



Greek Theories of Art and Literature down to 400 B. C.

T. B. L. Webster

The Classical Quarterly, Vol. 33, No. 3/4 (Jul. - Oct., 1939), 166-179.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0009-8388%28193907%2F10%291%3A33%3A3%2F4%3C166%3AGTOAAL%3E2.0.CO%3B2-X>

The Classical Quarterly is currently published by The Classical Association.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/classical.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to creating and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

GREEK THEORIES OF ART AND LITERATURE DOWN TO 400 B.C.

GREEK art and literature follow parallel courses through the long period from Homer to Euripides. Homer and Euripides, Dipylon vases and the latest white lekythoi are as far apart from each other as it is possible for works in the same medium to be. The distance can only be explained by a similar change in the views of artists, writers, and their public.

Plato's *Republic* can be shown to reflect the theories current at its dramatic date.¹ Before that the Presocratics, chance remarks preserved in the poets, later anecdotes, and inscriptions provide the fragments with which the story of the change can be reconstructed. Literary criticism starts with Xenophanes but is hardly systematic before the time of the sophists.² Art criticism begins with the boast of the vase-painter Euthymides, 'As never Euphronius (painted)', but again does not become serious until late in the fifth century.³ At most we can hope to say what different views the Greeks had and at what time each was prevalent.

Four of the Greek words for statue⁴ suggest four different ways of looking at sculpture. *Eikon* is a 'likeness', and implies the dependence of the statue on its subject; it occurs on an inscription⁵ of the early fifth century and in the *Septem*, but apparently not before. *Xoanon*, 'something carved',⁶ also not found before the fifth century, suggests the technical approach to sculpture. *Agalma* has a much longer pedigree. First used of any 'source of joy',⁷ it is then confined to an offering, 'a source of joy to a god',⁸ and then more particularly to a statue.⁹ *Kolosos* means 'a substitute' in a very ancient prescription of the Cyrenaean 'Decretals' and in the *Agamemnon*.¹⁰ It is a Prehellenic word, and takes us back to a time when a magical connexion was supposed to exist between the image and its subject.

These four words give us four Greek ways of looking at a work of art. We can add three more. The poet or artist may be regarded as a teacher who seeks to educate his public. Or his primary object may be to confer immortality by poem or statue. Or he may be held to be inspired and to derive his art direct from the Muses or the gods.

All these theories were probably current during the whole of the period that we are considering, as they are all current to-day. But they were dominant at different dates. At the end of the fifth century with the illusionistic painting of Zeuxis and the realistic drama of Euripides the likeness theory is paramount and is pilloried in the *Republic*. The second half of the fifth century particularly is a period of research into the craft of art and literature, and therefore the technical view is important. The idealism of Sophocles and Phidias implies the education theory which for us is articulate in the *Frogs* of Aristophanes. In a way the hedonistic theory is the direct opposite of this; but it persists all through the history of Greek literature and is not dominant at any particular time. The monument theory belongs to the time of the great victor odes. The belief in the direct inspiration of the Muses in its cruder forms belongs to the period before Pindar. The magical theory is the earliest of all.

¹ Cf. Steven, *C.Q.* 1933, 149.

² Cf. Diels, *N.Jbb.* xxv. 8.

³ Pfuhl, *Malerei und Zeichnung*, sec. 463.

⁴ Cf. Benveniste, *Rev. Phil.* 1932, 118.

⁵ Loewy, *Inscripfen griechischer Bildhauern*, 23 (between 484 and 472 B.C.); *Septem*, 559.

⁶ Acusilaus, 28J; Sophocles, *Xoanephoroi*.

⁷ *Δ* 144. Cf. Schweitzer, *N. Heidelberger Jb.*

1925, 37.

⁸ *μ* 347.

⁹ Loewy, op. cit. 1; early sixth century.

¹⁰ Benveniste, loc. cit.; Tod, *J.H.S.* 1929, 214; *Ag.* 416. ἀνδρίας, 'mannekin' (Kretschmer, *Glotta*, xiv. 100), may also have a magical significance; it is apparently first recorded in Pindar, *P.* v. 40.

In the tenth book of the *Republic* Plato attacks poet and painter alike, because they are both 'imitators', because they both produce 'likenesses'. Primarily, there is no doubt, he is thinking of the realistic drama and the illusionistic painting of the last quarter of the fifth century.¹ He says that imitation, *mimesis*, is an abuse of the intelligence of the audience. The painter's imitation is three times removed from truth, and in the same way the tragic poet, since he is an imitator, is three times removed from truth. The painter has no knowledge of what he paints; he paints its appearance only and imposes on those who judge by the forms and colours alone; similarly the poet seems to know what he talks about, but imposes on his hearers by the wizardry of his language and a superficial use of technical terms. 'In fact the imitative poet can truly be said to be the counterpart of the painter.'²

Two facets of this theory concern us. In the first place, artist and poet only wish to catch a momentary appearance of their subject, a three-quarter view of a chair or a hero in a passion. In the second place, the imitation is inferior to the original; the chair has more to it than can be seen in a three-quarter view, a hero is at his worst in a passion.³ We have now to see how far back these ideas can be traced.

The history of realism in art and literature is easy enough to trace. The literary form in which realism can be most fully attained is drama, because a play is composed of speeches and actions, which are the external manifestations of personality. The decisive stages are the abandonment of the heroic manner in the twenties of the fifth century, the introduction of the third actor in the sixties, the introduction of the second actor in the late sixth century (?), and the institution of the official contests in 534 B.C. The art form of *mimesis* is three-dimensional painting, because perspective and shading make it possible to represent the momentary appearance of the external world. Shading first became common with Apollodorus in the twenties; perspective was 'invented' by Agatharchus in the sixties. The frontality law was abandoned at the beginning of the fifth century. The first hint of depth is the piling of folds in paintings of the third quarter of the sixth century.

Artistic theory is not so easy to trace. But we can follow the history of *mimesis* and its cognates, and we have a certain amount of other evidence. Xenophon⁴ has a use of *mimēsthai* parallel to that in Plato. Asked whether he can 'imitate' the soul, the painter Parrhasius replies: 'How can it be imitated since it has neither shape nor colour . . . and is not visible at all?'; imitation means the accurate reflection of the external world. A little earlier Agathon in the *Thesmophoriazusae*⁵ tells Mnesilochus that what the poet does not possess he tracks out by the aid of *mimesis*, just as in Plato the poet has no knowledge but imposes on the audience by an adroit use of technical terms. In 412 B.C. Teucer, in Euripides' *Helen*,⁶ seeing Helen, whom he believes to have been drowned with Menelaus, addresses her: 'Great heaven, what do I see? The very shape Of that detested woman who has proved My ruin and the curse of Greece. May God Reject thee for the likeness that thou hast To Helen.' 'Shape' is *eikon* and 'likeness' is *mimema*. Teucer is using the terminology of realistic portraiture to describe the woman before him, who is the spit of Helen. The passage confirms our assumption that there is a connexion between the use of *eikon* to describe a work of art and the *mimesis* theory. Before the *Helen* Herodotus uses *mimesis* and its cognates of works of art, always with reference to the original from which they are copied; the wooden representation of a dead body which is brought into Egyptian dinner parties is 'made as like as possible (*memimemenon*) by painting and carving'—it is a realistic representation.⁷ This part of the history was probably written soon

¹ Cf. Steven, op. cit.; Friedländer, *Platon*, 138.

