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INTRODUCTION

ΤΑ ΠΡΟ ΤΗΣ ΑΝΑΓΝΩΣΕΩΣ

In the philosophical schools of Late Antiquity, systematic philosophy was taught in the classroom by a master who expounded to his students the major works of the great classical philosophers, Aristotle and Plato. Privileged or very gifted students were granted private instruction. The doctrines of these two towering figures were believed to be in harmony for the most part if only their works were understood in the proper way. Doing philosophy had become, by and large, the study of philosophical subjects through the interpretation of texts.

In order that students be prepared for the strenuous efforts required of them when devoting themselves for a number of years to the study of these often difficult works, they were first given a preliminary moral instruction, which purified their souls of greed and passion, and taught them what are man’s primary obligations towards his fellow men and towards the gods. To that end, the pseudo-Pythagorean Golden Verses or the moral Handbook of the Stoic philosopher Epictetus could be used. A number of Aristotle’s so-called school-writings, that is to say his systematic monographs and treatises, came next. The Aristotelian works themselves were read as a preparation for the study of a selected group of Plato’s dialogues, which were read in a definite sequence. The first dialogue to be studied was the Greater Alcibiades, which demonstrates to its readers that man’s real self, or essence, is his soul. The last dialogue to be taught was the Parmenides, which was interpreted as dealing with the highest metaphysical realities. The study of Aristotle began with the interpretation of his logical works, of which the Categories was the first to be expounded. Quite understandably, a command of the correct techniques of argument was considered to be an indispensable aid to the study of philosophical reasoning in the domains of ethics, physics and metaphysics. The study of the Categories itself was preceded by that of a little book by the influential third-century Platonist Porphyry which itself was called Isagoge, ‘Introduction’ — an introduction to the Categories, or rather to the whole of logic
as an introduction to the whole of philosophy. The last of the commentators even wrote introductions to philosophy in the shape of introductions to this *Isagoge*.

The study of philosophy by means of a detailed and often creative exegesis of the great masters already had a long history before acquiring these scholastic trappings in the curriculum of the Late Neoplatonist schools. As a matter of fact, the exegetical literature dealing with the philosophical classics which is bound up with the teaching of philosophy begins in the first century BCE and even earlier, for instance in the school of Epicurus. We may cite a few of the better known examples. In the second century CE, the Middle Platonist philosopher Taurus read Plato’s works with his students, and the Stoic philosopher Epictetus read and explained the works of the great Stoic philosophers. Relevant literature, mostly commentaries written by predecessors who dealt with the same subjects, was consulted and discussed in a systematic way. At the end of the second century CE the Aristotelian philosopher Alexander of Aphrodisias expounded (Aristotelian systematic) philosophy to his students by means of a study of the works of the master. We are rather better informed than usual about the way in which in the third century CE Plotinus organized his classes in philosophy, but it is important to realize that there is hardly anything about this organization that was exceptional. The works of Plato and, to a lesser extent, Aristotle were read and interpreted in class, and the major works and commentaries written by the teachers of philosophy of the preceding centuries were adduced, discussed and evaluated as to their usefulness and validity. Sometimes even works of representatives of other schools which were critical of Aristotle and/or Plato were examined, though often their arguments had already become part of the commentary literature which cited and criticized them.* Accordingly, the canonical texts were approached via interpretations that were already current, and with a view to existing problems.

Such debate or free discussion as took place in these schools, both in and after the class, often started from a difficult passage in a classical text, or a more general interpretative problem which often was already traditional, though the master might also be

---

* Doubts that this was done correctly are expressed at e.g. Lucian, *Hermotimus 33.*
approached with questions that had no immediate connection with the subject taught. A number of Epictetus’ diatribes appear to be examples of extra-curricular counseling. Among the surviving works attributed to the scholarly Alexander of Aphrodisias we find collections of Questions, or problems. These deal with difficult passages in Aristotle’s works or with traditional issues in systematic philosophy which were relevant to the exegesis of these works, or on which the correct interpretation of passages in these works was believed to project a strong beam of light. Not all the individual Questions were composed by Alexander himself. The important works of Epictetus (extant in part) and Plotinus (extant in full) arose out of the treatment and discussion of such interpretative and systematic problems, and it is only the systematic rearrangement brought about by their editors (in Epictetus’ case necessitating the redaction of his oral impromptus by Arrian, in Plotinus’ the stylistic revision of his written essays by Porphyry) which provided these effusions with a more or less impressive systematic structure.

With very few exceptions, the philosophical commentary literature by Aristotelians earlier than Alexander of Aphrodisias in the late second century CE, or by Platonists earlier than Proclus in the fifth century CE, has been lost. For information about these lost works we have for the most part to rely on the often generous reportage of earlier views and interpretations in the later commentaries.

But an important set of commentaries from the second century CE does survive. These however are not devoted to the interpretation of a philosopher’s works but to those of a physician. I am referring to Galen’s commentaries on a number of treatises attributed to the great Hippocrates. In these often voluminous commentaries Galen taught the medicine of Hippocrates to his students in a way which bears comparison with the practice of the professor of Aristotelian or Platonic philosophy who expounded the philosophy of Aristotle or Plato to his pupils. From these commentaries we learn that a tradition, or even various traditions, concerned with the interpretation of Hippocrates’ writings had flourished since Hellenistic times. Because Galen was not only an immensely learned doctor but also a trained and, in a way, still practising philosopher, and because the professional, didactic and exegetical problems he was faced with to a certain degree
resemble those confronting the philosophy professors, his commentaries deserve more attention than they have received so far at the hands of the historians of philosophy, and they are, or should be, of major interest to the students of the philosophical traditions of the Greco-Roman world.

Galen, like the Late Platonist commentators with regard to the works of Aristotle and Plato of their scholastic curriculum, but also like one of his own teachers, the Middle Platonist Albinus, with regard to the study of Plato's dialogues, wanted his pupils to be both intellectually and morally prepared for the study of medicine, or rather the study of the books of Galen himself and of Hippocrates. These books too had to be studied in a definite sequence. In his old age he gave advice on the two different orders of study of his own works that are open to two different classes of students, viz. those who wish to become medical scientists and others who are to practise medicine on a less scientific level. This advice can be compared with the two alternative readings of Plato's dialogues as described, or rather prescribed, by Albinus. One course, consisting of four dialogues, is recommended by Albinus to the gifted, serious and enthusiastic dilettante, another, consisting of the whole corpus, is prescribed for the person who 'chooses Plato's side' (ἂν τὰ Πλάτωνος αἰρομένα, Prologos ch. 6, p. 150.15), that is to say has decided to become a Platonist.

Galen's student does not become a follower of one of the medical schools. Galen is not a sectarian; what he professes to teach is a scientific medicine which is impartial towards the schools that are each other's rivals. His pupils are to become not Galenists but Hippocratic physicians, because Hippocrates' teaching is believed to embrace the whole of medicine and to be exemplary and true. The more important part of the preliminary preparation for the serious study of the works of Galen, or Hippocrates, or Plato, consisted in the study of a specific work, or specific works, of these authors themselves. However, the beginning student should not only be gifted but should also have received a proper literary and rhetorical education, and if possible even be versed in mathematics.

Didactic and exegetical issues are also very much an ingredient of the study and teaching of works of literature in the sense of belles lettres. As is well known, the secondary education of a young Greek or Roman consisted largely in the study and
explanation, under the supervision of a teacher (a grammaticos), of the great classics, among whom Homer and Virgil were the most important. Unfortunately, we know little about the contents of the commentaries and introductions to the great writers that were current, but a commentary on Virgil from the late fourth century CE and the first part of another such commentary that is a little earlier are still extant. We also still have the remains of introductions and commentaries to the immensely popular astronomical epic of the Hellenistic poet Aratus (active in the first half of the third century CE), the core of which may perhaps be dated to the first century CE and ascribed to Theon the grammarian. That a flourishing commentary literature on Aratus already existed in the Alexandrian period is attested by the great astronomer Hipparchus, whose own treatise on Aratus still survives. Other important sources of information are the commentaries on books of the Old and New Testaments written by Christian authors, for example by the unbelievably learned and prolific Origen in the first half of the third century CE. These men followed the example set by their pagan predecessors and colleagues. Commentaries on Psalms, for instance, of which quite a number are extant either entirely or partly, may be fruitfully compared with the Latin commentaries on another collection of individual poems, viz. Virgil’s Bucolics.

Introductions to authors of whatever kind also existed independently, and a few philosophical examples have miraculously survived. From the second century CE we have a brief abstract of the Prologos, an introduction to the study of Plato’s dialogues, written by Galen’s teacher Albinus. This may have been the first section of a lost treatise which went into greater detail later on.* A fairly brief systematic compendium of Plato’s doctrines to be dated to about the same time or about a century earlier, entitled Didaskalikos (‘For Instruction’), was written by an otherwise unknown Platonist called Alcinous. A Latin counterpart of Alcinous’ work exists, the De Platone et eius dogmate, written by the Apuleius better known as the author of the Golden Ass. This treatise begins with a brief biography of Plato. From works such as these we may derive an impression of the various ways in which the philosophy of Plato was interpreted and taught in the first centuries of

* See Baltes in Dörrie–Baltes (1993) 182 ff.
our era — albeit an impression which unavoidably gives us only part of the picture.

The biography of a philosopher or literary figure was often placed at the beginning of an edition of his works, but it could also circulate independently, or as part of a collection of biographies of individual figures. When it was placed before the works it served as a sort of introduction to them and was intended to further our understanding, then as now. The biography of a philosopher may therefore have a function comparable to that of a systematic introduction after the manner of the Didaskalikos. Such bioi may vary in length, complexity and profundity. An important example is Porphyry's On the Life of Plotinus and the Arrangement of his Books, which formed the introduction to his great edition of the opera omnia of the master. From the title alone it becomes apparent that a discussion of the œuvre, or at least a (systematic) catalogue of the books, could be an important ingredient of the biographies of those whose works were to be read and studied. The numerous biographies which together constitute the invaluable work in ten books of Diogenes Laërtius (first quarter of the third century CE), the Lives and Apophthegms of those who have Distinguished themselves in Philosophy and the Doctrines of Each School, as a rule contain bibliographies and discussions of the works of the philosophers which are dealt with. It would appear that among the sources used by Diogenes Laërtius, either directly or at one or more removes, we may postulate a number of introductions to the works of eminent philosophers. I shall look in particular at the third book of his treatise, the On Plato, which contains important information concerned about the interpretation and study of the corpus platonicum in the first centuries of our era. Of especial interest is his reportage about Thrasyllos’ famous tetralogic ordering of the dialogues of Plato, from which it appears that the first set of four, the Euthyphro + Apology + Crito + Phaedo, was intended by Thrasyllos and those who shared his view to provide the preliminary moral and intellectual education which the Late Neoplatonists sought to achieve by means of for instance the preliminary study of the Pythagorean Golden Verses. Albinus’ reading order of all the dialogues of Plato, which he prescribed for the student who wanted to become a Platonist, was meant as a revision of Thrasyllos’ arrangement. Albinus and Diogenes also provide information about a systematic classification of Plato’s dialogues by means of a
diaeresis according to their purported character. This classification is independent of the tetralogic arrangement. I shall argue that it is to be dated after Thrasyllus and before Albinus, and that it entails an order of study which is different from that suggested by the tetralogic arrangement. It is therefore of particular importance for the history of Middle Platonism.

Preparing one's students for the study of a text, or writing an introduction to an author, or to a particular work by a particular author, involves a number of preliminary issues. It still does. If you open a modern monograph on, say, Plato or Aristotle, or for example look at the individual chapters of a book entitled *The Presocratic Philosophers*, you find that the student or reader is informed about the person of the particular philosopher to be studied, when he lived, what his affiliations were, what works he wrote or at least what works may be safely attributed to him, what these works are about and against what kind of background, or in what sort of historical or intellectual context, they should be placed. The student should of course also learn why these works are worth reading or studying in the first place, if he does not already know. The Late Neoplatonist commentators of Aristotle invariably discussed such isagogical issues in the introductory sections of their commentaries on the particular works of Aristotle and Plato they were teaching, and did so according to fixed patterns. In the scholarly literature such a pattern is called a *schema isagogicum*, or 'introductory scheme'. We know that Proclus wrote introductions to Plato and Aristotle in which such issues were treated. The title of the work dealing with the study of Plato may have been Τὰ πρὸ τῆς (συν)ἀναγνώσεως τῶν τοῦ Πλάτωνος διαλόγων; in the proem of his *In Platonis Rempublicam* he says that 'before the study of the *Republic* (πρὸ τῆς ἀναγνώσεως τῆς Πολιτείας, p. 5.38-9) seven preliminary questions must be dealt with'. The title of the work dealing with Aristotle may have been something like Τὰ πρὸ τῆς συναναγνώσεως τῶν Ἀριστοτέλους ἀκροαματικῶν συνταγμάτων. The expression τὰ πρὸ τῆς συναναγνώσεως is already used as a technical formula by Origen, *In Ev. Ioann. I* 88 (αὕτω ποιν καταπαύσομεν τὰ πρὸ τῆς συναναγνώσεως τῶν γεγραμένων). As a matter of fact, a version of a *schema isagogicum* was already familiar to Origen before the mid-

---

third century CE, and similar introductory schemes are a feature of the proems of the fourth-century commentaries on Virgil.

Long before Porphyry and Proclus wrote their introductory treatises, Thrasyllus, in the first century CE, wrote introductions to Democritus and Plato. The first of these was entitled *What Comes Before the Study of the Books of Democritus* (ἐν τῷ ἐπιγραφομένῳ Τὰ πρὸ τῆς ἀναγνώσεως τῶν Δημοκρίτου βιβλίων, D.L. IX 41). It described the life and provided a *catalogue raisonné* of the books. The introduction to Plato, which has already been cited above, was probably entitled *What Comes Before the Study of the Dialogues of Plato* (Τὰ πρὸ τῆς ἀναγνώσεως τῶν Πλάτωνος διαλόγων).* We shall see that Thrasyllus already treated a number of issues which we may call isagogical.

In the pages that follow I have attempted to provide a contribution to the history of these preliminary *schemata*. Because actual practice usually precedes theorizing, some time has been spent on sources which do not mention these questions in an explicit way but merely put them to use. I have looked at both commentaries and biographies with an eye which I hope does not prejudge the evidence. Not only the introductory sections of Galen’s Hippocratic commentaries, but also his specially written introductory essays to his own works will provide a noteworthy object of study. Galen too is very much aware of the issues involved in providing an exegesis of the text of an important author, and of the many preliminary problems which beset both a teacher and his audience.

Furthermore, I have devoted some attention to the fascinating issue of the ‘unclearness’ (ἀσάφεια) attributed by commentators and exegetes to the texts which were studied and explained, and to its corollary, creative interpretation. The issue ‘why Aristotle purposely expressed himself in an obscure way’ is one of the standard preliminary questions of the late Neoplatonist introductions to his works, but it was also exploited on a large scale by the exegetes of other authors and texts. For Origen, for instance, ἀσάφεια, which according to him is one of the main characteristics of Scripture, obliges the exegete to bring its hidden meanings to light.

---

* ΤΑ ΠΡΟ ΤΗΣ ΑΝΑΓΝΩΣΕΩΣ was the working title of the present study. It was abandoned for bibliographical reasons.
Though occasionally I have ventured *ultra crepidam*, I have of necessity restricted myself most of the time to works within the domain of ancient philosophy, and to some extent those of ancient medicine and of patristic studies. The scope of this investigation has been interpreted in a rather relaxed way, so as to be able to include topics which are not part of a *schema isagogicum* in the strict sense of the word, but which were still regarded as indispensable preliminaries to the interpretation and study of an author, or a text, in antiquity. One of these is concerned with the paradigmatic function of the *bios* of the philosopher, and with the relation which should obtain between his theory and his practice.

Others as a rule have studied only portions of the rather diverse and occasionally bizarre or boring material which is at our disposal, or have done so from other perspectives than the present one. It has been my ambition to provide a more general and generalizing overview of the continuity of the exegetical traditions and various forms of reception that are involved. But it goes without saying that my debts to earlier scholars are far greater than appears from the references in the text and footnotes.
CHAPTER ONE

SCHEMATA ISAGOGICA FROM ORIGEN TO STEPHANUS

1.1 Commentaries on Aristotle and Christian Commentaries

The Late Neoplatonist commentators on Aristotle, as is well known, habitually begin their interpretation of individual Aristotelian treatises according to a schema isagogicum which in its systematic form is believed to derive from Proclus. They discuss a set of preliminary particular questions, also called ‘headings’ or ‘main points’ (κεφάλαια). These are concerned with

(1) the theme, aim or purpose of the work to be expounded (πρόθεσις or σκοπός, operis intentio) — often the same thing as the intention of the author, but the latter may occasionally be distinguished from the former —;

(2) its position in the (Aristotelian) corpus according to the order of study (τάξις τῆς ἀναγνώσεως, ordo) which is related to a systematic ordering;

(3) its utility (χρήσιμον, utilitas);

(4) the explanation of its title (αὐτίον τῆς ἐπιγραφῆς, operis inscriptio) if this was difficult to understand or according to some experts failed to agree with the contents;

(5) its authenticity (γνήσιον, germanus propriusque liber est), especially if this had been in doubt; and

---

1 For references to the secondary literature see below, pp. 192 f., complementary note 1.

2 For the evidence in David (Elias) see infra, text to n. 27. Proclus’ pupil Ammonius, In Isag. p. 21.6-8, speaks of τὰ πρὸς τῶν φιλοσόφων οὗτω προσαγορευόμενα ‘προλεγόμενα’ ἢτοι ‘προτεχνολογούμενα’ ἐπὶ παντὸς βιβλίου. The term προτεχνολογούμενα is rare; parallels at Alexander, In Top. pp. 124.33 and 518.3 προτεχνολογεῖται, Eusebius, In Psalms, PG 23, pp. 1001.31 and 1072.1-2, ἐν τοῖς προτεχνολογομένοις, Gregory of Nyssa, Contra fatum p. 60.14-5 McDonough, καὶ τινα προτεχνολογοῦσιν ἑαυτοῖς ὀπὸ τούτων μέλει, and Stephanus Byzantinus, Ethnica (epit.), p. 47.20-1, πλατύτερον ἐν τοῖς τῶν ἐθνικῶν προτεχνολογήμασι προερχομαι. The term προλεγόμενα is less rare but not very frequent either; see e.g. Alexander, In Met. pp. 138.8 and 172.20, Olympiodorus, Proleg. p. 14.13, Ammonius, In Isag. p. 22.2, David, Proleg. p. 79.29, David, In Isag. p. 94.10, David (Elias), In Cat. pp. 116.27-8 and 134.11. For Proclus see infra, sections 1.5-1.6.

3 See below, pp. 193 f., complementary note 3.
(6) its division into chapters or sections or parts (διαίρεσις or τομή εἰς κεφάλαια or μεμαρτα or μέρη). The very last of these commentators, David and Elias, add another issue, viz.

(7) to what part of philosophy the treatise belongs (ὑπὸ ποίον μέρος ... ἀνάγεται). This seventh heading is already used by Origen (see below) and to some extent paralleled in two commentaries on Virgil composed in the fourth century CE, as we shall see in section 1.7 below. It is also paralleled in the late commentaries on Hippocrates and Galen written by contemporaries of David and Elias.4

Independently from one another, Neuschäfer and Mme Hadot have discovered that four of these preliminary questions are already found in (the Latin translation of) a commentary of a Christian author on a book of the Bible, viz. in the long prologue of the learned Origen’s major commentary on the *Song of Songs*.5 This is to be dated before the mid-third century CE; Origen’s dates are ca. 185 – ca. 250, and the major commentary is believed to be a product of his old age. The following issues are listed in the prologue, ch. 1.8, and treated at length in the chapters that follow:

(1) theme or aim (here called *causa*, later also *causa praecipua*), treated in ch. 2;

(2) position in the (Solomonic) corpus (*de ordine librorum ..., hic liber tertio loco positus*), treated in ch. 3, which also includes

(7) to what part of philosophy it belongs; and finally

(4) the explanation of the title (*de attitulatione libelli*), treated in ch. 4.

We may observe that utility (3) is discussed as well, viz. at Prol. ch. 1.4-7. For Origen, the question of authenticity is clearly irrelevant in regard to this work (see below, on the introduction to Ps 1). Mme Hadot naturally does not fail to point out that he also

---

4 For Servius' *qualitas* see *infra*, text to n. 81, and for the medical literature *infra*, n. 96 and text thereto. Cf. also *infra*, text to n. 197.

5 See the full discussion by Neuschäfer (1988) I, 77 ff., "Die Topik des Canticumkommentarprologs", who emphasizes its philosophical colouring, and by I. Hadot (1990) 36 ff. (the only Christian commentary discussed here is Origen’s *In Cant. cant.*). The text of Rufinus’ translation — in four books; Origen’s treatise numbered ten books, of which only the prologue and books one to three and perhaps the beginning of book four seem to have been translated — may now be consulted in the edition by L. Brésard & al. (1991). For the pioneering study of Neuschäfer’s *Doktorvater* Schäublin see below, end of this section.
deals with two questions which were to become two of Proclus' interpretative issues regarding Plato: Procl. ch. 1.1-2, the *dramatis personae*, which are interpreted allegorically in the sequel, and ch. 1.3, the mise-en-scène. We may add that the identity of the πρόσωπα was already an issue in the minor commentary on the *Song of Songs* written by young Origen in Alexandria according to the abstract preserved at *Philocalia*, ch. 7.6

The issue of the meaning of the *dramatis personae* has a long tradition behind it, viz. the interpretation of a literary text 'from the person' or 'persons' by both pagans, who use the formula ἐκ (τοῦ) προσώπου, and Christians, who use both ἐκ (τοῦ) προσώπου, or ex (cuius) persona, and ἀπὸ (τοῦ) προσώπου (a biblical formula which originally had a different meaning).7 Finally, at Procl. ch.

---

6 I. Hadot (1990) 36 ff. For Origen's minor commentary on the *Song of Songs* see Harl (1972b) 323 ff. The Φιλοκαλία or anthology, 'plus belles pages', is a collection of passages taken from Origen's works (otherwise mostly lost) dealing with problems of exegesis, and with the *liberum arbitrium*. It is attributed to Gregory of Nazianzus and Basil; see now Steenson (1985) 245 ff., who argues for the early date of compilation. For Proclus see below, sections 1.5-1.6.

7 For the method of interpretation ἐκ προσώπου or ἀπὸ προσώπου see Dachs (1913) 9-26, and Roemer (1923) 255 ff. (also for references to the author's earlier contributions). The important passage is the A-scholium on *Iliad* Z 264, which points out that the contradiction between lines 261 and 264 is only apparent, because the speakers as well as the circumstances are different. I note in passing (and intend to argue at greater length elsewhere) that this defense of Homer may be connected with the claim of for us anonymous persons — which may derive from a claim made by Pyrrho himself, who was fond of referring to Homer — who according to D.L. IX 71 made Homer the founder of the Pyrrhonist school of thought, because 'in regard to the same things he more than anyone else always makes different assertions at different times and is never dogmatic in a definite way as to what he affirms' (ἐπεὶ περί τῶν αὐτῶν πραγμάτων παρ’ ἄντινον ἄλλοτ’ ἄλλως ἀποφαίνεται καὶ οὐδὲν ὅρικῶς δογματίζει περί τὴν ἀπόφασιν). The view of Aristarchus and his followers is cited by Porphyry in his early work *Quaestiones Homericae ad Iliadem pertinentes*, pp. 99.22-100.9, who, having pointed out the apparent contradiction between these two lines of *Iliad Z*, says that 'the solution of the majority' is that the 'persons' who are speaking differ and that only those things said by the poet *ex propria persona* should be consistent with each other (ἡ ...ὑπὸ πολλῶν γενομένη λύσις τοῦ ἰτήματος τοιαύτη, ὅτι ἔτερον ἐστὶ πρόσωπον Ἐκάβας ... ἔτερον δὲ τὸ τοῦ Ἐκτώρος ... ὅσα μὲν γὰρ ἔργον αὐτὸς ἀφ' ἐαυτοῦ ἔξ ἱδίῳ προσώπου, ταύτα δὲ ἀκόλουθα εἶναι καὶ μὴ ἔναντι ἀλλὰς τοίχαι: ὅσα δὲ προσώπωι περιτίθεσιν, ὁμοί αὐτοῦ εἰσίν κτλ.). For πρόσωπον also φωνή may be used, which explains Eudorus on Plato *ap*. *Ar. Did. ap*. Stob., *Ecl.* II pp. 49.25-50.1, τὸ δὲ γε πολύφωνον τοῦ Πλάτωνος (οὐ πολύφωςος). Dachs attempts to connect Porphyry’s statement with various passages in the Homeric scholia. Cf. also Porter (1991) 78. On exegesis 'from the person' see further Andresen (1961) 12 ff., who for *prosophoria* refers to
1.4-7, another general point is mentioned which the later commentators discussed in relation to the study of Aristotle, viz. the qualities required of the student. According to Origen, the Song of Songs is not a work for the young or the impure but may only be studied by those who are capable of understanding its deeper (i.e. allegorical) sense. Pace Neuschäfer, one may therefore also include the issue of the qualities required of the student (and/or exegete). As a parallel we may quote the abstract from an unknown work preserved at Philologia, ch. 3, where Origen says that the deeper meaning is only granted to him who comes to the text κεκαθαρμένη ψυχῇ. The fact that the triptych of Solomon’s writings is said to correspond to the three canonical parts of philosophy, viz. Proverbs to ethics, Ecclesiastes to physics, and Song of Songs to epoptics or metaphysics in this order, shows that Origen thinks of a τάξις τής (συν)άναγνώσεως which is related to a systematic arrangement.

Neuschäfer has also rewardingly studied Origen’s commentaries on Psalms. Of these, however, only numerous fragments survive, and their authenticity moreover is not in every case

---

ps. Plutarch, De Homero 2, chs. 66, 164 ff. and 218.3; Harl (1977) 167 ff., and the full and exemplary treatment by Rondeau (1985) 40 ff. on Origen’s use of an already traditional “technique scolaire”, 44 ff. on Origen, In Cant. cant.). Standard treatment of prosopopoia at Aelius Theon, Progymnasmata, in: Rhet. graec. min. Vol. II, pp. 115.12 ff. For Proclus see infra, sections 1.5-1.6, and for the treatises in which Aristotle according to his late commentators speaks for himself see below, section 1.10 ad finem. For Diogenes Laërtius and Sextus on this aspect of the interpretation of Plato’s dialogues see infra, n. 134 and text thereto.

8 Neuschäfer (1987) I, 78 f. For the Platonic and Aristotelian roots of this idea see e.g. Rep. VII 539bd (including both the moral and the logical aspect) and Met. Γ 3.1005b3 ff. See further infra, n. 38 and text thereto, text to n. 59, after n. 120, n. 132, text to n. 296, n. 304. Some material is to be found at Tarrant (1993) 98 ff.

beyond doubt. They have been laboriously though provisionally reassembled by patristic scholars and to some extent may add up to new wholes, but a modern edition is still lacking. In his youth, that is to say in his Alexandrian period, Origen wrote a relatively short commentary on Psalms 1-25, while in his old age he wrote an astonishing number of commentaries, most of them in one book, on a great number of individual psalms. The series began with a commentary on Ps 1, which contained an introduction to the whole collection of which excerpts are extant at his Selecta in Psalms: the Υπόμνημα Ωριγένους εἰς τοὺς ψαλμούς, PG 12, pp. 1060C-76B, to which three fragments printed earlier in the same volume of the PG may be added. It is however not true that the evidence concerned with the isagogical issues derives from a prologue only. Several issues were treated in the introductions to the commentaries on individual psalms, just as in the individual sections of the commentaries on Psalms of Eusebius of Caesarea and Theodore of Mopsuestia (both of whom knew Origen’s work), or in that of Servius on individual bucolic poems by Virgil, as we shall presently see. The appropriateness of the title of Ps 50, for instance, is an issue in the late commentary on this particular psalm according to the abstract at Philologia, ch. 1.29.

But it is at any rate certain that Origen in the introduction to the late commentary on Ps 1 referred to the question of authenticity

---

10 Praechter (1909b) 531, English transl. 47 [references hereafter are to this transl.], had already referred to a fragment from one of these commentaries which however he did not accept as genuine.

11 On the fragmentary nature of the evidence see Nautin (1977) 249 f. (on Jerome’s list), 262 ff. (on the early commentary), 275 ff. (on the commentaries written at Caesarea), esp. 276 ff., on the preliminary questions (texts assembled by Rietz (1914)), Rondeau (1982) 44 ff., and Neuschäfer (1987) I, 38 ff., esp. 53 f., 67 ff. On the “Topik des Psalmenkommentarprologs” see Neuschäfer (1987) I 69 ff., who argues that Origen’s isagogical issues are a mixture of the literary (he rewardingly compares Donatus and Servius on Virgil) and the philosophical. My overview of the issues concerned follows the presentation of the material by Neuschäfer, whose interpretation I have not always been able to accept; for the sake of convenience I add between round brackets the numbers used above for the individual points of the schema isagogicum of Ammonius and others. The attribution of fragments to Origen’s commentaries remains problematic as long as the Catenae traditions have not been sorted out. For the difficulties which are involved and the road to be followed see the magisterial study of Dorival (1986-92).

12 See Harl (1983) 208 ff. Cf. also the abstract from the proem to the late commentary on Ps 118 edited by Harl (1972b) T. 1, 182 ff., with the comments of Mme Harl at T. II, 545.
(5). Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* VI xxv.1-2, quotes verbatim two passages from the commentary on Ps 1, in which Origen points out that there are twenty-two canonical books of the Old Testament according to the Hebrews,\(^{12a}\) and lists their titles in both Greek and Hebrew. He also discussed the number of books of *Psalms* (6), of which, following the Hebrews, he said there were five (*PG* 12, p. 1056A). The ascription of individual psalms to individual purported authors, e.g. Moses or David (5), is dealt with (*PG* 12, pp. 1060C-72B) in the context of the discussion of their titles (4). A number of psalms are not ascribed to particular authors in the text. The correct form of the title of the whole collection (((4) again) also was a matter for discussion (*PG* 12, pp. 1070B-73C). And in the context of this treatment of the titles (or in some cases of their absence) questions concerned with the various literary genres to which sets of psalms may be said to belong are treated. This resembles the discussion of Solomon’s works in relation to the parts of philosophy (7) in Origen’s *In Cant. cant.*, or the later issue of the part of philosophy to which a particular work of Aristotle belongs. But it is more strictly parallel to such discussions in the Virgil commentaries. The historical circumstances and further background relevant to each psalm were also treated. I believe that in the later commentaries these certainly, and the individual titles presumably, were discussed in the exegesis of the individual psalm at issue. The numbering of the psalms must have been discussed in the prologue (too), to judge from the fragment of the early commentary to Ps 1 at *Philocalia*, ch. 3. In the first installment of the major commentary the τάξις (2) is treated as well, and in two ways. The sequence of the psalms (*PG* 12, pp. 1073C-76B) clearly is not chronological, so is either a matter of historical accident\(^{13}\) (Esra or others having put together the songs and psalms as they found them) and consequently irrelevant or — and this seems to be what Origen prefers — has a deeper meaning to be found with the aid of arithmology. If the latter, we have a

---

\(^{12a}\) Compare the fragment from the early commentary on *Psalms, Philocalia* ch. 3.9 ff., quoted below, p. 198, complementary note 84. Grant (1957) 143 ff. discusses some passages in early Christian literature dealing with questions of authenticity of biblical texts.

\(^{13}\) Compare the comments of Donatus and Servius on the *Bucolica* for which see below, section 1.8.
parallel for the later τάξις τῆς ἀναγνώσεως, just as in the commentary on the Song of Songs.

One issue which became isagogical in later authors (more on this below) is not mentioned by Neuschäfer. Origen, in the minor commentary on Psalms for instance, also dealt at length with the obscurity (ἀσάφεια, or being σκοτεινός) of many, if not of most, passages in Scripture. It has escaped the attention of these scholars because it is not part of Origen’s isagogical scheme, though it is in fact the major and ever recurrent factor in the whole of his exegetical enterprise, which is explaining the Bible allegorically. A quite revealing abstract from the prologue of the minor Psalms commentary, i.e. from the introduction to Ps 1, has been preserved at Philocalia, ch. 2. Scripture is a book closed with seven seals, and its ἀσάφεια (ch. 2.3) is intentional. The Divine Spirit who speaks through the authors of the sacred books does not object to being understood in a homely way by simple-minded people; this, in fact, is his secondary σκοπός. But his primary σκοπός is to hide a deeper meaning beneath the various histories and sets of laws which can only become clear to the patient interpreter who knows and accepts as inspired both the books of the Old (rejected by Marcion and some other Gnostics) and those of the New Testament (rejected by the Jews), and is capable of explaining the sense under the surface of one passage by means of all the others. We may say that the Divine Spirit has a twofold auctoris intentio (cf. Philocalia ch. 1.14-21 = De principiis IV chs. 2-3). It is not, however, the interpreter who makes things clear (σαφηνίζειν), but Scripture, or Jesus, itself or himself. It is the New Testament which lends a deeper sense to the Old Testament.14

14 On Origen’s interpretative methods see Grant (1957) 90 ff., Hanson (1959) esp. 97 ff., 162 ff., 235 ff., Harl (1983) 143 n. 1, and esp. 254 n. 5, and 75 ff. (on the two σκοποι of the Divine Spirit), 81 ff., 90 ff., 110 ff., 125 ff.; good brief account at Grant–Tracy (1984) 56 ff. For Origen’s innovatory contributions to Christian exegesis based on the idea of ἀσάφεια see Harl (1972a) 175 ff. and (1982) 550 ff., and for his application of the allegorical method now also le Boulluec (1992). On (intentional) obscurity and clarification see further infra, n. 34, n. 36, n. 202, n. 275, n. 276, n. 282, n. 286, text to n. 291, n. 310; on creative interpretation see below, chapter five, section 4. On Origen and ἀσάφεια cf. also infra, n. 290 and text thereto, and on his application of the Homerum ex Homero rule infra, p. 204 f., complementary note 316. Grant (1957) 120 ff. provides a very useful overview of “Greek exegetical terminology“ which however lacks a paragraph on ἀσάφεια. For Clement and Origen see also infra, n. 289 and text thereto. That Jesus himself validates (most of) the Old Testament was already the view of the Valentinian
The systematic parallels in Origen are very early and therefore of particular importance. We may also cite Eusebius of Caesarea's *In Psalms*. Abstracts of his introduction, which is much indebted to Origen, survive. The first is called *Eusebius on the Titles of the Psalms. Explanation of Some Things, an Epitome*, and is printed at *PG* 23, pp. 66.4-33. We are told that psalms are about ethics and that for this reason their titles are of primary importance, p. 66.24-6: Ἠσθάμως δὲ ὑδής ἑπάξις ὑπὸ γνώσεως ὁδηγουμένη, περὶ τοῦ πῶς καὶ πότε πρακτέον· διὸ καὶ πρῶται τῶν ψαλμῶν αἱ ἐπιγραφαῖ. The second abstract is called *Hypothesis of Eusebius Son of Pamphilus* (pp. 66.34-8.7). This is about the division of the collection into five parts by the Hebrews. We also hear that a number of psalms have no title (ἀνεπίγραφου), whereas others do have one and are attributed to various authors. There are also anonymous psalms which do have a title but fail to make clear by whom they were written (p. 68.4-7, εἰσὶ δὲ ἀνώνυμοι ὁσοὶ ἐπιγραφάς μὲν ἔχουσιν, οὐ μὴν δηλώσι τίνος εἰσίν). A complete list of the titles of the one-hundred-and-fifty psalms follows, pp. 68.9-72.53. We may note in passing that this became one of the four alternative lists in the Latin tradition. Another abstract comes next, entitled *Of Eusebius: On the Psalms* (pp. 72.53-6.13). The most interesting part of this deals with arrangement and division. In the Hebrew Bible the psalms are not numbered, and their ordering is not chronological (μὴ κατὰ ἀκολουθίαν τῶν τῆς ἱστορίας χρόνων ἢ τῶν ψαλμῶν σύγκειται τάξις). The reason for this disorder is sought in the origin of the collection: Esra or others put the psalms together as they happened to find them, and not even those attributed to David form a sequel (τάττειν δὲ ἐν πρώτοις τούς πρῶτους εὐρισκομένους· μηδὲ τούς τοῦ Δαυὶδ ἑφεξῆς κεῖσθαι πάντας). Furthermore, the Hebrew Bible counts Ps 1 + 2 as one,

---

Gnostic Ptolemy (to be dated to the second half of the second century CE), see Quispel (1966) 12 ff., and esp. 20 ff. (on the interpolations in the text according to Ptolemy). In his comments on the final draft of the present study Gilles Quispel pointed out to me that upon further reflection he now considers Ptolemy's *Letter to Flora* to be a sort of prolegomenon to the interpretation of the Old Testament.

15 See Rondeau (1982) 64 ff. The part dealing with Ps 51-95.3 is extant in a single Parisian ms. (*Paris. Cois. 44*), the commentary on Ps 37 has survived among the works of Basil, and numerous fragments are found in the *Catena*. There is as yet no modern edition; that in *PG* 23 is to be used with caution, esp. as to the *Catena* fragments. For the tradition of Eusebius' titles in Latin see Salmon (1959) 114 ff.
whereas it divides Ps 9 into two separate psalms (we shall see presently that the latter issue is also discussed by the Anti­ochenes). From the part of the commentary that is extant we may gather an impression of Eusebius’ treatment of individual psalms. In his comments on Ps 51, for instance (PG 23, pp. 441.40-52.18), he discusses the historical background and from this point of view connects it with another item in the collection. The ἐπόθεσις is mentioned at p. 444.42.

One should add that Gregory of Nyssa († 394 CE, eighteen years before Proclus was born), in the prologue of his In inscriptiones Psalmorum, p. 24.13 ff. McDonough — Alexander, lists five introductory questions, viz. the σκοπός, the τάξις τῶν ψαλμῶν, the τιμήματα παντός τοῦ βιβλίου ἱδίαις τις περιγραφῶις ὑρίζομενα, and the ἐκ τῶν ἐπιγραφῶιν ὕφελεια. Gregory (just as Eusebius) knew Origen’s commentary on the Song of Songs, see his In Cant. cantic., p. 13.2 ff. Langerbeck.

For a pioneering study of the preliminary issues in commentaries by Christian authors, especially the members of the school of Antioch, credit is due to Schäublin. The prologue to the commentary on Psalms by one of the protagonists of this school, Theodore bishop of Mopsuestia († ca. 428 CE, so to be dated earlier than Proclus), is no longer extant. But one of his followers, Theodoret bishop of Cyrrhus (a contemporary of Ammonius) in the prologue to his commentary on Psalms discusses utility (ὕφελεια), purpose (or aim, theme), authenticity, title and ordering. In his Psalms commentary itself Theodore, like Eusebius before him, discusses the division into two parts of Ps 9 in the Hebrew and Syriac texts, so it has been suggested that perhaps he discussed this issue in the lost proem too. See also e.g. In Psalm.

17 Schäublin (1974) 68 ff., citing PG 80, pp. 857A-860A, 861AD, 865A. He also discusses the parallels in an anonymous prologue perhaps to be ascribed to Diodorus of Tarsus († before 394 CE), the teacher of Theodore of Mopsuestia. On Diodorus of Tarsus’ commentary see Rondeau (1982) 93 ff., on that of Theodore of Mopsuestia ibid., 102 ff., on that of Theodoret ibid., 134 ff. On those of the Anti­ochenes as a group see Rondeau (1985) 275 ff., who points out (275) that “Diodore et Théodore ne consacrent plus les arguments qu’ils placent au début de chacque Psalme qu’à déterminer deux choses: le thème (ὑπόθεσις) et le locuteur (ἐκ προσώπου τίνος)”.
18 The references are to the pages of the edition of Devreesse (1939). Schäublin (1974) 71 f., citing In Psalm. p. 49.32 f., hic autem nonus psalmus, cum
p. 2.13, *est igitur moralis psalmus* (the issue of the *qualitas* or rather of the part of philosophy (?) to which it may be believed to belong; see further Devreese's index, *s.v. morales psalmi*. Origen already argued that Ps 112 and 118 are ἡθικοί and that the theme of Ps 118 belongs with the ἡθικὸς ... τόπος). For the issue of the title see this same index, *s.v. psalmorum inscriptiones*. The comments on each individual psalm as a rule begin with a short discussion of what we may call its theme, or aim (ὑπόθεσις), and background. In the recently published and translated new material preserved in Syriac which was not yet accessible to Schaublin and Rondeau, the long introduction to Ps 118 is of particular interest for a number of reasons. One of these consists in what we may interpret as an explicit brief reference to the issues of the σκοπός of the work, the *intentio auctoris* and the χρήσιμον, *In Psalm*. pp. 13.30-14.6: 'L'objectif et l'intention des écritures divines vise donc à notre profit et (c'est) selon cette (intention) (que les auteurs bibliques) rédigent la composition de leur texte en conformité avec la vérité: (c'est ce qu') on peut constater non seulement par ce qui est dit, mais aussi par (l'exemple de) tous ceux qui ont été jugés dignes de la grâce divine. Et avant tout c'est le cas de Moïse ...'.\(^{19}\) We may also note that in the extant prologue of his commentary on the *Gospel of John*\(^{20}\) Theodore does not follow a strict *schema isagogicum*, though he treats several points. His commentary will be useful (p. 1.29). The *argumentum libri* is given, and Theodore clearly believes that it has really been written by John the disciple (p. 2.31 ff.). The intention of the author is mentioned (*propter hunc igitur finem intendit Johannes evangelium scribere*, p. 4.9 and what follows).

---

\(^{19}\) Quoted from the transl. of van Rompay (1982); on this passage see Runia (1993) 265 ff. Cf. also Theod. *In Psalm*. p. 9.7-8, "l'intention de ce qui est écrit". Theodore silently corrects Origen, who had attributed the 'intention' to the Divine Spirit (see *supra*, n. 14).

\(^{20}\) Transl. from the Syriac into Latin by Vosté (1940).
1.2 Other Parallels: *Anonymus* In Theaetetum, *Porphyry, Calcidius, Macrobius*

We may also adduce the surviving part of the proem of the Middle Platonist *Anonymus in Theaetetum*, a commentary to be dated to the first century CE. This contains (1) a substantial treatment of various views concerning the theme of the dialogue, including that of the present commentator, and deals with (5) a subordinate issue of authenticity in the context of a discussion of its genuine prologue versus another one. It also is concerned with two other issues, which are quite prominent in Origen’s commentary on *Song of Songs* and Proclus’ commentaries on Plato, viz. the dramatic mise-en-scène and the explanation of the persons. But these persons are not explained allegorically, as in Origen and Proclus.

We may further observe that the author says that he intends to clarify the (preliminary) issue of the theme in the commentary itself (col. 3.25 ff., τὰ [ἡ] μὲν οὖν τοι[αυτ]ὰ κα[ὶ] ἐν τῇ ἐξηγήσει σα[φην]θῆσεται).²²

In his surviving erotapocritic commentary on Aristotle’s *Categories* which is to be dated to the late third century CE, i.e. is about half a century later than the commentaries of Origen’s maturity cited above, Porphyry discusses the title of this treatise (4), its position in the corpus (2), its theme (1) and the relative utility (3) of its three main sections (6), though not according to a *schema isagogicum*; most of the time he does not use the later technical vocabulary either.²³ This means that five particular headings are here accounted for. It should be noted that in the *In Cat*. Porphyry’s term for subject or theme is always the

---


²² To some extent this remark acknowledges the distinction between what is said *ante opus* and *in ipso opere* for which see below, section 1. 8. See also infra, text to n. 204.

²³ See Moraux (1973) 82, also for references to earlier literature, and I. Hadot (1990) 35 f.; the passages cited by Mme Hadot are *In Cat.* pp. 55.3 ff., 56.23 ff., 57.16 ff. and 60.1 ff. Plezia (1949) 26 wanted to derive the full-blown Neoplatonist *schema isagogicum* from Porphyry (he thought of the lost major commentary on the *Categories*), but this is precluded not only because of the evidence in Origen but also in view of Porphyry’s manner of treatment in the minor commentary on *Cat.* and in his commentaries on works by Ptolemy.
Aristotelian term πρόθεσις, whereas in the V. Plot. he always uses ὑπόθεσις.²⁴

There are parallels in Calcidius In Timaeum too (fourth century CE, dependent on Middle Platonist predecessors but also on Porphyry), viz. for the purpose of the author and of the work, and its division into parts.²⁵ At In Tim. ch. 4, p. 59.1-2, Calcidius says rationem ... totius operis et scriptoris propositum et ordinationem libri declaranda esse duxi. The former is explained at ch. 2, p. 58.1-2, and the division into twenty-seven chapters is set out in ch. 6. What is more, the (first) title is explained at ch. 6, pp. 59.23-60-3, or so I believe: Plato is said to need a Pythagorean spokesperson.

We should also adduce Macrobius, In Somnium Scipionis I 4.1, nunc ipsam eiusdem somnii mentem, ipsumque propositum, quod Graeci σκοπόν vocant, antequam verba inspicientur, tentemus aperire. The formula antequam verba inspicientur shows that Macrobius is aware of the distinction between ante opus and in ipso opere.²⁶ In the previous paragraphs he has demonstrated to what genre the Somnium belongs (I 4.1, tractatis generibus et modis) and among other things spoken of the ordo of the main sections of several Platonic dialogues and of those of Cicero’s De republica (I 1.6-8). It is clear that several preliminary issues are treated by Macrobius.

²⁴ πρόθεσις: In Cat. pp. 57.16, 57.19, 58.4, 58.16, 59.15, 70.29, 70.32, 71.12, 71.15, 91.8, 91.10 and 91.19; for precedent in Aristotle see below, pp. 195 f., complementary note 65. Porphyry also uses πρόθεσις in the proem of his early De philosophia ex oraculis hauriendae, ap. Euseb., Praep. Ev. IV vii.2, I, p. 177.9 (p. 109 in Wolff (1856)). For ὑπόθεσις in the V. Plot. see infra, n. 193 and text thereto; for the parallel in Thrasyllus and its precedents in the Alexandrian philological tradition see infra, n. 82, n. 116 and text thereto, n. 118, and for that in Galen infra, n. 232, text to n. 267. Dalsgaard Larsen (1972) 234, who states that Porphyry as a rule prefers ὑπόθεσις to σκοπός, is inaccurate, though he is of course correct in arguing, passim, that Iamblichus paid particular attention to the σκοπός of the dialogues of his Platonic canon (see infra, n. 150; cf. also Dillon (1973) 56, 245, 264 f., Westerink (1990b) lxvi). His suggestion that Iamblichus may have introduced σκοπός as the technical term however is dubious; Aelius Donatus knew it (see infra, text to n. 79), who must have found it in prolegomena to commentaries on poets such as Theocritus. Ptolemy uses πρόθεσις both for the theme of his musicological work and for the intention of the musician, Harmonica pp. 2.2 (τις πρόθεσις ἀρμονικοῦ — α κεφάλαιον, cf. p. 5), 5.13, 5.24. 11.5 (τὴν παρούσαν πρόθεσιν), 32.1.

²⁵ See Praechter (1909b) 46, Plezia (1949) 27 ff., I. Hadot (1990) 38 (on the difficulty of the σκοπός only), and Waszink’s comments ad locc.

²⁶ See infra, section 1.8.
1.3 What Comes Before the Reading of a Text in Class

According to David’s (Elias’) testimony Proclus in a special syntagma (‘treatise’) established ten preliminary general points, which together form an introduction to the study of Aristotle’s treatises: In Cat. p. 107.24-6, ταύτα πάντα τοῦ Πρόκλου λέγοντος δεῖν προλαμβάνειν ἄρχομένους τῶν Ἀριστοτέλεικῶν συνταχμάτων ἐν τῇ συναναγνώσει· σύνταγμα δὲ τούτο [mss. τούτοι] Πρόκλειον (my emphasis). The title of this treatise will have been something like Τὰ πρὸ τῆς συναναγνώσεως τῶν Ἀριστοτέλειου ἀκροαματικῶν συνταχμάτων, i.e. ‘what (comes) before the reading in class of Aristotle’s acroamatic writings’. Westerink and Mme Hadot believe that the title of this lost work was Συνανάγνωσις, but I think that David’s note σύνταγμα δὲ τούτο Πρόκλειον pertains to the whole preceding clause.28 What is decisive is that Proclus himself uses this formula in a programmatic way in his commentary on Plato’s Republic. The first κεφάλαιον (here the first item on the table of contents, which there is no reason not to ascribe to Proclus),29 In Remp. I. p. 1.5-7, repeated p. 5.3-5, is: ‘On which and how many headings must be distinctly described before the reading in class of the Republic of Plato by those who wish to

27 Against Busse’s attribution of the commentary to Elias see Mahé (1990).
28 Cf. Ammonius, who at In De Int. p. 1.23-24 speaks of what has been said ἐν τοῖς προλαμβανομένοις τῆς συναναγνώσεως τῶν Κατηγοριῶν. The after all awkward title Συνανάγνωσις is proposed by Westerink (1990b) Ixiii and accepted by I. Hadot (1990) 26, who translates “Commentaire d’un texte sous la direction d’un maître” (for another possibility see the Galen passage cited below, p. 193, complementary note 3). David (Elias)’ In Cat. is a commentary ἀπὸ φονῆς (cf. Richard (1950)), which explains the rather stilted form of expression due to the reportator, note that Busse, in app. crit., toys with the idea that σύνταγμα δὲ τούτον [sic] Πρόκλειον is a gloss which got into the text. Plezia (1949) 73 excellently addsuces D.L. IX 41 (for which see infra, text to n. 157) and proposes Τὰ πρὸ τῆς συναναγνώσεως τῶν Ἀριστοτέλειου βιβλίων. This seems less good because βιβλίων would include the works not taught by the late Neoplatonists (cf. I. Hadot (1990) 72 f.). For the precedent in Origen see infra, text to n. 37. See also infra, n. 157 and text thereto.
29 See Saffrey–Westerink (1968) 129 on the list of contents of Proclus’ Theologia Platonica; for the history of such tables of contents and chapter-titles (also called κεφάλαια) see the literature cited ibid.; add Zuntz (1945) 78 ff., a historical overview citing numerous instances, with special attention to the practice of the προεκθέσεις or ἕκθεσις τῶν κεφαλαίων (important passages in an early Hellenistic author, Philo of Byzantium, Belopoĩika chs. 14 ff., 20), Regenbogen (1950) 1472 ff., ‘Inhaltsangaben, Kephalaiosieis, Kapitulationen’, Goulet-Cazé (1982) 315 ff. For the introductory essays of the In Remp. see further infra, section 1.5.
interpret it correctly' (περὶ τοῦ τίνα χρῆ καὶ πόσα πρὸ τῆς συναναγώσεως τῆς Πολιτείας Πλάτωνος κεφάλαια διαρθρῶσαι τοὺς όρθως ἐξηγουμένους αὐτήν). These headings are then described in some detail. Proclus adds that this is the 'model' (τύπος) pertinent to all Platonic dialogues, which he is now going to apply to the dialogue at issue: 'before the study of the Republic (πρὸ τῆς ἄναγνώσεως τῆς Πολιτείας, p. 5.38-9) seven questions must be dealt with'.

In the Aristotelian commentators who come after Proclus the ten general points are to be found in the introductions to their commentaries on the Categories. Eight of these questions are of particular interest in the context of the present inquiry, viz. (a) the issue of the different philosophical sects, or schools, (b) the systematic organization of the Aristotelian corpus as a whole and the classification of his writings, (c) the question of the treatise with which the course should begin, (d) Aristotle's mode of expression, or rather method of instruction (τρόπος τῆς διδασκαλίας), (e) the reason for the intentional obscurity of most of his acroamatic writings (διὰ τί ἀσάφειαν ἐπετήδευσεν, cf. e.g. Ammonius, In Cat. pp. 1.10, 25.13-5, Philoponus, In Cat. p.29.2, David (Elias), In Cat., pp. 124.25-5.2, esp. 124.32-31: ἐπίτηδεύει δὲ αὐτὴν διὰ τρεῖς αἰτίας: ἣ γάρ κρύψις χάριν ἢ δοκιμασίας ἢ γνώμης κτλ.), and two issues which are closely related to (e), viz. (f) the qualifications of the exegete or master and (g) the qualifications of his pupils, and finally (this being Proclus' last general point) (h)

30 For the technical term cf. e.g. the prescriptive τύποι περὶ θεολογίας at Plato, Resp. II 379a5.
31 See now I. Hadot (1990) 26 ff.
32 See infra, text to n. 44, to n. 209 and to n. 213.
33 See infra, text to n. 148 and to n. 149.
34 See I. Hadot (1990) 108 ff. (mode of expression, as she calls it), 113 ff. (unclearness or obscurity, for which see also Barnes (1992) 266 ff., and Olympiodorus, In Mete. p. 4.16 ff., who points out that according to some experts the first book of the Meteorology is not genuine because it is clear), 122 ff. (exegete, avoiding of sectarianism), 131 ff. (pupils). For the issues themselves see further below, chapter five, and for the topic of unclearness also Jones (1931) ix ff., “Intentional Obscurity in Ancient Writings”, A. S. Pease’s note on Cic., Nat. deor. II 74 (a selection of passages), and Erler (1991); cf. supra, n. 14 and text thereto for parallels in Origen, and see further infra, n. 36, n. 202, n. 275, n. 276, n. 282, n. 286, n. 291, n. 310. The earliest instance of the use of the formula ‘intentional obscurity’ is Arist., Athen. pol. 9.2, according to whom some people believed that Solon purposely formulated his laws in an unclear way, in order to put the power of decision in the hands of the dicastery and the people (ἐπὶ δὲ καὶ διὰ τὸ μὴ γεγραφθ’αι
what are the particular questions to be settled before one starts on the study of each individual treatise. The latter have already been listed in section 1.1 of the present chapter. Mme Hadot is of course right in pointing out that the parallels in Anon. in Theaet., Origen and Porphyry prove that some among these questions must have been features in the commentary literature three to four centuries before Proclus’ time, and Plezia already pointed to Porphyry. Boethius, who has pretensions of a literary sort, discusses in a standard but unsystematic way the issues listed under Proclus’ tenth general point,35 though he does not deal with the division into sections. The earliest surviving discussions which are both complete and rigorously scholastic are found in the introductory paragraphs of the In Isag., In Cat. and In De int. of Proclus’ pupil Ammonius, to be dated to the second half of the fifth century CE.

I do not know whether it has been noticed that (e), Aristotle’s obscurity, is already referred to by Galen as a well-known fact.36

35 See below, p. 193, complementary note 1, and Shiel (1990) 354 f., whose claim that Boethius’ full-fledged list derives from a source contemporary with or even a bit later than Proclus has however to be rejected.

36 The De captionibus is quoted according to the pagination of Edlow (1977) and Ebbesen (1981). Cf. further supra, n. 14, infra, n. 310 and text thereto. For Galen on stenography see De propriorum animi eiuslibit effectuum dignitione et curatione ch. 9.9, CMG V 4.1,1, p. 32.17, De praenotione ad Posthumum (Epigenem) XIV 630.6 ff. K., De libris propriis ch.1 (Scr. min. II, p. 95.24). The quotation from the Compendium Timaei is from the edition by Kraus–Walzer (1951). On Aristotle’s brevity as entailing obscurity see also Alexander, In Top. p. 239.14, ἀσαφῶς εὑρήκατα διὰ βραχυτητὰ οἱ τόποις. For Galen on the difficulty of Aristotle’s acroamatic works in general see De propriis plactionis IV 758.6-11 K., quoted infra, p. 203, complementary note 288. I have found no references to obscurity as a general mark of Plato’s style; what is at D.L. III 63, ὁνόμασι δὲ κέχρηται ποικίλος πρὸς τὸ μὴ εὐσύνοπτον εἶναι τοὺς ἀμαθεῖς τὴν πραγματείαν, cannot count as such but merely points at the need of a preliminary general education (cf. supra, n. 8). For τάχος in the sense of ‘brevity of treatment’ see e.g. Cic., Brutus 29, on Attic orators in the time of Thucydides: compressione rerum breves et ob eam ipsam causam interdum subobscuri, Horace, Ars poet. 25-6, brevis esse laboro, obscurus fio (though the right sort of brevity is advocated ibid., 335-6), Quintilian, X i.102, immortalem Sallusti velocitatem, Lucian, Quomodo historia conscribenda sit, 56.1, τάχος ἐπὶ πᾶσι χρήσιμον, and 57.20, on Thucydides, εἰσή ... τὸ τάχος καὶ ὡς φεύγοντος ὄμως

In his *On Fallacies* (*De captionibus penes dictionem*), ch. 1, he quotes a difficult sentence from the *De sophisticis elenchis* and comments, pp. 90.22-92.1 Edlow = 6.20-2 Ebbesen: ‘But it is the Philosopher’s [sc. Aristotle’s] custom to speak with such velocity [i.e. brevity] and to express many of his points as it were by (stenographic) signs, because he writes for those who have already read him’ (σύνήθες δὲ τὸ τοιοῦτον τάχος τῷ φιλοσόφῳ καὶ καθάπερ ἐπὶ σημείων ἐκφέρειν τὰ πολλὰ [καὶ bracketed by Edlow] διὰ τὸ πρὸς τοὺς ἄκηκοότας ἦδη γράφεσθαι). In what follows Galen points out that some of Aristotle’s commentators did not even attempt to explain this passage, while others failed. The obvious inference is that he found remarks about Aristotle’s obscurity in the (lost) commentary literature which he consulted. We must also adduce *Compendium Timaei* ch. 1.14-6, where Galen compares Plato’s style in the *Timaeus* with that in his other dialogues and that of Aristotle, and says that it is different both from the flowing richness of the former and from the ‘brief and dark style’ of the latter (*a constricto et obscuro sermone Aristotelis ... remotus*).

The assumption that Aristotle is obscure, or even intentionally obscure, in (most of) his acroamatic writings should make us pause. Aristotle himself insists that it is the virtue of a style to be clear, and that to achieve this end one should use ordinary verbs and nouns: *Rhet.* Γ 2.1404b1 ff., λέξεως ἀρετῆ σαφῆ εἶναι, ... τῶν δ’ όνομάτων καὶ ῥημάτων σαφῆ ... ποιεῖ τὰ κύρια, and *Poet.* 22.1458a17 ff., λέξεως δὲ ἀρετῆ σαφῆ ... εἶναι, σαφέστατη μὲν ὦν ἀπὸ ἕστιν ἢ ἐκ τῶν κυρίων όνομάτων. This is why he strives to be clear and easy to follow even when coining new terms (e.g. *Eth. Nic.* B 7.1108a18 f.). The Stoics shared this view; according to the standard account at D.L. VII 59, σαφήνεια is one of the five virtues of λόγος (*SVF* III, Diog. Bab. 24 = *FDS* 594; cf. also the quotations from grammatical treatises at *FDS* 595 and 595A). A substantial treatment of clarity is found in the discussion of the simple style at Demetrius, *De elocutione* 191-203 — starting with the remark μάλιστα δὲ σαφῆ χρῆ τὴν λέξιν εἶναι —, which contains a good deal of detailed and excellent advice on how to achieve this. The first prescription is that one should use ordinary words, the second that connective particles are a must, etc. But Theophrastus (fr. 696 Fortenbaugh, *ap. Demetr.* 222) added a rider to Aristotle’s

ἐπιλαμβάνεται αὐτοῦ τὰ γεγενημένα πολλὰ ὄντα.
view. He states that 'one ought not to elaborate everything in
detail, but leave some things to the reader, for when he notices
what you have left out he does not remain a mere reader but
becomes a participant'. This appeal to the understanding of the
reader provides an opening for his more or less independent
involvement with what is said, or written.\textsuperscript{36a}

Now those exegetes who declare an author to be obscure, or
even intentionally obscure, still see clarity as the goal, though
they believe that interpretation is needed to achieve it. Justifi­
cations have to be found for the author's motive for avoiding
clarity, or for his unintended obscurity. Various reasons may be
mentioned and brought forward in this connexion, for instance
the fact that the author's terminology is old-fashioned and conse­
quently difficult to understand, or that he writes for an inner
circle and therefore prefers not to be immediately accessible to
readers that are unprepared, or insufficiently prepared. Another
reason may be the difficulty of the subject-matter. Assumptions
of this nature allowed interpreters of the philosophical, medical
and scientific classics, but also biblical exegetes, to indulge in creative
interpretation.

This is a theme about which I shall say more in chapter five
below, though some examples have already been cited in the
preceding pages and footnotes. As for now we had better return to
the topic of the preliminary issues.

To the best of my knowledge it has not yet been observed that
the important formula 'before the reading-together of the work(s)
of \( x \)' itself is actually found as early as, again, Origen.\textsuperscript{37} Here it is
not a title, but beyond doubt derives from the context of a \textit{schema
isagogicum}. Concluding the lengthy prologue to his commentary
on the \textit{Gospel of John}, he says, \textit{In Ev. Ioann.} I 88: 'here we shall end
what comes before the reading in class of what has been written'
\( \text{αὐτὸῦ ποὺ καταπαύσωμεν τὰ πρὸ τῆς συναναγνώσεως τῶν γε-
γραμμένων – my emphasis} \). Also compare the similar formula at
\textit{In Cant. cant.}, prol. ch. 1.8, \textit{antequam ad ea quae in hoc libello scripta
sunt discutanda veniamus}. We may further point out that Theon of
Smyrna, who has to be dated to the time of the emperor Hadrian,

\textsuperscript{36a} See further Baltussen (1993) 42 with n. 110.
\textsuperscript{37} For the importance of Origen's evidence in this connexion see \textit{supra},
text to n. 5, n. 14 and text thereto.
compiled a book, still extant, which is entitled ‘What is Useful in Mathematics for the Study of Plato’ (τῶν κατὰ τὸ μαθηματικῶν χρησίμων εἰς τὴν Πλάτωνος ἀνάγνωσιν). We may note the emphasis on utility in this title as well the fact that the study of the relevant parts of mathematics is a preliminary propaedeutic to that of Plato, though the book itself shows no traces of the use of a schema isagogicum. Such a trace, however, is found in a crabbed statement in the proem of Plutarch of Athens’ pupil Hierocles, In Aureum Pythagoreorum carmen commentarius, pp. 6.26-7.1: ‘And this is the aim (σκοπός) of the [Pythagorean] verses and the position (τάξις), viz. to produce a philosophical character in the pupils before the other readings (πρὸ τῶν ἠλλῶν ἀναγνωσμάτων).’ The place of the Χροσᾶ ἔπι in the order of study according to Hierocles is that they fulfill the role of a sort of Πρὸ τῆς ἀναγνώσεως before the study of the works of Aristotle and Plato can commence, and do so by morally purifying the pupils’ souls.38

The study of a text in class under the direction of a master is attested for a surprisingly early date thanks to the carbonized remains of one of Philodemus’ works found at Herculaneum. From a fragment of a letter of Epicurus (Epic. fr. 104 Arrighetti) quoted at Philodemus, Ad contubernales fr. 116.4-8, it appears that Nausiphanes, whose classes Epicurus attended in his youth, is accused of a hyper-interpretation of the works of Anaxagoras and Empedocles which apparently he used to read with his pupils: τοῦ σοφιστεύσα[ν]τος τὰν[α]ξιογόρου ἀναγι[ν]όσκοντος καὶ Ἐμπεδο[τά]κλέους ταῖς ταῦτα τ[ε]πρῆ[ν]ν[υ]ο]μένου κατατεταμένως[;]39 but in this case we know nothing of a reading order, let alone of preliminary questions. According to Cicero, De oratore I 37,

38 On Theon of Smyrna’s compilation see I. Hadot (1984) 69 ff. Because in this tract he cites a book by Thrasyllus, it is possible that his title echoes that of another book of the latter, viz. the Before the Study of the Dialogues of Plato, see infra, n. 158 and text thereto (cf. also infra, n. 102, n. 111). Praechter (1909b) 48 already noticed the presence of preliminary issues in the Hierocles passage. On the propaedeutic function of the study of the Χροσᾶ ἔπι see I. Hadot (1978) 160 ff. The Arabic version, with German transl. and comm., of the until now lost commentary of Lamblichus on this work will be published in Verhandelingen KNAW by H. Daiber, Neuplatonische Pythagorica in arabischem Gewande: Der Kommentar Lamblichs zum <<Carmen aureum>>. That of Proclus has been published by Linley (1984); see the important review by Daiber (1988) and the comments of Westerink (1987).

39 Quoted from the ed. by Angeli (1988) who in my view rightly translates, ibid. 190, “che sofisticava leggendo i libri” etc. ἀναγι[ν]όσκοντος is a durative participle. See further below, p. 193, complementary note 3.
Crassus, while a student at Athens, read Plato’s *Gorgias* under the direction of the Academic philosopher Charmadas; he may, or may not, have been (or have been pictured as being) a private pupil.

Furthermore, I have always believed that the fictitious situation described in Plato’s *Parmenides*, where Zeno of Elea reads his book to a selected audience, which then discusses part of its contents and the further issues arising therefrom during the conversation reported in the dialogue itself, especially in the part directed by the old master, Parmenides, is a splendid travesty of the reading of a text in class, that is to say of a seminar or a series of seminars, and of the stimulating discussion that is part of or follows upon such seminars. Just imagine listening to Zeno reading all his paradoxes at one sitting! We may also think of the fictional series of seminars under the direction of Antiochus of Ascalon during which the two volumes of Philo of Larissa’s *Sosus* were read and discussed according to Cicero, *Lucullus* 11 ff.

### 1.4 Proclus’ Introduction to the Study of Plato

The so-called *Anonymous Prolegomena to Platonic Philosophy*, to be dated to the later sixth century CE, provide information concerned with ten (or eleven, if the *bios* is included) preliminary matters to be treated and discussed before the study of Plato’s works may begin: the προτέλεια τῶν τοῦ Πλάτωνος διαλόγων (§ 27.1) or προτέλεια τῆς συναναγνώσεως τῆς Πλάτωνος φιλοσοφίας (§ 28.1, cf. § 28.16). Plezia and Westerink have argued that the greater part of this list, viz. the ten points minus the *bios*, goes back to a work by Proclus.40 The title of this book will have been something like Τὰ πρὸ τῆς ἀναγνώσεως τῶν τοῦ Πλάτωνος διαλόγων.41 The evidence on which this attribution is based is found in the *In Alcibiadem*; at § 10.4 ff., Proclus refers to what he has said ‘elsewhere’ (καὶ ἐν ἄλλοις) about the dialogues in general. Each

---

40 Plezia (1949) 86 ff.; Westerink (1962) xli (and (1990b) lxxv), who excludes the *bios*. See also I. Hadot (1990) 31 ff., who believes that this scheme too may derive from what she calls the Συνανάγγεια, but Plezia (1949) 70 ff., 86 ff., and Westerink (1990b) lvi ff. are in my view right in assuming that Proclus’ introductions to Aristotle and Plato were two distinct works. As a title, Westerink suggests Ὑποτύπωσις τῆς Πλάτωνος φιλοσοφίας, admitting though that this is hypothetical.

41 Cf. supra, n. 28 and text thereto.
dialogue has to be analogous to 'the All' in five respects: there must be something analogous to (1) the Good, (2) the Intellect, (3) the Soul, (4) the 'form' (ἐἶδος) and (5) the matter. In this other work, Proclus says, he has argued that becoming like God is analogous to the Good, self-knowledge to the Intellect, the multitude of proofs to the Soul, the character of expression and other literary aspects to the form, and the persons,\(^{42}\) the time and 'what some people call the hypothesis'\(^{43}\) to the matter. 'These are to be found in every dialogue'. The last of these is the fifth preliminary issue to be treated at Anon. proleg. §§ 16-7 (where a sixth ingredient is added, 'nature'). At In Alc. § 11.15 ff. Proclus again says that he has given 'particular' attention to preliminary issues 'elsewhere' (προηγουμένως ἐν ἄλλοις), viz. to the ten + two dialogues of Iamblichus' canon and their arrangement (ὁποῖς αὕτοις προσήκει τάττειν). This corresponds with the tenth preliminary issue as treated at Anon. proleg. §§ 24-6. Here we are further told (§ 25) that Proclus declared the Epinomis to be spurious and put the Letters, Republic and Laws in a separate class, so thirty-two were left from the original thirty-six dialogues of the (rejected) tetralogical arrangement. As to these, only the order of study of the twelve dialogues of the Iamblichean canon, beginning with the Greater Alcibiades and ending with the Parmenides, is said to be relevant.

The majority of the issues discussed in the Anon. proleg. are paralleled to a greater or lesser degree by the headings in the late commentaries on Aristotle, but some among them are only relevant in relation to Plato. Those that are of particular interest in the context of the present inquiry are the following: (α), Anon. proleg. §§ 7-12: a discussion of the various philosophical sects in relation to Plato's doctrines;\(^{44}\) (β), Anon. proleg. §§ 14-5: why did Plato choose the dialogue form;\(^{45}\) (γ), Anon. proleg. § 18: did he take the titles of his dialogues from the persons involved (πρόσωπα) or from the contents (πράγματα); (δ), Anon. proleg. 19: what is the division into chapters; and (ε), Anon. proleg. §§ 21-3: what are the

---

\(^{42}\) This (allegorical) interpretation of the dramatis persona already had a long history; see supra, n. 7 and text thereto, infra, n. 134 and text thereto.

\(^{43}\) Presumably the 'dramatic setting' (for which Proclus himself as a rule uses δραματικὴ διασκεδή, but see infra, text to n. 57).

\(^{44}\) For the sects cf. supra, n. 92 and text thereto.

\(^{45}\) For the issue of the genre compare Donatus' causa, infra text before n. 77, and Servius' qualitas, infra, text to n. 81. For the question of the dialogue form and its history see further infra, text to n. 176.
rules for establishing the σκοπός, a section which includes a discussion of the rationale of the double titles. The issue of the sequence (τάξις) of the dialogues, which includes the question of the first work to be studied, has already been mentioned above. Because he rejected the Epinomis, Proclus also dealt with the question of the γνήσιον, as we have noticed; Anon. proleg. § 25 further states that the Definitions and four (extra-tetralogic) dialogues are considered spurious by everybody.

Mme Hadot, discussing the evidence of the Anon. proleg. and the In Alc., and referring to passages in Proclus' Platonic commentaries and in those of Olympiodorus, Hermias and Damascius, rigorously separates the general from the particular introductory questions and argues that the complete list of preliminary questions in the introductory sections of the commentaries to individual Platonic dialogues contained (or could contain) eight points. But this appears to be a case of hyper-systematization. From the overview given above it may have become clear that it is not always easy to distinguish between general and particular issues in the case of the information provided by the Anon. proleg., or rather that most of the general issues are also relevant for the treatment of an individual dialogue.

