

## Chapter One: Hippocrates and Aristocratic Concerns

### 1. Introduction

The *Protagoras* begins with a young Athenian named Hippocrates awakening Socrates in the middle of the night and declaring that Protagoras has come to town. (310b) Hippocrates wishes to see Protagoras and obtain from him a “a general education suitable for a gentleman.” (312b) After cautioning Hippocrates to be careful with his choice of teacher, Socrates accompanies Hippocrates to the home of the wealthy Callias where Protagoras is staying. Socrates approaches Protagoras and tells him that Hippocrates wishes to know what he could gain from studying with Protagoras. (316c) Hippocrates thus drives the action of the dialogue. His interest, not Socrates’, in speaking to and learning from Protagoras is what leads Socrates to engage in discussion with the sophist.

Hippocrates quite clearly thinks that there is something he can get out of associating with Protagoras. For his part, Protagoras attempts to describe his teaching as something attractive to someone like Hippocrates, to someone who has the sort of concerns and goals Hippocrates has. Socrates, on the other hand, is concerned throughout the dialogue to determine whether Protagoras can indeed teach Hippocrates what he claims to teach. Hippocrates’ goals and desires are thus a starting point for the discussion between Protagoras and Socrates.

For understanding the dialogue, it is of great importance (and an aim of this chapter) to elucidate the nature of Hippocrates’ interests, to answer the question of precisely what drives Hippocrates to want to study with Protagoras. Understanding Hippocrates’ interests and background renders intelligible otherwise puzzling episodes in the *Protagoras*, as will be demonstrated in this chapter with an analysis of Socrates’ and Protagoras’ discussion of Simonides’ poem. It should be clear from this episode in the dialogue that both Protagoras and Socrates intend to address themselves to Hippocrates and to the concerns Hippocrates articulates.

### 2. What does Hippocrates want and why does he want it?

The first thing to note about Hippocrates and the dramatic audience of the *Protagoras* is his and its relatively youthful and extraordinarily aristocratic character. The audience of the dialogue is drawn from those noble families of Athens traditionally influential in her public affairs—those families of *aristoi*, which in prior centuries had in fact monopolized political power (*kratos*). The Alcmaeonid family, a traditionally politically powerful family, of whom Pericles was a member, is represented in the dialogue by Alcibiades (316a) and Pericles' two sons (315a). Critias and Charmides are present (315a), two members of Plato's own aristocratic family, which traced its ancestry back to Solon. Critias and Charmides are also future participants in the oligarchic revolution of the Thirty. Furthermore, the setting is the house of Callias, an Athenian famous for his extensive wealth and his willingness to spend it on the fees of sophists. Hippocrates himself may simply stand for young aristocrats generally—Socrates introduces Hippocrates as a “a member of a great and well-to-do family.” (316c) Hippocrates' name marks him as an aristocrat—one might consider in this context the statement of Strepsiades in Aristophanes' *Clouds* that his wife urged him to add “hippo” to the name of his child in order to give him aristocratic airs. (*Clouds*, 65)

What is it, then, that brings these aristocratic youths together around the sophists? When questioned by Socrates, Hippocrates characterizes what he desires to gain from Protagoras alternatively as wisdom (310d), a general education suitable for a gentleman (312b), and rhetorical cleverness or skill (*deinos legein*) (312d). When representing Hippocrates to Protagoras, Socrates implicitly indicates that he sees all these goals as subordinate to a further goal, as a means to a greater end: “It's my impression,” Socrates says of Hippocrates, “that he wants to be renowned (*ellogimos*) in the city, and he thinks this is most likely to happen if he associates himself with you.” (316c) It is clear that the kind of respect or renown that Hippocrates seeks is not the renown of athletic glory or poetic skill. Hippocrates is interested in political renown, the fame that comes from holding a preeminent position in the ranks of the politically powerful in Athens, the sort of position and fame Pericles possessed.

What does it mean, then, to be a youthful, politically ambitious Athenian in the second half of the fifth century BC? What is the nature of the position to which Hippocrates aspires? These questions necessitate an investigation into Athenian political life—an aspect of ancient Athens undergoing continually rapid and radical change during the fifth century.

