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THE LIBRARY OF PHILOSOPHY.

THE LIBRARY OF PHILOSOPHY is in the first instance a contribution to the History of Thought. While much has been done in England in tracing the course of evolution in nature, history, religion, and morality, comparatively little has been done in tracing the development of Thought upon these and kindred subjects, and yet "the evolution of opinion is part of the whole evolution."

This Library will deal mainly with Modern Philosophy, partly because Ancient Philosophy has already had a fair share of attention in this country through the labours of Grote, Ferrier, and others, and more recently through translations from Zeller; partly because the Library does not profess to give a complete history of thought.

By the co-operation of different writers in carrying out this plan, it is hoped that a completeness and thoroughness of treatment otherwise unattainable will be secured. It is believed, also, that from writers mainly English and American fuller consideration of English Philosophy than it has hitherto received from the great German Histories of Philosophy may be looked for. In the departments of Ethics, Economics, and Politics, for instance, the contributions of English writers to the common stock of theoretic discussion have been especially valuable, and these subjects will accordingly have special prominence in this undertaking.

Another feature in the plan of the Library is its arrangement according to subjects rather than authors and dates, enabling the writers to follow out and exhibit in a way hitherto unattempted the results of the logical development of particular lines of thought.

The historical portion of the Library is divided into two sections, of which the first contains works upon the development of particular schools of Philosophy, while the second exhibits the history of theory in particular departments. The third series contains original contributions to Philosophy, and the fourth translations of valuable foreign works.

To these have been added, (1) by way of Introduction to the whole Library, an English translation of Erdmann's "History of Philosophy," long since recognised in Germany as the best; (2) translations of standard foreign works upon Philosophy.

J. H. MUIRHEAD,

General Editor.
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NOTICES OF THE PRESS.

"A splendid monument of patient labour, critical acumen, and admirable methodical treatment. . . . It is not too much to predict that, for the library of the savant, for the academical student, whose business it is to be primed in the wisdom of the ages, and for the literary dilettante, who is nothing if not well up in 'things that everybody ought to know,' these volumes will at once become a necessity for purposes, at least, of reference, if not of actual study. . . . We possess nothing that can bear any comparison with it in point of completeness."—Pall Mall Gazette.

"It is not necessary to speak of the great merits of Erdmann's History of Philosophy. Its remarkable clearness and comprehensiveness are well known. . . . The translation is a good, faithful rendering, and in some parts even reaches a high literary level."—Professor John Watson, in The Week, of Canada.

"It is matter of real congratulation, in the dearth still of original English or American work over the whole field of historical philosophy, that by the side of the one important German compend of this generation, the other, so well fitted to serve as its complement, is now made accessible to the English-speaking student."—Mind.

"It has been long known, highly esteemed, and in its successive editions has sought to make itself more worthy of the success it has justly achieved. Erdmann's work is excellent. His history of mediæval philosophy especially deserves attention and praise for its comparative fulness and its admirable scholarship. . . . It must prove a valuable and much-needed addition to our philosophical works."—Scotsman.

"The combination of qualities necessary to produce a work of the scope and grade of Erdmann's is rare. Industry, accuracy, and a fair degree of philosophic understanding may give us a work like Ueberweg's; but Erdmann's history, while in no way superseding Ueberweg's as a hand book for general use, yet occupies a different position. Erdmann wrote his book, not as a reference book, to give in brief compass a digest of the writings of various authors, but as a genuine history of philosophy, tracing in a genetic way the development of thought in its treatment of philosophic problems. Its purpose is to develop philosophic intelligence rather than to furnish information. When we add that, to the successful execution of this intention, Erdmann unites a minute and exhaustive knowledge of philosophic sources at first hand, equalled over the entire field of philosophy probably by no other one man, we are in a condition to form some idea of the value of the book. To the student who wishes, not simply a general idea of the course of philosophy, nor a summary of what this and that man has said, but a somewhat detailed knowledge of the evolution of thought, and of what this and the other writer have contributed to it, Erdmann is indispensable; there is no substitute."—Professor John Dewey, in The Andover Review.

"It is a work that is at once compact enough for the ordinary student, and full enough for the reader of literature. . . . At once systematic and interesting."—Journal of Education.

"The translation into English of Erdmann's History of Philosophy is an important event in itself, and in the fact that it is the first instalment of an undertaking of great significance for the study of philosophy in this country. Apart, however, from its relation to the Library to which it is to serve as an introduction, the translation of Erdmann's History of Philosophy is something for which the English student ought to be thankful. . . . A History of past endeavours, achievements, and failures cannot but be of great use to the student. Such a History, able, competent, trustworthy, we have now in our hands, adequately and worthily rendered into our mother-tongue."—Spectator.
EDITOR’S PREFACE.

The present translation of Erdmann’s *Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie* has been made from the third and last edition (Berlin, 1878), and executed by different hands, as follows: The Ancient Philosophy (vol. i., pp. 1–222), by Mr. Canning Schiller, B.A., late Exhibitioner of Balliol College, Oxford; The Patristic and Scholastic periods of Mediæval Philosophy (vol. i., pp. 225–542), by the Rev. Arthur C. McGiffert, Ph.D., of Lane Theological Seminary, Cincinnati; The Period of Transition of Mediæval Philosophy (vol. i., pp. 543–723), by the Rev. Andrew Rutherford, M.A., of Dundee; Modern Philosophy down to Kant (vol. ii., pp. 1–358), by Mr. George Macdonald, M.A., Master in Kelvinside Academy, Glasgow; Modern Philosophy from Kant to Hegel’s death (vol. ii., pp. 359–707), by Mr. B. C. Burt, M.A., formerly Fellow of Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore; German Philosophy since Hegel’s death (vol. iii., pp. 1–330), by the Rev. E. B. Spiers, M.A., of Glendevon, Dollar.

The Editor has revised and is responsible for the entire translation. But the rendering given to technical terms and phrases, and the literary form of the whole, are more particularly his work, while the general phraseology is, in the main, the unaltered work of the several translators. For the translation of the Author’s prefaces, the tables of contents and the indexes, the Editor is alone responsible.

The attention of the reader is directed to what the Author says in his prefaces—which have been reprinted largely on this account—in explanation of two characteristics of his work—the relatively full treatment of the Middle Ages, and the principle on which the bibliography has been given. Concerning the latter, no attempt has been made to supplement the Author’s citations, in order to furnish something approaching a systematic and complete bibliography. In some respects, such a plan undoubtedly would have been desirable; but on the whole it seemed better to preserve the Author’s
principle intact. As it stands, the literature given has a special significance in reference to the exposition; and it is believed that all scholars will appreciate the fact that extraneous additions have not been made. The Editor has sought, however, to add information about all works cited as in progress at the time of publication.

For obvious reasons of convenience, it has been thought advisable to publish the very lengthy "Appendix" to vol. ii. as a third volume. But in consideration of the fact that the Author does not regard this part of his work as strictly continuous with the rest (as is explained in vol. ii., § 330, 2), the designation of "Appendix" has been retained, although it now forms a separate volume. Dr. Erdmann's statements about the history of the "Appendix" are of course to be found in his prefaces to vol. ii. As this account of the German philosophy of this century is the only one of note extant, it is believed that it will be very welcome, notwithstanding the Author's conviction that he has here supplied, not a history, but only a contribution of material towards a history. The Editor has undertaken to bring the necrology of this part down to date, and to add the important works of Lotze and Eduard von Hartmann that have appeared since its publication. He has also supplied vol. iii. with a General Index to the entire work.

In conclusion, the Editor desires to acknowledge his indebtedness to Professor J. H. Muirhead, M.A., of London, for reading the sheets on Plato and Aristotle, and for correcting the second proof of the entire third volume after page 96; to Miss Arlisle M. Young, B.A., for assistance with portions of the proof; and to many others whom he cannot mention by name for information and assistance of the most varied kinds. As manifestly more appropriate to the English version in three volumes, it has been decided to omit the designation of "Outlines" from the title-page, although the work is referred to by that name in the Author's prefaces and in the text, particularly of the third volume.

It should perhaps be added that Professor Erdmann gave his ready assent to the translation of his work, and has kindly communicated with the Editor on any points of unusual difficulty.

W. S. H.
A few words respecting the origin of these Outlines may perhaps prevent them from receiving unwarranted criticisms in addition to the numerous ones which will doubtless be deserved.

As it seems to me that Schleiermacher's remark, "A professor who dictates sentences for his students to take down, in reality claims for himself the privilege of ignoring the discovery of printing," although likely to be forgotten by many, is in danger of being discredited by no one, I have, where it appeared desirable that my students should carry home notes approved, not only by them but by me, had Outlines printed for my lectures. But I thought such outlines unnecessary for the History of Philosophy. For a long time, in answer to the oft-recurring question, what compend I preferred, I was able to recommend only Reinhold's, much as his book leaves to be desired, since Tennemann's Manual was out of print, Marbach's seemed never likely to be completed, and, finally, Ueberweg's learned work was not yet expected. As I saw, however, that (what would have horrified the author himself) Schwegler's Outline, and at length even pitiable imitations of this cursory work, were the only sources from which students,—especially those preparing for examinations,—gained their knowledge, I attempted to sketch an Outline which should give my students in concise form what I had said in my lectures, and which at the same time should indicate throughout where the materials for a more thorough study were to be found. For Ancient Philosophy, inasmuch as we possess the excellent works by Brandis and Zeller, and the valued collection of citations by Ritter and Preller, this method could be followed, as indeed it likewise could for the Gnostics
and Church Fathers; and hence the first fifteen sheets of these *Outlines* contain only in very few parts more extended expositions than I was accustomed to give in my lectures. Had I been able to follow this plan to the end of the work, the further designation "For Lectures" would have been added to the title of "Outlines," and it would have appeared in one volume instead of in two. That, however, this would not be possible, was clear to me as soon as I came to the treatment of the Schoolmen. However great my respect for the labours of Tiedemann on the earlier Schoolmen, and of H. Ritter and Hauréau on the later; however much, further, I am indebted to monographs upon individual Schoolmen; with whatever appreciation and wonder, finally, I regard the gigantic labour which Prantl undertook in behalf of the Mediæval Logic, I nevertheless found so much in the philosophers since the ninth century, of which the existing expositions of their doctrines said nothing, and I saw myself so often obliged to deviate from the traditional order and arrangement, that, especially as I desired in this book to keep myself free from all controversy, I regarded greater fulness essential to the establishment of my views. The introduction of citations into the text of this part was furthermore obligatory, since we do not possess a chrestomathy of Mediæval Philosophy, such as Ritter and Preller have prepared for the Ancient. The limitation "For Lectures" had to be omitted; for I am able to compress only a very condensed summary of what the last twenty-four sheets of this volume contain into the few weeks which I can devote to the Middle Ages in my lectures. On account of the difference of character which thus falls to the first and to the two other thirds of this volume, it has come about (what may strike many readers as strange), that Mediæval Philosophy here occupies more than twice the space devoted to the Ancient. Whoever would make out of this a charge of disproportion, and refer me to many of the recent expositions of the history of philosophy as models worthy of imitation, should first consider that where Brandis, Zeller, and others, had
convinced me of the correctness of their views, I naturally did not need to introduce also the reasons for them. On the contrary, every assertion of mine which conflicted with the customary view had to be substantiated. In the second place, however, I wish to say, that I am not moved to imitate the example of those who begin by asserting that the Middle Ages brought forth no healthy thoughts, and then proceed to give themselves no further trouble about them, except perhaps to relate some curiosity or other from Tennemann, in order after all to say something. It may be a very antiquated notion, but I hold it to be better,—not to speak of the dogmatism of proceeding otherwise,—first to study the doctrines of these men, and then to ask whether they, who among other things have given us our entire philosophical terminology, are to be counted as nothing. I know very well that what we have ourselves produced, and not learned from another, is wont on that account to seem more important to us than to others, perhaps indeed than it is; and so I will not dispute with my critic who would bring the charge, perhaps, that because I myself was obliged to pore so long over Raymond Lully, I now burden my reader with such a lengthy description of his famous Art. But I shall be ready to declare this exhaustiveness to be wholly useless only when the critic tells me that he (more fortunate than I) has been able easily to gather from the previous expositions of Lully's doctrines how it happened that Lully's disciples at one time nearly equalled in number the followers of Thomas Aquinas, that Giordano Bruno became enthusiastic over him, that Leibnitz had such a high opinion of him and got so much from him, etc. What I mean to say, is this: To the reproach of disproportion, I answer by way of apology, that where I only said what was to be found elsewhere, I could be brief; but where I differed from others, I was obliged to be explicit.

J. E. ERDMANN.

Halle, 1865.
PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION.

INASMUCH as the Preface to the first edition fixes the point of view from which I desire that this work should be judged—and it is on that account that I have had it reprinted—it only remains here to speak of the points wherein this second edition differs from the first. With the single exception that the earlier exposition of Weigel's doctrines was exchanged for quite another (partly because I took into consideration Sebastian Franck, omitted before, but also for other reasons), I have altered nothing, but only made additions. A somewhat larger size nevertheless made it possible to meet the wish of the publishers not to increase the number of sheets. I was brought to make most of these additions by various reviews, of which my book has received a gratifying number, among them undeservedly laudatory ones. Most of my critics will find that I have followed their suggestions. Where that is not the case, let them not at once suppose that their suggestions passed unheeded. When, however, the grounds given in my book for separating Anaxagoras from the earlier philosophers are only met with the question whether this is really necessary,—when my separation of Neo-Platonism from ancient philosophy, supported by reasons, is treated as an unheard-of innovation, although Marbuch in his Text-book, and Brandis in his Lectures, as I know from his own lips, have made precisely the same division,—when, finally, my pointing out that the doctrines of Thomas Aquinas and those of Duns Scotus form different phases of scholasticism, meets only with the peremptory assertion that both stand upon the same level (to be sure, with the immediately added declaration that Duns is related to Thomas as Kant is to Leibnitz),—I am only able, inasmuch as once for all I will not enter into controversy, to pass over such unsubstantiated, or self-destroying criticisms in silence. Other suggestions I should perhaps
have followed, had not those who gave them made it themselves impossible. Thus, an anonymous critic in the Allg. Augsb. Zeit., whom one cannot otherwise charge with not being perfectly explicit, has omitted to indicate the passages where my book seeks to force applause by "exits from the stage," and thus deprived me of the opportunity of proving to him by expunging the same, that a ranting actor is at least as offensive to me as to him.

It was not through criticisms that the alteration was occasioned by which the second edition contains a considerable amount of bibliography wanting in the first. This has not been added in order to make my work into a serviceable reference book; even were I prepared to write such a work, I should certainly have forborne doing so now that we possess such a good one in Ueberweg's Outlines. But what I had declared in the Preface to the first edition as my purpose: at every point to indicate where advice and instruction for a profounder acquaintance with any philosopher was to be found, was not adequately executed, so long as the titles of books were unmentioned from which I myself had gathered information, and which I thus knew from experience to contain it. The list of these has been completed, and in addition those books are indicated which I have read with profit since the appearance of the first edition. The limitation solely to such books as have been of value to myself, rests upon a wholly subjective principle, and must result in a great disproportion in the literature given. But if I had abandoned this method, my book would have lost its character, and therewith its chief, perhaps only, worth.

My entire work, indeed, is based upon a principle which on my behalf may be called a subjective one, and shows, just as the bibliography it contains, no proportion whatever in its several parts. Had my exposition of the history of philosophy sought to be like the great panoramas which one surveys by following round a circular gallery, and hence by constantly changing the point of view, but which, precisely on that ac-
count, can be executed only by several artists working upon them at the same time, I should have looked about me for coadjutors, and should have followed the example shown by famous works of the day in pathology and therapeutics. This, however, since I belong to the old school, I would not do, but adopted as my model, not the painter of a panorama, but the landscape painter, who delineates a scene as it appears from a single, unalterably fixed point of view. Be it, now, that the subject chosen was too large for me; be it that I did not set about the work soon enough; be it that I did not apply myself to it assiduously enough; be it, finally, that all these causes were combined together,—no one knows better than I, that what I have exhibited before the world is no painting on which the artist has put the finishing touches. Let it therefore be regarded as a sketch in which only certain parts have been executed in detail, namely those in which light and colour effects never to recur were involved; while other portions have remained in sketch-like touches, since here the work could be completed at leisure in the studio, after earlier studies or the paintings of others. To drop the figure—I have sought before everything so to represent such systems as have been treated in a step-motherly fashion by others, that a complete view of them might be obtained, and perhaps the desire aroused to know them better. And this because, in particular, my chief aim has after all always been to show that, not chance and planlessness, but strict coherence, rules the history of philosophy. For this end, however, philosophers not of the first rank (just as for Zoology, the Amphibians, and other intermediate species) are often almost more important than the greatest. More than all else, however, this my aim demands an unswerving adherence to a single point of view. Since this cannot be occupied by two at the same time, I might treat in my exposition only of what I myself had, if not discovered, then at any rate seen. The gratifying consciousness that I have, not deviated from this singleness of view will be felt, if I mistake not, by the attentive reader.
This open, I might almost say innocent, character would have lost its physiognomy, or only been able to assume it again artificially, if I had copied from others without verification, even were it only in the matter of the iron inventory of the customary bibliography. "If I mistake not," I said. Without this reservation I declare that now, but only now, I am certain, that everything that I have made an author say, often perhaps through a misinterpretation,—the possibility of which I of course do not deny,—has nevertheless always been found in him with my own eyes. In the case of many a remark, it would now be very difficult for me to find among my excerpts the passage where it stands; in the case of others, it would be impossible without indeed reading through the entire author, as the exposition was made direct from the text without extracts. Now, however, I am in the fortunate position of one who, when a promissory note is presented to him written in his own hand, dated at his place of residence, without referring to his diary to convince himself that he was not at home on that day, refuses acceptance, because he never gives promissory notes. It is unpleasant for any one when his critic exclaims: "What thou assertest is said, is nowhere to be found," and so, where I feared that, I have given citations; and I am accustomed, when this fate nevertheless befalls me, to search first among my extracts, then in the books themselves from which the extracts were taken, to see whether I cannot find a quotation. If I do not find it, I relinquish the pleasure of having convinced my critics. For myself, the matter no longer disquiets me, which, did I otherwise, might give me a sleepless night. This my certainty, resting upon subjective ground, I cannot of course communicate to others; and they will, where they find assertions without citations, consult other expositions. So much the better; for, as I have no love for the homines unius libri, I have not wished by my book to increase their number.

J. E. ERDMANN.

Halle, 1869.
PREFACE TO THE THIRD EDITION.

