PLUTARCH AS A SOURCE FOR EMPEDOCLES

HALLIE REBECCA MARSHALL

NOTE TO USERS

Plutarch as a Source for Empedocles

by

© Hallie Rebecca Marshall

A thesis submitted to the

School of Graduate Studies

in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

Department of Classics

Memorial University of Newfoundland

October 2002

St. John's, Newfoundland

Table of Contents

Abstract

The purpose of this thesis is two-fold: (1) to evaluate Plutarch's value as a witness to Empedocles' work, which survives only in fragments; and (2) to discuss whether it is possible to reconstruct Empedocles' *Eis Empedoklea*. It consists of five chapters. Chapter one is an introduction to the thesis topic and the previous scholarship on this subject. Chapter two gives a brief introduction to Plutarch and his interest in Plato. It examines how Plutarch cites Plato in *Platonic Questions* I-X (*Moralia* 999C-1011F). Chapter three discusses what is known about the text of Empedocles' work and Plutarch's interest in that work. It examines the Empedoclean quotations found in Plutarch's *Moralia*. Chapter four discusses whether it is possible to reconstruct Plutarch's *Eis Empedoklea*. Chapter five is a brief summary which brings together the material from the previous chapters.

Acknowledgments

I would like to acknowledge the School of Graduate Studies and the Department of Classics for their financial support. I would like to thank my supervisor Dr. Mark Joyal for his thorough reading of each draft of this thesis. His guidance and comments made it a much better thesis than it otherwise would have been. I would also like to thank my readers, Dr. Brad Inwood and Dr. John Scott, for their helpful comments and kind words. A very special thanks is owed to Cathy Kieley. Thanks is also owed to my parents for their encouragement and support. My biggest debt, however, is to my beloved husband who sacrificed a great deal to help me finish this thesis. This would have been an unspeakably large task without his love, support, and encouragement. And finally I must thank Jonah who reminds me at the end of the day there is so much more to life than my books.

Chapter One

An Introduction to Plutarch on Empedocles

Empedocles, since antiquity, has been an object of fascination. Because of this fascination he has made regular appearances in literary and academic pages from the years immediately following his death up to the present.[1] And while there has always been a steady trickle of studies on Empedocles, interest in him and his philosophy has flourished in recent years with the publication by Martin and Primavesi of the Strasbourg papyrus.[2] Unfortunately, despite the anticipation which preceded the publication of this work, it has not lived up to expectations, adding relatively little to our ability to interpret Empedocles' philosophy.[3] However, the excitement generated by the prospect of a directly transmitted text of Empedocles raises questions about the value of our indirect

---

[1] Heraclides of Pontus, who flourished in the middle part of the fourth century B.C., wrote a work entitled Περὶ τῆς ἄπνου about Empedocles' last day on earth and his apotheosis; see Gottschalk (1980)13-36. On allusion to Empedocles in the works of Callimachus, who flourished in the third century B.C., see Bing (1981). For a discussion of the literary debt of Lucretius, who wrote in the middle of the first century B.C., to the work of Empedocles, see Sedley (1989) and (1998). On allusion to Empedocles in Ovid's *Ars Amatoria,* see Rusten (1982). Lucian, who flourished in the second century A.D., wrote a number of works which not only included numerous references to Empedocles but in which Empedocles appeared as a character. On the influence of Empedocles in the English Renaissance, see Bercovitch (1968). Perhaps the most recent allusion to the philosopher was an *X-Files* television episode written by Greg Walker entitled "Empedocles" which aired April 22, 2001.

[2] In 1999 Martin and Primavesi published their reconstruction of *P. Strasb. gr.* Inv. 1665-1666. The papyrus had originally been purchased from an antiquities shop in Akhmim, Egypt by Otto Rubensohn in 1904. According to Rubensohn's description, at the time of purchase the papyrus was in the form of a wreath composed of an incurvate, stiff strip of papyrus upon which copper leaves had been pasted. After the wreath had been purchased the copper leaves were removed and the papyrus strip itself disintegrated into fragments. It was in this fragmented condition that the papyrus was received by the Library at Strasbourg in 1905. The papyrus remained at the library, preserved under two frames of glass, unedited for almost a hundred years until the task was taken up by Martin, who brought in Primavesi to help prepare the *editio princeps*. Martin, having begun reconstruction of the papyrus fragments, identified the text as Empedoclean on the basis of the fact that in four of the six ensembles there are some lines which are identical to or very similar to previously known lines of Empedocles. See Martin and Primavesi (1999) 339-342.

[3] For a discussion of the papyrus and its impact on our interpretation of Empedocles, see Primavesi (1998) 64-88; Inwood (2001) 75-79.

sources.[4] Osborne has questioned the view that the evidence provided by this papyrus is decisively better than what we had before. The basis of her objection is largely valid: "Are the tattered scraps of papyrus written six centuries after Empedocles' death a closer record of what he wrote than the lengthy and thorough transcriptions of his lines, read by Plutarch from just such a papyrus (though in rather better shape)?"[5] While Osborne is right to question the assumption that direct evidence is inherently of greater value than indirect evidence, there is a more fundamental question which needs to be asked. What is the value of our indirect sources for Empedocles? Astonishingly, despite the fact that since late antiquity the indirect sources have been our only sources for Empedocles, until the publication of the Strasbourg papyrus, the value of these sources has never been assessed in any detail.[6]

It is the purpose of this thesis to begin to evaluate the indirect sources. While a complete evaluation of all the sources for Empedocles is beyond my present scope, in this thesis I will examine our most prolific ancient witness to the work of Empedocles.[7] Plutarch, the second-century polymath and biographer, seems to have had a profound interest in Empedocles. In his extant works there are more than seventy quotations and

---

[4] Until the publication of the Strasbourg papyrus all of our texts for Empedocles and other presocratic philosophers were drawn from the fragments preserved in other authors. That the value of these witnesses has never been evaluated in any systematic way is, therefore, surprising. For a brief overview of the sources for early Greek philosophy, see Mansfeld (1999) 22-44.

[5] Osborne (2000) 353.

[6] Simplicius is the last person who we can be fairly certain had a complete text of Empedocles. Tzetzes is unlikely to have had one despite his reference to a specific book. There is report of the presence of a manuscript of the Καθαρμοί in the private library of Giovanni Aurispa in a letter to Traversari written on August 27, 1424. Because of a lack of detail in the letter aside from the title and the subsequent loss of the work, it is impossible to say what was contained therein; see Mansfeld (1994).

[7] I would like to thank Brad Inwood for suggesting this topic to me.

references to Empedocles.[8] He also appears to have written a work, now lost, in ten books on Empedocles, which is mentioned by Hippolytus and recorded in the *Lamprias Catalogue*.[9] Given Plutarch's profound interest in Empedocles' work and philosophy and his obviously detailed knowledge of them, he must be counted as one of the most important witnesses to this presocratic philosopher's work. It is not sufficent, however, to simply to say that Plutarch is an important witness. Criteria must be established by which it is possible to assess Plutarch's importance as a witness for Empedocles. The aims of this thesis are twofold: first, to evaluate Plutarch as a witness to Empedocles' work by substantive criteria; second, to discuss whether it is possible to reconstruct Plutarch's Εἰς Ἐμπεδοκλέα.

In the first instance, like all material indirectly preserved in the textual tradition, Plutarch's quotations of Empedocles must be closely examined for their accuracy. While some errors in quotation are going to be the result of carelessness, faults of memory, and corruption during transmission of the text, the majority, in cases where Empedocles is extensively quoted, may be alterations consciously made by the person citing them in order to affect a certain literary style.[10] This is because, as Whittaker has pointed out, an ancient author's objective was not "to preserve for posterity the fragments of texts which

---

[8] Fairbanks (1897) 82 gives a number of more than sixty quotations but does not list them; Hershbell (1971) 157 gives a number of over 80; Helmbold and O'Neil (1959) 25-26 list 101. Osborne (1987b) 92-94 has also briefly discussed Plutarch as a source for Empedocles, but only in the context of whether the quotations of Empedocles found in the *Refutatio* of Hippolytus, the early third-century bishop of Portus, were made second-hand from those contained in Plutarch's work.

[9] Hippolytus at *Ref.* 5.20.6 refers to a ten-book work by Plutarch on Empedocles, while the *Lamprias Catalogue*, as its forty-third item, records a ten-book work called Εἰς Ἐμπεδοκλέα. Osborne (1987b) 92 states that these must be the same work.

[10] The contrary opinion on this matter, against which Whittaker (1987) argues, can be seen in the statement of Hershbell (1971) 164: "The alleged carelessness in individual lines is usually due to a copyist or a divergence in the ancient traditions."

he quoted, but only to exploit them according to current literary convention."[11] This being the case, it should be possible to isolate and examine an individual author's style of quotation or misquotation. Plutarch's quotations should be considered one among the best sources we have for Empedocles, so long as they are used with due caution. To this end recent scholarship has argued strongly in favor of abandoning the practice of printing the fragments without their surrounding context.[12] It is the intention of this thesis to further that argument by emphasizing that we are foremost dealing with a text of Plutarch, not Empedocles. That is to say, only when we have thoroughly examined where, when, why, and how Plutarch is deploying these fragments of Empedocles' work for his own literary and philosophical purposes can we begin to use the fragments to build an understanding of Empedocles' work itself.[13]

Plutarch's use of Empedocles has been examined in the past, most notably by Fairbanks in 1897 and Hershbell in 1971.[14] These studies are general surveys consisting of various specific observations about Plutarch's habits of citation but make few advances in laying out general ground rules by which Plutarch can confidently and

---

[11] Whittaker (1987) 95.
[12] See Osborne (1987b) 23-32 and Inwood (2001) 1-6.
[13] Kidd (1998) 288-302 has also argued the importance of context, not only the immediate context of a fragment but also the general context of the reporter himself: "to understand how they operate, how they use fragments, we have to see through their spectacles and grasp how their mind works, what they are doing and what their purpose is. Each reporter is a study in himself as a reflector of the fragments he quotes." Kidd further argues that Plutarch is an ideal author for such a study.
[14] Fairbanks (1897) 75-87; Hershbell (1971) 156-184.

reliably be used as a source for Empedocles. Fairbanks' article is a brief overview of Plutarch's quotation of presocratic philosophers. He seeks to identify the sources used by Plutarch for these quotations. His conclusions, like the rest of the article, are brief and general: he believes that Plutarch cites Heraclitus, Xenophanes, and Parmenides from an intermediate source, but that at least a sizeable number of his quotations of Empedocles were made at first hand.[15] With its publication date falling between those of Diels' two *magna opera* — *Doxographi Graeci* and *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker* — Fairbanks' general conclusions are far outstripped by Diels' detailed and invaluable work on the fragments of the presocratic philosophers and the doxographic tradition in these works.[16] The detail and breadth of Diels' works have not been surpassed in the century since their publication. Indeed it is only recently that his conclusions have begun to be re-evaluated and in some places challenged.[17] As such Fairbank's article is of very limited value to the present study.

Hershbell's article, published almost seventy-five years later, takes a much more detailed approach, looking at Plutarch as a source for Empedocles specifically. At the outset of the article Hershbell sets forth his methodological approach to the fragments, which is to examine them while keeping the following four sets of issues in mind: (a) What does Plutarch report about Empedocles' life and what are his general views on Empedocles? (b) How accurate are his quotations of Empedocles? What use does he

---

[15] Fairbanks (1897) 84.

[16] Diels coined the neologism 'doxography' and established it as a field within the discipline of Classics. His *Doxographi Graeci* (1879) would have been available to Fairbanks when he was writing his article, though Fairbanks acknowledges no awareness of it. Diels ensured his pre-eminence within the field of doxography for the next century with the publication of his *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker* (1903, rev. eds. 1906, 1912, 1922), which would be further revised by Kranz in 1934-7 and 1951, and has since undergone numerous reprints and remains the standard text for the fragments of the presocratic philosophers.

[17] See Kingsley (1994) 235-254, and Mansfeld's response to that article (1995) 109-115.

make of them? What interpretations does he offer? What were his sources? (c) What, if anything, does he tell us about the order of the fragments and their place and meaning in Empedocles' poems? (d) How, in certain cases, do various interpretations of Empedocles by Plutarch affect our interpretations of Empedocles, and, furthermore, *should* they affect our interpretations?[18] Hershbell deals adequately with the first two sets of issues. However, his approach to the remaining two sets of issues is limited by his preconceptions regarding Empedocles' work, in that he is willing to dismiss Plutarch as a witness entirely when the evidence presented by Plutarch is at odds with Hershbell's own preconceptions. For example, of Plutarch's statement at Περὶ φυγῆς 607C-D, ὁ Ἐμπεδοκλῆς ἐν ἀρχῇ τῆς φιλοσοφίας προαναφωνήσας,[19] Hershbell says, with no argumentation whatsoever, that it is a "misleading report" and that "whatever Plutarch meant it is clear that his report is not especially helpful in ordering the fragments of Empedocles' poems."[20] Plutarch's statement is only unhelpful because it is at odds with Hershbell's own view that Empedeocles wrote two poems of separate and distinct characters: one on the nature of the world and one religious.[21] This passage in Plutarch is, in fact, one of the few statements from antiquity that we have about the ordering of

---

[18] Hershbell (1971) 158.

[19] ὁ Ἐμπεδοκλῆς ἐν ἀρχῇ τῆς φιλοσοφίας προαναφωνήσας
ἔστιν ἀνάγκης χρῆμα, θεῶν ψήφισμα παλαιόν,
εὖτε τις ἁμπλακίῃσι φόνῳ φίλα γυῖα μιήνῃ
δαίμονες ὅιτε μακραίωνος λελάχασι βίοιο,
τρὶς μιν μυρίας ὥρας ἀπο μακάρων ἀλαλησθαι.
τῶν καὶ ἐγὼ νῦν εἰμι, φυγὰς θεόθεν καὶ ἀλήτης.

[20] Hershbell (1971) 167.

[21] For full discussions of the number and nature of Empedocles' works, see Wright (1995) 17-21; Solmsen (1980) 219-227; Sider (1982) 76-78; Osborne (1987a) 24-50; Sedley (1989) 269-296; Kingsley (1996) 108-111.

fragments from antiquity.[22] The veracity of Plutarch's statement has recently gained further credence from the verses contained in *P. Strasb. gr.* Inv. 1665-1666. They provided proof that *daimones* played a large role in Empedocles' poem, thus removing a central objection to Plutarch's statement.[23] All collections of the fragments which are presented in modern editions are based on the historical and rational reconstruction of their modern editor.[24] Evidence of this is that the most recent edition of the fragments of Empedocles[25] acknowledges Plutarch's statement that fragment DK 115 belongs at the beginning of the poem. However, while the editor prints it nearer the beginning of the poem (as the eleventh fragment), he still does not fully take Plutarch's statement into account. Plutarch's statement that the fragment is ἐν ἀρχῇ of Empedocles' work recalls the Alexandrian bibliographical tradition of identifying books through their opening

---

[22] There are testimonia which ascribe certain fragments to particular books, but nothing more particular than a given book, Plutarch's statement aside. Simplicius ascribes DK17 and DK 96 to book one of Empedocles' *Physics* and ascribes DK 62 to book two. John Tzetzes in his *Chiliades* ascribes DK 134.4-5 to book three of Empedocles' *Physics*. It is highly doubtful, however, that Tzetzes himself had access to complete manuscripts of Empedocles. In the face of conflicting evidence as to whether Empedocles' work consisted of two or three books it seems best to accept the testimonia, which are both of greater antiquity and number than the statement of Tzetzes, that Empedocles' work consisted of two books.

[23] For the argument against accepting Plutarch's statement, see O'Brien (1981) 14-15; Wright (1981) 81-82, 270-271; for the argument in favor of accepting Plurtarch's statement see Van der Ben (1975) 16-20; Primavesi (1998) 85.

[24] Makin (1988) 121-132 has stated that, faced with the problem of limited and incomplete textual evidence, "we have to, at times, go in for reconstruction, with the aim of coming up with an account of some presocratic's thought which accommodates the evidence we do have and presents as reasonable and interesting an account as possible." He argues that there are two parts to any such reconstruction: historical and rational. He defines historical reconstruction as giving an account of what some thinker said or would have said to his contemporaries. It must obey Skinner's Maxim that no agent can eventually be said to have said or meant something that he could never be brought to accept as what he had said or meant. Rational reconstruction, on the other hand, treats a thinker as being within our own philosophical framework and allows any reconstruction to include thoughts that the philosopher never constructed, perhaps about matters that he never contemplated. Rational reconstruction therefore does *not* follow Skinner's Maxim.

[25] Inwood (2001).

words, or their ἀρχή.[26] This being so, I would argue that the fragment should be printed as the first in the poem. While more recent editors have still not given the statement its proper due and printed the fragment as the poem's opening lines, the fact that Hershbell is willing to jettison such an unambiguous historical statement, without any discussion, in deference to a modern editor's rational reconstruction undermines his conclusions about Plutarch as a source for Empedocles.[27] The value of Hershbell's article lies in the questions that he suggests need to be asked. Despite asking the right questions, however, the methodology by which he approaches these questions is deeply flawed. Rather than arguing from the ancient evidence, either in favor of or against modern theories, Hershbell allows modern theories to shape his reading and use of the ancient evidence. Similarly, he at times forgets that his central topic is the examination of Plutarch as a source for Empedocles and not Empedocles himself. Therefore, in this study due consideration will be given to the questions put forward by Hershbell regarding

---

[26] Identifying works by their ἀρχή had a number of advantages. Titles could vary. Names could be ambiguous due to homonymy. Variants, errors by a copyist or bibliographer, a damaged book-roll, a lost or unreadable title-tag could hamper the identification of copies from any given book. The ἀρχή of a text was a more secure means of identifying it and could compensate for uncertainties and variations of the ἐπιγραφή. One had only to unroll the scroll and compare opening lines to be certain of the identification of a text. See Jacob (2000) 96-97. Plutarch was certainly aware of this practice, and seems unlikely that he would use the phrase ἐν ἀρχῇ in a manner independent of that usage.

[27] There are a number of controversial issues which Hershbell never discusses in any detail, yet at the same time he uses the issues to question Plutarch's accuracy. For example, he suggests that the fact that Plutarch never assigns his quotations from Empedocles to any particular poem is a mark against his value as a source for Empedocles ([1971] 173). At no point, however, does he mention that this might be because, as scholars such as Osborne and Inwood believe, Empedocles only wrote one poem. In support of his suggestion that Plutarch can be misleading when it comes to providing information about the ordering of the fragments, Hershbell states that at Περὶ Ἴσιδος καὶ Ὀσίριδος 370E there can "be no doubt that Plutarch has here brought together the fragments of the physical poem and the Καθαρμοί ([1971] 167). Again Hershbell dismisses out of hand the ancient evidence of Plutarch because it contradicts his assumptions, following Diels, about Empedocles' poetry. He chastises other scholars, such as O' Brien for just such behavior ([1973] 98-99): "Some students of Empedocles, however, seem prepared to give or withhold credence contingent on a point they are anxious to prove."

Plutarch's use of Empedocles. However, Hershbell's methodology will be set aside in favor of a more objective one which gives due weight to the ancient evidence.

