

ANIMADVERSIONES IN DIOGENEM LAERTIUM*

Over the past two decades, a few studies have unearthed and consolidated the important new insight that Diogenes Laertios was not the mindless and untrustworthy copier he has so long been taken for by nineteenth- and twentieth-century scholarship; thus, it has been demonstrated that the standard ancient technique of excerpting – such as it was adopted, among others, by Varro – also underlies Diogenes' work, and that this author may be thought to have assembled by himself a substantial number of the extracts scattered across the ten books constituting the *Lives and Opinions of Eminent Philosophers*¹. All the same, this deserved rehabilitation does not alter the fact that present-day scholarship frequently comes away from the long-winded treatise with a feeling of frustration, when trying to move beyond the manifold stories recounted by Diogenes and attempting, for instance, to gather precise information even about the sources to which he refers by name (how did he use them, and what did they actually say?). These problems originate in Diogenes' seemingly carefree method of quoting those sources (in itself wholly in line with standard ancient practice, since there were no strict rules enforcing the exact acknowledgement of name, title and book-number of the sources consulted) and in his manner of editing, rewriting and organizing the material drawn from them. Scattered throughout his work, there are effectively dozens of passages which offer details and/or source-citations in abundance but, at the same time, suffer from poorly thought-out structuring, as borne out by excessive compression or accumulation of information and the resultant confusion and ambiguity.

*) A list with detailed bibliographical information on modern studies cited throughout the present article can be found at the end of this paper; references to works cited just once or twice are given in full in the appropriate places.

1) See Mejer (1978: 16–29); Gigante (1986: 15–34 passim); Hahm (1992: 4079–4082).

D. E. Hahm has recently suggested that this apparent lack of compositional skills – which, certainly by modern standards, seriously detracts from Diogenes’ literary and historiographical merits – is a direct consequence of the excerpting method adopted by the Laertian². That would have led him (and every other author composing an informational work like the *Lives and Opinions*) to engage himself in a continuous process of editing the vast collection of extracts (paraphrases and literal quotations) which made up the first, rough draft of his book: writing summaries and transitions, rearranging certain items, deleting duplications, and dealing with contradictions or discrepancies (either harmonizing or simply recording them), etc. This means that “there seems to have been no single moment that we might identify as the ‘writing’ of the work”, and that the actual book gradually evolved from a compilation of loosely connected excerpts to an increasingly coherent and unified work, “with some sections perhaps progressing ahead of others”³; also, “the state of completion of each part depended on the caprice of the author”, and we should not “be too critical of the literary style or the lack of coherence in overall organization and presentation. Coherence and grace in exposition of historical material drawn from a variety of sources might be bought at the price of faithfulness to the details of content and interpretation found in the source”⁴. In other words, the way in which Diogenes composed his work would account for its stylistic qualities (or lack thereof), and the latter could only be used as a yardstick for measuring the author’s literary competence or objectives with the utmost caution, after close investigation.

Be that as it may, Hahm at the same time admitted that “a state of revision that one author might have regarded as unfinished, an-

2) See Hahm (1992: 4081–4082).

3) Both quotes from Hahm (1992: 4081).

4) Id. (1992: 4082). In the same breath, this scholar has convincingly stressed that during the process of composition sketched above, “a work could be regarded as incomplete, yet the incompleteness would not necessarily show up in the form of an abrupt ‘unfinished’ ending”; further, that “there is little point in attempting to pass judgment whether the work as a whole is ‘finished’”, since some sections are inevitably less completely revised and unified than others. On the issue whether or not Diogenes’ work was published ‘unfinished’, see also the comments of Mejer (1978: 15–16), which should be complemented with the pertinent observations of M. Gigante, rec. J. Mejer, *Diogenes Laertius and his Hellenistic Background*, *Gnomon* 55, 1983, 9–14, esp. 10; Id. (1986: 25–34).

other would have proudly ‘published’⁵; accordingly, one may still wonder whether not even Diogenes’ ancient readership at times was baffled by the formulation or the structure of a given passage (as I will try to make clear below). Anyhow, the problems sketched in the opening paragraph remain in need of close investigation. The present article is concerned with three passus which cause one to ponder all the afore-mentioned matters; the unifying element are the recurring references to Hermippos of Smyrna, the Hellenistic biographer who was active in late third-century Alexandria and whose writings Diogenes eagerly mined for biographical information on his subjects⁶.

a) Diog. Laert. 2.38–39: On the Trial Against Sokrates

(38) Ἀπηνέγκατο μὲν οὖν τὴν γραφὴν (sc. κατὰ Σωκράτους; SSR I D 1) ὁ Μέλητος, εἶπε δὲ τὴν δίκην Πολύευκτος, ὡς φησι Φαβωρίνος (F 31 Mensching = F 63 Barigazzi) ἐν Παντοδαπῇ ἱστορίᾳ· συνέγραψε δὲ τὸν λόγον Πολυκράτης ὁ σοφιστής, ὡς φησιν Ἑρμιππος (FGrHist 1026 F 67 = F 32 Wehrli SdA Suppl. I), ἢ Ἄνυτος, ὡς τινες· προητοίμασε δὲ πάντα Λύκων ὁ δημαγωγός. (39) Ἀντισθένης (F 4 Giannattasio Andria) δ’ ἐν ταῖς τῶν Φιλοσόφων Διαδοχαῖς καὶ Πλάτων ἐν Ἀπολογίᾳ (cf. 23e–24a; 36a) τρεῖς αὐτοῦ κατηγορησάσασιν, Ἄνυτον καὶ Λύκωνα καὶ Μέλητον·

5) See Hahm (1992: 4082).

6) Judging from the sheer number of references to Hermippos in the work of Diogenes Laertios (no less than thirty-seven, making him by far the biographer cited most often by the Laertian), the latter regarded him as a valuable source of information. I have discussed the relationship between both authors at greater length elsewhere in a monograph entitled ‘Hermippos of Smyrna and his Biographical Writings. A Reappraisal’ (Leuven 1999; see esp. chapter II C). This monograph is one of two publications resulting from my doctoral dissertation, *The Biographical Fragments of Hermippos the Callimachean. Critical Edition with Translation and Commentary* (Leuven 1996); it presents the main conclusions about this biographer’s work, supplemented with commentaries on exemplary fragments. The individual commentaries on all fragments (not just the biographical ones) of Hermippos have been published in fascicle IV A 3 of FGrHist (Leiden – Boston – Köln 1999), in which the biographer has been accorded number 1026 (on the continuation project set up to carry on Jacoby’s FGrHist, see the ‘Arbeitsvorhaben’ published in *Gnomon* 66, 1994, 192; the first fascicle – IV A 1 – came out in October 1998, courtesy of Brill Editors from Leiden). Because the two tomes came out not too long ago, I have made sure to quote, in the present article, both the new fragment-numbers as featured in FGrHist IV A 3, and the corresponding ones in the Hermippos-edition which F. Wehrli (Basel – Stuttgart 1974) issued as Supplement I to his work ‘Die Schule des Aristoteles’ (hereafter SdA).

τὸν μὲν Ἄνυτον ὑπὲρ τῶν δημιουργῶν καὶ τῶν πολιτικῶν ὀργιζόμενον· τὸν δὲ Λύκωνα ὑπὲρ τῶν ῥητόρων· καὶ τὸν Μέλητον ὑπὲρ τῶν ποιητῶν, οὓς ἅπαντας ὁ Σωκράτης διέσυρε. Φαβωρίνος (F 3 Mensching = F 34 Barigazzi) δὲ φησιν ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ τῶν Ἀπομνημονευμάτων μὴ εἶναι ἀληθῆ τὸν λόγον τὸν Πολυκράτους κατὰ Σωκράτους· ἐν αὐτῷ γάρ, φησί, μνημονεῖ τῶν ὑπὸ Κόνωνος τειχῶν ἀνασταθέντων. ἃ γέγονεν ἔτεσιν ἕξ τῆς τοῦ Σωκράτους τελευτῆς ὕστερον. Καὶ ἔστιν οὕτως ἔχον⁷.

(38) Meletos handed in the accusation (sc. against Sokrates) and Polyuktos pleaded the cause, so we are told by Favorinus in his *Miscellaneous History*. According to Hermippos, Polykrates the sophist wrote the speech, but some say that it was by Anytos. Lykon the demagogue made all preparations beforehand. (39) Antisthenes in *The Successions of the Philosophers*, and Plato in his *Apology*, state that there were three accusers, Anytos, Lykon and Meletos; that Anytos was roused to wrath on behalf of the artisan class and the politicians, Lykon on behalf of the rhetoricians, and Meletos of the poets – for Sokrates had poured scorn on all of these classes. Favorinus in Book 1 of his *Memorabilia* declares that the speech of Polykrates against Sokrates is not genuine, since he mentions the rebuilding of the walls by Konon in it [393 B. C.], an act which happened six years after Sokrates' death [399 B. C.]. And this is the case.

Regarding the genesis of the first part of this passus (the closing half of 2.38), Wehrli⁸ has argued that Hermippos need not necessarily have been used directly or indirectly by Diogenes, but that the Laertian might merely have come across his name in a “Liste von Varianten”. While I can go along with the suggestion that Diogenes only found Hermippos' name in connection with an alternative to the main tradition, I beg to differ about the “list of variants”; though the evidence is slight, there is a slim chance that the biographer from Smyrna was not just mentioned as one of several authors with divergent information in this respect, but that he was the only one listed by the Laertian's source; moreover, it might be possible to identify this intermediary by name.

As a starting point, we may take the observation that the two quotations from Favorinus of Arelate – the statement on the identity of one of the litigants against Sokrates at 2.38, and the exposure of Polykrates' speech of indictment as an inauthentic one, written long after the facts, at 2.39⁹ – obviously touch on the same issue

7) The text edition followed for this passage and those dealt with below, in parts b and c of this article, is that by H. S. Long, Oxford 1964.

8) See Wehrli SdA Suppl. I (1974: 66).

9) Let it be noted, incidentally, that the fact that Favorinus (active in the first half of the second century A.D.) argued that Polykrates' speech against Sokrates was not genuine, does not necessarily mean that he was the first, let alone the only writer

and, moreover, betray a keen interest, on the part of this ‘poikilographer’, in the Sokrates case¹⁰. His regard for prosopographical details about the prosecutors in a notorious lawsuit also shines through in Diog. Laert. 5.5, dealing with the charges of impiety brought against Aristotle¹¹. Seen in this light, the quotation at 2.39 becomes particularly relevant. Since Favorinus felt compelled to refute the (anyway manifestly inaccurate) assertion that Polykrates’ λόγος κατὰ Σωκράτους was the result of the latter’s active involvement in the proceedings against Sokrates, it is only natural to presume that, in the course of his researches on Sokrates’ prosecutors, he had come across the unusual assertion that Polykrates was the author of the authentic speech of indictment, and not Anytos, who was usually credited with it¹².

On the one hand, now, we have just seen that this information was given (among others?) by Hermippos. On the other, we know from yet another passage in Diogenes that Favorinus knew the works of Hermippos; describing Theophrastos in his old age, Favorinus is explicitly said to have relied on the account given thereof by the Alexandrian biographer¹³. Furthermore, the surviving

who had noticed the anachronism contained in it. In fact, this piece of information does not even furnish conclusive proof that the text of the κατηγορία was still extant in Favorinus’ time; this was also the opinion of Wehrli SdA Suppl. I (1974: 66), who stated: “Die Richtigstellung eines unbekanntes Autors hellenistischer Zeit, dem Favorinus bei Diogenes Laert. II 39 folgt, etc.”

10) That Favorinus must have dealt at some length with the trial, in both his miscellanies, can be gathered from a further quotation by Diogenes at 2.40: “The affidavit in the case, which is still preserved, says Favorinus (F 51 Mensching = F 34 Barigazzi), in the *Metron*, ran as follows: “This indictment etc.”

11) Cf. Diog. Laert. 5.5: “He (sc. Aristotle) came to Athens, was head of his school for thirteen years, and then withdrew to Chalkis because he was indicted for impiety by Eurymedon the hierophant, or, according to Favorinus in his *Miscellaneous History* (F 36 Mensching I = F 68 Barigazzi), by Demophilos”.

12) The tradition about Sokrates’ prosecutors appears to have been shaped from early on by the mention Plato twice made of them in the course of the *Apologia* (cf. the references in Diogenes’ text). The names that were firmly established were those of Meletos, Lykon and Anytos (who, indeed, are all mentioned in the passage quoted above), and even the factions each of them stood for were derived from Plato. On Sokrates’ three prosecutors, see T. C. Brickhouse – N. D. Smith, *Socrates on Trial*, Princeton 1989, 27–30; those scholars have also covered various other aspects concerning the trial against Sokrates (the procedure, the jury and the formal charges brought against Sokrates) on p. 24–27; 30–37.

13) Cf. Diog. Laert. 5.41: “Favorinus (F 53 Mensching = F 92 Barigazzi) – quoting Hermippos (FGrHist 1026 F 35 = F 53 Wehrli SdA Suppl. I) on this, who

fragments of both authors indicate that they shared a keen interest in prosopographical details about participants in ‘causes célèbres’; in fact, there is good reason to believe that Favorinus had (at least indirect) access to Hermippos’ discussion of the identity of the official accuser in the trial of impiety brought against Aristotle¹⁴. Putting two and two together, the conclusion that the Hermippos-quotation at 2.38 could be traced back to Favorinus appears very attractive indeed¹⁵. As a matter of fact, from the foregoing, it is clear, firstly, that Favorinus must have given more names than just that of Polyuktos in his discussion of the prosecutors in the Sokrates case; and secondly, that Diogenes appreciated him as an authority on this trial and used him as one of his principal sources for his account on the subject¹⁶. Since, in addition, Favorinus must have been one of the few authors whom Diogenes drew on directly¹⁷, it might be suggested that the passage cited above goes back to that writer of miscellanies in its entirety. Verily, Favorinus can be expected to have mentioned, besides the obscure Polyuktos, the ‘established’ names of Meletos, Anytos and Lykon, the more so

in turn relied on a piece of information narrated by Arkesilaos of Pitane (T 1a Mette) to Lakydes of Kyrene – relates that as an old man he (sc. Theophrastos) was carried around in a litter”.