By the middle of the fifth century, the center of power in Athens had shifted away from certain formerly influential administrative offices and institutions, such as the Areiopagos council. In Athens prior to 462 BC, W. Robert Connor writes, “an aspiring leader might seek to win various public offices, eventually becoming eponymous archon and thereafter serve for life on the council that met on Ares’ hill.”<sup>1</sup> These former objects of Athenian ambition were restricted to wealthier Athenians. To be eligible for certain elected offices, such as the various archonships, prior to 457/6 BC one had to belong to one of the two highest Athenian property classes (the *pentakosiomedimnoi* and *hippeis*). After 457/6 BC members the third of the four property classes (*zeugitai*) were also admitted, but Athenians of the lowest property class (*thetes*) were never eligible. The Areiopagos council, which was charged with the “guardianship of the constitution,”<sup>2</sup> was composed of ex-archons who served on the council for life.

Around 460 BC, however, the Athenian politicians Ephialtes and Pericles divested the Areiopagos council of nearly all of its powers—it only continued during this period as a homicide court. By this time as well, most of the holders of the formerly elected offices of Athens were determined by lot and the offices themselves thereby lost their political clout, the office of general being a notable exception.<sup>3</sup> These aristocratic channels to power were thus closed. The Areiopagos council, which once had wide and vaguely defined powers over the state, and archonships, once offices bestowing political power and influence on their holders, were no longer venues through which aristocrats might significantly influence the policies of Athens.

---

<sup>1</sup> Connor [1971], p. 11.

<sup>2</sup> Pseudo-Aristotle, *Athenian Constitution*, 25.1-2

<sup>3</sup> Connor [1971], pp.9-10.

Important matters of governance were diverted from these institutions traditionally monopolized by aristocrats to the *ecclesia* first and foremost (the assembly of adult male citizens), but also to the law courts and the *boule* (a council which did some preliminary work for the meetings of the *ecclesia*, comprised of 500 citizens chosen annually by lot). All free male citizens above the age of 18, regardless of property class, were eligible for membership in the *ecclesia*. At about the same time that he worked to restrict the powers of the Areiopagos council, Pericles introduced pay for jurymen, thus allowing poorer citizens to participate in one of the primary institutions by which Athens regulated herself. Finally, as Athens increased in her imperial ambitions, the poorer citizens who manned her navy grew in importance and could exercise power through these newly powerful institutions.

The consequences for a Hippocrates are clear: in order to attain a position of political prestige, a young aristocrat of this period would have needed to make himself conspicuous in these less aristocratic, more democratic political institutions, above all in the *ecclesia*. It was in this body that the Athenians decided their most important questions concerning domestic and foreign affairs. In describing the role of the *ecclesia* within Athenian society, M. I. Finley writes that it was “the crown of the system, possessing the right and the power to make all the policy decisions, in practice with few limitations, whether of precedent or scope.”<sup>4</sup>

To hold a position of prestige in a body such as this posed special problems. To begin with, there were no official positions of authority within the *ecclesia* itself. To quote Finley again:

A man was a leader solely as a function of his personal, and in a literal sense, unofficial status within the Assembly itself. The test of whether or not he held that status was simply whether the Assembly did or did not vote as he wished, and therefore the test was repeated with each proposal.<sup>5</sup>

How might one go about establishing such a position for oneself?

To achieve this aim, Hippocrates could have cultivated support in traditional, aristocratic organizations. He could have looked to his extended family group, his *genos*, as a traditional

---

<sup>4</sup> Finley [1962], p.9.

<sup>5</sup> Finley [1962], p.15.

source of support. He furthermore could have attempted to further his career through being a part of *hetaireiai*, drinking clubs of the elite which one could call upon for political purposes.<sup>6</sup> Members of both these sorts of groups might then be relied upon to support Hippocrates and his interests in the *ecclesia*, the *boule* (of which he could only once be a member), etc. Furthermore, as the example of Pericles shows, he could also have sought the office of general, which, still being elective, continued to carry some influence and substantive responsibility. While the office of general provided a means for politicians to gain or reinforce their influence, it was neither indispensable, nor perhaps the most expedient way to attain a position of prominence. Pericles himself did not hold the office until well into his public career.<sup>7</sup>

However, aristocratic groups, in the course of the late fifth century, appear to have become less effective for the purposes of securing influence in the government of the city's affairs. Far more effective in such an endeavor was the support of the majority of the *ecclesia* itself, of the *demos*, rather than any minority faction within it. In order to be truly influential in Athenian public life, one had to appeal directly and successfully to the *demos*.

