

剑桥政治思想史原著系列（影印本）

CAMBRIDGE TEXTS IN THE HISTORY OF POLITICAL THOUGHT

早期希腊政治思想： 从荷马到智者

*Early Greek Political
Thought from Homer
to the Sophists*

Edited by

MICHAEL GAGARIN

and

PAUL WOODRUFF 中国政法大学出版社

早期希腊政治思想： 从荷马到智者

*Early Greek Political Thought
from Homer to the Sophists*

TRANSLATED AND EDITED BY

MICHAEL GAGARIN

University of Texas

PAUL WOODRUFF

University of Texas

中国政法大学出版社

图书在版编目(CIP)数据

早期希腊政治思想:从荷马到智者/(美)加加林等编译.—北京:中国政法大学出版社,2003.5

剑桥政治思想史原著系列(影印本)

ISBN 7-5620-2408-1

I. 早... II. 加... III. 政治思想史—古希腊—英文 IV. D091.2
中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字(2003)第 052781 号

* * * * *

| | |
|-------|---|
| 书 名 | 《早期希腊政治思想:从荷马到智者》 |
| 出 版 人 | 李传敢 |
| 经 销 | 全国各地新华书店 |
| 出版发行 | 中国政法大学出版社 |
| 承 印 | 清华大学印刷厂 |
| 开 本 | 880 × 1230mm 1/32 |
| 印 张 | 12.25 |
| 版 本 | 2003 年 7 月第 1 版 2003 年 7 月第 1 次印刷 |
| 书 号 | ISBN 7-5620-2408-1/D·2368 |
| 印 数 | 0 001-2 000 |
| 定 价 | 27.00 元 |
| 社 址 | 北京市海淀区西土城路 25 号 邮政编码 100088 |
| 电 话 | (010)62229563 (010)62229278 (010)62229803 |
| 电子信箱 | z5620@263.net |
| 网 址 | http://www.cup1.edu.cn/cbs/index.htm |

声 明

1. 版权所有,侵权必究。
2. 如发现缺页、倒装问题,请与出版社联系调换。

CAMBRIDGE TEXTS IN THE
HISTORY OF POLITICAL THOUGHT



*Early Greek Political Thought from
Homer to the Sophists*

原书由剑桥大学出版社于 1995 年出版,此影印本的出版获得剑桥大学出版社财团(英国剑桥)的许可。

© Cambridge University Press 1995

This book is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

剑桥政治思想史原著系列

丛书编辑

Raymond Geuss

剑桥大学哲学高级讲师

Quentin Skinner

剑桥大学近代史讲座教授

在政治理论领域，“剑桥政治思想史原著系列”作为主要的学生教科丛书，如今已牢固确立了其地位。本丛书旨在使学生能够获得从古希腊到 20 世纪初期西方政治思想史方面所有最为重要的原著。它囊括了所有著名的经典原著，但与此同时，它又扩展了传统的评价尺度，以便能够纳入范围广泛、不那么出名的作品。而在此之前，这些作品中有许多从未有过现代英文版本可资利用。只要可能，所选原著都会以完整而不删节的形式出版，其中的译作则是专门为本丛书的目的而安排。每一本书都有一个评论性的导言，加上历史年表、生平梗概、进一步阅读指南，以及必要的词汇表和原文注解。本丛书的最终目的是，为西方政治思想的整个发展脉络提供一个清晰的轮廓。

本丛书已出版著作的书目，请查阅书末。

CAMBRIDGE TEXTS IN THE HISTORY OF POLITICAL THOUGHT

Series editors

RAYMOND GEUSS

Lecturer in Philosophy, University of Cambridge

QUENTIN SKINNER

Regius Professor of Modern History in the University of Cambridge

Cambridge Texts in the History of Political Thought is now firmly established as the major student textbook series in political theory. It aims to make available to students all the most important texts in the history of western political thought, from ancient Greece to the early twentieth century. All the familiar classic texts will be included, but the series seeks at the same time to enlarge the conventional canon by incorporating an extensive range of less well-known works, many of them never before available in a modern English edition. Wherever possible, texts are published in complete and unabridged form, and translations are specially commissioned for the series. Each volume contains a critical introduction together with chronologies, biographical sketches, a guide to further reading and any necessary glossaries and textual apparatus. When completed the series will aim to offer an outline of the entire evolution of western political thought.