² The most important passages are 595b, 597e, 601, 605a.

³ Cf. 598, 603c.

⁴ *Mem.* iii. 10. 1. Cf. Tate, *C.Q.* 1936, 162.

⁵ 156.

⁶ 71, tr. Sheppard.

⁷ ii. 78, cf. ii. 86. 2, 169. 5, iii. 37. 2.

after 449.¹ The author of the Hippocratic treatise 'On Diet', an imitator of Heraclitus who probably wrote in the fifth century,² speaks of sculptors making an 'imitation' of the body.

The same writer says that the processes of all the arts are 'imitations' of the processes of Nature, though the artists do not know it.³ Here he is clearly in the same tradition of thought as the Pythagoreans,⁴ who held things to be an 'imitation' of numbers, and this tradition is handed on to Plato, who regards the phenomenal world as an imitation of the world of forms.⁵

Mimesis and its cognates do not seem to have been applied to art and literature before the fifth century, but imitation by voice is much older. Whether Democritus' theory that music is an imitation of bird song can justifiably be traced back to Alcman⁶ appears to me extremely doubtful. Pindar certainly knows of the imitation theory of music, when he says that Athena invented the flute in order to imitate the Gorgon's shriek.⁷ Alcman⁸ 'knows the tunes of all the birds' and 'discovered words and song after hearing (or 'by composing'?) the chatter of partridges'. But knowledge and use of bird song do not imply that the resultant music was an imitation of bird song.

But vocal imitation has a much longer past. In the *Choephoroi* Orestes and Pylades plot to gain entry to the palace by pretending to be Phocians, 'imitating the sound of the Phocian tongue'.⁹ The Delian maidens in the Homeric hymn to Apollo¹⁰ 'know how to imitate the voices and the dance of all men. Each would think that himself was speaking. So well is their song composed.' This is probably the earliest use of the word *mimēisthai*, but Helen already possesses the accomplishment in the *Odyssey*:¹¹ 'You called the most valiant of the Greeks by name, likening your voice to the wives of all the Argives.' The use of the word in the hymn is in line with the later uses which we have examined; it means a realistic copy which is known to be a copy because it is executed in the presence of the original. The song is a trick, just as in Plato's eyes illusionistic painting is a trick, and this kind of unreal trickery is called *mimesis*.

The word *mimesis* and its cognates are not the only means of expressing the imitation theory. Other traces can be found of its application both to art and to literature. If the work of art is merely a reflection of the momentary appearance of its subject, it is a lifeless copy. Therefore we find a number of texts of the fourth and fifth centuries in which the lifelessness of the statue is stressed. The best known is in Plato's *Phaedrus*,¹² but before that Democritus had spoken of images 'a bright spectacle in their clothing and ornaments, but heartless',¹³ and the same idea occurs in the treatise on diet which has already been quoted.¹⁴ The earliest of these texts is probably the beginning of Pindar's fifth *Nemean*, where he contrasts his mobile song with the statue which has to remain fixed on its base.

Empedocles,¹⁵ presumably writing about the middle of the century, compares the growth of the world from elements to the growth of the painter's world from colours, and he says that the painter 'produces forms like to everything', or in other words 'produces likenesses'. The word for 'likeness', *eikon*, is not found before the fifth

¹ Legrand, *Hérodote* (Budé), 25.

² Diels-Kranz, *Heraclitus*, C. 1, 21.

³ Loc. cit. 11.

⁴ Diels-Kranz, *Pythagoras*, B. 12; cf. Tate, loc. cit.

⁵ e.g. *Rep.* 509d; cf. Baldry, *C.Q.* 1937, 146.

⁶ Democritus, B. 154. Bowra, *Greek Lyric Poetry*, 69, refers to an 'old legend', but quotes Plutarch, *de Soll. Anim.* 20, which is expressly based on Democritus.

⁷ P. xii. 21 (490 B.C.).

⁸ 92, 93 D.

⁹ *Cho.* 564.

¹⁰ 163 f.

¹¹ 8 278, quoted by Allen on the Homeric hymn; cf. the divine impersonations, e.g. X 227 (Athena and Deiphobus), and Patroclus' ghost, which was 'terribly like him', Ψ 107.

¹² 275d. See App. vii of Schuhl's *Platon et l'art de son temps*, though all his instances do not seem to me relevant.

¹³ B. 195.

¹⁴ Heraclitus, C. 1, 21.

¹⁵ B. 23.

century, but we have a means of tracing it back farther. Painters of vases customarily name the figures that they paint; sometimes they put the name into the genitive instead of the more usual nominative case. Then there must be an ellipse of some such word as *eikon*, of a word meaning image or likeness; the painter is a conscious *mimetes*. One of the earliest instances is the inscription¹ 'of Ajax' on the Vatican Exekias, painted in the third quarter of the sixth century. The usage recurs sporadically in the last quarter of the sixth² and through the fifth century.³ Thus the painter acknowledges that he is a *mimetes* at the moment when he starts on the path of realistic representation.

If we look for the application of the likeness theory to literature, Gorgias takes us back a stage beyond Plato when he implies that the tragedian undertakes to deceive and the spectator is foolish if he does not yield to the illusion.⁴ Here is the philosophy of the realistic dramatist and sophistic rhetorician,⁵ who are not concerned with truth but with appearances. A late quotation from Simonides takes us a stage farther back still: 'Speech is an *eikon* of actions'.⁶

Simonides wrote at the beginning of the history of drama. Demodocus' song of the Trojan War⁷ was very correct but had no intention of deceiving, since earlier poets made other claims. Their pretensions may have been occasionally challenged.⁸ But the sustained attack starts with Xenophanes and Heraclitus,⁹ who criticize the authority of Homer and Hesiod, and emphasize the relativity of human knowledge. The philosophers relegate the poet to the world of appearance at the moment when the poet is himself seeking it by inventing drama.

The origin of the *mimesis* theory lies in the third quarter of the sixth century, but it does not become dominant for a hundred years. Before that artist and poet must reach technical perfection in the realm of realistic representation, in the art of producing the illusion of reality. Therefore we find not only the artist but also the public interested in the craft of writing, sculpting, and painting, since we must assume this more general interest to account for the number of technical books which we know to have been written during the fifth century.

