Introduction

This Introduction and the chronological table that follows it are intended to give readers who may not be familiar with this period of Peripatetic philosophy a guide to the major trends and developments, and to introduce some of the philosophers who will be considered in the following pages. The actual ancient evidence relating to some of the identifications and dates will be found below in Chapter **1**, 'People'.

Aristotle's school, the Lyceum, has been regarded both in antiquity and by modern scholars as entering a period of decline after its third head, Strato. This impression may in part be the result of tendentious representation in the ancient evidence,[1] but in so far as it is accurate, the fundamental reason for the decline seems to be, not that Aristotle's works were no longer available (below, **2**), but that the Lyceum had never had an agenda that was philosophical in the narrow sense of that term predominant in antiquity, as promoting a way of life and an attitude towards its events. From Aristotle himself onwards, the concern of the school had largely been with the collecting and analysis of information on a wide range of topics, and it thus suffered from the double disadvantage that, on the one hand, it did not have such a clear evangelical message to propound as did the Epicureans or the Stoics (for the message of *Nicomachean Ethics* 10, that the highest human activity is theoretical study for its own sake, was probably of no wider appeal in antiquity than it is now), and, on the other, that such research was being carried on elsewhere, above all in Ptolemaic Alexandria.[2] The notion of Aristotelianism as a distinctive philosophical system, in a sense closer to modern understandings of 'philosophical', is in no small part the result of a process that had its beginnings in the period considered in the present book.

Critolaus of Phaselis in the second century BC (below, **1A**) was the most distinguished head of the Peripatetic school between Strato and the

[1] See White 2004; Sharples 2006, 323; Hahm 2007. [2] See Glucker 1998.

apparent end of the school as an institution with Sulla's sack of Athens in 86 BC.[3] Critolaus' philosophical positions are in many respects, though not all, marked by an apparent desire to distance Aristotelianism from Stoicism (see below, **16T**, **18EHIM**, **20AB**, **22KLO**). Hahm has argued (2007, 76–81, 95–6) that Critolaus' subsequent reputation suffered doubly, first from the way in which Antiochus of Ascalon (**1B**) deliberately emphasised Critolaus' divergence from Aristotle while suppressing how similar Critolaus' views were to Antiochus' own, and then from the shift from philosophical debate to text-based exegesis; see further below, on **2A** and **18M**.

Antiochus of Ascalon (*c.* 130–69/8 BC) regarded himself as an Academic, and indeed as restoring the true tradition of the Academy after the sceptical interlude of the Middle Academy of Arcesilaus (316/15–242/1 BC), and the New Academy of Carneades (214/13–129/8 BC) and his followers. Antiochus taught that the views of Plato, his immediate successors in the Old Academy, Aristotle and the Stoics were essentially similar – a view which has a degree of philosophical plausibility, especially if one contrasts these three schools with the Epicureans and the various sceptical traditions. Unfortunately Antiochus was too ready to attribute apparently Stoic theories on specific topics to the Platonists and the Peripatetics, though it has recently been argued (Sedley 2002) that in the case of the former at least there may be more historical accuracy in this than has often been supposed.

After Antiochus' death his school was taken over by his brother Aristus. Ariston of Alexandria and Cratippus of Pergamum left Antiochus' school and declared themselves Peripatetics. Cicero shows great admiration for Cratippus (**1JKLM**, **27EF**). Subsequent historians of philosophy have not endorsed Cicero's view, but Cicero may be judging Cratippus as a teacher (and debater; see Hahm 2007, 94) rather than for acumen in the more technical aspects of philosophy. The significance of Cicero's praise of Cratippus in modern discussion has chiefly been as an argument from silence, suggesting either that Andronicus of Rhodes was not active until after Cicero's death (**1KLM** being written in November 44) or that Cicero was not interested in the unpublished writings of Aristotle that preoccupied Andronicus. Cratippus taught Cicero's son in Athens; but in the first century BC and thereafter, although Athens continued to be a centre where the sons of the Roman elite went to study, philosophers were active in the major centres of the Roman Empire, including Rome itself, and it is not always possible to be certain where a particular individual studied and taught.[4]

[3] See Lynch 1972, 192–8. [4] See Barnes 1997, 23–4 on Andronicus and Boethus.