Perhaps of most value to this study, while not explicitly on Plutarch's value as a source for Empedocles, is Kidd's 1998 article "Plutarch and his stoic contradictions."[28] One of the principles that Kidd strongly advocates is the "crucial relevance of context for both the identification, establishment and definition of the fragment, and for the interpretation and understanding of it."[29] Kidd's interest is in Posidonian rather than Empedoclean fragments, and he is examining the use of quotations in a different Plutarchean essay than those to be discussed in this thesis. Nevertheless the principles and methodology put forward by Kidd are as well suited to the present undertaking as they were for his own study.[30] Kidd suggests that there are three reasons why Plutarch is an ideal subject for such a study; the first two are discussed elsewhere in this chapter, and the third I am very grateful to have articulated for me. (1) Plutarch is such a prolific quoter throughout his extant works. (2) Such a large number of Plutarch's works have survived extant. (3) Plutarch "is an ancient author who clearly displays an individual character of his own."[31] Kidd sees two basic questions which need to be asked of Plutarch's works: (i) how accurate are the quotations themselves? (ii) since an isolated

---

[28] Kidd (1998) 288-302.
[29] Kidd (1998) 288.
[30] I had determined my methodology for this study and written a number of drafts of its first chapter before reading Kidd's article. The methodology is not derived from that advocated by Kidd but rather complemented by it. I therefore take complete responsibility for any methodological weaknesses that might be found in this study. I am, however, very grateful for the encouragement provided by Prof. Kidd's article as it has reassured me at the outset of my task that I was heading in the right direction.
[31] Kidd (1998) 288.

quoted sentence is of limited value, does Plutarch in his translation, comment, interpretation, and use of it reliably fill in what we need, or is missing or relevant? He adds that further to both of these questions is the issue of whether Plutarch is quoting first-hand from a given work, and therefore with personal knowledge of the work, or simply copying a quotation second-hand from a collection of such quotations.[32] Kidd's questions and the order in which they are asked seem to isolate the most important issues and provide a sound methodology for any such study. Therefore this study will closely follow the principles and methodology advocated by Kidd.

There are also two other articles which are of importance to and have had a significant impact upon this thesis: Whittaker (1989) and Runia (1997). The second builds upon the first. The traditional view when dealing with indirectly transmitted texts has been that these texts often differ from their directly transmitted counterparts either because the author citing them was working from memory or from a corrupt text. However, Whittaker has convincingly argued that such a view diminishes authorial intent to an excessive degree and does not allow for ancient authors to practice "the art of misquotation." That is to say, ancient authors, unconstrained by modern notions regarding the importance of accurate quotation, often made deliberate alterations to the indirectly transmitted text to make it better fit their literary style and purposes. In his article Runia applies this insight to the Platonic citations found in Philo of Alexandria. While Runia's study is helpful for the guidance it provides for a study such as that which I have undertaken, its principal contribution to this thesis is its clear articulation of the

[32] There is overlap between the questions posed by Hershbell (1971) 158 and those posed by Kidd (1998) 289. Kidd's questions, however, are more focused and there is a distinction between those which are more and less important which is lacking in Hershbell.

four categories of textual alterations which Whittaker saw at work.[33] These categories are *inversion*, *addition*, *subtraction*, and *substitution*. Thus, this study will examine whether any discrepancies between the directly and indirectly transmitted texts being discussed can be attributed to the intentions of the ancient author who preserves the indirectly transmitted text. Such changes will be examined and discussed using the categories of changes and their definitions as provided by Runia.

To say that the study of the presocratics is fraught with methodological problems would be an understatement. Until the Strasbourg papyrus was published our texts of the presocratics were solely based on fragments preserved by indirect transmission, embedded in the texts of other ancient authors.[34] Since the nineteenth century the traditional approach to these fragments has been to extract the quotations from their context and then reassemble them. It has also been traditional to regard the immediate context surrounding the fragments with suspicion and skepticism. We have already seen this attitude in the work of Hershbell who, as discussed earlier, is immensely skeptical of ancient testimonia surrounding fragments and in many cases eager to disregard it entirely. Another representative of this approach is Kahn's 1979 book on Heraclitus in which he prints the fragments without their context in the writers who cite them.[35] Osborne points out that such an approach depends on the assumption that the ancient interpretations represent a necessarily biased reading while the fragments in themselves present no bias. The fact of the matter is that the fragments which we possess are small samples from

---

[33] See Whittaker (1989) 71 and Runia (1997) 264.
[34] The only possible exception to this is Antiphon's *Aletheia* which was concerned with *nomos* and *phusis*. Antiphon is the first Attic orator whose work is preserved and was part of the intellectual atmosphere which inspired the sophistic movement. Because his work lies somewhere between the presocratics and the sophists it is not generally counted as a work of presocratic philosophy. See Pendrick (2002) 32-38, 53-67.
[35] Kahn (1979) 37-95.

much more extensive texts, and those samples are anything but random.[36] The lack of randomness among the fragments that are preserved is clearly indicated by the fact that some fragments are quoted repeatedly, not only within the works of a single author but by multiple authors. They are selections based on the interests of those who cite them, and represent the same "biased" readings to which the traditional approach objects. As Kidd observed:

> By far the greatest problems of methodology derive from the fragmentary nature of the evidence. The interpretation of the fragmentary evidence tends to be far more complex than is sometimes assumed, or to put it another way, that ancient writers (as indeed modern authors) use and employ earlier and contemporary sources in highly diverse and complicated ways. It would be naïve and unsafe to assume that all, or indeed any writers simply reproduce a single source at any given time as though they were impersonal unintelligent tape recorders.[37]

To extract these fragments while jettisoning their context and any accompanying ancient commentary is to discard material potentially invaluable to our study and understanding of the presocratics.

The volume of Empedoclean quotations contained in the works of Plutarch, and the fact that we can be fairly certain that he had the ability to make many of them first-hand with detailed background knowledge, means that we have more than an adequate sample to use in order to evaluate Plutarch's habits of quotation. At issue is not whether, but *how* Plutarch quotes Empedocles. Do his quotations tend to be verbatim or do they often contain inaccuracies? If a quotation is inaccurate does Plutarch acknowledge the inaccuracy, or the possibility of inaccuracy? Are inaccuracies more prevalent in certain contexts, such as in reported dinner conversations or philosophical discourse? If the

---

[36] Osborne (1987b) 3-4.
[37] Kidd (1985) 1-28.

inaccuracies are more prevalent in certain contexts, is the purpose of those inaccuracies readily discernible? Such would be the case if the quotations were altered to cohere better with Plutarch's platonizing philosophy.[38] Similarly, the inaccuracies might be changes in vocabulary. Plutarch may have added Stoic or Platonic vocabulary or simply made changes in vocabulary that he thought would make Empedocles' meaning more readily discernible to his audience.[39] Once we have examined in detail how Plutarch cites Empedocles it is a much easier task to pass judgement on what sort of witness he is.

Both the number of Empedoclean fragments preserved by Plutarch, and the volume of work by Plutarch which is extant allow such a study to be possible. There is enough Empedoclean material for us not only to be able to assert whether Plutarch is generally accurate, generally inaccurate, or completely haphazard in his quotations, but also to try to identify a style or methodology behind Plutarch's habits of quotation. Likewise, there is enough, indeed more than enough, of Plutarch's work for us to be able to compare his treatment of Empedocles with his treatment of other philosophical authors, which is to say whether he quotes and uses his quotations of other authors differently than he does those of Empedocles. By comparing Plutarch's habits of citation in regard to Empedocles and another author it may be possible to determine whether Plutarch had a consistent style or methodology for quotation. This study will compare Plutarch's quotation of Empedocles, as found in the *Moralia*, and his quotation of Plato, as found in Πλατωνικὰ ζητήματα I – X (*Mor.* 999C-1011F).

---

[38] For a discussion of Plutarch's Platonism, see Russell (1973) 63-83 and Dillon (1977) 184-230.

[39] For example in Περὶ φυγῆς 607D Plutarch's use of πνεῦμα συγκραθέν in his summary of Empedocles' thought is undoubtedly influenced by Aristotelian and Stoic theories, as Hershbell (1971) 167 notes, making it clear that these are not Empedocles' own words.

For the purposes of this study Plato is an ideal comparison. As with Empedocles, we can be certain that Plutarch was extremely familiar with the works of Plato and made most of his citations first-hand.[40] And again the volume of quotations, even in such a small segment of the *Moralia* as Πλατωνικὰ ζητήματα I-X, allows us to gain a clear picture of how accurately Plutarch cites Plato. Because of the relatively stable textual tradition of Plato's dialogues, the task of evaluating the accuracy of Plutarch's Platonic quotations is straightforward.[41] Unlike the work of Empedocles, all the dialogues of Plato have come down to us intact — along with a few others incorrectly attributed to Plato —and with a fair degree of certainty as to how the text should read. We can therefore be relatively sure that when there are misrepresentations in Plutarch's quotations of Plato, they are willful and purposeful misrepresentations. Once the accuracy of the Platonic quotations has been evaluated, we can then examine possible reasons for any inaccuracies in the quotations as discussed above. Having completed a thorough examination of Plutarch's quotation habits in regard to Plato, it will then be possible to compare those to his habits regarding Empedocles.

Therefore I propose to approach in the following the question of whether there is an identifiable style or methodology behind Plutarch's habits of quotation and misquotation. First, in chapter two I will give a brief introduction to Plutarch and discuss his interest in the works of Plato. Then I shall examine in detail how Plutarch cites Plato in Πλατωνικὰ ζητήματα I-X. I will discuss the number of quotations and the contexts in which they are found. From these quotations I will select a handful which fit into

---

[40] Plutarch was an avowed Platonist and had spent time in Athens studying at the Academy; see Russell (1973) 4, 63-83 and Dillon (1977) 184-233.

[41] For an extensive bibliography of the Platonic textual tradition, see work on http://www.ucs.mun.ca/~mjoyal/bibliography.html (URL accurate as of 17.10.02).

Runia's categories of: (1) verbatim quotation; (2) erudite brief quotation; (3) brief allusion; and, (4) extended paraphrase. Of the quotations in each category I will then ask Kidd's two basic questions: How accurate are the quotations? Does Plutarch provide us additional information in the context surrounding the quotation? After all of the categories have been addressed I will discuss whether Plutarch seems to quote Plato first-hand or second-hand. This will be followed by a summary of what can be discerned about Plutarch's style and methodology when quoting Plato.

In chapter three I will discuss the quotations from Empedocles' work which are to be found in Plutarch's *Moralia*. To begin I will briefly discuss what is known about the text of Empedocles' work and Plutarch's interest in that work. As with the quotations of Plato, I shall discuss the number of quotations and the contexts in which they are found. Again a handful of quotations will be selected for discussion which fit Runia's four categories. Once the quotations in all four categories have been discussed, I will examine how familiar Plutarch seems to be with the work of Empedocles, which is to say whether he appears to have had a text of Empedocles or been relying on an intermediary source. This will be followed by a summary of what can be discerned about Plutarch's style and methodology when quoting Empedocles.

My fourth chapter will discuss whether it is possible to any extent to reconstruct Plutarch's Εἰς Ἐμπεδοκλέα. The chapter will be broken into two parts. The first half of the chapter will discuss the sources for the existence and content of the Εἰς Ἐμπεδοκλέα. Included in this discussion will be the *Lamprias Catalogue*, the Church Father Hippolytus, and, of course, Plutarch himself. Once these sources and the evidence

that they are able to provide have been discussed, the second half of the chapter will assess the extent to which it is possible to reconstruct Plutarch's Εἰς Ἐμπεδοκλέα.

The fifth and final chapter will consist of a brief summary which will assess the material from the three previous chapters.

Chapter Two

Plutarch's *Platonic Questions*: A Test Case for the Value of Plutarch as a Witness to Ancient Philosophy

2.1 Introduction

Plutarch was born in the middle of the first century of the Christian Era under the reign of Claudius and died some time in the second decade of the second century under the reign of Hadrian.[1] He stood on the cusp of the Second Sophistic movement, to the rise of which his contribution was not insignificant.[2] While in the last century it was for his *Parallel Lives* that Plutarch was read, recently more attention has been paid to what he says —and what he doesn't say—about the world of his own experience.[3] Indeed, that Plutarch is working from the world of his own experience is a factor of utmost importance when reading his works. Plutarch writes in a literary style that is self-referential, and that in a very personal way. Essays are introduced with dedications to friends and family members, and casual mention of his father (*Mor.* 687E-679A; 816D-E), brothers (*Mor.* 487D; 617A; 726D), and sons (*Mor.* 964D; 1012A) appears frequently. His most personal work is his essay written to his wife attempting to console her after the death of their child (*Mor.* 608A-612B). Each reference to friends and family should serve as a reminder that what we are reading comes to us reflected through the

---

[1] On the probable dates for Plutarch's birth and death, see Dillon (1977) 185-186. For a general overview of Plutarch's life and times, see Russell (1973) 1-17 and Lamberton (2001) 1-59.

[2] The *Oxford Classical Dictionary* defines Second Sophistic as "the term regularly applied in modern scholarship to the period c. A. D. 60-230 when declamation became the most prestigious literary activity in the Greek world. It is also in this period that Platonism started gaining prominence over rival philosophical systems emerging in later antiquity as the only intellectual alternative to Christianity." See also Swain (1997) 174.

[3] On Plutarch and his intellectual world, see Dillon (1977) 184-230; Opsomer (1998); Mossman (1997). Even general works on Plutarch have begun paying more attention to Plutarch and his relationship to his contemporary world than to his relationship to older Greek literature and philosophy; see Russell (1973) and Lamberton (2001).

experience of Plutarch. Regardless of whether he is discussing the philosophy of Plato, the proper way to arrange seating at a symposium, or the priesthood at Delphi,[4] what Plutarch writes has been reflected through the prism of his own experiences. Indeed, as we shall see later in this chapter, what may at first appear to be a verbatim quotation by Plutarch can be seen under closer scrutiny to be tailored to suit his own literary purposes, whether through minor changes to the quotation itself or through the way it has been employed in the larger context. Plutarch is writing about his own world, and his literary style is the result of his worldview shaped by his own personal experience.

A defining aspect of Plutarch's worldview was his Platonism. As a young man Plutarch went to Athens in A.D. 66/7[5] to study at the Platonic Academy[6] under Ammonius, though Chaeroneia always remained the place he called home. While Plutarch was not always in agreement with the orthodox views of the Platonic school, he saw himself as a consistent and devoted Platonist.[7] Such was Plutarch's interest in Plato that the quotations from or references to Plato in Plutarch's works were exceeded only by quotations from and references to Homer.[8] It is clear from these quotations and references "that Plutarch had a command of the philosophical literature that included texts, commentaries, and concepts, and that he moved freely in this difficult medium, and not in the manner of a thinker with only second-hand knowledge of the texts."[9] Indeed, Plutarch

---

[4] Plutarch himself served as a Delphic priest for twenty years or more; see Lamberton (2001) 52-59.
[5] See Dillon (1977) 185.
[6] For a discussion of the nature of the Academy in this period, see Dillon (1977) 231-233.
[7] On Plutarch's express devotion to Platonism and the unorthodox views that he held, see Russell (1973) 61-69 and Dillon (1977) 192-230. Plutarch believed in the importance of philosophers contributing to their communities, see *Mor.*1126B.
[8] See Helmbold and O'Neil (1959) 56-63, 39-48.
[9] Lamberton (2001) 17.

would most probably have defined himself foremost as a philosopher and a teacher of philosophy. It was his effort to live according to his philosophical views that committed him to an extraordinarily long and active public life.[10]

While the primary purpose of this thesis is to evaluate Plutarch as a witness to the work of Empedocles, it is necessary to have some sort of control against which we can compare his Empedoclean quotations. For this purpose Plutarch's Platonic quotations are ideal. Like Empedocles, we know that Plutarch had a profound interest in Plato and his philosophy. However, unlike the case with Empedocles, we have a complete corpus of directly transmitted Platonic texts to which we can compare Plutarch's Platonic quotations. The volume of Platonic quotations contained in all of Plutarch's works is far too large to be dealt with here. Instead I shall examine only the quotations found in Plutarch's Πλατωνικὰ ζητήματα (*Mor.* 999C-1011F), which contains approximately the same number of Platonic quotations as the number of Empedoclean quotations which are to be found in the *Moralia*.

Item 136 in the *Lamprias Catalogue*[11] is Plutarch's Πλατωνικὰ ζητήματα or

---

[10] On Plutarch's life of public service both to his home community of Chaeroneia and as a priest at Delphi for twenty years, see Russell (1973) 14-15 and Lamberton (2001) 10-12, 52-59.

[11] The *Lamprias Catalogue* appears to be a library inventory. In the Neapolitanus manuscript, the catalogue is preceded by an anonymous letter whose writer says that he is sending a list of his father's writings to an unnamed acquaintance. Who wrote this letter, and where and when, is unknown, but the Suda — an encyclopedia from around the end of the tenth century — identifies the writer as Lamprias, son of Plutarch of Chaeroneia. There is no record, however, of Plutarch having a son named Lamprias. In the Marcianus manuscript the scribe John Rhosos transmits a second account of the catalogue's origin saying that it was once part of an ancient work which contained a list of titles and summaries of the works listed. He goes on to say that the summaries have been lost but he is recording the titles so that people may know all of the works written by Plutarch. He was mistaken about the existence of summaries of all of the listed works, though summaries did and do exist for a few items on the list; see Sandbach (1969) 5. Both the Suda and Rhosos are also mistaken in their assertion that this list contains all the works of Plutarch. Included in the list are the titles of three extant spurious works, while other extant spurious works and extant genuine works are not included in the list. When the catalogue was made is unclear, though it is likely to have been early. Treu (1873) and Flacelière-Irigoin (1987) ccxxix argue for a date in the third or fourth century, while Ziegler (1951) 697 argues for a fifth-century date. Mansfeld and Runia (1997) 122 suggest that the catalogue might, in some way, go back to Plutarch himself. On the *Lamprias Catalogue* see also chapter 4.

Platonic Questions. It is one of the two surviving works on Plato from the seven listed in the catalogue.[12] As we have received it — and there is no reason to believe that it has not come down to us intact — the text consists of ten individual questions or ζητήματα.[13] The questions each deal with the meaning of a single Platonic passage or a number of seemingly related passages. The individual questions, however, are not related to one another, and as Cherniss points out they are not linked by any transition and are "without any general introduction or conclusion to give the collection unity or to suggest a reason for the sequence in which the questions are arranged."[14] The questions themselves are not original, as Plutarch clearly indicates by discussing and referring to the answers which others had previously provided to these questions. It seems plausible, even probable, that these ζητήματα are Plutarch's personal musings upon traditional Platonic questions. The reason that they were bound together in a single work is not readily apparent. Opsomer has suggested that in them Plutarch "tries to come to terms with the Academic legacy within a truly Platonic framework."[15] Opsomer's observation can be true — and his observation seems truer for some questions than for others — without this being the primary reason that the questions were gathered together. It may simply be that while Plutarch had been writing these notes over a period of time he had not yet found places in

---

[12] The seven works are: (65) Περὶ τῆς ἐν Τιμαίῳ ψυχογονιάς, (66) Περὶ τοῦ γεγονέναι κατὰ Πλάτωνα τὸν κόσμον, (67) Ποῦ εἰσιν αἱ ἰδέαι;, (68) Πῶς ἡ ὕλη τῶν ἰδεῶν μετείληφεν; ὅτι τὰ πρῶτα σώματα ποιεῖ, (70) Ὑπὲρ τοῦ Πλάτωνος Θεάγους, (136) Πλατωνικὰ ζητήματα, (221) Τί τὸ κατὰ Πλάτωνα τέλος;. Items 65 and 136 are extant. These can be found in Plutarch's *Moralia* 1012A-1030C and 999C-1011E respectively.