Since on the appearance of a new edition of a book it is usually important for the reviewer, often also for the reader, speedily to ascertain the deviations from the last edition, I give the additions which have enriched or otherwise altered the present work. I shall confine myself, of course, to the more extended ones. For although the result of the reading of an entire work has been frequently condensed into a few short sentences, I nevertheless would not venture to call attention to these cases, as I will not offer the reading public the history of my "Outlines," instead of my "Outlines of History." Accordingly, I note first that in § 113, instead of the mere mention of the name, Hermes Trismegistus has received a full exposition. As I am unfortunately unacquainted with Arabic, the reference of his Holiness, the Bishop of Speyer, in a letter to me of the 8th November, 1873, to the "Youthful editor of the Arabic Trismegistus," remained unnoticed. I can only concur in the wish of his Reverence, expressed in the same letter, that some one would edit, together with Hermes, the _Theologia Aristotelis_ and the _Liber de causis._—The additions in § 135 on the Latin Apologists, are at the same time an expression of indebtedness to Ebert for the information which his excellent book on the Christian Latin Literature affords. § 147 is designed to bring Isidore of Seville, previously only mentioned by name, to merited recognition; likewise § 155, at Prantl's suggestion, William of Hirschau. In § 182, the previously unmentioned _Theologia Aristotelis_ is noticed. Averroes occasioned me the greatest trouble in the entirely
written § 187, about whose doctrines I believe I have said some things hitherto nowhere to be found. In the following sections Joël's thorough investigations have occasioned additions, as likewise in § 237 has Fr. Schultze's Philosophie der Renaissance. § 232, which treats of the German Reformation and its influence on philosophy, is wanting in the earlier editions.

In accordance with my previously-mentioned plan, I have added the titles of books from which I have learnt anything worthy of note. On the other hand, it seemed to me, inasmuch as I state exactly where all the citations are to be found in Ritter and Preller, and in Mullach, a waste of space should I particularly specify some of them besides. So I have struck out the references of the earlier editions. What I have further to say to the reader, he will find, be he so disposed, in the prefaces to the earlier editions, which for that reason I have had reprinted.

J. E. ERDMANN.

HALLE, 1876.

EDITOR'S PREFACE TO THIRD ENGLISH EDITION.

In preparing the Third Edition of this translation for publication, the Editor has been specially indebted to Professor Henry C. King, of Oberlin College, for a number of important corrections and suggestions, as well as for the "Outline" which is printed at the end of the third volume. His obligations are due also to Mr. Theodore G. Soares, B.A., for a careful revision of the Indexes, which, it is hoped, will now be found wholly free from error. Other alterations have been confined to such few verbal improvements as the limits of a stereotyped work would permit.

The Editor may take this opportunity of expressing his appreciation of the uniformly generous treatment he has received at the hands of his critics.

W. S. HOUGH.
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HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY.

INTRODUCTION.

§ 1.
If the History of Philosophy admitted of no other mode of treatment than either the simply learned, which regards all systems as equally true, as being alike mere opinions; or the sceptical, which sees equal error in all; or lastly, the eclectic, which discovers fragments of the truth in all, we should have to agree that those are right who, in the interests of philosophy, warn all, or at least beginners, against studying its history. But whether a better method exists, and which is the right one, can only be decided by a consideration of the conception of a history of philosophy.

§ 2.
Philosophy arises when, not content with the facts of existence (that is, of the world), men proceed to the inquiry into their reasons, and ultimately into their unconditioned reason, i.e. their necessity or rationality. It is not, however, on this account, merely the work of an individual thinker; rather, there are laid down in it the practical and theoretical convictions of mankind, just as the wisdom and the experience of individuals is laid down in their maxims and principles, and that of nations in their proverbs and laws. Just as a people or a country utters its wisdom and its will through the mouth of its sages and lawgivers, so the world-spirit (i.e. collective humanity) utters its (or the world its) wisdom and its will through the philosophers. If, therefore, we substitute "world-wisdom" for philosophy, "the world" here stands as at once the subjective and objective genitive.

VOL. I.
§ 3.

And just as the individual passes through the various stages of life without detriment to his unity, so the world-spirit is in succession the spirit of the various times and centuries. Man in the eighteenth century is not the same as in the seventeenth. If by the same substitution by which we say "world" instead of "world-spirit," we say "times" instead of "spirit of the age," and "century" instead of "spirit of the century," then every time has its own wisdom, every century its own philosophy. And those who are the first to utter it, are the philosophers of that particular time. They have the true knowledge of their time, and the philosophy, in which the time arrives at knowledge of itself, does nothing but formulate the unconscious life, the instinctive tendencies of that time. It only utters its secret, utters what people feel to be true and right.

§ 4.

This dependence upon a particular time, into which every philosophy is driven by the fact that it is final truth only for that time, impairs its absoluteness just as little as duty ceases to be unconditional because duties are different at different times of life. Nor does duty thereby become transitory; for the boy's function of obedience is preserved in the man—who learnt by obedience to command—in the form of having obeyed. Moreover, since philosophy ever follows like the fruit upon the flower of an age, it has often appeared to be as the cause of a decay, which, however, it never calls forth, but only betrays. In particular, it is not philosophy that destroys naïve piety, but rather this must have ceased before philosophic movements can appear.

§ 5.

Just as the world-spirit passes through the different spirits of the ages that make up the history of the world, so its consciousness, the wisdom of the world, passes through the different consciousnesses of the times, and it is just in this that the history of philosophy consists. In the one case, as in the other, there is nothing lost; but the results of one age and one philosophy afford the material and the starting-point for
their successors. Hence the distinctness and even the conflict of philosophic systems is no disproof of the assertion that all systems of philosophy are only the development of a single philosophy, but rather speaks in favour of this same assertion.

§ 6.

Every philosophic system is the outcome of that or those put forward before it, and contains the germs of its successor. The first part of this assertion is not overthrown by exceptions in the shape of philosophers apparently, and as a rule only apparently, self-taught, nor by the fact that such intellectual descent is generally protested against; for the connection need not be one of direct discipleship, and opposition also is a form of dependence. Just as little is the second disposed of by the fact that no philosopher wishes to be the father of the system which goes beyond him. That this should be so is inevitable by reason of the limitations, without which nothing great is achieved, and without which, therefore, no system is constructed. This phenomenon therefore recurs everywhere; but it proves nothing, because the full and proper significance of a system cannot be rightly appreciated by its founder, but only by posterity, which in this respect also stands on a higher eminence than the former.

§ 7.

The history of philosophy can be represented rightly, i.e. in its true nature, only with the help of philosophy, since it alone enables us to trace in the sequence of systems, not random change, but progress, i.e. necessity, and since also it is impossible, without a consciousness of the course of the human spirit, to show what has been the course of its wisdom, and the recognition of such necessity and such consciousness is, as we saw in § 2, philosophy. The objection that a philosophic representation of the history of philosophy must not be called history, but rather philosophy of the history of philosophy, is distinguished neither by its novelty nor by its insight; it forgets that even an unphilosophic representation is not the history itself, but only a representation of the history.

§ 8.

A philosophic treatment of the history of philosophy takes
an interest, like the merely learned, in the finest differences of systems, admits, with the sceptics, that they conflict with one another, and concedes to the eclectics that there is truth in all. Hence it neither loses sight of the thread of growing knowledge, like the first, nor regards the result as nil, like the second, nor, like the third, recognises in every system only pieces of developed truth, but the whole truth only in an undeveloped form. And thus it does not, like the first, beguile us into regarding philosophic doctrines as mere fancies and opinions, nor does it, like the second, shake the confidence in reason necessary to philosophy, nor lastly does it, like the eclectic method, make us indifferent towards dependence on a principle, i.e. towards systematic form.

§ 9.

And this method not only avoids these dangers to philosophy, but, by teaching us to philosophize about the history of philosophy, it is so far from seducing us from philosophic activity, that it is even a practical introduction to it. And indeed, where the interest in philosophy has given way to that in its history, and especially where a shrinking from strictly philosophic, i.e. metaphysical, inquiries manifests itself, a philosophic representation of the history of philosophy is perhaps the best means to induce those who merely wish to hear the tale, to join in the philosophizing, and to show to those who doubt the importance of metaphysical definitions, how wholly different views of the world and of life often depended only on the difference of a couple of categories. In some circumstances, the history of philosophy, though in the system of science it forms the conclusion, may be the subject of which the study is to be recommended most of all to beginners.

§ 10.

Since every attempt at philosophy must have a definite character, and it is impossible to represent a development as rational unless it leads up to some end, every philosophic representation of the history of philosophy must be coloured by the philosophy which the author regards as the completion of the previous development. To require the contrary of this under the name of dispassionateness and impartiality is to make a preposterous demand. It is true that fairness must be
required of every historian, and it is the duty also of the philo-
sophic historian. And if, in the case of the former, fairness
consists in his narrating, not how he himself, but how history
has judged this or that phenomenon, it is the duty of the latter
to display the rationality of this judgment, i.e. to justify it.
And in that alone does the criticism consist which he not only
may, but should apply.

§ 11.

Philosophic criticism, then, must display the necessity, both
of the appearance of a philosophic system in history, and of
its supersession by another which went beyond it, and there
must therefore be distinguished in it a positive and a negative
element. Now this necessity is twofold: the appearing and
the superseding of a system is necessary to the history of the
world, in that the former was conditioned by the character of
the time of which the system was the right understanding, and
the latter, again, in that the time changed (vid. § 4). And again,
the necessity, in the history of philosophy, of each of these
processes is exhibited, when there is shown in a system the
conclusion to which previous systems formed the premises, and
on the other hand, that it was necessary to advance in order
not to stand still half-way. Hence we can note it as a defect
of a system only if it fails to go on to what follows imme-
diately from it, but we must not take as the standard, whereby
to judge it, a system separated from it by intermediate stages.
And just as history has corrected Cartesianism by Spinozism,
but not by the Kantian doctrine, so it is only by Spinoza and
not by Kant that the philosophic critic may estimate Descartes.
The observance of this rule secures a philosophic historian of
philosophy against committing himself to a single system in a
narrow-minded way, without requiring him to disavow his own.

§ 12.

The epochs of the history of philosophy, i.e. the points at
which a new principle is asserted, as well as the periods which
they dominate, the spaces of time required to set free the new
doctrine from its revolutionary and despotic character, run
parallel to the epochs and periods of the world's history, but
in such a way that they succeed them at a greater or less dis-
tance, but never precede them. Epoch-making systems them-
selves can have no appreciative understanding for the past, which, however, will be shown all the more by those that conclude a period. Hence the adherents of the former type of philosophy will, in their treatment of its history, run greater danger than those of the latter of disregarding historical justice.

§ 13.

Literature.

Until the end of the 18th century all expositions of the history of philosophy only sought to satisfy the interest of the learned, of sceptics, or of eclectics. After that there is not one that is not coloured more or less by philosophy. And in most cases we must complain not so much that each author regards his own system as the conclusion of the previous development, as that his views are continually making themselves heard before the narrative has reached its end. This holds good already of the first writer who regards the history of philosophy from a philosophic point of view, viz. the Frenchman Degerando. And the Germans who followed his example can just as little be acquitted of his fault. Kant, who himself had given only hints as to how the history of philosophy was to be philosophically treated, left the development of his idea to his disciples. But his system was too much of an epoch-making one to be able to lead to a just estimation of the past. Hence, in the historians of the Kantian school, the comparison, censured above in § 11, of even the oldest systems, with doctrines that could only be propounded in the 18th century—a procedure which so

---

1 Stanley: History of Philosophy; 1655, 2nd ed. 1687: also as: Historia philosophica autore Thoma Stanlejo. Lips., 1712. 2 vols. small fol.
3 J. J. Brucker: Historia critica philosophiae a mundi incunabulis. Lips., 1766, 6 vols. 4to. J. G. Buhle's: Lehrbuch der Geschichte der Philosophie und kritische Literatur derselben; Göttingen, 1796–1804, 8 Pts. 8vo, is also eclectic.
disfigures the otherwise valuable works of Tennemann.\(^1\) Fichte's doctrine could neither rule long nor stimulate to historical studies; and thus it had at the most this result for the treatment of history, that the canon was established even more firmly than in Kant, that progress consisted in the compensation of one-sided oppositions. Far more lasting was the effect of Schelling's philosophy;\(^2\) what could alone be regretted was, that the individual differences of the subject-matter were obliterated by the ready-made scheme applied to it. The peculiar views on the history of philosophy, and of ancient philosophy in particular, which Schleiermacher developed in his lectures, had already long been made known to the reading public through others,\(^3\) when they were published after his death.\(^4\) To some extent this was also the case with Hegel, with whose way of regarding isolated portions of the history of philosophy and of its course, disciples\(^5\) and readers of his works\(^6\) familiarized the world, long before his lectures on the history of philosophy\(^7\) were placed before it. The greater part, however, of the historical works proceeding from the Hegelian school treat only of isolated periods, although some\(^8\) also attempt to narrate the history of philosophy as a whole. Connected with these are the surveys attempted from

---

\(^1\) W. G. Tennemann: *Geschichte der Philosophie.* Leipzig, 1794, 12 vols. (unfinished). The same: *Grundriss der Philosophie,* 1812. 5th ed. by Wendt, 1829. (Distinguished by its copious bibliography. Often translated.)


\(^3\) E.g. in H. Ritter's *Geschichte der ionischen Philosophie.* Berlin, 1821.


\(^5\) As Rötscher, in his: *Aristophanes und sein Zeitalter,* 1827, where Hegel's views about Socrates are developed.


different but yet kindred points of view. Speculative eclecticism has greatly increased the interest in historical works both in France, and also in Germany; and we owe to it accounts of the development both of philosophy as a whole and of separate philosophic problems, in which the effect of the ideas of Schelling and Hegel is perceptible. From their influence not even those have been able wholly to withdraw themselves, who in their account take up a different position, more akin to that of Kant, or quite peculiar to themselves, or protest against every philosophic treatment of history as an a priori construction.

§ 14.

Just as the history of the world is divided into three main periods by the entrance of Christianity and the Reformation, so in the history of philosophy, on the one hand those systems

---

which arose as yet wholly uninfluenced by Christian ideas, and on the other, those which developed under the influence of the ideas called forth by the Reformation, stand apart from the intermediate systems, because of them neither of these assertions holds good. These three main periods we shall denominate the Ancient, the Mediæval, and the Modern.
PART FIRST.
ANCIENT PHILOSOPHY.
ANCIENT PHILOSOPHY.

INTRODUCTION.

§ 15.

The task of apprehending its own nature in thought can only tempt the human mind, and indeed it is only then equal to it, when it is conscious of its intrinsic dignity. And as in the East, except among the Jews, this point is not reached, we must not be induced to talk of a pre-Hellenic philosophy, or worse still, of pre-Hellenic systems, either by the rules of propriety and external decorum enunciated by the Chinese sages,¹ or by the pantheistic and atheistic doctrines which the Indian spirit attains in the Mimansa, and in Kapila’s teaching in the Sankhya, or by the intellectual exercises to which it rises in the Nyaya,² or finally by the confused semi-religious and semi-physical doctrines of the ancient Persians³ and of Egypt.⁴ For, since it is the Greek ear that first catches the γνωθί σεαυτόν, philosophizing, i.e., the attempt to comprehend the nature of the human mind, in Western or at least in Greek parlance, is called thinking; and the history of philosophy begins with the philosophy of the Greeks.

¹ Windischmann’s, Schmidt’s, and other idealizing panegyrics on Chinese wisdom have been successfully opposed, especially by Stuhr.
² The reports of Colebrooke, Balentine, Röer, and Max Müller supply the data of an estimate which avoids the extremes of the earlier adoration and the subsequent contempt.
³ The fancies of Röhde and others have long been forgotten, and the later origin of many of the doctrines of the Zendavesta has been proved.
⁴ Aristotle, though he calls the Egyptian priests the first philosophers, is yet unable to mention any philosophic doctrine of theirs. Röth, who more recently has been foremost in insisting on the Egyptian origin of all philosophy, nevertheless throughout calls their doctrine a faith, and himself denies the scientific importance of Pherecydes, whom he asserts to have deviated least from it.
§ 16.

SOURCES AND AUTHORITIES.

As the whole or the greater part of the writings of the older Greek philosophers have been lost, we are compelled to draw upon the accounts of those to whom they were still accessible. And although historical works on individual philosophers were composed even before the time of Socrates, and since his time there has been no school that failed to produce several such works, and hardly one from which there have not issued treatises on the different tendencies of philosophy, this avails us but little, as the majority of these works, a list of the authors and titles of which has been compiled by Jonsius 1 and Fabricius 2 with unwearing industry, have also been lost. For us the oldest authorities are Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, Seneca, and Plutarch, all of whom only quote the opinions of others by the way, in order to develop their own, and from whom therefore we can hardly expect fidelity, and much less require completeness. Were the treatise of Plutarch on the doctrines of the philosophers 3 really genuine, it would certainly be the oldest account we possess of the different systems. But it has now been shown that it is only an excerpt from the genuine work of Plutarch, which Stobæus 4 still had before him, and from which he made extracts. Thus the nearly contemporaneous works of Sextus Empiricus 5 and Diogenes Laertius 6 may perhaps be older than this work of

---

1 Joannis Jonsii Holsati: De scriptoribus historiae philosophicae. Libb. II. Francof. 1659.
6 Διογένους Δαμερίου περὶ βιῶν καὶ γνωμῶν καὶ ἀποθεμάτων τῶν ἐν φιλοσοφίᾳ εὐδοκιμητῶν βιβλία ἑδέκα, first appeared in Latin at Rome, 1475, fol., afterwards in Greek at Bale, 1533, Froben, 4, and in 1570, pub. by H. Stephanus. The latter commentaries, as well as those of Casaubon and Menagius, were included by Pearson in his edition: Lond., 1664. This has been reprinted, imperfectly by Meibom: Amst., 1692, 2 vols. 4to; far better
the Pseudo-Plutarch. These are our most important sources, although both must, for contrary reasons, be used with caution. The history of philosophy ascribed to a contemporary writer, the physician Galen, is not genuine, but a compilation from (the Pseudo-)Plutarch and Sextus. The later commentators also on Aristotle,\(^1\) as well as some of the Fathers,\(^2\) are important, because they possessed much that has since been lost. The collections of the chief passages out of the above writings, which have been made from time to time,\(^3\) are the most meritorious preliminaries to the treatises on Greek philosophy. In this respect progress has been so rapid, especially in Germany, that works which a few decades ago were justly praised,\(^4\) are to-day forgotten, because so much better ones have been since published.\(^5\)


\(^1\) Above all, Simplicius, who still possessed the lost history of Porphyry. Afterwards, John Philoponus.


\(^3\) Παραρτέμι (Preparationes evangelica). Ed. Heinichen: Leipz., 1852, 2 vols. 8vo. Hippolytus, especially in the first book of his Philosophumena, which after their discovery by Gronovius used to be ascribed to Origen, until they were rediscovered by Miller (Hippolyti reformationes omnium haeresium libb. x. rec. lat. vertt. L. Duncker et F. G. Schneiderw. 2 voll. Gött., 1856–59). Augustine: especially in his Civitas Dei and Retraactiones.


§ 17.

