

Notes



CHAPTER ONE

All translations are mine, unless otherwise indicated.

1. M. R. Lefkowitz, *Lives of the Greek Poets* (Baltimore, 1981), vii–viii; A. Riginos, *Platonica: The Anecdotes concerning the Life and Writing of Plato* (Leiden, 1976), 1–8; J. Fairweather, “Fiction in the Biographies of Ancient Writers,” *Ancient Society* 5 (1974): 231.
2. B. Gentili and G. Cerri, *History and Biography in Ancient Thought* (trans. L. Murray, Amsterdam, 1988), 72; Lefkowitz 1981, 12–14, 60–61; F. Wehrli, “Gnome, Anekdote, und Biographie,” *Museum Helveticum* 30 (1973): 193–208; A. Momigliano, *The Development of Greek Biography* (Cambridge, Mass., 1971), 68–73. Nor, unfortunately, is it restricted to the ancient world, as we will see.
3. Empedocles’ dates are uncertain. Apollodorus assigns him to the Eighty-Fourth Olympiad, 444–40 BCE; M. R. Wright, *Empedocles: The Extant Fragments* (New Haven, 1968), 3–6, suggests the dates 494–34 BCE. Generally speaking, Empedocles’ dates are agreed to fall between 494/2–34/2 BCE.
4. A. E. Freeman, *History of Sicily*, vol. 2 (Oxford, 1891), 34; A. Andrews, *The Greek Tyrants* (London, 1974), 132–34.
5. The biographical sources are given in citations 1 and 2.
6. Lefkowitz 1981, 62.

7. Other sources and names also exist: the *Suda* gives Meton, Exaenetus, and Archinomos for the father's name. The latter name, Archinomos, otherwise exists only in a letter said to have been written by Pythagoras' son Telauges (see Diogenes Laertius' *Life of Pythagoras* 8.53). The letter, almost unanimously considered spurious, exemplifies the manner in which names mentioned in literary or philosophical texts become themselves part of the biographical tradition, as I have discussed previously.

8. The biographers, and Diogenes Laertius in particular, had access to many of the same records we do, and among them were the lists of Olympic victors. On this point, see C. B. R. Pelling, "Plutarch's Method of Work in the Roman Lives," *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 99 (1979): 79 and A. T. Cole, "The Anonymus Iamblichii and His Place in Greek Political Theory," *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 65 (1961): 134.

9. For the victories of Exaenetus the elder, see Diodorus Siculus 12.82.1, 13.34.1, 82.7.

10. Wright 1981, 3–6.

11. On this point, see S. Miller, *Arete* (Chicago, 1979), 102; E. Mensching, *Favorinus von Arelate: der erste Teil der Fragmente* (Berlin, 1963), 93, and W. K. C. Guthrie, *A History of Greek Philosophy*, vol. 2 (Cambridge, 1962), 132. The events held at the various games were too well known for the biographers to change them and believably award Empedocles a prize in, for example, poetic recitation at Olympia. This probably further influenced the tradition of his victory in the horse race there. For the biographers' care in using well-known historical facts, see H. S. Schibli, *Pherekydes of Syros* (Oxford, 1990), 10.

12. The association between famous men and towns is quite common and quite often causes problems with philosophers' dates as well as family background and names. See, for example, the problem of an accurate date for Xenophanes, Zeno, and Parmenides, because of their connection to the founding of Elea, or of Protagoras with Thurii, as discussed by L. Woodbury, "Sophocles among the Generals," *Phoenix* 24 (1970): 209, or F. Jacoby, *Apollodors Chronik* (Berlin, 1902), 21.

13. The only missing element, Empedocles' distasteful behavior, is discussed later in this chapter.

14. The topos occurs in Diogenes Laertius' life of Plato, also set at Olympia (3.25), and in the lives of Pythagoras, at Delos (Iamblichus VP 2.52.8.35) and Apollonius, at Olympia (Philostratus VA 8.15). For the topos in general, see Riginos 1976, 190.

15. For the lineage and description of later biographers and their students and teachers in "the golden chain" of philosophers, see G. Fowden, "The Pagan Holy Man in Late Antique Society," *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 102 (1982): 33–59.

16. Wright 1981, 264–67; Guthrie 1962, vol. 2, 217 and 246.

17. For personal and autobiographical interpretation of first-person statements in literature, see Lefkowitz 1981, 25 ff.; Gentili and Cerri 1988, 68–73; Fairweather 1974, 258; Momigliano 1971, 68–73.

18. "Effeminate dress" is a common topos of philosophical abuse and may be suggested here. See G. E. L. Owens, "Ancient Philosophical Inveective," *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy* 1 (1983): 15. The bronze sandals, as we will see, play a vital part in the Etna story. Empedocles' "long hair" also occurs and perhaps originates in the biography of Pythagoras, discussed later in this chapter. In citation 10, this description

of Empedocles is part of Apollonius' defense on charges of claiming to be a god; Apollonius mentions his own long, disheveled hair and defends it with reference to Empedocles and with allusion to Pythagorean cult practice as well.

19. For the hostile tradition of biography that suggests this interpretation of the fragment and its illustration in citations 8 and 9, see Lefkowitz 1981, 17 and 1987, 156; Wehrli 1973, 202; R. McKim, "Democritus against Scepticism: All Sense-Impressions Are True," *Proceedings of the First International Congress on Democritus* 1 (1983): 288; D. R. Stuart, "On Vergil Eclogue iv. 60–63," *Classical Philology* 16 (1958): 209; and Woodbury 1970, 215 and 219. On the biographical relation between philosophers and gods in later antiquity, see T. Häag and P. Rousseau, *Greek Biography and Panegyric in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley, 1997), 52; P. Cox, *Biography in Late Antiquity: The Quest for the Holy Man* (Berkeley, 1983), 20.

20. His gravity as described may also suggest melancholy; Empedocles, like Plato and Socrates, was considered melancholic: Aristotle *Pr.* 30.1 = DK 31A17; Aetius 5.27.1, 5.24.2, 5.22.1; Caelius Aurel. *Morb. chron.* 1.5 = DK 31A98; Soraenus *Gynaec.* 1.57 = DK 31A79. His alleged melancholy may stem from the belief that he investigated mental disorders, Wright 1981, 8; Guthrie 1962, vol. 2, 227; it is not, however, an uncommon accusation as citations 24 and 45–49, in the Heraclitus and Democritus chapters discuss. For example, Aelian *VH* 8.13 = DK 31A18, groups Empedocles with Plato and Anaxagoras, who never laughs, in opposition to Heraclitus, who always cried, and to Aristoxenus, who always laughs; see Riginos 1976, 150. Empedocles' gravity and melancholy probably result from Pythagorean biography, as discussed later.

21. For Anaximander, see Diodorus of Ephesus *ap.* DL 8.70; for Pythagoras, see Alcidas *ap.* DL 8.56.

22. For Parmenides, see Theophrastus *ap.* DL 8.56; for Anaxagoras and Pythagoras or Xenophanes, see Hermippus *ad.* DL 8.56.

23. According to Apollodorus, Anaximander died "soon after" 547/6 BCE; Empedocles was not born until about 494/2 BCE. See G. S. Kirk and J. E. Raven, *The Presocratic Philosophers* (Cambridge, 1981), 100.

24. Schibli 1990, 13; C. H. Kahn, "Plato and Heraclitus," *Proceedings of the Boston Area Colloquium in Ancient Philosophy* 1 (1985): 244; M. R. Lefkowitz, "Was Euripides an Atheist?" *Studi italiani di filologia classica* 5 (1987): 156; A. Szegedy-Maszak, "Legends of the Greek Lawgivers," *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 19 (1978): 203; Fairweather 1974, 262; Wehrli 1973, 206.

25. Wright 1981, 5; C. H. Kahn, *The Art and Thought of Heraclitus* (Cambridge, 1979), 429, 439; Guthrie 1962, vol. 2, 115; J. B. Bury and R. Meiggs, *A History of Greece* (London, 1985), 570.

26. Diodorus of Ephesus' report of Anaximander as Empedocles' teacher may be a simple corruption of Alcidas' account, per N. Demand, "Pindar's Olympian 2, Theron's Faith, and Empedocles' Kathermoi," *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 16 (1975): 356, or an attempt to link Empedocles and Anaximander, much as Aristotle links them, through theories of condensation and rarefaction, Aristotle *Ph.* 187a12; G. E. R. Lloyd, "The Hot and the Cold, the Dry and the Wet, in Greek Philosophy," *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 84 (1964): 95.

27. For Xenophanes' influence on Parmenides, see Kirk and Raven 1981, 265; for

Xenophanes' influence on Empedocles, see Kirk and Raven 1981, 323; Guthrie 1962, vol. 2, 169.

28. Timaeus *ap.* DL 8.54; Alcidas *ap.* DL 8.56; Eusebius *PE* 10.14.15 = DK 31A8 and DL 8.43; Neanthes *ap.* DL 8.45; for Empedocles as a student of the Pythagoreans Hippasus and Broninus, see DL 8.88 and the letter falsely attributed to Telauges.

29. Empedocles' text (fr. 129) continues, "master of all kinds of wise works; for whenever he reached out with all his thoughts / easily he saw each of the things that are / in ten and even twenty generations of men."

30. In DL 8.54, in which citation 11 is found, Timaeus flatly states that Empedocles was a student of Pythagoras, expelled for stealing Pythagoras' "discourses" and ends with the citation 11, in which Empedocles, according to Timaeus, "mentions" Pythagoras. The charge of stealing from Pythagoras, made of both Empedocles and Plato, is an example of the hostile student-teacher topos or tradition, which disparages the thief/philosophers on both moral and philosophical grounds, i.e., that their ideas, beliefs, and theories were not original, but stolen from a true master.

31. Pythagoras boxing in purple robes and long hair, DL 8.47 and 49.

32. This studied solemnity is reminiscent of Pythagoras' advice to avoid immoderate laughter and sullen looks, DL 8.19–20 and 23. Plato is the other philosopher who attracts attention at the games (he competes at Isthmia and Pythia, according to Apuleius *de Platone* 1.2 and is a victor at the Neamean and Olympia games, according to the *Anonymous Prolegomena* 2.26–28.) This strongly suggests that the topos originates with Pythagoras and was thought applicable for only those philosophers related to him, Empedocles and Plato, former students who claimed Pythagorean work as their own, and who became rivals. For the intentional modeling of Plato's biography on Pythagoras (to prove him as a "good" philosopher), see Riginos 1976, 66. The only other philosopher to achieve notoriety at the games is the much later Apollonius, whose biography contains both Pythagorean and Empedoclean elements, see note 17 in this chapter.

33. Pythagoras is the son of Apollo or Hermes, DL 8.4; is hailed as a fellow god by a river, DL 8.11; called Apollo Hyperboreios by the people of Croton, Aristotle *Metaph.* A5986a29, and Apollo by his disciples, DL 8.11 and 14. For the continued use of Pythagoras as a literary model in later biographies, see M. J. Edwards, "Birth, Death, and Divinity in Porphyry's Life of Plotinus" in Häag and Rousseau 1997, 54.

34. W. Burkert, *Lore and Science in Ancient Pythagoreanism* (Cambridge, Mass., 1972), 133; G. Zuntz, *Persephone* (Oxford, 1971), 232; Guthrie 1962, vol. 2, 141 and 245; W. Kranz, *Empedokles: antike Gestalt und romanische Neuschöpfung* (Zurich, 1949), 18, 26, and 31; J. Burnet, *Early Greek Philosophy* (London, 1945), 93. See, however, Demand 1975, 347–58, who argues that belief in metempsychosis (which informs Pindar's *Olympian* 2 and connects it with Empedocles' fr. 128, citation 7) was brought to Acragas from Crete and Rhodes (by the original settlers of Acragas, Theron's ancestors praised in *Olympian* 2) and reflects cult practice in Acragas and not Pythagorean influence; see also R. S. Bluck, "The Phaedrus and Reincarnation," *American Journal of Philosophy* 79 (1958): 160 and J. B. Bury, *The Cambridge Ancient History*, vol. 4 (London, 1926), 510, 546, and 566. Xenophanes' identification with Empedocles may stem from this same phenomenon, for he criticized the theory of metempsychosis (and Pythagoras) in a widely known satirical poem, DK 21B7: "And once, they say,

passing by when a puppy was being beaten, he pitied it, and spoke as follows: ‘Stop! Cease your beating, because this is really the soul of a man who was my friend; I recognized it as I heard it cry aloud.’”

35. In several instances, Empedocles, like Plato, is said to have stolen rather than imitated Pythagoras’ theories (Timaeus *ap.* DL 8.54; Neanthes *ap.* DL 8.55). The charge of stealing another philosopher’s work is a common and quite hostile biographical topos, Riginos 1976, 67, 169–74. For the Pythagorean practice of secreting doctrines, which Plato violated by making public, see W. Burkert, “Shamanismus,” *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 14 (1962): 36–55; G. Boas, “Fact and Legend in the Biography of Plato,” *Philosophical Review* 57 (1948): 438–52.

36. If a written form ever existed; see J. Barnes, *The Presocratic Philosophers* (London, 1982), 100.

37. See notes 17 and 31.

38. Personal characteristics are quite often transferred from “teacher” to “student”; Timon and his pupil Dioscurides were both said to be one-eyed, DL 9.112; see Wehrli 1973, 206; R. Hope, *The Book of Diogenes Laertius* (New York, 1930) 101.

39. Thales (DL 1.25), Pythagoras (8.3), Menedemus (2.140), and Solon (1.34–35) are among the statesmen; physician/philosophers include Democritus (DL 8.12), Pausanias (8.61), Eudoxus (8.89), Alcmaeon (8.83), and Plato (3.85). Plato also wrote poetry and tragedy as well as philosophy (DL 3.5); predictions are attributed to Thales (DL 1.23), Chilon (1.70), Epimenides (1.114–115), Pherecydes (1.116), Anaxagoras (2.10), Plato (3.17), Aristotle (5.5), and Democritus (9.39).

40. Empedocles’ career as a god is discussed separately.

41. See Lefkowitz 1981, 67–74, 88–104.

42. On the mixed tradition that presents the subject in a favorable or hostile light, see Owens 1983, 19; Lefkowitz 1981, 136–38; J. Mejer, *Diogenes Laertius and His Hellenistic Background* (Wiesbaden, 1978), 53; Riginos 1976, 160; Wehrli 1973, 202.

43. We might assume as much, from the reports of race horses and Olympic competitions in citations 1 and 2, but Diogenes Laertius also makes specific mention of family wealth and influence at 8.51, 72, and 73. For wealth and power as standard parts of philosophical biography, see L. Holford-Strevens, *Aulus Gellius* (Chapel Hill, 1988), 75; D. Furley and R. E. Allen, *Studies in Presocratic Philosophy* (London, 1973), 48; E. Bowie, “Greeks and their Past in the Second Sophistic,” *Past and Present* 46 (1970): 17; G. S. Bowersock, *Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire* (Oxford, 1969), 9.

44. For Heraclitus, see DL 9.6, for Solon, DL 1.49, and the discussion of citation 11 in the Heraclitus chapter. For discussion of the topos in general, see J. Kindstrand, “The Cynic and Heraclitus,” *Eranos* 82 (1984): 164; Lefkowitz 1981, 92, 33; K. Dover, “The Freedom of the Intellectual in Greek Society,” *Talanta* 7 (1976): 33; Wehrli 1973, 201.

45. Lefkowitz 1981, 49–52.

46. Wright 1981, 7; T. S. Brown, *Timaeus of Tauromenium* (Berkeley, 1958), 52; R. Fenk, *Adversarii Platonis quomodo de indole ac moribus eius iudicaverint* (Jena, 1913), 67.

