

## HERMARCHUS, AGAINST EMPEDOCLES

The standard histories give notice of a polemical treatise entitled *Letters on Empedocles*, Ἐπιστολικά περὶ Ἐμπεδοκλέους (Diog. Laer. *Vitae* 10.25) in twenty-two books by Hermarchus, Epicurus' favourite pupil and successor. The work survives in some twenty fragments<sup>1</sup> of more than probable ascription. The most important of these is an extensive extract<sup>2</sup> preserved by Porphyry at *De Abstinence* 1.7–12 on the origin in human history of justice, homicide law, and expiatory purifications, which has been the subject of much discussion.<sup>3</sup> Porphyry himself never names the title of Hermarchus' treatise, though he makes it clear that it was in the form of a polemical attack on the views of Empedocles. A recent papyrus find gives the title not as *Letters on Empedocles*, but as Πρὸς Ἐμπεδοκλέα (*Against Empedocles*). In what follows it will be convenient to show that this is no mere variant but in fact the original and correct form of the title,<sup>4</sup> and to determine what can be known with certainty as a result about the make-up of the work.

Apart from Diogenes Laertius (*Vitae* 10.25), the only ancient writer to supply the title of the work is Philodemus, who three times cites the work in the form Πρὸς Ἐμπεδοκλέα in *De Pietate* (pp. 99,3–4, 101,14–15, and 112,26–7 Gomperz),<sup>5</sup> as part

<sup>1</sup> Collected by K. Krohn, *Der Epikureer Hermarchos* (Diss. Berlin, 1921), frs. 20–39, pp. 22–32 with Nachtrag, p. 39.

<sup>2</sup> New text in J. Bouffartigue and M. Patillon, *Porphyre, De l'abstinence*, Tome I (Paris, 1977) = 22M–N in A. A. Long and D. N. Sedley, *The Hellenistic Philosophers*, vol. 1 (translation), vol. 2 (text) (Cambridge, 1987). A neglected discussion is J. Bernays, *Theophrastos' Schrift über Frömmigkeit* (Berlin, 1866), pp. 7–10, 139–41.

<sup>3</sup> R. Philippson, 'Die Rechtsphilosophie der Epikureer', *AGPh* 23 (1910), 289–337 and 433–46, esp. 290–320 = *Studien zu Epikur und den Epikureern*, edd. W. Schmid and C. J. Classen (Hildesheim, 1983), pp. 27–89, esp. 28–58, answered by M. Gigante, *Ricerche Filodemee*<sup>2</sup> (Napoli, 1983), pp. 247–59; also: M. B. Boyd, *CQ* 30 (1936), 188–91, and more recently V. Goldschmidt, *La Doctrine d'Épicure et le droit* (Paris, 1977), pp. 287–97, R. Müller, 'Konstituierung und Verbindlichkeit der Rechtsnormen bei Epikur', in *ΣΥΖΗΤΗΣΙΣ. Studi sull'Epiceureismo greco e romano offerti a Marcello Gigante* (Napoli, 1982), i. 153–83, and id., 'Zu einem Entwicklungsprinzip der epikureischen Anthropologie', *Philologus* 127 (1983), 187–206, I. Gallo, 'Ermarco e la polemica epicurea contro Empedocle', in *Esistenza e destino nel pensiero greco arcaico*, ed. P. Cosenza, Univ. di Salerno Sez. Atti Conv. Miscell. 9 (Napoli, 1985), 33–50, A. A. Long, 'Pleasure and Social Utility – the virtues of being Epicurean', in Fondation Hardt, *Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique* 32, *Aspects de la philosophie hellénistique* (Vandoeuvres–Genève, 1986), 283–329, Long–Sedley, vol. 1 (note 2), 126–39, P. A. Vander Waerdt, 'The Justice of the Epicurean Wise Man', *CQ* 37 (1987), 402–22, id., 'Hermarchus and the Epicurean Genealogy of Morals', *TAPA* 118 (1988, forthcoming), P. Mitsis, 'Natural Law and Natural Rights in Post-Aristotelian Philosophy', in *ANRW* II.36.4 (Berlin–New York, forthcoming).

<sup>4</sup> Gigante (note 3), like most commentators, still regards the title as Ἐπιστολικά περὶ Ἐμπεδοκλέους. A. Tepedino Guerra, 'I primi seguaci di Epicuro', in *ΣΥΖΗΤΗΣΙΣ* (note 3), ii. 519–23 at 520 discusses the evidence of the papyri but renders the title as 'Trattati in forma epistolare in 22 libri'. (After this article was accepted for publication, I was delighted to learn that similar conclusions regarding the title Πρὸς Ἐμπεδοκλέα were reached independently by Francesca Longo Auricchio and will appear in her forthcoming new edition of the fragments of Hermarchus; I am grateful to her for kindly making the relevant portions of her work available to me in advance of publication.)