Mme Hadot further argues, rightly, I think, that the classes on Aristotle and Plato will have started with the reading of a bios. In this context, we may observe that according to the careful notes of the reportatores of Olympiodorus' exegesis of the Greater Alcibiades, i.e. the first dialogue of the Platonic curriculum, the master, after a few general remarks, began with a life of Plato (here called γένος), which took up about half the first lecture (πρῶτον) and preceded the discussion of the preliminary questions pertaining to the aim etc. of this particular work (Olympiodorus, In Alc. §§ 2.14-3.1, i.e. about 150 lines). The Anon. prol., as we have seen, makes the bios of Plato a part of the introduction itself.

1.5 Proclus' Commentaries on Plato

Proclus' own practice is less scholastic, or schematic, than that recorded in the Anon. proleg, though not less systematic. We may

---

46 I. Hadot (1990) 31 ff., 46 f. See also Festugièrè (1971b).
47 I. Hadot (1990) 27 f. Düring (1957) 112 argues that the tendency of the bios of Aristotle presupposed by Ammonius and Olympiodorus can be reconstructed. For the bios to be found before editions see infra, n. 185, n. 187.
start with the *In Platonis Rempublicam*, which according to Marinus, *Vita Procli* ch. 13, he wrote at the age of twenty-seven (he later revised it). The first item on its table of contents, which is also the title of the first essay, is about the preliminary issues that have to be discussed before the *συνανάγνωσις* of the dialogue. It has been quoted above.\(^{48}\) Proclus explains — and in this way provides us with important information regarding his lost predecessors — that the 'introductions' (*προλόγους*, I, p. 5.6 Kroll) to the Platonic dialogues should steer a middle course. One should not follow the example of the numerous exegetes who baldly state the 'problem with which the work is concerned' (*τὸ πρόβλημα περὶ οὗ ὁ λόγος*, p. 5.14). Other Platonists had done too much and overloaded their 'considerations which come before the text' (*ἐν τοῖς πρὸ τῆς λέξεως σκέψεις*, p. 5.16-7) with polemics against the views of others. What one should offer one's pupils are five things, viz. (a) the 'theme of each (dialogue)'\(^{49}\) which as we shall see includes the issue of its title, (b) its 'genre' i.e. its character, (c) its 'material component' i.e. what pertains to persons, places, and times, (d) the 'doctrines', and (e) the 'subject of the discussions which pervades the work as a whole' (*τῇ πρόθεσιν ... ἐκάστου, τὸ εἴδος, τῇ ὑλῇ, τὰ δόγματα, ... τὴν δὲ ὁλοκληρωματικὸν διήκουσαν τῶν λóγων ὑπόθεσιν*, p. 5.21-3). This is the 'model' which Proclus says he is now going to apply to the *Republic* (p. 5.26-7).

'Before the study of the *Republic* (*πρὸ τῆς ἀναγνώσεως τῆς Πολιτείας*, 5.38-9) seven issues must be dealt with (pp. 5.28-7.4): (i = (a)) the aim (*σκοπός*), which is to be established according to the rules; (ii = (b)) the genre, an issue which as he says will be clear to those who remember what and how many are the genres of the Platonic dialogues; and (iii = (c)) the material component, which will be shown to be in agreement with the aim (*σκοπός*) of the dialogue. The remaining issues (iv-vii) are to some extent a blend of (d) and (e). Because (iv) most of the discussion is *περὶ πολιτείας*, a division of the constitutions to be found in Plato's whole *œuvre* has to be set out, and one has to establish which constitution is dealt with in the present work. Next (v) the only

\(^{48}\) See supra, text to n. 27.

constitution which conforms to reason has to be studied, and one should try to establish whether there are one or many of these, and if many, how many, and which these are. Then (vi) we have to find out in how many ways Plato desires us to regard the selected constitution, and to inquire whether his treatment is perhaps incomplete. The last issue, viz. (vii), deals with the 'consistency of the doctrines which pervades the work as a whole' (τὴν δὲ ὅλον τοῦ συγγράμματος διήκουσαν τῶν δογμάτων ἀκολουθίαν, p. 6.24-5). This will show us how many 'chapters' there are (τὸ πλῆθος τῶν κεφαλαίων, p. 7.1-2); their ordering will become clear, and we shall see how they all tend towards the same aim (σκοπός).

These seven issues were treated at considerable length, for the first two essays of Proclus' work were devoted to them. Unfortunately the whole second essay and part of the first have been lost. All that survives of this discussion are the sections dealing with the aim and genre (or character) of the dialogue, and the first half of the section dealing with the material component, the section dealing with the persons being lost. It is however clear from the summary at the beginning that the last issue included a discussion of the division of the dialogue into its natural and coherent parts.

In his extensive treatment of the first issue (pp. 7.5-14.14), the one concerned with the aim (σκοπός, p. 7.6) or theme (πρόθεσις, p. 7.9), Proclus discusses various suggestions that have been made. This involves the issue of the title — in the present case both that of the first and that of the second title of the dialogue. Some exegetes argue that the theme is justice (περὶ δικαιοσύνης); Proclus lists their arguments but curiously enough fails to put on record that they could have appealed (or actually did appeal) to the dialogue's second or thematic title, viz. Περὶ δικαιού. Others, pointing out that the discussion concerning justice is preliminary, argue that the real theme is the constitution (πολιτεία) and appeal to the title (ἐπιγραφή), which in fact is very old (p. 8.10-1), for Πολιτεία — i.e. the first title — is found in both Aristotle and Theophrastus. An interesting discussion of first titles attributable to

50 These terms are used interchangeably by Proclus, cf. e.g. In Alcib. §§ 6.6, 7.17, 10.1-3, 11.1, In Tim. 1, pp. 1.1, 1.17, 4.6.
51 On these titles see chapter two, section 4.
Plato himself follows, during which it is also pointed out that some titles will surely have been added at a later date. One of the implications, presumably, is that the second title Περὶ δικαίου is believed to be later and therefore to lack authority according to these ‘others’. In the course of his report, Proclus distinguishes between titles which are derived from the contents (πράγματα) or main issue (προηγούμενον ζήτημα), e.g. Sophist and Politicus, those which are derived from persons, e.g. Alcibiades and Phaedo, and those which are derived from external circumstances, e.g. Symposium. Proclus' compromise solution is that the σκοπός of the dialogue includes both the constitution and justice, because justice in the soul is what the constitution is in the body politic. The (first) title has been chosen by Plato because the word constitution is more familiar than the word justice (p. 14.11-2). We may note that Proclus skilfully includes the information to be derived from the thematic second title which he fails to mention.

As to the second issue, the genre of the dialogue, Proclus argues that there are three, viz. the dramatic, undramatic and mixed genres, and that the Republic belongs with the third. This division is put on a par with the (traditional) one advocated by 'some among the Platonists', who divide the genres into one 'for instruction', one 'for inquiry' and one that is mixed.

Matters are different in the prologues of the other commentaries on Plato by Proclus that are extant (or largely extant), because the ‘model’ is not applied in a strict way. That of the In Alcibiadem discusses three preliminary issues at length, viz. the aim or theme of the work (§§ 6.15-10.23 Segonds; Proclus rejects other views than the one he proposes himself, viz. knowledge of our essence), its position in the order of study of the dialogues, viz. as the first dialogue to be studied (§ 11.1-17), and its division into parts, that is to say into three chapters or κεφάλαία and ten syllogisms (§§ 11.22-18.12; other proposals are again rejected).

At § 10.4 ff., however, Proclus refers to what he has said 'elsewhere’ about the dialogues in general, viz. that each dialogue has to be analogous to 'the All' in five respects. Interestingly enough, this scheme is not worked out in detail. Proclus only says that the

---

52 Cf. infra, n. 124.
53 See below, chapter two, section 5.
54 These are the only ones listed by Segonds (1985) xlix ff.
55 Cf. supra, text to n. 42 and n. 43.
aim of the present dialogue is the achievement of the knowledge of our own essence (§ 10.16-7). We may observe that this aspect of the work corresponds with the second analogy cited above, viz. that with the Intellect in the All. Accordingly, the issue of the σκοπός, though variously relevant to each particular dialogue, is a general preliminary issue. Proclus continues by stating that ‘just as with the (supreme) Causes the Intellect depends on the Good’, so also here the theme of the inquiry, i.e. self-knowledge, is linked with its ultimate goal. The analogy with Soul is beyond doubt provided by the ten syllogisms in which Proclus divides the dialogue (§§ 14.20-18.12). But its so-called form and especially its matter do not receive separate treatment. This constitutes a major and surprising difference with the introductory sections of the In Remp. and, as we shall see, with those of the In Tim. and In Parm., but the bare fact that Proclus mentions them is evidence that these preliminary issues could have been treated at some length. Another difference is more easily explained; the Republic, unlike the Alcibiades, does not belong with the ten dialogues of the canon of Iamblichus. The question of the order of study is not a general preliminary issue that is pertinent to all dialogues, because only ten + two are studied in succession.

We may be more brief about the In Cratylum; only excerpts are extant, which makes this commentary slightly difficult to gauge. But Proclus at any rate discussed the σκοπός (In Crat. § i Pasquali) and, apparently, its ‘form’ or character, for he states that it is λογικὸς τε κοι διαλεκτικὸς (In Crat. § ii). He also treated the persons (In Crat. §§ x, xix).

Turning now to the In Timaeum, we find that Proclus begins with a leisurely discussion of the aim (πρόθεσις) of the dialogue —in other words with what is on the level of the Intellect which in its turn depends on the Good (I, p. 1.4-4.7 Diehl). This involves its traditional second title, ‘On Nature’, though not explicitly; the title Περὶ φύσεως of the Pythagorean forgery [ps.]Timaeus (accepted as a genuine early tract by Proclus) is however cited in a prominent position (p. 1.9). Though the terminology is not used, what follows is in fact a discussion of a division into (three) parts (pp. 4.7-7.16; called οίκονομία at p. 9.26). Next is a treatment of its

56 I have used the reprint of Pasquali’s Teubneriana with Italian transl. and a few comments by Romano (1989).
eīδος and χαρακτήρ (pp. 7.17-8.29), i.e. the fourth level of analogy cited above. This is described as a blend of the Pythagorean and the Socratic which is said to embrace all the main parts of philosophy. We then come to the fifth level of analogy: the dramatic setting(s) and time which Proclus here calls by the name of ὑπόθεσεις57 (pp. 8.30-9.24), and the persons (p. 9.28). But Proclus refrains from discussing the latter topic and instead provides a long exposition of what φύσις means in Plato and others. There is however a note which has to do with the order of reading, since we are told that according to the divine Iamblichus the whole of Plato’s philosophy is encapsulated in the Timaeus and Parmenides (p. 13.14-7).58

By contrast, the prologue to the In Parmenidem, which comes after the introductory prayer, begins at the fifth level. First the δραματικῆ διασκευή, a lengthy synopsis of the contents of the dialogue which includes an analysis of its various locations (pp. 618.21-27.39 Cousin). In the course of this exposition, we encounter a reference to what according to ‘some’ is the (second) title of the dialogue, viz. Περὶ ιδεῶν (p. 626.3-4, cf. p. 630.26-8). Then the allegorical interpretation of the persons (pp. 628.1-630.10); these are linked up with the various parts of the All, Parmenides being analogous to the First Intellect, Zeno to the Second Intellect, and so on. This time, therefore, the general rule that aspects of a dialogue should be analogous to various hypostases of the All is applied to the persons, both those speaking and those listening; the settings of the various stages of the reportage of the original conversation are included. Though we started at the fifth level of analogy we now are in fact at levels two to five. The σκοπός (or πρόθεσις) is discussed at extraordinary length (pp. 630.22-45.8). This discussion includes a treatment of other preliminary issues. We learn that some people are of the opinion that the (second) title Περὶ ιδεῶν does not square with the contents and the persons (pp. 633.14-6). They argue that the aim of the dialogue is logical training (λογικῆς ... γυμνασίας τὴν πρόθεσιν, p. 634.6-7, cf. p. 635.28-9, λογικὸν ... τὸν σκοπὸν), and divide it into three main parts or ‘chapters’ (κεφάλαια), viz. first the introductory discussion of the problems regarding the Ideas, secondly the brief instruction in

57 Cf. supra, n. 43 and text thereto.
58 See infra, n. 150 and text thereto.
the method of inquiry to be followed, and thirdly Parmenides’ demonstration of the application of this method (p. 634.6-12). Others again argue that the inquiry is ‘about Being’ (περὶ τοῦ ὄντος, p. 635.35-6: an alternative second title). Proclus concludes that ‘the ancients’ (οἱ ... παλαιοί) disagreed about the aim of the dialogue (p. 640.17-8), and continues with a substantial account of the σκοπός according to Syrianus (pp. 640.19-5.8). Its character is analyzed next (pp. 645.9-647.22). A lengthy excursus follows, which deals with the various senses of ‘dialectic’ (pp. 647.23-58.31), and the introduction is concluded with a brief paragraph which lists various approaches to the introductory passages of the dialogue (including the one preferred by Proclus) and emphasizes the unity of the Parmenides (pp. 658.32-9.23).

Proclus’ grand manner as displayed in these introductions is different from the practice of the later scholastic commentators on Plato. The In Remp. is an exception to the extent that it is explicit about the preliminary issues to be treated. But even this introduction is quite different from the prolegomena found in the commentaries by others. The reason for the exceptional explicitness of the In Remp. may be that this dialogue did not belong to the Iamblichean canon and so may have been read with a different, i.e. more general, audience. It is at any rate noteworthy that Proclus says right at the start ‘I shall demonstrate also to you (καὶ ὑμῖν), using only the Republic, what structure prologues to Platonic dialogues should have’ (p. 5.6 ff., my emphasis).58a We may interpret this as further confirmation of the evidence that a separate and general introduction to the Iamblichean curriculum was read to professional students.

The differences with the later commentators become clear if we look at some examples. In the short introduction to his In Alcibiadem, Olympiodorus in a scholastic way discusses four points, viz. the σκοπός (various views are described at some length, §§ 3.3-9.18 Westerink), the χρήσιμον (§§ 9.23-10.17), the τάξις (§§ 10.18-11.6, first the Alcibiades, last the Parmenides) and the division into three κεφάλαια (§§ 11.7-12.16). In his In Gorgiam, he first discusses the general question why Plato wrote dialogues at

---

58a The twelve essays which form the main body of the In Remp., viz. nrs. 1-5 + 7-8 + 10-12 + 14-15, constitute a simple Eisagoge to Plato’s dialogue, see Sheppard (1980) 34 ff., 203 f.
all (Prol. § 1 Westerink), and then lists (Prol. § 2) and treats in succession five preliminary questions (δει δὲ ζητήσαι πρὸ τοῦ διαλόγου πρῶτον μὲν κτλ.). These are first the δραματική διασκευή (Prol. § 3), secondly the various views of the σκοπός, the discussion of which includes one of the various ἐπιγραφαί that were used or had been proposed as alternatives, thirdly the division into three parts concerned with Gorgias, Polus and Callicles respectively (Prol. § 6), which includes a remark of about the τάξις τῶν διαλόγων (the order is Alcibiades — Gorgias — Phaedo), fourth the persons and their analogical interpretation (Prol. § 8), and finally the question how Plato came to write a Gorgias (Prol. § 9). Or consider Damascius, who in his In Philebum successively but very briefly discusses, firstly, various views concerning the σκοπός, the first of which depends on the ἐπιγραφή, viz. the second title (Prol. §§ 1-6 Westerink), secondly the division into parts (Prol. § 7), thirdly the interpretation of the persons (Prol. § 8), and finally several issues pertinent to this particular dialogue.

1.6 Proclus' Commentary on Euclid

I have also briefly looked at Proclus' In primum librum Euclidis Elementorum commentarii. To the best of my knowledge the prolegomena to this work has never been compared with those to the commentaries on Plato. It is interesting for a number of reasons, not the least important among which is the fact that it deals not only with a particular work but also with an entire discipline.

When one has progressed more than half-way through the second prologue of the In Euclidem, one finds that this time Proclus devotes what follows to a discussion of introductory particular issues according to a more or less rigorous schema. The σκοπός is discussed at p. 70.19 ff. Friedlein, the ἐπιγραφή at p. 71.27 ff. (with a substantial excursus on the meaning of 'element'), and the χρήσιμον is mentioned at p. 74.10 ff. (Euclid's treatise is said to be better than works on the same subject by others). Again, the aim (both σκοπός and πρόθεσις) and the division into parts of book I of the Elements are mentioned at p. 81.24 ff., the former being discussed at p. 81.26 ff. and the division εἰς τρία μέγιστα τμῆματα at p. 83.7 ff. Its particular σκοπός however is not discussed here but at the end of the commentary, p. 432.5 ff., where it is said to be the study of the simplest rectilinear figures. Authenticity apparently
is not an issue. A brief biographical paragraph dealing with Euclid is found in this prologue before the discussion of these preliminary points (pp. 68.6-9.4); it is concerned with his date, his philosophical allegiance (he is said to be a Platonist), and his many books. But no formal catalogue is provided; Proclus mentions six titles only. Some of the works listed are now lost, whereas others not mentioned here are extant. The *Elements* is of course included, and Proclus speaks at some length of the methodological qualities of this major treatise. The sixth work on the list is the (lost) *Pseudarion*, in which Euclid purportedly collected and discussed fallacious arguments in order to help the beginning student (p. 70.1 ff.). This work according to Proclus is 'for purification and training',59 which presumably refers to what he believes to be a proper order of study for beginning mathematicians (though not for philosophers): first the *Pseudarion*, then the *Elements*. A remark about what later came to be called the intention of the author is an interesting ingredient in this section: purportedly, Euclid's ultimate goal (τέλος) was the construction of the so-called Platonic bodies (p. 68.22 ff.).

In the first prologue of this commentary and in the first half of the second prologue, Proclus discusses more general introductory issues, viz. the status of mathematics as a science and that of its objects from a Neoplatonist philosophical point of view, as well as its utility (p. 20.8 ff.) in relation to the sub-disciplines of philosophy, viz. theology, physics, political and moral philosophy, and to other arts such as rhetoric. He further speaks at length of the qualities the mathematician — and so, we may add, the teacher of mathematics as well — should be required to have (p. 32.21 ff.). Various divisions of the mathematical sciences into sub-disciplines are discussed next (p. 35.17 ff.), as is that of geometry into plane geometry and stereometry (p. 39.7 ff., followed by a description of the various disciplines in which mathematics is an indispensable ingredient). In the second prologue the subject is geometry and the *Elements*. Geometry is said to be a part of general mathematics, second only to arithmetic (p. 48.9 ff.). The utility of geometry for those who learn it is discussed p. 49.3 ff. (ἡ ἀφέλεια ἢ ἀτίς αὐτῆς καὶ τὸ ἀγαθόν, ὃπερ εἰς τοὺς μανθάνοντας παραγίνεται; cf. also p. 63.7 ff.). The discussion of the ontic status

59 See also Proclus, *In Crat.* § ii and cf. *supra*, n. 8.
of the objects of geometry and its epistemic status as a science, which comes next, recalls that concerned with general mathematics in the first prologue. A history of the discipline up to Euclid is provided (p. 64.8 ff.). What follows has already been briefly described above.

What is interesting about these two long prologues (with their numerous philosophical excursuses to which we have by no means done justice here) are not only the parallels for a quite large number of individual and general issues of the later schemata isagogica pertaining to the study of Aristotle and, to a lesser extent, Plato. It is the distinction between general and particular issues, absent from the commentaries on Plato, which claims our attention. We may even be tempted to believe that Proclus here follows an already established model more closely. However this may be, the study of these prologues furthers our understanding of Proclus' introductory works on Aristotle and Plato, which—just as his introductions to his Platonic commentaries—will have been much richer philosophically and certainly less dry than one perhaps would believe on the basis of the more summary and scholastic accounts or even abstracts found in the works of his later and late followers. In this context it is quite instructive to compare the dry-as-dust scholastic treatment of mathematics at Elias, Prolegomena philosophiae pp. 60.13-5.9, which is divided into five kepalaia, viz. (1) how many and which species of mathematics there are, (2) why there are as many species as there are, (3) what is their order, (4) who discovered them, and (5) which disciplines are subordinated to the mathematical species.

What is outstandingly interesting too is that, to use Quintilian's well-known formula, the triad de arte (at length), de opifice (very briefly) and de opere (again at length) forms the backbone of Proclus' long and substantial introduction to the Elements of Euclid.60

---

60 Quintilian, Institut. II xiv.5. On the structure of ancient works dealing with an art or discipline see further Dahlmann (1953) 12 ff., also for references to earlier literature, Fuhrmann (1960) 144 ff., Dahlmann (1963) 28 ff., Brink (1963) 21 ff., 36 ff. (interesting criticisms of Dahlmann and his predecessors), Homeyer (1965) 63 ff., Dahlmann (1970) 4 ff., and Kollesch (1973) 13 ff. As a rule, Proclus' In Euclid. has not been adduced in this context. Cf. also infra, text to n. 94.
1.7 Precedents in Earlier Literature on Aristotle and Demosthenes

Interesting contributions to the discussion on the history of the preliminary schemata have been made by Lossau and Moraux. Alexander of Aphrodisias, like Porphyry, does not rigorously apply a scholastic scheme. Nevertheless he deals in his extant commentaries on Aristotle’s treatises with their position in the corpus (ταξις) and structure (the later διαιρεσις into sections). He occasionally discusses the importance, or utility, of the treatise (χρήσιμον), and he deals several times with the title (the question of the ἐπιγραφή) and the author’s purpose. Moraux adverts to the fact that Alexander, in his lost commentary on the De interpretatione, argued at some length against Andronicus of Rhodes (first century BCE), the famous editor of the Aristotelian corpus, who had denied that the treatise is authentic. So when need arose Alexander too handled the question of the γνήσιον (he also did so in other cases than the present one).

Moraux further argues that Andronicus already dealt with what the Neoplatonists called purpose, order, explanation of the title, authenticity and division into parts, and that what we find in the late commentators ultimately derives from him; this was already proposed by Littig in 1894. There are indeed indications

---

61 Lossau (1964).
62 Moraux (1973) 81 ff.; cf. also the convenient summary of his views on the methods of the commentators in Moraux (1986b).
63 For references see Praechter (1909b) 46, Moraux (1973) 82 f. [and (1986b) 132 ff.], who further points out, 83 n. 87 (references provided), that the Peripatetic scholar Boethus of Sidon — to be dated to the late first century BCE/the early first century CE, i.e. presumably to the generation after Andronicus; on him see Moraux (1973) 143 ff., with the corrections of Tarán (1981) 733 f., 743 ff.—, Alexander of Aegae, a court philosopher of the emperor Nero, see Moraux (1984) 222 ff., Sosigenes, a teacher of Alexander of Aphrodisias, to be dated to ca. 150 CE, see Moraux (1984) 335 ff., and Herminus, another teacher of Alexander of Aphrodisias, see Moraux (1984) 361 ff., discussed the purpose of the Categories, and that Adrastus of Aphrodisias, mid-second century CE, see Moraux (1984) 294 ff., dealt with the titles of the Categories and Physics. Adrastus also wrote a book dealing with the arrangement of Aristotle’s writings, see Simpl. In Cat. pp. 15.36 ff. and 18.16 (cf. Moraux (1984) 314 ff., Donini (1982) 53). The prologues to Galen’s Hippocratic commentaries should be compared, see chapter four below.
64 Moraux (1973) 117 ff.; see also Moraux (1974) 271 ff. and (1986b) 137 ff., where other discussions concerned with authenticity in Alexander and other commentators on Aristotle are conveniently reported. See further below, pp. 194 f., complementary note 64.
65 Littig (1894) 19 ff., Moraux (1973) 66 ff., 70 ff., and 84 f. with references
that in individual cases Andronicus dealt with the division of treatises into main sections (*Categories, Physics*) but we do not know whether he also treated the detailed division into smaller units, viz. books or chapters etc., which we find in the late commentators. The inference that he will have provided explanations for the titles given to his combinations of individual books and/or smaller sets of books into one treatise (for instance the *Topics;* in the early catalogue in Diogenes Laërtius each book has a different title) is virtually unavoidable, but this is a different matter from the justification of a transmitted or traditional title. He may of course have justified his preference for one such title over another. As to the general introductory issues it is indeed highly plausible that he explained his systematic classification of the treatises, but one cannot exclude that he took an ordering according to a variety of the standard Hellenistic division and subdivisions of philosophy for granted and began with the *Organon* for this

(not however for purpose or utility), but he fails to appeal to evidence beyond the pale of ancient Aristotelian studies. See further below, pp. 195 f., complementary note 65.

66 For Andronicus on the title and the division into two main parts of the *Categories* (the second of which, the so-called *Postpraedicamenta,* he according to Moraux (1973) 65, 99, believed to have been added to the first by someone else) see the evidence in Boethius, *In Cat., PL* 64, p. 263B, as reconstructed by Shiel (1957) 183, which as he points out (184 f.) is confirmed by Simplicius, *In Cat.* p. 379.6 ff. For the division of the *Physics* and the titles of its two parts—five books of *Φυσικά,* three books *Περί κυνήγιος*—see Simplic., *In Phys.* p. 923.8 ff. (T 75 m in Düring (1957) 417 with the comments of Moraux (1973) 65, 115 f.; Simplicius says οὕτω ... καὶ Ἀνδρόνικος ἐν τῷ τρίτῳ τῶν Ἀριστοτέλους βιβλίων διατάττεται (my emphasis).

67 See *infra,* text to n. 191 and to n. 192, and Moraux (1973) 60 ff., and (1986b) 131. Against Moraux’s claim that Andronicus is the inventor of the late *schema isagogicum* see the convincing remarks of Tarán (1981) 736 ff.

68 According to Philoponus, *In Cat.* p. 5.18 ff. (printed by Düring (1957) 418 as T 75 n), and David (Elias; see *supra,* n. 27), *In Cat.* p. 117.22-24, ‘logic’, i.e. the logical part of philosophy, came first. Philoponus adds a purported motive: Andronicus ... ἀκριβεστέρον ἔξετάζων ἔλεγε χρήσαι πρότερον ἀπὸ τῆς λογικῆς ἀρχεῖαι, ἦτις περὶ τὴν ἀπόδειξιν καταγίνεται. Gottschalk (1990) 66 paraphrases “the basic rules of argument”, but ἀπόδειξις means ‘proof’ so should pertain to the *Analytis.* Philoponus at any rate cannot be quoted in support of the view that Andronicus’ edition began with the *Categories,* though it will probably have done so according to a Stoicizing order beginning with the Aristotelian equivalents of the *λεκτα ἐλληπτή* (see D.L. VII 52 ff.). Because Andronicus believed the *De interpretatione* (dealing with the equivalents of the *λεκτα σὐντοτελή* and *ἀξιωματα*) to be inauthentic, it is a bit of a problem where he put it; perhaps he nevertheless placed it between the *Categories* and the *Analytis* (dealing with the equivalents of the Stoic *λόγοι*), adding a reference to his discussion of the status of this little treatise
reason only. This would entail that he need not have been very specific about his motives for beginning with one of the logical works. However this may be, Moraux' claim that the \textit{schema isagogicum} concerning the individual treatises found in the late commentators ultimately derives from Andronicus is hardly cogent. We really know too little about his \textit{Pinakes}. Düring, who argued that there is no evidence that this work contained a \textit{bios} of Aristotle,\footnote{Düring (1957) 422.} is prepared to believe (though this is very far from certain) that the so-called Ptolemy in his \textit{vita}, extant only in Arabic, quotes Aristotle's will from Andronicus.\footnote{Düring (1957) 422, 470; \textit{ibid.}, 239, 424, he laboriously suggests that a text of the will was among the papers from the famous cellar at Skepsis and added by Andronicus in an appendix, but how do we know?} But the only proper place for a will is in a \textit{bios}.\footnote{The \textit{vita} of Ptolemy is also said to contain a number of apophthegms and biographical anecdotes. In a later paper, Düring (1971) 268, he stated: "It seems to me extremely improbable that Andronicus' book [i.e., its hypothetical biographical section] contained a collection of aphorisms and anecdotes". This is mere prejudice, see \textit{infra}, n. 322 and text thereto. Gutas (1986) 15 ff. has shown that Düring's treatment of the Arabic tradition is extremely unreliable. Plezia (1985) provides an abstract and briefly discusses the contents. He says it is different from the later \textit{vitae} with their Neoplatonist colouring, and tends to believe the author's statement that Andronicus' work was not available to him. Until a competent edition with translation and commentary is available judgement has to be suspended.}

Other early evidence that has been adduced in the scholarly literature concerns Didymus Chalcenterus of Alexandria (first century BCE), who is argued to have discussed purpose, order, authenticity and title in his commentaries (or treatise) on Demostenes' orations; the assumption that a \textit{bios} was provided at the beginning is not implausible. But there is no evidence for such a \textit{bios}, and in the remains of the papyrus only a discussion of authenticity and a concern with the ordering of the orations are attested.\footnote{Lossau (1964) 66 ff., 78 f., 127 f., bases his argument in part on the papyrus fragments (discussion of authenticity in Didymus, \textit{In Demosthenem commenta} [\textit{P. Berol. 9780}, ed. Pearson–Stephens (1983)], XI col. 11.7 ff., with references to the views of his predecessors — add the ordering of the orations}
1.8 Commentaries on Virgil

Curtius\textsuperscript{73}, Plezia, van Berchem\textsuperscript{74} and Neuschäfer\textsuperscript{75} have pointed out that the fourth-century commentaries on Virgil (which must be dependent on Greek models) provide valuable evidence on what must have been common practice. Of a commentary by Aelius Donatus (mid-fourth century CE) only the beginning, viz. the dedication to L. Munatius, the \textit{vita} and the proem to the commentary on the \textit{Bucolics} (which has been worked into the \textit{vita}) have been preserved.\textsuperscript{76} The author tells us that a commentary should traditionally be twofold (\textit{bifariam tractari solet}), and consist of an introduction (\textit{ante opus}) and an exegesis (\textit{in ipso opere}). The introduction should discuss first the \textit{titulus} (i.e. \textit{ἐπιγραφή}), viz. \textit{cuius sit} (the issue of the \textit{γνήσιον}) and \textit{quid sit} (the meaning or issue of the title itself). Next is what Donatus calls the \textit{causa}, or the theme (here the experiences of pastoral persons), which however is treated in a rather particular way because it boils down to the question \textit{unde ortum sit}, or that of the origin of the literary genre, and to the further question \textit{quare hoc poissimum sibi ad scribendum poeta praesumpserit}, i.e. the reason why the author choose to practise it.\textsuperscript{77} Third is the \textit{intentio}, \textit{in qua cognoscitur quid efficere} according to the \textit{scriptio} of the papyrus —, in part on discussions in later authors among whom Dionysius of Halicarnassus. But tracing back to Diodorus what is in these later authors is hazardous. Arrighetti (1987) 194 ff. argues that the papyrus contains an \textit{epitome} of the commentary; arguments contra at Pearson–Stephens (1983) vii f. The work anyhow does not seem to have been a commentary \textit{cuius \ λέξιν} but a treatise in the \textit{περί}-style, cf. \textit{infra}, n. 189 (the \textit{scriptio} is \textit{Διδύμου Περί Δημοσθένους ΚΗ, Φιλολογίων Γ. Θ I IA IB}). Arrighetti also argues that there is no evidence whatever that Diodorus' commentary began with a \textit{bios} (\textit{ibid.}, 186, 195), because the extant remains do not exhibit an interest in biographic detail. This argument is not fully cogent, because biographic-historical details are an impressive feature of this text.

\textsuperscript{73} Curtius (1954) 238 f.
\textsuperscript{74} Plezia (1949) 22 ff., van Berchem (1952).
\textsuperscript{75} Neuschäfer (1987) I, 59 ff. He points out that Donatus and Servius do not fully agree with each other, but it would in my view be more correct to say that their presentations differ.
\textsuperscript{76} For the text see Diehl (1911) 22.12 ff., and the \textit{Teubneriana} of Brummer (1911). I shall quote a bit more from Donatus than the scholars I have consulted; references will be to the pagination of the more easily accessible Brummer. For Aelius Donatus see Daintree (1990). The plan of his prolegomenon is conveniently set out at Osebold (1968) 163; it is compared with that of Servius \textit{ibid.}, 86 ff.
\textsuperscript{77} Cf. \textit{infra}, text to n. 79. For the relation of the Latin commentaries and scholia on the \textit{Bucolica} to their Greek predecessors who dealt with Theocritus.
conetur poeta, or the intention which shows what the poet wanted to achieve. In the present case the Greek example he wants to imitate is meant, but it is in my view clear that the aim of an author need not, in principle, be restricted to such imitation. As soon as we realize that Donatus is indebted to Greek predecessors, we see that imitatio can hardly have figured as prominently in their description of an author’s purpose.

The exegesis proper in ipso opere should deal with the numerus, viz. of the individual poems or books (i.e. εἰς τιμήματα διαίρεσις), and their ordo (i.e. τάξις) and explanatio. But the relegation to the commentary proper of the questions regarding the number and sequence should not be misunderstood. The numerus and ordo and even the explanatio of the bucolic poems are actually discussed ante opus in general terms (17.300 ff.), which is to say that they are not the exclusive affair of the commentary to the individual poems and lemmata. What Donatus presumably means is that in a commentary on collections of individual poems such questions will or may be treated in more detail in the introduction to each individual piece, or to some of them. Compare the In Psalmos of Origen and the In Psalmos of Theodore of Mopsuestia, which have been briefly discussed above (Theodore is a near contemporary of Donatus), and see below, on Servius’ practice, which extends even to the individual books of the Virgilian epics.

The issue of the γνήσιοιν is treated first by Donatus: ‘though many pseudepigraphous works have been published with a false title under another name, e.g. the tragedy Thyestes of this poet, there can be no doubt whatever that the Bucolics are by Virgil’ (11.201 ff, quamvis ... multa ψευδεπίγραφα, id est falsa inscriptione sub

---

78 Cf. infra, text to n. 85. Aratus is called a ζηλωτής (‘follower’) of Hesiod at Vita I, p. 9.10 Martin, where Callimachus, Epigr. 27 Pfeiffer, is quoted in support. At Vita II, p. 12.8-9, the view of some people is cited who said he was a Ἡσιόδου μυθής, viz. in his proem, but according to the Stoic philosopher Boethus of Sidon (in his Commentary on Aratus, no doubt; cf. below, pp. 197 f., complementary note 84), cited ibid., p. 12.15 ff. (not in SVP III), this is not true: οὐχ Ἡσιόδου ἄλλοι ὦμηρος ζηλωτήν γεγονέναι τὸ γὰρ πλάσμα τῆς ποιήσεως μετέχειν ἤ κατὰ Ἡσιόδου. Accordingly, either the style or points of detail are at issue here, not the purported desire to become another Hesiod or Homer. See further Reiff (1959) 115 ff. and passim. (References here and in what follows are to the pages and lines of Martin (1974) and whenever necessary to Maass (1898), whose index verborum moreover is still indispensable; cf. also infra, n. 84).
alieno nomine sint prolata, ut Thyestes tragoeidia huius poetae, ... , tamen Bucolica ... Vergilii esse minime dubitandum est; proof-texts follow). The title is correct (12.211, “bucolica” autem et dico et recte; proofs follow). Then comes a lengthy discussion of the twofold causa ‘from the origin of the (bucolic) poem and the intention of the author’ (12.220-16.280, ab origine carminis et a voluntate scribentis etc.) Next is the ‘theme of the work, which the Greeks call σκοπός’ (16.281 ff., intentio libri quam Graeci σκοπόν vocant). We note that Donatus knows a bit of Greek technical terminology. Finally, the three issues which are dealt with in ipso carmine are briefly discussed. The question of the number of the poems involves that of the appropriate title: ‘the number of the eclogues is clear, for there are ten of them, among which seven are believed to be eclogues in the proper sense of the word’ (17.302 ff., numeros eclogarum manifestus est, nam decem sunt, ex quibus proprie bucolicae septem esse creduntur). The titles and themes of the individual pieces are briefly listed. Their ordo is a bit problematic (18.316 ff.). Donatus argues that Virgil himself makes clear which poem is first and which last, but states that the order of the others is uncertain (verum inter ipsas eclogas naturalem consortumque ordinem nullum esse certissimum est). He further refers to the view of other critics who put the sixth poem first, and concludes, 18.326 ff., with (the issue of) the explanatio, which will follow in due course (i.e. in the commentary itself). One preliminary observation must be stated already (illud imprimis tenendum esse); it is concerned with the metrical peculiarities of bucolic poetry.

The commentary on the whole of Virgil by Servius (probably 400 CE) explicitly states at its beginning, here the proem to the commentary on the Aen., that ‘in the explanation of authors the following issues are to be considered’:\textsuperscript{80} poetae vita, titulus operis, qualitas carminis (compare the seventh particular question added by

\textsuperscript{79} Cf. supra, text to n. 77, infra, text to n. 251. For σκοπός = intentio or propositum in Latin authors see also Alpers-Golz (1976) 132, 133. For the interesting parallel in Macrobius see above, section 1.2 ad finem.

\textsuperscript{80} In Aen., I p. 1.1, In exponendis auctoribus haec consideranda sunt e.q.s. Reference to this vita at the end of the proem to the Buc., III p. 3.29. The introductory sections do not belong with the so-called “Servius auctus” material. The plan of this prolegomenon is conveniently set out at Osebold (1968) 164. I shall quote a bit more from Servius than the scholars I have consulted; references in the text and notes are to volume, page and line of Thilo–Hagen (1881-87).
David and Elias81; not clearly paralleled in Donatus, though he speaks of the genre and its history), *scribentis intentio, numerus librorum, ordo librorum, explanatio*. The question of the division into books is otiose because Virgil himself, just as the other Roman authors of epic poems beginning with Ennius, had carefully planned each of the books concerned as well as their total number. It follows that it simply has to be traditional and is an echo of earlier literature on other authors. To Alexandrian scholars it had made sense in Homer’s case.82 Latin examples exist; according to Suetonius, for instance, C. Octavius Lampadio (mid-second century BCE) who edited Naevius (end third century BCE) divided the epic into seven books.83 Servius himself, I p. 4.14 ff., says ‘the number of books is not a problem here at all, though it is so in connection with other authors’ (*de numero librorum nulla hic quaestio est, licet in aliis inventur auctoribus*). He refers to various views concerning the number of plays by Plautus, which—though he does not say so—involves the question of authenticity and is more pertinent to the quantity of genuine works than to the division of individual plays into acts, and adds, p. 4.16 f., ‘the order is also evident’ (*ordo quoque manifestus est*). There is however one small exception to the fact that the division into books is not problematic. As we shall see, differences of opinion existed as to where Aen. V should end and Aen. VI begin.

Several of the above-mentioned points are also discussed in the proems to Servius’ commentaries on the *Bucolics* and *Georgics*. In these proems the titles of the works concerned are explained and the genre to which they belong is indicated (III p. 1.1 ff., including a discussion of the various views concerned with the *origo* of

81 Cf. supra, text to n. 4.
82 See e.g. the remark in ps.Plut., *De Homero* 2, ch. 4.1, ... Ἐπίθεσις ἔχεις καὶ Ὀδύσσεια, διήρημένη ἐκατέρα εἰς τὸν ἄριθμὸν τῶν στοιχείων, οὕτως ὑπὸ αὐτοῦ τοῦ συμποτοῦ ἄλλον ὑπὸ τῶν γραμματικῶν τῶν περί Ἀρίσταρχον. Cf. also a ὑπόθεσις by Aristophanes of Byzantium (*infra*, n. 108, n. 119 and text thereto), *Oxyg. Pap. 20* (1952) 2257 fr. 1 = Aesch. fr. 26 Mette; see Radt (1985) 126 f. and Pfeiffer (1978) 241. According to this text the play at issue has five μέρη, here equivalent to ‘acts’ (for μέρη as ‘acts’ see also *POxy* 2086 fr.1.12). Irigoin (1952) 35 ff. argues that Aristophanes divided Pindar’s poems in seventeen books (i.e papyrus scrolls) and classified them according to subjects (ἄμνοις, πατάνας, διθυράμβοι β’ etc.); Callimachus already classified them as well, see fr. 450 Pfeiffer.
83 Suetonius, *De grammaticis et rhetoricos* (2).4, p. 4.14-17. See further van Berchem (1952) 82 ff., and Suerbaum (1992). For the ancient discussion about the authenticity of Plautus’ plays see Holst Clift (1945) 47 ff.
pastoral poetry, and a brief survey of its history; III p. 128.6 ff., with reference to Hesiod’s Opera et dies as Virgil’s model, and III p. 129.9, where we read hi libri didascalici sunt). In the Bucolics the intentio poetae is to imitate Theocritus (III p. 2.14 ff.). The biographical reason for writing these poems is set out at III p. 2.24 ff. In the proem to the commentary on the Bucolics, Servius states ‘there can be no doubt here about the number of books or their order, because there is (only) one book. Numerous (exegetes) express doubts about the (individual) eclogues. There are indeed ten of them, but it is uncertain what is their order of composition’ (III p. 3.14 ff., nec numerus hic dubius est nec ordo librorum, quippe cum unus sit liber; de eclogis multi dubitant, quae licet decem sint, incertum tamen est, quo ordine scriptae sint). In that to the Georgics he states that Virgil ‘divided Hesiod’s one book into four’ (III p. 128.14, unus Hesiodi librum divit in quattuor). Connecting this issue with that of the titulus and utilitas, he adds that those who say that only books one and two of the Georgics deal with farming are mistaken, because books three and four too deal with subjects which are useful for agriculture (III p. 129.1 ff., male autem quidam georgicorum duos tantum esse adserunt libros, dicentes georgiam esse γῆς ἔργον, id est terrae operam, quam primi duo continent libri— nescientes tertium et quartum, licet georgiam non habeant, tamen ad utilitatem rusticam pertinere). The operis explanatio of the Bucolics is to follow after the proem (III p. 3.25 f.).

Aelius Donatus’ commentary on the Bucolics is lost, so it is impossible to cite what he actually treated in opere. But that of Servius is interesting in that it also contains brief introductions to the individual poems in the comments on the first lemma of each, which deal selectively with the persons that occur in them, the relation to Theocritus’ examples, the circumstances of their composition and further historical background, and in one case even their structure (the ninth eclogue continum non habet carmen, III p. 108.12). We have seen that such introductions to individual pieces are also found in Theodore of Mopsuestia’s commentary on Psalms and, or so I would suggest, in that of Origen on the same work.

Further details are to be found in Servius’ proems to individual books of the epics. Commenting on the first line of Georg. II, he briefly describes the contents of the book (III p. 217.3-4, in hoc libro exsequitur etc.). A short proem is part of the comments on the first line of Georg. III. This time Servius indicates that to some degree
there is a change of genre: aliud quodammodo inchoaturus est carmen, pastorale scilicet, post completum georgicum (III p. 271.4-5). The proem which is part of the comments on the first line of Georg. IV is about the author's intention; it also tells us that Virgil rewrote the last part (III p. 320.1 ff.). There is no proem to Aen. II, but the commentary to book III has a short proem dealing with the difference between the chronological order of the events and the narrative arrangement by the poet. The proem to Aen. IV deals with the connection between books three and four (I p. 458.1 ff.), and that to Aen. V with the connection between books four and five. The proem to Aen. VI gives an interesting description of its learned contents and tells us that Probus and others put the first two lines of book six at the end of book five, so were in favour of a different division; Servius, invoking Homeric precedent, disagrees (II p. 1.1 ff.). In the proem to Aen. VII the commentator speaks of a division of the epic into two parts (in duas partes hoc opus divisum est); books one to six follow the example of the Odyssey, books six to twelve that of the Iliad (II p. 124.1 ff.). There is no proem to Aen. VIII, X, XI and XII; that to Aen. IX is part of the comments on the first line, and deals with the contents of the book. Consequently, we may observe that, if there are reasons for doing so, not only the εἰς τῷματα διαίρεσις and τάξις are discussed in opere, but also the theme, the intention of the author, the historical and literary background, etc.

An interesting conclusion follows. If the proem to Servius' commentary on the Aeneid had been lost, one would be inclined to believe that he dealt with the preliminary issues in an implicit way only, or that he was not aware that one could, if one wished, discuss a full set (his treatment in the proem to the Georg. commentary being quite eclectic). Accordingly, the fact that in other extant ancient commentaries preliminary issues are often dealt with in an implicit and/or incomplete way does not always entail that no schema isagogicum was put to use. On the other hand, individual issues may of course be discussed, and are in fact discussed, by authors who wrote before the schemata isagogica came to be formalized. As so often happens, the actual practices existed long before a formal theoretical system was developed.
Parallels for some among the individual preliminary issues can be found in the fragmentary remains of the prolegomena to an early edition, or editions, of the *Phaenomena* and in the various versions of the *vita* of Aratus found in this edition or editions (*ante opus*), as well as in the scholia which are the remains of a commentary, or commentaries, κατὰ λέξιν (*in ipso opere*). These have been traced back by Martin to an edition-with-commentary to be ascribed to the *grammatikos* Theon son of Artemidorus of Tarsus, a contemporary of Caesar and/or Augustus, who also did much work on other poets, rather than to Theon the father of Hypatia.\(^{84}\) Martin's postulate of an *Einzelquelle* for the fragmentary remains of the commentaries, and of an *Urvita*, is quite problematic, though it is certainly true that the fragments of the commentaries and the related portions of the *vitae*, as well as the *vitae* themselves *qua* biographies, have a strong family resemblance and so must belong to one and the same tradition. We may e.g. compare the late Neoplatonist commentaries on Porphyry's *Isagoge* and Aristotle's *Categories*, which are much more alike than different, but still are individual works. We should also think of the editions of Homer and other poets made in later antiquity, in which compilations of abstracts from various commentaries were added to the text in the form of strings of scholia. In what follows however I shall for the sake of convenience use the singular form 'commentary'.

As far as I know, the parallels in this Aratus material have not yet been discussed in the scholarly literature concerned with the isagogical questions. These precedents are important because this is the only extant, though fragmentary, *early* commentary on an ancient poet; its basic ingredients are certainly earlier than the Virgil commentaries described in the previous section of this chapter. We accordingly are in a position to see in what way

---

\(^{84}\) For the editions of the prolegomena, the *vitae* and the early scholia which are cited see *supra*, n. 78. For part of the material, including the important so-called *Isagoge* of Achilles (see *infra*, n. 281 and text thereto) Maass (1898) is still the only available scholarly edition. For the comparable cases of the *vitae* of Hippocrates and Plato see *infra*, n. 329, n. 344. On the Aratus commentaries and scholia see also below, pp. 197 ff., complementary note 84. For the production of editions with scholia in the fourth-fifth centuries CE see Wilson (1984) 106 ff.
individual issues were handled in such commentaries before they were frozen into a schema isagogicum.

In the excerpts from a proem (fragmentum praefationis = Anon. II 3 Maass), the poem is divided into two main parts, one dealing with the stars and therefore called Phaenomena in the proper sense of the word (ιδίως Φαινόμενα λέγεται, p. 1.4), the other with the phenomena which occur under the heavens and were formerly called ‘on high’ (τῶν πάλαι λεγομένων μεταρραίων, p. 1.6-7). Both these parts have to be explained by the professional astronomer. The questions at issue here are those of the theme(s), the division into parts and the title. This editor further writes that in his critical edition he has added four kinds of diagnostic signs, but it is unfortunately not clear to what purpose these were used. In the first version of the biography (Vita I Martin, ascribed to Achilles by Maass, pp. 76 ff.), Aratus is called a follower of Hesiod (Ζηλωτής Ἤσιόδου, p. 9.10), which to some extent resembles the intentio poeta or scribentis voluntas discussed in proems to the Virgil commentaries.85 A brief catalogue of his poetic works is given (p. 9.17 ff.).86 An interesting component of this list is a work entitled Διοσκορεία, which in fact is the third main part of the Phaenomena;87 that parts of works or single books of multi-book treatises are listed along with the work of which they are a part is a not uncommon phenomenon in ancient catalogues, which strive for completeness at all costs. Finally, virtually all authorities, with one exception, are said to agree that the (prose) letters ascribed to Aratus are by him (p. 10.13 ff., πάντων σχεδόν συμφωνούντων τάς εἰς αὐτὸν ἀναφερομένας [sc. ἐπιστολάς] αὐτοῦ εἶναι καὶ ὄμολογούντων γνησίας αὐτάς κτλ.). Here we have the issue of authenticity.

In the fragment On Exegesis88 the contents of the first main part of the poem are further described, and its subdivisions specified. We now learn that Aratus first describes a motionless stellar sphere and that next, when he gets to the part on the 'risings and

---

85 See supra, n. 78 and text thereto.
86 See infra, n. 127, n. 165, n. 206, and pp. 194 ff., complementary note 64, on bibliographies as ingredients of vitae.
87 See infra, n. 90 and text thereto.
88 Maass (1898) 80 ff. attributed this to Achilles too, but according to Martin it derives from the early commentary. On this interesting piece see also infra, text to n. 280.
settings together’ (pp. 32.16-33.1, συνανατελλόντων καὶ ἀντιδυνόντων), this sphere is conceived as moving. This division must be quite ancient, for the separate title Συνανατολαί is already attested for Phaen. 569-732 in the great Hellenistic astronomer Hipparchus of Nicaea (active between 161 – 127 BCE), in the extant ‘Three books of Interpretation of the Phaenomena of Aratus and Eudoxus’ (Τῶν Ἀράτου καὶ Ἐυδόξου Φαινομένων ἔξηγήσεως βιβλία γ’) written in his youth, I ch. 1.1 and elsewhere in this work. In the fragment On Exegesis, we are also informed about versions of the poem without a proem, or with other proems, of which the first formulas are cited (p. 33.10 ff.; cf. also the fragmentum praefationis [this time in barbaric Latin only], p. 2.22-3.3). The traditional proem is defended. This is the issue of authenticity again, though on a smaller scale. The argument may be compared with Anon. in Theaet., col. 3.28 ff., on the alternative proem of the Theaetetus, the opening words of which are likewise quoted.

A division of the epic into three parts is confirmed by the scholia. One on line 451 (p. 283.15 = p. 426.12 Maass) laconically states: ‘up to here the (part) concerned with the constellations’ (ἐν τῇ δὲ τῆς ἀστροθεσίας). The scholion to the next line (pp. 283.16-284.1 = p. 426.13-5 Maass, who has a rather different text) refers back to this first part and announces the next, viz. the ‘settings and risings’ section, in the following words: ‘you may see, as the years go by, that the aforesaid phenomena [sc. the constellations] are firmly placed after each other, and that they rise and set in orderly fashion in the same seasons’. Finally, a scholion on line 733 (p. 371.10-2 = pp. 472.26-3.2 Maass, who has a slightly different text) looks back towards the second part of the poem and introduces the third, which is here even called a book, as follows: ‘having completed the account of the seasons by means of the understanding of the stars, he now turns to another book which is extremely useful for daily life, which is called Weathersigns’. The issue of utility is without doubt included here. Cicero’s title for the second part of his translation of Aratus is Prognostica (De div. I 13, II 47), so the separate title for this part of the epic (just as that of

89 τοῦτα τὰ προειρημένα φαινόμενα θεωρησείας τῶν ἐνιαυτῶν ἀνυμένων ἐφεξῆς κείσθαι καὶ κατὰ τάξιν τὰς αὐτὰς ὀρας ἀνατέλλοντα καὶ δυόμενα.
90 πληρώσας τὸν περὶ τῶν ὀρών διὰ τῆς τῶν ἀστρον καταλήψεως λόγον, ἔρχεται ἐπὶ ἄλλο βιβλίον σφόδρα βιωφέλες, δὴ καλεῖται Διοσκήρεια.
the second part attested already by Hipparchus) must be earlier than the commentary of (?)Theon.

The tripartition of Aratus’ epic is also attested at *Vita II* (p. 12.4-6 = *Isagoga bis excerpta*, p. 323.17 ff. Maass), ἐστὶ δὲ τριχῶς ἢ τῶν Φαινομένων αὐτοῦ πραγματεία, καταστέρωσις καὶ (περί) συναντελλόντων καὶ προγνώσεις διὰ σημείων.

The only early parallel for the issue of the title relating to the Homeric epics I have found is an exegetical scholium—which used to be attributed to Porphyry91—to the first words of the *Iliad*, where the question why the *Iliad* is called thus and not *Achilleia* after a main character, just as the *Odysseia*, is put and answered: *Scholia Graeca in Iliadem (scholia vetera)*, I, p. 4.30 ff. Erbse: πάλιν ζητεῖται, διὰ τί Ἀχιλλέας ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πλεῖστον ἀριστεύοντος οὐκ Ἀχιλλέαν ὡς. “Ὁδύσσειαν ἐπέγραψε τὸ σωμάτιον. φαμέν δ’ ὅτι εκεῖ μέν, ἢτε μόνως ἐφ’ ἐνὸς ἤρως τοῦ λόγου πλακέντος, καλῶς καὶ τούνομα τέθειται, ἐνταῦθα δὲ, εἰ καὶ μάλλον τῶν ἄλλων Ἀχιλλέας ἡρίστευεν, ἄλλα γε καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ ἀριστεύοντες φαίνονται.

1.10 Late Commentaries on Rhetorical and Medical Writers

Van Berchem, basing himself on a masterly and pioneering paper by Rabe, points out that important Greek parallels (including the particular introductory questions) for the philosophical *schemata isagogica* are to be found in the late (fifth-sixth century CE and later) prolegomena to Hermogenes and other rhetoricians.92 Those to Hermogenes’ Π. στάσεων observe the following scheme: considerations on rhetoric in general,93 *bios* of Hermogenes, characteristics of this particular treatise. Van Berchem rightly compares Quintilian’s formula *de arte, de opifice, de opere*.94 A prolegomenon to Hermogenes’ Π. ἰδέων states that the *προθεωρία*

91 On the relation of the exegetical b-scholia to Porphyry’s *Quaestiones Homericae* see Erbse (1960) 17 ff. I note in passing that Pépin (1965) does not deal with the *Quaestiones Homericae*.

92 Rabe (1909) already derived the rhetorical *schema* from that of the Late Neoplatonist commentators; see further van Berchem (1952) 80 f. Convenient overview in Plezia (1949) 46 ff. Cf. also Schäublin (1974) 66 n. 2.

93 This should be compared with Proclus’ discussion of mathematics at the beginning of his *In Euclid.*, see *supra*, section 1.6, or with the general questions concerned with philosophy found at the beginning of the late Neoplatonist commentaries on Porphyry’s *Isagoge* for which see e.g. I. Hadot (1990) 44.

94 Van Berchem (1952) 81. See further *supra*, n. 60 and text thereto.
which habitually should precede the explanation of a book, esp. a ‘technical’ one dealing with a particular discipline or art, should discuss the purpose, utility, title, order of study, and division into parts etc. (Proleg., p. 108.7 ff. Rabe). The similar schema isagogicum as applied in the late commentaries on the grammar attributed to Dionysius Thrax has been analyzed in full by Plezia.95

Such schemata are also a feature in the late ἀπὸ φωνῆς commentaries on Hippocrates by Stephanus of Athens, and in other such late commentaries on medical writers such as that of Agnellus of Ravenna on Galen’s On Sects for Beginners.96 In this case too we may believe that the late commentaries on Aristotle were the example. Stephanus’ commentary on Hippocrates’ Prognosticum, for instance, to be dated roughly between 550 – 650 CE, has the following opening sentence, p. 26.3-4: ‘Let us also this time begin with the eight headings which are the customary prolegomena for each work: the intention, the usefulness and so on’ (τὸ εἰσοθότα ἐπὶ ἑκάστου συγγράμματος προλέγεσθαι η̲'̲ κεφάλαια καὶ νῦν προλάβωμεν, τόν σκοτόν, τὸ χρήσιμον καὶ τὸ ἔξης. Italics mine). Practically the same sentence stands at the beginning of Palladius/Stephanus In De fracturis, pp. 16.2 ff.-17.3 ff., where each of the points is then discussed at appropriate length. As to the γνήσιον, the Prognosticum according to Stephanus is by Hippocrates

95 Plezia (1949) 30 ff.
96 Stephanus, In Progn. has been edited by Duffy (1983); see further Westerink (1985) for the references provided in the apparatus to the proem of Stephanus, In Aphor. Agnellus of Ravenna, Lectures on Galen’s De sectis, has been edited by AA. VV. (1981). On Stephanus and others see further Westerink (1964), Peterson (1974) 93 ff., Irmer (1977) vii ff., Duffy (1985) 21 ff., and Temkin (1991) 228 ff. Modern editions of other such medical commentaries are Pritchett (1975), John of Alexandria In vi Epidem. (medieval Latin version, possibly by Bartholomaeus of Messina; I quote from the end of the proemium, 2 ra 55-60, p. 17: in plerisque codicibus exponendis hoc quedam necessaria videntur predici; primo videlicet que sit intentio auctoris; secundo si codex est eius proprius; tertio quanta utilitas inde provenire sentitur; quarto ad quam partem medicine iste liber pertinet; quinto qualsis sit pretitudalio libri; sexto quis ordo legendi; septimo in quo dividitur particulis; octavo modus doctrine conquiritur; Irmer (1977), Palladius and Stephanus In De fracturis (with German transl.); Pritchett (1983), John of Alexandria In Librum De sectis Galeni. It is as yet not certain how many Stephani have to be assumed; the medical commentator may or may not be the same person as the author of a commentary on Aristotle’s De interpretatione, see Westerink (1985) 19 ff. On the Galen curriculum in late antiquity see also Meyerhof (1926) 703, 723, Beccaria (1971), who also deals with the Alexandrian course, Iskandar (1976), and the introd. to the ed. of Agnellus, AA. VV. (1981) vi f.; cf. further infra, n. 221 and text thereto.
although it is not certain by which Hippocrates; the author however plumps for a candidate (p. 30.12 ff.). The title is explained (30.21 ff.), and there is an interesting section on the order of study (τάξις τῆς ἀναγνώσεως, pp. 30.32-2.27) which involves a detailed discussion of the systematic classification of the writings of the Hippocratic corpus. *Aphorisms* is the one with which one should begin. As to the εἰς τὰ μόρα διαίρεσις, we are told that according to Galen the work has three main parts (τμήματα), whereas there is no such division according to Hippocrates, whose sections (τμήματα) are equal in number to the topics that are treated (p. 32.28 ff.). The part of medicine to which the treatise belongs is the theoretical genus (ἀναγεταὶ ... ὑπὸ τὸ θεωρητικὸν κτλ., p. 32.32 ff.). The eighth preliminary point deals with Hippocrates’ various modes of instruction in his different types of writing; this too is analogous to a general introductory issue found in the commentaries on Aristotle. A similar exposition is found in the proem to Stephanus’ *In Hippocratis Aphorismos*, though with an interesting difference. The order of study this time is said to be twofold (p. 30.19 ff.). There is a ‘natural’ order starting with Hippocrates’ *De natura hominis* in which *Aphorisms* comes third, and a ‘logical’ one starting with *Aphorisms* (cf. the commentary on the *Prognosticon*). The natural order informs us about our physical make-up (*mutandis mutatis*, this work is the *Greater Alcibiades* of the Hippocratic corpus), the logical order has us begin with the main general topics. Stephanus adds that beginners should first of all learn by heart the Hippocratic *Oath* and the *Law*. This, no doubt, is prescribed with a view to preliminary moral purification. We may finally point out that in Stephanus’ commentaries each individual book of the *Aphorisms* and of the *Prognosticum* is called a τμήμα at the beginning of the comments to it, and that remarks are made about its contents.

In Stephanus’ proems there is no reference to a preliminary reading of a bios of Hippocrates. Nevertheless, the obligatory presence of a vita of Virgil according to Aelius Donatus and Servius and of a bios of Hermogenes according to the prolegomenon to the Π. ἰδέων, and especially the presence of a genos of Plato in the first lecture of Olympiodorus’ *In Alcibiadem*, which support the hypothesis that the Neoplatonist study of Aristotle and of Plato began with the study of a bios, suggest that this may well
have been the case for the classes on Hippocrates as well.\footnote{See supra, n. 47 and text thereto. The Neoplatonist Simplicius assumed that those who followed his Epictetus class had read or would read the \textit{bios} by Arrian, see infra, n. 187 and text thereto.} In the following chapters we shall find further instances of such \textit{bioi}.

1.11 \textit{Proclus on Homer and Hesiod}

Summing up the overview given so far, we may conclude that a systematic codification of the introductory questions to the study of Aristotle, and to a lesser extent to that of Plato, may have been Proclus’ contribution. It has emerged, however, that many of these questions are already found in a wide range of earlier authors of various provenance. Precedents are already found in an early commentary on Aratus’ astronomic epic. In view of the parallels in the introductory and exegetical literature dealing with Virgil, it appears to be rather plausible that the more or less rigorous later distinctions between general and particular issues in the philosophical literature were to some extent inspired by those described and applied in prolegomena to commentaries on poets and other literary figures.

Here we should of course remind ourselves of the fact that both Proclus and his teacher Syrianus are credited with a commentary (ὑπόμνημα) on the whole of Homer (\textit{Suda} I 4, \textit{s.v.} Πρόκλος, p. 210.9 f.; \textit{ibid.}, \textit{s.v.} Συριανός, p. 478.23). There is at any rate evidence in Proclus himself (\textit{In Tim.}, I, p. 95.26-31) that Syrianus composed a work entitled Λύσεις τῶν Ὅμηρικῶν προβλημάτων. The (sacred?) number of books of Syrianus’ commentary is given in the \textit{Suda} as seven, whereas no number is given for that of Proclus. Praechter has argued that the \textit{Suda} lemma mistakenly attributes a number of works by Syrianus to Proclus, among which those on Homer. The identical titles make one pause, but we know that Proclus’ commentary on the Orphic poems was written in the margins of those of his predecessors (Marinus, \textit{Vita Procli} ch. 27). Proclus moreover composed a commentary (ὑπόμνημα, \textit{Suda}, I 4, p. 210.10 f.) on Hesiod’s \textit{Opera et dies}, which presumably was a revision of one by his other teacher, Plutarch of Athens; no such commentary is attributed to Syrianus. Essays five and six of Proclus’ \textit{In Remp.} attempt to come to grips with the problem of Plato’s views on Homer, and the sixth essay has been
proved to be indebted to Syrianus' interpretations.\footnote{For Proclus' attitude towards Homer and Hesiod see Erler (1987) 187 ff. For Praechter's view see his (1905). For a more nuanced and plausible evaluation of the relation between Syrianus and Proclus and the information provided by the Suda catalogues see Sheppard (1980) 43 ff. (also for reference to the similar works by Aristotle, [Heraclitus] and Porphyry; add Plutarch of Chaeronea's 'Ομηρικαὶ μελέται, frs. 122-127 Sandbach), and ibid. 78 ff.; for Proclus' two essays ibid., 15 ff. and passim. For the Hesiod commentary see Faraggiana di Sarzana (1987), also for references to her earlier papers; on the use of "commentaires déjà disponibles" ibid., 22. Plutarch of Chaeronea wrote a commentary on Hesiod, frs. 25-112 Sandbach, which was used by Proclus; Gellius, Noct. Att. XX 8 = fr. 102 S., quotes from book four of this work. It is entirely improbable that the grammarian Proclus whose Chrestomathia was excerpted by Photius, cod. 239 (the other excerpts have been edited by Severijns (1963)) is to be identified with the Neoplatonist, though the Suda lemma adds the Chrestomathia to its list of Proclus' works (although not, be it noted, to the Syrianus catalogue, which shows that the Proclus catalogue is really intended as one of Proclus' works and based on evidence, though this may have been interpreted wrongly).} It is an obvious assumption that Syrianus and Proclus had studied earlier commentaries and treatises on Homer, and that Plutarch and Proclus had gone through commentaries on Hesiod. It is at any rate certain that Proclus used the commentary on the Works and Days by Plutarch of Chaeronea.

But earlier commentaries on these poets cannot have been Proclus' only examples. The fact that Origen, two hundred years before Proclus, not only applies a schema isagogicum but already uses the expression 'what comes before the reading of a text in class' is highly significant. We may safely assume that the preliminary schema he used as well as the expression which denotes it had been taken over by the learned Christian exegete—who, before selling his classical library and devoting himself almost exclusively to Christian culture, for several years had made a living as a professional grammaticos—from the pagan commentary literature, both literary and philosophical (on Plato, but possibly also on Aristotle), which he knew and we do not. In his later years, at Caesarea, Origen again taught the philosophical classics and undoubtedly availed himself of current commentaries on the works he read with his students. Proclus, moreover, in the introductions to his commentaries on Plato, attests that preliminary issues were discussed by his predecessors. Later Biblical commentators such as Eusebius of Caesarea and Gregory of Nyssa (certainly) and Theodore of Mopsuestia and company
(probably) depend on Origen, but one may believe that these men also knew other works in which the technique was applied in an explicit way. We have also seen examples of a more relaxed use of isagogical issues, for instance in Porphyry’s minor commentary on the Aristotelian *Categories*.

What Proclus appears to have done further (though one cannot be sure that he was the first to do so) is to distinguish questions applicable to Plato from others which were relevant in relation to Aristotle’s acroamatic writings. To give a few examples: the general preliminary questions ‘Why dialogues ?’ and ‘Why these *dramatis personae* ?’ are in principle applicable to both Plato and Aristotle, but Plato wrote nothing but dialogues, whereas Aristotle not only wrote dialogues but also other works, and it is these other works, not his dialogues, which were believed to represent his personal views and so to contain his real philosophy (e.g. Ammonius, *In Cat.* 4.16-7, тά δὲ αὐτοπρόσωπα ώς ήσα γέγραφεν ὰς ἀφ’ ἑαυτοῦ, Olympiodorus, *Proleg. phil.* 7.4-5, αὐτοπρόσωπα μὲν ὰσα ἀπὸ τοῦ ἰδίου προσώπου προήνεγκεν). Origen’s earlier version of the *schema* comprizes not only issues which according to Proclus’ system are relevant in relation to Plato only, but also issues relevant in relation to both Plato and Aristotle.
CHAPTER TWO

PRELIMINARY ISSUES IN THRASYLLUS, ALBINUS,
AND
DIOGENES LAÆRTIUS ON PLATO

2.1 Introduction

In the previous chapter, we looked at evidence concerned with individual issues of the schemata isagogica which antedate the later systematizations. But there is more material of a philosophical nature than has usually been realized. We should therefore also study evidence which, to the best of my knowledge, has not been discussed in this connection in an appropriate way,99 or even not at all.

We may start with Diogenes Laërtius book III, on Plato, noting in passing that Diogenes is presumably to be dated to the earlier third century CE. This book begins with the biographical part of a bios (III 1-47a). Next, at III 47, Diogenes apostrophizes a person:

Now, as you are a philoplatonic lady, and rightly so, and as you eagerly seek out that philosopher’s doctrines (δόγματα) in preference to all others, I have thought it necessary to give some account of the character (φύσιν) of his works, the ordering (τάξιν) of his dialogues, and the method of his inductive procedure, as far as possible in the manner of an elementary introduction and restricting myself to the main points (στοιχειωδὸς καὶ ἐπικεφαλαίων), in order that the material concerned with the life (περὶ τοῦ βίου) may not suffer by the omission of his doctrines. For, as the proverb has it, it would be taking owls to Athens were I to give you the full particulars (τὰ κατ’ εἰδός).100

---

99 Plezia (1949) 74, 94 ff., 101 ff., who for instance rewardingly discusses the evidence in D.L. III and IX, believed that Thrasyllus and other earlier authorities and authors only treated three aspects, viz. “vita, scripta, placita”, and failed to see the parallels for the schemata isagogica to be found there. I also believe that he attributes too much of D.L. III to Thrasyllus; see now also Tarrant (1993) 17 ff., who tends to do so too. Donini (1922) 55 ff. compares three general issues raised by Albinus, viz. (1) what is a dialogue, (2) how do we classify the dialogues and (3) with which dialogue should one begin, with those of the later schemata isagogica, but he does not compare this classification with that at D.L. III 49 ff.

100 Transl. Hicks, modified. For D.L. III the edition by Breitenbach &
I shall presently say something about the oddity of this apostrophe, or dedication (as it is called in the scholarly literature). What should be noticed now is that Diogenes follows up his promise by first discussing the character of the works, i.e. the fact that they are dialogues (no mention of the *Letters* as a separate genre), telling us how these may be classified in a variety of systematic ways, and providing an evaluation of them as sources for Plato’s philosophy (48-52). Induction is treated next (53-5), i.e. before and not after that of the ordering of the works as had been announced. The ordering is treated third at considerable length (56-62; note that the key-word τὰξις itself does not occur in these paragraphs), though one would have been even more delighted if Diogenes had given the full particulars.

### 2.2 Tetralogies and Trilogies

An important source of Diogenes — though I believe one can prove that it was not used at first hand — is a book by the Platonic and Pythagorean philosopher Thrasyllus who served the emperor Tiberius as court astrologer in the early first century CE. The most plausible hypothesis is that the work concerned was an introduction to Plato. It is certain that Thrasyllus provided a *bios*, for at D.L. III 1 he is cited for the information that Plato’s ancestors Codrus and Melanthus were descendants of Poseidon. Facts, or pseudo-facts, such as these belong with a standard part of a biography, viz. the protagonist’s origin or *genos*. More generous extracts are concerned with Thrasyllus’ views concerning the famous *ordering* of Plato’s works in sets of four. Already in

---

101 Müller (1974) 40 n. 4 explains that letters may be viewed as mezzo-dialogues, which give only the words of the person who speaks to an addressee who of necessity remains a silent partner but is expected to reply. This was already the view of a certain Artemon who according to Demetrius, *De elocutione* 223, made a list of Aristotle’s letters: εἶναι ... τὴν ἐπιστολὴν οἶον ἔτερον μέρος τοῦ διαλόγου, cf. Thraede (1970) 22. See also Synesius, *Ep.* 138.7-8.

102 Compare *infra*, section 2.8, for his essay on Democritus, which likewise contained both a *bios* and a systematic bibliography. See further Usener (1892) 209 ff. (*ibid.*, 210, he employs the formula “Einleitungsschrift zu Platon”), Plezia (1949) 101 ff., Pasquali (1974) 265, and esp. Regenbogen
Callimachus' *Pinakes* (Πίνακες τῶν ἐν πασῇ παιδείᾳ διᾶλαμψάν-των καὶ ἄν συνέγραψαν, 'Lists of persons eminent in every branch of culture and of what they wrote') biographical and bibliographical data were given for each individual author listed.103 The combination of biography and bibliography attested for Thrasyllus is of Alexandrian provenance, though his treatment will have been less brief than that of those of his philological predecessors who dealt with Plato.