[13] Cherniss (1976) 3 n. *e* notes that Plutarch specifically allocated ten questions to each book of the Συμποσιακὰ προβλήματα with the singular exception of the ninth in which he expressly apologizes for exceeding "the customary ten" (736 C). For further discussion of Plutarch's habit of dividing works into groups of ten, see chapter 4, page 82.

[14] Cherniss (1976) 4.

[15] Opsomer (1998) 127.

which to incorporate them into other works and so gathered ten separate jottings into a single work.[16]

Plutarch's other extant work on Plato, Περὶ τῆς ἐν Τιμαίῳ ψυχογονιάς or *On the Generation of the Soul in the* Timaeus (1012A-1030C), provides a precedent for such an origin. Plutarch dedicates the work to his two sons Autobulus and Plutarch (1012A). He begins by stating that the work is the result of their suggestion that he make a unified collection of his various statements regarding what he held to be Plato's opinion about the soul. It is clear from Plutarch's words that he is here giving formal voice to thoughts and ideas which he had previously discussed in conversation and scattered writings (1012 B). Περὶ τῆς ἐν Τιμαίῳ ψυχογονιάς differs from Πλατωνικὰ ζητήματα in a number of instructive ways. First, it opens with a dedication.[17] Second, it begins with a clear statement of purpose.[18] Third, it sets out immediately, by means of a precise direct quotation, the exact passage from Plato's *Timaeus* with which he will deal.[19] Fourth, it frequently refers to authors of counterarguments by name.[20] Fifth, it often refers to Plato by name with explicit reference to individual works.[21] This is in stark contrast to the form of the Πλατωνικὰ ζητήματα.

---

[16] Cherniss (1976) 4.

[17] Ὁ πατὴρ Αὐτοβούλῳ καὶ Πλουτάρχῳ εὖ πράττειν (*Mor.* 1012A).

[18] Ἐπεὶ τὰ πολλάκις εἰρημένα καὶ γεγραμμένα σποράδην ἐν ἑτέροις ἕτερα τὴν Πλάτωνος ἐξηγουμένοις δόξαν ἣν εἶχεν ὑπὲρ ψυχῆς, ὡς ὑπενοοῦμεν ἡμεῖς, οἴεσθε δεῖν εἰς ἓν συναχθῆναι καὶ τυχεῖν ἰδίας ἀναγραφῆς τὸν λόγον τοῦτον, οὔτ' ἄλλως εὐμεταχείριστον ὄντα καὶ διὰ τὸ τοῖς πλείστοις τῶν ἀπὸ Πλάτωνος ὑπεναντιοῦσθαι δεόμενον παραμυθίας, προεκθήσομαι τὴν λέξιν ὡς ἐν Τιμαίῳ γέγραπται (*Mor.* 1012B).

[19] For discussion of the variations between the transmitted text, *Ti.* 35 a1-b4, and Plutarch's quotation of it, see Cherniss (1976) 159 n. *c*, 160-161 nn. *a*, *d*.

[20] See 1012D (Xenocrates and Crantor); 1013B (Eudorus); 1023B (Posidonius); 1026B (Empedocles, Heraclitus, Parmenides, Anaxagoras and, Zoroaster); 1022C (Crantor, Clearchus and, Theodorus).

[21] See references to Plato by name at 1012B, 1015B, 1017 D, 1023D, 1027A, 1029C, etc.
See references to titles of works by Plato at 1012B, 1014E, 1015A, 1016A, 1017C, 1029C, etc.

While the purpose of Περὶ τῆς ἐν Τιμαίῳ ψυχογονιάς and the Πλατωνικὰ ζητήματα is the same — that is, to set out Plutarch's interpretation of certain aspects of Plato's philosophy — their format is very different. Of the five ingredients mentioned above Plutarch employs none in the Πλατωνικὰ ζητήματα. Not one of the ten questions nor the collection as a whole has any sort of dedication. None has a clear statement of purpose but begins as it were *in medias res*. There are only two direct quotations in the collection (999D and1000A) and neither is a quotation of the Platonic passage which is at the heart of the ζητήματα. Plutarch does employ a handful of direct quotations from other ancient authors, particularly in ζητήματα VIII, 1007 A-B. These, however, are more decorative than instructive; that is to say, far from being fundamental to Plutarch's discussion they add a literary flourish to the work of a polymath. Finally, in the Πλατωνικὰ ζητήματα Plutarch infrequently refers to Plato by name or identifies the titles of the Platonic works to which he is making reference.[22] There seems to be a tacit assumption that the reader both knows that Plato is the author of the quotations and references and is able to identify the source of those quotations and references. Plutarch takes a great deal more care, however, to identify Plato as the author and to name works in formal essays such as Περὶ τῆς ἐν Τιμαίῳ ψυχογονιάς. None of these factors, however, should be taken to imply that these essays are either uninformed or lack seriousness. Rather, they should be read as evidence for the nature of their origin.

Each question has the tone of casual, albeit learned, conversation. In a formal essay such as Περὶ τῆς ἐν Τιμαίῳ ψυχογονιάς Plutarch sets forth his argument with

---

[22] Plutarch identifies Plato by name at 1001B, 1004A, 1004D, 1005D, 1006C, 1006F, 1007C, 1007E, 1008C, 1009B, 1009C, 1009E, 1011E. *Tht.* is referred to by title at 999C, 999D; *Smp.* at 1000F, 1002E; *R.* at 1001C, 1006F, 1007E; *Lg.* at 1002C; *Phdr.* at 1004C.

frequent citations of the name of the work he is referring to and its author.[23] We could reasonably anticipate that had Plutarch expanded any of these questions into extended essays, he would have employed this same more precise method of citation there as well. As it stands these questions seem to be informal jottings — perhaps personal notes or notes meant to form the basis of expanded essays. Their format is informal, without dedication or introduction. Their method of quotation is also informal, with titles of works and their authors mentioned infrequently and direct quotations rare. This may prove to be instructive in regard to Plutarch's habits of quotation. How does Plutarch quote and use the quotations of an author with whose works he is intimately familiar in compositions whose principal audience seems to have been himself? When he is concerned primarily with setting his own thoughts on paper and not arguing his position against those of others, how does Plutarch use quotation? Are his quotations accurate or inaccurate? In the case of inaccuracies does the inaccuracy seem to be deliberate or is it simply an error on Plutarch's part? Such are the questions with which this chapter is concerned.

While it is not practical here to explore in detail every reference made to Plato in the Πλατωνικὰ ζητήματα, a handful of references, taken to be representative of the different aspects of Plutarch's habits of quotation, will be thoroughly examined. These Platonic references will be examined on the basis of two questions posed by Kidd. (1) To what degree are the quotations accurate? (2) Given the limited value of an isolated quotation, does the context surrounding the quotation provide us with additional, useful information such as author, source, or intended meaning? This second question is more

[23] See page 21.

applicable to fragmentary authors such as Posidonius or Empedocles than it is to Plato whose works survive so that we have the context of later questions. It is for precisely this reason, however, that I am here asking the question of Plutarch's Platonic quotations. Because we have the complete works of Plato — indeed we can be as familiar with the works of Plato as Plutarch was — we can evaluate the information that Plutarch provides. If we possessed the works of Plato in only a fragmentary state, would the information provided by Plutarch assist us in the reconstruction those works with any degree of accuracy? My purpose is not to add anything to our knowledge of the works of Plato. Rather, the point of the questions that I am asking is what sort of information does Plutarch provide us about the work of Empedocles, and is it reliable? Because so little can be said with certainty about the work of Empedocles it seems best to begin with another ancient author about whose works some certainties exist. By beginning with Plutarch's Platonic quotations it might be possible to draw more certain conclusions in regard to his Empedoclean quotations.

Almost all of Plutarch's citations of Plato in the Πλατωνικὰ ζητήματα are inexact. I shall be examining the nature of the discrepancies and exploring possible reasons for them. The references will be dealt with in the following order: (1) verbatim quotation; (2) erudite brief quotation; (3) brief allusion; and (4) extended paraphrase.[24] The changes I am looking for fall into four general categories as set forth by Runia, following the work of Whittaker.[25] The categories are:

> (a) *inversion* (and *dislocation*): when words in the original text are reversed or moved around.
> (b) *addition*: when extra words are added to the original.

[24] My categories follow those articulated by Runia (1997) 286.
[25] Runia (1997) 264; Whittaker (1989) 63-95.

(c) *subtraction*: when words are removed from the original.
(d) *substitution*: when words in the original are replaced by synonyms or other related terms.

These categories require close attention, particularly in cases where Plutarch has quoted Plato more or less verbatim. As Runia notes, there has been a tendency in these cases for editors "to correct the text of the manuscripts on the basis of the received Platonic text."[26] Whittaker has argued convincingly why emendation should be avoided and careful attention paid in these instances. His argument is that an ancient author's objective was not "to preserve for posterity the fragments of texts which he quoted, but only to exploit them according to current literary convention."[27] While some errors in quotation are likely to be the result of carelessness, faults of memory, and corruption during transmission of the text, the majority, in cases where an author is extensively quoted, are likely to be alterations consciously made by the person citing them in order to affect a certain literary style. If we are to make any determinations about Plutarch's habits of quotation we must give due attention his to literary style and how he uses and alters quotations in order to affect that style.

2.2 Verbatim Quotation

As already mentioned there are only two direct quotations in the ten ζητήματα.[28] The first is at *Mor.* 999D (=*Tht.* 151c5-d3):

(i) 999D

καὶ ἄλλως ἐν τῷ Θεαιτήτῳ πολλὰ μεγάλαυχα καὶ σοβαρὰ Σωκράτει περιτέθεικεν, ὧν καὶ ταῦτ' ἐστί·
πολλοὶ γὰρ **δή**[29], ὦ θαυμάσιε, πρός με οὕτω διετέθησαν, ὥστ'

[26] Runia (1997) 264.
[27] Whittaker (1987) 95.
[28] For the textual tradition of the Πλατωνικὰ ζητήματα, see Cherniss (1976) 6-17.
[29] Plutarch's manuscripts are unanimous in this reading, though Nogarola emended δή to ἤδη on the basis of *Tht.* 151c5; see Cherniss (1976) 18.

ἀτεχνῶς δάκνειν, ἐπειδάν τινα λῆρον αὐτῶν ἀφαιρῶμαι· καὶ οὐκ οἴονταί με εὐνοίᾳ τοῦτο ποιεῖν, πόρρω ὄντες τοῦ εἰδέναι ὅτι οὐδεὶς θεὸς δύσνους ἀνθρώποις οὐδ' ἐγὼ δυσνοίᾳ τοιοῦτον οὐδὲν δρῶ, ἀλλά μοι ψεῦδός τε συγχωρῆσαι καὶ ἀληθὲς ἀφανίσαι οὐδαμῶς θέμις.

***Theaetetus* 151 c5-d3**

πολλοὶ γὰρ **ἤδη** ὦ θαυμάσιε, πρός με οὕτω διετέθησαν, ὥστε ἀτεχνῶς δάκνειν **ἕτοιμοι εἶναι**, ἐπειδάν τινα λῆρον αὐτῶν ἀφαιρῶμαι· καὶ οὐκ οἴονταί με εὐνοίᾳ τοῦτο ποιεῖν, πόρρω ὄντες τοῦ εἰδέναι ὅτι οὐδεὶς θεὸς δύσνους ἀνθρώποις, οὐδ' ἐγὼ δυσνοίᾳ τοιοῦτον οὐδὲν δρῶ, ἀλλά μοι ψεῦδός τε συγχωρῆσαι καὶ ἀληθὲς ἀφανίσαι οὐδαμῶς θέμις.

Our first question is *how accurate is Plutarch's quotation?* There are only two discrepancies between Plutarch's quotation and the text of Plato (which are emphasized in the passages above). In the first instance a strong case can be made that Plutarch has omitted nothing, as both readings are plausible. These are genuine variants; while ἤδη works better, δή is certainly possible. In the second case something appears to have been omitted from Plutarch's text, and so would fit Runia's category of *subtraction*. In this instance it is two words, ἕτοιμοι εἶναι, which are not found in the manuscripts of Plutarch. However, on the authority of Plutarch, the Oxford editors (Duke et al.) of Plato do not read ἕτοιμοι εἶναι but maintain the *lectio difficilior* by omitting it. Neither variant reading has any particular impact on the meaning of the passage. Context provides no clues as to the origin of the discrepancies in the second instance. It is possible that Plutarch by fault of memory or error in transcription omitted the missing items. Or perhaps they were in the original text of Plutarch but dropped out during later transmission. It is also possible that the omission originated in the text of Plato on which

Plutarch was drawing.[30] Equally plausible, and in this particular case perhaps more likely, is the possibility that Plutarch here is preserving genuine readings where the manuscripts of Plato have been corrupted. In this instance the variant does not seem to serve any literary function and it seems probable that the discrepancy is the result of an error, though it is impossible to determine whether that error originated in the textual tradition of Plutarch or Plato. Context does, however, provide an explanation in the first instance. Plutarch was quoting a passage which in its original context had a dramatic setting. ἤδη, "by now" or "up to now", makes little sense if the passage is quoted out of context. Plutarch's change to δή produced the very common combination γὰρ δή,[31] which made the passage less obviously dependant on its context. This suggests of course that Plutarch himself made the change. We can say that then that despite these two minor variations, one of which appears to originate with Plutarch himself while the origin of the other is uncertain, Plutarch's direct quotation of Plato is verbatim. This brings us to our second issue.

Does the context surrounding the quotation in Plutarch provide us with information in addition to the text that Plutarch quotes or makes reference to? The context surrounding the quotation in Plutarch provides us with the following information. The source of the quotation is the *Theaetetus* and the speaker is Socrates. The *Theaetetus* states that Socrates was bid by some sort of divinity to act as a midwife to the philosophical thoughts of others but not to beget any of his own.[32] Socrates' claim of divine guidance must be read in one of two ways: either Socrates is making an

---

[30] It is worth noting, however, that no extant manuscripts contain these variants.
[31] See Denniston (1954) 243-244.
[32] Τί δήποτε τὸν Σωκράτην ὁ θεὸς μαιοῦσθαι μὲν ἐκέλευσεν ἑτέρους, αὐτὸν δὲ γεννᾶν ἀπεκώλυσεν, ὡς ἐν Θεαιτήτῳ λέγεται;

***Laws* 731e5-6**[36]

τυφλοῦται γὰρ περὶ τὸ φιλούμενον ὁ φιλῶν,...

How accurate is Plutarch's quotation? Plutarch's quotation here shows minor variations. The variations are such that they are unlikely to be errors contained in the Plato manuscript from which Plutarch was working, that is if he was working from a Plato manuscript. περὶ τὸ φιλούμενον has been transposed with ὁ φιλῶν, which has become τὸ φιλοῦν in Plutarch's passage. This fits Runia's category of *inversion*. The concrete "lover" in Plato has in Plutarch become the less concrete "what loves". The sense of the sentence has not changed but the subject doing the loving has become more abstract. There should be no doubt here that the alterations in Plutarch's quotation are purposeful. Plato in his passage is referring to man with ὁ φιλῶν while Plutarch is referring to judgement with τὸ φιλοῦν. Through these subtle changes Plutarch has adapted the quotation to fit seamlessly into his discussion and literary style. Despite the changes made to the quotation, however, it is still faithful to the sense of the quotation in Plato.

Does the context surrounding the quotation in Plutarch provide us with information in addition to the text that Plutarch quotes or makes reference to? Indeed, the context surrounding the quotation in Plutarch is in no way unfaithful or contradictory to the context surrounding the quotation in Plato. Both passages are elucidating the reasons why men are poor judges when attached to something through love. The

[36] England (1921) 488 suggests that this line from *Laws* is drawing on a preexisting proverb "love is blind". Regardless of whether Plato was drawing on a proverbial phrase Plutarch is making specific reference to the line found at *Lg.* 731e5-6. This is not the only place where Plutarch quotes a line from a philosophical work which also, in a more general form, circulated widely as a proverb, see chapter 3, page 67.

examples that they use are different though the central argument, as summarized by the brief quotation, is the same. They are, however, using the argument to different ends. Plato is discussing the right character of institutions and individuals. Plutarch is discussing why the barren Socrates is a better judge of men's ideas than they themselves are. So while the context surrounding the quotation in Plutarch helps to illuminate the meaning of the passage in its original context it certainly could mislead as to what the nature of its original context was. Nor does Plutarch help the reader in this regard as he does not identify the quotation as such, nor its source, nor does he name its author. It must be noted, however, that these omissions are an impediment only to the modern reader. I am certain that almost any ancient reader of Plutarch's work would have readily identified the quotation, its source, and its author.

2.3 Erudite Brief Quotation

> **1004C**
>
> Πῶς ποτ' ἐν τῷ Φαίδρῳ λέγεται τὸ τὴν τοῦ πτεροῦ φύσιν, ὑφ' ἧς ἄνω τὸ ἐμβριθὲς ἀνάγεται, κεκοινωνηκέναι μάλιστα τῶν περὶ τὸ σῶμα τοῦ θείου;
>
> ***Phaedrus* 246 d6-8**
>
> Πέφυκεν ἡ πτεροῦ δύναμις τὸ ἐμβριθὲς ἄγειν ἄνω μετεωρίζουσα ᾗ τῶν γένος οἰκεῖ, κεκοινώνηκε δέ πῃ μάλιστα τῶν περὶ τὸ σῶμα τοῦ θείου [ψυχή],...

How accurate is Plutarch's quotation? Plutarch here has employed all four of Runia's categories of *inversion*, *addition*, *subtraction* and *substitution*. τὸ ἐμβριθὲς ἄγειν ἄνω has been inverted so that in Plutarch's text it reads ἄνω τὸ ἐμβριθὲς ἀνάγεται. Plutarch has substituted ἀνάγεται for Πέφυκεν... ἄγειν ἄνω and φύσιν — working in the idea which he lost by omitting πέφυκεν —for δύναμις. μετεωρίζουσα ᾗ

τῶν γένος οἰκεῖ has been subtracted, as has πῃ. Socrates, who is speaking here, typically qualifies his descriptions with terms such as πῃ, so as to disclaim accurate knowledge of his topic. However, Plutarch sees no need for such qualifiers and is more dogmatic, as we would expect a Platonist at this time to be. ὑφ' ἧς has been added. It is not an exact quotation but nothing of the sense or meaning of the original has been lost, despite the numerous small changes.

Does the context surrounding the quotation in Plutarch provide us with information in addition to the text that Plutarch quotes or makes reference to? Question six, in its brief entirety, is devoted to elucidating this quotation. In addition to naming the *Phaedrus* as the source of the quotation Plutarch tells us that the subject of the discourse is love. He specifies that physical beauty is the object of love and that beauty, by its resemblance to the divine, affects the soul and causes it to remember the divine.[37] However, despite the part of the soul's attachment to physical beauty, other parts, the faculties of reason or intellect, are more concerned with matters celestial and divine. These matters are more akin to the divine than is physical beauty.[38] Therefore Plutarch argues that Plato has referred to the faculties of reason or intellect as wings because they bear the soul up away from things mortal and base towards those things which are closer to the divine. Thus Plutarch has accurately and adeptly summarized the subject of the discourse in the *Phaedrus* by reference to a single quotation. However, the discussion is superficial —as it must be given that it is hardly more than a paragraph in length. While

[37] Cf. *Phdr.* 249d4-251a7 and 254b5-7. See Cherniss (1976) 62-63.
[38] For the ideas, the objects of reason or intelligence, as θεῖα cf. *Phd.* 80b1-3, 84a7-b4; *Smp.* 211e3- 212a2 with *Phdr.* 247c6-8, 248b7-c2, and 249c4-6 and *R.* 611e1-5; and also *Phlb.* 62a7-8. See Cherniss (1976) 62-62.