<sup>5</sup> Th. Gomperz, *Philodem Über Frömmigkeit*, Herculaneische Studien 2 (Leipzig, 1866). The first citation does not appear in Gomperz's text, but was convincingly restored already by Fr. Bücheler, *Jahrbuch für Philologie* 91 (1865), 513–41, at 538 = *Kleine Schriften* I (Leipzig–Berlin, 1915), 580–612, at 608–9 (title only), and independently (with Hermarchus' name) by H. Diels,

of his defence in the first part of that work of Epicurus and his earliest followers against philosophical charges of atheism and impiety. The Epicureans, Philodemus repeatedly insists, regularly attacked other philosophers – in this case Empedocles (or those who appealed to him as an authority) – for their impious views on the gods. Cicero, responding critically to the defence in *De Pietate* (or a common source), reflects this form of the title when he makes the Academic Cotta in *De natura deorum* (1.33.93) say in parody: ‘istisne fidentes somniis non modo Epicurus et Metrodorus et *Hermarchus contra* Pythagorem, Platonem *Empedoclemque* dixerunt’.<sup>6</sup> Cotta’s list harbours similar attested titles of polemical works known to Cicero through his use of *De Pietate* as a source, for example, Metrodorus’ *Πρὸς τὸν Εὐθύφωνα Πλάτωνος* (p. 107, 1–13 G.,<sup>7</sup> 102, 1ff. G.<sup>8</sup>) and his *Πρὸς τὸν Πλάτωνος Γοργίαν* (p. 101, 21ff. G.).<sup>9</sup>

The title *Πρὸς Ἐμπεδοκλέα* known to Philodemus and Cicero was recently corroborated by the publication of an Oxyrhynchus papyrus (P.Oxy. 3318)<sup>10</sup> which preserves the title-tag, *σύλλυβος* or *σίττυβη* (or – slightly less likely – the *colophon* or *subscriptio* at the end of the text),<sup>11</sup> from a roll containing the ninth (Θ) book of Hermarchus’ extensive twenty-two book work, bearing the title [*Πρό*]ς Ἐμπεδοκλέ[α], without any doubt the full form. Dating from the first or second century A.D., the papyrus provides possible evidence that Porphyry could have known Hermarchus’ work from first hand. The reference to book (?) nine of *Against Empedocles* confirms the expansive character of the work as suggested by Diogenes’ specification *εἴκοσι καὶ δύο*. Philodemus twice (*De Piet.* pp. 101, 14–15, 112, 26–7 G.) cites the final book of the treatise (*ἐν τῷ τελευταίῳ*, sc. *βιβλίῳ*<sup>12</sup>), which demonstrates that the work was arranged by books, not individual epistles;<sup>13</sup>

*Doxographi Graeci* (Berlin, 1879), p. 127 n. 1 – accepted by Krohn in his dissertation (fr. 32, cf. fr. 33–4) and in the rendition by R. Philippson, *Hermes* 56 (1921), 369. (See the new text below, p. 430.)

<sup>6</sup> Bernays, op. cit. (note 2), p. 140. On Cicero’s debt to Philodemus’ *De Pietate* for these titles in this passage and on the relationship of sources, see R. Hirzel, *Untersuchungen zu Ciceros philosophischen Schriften* 1 (Leipzig, 1877), p. 19; Diels (note 5), p. 127 n. 1.

<sup>7</sup> A. Koerte, *Metrodori Epicurei Fragmenta*, *Jahrbücher für classische Philologie Supplbd.* 17 (1889–90), 547 (fr. 15, cf. fr. 14); W. Crönert, *Kolotes und Menedemos*, *Studien zur Palaeographie und Papyruskunde* herausg. C. Wessely 6 (Leipzig, 1906), p. 24; see further D. Obbink, ‘The Earliest Notice of Plato’s *Euthyphro*’ (forthcoming).

<sup>8</sup> Philippson, art. cit. (note 5), 370f. (missing in Koerte).

<sup>9</sup> Philippson, art. cit. (note 5), 370f. (missing in Gomperz, Koerte), the title independently attested elsewhere in Philodemus: Koerte (note 7) 542, 546. Metrodorus also wrote not only *Πρὸς Τιμοκράτην*, *Πρὸς τοὺς διαλεκτικούς*, *Πρὸς σοφιστάς* and *Πρὸς τοὺς ἰατρούς*, but also *Πρὸς Δημόκριτον* (Diog. Laer. *Vitae* 10.23–4).

<sup>10</sup> R. A. Coles, ed., *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, vol. 47 (London, 1980), p. 10 no. 3318 with pl. 3 (further discussion in T. Dorandi, ‘SILLYBOI’, *Scrittura e Civiltà* 8 (1984), 185–99, at 195 with tav. 5a).