Plato's *Phaedrus* gives us a good idea of the activity of rhetorical theory at its dramatic date, the end of the fifth century; in it we have both Plato's own criticism of the lack of structure and method in the speech which he puts into the mouth of Lysias,¹⁰ and later¹¹ the list of technical terms associated with the names of the great sophists and rhetoricians of the fifth century. Plato mentions Theodorus, Evenus, Tisias, Gorgias, Prodicus, Hippias, Protagoras, and Thrasymachus, a formidable list. Protagoras founded the study of grammar, Prodicus wrote on the meanings of words, Gorgias and Tisias were both pupils of Corax the founder of Sicilian rhetoric, Thrasymachus developed rhythmical prose. Protagoras was in Athens soon after 450, the Sicilian school was already flourishing in 460, and Thrasymachus and Gorgias were both in Athens in 427. Thus by the time that the *Knights* is produced, 424, the smart young Athenian knows all the correct phraseology and can describe an orator as

¹ Pfuhl, fig. 229. London, B 164 is not earlier; Gerhard, *A.V.* 205, is later. There are no genitive inscriptions on Rhodian or Corinthian. On the subject on general see Walters, *Greek Pottery*, ii. 260; Langlotz, *Zeitbestimmung*, 46n. My material is drawn from Pfuhl, op. cit., and Reinach, *Répertoire*.

² Late black figure, Gerhard, *A.V.* 21, 25; London, B 195 (*C.V.A.*, pl. 37); Furtwängler-Reichhold, iii, p. 226 (Lysippides painter). Early red figure, Pfuhl, fig. 318 (Menon painter).

³ e.g. Pistoxenus painter, Pfuhl, fig. 498;

Lycaon painter, Pfuhl, fig. 515; *J.H.S.* 1934, pl. 11.

⁴ *B.* 23; cf. *Dialexeis*, iii. 10.

⁵ e.g. Gorgias, *B.* 11, 13.

⁶ Psellus, 821 (Migne).

⁷ *θ* 488.

⁸ Solon, 21 D, etc.

⁹ Xenophanes, *B.* 11, 12; Heraclitus, *A.* 23, *B.* 104-6.

¹⁰ 235a, 264c.

¹¹ 266d.

'skilled in simple style and periodic, moulder of gnomes, crystal clear, hard hitting, and a master of pathos'.¹ Grammar, vocabulary, argument, composition, and all the various ways of playing on the emotions of the audience have been worked out and reduced to a system.

Something analogous was happening in the sphere of poetry. The contest between Aeschylus and Euripides in the *Frogs* of Aristophanes is excellent fooling, but also presupposes technical research into the craft of poetry. The division of poetry into dialogue, songs, and construction,² the scientific discussion of prologues and choruses, and above all the carefully elaborated distinction between the poet of genius and the poet of reason, all show that Aristophanes was well versed in literary criticism and that the craft of poetry had been well examined before he wrote; indeed a manual seems to have been published which he expected his spectators to have read.³ The criticism of the prologue to the *Choephoroi* is so like in method to the criticism of Simonides' poem in Plato's *Protagoras* that Protagoras may be the source of both, but Pohlenz is probably right in referring the bulk of the theorizing to Gorgias.⁴ To the second half of the century also belongs Sophocles' book 'on the Chorus'. If, as is natural, we ascribe to this the three dicta of Sophocles that have survived, we can have no doubt that Sophocles discussed the whole technique of tragedy. All three quotations imply a conscious poet working towards the realization of his own clearly conceived ideals. Perhaps the most interesting from our point of view is the criticism of Aeschylus: 'even if he does right, he does it without knowledge'. The classical poet is conscious of his object and his methods; when Democritus praises Homer, he praises him for 'carpentering a system of varied stories'.⁵

Yet earlier is the book on music by Lasus of Hermione.⁶ Lasus was born in 548. Perhaps his interest in his craft is partly responsible for the frequent references in his pupil Pindar. Pindar says that the prologue must be far shining and every ode must have its limit.⁷ Pindar is proud of his art; it is his own and was given him by nature.⁸ Bacchylides is also a conscious craftsman, but his art is not spontaneous; 'One learns from another, now as of old. For it is not easy to find the gates of secret words.'⁹ Bacchylides here proclaims himself the traditional stylist which every line that he writes proves him to be.

Why do Pindar and Bacchylides break the illusion of their odes by such references to their craft? We cannot take refuge in the theory that the poet is writing before the days of the prose manual. Lasus' book proves that the prose manual was possible, if uncommon, in Pindar's day. Rather we must assume first that the poet's craft was a matter of supreme interest to him and secondly that breaking the illusion was unobjectionable. The comic chorus spoke as ordinary Athenians in the *parabasis*, and in the late sixth or early fifth century this cannot yet have become a traditional convention. The tragic chorus can also break the illusion of its character either by singing words that express the poets' view of contemporary events¹⁰ or by referring to its own dances and the musical instruments that accompany them.¹¹ The craft of the Greek poet is a matter of supreme interest to him because the Greek genius is essentially rational and rejoices in the elaboration of form and proportion. We cannot

¹ 1378. My clumsy paraphrase gives the sense but not the neatness of the technical jargon.

² 862. See Radermacher, ad loc.

³ 1113. See Radermacher, ad loc.

⁴ *GGN*. 1920, 142.

⁵ *B.* 21. Democritus wrote eight works on literature (*A.* 33).

⁶ *S.-S.* (= Schmid-Stählin, *Griechische Literaturgeschichte*), i. 544.

⁷ e.g. *O.* vi. 1; *I.* i. 63. See *S.-S.* i. 595; Davison, *Proc. C.A.* 1936, 41.

⁸ Davison, 39.

⁹ *Paeon*, 5. Snell refers this to B.'s view of poetry.

¹⁰ See *S.-S.* ii. 105. 2. He quotes Sophocles, *Aj.* 154; *Ant.* 332; *O.T.* 863.

¹¹ *Soph. O.T.* 895; *Trach.* 216; *Aesch. Ag.* 990; *Eum.* 332; *Eur. I.T.* 146; *Phrynichus*, fr. 11. See Müller, *Dissertation on the Eumenides*, 25.

follow this farther back in theory, but in practice it is clear enough in the complicated symmetry of the Homeric epic.¹

The technical view of art runs parallel to the technical view of poetry. Plato demands proportion, arrangement, and 'harmony' in a work of art as in a speech.² In the second half of the fifth century Parrhasius wrote on painting and Polyclitus on sculpture. Polyclitus dealt largely with proportions but, though the idea of publishing his system was probably new, sculptors had long carved statues in which the parts stood in a numerical relation of size to each other.³ Agatharchus' book on *Scene painting* was more like the treatises of the rhetoricians, a new book on a new subject, intimately connected with the technique of producing illusion. It gave rise to further writings by Democritus and Anaxagoras on perspective.⁴ Of earlier books on sculpture we know nothing certain; but Theodorus of Samos,⁵ who was architect as well as sculptor and gem engraver to Polycrates, wrote a description of the Heraeum, and that artists were conscious of their skill is clear from the use of *sophia* with signatures.⁶

Indirect evidence of careful craftsmanship and conscious composition we have in abundance; the decoration of Dipylon vases is a parallel on a small scale to the symmetry of the Homeric epic.⁷ Sometimes the artist breaks the illusion in the same way as the poet when he leaves his subject to speak of his technique. The Greek artist sometimes indulges his love for the precision of formal and abstract design where it is disturbing to the modern eye, though presumably unobjectionable to the ancient. On a vase⁸ of the early classical period a winged goddess runs up to a bush, and a small bird flies out. The bush is a formal pattern of volutes and palmette.⁹ The painter could have painted a realistic bush, but he liked the abstract formal design¹⁰ and the incongruity did not disturb him. Like the poet, the artist strives for clear rational form.