Andronicus is best known for his alleged part in editing, and thus making available again, the unpublished works of Aristotle, though the extent of his contribution to the editorial tradition has recently been called into question.[5] What is clear is that he was among the first to engage in the activity of writing commentaries on these Aristotelian texts, which remained the centre of Peripatetic activity until, and even after, the Peripatetic tradition largely ceased to exist as a separate one by being absorbed into Platonism in the third century AD.[6] In producing commentaries Andronicus was followed by his pupil Boethus.[7]

Also in the mid to late first century BC, Xenarchus of Seleucia (on whom see **17C**, **21D–I**, **24K**, **27A**) is best known for his criticisms of Aristotle's view that the heavens are composed of a fifth element different from those which constitute the sublunary region. This raises questions as to how far Aristotelian orthodoxy was and should now be a criterion for regarding someone as a Peripatetic, and how far it was simply a matter of a predominant interest in the views and writings of Aristotle rather than in those of any other philosopher or school; see Falcon 2008 on this, and on Xenarchus' relation both to Hellenistic critics of Aristotle such as Strato and to the later commentary tradition. Xenarchus criticises Aristotle's views by using arguments drawn from Aristotle's own works, unlike a Platonist critic of Aristotle such as Atticus, and unlike Strato, who developed his own theories rather than arguing on the basis of Aristotle's. There is, however, a danger of reading back into the first century BC, as Moraux arguably did, Alexander's concern in the second to third centuries AD to establish a consistent and orthodox Aristotelian doctrine; the shift from the Hellenistic continuation of Aristotle's work to the focus in the late Republic and early Empire on Aristotle's *works*, that is the texts, did not necessarily bring with it an immediate concern for orthodoxy.[8]

Possibly from the latter part of the first century BC we have two summaries of Aristotelian doctrine, of rather different types but similar in the problems relating to their origin. One, conventionally attributed to 'Arius Didymus' a courtier of the emperor Augustus, is a summary of Peripatetic ethics (**15** below), which draws to some extent on Aristotle's esoteric works but also shows the influence of Hellenistic philosophical

[5] Barnes 1997, 28–44. See below on **2BFG**, **6A**, **7C**, **8A**.
[6] Largely; but Themistius, who wrote paraphrases of Aristotle in the fourth century AD, is one exception, and Nicolaus of Damascus may be another (see further below).
[7] Not to be confused with the *Stoic* Boethus of Sidon (second century BC), or with the sixth-century AD Roman Neoplatonist Boethius.
[8] For these points I am indebted to Andrea Falcon.

preoccupations both in its content and in its structure. We also have some much shorter reports of Aristotelian physics customarily attributed to the same writer; but the identification of the author of all these texts is a highly complex matter, discussed in the commentary to **1** below. The other summary, by Nicolaus of Damascus, is, or rather was, a condensed paraphrase of some of Aristotle's esoteric works; it survives only in a Syriac version which has itself been drastically and arbitrarily summarised by an epitomator and which has then suffered further damage owing to the loss of parts of the sole MS. Here the problem of attribution relates to whether the Nicolaus in question is the associate of Herod the Great and Augustus, or a later writer of the same name. See the commentary on **1PQ** below. The compendium occasionally supplements what Aristotle actually says by questionable interpretation of its own (Drossaart-Lulofs 1965, 156; however, see below, **21** n. 29),[9] but in general it reproduces Aristotle's thought and has rather little contact with the issues and debates which preoccupied Peripatetics in our period, and still less with the thought of other philosophical schools – facts which led Drossaart-Lulofs 1965, 20–1 to suggest that 'it seems doubtful whether Nicolaus', who worked in various literary genres and above all in history (his *Histories*, alluded to in **1P**, occupied 144 books), 'had any connexion with the schoolmen of his time, and was not rather a kind of freelance'. Nicolaus seems to have disregarded the *Categories*, the *Organon* and the ethical[10] and political works altogether, concentrating on physics and biology, and paid considerable attention to Aristotle's *Metaphysics*.[11] Although he followed Aristotle's texts as his source, he rearranged material in the interests of clarity, expressing dissatisfaction with the way in which in the *Metaphysics* all the problems for discussion are collected together into a single book, *Metaphysics* B, whereas in the *Physics* they appear at the start of

