its claim to political rule. The chapter suggests that in their contrasting portraits of Critias, Xenophon and Plato offer contrasting and, in all likelihood, competing accounts about what went wrong with the old aristocratic order that Critias represented, and about how to reform the ethics of the upper classes so that their leadership would be not only justified but also just.

Alex Gottesman is Associate Professor of Greek and Roman Classics at Temple University. He studies Greek politics and Greek political thought. He is the author of *Politics and the Street in Democratic Athens* (Cambridge, 2014), as well as of articles on Greek literature and history.

13. Philip Sidney Horky, “Anonymus Iamblichī, *On Excellence (Peri Aretēs)*: A Lost Defense of Democracy”

“Anonymus Iamblichī, *On Excellence (Peri Aretēs)*: A Lost Defense of Democracy” presents a comprehensive analysis and complete translation of the fragments of a lost treatise from the late fifth-century BCE, preserved in Iamblichus’ palimpsestic *Exhortation to Philosophy*. Its author is unknown; hence scholars refer to the work as “Anonymus Iamblichī.” And while Iamblichus included it because he thought its author was a Pythagorean, dialectical attributes and specific claims within the treatise point to someone conversant with Ionian philosophers, especially Democritus. Anonymus Iamblichī is a *rara avis*: it presents a unique view on excellence (*aretē*) and its parts; advances a defense of law and justice by appealing to both value and instrumental reasoning; provides an early reflection on social emotions, the weaknesses of the human condition, and the nature of true power; presents the first substantial “Superman” thought experiment; and develops the earliest extant and most philosophically sustained defense of democracy.

Phillip Sidney Horky is Associate Professor of Ancient Philosophy at Durham University. He is author of *Plato and Pythagoreanism* (Oxford, 2013) and editor of *Cosmos in the Ancient World* (Cambridge, 2019). His work ranges widely across ancient philosophy, with articles on ancient metaphysics, epistemology, ethics, political thought, and philosophical biography. He is currently writing a source book, *Pythagorean Philosophy: 250 BCE–200 CE* (Cambridge, forthcoming), and a monograph on theories of language prior to Aristotle.

14. David Conan Wolfsdorf, “On the Unity of the *Dissoi Logoi*”

“On the Unity of the *Dissoi Logoi*” considers whether and how the *Dissoi Logoi* is a unified work. The chapter argues for both global unity and unifying micro-relations among its individual sections, especially sections 1–3 and 4–5. With respect to global unity, the chapter argues that the first seven sections present a series of aporiae, to which the remaining sections 8 and 9 suggest a solution. With respect to the unifying micro-relations, the chapter argues that the topics governing sections 1–3 and 4–5, while treated aporetically, nonetheless constitute the foundations of wisdom and excellence, which the text precisely advertises to teach.

15. Susan Prince, “Antisthenes’ Ethics”

“Antisthenes’ Ethics” focuses on the treatment of virtue we can recover from the remains of Antisthenes’ own writings, in contrast to doxographic reports. Antisthenes locates virtue in the minds of individual sages, such as fictional characters created by Homer and of his own devising. He appears to associate particular characters with particular virtues, rather than considering them perfect instantiations of simple virtue; and this is consistent with his realism. He requires knowledge

or intelligence as both the fabric of virtue and the instrument of its acquisition and exercise. He promotes freedom of individual humans from the constraint of others as both an ethical goal and as a precondition for pursuit of proper virtue.

Susan Prince is Associate Professor of Classics at the University of Cincinnati. She works on Antisthenes and the Socratic tradition broadly considered, classical Athenian intellectual history, the ancient Cynics, Lucian, and doxography. She is the author of *Antisthenes of Athens* (Ann Arbor, 2015) and most recently “Socrates in Stobaeus: Assembling a Philosopher,” in C. Moore, ed., *The Brill Companion to the Reception of Socrates* (Leiden, 2019), 453–517.

16. Mikolaj Domaradzki, “Antisthenes and Allegoresis”

“Antisthenes and Allegoresis” examines the question of Antisthenes’ allegoresis. First, the chapter shows that persistent disagreement among scholars on this topic arises from divergent understandings of what qualifies as allegorical interpretation. Subsequently, the chapter demonstrates that those Antisthenean interpretations that are most frequently categorized as allegorical illustrate broader controversies in research on allegoresis such as whether allegoresis should be defined in terms of its intentionality and whether allegoresis should be defined in terms of its obviousness. Finally, the chapter suggests that Antisthenes’ diversified approach to epic poetry and traditional mythology was conducive to the development of two distinct traditions: a rationalist one and an allegorist one.

Mikolaj Domaradzki is Associate Professor in the Institute of Philosophy at Adam Mickiewicz University. His research is primarily concerned with ancient theories of interpretation and figurative language. He has published articles in *Ancient Philosophy*, *Classical Quarterly*, and *Classical World*, among other venues. He has also published in the field of contemporary linguistics, on metaphors in the Arabic language.

17. Voula Tsouna, “Aristippus of Cyrene”

“Aristippus of Cyrene” re-evaluates the evidence concerning, on the one hand, Aristippus’ alleged hedonism and, on the other, his affiliation with Socrates and the Socratic circle. The central thesis of the chapter is this: even though some sources attribute to Aristippus the sort of ethical hedonism that we know to have been held by his grandson (Aristippus the Younger), there is strong evidence that in fact Aristippus of Cyrene was not an ethical hedonist but endorsed Socratic concerns and values. These latter include philosophical inquiry focused on ethics, the paramount importance of philosophy for education and the care of one’s soul, concern to develop the virtues and assess the relative value of external goods, the crucial role of reason and prudence in ethical conduct, the ethical implications of systematically pursuing pleasure and avoiding pain, and the rationalism that should determine one’s attitudes toward relatives, acquaintances, fellow-citizens, and the city itself.