<sup>11</sup> That the fragment is a *σύλλυβος* or *σίττυβη*, i.e. the title-tag attached to the roll for reference during storage (rather than a *subscriptio* from the end of the actual text) is the careful conclusion of the editor, R. A. Coles, from the fact that the writing runs *across* the fibres of the papyrus (i.e. on the *verso* of the roll) while the ‘back’ (i.e. the *recto*) is blank. That the fragment contains a *subscriptio* from the end of a re-used or opisthographic roll with fortuitously unscripted space on the *recto* remains an alternative, though perhaps a less likely one.

<sup>12</sup> Although in the full form of the citation the author would probably have written *βιβλίῳ*, as at *De Piet.* p. 113, 5 G. *ἄλλο βιβλίον*: see E. Puglia, ‘BYBAOΣ e BYBAION in Filodemo’, *Cronache Ercolanesi* 15 (1985), 119–21.

<sup>13</sup> This does away with the possibility, raised by Coles (note 10), 10 n. 3, that the ordinal Θ in the Oxyrhynchus fragment might represent not the book number but the ninth complete letter (if the letter occupied exactly an entire roll of papyrus) – a possibility which in this case would hold only if the ninth letter and the ninth book were coterminous (which seems highly unlikely).

thus Bailey's translation of the title at Diog. Laer. *Vitae* 10.25 as 'twenty-two essays in the form of letters *On Empedocles*' cannot be right.<sup>14</sup> Because of its complex editorial history, the third citation in Philodemus' *De Pietate* merits a more detailed exposition:<sup>15</sup>

**P.Herc. 1077 fr. IV + fr. V (pp. 98–9 Gomperz)**

- |                            |           |  |
|----------------------------|-----------|--|
| 25 αἰτίαν ἡμεῖς[ιν ἀπε-]   | (1077 IV) | (Polyaenus) demonstrated that          |
| φῆν[α]τ' εἶνα<ι> τ[ῆν]     |           | divine nature is a cause for us        |
| 27 θείαν φύσιν, Ἑ[ρμαρ]-   |           | (of great benefits), and similarly     |
| χος θ' ὁμο[ο]ως θ[ε]-      |           | Hermarchus (showed) that a             |
| 29 οὔτ[ε]ρ[αν] ψυχῆν ἐκ    |           | god-like soul derives many             |
| 1 θεῶν πο[λλὰ] κάγα-       | (1077 V)  | goods from the gods, and, in           |
| θαῖ<ι> συν[ε]χ[ε]ιν, ἀν[τ] |           | his (disquisition?) <i>Against</i>     |
| 3 τῇ προ[ῶ]ς Ἑμπεδο-       |           | <i>Empedocles</i> , that this provides |
| κλέα προ[ ]                |           | (peace?) for some and the              |
| 5 τῆν εἰ[ ] . . . (.)έ-    |           | opposite for others.                   |
| χειν ἐν[ίοις] καὶ τὸ]      |           |  |
| 7 ἐναντι[ον] ἄλλοις.]      |           |  |

Col. 30

**P.Herc. 1077 IV (H<sup>v</sup> ii 68; p. 98 G.)** 27ff. Hermarchus fr. 32 Krohn; Cic. *ND* 1.33.93 27–8 Ἑ[ρμαρ]||χος θ' ὁμο[ο]ως Diels 28–9 θ[ε]||οὔτ[ε]ρ[αν] (or οἰ[κε]||οὔτ[ε]ρ[αν]?) Obbink: C[2–4]||E[TH].]AN N 29f. fragments joined by Diels

**P.Herc. 1077 V (H<sup>v</sup> ii 69; p. 99 G.)** 1–2 Obbink ('iota mutum vitiose adscriptum'): πο[λλῇ] χρῆσ[θ]αι συν[ε]σε[ι] Krohn: perhaps πο[λλὴν] ἔχεσ[θ]αι συν[ε]ργίαν could be read (see p. 124.21 G. = Epic. *De fat.* fr. 23 Us., 14 Arr.<sup>2</sup>) 3–4 προ[ῶ]ς corr. Krohn: προ[ω] [7–9] N: [ἐν]|| τῇ πρώτῃ πρὸς Ἑμπεδο||κλέα Bücheler, Diels (but longer than space allows): [ἐν]|| τῇ πρώτῃ Πρὸς Πυθο||κλέα tentatively Gomperz 4 προ[ ] N: προ[α]γματεῖαι Bücheler: προ[ώ]τῃ (sc. ἐπιστολῇ) Krohn: γρ[α]φῇ (sc. 'libro') Longo Auricchio 5–6 εἰ[ρ]ῆνην Philippson: εἰ[δ]ῶσιν Krohn [παρ]ε[χ]ειν corr. Krohn: -χουν N, cf. Crönert, *Mem. Graec. Herc.* 222f. (perhaps τῆν οἰ[κ]ειώτῃτ' εἰ||χειν? cf. p. 124.6–10 G. = Epic. *De nat.* 13 fr. 88 Us., 28 Arr.<sup>2</sup>) 6 Krohn 7 ἐναντι[ον] Gomperz [ἄ]λλοις Krohn