How might one go about gaining the support of the *demos* and ensuring that the *ecclesia* voted as one wished? What, if anything, did reliably guarantee a position of leadership in the *ecclesia*? Quite simply, the successful leaders of fifth century were those who were able to persuade the *demos* to vote for their proposals by their speeches in the *ecclesia*. "Oratory," J. K. Davies writes, "became the vehicle of power."<sup>8</sup>

This helps to explain why Hippocrates, when pressed to say precisely what knowledge he wishes to learn from Protagoras, says that the sophist knows how to make men clever speakers. (312d) This is at least part of why Hippocrates wants to study with Protagoras—Hippocrates aspires to be a political leader and an essential means for being a successful politician is the ability to speak persuasively. As Finley writes:

---

<sup>6</sup> Connor [1971], pp.9-14.

<sup>7</sup> Davies [1975], p.378.

<sup>8</sup> Davies [1993], p.112.

Debate designed to win votes among an outdoor audience numbering several thousands means oratory, in the strictest sense of the word. It was therefore perfectly precise to call political leaders “orators”, as a synonym and not merely, as we might do, as a mark of the particular skill of a particular political figure.<sup>9</sup>

However, more was required of the rhetorical skills of the aspiring politician than mere cleverness. Due to the general character of the ecclesia, the orator had to be prepared not merely to speak persuasively, but to speak persuasively on a mind-boggling number and variety of topics. Since the ecclesia was the sovereign decision-making institution on all matters, an orator might conceivably have been required to speak on virtually any aspect of the city’s affairs. This required the orator to be knowledgeable and to possess some amount of expertise concerning the technical side of city management. In chapter four of the first book of the *Rhetoric*, Aristotle lists the topics about which the orator must be prepared to offer counsel: all the city’s sources of revenue, the military strength and character of the city and its neighbors, the food supply, the state of trade, etc. The transition of Athens from “small town to imperial city”, as Connor puts it<sup>10</sup>, resulted in a bewildering administrative burden. No small amount of technical knowledge would be necessary in order to cope with this burden.

Davies summarizes the necessary qualifications for a successful politician well—fifth century Athens required politicians “who could compile a set of accounts and check that they were right, who had enough sense of logic to put a case persuasively, and who could cope on their feet with malicious opponents and a bloody minded Assembly.”<sup>11</sup>

This is the sort of role to which Hippocrates aspires. Why Hippocrates would desire such a position, however, is a further question. What sorts of reasons would an individual such as Hippocrates have for pursuing political success?

The aristocracy was accustomed to taking a leading role in Greek society. Taking a leading role, however, meant a variety of different things at different points in Greek history. In the Homeric poems, it often meant demonstrating military prowess and being preeminent in

---

<sup>9</sup> Finley [1962], p.12.

<sup>10</sup> Connor [1971], p.122. For the administrative expertise required of the orators, see also Andrewes [1962] pp.83-84 and Brunt [1961], pp.143-144.

<sup>11</sup> Davies [1993], p.99.

single combat against the champions of the enemy. As the hoplite formation became the most effective military strategy, however, excellence in single combat was no longer an available means of taking a leading role. Aristocrats began to take leading roles in other capacities—in athletics, archonships, etc. As I have outlined above, traditional ways of taking a leading role in Athens were also changing. The old aristocratic institutions were, in the fifth century, losing influence to democratic institutions—institutions where different skills and tactics were required for success.

What taking any of these leading roles did require, however, was some sort of excellence (*arete*), whether it was military, athletic, etc. A reward and incentive for *arete*, for attaining these positions of excellence, was *time* (honor). As positions of preeminence, roles through which one might demonstrate *arete* and thereby gain *time*, shifted from one sphere to another, the activities of the aristocracy changed accordingly. Aristocrats continued to aspire to those leading roles that might grant them a share of honor comparable to that honor enjoyed by aristocrats traditionally.

Thus, a driving force for the eager Hippocrates may be *philotimia*, love of honor. Davies writes of Athenian society in the fifth century that “competition for power was very generally seen as, or transformed into, competition for *honour*.”<sup>12</sup> To support his claim, Davies quotes Aristotle’s statement in the *Nicomachean Ethics* that honor is generally taken to be “the goal of political life”. (1095b 22-23)

This, then, is the sort of figure that drives the dialogue—a young aristocrat seeking rhetorical and administrative expertise in order to gain a position of prominence in the ecclesia. Hippocrates may have this goal in mind in order to insulate himself from the radical social changes engulfing Athenian society—he lives at a time when Athens is growing more democratic and more hostile to aristocrats.<sup>13</sup> However, Hippocrates undoubtedly has traditional motivations

---

<sup>12</sup> Davies [1993], p.114.

