Brill's New Jacoby

Hippias of Elis (6) by Marek Węcowski

T 1

Suda, s.v. Ἰππίας (1 543 Adler)

Subject: Genre: Biography
Source Date: 10th century AD
Historian's Date: 5th-4th century BC, 4th century BC
Historical Period: 5th-4th century BC, 4th century BC

Διοπείθους Ἡλεῖος· σοφιστὴς καὶ φιλόσοφος· μαθητὴς Ἡγησιδάμου, οὗ τέλος ὤριζετο τὴν αὐτάρκειαν. ἔγραψε πολλά.

The son of Diopeithes, from Elis, sophist and philosopher, a disciple of Hegesidamos; he set up self-sufficiency as the goal [sc. of human existence]; wrote a lot.

Commentary

(= 86 A 1 DK = Untersteiner 8 A 1) For Hippias’s background, his life and career, see the ‘Biographical essay’ below (for his works, see below, esp. comm. on T 2 and on F 4). We know nothing in particular about Hippias’s alleged teacher Hegesidamos (pace C. Müller, FHG 2.59 n.**), the mysterious Hegesidemus in Pliny, Naturalis historia 9.8 (27) is certainly someone else, cf. F. Jacoby, ‘Hegesidemos’, RE 6 (1912), cols. 2608-2609), hence the temptation to change this name into that of Hippodamos (e.g. E. Wellmann, ‘Hippias (13)’, RE 8.2 (1913), col. 1706); in principle, the famous architect interested also in constitutional issues might seem a plausible candidate, but this hypothesis is superfluous. The syntax of the entry is ambiguous, but the subordinate clause logically refers to the subject of the entry, i.e. Hippias, not to Hegesidamos. The wording (... τέλος ὤριζετο τὴν αὐτάρκειαν) is perhaps due to a technical usage of later doxographic literature, probably stemming from Demokritos’ treatise (68 B 4 DK) Περὶ τέλους (in general, cf. Clement of Alexandria, Stromateis 2.127.1-131.1, esp. 130.4-5 (p. 184.10 Stählin), on the Abderites, including Hekataios of Abdera (73 A 4 DK = FHG 2.396 (‘sedis incertae’ 20)) who also defined the τέλος in terms of αὐτάρκειαν. There is no scholarly agreement as to the value of this testimony and to the meaning of autarkia here (which is of course not the Cynico-Stoic ideal of self-sufficiency through renouncement and self-control; for a stimulating interpretation of autarkia in general, see G.W. Most, ‘The Stranger’s Stratagem: Self-disclosure and self-sufficiency in Greek culture’ JHS 109 (1989)esp. 127-30). For some students, the mention of autarkia in the Suda is negligible for our understanding of Hippias’s thought (either as based solely on a highly ironic and anecdotal passage by Plato (below, T 2) or as attributed to Hegesidamos, not Hippias). Others, considering Plato’s view of Hippias’s technical skills (again, T 2 below), understand this autarkia as a purely technical one (or as a common term, cf. Demokritos, 68 B 246, B 210, and B 209 (?) DK) – before its ultimate ‘interiorization’ and ‘moralization’ in later philosophy. M. Untersteiner (comm. ad loc.) argued that the notion of autarkia may be related to Hippias’s doctrine of cognition, whereas W. Nestle, Vom Mythos zum Logos (Stuttgart 1940), 369 took this term as referring to the sophist’s ideal of the independence of an individual from the community. It is perhaps better, however, to understand it along the lines of (Hippias’s younger contemporary) Thucydides (2.41.1, with K. Raafflaub, The Discovery of Freedom in Ancient Greece (Chicago – London 2004), 184-187, 274,
338-339 n. 95-100, esp. n. 98), namely as the ideal of a citizen’s exceptional versatility and individual success in diverse aspects of his life and his activity within the polis (cf. esp. Plato, *Hippias maior* 295e–296a and 304a-b; the context of Plato’s colorful *T 2*, below, may, to some extent, be a radical parody of this ideal). Elaborating on that, one could interpret Hippias’s *autarkia* as related to his *polumathia* and to his broader intellectual design: what renders a wise-man versatile and self-sufficient are his skills and his knowledge based on his encyclopedic project (on which see below, comm. on *T 2*). Hippias’s *autarkia* is also to be linked with his ideal of the ‘natural kinship’ of the sages (in Plato, *Protagoras* 337c-d; cf. E. Schütrumpf, ‘Kosmopolitisimus oder Panhellenismus? Zur Interpretation des Ausspruchs von Hippias in Platons Protagoras (337c ff.)’ *Hermes* 100 (1972), 5—29; in general, cf. also W.K.C. Guthrie, *A History of Greek Philosophy* 3 (Cambridge 1969), 118-120, 138). Meanwhile, his ideal of life in Plato (*Hippias maior* 291d-e) looks much more traditional, nay pedestrian: wealth, health, great renown among the Greeks, happy old age, and a sumptuous funeral – which may well be due to Plato’s overall unfairness to Hippias. In general, for *autarkia* in the fifth century BC, see e.g. Thucydides 2.41.1-2 (cf. 2.36.3-4); contrast a pessimistic view (ascribed to Solon) in *Herodotos* 1.32 (esp. 1.32.8; cf. Thucydides 2.51.3, with T.F. Scanlon, ‘Echoes of Herodotus in Thucydides: Self-Sufficiency, Admiration, and Law’ *Historia* 43 (1994), 143—176).

**T 2**

**Plato, Hippias minor 368 B-D**

Subject: *Genre*

Source Date: 5th-4th century BC, 4th century BC

Historian’s Date: 5th-4th century BC, 4th century BC

Historical Period: 5th-4th century BC, 4th century BC

You said that once, when you went to Olympia, everything you had on your person was your own work ... And in addition you said that you brought with you poems, both epics and tragedies and dithyrambs, and many writings of all sorts composed in prose; and that you were there excelling all others in knowledge of the arts of which I was speaking just now, and of the correctness of rhythms and in knowledge of harmonies and letters, and many other things besides... (tr. W.R.M. Lamb, adapted)

**Commentary**

(cf. 86 A 12 DK = Untersteiner 8 A 12) On the sophists, including Hippias (cf. *Hippias minor* 363c–364a: Lucian, *Herodotus* 3; *Pausanias* 5.25.4, on which below), at the festivals in *Olympia*, *Delphi*, and elsewhere, see W.K.C. Guthrie, *A History of Greek Philosophy* 3 (Cambridge 1969), 42-44. The anecdotal portrait of Hippias in Olympia – with his hand-made sandals, cloak, tunic, girdle, ring, seal, strigil, and oil-flask (skipped by Jacoby in *T 2*) – should be read alongside Plato’s general criticism of the sophists in *Protagoras* 313c–314d (esp. 313d: ‘those who take their doctrines the round of our cities, hawking them about to any odd purchaser who desires them, commend everything that they sell’ (tr. W.R.M. Lamb)). In *T 2*, Hippias is just the arch-sophist excessively proud of his ‘merchandise’ (cf. also *Hippias maior* 294a). There is no way to know whether Hippias was indeed so skilled in all the handicrafts involved or a part of the list is...
just another tour de force of Plato’s irony (cf. the preceding sentence in the dialogue: Hippias shows his wisdom off ‘in the market-place at the tables of the moneychangers’; see, however, Respublica 596c). At any rate, it is risky to claim, based on this testimony, that Hippias was the first to re-evaluate against the traditional aristocratic system of values (thus, e.g., A. Momigliano, ‘Idealis di vita nella sofistica: Ippia e Crizia’ eiusdem, Quarto contributo alla storia degli studi classici e del mondo antico (Roma 1969), 149 (originally published in 1930)). Be it as it may, it is the variety of Hippias’s literary display-pieces brought to Olympia that fulfills his ideal of autarkia (cf. above, T 1). The ἔπη encompass here both his epics (totally unknown) and his elegiacs (Hippias’s dedicative couplets accompanying a statuary group in Olympia, by the sculptor Kalon of Elis, in honor of a boy-choir from Messana, is mentioned by Pausanias. 5.25.4 (= 86 B 1 DK = Untersteiner 8 B 1, with a comm. ad loc.)). Other sophists excelling in poetry (elegiacs, epics and iambics) included Euenus of Paros (see M. West’s edition in IEG 2); cf. also the literary activity of Ion of Chios and of Kritias of Athens. Nothing is known of Hippias’s tragedies and dithyrambs. (Incidentally, Plato’s irony here may not be devoid of some autobiographic, and self-mocking, undertones: cf. D.L. 3.5, on Plato’s juvenile poetic productions.) As far as Hippias’s works in prose paraded in Olympia are concerned, Plato emphasizes their variety. Although the wording of the passage πολλοίς λόγοις καὶ παντόθεποι συγκειμένους (cf. also Hippias minor 363c) recalls the crucial passage of Hippias’s F 4 (see below, comm. ad loc.) and so may ironically allude to his Collection, one would expect the sophist to carry with him some epicodieic logoi rather than excerpts from his erudite works (for which see below, comm. on T 3 and on F 1-13). Among the non-extant epicodieic speeches, one is known to us well enough, namely the so-called Trojan Speech delivered in Sparta and envisioned also for Athens (see Hippias maior 286a (= 86 A 9 DK = Untersteiner 8 A 9, with his comm.); cf. Philostratos, Vitae sophistarum 1.11.4 (= 86 A 2 DK = Untersteiner 8 A 2, with comm.), a didactic speech addressed to Neoptolemos by Nestor in the wake of the Trojan War. Its underlying intellectual program makes it a sort of epicodieic counterpart of the antiquarian treatise Sunagoge (see below, F 4 with comm.) and its general import as well as its setting link it with the time-honoured Greek wisdom tradition sometimes dubbed Hupothekai, or ‘Instructions’, in verse and in prose alike (see Isocrates, To Nicocles 13, and 42-43; cf. already Ed. Norden, ‘Die Composition und Litteraturgattung der horazischen Epistula ad Pisones’ Hermes 50 (1905), 521—524; in general, cf. P. Friedländer, ‘ΠΙΟΘΗΚΑΙ’ Hermes 48 (1913), 558—616). Another important oration, an Olympian Speech, can reasonably be postulated (cf. E. Schüttrumpf, ‘Kosmopolitisimus oder Panhellenismus? Zur Interpretation des Ausspruchs von Hippias in Platons Protagoras (337c ff.)’ Hermes 100 (1972) esp. 28). Hippias’s teaching about ‘the correctness of rhythms and harmonies’ must have touched upon the rules of accentuation and not the melody of song (see Untersteiner, 8 A 11, comm., referring to Dissoi logoi 90 DK 5.11-12; cf. Plato, Kratylos 416b, 424c; cf. also below, comm. on F 6). The mention of ‘the correctness of letters’ most probably alludes to his studies on the qualitative and quantitative value of the syllables (cf. Hippias maior 285b-d). For a contrary view, however, see R. Pfeiffer, History of Classical Scholarship. From the beginnings to the end of the Hellenistic Age (Oxford 1968), 53 with n. 7.

Generally speaking, Plato’s portrait of Hippias in Hippias minor (leaving aside its inherent antipathy to the haughty sophist) hits the right note as it stresses his versatility and encyclopedic interests. His self-proclaimed and indeed original wisdom is based on his wide erudition in a variety of subjects (cf. esp. Hippias minor 363c-d) – contrasting with that of the majority of the sophists including his elder contemporary Protagoras, who offers his disciples diverse rhetorical and indeed eristic tools to cope with their potential antagonists (see Plato, Sophista 232b-e), but typically disdains erudition (Plato, Protagoras 318d-e). In a word, polymathy is Hippias’s widely acknowledged trademark, closely linked with his pride in intellectual novelties (see esp. below, F 4 ad fin. and Xenophon, Memorabilia 4.4.6 (= 86 A 14 DK); cf. also the late testimony of Cicero, De oratore 3.32 (127), absent from DK), and was practicable only thanks to his proverbial mnemonic capacities and his mnemonic techniques (see the very next sentence in the dialogue: Hippias minor 368d; cf. Hippias minor 363c-d; Hippias maior 258e; Respublica 350e; Epinomis 976b-c (?); Xenophon, Symposium 4.62: Philostratos, Vitae sophistarum 1.11.1 (= 86 A 2 DK = Untersteiner 8 A 2, with comm.); Amm.Marc. 16.5.8; in general cf. H. Blum, Die antike Mnemoiotechnik, diss. phil. (Tübingen 1964), 48-55). Such polumathia was abhorrent to Plato and the Academy as directly opposed to the true episteme (apart from the ‘Hippian’ dialogues referred to above, see e.g. Laws 811a-b, 819a; Alcibiades II 147a-b; Ps.-Platonic Lovers 133c, 137b, 139a), but the intellectual attitude characteristic of Hippias (in this respect reaching back to the perception
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of the mythical Linus by Hesiod, F 306 Merkelbach–West) had already been under attack for some time, esp. beginning with Herakleitos (22 B 40 DK (against Hesiod, Xenophanes, Pythagoras, and Hekataios); B 41 DK; cf. the spurious B 129 DK (against Pythagoras); cf. also Demokritos of Abdera (?), 68 B 64, and 65 DK). In a word, then, Hippias is one of the protagonist in the debate between the advocates of the ‘pluralistic’ wisdom, on the one hand, and those of the ‘monistic’ one, on the other (however, for a certain unity of the world-view behind Hippias’s polumathia, see perhaps Plato, Hippias maior 301b). As I have tried to show elsewhere (M. Węcowski, ‘The Hedgehog and the Fox. Form and Meaning in the Prologue of Herodotus’ IHS 124 (2004), 143—164), some characteristics of Herodotos’ program stem from the ideal of polumathia as associated at the time especially with antiquarian and historical inquiries. For polumathia, see further below, comm. on T 3.