Plutarch quickly sketches out the essence of the discourse in the *Phaedrus* and illuminates the quotation, he by no means provides a complete picture of the contents of the *Phaedrus*.

2.4 Brief Allusion[39]

999C

Οὐ γὰρ **εἰρωνευόμενός γε καὶ παίζων** προσεχρήσατ᾽ ἂν τῷ τοῦ θεοῦ ὀνόματι.

***Symposium* 216e4-5**

εἰρωνευόμενος δὲ καὶ παίζων πάντα τὸν βίον πρὸς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους διατελεῖ

How accurate is Plutarch's quotation? In this instance we are dealing not with a quotation but rather an allusion. Plutarch has preserved the forms exactly as they appear in the *Symposium*, making the allusion more explicit. The only slight variance between the phrases is in Plutarch's replacement of δέ with γε. This phrase fits Runia's category of *substitution*. This not does impede the allusion in any way; δέ is dropped for syntactical reasons, and γε is a natural and easy substitute. One can say that the allusion is exact in its reference.

Does the context surrounding the quotation in Plutarch provide us with information in addition to the text that Plutarch quotes or makes reference to? The context surrounding this passage provides us with virtually no additional information regarding this allusion. At most we could read into the following sentence that some

[39] I owe the choice of this allusion and much of the following discussion to the work of Opsomer (1998) 108, 128-133.

perceived Socrates to be arrogant and haughty because of his public statements.[40] Of course, as in the case of all well-executed allusion the anonymous, and at first sight innocuous, phrase tells the reader who is able to identify it far more than is explicit in the text. In this case the knowledgeable reader would immediately identify the phrase with Alcibiades' words at *Symposium* 216e, which more than any other passage has contributed to the image of Socrates employing an ironic façade. Opsomer argues that "Plutarch's contemporary public must also have associated both terms with sceptical tendencies in and outside Platonism."[41] So while the context surrounding this allusion provides us with virtually no additional information, the allusion itself may have held nuances for the ancient reader.

2.5 Extended Paraphrase

1002E

τὸ δὲ μέγιστον αὐτὸς ἐν Συμποσίῳ διδάσκων πῶς δεῖ τοῖς ἐρωτικοῖς χρῆσθαι, μετάγοντα τὴν ψυχὴν ἀπὸ τῶν αἰσθητῶν καλῶν ἐπὶ τὰ νοητά, παρεγγυᾷ μήτε σώματός τινος μήτ' ἐπιτηδεύματος μήτ' ἐπιστήμης κάλλει μιᾶς ὑποτετάχθαι καὶ δουλεύειν, ἀλλ' ἀποστάντα τῆς περὶ ταῦτα μικρολογίας ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ τοῦ καλοῦ πέλαγος τρέπεσθαι.

***Symposium* 210c6-d4**

μετὰ δὲ τὰ ἐπιτηδεύματα ἐπὶ τὰς ἐπιστήμας ἀγαγεῖν, ἵνα ἴδῃ αὖ ἐπιστημῶν κάλλος, καὶ βλέπων πρὸς πολὺ ἤδη τὸ καλὸν μηκέτι τὸ παρ' ἑνί, ὥσπερ οἰκέτης, ἀγαπῶν παιδαρίου κάλλος ἢ ἀνθρώπου τινὸς ἢ ἐπιτηδεύματος ἑνός, δουλεύων φαῦλος ἦ καὶ σμικρολόγος, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ πέλαγος τετραμμένος τοῦ καλοῦ...

---

[40] καὶ ἄλλως ἐν τῷ Θεαιτήτῳ πολλὰ μεγάλαυχα καὶ σοβαρὰ Σωκράτει περιτέθεικεν... (*Mor.*999D)

[41] Opsomer (1998) 128.

How accurate is Plutarch's quotation? Here again we are not dealing with direct quotation but rather paraphrase. Thus in examining Plutarch's accuracy we are not looking at whether he preserves Plato's text word for word but whether he preserves the sense of Plato's text. The part of Socrates' speech that Plutarch paraphrases is indeed accurate, but at the same time it is potentially misleading. Plutarch states that Plato in the *Symposium* says that one must deal with the soul's desire to love by turning from the love of singularities towards "the large sea of beauty." While the *Symposium* does indeed say this, Socrates' argument does not end where Plutarch's paraphrase ends. Socrates continues on to make the central point of his speech at 211d1-3: ἐν ταῦθα τοῦ βίου εἴπερ που ἄλλοθι, βιωτὸν ἀνθρώπῳ, θεωμένῳ αὐτὸ τὸ καλόν. This is not an insignificant omission. Certainly Plutarch knew the conclusion of Socrates' speech and so his accurate but incomplete paraphrase must be seen as a willful misrepresentation: though willful misrepresentation should not be read to imply ill intent. It is only Plutarch's statement that the argument which he paraphrases is the "most important" teaching which presents a problem. To anyone not familiar with the *Symposium* this could, and probably would, be read as Plutarch's statement that the most important point of *Symposium* is the paraphrased argument. This is manifestly not so. Indeed Plutarch's statement of this point's importance and his incomplete paraphrase serve his own literary purpose and style. Plutarch certainly would have expected a contemporary reader to know Socrates' argument in its entirety and to recognize that he had used only part of it in his own argument. What results is a passage that would mislead a modern reader who is attempting to reconstruct Socrates' speech from this paraphrase, but would have been

recognized for what it was by an ancient reader: Plutarch writing his own philosophical arguments using Platonic examples tailored to fit his style and purpose.

Does the context surrounding the quotation in Plutarch provide us with information in addition to the text that Plutarch quotes or makes reference to? The context surrounding this paraphrase identifies its source as the *Symposium*. It does not tell us, however, that the passage comes from Socrates' eulogy on love and is part of what Socrates claims Diotima told him. As I mentioned above, the context may even be misleading through the statement that this is τὸ δὲ μέγιστον αὐτὸς ἐν Συμποσίῳ διδάσκων. It is not the most important point of the teachings in the *Symposium* but rather of the teachings in the *Symposium* the point most important to the argument that Plutarch is making. The case can be made, however, that by clearly identifying the *Symposium* as his source Plutarch drew his readers' attention to its original context and gave them adequate tools to evaluate its use in this new context. Once again the context surrounding a Platonic quotation in Plutarch would, in all probability, have been much more suggestive to the ancient audience than to a modern audience.

2.6 Summary

Plutarch's allusions, paraphrases and quotations, on the whole, adhere closely to the received Platonic text. At the same time, however, there is only one quotation, example 2.2.i, from more than a hundred references in the Πλατωνικὰ ζητήματα that may have been made exactly verbatim. Where Plutarch appears to have altered the received text the changes he makes, at various points, fit all four of Runia's categories of *inversion, addition, subtraction and substitution.* In the first three categories of quotation —verbatim quotation, erudite brief quotation, and brief allusion — any changes made by

Plutarch appear to be insignificant and to have been made for purposes of literary style. It is only in the final category — paraphrase — that Plutarch is perhaps not completely faithful to the original Platonic context. In this case Plutarch insinuates that Socrates' central point in his eulogy on love in the *Symposium* was something other than what in fact it was. Plutarch creates this insinuation with rhetoric and omission. But any ancient reader would have recognized both these elements in Plutarch's essay. For the modern reader Plutarch's use of paraphrase should perhaps provide a cue to take a closer look at how he is using the Platonic text. Certainly the quotations prove, if there was any doubt in the first place, that Plutarch was intimately familiar with the text of Plato. Plutarch seems to take care not to alter Plato's philosophy for his own philosophical purposes. That is not to say, however, that he is averse to altering Plato's words in order to accommodate his own literary style. The more changes that Plutarch makes to the words of Plato, though, the closer should be our attention to what sorts of changes they are and why those changes are being made. Plutarch is a Platonist who has the utmost respect for the words of Plato. However, he is also a philosopher and a writer in his own right, and while he seems actively to avoid tampering with Plato's words, to use Whittaker's and Dillon's phrase, he is willing to tweak them to fit his philosophical purposes and literary style.[42] The occasional word inverted, added, subtracted or substituted should suggest to the reader that Plutarch is altering the Platonic text to better fit his literary style. A reluctance to use Plato's own words and instead employ large-scale paraphrase should give us reason to look more closely at the philosophy propounded by Plutarch and that

[42] Whittaker and Dillon describe as 'tamperings' a special category of changes that are deliberate and often ideological in nature. See Whittaker (1989) 80; Dillon (1989) 50-72; also Runia (1997) 264.

propounded in the original Platonic context. Plutarch is loyal to the philosophy of Plato but he is willing to reframe it to create a picture of his own.

Chapter Three

Empedoclean Quotations in Plutarch's *Moralia*
Evaluating Plutarch as a Witness to the Philosophy of Empedocles

3.1 Introduction

Since the purpose of this chapter is to evaluate Plutarch's use of Empedoclean quotations, something first should be said about Empedocles, his philosophy, and Plutarch's relationship to them. Empedocles was from Acragas (Agrigentum) in south-central Sicily. He was born around the beginning of the fifth century B.C. and died, perhaps, around 430.[1] Few facts about his life are known with any degree of certainty, though through accretion his biographical tradition gained a large number of legends in antiquity.[2] Plutarch, in his extant works, preserves little of the biographical tradition of Empedocles.[3] Indeed, so little is known about Empedocles with certainty that even the number of poems that he wrote is debated.[4] When it comes to the nature of his

---

[1] Like most everything else with Empedocles, the dates for his life and death are unceratin. Much of our information comes from fourth-century and Hellenistic biographers who tended to preserve sensational and romantic traditions instead of reliable details. Thus the biographical tradition tells us that Empedocles raised a woman from the dead and met his death by leaping into volcanic Mt. Etna (D. L. 8.60-61 and 67; 8.69-75). The historicity of both these tales has been questioned for obvious reasons. It is relatively certain, however, that Empedocles flourished in the middle of the fifth century B.C. On Empedocles' life, see Diogenes Laertius 8.51-77; Inwood (2001) 6-8; Wright (1995) 3-17; Gottschalk (1980) 1-36.

[2] In addition to the reports mentioned in the previous note the following legends are also preserved in Diogenes: he stopped pestilent winds from blowing through Acragas (D. L. 8.60; this is one of the few biographical details about Empedocles that are mentioned by Plutarch [*Mor.* 515C]); he purportedly went about wearing a purple robe with a bronze girdle and bronze slippers with a laurel wreath on his long hair; and he was attended by a train of young boys (D. L. 8.73).

[3] Aside from his stopping of the pestilent winds (*Mor.* 515C), the only biographical detail from Empedocles' life mentioned by Plutarch is his role in ensuring democracy in Acragas (*Mor.* 1126B). See Hershbell (1971) 158-159.

[4] For the argument for two poems, see Wright (1995) 17-21 and Kingsley (1995) 7-8, 359-370. For the argument for one poem see Osborne (1987a) 24-50 and Inwood (2001) 8-19.

philosophy there is more certainty.[5] Empedocles introduced the idea of repeated world cycles in which the influence of Love (*eros*) and Strife (*eris*) alternated. Empedocles claimed there were only four basic elements, fire, air, earth and water, which were unchangeable.[6] Within this cyclical cosmos built out of four elements dwelt *daimones* which undergo transmigration and reincarnation. It is in this part of Empedocles' philosophy in particular that strong Orphic and Pythagorean influences can be seen.[7] While more is known about Empedocles' philosophy than other aspects of his life, it, too, is not without debate.

While little can be said about Empedocles with certainty, one issue that does need to be addressed here is the availability of his work in antiquity. From the time of its composition down to the end of the Hellenistic period Empedocles' work seems to have been in wide circulation. The extant works of Plato, Aristotle and Theophrastus preserve Empedoclean quotations.[8] Diogenes Laertius in his *Life of Empedocles* records the names of a number of Classical and Hellenistic authors who seem to have discussed

---

[5] For a detailed account of Empedocles' philosophy, see O'Brien (1969). For a more recent summary of what is known and can be known about Empedocles' philosophy and a valuable, if at times harsh, critique of the writings of other scholars on the subject, see O'Brien (1995) 403-470.

[6] Aristotle adopted Empedocles' view of a four-element universe but, unlike Empedocles, thought the elements were changeable. For a discussion of Aristotle's relationship to presocratic philosophy and Empedocles in particular, see Cherniss (1964) esp. 102-127, 173-180, 230-234, 268-288, 293-295, 306-314, 324-325.

[7] Diogenes Laertius records that the Sicilian historian Timaeus said that Pythagoras was Empedocles' teacher (D. L. 8.54, *Life of Empedocles*). On the Pythagorean and Orphic influences in Empedocles' philosophy, see West (1971) 233-235, Kingsley (1995) 112-148, 217-347. For a general overview of Empedocles' theology, see Jaeger (1947) 128-154.

[8] Pl. *Lg.* 10.889b-c; *Men.* 76c-d; *Phd.* 96a-b; *Sph.* 242c-e. Arist. *Metaph.* 1014b35-1015a3, 1000a18–b20; *Ph.* 250b23–251a5, 196a17-24; *GC* 334a1-7, 333a35-b3; *Cael.* 294a21-28; *Po.* 1461a23-25; *Mete.* 381b31-382a2; *De An.* 430a28-30; *GA* 722b3-28, 723a23-26; Thphr. *CP* 1.13.2, 1-8; 1.7.1, 1-5; *Sens.* 59; etc.

Empedocles in their works.[9] Hermarchus of Mytilene, in the early third century B. C., wrote a twenty-two book work entitled Πρὸς Ἐμπεδοκλέα.[10] In the first century B. C. Empedocles' work still seems to have been circulating fairly widely, and authors such as Lucretius appear to have had access to it.[11] By the time of Plutarch, however, the evidence is less clear as to whether authors who make reference to Empedocles' work are doing so first-hand or second-hand. As is discussed at the end of this chapter, there is every reason to believe that Plutarch had first-hand knowledge of Empedocles' work. It is less clear, however, whether his contemporaries such as Favorinus and Aulus Gellius also had first-hand knowledge. The evidence from this period suggests that it would not at this time have been difficult to acquire a copy of Empedocles' work if one wanted, but the number of people who wanted one seems to have been dwindling.

Relevant to the question of how widely texts of Empedocles were circulating in the first and second A.D. is the Strasbourg papyrus. Purchased in Akhim (Panopolis) / Upper Egypt in 1904 it "was an incurvate, stiff strip of papyrus in the shape of a stand-up collar"[12] to which copper leaves had been pasted so as to make a funerary crown. The writing upon the papyrus is in a literary book-hand which is dated to the late first or early second century A.D.[13] The presence of a stichometric letter in the left-hand

[9] Authors mentioned by Diogenes in relation to Empedocles include: Alcidamas, Aristotle, Apollodorus of Athens, Aristippus, Demetrius of Troezen, Diodorus of Ephesus, Eratosthenes, Heraclides Lembus, Heraclides of Pontus, Hermippus of Smyrna, Hieronymus of Rhodes, Hippobotus, Neanthes, Satyrus, Theophrastus, Timaeus, Timon of Phlius and, Telauges/Philolaus.
[10] For a brief discussion of ancient authors who wrote works on Empedocles, see Hershbell (1971) 156-157.
[11] Sedley (1998) 1-15.
[12] Martin and Primavesi (1998) 339.
[13] Martin and Primavesi (1998) 14-15, 341.

margin of fragment a(ii) identifies the text as the work of a professional scribe.[14] The presence of corrections and/or variants suggests that the papyrus should be classified as a "scholar's text".[15] This text assures us that the work of Empedocles was still in circulation in the late first/early second century A.D. centuries in Egypt. The presence of corrections and/or variants suggests that someone using this text had access to other copies of all or at least part of Empedocles' work. This supports my earlier conclusion that during the lifetime of Plutarch and his contemporaries copies of Empedocles' work would not have been particularly difficult to obtain.

The Strasbourg papyrus is of interest for reasons other than its production during a period in which interest in Empedocles appears perhaps to have been waning. Another reason the Strasbourg papyrus is of interest is the fact that our only directly transmitted text of Empedocles has come to us in the form of a funerary crown.[16] How did this text come to be used for such a purpose? There are two possible answers to that question, both of which have implications for the survival of texts of Empedocles after this time. The first possible answer is that when the funerary crown was made — a date which we do not know — the papyrus was randomly selected from scrap papyri. If this were the case, it would suggest that within a relatively short period of time after the text had been written there ceased to be sufficient interest in Empedocles to keep his work in circulation. A lessening of interest in Empedocles and the other presocratic philosophers during this period is also indicated by the dwindling number of citations by ancient authors, particularly citations that were clearly made first-hand. It might at

[14] Martin and Primavesi (1998) 21-22, 341.
[15] Martin and Primavesi (1998) 22-25, 341.
[16] Martin and Primavesi (1998) 27-51.

first seem a bit surprising that a good quality copy of an increasingly rare text written by a professional scribe would end up in the refuse pile. However, the thousands of papyri discovered in an ancient garbage dump at Oxyrhynchus make it clear that such a fate would not have been unusual.

The other possible answer is that the text of Empedocles was specifically chosen as the base upon which the funerary crown was built.[17] Empedocles' association with Pythagorean and Orphic mysticism suggests a plausible reason why one might choose such a text for a funerary crown.[18] If the text of Empedocles was largely of interest in this period to those interested in religious mysticism —which (as we will see in chapter four) might have been what drew Plutarch to the text of Empedocles—there is yet another reason why the number of texts available might have begun to rapidly dwindle. This was a period within which the Christian church was rapidly growing in numbers and influence. If the text of Empedocles was primarily of interest at this point to those interested in Orphic and Pythagorean doctrines, as their numbers dwindled so too would the number of people interested in Empedocles. We cannot know, however, whether either of these answers provides the reason for the use of Empedocles' text as the base for this funerary crown. What the papyrus does tell us is that copies of Empedocles were accessible in the late first/early second century A.D., when this papyrus was written. However, by the time it went out of circulation it would seem to have been either of no interest and ended up in the recycling-pile, or it was only of religious interest to those involved in a dying religious movement. Either way we can suggest, on the basis of the fate of this papyrus and the dwindling number of apparently

[17] Martin and Primavesi (1998) 36-28.
[18] On the Pythagorean and Orphic influence in Empedocles' philosophy, see note 7 above.

first-hand quotations in other ancient authors, that within a hundred years of Plutarch's death the text of Empedocles had become considerably rarer than it had been in his lifetime.