Voula Tsouna is Professor of Philosophy at the University of California, Santa Barbara. She has also been a fellow of the NEH, the Onassis Foundation, St John’s College (Cambridge), Christ’s College (Cambridge), Centenary Fellow of the Scottish Philosophical Society for 2016. She currently serves on the Board of Directors of the European Cultural Centre at Delphi. Her books include *Philodemus: On Choices and Avoidances* (Naples, 1995); *The Epistemology of the Cyrenaic School* (Cambridge, 1998; also published in Greek translation: Athens 2018); *The Ethics of Philodemus* (Oxford, 2007); and *Knowledge, Pleasure, Happiness. Collected Essays on the Socratics and the Hellenistic Philosophers* (Athens, 2012). She has recently completed a monograph on Plato’s *Charmides*. And she is currently working on Plato’s *Republic*, the Platonic and the Peripatetic traditions, and topics in Hellenistic and Roman philosophy.

18. David M. Johnson, “Self-Mastery, Piety, and Reciprocity in Xenophon’s Ethics”

“Self-Mastery, Piety, and Reciprocity in Xenophon’s Ethics” focuses on the following aspects of Xenophon’s ethics. Xenophon’s interest in leadership makes ethics a central concern across his wide-ranging body of work. The foundation of virtue, for Xenophon, is *enkrateia* (self-mastery), which he believed could be squared with Socratic intellectualism as it was required both for the acquisition of knowledge and for the successful application of knowledge in the face of non-intellectual drives. Xenophon’s famous piety is also of ethical import, as he argues that the gods designed the world to our benefit, benefit the pious through divination, and established unwritten laws which should regulate our conduct. Among those laws is one rewarding reciprocity, which is the central factor in successful interpersonal relationships and friendship. Xenophon, despite his emphasis on self-mastery, believed that the best life was also the most pleasant life, though he also distinguished between pleasures.

David M. Johnson is Associate Professor of Classics at Southern Illinois University, Carbondale. His research focuses on Xenophon’s Socratic works. His recent publications included, co-edited with G. Danzig and D. Morrison, *Plato and Xenophon: Comparative Studies* (Leiden, 2018); “Xenophon’s *Apology* and *Memorabilia*,” in M. Flower, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Xenophon* (Cambridge, 2017), 119–31; “From Generals to Gluttony: *Memorabilia* Book 3,” in A. Stavru and C. Moore, eds., *Socrates and the Socratic Dialogue* (Leiden, 2018), 481–99; and “Xenophon’s Socrates and the Socratic Xenophon,” C. Moore, ed., *The Brill Companion to the Reception of Socrates* (Leiden, 2019), 150–70.

19. Nicholas D. Smith, “Ethics in Plato’s Early Dialogues”

“Ethics in Plato’s Early Dialogues” reviews the main features of the ethical thought given to Socrates in Plato’s early dialogues. These topics include: eudaimonism (and whether that entails a problematic kind of egoism), virtue intellectualism (the view that virtue is a kind of knowledge that is at least similar to craft) motivational intellectualism (the view that all human action follows whatever the agent thinks is in her best interest at the time of action, among all of the options of which she is aware at the time), and the connections that are made in these dialogues between virtue and happiness. Also discussed are the views expressed about how and why ethical agents go wrong.

Nicholas D. Smith is James F. Miller Professor of Humanities in the Classics and Philosophy Departments at Lewis & Clark College. His research focus is ancient philosophy (particularly Plato) and ancient and contemporary epistemology. His recent publications include *Summoning Knowledge in Plato’s Republic* (Oxford, 2019); as co-editor with S. Hetherington, *What the Ancients Offer to Contemporary Epistemology* (New York/London, 2019); and, as co-author with T. Brickhouse, *Socratic Moral Psychology* (Cambridge, 2010).

20. Philip Sidney Horky and Monte Ransome Johnson, “On Law and Justice Attributed to Archytas of Tarentum”

Archytas of Tarentum, a contemporary and associate of Plato, was a famous Pythagorean, mathematician, and statesman of Tarentum. Although his works are lost and most of the fragments attributed to him were composed in later eras, they nevertheless contain valuable information about his thought. In particular, the fragments of *On Law and Justice* are likely based on a work by the early Peripatetic biographer Aristoxenus of Tarentum. The fragments touch on key themes of

early Greek ethics, including: written and unwritten laws, freedom and self-sufficiency, moderation of the emotions and cultivation of virtues, equality and the competence of the majority to participate in government, criticism of “rule by an individual,” a theory of the ideal “mixed constitution,” distributive and corrective justice and punishment, and the rule of law. The fragments also contain one of the only positive accounts of democracy in ancient Greek philosophy.

21. Joseph Skinner, “Early Greek Ethnography and Human Values”

The relationship between early Greek ethnography and early philosophical inquiry is typically regarded as tenuous at best. A paucity of references to the cultures and beliefs of other peoples among the fragmentary works thought to preserve the theorizing of the Presocratics and, latterly, the sophists, has created the impression that philosophical interests and concerns developed separately from ethnography with only minimal crossover between the two. Instead, “Early Greek Ethnography and Human Values” draws on a variety of literary and non-literary evidence to argue that ethnographic knowledge played a significant role in the emergence of a sense of popular ethics—the very ideas and values that helped define what it meant to be “Greek” in the first place.