It does not follow from the fact that the attempt to solve the riddle of one's own existence and of existence generally is in Greek called thinking, that the philosophic spirit at once thinks in the characteristic Greek manner or grasps its own Hellenism in its purity and superiority to all barbarism. Rather, just as man rises above the level of the beast only by passing through it in his pre-human (immature) state, so Greek philosophy matures in the direction of its aim, to solve that fundamental problem (§ 15) in the Hellenic spirit, in such a way that it at first answers the question contained therein in a pre-Hellenic sense. Hence those who belong to this period of immaturity seem "dreamers" to the later philosophers, for the same reason that we are wont to call embryonic life a dream-life. That which had been the principle of the religious and moral being, and the life of mankind in its pre-Hellenic stages, is here formulated as the principle of philosophy; and even if the several Greek philosophers had not been influenced by the several stages of popular culture, we should be able to assert and to comprehend their parallelism.


FIRST
PERIOD OF ANCIENT PHILOSOPHY.
GREEK PHILOSOPHY IN ITS IMMATURITY.
INTRODUCTION.

§ 18.

In Greece, as everywhere else, philosophy becomes prominent when the heroic struggle to acquire the conditions of existence has been followed by its enjoyment, the labour for the necessaries of life by the luxury of artistic creation and of thought, and the unconscious growth of custom by its formulation into laws, necessitated by the attacks to which it has been subjected; in short, when the unquestioning acceptance of life has yielded to reflection. And these reflections, the maxims and proverbs, though their value is chiefly national, form the transition to philosophy proper. The fact that their authors, the sages (Solomons) of Greece, were generally active also as legislators, is to be explained in the same way as is the fact that the one among them whose maxim contains the whole problem of philosophy, is not only accounted one of them, but is regarded as the pioneer of philosophy proper. Differences have been introduced into the traditions as to who were to be counted among these sages, through respect for the number seven, combined with preponderating preferences for one or other of the claimants.


§ 19.

In order that not only laws and moral maxims, but also reflections on the totality of existence, and thus philosophy, may arise, the freshness of existence must die out still more, and decay must begin. And in any case these conditions are specially found in colonies, in cities or States originating from prudent calculation and developing with rapid splendour; while in the case of the Greek colonies we must further take into consideration that just among them intercourse with non-
Hellenic nations rendered possible the growth of philosophies that \( \text{vid. \ $\S$ 17} \) should answer the question of the riddle of existence in the pre-Hellenic spirit. For many reasons, therefore, the Ionic colonies in Asia Minor and the Archipelago became the cradle of philosophy; from there went forth even those who kindled in other quarters the spark that grew into the flame of a philosophy very different from that of the three Milesians who first taught men to philosophize.

\[ \S \ 20. \]

In the presence of the splendour of the East, the Ionic spirit can produce only a realistic philosophy of nature in its philosophy, just as in its poetry it found its satisfaction in the objective epic, and in religion in the mysteries connected with the worship of nature. According to the content of their doctrine, we shall call the first Greek philosophers, \textit{physiologers} pure and simple, and understand thereby, in agreement with Aristotle, those who considered the riddle of existence solved when the original material had been stated, out of the modifications of which all things consist. Thus the answer to the questions, What the world is, and, What man is, is in this case, that they are material substance; an answer, it is true, spoken rather in the spirit of a primitive race than adequately expressive of the Hellenic mind. But it cannot be called materialistic so long as the antitheses of Matter and Spirit and Matter and Force are still unknown. It is naive Hylozoism.

\[ \text{FIRST DIVISION.} \]

\[ \text{The Pure Physiologers.}\]

\[ \text{H. Ritter: Geschichte der \textit{ionischen} Philosophie. Berlin, 1821.} \]

\[ \S \ 21. \]

When the inquiring mind identifies the reality it seeks with the material substratum, modifications of which all things are

\[ \text{* It has been thought preferable to translate the Greek \textit{φυσιολόγος} by the more accurate \textit{"physiologers,"} rather than by the more familiar \textit{"physiologists,"} in order to guard against the misleading associations of the modern sense of the latter word.---[Tr.]} \]
supposed to be, it has no unlimited choice of such primal matter. The more definite is the configuration of such matter, and the more it withdraws itself from certain modifications, the less suitable will it be for such a purpose; the more formless and modifiable is it, the more suitable. Hence fluids are regarded as the primal substance. But of all fluids, that which first presents itself as such, which moreover appears the most powerful to a maritime population, and is susceptible of the greatest variety of form in atmospheric phenomena, which, in a word, seems most worthy of veneration to minds just emancipating themselves from mythology, is Water, and especially the sea. Hence it is quite intelligible that Thales, the first philosopher, properly speaking, should make Water his primal substance or element, of which all things were to be regarded as modifications, although this doctrine might perhaps appear to savour of impiety and foreign wisdom to the Greeks, who felt that they were something more and better than condensed water.

A.—THALES.


§ 22.

Thales was born at Miletus in the 35th Olympiad, and is said to have been still alive in Ol. 58. His mathematical and astronomic knowledge, which he seems to have embodied in metrical writings, lost at an early period, as well as his political sagacity, indicate a sensible turn of mind. Hence he was accounted one of the Seven Sages. He is also a philosopher in being the first to search for a permanent and ultimate matter underlying all things as their substance, out of which they are composed and to which they revert. Water, which he regards as such a substratum, is also in his eyes the support in space on which the earth, the principal part of the universe, floats. Whether it was the observation that all seeds and all food were moist, or whether the myths of the old theogony induced this supposition, was uncertain even in Aristotle's time. The later ancients asserted the first, the moderns the second, as certain; and the former have also founded an argument on the theory that the constellations are nourished by the evaporating water. The assertion of Cicero, which he ascribes to an Epicurean and afterwards himself
retracts, that Thales, in addition to his elemental matter, assumed a world-soul, is certainly erroneous, as well as that of others, that he regarded the universal world-reason as a principle. It harmonizes with his naïve hylozoism that he regards all things as animated, all things full of demons and gods, and every physical motion as a sign of life. The saying, also ascribed to him, that there is no difference between living and dying, agrees well with this. Wherever, as in this case, a definite quality is ascribed to the elemental matter, there is a temptation to consider all differences as merely quantitative. Hence the remark of Aristotle about certain physiologers, that they regarded everything as arising out of the condensation and rarefaction of an elemental matter, has probably been rightly referred by later authors to Thales. By the side of Thales, Hippo is frequently mentioned, who was probably a Samian by birth, and whose “moisture” can hardly have been different from the Water of Thales. The circumstance that a man living in the age of Pericles could still satisfy himself with the doctrine of Thales, would alone suffice to justify Aristotle’s unfavourable judgment about him.

The authorities for this § are found fairly complete in Ritter and Preller, I., c. i. § 14-18.

§ 23.

For the reason, already correctly indicated by Aristotle, that a substance of so definite a nature as water, excludes many physical qualities by reason of its opposition to them, so that it is impossible to derive them from it, it is necessary to conceive the first principle in a different form. What is left out is not its material character, but only the definite exclusive quality. And just as the doctrines of Thales have reminded many of the Homeric tale of Oceanus, the father of things, so the theory of the second Milesian philosopher, as to the indefinite elemental substance, invites us to suppose a dependence on the Chaos of Hesiod.

B.—ANAXIMANDER.


§ 24.

1. ANAXIMANDER, son of Praxiades, a Milesian, twenty-eight years younger than Thales, can hardly be, as is asserted, a
disciple of his, although he shared with him his fondness for astronomic and mathematical studies, as his acquirements and inventions prove. His book, which was composed in poetical prose, probably had the title περὶ φύσεως.

2. Seeing, as Aristotle remarks, that everything definite is relative to something else, Anaximander took as his principle what he called the ἀπειρον, or according to others, the ἀόριστον, and always opposed to the εἰδοπεποιημένον. It is the unchangeable in all changes and therefore the immortal. It must certainly be conceived as material, only we must not yet admit the idea of dead matter. Because it, like Hesiod's Chaos, is only the ground of all things qualitatively definite, and contains them potentially (seminaliter), Aristotle and Theophrastus are entitled to call it a mixture, with a reference to Anaxagoras and Empedocles. That the passages in Aristotle in which he speaks of those who take for their principle a substance intermediate between air and water, and which many commentators apply to Anaximander, really refer to him, has been made very improbable by Schleiermacher.

3. In the case of an original substance devoid of qualities, it is impossible to derive all qualitative differences from differences of quantity and degree. Hence the doctrine of Anaximander is, that qualitative oppositions separate out from the Indefinite (ἐναρτιότης ἐκκρίνεσθαι). The opposition of the Cold and the Warm, which appears first, is followed only at a later stage by that of the Dry and the Moist. Schleiermacher ingeniously suggests, that before this last antithesis the undifferentiated Warmth (Fire—Air), which may be what Aristotle means when he speaks of a substance intermediate between Air and Fire, is opposed to the undifferentiated Cold (Earth—Water) which may be the πρῶτη ὕγρασια, of which Anaximander is said to have called the sea the remnant (after the earth had separated from it). And this theory is rendered still more probable by the manner in which he conceived the further development. For while the earth, shaped like a (flat) cylinder, separates itself off from the rest of the universe, there is formed opposite to it a warm sphere. And the condensations of this fiery air are the constellations, which are called the gods that have come into being, or the gods of the heavens, as opposed to the eternal ἀπειρον. (According to other accounts, the flat disc of the earth is said to be
encompassed by the stream of Ocean, the further shore of which is formed by the edge of the heavenly hemisphere. This hemisphere consists of opaque layers, like the bark of a tree, and through their apertures the light of the sun, the moon, and the stars passes, when they do not, as in the eclipses, obstruct one another.) The influence of this warm environment produces bubbles in the earthy slime, out of which the organic creatures are generated, and at last, in their further development, men, who therefore have originally lived in the form of fishes. As all things have issued from the Indefinite, so they also pass back into it, "paying the penalty after the order of time"; an assertion which it is certainly very natural to explain with Schleiermacher as referring to a periodic compensation of the one-sided predominance of one of the contraries. Anaximander, however, seems to have assumed many such periods of egression and return, so that the plurality of worlds which he is said to have taught was perhaps one of succession. Each of these worlds was a transitory deity compared with the ἀφθαρτὸν.


§ 25.

The advantage offered by the doctrine of Anaximander, that the Dry and the Warm do not stand in a more hostile relation to his principle than the Moist and the Cold, is outweighed by the disadvantage that it is, properly speaking, impossible to derive qualitative differences from that which has no qualities. His is, therefore, the contrary one-sidedness to that of Thales, whom he nevertheless transcends by making the elemental moisture a secondary thing. By introducing the convenient expression of "issuing" or "separating," he really again let in by a back door the qualitative definiteness which he had just before excluded from his principle. Hence, any one who does consciously what Anaximander did unconsciously, and attributes a definite quality to the ἀπειρόν, will stand above him, because he understands him better than he did himself, and at the same time return in a way to the position of Thales. This does not mean, of course, that he will attribute to his principle the same quality as Thales, which was an exclusive one. Rather, in positing the infinite Air as the original substance of all things,
the younger companion of Thales and Anaximander has overcome the one-sidedness of both, since his principle is not, as might have been supposed, the sum, but the negative unity of theirs.

C.—ANAXIMENES.

§ 26.

1. Anaximenes, son of Eurystratus of Miletus, cannot, indeed, have been born in Ol. 63, and have died at the time of the capture of Sardis, as Diogenes relates on the authority of Apollodorus. The dating by an historical fact causes less suspicion of false reading than that by a number, but it also is indefinite, as it may refer either to the capture by Cyrus or to that by the Greeks. Probably Anaximenes was a younger contemporary of Thales and Anaximander. He is called the pupil of the latter, and approximates to the former in his doctrine: perhaps he had known and listened to both, which would explain the origin of his intermediate position between them. His work, composed in the Ionic dialect, was still known to Theophrastus and discussed by him in a separate essay. All later authorities seem to have derived their information from him and from Aristotle.

2. Anaximenes also seeks some principle underlying all definite existence, which must therefore be universal and infinite, but he wishes it to be at the same time definite in quality. When therefore he said, not Water, as Thales had said, but Air was the first principle and the Infinite Substance out of which everything issued, he was perhaps impelled by the consideration that water could not accept many qualities, and certainly by this, that the breath of life, which he identifies with the soul, and the heavens encompassing all things were air. Just as the water in the case of Thales, so in his the air bears up the earth, which floats on it like a leaf. With regard to the derivation of individual things, it is certain that he let everything be represented as generated by condensation and rarefaction, and was probably the first to go into the details of this derivation. But when at the same time he introduces the antithesis of Cold and Warmth, he appears here again to mediate between Thales’ method of derivation and that of Anaximander, a task all the easier to him as blowing hot or cold depended upon the rarefaction or condensation of the breath. The more probable assertion, that he regarded the air
as generating clouds, the latter water, and this, by its precipitates, the earth, is contradicted by another, according to which the earth was the first product. Perhaps the latter refers to the whole earth containing all the elements, and the former only to earth as an element. The earth forms the centre of the universe, and in it have originated the constellations, which consist of earth and fire, and move round it. We have express testimony to confirm what was probable in itself, viz., that everything was to be resolved again into air.


§ 27.

Anaximenes completes the circle of a group of views, since the thesis “qualitative,” the antithesis, “without quality,” and the synthesis, “yet qualitative,” neither requires nor permits any further development. And accordingly, as far as its matter went, there was no further progress in the direction of the pure physiologers. On the other hand, there arises a man, who attempts to prove the silent assumptions from which the Milesians had set out, because they were being contested from another point of view, and thus, as is always the case with defenders of an opinion, promotes the doctrines of the physiologers in the point of form. But since the point of view from which the assumptions of the Milesian philosophers of the unity and materiality of the first principle are combated, is a higher one than theirs, Diogenes of Apollonia may be denominated a reactionary. Like all champions of a lost cause, he displays in his performances a high degree of subjective ability, without greatly furthering his cause objectively. This is the explanation of the fact that Schleiermacher shows such a preference for him, while he is not even mentioned by Hegel.

D.—DIOGENES APOLLONIATES.


§ 28.

1. Diogenes was born at Apollonia in Crete, and therefore belonged to the Dorian stock, but, like all the writers peri φύσεως, made use of the Ionic dialect. His synchronism with
Anaxagoras, which can hardly be denied, can only be reconciled with the statement that he heard Anaximenes by means of very forced suppositions. Probably he learnt the latter's doctrine by tradition, and also in the same manner that of Anaximander. The work, of which fragments have come down to us, was perhaps his only one, and the others that are mentioned only subdivisions of it.

2. As his historical position requires, Diogenes demands a greater formal perfection of the doctrine by the setting up of a fixed principle and a simple and dignified mode of statement. Hence he attempts to prove, in the first place, what hitherto has been a tacit assumption, that the original substance was one, and everything a modification of it. If this were not the case there would be no mixture and no relation of different things, there would be no development and no transition, since all these are only thinkable if a single (permanent) One is transformed. But if there is only one unique ultimate substance, it immediately follows that there is no generation, properly speaking, but only change. Secondly, Diogenes denies consciously what his predecessors had denied unconsciously, viz., the existence of the immaterial. Not only does he expressly call his original substance of which all things are modifications, a σῶμα, but he already knows that a distinction is made between matter and spirit, and it is evidently in opposition to such a dualism that he maintains that reason, which to him is identical with vitality and feeling, is immanent in the air and unthinkable without it. Hence everything, even inorganic existences, and especially man, receive life and knowledge by breathing. Physiological examples, e.g., the foam-like nature of seeds, are intended to prove the life-giving nature of the air. This attempt to maintain the earlier Monism against Dualism makes the naïve hylozoism into a materialistic doctrine.

3. Like Anaximander, Diogenes derives the individual by means of the antithesis of Cold and Warmth, like Anaximenes, he identifies it with that of the Dense and the Rare, but then proceeds to make both equivalent to that of the Heavy and the Light. As he is said to have adopted Anaximander's view that the sea was a "remnant," we must probably modify the statement that his principle was something intermediate between Air and Fire, in the sense that this intermediate substance was already secondary, just as in
the case of Anaximander. The earth arises out of the separation of the Light and the Heavy, and likewise the constellations, the circular motions of which are considered a consequence of warmth. Since they are nourished by the exhalations of the earth, the latter is continually becoming drier and on the way to complete exsiccation. His doctrine as to the nature of the stars, viz., that they resembled pumice-stone, was probably borrowed from Empedocles or Anaxagoras, and may have contributed to bring upon him the reproach of atheism. All individual things partake of Air, but each in a different way, depending on the different degree of their warmth, dryness, etc. The Air itself seems to have not only different degrees of warmth, but also of density. The individual human souls also differ only in their different participation in the principle of life and knowledge. Altogether Diogenes made living beings, and above all man, the special subject of his inquiries, a fact also indicated by his investigations into the nature of veins.


§ 29.

If Philosophy is the self-comprehension of the spirit, the proof that a philosophic system does not understand itself, is also a proof that it is not a complete philosophy, and therefore must be transcended. Now such is the condition of the pure Physiologers. If they understood themselves, they would admit that they were not concerned about Water or Air, but about what was permanent, substantial, and essential in all things; and that they are not driven beyond animal and vegetable nature in virtue of its animal and vegetable character, but in virtue of its being variable and merely apparent. Strictly speaking, therefore, the question is not at all about substances that can be perceived by the senses, but the interest lies in permanency and change, i.e., in thought-determinations or categories. The mind is prevented from perceiving this by the paradiasiacal splendour of the East, in which the external world so occupies men that even one who begins to reflect, like Diogenes, always returns to the opinion that he is interested in warm air. In the twilight of the Western world, on the other hand, the mind is induced to reflect upon its own nature, and thereby makes the discovery
that it is not what shows itself most modifiable to the senses that can solve the riddle of existence, but only what is discovered by thought. Hence there arise the Pure Metaphysicians, in those colonies of Magna Graecia which, even where their origin was not Dorian, were yet inspired by the Dorian spirit. They form the diametrical opposite of the physiologers pure and simple; and whereas the aim of the latter is to derive everything from material substance, theirs is to deduce all things from thought-determinations. The rupture between them and the views of the physiologers is marked by the fact that the first metaphysicians are Ionians, and yet emigrate from the land of the philosophy of nature.

SECOND DIVISION.

The Pure Metaphysicians.

§ 30.

The previous development of philosophy prescribed in what form thought-determinations were to be regarded essential and decisive of everything. When all variety has been explained by condensation and rarefaction, the mind, in reflecting upon itself, must arrive at the conclusion that differences of essence have become differences of greater simplicity or greater complexity, of more or less, that is to say, differences of number. If then differences of essence are only differences of number, it is an easy transition to the conclusion that Essence and Number are one and the same thing. And if the far more advanced thought of Plato is still fond of designating the relation of Substance and Accident as that of the One and the Many, it is intelligible that when metaphysical thought is only just beginning its flight, these quantitative categories seem to be quite sufficient. For do they not, as has been rightly remarked by philosophers of ancient and modern times, form as it were a connecting link between the physical and the logical? And thus they supply the readiest means of facilitating the great step from the one to the other by dividing it. Hence the mathematical school of Pythagoras displays the first beginnings of metaphysic.
A.—THE PYTHAGOREANS.