14) As I have tried to argue in the commentary on Hermippos’ F 30, in FGrHist IV A 3 (1999: 316). On Hermippos’ and Favorinus’ common interests in notorious lawsuits, see FGrHist 1026 F 30 (on Aristotle; F 48 Wehrli SdA Suppl. I), 65 (on Anaxagoras of Klazomenai; F 30 Wehrli SdA Suppl. I) and 67 (on Sokrates; F 32 Wehrli SdA Suppl. I), and the respective commentaries in FGrHist IV A 3; in addition, see Mensching (1963: 43–44).

15) Though there is no (or hardly any) way to decide whether Favorinus would have used Hermippos directly or via an intermediary in this particular instance; see also Mensching (1963: 44): “Ob Favorin manches direkt aus Hermipp nahm, läßt sich nicht sagen”. I have argued that, in the case of the trial against Aristotle, Favorinus did not have the work of the Hellenistic biographer directly at hand (cf. the previous note), and it is rather obvious to assume that this was also so for the Sokrates-case, but all this is very speculative indeed.

16) This being a rare instance where Favorinus is not merely used by Diogenes for a minor addition to the main exposition; on this issue, see Moraux (1955: 141–142); Mensching (1963: 11–17); Mejer (1978: 30–32).

17) See Mensching (1963: 8–9) and Mejer (1978: 30–32); both scholars have observed that the closeness in time of both authors (Favorinus lived in the early second century A.D., Diogenes in the third) leaves little other choice but to conclude that Diogenes must have disposed of copies of both of Favorinus’ miscellanies and must have drawn on them directly.

because the roles in the trial assigned to the latter three are all complementary to that of the said Polyeuktos¹⁸.

Admittedly, Diogenes does not so much as suggest that Favorinus was his main source for the entire *passus* in question¹⁹. Moreover, the Hermippos-quote is separated from Favorinus' refutation of the Polykrates-speech (at 2.39) by several lines, and Diogenes' phrasing in 2.38 even seems to disregard this very rebuttal, presenting Hermippos' account as a valid alternative to that of other authorities. However, a brief glance at Diogenes' working and writing method goes far towards taking the edge off these objections. First of all, it is an established fact that, unlike today, there were no strict regulations for acknowledging one's sources in antiquity. As a result, we cannot be sure to draw reliable conclusions about our ancient authorities' sources from their surviving writings; even their own explicit indications could be wholly misleading. Thus, in expressly attributing to Favorinus the specific detail about Polyeuktos, Diogenes could well have chosen to credit his source with a little-known piece of information which stood out from the additional and very traditional data about the prosecutors of Sokrates, while in fact the whole paragraph derived from him²⁰.

18) For sure, the interpretation of the *passus* under discussion given by Hicks I (1925: 168 n. *b*) – that the entire paragraph presents itself as the *vulgata* combined with interjections from Favorinus and Hermippos – is erroneous, at least as far as the Favorinus-part is concerned: the *nominatum* quotation from the latter is the first of a tripartite *δέ*-sentence corresponding to the preceding *μέν*-phrase ('*Ἀπηνέγκατο μὲν ... ὁ Μέλιτος, εἶπε δὲ ... Πολύευκτος, ... συνέγραψε δὲ ... Πολυκράτης ... ἢ Ἄνυτος ... προητοίμασε δὲ ... Λύκων*), so it is an integral and important part of the exposition.

19) In fact, Mensching (1963: 118) only printed the single sentence in which Favorinus is mentioned by name as the text for F 31 in his edition. Barigazzi (1966: 225) included the wider context of that sentence (including the first half of 2.38), as if to suggest that the same must also have been said by Favorinus. Strangely, the one sentence the Italian scholar left out of his F 63 was, precisely, the Hermippos-quotation; this is rather strange, since there is nothing in that phrase to suggest that it could not possibly derive from Favorinus.

20) To give but one other example of the caution one must apply in assessing an ancient writer's source citations: while Diogenes only twice explicitly acknowledges that he has used information from Hermippos indirectly, there are serious indications that this may also be the case in instances where he simply writes "Hermippos says that ...", without reference to an intermediary; regarding this point, see the commentaries on F 16, 69–70, and 81 (cf. F 9; 40–41; 59 Wehrli SdA Suppl. I) in FGrHist IV A 3.

Secondly, the two literal quotations from Favorinus in 2.38–39 derive from two different works. Now, the ancients' technique of excerpting was not as sophisticated as the present-day state of the art. Given the writing material they had to make do with (papyrus scrolls, not filing cards), they could not jot down notes and arrange them in a systematic way – topic by topic and, per topic, author by author –, but had to write them on separate scrolls, arranged either author by author or topic by topic; more importantly, our ancient counterparts could only consult those excerpts in the order in which they had read and noted them²¹. In the particular case of Diogenes Laertios, this explains why the use of one excerpt often leads to the introduction of another excerpt from the same source, or on the same subject matter from a different source²². In his discussion of the Sokrates trial (especially the two paragraphs 2.38–39), Diogenes unmistakably relied on a subject-oriented collection of excerpts, which he put to use in a disconcertingly awkward and clumsy way, with a lot of repetition and overlaps. In this respect, the most glaring and, anyway, inexcusable mistake is that the two statements about Polykrates' involvement in the trial have not been placed together; if only from a compositional point of view, this simply does not make sense. Yet, one of the consequences of the technique that has just been described is that excerpts from two different works of the same author may have been regarded as excerpts from two different sources altogether by an ancient man of letters. In this specific case, it might correspondingly be speculated that Diogenes' excerpts taken from the two miscellaneous works of Favorinus did not form a continuous section, but were interspersed with several other references. Ultimately, we cannot, in fact, take for granted that the Laertian read both of Favorinus' works the one

21) On this, see J. E. Skydsgaard, Varro the Scholar. Studies in the First Book of Varro's *De re rustica*, København 1968, 101–116; Mejer (1978: 16–19); Hahm (1992: 4079–4082). Cf. for instance the two Hermippos-quotations found at Athen. 13.590c–e and 8.342c (FGrHist 1026 F 46 a & c = F 68aI–II Wehrli SdA Suppl. I); seemingly dealing with two entirely different subject matters (Hypereides' fondness of female company, and his daily visits to the fish market), those quotations can be shown to derive from the same context on the basis of the parallel at Ps.–Plut. Dec. or. 849d–e (FGrHist 1026 F 46d = F 68b Wehrli SdA Suppl. I).

22) On this, see Mejer (1978: 18; 22–23). Cf., for instance, Diog. Laert. 8.40–41, where two quotations from Hermippos are put together which both deal with Pythagoras, but which could not possibly derive from the same context in Hermippos' *On Pythagoras* (cf. FGrHist 1026 F 24–25 = F 20 Wehrli SdA Suppl. I).

straight after the other, and his thematic scroll containing excerpts dealing with the trial against Sokrates may have been copious²³.

In sum, one cannot exclude the possibility that in the general discussion of the tradition about Sokrates' prosecutors that was part of his *Miscellaneous History*, Favorinus merely noted that according to some writers, Anytos wrote the indictment speech delivered against Sokrates, while according to Hermippos, Polykrates did this; that in his *Memorabilia* he explicitly denied the latter version²⁴; and that Diogenes made extensive but ill-considered use of this material from both works. As I stated at the outset of this exposition, the evidence is slight, and the results are indeed not free from conjecture, but still, the circumstantial arguments adduced here cannot simply be brushed aside, either²⁵.

*b) Diog. Laert. 5.2–3: On Aristotle and the Foundation
of the Peripatos*

Diogenes' vita of Aristotle, placed at the beginning of Book 5 of the *Lives and Opinions*, starts with an introductory paragraph on the philosopher's origin and physical appearance (5.1). Then, he

23) For all we know, he read first Favorinus' *Miscellaneous History*, then (a work in which he found references to) Antisthenes' *Successions of Philosophers* and Plato's *Apologia*, and next Favorinus' *Memorabilia* – that is, the order of the quotations in 2.38–39.

24) Either, he merely contented himself in the *Miscellaneous History* with juxtaposing the different statements that had been made before him about the authorship of the speech of indictment against Sokrates, and reserved his 'critique' of the Polykrates-version for his *Memorabilia*; or else he wrote the latter work after the former, and he only learnt about the contents of Polykrates' speech in the meantime, this prompting the retraction or correction of his earlier information about the matter (cf. the suggestion, made above, n. 9, that Favorinus was neither the first, nor the only writer in antiquity to spot the anachronism in Polykrates' speech). Admittedly, we are absolutely groping in the dark about the relative chronology of both his works.

25) Of course, one would like to go even further than this. Once it is accepted that Favorinus was acquainted with Hermippos' treatment of the Sokrates case and that he drew on Hermippean material for the trial against Aristotle, it might be conjectured that the information about the obscure Polyuektos or the quotation of the authentic affidavit in the Sokrates trial could also derive from the Hellenistic biographer. However, these musings are simply unwarranted, since they lack any support in our sources. Therefore, I choose not to burn my fingers on this sheer speculation.

turns his attention to Aristotle's relationship with Plato (5.2) and to the circumstances leading up to and involved with the foundation and organization of the Peripatos, with an added touch of etymology (5.2–3). The latter account contains the second of two nominatim citations of Hermippos of Smyrna in Diogenes' biography of the Stagirite²⁶:

(2) Φησὶ δ' Ἐρμιππος (FGrHist 1026 F 33 = F 45 Wehrli SdA Suppl. I) ἐν τοῖς βίοις ὅτι πρεσβεύοντος αὐτοῦ (sc. Ἀριστοτέλους) πρὸς Φίλιππον ὑπὲρ Ἀθηναίων σχολάρχης ἐγένετο τῆς ἐν Ἀκαδημίᾳ σχολῆς Ξενοκράτης· ἐλθόντα δὲ αὐτὸν καὶ θεασάμενον ὑπ' ἄλλω τῆν σχολῆν, ἐλέσθαι περίπατον τὸν ἐν Λυκείῳ καὶ μέχρι μὲν ἀλείμματος ἀνακάμπτοντα τοῖς μαθηταῖς συμφιλοσοφεῖν ὅθεν περιπαθητικὸς^a προσαγορευθῆναι (οἱ δ', ὅτι ἐκ νόσου περιπατοῦντι Ἀλεξάνδρῳ συμπάρων^b διελέγετο ἄττα). (3) Ἐπειδὴ δὲ πλείους ἐγένοντο ἤδη, καὶ ἐκάθισεν εἰπών·

αἰσχρὸν σιωπᾶν, Ξενοκράτη δ' εἶν λέγειν

(cf. Eur. F 796 Nauck²).

Καὶ πρὸς θέσιν συνεγύμναζε τοὺς μαθητάς, ἅμα καὶ ῥητορικῶς ἐπασκῶν.

^a περιπατητικὸς Reiske, Hermes 24, 1889, 311 : περιπατητικὸν codd. Hicks Long Gigante

^b συμπάρων codd. Hicks Long Gigante Wehrli : συμπεριπατῶν Cobet Düring : περιπατῶν (...) συμπεριτῶν Richards, CR 18, 1904, 345

(2) Hermippos relates in his biographies that, while Aristotle was away at Philip as an ambassador on behalf of the Athenians, Xenokrates became head of the Academy. When on his return he found the school had a new leader, he chose a gallery in the Lykeion where he used to pace up and down discussing philosophy with his pupils until it was time to put on ointments; this earned them the epithet 'Peripatetics' (others say that the name was given to him because, when Alexander was recovering from an illness and taking daily walks, Aristotle joined him and discussed certain matters with him). (3) In time, the number of his pupils increased considerably; he then sat down to lecture, explaining:

It were base to keep silence and let Xenokrates speak.

He also taught his disciples to discourse upon a set theme, besides exercising them in rhetoric.

26) This follows closely on the first reference, at 5.1 (= FGrHist 1026 F 32 = F 44 Wehrli SdA Suppl. I). Despite the fact that the quotation at 5.2 is the last mention by name of Hermippos in the Aristotle-biography, some scholars have tried to argue that he was Diogenes' main source for it; on this highly problematic view, to which I strongly take exception, see my observations in chapter II A 4 of the monograph on Hermippos, mentioned above, n. 6.

This entire (confused and confusing) section poses a number of problems, not in the least that of the exact delimitation of the text to be attributed to Hermippos. On close scrutiny²⁷, it can be shown that in a failed attempt at utter conciseness, Diogenes has thrown together four different pieces of information in one monstrous sentence: the election of Xenokrates to head of the Academy; Aristotle's subsequent withdrawal from the Academy and secession to the Lykeion; the organization of his new school; and the origin of the name 'Peripatetics'. To add to the confusion, elements that really belong together have been torn apart (concerning Aristotle's relationship with Xenokrates and the contents of the programme of the new school), and on top of that, they have been interspersed with additional information (a small excursus on the origin of the nickname 'Peripatetics').

At the same time, though, the sentence does have a sense of unity. On the one side, Aristotle's troubled relation with Xenokrates is a recurring theme in the *passus*, brought up at the beginning (*ἐλθόντα δὴ αὐτὸν* – sc. Ἀριστοτέλην – καὶ θεασάμενον ὑπ' ἄλλῳ – sc. Ξενοκράτει – τὴν σχολήν, ἐλέσθαι περίπατον τὸν ἐν Λυκείῳ) and towards the end (the Euripides-paraphrase). Additionally, the syntax holds everything together: if it were not for the words *μέχρι μὲν ἀλείμματος ... Ἐπειδὴ δὲ ...*, it would have been difficult not to get lost in the labyrinth of scattered bits of information; now, it is clear that the two constituents, which are in fact related in contents and complement each other, go together.

If, as seems likely in the light of the foregoing, this means that Diogenes had one primary source for the passage, that authority might very well be identified as Hermippos, who is quoted at the very beginning. It would seem that his account of the foundation and organization of the Peripatos by Aristotle was worked out in much more detail and that the Laertian (and/or his intermediary) practically condensed it to the point of incomprehensibility. All this will be made clear and modified in the following exposition.

27) For this, I have taken advantage of the penetrating analyses made of the passage under discussion by Moraux (1955: 129–137), Gigon (1958: 158–171) and Chroust (1973: 35–38). To be sure, my interpretation is not entirely concurrent with that of my predecessors (in fact, on a number of points I am at variance with them, as I will not fail to indicate in the course of the following), but is based on a combination of their best elements.