Thrasyllus claimed that Plato himself had 'made' his dialogues 'public' by following the example of the tragic tetralogy (κατὰ τὴν τραγικὴν τετραλογίαν ἐκδούνας αὐτόν, D.L. III 56). The tragedians, he quite unhistorically advises us, used to contend with four plays at four separate festivals (sic), viz. the Dionysia, Lenaea, Panathenaea and Chytri at a ratio of one play per festival, the final play each time being a satiric drama.104 Such an annual set, or rather series, of four pieces was called a tetralogy. I translate

(1950) 1441 ff., who all compare the book about Plato with that on Democritus. According to the Fihrist of al-Nadim, Ch. 7.1, Theon (of Smyrna, presumably) said that Plato's 'father was called Astun [i.e. Ariston] and that he was one of the aristocrats of the Greeks'; see Dodge (1970) II, p. 591. *Ibid.*, p. 614, a work entitled *Sequence of Reading Plato's Books and the Titles of his Compositions* is attributed to Theon, and a garbled list of titles according to Theon is found *Ibid.*, p. 592; he is also quoted for saying that Plato arranged his works in tetralogies, *ibid.*, pp. 593-4 (see further *infra*, n. 111). The assumption that this lost work, just as 'Thrasyllus', contained both a genos and a bibliographie raisonné made by Dunn (1974) 120 ff., who also discusses earlier literature on Theon in the Arabic sources, is an obvious one. I note in passing that the translation with commentary of ch. 7 of the *Fihrist* by A. Müller (1873) is out of date. For 'Thrasyllus' philosophical orientation see Longinus *ap.* Porph., *V. Plot.* 20, on his Platonic and Pythagorean studies. Cf. further Dillon (1977) 184 f., Dörrie (1981), Brisson (1982) 87, and Tarrant (1993) 7 ff., 230, and *passim* (but with caution).

103 See Pfeiffer (1978) 163, Fraser (1972) 1, 452. The fragments are 429-453

Pfeiffer.

104 Inaccurately echoed at *Anon. prolog.* 24.20 ff.: those who arranged the dialogues into tetralogies claimed he published them (ἐκδεδόθαι αὐτῷ — see *infra*, n. 105, n. 106, n. 183, pp. 198 f., complementary note 110) in imitation of the tragedians and the comic poets, who competed with four plays having the same theme (σκοπῶν), the last one being amusing (i.e. a satyr play). This is obviously odd in reference to the writers of comedies, who therefore may be regarded as having been interpolated in an earlier version. At 25.2 ff., the author argues against the tetralogic arrangement, quoting two arguments by Proclus to which others are added; a rather good one is that the *Phaedo* is not amusing. Albinus, *Prol.* ch. 4, also rejected the tetralogies, as we shall presently see. Tarrant (1993) 71, forgetting that the satyr play is the last item of the tragic tetralogy, oddly believes that 'the 'satyric' dialogue of a tetralogy (has) a fairly obvious introductory purpose'.
The instance of Thrasyllus book already analogy of) ff., as a private "production" adduce d'autrui"), Plato n. private "production"
praestabatur, friend and tion for
Parmenides. The idea behind this will be that (most of) the dialogues are dramatic in a technical sense, and that practically all their first titles are of the same ilk as those of plays. The dramatic character of the Socratic dialogues qua genre was already pointed out by Aristotle, Poet. 1.1447b3 f., and in the first book of the lost De poetis ap. Athenaeus 505C and ap. D.L. III 48 (Arist. fr. 72 Rose), which is also cited in fr. 1 of an introduction to Plato surviving on papyrus.107

105 Cf. Porph. V. Plot. 24.5 ff., where he speaks of the treatises 'released in a haphazard way' (φύρῳν ἐκδοιμένα) to a much restricted circle by Plotinus as distinguished from his own systematic and official edition. On Plotinus' practice and Porphyry's publication see Goulet-Cazé (1982) 284 ff. and (1992) 72 f., who suggests that ἐκδοσῖς at V. Plot., 4.14 f. and 26.32 f., means private "production" or "communication". Cf. also infra, n. 106, n. 183 and pp. 198 ff., complementary note 110. For Galen see further infra, text before and after n. 208 and n. 223, text to n. 237 and to n. 259 on (κοινή) ἐκδοσῖς as distinguished from private or restricted communication. For ἐκδοσῖς in the different sense of 'interpretation' see below, pp. 201 f., complementary note 256 ad finem. Van Groningen (1963) wants to restrict the sense of ἐκδοσῖς to private communication (cf. 5, "l'auteur met le texte à la disposition d'autrui"), but his material is far from complete: no references to Porphyry, or to the Galenic passages which speak of (κοινή) ἐκδοσῖς. We may also adduce Quintilian, who I, proem. 6-7, compares his own definitive publication with those made from the notes taken by his students (cf. infra, n. 208), and says: duo iam sub meo nomine libri ferreabant neque editi a me neque in his comparati, namque alterum sermonem per biduum habitum pueri, quibus id praestabatur, excepterant, alterum pluribus sane diebus, quantum notando consequi potuerant, interuptum boni iuvenes, sed nimium amantes mei temerario editionis honore vulgaverant. The younger Pliny carefully revised his orations and asked his friend for suggestions before giving them to the general public (in manus hominum), see Ep. VII 17.15; cf. ibid. I 8.5, erit enim et post emendationem liberum nobis vel publicare vel continere.

106 Important parallel at Anon. proleg. 16.35 ff. (Westerink's transl.): 'As for the time when he published (ἐξεδωκεν) his dialogues, this was not left to chance, but he chose holy-days and festivals of the Gods for his works to be offered up and made known to the public (κηρύττονται), for it is on festivals that hymns are traditionally sung. Thus he published (ἐξεδωκεν) the Timaeus at the Bendidia — a feast in honour of Artemis in the Piraeeus —, the Parmenides at the Panathenaeia, and others at other festivals' ('published' for ἐξεδωκεν is not entirely fortunate). We see that the theatrical performances at the festivals have been replaced by more strictly religious poetry as the tertium comparationis.

107 For the remains of this work (earlier than Diogenes' account) and its interpretation see Haslam (1972) and his edition of the text with notes,
The majority of the medieval Plato manuscripts (deriving in various ways from a single archetype) and indeed our modern editions who follow them present Plato’s works according to tetralogies. Those manuscripts which for some reason or other do not have the tetralogic arrangement throughout still contain the first Thrasyllean tetralogy. The ordering according to Thrasyllass’ numerical system has indeed been a thundering success. One can understand why this is so. Catalogues of books are fragile in the sense that titles may be lost during transmission, or other materials inserted. But when the exact number of dialogues you want to include in an authoritative list of genuine works is established according to a very simple arithmetical calculation, your catalogue is safer. One may more readily believe that this was one of the motives behind the original proposal, because the alternative solution of the great Alexandrian philologist Aristophanes of Byzantium (ca. 250-180 BCE) and others, i.e. presumably those who followed his example, was more vulnerable. Nevertheless, tetralogic catalogues may suffer as well when their rationale is no longer understood, as is clear from the muddled reproductions of the tetralogic arrangement (if this is what they are) in the Arabic sources.

Diogenes provides information about the last-named alternative as well (III 61-2). Fifteen dialogues were arranged in trilogies, the rest remaining unordered, i.e. not arranged in sets of three. Accordingly, we do not even know precisely which dialogues were listed in the second part of Aristophanes’ catalogue. Fragile indeed.

Much scholarly energy has been devoted to the question which arrangement was earlier, that according to tetralogies or that according to trilogies. Although there is no evidence

Haslam (1977); he is followed by Nüsser (1991) 15 ff., 199 ff.

108 On Aristophanes see Pfeiffer (1978) 214 ff., Fraser (1972) I, 459 ff., and supra, n. 82, infra, n. 109, text to n. 119, n. 146. Tarrant (1993) 205 speculates that only the works arranged in trilogies were originally available to Aristophanes, and that “he or his successor issued others singly as they became available”, but see infra, text to n. 119.

109 See Regenbogen (1950) 1441, and further e.g. Müller (1974) 27 ff., 328 f., Dörrie-Baltes (1990) 334 ff. The general view today seems to be that the trilogies are earlier, though Philip (1970) still believed in a fourth-century BCE origin of the tetralogies. Pfeiffer (1978) 242 f. assumes that the tetralogies are earlier but argues that there is no evidence that Aristophanes edited Plato’s works. His suggestion (after others, see ibid., 243 n. 171) that
whatever, the tetralogic ordering has even been dated to the time of the Early Academy.

I believe it can be proved that the arrangement according to sets of three is earlier. Thrasyllus’ (or his predecessor’s) strange remark that Plato followed the custom of the tragedians who added a satyr play (σατυρικόν) as a fourth piece of course does not imply that fourth items in Plato’s tetralogies are unserious, but should be understood as an argument underpinning the revision of the ordering according to dramatic trilogies. This also explains the inappropriate note about the four Athenian festivals, the analogy being four individual plays ~ four individual festivals. The fact that Diogenes describes the tetralogic arrangement before the trilogies is irrelevant. His remark, at III 61, that Aristophanes and some others ‘force’ (ἐλκουσι) the dialogues into trilogies indeed implies an unfavourable comparison of this other arrangement with that according to tetralogies, but by no means entails that the former was based on the latter. The term ἐλκουσι should not be pressed, and what Diogenes says is that these men arranged ‘the dialogues’ into trilogies; he does not say they did so with the dialogues of the tetralogic ordering. Indeed they did not, for they left an unspecified number of dialogues minus fifteen ‘unordered’ (ἄτακτα).

2.3 Preliminary Issues in Thrasyllus

I am not concerned here with the slippery theme of the history of the ancient editions of Plato, but only with what Diogenes tells us about Thrasyllus’ treatment of the corpus platonicum. I submit that Thrasyllus already dealt with several of the general and particular preliminary questions which are found in the commentaries that have been described in chapter one above, though we do not know that he used the technical vocabulary found in later sources, or availed himself of a schema isagogicum. He presumably derived most or part of this technique from earlier authors writing about Plato and/or about other authors.

the argument about the trilogies was to be found in Aristophanes’ supplement to Callimachus’ Πινάκες is not entirely implausible, but note that Slater (1986) 156 f. places this text (his fr. 403) among the “fragmenta incertae sedis” (on the nature of the Πρὸς τοὺς πίνακας τοῦ Καλλιμάχου see ibid., 134).

110 For this issue see below, pp. 198 f., complementary note 110.
At any rate Diogenes, who at III 61 rounds off his section on the tetralogies with the remark καὶ οὖτος (sc. Thrasylus) μὲν οὖτω διασφέι καὶ τίνες, tells us that Thrasylus was not the only person to advocate a tetralogic ordering (i.e. τὰξίς). The Middle Platonist Albinus, to be dated to the first half of the second century CE, at Prologos, ch. 4, ascribes the tetralogic arrangement to Dercyllides and Thrasylus (in that order), but we do not know whether Dercyllides has to be dated earlier or later than Thrasylus, his t.a.q. being provided by this particular reference. It is certainly true that Dercyllides was a serious scholar. Porphyry ap. Simplic., In Phys. p. 247.31 ff. (cf. ibid., p. 256.34), quotes from book eleven of his Platonic Philosophy (ἐν τῷ ὑπ’ τής Πλάτωνος φιλοσοφίας), and we may readily believe that in a treatise of this size there must have been room for a discussion of the arrangement of the dialogues. Other references to Dercyllides (without book-title this time) deal with his interpretations of passages in Platonic dialogues (the Timaeus, see Proclus, In Tim., I, p. 20.9 f.; the Republic, see Proclus, In Remp., II, pp. 24.6 ff., 25.14 ff.), which presumably may also be traced back to the great work. A long and mostly verbatim excerpt from a book with a different title (ἐν τῷ Περὶ τοῦ ἀτράκτου καὶ τῶν σφονδύλων τῶν ἐν τῇ Πολιτείᾳ παρὰ Πλάτωνι), though this may be a part of the section on the Republic in the Platonic Philosophy too, is at Theon of Smyrna, pp. 198.9 ff.; we may observe in passing that in this passage Dercyllides begins by citing Eudemus of Rhodes (fr. 145 Wehrli). Theon also cites Thrasylus several times, but never verbatim and never with reference to a book-title. My hunch is that Dercyllides is later than Thrasylus and that Albinus and Theon cite the latter from the former.111

111 On Thrasylus and Dercyllides see Plezia (1949) 103, Regenbogen (1950) 1441. Dillon (1977) 397 seems to believe that Theon quotes Dercyllides via Thrasylus. I cannot, at any rate, accept the view of Brisson (1992) 3710, who is the most recent supporter of the scholarly myth of a Plato edition by Dercyllides sponsored by T. Pomponius Atticus (who died 32 BCE). Dunn (1974) 53 ff. and Tarrant (1993) 11 ff., 67 ff., correctly argue that there is no evidence which would date Dercyllides before Thrasylus, but have not thought of the likelihood that Theon quotes the latter from the former; Dunn moreover still suggests that the chronological order Dercyllides – Thrasylus is perhaps the most plausible. For the conclusions to be drawn from Varro’s reference to the first tetralogy see below. According to the Fihrist of al-Nadim, Ch. 7.1 (see supra, n. 102), Theon (of Smyrna) said that ‘Plato arranged his writings for reading. Each group, consisting of four
Arithmology seems to be involved as well \( (3^2 \times 2^2) \), just as in Porphyry’s systematic arrangement of Plotinus treatises \( (2 \times 3 \times 3^2) \), see V. Plot. 24.13-4, ἥ τελειότητι τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ καὶ τὰς ἑννέασιν ἀσμένως ἐπιτυχόν). Nine is the number to keep in mind: nine tetralogies and six enneads. I have argued above that catalogues constructed according to such calculations are not only convenient, but safe as well because modifications are virtually excluded. Thrasyllus and Porphyry may well have believed that the perfect numbers involved in their calculations provided strong protection for their listing and ordering of the works. Such numbers and relations between numbers according to Platonist and Pythagorean thought are not just an expression of order, but a cause of order in the first place. The sets of nine Platonic tetralogies and six Plotinian enneads are a sort of micro-cosmoi.

But we should return to the history of the tetralogic ordering. One cannot at one and the same time hold both that the tetralogies were introduced for arithmological reasons by the Pythagoreanizing philosopher Thrasyllus, and that they are the work of an earlier person, Dercyllides (who then must have been a sort of Pythagorean too). What remains the most likely hypothesis in my view is that Thrasyllus revised and amplified an earlier tetralogic arrangement in order to reach nine tetralogies and therefore included dialogues whose attribution was in doubt. A

books, he called a tetralogie'; see Dodge (1970) II, 593-4, and Nüsself (1991) 144 ff. Accordingly, Theon (of Smyrna) may be included among the ‘some’ mentioned by Diogenes who shared Thrasyllus’ view. But as Dunn (1974) 130 ff. points out, the list of writings attributed to Theon in the Fihrist is not tetralogic. Another catalogue of Plato’s works is extant in Ibn Abi Usaybi’a; a translation is quoted by Dunn (1974) 127 f., who speculates that it perhaps derives from Theon. He states that “the nine tetralogies are almost intact on this list”. But this list is a rather mixed bag, and its partial resemblances to the tetralogic list do not make it one. Dunn’s ingenious suggestion that what is in the Fihrist is a mere preliminary description and that Theon’s tetralogic list survives in other Arabic authors is therefore not borne out by the evidence. Diels, in Diels–Schubart (1904) xvii ff., argues (on the basis of the subscriptio, quoted supra, n. 72) that Didymus arranged the speeches of Demosthenes in tetralogies (and so would provide an earlier and even philological parallel for this type of arrangement), but the evidence is too flimsy, see Pearson–Stevens (1988) vi f.

112 See e.g. Bickel (1944) 129 f. (who however traces back the arithmology to the Early Academy), and especially Dunn (1974) 68 ff., who discusses early parallels for the importance of the number thirty-six. A slightly different suggestion is made by Brisson (1992) 3711. For Thrasyllus’ Pythagoreanizing tendencies see supra, n. 102.
number of ἐπιγραφαί are attested earlier,¹¹³ and there is one famous piece of evidence which would entail that a pre-Thrasylean tetralogic arrangement existed. Varro in the De lingua latina, a treatise published before Cicero’s death in 43 BCE, says (VII 37) that ‘Plato (speaks) in the fourth about the rivers which are in the nether world; one of these he calls Tartarus’ (Plato in III de fluminibus apud inferos quae sint; in his unum Tartarum appellat). The reference is to Phaed. 112a, and the Phaedo is indeed the fourth dialogue on Thrasyllos’ list at D.L. III 62. Now only dialogues two to four of the first tetralogy are provided with ordinal numbers in this list, and the Phaedo is introduced thus: τέταρτος Φαίδων.¹¹⁴ If Varro’s source really was Dercyllides’ purported edition or a discussion of the tetralogies in the latter’s Platonic Philosophy, this edition or this work could hardly have remained unknown to Cicero, who however never refers to a person who is supposed to have worked under the aegis of his intimate friend Atticus. The inventor of the tetralogical arrangement remains anonymous.

Important information has been preserved at D.L. III 57. Thrasyllos said that if the Republic is ‘divided into ten’ (ei̇ς δέκα διατρομένης) and the Laws ‘into twelve’ (ei̇ς δυοκαϊδέκα) — as they still are in our manuscripts and editions — there are fifty-six genuine (γνήσιοι) dialogues.¹¹⁵ The set of Letters which he

¹¹³ For these first and second titles see below, section 2.4.
¹¹⁴ It has been suggested, e.g. by Barnes (1991a) 127 n. 50, that this evidence is dubious because Varro’s text may be corrupt and at any rate does not refer to the first tetralogy, cf. also Dunn (1974) 55. Tarrant (1993) 73 ff. argues on similar lines. He points out that if Varro’s text is taken au pied de la lettre, its author is saddled with a mistake because Tartarus is not a river in the nether world. He therefore considers various emendations, or explanations, of the muddle, in which consequence gets even worse. He adds that ordinal numbers are only used within a tetralogy and that there is no evidence that the dialogues were numbered from first to thirty-sixth. True enough, but the fourth item of the first set of four undeniably is the fourth of the whole series, and I hold on to the belief that the ordinal in Diogenes’ text sufficiently explains what is in Varro.
¹¹⁵ Among these γνήσιοι Thrasyllos includes the Epinomis (also accepted by Aristophanes), ascribed by other ancient critics to Philip of Opus (D.L. III 37; see now Tarán (1975) 3 ff., who strongly argues in favour of inauthenticity), as well as a few other pieces (e.g. Alc. min., ascribed by some to Xenophon according to Athenaeus 506C) the authenticity of which has been and still is in doubt, see e.g. Guthrie (1975) 40 ff., Tarán (1975) 7, and Slings (1981) who reluctantly opts for the inauthenticity of the Clit. That Thrasyllos really believed the Erastai (which he called Anterastai) to be
accepted as genuine consist of thirteen individual items. He accordingly dealt with the questions of (1) authenticity (γνήσιον) and of (2) the division (διαίρεσις) into parts, the latter in the way attested by Aelius Donatus and Servius. The two large works are each divided into books (numerus librorum), just as the Aeneid and Georgics, and the Letters consist of individual pieces, just as the Bucolics. For the tetralogic ordering, however, the Republic, the Laws and the Letters are counted as one each, so that we get nine tetralogies, or a total of thirty-six dialogues believed to be by Plato. Here he followed the example of Aristophanes, who also counted the Republic and the Laws as one dialogue each. That Aristophanes did so is worthy of note, because the divisions into ten and twelve books respectively will be Alexandrian and perhaps even go back to Aristophanes himself. Yet they were counted as one each by him not only because of their title but also because they had reached him as individual works (we do not know how many papyrus scrolls were needed for each of them). Thrasyllus accepted the tradition. Innovation, that is to say counting the Republic as ten and the Laws as twelve dialogues, would have destroyed the arrangement according to the gratifying and useful $3^3 \times 2^2$ calculation. But the number fifty-six may also be resolved into arithmetically satisfying factors, viz. $7 \times 2^3$ (cf. Philo, Quaest. Gen. I 91). Fifty-six dialogues could have been divided into fourteen (i.e. $2 \times 7$) tetralogies. In fact, Thrasyllus acknowledged that there are fifty-six dialogues if the individual books of the Republic and Laws are counted as one dialogue each, a fact which may have pleased him. I believe that he preferred the arrangement into nine sets of four because it would have been a major innovation, and indeed a quite difficult undertaking, to devise first and second titles for each book of the Republic and the Laws.

Thrasyllus' ordering from tetralogy one to tetralogy nine, as we shall see, is to some extent meant as a systematic order of study, so (3) a third preliminary question is implied, viz. the one later called τὰ ἔξι τῆς ἀναγνώσεως. As his very first tetralogy Thrasyllus positions the one which has a 'common plot' (or subject, κοινὴν ὑπόθεσιν), as he calls it, 'for he intends to

---

116 See supra, n. 24, infra, n. 193 and text thereto, n. 232. Dunn (1974) 78 ff. and (1976) 63 ff. suggests that the "common theme" (as he translates) may
demonstrate what should be the life (βίος) of the philosopher’. From a dramatic and biographical point of view Euthyphro + Apology + Crito + Phaedo indeed form a unity, and may be said to show how the life-and-death of a philosopher, or even of a man, should be. Thrasyllus, in other words, belongs with those who advocate the exemplum Socratis; he follows a trend. The Euthyphro deals with the proper attitude towards the gods. The dualistic Phaedo is very much a pythagoreanizing dialogue. Socrates’ main discussion partners are two Pythagoreans, Simmias and Cebe, and the doctrines of another Pythagorean, Philolaus, are discussed at some length. Socrates’ own argument in favour of the immortality of the soul must also have been entirely acceptable to a pythagoreanizing Platonist or platonizing Pythagorean such as Thrasyllus. He will however have been a rather enlightened Pythagorean, for apparently he did not mind the sacrifice of the rooster to Asclepius. Some of the Letters must have been equally welcome, for instance the (as we know pseudepigraphic) Pythagoreanizing Second Letter.

We should realize that the theme of the bios actually occurs three times in Thrasyllus’ essay on Plato, viz. first in the

be either that of the first tetralogy or of the whole set of nine and is inclined to believe the latter, though he does not wish to press the point. He attempts to make sense of the whole series of nine tetralogies from the point of view of an order of study. His argument is attractive because it arranges groups of tetralogies under systematic headings, just as Thrasyllus did in his Democritus catalogue or, mutatis mutandis, Porphyry in his systematic rearrangement of Plotinus’ treatises (Dunn (1974) 77 f.). But it fails because it is dependent on the ‘characters’ which, as we shall see below, do not belong with Thrasyllus’ original arrangement. Tarrant’s alternative but similar attempt (1993) 89 ff. does not convince for the same reason (but note that ibid., 24 n. 1, he suggests that the characters were added to Thrasyllus’ list by Diogenes Laërtius).

117 Regenbogen (1950) 1441 argues that Thrasyllus is responsible for this “eisagogische Wendung”; see also Dörrie–Baltes (1990) 340 f. We do not know which dialogues apart from the Phaedo were contained in the first tetralogy of the anonymous predecessor cited by Varro, but it is rather unlikely that these were different. If so, this predecessor may already have emphasized the philosophical life and Socrates’ paradigmatic function. For the exemplum Socratis in the early imperial period see Döring (1979), Fiore (1986) 115 ff., and Long (1988) 155 on Socrates as the paradigm of the philosophical life in the Socratic schools, 150 f. on Epictetus’ Socrates; cf. also Fiore (1986) 176 ff. on the stories in the so-called Socratic Epistles about Plato as a personal example to his immediate pupils. See also Newman (1989) 1491 ff., on exempla in Seneca, and 1503 ff., on exempla in Epictetus. Cf. further below, chapter six, section 2.
biography of Plato before the account of the dialogues, secondly as the subject (the life-and-death of the philosopher Socrates) shared by the dialogues of the first tetralogy, and finally in relation to the life of the philosopher Plato as documented in the last item of the final tetralogy, viz. the Letters. Hence the use of the word ὑπόθεσις is particularly apposite. Its origin has to be sought in the practice of the Alexandrian philologists, especially Aristophanes of Byzantium, who was famous for his hypotheseis (‘plots’) of individual tragedies and, presumably, comedies.\textsuperscript{118} We may readily believe that Aristophanes justified his arrangement of fifteen Platonic dialogues as five trilogies by their dramatic relationship in a more literary sense, basing himself on internal cross-references and similar clues.\textsuperscript{119} From there it is a small step to the assumption that he wrote a kind of hypothesis for each individual dialogue, in which he also explained its relation to the other dialogues in the same trilogy, while the unordered dialogues will have been treated differently: with hypotheseis but without interrelations. This anyhow would give more point to Thrasyllus’ remark about the ‘common’, or ‘shared’, hypothesis of his first set of four dialogues. If these considerations are acceptable, Thrasyllus would have criticized Aristophanes’ arrangement consistently by arguing that trilogies are inapposite and, perhaps, that individual hypotheseis are mistaken.

Thrasyllus also answers the later general question (4) as to

\textsuperscript{118} See Pfeiffer (1978) 238 ff. (and cf. supra, n. 82), Holwerda (1976) 184 f. In the introductions to and vitae of Aratus, ὑπόθεσις is used a number of times in the sense of ‘subject’, ‘theme’: in the so-called Isagoge of Achilles (see infra, n. 281 and text thereto), p. 29.27 (theme of the Iliad), p. 30.12 (astronomical subjects to be found in Homer); in the fragment On Exegesis, pp. 33.22 and 34.24 Martin = p. 81.6-7 and 32 Maass (theme of Aratus’ epic); and in Vita III, p. 16.25 Martin = p. 149.12 Maass (idem). Ps.Plut., De Homero 2, ch. 218.1.3.4, uses ὑπόθεσις three times (in this ch. only) for the themes of the two Homeric epics. In the prolegomena of the Scholia in Apollonium Rhodium vetera, pp. 2.16 and 3.18, the contents of the epic which are briefly summarized (two alternative versions) are announced with the word ὑπόθεσις. At Anaximenes, Ars rhetorica 29.1 (= Ps.Arist., Rhet. Alex. 1436a34 ff.), ὑπόθεσις is used for the ‘subject of a speech’, then also by later rhetoricians, see Meijering (1987) 107 ff.; for its use in literary and rhetorical contexts see ibid., 116 ff., where numerous examples are provided. Cf. also Lucian, Quom. hist. conscr. 6, τῆς παρὰ τὸν ὑπόθεσις (transl. “das vorliegende Thema” by Homeyer (1965) 101).

what has to be the first work to be studied by putting the *Euthyphro* first, as D.L. III 62 explicitly confirms. In a less literal sense, the sequence of the first four dialogues is placed first, as a dramatic whole-in-four-parts which moreover demonstrates that the (study of the) dramatic bios of the philosopher Socrates should precede that of the other works in which he appears, or even fails to appear. At the same time, his remark about the common subject anticipates (5) the preliminary question later called σκόπος,\(^{120}\) and a concern with the theme and scope of the dialogues is of course also apparent from the systematic use of thematic titles. What is more to the point, however, is that the *Euthyphro* + *Apology* + *Crito* + *Phaedo* as the first dialogues to be studied may be believed to produce in the reader, or student, the necessary preliminary moral education and spiritual purification which the Late Neoplatonists sought to achieve not by reading Plato's *Greater Alcibiades* (their curriculum, after all, began with Porphyry's *Isagoge* and Aristotle's logical works), but by means of the study of the Pythagorean *Golden Verses* or Epictetus' *Enchiridion*. If this is correct, the second tetralogy, *Cratylius* + *Theaetetus* + *Sophista* + *Politicus*, which consists of dialogues dealing with logical and epistemological questions, also seems to fall into place. After the preliminary moral and intellectual purification, the first set of works to be studied is the one devoted to the logical part of philosophy in the Hellenistic, especially Stoic, sense of the word ‘part’, for in the Stoic system epistemology was included in logic (e.g. D.L. VII 43 and 49 ff.). Accordingly, Thrasyllus' arrangement of Plato's dialogues to some extent seems to follow the general trend, just as, presumably, Andronicus' arrangement of Aristotle's works did.

Yet it is not clear in what sense the dialogues in between the second tetralogy and the last item in the final tetralogy are ordered according to a didactic sequence. It would seem that most of the time Thrasyllus still applies literary rather than philosophical criteria, just as Aristophanes had done before him. The dialogues of his first tetralogy have a common philosophical theme, but as a set of dialogues which belong together this tetralogy can also be justified from a literary point of view, viz. one concerned with the chronology of the events that are depicted. It is precisely because of the dramatic links between the dialogues

\(^{120}\) Cf. Dalsgaard Larsen (1972) 234.
according to the tetralogic arrangement that Albinus, *Prol.* ch. 4, p. 149.5 ff. Hermann, severely criticizes Thrasyllos and Dercyllides. The sequence of the dialogues of their first tetralogy, he argues, is entirely determined by the chronology of Socrates’ trial, conviction, imprisonment and death. These men wish to impose an ordering (τάξιν) according to the persons involved and to what happens to them. From his point of view this is useless, because what he ‘wants to find is a first beginning and ordering of the instruction (sc. by means of the dialogues) according to wisdom’ (βουλόμεθα ... ἄρχην καὶ διάταξιν διδασκαλίας τῆς κατὰ σοφίαν εὑρεῖν). Instead of criticizing one or several of the other tetralogies Albinus picks the one for which Thrasyllos had in fact provided a philosophical justification, and the one he had put first. From a strictly philosophical-and-didactic point of view the tetralogic ordering in his view should therefore be rejected. But even Albinus did not entirely abandon the tradition. According to the order of study he prescribes for future Platonists, for instance, the *Euthyphro* is still the first dialogue to be studied. This is a point to which I shall return below, in section 2.7.

2.4 *The Double Titles*

Diogenes tells us that Thrasyllos ‘used double titles’ for the individual books (διπλαῖς .. χρηται ταις ἐπιγραφαις),\(^\text{121}\) the first taken from the name\(^\text{122}\) (ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄνοματος, viz. of a *dramatis persona*—e.g. *Phaedo*; or a dramatic event—e.g. *Symposium*), the second from the contents (ἀπὸ τοῦ πράγματος). We may recall Proclus’ preliminary question as to whether Plato’s titles are derived from names or from contents. The full lists come next (III 58-61). But some of these titles are attested long before Thrasyllos, who therefore must have followed established usage. It seems certain that the majority of the *first* titles (of the genuine works at least)

---

\(^\text{121}\) The thematic title of the *Apol.* is lacking while the *Epin.* sports two, the first of which is entirely apposite; this may be due to errors in the transmission and the second thematic title of the *Epin.* should perhaps be transferred to the *Apol.* The collection of 13 *Letters* either lacks a first title, which however seems to be compensated for in a way by the list of addressees of individual pieces added *ad fin.*, or, understandably, a second title.

\(^\text{122}\) This is a bit odd, because first titles such as *Soph.*, *Politic.*, *Rep.* and *Leg.* are thematic. But for the first two we may perhaps think of dramatic titles such as Menander’s Δεισιδαίμων, Δύσκολος and Νομοθέτης.
derive from Plato himself. We should adduce his remarkable lapse at Politic. 284b7, 'just as in the Sophist we forced non-being to be' (καθότερ ἐν τῷ Σοφιστῇ προσηναγκάσαμεν εἰναί τὸ μὴ οὖν).

Aristotle cites the first titles of eight dialogues, and Theophrastus in his lost Laws cited the first title of the Republic. Fifteen first titles are attested in the next century in the ordering according to trilogies of Aristophanes of Byzantium at D.L. III 62. Again, Aristotle already refers to the Menexenus by its (Thrasyllean) second, i.e. thematic, title only (Pol. Γ 14.1415b31), and his reference to the Symposium is also by a second title (Pol. B 4.1262b11), though one different from Thrasylus'. Callimachus cites the Phaedo by its second title only (Epigr. 23.4 Pfeiffer). We have

---

123 See e.g. Alline (1915) 55 with n. 5, Dirlmeier (1962) 7. Cf. also Politic. 286b10. Skemp (1952) 172 translates "when discussing the sophist", but this seems far-fetched.

124 See Bonitz, Ind. arist. 598a-599a, s.v. Πλάτων, and Alline (1915) 54 f.: Aristotle cites the first titles of Rep., Nom., Tim., Phaed., Phaedr., Hipp., Men. and Gorg. Proclus, In Remp., I, p. 8.10 ff. (cf. supra, text before n. 52) refers to both Aristotle (two lost works, see frs. 180 and 181 2Rose, and the Pol.) and Theophrastus (see fr. 595 Fortenbaugh) in support of the view that the title Πολιτεία is 'very old'. Proclus, In Remp., I, pp. 8.16-9.16, also mentions other titles which were believed to have been given by Plato, viz. those pertaining to the matters that are discussed; his examples are Soph. and Politic. Other titles (Proclus does not say which) were believed to have been added by later people who availed themselves of their opportunity to do so.

125 The Symp. is cited by Aristotle as οἱ ἔρωτικοι λόγοι (cf. Schütrumpf (1991) 185), a second title much different from Thrasylus' περὶ ἀγαθοῦ. It is equivalent to περὶ ἔρωτος as the second title of the Symp. found in the medieval manuscript tradition, see Alline (1915) 55. Conversely, the second title περὶ ἔρωτος goes with the Phaedr. in Thrasylus' catalogue and so was not available for the Symposium; the manuscripts have περὶ καλοῦ for the latter. In the catalogue περὶ καλοῦ goes with the first Alc., tetralogy VII 1. See Alline (1915) 125 ff., also for further (but minor) differences of this nature. There is accordingly some evidence that Thrasylus was in a position to choose from alternative second titles, or in certain cases perhaps in vain tried to impose second titles of his own. Note that in Thrasylus Symp. is tetralogy III 3 and Phaedr. III 4. According to Hunain ibn Ishaq, Über die syrischen und arabischen Galenübersetzungen, transl. Bergstrasser (1925) 41 (cf. the Latin transl. in Kraus-Walzer (1943) 97 f.) the following second titles were found in a volume of Galen's Synopsis of Plato's Dialogues: '... Κρατύλος über die Namen, ... Σοφιστής über die Einteilung, ... Πολιτικός über den Regenten, ... Παρμενίδης über die Bilder [i.e. the Ideas]' (cf. also Nüsser (1991) 135). Here the second title of the Politicus is (oddly) equivalent to the first, while those of the others are the same as or equivalent to those in the Thrasylus catalogue. In our manuscripts, however, the second title of the Parm. is περὶ τοῦ άντος (preferred by some of the 'ancients' according to Proclus, In Parm. p. 635.35-6; cf. supra, text after n. 58, and cf. also supra, text to n. 52). Galen's arrangement according to Hunain's information regarding
seen that Varro appears to be in a position to refer to the *Phaedo* by means of an ordinal number. I believe that the second title of the *Timaeus* is also very much pre-Thrasyllean, for it is περὶ φύσεως not περὶ κόσμου. The most likely hypothesis is therefore that Thrasyllus generalized the use of the second title, that is to say provided a second title for every work included in his tetralogies. A perusal of the catalogues of individual philosophers in Diogenes, for what these are worth, shows that titles which are personal names are rather common, but that such names are not as a rule accompanied by a thematic title of the form ή (περὶ) x.127

The books of the *Synopsis* he knew is peculiar: *Crat.*, *Soph.*, *Politic.*, *Parm.*, *Euthyd.*, *Resp.*, *Tim.*, *Leg.* Tarrant (1993) 32 ff. speculates that the (non-tetralogic) arrangement of Plato's works with some discussion cited by al-Farabi (ed. Rosenthal-Walzer (1948)) derives from Galen's *Synopsis*, but what is in al-Farabi is very much different from what is in Hunain. Rosenthal-Walzer (1948) xii ff. argued that al-Farabi's source is a Middle Platonist author and suggested Theon of Smyrna; this was refuted by Dunn (1974) 146 ff., who speculated that Themistius is the source. For the second titles recorded by al-Farabi, which sometimes differ from those in Thrasyllus, see the notes in Rosenthal-Walzer (1948) 17 ff.; this evidence shows that in some cases alternative second titles were current in later times. The decisive factor was the interpretation of the scope of the dialogue, as is also clear from what Proclus says (cf. supra, n. 124). Such differences of interpretation may help to explain some of the cases where the second title in our manuscripts differs from those in Thrasyllus catalogue.

126 See Mansfeld (1992b) 399 f. and n. 59. For περὶ φύσεως in Plato see e.g. *Lys.* 214b4-5, *Phaed.* 96a8, and the discussion by Schmalzriedt (1978) 83 ff. The thesis of Hoerber (1957) 18 ff. that the second titles must be fourth-century because thematic titles with περὶ are very common in the fourth century BCE is entirely unconvincing (cf. infra, n. 127). He further supports this by arguing that *Ep.* 13 is genuine (wrong) and that it refers to the *Phaed.* by its second title at 363a (right). Tarrant (1993) 91 f. correctly argues that Thrasyllus is responsible for the fact that all (or nearly all) the dialogues have a second title.

127 General overview in Regenbogen (1950) 1430 ff. For our present purpose one should not count those instances where the formula ή (περὶ) introduces a second title which is of the same type as the first. The unambiguous cases of the form ή (περὶ) x indicating the subject I have seen are D.L. IV 13 (Xenocrates): 'Αρχέ­θη­μος ή περὶ δικα­ίωσιν, V 22 (Aristotle): the slightly differently formulated Περὶ η­το­ρι­κῆς ή Γρύ­λος and 'Αλέ­ξαν­δρος ή υ­περ ά­σι­κιον (contrast e.g. the Νή­π­ρι­νθος and Μενέ­ζε­νος, without added thematic title), V 44 (Theophrastus): Κα­λι­λι­θ­ε­νῆς ή πε­ρὶ πέ­ν­θους (contrast the Με­γα­κ­λῆς, without added thematic title), and VI 15-18 = Antisth. fr. 1 Decleva Caizzi, fr. V A 41 Giannantoni, catalogue of the edition of Antisthenes in ten τόμοι = groups of scrolls (on which see Patzer (1970) 127 ff., 140 ff., and Giannantoni (1990) IV 235 ff.; the tenth 'tome' seems to have contained works the authenticity of which had been in doubt): 'Η­ρα­κ­λῆς ή με­ι­ζων ή πε­ρὶ ι­σ­χ­υος, Κύ­ρος ή πε­ρὶ βα­σι­λε­ίας, Σύ­θων (ή) πε­ρὶ το­ύ ά­ν­τι­λ­έ­γειν, and in the last tome 'Η­ρα­κ­λῆς ή πε­ρὶ φ­ρο­ν­ή­σεως κατί ι­σ­χ­υος, Κύ­ρος ή έ­ρ­ω­μενος, Κύ­ρος ή κα­τά­σκο­ποι, Με­νέ­ζε­νος ή
However this may be, the important thing is that Thrasyllus also dealt with (6) the issue of the αἰτία τῆς ἐπιγραφῆς, for as we have seen he indicated the nature of each type of title, viz. name and theme, and the majority of his second titles indicate the theme (the later σκοπός).

2.5 The 'Characters' and their Diaeresis

Thrasyllus' catalogue as reported in Diogenes also contains a third element for each Platonic work, viz. a descriptive term denoting its so-called 'character' or characterizing attribute. Diogenes as we have seen explicitly tells us that 'he used double titles' for each work, but does not say whether this third element was already found in Thrasyllus as well.

These descriptive terms are not only present in the catalogue but are also discussed in a systematic way in an earlier passage in Diogenes, viz. III 49 ff. This characterization is a classification according to a systematic point of view. With one exception (for which see below) the classificatory species at III 50 f. do not have one-to-one relations with sections of the tetralogic ordering, so represent an originally different attempt to provide the Platonic corpus with a sort of structure. A mutilated version of the same classification is found at Albinus, Prol. ch. 3, and taken up again ibid., ch. 6. Albinus explicitly discusses and sharply criticizes the tetralogic ordering of Dercyllides and Thrasyllus in a different chapter, viz. ch. 4. All the works listed in his third chapter are also found in the Thrasylllean tetralogies. It is important to acknowledge that strictly speaking Albinus provides the t.a.q. for this classification.

At D.L. III 49 the classification has the form of a three-tiered (and as to its formal structure typically Middle Platonist) strictly dichotomous diaeresis. It is noteworthy that in the intelligent
excerpts from D.L. III in the Viennese *Cod. phil. gr. 314*, f. 27v., chapter III 49 is represented by a diaeretic scheme only.\(^{128}\) The dialogues subsumed under the atomic species are listed at III 50-1, and the diaeresis itself may be set out as follows:

\[\text{dialogue} \]
\[\text{for instruction} \quad \text{for inquiry} \]
\[\text{theoretical} \quad \text{practical} \]
\[\text{physical} \quad \text{logical} \]
\[\text{Tim.} \quad \text{Pol.} \quad \text{Apol.} \quad \text{ethic.} \quad \text{materia} \quad \text{Prot.} \]
\[\text{Crat.} \quad \text{Crito} \quad \text{Rep.} \quad \text{theo} \quad \text{Euthypro} \quad \text{Euthyd.} \]
\[\text{Parm.} \quad \text{Phd.} \quad \text{Leg.} \quad \text{Men} \quad \text{Gorg.} \]
\[\text{Soph.} \quad \text{Phaedr.} \quad \text{Minos} \quad \text{Io} \quad \text{Hipp.} \]
\[\text{Symp.} \quad \text{Epin.} \quad \text{Crit.} \quad \text{Lysic.} \quad \text{Hipp. I} \]
\[\text{etc.} \quad \text{Crito} \quad \text{Charm.} \quad \text{Theaet.} \quad \text{Hipp. II} \]

\(^{128}\) Surprisingly, D.L. III 49-51 is not printed among the *Bausteine* texts in Dörrie–Baltes (1990); it is however discussed *ibid.*, 342 ff. It has not been noticed by Hoerber (1957) 14 ff. Dillon (1977) 304 and Whitaker (1987) 97 unfortunately attribute the classification at D.L. III 49 to Thrasyllus (cf. also *infra*, n. 150). Brisson (1992) 3699 ff., following Alline (1915) 52 ff., is explicit about the diaeretic structure. Philip (1970) 302 sets out Diogenes' diaeresis (which *ibid.*, 302 ff., he compares with that of Albinus) but unfortunately believes (*ibid.*, 304) that the method of diaeresis was not used after the fourth century BCE. The relevant sections in Diogenes Laërtius and Albinus were first compared in the pioneering study of Freudenthal (1879) 256 ff., who *ibid.*, 262, prints a diaeresis which, as is pointed out by Dunn (1974) 167 and as we shall see below (*infra*, n. 152 and text thereto, n. 138 *ad finem*) is not a diaeresis. A correct version of the diaeresis at D.L. III 49-51, including the dialogues to be subsumed under the atomic species, is to be found at Schissel (1931) 219, at Dunn (1974) 9 ff., at Neschke-Hentschke (1991) 171 n. 14, and at Nüsser (1991) 243. For a preliminary history of the method up to Late Antiquity see Mansfeld (1992a) 326 ff.; for the standard Middle Platonist version of the Platonic dichotomous diaeresis see *ibid.*, 78 ff. For the Viennese excerpts see the forthcoming paper of T. Dorandi, *Estratti dal libro III di Diogene Laerzio in un codice di Vienna* (*Cod.phil.gr. 314*). Speculations on the original scope of the systematic classification are to be found in Tarrant (1998) 46 ff. The attempts of Dunn (1974) 135 ff. and Nüsser (1991) 152 ff. to ascribe a variety of the systematic diaeresis to Theon of Smyrna on the basis of the garbled lists in the Arabic sources are entirely speculative. No remark by Theon concerned with this classification is recorded, and a good deal of rewriting or of indulgence towards the numerous deviations is needed to achieve the desired result.
We must take into account that in the tetralogic arrangement at D.L. III 58-60 the third items, or descriptive attributes of the individual dialogues, are the same as those found in the systematic diaeresis at III 49 ff. There is only one exception: the Critias is called political at III 50 and ethical at III 60 (what is more, at III 50 it is referred to with its second title only). The parallel division at Albin., Prol. ch. 3, lacks the second tier and so is incomplete in a most interesting way, as we shall see. The characterizations in the bottom row of Diogenes’ diaeresis which I have italicized occur in a somewhat different sequence in Albin., Prol. ch. 3 (according to Baltes' reconstruction of the text), viz. political before ethical and ‘peirastic’ before ‘maeutic’. These differences are not overly significant; instead of ‘endeictic’ Albinus moreover has the perhaps equivalent term ‘elenctic’. The division according to Albin., Prol. ch. 3, is as follows:

---

129 See Hoerber (1957) 17 (but as we shall see his contention that the characterizing adjectives were added by Thrasyllos does not follow); see further infra, text after n. 147.

130 Baltes’ reconstruction of the Albinus passage in the archetypus as given at Dörrie–Baltes (1990) 516 f., which I follow here, is entirely convincing: emendations based on a study of the only relevant manuscript, and a revision of the similar attempt of Freudenthal (1879) 322 ff., who as we have seen (supra, n. 128) adduced D.L. III 59-61, and of the less commendable effort of Schissel (1991) 220 ff. See also Dörrie–Baltes (1990) 341 ff. Either because of accidents of transmission or because the excptor left them out (think of the dialogues with the same personal name in their first titles) several dialogues have dropped out in Albinus’ survey in Prol., ch. 3, while that of Diogenes at III 50-51 is complete. Dunn (1974) 165 ff. has noticed that the diaeresis at Prol. ch. 3 is incomplete. Tarrant (1993) 58 ff. provides a complicated reconstruction of his own and implausibly argues that Albinus does not list all the thirty-six dialogues of the Thrasyllean canon to begin with, and that the fact that several titles are missing is therefore no accident. Hoerber (1957) has missed the parallels in Albinus. Philip (1970) 302 f. compares Diogenes and Albinus, and has seen that the second tier is lacking at Prol., ch. 3; though he refers to ch. 6 he has missed the differences from ch. 3. Brisson (1992) 3699 ff. refers to Prol., ch. 3, but not to ch. 6, and fails to discuss the differences between Diogenes and Albinus. Dillon (1977) 305 points out that Albinus at Prol. ch. 3 “simplifies Thrasyllos’ diereetic scheme drastically” (the attribution of D.L. III 49 to Thrasyllos however is not good, cf. supra, n. 128). For the first tier of Albinus’ (and Diogenes’) diaeresis in Galen see infra, text to n. 228.
One observes that this is indeed a mutilated but still quite faithful version of what is in Diogenes. What is important to note is that if we read the lowest tier in Diogenes and its twin at Albin., *Prol.* ch. 3, from left to right, we first have a standard division of philosophy into its three parts though in a rather unusual order, viz. physics—logic—ethics-cum-politics.131 ‘Logic’ here (represented

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>physical</th>
<th>logical</th>
<th>political</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hellen.</td>
<td>Minos</td>
<td>Alc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parm.</td>
<td>Leg.</td>
<td>Prot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Epin.</td>
<td>Hipp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Euthyp.</td>
<td>Euthyd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mem.</td>
<td>Gorg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charm.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Laches</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

131 Not cited by P. Hadot (1990). According to the Middle Platonist Atticus (second century CE), fr. 1 des Places, *ap. Eus.* *P. E. XI* ii 2.1, the sequence is ethics—logic—physics, ethics itself being subdivided in ethics proper, economics and politics. According to the Aristotelian Aristocles (second century CE), *ap. Eus.* *P. E. XI* iii 3.6, Plato’s sequence is physics—ethics—logic. The Peripatetic scholar Boethus argued that one should start the study of Aristotle with the physical treatises, see Philoponus, *In Cat.* p. 5.16 ff., and Moraux (1973) 144. Hoerber (1957) 17 cites the classification which D.L. V 28 f. attributes to Aristotle incorrectly, as a next step wrongly attributes this to the fourth century BCE, and caps his argument by stating that it is a parallel for D.L. III 49. At D.L. V 28 f. the division begins with practical philosophy / theoretical philosophy (genuinely Aristotelian, see *Met.* E 1.1025b3 ff.). What follows however is a later development. Practical philosophy is subdivided into (a) ethics and (b) politics under which (b) economics is subsumed (cf. the parallels cited infra, n. 139). Theoretical philosophy is subdivided into (c) physics and (d) logic, logic itself, though just listed as a *part* of theoretical philosophy, now being defined as ‘not fully *part*, but instrument’ (my emphasis; οὐ όλομέρος ἄλλα ὡς δραμαν—ορ: ‘not as part of (the) whole’, with Moraux’s plausible conjecture οὐ ός ἄλοι μέρος printed in the OCT text. Of the mss., BP have ως...μέρος (rasura 3 lin.), whereas F has όλομέρως). This instrumental discipline is then divided into (d1) a part dealing with probability (subdivided into (d1a) dialectic and (d1b) rhetoric) and (d2) a part dealing with truth (subdivided into (d2a) analytics and, oddly, (d2b) ‘philosophy’). The *Top.* are said to deal with invention and the *Anal.* with proof, viz. the *An. pr.* with the testing of premises and the *An. po.* with that of arguments, and the *Soph. el.* and similar works are said to be aimed at utility. For this later Aristotelian division and Diogenes’ surprising and at first sight inconsistent treatment of Aristotelian logic see...
by four and only four dialogues, in the order *Politics*, *Crat.*, *Parm.* and *Soph.* in Diogenes, and as we shall see by the same dialogues in a different order in Albinus) perhaps is not logic in our sense of the word but dialectic, Plato’s supreme science. The left-hand part of the division as a whole comprises the works which according to Diogenes and Albinus are ‘for instruction’ (*χαρακτήρ υφηγητικός*), which term is explained by Albinus as meaning ‘being geared towards teaching and action and proof of the truth’ (ἡμοσται πρὸς διδασκαλίαν καὶ πρᾶξιν καὶ ἀπόδειξιν τοῦ ἀληθοῦς). The other group of four atomic species contains the works which according to Diogenes and Albinus are ‘for inquiry’ (*χαρακτήρ ζητητικός*), explained by Albinus as being geared ‘towards training and competition and the unmasking of falsehood’ (πρὸς γυμνασίαν καὶ ἀγώνα καὶ ἑλέγχον τοῦ ψεύδους).

Freudenthal and others oddly believe that these two tripartite qualifications represent the second tier of Albinus diaeresis. But apart from the fact that a tripartite diaeresis is not Platonist, or Middle Platonist, and that the eight atomic species of the characters cannot be satisfactorily (i.e. by means of further division) linked with these six purported species, a short glance at the first of these descriptions already shows that this suggestion cannot be right. The word διδασκαλία is synonymous with υφήγησις, as clearly appears from Proclus’ reference to the first tier of the diaeresis, *In Alc.* § 236.12 ff., μία μὲν ἡ ζήτησις, μία δὲ ἡ διδασκαλία· διὸ καὶ τῶν τοῦ Πλάτωνος ἔξηγητών τινες τοὺς διαλόγους διείλον εἰς τε τοὺς διδασκαλικούς καὶ τοὺς ζητητικούς, ἐντεύθεν λαβόντες τὴν ἀφορμὴν τῆς τοιαύτης διαιρέσεως. At *In Remp.*, I, p. 15.20 ff., using the standard terminology for the two genera, he mentions a threefold division of the dialogues by ‘some among the Platonists’ into υφηγητικῶν, ζητητικῶν and μικτῶν (this third category is not found in our Middle Platonist sources).

A secondary species or lower genus in a division cannot be co-extensive with the genus under which it falls. It is clear what

Moraux (1986a) 268 ff. It has however occurred to me that Diogenes’ source to some extent may have seen logic in the same way as the Late Neoplatonists, viz. as in itself an instrument which however becomes a part as soon as it is applied to a higher purpose. At any rate, this would explain why ‘philosophy’ is said to belong with logic as geared towards the truth; what should have been said is that this logic belongs with philosophy in the elevated sense of the word. On these divisions and their antecedents in Stoic thought see further Donini (1982) 51 ff.
Albinus did. For his characterization of the two genera he included terms which are inspired by the vocabulary of the second tier of the original division: πράξις, which is based on the second species of the genus 'for instruction', viz. πρακτικός, and γυμνασία + ἀγών, which derive from the two species of the genus 'for inquiry', viz. γυμναστικός and ἀγωνιστικός. Freudenthal and his followers have been led astray because they looked at words rather than conceptual structures. As a matter of fact, the characterizations in this chapter of the genera by means of tripartite descriptions apply to all the atomic species under each genus. The first characterization therefore qualifies all the dialogues that are 'for instruction', and the second all those that are 'for inquiry'. According to this view, all the dialogues concerned with instruction are demonstrations of the truth, and all those concerned with inquiry are refutations of what is false.\(^{132}\) Such a distinction, in inverse order, is also found at Alcinous, Didask. ch. 6, p. 158.16-20

Hermann, in relation to syllogisms: ἐλέγχον μὲν διὰ ζητήσεως τὰ ψευδή, ἀποδεικνύον δὲ διὰ τινος διδασκαλίας τὰ ἀληθή.

Furthermore, I believe that the twofold subdivision of the species practical philosophy as found in Diogenes' first section not only conforms to the Middle Platonist method of constructing dichotomous diaereses, but has in the first place been introduced to achieve perfect symmetry with the right-hand set of four atomic species. Albinus adds that the first group is directed

\(^{132}\) For Freudenthal's misguided attempt at constructing a division see supra, n. 128, and for his argument from Wortphilologie and Sperrdruck Freudenthal (1879) 257; he is followed by e.g. Philip (1970) 303, who states that the defining descriptions by Albinus are "two tripartite divisions". Nesche-Hentschke (1991) 172 ff. believes that the epitomator deleted the diaeresis, but her reconstruction, 173 n. 27, of an a-symmetrical and partly tripartite division is not supported by an analysis of the text. Nüscher (1991) 81 ff., 160, points out the difference between "zwei Zweigen" and "drei Funktionen", but fails to follow this up. For the meaning of διδασκαλία see further e.g. Alcinous, Didask. ch. 1, p. 152.2, and Albinus himself, Prol. ch. 4, p. 148.16 (cf. Nüscher (1991) 292). It is interesting to compare the terminology in Galen, Quod animi mores corporis temperamenta sequantur ch. 11, Ser. min. II, p. 73.3-5, οὖν οὖν ἀναιρετικός δὲ ὁ λόγος ἐστι τῶν ἐκ φιλοσοφίας καλὸν ἄλλ' ψηφιτικός τε καὶ διδασκαλικός, De locis affectis VIII 119.13 f. K., τῆς δ' Ἀρχίγενου διδασκαλίας ἴδιον ἐξαιρέτων ἐστιν οὐ πραγμάτων ψηφίσεως καίνων, ἄλλ' ἀνομέτων οὐδὲν πράγμα δηλοῦντον, and pS. Galen, Introductio sive medicus ch. 2, XIV 676.17-677.1 K., where παράδοσις is an alternative for ψηφίσεως (on this interesting tract, to be dated to the second cent. CE, see Kollesch (1973) 30 ff.). For training see supra, n. 8, n. 38, text to n. 59, infra, text to n. 298, n. 304 and text thereto.
towards the contents or doctrines (τῶν πραγμάτων στοχάζεται) and the second aimed at the persons (τῶν προσώπων) of the dialogue, i.e. is polemical, protreptic or maieutic. This distinction is rather different from that between the second and first titles of the tetralogic arrangement as set out by Thrasyllos, and also from Proclus’ question as to whether the titles of the dialogues are derived from themes or names.

The bipartite division of the dialogues in the first tier of the diaeresis at D.L. III 49 and Albin., Prol. ch. 3, is also paralleled to some extent at D.L. III 51-2.133 The difference in approach should of course not be overlooked. At III 51-2, Diogenes briefly adverts to the dispute concerned with Plato’s intentions: is he a dogmatic philosopher or a sceptic? The answer is: both, and he is a polemical philosopher as well. In our present context only the first and third alternatives are relevant: ‘Plato states his own position with regard to the things he knows, and thoroughly refutes falsehoods’, and it is noteworthy that only these are determined by Diogenes ἐκ προσώπου. As mouthpieces for expounding his own tenets (τῶν αὐτῷ δοκούντων) Plato uses Socrates, Timaeus, the friend from Athens and the friend from Elea. As to the falsehoods, the role of those that are refuted is given to Thrasymachus, Callicles, Polus, Gorgias, Protagoras, Hippias, Euthydemus and the like.134

133 Brisson (1992) 3718 n. 469, referring to ibid., 1704, compares what is said at III 51-2 with the third interpretative rule at III 65 which is cited next in D.L. Nüser (1991) 139 ff. has seen the connection between the two passages, and also adduces the important parallel for D.L. III 51-2 at Sextus, P. I 221 (following Dunn (1974) 19 with 42, n. 23). Cf. also fr. 2 of the anonymous introduction to Plato on papyrus, though some personae are here indentified in a different way; see Haslam (1972) 24 ff., and Nüser (1991) 16 ff.

134 For the interpretation ἐκ προσώπου see supra, n. 7 and text thereto, text to n. 42. Diogenes says περὶ δὲ τῶν ψευδῶν ἐλεγχομένως εἰσάγει οἶδιν θρασύμαχον καὶ Καλλικλέα κτλ.; the term εἰσάγειν, ‘to introduce on the stage’ (cf. Aristoph., Acharn. 11. εἰσαγ., ὁ Θέσουν, τῶν χορόν), is technical in this context. See also Sextus, P. I 221, ὁ Σωκράτης εἰσάγεται; for speeches in historical works see e.g. Lucian, Quom. hist. conscr. 58, ἢν δὲ ποτε καὶ λόγους ἐρωτάτα τινα δεὶ εἰσάγειν κτλ. For D.L. III 51-2 see Andreosen (1952-3) 17. Cf. also Quintilian, III viii.51-4, and the remark of Rondeau (1985) 43: “Quand il envisage le texte comme une prosopopee, l’exégète scrute plutôt le couple formé par l’auteur et locuteur; l’auteur parle-t-il en son propre nom, ou bien parle-t-il au nom d’un autre, et alors au nom de qui?”. For a rhetorical appreciation of this aspect of Plato’s art see Aelius Theon, Progymnasmati, in Rhet. graec. min. II, p. 68.21 ff. The distinction is also found at e.g. Simplicius, In Enchir. p. 28.37 ff., where first Socrates in the Phaedo is quoted and then
There is a further parallel at D.L. III 65, which with tantalizing brevity deals with the threefold method of interpretation of Plato’s dialogues, including that of individual passages (η ἐξήγησις αὐτοῦ τῶν λόγων). One of the objectives is to distinguish between what is said to establish Plato’s own doctrines (ἐἰς δογμάτων κατασκευὴν) on the one hand, from what is said to refute an opponent (ἐἰς ἔλεγχον τοῦ προσδιαλογουμένου) on the other. We must take notice of the fact that dogmatic and polemical passages may and do occur in one and the same dialogue, for instance in the Republic. Accordingly, this method of interpretation allows for finer distinctions than the after all rather rough distinction between dialogues which are ‘for instruction’ and others which are ‘for inquiry’. This is to some extent true of the interpretation ἐκ προσώπου as well, which equally permits distinctions to be made within a dialogue.

Furthermore, in the account of the nine diagnostic signs found in a critical edition (or editions) of the works which follows immediately at D.L. III 65-6, we are told that the first sign to be mentioned, the so-called ‘dipλē’, denotes the doctrines (τὰ δόγματα καὶ τὰ ἀρέσκοντα [i.e. ‘placita’] Πλάτων). But no sign is listed which would be prefixed to passages that are purely polemical. It is at any rate clear that the divisions at D.L. III 49 and Albin., Prol. ch. 3, must be seen against the backdrop of a thoroughly systematic interpretation of Plato’s doctrines and arguments.

Plato in the Laws who speaks in propria persona (ἐν δὲ τοῖς Νόμοις αὐτοπροσώπου αὐτός ὁ Πλάτων διατείνεται λέγον κτλ.). — I need not discuss the paragraphs on induction which come next (D.L. III 52-5); as Nüsser (1991) 139 f., 236 f., has shown these are also geared towards the distinction between polemical inquiry and dogmatic instruction. See III 54, … ὁ τῆς ἐπαγωγῆς κατ’ ἐναντίωσιν καὶ μάχην τρόπος, ὃ ἔχρητο ὅπρος τὸ δογματίζειν, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὸ διελέγειν (the examples provided are similar to the paralogisms of the Euthyd.), and III 55, on the other form of induction: τούτῳ δὲ ἔχρητο εἰς τὴν τῶν ἔκτυφῳ δοκοῦντος κατασκευὴν (with a reference to the argument in favour of the immortality of the soul in the ‘On the Soul’, i.e. the Phaed.).

On III 65 see Dörrie–Baltes (1993) 169 f., 354 f.; for III 65-6 on the signs cf. below, p. 198, complementary note 110. Seneca writes that in the books he is sending to Lucilius he has prefixed signs (notae, the Latin technical term for σημεῖα) to the passages he approves and admires, to help his pupil find them quickly (Ep. 6.5, inponam notas, ut ad ipsa protinus, quae probo et miror, accedas). This passage proves that the use of such signs may serve a didactic purpose. Cicero placed a διπλὴ next to a passage of a letter of Pompey to which he wanted to draw Atticus’ attention (Ad Att. VIII 2.4). On adnotare see also Dorandi (1991a) 15 and n. 21.
An important though at first sight not entirely clear parallel, which however provides further confirmation that the background is first/second century CE Middle Platonism, is found at Alcinous, *Didask.* ch. 6, p. 158.27 ff., that is to say in the logical section of the work.\(^{136}\) This is a distinction between dialogues which are (1) ‘for instruction’ (ὀφηγητικός, the same term as in Diogenes and Albinus), where Plato uses apodictic syllogisms, (2) those in which ‘sophists and youngsters’ appear, where Plato uses reputable arguments, and (3) those where ‘eristic people’ in the proper sense of the word appear, ‘e.g. Euthydemus and Hippias’, in which Plato uses eristic arguments. Because types, or persons, are used to pinpoint and distinguish Alcinous’ groups (2) and (3), the method of interpretation ἐκ προσώπου is at issue. Furthermore, these latter groups will correspond to rough subdivisions of the genus ‘for inquiry’ which, however, is not mentioned. What we have here is an ordered series (according to kinds of syllogism)\(^ {136a}\) rather than a division, though it is derived from a division.

We may observe that according to both Albin., *Prol.* ch. 3, and D.L. III 61, the *Euthydemus* and the *Hippias* (Diogenes mentions two dialogues with the latter first title, Albinus only one) belong to the ‘anatreptic’ species, which in Diogenes is one of the two atomic species falling under the species ‘aimed at victory’ which itself is a species of the genus ‘for inquiry’. In Albinus, as we have seen, the genus ‘aimed at victory’ has been omitted, so the atomic species ‘anatreptic’ comes immediately under the genus ‘for inquiry’. It is quite significant, or so I believe, that Alcinous does not call Hippias a sophist and therefore implicitly excludes the dialogue(s) bearing his name from his second group. The only explanation I can think of is that he is indeed indebted to the division we know from Albinus and Diogenes, according to which the *Euthydemus* and the *Hippias* are members of one atomic species.

The dialogues of the second group, in which according to Alcinous sophists and youngsters appear, are presumably the

\(^{136}\) I accept most of Nüsser’s argument concerned with this parallel at (1991) 110 ff., but he emphasizes the points of agreement between Alcinous and Albinus rather than their differences, and suggests that when speaking of ‘sophists’ Alcinous thinks e.g. of Euthyphro and Meno, which is unlikely.

\(^{136a}\) Cf. *infra*, n. 153.
following. First, the *Protagoras*, named after the famous sophist; in Diogenes and Albinus this dialogue is the only member of the 'endeictic' or 'elenctic' atomic species, which in Diogenes comes under the species 'aimed at victory' and then under the genus 'for inquiry', and in Albinus falls directly under the genus 'for inquiry'. Secondly, the *Gorgias*, in which the sophists Callicles, Polus and Gorgias make their appearance. According to both Diogenes and Albinus this is an 'anatreptic' dialogue, like the *Euthydemus* and (both) *Hippias* (see above). In Diogenes, the *Gorgias* comes under the genus 'for inquiry' via the species 'aimed at victory', whereas in Albinus it comes directly under this genus. If this is correct, Alcinous has placed this dialogue on a *different* level (comparable to what falls under Diogenes' genus 'for training', not 'for victory') than these two other dialogues by putting it on a par with those figuring the young. Yet such distinctions within a genus are tenuous; we should compare Proclus, *In Parm.* pp. 654.15-5.12, where the *Gorgias*, the *Protagoras* and the part of the *Republic* dealing with Thrasymachus are said to belong with the gymnastic kind of Socratic dialectic which aims at the refutation of the sophists and the training of the young. This is already paralleled at Galen, *PHP* II iii.8-10, who distinguishes the class of scientific premisses from all the others; the dialectician 'uses' the latter 'for training, and for the refutation of sophists, and for the testing of a youngster's pregnancy and playing the midwife' etc. (εἰς τὸ γυμνάσασθαι χρήσαι καὶ σοφισταῖς ἔξελέγξαι καὶ πείραν λαβεῖν κυήσεως μειρακίου καὶ μαιεὺσασθαι κτλ.).

Thirdly, the dialogues in which these youngsters appear are probably the *Charmides*, which according to both Albinus and Diogenes is a 'peirastic' dialogue, and the *Alcibiades*, *Theages* and *Lysis* which according to both Albinus and Diogenes are 'maieutic' dialogues. In Albinus and Diogenes the 'peirastic' and 'maieutic' dialogues fall under the genus 'for inquiry', in the latter via the species 'for training', in the former directly.

It is clear that Alcinous uses the species of the genus 'for inquiry' in a rather loose way, or rather in a way of his own or one indebted to the particular interpretative tradition to which he belongs. We must moreover observe that not a single one of the characters in the right-hand section of Albinus’ and Diogenes’ division, that is to say those belonging to the genus 'for inquiry' and including this genus itself, is paralleled in Alcinous. The
very words are not found in the Didaskalikos. The words designating the characters in the left-hand section of this division on the other hand do occur in this work, but with the exception of ‘for instruction’ are never used to characterize dialogues. The only parallel I have found is that the Cratylus, which according to Albinus and Diogenes is a ‘logical’ dialogue, is said to deal with the etymological part of ‘dialectic’ at Didask. ch. 6, p. 159.43 ff. Though the terminology is not identical, the meaning is the same.

We have noticed that the division of the various kinds of dialogues has been sort of tucked away by Alcinous in a chapter dealing with different kinds of argument. Because he deals with Plato’s doctrines (δόγματα), as the full title and explicit of his treatise as well as its contents demonstrate, he is not primarily interested in the dialogue qua literary genre, and certainly not in those dialogues which are ‘for inquiry’ only. The latter merely engage his attention insofar as they are believed to show that certain forms of argument were already known to Plato. Nevertheless, it is possible to see that he knew a variety of the division of the dialogues found in Albinus and Diogenes. The fact that it is remarkably different from theirs (and this also includes the third variety found at Albin., Prol. ch. 6, to be discussed in the next section of the present chapter) is additional confirmation of the view that the Didaskalikos and the Prologos were not written by the same author and that Alcinous is a different person than Albinus.\(^\text{137}\)

2.6 Albinus, Prologos Ch. 6

We must return to Albinus. Alcinous is not the only Middle Platonist to deal with the division in a rather free way, for at Albin., Prol. ch. 6, too the incomplete systematic diaeresis is to be reconstructed differently, as follows:

\(^{137}\) See further the entirely convincing arguments of Whittaker (1987) 83 ff., and in Whittaker (1990) vii ff. Nüser (1991) 210 ff. and passim again argues in favour of Freudenthal’s hypothesis that the Didaskalikos is to be attributed to Albinus, but had not yet seen Whittaker (1990).
In this chapter the division has been revised rather drastically. In fact, the reason why the second tier (consisting of the species ‘theoretical’ and ‘practical’ + ‘for training’ and ‘aimed at victory’) is omitted at Procl., ch. 3, now becomes clear. The atomic species fall directly under the two main genera, ‘for instruction’ and ‘for training’, which allows Albinus to reshuffle the elements of the original system in his final chapter. The logical dialogues are removed from the first set of four atomic species and put among those which are ‘for training’ (151.5-6, τοῖς τοῦ λογικοῦ χαρακτήρος διαλόγοις, ὃντος καὶ αὐτοῦ ζητητικοῦ — my emphasis). Albinus says that they deal with the diaeretic, defining, analytical and syllogistic methods, by means of which truth is proven and falsehood refuted (151.7-9). This statement produces a contradiction with ch. 3, p. 148.26-8, according to which the genus ‘for inquiry’ is concerned with the refutation of falsehood and the genus ‘for instruction’ with proving the truth. But the text should not be changed; apparently, Albinus in ch. 6 corrects the (presumably traditional) view formulated in the earlier chapter, and implicitly argues that the dialogues concerned with instruction do not demonstrate their point by logical means but merely impart the doctrines. At p. 150.24 ff., too, the producing of the doctrines in the minds of the pupils (ἐπιστήμων δόγματα) by means of the dialogues concerned with instruction comes before the ‘binding by means of the reasoning concerned with the cause’ (τῷ τῆς αἰτίας λογισμῷ, cf. Plato, Meno 98a), i.e. by means of logical arguments.138

138 Nüserr (1991) 81 ff., 161 ff., defends Freudenthal’s emendation ὃντος αὐτοῦ καὶ, which he even puts into his text (p. 34); it is rejected by Dunn (1974) 174 ff. (who argues that the problem of the reconciliation of the data of ch. 3 with those of ch. 6 remains), and by Tarrant (1993) 42 n. 22. The meaning of the emended formula, then, would have to be not ‘this too being for inquiry’ but ‘this being for inquiry as well’. Logic on this account would
Accordingly, in this variety of the Middle Platonist doctrine logic is not Plato's supreme science but very much an Aristotelianized one. On the other hand, Albinus betrays that he still has an original grid of four + four atomic species in mind, for in the first group 'logical' is replaced with 'economic'. He takes care to limit the atomic species in the second group to four as well and for this reason combines the 'peirastic' and the 'elenctic' species into one, speaking of 'the dialogues of the peirastic character, which also contain the elenctic and the so-called cathartic'. The atomic species 'anatreptic' too receives a double denomination, viz. 'epideictic' and anatreptic'.