<sup>13</sup> One reason for Hippocrates to engage in politics may simply have been to protect his interests (perhaps even his life) and those of his friends and family against political predators. In the *Hippias Major*, Hippias articulates this use of oratory in contrast to Socrates’ preoccupations: “What is beautiful and most precious is the ability to produce an eloquent and beautiful speech to a law court or a council meeting or any other official body you are addressing, to convince your audience, and to depart with the greatest of all prizes,

in mind—he wishes to derive the honor that comes from human excellence, as *time* has come from *arete* in Greek society at least since Homer. This individual, possessing the concerns and desires elaborated above, is the one to whom Protagoras and Socrates must address themselves.

### 3. Aristocratic Concerns and the Discussion of Simonides' Poem

Both Protagoras and Socrates are aware of the general character of their audience. Both clearly desire to portray themselves as knowledgeable and helpful concerning aristocratic concerns.

One encounter in the dialogue demonstrates this fact clearly—the roughly eight Stephanus pages of the *Protagoras* (339-347) wherein Socrates and Protagoras discuss a poem of Simonides. Directly before this section of the dialogue, Protagoras, after Socrates has examined and apparently refuted his views on virtue, refuses to continue any further in the discussion with Socrates. He agrees, after much pleading by various members of the audience, to resume speaking on the condition that he be the one to choose the topic and to put questions to Socrates. (338d-e) At this point, Protagoras says:

I consider, Socrates, that the greatest part of a man's education is to be in command of poetry, by which I mean the ability to understand the words of the poets, to know when a poem is correctly composed and when not, and to know how to analyze a poem and to respond to questions about it. So my line of questioning now will still concern the subject of our present discussion, namely virtue, (339a)

To inaugurate the discussion of virtue through poetry, Protagoras then asks Socrates whether he thinks that a certain poem Simonides wrote for a tyrant of Thessaly named Scopas is “well and correctly composed.” (339b)

When Socrates responds that he thinks it is well composed, Protagoras argues that there is a blatant contradiction in the poem—Simonides claims in lines 1-2 of his poem that “to

---

your own salvation and that of your friends and your property.” (304a-b) This may be a concern, Prof. Kerry Christensen pointed out to me, more appropriate to Plato's Athens (with its greater experience of political turmoil) than to Athens in the mid-fifth century (the dramatic date of the *Protagoras*).



become a good man truly is hard” (*andr’ agathon men alatheos genesthai chalepon*) while he says that it is not true that “it is hard to be good” (*chalepon phat’ esthlon emmenai*) in line 13. Protagoras concludes on the basis of conflict between these statements that the poem is not well composed. To defend the consistency of Simonides’ poem and his judgment of it, Socrates proceeds to offer a complex and lengthy interpretation of the poem, relying primarily on a distinction he emphasizes between “to become” (*genesthai*) in line 1 and “to be” (*emmenai*) in line 13. Simonides, according to Socrates’ interpretation, holds that it is hard to become good and only denies that being good is difficult. (340-347)

This development in the dialogue may perhaps make little sense when first encountered. While Protagoras claims that discussing poetry will continue the previous discussion about virtue, it is entirely unclear how his concern with Simonides’ consistency helps to settle the questions of whether virtue is teachable or how the various virtues are related to each other. Indeed, his contribution to the discussion does not appear to further anyone’s knowledge about virtue at all. Socrates behaves in a fashion no less confusing. In Plato’s early dialogues, Socrates is almost entirely uninterested in discussing poetry in any significant amount of detail. Here, however, he not only speaks at length on the subject, but also appears to offer a parodic and deceptive account of what Simonides actually meant.<sup>14</sup> Among the more bizarre claims Socrates makes in his speech are that the Spartans are secretly preeminent philosophers (342a-343b) and that Simonides (not Socrates) thinks that no one errs willingly—a view he extracts by a somewhat dubious account of the poem’s grammar. (345d-346c)

In his introduction to the dialogue, Vlastos articulates his own bafflement concerning this passage:

In his exegesis of the poet [Socrates] turns into a practical joker, almost a clown. He is entitled to his opinion that looking to poets for moral instruction is like getting your music from the clever harlots who dance and play the flute for the stupid bourgeois. But why act out this dubious metaphor in a labored one-man charade, throwing in some