Joseph Skinner is Lecturer in Ancient Greek History at Newcastle University. His research primarily focuses on the history and reception of ancient ethnographic thought, Herodotus, and ancient Greek identity. His publications include *The Invention of Greek Ethnography: From Homer to Herodotus* (New York, 2012); and, as co-editor with Eran Almagor, *Ancient Ethnography: New Approaches* (London, 2013). He is currently working on a monograph titled *Neglected Ethnographies: the Visual and Material* and, as co-editor, *Routledge Companion to Identities in Antiquity*.

22. Paul Demont, “Ethics in Early Greek Medicine”

“Ethics in Early Greek Medicine” consists of two parts. The first examines analyses of emotions, character, and ethical conduct in the Hippocratic treatises; precisely in chapter 9 of *Humors* and its echoes in the *Epidemics*; and various theories of the physiology of ethical emotions developed in the *Sacred Disease*, *Airs Waters Places*, and *On Regimen*. The second part examines the ethics prescribed for the physician, his entourage, and patients; precisely the ethical function of the myth of Asclepius (particularly in terms of the question of the pursuit of profit and the limitations of medicine in the face of incurable diseases), the ethics of assisting nature (in view of the problem of violent therapies), and the duties of the physician and patient (in view of the—admittedly difficult to date—Hippocratic Oath).

Paul Demont is Professor Emeritus of Greek at the Sorbonne University (formerly the Paris-Sorbonne University). He specializes in the history of ideas. He has published, among other works, *La Cité grecque archaïque et classique et l'idéal de tranquillité* (Paris, 2009²), and numerous articles on Hippocratic medicine. Among his recent publications are: “Thucydide et la vengeance,” in I. Boehm, J.-L. Ferrary, and S. Franchet d'Espèrey, eds., *L'Homme et ses Passions. Actes du XVIIe Congrès international de l'Association Guillaume Budé* (Lyon, 26–29 août 2013) (Paris, 2016), 261–76; “A Note on Demosthenes (19.246–250) and the Reception of Sophocles' Antigone,” in A. Fountoulakis, A. Markantonatos, and G. Vasilaros, eds., *Theatre World. Critical Perspectives on Greek Tragedy and Comedy. Studies in Honour of Georgia Xanthakis-Karamanos* (Berlin/Boston, 2017), 235–41; “Herodotus on Health and Disease,” in E. Bowie, ed., *Herodotus—narrator, scientist, historian* (Berlin/Boston, 2018), 175–96; and “Xénophon et Plutarque dans Der Tod in Venedig de Thomas Mann,” *Costellazioni* 6 (2018), 45–66.

23. Radcliffe Edmonds III, “The Ethics of Afterlife in Classical Greek Thought”

The Greeks imagined the afterlife in a variety of ways, from a shadowy continuation of existence in the Homeric Hades to a dramatic compensation for one’s actions in life, either horrific torments in the underworld or blissful feasts and celebrations in paradise. Whether the afterlife was thought of as a continuation or a compensation, however, the same ethical standards govern existence in the afterlife as in life itself; virtues and vices deserve the same kind of recompense, and the overall happiness of the individual is reckoned in the same ways, even though the individual ceases to be an ethical actor after death. As “The Ethics of Afterlife in Classical Greek Thought” argues, the afterlife is always good to think with, and the Greek ideas of afterlife differ not so much from place to place or from time to time, but rather from text to text, as particular authors make use of different elements of the tradition to express their ideas.

Radcliffe Edmonds III is the Paul Shorey Professor of Greek and Chair of the Department of Greek, Latin & Classical Studies at Bryn Mawr College. His research interests include Greek myth, religion, and philosophy, with particular focus on ideas of afterlife, mystery rites, Orphica, magic, and Platonic philosophy. His most recent publications include *Drawing Down the Moon: Magic in the Ancient Greco-Roman World* (Princeton, 2019); *Redefining Ancient Orphism: A Study in Greek Religion* (Cambridge, 2013); and co-edited with Pierre Destrée, *Plato and the Power of Images* (Leiden, 2017).

24. Dimitri El Murr, “Friendship in Early Greek Ethics”

“Friendship in Early Greek Ethics” examines the accounts of friendship (*philia*) in the early philosophical literature and argues that there is a coherent narrative of philosophical theorizing of friendship prior to Aristotle, one which does not make the Presocratics and Socratics mere pre-Aristotelian. The main treatments of friendship considered in this chapter—namely, those in Empedocles, Democritus, the Sophists, and the Socratics—can be understood as efforts to provide a convincing explanation of what motivates the relation of *philia* and to isolate the conditions for and key features of this specific form of relation essential to the good life.

Dimitri El Murr is Professor of Ancient Philosophy in the Department of Philosophy at the Ecole Normale Supérieure—Université PSL, and a member of the Centre Jean Pépin (CNRS). His research area is ancient philosophy, especially Socrates, Plato, and political Platonism in antiquity and beyond. He has edited *La Mesure du savoir. Études sur le Théétète* (Paris, 2013), co-edited, with A. Brancacci and D. P. Taormina, *Aglaiā. Autour de Platon* (Paris, 2010); co-edited, with G. Boys-Stones and C. Gill, *The Platonic Art of Philosophy* (Cambridge, 2013); co-edited, M. Dixsaut et al., *Platon. Le Politique* (Paris, 2018). His most recent monograph is *Savoir et gouverner. Essai sur la science politique platonicienne* (Paris, 2014).

25. Svavar Hrafn Svavarsson, “Justice and the Afterlife”

Until the end of the fifth century BCE, there were few expectations of divine justice after death, or even of a meaningful afterlife. While such beliefs became ever more conspicuous after the fifth century, we do nevertheless find ideas of an afterlife before that time, and of divine justice for the dead. On the one hand, we find the idea of postmortem retributive justice as early as in Homer. On the other, we find promises of posthumous happiness and salvation for those who have lived justly and piously. Among the earliest instances is found in the *Hymn to Demeter*. Both conceptions express the

workings of divine justice. Tracing them from Homer to the end of the fifth century, through such authors as Aeschylus and Pindar, “Justice and the Afterlife” attempts to shed some light on the emergence of this feature of ancient Greek thought.