The actual sequence in which he lists the atomic species according to the order of study however is not that of *Prol.*, ch. 3, or of the division in his ch. 6 as reconstructed above. The serious student who has decided to become a Platonist and accordingly must familiarize himself with the whole of Plato should begin

occupy an intermediate position, being 'for inquiry' as well as 'for instruction'. But the emendation is impossible. In all the cases of ὄντος αὐτοῦ καὶ I have found by means of a *TLG* search, the participle ὄντος goes with another word which comes before it, not with a word following upon καὶ (see Plutarch, *Arat.* ch. 20.7.2, Galen, *Meth. med.* XI 137.5 K., Sextus, *M. VIII* 452, Origen, *C. Cels.* VI 47.7, Plotinus, *Enn.* III 2.3.4, and VI 7.25.14, Simplicius, *In Phys.* pp. 1274.38-9 and 1289.40-90.1), whereas ὄντος καὶ αὐτοῦ always places the item indicated by αὐτόν under a more general concept or formulates another aspect under which it may be seen (see Galen, *De rebus boni malique suci*, VI 801.5 K., *Inst. log.* IX 2.6 K., Alexander, *In Met.* p. 123.13-4, *In Mete.* p. 57.16, *Eth. probl.* p. 140.16-7, Asclepius, *In Met.* p. 106.15, Philonorus, *In Mete.* p. 85.18, *In De an.* p. 291.35, Simplicius, *In De an.* p. 255.17, *In Epict. Enchir.* p. 77.23-4). In Freudenthal's reconstruction (see *supra*, n. 128), the atomic species 'logical' falls under both genera; this violates the rules of diarieses. For an echo of Albinus' description of the uses of logic in Galen see *infra*, text to n. 228. A parallel for the idea behind Albinus' ἐμποιεῖν δόγματα is at *Hippocrates*, *Lex* ch. 3: ἡ ... φύσις ἡμέων ὄκοιν ἡ χάρη, τὰ δὲ δόγματα τῶν διδασκόντων ὄκοιν τὰ σκέρματα.

Instead of the bipartition of practical philosophy found at D.L. III 59 Albinus thus in fact provides a tripartition, but is able to get away with this because the intermediate species is lacking. Compare the division of the practical part of philosophy into ethical, political and economical subdisciplines at D.L. V 28 f. (see *supra*, n. 131), Alcin., *Didask.* ch. 3, p. 153.38 ff. (cf. I. Hadot (1990) 77), the parallels listed by Whittaker (1990) 80 f. n. 35, and those I have added at Mansfeld (1993a) 374 n. 121.

139 ἐπιθετικός, perhaps a *varia lectio* for ἐνθετικός at D.L. III 49 and 59 (or an alternative). We have noticed that Albinus in ch. 3 replaces Diogenes' ἐνθετικός by (the perhaps suspect) ἐλεγκτικός, while the latter is added to πειραστικός in ch. 6. The only dialogue which in both Diogenes and Albinus is characterized in this way, viz. as ἐνθετικός / ἐλεγκτικός, is the *Prot*. 
with the ‘peirastic/elenctic’ dialogues (i.e. Euthyphr., Men., Io and Charm.) and then read the ‘maieutic’ (i.e. Alcib., Theag., Lys. and Lach.). The dialogues ‘for instruction’, viz. those containing (1) physical (i.e. Tim.), (2) ethical (i.e. Apol., Crit., Phaed., Symp., Epist., Menex., Clitoph. and Phileb.), (3) political-and-(4)- economical doctrines (i.e. Rep., Min., Leg. and Epin.) come third. Physics and ethics pertain to theory and the theoretical life, politics and economics to practice and the practical life; together these produce the ‘becoming like God’, that is to say culminate in theology.\textsuperscript{141} The logical dialogues (i.e. Crat., Soph., Polit. and Parm.), which are ‘for inquiry’, are fourth, and the ‘epideictic (or: elenctic)/anatreptic’ dialogues (i.e. Prot., Hipp., Euthyd. and Gorg.) form the fifth and last set to be mastered.\textsuperscript{142} Consequently, the order of study advocated by Albinus at Prol., ch. 6, is very much different from that which, as we shall shortly see, one may deduce from Diogenes’ division at III 49 ff. and from the mutilated version thereof as presented by Albinus himself at Prol., ch. 3, to which we may attribute a more standard character. It is also quite different from the order advised at Prol., ch. 5, which lists only four dialogues, viz. Greater Alcibiades, Phaedo, Republic and Timaeus.

In this chapter Albinus clearly thinks of people whose desire to acquaint themselves with Plato’s thought is innocent of professional ambition.\textsuperscript{143} We shall see that his pupil Galen, too, prescribed two separate courses of study for two different types of students, or readers, though there is a distinction: Galen thinks of two different types of professional doctors.\textsuperscript{144} What is rather remarkable is that the order of study prescribed by Albinus for the person who has decided to become a Platonist was not taken over by the later

\textsuperscript{141} See the pertinent remarks of Donini (1982) 57 f.
\textsuperscript{142} See the table at Dörrie-Baltes (1990) 344.
\textsuperscript{143} This was already noticed by Freudenthal (1879) 252 f., 274 f., but has been missed by Tarrant (1993) 38 ff.; see further Donini (1982) 57, and Nüsser (1991) 72 ff. For a transl. of and comm. on ch. 5 see Festugière (1971a) 535 f., and for the Neoplatonist order of study infra, n. 150 and text thereto. Nüsser (1991) 170 f. has seen that the position of the first Alc. according to Albinus’ amateur course anticipates that of the Neoplatonists beginning with Iamblichus, but does not dwell on the consequences this had for the professional course he recommended. Schissel (1928) 32 ff. plausibly argues that this course is analogous to or even influenced by Philo of Larissa’s division of ethics (ap. Stob. Ecl. II pp. 39.19 ff.); this is accepted by Nüsser (1991) 73 f.
\textsuperscript{144} See below, chapter four. For Epicurus’ proems cf. also below, pp. 195 f., complementary note 65, and p. 203, complementary note 288.
Neoplatonists, beginning with Iamblichus. Their curriculum is a revised and expanded form of the order of study Albinus mentions first; all began their Plato classes with the *Greater Alcibiades*, and the *Timaeus* was the penultimate dialogue to be studied. The *Republic* was not part of this Neoplatonist curriculum. As we have seen in chapter one above, it was taught to serious amateurs by Proclus. This may perhaps count as a legacy of Albinus' first order of study. Likely enough, the course for professionals described in Prol., ch. 6, based on a creative modification of the traditional diaeresis of the dialogues, was an unsuccessful innovation. The Neoplatonists were unable to accept that the diaeretic, defining, analytical and syllogistic methods would not be taught at the beginning of the philosophical curriculum, and they moreover used Aristotle's works to teach these subjects.

Long before Albinus' time Epicurus, in the proems to his didactic letters, had already made a similar distinction between those who study all his works (no order of study, however, being indicated) and those who for one reason or other are not in a position to devote their life to 'physiology'. For the latter the (lost) so-called *Greater Epitome* has been especially written (*Ad Herod*. 35), whereas the accomplished student will only need the present aide-mémoire, viz. the *Ad Herodotum*. An interesting parallel is at Plutarch, *Alex.* 7.8, 668C, where we are told that Aristotle's *Metaphysics* is not at all useful for instruction and teaching purposes, since it has been written as an aide-mémoire for those who have already been fully educated (in Aristotelian philosophy).⁴⁴⁵ A rather complicated, difficult and long aide-mémoire! Furthermore, at *Ad Pyth.*, 84-5, Epicurus says that a succinct account of cosmo-meteorology will be useful both for beginning students and for those who are too busy to study the subject in depth. From a didactic point of view, the *Ad Pythoclem* therefore is on the same level as the *Greater Epitome*. The *Ad Herodotum* is a quite different sort of work.

That Albinus' manipulation of the diaeresis is intentional also follows from the incomplete parallel for the systematic classification in the much later *Anon. proleg.*, 17.20-4, for here the second tier has been largely preserved, though there are other differences and omissions:

---
⁴⁴⁵ Cf. *supra*, n. 9.
The second species of the first subdivision, viz. ‘practical’, has been replaced by one of its atomic species, viz. ‘political’ (exemplified by the *Rep*.). In fact, ‘political’ is the only relic of the original third tier of eight atomic species. The species of the second tier are given in a sequence which is the converse of that in D.L. III 49. We are also told that the species ‘theoretical’ is theological, without however being provided with dialogues as examples.

2.7 *Priority of the Tetralogic Arrangement to the Systematic Classification. Orders of Study.*

There are excellent reasons for believing that this ordering according to ‘character’, as found at D.L. III 49 ff. and as reflected at Albin., *Prol.* chs. 3 and 6, is posterior to the tetralogic system. It has already been pointed out that the characterizations themselves occur as third items in Thrasyllus’ listing of the dialogues, and that Diogenes’ systematic diaeresis of the characteristic attributes and Albinus’ mutilated version of this division differ as to the ordering of the atomic species. In *Prol.*, ch. 3, moreover, several dialogue titles have dropped out, and the individual sequences of dialogues falling within an atomic species in some cases differ from Diogenes’ at III 50-1. It is therefore all the more remarkable that the sequences of the dialogues of two atomic species in Albinus and of a third in Diogenes roughly correspond with sequences in the tetralogic arrangement, and that each time we have four items in one atomic species. Albinus’ set of four logical works corresponds to Thrasyllus’ tetralogy II 1 *Crat.*, II 3 *Soph.*, II 4 *Politic.* and III 1 *Parm.*, the tetralogic series of four logical dialogues so to speak being interrupted by the ‘peirastic’ *Theaet.* in tetralogy II. Diogenes’ ordering of these dialogues is different: *Politic.*, *Crat.*, *Soph.*, *Parm.*, *Theaet.*
Parm., Soph. Albinus’ set of four political works corresponds to Thrasyllus’ tetralogy VIII 2 Rep., IX 1 Min., IX 2 Leg. and IX 3 Epin.; this time there are two dialogues in between in tetralogy VIII. Diogenes’ ordering of these dialogues is slightly different: Rep., Leg., Min., Epin. The atomic species ‘anatreptic’ in Diogenes’ diaeresis corresponds with Thrasyllus’ tetralogy VI 1 Euthyd., VI 3 Gorg., VII 1 Hipp. 1 and VII 2 Hipp. 2; there are two interruptions here. This time Albinus’ ordering is different: Hipp. (the distinction between the two homonymous dialogues has dropped out), Euthyd., Gorg.

It is quite unlikely that these serial correspondences, which as we have seen are not identical in our two sources, are due to chance, and rather easy to understand why the original ordering of the items in the remaining species was not preserved throughout the division, as also happened in the above-listed cases where Diogenes differs from Albinus, and conversely. It is clear, on the other hand, that the tetralogic ordering does not depend on the systematic classification, for from the point of view of the tetralogies the distribution of characteristic attributes not only suffers from interruption but is even erratic, and it is never the case that a set of four identical characters corresponds with a single tetralogy.

The correspondences of sub-sets of dialogues in Albinus and Diogenes Laërtius with sets of dialogues in Aristophanes’ earlier trilogies can be explained as having been mediated by the tetralogic arrangement. Of the four logical dialogues in Diogenes’ and Albinus’ divisions, three correspond with all of those in Aristophanes’ second trilogy, but the latter’s ordering differs both from that of Diogenes and from that of Albinus, and the Parm. is lacking. The correspondence between the sets of four political dialogues and the three items (Leg., Min., Epin.) which constitute Aristophanes’ third trilogy is less convincing than that with

---

146 For the argument that the tetralogic arrangement preserves much of Aristophanes’ ordering see e.g. Müller (1974) 31 and Dörrie–Baltes (1990) 335 ff. Slater (1986) 158, who believes that the tetralogic arrangement “may be older, but cannot be said to antedate Varro”, points out that “the first trilogy fits within the 8th tetralogy, the second in the 2nd, the third in the 9th, and the fourth consists of two from the 1st and the remaining one of the 2nd. Some sort of dramatic unity seems to be intended. It cannot be just a coincidence that the first and second and last and second last of the tetralogies are mentioned, but no reason is obvious".
Thrasyllus' tetralogy VIII 2 *Rep.*, IX 1 *Min.*, IX 2 *Leg.* and IX 3 *Epin.*, discussed above. Both Diogenes and Albinus have the *Rep.* as their first political dialogue, which corresponds to Thrasyllus' first instance of such a dialogue, whereas in Aristophanes this work comes first in the first trilogy (the two other dialogues of which are not political). In their lists of ethical dialogues both Diogenes and Albinus have *Apol.*, *Crit.*, *Phaed.* at the beginning. In Aristophanes the *Apol.* is the third item of the fourth trilogy, while the *Crit.* and *Phaed.* are the first and second items of the fifth trilogy. The ordering is therefore the same, but it is easier to derive what is in Diogenes and Albinus from Thrasyllus' catalogue where these dialogues are tetralogy I 2, I 3 and I 4, i.e. are all found in one and the same tetralogy.

An important argument in favour of the view that the *tetralogic arrangement* as constructed by Thrasyllus is earlier than the systematic classification is that the total number of works assigned to the various characters at D.L. III 50-1 *is exactly thirty-six*, that is to say is equal to that of the works according to the tetralogic ordering, and that *precisely the same works* (including dialogues whose authenticity was disputed already in Antiquity) are found both times. The systematic arrangement therefore depends on what by now we may call the tetralogic *canon*.\(^{146a}\) Although Albinus' list at *Prol.*, ch. 3, is different because it is incomplete, it does not include works outside this canon either. We shall see presently that also the order of study according to the tetralogic arrangement is very much different from that according to the systematic classification by means of 'characters'.\(^{147}\)

We therefore are now in a position to explain the double mistake concerned with the *Critias*. It would seem that the dialogues

\(^{146a}\) The use of κανών in the sense of 'canon' is late and Christian, but the idea behind it is much older; see Oppel (1937) 68 ff.

\(^{147}\) Nüsser (1991) 139 posits that the diaeretic classification originally may have comprised less than thirty-six dialogues and so will be earlier than the tetralogic arrangement. This is speculation *pour le besoin de la cause*; he has moreover failed to notice that the different orders of study militate against this assumption, and does not tell us why the systematic classification should have complied with the tralogic canon at a later stage. His other argument for the priority of the diaeresis *ibid.*, 140 f., viz. that the organization of the Platonic dialogues according to Aristotelian patterns is only possible after Antiochus (or perhaps Andronicus of Rhodes), merely provides a *t.p.q.* (cf. *infra*, n. 153). For the mistakes in D.L. concerning the *Critias* see *supra*, text to n. 129.
which form the contents of each atomic species according to the systematic arrangement were listed by abstracting their titles from the tetralogic catalogue. This would explain why the Critias is called Ἀτλαντικός at D.L. III 51; its second title (not of the ἡ περὶ type) was mistakenly ticked off in place of its first. When at a later stage the 'characters' according to the atomic species of the diaeretic system were distributed over the individual dialogues of the tetralogic arrangement the Crit(ias) was confused with the Crit(on) and consequently labelled 'ethical'. It follows, or so I believe, that we have to think of two mistakes, the first of which helps to understand the second. These can hardly have been made by one and the same person.

It is hard to avoid comparing Diogenes' systematic diaeresis of Plato's works at III 49 f., which accommodates in separate sections those dialogues and writings which come under the traditional parts of philosophy and those which are outside the tripartite discipline, with the extremely elaborate Late Neoplatonist division of all of Aristotle's works, which also accommodates a plurality of groups of works which are not subsumed under the parts of philosophy. The question concerning this classification is one of the general preliminary issues in the late Aristotelian commentators. An at first glance major but of course unsurprising difference is that in the Neoplatonist Aristotelian division the logical works (in our sense of the word) do not constitute a canonical part of philosophy but are instrumental, i.e. belong with the organon. Aristotelian instrumental logic (including the Topics and Sophistical Refutations) is different from Platonic dialectic qua supreme science. Its peripheral position compares well with that of the dialogues concerned with inquiry in the Platonic division found at D.L. III 49, which according to what Albinus reports at Prol., ch. 3, are concerned with gymnastics, refutation and the exposition of falsehood.

We may however also read the lowest tier of the Late Neoplatonist Aristotelian division from right to left, thus starting, appropriately, with the Categories and ending with the Metaphysics. This is the order of study (we may perhaps call it πρῶς

148 See supra, text to n. 33, and I. Hadot (1990) 63 ff., esp. the division as fully set out ibid., 65, which allows one to read the bottom row from right to left.

\(\text{ήμως}\), whereas the order from left to right is that according to importance (which perhaps we may call \(\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\ \phi\sigma\tau\nu\)).

If we read the lowest tier of Diogenes' Platonic division at III 49, and its echo at Albin., Prol. ch. 3, from right to left too, we make an appropriate start with an 'anatreptic' dialogue and end with the Timaeus, because at the time this dialogue, not the Parmenides, was considered to be Plato's most theological work (physics-cum-theology).\(^{150}\) As 'anatreptic' dialogues Diogenes lists Euthyd., Gorg. and both Hipp., in that order, whereas Albinus begins with one Hipp. (the other may have simply dropped out in the course of transmission or by the abridgement), and then has Euthyd. and Gorg. If we read from left to right, the sequence is according to the level of importance.\(^{151}\) The arrangement at Albin., Prol. ch. 6, as we have noticed, is quite different from that at D.L. III 49 f., because the way the logical works are treated and logic itself is evaluated conforms to a more Aristotelianizing pattern. We may therefore surmise that D.L. III 49 f. (and its echo at Albin., Prol. ch. 3) and Albin., Prol. ch. 6, represent, or at any rate derive from, two different tendencies in or approaches to Platonic studies, viz. a more purely Platonist and a more Aristotelianizing one.

Our earlier conclusion based on the number thirty-six is thereby confirmed. The tetralogic ordering and the systematic division are originally independent from one another, because the order of study advocated is quite different in each case. Thrasyllus has the student begin with what later came to be called a 'peirastic' dialogue (or rather with a set of four consisting of one 'peirastic' and three ethical dialogues, as they were subsequently called, all pertaining to the exemplary bios of the philosopher, viz. Socrates) and end with the Letters, which also pertain to the life of the philosopher, now Plato himself.\(^{152}\) We have already pointed out above

\(^{150}\) In the post-Iamblichean order of study (for which see e.g. Festugière (1971a)) the Parm. no longer belongs with the logical dialogues but is put last, after the Tim., cf. Procl., In Alc. p. 11.14 ff., In Tim. proœm., I, p. 13.3 ff.; see further Dalsgaard Larsen (1972) 419 ff. and O'Meara (1989) 97 ff.

\(^{151}\) Baltes' reconstruction of the order of study for both Diogenes and Albinus at Dörrie-Baltes (1990) 343 ff. could be improved. In his second table he places the 'maieutic' dialogues between the political and the logical, which corresponds neither with Diogenes' arrangement nor with that of Albinus. He also places the logical dialogues under the heading 'for instruction', which is correct for Diogenes but not for Albinus.

\(^{152}\) This is explicitly stated at Anon. proleg. 25.10-20; see also the excellent remarks of Regenbogen (1950) 1441.
that the study of the set of four dialogues in the first tetralogy is presumably intended to bring about a preliminary moral and intellectual purification in the reader. The original author of the systematic diaeresis, on the other hand, has the student begin with an ‘anatreptic’ dialogue and end with the *Timaeus*. But Albinus himself modified this in *Prol.* ch. 6, where the dialogues to be studied *last* are ‘epideictic/anatreptic’. It follows that Thrasyllus’ only motive for adding the characterizing epithets could have been a striving for completeness. But I believe we may rule out that this occurred, because from a numerical point of view the systematic classification, as we have seen, is dependent on his canon in the first place, while on the other hand the distribution of the particular ‘characters’ over the individual dialogues as arranged in tetralogies is quite haphazard. I therefore believe that the characters were added to the double titles in a source that served as one of the intermediaries between Thrasyllus and Diogenes. They were added because of the systematic importance and general acceptance of various forms of the classification by means of division, but the conjunction of these two systems is a far from happy one. Diogenes’ information about Thrasyllus, at any rate, must be at second hand. The most likely hypothesis is that his source already used a list which was a blend of the two systems.

We may recall that according to Albinus the main objection against the tetralogic ordering is that it is useless from a philosophical-and-didactic point of view, that is to say the point of view which is the *primum movens* of the systematic ordering according to the classificatory division. It is indeed clear that the first parts of the two alternative orders of study advocated by Albinus are both meant as revisions of, or rather as better alternatives for, that proposed by Thrasyllus. Albinus has the same objectives in mind as Thrasyllus, but believes he has found a better way to reach these goals. According to *Prol.*, ch. 5, which deals with the study of four dialogues only, the student begins with the *Greater Alcibiades*, to further self-knowledge. This clearly is meant as a preliminary purification. Next, the student will have to study the *Phaedo*, because here he will find an example (παράδειγμα, p. 149.37) to follow and will discover what it really means to be a philosopher and what it is that the philosopher wants to achieve (τίς ἔστιν ὁ φιλόσοφος καὶ τίς αὐτοῦ ἡ ἐπιτήδευσις, p. 150.1). This is not at all different from what Thrasyllus wanted to bring about by
means of the study of the first tetralogy, but to demonstrate what
the philosophical life is like and means Albinus needs only one
dialogue, not four. In Prol. ch. 6, where he has the student who
has decided to become a Platonist (τὸ τά Πλάτωνος αἰρωμένω) in
mind and the order of study of all the dialogues is described, great
emphasis is laid on the indispensable preliminary purification. In
chapter five, below, we shall find that Albinus’ pupil Galen, too,
demanded that his students be well prepared both morally and
intellectually. Because for the study of Plato’s complete works this
purification has to be as thorough as possible, Albinus’ profes­sio­nal
student has to begin with the ‘peirastic’ dialogues, which
refute what is wrong and contain what is purifying (p. 150.30 ff.).
‘Peirastic’ here without doubt has a more or less etymological
sense; these dialogues, viz. the Euthyphro, Meno, Io and Charmides
according to Prol., ch 3, constitute a preliminary πεῖρα, i.e. a ‘test’,
or ‘trial’. Albinus’ second order of study, just as that according to
Thrasylus’ tetralogic arrangement, begins with the Euthyphro.
Both Thrasylus’ full list and Albinus’ second order of study are
concerned with the whole of Plato’s œuvre, and what we find in
Prol., ch. 6, is certainly meant as a revision of the reading order
according to the nine tetralogies. Conservatism and innovation
are not mutually exclusive in this case. But both the orders of
study described by Albinus make sense from a philosophical
point of view from beginning to end, whereas Thrasylus’ arrange­ment,
as we have seen, is far from clear in this respect. One of the
further reasons (others have been mentioned above) why
Iamblichus and his followers chose to adopt and adapt Albinus’
first order of study rather than his second perhaps is that the latter
was believed to be still too close to the tetralogic arrangement. As
the first dialogue to be studied, the Greater Alcibiades was at any rate
preferred to the Euthyphro with which both Thrasylus’ list and
Albinus’ reading order for professionals began.

The systematic classification can therefore be dated to the
period between Thrasylus (t.p.q.) and Albinus (t.a.q.), i.e. between
the early first and the mid-second century CE. This dating is of
importance for the history of Middle Platonism, because, as Dunn
has proved, most of the terminology used in the diaeresis and
several subdivisions are originally Aristotelian.\textsuperscript{153} At Met. Γ
2.1004b25 ff., Aristotle says that dialectic is 'peirastic' concerning the things about which philosophy provides knowledge, and that sophistic only seems to know. At Soph. El. 2.165a38 ff., he distinguishes four kinds of argument: 'didactic (διδασκαλικοὶ), dialectic, peirastic and eristic'. But 'peirastic' is also treated as part of dialectic (Soph. El. 8.169b25) or put on a par with it (Soph. El. 34.183a39-b1). At Top. VIII 5.159a25 ff., Aristotle distinguishes between those who formulate arguments for the sake of 'training and testing' (γρηγοροί καὶ πείρας ἐνέκα), those who do so in a didactic context, and thirdly those who are contesting each other's view (ἀγωνιζόμενοι). He points out that to a pupil one always has to state 'the views one holds' (τὰ δοκοῦντα), i.e. one's doctrines.

By and large, these distinctions and sub-distinctions are at the basis of the systematic classification of Plato's dialogues by means of the diaereses. It would seem that this systematic approach ultimately derives from the serious study of Aristotle's logical writings which followed upon the publication of the corpus by Andronicus of Rhodes. Andronicus also wrote a technical treatise entitled Περὶ διαφέρεσεως, which seems to have influenced Boethius' still extant De divisione. The earliest commentary on an Aristotelian logical work we know of is that of Boethus on the Categories, to be dated near the end of the first century BCE or the beginning of the first century CE. Nothing is known about early commentaries on the Topics or Sophistici Elenchi apart from the fact that Galen had seen commentaries on the latter work.154 The application of this technical Aristotelian terminology to the division of the corpus of the canonical thirty-six Platonic dialogues is an early instance of the influence of Aristotelian logic, i.e. his views about the various functions of logical arguments, on Middle Platonism. I would tentatively date the original systematic diaeresis around the mid-first century CE, and make it out to be about contemporary with the Middle Platonist divisions of the whole of reality according to Aristotle, Plato and the (or some

scholars); he is followed by Nüsser (1991) 106 ff. For the terminology and the ideas behind it see also Tieleman (1992) 34 ff. Dunn (1974) 19 ff. argues that Antiochus of Ascalon provides the t.p.q. (cf. supra, n. 147).

154 For Galen see supra, text after n. 36. For Andronicus' and Boethius' works see Mansfeld (1993a) 74 n. 54, where als other literature is cited; for the Middle Platonist ingredients in Seneca, Ep. 58, see Donini, in Donini-Gianotti (1979) 152 ff., "L'eclettismo impossibile: Seneca e il platonismo medio", and Mansfeld (1992a) 84 ff.
Stoics in Seneca, *Ep.* 58. A further argument for this date is that Epictetus seems to use the main characters of the diaeresis as a matter of course and in a rather free manner. At *Diatr.*, III 23.33, he makes a distinction between three types of philosophical discourse, viz. the ἐμπροσθοτικός χαρακτήρ, the ἐλεγκτικός, and the διδασκαλικός. At III 21.19, he distinguishes between the ἐλεγκτική χώρα to which Socrates was appointed by the god, the kingly and rebuking office given to Diogenes the Cynic, and the διδασκαλική καὶ δογματική (χώρα) allotted to Zeno of Citium. At II 23.34, however the ‘protreptic’ mode is in fact put on a par with the ‘elenctic’, for it is said to consist in the demonstration of the inconsistencies and irrelevance of what other people believe (cf. also II 26.4-5). Diogenes is a special case. So the main diaeresis is that between ‘protreptic’ and ‘elenctic’ on the one hand and ‘didascalic’ and ‘dogmatic’ on the other. This is not a Stoic distinction, but a Platonizing one.

2.8 Thrasyllus on Democritus

Before we bring our study of the information concerning Plato’s works in Diogenes book III to a close, we should first have a look at the important passages in book IX which preserve information about Thrasyllus’ treatment of Democritus’ life and works, which is very much parallel to his treatment of Plato. It is clear that he not only provided an arrangement of Democritus’ books but also compiled a *bios*. To begin with the latter: at IX 41 Diogenes cites him for a point of chronographic detail belonging to the genos section of the biography. Democritus was born

in the third year of the 77th Olympiad according to Thrasyllus in his work entitled *What Comes Before the Study of the Books of Democritus* (ἐν τῷ ἐπτυχαραφομένῳ Τά πρὸ τῆς ἀναγνώσεως τῶν Δημικρίτου βιβλίων), thus being, he says, one year older than Socrates.

It is extremely important that Diogenes preserves the title of Thrasyllus’ work,157 which immediately reminds one of that of

---

155 See Döring (1979) 70 f.
156 See *supra*, sections 2.2 and following. In fact, Diogenes IX 45 says the Platonic tetralogies were Thrasyllus’ model (quoted *infra*, text before n. 163).
157 Emphasized by Regenbogen (1950) 1442, who points out that Thrasyllus combined “Biographie, εἰσαγωγή und Schriftenverzeichnis”. For
Proclus' introductory monograph on Aristotle and the terminology of his introduction to his commentary on the *Timaeus*, and of the references in Origen to the introductory sections of his commentaries. The study and understanding of a philosopher's life according to Thrasyllus is a necessary preliminary to the study of his works. One may therefore safely hypothesize that his Plato book, which as we have seen belongs with the ultimate sources of D.L. III, was entitled 'What Comes Before the Study of the Dialogues of Plato' (*Τὰ πρὸ τῆς ἄναγνώσεως τῶν Πλάτωνος διαλόγων*).158 We recall that, in the early second century CE, the Platonist Theon of Smyrna wrote a book with a similar title, viz. 'What is Useful in Mathematics for the Study of Plato' (*τὸν κατὰ τὸ μαθηματικὸν χρησίμων εἰς τὴν Πλάτωνος ἄναγνωσίν*). Accordingly, we can trace the career of this terminology from Thrasyllus in the first century via Theon of Smyrna in the second and Origen in the third, to Hierocles and Proclus in the fifth century CE.

Two substantial verbatim quotations from the introduction to Democritus are found at D.L. IX 37 and 38. The second of these reveals the motive for Thrasyllus' interest in the great Atomist of Abdera, which at first glance may seem surprising because of Thrasyllus' Platonizing and Pythagoreanizing tendencies.159 He saw Democritus as a Pythagorean (III 38):

He would seem, says Thrasyllus, to have been a follower of the *Pythagorikoi*. Moreover, he also refers to Pythagoras himself, admiring him in a work of his own having (as its title) this very

---

158 As argued by Usener (1892) 210, followed by Plezia (1949) 102. The transmitted title of the excerpts from Albinus' little introduction to the study of Plato's dialogues in the codex unicus of which the other mss. are descendants is, simply, Πρόλογος, but we do not know that this is the original title. Albinus, moreover, as we have seen refers to Thrasyllus' tetralogic arrangement of Plato's dialogues, though possibly via Dercyllides (see supra, n. 111 and text thereto). For the title of Theon of Smyrna's tract concerned with mathematics as a preliminary to Plato, extant in Greek, and Hierocles' formula see supra, text to n. 38. For the much more similar title of an introduction to Plato attributed to Theon (of Smyrna) in the *Fihrist* see supra, n. 102.

159 See supra, n. 102 ad finem, and text thereto. Tarrant (1993) 85 ff. fails to explain why it was possible for Thrasyllus to see Democritus as a Pythagorean; he does not mention the passages in Aristotle or the information of Glaucus, Apollodorus and Duris.
name. He seems to have taken all (his views) from him, and if chronology had not been in the way would certainly have attended his lectures.

Two Aristotelian passages may help to explain why atomism could be interpreted in a Pythagoreanizing sense, though we do not know whether or to what extent these influenced Thrasyllus’ view. The first is *De cael.* 3.303a3-11, where Aristotle argues that Leucippus and Democritus, who posit that the ‘primary magnitudes’ are infinitely numerous, ‘in a sense make all the things that exist out to be numbers or to be composed of numbers’, though they fail to express themselves with sufficient clarity. The formula ‘things are numbers or composed of numbers’ fully agrees with the terminology used for the doctrine of the Pythagoreans at *Met.* A 5.985b26-6a3. The second is *Met.* Z 13.1039a3-14, where the composition of things from atoms according to Democritus is compared to that of numbers from monads according to others. Passages such as these are liable to be interpreted in a creative way.

There are further pointers. Immediately after the Thrasyllus quotation at IX 38, Diogenes states that Glaucus of Rhegium, Democritus’ contemporary, said that Democritus ‘was taught by one of the Pythagoreans’, and that according to Apollodorus of Cyzicus (to be dated to the first half of the fourth century BCE) he knew Philolaus. Porphyry, *Vita Pythagorae* 3, cites book two of the *Horai* of Duris of Samos (ca. 340-270 BCE; *FGrH* 76F23), who said that Pythagoras’ son Arimnestus was Democritus’ teacher. The tradition which posits a connection between Democritus and Pythagoreanism is therefore quite old, and knowledge of it persisted till long after Thrasyllus’ time. Furthermore, a form of atomism is attributed in some of our doxographic sources to the Pythagorean Ecphantus (Aëtius, I 3.19, cf. Theodoret, *Graec. aff. cur.* IV 11; Hippolytus, *Ref.* I 15.1).160 According to Proclus, *In Remp.* II, p. 113.6 ff., Democritus in his *On the Hades* (i.e. the third item of Thrasyllus’ first tetralogy) spoke of ‘those who are believed to die and then live again’. This too is capable of an *interpretatio pythagorica.*

---

160 For Democritus and Pythagoreanism see Burkert (1972) 174 n. 146, 215, 229, 259 (brief mention of the passages in Aristotle), 259 n. 101. On Ecphantus see also Mansfeld (1992a) 35 f.
The work entitled *Pythagoras*, significantly enough, is the first item of the first Democritean tetralogy listed by Thrasyllus (D.L. IX 46). So it is the work with which our reading of the *corpus democriteum* should begin. The text quoted above and the positioning of this treatise in the catalogue show that Thrasyllus in this essay too dealt with the by now familiar question of which work of a philosopher is the first one should study.

In the other quotation Thrasyllus appeals to a Platonic proof-text in implicit support of his systematic arrangement of the books (IX 37):

> Because (ἐξερ) the *Anterastae* are by Plato,\(^{161}\) says Thrasyllus, Democritus will be the anonymous participant, different from Oenopides and Anaxagoras and their following, who makes his appearance when conversation is going on with Socrates on philosophy, and to whom he (sc. Socrates) says that the philosopher is like the pentathlon athlete. And he was indeed a pentathlon athlete with regard to philosophy, for he (had a thorough command of)\(^{162}\) [1] physics and [2] ethics, even of [3] mathematics and [4] literary studies (ἐγκυκλίους λόγους), and he was a real expert in [5] all the arts.

Both these quotations occur in the biographical section of Diogenes' account of Democritus, and they do indeed pertain to purported events in his life. But their real significance is that they point the way to a quite specific interpretation of the works. Democritus is a Pythagorean in disguise, and he is an expert in the main philosophical disciplines (including mathematics; but note that logic is not mentioned) as well as in literary studies and all the other arts. The catalogue itself is introduced as follows (IX 45):

> Thrasyllus made a list of his (sc. Democritus') works in an orderly sequence (κατ' ιάξιν) in precisely the same way as those of Plato, in tetralogies.

According to the *Suda*, s.v. Καλλιμαχος, I.3 p. 19.30-1, Callimachus composed a Πίναξ τῶν Δημοκράτων [lege Δημοκρίτου] γλωσσῶν και συνταγμάτων ('List of Democratus' [read: Democritus'] rare expressions and writings'. Thrasyllus may have used this catalogue (or derivative literature in which it was cited), just as he used the Plato catalogue of Aristophanes of Byzantium. But *pace*

---

161 See *supra*, n. 115 *ad finem. εξερ*, for which see *LSJ*, s.v., II, has been wrongly translated 'if' by e.g. Apelt, Hicks and Gigante.

162 Lacuna, which I have filled *ad probabilem sententiam.*
Diels-Kranz\textsuperscript{163} there is no evidence that the tetralogic ordering of Democritus' works is pre-Thrasyllean. Diogenes says the Platonic tetralogies were his model, and as we have seen there are specific reasons for this ordering in the case of Plato's works. These are lacking in Democritus' case.

At D.L. IX 45 we may observe the use of the key-word τάξις, familiar from the later scholastic prologues, which is not found in or near Thrasyllus' Plato catalogue at D.L. III 56 ff. but, as we have seen, it does occur in the apostrophe to the phioplatonic lady at III 47. There are however two important differences with the Plato catalogue. Thrasyllus this time is explicit about the systematic character of his arrangement, and he is unable to arrange a number of works as tetralogies.

There are five main sections, corresponding both as to their subjects and as to their sequence with the five fields of expertise of the pentathlon athlete.\textsuperscript{164} [1] Two ethical tetralogies come first (IX 46, ἕστι δὲ ἡθικὰ μὲν τάδε — καὶ ταῦτα μὲν τὰ ἡθικὰ). [2] Next are four physical tetralogies (IX 46-7, φυσικὰ δὲ τάδε — ταῦτα καὶ περὶ φύσεως). \textit{Nine unarranged} physical treatises are next (IX 47, τὰ δὲ ἀσύντακτά ἐστι τάδε — ταῦτα καὶ τὰ ἀσύντακτα). One does not know why Thrasyllus declined to arrange these as two tetralogies and one left-over, unless he had an arithological justification: 16 + 9 = 25 (or $4^2 + 3^2 = 5^2$) physical works. [3] Three mathematical tetralogies follow (IX 47-8, μαθηματικὰ δὲ τάδε — τοσσύτα καὶ τὰ μαθηματικά). [4] Then we have two tetralogies devoted to literary studies (IX 48, μουσικὰ δὲ τάδε — τοσσύτα καὶ τὰ μουσικά), and finally [5] two tetralogies devoted to the arts (IX 48, τεχνικὰ δὲ τάδε — τοσσύτα καὶ τάδε).\textsuperscript{165}

\textsuperscript{163} Note on \textit{Vorsokr.} 68A33, II p. 91.17.
\textsuperscript{164} See Thrasyllus \textit{ap.} D.L. IX 37, quoted above.
\textsuperscript{165} The only other catalogues in Diogenes Laërtius which are explicitly systematic are those of Heraclides of Pontus ("Ausgabe wahrscheinlich" according to Regenbogen (1950) 1439) at V 86 ff. = Heracl. \textit{fr.} 22 Wehrli (ἡθικὰ μὲν [...] φυσικὰ δὲ [...], γραμματικὰ δὲ [...], καὶ μουσικὰ δὲ [...], ῥητορικὰ δὲ [...], ἱστορικὰ [...]. [...] ἀλλὰ καὶ γεωμετρικὰ ἐστίν αὐτὸν καὶ διαλεκτικὰ), of Demetrius of Phalerum at V 80 ff. = Demetr. \textit{fr.} 74 Wehrli, where the section headings (τὰ μὲν ἰστορικά, τὰ δὲ πολιτικά, τὰ δὲ περὶ ποιητῶν, τὰ δὲ ῥητορικά κτλ.) have been lumped together before the list of the works, and of Chrysippus at VII 189 ff., on which see Regenbogen (1950) 1439 f. (Stoic; the λογικὰς τόπους and the first part of the ἡθικὸς τόπος are extant). The analogy between the headings of the sections in the Heraclides catalogue (and to a lesser extent in the Demetrius catalogue) with those of Thrasyllus' catalogue of Democritus is striking. The catalogues of both Heraclides and Demetrius
In the catalogue itself there are several glosses the gist of which we may safely attribute to Thrasyllocus himself. The meanings of the cryptic titles of the fourth treatise of the first tetralogy, 

Philostratus's works, and of the first treatise of the sixth, Kratuntiera, are explained. The explanation of the latter is particularly interesting; though unfortunately the reference is imprecise, the work is said to deal in a critical way with the issues of the preceding treatises. This is a further symptom of a concern with a useful arrangement. The remarks on these two titles represent what later came to be called the aitia the epitrafhas; there is no other catalogue in Diogenes where a similar explanation of a title is to be found. A note appended to the ethical section tells us that 'the Eusebous is not (to be) found'. Thrasyllocus may have been able to find references to a Eusebous which was attributed to Democritus (or have heard rumours about it—the word Eusebous after all is found in Democritean fragments).

But he had never been able to find a copy of this work, or of a Democritean work which he already knew under another title with Eusebous as an alternative title. His cautious remark proves that he possessed or at any rate had actually seen copies of all the other works listed in his catalogue, and gives one an impression of his philological meticulousness. Another note concerned with the issue of the title is appended to the fourth treatise of the fourth tetralogy; it tells us that some people gave the title On the Soul to the third (the On Mind) + fourth treatise (the On the Senses) of this tetralogy, combining them and giving them this other title (tauta tina omu grajon dom PEKl evos esa epitrafousin). Again, no other catalogue in Diogenes contains a similar remark. Thrasyllocus had to deal with this issue because a refusal to accept a no doubt traditional possibility of division into two separate treatises would have disturbed his tetralogic arrangement. He must have had very good reasons for doing what he did, since his ordering would have been nearly perfect if he had accepted the On the Soul as a single treatise and included the On the Magnet, now the last of his nine unordered treatises, in one of his physical tetralogies (but

are however incomplete and disorderly. See further Wehrli (1969) 64 ff. and Gottschalk (1980) 6 ff; Wehrli (1968) 56 f.

166 Cf. supra, chapter one, section 7, for the converse case of the separate titles of the three parts of Aratus' epic (of which the third is even called a 'book'), and infra, text after n. 265, on the controversy regarding the title or titles of Hippocrates' De nat. hom. + De sal. diaet.
see below). We must also observe that the first two items of the fourth tetralogy are numbered 'first' and 'second'; the reason presumably is that according to a different arrangement these two works were considered to form one treatise in two books. A concern with titles is also clear in respect of the second item of this tetralogy, for the title On Flesh is listed as the alternative for On the Nature of Man. Alternative titles are also given for the first item of the seventh, the first of the ninth, the second of the twelfth and the first of the thirteenth tetralogy. There are three cases where the number of books belonging with a title are given, viz. for the fourth item of the sixth tetralogy, the first of the eighth, and the seventh of the unarranged physical works; division again. There is also a note dealing with a question of authenticity (γνήσιον), appended to the title of the first treatise of the third tetralogy, the Great Diacosmos. It tells us that Theophrastus and those who follow him attribute this work to Leucippus. As we have seen, remarks concerned with authenticity, or attribution, are frequently found near catalogues or enumerations of writings or elsewhere in the lives of individual philosophers in Diogenes Laërtius, and in one other case even in a catalogue itself, viz. in that of Chrysippus. These parallels however do not entail that the note on the Great Diacosmos was added subsequently to Thrasyllus' catalogue by someone else.

Two further aspects deserve our attention. At first sight, it seems difficult to decide whether or not the systematic headings, viz. 'ethical' etc., were already used by Thrasyllus himself. My argument that the 'characters' of Plato's works do not derive from Thrasyllus and the fact that other catalogues too in Diogenes (viz. those of Heraclides of Pontus, Demetrius of Phalerum and Chrysippus of Soli) have been equipped with systematic headings, would seem to suggest that these were added to the Democritus catalogue by someone else. Against this is the indubitable fact that these systematic section headings correspond with the five fields of expertise Thrasyllus explicitly attributes to Democritus in the passage quoted above where he adduces a Platonic proof-text. The majority of these headings moreover are not paralleled by the

167 For Thrasyllus on Plato's genuine works see supra, n. 115 and text thereto.
168 Cf. below, pp. 194 f., complementary note 64.
'characters' added in the Plato catalogue. It is therefore in my view fairly certain that the headings in the Democritus catalogue indeed derive from Thrasyllus.

The list of nine unordered physical works is another interesting phenomenon. It immediately calls to mind the set of unordered Platonic works which in Aristophanes' arrangement *ap. D.L. III 61* followed upon the five trilogies,\(^{169}\) and Thrasyllus, as we have seen, must have known Aristophanes' list. The titles of eight of these unordered treatises begin with the word *αἰτίαι*, 'causal explanations'. The first seven deal with specific topics, whereas the eighth is a miscellaneous collection: *Various Causal Explanations* (′Αιτίαι σώματοι). The ninth has a different title, viz. *On the Magnet* (Περὶ τῆς λίθου). It is clear why the *Various Causal Explanations* could not be part of a systematic tetralogic ordering; its contents obviously were too diverse. So Thrasyllus decided to lump these 'causal explanations' treatises together, that is to say used an arrangement which differs from that of the tetralogies but is still a sort of systematic ordering, and added one work which for arithmetical reasons could not be fitted into the tetralogies anyway (it is not clear why he chose precisely this one, unless the word Αἰτίαι was lost before περὶ τῆς λίθου). We may moreover note that the fourth item of the twelfth tetralogy is also of the *Causal Explanations* type: Αἰτίαι περὶ ἀκαριστῶν καὶ ἑπικαριστῶν. Thrasyllus put it where he put it because he needed two tetralogies of 'technical' works, and the contents of this treatise apparently enabled him to do so.

The heading 'the unordered (treatises) are the following' (τὰ δὲ ἀσύντακτά ἐστι τάδε) has a critical colouring, and I find it a bit hard to believe that this is how Thrasyllus expressed himself, though he may well have said something like 'the other physical treatises are', etc. The formula 'the others separately and without order' (τὰ δὲ ἄλλα καὶ ἐν καὶ ἀτάκτως), which is found after the listing of the Platonic trilogies at D.L. III 62, is evaluative as well; again, it is hard to believe that it derives from Aristophanes himself. The most likely assumption is that refraining from ordering a number of works is what Aristophanes and Thrasyllus did, not what they said they did.

\(^{169}\) Regenbogen (1950) 1441 points that that this “entspricht ... dem Zustand älterer Kataloge”.
After Thrasyllus' catalogue of the treatises Diogenes adds a list of nine individual items which, he says, derive from Democritus' Nachlaß and were added by some authorities (IX 49). Other works attributed to him are either compilations from his treatises or considered spurious by common consent (IX 49, ὁμολογουμένας ... ἀλλοτρία). As so often, Diogenes rounds off the main bibliography with further considerations concerned with the issue of the γνήσιον.¹⁷⁰

2.9 Further Preliminary Issues in Diogenes Laërtius III

We may now briefly return to Diogenes Laërtius' book III. Several of the issues of the later schema isagogicum are also treated elsewhere in the Plato book. At D.L. III 62, after the chapters on the catalogues, various views are listed which are concerned with the general question which dialogue has to come first. Diogenes fails to distinguish between first positions in catalogues and first positions according to the order of study, which in fact he does not mention (he just says 'some begin with ...', others with' etc., ἀρχονταὶ δὲ οἱ μὲν ..., οἱ δὲ κτλ.). From the actual instances provided it is however clear that with one possible exception alternative orders of study are meant.¹⁷¹ This exception is the Republic as the first dialogue according to Aristophanes and his followers, because as we have seen Aristophanes' ordering appears to be based on philological and historical criteria deriving from data to be found in the dialogues themselves,¹⁷² and there is no indication that he was thinking of professional lecturers on Plato and their audience in the first place.

The specific preliminary issue of authenticity is discussed next, that is to say after the treatment of the tetralogies and trilogies and of the question which work has to come first. Diogenes lists a number of dialogues which by common consent

¹⁷⁰ Cf. infra, text to n. 173, below, pp. 194 f., complementary note 64.
¹⁷¹ See further Donini (1982) 54, and Dörrie-Baltes (1990) 358 ff. According to Gellius, Not. Att. I ix, 9-10, the Middle Platonist philosopher L. Calvenus Taurus (ca. 150 CE) said that unserious pupils too had preferences as to the order of study: Alius ait "hoc me primum doce", item alius "hoc volo" inquit "discere, istud nolo". Hic a Symposio Platonis incipere gestit propter Alcibiadæ commissationem, ille a Phaedro propter Lysiae orationem. Est etiam ... qui Platonem legere postulet non vitae ornandae, sed linguæ orationisque comendae gratia, etc.
¹⁷² See supra, n. 119.
are considered to be spurious (III 62, νοθεύονται ... ὀμολογουμένως).173 At D.L. III 62 none of these *spuria* has a double title representing a name (or a noun) and a theme;174 the majority have only names as titles, and a few have nouns. These dialogues were therefore not subjected to the same treatment as those collected in the Thrasyllus canon, a fact which is quite significant.

Finally, at the beginning of his account of the works and immediately after the dedication, at III 48, the question of the dialogue form is addressed (cf. Albin., *Prol.* ch. I; Anon. *proleg.*, 14.1 ff.).175 Diogenes deals with the later general preliminary question of the dialogue qua literary genre, even providing a very brief history of the genre itself.176

The conclusion that Diogenes used one or several general introductions to Plato seems indeed inescapable. This moreover would explain the surprising dedication to the philoplatonic lady rather late in the day, viz. at III 47. Diogenes needed a sentence describing the contents of the account that was meant to follow, an account which included the important section dealing with the τάξις, and found this at the beginning of this part of such an introduction. He transcribed it (or rather had it transcribed) lock, stock and barrel,177 no doubt intending to rephrase it when

---

173 See Müller (1974) 37 ff. However Diogenes’ formula only entails that Thrasyllus and his predecessors and followers too accepted that these dialogues are inauthentic, and by no means implies (*pace* Müller, *loc. laud.* and 328 f.) that the list itself is dependent on and contemporaneous with the tetralogic arrangement. For suggestions concerned with the meaning of ἀκέφαλοι see Müller (1974) 39 n. 1, Oswieimski (1979), Mejer (1979-80), and Goulet-Cazé (1989) 91 ff. For historical works without introduction (here called ἀκέφαλα ... σώματα) see Lucian, *Quom. hist. conscr.* 23.

174 The four extant *spuria* which have the name of a person as their title (the *Demodocus, Sisyphus, Eryxias* and *Axiochus*; only the last three are listed at D.L. III 62, and the first in fact consists of four separate little pieces) are provided with thematic titles in a number of manuscripts: Ἑμύδοκος ἦ περὶ τοῦ συμβουλεύοντος, Σίσυφος ἦ περὶ τοῦ βουλεύοντος, Ἐρυξίας ἦ περὶ πλούτου and Ἀξιόγος ἦ περὶ θανάτου.

175 Cf. *supra*, n. 45 and text thereto.

176 For the topic of the history of the genre *supra*, text to n. 77, and chapter one, section 6, on Proclus’ short history of geometry.

177 A similar suggestion was already made by Usener (1887) xxxiii with n. 1, who thought of an *Einzelsquelle* for the whole of Diogenes Laërtius; at Usener (1892) 210 he had changed his mind and spoke of a source for III 47-81 only. Philip (1970) 297 f. argues that Diogenes took over this section, “as if with scissors and paste”, from a work dealing with the dialogues and doctrines of Plato. Other scholars (adducing the apostrophe at X 29, which if the text is correct is however addressed to a person with a special interest in
completing the final version of his work.\textsuperscript{178} There is no need to assume that a dedication to this lady, which originally would supposedly have stood before the prologue of book I, has been lost in transmission or that, though planned, it was never written.

Epicurus) tend to assume that it was composed by Diogenes himself, see e.g. Plezia (1949) 94, and, more exuberantly, Gigante (1983) I, ix: “L’opera era dedicata ad una dama φιλοπλάτων, forse di alto rango”; cf. also Gigante (1986) 64 ff.

\textsuperscript{178} That the \textit{Lives} as we have it is unfinished has been proved by Schwartz (1905) 741, 745 ff., and has been further worked out by Gigante (1986) \textit{passim}. On drafts and penultimate versions in general see Dorandi (1991a).
CHAPTER THREE

PORPHYRY'S INTRODUCTION TO PLOTinus

3.1 Preliminary Questions in the Vita Plotini

An opus magnum dealing with about every imaginable aspect of the so-called Vita Plotini has been composed by a formidable équipe of Parisian scholars: 'Porphyre, La Vie de Plotin', in two hefty volumes.\(^{179}\) This is a work for which I have the profoundest admiration. Yet I believe that, for all the magnificent trees, the wood occasionally becomes invisible.

Porphyry's monograph is entitled Περὶ Πλωτίνου βίου καὶ τῆς τάξεως τῶν βιβλίων αὐτοῦ, On the Life of Plotinus and the Arrangement of his Books.\(^{180}\) Such a combination and division are paralleled in the dedication to the philoplatonic lady at D.L. III 47: τάξις τῶν διαλόγων καὶ βίος.\(^{181}\) That the transmitted title of Porphyry's work is appropriate and must be original is proved by what he states at V. Plot., 24.1 ff., where we have a remarkable caesura. Porphyry says that in the first part he has described Plotinus' life, and that from now on he will continue with the arrangement of his books.\(^{182}\) We have seen that Thrasyllus wrote an essay on Plato and one on Democritus in which he gave both a bios and a catalogue raisonné, and that these were intended to serve as an introduction to the study of the works of the philosopher concerned. There is no evidence whatever that he published editions of these opera omnia; presumably, the learned editions that were available were sufficient for his purpose and for that of his public. Porphyry, however, published a corrected\(^{183}\) edition of his master's treatises


\(^{180}\) The correct translation is not found on the title pages but at AA. Vv. (1992) 132, 764.

\(^{181}\) See supra, text to n. 100.

\(^{182}\) τοιοῦτος μὲν οὖν ὁ Πλωτίνου ἡμῖν ἱστορήται βίος, ἐπεὶ δὲ αὐτὸς τὴν διάταξιν καὶ τὴν διάφρωσιν τῶν βιβλίων ποιεῖσθαι ἡμῖν ἐπέτρεψεν κτλ. (my emphasis). For this division into two main sections see Goulet (1992) 78; for the parallel structure of Possidius' Vita Augustini + indiculus see infra, n. 206. Porphyry says that Plotinus entrusted him with the διάφρωσις (emendatio); the younger Pliny gave the drafts of his orations to several of his friends for the same purpose, see Ep. VII 17.

\(^{183}\) See V. Plot. 7. 51 and 26.39 διορθοῦν, and 24.2 quoted supra, n. 182. We
which in his (and Plotinus') view had hitherto been made available in a most unsatisfactory and quite restricted way,\textsuperscript{184} and the \textit{V. Plot.}, dealing with the life of the philosopher and the systematic arrangement of his works, stood at the beginning of this edition, as an indispensable aid to study. The \textit{V. Plot.}, accordingly, is a sort of \textit{Πρὸ τῆς ἀναγνώσεως}, and should be placed in the same category as the two introductory essays by Thrasyllus.

Porphyry clearly wants us to understand that the \textit{V. Plot.} belongs to a well-established genre and that Plotinus is a philosopher worthy to be compared with for instance Aristotle, or Plato. He should be studied in the same way as the great classical philosophers, and for this reason a \textit{bios} and an explanation of the order of study of the treatises should precede the authoritative edition of the books now made available for the first time to a more general public.\textsuperscript{185} But we should not only think of the great philosophers of the distant past whose \textit{bioi} were placed before editions of their works. Epictetus is much closer chronologically to Plotinus. Epictetus did not even write down the \textit{Discourses} on themes that arose from the discussions and study of texts in his seminar himself. His pupil Arrian took notes and in the end gave them to

\textit{—————}

may believe he went about his business not less carefully than in his earlier treatment of the 'oracles', see \textit{De philosophia ex oraculis haurunda} pp. 109 f. Wolff (\textit{ap.} Eusebius, \textit{P. E. IV} vii). An early example of a master entrusting a pupil with the revision of his works is found in the testament of the Peripatetic scholarch Lycon († 225 BCE) \textit{ap.} D. L. V 73: 'the books that have been read (i.e. before an audience, ἀνεγνωσμένα — cf. \textit{infra}, p. 194, complementary note 3 \textit{ad finem}) I leave to Lycon; those not made public (ἀνέκδοτα) I leave to Callinus, that he may correctly edit them (ἐπιμελῶ ... ἐκδοθῆ)'.

\textsuperscript{184} See Goulet-Cazé (1982) 280 ff.

\textsuperscript{185} Regenbogen (1950) 1444 excellently points out that the \textit{V. Plot.} has to be compared with Thrasylus' and Galen's essays. See also Saffrey (1992) 33 ff., who is aware of the fact that "c'était déjà un usage établi dans l'Antiquité de faire précéder l'édition des œuvres des grands classiques d'une \textit{Vita}", and who adds that "Porphyre, voulant éditer les traités de Plotin, n'a fait que se conformer à cet usage en plaçant en tête de son ouvrage une \textit{Vita Plotini}" (for evidence in the early papyri see del Fabbro (1979) 95). But he overstresses the exceptionality of the \textit{V. Plot. qua} biography and fails to dwell on the importance of the section on the systematic ordering of the books. This mistake is also made by Cox (1983) 102 ff., who only discusses the biography proper and its hagiographic ingredients. The main difference between the \textit{V. Plot.} and the \textit{Vita Pythagorae} (the only one from Porphyry's \textit{History} that is extant), which is much closer to a Laërtian \textit{bios} because of its quotation of early sources and description of doctrines, is that the former is about the life of someone the author had known personally. In this respect, the \textit{V. Plot.} resembles an encomium rather than a traditional biography.
the world, taking care to place a bios at the beginning of this publication.

Arrian had known Epictetus very well, just as Porphyry had known Plotinus. Both were able to speak from personal experience and could attest that their philosopher’s doctrines and his way of life were in agreement. Porphyry’s V. Plot. has often been seen as quite unique, but I suspect that this is only because comparable bioi, among which Arrian’s Life, are lost. But we do have some information. Simplicius begins his commentary on the Enchiridion\(^\text{186}\) by telling us that Arrian,

> who arranged the Diatribes of Epictetus in books containing many lines (ἐν πολυστίχοις συντάξας βιβλίοις), wrote about the life and death of Epictetus. From him (sc. Arrian) one may learn what sort of man he was as to his life (ὁποῖος γέγονε τὸν βίον ὁ ἀνήρ — [my emphasis]).\(^\text{187}\) Arrian also arranged the present book, entitled Epictetus’ Enchiridion, selecting and collecting from Epictetus’ arguments the (sayings that are) most important and philosophically most necessary and most capable of influencing souls, as he says himself in the dedicatory epistle to Massalinus.

Simplicius assumes that his students have read it, or will. Again, the bios of the philosopher is said to have a paradigmatic function, and his editor will have explained the arrangement of the Diatribes he adopted.

---


\(^{187}\) This bios, as has been noted, is lost; all we have is the dedicatory epistle to Lucius Gellius, in which Arrian modestly says he has not ‘written’ the discourses. They are ὑπομνήματα (‘records’) not intended for publication, which others however got hold of without his will or knowledge (οὐτε ἐκόντος ἐμοῦ οὔτε εἰδότος. Compare Cic., De or. I 94, scripsi ... illud quodam in libello, quod me invito [= οὐχ ἐκόντος ἐμοῦ] excidit et pervenit in manus hominum, and Tertullian, Adversus Marcionem I 1, on the ‘theft’ and pirated publication of the second version of his work: primum opusculum quasi propteram pleniore postea compositione resideram. Haec quoque nondum exemplarii suffectam fraudae tunc fratris ... amisi, qui forte descripterat quaedam mendosissime et exhibuit frequentiæ, see Quispel (1943) 3 ff. For the parallels in Galen and Plato see infra, n. 208). So Arrian decides to publish his records himself; what should be noted is that these ὑπομνήματα as published are not verbatim reports, but have been polished up. Arrian’s models are the Memorabilia of Xenophon and probably lost works such as Zeno’s Memoirs of Crates; see Wirth (1967) 204 ff., who also points out that the letter to Lucius Gellius serves the purpose of a “fiktive Begläubigung”.

PORPHYRY'S INTRODUCTION TO PLOTinus

It is of course well known that Porphyry in the bios itself, V. Plot. chs. 4-6, also provides lists of the treatises according to the chronology of their preliminary publication. He tells us that Plotinus before his (i.e. Porphyry's) arrival had written twenty-one treatises 'without providing them with a title', and that the happy few who had got hold of copies 'gave different titles to each' (διὰ τὸ μὴ αὐτὸν ἐπιγράφειν ἄλλος ἄλλο ἕκαστῳ τούτῳ γραμμα ἐτίθει, 4.17-8). For the twenty-one earliest treatises the chronological list at V. Plot., 4.22 ff., gives 'the titles that had prevailed' (αἱ ... κρατήσασι ἐπιγραφαί, 4.18-9). Porphyry is silent about the origin of the titles of the other treatises; we may believe he provided the majority of these himself, but should not overlook that there are some points of difference between the pinax at the end of the V. Plot. and the catalogues in the body of the work. I have found no explanation for these differences. But we should anyhow realize that Porphyry is explicitly concerned with the later preliminary particular question of the αἰτία τῆς ἐπιγραφῆς.

At V. Plot. 24, he tells us that for his definitive edition he decided to abandon the chronological sequence in favour of a systematic ordering. His examples, he says, were the edition of the comedies of Epicharmus by Apollodorus of Athens (second

---


189 The famous scholar, best know to historians of Greek philosophy as the author of the Chronica of which important fragments and testimonia are extant (FGrH 244. See further Dorandi (1979) 271 ff.). Porphyry used Apollodorus' Chronica for his Φιλόσοφος ἱστορία, as is explicitly attested at FGrH 244 F61b = Porph. Hist. philos. fragm. 1 Nauck = 200F./200aF. Smith (from book one of the Hist. philos.), but this may also be surmized to be the case for chronographic details in other fragments of this work; see already Rohde (1901) 89 ff. Porphyry moreover wrote a Chronicon himself, in which he is said to have used excellent sources; the fragments (from Eusebius) are to be found at FGrH 260. Apollodorus is also cited at Porphyry, De abstinentia II 55, presumably his Περὶ τῶν θεῶν (FGrH 244 F125); in his Περὶ Στυγύς (375F Smith), at any rate, Porphyry quotes from this work at length. According to Eustathius, Commentarii ad Iliadem pertinentes p. 263.35 ff. = Porph. 387F Smith he praised Apollodorus' treatise on the Homeric ships catalogue in twelve books. Not much is known about Apollodorus' edition of Epicharmus; see Schwartz (1894) 2863, and Pfeiffer (1978) 319 ff., also for his Περὶ Ἐπιχάρμου in at least seven books and Περὶ Σώφρονος in at least four. Pfeiffer's doubts as to the existence of the Epicharmus edition seem unjustified; there is no reason not to believe Porphyry. The Περὶ Ἐπιχάρμου and Περὶ Σώφρονος may have been commentaries, though Pfeiffer, op. cit., 319, argues that they were "Monographien mit Erklärungen im pep-Stil" (cf. supra, n. 72, for a title of
century BCE), and the editions of Aristotle and Theophrastus by 'Andronicus the Peripatetic'. Apollodorus collected the comedies in ten volumes (eis δέκα τόμους), and Andronicus 'divided the works ... into major treatises by combining the subjects that are appropriate' (τὰ 'Αριστοτέλους καὶ Θεοφράστου εἰς πραγματείας διείλε, τάς οἰκείας ὑπόθεσεις συναγαγόν). It is relatively clear to what extent Porphyry followed Andronicus' example, for in his systematic arrangement he indeed separates from each other (~διείλε) the treatises which originally were linked by their chronology, and as his next step combines groups of treatises into wholes (~πραγματείαι) devoted to a common subject (~ὑπόθεσις).

We note the term ὑπόθεσις, paralleled in the report about Thrasyllus at D.L. III 57. Porphyry is very much concerned with what in the later schemata isagogica is called the issue of the σκοπός. Just as Albinus and others before him he is also concerned with the order of study or τάξις τῆς ἀναγνώσεως, which in fact is the primum movens of the systematic arrangement as a whole: 'I gave the first position to the lighter problems'. The

Didymus Chalcenterus). The fourth book of the Περὶ Σώφρονος is cited at Athenaeus 281EF as containing τῶν ἀνδρείων μιμοὺς. That he rejected the Politeia ascribed to Epicharmus (Athen. 648DE; on this passage see Berk (1964) 102 f.) shows that in his commentary, or treatise, and perhaps also in his edition he dealt with the issue of the γνήσιον.

This passage is printed as T 75 g in Düring (1957) 414 f., who says it is "the backbone of our information on the Roman [sic] edition of Aristotle". See further Gottschalk (1990) 56 ff.

Cf. what follows, 24.11-13, οὕτω δὴ καὶ ἐγὼ νῦν ὡς ταῦτα ἔχων ταῦτα Πλατίνου βιβλία διείλον μὲν εἰς ἔξις ἐννεάδας. What is more, Porphyry divided the so-called Grobschrift, i.e. Enn. [30-33], into four (see Harder (1960)) and took other liberties (see Armstrong (1967) 217) in order to arrive at the desired total of 9 x 6 treatises. He may have believed that this activity came under the διάταξις which Plotinus asked him to provide (cf. supra, n. 182), but the result to some extent resembles a διασκευή, i.e. a revision involving modifications in details (for the term διασκευή cf. Galen, In Hippocratis De victu acutorum, CMG V 9,1, p. 120.5–14, and see further Emonds (1941) 22–3, 341, 353, Dover (1968) lxxxii ff.).

Cf. supra, n. 116 and text thereto; for the parallel in Galen see infra, n. 232. Cf. also V. Plut. 24.36-37, ἢ ... πρῶτη ἐννέας τάδε περιέχει ἡθικοτέρας ὑπόθεσεις περιλαμβάνει, 25.31-2, ἢ ... τετάρτῃ ἐννεάς τάς περὶ ψυχῆς αὐτῆς ὑπόθεσεις ἐσχή πάσας, as well as 4.11 and 5.61.

24.15-16, δοῦχαι τάξιν πρῶτην τοῖς ἐλαφροτέροις προβλήμασιν. In this first part of his systematic arrangement Porphyry conforms to a pattern which seems to be rhetorical rather than philosophical; cf. Aelius Theon on the theoretical thesis, Progymnasmata, in Rhet. graec. min. II, p. 125.27 ff., ἀρμότουσα δὲ τάξις ἐκάστῳ προβλήματι ἐστιν, ὅταν τὸ κατ’ ἀρχάς τὰ
main sequence\textsuperscript{195} is ethics (\textit{Enn. I}) — physics (\textit{Enn. II-III}) including psychology (\textit{Enn. IV}) — and what P. Hadot has called ‘epoptics’, i.e. on the intellect (\textit{Enn. V}) and on the highest realities (\textit{Enn. VI}).\textsuperscript{196} In ch. 25, Porphyry explains why he has put four treatises in the third ennead which deals with cosmic matters, although their titles do not suggest that this is where they belong. So we find Porphyry addressing the question which had already been addressed by Origen before him, and which was to be explicitly formulated by Elias and David several centuries later, viz. \textit{упо πόιον μέρος τῆς φιλοσοφίας ἀνάγεται}.\textsuperscript{197} The systematic ordering according to the parts of philosophy of the whole œuvre corresponds as to its structure with the classification of Aristotle’s acroamatic writings (the \textit{Organon} excepted) by the Late Neoplatonists.\textsuperscript{198}

3.2 Porphyry and Apollodorus. Authenticity

It remains a bit of a mystery why Porphyry chose Apollodorus’ edition of (the comedies of) Epicharmus as one of his two \textit{Vorbilder}.\textsuperscript{199} It is also quite remarkable that he fails to refer to

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{195} See P. Hadot (1966) 128 f. and (1979) 218 ff.; Goulet-Cazé (1982) 304, also for further references. Cf. also supra, n. 9 and text thereto. David T. Runia points out to me that this sequence is also parallel with the ascent described at \textit{Enn. V} 1[10].1-4. Mahé (1991) has discussed another important parallel, viz. the distinction between introductory tracts (λόγοι γενικοί), tracts dealing with specific subjects (λόγοι διεξοδικοί), and the mystical vision of the highest realities according to the \textit{Hermetica}.

\textsuperscript{196} The terminology (ethics / physics) may in part be compared to that found in Diogenes Laërtius’ classifications and catalogues (see supra, n. 131 and n. 165): 24.16-17 ἡθικάτερα (cf. 24.37), 24.37 τῶν φυσικῶν. For 24.38 and 59 τὰ περὶ κόσμου as an originally Stoic subdivision of physics see Mansfeld (1992b).

\textsuperscript{197} See supra, text to n. 4, text to n. 81 and to n. 96.

\textsuperscript{198} See supra, text to n. 131, n. 148.

\textsuperscript{199} The suggestion of Harder (1928) 651 n. 3, and in his Plotinus commentary \textit{ad loc.}, cited with what seems approval by Goulet-Cazé (1982) 303 n. 1, that Porphyry echoed something Andronicus had said about Apollodorus in the introduction to his edition of Aristotle is in my view implausible. Porphyry must have had reasons of his own for mentioning Apollodorus’
Thrasyllus' arrangement of Plato's works. The reason, I believe, is that though arithmologically interesting, it was unsufficiently systematic from a philosophical and didactic point of view, as Albinus already pointed out (Prol. ch. 4). The Middle Platonist systematic classifications attested by Albinus, Prol. chs. 3 and 6, and at Diogenes Laërtius III 49 f., which as we have seen in chapter two above entail an order of study, must have been much more to his taste though he does not refer to them either. Thrasyllus moreover did not edit the corpus platonicum. Andronicus' ordering of Aristotle's (and Theophrastus') works appears to have been systematic but was not, of course, pressed into an arithmological straight-jacket.

My guess is that Apollodorus' edition of Epicharmus was singled out for several reasons. The first reason, not entirely speculative, is that he will have divided them into sets according to what we may call a systematic point of view, for the distinction of Sophron's mimes into 'masculine' (ἀνδρείοι) and 'feminine' (γυναικείοι—perhaps already alluded to at Plato, Rep. 451c ff.) was a significant feature of his Περὶ Σωφρονος. The system at issue this time is of course not philosophical but belongs to the domain of literary theory. What is more, we know that Apollodorus was an expert on chronological matters, so he can hardly have refrained from discussing the chronology of the plays (and of the bios of its author) in his commentary or treatise, and perhaps in the hypotheseis to the individual plays in his edition. Porphyry had used Apollodorus' Chronica for his Philosophical History. If his arrangement of Epicharmus' plays, as we may plausibly believe, was according to subject rather than chronology although the chronology was discussed, we would have a quite good parallel for Porphyry's modus operandi. There is no evidence which suggests that Andronicus discussed the chronology of Aristotle's works. A second possible reason, relatively unimportant and perhaps merely additional, is that the name Epicharmus may have

dition, whether Andronicus referred to this work or not. What is more, why would Andronicus have mentioned it? Porphyry appears to have been familiar with Apollodorus' scholarly oeuvre, see supra, n. 189.

200 Pfeiffer (1978) 320 believes that Porphyry states that Apollodorus' arrangement was systematic, but I fail to see how this can be got out of his text. As a parallel for Apollodorus' classification that of Pindar's poems by Callimachus and Aristophanes of Byzantium may be cited, see supra, n. 82.
rung a bell; in Platonizing and Pythagoreanizing circles he was considered to be a Pythagorean. A third possible reason is that Apollodorus, as we have seen, published the numerous comedies in ten ‘volumes’ (τόμοι), or large papyrus scrolls capable of containing a number of individual works each. How many scrolls Andronicus needed for each copy of his edition is unknown but the amount will have been larger. The number ten itself has a Pythagorean ring for those who wish to hear it, viz. that of the tetraaktus. But Apollodorus’ edition of Epicharmus is not the only one in ten volumes of the entire output of an author that is attested. A ten-volume edition of the opera omnia of Antisthenes is also known to have existed. He however is perhaps not an author Plotinus’ editor wished to mention in relation to his master.²⁰¹ At any rate, in the edition in three large corpora (σωμάτια), each of which formed a unity rather than a unit, Enn. I–III were put in Vol. I, Enn. IV–V in Vol. II, and Enn. VI in Vol. III (see V. Plot. ch. 25.1-2, ch. 26.1-6). Porphyry was not only concerned with a meaningful arrangement of individual treatises into groups of nine, but also with a meaningful distribution of Enneads over three volumes. The number three too is loaded with meaning for one who, more pythagorico, is addicted to number symbolism.