§ 31.

HISTORICAL.


The untrustworthy character of the three biographies of Pythagoras that have come down to us from antiquity, and the objections that have been raised against them by more sober authorities, have made critical investigations necessary. These, however, led to contradictory results, according as the critic was an enthusiast for the originality of everything Greek, or an Indo- or Egypto-maniac. The last few decades have been marked by a one-sided predominance of the former tendency, and hence the latter, represented, e.g. by Röth, seems in these days an innovation in a way it would not have done formerly. It is generally agreed that Pythagoras was born in Samos, as the son of the engraver Mnesarchus, and was a descendant of Tyrrenian Pelasgians, which may explain his preference for mystic rites. On the other hand, the more recent authorities, for the most part, after putting his birth in Ol. 49, i.e. 584–580 B.C., or in some cases twenty-four years earlier, regard him as leaving his native city in his fortieth year, and after travelling for twelve years in Ionia, Phoenicia, and Egypt, as settling in Croton, in Magna Græcia, in his fifty-second year, and founding his school. Röth, on the contrary, chiefly on the authority of Jamblichus, gives 569 B.C. as the date of his birth, and maintains that he left Samos as early as his eighteenth year, then received for two years the instruction of Pherecydes, and spent two years more in travelling in Phoenicia, then twenty-two years in Egypt, and, finally, twelve in Babylon, whither Cambyses had brought him with other Egyptian prisoners. It was only after this, i.e. in his fiftieth year, that he returned to Samos, and came in his sixtieth year to Magna Græcia, where he lived twenty years in Croton, and, being driven out thence, nineteen years more in Tarentum and Metapontum, and died in his ninety-ninth year. Nor are the divergences of opinion as to the true sources of the Pythagorean doctrine less than as to chronology. For whereas most modern authorities only lightly touch upon the tradition of antiquity, that Pythagoras was a
disciple of Anaximander and Pherecydes, and call the first part of this improbable, because of the different character of his doctrine, and the second futile, because we know nothing about the doctrines of Pherecydes, Röth attributes great importance to both. According to him, the doctrine of Pherecydes was that of the Egyptians quite unchanged, in which the deity was conceived as Four in One, viz. Spirit, Original Matter, Time, and Space, from which proceeded by way of emanation the World-egg. Familiarized with this doctrine by Pherecydes, who taught it quite unscientifically, Pythagoras afterwards became acquainted with other Ionians, e.g. Anaximander, whose doctrine was also of Egyptian origin, and then acquired so thorough a knowledge of the wisdom of that country in Egypt itself, that he must be considered the chief channel by which it was transmitted to Greece. Theology and geometry are the subjects which Pythagoras is said to have learnt in Egypt; into arithmetic on the other hand, in which he excelled perhaps even more than in geometry, he was initiated by the Chaldeans whom he met in Babylon. The reports of antiquity as to a league, involved in peculiar secrecy, to which the more advanced disciples of Pythagoras belonged, are too unanimous to make it possible to doubt its existence. But while most modern authorities ascribe to this league religious and perhaps also political, but by no means scientific importance, Röth differs from them in this point also. Those who not only used to attend the public lectures of Pythagoras on the rules of morality, immortality, etc. (the Acusmatics), but really belonged to his school, were received after a previous moral and intellectual examination, and first severely trained, especially in music and mathematics (hence called mathematicians). Those among the disciples who approved themselves—for many were formally excluded—were declared fully competent by means of religious initiations, and instructed in the most truly profound doctrines, which were the same as the Egyptian theology and cosmology, only modified to this extent, that Dionysus was substituted for Osiris, etc. Since, however, some of the disciples never became acquainted with this dogmatic teaching, while they had yet penetrated far enough into the doctrine of Pythagoras to recognise that everything they knew was only the prelude to science proper, it was possible that these should look round for another metaphysic, which they could combine with the doctrine of number
they had learnt in the lower classes. Hence it came about that from the mathematically trained disciples of Pythagoras there issued in the first place true pupils of his (whom Röth calls Pythagorics), whose reverence for the doctrines imparted to them, prevented them from publishing what they had written down in or after the lectures, so that for this very reason it remained concealed down to the times of the Neo-Platonists. But in the second place, especially through the expelled pupil Hippasus, who combined with the Pythagorean doctrine of Number the dualistic metaphysics of Zoroaster, of which Democedes, the former court-physician of the Persian king, and the Crotoniate medical school generally were adherents, there arose the metaphysic of the spurious disciples of Pythagoras, whom Röth calls Pythagoreans. These were the first to make current the doctrine of opposites, and, finally, even the absurd doctrine that numbers were the essence of things. To them there belonged above all Philolaus. Since, however, recent criticism had declared spurious all the fragments of Timæus, Ocellus Lucanus, Eurytus, and Archytas transmitted to us, and did not admit the genuineness of anything except the fragments of Philolaus collected by Böckh, and the unimportant χρυσά ἐπη, and since, moreover, Plato was wholly indebted to Philolaus for his doctrine of Numbers and of Ideas, one could understand how in modern times we regarded as the teaching of Pythagoras and the Pythagorics, that which the Pythagoreans and Platonists had made out of it. If the testimony of antiquity had not been treated with contempt, when it represented Pythagoras as deriving his wisdom from Egypt, and if the Egyptian doctrines had been better known, it would have been more readily obvious that there was no reason to complain of lack of authorities, seeing that the so-called Orphica contained writings by Pythagoras himself, especially the ἴερος λόγος for the more deeply initiated disciples. Even if, as can hardly be maintained, Röth were right in all that he says, the result of his inquiries would yet involve not even a change in the name of Pythagoreans, but only in that of the first author of the doctrine of Philolaus and Plato. He would have to be called Hippasus henceforth, instead of Pythagoras. For he himself admits that the doctrine of the Pythagorics had no influence on the subsequent development, while that of the Pythagoreans was immense. And this change would be doubly unimportant, as all later authorities, following the
example of Aristotle, have taken great care to avoid distinguishing the doctrines of Pythagoras himself from the additions of his successors.

§ 32.

The Doctrine of the Pythagoreans.


1. Aristotle mentions as the first reason why the Pythagoreans did not assume a sensible original substance, but found the elements of all things in those of numbers, that numbers are the principle of all mathematics; secondly, that all harmony depends on the relation of numbers; thirdly, that certain numbers continually recur in so many natural phenomena. There was added to these objective reasons the subjective one, that Number is the means to true knowledge, and that the Pythagoreans also never denied the fundamental maxim of this whole period, that like is known by like. As to how they conceived the relation of things to the numbers, our accounts are contradictory. In addition to the two ancient views, that they regarded the numbers as the things themselves, i.e., their immanent essence; and secondly, as the archetypes of things, according to which the latter were fashioned; Röth has in modern times advanced the assertion, that the numbers were only made use of as the symbolic or tropical designation, in such a way that because the Pythagorean (i.e., Egyptian) doctrine regarded matter as a combination of two substances, it was called "the Two," in the same way as we talk of "the Twelve" and mean the Apostles, and of the "evil Seven," and mean the deadly sins. If Philolaus can be regarded as the representative of the strictly scientific Pythagoreans, their doctrine is, that the Numbers are the Things, strictly speaking, so that the development of the numbers, really and not only by the substitution of the part for the whole, coincides with the development of things, and the system of numbers with that of the world.
2. That out of which all numbers come, their ground or principle, which is henceforth called their origin \(\gamma\omega\nu\iota\) or the father that generates them, is the One \(\epsilon\nu\) or Unity \(\mu\omicron\upsilon\nu\alpha\varsigma\), which because it contains all numbers within itself, is often called Number as such. From the One as their common origin there emanate the numbers, in virtue of the opposition, so important for the whole system, between the Indefinite \(\alpha\pi\epsilon\iota\omicron\nu\omicron\nu \) or \(\alpha\omega\omicron\rho\iota\omicron\sigma\tau\omicron\nu\) and the Limiting \(\tau\alpha\ \pi\epsilon\rho\alpha\iota\omicron\nu\omicron\tau\alpha\), or, as Plato more significantly calls it, \(\tau\omicron\ \pi\epsilon\rho\alpha\varsigma\). Hence, though it is permissible to call the introduction of the \(\epsilon\nu\alpha\nu\tau\tau\iota\) with a view to the derivation of things an approximation to Anaximander, this great difference, that a logical opposition has here taken the place of physical ones like cold and warmth, etc., must not be overlooked. And indeed, that the Pythagoreans were conscious of going beyond the Milesian physiologers is shown by the fact that the same word which Anaximander had used to designate his principle, describes only a single, and, as will appear presently, a subordinate aspect of theirs. The Limiting is continually described as the higher and more powerful factor, but the Unity stands above both and contains both bound together; hence it is called a harmony, and it comes to the same thing whether the Number or the Harmony is mentioned. This Unity devoid of oppositions is the highest idea of the system, and therefore its god, and it matters little whether the name of god or deity is expressly applied to it at an earlier or only at a later period. The emanation of the numbers out of the One, of things out of God, takes place in virtue of this opposition. But since it is itself conceived in the most different ways, and ten different conceptions of it, in particular, were soon established, we can easily reconcile the reports that according to some the Pythagoreans derived everything from Number, according to others, from the ten contraries. The latter are secondary principles, but not the primitive element, for this the One alone is. The opposition of the Even and the Odd, which is also one of the ten, was probably the one that first struck the Pythagoreans in their speculations about number, and perhaps it was only by retrogressive abstraction that they were induced to assume the germ of this opposition among numbers already in the common root of all. The Odd as corresponding to the Limit is considered the higher principle, and the preference for odd numbers grounded on the power they display of changing the character of any number they are com-
bined with, further on the fact that they alone have a beginning, end, and middle, and finally, on the fact that they are all differences of squares, and hence, when conceived spatially, are enclosing and comprehending gnomons. When the One, which as it is superior to all oppositions is superior also to this, is called the ἄρτιοτέριττον, this word must not be taken in the usual mathematical sense. The fact that the odd numbers are put above the even has been emphasized by Gladisch in his comparison of the Pythagorean with the Chinese doctrine, and the fact, moreover, that among the oppositions, we find those of Light and Darkness, Good and Evil, has induced many in ancient and modern times to suppose that they were borrowed from Zoroastrianism. If among the various expressions of the opposition is found also that of ἐν καὶ πλῆθος, this brings out clearly the preference for the one side, but also involves the possibility of misconceptions as to whether the ἐν refers to the first principle itself, or only to one of its factors. The distinction later authors made between μονᾶς and ἐν has remained unfruitful, because the one called the μονᾶς precisely what the other called the ἐν; and that between the first and the second One, which is also found, is certainly clearer. The Plurality which is opposed to the (second) One is sometimes also called δύνας, and later δύνας ἀόριστος, in order to distinguish it from the number two. Geometrically this opposition is conceived as that between the Rectangle and the Square, logically as that between the Moving and the Quiescent, physiologically as that between the Female and the Male, and Left and Right, in such a way that the first member of each pair represents the ἀπειρον, the second the περαινοῦτα.

3. When the oppositions, quiescent in the absolute One, meet outside it, there arises the system of numbers or things. And since arithmetical conceptions are not yet as strictly distinguished from geometrical ones as was the case in later times, not only the numbers, but also their factors, are thought as spatially extended; and hence the conception of the Indefinite coincides with that of the Void, as being undefined spatiality, which then is easily regarded as that which is like breath, i.e., capable of definition. Opposed to it is the Limiting as the spatially extended substance which fills the void, which is often comprehended under the word Heaven (i.e. the universe). Hence the expression which seems at first surprising, that the heaven by drawing or breathing in the void thereby produces
διαστήματα, and thus plurality. This expression we could reproduce in the abstract modern speech without changing the idea, by saying that opposition enters into the Unity and thereby produces plurality, all plurality, and therefore also that of moments following one another, and hence Time. The more prominent this spatial way of regarding things becomes, the nearer does this metaphysic approach to a physical theory, and thus it may come about, that Aristotle can make it a reproach to the Pythagoreans that their numbers were not μοναδικοί, i.e., not out of space, and that one of the younger Pythagoreans, Euphantus, conceived them so materially that he came very near to the atomistic doctrine of the Void and the Plenum. If, moreover, numbers are things and at the same time form a system, it is intelligible that the Pythagoreans were the first to think and to call the universe an order (κόσμος). And if the inexplicit number or the One was identical with the Deity, it ceases to be strange that the world is said to be ruled by one akin to it, or that it should be called an unfolding (ἐνέργεια) of God. But Ritter's conclusion from this expression, and the dictum of a Pythagorean, that not the first was the most perfect, but the later, that the world was the evolution of the Deity, seems too bold; all the more so that this dictum perhaps only referred to the relation of larger and smaller numbers. The system is consistent in regarding the world as correlated to the Deity, and therefore as eternal and indestructible.

4. As regards the details of the derivation, there is generated by the first meeting of the ἐν and the πλῆθος, i.e., by the first multiplying of unity, the number two, διὰ (different from δυάς ἄνθρώπων), which at the same time is the line or the first Dimension, just as the point coincides with unity, from which it is only distinguished by its θέσις, i.e. spatiality. The one and the two together produce the τρίας, the first complete number, which at the same time the number of the plane, as being the διὰ διαστάτων. The most perfect number, however, is the number four (τετρακτύς), not only because it is the number of perfect spatiality (τριχαμήν διαστάτων), but also because the series 1 : 2 : 3 : 4 gives the essential harmonic relations, the ἄρμονία or διὰ ταῖς, διὰ τέντε ὅρι ὁ ἄρχειν, διὰ τεσσάρων or συλλαβά. But if the number four is space with all its relations of harmony, the veneration thereof, i.e., of the harmoniously ordered universe, is very intelligible. Moreover, since 1 + 2 + 3 + 4 =
10, the δέκα is only a further development of the Tetraktys, and, like it, not only a symbol but the most exact expression of the world. The world itself is represented, at least in the later development of the Pythagorean doctrine, as ten divine spheres, of which the outermost is the sphere of fire or of the fixed stars, within which move the seven spheres of the planets (including the sun and the moon), the circle of the earth's orbit, and lastly that of the counter-earth, which conceals from us the direct sight of the Central Fire, the hearth of Zeus, which we see only in the reflected light of the sun and the moon. At an earlier period, when the earth was regarded as the stationary centre of the universe, the idea that the seven moving and therefore vibrating planets formed a heptachord, was quite natural, but it cannot be reconciled with the moving spheres, and hence Philolaus knows nothing about the music of the spheres, which we were said not to notice only because we always heard it. As a heavenly body the Earth, like the whole Cosmos, is subject to the law of Necessity, but on the other hand it is the centre of the sublunary world, the νεφελώδης, the world of change, in which chance also shows its power. The totally different character of the Pythagorean and Ionian physics is at once evident in their account of the earth's sphere in their doctrine of the elements. The antithesis of Earth and Fire is not derived from the physical antithesis of Cold and Warmth, but from the arithmetical one of the Straight and Curved, and water as containing both is called the first curved and straight substance (in the mathematical sense). Others give geometrical reasons for assigning to each element one of the five regular solids as its primary form (i.e., of its particles) so that the tetrahedron is ascribed to Fire, the cube to Earth, the icosahedron to Water, octahedron to Air, and the dodecahedron to the all-embracing Ether. They also wish to trace the number four in physiological functions, and Eurytus, a pupil of Philolaus, is said to have gone into such detail that he even attempted to refer every thing to the number that expressed its essence.

5. Connected with the Pythagorean physics is their doctrine of the soul, i.e., of the principle of life. They begin by ascribing a soul even to the world, which from the centre of the universe is said to penetrate all things as the harmony that rules them. Hence it, and sometimes even the centre of gravity of the universe, is called One instead of the
principle of union. Whether it is to be conceived of as the substance of the individual souls, or as their archetype, or as the whole out of which they are developed as its parts, it would be possible to decide only if we possessed more of the third book of the work of Philolaus. The conception of the human soul as the harmony of the body, and that moreover it was, like the world itself, the number ten, and hence capable of knowing the world, evidently contains the germs of the later doctrine of the macrocosm and the microcosm, and agrees with the other doctrines of the Pythagoreans; but the assertion that the body is the prison of the soul, and that of metempsychosis connected with it, has a more foreign appearance. Both of these assertions, as well as the doctrine of the daemons and spirits of the air, seem to be unconnected with the theory of Numbers. All the clearer, however, is its connection with the fragments of their theory of knowledge and their ethics that have come down to us. The psychological foundation of both is the distinction of a rational and an irrational part, in addition to which ὑμός was probably already assumed in order to mediate between them. And as the different functions of the soul are attributed to different bodily organs, this doctrine has also a physiological basis. It goes without saying that knowledge is ascribed to the rational part of the soul. It is brought about by Number, which is impervious to deception; hence what is not susceptible of definition by mathematics is unknowable, because it lies beneath knowledge. The distinction of the four degrees of knowledge, and their comparison with the first four numbers, is probably a later one: the νοεῖς is related singly to its object, while knowledge is represented by two, opinion by three, and perception by four. The moral spirit which the whole character and also the doctrine of Pythagoras breathes, has induced some to assert that his philosophy was chiefly ethics. This, however, is erroneous, for only slender efforts are made, not to recommend moral action merely, but also to grasp its nature. That the Pythagoreans proposed a mathematical formula for justice, which is censured by Aristotle, is rather to be praised for its consistency; even that it is designated as ἀριθμὸς ἰσός ἱσος, is intelligible when one considers that they regard it as consisting only in retribution. The report, too, that they defined virtue as the health of the soul, in which the ἀπειρον (i.e., the sensuous) was subjected to measure, is not incredible in
spite of its approximation to Platonic and Aristotelian formulas. This becomes still more prominent in their discussing justice with special reference to the life of the State, and in their comparison of the legislative and judicial function with that of hygiene (gymnastic) and medicine, which is in verbal agreement with the Platonic Gorgias. With an aristocratic temper, they despised the πανθεῖα, the masses, and called anarchy the greatest evil. Even their dislike to beans has been regarded, perhaps not wrongly, as a political demonstration against the democratic method of filling magistracies by lot. The fact that all practice was confined to the sphere of the changeable, was probably one of their reasons for placing it so far beneath theory, and considered the latter, and especially the study of the scientific properties of number, the true happiness.

6. Besides Philolaus and his pupils Simmias and Kebes, through whom Pythagoreanism passed into the neighbourhood of Athens and into the possession of the disciples of Socrates, Ocellus the Lucanian, Timæus of Locri, Archytas of Tarentum, Hippasus of Metapontum, Lysis, Eurytus and Ecphantus, a famous mathematician, may be mentioned. The fragments of their supposed writings have all been attacked by modern critics, and those who consider the most recent attacks on the genuineness of the fragments of Philolaus also well founded, will have to content themselves with the conclusion that all the accounts of this school are third- and fourth-hand evidence.


§ 33.