T 3

Plato, Hippias maior 285 D

Subject: Genre: Genealogy, Genre: Antiquities
Source Date: 5th-4th century BC, 4th century BC
Historian’s Date: 5th-4th century BC, 4th century BC
Historical Period: 5th-4th century BC, 4th century BC

They are very fond of hearing about the genealogies of heroes and men, Sokrates, and the foundations of cities in ancient times and, in short, about antiquity in general, so that for their sake I have been obliged to learn all that sort of thing by heart and practise it thoroughly. (tr. W.R.M. Lamb)

Commentary

(cf. 86 A 11 DK = Untersteiner 8 A 11) This testimony is crucial to our assessment of Hippias’s importance for ancient antiquarianism and historiography. Alas, the flavor of the whole context of this passage in Plato is once again highly ironic (cf. above, comm. on T 1 and T 2), so in principle it may be deceptive. In a more general vein, a large part of the dialogue was intended as a piece of mocking, merciless but also quite detailed criticism of Hippias’s intellectual design. Hence, interpreting this passage in its wider context seems worthwhile. At this juncture in the dialogue, Hippias enumerates the elements of his teaching that did not gain public acclaim among the Spartans (285a-d: his practical paideia, astronomy, geometry, mathematics, metrics etc.), only to stress his ultimate success in Sparta when dealing (in epideictic speeches?) with ‘all kinds of antiquities’. Sokrates sums it up, not very politely, as childish fairy-tales (286a), and goes on, in the consecutive development, attacking diverse elements of Hippias’s wisdom. This includes a reductio ad absurdum of one of Hippias’s arguments in the very sphere of (mythical) genealogy (292e-293b). Furthermore, I posit that the whole intervening discussion about beauty contains quite a few ironic references (287e, 289a, 289e, 290d) to what might figured in Hippias’s Collection (for this work, see below, comm. on F 3 and 4). All in all, I would argue that the mention of genealogies, foundations of cities and ‘antiquities’ in general also hints at a crucial element of Hippias’s broader intellectual project incarnated in his Sunagoge. Just as the mention of the Trojan Dialogue, immediately following our passage in Hippias maior 286a (86 A 9 DK = Untersteiner 8 A 9), gives us a solid basis for the reconstruction of its original content, probably quotes its opening and preserves some idiosyncrasies of Hippias’s style (cf. Untersteiner, ad loc.), so in my view does this testimony have good chances to follow quite closely the proem of the Sunagoge (see further below,
The logic of the dialogue suggests that antiquarian interests are not quite what one would expect of a sophist (cf. esp. 285e). Indeed, Hippias appears to be the only one to pursue this kind of activity, in the tradition of both some archaic and classical poets and of the so-called logographers, when dealing, on the one hand, with genealogiai and, on the other, with ktiseis. The possibility (above) that our testimony may closely follow the proem of Hippias’s Sunagoge is strengthened by the fact that here he indistinctly hints at two subject-matters with both poetic and prosaic antecedents; on this hypothesis, this assertion was further rounded off (in the extant F 4) by the clear distinction between the poetic and prosaic sources of Hippias’s knowledge. The traditional heritage behind Hippias’s genealogical studies goes back to Homer (esp. in Odyssey 11) and to Hesiod’s Theogony, and esp. to his model achievement in the Ps.-Hesiodic Catalogue of Women (cf. M.L. West, The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women: Its Nature, Structure, and Origins (Oxford 1985), esp. 1-30, on the nature of Greek genealogies in a comparative perspective). Methodical gathering, critical analysis, chronological reevaluation, systematization and rationalization of genealogical traditions were tasks undertaken by the so-called logographers – from Hekataios of Miletos (BNJ 1 F 1-35) onwards, with Akousilaus of Argos (BNJ 2 T 1, 4, 6; F 1-43), Pherekydes of Athens (BNJ 3 T 7; see esp. F 2), Hellanikos of Lesbos (BNJ 4), and many others. For Hippias’s genealogical works see also below, comm. on F 1. In the present context, it is possible although by no means sure that Hippias dealt in Sparta among other things with Spartan genealogical traditions (such as their king lists and, say, genealogies of the families whose representatives figured prominently in his Catalogue of the Olympic victors, esp. in the years 720-576 BC). For the first sample of the ‘foundation poetry’ in nuce, see already Homer, Iliad 2.661-669 (cf. Odyssey 6.4-12). The poetic antecedents of Hippias’s treatises include the elegiacs by Kallinos of Ephesos (cf. F 7 West) as well as by the Colophonians Mimnermos (cf. F 9 and 10 West) and Xenophanes (cf. D.L. 9.20 = BNJ 450 T 1, but see F. Jacoby ad loc.: a late forgery by Lobon), and possibly by Semondes of Amorgos (Archaeology of the Samians (?) in the Suda, s.v. Συμωνίδης Ῥόδος (360.7 Adler = BNJ 534 T 1), but see F. Jacoby, FGrHist IIIb (Kommentar: Text), 456 (with n. 8a)); perhaps also the epics (in pentameter) by Panyassis (cf. T 1 Bernabé (= Suda, s.v. Πανύασις (π 248 Adler)). It is not clear, however, whether ktiseis formed a separate poetic genre or were just a literary topos practicable in diverse poetic genres and at different occasions (cf. C. Dougherty, ‘Archaic Greek foundation poetry: questions of genre and occasion’ JHS 114 (1994), 35—46). In general, see now E.L. Bowie, ‘Ancestors of Historiography in Early Greek Elegiac and Iambic Poetry?’ N. Luraghi (ed.), The Historian’s Craft in the Age of Herodotus (Oxford 2001), 45—66. The ktiseis in prose started not long before Hippias, with Ion of Chios (BNJ 392 T 1 and 2, F 1-3), Hellanikos (BNJ 4 F 71a-c) and Charon of Lampsakos (BNJ 262 T 1; if it is right to date Charon so early). Now, the common denominator of the inquiries in the two spheres, genealogies and ‘foundations’ (for the classical genre of ‘mythography’, cf. R.L. Fowler, Early Greek Mythography, I: Texts (Oxford 2000), esp. xxvit-xxviiis; for early archaiologiai in general, cf. A. Corcella, ‘The New Genre and its Boundaries: Poets and Logographers’ A. Rengakos and A. Tsakmakis (eds), Brill’s Companion to Thucydides (Leiden 2006), 33-56), is the typically antiquarian interest in aitia, or ‘origins’ – of particular gods and their domains, of heroes, human families, cities, peoples, tribes etc. (often with a focus on ‘first founders’ and eponyms). This presupposes intensive investigation into Greek local traditions; immediately after having mentioned his antiquarian inquiries Hippias stresses the need to memorize this mass of information (285e). Hippias’s originality as compared to his prose predecessors was his rather passive attitude towards the traditions at his disposal, attitude consisting in gathering erudite minutaiae and in their categorization subordinated to his underlying ambitious intellectual design (in the Sunagoge, cf. below, F 3 and 4), but surely without seeking, in the vein of Hekataios or Hellanikos, chronological (and logical) consistency of the traditions employed (but contrast his Olympic Victors, comm. on F 2). Because of the theoretical foundation of his
variegated inquiries, Hippias may be considered one of the legitimate ‘founding fathers’ of ancient antiquarianism (and was himself well aware of his originality, see F 4). The logic of Sokrates’ reaction to the claims of Hippias (285e 3-6) suggests that lists of eponymic officials (‘our archonts beginning with Solon’) belonged at the time to the broadly conceived ‘antiquities’ alongside genealogiai and ktiseis, but were not specifically treated by Hippias (but cf. below, comm. on F 2), unless we take it as a hint at his interest in the lists of the Spartan kings and ephors (cf. above) but not in the Athenian officials.

The term ἀρχαιολογία appears here for the first time, so it is natural to ask whether this abstractum was Hippias’s or Plato’s own invention. Ed. Norden, Agnostos theos (Leipzig – Berlin 1913), 373 rightly points to some analogous sophistic formations (cf. Plato, Phaidros 272a: ἔλεεινολογία, βραχυλογία). It may well be that Plato’s role here was similar to that in the history of the term philosophia (cf. the disputable F of Herakleitos, 22 B 35 DK; Hdt. 1.30.2; and Thuc. 2.40.1), i.e. ultimately conceptualizing and sanctioning the use of the preexistent word (for philosophia, cf. recently W. Burkert, ‘Platon oder Pythagoras? Zum Ursprung des Wortes "Philosophie”‘, eiusdem, Kleine Schriften III: Mystica, Orphica, Pythagorica (Göttingen 2006), 217-235). Be it as it may, for Plato Hippias’s dealing with ‘antiquities’ is a futile intellectual activity, analogous to ‘mythologizing’ (in the sense of storytelling (Hippias maior 286a 1-2; cf. Respublica 350e 2-3; cf. esp. Timaeus 22a 4–b 3 and 23b 3-5). On Plato’s attitude to the study of the past in general, cf. e.g. R. Weil, L’archéologie de Platon (Paris 1959); on archaiologia (sensu lato) in the Sophistic movement, see already Ed. Norden, Agnostos theos, 370-374. For Hippias, ‘antiquities’ encompass diverse types of antiquarian subjects (here: mythography, i.e. genealogy and ktiseis, but also, by implication, horography and chronography), not just local antiquitates of particular cities, peoples, or nations (see further below, comm. on F 4). The meaning of ἀρχαιολογεῖν in Thucydides 7.69.2 is ambiguous (‘speaking in an old-fashioned manner’ or ‘speaking of well-known issues’?); at any rate it concerns rhetorical topoi and not some kind of inquiries into the past, so may reflect a pre-specialized usage (note, however, that the whole passage may well be a late interpolation).

Hippias’s multiple visits in Sparta on his diplomatic missions are well attested (Plato, Hippias maior 281a; 286e); at these occasions, he certainly gave some lectures. Plato’s picture of the sophist trying to lecture on diverse ‘scientific’ issues, and in particular to teach the Spartans his practical paideia is highly ironic (cf. esp. Protagoras 342c-d). Their remarkable interest in the intellectual speculation (as opposed, I would assume, to their own time-honored traditions) about antiquarian matters might seem surprising given the traditional modern view of the Spartan culture at the time. Already in antiquity purely utilitarian motives behind the Spartan curiosity have been suggested (Philostratos, Vitae sophistarum 1.11.3; cf. also Untersteiner 8 A 2, comm. ad loc.: some cultural interests in Sparta, but limited to practical political aims). Philostratos’ guess (Hippias’s antiquarian erudition as potentially serving the Spartan hegemony) may not be absurd, for diplomatic arguments based on genealogiai and ktiseis often operated in Greek (and Graeco-barbarian) inter-state relations (both notions bring us to sungeneiai, or legendary ‘kinships’ between diverse cities and peoples). However, the traditional opinion about Sparta as a cultural desert in the classical period is of course highly exaggerated. On the other hand, Hippias’s use of the notion of the ‘natural kinship’ of all the Greeks in his pan-Hellenic ideal (in general, cf. E. Schütrumpf, ‘Kosmopolitismus oder Panhellenismus? Zur Interpretation des Ausspruchs von Hippias in Platons Protagoras (337c ff.)‘ Hermes 100 (1972), 5-29) makes it possible that his epideictic speeches in Sparta ‘about the genealogies of heroes and men and the foundations of cities in ancient times’ (eventually pointing to the common ancestry of the Hellenes, and of the Dorians in particular) should perhaps be read in the context of his diplomatic missions with a view to stop the Lakedaimonian hostilities against Elis (in 421 BC? or maybe rather in 410-399 BC? cf. below, ‘Biographical Essay’ and comm. on F 2).

T 4

Philostratos, Vitae sophistarum 1.11

Translation

Subject: Genre: Biography
Source Date: 2nd-3rd century AD, 3rd century AD
Historian's Date: 5th-4th century BC,
4th century BC
Historical Period: 5th-4th century BC,
4th century BC

διελέγετο δὲ καὶ περὶ ζωγραφίας καὶ περὶ ἀγάλματοποιίας, He also lectured on painting and on sculpture.

Commentary

(cf. 86 A 2 DK = Untersteiner 8 A 2) This may be yet another example of Hippias’s polumathia, on which see above, comm. on T 2. However, the value of this testimony is disputable, since this mention is, as far as I can see, the only one in Philostratos’ longer treatment of Hippias (Vitae sophistarum 1.11.1–8) that seems independent from Plato’s picture of the sophist. Does Philostratos draw here from another early source, or is it a mere speculation based on the nature of classical and Hellenistic erudition? Impossible to say in the current state of our evidence.