The last author who we can be relatively certain had first-hand knowledge of Empedocles' work is Simplicius, who was writing in the sixth century A.D. Simplicius tells us that he made a habit of copying out long passages from texts that were extremely rare (*In Phys.*144.25). The length of many of his quotations from Empedocles suggests that he was often working first-hand from a text that he considered to be extremely rare. John Tzetzes, writing in the twelfth century, makes reference to "the third book of Empedocles' *Physics*."[19] There is no reason to believe, however, that Tzetzes had actually seen Empedocles' work and made his quotation first-hand. Indeed his reference to a third book, something mentioned by no previous authors, suggests he may have taken his reference from a corrupt second-hand source. The last mention of an extant work by Empedocles occurs in a letter from Giovanni Aurispa to Ambrogio Traversari written in 1424. In a list of other rare manuscripts that he had in his library in Venice Aurispa lists Καθαρμοὺς Ἐμπεδοκλέους.[20] The manuscript was subsequently lost, but there is no reason to doubt Aurispa's report. Unlike Simplicius, however, Aurispa does not preserve any quotations from his rare manuscript. Indeed, the only value of Aurispa's notice is to suggest that a complete manuscript of Empedocles work survived until the fifteenth century, nine centuries later than the last certain report by Simplicius of the existence of such a manuscript.

---

[19] Ἐμπεδοκλέους τῶι τρίτωι τῶν Φυσικῶν... Tzetzes, *Chiliades*. 7.522-526.
[20] See Mansfeld (1994) 79-82.

It is precisely because of the debate which surrounds all areas of Empedoclean studies that our sources must be examined closely. Plutarch is obviously an important source. However, the large number of Empedoclean quotations preserved by Plutarch does not necessarily ensure accuracy and it certainly does not mean that the quotations have not been shaped by their new Plutarchean context. Plutarch is writing about his own world. His literary style is the result of the world seen through the prism of his own personal experience. As we saw in the previous chapter even an author like Plato, to whom Plutarch was extremely loyal, could be altered to suit Plutarch's purposes. The context of a reference, however, often provides a reason for the alteration. This warns against the practice of ripping Empedoclean quotations out of their Plutarchean contexts and then using them in an attempt to recreate Empedocles' lost work, as Wright has done.[21] Empedocles must be examined within the context in which he is found in Plutarch.

Within Plutarch's *Moralia* there are approximately seventy quotations from Empedocles. They appear in numerous works in a variety of contexts.[22] To suggest that these quotations can be used independently from their contexts in Plutarch is

---

[21] Wright (1995). For an alternative approach which takes context into account, see Inwood (2001).

[22] Περὶ τύχης 97C-100A; Περὶ δεισιδαιμονίας 164E-171F; Περὶ πολυπραγμοσύνης 515B-523B; Πολιτικὰ παραγγέλματα 798A-825F; Πρὸς Κωλώτην ὑπὲρ τῶν ἄλλων 1107D-1127F; Πῶς δεῖ τὸν νέον ποιημάτων ἀκούειν 17D-37A; Περὶ τῆς ἐν Τιμαίῳ ψυχογονίας 1012A-1030C; Αἴτια Ῥωμαικά 263D-291C; Περὶ τοῦ ἐμφαινομένου προσώπου τῷ κύκλῳ τῆς σελήνης 920A-945D; Περὶ τοῦ πρώτως ψυχροῦ 945E-955C; Συμποσιακῶν προβλημάτων Βιβλία θ' 612C-747D; Αἴτια φυσικαί 911C-919F; Περὶ πολυφιλίας 93A-97B; Περὶ Ἴσιδος καὶ Ὀσίριδος 351C-384B; Πῶς ἄν τις διακρίνειε τὸν κόλακα τοῦ φίλου 48E-74F; Ἐρωτικός 748E-771D; Ὅτι οὐδὲ ζῆν ἔστιν ἡδέως κατ' Ἐπίκουρον 1086C-1107C; Περὶ τοῦ ὅτι μάλιστα τοῖς ἡγεμόσι δεῖ τὸν φιλόσοφον διαλέγεσθαι 776A-779B; Περὶ τοῦ μὴ χρᾶν ἔμμετρα νῦν τὴν Πυθίαν 394D-409D; Περὶ τῶν ἐκλελοιπότων χρηστηρίων 409E-438F; Πλατωνικὰ ζητήματα 999C-1011F; Περὶ φυγῆς 599A-607F; Περὶ σαρκοφαγίας λόγοι 993A-999B; Περὶ τοῦ μὴ δεῖν δανείζεσθαι 827D-832A; Περὶ εὐθυμίας 464E-477F; Πότερα τῶν ζώων φρονιμώτερα τὰ χερσαῖα ἢ τὰ ἔνυδρα 959A-985C; and, Περὶ ἀοργησίας 452E-464D.

misguided. Any use of excerpts has its perils, but Plutarch was not composing an ancient version of *Bartlett's Dictionary of Quotations*; he was writing literary works with philosophical, educational, and religious purposes.[23] The quotations that Plutarch employs, both from Empedocles and from other ancient authors, are quotations which he has selected because they suit his purpose and which he has tailored to fit his literary style.[24] That is not to say that the quotations from Empedocles found in Plutarch have no independent value. Their value, however, can only be determined by evaluating Plutarch as a source.

In the previous chapter we saw that while Plutarch frequently employed Platonic references in his Πλατωνικὰ ζητήματα, these were almost never verbatim quotations. Indeed, closer inspection of what at first appeared to be a verbatim quotation showed that minor alterations had been made in order to tailor the quotation to fit Plutarch's literary context.[25] It was also apparent that while Plutarch altered these quotations to varying degrees, he was careful to preserve their philosophical intent. It is on the rare occasions that Plutarch employed examples from Plato that were not entirely faithful to their original Platonic context that we find him paraphrasing Plato, rather than using Plato's own words.[26] Even here Plutarch cannot be accused of intentional deception, as he provides his reader with enough information to identify the original context of the passage, and thus effectively provides an academic footnote. The

---

[23] Kidd, however, does refer to Plutarch's work as "nothing less than the Chaeroneia Dictionary of Quotations" (Kidd [1998] 290). The vast range of works to which Plutarch refers and the huge number of quotations found in his work have often been used to argue that Plutarch could not have read everything to which he makes reference and that therefore he must have read nothing but notebooks; see Pohlenz (1930) 1ff.; Sandbach (1940) 20ff. For the counter-argument to this, see Kidd (1998) 290–293.

[24] For discussions of Plutarch's literary style, see Russell (1973) 18-41 and Swain (1997) 168, 170-171.

[25] See chapter 2, pages 25-30.

[26] We saw this when we examined his paraphrase of *Smp.* 210c6-d4. See chapter 2, pages 33-34.

paraphrased passage that Plutarch employs is generally accurate but incomplete, but again by naming its source he draws attention to its original context. And so we see repeatedly that Plutarch means to be faithful to his source. That is not to say that he does not alter the quotations that he employs, but he does strive to maintain their philosophical integrity. The farther their purpose in their new Plutarchean context is from their purpose in their original context, the farther Plutarch moves away from using his source's own words.

The question in this chapter is whether Plutarch shows the same sort of loyalties when he employs quotations from Empedocles.[27] There are a couple of issues which suggest that Plutarch employs Empedoclean quotations in a different manner than he would Platonic quotations. The first issue is one of literary style. As we saw in the previous chapter, with a few minor alterations Plato's prose could easily be fitted into Plutarch's own prose. There are two consequences of this: (1) it is more difficult to identify a prose quotation in a prose passage than a verse quotation in a prose passage[28]; (2) because of the close scrutiny required to identify a prose quotation in a prose passage, alterations are more likely to be identified by modern critics than with verse

[27] For Plutarch's use of Stoic fragments and his reliability as a witness to Stoic philosophy, see Kidd (1998) 288-302.
[28] On this issue see Edelstein and Kidd (1972) xv-xxiii, esp. xix, and Kidd (1988) ix-xi.

texts.[29] This is part of what complicates the identification of such quotations. Plutarch must either paraphrase Empedocles' verse into prose in order to integrate it into his own prose writing, or he must leave it in its verse form, which clearly marks it as a direct quotation — no less so than if it were enclosed by quotation marks. Of course preserving the quotation in verse does not mean that it is necessarily unaltered.

The second issue is one of philosophical loyalties. Plutarch was a Platonist. This philosophical allegiance was a defining factor in Plutarch's life. It should not be surprising then that Plutarch shows intense loyalty to Platonism, and takes care not to misrepresent Plato's words. Indeed, Plutarch is keen to "prove" that Plato's system is internally consistent, an effort which may in fact lead him to distort Plato's meaning at times. But does Plutarch have the same loyalty to Empedoclean philosophy? There is no immediately clear answer to this question. Plutarch obviously had deep interest in the work of Empedocles, as is evident from the number of quotations preserved in his extant works, not to mention the ten volumes of the lost Εἰς Ἐμπεδοκλέα.[30] Interest does not, however, automatically translate into loyalty. As Hershbell notes, the number of Empedoclean quotations employed by Plutarch "are no immediate guarantee that

---

[29] The situation would have been very different, however, for ancient readers. Many ancient readers would have identified alterations to poetic and prose passages with equal ease. Indeed the purpose of many alterations was for them to be identified by their readers and/or listeners, so as to demonstrate their authors' literary skills. Modern readers face far more difficulties, even with extant texts such as those of Homer and Plato, in identifying alterations than would an ancient audience. For example, two partial and two complete lines of verse are quoted anonymously at Περὶ σαρκοφαγίας λόγοι 993E. Their metrical form in hexameter verse immediately marks them as a quotation. However, our inability to identify their author means that we cannot provide a larger context for the fragment or even begin to guess at possible alterations that Plutarch might have made here. The result is that verse fragments will almost always be identified, even if we cannot identify their author or original context. However, in the absence of a text against which to make comparisons any alterations to the original text are unlikely to be identified as long as metre is preserved. Anonymous prose quotations are less likely to be identified in the first place, but when they are identified it is most often because we have information which makes their identification possible, which also allows alterations to be identified.

[30] For a full discussion of the Εἰς Ἐμπεδοκλέα, see chapter 4.

Plutarch is a wholly reliable authority on Empedocles."[31] We must let Plutarch's use of Empedoclean quotations speak for itself.

Why is Plutarch so interested in Empedocles' philosophy? Plutarch does not, in his extant works, provide an explicit answer to that question, and so we must look for the answer in what type or types of quotations he chooses, as well as the context and manner in which he employs them. Through such an examination it may be possible to establish criteria to evaluate Plutarch's importance as a witness for Empedocles. The aims of this study are threefold: First, we must examine what sort of quotations Plutarch chooses, and the context and manner in which he employs them. Is there any resulting pattern which might suggest what motivated Plutarch's fascination with Empedocles? Second, we must examine a sample of Empedoclean quotations, following a similar format as used for Plutarch's Platonic quotations in the previous chapter, to determine whether there is an identifiable style or methodology for how Plutarch employs his Empedoclean quotations. Third, using the information gleaned from these investigations and additional information from sources other than Plutarch, we must explore whether it is possible to reconstruct Plutarch's lost Εἰς Ἐμπεδοκλέα. This third aim will be the subject of the fourth chapter. The present chapter will deal exclusively with Plutarch and his use of Empedoclean quotations in his extant works.

Helmbold and O'Neil list more than a hundred Empedoclean references and quotations in the Plutarchean Corpus.[32] I, however, am working with just over seventy

---

[31] Hershbell (1971) 157.

[32] Helmbold and O'Neil (1959) 25-26. Helmbold and O'Neil have put aside any questions regarding the authenticity of some works and indexed the entire Plutarchean Corpus; see Helmbold and O'Neil (1959) xi.

references and quotations.[33] The discrepancy in numbers is due to the inclusion in the catalogue of Helmbold and O'Neil's of almost thirty references found in the five books of *De placitis philosophorum* which, while transmitted as part of the Plutarchean corpus, should properly be ascribed to Aetius.[34] For the purposes of this study it is important to distinguish between the Plutarchean and pseudo-Plutarchean quotations. The quotations found in *De placitis philosophorum* focus exclusively on Empedocles' physical doctrines. This is in stark contrast to the other quotations and references found in the *Moralia* which pay almost no attention to the physical doctrines. Adding more than thirty quotations that deal exclusively with the physical doctrines would dramatically skew our picture of where Plutarch's interests lay. Even if we were to discover that Plutarch had himself made this epitome of Aetius' work, which was the widespread opinion in antiquity, its quotations would tell us little about Plutarch's interest in Empedocles. They are not quotations selected by Plutarch on the basis of his interest in Empedocles, but are quotations selected by an earlier author, perhaps going back all the way to Theophrastus, for the express purpose of illustrating Empedocles' physical doctrines.[35] Therefore, even though an argument can be made for ascribing the work to Plutarch, its quotations should not be counted among Plutarch's quotations of Empedocles. Despite a list of quotations that is substantially shorter than Helmbold and O'Neil's, the remaining seventy quotations and references, and the limited scope of this thesis make a complete discussion of all Plutarch's Empedoclean quotations

---

[33] Hershbell (1971) 157 gives the number of quotations and references to Empedocles as "over eighty." He provides no explanation, however, for the discrepancy between the number of quotations and references listed by Helmbold and O'Neil and the smaller number given by himself.
[34] For a complete discussion of Pseudo-Plutarch's *De placitis philosophorum* and its relationship to the earlier work by Aetius, see Mansfeld and Runia (1997) 121-195.
[35] See Mansfeld and Runia (1997) 123, 183.

impossible. While only a handful will be discussed as examples, the conclusions that I have reached have taken all the references into consideration.

Plutarch's quotations of Empedocles are scattered throughout the *Moralia,* with almost a third of the dialogues and essays containing recognizable references to Empedocles.[36] While many of these contain only one or two brief references or quotations, there are also some works that contain several references and quotations, including Πρὸς Κωλώτην ὑπὲρ τῶν ἄλλων φιλοσόφων, Περὶ τοῦ ἐμφαινομένου προσώπου τῷ κύκλῳ τῆς σελήνης, Περὶ τοῦ πρώτως ψυχποῦ, Συμποσιακῶν προβλημάτων Βιβλία θ', Αἰτίαι φυσικαί, and Περὶ σαρκοφαγίας λόγοι. A few general observations can be made before we move on to discuss specific quotations. In contrast to Plutarch's habits of citing Plato, in which the citations were most often indirect and their author unnamed, when Plutarch cites the work of Empedocles he almost always identifies the author by name, and the quotations are more often direct than indirect.[37] The second point of interest is the difference between Plutarch's use of Empedocles and his use of Plato. Plutarch almost always uses his Platonic citations in philosophical contexts. While Plutarch is frequently arguing his own philosophical views he is also loyal to the meaning of the quotation in its original

[36] By my count twenty-four of the seventy-seven works that make up the *Moralia* contain references to or quotations from Empedocles. See note 22 above.

[37] It is of course possible that Plutarch cites Empedocles indirectly more often than has previously been identified. There is obviously no difficulty in identifying Empedoclean quotations when Plutarch explicitly attributes them to Empedocles (*Mor.* 646D, 618B, 912C, etc.). The difficulty in identifying even direct Empedoclean quotations in verse (as are all direct quotations from Empedocles), however, when Plutarch does not explicitly name Empedocles as their author should be a warning (*Mor.* 691B, 520E, and 777C). In fact no quotation found in Plutarch's works has been ascribed to Empedocles with certainty except those which Plutarch himself identifies as being Empedoclean. If we cannot identify the authorship of material which is clearly a quotation, it is reasonable to suspect that there is also indirect material whose source has not been identified. So while it appears that there are far more direct quotations from Empedocles than indirect it is possible that there are a number of quotations and references which have not yet been identified.

Platonic context. This is not the case with his citations of Empedocles. Plutarch's citations of Empedocles appear in philosophical contexts only infrequently. When these quotations and references do appear in philosophical contexts, often Plutarch is arguing against the way that other philosophical schools, generally the Epicureans or Stoics, are employing a particular Empedoclean quotation in support of their philosophical position. Indeed, most of the Empedoclean quotations in Πρὸς Κωλώτην ὑπὲρ τῶν ἄλλων φιλοσόφων fall into this category (1111F; 1112F; 1113A-B, 1113C, 1113D; 1123B). Plutarch also uses examples from Empedocles with which certain philosophical schools disagree (Περὶ τῶν ἐκλελοιπότων χρηστηρίων 400B; Περὶ τοῦ πρώτως ψυχποῦ 948F; Περὶ τοῦ ἐμφαινομένου προσώπου τῷ κύκλῳ τῆς σελήνης 922C). For the most part, however, Plutarch's quotations of Empedocles are used to illustrate and/or support the point that Plutarch, or his speaker, is making. These discussions are rarely what we consider philosophical. For example, Empedocles is brought to bear on such questions as the divine nature of salt (Συμποσιακὰ προβλήματα 685F), and why domesticated pigs have more than one litter, yet wild pigs have only one (Αἰτίαι φυσικαί 917C). Occasionally, Plutarch's Empedoclean quotations seem to serve no function beyond being literary quotations appropriate to the situation at hand. An example of such usage occurs in Πῶς ἄν τις διακρίνειε τὸν κόλακα τοῦ φίλου at 63D when Arcesilaus comments on the poverty of his friend, Apelles of Chios, by saying "there is nothing here but Empedocles' elements, fire, water, and earth, and the gentle heights of aither." Less flatteringly in Περὶ πολυφιλίας at 93B Plutarch uses Empedocles' words to describe Meno's overconfidence in his debating skills, saying he was "haunting the lofty heights of

wisdom." Aside from preserving the words themselves, such quotations tell virtually nothing about the philosophy of Empedocles. Indeed, the quotations scattered throughout the essays and dialogues of the *Moralia* generally seem not to have Empedocles' philosophy as their main point of interest.[38] Perhaps more can be said about Plutarch's habits of citation regarding Empedocles by examining a selection of references in detail.

Like the Platonic references in the previous chapter, these Empedoclean references will be examined on the basis of two questions, drawn from the work of Kidd.[39] (1) To what degree are the quotations accurate? (2) Does the context surrounding the quotation in Plutarch provide us with information in addition to the text that Plutarch quotes or makes reference, such as author, source, or intended meaning? The quotations will be dealt with in the following order: (1) verbatim quotation; (2) erudite brief quotation; (3) brief allusion; and (4) extended paraphrase.[40] Again the alterations to the text that I am looking for follow four general categories as set forth by Runia, following the work of Whittaker.[41] Those categories again are: *inversion*, *addition*, *subtraction,* and *substitution.* I will not be dealing with errors that appear to have originated with a copyist during the process of transmission. These errors have little impact on the discussion at hand and have been discussed elsewhere by

---

[38] For Hershbell (1971) 160-161, "although many of Plutarch's quotations from and comments on Empedocles show a preoccupation with the physical and 'religious' opinions of the latter, several suggest an interest in Empedocles' style." I would argue, however, that Plutarch shows little more interest in Empedocles' style than he does in Empedocles' biography, something Hershbell describes Plutarch as having little interest in ([1971] 158-159). What is notable, however, is the fact that Plutarch shows less interest in Empedocles' biography and more interest in his style than his contemporaries apparently did.
[39] Kidd (1998) 289.
[40] My categories follow those articulated by Runia (1997) 286.
[41] Runia (1997) 264; Whittaker (1989) 63-95.

Hershbell.[42]

3.2 Verbatim Quotation

The verbatim quotation that is here being discussed is fragment 76 in Diels-Kranz. While there are a vast number of verbatim, or seemingly verbatim, Empedoclean quotations to choose from in the *Moralia,* there are two reasons for examining this particular citation as my example. First, Plutarch cites this fragment in two different works within the *Moralia*, allowing for comparison between his two uses of a single fragment.[43] Second, the recently published Strasbourg papyrus has provided us with a directly transmitted text of this fragment against which we can compare Plutarch's quotations.