---

<sup>14</sup> Socrates presents an interpretation so bizarre and misleading that modern scholars are still unable to agree about what Simonides himself meant by the poem. For differing modern views on the poem’s meaning, see Woodbury [1953], Parry [1965], Donlan [1969], Carson [1992].

philosophical edification on the side, as when he drags in (by a misplaced comma) his doctrine that no man sins voluntarily?<sup>15</sup>

Vlastos's puzzlement is typical of most general, philosophical interpretations of the dialogue.<sup>16</sup>

To many scholars, there appears to be no good, philosophical reason for Socrates to behave in the fashion he does in this episode. What explanation, then, can there be for his actions?<sup>17</sup>

There are ways of explaining Socrates' and Protagoras' actions that do not rely on the ascription of some intention to advance the discussion at hand philosophically. Here, being mindful of the audience which Socrates and Protagoras address can help resolve the difficulty.

Protagoras is presenting himself as a teacher of a general sort of education for young aristocrats. Since Protagoras is endeavoring to prove himself an acceptable teacher, he must show himself to be knowledgeable about things generally and traditionally a part of aristocratic life—he must be able to advise his pupils how to deal best with these matters. If Protagoras could not do so, his instruction would be useless concerning the sort of life that a young ancient Greek aristocrat would expect to lie ahead of him.

The sophist undoubtedly fears that his credentials as a teacher have been called into question by Socrates' refutation. He presumably desires to reestablish himself as the best qualified to teach virtue and to do so at the expense of his most conspicuous rival, Socrates.

---

<sup>15</sup> Vlastos [1956], p. xxiv.

<sup>16</sup> Most scholars simply fail to give an analysis of the passage (e.g. Irwin [1995]). C. C. W. Taylor, while taking the passage to present an obscure, implied criticism of the sophists (Taylor [1991], p.148), nevertheless admits an inability to make sense of other aspects of the passage. (Taylor [1991], p. 225)

<sup>17</sup> Despite Vlastos's judgment, some scholars have found philosophical significance in Socrates' interpretation. Dorothea Frede sees the distinction between being and becoming in the *Protagoras* as a sign of a later philosophical addition by Plato, who came to make such a distinction himself in his later dialogues. Specifically, Frede sees a parallel between several of Socrates' comments in his interpretation of Simonides' poem and Diotima's speech in the *Symposium*. Socrates, translating his interpretation of Simonides into Socratic terminology, states that faring ill or becoming bad (which, of course, must be preceded by becoming good) must involve the only real kind of loss, namely, the "loss of knowledge." (345b) Frede rightly points out that the possibility of losing knowledge conflicts with most of Plato's early and middle dialogues. (D. Frede [1986], 744) Frede explains this inconsistency by reference to a "textual oddity" which I discuss below in note 21.

While a genuinely philosophical distinction between being and becoming does seem out of place in an early dialogue, Michael Frede argues that Socrates emphasizes by this distinction the difference between autonomous moral action (being good) and socially coerced moral action (becoming good)—a distinction that would not be strange in an early dialogue. (M. Frede [1992], xiii) However, Socrates never explicitly makes this sort of distinction in his interpretation—he makes no actual reference to some kind of contrast between autonomous and coerced action. If this is the contrast he generally means to make by distinguishing being from becoming, he does not make that clear in the *Protagoras*.

Protagoras seems to think that Socrates will be likely to continue to refute him if the discussion continues in Socrates' favored format, dialectic. He would thus wish to change the format of the discussion in a fashion likely to favor himself.

To achieve this end, Protagoras relies on poetry. Greek lyric poetry was a traditional presence in a Greek aristocrat's life, as Protagoras himself implies. A large portion of Greek poetry was an essential feature and product of traditionally and exclusively aristocratic institutions such as the symposium and the *hetaireia*. In symposia and similar gatherings, lyric poetry would be recited—it is probable that much of the lyric poetry extant was composed for precisely such occasions.<sup>18</sup> Calling upon poetry to discuss virtue thus has distinctly aristocratic overtones. Since Protagoras hopes he will be more knowledgeable concerning poetry than Socrates, it is possible that Protagoras is trying to show precisely what Socrates was not—an aristocrat. If Protagoras could show that Socrates is ignorant and unable to converse concerning poetry, then it would become apparent to the audience that Socrates is not able speak about the matters traditionally a part of aristocratic life. It would perhaps seem to a Greek aristocrat that it is Protagoras and not Socrates who is better able to speak concerning a gentleman's education.<sup>19</sup>

Socrates thus has a problem on his hands. Although, as he will later make clear, Socrates objects to poetic exegesis in philosophical discourse, in order to be taken seriously in his current aristocratic surroundings Socrates must show himself adept at analyzing poetry and defend Simonides. Through a discussion of the poem, Socrates must show himself to be educated in poetry sufficiently—to the extent that he is acceptable in discussions of matters of importance in aristocratic circles.