In the fifth century another factor also¹¹ was operating, the new theory of the relationship between the artist and his craft. In place of the older theory that the artist was given his craft by the gods men began to believe that human skill was responsible for human progress. This belief can be traced ultimately to Xenophanes.¹² When it had become general, as it had by the time that Sophocles wrote his *Antigone*,¹³ the conditions were suitable for the great and sometimes rather flamboyant literary and artistic personalities who wrote their *Technai*.¹⁴

The great artists and writers of the fifth century, particularly of its first three quarters, were not primarily interested either in realistic representation or in technical *tours de force*. Realism was a fashion to which they paid greater or less heed, and technique was a means to an end. The end was the education of their fellow citizens. Euripides and Aeschylus both accept this criterion of poetry when they are judged by Dionysus, and Aristophanes sketches a history of literature on these lines.¹⁵ Plato

¹ See Myres, *J.H.S.* 1932, 274; Schadewaldt, *N.Jbb.* 1938, 73; *Iliasstudien*, 131.

² See Steven, op. cit. 154 for references.

³ See Déonna, *Dédale*, 300.

⁴ Vitruvius, vii, *pref.* 11.

⁵ Cf. Otto, *Handbuch der Archäologie*, 255.

⁶ Geffcken, *Gr. Epigramme*, nos. 2, 29; cf. Pindar, *O.* vii. 50; Solon, I, 49 D. Schweitzer op. cit. 64, thinks that Solon only gives *sophia* to the poet; but Solon equates the two (cf. *p.* 385); both 'gather a livelihood' and both 'know the bounds of lovely wisdom'.

⁷ Myres, op. cit. 271.

⁸ Jacobsthal, *Ornamente*, pl. 64a.

⁹ The formal bush goes back to the early

seventh century.

¹⁰ Sometimes realistic and formal trees alternate (Jacobsthal, op. cit. 87). Cf. the ears of the Sunium Apollo, the hand-clasp of Peleus and Thetis (Pfuhl, fig. 417); perhaps also the 'punning' groups of animals, whatever their origin (Roes, *B.C.H.* 1935, 312).

¹¹ Well discussed by Schweitzer, op. cit. 66.

¹² *B.* 18; cf. Nestle, *Plato: Protagoras*, 23.

¹³ *Antigone*, 332.

¹⁴ Cf. the description of Parrhasius (Ath. xii. 543) and the town-planner Hippodamus (Ar. *Pol.* ii. 5 (8). 1267^a).

¹⁵ *Frogs*, 1008, 1030.

has to attack the view that Homer is omniscient,¹ and the necessity of this is shown by the story of Niceratus,² who was forced to learn the complete works of Homer in order that he might become a good man. Sophocles' statement that he drew ideal characters implies that he held the education theory. He carried it out in practice by creating characters who in the main conform to his high standards of life and conduct and whose divergences from those standards are clearly marked.³ Phidias⁴ designed the whole decoration of the Parthenon to instil the lessons of *eusebia* and *sophrosyne*. The ethical purpose of the designer of the pediments at Olympia is no less clear; the message, *sophrosyne*, is the same, but the emphasis has moved from the mortal actors to the gods, Zeus and Apollo, just as in the plays of Aeschylus the emphasis is on the divine law rather than on the human characters. The moral is an essential part of Pindar's odes, and he carefully criticizes all myths that seem to him objectionable.⁵ At the end of the sixth century Simonides sets up a new ethical ideal in the Scopas song;⁶ the man 'who never of free will does anything base' is illustrated by the blond boy from the Acropolis.⁷ The new idealism is the answer of the poets to Xenophanes' challenge, and they carry the artists with them. Parallel, but on different lines, is the defence of Homer adopted by the allegorists from Theagenes of Rhegium to Metrodorus of Lampsacus.⁸ Earlier poets also were didactic, but they were passing on the message of the Muses unchallenged, and were not so conscious of their position.

To the modern puritan mind it is at first sight surprising that the educational view can live in harmony with the hedonistic view, but in Greece it undoubtedly did, and every Greek knew that whatever other purpose art and literature might have, they were certainly meant to give pleasure. It is not necessary to quote all the reiterations of this view from Homer's 'divine singer who rejoices by his song'⁹ to the time when Gorgias speaks of the 'divine spell of literature, pleasure's inducer, seducer of pain'.¹⁰ But we may notice that the didactic Hesiod, the fierce Archilochus, and the statesmanlike Solon take as much pleasure in poetry as the more obvious hedonists such as Anacreon and Simonides.¹¹ Similarly Gorgias says that sculpture and painting 'rejoice the eye', and Aeschylus speaks of 'the charm of lovely statues'.¹² The word most often used for a statue dedicated to a god, *agalma*, means a source of delight. Therefore Democritus says the Arts are not the result of necessity but of superabundance,¹³ and they do not find a place in the Platonic commonwealth until the state of necessity has turned into the luxurious state.¹⁴

To these later writers art and poetry, if they are meant to please, are only a luxury. Earlier, however, when it was assumed that the pleasures of the gods were the same as the pleasures of men, these luxuries were of extreme importance, since the goodwill of the gods must be secured. The *agalma* gave the god a pleasure which he might be expected to repay—the theory is the same as the theory of sacrifice.¹⁵ A pillar of the sixth (?) century on the Acropolis¹⁶ has the inscription: 'Maiden, Telesinus dedicated

¹ *Republic*, 598e.

² Xenophon, *Symposium*, iii. 5; iv. 6.

³ Webster, *Introduction to Sophocles*, 57.

⁴ *Eusebia*: E. and W. pediments; base of Parthenos (Pandora = lady who receives all gifts, i.e. Athens). *Sophrosyne*: Gigantomachy (E. metopes; inside shield of Parthenos); Centauromachy (S. metopes; sandals of Parthenos); Amazonomachy (W. metopes; outside shield of Parthenos); Trojan War. (N. metopes)

⁵ S.-S. i. 584, 624; Fehr, *die Mythen bei Pindar*.

⁶ 4 D. See Bowra, op. cit. 340.

⁷ Winter, *KiB*. 218. 5.

⁸ Zeller, op. cit. 71.

⁹ ρ 385.

¹⁰ B. 11, 10.

¹¹ Theog. 97; Archilochus, 1 D; Solon, 1, 52 D; Anacreon, 32 D; Simonides, 79 D. I am indebted for these references to Mr. J. A. Davison.