Here the restoration of the title as *Πρὸς Ἑμπεδοκλέα* seems likely and has been followed almost universally by editors, though its exact formulation is subject to dispute. Gomperz (without knowledge of the adjoining fragment introducing the citation and naming Hermarchus) had restored [ἐν]|| τῇ πρώτῃ *Πρὸς Πυθο*||κλέα, sc. the letter by Epicurus, but this yields no satisfactory sense (there was only one known by this title); correcting to [ἐν]|| τῇ *Προῶ*||κλέα would yield a line too short for the available space. Subsequently H. Diels recognized a citation naming Hermarchus lurking in the fragmentary remains of the preceding column (fr. IV in the Naples numbering) and, linking the two columns into continuous text by combining ἐκ of fr. IV,29 with θεῶν of fr. V,1, restored (following a suggestion of Fr. Bücheler) the title

<sup>14</sup> C. Bailey, *Epicurus. The Extant Remains* (Oxford, 1926), p. 157.

<sup>15</sup> Excerpted from col. 30 of the new edition, edd. A. Henrichs and D. Obbink (forthcoming). The text amalgamates the readings of the original Naples copy (N) with the supplements of all editors and commentators. The papyrus itself does not survive and there is no Oxford copy; for a facsimile of the Naples copy see *Herculaneum Voluminum quae supersunt*, Collectio Altera, tom. 2 (Neapoli, 1863), 68–9 (= H<sup>v</sup> ii). (Letters designated in the text by a sublinear asterisk indicate editorial corrections of putative errors in the nineteenth-century copy.)

[Πρὸς Ἑμπεδο]κλέα in line 3. If [Ἑμπεδο]κλέα is to be restored (which seems most promising), then we must accept in line 3 the (palaeographically easy) correction of the apograph's πρω[...] to πρὸς[...], for the reason that the restoration [ἐν] τῇ πρώτῃ Πρὸς Ἑμπεδο]κλέα would yield a line far too long for the parameters followed by the scribe throughout the text of *De Pietate* – namely a line of 18–19 letters in a text where line lengths average 14–15 letters and never exceed 16. (Editors universally allow only 13 letters to the preceding line 2, so that [ἐν] τῇ πρώτῃ Πρὸς Ἑμπεδο]κλέα would then produce an inconceivably long line, nearly half again as long as the preceding one.)

Furthermore, the papyrus' reading [ἐν] τῇ πρω[...] shows clearly that in this instance Philodemus did *not* cite Hermarchus' treatise by reference to a specific βιβλίον of that work. But from [ἐν] | τῇ πρω[...] | πρ [it is at least clear that the lost dative noun, though feminine, cannot have been ἐπιστολή. It may well have been πραγματεία] ('opus' or 'disquisition'), as Bücheler suggested.<sup>16</sup> This receives support from Porphyry's allusion (*De Abst.* 1.3.4) to Hermarchus' treatise as ὡν τὰς πραγματευτικὰς... τὰς ἰδίως πρὸς τὰ τοῦ Ἑμπεδοκλέους φερομένας.

Although Porphyry, in discussing his sources early in *De Abstinencia* 1, never explicitly names the title or its author, he does refer (1.3.3) to his opponents in this section as οἱ... τοῦ Ἐπικούρου τὸ πλείστον τῆς ἀντιλογίας πρὸς τὴν Πυθαγόρου καὶ Ἑμπεδοκλέους ἀποτεινόμενοι φιλοσοφίαν, and notes (1.3.4) that he intends to exclude in his summary what was πρὸς τὰ τοῦ Ἑμπεδοκλέους in the Epicurean account. That his source in this section was our treatise by Hermarchus seems to be sufficiently given away by these remarks (possibly an allusion to its title), combined with the polemical attempt (reported at 1.26.4) to make τοὺς Πυθαγορείους out to be partakers of animal sacrifice,<sup>17</sup> where τοιαῦτα are contemptuously ascribed *inter alios* to Ἐρμάρχῳ (Bernays' correction<sup>18</sup> for Ἐρμάχῳ of the codd.) τῷ Ἐπικουρείῳ.

As regards the scope and purpose of the work, it emerges clearly from the extant fragments and testimonia that Hermarchus criticized in it the views not only of Empedocles, but also those of Pythagoras (so Cicero, *De nat. deor.* 1.33.93 and Porph. *De Abst.* 1.3.3; 1.26.4; cf. Sext. Emp. *Adv. math.* 9.127–8) and of Plato (so Cicero, from Philodemus). Under discussion were matters of cultural history, including the formation among early mankind of the concepts of the divine, justice and law, together with theories of natural relations between gods and men and between men and beasts, and philosophical daemonology (e.g. Empedocles: see Plut. *Adv. Col.* 1123b = fr. 22 Krohn). Hermarchus' ultimate objective, however, was a