[9] Cf. also Drossaart-Lulofs 1965, 8–9, 17–19, but the points here (on the Presocratics Xenophanes and Diogenes of Apollonia; Simplicius, *In Phys.* 23.14, 25.8, 149.18, 151.21) relate to Nicolaus' *On Gods*, which Drossaart-Lulofs suggests was an early work on physical doxography, rather than to the compendium *On the Philosophy of Aristotle*. A paraphrase *can* indeed be a form of commentary or interpretation (cf. the comments of the Arabic authors cited by Fazzo 2008, 111) but, to judge from the extant remains of the work, there is rather little of this in the compendium.

[10] In the compendium. But see Drossaart-Lulofs 1965, 7 and 16 (T2) for another work *On What Is Noble in Actions*, and 1965, 13–14 (T13) for an *Introduction to Ethics*, judged spurious by Drossaart-Lulofs because it refers to Plotinus, but cf. Fazzo 2005, 289 n. 52; 2008, 114–16 and references there.

[11] Both the interest in the *Metaphysics* and that in the biological works are remarkable if the work is first century BC in date; Fazzo 2008, 118–19. It is true, as Jan Opsomer reminds me, that others such as Eudorus the Platonist took an interest in passages in the *Metaphysics* in this period (see Dillon 1996, 128 n. 1), but that is rather different from dealing with the work as a whole.

the relevant sections,[12] and placing material from the philosophical lexicon in *Metaphysics* Δ in the sections to which it seemed relevant.[13]

Also probably from the latter part of the first century BC or the first half of the first century AD are: the surviving pseudo-Aristotelian treatise *On the World* (*De mundo*), which goes beyond Aristotle's explicit statements in giving an account of the world as a whole as a system governed by a divine ruler, who does not, however (unlike the Stoic god), himself become involved in the details; the work *On Philosophy* by Aristocles of Messene, surviving only in fragments, which seems to have been a general history of philosophy inspired by Aristotle's exoteric work of the same name (see Chiesara 2001, xxxv–xxxviii), though making use also of the esoteric works (Chiesara 2001, xiii), and engaging in controversy as well as in narrative (below, **14**); and the treatise *On Emotions* falsely attributed to Andronicus, which is a combination of Stoic and Peripatetic material, the latter chiefly on virtues and vices and indeed largely dependent on the pseudo-Aristotelian treatise of that title, which may itself be from the same period.[14]

After this there appears to have been a decline until the second century AD in distinctively Peripatetic activity known to us (which does not mean that Peripatetic views were not discussed by members of other schools, notably the Stoic Seneca); the exception is Alexander of Aegae, teacher of the emperor Nero (AD 37–68; **1S**), who produced a commentary on Aristotle's *Categories* and discussed an argument in *On the Heaven* (*De caelo*) (Moraux 1984, 222–5; see **1Y**). Aspasius, much of whose commentary on the *Ethics*[15] is still extant and is the earliest commentary on Aristotle to survive substantially rather than in the form of second-hand reports,[16] also commented on a wide range of Aristotle's works (Moraux 1984, 226–93); he is to be placed in the first half of the second century AD (see **1T**).[17] So too is Adrastus (see

[12] Averroes, *In Metaph.* 168.5 Bouyges 1952= Nicolaus T7.4 in Drossaart-Lulofs 1965, 12.

[13] Averroes, *In Metaph.* 476.3 Bouyges 1952 = Nicolaus T7.5 in Drossaart-Lulofs 1965, 12, 32–4; for example, a rearranged version of *Metaph.* Δ.1, on principles, along with material on these from elsewhere in the *Metaphysics*, introduced his summary of the *Physics*, Drossaart-Lulofs 1965, 99, and a version of *Metaph.* Δ.8 incorporating material from Z introduced the summary of Metaph. Λ, Drossaart-Lulofs 1965, 144–5.

[14] See Moraux 1973, 138–41; Gottschalk 1987, 1129–31.