Svavar Hrafn Svavarsson is Professor of Philosophy at the University of Iceland. His work has focused on ancient Greek ethics and epistemology.

26. Eleonora Rocconi, “Music and the Soul”

The belief that music can affect the human soul was deeply rooted in ancient Greece. Many philosophers tried to describe the sympathetic responses of human beings to musical performances and their ethical consequences, even without framing their remarks within a consistent and systematic theory. “Music and the Soul” aims at analyzing the cultural background and the contemporary intellectual milieu in which Plato operated, in order to assess earlier or alternative views of the ethical power of *mousikē* overshadowed by his influential theorization. To this end, the chapter focuses on the role of music in the early Pythagorean environment and the evidence for sophistic (in the broadest sense) *epideixeis* on the psychagogic effects of music and the anti-ethical reaction documented by the fourth-century Hibeh papyrus.

Eleonora Rocconi is Associate Professor of Classics in the Department of Musicology and Cultural Heritage at the University of Pavia, Italy. She is editor-in-chief of *Greek and Roman Musical Studies*, the first specialist periodical in the field, and co-editor of the *Blackwell Companion to Ancient Greek and Roman Music* (forthcoming). Her research interests focus on ancient Greek music and drama. Among her publications are: *Le parole delle Muse* (Rome, 2003); “Moving the Soul through the Immovable,” in L. Gianvittorio, ed., *Choreutika Choreia and Mimesis in Fourth-Century Greece. Performing and Theorizing Dance in Ancient Greece* (Pisa/Rome 2017), 174–187; “Music and Dance,” in D. Cairns, ed., *A Cultural History of Emotions in Antiquity* (London/New York/Oxford, 2019), 47–61.

27. Christopher Rowe, “The Teachability of *Aretē* among the Socratics”

“The Teachability of *Aretē* among the Socratics” surveys the Socratics’ views on the teachability of *aretē* (“virtue” or better “goodness”), bringing together the key evidence relating to Euclides, Antisthenes, Xenophon, Aeschines, and Plato—those Socratics for whom we have significant evidence on the topic. The chapter ends with brief speculations on the position of Socrates himself. The survey is in roughly equal parts original, synthetic, and critical. The chief focus is on the implications of the various figures’ treatments of the question “Is *aretē* teachable or not?” for their views on what *aretē* actually is, and on the degree to which those views may or may not have committed them to one form or another of intellectualism.

Christopher Rowe is Professor Emeritus of Greek and Leverhulme Emeritus Fellow. He is currently preparing a new critical edition of Aristotle’s *Eudemian Ethics* (replacing the 1991 Oxford Classical Text and to be delivered in 2021). Reference to some of his more important publications is made in his contribution to the present volume. Other publications include: *Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics: Translation, Introduction, and Commentary, with Sarah Broadie* (Oxford, 2002); the new Penguin edition of Plato’s *Republic* (London, 2012); “Plato, Socrates, and the *genei gennaia sophistikē* of *Sophist* 231b,” in D. Nails and H. Tarrant, eds., *Second Sailing: Alternative Perspectives on Plato* (Helsinki, 2015), 149–67; and “Philosophy and linguistic authority: the problem of Plato’s Greek,” in C. Stray, M. Clarke and J. T. Katz, eds., *Liddell and Scott: The History, Methodology, and Languages of the World’s Leading Lexicon of Ancient Greek* (Oxford, forthcoming).

28. William Desmond, “Diogenes of Sinope”

Diogenes of Sinope is the great exemplar whom later Cynics continually evoke. Yet despite the many vivid anecdotes told of him, he is historically a shadowy figure, and his ideas are difficult to pinpoint with absolute precision. In seeking to locate Diogenes somewhat precisely both in his own time and in the longer *durée* of Greek ethical thought, “Diogenes of Sinope” first surveys major themes of Cynicism that may be traced back to Diogenes himself: living according to nature, criticism of customs, shamelessness and *parrhēsia*, ascetic self-sufficiency, cosmopolitanism, and the pursuit of happiness through virtue. While there may be a general consensus on these topics, controversies remain, and perhaps must remain. In its second section, therefore, the chapter explores diverse, even opposite ways in which Diogenes has been construed and categorized. This series of antinomies again highlights the difficulties of precise interpretation, and suggests the deliberately elusive nature of Diogenes’ ethical thinking.

William Desmond is Lecturer in the Department of Ancient Classics at Maynooth University. His research focuses mainly on the history of philosophy and intellectual history more broadly, both within the Greek world (Socratic, Platonic, and Cynic traditions) and certain periods of modern reception (German Idealism, Process Thought). Recent publications include single-authored monographs *Philosopher Kings of Antiquity* (London, 2012) and *Hegel’s Antiquity* (Oxford, forthcoming).

29. Tim O’Keefe, “Anaxarchus on Indifference, Happiness, and Convention”

Anaxarchus accompanied Pyrrho on Alexander the Great’s expedition to India and was known as “the Happy Man” because of his impassivity and contentment. Our sources on his philosophy are limited and largely consist of anecdotes about his interactions with Pyrrho and Alexander, but they allow us to reconstruct a distinctive ethical position. This position overlaps with several disparate ethical traditions, but is not merely a hodge-podge; it hangs together as a unified whole. Like Pyrrho, Anaxarchus asserts that things are indifferent in value and that realizing this indifference leads to contentment. But this doctrine of indifference is rooted in Democritean atomism. And in his pursuit of pleasure and dismissiveness of conventional standards of what is just, noble, and pious, Anaxarchus is closer to fifth-century thinkers such as Aristippus, Antiphon, and Critias.