F 1

Scholia ad Apollonium Rhodium 3.1179

Subject: Genre: Ethnography
Source Date: Various
Historian's Date: 5th-4th century BC,
4th century BC
Historical Period: 5th-4th century BC,
4th century BC

Ἱππίας δὲ ὁ Ἡλεῖος ἐν Ἐθνῶν ὄνομασίας φησιν ἔθνος τι καλείσθαι Σπαρτοῦς· καὶ ὁμοίως Ἀτρόμητος.

In his Names of Peoples, Hippias of Elis says that a certain tribe was called Spartoi; in the same vein Atrometos (VI). s. 3 F 22.

Commentary

(86 B 2 DK = Untersteiner 8 B 2) This work was not a part of Hippias’s Sunagoge (cf. below, comm. on F 4). M. Untersteiner hypothetically linked this F (following F. Jacoby ad loc. (FGrHist I p. 477)) with Plato’s mention of the genealogical issues treated by Hippias in T 3 (see above). I would rather think that Hippias’s genealogical interests might have been realized, among other things, in his Sunagoge and were not limited to his Names of Peoples. It is true that names of cities and peoples prominently figured in the early prose ‘genealogies’, closely neighboring at the time to the domain of geography (witness Hekataios of Miletos, BNJBNJ 1 F 10-12, all cited by Stephanos of Byzantium). However, among the titles attributed to Hippias’s elder contemporary Hellenikos of Lesbos, we hear of two distinct categories of works: on the one hand, his Names of Peoples (BNJ 4 F 66-70; otherwise known as On Peoples, or as Origins of Cities and Peoples), on the other, his abundant mythographical and therefore genealogical production (for which see now esp. R.L. Fowler, EGM). The former class might have included some amount of data regarding the ‘barbarian’ world, whereas the latter one naturally focused in particular on Greek traditions. In Hippias’s times both categories seem, then, more specialized than at the beginning of the fifth century BC (cf. also one of Hippias’s contemporaries, and (perhaps) a disciple of Hellenikos, Damastes of Sigeion (BNJ 5 F 1): Catalogue of peoples and cities, or On Peoples, but known also as Periplous). Hippias might have been active in both fields, so the title mentioned in this F looks very plausible as a self-standing antiquarian treatise.

For the legend about the origins of the Theban Spartoi, see Pherekydes of Athens, BNJ 3 F 22 (= EGM F 22, of which our F is a part). Hippias clearly rationalizes traditional accounts when identifying the Spartoi not with the mythical fratricide fighters ‘sown’ by Kadmos, but with a human tribe (a pre-Greek one? thus e.g. R. Fowler in EGM I, xxxiii, n. 9), perhaps in some corner of Bocotia (thus also Dionysius of Samos (’Kyklographos’), BNJ 15 F 9 (= scholia on Euripides’s Phoenissae 670)). It cannot be excluded that Hippias tried to ‘etymologize’ the name.
of Spartoi in the vein of Androtation of Athens, BNJ 324 F 60b (= scholia on Pindar’s Isthmian Ode 7.13: διὰ τὸ σωμιτές καὶ σποράδην of the Cadmean fugitives from Phoenicia; cf. scholia on Euripides’s Phoenissae 938-943). Atrometos is an otherwise unknown mythographer (this personal name is well attested but rare enough, so it is superfluous to emend it here to, say, Amometos (BNJ 645)).

F 2
Plutarch, Numa 1.6

Subject: Genre: Biography
Source Date: 1st-2nd century AD, 2nd century AD
Historian’s Date: 5th-4th century BC, 4th century BC
Historical Period: n.a.

It is difficult to establish these chronological matters [sc. relating to Numa’s lifetime] with exactitude and in particular if one resorts to the chronology of the Olympic vicors, whose list – we are told – had been published late by Hippias of Elis, who was unable to base it on any cogent data.

Commentary

(86 B 3 DK = Untersteiner 8 B 3; cf. BNJ 416 T 3 (‘Zur Olympionikenliste’)) This work of Hippias, the most important of all his achievements for the consecutive development of ancient historiography (esp. chronography), is yet another title to his paternity of ancient antiquarianism (cf. above, comm. on T 3). It was not a section of the Sunagoge (cf. below, comm. on F 4), but a book apart. It listed victorious athletes of the one stadion race, from Hippias’s first Olympic Games, of the year corresponding to our 776/5 BC (see below on this date), onwards. F. Jacoby (comm. ad loc.) stresses that this work did not have the universal scope and import of Hellanikos’ Priestesses of Hera in Argos (BNJ 4 F 74-84; cf. A. Möller, ‘The Beginnings of Chronography: Hellenicus’ Hiercai’ N. Luraghi (ed.), The Historian’s Craft in the Age of Herodotus (Oxford 2001), 241—262). For Jacoby, it was a compilation of local data in the simple form of a prose catalogue (in general, cf. O. Regenbogen, ‘Ilīvoς’ RE 20 (1950), esp. cols. 1412-1414), devoid of mythical/historical notes or synchronisms from the outside world (but cf. below). Jacoby assumed (FGrHist IIIb (Kommentar: Noten), ‘XVIII. Elis und Olympia’, 147 (n. 24 and 27)) that the catalogue itself could have been preceded by a historical introduction (in the vein of Phlegon of Tralles, BNJ 257 F 1, most probably stemming ultimately from Hippias, or Pausanias 5.7.6-5.8.5). Well, such an erudite exercise combined with the dull list is very likely, esp. given Hippias’s predilection for ‘new and multiform’ genres (cf. below, F 4). It is here in the prologue, where Hippias might have advertised his (factitious) patriotic discovery, the ancient ‘sacred neutrality’ of Elis, perhaps mentioning its memorable ‘violations’ by diverse enemies of the Eleans up to the Spartan intervention in ca. 401-399 BC (cf. Ephoros, BNJ 70 F 115, 10-14 (ap. Str. 8.3.33 (C 357 ad fin.—358)) and D.S. 14.17.4-12, 14.34.1-2; with R. Bilik, ’Hippias von Elis als Quelle von Diodors Bericht über den elisch-spartanischen Krieg?’ AncSoc 29 (1998-99), 21—47; cf. also Phlegon and Pausanias mentioned above). Hippias most probably tellingly ascribed to Lykourgos, partnered by Iphitos of Elis, the foundation of the Games (or rather their re-founding, long after the first contest organized by Herakles), the decision to entrust their organization for all times to the Eleans, and the idea of the ‘sacred neutrality’, i.e. inviolability, of Elis. So the incentive to write the prologue, and perhaps to ‘publish’ the whole work at some point at the beginning of the fourth century (cf. below), might have been provided by Hippias’s likely involvement in the conflict between Elis and Sparta (endangering the Elean control over Olympia) in 401-399 BC (?) and perhaps already in 421 BC.
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This, however, is very unlikely to explain the decision to compile the Catalogue itself (pace P. Christesen, *Olympic Victor Lists and Ancient Greek History* (Cambridge 2007), esp. 56-57), a laborious work lasting, I believe, at least two decades (see below) and stemming above all from Hippias’s antiquarian interests. After all, Hippias’s epideictic speeches on his diplomatic missions to Sparta, not to mention backstairs negotiations with Spartan leaders, must have served his ‘patriotic’ goals much better (in general, see below, ‘Biographical Essay’ and above, comm. on T 3).

If Hippias was really incited to get down working on the catalogue by the publication of Hellanikos’ *Priestesses of Hera in Argos* (as I think he was, cf. below), the terminus post quem for the beginning of his Olympic enquiries would be sometime after 423 BC (cf. Thucydides 4.133) or at a minimum after 429 BC (cf. Thucydides 2.2.1), which well agrees with the beginning of the period when the Olympic Games and its presidency became a hotly debated issue (cf. above). Be it as it may, the Olympionikai must have been published, or at least won acclaim, at some point between the time when Thucydides was writing his Peloponnesian War ca. 400 BC (no Olympic date at 2.2.1; the Games, when referred to, defined using alternatively the stadion or the pankration winners: 3.8.1; 5.49.1) and the formative period of Philistos’ *Syracuse Sykelika* in the eighties of the fourth century (BNJ 556 F 2 (= Stephanus Byzantinus s.v. Δύμη): a stadion winner from Dyme labeling the Olympiad of 756/2 BC). Hippias’s authority was universally acknowledged and his achievement (enhanced by Aristotle, cf. P. Christesen, *Olympic Victor Lists*, esp. 11, 24, and 170-173) adopted by the whole chronographic tradition of antiquity. On the offspring of Hippias’s work and the relative uniformity of the ancient transmission of the list, see F. Jacoby, *FGroHist* IIIb (Kommentar: Text), 222-225. In general, see now P. Christesen, *Olympic Victor Lists, passim*, esp. 45-160. For the catalogue of the Olympic winners, see L. Moretti, ‘Olympionikai, i vincitori degli agoni olimpici’, *Atti dell’Accademia dei Lincei. Memorie* 8.2 (1957), 55-198; eiusdem, ‘Supplemento al catalogo degli Olympionikai’ *Klio* 52 (1970), 295—303; L. Moretti, ‘Nuovo supplemento al catalogo degli Olympionikai’ *Miscellanea greca e romana* 14 (1987), 67—91.

The reliability of Hippias’s list of the Olympic victors is a much debated problem which not only has a direct bearing on the history of the Games in Olympia, but also far-reaching consequences for the chronology of early Greek history in general. Plutarch’s skepticism is rather irrelevant given his a priori mistrust in chronography (cf. Solon 27.1). F. Jacoby (ad loc.; *FGroHist* IIIb (Kommentar: Text), 224-225) argues that this assessment reflects at best a consecutive polemic (by Aristotle, *Timaios of Tauromenion, Eratostenes*, and others) with diverse aspects of Hippias’s work. The modern debate on Hippias’s credibility (for a convenient overview of the arguments, see R. Bilik, ‘Die Zuverlässigkeit der frühen Olympionikenliste. Die Geschichte eines Forschungsproblems im chronologischen Überblick’ *Nikephoros* 13 (2000), 47—62; add the works listed in P. Christesen, *Olympic victor lists*, 76 n. 65) focuses, on the one hand, on his possible sources, on the other, on the nature (method, goals etc.) of his Catalogue. Most probably there was no comprehensive catalogue of the Olympic victors, i.e. one listing the victors of all the Games till the time of its recording, before Hippias (see now P. Christesen, *Olympic victor lists*, 76-122 and 461-465; cf. F. Jacoby’s ‘palinode’ of his earlier position in F. Jacoby, *Athens. The local chronicles of ancient Athens* (Oxford 1949), 355 n. 3). Early archival data for the victors is very unlikely on comparative grounds (the generally late recording of the eponymic officials and late compilations of winner lists of other important games in Greece) and given the confused and chronologically divergent traditions surrounding an early conflict between Elis and the Pisatans over Olympia, testifying to the lack of a uniform chronology of the Games in the eighth century BC. Previous existence of some partial epigraphic lists in Olympia (perhaps starting at some point with the Games won by the individual issuing the list in the gymnasion and then systematically continued or occasionally updated) depends on the dating of two *Eleans* (BNJ 416 T 1-2 = Pausianias 6.6.3 (Paraballon) and 6.8.1 (Euanoridae)) believed to have inscribed such lists; it seems clear nowadays that they belong to the third century BC (cf. recently G. Maddoli, M. Nafissi and V. Saladino (eds), *Pausania. Guida della Grecia. Libro VI: L’Elide e Olimpia* (Milano 2003), ad loc.). I take the mention that the ‘Eleans did not register’ (ου... ἐνεπηγράφωσαν...) the Games presided over by Pheidon of Argos (Ephoros, BNJ 70 F 115, 28-29 *apud* Strabonem 8.3.33), the whole account probably stemming from the prologue of Hippias’s Work, (cf. above) as either referring to some bare list of the officials in charge of the Games or as a hint by Ephoros at some systematization of the so-called ‘anolympiads’ (cf. Pausianias 6.22.2-3; cf. Pausianias 6.4.1-2) by Hippias or later on in Elean local traditions – but not as evidencing an official catalogue of the winners used by Hippias. Be it as it may, fifth-century historians do not resort to the list of the winners (cf. the symptomatically mysterious chronological position of Pheidon of Argos, a character closely related to the chronology of the Games, in
Hippias of Elis (6): Brill’s New Jacoby : Brill Online

Herodotos, Book 6; for Thucydides see above). The sources at Hippias’s disposal (oral traditions of Elean aristocratic clans (including his own?) no doubt claiming some role in organizing and supervising the Games in the past, various local and outside inscriptions commemorating individual Olympic victors, local collective memory, diverse extra-Elean traditions – both oral and epigraphic – cherishing the names of victorious compatriots, oral memories of Greek aristocratic families, various literary accounts etc.) must have been extremely rich but contradictory; the bulk of the epigraphic material hardly reaching back far beyond the sixth century BC. Worse still, early history of the Games and of the region was a deeply political matter (old and new conflicts involving Eleans, Pisatans, Spartans, Arcadians etc.), so in want of any solid basis the inquirer was bound to rely on his own and his informants’ beliefs and sympathies, and/or anachronistically to project current realities (political, athletic etc.) into the distant past. However, it is far from sure that Hippias worked ad maiorem gloriae of his fatherland Elis when compiling the catalogue itself (the Elean appropriation of some ‘mainstream’ Olympic traditions must have happened much earlier, following the annexation of Olympia in early sixth century (ca. 580 BC?)); his overtly ‘patriotic’ historical program was most probably limited to the prologue to the Olympionikai (rather extensive and containing the material suitable for his epideictic speeches, too; cf. above). Neither is it obvious that he arrived at his date of 776/5 BC for the first Games solely through an artificial backward calculation based on the date of the Games of 476 BC (or 576 BC) or just on some mythical genealogies (of Iphitos and/or of Lykourgos, or of Herakles). Even if, as it is likely (recently, see P. Christesen, Olympic victor lists, esp. 147-151), Hippias used the figure of Lykourgos (and the Spartan king lists, to which he was traditionally related) to pinpoint this date, his reasoning was far from a simple genealogical calculation (on our current knowledge of the Spartan king lists, no straightforward computation would make Lycurgus easily fit in with the date of ca. 776 BC). This must have been due to a laborious accumulation and combination of particular data (such as the so-called discus of Iphitos, a non-extend early sixth-century (?) forged inscription mentioning Lykourgos, cf. Plutarch, Lykourgos 1.1 and Pausanias 5.20.1) and to a confrontation of divergent available chronological schemes; and the same hold true for ascribing the names of individual stadion winners to the particular Games from 776 BC onwards. On the whole, although the results of Hippias’s work must have perforce largely been due to his imaginative speculation, some characteristics of the Olympionikai show a serious scholar at work. Witness the respective (dis-)appearances of Messenian and Spartan winners on the list which seem to be correlated with the chronology of the First Messenian War (cf. P. Christesen, Olympic victor lists, 120-121 and 482-487); far from guaranteeing the historicity of the catalogue, at the very least this evidences some attempt at a comprehensive historical re-construction.