¹² Gorgias, B. 11, 18; Aeschylus, *Ag*. 416.

¹³ B. 144.

¹⁴ *Republic*, 373b.

¹⁵ e.g. Homer, δ 351.

¹⁶ Geffcken, *Gr. Ep.* 12, cf. 13, 23. So also Empedocles, B. 128.

an *agalma* on the Acropolis, *rejoicing in which* may you grant him to dedicate another.' Poems had the same purpose; the poet of the *Hymn to Apollo*¹ names song as one of the reasons why Apollo delights in the Delian festival, and among songs those of the Delian maidens who are 'mindful of the men and women of long ago'. We may then assume that just as Demodocus sang 'the fames of men' to delight the court of Alcinous,² so the writer of epic told his story to delight the god of the festival at which he was reciting. Thus the hedonistic theory of poetry is not in its origin hedonistic but religious. In this form it survives as the ultimate religious reason for choral lyric, tragedy, and comedy, and for the sculptural adornment of temples, although by the fifth century, as the Democritus quotation proves, this ultimate reason was forgotten.

The monument theory of art and literature is founded on the preservation of the past. This was not the object of the Homeric 'fames of men': the Homeric hero's name was preserved by his tomb. Hector says that his fame will never die because seafarers will see his tomb,³ and later in Tyrtæus⁴ the brave man's name is preserved for ever by his tomb, though he himself is dead. Then with a change of fashion the tomb statue or relief becomes the vehicle of fame instead of the tomb itself. The bronze maiden on the tomb of Midas⁵ gives its eternal message 'that Midas sleeps below'. When the dead man has a portrait of himself on his tomb, the portrait keeps his memory alive: the portrait is immortal, while he is mortal and dead. The relation of the tomb statue or the athlete statue to its subject is totally different in kind from the relation of the mimetic statue to its subject. The mimetic statue or picture is a fleeting impression of a momentary appearance; the monument is a permanent memorial of the best in its subject. The sculptor might have claimed that his art gave immortality to those who would otherwise be forgotten. The poets did make this claim, and Simonides ridiculed the writer of the Midas epigram: immortality of stone might be destroyed by god or even man.⁶ Our earliest reference for the monument theory of poetry is in Sappho, when she says 'You shall lie dead and there will be no memory of you hereafter. For you have no share in the roses of Pieria'.⁷ Before Sappho the idea only occurs in Homer, and there faintly, because the Homeric 'fames' have another purpose; Helen chides Paris, saying, 'We shall be a song hereafter'.⁸ The essential idea, which is not present in the Homeric passage, is that the immortal poem gives immortality to a mortal: 'I gave you wings. . . . Not even in death shall you lose your fame, but your immortal name shall be men's care.'⁹ It is common in Bacchylides and in Pindar.¹⁰ Indeed, the monument theory provides the reason of the Epinician ode as of the memorial statue, and like the memorial statue the ode is a monument to what is best in its subject, a record of noble deeds¹¹ and therefore both a means of moral instruction and an idealization of the athlete.¹²

The consideration of the hedonist and monument theories has taken us back to a wholly different conception of art from the mimetic conception. With this different conception of the work of art we have also reached a different conception of the artist. The technical skill comes not from man's inventive brain but from god. The story of Aeschylus and Tynnichus neatly illustrates the distinction: Aeschylus said that

¹ 150; 160.

² *θ* 73; cf. Achilles, *I* 189.

³ *H* 91; cf. *a* 239, *δ* 584.

⁴ 9, 29 D.

⁵ Plato, *Phaedrus*, 264d. See *RE*. viii. 2165. The first and last lines of the epigram certainly belong to the original form, and are of the seventh century B.C.

⁶ 48 D.

⁷ 58 D. For further references see S.-S. i. 590 n. 6.

⁸ *Z* 357.

⁹ Theognis, 237.

¹⁰ Bacch. iii. 90; Pind. *P.* iii. 114. See S.-S., loc. cit.; Davison, op. cit. 40; Gundert, *Pindar u. sein Dichterberuf*, 14, 16.

¹¹ e.g. *N.* vii. 14 *ἔργους δὲ καλοῖς ἔσοπτρον ἴσμεν.*

¹² Cf. von Salis, *Kunst der Griechen*, 58, 70, 73, on the aristocratic beauty of the late archaic athlete.

his song compared with that of Tynnichus would be in the same case as modern statues compared with old. The old, although of simple workmanship, were regarded as divine, the new excited admiration for the excessive elaboration of their workmanship but had less divine feeling.¹ The new works were technically excellent, but the old had inspiration. The inspiration theory² survived in the fifth century to explain the poet's creative urge. When writing, he is possessed, and the dramatist can get out of himself into his characters' heads, think their thoughts, and speak their words. Later when Aristotle³ urges the poet to act his story with the very gestures, he says that poetry demands genius or madness. Therefore Agathon in the *Thesmophoriazusaë*⁴ has a crowd of Muses in his house to help him with his new play, and when he comes out, he is wearing female dress because he is writing a female part. Socrates regarded this irrational element in poetry as the essential element and denied the poet any knowledge at all.⁵ The two were not necessarily incompatible as we see from Democritus: 'Having a divine nature, Homer carpentered a world of varied stories.'⁶ Gorgias speaks of the 'divine spells' cast by words,⁷ and in fifth-century terminology 'divinity' (and particular gods and goddesses) implies the recognition of a strong and irrational force rather than a belief in the hand of God. Whether the fifth-century artist also called his genius inspiration by Athena we cannot say; but it is arbitrary to assume that Parrhasius and his colleagues were incapable of all the artifices of an Agathon.⁸

With Pindar we are back in a time when the poet really believed in the Muses. 'Pindar's own view seems to be that poetry, though ultimately the gift of God through the Muses, is immediately the product of the poet's own mind, in which the two elements (the teaching of the Muses and the poet's own thoughts) are blended into a harmonious whole, and the special function of the omniscient Muses is to punish him if he strays from the truth.'⁹ The poet uses the art which the Muses give him. The relation between poet and Muse is the same as the relation between the Rhodian artists and Athena which Pindar records in the seventh *Olympian*.¹⁰ Thus on an Athenian vase of about 490 Athena herself sits among the potters and bronze-workers while they exercise their arts.¹¹ Earlier still, in a passage of Solon which has already been discussed, poet and craftsman are both said to owe their art to the teaching of the gods.¹²

Bacchylides,¹³ the contemporary of Pindar, and Alcman,¹⁴ who are both consciously writing in the Homeric tradition, speak as if the Muse were not only the source of their inspiration but were actually using them as a mouthpiece. With them this form of expression is probably intentionally archaic; in Hesiod and Homer it is the poet's considered view of his art. Hesiod tells in the *Theogony*¹⁵ how the Muses 'once taught Hesiod a fair song, pasturing his sheep below lovely Helicon . . . and they gave me a staff of bay . . . and they breathed into me divine song that I might tell of the future and the past, and bade me praise the race of the immortals and sing always of themselves first and last'. A romantic glamour surrounds Hesiod's mystic communion

¹ Porphy. *de Abst.* ii. 18.