The necessity of going beyond also the Pythagorean point of view is proved, as soon as it is shown that it really aims at something quite different from that which it achieves; for thus it would fail to be the full understanding of itself, which philosophy should be. The tendency of the Pythagoreans is evidently to exalt the One above the Many, at the expense of the Many, and to make it the only Absolute. Yet it is continually becoming again the other side diametrically opposed to the Many, but just for this reason co-ordinated with it, its mere correlative, and thereby ceases to be, properly speaking, the first principle. They are driven into this contradiction between what they intend and are able to effect, by the
mathematical form of their doctrine, however necessary that had been. If the difference between a principle and that which is derived from it, is conceived as a numerical one, it is inevitable that since both are numbers, they should be put into the same rank; and, since the higher number contains the lower and therefore contains more than it, it may even come about that the relation of the principle and that which is derived from it, is inverted, at least in appearance. Moreover, the Pythagoreans, when they call the Many also the Other or the Moved, and thus give to its opposite the meaning of the Same and the Persistent, themselves begin to use qualitative instead of quantitative categories. And if, instead of those they used, the more abstract categories underlying them, such as the unchangeable Being and the Changing or Becoming, are applied, the human spirit will not only understand itself better than where it contented itself, as among the Ionians, with an original matter common to all things, but will also succeed in what it failed to accomplish where, as among the Pythagoreans, the manifold things were multiplications of the principle. Hence just as the Pythagoreans represent the transition from physiology to metaphysics, so the Eleatics represent pure metaphysics in its extreme anti-physiological form.

B.—THE ELEATICS.


§ 34.

XENOPHANES.


1. XENOPHANES, son of Orthomenes or of Dexinus, was born in the Ionic colony of Colophon. As regards his date, it is impossible to reconcile the direct statements of Timæus and Apollodorus, found in Clement of Alexandria. It is necessary, therefore, to make a supposition which will agree with the established facts, that he mentions Thales and Pythagoras as famous sages, that he is known to Heraclitus, and that he celebrated in song the foundation of Elea (or Velia), where he settled, apparently after long wanderings over many cities of Sicily and Magna Græcia, and lastly, that he lived to the age
of ninety-two, at least. These facts may be reconciled with the ancient tradition that he flourished in Ol. 60, although this also has been disputed, e.g., by Brandis. He composed didactic poems, besides some of an epic character, and sang them as a rhapsodist: they are called σίλλαου, probably because they often displayed a satirical vein. The fragments of these poems, collected first by H. Stephanus, then by Fülleborn, Brandis and Karsten, imply great knowledge on his part.

2. According to Plato, the Eleatics, whose doctrine was perhaps older than Xenophanes, called that which we call the universe, the One. But since all their proofs of unity consist in polemics against Becoming, it is evident that the One is their name for unchanging Being, which also agrees with the assertion of Theophrastus, that they conceived Being as one. This name justifies the inference as to Pythagorean influences, even if the tradition that Xenophanes was instructed by the Pythagorean Telauges, should be false. It is a polemical contradiction of the Pythagorean doctrine, when Xenophanes asserts that the One does not breathe (cf. supra, § 32, 3). The above Platonic testimony is completed by that of Aristotle, who says that Xenophanes, contemplating the whole universe, had said this One was God. Since Time contains multiplicity, the alone existent One, or the Deity, is eternal. Together with plurality, the indefiniteness (the ἀπειρον) of the One is denied, and Aristotle's censure that it remained a moot point whether Xenophanes conceived his principle as πεπερασμένον, is undeserved. The spherical figure which Xenophanes is said to have ascribed to the Deity, is intelligible in one to whom the universe displays the Deity, and a consequence of the denial of every multiplicity of functions, and hence also of organs. "A whole it sees, a whole it hears." Where all plurality is excluded there can be no question of Polytheism, nor, where no Becoming is assumed, of a Theogony: hence his scorn of the popular religion, his hatred of Homer, etc.

3. With regard to the physics of Xenophanes, our accounts are conflicting. The derivation out of four elements is too strongly attested as due to Empedocles to be already assumed here. That everything was derived from the earth, can only be reconciled with the assertions of Aristotle, if the earth is understood not as element but as heavenly body, in which case it might be combined with the other report, that he regarded all things as being generated from earth and water
(the primeval slime). We can hardly, however, believe that Xenophanes already displayed the logical consistency of Parmenides, and regarded all sensible things as illusive appearances; and it is far more probable that, as other authorities say, he himself was in doubt. This would also explain why he was so soon considered a sceptic, in spite of the fact that there is hardly any doctrine as dogmatic as that of the Eleatics.


§ 35.

The One devoid of all Multiplicity, the Being devoid of all Becoming, is, it is true, an abstraction to be grasped only by thought, but there is nevertheless another underlying it, which, together with a more precise determination, composes it, and which is therefore its element. Such is Being (das Sein), the purest of thought-determinations, in which the Existent (Seiende) itself describes itself as participating. Hence if philosophy proceeds to the ultimate or absolute ground (§ 2), it cannot be satisfied with that which is based upon, or participates in, something else, but must proceed to this ulterior principle. Hence it is something more than an unimportant change in the terminology, when the successor of Xenophanes omits altogether the Pythagorean determination by number, and substitutes for the Absolute described by a participle (ôν), one which he thinks he cannot better describe than with the infinitive, Being (eiναι). Parmenides brings to perfection the abstract metaphysics which are opposed to physiology, and the supporters of which Aristotle rightly calls ἀφύσικοι (deniers of nature).

§ 36.

 Parmenides.

1. Parmenides, the son of Pyrrhes of Elea, is called by some a disciple of Xenophanes, by others of the Pythagoreans, being perhaps attracted by their mode of life rather than by their doctrine. According to Plato he must have been born in Ol. 64, or 65. The respect in which he was universally held because of his moral worth and civic virtue, was extended by Plato and even by Aristotle, who does not betray any preference for the Eleatic doctrines, also to his scientific impor-
tance. His metrical work, entitled \textit{peri phainews}, begins with an allegory, which Sextus Empiricus, through whom it has come down to us, on the whole interprets rightly. It was divided, like the doctrine of Parmenides, into two parts, of which the first treated of truth and knowledge, the second of appearance and opinion.

2. Truth is attained, not by the presentations of sense, but by purely rational cognition. The principal doctrine here implied is that Being alone has truth, and Non-Being none, and for this reason also the existence of the Void is denied. The reason given, that otherwise knowledge would be impossible, displays the confidence of Reason in itself, as yet unshaken by scepticism. Being is one and excludes all plurality and multiplicity, whether they consist in temporal or in spatial differences, and also all Becoming, because this contains an element of Non-Being. Free from all determination from without, it reposes on its own internal necessity, and for both these reasons is thought to have the form of a sphere. It is not unlimited, else it were defective, but yet not limited by anything outside it. There is not even opposed to it a thinking Reason to which it would stand in the relation of object; for that which thinks and that which is thought are one, Being is Reason, and thought has Being for its attribute. There is no room for any other deity by the side of this the only true Being, and hence Parmenides leaves the existence of the popular gods an open question transcending the province of reason. When, therefore, upon occasion he calls Eros the father of the gods, he probably means thereby the necessity which is the bond of the universe, which he has often called the Dæmon, and apparently also Aphrodite.

3. A position like this does not admit of any derivation of the manifold. The evidence of the senses alone compels its recognition. But since the senses do not perceive Being and are deceptive, multiplicity also is a mere appearance and physics is the doctrine of opinions. Why man is subjected to these opinions, is a point Parmenides cannot understand, but only deplore. Nevertheless, although Non-Being is only appearance, the world is not so denuded of truth that it would be hopeless to seek to penetrate into it by means of knowledge. The two principles from which he derives all multiplicity, and which he calls sometimes Flame and Night, sometimes Warmth and Cold, sometimes Fire and Earth,
repeat the fundamental opposition of Being and Non-Being, and hence the one is called the self-identical, the other the apparent, the unknowable, etc. These two contraries are mingled and combined by the power which also impels the male towards the female, the love of the universe mentioned above, or the friendship that rules all things. Like every individual thing, man also is a mixture of these elements: generated out of the primeval slime, he is the more perfect the warmer he is, and just as his igneous nature enables him to recognise Being, so his earthy structure subjects him to Opinion, i.e., he perceives Non-Being. And because neither of these elements occurs without the other, it is possible to say that the higher and the lower knowledge are the same (i.e., probably, differ only in "degree"). Parmenides' conceptions of the system of the heavens have either been wrongly handed down to us, or are unintelligible, owing to the strangeness of his phraseology. Yet they did not prevent him from having considerable astronomical learning for his time.


§ 37.

Just as Anaximenes represents the highest perfection of the physiological, so Parmenides represents that of the metaphysical tendency. As in the former case, it is no more possible to make further progress in the doctrine itself, but it can be defended against opponents. Such defence, which in the original philosophy could be directed only against more advanced thinkers, and hence had to be reactionary (cf. § 27), may indeed be this also in this case; but it may also be directed against the obsolete and lower position of the Physiologers. This latter task Melissus takes upon himself. It is less difficult and requires less strength to accomplish it, just like swimming with the stream. Moreover, since every conflict with another point of view makes it necessary to enter upon that of one's opponent and thus to approximate to it, the reactionary contest with the higher position will lead beyond one's own, at least in matters of form, while that with the lower will cause a decline below one's own. Hence it is inevitable that Melissus should be—what Aristotle censures in him—a less subtle thinker than the other Eleatics, and that he should have
conceived in too sensuous a manner things having the nature of thought, *i.e.* have regarded their metaphysical determinations too physically.

§ 38.

**MELISSUS.**

(Pseudo-) Aristotle: *De Xenophane (i.e. Melisso) Zenone et Gorgia.* Ch. 1 and 2.

1. **MELISSUS,** the son of Ithagenes, a Samian, and distinguished as a general, is called the disciple of Parmenides, to whose doctrine he had perhaps been converted by writings alone. He flourished about Ōl. 84, and wrote a book in prose, in the Ionian dialect, called according to some authorities περὶ φύσεως, according to others περὶ ὀρνυτος, of which some fragments have been preserved. He seeks to refute the doctrine of his kinsmen the Physiologers, in the interest of the Eleatics. The negative result of some of his arguments, though consonant with this object, has brought upon him the undeserved reproach of scepticism. On the other hand, the way in which he entered upon the point of view of his opponents has, not always undeservedly, subjected him to the accusation that he sullied the purity of the Eleatic abstractions, and understood Parmenides somewhat crudely.

2. Melissus, like Parmenides, puts aside the religious conceptions as lying outside the possibility of knowledge. His subject is the εἷς, which he puts in place of the Parmenidean εἶναι, and thereby again approximates to Xenophanes. What he meant, if he really distinguished simple Being from Being, is obscure. After showing why Being could neither originate nor pass away, he at once concludes from this infinity in time, that of space, and thus, to Aristotle’s disgust, gives up the definiteness attributed to the Absolute by Xenophanes and Parmenides. Unity, indivisibility, immateriality, and the impossibility of all movement, are the further predicates of Being. His polemics against condensation and rarefaction, mixture and separation, are combined with the assertion that the Void, and therefore movement into it, are impossible. Thus there is hardly one of the Physiologers who is not referred to.

3. With an inconsistency similar to that of Parmenides, Melissus asserts, indeed, that multiplicity is only a product of the illusion of the senses, which everywhere illude us with
a show of transition, where there is in reality, only immovable Being, but yet sets up a scientific knowledge of this illusion in the form of physics. That he assumed Fire and Earth as the original substances is probable in view of his relation to Parmenides. The transition from Parmenides to Empedocles is so easy that it is hardly contradicted by the other tradition, that Melissus altogether followed the latter.


§ 39.

By the side of Melissus, as the champion of Eleaticism as opposed to the doctrines beneath it, stands Zeno, who protects it as a reactionary combating innovations. His task is a desperate one, and therefore requires great force. Hence the great subjective importance of the man. It is not a question here of discovering profound novelties, but of exercising all imaginable acuteness in order to secure what has been found. Hence the perfection of the formal side of his philosophizing, which makes Zeno into the Diogenes of Apollonia of his school. And since the position against which Zeno defends his master combines his fundamental idea with its contrary, it is intelligible that Zeno's defence aims at proving contradictions in the doctrines of his opponents. Hence he is the inventor of dialectic as the art of discovering contradictions; but although his dialectic only leads to negative results, and was afterwards made use of in the interest of the Sceptics, it nevertheless here stands wholly in the service of the thoroughly dogmatic Eleaticism.

§ 40.

Zeno.

(Pseudo-) Aristotle: De Melisso Zenone et Gorgia, Ch. 3 and 4.

1. Zeno of Elea, son of Teleutagoras, according to some the adopted son of Parmenides, his senior by twenty-five years, was alike distinguished for his political insight and for his heroism and character. Amongst other prose works, he composed when still young a defence of Parmenides, which has become especially famous. The form of this, which if it was not a dialogue at least came very near it, and the frequent employment of the dilemma, to say nothing of its contents,
was one of the reasons why Zeno was called the inventor of dialectic. This dialectic is negative, because his only object was to bring home to the opponents of the Eleatic doctrine, the reproach of self-contradiction they had made against it.

2. While Parmenides had only attributed truth to the Unity excluding all Plurality, the Being negating all Becoming, the Persistent devoid of all Motion, Zeno’s aim is rather to show that all who assume Plurality, Becoming and Motion involve themselves in contradictions. The proof consists in showing that on the supposition of the reality of plurality one and the same thing would be definite and yet indefinite, and rests upon the fact that all plurality is a definite thing, i.e. number, and yet contains an infinity i.e. of fractions. His argument is based on infinite divisibility, only he regards the δισχοτομία as one in space, by at once substituting for the idea of being distinct, that of being separated (by something). The Many, too, would be infinitely great as containing an infinite number of things, and at the same time infinitely small, as consisting of nothing but infinitely minute particles. And Becoming is combated by him in just the same way as plurality. Whether it is supposed to start with what is like or what is unlike that which becomes, it contains a contradiction. Lastly, the possibility of Motion is disputed. Of the four proofs of this which Aristotle mentions as due to Zeno, the first two again rest upon the infinity produced by the infinite divisibility, in the one case of the space to be passed through, and in the other of the start which Ἡκτόρ (or the tortoise) has as regards Ἀχιλλες (or the hound). The third proof first takes for granted that the flying arrow at every moment is at a point (i.e. at rest), and then draws from this the inevitable conclusions. Lastly, the fourth seems to regard motion as being merely a change of distance, and to conclude from the fact that a moving object approaches an observer who is at rest more slowly than one who goes to meet it, that in the first place the results may be different in spite of the equality of the velocities and the times, and secondly all sorts of other absurdities. In view of the important bearing which space has upon the question of motion, and according to Zeno also upon that of plurality, it is natural that he should seek a contradiction in this conception also. This is said to lie in the fact that space cannot be thought except as in space, and thus pre-supposes itself.
3. To Zeno, as to the other Eleatics, the deliverances of the senses are deceptive. Perhaps in order to prove this he invented the confusion (Ψόφος) which shows that the senses will not admit the validity of things which have been rationally admitted. If this and others like it were later applied by sophists and sceptics, it is nevertheless no proof that Zeno belonged to the latter, and the report that he denied the existence of the One, is also probably due to a misunderstanding—perhaps of a passage which has been preserved in which, speaking once more of infinite divisibility, he seems to indicate the impossibility of ultimate particles (atoms). With an inconsistency like that of his predecessors, he also supplies a system of physics. Our accounts say he took the four contraries of Anaximander for his elements, friendship and strife for his formative principles, and necessity for his regulating law, and conceived the soul as a mixture of these four elements. The premises of all these positions were already given, but their approximation to the doctrine of Empedocles is so close, that the report that in later life Zeno wrote comments on the didactic poem of Empedocles, becomes explicable. But if he even then still taught the possibility of the transition of one element into another, the difference between him and Empedocles would be one of principle. Probably, however, he remained nearer to the position of Anaximander on this point also. One is also reminded of Anaximander by his doctrine of a (probably successive) plurality of worlds. It seems as if this doctrine was directed polemically against Heraclitus and the Atomists.

Ritter and Preller, § 154-159.—Mullach, i. 266-270.

§ 41.

The antithesis of matter and category, ἄλη and λόγος, as Aristotle calls it, has been reduced by the Pythagoreans to that of the Many and the One, and, finally, by the Eleatics, to that of Non-Being and Being, to formulas which even Plato makes use of as being quite adequate. In attempting, however, to carry out a tendency to which the Pythagoreans had only inclined, viz., to lay stress on Being to the exclusion of Non-Being, the Eleatics become pure and anti-physical metaphysicians, and form, as Plato and Aristotle rightly remark, the opposite extreme to the Physiologers. But just this
extreme position which they have taken up, continually compels them against their will to set up again what they had tried to deny just before. And this is natural; for if Being is to be thought, to the exclusion of all Non-Being, and the One in opposition to all plurality, the thought of the second reappears by the side of the first, just as along with the thought of the concavity of a surface, there appears that of the convexity of the other side. The Eleatics, as Aristotle rightly says, have been compelled to set up, by the side of their science of Being, a theory of that which they nevertheless declared illusive appearance. And if progress, as was remarked above (§ 25), consist in doing wittingly and deliberately what was done unconsciously and under compulsion from an earlier point of view, progress will require a philosophy which combines Being and Non-Being, the One and the Many, and hence also metaphysics and physics. Hence the Metaphysical Physiologers, or physiological metaphysicians, occupy a higher position, as compared with the groups considered hitherto. And in the case of at least two of them, the "Ionian and Sicilian Muses," this position has been fixed by Plato with an accuracy that admits of no improvement. If, on the other hand, Aristotle reckons them among the physiologers, he overlooks the fact that his own definition of the conception no longer fits them, since they do not derive everything from the material alone.

THIRD DIVISION.

The Metaphysical Physiologers.

§ 42.

The first step taken in this direction is to show that that which Parmenides has denied, but has always been compelled to re-affirm, viz., Non-Being, is the predicate of everything just as much as Being; if this is the case, their combination, Becoming, is really the only true category, in spite of the contradiction it contains. This purely metaphysical advance is followed by the second one, that this category is also at the same time regarded physically. In order to appear physically Becoming cannot require a natural substance, but only a
natural process. Heraclitus, who makes this twofold advance beyond the Eleatics, recognises Becoming in the process of volatilization and especially in that of combustion. Since, moreover, there is as yet no question of a distinction of the material and the spiritual, of the physical and the ethical, the different degrees of the fire are at the same time the different stages of life and of knowledge. All that withdraws or excludes itself from the influence of the universal fire, separates itself from the life and the reason of the universe, and falls a prey to death, idiocy and egotism.

A.—HERACLITUS.


§ 43.