<sup>16</sup> Bücheler, art. cit. (note 5), 538 (= 609); Philippon, art. cit. (note 5), 369. Cf. Philod. *Rhet.* 1.89.30; 1.91.16; 1.121.4; 2.117.11; *De adulat.* (Περὶ παρρησίας, π. κολ.) P.Herc. 1082, 11; M. Capasso, *Elenchos* 2 (1981) 397. Not very promising is the syntactically odd supplement by Krohn in line 4 πρ[ώτῃ], i.e. [ἐν] τῇ Πρ[ὸς] Ἑμπεδο]κλέα πρ[ώτῃ] (sc. ἐπιστολή). Longo Auricchio, op. cit. (note 4), against the reading of the *disegno*, corrects here to γρ[αφή...] (= 'libro', a meaning attested elsewhere in the Herculaneum papyri), arguing that the ordinal numeral in her reading (following Bücheler and Diels) of 3–4 as [ἐν] τῇ πρώτῃ Πρὸς Ἑμπεδο]κλέα requires the citation of a specific book; πραγματεία never occurs with this meaning. But I have argued that πρ[ώτῃ] is very likely to be wrong, and the correction to πρ[ὸς] [...] right, on the grounds of line length alone.

<sup>17</sup> A tradition stemming from Aristoxenus (e.g. frr. 25, 28, 29) and which appears e.g. in Theophrastus (*De Piet.* ap. Porph. *De Abst.* 2.28.2). The Pythagorean tradition was itself divided between ἐμψύχων ἀπέχσθαι (Porph. *VP* 36, Iambl. *VP* 54) on the one hand, and δικαιοτάτων θύειν (Iambl. *VP* 82, 100; Diog. Laer. *Vitae* 8.12): see W. Burkert, *Lore and Science in Ancient Pythagoreanism* (Cambridge, Mass., 1971), pp. 180–3.

<sup>18</sup> Bernays, op. cit. (note 2), p. 139; cf. Madvig on Cic. *De fin.* 2.30.96.

defence of Epicurean doctrine on these points, and given the wide array of topics addressed and philosophical schools attacked<sup>19</sup> in the work, it is likely that Hermarchus' principal opponents were not in the first instance those attacked openly and by name, but rather contemporary philosophical rivals (especially Stoics and Peripatetics) who had appealed to these figures as authorities.<sup>20</sup> Of this there are several indications, which have gone unnoticed. In our most extensive passage, Empedocles came under attack principally for his view that a fellowship between mankind and irrational animals exists which makes it unjust to slay or sacrifice them; Hermarchus argued in turn that no animal which lacks *λογισμός* has any share in justice (Porph. *De Abst.* 1.12.5–6; cf. Epic. *Kur. Dox.* 32).<sup>21</sup> Much more recently than Empedocles, however, Theophrastus had defended the former position, in the form of the Peripatetic concept of *οἰκειότης* or affinity between men and beasts, citing Empedocles in support of his view and quoting actual passages from his poem(s) (Theophr. *De Piet.* ap. Porph. *De Abst.* 2.21.2–3 and 2.27.7 = Emped. 31 B 128 D.–K., fr. 118 in M. R. Wright, *Empedocles: The Extant Fragments* [New Haven, 1981]).<sup>22</sup> In a related account (*Adv. math.* 9.126–31) Sextus Empiricus, quoting from the same passage of Empedocles (*Adv. math.* 9.128–9 = Emped. 31 B 137 D.–K., fr. 124 Wright; cf. *Adv. math.* 9.119 = Emped. 31 B 136 D.–K., fr. 122 Wright), directs criticism of the same position (attributed to 'Pythagoras and Empedocles and the rest of the Italians') rather pointedly at the *Stoics* (9.131 *τί οὖν φασὶν οἱ Στωικοὶ κτλ.*); which suggests that support for Stoic theories of natural and personal affinity (*οἰκείωσις*) may also have drawn on the authority of Empedocles. Similarly Diogenes of Oenoanda's attack on Empedocles' doctrine of metempsychosis,<sup>23</sup> which Krohn believed to have been derived from Hermarchus' work (Hermarchus fr. 31 in part), is a pointed attack on the Stoics. It is enough to say here that the issue of natural relations was a growing one and hotly debated, both within and among contemporary schools, and that a certain amount of controversy concerned such philosophical pedigrees and centred on the validity of and support to be garnered from the views of famous philosophical representatives of the past.<sup>24</sup>

<sup>19</sup> Goldschmidt, *op. cit.* (note 3), pp. 176–9 argues as well for polemic with the Cynics at Porph. *De Abst.* 1.12.2–3 (from Hermarchus).

<sup>20</sup> Thus Philodemus in *De Pietate* cites Hermarchus' treatise (above pp. 428f. with note 5) in defence of the main tenets of Epicurean theology against its critics and of Epicurus and his followers against contemporary or post-Epicurean charges (by rival unnamed philosophers).

<sup>21</sup> See now Vander Waerdt, 'Hermarchus and the Epicurean Genealogy of morals' (note 3 above). Already Hesiod, *Op.* 276ff. denied to animals any share in *δίκη*: see further West's note *ad loc.* (on Archil. fr. 94 Diehl).