² See now O. Falter, *Der Dichter und sein Gott*.

³ *Poetics*, xvii.

⁴ 41 ff.

⁵ Particularly *Ion* and *Apology* 22.

⁶ *B.* 21, cf. 18 and Epicharmus *B.* 57 (not genuine, but fifth century).

⁷ *B.* 11, 10.

⁸ For the contrary view, see Schweitzer, *op. cit.*, *passim*.

⁹ Davison, *op. cit.* 39, quoting *Paeon*, vi. 54,

O. vi. 19, vii. 7, *P.* iv. 67.

¹⁰ 50 ἀνὰ δὲ σφίσιον ὤπασε τέχνην | πᾶσαν ἐπιχθονίων Γλαυκῶπις ἀριστοπόνοισι χερσὶ κρατεῖν.

¹¹ Casson, *Technique of Early Greek Sculpture*, 160. His explanation that the seated Athena is a statue is far-fetched.

¹² i. 49 f. See p. 171 n. 6. Cf. also of poetry, Archilochus, 1 D.

¹³ e.g. xv. 47.

¹⁴ e.g. 67 D, with S.-S. i. 463. 8.

¹⁵ 22 f.

with the Muses. The colder account of the Homeric singer in the eighth book of the *Odyssey* describes exactly the same relationship between the poet and the Muses. When the time comes, the Muse causes Demodocus to sing.¹ The Muse teaches him the paths of song.² The most interesting passage is Odysseus' request for the story of the wooden horse:³ 'Either the Muse taught you, the daughter of Zeus, or Apollo. For very correctly you sang of the path of the Achaeans, all that they did and suffered, and all that the Achaeans toiled, as though somehow you had been there yourself or had heard of another.' Demodocus had not been there himself, and Odysseus was the first Western wanderer. Nor had Homer been there, but the Muse or Apollo had given him his song. Behind the mortal singer who sings to please Alcinous and his court stands the divine singer, who sings to please the gods.⁴

Beside the poem given ready-made by the Muses to the singer stands the statue given by the gods to men. The Taurian Artemis had fallen from heaven.⁵ The Heracles of Erythrae came from the sea on a raft,⁶ and the Dionysus of Methymna was fished up by fishermen.⁷ If the fishermen had been asked who made the image, they would presumably have answered Hephaestus or Athena, since they were divine craftsmen, as Apollo and the Muses were divine singers.

Odysseus complimented Demodocus on telling all that the Achaeans did, suffered, and toiled, as though he himself had been present. Demodocus had not been present, but the Muse had given him the complete truth about the path of the Achaeans.⁸ In the same way the Muses in the invocation at the beginning of the Catalogue⁹ are asked to tell of the leaders of the Greeks, since the poet himself has neither knowledge nor strength for the task; and Hesiod¹⁰ is prepared to talk of seafaring, although he has no great knowledge of shipping or ships: 'But, even so, I shall tell the mind of aegis-bearing Zeus. For the Muses have taught me to sing a marvellous song.' If we ask what the audience of the epic poet demanded of his narrative, the answer is given by the words of Odysseus, 'very correctly . . . all that they did and suffered'. The hearer demands a complete and orderly account (*κατὰ κόσμον*). Everything that happened must be in it, and there must be no gaps in the narrative. The Homeric narrative has no gaps; if he leaves the Greeks to tell of the Trojans, he returns to the Greeks at exactly the point where he left them; they have not done anything by themselves in the interval.¹¹ The geometric painter shows the same need to make everything clear; the chariot must have two wheels and the ship two rows of oars, whether both can be seen or not. As von Salis¹² says, 'intelligibility is more important than a convincing rendering of the visual impression'. If the geometric painter were asked how he saw the farther wheel of the chariot, perhaps he would answer like Hesiod, 'I did not, but Athena told me about it'. In any case, neither the Homeric epic nor geometric painting is *mimesis*. Plato calls epic *diegesis* or narrative. I should prefer to use the word which Homer uses of Hephaestus but which was apparently not applied to poetry until the fifth century,¹³ *poiesis*, 'creation', because Homer, like Demodocus, was not there. Homer and the geometric painter are creating a world complete in all its parts and in some sense alive.

¹ Cf. Becker, *Bild des Weges*, 68, who interprets 73 as 'gave D. a free rein'. Kalinka, *Die Dichtungen Homers*, 24, notes that in most later epics the poet names himself in the first line instead of calling on the Muse.

² 481.

³ 488.

⁴ e.g. *A* 604.

⁵ Euripides, *I.T.* 87.

⁶ Paus. vii. 5. 5; cf. Picard, *Manuel*, i. 89; Déonna, *Dédale*, 87.

⁷ Paus. x. 19. 3.

⁸ Cf. the very similar terminology in Aesch. *Ag.* 1200, where the chorus wonder at Cassandra's power of telling the past history of Argos, and she refers her power to Apollo.

⁹ *B* 484.

¹⁰ *Op.* 649 f.

¹¹ Cf. Stählin, *Philologus*, lxxviii. 280; Cauer, *Grundfragen*, 444-8.

¹² *Op. cit.* 37; Pfuhl, sec. 57, fig. 10, 15.

¹³ S.-S. i. 10. 1.

What is true of the Homeric epic and geometric painting is true in varying degrees of the whole archaic period. The painters of the seventh and sixth centuries no longer completely disregard the visual impression in their search for intelligibility like the geometric painters, but intelligibility is still their chief object.¹ Robert² compares the archaic painter's narrative with epic. The archaic painter tries to put the whole story into his picture and has no hesitation in introducing elements which could not possibly be seen at that particular moment. The Laconian plate with the blinding of Polyphemus is an extreme instance.³ The Cyclops sits on a rock holding in each hand a leg of one of Odysseus' sailors. Odysseus holds a cup to the Cyclops' lips with his right hand, while with his left he inserts the stake in the Cyclops' eye; three moments are here combined—the eating of Odysseus' companions, the acceptance of Odysseus' wine, and the blinding. Similarly, when Exekias⁴ paints the death of Ajax, to make the situation quite clear he puts a palm-tree on one side to show that the action takes place in Asia and on the other side the arms of Achilles to show the cause of Ajax' suicide. Narrative of this kind is much rarer in the fifth century. Then the painter usually chooses a definite moment and gives a visual impression of that moment. Robert ascribes this change to the influence of the drama.⁵ I am inclined to doubt the truth of his ascription. That it is a parallel change to the change from epic to drama is undeniable, and Robert deserves all credit for seeing this. But the change in art is not necessarily dependent on the change in literature. Indeed, it is far more likely that the choice of a single moment to represent is part of the general movement towards realism which leads the artist at the same time to explore the possibility of perspective and shading. So far from being dependent on the drama, artist and poet are moving along parallel courses towards the full realization of the *mimesis* theory of literature and art.