1. HERACLITUS, the son of Blyson, born according to most authorities at Ephesus, is said to have flourished about Ol. 69, and to have lived more than sixty years. The descendant of a noble family in which the honorary office of βασιλεύς, which he resigned to his brother, was hereditary, he retained to the end his contempt for the masses. The polemical way in which he mentions Thales, Xenophanes and Pythagoras, and insists that he taught himself, shows that his predecessors benefited him chiefly by provoking him to contradict them. The way in which he adhered to his own convictions has become proverbial. His book περὶ φύσεως, called the “muses” by the later ancients because of an expression of Plato’s, contained perhaps still more ethical and political advice than we can gather from the fragments that have been preserved. Perhaps the later ones among the many interpreters of his work, separated these teachings from the rest, and thus brought about the existence of several divisions of it, and finally the legend that he wrote more than one. The gloomy conciseness of his character is reflected in his writings, which even Socrates called hard of comprehension, and which at an early period earned him the
sobriquet of "the dark." Perhaps, in addition to their profundity and their adoption of foreign doctrines, reasons of style also contributed to this.

2. In opposition to the Eleatics, who attributed truth only to Being and denied Non-Being, Heraclitus maintains that everything, and even one and the same thing, both is and is not. Thus he substitutes for the Eleatic Being its combination with Non-Being, i.e. Becoming; and the idea that everything is in process and nothing at rest, and the idea that everything is undergoing continual change, objects as well as the subject that contemplates them, for of this also the Being is explicitly denied, is expressed by him in the most various ways. While to Xenophanes Being and the One void of difference were identical, and Parmenides exalted Eros or Friendship above all, Heraclitus finds pleasure in conceiving everything as contradicting itself; he extols conflict, and blames Homer for his love of peace, since rest and stationariness (στάσις) exist only among the dead. Connected with this continual flux of things is the uncertainty of the senses. For the flux escapes their notice, though it is perceived by rational cognition; and it is because what we see is stark and dead, that the eyes and ears are untrustworthy witnesses. (Compare by way of contrast the doctrine of Melissus, § 38, 3.) Perhaps the preference which he displays for the sense of smell is based upon the fact that it perceives volatilization, and thus is most of all dependent upon the change of form. Schuster acutely shows that the passages which seem to imply Heraclitus' contempt for the senses may also be differently utilized, especially so as to make him appear as the champion of the inductive method, in opposition to one-sided deduction.

3. However this may be, a doctrine like that of the universal flux, separates Heraclitus from the Ionian Hylicists; and since this principle is the result of thought, it makes him a metaphysician, like the Eleatics considered above. On the other hand, he is opposed to them, through the fact that his principle is contemplated also physically. Now Becoming, interpreted physically, is noticeable, first, in Time,—and accordingly he is actually said by Sextus Empiricus to have made time his first principle, whereas both Xenophanes and Parmenides denied this,—secondly, and more concretely, in the elementary process of combustion. Heraclitus did not seek the ground of the universe in any creative deity, but considered
it eternally burning fire. It would, however, be a misunderstanding to regard this fire as a substance, the condensation and rarefaction of which explained the manifold. Rather Heraclitus sees different degrees of the process of combustion or volatilization in the different forces of nature, which as πυρὸς προσταί stand in such relations with one another that each lives in the death of the other, and the process of combustion is the measure of true being in all, as gold is the measure of the value of all things. This, the sum and substance of reality, is also conceived as the spatial envelope of the universe, and is called the περιέχον, the περιοδικὸν πῦρ, etc. And just as Becoming corresponds to the process of the fire, so its two forms, coming into being and passing out of it, correspond to the rise and fall of the fire, the famous ὁδὸς ἄνω κάτω, in which the direction in space is not more essential than the increasing or waning. In this, the stiffening and cooling are the descent.

4. The inseparable connection between the forms of Becoming has been illustrated by Heraclitus in the most various ways. Sometimes he calls the two paths one and the same; sometimes he speaks of an alternation of desire and satiety, and of a play in which the world is produced; sometimes he says that necessity regulates the two contrary currents. (It is characteristic of Heraclitus' attitude towards the pure physiologers and metaphysicians, that where Anaximander and Pythagoras had alike spoken of ἐναντία, contrary propositions, we find in his case ἐναντία ροή, contrary current.) The names given to this power are Εἰμαρμένη, Δαίμον, Γνώμη, Δίκη, Δόγος, etc. The fact that the handmaids of this force, which he calls the seed of all that happens and the measure of all order, are entitled the "tongues," has probably been rightly ascribed to the influence of the Persian Magi. On the other hand, he connects himself with his country's mythology, not indeed without a change of exegesis, when he places Apollo and Dionysus beside Zeus, i.e. the ultimate Fire, as the two aspects of his nature. In this twofold tendency or scale, the rigid earth forms the lower, and the mobile fire the upper extreme, since the latter as an element (Hephaestus) is distinguished from the ultimate fire or Zeus. This last is the permanent factor in the circulation of the elements, and therefore never appears as such. Fire, as the extreme contrary of rigid corporeality, is conceived as the moving and animating principle. Midway between it and the earth is situated the sea, consisting half of
earth and half of fiery air, and hence precipitating the former and exhaling the latter, and often called the seed of the world. Hence the transition to rigid corporeality is called a quenching or moistening, while the increase of the fiery nature is also an increase of life. Hence, even if the expression ἐκπυρωματις, found in the writings of the Stoics, were due to Heraclitus, it would be wrong to understand by it a destruction of the world, rather than the eternal circular motion of all things, the expiration of which may have been the "great year" of Heraclitus, the one turning-point, to which would be opposed as its diametrical opposite the transition into earthy slime.

5. Heraclitus found his views confirmed by the phenomena of the air, amongst which he includes the constellations. They are in his opinion collections of shining vapours in the boat-shaped hollows of the heavens, or, conglomerations of fire, but in any case generated and nourished by the evaporation of the earth and the sea. Especially is this the case with the sun, which radiates forth and loses its light daily, and daily renews itself by this nourishment. And since the evaporation is of two kinds, one dark and damp, another dry and bright, it serves to explain day and night, eclipses and meteoric appearances of light, although at the same time stress is laid on their strict subjection to laws. The two contrary tendencies conflict still more in organic beings, than in the forces of nature which compose them. Perhaps because it is more difficult to recognise it in them, Heraclitus says that the hidden harmony is better than the visible. Isolated utterances indicate that he assumed a gradation of beings. Thus, because nothing in the world is entirely devoid of the principle of life, he regards all things as full of gods and daemons, and says a god is only an immortal man, and man a mortal god. But man also is a worthless being on the purely bodily side, and is hence called the naturally reasonless. Life and soul, and, since the latter is still regarded as identical with consciousness and cognition, these also, man acquires only by participation in the all-animating fire, and in its purest appearance, the enveloping. It is this which is alone rational, and the soul partakes of it the more fully, the warmer and drier it is, and hence more easily in warm and dry countries. As consistency requires, the soul's entrance into the body is to man a moistening, and hence an extinguishing and dying. The death of the body, on the other hand, is the true return to life of the soul.
6. As the enveloping fire is the truly rational existence, reason is that which is common to all (καυνόν), and the individual partakes of it only when he allows himself to be penetrated by it through all the channels, especially of the senses, and is permeated by its glow, like a coal which remains close to the fire. Thus sleep is the half-way house to death, because in it the gates of the senses are closed, and man has part in the enveloping reason only by breathing, and lives in other respects in an isolated world of his own. And no less does he shut himself off by his merely subjective opinion, which Heraclitus calls a disease from which no one is quite free, since every one pursues the childish play of opinion, and cherishes the illusion that the reason within him is his own. Laying the stress he did on the common element, as against isolating subjective contemplation, it is intelligible that he should regard language as the proper means of cognition, and should be the first to subject it to philosophical examination. His ethical doctrines also quite agree with the rest: the transition to fieriness becomes identical with the good, that to rigidity and death with evil. And just as those two processes belong together, so good and evil form a harmony, even as in the form of the bow or the lyre contrary tensions are harmoniously united. (The fact that in another passage the arrow is mentioned instead of the bow, leads Lassalle to the supposition that here also we have an allusion to the double activity of Apollo.) Hence in ethics also, conflict and not rest is the ideal. The position held by opinion in theoretical matters, is here taken by insolent self-will. Nevertheless it must be suppressed, hard as that may be, for the law stands highest, just as above the καυνός λόγος did. The citizen should fight more strenuously for the laws than for the walls of his city. Hence what Heraclitus demands of man is submission to necessity, as the result of the recognition of the fact that the alternating predominance of good and evil is far better than what is desired by the selfish wishes of man. And because this submission rests upon such insight into the nature of things, it is free, and its requirement does not conflict with his polemical attacks upon astrology and other fatalistic notions.

§ 44.

Heraclitus' polemics against the Eleatics lower the superiority of his point of view and render it one-sided in its turn, though in a contrary way. This is still more markedly the case with his disciples. When Cratylus outdid his master, and declared it impossible to enter the same river not only twice but even once, he thereby made Heraclitus a denier of all Being. Thus it could come about that the sceptics, who only assume Non-Being, counted him among their number, and that Aristotle classed him, the opponent of the anti-physical doctrines, among the mere physiologers. In this an injustice is indeed done to Heraclitus, but there was some ground for it. Hence the problem of philosophy is to retain the Eleatic Being by the side of the Becoming exalted by Heraclitus, without, in so doing, relapsing into abstract metaphysics. Hence it is necessary to assume, in agreement with the Eleatics but in opposition to Heraclitus, an unchangeable Being. But it must be conceived, in opposition to the Eleatics, as a physical substance, and, in the spirit of Heraclitus, as a plurality, i.e. a plurality of unchangeable substances or elements. Further, it will be necessary to assume, in agreement with Heraclitus, and in opposition to the assertions of the Eleatics, a real process. But this process will not be, like that of Heraclitus, a burning without a substratum, but one which the substrata undergo. It will differ from that of the pure physiologers, in that it will consciously rest upon metaphysical principles. Empedocles is the man who was enabled by his nationality and the course of his development to make this advance, and to combine in his doctrine, not eclectically, but in an organic whole, what previous philosophers had taught. Thus there is not a single school among which he has not been counted with an appearance of justification. For he recognises the chaotic primeval mixture of Anaximander, the spherical form of Xenophanes, the water of Thales, the air of Anaximenes, the earth and the fire of Parmenides and Heraclitus, the love of the Eleatics, the strife of Heraclitus, the condensation and rarefaction of Thales and Anaximenes, the mixture and separation of Anaximander, and finally even the domination of numerical relations in the mixtures, like the Pythagoreans.
B.—EMPEDOCLES.


§ 45.

1. Empedocles, the son of Meton, born at Akragas (Agrigentum) in Sicily as the descendant of a noble family, lived probably from Ol. 72—Ol. 87. Famous for his patriotism, eloquence and medical skill, he was indebted to the last, together with many peculiarities in his mode of life, for his reputation as a magician. His death was adorned with fabulous details at an early period, in the interest of different views. There is considerable authority for his familiarity with Pythagorean doctrines; and even if chronology does not admit of his being a disciple of Pythagoras personally, he has been called a Pythagorean even by modern writers. Others, in reliance on the reports which make him a disciple of Parmenides, call him an Eleatic. Finally, the majority follow the example of Aristotle (who had really no right to do so, according to his own statements; *vid. sub. 2.*), and account him one of the physiologers. But it is Plato’s mention of him together with Heraclitus, which is justified also by the influence of the Ephesian upon him, that assigns to him his proper position. Of the writings of Empedocles, the titles of which are stated variously, there have been preserved fragments of two, the *peri fýseos* and the *katharmoi*. Some modern writers regard the latter, and also the *iátriká*, as subdivisions of the former.

2. Empedocles agrees with the Eleatics in retaining unchangeable Being, in opposition to the coming into existence, which he declares impossible. But by admitting the factor of plurality and materiality, which the Éleatics had denied, his Being becomes a plurality of unchangeable elements, of which he was the first to assert that they were four in number, while he denied that they passed into one another. In this doctrine, one is reminded of the Pythagoreans by the occurrence of the number four, and of Heraclitus by his calling them Æmmons and giving them the names of the popular deities, and by the preference for Zeus or Fire. In addition to these unchangeable substrata (*píçómatá, ýleikai árχai*), he regarded as principles
two forces or formative principles, Friendship and Strife, the attraction and repulsion of different substances, conceived as yet only physically. This avoids the rigid Rest of the Eleatics, and substitutes for the Heraclitean process without a substratum, a process of the substrata, \textit{i.e.} change with its two Anaximandorean forms of mixture and separation. These two active principles are inseparably united, and their combination is called sometimes necessity, sometimes chance. But to infer from isolated expressions of Empedocles that he considered friendship identical with fire, strife with the remaining elements, would disturb the clearness of his doctrine. This would reduce him to a mere physiologer, and it is more correct to recognise with Aristotle, that he regarded these active principles as efficient causes by the side of the material substrata.

3. The primitive condition of matter is described as a \textit{μίγμα}, which is often designated the One, in Pythagorean fashion, or, Eleatically, Being, and also the universe or the eternal world, but generally the \textit{σφαῖρας} in virtue of its figure. Naturally it does not admit of any definite quality, and hence as being \textit{ἀποίχω}, corresponds to the indefinite Chaos of Anaximander. And as such a state of intermixture, which is so intimate as to admit of no void, suggests the idea of very small particles, Empedocles has been by some identified with the Atomists, and has had attributed to him by others the views of Anaxagoras, and even the very expressions which are generally ascribed to the latter. But Empedocles cannot assume any existence beside the \textit{σφαῖρας} or the whole, and all conceptions of a transcendent deity are either falsely ascribed to his doctrine, or inconsistencies in it. Just as little may we conclude, as many ancient and modern authorities have done, from the fact that not the separate senses (which are set apart for the perception of the separate elements), but the \textit{νοῦς} perceives the \textit{σφαῖρας}, that Empedocles taught the existence of a \textit{κόσμος νοητός} in the sense of Plato. In the original state of mixture Friendship is of course alone active, or at least Strife is reduced to a minimum. This so easily suggests the confusion of the unity with the cause of union, that we must not be surprised to find the One and Love used as synonymous. In virtue of the action of Strife upon this mixture, the heterogeneous substances are separated; and it has been unreasonably called an inconsistency, that he makes Hatred a cause of union, \textit{i.e.}
of the homogeneous. At this point similar particles unite, and there ensues the separation of the elements. As to the order of this separation our authorities differ. And since it is a separation of the heterogeneous, the heavens have become void of Love and the elements of the world are ruled by Hatred. But it is only part of the whole that enters into this severance, and only in it, the κόσμος, does Strife bear sway, but not in the rest of the universe. The unseparated chaotic part of the σφαῖρος is only rarely considered dead matter in the spirit of Heraclitus; generally Empedocles, like the Eleatics, regards it as the higher existence, and therefore regards all things as ultimately reverting into this negation of all particularity.

4. Of course it is only the simple elements that owe their existence to Strife; other substances and especially organic beings are very composite and the result of Love, which keeps together the individual limbs that originally grew separately out of the ground, and the increasing power of which is displayed in the succession of beings of increasing complexity. The perfection of organisms is conditioned not only by the number of its components, but also by the proportions of the mixture, which are even expressed, in Pythagorean fashion, by figures. But even man, most perfect of all, and therefore of most recent origin, is not eternal as a separate being; and metempsychosis here takes the place of immortality. The fact that he is himself composed of them, enables man to perceive all the six principles. The fire within him perceives the fire without him, etc. In his consideration of sense-perception, Empedocles seems to have gone into great detail, and to have explained many things by the assumption of pores. The mixture of the elements is nowhere more thorough than in the blood. Hence he regards it as the seat of the νόημα, i.e. of the sum of all perceptions. Cognition by the senses is deceptive because it depends on a single object, and one element, and can only grasp the elements in their separation, and not the σφαῖρος. This is not the case with the νόημα, which, itself the combination of all perceptions, has cognition also of that which is united by Love. Just as in these passages the principles of life and of cognition are still quite identical, so also the conceptions of physical and moral evil. These exist only in the κόσμος, subjected to segregation; beyond it, in the unseparated σφαῖρος, all things are good. The ascetic rules which Empedocles gives are based upon
reverence for all the manifestations of Love. The religious
doctrines, contained chiefly in the καθαρμός, refer especially to
the future life, alike of the blessed in the seat of the gods,
and of those who are guilt-laden and hunted through the world
in restless flight. They breathe a priestly spirit, and show many
points of contact with Pythagorean doctrines; but they do not
always agree with those of Empedocles himself. The same
applies to his treatment of the popular deities, where he does
not, as above, mean the elements. Zeller has given a full
account and a just estimate of these doctrines. (Vol. i., p.
547 f., 2nd ed.)

with supplements by Peyron (1810), and Bergk (1835–39). Karsten, Lc.

§ 46.

The reproach which could be brought against Heraclitus
with a show of reason, against his successors with an abundance
of reason—that they really affirmed Non-Being only, will
be brought against Empedocles by no one. Rather the contrary reproach: for he expressly denies the void, which is
Non-Being regarded physically. Not only does this in a way
justify his being counted altogether among the Eleatics, but it
also involves him in contradictions, which, perhaps, induced
Plato to place him so far below Heraclitus. That all multiplicity is generated only by διαστήματα, i.e. interpositions of
the void, had been shown by the Pythagoreans; that motion is
only possible by reason of the void, was known already to the
Eleatics. But since it is through these that the world comes
into existence, Empedocles affirms its reality, while denying
its conditions. It is a similar contradiction when the segregated part of the universe receives the honourable title of
κόσμος, and then the unseparated portion of the σφαῖρα is preferred, i.e. chaotic disorder to order, to say nothing of the subordinate contradiction involved, when one who denies the void
explains so many things by the assumption of pores, etc. Hence
the advance required by such contradictions will consist in
this, that in opposition to the Eleatics and Heraclitus, the
metaphysical principle be maintained, that Being and Non-Being
be alike justified; that the time of mere metaphysics being
past, this principle be carried out in a system of physics, in
which Non-Being is opposed to the many unchangeable substrata which represent Being; and that the two entering into each other produce Becoming, viewed physically, i.e., motion and change. This advance is made by the Atomism of the Abderite philosophy. Hence, even if its champions had not been acquainted with their predecessors in philosophy, as may be proved to have been the case with its chief representative, we should have to say that their point of view surpassed all previous ones, because it combined them.

C.—THE ATOMISTS.


§ 47.

1. As hardly anything is known of Leucippus, and the accounts of his date vary, while none of his writings have come down to us, and since, moreover, it is perhaps nothing more than a misunderstanding that Theophrastus is said to have ascribed to him one of the writings of Democritus, we must regard as the true representative of Atomism his countryman and disciple, or younger companion, Democritus, the son of Hegesistratus, especially as he would probably have included in his work the whole teaching of his predecessor. Democritus, born about Ol. 80, spent his large fortune in travels undertaken with the object of accumulating treasures of knowledge in all lands then known, laden with which he returned to his native city, and died at a very great age. Of his numerous writings, which Thrasyllus arranged in tetralogies, many are, perhaps, subdivisions of larger works. The most important, probably, were the μέγας and the μικρός διάκοσμος, which, together, contained his doctrine of atoms and of the construction of the world. Probably many of the fragments preserved belonged to them. In spite of occasional solecisms, the style of Democritus was famous in antiquity.