²⁰¹ For Epicharmus as a Pythagorean Berk (1964) 83 f. among other passages cites Anon. in Theaet., col. 71.12 ff. (add 70.5 ff.), Plutarch, Num. ch. 8.17, 65D, D.L. VIII 78 (Vorsokr. 23A3), Clement, Strom. V 101 (a mistake for V xiv.100.6), Iamblichus, De vit. pyth. p. 143.10 ff. (Vorsokr. 25A4). For the edition in ten volumes (τόμοι) of the enormous output of Antisthenes by we know not whom see supra, n. 127. For Porphyry’s edition of the Enneads in three vols. see Goulet-Cazé (1982) 305, and Tardieu (1992) 524 ff. Tardieu (just as Birt (1882) 39, 114) argues that σωμάτιον means ‘codex’. At ps.Longinus, De sublimitate ch. 9.13, the term is used as a designation of the Iliad (τῆς μὲν Ἰλιάδος γραμμάτων ἐν ἀκμῇ πνεύματος ἀλον τὸ σωμάτιον δραματικῶν ὑπεστή- σατο καὶ ἐναγώνιον); cf. also Scholia graeca in Iliadem (scholia vetera) I, p. 4.32 Erbse (text quote above, chapter one, section 9 ad finem). W. Hamilton Fyfe in the Loeb ed. of ps.Longinus oddly translates “whole piece”, H. Lebègue in the Budé ed. has the much better “tout le corps de son ouvrage”; see Russell (1964) 96 f., who cites Cic., Ad Att. II 1.4, and [Heraclitus], Homericia problemata ch. 1.2; the transl. “volumen” in Neuberger-Donath (1987) 76 is to be rejected. Though even at this early date the meaning ‘codex’ for σωμάτιον cannot be excluded a priori (there is a reference to a private vellum codex at Galen, De compositione medicamentorum secundum locos, XII, 423.13-5 K., τούτῳ τὸ φάρμακον οὗτο γεγραμμένον εὑρε Κλαυδίανός ὁ ἔταιρός ἡμῶν ἐκ πυτιδὶ διφθέρα, τοῦ χρωμένου αὐτῷ ἀποδανόντος), I believe that the meaning in Porphyry is ‘corpus’ too, i.e. a collection of individual books forming a whole. Porphyry’s Plotinus was an édition de luxe, while the codex outside the Christian community was used for cheap copies or private notes.
Porphyry does not deal disertis verbis with the issue of authenticity. But the whole account of his relations with Plotinus and his other pupils, the fact that the master so to speak chose him as his principal research assistant, entrusting him with the collection and textual revision of his writings, the fussily meticulous report about what treatises were published when and how they were written, as well as the precise information about their titles and opening formulas in actual fact guarantee that all the treatises to be found in this editio maior are by Plotinus.

In the final chapter (V. Plot. 26) Porphyry explains why his introductory essay does not contain a brief account and discussion of the doctrines themselves. In the past, he had not only written commentaries (or comments) on difficult passages in a number of treatises without bothering about their order but also summaries, or rather lists of contents (κεφάλαια) of each individual treatise (one treatise excepted, which at the time was not at his disposal) according to the chronology of their production. In the systematic edition these κεφάλαια are now added to each treatise according to the new arrangement. A number of arguments (ἐπιχειρήματα) are also added to the treatises; these are numbered together with the κεφάλαια. Porphyry, in other words, adopts a form of the distinction between what is ante opus and what in ipso opere of which we have seen an explicit trace in Aelius Donatus’ introduction to Virgil: bios and catalogue raisonné as a general introduction, lists of contents of particular treatises (including the problem which was the starting-point of the treatise, V. Plot. ch. 5.60 ff.), and arguments, in the main body of the edition.

---

202 He had done so at the request of friends who desired ‘clarification’ (εἰς ἀπὸ αὐτοῦ τὴν σαφῆνειαν αὐτοῖς γενέσθαι ἥξιον); on the problems connected with these comments or commentaries see Goulet-Cazé (1982) 307 ff. Eunapius, Vitae sophistarum 465 = Porph. 1T, 59-63 Smith, posits that Porphyry clarified the intentional obscurity of his master, but he exaggerates: τῶν δὲ φιλοσόφων τὰ ἀπόρρητα καλυπτόντων ἀσαφεία, καθάπερ τῶν ποιητῶν τοὺς μῦθους, ο Πορφύριος τὸ φάρμακον τῆς σαφηνείας ἐκαίνισας καὶ διὰ πείρας γεναίμενος, ὑπόμνημα γράφας εἰς φῶς ἠγάγεν. For Porphyry and σαφήνεια see also infra p. 204, complementary note 316.

203 On these κεφάλαια and ἐπιχειρήματα see Goulet-Cazé (1982) 305 f., 315 ff., whose interpretation I follow; note however that Regenbogen (1950) 1447 suggests, not implausibly, that the ἐπιχειρήματα are “Argumentationen pro und contra, Problemfragen u. dgl.” On κεφάλαια see also supra, n. 29 and the literature there cited.

204 See supra, text after n. 76, infra, n. 254.
4.1 The De ordine librorum. The Two Orders of Study

As Regenbogen has pointed out, the information to be found in two essays forming a sort of diptych written by Galen in his old age is extremely valuable for the understanding of Porphyry’s V. Plot. These works are the On the Arrangement of His Own Books and its sequel, the On His Own Books, a sort of autobiographies raisonnées. We note the presence of the key-word τάξις in the

205 Regenbogen (1950) 1444 ff. For the dates of Galen (129 - after 210) and the chronology of his career see Nutton (1973) and (1984) 321 ff. For shorter catalogues embedded in other Galenic writings and for his cross-references see Nutton (1972) 53 f. (cf. infra, n. 206).

206 Περὶ τῆς τάξεως τῶν ἰδίων βιβλίων (hereafter De ord.) and Περὶ τῶν ἰδίων βιβλίων (hereafter De libr. propr.); the latter is announced in the former at p. 89.9 ff. Both have been edited, though not too well, by von Müller (1891); references are to the pages of this edition. At the end of a shorter catalogue of a number of his writings, Ars medica, I, 411.16 ff. K., Galen announces that he intends to compose a De libr. propr. in one or two books (περὶ δὲ τῶν ἄλλων συγγραμμάτων τε καὶ ύπομνήματόν ὑπὲρ ἐγράφωμα, οὐκ ἀναγκαῖον ἔστι διεξερεύσθαι μόνον, ὑπὲρ ἰδίων γε μέλλοντας ἐρεῖν ἐτέρῳ, καθ’ ἐν ἰδίας ἡ δυὸ βιβλία τὴν ἐπιγραφὴν ἐξοντα Γαληνοῦ Περὶ τῶν ἰδίων βιβλίων). With Galen’s two works one may compare Augustine’s Retractiones (see Regenbogen (1950) 1437, Mutzenbacher (1984) xiv), also written in the author’s old age, in which he lists, describes and criticizes ninety-three of his works (i.e. by no means all of them) in the order in which they were composed. His pupil and friend Possidius, Vita Augustini ch. 28 (ed. Pellegrino (1955)), calls this treatise De recensione librorum. Augustine gives the titles of these works, the number of books for each of them, its subject, his motive for writing it and the circumstances at the time of writing, and often the date at which it was written. He suggests that the chronological order is a proper order of study, Retract. prol. 3: inventet ... fortasse quomodo scribendo profererim quisquis opuscula mea ordine quo scripta sunt legerit. As Regenbogen, loc. cit., points out, this emphasis on personal development is quite original. A systematic classification is lacking, which constitutes a major difference with catalogues such as the enneadic ordering of Plotinus’ essays by Porphyry discussed in chapter three and Galen’s overviews of his own works in the two treatises to be studied in the present chapter. Possidius says that he appends a list of all the works at the end of the Vita; see ch.18, statui ... in huius opusculi fine etiam eorumdem librorum, tractatuum et epistolarium indiculum adiungere (for the parallel in Porphyry, V. Plot., see supra, n. 182 and text thereto). From this list, he says, one may
first title. In sections 4.3 and following of the present chapter I shall also look at the introductory paragraphs of his extant commentaries on treatises of the Hippocratic collection and in some cases at the proems to individual books of these commentaries. This bulky exegetical corpus has been somewhat neglected by students of the philosophical commentary literature, though as we shall see rewarding forays have been made by Moraux and Barnes.

In the first chapter of the *De ord.* Galen addresses a certain Eugenianus and is delighted to accept his request for a little book which would explain the arrangement of the books he has written (80.1-3, τι βιβλίον ... τὴν τάξιν τῶν ὑπ’ ἐμοῦ γεγραμμένων ἐξηγοῦμενον), that is to say provide guidance on how to study them. In what follows, he explains that (most of) his writings were never intended for the public at large but only for his friends and pupils. Copies came into the hands of others against his will (ἀκοντος ἐμοῦ), and were used by these others. Today we would speak of

choose a title and for instance write to the library at Hipp for a revised copy which one then may have copied for one’s own use. He did not have to provide a catalogue in chronological order because Augustine had already done this himself for his more important works; in the *Vita,* however, he occasionally adverts to the circumstances under which certain groups of works were composed (ch. 7, ch. 18). As to its structure Possidius' *Vita + indiculus* as intended by the author indeed resembles Porphyry's *V. Plot,* but it was not written as the introduction to an edition. We have however noticed that readers were encouraged to choose those works they wanted to possess and read, so in a sense Possidius' *work* was an introduction to the works of Augustine. Its structure also to a certain degree resembles Galen's *De ord. + De libr. propr.* It is however doubtful whether the *indiculus* which has been transmitted under Possidius' name is the original one; Ludwig (1983) argues that it is a catalogue composed in the fifth century CE which is based on the holdings of one or more libraries. If this hypothesis is correct, the *indiculus* would have the same sort of authority as the so-called Lamprias catalogue of Plutarch's works, for which see Sandbach (1969) 4 ff.; consequently, I have refrained from adducing it in detail. The text of the *indiculus* has been critically edited by Wilmart (1981); a new edition by Fr. Glorie is to appear in the series Corpus Christianorum.

One is reminded of the letter Henry James wrote on September 14 1913 to Mrs Prothero, who had asked for advice on behalf of a young man from Texas who wanted to know in what order he should read the novels of the master. James sent two lists of his more important works, one for beginners and one for the more advanced, each containing five titles.

For the parallels in Cicero, Arrian and Tertullian see *supra,* n. 187. Though Galen's story may to some degree be true, I believe it is in the first place a variety of the *modus modestiae* based on this *topos,* which is already instanced at Plato, *Parm.* 128d. But his account at any rate takes the distinction between private or limited circulation and regular publication for
pirated editions. These developments (he says, but note that Galen tends to lend a personal background to standard features of a career) forced him to write a little book entitled *On the Best Sect* (Περὶ τῆς ἀρίστης αἰρέσεως, 81.13 ff.),208a in which he argued among other things that the person who wants to make a responsible choice among the sects, or schools (of thought), in any field needs to know what constitutes a proof. The title Περὶ τῆς ἀρίστης αἰρέσεως, we are told, had been used by physicians and philosophers who wished to defend the doctrines of their own school, but this is not Galen’s purpose; on the contrary. The point about the various schools calls to mind one of the general preliminary issues of the schema isagogicum.209 He repeats his account of the distressing circumstances which forced him to write this essay, telling us that ‘the explanation for the title has been stated in it’ (or: for its ‘writing’, the reason why he wrote it, i.e. *intentio auctoris*, as well as for its purpose, the later σκοπός). The title at any rate expresses the intention of the author and the purpose of the work.210

He who wants to start the study of Galen’s works will be well advised to study (ἄναγγελον· οὐκέτι) first of all the contents of this

---

208a This work has been lost; the interesting extant treatise with this title printed in Kühn, Vol. I, pp. 106-223, is not by Galen.

209 See supra, text to n. 32, to n. 44, infra, text to n. 213. The proem of Celsus, *De medicina*, consists of a brief history of medicine (1-11) and a detailed comparison of the dogmatist and empiricist sects (12-75).

210 P. 82.20, εὑρηται δὲ ἐν αὐτῶ καὶ ἡ τῆς γραφῆς αἰτία. It is tempting to conjecture (ἐπιγραφῇ), but at *De libr. pror.* p. 91.2 γραφῆ apparently means ἐπιγραφῇ (see p. 91.8). In the present passage ‘writing’ is an entirely plausible translation. At p. 89.10-11, ... ἐν ὑ ἐν τῇ γραφῇ τῇ ὑ πονήσῃ ἄπαντων τῶν ἐμῶν βιβλίων, it is tempting to conjecture (ἄναγγελον, but γραφῆ may mean ‘list’, ‘catalogue’, see *LSJ*, s.v., II 2 b.
essay (p. 82.20 f.). As a matter of fact, in the other essay, *De libr. propr.* p. 120.9, the treatise *On the Best Sect* is listed among the logical works. If the student of Galen, convinced by the arguments to be found in this treatise, wants to become an expert at proving things (ἐπὶ δεικτικός) before continuing his inquiry into the doctrines of the schools, the voluminous treatise *On Proof* is at his disposal (p. 82.21 ff.).211 This, Galen continues in the next chapter, is 'one beginning of the study of our treatises', μία ...τῶν ἡμετέρων ύπομνημάτων ἐστιν ἀρχή τῆς ἀναγνώσεως, viz. for the intelligent and the friends of the truth (p. 83.7-9, my emphasis). The fact that the *On the Best Sect* and the *On Proof* have perished is perhaps in part to be explained by the fact that the public for which these two works were intended was rather elitist.

But a different order of study is also possible, viz. for those who have experienced Galen 'as to his life as a whole' (ἐπὶ ... τοῦ βίου παντὸς, p. 83.11) and his medical accomplishments (ἐργα, p. 83.12). Knowing Galen's way of life and character (τρόπος τῆς ψυχῆς, p. 83.13) means that one knows that he is impartial with regard to the sects, and that his actions and results attest the truth of his doctrines (μαρτυρεῖ τῇ τῶν δογμάτων ἀληθείᾳ). These students need not possess knowledge but may be content with true opinion, which differs from knowledge merely in not being firm (p. 83.19 ff.; reference for the *cognoscenti* to Plato, *Meno* 98a). The student will start with the introductory writings (ἀναγνώσεται τοιγαροῦν οὗτος ἀπάντων πρότα τὰ τοῖς εἰσαγωγέοις γεγραμμένα, pp. 83.21-84.2; my emphasis), first the *On Sects for Beginners*,212 and then two other books with the words 'for beginners' in their title. This time too Galen's course begins with a treatise devoted to an issue which recalls one of the preliminary general points of the *schemata isagogica*.213 Details as to what to study next are given in

211 We no longer have it; the σύνοψις in one book listed *De libr. propr.*, p. 120.20, is also lost. See the still indispensable account (containing testimony) of von Müller (1897). Moraux (1984) 691 n. 15 gives information on further fragments preserved in Arabic translation (but his suggestion, *ibid.*, 691, that the *On Proof* "zweifellos ein breiteres Publikum erreichen wollte" is not good); see also Iskandar (1988) 158 with n. 1. Hunain ibn Ishaq (Bergsträsser (1925)) 38 f. tells us that for all his efforts he never succeeded in finding a complete text, though at one time he possessed damaged books and fragments constituting more than half the work. See further Barnes (1991a), Hankinson (1991a) 15 ff. and (1992) 3511 ff.


213 Cf. *supra*, n. 209 and text thereto.
the pages that follow. The anatomical treatises come first, a solid knowledge of anatomy according to Galen being absolutely indispensable to the practising physician, and those belonging to the other parts of medicine follow. Somewhat to our surprise book thirteen of the On Proof is included (p. 85.16 f.), but admittedly this one book only. At the end Galen states that whoever will read these works in the sequence in which they have been listed will do so ‘according to the appropriate arrangement’ (ἐν τῇ προσκούσῃ τάξει, p. 86.7). The two different orders of study and the two classes of potential students that go with them recall the two different orders of study advocated by one of Galen’s teachers, Albinus, at Prol., chs. 5-6, and I believe that we may posit a connection. The difference is that Albinus thinks of professionals as distinguished from more or less eager dilettantes, whereas Galen thinks of true-blue scientists as distinguished from less well-educated general practitioners.

In passages dealing with the study of his own writings in earlier works Galen does not yet make this distinction between two different classes of students and two different orders of study, at least not explicitly. I give a few examples. At the end of the quite substantial catalogue at Ars Medica, I 411.13 ff. K., he states he has shown in the On the Best Sect that a preliminary training in the practising of proof has to precede the study of all the works that have been listed, and that this is absolutely indispensable for whoever wishes to pursue medicine in a rational way. But he does not mention the On Proof here. And he gives the impression of not being concerned with a preliminary training in the epideictic method at all at De methodo medendi II 6.12, X 122.2 ff. K., where he provides a list of eight of his medical treatises, beginning with the De elementis secundum Hippocratem and ending with the De symptomatum differentiis, which have to be studied in succession by whoever wishes to know the proofs (ὁστις τὰς τούτων ἀποδείξεις ἐπιστήμη βούλεται περιλαβεῖν) of the topics he is dealing with in this passage of the present work.

Because the On the Best Sect is lost and a full text of the On Proof is not available, and since moreover we have no personal know-

214 See also Regenbogen (1950) 1445: “Tendenz und Abzweckung der Schrift ist ... vollkommen klar. Sie ist eisagogisch”.

215 See supra, text to n. 143; cf. also infra, text to n. 228, and chapter five, section 4 ad finem.
ledge of Galen's life, character and actions,\textsuperscript{216} we no longer are in a position to study his works the way we should, if, that is, we take his remarks at face-value. But this is by the way. However we do find important (auto)biographical data in the subsequent treatise, viz. the \textit{De libr. propr.}, as well as in many passages in his other works.

The first thing to be noted is that in the passage from the \textit{De ord.} quoted above Galen does not distinguish the 'unauthorized' distributions of his writings from a regular and corrected edition intended for the appropriate professional or general public,\textsuperscript{217} but rather from an order of study, or from two different orders of study, of these same writings. The second is that the first work to be studied after the introductory logical essay according to the scientific order of study is the \textit{On Proof}; Galen accordingly conforms to a quite general trend by putting logic first. His father, after all, made him begin his philosophical training with the study of logic at the age of fifteen (p. 88.9 ff.).

The second order of study recommended is only open to those who know Galen personally, that is to say who are familiar with his way of life (\textit{bios}) and character and know from experience that his doctrines are confirmed by experiment and by the successes of his general practice. This remark about the author's \textit{bios} and actions as warrants for the truth is extraordinarily interesting. Galen produces a personal variation on a very common theme. The \textit{bios} of an author, as we have seen in the preceding chapters, should be studied and known before one starts with his writings. But an edition-cum-\textit{bios} of Galen's \textit{opera} is not available. This gap is filled by a list of the writings authenticated by the author, by recommendations for the various orders of study, by the statement that those who know his life and actions

\textsuperscript{216} We do not have the \textit{Περὶ τῆς δυσβολῆς, ἐν ὧ καὶ περὶ τοῦ ἰδίου βίου} (\textit{De libr. propr.} p. 122.2) either, but note that Galen does not recommend the study of this autobiographical essay as a substitute for personal knowledge.

\textsuperscript{217} This distinguishes his present approach from that of Porphyry, though there is a partial analogy between this unauthorized form of circulation and the limited availability of Plotinus' treatises as they came to be written (for which see Goulet-Cazé (1982) 284 ff., who translates and interprets part of the prologue of the other essay, viz. the \textit{De libr. propr.}). It should however be acknowledged that Galen revised a number of his books, presumably in view of their regular publication, and that he wrote a number of Hippocratic commentaries 'for common publication' or 'available to all', as he calls it (\textit{ἐἰς κοινὴν ἐκδοσιν ἀποβλέπων, De libr. propr.} ch. 6, p. 112.19).
from their own experience may safely study his works, and by the regular publication of versions of at least a substantial number of works in the Galenic corpus corrected and revised by the author.

But there is even more to this at first sight innocuous remark, for according to a quite general view knowledge of the living voice, way of life, character and actions of the living master is infinitely more precious than such knowledge as may be gained from the written bios and doctrines of a dead (or absent) one. The mere contents of the things taught may not be sufficient in themselves, as for instance we may learn from a passage in one of Seneca’s letters. Seneca writes that he will send ‘the books’ (he does not say which books, but works by important Stoics and perhaps other philosophers are probably what is meant), yet urges Lucilius to seek the knowledge that arises from the intimacy of personal acquaintance, Ep. 6.5-6:218

A living voice (viva vox) and a shared life will help you more than the written word. [...] Cleanthes could not have been the living image of Zeno, if he had merely heard his lectures. He shared his life, understood his secrets, and observed him to see whether he lived according to his own rule. Plato and Aristotle and the whole crowd of wise men who were to go their different ways derived more benefit from Socrates’ morals than from his words. It was not the class-room of Epicurus, but living together under the same roof, that made great men of Metrodorus and Hermarchus and Polyaeus.

It is therefore all the more remarkable that what Seneca calls ‘the living voice and the intimacy of the common life’ is not an ingredient of the first order of study of Galen’s works. Those pupils who are sufficiently gifted to study and assimilate the monograph On the Best Sect and the whole of the great treatise On Proof only need the books. This is because the scientific method, based on the absolute certainty provided by mathematical reasoning and logic, is impersonal. There is nothing about it that is in any way sectarian, or a matter of a particular ‘school’. We must admire him for taking this stance, which is toto coelo different from that of Proclus, In Crat. ii, who says the Peripatetic apodeictic

218 Transl. Gummere, slightly modified; on this passage see Cancik (1967) 59 f., I. Hadot (1969) 164. Cf. also Seneca, Ep. 94.40-1, on the advantages of personal contacts with good people, and infra, text to n. 342. For Galen’s and Gellius’ rider see infra, n. 220.
is very much inferior to Platonic dialectic and accessible to all but the most stupid.

At the same time one might perhaps indulge in a bit of crude psychologizing and suggest that he must have felt rather lonely. The enormously successful Galen who writes in his old age about the order of study of his own books had numerous friends, followers and pupils, but he seems to have been aware that for all his following he had no successor to take his place (as Cleanthes, for instance, had been a sort of second Zeno), to become a living example in his turn.219 Though he often speaks of his pupils, I have found only two references to these in a teaching role. At De compositione medicamentorum per genera, XIII, 603.10 ff. K., he tells us that his pupils habitually teach their pupils by putting to use his own anatomical works (πολλοί δὲ ... τῶν ἐμῶν ἑταίρων ὑσασι ἄπαντα ταύτα καὶ δεικνύουσι τοῖς μαθηταῖς, ἀναγινωσκομένων τῶν ἐμῶν ἀνατομικῶν βιβλίων). And at De semine II 1.11 (CMG V 3,1, p. 146.11) he states that after his death all his pupils will be capable of demonstrating the simple anatomical fact he has just described (δείξουσι δὲ τούτῳ κἂν ἡμεῖς ἀποθάναμεν οἱ ἑταίροι πάντες).

219 On Galen’s having no successor and on his isolated position among contemporary physicians see Kudlien (1970) 26 f. Galen’s apparent lack of influence in medical (as different from philosophical) quarters for more than 150 years after his death is discussed by Scarborough (1981); a more nuanced view is argued by Nutton (1985). On pupils as a source of information when a master is (long) dead or even his works may be lost see De venae sectione adversus Erístrateos Romæ degentes, XI, 221.11-7 K., ἕγω μὲν ὄν ἐστι καὶ μηδὲν ἐσάξετο Ἐρασιστράτου βιβλίων, ἀλλ’ ἢδη πάντα ἀπολαλεῖ, καθάπερ τὰ Χρυσίππου κινδυνεύει παθεῖν, τούτῳ τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ μᾶλλον ἐκπείτευσα περὶ τοῦ διδασκάλου λέγουσαν ἢ τοῖς μῆτρ’ Ἐρασιστράτον αὐτὸν ἱδούσι ποτὲ μήτε μαθητὴν αὐτοῦ, μήτε τὸν ὃς ἐκείνου φοιτησάντων ἢ τὸν τούτους συγγενομένων. I believe that this Galen passage is the parallel from pagan literature for the well-known pronouncement of Papias of Hierapolis at the beginning of his treatise in five books, the Interpretation of the Sayings of the Lord (τοῦ δὲ Παπία συγγράμματα πέντε τῶν ἀριθμῶν φέρεται, ἢ καὶ ἐπιγέγραπται Λογίων κυριακῶν ἐξηγήσεως, ap. Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. III xxxix.1), to be dated to ca. 130 CE. He says that he preferred what he could learn from the living voice of tradition, viz. what he had heard from the ‘elders’ (τοὺς τῶν πρεσβυτέρων ἀνέκδοτον λόγους, τι Ἀνδρέας ἢ τί Πέτρος ἔπειν ἢ τὶ Φιλίππος ἢ τὶ Θομᾶς ἢ Ἰάκωβος ἢ τὶ Ἰωάννης ἢ Μαθαών ἢ τὶς ἔτερος τῶν τοῦ κυρίου μαθητῶν ἢ τοῖς ἐρίτεροι τοῦ κυρίου μαθητῶν ἢ τοῖς ἐρίτεροι τοῦ κυρίου μαθητῶν, λέγουσιν) who had personally known Jesus’ immediate followers (cf. Eusebius, ibid. III xxxix, 3-4, 7), to what he could learn from the books (οὐ γὰρ τὰ ἐκ τῶν βιβλίων τοσοῦτον μὲ ὄψειν ὑπελάμβανον ὅσον τὰ παρὰ ἔσης φωνῆς καὶ μενοῦσης). See further next n., also for the view attested by Porphyry that information from an intermediary is less good than the original vivâ voce.
What Galen did was leave a sort of last will and testament containing a signpost which to men of sufficient determination, intelligence and independence of mind would point in the right direction. In earlier works he had already expressed the view that his own systematic and ‘clearly written’ works might under certain conditions replace the ‘living voice’ of the master.220 I think that in his old age he must have realized that the generation of those pupils who had known him personally would eventually die out, which means that the second order of study of his works was only a temporary matter. But he seems to have assumed that in the future individual persons would be born who would be

220 Compare the first sentence of the De compositione medicamentorum secundum locos VII, XII 894.1 ff. K.: ἀλήθης ... οἱ λεγόμενοι ὑπὸ τῶν πλείοστων τεχνῶν ἔστι λόγος, ὥστε ὑσόν οὐδ᾽ ὦμοιον εἴη παρὰ ζώσης φωνῆς μαθεῖν ἢ ἐκ συγγράμματος ἀναλέξασθαι. τούτους γε μὲν φιλοσόφους καὶ φύσει συνετοὺς οόυ᾽ ἡ τυχόντα πολλάκις ὁφέλεια γίνεται βιβλίως ἑντυπαγάνουσι σαφῶς γεγραμένους. 

The same thought is expressed at De alimentorum facultatibus, CMG V 4.2, p. 216.19–27 Helmreich: ... μιᾷ δοκοῦσι καλῶς οἱ πολλοὶ λέγειν ἄριστην εἶναι διδασκαλίαν τὴν παρὰ τῆς ζώσης φωνῆς γινομένην, ἐκ βιβλίου δὲ μήτε κυβερνήτην τινὰ δύνασθαι γενέσθαι μήτε ἄλλης τέχνης ἐργατῆν ὑπομνήματα γάρ ἐστὶ ταῦτα τῶν προμεμαθηκῶν καὶ προεγκόμων, οὐ διδασκαλία τελεία τῶν ἀγνοοῦντων. εἰ γε μὲν ἐθέλοιν τινας καὶ τούτως, ὡςαι διδασκάλων ἀποροῦσιν, ἑντυπαγάνει ἐπιμελῶς τοὺς σαφῶς τε καὶ κατὰ διέξοδον, ὥσποτα ἤμειν ποιούμεθα, γεγραμένοις, ὄνησινται μεγάλως, καὶ μάλιστα ἐὰν πολλάκις ἄναγγειόκειν αὐτά μὴ ὁκνῶσιν. What is important is that according to Galen the majority of the experts in various fields or indeed people in general agree as to the priority of the ‘living voice’. Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. V x.4, tells us that Pantaenus, the teacher of Clement and the founder of the catechetical school at Alexandria, taught Scripture both viva voce and by means of books: Πάντανος ἐπὶ πολλοῖς κατορθώμας τοῦ κατ᾽ Ἀλεξάνδρειαν τελευτῶν ἤγεται διδασκαλεῖν, ζώσῃ φωνῇ καὶ διὰ συγγραμμάτων τοὺς τῶν θείων δογμάτων θησαυρὸν ὑπομνηματιζόμενον. A scholion ascribed to Porphyry illustrates the distinction between learning from what someone says and doing so from what is written or from someone who has heard the original person, Quaestiones Homericae ad Iliadem pertinentes p. 434.28 ff., ὥστε καὶ ἐν τῇ συνθέσει εἰὼν ὑσότεις λέγειν παρὰ ζώσης φωνῆς ἀκηκόαναι καὶ μήτε διὰ γραπτῶν λόγων ἀκούσι μήτε τὰ παρ᾽ ἄλλον ἄλλου διηγομένου. A rider much similar to Galen’s is expressed by Gallus, Not. Att. XIV ii.1, libros utrisque linguae de officio iudicis conscriptae consquisivi, ut […] rem iudiciaria, quomiam vocis, ut dicitur, viva peius erat, ex mutis, quod aiunt, magistris cognoscerem. Compare also Dio Chrysostomus, Or. 55.3-5, who argues that to be a follower (ζηλωτῆς) is equivalent to being a pupil (μαθητῆς), and that one need not be dependent on personal acquaintance to be a follower. On the ‘living voice’ see Karpp (1964), who could not find the Galenic passages; on Papias ibid., 194 ff. Interesting passages at Quintilian, II iv.4-8, on the moral and didactic qualities required of the teacher (of rhetoric) and the utility of the viva vox, and II v, on the order of study of the rhetorical literaturae (II v 19-21: one should begin with the speeches in Livy and continue with Cicero, but the Gracchi and Cato are to be avoided).
capable of following the first order of study. In a way, the relation of these as yet unborn scientists to Galen was the same as that of Galen to long dead Hippocrates. He expected that the *On Proof* which in his youth he had written to educate himself would help the best physicians of the future to educate themselves as well. We know that this expectation did not come true.

There appears to be no trace of a reception of Galen's *medical* doctrines until around the middle of the fourth century CE, when the emperor Julian's personal physician Oribasius used him on a large scale for his vast collection of excerpts entitled 'Ἰατρικαὶ συναγωγαί. But the fact that we possess no information pertaining to the years in between does not of course entail that nothing happened. The very fact that Oribasius and later authors of medical text-books use Galen in this way shows that Galen's works and medical thought had meanwhile become a fixed item in the world of ancient medicine, like the works and thought attributed to Hippocrates. There is nothing about what Oribasius did which suggests in any way that he was responsible for a rediscovery, or renascence, of Galenic medicine. When several centuries later again (which is the date at which we can pick up the tradition) a number of his works came to be taught the *On Proof* was not among them. The *On the Best Sect* was not taught either; its place was taken by the *On Sects for Beginners*, the first work to be read according to Galen's own second order of study.221 So it would appear, quite understandably, that such continuity as existed was a matter of applied, or applicable, medicine rather than logic and scientific method.

4.2 Preliminary Issues in the De libris propriis

The second essay, the *On His Own Books*, is complementary to the first.222 Here Galen's primary concern is not with the order of study but with the authentication and systematic classification of those of his many works which had not perished in his own lifetime. In the prologue he again speaks of the unauthorized

---

221 See Baffioni (1958). Ioannes Alexandrinus, *In De sectis*, 2 rb 13, p. 18, states *ordo etiam requirit ut ante omnes velut introducendis debeat legi*. Photius read the *On Sects for Beginners* (cod. 164, brief abstract and evaluation) and affirms that it is obviously the first medical work one should read. See further *supra*, n. 96.
222 Good brief abstract at Regenbogen (1950) 1445 f.
circulation of his writings, adding remarks on the *spuria* that crept in among them. He complains that there are persons who 'use them for teaching purposes as if they themselves had written them', in one case even adding a proem of their own (πολλοὺς ἀναγγελόσκειν ὡς ἵδια τὰ ἐμά, *De libr. propr.* p. 92.12; cf. 98.5-6, καὶ τις ἥλεγχθη προοίμιόν τι τεθεικὼς αὐτοίς εἶτ' ἀναγγελόσκοιν ὡς ἵδια), which they were capable of doing because these books circulated χωρίς ἐπιγραφῆς (p. 92.14; we observe that 'title' here includes the name of the author). One of the lost monographs mentioned in the section listing the ethical treatises is entitled Περὶ τῶν ἀναγγελόσκοιν κατὰ τάθρα (ch. 11, p. 121.14). Because this is an ethical work, the title must mean *On those who Teach Surreptitiously*, and we may feel sure that Galen here too lambasted the thieves who appropriated his works.

What follows after the prologue of the *De libr. propr.* provides a noteworthy parallel to Porphyry's account of the order and ordering of the treatises of Plotinus. Galen first describes his treatises (though not all of them) in chronological order, listing in ch. 1 several composed during his first Roman period. At the beginning, however, he also speaks about his second Roman period, telling us that when he was given back his introductory works to correct the text and provide them with a title he wrote the *On Sects for Beginners*. This is the first book those who want to become doctors should study (ὅ πρῶτον ὁν εἴη πάντων ἀναγγελοστέον, p. 93.25). In ch. 2 he lists the early writings which were returned to him when he had gone back to Asia (viz. in 167 CE), tells us about his return to Italy (viz. in 169 CE) and adds that subsequently he wrote a great number of books (partly lost when the temple of Pax and a lot of other buildings burned down, viz. in 192 CE). Other treatises survived because copies existed, and others again were

---

223 Cf. *supra*, n. 208.
224 At *De libr. propr.* p. 91.3 ff. we read about someone who in a shop found and bought a book entitled 'Galen, physician' (ἐπεγέγρασε ... Γάληνδος ιστρός). An educated person, 'puzzled by the oddity of the title' (ὑπὸ τοῦ ξενοῦ τῆς ἐπιγραφῆς κινήθες), read the first two lines and immediately declared it to be spurious. For examples of ἐπιγραφάι including the name of the author see *supra*, n. 186, and Lucian, *Quom. hist. conscr.* 16, 30, 32.
225 Pointed out by Regenbogen (1950) 1446.
226 P. 93.23 διδάσκοντας (cf. p. 93.14 ἐπισταθείσας). In the prologue, p. 92.23-4, he speaks in general terms of treatises which were sent back to him with the request that he correct them (ἐπισταθείσας). For the parallels in Porphyry cf. *supra*, n. 183 and text thereto.
completed or newly written. Titles are mentioned throughout, and Galen tells us much about his own life and development: the happy influence of his father and teachers, what he did at Rome, why he left, why he came back, etc. He winds up this account with the remark that he has now told those who want to study (ἀναγνώσσομαι, p. 102.11) any work by him at what age he wrote it and to what purpose (κατὰ τίνα τὴν αἰτίαν,227 p. 102.12-3).

He adds (p. 102.14 ff.) that the distinction between those works which lack a final revision and those which have been fully finished will also have become clear, as will that between those ‘written to refute the imposters from those written for instruction’ (τὰ τε κατὰ τὸν πρῶτον τούς ἀλαζόνευομένους ἔλεγχον ἀπὸ τῶν διδασκαλίων). The latter classificatory bipartite diaeresis is of extreme interest, because it recalls the bipartite division of Plato’s works into those for instruction and those for inquiry (a category which includes the polemical and protreptic dialogues) described by Diogenes Laërtius, known to Alcinous and revised by Albinus.228 This is the second instance of a significant similarity between Albinus and the physician-cum-philosopher, and it is not an accident that both occur in the same context, viz. one dealing with the classification of books and the order of their study. Albinus’ introductory classes which Galen attended at Smyrna in his early youth were still remembered in his old age, or so it would appear. See De libr. ἐπικρ., p. 97.10-1, which significantly enough is the only passage in the whole of his extant œuvre where he mentions Albinus’ name. A third parallel which may be mentioned here, though there is again a significant difference, concerns scientific method. At Prol. ch. 6, p. 151 ff., Albinus states that the traditional four logical sub-disciplines which prove what is true and refute what is false are to be taught by means of the logical dialogues which in his curriculum for professionals come after the study of the dialogues imparting the tenets. At De animi cuiuslibet peccatorum dignitione et curatione ch. 3, CMGV 4.1.1, p. 47.10 ff., Galen substitutes four mathematical sub-disciplines which are indispensable as a preliminary training. These ‘refute the person

227 An explicit instance e.g. at p. 101.18-20: ἐπιγέρασαι δὲ ταῦτα (Περὶ) τῶν ἠγανακτηθέντων τῷ Λύκῳ κατὰ τὰς ἀνατιμὰς, διὰ τὴν τὴν αἰτίαν.
228 See Tieleman (1992) 34 ff., and cf. supra, chapter two, section 5; infra, chapter five, section 4 ad finem. For Albinus on logic in Prol., ch. 6, see supra, n. 138 and text thereto.
who falsely believes to have found what is sought and testify in favour of those who have truly found it’ (προγεγυμνάσθαι πρότερον ἐν ἠλαίᾳ πραγμάτων ἔλεγχούσισι μὲν τὸν ψευδὸς οἰόμενον εὐρηκέναι τὰ ζητούμενα, μαρτυρούσισι δὲ τοῖς ἄλθως εὑρηκόσιν).

The remaining part of the essay consists of chapters containing catalogues, either in the form of arid lists or of titles interspersed with comments, anecdotes, (auto)biographical data and advice. The titles are classified according to a systematic arrangement. Medicine comes first: ch. 3 lists the anatomical works (starting with the books written for beginners),229 ch. 4 the therapeutical treatises, ch. 5 the books dealing with prognosis, ch. 6 the commentaries on Hippocrates, ch. 7 the works against Erasistratus, ch. 8 two works about Asclepiades, ch. 9 works criticizing the Empiricists, ch. 10 two works criticizing the Methodists. Philosophy is next:230 ch. 11 lists the works ‘that are useful for proving things’231 (i.e. the logical treatises) and then other works dealing

229 There is a lacuna at ch. 3, p. 108.14-15; from p. 108.15 we have the extant portion of the chapter containing the titles of the diagnostic treatises. At De ord. p. 84.6 ff., too, the anatomical treatises come before the other medical (and the philosophical) works.

230 For Galen’s philosophical position see now Donini (1992), Hankinson (1992).

231 Including commentaries on Aristotle originally written by young Galen for private use, but in circulation nevertheless; only the commentary on Cat. was written later at the request of his friends (see p. 117.25 ff.; list at p. 122.21 ff.). These commentaries however are only recommended to those who had already studied the logical works under the direction of a master (p. 118.23-4, μόνοις τοῖς ἄνεγγυοις παρὰ διδασκάλῳ τὸ βιβλίον — Galen seems to be thinking of Aristotle’s Categories in the first place) or were already familiar with the commentaries of authorities on Aristotle such as Adrastus (see supra, n. 63) and Aspasius (the teacher of Herminus, to be dated to the first part of second century CE, see Moraux (1984) 226 ff.). On Galen’s logical treatises and commentaries see further Moraux (1984) 689 ff., and Hülser (1992) 3536 ff. Interesting reference to the Cat. commentary at Instituto logica ch. 13.11 Kalbfleisch, from which it is clear that Galen went beyond the text; he discussed, or rather invented, a category which he argues had been omitted by Aristotle, viz. ‘composition’. The importance he attached to the Aristotelian categories is clear from a number of passages where he uses and recommends the doctrine, e.g. De methodo medendi II 7.30, X, 148.3-4 K., τὸ γὰρ διαιρεῖν τὰς κατηγορίας ἀρχὴ τῆς λογικῆς ἐστί θεωρίας (cf. Hankinson (1991a) 222 f.), and the long discussion of diaeresis and the categories at De differentia pulsuum, VIII 620.5-624.19 K., esp. 624.4-8, ὡστε δὲ ἀκριβῶς τούτος ἔκειθα θυαλαται, γεγυμνάσθαι πρότερον αὐτὸν χρή πέρι τὰς κατηγορίες. τὸ γὰρ τοῦ Ἀρκετιλάου καλόν, ὡς οὐδεὶς πόκον εἰς γναφείον φέρει. τάξις γὰρ ἐστίν ὃστερ ἐρίον ἐργασίας, οὕτω καὶ μαθημάτων διδασκαλίας. See also ibid., 656.6 ff. K., where Galen quotes this tag against his incompetent colleagues (πόκον,
with related philosophical issues, ch. 12 the ethical treatises, ch. 13 those dealing with Plato’s philosophy, ch. 14 those dealing with Aristotle’s philosophy (with an interesting note on the alternative titles of the On Syllogisms or Analytics), ch. 15 those criticizing the Stoics, ch. 16 those dealing with Epicurus’ philosophy. We may note the parallel between the philological and medical sections: first general subjects, then individual physicians or philosophers, and schools. The last chapter (ch. 17) enumerates the works dealing with grammatical (i.e. literary) and rhetorical themes. A number of titles occur in more than one chapter.

Though in these two essays Galen does not apply a schema isagogicum and only incidentally avails himself of a technical vocabulary, one may conclude that the following introductory issues are relevant in relation to his own works: (a), general: the distinction between the sects, the systematic classification of the treatises, the work that has to be studied first (not the same for the two different classes of readers); (b), particular: the purpose, or theme, of each individual work,232 or the author’s motive for writing it (sometimes it is implied what it is useful for, as in the On Proof),233 the question of authenticity,234 the position of the treatise or mono-

232 Galen uses the terms ἐπαγγελία (pp. 80.5 and 7, 91.9-10, 92.11, 98.8) and υπόθεσις (pp. 89.8 and 17); cf. also infra, text to n. 265 and n. 267; at Compendium Tim., ch. 1.2., proposition translates πρόθεσις rather than σκοπός, pace Kraus and Walzer. At Galen, De ord., p. 80.3 and 7, σκοπός means ‘intention’ in regard to the public the writer has in mind, and in the first sentence of the On Sects for Beginners, Op. min. III, p. 1.1 f., the aim of medicine (τῆς ἰατρικῆς τέχνης σκοπός μὲν ἡ ὑγεία, τέλος δ’ ἡ κτίσις αὐτῆς); cf. however also infra, text to n. 246. For υπόθεσις in Porphyry see supra, text to n. 193, and for its use by Thrasyllus supra, text to n. 116.

233 The distinction between ‘indispensable’ and ‘useful’ (χρήσιμως) at p. 104.11 does not seem to be relevant to the issue of utility in general, because what is indispensable is useful a fortiori. In Galen’s science there was no room for logic that was not useful; see e.g. Hulser (1992) 3529 ff., Barnes (1993).

graph in the order of study and the reason for or explanation of its title. Also note that at De libr. propr. ch. 6, p. 112.25 ff., he says that he prefers a different title for the Hippocratic treatise traditionally called Airs Waters Places. He gives a careful account of divisions into parts; for his larger treatises the number of books is always stated, and at De libr. propr. ch. 6, p. 113.2 ff., he tells us that the first three books of his commentary In Hippocratis De diaeta acutorum are devoted to the authentic part (γνήσιον μέρος) of this work, and the other two to the addenda (προσκείμενα). Last but not least, we are informed to what part of philosophy or medicine a specific essay or treatise belongs.

4.3 The Hippocratic Commentaries

Further evidence is to be found in Galen’s commentaries on a number of Hippocratic works. In the present inquiry it is impossible to consider this large body of material in toto; a brief look at the proems will have to suffice. In the context of the present chapter I am not primarily concerned with the veracity of Galen’s affirmations, but only with their classification, that is to say with what they are and what they are about.

The sixth chapter of the De libr. propr. is entitled ‘On the Hippocratic Commentaries’ (Περὶ τῶν Ἰπποκρατείων ὕπομνημάτων). Galen divides his commentaries in the proper sense of the word (cf. De libr. propr. ch. 6, p. 1.124 f., ‘according to each phrase of his’, καθ’ ἐκάστην αὐτῶν [sc. Hippocrates'] λέξιν) into two groups. Though the original composition of these works may presumably be dated to the seventies and eighties of the second century CE, the details of the chronology are not entirely clear.236 According

---

235 On this commentary see infra, n. 250 and text thereto.
236 See Peterson (1977) 493 ff. Compressed information about the commentaries is to be found in the Loeb Hippocrates, Jones (1923), I, xi ff. A survey in purported chronological order is given by Ilberg (1889) 229 ff. Further information, with references to earlier scholarly literature, is to be found in the prefaces to two volumes of the CMG edition of the In Epid., viz. CMG V 10.1, vii f., xxx f., and CMG V 10.2, ii f. See also the overview of Garcia Ballester (1972) 62 ff. An over-confident absolute and relative chronology is given by Smith (1979) 123 f., who places the composition of the In Aphor. between that of the In De vuln. cap. and the In i Epid. (see next n.). I hasten to add that much is to be learned from Smith’s cautious and detailed study, "Galen’s Hippocratic Scholarship", op. cit., 123-76, although he discusses Galen and the Hippocratic commentary tradition in vitro, that is to say without placing him and it in the context of the larger body of interpretative
to *De libr. propr.*, ch. 6, the first group consists of works written for his own use and that of his friends and pupils, while the second was composed in view of 'common publication' (πρὸς κοινὴν ἔκδοσιν). During the first part of his first Roman period, he tells us, he was prevented from putting to use the existing Hippocratic commentary literature in a systematic way, because his library (including, no doubt, his personal memoranda) had remained behind in Pergamum.

The *first* group consist of nine commentaries, two of which are lost; those extant (the numbers I have added conform to the sequence at *De libr. propr.* ch. 6, p. 112.13 ff.) are (1) the In

efforts devoted to the writings of Plato, Aristotle & al. So he comes to hold Galen personally responsible for what in fact was common practice. As regards Galen's sources he is occasionally hypercritical, see *infra*, n. 266, and pp. 199 ff., complementary note 256. Excellent preliminary remarks on Galen's methods as a commentator are found in Roselli (1990) 120 ff. and *passim*. The author points out (121) that 'i commenti di Galeno sono il prodotto maturo di una ormai consolidata pratica scolastica di commento, e che, in particolare, tra i suoi precedenti vi sono i commenti empirici, che Galeno utilizza, e che sono più o meno contemporanei di Demetrio' [i.e. Demetrius Laco]. Much, one may be certain, will be learned from D. Manetti–A. Roselli, *Galeno come commentatore di Hippocratic*, to be published in *ANRW* II Bd. 37.2 (announced at Roselli (1990) 121 n. 9). See also Nutton (1993) 19 ff., "Galen and the Alexandrian art of commentary". A rapid overview of Galen on authenticity is at Grant (1993) 61 ff. Hunain ibn Ishaq (Bergsträsser (1925) 32) also attributes another commentary to Galen, viz. one on the *Iusiusrandum* (lost; cf. also Meyerhof (1926)); fragments have been collected by Rosenthal (1956), and references to it in the *Adab al-Tabib* of al-Ruhawi (transl. with introd. by Levey (1967)) have been indicated by Jouanna (1991a) 247 ff.). It is cited in the *Fihrist* too, ch. 7.3, Dodge (1970) p. 679, and if authentic (Rosenthal (1956) 82 ff. argues in favour of a *non liget*) must have been composed after the *De libr. propr.* which does not refer to it.


Cf. *supra*, n. 105. On the differences between the two groups see Smith (1979) 131 ff., 148 ff. Some of the early commentaries, e.g. the *In Aphor.*, were later revised; at *In Aphor.*, XVII.2, 647.15 ff. K., there is a noteworthy reference to the late essay *De ord.* (καταμαθήσει πρὸς αὐτὰς [sc. Galen's treatises] ὁ βουλόμενος ὕποκειται τῷ εἰσὶ καὶ ὑποκεῖται καὶ ἔννοια θεωρῶν διδάσκοντα ἑκάστη τῷ Περὶ τις τέχνης τῶν ἴμμετρων ὑπομνημάτων ἀνάγνωσις βιβλίων). As far as I know, this is the only reference in Galen to the *De ord.;* note that the form of the title is slightly different. We may at any rate be confident that (just as Proclus) he went on revising his commentaries in his old age; see Vogt (1910) 3.

Nrs. (6) and (7), viz. the *In De ulceribus* and the *In De vulneribus in capite*. According to Hunain ibn Ishaq (Bergsträsser (1925)) 34, who translated both works, each consisted of one book only.
Aphorismos; (2) the *In De fracturis*, (3) the *In De articulis*; (4) the *In Prognosticum*; (5) the *In De diaeta acutorum*, and (8) the *In librum i Epidemiarum*. The second group consists of nine commentaries, two of which survive in Arabic only while two others are lost. Those extant in Greek (the numbers are again added according to the sequence at *De libr. propr.*, ch. 6, p. 112.21 ff.) are (2) the *In librum iii Epidemiarum*; (3) the *In librum vi Epidemiarum*; (6) the *In Prorrheticum*; (7) the *In De natura hominis*, and (8) the *In De officina medici*.

In the long and substantial proem to the second book of *In iii Epidem.*. pp. 60.4-6.7, the commentaries written until then — i.e. up to the composition of the second book of *In iii Epidem.* — are listed in a different order (pp. 61.2-3.9). Galen tells us that he began

239 References will be to the pages of the following editions (for several commentaries we still have to be satisfied with Kühn): *In Hippocratis Aphorismos commentariori vii*, XVII.2, pp. 345-887 and XVIII.1, pp. 1-195 K.; *In Hippocratis librum De fracturis commentariorii iii*, XVIII.2, pp. 318-628 K.; *In Hippocratis librum De articulis et Galeni in eius commentarii iv*, XVIII.1, pp. 300-345, 423-767 K.; *In Hippocratis Prognosticum commentariorii iii*, CMG V 9.2, pp. 197-378; *In Hippocratis De victu acutorum commentaria iv*, CMG V 9.1, pp. 117-366; *In Hippocratis librum primum Epidemiarum commentariorii iii*, CMG V 10.1, pp. 6-151. Fichtner (1985) is a useful work of reference, though it fails to list the titles of the lost works mentioned in Galen's autobiographical essays or cited by him elsewhere of which no manuscripts or fragments are extant (or have been found).

240 The second on the list, the *In librum ii Epidemiarum*, is extant in the Arabic translation of Hunain ibn Ishaq; German transl. by Pfaff, in CMG V 10.1, 153-409. The ninth, the *In De aere aquis locis*, partly survives in Hebrew, ed. with English transl. and notes by Wasserstein (1982); the proem is lacking in this version. A more complete Arabic version (said to be the source of the Hebrew) has been discovered but not yet been published and/or translated (ed. by G. Strohmaier in preparation for the CMG, Suppl. Or.). See Ullmann (1977), Strohmaier (1981) 190, who says it is a "voluminous work", Jouanna (1991a) 241 ff. (who also refers to fragments of another Arabic translation to be found in the *Adab al-Tabib* of al-Ruhawi), and Strohmaier (1993). Nrs. (4) and (5), the *In De Humoribus* and the *In De alimento*, are lost (the *In De Humoribus* printed by Kühn is a Renaissance forgery incorporating genuine fragments). Hunain ibn Ishaq had translated both these lost commentaries, see Bergsträsser (1925) 35.

241 References will be to the pages of the following editions: *In Hippocratis librum iii Epidemiarum commentariorii iii*, CMG V 10,2.1, 1-187; *In Hippocratis librum vi Epidemiarum commentariorii iii*, CMG V 10,2.2, 3-351 (with German transl. by Pfaff of those portions extant only in Arabic); *In Hippocratis Prorrheticum i commentaria iii*, CMG V 9.2, pp. 3-178; *In Hippocratis De natura hominis librum commentariorii iii*, CMG V 9.1 pp. 3-88; and, available only in Kühn, *In Hippocratis librum De officina medici commentariorii iii*, XVIII.2, pp. 629-925 K. The extant part of the Arabic transl. of this commentary begins at p.758.4 K. (ed. with English transl. by Lyons (1973)).
writing commentaries at the request of his friends and first treated
the 'most genuine and most useful books of Hippocrates' (my italics; 60.16 f., ἀπὸ τῶν γνησιωτάτων καὶ χρησιμωτάτων Ἱπποκράτους βιβλίων). We should acknowledge the point of the formula 'most genuine'; according to Galen no Hippocratic treatise has escaped some measure of adulteration by rewriting and/or interpolation. The first group of six consists of the In De fracturis, the In De articulis, the In De ulceribus, the In De vulneribus in capite, the In Aphorismos and the In Prognosticum. The second group, written subsequently, also numbers six commentaries and is composed of the In De diaeta acutorum, the In De humoribus, the In De officina medici, the In librum i Epidemiarum, the In librum ii Epidemiarum and the In Prorrheticum. He tells us that the writing of the In Prorrheticum interrupted that of his series of commentaries on the individual books of the Epid. This explains why the second book of the In iii Epidem. has its informative, backward-looking proem. 242 He wrote the In Prorrh. because, as he says, the Prorrh. should be used with caution since it is not by Hippocrates; this, at least, is what he had come to think.

In the third chapter of the didactic De ord. (pp. 86.13-7.23), the beginning of which is unfortunately lost, Galen reconsiders his Hippocratic commentaries and tells us that he intends to write more of them. However, in case he does not live to complete this task, other commentaries may be recommended because they are close to his own views, whereas others again are not advisable for beginners. The names of the commentators mentioned by Galen (with the exception of Rufus of Ephesus, early first century CE) are those of his teachers and the teachers of these teachers, and of other followers of these teachers. 243 The fact that here he does not mention earlier commentators should not be pressed. Galen's commentaries were written for readers and students who were to be provided with reliable and up-to-date information, not for historians of medicine.

242 Cf. e.g. Diels (1915) x, Smith (1979) 135, 155 ff. We have already noted that some of the earlier commentaries were revised. The references to his predecessors in the later ones are far from thorough or systematic, see Wenkebach (1934) ix f. and (1936) vii f. (referring to Galen's explicit statement at In iii Epidem., p. 66.4 ff., that he will continue from now on in his earlier manner), as well as Smith (1979) 129 ff., 145 f., 148 f., 150 ff.
243 On this passage see Smith (1979) 64 ff.
I shall briefly list the relevant passages in the proems of the commentaries (and a few others) according to the order of enumeration of the two sets at De libr. propr. ch. 6, p. 112.13 ff.

4.4 Prolegomena in the First Group of Commentaries

The In Aphorismos has no proem. It may have been lost; book three, at any rate, XVII.2 561.1-562.11 K., has a short programmatic προοίμιον Γαληνοῦ, perhaps added later by the author but more likely not (the words προοίμιον Γαληνοῦ are of course an editorial insertion), in which the author states that he will make clear what is unclear in the text, and add proofs of what has been correctly stated because this is what commentators habitually do.244 We shall see in the next paragraph (and in the next chapter) that he changed his mind to a degree, for in the subsequent commentaries he is more concerned with the explanation of the author than with proving that the doctrines are right. Proofs apparently are more a matter of systematic works, especially such works as deal with a medical theme secundum Hippocratem.245

The important προοίμιον of the In De fracturis (XVIII.2, 318.1-22.2 K.) deals with exegesis in general at greater length and in more specific detail. It may have been added subsequently when the commentary was revised in order to be released to the general public. This proem includes a quite important short description of the general rules laid down in his On Exegesis (Περὶ ἐξηγήσεως, lost) and applied in the commentaries; I shall return to this passage at greater length in chapter five. We may already note, however, that Galen this time says that his own σκοπός (i.e. his intentio auctoris as author of the commentary) is to explain the text rather than to test each tenet as to its truth or to defend it against sophist criticisms, though the justification of the so to speak self-

244 561.4 ff., μάλιστα μὲν οὖν ὅσον ἐν αὐτοῖς ἁσαφές ἦστι σαφηνίζοντες, ἔργον γὰρ τούτο ἕνδον ἐξηγήσεως, οὐ μὴν ἄλλα καὶ τὴν ἀπόδειξιν ἐκάστου τῶν ὀρθῶς εἰρημένων προστιθέντες, ἐπειδὴ καὶ τοῦτο ἔστω ἔδος ἐν τοῖς ὑπομνήμασιν γίνεσθαι. Cf. infra, n. 246.

245 Cf. De placitis Hippocratis et Platonis [hereafter abbreviated PHP] VIII 2.13: ‘My work On the Elements According to Hippocrates is an exegesis of the work On the Nature of Man. It does not interpret every word, however, as writers of exegeses commonly do; rather, it comments only on those statements which give consistency to the doctrines, along with the pertinent proofs’ (transl. De Lacy, slightly modified). See also below, chapter five, sections 1-3. On the Aphorisms commentary see further Smith (1979) 129 ff.
evident correctness of the doctrines of the great Hippocrates remains an important side-issue (319.3 ff.).

It is interesting to find him using the formula ‘stating this, and no more, on these matters as an introduction for those who are to study the book’ (τοσοῦτον προειπόντα περὶ αὐτῶν ἔτι τοῖς ἀναγνωσομένοις τὸ βιβλίον, 321.1 ff.; my italics), which recalls the titles of Thrasyllus’ and Proclus’ introductory works. In his extensive comments on the first lemma (322.7 ff.), a sort of second preface, Galen among other things deals with the relation of the De fract. to the De artic. Some people say that originally these treatises were books one and two of a larger treatise with a different title, others that they had always been separate works. Galen does not take sides explicitly; for this we have to wait till the next commentary. He also speaks, most interestingly, of Hippocrates’ various styles, which may be related to the audience the great man had in mind; we may note his formula ‘the aims of the instruction being not the same in all the books’ (327.1 f., τοὺς σκοποὺς τῆς διδασκαλίας οὖ τοὺς αὐτοὺς ὄντας ἄπασι τοῖς βιβλίοις). We have met this issue, formulated in practically the same terms, among the general preliminary questions relating to the study of Aristotle and others.

The Γαλένον προοίμιον of the In De articulis (XVIII.1, 300.1-4.12 K.) too is concerned with several issues of the later schemata isagogica. Referring back to his In De fracturis, Galen makes a point about the τάξις: in the preceding commentary, it had already been affirmed that the De artic. is the sequel of the De fract. (300.1 f., τὸ βιβλίον ἔπεται τῷ Περὶ ἀγμάν). By positing that the Oeconomica is the last book of Xenophon’s Memorabilia he refutes those who, adducing the particle δὲ at beginning of this book as a parallel for δὲ at the beginning of the De artic., argue that the De artic. is a wholly independent treatise. More specifically, he is again

246 For Galen’s use of σκοπός see also supra, n. 232; for the intentio auctoris at issue here see further below. On this passage and several others in Galen see also Barnes (1992) 271. Roselli (1990) 121 n. 9, commenting briefly on this passage, excellently points out that “Galeno dichiara che la difesa dell’autore commentato non è costitutivamente parte di un commento; ma la sua osservazione è dovuta proprio al fatto che normalmente i commentatori vengono piegati a questo scopo, e Galeno del resto non si sostrae a questa pratica”.

247 Cf. supra, text after n. 2, n. 34, text after n. 77. For the intentio auctoris see also In ii Epid., p. 329.34 f.; cf. also infra, text to n. 260.
concerned with the issue of the *division* of the treatise (*De fract. + De artic.*) into two books by Hippocrates himself. He disagrees with those who posit that a single treatise with a different title was later subdivided by someone else. This also involves the later issue of the reason for or explanation of the title, and Galen in fact indicates why the separate titles for the two books are appropriate. He deals with the question of authenticity as well, stating that it is by Hippocrates because of its style, as had also been pointed out in the previous commentary with regard to the *De fract.*

The *In Prognosticum* lacks a proem (it may have been lost); in his comments on what he calls ‘Hippocrates’ proem’ Galen speaks of the author’s wish to prove the utility of prognosis, and tells us that he divides his account of this matter into three *kephalaia*; all three are analyzed.

The *In De diaeta acutorum* has no proem either, but its fourth book possesses a rather important one (*CMG* V 9.1, pp. 271.3-2.3). Here it is argued that the final section (called ‘Appendix’ by modern editors) has to a large extent been written by others, as a number of physicians had already suspected. Others, however, have reasonably maintained that it is by Hippocrates, because the meaning of what is written agrees with that author’s intention

248 301.17-302.3, διό καὶ τινὰς ἔφην σοῖς ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ λέγειν Ἰπποκράτους εἰς δύο βιβλία τετμημαθαὶ τὴν ἔλην προγνωστείαν, ἀλλ’ ὑπ’ ἐκείνου μὲν ἐν γράφεσιν θαυμάζει βιβλίον ἐπιγραφέν ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ Κατ’ ηπτρεύον, ὕστερον δὲ ὑπ’ ἄλλου τινὸς εἰς δύο τιμηθήναι διὰ τὸ μέγεθος. Jouanna (1977) 393 ff. has proved that sometimes the contents of papyrus scrolls were transcribed in the wrong order on new and larger scrolls. He detects one instance which is earlier than Galen because Galen already used the defective ‘edition’ of *Morb.* II which has been transmitted by the medieval manuscripts. One consequently might suggest that different views concerning the sequence of books of a particular treatise, or its division into parts, may occasionally have been a consequence of such material differences between the texts that were used. Possibly the defective edition of *Morb.* II used by Galen was that of Artemidorus Capito and/or Dioscurides (see *infra*, n. 258); the error may have occurred when the transcriptions for their edition(s) of the *opera omnia* were made.


250 Cf. also supra, text to n. 235. The ‘genuine part’ of the treatise, the so-called Περὶ πτισάνης (‘On Barley-Gruel’), is mentioned several times in the body of the commentary. The προσκείμενα (or παρεγκείμενα, p. 271.21 f.) may be compared to those of the De nat. hom. according to Galen’s analysis, for which see below. There is a reference to this commentary with a note on the various proposals for the title at *PHP* IX 6.5, ... ἐν τοῖς ὑπομνήμασιν ἐξήγησα τοῦ περὶ διαίτης ὄξεων, ὁ τίνες μὲν ἐπιγράφουσι Πρὸς τὰς Κνιδίας γνώμας, ἐνιοὶ δὲ Περὶ πτισάνης, ἐκάτεροι μοχθηρῶς. See also Potter (1988) 259 ff.
(271.7-8, κατὰ ... τὴν ἐκείνον προσέρεσιν), so Galenus believes it may be the work of a pupil. Unless I am very much mistaken, the use of the word προσέρεσις for the intention of the author (scribenitis voluntas or intentio auctoris)²⁵¹ is highly significant. There is an exact Hellenistic parallel, viz. in the proem of Attalus to his editio correctior of and commentary on Aratus.²⁵² Accordingly, the others who argued in favour of the authenticity of the ‘Appendix’ may be one or several of the Hellenistic commentators on Hippocrates to be mentioned presently.

Another argument for authenticity is that further treatment of these topics had anyway been promised by the author in the (preceding part of the) De vict. acut. But several lemmata in the ‘Appendix’ are unworthy of Hippocrates; they have been added later, just as happened in Aphorisms in the later part of the work. The same thing happened in the De vulneribus in capite (a reference, no doubt, to the analysis of this work to Galen’s own lost commentary), and in Epidemics book three. Those who insert extra material according to Galen usually do so at the end of a book. The issue of authenticity again.

The beginning of the quite long proem to the In librum i Epidemiarum is lost in Greek but preserved in Hunain ibn Ishaq’s meticulous Arabic version (available in Pfaff’s German translation). Galen explains the title, CMG V 10.1, p. 3.8 ff.: ‘Galen sagte: Hippokrates nannte dieses Buch deshalb “Epidemien”, weil seine Ausführungen und Erörterungen in ihm von Krankheiten handeln, welche Epidemien heißen. Und die Bedeutung davon ist “die ankommenden”’. We note in passing that this explanation is not accepted today. A very interesting passage is devoted to the order of study of Hippocrates’ works: whoever wants to profit professionally from the Epid. should first study the De natura hominis, the De aëris aquis locis, part of the Aphorismi, and the Prognosticum, in this order.²⁵³ The doctrinal justification for this

²⁵¹ See above, chapter one, section 1 and passim.
²⁵² Quoted infra, n. 295.
²⁵³ CMG V 10.1, p. 6.26 ff., ὡστὶς οὖν βούλεται μεγάλος εἰς τὴν τέχνην ἐκ τῆς ἀναγνώσεως τῶν Ἕπιδημιῶν ὀφεληθῆναι, προαναγώναι τούτω βέλτιόν ἔστι τὸ Περὶ φύσεως ἀνθρώπου καὶ τὸ Περὶ υδάτων καὶ ἀέρων καὶ τόπων, ἐπὶ τῶν Ἀφορισμῶν ἑκείνους, ἐν οἷς περὶ τῶν ὄρων διέρχεται καὶ τὰς δυνάμεις διδασκεῖ τῶν ψυχῶν καὶ θερμῶν καὶ ἕρας καὶ ὑγρῶν κατα­στάσεων. (καὶ) ἀναγκαίον δ’ ἔστι πρὸς τοὺς εἰρημένοις αὐτοῦ τὸ Προγνωστικὸν ἄνεγγυκέναι.
sequence is expounded at length in what follows. At the end of this section we note a sentence which pertains to the distinction between proem and commentary proper. 'It is better to establish these points before the subsequent exegesis of the individual (lemmata). Hereafter I shall then turn to this exegesis, stating beforehand only this' etc.254

4.5 The Second Group of Commentaries

We may now turn to the commentaries of the second group. The In librum ii Epidemiarum lacks a formal proem, but in the comments on the first lemma Galen provides a short overview of the contents of Epid. books one and two. There is also a brief note pertaining to the issue of authenticity, CMG V 10,1, p. 155.31 ff.: "Wir finden nämlich den Verfasser dieses Buches, sei es nun Hippocrates selbst oder sein Sohn Thessalos, eifrig auf Kürze bedacht. Meines Erachtens ist es für unseren Zweck gleichgültig, ob man sagt, dieses Buch sei von Hippocrates oder Thessalos". The sixth book has a short proem, p. 354.3-13, in which Galen points out that he will have to distinguish between what is by Hippocrates on the one hand and what cannot be by him on the other. There is a difference with his earlier commentaries in that the references to the predecessors are a bit more copious.255

The In librum iii Epidemiarum does not have a proem (or no longer has one). The important proem to its second book has been cited in the previous section of the present chapter. The very brief proem to its third book adverts to the contents (theme) of the part of the treatise that is explained in it.

The In librum vi Epidemiarum has a quite substantial proem. Galen complains that a number of exegetes have done damage to the text. He claims, CMG V 10,2,2, p. 3.8 ff., that he has checked the commentaries of the first exegetes (τὰ ... ὑπομνήματα τῶν πρώτων ἐξηγησιμένων τὸ βιβλίον), among whom Zeuxis (second century BCE), Heraclides of Tarentum (first half of the first century BCE) and Heraclides of Erythrae (second half of the first century BCE), and the even earlier Bacchius of Tanagra (third century BCE)

254 P. 10.21 ff., ταύτα μὲν όν ἀμεινόν ἐστι διωρίσθαι (πρὸ) τῆς μελλούσης ἐξεσθαί τῶν κατὰ μέρος ἐξηγησιών, μετὰ ταύτα δὲ εἰς ἐκείνην ἤδη τρέψομαι, τοσοῦτον ἐτι προεποίην κτλ. For this distinction between ante opus and in ipso opere see supra, text after n. 76, text to n. 204.

and Glaucias of Tarentum (second century BCE). On occasion these names had also been mentioned by Galen in earlier commentaries, or inserted in these works at a later stage. He argues that these men often changed the text without reason and without producing something useful (CMG V 10.2.2, p. 4.3, χρήσιμον) that agreed with Hippocrates’ views. So he prefers to stick to what he calls the ‘ancient reading’ (παλαί γραφή), admitting only palaeographically plausible conjectures (as an example he cites a brilliantly simple one by Heraclides of a word in Epid. ii). The edition(s) of the emperor Hadrian’s contemporaries Artemidorus Capito and Dioscurides (the current standard edition(s) he apparently had to work with), he contends, are full of idiosyncratic changes. Textual problems will be discussed, he says, and those who believe that this makes for too long a work may now stop. He coyly adds that he originally composed this commentary for his own friends and pupils, but felt constrained to add ‘these particular preliminary remarks because it had percolated to the general public’ (p. 5.2 f., θεωρῶν δ’ εἰς πολλοὺς ἐκπίπτοντα τὰ γραφόμενα προοιμίων τοιούτων ἐδεήθην). Another preliminary remark concerns the style of the treatise, which is very much different from that of Epid. books I and III, which as almost all experts agree are the only ones to have been written by Hippocrates for publication. Again the general introductory issue of the mode of presentation.

256 See Smith (1979) 162 ff. See further below, pp. 199 ff., complementary note 256.
257 On this emendation see Smith (1979) 211 f., Roselli (1990) 129.
258 Dioscurides the grammarian and glossographer is not to be confused with his namesake, the author of the extant De materia medica, a contemporary of the emperors Claudius and Nero. On these edition(s) see Ilberg (1890) and the rather speculative account of Smith (1979) 235 ff. Smith’s suggestion that Dioscurides established a canon of genuine works (cit., 238) is attractive but improvable. His further suggestion that the edition(s) contained hypotheses (ibid., 239) is entirely plausible, but we know nothing about them, and the idea that such hypotheses would have been Galen’s main or even only source for questions concerned with authenticity, division etc. is unattractive. On the other hand, it is not improbable (or so I believe) that this edition began with a bios (for the Hippocrates vitae cf. infra, n. 329).
259 P. 5.3 ff., ὠπερ οὖν τούτο προείπον, οὕτω καὶ τόδε προειπεῖν ἀναγκαῖον ἔστιν, ὡς τὸ τῆς ἐρμηνείας εἴδος ἐν τῶδε τῷ βιβλίῳ πάμπολυ διαλλάττει τούτῳ κατὰ τῷ πρῶτῳ καὶ τρίτῳ τῶν Ἔπιδημίων, ἢ σχεδὸν ἄπαντες ἢγονται γεγραφθαί πρὸς ἔκδοσιν ὑφ’ Ἰπποκράτους μόνα. For ἔκδοσις cf. supra, n. 105, n. 183, text to n. 237.
260 See supra, n. 34 and text thereto.
Of the remaining five books of the treatise, books five and seven are 'clearly inauthentic' (p. 5.8, ἐναργῆς ... νόθα). It is said by some people that books six and two have been edited from Hippocrates' Nachlaβ by his son Thessalus. Some people believe that Thessalus made additions, others that others did so. This of course is the question of the γνήσιον which often is at the forefront of Galen's concerns, as it was at those of his predecessors. Galen continues with the issue of the explanation of the title (p. 5.15 ff.). Epidemics is correct for books one and three. He explains why this is so (cf. above, quotation of CMGV 10,1, p. 3.8 ff.): 'he gave this title to the books because the elucidation of the epidemic diseases is to be found in them' (δι' τοῦτο καὶ τὸ ἐπίγραμμα τοῖς βιβλίοις τούτο ἐποιήσατο, τῶν ἐπιθημίων νοσημάτων διδασκαλίας (ἐν) αὐτοῖς γινομένης κτλ.). But from the point of view of the mode of presentation books two and six are much different from books one and three, since they consist mostly of pithy aphorisms. So people say that for lack of a better title also these two books were entitled Epidemics, even though this is quite inapposite.261

Galen winds up this proem by stating that this will be enough for now; though other exegetes (viz., in their proems) have included a number of other preliminary points, he will continue with the real job, that is to say from now on explain the text. This off-hand remark is valuable because it shows that such preliminary issues were a regular feature of the earlier commentaries as well.