<sup>22</sup> On the Peripatetic view and tradition see D. Obbink, 'The Origin of Greek Sacrifice: Theophrastus on Religion and Cultural History', in *Theophrastean Studies. Ethics, Rhetoric and Religion*, edd. W. W. Fortenbaugh and R. W. Sharples, Rutgers University Studies in Classical Humanities 3 (New Brunswick and London, 1988), *passim*, esp. nn. 71–2 (Theophrastean *οἰκειότης* with bibliography) and 88 (on the compassion for animals attested for the Cynics: cf. note 19, above).

<sup>23</sup> Diogenes of Oenoanda frs. 34–5 Chilton, with New Fragments 2 (in M. F. Smith, *AJA* 74 [1970], 58–60) and 61–2 (in M. F. Smith, *Anatolian Studies* 28 [1978], 57–60). For the polemic with the Stoics, see further Vander Waerdt, 'Hermarchus and the Epicurean Genealogy of Morals' (note 3 above).

<sup>24</sup> Compare the appeal to famous figures of the past (often in disputes over *κοινὰ ἔννοια*) by members of the sceptical New Academy, especially Arcesilaus (lists of such authorities appear e.g. at Cic. *Acad.* 2.14 and 72–6, cf. 1.44–6; Plut. *Adv. Col.* 1108b, 1121f–1122a). The Epicurean Colotes responded not by attacking Arcesilaus (whom he in fact never named: *Adv. Col.* 1120c, cf. 1124b), but by criticizing his 'authorities'. On the method, and disputes over philosophical pedigrees: A. A. Long, 'Stoa and Sceptical Academy: Origins and Growth of a Tradition', *LCM* 5.8 (Oct. 1980), 161–74; G. Striker, 'Sceptical Strategies', in *Doubt and Dogmatism*, ed. M.

None of our testimonia, however, ever alludes to the *epistolary form* of Hermarchus' work, whether in genre, title or style. For this aspect we are dependent entirely on the entry in Diogenes' list of Hermarchus' 'finest writings' (κάλλιστα βιβλία) at *Vitae* 10.25 as 'Ἐπιστολικά περὶ Ἐμπεδοκλέους εἴκοσι καὶ δύο. This could of course be regarded as a mere variant for the form *Πρὸς Ἐμπεδοκλέα*.<sup>25</sup> Since the titlature of ancient books was subject to much variation,<sup>26</sup> especially in citations<sup>27</sup> (though this is *not* the case in P.Oxy. 3318) we should not have much cause for wonder, unless an obvious solution were forthcoming.

As it happens, a key to the solution was uncannily discerned early on by Jacob Bernays, one which has gone subsequently unnoticed. Bernays, who could not of course have known the Oxyrhynchus fragment, was apparently also unaware of the citations in Philodemus' *De Pietate*. But he did in fact know that work at a second remove, through Cicero's use of it as a source in *De natura deorum*.<sup>28</sup> He noted that Cicero's *Hermarchus contra ... Empedoclem* (1.33.93) did not square with Diogenes' 'Ἐπιστολικά περὶ Ἐμπεδοκλέους, and recognized the incongruence inherent in a document in epistolary form extending to 22 books. His suggestion<sup>29</sup> was to treat 'Ἐπιστολικά at the beginning of Diogenes' list as an independent entry, and consequently he regarded the title of the second work in the list as *Περὶ Ἐμπεδοκλέους εἴκοσι καὶ δύο* (in the mediaeval manuscripts this requires only the placement of a comma or raised point following 'Ἐπιστολικά). Now, with independent attestation for the form *Πρὸς Ἐμπεδοκλέα* both in the secondary citations in Philodemus' *De Pietate* and in at least one ancient manuscript (P.Oxy.

Schofield et al. (Oxford, 1980), 54–83; D. Sedley, 'The Motivation of Greek Skepticism', in *The Skeptical Tradition*, ed. M. Burnyeat (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1983), 9–29 at 15f. with n. 27; already Ph. De Lacy, *Introd. to Adv. Col. in Plutarch's Moralia XIV* (Cambridge, Mass., 1967), pp. 155f. and 165; id., 'Colotes' First Criticism of Democritus', in *Isonomia. Studien zur Gleichheitsvorstellung im griechischen Denken*, edd. J. Mau and G. Schmidt, Veröffentlich. der Arbeitsgruppe für hellenistisch-röm. Altertumskunde (Berlin, 1964), 67–86. For a well known Stoic instance: A. A. Long, 'Heraclitus and Stoicism', *Φιλοσοφία* 5–6 (1975–6), 133–53, especially 152.

<sup>25</sup> So apparently Krohn (note 1), 22, 30 (frr. 32–34); Tepedino Guerra (note 4), 520; Dorandi (note 10), 195.