[15] I deliberately put the matter this way, for, while Aspasius includes the 'common books' (*Nicomachean Ethics* 5–7 = *Eudemian Ethics* 4–6) in his commentary on the former, it is not clear that he regarded them as actually belonging to the *Nicomachean Ethics*, and in fact there are indications that he did not do so. See Barnes 1999, 21, and below on **2I**.

[16] At a time when books could only be preserved through laborious copying by hand, later commentaries tended to supersede earlier ones; why bother to copy out a superseded commentary, especially when later ones often include quite extensive parts of their predecessors (explicitly attributed or not)?

[17] Donini has argued (1974, 98–125; 1982, 217–19) that Aspasius shows markedly Platonising tendencies (and see below on **16Ad**); however Barnes 1999, 5–6 (cf. 30) rightly maintains that Aspasius is using

1UV), who produced a work on the *Ethics* which seems to have been a discussion of specific passages, explaining allusions in Aristotle's text, rather than a general commentary (**1W**). Adrastus also updated Aristotle's theory of the heavenly spheres to take account of developments in astronomical theories since Aristotle's time (**21MN**) and apparently did so in a commentary on Plato's *Timaeus* (see the commentary on **1V**; Moraux 1984, 296–300) – which is significant for readiness to cross boundaries between schools in our period; on this see also the commentary on **23LMN**. Adrastus' work on the *Ethics* was apparently utilised, though we have no explicit evidence of this, by the anonymous commentator on *Nicomachean Ethics* 2–5, who may have written in the latter part of the second century AD (see below on **1X**).

In AD 176 the emperor Marcus Aurelius established publicly funded posts at Athens for teachers of Platonism, Aristotelianism, Stoicism and Epicureanism.[18] It is doubtful whether there was any institutional continuity with the Hellenistic schools, which had probably ceased to exist as such centuries earlier.[19] Alexander of Aphrodisias was appointed to the post of teacher of Aristotelianism between AD 198 and 209 (**1Ab,Ac**).[20] Alexander was taught by Sosigenes (for whom see **8G**, **13F**(2)**G**(1), **21KL**, **26D**), Herminus (**1Y**, **21J**) and perhaps Aristoteles of Mytilene (**1Z**, **Aa**).[21] Although we do not know at what stage in Alexander's career he was appointed to the post in Athens, it seems likely that Sosigenes, Herminus and Aristoteles of Mytilene, as Alexander's teachers, are to be dated rather later in the second century than Aspasius and Adrastus.

SOME NOTABLE PERIPATETICS (AND OTHERS) AND THEIR DATES

For the period before 200 BC no attempt has been made to list all known Peripatetics, or even all significant members of the school; the listing is confined to those whom there has been occasion to mention in this sourcebook, and it is provided for the convenience of the reader. For the same reason some individuals who were not primarily identified as members of the Peripatetic school have also been included. Where dates can only be given in terms of a century or part thereof, the reference is to the time when

philosophical ideas which had become common property, and that he not only does not subscribe to the most distinctive Platonic doctrines, but never actually disagrees with or criticises Aristotle. See also below, **16Ad** and commentary.

[18] Philostratus, *Lives of the Sophists* p. 566. [19] See Sharples 2005, 52–3 and references there.

[20] For Alexander of Damascus, who may have held the post at some point before Alexander of Aphrodisias, see **14KL** and the commentary there.

[21] See Accattino 1985; Moraux 1985; and also below on **27K**.

the person seems to have been philosophically active. For the historical evidence behind the identifications and dates see below, Chapter **1**.