The beginning of the proem to the In Prorrheticum is lost; we pick it up during a discussion of the explanation of the title, which Galen however prefers to leave to others (CMGV 9,2, p. 3.20 f., ὅπως ἄν ἔχῃ τὰ τῆς ἐπιγραφῆς τοῦ βιβλίου καταλιπόντες ἐτέρως ἐπιζητεῖν) who are not interested in medicine itself.

The long proem to the In De natura hominis has been preserved entire. Galen first recounts that the doctrinal contents of this Hippocratic treatise had already been discussed by him a long time ago in his De elementis secundum Hippocratem, written for one of his friends. In this earlier treatise he had refrained from treating matters which the dedicatee already knew, and he had

261 P. 5.20 f., ὡστε δι’ ἀπορίαν οἰκείας ἐπιγραφῆς καὶ ταύτα τὰ δύο βιβλία συγχρήσασθαι φασὶ τῇ τῶν Ἐπιθημίων, ὁλίγιστον ἔχοντα τὸ τῆς ἐπιγραφῆς οἰκείον.
postponed writing a full commentary. This is what he is doing now at his pupils' request, and he will start with what was left out in the earlier work.262

A long and learned discussion of the notions φύσις, στοιχεῖον and όμοιομερές follows, which helps to explain the title of the treatise. Galen continues with the question of the γνήσιον (p. 7.15 ff.). He does not agree with those who believe the work to be inauthentic (ὁσοὶ νομίζουσι τὸ Περὶ φύσεως ἀνθρώπου βιβλίον οὐκ εἶναι τῶν γνήσιων Ἰπποκράτους, ἀλλ’, ὡς αὐτοὶ καλέιν εἰώθασιν, νόθον), arguing that they have been deceived by the way its various parts have been assembled. These matters will be discussed in detail in the commentary itself (e.g. in the excursus at the end of its first book, pp. 53.15-6.6). For present purposes a long verbatim quotation (pp. 7.21-8.18) from Galen's (lost) monograph On the Genuine and Inauthentic Books of Hippocrates must suffice. To the best of my knowledge there are no other references to this monograph, which makes the present quotation all the more interesting.263 In this other work Galen had divided the De nat. hom. into two main parts, the second of which is again subdivided into nine small parts. The number of lines of the first part is given (τὸ μὲν κατὰ τὸ Α γράμμα μέρος τὸ πρῶτον εἰς γ' και μ' στίχους ἐξήκα), as is that of the tiny last part (διὰ στίχων ὡς δέκα), and the contents of all the parts are briefly described. The whole work numbers about six hundred lines. This of course is the division into parts, or sections, of the later schemata isagogica again.

The issue of authenticity can now be formulated more precisely. The first main part and the first sub-part of the second main part are genuine, but the second sub-part is wrong and cannot be by

262 CMG V 9.1, p. 3.17 ff., ἀρχόμενος τῆς ἐξηγήσεως ἑκείνα λέξιω πρῶτον, ὡσα παρέλπων εἰκεῖν ἐν ἀρχῇ τοῦ Περὶ τῶν καθ’ Ἰπποκράτην στοιχεῖων. For the difference between the commentary and the systematic treatise see also supra, n. 245.

263 Smith (1979) 169 f. n. 85 acknowledges that this reference is unique, but then goes on to speculate that the book is not by Galen but a Pinax which accompanied the edition(s) of Dioscurides and Capitio. Ibid., 125 n. 49, however, he is not troubled by the unique reference to the On Exegesis in the In De fract., and rightly so. For another unique reference (this time to an extant work) see supra, n. 237, and for one to another lost one (the On Exegesis) supra, text to n. 246. But Smith is already refuted by the fact that Hunain ibn Ishaq (Bergsträsser (1925)) 36 lists 'Sein Buch über die echten und die unechten Bücher des Hippokrates' as nr. 104 of Galen's writings (cf. also Meyerhof (1926) 699). This translation is moreover cited in the Fihrist, ch. 7.3, Dodge (1970) p. 685.
Hippocrates. Of the other sub-parts some are later insertions, as will become clear in the commentary itself, whereas others again are commensurate with Hippocrates’ doctrine — ‘compare what has been said about the De salubri diaeta’.

Galen continues by stating that the first main part, which deals with the elemental ingredients of the human body, ‘contains what we might call the foundation of Hippocrates’ art’ (p. 8.19 f., τὸ δὲ πρῶτον αὐτοῦ μέρος ἁπάσης τῆς Ἰπποκράτους τέχνης ἔχει τὴν ὀλον κρηπίδα). Most experts hold it to be genuine, though some ascribe it to his pupil and successor Polybus who (just as Thessalus) did not modify the doctrines. Plato certainly knew it to be by Hippocrates, because the (famous) reference at Phaedr. 270b ff. (proof-text quoted in part by Galen here, at greater length earlier in the proem) in his view can only pertain to the De nat. hom. Further arguments in favour of the authenticity of at least the first main part follow.

The second book of this commentary has a short proem (p. 57.4-21), in which Galen tells us that he shall now comment on the ‘unfortunate accretions’ (τὰ προσκειμένα κακῶς). He again argues that the first main part of the De nat. hom. is by Hippocrates and adds that another treatise exists, the De salubri diaeta, which is assumed to have been written by Hippocrates’ pupil Polybus. Someone else combined these two small treatises, and either he or another person added the accretions. Galen dates this fraud to the period of rivalry between the kings of Pergamum and those of Egypt and believes that material gain was the motive.264

The proem to the In De salubri diaeta — a short commentary which immediately follows upon the In De natura hominis (in the CMG edition it is printed as the third book of the latter) — is brief (CMG V 9.1, p. 89.3-14). Galen refers to the De nat. hom. as ‘the preceding book’ (τοῦ προκειμένου βιβλίου), and argues that De sal. diaet. has a ‘theme of its own’ (ἰδίαν ἐπαγγελίαν),265 just as the first main part of its predecessor. The first part of the first treatise (the De nat. hom.) gives in full what was announced without needing

---

264 On this (supposed) motive see Speyer (1971) 112, 133 f. Galen’s remark (cf. Müller (1969) 121, Fraser (1972) I, 525) proves that this explanation was not invented by the late commentators.

265 For ἐπαγγελία cf. supra, n. 232. For the part of the ms. tradition which combines these treatises under the title of the first see Jouanna (1991b) 24.
any further additions, just as the second treatise (the *De sal. diaet.*) really teaches what it set out to present (ἄ προοθετο; cf. the later *intentio auctoris*). If what is in between the first part of the first treatise and the beginning of the second is excised, the remaining whole may receive an appropriate title of its own, which in fact was given to it by some people (προσηκούσης ἐπιγραφής ιδίας ἔτυχε τὸ σύμπαν, ἢν ἐπέγραψαν τινες αὐτῷ, *Perī φύσεως ἀνθρώπου καὶ διαίτης*). The (first main part of the) *De nat. hom.* is beyond reproach, but the addenda are not; in the same way, most of the *De sal. diaet.* is beyond reproach, though there are a few bad sections. Galen again accepts the common attribution of the *De sal. diaet.* to Polybus.

The remark about Polybus as the purported author of the first main part of the *De nat. hom.* according to some authorities is most interesting, because we have independent evidence of the ascription of the section on the elemental ingredients to Polybus, viz. by the early Peripatetic author who is the source of the first section of the so-called Anonymus Londinensis (col. xix.1-18). There is also a note on this issue in Galen’s *PHP VIII* 2.7, ‘Hippocrates wrote a book *On the Nature of Man*, to which was added the little book *On Regimen*; and between them was inserted an anatomy of the veins which, in my opinion, an interpolator added to the *On the Nature of Man and On Regimen*’ (transl. De Lacy). This anatomy of the veins is not attributed to Polybus by Galen, at least not explicitly, but it is so attributed by no less an authority than Aristotle (*De hist. an.*, Γ 3.512b12). In the present case, we can still see to what extent the various views cited by Galen may be ultimately traced back to quite early sources. These he did not know at second hand only, for he cites and describes the Peripatetic history of medicine used by Anonymus Londinensis at some length in the very commentary on the *De natura hominis*, CMG 9.1, pp. 15.13-6.3. Galen here speaks of the works of Theophrastus and the author of this Peripatic treatise, whom he calls Meno. The ἱατρικὴ συναγωγή written by this person according to Galen is a compilation made directly from the medical works accessible to him (ἀναξιτήτας ἐπιμελῶς τὰ διασφζόμενα κατ’ αὐτὸν ἐτι τῶν παλαιῶν ἱατρῶν βιβλία, τὰς δόξας αὐτῶν ἐκεῖθεν ἀνελέξατο).266 Accordingly,
what Galen tells us about the composition and authorship of the *De nat. hom.* and the *De sal. diaet.* presumably represents a blend of both first-hand information and of information found in commentaries which themselves are ultimately indebted, at least to some extent, to early Peripatetic sources. Galen knew Aristotle rather well, so one cannot exclude he knew about his ascription. It is also clear that he refuses to accept the ascription by, or going back to, the so-called Meno of the chapters containing the elemental theory to Polybus. He sticks to what he believes to be Plato’s testimony. But he is prepared to give to Polybus what in his view cannot be by Hippocrates.

The proem to the *In De officina medici* begins with a discussion of the title (XVIII.2, 629.1 ff. K.). Galen believes that Περὶ τῶν κατ’ ἱπτρείων would have been more appropriate than the bald Κατ’ ἱπτρεῖον. In fact, treatises by Diocles (of Carystus, the famous physician to be dated to the fourth century BCE), Phylotimus (third century BCE) and Mantias (second century BCE) which deal with the same theme (τὴν αὐτὴν ὑπόθεσιν) have been given this more complete title, though some copies show the shorter form (Κατ’ ἱπτρεῖον ἀπλῶς ἐπιγεγραμμένον). Galen points out that this preliminary point has to be settled before the detailed exegesis can begin (630.8 ff., ταῦτα μὲν οὖν αὐτὸ τὸ βιβλίον

the late Hippocrates legend. This in spite of the fact that, as he admits, *ibid.* 221, Aristotle ascribed most of *De nat. hom.* ch. 11 (the anatomy of the veins) to a Polybus (and not, *pace* Smith, a “Polybus or Polybius”. The latter form, which is found several times elsewhere, is an obvious corruption, viz. a vulgarization, cf. von Staden (1976) 496). For Galen’s handling of *De nat. hom.* ch. 11 see also Lloyd (1991) 404. The compiler of the medical doxography edited by Diels (1893) ascribes doctrines found in *De nat. hom.* chs. 3 and 4 to Polybus. (For this work, the first part of which — including the paragraph on Polybus — derives from an Early Peripatetic historical account of medicine, see now Manetti (1986) and (1989). The method of this Peripatetic author is described by Smith (1989) 93 ff.). On Polybus see further Grensemann (1968b) 6 ff., and (1974) 428 ff. I believe that Polybus entered the legend, perhaps becoming Hippocrates’ son-in-law in the process, because his contribution to the corpus hippocratum was attested by early authorities. The problem of the contributions of Polybus, Thessalus & al. deserves further study (Grensemann’s ascriptions of Hippocratic treatises to Polybus have not found general favour).

267 For ὑπόθεσις cf. *supra*, n. 232. On Phylotimus, a pupil of Praxagoras (second half of the fourth century BCE) and a contemporary of Herophilus (first half of the third century BCE), see Diller (1941); on the Herophilean Mantias see von Staden (1989) 515 ff. These three authors are also mentioned at *In De off.* p. 666.8-10.
A discussion concerned with the constitutio follows; Galen claims that he has profited from consulting the early commentators who used very old manuscripts, and again sharply criticizes the wild conjectures of Dioscurides and Artemidorus Capito. But this time he refrains from reporting and discussing the variae lectiones in detail.

He continues by pointing out that the treatise entitled De off. med. contains at its beginning ‘a proem common to the whole of medicine’ (632.4, κοινὸν ἀπάσης τέχνης προοίμιον). ‘Therefore some people plausibly believed that it should be studied before all the other treatises’ (τινες εἰκότως ἡξίωσαν αὐτὸ πρῶτον ἀπάντων ἀναγινώσκεσθαι), because its purpose is similar to that of the writings entitled Introductio (ταίς ... ἐπιγραφομέναις εἰσαγωγαῖς). A concern with the proper order of study of Hippocrates’ works is thus attested for Galen’s predecessors. Directly after this ‘common proem’, Galen concludes, the treatise contains those things which are ‘most useful for beginning medical students’ (τὰ χρησιμώτατα τοῖς ἀρχομένοις μαθαίνειν τὴν ἱατρικὴν τέχνην). The explicit reference to the Isagogai literature is as interesting as it is opposite. We may moreover remind ourselves that Galen too had written works destined for ‘those who are to be introduced’ to the more important medical sects and disciplines. The fact that Galen does not reject the De off. med. as an absolute starting-point for those who want to study medicine may perhaps be combined with his remark, quoted above, on the sequence of four works to be studied before the Epidemics. The De off. med. presumably has to be studied before one embarks on the De nat. hom. There is no mention of a preliminary study or memorization of the Oath, as in late Alexandrian times.

At 665.1-6 Galen discusses the brevity, that is to say the intentional obscurity, of a lemma (αἱ τοιαῦτα βραχυλογία προδήλως ὢρ’ ἐκόντων γίγνονται, ἀσαφῶς ἐρμηνεύσαι τι βουληθέντων. ὅπου γὰρ ἐνίστε μὲν ὄνοματος ἐνός ἢ ῥήματος ἢ δυοῖν ἢ τὸ πλεῖστον τριῶν προσθέσει τὸν λόγον ἐργᾶσασθαι ἐστι σαφῆ, πῶς οὐκ ἂν τις ἀσάφειαν ἐπιτηδεύεσθαι φαίνει τοὺς οὕτω συγκειμένους λόγους;), and in what follows provides a long exegesis. He points out that some experts prefer a different title, viz. Κατ’ ἱητρείν, ‘On Medicine’ (665.16-17); at 666.11-12, he tells us that Asclepiades did so. He rejects this proposal, because the author of the treatise,
'Hippocrates or his son Thessalus', had a much more limited objective, just as, later, Diocles and Phylotimus and Mantias did. In the proem to the *In de aere aquis locis* Galen discusses at length the various forms of the title of this treatise that had been used, proposed and defended, and argues in favour of a title of his own devising.268

The overall picture which emerges from Galen's prologues to his Hippocratic commentaries fully agrees with what we were able to infer from a study of the *De ord.* and the *De libr. propr.* An impressive amount of detailed information concerned with both general and particular isagogeic issues is added to our dossier. A most important addition is Galen's concern with the general question of the modes of presentation in the various works. I shall say more about these matters in the next chapter.

---

268 See the transl. of Ullmann (1977) 362 ff. For further details we will have to wait until Strohmaier's translation is available.
CHAPTER FIVE

GALEN ON EXEGESIS, AND ON TEACHERS AND PUPILS

5.1 A Principle of Exegesis

It is worth our while to take a closer look at what Galen tells us about the exegetical principles expounded in his On Exegesis, and at what he says elsewhere on this subject. We may begin by pointing out that in the excerpt from this lost work, at In De fracturis XVIII.2, 318.1 ff. K., he does not allude to the Homerum ex Homero rule, which he knew but did not consistently apply. This is somewhat surprising. That he was familiar with this principle is clear from the De dignoscendis pulsibus, VIII, 958.6 ff. K.:

indeed, my exegetic law is this, to make clear each of the(se) men from himself and not to indulge in foolishness through empty assumptions and unproved assertions ad lib. 270

Compare also the less clear formula of justification to be found in the systematic account of a medical topic according to

269 For the excerpt from the On Exegesis in the In De fract. see also supra, text before n. 246. This work (not listed by Fichner (1985); the On Clarity and Unclearness, for which see below, is not listed by him either) was probably written between the composition of the (first version of the) In De Aphor. and the (final revision of the) In De fract. For the Homerum ex Homero rule see infra, pp. 204 ff., complementary note 316. On Galen’s exegetical principles and methods see the excellent remarks of von Müller (1991) 88 ff.; see further Deichgräber (1965) 23 ff., also for references to the texts, Moraux (1986b) 132, 135, and Barnes (1992) 269 ff. For philological aspects of the In Aphor. see López Férez (1991b) 179 ff. A useful survey of exegetical doctrines and methods in the commentary literature on Plato is at Dörrie–Baltes (1999) 162 ff.

270 καὶ γὰρ μοι καὶ νόμος οὗτος ἔξηγήσεως, ἐκαστὸν τῶν ἄνδρῶν ἓξ ἕκαστου σαφὴν ἰδεαθαι καὶ μὴ κεναίας ὑπονοιῶσαι καὶ φάσεσιν ἀναποδείκτης ἀποληπτεῖν ὡ τι τις βουλεῖται. Moraux (1977) 6 has not noticed that this sentence (only difference: καναίας for κεναίας) is quoted in a group of scholia on Galen discovered by him, and ascribes it to the scholiast who in his view “ein bekanntes Prinzip der Homerexegese auf die Erklärung medizinischer Schriften [sc. by Galen] überträgt”. True enough, but he got this principle from Galen himself.
Hippocrates, *De comate secundum Hippocratem, CMG V 9,1, pp. 183.23-4.2.*

It is necessary to explain the wording from Hippocrates himself, so that we are not only in a position to affirm that what has been said is plausible, but also that it agrees with his thought. For I believe that the good exegete should not limit himself to considering whether what has been said is plausible or true, but rather whether it relates to the author’s judgement.

5.2 *The Clarification of what is Unclear. Parallels in Erotian*

The first rule which is formulated in the *On Exegesis* is of particular interest because it concerns the clarification of what is unclear, of which we have already spoken in the previous chapter. At *De difficultate respirationis*, VII 825, 6-7 K., where he first tells us that his treatise is an exegesis of what Hippocrates has said about difficulties in breathing (όου μὲν ὁ λόγος ἔξηγησις ἔστι τῶν ὦφ’ Ἰπποκράτους περὶ δυσπνοίας εἰρημένων), Galen claims that this principle is traditional: ‘exegesis, as one of the ancients has said, is ‘the explanation [more literally: the ‘rendering more simple’, or ‘rendering unambiguous’] of the unclear expression of thoughts in words’ (ἔστι μὲν οὖν ἡ ἔξηγησις, ὡς ποὺ τις τῶν παλαιῶν εἴπεν, ἀσαφοῦς ἔρμηνείας ἔξαπλωσις’). I have not been able to trace the origin of this adage, but something very much like it seems to be presupposed in the proem of Erotian (a contemporary of the emperor Nero), which however is about the explanation of difficult words rather than formulas or statements. At p. 29.10 ff., the lexicographer states that he wants to ‘interpret the unclear expressions’ (ἀσαφεῖς ... ἔξηγήσασθαι λέξεις) in the Hippocratic writings, which once ‘explained’ (or rather: ‘rendered simple’, ἔξαπλωσθαι) make it possible to understand what the author means. Compare also *ibid.*, p. 33.14, ‘to explain what is unclearly said’ (τὸ ἁσαφῶς λεγόμενον ἔξαπλωσαι), and p. 34.13 ff., where he argues that it is useless to explain (ἔξαπλοῦν) the words everybody knows. For then you either have to interpret

---

(έξηγήσασθαι) all of them, which is impossible, or some, which is feasible. Again, we have to explain (έξαπλώσομεν) the latter either through words that familiar or through those that are not. The latter is counter-productive, while the former is useless; these substitutes, 'being equally clear, will not contribute to the clarification of the wording, as Epicurus [fr. 258 Usener; on Epicurus’ views see the next section] says' (τῷ ἐπὶ ἵπτε ἵνα θανεραί πρὸς τὸ δηλωτικὸν τῆς ἐρμηνείας οὐκ ἔσονται, ὡς φησιν Ἐπίκουρος). The terms εξάπλωσις, ἀνάπλωσις, and έξαπλοῦν (the latter used interchangeably with έξηγήσασθαι and ἐμφανῆ ποιήσαι, see pp. 32.7.11 and 33.2-3) are favourites with Erotian. Here we must note that already in the first century BCE Apollonius of Citium concludes his illustrated In De articulis with a remark about Hippocrates’ ‘unclarity of expression’ (τὸ τῆς Ἰπποκράτους λέξεως ἀσαφές) which needs ‘sorting out’ (διαστολή, CMG XI,1,1, p. 112.10 ff.).

Galen also wrote a monograph entitled On Clarity and Unclearness (Περὶ σαφηνείας καὶ ἀσαφείας, lost), which is listed among the philological works at De libr. propr. p. 124.16. This citation is the only one in the corpus galenicum. This work too—if it is indeed another one and not the On Exegesis referred to by a different title—must have dealt with interpretation.

5.3 Two Types of Unclearness, and Two Senses of Interpretation

According to what Galen says in his summary account of exegesis at In De fracturis, XVIII.2, 318.1-22.2 K., there are two forms (or rather causes) of unclearness, viz. an objective and a subjective one. A word, expression, formula or lemma may (1) either be unclear in itself or (2) unclear to the unprepared or stupid reader or student:

The unclear is twofold. ... What is genuinely unclear is so in and by itself. The other sort however is not originally obscure, because there are after all numerous differences among those who read the argument as to their having either received a preliminary education and training in relation to arguments, or being entirely

---

272 Cf. supra, n. 237, for Galen’s own reference to the De ord.
untrained.\textsuperscript{273} And as regards their natural disposition, some are sharp and intelligent, others dumb and stupid.\textsuperscript{274}

The second form of unclereness pertains to an all too familiar ingredient of the teacher-pupil relation. Yet it does not represent a particularly interesting difficulty, as the first of course does. In his own works Galen circumvents this difficulty by expressing himself as clearly as possible by using ‘common words’, see e.g. \textit{De alimentorum facultatibus}, CMG V 4.2, p. 271.3–7, ἀμεινὸν ... μακρῷ τὸ σαφῶς ἐρμηνεύειν ἐστὶ τοῦ μετά περιεργίας ... ἀσφαλῇ τὴν διδασκαλίαν ἐργάζεσθαι: σαφηνείας δὲ μάλιστα τυχεῖν ἐστὶ τὰ συνηθέστατα τοῖς πολλοῖς όνόματα λέγοντα μετὰ τοῦ φυλάττειν αὐτῶν τὰ σημαινόμενα. But he tells us that there are in Hippocrates’ works numerous formulas and passages which are unclear in themselves. The reason as a rule is not that Hippocrates is deliberately obscure,\textsuperscript{275} but on the one hand that the topic(s) is/are difficult and technical, and on the other that the works published by the master himself are written for the cognoscenti (so many

\textsuperscript{273} Cf. \textit{supra}, n. 8, text to n. 120; \textit{infra}, text to n. 298, n. 304 and text thereto. See also David, \textit{In Isag.} p. 105.9-28, who points out that unclereness is a matter either of style or of doctrines (ἡ ἀπὸ τῆς λέξεως ἡ ἀπὸ τῶν θεωρημάτων). Heraclitus is known for his unclear doctrines. Unclearness due to style is twofold; an author (e.g. Galen) may be too long-winded, or he may express himself in a peculiar way (e.g. Aristogenes). The primary examples of unclearness are Plato and Aristotle. Aristotle’s doctrines are easy but his style and terminology are difficult; Plato’s style is easy but his doctrines are difficult (τὶ διὰ ἀπὸ πολλῶν τούτῳ δεικνύει ἐπιχειροῦμεν ἥμων εὐποροῦντων τούτῳ αὐτῷ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀρχηγῶν καὶ προστάτων τῆς φιλοσοφίας δεξία, Πλάτωνος τε καὶ Ἀριστοτέλους; τούτων γὰρ ὁ μὲν εἰς τὴν ἁσάφειαν διὰ τῶν φράσεως ποιεῖν ἐκπειδήσεν, ὁ δὲ ἔτερος διὰ τῶν θεωρημάτων: τὰ μὲν γὰρ Ἀριστοτελικὰ θεωρήματα εὐχερή εἰσιν, ἢ δὲ φράσεις δύσκολος, ἁμέλει εἰ νοήσεις τὶ ἐστὶν ἐντελέχεια καὶ ποιοῦν καὶ δύναμις, ἡδὲ καὶ εὐχερῆ φαίνεται σοι τά λεγόμενα: ὅστε ὅν ἡ φράσεις ἐστὶ δύσχερης, τὰ δὲ Πλατωνικὰ θεωρήματα πάνυ τι δύσκολά εἰσι καὶ δυσχερή καὶ ἀπλός εἰσεῖν πάση δόξῃ σχεδὸν ἐπόμενα [...], ἢ δὲ φράσεσ εὐχερῆς καὶ ὑμαλή καὶ ἀπλῶς εἰσεῖν Πλατωνικῆ). Cf. also \textit{infra}, p. 276, text to n. 286.

\textsuperscript{274} \textit{In De fract.} 319.7 ff., τὸ ἁσφαλὲς αὐτῷ διττὸν ἐστιν. ... τὸ μὲν ὅντως ἁσφαλὲς αὐτῷ δι’ ἑαυτῷ τοιοῦτον ὑπάρχον, τὸ δὲ ἐν αὐτῷ πρότερον τὴν γένεσιν οὐκ ἔχον, ἐπειδὴ τῶν ἐκονότων τοῦ λόγου διαφορᾶς πάμικλας τυγχάνοντι οὖσα κατὰ τὸ προσατελεθείαι καὶ γεγομάτθαι περὶ λόγους ἡ παντάπασι γε ἀγνοούστους ὑπάρχειν, εἶναι τι φύσει τοὺς μὲν ὀξεῖς τε καὶ συνετοὺς, τοὺς δὲ ὁμολόγητος καὶ ἀπονύτους.

\textsuperscript{275} That Hippocrates ἐκπειδήσευσαν ... ἁσφαλῆς φανῆναι is already rejected by Erotian, p. 3.20 (quoted from the ed. by Nachmanson (1918)). One of the explanations of the covered head of the statues of Hippocrates provided in the \textit{bios} of ps.Soranus, CMG IV p. 177.16, is the ‘unclearness (to be found) in his writings’, see Kudlien (1989) 362.
things are left unsaid), and that those published from his Nachlaß are even more cryptic personal notes, which moreover have undergone the process of 'editing'.

Such in themselves unclear passages can only be explained, i.e. made clear, by a medical expert like Galen himself who really knows the subject, for only such a cognoscente is in a position to understand what Hippocrates really meant.\(^\text{276}\) As an example Galen quotes an ‘intrinsically obscure phrase’ (320.3 f., τὸν ἀσάφειαν ἐξει αὐτῇ δι᾽ ἐκβάλειν Ἑλέζις) which can only be explained (as he then does) by someone who has a solid knowledge of the discipline that is needed for understanding it, viz. anatomy.\(^\text{277}\) This entails that, notwithstanding his at first sight impeccable principles, Galen’s interpretation of Hippocrates is often a creative one which, as is only to be expected, modernizes the doctrines of the archetegate of scientific medicine and in fact turns him into a sort of proto-Galen, whose unclear utterances only need proper handling.\(^\text{278}\) There is thus a gliding scale on which ἔξηγησις and

\(^{276}\) Barnes’ remark, (1992) 272, “an item is obscure ‘in itself’ if it is obscure to every reader” (his italics), is slightly obscure. Cf. already Galen’s explanation of the two causes of obscurity in the Timaeus, at Compendium Tim. ch. 1.11-27: nos autem eas notiones quas Timaeus in hoc libro expressit non eadem ratione in artum coegimus quas in ceteris (Platonis) libris usum sumus, quorum notiones in artum coegimus. in illis enim libris sermo eius [sc. Platonis] abundans et diffusus (fuit), in hoc autem libro brevissimus est, tam a constricto et obscuro sermone Aristotelis quam a diffuso illo quem Plato in reliquis suis libris (adhibuit) remotus. [...] quodsi animum huic reri adieceris, manifestum tibi erit hoc non obscuritate sermonis in se per se fieri, sicut accidit lectori qui parum intellegit quando ipsi sermo genus aliquid indistinctum (et) obscurum inest. sermo vero in se obscuros ille est quem is modo intellegere potest qui in hac disciplinas se exercitaverit [Kraus and Walzer wrongly postulate a lacuna between est and quem]. Et ex exordio sermonis quem Timaeus seruit tibi constabit hanc (rem) ita haberit ut descripsi. Dixit enim: ‘Quid est quod in aeternum est neque generationem habet, et quid est quod continue gignitur neque unquam est?’ Nam haec sententia illi qui in ceteris Platonis libris se exercitaverit manifesta et aperta erit. This moreover is an example of Platonem ex Platone. See also supra, n. 273, for the parallel in David, who exaggerates Plato’s doctrinal obscurity, and infra, text to n. 286, for Cicero.

\(^{277}\) And ideally anatomy should be learned in practice (esp. by dissecting apes) before it can be learned from books; see e.g. De anatomicis administrationibus, II 384.15 ff., 385 8 ff. K., and e.g. Kollesch (1973) 14 with n. 3.

\(^{278}\) Deichgräber (1965) 24 and n. 1 rightly points out (again with references to the texts) that Galen is very much concerned with the utility of the doctrines to be found in Hippocrates’ writings (for Heraclides’ similar view see Smith (1979) 238 n. 86). For Galen’s view of Hippocrates see also infra, n. 312, and see further Temkin (1973) 32 ff., 58, Smith (1979) 125 ff., Manuli (1984). So in fact Galen did not really apply the Homerum ex Homero rule consistently. It will become clear that I cannot accept Manuli’s view that the commentaries are not intended for the medical world. On Galen’s creative
εξηγεῖσθαι move from the ‘interpretation of a text’ to the ‘explanation of a medical, or philosophical, or scientific, issue’, and conversely. In fact, Galen uses the word εξήγησις in his systematic works in the sense of the ‘explanation’ or ‘elucidation’ of anatomical data, e.g. De venarum arteriarumque dissectione, II, 807.16 f. K., ‘the explanation of all the veins above the diaphragm being now complete’ (συμπεπληρωμένης ἡδη τῆς εξηγήσεως ἀπασῶν τῶν ἄνω τοῦ διαφράγματος φλεβῶν), and De usu partium II 1, I, p. 64.14-15 Helmreich, ‘I began my explanation with the hand’ (ηρξάμεν τε τῆς εξηγήσεως ἀπὸ χειρός), etc. A very nice example of this sense is found ibid., I 8, I, p. 11.24-6, where Aristotle is said to be ‘very good at the exegesis of Nature’s art’ (Ἀριστοτέλης δεινόστατος ὁ... τέχνην φύσεως εξηγήσεσθαι); contrast De metodo medendi I 2.9, X, 15.8-9 K., where Aristotle is called an ‘exegete of Hippocrates’ arguments about nature’ (εξηγητὴν ὄντα τῶν περὶ φύσεως λογισμῶν ἱπποκράτους Ἀριστοτέλη).279 Instances are also found in the PHP, e.g. V 5.27, where he says that Aristotle ‘explains’ (εξηγεῖται) that the characters of humans are a consequence of differences in mixture, VI 6.8, where he speaks of ‘Erasistratus, explaining the phenomenon’, VI 6.27, on the explanation of nutrition, and VI 7.7, where Erasistratus is said to give a wrong explanation of the origin of the movement of the arteries. ‘Hippocrates on anatomy’ may in this way become equivalent to ‘anatomy’ tout court.

Parallels exist. For instance, in the fragmentary excerpt, entitled Περὶ εξηγήσεως, from the proem of one of the ancient commentaries on Aratus’ Φαινόμενα,280 the word εξήγησις is first used for Aratus’ ‘explanation’ of the celestial phenomena themselves (p. 32.1) and then for the numerous ‘idiosyncratic interpretations’ of the epic by graphic artists, astronomers, grammarians and geometers (p. 33.12-3, εξηγήσεως ιδίας). The latter meaning also occurs in a fragment found by Moraux, which speaks of the ‘position of the cosmic stellar sphere in accordance with the interpretation’ of the epic of Aratus: ἦ δὲ κατὰ τὴν εξήγησιν τῶν τοῦ

reinterpretation of Hippocrates see also Lloyd (1991).

279 Kudlien (1989) 356 has misunderstood this passage. What Galen believes is not that Aristotle Hippocrates’ “Grundanschauungen weitergeführt hat”, but that one may interpret Aristotle in such a way that it becomes clear that he is following Hippocrates.

280 Cf. supra, n. 88 and text thereto. The version to be cited next has been found and published by Moraux (1981); I quote p. 48.2.
'Αράτος Φαίνομένων θέσις ἔστιν αὕτη, κτλ. The title Περὶ ἑξηγήσεως of the fragment of the poem is ambiguous, but seems to pertain to the explanation of the stellar sphere itself in the first place, not to that of the poem.

In the collection of excerpts from Achilles' treatise On the Universe (or On the Sphere, itself a compilation from earlier literature; the compiler is dated to the third century CE) which at a later date were made to serve as an Isagoge to Aratus' poem, two chapters were added from which it is clear that the instructor (ἠξηγοῦμενος) is required to explain the orrery, or stellar sphere, used in the class-room and the poem itself at the same time (Isag. ch. 35, p. 72.13 and 15, and ch. 36, p. 72.26).281

The 'sophists' mentioned by Galen who attacked Hippocrates are those physicians, from Herophilus to Asclepiades and beyond, who in their lectures, treatises or commentaries dared to criticize Hippocrates or failed to agree with him. These men, he believes, often did not understand what Hippocrates really means. Galen most of the time refuses to allot much space to such objections and deviations, because his first objective is the explanation of Hippocrates himself, i.e. of medicine itself, though in his later commentaries he is occasionally a bit more generous in this respect.282

---

281 On the excerpts from Achilles see Pasquali (1910) 219 ff. On the "Himmelsglobus" as "ständiges Requisit des astronomischen Unterrichts" see Weinhold (1912) 41 ff., 59 ff.; ibid., 49, 58 ff., he discusses the chapters that were inserted among the abstracts from Achilles for the specific didactic purpose of explaining Aratus' poem. See also the anonymous late excerpts at Comm. rel. pp. 98.8, 102.3-4.18-9, 108.5-6 Maass, and cf. Schlachter (1927) 20 ff. For the verb ἑξηγεῖμαι both meanings are of course listed in our dictionaries.

282 A TLG search for ἀσάφεια in Galen reveals a broader spectrum. He applies it to physicians with whom he disagrees in a disparaging sense, and it is rather significant that in the In Prorh. it is used throughout to criticize the author of this bad book which, as we have seen, according to Galen is not by Hippocrates. See e.g. CMG V 9.2, pp. 100.9-10 and 110.9-11, where he accuses the author of a deliberate (mis)use of unclarity. Chrysippus too is criticized in this way, see PHP III 4.7, 4.8, 4.10. The context, or rather the intention of the author, determines whether ἀσάφεια is used in bonam or in malam partem. Hippocrates' unclear statements are riddles which can be solved; those of others are just unclear, and remain so. In other authors too ἀσάφεια is often used in a critical sense. As Quintilian VII v.5 says, scriptum aut apertum est aut obscurum aut ambiguum; he adds, ibid. 6.1, that obscurity in scholis ... etiam de industria fingitur.
5.4 Creative Exegesis

Galen’s creative interpretative method, his *clarification of what is unclear*, is by no means an isolated phenomenon. Instances of this enterprise are already to be found in Plato, who has Protagoras say that Homer, Hesiod, Simonides, Orpheus and Musaeus deliberately disguised (προκαλύπτεσθαι) their real meaning because they were afraid of giving offence (Prot. 316d). In a later dialogue (*Theaet.* 180cd) we are told that the ancient poets spoke in a hidden way (ἐπικρυπτομένων), while later experts stated the same things quite openly (ἀναφανδόν ἀποδεικνυμένων). The well-known implication of course is that the intended *sensus plenior* can be got out of what these people actually say by means of *(creative, in this case allegorical)* interpretation. Aristotle too argues that what the poets say is unclear, but is less sure that we can get at their real and unambiguous meaning *(e.g. Met. A 3.984a3)*. Matters according to him are however different as regards the early philosophers. These men may express themselves in an unclear way *(e.g. Met. A 4.985a13 ff., ἀμυδρῶς ... καὶ οὐθέν σαφῶς, 6.988a35 ff., σαφῶς μὲν οὐθεὶς ἀποδέδωκε, 10.993a23, σαφῶς δὲ οὐκ εἴρηκεν)*. This, no doubt, is because the subject is difficult. But Aristotle is quite confident that what they really mean *(e.g. Met. A 4.985a4, διάνοιαν) can be deduced from what, in their inarticulate way, they say.*

283 See also *De cael.* Γ 3.303a9-10, where he argues that Leucippus and Democritus in a sense make things out to be numbers or composed of numbers: καὶ γὰρ εἰ μὴ σαφῶς δηλούσιν, ὁμως τοῦτο βούλονται λέγειν. The motivating idea behind this form of interpretation is that the truth is eternal, or that ideas at any rate are a scarce commodity, though they may be expressed in different ways and according to different standards of precision and explicitness; or, more pertinently, that on occasion one’s own doctrines can be validated because they have been anticipated in embryonic form by venerable authorities.

If we look around for examples closer in time to Galen we find that these are quite plentiful. This is not at all astonishing,

---

283 For these passages in Aristotle and Plato see Mansfeld (1986a) 19 ff., 29 ff. Similarly, at *Rhet.* A 13.1374b10 ff., Aristotle says that ‘we should thinks less about the laws than about the legislator, and less about the expression (λόγον) than about what the legislator meant (διάνοιαν)’; cf. also *Rhet.* A 15.1374b27 ff. On such Aristotelian passages and their antecedents in the Attic orators see Schäublin (1977) 224 ff.
because the method in question allows one to update the archegete of the school to which one’s allegiance belongs, or to appropriate the philosophical (or, in Galen’s case, medical) spiritual ancestor one has deliberately chosen. Philodemus argues that it is worth one’s while to study the writings of those who purposely formulate their ideas in an unclear way (Ad [cont. col. xvi.6-7, τὰ τῶν ἐπιτετησιευκότων ἁπάφειον), and that we need to educate ourselves in order to understand and interpret such authors.\textsuperscript{284} As a matter of fact, this method of interpretation may be applied to Epicurus’ own writings and help his followers in overcoming objections raised by Epicurus’ critics, or be used in discussions among members of the school themselves.\textsuperscript{285} Cicero, De fin. II 15, says that obscuritas is acceptable in two cases, viz. when someone expresses himself intentionally in an obscure way, ‘as Heraclitus, who has been dubbed “the Obscure”’ (de industria ... ut Heraclitus, cognomento qui σκοτεινὸς περιβετο — cf. Nat. deor. I 74, nec consulto dicis occulte tamquam Heraclitus), or when the subject, not the language, is obscure, ‘as it is in Plato’s Timaeus’ (qualis est in Timaeo Platonis), that is to say in this dialogue only, not in the others, as Galen also held.\textsuperscript{286} But what is seen as Epicurus’ clumsy obscurity cannot be excused on either ground. Cicero accordingly knows about the interpretative technique of the younger Epicureans (cf. also Nat.

\textsuperscript{284} See the seminal account of Erler (1991) 83 ff.
\textsuperscript{285} See Sedley (1989) 97 ff., who does not deal with the Epicureans only but also with the Stoics’ interpretations of the teachings of Zeno, Erler (1992) 179 ff., and Erler (1993) 281 ff. Compare also Philod. Ad [cont.], col. iv.5 ff., quoted below, p. 193, complementary note 3. It was already part of the method practised by Demetrius of Laconia (ed. with important introd. and comm. by Puglia (1988)); see also Puglia (1982), Sedley (1989) 106 f., and Roselli (1990). Note however that according to D.L. X 14 Epicurus wrote a very clear style and advocated σαφήνεια in his Rhetoric (fr. 54 Usener); see Acosta Méndez (1983).
\textsuperscript{286} De fin. II 15 is cited by Angeli (1988) 319; see further Erler (1991) 87 f. For the parallel in Galen’s Compendium Tim. see supra, n. 276, for that in David (who likewise mentions Heraclitus) supra, n. 273. In the fragments of his Timaeus commentary Galen three times uses ἁπάφεια in a rather indulgent sense (CMG Suppl. I, pp. 17,14, 18.3 and 19.17). Interesting reference at PHP VI 8.35, where Galen says that elsewhere (i.e. either in his lost On Colors or in the Timaeus commentary), in his exegesis of Plato’s theory of colours, he has proved that that it is correct (εἰρηταί δὲ καὶ ὑπὸ Πλάτωνος μὲν ἐν Τιμαίῳ περὶ τῆς τάνδε τῶν χρωμάτων γενέσεως, ἀτὰρ δὲν καὶ ἡμεῖς αὐθίς ἐξηγησαίμεθα τε καὶ ἄπεδείξαμεν ὡς ὑπάρχει τάντα τε γεγραφότες ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ἰδία καθ’ ἐτερον λόγον). On obscurity see also supra, n. 14 and text thereto, n. 94, n. 36, n. 202, n. 276, text to n. 291, n. 310.
deor. I 85, on the interpretation of Rat. sent. i) and contests its validity whenever it was used to prove that Epicurus was right after all. Furthermore, we may recall Philo of Alexandria’s immense effort to find Greek (especially Platonic) philosophy in what he believes to be the books written by Moses, and in the Old Testament in general.²⁸⁷ At PHP IV 2.44, Galen speaks of Chrysippus’ ‘interpretation of the definitions’ of his predecessors (τής τῶν ὄρων ἔξηγήσεως). This Stoic procedure is often attested; compare for instance Sextus, Adv. math. IX 133-5, according to whom Diogenes of Babylon reformulated a premiss in a syllogism by Zeno in order to make it less vulnerable to criticism. The Suda, I, p. 356.13-15 (not in SVF or FDS), has a brief lemma on Aristocles of Lampsacus, a Stoic philosopher, who wrote an Exegesis in four books of a work by Chrysippus (ἔγραψεν ‘Εξήγησιν τῶν Χροισίππου Περὶ τοῦ πῶς ἔκαστα λέγομεν καὶ διανοούμεθα, βιβλία δ’).²⁸⁷a

At PHP III 5.21, Galen describes Chrysippus’ method of quoting and explaining the poets as follows: ‘Chrysippus begins with the testimonies of the poets, interlarding these with a few sentences of his own, often as an exegesis of the meaning of the quotation, often as a sort of summary’ (ὁ Χρύσιππος ἀπάρχεται παρατίθει· ἄρα τὰς τῶν ποιητῶν μαρτυρίας μεταξὺ παρεντιθείς αὐτῶν ὀλίγους λόγους ἐκατον, πολλάκις μὲν ὡςπερ ἔξηγησιν ὡν ἡ ρήσις βούλεται, πολλάκις δ’ ὡςπερ ἐπιτομήν τινα κτλ.). As a matter of fact, Galen found a support for his Platonism and one of his justifications for his creative interpretation of Hippocrates in his conviction that Plato had derived his ‘most important doctrines’ from Hippocrates, see e.g. De usu partium I 6, I, p. 11.21-3, ζηλωτῆς ὡν Ἰπποκράτους ὁ Πλάτων, εἴπερ τις καὶ ἄλλος, καὶ τὰ μέγιστα τῶν δογμάτων παρ’ ἐκείνου λαβών. Compare also PHP VIII 4.18, where he posits that Plato deliberately followed a statement of Hippocrates in the De nat. hom. (αὕτη μὲν ἡ τοῦ Ἰπποκράτους ἰδιός ἡ μοι δοκεῖ βουλόμενος ἀκολουθεῖν ὁ Πλάτων κτλ.).

Galen’s younger contemporary Clement of Alexandria testifies to creative interpretation as a general practice in the philosophical schools, Strom. V ix.58.1-4.²⁸⁸ Notwithstanding the rather exagge-

²⁸⁷ See e.g. the fundamental study of Runia (1986), and Mansfeld (1988).
²⁸⁷a See further Follet (1989), whose suggestion I accept.
²⁸⁸ Quoted and correctly interpreted by I. Hadot (1990) 74, 121, who adduces the forged exchange of letters between Alexander and Aristotle; cf. also Barnes (1992) 269. See further below, pp. 202 ff., complementary note
rated Pythagoreanizing way in which it is formulated, this
passage is interesting in that it alludes to an order of study
practised by the teachers of Epicurean and Stoic philosophy:

It is not only the Pythagoreans and Plato who put a number
of things in a cryptic way (ἐπεκρύπτοντο), but the Epicureans too say
does certain things are esoteric (ἀπόρρητα) also with him [sc.
Epicurus], and that they do not allow everyone to see these
writings. But also the Stoics say that the first Zeno [sc. Zeno of
Citium] wrote certain things which they do not easily allow their
disciples to study (ἀνογινώσκειν), unless these have already passed
a test which proves (μὴ οὐχὶ πείραν δεδωκόσι πρῶτερον) that they
practise philosophy in a genuine way. The followers of Aristotle
too say that some of his writings are esoteric (ἐσωτερικά).

In the next century Plotinus, in one of his earlier treatises,
affirms that his (to us quite original) statements are not new but
were made long ago, though ‘not explicitly’ (μὴ ἄναπεπταμένως,
Enn. V 1[10].8.10 ff.). The things said now are interpretations of
these earlier ones (τοὺς ... λόγους ἐξηγητὰς ἐκείνον γεγονέναι), for
which one may appeal to Plato’s own writings in support of the
antiquity of the doctrines.288a Longinus, in the preface to his On the
End quoted at Porphyry, V. Plot. 20.68-76, confirms this judgement
by stating that what Plotinus did in his works was to provide ‘a
clearer exegesis of the Pythagorean and Platonic principles than
his predecessors’ (δὲ ... τὰς Πυθαγορείους ἀρχὰς καὶ Πλατανικὰς
... πρὸς σαφεστέραν τῶν πρὸ αὐτοῦ καταστησάμενος ἐξήγησιν
οὐδὲ γὰρ οὕδεν ἐγγὺς τι τὰ Νομομνίου καὶ Κρόνιου καὶ
Μοδερίκτου καὶ Θρασύκλου τοῖς Πλατίνου περὶ τῶν αὐτῶν
συγγράμμασιν εἰς ἀκρίβειαν κτλ.). Eusebius, P. E. XI, proem. 4,
who is about to compare Plato’s philosophy with that of the
Hebrews, finds it quite normal to adduce not only Plato but his
followers as well, viz. ‘for the sake of clarity’ (εἰ δὲ ποιοῦντο,
σαφηνεῖας ἕνεκα τῆς τοῦ ἀνδρὸς διανοιας, καὶ τοῖς τὴν κατ’ αὐτὸν
ἐξηλακόσι φιλοσοφίαις μάρτυσι χρήσομαι κτλ.). Galen, De
differentia pulsuum IV 3, VIII 723-4 Κ. (= Herophilus T150 von
Staden), points out that Herophilus as a rule expressed his views in

288 Much of Strom. V deals with hidden meanings and correct interpretation;
et Clement professes to interpret Scripture from itself, see Strom. VII
xvi 96.1, quoted infra, p. 204, complementary note 316.
288a See e.g. Szlezák (1979) 28 ff., and Gelzer (1982) 111 ff., who points out
that Plotinus echoes Plato, Tim. 28b4-5. For Plotinus on the interpretation of
Plato’s ‘unclear’ predecessors see Mansfeld (1992a) 300 ff.
an unclear way, and that 'his followers interpreted these to make them clear in the treatises they wrote on Herophilus' sect' (όλλα ὡς ἔθος Ἡροφίλῳ δι' ἐρμηνείας σαφοῦς, ἣν ἐπὶ τὸ σαφὲς οἱ ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ μεταλαμβάνοντες ἔγραψαν ἐν αἷς ἐποιήσαντο πραγματείας περὶ τῆς Ἡροφίλου αἱρέσεως). He finds it quite normal to avail himself of these later clarifications rather than of Herophilus' own writings, or to put them alongside a reference to the archegete. Diogenes Laërtius, VII 38, sees no problem in summarizing the general Stoic doctrines in the life of Zeno, the founder of the school. This attitude is to some extent anticipated in Cicero's report about Antiochus of Ascalon's views, Ac. post. I (Varro) 17, where it is argued that Plato's pupils converted the thought of the master into a (quotable) system288b (but note that Antiochus includes the Peripatetics). Proclus, on the other hand, himself no stranger to creative interpretation or disinclined to accept the creative interpretations of his more immediate predecessors, professes that when explaining enigmatic passages in Plato one may only find 'clarity' (τὴν σαφήνειαν) by adducing other passages from Plato's own and most genuine works (Theologia Platonica, I 2, p. 10.1 ff.). But he is opposed to clarity as a general aim; at In Parm., p. 928.5-9, he argues that the professor οὔδε ποιήσεται λόγον ὁποιον ἄν λέγειν δόξῃ σαφῶς, and that mystical subjects are to be taught in a mystical way.

We may here limit ourselves to a single example from among the innumerable ones that are available for the early Christian interpretation of the Bible. Jewish exegetes had interpreted the Old Testament allegorically, and their Christian colleagues followed suit; from the time of Clement of Alexandria they also began to apply this technique to the New Testament.289 The section of Origen's early work De principiis, IV chs. 2-3, which deals with hermeneutics, has been preserved in Greek in the first chapter of the Philoica. The apposite title given to these chapters by the compilers of the Philoica runs 'what is the reason for the uncleanness of Scripture and of the impossible or absurd character of certain passages when these are taken literally' (τίς τε ὃ τῆς ἐν αὐτῇ

288b See Baltes (1993) 219 f.
289 Cf. supra, n. 14; for Clement see Grant (1957) 85 ff., Hanson (1959) 117 ff. For Philo's influence on Clement, and especially for the evidence regarding his influence on Origen which combines with that of Clement see Runia (1993) 132 ff., 157 ff.
ἀσαφείας λόγος καὶ τοῦ κατὰ τὸ ῥήτον ἐν τισιν ἀδυνάτου ἢ ἀλόγου). This method of exegesis determines Origen’s astonishingly prolific exegetical practice.290 It is well described by Gregory Thaumaturgus, Oratio Panegyrica, xiv.174-6, who among other things says that his master ‘clarified whatever was obscure and enigmatic, of which many examples are found in Scripture’ (σαφηνίζων ὁ τί ποτε σκοτεινόν καὶ αἰνιγματώδες ἢ, οἷα πολλά ἐν ταῖς ἱεραίς ἐστὶ φωναίς). Origen was taken severely though not inappropriately to task by Porphyry, who in the third book of his Against the Christians (fr. 39 Harnack, preserved at Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. VI 19) among other things says of Christian exegetes like Origen, to whom he refers disertis verbis, that they ‘boast that the things which in Moses’ (works) are clearly formulated are riddles’ (αἰνίγματα ... τὰ φανερῶς παρὰ Μωυσεῖ λεγόμενα εἶναι κομπάσαντες, VI 19.4). Nevertheless, as the De antro nympharum shows, Porphyry himself was not averse to fanciful allegorical interpretations of Homer.

We have noticed above that one of the preliminary issues discussed by the late commentators on Aristotle is the question why some of his works are obscure, or rather why in these works obscurity is deliberately practised.291 These men are the latest representatives of a spiritual attitude which, as we may now conclude, is also characteristic of Galen. To be sure, in Galen’s view the obscurity of a number of Hippocrates’ pronouncements is not intentional but among other things due to the difficulty of the topics treated, just as is the case in Plato’s Timaeus according to a

290 See Harl (1983) 182 ff., and for the Greek text Crouzel & al. (1980) 256 ff. On the ‘absurdities’ see e.g. Pépin (1957). Also compare Philocalia ch. 2.2.10-14, ἄλλα καὶ περὶ πάσης θείας γραφῆς, ὀμολογουμένος παρὰ τοῖς κάν μετρίως ἐπαίειν λόγον θείων δυναμένοις πεπληρωμένης αἰνιγμάτων καὶ παραβολῶν σκοτεινῶν τε λόγων καὶ ἄλλων ποικίλων εἴδων ἀσαφείας, δυσλήπτων τῇ ἄνθρωπην φύσει (from the introduction to Ps 1 which simultaneously is the introduction to the whole minor commentary on Psalms). For Clement see supra, n. 288; for Origen’s methods and his involvement with the idea of ἀσάφεια see further supra, n. 14 and text thereto and infra, p. 204 f., complementary note 316. The scriptural proof-text which was believed to legitimize the allegorical method of interpretation is Gal 4:24. For the passage from Porphyry see e.g. Nautin (1977) 197 ff., and for Porphyry’s own more moderate view regarding unclerness and exegesis infra, p. 203, complementary note 316. For the views of Didymus the Blind on ἀσάφεια (he is defending the allegorical method against one of Porphyry’s parodies) see Binder (1968) 88 with n. 25.

291 See supra, text to n. 34, n. 36 and text thereto.
view he also shares. But Galen’s technique of interpretation of such accidentally obscure passages is not different from the method of interpretation of the (as they believed) intentionally obscure Aristotelian passages by the Neoplatonist commentators.

This technique may also be expressed by means of the formula ‘to arrive from what is written at what is not written’ (ex eo quod scriptum sit ad id quod non sit scriptum pervenire). This rule, already familiar to the young Cicero whose words at De inv., II 152, I have just quoted, was applied on a large scale by pagans and Christians alike: by philosophers, critics and exegetes, by rhetoricians and orators, and by lawyers dealing with written laws, or testaments and similar documents. Quintilian, for instance, Institut. VII viii.3, says that by means of reasoning one may infer ‘what is not (yet) certain from what is written’ (ex eo, quod scriptum est, id, quod incertum est). We may also quote the happy formula of Syrianus, In Met. p. 11.11 ff.: ‘it will be our job to say what he [sc. Aristotle] does not say straight-away but is necessarily entailed by what he posits’ (δὲ δὲ μὴ λέγει μὲν αὐτόθεν, ἐπόμενα δὲ ἐστὶν ἀναγκαῖος οἷς τίθησι, ταῦτ’ ἄν εἰ ἦν λέγειν ἡμέτερον).

I note in passing that I have seen modern instances of the application of the rule advocated by Syrianus, some of which are justified, or justifiable, while others, at least from a strictly historical point of view, are not.

5.5 Qualities Required of the Exegete and his Students

But the clarification of what is unclear is not the only general issue belonging with the later schema isagogicum that is to be found in these pages of Galen. He also deals in his own way with the two related general issues of this schema, viz. the proper qualifications of the exegete — which are of course dependent on one’s view of exegesis —, and those to be demanded of his pupils.

We may begin by pointing out that the two objectives which Galen formulated for the exegete (see above), viz. the explanation of what is said in the text and its evaluation as to the truth, which he says are pursued by commentators in general, are paralleled

---


293 See supra, n. 34 (for references to Mme Hadot’s ample discussion of these issues in the Neoplatonist Aristotelian commentators), and text thereto.
by two of the three rules to be applied in the exegesis of Plato’s works cited at D.L. III 65. ‘First, the meaning of every phrase must be explained [...]’; third, (one must examine) whether it is correctly spoken (πρῶτον ... ἐκδιδάξαι χρῆ ὅ τι ἑστὶν ἐκαστὸν τῶν λεγομένων [...] τρίτον, εἰ ὥρθως λέεικται). In view of the almost complete loss of pre-Neoplatonic commentaries on Plato this testimony is invaluable.\footnote{294}

That commentators in general indeed proceeded in this way is proved by a surprisingly extant early example. The astronomer Attalus (second century BCE) published an editio correctior of the poem of Aratus, with a commentary (though presumably not one κατὰ λέξιν). Two verbatim passages are quoted from Attalus’ proem by his contemporary and opponent Hipparchus. From these it is clear that Attalus had two aims. The first was to make sure that each individual statement in the poem agreed with the (celestial and meteorological) phenomena, in other words is true. The second is to show that it is consistent with what the author has written, which involves a certain amount of explanation, or interpretation, of the (rest of the) text. In order to achieve these aims, Attalus emended the wording if necessary, giving priority to the agreement with the phenomena and being firmly convinced that by doing so he was faithful to the \textit{intention of the author}.\footnote{295} His textual interventions resemble those of the Hippocrates commentators and editors criticized by Galen. But note that Hipparchus reports that actually Attalus most of the time attempted to justify what Aratus had said.\footnote{296} It may be added that according to Hipparchus, I ch. 1.4, the interpretation of what Aratus means

\footnote{294}{For explanation, or rather clarification, in the \textit{Anon. in Theaet.} see \textit{supra}, text to n. 22.}

\footnote{295}{I quote the text of Hipparchus, \textit{In Arat.}, I ch. 1.3 (= Attalus fr. 1, p. 3.12 ff. Maass; for Hipparchus see \textit{supra}, text after n. 88, and below, pp. 197 f., complementary note 84) from the ed. by Manitius (1894) p. 24.13 ff.: διδ δὴ τὸ τε τοῦ Ἀράτου βιβλίον ἐξαπεστάλκαμεν σοι διωρθωμένον ὑπ’ ἡμῶν καὶ τὴν ἐξήγησιν αὐτοῦ, τοῖς τε φαινομένοις ἑκάστα σύμφωνα ποιήσαντες καὶ τοῖς ὑπὸ τοῦ ποιητοῦ γεγραμμένοις ἀκόλουθα. (καὶ πάλιν ἐξῆς φησίν;) τὰχα δὲ τινὲς ἐπιζητήσαντες, τίνι λόγῳ πεισθέντες φαμέν ἀκολούθως τῇ τοῦ ποιητοῦ προοιμίσει \textit{(intention auctoris, cf. \textit{supra}, text to n. 251}; Martin (1956b) 24 translates “the intention of the auteur”) τὴν διόρθωσιν τοῦ βιβλίου πεποίησαν. ἡμεῖς δ’ ἀναγκαστάτην αἰτίαν ἀποδίδομεν τὴν τοῦ ποιητοῦ πρὸς τὰ φαινόμενα συμφωνίαν.}

\footnote{296}{Hipparchus, \textit{In Arat.}, I ch. 3.2, p. 24.8 ff.: πᾶσι σχεδόν τοῖς ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἀράτου λεγομένοις περὶ τῶν οὐρανίων συνεπιγράφεται ὡς συμφώνοις τοῖς φαινομένοις ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ λεγομένοις κτλ. On Attalus’ method of interpretation see also Erren (1967) 307 ff.}
(διάνοιαν) is not difficult, because he is sufficiently σαφής to those who pay some attention to what he says. The trouble is that Aratus and his model, i.e. Eudoxus according to Hipparchus, are often simply wrong, as our expert astronomer is going to prove.

That the commentator should not only explain his author correctly but also devote part of his energies to the evaluation of the truth of what he says became a secondary aim only for Galen, while it is quite important to the Late Neoplatonists. This is in the first place the case when they expound the logical works, which after all introduce their students to the philosophy of Aristotle-and-Plato. Ammonius, In Cat. p. 8.13-5, says one should ‘both present the philosopher’s meaning and scrutinize to what extent what is said is true’ (τὸ μὲν παριστᾶν τὴν τοῦ φιλοσόφου διάνοιαν τὸ δὲ τὴν ἐν τοῖς λεγομένοις ἀλήθειαν ἐξετάζειν). In the same context Olympiodorus, Proleg. p. 10.27, says that the exegete should distinguish between what is true and what is not. Similar claims are made by Philoponus, In Cat. p. 6.30 ff., Simplicius, In Cat. p. 7.26-7, and David (Elias), In Cat. p. 122.25-7. For this magis amica veritas see also Plutarch, De recta ratione audiendi 41B; though he speaks of hearers rather than teachers, he formulates the following general truth: ‘one must set aside the reputation of the speaker and test philosophical arguments on their own merits’ (τοὺς δὲ ἐν φιλοσοφίᾳ λόγους ἀφαιροῦντα χρὴ τὴν τοῦ λέγοντος δόξαν αὐτοὺς ἐφ᾽ ἐαυτῶν ἐξετάζειν). Galen, as we shall see, believes that trained physicians, that is to say those who know from a study of Galen’s other writings as much, or almost as much, as Galen knows himself, will be able to test the truth of Hippocrates’ utterances for themselves, and that it does not make sense to demand too much of beginners, though what is said should enable them to find the right way.

Furthermore, both the Late Neoplatonists and Galen hold that the commentator should be an expert. For the former this means in the first place that he should be thoroughly familiar with the works of Aristotle and Plato, down to the individual lemmata.

---

296a Yet Hyginus. De astronomia proem. 6, says that he has written his treatise because Aratus is obscure and the subject stands in need of a clear exposition (et enim praeter nostram scriptionem sphaereae, quae fuerunt ab Arato obscurius dicta, persequut planius ostendimus etc.). See Santini (1990) 11 f.

297 See Tarán (1984) 98 ff. (antecedents in Plato and Aristotle), 104 ff.; he emphasizes that this rule applies not only to teachers but also to students.
Ammonius, *In Cat.* p. 8.12-3, says that he must have excellent knowledge of the texts he is to explain. Simplicius, *In Cat.* p. 7.24-4, says 'he must be familiar with everything written by the philosopher everywhere' (δεῖ δὲ καὶ τῶν πανταχοῦ τῷ φιλοσόφῳ γεγραμμένων ἔμπειρον εἶναι). David (Elias), *In Cat.* p. 123.7-8, says 'he [sc. the commentator] should know all things by Aristotle' (δεῖ αὐτὸν πάντα εἰδέναι τὰ 'Ἀριστοτέλεις'). In Galen's case a thorough knowledge of the details of the Hippocratic writings is not an explicit presupposition, but in actual practice he demonstrates his intimate and profound familiarity with Hippocrates' writings. What he emphasizes explicitly is the indispensability of expertise in the various fields of medicine. Yet someone who claims to be in a position to evaluate the truth of Aristotle's claims must necessarily, or at least ideally, be a competent logician. He will have a sufficient knowledge of the other parts of systematic philosophy, and be thoroughly familiar with (the correct interpretation of) Plato's thought.

As to the students, the Late Neoplatonists require that these must have successfully accomplished a preliminary moral purification and that they must be intelligent as well as devoted. Ammonius, *In Cat.* p. 6.22-3, says of the student that 'he must have been educated as to his morals and purified as to his soul' (δεῖ πεπαιδευμένον τὰ ἡθη εἶναι καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν κεκαθαρμένον).298 Olympiodorus, *Proleg.* 10.3 ff., says the same thing in many more words. We may note that he explicitly wants the student to be 'sensible and keen', and that Philopoulos, *In Cat.* p. 6.29-30, says he has to be 'righteous, gifted as to his understanding, serious in relation to the arguments, orderly in every respect' (δίκαιος ... εὐφυὴς τὴν διάνοιαν, σπουδαῖος περὶ τοὺς λόγους, ἐν πᾶσι κεκοσμημένος). Simplicius, *In Cat.* p. 9.33 ff., wants him to be 'excellent and of a sufficiently good moral disposition'; he should not indulge in eristic logic-chopping and must even be punished if he refuses to listen to argument. Similar things are said at greater length by David (Elias), *In Cat.* p. 121.23 ff. Proclus too, explaining the words πολλὸν ... ἔμπειρος ... καὶ μὴ ἀφυῆς of the lemma Plato, *Parm.* 133a, at *In Parm.* p. 926.7-35, wants the acceptable student (ἀκροατῆς ἀξιόχρεως τῆς τούτων ἀκροάσεως)

---

298 Cf. *supra*, text to n. 8, text to n. 38, n. 59 and text thereto, n. 132, *infra*, n. 304 and text thereto.
to possess εὐφυία to a degree, and to have experience of logical, physical and mathematical theorems; ibid., pp. 927.35-928.9, he discusses the qualities the professor should possess. For the student compare also Proclus, *Theologia Platonica* I 2, pp. 10.11-11.26. Iamblichus’ follower Salustius, *De dis et mundo* ch. 1, wants the student to have had a decent education, to be good and intelligent so as to have some affinity with the doctrines to be taught, and to know the ‘common notions’, for instance that every god is good and immutable.299

Sometimes Galen’s remarks about the students are a bit more down to earth. But he points out that among the causes for misunderstanding a text are a lack of proper intellectual preparation, and sheer stupidity (see *In De fract.*., 319.9 ff. K., quoted above). We have moreover seen and shall see again that he wrote monographs *On Sects* (not only ‘For Beginners’ but for ideal students too) in order to enable his students to free themselves from the irrational passions which are inevitably bound up with the feelings of loyalty to a particular school, or sect. His sarcastic description of the motives which make people opt for a particular medical or philosophical sect seems to be in part traditional. At *De ord.* ch. 1, p. 80.14 ff., he says that people make a particular choice because their fathers were Empiricists or Dogmatists or Methodists, or their teachers, or their friends, or because their city counted among its inhabitants a famous representative of one of these sects. We may compare what Cicero says two centuries before Galen, *Ac. po.* I.8 (*Lucullus*), on young people opting for one of the dogmatist positions: *infirmissimo tempore aetatis aut obsecuti animo cuipiam aut una alicuius quem primum audierunt oratione capiti de rebus incognitis iudicant, et ad quamquamque sunt disciplinam quasi*

299 Cf. *supra*, text to n. 138 and to n. 228. For the qualities of the philosophy student see Whittaker (1987) 106 f. (with n. 91 on εὐφυία) who cites further parallels but has missed Plato, *Parm.* 133a; for Alcinos see *infra*, n. 304 and text thereto. Cf. also the anecdote on Arcesilaus at D.L. IV 30, and another one at Sextus, *P. I* 234. One of the other main passages on preliminary education in Plato himself is *Resp.* V 475d-480a. Very interesting is what Origen writes to one of his star pupils, *Letter to Gregory Thaumaturgus (= Philocalia* ch. 13), 1: ή εις σύνεσιν, ώς οὖθα, εὐφυία ἔργον φέρειν δύναται ἄσκησιν προσλαβόντα, ἢν ἕπε τατά τὸ ἐνδεχόμενον, ἢν ὡς τὸ ὄνομά, τέλος ἑκέινον ὑπὸ σκέτην τινι δουλεῖται. δύναται οὖν ἡ εὐφυία σου ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίων σε νομικόν ποιήσαι τέλειον, καὶ Ἑλληνικόν τινα φιλόσοφον τῶν νομιζομένων ἐλλογίμων αἵρεσεων. ἄλλ' ἐγὼ τῇ πάσῃ τῆς εὐφυίας δυνάμει σου ἑβουλόμην καταχρήσασθαι σε, τελικῶς μὲν εἰς χριστιανισμὸν κτλ.
tempestate delati ad eam tamquam ad saxum adhaerescunt. A similar image is found at Lucian, *Hermotimus* 86, where the person who regrets having opted for a sect sees himself as having been carried along, not against his will, with a wild and muddy torrent. A comparable account is given at Gregory Thaumaturgus, *Oratio Panegyrica*, xiv.162, on the partisans of the warring philosophical schools: 'each declares those doctrines to be true which in the beginning he has encountered by accident, driven by some (irrational) impulse' (οἱς προσέτυχεν ἐκαστὸς ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἔλαβεις ὑπὸ τινὸς ὀρμῆς). A comparison between the medical sects and those of philosophy is found at Origen, *Contra Celsum* III 12. Celsus attacks the Christians because there are many different sects. Origen retorts that this proves Christianity's worth. Medicine is useful and indispensable; many are the problems related to the treatment of the body, so naturally there are several different medical sects. Philosophy is concerned with the truth and knowledge of things and the foundation of morality, subjects which are problematic and various, which is why there are numerous philosophical sects. The physician who has studied the various sects and chosen the best is competent, and so is the philosopher who has examined all the doctrines and accepted the best. Indeed, Origen's educational practice as described by Gregory, *Oratio Panegyrica*, xiv.170-172, much resembles Galen's attitude as expressed in his introductory tracts. Galen provided information about the important medical schools; Origen is said by Gregory to have instructed his pupils in the doctrines of all and especially of the most important (i.e. non-atheistic) philosophical schools, selecting from each what was useful and true (πᾶν μὲν ὁ τι χρήσιμον φιλοσόφων ἐκάστων καὶ ἀληθὲς ἢ, ἀναλέγων καὶ παρατιθέμενος ἡμῖν).

We may further adduce a passage in Albinus' *Prologos*, which is not only an interesting anticipation of those in the Neoplatonist authors and commentators cited above, but also formulates ideas that in my view are likely to have been known to Galen, and to have influenced him. In ch. 5, Albinus speaks of the various sorts of students who are to follow the course intended for the serious dilettantes, and of the various ways in which these may be gifted or not (... κατὰ φύσιν, ὥσπερ εὐφυῆς ἀφυῆς, p. 149.26-27), or already prepared or not ( ... κατὰ ἐξιν, ὥσπερ προτετελεσμένος ἢ ἰμαθῆς, p. 149.29). The students who combine all the positive qualities are
allowed to begin with the Alcibiades. On the other hand, those who want to study Plato in order to become Platonists— the advice is given τῷ τὰ Πλάτωνος οἰρομένῳ— first have to purify (δεί πρῶτον ... ἐκκαθάραι, p. 150.15 ff.) themselves by means of a study of the ‘peirastic’ dialogues (see above, chapter two, section 7 ad finem). It seems likely enough that Galen not only adopted these ideas but also adapted them to his own specific purposes, just as he adapted the two different orders of study intended for two different groups of students advocated by Albinus to that of his own writings, or applied the division of Plato’s dialogues into dogmatic and polemical works found in Albinus and other Middle Platonist texts to his own œuvre.

