

REVIEW–DISCUSSION

FRAGMENTS OF LATE HELLENISTIC BIOGRAPHY

Pietro Zaccaria, ed., *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker Continued. Part Four: Biography and Antiquarian Literature. IV A: Biography, Fascicle 5: The First Century BC and Hellenistic Authors of Uncertain Date*. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2021. Pp. xiii + 903. Hardback, \$229.00. ISBN 978-90-04-20913-8.

This volume contains the fragments of eleven biographers (Jacoby numbers 1035–45), including first editions of Apollonius of Tyre, Diocles of Magnesia, Stratocles of Rhodes, and an Anonymous Stoic whom Philodemus used in his *History of the Stoics* (*PHerc.* 1018). Jacoby himself edited Alexander Polyhistor, Laitos, and Nicanor, and these were then updated in *Brill's New Jacoby* in the 1990s. Giannattasio Andria edited many of them in her collection of the fragments of ‘successions of philosophers’, including Nicias of Nicaea (1989);¹ he had previously been included by Müller in *FHG*, as were Amphicrates of Athens and Jason of Nysa.² Demetrius of Magnesia received a provisional edition from Mejer.³ Some of these eleven authors were split up among different parts of *BNJ* because diverse material fits best in different places; this volume only contains fragments attributable to biographical and antiquarian treatises with a reasonable degree of certainty.⁴ (Users will thus have to contend with multiple numerations for several authors, but Zaccaria makes that as easy as possible, and in any case he often has more to say.⁵) Taken together, Zaccaria’s editions constitute the first collected corpus

¹ R. Giannattasio Andria, *I frammenti delle ‘Successioni dei filosofi’* (Naples, 1989). She edits the fragments of the *διαδοχαί* of an Antisthenes, Sosicrates of Rhodes, Alexander Polyhistor, Nicias of Nicaea, and Jason of Nysa.

² Müller mixed Jason of Nysa in with Jason of Argos and other Jasons; Jacoby had planned to separate them; cf. *BNJ* 94, 446, and 632.

³ J. Mejer, ‘Demetrius of Magnesia: *On Poets and Authors of the Same Name*’, *Hermes* 109 (1981) 447–72.

⁴ He notes previous editions in the first part of the commentary to each author (‘NN in modern scholarship’).

⁵ For example, he criticises Lopez-Ruiz’s entry for Laitos (*BNJ*² 784, published in 2019) for failing to take into account relevant epigraphic evidence. He also had access to Jacoby’s unpublished notes.

of ‘late Hellenistic’ (in practice, first century BCE) biography, one focused on philosophers, as it happens.

In line with *FGrHist* practice, only passages in which the author is explicitly named and which have some claim to being biographical are included, and fragments are distinguished from testimonia. So, e.g., the fragment of Alexander Polyhistor’s *On Pythagorean Symbols* at Clem. *Strom.* 1.15.70 is not included in this book, but you can find it at *FGrHist/BNJ* 273 F 94 = F 10 (Giannattasio Andria). Within the fragments, normal typeface indicates reasonably secure attribution, *petit* font indicates doubt or uncertainty, as well as contextual material.⁶ Verbatim quotations are given in quotation marks. Zaccaria provides an abbreviated apparatus and aims at listing important variants only, though in practice it is quite full.

Many of the fragments come from authors like Diogenes Laertius and Athenaeus, which means a good deal of commentary space is spent summarising and sorting out the debates of *Quellenforschung*.⁷ Direct vs indirect use and embedded quotations (e.g., Nicias of Nicea’s use of Sotion) are frequent concerns. All this is important work, especially when so much of our understanding of an author hangs on a second author who had his own reasons for quoting him. Zaccaria’s summaries are fair and complete, and his own judgement is cautious (sometimes, in my view, overly so, but he gives us the tools to evaluate it). Zaccaria deploys this same reasoned scepticism to questions of date, attribution, and use of other sources. The primary material is not very extensive, and it would be very difficult to press the stones for more blood than Zaccaria gets. His commentary is sober and complete.

This Jacoby series provides texts, translations, and commentaries, but not monographic treatments nor much space for reflection. In lieu of having Zaccaria’s own thoughts on the meaning and importance of the material that he has ably gathered and edited, you will have to accept mine instead.

Greek philosophers’ interest in the history of their own discipline is a major preoccupation of this material. This is a reasonably well-known feature of the Epicurean school, which had a tradition of rather hagiographic biographies (e.g., *Life of Philonides*, *Philistas*, Philodemus’ *On Epicurus*), as well as various historiographic/apologetic works (Philodemus’ *Pragmateiai*, possibly parts of

⁶ The distinction between normal font and quotation marks must be emphasised: e.g., it is clear that Diogenes adapted Alexander Polyhistor’s lengthy F 8 by putting it into indirect discourse and he may have abbreviated it as well.