For a list of titles published in the series, please see end of book

Preface

The passages printed in this book are for the most part short, and many of them are fragmentary. They have all been the subject of far more scholarly research than can be aired in this format. We have tried to provide sufficient explanatory material for students to reach a basic understanding of the texts. Those who wish to go further may consult the Bibliographical Note. All readers should be warned that nothing presented here is beyond controversy.

We have been generous in our selection of texts. Some texts of doubtful authenticity that nevertheless represent pre-Platonic political thought have been included. Some texts have been chosen not because of what they say about political theory, but for the light they shed on other texts that are directly relevant to our themes. Questions of authenticity are mentioned in the notes when they arise. We have arranged our texts by genre, with the sophists at the end. We exclude texts representing the thought of Socrates, who will be the subject of another volume in this series. For a chronology of authors and events, see below, pp. xxxii–xxxv. Unless otherwise indicated, all our dates are BCE.

The translations aim at clarity and accuracy, and for the most part follow the structure of the original Greek. Translations of Greek verse are roughly line-for-line, and verse passages are provided with the Greek line numbers for convenient reference. Important words such as *dikē* (“justice”) are translated as consistently as possible throughout. Technical Greek words that do not have close English equivalents and words such as *aretē* and *hubris* that have developed a history of their own in modern discussions are

Preface

transliterated in the text and discussed in the Glossary. Generally we use square brackets, [], for explanatory material inserted in the text and angled brackets, < >, for material that is not in the preserved Greek text but that (in our view) must have been in the original. We have generally adhered to a thematic arrangement of the material, but the arrangement may vary from author to author. In cross-references we identify passages by bold-face numbers usually preceded by "fr." even if the passage is not technically a fragment.

We have furnished new translations for all of the texts in this volume. Gagarin was primarily responsible for the *Hymn to Hephaestus*, Aeschylus, Sophocles, the minor tragedians, the Old Oligarch, Democritus, Antisthenes, Gorgias, Prodicus, Antiphon, Thrasymachus, Evenus, Critias, Lycophron, Alcidamas, *Anonymus Iamblichi*, and *Dissoi Logoi*. Woodruff was primarily responsible for Homer, Hesiod, Archilochus, Tyrtaeus, Solon, the Theognid corpus, Simonides, Xenophanes, Pindar, Euripides, Herodotus, Thucydides, Aesop, Heraclitus, the medical writers, Protagoras, Hippias, and the unknown sophist authors. Dr. Michael Nill prepared a translation, which we followed extensively, of the following texts: Democritus, Gorgias, and the Old Oligarch. Mark Gifford contributed to the translations of Aesop, the Old Oligarch, the medical writers, and the tragic fragments. He also provided useful comments on the Thucydides translation; this began as a revision of the Hobbes version of 1626 but in the process of modernization took on a life of its own. Both Gagarin and Woodruff have reviewed and edited all the translations.

Introduction

Western political thought begins with the Greeks – not just with recognized masterpieces, such as Plato's *Republic* and Aristotle's *Politics*, but with a host of earlier thinkers who are less well known. The purpose of this volume is to present the broad range of ideas about politics and the nature of human society that were proposed and debated before the more formal works of Plato and Aristotle began to dominate and control the expression of political theory.

Greek political thought before Plato comprises everything the Greeks deemed important to the functioning of the city-state, or *polis*: political theory, sociology, anthropology, ethics, rhetoric, and more. These issues come together in the last half of the fifth century in the teaching of the sophists, whose profession it was to prepare young adults for participation in public life. Long before the sophists, however, such issues were central to the poetry that served as the cultural memory of the Greeks. Accordingly, the texts in this volume represent more than thirty authors, including poets, philosophers, playwrights, historians, medical writers, and, of course, sophists. Because the sophists made the most striking contribution to political theory in this period, their surviving works are translated here in their entirety. In the case of other writers, we have included texts that reflect sophistic influence, as well as earlier texts with themes relating to the political thought of the time on such matters as human nature, the origin of human society, the origin of law, the nature of justice, the forms of good government, the distribution of wealth, and the distribution of power among genders and social classes.