47. See, for example, Guthrie 1962, vol. 2, 131, although his opinion is by no means unique; Empedocles enjoys a reputation as an active, democratically motivated politician. W. Jaeger calls him “a friend of the people” (*The Theology of Early Greek Philosophers* [Oxford, 1947], 143), and Burnet assures us that, “At any rate [given that

many of the anecdotes are “old wives’ tales,” which nonetheless, reflect an accurate historical tradition], we see that Empedocles was the great democratic leader at Acragas in those days, though we have no clear knowledge of what he did” (1945, 199). The quotation’s ending takes on even greater significance when we consider just how little is known about “those days” in Acragas and how much has been inferred about Empedocles. The facts are these: Theron, Acragas’ powerful and beneficent ruler, died in 473 BCE. He was succeeded by his son Thrasydaeus who was driven out within a year and killed. Ten years later (ca. 462 BCE), civil strife broke out in many of the Sicilian democracies; the ten intervening years were probably years of strife and unrest as well. Our evidence comes from the historian Diodorus Siculus who, in his descriptions of those years, never mentions Empedocles, except in reference to the hospitality of Acragas, for which he partially quotes citation 10. His silence, given his obvious knowledge of Empedocles, casts grave doubt upon the political actions mentioned by Empedocles’ biographers. For this era of Acragas history, see A. E. Freeman, vol. 2, 349 and 560, with the caveat, however, that Freeman’s primary source is Diogenes Laertius. See also Wright 1981, 8; Bury and Meiggs 1985, 190.

48. M. R. Lefkowitz, “Aristophanes and Other Historians of the Fifth-Century Theatre,” *Hermes* 112: 147 and 1981, 67 and 112; J. M. Bell, “Simonides in the Anecdotal Tradition,” *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica* 28 (1978): 30; Riginos 1976, 180–83; Fairweather 1974, 213; K. Dover, *Greek Popular Morality in the Time of Plato and Aristotle* (Berkeley, 1974), 243.

49. Bell 1978, 73.

50. Tyrants and philosophers were a favorite biographical contrast, see J. P. Dumont, “Les modes de conversion a la philosophie chez Diogene Laerce,” *Augustinus* 23 (1987): 79; Kindstrand 1984, 151; Riginos 1976, 74; Wehrli 1973, 193.

51. Diogenes Laertius also says it proved Empedocles was wealthy; he had trouble reconciling Empedocles’ wealth, political standing, and arrogance as expressed in his work with democratic tendencies. This contradiction was noted by other biographers and commentators and is discussed later in this chapter.

52. It has been suggested that the Thousand was an oligarchic club, conspiracy, or council. See Freeman 1891, vol. 2, 349 and 560; Wright 1981, 8. Like the anecdote in citation 14, this is probably a vague reference to political change in Acragas after Theron and Thrasydaeus. For Diodorus Siculus as historian, see J. G. Dellis, “Diodorus Siculus on Democritus,” *Philosophia* 13 (1983): 124; J. Palm, *Über Sprache und Stil des Diodorus von Sizilien* (Lund, 1955), 2–21; N. G. L. Hammond, “The Sources of Diodorus Siculus XVI,” *Classical Quarterly* 31 (1937): 90.

53. We do know of a somewhat similar situation in Syracuse, ca. 491 BCE, when the oligarchy of nobles was driven out by the common people. However, the nobles then appealed to Gelon who defeated the people and established his tyranny over noble and simple alike. See Bury and Meiggs 1985, 188.

54. Wright (1981, 9 and 19), who calls the epigram almost completely spurious, notes that not only is it attributed to Simonides but that the first four words also appear anonymously in Eustathius *ad Od.* 1634.12. Among these reports, we should probably include statements from Glaucus and Hippobotus in DL 8.52 that suggest (with various degree of hesitation) that Empedocles went to Thuri just after its foundation (ca. 445–44 BCE) and that he went to Syracuse to fight against the

Athenians (ca. 415 BCE). Glaucus himself doubts the Syracuse report, remarking that Empedocles would either be dead or too old for this to be plausible; the trip or embassy to Thuri is probably nothing more than the biographical desire to link a favorite son to an important colony. There also exists, in DL 8.72, the remark that a statue of Empedocles was taken from Syracuse to Rome, where it was on public display. Considering the Roman tendency to rob the conquered cities of Magna Graecia, the report may well be true.

55. The two speeches “about freedom” (DL 8.65 and 72) may reflect the rhetorical tendency for set pieces, see B. A. van Gronigen, “General Literary Trends in the Second Sophistic,” *Mnemosyne* ser. 4, no. 18 (1965): 50 and Bowie 1970, 5.

56. Empedocles, after all, “invented rhetoric.” This mysterious statement, which comes to us from no less an authority than Aristotle (*ap.* DL 9.57), has as its only corroboration the report that Gorgias, the famous Leontine rhetorician, was Empedocles’ student (Satyrus *ap.* DL 9.58; Sextus Emp. *adv. math.* 7.6 and Quintilian 3.1, both = DK 31A19.) While the number of philosophers who invent things constitutes a very common topos (see Riginos 1976, 188; Stuart 1967, 93; A. Kleingunther, “Πρωτο εὐρετη,” *Philologus* suppl. 26 [1933]), this is one of the oddest examples. Wright suggests that the report of Gorgias as Empedocles’ student comes from Plato’s *Meno* 76C, when Socrates first asks Meno to answer “in the manner of Gorgias,” and then asks if Meno, “like Empedocles,” believes in the effluence of certain things. The biographers may have reasoned as follows: if Meno himself was Gorgias’ student he would presumably have learned Empedocles’ theory from him, and thus the intellectual succession is established from Empedocles to Gorgias to Meno. The determination to establish such successions or genealogies is discussed by Lefkowitz 1981, 77 and 87; Szegedy-Maszak 1978, 203; M. I. Finley, *The Use and Abuse of History* (New York, 1975), 15–26; Fairweather 1974, 262; see, however, G. B. Kerferd, “Gorgias and Empedocles,” *Siculorum Gymnasium* 30 (1985): 595.

57. R. D. Hicks (*Diogenes Laertius. Lives of Eminent Philosophers* [Cambridge, Mass., 1925], 300) translates as “when Acragas came to regret him”; see also Wright 1981, 16, and E. Bignone, *Empedocle. Studio critico, traduzione e commento della testimonianze e dei frammenti* (Turin, 1916), 106.

58. It also supplies a handy, favored setting for violent death, see Lefkowitz 1981, 95. For the topos of exile in general, see Lefkowitz 1981, 128; Szegedy-Maszak 1978, 206; Holford-Strevens 1988, 75; Fairweather 1974, 262; Wehrli 1973, 206. Philosophical exile was also to become a standard topos in the life of the Christian holy man; see Häg and Rousseau 1997, 46–47.

59. For internal logic or consistency within a philosopher’s biography, see Szegedy-Maszak 1978, 203; Kirk and Raven 1981, 75 and 217.

60. See citations 40–42 in chapter 3.

61. Diogenes Laertius’ text is ambiguous here, and the anecdote may have originated with Timaeus. If so, it may have had a more hostile tone originally.

62. Guthrie 1962, vol. 2, 254; Wright 1981, 276.

63. Pliny lists Empedocles with Pythagoras, Democritus, and Plato as philosophers whose travels, undertaken for their studies, more truly resemble exile, *HN* 30.1.9 = DK 31A14.2; Timaeus *ap.* DL 8. The newly discovered additions to fr. 139 of the Strasburg papyrus also support the notion of exile in this manner and may also be

included in the various accounts of Empedocles' death. See A. Martin, "L'Empédocle di Strasburgo: Aspetti Papirologici," *Elenchos* 19, no. 2 (1999): 145–49 and Wright 1981, 16.

64. I follow Diels' text here rather than Hicks; see Hicks 1925, 380 for comparison.

65. Which is not to say, however, that the number, date, and topic of the two poems are. The disputes are of long standing and give no indication of ending: see J. Bidez, *La Biographie d'Empédocle* (Ghent, 1894), 20; Bignone 1916, 43; E. Rohde, *Kleine Schriften II* (Leipzig, 1901), 379; A. Delatte, *La Vie de Pythagore de Diogene Laërce* (Brussels, 1922), 25; O. Kern, *Die Religion der Griechen*, vol. 2 (Berlin, 1935), 146; W. J. Verdenius, "Abro," *Mnemosyne* 15 (1962): 292; Kranz 1949, 2; K. Reinhardt, *Parmenides und die Geschichte der griechischen Philosophie* (Bonn, 1916), 172; E. R. Dodds, *The Greeks and the Irrational* (Berkeley, 1951), 146; F. M. Cornford, *Principia Sapientiae* (Cambridge, 1952), 109; Guthrie 1962, vol. 2, 124; Wright 1981, 17; C. Osborne, *Rethinking Greek Philosophy: Hippolytus of Rome and the Presocratics* (London, 1987), 24–31.

66. Plutarch *quaest. conv.* 683e (on fr. 148); Lucretius 1.731–35; see also Bury 1926, 481; Guthrie 1962, vol. 2, 136, 154, 188, 199.

67. Aristotle fr. 70 Rose. On the epic or Homeric use of repetition and simile by Empedocles, see Bignone 1916, 602; J. Souilhé, "L'enigma d'Empédocle," *Archives für Philosophie* 9 (1932): 340; F. Solmsen, "Nature as Craftsman in Greek Thought," *Journal of the History of Ideas* (1963): 476–79; B. Snell, *The Discovery of the Mind: The Greek Origins of European Thought* (Oxford, 1953), 213; B. A. van Groningen "Empédocle, Poète," *Mnemosyne* 24 (1971): 185–88. For Empedocles' admiration and stylistic imitation of Parmenides and Xenophanes, see Theophrastus *ap.* DL 8.55, 56, and Guthrie 1962, vol. 2, 135. See also the discussions by Wright 1981, and note 80 in chapter 2.

68. See G. M. A. Grube, *Aristotle on Poetry and Style* (New York, 1958), 4 and 77.

69. K. Freeman (Companion to the Pre-Socratic Philosophers [Oxford, 1966], 179) refers to the "complete misunderstanding of Aristotle's views in Diogenes Laertius" in 8.57.

70. Lefkowitz 1981, 16, 21; Riginos 1976, 168; G. S. Kirk, *Heraclitus: The Cosmic Fragments* (Cambridge, 1962), 8; Wright 1981, 18.

71. Menander, for example, says that Empedocles, like Parmenides, wrote natural/philosophical hymns. A hymn to Apollo is specifically mentioned, Menander *Rhetor* 1.2.2, 5.2 = DK A23, see F. Solmsen, "Hymn to Apollo," *Phronesis* 25 (1980): 219ff. For the medical treatise see Zuntz 1971, 237–38. See also Wright 1981, 18; Guthrie 1962, vol. 2, 127; A. Stevens, "La physique d'Empédocle," *Revue Belge de Philologie et Histoire* 76 (1989): 68. There have, however, been at least two attempts to find these two lost works in the extant fragments of Empedocles; for the hymn to Apollo, see Solmsen 1980, 219–27; for the "Persika," see D. Sider, "Empedocles' Persika," *Ancient Philosophy* 2 (1982): 76–78.

72. See Wright 1981, 7; Freeman 1891, v. 2, 345.

73. Bury and Meiggs 1985, 190. For the confusion of military battles, Empedocles' dates alleged participation in these battles, see Wright 1981, 5; Freeman 1891, 173–75.

74. See, however, Wright 1981, 18. The same impulse that connects famous men and events, such as Aeschylus and Salamis or Empedocles and Himera, is also seen in the later report that links Empedocles with another famous Sicilian victory, the destruction of Athenian forces at Syracuse in 415 BCE; Apollodorus *ap.* DL 8.52 says that the unnamed sources for the story are mistaken. On this point also, see Wright 1981, 4.

75. Wright 1981, 18. This also elucidates Timaeus' remark in citation 1 that Empedocles, the poet's grandfather, had been "a man of distinction." The habit of attributing doubtful works to a subject's youth is commonly used to explain inconsistencies of style or lost work; see Lefkowitz 1981, 21.

76. It may also demonstrate another topos of philosophical biography, the literary versatility or genius of the philosopher who renounces all other work for philosophy's sake. Plato's literary career is very similar to Empedocles'; he is said to have written dithyrambs, lyric poetry, epic poetry, and tragedy before renouncing them all for philosophy. Many of the sources makes Socrates the cause of Plato's renunciation of other genres; others report that Plato burned his literary efforts either because they were bad or to demonstrate his renunciation. Riginos (1976, 43–51) demonstrates that the reports of Plato's work in different types of poetry, including tragedies, stem from his remarks on poetry and education in works such as the *Republic*, especially in the detailed criticism of poetry that occurs in books three and ten. Renunciation of other work is itself a standard theme, sometimes called the conversion to philosophy, which A. Nock (*Conversion* [Oxford, 1933], 164–68) and Dumont (1987, 581–59) have shown to be typical in philosophical biography.

77. Galen *Meth. Med.* 1.1 (= 10.5 Kayser); Pliny *NH* 29.1.5, both = DK 31A3; Celsus *proem* 2.11; Iamblichus *VP* 113 = DK 31A15, discussed later in this chapter.

78. *VM* (1–2, 15, 20) and *Morb. Sacr.* 2.1–32 are included in the Hippocratic corpus; Empedocles' connection with charlatans and miracle workers is discussed in the next section; Empedocles' connection with the physician Acron was discussed earlier. Judging from descriptions of Acron, their association may also hint at Empedocles' career as a physician: Acron is said to be older than Hippocrates, to have written *On Healing* and *On Health*, and to have studied respiration. Pliny tells us that he cleansed Athens of plague by burning, *HN* 29.1.5; Plutarch *de Is. et Os.* 79; both = DK 31A3.

79. G. Vlastos, "Equality and Justice in Early Greek Cosmogonies," *Classical Philology* 42 (1947):158. See also Jaeger 1947, 143; Guthrie 1962, vol. 2, 216–28; F. Cleve, *The Giants of Greek Philosophy* (The Hague, 1973), 226.

80. Guthrie (1962, vol. 2, 133) remarks that Empedocles' "serious contribution of physiology and medical history . . . are not to be rigidly separated from his fame as a wonder-worker which has brought to the lips of many modern critics the word 'charlatan.'" The biographers certainly did not separate them nor, unfortunately, do some modern scholars, who deny Empedocles' importance as a philosopher by making him a shaman; see P. Kingsley, *Ancient Philosophy, Mystery, and Magic* (Oxford, 1995), 227. For a different view, see Wright 1981, 9–14. For the use of the Pythagorean model in late biography and in the life of the holy man in the form of "Miracles, clairvoyance, vegetarianism, and readiness to die . . ." see Edwards 1997, 54ff.

81. Wright 1981, 10; see also H. Diels, “Gorgias und Empedokles,” *Sitzungsbericht der preussischen Akademie* 49 (1884): 344.

82. Investigations into these areas of physical research form a fairly standard part of the early philosophers’ repertoire; Wright 1981, 13; G. E. R. Lloyd, “Who Is Attacked in *On Ancient Medicine?*” *Phronesis* 8 (1963): 121 and 1964, 102; Guthrie 1962, vol. 2, 133.

83. van Groningen 1965, 48; Holford-Strevens 1988, 5; Bell 1978, 59; Momigliano 1971, 84; Hope 1930, 171, 178, 184, 214.

84. Some states, such as Corinth, had officials called “wind-calmers” or “wind-soothers,” see L. Farnell, *Greek Hero Cults*, (Oxford, 1921), 416–17. It is tempting to see this anecdote as one that once belonged to Empedocles’ political tradition or at least an anecdote that combined politics, miraculous works, and control of the elements. A similar anecdote exists, in which Empedocles “soothes” or “calms” his future pupil Pausanias who, in a maddened frenzy, is about to kill his father, DK A15. The fact that Empedocles uses music to effect his cure suggests, however, a Pythagorean basis to the story.