⁷ Although very occasionally (and inevitably) some points of detail that interested me were not explained—e.g., on what grounds Meineke and Kaibel conjectured the numbers for the amount of money that Dionysius the Stoic owed to the brothel in Nicias of Nicea (F 3), or why Kroll ruled out the possibility that a Roman in the third or second century BCE could have translated Phoenician—Zaccaria always gives the bibliography to track down the answers.

letter collections); it emerges here clearly for the Stoics as well. There was a major debate over Zeno the Stoic and the early history of the Stoic school and a related debate over the Cynics and their relationship backwards to Socrates and forwards to the Stoics. We might connect this flowering of historiography to the break-up of centralised authority in Athens, but perhaps also to an increasing need felt by the philosophers to explain themselves to Romans.⁸ Generally, philosophical discipleship, even the temporary discipleship of a long-dead person, had consequences—the views of the master became the views of the students, and, as Zaccaria says, ‘the problem of Zeno’s teachers clearly concerned the very origins of Stoicism’ (149).⁹ Zeno’s ‘Cynic books’ were a source of embarrassment for later Stoics: were the Stoics really the moralists that they claimed to be? Panaetius (c. 180–c. 110) and his school (including Hecato and maybe Apollonius of Tyre, but see below) were hostile to Cynicism, and might have had a major influence on our sources.

An interesting difficulty arises in pulling apart straight biography from ‘doxography’ in the weak sense, i.e., incomplete/unsystematic description of views, as shown by Schorn.¹⁰ These works are apparently all, if not polemical or argumentative, at least *parti pri*, and interesting problems emerge: how big is the difference between a ‘Lives of the Philosophers’ and an ‘On the Schools of Thought’? To what extent is the information historically reliable? For instance, the various dates given for Zeno of Citium’s life are irreconcilable with each other. Apollonius, Persaeus, Philodemus, and the Suda all give different dates. Persaeus, a direct student of Zeno’s, ought to be perfectly informed, but then why the confusion? Apollonius’ deviation can be attributed to the use of an *acmē*-age and his acceptance of the authenticity of forged letters (cf. F 2).

Bibliologically, there is an interesting variety of book titles in the Hellenistic era: not just the expected Περὶ + NN/topic (including Amphicrates

⁸ Sulla’s sack of Athens (87–86) is the traditional cause for the upheaval (cf. D. Sedley, ‘Philodemus and the Decentralisation of Philosophy’, *CErc* 33 (2003) 31–41), but diffusion had clearly begun earlier—note the famous Stoic school, and less famous Epicurean one, on Rhodes, high-level philosophising in Alexandria (cf. Cicero *Lucul.* 11–12 and Philod. *Index Academicorum* 34.35–35.2 with K. Fleischer, ‘New Readings in Philodemus’ *Index Academicorum: Dio of Alexandria (P. Herc. 1021, col. XXXV, 17–19)*, in T. Derda, A. Łajtar, and J. Urbanik, edd., *Proceedings of the 27th International Congress of Papyrology* (Warsaw, 2016) 459–70, and his forthcoming edition), and Epicurean Demetrius Laco’s activity, perhaps in Miletus (*PHerc.* 1012, col. 24, ed. Puglia), as well as a sort of Epicurean missionary activity in Italy reported by Cicero, *Tusc. Disp.* 4.6–7. Zaccaria (33–4) himself notes that Roman elites were surely part of the audience for succession literature.

⁹ This material is summarised on 275, in the commentary on Demetrios of Magnesia F 8—an example of how each section is meant to stand alone (and how this contributes to the length of the book).

¹⁰ S. Schorn, *Studien zur hellenistischen Biographie und Historiographie* (Berlin, 2018) 301–37.

of Athens' *On Famous Men*, Περὶ ἐνδόξων ἀνδρῶν, cf. Suetonius and Nepos) and Βίος τοῦ ΝΝ, but also Διαδοχή/-αί and Ἐπιδρομή τῶν φιλοσόφων (Diogenes of Magnesia), Cύνταξις τῶν φιλοσόφων (Philodemus, not included in this collection), Πίναξ τῶν ἀπὸ Ζήνωνος φιλοσόφων καὶ τῶν βυβλίων (Apollodorus of Tyre, not included in this collection), Τῶν φιλοσόφων ἀναγραφὴ (Hippobotus, not included in this collection), and a Βίος Ἑλλάδος (Jason of Nysa). Διαδοχαί are *mainly* biographical; Περὶ αἰρέσεων are *mainly* doxographical/doctrinal, but discussing the life of a philosopher necessarily involves explaining his contributions to his school, and explaining the history of a school necessarily involves naming the philosophers who developed it. Are deviations from the most common titles just authorial whimsy or are they intended to signal some innovation in method or content?