A list of no less than seven qualities required of the medical student who is to learn and understand the truth is found in Galen’s De constitutione artis medicæ, I, 244.4-5.7 K.³⁰⁰ He must in the first place be sharp-witted (have an ὀξεία φῶς) in order to be able to understand a μάθημα λογικὸν. Secondly, he must have been properly educated as a child and be familiar with arithmetic and geometry. Third, he must only attend the courses of the best people available (cf. e.g. Quintilian, II 3). Fourth, he must work very hard, day and night (cf. e.g. Epictetus, I 7.30, I 20.13-4). Fifth—a quality only very few possess—he must strive for the truth, and be concerned with the truth and only the truth in his whole way of life. Sixth, he must also learn a method to distinguish what is true from what is false; it is not sufficient to long for the truth of what one discovers, since these discoveries have also to be strengthened (χρῄ καὶ δύναμίν τινα τῆς εὐρέσεως πορίσασθαι). Seventh, to crown all these other requirements, he has to practise this method so as to be able not only to know it but also to use it.

³⁰⁰ I owe this reference to Mario Vegetti (per litt.). For logic in Albinus, Prol. ch. 6, see supra, text to n. 138. For natural talent and the capacity for hard work cf. supra, n. 220 (which is about books), and De diebus decretoriis, IX, 831.3-7 K., γενναίος δὲ τις καὶ ἀληθείας ἑταῖρος καὶ ταλαιπωρεῖν ἐπὶ τοῖς καλοῖς ὅψθεν, οὐτε τῶν θεωρημάτων τὸ χαλέπιν οὔτε τοῦ χρόνου τὸ μήκος οὔτε τῆς ἀσκήσεως τὸν πόνον ὑπειδόμενος, ἐπὶ τὸ τέλειον ἀφίζεται τῶν εἰρήμηνον κτλ., and De crisibus, IX, 645, 16-7 K., ἐπὶ γὰρ τὸν τῆς ἀληθείας ἑταῖρον ἥδη τρέφομαι. Some of Galen’s points are paralleled in late ps.Hippocratic writings. At Lex ch. 3, φῶς, παιδιομαθή ('being taught at an early age') and φιλοπονή are recommended, whereas at Praeceptiones ch. 13 ὄψμαθή is rejected; on these passages see Kudlien (1970) 19 f.
Implicitly, Galen in this passage too distinguishes between two classes of students, for those who really love the truth are said to be a small minority, but he does not speak of different orders of study for each separate group. He does not refer to a preliminary purification, and fails to make clear at what stage the apodeictic method should be mastered. What he seems to suggest is that first one is taught medicine and as a next step has to learn to distinguish between what is true and what is not, and (not unreasonably) that at any rate invention, or discovery, precedes proof. This time we are reminded of Albinus’ recommendation at Prol., ch. 6, according to which the doctrines have to be imbued by studying the dialogues that are ‘for instruction’ and are only subsequently strengthened by the study of the logical dialogues. In the present passage Galen’s view is rather different from the position advocated elsewhere. The explanation for this difference, presumably, is that he is thinking of the study of medicine rather than of medical literature. Still, the majority of the claims formulated here are paralleled in his remarks on the qualities the student should have which are found in his other writings.

Another interesting passage is at De optimo medico cognoscendo, ch. 5.\(^{301}\) The good doctor differs from the bad or not so good because the latter does not know the works and doctrines of Hippocrates and the other medical classics: Erasistratus, Diocles, Pleistonicus, Phylotimus, Praxagoras, Dieuches, Herophilus and Asclepiades. ‘(A student) who has followed the right course of instruction will be able to describe the doctrines of each of these. If he is really perfect, he will be able to describe to you the doctrines of the Ancients, together with those of their successors, outlining the differences and agreements. Furthermore, he will be able to inform you of his own judgement on their differences, justifying correct doctrines and exposing those which are erroneous. Nevertheless, this method demands training in the demonstrative science [...]. This is because nobody can understand demonstration unless he has had previous instruction and has become knowledgeable in it’ (p. 69.15-23). Again the emphasis on the methods taught in the On Proof, this time moreover linked with the requirement of being familiar with the important medical

---

\(^{301}\) I owe this reference to Mario Vegetti too. Cf. also the preliminary publication by Iskandar (1962) 364.
literature. This makes it all the more remarkable that Galen in his
*In Hippocratis Epidemiarum librum iii* does not comment on *Epid.* III
3.16.1 ff. (III p. 100.7 ff. Littré), where the study of the *Epidemics* is
particularly recommended by the author—i.e. Hippocrates, as
Galen believed (μέγα δὲ μέρος ἡγεύματι τῆς τέχνης εἶναι τὸ
δύνασθαι κατασκοπέσθαι περὶ τῶν γεγραμμένων ὀρθῶς, ὁ γὰρ
γνώς καὶ χρεόμενος τούτοις, οὐκ ἂν μοι δοκή μέγα σφαλλέσθαι
ev tē tēchnē). Galen only says that this topic is discussed
elsewhere.

5.6 Parallels in the Autobibliographies

Further relevant information concerning Galen’s views about the
expert teacher and his students is to be found in the two auto-
bibliographies discussed in chapter four above. Here not the works of
Hippocrates but those of Galen himself are involved, to which
these essays are a kind of Pro tīs ἀναγνώσεως. One of the
purposes of the study of the *On the Best Sect* is that the best students
must in a sense purify themselves morally (πάθους ἀπηλλάχθαι, p. 81.23), that is to say liberate themselves of all partisan feelings.
The study of the *On Proof*, which comes next, not only provides
the indispensable logical ‘training’ (γυμνάσηται, p. 82.5-6)\(^\text{302}\) and
not merely stimulates the love of the truth which are indis-
pendable for the scientific study of medicine, but should also enable one to contemplate the world of medicine without being
inconvenienced by ‘irrational passion’ (πάθος ἀλογον, p. 83.2). Compare also *De differentia pulsuum*, VIII, 657.1-14 K., where he
says that it is easier to make the followers of Moses and Jesus
change their mind than the sectarian physicians and philo-
sophers, and that he has written the present treatise for perhaps
only one or two persons, who are sufficiently gifted and eager
and above all are not affected by sectarian lunacy.\(^\text{303}\)

---

\(^{302}\) Cf. *supra*, n. 273 and text thereto.

\(^{303}\) Cf. *supra*, text to n. 32, n. 44 and text thereto. The Greek at VIII, 657.1-
14 K., is ἃθατον γὰρ ἂν τις τῶς ἀπὸ Μωυσῆο καὶ Χριστοῦ μεταδιδάξειν ἡ τούς
taquς αἴρεσαι προστετήκοτας ἰατρῶς τε καὶ φιλοσόφους. [...] καὶ τάδε τὰ
grάμματα σφάς εἶδος ἀνωφελῆ πάσιν ὀλίγου δεῖν ἐσόμενα, πλὴν ἐνὸς ἰσός
tiνός, ἢ δυνὸι, οἱ ἂν καὶ φύσει θανάματη καὶ διδασκαλία καὶ μελέτη χρήσωνται,
kai πρὸ τούτων ἀπάντων ἐξω τῆς περὶ τὰς αἴρεσεις καταστώσι μανίας, ὃμως
γράφω.
Similar views are expressed at Galen, *De animi ciuislibet peccatorum dignotione et curatione* ch. 2, CMG V 4,1,1, pp. 44.23-5.3, where among other things he tells us about his experiences as a teacher of obtuse students. At the very least, he concludes, the learner must be intelligent and have received a proper training during his primary education, so that he can remember and reproduce what he has been told or at least put it down in writing. He must also be a lover of the truth. There is no hope for the person whose education has been wrong from a moral point of view. This idea is paralleled in the first chapter of the introductory section of Alcinous’ *Didaskalikos*, and in a number of other authors.\(^{304}\) Galen is one witness among many for a quite common view. For the analogous conception among the Late Neoplatonist commentators see some of the passages quoted above, and more especially Olympiodorus, *Proleg.* p. 10.10 ff., Philoponus, *In Cat.* p. 6.33 and David (Elias), *In Cat.* p. 122.2 ff. An important parallel is found in Origen’s *Letter to Gregory Thaumaturgus*, I: the person who is to become a perfect Christian should possess natural talent. He should study Greek philosophy as a sort of encyclical studies or propedeutic, and take from geometry and astronomy all that is useful for the interpretation of Scripture. This program of studies is described at length in Gregory’s *Oratio Panegyrica*, vii-xv: the preliminary purification (cf. xiii.98, ἐκκαθαίρων) culminates in dialectical and logical training; the other parts of pagan philosophy follow, viz. the study of physics (including the geometrical and astronomical sciences), and of ethics, the latter not merely theoretical but actually practised. This pagan curriculum is followed by the study of theology, i.e. the interpretation of Scripture.

Galen’s ideal students must have a natural capacity to understand (φύσει συνετοί, *De ord.* p. 83.9). The less gifted ones, who follow the first order of study which is recommended by him, should begin with the three isagogical essays and continue with

\(^{304}\) P. 152.7 ff., esp. χρῆ ... πρὸς τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἔχειν ἐρωτικὸς καὶ μηδαμῇ προσδέχεσθαι τὸ πρεσβύτερος, ἐπὶ τούτων δὲ καὶ φύσει ποιος σώφρονα εἶναι, καὶ κατὰ τὸ παθητικὸν τῆς ψυχῆς φυσικὸς κατεστάλμενον. Alcinous first speaks of the philosopher in general, i.e. in the more or less etymological sense, but from the sequel it is clear that he has the student in mind (τὸν μέλλοντα φιλοσοφεῖν, p. 152.17). See Whittaker (1990) 74 n. 6, and in general Clark (1957) 4 f. Cf. also supra, n. 299.
the anatomical treatises, as we have seen in chapter four. One may only go on with the next group of treatises if one has been properly ‘trained’ (γυμνασάμενος, p. 84.14) in anatomy. The beginning of De ord. ch. 3, which as we have seen deals with the Hippocrates commentaries, is lost; we pick it up in the middle of a phrase which states that the person (i.e. not the beginning student but the advanced learner) who wants to test the interpretations as to their being correct or not must first have received a proper preliminary training by means of a study of Galen’s systematic treatises (προγεγμασμένω κατὰ τὰς ἠμετέρας πραγματείας, p. 86.14-5) dealing with the medical issues that are involved. These people may even safely study the commentaries by others which are too dangerous for beginners (p. 87.20 ff.).

There is also a glimpse of the qualities required of the philosophy student. The person who wants to study Galen’s logical works must ‘be intelligent, have an excellent memory and be a hard worker’, and ideally should have been as fortunate as Galen himself had been in his early youth, when his father first made him study mathematics, grammar and other liberal disciplines, and then both philosophy (starting with logic) and medicine.

The importance of a primary literary education as a necessary preliminary to the study of either philosophy or medicine or both is emphasized in the proem of the De libr. propr., p. 90.13 ff., where Galen — who in this respect is not much different from the rest of us — complains that today’s students are ‘even unable to read properly’ (οὐδ᾽ ἀναγνώριζοι καλῶς δυνάμενοι). By following up these clues we get a clearer picture of the qualities Galen wants those beginning students to have who are invited to study his commentaries on Hippocrates. They must at least have had a proper liberal education and be intelligent. We may note in passing that according to the Vita Sorani, CMG IV, p. 175.15-6, Hippocrates himself had not only received medical training but been educated in the liberal arts as well (συνασκηθείς ... ἐν τῇ ἰατρικῇ καὶ τοῖς ἐγκυκλίοις μαθήμασιν).

An impression of Galen’s conception of the good teacher can be gained at De libr. propr. ch. 1, p. 95.2 ff. We recall that he wanted his star pupils to become impartial as to the different medical schools. In the present passage he tells us that, when once asked to what school he belonged (ἀπὸ ποίας ἐ姮 ἀφέσεως), his answer was that he considered ‘those who call themselves Hippocrateans
or Praxagoreans or after another person to be *slaves* and that from each sect he 'selected what was good' (*ἐκλέγομι ... τὰ καλὰ*). The question itself does not seem to have been uncommon; Lucian, *Vita Demonactis* 9, tells us that someone asked Demonax which philosophical sect he preferred (τίνα αἴρεσιν ἀσπάζεται μᾶλλον ἐν φιλοσοφίᾳ). Rather precise parallels to Galen’s answer may be quoted from the Neoplatonist commentators on Aristotle. Olympiodorus, *Proleg.* p. 10.10 ff., Philoponus, *In Cat.* p. 6.33 and David (Elias), *In Cat.* p. 122.2 ff. quote varieties of the well-known adage *amicus Plato, magis amica veritas.*

We may further compare Ammonius, *In Cat.* p. 8.17-8, Olympiodorus, *Proleg.* p. 10.27 ff., who says the teacher should not be the ‘slave of a particular school’, Philoponus, *In Cat.* p. 7.28 ff., and David (Elias), *In Cat.* p. 123.1 ff., ‘he should not be a sympathizer of a particular school’ (δεῖ αὐτὸν μὴ συμπάσχειν αἰρέσει τινί κτλ.). The responsible philosopher or physician, or the good teacher of philosophy or medicine, must be an eclectic in the good sense of the word. Elsewhere, Galen singles out Posidonius from among the other Stoics who will give up their own home-town rather than their doctrines, whereas Posidonius (at least according to Galen) would rather give up the Stoic sect than forsake the truth (*Quod animi mores corporis temperamente sequuntur*, at *Scr. min.* II, pp. 77.17-8.2 = Posidon. T58 Edelstein–Kidd).

We may also compare Proclus’ words at the beginning of the second prologue to his *In Euclident*, p. 48.3 ff.: ‘... following Plato’s lead and also collecting ideas from others which contribute to the present study’ (Πλάτωνι συμπορευόμενοι καὶ παρὰ τῶν ἄλλων ἀναλεγόμενοι τὰ πρὸς τὴν παροῦσαν πραγματείαν συντείνοντα νοῆματα). This recalls Seneca’s adage ‘the truth is mine’ (*quod verum est, meum est*, *Ep.* 12.11), Justin Martyr’s ὁσα οὖν παρὰ πᾶσι καλῶς ἔρημαι, ἥμιῶν τῶν Χριστιανῶν ἐστι (*Apologia sec. ch. 14.4.1*), Clement’s χρῆναι τὸ ἔξ ἀπάσης παιδείας χρήσιμον ἐκλεγομένους ἡμᾶς ἔχειν (*Strom.* II ii.4.1), and Origen’s attitude to pagan

---

305 Cf. *supra*, n. 297.

306 Donini (1988) has convinced me that, pace Zeller and others, the terms ‘eclectic’ and ‘eclecticism’ *in malam partem* are not conducive to understanding later developments in Greek philosophy. But this does not entail (and Donini of course does not argue it does) that justifiable and even justified instances of an eclectic, or rather selective, attitude did not exist or that those who adopted this stance did not know what they were doing. Quite the contrary.
philosophy which has been briefly described above. Philosophy and medical science are disciplines in which progress after all does occur. From a systematic point of view such advances should be welcomed, even if they have been developed in a school which is different from the one to which one feels one belongs, or to which one has chosen to ally oneself. A person who has chosen Hippocrates as his lode-star may still welcome later developments in anatomical science when these discoveries are indispensable for the practising physician, especially if he is capable of finding them anticipated in the more obscure pronouncements of his ideal spiritual ancestor.

Accordingly, creative interpretation proves again most helpful. We may think of those Middle Platonists who incorporated Aristotelian logic, or at least parts of it, into their own system and found passages in Plato in which for instance the doctrine of the categories, or the techniques of the syllogism, were hinted at or even used.\textsuperscript{307} Creative hindsight provided the legitimation for the incorporation of these parts of systematic philosophy into their updated Platonism.

5.7 Conclusion: Preliminary Issues in Galen. The Commentary Tradition

Summarizing this evidence concerned with both general and particular issues to be found in Galen, I find that several general and the great majority of the particular issues of the later schemata isagogica are anticipated in his autobibliographies and commentaries, and sometimes in his other works as well. The clarification of what is unclear, the various modes of expression or elucidation, the aims and qualifications of the exegete, the proper qualifications of the students, the theme of the work, the intention of the author (of the treatise or of the commentary), the utility of the work, its authenticity (or that of its parts), its title and its division into books or sections, the systematic ordering of individual treatises as well as the order of study of the works of Hippocrates (and Galen himself) are discussed whenever necessary. There are references to various views on some of these issues as formulated by others, both named and anonymous.

\textsuperscript{307} See e.g. Alcinous, Didaskalikos ch. 6, p. 158.17 ff. (syllogisms, both categorical and hypothetical), and p. 159.43 ff. (categories); see further Whittaker (1990) \textit{ad loc.}, 90 ff., also for further parallels.
Though Galen neither follows a rigid scheme nor adheres to a technical vocabulary throughout, he is fully aware of most of the questions which are encompassed by these later schemata, discussing them as the need arises or external circumstances require. It has also become clear that he knows what it is to write an introduction, or prologue. This is not at all amazing; the technique of writing prologues was part of a decent rhetorical education, and we may recall the dishonest person who wrote a proem of his own to a work by Galen which he pretended to have composed himself (De libr. propr. p. 98.5-6). References to Galen’s predecessors in the field of Hippocratic studies show that a number of these people too habitually dealt with several isagogic questions.

These procedures are rather similar to the ways in which Galen’s younger contemporary Alexander of Aphrodisias, and some of the latter’s predecessors who wrote commentaries on Aristotle, dealt with the preliminary issues.308 In this respect, at least, the Hippocratic exegetical tradition from say the first century BCE to ca. 200 CE does not appear to have differed much from the Aristotelian exegetical tradition from the first century BCE to ca. 200 CE; both ultimately derive from the philology of Hellenistic Alexandria.309 Most of Galen’s own (lost) Aristotelian commentaries, as we have seen, were originally written for private use (at least, this is what he says). It is interesting to note that he was to some extent familiar with the Peripatetic exegetical traditions, for he refers to commentaries by Adrastus and Aspasius. In his little tract On Fallacies, ch. 1, 90.92.1-3 Edlow = 6.22-7.2 Ebbesen, having quoted a difficult sentence from Aristotle, viz. Soph. el. 4.165b27-30, he points out that ‘some of his commentators did not even try to give a precise and appropriate explanation of this passage, and others just did not succeed’ (τῶν οὖν ἐξηγησαμένων αὐτὸν οἱ μὲν οὐδὲ ἐπεχείρησαν ταῦτα άκριβῶςα τὸν

308 See above, chapter one, section 7; below, pp. 194 f., complementary note 64.
309 Other parallels between Galen’s commentaries and those of Alexander and his predecessors are briefly but usefully discussed by Moraux (1986b) 135 f.; for those with Demetrius Laco see Roselli (1990). As was already pointed out by Geffken (1932) 400, who says “wir sind in der gücklichen Lage, ein Seitenstück zur Homerphilologie in Händen zu halten”, we are also to some extent informed about the philology of Alexandria in the commentary of Attalus on Aratus quoted by Hipparchus, and by Hipparchus own work; see supra, text to n. 252, n. 295 and text thereto, n. 296 and text thereto.
Galen this time is not so much concerned with the proper exegesis of the author’s words as with the argument itself. For he adds that he shall try to provide the necessary precision, but not for Aristotle’s sake or in order to ‘help the argument’ (for the expression cf. e.g. Plato, *Phaed.* 88de, Arist., *De cael.* A 10.279b32 ff.), but for our own sakes. It is at any rate clear that he had seen more than one commentary on the *Sophistici Elenchi*. The earliest extant commentary in Greek on this treatise is that of ps. Alexander (Michael of Ephesus, twelfth century CE).

It is certain that this was true as well in relation to the commentary tradition on Plato and Galen’s commentary in four books on the medical part of Plato’s *Timaeus*, fragments of which survive, and for other lost works or passages in extant works dealing with Plato. At *PHP* VIII 5.14 f. he says that ‘many people have written commentaries on the other parts [sc. of the *Tim.*], some at greater length than was appropriate, but on these themes few have written, and not well into the bargain’ (εἰς μὲν γὰρ τὰλά πολλοῖς ὑπομήματα γέγραπται καὶ τοῖς γ’ αὐτῶν μακρότερον τοῦ προσήκοντος, εἰς τὰύτα δ’ ὀλίγοι τε καὶ οὐδ’ οὕτοι καλῶς ἔγραψαν). Likely enough, his hermeneutical reflections and his ideas on the proper qualifications and aims of the exegete as well as on the qualities and preparation to be required of one’s students were much more stimulated by the classes in philosophy he had attended in his youth and the philosophical exegetical literature he had seen than by his medical education or the commentaries on Hippocrates he knew. In the *In De articulis* of Apollonius of Citium at any rate, which is the only extant pre-Galenic Hippocratic commentary (*CMG* XI,1,1), nothing of the sort

310 For Adrastus and Aspasius see *supra*, n. 231; for the passage quoted from the *De captionibus* see above, chapter one, section 3. We do not know the names of the authors of the lost Greek commentaries on the *Soph. el.* referred to by Galen, see Ebbesen (1981) 236 ff.; an earlier version of Michael’s commentary has been published by Ebbesen, *ibid.* 153 ff., the other by M. Wallies in *CAG* II.3. Remains of Galen’s *Timaeus* commentary have been published by Schröder (1934) 1-35; brief and rather uninteresting recently discovered fragments from books I and II of this commentary have now been published with comm. by Larrian (1992) — no index verborum, primitive software and printer. For Galen’s knowledge of Atticus’ commentary see Baltes (1976) 63 ff. The point about the obscurity of the *Timaeus* mentioned by both Galen and Cicero (*supra*, n. 276 and text to n. 286) must derive from a commentary tradition.
is to be found, though as we have seen he speaks of Hippocrates' unclerarness of expression. It has however to be acknowledged that Erotian, in the proem to his lexicon, is very much concerned with
the question of exegesis, and that some of the qualities of the acceptable medical student are described in two late pieces in the corpus hippocraticum.311

The loss of Galen's *On the Genuine and Inauthentic Books of Hippocrates*, from which we could have learned much more, is of course very much to be regretted. Hunain ibn Ishaq calls it 'ein schönes, nützliches Buch'. Conceivably, it may have been a rather systematic work, and without doubt it will have assembled the arguments in favour of Galen's canon of genuine works (and sections of works) by Hippocrates.312 We must also deeply regret the loss of his *On Exegesis* and his *On Clarity and Unclearness*.

---

311 For Apollonius of Citium and Erotian see supra, section 2, and for passages in late ps.Hippocratic works dealing with the qualities required of pupils supra, n. 300.
312 See Hunain ibn Ishaq (Bergsträsser (1925)) 36. The question of the authenticity of the treatises of the Hippocratic corpus (and even of certain ingredients of the genuine treatises), as we have seen, plays an important part in Galen's writings. Among other things it enables him to eliminate what fails to measure up to his idealized and updated *Hippocratesbild* (on which cf. also Temkin (1991) 42 f., 47 ff.; on its antecedents in the Hellenistic period see Kudlien (1989) 361 ff.) and so is an important ingredient of his exegesis. See the references collected by e.g. Bröcker (1885) 426 ff., and by Mewaldt (1909). To these texts add e.g. *In iii Epidem. ii*, p. 213.20 ff., *In iii Epidem. v*, p. 310.22 ff., and the passages from the *De septimestri partu* cited by Smith (1979) 154 f. A particularly flagrant case is Galen's idiosyncratic rejection (for ideological reasons) and damnatio memoriae of the *De morbo sacro*, a treatise intimately connected with the *De aere aquis locis* which he believed to be by Hippocrates. The *De morb. sacr.* was accepted as genuine by important authorities, viz. the glossographer Erotian and the great Methodist physician Soranus (ca. 100 CE). See the testimonia which have been conveniently assembled by Grensemann (1968b) 48, and my remarks at Mansfeld (1993b) 125.
CHAPTER SIX

CICERONIAN LIGHT ON THE AIDS TO INTERPRETATION, AND ON DIOGENES LAËRTIUS

6.1 Cicero on Interpretation

In the second book of the De inventione, the unoriginal work written by Cicero in his early youth which is important precisely because it is not original, we find a passage dealing with the interpretation of written documents. Though Cicero is concerned with wills and laws, the background of his recommendations is much wider. What is of interest in our present context is what we are told about three reasons which render the interpretation of such documents difficult and so result in differences of opinion: ambiguity, the literal formula(s) as contrasted with the possible intention, and conflicting laws. Several ways of dealing with these obstacles are prescribed. The for us most important piece of advice runs as follows:

\[\text{De inv. II 116 ff., printed by Matthes (1962) as Hermagoras fr. 20c (though the name is not mentioned). The rhetorical backdrop is the stasis doctrine.}\]

\[\text{De inv. II 116, in scripto versatur controversy cum ex scriptionis ratione aliquid dubii nascitur. Id fit ex ambiguo, ex scripto et sententia, ex contrariis legibus. Compare also Quintilian VII iv.5 ff. on the problems that arise from the possible opposition between scriptum and voluntas, from leges contrariae and from all sorts of ambiguitas in documents.}\]

\[\text{De inv. II 117 (transl. Hubbell, slightly modified; my emphasis): Deinde, qua in sententia scriptor fuerit ex ceteris eius scriptis et ex factis, dictis, animo atque vita eius sumi oportet, et eam ipsam scripturam, in qua inerit illud ambiguum de quo quaeretur totam omnibus ex partibus pertinere, si quid aut ad id oppositum sit, quod nos interpretemur, aut et quod adversarius intellegat adversetur. For the dicta and facta cf. also Quintilian, quoted infra, n. 322. Compare also Cic., De part. or., 132-8, which is however more strictly restricted to juridical documents though there is a hint a 132 (... discrepare cum ceteris scriptis vel aliorum vel maxime si poterit eiusdem). The prescription of De inv. II 117 is not an ingredient in the parallel passages dealing with this stasis in the contemporaneous Rhetorica ad Herennium, I 19 f., II 14 f., and it is also lacking in the passage in Quintilian for which see supra, n. 314. Dealing with ambiguity in written documents (when a sententia scriptum dissidet, De or. I 139) is one of the standard elements of the course in rhetoric prescribed according to De or. I 137 ff. So it is clear that Cicero, carried away by youthful zeal, says more at De inv. II 117 than he need have.}\]
In the next place, one ought to estimate what the writer meant *from the rest of his writings and from his acts, words, character and life,* and to examine the whole document which contains the ambiguity in question *in all its parts,* to see if any thing agrees with our interpretation or is opposed to the sense in which our opponent interprets it.

In a seminal article⁴¹ Schäublin has pointed out that this passage constitutes the earliest extant attestation of the interpretative method which used to be ascribed to Aristarchus, viz. the principle that an author should be interpreted by means of his own works and words. He argues that the origin of the method must be sought among the Classical and Hellenistic orators and rhetoricians who had to be very good at interpreting legal texts and similar documents, and that it was only subsequently adopted by the grammarians. He also points out that Porphyry, speaking of the interpretation of Homer, does not mention the "facta und *dicta...,* den animus, die allgemeinen Umstände des Lebens", and infers: "Darin wirkt sich wohl der Unterschied zwischen literarischer und forensischer Interpretation aus".⁴¹ I believe, however, that something more needs to be said, because Cicero really says more than, given his context, he need have said.

In the first place, if a work, or a passage of a work, of an author has to be interpreted with the help of *all* his other writings of which one even has to know the *details,* a canon of authentic works must have been established to begin with. This entails that a preliminary discussion of the distinction between works that have been rightly attributed and the others must have taken place, and further that the authentic works must be thoroughly familiar. We have seen above, to mention only a few examples, that Thrasyllus established a canon of Plato's dialogues and Galen one for his own books, and that the Neoplatonist commentators so to speak knew Aristotle and Plato by heart, just as Galen knew his Hippocrates. In the second place, the importance of the *facta, dicta,* *animus* and *vita* of an author is rather precisely paralleled by what Galen, *De ord.* p. 83.7 ff., says about the indispensability of a

⁴¹ Schäublin (1977) 225 ff.; the attribution to Aristarchus has been contested by Pfeiffer (1978) 276 ff. See further *infra,* pp. 204 ff., complementary note 316.

⁴¹ Schäublin (1977) 226. The attempt of Lee (1975) to date the principle to the age of the Sophists because of the joke attributed to Agathon at Aelianus, *Varia historia* 14.13, is misguided. There is no evidence whatever that the joke is historical.
thorough acquaintance with his own βίος, ἔργα and τρόπος τῆς ψυχῆς for those who want to study his works without being in a position to avail themselves of the On Proof. What is more, in the biographical first part of the V. Plot. Porphyry dwells at appropriate length on what we certainly may call the facta, dicta, animus and vita of the master whose works he is editing. The interpretative technique described by Cicero is in fact put to use in various ways by Galen and Porphyry in these very works, and we may safely assume that they knew they did so. We may believe that this also helps to explain why Thrasylus’ introductions to Plato and Democritus contained a bios and a list of the authentic works, or why Arrian’s edition of Epictetus began with a bios which, as we have noticed, was referred to in approving terms by Simplicius. I am not, of course, saying that this holds for all the bioi of intellectual and literary figures that still survive: it is sufficient that it is true of a respectable number of important instances.

6.2 Inferences to be Drawn for Diogenes Laërtius. Life and Works, Works and Life

What is perhaps even more important, however, is that the biographical ingredients of the method of interpretation described by Cicero throw a strong beam of light on Diogenes Laërtius’ book. I believe that this work is indebted to the interpretative practices of the Hellenistic and early Greco-Roman critics and exegetes rather than to those of the rhetoricians, though these critics and exegetes may ultimately have been indeed indebted to the orators and rhetoricians.

Scholars have as a rule been dissatisfied with what seems to us to be an odd medley of biographical data, apophthegms

---

318 See supra, text before n. 212.
319 See above, chapter two.
320 See supra, text to n. 186.
321 For the protreptic and paradigmatic intention of the often sanctimonious later philosophical bioi see Goulet (1981) and Blumenthal (1984). These biographies were not written to serve as an introduction to the study of the works of the author, because for instance the works of Proclus were not taught the same way those of Plato or Aristotle were taught.
322 On apophthegms as an important ingredient especially in the biographies of philosophers see Gallo (1980) 13, Musses (1992). On the gnomologia literature see infra, n. 325; note Quintilian, XII ii.29, ... magis etiam, quae sunt tradita antiquitus dicta ac facta praecclare, et nosse et animo semper agiare
(occasionally insipid), bibliographies and information about the
doctrines to be found in Diogenes’ sections devoted to individual
philosophers, that is to say archegetes of a school as well as other
figures. Diels’ unfavourable comparison of biography with what
he called doxography still largely holds the field. But as we have
seen, the study of the life, activities and sayings of a philosopher
was often regarded as an indispensable preliminary to that of his
writings. In those cases where no books were available the bios
itself, including acts and apophthegms and in some cases private
documents, had to suffice; we should not only think of some of
Diogenes’ ‘lives’, but for instance also of Philostratus’ lengthy Life
of Apollonius of Tyana. Conversely, if biographical data were
unavailable they were fabricated from what a person wrote (cf.
Heraclitus’ life-and-death at D.L. IX 1 ff., or Chamaeleon’s and
Satyrus’ manner of composing biographical studies).323 Practices
such as these gave ancient biography, or at least part of it, its bad
name.324 In the present study, however, I am not concerned with
the reliability of the fluid genre from a historical point of view but
with its historic function, or Sitz im Leben. Life and work have to be
in agreement; in some cases the works may be used to reconstruct
the relevant aspects of the bios, but the bios itself, be it detailed or
compressed, is certainly needed to understand the works and
doctrines.

conveniet (cf. also ibid., XI ii.1).

323 See e.g. Fränkel (1955), which has not been superseded by Mouraviev
(1987); Kirk (1962) 4 ff. Chamaeleon the Peripatetic and Satyrus without
compunction converted elements in the works of authors they wrote studies
or biographies of (or in other early literary sources) into anecdotes or data
concerning their discoveries, character and way of life, see e.g. Leo (1901)
104 ff., 118 ff.; Pédech (1961) 117 f. and Kassel (1966) 8 f., on Timaeus of Tau-
romenium (FGrH 566 F 152) ap. Polybius XII 24.1, according to whom τοῦς
ποιητὰς καὶ συγγραφέας ... ἐν τοῖς ὑποκμήσας διαφαίνει τὰς ἐκατέρων φύσεις,
compared by Pédech (who disagrees with Polybius’ critique of Timaeus) and
Kassel with the practices of Chamaeleon and Satyrus; Dihle (1970) 104 ff.
(on Satyrus); Pfeiffer (1978) 189 f. (on Satyrus too); Momigliano (1974) 74, 82
f. [for interesting criticisms of Momigliano’s too schematic distinctions and
worthwhile reflections on ancient biographical writing in general see
an interesting discussion of the precedents in Aristophanes, Aristotle — see
also ibid., 170 ff. — and post-Homeric early Greek poetry in general), and
ibid., 161 ff., for references to the literature too. But see also infra, n. 337 and
text thereto.

324 In general see Lefkowitz (1981).
In many respects — including of course its historical reliability — Porphyry’s *On the Life of Plotinus and the Arrangement of his Books* is superior to a Laërtian ‘life’ or, for that matter, to his own *Vita Pythagorae* dealing with a person who had long been dead. The major difference of the *V. Plot.* with a Laërtian ‘life’ (and with Porphyry’s own *V. Pyth.*) is that there is no section dealing with *placita.* In Diogenes the doctrines as a rule come after the biography and bibliography. The major parallel between a Laërtian ‘life’ and the *V. Plot.* is the combination of biography and bibliography. We therefore are indeed justified in thinking that among the sources used by Diogenes Laërtius, either directly or (more probably) at one or more removes, or rather among the traditions he was indebted to, a number of introductions to individual philosophical *authors* were also to be found:325 representatives of a sort of sub-genre which perhaps we may call by the name of Τὰ πρὸ τῆς ἀναγνώσεως.

The full title of Diogenes’ book according to the *inscriptiones* of two of the three principal manuscripts, viz. F and P,326 is ‘Diogenes Laërtius’ ten books of *Lives and Apopthegms of those who have

---

325 As has already been argued in chapter two above for books III (Plato) and IX (Democritus). For other traditions involved (the *Successions* literature, the literature *On Sects*, the collections of doxai) see e.g. Mejer (1978) 60 ff. As the many extant examples prove, collections of apopthegms circulated on a massive scale. Excellent overview (with references to earlier literature) and discussion of the problems of transmission and contamination that are involved by Gutas (1975) 9 ff. See also the remarks in the introd. of Kindstrand (1991) 8 f., 20 f., 25 ff. The gnomologia could serve as a source for the other genres, and conversely. Wehrli (1973) 193 argues that “die antike Biographie ... gattungsmässig keine strenge Einheit bildet”. Krischer (1982) is right in arguing against Wehrli (and others) that a number of ancient authors were very much aware that they were writing *biographies*, not something else; but this still does not make for a closed genre. Wehrli’s judgement also holds for other historiographical genres or semi-genres. *Successions* as well as *Lives* may contain doxai, and Diels’ Aëtius occasionally includes successions. See further Mansfeld (1986b) 299 ff., where I use these examples in order to argue against too rigid distinctions.

326 See Martini (1899) 82 f., 86 f. The title of ms. B (Martini, *op. cit.*, 79) is much shorter, but Knoepffler (1991) has demonstrated that whenever two of the three primary manuscripts agree against the third their reading will probably be correct. In P a version of the full title is found before the famous list of persons to be found in the ten books. I have argued, Mansfeld (1986b) 310 ff., that this list is reliable; see now the codicological arguments of Dorandi (1992) 121 ff.: from the evidence of mss. P and F (and probably from B as well) it is clear that the lacuna at the end of book VII must have contained rather much more than the missing part of the Chrysippus catalogue.
Distinguished themselves in Philosophy and the Doctrines of Each School
(bίον καὶ γνωμóν τῶν ἐν φιλοσοφία ἐυδοκιμεύσαντων καὶ τῶν ἑκάστη αἰρέσει ἄρεσκόντων κτλ.). 327 The title of a lost work, with exactly the same number of books as that of Diogenes, written by Soranus of Ephesus (ca. 100 CE)—which however does not refer to apophthegms, just as Diogenes' does not list the catalogues which are such an important ingredient of his work—is quite similar: 'Lives of Physicians and Schools and Writings, ten books' (Suda I.4 s.v. Σωρανός, p. 407.23 f., Βίοι ἰατρῶν καὶ αἱρέσεις καὶ συντάγματα βιβλία 1'). He is also said to have written a Successions of the Physicians. 328 This may or may not be the same work, but we should at any rate remember that the book of Diogenes Laërtius is structured according to successions (διαδοχαί), though the word itself does not occur in its title. The so-called Vita Hippocratis secundum Soranum, 329 with its numerous biographical details and


328 A brief quotation at Oribasius, CMG VI 3, p. 132 Raeder, is identified as from ὁ Σωρανός ἐν ταῖς τῶν ἰατρῶν διαδοχαῖς.

329 Edited by Ilberg (1927) pp. 173 ff., and conveniently accessible at Rubin Pinault (1992) 127 f. (Greek text), 7 f. (transl.). The extant vitae of Hippocrates (ps.Soranus, Suda I.2 s.v. Ἱπποκράτης, p. 662.7 ff., Tzetzes, Chil. VII 944-989, and the Vita Bruxellensis) have recently been studied by Rubin Pinault (1992) 28 ff., who argues that all four in one way or another go back to Soranus' Lives of Physicians and Schools and Writings. This is not implausible, but we may believe that biographies of Hippocrates were also written before Soranus and so cannot exclude contamination. At any rate, Rubin Pinault's analysis, which does not include that of the tradition of the Hippocrates manuscripts which contain the Vita Sorani, is far less thorough than Martin's study of the vitae of Aratus (see below, pp. 197 f., complementary note 84). A bios or genos of Hippocrates may also have stood before the edition(s) of Dioscurides and/or Artemidorus Capito (cf. supra, n. 258). It is a fact that Tzetzes names Soranus as his source. I am prepared to accept that there is a strong family resemblance among the four extant vitae (cf. infra, n. 344, on the Plato vitae) but would argue that Ms Rubin Pinault underrates the importance of the differences of the bibliographical sections. The only vita containing a full catalogue is the Brussels life, viz. fifty-three titles. Tzetzes (970-1) does not list any titles, but says Hippocrates wrote fifty-three books so agrees as to the number. Ps.Soranus (CMG IV, p. 177.19 ff.) lists no titles and does not pronounce himself on their number either, because as he says these things are a matter of controversy. The Suda entry (wrong translation at Rubin Pinault (1992) 19) says that the books are very well known, but that the first may be mentioned, viz. (1) Oath, (2) Aphorisms, (3) Prognosis, and (4)
citations of recherché and distinguished sources bears comparison with the biographical section of a Laërtian περὶ τοῦ δείνα (and with Porphyry’s Life of Pythagoras), and the fact that Soranus himself in his major work cited above provided bioi as well as lists of works (catalogues raisonnés) recalls the structure of Thrasyllus’ Introductions to Plato and Democritus, of Porphyry’s Life of Plotinus, and of Possidius’ Life of Augustine. A work of an apparently similar nature, viz. a combination of succession, biographies and catalogues (of the Stoics only) is cited as a work of the Stoic Apollonius by Strabo, XVI 2.24: ‘from Tyre ... a little before our time Apollonius, who composed the Pinax of the Philosophers from Zeno and their Books’ (ἐκ Τύρου ... μικρὸν πρὸ ἡμῶν Ἀπολλώνιος ὁ τῶν Πίνακα ἐκθεῖς τῶν ἀπὸ Ζήνωνος φιλοσόφων καὶ τῶν βιβλίων).330

But there is more to this relation between the living man and the things he wrote, or said. Discussing Thrasyllus’ essay on Plato in chapter two, section 3 above, I have cited some evidence which shows that in certain cases the life, or rather way of life, of a philosopher has a paradigmatic moral and epistemic value. The works of a philosopher, at least some of them, may be studied in view of their usefulness for our own life, and it is precisely this aspect which is the reason why his bios not only helps to understand the writings but should also be consistent with them in a very real way. This is a variety of the more general and wide-spread idea that someone’s words and deeds should not conflict with each other. As applied to the philosopher this conviction becomes especially important from the Hellenistic period onwards,331 though there are also earlier instances.

The claim that the life of someone who is concerned with virtue in a theoretical way should be in agreement with his

330 On Apollonius of Tyre see Goulet (1989a).
331 See in general Cambiano (1983) 118 ff.

the famous Sixtybooks (ἡ πολυθρόλλητος καὶ πολυθαύματος Ἑξηκοντάβιβλος) containing all of medicine. Edelstein (1935) 1292 ff. slightly exaggerates the differences between the vitae, but in my view correctly points out that ps.Soranus is more interested in the exemplary person than in the science of the physician. The Brussels life with its complete catalogue seems to be closer to the genuine Soranus, whereas the Suda entry, though probably indebted to Soranus as well, provides a catalogue which can hardly go back to him; Rubin Pinault (1992) 21 correctly suggests that this list is related to the late Alexandrian order of study (see above, chapter one, section 10). On the interesting proem to a collection of Problematas to be dated to the fourth - seventh cent. CE, which sings the praises of Hippocrates, see Flashar (1962).
doctrines. This theory (λόγος) causes the human being who holds it to contradict his tenet through his actions; indeed his actions and his tenet contradict each other (ὑπεναντιότης τῶν ἔργων καὶ τῆς δόξης). A more generalised version of this critique was the theme of Epicurus’ pupil Colotes’ work That Conformity to the Doctrines of the Other Philosophers Actually Makes it Impossible to Live ("Ὅτι κατὰ τὰ τῶν ἀλλῶν φιλοσόφων δόγματα οὐδὲ ἔστιν, Plut., Adv. Col. 1107D, Non posse 1086C). Though Colotes is not primarily concerned with the contradiction between the actual lives and the doctrines of the philosophers he singled out for criticism, this point is explicitly made against Socrates—who is apparently seen as a sort of proto-Sceptic—at Adv. Col. 1117D: ‘what you said in your dialogues was one thing, but what you actually did was something else again’. Colotes does not in the first place object to the actions themselves (as Plutarch has us believe, Adv. Col. 1117DE) but to the doctrines, which he calls ἀλαξίονας ... λόγους, ‘arguments of a charlatan’ (for this criticism of Socrates also compare Adv. Col. 1118C, 1118F, 1119B). Seneca, De vita beata 18.1 ff., who defends himself against the criticism aliter vivis, ... aliter loqueris, may have such criticisms in mind when he points out hoc ... Platoni obiectum est, obiectum Epicuro, obiectum Zenoni. For this well-known critique against Seneca compare e.g. Cassius Dio LXI x.2, πάντα τὰ ἐναντιώτατα οἷς ἐφιλοσόφει ποιῶν


333 For the attacks of the Epicureans against Socrates see Kleve (1988), who assembles the evidence and points out that they considered Socrates to be an outstandingly bad example, and Long (1988) 155 f.
As a matter of fact, Seneca in his letters emphatically promotes the harmony of doctrine and life. See Ep. 20.2: hoc exegit (sc. philosophia), ut ad legem suam quisque vivat, ne orationi vita dissentiat, and Ep. 108.36, nulos autem peius mereri de omnibus mortalibus iudico quam qui philosophiam velut aliquod artificium venale didicerunt, qui aliter vivunt quam vivendum esse praecipuunt.

A fragment of another Epicurean of the first generation, Polyaenus, is quoted Stob., Ecl. II xv.44 (= Polyaen. fr. 44 Tepedino Guerra), possibly from an Epicurean gnomologium: ‘When the test of the actions is consistent with the solemnity of the theories, we may speak of the doctrine of a philosopher.’ But when the theory promises great things and the life accomplishes not the least bit, what else do we have but boasting and the showing off of a sophist who wishes to impress the young?” (ὅταν μὲν γὰρ τῇ σεμνότητι τῶν λόγων καὶ ἡ πείρα τῶν ἔργων ἐπιταί, τοῦτο τοι χρή καλεῖν δόγμα φιλοσόφου: ὅταν δὲ ὁ μὲν λόγος ἐπαγγέλλεται μεγάλα, ὁ δὲ βίος πράττῃ μηδὲ τούλαχιστον, ἀρα οὐ κόμπος ταύτα καὶ τερατεία σοφιστοῦ καὶ μειρακίων ἀκούας ἐκπλήττειν ἐσπουδακότος;). We may also refer to the famous argument of the Dogmatists that Scepticism by making choice impossible leads to inaction (ἀπραξία, Plut., Adv. Col. 1122AB, cf. D.L. IX 107). It follows that a Sceptic who chooses a line of action is in conflict with his own doctrine. But Pyrrho is said to have lived his Scepticism (D.L. IX 62, ἀκόλοουθος δ’ ἃν ... τῷ βίῳ). Again, speaking of certain philosophers (he calls them sophists, just as Polyaenus) Philo, De congressu 67, says ‘their doctrine is praise-worthy, their way of life blameworthy’ (τούτων ὁ μὲν λόγος ἐπαινετός, ὁ δὲ βίος ψεκτός ἐστι). It is worth one’s while to read the passages collected at Stob., Ecl. II ch. xv (esp. those at xv.14 ff.), ‘On being and seeming, and that a man ought to be judged not on account of his theory but of his character. For all doctrine is superfluous without action’. The loss of the preceding chapter, entitled ‘that the company of the wise should be valued highly, and evil and uneducated people be avoided’ (II xv, ὃτι χρὴ περὶ

334 For Seneca’s position see Cancik (1967) 107 ff., and the fundamental study of Griffin (1991) which is particularly good on the distinction between the authorial I and the real person.

335 Tepedino Guerra (1991) 126 wrongly translates τούτο τοι χρή καλεῖν δόγμα φιλοσόφοιν as “bisogna almeno citare questo dogma di un filosofo”, and so assumes that the words which follow are a quotation.
Cicero, *Tusc. V* 47, ascribes the following thought to Socrates: *qualis cuiusque animi affectus esset, talem esse hominem, qualis autem homo ipse esset, talem esse eius orationem. orationi autem facta similia, factis vitam.* The middle clause is a version of a proverb: Apostolius *Cent. XII, 42c*, ὁ τρόπος, τοιοῦτος ὁ λόγος (*Corpus Paroemigraphorum Graecorum* Vol. II, p. 552). Compare Aristides, *Against Plato on Behalf of Rhetoric* 392 (I, p. 269.2-3), ἡ παρομία ... ἡ λέγουσα ὁ ὁ τρόπος, τοιοῦτον ἐνει γὰρ τὸν λόγον. Plutarch alludes to this proverb at *De recta ratione audiendi*, 41B. Early parallels are Menander's often-quoted line, ἀνδρὸς χαρακτήρ ἐκ λόγου γνωρίζεται (fr. 143 Kock), and Terence, *Heaut. 384*, *quale ingentium haberes, fuit indicio oratio*. Another version is quoted by Philo, *De vita Mosis* I 29, who applies it to his hero: he demonstrated his philosophical tenets by his daily actions, saying what he thought and acting in accordance with what he said in order to achieve consistency between doctrine and life, so that the life was found to be like the doctrine and the doctrine like the life’ (τὰ φιλοσοφίας δόγματα διὰ τῶν καθ’ ἐκάστην ἡμέραν ἔργων ἐπεδείκνυτο, λέγον μὲν οὐκ ἔφρονε, πράττον δὲ ἀκόλουθο τοῖς λεγομένοις εἰς ἀρμονίαν λόγου καὶ βίου, ἵνα ὁ λόγος τοιοῦτος ὁ βίος καὶ ὁ λόγος τοιοῦτος ὁ λόγος ἑξετάζωνται). It is also quoted by Clement, *Strom. VII xvi.100*, ὁ λόγος γὰρ ὁ λόγος, τοῖσδε καὶ ὁ βίος ἐνείᾳ τῷ πιστῷ προσήκει. We may also adduce Musonius, fr. 2 Hense (*ap. Stob. Ecl. II* xxxi.125, p. 244.3-5), who says that the actions of the philosophical pupil should be consistent with the sound doctrines he has been taught (οὗτο ... μόνως ἔσται τις ἐκ φιλοσοφίας ὀφελημένος, ἐν οἷς παραδείκται λόγος ὀδύσων ὑγείας τὰ ἔργα παρέχεται συνφιδά). The Greek parallels for the ascription of varieties of the proverbial expression to Socrates I have found are the following. Stob., *Ecl. II* xv.37: ‘Socrates, when asked whose doctrine is the strongest, replied: of those whose action is consistent with the doctrine’ (Σωκράτης ἐρωτηθείς, τίνων μᾶλιστα ὁ λόγος ἵσχυε, ἄν ὁ πρᾶξις’, έπε, ‘συνακολουθεῖ τῷ λόγῳ’). Stobaeus again, *Ecl. II* xxxi.48: when Socrates was rebuked by someone for his uncivil behaviour he said: ἔγω μὲν τῷ λόγῳ, ὑμείς δὲ τῷ τρόπῳ. Syrianus, *In Hermogenis Peri στάσεων*, p. 19.20 ff., writes: ὁρθότατα γὰρ καὶ
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Σωκράτης ἦμιν τὸ φιλοσοφίας κεφάλαιον (‘quintessence of philosophy’) ... τὸ τοιοῦδε συνεχῶς ἐβόσα ὅιος ὁ βίος, τοιοῦτος ὁ λόγος· ὁιός ὁ λόγος, τοιαύται αἱ πράξεις.’ See also Scholia in Hermogenis Status, Rhetores Graeci IV, p. 87.5 ff.: ὅποιον γὰρ ἂν ἦ τὸ πράγμα, χρηστὸν ἢ φαύλον, τοιοῦτον καὶ τὸ πρόσοπον, ὡς καὶ Σωκράτης βοᾷ· ὅιος ὁ βίος, τοιοῦτος καὶ ὁ λόγος, καὶ οἰός ὁ λόγος, τοιαύται καὶ αἱ πράξεις’.

The ascription of the adage to Socrates may derive from the common view that Socrates is the paradigm of the true philosopher. Xenophon several times states that Socrates words and actions were in agreement, and points out that this influenced his pupils. See Mem. IV 3.18, τοιαύτα μὲν δὴ λέγων τε καὶ αὐτός ποιῶν κτλ., IV 4.25, τοιαύτα λέγων τε καὶ πράττων κτλ. This is expressed in more general terms by Dicaearchus ap. Plutarch, An seni 796E = fr. 29 Wehrli (not verbatim): ‘he [sc. Socrates] was the first to demonstrate that life at all times and everywhere, indeed in all experiences and circumstances, admits philosophy’ (πρῶτος ἀποδείξας τὸν βίον ἄπαντι χρόνῳ καὶ μέρει καὶ πάθει καὶ πράγμασιν ἀπλῶς ἄπασι φιλοσοφίαν δεχόμενον). The closest verbal parallel in Plato for the idea expressed at Cic., Tusc. V 47, is found at Resp. III 400d (for the context see below): τι δ’ ὁ τρόπος τῆς λέξεως, ἢν δ’ ἐγὼ, καὶ ὁ λόγος; οὗ τῷ τῆς ψυχῆς ἦθει ἔπεται;

An interesting instantiation of an inference based on this adage is the dating of the Phaedrus to Plato’s early years, as the first dialogue to have been written. Its subject (according to its second Thrasylean title, Περὶ ἔρωτος) is love. D.L. III 38, citing a psychological explanation, says this issue is one to interest the young: λόγος δὲ πρῶτον γράματι αὐτόν τὸν Φαιδρον· καὶ γὰρ ἔχειν μειρακιώδες τι τὸ πρόβλημα (the Anon. Proleg., ch. 24.6 ff., also refers to the view that the Phaedrus is the earliest dialogue, but provides a quite different reason, viz. that Plato ponders whether or not one should write). Seneca, Ep. 114.1, cites the idea referred to by Cic., Tusc. V 47, as proverbial but this time applies it to a particular style of speaking, or writing, rather than to doctrines: quod audire volgo soles, quod apud Graecos in proverbium cessit: talis hominibus fuit oratio qualis vita. But he uses it in a general moral sense at Ep. 52.8: ... eos qui vita docent, qui cum dixerunt quod faciendum sit, probant faciendo etc. In a letter dealing with the books of the Stoic philosopher C. Fabianus Papirius who had taught him in his youth (a vir egregius et vita et scientia, Ep. 40.12) he points out...
that the author's style shows that he meant what he wrote (*Ep. 100.11, sensisse quae scripsit*). Quintilian XI i.30 uses the idea that style corresponds with character in a generally moralizing context pertaining to forensics: *profert enim mores plerumque oratio et animi secreta detegit: nec sine causa Graeci prodiderunt 'ut vivat, quemque etiam dicere* (cf. also *ibid.*, XII i.29-30). Speaking of Origen, Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* VI 3.7, cites and applies the version found in Apostolius: 'as the doctrine is, so is the character, it is said, and as he (sc. Origen) proved his character, so (he proved) his doctrine’ (οἶνον γοῦν τὸν λόγον, τοιὸνδε, φασίν, τὸν τρόπον καὶ οἶνον τὸν τρόπον, τοιὸνδε τὸν λόγον ἐπεδείκνυτο). See also Lucianus, *Apologia* 3-4, too long to quote, and *Vita Demonactis* 2, where he tells us that Demonax was such an exemplary philosopher that the younger generation were not dependent on the ancient paradigms only (μὴ πρὸς τὰ ἄρχαία μόνα τῶν παράδειγμάτων σφῶς αὐτοὺς ῥυθμίζειν).

Points such as these are to some extent anticipated by the comic poet Aristophanes, who points out (though to a less theoretical or elevated purpose) that a dramatic author's behaviour and character are, or should be, in agreement with, or are illuminated by, that of his *dramatis personae*, and conversely. See for instance his witty adage at *Thesm.* 149-50, 'the poet should have character traits corresponding to (those of the persons in) the dramatic works he has to compose' (χρὴ γὰρ ποιητὴν ἄνδρα πρὸς τὰ δράματα / ἃ δεῖ ποιεῖν, πρὸς ταύτα τοὺς τρόπους ἔχειν).336 Plato, *Resp.* III 396c, 400d (quoted above), argued that there is a relation between a poet's character and his choice of subject.

In relation to drama, poetry or fiction this inference falls rather oddly on modern ears. To us, it is sort of self-evident that we must distinguish, at least to a degree, between the poetic or fictional 'I' and that of the author, and a fortiori between the personality of the author and the various characters that figure in a drama or a novel. We have seen above that in antiquity also another, more sophisticated method of interpretation was current, viz. that ἐκ προσόπου, which allowed critics to distinguish between figures or persons that occur in works of literature on the one hand and

---

their author on the other. In Plato’s case, for instance, whose dramatic philosophical works are works of literature, a distinction was made between those persons who were his mouthpieces and those he disagreed with. But I think that we would still agree that the author of a book which purveys a moral or political message, or which is prescriptive in some other way, had better live up to his own rules, and this is also applicable to Plato’s own life in relation to the doctrines of the personae who are believed to represent him.

Passages from Xenophon’s Memorabilia which stress the agreement between Socrates’ doctrines and his actions have been quoted above. Another important passage, Mem. IV 1.1, is about the exemplum Socratis: he is said to have instructed his pupils through his way of life. We may also cite the honorary decree which the Athenians erected for Zeno the Stoic (quoted in full D.L. VII 10-12; whether or not it is genuine does not matter now). It states that this philosopher ‘presented his own life as a paradigm to all people, in perfect consistency with his doctrines’.

Seneca, Ep. 6.6, tells us that Cleanthes not only followed Zeno’s lectures but also shared in his life: vitae eius interfuit, secreta perspexit, observavit illum, an ex formula sua viveret, that Plato, Aristotle and the other Socratics owed most to the example of Socrates’ way of life, and that Metrodorus, Hermarchus and Polyaeus owed most to the

---

337 For the interpretation ἐκ προσώπου see supra, n. 7 and text thereto, and for its application to Plato supra, n. 134 and text thereto. The theoretical distinction between the poetic ‘I’ and the person of the poet himself seems to go back to G. E. Lessing’s Rettungen des Horaz of 1754. In classical philology it was applied to the bios and poetry of Sappho in a very influential little book by F. G. Welcker, Sappho von einem herrschenden Vorurteil befreit, Göttingen 1816. I have derived this information from the fascinating paper of Calder III (1986). It is quite funny that Welcker’s influential criticism of ancient biographical statements which are derived from an author’s works (cf. supra, n. 323) did not deter Wilamowitz (who accepted Welcker’s view of Sappho) from indulging in phantasy in his Platon, but this is by the way.

338 οὗτος δὲ Σωκράτης ἦν ἐν παντὶ πράγματι καὶ πάντα τρόπον ὕφελμος, οὕτω τῷ σκοπούμενῳ τῷ καὶ μετρίῳ αἰσθανομένῳ φανερὸν εἶναι ὅτι οὐδὲν ὕφελμωτέρον ἦν τοῦ Σωκράτης συνεῖναι καὶ μετ’ ἐκείνου διατριβεῖν ήποιον καὶ ἐν ὁποίων πράγματι ἐκείνῳ μηχανήθαι μὴ παρόντος σὺ μικρὰ ὑφέλει τοὺς εἰσωθότας τοὺς εἰσωθότας τοὺς εἰσωθότας καὶ ἀπεδεχομένους ἐκείνον. καὶ γὰρ πάλιν σουτὶν σουτὶ πάλιν ἐλυσιτέλει τοὺς συνδιατριβούσι.

339 παράδειγμα τὸν ιδίον μὲν ἔκδει ἐπαίσιν ἀκόλουθον ὅτα τοῖς λόγοις οἷς διελέγετο. For Aristophanes’ view of the relation between life and literature and Plato’s ideas about that between literature and life see Arrighetti (1987) 148 ff., 152 ff.
contubernium with Epicurus.\textsuperscript{340} The wise man strives to be useful even after his death (\textit{Ep. 102.30, id agit ut etiam post mortem utilis esse possit}). Accordingly, the \textit{bios} of a philosopher may have prescriptive implications; its utility is not restricted to the help it offers for understanding what he wrote. To be sure, such implications do not hold for the \textit{bios} of the philosopher alone. The life of the statesman or politician too may be exemplary,\textsuperscript{341} and such a person may be presented as an example one should try to emulate or, in certain cases, even to avoid. Yet one may believe that in the case of the philosopher with a message the prescriptive ingredient holds a fortiori precisely because he claims, and often states in writing, that one should live the life of virtue. In the first chapter of his \textit{On Stoic Self-Contradictions}, Plutarch writes as follows:\textsuperscript{342}

In the first place, I require that the consistency of the doctrines be visible in the lives (\textit{τήν τῶν δογμάτων ὁμολογίαν ἐν τοῖς βίοις θεωρεῖσθαι}), for it is even more necessary that the philosopher's

\textsuperscript{340} On this passage see Döring (1979) 19 f. The sentence on Cleanthes is printed as \textit{SVF I} 466; see further \textit{supra}, text to n. 218. See also \textit{supra}, n. 219, n. 220, for the importance, under appropriate circumstance, of the \textit{viva voce} of the master or his immediate disciples or the immediate disciples of these disciples, and \textit{supra}, text to no 117, for Thrasylus. See also Talbert (1974) 90 ff., 93. For the importance of the \textit{contubernium} (‘shared life’) see Hahn (1989) 73.

\textsuperscript{341} Compare Talbert (1978), and for philosophy \textit{ibid.}, 1642 ff., “The Link between the Life and the Teaching/Laws of the Hero”, esp. for the interesting account of Hadrian’s testing of Secundus (for the text see Perry (1964) pp. 70.15 ff.).

\textsuperscript{342} \textit{De Stoic. repugn.} 1033AB; transl. Cherniss, slightly modified. (Plutarch knows the proverb studied above, see \textit{Dem. et Cic.} 1, \textit{Cat. Mai.} 7). As is well known, Plutarch’s main interest when writing a biography is the protagonist’s character (\textit{โดยเฉพาะ}) as demonstrated by his actions (\textit{πράξεις}), see e.g. Leo (1901) 184 ff., and his main objective is “to incite the reader to virtue”; see Stadter (1988) 284, 286. For the importance Plutarch attached to unspectacular but characteristic actions and to “jokes, sayings, anecdotes” (thus Stadter (1988) 286) see the famous programmatic proem to the \textit{Alexander} (and-Caesar), ch. 1.2, 664F-5A, ὡς τὸ γὰρ ἱστορίας γράφομεν ἄλλα βίους, ὡς τοῖς ἐπιφανεστάταις πράξει πάντως ἕνεκεν δήλωσις ἀρετῆς ἢ κακίας, ἀλλὰ πράγμα βραχύ πολλάκις καὶ ῥήμα καὶ παιδιά τις ἐμφασιν ἡθοὺς ἐκοίμης μάλλον ἢ μάχι μυρινόνεροι κτλ. (my italics). On the role played by “Anekdoten und Apophthegmatik” in Plutarch’s biographies see also Dihle (1970) 96 f. (these are “so angeordnet, daß sich aus ihnen allein schon ein Charakterbild und, wenn man will, auch eine Entwicklung des Charakters ergibt”). Leo’s sharp distinction, (1901) 187, between Plutarch’s kind of biography on the one hand and Diogenes’ (and Suetonius’) on the other is obsolete. I note in passing that Plutarch’s \textit{Demosthenes-}and-Cicero are biographies of political figures, not introductions to the works of these men; in fact, these are explicitly excluded in the common proem to this pair, \textit{Demosth.} ch. 3, 847A, τὸ δὲ τοὺς λόγους ἀντεξετάζειν ... ἐάσομεν.
life be in accord with his theory than that the orator's language, as Aeschines says, be identical with that of the law. The reason is that the philosopher's theory is a law freely chosen for his own — at least it is if they believe philosophy to be not a game of verbal ingenuity played for the sake of glory but, as it really is, an activity worthy of the utmost earnestness.

This, in its turn, helps us to understand why the colouring of 'lives' of philosophers changes as the interpretation of their writings changes. To give only one example, the lives to be found in the first lecture of Olympiodorus' course on the Alcibiades and in the Late Neoplatonist Anonymous Prolegomena to Plato's Philosophy are rather different from that in Diogenes book III or from the brief life (§§ 180-189) prefixed to the Middle Platonist account of the physical and moral doctrines in Apuleius, De Platone et eius dogmate. In Diogenes and Apuleius Plato after all is still a human being, however exemplary or even 'divine' he may be. The Late Neoplatonists wanted the consistency of the doctrines according to their interpretation to be visible in the life; consequently, they made their paradigm a much more holy and improbable figure.

---

343 The anecdote-cum-apophthegm at Anon. proleg. 3.28 ff. (the only one in this late work; also told by Olympiodorus, In Gorg. pp. 41.6, 211.11-6) is paralleled at D.L. II 41, i.e. not in the Plato book. Olympiodorus, In Alc. 2.97-110, recounts the anecdotal conversation with the elder Dionysius (cf. also Olympiodorus, In Gorg. pp. 41.7, 212.7-23) which is paralleled at D.L. III 18 and also found elsewhere. See further Swift Riginos (1976) 56 ff., 74 ff.

344 Sinko (1927) argues that the lives in Apuleius, Diogenes Laërtius, Olympiodorus and the Anonymous Prolegomena derive from an Urvita, but he has only looked at the genos section and payed insufficient attention to the rather more interesting differences. The fragments of Plato's bios (without bibliography) in Philodemus, Index Academicorum cols. i-v, should also be compared (on the sources see Gaiser (1988) 85 ff., and Dorandi (1991b) 29 ff.); here there is nothing about Plato that is divine at all. I do not, of course, wish to deny a family resemblance, just as in the case of the vitae of Aratus (see supra, text after n. 84, infra, p. 197 f., complementary note 84) or Hippocrates (see supra, n. 329).

345 For the philosopher as holy man in late antiquity see Fowler (1982) 33-8 and the literature cited supra, n. 321.
Aristotelian who with though the reception of Porphyrii survey is given in the “Introduction” of Westerink 1962; cf. also the French version in Westerink (1990b) xiii ff., and the very detailed discussion of I. Hadot (1990) 23 ff. and passim, 138 ff. (cf. also I. Hadot (1991)). A wonderfully complete list of passages dealing with introductory issues in the late commentaries on Aristotle, the so-called scholia (i.e. remains of late commentaries) on the grammar attributed to Dionysius Thrax, the late rhetorical commentaries on and prolegomena to Hermogenes and others, and in the late commentaries on writings by Hippocrates and Galen is found in the apparatus superior of Westerink (1985) 28. Tables of the issues contained in the Neoplatonist introductions to philosophy in general and to the philosophy and the particular works of Aristotle (and Porphyry’s Isag.) are to be found in Plezia (1949) 11 ff., Westerink (1990a) 342 ff., Moraux (1973) 67 (the general questions only), and I. Hadot (1990) 44 ff. Plezia (1949) 83 ff., Westerink (1992) xxxii ff. (and in the updated version at Westerink (1990b) lxi ff.) and I. Hadot (1990) 30 ff., 46, include the issues listed in the general and particular introductions to Plato, but the distinction between general and particular is less relevant here than in the case of the introductions to Aristotle. A hurried overview is given by Goulet-Cazé (1982) 277 ff., and a selective one by Erler (1991) 83 ff. The Latin equivalents of the Greek technical terms given in chapter one, section 1 above, are those of Boethius, In Isagogen Porphyrii commenta ed. pr., pp. 4.14-5.10. Excellent overview, including tables with the late lists for Aristotle and Plato and a useful comparison with the Prologos of Albinus, in Donini (1982) 50 ff. A competent short survey is given by M. Baltes in Dörrie–Baltes (1993) 167 ff. For the reception of this method in the Middle Ages see Quain (1945) 215 ff., who furthermore, ibid., 243 ff., traces back what is in Boethius to the Aristotelian commentators, and ibid., 256 ff., discusses the late rhetorical introductions and commentaries. Neuschäfer (1987) I, 57 ff., II, 355 ff., “Die Topik des Kommentarprologs”, has to be used with caution. Though the book contains much material one is grateful for, esp. on Origen, and though the author is concerned with the interesting question whether the origin of individual issues has to be sought in literary or philosophical commentaries or in both, the treatment of the pagan commentary literature remains insufficient. The distinction between general and particular isagogic questions unfortunately plays no part whatever, and the issue of Proclus’ contribution remains outside
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the picture. The Neoplatonist commentators on Plato, the Anonymous prolegomena, the earlier Aristotelian commentators, the so-called scholia on Dionysius Thrax and the late commentators on Hippocrates and Galen, to mention only sources for the use of schema which have already been dealt with in the secondary literature, are not discussed.

COMPLEMENTARY NOTE 3 (to p. 10)

For ἀναγιγνώσκειν, ἀνάγνωσις and συνανάγνωσις in the sense of ‘reading of a text in class’ or ‘study of a text under the direction of a master’ see Brun's (1897) and Goulet-Cazé (1982) 264 f.; cf. also supra, text to and after n. 39. ‘Reading for oneself’ is called ψιλή ἀνάγνωσις by Marinus, Vita Procli ch. 9. Further examples in Festugière (1971a) 541 n. 28. Cicero, De or. 1 39 (Crassus speaking), gives the Latin equivalent of συναναγιγνώσκειν: ... Platoni, cuius tum Athenis cum Charmada diligentius legi Gorgiam. In an interesting passage in one of Galen's earlier Hippocratic commentaries (on these see above, chapter four, sections 3 and following), In Hipp. De fract., XVIII.2, 321.7 ff. K., συναναγιγνώσκειν means ‘reading a text together with a pupil’ (my emphasis; ἐγώ γὰρ όταν μὲν παρών παρόντι συναναγιγνώσκω τι βιβλίον, ἀκριβῶς στοχάζομαι δύναμαι τοῦ μέτρου τῆς ἐξήγησεως, ἀποβλέπων ἐκάστοτε πρὸς τὴν τοῦ μαθήματος ἐξίν). But cf. Galen, In Hipp. De art., XVIII.1, 748.1 ff. K., ἕπι μὲν οὖν τὸν ἀναγιγνωσκόντων παρ’ ἑμοί τὸ βιβλίον κτλ., on the reading of a text under the direction of the master. It is of course true that ἀναγιγνώσκειν often means to ‘read’ or ‘study’ on one’s own, though ‘reading’ or ‘studying on one’s own’ is called ἰδίας καὶ καθ’ οὗτον ἀναγιγνώσκειν at Galen, De simplicium medicamentorum temperamentis ac facultatibus, XI, 793.11 K. The reading of a text under the direction of Proclus is described as follows by Marinus, Vita Procli ch. 27: ἀναγιγνωσκών δὲ ἐγώ ποτε παρ’ αὐτῷ τὰ Ὀρφεάς καὶ οὐ μόνον τὰ παρά τῷ Ἱαμβλίχῳ καὶ Σωριανῷ ἀκούσων ἐν ταῖς ἐξήγησεσιν, ἄλλα πλεῖον τε ἄμα καὶ προσφεύσετα τῇ φιλοσοφίᾳ κτλ. A not entirely clear passage in the Index Acad., col. xxii.35-xxii.3 (ed. Dorandi (1991)), speaks of Carneades’ pupil Zeno of Alexandria, who had written up Carneades’ lectures (σοφιάς ἀναγιγνώσας αὐτότι) and was criticized by Carneades in the presence of the other pupils ‘as these notes were read’ (τῶν ὑπομνημάτων ἀναγιγνωσκομένων). Though in this passage ὑπομνημάτα certainly does not mean ‘commentaries’ or the verb ‘studied’, we nevertheless seem to have here an early instance of the reading in class of a text, which this time is an account of the lectures of the master himself. We may presumably believe that Clitomachus’ voluminous lecture-notes were so to speak authorized. For the practice of taking notes of a master’s lectures see also Index Acad., O 30 ff., p. 157, on Apollonius pupil of Telecles, ὥς καὶ ὑπομνημάτα ὑπομνημάτα ἐκ τῶν] σοφιῶν αὐτοῦ. Here we seem to have another instance of authorized reporting. Parody at Lucian, Hermotimus 2, ὑπομνηματά τῶν ἱστοριῶν ἀπογραφομένων. See further Sedley (1989) 103 ff., and cf. also supra, n. 39 and text thereto. According to Philodemus, Ad iunt., col. iv.5 ff., one of his opponents claimed to be the ‘true reader [i.e., exegete] of selected
writings [or rather: passages] and a great number of treatises' (sc. of Epicurus; ἡς εἰν[α]λ ὁ γνήσιος ἀνάγνωσ[σ]τις ἐκ γραφάς [ἐγγέλει]τάς καὶ[π] πλήθε συγγρα[μμ]άτων. Ed. Angeli (1988)). For the very much later usage cf. Lamberz (1987) 5, who somewhat cavalierly states “Der Terminus [sc. συνανάγνωσις] kann sich sowohl auf den gelesenen Text als auch auf dessen mündliche Erklärung beziehen”. Usener (1892) 183 with n. 6, citing parallel passages, points out that ἀνάγνωσις (just as ἐκδοσις, see Usener, *ibid.*, 188 with n. 15) may even simply mean ‘text’; this perhaps explains to some extent why Origen and, much later, Proclus preferred συνανάγνωσις (see *supra*, text to n. 28, text to n. 37). For the meaning ‘text studied’ or even ‘section of a text’ see also Zuntz (1945) 105. In the fragment of Theophrastus’ letter to Phanius ἀπ. D. L. V 37 ἀνάγνωσις means the ‘reading of one’s own text before an audience’, see Sollenberger (1992) 3872 ff. It also has this meaning at Proclus, *In Parm.* p. 863.2. For the verb cf. *supra*, n. 183.

