

no longer refers to Hippolochus, Athenaeus' subject at this point, but to his two contemporaries, who are really in this sentence to assist in the identifying and dating of Hippolochus (Lynceus as the recipient of the letter that is about to be quoted; Duris as Lynceus' better-known brother). Textually the *μαθητῆς* of the manuscript is *lectio* slightly *difficilior*, since it agrees with a singular noun quite a long way back in the sentence.

Athenaeus is not famous for relevance, and it is not impossible for a *conjectura facillior* to be right. But by adopting Korais's conjecture into their texts (Gulick's, now the most often used, does not indicate that it is a conjecture) nineteenth- and twentieth-century editors¹⁴ have had a strong effect on historiography. They no longer make Athenaeus say that the otherwise unknown Hippolochus was a pupil of Theophrastus. Instead they make him say that Lynceus and Duris were. As regards Lynceus, if anybody cares about him,¹⁵ there is the evidence of Hippolochus' letter (cited above, note 13) to confirm that Lynceus listened to Theophrastus' lectures; but as regards Duris, a historian of some significance, there is no other evidence on the point.

In the present state of our knowledge, then, although we cannot deny outright that Duris of Samos might have been a student at the Lyceum, we must recognise that no ancient author is known to have asserted it. There is thus no need for surprise that Duris' own writings, though influenced by Peripatetics among others, do not demonstrate him unequivocally to have been a disciple of the Peripatetic school.

London House for Overseas Graduates

ANDREW DALBY

¹⁴ *Athenaei Deipnosophistarum libri XV*, ed. G. Dindorf (Leipzig, 1827); *Athenaei Deipnosophistae*, ed. A. Meineke (Leipzig, 1858–9); *Athenaei Naucratis Deipnosophistarum libros XV*, ed. G. Kaibel (Leipzig, 1887–90); Athenaeus, *The Deipnosophists*, ed. and tr. C. B. Gulick (London etc., 1927–41).

¹⁵ According to G. Ferrero, 'Tra poetica ed istorica: Duride di Samo', *Miscellanea di studi alessandrini in memoria di A. Rostagni* (1963), pp. 68–100, 'sembra quasi che i due fratelli costituiscano una sorta di inseparabili Dioscuri della cultura samia dell'epoca'; Robert Kébric, *In the Shadow of Macedon: Duris of Samos* (Wiesbaden, 1977), p. 20 asserts 'the fact that Duris and Lynceus led the island's cultural rejuvenation'. There is room for a study of Lynceus that stays closer to the evidence. The numerous, brief fragments of his works, all preserved by Athenaeus, have never been collected and printed separately.

TWO ATTRIBUTIONS

I. *De mundo*

The short treatise *On the Cosmos*,¹ which most scholars believe to be not by Aristotle, has confidently been attributed to Aristotle by G. Reale and A. P. Bos.² I do not wish to enter into their arguments for this attribution, because I believe it can be proved to be untenable.

In the theological section of *De mundo* ch. 6, the author argues that the supreme deity rules the world and keeps it together. He compares its function to that of the

¹ I use the ed. and transl. by D. J. Furley, *Pseudo-Aristotle De Mundo*, Loeb Cl. Libr. Vol. 400 (London and Cambridge, MA, 1965 and later repr.), pp. 331ff.

² *Aristotele: Trattato sul cosmo per Alessandro*, ed., Italian transl., introd. and comm. by G. Reale, *Filosofi antichi* 5 (Naples, 1974). Bos's latest publication on the topic is a Dutch transl. with introd. and notes, *Aristoteles: Over de kosmos* (Meppel and Amsterdam, 1989); see also A. P. Bos, 'Greek Philosophical Theology and the *De mundo*', in *On and Off the Beaten Track. Studies in the History of Platonism* (Nijmegen, 1986), pp. 1ff.

keystones in a vault which 'lie in the middle' (399b31, μέσοι κείμενοι) and so ensure the stability of the whole structure. He then gives another illustration (399b34–400a9, tr. Furley):

They say (φασί) too that the sculptor Pheidias, when he was making the Athena on the Acropolis, carved his own face into the middle of her shield (ἐν μέσῃ τῇ ταύτης ἀσπίδι), and by some hidden trick of craftsmanship attached it to the statue in such a way that if anyone tried to remove it he inevitably destroyed and demolished the whole statue.