2. The agreement of the atomist doctrine with that of the Eleatics, which ancient authorities explain by historical connections, is seen in the fact that both deny the reality of Becoming, both of the Many out of One, or of the One into Many; also in their conception of extended matter, as τὸ ὅν, and the unchangeable reality attributed to it; and, finally,
in their designation of the void as the μὴ ὄν. Similarly
the Atomists agree with Heraclitus, the opponent of the
Eleanics, probably once more not without historical connec-
tions, and his rightness or wrongness is, like theirs, acknow-
ledged in the sentence which contains the substance of atomist
metaphysics, viz., that Being is no more than Non-Being.
But it is a further step that these thought-determinations
are at the same time conceived physically; Being is the
full (πλήρες), extended (στερεόν), corporeal (σῶμα), Non-Being
the void (κενόν), or according to others also the rarefied (μανόν).
Their curious formula for this antithesis, δέν and μηδέν, may be
represented by “a-thing,” and “nothing.” The idea that the
void, by entering into the existent, produces plurality in the
latter, is familiar already to the Pythagoreans. Hence the
existent consists of an infinite number of very small and there-
fore invisible σκόματα or ιδέαι, which, because they have no
interstices within them, are παμπλήρη, and because they can
have none, are ἀδιακριτά, ἀτομα. The void, on the other hand,
by forming the intervals between the ultimate particles, sup-
plies the διαστήματα or πάροι; by enveloping them all, it is
the void properly speaking, or the ἀτερφων, the name given to
it already by the Pythagoreans. In this infinite void there
exist an innumerable number of worlds, perhaps separated
from one another by membranous partitions, but all consisting
of similar atoms, as different books consist of the same letters.
These atoms do not display any qualitative differences at all,
they are ἀτομα, and differ only in size and shape. For this
reason, the assertion that different weights were attributed to
the atoms is more credible than that this was not done.

3. The Atomists think that multiplicity and change can be
explained only on the assumption of a real Void, without
which things would form a continuous mass. Change, again,
is reduced to motion, which either implies an enveloping void
or, if it consists in condensation or rarefaction, void spaces or
pores within bodies. The Atomists, just like Empedocles,
therefore, teach the existence of Becoming, only with an un
changeable Being for its substratum, and their agreement be-
comes a verbal one, when they deny the possibility of coming
into being, and substitute for this, mixture and separation.
They agree further with Empedocles, that necessity (ἀνάγκη,
δίκη, εἰμαρμένη) regulates these minglings and separations.
This, too, may have been the fiery world-soul which, accord-
ing to an old account, Democritus is said to have declared to be the Deity. But since this power which regulates the atoms
is not immanent, and, according to Aristotle, acts not naturally
but by force, it has not unjustly been called chance; for
Democritus' protest against this word merely amounts to say-
ing, that nothing falls outside of the bond of cause and effect,
and everything has a reason. But those who attribute to him
a teleological point of view as well, forget that in opposition
to the νοῦς of Anaxagoras (vid. § 52, 3) he expressly maintains
a φύσις ἀλογος.

4. The atoms, though themselves devoid of qualities, give
rise to qualitative differences, in that a greater or less number
of them produces a greater or less density, and therefore
weight, which is also supposed to account for differences of
heat. Moreover, they also have different shapes and sizes,
and can combine in different positions and in different order.
Thus the elements consist of atoms of different sizes, fire, e.g.
of the smallest and roundest. Similar to it, and consisting of
atoms like the motes in a sunbeam, Democritus imagines the
soul to be, which permeates the whole body, and renews itself
in breathing by continually taking up similar atoms. And
because of the general diffusion of such atoms, no body can be
declared quite inanimate and devoid of soul. The outward
manifestations of the soul depend on the different organs:
thus it manifests itself as thought in the head, as eagerness in
the heart, and as desire in the liver. And as animation and
the principle of cognition are not distinguished from each
other, his theory of knowledge is purely physical; the images
propelled from the objects immediately or mediatelystrike the
organ of sense, and thereby arouse sensation. But since
many of these sensations, especially those of sight, indicate
not so much what is the nature of the object in itself (ἐπί
τοι), but rather how they affect us or are for us (νόμιμον), it becomes
necessary to distinguish between deceptive (σκοτίν), and true
(γνωμῖν) cognition. The latter, rational cognition or διάνοια, is
related to the underlying (ἐν βρόθο) truth, i.e. the atoms: but,
like the first, it depends on material action, and is concerned
with phenomena (φαινόμενα).

5. Ethical determinations are hardly to be expected from
such a point of view. Nevertheless, a large number of
maxims and ethical precepts have been preserved, of which
Democritus is said to be the author. Their number has been
still further increased, since also those formerly attributed to Democrats, have begun to be ascribed to him; so that the critics are already beginning to sift the material once more. And since some of these dicta did not seem to fit in well with the materialism of his philosophy, some have maintained the opinion that they were composed at an early period, and the *Diacosmus* in his old age. But in the case of many of these wise sayings, it would be more difficult to deny that they represent the experience of an old man, than in that of the atomic theory, which may even have been handed down to Democritus in his youth. Besides, he would not be the only example of a man upon whom life forced maxims differing from those of the theory he had sketched. As to the content of his ethical advice, his praise of equanimity (*eirēnē*) fits in quite well with his system of necessitarianism: a considerable number are rather trivial, others bear witness to his experience and to a loving heart; and others, again, can only have been invented by an old bachelor. Those which connect morality with thought about the gods, might be the most difficult to reconcile with his other doctrines; for it is known that he derived the belief in the gods merely from the fear of thunderstorms and similar phenomena.


§ 48.

The Atomists close the period of the men whose philosophy appeared to Aristotle to have been one of "dreamers," because they show the truly Greek wisdom only in an embryonic state. Aristotle's judgment about them, that as yet no distinction was made between that which knows and that which is known, may also be expressed in the form, that the peculiar dignity of the human spirit is not recognised. In this form, it gives the reason why their doctrines were certain to appear to the Greek people as exotic growths, even if they did not in their wide travels really bring them from foreign countries. Thus the doctrine of the pure Physiologers, that everything, including man, is a modification of a material substance, reflects the spirit, not of the Greeks, but of primitive peoples. The absolute supremacy of number and of mathematical laws, announced by the Pythagoreans, is something which the Chinaman experiences in the prescribed precision of his daily
life, far rather than the cheerful Greek. The absorption of all separate existences in a single substance, as it is taught by the Eleatics, seems rather an echo of Indian pantheism than a principle of the Hellenic spirit. The kinship of the doctrines of Heraclitus with those of the Persian Fire-worshippers, has both in ancient and in modern times led to the assertion of historical connections between them; and even those who will not let themselves be convinced by the evidence adduced in order to represent Empedocles as a disciple of the wisdom of the Egyptian priests, will be unable to deny the relationship of his doctrines with theirs. The Atomists finally, the inheritors of all the previous systems, may be described as those who formulate not merely the nature of a single stage preparatory to the spirit of Hellenism, but of Pre-Hellenism as a whole, on the point of advancing to Hellenism.
SECOND
PERIOD OF ANCIENT PHILOSOPHY.

GREEK PHILOSOPHY AT ITS HEIGHT, OR THE ATTIC PHILOSOPHY.

INTRODUCTION.

§ 49.

In the heart of Greece, at Athens, there had been no philosophy hitherto, because other tasks, like the liberation of Greece, etc., had been more urgent. It is only after these achievements that Athens enjoys the leisure which Aristotle says is required for philosophy. But at this time the previous state of things, when a single spirit permeated the whole city to such an extent that the superior ancient families were not hated as nobles, nor the inferior despised as the mob, had already come to an end. Their reputation and the wealth which flowed into Athens, called forth insolence and selfishness in individuals; and the vulgar temper of the masses, devoid of all patriotic feeling, developed to such an extent, that the noblest Athenian, who has given his name to this age, was compelled to make use of it, and thus to nourish it, in order to realize his own aims and those of the State. He, as well as all others on a level with the age, would have smiled if any one had asserted, like Diogenes of Apollonia, that reason dwelt in the masses, or, like Heraclitus, that all things were full of the divine. But when Anaxagoras came forward in Athens with this general formula of the world: that it was reason which determined the mass in accordance with its ends, Pericles himself, and all those who lived in harmony with the more modern ideas, were bound to recognise him as the man they wanted, who truly understood the times. As always, the adherents of the old times hated and persecuted as the author of this decay, the man who only proclaimed its existence.
§ 50.

Besides this necessity in the history of the world (cf. § 11), possessed by the dualism of Anaxagoras, he is also called forth by the fact that the previous development of philosophy requires him as a necessary consequence. For since, according to the Atomists, the individual material particles have no qualitative character, in virtue of which they can seek or avoid one another, as in Empedocles, it is necessary to assert that the material contains no reason why they should combine in one way and not in another. But since they again expressly maintained that this combination did not take place without reason, but ἐκ λόγου, they had asserted two positions which could only serve as the premises to this single conclusion, that the reason of this combination, i.e. of motion, lay in the immaterial. And since, moreover, the reasons of motion which lie in the immaterial are called motives, these two principles of the Atomists so nearly lead up to the assertion of an immaterial existence besides the material, which moves the material according to motives, i.e. of a Reason (νοῦς) that acts according to design, that the most important Atomist himself considered it necessary to attack this doctrine.

§ 51.

Anaxagoras is the father of the Attic philosophy, not only because he transplanted philosophy to Athens, but because he laid before it the subject which it had to develop there. His assertion that the νοῦς was the highest existence, and the demand contained in it that everywhere search must be made for the final cause, has been repudiated by none of his successors. In spite of the difference between the Sophists, who regarded the νοῦς as mere sharpness, and Aristotle, who regarded it as the universal reason thinking itself; in spite of the antithesis that the final cause meant to the former the use, to the latter the justification of a thing, both move within the limits of the task first propounded by Anaxagoras. And so do all those who intervene between the Sophists and Aristotle. In Anaxagoras, Greek philosophy issued out of its embryonic condition, in which its doctrine was pre-Hellenic. The first principle of its own and all existence is now no longer found by the human mind in a single element, or in a
mathematical rule, or in the collisions of atoms, but in that in which it transcends the natural. This is the first solution of the problem of philosophy in a Greek spirit, and hence the philosophy of Anaxagoras does not reflect any stage of pre-Hellenism, but the life of the Greek, and especially of the Athenian. Hence it is intelligible that Socrates, the incarnation of anti-barbarism, and Aristotle, the concluding representative of Attic philosophy, should regard Anaxagoras as the first who was "awake," that is, who had spoken sensibly, in contrast with the dreamers before him.

FIRST DIVISION.

Anaxagoras.


§ 52.

1. ANAXAGORAS, the son of Hegesibulus, was born at Clazomenae, probably about Ol. 70, and therefore cannot have been, as is reported, a personal disciple of Anaximenes. After he had sacrificed his fortune in the interests of science by leaving Ionia, he selected Athens as his place of residence, according to some at once, according to others only after long travels. More important probably for his scientific development than his travels, and the intercourse with his countryman, Hermotimus, must have been his acquaintance with the doctrines of the earlier Physiologers, of Empedocles, who, although a little younger, began to write before him, and of Leucippus. The reproach of plagiarism from his predecessors, made against him by Democritus, refers perhaps to Leucippus, the common teacher of Anaxagoras and himself. At Athens, Anaxagoras was active as a teacher of philosophy for thirty years, and not only won the friendship of Pericles, but surrounded himself with a circle of men, to which Archelaus, Euripides and Thucydides, and perhaps also Socrates belonged. They were all regarded with suspicion by those who kept to the old-fashioned ideas, and in part perhaps decried as atheists.
Thus Anaxagoras' knowledge of physics, with his zeal to explain what the masses regarded as miracles (e.g. the shower of stones; whence the legend that he had predicted it), his allegorical method of explaining the Homeric myths, all these things contributed to arouse the suspicion of atheism against him, which finally, perhaps in consequence of the book he published in his old age, issued in his accusation. This was followed by his imprisonment, and exile or flight from Athens. He betook himself to Lampsacus, where he died soon afterwards, in Ol. 88, 1. Besides a mathematical work elaborated in prison, he was the author of a book περὶ φύσεως, perhaps his only other work, of which fragments have been preserved.

2. Like Empedocles and the Atomists, Anaxagoras denies the Becoming of the material substance, and only admits in it a change due to mixture and segregation, in the course of which the substratum is neither increased nor decreased. Like Anaximander and Empedocles, he imagines the original condition of things to have been chaotic, in which the most different things were mingled, and therefore nothing individual was perceptible (ἐνθελον). But he agrees with the Atomists in thinking that there were not only four kinds of these particles, but an infinite number, and infinitely various shapes. Lastly, he again asserts, in agreement with Empedocles and in opposition to the Atomists, the qualitative variety of these particles, so that not only were the larger combined with the smaller, but that gold, and flesh, and wood, etc., in their finely divided condition, were united into a mass without gaps or pores. Hence there is here really no question of a mixture of elements, but things (χρώματα, i.e. πράγματα) are mixed; and their finest molecules, which even in their infinite division retain their qualities, are called στέρματα, or in atomistic phraseology also ἰδεῖα. The beginning of his book, viz., ὅμων πάντα χρώματα ἢν, became the classical expression, to describe this condition, which Anaxagoras himself called σύμμεισις or μίγμα, and this formula is also used in an abbreviated form and substantively. On the other hand, the report that Anaxagoras called the ultimate particles ὁμοιομερῆ or even (contrary to all analogy) ὁμοιομέρεια, arose at an early period, owing to a misunderstanding of passages in Aristotle in which Anaxagoras is blamed for regarding as ultimate-substances, complicated substances, which Aristotle calls ὁμοιομερῆ. At the most it might be admitted that Anaxagoras uses ὁμοιομέρεια to
designate the condition of mixture, but even this is improbable. The combination of the individual particles is so close, that, as their divisibility is infinite, it is impossible to arrive at an ultimate wholly unmixed particle. Hence it is necessary to say that everything is contained in each thing, an assertion which was combated by his opponents, and involves him in great difficulties himself, unless by everything and each thing material substances are meant.

3. This mass void of form and of motion, in which we may recognise the ἀπειρον of Anaximander, the σφαῖρα of Empedocles, and the union of smallest particles of the Atomists, is now approached, not indeed by a separating and combining necessity, which is just what Anaxagoras denies, but by the νοῦς, a conscious power, the introduction of which at once provokes the teleological mode of regarding things. In direct opposition to the principle of the previous period as formulated by Aristotle (v. § 48), Anaxagoras ascribes to the knowing νοῦς predicates contrary to those belonging to the known object (the mass). The νοῦς is ἀμηγής; it is the One and therefore knows the mass, which had been defined as the Many and the ἀπειρον. And whereas of material things everything is contained in everything else, the νοῦς is not, because it is not passive, and just for this reason does it sway the material. Thus in Anaxagoras separation and combination become a purposive forming and ordering, and to the Becoming of the διάκοσμος of the Atomists there corresponds an active διάκοσμεῦν on the part of the νοῦς. It is true that Anaxagoras contents himself with enunciating his principle. In discussing particular instances, he does not state the purpose, but only the nature, or at the utmost the reason of the change, so that it here becomes almost indifferent whether it is referred to a conscious or to a blind power. This is justly censured by Plato as a relapse to a lower point of view.

4. The process of segregation initiated by the νοῦς unites the qualitatively similar particles, and according to the preponderance of one substance or another their names are given them, though, as has been remarked, they are never wholly pure. As in Empedocles, not all things take part in this segregation, and the unseparated residuum is probably the "envelope of the many" (things) which he mentions. The segregation is conceived as a successive one, starting from a centre and extending in ever-growing circles and with an
ever-growing impetus. In consequence of this there arises
the ether, which composes also the red-hot bodies like pumice-
stones, which are called stars, as the warm, light, and bright
substance, opposed to the cold, damp, and heavy earth which
prevails at the centre. And like the elements, organic beings
also are composed of the ultimate particles. They arise out
of the primeval slime, as in Anaximander, and attain to self-
propagation only at a later period. The more perfectly a
body is organized the more powerful is the νοῦς within it, and
the more powerfully does it promote knowledge and animation.
Hence even the plants are not devoid of soul; but the ex-
perience and reason of the soul of man is greater, because he
is endowed with hands. Compared with the reason, the senses
do not supply any sure knowledge; and hence the appearances
with which they illude us, as e.g. the white colour of snow, are
often refuted by the reason, which teaches that snow is water,
and therefore not white. Apparently Anaxagoras already
connected with this uncertainty of the senses extremely sub-
jective opinions as to the nature of knowledge. Ethical
dicta, which one would have been far more inclined to expect
from Anaxagoras’ point of view than from his predecessors,
have not been handed down to us.

Ritter and Preller, § 58–70 Mullach, i. 243–251.

§ 53.

The philosophy of Anaxagoras must give way to another,
not only because the times of which it was the expression
pass away, and the rule of demagogues like Kleon and others
far worse follows upon the guidance of Athens by Pericles,
but this is also required by an internal defect. That reason
takes the first place, and that everything should be con-
sidered teleologically, is to say very little, so long as the
question is not decided whether by reason we are to under-
stand that displayed in the cunning of the subject, or in the
order of the world, and so long as the real meaning of con-
formity to end is not more closely determined. And since
Anaxagoras refuses to decide the first of these questions when
he expressly says that all reason is alike, the greater, or uni-
versal, as well as the smaller or particular, he cannot possibly
decide whether the world exists for our use, or in order
to fulfil its purpose. Not having decided this, he must put
§ 54.] THE SOPHISTS. 69

aside all questions as to the wherefore of things and renounce every teleological point of view. And yet the decision was not far to seek. For if the mass in itself is devoid of spirit and of reason, the purposes which the reason brings into it must be external to it, and it must be forcibly adapted to them. If now we call such purposes or ends,—since they have their limit in the material opposed to them, as it has its limit in them,—finite, then the first determination given to the wherefore, which Anaxagoras had failed to define, will be, that it means a finite conformity to end, and not one immanent in things. But as soon as the nature of the end has been more closely determined, the indefiniteness as to what was called reason also ceases. For reason having finite ends for its content is reasonableness or cleverness, as it exists in reasonable subjects that seek their own advantage. However much, therefore, it may appear as a retrogression that the dictum of Anaxagoras, that reason rules the world, should receive the sense of “cleverness rules,” or “the clever are masters of everything,” it was yet a meritorious achievement to have determined more closely what had been undefined. And that the definition thus given by the Sophists was the one required by the position of affairs, is shown by the way in which not only Archelaus but Anaxagoras himself approximates to the sophistic point of view. For Archelaus’ dictum, that right and wrong depend only upon arbitrary enactment, only completes the assertion ascribed to Anaxagoras, that nothing is true in itself, but everything only for us.

SECOND DIVISION.

The Sophists.


§ 54.