Tim O’Keefe is Associate Professor of Philosophy at Georgia State University. He has published extensively on Epicureanism, including two books, *Epicurus on Freedom* (Cambridge, 2005) and *Epicureanism* (Berkeley/New York, 2009), and articles on topics such as the Epicureans on the mind-body relation, freedom of action, sensible qualities, friendship, justice, and death. But his interests range broadly, and he has also published on the Pyrrhonian skeptics, the Cyrenaics, Aristotle’s cosmology, and the spurious Platonic dialogue *Axiochus*.

30. Carl A. Huffman, “Aristoxenus’ *Pythagorean Precepts*: A Rational Pythagorean Ethics”

“Aristoxenus’ *Pythagorean Precepts*: A Rational Pythagorean Ethics” examines neglected evidence for Pythagorean ethics and the Pythagorean way of life as it existed in the late fifth and early fourth century BCE: the *Pythagorean Precepts* by Aristoxenus of Tarentum. The most characteristic feature of the ethical system found in the *Pythagorean Precepts* is its distrust of untutored human nature and its insistence on the necessity for supervision of all stages and aspects of human life. The emphasis on structure in life is so extreme as to value order even over correctness. The *Precepts* represents a much

more rational ethical system than the earlier Pythagorean *acusmata* and suggests a level of development similar to that of the ethical fragments of Democritus.

Carl A. Huffman is Emeritus Professor and Research Professor of Classical Studies at DePauw University. His research focuses on ancient Pythagoreanism. He is the author of *Philolaus of Croton: Pythagorean and Presocratic* (Cambridge, 1993); *Archytas of Tarentum: Pythagorean, Philosopher, and Mathematician King* (Cambridge, 2005); and *Aristoxenus of Tarentum: the Pythagorean Precepts (How to Live a Pythagorean Life)* (Cambridge, 2019). He is also the editor of *A History of Pythagoreanism* (Cambridge, 2015).

Introduction

David Conan Wolfsdorf

Circa 530 BCE, Pythagoras emigrated from Samos to Croton.¹ *Circa* 500 BCE, Heraclitus composed his book on the cosmos, justice, and the soul.² By 380 BCE, Plato had composed most of his early dialogues.³ And shortly after 370 BCE, Xenophon had completed his *Memorabilia*.⁴

I will refer to the century and a half or so—from the last decades of the archaic period through the first century or so of the classical period—as the “formative period” of Greek philosophical ethics. The end of the formative period immediately precedes the completion of Plato’s and then Aristotle’s major ethical works: the *Republic* and *Eudemian Ethics* and *Nicomachean Ethics*.

This volume aims to enhance understanding of Greek philosophical ethics in the formative period. Each chapter is devoted to one of four things: an ethical philosophical text such as the *Dissoi Logoi*, *Anonymus Iamblichii*, or *On Law and Justice*; a philosopher who contributes to ethics such as Empedocles, Antiphon, or Prodicus; an ethical philosophical topic such as friendship or the teachability of *aretē*; or a subject or field such as the afterlife, music, or medicine that, while not per se philosophical, was particularly influential on philosophical ethics of the formative period and subsequently.

Not all philosophers who could have been included have been included. For instance, Archelaus of Athens might have been included,⁵ and Aeschines of Sphettus might have been included.⁶ Other ethical philosophical topics could have been included. In particular, I would have liked to have chapters on fortune, *autarkeia* (self-sufficiency), and the variety of forms of ethical argumentation.⁷ Other fields as well as genres of the formative period could also have been included, for example, forensic rhetoric; psychology; theology; various genres of poetry such as tragic drama, lyric, and epinician poetry; and poetics itself. Many of the chapters in fact variously engage with some of these topics and aspects of

¹ For a recent discussion of Pythagoras’ dates, cp. C. Huffman, “Pythagoras,” *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*; C. Rowett, “The Pythagorean Society and Politics,” in *A History of Pythagoreanism*, C. Huffman, ed. (Cambridge, 2014), 112–30.

² This standard date is based on Heraclitus’ *floruit* given in DL 9.1.

³ This date is based on Plato’s standard dates of 427–347; the assumption that his literary career began *c.*400; and the common division of his dialogues into early, middle, and late periods of approximately equal length.

⁴ Cp. L.-A. Dorion, *Xenophon Mémoires*, Livre 1 (Paris, 2003), CCXL–CCLII.

⁵ Cp. G. Bétégh, “Archelaus on Cosmogony and the Origins of Social Institutions,” *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy* 51 (2016) 1–40.

⁶ Cp. C. Kahn, “Aeschines on Socratic Eros,” in P.A. Vander Waerdt, ed., *The Socratic Movement* (Ithaca, 1994), 87–106; K. Lampe, “Rethinking Aeschines of Sphettus,” in U. Zilioli, ed., *From the Socratics to the Socratic Schools* (New York, 2015), 61–81. (A number of other philosophers or schools could have been included in the coda.)

⁷ Chapters on all of these topics were originally commissioned, but unfortunately never realized. Topical and thematic chapters were the most difficult to achieve—a fact that, I believe, owes to their dependence on the availability of adequate groundwork on individuals and texts or fragments.

these fields. Nonetheless, the volume is not being offered as a comprehensive treatment of philosophical ethics and its principal sources of influence in the formative period. Rather, it is quite comprehensive, and principally so with respect to philosophers and texts.