Homer and the geometric artists set up conventions and worked on theories which were not finally displaced until the days of Euripides and Parrhasius when the *mimesis* theory was fully established. We have now to consider the evidence for this earlier view of art and literature, particularly of the relation between the work of art and its subject. Something has already been said in connexion with the hedonistic theory and the monument theory. The realist approach, at least as understood in the late fifth century, is inconsistent with either. The memorial and the *agalma*, whether literary or artistic, the *hore*, the athlete, the ode and the epic, crystallize in a living work the best and most essential characteristics of their subjects;⁶ they are not intended to be a lifeless record of momentary appearance.

I have tried to show that the Homeric poet felt that he was creating a real world. Pindar contrasts the stationary statue with his mobile song: 'Come on every boat, great and small, from Aegina, sweet song.'⁷ And again: 'a well-spoken word goes, for ever speaking, and over the fruitful earth and across the sea it is gone, an unquenchable light on fair deeds.'⁸ Here too the poem is felt as something alive, existing in its own right. It journeys from mouth to mouth and land to land, everywhere producing an effect. The hymn, telling the deeds of a god and perhaps the fame of some hero closely related to him, was intended to 'praise the *aretè* of the god and

¹ Cf. the demands of the Chinese painter, Tung Ch'i-ch'ang (1555-1636 A.D.), *ap.* Sirén, *The Chinese on the Art of Painting*, 142.

² *Bild und Lied*, 14.

³ *Ibid.* 19. Robert also quotes the Amphiarus krater, and pictures of Troilus and of Peleus and Thetis.

⁴ Pfuhl, fig. 234. Notice also how carefully the painter shows that Heracles has disposed

of two of the three bodies of Geryon (Pfuhl, fig. 226), and that on the Sosias cup an arrow stuck in the ground explains the source of Patroclus' wound (Pfuhl, fig. 418).

⁵ 28 f.

⁶ Cf. Buschor on the Dipylon head, *Ath. Mitt.* 1927, 206.

⁷ *N. v.* 2.

⁸ *I.* iv. 44.

thereby increase his strength for the work which he is desired to do or to cause him by the narrative to act in the same way again'.¹ The Homeric epigram to the potters is a winged word, a powerful force which will cause one of two effects: either the poet will be paid or the pots will be spoiled. Hipponax' satire on Bupalus and Athenis was so powerful that they are said to have committed suicide.²

But Bupalus and Athenis had also created a live and powerful thing, a grotesque labelled Hipponax, which being therefore a Hipponax, could change him into its horrid likeness.³ The painter Mimas has the same creative power: his painted snake may bite the captain's shin.⁴ Behind the joke lies a belief in a magic connexion between the painting and its subject, in the painter's power of creation.

When the archaic statue is inscribed, the inscription is normally a speech made in the first person by the statue.⁵ The bronze maiden on Midas' tomb⁶ says: 'I am a maiden of bronze and I stand on the tomb of Midas.' A sixth-century base in Paros⁷ has: 'Artemis, to you Telestodice dedicated this statue . . . I claim to be the work of Parian Critonides'; it seems likely, therefore, that all the epigrams which address the god or a passer-by in the second person are conceived as speeches by the statue or relief.⁸ On vases, too, the figures speak: on a Corinthian aryballos of the seventh century⁹ 'I am Aineta' is written beside a woman's head, and Hermes on a black figure vase of about 560 B.C. says, 'I am Cyllenian Hermes'. The archaic artist conceives his statue or painted figure as a personality which he has created; he may himself address it in the second person, 'Hullo, Sphinx!'¹⁰

It is not surprising that Homer describes the golden and silver dogs, which Hephaestus had made to stand on either side of the front door, as 'guarding the house, deathless and ageless through all time'.¹¹ Hephaestus' golden maidens¹² are 'like living maidens'. Hephaestus is not an imitator but a creator: 'he wrought on it (the shield) earth . . . he made on it two cities . . . he set on it a rich field'.¹³ All men wondered at Odysseus' brooch, because 'though they were golden, the dog had its teeth in the fawn, strangling it, and the fawn struggled with its feet, striving to escape'. Here too the terminology belongs to *poiesis* rather than *mimesis*.¹⁴

Daedalus, who is the artistic parallel to the magical singers, Orpheus and Amphion, made living statues. They saw and walked, they had to be chained up for fear they would run away.¹⁵

The archaic statue is alive and has power to conduct the office which is assigned to it. The statue of the goddess is in some sense the goddess. The Trojan women lay their robe 'on the knees of fair-haired Athena'.¹⁶ Sappho calls on 'Aphrodite of

¹ Pfister, *Ph. W.* 1933, 938.

² Pliny, *N.H.* xxxvi. 12.

³ See Déonna, *Dédale*, 545.

⁴ Hipponax, 45 D.

⁵ Geffcken, nos. 9, 10, 11, 20, 31, 32, 36, etc. Exceptions are rare, and here it is not certain that the statue does not speak, especially when ὄδε is used (very common in literature for the first person).

⁶ See above, p. 173, n. 5. Cf. Déonna, *op. cit.* 113.

⁷ Geffcken, no. 33; cf. Buschor, *Altsamische Standbilder*, ii. 26: 'I am Antioche who also made this dedication' (about 560 B.C.).

⁸ Geffcken, nos. 9, 12, 19, 29, 37, 44.

⁹ Payne, *NC.* 162; Walters, *Greek Pottery*, ii. 260.

¹⁰ Walters, *loc. cit.* Little Master cup.

¹¹ η 91, cf. 100. A Chinese picture of a cat,

4599

painted in the second century, could drive away mice, and a painted dragon flew away when the eyes were dotted in (Sirén, *op. cit.* 154).

¹² Σ 418.

¹³ Σ 483.

¹⁴ τ 229. In the Shield (Σ 548) ἀρηρομένη δὲ ἐφικει means 'seemed to have been ploughed' (cf. Z 389-90) rather than 'was like a ploughed field'; but Homer is referring to the Minoan use of niello on gold (cf. Lorimer, *J.H.S.* 1929, 146), and Minoan art is more realistic than early Greek art.

¹⁵ See Schuhl, *op. cit.*, App. vii; Déonna, *op. cit.* 88; cf. also the Telchines of Rhodes (Blinkenberg, *Hermes*, 1915, 280, 287).

¹⁶ Z 303; cf. Déonna, *op. cit.* 121. See also Daremberg-Saglio, s.v. *statua*, 1472; V. Müller, *RE.*, Suppl. v. 473; Ehnmark, *The Idea of God in Homer*, 55; Schefold, *Jahrb.* 1937, 30. Accord-

the painted throne' to come to her aid; her hearers in Lesbos would know which seated statue in what temple she meant.¹ The *kolossos* is a substitute for the man whom it represents and in some magical way controls his presence.² The tomb relief is the dead man: it speaks with his voice and continues the life which he has lost.³ The bronze maiden on the tomb of Midas is a mourner who will continue to utter her lament, 'so long as water flows and the tall trees grow'. The tomb is filled with terra-cotta statuettes, servants who are to help the dead man in the after life.⁴ The squinting Gorgon on the roof of the temple frightens evil spirits and evil men from the precincts of the goddess, as fierce and as effective as the Homeric epigram to the potters.⁵ The dedicator of an *agalma* was either dedicating himself to the god⁶ or giving the god a servant.⁷ By the time of Xenophanes much of this belief was dim and much of its practice literary and artistic convention, since it has its roots in a magic quite alien from the clear thought of the wisest thinkers. Yet the wise thinkers are never a great majority, and much of the old belief must have lingered on, and many of the practices still have been real, even in the time of Euripides.