The first use of the fragment is at Συμποσιακὰ προβλήματα 618B = DK 76:

> τοῦτο μὲν ἐν κόγχαισι θαλασσονόμοις βαρυνώτοις,
> ναὶ μὴν κηρύκων τε λιθορρίνων χελύων τε,

φησὶν Ἐμπεδοκλῆς,

> ἔνθ' ὄψει χθόνα χρωτὸς ὑπέρτατα ναιετάουσαν, ...

Here is the text of the passage in Περὶ τοῦ ἐμφαινομένου προσώπου τῷ κύκλῳ τῆς σελήνης 927F, DK 76:

> ναὶ μὴν κηρύκων τε λιθορρίνων χελύων τε,

καὶ παντὸς ὀστρέου φύσιν, ὡς φησιν ὁ Ἐμπεδοκλῆς, καταμανθάνων

> ἔνθ' ὄψει χθόνα χρωτὸς ὑπέρτατα ναιετάουσαν, ...

---

[42] See Hershbell (1971) 163. Fairbanks (1897) did not take errors in transmission into account in his examination of Plutarch's quotations from the early Greek philosophers.

[43] For a list of other places where Plutarch employs identical or almost identical quotations in different contexts, see Hershbell (1971) 165.

Here is the text of Strasbourg papyrus *ensemble* b, as reconstructed by Martin and Primavesi.

[τοῦτο μὲν ἐν κόγχαισι θαλασσονόμοις βαρυνώτοις]	**b**0
[ἠδ' ἐν? πε] τραίοισι κα[.....]	**b**1
[ἔνθ' ὄψει] χθόνα χρωτὸ[ς ὑ]πέ[ρτατα ναιετάουσαν]	**b**2
[θώρηξ δ' αὖ?]τε κραταιν[ώ]των α.....	**b**3
[ναὶ μὴν κηρΕ̂]κων γε λιθορίνων χ[ελύων τε]	**b**4
[.....] μελίαι κεραῶν ἐλά[φων.....]	**b**5
[ἀλλ(ὰ) οὐκ ἄν τελέσαιμ?]ι λέγων σύμ[παντα?.....]	**b**6

How accurate is Plutarch's quotation? Until the publication of *P. Strasb. gr.* Inv. 1665-1666 in 1999 Plutarch's quotation of fragment DK 76 appeared to be accurate. He quotes the lines in two different works, which likely had some period of time separating their dates of composition.[44] Despite his use of the quotation in two different contexts there are no discrepancies between them. The passage in Συμποσιακὰ προβλήματα contains an extra line preceding those cited in Περὶ τοῦ ἐμφαινομένου προσώπου τῷ κύκλῳ τῆς σελήνης but the shared lines are identical. Indeed, on the basis of these two references, in regard to this fragment Hershbell has said: "In sum, although Plutarch tends to be editorial, he is generally reliable in reproducing his quotations from Empedocles."[45] There was no indication, either from the quotations themselves or their surrounding contexts, that Plutarch had altered the quotations in any way. The Strasbourg papyrus has revealed the fallacy in the assumption that Plutarch was faithful in citing these lines from Empedocles. Even

[44] It is impossible to tell how much time separated the dates of composition of Περὶ τοῦ ἐμφαινομένου προσώπου τῷ κύκλῳ τῆς σελήνης and Συμποσιακὰ προβλήματα. Jones (1966) 72-73 dates Συμποσιακὰ προβλήματα to some time after 99 A.D. but before 116 A.D. He argues (70), against Ziegler, that there is insufficient evidence to date Περὶ τοῦ ἐμφαινομένου προσώπου τῷ κύκλῳ τῆς σελήνης.

[45] Hershbell (1971) 165.

though *ensemble* b, which contains the lines, has been formed from two separate papyrus fragments there is no doubt as to the order of the lines they preserve.[46] We now have evidence for seven lines. Certainly we have enough of the passage to see that while the lines quoted by Plutarch are in themselves accurate, the order in which they are cited appears not to be the same as their original order in Empedocles. Plutarch cites lines 1, 5, and 3 in that order.[47] While the new order seems not to change the meaning of the lines preserved by Plutarch, it does raise questions about how reliable a witness Plutarch is in regard to Empedocles.[48] While the lines are, in themselves, accurate, the *subtraction* and *inversion* of complete lines, to use Runia's terms, is troubling. The apparent reason for the subtraction of lines is an effort to limit the length of quotations cited. In Συμποσιακὰ προβλήματα, where the three-line version of the quotation is employed, Plutarch seems to have strived to limit quotations to no more that three lines.[49] In Περὶ τοῦ ἐμφαινομένου προσώπου τῷ κύκλῳ τῆς σελήνης the line

---

[46] See Plate IV in Martin and Primavesi (1999). The order of the lines in *ensemble* **b** is certain and the Strasbourg papyrus appears to be the fragmentary remains of what was once a complete text of Empedocles. Therefore, the only possible way that the Strasbourg papyrus and Plutarch's quotation could both be correct is if Plutarch is citing the lines from a separate occurrence in Empedocles' work where some lines were omitted and others had their order inverted. This, however, is not generally how line repetition functions in epic and it is more likely that Plutarch, or his source, is responsible for the omission and inversion of lines.

[47] The first line of Plutarch's quotation in Συμποσιακὰ προβλήματα is not preserved by the Strasbourg papyrus. So while its placement immediately preceding the preserved text is a reasonable reconstruction, it is not impossible that further evidence may come to light that provides intervening lines between b0 and b1. For their commentary on the reconstruction of *ensemble* **b** and line **b0** in particular, see Martin and Primavesi (1999) 247-254.

[48] For an interpretation of the lines before publication of the Strasbourg papyrus, see Wright (1995) 227. For the implications of the new papyrus on interpretations, see Osborne (2000) 351 and Inwood (2001) 75.

[49] Of the more than one hundred and fifty poetic quotations cited in Συμποσιακὰ προβλήματα only a handful have more than three lines. At times parts of four lines are cited but their sum total is three complete lines. There are occasional exceptions to this: at 662D-E there is a five-line quotation which is a list of trees; at 677A-B there are two five-line quotations which are cited because they mention celery; and at 741E-742A (notably a single question) there is one five-line and two four-line quotations from Homer.

limit seems to have been two lines.[50] While a desire to limit the length of quotations may explain the omission of lines it does not explain why the preserved lines have apparently had their order inverted. On the face of it, it appears that the text Plutarch was working from recorded the lines in the order preserved by him.

Does the context surrounding the quotation in Plutarch provide us with information in addition to the text that Plutarch quotes or makes reference, such as author, source, or intended meaning? In both cases we are provided with the source of the quotation: Empedocles. In Συμποσιακὰ προβλήματα (618B) the quotation comes up in discussion of whether dinner guest should be seated according to rank or affinity. The speaker, Lamprias, provides numerous examples in which affinity takes precedence over worth, resulting in a product that is better than if worth had taken precedence over affinity. To further this argument he says that everyone has seen how god does not always place fire above and earth below, but rather places them as suits the object at hand. In support of this statement Lamprias quotes Empedocles. He elucidates the quotation by saying that it means that the earth covering on sea-creatures, such as mussels and turtles, is not in the position which nature allotted earth. Rather it is in the position which the functioning of the creature demands. Certainly the context suggests that the quotation is part of an argument by Empedocles that the elements do not follow a fixed pattern of positioning, as Aristotle's doctrine of natural place would suggest, but rather are positioned according to need.[51] Thus we see in turtles and

[50] The only poetic quotation in Περὶ τοῦ ἐμφαινομένου προσώπου τῷ κύκλῳ τῆς σελήνης which is more than two lines is the second quotation consisting of three lines, which describes the moon, cited in the work at 920E.
[51] See Arist. *Cael.* 296b 21-22.

shellfish the earth occupying the outermost or highest regions rather than the lower regions which we might have expected.

In Περὶ τοῦ ἐμφαινομένου προσώπου τῷ κύκλῳ τῆς σελήνης (927F) Plutarch is discussing the functions of the parts of humans. He argues that the heavy earthy parts are above, namely in the head, the hot fiery regions are in the middle, and teeth grow from both above and below. Yet none of these things is contrary to nature but rather fills its position of function. In support of this argument he cites the two lines from Empedocles which suggest that such is the case with turtles and tritons and indeed all shellfish. For these creatures, he says, the fact that the heavy earthy part is the top, outermost layer does not result in the rest of the creature being crushed. Nor does such an arrangement allow the fiery region to rise to the top and escape. Rather Plutarch says the elements have intermingled with each element taking up the position in which it serves its function.[52] Plutarch then carries on to say that this argument can also be applied to the cosmos, as it too is a living thing (928A).

In both cases the context surrounding the quotation suggests that in its original context the quoted passage dealt with sea creatures which had forms in which the elements intermingled according to function, rather than separated according to nature. The Strasbourg papyrus in no way contradicts this interpretation. However, the inclusion of κεραῶν ἐλάφων, "horned stag," makes it clear that Empedocles'

[52] Hershbell (1971) 168 notes that while Plutarch's citation of DK 76 in support of the contention that Empedocles did not assign "natural places" to his four roots is undoubtedly basically correct, the pronounced teleological emphasis provided by the context in which the fragment occurs is most probably not faithful to its original context. He argues that Aristotle's complaints about Empedocles' introduction of chance and necessity make it clear that this "teleological coloring" was not in Empedocles' thought.

argument was far more general than is implied by Plutarch's quotation. That is to say, it dealt not just with sea creatures but all animals in which the earthy parts form the topmost layer, such as the shell of a turtle or the horns of a deer.[53] Neither Plutarchean context contradicts the other on matters of interpretation. We can say, therefore, that context seems to provide us with additional information about how the quotation should be interpreted. However, it is distinctly possible that this information may be neither as complete nor as accurate as it first appears.

3.3 Erudite Brief Quotation

Here is the passage from Plutarch's Περὶ φυγῆς 607C-D = DK 115:

ὁ δ' Ἐμπεδοκλῆς ἐν ἀρχῇ τῆς φιλοσοφίας προαναφωνήσας,

> ἔστιν ἀνάγκης χρῆμα, θεῶν ψήφισμα παλαιόν
> εὖτέ τις ἀμπλακίῃσι φόνῳ φίλα γυῖα μιήνῃ
> δαίμονες οἵ τε μακραίωνος λελάχασι βίοιο
> τρὶς μιν μυρίας ὥρας ἀπὸ μακάρων ἀλάλησθαι
> τὴν καὶ ἐγὼ νῦν εἶμι, φυγὰς θεόθεν καὶ ἀλήτης

οὐχ ἑαυτόν, ἀλλ' ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ πάντας ἀποδείκνυσι μετανάστας ἐνταῦθα καὶ ξένους καὶ φυγάδας ἡμᾶς ὄντας.

While Plutarch preserves the longest, apparently continuous quotation from this part of Empedocles' work, other authors preserve bits and pieces of this same quotation. Most of these authors cite only a line or a phrase and provide for little in the way of comparison.[54] There is one exception: Hippolytus preserves a larger fragment than Plutarch, but his quotation is broken into smaller chunks, most often a line or two,

---

[53] For the impact of the papyrus on our understanding of this fragment, see Inwood (2001) 75.
[54] Other authors who quote lines of this passage are Plotinus, *Enneads* 4.8.1; Celsus *apud* Origen, *Contra Celsum* 8.53; Porphyry *apud* Stobaeus, 2.8.42; Hippolytus 7.29.9-7.30.4; Hierocles, *In Carmen Aureum* 24.2-3.

interspersed with commentary. I will compare the text preserved by Plutarch to the text preserved by Hippolytus.

The text of Hippolytus that is given below covers far more than just the sections where the quotations overlap with Plutarch (the lines which overlap in the two authors are emphasized). It is important to note that unlike the quotation in Plutarch, the quotation in Hippolytus exists within a cluster of other Empedoclean quotations. The relationship between these Empedoclean quotations in Hippolytus is unclear, as we will see; fragments found in other authors will be discussed where necessary or relevant.

Here is the text from Hippolytus' *Refutatio* 7.29.4-7.30.4 with his commentary omitted (the lines which overlap with Plutarch's quotation have been emphasized):

. . . . .

τέσσαρα τῶν πάντων ῥιζώματα πρῶτον ἄκουε·
Ζεὺς ⟨αἰθὴρ⟩ Ἥρη τε φερέσβιος ἠδ' Ἀϊδωνεὺς
Νῆστίς θ', ἣ δακρύοις τέγγει κρούνωμα βρότειον.

. . . . .

ἦ γὰρ καὶ πάρος ἦν, καί ⟨γ'⟩ ἔσ⟨σε⟩ται, οὐδέ ποτ', οἴω,
τούτων ἀμφοτέρων κεν⟨ε⟩ώσεται ἄσπετος αἰών.

. . . . .

οὐ γὰρ ἀπὸ νώτοιο δύο κλάδοι ἀίσ⟨σ⟩ονται,
οὐ πόδες, οὐ θοὰ γοῦν', οὐ μήδεα γεν⟨ν⟩ήεντα,
ἀλλὰ σφαῖρος ἔην ⟨μοῦνός τε⟩ καὶ ἶσος [ἐστὶν] ⟨ἑ⟩αυτῷ.

. . . . .

τὴν καὶ ἐγὼ ⟨νῦν⟩ εἶμι, φυγὰς θεόθεν καὶ ἀλήτης,

. . . . .

⟨ὅρκον θ'⟩ ὅς κ' ἐπίορκον ἁμαρτήσας ἐπομόσ⟨σ⟩ῃ,
δαίμονες οἵτε μακραίωνος λελάχασι βίοιο

. . . . .

τρίς μιν μυρίας ὥρας ἀπὸ μακάρων ἀλάλησθαι

. . . . .

φυομένους παντοῖα διὰ χρόνου ‹ε›ἴδεα θνητῶν,
ἀργαλέας βιότ(οιο) (μ)εταλλάσσοντα κελεύθους.

. . . . .

ἀργαλέας βιότοιο μεταλλάσσοντα κελεύθους.

. . . . .

αἰθέριον ‹μὲν› γάρ σφε μένος [ψυχὰς] πόντονδε [ἐχθονὸς]
διώκει,
πόντος δ' ἐ(ς) χθονὸς οὖδας ἀπέπτυδε, γαῖα δ' ἐς αὐγὰς
ἠελίου φαέθοντος, ὁ δ' αἰθέρος ἔμβαλε δίναις·

. . . . .

γαῖα δ' ἐς αὐγὰς
ἠελίου φαέ(θο)ντος, ὁ δ' αἰθέρος ἔμβαλε δίναις·
ἄλλος ‹δ'› ἐξ ἄλλου δέχεται, στυγέουσι δὲ πάντες.

. . . . .

ἔστιν ἀνάγκης χρῆμα, θεῶν ψήφισμα παλαιὸν
ἀίδιον, πλατέσ‹σ›ι κατεσφρηγισμένον ὅρκοις·

. . . . .

εἰ γάρ κέν σφ' ἀδινῇσιν ὑπὸ πραπίδες‹σ›ιν ἐρείσας
εὐμενέως (κ)αθαρῇσιν ἐποπτεύ‹σ›ῃς μελέτῃσιν,
ταῦτά τέ σοι μάλα πάντα δι' αἰῶνος παρέσονται,
ἄλλα τε πόλλ' ἀπὸ τῶνδ' ἐκτή(σ)εαι· αὐτὰ γὰρ αὔξει
ταῦτ' εἰς ἦθος ἕκαστον, ὅπη φύσις ἐστὶν ἑκάστῳ.
εἰ δὲ σύ γ' ἀλλοίων ἐπορέξεαι, οἷα κατ' ἄνδρας
μυρία δειλὰ πέλονται ἃ τ' ἀμβλύνουσι μερίμνας,
ἦ σ' ἄφαρ ἐκλείψουσι περιπλομένοιο χρόνοιο
σφῶν αὐτῶν ποθέοντα φίλην ἐπὶ γέν‹ν›αν ἱκέσθαι·
πάντα γὰρ ἴσθι φρόνησιν ἔχειν καὶ νώματος ‹α›ἶσαν.

How accurate is Plutarch's quotation? Plutarch's quotation, at first glance, seems to be accurate. As we saw in the earlier section on verbatim quotations, however, the appearance of accuracy can be misleading. We must begin by looking at whether the lines are in themselves accurate in the cases where the same lines have been preserved by other authors.[55]

Celsus preserves the line τρίς μιν μυρίας ὥρας ἀπὸ μακάρων ἀλάλησθαι (*ap.* Origen *Contra Celsum* 8.53). There are no variations between the quotation from Celsus and the quotation from Plutarch, a fact which suggests that the line is accurate, but Celsus provides us with no evidence for the position of the line. Similarly Porphyry (*ap.* Stobaeus 2.8.42) preserves

θεῶν ψήφισμα παλαιόν
ἀίδιον, πλατέσ‹σ›ι κατεσφρηγισμένον ὅρκοις·

This quotation contains a line not found in Plutarch. Plutarch's quotation reads:

ἔστιν ἀνάγκης χρῆμα, θεῶν ψήφισμα παλαιόν
εὖτέ τις ἀμπλακίῃσι φόνῳ φίλα γυῖα μιήνῃ

Porphyry's version is also attested in Hippolytus 7.29.23, which preserves the same reading. The evidence suggests that Plutarch again has omitted at least one line, or in Runia's terms has *subtracted* a line. This is not entirely surprising, since we saw in the case of DK 76 that Plutarch seems to subtract lines in order to limit the size of the quotations that he is using. Certainly the line preserved by Porphyry and Hippolytus, which is absent in Plutarch, adds detail to the quotation but nothing of substance to its meaning. It is an ideal candidate for subtraction. While this quotation is not the largest

[55] For line-by-line commentaries on the entire fragment DK 115, see Zuntz (1971) 193-199 and Wright (1995) 138-139, 270-275.

preserved in Περὶ φυγῆς, it is among the larger quotations found in the work.[56] The final line is essential to Plutarch's point as it brings up the subject of exile, and the preceeding lines provide explanation as to why the author is in exile. It is easy to accept that Plutarch has pared down a passage from Empedocles in order to limit the size of his quotation while preserving the essence of the passage. The question remains, however, whether the lines preserved by Plutarch are in the correct order relative to each other.

The final place where another ancient author preserves part of this Empedoclean quotation which overlaps with the quotation preserved by Plutarch is Hippolytus 7.29.14-7.29.17. Plutarch preserves the following:

> δαίμονες οἵ τε μακραίωνος λελάχασι βίοιο
> τρὶς μιν μυρίας ὥρας ἀπὸ μακάρων ἀλάλησθαι
> τὴν καὶ ἐγὼ νῦν εἶμι, φυγὰς θεόθεν καὶ ἀλήτης

Hippolytus, however, cites the lines in the following way:

> τὴν καὶ ἐγὼ ‹νῦν› εἶμι, φυγὰς θεόθεν καὶ ἀλήτης,
>
> . . . . .
>
> ‹ὅρκον θ'› ὅς κ' ἐπίορκον ἁμαρτήσας ἐπομόσ‹σ›ῃ,
> δαίμονες οἵτε μακραίωνος λελάχασι βίοιο
>
> . . . . .
>
> τρὶς μιν μυρίας ὥρας ἀπὸ μακάρων ἀλάλησθαι

If we number Plutarch's lines 3, 4, 5, Hippolytus cites them in the order 5, 3, 4. The question then is which, if either, preserves the correct order of the lines?