Accounts of the sophists have too often assumed the perspective of Plato and later thinkers, who ask in what ways the sophists do or do not address the issues of concern to classical philosophy. In presenting the sophists in this volume together with their predecessors and contemporaries, we hope to foster the view that the sophists are the culmination of a long tradition of inquiry into these matters, and not merely precursors of classical political theory. The latter tradition was inaugurated by Plato and Aristotle and has had so much influence on modern thinking that it has largely eclipsed earlier contributions to political thought. This is regrettable. Political thinking had advanced long before Plato to provide foundations for the development of democracies in Athens and elsewhere. Greek authors as early as Homer and Hesiod understood the importance of procedural justice in communities, and the sophists gave this view theoretical support. By the late fifth century, moreover, perceptive writers such as Thucydides had learned from bitter experience that all elements of a community must be represented in government, and that no class – not even the ordinary people or *dēmos* – should be allowed to tyrannize over others. Thucydides' political thoughts, which anticipate Aristotle's in many respects, are clearly a product of the innovative thinking of the sophistic age – an age that still has considerable indirect influence on modern thinking.

Historical background

The political history of Greece before the fifth century has to be reconstructed from later sources supplemented by evidence from poetry and archaeology. The Homeric epics look back to the Bronze Age (which ended in the twelfth century), when there was a great king in Mycenae; but at the same time the epics reflect the realities of life in the eighth century – Greece fragmented into small communities presided over by hereditary aristocrats known as kings. Book 2 of the *Iliad* shows an assembly of the Greek army in which only kings are permitted to speak. Homer is probably responding to some popular resistance to this system when he introduces a caricature of a common man, Thersites, who attempts to speak in the assembly of the army. Thersites does not stand a chance: Odysseus drives him away, to the laughter of the assembly.

Hesiod's political landscape is similar, but seen from the perspective of a small land-owner and farmer. Power is in the hands of kings, and justice is fragile and easily subverted. Hesiod is passionate in his advocacy of a fair and effective judicial process, but pessimistic about the chances of justice being realized in the community as he knows it. Political change is a remote possibility.

After Homer and Hesiod the seventh and sixth centuries saw the rise of the Greek city-state or *polis* along with the development of constitutions and the codification of statute law. The *polis* was a tightly knit community bound by cultural and religious ties and sharing certain military and economic goals. The development of disciplined heavy infantry (hoplites) gradually eroded the dominance of the cavalry and the aristocrats, whose power had come from their ability to afford horses. This forced the leaders of a city into a sense of community with the middle class who could afford armor and weapons. Power now depended on the ability of a city to field a well-trained phalanx of hoplites who had enough in common to be willing to stand together and fight, each protecting with his shield the sword arm of the man to his left. Leaders and their troops had to work together in the interests of the community as a whole, and there was no place for the individualism of an Achilles. This is the world of Archilochus and Tyrtaeus, the world in which Athens and Sparta came to evolve as the paradigmatic city-states of classical Greece.

The seventh and sixth centuries are also the time when laws begin to be written down in cities all over Greece. Often the laws of a city are attributed to a specific lawgiver; Lycurgus in Sparta and Solon in Athens are the most notable of these. We are told that Lycurgus received his laws from an oracle in Delphi and that Solon rewrote almost the entire set of laws written by his overly harsh predecessor, Draco. The laws and political institutions of this period reflected the interests of those who served in the army – a middle class of farmers, artisans, and merchants. Calls for political reform now had to be taken more seriously, and compromise between the classes was more likely to succeed than total victory for one side or the other.

At the same time, population growth and an increase in commerce created pressure for new forms of political and social organization to replace traditional land-based aristocracies. In many cities non-

traditional rulers known as *tyrannoi* came to power in relatively peaceful coups. Even Solon's reforms in Athens in the sixth century did not suffice to preserve the old order or prevent the rise of Peisistratus, who together with his sons ruled Athens for half a century (561–510). Such rulers often had the support of the people and rarely had to resort to force to maintain their positions. Still, the name for such a ruler, *tyrannos*, acquired a bad connotation in the later fifth century, and by Plato's time the word "tyrant" conjured up images of unbridled rapacity supported by unlawful violence. The image does not fit what we know of early tyrants, however, and Thucydides was probably right to insist, against the grain of Athenian opinion, that Peisistratus and his sons had actually been good rulers.