The Sophists, by placing the reasoning subject above everything, and showing how everything exists only to be mastered by man theoretically and practically, hold the same position in
Greece that the cosmopolitan sages of the 18th century do in modern times, viz., that of the fathers of culture. The likeness begins with the names they respectively applied to themselves; for “enlightening” and “making clever” are the same thing. It extends to the object of education they lay down; for the δεινός of the Sophists precisely corresponds to the “strong mind freed from prejudice” of the others, and the virtue which the former undertake to teach, to the reasonableness and light which it is the latter’s boast to disseminate. The means, finally, which they use are identical. For the ἀντιλογική τέχνη, which, according to the testimony of their opponents and the admission of the Sophists themselves, was their real weapon; is only the art of representing things differently from different points of view, i.e., the art of argumentation, which produces versatility, the enemy and opposite of narrow-minded simplicity. And because no simplicity can withstand argumentation, simple piety and simple manners also yield to it. Hence the arguer is not only formidable in his own estimation, but appears dangerous to others and especially to the simple. Enlightenment carries its dangers with it; the Sophists make the people too clever, and the words “Enlightener” and “Sophist” became terms of abuse instead of titles of honour.

§ 55.

There is, however, this difference between sophistry and the enlightenment of the 18th century, that the former has greater consideration than the latter also for the practical domination of man over things. Hence the Sophists strive to deliver man, not only from the narrowness of his views, but also from the narrowness of his means, and to free him, not only from prejudice, but also from poverty. The possession of these means is not only called, but really is, to have money. Hence the Sophist, just like the merchant, regards his money-making power as the measure of his skill, and makes it a subject of his instruction. This end also is attained most surely by argumentation. For since in those days it was impossible to make money without lawsuits, and lawsuits could not be won without persuading the judges, i.e. by finding as many good points as possible in one’s cause, the ἀντιλογική τέχνη was the surest introduction to the art of pettifogging successfully, τὸν ἐπτω λόγον κρείττω ποιεῖν, as the sophistic formula ran.
Evil as this art is, it yet brought in its train the development of grammar, style, and rhetoric, all of which owe, in part their existence, in part their advancement, to the Sophists. And however much they might diverge in other respects, they were all united in their labours on behalf of the art of eloquence, or at least of the exercises preparatory to it; and even their enemies have not denied their merits in this respect.


§ 56.

A strictly scientific proof, and a view of the world based upon a single principle, are incompatible with the historical position of the Sophists, and with the task they had put before themselves. The one appears to them pedantic, the other as one-sided, and both as uncultured. In order to obtain as many points of view as possible, it is necessary to make use of the most various doctrines, and to borrow from every possible system. A sceptically-tinged eclecticism is always the attitude of the "enlightened," and so it was in Greece. Nevertheless the Sophists had a great influence, not only on general culture, as has been shown so far, but also on the growth of systematic philosophy. Not only, as was shown above (§ 53), did their position result from the previous development of philosophy, but it made possible that which followed. It is only the facility with which, in arguing, the mind regards things from every possible point of view, that enables it to adopt so entire a novelty as Socraticism; and it is only by the practice of finding the contradictions between the various aspects of a thing, that it becomes acute enough to discover with the Platonic Dialectic the contradictions that lie within itself. And again, it was necessary that the wisdom produced by the Dorian and the Ionian spirit should be intermingled, in order that the lightning spark of Socrates' genius should produce in it the Attic wisdom which combines them both, not in the form of a mixture, but in a higher unity.

§ 57.

It is only in the sense that different elements predominate in each, that Gorgias, as the Sophist trained by the Eleatics, can be opposed to Protagoras, as the adherent of Heraclitus. The opposition between them, which often rises to actual con-
lict, does indeed draw some of its nourishment from this fact, but depends still more on their tendencies. For while Protagoras defines as his proper aim, the art of making men clever in practical matters, Gorgias wishes merely to be, and to train, an arguing rhetorician. They both recognise the importance of the study of language, and divide their labours in such a way that Protagoras concerns himself especially with words and their forms, and Gorgias with the formation of sentences. In as high repute as these two, stood Prodicus, apparently morally the strictest of the Sophists, and Hippias, the most learned. These, however, did not attach themselves to any master by preference; the first, because he regarded practice as the most important; the second, because he esteemed above all things theoretical and practical versatility. But they also paid attention to language, Prodicus especially with regard to correctness of expression, and Hippias in respect of its rhythm and the measure of syllables. Besides this, he subjects the laws of the State to his arguments. Around these chief figures are grouped the less important Sophists. Thus Antimæurus, Antiphon, and Critias may be connected with Protagoras: the two eristic polemics, Euthydemus and Dionysodorus with Gorgias, because of their rhetorical artifices: and lastly Polus, in spite of the encouragement which he may have received from Gorgias, with Hippias, by reason of the principles which he maintains with regard to the laws of the State.

§ 58.

Protagoras.


I. Protagoras, the son of Artemon, or, according to others, of Mæandrius, has been regarded as the disciple of Democritus, probably only because he was born at Abdera. The latter was, however, twenty years younger than Protagoras. Already at an early period stress was rightly laid on the close connection of the doctrines of Protagoras with those of Heraclitus; but this does not exclude the possibility that at an early age he became acquainted with the sources by which Democritus and Anaxagoras had profited, viz., earlier atomistic doctrines. He acquired fame and, since he was the
first to teach for money, also wealth, by his instructions, at
first in Sicily, and from his 30th year at Athens. The excel-
"lence (ἀρετή) and strength (δεινότης) which he promised to
instil by means of his instructions, and on account of
which he called himself a Sophist, in the sense of a teacher
of cleverness, consisted in the adroit management of one's
property and of civic affairs. And since this could not be
thought of unless a man was a match for every law-suit, his
instruction aimed at giving directions for speaking correctly,
beautifully, and, above all, persuasively. Hence the subjects
of his instruction were grammar, orthoëpy, and especially the
art of making the most of every case, by representing it from
various points of view. He was also the panegyrist of decorum
and morals, without which no one could be esteemed in the
State; and altogether he was extremely conservative in his
politics. He also committed his doctrines to writing; and the
titles of many of his works have been preserved. A work of
his concerning the gods was publicly burnt, and caused his
exile from Athens, in the course of which he died.

2. The Heraclitean doctrine of the flux of all things, which
Protagoras interprets in the sense of the Heracliteans, induces
him to go even beyond Democritus, and to regard all sen-
sations without exception as mere subjective affections. Per-
haps he combined with it the dictum, uttered already by
Leucippus, as to the equal importance of Being and Non-
Being. In short, Protagoras maintains that every assertion
may be opposed by its direct opposite with an equal amount
of truth, since one thing is true for one man, another thing
for another, and existence as such is not found anywhere
at all. This subjectivism is adequately formulated in the
dictum, that every individual man is the measure of all things.
This means, on the theoretical side, that what is true to me, is
true; on the practical, that what is good for me, is good.
Thus probability takes the place of truth, and utility that of
goodness. It is consistent with this, that he extols prudence
as the highest virtue. But it is clear that such subjectivism
destroyes the meaning of all objective determinations of
universal validity. Hence the Athenian people did not let
itself be pacified by the modest sound of his sceptical utter-
ances with regard to the existence of the gods; nor did Plato
allow himself to be dazzled by his declamations as to the beauty
of god-given virtue. Nevertheless Protagoras deserved the
high esteem in which he was held, on account of his moral worth, which also explains the fact that a doctrine which idolized what Heraclitus had called a disease, viz., individual opinion, was less dangerous to its author.

Ritter and Preller, § 184-188. Mullach, II., 130-134.

§ 59.

PRODICUS.

F. G. Welcker: Prodikos von Keos Vorgänger des Sokrates. (Kleine Schriften, ii. pp., 393 foll.; originally in Rhein. Museum. 1833. 1.)

Prodicus, born at Iulis, in the island of Ceos, seems to have come to Athens about Ol. 86, where he taught for some forty years, apparently without interruption. His lectures consisted partly of longer courses, partly also of separate essays on some subject or other, and were paid for at a higher or a lower rate, according as they seemed to promise a smaller or a larger audience. He, too, regarded it as the proper aim of his instruction to prepare men for the management of their household and their State, partly by means of speeches which were midway between scientific lectures and exhortations, and partly by instructing others how to compose such speeches. The means by which he produces his effect are not a various stock of knowledge, as in the case of Hippias, but rather a right use of language, as also its force and expressive picturesqueness, together with the quotation of favourite passages from the poets. The speech about the virtue of Heracles, reproduced in the Protagoras of Plato, the depreciation of life and the exaltation of death, preserved to us in the pseudo-Platonic Axiocbus, his panegyric on rural life, and his preference of virtue to riches,—all these things explain why even the opponents of the Sophists speak of Prodicus with greater respect. His interpretation, to the effect that the gods were the forces of nature, does not prove that he devoted himself more to physics than the rest. His chief merit, with which the influence also which he exercised on later orators was connected, was probably his accurate discussion of the meanings of words, perhaps combined with hints for the construction of effective plays upon words, etc. Hence the fame and the high fee of his lecture at fifty drachmas.

Mullach, ii. pp. 135-142.
§ 60.

GORGIAS.


I. GORGIAS, the son of Carmantidas or Charmantidas, by birth a Leontine, probably lived from Ol. 72 to Ol. 98, and is often described as the disciple of his contemporary Empedocles, to whom he may have been considerably indebted in his opinions upon physics. Probably, however, the influence of Zeno upon him was still greater. As a distinguished orator, trained by Tisias, he was sent by his countrymen to Athens in Ol. 88, 1. There he not only succeeded in obtaining the help against Syracuse he asked for, but was requested soon to return and to take up his residence at Athens. This he did, and lived partly at Athens, partly in other cities, especially in Thessaly, as a Sophist in the later sense of the term, i.e., as an arguing rhetorician and a brilliant type of the Sicilian school. His orations were not forensic, and indeed not really composed for any special occasion, but were delivered in a house or a theatre to the assembled audience. He also made improvised speeches and maintained debates upon any given subject, which, in spite of the vanity and a kind of bombast he displayed in them, were much admired. He did not wish to be anything but an orator, and derided those who called themselves teachers of virtue. Whether the two declamations which have come down to us under his name are genuine, is disputed, at least in the case of one. Other accounts make mention of several orations as well as of a rhetoric, which have been lost. The pseudo-Aristotelian writing and Sextus Empiricus give us an account of his book περὶ φύσεως ἦ τοῦ μή δίτος. According to them, its train of thought was as follows:

2. Nothing exists, for neither that which is nor that which is not, nor lastly, that which both is and is not, can exist. Nor, in the same way, can the one and the many, the generated and the ungenerated, exist. But supposing that something that was did exist, it would be unknowable; for it may easily be shown that our presentation of an object is not identical with the object. And lastly, even if something existed, and were knowable, it yet could not be communi-
licated; for the words, by which we communicate our thoughts, are different from the latter, which are peculiar to the individual, and cannot therefore be communicated. The whole arrangement of this deductive reasoning betrays the orator, with his love of climax; and its outcome is, of course, complete subjectivism. Thus, in spite of the difference of their theoretical basis, Gorgias and Protagoras arrive at the same result, that since all objective reality disappears, it is left open to the subject to represent everything just as he pleases. Hence he and Protagoras were equally the masters of the eristic writers of speeches, who composed, or even had in stock, pleas for every possible case, to be read out by the contending parties. Plato's satire on Euthydemus and Dionysodorus seems to be often intended for Gorgias.

Ritter and Preller, § 189-193. Mullach, II., § 143-146.

§ 61.

Hippias.

Mähly, in the Rhein. Museum. New Series, XV., XVII.

Hippias of Elis, a contemporary of Prodicus, acquired fame and fortune, less at Athens perhaps than in Sicily, and also in Sparta, by lectures and improvised answers to all sorts of questions. The fulness of his knowledge, of which he was fond of boasting, really seems to have been very great, and probably disposed Aristotle more favourably towards him. Of his activity as an author we know little. Philostratus asserts that the speech on the wisdom of life, mentioned by Plato, was a dialogue. Whether he actually wrote a book of miscellanies, which evinced his learning, seems a moot-point. While Protagoras and Gorgias dazzled by means of their clever points of view and antitheses, he preferred to do so by the continuous stream of thoughts which he poured forth. Hence their jeers at him, and his proud contempt for their ignorance. Language he took into consideration chiefly from the musical point of view. He took an interest alike in the phenomena of nature and the customs of men, of barbarians no less than of Greeks. His frequent occupation with these probably contributed to the sceptical result at which he arrived with regard to the laws of the State, viz., that they
were altogether a product of arbitrary enactment, and that a universal, natural right, valid in itself, did not exist. There agree with this negative result of Hippias, Polus, who however is said to have been a pupil of Gorgias, and Thrasymachus, as to whom we are unable to decide whether he attached himself more closely to the one or to the other.

§ 62.

The Sophists neutralized the doctrines of the previous philosophers by mixing them together, and at the same time made their mode of treatment the common possession of all educated men; and hence it is not possible to revert to the position of any one among them. And since, moreover, their chief point of view is suitableness, utility, they also made it a matter of course that the question of the wherefore had to be raised first of all. This lesson remains unforgotten, even when there issues from the soil of sophistry a philosophy which devours and denies it for this very reason. The necessity of this is found in the fact that the principle of the Sophists leads further and beyond them. The Sophists posited the Useful as the universal finite aim of all thought and action. But there exists in the conception of the Useful these two opposite determinations, that in the first place it is that which is conformed to an end, i.e. an attained end, and secondly, that it is useful for something, i.e. a means to an end. And though consciousness in making use of this category experiences in every definite case, that that which it regarded as an end just before, is really only a means, yet it does not in the one case think of the other; or if this contradiction once strikes it, it calms itself by keeping the two apart by the sophistical, "from one point of view" and "from another," so that that which is an end from one point of view, is supposed to be a means from another. But if the mind understood itself and the category it made use of, it would be compelled to perceive that these two determinations must be connected into a single idea, which must take the place of the Useful. And conversely, when the human spirit has made this new thought-determina-
tion its own, instead of the previous one, it is an indication that it has risen to the next higher stage of self-knowledge, i.e. of philosophy. And again, if in that which is called an End-in-itself, or Idea, means and end are really one, Idealism
is the proper consequence and truth of subjective finalism; and Socrates, who is the first to raise philosophy to the level of ideal contemplation, here takes the next step in advance beyond the Sophists, whom he rightly combats, although he could neither have come forward himself, nor have found adherents without them.

THIRD DIVISION.

Socrates.

§ 63.

His Life.


1. Socrates, the son of the sculptor Sophroniscus, and the midwife Phænarete, was born at Athens in Ol. 77, 3 (469 B.C.), and is said to have first carried on his father's art, which, however, he soon abandoned in order to devote himself wholly to philosophy. However justly he attributes to himself complete originality, one need not on that account deny that his friend and music-master Damon, and the proximity of Thebes, the residence of Philolaus, familiarized him with Pythagorean doctrines; that already in his youth he conversed with the most important of the Eleatics; that by the advice of Eupides he read and appreciated Heraclitus, and finally that he was induced, either by his previous intercourse with its author or by Archelaus, to throw himself enthusiastically into the study of the book of Anaxagoras. In this indeed he was so disappointed by the lack of teleological explanation that he discarded it. His frequent intercourse with the Sophists is also well established; and he even paid one of them, Prodicus, for a lecture. It is true indeed that he did not receive his proper philosophic instruction from any of these, but by associating with all sorts of men, whereby he acquired what he himself, and in his opinion also the oracle given to Chære-
phon, regarded as his peculiar wisdom, viz., the knowledge of his own ignorance.

2. Passionately fond of Athens, he left it only when the duty of defending his country required it; but once in the field, he excited admiration by his endurance of hardships, his bravery, coolness, and care for his comrades, together with his ungrudging recognition of their merits. With his contempt for the masses, he could not be attracted by democracy in any form; with his truly patriotic feelings, not by the form of democracy he found at Athens. Hence his attacks on the favourite institution of democracy—the filling up of offices by lot; hence too, his abstention from a direct participation in State affairs. On the two occasions on which he did take part in them he showed his independence, not without danger to himself; in the one case by opposing the will of the people after the battle of Arginusae, in the other by opposing the arbitrary will of the Thirty Tyrants in the matter of Leon of Salamis. Nor did he show any greater appreciation of domestic life than of public affairs; and Xanthippe's outbursts of anger must be excused, on the ground that, in the pursuit of his higher mission, her husband left her to bear by herself the burden of his disordered household.

3. This higher mission he fulfilled, by strolling about the whole day and engaging in conversation with everybody, in order to discuss philosophic questions with them. He pursued by preference beautiful and clever youths, but in such a way that the gallantry towards youths, prevalent at Athens, and rightly regarded as so objectionable by us, was spiritualized and rendered at least endurable. And not only were the youths with whom he consorted enchanted with him, but the most different natures found him irresistible, and could not dispense with his company. Thus one sees the proud, practical Critias by the side of the dissolute genius of Alcibiades; Antisthenes, proud of his virtue, by the side of Aristippus, devoted to tasteful pleasure; the strictly logical Euclides and the master of dialectic, Plato, by the side of Hermogenes with his childlike piety, and the worthy Xenophon with his lack of all speculative talent; the enthusiastic youth Chærephon by the side of the cool-headed though equally young Charmides; and Euripides, now growing old, with his sentimentality based upon reflection,—together forming what one must call the circle rather than the school of Socrates. The attrac-
tive force he exercised may be explained; for the disproportion between external ugliness and internal beauty, which appeared such a perversion, especially to the Greeks, and at first only produces astonishment, soon excites to admiration. Poor and without wants, in spite of the assertions of the later Cynics, he was at the same time also the model of a cultivated man, and the favourite of the graces gifted with Attic urbanity. According to some, it was a happy disposition, according to others, the force alone of his character, that made him the noblest of men, and one who, when he had fought out in secret the hard struggle against his evil inclinations, had nothing more to overcome or to fear; and for this very reason need not reject pleasure, because he was certain never to be lost in it. In this security he is able to put himself into positions which would have been compromising for everybody else, but not for him, who, truly ἀντωργός, had wrought himself into the most perfect image of Greek virtue.

§ 64.

THE DOCTRINE OF SOCRATES.


1. Socrates himself repeatedly places true wisdom in the fulfilment of the Delphic exhortation: “Know thyself.” This alone makes a man truly himself, for σωφροσύνη combines the conceptions of consciousness as a whole, of conscious knowledge, of theoretic self-cognition, and of practical mastery of self: its contrary, the condition of the ἀφρων, necessarily implies also ἄκολασία in practice, and is not much better than madness. Nevertheless, in spite of his making, like Protagoras, man the subject of science, rather than the heavens and stars, Socrates is yet able to speak disparagingly about Protagoras, because he ranks the individual highest. Not πάς ἄνθρωπος, as in Protagoras, but ὁ ἄνθρωπος is regarded by Socrates as the measure of all things; and he identifies the former with ἦ ὃς, and the latter with ὁ Θεός. Compared therefore with the point of view of the Sophists, that of Socrates is