πρεσβεύοντος αὐτοῦ (sc. Ἀριστοτέλους) πρὸς Φίλιππον ὑπὲρ Ἀθηναίων
 σχολάρχης ἐγένετο τῆς ἐν Ἀκαδημείᾳ σχολῆς Ξενοκράτης:

All in all, there are in ancient literature three different traditions about the succession of Speusippos as head of the Academy, all of which are clearly inspired by a different point of view on the matter. Two need not detain us here, since they are obviously later inventions or manipulations of the third one, to which the clause under discussion belongs²⁸. Instead, most interesting to our purposes is the relevant account included in Philodemos' *Historia Academicorum* (col. 6,38–col. 7,10 p. 190; 193 Gaiser; cf. p. 136–137 Dorandi). The similarity in contents between that passage and the Hermippos-quotation is striking: twice it is stated that Xenokrates became the Academy's scholarch while Aristotle was away to Macedonia (in this respect, the papyrus reads: Ἀριστοτέλους μὲν ἀποδημηκότος εἰς Μακεδονίαν). On top of that, Philodemos has some interesting details: he adds that Xenokrates was elected (the only time this procedure is mentioned in the context of the Academy – and surprisingly democratic it is, too²⁹!) and that, in the absence of Aristotle, there were two contenders (Menedemos of Pyrrha and Herakleides of Herakleia) who were only defeated by a narrow margin of votes.

Of course, one immediately wonders what the relation is between the two texts: did Philodemos use Hermippos as his authority, or did they rely on a common source? As it is, both op-

28) At Diog. Laert. 4.3 and Themist. Or. 21.255b, we read that Speusippos by letter entreated Xenokrates to take over the headship of the school; a condensation of this account can be found at Ps.-Galen. Hist. phil. 3 p. 599 Diels, according to which Speusippos simply appointed Xenokrates as his successor. In the Neoplatonic tradition, it was said that Aristotle and Xenokrates both became head of the Platonic school and that, purely for organizational reasons, the latter remained in the Akademeia while the former moved to the Lykeion; the two schools continued to exist harmoniously next to each other, with the Lyceum qualifying as a kind of branch of the Academy (cf. Vita Marciana 24 p. 101 Düring = 112–116 p. 4 Gigon; Vita Vulgata 18 p. 134 Düring; Vita Latina 24 p. 154 Düring; Ammon. In Arist. cat. comm. prooem. p. 3 Busse). Interesting to note is that the latter tradition can be traced back to a legend already recounted by Cic. Acad. 1.4.17. On these two variants of the story of the succession of Speusippos which, unlike the one discussed above, are favourable to Xenokrates, see P. Merlan, The Successor of Speusippus, TAPhA 77, 1946, 103–111, esp. 107–111; Gigon (1962: 64); Chroust (1973: 36); M. Isnardi Parente, Speusippo, Frammenti. Edizione, traduzione e commento, Napoli 1980, 204–205; 403–404; Ead., Senocrate. Frammenti. Edizione, traduzione e commento, Napoli 1982, 268; Natali (1991: 59–60).

29) See Gaiser (1988: 468).

tions have had their supporters in the past. Because the *Historia* makes a reliable and serious impression – it contains very detailed information, seemingly garnered from an inside source close to the Academy, and presented in a sober way –, some scholars have been tempted to attribute the passage to Philochoros, the Athenian erudite who is in fact quoted immediately prior to it (cf. *Hist. Acad.* col. 6, 30–38 = FGrHist 328 F 224); at the same time the Atthidographer has been put forward as Hermippos’ source as well³⁰. Others have pointed out that the additional details reported by Philodemos could originally have featured in Hermippos’ account, too, and could subsequently have been omitted in the course of transmission, either by Diogenes Laertios or some intermediary; accordingly, the biographer from Smyrna has also been named as Philodemos’ putative source³¹.

Unfortunately, neither of these two arguments is iron-clad; on the contrary, both appear more than a trifle gratuitous. On the one hand, there is no ground whatsoever for assigning the Philodemos-passus to Philochoros (or, in fact, any other author) to any degree of certainty³². On the other hand, Philodemos’ and Hermippos’ accounts are unmistakably different in tone (the former soberly reports that Aristotle was away to Macedon – ἀποδημηκότος εἰς Μακεδονίαν – while the latter is outspokenly favourable, stressing the philosopher’s engagement on behalf of the Athenians – πρεσβεύοντος ὑπὲρ Ἀθηναίων) and one should readily admit that an unbiased account is more likely to be rewritten in a person’s favour rather than the other way round (in that case, one would sooner expect a negative adaptation)³³. Clearly, then, a breakthrough is still very much wanting in this matter³⁴.

30) See the references made by Gaiser (1988: 116), to which may be added Plezia (1951: 275–276).

31) So Merlan (n. 28) 110–111.

32) This has been duly stressed by Jacoby, in the commentary on FGrHist 328 F 224 (IIIb Suppl., p. 589–591), and by Gigon (1958: 159). Wehrli SdA Suppl. I (1974: 71–72 ad F 42) occupies the middle position between Jacoby and Gigon on the one hand, and Plezia and Düring on the other; he thinks that Philodemos and Hermippos go back to the same authority, but wisely does not identify this common source as Philochoros.

33) Isnardi Parente, Senocrate. Ermodoro (n. 28) 288, too, subscribes to this view.

34) Gaiser (1988: 115–118) has put forward the name of Diokles of Magnesia as possible source for Philodemos, but he, too, had to concede that “jene

Comparing the bare description of the events that preceded Aristotle's secession from the Academy in the present fragment to the established chronology of the period from 348 until 335 B. C. in Aristotle's life, which roughly corresponds with that of Apollodoros of Athens³⁵, we find, on the one hand, that the relative chronology is respected in that Aristotle's move to a different *περίπατος* postdated that of Xenokrates' accession to the scholar-chate of the Academy (the two facts are dated to 335/4 and 340/39 or 339/8 B. C. respectively); on the other hand, however, a diplomatic mission of Aristotle to Philip II in the capacity of ambassador on behalf of Athens at the time of the election of a successor for the deceased Speusippos is incompatible with the fact that, as far as we know, Aristotle had not been in Athens since he left the city nearly ten years earlier, in 347 B. C., and that he actually had sojourned on a permanent basis at the court of Philip II since he was invited there by the king in 343 B. C. (in order to tutor Alexander or otherwise)³⁶.

A first and normal reaction would be to dismiss the story as a pure invention, especially in view of the decidedly pro-Aristotelian connotation of Hermippos' words *πρεσβεύοντος ... ὑπὲρ Ἀθηναίων*³⁷. For the moment it cannot be determined whether those

Zurückführung auf Diokles zugegebenermaßen nicht als sicher gelten kann". Besides, this conjecture hardly sheds any light on Hermippos' position in the tradition.

35) A reconstruction of the chronology of Aristotle's life has been attempted by the following scholars: Düring (1957: 249–262); Id. (1966: 1–21); Id. (1968: 171–184); Chroust (1973 *passim*); Natali (1991: 11–91). All of them tend to follow rather faithfully the chronological pattern set out by Apollodoros of Athens, which is quoted at Diog. Laert. 5.9–10 (with explicit mention of Apollodoros) and Dion. Halik. Epist. Amm. I 5 (a passage where the chronographer's name is missing, but which can nevertheless be attributed to him on the basis of the close resemblance to the Laertian passage); cf. FGrHist 244 F 38a–b, and see Sollenberger (1992: 3842–3843).

36) It will be noted that the neutral statement *ἀποδημηκότος εἰς Μακεδονίαν* in Philodemos' version can be brought in line with the Apollodorean chronology.

37) See Gigon (1958: 158; 160); Chroust (1973: 31–32) – though the latter's argument that Hermippos was "a Peripatetic and a man inclined to depreciate the Platonists" is not valid, since the fact that a few later sources designate the biographer as a 'Peripateticus' should by no means be interpreted as implying that he ever was a confirmed member of that school (on this, see my observations in chapter I.3 of the monograph on Hermippos mentioned above, n. 6). A further problem would seem to be that the Athenian people would have entrusted a *ξένος*, a metic with an important official diplomatic mission.

words have an anti-Xenocratic purport as well, but there is little doubt that the Academic electorate, responsible for the appointment of Xenokrates, bears a good deal of the brunt here: in return for the good services rendered by Aristotle to the city of Athens in general and, thus, also to the Academy (being a part of that city), its members so to speak owed it to him to appoint him to the position of head of the school; if he nevertheless failed to occupy the scholarchate of the Academy, this certainly was not due to any personal shortcomings, but only to his fellows' ingratitude. Along these lines, Düring³⁸ labelled Hermippos' account an "apologetic fiction", concocted by the biographer himself³⁹.

However, Gigon⁴⁰ was quick to point out that this point of view, though not to be dismissed as such, requires some qualification. Indeed – and this had already been observed, before Düring, by Plezia⁴¹ –, there are a few passages in the later Aristotle-biographies that bear out the existence of a tradition according to which Aristotle was a universal benefactor, for individuals, cities and mankind in general alike; this can be brought in relation with the representation of the facts such as we encounter it in the passus under discussion. Most interesting in this respect (because it is the fullest account we have concerning the matter) is a report contained in one of the Arabic Aristotle-vitae and deriving from the earlier biography by Ptolemaios-el-Garib⁴². The text in question not only speaks of the same political εὐεργεσία as alluded to by Hermippos (i. e., interventions with King Philip for the purpose of promoting the Athenians' interests), but actually quotes a decree (of προξενία) passed by the Athenian δῆμος in honour of Aristotle's action.

In this respect two key questions arise, which both lend themselves to "mental gymnastics" but, unfortunately, lead to divergent and by no means cogent answers. The first is whether the inscription

38) See Düring (1957: 58).

39) This possibility was duly acknowledged by Chroust (1973: 32), too, but ultimately he found that this was too easy a solution.

40) See Gigon (1958: 162–165).

41) See Plezia (1951: 276).

42) Cf. Vita Arabica Usaibia B 16–21 p. 215–216 Düring. In addition, cf. Vita Marciana 15–22 p. 99–100 Düring = 75–102 p. 3–4 Gigon (= Vita Latina 15–22 p. 153–154 Düring); Vita Arabica Fihrist 12 p. 194 Düring; Vita Arabica Mubashir 25–26 p. 199–200 Düring; Vita Arabica Usaibia B 24 p. 216 Düring.

is a genuine document that was actually set up on the Akropolis in Aristotle's lifetime, or a later fabrication of the favourable tradition. It is generally agreed that the text of the decree reported by Usaibia could not be an Arabic fiction, nor an invention of his source, Ptolemaios, but must go back to a Greek source familiar with such honorary inscriptions, i. e., not later than the second century A.D.⁴³. Regrettably, that is only how far the evidence allows us to go, and several options are left open. Correspondingly, the opinions of modern scholars range from total acceptance⁴⁴ to scepticism⁴⁵.

The same bipolarity governs the second issue at stake here, whether the succinct quotation in Diogenes Laertios conceals a much fuller account, similar to the one in Usaibia, or whether Hermippos' report was only an early incarnation of the subsequent tradition, a nucleus which in later times had been amplified on the basis of additional material such as the (open) letters to Philip, Alexander, Antipatros and others (all included in Diogenes Laertios' catalogue of Aristotle's writings)⁴⁶. All that can be said

43) The text given by Usaibia faithfully follows the usual pattern of a decree of προξενία (which is what it amounts to) and its language also has an authentic ring; a close parallel is offered by Diog. Laert. 7.9–12, where an honorific decree for Zenon is quoted. Since, moreover, most of the factual details included in it can be verified, the obvious conclusion is that the decree could not have been invented by Usaibia or any other Arab. Since, moreover, the use of Hellenistic collections Περί ψηφισμάτων, Περί ἀνοθημάτων, Περί μνημάτων and the like can only be traced back to the second century A.D. at the latest, Usaibia's (ultimate) source Ptolemaios is an equally unlikely candidate for having contrived the whole story. See Düring (1957: 232–235); Gigon (1958: 162–163); Id. (1962: 59); Chroust (1973: 139–141).

44) Chroust (1973: 31–32; 137–141; 162–163; 164–166), for instance, connected the story with interventions of Aristotle with the Macedonian rulers on behalf of Athens on several crucial occasions in the course of the 330s. Totally abandoning the reservations he had voiced earlier (1958: 163–165), Gigon (1962: 58–59) was also inclined to accept the historicity of a diplomatic mission of Aristotle, on behalf of Athens, to Philip II in the year before Chaironeia, and of honours bestowed upon the Stagirite by the Athenian people in the aftermath of the great battle.

45) Düring (1957: 100 app. crit. ad Vita Marciana 19; 233–236), for instance, dismissed the story as a pro-Aristotelian adaptation of certain historical elements.

46) Düring (1957: 58; 233; 235) favoured the latter possibility, ruling out that Hermippos had a direct hand in the development of the story on the grounds that such a "fine story" could hardly have been lost in the process of transmission, only to show up again in late antiquity, had it originally been included in Hermippos' renowned biographical work. To this, Gigon (1958: 163) – cf. Id. (1962: 58–59) – replied that the 'argumentum e silentio antiquorum' must be used with extreme caution in the case of the biographical tradition regarding Aristotle, which he labelled as "ungewöhnlich diffus und kapriziös". Accordingly, he suggested that Diog.

with certainty in this matter is that, if the decree was a genuine document and if it was originally placed on the Athenian Akropolis, the possibility that Hermippos knew of it should not be excluded a priori. Indeed, from two of his fragments (FGrHist 1026 F 46e and 47; cf. F 68b Wehrli SdA Suppl. I), we can (cautiously) infer that he used the work *Περὶ μνημάτων* by Diodoros the Periegete; therefore, he may be expected to have regularly mined that and similar collections (*Περὶ ψηφισμάτων*, *Περὶ ἀναθημάτων*) for information on various subjects. Beyond that, however, speculation is rife, so we should rather admit our defeat in the face of tradition.

Apart from all this hypothesizing, there arises a question which, from a methodological point of view, is much more interesting. Indeed, one can wonder whether we are entitled to assume that the chronology of Aristotle's life from 348/7 until 335/4, as established by Apollodoros of Athens (cf. *supra*), was the only one that ever prevailed in antiquity (let alone whether it was the correct one) – and especially so in the time before the chronographer. Until the shifted sands of the Egyptian desert come up with valuable information in this respect, the relation of Hermippos' chronology to that of Apollodoros will remain a matter of guesswork (in which I do not intend to indulge myself here); hence, it is unwarranted to judge Hermippos' account by the Apollodorean standards⁴⁷.