It is premature to attempt a comprehensive work on philosophical ethics of the formative period. This is the first volume devoted to the subject. Generally, with the exception of Plato's early dialogues, Empedocles' poem or poems *On Nature* and *Purifications*, and Xenophon's Socratic writings, the various ethical philosophical contributions of the formative period have been neglected, especially among Anglophone scholars.⁸ For example, the fragments of the *Anonymus Iamblichii* were first identified in 1888 as belonging to a work of the sophistic milieu, and there remains no comprehensive English edition of the text.⁹ The *Dissoi Logoi* was first translated into English in 1968;¹⁰ and very little scholarship has since been done on this text,¹¹ let alone prior scholarship. The main fragments of Antiphon's *On Truth* were discovered in 1905 and 1984. A fair amount has been done on this text, but relatively little in the last couple decades.¹² Almost nothing has been done on the fragments of Antiphon's *On Concord*.¹³ Philosophical treatment of Antiphon's *Tetralogies* remains almost non-existent. Likewise, philosophical examination of Gorgias' *Helen* and especially *Palamedes*.¹⁴ Democritus' ethical fragments continue to be remarkably understudied—despite the fact that there are hundreds of them. The ethical dimensions of Heraclitus' fragments have only recently been the subject of concerted attention.¹⁵ Archytas' *On Law and Justice* has rarely been discussed. The first English edition of Antisthenes' testimonies and fragments was published in 2016.¹⁶ The first edition of Aristoxenus' *Pythagorean Precepts* is being published at the time that this introduction is being written.¹⁷

In short, much remains to be addressed before the individual contributions of the formative period are adequately understood and properly appreciated, and a comprehensive perspective on the period becomes available. This volume is a contribution to that ultimate objective.¹⁸

⁸ It is no surprise to me that nine of the chapters were composed by non-native English speakers. Paul Demont's chapter on Greek medicine was actually originally written in French.

⁹ Contrast two Italian editions: D. Musti and M. Mari, *Anonimo di Giamblico, La pace e il benessere: Idee sull'economia, la società, la morale* (Milan, 2003); A. Ciriaci, *L'Anonimo di Giamblico: Saggio critico e analisi dei frammenti* (Naples, 2011).

¹⁰ R.K. Sprague, "Dissoi Logoi or Dialexeis," *Mind* 72 (1968), 155–67.

¹¹ T.M. Robinson's edition, *Contrasting Arguments: An Edition of the Dissoi Logoi* (New York, 1979), is an excellent exception.

¹² In particular, I acknowledge the excellent edition of G.J. Pendrick, *Antiphon the Sophist. The Fragments* (Cambridge, 2002), and the important work of M. Gagarin, *Antiphon the Athenian. Oratory, Law and Justice in the Age of the Sophists* (Austin, 2002). For a relatively recent philosophically oriented treatment of fragment 44, cp. David J. Riesbeck, "Nature, Normativity, and Nomos in Antiphon, Fr. 44," *Phoenix* 65 (2011), 268–87.

¹³ But cp. A. Hourcade, "L'Homonoia selon Antiphon d'Athènes," *Elenchos* 22 (2001), 243–80.

¹⁴ Cp. R. Barney, "Gorgias' *Encomium of Helen*," in *Ten Neglected Classics of Philosophy*, E. Schliesser, ed. (Oxford, 2016), 1–25.

¹⁵ To be clear, I intend here studies in English focused on Heraclitus' ethics. For example, cp. D. Sider, "Heraclitus' Ethics," in *Doctrine and Doxography: Studies on Pythagoras and Heraclitus*, D. Sider and D. Obbink, eds. (Berlin, 2013), 321–34.

¹⁶ S. Prince, *Antisthenes of Athens* (Ann Arbor, 2015).

¹⁷ C. Huffman, *Aristoxenus of Tarentum: The Pythagorean Precepts* (Cambridge, 2019).

¹⁸ The fact that twenty-eight authors have contributed to the present volume of course significantly compounds the difficulty of creating a work on the formative period in which this period is envisioned as in some way unified.

The chapters are organized in three sections: individuals and texts, topics and fields, and a brief coda. The first section is organized chronologically,¹⁹ the second alphabetically, the third chronologically.

For reasons stated below, I am disinclined to regard Pythagoras himself as a philosopher. Rather, Heraclitus seems to me the first Greek thinker to have composed a work that crosses the threshold of philosophy and in which ethical concerns are salient, if not central.²⁰ Nonetheless, Pythagoras was “the first [Greek] thinker to set forth a comprehensive plan for a good life.”²¹ In the course of the fifth century and in subsequent centuries continuously through late antiquity, diverse philosophers, some of whom identified themselves as Pythagoreans, variously developed Pythagoras’ and then his successors’ views and ways of life. So, while Pythagoras was not a founder of Greek ethical philosophy, he was one of the principal influences on the foundations of this tradition. Moreover, Pythagoreanism was probably the most prominent ethical philosophical movement of the formative period. Consequently, I have placed the chapter on the Pythagorean *acusmata*, whose contents are widely thought to represent the earliest Pythagorean views, at the beginning of the volume.

Three chapters—on Diogenes of Sinope, Anaxarchus, and Aristoxenus’ *Pythagorean Precepts*—constitute a coda to the volume.²² All three philosophers are squarely of the fourth century and so post-formative. The following two considerations motivated the inclusion of Diogenes and Anaxarchus. Like the formative period as a whole, these two philosophers are understudied. Moreover, they make fundamental contributions to two important late classical or post-classical ethical philosophical traditions: cynicism and skepticism. The inclusion of Aristoxenus’ *Pythagorean Precepts* owes to the fact that it too is understudied, that the rationalist Pythagorean ethics that it describes may reflect fifth- as well as fourth-century commitments, and that it bookends the opening chapter on the *acusmata* and thereby highlights the centrality of Pythagorean ethics in the formative period.