Aristotle of Stagira	384–322 BC
Theophrastus of Eresos	372/1 or 371/0 – 288/7 or 287/6 BC
Eudemus of Rhodes	latter part of fourth century BC
Strato of Lampsacus	head of Peripatetic school from death of Theophrastus until *c.* 269 BC
Ariston of Ceos	later third/early second century BC
Critolaus of Phaselis	early to middle second century BC
Staseas of Naples	born before 120 BC
Apellicon of Teos	first quarter of first century BC
Antiochus of Ascalon (Academic)	*c.* 130 – *c.* 69/8 BC
Cicero (Academic)	106–43 BC
Cratippus of Pergamum	middle of first century BC
Andronicus of Rhodes	mid to late first century BC?
Xenarchus of Seleucia	mid to late first century BC
Boethus of Sidon	second half of first century BC
Athenodorus of Tarsus (Stoic)	second half of first century BC
Arius Didymus (?) (Stoic)	late first century BC (?)
Nicolaus of Damascus (?)	second half of first century BC (?)
Aristocles of Messene	late first century BC/early first century AD
Alexander of Aegae	early to mid first century AD
Seneca (the Younger) (Stoic)	*c.* 4 BC/AD 1 – AD 65
Cornutus (Stoic)	first century AD
Aspasius	first half of second century AD
Adrastus	first half of second century AD
Sosigenes	second half of second century AD
Herminus	second half of second century AD
Aristoteles of Mytilene	second half of second century AD
Alexander of Aphrodisias	*fl. c.* AD 200

Individuals

CHAPTER I

People

A. Cicero, *On the Orator* 2.155

[Scipio the younger, Laelius and Furius] said that the Athenians did something most welcome both to them and to many of the leading citizens, in that, when they sent envoys to the senate about their most important concerns [in 156/5 BC], they sent the three most distinguished philosophers of that age, Carneades and Critolaus and Diogenes [of Babylon]; and so these, while they were at Rome, were frequently listened to both by themselves and by others.

B. Cicero, *On Ends* 5.14

Critolaus wished to imitate the early [Peripatetics], and indeed he is closest [to them] in seriousness, and his style is free-flowing; but not even he holds to the principles of his ancestors. Diodorus, his pupil, adds to moral virtue [*honestas*] freedom from pain. He too has a position of his own; and since he disagrees about the supreme good he cannot truly be called a Peripatetic. It seems to me that our Antiochus follows the opinion of the ancients most carefully; he teaches that it was the same for Aristotle and for Polemo.[1]

C. Eusebius, *Preparation for the Gospel* 15.2.13

Concerning Hermeias and Aristotle's friendship with him many others have written, and in particular Apellicon; whoever reads his works will cease from blasphemy against [Hermeias and Aristotle].

D. Cicero, *On Ends* 5.8

'You know that I agree with you on [the importance of Aristotle and the early Peripatetics], Piso,' I said, 'but your mention of [the Old Academy] is

[1] The fourth head of Plato's Academy.

timely; for my [cousin, Lucius] Cicero is eager to hear what is the opinion concerning the moral end of that Old Academy which you mention, and of the Peripatetics. We think that you will be able to explain it very easily, because you have had Staseas from Naples in your household for many years, and we are aware that for many months you questioned Antiochus at Athens about these same things.'

E. Philodemus, *Index of Academic [Philosophers]* 35.2–17

[Antiochus'] school was taken over by his brother and student Aristus; although he was busy he had several students including my friends Ariston and Dio of Alexandria and Cratippus of Pergamum, of whom Ariston and Cratippus, <since they had heard Xenarchus and were enthusiastic [about him]>,[2] became Peripatetics, leaving the Academy.

F. Plutarch, *Life of Brutus* 2.3

[Brutus, the killer of Julius Caesar,] did not greatly approve the New and the so-called Middle Academies, but attached himself to the Old, and was a constant admirer of Antiochus of Ascalon and made [Antiochus'] brother Aristus his friend and associate, a man who was inferior to many philosophers in argument, but a rival of the foremost in his self-discipline and his mildness.

G. Strabo, *Geography* 14.2.19

[Strabo is listing famous people from Cos] . . . and in our time Nicias who was also the tyrant of Cos, and Ariston the pupil and successor of the Peripatetic. Also famous was Theomnestus the harp-player, the political opponent of Nicias.

H. Strabo, *Geography* 17.1.5

But I will pass over these things [the causes of the annual flooding of the Nile] which have been discussed by many people, of whom it will be sufficient to mention just two, those who have composed a book about the Nile in our own time, Eudorus and the Peripatetic Ariston. For except

[2] Puglia's supplement, following Buecheler; only the letters -na- are readable. See Karamanolis 2006, 81 and n. 110.