We should take this as the starting point for understanding Socrates' motivation for presenting an interpretation of Simonides. Since Socrates must necessarily engage in this activity

---

<sup>18</sup> Murray [1990], p.9.

<sup>19</sup> That Protagoras was a foreigner should not have caused him any worry at the house of Callias--in contrast to the lower economic classes, the aristocracy maintained ties with and welcomed aristocrats and intellectuals from other cities.

to be an acceptable participant in a discussion among aristocrats, we need not apologize for him or condemn his actions. We need not imply, as Vlastos does, that Socrates offers his interpretation frivolously and gratuitously—his actions serve a non-parodic purpose. Nor need we condemn the levity of Socrates' tone. He is merely required to show an adequate familiarity with the poetry of symposia and with its characteristic themes and concerns. Demonstrating this is certainly not incompatible with employing parodic overtones—indeed parodying poetic discussion could itself show evidence of the requisite familiarity.

Furthermore, we need not necessarily see Socrates as making a philosophical point in his interpretation of Simonides. Since, for non-philosophical reasons, he must provide an interpretation, he is not necessarily philosophizing. It is, of course, not impossible that he is doing so, nor is philosophizing incompatible with demonstrating exegetical expertise. However, we need not make Socrates' interpretation philosophically substantive in order to apologize for him.<sup>20</sup>

If he takes care to cater to his aristocratic audience, can we think of Socrates as the egalitarian figure he is occasionally thought to be, taking the proper philosophical interlocutor to be anyone and everyone he meets? At least one of his comments suggests we cannot. Socrates' interpretation has just gone over favorably with the assembled crowd when he says:

I leave it up to Protagoras, but if it's all right with him, why don't we say good-bye to odes and poetry...Discussing poetry strikes me as most like the symposia of simple (*phaulon*) and agora-frequenting (*agoraion*) men...But when gentlemen (*kaloik'agathoi*) drink together... [such a group] should require no extraneous voices, not even of poets, who cannot be questioned on what they say. (347c-e)

Socrates is thus explicitly addressing himself to an aristocratic audience, speaking on how best to manage (and reform) a distinctly aristocratic institution, the symposium.<sup>21</sup> He furthermore uses

---

<sup>20</sup> While Socrates' goal of showing himself versed in poetry is not incompatible with making philosophically significant remarks, one would expect Socrates to submit to the trial of dialectic any explicit philosophical claim necessary for any of his arguments--Socrates obviously feels that it is in dialectic that philosophical claims can most profitably be discussed. I would therefore be skeptical as to the relevance of any philosophical claims in Socrates' speech for any of his arguments in the *Protagoras*.

<sup>21</sup> Dorothea Frede, who takes this reference to symposiums to be a textual "oddity" out of place in the *Protagoras* and hinting at the *Symposium*, writes that "the situation in the *Protagoras* does not call for a comparison with a symposium at all." (Frede, 747 n.41) This seems incorrect, however, when one considers that the original context of monodic lyric poetry (of which Simonides' poem is a prime example) is, in fact, the

a phrase, *kaloī k'agathoi*, with the most elite connotations possible. He contrasts this group with those whom he would rather not associate—the *phauloi* and the *agoraioi*. In the context of the fifth century, these words designate those who are newly rich and lacking in proper aristocratic heritage (*agoraioi*) and those who are politically unambitious (*phauloi*).<sup>22</sup> Socrates here uses prejudice against the newly rich to press for a poetry-free, more properly aristocratic symposium

This episode thus demonstrates both Protagoras' and Socrates' awareness of the social makeup of their audience. Both unabashedly appeal to aristocratic prejudices. This is not to say, however, that either Socrates or Protagoras call only upon prejudice to make their appeals.

---

symposium. Socrates therefore has good reason to refer to symposia--it was at symposia that lyric poetry was traditionally recited and discussed.

<sup>22</sup> See Connor [1971], pp.154-155 and Connor [1971], p. 89 n.3.