I would argue that what made this enterprise worthwhile for Hippias was perhaps the necessity to deploy a whole range of methods, master a wide variety of diverse data from all over the Greek world. In a word, this was the right challenge for Hippias’s encyclopedic polumathia supported by his outstanding mnemonic capacities (cf. above, comm. on T 2). This display of Hippias’s antiquarian skills (no doubt fueled to some extent by his local patriotism) in the severe form of a plain list sharply contrasted with his accomplished epideictic oratory, but was at the time impressive and revolutionary nonetheless, testifying to his bent for intellectual novelties (cf. below, F 4 ad fin.; Xenophon, Memorabilia 4.4.6, and above, comm. on T 2). All in all, I would posit a close intellectual affinity between Hippias’s Catalogue of the Olympic victors and his antiquarian Collection (on which below, comm. on F 4) and perhaps also the proximity of both projects in time (see also above, ‘Biographical Essay’). In general, despite the local content of the catalogue, its ambitions (pace Jacoby) were clearly pan-Hellenic as gathering data from, and pertaining to, the whole Greek world. One could even be tempted to interpret Hippias’s decision to conceive his Olympionikai as responding to Hellanikos’ earlier achievement, the Priestesses of Hera in Argos (a good analogy is provided by Charon of Lampsakos who most probably responded to Hellanikos writing his Officials of the Lacedaemonians (or Officials of the Lampsaikens?), cf. BNJ 262 T 1). After all, this is how later historians must have understood Hippias’s undertaking, acknowledging its superiority over Hellanikos’ one as a chronological tool.

F 3

Athenaios 13 608 F Translation

Subject: Everyday culture: Women
Source Date: 2nd-3rd century AD, 3rd
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The women famous for their beauty: 

**Thargelia of Miletos**, who had fourteen times been married, and was physically extraordinarily beautiful as well as wise as Hippias the sophist asserts in his book entitled *Collection*.

Commentary

(cf. 86 B 4 DK = Untersteiner 8 B 4) The only F of Hippias unambiguously attributed to the *Collection* (on its nature in general, see below, comm. on F 4). The title *Sunagoge*, alluded to in its proem, F 4 (‘having collected’, συνθείς), may be Hippias’s own ingenious invention, very appropriate to the quasi encyclopedic, doxographical and antiquarian, contents of this work. We do not hear of such titles in earlier Greek literature, but later on it is de rigueur for various archival collections, antiquarian compilations, and doxographical compendia, esp. in the Peripatetic tradition, e.g. Theophrastos’ doxographical compendia (D.L. 5.43; 5.44; 5.47; cf. 5.47 and 5.45), Demetrius’ of Phaleron *Collection of Aesop’s fables* (D.L. 5.80) and *Apollodorus’* of Athens *Collection of Doctrines* (D.L. 7.181); on the other hand e.g. Krateros’ of Makedon *Collection of Athenian Decrees* (BNJ 342 F 1-8) and Istrōs’ the Callimachean *Collection of Atthides* (BNJ 334); cf. already Aristotle’s mention of the usefulness of ‘collections of laws and constitutions’ (Ethica Nicomachea 1118b 8; cf. also D.L. 5.24 and 25). This F may give us some idea of the structure of Hippias’s work: a series of ‘entries’ (here: Thargelia), illustrated by one or more quotations on the issue, organized in a certain number thematic ‘complexes’ (thus A. Patzer, *Der Sophist Hippias als Philosophiehistoriker* (Freiburg/Breisgau–München 1986), 100-105). In this case, however, it seems very unlikely that the overall ‘complex’ was entitled *On beautiful and wise women* (vel sim.), suggesting the existence of the ‘complex’ *On beautiful and wise men* (thus, unconvincingly, A. Patzer, *Der Sophist Hippias* (Freiburg 1986), 103-105, with a reference to Plato, *Hippias maior* 281a: a parody of Hippias’s classificatory method?). I would rather opt for a series of examples of extraordinary (and man-like?) feminine practical wisdom (with, e.g., citations from Herodotos under the headings *Artemisia, Nitokris* etc., but also with some ‘philosophical’ women of the past, both Greek and ‘barbarian’). As such, this would be the ultimate starting point of the tradition of diverse treatises *de mulieribus* in later antiquity. Hippias’s sources for Thargelia (A. Patzer, *Der Sophist Hippias*, 103-105), a legendary beauty married to a Thessalian leader and allegedly actively ‘medising’ during the Persian Wars, might have included some early historians dealing with Ionian-Persian and with Thessalian issues, such as Charon of Lampsakos (BNJ 262; 697b), Hellenikos of Lesbos (BNJ 4 F 52; 601a; 687a), some Thessaliaka (FGHist IIIb (LXXVII: ‘Thessalian’)), and perhaps also Dionysius of Miletos (BNJ 687). Our most important sources for Thargelia include Plutarch, *Pericles* 24.2, Philostratos, *Epistles* 73 (= Gorgias, 82 A 35 DK = 4 A 35 Untersteiner, with comm. ad loc.) quoting the *Logos on Thargelia*, probably a passage from the non-extant dialogue *Aspasia I* by Aeschines the Socratic (cf. D.L. 2.61); Hesychios, s.v. Θαργηλία; Suda, s.v. Θαργηλία (Θ 51 Adler)(cf. Anonymi tractatus de mulieribus 11, in A. Westermann (ed.), Paradoxographoi. Scriptores rerum mirabilium Graeci (Brunsuiage–Londini 1839), 217). In general, cf. Ed. Meyer, *Theopomps Hellenika. Mit einer Beilage über die Rede an die Larisacer und die Verfassung Thessaliens* (Halle/Salle 1909), 243 n. 3, 245.

F 4

Clemens Alexandrinus, *Stromateis* 6.15.1-2 p. 43. 21

Subject: Genre

Source Date: 2nd-3rd century AD, 3rd
century AD
Historian’s Date: 5th-4th century BC,
4th century BC
Historical Period: 5th-4th century BC, 4th century BC

’Ιππίαν τὸν σοφιστήν τὸν Ἡλεῖον ... παραστησώμεθα ὡδὲ πῶς λέγοντα·
τούτων ἵσας εἴρηται τὰ μὲν Ὄρφει, τὰ δὲ Μουσαίοι κατὰ βραχὺ ἄλλοι ἄλλα λόγοι,
τὰ δὲ Ὅσιοδοι, τὰ δὲ Ὅμηροι, τὰ δὲ τοῖς ἄλλοις τῶν ποιητῶν, τὰ δὲ ἐν συγγραφαῖς,
τὰ μὲν Ἀλλησι, τὰ δὲ βαρβάροις· ἐγὼ δὲ ἐκ πάντων τούτων τὰ μέγιστα καὶ ὀμφύλα συνθεῖς τούτων
καὶ πολευτική τὸν λόγον πιοίσομαι.

[As a straightforward witness in favour of my argument (sc. that the Greeks were utter plagiarists)... ], let me produce the sophist Hippias of Elis, who says more or less this: ‘[...] of these things, perhaps some have been said by Orpheus, others by Musaios, briefly hither and thither, some by Hesiod, others by Homer, and some by the other poets, and still others by prose writers, some by Greeks and others by barbarians. As for me, from all those things I will collect the most important issues and at the same time classifiable as homogeneous, and thus compose the following work, new and multiform’.

Commentary

(= 86 B 6 DK = Untersteiner 8 B 6 = PEG 1146 T Bernabé) In the whole corpus (but cf. above, comm. on T 2 and 3, for Pl. parodying Hippias’ style), this is the only literal quotation from Hippias (despite of the cautionary ὡδὲ πῶς λέγοντα, suggesting perhaps a second-hand citation). Diverse emendations have been proposed in modern scholarship (perhaps the most radically by Th. Gomperz, Hellenika. Eine Auswahl philologischer und philosophiegeschichtlicher kleiner Schriften 1 (Leipzig 1912), 288-289; a useful discussion in A. Patzer, Der Sophist Hippias als Philosophiehistoriker (Freiburg/Breisgau – München 1986), 20-30; the whole argument below owes much to this indispensable treatment of Hippias’s work and of this F in particular), but the text as it stands in Clement does make sense (with the sole exception of the words ἄλλως ἄλλα λόγοι: we should either place them, with Th. Gomperz, after the mention of ‘the barbarians’ or, perhaps less plausibly, posit a lacuna containing one or more names before them; in any case, these words remain difficult). A commentary on the contents of the F is not feasible before deciding on its provenance. It is clear that it belongs to the prologue (cf. esp. τὸν λόγον ποιήσομαι in future tense) of some prose work by Hippias, more precisely to the ultimate part of a longer preface (cf. the opening τούτων and the conventional shift to the first person in the last phrase). Based on Herodotus 1. proem.—1.5 (perhaps one of Hippias’s literary models here), the prologue of Thucydides (1.1-23), and on the sheen extent of the F one can assume a rather lengthy development between these sentences and the opening self-presentation of the author (on the prologues in early Greek prose, see e.g. D. Fehling, ‘Zur Funktion und Formengeschichte des Prooemiums in der älteren griechischen Prosa’ ΔΩΡΗΜΑ. Hans Diller zum 70. Geburtstag... (Athens 1975), 61-75). Despite Jacoby’s skepticism (FGrHist Ib (Kommentar), 478: ‘preziöse einleitung irgend eines epideiktischen λόγος’; following C. Müller, FHG 2.62, there are good reasons to identify this F as a part of the prooemium to Hippias’s Sunagoge (thus e.g. Th. Gomperz, Griechische Denker. Eine Geschichte der antiken Philosophie 1 (Berlin – Leipzig 1922), 359). The expression ‘from all that having collected (συνθείς)...’ unambiguously refers the reader to this work. For some scholars, it would have been a collection of a very specialized character: that of ‘famous women’ (C. Müller, FHG 2.60b) or of ‘customs of diverse peoples’ (Ed. Meyer, Theopomps Hellenika. Mit einer Beilage über die Rede an die Larisaeer und die Verfassung Thessaliens (Halle/Salle 1909), 243 n. 3). For F. Osann, ‘Der Sophist Hippias als Archäolog’ Rheinisches Museum 2 (1843), 502), on the other hand, it was a late compilation of diverse Hippias’s works or of some excerpts thereof. Meanwhile, our F suggest an all-encompassing (cf. also the long series of τὰ μὲν – τὰ δὲ) learned project embodying Hippias’s ideal of polunathia
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(cf. above, comm. on T 2), a sort of erudite counterpart of his epideictic Trojan Speech (cf. ibid.) and perhaps serving a similar purpose: instruction of the young towards great renown and wisdom (cf. Plato, Hippias maior 286a (86 A 9 DK = 86 B 5 DK)). Now, the list of authorities (classical authors of the time, see esp. Aristophanes, Ranae 1030-36; cf. also Pherekydes of Athens, BNJ 3 F 167 (cf. Hellanikos of Lesbos, BNJ 4 F 5b, and Damastes of Sigeon, BNJ 5 F 11b); Herodotos 2.53.2-3; Gorgias, 82 B 25 DK) mentioned by Hippias in this F is revealing as they all are sages playing an important role in the wisdom tradition of Hupothekei (cf. above, comm. on T 2); as such, they are placed here as emblematic of the whole work. I assume that the anonymous ‘other poets’ (given the tradition in question, most probably epic and elegiac ones) and ‘prose writings’, Greek and barbarian alike, are treated by Hippias in the same manner. Hippias is here the first in our extant sources clearly to state the distinction between poetry and prose (although συγγραφή could have already had also a more specialized meaning of ‘historical work’ broadly speaking at the time). Putting side by side Greek and ‘barbarian’ authorities is yet another trait of Hippias’s comprehensive ambitions (perhaps owing more to Herodotos’s proem than to the cosmopolitan bent wrongly attributed to Hippias; cf. E. Schütrumpf, 'Kosmopolitismus oder Panhellenismus? Zur Interpretation des Ausspruchs von Hippias in Platons Protagoras (337c ff.)' Hermes 100 (1972), 5—29). Particular writers such as Xanthos of Lydia (BNJ 765, if not writing too late to be included) may of course be implied among the ‘barbarians’, but I would rather take this mention more broadly, as referring to the whole range of (Greek) wise utterances supposedly drawing from barbarian wisdom (e.g. Thales (cf. below, comm. on F 8) and Solon learning from Egyptians etc.), to Greek sages of non-Greek origin (e.g. Aisopos; Orpheus is explicitly named in the prologue), and to the rich body of anecdotes concerning, and apophthegms ascribed to, mythical and historical wise barbarian rulers (in the vein of Herodotos and earlier geographical and ethnographic tradition, but also from earlier Greek poetry) including women (cf. above, comm. on F 3). In a work of this kind, one would naturally expect also the abundant oracular tradition (esp. given the presence of Musaios on the list) circulating under barbarian names (Bakis etc.), but our evidence is too scanty to be sure of that.