85. Empedocles blocks a wind that both makes women barren and causes miscarriage, Plutarch *de curios.* 515C and Clement *Strom.* 6.3.30 (2.445.11 St.), both = DK 31A17. Empedocles stops a storm cloud that threatens Acragas, Philostratus VA 8.7.8 = DK 31A14. Empedocles rids Selinus of a plague by mixing two rivers, Diodorus of Ephesus *ap.* DL 8.70. Finally, Empedocles is tellingly linked with Pythagoras, Democritus, and Plato as philosophers who travel to converse with magicians, Pliny NH 30.1.9; Philostratus VA 1.2 = DK 31A14. The mention of the animal skins and their magical/medical use calls the death of Epimenides irresistibly to mind; his corpse was found to be covered with tattoos that were, perhaps, the texts of oracles attributed to the prophet/philosopher. If so, we have another link in the tradition that makes Empedocles and Plato holy thieves, students who stole secrets hitherto available only to the initiates of the Pythagorean mysteries and made them public.

86. The several stories that mention Empedocles and women (he saves the women of Selinus from miscarriage and barrenness, Pantheia from her trance, and even provides dowries for the young women of Acragas) are equally the result of his interest in embryology and his belief, quite rare in the ancient world, of female contribution to the developing embryo, see G. E. R. Lloyd, *Science, Folklore, and Ideology* (Cambridge, 1983), 87; Aristotle GA 722b6, coupled with the tradition of a democrat reformer who works in the people’s interest.

87. See the discussion of citation 30 in chapter 3.

88. For the tradition of Empedocles in this anecdote see Guthrie 1962, vol. 2, 133; Wright 1981, 11; for wind cults in antiquity see Farnell 1921, vol. 2, 415. For the topos in general, see Schibli 1990, 5; Holford-Strevens 1988, 74; Wehrli 1973, 201; Freeman 1966, 176; Hope 1930, 99, 118. In Diogenes Laertius, philosophers who performed such acts and were awarded with deification include Epimenides (1.110), Menedemus (6.102), Pythagoras (8.14 and 21), and Democritus (9.3). Pherecydes (1.116) does not seem to have been deified despite his miraculous acts.

89. Lefkowitz 1981, 10, 23; Mejer 1978, 39; Riginos 1976, 194–98; Fairweather 1974, 233–39; Wehrli 1973, 193. See, for example, Valerius Maximus 9.12, *De mortibus non ordinariis* (Extraordinary Deaths), and Pliny NH 7.180–84, with its list of

those who died of joy, of shame, while putting on their shoes, while sucking eggs, and so on.

90. D. R. Stuart, *Epochs of Greek and Roman Biography* (Berkeley, 1967), 245.
91. For death as a refutation of one's work, character, or beliefs, see Edwards 1997, 56.
92. See the discussion of citation 32 in chapter 2.
93. Suicide is often used in such a way: Sappho kills herself for love of a young man. See Lefkowitz 1981, 37.
94. It also punishes Empedocles for his insulting appraisal of the common man in citation 32, which begins, "The fools. For they have no long-reaching thought . . ."
95. Osborne 1987, 119–122.
96. Osborne 1987, 127–31; Wright 1981, 15; Burnet 1945, 202; Bidez 1894, 64. Certainly, the church fathers saw in Empedocles' death the danger involved in claiming divinity; see Claudian *Paneg. Theod.* 71; Tertullian *De Anim.* 32; Lactantius *Div. Inst.* 3.18; Greg. *Ad. Nem* 281; Bidez 1894, 64, 86.
97. In the second anecdote, citation 41, we also see the character of Empedocles as champion of the people and the divine honors he receives for saving the community. In this anecdote, at least, he has fulfilled the promises made in citations 10, 12, and 29.
98. The identification of the different roots by their divine names was a matter of dispute in antiquity; see DK 31A33; J. Longrigg "Roots," *Classical Review* 17 (1976): 1–4; Guthrie 1962: 2, 144; Bignone 1916, 542.
99. H. B. Gottschalk (*Heraclides of Pontus* [New York, 1980], 17) suggests that the scene is patterned on the apotheosis of Oedipus in Sophocles' *Oedipus at Colonus*, 1626.
100. His student and beloved, or so the biographers understood it; Diogenes Laertius, 8.60–61, draws upon both Aristippus and Satyrus as evidence that Pausanias was Empedocles' "beloved." All three biographers present as their only evidence Empedocles' address of Pausanias in fr. 1. For a love relationship between student and teacher adduced from like address or for the existence of either a student or a teacher from such an address, see Schibli 1990, 13; Lefkowitz 1987, 128; Fairweather 1974, 262; Hope 1930, 152; Stuart 1921, 149.
101. Bury and Meiggs 1985, 189.
102. Messene was not far from Olympus and mysteries similar to those at Eleusis, which also promise life after death, were celebrated near Messene in Hellenistic times. The biographers may be indulging in a bit of anachronism to suggest that Empedocles traveled from festival to festival, performing miraculous acts. See M. P. Nilsson, *A History of Greek Religion* (Oxford, 1949), 22, 478; Kern 1926, vol. 2, 188.
103. Wright 1981, 16.
104. Wright (1981, 17) notes that Hippobotus answers these objections with a description of the two statues of Empedocles raised in his honor, DL 8.72.
105. Or that a sandal of any material would have survived, Strabo 6.2.8.
106. The newly recovered addition to fr. 139 from the Strasburg papyrus certainly would have given the biographers free rein to speak of such a death; the additional material states, in part, that the exiled soul, regretting his past, enters the "Whirl" of "constant griefs" and an "inextinguishable flame, bringing upwards a mixture of much

woe” (A. Martin and O. Primavesi, *L’Empedocle de Strasburg*, trans. R. Gaskin [Berlin, 1999], 147).

CHAPTER TWO

1. Apollodorus, FHG. Fr. 340A. A lack of evidence, as much as anything else, has led to general agreement for that date. See Kirk 1962, 1–3 for acceptance of Apollodorus as a “rough guide” and for his discussion and refutation of Reinhardt’s attempt to date Heraclitus some twenty years after, rather than before, Parmenides, Reinhardt 1916, 157. Kahn (1979, 1 and n. 1) also accepts the Apollodoran date for Heraclitus and notes its synchronism with the date of Darius. For other, more general introductions to the philosopher and his era, see Kirk and Raven 1981, 185–215; R. Mondolfo and L. Tarán, *Eraclito. Testimonianze e imitazione* (Florence, 1972), 1–24; M. Marcovich, “Herakleitos,” *PW Suppl. Band 10* (1965): 246–320; D. Ramnoux, *Heraclite ou l’homme entre les choses et le mots* (Paris, 1959) 1–10. For methods and problems associated with Apollodoran chronology, see Jacoby 1902, 227, and Burnet 1945, 143–91.

2. When more than one name is given, it probably indicates that both were mentioned somewhere in the author’s work; see O. Masson, “A propos de Blosson, nom du pere d’Heraclite,” *Revue de Philologie* 40 (1986), 279–81; Lefkowitz 1981, 62–63; L. Tarán, *Parmenides* (Princeton, 1965), 12.

3. Hicks 1979, 413. Strabo 14.25 = DK 22A2; Antisthenes FHG III 182 = DK 22A1, 6.

4. Antisthenes is elsewhere fairly snide in his remarks about philosophers; see, for example, his remarks on Democritus and his investigative methods and research, in chapter 3, citation 18.

5. The words μεγαλοφροσύνη and μεγαλόφρον do, of course, have positive shades; they mean “greatness of mind,” or “high-mindedness” or even “magnanimity”; see Plato *Smp.* 194b; Protagoras 9; Isocrates 9.27. However, their context here, the coupling of μεγαλόφρον with ὑπερόπτης, and mention of Antisthenes all conspire to give the words their darker meaning of “pride” or “arrogance”; see Herodotus 2.4; Antiphones 4.3.2; Plato *Euthd.* 293a. On this point, see Kirk (1962, 3) who translates as “exceptionally haughty and supercilious”; see also S. N. Mouraviev, “La vie d’Heraclite de Diogene Laerce,” *Phronesis* 32 (1987): 17 and note 11 in this chapter.

6. See note 11.

7. Heraclitus’ honorific, the Dark One of Ephesus, is borrowed from Kahn 1985, 253. Mejer (1978, 18) notes that for Diogenes Laertius, “excerpts are per definition out of context,” and that such quotations are used in a different context and for a different purpose than was originally intended.

8. Diogenes Laertius frequently suggests that his subject’s “character may be seen from his writing,” e.g., in 9.38, 7.185, and 8.66. That Diogenes Laertius tends to quote illustratively is demonstrated by Mejer 1978, 50 and Hope 1930, 128. That biographers tend to use quotations to characterize is discussed by Fairweather 1974, 258–59; Wehrli 1973, 200–202; F. Leo, *Die griechischen-romische Biographie nach ihrer litterarische*

Form (Leipzig, 1901), 95. For a similar use of quotation in the lives of the poets, see Lefkowitz 1981, 99; Bell 1978, 29–86.

9. See R. Dilcher, *Studies in Heraclitus* (Zurich, 1995), 21. For the professional hostility that existed between Heraclitus and the “great men” of archaic Greek literature, see J. Tate, “On the History of Allegorism,” *Classical Quarterly* 28 (1934): 105.

10. This is perhaps a good time to alert the general reader to the fragmentary state of Heraclitus’ work. We currently possess a debated number of short statements or fragments, which come to us from the ancient world not neatly ordered and collected in a book, but singly and by collection from philosophers such as Aristotle to biographers such as Diogenes Laertius. The fragment numbers used in this chapter follow those of Diels and Krantz, who collected them and ordered them simply on alphabetical grounds. Whether Heraclitus himself ever wrote a book is still a debated question, to be taken up later in this chapter. All readers should note that no attempt is made here either to order the fragments or to supply context for Heraclitean philosophy as a whole. Simply, a comparison of those fragments that mention wisdom and the wise may clarify Heraclitus’ and Diogenes Laertius’ use of them. For philosophical interpretation of fr. 40, 41, and 42, see Osborne 1987, 181; Kahn 1979, 107–10, 111, and 170–72; K. Pritzl, “On the Way to Wisdom in Heraclitus,” *Phoenix* 39 (1985): 308; A. Lebedev, “The Cosmos as Stadium. Agonistic Metaphors in Heraclitus’ Cosmology,” *Phronesis* (1985): 139; Kirk 1962, 386–91.

11. See Kahn 1979, 20.

12. See Pritzl 1985, 308; Kahn 1979, 21; Guthrie 1962, vol. 1, 417–18; Dilcher 1995, 21.

13. Mouraviev (1987, 17) argues that the passage in question is written with the sole purpose of illustrating the misdeeds that result from arrogance. A very compelling piece of evidence to support this view comes from Tatianus, the Christian apologist, who says that he cannot approve or accept Heraclitus because of his “arrogance” (*ad. Gr.* 3). A shunning of civic concerns was to become standard in the life of later Christian biographies, see Häag and Rousseau 1997, 47; in them, however, the withdrawal is admirable, evidence of a required humility.

14. Lawmaking was an accepted part of the philosopher’s (biographical) role; Heraclitus’ refusal to make laws and his contempt for the law are both atypical of the topos and characteristic of his misanthropic biographical personality. See notes 15 and 18.

15. Kindstrand (“Diogenes Laertius and the Chreia Tradition,” *Elenchos* 7 [1986]: 238) points out that Diogenes Laertius often arranges his material by association. For the uncritical use of original texts by the biographers, see Gentili and Cerri 1988, 73–74; Lefkowitz 1981, 41; Mejer 1978, 50; Bell 1978, 78–79; Fairweather 1974, 258–59; Wehrli 1973, 200–202.

16. The working methods of ancient scholars in general has been examined by F. Munzer, *Beiträge zur Quellenkritik der Naturgeschichte des Plinius*, pt. 1 (Berlin, 1987); J. E. Skydsgard, *Varro the Scholar* (Copenhagen, 1968), ch. 7; and P. G. Walsh, *Livy, His Historical Aim and Methods* (Cambridge, 1961), 141–42. Mejer (1978) in particular provides an account of Diogenes Laertius’ methods. For practical difficulties of working with scrolls, readers, scribes, and their influence upon the manuscript, see pp. 16–29.

17. Heraclitus seems to recommend here that the youths should be left alone in the city, to make its laws, and to govern the state. While I find it difficult to believe that Heraclitus is serious in this statement or making a real recommendation for the governing of a city by its adolescents, there is some reason to think that Plato may have taken the passage to heart. In discussion, Diskin Clay noted that at the onset of adolescence, public education would begin and refers the reader to Socrates' advice for foundation of the state: "They will begin by sending out into the country all the inhabitants of the city who are more than ten years old and they [the guardians] will take possession of their children, who will be unaffected by the habits of their parents" (*Pl. Rep.* 7.542, Jowett's translation). In other words, the adults would leave the city and their adolescent children behind where, under the rule of the guardians, the children would be educated as future rulers, without the harmful influence of their parents. Would Heraclitus, in his scenario, act as guardian? More to the point, is Plato once again using Heraclitus in subtle satire? Plato was greatly influenced by Heraclitus, although his interpretations of Heraclitean philosophy and his philosophical portraits of Heraclitus, were not always accurate or even fair; see Kahn 1979, 4 and Kirk 1962, 15–16. Heraclitus' influence upon Plato was certainly noted by the biographers and results in a certain amount of conflation between their biographical characters. For example, Plato shares Heraclitus' melancholy in his characterization as the philosopher who never laughs (*DL* 3.26); see Riginos 1976, 150–51. Socrates, Plato's great spokesman and teacher, is linked several times with Heraclitus; see note 62.

18. See note 3 in this chapter and Kirk 1962, 8–12.

19. Renunciation of kingship specifically occurs in Diogenes Laertius' lives of Solon (1.67) and Empedocles (8.63). Renunciation of politics, poetry, business and other pursuits constitutes a larger biographical topos, see Hope 1930, 154.

20. The assumption is weakened rather than strengthened by the number of philosophers who engage in politics: the sheer number of those who make laws, draft constitutions, and are otherwise politically active render them suspicious. To engage in politics was considered particularly appropriate for philosophers; see Lefkowitz 1981, 17; Bell 1978, 84; Wehrli 1973, 202; Hope 1930, 155. For Heraclitus' atypical refusal to make laws, see Kahn 1979, 1 and Kirk 1962, 81.

21. For the evidence on Heraclitus' friend Hermodorus, see Kahn 1979, 178 and Kirk 1962, 1–2; see also Kirk and Raven 1981, 183–84 on Heraclitus and the Ephesians. The biographers may also be insinuating a scandalous relationship between Heraclitus and his "friend," especially if Hermodorus is to be understood as Heraclitus' student. See Wehrli 1973, 193 and Stuart 1967, 149. A lack of hard data, on the other hand, was no impediment to the writing of biographers, as Dover (1976, 28–31) points out. When data was lacking, biographers simply invented what they felt was most likely to have occurred. On this point, see Szegedy-Maszak 1978, 203 and Finley 1974, 15–26. We should further note that, in spite of Heraclitus' reputed antipathy to the Ephesians, he is also said (by Diogenes Laertius, 9.15) to have preferred them to the Athenians. Because of Athens' strong association with philosophy among biographers and later writers, Heraclitus' preference for the Ephesians would be a further mark of his eccentricity and arrogance. For the importance of Athens in philosophical biography, see Hope 1930, 117. However, for the view that Heraclitus was concerned with

and wrote about political affairs in Ephesus, see J. Frère, “Les idées politiques d’Héraclite d’Éphèse,” *Ktema* 19 (1994): 231–38.

