

learned of it? Very soon, if he was in Athens at the time. But we have no certain knowledge of his whereabouts in 427; and I have already indicated elsewhere that there is reason to think that his famous encomium of Athens was written somewhere else, at the beginning of the Peloponnesian War.<sup>7</sup> Thuri was to claim his grave.<sup>8</sup> If 9. 73. 3 was written in 429 or 428, and if Decelea was plundered in 427, Herodotus may have remained unaware for some time that his faith in Sparta's continued observance of her ancient custom was ill-founded.<sup>9</sup> So 424 is still a better terminus ante quem than 427, and F. Jacoby's date seems still to be solidly based.<sup>10</sup>

J. A. S. EVANS

*The University of British Columbia*

7. Evans, *Herodotus*, pp. 12–14.

8. W. W. How and J. Wells, *A Commentary on Herodotus*, vol. 1 (Oxford, 1928), pp. 2–3.

9. There is little evidence on the speed with which news was disseminated in the fifth century B.C., but the evidence for the sixteenth century of our era, when conditions of travel were still not greatly different, is of some value; cf. F. Braudel, *The Mediterranean World in the Age of Philip II* (New York, 1976), pp. 358–71. If Herodotus was at Thuri in the early years of the Peloponnesian War, news from Athens could take up to a year to reach him. However, there are other factors to consider as well as distance and the shortness of the navigation season. The news received in Thuri from Athens must have been somewhat spotty.

10. "Herodotos," *RE* Suppl. 2 (1913): 233; cf. How and Wells, *Commentary*, 1:9. I have not dealt here with the other evidence for Herodotus' publication date, for I have little to add to my article cited in n. 1. It should be reiterated, however, that at 6. 98. 2, where Herodotus marks off three generations by the reigns of Darius, Xerxes, and Artaxerxes, the implication that Artaxerxes was already dead is not a necessary one. We must believe, however, that Artaxerxes had ruled for a generation when this passage was written. If, on the other hand, Herodotus is counting three generations as one hundred years (cf. 2. 142. 2), then he is reckoning only approximately at 6. 98. 2, for the reigns of Darius, Xerxes, and Artaxerxes make up slightly less than a century. It is best not to insist upon the exactitude of Herodotus' mathematics in this passage.

After I had completed this paper, the Editor very kindly drew to my attention Cobet's essay, "Herodotus and Thucydides on War," in *Past Perspectives: Studies in Greek and Roman Historical Writing*, ed. J. S. Moxon, J. D. Smart, and A. J. Woodman (Cambridge, 1986), pp. 1–18, where he refers once again (pp. 17–18) to the question of the date of publication of the *Histories*. However, I have not as a result modified my paper, which is intended simply to demonstrate that 9. 73 of the *Histories* cannot be used to weaken Jacoby's arguments for a terminus ante quem of 424.

## A NOTE ON THE LIVES OF THEOPHRASTUS AND STRATO IN DIOGENES LAERTIUS 5. 57–58

In all modern editions of Diogenes Laertius' *Vitae Philosophorum* the life of Theophrastus ends with this notice (5. 57):

Ἀκούσαι δ' αὐτοῦ καὶ Ἑρασίστρατον τὸν ἱατρὸν εἰσι δ' οἱ λέγουσι· καὶ εἰκός.<sup>1</sup>

After εἰκός editors break the text, print the name Strato as the title of the next life, and then begin the life of Strato as follows (5. 58):

ΣΤΡΑΤΩΝ

Διεδέξατο δ' αὐτοῦ τὴν σχολὴν Στράτων Ἀρκεσιλάου Λαμψακηνός, οὐ καὶ ἐν ταῖς διαθηκαῖς ἐμνημόνευσεν· ἀνὴρ ἐλλογμώτατος κτλ.

1. The text is reproduced as it appears in H. S. Long, ed., *Diogenes Laertii "Vitae Philosophorum,"* vol. 1 (Oxford, 1964), p. 228.

The manuscripts of Diogenes' work, however, together with the content and sense of these passages, suggest that this division between the two lives is incorrect. The purpose of this paper is to demonstrate that what has come to be regarded as the beginning of Strato's life is properly the end of the life of Theophrastus.