And this is the position held in the cosmos by God, who maintains the orderliness and preservation of the whole; except that he is not in the centre (μέσος) – for here lies the earth... –, but high aloft, pure in a pure region which we rightly call 'heaven'...

What these similes have in common is their emphasis on something *in the centre*; in fact, the author emphasizes that the deity, unlike the self-portrait of Pheidias on the shield, is not literally in the centre of the universe.

I find it impossible to believe that this passage can have been written by Aristotle. Copies of the dramatic scene carved on the convex side of the shield of the chryselephantine Athena Parthenos survive;³ to the right, it showed the Amazons climbing the Acropolis and to the left their being thrown off. Either at the top or (more probably) at the bottom of the shield were two male figures. The description of Plutarch, *Life of Pericles* ch. 31, who identifies one of these as Pericles and the other as Pheidias, agrees with what we see on these extant copies. He tells us that Pheidias had carved himself on the shield as a bald old man lifting a piece of rock with both hands (αὐτοῦ τινα μορφήν ἐνετύπωσε πρεσβύτου φαλακροῦ πέτρον ἐπηρημένον δι' ἀμφοτέρων τῶν χειρῶν), and had added a splendid portrait of Pericles fighting the Amazons. The faces of both figures according to him were not clearly visible because the hand of the Pericles holding the spear to some extent hid them both. These identifications are doubted by some scholars and accepted by others.⁴ What matters in our context, however, is firstly that the so-called self-portrait of Pheidias was not 'his own face' only, and secondly that it was not in the centre.

A head is of course more likely to serve as the boss of a shield than a whole figure. Aristotle lived in Athens for many years. One need not doubt that he visited the Acropolis and, just as Plutarch, had seen the statue with its shield. He cannot have affirmed that Pheidias' face was in the centre, because there was no such face there. Apuleius, in his translation of the *De mund.*, ch. 36, omits the simile of the keystones but reproduces that about the portrait. He brazenly renders the 'they say' (φασί) of his original by an even more persuasive 'I have seen with my own eyes' (*vidi ipse*).

But the story about the self-portrait at the centre which miraculously keeps the whole statue from falling apart is a fable. It belongs with a rather late and utterly implausible topos,⁵ which moreover occurs in several forms.

³ E.g. the Strangford copy of the shield in the British Museum and the shield of the Lenormant statuette in the National Museum at Athens. See N. Leipen, *Athena Parthenos: A Reconstruction* (Royal Ontario Museum, 1971), figs. 23, 26–7 and fig. 83 for reconstructions of the Amazonomachy.

⁴ The issue is whether portraits are feasible in the fifth century B.C.E. G. M. A. Richter, *The Portraits of the Greeks*, i (London, 1965) pp. 103f., 150, accepts the portraits, or at least that of Pheidias. H. Philipp, *Tektonon daidala* (Berlin, 1968), p. 113, calls them in doubt. For further references and discussion see J. Mansfeld, 'The Chronology of Anaxagoras' Athenian Period and the Date of his Trial', Pt. II. 'The Plot against Pericles and his Associates', *Mnem.* 33 (1980), 29f.

⁵ See the references in J. Overbeck, *Die antiken Schriftquellen zur Geschichte der bildenden Künste in der Antike* (Leipzig, 1868; repr. Hildesheim, 1959), pp. 122f. The passage from the *De mundo* is Overbeck nr. 669, its translation by Apuleius nr. 671.