In ordinary English, “ethical” and “moral” are very close in meaning, if not synonymous. Granted this, there is a recent tendency in contemporary Anglophone history of ethical philosophy to prefer the terms “ethical” and “ethics” over the terms “moral” and “morality” when discussing ancient thought and writing on the subject. A primary motivation here is to underscore features of ancient ethics absent from modern, especially Kantian, and contemporary morality and vice versa. Central among such features is the tendency in ancient ethics to treat personal wellbeing as the goal of human life. In contrast, modern and

¹⁹ This is according to standardly accepted dates, which are, especially for some of these early figures, notoriously difficult to pin down.

²⁰ Contrast N. Georgopoulos, “Why Heraclitus Is Not a Philosopher,” in K. Boudouris, ed., *Ionian Philosophy* (Athens, 1989), 136–41, and P. Curd, “The Presocratics as Philosophers,” in A. Laks and C. Louguet, eds., *Qu’est-ce que la Philosophie Présocratique?* (Lille, 2002), 115–37. And, in light of my claim below regarding the centrality of argumentation for philosophy, cp. H. Granger, “Argumentation and Heraclitus’ Book,” *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy* 26 (2004), 1–17. (Let me add here that with respect to the case of Xenophanes, I am sympathetic to the views that Shaul Tor expresses in the Introduction of his chapter in this volume. And—at the other end of the volume—in the case of Diogenes of Sinope, cp. n.127 in Williams Desmond’s chapter.)

²¹ Carl Huffman, “The Pythagorean Tradition,” in A.A. Long, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Early Greek Philosophy* (Cambridge, 1999), 66–87, at 75.

²² The chapter on Aristoxenus’ *Pythagorean Precepts* is the only reprint in the volume. More precisely, it has been slightly expanded to include the Greek texts corresponding to the English translations from Aristoxenus’ work that are quoted.

contemporary morality is, firstly, concerned with our obligations to others. Moreover, modern and contemporary morality maintain that all moral agents are, in some crucial respect, equal. This moral or so-called basic equality is largely, if not wholly, absent from Greco-Roman philosophical ethics.²³

Broadly sympathetic to the tendency to view ancient ethics and modern and contemporary morality as having distinct foci or orientations, I have in this volume opted for the terms “ethics” and “ethical”; and I have invited my contributors to consider this usage. Minimally, for those contributors unmoved by the recent theoretical trend, their employment of “ethics” and “ethical” has contributed to greater stylistic unity. A small number of contributors have preferred to retain the terms “moral” and “morality” throughout their chapters or at least in certain passages; and in some of these cases they have explained their decisions.

Most broadly, ethics may be characterized as concerning how one ought to live. Ethics might just as well be characterized as concerning fundamental values in and of human life. Understandably then ethics, taken in this very broad sense, pervades human culture. But the primary concern of this volume is with philosophical ethics. Therefore, some delineation of philosophical from non-philosophical ethics is important for clarifying the volume’s aim and scope.

I suggest that the conjunction of the following two features distinguishes philosophical from non-philosophical ethics: a dominant concern with universal or at least very general principles pertaining to the domain in question and a dominant concern with explicit argumentation for these principles.

The first of these features distinguishes philosophical concern from those concerns that we find among, say, the historians, whose focus is datable events. Regarding the second feature, forms of what might be called “argumentation” occur in non-philosophical genres. For example, a tragic drama might be read as an argument for a principle. But insofar as this occurs, the argument proceeds indirectly, via narrative elements and thereby a mimesis of human actions.²⁴ Direct forms of argumentation are central to forensic rhetoric. However, in this case arguments are for the guilt or innocence of particular individuals and so for the truth of singular propositions—not principles.

In describing “philosophical” concern, I speak deliberately of a “dominant” concern with principles and explicit argumentation for them. Concern with principles and explicit argumentation are matters of degree. The more we find concern with principles or explicit argumentation for principles in, say, a lyric poem, the more philosophical we regard that poem as being.

It is also noteworthy that philosophy and so ethical philosophy tends to use prose as opposed to poetic verse to pursue and communicate its concerns. Evidently, the use of

²³ Cp. G.E.M. Anscombe, “Modern Moral Philosophy,” *Philosophy* 33 (1958), 1–19; B. Williams, *Ethics and the Limits of Philosophy* (Cambridge, MA, 1985), especially at 174–96; D. Wolfsdorf, “Morality and Aristotelian Character Excellence,” in I. Fileva, ed., *Questions of Character* (Oxford, 2016), 19–32; J. Annas, “Ancient Eudaimonism and Modern Morality,” in C. Bobonich, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Ancient Ethics* (Cambridge, 2017), 265–80. On the use of the terms “ethics” and “morality,” compare the title of Terry Irwin’s *Plato’s Moral Theory* (Oxford, 1977) with his more recent work, *Plato’s Ethics* (Oxford, 1995); and consider B. Adkins, *A Guide to Ethics and Moral Philosophy* (Oxford, 2017). But consider also J. Annas, *The Morality of Happiness* (Oxford, 1993). On the topic of basic equality, cp. U. Steinhoff, ed., *Do All Persons Have Equal Moral Worth? On ‘Basic Equality’ and Equal Respect and Concern* (Oxford, 2014).