No manuscript of Diogenes' work ends the life of Theophrastus with εἰκός; all of them continue with διεδέξατο δ' αὐτοῦ τὴν σχολήν.<sup>2</sup> However, only four late manuscripts offer Στράτων after σχολήν as the subject of διεδέξατο.<sup>3</sup> The omission of a subject for the verb in all other manuscripts is striking and clearly due to haplography resulting from two or even three consecutive occurrences of Strato's name: as the subject of διεδέξατο; as the title of the succeeding life; and as the first word in the life of Strato. Since several of the manuscripts appear to have been copied independently of one another, it seems likely that the omission had occurred already in the archetypal manuscript. It is believed that the *archetypus unicus* of Diogenes' work, from which all extant manuscripts ultimately derive, was an uncial manuscript of the tenth century at the latest.<sup>4</sup> Either the scribes of the four manuscripts that do include Στράτων as the subject of διεδέξατο each noticed the omission and corrected it independently; or it was corrected by one scribe and imitated by the others; or it had already been corrected in the (now-lost) exemplar from which these four manuscripts descend. Whatever the source of the reading, these four manuscripts have it right; the life of Theophrastus does not end with εἰκός but continues with διεδέξατο δ' αὐτοῦ τὴν σχολήν Στράτων.

Not only does the almost unanimous testimony of the manuscripts virtually guarantee that the διεδέξατο-clause belongs in the life of Theophrastus,<sup>5</sup> but the content and sense of the passage also strongly suggest that this is its proper

2. Only one manuscript, cod. Cantabrigiensis Collegii S. Trinitatis R 9.18/19 (=C), of the late fifteenth century, ends the life of Theophrastus differently, leaving off with ὥδ' ἔχουσιν αὐτῶ καὶ αἱ διαθήκαι (S. 57) and omitting the notice about Erasistratus. After διαθήκαι appear the symbols ":", and "+", indicating the end of the previous life. The last half of the line is left blank, presumably for a rubricator to fill in the name ΣΤΡΑΤΩΝ as the title of the next life. On the next line we read ιεδέξατο δ' αὐτοῦ τὴν σχολήν, Στράτων Ἀρκεσίλαου Λαμψακηνός, οὐ καὶ ἐν ταῖς κτλ.: the initial δ of διεδέξατο was apparently left for the rubricator to enter, but again he did not complete his task.

3. Cod. Neapolitanus Burbonicus III B 28 (=D), cod. Laurentianus 69.28 (=G), cod. Vaticanus Palatinus Graecus 261 (=S), and cod. Vaticanus Urbinas Graecus 109 (=T). These four manuscripts, all dated to the fifteenth century, form a distinct subgroup among the various manuscript families of Diogenes' work. Their text is almost completely uniform, which indicates that they were either copied from one another or from the same (now-lost) exemplar. See E. Martini, "Analecta Laertiana: Pars prima," *Leipziger Studien zur classischen Philologie* 19 (1899): 92-94, 115-17; A. Biedl, *Zur Textgeschichte des Laertios Diogenes: Das grosse Exzerpt* Φ, Studi e testi 184 (Vatican City, 1955), pp. 17-18; I. Düring, *Aristotle in the Ancient Biographical Tradition*, Studia Graeca et Latina Gothoburgensia 5 (Göteborg, 1957), p. 22; G. Donzelli, "Per un'edizione critica di Diogene Laerzio: I codici VUDGS," *BollClass* 8 (1960): 102-5, 112-18; and M. Sollenberger, "Diogenes Laertius 5. 36-57: The Vita Theophrasti," *Rutgers University Studies in Classical Humanities* 2 (1985): 5.

4. See C. Wachsmuth, *Sillographorum Graecorum Reliquiae*, fasc. alter: *Corpusculum Poesis Epicae Graecae Ludibundae* (Leipzig, 1885), pp. 53-54; Martini, "Analecta Laertiana," pp. 104-6, 176; A. Gercke, "Die Überlieferung des Diogenes Laertios," *Hermes* 34 (1902): 403-4, 413-14; E. Schwartz, "Diogenes (Laertios)," *RE* 5 (1905): 739-40; Düring, *Aristotle*, pp. 15-17, 24; Long, *Diogenis Laertii Vitae Philosophorum*, l.vi, and in his introduction to the reprint of R. D. Hicks' Loeb edition, *Diogenes Laertius: "Lives of Eminent Philosophers"*, vol. 1 (Cambridge, Mass., 1980), p. xxv; L. Tartaglia, "Probabile cognatio dei codici Neapolitanus Burbonicus Gr. III B 29 (=B) e Parisinus Gr. 1759 (=P) di Diogene Laerzio," *Vichiana* 3 (1972): 320-21; and Sollenberger, "Diogenes Laertius 5. 36-57," pp. 2-4.