The ‘most important things classifiable as homogeneous’ announce the overall value of the Sunagoge, but also suggest its reasoned selectivity and imply the thematic organization of the material. For Hippias’s striving for artistic and intellectual novelty (καινόν), cf. Xenophon, Memorabilia 4.4.6 (86 A 14 DK); Cicero, De oratore 3.32 (127). The adjective πολυειδῆ, besides advertising the colorful variety of the contents, (proudly) warns the reader of a striking feature of the work which combines diverse genres, types, and registers of literature. Actually, this must have been one of the main novelties of Hippias’s project. There is no safe way to date the appearance of the Sunagoge (A. Patzer, Der Sophist Hippias, 114: in the twenties of the fifth century), but it is tempting to parallel the opening list of Hippias’s authorities with Aristophanes, Ranae 1030-36 (again, the four poets as sources of wisdom): the list itself is banal, but the identical sequence in both may not be fortuitous; it may be reminiscent of the memorable proem of the freshly ‘published’, and perhaps very fashionable among the public of the sophists, Sunagoge. If so, one could tentatively put the Collection before 405 BC, the time of the peak of Hippias’s activity anyway, not long before his Olympionikai (cf. above, comm. on F 2).

For the title of the work, see above, comm. on F 3. The form of the Collection was by no means limited to mere catalogue, or pinax, allegedly useful for Hippias as orator and teacher (pace R. Pfieffer, History of Classical Scholarship. From the beginnings to the end of the Hellenistic Age (Oxford 1968), 52); after all, this would be incompatible with Hippias pride in his astonishing memory in Plato, Hippias maior 285e and with his pride in the current achievement as stated in the prologue. The arrangement and method of the Sunagoge were ingeniously elucidated by B. Snell, ‘Die Nachrichten über die Lehren des Thales und die Anfänge der griechischen Philosophie- und Literaturgeschichte’ C.J. Classen (ed.), Sophistik (Wege der Forschung 187) (Darmstadt 1976), 478—490 (= Philologus 96 (1944), 170-182), esp. 488-489, who tentatively identified a new F of Hippias (cf. below, on F 5) based on Plato, Kratylos 402b and Aristotle, Metaphysics 1.3.983b 21ff. (= Thales, 11 A 12 DK). Therein Hippias quotes Thales, Homer (Iliad 14.200-201), Hesiod (Theogony 337), Orpheus (1 B 2 DK = F 15 Kern = 22 F Bernabé) and introduces his own scintillating comment to illustrate the famous contention of Thales that ‘water is the arke of all things’: ‘The Ancients represented the oath of the gods to be by water, the river Styx, as they call it. Now what is most ancient is most revered, and what is most revered is what we swear by’ (tr. H. Tredennick, adapted). This is how the whole work must have looked like, probably organized in some more general thematic ‘complexes’ divided into smaller sections (cf. also above, comm. on F 3). For Snell, this is the earliest sample of historical-philosophical writing in Greek tradition, a basic
form of a doxographical treatise. Now, if we combine this argument with the import of our F 4, stemming from the prologue of the Sunagoge, two organizing principles of the work become apparent: Hippias’s interest in the origins (e.g. the discoverer of an important truth) and the rooting of his arguments in the wisdom tradition or, to put it more broadly, in the writings of the ‘Ancients’. The two principles correspond clearly to the theory and practice of antiquarianism of later times (in general, cf. B. Bravo, ‘Antiquarianism and history’ J. Marincola (ed.), A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography 2 (Oxford 2007), esp. 516-518). A. Patzer (Der Sophist Hippias als Philosophhistoriker, 110-12) aptly describes Hippias’s underlying idea: important historical, philosophical and scientific ideas of his time have already been present in nuce in the thought of ancient Greek poets and among sage barbarians. In Hippias’s lifetime this assertion, widespread though it is in later European tradition, must have been novel, nay revolutionary, sharply contrasting with the critical and polemical attitude towards the intellectual achievements of the past in Xenophanes (21 B 11 DK), Hekataios (BNJ 1 F 1), or Herakleitos (22 B 40, 42, 56, 57). To do justice to the ‘Ancients’ (cf. also Plato, Hippias minor 282a), Hippias must have conceived their intellectual world (and, I would argue, their ‘factual’ milieu and realia) as a bygone era as compared to the feats (and realities) of the present epoch (for the contemporaneous awareness of the unusual progress in diverse areas, cf. Ch. Meier, The Greek discovery of politics (Cambridge, Mass. 1990), chap. 10), and hence must have considered it an appropriate object of antiquarian studies. This approach, still according to Patzer (ibid.), seems a psychological and philosophical basis of the intellectual project of the Collection.

But the Sunagoge is very unlikely to have been a true ‘encyclopedia’ of knowledge of Hippias’s times (pace A. Patzer, Der Sophist Hippias, 14 and 32: quotations in all the fields of knowledge of the time, drawing from the whole literary tradition), even encompassing all the disciplines practiced by the sophist. In my opinion, ‘the most important issues’ of the proem suggest a high degree of selectivity (within the frames of the above-mentioned thematic ‘complexes’) and most probably a polemic character of the work (cf., perhaps, below, F 6, 7, 9-13, with comm. ad locc.). Such an original and authoritative collection of wisdom containing (at times briefly commented) utterances of ‘classical’ authorities on (supposedly) important topics, or on much debated or just difficult or ambiguous passages of important authors (below, F 12?), would well agree with the educational purpose of the whole (above). One could be tempted to understand the origins of this project in terms of an erudite aide-memoire for use by Hippias’s (prospective) disciples in their debates with the representatives of other ‘schools’ of the sophistic movement (cf. above, comm. on T 2, on analogous but very different ‘tools’ offered by Protagoras to his students), but of course widely ‘published’ and advertising accordingly Hippias, his wisdom and his teaching. Now, Hippias’s practical ideal of politico-rhetorical effectiveness (esp. Plato, Hippias maior 304a-b, cf. 296a) was directly linked with his intellectual project as stated in the Trojan Speech (presenting ‘manifold and most beautiful customs’ (νόμιμα), Plato, Hippias maior 286b; cf. above), but also, I posit, in his antiquarian Collection. If so, Hippias must have believed that his wide erudition in the matters of the past (distant past, or ‘antiquities’ as well as wisdom of times of old) may be informative for the understanding of, and excelling at, political activities (cf. above, on Hippias’s autarkeia, comm. on T 1) – more instructive than, say, the political philosophizing of Gorgias and Protagoras. This pragmatic politico-rhetorical agenda, typical of the sophistic movement, of Hippias’s antiquarianism sharply contrasts with the disinterested and detached approach of later antiquarian studies, but to some extent corresponds to the notion of utility of historical inquiries as explicitly stated by Thucydides 1.22.4 (and implicitly already in Herodotos). Unlike his successors in the field of antiquarianism, Hippias still felt he belonged to the old tradition of sages supposed to teach their audience principally political skills and virtues.

Given the deplorable state of our extant material, there is no non-circular argument regarding the contents of the Collection. Meanwhile, the testimony of F 3 about the wise Thargelia, the only F unambiguously ascribed to the Sunagoge by the ancient tradition, is crucial as it could hardly have originated in a purely doxographical context. Among the FF which one could hypothetically attribute to the Collection, there is only one analogous to that tentatively identified by B. Snell and stemming in all probability from a doxographic work by Hippias (F 5 below), and another one that mentions a famous character specialized in geometry (F 8), with yet another F specifying the country of origin of another sage, Homer (F 13). Among other FF, one touches upon historical and antiquarian matters (F 6) and one more, antiquarian, with perhaps some moralistic undertones (F 7); one is erudite and astronomical-mythographic (F 9), one geographical-mythographic (F 10), one perhaps purely mythographic (F 11), and one erudite-geographic (F 12). It seems clear, then, that the
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Sunagoge could not have been a merely doxographical work (pace A. Patzer), nor a straightforwardly mythographical one (as R. Fowler, EGMI, xxxiii rightly notes), but must have treated a broad variety of subjects, including those of antiquarian character (for Hippias’s notion of ‘antiquities’, cf. above, comm. on T 3; see also below). On the other hand, I would argue that Hippias’s original teaching on rhythms, metrics, harmonics (cf. above, T 2) and language in general did not figure in the Sunagoge (although naturally must have formed the background of many of his interpretation, cf. comm. on F 6). There is an indirect argument to that effect, namely the fact that Plato’s puns in Kratylos 402b, most probably parodying some ‘linguistic’ method of Hippias, operate on scraps of a doxographical ‘entry’ from the Collection (above). The original method applied by Hippias in this sphere of his activity was incompatible with the profile of the Sunagoge. After all, it would be extremely difficult to find explicit statements of ancient authorities (let alone barbarian ones) in those realms, which can hardly be implied in the list of sources mentioned in the prologue. If anything, one could expect Hippias to include in the Collection some data regarding the ‘first founders’, or history, of the disciplines he practically dealt with (geometry, arithmetics, astronomy, rhythms, metrics, harmonics, mnemonics etc.). This may be inferred from F 8, but also implied by Plato, Phaidros 274c–275b (where the figure of Theuth strongly looks like a sophisticated parody of Hippias, his areas of interest and his method; cf. esp. ‘the drug for memory and wisdom’ supposedly discovered by Theuth, but also such terms applied to his poor disciples as πολυγνώμονες (cf. Plato’s on Hippias’s polumathia, above, comm. on T 2), γολεποί (cf. Hippias’s character in Plato), δοξόσοφοι (cf. Hippias repeatedly boasting about his wisdom in Plato); cf. already E. Dupréel, Les sophistes. Protagoras, Gorgias, Prodicus, Hippias (Neuchâtel 1948), 333 n. 1, cf. also 256-265). In a word, all those disciplines could have found their way to the Collection, but only in antiquarian terms.

A. Patzer rightly pointed to some ‘thematic complexes’ of philosophic-historical character that must have been included in the Sunagoge (e.g. ‘water’, ‘Eros’, ‘everything flows’, ‘in the beginning everything was mixed together’ etc.). In view of my argument thus far, I think we are entitled to postulate a certain number of big sections of this work, namely a ‘chapter’ ‘on poets and sages’, in the vein of Damastes of Sigeon (BNJ 5 F 11a) and Glaukos of Rhegion (roughly speaking, both of them Hippias’s contemporaries), represented by F 13 (Homer) and perhaps F 3 (Thargelia) and F 8 (Mamerkos), too (maybe also the ‘physical’ FF of Thales, if not figuring in the next section); another one gathering diverse doxographical utterances dealing with nature, cosmos and all types of ‘physical’ phenomena (Thales: F 5 and the one reconstructed by B. Snell, above); another one assembling geographical (or geographical-astronomical) data drawn from a number of classical authorities and discussing debatable issues involved (F 9: Hyades, F 10: Oceanidae). Another conceivable ‘chapter’ might have gathered ‘all kinds of antiquities’, including foundations of cities in ancient times, and genealogies of heroes and men (as in T 3), but perhaps also diverse ‘customs’, or νόμιμα, with which I would be tempted to link our F 7 (on Lykourgos, cf. comm. ad loc.) and F 6 (if not belonging to the next section). Another class of data (a section apart, or perhaps attributable to some section on ‘problems’, προβλήματα, in the poets of old) touching upon problematic names (geographical homonyms as in F 12, disputable names of particular mythical characters as in F 11). This section could have also included debatable origins of geographical names as in F 10, or arguable numbers, and therefore names, of some mythical groups as in F 9. Be it as it may, I assume that a (restricted) number of such ‘chapters’ must have been enumerated in the prologue of the Sunagoge, between some conventional incipit of the work (a more elaborate equivalent of ‘Hippias of Elis says this’) and what is now F 4. One element of this exposition can plausibly be envisaged based on Plato, Hippias maior 285d that may follow the opening of Hippias’s Collection rather closely (see above, comm. on T 3): ‘... about the foundations of cities in ancient times and, in short, about antiquity in general’ (... καὶ συλλήβδην πάσης τῆς ἀρχαιολογίας).