ἐλθόντα δὴ αὐτὸν καὶ θεασάμενον ὑπ' ἄλλω τὴν σχολήν, ἐλέσθαι
περίπατον τὸν ἐν Λυκείῳ καὶ (...) συμφιλοσοφεῖν' (...) εἰπών·

αἰσχρὸν σιωπᾶν, Ξενοκράτη δ' ἔαν λέγειν.

Upon his return to Athens, Aristotle finds that the headship of the Academy has been conferred upon Xenokrates; promptly, he with-

Laert. 5.2 and Usaibia 17–22 might indeed ultimately go back to the same source, the former having preserved only a severe abridgement of Hermippos' original account, the Arabic biographer giving an almost complete reproduction. Strangely, Trampedach (1994: 55–57) combined the opinions of Düring and Gigon.

47) Pace Trampedach (1994: 55), who did use the conflict between Hermippos' account and Apollodoros' chronology as an argument for exposing the former as a fiction. The same idea as the one expounded above was voiced by Gigon (1958: 165–166); Id. (1962: 58–59); Sollenberger (1992: 3817). Düring (1957: 256–258), for his part, thought Hermippos and Apollodoros both had the same chronology, which they supposedly based on Philochoros, but this assumption is rather gratuitous, I am afraid.

draws from the Platonic school and starts teaching elsewhere in the city. Inspired by the conciliatory Neoplatonic tradition according to which Aristotle and Xenokrates, after Speusippos' death, jointly took up the scholarchate and spread their teaching activities over the city merely for practical reasons⁴⁸, and furthermore keeping in mind the patently pro-Aristotelian tenor of Hermippos' account, Düring interpreted the *passus* under discussion as meaning that Aristotle left the Academy wholly in an amicable spirit, out of respect for the new head whose position he did not want to challenge⁴⁹. Others have maintained that the fact that Aristotle chose to establish a new school in the same city as Xenokrates could only be taken as a declaration of independence and an act of polemical opposition, meant to express his disenchantment with the course of events in the Academy and especially with the election of someone whose ideas and intellectual interests he could not relate to⁵⁰.

As it is, Düring's interpretation is to no small degree invalidated by the combination of the sentence under discussion with the immediately preceding one, in which the members of the Academy who voted for Xenokrates get a lashing. This provides a strong basis for arguing that Xenokrates was represented by Hermippos as a despicable character who accepted his election, whereas he should have renounced the scholarchate spontaneously as Aristotle was far more entitled to it⁵¹. The most serious point eroding the credibility of Düring's reading would seem to be the parodying quotation from Euripides' *Philoktetes* which Diogenes Laertios has preserved towards the end of the entire *passus* under discussion⁵². However, this citation does not yield up its secrets just like that. For one, if the name Xenokrates is correct, the parody is given in the wrong context; it is obvious to connect it with the moment in time when Aristotle discovered that the Academy was being run by Xenokrates and decided to start teaching elsewhere, not when the Lyceum was

48) Cf. *supra*, p. 9 with n. 28.

49) See Düring (1957: 58).

50) Natali (1991: 59–60).

51) So Gigon (1958: 158–159). Further criticism of Düring by Lynch (1972: 73) and Natali (1991: 59–60).

52) We are fortunate to be able to reconstruct the original version of the Euripidean verse in question from chance (and incomplete) quotations at Cic. *De or.* 3.35.141 and Plut. *Adv. Col.* 1108b: ὑπέρ γε μέντοι παντός Ἑλλήνων στρατοῦ αἰσχρὸν σιωπᾶν, βαρβάρους δ' ἔαν λέγειν (F 796 Nauck²).

attracting large crowds and Aristotle had to change from teaching while walking up and down, to lecturing *ex cathedra*⁵³. Moreover, we find the Euripidean verse paraphrased several times more in ancient texts, and there it is always associated with the similarly named Isokrates and the rivalry that existed between him and Aristotle⁵⁴. As it happens, Diogenes Laertios, too, mentions it when discussing the expansion of Aristotle's new school and the consequential introduction of rhetoric in the teaching package. Keeping in mind these two observations and the fact that all modern scholars are reluctant (and rightly so, if only from a methodological point of view) to assume a mistake by a medieval copyist, we are left with two options: either Hermippos wrote 'Isokrates' and Diogenes somehow changed it, or Hermippos wrote 'Xenokrates' and Diogenes quoted it correctly, but in the wrong place.

At the risk of stating the obvious, both possibilities have over the years been defended by modern scholarship. A seemingly valid argument in favour of the first assumption is the placing of the quotation in the text as we have it, i. e., in the context of rhetoric being taught in the Lyceum; correspondingly, it has been argued that Diogenes Laertios was responsible for the change of 'Isokrates' into 'Xenokrates', either deliberately⁵⁵ or out of carelessness⁵⁶. A serious counter-argument, however, is that the point of the parody would have been strongly weakened if Aristotle had really uttered it some time after the foundation of the Lyceum,

53) This was rightly observed by Moraux (1955: 132). However, Natali (1991: 33 with n. 51) does not seem to be surprised by the odd placing as such (though, to be sure, this Italian scholar has no idea about the origin of the story, either).

54) Cf. Philod. Vol. rhet. p. 50 Sudhaus II, col. 48, 36, 1–5; p. 55 Sudhaus II, col. 51, 40, 5–8; Cic. De or. 3.35.141; Quint. Inst. or. 3.1.14; Syr. In Hermog. comm. p. 59 Rabe.

55) Thus Moraux (1955: 135–137). He argued that in Diogenes' source, Aristotle's animosity towards both Xenokrates and Isokrates had been duly discussed and that, in his attempt at the utmost conciseness, Diogenes would have chosen not to mention the rivalry with Isokrates, merely concentrating on that with Xenokrates. The Laertian would nevertheless have wanted to retain the famous Euripides-paraphrase quoted in his source in connection with the anti-Isocratean passage, and therefore changed the name, so that it corresponded with the anti-Xenocratic contents of his own exposition.

56) So Plezia (1951: 277–278); Düring (1957: 58); on p. 303 of the same work, Düring asserts without further ado that Hermippos wrote 'Isokrates' and that Diogenes wrongly transferred it to Xenokrates.

when Isokrates had already been dead for at least three years⁵⁷; instead, the Stagiritic would sooner have said those words during his first stay in Athens, when he was an eager disciple of Plato (traditionally agreed to be the period from 367/6 until 348/7 B.C.) and Isokrates was still very much alive and present on the Athenian intellectual scene⁵⁸. It might be maintained that this is what Hermippos (or any other source) had actually reported, but then Diogenes is required not only to have changed the name, but also to have transferred the quotation from an entirely different period in Aristotle's life. In short, this suggestion entails a number of hypothetical interventions and changes by the Laertian in the text of his source(s).

On the other hand, it can plausibly be suggested that the Xenokrates-version makes very good sense in an outspoken pro-Aristotelian context; in fact, it enhances this feeling by its own anti-Xenocratic tenor, so that it could well have been part of the original Hermippos-text⁵⁹. In this case, the odd placing of the verse might be explained by reference to the severe abridgement inflicted by Diogenes Laertios on his source, as a result of which the inner consistency of the passage under discussion would have badly suffered. This solution could further seem to be favoured by the unmistakable traces of an ancient tradition that antagonized Xenokrates and Aristotle, on a personal level as well as in philosophical terms⁶⁰. Regardless of the truthfulness of this tradition – for which we have no secure grounds⁶¹ –, it is a fact that it existed and that this passage might have been an emanation of it⁶². Alternatively, though, the bit-

57) It is also pointless to suggest that Isokrates' name might have been used as a metaphor for the type of rhetoric he had stood for.

58) See Moraux (1955: 132); Natali (1991: 33 with n. 50).

59) So Gigon (1958: 166); Wehrli *SdA* Suppl. I (1974: 74). See also Chroust (1973: 36–37); Sollenberger (1992: 3816–3817 with n. 112).

60) See Gigon (1958: 159–161) and Chroust (1973: 33–34; 35–37), who also refer to the (counter-)tradition that tried to play down the rivalry between Aristotle and Xenokrates. As an aside, it is to be regretted that Düring, in his 1957 monograph, did not put together under one heading all the ancient material pertaining to the relationship of Aristotle with Xenokrates.

61) See Gigon (1958: 161); Lynch (1972: 73).

62) Chroust (1973: 33–34) and Wehrli *SdA* Suppl. I (1974: 74) have actually argued that H. himself was responsible for this contrivance. This view, however, merely amounts to guesswork. There is, for instance, no ground whatsoever for Wehrli's affirmation (*ibid.*) that Hermippos transferred to Xenokrates the Euripides-citation which "andere vor ihm auf Isokrates bezogen hatten": all quota-

ter gulf of enmity separating Aristotle and Isokrates had, for sure, already been laid down on record by many ancient authors as well and, thus, constituted a tradition in its own right⁶³. Consequently, the connection with a corresponding tradition works in both directions, so this argument does not take us a step nearer to a solution, either.

We obviously find ourselves in a catch-22 situation in which no definite conclusion can be reached⁶⁴. All that can reasonably be done in the light of all this contradictory speculation is to keep the quotation as we have it and to connect it with the pro-Aristotelian purport of the *passus* under discussion, but with the utmost caution and due reservations. Anyhow, whether or not there was only one version of the Euripides-parody, the animosity of Aristotle towards one of his contemporaries was the main theme of this particular anecdote. This spicy story might, moreover, have been interlarded with a literary allusion, two elements that make up typical ingredients for the kind of story Hermippos seems to have relished⁶⁵. Consequently, concluding on a positive note, we may cautiously assume that Diogenes did ultimately derive the verse from him.

ἐλέσθαι περίπατον τὸν ἐν Λυκείῳ καὶ μέχρι μὲν ἀλείμματος
ἀνακάμπτοντα τοῖς μαθηταῖς συμφιλοσοφεῖν

tions of the verse with ‘Isokrates’ (cf. *supra*, n. 54) stem from the second half of the first century B.C. at the earliest.

63) Full references are given by Chroust (1973: 36 n.73); see also Natali (1991: 32–34). Hostilities between “the school of Isokrates” and the “the Peripatetics” broke out with Isokrates’ direct pupil Kephisodoros of Athens, who wrote a tract *Κατὰ Ἀριστοτέλους* in four books: cf. Dion. Halik. *Isocr.* 18; Athen. 2.60d–e; 3.122b; 8.354c; Eus. *Praep.* ev. 14.6.9–10; 15.2.7.

64) It does not even help that all ‘Isokrates’-verses postdate the version of Hermippos and that they all stem from the same period, the second half of the first century B.C. (either coinciding with or closely following Andronikos’ new edition of Aristotle’s works). The possibility that Hermippos is the sole remaining representative of an older ‘wave’ that related the quotation to Xenokrates cannot be dismissed right away, but it is not compelling, either.

It will be clear by now that the assertion of Plezia (1951: 276–277) that “inimicos deinde Aristotelem Xenocratēque factos esse certe finxit Hermippus” should be approached with extreme caution (it should also be noted that the Polish scholar on the one hand assumed that Hermippos originated the tradition of rivalry between Xenokrates and Aristotle, but on the other connected the Euripides-paraphrase with the name of Isokrates).

65) On this, see my observations in chapter III.1–2 and III.3 respectively of the monograph on Hermippos mentioned above, n. 6.

As I have dealt with this passage elsewhere, I limit myself to a brief recapitulation of what I have said there⁶⁶.

Düring contested this account of Aristotle's foundation and organization of his new school because it was, in his view, marred by two anachronistic mistakes on the part of Hermippos⁶⁷. To begin with, he disputed the assertion that Aristotle, being a metic, founded a school in the first place; only when Demetrios of Phaleron granted Theophrastos the right of ἔγκτησις (cf. Diog. Laert. 5.39) could the new movement acquire the immovables indispensable for setting up decent teaching and research facilities⁶⁸. Düring further argued that the association of the school with the Lykeion, which was a public gymnasium, could only have occurred when Theophrastos had built his private περίπατος in the vicinity of the sacred grounds of Apollo Lykeios. By way of conclusion, the Swedish scholar accused Hermippos of having created the legend that "Aristotle founded a school in the Lyceum".

All of Düring's objections are easily refuted. With regard to the first one, suffice it to say here that the organization of a school did not depend on the possession of landed property, but could also be realized in public halls and hired rooms⁶⁹. As for the second one, it seems that Düring jumped to conclusions about the contents of Hermippos' original statement, and that the blame for this misunderstanding can (mainly, but not exclusively) be laid at the door of Diogenes Laertios. Indeed, the fact that Aristotle's move to the Lykeion and the organization of the Peripatos are bracketed together in the clause under discussion, does not necessarily mean that Hermippos presented these distinct events in the same way.

66) See chapter II.4 in the same work.

67) See Düring (1957: 57; 406).

68) Düring is one of several scholars who believe that Aristotle merely contented himself with informal philosophical lectures to, and discussions with friends, outside any strictly organized context. See, among others, Brink (1940: 905–907); A.-H. Chroust, Did Aristotle own a school in Athens between 335/34 and 323 B.C.?, *RhM* 115, 1972, 310–318; and also, in addition to the pages quoted above, Düring (1957: 360–361; 460–461); Id. (1966: 13); Id. (1968: 180). On ἔγκτησις, see J. Pecirka, *The Formula for the Grant of Enktesis in Attic Inscriptions*, Praha 1966; A. R. W. Harrison, *The Law of Athens. The Family and Property*, Oxford 1968, 236–238.

69) See Gottschalk (1972: 329); Guthrie VI (1981: 38–40); Natali (1991: 61–62). Chroust (n. 68) 317–318 also conceded that this was possible, but nevertheless denied that Aristotle founded a school of his own.

The text such as we have it actually supports the assumption that, in the process of condensing his source, Diogenes garbled what was originally a clearer and more balanced account. If *περίπατος* is understood not as referring to “the school established in a *περίπατος*” but in its original meaning of “walk”⁷⁰, it follows that, according to Hermippos, Aristotle settled himself in the *περίπατος* of the Lykeion, the public gymnasium located in the precinct of Apollo Lykeios, and began teaching there (which is not tantamount to “founded a school there”); subsequently, this impromptu practice gradually evolved into regular courses being held (cf. *infra*)⁷¹. This corresponds perfectly with the standard practice of ancient philosophers who wanted to create a distinct profile for themselves, and to establish themselves on the intellectual forum at Athens: they picked out (*ἐλέσθαι*) a fixed spot for themselves in the city – as a rule a public one where great numbers of people came together, such as colonnades and the *peripatoi* that were part of every monumental gymnasium – and hoped to attract a steady group of followers by regularly discoursing there.