22. Many philosophers in Diogenes Laertius make laws for their states, e.g., Pythagoras (8.3), Thales (1.25), Menedemus (2.140), Parmenides (9.23), Pittacus (1.75), and Solon (1.55 and 1.45). Only two refuse to do so, Heraclitus and Plato (3.23). On this topos of law making, see Szegedy-Maszak 1978, 199–200 and Finley 1974, 39 and 44. On Plato’s refusal to make laws, see Riginos 1976, 191–93, and note 16 in this chapter. That his anecdote arises from Heraclitus’ interest in law (*nomos*) as seen in citation 8, fr. 40, and elsewhere, see Kirk 1962, 4–5.

23. For the further importance of children in Heraclitus’ biography, see also fr. 70 and 79 (citations 39 and 40) and Diogenes Laertius’ account of Heraclitus’ death 9.3–4 (citation 32), both discussed in the last section in this chapter.

24. Anecdotes of this type (“concretized,” see note 26) are often used in this manner; see R. Scodel, “Hesiod Redivivus,” *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* (1981): 320; Finley 1975, 44; Wehrli 1973, 197.

25. Owens (1983, 15) notes that hatred of one’s city or of the people as a whole constitutes a standard means of abuse in comedy and rhetoric which was taken over for the philosophers. See also W. Süss, *Ethos* (Teubner, 1910), 244–54.

26. Those anecdotes that give concrete form to poetry or philosophy I call *concretized*, following Finley 1975, 44, although he did not apply the term specifically to anecdotes. See also Lefkowitz 1981, 92–93; W. J. Slater, “Simonides’ House,” *Phoenix* 26 (1972): 238; Stuart 1921, 225.

27. See Mouraviev 1987, 19. Philosophers were generally thought to be hateful and abusive, see Fairweather 1974, 248; Athenaeus 220 a, e. Other notable philosopher/misanthropes were Myson, Timon, and Apemantus (DL 1.1.07); see Hope 1930, 150.

28. See, for example, Seneca *de tranq.* 15.2; Lucian *vit. auct.* 14 = DK 22C5.

29. Kirk and Raven 1981, 184; see also Kirk 1962, 381; Kahn 1979, 168.

30. These other character traits are discussed later in this chapter. Ancient interpretation and characterization seem alike and primarily seem to have arisen from attempts to deal with Heraclitus on a purely physical plane. See C. Kahn, *Anaximander and the Origins of Greek Cosmology* (New York, 1960), 17–24; G. M. Stratton, *Theophrastus and the Greek Physiological Psychology* (London, 1917), 52; Dilcher 1995, 162.

31. On knowledge and perception and their difference in Heraclitean and archaic thought, see K. Narecki, “Le Rôle des sens et de l’âme humaine dans la théorie de la connaissance d’Héraclite d’Éphèse,” *Eos* 82 (1994): 18–30; J. Wilcox, “On the Distinction between Thought and Perception in Heraclitus,” *Apeiron* 26, no. 1 (1993): 1–18; J. Mansfeld, “Parménide et Héraclite avaient-ils un théorie de la perception?” *Phronesis* 44, no. 4 (1999): 326–46. For a more detailed discussion of the soul in Heraclitus, see M. Nussbaum, “ $\psi\upsilon\chi\mu$ in Heraclitus,” *Phronesis* 17 (1972): 153–70.

32. G. S. Kirk, “Sense and Common-Sense in the Development of Greek Philosophy,” *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 81: 109 and 1962, 377; Kirk and Raven 1981, 196–99; Kahn 1979, 168, 223; 1985, 249; see also the discussion of fr. 31 (citation 55); for ancient testimony of the notion of flux and movement, see S. N. Mouraviev, *Héraclite d’Éphèse, Traditio: La Tradition Antique et Médiéval* (Sankt Augustin, 1999): 1–8.

33. Kahn 1979, 243–58; Kirk 1962, 14–16, 378.

34. Plato *Cra.* 401D, 402A = DK 22A6; see also *Theat.* 160D.

35. In this passage, Socrates and Cratylus discuss the theory and the flux, and Socrates sums up his opinion as follows: “[Such men who think] that there is nothing sound, but that all things flow like leaky pots, are just like people suffering from a cold and a runny nose who believe that things are in their condition, and that everything is subject to rheum and dripping” (*Cra.* 440C).

36. Aristotle himself reacted to this interpretation of the fragment and made explicit, as Kirk remarks, its implicit problems: our own common sense and visual perceptions argue against a universe where stationary objects are seen to be immobile and not in a state of change. See Aristotle *Phys.* 8.3, 253b9; G. S. Kirk, “Natural Change in Heraclitus,” in *The Pre-Socratics*, ed. A. P. D. Mourelatos (New York, 1974), 189–95 and 1961, 109; Dilcher 1995, 161.

37. Kahn (1979, 21) believes Theophrastus’ frustration comes from his problems with the content, that is, with the argument itself, while Kirk and Raven (1981) think the problem may lie with the state of the manuscript. See also K. Reinhardt, “Heraclits Lehre vom Feuer,” *Hermes* 77 (1942): 24.

38. Aristotle *E. N.* 7. 8, 1150b25; see Kirk 1962, 8; K. Deichgraber, “Bermerkungen zu Diogenes’ Bericht über Heraklit,” *Philologus* 93 (1938): 12 and 21. There is little discussion of melancholy in the ancient world before Aristotle. One of Hippocrates’ very few remarks on the subject points out the effect of summer drought on the bilious. The onset of melancholy, which, from his remarks, seems a fairly rare occurrence, is accompanied by dry eyes and lengthy bouts of severe fever. This seems more akin to the brain storm or intellectual flightiness that Theophrastus describes than despondency or depression (Hippocrates *Aer.* 10). Manic/depressive states, then as now, were often associated with genius; Aristotle probed the link between genius and madness in *Problemata* 30. Empedocles, Plato, and Socrates were all considered melancholy-mad, while Democritus was considered a manic type. See B. Simon, *Mind and Madness in Ancient Greece* (Ithaca, 1978), 151, n.49, 229, and 322, n.11. We should also note that distinctive character traits, such as misanthropy, melancholy, or arrogance, were considered grounds for fame by Diogenes Laertius and as such would be eagerly included and discussed; see Hope, 1930, 149–50.

39. This characterization of Democritus will be discussed in chapter 3. For Heraclitus’ characterizations as “gloomy,” see A. M. G. Gomez, *The Legend of the Laughing Philosopher and its Presence in Spanish Literature* (Cordoba, 1984), iii; Kahn 1979, 1 and n.16; C. E. Lutz, “Democritus and Heraclitus,” *Classical Journal* 49 (1954), 313. See also Lucian’s comic description of his meeting with Heraclitus, which satirizes both Heraclitean thought and character, *Vit. auct.* 15 = DK 22C5. A similar process of biographical simplification took place in the life of Euripides, see Lefkowitz 1981, 89. On this point and for the contrasting characterization of Democritus, see Gomez 1984, 2–18; Bell 1978, 58; A. Buck, “Democritus ridens et Heraclitus flens,” *Wort und Text: Zeitschrift für Fritz Salk* (Frankfurt, 1963), 169–80.

40. For the tendency toward comic caricatures, see Bell 1978, 58; Wehrli 1973, 208; Momigliano 1971, 84. For biographical lives written to fit into schematized patterns, see Bell 1978, 56. That the preferred material within these schematized lives are sensational and negative, see Lefkowitz 1981, 100; M. Delcourt, “Biographies

anciennes d'Euripides," *Antiquité Classique* 2 (1953): 286. For the tendency toward philosophical mockery, see Z. Stewart, "Democritus and the Cynics," *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 63 (1958): 185; Stuart 1967, 139–40; G. C. Fiske, *Lucilius and Horace* (Madison, 1929), 158–60, 229.

41. Plutarch *de. garr.* 17, 511B; Themistius *de virt.*, both = DK 22A3, b. For this anecdote, see S. N. Mouraviev, "The Moving Posset Once More: Heraclitus' fr. 125B in Context," *Classical Quarterly* 46 (1996) 34–43.

42. Kirk 1962, 13; K. Freeman 1966, 105. Naturally, the topos is reversed here to show Heraclitus as the philosopher who refused to help his state. The reversal emphasizes the extreme misanthropy of Heraclitus' character and the hostility of the biographers.

43. Kirk 1962, 13.

44. Kirk 1962, 51.

45. These philosophical topoi are discussed at greater length later in this chapter. K. Freeman (1966, 105) notes that the anecdote about the mixed drink is a typical story of the wise man who helps his country during the war as, for example, in Diogenes Laertius, do Thales (DL 1.25), Solon (DL 1.46), and Pythagoras (DL 8.40); the war in question was with Persia. I take the anecdote as a hostile inversion of the standard theme. For discussion of the topos generally, see R. Lattimore, "The Wise Advisor in Herodotus," *Classical Philology* 34 (1939): 24–28.

46. Kindstrand 1986, 219.

47. Fairweather 1974, 266–68. We have, for example, Anaxagoras' response to his death sentence, "Long ago nature condemned both my judges and myself to death." This is a statement also attributed to Solon and to Xenophon; see DL 2.13.

48. Diogenes Laertius 2.7: "Anaxagoras, known for his theories on astronomy, as he grew old, retired from public life and gave himself up to his physical speculation. When someone asked if he had no interest in his native land, he replied that he was greatly interested in it and pointed to the sky." Remarks of this sort can either be ethical in import (Wehrli 1973, 206) or summarize, as here, the speaker's philosophical doctrine (Bell 1978, 46 n. 55).

49. Speech and hearing, like sight, are useless without the interpretation of a wise and knowledgeable soul; see Kirk 1962, 376; H. D. Rankin, "Limits on Perception and Cognition in Heraclitus' Fragments," *Elenchos* 16 (1995): 241–52. The silent philosopher probably makes an analogue to the excessively serious, sober philosophical types such as Pythagoras, Empedocles, Zeno of Citium, and Plato; see Hope 1930, 150; DL 7.18 and 3.26. Plato's sobriety and an alleged preference for solitude are based at least partly on the biographical figure of Heraclitus; see Riginos 1976, 151.

50. H. Cherniss, *Aristotle's Criticism of Presocratic Philosophy* (Baltimore, 1935), 356. Although Cherniss speaks specifically about Aristotle, the method was used by both critics and biographers as well.

51. A. M. Battagazzore (*Gestualita e oracolarita in Eraclito* [Genoa, 1979], 43) uses this fragment (fr. 125, citation 15) to suggest that Heraclitus worked, i. e., composed and taught, as a mime, a theory which has not been well received; see M. Marcovich, "Battagazzore," *Gnomen* 54 (1982): 380.

52. The work itself will be discussed in a separate section in this chapter.

53. Riginos 1976, 15–21; Hope 1930, 146; Stuart 1967, 215. The rubric of an

unusual childhood may conform to a schema drawn from preestablished patterns of heroic lives; see Lefkowitz 1981, 93.

54. Wehrli 1973, 195; Stuart 1921, 216. Diogenes Laertius also reverses this topos to emphasize the eccentricity of Heraclitus' character, see further in this chapter.

55. Hope 1930, 99; Delatte 1922, 46. See, however, the view that proper interpretation of the Heraclitean fragments depend on this (biographical) misanthropy, a view that, among other things, denies abstract thought to Heraclitus, G. Moyal, "On Heraclitus' Misanthropy," *Revue de philosophie ancienne* 7 (1989): 131–48.

56. Fairweather 1974, 263.

57. Szegedy-Maszak 1978, 203; Fairweather 1974, 262.

58. Lefkowitz 1981, 77; Cherniss 1935, 320–24; Stuart 1967, 174.

59. Socrates and Archelaus (DL 9.19) and Empedocles and Pausanias (DL 8.60), are only a few of the figures so linked; see Owens 1983, 17; Stuart 1928, 149.

60. Within such a hostile biographical tradition, it may seem surprising that no use at all is made of this most common form of biographical abuse. Heraclitus, however, was perceived as too much the misanthropic loner for such an assertion to fit within the lines of his biographical character. Szegedy-Maszak (1978, 202) demonstrates the logical consistency that exists within the biographical scheme, even in cases such as this.

61. For Xenophanes' criticism of Pythagoras, see DL 9.19 = DK 21B7; for Heraclitus, see citation 2, within which, however, he also criticizes Xenophanes. Both philosophers were critical of Homer and Hesiod (Xenophanes, DK 21B11; Heraclitus, citations 2 and 4). Finally, both Heraclitus and Xenophanes share a free-floating anecdote of the bon mot kind: Xenophanes, when asked by the Eleans if they should sacrifice to the white goddess and whether they should lament or not, advised them that if they considered her a god, they should not lament and that if they considered her mortal, they should not sacrifice (Aristotle *Rhet.* B 26 1400 b 5 = DK 22A13; Kirk and Raven 1981, 166).

62. Barnes 1982, 83; H. Cherniss, "The Characteristics and Effects of Presocratic Philosophy," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 12 (1951): 334; Burnet 1945, 112.

63. Heraclitus shares this state only with Thales (DL 1.27), that is, only with the philosopher who by virtue and necessity of being Greece's first philosopher could not have had a teacher.

64. Kirk (1962, 6) notes that Heraclitus' statement that he "knew nothing" was later in fact associated with Socrates; see Plutarch *adv. Col.* 1118C, where Heraclitus' fr. 101, citation 27, is compared to the Delphic "know thyself," and to Socrates' inquiry into the nature of man. Fr. 50, citation 23, must also have played some part in its formation, as would his biographical arrogance to know everything in his adult state.

65. See the discussion of fr. 41, citation 3. See also Dilcher 1995, 45; H. D. Rankin, "Heraclitus on Conscious and Unconscious States," *Quaderni urbinati di cultura classica* 50 (1995): 77–78; and E. Hussey, "Heraclitus on Living and Dying," *The Monist* 74, no. 4 (1991): 522–24.

66. See Pritzl 1985, 308; S. Scolnicov, "I Searched Myself," *Scripta Classica Israelica* 7 (1983): 1–13; and Kirk and Raven 1981, 212–14, for agreement on interpretation of fr. 101, citation 22, but see also Kahn 1979, 116. Kahn sees in the fragment a

statement of personal alienation and the importance of self-knowledge, rather than knowledge of the Logos that comes from within.

67. The problems of Heraclitus' book, and indeed its very existence, have occasioned much debate, ranging from no book at all, to Battagazorre's belief that Heraclitus wrote no book because he was a mime (note 48 in this chapter), and Kirk (1962, 7), who conjectures a series of gnomic orally delivered statements, to Diels (*Herakleitos von Ephesos*, 2nd edition. [Berlin, 1909], viii) who hypothesizes a commonplace book in which Heraclitus jotted down random thoughts, to Kahn (1979, 3–9), who supports a deliberate literary composition, stylistically comparable to the work of Aeschylus and Pindar. Like Kahn, I believe the book to have been a deliberate, structured work, the internal, thematic logic and unity of which can be demonstrated through examination of the fragments that are themselves the result of a deliberately ambiguous and quite beautiful style; see notes 85–87.

68. D. Clay, *Lucretius and Epicurus* (Ithaca, 1983), 82 and n.1; Kirk 1962, 7. Diogenes Laertius' own introduction to the work seems hesitant and vague; Hicks' translation is just right: "in the work that passes as his . . ."

69. A. A. Long and D. N. Sedly, *The Hellenistic Philosophers* (Cambridge, 1987), 326; Deichgraber 1983, 18–20. Kahn, who disagrees with Deichgraber and thinks Diogenes Laertius' remarks are a valid description of the work, feels that a better sense of it is rendered by translating it as, "the work falls naturally into three discourses, on the universe, on politics [and ethics], and on theology." Kahn (1979, 8–9) argues that there exists no Stoic classification which could combine the three subclassifications of politics, physics, and theology, and that politics must instead be understood to include ethics as well. See also S. N. Mouraviev, "Titres et Articulations du Texte dans les Oeuvres Antiques," *Collection des Études Augustiniennes* 152 (1994): 35–53.