Cicero's remarks on the subject are quite sane. At *Orator* 234 (Overbeck nr. 673) he says that if 'the shield of Pheidias' is taken apart the beauty of the composition will be destroyed, but not that of its several pieces. At *Tusculans* 1.34 (Overbeck nr. 674) he says that Pheidias 'sui similem speciem inclusit clipeo Minervae', but does not say this image was at the centre of the shield. The most likely explanation of the fable is that the idea of the statue's collapse as the inevitable result of removing the portrait at the centre of the shield is a distortion of sensible observations such as the one found at *Orat.* 234.

In the first century C.E. Valerius Maximus, *Facta et dicta memorabilia* 8.14.6 (Overbeck nr. 670), reproduces the fable without however stating that the self-portrait was at the centre: '... Phidiae secutus exemplum, qui clipeo Minervae effigiem suam inclusit, qua convulsa tota operis conligatio solveretur.' A version with a portrait at the centre, but not that of Pheidias but of someone else, is found in Ampelius (perhaps fourth century C.E.), *Liber memorialis* 8 (Overbeck nr. 672): '... in quo clipeo medio Daedali est imago ita collocata, quam si quis imaginem a clipeo velit tollere perit totum opus, solvitur enim signum.' The version in the ps.-Aristotelian *De mirabilibus auscultationibus* 155 (864a16 ff.; cited Overbeck nr. 669), a passage of uncertain date,⁶ is virtually identical with that of the *De mundo*, although of course it does not add a theological amplification. The account begins with λέγεται; in the *De mirab. ausc.* this word, just as φασι does, regularly serves to introduce a sensational story, and we recall that in the *De Mundo* too the passage about the shield begins with φασι. These formulas do not suggest autopsy. I do not know which ps.-Aristotelian treatise is the earlier, or whether either of them may have been the immediate source of the other,⁷ but feel quite confident that the proper and original place of the story of the portrait and the crumbling statue is in the *mirabilia* literature, which after all is where, because of its implausibility, it belongs.

The facts concerned with what one could see on the shield are not mentioned by either Bos or Reale, although the latter comments on the keystones and the self-portrait in the *De mundo*. He argues⁸ that these images are 'felicissimi, proprio perché fanno capire perfettamente, in modo intuitivo, che cosa significa che Dio è il principio del cosmo tolto il quale si toglie lo stesso cosmo' (his italics). In so far as the rhetorical purpose of the author of the tract is at issue, this is correct. But Reale's suggestion that Aristotle included the story about the shield in order to 'tener vivo l'interesse del giovane [scil., Alexander] cui... sta parlando' is not even *ben trovato*.

II. Anonymus In *Theaetetus*

The Middle Platonist commentary on Plato's *Theaetetus* has been tentatively attributed to the Alexandrian philosopher Eudorus⁹ by H. Tarrant.¹⁰ I do not wish

⁶ Some items are certainly of later provenance than others, so either the whole collection is late, or it was added to in the course of its transmission.

⁷ H. Flashar, *Aristoteles, Mirabilia*. Aristoteles: Werke in deutscher Übersetzung Bd. XVIII 2² (Berlin and Darmstadt, 1981), p. 147 argues that *De mundo* must be the source because it would be the source of the preceding paragraph too, but this argument also holds the other way round.

⁸ Reale, op. cit. (n. 2), p. 265 nn. 76 and 77. The parallel in the *De mirab. ausc.* 155 which he cites with due caution fails to prove that Aristotle wrote the *De mundo* for Alexander.

⁹ Whom we may call a Platonist or even an early Middle Platonist, see e.g. J. M. Dillon, *The Middle Platonists* (London, 1977), pp. 115ff.

¹⁰ H. Tarrant, 'The Date of Anon. in *Theaetetus*', *CQ* 33 (1983), 161ff., esp. pp. 180ff.; less confidently H. Tarrant, *Scepticism or Platonism? The Philosophy of the Fourth Academy* (Cambridge, 1985), pp. 66ff.

to enter into his often attractive arguments for this attribution because I believe it can be proved to be highly improbable.