In sum, Hermippos’ account makes perfect sense as it stands and can be brought in line with the prevalent opinion among modern scholars that Aristotle was the spiritual and intellectual father of the movement who, by withdrawing from the Academy and starting to teach on his own, did the groundwork for the later Peripatos. To read an underlying eulogistic purport into Hermippos’ story is simply stretching the evidence.

καὶ μέχρι μὲν ἀλείμματος ἀνακάμπτοντα τοῖς μαθηταῖς συμφιλοσοφεῖν (...) Ἐπειδὴ δὲ πλείους ἐγένοντο ἤδη, καὶ ἐκάθισεν (...) Καὶ πρὸς θέσιν συνεγύμναζε τοὺς μαθητάς, ἅμα καὶ ῥητορικῶς ἐπασκῶν.

70) The same goes for the relevant passages in Hesychios (= Suda A 3929 s. v. Ἄριστοτέλης) and Ps.-Gal. Hist. phil. 4 p. 602 Diels. This is also how the noun should be interpreted in the extant text of Theophrastos’ last will and testament (cf. Diog. Laert. 5.52): he designates the whole of the school property as “the garden and the walk and all the houses adjoining the garden” (τὸν δὲ κήπον καὶ τὸν περίπατον καὶ τὰς οἰκίας τὰς πρὸς τῷ κήπῳ πάσας).

There is disagreement about what exactly the word *περίπατος* denotes: on the one hand, it has been identified as a building (a covered walk or colonnade) – thus, for instance, R. E. Wycherley, *Peripatos. The Athenian Philosophical Scene – II*, G&R 9, 1962, 2–21, esp. 21 n. 2 –, while on the other hand, a (stronger?) case has been built for understanding it as “a formal garden walk” or “an avenue of trees” – so, among others, Gottschalk (1972: 333–335) and Natali (1991: 144).

71) This is also the interpretation given of the passage under discussion by Guthrie VI (1981: 38).

Moraux pointed out that the second of these constituents (starting with Ἐπειδὴ δὲ πλείους) is the logical continuation of the first and that this connection is almost obliterated in our text by the interjected notes on the etymology of the word “Peripatetic” (cf. *infra*) and on Aristotle’s clouded relationship with Xenokrates (cf. *supra*)⁷². At the same time, the Belgian scholar ingeniously observed and persuasively argued that in these few words two traditions about Aristotle’s school are interwoven, one concerned with its development and organization, the other with the program of instruction⁷³. With regard to the former, the text relates that at first, there were only few pupils, who were taught walking up and down with their master, and that later, with the growing success of the school, Aristotle had to take up teaching *ex cathedra*, sitting down. This vaguely echoes the second tradition (attested elsewhere), which deals with Aristotle’s esoteric or *acroa(ma)tic* and exoteric lessons; reportedly, during one part of the day, he taught philosophy to a small number of (advanced) students, and during the other, he held courses in rhetoric for the general public. Our ancient sources agree about this separate organization, but are in disagreement as to which courses were given in the morning and which ones in the afternoon or evening⁷⁴.

Moraux’s conclusion ran that these were two entirely distinct traditions which only had in common that they both centred on the difference between courses given to a large and a small number of attendants, and that Diogenes Laertios put them together rather clumsily, picking out a few elements from the one and a few from the other (or rather, so Moraux admitted, that they were increasingly jumbled in the course of tradition). However, it may equally be argued that the two traditions had been reported together by Diogenes’ ultimate source (i. e. Hermippos) and that the confusion

72) See Moraux (1955: 131 with n. 2).

73) See Moraux (1955: 133–137). His observations were substantially agreed upon by Gigon (1958: 169–171) and Chroust (1973: 35 with n. 69; 37–38).

74) Cf. Philod. Vol. rhet. p. 50 Sudhaus II, col. 48, 36, 1–3; Quint. Inst. or. 3.1.14; Gell. Noct. Att. 20.5.1–5; Syr. In Hermog. comm. 4.297 Walz; *ibid.* 2.5.21 Rabe. Compare also Cic. Tusc. disp. 2.3 (9); Strab. Geogr. 14.1.48. On Aristotle’s δειλινὸς περίπατος and ἐσθινὸς περίπατος, and on the “organizzazione interna” of the Peripatos as a centre for teaching and research in general, see W. Jäger, Aristotle. Fundamentals of the History of his Development. Translated by R. Robinson, Oxford² 1948, 311–341; Düring (1957: 432); Lynch (1972: 68–105); Natali (121–146).

in the text primarily arose from the extreme abridgement inflicted on that source text, either by the Laertian, his intermediary source(s?) or both.

Unfortunately, we mainly have to rely on circumstantial evidence for attributing this passage to Hermippos, but a number of arguments can nevertheless be provided which cumulatively point in his direction. To begin with, the phrase μέχρι μὲν ἀλείμματος ἀνακάμπτοντα τοῖς μαθηταῖς συμφιλοσοφεῖν is so inextricably connected with his reference to the Lykeiongymnasium (μέχρι ἀλείμματος; cf. *supra*) and with his etymological note (ἀνακάμπτοντα τοῖς μαθηταῖς συμφιλοσοφεῖν paraphrases the essence of the word περιπατεῖν; cf. *infra*) that it may be assumed that all elements contained in it derive from him. The phrase ἀνακάμπτοντα τοῖς μαθηταῖς συμφιλοσοφεῖν might be read as an echo of the custom that the philosophical classes were reserved for the few initiated pupils; the organization of the courses in morning- and afternoon-sessions could be reflected in the phrase μέχρι ἀλείμματος, which refers to the early hours of the day, before it was time for the listeners to prepare themselves for their gymnastic exercises. Taken together, this could be interpreted as a reference to the branch of tradition asserting that the perambulatory acroatic lessons were given in the morning.

Furthermore, Hermippos' awareness of the distinction between teaching while walking around or sitting down, might be reflected in the explanation of the name 'Peripatetic' in the present passage as well as in the specification εἶτα καθίσαντα διατίθεσθαι τὸν λόγον contained in another fragment of his, dealing with Theophrastos' teaching habits⁷⁵. Admittedly, the bare link between this observation and the words Ἐπειδὴ δὲ πλείους ἐγένοντο ἤδη, καὶ ἐκάθισεν is an extremely tenuous one, but in addition, the καί in the latter phrase does unmistakably hark back to the earlier statement ἀνακάμπτοντα, just like ἐπειδὴ δέ corresponds to μέχρι μὲν ἀλείμματος, both of which have been attributed to Hermippos above.

Our knowledge of Diogenes Laertios, his sources and the use he made of them may be so defective that we are not really entitled

75) Cf. Athen. 1.21a-b = FGrHist 1026 F 35 = F 51 Wehrli SdA Suppl. I. Some scholars have opined that the explicit reference to teaching ex cathedra as opposed to walking up and down might be an element derived from the tradition hostile to the Peripatetic school; to be sure, this would be wholly in keeping with the tenor of F 35 (see the commentary in FGrHist IV A 3, p. 336-337).

to underestimate his own creative input in the finished work, and the arguments that have just been put forward certainly do not offer conclusive proof either. Still, all things considered, it could nevertheless be argued that the Laertian did not combine the two elements himself, but that this had already been done before him, possibly by his ultimate source Hermippos. As Wehrli⁷⁶ justly observed, it is conceivable that the latter wanted to give an aetiologic explanation for the tradition of the two types of courses organized in the Peripatos by reference to the historical development of the school in the early days. Subsequently, this detailed account would have been rigidly abbreviated, eventually resulting in the text such as we have it in Diogenes⁷⁷.

ἐλέσθαι περίπατον τὸν ἐν Λυκείῳ καὶ μέχρι μὲν ἀλείμματος ἀνακάμπτοντα τοῖς μαθηταῖς συμφιλοσοφεῖν ὅθεν περιπατητικούς προσαγορευθῆναι (οἱ δ', ὅτι ἐκ νόσου περιπατοῦντι Ἀλεξάνδρῳ συμπαρὼν διελέγετο ἅττα).

This is not the place to disclose the complex matter of the origin of the name 'Peripatetics'; I will only make some observations concerning the present text⁷⁸.

The majority of modern scholars⁷⁹ has failed to trace back to Hermippos both aspects of the twofold explanation of the name 'Peripatetic' contained in the first sentence of this passus; they maintain that he merely connected the name with Aristotle's custom of philosophizing with his disciples while walking up and down (ἀνακάμπτειν = περιπατεῖν⁸⁰), at the same time taking excep-

76) Wehrli SdA Suppl. I (1974: 74).

77) Düring (1957: 313) and Gigon (1958: 169–170) elaborated on the statement about the inclusion of rhetoric in the teaching package of the Peripatos, relating it with the tradition about Aristotle's animosity towards Isokrates. Again, however, their reasoning is highly conjectural, and hardly based on any textual evidence (apart from the fact that Hermippos wrote a work on both men).

78) The main evidence from antiquity regarding this matter has been collected by Düring (1957: 404–411) and Chroust (1973: 37 n. 74); the basic discussion of the problem (though not entirely free from error, as will be shown in the following) can be found in Brink (1940: 899–904).

79) With the notable exceptions of Moraux (1955: 130–131), Gigon (1958: 166–167) and Chroust (1973: 37) (though the latter made too much of the therapeutic meaning of περιπατεῖν; I will return to this below).

80) Cf. Plut. An seni 796d: "For, as Dikaiarchos (F 29 Wehrli SdA I) used to remark, those who circulate in the porticoes (τοὺς ἐν ταῖς στοαῖς ἀνακάμπτοντας) are said to be 'promenading' (περιπατεῖν; transl. H. N. Fowler, Cambridge, Mass. 1936)"; cf. also Strab. Geogr. 3.4.16; Diog. Laert. 2.127; 7.5.

tion to this derivation of the noun not from the locality where the philosopher displayed his activity (besides the name of the founder, one of the principal sources of inspiration for the naming of the various philosophical schools in antiquity), but from the activity alone⁸¹. However – and this may be regarded as the single felicitous intervention of Diogenes Laertios in an otherwise much too strongly abridged passage that is marred, moreover, by an accumulation of interjected digressions and explanatory notes –, this is not exactly the right interpretation of the passus; after the quick mention of Aristotle installing himself in the *περίπατος* of the Lykeion and starting to walk up and down with his pupils, the Laertian declares, obviously on the authority of Hermippos, that ‘this’ (cf. ὄθεν) earned the Stagirite and his disciples the nickname ‘Peripatetics’, ‘this’ clearly being a reference to both *περίπατος* and the habit of philosophizing while walking up and down.

Even in this case, it might be considered a mistake on the part of Hermippos to have tried to explain the name not only on the basis of the place of activity, but also of that activity itself. However, the ancient evidence shows that the name Peripatetics only took hold in the first half of the third century B. C. (under or after Theophrastos – cf. *infra*), that is, not long before Hermippos (active in the second half of that century). At the same time, we know that the systematization of the naming of philosophical schools such as we find this, for instance, at Diog. Laert. 1.17 and Ps.-Galen. Hist. phil. 4, was not established before the first century B. C.⁸². Since, finally, the name lacked a very specific connotation or nuance, it is quite possible that the exact provenance of the name was very much up in the air by Hermippos’ time and, correspondingly, could have been (and was) explained in a variety of ways.

81) That ‘Peripatetic’ has to be derived from the place ‘Peripatos’ has gained near unanimous consent among modern scholars: see U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Antigonos von Karystos*, Berlin 1881, 267; A. Busse, *Peripatos und Peripatetiker*, *Hermes* 61, 1926, 335–342; Brink (1940: 899–904); Lynch (1972: 74–75); Sollenberger (1992: 3810). The main grounds for this view are the expression of ἀπό (ἐκ) τοῦ Περιπάτου found in a number of sources, and the discussions at Diog. Laert. 1.17 and Ps.-Galen. Hist. phil. 4 p. 601–602 Diels, where ἀπὸ τόπων is mentioned as one of the categories connected with the provenance of the names of the various philosophical schools. As for the latter argument, however, cf. *infra*, p. 91 with n. 85.

82) The name of Antiochos of Askalon has been mentioned in this respect; see Brink (1940: 902–903); Düring (1957: 406).

As a matter of fact, it has been acknowledged that on a purely linguistic level, περιπατητικός is not the normal derivation from Περίπατος (one would sooner expect περιπατικός), but can only be accounted for when the original verb περιπατεῖν is taken into consideration as well⁸³. If the same scholar who writes this, next proceeds to denounce the explanation given by Hermippos along these very same lines as an “aetiological fairy-tale”⁸⁴, this strongly smacks of modern nitpicking, resting on a misplaced insistence on an advanced degree of consistency that was entirely alien to the ancients. Most significant in this respect is that the two explanations ascribed by Diogenes Laertios to Hermippos were also accepted by Cicero, albeit in different works⁸⁵. Modern scholars have been puzzled by this, but it may serve as a warning against demanding from the ancients the same rigid consistency adopted in our times⁸⁶. Also, it does not hold good asserting that the ancients were anxious to invent this historical story because the act of περιπατεῖν or ἀνακάμπτειν was not specifically Aristotelian⁸⁷; the same goes for the Stoa, the Garden and, in fact, the Peripatos as names derived

83) Cf. Brink (1940: 901–902): “Am nächsten liegt wohl die Annahme, daß im Substantiv Περίπατος noch immer das Verbum gefühlt wurde, von dem es (anders als Akademie, Stoa, Kepos) ursprünglich abgeleitet war; so ergab sich statt Περιπατικός die aktivere Bildung Περιπατητικός”.

84) See Brink (1940: 902; “ätiologisches Märchen”), and also Lynch (1972: 73–74): “The story given in Diogenes Laertius, on the authority of Hermippos, about the derivation of ‘Peripatetic’ must be a fabrication.”

85) Cf. De or. 3.28.109; Acad. 1.4.17.