70. In 9.22, this remark is attributed to Socrates. The dual attribution is discussed later in this section.

71. Lefkowitz 1987, 153; Kirk, 1962, 8–10.

72. Kirk 1962, 10. See the discussion of citation 14 and note 32 in this chapter and the discussions of citations 46–49. For Heraclitus' death by "drowning," see Diogenes Laertius' epigram upon his death, citation 65. The fact that it needed a Delian diver may also have had special significance; see the discussion of citation 31.

73. *Oxford Classical Dictionary*, ed. S. Hornblower and A. Spawforth (New York, 1996): 972.

74. Strabo 3.5.9.

75. There is a further problem, however. Crates of Mallos lived some centuries after Heraclitus and so could scarcely have introduced the book into Greece, although he might well have quoted from it. Probably, either Croton or Diogenes Laertius himself is confusing Crates of Mallos with the Athenian comic poet Crates, giving us a perfect comic source for the remark. The confusion between men of the same name is by no means uncommon in biography; see, for example, the tragedies attributed to Empedocles the philosopher but actually written by his grandson discussed in chapter 1, citations 1 and 23.

76. Lefkowitz 1987, 153–59.

77. J. Fairweather, "Traditional Narratives, Influence, and Truth in the Lives of the

Greek Poets, *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar* 4 (1983): 256; on the tendency to portray doctrines as individuals, see Lefkowitz 1981, 128 and van Groningen 1965, 48.

78. Although they are a standard rubric of his biographies, Diogenes Laertius collects an unusually large number of such bon mots for Socrates, reinforcing the notion that much of his material was collected with as much an eye toward entertainment as education. For example, when Socrates' wife Xanthippe complains that he suffers unjustly, Socrates replies, "Why, would you have me suffer justly?" (DL 2.35) For jokes as a standard part of Diogenes Laertius' biographies, see Hope 1930, 172–74; Delatte 1922, 56. For entertainment values in the biographies, see Lefkowitz 1981, 100; Wehrli 1973, 208; Delcourt 1933, 286.

79. Kirk 1962, 10; Plato *Soph.* 24D = DK A10.

80. DL 4.24. Kahn, however, finds the story plausible precisely because there are so many parallels to the story (1979, 2 and n.4). See, on this point, Fairweather 1974, 251–52, for discussion of the association of famous men with famous towns and temples. For the dedication of books, a discussion of the topos, and a list of other famous offerings, e.g., Xenocrates dedication of his calculations for the height of a mountain, see W. H. D. Rouse, *Greek Votive Offerings* (Cambridge, 1902), 64.

81. Kirk 1962, 8. I think that the comment reflects intellectual abilities, rather than socioeconomic ones. Otherwise, I agree with Kirk in finding the comment, as he does the biography as a whole, a reaction to the work.

82. Kirk 1962, 8.

83. Kirk and Raven (1981, 184), for example, find the charge valid, as does Kahn (1979, 99), although for different reasons. See, however, J. Mansfeld, "Insight by Hindsight: Intentional Unclarity in the Presocratic Proems," *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 40 (1991): 226. Mansfeld argues that archaic philosophers (specifically Empedocles and Heraclitus) blended the proem purposes identified by Aristotle *Rhet.* g. 1415a22–23 (an announcement of the subject or theme, and as a means to influence or attract the public) and thus were criticized as obscure or unclear.

84. Pritzl 1985, 304; see also Guthrie 1962, vol. 1, 419; Kahn 1979, 92 and n.51, 270–71; E. Hussey, *The Presocratics* (London, 1972), 57–59.

85. Pritzl 1985, 303 and n.4.

86. As does Dilcher 1995, 14–20; see also Mansfeld, 225–32; 133–36. For the archaic, as opposed to classical, nature of the Heraclitean statements, see Reinhardt 1916, 53–64; F. Dornseiff, *Pindars Stil* (Berlin, 1921), 66; B. Snell, "Die Sprache Heraklits," *Hermes* 61 (1926): 357.

87. See the discussion of Heraclitus' "melancholy" and his reputation as the "weeping philosopher" earlier in this chapter.

88. Kahn 1979, 123–24; Kirk 1962, 118; Cherniss 1951, 331. See also Mansfeld 1991, 231, with words that specifically comment upon the proem of Parmenides, perfectly describe Heraclitean intent, as discussed elsewhere in his article, "Why not just admit that these lines are intentionally obscure and can only be understood, if at all, by someone who has understood the doctrine of the proem as a whole?"

89. Of course, these details may also have occurred in Hermippus and Neanthes and Diogenes Laertius simply chose not to repeat them.

90. DK 22A1a substitutes sand for dung; see citations 73–75.

91. H. Fränkel, “A Thought Pattern in Heraclitus,” *American Journal of Philology* 59 (1938): 309–37.

92. For interpretations of the Logos, see E. L. Minar, “The Logos of Heraclitus,” *Classical Philology* 34 (1939): 324–41; Kirk 1962, 62; W. Schadewaldt, *Die Anfänge der Philosophie bei den Griechen* (Frankfurt, 1978); E. Kurtz, *Interpretationen zu den Logos-Fragmenten Heraklits* (Hildesheim, 1971); Dilcher 1995, 45.

93. In Diogenes Laertius, exile (involuntary and voluntary) occurs for Thales (1.22), Aeschines of Sphettus (2.63), Stilpon (2.116), Plato (3.3), Theophrastus (5.38), Diogenes (6.20), Empedocles (8.52 and 57). Epimenides enjoys a rather unique form of exile; he slept for over fifty years (1.109). For exile and travel as *topoi*, see Lefkowitz 1981, 95 and 128; Szegedy-Maszak 1978, 202; Riginos 1976, 161; Fairweather 1974, 268. For the connections, allegorical and philosophic, of sleep and death in Heraclitus, see Hussey 1991, 518; H. Granger, “The Other Kingdom: Heraclitus on the Life of the Foolish and the Wise,” *Classical Philology* 95 (2000): 260–81.

94. The philosophers in Diogenes Laertius who travel include Solon (1.50), Epicharmus (8.78), Xenophanes (2.49), Plato (3.5), Democritus (9.53), Bion (4.53), Aristotle (5.1), Pythagoras (8.2), Eudoxus (8.86).

95. Exile or some sort of withdrawn solitude, physical, intellectual, or medial (sleeping), also gives a god or muse the chance to appear, as when Athena visits Zaleucos in a dream (Szegedy-Maszak 1978, 205). Democritus prayed for such visits and wandered around remote places hoping to receive them, see citations 40, 41, 42 in chapter 3 in this volume. Plato was visited by the emissary of the Muses, the bees who sat upon his lips; Riginos (1976, 17–18) notes that this “portent of poetic eloquence” is transferred from poetic to philosophic biography.

96. Fairweather 1974, 268; Szegedy-Maszak 1978, 202.

97. See Owens 1983, 15, for the notion that hatred of one’s city or of the people constitutes a standard means of abuse for the philosophers.

98. Could the biographers have also had in mind Aristotle’s definition of human as social animals (*Politics* 1.1253)? In view of Theophrastus’ importance to the biographical tradition, and both Theophrastus’ and Aristotle’s less than objective attitude toward earlier philosophers, I think it not unlikely. On their influence, see J. B. McDiarmid, “Theophrastus on the Presocratic Causes,” in *Studies in Presocratic Philosophy*, ed. R. E. Allen and David Furley (London, 1973), 178–328; Diels 1979, 1–25; Kirk 1962, 19–30; Cherniss 1935, 347–74. Certainly, the dogs seem to mistake him as such; see the discussion of citation 32 later in this chapter.

99. For symptoms, discussion, and treatment of edema in ancient medicine, see E. D. Phillips, *Greek Medicine* (London, 1973), 154. See also Caelius Aurelianus, *Chronic Diseases* III, 8.122; Celsus *de medicina* III, 21; Galen XVIII, A 39K. For Diogenes Laertius’ language here, see Kirk 1962, 6–7.

100. Citations 32–65.

101. R. Muth, “Der Forschungsbericht Herakleitos,” *Anzeiger für die Altertumswissenschaft* 7 (1954): 87 discusses both the medical treatment and Heraclitus’ death; M. L. West, however, is very critical of the theory, see *Early Greek Philosophy and the Orient* (Oxford, 1971), 198.

102. Fairweather 1974, 238.

103. Kirk 1962, 5; Kirk and Raven (1981, 183) believe the story to be based on fr. 96, citation 53, Fränkel (1938, 310) believes it to be based on the theory of exhalations. West (1971, 198–99) criticizes both these interpretations. For Diogenes Laertius' discussion of the theory of exhalations, see the discussion of citation 54 in this chapter.

104. The same reductionism occurs for other early philosophers also. For example, water was identified as Thales' principle material, as was air for Anaximenes, see Aristotle *Met.* A3 983b-984a; Theophrastus *Phys. Opin.* fr. 1 *ap.* Simplicius *Phys.* 23, 33, both = DK 22A5. See also Cherniss 1935, ch. 7; 1951, 321–31; Dilcher 1995, 161.

105. See Kahn 1979, 141, 137; Kirk 1962, 19–20, 270–77; Dilcher 1995, 182.

106. Kahn 1979, 314; McDiarmid 1979, 174–84; Kirk 1962, 314.

107. For arguments for and against *ekpyrosis* in Heraclitus, see Reinhardt 1942, 163–80; Kirk 1962, 245; Kahn 1979, 134; Dilcher 1995, 57; see also Aryeh Finkelberg, "On Cosmology and Ecpyrosis in Heraclitus," *American Journal of Philology* 119 (1998): 195–222. For the death of a watery soul, and the confusion between cosmic elements and those of the human body, see Dilcher 1995, 182ff. See also Mouraviev 1999, T1–8 and T153–65.

108. See Kahn 1979, 45–47 for text and translation, 138–44 for interpretation; Kirk 1962, 194; 1962, 325–27 for text and translation, 329–35 for interpretation.

109. Riginos 1976, 195, n.8, and see note 67 in this chapter.

110. See the discussion of fr. 58, citation 50.

111. Discussion of the theory and problems of interpretation are found in Osborne 1987, 143–53; Kahn 1979, 148–50; Kirk 1962, 89–96; Cherniss 1951, 331–33.

112. Kahn 1979, 94; 1985, 241–43.

113. Aristotle criticizes Heraclitus for denying the law of contradictions in *Top.* 5, 155b30; *Phys.* A2, 185b19; *Met.* G 3, 1000b23; see also Hippolytus fr. 57, 58; Simplicius *Phys.* p. 50, 10; p. 82, 20 Diels.

114. The reason for this is twofold. First, the material necessary for his death existed only in his philosophy; second, no other philosopher seems to have antagonized the biographers to the extent that Heraclitus did, see I Nareki, "Heraclite d'Ephese dans la legende antique," *Roczniki humanistyczne* 31 (1983): 19. Other philosophers do share similar deaths: Stilpon, Arcesilaus, and Chrysippus die from overindulgence of wine, while Plato, Speucippus, and many, many others die of ptheireisis, lice disease. Plutarch compiled a list, in fact, of famous men who died of lice disease (*Sulla* 36, 5–6). See also Riginos 1976, 194–97; Hope 1930, 162–68.

115. Apollonius of Tyana, Epictetus, Ameinias, and Diogenes all enjoyed cult status after death, see Nock 1933, ch. 11.

116. Lefkowitz 1981, 97 n.46; Kirk 1962, 6. Heraclitus' burial in the agora and his cult status depend in part on his descent from a royal family (Kahn 1979, 1–2); see also Strabo 14.25; Pindar (*Pythean* 5.93) tells us that the kings of Cyrene were buried in the agora also. For posthumous cult status and worship for philosophers and others, see J. P. Dumont, "Les modeles de conversion a la philosophie chez Diogene Laerce," *Augustinus* 23 (1987): 175–76; G. Nagy, *The Best of the Achaeans* (Baltimore, 1981), 221; H. Lloyd-Jones, "Modern Interpretations of Pindar: The Second Pythian and Seventh Nemean Odes," *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 93 (1973): 197; W. Burkert, "Das Prooimium des Parmenides," *Phronesis* 14 (1969): 27.

117. For the reversal of public opinion that occurs in the lives of Homer, Aeschy-

lus, Sophocles, and Euripides, which may reflect the influence of Greek heroes' lives, see Lefkowitz 1981, 97. Philosophers who undergo this reversal are listed in note 108 in this chapter.

118. For this tendency in the lives of poets and philosophers and the ambiguous attitude of the biographers, see Lefkowitz 1981, 97; Riginos 1976, 199 and n. 5.

119. The few exceptions to the hostile tradition of Heraclitean biography are seen in citation 65, discussed at the end of this chapter, and in the alternate sanitized version of his death that occurs in the *Suda* (= DK 22A1a); there, Heraclitus is buried not in dung but in sand. The anecdote told of Heraclitus by Aristotle, discussed subsequently, may be favorable, or at least neutral. For discussion of the hostile and favorable traditions and a tentative explanation for both, see Nareki 1983, 19.

120. See Kahn 1979, 175; but see the rather different use Plato makes of the sentiment in the *Republic* 2.375A.

121. West 1971, 196–202.

122. J. Fairweather, "The Death of Heraclitus," *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 114 (1973): 233–39. See also Lefkowitz 1981, 90; Kindstrand 1984, 159; Kahn 1979, 10–21.

123. For Stoic and Peripatetic interpretations of this fragment and on the danger of an inattentive reading of Diogenes Laertius, see the discussion in Dilcher 1995, 164–68.

124. For the attribution of the epigram, and the discussion of it as a typical Stoic allegory, see the discussion in Dilcher 1995, 191–94. For Heraclitean allegory in the context of archaic literature, see Tate 1934, 105–14; see also "Allegory I," in *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, ed. J. Geffken, 327–31 (Edinburgh, 1980).

125. Kirk 1962, 12; Dilcher 1995, 182.

126. Dilcher 1995, 15.

127. See the discussion in Dilcher 1995, 183, for the approximation of the elements of the physical cosmos to the humors of the human body.

CHAPTER THREE

1. The most accessible introduction to Democritus' text and its problems is found in K. Freeman 1966, 293–99. Many consider the best introduction to the problem of the fragments still to be found in the discussion in P. Natorp, *Die Ethica des Demokritos, Text und Untersuchungen* (Marburg, 1893). See also Guthrie 1962, vol. 2, 238; C. Bailey, *The Greek Atomists and Epicurus* (Oxford, 1928), 2–12; W. Schmid and O. Stahlin, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur* (Munich, 1929), 353.

2. Democritus, like Empedocles and Heraclitus, uses the first person in his writing, which contributes immensely to the biographical data generated from his work. See Lefkowitz 1981, 25, 31, 49, 57; Gentili and Cerri 1988, 73. For Democritus' self-dating, see DK 68B5 = DL 9.41. For the date given by Apollodorus, see Guthrie 1962, vol. 2, 386 n.2, for although Guthrie agrees with this date, he finds it "suspiciously Apollodorean," in that Apollodorus liked to space generations of philosophers at forty-year intervals. See also Barnes 1982, 306–7; Kirk and Raven 1981, 400–404.

3. The few sources that speak of him as Milesian no doubt reference his intellec-

tual origins as Ionian; see Kirk and Raven 1981, 401; Bailey 1928, 109. For a similar attempt in the life of Leucippus, see McDiarmid 1973, 178–28.

4. DK 68A2, 3, 4b, 6, and 7; DL 9.34.

5. Valerius Maximus 8.7.4. For the problems with dating, see Bailey 1928, 110. There is, in fact, little support for this story, although some would gloss the chronological inconsistencies by the early influence of the Magi on a young and impressionable mind. Most often, however, the tradition of the Magi and Chaldaeans is used to support stories of Democritus' magic powers, as we will see.