F 5

Diogenes Laertios 1.24

| Subject: Philosophy: Pre-socratic |
| Source Date: 3rd century AD |
| Historian's Date: 5th-4th century BC, 4th century BC |
| Historical Period: 7th-6th century BC, 6th century BC |

Translation
Aristotle [De anima 1.2.405a 19] and Hippias say that he [sc. Thales] attributed souls also to the inanimate objects, judging from the magnet and from the amber [cf. 11 A 1 DK].

Commentary

(cf. 86 B 7 DK = Untersteiner 8 B 7) This is the only extant (sensu stricto) doxographical F of Hippias. In his commentary, F. Jacoby suggested its appurtenance to a separate treatise ‘on poets and sophists’ (i.e. ‘sages’); I would rather take it as belonging to a relevant section on the Sunagoge (cf. above, comm. on F 4). As demonstrated by B. Snell (see below, cf. also above, comm. on F 4), Hippias was Aristotle’s main source of information here. In fact, Aristotle (De anima 1.2.405a 19) does mention only magnet (cf. Plato, Ion 33d), so it is by no means clear whether Hippias originally adduced just amber, or magnet (i.e. ‘Magnesian stone’), or both (on amber in our extant Greek sources, cf. Blümner, ‘Bernstein’, RE 3 (1899), cols. 295-296). In De anima 1.5.411a 8 (= 11 A 22 DK), Aristotle provides a wider context of Thales’ thought (‘everything is full of gods’; cf. Sir D. Ross, Aristotle. De anima (Oxford 1961), comm. ad loc. (205); W. Jaeger, The Theology of the Early Greek Philosophers (Oxford 1967), 20-22; G.S. Kirk, J.E. Raven and M. Schofield, The Presocratic Philosophers. A Critical History with a Selection of Texts2nd ed. (Cambridge 1983), 95-98). More generally on Hippias’s doxographical interests and studies, see B. Snell, ‘Die Nachrichten des Thales und die Anfänge der griechischen Philosophie- und Literaturgeschichte’ C.J. Classen (ed.), Sophistik (Wege der Forschung 187) (Darmstadt 1976), 478—490 (= Philologus 96 (1944), 170-182), (for this F see esp. 485-486), and A. Patzer, Der Sophist Hippias als Philosophiehistoriker (Freiburg/Breisgau – München 1986) passim. The latter scholar rightly argues for our profound dependence (via Aristotle) from Hippias’s doxographical studies in our modern view of the Presocratic philosophy (A. Patzer, Der Sophist Hippias, 114-116). On the other hand, later tradition, esp. the Peripatetic school, followed Hippias’s example in marrying philosophy with antiquarianism (cf. esp. later doxographic studies). Thus, the historical importance of Hippias the historian of philosophy (or better: of wisdom) should not be underrated. Cf. also C.J. Classen, ‘Bemerkungen zu zwei griechischen “Philosophiehistorikern”. Hippias’ Philologus 109 (1965), 175—178.

F 6

Sophokles, Oedipus Rex, argumentum

Subject: Politics: Tyranny
Source Date: 5th century BC
Historian’s Date: 5th-4th century BC,
4th century BC
Historical Period: Unknown

There was something peculiar about the post-Homeric poets who address the kings ruling before the Trojan War as ‘tyrants’; this word having been disseminated among the Greeks only late, in Archilochos’ times [cf. F 19.3 West2] according to Hippias the sophist. At any rate, Homer calls Echetos, the most lawless of all people, ‘king’ and not ‘tyrant’ (Odyssey 18.85; tr. R. Lattimore): ‘to Echetos, who preys on all men, and who is king there’. People say that the word turannos [‘tyrant’]
Commentary

(= 86 B 7 DK; cf. Untersteiner 8 B 9) This F, from a hypothesis reaching back perhaps to Alexandrian sources, is a precious piece of evidence as it provides us with a sample of Hippias’s method in what must have been an antiquarian project, gathering testimonies of the poets of old on a given subject. I think this F belongs to the Sunagoge (cf. above, F 4). Most probably, the juxtaposition of Archilochos and Homer was also due to Hippias, but not in the context of his (alleged) specialized Homeric studies (thus, e.g., W. Nestle, Vom Mythos zum Logos (Stuttgart 1940), 362), nor in that of his political theory (thus Untersteiner, ad loc.). I would rather expect this F to belong to some section of the Collection gathering diverse ‘customs’, or νόμιμα (cf. Plato, Hippias maior 286b), and mentioning perhaps the (relative) novelty of this word (and of the political regime) based on the ‘cyclic poets’ and Archilochos, and culminating in Hippias’s own ingenious antiquarian reasoning (the case of Echetos in Homer) in the vein of his method studied by B. Snell for doxographic ‘entries’ of the Collection (see above, comm. on F 4). In that, this ‘entry’ of the Sunagoge might have been to some extent influenced by Hippias’s political teaching. Although quite probable, it is not certain that Hippias realized the ‘Asianic’ origin of the word and/or linked the idea with that of oriental despotism (but if the mention of the Etruscans also stems from Hippias, such a link is conceivable given the tradition of their Lydian descent, as in Herodotos 1.94.4-7), for instance arguing that Gyges (mentioned by Archilochos) had been the first to be called ‘tyrant’ (as Euphorion of Chalkis did in his third-century BC treatise On the Aleuadae, FHG 3.72 F 1 (quoted by Clement of Alexandria, Stromateis 1.117.9), based on the same F of Archilochos). The ultimate part of this argumentum, the ‘etymologising’ reference to the Etruscans, may be of later origin (Aristotle or his school? Timaios of Taumomenion? Ephoros? On this hypothesis, the comment may have originated from some (indirect) knowledge of the Etruscan word turan, i.e. Venus (= Mistress?), hypothetically related to the Greek τύραννος (according to P. Chantaine, DELG, s.v., ‘the link is doubtful’)). If, however, we take it as based on the speculation regarding the change of accent (and/or quantity of a syllable), or adding or removing a letter, as changing the meaning of a word (here: τύραννος vs. Τύραννος, or even Doric Τυρρανός), Hippias’s paternity of this interpretation becomes possible (cf. Plato, Kratylos 418a and in particular Dissoi logos 90 DK 5.11-12, most probably drawing on Hippias; see M. Untersteiner, Sofisti. Testimonianze e frammenti 3 (Firenze 1954), Dissoi logos 10 (90), ad loc. (and introduction, p. 148-149) with E. Duprélè, Les sophistes. Protagoras, Gorgias, Prodicus, Hippias (Neuchâtel 1948), 41-43, 89-94, 191-200, 206-213, and esp. 273-274; cf. Untersteiner 8 A 11 and 12 and above, comm. on T 2 (on the ‘knowledge of harmonies’)). Such a brilliant idea would ingeniously round off the (hypothetical) entry. All in all, and given that Hippias is the only authority quoted in this passage, it cannot be ruled out that we face here yet another (abbreviated and reworked) entry of the Sunagoge (the change from the singular ‘Hippias says’ to the plural ‘people say’ may be due to an intermediary authority from which our argumentum in its present form stems). The word τύραννος is most probably of Minor Asiatic origins (via hypothetical Lydian *turan-? cf. the hieroglyphic Hittite tarvana; in general, cf. F. Pintore, ‘Seren, tarawanis, tyrannos’ O. Carruba and C. Liverani (eds), Studi Orientalistici in Ricordo di Franco Pintore (Studia Mediterranea 4) (Pavia 1983), 285-322; recently cf. V. Parker, ‘Tyrranos. The Semantics of a Political Concept from Archilochus to Aristotle’ Hermes 126 (1998), esp.145-149.), just like some other Greek terms for the rule of an individual (ἄναξ, βασιλεύς), understandably entering the Greek vocabulary in diverse epochs (cf. various words for ‘emperor’ in European languages, from Latin, or Slavonic words for ‘king’, e.g. Polish król, from Kar[all], Carolus).

F 7

Plutarch, Lykourgos 23

Translation

Subject: Genre: Biography
Source Date: 1st-2nd century AD, 2nd century AD
Commentary

(cf. 86 B 11 DK = Untersteiner 8 B 11) It is difficult to say in which of Hippias’s works this F may have originated, but his Sunagoge seems a plausible candidate. Another serious, although less likely, possibility might be (the prologue of?) the Catalogue of the Olympic Victors. Lykourgos most probably played an important role there as one of the founders of the Games and his genealogy, combined with the Spartan king list, was perhaps used to pinpoint the date of the first Olympics to (the year corresponding to) 776 BC (see above, comm. on F 2). A separate ‘logos on Lykourgos’ (thus J. Mähly, ‘Der Sophist Hippias von Elis’ Rheinisches Museum 16 (1861), 43) is rather unlikely. Hippias’s Lykourgos (πολεμικός: ‘warlike’ and not ‘fit for warfare’, as πολεμικός rather unlikely. Hippias’s Lykourgos (thus J. Mähly, ‘Der Sophist Hippias von Elis’ Rheinisches Museum 16 (1861), 43) is rather unlikely. Hippias’s Lykourgos (πολεμικός: ‘warlike’ and not ‘fit for warfare’, as unconvincingly argued by Untersteiner, ad loc.), just like that of Herodotos (1.65.5 ad fin.) and esp. of Xenophon (Respublica Lacedaemoniorum 11-12), is also a military reformer. But for Plutarch (or for his source, see below) there was something more to that in Hippias, namely a hint of paradox. I assume that in the original passage of Hippias the figure of Lykourgos served to illustrate the idea close to the Latin maxim si vis pacem para bellum (was there a quotation of an apophthegm attributed to Lykourgos?). Such an idea would be fully understandable in the context of Hippias’s moral and political teaching (cf. Plato, Hippias maior 295e 9–296a 4) and in the wider context of the debates within the Sophistic movement. If so, we could ascribe this hypothetical piece of Spartan wisdom to some – a very likely section of Hippias’s νόμιμα (‘Spartan) context of the debates within the Sophistic movement. If so, we could ascribe this hypothetical piece of Spartan wisdom to some – a very likely section of Hippias’s Sunagoge, or to a series of apophthegms of Greek (political in the event?) sages, which no doubt figured in this Collection, too (see above, comm. on F 4). The same holds true if Plutarch simply followed here Demetrios of Phaleron (see below) or Hermippos of Smyrna (thus e.g. M. Manfredini and L. Piccirilli, Plutarco. Le Vie di Licurgo e di Numa (Milano 1980), 271 (comm. ad loc.)), referred to a little further, in 23.3 (= FHG 3.37 F 5 = 85 Wehrli, with F. Wehrli, Die Schule des Aristoteles, Suppl. I: Hermippos der Kallimacheer (Basel – Stuttgart 1974), 93-94, comm. ad loc.; cf. J. Bollansèc, FGrHist Iva 3 (FGrHist 1026 F 8a), p. 160), without having direct access to Hippias’s passages regarding Lykourgos. Hermippos must have owed much to Hippias’s Sunagoge when writing his treatise On Lawgivers in the second half of the third century BC. For Demetrios’ F adduced by Plutarch, see F. Jacoby on FGrHist 228 F 21, and F. Wehrli, Die Schule des Aristoteles, IV: Demetrios von Phaleron (Basel 1949), 62-63 (comm. on Περὶ εἰρήνης, F 89). Demetrios, with his typical passion for paradoxes (cf. e.g. BNJ 228 F 43.2-3), obviously argues here against a widespread opinion of Lykourgos’ bellicosity and might have quoted Hippias as a representative of this (for him untenable) contention.

Translation

Hippias the sophist says that Lykourgos was highly warlike and experienced in many campaigns ... Demetrios of Phaleron [BNJ 228 F 21 = 89 Wehrli], however, says he did not make use of warfare but he set up the constitution [sc. of Sparta] in peacetime.

μετὰ δὲ τούτων (sc. Θαλῆν) Μάμερκος ὁ After him [sc. Thales], Mamerkos the
brother of the poet Stesichorus is remembered for his commitment to the study of geometry and Hippias of Elis recorded him as having obtained renown on account of his knowledge of geometry.

Commentary

(= 86 B 12 DK = Untersteiner 8 B 12; cf. Eudemos of Rhodes, F 133 Wehrli) This F might have belonged to the section of the Sunagoge (cf. above, comm. on F 4) devoted to ancient sages (F. Jacoby, ad loc., thought of a separate treatise ‘on poets and sophists’, i.e. ‘sages’). As regards geometry, this section could have been organized in a series of ‘successions’: following the discovery of the discipline by Thales (drawing from Egyptian wisdom (on the tradition of Thales’ visit to Egypt, cf. G.S. Kirk, J.E. Raven and M. Schofield, The Presocratic Philosophers. A Critical History with a Selection of Texts 2nd ed. (Cambridge 1983), 79-80), which to some extent explains the presence of some ‘barbarian writers’ in the prologue of the Collection, cf. above, comm. on F 4), through Mamerkos, Pythagoras, and so on. We find this series in Eudemos of Rhodes, F 133 Wehrli (with F. Wehrli, Die Schule des Aristoteles, VIII: Eudemos von Rhodos (Basel 1955), 114-115 (comm. ad loc.,)) from which our F 8 has been extracted; on Eudemos’ dependence on Hippias, see briefly G.B. Kerferd, ‘Plato and Hippias (epitome of a lecture)’ Proceedings of the Classical Association 60 (1963), 35–36. It is important to dissociate this erudite piece, stemming from Hippias’s interest in the history of the discipline (for B. Snell’s analyses of Hippias’s studies of early Greek thinkers, cf. above, comm. on F 4), from some form of presentation of Hippias’s own theories in the field (cf. Plato, Hippias maior 285b = 86 A 11 DK = Untersteiner 8 A 11) that in all probability did not figure in the antiquarian Collection save for some occasional brief notes at the end of a given ‘entry’ or series (see above, comm. on F 4, with a reference to the aforementioned Snell’s analysis of Hippias’s method; cf. also above, comm. on F 6). We do not hear anything about Mamerkos (the name itself is not assured; the Suda, s.v. Στησίχορος (σ 1095 Adler), calls him ‘Mamertinos, a distinguished geometer’).