In his account, or exegesis, of Aristotle's *Categories* Eudorus introduced an important innovation (Simplicius, *In Cat.* 206.10ff. Kalbfleisch = Eudorus Fr. 17 Mazzarelli),¹¹ i.e. the sequence (substance /) quality / quantity: the *ποῖόν* before the *ποσόν*. Aristotle himself, in the list of the ten categories at *Cat.* 4.1b26–7, has quantity before quality.¹² In the detailed exposition at *Categories* chs. 5–8 quality even comes last. The Eudoran sequence is found at e.g. ps.-Archytas, *Cat.* 22.14 and 23.21f. Szlezák,¹³ Philo, *Decal.* 30,¹⁴ Arius Didymus *ap.* Stob. (*Ecl. eth.*) 2.42.2–4 Wachsmuth, Theodorus of Gadara *ap.* *Quintil.* 3.6.36, and Martianus Capella 4.340. Porphyry, explaining Aristotle's text, has the sequence quantity / quality, e.g. *In Cat.* 86.14ff., 100.11ff. Busse (where an argument for the Aristotelian order is provided), but *ibid.* 87.24–5 has quality before quantity. Arius Didymus, *loc. cit.*, is speaking in his own right; having finished his discussion of Philo of Larissa he is about to start on Eudorus.

Anonymus *In Theaetetum* occasionally uses the Aristotelian categories in the course of his sometimes laboured exegesis. See esp. col. 68.1–24 Diels-Schubart: substance, quantity, quality, relative.¹⁵ It is worthy of note that in order to produce a sequence which corresponds to what is in Aristotle, *Categories* ch. 4, Anonymus has to cite the items in Plato's text from which he extracts each separate category in an order different from that in which they occur at *Tht.* 152d. Anonymus practises sleight-of-hand in order to produce the order he prefers, that is to say the original Aristotelian sequence. Consequently, it is virtually precluded that Eudorus wrote the anonymous commentary.

University of Utrecht

JAAP MANSFELD

¹¹ C. Mazzarelli, 'Raccolta e interpretazione delle testimonianze e dei frammenti del medioplatonico Eudoro di Alessandria', Pt. I, *Riv. Filos. Neosc.* 77 (1985), pp. 197ff. – Pt. II, *ibid.*, pp. 535ff. On Eudorus and other Platonists on the categories see H. Dörrie, 'Der Platoniker Eudoros von Alexandria', in *Id.*, *Platonica minora* (Munich, 1976), pp. 300f. Cf. also Dillon, *op. cit.* (n. 9), pp. 134f.

¹² But note that elsewhere, in less full listings of the categories, he rather often has *ποῖόν* before *ποσόν*; see the table in K. Oehler, *Aristoteles, Kategorien*. Aristoteles: Werke in deutscher Übersetzung, Bd. I 1² (Berlin and Darmstadt, 1986), pp. 352ff. Eudorus may have appealed to such passages.

¹³ See T. A. Szlezák, *Pseudo-Archytas: Über die Kategorien*, *Peripatoi* 4 (Berlin and New York, 1973), *ad loc.* Simplicius, *In Cat.* 206.8ff. points out the parallel between Eudorus and (ps.-)Archytas.

¹⁴ Cf. W. Theiler, 'Philo von Alexandria und der Beginn des kaiserzeitlichen Platonismus', in *Parusia. Festschr. J. Hirschberger* (Frankfurt a. M., 1965), pp. 204f., repr. in *Id.*, *Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur* (Berlin, 1970), pp. 489f.

¹⁵ See P. Moraux, *Der Aristotelismus bei den Griechen*, II: *Der Aristotelismus im I. und II. Jh. n. Chr.*, *Peripatoi* 6 (Berlin and New York, 1983), pp. 485ff.

THREE NOTES ON LUCRETIUS

I

2.515:

denique ab ignibus ad gelidas †hiemisque† pruinas.

hiemisque OQ: *hiemum usque* Munro: *iter usque* Lachmann

To Munro's conjecture, which has been accepted by Diels (1923), S. B. Smith (1942), Bailey (1947), Büchner (1956), Martin (1959), and M. F. Smith (1982), there is a