²⁴ On Plato’s philosophical employment of the form of dramatic dialogue, cp. D. Wolfsdorf, *Trials of Reason: Plato and the Crafting of Philosophy* (Oxford/New York, 2008), especially at 3–28.

prose is not necessary for the presentation of philosophy. Parmenides' *On Nature*, Empedocles' *On Nature and Purifications*, and Lucretius' *On the Nature of Things* are important and familiar counterexamples.²⁵ Still, the reason poetic verse is ultimately ill-suited to philosophical writing is that the constraints of meter and preoccupation with the musical and more generally acoustic and sensory qualities of language tend to jeopardize the aims of explicit argumentation for principles.²⁶

So much for the scope, organization, and title of *Early Greek Ethics*.²⁷

Bibliography

- Adkins, B., *A Guide to Ethics and Moral Philosophy* (Oxford, 2017)
- Annas, J., *The Morality of Happiness* (Oxford, 1993)
- Annas, J., "Ancient Eudaimonism and Modern Morality," in C. Bobonich, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Ancient Ethics* (Cambridge, 2017), 265–80
- Anscombe, G.E.M., "Modern Moral Philosophy," *Philosophy* 33 (1958), 1–19
- Barney, R., "Gorgias' *Encomium of Helen*," in *Ten Neglected Classics of Philosophy*, E. Schliesser, ed. (Oxford, 2016), 1–25
- Bétegh, G., "Archelaus on Cosmogony and the Origins of Social Institutions," *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy* 51 (2016) 1–40
- Ciriaci, A., *L'Anonimo di Giamblico: Saggio critico e analisi dei frammenti* (Naples, 2011)
- Curd, P., "The Presocratics as Philosophers," in *Qu'est-ce que la Philosophie Présocratique?*, A. Laks and C. Louguet, eds. (Lille, 2002), 115–37
- Dorion, L.-A., *Xénophon Mémoires*, Livre 1 (Paris, 2003)
- Gagarin, M., *Antiphon the Athenian. Oratory, Law and Justice in the Age of the Sophists* (Austin, 2002)
- Georgopoulos, N., "Why Heraklitus Is Not a Philosopher," in *Ionian Philosophy*, K. Boudouris, ed. (Athens, 1989), 136–41
- Granger, H., "Argumentation and Heraclitus' Book," *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy* 26 (2004), 1–17
- Hourcade, A., "L'*Homonoia* selon Antiphon d'Athènes," *Elenchos* 22 (2001), 243–80
- Huffman, C., "The Pythagorean Tradition," in *The Cambridge Companion to Early Greek Philosophy*, A.A. Long, ed. (Cambridge, 1999), 66–87
- Huffman, C., "Pythagoras," *SEP*
- Huffman, C., *Aristoxenus of Tarentum: The Pythagorean Precepts* (Cambridge, 2019)

²⁵ There are, of course, culturally and historically specific reasons for the poetic forms of these particular philosophical works.

²⁶ I do not suggest that the philosophers themselves would uniformly agree with this claim. Heraclitus in particular would forcefully object. On the poetic dimensions of Heraclitus' prose, cp. the remarkable observations of S. Mouraviev, "Editing Heraclitus (1999–2012) Ten Volumes Plus One," *Epoché* 17 (2013), 195–218, at 202–6; and more fully, S. Mouraviev, *Heraclitea, IV.A, Refectio: Héraclite d'Éphèse, "Les Muses" ou "De la nature"* (Sankt Augustin, 2011).

²⁷ I am very grateful to all my contributors for their efforts and their patience. I am also grateful to my editor at Oxford University Press, Peter Momtchiloff, for his support of this project. I also want to thank Juliet Gardner for her excellent work as copy editor.

- Irwin, T., *Plato's Moral Philosophy* (Oxford, 1977)
- Irwin, T., *Plato's Ethics* (Oxford, 1995)
- Kahn, C., "Aeschines on Socratic Eros," in P.A. Vander Waerdt, ed., *The Socratic Movement* (Ithaca, 1994), 87–106
- Lampe, K., "Rethinking Aeschines of Sphettus," in U. Zilioli, ed., *From the Socratics to the Socratic Schools* (New York, 2016), 61–81
- Mouraviev, S., *Heraclitea, IV.A, Refectio: Héraclite d'Éphèse, "Les Muses" ou "De la nature"* (Sankt Augustin, 2011)
- Mouraviev, S., "Editing Heraclitus (1999–2012) Ten Volumes Plus One," *Epoché* 17 (2013), 195–218
- Musti, D. and M. Mari, *Anonimo di Giamblico, La pace e il benessere: Idee sull' economia, la società, la morale* (Milan, 2003)
- Pendrick, G.J., *Antiphon the Sophist. The Fragments* (Cambridge, 2002)
- Prince, S., *Antisthenes of Athens* (Ann Arbor, 2015)
- Riesbeck, R.J., "Nature, Normativity, and Nomos in Antiphon, Fr. 44," *Phoenix* 65 (2011), 268–87
- Robinson, T.M., *Contrasting Arguments: An Edition of the Dissoi Logoi* (New York, 1979)
- Rowett, C. "The Pythagorean Society and Politics," in *A History of Pythagoreanism*, C. Huffman, ed. (Cambridge, 2014), 112–30
- Sider, D., "Heraclitus' Ethics," in *Doctrine and Doxography: Studies on Pythagoras and Heraclitus*, D. Sider and D. Obbink, eds. (Berlin, 2013), 321–34
- Sprague, R.K., "Dissoi Logoi or Dialexeis," *Mind* 72 (1968), 155–67
- Steinhoff, U. (ed.), *Do All Persons Have Equal Moral Worth? On 'Basic Equality' and Equal Respect and Concern* (Oxford, 2014)
- Williams, B., *Ethics and the Limits of Philosophy* (Cambridge, MA, 1985)
- Wolfsdorf, D., *Trials of Reason: Plato and the Crafting of Philosophy* (Oxford/New York, 2008)
- Wolfsdorf, D., "Morality and Aristotelian Character Excellence," in *Questions of Character*, I. Fileva, ed. (Oxford, 2016), 19–32