86) At the same time, those Ciceronian passages simply go to show that the singular explanation of ‘Peripatetic’ given by Hermippos was still in circulation in the first century B.C. In fact, there are indications that it had not even become fully obsolete by Diogenes Laertios’ time. Most revealingly, the latter classifies the Peripatos under the schools named ἀπὸ συμπρωμάτων (cf. Diog. Laert. 1.17); cf. also Hippol. Phil. 20.7 p. 571 Diels; Aug. De civ. Dei 8.12. Of course, this seriously undercuts the argument of modern scholars that, in accordance with the prevailing system for the naming of philosophical schools in antiquity, ‘Peripatetic’ could only have been derived from ‘Peripatos’.

87) This argument was also used by Brink (1940: 902). To be sure, the act of walking up and down while discussing things does on the one hand seem to have been characteristic of philosophers only, but, on the other hand, was indeed not typically Peripatetic: we also find it mentioned with regard to Pythagoras (cf. Iambl. Vita Pyth. 95–96), Protagoras (cf. Plat. Prot. 315b), Plato (cf. Diog. Laert. 3.27 = Alexis F 151 Kassel – Austin; and see below, n. 90, on the Neoplatonic tradition in which emphasis is laid on the therapeutic effects attributed to the act by Plato), Menedemos (cf. Diog. Laert. 2.130) and Polemon (cf. Diog. Laert. 4.19). See Chroust (1973: 37 n.76–77); Natali (1991: 143–144).

from the school's location, for they all stem from an otherwise highly common and unspecified place-name⁸⁸. We simply have to admit that it can no longer be retrieved why one particular school was provided with a name that was otherwise very general and lacked any specific character at all – if ever the Ancients themselves realized the exact reasons for doing so.

In sum, it can be shown that both sides of Hermippos' explanation of the noun 'Peripatetic' reported here were equally firmly rooted in tradition. Still, taking into consideration this biographer's penchant for the picturesque and the extraordinary, his interest in it may have been sparked by the colourful image that it evoked, rather than by its traditional value as such. Indeed, in the light of other fragments of Hermippos which contain vivid and elaborate descriptions of various remarkable events (both fictitious and historical)⁸⁹, one is instinctively reminded of Plato's description of the disciplined procession of disciples constantly accompanying the lecturing Protagoras (cf. Prot. 314e–315b).

A last problem to be addressed regarding the contents of the text quoted above concerns the attribution of the additional interjection given by Diogenes Laertios, the third explanation of the name 'Peripatetics'. Here, its etymology is traced back to Aris-

88) See, in this respect, Lynch (1972: 74): he observed that "it is unjustified to assume that the *περίπατος* after which the school was named must be the private *περίπατος* owned by Theophrastus and mentioned in his will". A similar statement can be found in Gigon (1958: 167 with n. 35): "Man hat Peripatos als Name eines Lokals gefaßt, obschon alle möglichen Lokale so heißen konnten. Daß in diesem Zusammenhang die Notiz Diog. Laert. 5.39 nicht überbewertet werden darf, sei ausdrücklich betont".

89) Cf. FG_{GrHist} 1026 F 8a (describing how Lykurgos was impelled to support the Olympic Games of Iphitos at the insistence of an incorporeal voice); F 17 (recounting how Thales once played a cruel practical joke on Solon); F 20 (describing how Pherekydes of Syros decided a military conflict between Magnesia and Ephesos in the latter's favour by having himself dragged by the legs into the Magnesian territory); F 24 (telling the tale of how Pythagoras simulated a descent into Hades by hiding himself in a subterranean room); F 62 (on Empedokles miraculously curing a woman who is terminally ill, and subsequently ascending to the heavens); F 66 (on the dying Demokritos managing to prolong his life for a couple of days through the scent of fresh bread); F 71 (on the simultaneous death of Herakleides of Pontos and the Delphic Pythia, whom the former had bribed in order to procure a favourable oracle) = F 85; 10; 17; 20; 27; 31; 42 Wehrli SdA Suppl. I. This list is by no means exhaustive; in addition, see chapter III.1–2 in the monograph on Hermippos mentioned above, n. 6.

totle's training of Alexander, and especially to a time when the latter was recovering from an illness; to the act of περιπατεῖν is not only ascribed educational and philosophical value, but also therapeutic properties, resulting from the physical activity involved⁹⁰. This has been connected with the information, reported in our sources, that Aristotle's father Nikomachos was a physician and that the philosopher had inherited the medical interests of his father⁹¹. Since, on the one hand, Hermippos' name is linked to part of this tradition (cf. FGrHist 1026 F 32 = F 44 Wehrli SdA Suppl. I), and because, on the other, it can be related to Plutarch's detailed account on Aristotle's tutorship of the future Alexander the Great (cf. Plut. Alex. 7–8) – Plutarch, who elsewhere in his *Alexandervita* gives a long quotation from Hermippos (cf. Alex. 53.3–54.1 = FGrHist 1026 F 73 = F 50 Wehrli SdA Suppl. I) –, it has been conjectured that Hermippos might have mentioned this variant as well, if only as an isolated curiosity, and could have been both Diogenes' and Plutarch's source for the episode in question⁹².

This assumption, however, incurs at least two grave difficulties. First, Hermippos only appears to have mentioned the profession and divine descent of Aristotle's father, while the additional elements connected with this in later tradition (Phaistis also a descendent of Asklepios, Aristotle inheriting an inclination towards medicine from his father) seem to be further elaborations contrived by the authors of that later tradition (starting from Andronikos of Rhodos)⁹³. Second, elaborate though Plutarch's story about Aristotle's tutorship of young Alexander may be, no mention whatsoever is made of any illness of the Macedonian crown

90) On the salutary and hygienic effects of walking about in general (i. e., not the 'philosophical' περιπατεῖν), cf. Aristot. Eud. Eth. 1.2.4–5; Probl. 5.35,40; Plut. De tuenda sanit. praec. 19 = F 233 Rose = F 736 Gigon. A link can furthermore be established between the passage under discussion and the information from the Neoplatonic tradition – Ammonios, Olympiodoros, Elias, Philoponos and David – that Plato taught while walking up and down for therapeutic reasons; on this, see Gigon (1958: 167 with n. 33); Chroust (1973: 37 n. 77).

91) Cf. Vita Marciana 2; 4 p. 96–97 Düring = 13–15; 21–26 p. 1 Gigon.

92) Thus Gigon (1958: 167); Chroust (1973: 37), too, admitted the possibility that Hermippos had the common source for both Plutarch and Diogenes Laertios, but nevertheless had some qualms about it (though he was quite sure that they did use a common source).

93) On this, see the commentary on Hermippos FGrHist 1026 F 32 (= F 44 Wehrli SdA Suppl. I), in fascicle IV A 3, p. 320–329.

prince which Aristotle tried to remedy with having him philosophize while walking up and down; the only element from that account that is remotely relevant to the present passage is the statement that “Alexander’s love of the art of healing was inculcated in him by Aristotle”⁹⁴. There is little ground, then, for tracing that account back to an author who is quoted only once by Plutarch in the same biography, for a completely unrelated story. Consequently, I am not inclined to endorse the attribution of the οἱ δέ-passus to Hermippos, but would rather suggest that this was an addition made by Diogenes Laertios himself or by an intermediary source active after the first century B. C.⁹⁵.

Finally, there has been a minor controversy over the reading ὄθεν περιπατητικὸν προσαγορευθῆναι of the manuscripts for the passus under discussion. Apparently, the name Περιπατητικοί did not come into general use until the first half of the third century B. C. (either before or after Theophrastos’ death): the earliest historical figures that would seem to have used the term (as far as we can tell by the still extant ancient literature) are Kolotes and Antigonos of Karystos⁹⁶. Correspondingly, it would be an anachronism to write that already Aristotle was called a Peripatetic after his habit of teaching his pupils while walking up and down. This (all in all trivial) matter has spurred two different reactions. Some scholars have imputed a mistake to Hermippos, which Diogenes afterwards copied⁹⁷. A different solution is simply to emendate the text to Περιπατητικούς, taking it as a reference to Aristotle and his pupils in general without thinking in strict chronological terms⁹⁸.

94) Cf. Plut. Alex. 8.1 (the translation given above is that of B. Perrin, Cambridge, Mass. 1919).

95) This was also the opinion of Düring (1957: 58), who thought of Favorinus of Arelate in the role of intermediary.

96) Cf. Plut. Adv. Col. 1115a (for Kolotes); Athen. 12.547d (for Antigonos). See Düring (1957: 405); Gigon (1958: 167 with n. 34); Chroust (1973: 37 with n. 75); Sollenberger (1992: 3810).

97) So Chroust (1973: 37 n. 75). Düring (1957: 58), though inclined to favour another solution (cf. the following note), did not exclude this alternative, either. M. Gigante (trad.), Diogene Laerzio, Vite dei filosofi, Milano 1991, 509 n. 7, seems to blame just Diogenes Laertios for the mistake, referring to Diog. Laert. 4.67 (περιπατητικούς, ὃν ἤρξεν Ἀριστοτέλης) – but this is a most debatable argument which, again, rests on the distinction that can be made (but maybe was not made in antiquity) between the spiritual and the institutional father of the Peripatos.

98) The suggestion was made by Reiske – see H. Diels, Reiskii animadversiones in Laertium Diogenem, Hermes 24, 1889, 302–325, esp. 311 – and accepted

As is clear from the text given above, I have opted for accepting this emendation.

At the end of this investigation it is not without importance to mark out the Hermippos-fragment from the preceding and the following parts of Diogenes' account, for modern scholarship is not agreed on this point, either.

Immediately prior to the passage I have been discussing, the Laertian reports the statement that Aristotle seceded from the Academy and deserted Plato while the latter was still alive; this is complemented with an apophthegm of Plato which amounts to a scathing comment he supposedly made on this occasion at the expense of his renegade pupil (cf. Diog. Laert. 5.2). This assertion can be brought in relation with the story, quoted twice in the extant ancient evidence from the *Life of Plato* by Aristoxenos of Tarentum, that a rival school of the Academy was established in the absence of Plato. Admittedly, Aristoxenos apparently did not explicitly connect Aristotle's name with this act; nevertheless, it is believed that he insinuated this much or, at least, that the story was swiftly picked up by the unfavourable Aristotle-tradition, for as early as Philochoros we find a reaction to it⁹⁹. Hence, Diogenes' opening affirmation of this section might ultimately go back to Aristoxenos as well¹⁰⁰.

by Düring (1957: 30; 58) and Wehrli SdA Suppl. I (1974: 22). It was, however, ignored by Hicks I (²1972: 446) and H. S. Long, in the Oxford-edition of Diogenes (vol. I, p. 197), and expressly rejected by Gigante (supra n. 97) 509 n. 7; all three stuck to the reading of the manuscripts.

99) Cf. Aristokles ap. Eus. Praep. ev. 15.2.3 = T 58d Düring = Aristoxenos F 64 Wehrli SdA II; cf. also Ael. Ar. Or. 46.249.10 = T 1a Düring, and see F 64 Wehrli SdA II, comm. (in those two passages, the unnamed renegades who found a rival school are, respectively, described as strangers and identified as Plato's closest disciples – two descriptions that fit Aristotle like a glove). Philochoros' attempt to set the record straight in Aristotle's favour, can be found at Vita Marciana 9–12 (p. 98–99 Düring = 48–68 p. 2–3 Gigon) = Philochoros FGrHist 328 F 223 = T 1f Düring (cf. also Vita Marciana 25–26 p. 101 Düring = 118–122 p. 4 Gigon). On this fragment, see the commentary of F. Jacoby (FGrHist IIIb Suppl., p. 588–589); Düring (1957: 256–258). On the (dubious) historicity of the rift between Aristotle and Plato/the Academy having occurred already in the latter's lifetime, and on the circumstances of Aristotle's departure from Athens in the early 340s, see, most recently, Guthrie VI (1981: 24–26); Natali (1991: 35–36).

100) So also Düring (1957: 58); Gigon (1958: 156); Chroust (1973: 29–31).

At the same time, though, some scholars have argued for connecting it with the ensuing Hermippos-quotations¹⁰¹. Starting from the unmistakable pro-Aristotelian tenor underlying that *passus*, the preceding sentence was interpreted as a contribution to that projected image; with it, Hermippos supposedly wanted to emphasize Aristotle's originality and independence as a philosopher, who already at a very young age emerged from under his master's wings. Corroborative support for this view was derived from the stray statement at Diog. Laert. 5.1 that Aristotle was Plato's most genuine disciple¹⁰², which supposedly could not be but interconnected with the *passus* under discussion and, thus, had to go back to Hermippos as well. On this basis, the latter's main contribution to the biographical tradition concerning Aristotle was assessed in the following, twofold manner. Firstly, he was aware of Aristoxenos' malicious account and adapted it to his own purposes, moulding it to a story in praise of Aristotle's highly independent spirit and, thus, perpetuating the tradition of the chilly relation of Aristotle to Plato¹⁰³. Secondly, he concocted a reason why Aristotle was never appointed head of the Academy, thus at the same time originating the legend that Aristotle was the true and sole founder of the Lyceum, the Peripatetic school (an issue already discussed above). To top it off, Hermippos' own adherence to the Peripatetic school was adduced as final proof of the rabid anti-Platonic stance of his account¹⁰⁴.

The problems with this interpretation are many and serious. The last-mentioned point can be dismissed forthwith, because there simply is no indication that Hermippos belonged (or even considered himself as belonging) to the Peripatetic school¹⁰⁵. Furthermore, the attribution of the isolated statement at Diog. Laert. 5.1 to him is absolutely gratuitous: no conclusive argument can be brought against it, but there is none in favour of it, either. Thirdly,

101) See Düring (1957: 58; 387; 465), whose conclusions were wholeheartedly endorsed by Chroust (1973: 3–4 with n. 26–27; 5 with n. 34–36; 28; 29–31).

102) The assertion is hemmed in between the genealogy of Aristotle and a report on his physical appearance.

103) This view was well-known in antiquity: cf. Ael. Var. hist. 3.19; 4.9; Theodor. Graec. aff. cur. 4.46; Aug. De civ. Dei 8.12; Eus. Praep. ev. 15.2.3,13; Philoninos, In Arist. Analyt. post. comm. p. 243 Wallies.

104) So both Düring (1957: 464) and Chroust (1973: 32).