6. For the problem with dating, see Bailey 1928, 110.

7. Fairweather 1974, 267. For the influence, real or imagined, of the east upon the archaic philosophers, see Kirk and Raven 1981, 77; West 1971, 3.

8. See the discussion of Empedocles and Pausanias in chapter 1 (DL 8.60–61); on this topic, see also Gentili and Cerri 1988, 72; Lefkowitz 1981, 131; Bell 1978, 62.

9. Kirk and Raven 1981, 404 and n.1; K. Freeman 1966, 290. The problem was even acknowledged by Diogenes Laertius; at the end of his life of Democritus, Diogenes Laertius states that some are compilations and not genuine. On this matter, see Aulus Gellius NA 10.12.

10. Note that in the *Amatores*, 132A, Dionysus is not specifically mentioned as Plato's teacher, but simply as a teacher; see Riginos 1976, 40 and n.8. The tradition of Oenopides and Democritus could easily arise from this same text for, in the dialogue, Socrates converses with Anaxagoras, Oenopides, and an "unnamed character," who Diogenes Laertius identifies as Democritus. He bases his identification on Socrates' comparison of philosophers and athletes; the characterization of Democritus as athlete occurs in 9.37 and is discussed in citation 20.

11. Aetius 2.12.2, 2.32.2; Macrobius *Sat.* 1.17.31; all = DK 41A7.

12. Diogenes Laertius' phrasing here is extremely suspicious; he is rather more vague than usual, stating that, "and indeed he mentions him" (9.41). For the association of Democritus, Oenopides, and Pythagoras, see Diodorus 1.98.2; DK 41A7; for Democritus' biographical association with Pythagoras, see Cole 1961, 155; Q. Cataudella, "L'Anonymus Iamblichi e Democrito," *Studi Italiani di Filologia Classica* 10 (1932): 22.

13. In the life of Protagoras, Democritus is given as Protagoras' teacher in 9.50 and the explanatory story in 9.54.

14. On this point, see J. Warren, *Epicurus and Democritean Ethics* (Cambridge, 2002) 14–18.

15. J. A. Davison ("Protagoras, Democritus, and Anaxagoras," *Classical Quarterly* 47 [1953]: 38) suggests that the story of Democritus' adoption of Protagoras may be a biographical attempt to reconcile the chronological difficulties of the story, which stem from Protagoras' birth date as ca. 490 BCE, making him some thirty years older than Democritus and therefore a biographically awkward candidate as Democritus' student. However, the shared tradition that Protagoras, like his fellow citizen Democritus, studied with the Magi, suggests that this was an association, based upon citizenship, that the biographers were eager to strengthen by all possible means.

16. Barnes 1982, 354; Kirk and Raven 1981, 222–24, 409; Aristotle *Met.* 1039a9 = DK 68A42.

17. For an example of influence construed as an actual student-teacher relationship, see the discussion of Anaxagoras as the teacher of Euripides and Archelaus in

V. Alfieri, *Atomos Idea* (Florence, 1953), 228, and in Kirk and Raven, 1981, 364 and n.1. In the report that Democritus mentioned Zeno and Parmenides, another characteristic of biographical writing should be considered: the tendency to project what was most likely to have happened, often further influenced by a taste for the sensational, negative, or bizarre. Absence of data often generates this kind of report as well, as Szegedy-Maszak (1978, 203) and Finley (1974, 18–20) point out. Dover (1976, 33) speaks of the type of projected scholarship that occurs when an author reports what he thinks most likely happened.

18. For an example of this type of phrasing, see DL 8.55. Democritus “meets” Anaxagoras and Democritus in DL 9.34. Such phrasing is, of course, open to the widest possible interpretation; see Hope 1930, 99.

19. Kirk and Raven 1981, 404.

20. Kirk and Raven 1981, 368–70.

21. Fairweather 1974, 263; Lefkowitz 1981, 77; Stuart 1967, 174.

22. Fairweather 1974, 256. We should note that the biographers, like nature, abhor a vacuum; as Dover (1976, 28–31) points out, to the biographers, false information is preferable to no information; see also Szegedy-Maszak 1978, 203; Finley 1975, 16–26.

23. 1974, 261. For attempts to establish philosophical and/or chronological successions, see G. L. Huxley, *The Early Ionians* (New York, 1966), 101–2; Finley 1975, 22; Szegedy-Maszak 1978, 203; Lefkowitz 1981, 77; Warren 2002, 31; see also J. Barns, “A New Gnomologium: With Some Remarks on Gnomonic Anthologies,” *Classical Quarterly* 44 (1950–51): 126–37. When Anaxagoras is involved, there may be a further emphasis of attempts to date this dateless philosopher; see Dover 1976, 33.

24. Lefkowitz 1981, 77 and 87; Fairweather 1974, 263; Stuart 1967, 174.

25. For example, the suggestion that Empedocles and Pausanias (DL 8.60), Socrates and Alcibiades (DL 2.23), and Plato and Aster (DL 3.29) were romantically as well as intellectually involved; see Owens 1983, 17; Wehrli 1973, 193; Hope 1930, 152; Leo 1901, 102.

26. For contests and feuds in general, see Lefkowitz 1981, 57; Holford-Strevens 1988, 198; Wehrli 1964, 196; P. Friedlander, “Hypothekai,” *Hermes* 48 (1938): 558; for the contest between Thales and Pherecydes and the false letters that attest to it, see DL 1.14 and Lefkowitz 1981, 34; Schibli 1990, 13; C. Mulvany, “Notes on the Legend of Aristotle,” *Classical Quarterly* 20 (1926): 156.

27. Lefkowitz 1981, 33 and 122–28; Holford-Strevens 1988, 198; Riginos 1976, 108–10; Dover 1976, 39.

28. For charges of plagiarism (or collaboration, for the biographical motives are the same, defamation of one’s talent), see Lefkowitz 1981, 99 and n.58; Fairweather 1974, 258; Owens 1983, 8. See also the spurious Heraclitean fragment (DK 68B129) that accuses Pythagoras of plagiarism, or Theophrastus’ charge that Plato stole from Aristippus, Antisthenes, and Byson, ap. Athenaeus 2.508 c–d; see also the topos of book burning, citation 20, discussed later in this chapter.

29. Hope 1930, 101 and 154; Stuart 1967, 139; Fiske 1920, 158–60.

30. Or, as Guthrie puts it, “to rescue the reality of the physical world from the fatal effects of Eleatic logic” (1962, vol. 2, 389–93); see also Barnes 1982, 364; Kirk and Raven 1981, 388 and 404. See also DL 2.14 for the reports of hostilities in the life of Anaxagoras.

31. Guthrie 1962, vol. 2, 389–92, 427–30; E. Zeller, *Die Philosophie der Griechen*, ed. W. Nestle (Leipzig, 1923), 211 and n.1.
32. Xenophon mentions Plato once (*Mem.* 3.6.1). Diogenes Laertius recounts the rivalry between Plato and Xenophon in 2.57 and 3.34. See Hope 1930, 154; also Dover 1976, 182; Fairweather 1974, 260.
33. Riginos 1976, 108.
34. Riginos 1976, 102 and especially n.12, 166–71.
35. For Aristotle, see the discussion in Riginos 1976, 130 and 167, and the evidence of Eubulides in I. Düring, *Aristotle in the Ancient Biographical Tradition* (New York, 1987), *Test.* 58F = Eubulides *ap.* Eusebius *PE* 15.2.5. For Plato, see *DL* 9.40; for Protagoras, see *DL* 9.52. For the Athenians, see Timon fr. 5 Diels *ap.* Sextus Empiricus *M.*9.56.
36. Riginos 1976, 14 and 66. Many of the anecdotes transferred from Pythagoras to Plato reflect this later literary or philosophical rivalry; see note 12 in this chapter.
37. Riginos (1976, 165) points out that this anecdote reflects the dual tradition that existed for Plato, one favorable and one hostile: the favorable tradition presents Plato as a bibliophile, the hostile one answers with an anecdote in which Plato burns books.
38. For a preference among biographers for the sensational, see J. Mansfeld, “Diogenes Laertius on Stoic Philosophy,” *Elenchos* 7 (1986): 302; Bell 1978, 58; Wehrli 1973, 208; Momigliano 1971, 84; Lefkowitz 1981, 100.
39. Travel for the sake of education is a common theme in the lives of the early lawgivers and philosophers, and occurs, for example, in the life of Solon (Plutarch *Solon* 2.1; Herodotus 1.29) and Lycourgos (Plutarch *Moralia* 345e); on the importance of this topos, see Lefkowitz 1981, 13 and 21; Szegedy-Maszak 1978, 202; F. Voros, “The Ethical Theory of Democritus: What Is the ‘Criterion?’” *Platon* 27 (1975): 24–26.
40. There is a long tradition of philosophers who travel to the east; in Diogenes Laertius, besides Democritus, we find Plato (3.6), Thales (1.27), Solon (1.50), Pythagoras (8.23), Cleobulus (1.89), Eudoxus (8.87), and Pyrrho (9.61). For discussion of the topos, see Riginos 1976, 64 and n.16; see also Warren 2002, 58. Hope (1930, 158 and 187) remarks on the unusual extent of Democritus’ travel; see also Fairweather 1974, 268.
41. See Diels’ discussion of the fragments (1952, 154). The ancient evidence is further weakened by Woodbury’s conjecture, that “On Phrygian Theory” was actually the work of Diagoras of Melos, and transferred to Democritus by the shared tradition of travel; see note 5 in this chapter. The Epicureans (although not Epicurus himself) claimed Democritus as their intellectual ancestor and sought to glorify Democritus at the expense of other philosophers, often at the expense of chronology and fact; see Davison 1953, 38. Diogenes Laertius’ own hesitation in introducing the doubtful fragments is a further indication of their spurious nature, although not one usually noted.
42. Opinions differ, of course, and more traditional scholars argue for a more traditional view. Bailey, for example, thinks the tradition of Democritus’ travel plausible and offers citation 4 and 6 in support. In addition, he mentions Democritus’ habit of living in tombs, a practice that, according to Bailey, “may well be derived from

Eastern sages” (1928, 110). Democritus’ (biographical) propensity for tombs, citation 40, is discussed later in this chapter. Guthrie (1962, vol. 2, 386) comes to much the same conclusion, by using much the same evidence, and adds to it citation 3. Kirk and Raven (1981, 404) think there may be some basis for the tradition of Democritus’ travel, but do not admit these fragments as proof, nor do they consider them genuine. On arguments for and against the genuineness of the citations themselves (especially citation 3), see Zeller 1923, 431 n.1 and Alfieri 1936, 278.

43. See Lefkowitz 1981, 48; Szegedy-Maszak 1978, 200. For the mechanics of the method in general, see Lefkowitz 1981, 88; Kindstrand 1986, 232; Riginos 1976, 132; Momigliano 1971, 78; Finley 1974, 44; Stuart 1921, 225; A. Podlecki, “The Peripatetics as Literary Critics,” *Phoenix* 39 (1969): 114–37; Leo 1901, 577.

44. See chapter 2, citation 16.

45. Diogenes Laertius does mention one school of alternative thought, represented by Theophrastus, who considered Leucippus the author (DL 9.39, 46); Diogenes Laertius represents the more commonly held view. Democritus’ travels were a commonplace among ancient authors; see, for example, Strabo 15 = DK 68A12 and Cicero *de fin.* 5.50.10 = DK 68A13, which speak in concrete terms of his extensive travel undertaken for wisdom’s sake; see also Philo *de vita contempl.* 4.49 CW; Dio 54.2, p. 113, 21 Arn.; Cicero *de fin.* 5.19.87; Horace *Ep.* 1.12.12 (all = DK 68A15), which speak of Democritus’ travel in rather more metaphysical terms, suggesting intellectual as well as physical quests.

46. Fairweather 1974, 265; see also DL 8.57, where Empedocles is said to be the inventor of rhetoric and DL 1.23–24 where Thales seems to have been the first to do everything. On the topos of inventions and firsts, see Kleingunther 1933, 106 and 111.

47. Those who enjoy aristocratic birth and background in Diogenes Laertius are Heraclitus (9.6), Empedocles (8.51), Thales (1.22), and Anaxagoras (2.6); see also Hope 1930, 115–18. Happily, second-century literature and early Roman historiography allow philosophers to triumph over their privileged birth by further refusing kingships, disdaining wealth, and championing democracy. Their admirable efforts are in accord with the literature’s ethical didacticism and “reversion to the past,” (Holford-Strevens 1988, 2), which celebrates an earlier (largely imaginary) time whose frugality and simplicity are contrasted with the debauched standards of the present time. See also Gentili and Cerri 1988, 46; Mejer 1978, 56; Bowie 1970, 3; van Groningen 1965, 46–50.

48. This anecdote and that in citation 18 are taken by Diogenes Laertius from Demetrius of Magnesia, who may have quoted Demetrius of Phalerum, see Mejer 1978, 20; Leo 1901, 39–41; see also note 55 in this chapter.

49. For another example of the etiological anecdote, see chapter 2 and the discussion of citation 29, the biographical account of Heraclitus’ deposit of his book in the (later destroyed) temple of Artemis of Ephesus. The anecdote is interpreted by Kirk (1962, 8) as a biographical attempt to explain the lack of a complete Heraclitean text.

50. A topos that seems to have developed in the fourth century BCE (see O. Murray, *Early Greece* [London, 1980], 274; see the discussion of Riginos’ anecdote #56, pp. 105–106; Dover 1974, 289; Woodbury 1970, 210; C. Habicht, “False Urkunden zur Geschichte Athens im Zeitalter der Perser Keige,” *Hermes* 89 [1961]:

35), and was further elaborated and emphasized in second-century literature; see note 47 in this chapter. Many of the philosophers in Diogenes Laertius display a proper contempt for money: Thales (1.27), Socrates (2.31), Heraclitus (9.14), and Empedocles (8.63). For discussion of the topos itself, see Gentili and Cerri 1988, 46; Bell 1978, 48–50; Slater 1972, 234; K. Dover, *Aristophanic Comedy* (London, 1972), 141; H. Brühler, *Beitrag zur Erklärung der Schrist vom Erhabenen* (Göttingen, 1964), 18. Lefkowitz (1981, 50) points out an interesting analogue in the life of the poets, who become more avaricious and parasitical in their biographies; see, for example, the lives of Simonides and Pindar.

51. The further prediction, that the children will do some “ruinous thing” also becomes true, as we will see in citation 24.

52. Mejer 1978, 19.

53. Burnett 1945, 33.

54. Valerius Maximus = DK 68A11. The tradition of Democritus in Athens is extremely problematic. In DL 9.37, Demetrius of Magnesia states that Democritus was unknown to Socrates, because of Democritus’ “horror of fame” and quotes citation 19 as proof (“I went to Athens and no one knew me.”) Valerius Maximus agrees, although his reason for Democritus’ statement in citation 19 is Democritus’ zeal for work. Demetrius of Phalerum, whom Diogenes Laertius also cites in 9.37, disagrees with both accounts and states that Democritus was never in Athens at all. Diogenes Laertius explains Demetrius of Phalerum’s statements as follows: Democritus, he says, preferred not to win fame from Athens, but to make a place famous himself, which Diogenes Laertius further characterizes as the larger claim. Although we may never know the truth of the matter, each version has strong biographical implications. Demetrius of Magnesia praises Democritus by placing him among those philosophers who, like Plato, exhibit modesty and shun fame (see Riginos 1976, 154), while Valerius Maximus once again emphasizes Democritus’ devotion to his work. Demetrius of Phalerum’s remarks, which occurs in his *Defense of Socrates*, according to Diogenes Laertius are perhaps the most realistic; Diogenes Laertius’ interpretation of it is discussed subsequently. The common thread to all the anecdotes is a lack of contact with Socrates that, biographically speaking, probably seeks to explain the exclusion of Democritus in Plato’s work and has nothing to do with Socrates per se. As regards chronology, both Anaxagoras and Democritus are assigned only potential dates, and can be of little help here; see notes 6 and 29. As regards Democritus’ exclusion from the Platonic corpus and the feud that is often alleged for the exclusion, both are explained if Democritus never came into contact with Socrates: then, biographically speaking, Plato would have no reason to know him or feud with him. If, on the other hand, he was in Athens but failed to contact Socrates, then Plato has good grounds for his hostility (the slight to his teacher; see the discussion of their feud earlier in this chapter). Dover (1976, 31) sums up the problem rather well when he remarks that if Demetrius of Phalerum’s statement is true, then Democritus is lying or the fragment is spurious, a point well made.