---

[56] 599E preserves a six-line epigram; 604D-E preserves nine lines from Euripides' *Erectheus*; 605F-606A preserves six lines of stichomythic dialogue from Euripides' *Phoenissae*.

Already within this quotation it has been demonstrated that Plutarch has omitted at least one line. Similarly, in our example of a verbatim quotation we saw Plutarch apparently inverting the order of lines. Given these two facts Plutarch's quotation must be suspect. Is there, however, any evidence beyond precedent to suspect that Plutarch's quotation here has preserved the lines out of their original order? The only evidence we have are the quotations preserved by Hippolytus. The value of this evidence is questionable for two reasons. First, unlike Plutarch, Hippolytus preserves the lines not as a single continuous quotation but rather as three separate quotations with commentary between them. Hippolytus never says that these lines follow after each other or even that they were located in close proximity to one another.[57] There is a second reason to believe that Hippolytus might have dubious value as an example by which to evaluate Plutarch's citation habits, namely, the possibility that both the quotations and the surrounding commentary were plagiarized by Hippolytus from Plutarch's Εἰς Ἐμπεδοκλέα.[58] If this is the case, then we are not using a second, perhaps more reliable, source to evaluate Plutarch's habits of quotation. Rather we are then using Plutarch to evaluate his own habits of citation, and there is no reason to believe that Plutarch would be more accurate in his habits of citation in one work than another. In the absence of certain evidence in regard to Hippolytus' source the *Refutatio*

---

[57] These fragments, following Diels-Kranz, are generally printed together as a single fragment. See Wright (1995) 270 and Inwood (2001) 214-217. Van der Ben (1975) 128 rightly says that the evidence does not "warrant the assumption that these fourteen lines form one continuous whole." Indeed there would be value in heeding Van der Ben (1975) 151 when he says the fragments "still ought to be printed as they have come down to us: as separate fragments."

[58] In the words of Marcovich (1986) 50, Hippolytus had a "passion for plagiarizing." His apparent habit of borrowing large verbatim passages from the works of other ancient authors such as Sextus Empiricus, Irenaeus, and Josephus, coupled with his reference to Plutarch's Εἰς Ἐμπεδοκλέα at 5.20.6, has led many scholars to suspect that much of Hippolytus' material on Empedocles may have been drawn from Plutarch's work. For a complete discussion of the Εἰς Ἐμπεδοκλέα and Hippolytus as a source for that work, see chapter 4.

is an unreliable standard against which to measure the accuracy of Plutarch's Empedoclean quotations.

There is an argument to be made here in favor of Plutarch's line order. Plutarch says that these lines were ἐν ἀρχῇ of Empedocles' philosophy. Any bibliophile in this period would likely read this phrase as referring to the opening lines of a work. Plutarch was certainly aware of the practice of referring to a work by its opening lines and it seems unlikely that he would use the phrase ἐν ἀρχῇ in a manner contrary to its general usage. Identifying works by their ἀρχή had a number of advantages. Titles could vary. Names could be ambiguous because of to homonymy. Variants, errors by a copyist or bibliographer, a damaged book-roll, a lost or unreadable title-tag could hamper the identification of copies from any given book. The ἀρχή of a text was a more secure means of identifying a text and could compensate for uncertainties and variations of the ἐπιγραφή. One had only to unroll the scroll and compare the opening line to be certain of the identification of a text. If Plutarch here is referring to the opening lines of Empedocles' work, using a phrase meant to encourage reference, it seems unlikely that he would either omit a substantial number of lines or that he would cite the lines out of their original order. The manner in which Hippolytus cites the lines does not necessarily contradict the line order preserved by Plutarch. Elsewhere Hippolytus does cite lines out of order with commentary interspersed between the dislocated quotations. Because there is commentary interspersed between the lines it is possible to reorder the lines in Hippolytus to agree with Plutarch's ordering. There is a strong argument to be made that while Plutarch omits some lines, the lines that he does cite maintain their original Empedoclean order. The quotation as a whole, however, is

not what it first seems. That is to say, it is not a continuous five-line quotation from the text of Empedocles.

Does the context surrounding the quotation in Plutarch provide us with additional information about the cited passage? Plutarch identifies Empedocles as the author of the quotation: ὁ δ' Ἐμπεδοκλῆς ἐν ἀρχῇ τῆς φιλοσοφίας προαναφωνήσας. This statement has caused vexation among scholars for generations because it seems to ascribe material that scholars expected to belong to a poem of a religious nature, i.e. Καθαρμοί, to Empedocles' philosophical Περὶ φύσεως.[59] The debate as to which poem the quotation should be ascribed to, or if there was one or two poems in the first place, has been vigorous.[60] Publication of the Strasbourg papyrus should put an end to these debates. The papyrus clearly shows that the Περὶ φύσεως contained material regarding *daimones* which has previously been ascribed to the religious Καθαρμοί. While Plutarch's quotations seem often to be incomplete because of omission of lines, the material that is preserved is accurate, as is

---

[59] Hershbell (1971) 166-167 is among those scholars who have been troubled by this statement. He calls Plutarch's statement a "misleading report" and says "Whatever Plutarch meant, however, it is clear that his report is not especially helpful in ordering the fragments of Empedocles' poem." As discussed in my overview of his article in the introductory chapter to this thesis, Hershbell here has himself been mislead by his preconceptions of what the nature of Empedocles' work was. Hershbell is firm in his belief that there were two poems: one of a physical/philosophical nature and one of a religious nature. He also follows Diels' ascription of this fragment to the religious poem. Thus his vexation arises from Plutarch's apparent ascription of the fragment to a philosophical poem. His views seem to have been formed with far more weight given to the work of Diels than to the testimonia of ancient authors. On the uneasiness this passage has caused, see Osborne (1987a) 29-31. Plutarch himself shows no awareness of more than one work, simply ascribing the quotations to Empedocles. This is the only reference that goes beyond naming Empedocles as its source. Plutarch is not alone in showing no awareness of two separate poems. No author from antiquity shows a clear awareness of two poems. The only possible exception to this is Diogenes Laertius. He is the only author who provides the two titles Καθαρμοί and Περὶ φύσεως. It is unclear, however, whether he is referring to two separate works or two separate titles for one work, or if he is completely certain himself to which of these things he is referring. For the debate as to the number of poems, and discussion of the place of this statement by Plutarch in that debate, see Van der Ben (1976) 16-20; O'Brien (1981) 15; Osborne (1987b) 24-50; Sedley (1989) 269-296; Kingsley (1996) 108-111; Inwood (2001) 6-19.

[60] See the bibliography provided at the end of note 60 above.

the surrounding commentary. Perhaps more accurately, the information that Plutarch does preserve is accurate, if incomplete. This being the case, there is no reason to doubt the veracity of Plutarch's statement that the lines that he does preserve come from the beginning of what was a prelude to Empedocles' philosophy.[61]

In addition to providing us a description of the position of the quotation in the poem, Plutarch also provides some commentary following his citation of lines. He says that Empedocles is revealing not just himself but all of us as exiles. He then seems to provide us with a paraphrase of another vein of Empedocles' discourse on the nature of the body and the soul. But he returns to the soul as an exile. This is of course the point that is relevant to Plutarch's discussion of exile in that essay. Given that Plutarch's interpretation of the quotation is compatible with the interpretation of the quotation found in Hippolytus, it seems probable that this additional information on the meaning of the quotation is faithful to its original Empedoclean sense. Without Empedocles' poem to compare it to, however, it is difficult to be certain of its accuracy. In trying to reconstruct a fragmentary poem such as Empedocles' work we are reliant on the quotation and testimonia of other ancient authors. Unfortunately, being reliant on those authors also means that we may recreate the poem to reflect inaccurate interpretations

[61] It must be asked how φιλοσοφία is being used here. Here I shall quote Kingsley's answer ([1996] 109) to this question: "The evidence is of course Plutarch's own writings: it naturally helps to ask what he, rather than we, understood by the word. The answer may seem surprising. For him φιλοσοφία or 'philosophy' was from first to last geared to the ethical, and above all to the practical. Its task is to give knowledge of what is right and wrong, what is to be avoided and what is to be done (*Mor.* 7D-F, 36D, 78B and 82F)."

preserved in ancient works.[62] So while the context in Plutarch which surrounds the quotation seems to be accurate it would be foolish to attempt to gerrymander this quotation or other quotations to fit his interpretation.

3.4 Brief Allusion

Here is the text from "Οτι οὐδὲ ζῆν ἔστιν ἡδέως κατ' Ἐπίκουρον 1103F = DK 25:

> ὑπολαβὼν οὖν ὁ Ζεύξιππος, "εἶτα οὗτος," ἔφη, "δι' ἐκεῖνον ἀτελὴς ὁ λόγος ἔσται, καὶ φοβηθησόμεθα ταυτολογεῖν πρὸς Ἐπίκουρον λέγοντες;" "ἥκιστα, " ἔφην ἐγώ·
> "καὶ δὶς γὰρ ὃ δεῖ καλόν ἐστιν **ἀκοῦσαι**
> κατ' Ἐμπεδοκλέα. πάλιν οὖν ὁ Θέων ἡμῖν παρακλητέος· οὐ γὰρ ἀργὸν οἶμαι παρεῖναι τοῖς τότε λεχθεῖσιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ νέος ἐστὶ καὶ οὐ δέδιε μὴ λήθης εὐθύνας ὑπόσχῃ τοῖς νέοις."

A scholiast on Plato's *Gorgias* 498e11 reads:

> παροιμία "δὶς καὶ τρὶς τὸ καλόν", ὅτι χρὴ περὶ τῶν καλῶν πολλάκις λέγειν. Ἐμπεδοκλέους τὸ ἔπος, ἀφ' οὗ καὶ ἡ παροιμία· φησὶ γὰρ
> καὶ δὶς γὰρ ὃ δεῖ καλόν ἐστιν **ἐνισπεῖν**.

How accurate is Plutarch's quotation? The only variation between the line preserved by Plutarch and the line preserved by the scholiast to *Gorgias* 498e11 is the final word.[63] Plutarch says that it is good to *hear* what one must even twice, while the scholiast says that it is good to *say* what one must even twice. Obviously one of these

---

[62] We saw in the previous chapter when discussing Plutarch's paraphrase of *Symposium* 210c6-d4 that Plutarch can adapt another writer's work to his own purposes. His representation of that work may be accurate but incomplete. In its incompleteness it might be highly misleading for a modern reader attempting to reconstruct the original work from this new context. In Plutarch's use of the *Symposium* passage what has been lost is not a word or phrase but the entire conclusion of Plato's argument. Plutarch is paraphrasing Socrates' speech in order to support his argument that beauty which is intelligible is larger than beauty which is perceptible. However, the core of Plutarch's argument is different from that of Socrates' argument, and it is this fact which is likely to mislead, though that is not Plutarch's intention.

[63] Greene (1938) does not bother to record ἀκοῦσαι as a possible variant. At *Grg.* 498e11 Socrates alludes to a proverb which is quoted by the scholiast and the paroemiographers in the elliptical form δὶς καὶ τρὶς τὸ καλόν. It is clear that Plutarch is not alluding to this proverb but rather Plutarch's adaptation of it; see chapter 2, page 28-29. For discussion of the line in *Grg.* and the scholion, see Dodds (1959) 315.

words is not what Empedocles wrote, and there can be no doubt that it is Plutarch whose version is unfaithful. Plutarch has tailored the quotation to suit his literary purposes. He is responding to a pupil's request to continue a discussion that had occurred on a previous day, and he uses the Empedoclean quotation, saying that they will hear the discussion again. He then calls on another student to recall the earlier discussion. If Plutarch had intended to repeat his own lecture from the previous day, undoubtedly he would have preserved ἐνισπεῖν.[64] The context makes clear, however, that one student will recall the previous discussion while everyone else will listen and correct him when he errs. Plutarch's quotation is not a verbatim record of what Empedocles wrote but rather an erudite adaption. Plutarch would not have considered it an error but rather a completely legitimate appropriation of Empedocles' words for his own literary purposes. This, I would argue, is typical of learned quotation, where the quoter demonstrates knowledge of the source and then adapts it to his own purpose, which is yet another way of showing one's cleverness. What is interesting, and worth noting, is that if we did not have the version of the line preserved from the scholiast it is quite probable that we would not realize that Plutarch's line is inconsistent with what Empedocles wrote. Our reconstruction of the poem would be very different if we believed that this line should read ἀκοῦσαι rather than ἐνισπεῖν. One wonders if Plutarch provides us with any clues or makes any allusion to the quotation's original context in the context in which he uses it.

[64] In commenting on this line Hershbell (1971) 162 says: "The distortion ἀκοῦσαι instead of ἐνισπεῖν may, of course, be deliberate since the speaker is encouraging someone else to speak and professes his own willingness to listen." There should be no doubt that the distortion is deliberate.

Does the context surrounding the quotation in Plutarch provide us with additional information about the cited passage? As we have seen, it is generally the case when Plutarch cites a quotation from Empedocles that he identifies Empedocles as its author. Aside from telling us that Empedocles was the author of this quotation Plutarch provides us with no explicit information regarding the quotation or how it was used by Empedocles. Is it possible that Plutarch alludes to the Empedoclean context in which the quotation occurred through his employment of it in Ὅτι οὐδὲ ζῆν ἔστιν ἡδέως κατ' Ἐπίκουρον. The evidence is such that one could argue the question either way, but unless new evidence comes to light, a positive answer to this question is not possible. We must, however, allow that these authors may be using these quotations in erudite and nuanced ways that we cannot recognize because we lack the complete work. I think it is better to allow for such subtle nuances and at least consider the possibilities raised by them when attempting to reconstruct Empedocles' work.

That said, is there anything in the context surrounding this particular quotation that might be an allusion to its original context? One fragment does come to mind when considering this quotation and the context in which it is used. This is fragment DK 1, Παυσανίη, σὺ δὲ κλῦθι, δαίφρονος Ἀγχίτεω υἱέ. Ancient testimonia tell us that Pausanias was Empedocles' student.[65] It is possible that in the original work these two quotations were located in close proximity to one another. We might then have

[65] The issue of the number of addressees in Empedocles' work is another problematic question in Empedoclean scholarship. For discussion of this issue, see Osborne (1987a) 31-32 and Obbink (1993) 51-98. Diogenes Laertius (8.60-61) records that, according to Aristippus and Satyrus, Pausanias was Empedocles' close friend to whom he dedicated his Περὶ φύσεως. Diogenes Laertius (8.60) also tells us that according to Heraclides' work Περὶ τῆς ἄπνου Empedocles told Pausanias how he apparently raised a woman from the dead. On the basis of these references and DK1 Pausanias is often referred to as Empedocles' disciple.

"sceptical" or "Academic" text,[67] is dedicated to Favorinus. Plutarch describes him in question ten of book eight of Συμποσιακὰ προβλήματα (734F) as an enthusiastic admirer of Aristotle.[68] Given that the parallel source for this passage is the Peripatetic *Problemata,* it is distinctly possible that Plutarch is here dealing with a traditional Peripatetic question. This might suggest that he has selected this passage not because of his own personal interest in it, but rather because he believed that this passage would already be familiar to Favorinus from the Peripatetic tradition. By using passages familiar to Favorinus in this context, Plutarch might have hoped to make more clearly his point that "it is more befitting for a philosopher to withhold one's judgement than to give rash assent to mere opinions."[69] The context in which this Empedoclean passage is found raises this possibility but provides us with no answers.

3.6 Summary

In contrast to his practice with Plato Plutarch seems rarely, if ever, to give completely accurate quotations from Empedocles. Where we have Empedoclean texts to which we can compare the quotations we see that lines are consistently omitted, and it is possible that some of the lines are not preserved in their correct order. The reason for the omission of lines seems relatively straightforward: to limit the length of quotations. It is difficult, however, to discern a purpose behind the inversion of lines. It is possible that Plutarch was working second-hand from a source in which the original order of the lines was disrupted. The passage on Empedocles' philosophy preserved in

---

[67] On the relationship of this treatise to various philosophical schools, see Opsomer (1998) 213-222.
[68] τὰ μὲν ἄλλα δαιμονιώτατος Ἀριστοτέλους ἐραστής ἐστι καὶ τῷ Περιπάτῳ νέμει μερίδα τοῦ πιθανοῦ πλείστην (*Mor.* 734F).
[69] See Opsomer (1998) 214.

Hippolytus' *Refutatio*, whether it is a passage from the Εἰς Ἐμπεδοκλέα or not, provides a clear picture of the difficulties involved in determining the proper order for the fragments of Empedocles. However, we see that even when Plutarch is citing only a single line we cannot count on its accuracy. Plutarch is wont to alter the text of Empedocles to suit his own literary purposes. It is possible that the dislocation and omission of lines in Plutarch have originated in a source from which he is citing the quotations second-hand. It seems much more likely, however, that these alterations to Empedocles' poetry have been purposefully made by Plutarch so as to make the quotations fit his own literary purposes. If this is indeed the case, it would appear that Plutarch had few inhibitions about altering Empedocles' poetry both in content (DK 115) and meaning (DK 25). So while Plutarch frequently quotes from Empedocles (though not as frequently as the index in Helmbold and O'Neil suggests), he does not show the same fidelity to the words of Empedocles that he showed to the words of Plato. Indeed, we have seen that whenever possible we must cross-reference Plutarch's quotations with quotations and evidence surviving in other ancient works. Where there are no other witnesses, we must be careful in using Plutarch as support for certain arguments. When it comes to Empedocles' words, Plutarch does not prove himself to be a reliable witness.[70]

[70] I therefore disagree with the conclusion of Hershbell (1971) 165: "In sum, although Plutarch tends to be editorial, he is generally reliable in reproducing his quotations from Empedocles."

Chapter Four

Reconstructing Plutarch's Εἰς Ἐμπεδοκλέα

4.1 Overview of Evidence

The *Lamprias Catalogue* lists item number 43 under the title Εἰς Ἐμπεδοκλέα and indicates that the work consisted of ten books: Εἰς Ἐμπεδοκλέα βιβλία ι'.[1] This is the largest work recorded in the Catalogue. Given that Empedocles' entire body of work, at an upwards limit, may have been no more that 5500 verses, and may have been less than half of that, it seems remarkable that Plutarch's lost work was so large.[2] That is not to say that works of this size were without parallel. Alexandrian scholars and Platonic commentators provide evidence of voluminous commentaries that enlarge minor topics at exponential rates. Plutarch's work on Empedocles is remarkable, however, for the fact

---

[1] It has been suggested that the *Lamprias Catalogue* is a library inventory (see note 8 below), and it may well be that the information in the catalogue has simply been copied from the *sillyboi* —title tags that allow a papyrus scroll to be identified without being unrolled— in a library of papyrus scrolls. Indeed of extant *sillyboi* there is one that provides a parallel for a voluminous work on Empedocles. For *sillyboi*, see Dorandi (1984) 185-99; Turner (1987), 13-14, 34-35, esp. 195. *POxy* 3318 preserves what appears to be a title tag which reads:

]Ἑρμάρχου ›[
πρὸ]ς Ἐμπεδοκλέ[α
] θ̲ [

This seems to refer to the ninth book of a work by Hermarchus entitled Πρὸς Ἐμπεδοκλέα. Diogenes Laertius (10.25) knew of a work in twenty-two books by Hermarchus that he describes as ἐπιστολικὰ περὶ Ἐμπεδοκλέους. Cicero, *N. D.* I.93 indicates that the work was a polemic in nature. The title Πρὸς Ἐμπεδοκλέα might also suggest a polemical work.