‘Λαίτος’ (i.e., Ofellius Laetus?) is a fascinating character who must be taken into account in discussions of Romans writing in Greek.

From here on, a few scattered notes on individual fragments.

Alexander Polyhistor (c. 110–after 40) was an author of a *Successions of the Philosophers* (Φιλοσόφων διαδοχαί). Zaccaria argues, as convincingly as the evidence allows, that Diogenes used Alexander first-hand as a supplement to his main sources. This suggests that our impressions of Alexander’s willingness to believe variant traditions may be due to Diogenes’ strategy of citing him only for interesting tidbits he did not find elsewhere.

He mentions both Pherecydes (whom he records as a student of Pittacus, F 1) and Carneades (F 6), which suggests that he covered the whole philosophical-historical gamut, from the Seven Sages down to the generation before his birth; Socrates and the early Socratics seem to have played an important role in his construction of the history.

F 8, a very interesting Pythagorean doxography derived from a Hellenistic *Pythagorean Notes* (Πυθαγορικὰ ὑπομνήματα, cf. DK 58 b 1a) that Alexander found somewhere, is a hint that doxographic material might have bulked larger in succession-literature than one might suspect.¹¹ In F 1, Zaccaria intriguingly suggests, following Nietzsche, that Alexander is intentionally bringing Pythagoras back home to Greece, as it were, by connecting his teacher, Pherecydes of Syrus, to Pittacus the sage. An example of the debates over the Greekness of philosophy (cf. Diogenes Laertius’ preface and the frequent appearances of Magoi, Brahmins, and Druids as teachers in various lives of philosophers)? Similarly, the chronologically difficult connection of

¹¹ Cf. Schorn (n. 10) 317–18, 325. Incidentally, Zaccaria does not mention that his division of the material between Alexander and Aristotle matches the plain meaning of Diogenes’ indications: Alexander from 8.24, where he is named until the end of 8.33/beginning of 34, where Aristotle is named, then Diogenes’ concluding note (8.36) only mentions two excerpts, ‘this material’ (ταῦτα) from Alexander and ‘what followed that material’ (τὰ ἐκείνων ἐχόμενα) from Aristotle.

Pyrrho to Socrates via Bryso of Heracleia and/or Stilpo of Elis, if F 9 is understood correctly (the text is probably corrupt), may be an attempt to finesse or manufacture a suitable intellectual genealogy for the later philosopher.

Amphicrates of Athens, rhetorician and author of an *On Famous Men* (Περὶ ἐνδόξων ἀνδρῶν), fled or was exiled from Athens (maybe in the wake of Sulla's siege) and ended up in Parthia and then Armenia. He preserves a variant tradition about Themistocles' mother and notes that Theodorus the Atheist (a Cyreniac philosopher) died by judicial hemlocking, which contradicts the other known evidence for his life. Philo (*Prob.* 127–30 = SSR IV H 9 = T 5 Winiarczyk) reports that Theodorus, like Socrates, was accused of impiety and corrupting the youth, and notes Theodorus' witticism that Lysimachus had the power of hemlock, not a king (Stob. 3.3.32 = SSR IV H 9 = T 13 Win.). So Amphicrates played a role in a tradition of modelling Theodorus after Socrates.

Apollonius of Tyre (active in the first half of the first century BCE) was a Stoic biographer of Stoics who wrote a *Table of the Philosophers from Zeno and their Books* (Πίναξ τῶν ἀπὸ Ζήνωνος φιλοσόφων καὶ τῶν βιβλίων) as well as an *On Zeno* (Περὶ Ζήνωνος) in several books (unless somehow the latter is part of the former).¹² He probably downplayed Zeno's Cynic phase (cf. F 4) and made him a Socratic *via* the Academy and Megarians. The lack of a trace of a doxography *may* have a bearing on understanding his intended audience.

Wilamowitz's guess that Apollonius was Hekaton's student makes for a too schematic lineage, but it's reasonable to suppose that Apollonius was in the 'school of Panaetius'. In F 1, it is more useful, perhaps, to say that *συγχρωτίζω* means 'to get skin-to-skin (χρῶς) with someone (συν- + dat.)'. If Zeno were familiar with leather book-rolls from places that did not use papyrus exclusively, the prophecy would have been a personally relevant pun as well.

For Demetrius of Magnesia (first century BCE), note that Zaccaria is working on a paper to sort out whether some anonymous lists of homonymous people belong to Demetrius as well. I expect that this will increase the number of fragments attributable to him with a reasonably high degree of certainty.