105) On this, see my observations in chapter I.3 of the monograph on Hermippos mentioned above, n. 6.

the Plato-apophthegm clearly derives from the anti-Aristotelian, pro-Platonic branch of tradition; it is particularly derogatory to Aristotle. Since it is evidently combined with the earlier statement at 5.1, the natural conclusion is that both remarks can be traced back to the same origin. It is not clear how this can be reconciled with the pro-Aristotelian tenor of the remainder of the passage (i. e., the Hermippos-fragment), and, by implication, how the anecdote could be ascribed to Hermippos as well. What is more, according to the text that can be attributed to the Hellenistic biographer with certainty, Aristotle considered himself as a member of the Academy until he discovered who had become the new head of the school; the motive for his wandering off to the Lykeion is, in Hermippos' account, not Plato, but Xenokrates. Again, we find that the Hermippos-quotation in 5.2–3 is incompatible with the opening statement of 5.2. Lastly, Hermippos' alleged share in the development of the foundation-legend regarding the Lyceum has already been discussed and rejected above. So much for Hermippos' "chief contribution" to the biographical tradition regarding Aristotle: it is no more than a castle in the air¹⁰⁶.

A much more attractive (and down-to-earth) theory was proposed by Moraux¹⁰⁷. His thorough analysis of the opening paragraphs of Diogenes' Aristotle-vita has brought to light not only their disorderly state, due to the Laertian's hasty and maladroit processing of the heterogeneous material available, but also the freely associative style of writing employed in this part; one bit of information leads to another, and one interjection leads to another digression, as a result of which Diogenes (and his reader) loses track of the chronological and logical thread of the exposition. Looked at from this angle, § 5.2–3 might be interpreted as intended to juxtapose, first and foremost, the opposing traditions about the relationship between Aristotle and Plato: Diogenes came to speak about the tradition stressing the rivalry between the two men, and connected this with a story from the opposite camp, describing how Aristotle did not leave the Academy (mentally, that is) until well after Plato's death¹⁰⁸. In that case, Hermippos could at most have mentioned this

106) Criticism of the view of Düring was also voiced by Gigon (1958: 156–158).

107) See Moraux (1955: 127–137, esp. 129–130).

108) Another instance where one "digression déclenche à son tour toute une série d'autres" (thus Moraux [1955: 130]) is where Diogenes is reminded of the ety-

version as a (useless) variant, just like Diogenes; however, it is just as well possible that the comparison of the two traditions was carried out by the Laertian himself, or an intermediary author¹⁰⁹. For this reason, I believe that the opening sentence of 5.2 does not belong to the ensuing Hermippos-quotation¹¹⁰.

Moraux's analysis is also helpful for the identification of the fragment's lower boundary. After the description of Aristotle setting up his school in the Lykeion and gathering a large following, Diogenes goes on to record the Stagirite's departure to the court of Hermias of Atarneus (at 5.3). Apart from the fact that this sequence of events is not consistent with the Apollodorean chronology of this period in Aristotle's life, it is irreconcilable with Hermias having died many years before Aristotle founded his new school¹¹¹. Therefore, it seems best to assume with Moraux¹¹² that Diogenes' statement forms the beginning of a new section in his *Aristotle-vita*, the author resuming the (chrono-)logical structure of his composition that started with the discussion of Aristotle's origin and discipleship with Plato in the first paragraph, prior to the "fouillis de digressions du second paragraphe"¹¹³. So, irrespective of the theoretical possibility that this new piece of information does also go back to Hermippos (no source is mentioned by the Laertian¹¹⁴),

mology of the name 'Peripatetic': after having given the explanation of Hermippos, he provides his reader with yet another one. In turn, the latter interrupts an exposition on the organization of the courses in the Peripatetic school elicited by the derivation of the name from Aristotle's habit of walking up and down with his pupils (on which, see Moraux [1955: 131–137]).

109) This idea was also favoured by Gigon (1958: 158).

110) Wehrli *SdA Suppl. I* (1974: 22), too, left it out of the text of the Hermippos-fragment.

111) On the presumed date of Hermias' death (342–341 B.C.), see Trampedach (1994: 68–69).

112) Moraux (1955: 137).

113) As Gigon (1958: 171) was sharp to point out, this makes *ἔπειτα* at the beginning of the sentence all the more inexcusable. All in all, I find Moraux's explanation more elucidatory than that offered by Lynch (1972: 54 n.28; he merely put the chronological disruption down to a change of source), and also preferable to that given by Wehrli *SdA Suppl. I* (1974: 72–73).

114) To Düring (1957: 58–59; 466) and Chroust (1973: 5), there can be no doubt that Hermippos was Diogenes' source (but see Chroust [1973: 38], where Hermippos is not listed among the Laertian's main sources for his information concerning Hermias and Aristotle's connections with the latter).

it is clear that it no longer belongs to the contents and context of the quotation discussed in the previous pages.

c) *Diog. Laert. 8.67–71: On the Death of Empedokles*

In 8.67–74 Diogenes Laertios surveys a number of contrasting stories which circulated in antiquity about the death of Empedokles, interspersed with a few excerpts which (even with a stretch of the imagination) have only remote bearing on the subject¹¹⁵. The entire account is a clear example of Diogenes having drawn up “a series of loosely connected excerpts (...) [with] little continuity or development”¹¹⁶. I will concentrate here on the first part of this section (8.67–72), which still has as a unified sense to it. In this part, five authorities in all are referred to by name: Herakleides of Pontos (8.67–68), Hermippos (8.69), Hippobotos (8.69), Diodoros of Ephesos (8.70), and Timaios of Tauromenion (8.71–72). Three inferences from the text go undisputed: that Hippobotos told the famous story about Empedokles’ leap into Mount Etna and the subsequent ejection, out of the volcano, of one of his bronze sandals; that Diodoros of Ephesos recounted a radically different story which, nevertheless, also culminated in the jump into the fiery crater of Etna; and that Timaios had Empedokles wander off to the Peloponnese, where he died in an unknown place. However, the reading of the passus 8.67–69 is a hazardous undertaking; the text itself contains a few pitfalls, and the problem is further exacerbated by Diogenes’ report on Timaios’ criticism of his predecessors’ stories at 8.71. A variety of interpretations have been proposed over the years¹¹⁷; a new attempt at determining what each author (might have) said will be made here. For the sake of convenience, I quote the ‘Zitatennest’ in full:

115) For a discussion of the manifold ways of death imposed on Empedokles by his ancient biographers (Diogenes reports yet another variant at 8.73), see Wright (1981: 15–17); Chitwood (1986: 184–191); Campailla (1988: 666–669). The most important branch of the tradition – featuring the disappearance of Empedokles on Mt. Etna – will be looked at more closely below, p. 101–105.

116) Thus Mejer (1978: 21–22), who has tried to unravel the rationale underlying the entire section.

117) The relevant references will be made in the course of the following pages.

(67) Ἡρακλείδης (sc. of Pontos; F 83 Wehrli SdA VII) (...) φησιν ὅτι θυσίαν συντελεῖ (sc. Ἐμπεδοκλῆς; 31 A1 DK) πρὸς τῷ Πεισιάνακτος ἀγρῷ. Συνεκέκληντο δὲ τῶν φίλων τινές, ἐν οἷς καὶ Παισιανίας. (68) Εἶτα μετὰ τὴν εὐωχίαν οἱ μὲν ἄλλοι χωρισθέντες ἀνεπαύοντο, οἱ μὲν ὤπα τοῖς δένδροις ὡς ἀγροῦ παρακειμένου, οἱ δ' ὅπη βούλοιτο, αὐτὸς δ' ἔμεινεν ἐπὶ τοῦ τόπου ἐφ' οὗπερ κατεκέκλιτο. Ὡς δ' ἡμέρας γενηθείσης ἐξανάστησαν, οὐχ ἠϋρέθη μόνος. Ζητούμενου δὲ καὶ τῶν οἰκετῶν ἀνακρινόμενων καὶ φασκόντων μὴ εἰδέναι, εἷς τις ἔφη μέσων νυκτῶν φωνῆς ὑπερμεγέθους ἀκοῦσαι προσκαλουμένης Ἐμπεδοκλέα, εἶτ' ἐξαναστὰς ἑωρακέναι φῶς οὐράνιον καὶ λαμπάδων φέγγος, ἄλλο δὲ μηδὲν τῶν δ' ἐπὶ τῷ γενομένῳ ἐκπλαγέντων, καταβάς ὁ Παισιανίας ἔπεμψέ τινας ζητήσοντας. Ὑστερον δὲ ἐκώλυε πολυπραγμανεῖν, φάσκων εὐχῆς ἄξια συμβεβηκέναι καὶ θύειν αὐτῷ δεῖν καταπερεῖ γηγονότι θεῷ. (69) Ἑρμιππος (FGrHist 1026 F 62 = F 27 Wehrli SdA Suppl. I) δὲ φησι Πάνθειαν τινα Ἀκραγαντίνην ἀπηλπισμένην ὑπὸ τῶν ἰατρῶν θεραπεῦσαι αὐτὸν καὶ διὰ τοῦτο τὴν θυσίαν ἐπιτελεῖν τοὺς δὲ κληθέντας εἶναι πρὸς τοὺς ὄγδοήκοντα. Ἰππόβοτος (F 16 Gigante) δὲ φησιν ἐξαναστάντα αὐτὸν ὠδευκέναι ὡς ἐπὶ τὴν Αἴτην, εἶτα παραγενόμενον ἐπὶ τοὺς κρατῆρας τοῦ πυρὸς ἐναλέσθαι καὶ ἀφανισθῆναι, βουλόμενον τὴν περὶ αὐτοῦ φήμην βεβαιῶσαι ὅτι γηγονότι θεῷ, ὕστερον δὲ γνωσθῆναι. ἀναρριπισθείσης αὐτοῦ μιᾶς τῶν κρητῶν χαλκῆς γὰρ εἴηστο ὑποδεῖσθαι. Πρὸς τοῦθ' ὁ Παισιανίας ἀντέλεγε.

(67) Herakleides (...) relates that Empedokles offered a sacrifice close to the estate of Peisianax. Some of his friends, among whom Pausanias, had been invited with others to participate in the celebration. (68) After the feast, the rest of the company retired to go to sleep – some of them under the trees in the adjoining field, others wherever they pleased – while Empedokles stayed in the same place where he had been reclining for the meal. At daybreak all got up, and he was the only one who was nowhere to be found. A search was made, and the servants were questioned, but they said they did not know anything about the matter. Then, someone said that in the middle of the night he had heard an immensely loud voice calling Empedokles; he had got up and seen a light in the heavens and the shine of torches but nothing else. All bystanders were amazed at what had occurred; Pausanias came down and sent people to search for Empedokles. Later, he told them not to worry anymore about it all, explaining that divine things had happened and saying that they should make offerings to Empedokles, precisely since he was now a god. (69) Hermippos says that Empedokles cured Pantheia, a woman from Akragas whom the doctors had given up, and that for this reason he offered a sacrifice, to which ceremony about eighty people were invited. Hippobotos, for his part, maintains that he got up and set out on his way to Mount Etna; then, upon arriving there, he plunged into the fiery craters and disappeared, because he wanted to confirm the report about him that he had become a god. Afterwards, the truth was known, because one of his sandals was thrown up by Etna; for he had been used to wear bronze sandals. To this story Pausanias is made (sc. by Herakleides of Pontos) to take exception.

The first observation to be made is that Diogenes does not connect Hermippos' name with a specific way of death, but merely quotes this biographer for an alternative version – different from the one narrated by Herakleides of Pontos (cf. Diog. Laert. 8.61–62 = F 77 Wehrli SdA VII) – of a tale recounting a wonderful healing act performed by Empedokles and depicting the sacrificial ceremony celebrated afterwards¹¹⁸. In se, this story is not out of place in the present context, for the account on the miraculous curing of a woman is also connected with the decease of Empedokles in the death-stories reported by Herakleides of Pontos and of Hippobotos; since the quotation from Hermippos is placed right between the two authors just mentioned, a similar connection can also be assumed in his case. Still, it remains unclear exactly how he described Empedokles' departure from earthly life.

Basically, two misconceptions that kept dragging on, have guided research regarding this problem in the wrong direction. The first one ran to the effect that the quotation from Hermippos was handed down to Diogenes Laertios by Hippobotos, and that both authors together had brought an adapted version of the story as told by Herakleides Pontikos¹¹⁹. This assumption rested on a second mistake: for a long time it was believed that the suicide by jumping into the crater of Mt. Etna was common to Hermippos, Hippobotos and Herakleides alike, and that the Herakleides-quote had been intermixed by Diogenes with references to Hermippos and Hippobotos¹²⁰.

118) The curing of a woman in a trance was one of Empedokles' famous beneficial actions verging on the magical and miraculous which were no doubt invented to illustrate his reputation as a shaman-like mystagogue and wonder-worker, and which in turn helped to perpetuate this image. It cannot be determined whether it was Herakleides Pontikos who actually invented this particular story, but he is the earliest name that can be connected with it; he reported the story in a treatise entitled *Περὶ τῆς ἄπνου ἢ Περὶ νόσων*. Anyway, the anecdote was obviously contrived on the basis of Empedokles' writings. Hermippos' version clearly presents us with a further development of the anecdote, adding several details and giving the miraculous action a rational underpinning. For a full discussion of all this, see the commentary on Hermippos FGrHist 1026 F 62 (= F 27 Wehrli SdA Suppl. I), in fascicle IV A 3 (1999: 455–459).

119) This has been asserted, among others, by Leo (1901: 78–79); Chitwood (1986: 187); Campailla (1988: 667).

120) This mistake was made by a considerable number of modern scholars: see J. Bidez, *La biographie d'Empédocle*, Gent 1894, 6–10; Leo (1901: 78–79); E. Schwartz, *Diogenes* (40), RE V.1 (1903) 738–763, esp. 748; Mejer (1978: 21); Wright (1981: 15).