Starting in the eighth century, Greek cities had been sending out surplus population to found colonies in places accessible to their ships. Although politically independent, colonies often maintained close cultural ties with their mother cities, and in some cases economic ties as well. Almost all the Greek cities of Sicily and southern Italy had been founded as colonies by the end of the sixth century. The founding of colonies continued in the fifth century, and provided a practical context for discussions of ideal laws and constitutions. The sophist Protagoras, for example, was called upon to help draft the constitution for Thurii, a colony in Italy founded by Pericles and Athenian allies in 443.

A chief activity of the citizen class of Greek cities was war, and this accounts for the importance of military classification in the social and political orders that emerged in our period. By the fifth century, in Athens, clear lines were drawn between sailors, infantrymen, and cavalry. The rich could supply horses and join the cavalry, while the merely well-off could furnish their own heavy armor and weapons for service as hoplite infantry. The poor, having nothing to offer but themselves, usually saw service in the navy. The practical problem for Greek politics was to keep these groups in a cooperative balance.

In the fifth century, Greek cities were generally ruled by oligarchies or democracies. Oligarchies served the interests of the aristocrats, but some aristocrats such as Pericles held leading positions in democracies as well. Oligarchy was often said to be characterized by its supporters as having *eunomia* (literally, "good law"), but in

fact democracy was as dependent on the rule of law as any other form of government, and democratic Athens soon became famous for its litigiousness.

Rather than generalize further about Greek forms of government, we will describe the systems of Athens and Sparta, which became models for the debate about constitutions in the fifth century and afterwards.¹ They were the two most important city-states in fifth century Greece and the two main adversaries in the Peloponnesian War (431–404). Thucydides, who records the history of this war, describes the clash of their two political systems as a clash of two entirely different cultures, and many of the other authors in this volume refer explicitly or implicitly to one or both of these cities.

Athens and Sparta

The government of Athens in the fifth century was the paradigm of Greek democracy. The Assembly (*Ecclesia*) was open to all citizens, and combined legislative authority with considerable power over the policies and actions of the state. Business for the Assembly was prepared by the Council (*Boulē*) of Five Hundred, whose members were selected annually by lot and could serve no more than two (separate) terms. Managerial responsibility was in the hands of the ten *archōns* (“rulers”) and a host of minor officials, who were also selected annually by lot. Most judicial decisions were reached in the popular courts, whose large panels of jurors (sometimes as many as five hundred) were completely autonomous. Judicial service was open to all citizens, and jurors were selected by lot for each trial. The judicial panels were subject to no higher opinion and their verdicts could not be appealed to any higher authority. Compensation for service as a juror or assemblyman was small, but enough for basic sustenance.

Almost all public decisions in Athens were thus made by amateurs, who did their jobs and then returned to private life, and it

¹ Among the many good books about these cities, we recommend as starting points R. K. Sinclair, *Democracy and participation in Athens* (Cambridge, 1988), Mogens Herman Hansen, *Athenian democracy* (Oxford, 1991), and Paul Cartledge, *Sparta and Lakonia: A regional history, 1300–362 BC* (London, 1979). For Athens one may conveniently consult the most important source, Aristotle's *The Athenian constitution* in P. J. Rhodes' translation, with introduction and notes (Penguin Books, 1984).

was virtually impossible to become a professional politician except by continually persuading the citizens, gathered as assemblymen or jurors, to approve one's recommendations. The only offices not left to the chance of selection by lot and not limited in the term of service were military commands. The most famous Athenian leader, Pericles, maintained his leadership (as Thucydides reports) both by his ability to persuade the Athenians to follow his lead in the assembly and by being elected general year after year.

Athenian democracy (*dēmokratia*) was a form of government in which power was in the hands of ordinary people (the *dēmos*). In ancient Greece, however, *dēmos* referred only to adult male citizens. Women and slaves were never considered full citizens or allowed to participate publicly in political activity. As in the case of most democracies until quite recently, therefore, power was in the hands of less than a quarter of the population.²

We have less information about Spartan government. The sources we have are mostly non-Spartan and the reliability of their reports is in most cases questionable.

Sparta had two hereditary kings, whose primary duties were military leadership. There was also a Council of Elders and an Assembly, the relationship between which is uncertain. All judicial affairs were in the hands of five Ephors ("overseers"), elected annually by the Assembly.