The power of personification which gave the Greeks their gods and made their abstract concepts into human figures also made potters and carvers personify inanimate things. Here, too, inscriptions give us valuable aid. Vase, tripod, cauldron, and discus speak of themselves in the first person, like statue and painting. On a late-sixth-century discus the dedicator has written, 'Exoidas dedicated me to the Dioscuri, bronzen, with which he defeated the great-hearted Cephallenians'.⁸ Exekias signs a vase, 'Exekias painted and potted me'.⁹ The owner writes on a black-figured cup, 'I am the painted cup of Philto the beautiful'.¹⁰ In the same way the tripods which the Homeric Hephaestus makes are alive: 'they go of their own accord into the assembly of the gods and come back again home, a wonder to behold'.¹¹

The vase has a personality; it is alive. Therefore it may be given eyes to see the thief and ears to hear him.¹² By the middle of the sixth century these eyes were in some cases reduced to rudimentary triangles, their use forgotten.¹³ Sometimes, as we shall see, they were regarded simply as pattern. But originally the vase was alive and needed them. We see the same principle at work in the Caryatid.¹⁴ The column supporting a porch has come alive and turned into a woman or a giant. Caryatids are a special case of a common phenomenon. The knob on the lid of a geometric vase becomes a bird, a horse, or a little jug itself.¹⁵ A perfume vase turns into a lady, a lion, an antelope, or a swallow.¹⁶ The handle that supports the mirror turns into a maiden.¹⁷

This quickening tendency of the Greek artist is the opposite of the tendency discussed above,¹⁸ the tendency to turn the living form into pattern, the bush into a palmette, or the ear into a double S. Just as the vase painter may turn the living thing into an abstract form, so he may also turn the abstract form into a living thing.

ing to Benveniste, op. cit. 131, *ἔδος* (statue) is the god's 'déméure permanente où l'on emprisonne son pouvoir'.

¹ I. 1 D. Cf. Theognis, 11.

² See above, p. 166, n. 10.

³ See Déonna, op. cit. 61.

⁴ See Charbonneaux, *Les Terres cuites grecques*, 5; Scheurleer, *Bulletin vande Antieke Beschaving*, 1939, 12.

⁵ See Déonna, op. cit. 69; Curtius, *Antike Kunst*, 176.

⁶ See Daremberg-Saglio, s.v. *statua*, 1476.

⁷ See Graindor, *Rev. Arch.* 1938, 203, on the Athenian korai, quoting Eur. *Phoen.* 220.

⁸ Geffcken, no. 24; cf. 21, 22, 26, 27; cf. Homer's personification of weapons, *Δ* 126, *Α* 574, *Ψ* 81; Ehnmark, op. cit. 38.

⁹ Walters, op. cit. 257.

¹⁰ Ibid. 241. Cf. Proto-Attic bowl, *A.J.A.* 1936, 193.

¹¹ *Ε* 376. They had wheels (cf. *B.S.A.* xxxv. 88).

¹² e.g. Pfuhl, fig. 121.

¹³ Jacobsthal, op. cit., pl. 4, p. 16.

¹⁴ Déonna, op. cit. 70; Curtius, op. cit. 103.

¹⁵ e.g. Pfuhl, figs. 11-13.

¹⁶ Robertson, *J.H.S.* 1938, 41.

¹⁷ Lamb, *Greek Bronzes*, pl. 49, etc.

¹⁸ See above, p. 171.

When he puts a running gorgon under the handles of his vase, he is merely painting instead of modelling a Caryatid.¹ But when he takes the curves of the handle ornament and makes them into a pair of ears² or a complete face,³ he is playing the same trick with the material of his own art. When the apotropaic eyes have lost their significance and become merely pattern, the ripe archaic painter enlivens them again by turning them into the wings of Sirens⁴ or wineskins carried by satyrs.⁵

The ornament may become alive, and the frame may become a living part of the picture. The circular frame of the picture in a cup may be part of the action itself. The boy chasing a hare on the cup by the Panaitios painter has both feet on the curved ground as he runs and the hare runs up the circle to his hand.⁶ The wounded Patroclus by Sosias stretches his leg right across the cup and kicks against the curved frame.⁷ In both the use of the frame helps the painter to express what he wants to express, speed and tension in the one, pain in the other.

Greek poetry shows a similar tendency to enliven the formal element. The Homeric simile is sometimes a decorative formula and sometimes a living picture developed far beyond what is necessary for the comparison.⁸ In the lyric poets comparison and compared sometimes become as inextricably interwoven as pattern and picture on a vase.⁹ The chorus is a formal element in tragedy, an ornament separating the pictures; often it is kept as such an ornament, a quiet commentary with references forward and backward, echoing the lines of preceding and succeeding scenes but in a different idiom; but sometimes it takes on a life of its own and is developed independently of and out of proportion to its surroundings,¹⁰ and sometimes it becomes alive with the life of the play, is drawn into its action and assimilates its idiom to the idiom of the dialogue.¹¹

These two opposite tendencies, the enlivening of the formal and the formalizing of the living, spring, as I have tried to show, from two very different sides of the Greek genius. But both are present in the earliest Greek art and literature that we know and both are present in varying degrees and in varying guises until the end of our period. They are the two essential aesthetic driving forces.

Homer and Euripides, geometric pottery and the latest white lekythoi, are far apart. The Homeric poet and artist is a *poietes*, creating something which must be both complete and essential because it is to live and exercise an influence of its own. At the end of the fifth century poet and artist are more restricted and specialized, holding a mirror to the flux of appearance. Many stages separate the *poietes* from the *mimetes*. The turning-point is somewhere in the third quarter of the sixth century.

T. B. L. WEBSTER.

¹ Jacobsthal, op. cit. 30, pl. 14a.

² Ibid. 42, pl. 21a.

³ Ibid. 52, pl. 39d.

⁴ Ibid. 32, pl. 15b.

⁵ *C.V.A. California*, pl. xxv. 1.

⁶ Pfuhl, fig. 413.

⁷ Pfuhl, fig. 418.

⁸ e.g. *M* 278, particularly 281 f. Cf. S.-S. i.

103; and in general, van Groningen, *paratactische Compositie*.

⁹ e.g. Ibycus, 6 D.

¹⁰ e.g. particularly late Euripidean choruses, *Hel.* 1107, etc.

¹¹ e.g. the divided syzygy, *Soph. Phil.* 391, 507.