<sup>26</sup> See T. Birt, *Das antike Buchwesen* (Berlin, 1882), *passim*; W. Schubart, *Das Buch bei den Griechen und Romern*<sup>2</sup> (Leipzig, 1921), pp. 98ff.; E. Nachmanson, *Der griechische Buchtitel*, Göteborgs Högskolas Årsskrift xlvii 19 (Gothenburg, 1949), *passim*; C. Wendel, *Griechisch-Römische Buchbeschreibung*, Hallische Monographien 3 (Halle, 1949), K.-E. Hendriksson, *Griechische Büchertitel in der Römischen Literatur*, AASF B 102, 1 (Helsinki, 1956), T. Kleberg, *Buchhandel und Verlagswesen in der Antike* (Darmstadt, 1967), E. Schmalzriedt, *Peri Physéous. Zur Frühgeschichte der Buchtitel* (Munich, 1970), and witness the continuing controversy over the alternative citations of Empedocles' work(s) in antiquity as *περὶ φύσεως*, *τὰ φυσικά*, and *καθαρμοί*, especially W. A. Heidel, 'Περὶ Φύσεως', *Proceedings of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences* 45 (1910), 79–133; most recently: D. Sider, 'Empedocles' Persika', *Ancient Philosophy* 2 (1982), 76–8, C. Osborne, 'Empedocles Recycled', *CQ* 37 (1987), 24–50.

<sup>27</sup> An extreme example in a private letter of the first century A.D. (J. G. Keenan, *J. Paul Getty Museum Journal* 5 [1977], 91–4) which refers to Epicurus' *De voluptate* (Cic. *De div.* 2.27.59) as 'Ἐπὲρ τῆς ἡδονῆς, where *ὑπὲρ* is simply a *Koinē* variant for *περὶ* – though the actual book bearing the title is specifically said to be in the hands of the letter-writer!

<sup>28</sup> See above with note 6. The relevant passages from Philodemus' *De Pietate* had been published in a rudimentary form in the preceding year by Fr. Bücheler (note 5); Gomperz's edition appeared in the same year as Bernays' monograph (1866).

<sup>29</sup> Bernays (note 2) 139f., followed by Gomperz, *ZEÖG* 16 (1865), 825, R. Philippson, *Review of Krohn* (note 1), in *BPhW* 43 (1923), 3; cf. H. Usener, *Epicurea* (Leipzig, 1887), p. 369. Longo Auricchio (note 4) reports the appearance, previously unnoticed, of 'un punto in alto' (of the same type which separates the other titles) after 'Ἐπιστολικά in the authoritative twelfth-century Neapolitanus Borbonicus (III B 29) of Diogenes Laertius.

3318), it is obvious that a further corruption has occurred. One acceptable hypothesis would be that an ingenious editor or librarian, reading ἐπιστολικά πρὸς Ἑμπεδοκλέα (in *scriptio plena*, without punctuation) in an ancient manuscript, and knowing that Epicurus' successor could not have written letters to Empedocles,<sup>30</sup> simply corrected to περὶ Ἑμπεδοκλέους.

Hermarchus' treatise would not be the only ancient work to have been subject to such confusion. A similar case of ambiguity was Callimachus' treatise *Πρὸς Πραξιφάνην* (fr. 460 Pfeiffer).<sup>31</sup> In this instance R. Pfeiffer showed that the signification of the title was polemical (i.e. 'against' the leading Peripatetic, rather than simply signifying direct address) on the basis of a learned scholium which included Praxiphanes in a list of those adversaries called 'Telchines' by Callimachus.<sup>32</sup>

As for the title Ἑπιστολικά (elsewhere attested as an ancient title for epistolary collections),<sup>33</sup> Hermarchus' letters were well known in antiquity and circulated widely.<sup>34</sup> Diogenes himself tells (*Vitae* 10.15) of a famous instance in which Epicurus' death was related by Ἑρμαρχος ἐν ἐπιστολαῖς, though Diogenes otherwise includes no entry for these in his list of Hermarchus' writings at 10.25 (cf. 10.28, where the title *Letters* appears as the last entry<sup>35</sup> in the list of Epicurus' works). From another Herculaneum papyrus (P.Herc. 1044), we now know (though Bernays did not) that there in fact existed at least one ancient edition of Hermarchus' letters, namely the collection and epitome of the letters of Epicurus and his early followers (including Hermarchus) made at Antioch for circulation there among the 'slothful youth' (νέοι ἀργοὶ) by the second century B.C. Epicurean Philonides.<sup>36</sup> Letters from Epicurus to Hermarchus were also known in antiquity (Athen. 13.588b; Cic. *De fin.* 2.30.96, with Madvig's note *ad loc.*), and, it is now reasonable to assume, were collected together

<sup>30</sup> A source of confusion may have been the fact that the title *Πρὸς Ἑμπεδοκλέα* (*Against Empedocles*) would be identical with the standard epistolary title: thus Diog. Laer. *Vitae* 10.6 ἐν τῇ *Πρὸς Πυθοκλέα ἐπιστολῇ*; 10.85 ἐν τῇ μικρᾷ ἐπιτομῇ *Πρὸς Ἡρόδοτον*, and cf. the formulation with the dative in the standard epistolary opening, e.g. 10.83 Ἐπίκουρος Πυθοκλεῖ χαίρειν. In other words, on grounds of chronology the reading πρὸς Ἑμπεδοκλέα, if transmitted in the MSS. as in the papyri, would be the *lectio difficilior*.