5. All except C; see n. 2, above.

placement. Furthermore, there is an unequivocal indication that this clause is correctly placed in Theophrastus' life: the presence of the continuative δ' after διεδέξατο. No other life in Diogenes' work begins with a continuative particle of this sort. The probative value of the absence of the particle elsewhere at the beginning of a life is compelling; its presence here signals the inclusion of the clause as an integral part of Theophrastus' life. Moreover, once this correction is made, the beginning of Strato's life assumes the typical pattern found in the majority of lives in Diogenes' work: name plus patronymic plus ethnic or toponymic.<sup>6</sup>

In dividing the text as they have, editors have produced a correction that cannot be justified paleographically or philologically.<sup>7</sup> Future editors of the lives of Theophrastus and Strato should respect the manuscript tradition and print the following:<sup>8</sup>

Ἀκοῦσαι δ' αὐτοῦ καὶ Ἐρασίστρατον τὸν ἱατρὸν εἰσι δ' οἱ λέγουσι· καὶ εἰκός.  
διεδέξατο δ' αὐτοῦ τὴν σχολὴν Στράτων.

#### ΣΤΡΑΤΩΝ

Στράτων Ἀρκεσιλάου Λαμψακηνός, οὗ καὶ ἐν ταῖς διαθηκαῖς ἐμνημόνευσεν· ἀνὴρ  
ἐλλογιμώτατος κτλ.

1 εἰσι δ' οἱ λέγουσι Co P Q T V W: εἰσιν οἱ λέγουσι F D G S: εἰσι δ' οἱ λέγοντες B  
2 διεδέξατο—Στράτων d: διεδέξατο δ' αὐτοῦ (αὐτὸν B P Q V W) τὴν σχολὴν  
(om. Στράτων) a V W (haec verba post ΣΤΡΑΤΩΝ [v. 3] perperam transp. edd.) 3  
ΣΤΡΑΤΩΝ Co d F<sup>ms</sup> Q<sup>ms</sup> V: om. B P W (in W spat. ca. 12 litt. relictum)<sup>9</sup>

MICHAEL G. SOLLENBERGER  
Washington University

6. Forty-four of the eighty-two lives begin with this series. Of the thirty-eight that do not, twenty-two nevertheless begin with name plus ethnic or toponymic, omitting only the patronymic. Two more—the lives of Myson (1. 106) and Socrates (2. 18)—start with only name plus patronymic; but the toponymic or ethnic is close by, separated from the series by some brief parenthetical remarks.

7. In my own edition of the *Vita Theophrasti* ("Diogenes Laertius 5. 36–57"), I erred in following the editorial rather than the manuscript tradition and ended the life with καὶ εἰκός. It is noteworthy that Ambrosius Traversarius Camaldulensis, who first translated Diogenes' work into Latin (ca. 1432; first published at Rome in 1472, and at several different times and places in the following years), ended the life of Theophrastus as follows: "Sunt qui dicant Erasistratum medicum eius fuisse auditorem et fieri potest. Successit autem illius scholae Strato." Traversarius, at any rate, obviously adhered to his manuscripts.

8. The apparatus criticus following the text has been compiled from my own reading of photographs of the manuscripts. I have recorded variant readings from eleven manuscripts only: B Co F P and Q (the five major manuscripts; their consensus = a); V and W (the principal representatives of the *vulgata*); and D G S and T (consensus = d; see n. 4, above).

9. I am grateful to Kevin Herbert of Washington University and to the two referees of *CP*, whose valuable comments and suggestions helped this paper achieve its final form.

#### DISEASE IMAGERY IN CATULLUS 76. 17–26

o di, si vestrum est misereri, aut si quibus unquam  
extremam iam ipsa in morte tulistis opem,  
me miserum aspiciete et, si vitam puriter egi,  
eripite hanc pestem perniciemque mihi,