55. Mejer himself admits the point (1978, 16–29). See also the discussion of citations 2, 4, 7, and 8 in chapter 2, grouped together by Diogenes Laertius although they too, at first seem to have no logical or literary connection.

56. The fourth anecdote, in which Democritus is compared to a pentathlete, and

the continuing emphasis on Democritus' intellectual zeal and constant training are discussed subsequently in this chapter in connection with citation 41. The comparison depends, at least in part, on Democritus' fr. 179, which speaks of the necessity of work and training in order for children to learn letters, music, and gymnastics, see Freeman 1966, 319. The association of athletics and philosophy is ambiguous; the usual attitude toward athletes and contests is one of contempt; see, for example, Xenophanes DK 21B2, Euripides fr. 184N; Seneca *Ep.* 15.2–3; Epictetus 2.18.22; M. Ant. 11.2; Pliny *HN* 9.6.1. However, the Stoics and Cynics put the example of athletes and contests to good moral use; see also Seneca *Ep.* 80.3; Epictetus 3.310.6, 3.25.2–3. Nor should we forget that Thales died while watching an athletic contest (DL 1.39), or Plato's skills as a wrestler (DL 3.4–5); see Holford-Strevens 1988, 202–4; Hope 1930, 148.

57. The story of Thales occurs in Plato *Theat.* 174A; that of Anaximenes in DL 2.4; see also Kirk and Raven 1981, 79. This particular topos, which Horace (*AP* 455–60) uses to characterize the philosopher as a victim of heaven-sent madness may have originated with the statement attributed to both Pythagoras and to Anaxagoras, that the purpose of human existence is to contemplate the heavens, Iamblichus *Protr.* c. 19, p. 51.6ff. Pistelli. For the internal logic applied by the biographers in the characterization of their subjects, see Szegedy-Maszak 1978, 202.

58. For the hostile tradition and its expression in biographical literature, see Lefkowitz 1981, 26, 33, and 94; Delcourt 1933, 287; Owens 1983, 19; Szegedy-Maszak 1978, 200; Riginos 1976, 167–70; Dover 1976, 34; Wehrli 1973, 202; Woodbury 1970, 210–15; F. E. Adcock, "Literary Tradition and the Early Greek Code-Makers," *Cambridge Historical Journal* 2 (1927), 95–109; Stuart 1921, 229. The hostility toward philosophers is most obviously displayed, perhaps, in the biographies of Lucian, as, for example, in the *Demonax* or the *Nigrinus*.

59. Wehrli 1973, 202. Thales' killing on the oil market is reported by Diogenes Laertius in 1.26. This set of anecdotes must be carefully distinguished from that which condemns the philosopher for wealth, see Bell 1978, 39; Slater 1972, 234; Brühler 1964, 18.

60. Diogenes Laertius interrupts his report from Antisthenes with another report on a related event, discussed separately later in this chapter. At the end of the passage (and the anecdote of the public reading), Diogenes Laertius cites other sources who disagree with the story in its incidental details: Demetrius of Magnesia and Hippobotus agree that it was not Democritus himself who held the reading, but his relatives, and that the award was not five hundred, but one hundred, talents. In the anecdotes we see again the commonly held ancient opinion that it was Democritus who wrote the *Greater World System*, rather than Leucippus.

61. For the rebound-type anecdote, see Fairweather 1974, 238; for another example, see Pythagoras' death, which occurs crossing a bean field: this from a man who reportedly said "Stay strictly away from beans" (DL 8.39–40).

62. Owens 1983, 14; Süß 1910, 274.

63. Burial at public expense and a statue indicate such honors; see Lefkowitz 1981, 79; Riginos 1976, 167–70; Burkert 1969, 27; Farnell 1921, 421–36.

64. At the end of the passage, for example, Hippobotus and Demetrius quibble about the amount of money to be rewarded.

65. Typically, in Diogenes Laertius, philosophers refuse payment and hold wealth

in great contempt, as seen in the lives of Thales (1.27), Socrates (2.31), Heraclitus (9.14), Empedocles (8.63). See also Dover 1974, 141.

66. Hicks 1979, 488.

67. Given Diogenes Laertius' determination to exclude Roman sources, he may have known the stories, or assumed his reader's knowledge of them, and decided that an allusion to them would be sufficient. See Mejer 1978, 56; Hope 1930, 110.

68. For examples of predictions and prophecies that can confer such privileges in Diogenes Laertius see note 69 in this chapter; both result in divine status for the philosophers. On the topos in general, see Hope 1930, 99, 118; Wehrli (1973, 201) notes that actions that benefit the people as a whole are typical of the early philosophers' lives; Hope (1930, 130) draws attention to a similar aspect of the lives of the early philosopher-sages.

69. These honors are different from the posthumous honors and cult worship other philosophers receive after death; Democritus, like Empedocles, receives worship during his lifetime.

70. Timon fr. 94 FHG 1.215 *ap.* DL 8.60 = DK 31A1.10.

71. In Diogenes Laertius, similar recognition or deification occurs after "marvelous acts" in the life of Epimenides (1.110), Menedemus (6.102), Pythagoras (8.14 and 21), Empedocles (8.62). Pherecydes also performs miraculous acts, but is not deified for them (2.116). See Schibli 1990, 5–7; Holford-Strevens 1988, 74; C. Kahn, "Empedocles among the Shamans," *Archive für Geschichte der Philosophie* 42 (1960): 30–35; Dodds 1951, 135; Hope 1930, 121.

72. Freeman 1966, 176; Farnell 1921, 416. Epimenides also receives the title of wind-stayer after he frees Athens from plague (DL 1.110).

73. Theophrastus' *de Sensu*. 49–83 = DK 68A135.

74. This is, of course, a gross oversimplification but one that will suffice for our purpose and was probably sufficient for the biographers also. For a more complete explanation of Democritus' theory of vision, see McKim 1983, 281–89; Barnes 1982, 477; Kirk and Raven 1981, 421; K. von Fritz, "Nous, Noein, and their Derivatives in Pre-Socratic Philosophy (excluding Anaxagoras)," *Classical Philology* 40 (1974): 12–34; Guthrie 1962, vol. 2, 441–46.

75. The importance and familiarity of Democritus' work in these areas is brought out more fully later in this chapter, with the discussion of citation 40 and following. The two earlier anecdotes are in fact combined and transferred to Agathion's meeting with Herodes Atticus (Philostratus VS 2.554). There, Agathion refuses to drink the milk offered him; it is "impure" because drawn by a woman. Herodes Atticus then marvels at Agathion's "superhuman" powers of perception.

76. See, for example, Theophrastus' comments in *de Sensu* = DK 68A139–65. Guthrie, from the titles of books attributed to Democritus and Theophrastus' commentaries on them, conjectures work that "rivalled Aristotle in comprehensiveness and attention to detail" (1962, vol. 2, 465); Zeller (1923, 254) discusses Democritus' theories on plant growth and the origin and development of the fetus and its considerable ancient commentary. Democritus' biographical life and death may include an unusual number of women because he, like Empedocles, allows them an equal role in the creation and development of the embryo; see Aristotle *Gen Anim.* 4.1.746a6; Censorius *Die. Nat.* 5.4; Plutarch *Placita* 5.3.6; Lloyd 1983, 87; I. M. Lonie, *Ars*

Medica, vol. 4 (Berlin 1981), 62, 115, and n.101; E. Lesky, *Die Zeugnungs und Verberungslehre der Antiker und ihr Nachwirten* (Wiesbaden, 1951), 52–57.

77. The meeting between Democritus and Hippocrates relies, in part, on the biographers' fondness for arranging meeting, friendships, or letters between authors and others with similar interests (see Fairweather 1974, 261) and partly on the particular relationship that exists between Democritus and Hippocrates, discussed later in this chapter.

78. Athenaeus 46 e–f = DK 68A29.

79. Fairweather 1974, 238.

80. Women and children are commonly used to contrast the philosopher's wildly theoretical and intellectualized behavior with the dictates of sanity and common sense, see note 87 in this chapter.

81. Theophrastus CP 6.7.2 = DK 68A132; see also DK 68A33.5 = DL 9.46, which lists Democritus' work, "On Flavor"; Zeller 1923, 254. See, on this point and for this anecdote, Guthrie 1962, vol. 2, 439 n.1. Finally, compare DK 68A68, in which Aristotle speaks of Democritus' views on chance and casualty.

82. See Warren 2002, 193ff.

83. Cicero *Tusc.* 5.39, 114; Aulus Gellius NA 10.17; Himerius *Ecl.* 3.18; Tertullian *Apolog.* 46; Plutarch *de curios.* 12 p. 521D; see DK 68A22–27.

84. Aulus Gellius, Cicero, and Plutarch take the anecdote factually, but speak as apologists, finding in Democritus' quest for knowledge a palatable reason for the blinding.

85. Empedocles, for example, fails to prove his divinity when Etna belches out his sandal or when he commits suicide by hanging. Heraclitus is punished for his unorthodox views and misanthropy with a death both contemptible and degrading, being covered with dung and torn apart by dogs. For the hostility of the biographers toward their subjects, see Riginos 1976, 117; Lefkowitz 1981, 98. A similar anecdote is told of Plato, or rather of his students, that they put out their eyes so as not to be distracted from their studies. Riginos (1976, 129) notes that the story exemplifies the extreme nature of the philosopher's devotion to study and to the avoidance of worldly concerns. We should also remember that blindness is often the price for superhuman gifts in ancient literature, as for example, in Homer's case; see G. Casertano, "Pleasure, Desire, and Happiness in Democritus," *Proceedings of the First International Congress on Democritus* 1 (1983): 350.

86. In Democritus' philosophy, pleasure and the passions must be dominated and controlled by soul, never by the body. See Hussey 1983, 351; 1985, 120; J. Dudley, "The Ethics of Democritus and Aristotle," *Proceedings of the First International Congress on Democritus* 1 (1983): 381.

87. For examples of gluttony and excessive drinking, see Bell 1978, 31; for the role of women in similar anecdotes, see Lattimore 1939, 29; P. Munz, "History and Mythology," *Philosophical Quarterly* 6 (1956): 6.

88. Democritus is, in fact, slave to and destroyed by the last woman he sees; see the discussion of citations 51–53 later in this chapter.

89. The verb ἀσχεῖν occurs in Julian's *Epistle* 201 B–C (= DK 68A20), discussed in citation 43 and in Diogenes Laertius 9.30. It also occurs in two of Democritus' own statements, fr. 53a and 65.

90. Hicks 1979, v. 2, 440.

91. In Lucian *Demonax* 25, Demonax himself is asked to restore the φαντασία, the ghost or shade of one who is dead, just as Democritus had done. Democritus' ability to raise the dead, and his conflation with Demonax, are discussed later in this section, with citation 43.

92. For Democritus' use of εἶδωλα, see D. McGibbon, "The Religious Thought of Democritus," *Hermes* 93 (1965): 390–92. In conjunction with DL 9.38 and 42 and Democritus' characterization as a holy man, see D. Clay, "An Epicurean Interpretation of Dreams," *American Journal of Philology* 101 (1980): 344.

93. Diogenes Laertius, on the other hand, mentions only the *Greater World System* read on that occasion; see citation 24.

94. Athenaeus 4.168B = DK B30.

95. Philodemus *de morte* 29.27 = DK B1a; the passage also urges the reader not to delay writing one's will in an attempt to evade death; see the discussion of citation 54–56 in this chapter.

96. In theory, glimpses of the unseen world are vouchsafed to one whose senses are keen enough to apprehend them, see Guthrie 1962, 203. On the appearance of ghosts or spirits to living men, see D. McGibbon 1965, 392, and compare Plato *Phdr.* 81c–d. W. Burkert (*Greek Religion* [Cambridge, Mass., 1985], 195) notes that once the soul/breath leaves the body, it becomes εἶδωλα, a phantom image (like that in a mirror, transparent and without substance), whether of a dream or a ghost that, on appropriate occasions, appears to the living.

97. Democritus' link with the divine otherworld has already been established in those anecdotes that told of his predictions and control of the elements, which led to his own suprahuman status. Furthermore, he is mentioned as a diviner in at least one source (Cicero *de div.* 1.3.5 = DK 68A138) and often appears in the role of shaman, prophet, or magician. See citation 30 in this chapter.

98. Simon (1978, 148) notes that for the ancient Greeks, imagination was strongly visual, as the various terms of φαντασί suggest, and that the Greek stereotype for madness thus emphasized visual distortion. McGibbon (1965, 392) demonstrates that Cicero, in *de deor. nat.* 1.12.20 and 1.43.120, as a good Epicurean deliberately introduces confusion into Democritus' use of εἶδωλα to belittle his theories. McGibbon makes several other key points in his discussion: Democritus uses εἶδωλα not only in a strict technical sense to indicate the films that emanate from all objects, including gods, but also to indicate the gods themselves. The gods, then, could and did communicate with mortals, although not indiscriminately. They visited those mortals who had trained their minds to a level that transcends the usual rational plane, as Democritus himself suggests in fr. 18: Whatever a poet writes with enthusiasm and divine inspiration, is most beautiful. In this context, citation is quite reasonable.

99. O. Temkin, "Hippocrates as the Physician of Democritus," *Gesnerius* 42 (1985): 456; Kindstrand 1984, 154 and 167; H. D. Voigtländer, *Der Philosoph und die Vielen* (Wiesbaden, 1984), 32–54.

100. Democritus tells us that a certain divine madness is essential for noble work; see note 97 and fr. 18 in this chapter. Horace approved Democritus' attitude and summed it up as follows: "Democritus excludes the sane poets from Helicon" (*AP* 296); for further discussion of the "considerable exaggeration" to which the fragment gave rise, see Bailey 1928, 111.

101. See, for example, Dio Cassius' portrait of Domitian, 67.1–3. During the night, Domitian visited people when they were completely alone and placed beside them a miniature tombstone engraved with that person's name. Then, naked slaves painted black entered like ghosts (like εἶδωλα) and danced about.

102. Once again, we see the importance of not underestimating the biographers' knowledge of the philosophers; Antisthenes used ἀκρίβη, to train or practice, to introduce his idea; ἀκρίβη, of course, is a key element in Democritus' theory of education, virtue, and speculation. See citations 21–23 in this chapter, which speak of the necessity of training. For the claims of training over nature in Democritus' philosophy, see McKim 1983, 288; Hussey 1985, 123; L. Couloubaritsis, "Pensées et action chez Démocrite," *Proceedings of the First International Congress on Democritus 1* (1983): 333.

103. Here too we see that Diogenes Laertius' ordering of his selections reveals a greater coherence than is usually granted: in the passage immediately following, Diogenes Laertius records one of the few hostile anecdotes that exist for Democritus, the squandering of his inheritance and his prosecution, which also comes from Antisthenes. The placement of the two anecdotes thus reveals that their coherence, for Diogenes Laertius, both are hostile and as such should be presented together.