F 9

Scholia ad Aratum 172 p. 369.24

Subject: Genre: Biography
Source Date: Various
Historian’s Date: 5th-4th century BC,
4th century BC
Historical Period: Unknown

Θαλῆς μὲν οὖν δύο αὐτὰς (sc. τὰς Ὄαδας) εἶπεν εἶναι … Ἐυριπίδης … τρεῖς· Ἀχαῖος δὲ τέσσαρας· Μουσαῖος ἕ· Ἰππίας δὲ καὶ Φερεκύδης ἐπτά.

So Thales says [11 B 2 DK] there are two of them ([sc. Hyades],…, according to Euripides [Phaethon, F 780 Nauck² = 783b Kannicht = F 2 Diggle] – three; according to Achaeus [of Eretria, TrGF 20 F 46] – four; in Musaios [2 B 18 DK] – five; but Hippias and Pherekydes [BNJ 3 F 90c = EGM 90c] say they are seven.

Commentary

(cf. 86 B 13 DK = Untersteiner 8 B 13; cf. EGM) All the authorities adduced here predate Hippias and none postdate him (Achaios of Eretria was active in Athens in the forties of the fifth century BC), although we know that not long after Hippias Timaeos of Tauromenium (BNJ 566 F 91) also dealt with Hyades, giving their detailed genealogy and their no doubt memorably high number
Hippias of Elis (6): Brill's New Jacoby : Brill Online

It seems likely that the whole passage draws from some part of Hippias’s Sunagoge, where, as we know, Musaios and Thales figured prominently as sources of wisdom (cf. above, on F 4 and F 5). Jacoby’s F 9 does not mention the verses of Ps.-Hesiod’s Astronomy (F 291 Merkelbach–West = F 227a Most) enumerating five names of Hyades and quoted in scholia ad Aratum 172 (p. 166.6-10 Martin): “Hesiod says about them: “Nymphs similar to the Graces, Phaïsile and Koronis and well-garlanded Kleeia and lovely Phaio and long-robed Eudora, whom the tribes of human beings on the earth call the Hyades”” (tr. G. Most). This citation might have figured in Hippias, too. This might have been an ‘entry’ comparable to the F identified by B. Snell (see above, comm. on F 4), where Hippias quotes Thales on water, and Homer, Hesiod and Orpheus on Okeanos to introduce his own ingenious reasoning in the end. This F might have been similar: quoting at some occasion Pherekydes’ claim regarding the number of Hyades alongside several contradicting utterances by eminent poets to conclude with Hippias’s own definitive statement, probably listing the names of the ‘true’ Hyades and some arguments to this effect. On this hypothesis, however, it is not clear whether we should attribute this F to some astronomic ‘thematic complex’ or to a section devoted to ‘problems’, προβλήματα, in the poets of old, (Ps.-)Hesiod in the event (I would rather opt for the latter possibility, given the intensity of the debate on the number of Hyades before Hippias). Be it as it may, this F does not belong to some form of straightforward presentation of the results of Hippias’s own studies in astronomy (cf. Plato, Hippias maior 285b = 86 A 11 DK = Untersteiner 8 A 11). The most popular names of Hyades (sometimes confused with Pleiades), most often presented as divine nurses (e.g. of Dionysos) and sisters of the tragically killed hunter Hyas, are the following: Ambrosia, Koronis, Eudora, Dione (or Thyone), Kleeia, Phaïsile (Aissyle), Polyxo, and Phaio. Hyades are first briefly mentioned in Homer, Iliad 18.486 (cf. M.W. Edwards, The Iliad. A Commentary. V: Books 17-20 (Cambridge 1991), ad loc.) = Hesiod, Erga 615 (cf. M. West, Hesiod. Works and Days (Oxford 1978), comm. ad loc.); cf. Euripides, Ion 1156. For their myth see esp. Hellenikos of Lesbos, BNJ 4 F 19a. The etymology of the name of Hyades has been debated ever since antiquity: ‘the Rainers’ from ῥιε¨θαι? Or perhaps from the shape of the constellation, allegedly close to the Greek letter ‘ipsilon’? Or from Dionysos’ appellation ‘Hyes’? For Hyades in general, cf. W. Gundel, RE 8 (1913), cols. 2615-2624, and recently V. Machaira, ‘Hyades’ LIMC 5 1 (1990), 543–546.

F 10

Scholia (Eustathius) ad Dionysium Periegetam 270

Translation

Subject: Genre: Geography
Source Date: Various
Historian’s Date: 5th-4th century BC,
4th century BC
Historical Period: Mythical Past

Ἰππίας μέντοι φησίν ἀπὸ τῶν Ὀκεανοῦ νυκτέριν, δύο γὰρ Ὀκεανίδας πρότερον γενέσθαι, Ἀσίαν καὶ Ἑυρώπην, ἢν ὅν τὰς χώρας εἰρήσθαι.

Yet Hippias says that [sc. two continents have received their names] on account of the daughters of Okeanos; for two of the Okeanidae were born first, Asia and Europe, after whom the continents have been named.

Commentary

(cf. 86 B 8 DK = Untersteiner 8 B 8) Our earliest witness to the genealogy of the Okeanidae is Hesiod, Theogony, 357 for Europe, and 359 for Asia (cf. M.L. West, Hesiod. Theogony (Oxford 1966), 266-267 (comm. ad loc.)). For the consecutive development of their genealogies, see in brief W.H. Roscher, Ausführliches Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie 3.1 (Leipzig 1897-1902), 805-809. M. Untersteiner (comm. ad loc.) thought that this F might have belonged to the Names of Peoples (cf. above, F 1), but this is doubtful. Rather, it is tempting to interpret F 10 as stemming from the encyclopedic Sunagoge (cf. above, comm. on F 4). Within the frames of this
project, one could expect Hippias using the aforementioned verses of the ‘poet of old’ Hesiod to corroborate his (partly genealogical) speculations regarding the parts of the oikoumene and their names (cf. Andron of Halikarnassos, BNJ 10 F 7). For an earlier sample of the debates on the issue and of that of the feminine eponyms of the continents, see Herodotos 4.45.2-5 (with a splendid comm. ad locc. by A. Corella, Erodoto. Le Storie. Volume IV. Libro IV: La Scizia e la Libia (Milano 1993), 268-69). Zenodotos of Ephesos (BNJ 19 F 3) mentions two Europeae, the Okeanid and the Phoenician queen, and Hegesippos of Mekyberna in Thrace (BNJ 391 F 3) adds yet another candidate, a Thracian queen.

F 11
Scholia ad Pindarum, Pythia 4.288a

Subject: Genre: Biography
Source Date: Various
Historian's Date: 5th-4th century BC,
4th century BC
Historical Period: Mythical Past


Commentary
(cf. 86 B 14 DK = Untersteiner 8 B 14) It may not be fortuitous that all the authorities mentioned here predate Hippias. The situation is not as clear as in the case of F 9, but it cannot be ruled out that the whole passage (of course not literally quoted), perhaps drawing from the Alexandrians, ultimately derives from Hippias’s Sunagoge. It fits in well with the method and organization of this work as reconstructed by B. Snell (see above, comm. on F 4), namely quoting a series of authorities on a given subject to conclude with his own opinion on the matter (if F 9 also belongs to Hippias in its entirety, Hippias would be esp. fond of referring to Pherekydes of Athens, the first Athenian prose writer and his important predecessor in the realm of ‘antiquities’). It is intriguing that the list of ancient authorities does not include Euripides who wrote three directly relevant tragedies: Ino and as many as two tragedies on Phrixos. Rather than suggest a pre-Euripidean perspective (note that Ino can be placed before 425 BC), this may perhaps betray the standpoint of the ultimate source of this scholion, an author (Hippias?) for whom Euripides’ version of the myth might have been the ‘normative’ one (the most popular at the time?) and who consequently notes only interesting ‘deviations’ from it (this hypothesis assumes a certain consistency in Euripides’ treatment of these stories). The names of Phrixos’ mother and stepmother alternate in ancient literary traditions (cf. Philostephanos of Kyrene, FHG 3.34 F 37; Ps.-Apollodoros, Bibliothèke 1.9.1-2); Phrixos’ stepmother Ino (later miraculously changed in Leukothea), the second wife of the Boeotian king Athamas, is confused both with his first wife Nephele and with the third one Themisto. A convenient brief treatment of this set of legends in P. Grimal, Dictionnaire de la mythologie grecque et latine (Paris 1958), s.v. Athamas (with the list of ancient authorities on the subject); cf. also T. Gantz, Early Greek Myth. A Guide to Literary and Artistic Sources (Baltimore 1993), 176-179.

F 12
Scholia ad Pindarum, Nemea 7.53

Subject: Genre: Biography
Source Date: Various
Historian's Date: 5th-4th century BC,
Hippias of Elis (6): Brill's New Jacoby : Brill Online

4th century BC
Historical Period: Unknown

Hippias (6) deserves more than a fleeting mention. The first possible

28/10/2009 00:07

Anonymous, Vita Homeri Romana p. 30.27

Subject: Genre: Biography
Source Date: Unknown
Historian's Date: 5th-4th century BC,

4th century BC
Historical Period: n.a.

F 13

Hippias, on the other hand, and Ephoros
[BNJ 70 F 99] – [sc. say Homer was] a
Kymaean.

Commentary

(= Anonymus I, Life of Homer (Vita Romana) 7.2 West; cf. 86 B 18 DK = Untersteiner 8 B 18) Cf. Anonymus III (Vita Scorialensis) 1 West (= Vit. Escor. II p. 29.8 Wilamowitz): Homer
from Kyme ‘according to Ephoros and to the historians’ (cf. also Proklos, Life of Homer 2

4th century BC
Historical Period: Unknown

τέσσαρας δὲ ἀναγράφει τὰς Ἐφύρας·
πρῶτην μὲν τὴν αὐθείς Κόρινθον
όνομασθέασαν ... ἐτέραν δὲ τὴν περὶ
Θεσσαλίαν ... τρίτην δὲ περὶ Ἡλιν. ἢς
Ἰππίας μνημονεύει· τετάρτην τὴν ἐν
Θεσπρωτίας.

He [an earlier commentator? Philo of
Byblos?] records four Ephyrai: the first
one is the city which is also called
Korinthos [cf. Iliad 6.152];... the second
one in Thessaly [cf. Odyssey 1.259];...
the third one, mentioned by Hippias, near
Elis; the fourth one – in Thesprotia.

Commentary

(cf. 86 B 15 DK = Untersteiner 8 B 15) At first, the mention of Hippias as the source of
information solely for Ephyra in Elis looks plausible (if this was the case, several works of his
could be taken into account, esp. the historical preface to his Olympionikai, cf. above, comm. on F
2; alternatively: F. Jacoby, FGrHist IIIc, p. 788: ‘offenbar in der Homererklärung und in lokal-
patriotischer tendenz’). However, in the extant corpus of Pindar the only Ephyra is the one in
Nemean Ode 7.53 (cf. Pythian Ode 10.55). This may not be due to sheer coincidence (instead of
other instances from Pindar, the scholion quotes two relevant passages from Homer). On the other
hand, we have at our disposal a rather abundant dossier pointing to a lively scholarly debate of these
homonyms (see esp. F. Jacoby, FGrHist IIIc, p. 787-789, on Apollodoros’ of Athens comm. on
the Catalogue of Ships, BNJ 244 F 179, 180a-b, and 181; cf. Strabo 8.3.5-6 (C 338-339); (the
epitome of) Stephanos of Byzantium, Ethnica, s.v. Εφύρας, most probably triggered by the
geo-ographically inconsistent use of the name in the Iliad and the Odyssey (iliad 2.659, 6.152 and
210, 13.301, 15.531; Odyssey 1.259 and 2.328; cf. also Eustathios ad locc.). Hence, it is tempting
to take this scholion and its reference to other occurrences of the toponym in Pindar as awkwardly
abbreviating a longer scholarly note (a section of a commentary on Pindar?) adducing, among other
things, this Pindaric example (A. Meineke in his ed. of Stephanos Byzantinos thought of Philo
of Byblos (BNJ 790 = FGrHist IVa 7 1060, ed. J. Radicke) in his work About Cities and their
Famous Citizens as the source of the scholion). And it is not altogether improbable that the debate
about this case of homonymy might have started in Hippias’ Sunagoge, and more precisely in a
(hypothetical) section on ‘problems’ in the poet of old. Besides Corinth, the Thessalian, Elean and
Thesprotian Ephyrae, our authorities mention homonymous towns in Arkadia, Aitolia,
Campania, and a small island neighboring the island of Melos.