A crucial feature of Spartan government and life was that the large majority of inhabitants of the territory were not Spartan citizens but a native people called Helots. Sparta had conquered these people in wars during the eighth and seventh centuries, and thereafter most aspects of Spartan life were organized with a view to keeping the Helots in a serf-like status and preventing their uprising. Thus military considerations were prominent in almost every aspect of Spartan life. The training of young men was well organized and involved a famously high level of discipline that was envied by many conservative Athenians. Full Spartan citizens were highly valued by the state. Each citizen held an allotment of land, which was farmed by serfs, and the citizens were supposed to be more or less equal in social and economic status. In fact, however,

² As best we can tell, the share of the population eligible to participate in political decision making was almost the same in ancient Athens as in the United States before the Civil War.

some were wealthier or more aristocratic than others, and this seems to have affected Spartan political life, which was essentially oligarchic.

Early poetry

Poetry was the main cultural medium in early Greece. Easily committed to memory, it served as a vehicle for views on many subjects, including ethics, statecraft, and law, until the rise of prose literature in the fifth century. Part I of this volume covers poetry from the Homeric poems in the late eighth century to the works of Simonides and Pindar in the fifth century. These poets express or imply interesting views on social and political issues, and many of our passages are quoted widely by later writers and are taken up in their discussions of political theory. Generally, early Greek poets stress the importance of *themis* ("right"), *dikē* ("law, justice"), or *aidōs* ("respect"), and support either monarchy or aristocracy. They tend to see agitation for a greater share of power on the part of common citizens (the *dēmos* or *hoi polloi*) as a threat to public order. On the other hand, Homer's "kings" do not consider themselves absolute monarchs: both the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* portray assemblies, primarily composed of aristocrats (also called "kings"), who advise their leader (who is the "most kingly"). Homer's younger contemporary Hesiod questions whether the procedure for submitting disputes to these lords for judicial settlement is fair and effective; he also fashions myths about the origins of social and cultural institutions, most notably those of Prometheus and Pandora, that present a broadly pessimistic and regressive view of human civilization.

Other poets, especially Theognis and Pindar, express a more strongly aristocratic view: they emphasize the hereditary nature of virtue and the desirability of having the "better men" rule, and they bemoan the social mobility of their time. More moderate is the Athenian reformer Solon, who, as he tells us, did much to alleviate the sufferings of the common people without giving way to democracy or to a redistribution of land. Solon explicitly resists (as he says in passages 2–5)³ the attempts of the poor to acquire

³ Numbers in boldface refer to the numbering of the selections in this volume.

the land of wealthy aristocrats. In his poetry Solon forcefully asserts a traditional moral outlook based on moderation, and against this moral background he sets his political and legal reforms and theorizes about the operation of society. These sentiments of Solon and other early poets are often directed at very specific historical situations, but they provide evidence for the more general theoretical dialogue that must have occurred at the same time.

The works of these early poets provide a crucial background for understanding the rapid innovations of the fifth century – innovations not only in the ideas expressed but also in the forms of expression. One major development is the Athenian institution of tragic drama, which is said to have begun in 535.

Tragedy

Athens' most famous contribution to poetry was tragedy. Each year poets competed for a prize at the largest and most important public festival in Athens, the Greater Dionysia, a setting that in itself underscored the public, political significance of tragedy. A few early tragedies such as Aeschylus' *Persians*, which dramatizes the defeat of Xerxes' forces in 480, were based on historical events and thus had a direct political impact, but even tragedies based on traditional myths must have been understood in the context of contemporary social and political issues. This is especially true of works such as Sophocles' *Antigone* – which presents the bitter conflict between Creon, ruler of the state and upholder of law and order, and Antigone, whose devotion to her family leads her to reject the law and bury her brother in defiance of Creon – or the three plays constituting Aeschylus' *Oresteia* – which portray a series of family murders raising pointed questions about justice and legitimate retribution. These ought to be read in their entirety by anyone studying fifth-century political thought. We have confined ourselves in Part II to a limited number of passages which can be understood when excerpted from their contexts. Most of these passages show direct influence of the sophists in style or content – in the structure of paired speeches and debates, and in themes such as the rule of law, the status of women, the ideal constitution, and the origins of law in human society.

Comedy, which was produced at the same festival as well as at