104. Letters 10–17 speak of Hippocrates' visit, letters 18–21 report the conversation between Democritus and Hippocrates, see E. Littré, *Oeuvres complètes d'Hippocrate*, vol. 9 (Amsterdam, 1983). On the tradition and authenticity of the letters, see D. T. Sakalis "Beitrag zu den pseudo-hippokratischen Briefen," in *Formes de pensée dans la collection hippocratique: Actes du IVième colloque international hippocratique* (Geneva, 1983), 499–515; J. Pigeaud, *La maladie de l'âme* (Paris, 1981), 441–47; R. Philippson, "Verfasser und Abfassungszeit der sogenannten Hippokratesbriefe," *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 77 (1982): 293–328; L. Edelstein, "Hippocrates," *Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* Suppl. 6 (1935): cols. 1309–4.

105. Letter 10. See also Temkin 1985, 455–56.

106. Some of the details of the anecdote are uniquely Democritean, such as the allusion to his natural studies in the dissected animals, while others follow the typical image of the philosopher, see Hope 1930, 148, and see, for example, the unwashed Socrates in Aristophanes' *Birds* 1554, or barefoot (*Ra.* 1491), as dirty, unkempt, verminous, and pale (*Clouds* 103, 119, 198, 694). Thales himself advises others not to pride themselves upon outward appearance but to study to become beautiful in character (DL 1. 37), words all too easy to parody in a group who seemed so unconcerned with the mundane matters of daily life. Temkin (1985, 459) finds the pastoral setting strongly reminiscent of the setting of Plato's *Phaedrus*, 230b.

107. The meeting occurs in letter 17L. Temkin (1985, 460) notes that Hippocrates' deliberations revolve around the pseudo-Aristotelian discussion of genius and melancholy in *Problemata Physica* 30.1, which concludes with a strong correlation between the two states. Simon (1978, 229) makes the important distinction in the passage that "melancholy" denotes not madness or a mental disorder such as schizophrenia or manic-depressive states, but temperament, a distinction often overlooked by modern as well as ancient authors.

108. Edelstein 1935, cols. 1303–4; Temkin 1985, 461; Gomez 1984, 1–40. Myson, a philosopher famous for misanthropy, is also presented as laughing alone by himself in a solitary spot, DL 1.108.

109. As, for example, at the meeting of Solon and Croesus; see Wehrli 1973, 202 and note 77 in this chapter. Hippocrates' figure takes on special meaning in letters and anecdotes that bear his name, because physicians and medicine take on unprecedented importance in second-century literature. This is due in part to the rise of the sophistic movement at that time and the "old nexus between philosophy, oratory, and medicine" (Bowersock 1969, 64–66). See also Holford-Strevens 1988, 224–26; Kindstrand 1984, 155; Simon 1978, 148. Philostratus certainly emphasizes the role of physicians in the intellectual/philosophical world; he tells us, for example, that Polemo's teacher Timocritus wanted to be both physician and philosopher and was well versed in the theories of Hippocrates and Democritus (VS 5436). Hippocrates and Democritus were, of course, linked by a shared interest in physiology and anatomy.

110. Freeman 1966, 319. That withdrawal becomes a part of the necessary asceticism for the philosopher, see the portrait of Plato as the "ideal holy man," Riginos 1976, 161; Szegedy-Maszak 1978, 202.

111. One of the Abderites' proofs of Democritus' madness is his neglect of his property; Hippocrates shows that the fault lies with their own sordid preoccupation with money and land (Temkin 1985, 460); compare Pliny *HN* 18.48 = DK A17. See also Owens 1983, 15; Freeman 1966, 322; Zeller 1923, 213.

112. 68B1. Incidentally, Philodemus adds that, according to Democritus one should not put off writing one's will in an attempt to ignore death, reminding us once more of the attention given to Democritus and worldly goods. Gottschalk gives an excellent commentary of the text, the title of which is given variously by Proclus as *Letters about Death (or the Afterlife)* or by Diogenes Laertius (in 9.46) and Athenaeus as *About Death (or the Afterlife)*.

113. Beauty, like pleasure, plays an important part in the theory of Democritus and the two are often linked; beauty is that which gives the highest delight, and to contemplate and to admire the beauties of nature and the beautiful outcome of human genius is the greatest source of delight. See Casertano 1983, 352; Dudley 1983, 378; compare with DK 68B194.

114. The φαντασία, in fact.

115. In atomic theory, the soul atoms, like those of the body, simply disperse and thus death does not entail either punishment, pain, or the dreaded, shadowy afterlife. Despite, or rather because of the relative unimportance of death in atomic theory, later writers insist on a Democritean preoccupation with death and the decay of the body.

116. Cicero *Tusc.* 1.34; Tertullian *de an.* 51; Plato *Pol.* 10.614 (who cannot, of course, refer to Democritus by name); all = DK A160; Alex. *aphrod. Top.* 21.21; Aet. 4.4.7, both = DK A117. See also Barnes 1982, 440.

117. For Empedocles, see DL 8.67 and citation 27; for Pythagoras, see DL 8.14; for Demonax, see Lucian *Demon.* 25. See also Pliny's rather contemptuous remark that Democritus promises men that they will live again and then doesn't even do so himself, (*HN* 7.1.89).

118. Besides the two examples given here, see also Galen *Phil. Hist. prolegomena* = *Doxographi Graeci* 255; Horace *Ep.* 2.1.182–200; Lucian VA 13–14; Seneca *Tranq.* 155.2–3; Juvenal *Sat.* 10.28–53; Cicero *de orat.* 2.58, 235; DK A21; Sotion *ap. Stobaeus Flor.* 3.20.53.

119. Diogenes Laertius, who usually makes it a point to include the nicknames of his subject (Delatte 1992, 54), oddly makes no reference at all to this part of Democritus' character. The name and characterization finds its earliest expression in Cicero's *de oratore*, which Diogenes Laertius may have excluded in his aversion to Roman sources; see note 70 in this chapter. Stuart (1946, 187) however, believes that the characterization and nickname are the result of Cynic and Stoic influences and arose in a separate tradition of which Diogenes Laertius was unaware. See also Gomez 1984, 1–40; Kindstrand 1984, 151–64; Lutz 1954, 309.

120. Dudley 1983, 381; Casertano 1983, 351; A. E. Taylor, "On the Date of the Trial of Anaxagoras," *Classical Quarterly* 11 (1917): 86; Bailey 1928, 193.

121. Cicero *de fin.* 5.8.23 (= DK A169) speaks of εὐθυμία and εὐεστός; Stobaeus 2.7.3 = DK A167, of ἀταρξία. For further discussion of these terms, see Barnes 1982, 532 and Guthrie 1962, vol. 2, 492. Εὐθυμία in Democritus and its place in his ethical theory have been the subject of much debate, see B. Wisniewski, "Plaisir et Valeur chez Democrite et Hippias," *Les Etudes Classique* 55 (1987): 399; Casertano 1983, 347; Voros 1975, 20. Guthrie (1962, vol. 2, 489) represents the more traditional view, that there is no connection between Democritus' atomic theory and his ethical theory (although Guthrie doubts the existence of an ethical theory, as do many others; see, for example, Alfieri 1953, 193). Natorp (1893, 23) alone saw a coherent ethical system in Democritus' work and one bound up with his atomic theory. Natorp's theory has most lately been taken up by G. Vlastos (1945): 578; earlier, K. von Fritz (*Philosophie und Sprachliche Ausdruck bei Demokritos, Platon, und Aristoteles* [New York, 1935], 32) supported Natorp's view; the assumption that a coherent ethical system did exist and was related to atomic theory underlies all later arguments about pleasure and its value in Democritus.

122. Casertano 1983, 351; Dudley 1983, 374; Bailey 1928, 189 and 193.

123. On this point, see Lutz 1954, 310.

124. Riginos 1976, 151.

125. See the excellent discussion of the laughing philosopher in J. Salem's *La légende de Démocrite* (Paris, 1996), 82–114.

126. Sotion *ap.* Stobaeus *Florilegium* 3.20.53; See Osborne 1987, 209; Kindstrand 1984, 155; Lutz 1954, 309.

127. After Plato, of course, and his image of the rheumy or flowing Heraclitean philosophers. See note 35 in chapter 2.

128. Seneca (*Tranq.* 15.3 and *de ira* 2.4.4–7) also presents the contrast between the two philosophers and their responses.

129. Seneca's portrait of the sadistic Democritus does not seem to agree with his earlier characterization of the philosopher, see Gomez 1984, 5–8. Juvenal (*Sat.* 10) presents a Democritus who sneers and laughs at the human foibles and vanities and who defies fortune with an obscene gesture; see Gomez 1984, 12–15.

130. See Gomez 1984, 21. Stewart (1958, 185–87) demonstrates that by this time Democritus had become a hero of both Cynic and Skeptic schools, while Heraclitus had been adopted and lionized by the Stoics. Stewart argues that Lucian, himself influenced by Stoic writers, was the first to connect the laughing and crying of the two philosophers to their philosophies, and in such a way as to emphasize the Stoic

propensities of Heraclitus. Kindstrand (1984, 149) argues against Heraclitus' "Cynic qualities."

131. As does Aristippus of Cyrene, whose extravagant tastes has scared off buyers. Socrates, of course, gets the highest price, followed by Pythagoras, Aristotle, Chrysippus the Stoic, Pyrrho the Skeptic, and Diogenes the Cynic.

132. H. W. Fowler, *The Works of Lucian*, vol. 1 (Oxford, 1905), 190.

133. Two points in passing: first, Democritus does not laugh at the stupidity of the human race, as he does in Juvenal (and in some of Seneca's portraits); rather, he laughs at the futility or emptiness of the human state, which, in itself, is a further criticism of atomic theory. Second, Heraclitus' tears are those of compassion; he does not despise his fellow men, as in Diogenes Laertius' life, but despairs for them.

134. And, of course, on the reader's recognition of them. Compare the pseudo-atomic ravings of the philosophical cook in Damoxenus *ap.* Athenaeus *Deipnos.* 3.102b–e = DK 68C1.

135. Besides Democritus' remark that everything is atoms and the void, there is detailed allusion to Heraclitus' work: the world destroying conflagration is the theory of *ekpyrosis*, attributed to him by the Stoics. This "thunderbolt" or cosmic fire of his fragment 64, is thought by some to indicate the eventual destruction of the world through fire (Kirk 1962, 349–61; see also chapter 2 and citation 60 in this book). As to the other statements Heraclitus and the Buyer make, we see that "pleasure and ignorance, great and small" alludes to the theory of opposites as seen, for example, in citation 61; "the way up and down" to citation 60; the riddles of time and children to citation 13; "gods and mortal men" to fr. 62 ("immortals are mortal, mortals are immortal"); Heraclitus as a "veritable oracle of obscurity" refers to citation 27 and in general to Heraclitus' reputation for obscurity.

136. Gomez 1984, i; Lutz 1954, 310. Stewart (1958, 185) remarks that the desire to ridicule Democritus shaped the entire anecdote.

137. Other examples of the philosopher-tyrant relationship are Solon and Croesus (DL 1.50); Simonides and Hiero (Pl. *Ep.* 2.311a; Athen. 656d; Ael. *VH*); Plato and Dionysus (DL 3.18); and Apollonius of Tyana and Nero (Philostr. *VA* 25–26).

138. Riginos 1976, 74; Wehrli 1973, 204; Munz 1956, 6.

139. Bell (1978, 50) mentions Socrates who refused the gifts of Archelaus, Scopas, and Eurylochus (DL 2.25), Diogenes who refused Craterus (DL 6.57), and Stilpo who refused Ptolemy Soter (DL 2.115); Heraclitus, of course, refused an offer to live at Darius' court (DL 9.14).

140. Bell (1978, 74) speaks of this tendency, as does Lattimore (1939, 24).

141. Dumont 1987, 87; Kindstrand 1984, 164; Bell 1978, 34; Szegedy-Maszak 1978, 201; F. Wehrli, *Hauptrichtungen Griechischen Denkens* (Zurich-Stuttgart, 1964), 30. Women, children, and slaves, on the other hand, are used to show by their contrast, the impracticality, absentmindedness, or sheer silliness of the philosophers.

142. Kindstrand 1984, 151; C. W. Willink, "Prodikos and Tantalos," *Classical Quarterly* 33 (1983), 30; Stuart 1967, 127 and 159. For the related contrast between leader and philosopher, see Marcus Aurelius *Med.* 8.3, who contrasts Alexander, Gaius, and Pompey with Diogenes, Heraclitus, and Socrates. See also the three blessings of Thales, sometimes attributed to Socrates: to have been born human, male, and Greek, not beast, female, or barbarian, DL 1.33–34.

143. Lefkowitz 1981, 111; Finley 1974, 55; Wehrli 1973, 204.

144. Dumont 1987, 178; Bell 1978, 39; Riginos 1976, 170; Dover 1972, 41.

145. For the old age of philosophers, see Boas 1948, 450.

146. See Burkert 1985, 242; H. W. Parke, *Festivals of the Athenians* (London, 1977), 188. See also Diodorus Siculus 5.5.2; Callimachus *Cer.* 6.19; Servius in *Verg. Aen.* 4.58; Schol. *Luc.* 275.23–276.28 Rabe.

147. Burkert 1985, 244; *Ael. Fr.* 44 = *Suda* a 4329, th 272, s 1590, 1714; Pausanias 4.17.1; Herodotus 2.171 (who says that the festival comes from Egypt, brought by those “notorious men-killers,” the Danaids); Aristophanes *Thesm.* 627ff.

148. Fairweather 1974, 235. In a variant story, Democritus, like Plato, Speusippos, and Homer, dies of ptheirensis (lice disease) *Plut. Marc. Anton.* 3.3. Riginos (1976, 196) remarks that death by lice was “obviously a favored form of calumny.” Lefkowitz (1981, 162) notes that degrading deaths of this sort were often allotted to authors considered impious. For a list of those who died of lice disease, see Plutarch *Sulla* 35.5–6. Lucretius, on the other hand, says that Democritus committed suicide because his mind was failing (3.1039 = DK 68A24) making a further characterization of Democritus as one who lived solely for intellectual pursuits. Suicide, too, is a common death in philosophical biography, and occurs for Pherecydes (DL 1.118), Empedocles (DL 8.74), Anaxagoras (DL 2.13–14), Euclides (DL 2.112), Menedemus (DL 2.142), and Speusippos (DL 4.3). If Democritus’ death in citations 49 and 50 is to be considered suicide, Democritus becomes one of many who choose to starve themselves to death, including Pythagoras (DL 8.40), Zeno (DL 7.31), and Cleanthes (DL 7.176). On these deaths, see Schibli 1990, 8; Willink 1983, 28; Fairweather 1974, 260.

149. Doubtless, statements made at an earlier state of life. Note too that Democritus has achieved the old age of which he spoke. For the old age of the philosopher as another topos, see Boas 1948, 450.

150. *Athen.* 46 3–f = DK 68A29; *Acut. morb.* 2.37 = DK 68A28. Caecilius Aurelianus suggests an infusion of barley, bread, vetch, and myrtle, which sounds either very Heraclitean or very Eleusian; the *kykeon*, or sacred ritual drink of Eleusis, consisted of barley, water, and mint. Heraclitus, of course, mentions the drink in fr. 125, see citation 15 in chapter 2. For interpretation of the various fragments and their importance to Democritean philosophy as a whole, see Warren 2002, 36–39.

151. Varro, *Sat. Men.* fr. 81 Beuch. = DK 68A161; see Lucretius 3.891; Freeman 1966, 308.

152. *Arist. de anima* A 2.404a18.

153. I follow Hicks’ translation (1907, 11, 23) for the excerpts from Aristotle’s *de Anima*. For the notions that life is maintained by breathing in atomic theory, see Guthrie 1962, vol. 2, 434; Bailey 1928, 158; Zeller 1923, 259.

154. Guthrie remarks that “it is most interesting to notice how once again an old and popular belief (in this case the connection of soul with air) is retained and given scientific clothing” (1962, vol. 2, 434).

155. Casertano (1983, 349) also shows that disease is due only to the soul and that the soul, therefore, must find measure and impose it on the body.