**Complementary Note 64 (to p. 40)**

See also Müller (1969). Alexander’s arguments against Andronicus’ rejection of the De int. have been preserved at Boethius, *In de Int. ed. sec.*, pp. 11.13-12.19 (the beginning of which is printed as T 75 h in Düring (1957) 419); this passage is believed to derive from Porphyry’s lost major commentary. A somewhat different account (see Moraux (1973) 118 ff.) is found at Ammonius, *In De int.* pp. 5.24-6.14 (T 75 j in Düring (1957) 416) and in Philoponus, *In De an.* p. 27.21 ff. (T 75 o in Düring (1957) 418); these men moreover do not mention Alexander’s name though they do refer to Andronicus. For the *Postpraedicamenta* see *supra*, n. 66. Moraux (1973) 83 f. also refers to (not always indubitable) evidence pertaining to pre-Andronicus discussions of the authenticity of Aristotelian works. A brief but quite detailed historical overview of “die antike Echtheitskritik” beginning with Herodotus on the *Cypria* (II 116 ff.) and the *Epigoni* (IV 32) as not by Homer is given by Speyer (1971) 114 ff.; cf. also Sedley (1989) 106. Apart from a few incidental references the discussion in the early Church which from the last decades of the second century resulted in a growing consensus about the canon of the (Old and) the New Testament, has not been included, because its study should be left to the colleagues in the department of theology. Suffice it to say that also the orthodox Christians and the Gnostics were concerned with “Echtheitskritik”. See now Grant (1993).

This may be the best occasion to point out that questions of authen­ticity and attribution are discussed a number of times in the vicinity of the catalogues of individual philosophers (or elsewhere in their ‘lives’) in Diogenes Laërtius, though this is by no means a standard feature. Sometimes quite early authorities are adduced in this context, e.g. Zeno of Citium’s pupil Persaeus, who rejected a number of dialogues attributed to Aeschines of Sphettus (D.L. II 61 = SVF I 457), Satyrus, who in book four of his *Bioi* said that Diogenes the Cynic left nothing in writing (D.L. VI 80; i.e. the numerous works that are attributed are not by him), and the Stoic philosopher Panaetius, who was particularly critical as
On Andronicus' edition and editorial methods see further the more cautious account of Gottschalk (1990) 56 ff., who points out, ibid. 58, that we can only say that Andronicus discussed a few isagogical questions. In this context Moraux should certainly have adverted to the precedents for purpose and utility in Aristotle himself, see Top. A 1.100a18, πρόθεσις τῆς πραγματείας. Compare Fuhrmann (1960) 144 with n. 3, who points out that πρόθεσις in this sense also occurs in Anaximenes' Ars rhet. (i.e. in ps.Arist., Rhet. ad Alex.), viz. 2.2 = 1423a21 ff., 2.10 = 1423b34, 2.35 = 1425b31; cf. also Fortunatianus, Ars rhet. I 7, Rhet. lat. min., p. 86.30 Halm, scopos autem [sc. est] id quod omnis efficit ductus [sc. orationis]. For utility see Arist., Top. A 101a25 ff., πρός πόσα και τίνα χρήσιμός ἐστιν πραγματεία, with the comments of Alexander, In Top. p. 1.3 ff.; see already Rabe (1931) vi. For the πρόθεσις of an oration, which comes before the πίσις and summarizes the facts, see Arist. Rhet. Γ 13.1414a35 ff. Aristotle also uses other formulas, viz. περὶ διὸν/οὗ ὁ λόγος/τὸ δράμα, see Meijering (1987) 108. Cf. also the opening sentence, which speaks of the theme in general terms, at Arist. An. po. A 1.24a10, πρῶτον ... εἰτεὶ περὶ τί καὶ τίνος ἐστὶν ἡ σκέψις. Cf. also the introduction of ps. (?)Arist., Magna mor. A 1.1182a24-b27. According to Aristoxenus, Elementa harmonica p. 39.8 ff. da Rios, Aristotle always told his audience περὶ τίνον δ' ἐστιν ἡ πραγματεία καὶ τίς. In fact, the custom to announce the theme of a work in the proem or opening sentence(s) is as old as Greek literature; it begins with the Homeric epics. Zuntz (1945) 80 ff.
discusses the evidence for the listing of contents in a wide range of authors, with particular attention to rhetorical precepts. Neuschäfer (1987) I, 60, 66, derives the later use of σκόπος from Arist., Met. A 2.983b22, but the conclusions drawn by him from this single instance are too sweeping. Precedent for the issue of the notion of τάξις is found in the proem of the Mete., A 1.338a20 ff., where Aristotle refers in succession to the first part of the Physics, to Phys. V-VIII, to De cael. I-II, to De cael. III-IV and to the De generatione et corruptione, and announces the part that is to follow at 338a20 with the words λατινόν δ’ ἕστι μέρος τῆς μεθόδου ταύτης κτλ. The Politics are announced as the sequel of the Ethics at the end of the Eth. Nic., K ix.1186b22 ff., and from the prologues to the De mot. animal. and the De progr. animal. it is clear that in this order these two opuscula follow the De part. animal. There is also other early evidence, for in both his physical Epitomae Epicurus emphasizes utility. In the proem to the Ad Herod. (ap. D.L. X) 47, he says that the compendary method just described is ‘useful’ (χρήσιμως σύνης ...) τῆς τουμάτης ὑδατι) even for all those who have mastered the study of nature (cf. supra, text before and after n. 145; below, pp. 202 f., complementary note 288). In the proem to the Ad Pyth. (ap. D.L. X) 85, he says that the compressed arguments regarding the celestial and meteorological phenomena will be ‘useful’ (χρήσιμα τά διαλογίσματα ταύτα) for many others too, especially for those who have barely begun the scientific study of nature or are too busy to give it much time. Epicurus here also shows, implicitly, what is his intenio auctoris. A quite early example of this authorial intention (though a different term is used, viz. προαίρεσις) is in Attalus, see supra, n. 295, and for an important parallel in Galen supra, text to n. 251. Utility, again, is an important ingredient in the definition of techne (‘art’, ‘scientific discipline’) attributed to Zeno of Citium and found in numerous sources, who quote or rather use it both with and without Zeno’s name. The first text at SVF I 73 is Olympiodorus, In Gorg. p. 70.7 ff.: Ζήνων δὲ φησιν ὅτι τέχνη ἑστὶ σύστημα ἐκ καταλήψεων συγγεγυμοσμένων πρός τι τέλος εὑρησθαι τῶν ἐν τῷ βίῳ (my italics). Arist., Met. A 1.981b14 ff., distinguishes the useful aspect (χρήσιμον) of the arts and sciences from the cognitive, and at Eth. Nic. A 1.1094a1 ff. points out that every techne and scientific discipline strives for some good. The topos of the χρήσιμον even dates back to the Sophists, see Heinimann (1961). Now techne may stand for ‘art’ or ‘discipline’ in general, but may also (depending on the context) mean an art or a discipline, or even a book about such a discipline. Such a techne can be long but also short, and be addressed to professionals and pupils —but also to the general public, as Horace’s Ars poetica, or Lucian’s Quomodo historia conscribenda sit. The usefulness of a book or treatise may depend on its subject rather than on its treatment of its subject, or conversely, or of course on both. Authors of books dealing with an art or discipline, but also for example historians, in their introductions habitually stress the usefulness of their theme; see e.g. Herkommer (1968) 128 ff., also for references to the texts (e.g. already Thuc. I 22.4, φέλιμα) and to further scholarly literature; cf. also Neuschäfer (1987) I, 253, who includes the poets. See also e.g. Lucian, Quom. hist. consc. 9, who argues that the division of the useful (χρήσιμον) and the pleasant, which may be
apposite in poetry (cf. Horace, *Ars poet.* 332-44), should have no place in the writing of history, where what is pleasant may either be or not be a concomitant of what is useful.

**Complementary Note 84 (to p. 49)**

For the reconstruction of the ancient traditions and of Theon of Alexandria's purported commentary see Martin (1956b), esp. 130 ff., 197 ff. Pfeiffer (1978) 154 n. 90 *ad finem* dismisses Martin's attribution to this Theon ("Niemand, der recht mit Theons Kommentaren zu den großen hellenistischen Dichtern vertraut ist, wird an die von Martin S. 195 ff. versuchte Rekonstruktion seiner Ausgabe glauben"). For Theon's activities see Wendel (1934), where a work on Aratus is not mentioned. Martin (1956b) has been critically assessed by Keydell (1958), who admits that important progress has been achieved but rejects the attribution to the grammarian Theon (because the scholia are mostly concerned with the astronomical contents), and argues that the prolegomena as well as the *vitae* cannot as easily be traced back to an early *Urquelle* as Martin believed. Ludwig (1965) rather favours Martin's reconstruction of the tradition. Maas' analysis has been superseded but further research seems necessary; Martin (1974) p. iv stuck to his guns as to the remains of what he calls the Alexandrian commentary, but is less confident that it is to be attributed to "Theoni ... grammatico", though this attribution had been accepted by Irigoin (1957) 303. Against Pfeiffer and Keydell one may object that Didymus' comments on Demosthenes are historical rather than grammatical (cf. *supra*, n. 72, and the literature there cited) and so are, *mutandis mutatis*, a parallel for the astronomical rather than grammatical comments of Theon on Aratus. A useful brief overview of the ancient subdivisions of Aratus' epic and their titles or headings (some of the more detailed ones may be later) is found at Martin (1956a) xxii ff. Hipparchus, *In Arati et Eudoci Phaenomena commentariorum libri tres*, I ch. 1.3, attests the existence of numerous commentaries on Aratus already by the second century BCE. The Stoic Diogenes of Babylon's pupil Boethus of Sidon wrote one in at least four books (Geminus, *Elementa astronomiae* ch. 17, 198.25 ff. Manitius = ch. 17.48 Aujac cites book four: ... Βόθυς ο Φιλόσοφος εν τοι τετάρτῳ βιβλίῳ τῆς Ἀράτου ἔξηγήσεως — not in *SVF* III). Information deriving from these earlier works has been preserved in the remains we still have, see Martin (1956b) 201. Goulet (1980) 15 ff. cautiously argues that the astronomical treatises of Geminus and Cleomedes were written to serve as introductions to the study of Aratus. He points out that in some manuscripts these works are found together with (parts of) the epic, and argues that the formula εἰσαγωγῆ εἰς τὰ Φαίνομενα (i.e. the poem) not φαινόμενα (the phenomena themselves). I have not been able to come round to this idea, though I am prepared to believe that Geminus and Cleomedes may on occasion have been *used* as aids to the study of Aratus, just as the adapted excerpts from Achilles' *On the All* (or
On the Sphere; see supra, n. 281 and text thereto) were recycled as an Εἰσαγωγή to Aratus. The text of Cleomedes’ compilation (that it is one is stated in the final sentences, II ch. 7.11 ff.) is mostly found in manuscripts of miscellanea; by no means all of these contain Aratus too, and in one of the earlier ones, Vatic. gr. 1702, Cleomedes occurs after not before Aratus (see Martin (1956b) 243, 260, and the “codicum praeципiumorum conspectus” at Todd (1990) v ff.). Geminus’ little book too is found mostly in manuscripts of miscellanea, and most of the time not in the company of Aratus; see Aujac (1975) xci ff. As to the meaning of εἰσαγωγή εἰς, it should be pointed out that the εἰσαγώγει for whom Galen’s three introductory works,viz. the Περὶ αἱρέσεων τὸς εἰσαγομένως, the Περὶ σφυγμῶν τοῖς εἰσαγομένοις and the Περὶ ὀστῶν τοῖς εἰσαγομένοις (De ord. libr., p. 84.2 ff.) were written, were introduced to subjects not texts. On [Hippocrates’] De off. med. as a κοινὸν ἀπάσης τέχνης [medicine as a discipline, not a book] προοίμιον or εἰσαγωγή see above, chapter four, section 5 ad finem. But it is in fact already sufficient to refer to Chrysippus’ Περὶ τῆς εἰς τὸν νευδόμενον εἰσαγωγής πρὸς τὸν ‘Αριστοκρέοντα α’ in the catalogue ap. D.L. VII 196 = SVF II, p. 7.34; the so-called Liar is a logical paradox, not a book (for similar Chrysippean titles see SVF II, pp. 6.28.30, 7.35). In Origenes, Philologia ch. 3.9 ff., we read ὡς γάρ τὸ κβ’ στοιχεῖα εἰσαγωγή δοκεῖ εἶναι εἰς τὴν σοφίαν καὶ τὰ θεία παράδειγμα τοῖς χαρακτῆρι τούτους ἐντύπωμα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, οὕτω στοιχείωσις ἐκτὸς εἰς τὴν σοφίαν τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ εἰσαγωγή εἰς τὴν γνώσιν τῶν ἄντων, τὸ κβ’ θεόπνευστα βιβλία (for the text, a fragment of the early commentary on Ps 1, see Harl (1983) 261; cf. also supra, text to n. 12a). I note in passing that Goulet does not make use of Martin’s edition of the scholia vetera or of his study of the ancient commentary tradition and that Martin, in his turn, paid no attention to the part possibly played by Geminus and Cleomedes in the exegetical traditions concerned with Aratus.

Complementary note 110 (to p. 63)

The existence of an important edition (or editions) with diagnostic signs (cf. supra, text to n. 135, and below, pp. 204 f., complementary note 316) is attested at D.L. III 65-6, in a somewhat earlier Papyrus florentina (mid-second century CE), and in a fragmentary Latin text cited below, see Dörrie-Baltes (1990) 92 ff., 347 ff. Gigante (1986) 67 ff. suggests that the text on the Florentine papyrus and its parallel in Diogenes derive from Antigonus of Carystus but provides no evidence. Solmsen (1981) 106 ff. is certainly right in arguing that this critical Plato edition must be later than the Alexandrian editions of Homer. Cf. also Baltes in Dörrie–Baltes (1990) 350, who points out that the expression dogma uniuscuiusque philosophi of the so-called Anecdoton Cavenense (printed Dörrie–Baltes (1990) 96) suggests that this particular sign system may have been applied to philosophers in general. We do not know which works the critical edition contained and which were left out. The quotation from Antigonus of Carystus’ Life of Zeno at D.L. III 66, which tells us that whoever wanted to read through the books of Plato that had been νεωστὶ
ἐξδοθέντα paid a fee to the owners does not prove the existence of what we would call a publication, because ἐξδοθέντα here means no more than ‘been made available’, cf. supra, n. 105 and text thereto, n. 106. See the cogent arguments of Cavallo (1984) 8 f.; the emphatic protest of Gigante (1986) 61 ff. fails to convince. There is no reason to deny that these owners were the people in charge of the Academy. Antigonus’ νεοστί, ‘recently’, presumably refers to a date around, say, 280-270 BCE. It is precisely the lack of such an edition, or an edition in common circulation, which made it worthy of note that Arcesilaus owned Plato’s books (D.L. IV 32); cf. Tarrant (1993) 4. See also Philodemus, Index Acad. col. xix.14-6, who tells us that Arcesilaus acquired these when still a young man, ... Πλάτωνος καὶ γάρι ἐκέκτης’ ἔτι νέος ὄν] τὰ βυβλία] αὐτοῦ. These books, no doubt, were private copies made at his own expense. Compare the activities of the Epicurean Philonides (to be dated to the first half of the second century BCE), who devoted much energy to collecting the books of Epicurus according to Philodemus(?), Life of Philonides (P.Herc. 1044) fr. 66.6 ff. Gallo, ἄσποδὴ[ν ἔχον τῆς] συναισχυνθῆς τὸν Ἐπεικίκοι[ν] βυβλίων, ἔπερ Ῥώμης καλλί. Barnes (1991b) 123 ff. is to be particularly recommended for his deflation of the speculations concerning Academic and other early so-called editions of Plato, though it cannot be denied that the Academy must have possessed a text of all the works (cf. Tarán (1976) 763 f., who further points out that the evidence is against the assumption that this text was arranged either according to trilogies or according to tetralogies). There is no evidence whatever that Thrasyllus published an edition; those who believe he did because of his contribution to the tetralogic arrangement are obliged to accept that he also published an edition of the works of Democritus. I note in passing that Alcinous, Albinus, Theon of Smyrna and Proclus all wrote introductions to Plato without producing an edition of the works, like a number of others, e.g. Dercyllides (on whom see supra, n. 111 and text thereto). Tarrant (1983) is committed to the belief that Thrasyllus published a complete edition of Plato and attempts to prove that he interpolated the text, but I find this version even more unconvincing than the other views that have been ventilated.

Complementary Note 256 (to p. 140)

Zeuxis and Heraclides of Tarentum are Empiricists; see Deichgräber (1965) 168 ff. (fragments of Glaucias), 209 ff. (fragments of Zeuxis), 172 ff. (fragments of Heraclides), 220 ff., 317 ff. (texts concerned with “Die Hippokratererklärung” of the Empiricists, with addenda, 409 ff.; cf. also Smith (1979) 199 ff., 208 ff.). The Empiricists were especially interested in the Epidemics. Glaucias is mentioned as a glossographer at In i Epidem., CMG V 10.1, p. 230.12 ff. (cf. In vi Epid., CMG V 10.2,2, pp. 411.30 ff. and 481.1), but at In vi Epid., p. 174.20 ff., he is mentioned together with Heraclides of Tarentum (other names have disappeared in a lacuna), at p. 212.20 ff. he is listed as one of a number of commentators, while at p. 114.1 ff. Zeuxis’ opposition to his explanation and rewriting of a lemma (τὴν προκειμένην ρήσιν) is cited, and p. 451.36 ff. Zeuxis is cited
again, this time for a verbatim quotation of Glaucias’ explanation of another lemma (‘Ausspruch’). On Zeuxis see also Kudlien (1972) and Kollesch (1975). Bacchius and Heraclides of Erythrae are Herophileans; see von Staden (1989) 484 ff., 555 ff. On Galen’s use of earlier sources in his commentaries see Smith (1979) 146 ff., 153 ff., 159 f., 164 ff., who argues that the information about the earlier authorities that are cited is at second or even third hand (viz. from Galen’s notes of, or from what he remembers of, the commentaries or comments of his teachers, or derived from the commentaries of Asclepiades, Rufus of Ephesus and Rufus of Samaria, see ibid., 225 f., 240 ff. See also Pfaff (1932)). But Smith is occasionally hypercritical, see Kudlien (1989) 366 ff., and especially von Staden (1991), who proves that Galen at the very least used some works by Herophilus, Heraclides of Tarentum and Zeuxis (though he points out that Galen’s information on a number of Herophileans — and often on Herophilus himself — may have been cited from sources such as Archigenes, or Aristoxenus’ De secta Herophilii). We may also infer such a conclusion from the following example. At In De off. med. XVIII.2, 631.13 ff. K., Bacchius is listed among the commentators; Galen says that he did not write commentaries on all the Hippocratic works (which in my view means that according to Galen he anyhow wrote several). At In ii Epid., p. 230.12 ff., Bacchius and Glaucias are mentioned as glossographers, and Zeuxis and Heraclides of Tarentum as commentators. Smith (1979) 146 confronts these two passages and infers that “the statement about Bacchius as commentator is erroneous”. To be sure, the Lexeis in three books is a well-attested work, cited numerous times in Erotian’s lexicon. The note in the so-called Vita Bruxellensis published by Schöne (1903) [conveniently accessible in Rubin Pinault (1992) 131 ff. (Latin text), 25 ff. (transl.)], lines 64-6, <B>accius autem Erophi sectator is commorat [emended to Erophi sectator memorat by Schöne] post aforismos de infantis natura fecisse Ypocratem (not discussed by von Staden, though at 1989) 500 he assigns the passage to the glossary) may derive either from the glossary or from a commentary, but perhaps from the latter rather than from the former. The catalogue in the vita purportedly presents the Hippocratic writings in chronological sequence, but this does not entail that the note about Bacchius is fictitious too. A preoccupation with the chronological order of composition of these two Hippocratic works would not be out of place in the prologue of a commentary on either of them. Furthermore, at In vi. Epid., CMG V 10,2,2, pp. 8 ff., Bacchius is listed among those who wrote ὑπομνήματα. In Galen this is not yet the technical term for ‘commentaries’, though it often has this meaning; yet in the present passage it can hardly mean anything else. Several other references in Galen are to the glossary, though one of these, In Aphor. XVIII.1, 186.18 ff. K., may just as well pertain to a commentary. At In iii Epid., CMG V 10,2,1, p. 87.9 ff., however, in the interesting report (which according to von Staden (1991) 212 probably derives from Zeuxis and Heraclides of Tarentum but may be considered to be reliable) about the learned discussions and publications concerned with the meaning and authenticity of the mysterious letter symbols (or characters, χαρακτηρες), found appended to a number of case histories in the manuscripts —
though not in all of them — of Hippocrates (see Wenkebach (1920) and (1925)), Bacchius’ *ekdosis* of *Epid. III* (τὴν ὑπὸ Βαχχίου γενομένην ἔκδοσιν) is compared with copies of the same work in the royal library or ‘from the ships’ (i.e. allegedly confiscated by the king for the library). According to Smith (1979) 202 this means that “he copied, or had someone copy, at least one Hippocratic work, the work we call *Epidemics* 3”. It should be pointed out, however, (1) that a discussion of symbolic signs does not seem to belong in a glossary, and (2) that a quoted ἔκδοσις can hardly be a private copy. It is on the other hand improbable (*pace* Wenkebach (1925) 52 f., and von Staden (1989) 489) that Bacchius published a regular edition of *Epid. III*. The solution, I believe, is that ἔκδοσις here means ‘interpretation’, which would certainly be appropriate in the context of Galen’s exposition, and support the ascription of a commentary to Bacchius (we must observe that Galen does not attribute a monograph on the problem of the signs to Bacchius, though he cites monographs on this topic by other Hellenistic Hippocratic scholars). For this meaning of the word in later Greek see Lampe’s *Patristic Greek Lexicon*, *s.vv.* ἔκδοσις, 2.a, and ἔκδιδωμι, 2. At Proclus, *In Remp.* II, p. 109.11, printed Dörrie–Baltes (1990) 15, ἔκδεδοκασον likewise means ‘interpreted’ (their translation ‘herausgegeben’ is certainly wrong). As to the χαρακτήρες themselves, the hypothesis of Fraser (1972) I, 325 f., followed by Kudlien (1989) 362 f., that these were diagnostic signs to be compared with those in the Alexandrian texts of Homer is entirely speculative and, as I believe, wrong.

It is not hard to understand how the word *ekdosis* came to mean ‘interpretation’. A regular publication involves a *diorthosis*, i.e. a revision and correction of the text that is released to a public. The elimination of trivial errors is not a problem, but serious difficulties or even cruces are common phenomena. In such cases an editor may change the text according to the way he believes it should run, that is to say depending on how he understands or interprets it. Suggestions of this nature may also be made by commentators, or by exegetes in a more general sense, who explain a lemma, or a phrase or formula, and propose a ‘reading’ which is in fact a micro-edition of a particular passage, and who may either justify the transmitted text or emend it. Hence ‘interpretation’. Not all the predecessors cited by Erotian in his proem (pp. 4.21-5.19) are authors of glossaries, or of glossaries only; some among them wrote substantial polemical treatises, and some may have written commentaries as well. In such polemical treatises or commentaries you will find micro-editions of particular words or phrases (but not, of course, of symbols, though these may be explained). Anyhow, second-hand information (e.g. on Bacchius’ or Glauclias’ commentaries via Zeuxis via perhaps someone else) is not necessarily unreliable, think for instance of Simplicius citing Porphyry who quotes Dercyllides verbatim, or of Theon of Smyrna quoting Dercyllides verbatim who in his turn cites Eudemus of Rhodes (see *supra*, text to n. 111). Real difficulties encountered in the interpretation of the texts and the evaluation of the doctrines may have fostered theories of multiple authorship or forms of *Schichtenanalyse* not unlike those of today, the difference being that ancient scholars appealed to biographical data in a creative way or, if

---
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they thought fit, invented them. Yet such invention is not always wholly without a basis in historical fact. Hipparchus, *In Arat.* I chs. 2-3, had proved by philological means that Aratus, in the first main part of his poem, had versified an astronomical treatise of Eudoxus (the scholarly hypothesis of a pseudo-Eudoxus as Aratus’ source has now been refuted by Pingree (1971) 347 ff.) The results of Hipparchus’ argument were converted into the apocryphal story that king Antigonus Gonatas commissioned Aratus to put Eudoxus’ work into verse, as is reported in some of the *vitae* (*Schol. in Arat. vet.*, pp. 4.24 ff., 8.6 ff., 8.28 f., 16.24 ff.), and letters by Aratus were forged in support of, or at least based on and then cited in support of, this story (*Schol. in Arat. vet.*, pp. 8.14 ff.). See Martin (1956b) 170 ff.

**Complementary Note 288 (to p. 157 f.)**

See the letter (T 25a in *Düring* (1957) 284 f.) quoted by Plutarch — well-known Middle Platonist of Pythagorean leanings — in which Alexander, who according to Plutarch had also been instructed in the esoteric doctrines *τῶν ἀπορρήτων καὶ βαθυτέρων διδασκαλιῶν,* ὥς ὁι ἄνδρες ἰδίως ἀκροαματικάς καὶ ἐποτικάς (cf. *supra*, n. 9) προσαγορεύοντες οὐκ ἐξέφερον εἰς πολλοὺς, μετασχεῖν, *Alex.* 7.7, 668B = T 76 d in *Düring* (1957) 429, also to be consulted for parallels], reproaches Aristotle for publishing (!) his acroamatic writings. Plutarch paraphrases Aristotle’s reply. See further Gellius, *Noct. Att.* XX v (T 76 f in *Düring* (1957) 431 f.), about the distinction between Aristotle’s exoteric and esoteric writings; he transcribes both letters (in the original Greek) which he says he got from a ‘book by Andronicus’ (*ex Andronicī philosophī libro*). The reference must be to the *Pinakes* (which was a book), not to the edition of Aristotle. Simplicius, *In Phys.* p. 8.17 ff., explaining why Aristotle ἐν τοῖς ἀκροαματικοῖς ἀσάφειοι ἐπιτήδευσε, quotes both these letters and refers to Plutarch’s explanation, not to Andronicus (p. 8.29-31, Πλούταρχος δὲ ὁ Χαίρονεῖς ἐν τῷ Ἀλεξάνδρου βίῳ ἐπὶ τῇ ἐκδόσει τῆς Μετὰ τὰ φυσικὰ ταῦτα γεγράφατι φησιν). *Face* *Düring* (1957) 286, 433, and *pace* Gottschalk (1990) 60, I believe that Andronicus posited they were forgeries, for if he had thought they were genuine he would have added them to the *Letters* included in his edition. If this is correct, the forgeries must be pre-Andronician and have circulated independently of the *Pinakes*. That notwithstanding Andronicus’ rejection they were accepted at face-value by Plutarch and Gellius is another thing entirely. Sensible comments on this correspondence are found in Boas (1953) 80 ff.: no secret doctrines but a distinction between relatively simple and more difficult works. See also Seneca, *Ep.* 95.64, on the distinction between simple *praecepta* (‘practical rules’) and difficult *decreta* (i.e. *δόγματα*, ‘philosophical doctrines’ see *ibid.*, 95.10): *idem dicere de praeceptis possum: aperta sunt, decreta vero sapientiae in abdito. Sicut sanctiora sacrorum tantum initiati sciunt, ita in philosophia arcana illa admisiss receptisque in sacra ostenduntur; at praecepta et alia huissusmodi profanis quoque nota sunt* (cf. le Boulluec (1957) 352 ff.). A quite similar view is expressed by Lucian, *Hermotimus or On Sects* 20: it is not easy to make a responsible choice between the sects because the
doctrines of the schools are ‘secret and invisible’ and can only be learned by studying hard (ἔτσιν ὀπόρρητα καὶ ἐν ἄφανεί κεῖμενα, λόγοις καὶ συνουσίαις ἀναδεικνυμένα καὶ ἔργοις τοῖς ὁμοίωσ ὀνεῦ μάλις). On the Clement passage see further Boas (1953) 89, and the detailed comments of le Boulluec (1981) 211 ff., who speaks of “l’influence de platoniciens pythagorisants” on the wording of this passage, a suggestion rejected by Mme Hadot (who affirms that the idea derives from a “milieu juif alexandrin”) but with which I am inclined to agree. See also supra, n. 194 and text thereto, for the parallels in Porphyry and Aelius Theon. The earliest references to the distinction between esoteric and exoteric works written by Aristotle (and Theophrastus) are Cic., Ad Att. IV 16.2 = Düring (1957) T 76 a, and De fin. V 12 = Düring (1957) T 76 b; esp. the latter passage is interesting: de summo autem bono duo genera librorum sunt, unum populariter scriptum quod ἔξωτερικὸν appellabant, alterum limiatius [i.e. ‘with more attention to the stylistic details’], quod in commentariis [i.e. ὑπομήματα] reliquerunt. Düring (1957) 427 f. in his unsatisfactory comments submits that Cicero’s source is Antiochus. We may observe that Cicero suggests that the ἔξωτερικά are less difficult and that he clearly distinguishes between two different kinds of public; but he does not speak of the obscurity of the ὑπομήματα. The distinction is also referred to in passing by Galen, De substantia naturalium facultatum fragmentum (or De propriis placitis), IV, 758.6-11 K. = Düring (1957) T 76 g (cf. also supra, n. 36), who deals with seeming contradictions in Plato. These are to be resolved in a similar way as those between the different classes of writings of Aristotle and Theophrastus (διαφωνίᾳ οὖ χρή τοῦτο νομίζειν εἶναι, τάνδρος ἐαυτῷ τάναντια λέγοντος, ὡσπερ οὖδ’ Ἀριστοτέλους ἢ Θεοφράστου, τὰ μὲν τοῖς πολλοῖς γεγραφότοιν, τὰς δὲ ἀκρόκεκις τοῖς ἑταῖροις. ὡστε γὰρ τὸν ἐκφευγόντων ἀπασαν αἰσθήσιν δόμα πολλῶν λόγων δεόμενον εἰς ἀποδείξιν ἀκτικάσει λέγοντι, προσκρούει τοῖς ἀκόουσιν). On dark riddles in the Pythagoreans and (ps.)Plato see e.g. Mansfeld (1993a) 188 ff., 204 ff. The pseudepigraphic Platonic Second Letter, 312d, 314c, on riddles and esoteric doctrines, is quoted at Clement, Strom. V ix.65.1-3, i.e. is found not long after the passage quoted in the text; see further le Boulluec (1981) ad loc., 231 f. Clement’s note on the Epicureans faintly echoes Epicurus’ own distinction, in the proem to the Ad Herod., 35-6, between those who are not in a position to study all his works dealing with physics or even the major writings, and those who actually have mastered the books but still find a short synopsis most useful (cf. supra, text after n. 144; above, pp. 195 f., complementary note 65). For the various views of the Stoics concerned with the order of study of the parts of philosophy see D.L. VII 40-1. For Chrysippus on the theological part of physics as the last to be studied and on its study as an ‘initiation in the mysteries’ see the verbatim quotation from book four of his On Lives, ap. Plut., De Stoic. repugn. 1035AB (SVF II 42), and Etym. magn. s.v. τελετή (SVF II 1008); anticipated by Cleanthes (according to Epiphanius, Adv. haeres. III 2.9 = SVF I 538). See Boyancé (1936) 116 ff., Mansfeld (1979) 134 ff. On the order of the study of the parts of philosophy according to the Stoics see also P. Hadot (1991) (not cited in the interesting paper of Ierodiakonou (1993)).
Complementary Note 316 (to p. 178)

The formula with Homer's name is first attested at Porphyry, Quaestiones Homericae ad Ilidem pertinentes, p. 297.16-7 (quoted Schäublin (1979) 221): ἄξιων δὲ ἐγὼ Ὅμηρον ἔξ Ὅμηρον σαφηνίζειν αὐτὸν ἐξήγομενον ἑαυτόν ὑπεδείκνυν, ποτὲ μὲν παρακειμένως, ἄλλοτε δὲ ἐν ἄλλοις. Cf. also Porphyry, Quaestiones Homericae I, p. 1.11-3 Sodano, αὐτὸς μὲν ἑαυτὸν τὰ πολλὰ Ὅμηρος ἐξηγεῖται, and supra, n. 202, for Eunapius' report that Porphyry engaged in clarifying Plotinus (though it is not said there that he did so "from the author himself"), and for Porphyry's own remark in the last chapter of the V. Plot. That Porphyry was concerned with 'clarification' is also clear from the Introductio in Tetra-biblum Ptolemaei, where he tells us in the προοίμιον (p. 190.7-10) that he has decided to provide an explanation σαφηνείας ἕνεκεν since Ptolemy's comment on the cosmogony in the Timaeus (which replaces Aristotle's διδασκαλίας χάριν at De cael. A 10.280a1) has a different colouring (ap. Philoponus, De aetern. mundi pp. 145.20 ff. and 188.9 ff. Rabe = Theophr. fr. 241A + B Fortenbaugh, Theophr. Phys. fr. 11 Diels); cf. Baltes (1976) 20, 23. Maybe Taurus is responsible for this substitution, or Philoponus.

Porter (1992) 70 ff. argues again in favour of the attribution of a form of the Homerum ex Homero principle to Aristarchus, basing himself on a D-scholium to Ilid E 385 (also cited by Pfeiffer (1978) 277) according to which Aristarchus posited that interpreters should take the poet's words poetically and not bother about what is external to what he says (μηδέν ἐξω τῶν φραζομένων υπὸ τοῦ ποιητοῦ περιεργαζομένους). But the only scholion in the Scholia graeca in Ilidem (scholia vetera) where the verb σαφηνίζειν occurs in an interpretation deriving from Aristarchus cites a passage from Hesiod to explain one in Homer (V, p. 464.60 ff. Erbse).

This is consistent with an observation of Roemer (1924) 131 ff., who argues that Aristarchus' application of the principle is limited to linguistic usage or to what Cobet used to call interpretation "ex suae [i.e. Homer's] aetatis modulo", ibid., 179 ff. We may add that Aristarchus presumably eliminated seeming contradictions in Homer by means of various forms of exegesis (cf. supra, n. 7, and see further Nickau (1971) 132 ff., who shows that Aristotle already developed methods to this end), but this too is not yet the Homerum ex Homero principle. We have seen that the rule was known to Galen (supra, text to n. 270). I believe that it also underlies the use of the asterisk in the Plato editions described at D.L. III 65-6 (cf. above, p. 198, complementary note 110, and supra, text to n. 135), for this diagnostic sign denoted 'the agreement of the doctrines' (ἀστέρισκος πρὸς τὴν συμφωνίαν τῶν δομάτων) which, as we have also seen (text cited supra, p. 32), was an important issue to Proclus, and was also mentioned by Galen (supra, p. 202, complementary note 288). It is a principle of interpretation in Clement, see Strom. VII xvi 96.1, ἡμεῖς, ἐκ' αὐτῶν περὶ αὐτῶν τῶν γραφῶν τελείος ἀποδεικνύντες, and was certainly known to Origen, who at Philolalia, ch. 2.3 (a fragment from the commentary on Ps 1), attributes it to a Hebrew scholar (!): because of
their obscurity (cf. supra, n. 14), the sacred Scriptures are like locked rooms. The keys have been dispersed in such a way that no key is any longer to be found with the room to whose door it fits. The exegete therefore has to find out which key goes with which room: the texts have to be interpreted with the help of each other, ch. 2, 3.11 f., οὔκ ἀλλοθεν τὰς ἁφορμὰς τοῦ νοεῖσθαι λαμβανούσας ἢ παρ’ ἀλλήλων, ἔχουσών ἐν αὐταῖς τὸ ἐξηγητικόν (my italics). Harl (1983) 252 f. thinks that Origen really follows a Jewish tradition; cf. also de Lange (1976) 111, who argues that Origen combines two ideas, precedent for each of which can be found with Philo of Alexandria and the Rabbis respectively. But in Origen, as in Clement, the standard principle of interpretation Homerum ex Homero has become 'Scripture from Scripture'; one may moreover believe that the learned Hebrews Origen knew were Hellenized Jews. See also Proclus, Theologia Platonica I 2, p. 10.1-4, riddles are to be solved οὐκ ἐκ ἀλλοτρίων ὑποθέσεων ἀλλ’ ἐκ τῶν γνησιωτάτων τοῦ Πλάτωνος συγγραμμάτων (my emphasis), with the comments of Sheppard (1980) 106. We may note echoes of this interpretative rule in the late Aristotelian commentators on Aristotle too. Simplicius, In Cat. p. 7.25 ff., argues that the exegete has to be familiar with the works of Aristotle down to the details. David (Elias), In Cat. p. 122.25 ff., says the exegete has to show that Aristotle agrees with himself (σύμφωνον ... τῶν Ἀριστοτέλην ἐκπόν) and with Plato, who in this way is proved to agree with himself as well; see above, chapter five, section 5. See further I. Hadot (1990) 124 f.
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ch. 9.9, p. 32.17  24n36
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</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>319.9 ff.</td>
<td>151n274, 165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>321.7 ff.</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>In librum i Epidemiarum (CMG V 10.1, Wenkebach)</td>
<td>p. 3.8 ff.</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>In librum iii Epidemiarum (CMG V 10.2.1, Wenkebach)</td>
<td>pp. 60.4-6.7</td>
<td>133</td>
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<td>10n2</td>
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</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INDEX LOCORUM

Vita Plotini (Henry-Schwyzer)
4-6 12n7
4.11 112n193
4.14 f. 61n105
4.17-9 111
4.22 ff. 111
5.60 ff. 116
5.61 112n193
20.68-76 158
24.1 ff. 108
24.11-13 112n191
24.14-15 112n192
24.36-37, 25.31-2 112n193
24.5 ff. 61n105
25 113
25.1-2, 26.1-6 115
26 116
26.32 f. 61n105

Vita Pythagorae (Nauck)
3 99

Possidius
Vita Augustini (Pellegrino)
chs. 6-7, ch. 28 119n208

Proclus
In Alcibiadem (Segonds)
§§ 6.15-10.23 33
§ 10.4 ff. 28-9, 33-4
§ 10.16-7 34
§ 11.15 ff. 29
§§ 11.22-18.12 33
§§ 14.20-18.12 34
§ 236.12 ff. 78

In Cratylum (Pasquali)
ii 123-24

In Euclidem (Friedlein)
p. 32.21 ff. 38
p. 35.17 ff. 38
p. 39.7 ff. 38
p. 48.3 ff. 172
p. 48.9 ff. 38
p. 63.7 ff. 38
p. 64.8 ff. 39
pp. 68.6-9.4 38

p. 68.22 ff. 38
p. 70.1 ff. 38
p. 70.19 ff. 37
p. 71.10 ff. 37
p. 74.10 ff. 37
p. 81.24 ff. 37
p. 83.7 ff. 37

In Parmenidem (Cousin)
pp. 633.14-6 35
p. 634.6-12 36
p. 635.28-9 36
p. 635.35-6 72n125
p. 640.19-5.8 36
p. 645.9-7.22 36
pp. 654.15-5.12 83
p. 658.32-9.23 36
p. 863.2 194
p. 926.7-35 164-5
pp. 927.35-8.9 165

In Rempublicam (Kroll)
p. 1.5-7, p. 5.3-5 22-23, 31
p. 5.6 ff. 36
p. 5.14, p. 5.16-7 31
p. 5.21-3 31
p. 5.28-7.4 31-2
p. 6.24-5, p. 7.1-7 32
p. 8.10-1 32
p. 8.10 ff 72n124
p. 14.11-2 33
p. 15.20 ff. 78
pp. 24.6 ff., 25.14 ff. 64

In Timaeum (Diehl)
I, p. 1.4-4.7 34
I, p. 4.7-7.16 34
I, pp. 7.17-8.29 35
I, pp. 8.30-9.24 35
I, p. 9.6 34
I, p. 13.14-7 35
I, p. 20.9 f. 64
I, p. 95.26-31 56

Theologia Platonica (Saffrey-Westerink)
I 2, p. 10.1-4 205
I 2, pp. 10.11-11.26 165

PS. Athanasius (PG 27)
Argumentum in Psalmos
56A-60A 19n
### PS. Plato

**Epistula II**
- 312d: 203
- 314c: 203

### PS. Plutarchus

*De Homero* 2 (Kindstrand)
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- V, p. 464.60 ff.: 204

### Seneca

*De vita beata*
- 18.1 ff.: 184

*Epistulae ad Lucilium*
- 6.5: 81n135, 123
- 6.6: 189
- 12: 172
- 20.2: 185
- 40.12: 87-8
- 52.8: 187
- 58: 97
- 94.40-1: 123n218
- 95.64: 202
- 100.11: 188
- 102.30: 190
- 108.36: 185
- 114.1: 187

### Servius (Thilo-Hagen)

*In Aeneidem*
- I p. 1.1: 45n80
- I p. 4.14 f., 4.16 f.: 46
- I p. 458.1 ff.: 48
- II p. 1.1 ff.: 48
- II p. 124.1 ff.: 48
- III p. 1.1 ff.: 46
- III p. 128.6 ff.: 47

*In Bucolica*
- III p. 2.14 ff., 24 ff.: 47
- III p. 3.29: 45n80

*In Georgica*
- III p. 217.3-4: 47
- III p. 271.4-5: 48
- III p. 320.1 ff.: 48

### Sextus Empiricus

*Adversus mathematicos* (Mutschmann-Mau)
- IX 133-5: 157

*Pyrrhoniae hypotyposes* (Mutschmann)
- I 234: 165n299

### Simplicius

*In Categorias* (Kalbfleisch)
- p. 7.25 ff.: 205
- p. 7.26-7: 163
- p. 9.33 ff.: 165
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In Enchiridium Epicteti (Dübner)
p. 1.5 ff. 110n186
p. 28.37 ff. 80-1n134

In Physicam (Diels)
p. 8.17 ff. 202
p. 923.8 ff. 41n66

STEPHANUS ATHENIENSIS
In Hippocratis Prognosticum
p. 26.3-4 53

STOBÆUS
Eclogae (Wachsmuth)
II xv.14 ff. 185-6
II xv.37 186
II xv.44 185
II xxxi.22, 28 130n231
II xxxi.48 125, 186

SUDA
Lexicon (Adler)
I 1, p. 356 13-15, 157
I 2, p. 662.7 ff. 182n329
I 4, p. 210.9 f., 10 f. 55
I 4, p. 407.23 f. 182
I 4, p. 478.23 55

SYNÉSIEUS
Epistulæ (Hercher)
138.7-8 59n101

SYRIANUS
In Hermogenis Περὶ στάσεων (Rabe)
p. 19.20 ff. 186

In Metaphysica (Kroll)
p. 11.11 ff. 161

TERTULLIANUS
Adversus Marcionem
I 1 110n187

THEODORETUS CYRRHENSIUS
In Psalms (PG 80)
pp. 857A-860A, 861AD, 865A

THEODORUS MOPSUESTENUS
In Evangelium Ioannis (Vosté)
pp. 1-2 19

In Psalms (Devreesse)
p. 2.13 18-19
pp. 13.30-14.6 19
p. 49.32 f. 18-19 (n)

AELIUS THEON (ap. Rhetores graeci minores II, Spengel)
Progymnasmata
p. 68.21 ff. 80n134
p. 115.12 ff. 13n
p. 125.27 ff. 112-13n194

THEON SMYRNÆUS
De utilitate mathematicae (Hiller)
pp. 198.9 ff. 64

THEOPHRASTUS
Fragmenta (Fortenbaugh et al.)
241A-B 204
696 25

Physicorum opiniones (Diels)
fr. 11 204

TZETZES
Chiliades
VII 944-89 182n329

XENOPHON
Memorabilia
IV 3.18 187

VARRO
De lingua latina
VII 37 66
Augustine
Retractationes 117n206
authenticity s. isagogical questions

Bacchius of Tanagra 139, 200, 201
bibliography s. catalogue
biography (cf. bios) 38, 49
apothegms in – 179n322, 180;
– combined with bibliography
59 (Callimachus), 60 and 68
(Thrasyllus), 100 (Diogenes
Laërtius), 122-3 (Galen), 181
(Porphyry), 117n206 (Possidius);
historic function (Sitz im Leben)
180
bios (cf. vita) 54, 58, 68, 108, 110,
116, 121, 123, 179-80
– consistent with work 180; genos
31, 59, 60n102, 97; – of Aristotle
42; – of Hippocrates 54, 182n329;
classes on Aristotle and Plato
started with bios 31; παράδειγμα
95, 189n339; paradigmatic bios of
a philosopher 98, 110, 183; stu-
died before reading works 30,
122; written bios 124; vita Arati
49; vita Hippocratis Bruxellensis
182n329, 200; Vita Hippocratis
secundum Soranum 182; Vita Plotini
108, 109
s. also viva vox
Boethius 24, 24n35, 96
Boethius of Sidon 40n63, 44n78, 96,
197
Calcidius 21
Callimachus
cites the Phaedo 72
Pinarke 60, 65n109
Πίναξ τῶν δημιουργίων γλωσσῶν καὶ
συντάξιμων 100
canon of authentic works 178;
– of Aristotle 21n24; – of Plato
21n24
s. also Galen, Hippocrates
catalogue(s) 6, 38, 129
bibliographie raisonnée 60n102;
catalogue raisonné 116
s. also biography
Chamaeleon of Heraclea 180
Charmadas 28
chronology 111
s. also isagogical questions
(order of study)
Chrysippus, 103, 154n282
interpretation of definitions 157;
method of quoting 157; on
theology 203
Cicero
translation of Aratus (title) 51,
53; on ambiguity 177; on inter-
pretation 177-9
clarification 20, 26
s. also isagogical questions
(clarify)
classification s. isagogical questions
(systematic organization)
Cleanethes of Assos 189
Clement of Alexandria 157-8
(νείπα), 159, 204
Cleomedes 197-8
Clitomachus 193
Colotes 184
commentary 3, 5, 116
Anon. in Theaet. 20, 24
commentary tradition 12, 43-4
(on Virgil), 49-50 (literary), 67
(Thrasylus), 71 (Albinus), 127,
174 (medical, philosophical),
175 (on Plato), 173-6; commenta-
tor should be an expert 163;
introductions to In Cat. 23; καθ’
ἐκκάτερθν οὐς [sc. Hippocrates’]
λέξειν 131; – on Aristotle 21, 96
(Topica, Sophistici Elenchi), 129
n231, 174, 192; – on Psalms 5, 14,
18; – on Hippocratic works 118,
132-47; – on Virgil 8, 15, 43-8
s. also Aratus, Donatus, Galen,
Origen, Proclus, Servius
contents
– of a book 49
– of a dialogue 36
s. also isagogical questions
creative s. interpretation
Damascius 37
David 46
dedication 106-7
s. also apostrophe
Demetrius 132n236, 156n285,
174n309
Democritus 97-105 (Thrasylus on
life and works)
‘Pythagorean’ 98, 100
Causal Explanations 104
On the Hades 99
Demonax 188
Dercyllides 64 (date), 65, 71, 74, 199
diagnostic signs s. notae
diánoia s. isagogical questions (obscurity)
diáφρεσις Aristotelian terminology
in – of Plato’s dialogues 95-6
s. isagogical questions (division), Plato (systematic classification of dialogues)
Didymus Chalcenterus 41 and n, 112n189, 197
Dioeles of Carystus 145-6, 147
Diodorus of Tarsus 18n17
Diogenes of Babylon 157
Diogenes the Cynic 97, 194
Diogenes Laërtius 6
catalogues in – 194
diaeresis of Plato’s dialogues 74-81
D.L. III (on Plato) 58-84, 105-7, 181n932
D.L. VII, 181n326 (lacuna)
D.L. IX (on Democritus) 97-105, 181n325
D.L. IX 37 (ἐξέπερ), 100 and n
s. also Albinus, diaeresis
Dionysius Thrax, scholia on – 53, 192
Dioscurides 140n258, 140, 146, 182n329
diple 81
s. also notae
division s. isagogical questions
doctrines (δόγματα) 58, 84, 116, 202
(cf. bios)
consistency of – 32, 190, 204
Donatus, Aelius 14n11, 43-5, 46
In Bucolica 43, 47
Duris of Samos 99
Ecphantus 99
dition s. publication
ἔκδοσις, ἔκδοναι s. publication
ἔκδοσις (= ‘interpretation’) 109
n183, 201
Elias 46
Prolegomena philosophiae 39
Empedocles 27
ἐπαγγελία s. isagogical questions
(theme)
ἐπιγραφή s. isagogical questions
(title)
ἐξάπλωσις s. isagogical questions
(clarification)
ἐπιχειρήματα 116
Epicharmus 111 with n189, 115
n201
Epictetus 1, 3, 97, 109
Enchiridion 70
Epicurus 2, 88, 156, 195
proems 87n144
writings
Ad Pythoclem 88
Greater Epitome 88
On Nature 184
epoptics 13n9, 113 and n
Erastistratus 153
Erotianus 149 f., 200
Euclid
Elements 38
Pseudarion 38
Eusebius of Caesarea 56
dependent on Origen 57
treatment of individual psalms 18
In Psalmos 17
exegesis s. interpretation

Galen 3, 4, 87, 148-176
Hippocratic commentaries 8, 40n63, 131-47; influenced by Albinus 87, 95, 121, 128, 166-8;
on Aristotle as exegete of Hippocrates 153; on canon of genuine works of Hippocrates 176; on
canon of own works 178; on commentaries on Soph. El. 175; on eclecticism 172; on expertise
164; on good doctors 168; on how to study his treatises 119-21; on medical classics 168; on pre-
decessors 147, 174; on publishing (finished) works 128, 133; on pupils 124; two classes of stu-
dents 166-8; two courses of study 87, 119-23; comm. written for private use 132, 174
writings
Compendium Timaei 25
De captionibus penes dictionem 25
De elementis secundum Hippocrates 121, 141
De libris propriis 117n206, 117-21, 126-31
De ordine librorum propriorum 117n206, 117-22
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De sectis ad tirones 121, 126-7
De symptomatum differentiis 121
In Epidemiarum libros 133, 139-41
In De natura hominis 141, 144
In De officina medici 145
In De salute diaeta 143
In Prorrheticum 134, 141
On Exegesis (Περὶ ἐξηγήσεως) 52, 137, 148, 176
On Proof (Περὶ ἀποδείξεως) 121-3, 126, 169, 179
On the Genuine and Inauthentic Books of Hippocrates (Περὶ τῶν γνησίων τε καὶ νόθων ἰπποκράτειων συγγραμμάτων) 142, 176
Περὶ σαφηνείας καὶ ἀσαφείας 150, 176
Περὶ τῆς διαβολῆς, ἐν ὧ καὶ περὶ τοῦ ἰδίου βιοῦ 122n216
s. also publication
Aulus Gellius 56n98, 202
Geminus 197
genre
the literature On Sects 181n325
s. also isagogical questions
genus
geometry
Glaucias of Tarentum 140, 199, 200
Glauce of Rhegium 99
gnomologia 18ln325
Gregory of Nyssa 18
dependent on Origen 56-7

Heraclides of Erythrae 139
Heraclides of Pontus 101n165
Heraclides of Tarentum 139, 199-200
Heraclitus 151n273, 156
Hermarchus 189, 195
Herminus 40n63
Hermogenes 52-3
Περὶ στάσεων 52
Herophilus 158, 200
Hierocles 98
Hipparchus of Nicaea 5, 51, 162, 174n309
Hippias 82
Hippocrates 3
audience (cognoscenti) 151
style 136
difficult 151
obscure 151, 160
technical 151

writing
chronology 200
genuine books 134
useful books 134
APHORISMS 54
Epidemics 139-41, 199
Oath, Law 54
Homer 5, 12n7
Homerum ex Homero s. interpretation
Horace 196
Hunain ibn Ishaq 132n236, 142n263, 176

Iamblichus 21n24, 27n38, 35
Platonic canon 29, 36
ibn abi-Usaybi’a 65n111
induction 59
inscriptio s. isagogical questions (title)
intentio s. isagogical questions (theme)
interpretation 1, 12
allegorical – 36; creative – 26, 99
(Aristotle), 152 (Galen), 155-61
(Galen), 173 (Galen); – ἐκ προσόπου 12, 12n7, 18n17, 80-2, 188; – of Plato 81; – exegesis 2, 137, 148, 149; Homerum ex Homero
principle 16-17 (n), 148, 152
n278, 178, 204, 205
introduction 137
eἰσαγωγή eic 197, 198
s. also isagogical questions, reading
introductory issues s. isagogical questions
Isagoge s. Achilles

isagogical questions (= introductory/propaedeutic/preliminary questions) 7, 10, 14, 14n11, 28, 34, 37, 40, 58, 92, 105, 112, 121, 173-6 (Galen), 192
general isagogical questions 23-4

*ἀσαφεία (obscurity) 8, 15, 16n14 (Origen), 23, 25-6, 149-50, 150-54 (Galen), 151n273-275, 152n276 (Galen), 154n282, 155, 156n286, 160, 202 (Aristotle), 204 (Origen); aims of the instruction 136; Aristotle’s mode of expression 24, 29, 141, 173,
PROLEGOMENA

177; reason for obscurity 26 (terminology old-fashioned); τάχος 24 (Galen), 24n36 (Cicero, Quintilian, Lucian), 148; τρόπος τής διδασκαλίας 23
• clarification 16n, 149, 155, 173, 204; ante opus 43, 44, 116; from acts, words, character and life 178; διάνοια 155 and n; εξετάζειν, εξέτασις 149; exegesis, 149, 152; literal formula 177 (Cicero); make clear what is unclear 135 (Galen), 149; of the persons 20; in ipso opere 43, 49, 116; κατά λέξιν 49; exegete 13; explanatio 46; obscurity, intentional – 16n, 23n34; σαφήνεια 116n202, 159 (Proclus), 205 (Porphyry)
s. also interpretation, Plato (dialogue)
• first treatise to be read: 23, 30, 33, 70 (Thrasyllos), 71 (Albinus), 100 (corpus democriteum), 105 (Diogenes Laërtius on Plato), 128 (Galen)
• philosophical sects: sectarian 4, 23, 121 (Galen), 131; medical schools 171
s. also Galen
• qualities of the exegete: – of the philosophical exegete 24, 161-69, 173; – of the mathematician 39
• qualities of the student: 13, 24, 161-2, 173; εὐφυΐς 164, 165 and n; good moral disposition 165; intelligent and devoted 164 (Galen); irrational passions 165; μη ἀφυάς 164; preparation 165, 167; primary education 170-1
s. also purification
• systematic organisation of Aristotelian corpus: 23, 100, 111, 173; – of Galenic corpus 129-30; – of Platonic corpus s. Aristophanes, Thrasyllos, diæresis
• particular questions before the reading of a treatise: 24-5

particular isagogical questions 10, 23-4, 40 (Alexander of Aphrodisias), 116 (Porphyry)
• authenticity 11, 14-5 (Origen), 20 (Anon. in Theaet.), 37 (Proclus), 50 (Aratea), 67 (Thrasyllos), 73n127, 103, 106, 116, 128, 130 (Galen), 137 (Galen), 139-41 (Galen), 142n263 (Galen), 173 (Galen), 195 (Callimachus), 195 (Philodemus); germanus propriusque liber 11; γνήσιον 11, 30, 40 (Alexander of Aphrodisias), 44, 45, 55, 66, 66n115, 105, 142; spuria 105, 127; discussed near catalogues of philosophers in Diogenes Laërtius 194
• division into chapters (or sections or parts): = διαίρεσις εἰς τὰ μόρια 54; = διαίρεσις εἰς μῆματα 11, 44, 48; division 11, 77, 84, 102, 112 (Porphyry); division into books 46, 84, 89, 138, 174; division into chapters 10-11, 22n29, 30 (Anon. proleg.), 54 (Proclus), 37 (Olympiodorus); division into parts 17, 19, 54-6, 37-8, 48 (Servius), 49, 51 (Aratus), 53, 67 (Thrasyllos), 131 (Galen), 142 (Galen); division into sections 21, 40; μέρη 11, 46n82; numerus librorum 15, 36, 45-7, 67, 91, 103; summaries 116 (Porphyry), 116n203, 139
• to which part of philosophy (or literary genre) a treatise or work belongs: ὑπὸ ποιῶν μέρος τῆς φιλοσοφίας ἀνάγεται 11, 113, 132; causa 45; origin of the literary genre 43; origin of pastoral poetry 47
• order of study 10-11, 20-8 (of Aristotle’s works), 29-37 (of Plato’s works), 38 (of Euclid’s works), 45 (of Virgil’s poems), 53 (of rhetorical writers), 60n102 (Thrasyllos), 87n143 (Neoplatonist), 89-97, 93n150 (post-Iamblichean), 105, 111 (Galen), 112, 118-21 (of Galen’s works), 126, 127, 130-1 (of Galen’s works), 138-9 (of Hippocrates’ works), 146
s. also chronology
• arrangement of works (cf. canon) 11, 21, 23, 55, 74, 102, 113, 128, 130; 203 (Stoics); chronological – 111 (Stoics),
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112, 114, 127 (Galen); ordering
44, 59, 71; problematic 45; tetra-
logic – 59, 89-97; ordo librorum 10,
21, 46; ταξις 10, 15-6 (Origen),
27 (Hierocles), 30, 36-7 (τάξις
tων διαλόγων), 40, 48, 58, 67
(τάξις τῆς ἀναγνώσεως), 101
(Diogenes Laërtius), 106, 108,
108n182 (διάταξις), 117-8 (Ga-
len), 136, 196; unordered (tre-
tises) 63 (Plato), 104 (Plato),
104-5 (Democritus)
• theme (aim, purpose, subject,
contents): 10, 11, 20, 21, 32, 34,
35, 44, 48, 47-8, 50, 53, 60n104,
80, 118-9 (Galen), 120, 129, 130,
140-1, 145, 147, 174; ἐπαγγελία
130n232, 145; = intentio (auctor)
16 (Origen), 40, 45n79, 45, 46,
48, 119, 130, 138, 162, 173
(Galen), 177 (Cicero), 196
(Epicurus); = προαιρέσις 138,
162n295; = πρόθεσις 10, 21n24,
31-3 (Proclus), 34-5 (Proclus), 37,
48 (Servius), 130n232, 195; =
propositum 130 n232; = σκόπος 10,
16, 21, 26, 30-8, 45n79, 55, 70, 74,
112, 130n232, 136; 195, 196; =
tέλος 39; = ύπόθεσις 18, 18n17,
21n24 (Galen), 29 (Proclus), 30
(πράγματα), 35, 46n82, 68-9
(Thrasyllos), 69n118 (Aratus,
Anaximenes), 112; = voluntas
(scribentis) 10 ff., 138
• title (explanation of titles):
αίτια τῆς ἐπιγραφῆς 10, 74, 102,
111; ἐπιγραφή 37, 38, 66; = in-
scriptio (operis) 10; first titles, 33,
61, 67, 71 (Plato), of Rep. (Theo-
phrastus) 72; second titles, 32-3,
36, 37, 72, 72n125, 73 and n127;
explanation of title 10, 11, 41,
48, 54, 131, 137, 141; title 15, 17,
19, 20 (Porphyry), 30, 33, 39, 41,
46, 50, 53, 98 (Thrasyllos), 103,
143, 145, 147, 148, 174; title
derived from the person, 12, 37
(Proclus); – derived from exter-
nal circumstances 33; – derived
from the contents 33, 71 (ἀπὸ τοῦ
πράγματος); – derived from
name 72 (Thrasyllos); = titulus
operis 45, 47, 48
s. also Plato (titles)
• utility: 10 (utilitas), 11, 21, 27,
39, 41, 47, 54, 138, 174, 196
(Epicurus); = χρήσμον 10, 36, 38,
53, 195, 141, 147
κεφάλαια s. isagogical questions
(division)

Lampadio, C. Octavius 46
Leucippus 103
life s. bios, vita
logic 77, 86
influence of Aristotelian logic
96; first discipline 122; logical
part of philosophy studied first
70 (Thrasyllos); logical works
121 (Galen); logical training
169-70
Longinus 158
Lucian 196
Lycon 109n183
Macrobius 21
Mantias 145n267, 147, 147
Marcion 16
Marinus of Naples 31
mathematics 38-9
meaning s. isagogical questions
(ἀπόφεια)
Menon (so-called) 144-5
μέρη s. isagogical questions (di-
vision)
method of instruction s. teaching
Metrodorus of Lampsacus 123, 189,
195
al-Nadim 132n236
Nausiphanes 27
notae 81, 81n135, 200 f.
numerus librorum s. isagogical ques-
tions
obscenity s. isagogical questions
(ἀπόφεια)
Olympiodorus 36-7
In Alcibiadem 36, 191 and n
ordo librorum s. isagogical questions
(order of study)
Oribasius 126
Origen 5, 8, 10, 26-7, 56, 159, 204;
introductions of his commen-
taries 98; obscurity of Scripture
intentional 16; – and Jewish
tradition 205; — and philology 56
writings
  De principiis 159
  Epistula ad Gregorium 170
  In Canticum canticorum 11, 15
  In Psalms 1-25, 14, 16, 49
  Φιλοκαλία 12n6, 13
origin s. isagogical questions

Panaitius 194
Pantaenus 125n220
Papias of Hierapolis 124n219
Papirus, C. Fabianus 187
parts
  of ethics 87n143
  of philosophy 41, 77
  s. also isagogical questions (division)

πεῖρα s. Plato (dialogue); Clement of Alexandria
Persaeus 194
Phanius 194
Philip of Opus 66n115
Philo of Larissa 28, 87n143
Philo of Alexandria 157, 205
Philodemus of Gadara 27, 156
Philolaus of Croton 99
Philonides 199
philology (cf. publication)
  ἀνέκδοτα 109n183; ἐπανόρθωσις 127n224; διασκευή 112n191;
diorthesis (διαφθοράς) 108
  nn182-193, 127n224, 201; emen-
datio 108n182; Hellenistic Alexandria 174; higher criticism
  195
philosophy
  being a philosopher 94, 155;
  parts of philosophy 15, 113
Philostratus 180
Phoelius 126n221
Phylotimus 145n267, 147, 148
Plato 81, 155, 189
  amicus Plato 172
canon of Platonic works 91, 178
dialogues: character 12, 29, 30, 33, 35, 37, 38, 74, 80, 89, 91;
creative modification of diaeresis of dialogues 88 (Albinus); diaeresis of dialogues 11, 74-84, 88; didascalic 97; dogmatic 97; dramatic relationship 69; δραματική διασκευή 37
  (Olympiodorus); elenctic 97;
  first titles in Aristotle 72; for
  inquiry 34, 78, 79, 82, 87, 129;
  for instruction 34, 78, 79, 82, 85, 87, 129, 168; form of the
dialogue 106; gymnastic kind
  83; mise-en-scène 12, 20; mouth-
piece (of Plato’s views) 80, 189;
  number of dialogues 67; πεῖρα
  (‘test’) 95; protreptic 97;
  second/thematic title of the
  form ἡ (πεῖρα) x 73 and n127;
  Socratic dialogues 61; titles, double – 30, 71-4, 94
tetralogies 60-3, 70, 89-93, 199
trilogies 104, 199
writings 60n102
  Alcibiades maior 54, 94, 167
  Alcibiades minor 66n115
  Anterastae 100
  Cratylus 84
  Critias 76, 92
  Epinomis 30, 66n115
  Epistulae 66-7
  Euthydemus 82
  Euthyphron 68
  Gorgias 28
  Hippas 82
  Leges 67
  Menon 85
  Menexenus 72
  Parmenides 28, 35
  Phaedon 68n117, 94
  Republic 35, 67
  Timaeus 26 (style), 35, 156, 161
  s. also Thrasyllus, Aristophanes
Plotinus 2, 3, 127, 158
Plutarch of Athens 55, 202
  On Homer 69n118
Plutarch of Chaeronea
  commentary on Hesiod 56n98
  Ὄμηρως μελετά 56n98
Polyaenus 189, 195
Polybus medicus 144 and n266, 145
  and n266, 146
Porphyry 3, 21, 24, 40, 124n219, 178
  rearrangement of Plotinus’
treatises 68n116, 112-3, 114, 116
writings
  In Categorias 57
  Historia philosophiae 114
  Vita Plotini 108-16, 181, 183
  Vita Pythagorae 183
  s. also Apollodorus
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Possidius 183
Vita Augustini 108n182, 117n206, 118n206, 119n208
prooíomene s. isagogical questions (theme)
preliminary s. isagogical questions, introduction
Proclus grammaticus
Chrestomathia 56n94
Proclus 5, 7, 10, 12, 27n, 30-9, 98, 136, 172, 192, 199
commentaries
In Alcibiadem 34
In Cratylum 34
In Gorgiam 36
In Parmenidem 34, 35
In Rempitciam 7, 31, 34, 36, 57
In primum librum Euclidis
Elementorum 37, 52n93
In Timaeum 34, 35, 98
on Hesiod's Opera et dies 57
on Homer 57
on Plato 22-38, 56
monograph on Aristotle (τὰ πρὸ τῆς (συν)ἀναγνώσεως τῶν 'Αριστοτελείου ἀκροαματικῶν συνταγμάτων) 22, 98
monograph on Plato (τὰ πρὸ τῆς (συν)ἀναγνώσεως τῶν τοῦ Πλάτωνος διαλόγων) 7, 29
prooíomene s. isagogical questions (theme)
prosopopoioia 12-3 (n)
proverb 186
ps.Galen
De optima secta 119-24, 126, 169
ps.Soranus
Vita Hippocratis 182-3
Ptolemaeus gnosticus 17n14
publication 60n104, 61n106, 122n217, 142
codex 115n201
editions: of Aristotle 112; of Hippocrates' Epidemics 140; with diagnostic signs 198; unauthorised – 118 (Galen), 122, 127; revised – 108, 116 (Porphyry) 119n208, 122 and n217 (Galen), 128, 132n237
ἐκδοθέντα 199
purification, preliminary – 38, 54, 70, 94-5, 164-5, 170
Pythagoras 184
Pythagorean Golden Verses (Χρυσὰ ἔπη) 27 and n, 70
Pyrrho of Elis 12n, 185
qualities s. isagogical questions
Quintilian's formula de arte, de opifice, de opere 39, 54
reading
ἀναγνώσει 120, 127-8, 129n231, 158, 193; ἀνάγνωσις 27, 169; πρὸ τῶν ἄλλων ἀναγνώσματον 27, 109; reading of a text in class (συνοφνάγνωσις) 28, 193; what comes before the reading of a text in class (τὰ πρὸ τῆς (συν)ἀναγνώσεως) 22-8, 31, 56
titles: What Comes Before the Study of the Books of Democritus 8, 97; What Comes Before the Study of the Dialogues of Plato 8, 28, 98
s. also Proclus, Thrasylus
rhetoric 52, 125n220
riddles s. isagogical questions (ασαφεία)
Rufinus 11n5
s. also Origen
Rufus of Ephesus 134, 200
Rufus of Samaria 200
σωφηνίζειν s. isagogical general questions (clarify)
satyrs play 60, 65
Satyrus 180, 194
schema isagogicum: 10-57 (= ch. 1)
passim (e.g. 27, 37, 39, 48, 53, 56); 58, 105, 112, 119, 131, 138, 144, 161, 173, 173, 193
s. also isagogical questions
scholia (cf. commentary) 192
Scripture 15 (cf. Origenes)
Seneca 172, 185
Servius 14n11, 45-8
commentaries 48; – on the qualitas carminis 45; – on individual bucolic poems by Virgil 15, on Bucolics 5, on Georgics 67, on Aeneid 67
Simplicius
approves of Arrian 179
citing Porphyry 202
In Enchiridion 110
σκοπός s. isagogical questions (theme)
Socrates 184

Epistles 68n117; exemplum Socrates 68, 189; paradigm of the true philosopher 68n117, 187

Socratisc 189

Soranus 182-3

Stephanus of Athens, 10, 53-4

In Hippocratic Prognosticum 54

In Hippocratis Aphorismos 54

student s. isagogical questions (qualities)
successions 181n325, 182

Syrianus 36

τάξις s. isagogical questions (arrangement)
tάξος s. isagogical questions (clarity)
tό πρό τις (συν)άναγκεως s. isagogical questions, reading
Taurus 2, 105n171

teaching 23-4, 81, 125

s. also isagogical questions
tetralogy, 29, 62, 65-6, 101

first tetralogy 67; tragic tetralogy 60; tetralogic canon 91

s. also Plato, Thrasyllus

Theocritus 44-5n77

Theodore of Mopsuestia 14, 57
dependent on Origen 56-7

In Evangelium Johannis 19

In Psalmos 18, 44, 47

Theodoret of Cyrthmas 18

Theon of Alexandria 197

Theon of Smyrna 26-7, 60n102, 64-5n111, 199, 201

Theophrastus of Eresus 25-6, 32, 103, 112, 144

Thessalus medicus 139, 141, 144n266, 145n266, 147

Thrasylly 7, 8, 27n38, 58n99, 59-105, 108, 109, 136

introductions to Plato and Democritus with bios and list of works 179, 183; systematic arrangement of works 101; tetralogies 89-96; treatment of Democritus 97-105, 179; treatment of Plato's dialogues 59-63, 64, 65-70, 71-4 (double titles)

Timaeus of Tauromenium 180n323

titulus s. isagogical questions (title)
tομὴ εἰς κεφάλαια s. isagogical questions (division)

tranlation 51 and n

training, preliminary – 24n36, 27, 130, 171

trilogies s. Aristophanes of Byzantium, Plato

τρόπος τῆς ψυχῆς 179

s. also bios (paradeigma)

truth 163, 167, 170

unclear (=obscure) s. isagogical questions (ύσωφεία)

ὑπόθεσις 67

s. also isagogical questions (aim)

utilitas isagogical questions (utility)

ὑφήγησις 78

Varro 80n146

Virgil (cf. Servius) 5

commentaries on – 15, 45-8; – and Hesiod 47

vita 43, 45

s. also bios

viva vox 123-4, 124n219, 125n220; living example 124; living master 123; living voice 125

s. also bios

voluntas s. isagogical questions (theme)

Xenocrates 129n231

χρήσιμον s. isagogical questions (utility)

Zeno of Alexandria 193

Zeno of Citium 97, 184, 189

Zeno of Sidon 195

Zeuxis 199-200