Translation

'Ηππίας δ' αὖ καὶ 'Εφύρας Κυμαίον (sc.
γεγονέναι φασί τὸν Ὀμηρον).
candidate, suggested already by C. Müller (FHG 2.60), would be Hippias’s Trojan Speech (see above, comm. on T 2), i.e. an epideictic discourse on the suitable education of the young (cf. Plato, Hippias maior 286a-b); but as the characters of the speech were Nestor and Neoptolemos, they are rather unlikely to refer to Homer and his genealogy. Another possibility, and in my opinion the preferable one, would be Hippias’s Sunagoge. This work must have contained a section ‘on poets and sages’ (cf. also above, comm. on F 4), in the vein of (Hippias’s contemporary) Damastes of Sigeion (BNJ 5 F 11a). On this hypothesis, one may hesitate between the following two options: Hippias might have either recorded just a series of utterances in favor of the Kymean origin of Homer (and/or quoted some hypothetical passages from the epic tradition to the same effect) and ultimately presented his own opinion, or might have given a reasoning based on some presumed genealogy of Homer culminating in a citizen of Kyme (cf. Ephoros, BNJ 70 F 99, mentioned in Vita Romana 7.2 West, immediately after the passage which is our F 13). The former possibility looks more plausible as it accords better with Hippias’s method in the Collection (cf. B. Snell’s study quoted above, comm. on F 4). For prose writers referring to Homer’s place of origin before Hippias and in his times, see e.g. Pherecydes of Athens, BNJ 3 F 167; Hellanikos of Lesbos, BNJ 4 F 5b; Damastes of Sigeion, BNJ 5 F 11b; Gorgias of Leontinoi, 82 B 25 D-K (all FF stemming from Proklos’ Chrestomathy I (= Life of Homer 4 West = p. 26.14 Wilamowitz), which interestingly omits Hippias). On Homer’s ‘invention’ in the early Greek tradition, see recently B. Graziosi, Inventing Homer. The early reception of epic (Cambridge 2002).

Biographical Essay

A Reappraisal

F. Jacoby’s treatment of Hippias (FGrHist I (Kommentar), 477-478) was undeservedly brief, obviously due to his low assessment of Hippias’ role in the development of Greek historiography (cf. esp. the tiny introductory note to the comm. on FGrHist 6 as well as the virtual absence of Hippias from Jacoby’s programmatic paper in Klio 39 (1909), 80-123) and more generally owing to his overall concept of antiquarianism (for this, see recently the contributions by G. Schepens and B. Bravo, C. Ampolo (ed.), Aspetti dell’opera di Felix Jacoby (Pisa 2006), respectively: 149-171, and 227-257), which did not favor taking a closer look at Hippias. Hence, in my view, the need for a much more detailed commentary in this new edition. All the more so that B. Snell’s magisterial study of 1944 (but entering scholarly debates much later: see ‘Bibliography’ below), developed and completed in A. Patzer’s monograph of 1986, have fundamentally changed our view of Hippias’ work in general and finally enabled a reappraisal of his importance as one of the ‘founding fathers’ of ancient antiquarianism.

In his Names of Peoples (cf. F 1 above), Hippias remains in the main stream of the antiquarian studies of the time, but his two massive projects, Catalogue of the Olympic winners and Collection (Sunagoge), stand out in their historical context. His monumental and indeed eccentric Collection (cf. above, esp. F 4) gathered, organized thematically, and ingeniously commented upon a plethora of utterances of ‘the Ancients’ on a wide variety of subjects, accumulating a rich stock of earlier Greek (and purportedly barbarian) wisdom traditions in a polemical and highly selective manner. As one of the important sources of Aristotle, or perhaps even his main source of information about early Greek thinkers, this work has determined consecutive views of the Presocratic philosophy in its ancient and modern perception. However, the Sunagoge was not only a doxographical thesaurus of wisdom, but most probably also an erudite collection of ‘all kinds of antiquities’, including mythology, genealogies, foundation tales and early history of many Greek communities (cf. above, on T 3); its quasi encyclopedic ambitions surpassed the whole Greek antiquarian production thus far. The scope of the Collection cannot be accounted for without Hippias’ overall intellectual project that secured him the repute of a polymath (see above, on T 1 and 2) and aiming at instructing the young in all sorts of wisdom which lead to self-sufficiency (autarkēia) and versatility (polumathia) ensuring the (political, material etc.) success both in one’s native city and in a wider community of sages. In a word, Hippias’ antiquarianism is just one side of his philosophy. His Catalogue of the Olympic winners (see above, on F 2), most probably reacting to the epoch-making Priestesses of Hera in Argos by Hellanikos of Lesbos and to some extent fueled by Hippias’ Elean patriotism, was a laborious enterprise of several decades, consisting in gathering and consulting worldwide all available material (oral, documentary and literary alike) and in critically rethinking all existing chronological schemes pertaining to the history of the Games. This enabled him, first, to fix the date of the first Olympic games and then to attribute individual
names of *stadium* winners to the particular Games from 776 BC onwards. The role of his imaginative speculation therein must have been paramount, but he also set up extremely high standards of antiquarian research and built the backbone of the chronology of the archaic and classical Greek history, the chronological system we still cannot help referring to despite its objective lack of historical foundations.

Hippias is of course a good representative of the Sophistic movement, but his intellectual profile is not confined to this framework. His versatility and prolificity in many genres of prose and poetry alike, his variegated erudite research combined with his intense involvement in the political life of his community (see below) marks him off, as far as we can tell, also as compared with his predecessors and contemporaries in the field of antiquarian enquiries such as *Hellanikos*. In this perspective, he is paralleled by such multitalented and innovative figures as his older contemporary *Ion of Chios (BNJ 392 = 36 (25) DK)* or his peer *Kritias of Athens (88 (81) DK)*, who both seem to perceive their erudition as stemming from earlier wisdom tradition and as subordinate to their practical and political *paideia*. In a way, they form the pinnacle of an important current of the cohesive and undifferentiated culture of the archaic and early classical Greece – before its ‘fragmentation’, specialization and professionalization and before the differentiation of the cultural roles of the intellectual, which seems to have taken place in the fourth century BC (cf. R.W. Wallace, ‘Speech, Song and Text, Public and Private. Evolutions in Communications Media and Fora in Fourth-Century Athens’ W. Eder (ed.), *Die athenische Demokratie im 4. Jahrhundert v. Chr. Vollendung oder Verfall einer Verfassungsform?* (Akten eines Symposiums 3.-7. August 1992, Bellagio) (Stuttgart 1995), 199—217). Hippias’ *Collection* comes in the twilight of the history of this cultural paradigm and forms no less than its late apogee. To *Plato*, such an erudite and wide-ranging activity deeply immersed in politics looks vapid, superficial, obsolete and useless, in a word: unphilosophical. This is one of the factors involved in his deep antipathy to Hippias. And since Plato, who treats him much worse than other sophists, is our main source of information about Hippias, this perspective has long been dominating the general assessment of Hippias’ intellectual achievement.

**Life and Activities**

It is difficult to establish the chronological framework of *Hippias’* life. Our only source of information is *Plato*, who on the one hand puts in the mouth of Hippias the (perhaps much exaggerated and hence intended as amusing) claim that he is ‘much younger’ than *Protagoras* (*Hippias maior 382e = 86 A 7 DK*), on the other hand makes *Sokrates* mention Hippias, alongside *Gorgias* and *Prodikos*, as still teaching at the time of the trial (*Apologia 19e = 86 A 4 DK*). This would suggest some date after ca. 470 BC for his birthday and some unspecified moment at the beginning of the fourth century BC for his death at the earliest. Two other indications sometimes used to pinpoint both dates are vague and unreliable. The first one, *Isokrates* in his old age marrying *Plathane*, formerly the wife of Hippias the orator, and adopting *Aphareus* (the future orator and playwright), her youngest son (86 A 3 DK = *Ps.-Plutarch, Vitae decem oratorum* 4 (*Moralia* 838a)), is at best nonspecific. The second one (86 A 15 DK = *Tertullian, Apologeticus* 46), mentioning Hippias (but most probably the Athenian tyrant is confusedly meant here) ‘killed when plotting against his fatherland’, if regarding *Hippias of Elis* at all, might refer to Eleian political events at the beginning of the fourth century BC or at some point in the forties. The latter date appealed to M. Untersteiner (who ascribed to Hippias both the authorship of the *Anonymus Iamblichus* (as well as that of the interpolation in *Thucydides* 3.84.2) and of the *prooemium* later tacked on to *Theophrastos’ Characteres* (1-4)); he believed in the democratic sympathies of Hippias, so he linked his death with the failed democratic coup in (?) 343 BC (Untersteiner 8 A 15, comm. *ad loc.*). This would markedly down-date Hippias’ life and activity, but is far-fetched. I think we cannot rely on *Tertullian’s* testimony at all, nor has *Ps.-Plutarch* chances to be well informed on the matter. Meanwhile, if I am right in my preceding argument, we could locate the peak of his writing activity more specifically at the turn of the fifth century BC, when his *Sunagoge* and, perhaps a little later, his *Catalogue of the Olympic Winners*, might have been written. Ca. 420 BC, when he most probably started working on his both antiquarian projects, Hippias must have already been a well known figure, excelling esp. at poetry (cf. also below, on his possible involvement in big international politics as early as 421 BC); he was entrusted with composing an epigram for a statue in *Olympia* produced earlier by the esteemed sculptor *Kalon of Elis* (cf. above, comm. on T 2), whose activity might be dated, using an extant epigram on the basis of another statue in Olympia, to ‘ca. 450-425?’ (P.A. Hansen in *CEG* 1.388 = *LSAG* 221 #19 and 248 #16, Pl. 43. 19; ‘perhaps very soon after 450’, J.H. Jeffery, *LSAG* 245).
We are not informed about Hippias’ intellectual background, nor about his teachers (for his alleged teacher Hesigdamos, see above, comm. on T 1). Athenaios links his name with those of Antiphon of Rhamnos and of the musician Lampros when referring to the Platonic Menexenus (Athenaios 10.506f ad fin.), which could stimulate some speculation about their mutual links (cf. C. Müller, FHG 2.59); but in fact Hippias does not figure in Menexenus 326a at all, so Athenaios must have made a mistake. Given the very variety and the multidisciplinary character of his own teaching, Hippias must have travelled widely and socialize with a number of leading intellectuals of his time. In the sophist era, such a ‘curriculum’ would be understandable for a member of the highest aristocratic elite of his city. This must have started early, since Hippias emphasizes his young age when already traveling on his own for renown and money (Hippias maior 382e; but cf. above).

Later on, Hippias was able to reconcile his business travels, both lucratively lecturing (in Sparta, Athens, Olympia, in Sicily etc.) and massively gathering local material for his erudite projects (for his Catalogue of the Olympic Victors, Names of Peoples, and esp. for his Collection), with fulfilling his honorable duties as a distinguished ambassador of his fatherland Elis to Sparta, Athens and elsewhere (Plato, Hippias maior 281a (= 86 A 6 DK) and Philostratos, Vitae sophistarum 1.11.5-6 (= 86 A 2 DK); non vidi: J. Brunschwig, ’Hippias d’Elis, philosophe-ambassadeur’ K. Boudouris (ed.), The Sophistic Movement (Athens 1984), 276—296). Hippias might have been involved in the political negotiations leading to the anti-Spartan alliance of Elis with Athens, Argos, and Mantinea in 421 BC, resulting in Sparta’s exclusion from the Olympic Games in 420. He was most probably involved in some diplomatic missions in Sparta that did not prevent the Spartan intervention in Elis in 401-399/8 BC (?), but which ultimately saved Elis from losing the control over Olympia (this provides the context of, but does not explain his decision to write, the List of the Olympic victors, cf. above, comm. on F 2). His activity during the conflict with the Arcadian Confederacy in 365-362 BC remains highly hypothetical in view of the debates surrounding the date of his death (cf. above).

Besides his works commented in due course above and his variegated studies (in astronomy, arithmetics, geometry, prosody, music, theory of rhetoric, dialectic etc.), Hippias’ teaching focused also on ethics and political theory (including the idea of the contrast between nature and law, cf. briefly W.K.C. Guthrie, A History of Greek Philosophy 3 (Cambridge 1969), 118-120, and 284-285). He was famous for the practical skills ascribed to him, for his mnemonic capacities and for the wealth he earned as a sophist (this suggest a large number of disciples; in Athens, Plato typically associates with him the feeble Eudikos and Andron, the pompous Eryximachos, and the silly Phaidros). Although M. Untersteiner’s attribution of the Anonymus Iamblichi (89 DK) and of the prooemium to Theophrastos’ Characteres (1-4) to Hippias cannot stand, the interpretation of the Dissoi logoi (90 DK) as ultimately stemming from his teaching seems persuasive. Despite Hippias’ interest in mathematics, his identification with Hippias the discoverer of the Quadratrix (mentioned by Proklos, In Euclidem; cf. the discussion in Björnbo, RE 8 (1913), cols. 1707-1711), a curve used for the circle quadrature and for bisecting angles, remains doubtful.
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