<sup>31</sup> C. O. Brink, 'Callimachus and Aristotle: An Inquiry into Callimachus *Πρὸς Πραξιφάνην*', *CQ* 40 (1946), 11–26; W. Aly, *RE* 22.2 (1954), 1769–84.

<sup>32</sup> *History of Classical Scholarship* 1 (Oxford, 1968), 95 n. 4, 135–6, with Schol. Florentina to fr. 1 (line 7, p. 3); so already F. Wehrli, *Die Schule des Aristoteles*, vol. 9 (Basel, 1957) on Praxiphanes fr. 15–17.

<sup>33</sup> *Claudii Galeni opera omnia*, ed. C. G. Kühn, vol. 8 (Leipzig, 1824), 150.4; *Sorani Gynaeciorum*, ed. I. Ilberg, *Corpus medicorum graecorum*, vol. 4 (Leipzig, 1927), 6.1, and n.b. that in the latter instance the designation ἐπιστολικόν is employed to distinguish an epistolary from a polemical title in πρὸς + accusative.

<sup>34</sup> Fragments and testimonia collected by Krohn, op. cit. (note 1), pp. 36–9 (frr. 45–57). Longo Auricchio (note 4) following R. Philippson (Review of Krohn [note 1] in *BPhW* 43 [1923], 3) against H. Usener (*Epicurea* [Leipzig, 1887], p. 369) takes Ἑπιστολικά to refer to writings in epistolary form in addition to genuine epistles (in contrast to the designation Ἑπιστολαί in the list of the works of Epicurus at Diog. Laer. *Vitae* 10.28), but excludes from this group the treatise *Πρὸς Ἑμπεδοκλέα*.

<sup>35</sup> As the title in this instance appears *last* in the list, no similar confusion results from a succeeding title beginning with a preposition.

<sup>36</sup> *Incerti auctoris Bíos Φιλωνίδου* (P.Herc.1044) col. 14 (τὰς ἐπιτομὰς τῶν ἐπιστολῶν τῶν Ἐπικούρου Μητροδώρου Πολυαῖνου Ἑρμάρχου καὶ τῶν σὺν ἡγ[με]νων) in W. Crönert, 'Der Epikureer Philonides', *Sitz. Preuss. Akad. d. Wiss.* 1900, 2, 943–9 = *Studi Ercolanesi*, Ital. transl. E. Livrea (Napoli, 1975), 36–91; cf. *ibid.*, 'Die Epikureer in Syrien', *JOAI* 19 (1907), 145ff., and the new text by I. Gallo, *Frammenti biografici da papiri*, 2: *La biografia dei filosofi*, *Testi e Commenti* 6 (Roma, 1980), pp. 23–166 at fr. 14.3–10 (p. 46 Crönert, 68 Gallo) where Hermarchus' letters are included among those edited by Philonides.

with his own under the title 'Επιστολικά as it appears initially in Diogenes' list. This repunctuation of the Diogenes entry, prompted by the evidence of papyri both new and now long known, also yields a new title more in line with Hermarchus' working methods and with titles of other works by him<sup>37</sup> (among which, for instance, Diogenes includes *Πρὸς Πλάτωνα* and *Πρὸς Ἀριστοτέλην*). The title *Πρὸς Ἐμπεδοκλέα* contributes to the already polemical, almost vituperative cast of his work, in which he adopted a mode of discourse which was for Hellenistic philosophical writing a common rhetorical and argumentative strategy. Hermarchus was well known for his *Angriffstaktik*, his penchant for polemic and polemical use of irony, which are well illustrated in the surviving fragments.<sup>38</sup> Almost by way of apology, Diogenes concludes his list of Hermarchus' writings by characteristically telling us he was a 'good man' (10.25 *γενόμενος ἱκανὸς ἀνὴρ*).

Columbia University, New York

DIRK OBBINK

<sup>37</sup> Noted by Coles, op. cit. (note 10), p. 10.

<sup>38</sup> Krohn, op. cit. (note 1), pp. 1–16 esp. 9–11; for a striking instance see Philod. *De dis* 3 col. 13,20ff. Diels (fr. 39 Krohn) with the discussion of Diels *ad loc.* Porphyry, *De Abstinencia* 1.7.12 esp. 1.7.1 (from *Against Empedocles*) may be a case of polemical Epicurean appropriation by Hermarchus of the Stoic concept of *οἰκείωσις* (argued by Vander Waerdt, 'Hermarchus and the Epicurean Genealogy of Morals' (note 3 above)).