To be sure, the inescapable impression one gets from Timaios' criticism of the various sensational versions that existed of Empedokles' death is that the jump was actually featured in Herakleides' account as well: the *ad hominem* attack on the latter includes a reference to the crater¹²¹. However, a careful reading of § 67–69 reveals that the text from Herakleides Pontikos is perfectly sensible as it stands, and that the leap into the volcano was only mentioned as an untrustworthy variation. First, it is told that after the curing of the ἄπνοϋς, Empedokles held a sacrifice to which he invited some friends and pupils; the morning after, he had disappeared without a single trace, except for a brilliant light in the heavens and a voice in the night calling his name; after some time of vain investigation, Empedokles' favourite disciple Pausanias proclaimed his master's assumption to heaven and ordered the institution of a cult in his honour. Upon concluding this account, Laertios starts mentioning the alternative ones, which he interjects with a short return to Herakleides Pontikos; indeed, long ago already, it has been realized (on the basis of the imperfect tense of the verb ἀντιλέγειν) that the phrase πρὸς τοῦθ' ὁ Πανυσανίας ἀντέλεγε does not make sense within the framework of Diogenes' historical exposition, but goes straight back to Herakleides' work Περὶ τῆς ἄπνοϋς (which, accordingly, can be catalogued as a dialogue)¹²². Besides proving that the tradition of the jump into the Etna was older than Hippobotos, this goes to show that Herakleides mentioned it in his work, but only in a dismissive way, and that he obviously must have set it against a different account; clearly, then, he must have come up with a story purporting that Empedokles had risen to the status of a deity by literally vanishing into thin air¹²³.

121) Cf. Diog. Laert. 8.71–72, esp. 71: “He (sc. Timaios; FGrHist 566 F 6) replies to Herakleides, whom he mentions by name, in his fourteenth book (...) ‘How came he (sc. Empedokles),’ adds Timaios, ‘to leap into the craters, which he had never once mentioned though they were not far off?’ He must then have died in Peloponnesus (transl. R. D. Hicks, Cambridge, Mass. 1925; rev. and repr. 1950)”. Actually, this passage is a beautiful illustration of the quintessentially biographical method, adopted by the ancients in general, of deducing information about a person from his own writings; in this case the practice is inverted, in that Timaios argues that Empedokles could not have died in a specific way (by jumping in a crater) because his writings contain no allusion to it.

122) See H. Däbritz, Herakleides (45), in: RE VIII.1 (1912) 472–484, esp. 474; 479; Hicks II (21931: 384, note ad loc.); Wehrli SdA VII (21969: 86).

123) This interpretation is corroborated by Kingsley's demonstration that a celestial ascent taking place in the vicinity of Mt. Etna must have been the oldest in-

In the light of this reading, two possible explanations can be provided for Timaios' criticism. It can be conjectured that this historian, who – to say the least – gives evidence of a spiteful attitude towards Herakleides of Pontos, threw together all elements he found in the latter, and presented it as though Herakleides attached credence to the story of the jump as well. Admittedly, such a contention is somewhat gratuitous, but it nevertheless has some ground in Timaios' hyper-critical attitude known from other fragments of his¹²⁴. The alternative is that in Diogenes Laertios' source

carnation of the tradition regarding the death of Empedokles. Indeed, one of the centrepieces in Kingsley's monograph, *Ancient Philosophy, Mystery and Magic. Empedocles and Pythagorean Tradition* (Oxford 1995) is his brilliant in-depth investigation into the account of Empedocles' death on Etna, spread across four chapters and covering every single detail (chapters 16–19, p. 233–316). Among other things, he has convincingly shown that the seemingly bizarre element of the single bronze sandal is not a late elaboration or an obvious fiction, but an integral part of the original legend. On the one hand, it is linked to "the motif of the sage who dies a miraculous death by vanishing into thin air but who leaves a tell-tale item or items of his dress behind, [a motif which] is a common feature of folklore (p. 236)"; on the other hand, "in the ancient world a bronze sandal – unvariably one sandal, and one alone – was a symbol connected specifically with underworld ritual and magic (p. 238)". The derogatory story such as we find it in our sources came into being, according to Kingsley, when the ever-rationalizing Greeks failed to grasp the true meaning of the sandal (the very element which originally served to substantiate the divine nature of Empedokles' death) and interpreted it as a slanderous ingredient instead (on the tendency among Greek writers to rationalize and so misinterpret the details of magic, ritual and myth, see p. 237 with n. 16; 238 n. 20 in the same book). All this must have taken place before the account which skipped the jump and concentrated exclusively on the apotheosis (as reported by Herakleides) was invented (either by Herakleides or his unknown source).

The idea of apotheosis by celestial ascent recurs a few more times in ancient literature; the most obvious example is, of course, the Ascension of Christ, but the idea of a mysterious disappearance into thin air, accompanied by a divine voice, can also be found in Sophokles' *Oed. C.* (1586–1666) and was furthermore connected with Romulus (cf. Liv. 1.16.1), Pythagoras and Apollonios of Tyana (on the latter two, see I. Lévy, *La légende de Pythagore de Grèce en Palestine*, Paris 1927, 64–67; 73–78; P. Gorman, *Pythagoras. A Life*, London – Henley-on-Thames – Boston 1979, 177). On the ancients' 'Entrückungsglauben' in general, see F. Cumont, *Lux perpetua*, Paris 1949, 330–331. In sum, it is perfectly acceptable that Herakleides reported or invented a story featuring Empedokles rising to the heavens. Other scholars, besides Kingsley, who have dealt with the ancient tradition regarding Empedokles' apotheosis and Herakleides' role in it, are Wehrli *SdA VII* (²1969: 88–89 ad F 83–85); J. Biès, *Empédocle d'Agrigente. Essai sur la philosophie présocratique*, Paris 1977, 88–97; Wright (1981: 15); Chitwood (1986: 189–191); Campailla (1988: 666–667).

124) (Epi)Timaios' inclination towards petty historical rationalizing and his corresponding proclivity to polemizing are well-known; see Jacoby in the introduc-

the criticism of Timaios had been carelessly abridged to the point of distortion, conveying the impression that Herakleides regarded the less reverent stories about Empedokles' death as true as well¹²⁵.

We may now turn to the relation of Hermippos to Hippobotos and Herakleides. A striking fact is that Diogenes introduces the three alternative accounts mentioned after that of Herakleides (including the one attributed to Diodoros of Ephesos, at 8.70) all in the same way: ὁ δεῖνα δέ φησι κτλ. This can hardly be taken to mean that Hermippos was part of a quotation from Hippobotos, but clearly puts all three quotations on the same level, suggesting they represent three different departures from the main account. As it happens, the contents can be made to correspond with this construction: Hermippos told the first part of the tale as reported by Herakleides in a slightly modified version, but did not change its ending; Hippobotos gave a radically different conclusion to basically the same account as Herakleides'; Diodoros of Ephesos had the same ending as Hippobotos, but recounted yet another event preceding it. Therefore, I do not share the opinion that the quotations from Hermippos and Hippobotos represent two parts of a single account, and that the former was quoted by the latter¹²⁶.

tion to FGrHist 566 (IIIb, p. 537–538); L. Pearson, *The Greek Historians of the West. Timaeus and His Predecessors*, Atlanta 1987, passim (see Index I); R. Vattuone, *Sapienza d'Occidente. Il pensiero storico di Timeo di Tauromenio*, Bologna 1991, 28–39. The historian's lack of respect for Herakleides is voiced most articulately in the passage under discussion (FGrHist 566 F 6). That he wrote an extensive polemic against that philosopher can be inferred from a second fragment (FGrHist 566 F 57, where, admittedly, Timaios' criticism appears to be legitimate); see Jacoby in the commentary on FGrHist 566 F 6 (IIIb, p. 548); Pearson 126; Vattuone 315–316 with n. 51. To be sure, also in the case of Empedokles' death Timaios' reasoning is sound (though eventually lapsing to trivialities), and the opinion held about Herakleides in antiquity was not unanimously positive (other authors, too, derided Herakleides' *pueriles fabulae*, like Cicero – *De nat. deor.* 1.13,34 – and Plutarch – *Cam.* 22.3; *De aud. poet.* 1.14e). Still, that Timaios was not averse to distorting his source-material for the sake of criticism is evidenced by an attack on Kallisthenes (cf. Polyb. 12.12b.2 = FGrHist 566 F 155), which T. S. Brown, *Timaeus of Tauromenium*, Berkeley – Los Angeles 1958, 8–9, labelled “more than a little misleading”.

125) Thus H. B. Gottschalk, *Heraclides of Pontus*, Oxford 1980, 17, who also reckoned with the possibility that the Laertian himself distorted the original text of Timaios in the process of epitomizing it (so Wehrli *SdA* VII [1969: 89], too); however, this would seem to be less probable.

126) Pace Leo, Chitwood and Campailla (cf. the references given above, n. 119).

Rather, I assume that Diogenes, by throwing in a short reference to Hermippos, aimed at indicating that this biographer was one of three authors who had deviated from Herakleides' original account, but that, at the same time, his version was no radical departure from it, but an elaboration instead¹²⁷. Indeed, Diogenes would not have failed to point out that Hermippos had changed the finale of the story too, if he had really done so; since no mention is made of this, it may be assumed that he only reshaped a few elements in the circumstances leading up to the ending.

In sum, I subscribe to the view that Herakleides told the story of Empedokles' mysterious vanishing into thin air, at the same time rejecting the slanderous idea that he had simulated this by committing suicide; and I further believe that, a few modifications left aside, Hermippos' account of the event ran closely along the lines of Herakleides', including the 'open ending' which suggested the philosopher's apotheosis¹²⁸. This would be consistent with the few occurrences more of similarly miraculous, out and out fictitious stories in the remaining body of Hermippos' fragments¹²⁹.

Bibliography

- A. Barigazzi, *Favorino di Arelate, Opere. Introduzione, testo critico e commento*, Firenze 1966.
 K. O. Brink, *Peripatos, RE, Suppl. VII (1940) 899–949*.
 S. Campailla, *La leggenda di Empedocle*, in: *Aa.Vv., Filologia e forme letterarie. Studi offerti a Francesco della Corte, V. Religione e filosofia antica. Medioevo e umanesimo. La presenza classica*, Urbino 1988, 659–670.

127) Thus also Wehrli *SdA Suppl. I* (1974: 61–62); M. Gigante, *Frammenti di Ippoboto. Contributo alla storia della storiografia filosofica*, in: A. Mastrocinque (ed.), *Omaggio a Piero Treves*, Padova 1983, 151–193, esp. 172–173.

128) I do not go along with the opinion of W. Croenert, *Kolotes und Menedemos. Texte und Untersuchungen zur Philosophen- und Literaturgeschichte. Mit einem Beitrag von P. Jouguet und P. Perdrizet*, Leipzig 1906, 3, that the quotations from Herakleides were handed down to Diogenes Laertios on the authority of Hermippos; otherwise, the Laertian would not have given an additional reference to the latter as the first of the alternative accounts available on the 'death' of Empedokles.

129) Cf. the stories of how a divine voice impelled Lykurgos to associate with the founding father of the Olympic Games, Iphitos (*FGrHist 1026 F 8*); concerning the magical hunger-banishing food of Epimenides (*F 12*); about the soul of Kalliphon constantly accompanying Pythagoras (*F 21*); and the death-stories featuring Pherekydes of Syros (*F 20*), Herakleitos of Ephesos (*F 64*) and Demokritos of Abdera (*F 66*) = *F 85; 15; 22; 17; 29; 31* Wehrli *SdA Suppl. I*.

- A. Chitwood, *The Death of Empedocles*, *AJPh* 107, 1986, 175–191.
- A.-H. Chroust, *Aristotle. New Light on His Life and on Some of His Lost Works*, I. *Some Novel Interpretations of the Man and His Life*, London 1973.
- I. Düring, *Aristoteles. Darstellung und Interpretation seines Denkens*, Heidelberg 1966.
- Id., *Aristoteles* (18), in: *RE*, Suppl. XI (1968) 159–336.
- Id., *Aristotle in the Ancient Biographical Tradition*, Göteborg 1957.
- K. Gaiser, *Philodems Academica. Die Berichte über Platon und die Alte Akademie in zwei herkulanensischen Papyri*, Stuttgart – Bad Cannstatt 1988.
- M. Gigante, *Biografia e dossografia in Diogene Laerzio*, *Elenchos* 7, 1986, 7–102.
- O. Gigon, *Interpretationen zu den antiken Aristoteles-Viten*, *MH* 15, 1958, 147–193.
- Id., *Vita Aristotelis Marciana*. Herausgegeben und kommentiert, Berlin 1962.
- H. B. Gottschalk, *Notes on the Wills of the Peripatetic Scholarchs*, *Hermes* 100, 1972, 314–342.
- W. K. C. Guthrie, *A History of Greek Philosophy*, VI. *Aristotle. An Encounter*, Cambridge 1981.
- D. E. Hahm, *Diogenes Laertius VII: On the Stoics*, in: W. Haase (ed.), *ANRW II* 36,6, Berlin – New York 1992, 4076–4182.
- R. D. Hicks, *Diogenes Laertius, Lives of Eminent Philosophers*, Cambridge (Mass.), I: ²1972; II: ²1931.
- F. Leo, *Die griechisch-römische Biographie nach ihrer literarischen Form*, Leipzig 1901.
- J. P. Lynch, *Aristotle's School. A Study of a Greek Educational Institution*, Berkeley 1972.
- J. Mejer, *Diogenes Laertius and his Hellenistic Background*, Wiesbaden 1978.
- E. Mensching, *Favorin von Arelate. Der erste Teil der Fragmente. Memorabilien und Omnigena Historia*. Herausgegeben und kommentiert, Berlin 1963.
- P. Moraux, *La composition de la «Vie d'Aristote» chez Diogène Laërce*, *REG* 68, 1955, 124–163.
- C. Natali, *Bios theoretikos. La vita di Aristotele e l'organizzazione della sua scuola*, Bologna 1991.
- M. Plezia, *De Hermippi Vita Aristotelis*, in: *Aa.Vv., Charisteria Th. Sinko ab amicis collegis discipulis oblata*, Warszawa 1951, 271–287.
- M. G. Sollenberger, *The Lives of the Peripatetics: An Analysis of the Contents and Structure of Diogenes Laertius' 'Vitae philosophorum' Book 5*, in: W. Haase (ed.), *ANRW II* 36,6, Berlin – New York 1992, 3793–3879.
- K. Trampedach, *Platon, die Akademie und die zeitgenössische Politik*, Stuttgart 1994.
- F. Wehrli, *Die Schule des Aristoteles. Texte und Kommentar*, Heft VII. *Herakleides Pontikos*, Basel – Stuttgart ²1969.
- F. Wehrli, *Die Schule des Aristoteles. Texte und Kommentar*, Supplementband I. *Hermippos der Kallimacheer*, Basel – Stuttgart 1974.
- M. R. Wright, *Empedocles. The Extant Fragments*. Edited, with an Introduction, Commentary, and Concordance, New Haven – London 1981.