In F 10, I think Meyer is right to attribute the whole passage to Demetrius; the mentions of his name serve to introduce and conclude the summary. In F 12, the bit of the text that actually mentions the homonymous Hippasoi can safely be attributed to Demetrius' *Homonyms*. On 288–9, Burkert's parallels are apposite, but only inasmuch as they show titles as subject and object of ἐκδοῦναι (i.e., if the title was Περὶ τῶν ἀγαθῶν πραγματεία instead of simply

¹² He or a namesake also wrote a wonderfully named *Women Who Practiced Philosophy or Accomplished Some Other Illustrious Deed, and Thanks to Whom Families Were Brought to Goodwill* (Ὅσαι γυναῖκες ἐφιλοσόφησαν ἢ καὶ ἄλλως τι ἐπίδοξον διεπράξαντο, καὶ δι' αὐτῶν οἰκίαι εἰς εὐνοίαν συνεκράθησαν), mentioned by Photius.

περὶ τῶν ἀγαθῶν). But neither is a suitable parallel to the real problem, the lack of an article with *περὶ φύσεως*. Zaccaria probably has the right text.

F 19 is informative about his style: the phrase *πεπραγματευμένος τοῦτο μὲν ἔπος τοῦτο δὲ πρᾶγμα* is quite interesting, but *πρᾶγμα* has come under suspicion. Adler's *πράγμα<τα>* is probably the easiest solution (haplography would be easy before *τέταρτος*).

Diocles of Magnesia (ca. 100 BCE?) in his 'Run Down of the Philosophers' (*Ἐπιδρομὴ τῶν φιλοσόφων*) included both doxographic information (cf. the lengthy F 2 on Stoic logic, thirty-five chapters in Diogenes' Book 7) and biographical data, even trivia (F 1, Epicurus bought the Garden for 80 minas).

F 3: Zaccaria leaves open the question of whether Xenophon's sons really were educated in Sparta, and thinks that the version in Plutarch (*Ages.* 20.2) is not helpful because of its uncertain relationship to Diocles. But Plutarch reports that Agesilaos invited Xenophon to have his sons educated in Sparta, which is surely relevant to the question—it need not have been normal for Spartans to board foreign students.

In Nicias of Nicea (of unknown date), F 1, von Arnim's deletion of *εἶπε* should probably be accepted; it is otiose, possibly a wrongly incorporated reminder of the syntax given its distance from *ἔφη* at the beginning of the sentence. In F 3, the anecdote that Dionysius of Heraclia, an ex-Stoic who became an Epicurean or Cyreniac, was so free from shame that he paid off his tab at a brothel while walking *μετὰ τινῶν γνωρίμων*, has more point if he was walking with students rather than acquaintances. The transitional *καί ποτε* means that the anecdote need not take place in his youth.

The book is well produced both physically and content-wise; the binding stood up to a complete read-through without showing signs of strain (not so easy for a book of this size).¹³ The length could have been pared down by a more concise style. There are some very minor annoyances, caused I think by the rules of the Jacoby series: they are probably to blame for the pointless inclusion of pages of testimonia which merely point out that information of various sorts (e.g., ethnics and titles) is preserved in material printed as fragments. Publication of each author *separatim* online is the reason for separate

¹³ I have only the following, quite trivial, corrigenda: **22, first line:** *ὑψιστον <τόπον>* (add. Cobet) should have been printed, as discussed by commentary on p. 70. **27 n. 8:** read Suet. for Svet. **96, F 1:** the moveable *nu* should be printed on Ἑλλησί for the metre. **107ff.:** Habrotonon has lost her aspiration in English. **135** and **138:** Carthage is misspelled. **184:** read *Διογένης* for *Διόγενες* in F 7. **194** (Demetrius of Magnesia, F 19): it seems to me that the material through *τάδε* in l. 5, should be *in petit* as context. **412** (Diocles of Magnesia, F 2): similarly, I think ll. 1–3 should be *en petit*. **442** (id. F 5): likewise in line 1 through *ταυτί*. **702–3:** several instances of *γ]ε[γρ]α[μμένους* are missing most of their brackets.

bibliographies and a certain amount of repetition. The volume closes with concordances and *indices locorum et nominum (antiquorum)*.

Zaccaria is to be congratulated for this achievement: he summarises a huge amount of scholarship intelligently and useably, and prints reliable texts with accurate translations. It is the fault of the material that, beyond Jacoby completists, the volume will be of particular interest to historians of philosophy and those working on Diogenes Laertius, given the amount of *διαδοχαί* literature contained within.

Institut für Altertumskunde, Universität zu Köln

MICHAEL MCOSKER
mmcosker@umich.edu