[2] Both Diogenes and the Suda attest to the number of verses in Empedocles' work. It is the discrepancies between these two accounts, however, that have led to the complete state of confusion as to how many books there were, how many verses they contained and exactly what their titles were. Diogenes (8.77) says: τὰ μὲν οὖν περὶ φύσεως αὐτῷ καὶ οἱ καθαρμοὶ εἰς ἔπη τείνουσι πεντακισχίλια, ὁ δὲ ἰατρικὸς λόγος εἰς ἔπη ἑξακόσια. περὶ δὲ τῶν τραγωδιῶν προειρήκαμεν.

The Suda says:
καὶ ἔγραψε δι' ἐπῶν περὶ φύσεως τῶν ὄντων βιβλία β. καὶ ἔστιν ἔπη ὡς δισχίλια, ἰατρικὰ καταλογάδην καὶ ἄλλα πολλά.

It seems certain that the number of verses is corrupt in at least one case and possibly in both. For a discussion of the accounts given by Diogenes and the Suda, see Osborne (1987a) 28-29.

that it is two and a half times the size of his work on Homer. Given that numbers were particularly susceptible to corruption in the manuscript tradition, the number of books seems open to question.

In the textual tradition of the *Lamprias Catalogue* there are three central manuscripts that are relevant to this question. The oldest witness is Parisinus gr. 1678, 148^{r-v} which was copied probably in or around the first half of the twelfth century. It records item number 43 as Εἰς Ἐμπεδοκλέα βιβλία ι΄. There are seven other manuscripts later than this that preserve the catalogue. They divide into two groups. The archetype for the first group is Neapolitanus III.B.29 246^{v}, which was copied in Italy during the middle of the twelfth century. It records number 43 as Εἰς Ἐμπεδοκλέα but omits reference to the number of books. However, this is not the only place where information is omitted in this manuscript and so it is not surprising that the number of books has been omitted in this case as well.[3] The archetype for the second group is Marcianus gr. 481, 123^{v}. It records the title of item 43 as Ἐμπεδοκλέους βιβλία ι΄. While Neapolitanus III.B.29 246^{v} omits the number of books, no manuscript provides a number other than ten. The manuscript tradition can therefore be said to support the existence of a work entitled Εἰς Ἐμπεδοκλέα in ten books.

There is only a single piece of evidence external to the *Lamprias Catalogue* that explicitly provides any information about the lost Εἰς Ἐμπεδοκλέα. Hippolytus, an early Church Father (ca. A.D. 170-ca. 236), in his *Refutatio* (5. 20.6) makes reference to a

---

[3] See Joyal (1993) 100.

work πρὸς Ἐμπεδοκλέα in ten books (δέκα βίβλοις) which he ascribes to Plutarch.[4] On the basis of this reference it has often been suggested that Plutarch may have been Hippolytus' main source of information about Empedocles.[5] It is worth noting, however, that the context in which Hippolytus makes reference to the Εἰς Ἐμπεδοκλέα, which he refers to as being πρὸς Ἐμπεδοκλέα, deals not with Empedocles but rather with mystery religions. Also, of the thirty-five verses of Empedocles quoted in book seven of Hippolytus' *Refutatio*, only eight are quoted by Plutarch in his extant works. All eight common verses however come from the group of fragments collected as DK115, and Hippolytus provides a close commentary of these at *Refutatio* 7.29.16-21. Hippolytus may have been drawing on Plutarch's Εἰς Ἐμπεδοκλέα, but the overlapping Empedoclean quotations found in Hippolytus' *Refutatio* and Plutarch's extant works do not provide sufficent evidence to be certain about this.[6] On the basis of the witnesses of the manuscript tradition and Hippolytus' testimony we may conclude that Plutarch did in fact write a work on Empedocles in ten books.

There are obvious difficulties in attempting to reconstruct a lost work on the basis of a catalogue entry and single ancient citation. This is perhaps why, despite apparently being the largest work that Plutarch wrote, the Εἰς Ἐμπεδοκλέα is rarely mentioned by Plutarchean scholars. I certainly will not be providing a detailed table of contents for the Εἰς Ἐμπεδοκλέα. Neverthless, given that the Εἰς Ἐμπεδοκλέα appears to have been

---

[4] ἔστι δὲ παστὰς ἐν αὐτῇ, ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς παστάδος ἐγγέγραπται μέχρι σήμερον ἡ τὰ τῶν πάντων τῶν εἰρημένων λόγων ἰδέα. πολλὰ μὲν οὖν ἐστι τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς παστάδος ἐκείνης ἐγγεγραμμένα, περὶ ὧν καὶ Πλούταρχος ποιεῖται λόγους ἐν ταῖς πρὸς Ἐμπεδοκλέα δέκα βίβλοις.

[5] Diels (1898a) 399; O'Brien (1969) 32-33, 210 n. 3; Bollack (1965-9) vol. 3.1, 154; Osborne (1987b) 92-94.

[6] For a detailed discussion of Plutarch as a source for Hippolytus, see Osborne (1987b) 92-94.

the largest work that Plutarch wrote, its possible nature must be discussed when evaluating Plutarch as a witness for Empedocles. For this task I will be using three primary sources. First I will look at the *Lamprias Catalogue* itself and the entries surrounding item 43. Second, I will examine the Empedoclean quotations in the extant works of Plutarch himself. The third source is Hippolytus' *Refutatio,* which makes reference to the work by author and title.

The first place to begin looking for information about the Εἰς Ἐμπεδοκλέα is the *Lamprias Catalogue* itself. Joyal has argued that some information can be gleaned about lost Plutarchean works by examining their place in the *Lamprias Catalogue*.[7] Indeed, in looking at the works which precede the Εἰς Ἐμπεδοκλέα in the *Lamprias Catalogue* and those that follow it we do notice a pattern. The first twenty-five items listed in the catalogue are *Parallel Lives*. These are followed by fifteen unpaired lives and then by the Βίοι τῶν δέκα ῥητόρων. That there is a pattern in their grouping is clear. There is also a pattern to the next twenty-one entries. With the exception of item sixty, Περὶ ποιητικῆς, all of the entries in this part of the catalogue are recorded as being works in multiple books. These range from works in two books such as items 50, 55, 57 and 58, to the largest work, item number 43, the Εἰς Ἐμπεδοκλέα in ten books.[8] The *Lamprias Catalogue* lists no other works in multiple books apart from those in this section of the catalogue.[9] This suggests that the reason for these works being listed in proximity to one

---

[7] Joyal (1993) 97.

[8] It is worth noting here that it is the inclusion of a work in eight books on Artistotle's *Top.* (§ 56) that has led to the belief that rather than being solely a list of works authored by Plutarch the *Lamprias Catalogue* is a library inventory. See Treu (1873) 42-54; Ziegler (1951) 696-7; Russell (1973) 18-19; Lamberton (2001) 22.

[9] If the *Lamprias Catalogue* is in fact a library inventory it is possible that the works in multiple books are listed together for physical reasons — perhaps multiple books were stored together in the same area of the library.

another was their size rather than their content. Certainly the range of topics suggested by their titles argues for this being the case. With four books on Homeric studies (§42 Ὁμηρικῶν μελετῶν βιβλία δ′), three books on stories or myths (§46 Μύθων βιβλία γ′), three books on benefactions to and/or from cities (§51 Πόλεων εὐεργεσίαι βιβλία γ′), and five books on the summary of scientific views held by philosophers (§61 Περὶ τῶν ἀρεσκόντων φιλοσόφοις φυσικῆς ἐπιτομῆς βιβλία ε′),[10] the connective thread seems not to be based principally on content. It is difficult, however, to make any firm statements about content as all that remains of these large works is a half dozen fragments.[11] Therefore the position of the Εἰς Ἐμπεδοκλέα in the *Lamprias Catalogue* tells us little about its content but corroborates the earlier conclusion that the report about the size of the work is to be accepted.

While the position of the Εἰς Ἐμπεδοκλέα in the *Lamprias Catalogue* provides few answers about its contents it does raise some questions about the authorship of the work. Of the eighteen works[12] listed in the *Lamprias Catalogue* as works in multiple

---

[10] This work, while included in the *Lamprias Catalogue* and widely attributed to Plutarch by other ancient authors—Eusebius in his *Praeparatio Evangelica* 14.13.9, Cyril of Alexandria in his *Contra Julianum* 2.14, and Theodoret of Cyrrhus in his *Cohortatio ad Graecos* 4.31— is now generally considered to be a pseudo-Plutarchean work. Even if this were a genuine work by Plutarch it is of little value to our present purpose as we know with certainty that it is an epitome of an earlier work by Aetius. The authorial contribution of its writer lies largely in the decision either to preserve or to excise lemmata from the earlier work. See Mansfeld and Runia (1997) 187-195.

[11] The fragments from named works of Plutarch can be found in volume 15 of Plutarch's *Moralia* in the *LCL*, edited and translated by Sandbach (1969).

[12] §42 Ὁμηρικῶν μελετῶν βιβλία δ′; §43 Εἰς Ἐμπεδοκλέα βιβλία ι′; §44 Περὶ τῆς πεμπτῆς οὐσίας βιβλία ε′; §45 Περὶ τῆς εἰς ἑκάτερον ἐπιχειρήσεως βιβλία ε′; §46 Μύθων βιβλία γ′; §47 Περὶ ῥητορικῆς βιβλία γ′; §48 Περὶ ψυχῆς εἰσαγωγῆς βιβλία γ′; §49 Περὶ αἰσθήσεων βιβλία γ′; §50 Ἐκλογὴ φιλοσόφων βιβλία β′; §51 Πόλεων εὐεργεσίαι βιβλία γ′; §52-53 Περὶ Θεοφράστου πρὸς τοὺς καιροὺς (52) πολιτικῶν βιβλία β′; §54 Περὶ παρειμένης ἱστορίας βιβλία δ′; §55 Παροιμιῶν βιβλία β′; §56 Τῶν Ἀριστοτέλους τοπικῶν βιβλία η′; §57 Σωσικλῆς βιβλία β′; §58 Περὶ εἱμαρμένης βιβλία β′; §59 Περὶ δικαιουσύνης πρὸς Χρύσιππον βιβλία γ′; and, §61 Περὶ τῶν ἀρεσκόντων φιλοσόφοις φυσικῆς ἐπιτομῆς βιβλία ε′.

books only one is extant: §61 Περὶ τῶν ἀρεσκόντων φιλοσόφοις φυσικῆς ἐπιτομῆς βιβλία ε'. Because the work is extant we know that it is not a work by Plutarch. Despite being widely attributed to Plutarch in antiquity[13] most scholars from the seventeenth century onward have agreed that the work cannot be genuine.[14] It is an abridgement or epitome of an earlier work which summarized the views of the philosophers on physical questions.[15] How this work came to be attributed to Plutarch is unclear. Ziegler's suggestion that it was found among Plutarch's papers and subsequently published under his name is attractive.[16] Mansfeld and Runia raise the possibility that it might have been made as a sort of ὑπόμνημα either for private use or in a school enviroment.[17] It is of interest to note that while the work was attributed to him, Plutarch in his extant works shows little interest in doxography. Where Plutarch does raise doxographical issues there is no evidence to suggest that he was drawing upon this particular work or others like it.[18] Certainly despite the inclusion of this work in the *Lamprias Catalogue* and its attribution by other ancient authors to Plutarch the evidence points to it being a spurious work. Nor is this the only work in this section of the catalogue whose authorship has been questioned. The inclusion of §56 Τῶν Ἀριστοτέλους τοπικῶν βιβλία η' has raised questions about the nature of the catalogue and its origins. The title and number of books indicate that item 56 refers to the eight books of Aristotle's *Topics*. If this is indeed the work referred to by the catalogue there can be no doubt that Plutarch was not its author.

---

[13] See note 10 above.
[14] See Ziegler (1951) 879; Lachenaud (1993) 15; Mansfeld and Runia (1997) 32-63.
[15] For a thorough discussion of the textual tradition of the work and examination of its contents, see Mansfeld and Runia (1997) 121-195.
[16] Ziegler (1951) 880.
[17] Mansfeld and Runia (1997) 123, 195.
[18] See Mansfled and Runia (1997) 123 n. 13.

Thus, there is good reason to believe that at least two of the eighteen works in this section of the *Lamprias Catalogue* were not written by Plutarch.

The question must be asked whether the Εἰς Ἐμπεδοκλέα might also be spurious. In the absence of a copy of the Εἰς Ἐμπεδοκλέα it is impossible to give a definite answer to that question, but the possibility must be entertained. Certainly there is no stronger evidence that would suggest that the Εἰς Ἐμπεδοκλέα is genuine than there was for the Περὶ τῶν ἀρεσκόντων φιλοσόφοις φυσικῆς ἐπιτομῆς. That is to say, both works are listed in the *Lamprias Catalogue* and both are attributed to Plutarch by other ancient authors, and there is little doubt that Plutarch did not write the Περὶ τῶν ἀρεσκόντων φιλοσόφοις φυσικῆς ἐπιτομῆς. The size of the Εἰς Ἐμπεδοκλέα also raises questions about its authorship. While Plutarch does show more interest in Empedocles than in other presocratic philosophers he does not show sufficient interest to justify a work on Empedocles in ten books. Indeed, Plutarch appears to show far less interest in Empedocles than in Homer and Plato. Yet if we are to accept that the Εἰς Ἐμπεδοκλέα is genuine then it would appear that Plutarch wrote as much on Empedocles as he did on Homer and Plato combined. While that is possible it seems doubtful, and as we saw earlier there is no reason to doubt that the Εἰς Ἐμπεδοκλέα consisted of ten books. Of course, we have very little idea what the contents of those ten books were. It is possible that both Homer, for stylistic reasons such as the use of dactylic hexameter, and Plato, for philosophical reasons, were central topics in the work. The possibility remains that the Εἰς Ἐμπεδοκλέα is a spurious work. However, if more can be said about the contents of the Εἰς Ἐμπεδοκλέα reason might be provided as to why the work should be ascribed to Plutarch.

As for clues about the content of the Εἰς Ἐμπεδοκλέα, works with similar titles in the *Lamprias Catalogue* might be of assistance. There is only one other title that begins with the preposition Εἰς. That is item 120, Εἰς τὰ Νικάνδρου Θηριακά, *On Nicander's Antidotes to a Snake Bite*. Unfortunately, this work too has been lost and we are left with only three small fragments. However, these fragments, taken with the six fragments from the Ὁμηρικῶν μελετῶν (§42 in 5 books) —the only other work in multiple books of which fragments survive—and the single fragment of the Εἰς Ἐμπεδεοκλέα preserved by Hippolytus, may provide some indication of what sort of information was contained therein.

There are three fragments from Plutarch's Εἰς τὰ Νικάνδρου Θηριακά. The first, preserved as a scholion to line 94 of the *Theriaca*, discusses varieties of parsnip. The scholion records that Plutarch said that there were several varieties of parsnip, not just the two observed by Nicander. Their common characteristic is that they are pungent and fiery, which has the practical application of stimulating the menstrual flow, treating colic, rarifying the body, and reducing the size of the organs found in the chest area. The second fragment is preserved by a scholion to line 333 of the *Theriaca* which says that "leprous eruptions spread a chalky rash."[19] The scholion records Plutarch as saying "that bitter almonds remove blotches from the face."[20] It is unclear what in the third reference

[19] λευκαὶ δ' ἀργινόεσσαν ἐπισσεύονται ἔφηλιν.
[20] Ὁ Πλούταρχος τὰς πικρὰς ἀμυγδάλας φησὶ τὰς τῶν προσώπων ἐξαιρεῖν ἐφήλιδας.

should actually be attributed to Plutarch's work.[21] The kind of material being discussed is all that matters for our purposes, however, and that is clear enough. There is discussion on Nicander's use of either Oropaean or Coropaean Apollo, with reference to geography and shrines devoted to the particular gods.

The preserved fragments of the Ὁμηρικῶν μελετῶν are similarly wide-ranging and eclectic in their topics. Fragment 122 quotes Plutarch as saying that Aristotle said that Pythagoreans did not eat certain pig organs, sea nettle, and other things of that sort but ate everything else. Fragment 123 contains a criticism of Epicurus by Plutarch, again with no reference to Homer. Fragment 124 is another criticism of Epicurus. Fragment 125 suggests that Plutarch discussed Chrysippus' tendency to use Homeric passages to support those doctrines that he favored. Fragment 126 talks about the practice of summoning spirits by Thessalian magicians and the Spartans' use of these magicians to deal with the appearance of the spirit of Pausanias. And finally, fragment 127 discusses the strength of trees grown in sheltered and shady places versus those exposed to a harsh, windy environment. This is preserved as a scholion to *Iliad* 15.624.

The single fragment from the Εἰς Ἐμπεδοκλέα is similar to the above fragments in its seeming to have little or nothing to do with the purported topic of the work. Fragment 24 tells us that in the Εἰς Ἐμπεδοκλέα Plutarch describes the many paintings

---

[21] Νίκανδρος ἐν Θηριακοῖς·
ἢ ἐν Ἀπόλλων
μαντείας Κοροπαῖος ἐθήκατο καὶ θέμιν ἀνδρῶν.

Οἱ δὲ ὑπομωνηματίσαντες αὐτὸν Θέων καὶ Πλούταρχος καὶ Δημήτριος ὁ Χλωρός φασι· Νίκανδρος "Ὀροπαῖος" καὶ "Κοροπαῖος Ἀπόλλων"· ἀγνοεῖ δ' ὅτι Ἀμφιαράου ἱερόν, οὐκ Ἀπόλλωνός ἐστι. λέγεται δὲ κατ' ἔλλειψιν τοῦ ι Κοροπαῖος· Κορόπη δὲ Θεσσαλίας πόλις. βέλτιον δέ ὑπονοεῖν ὅτι ἡμάρτηται. καὶ γράφεται Ὀροπαῖος· Ὀρόπη γὰρ πόλις Εὐβοίας, ὅπου Ἀπόλλωνος διασημότατον ἱερόν.

depicting scenes related to Orphism and the Eleusinian mysteries that were to be found in a particular colonnade in Phlius and discussed the ritual words inscribed in the same colonnade.[22] It is not surprising that Empedocles might be discussed in relation to mystery religions, given his own apparent mysticism and his reputed association with Pythagoras.[23] There is, however, no mention of Empedocles or his work. Perhaps then the Εἰς Ἐμπεδοκλέα was not a flowing literary work, but instead a collection of notes and observations arising from or inspired by passages in Empedocles. This suggests that perhaps the work was structured according to lemmata. Each section might have begun with a quotation of a short Empedoclean passage or phrase or perhaps simply a general theme to be discussed. Other Plutarchean and pseudo-Plutarchean works provide precedents for such a structure, particularly for large works. Perhaps most obvious is Plutarch's Συμποσιακὰ προβλήματα or *Table-Talk* which consists of nine books which are themselves each divided into ten questions, with the exception of book 9.[24] Likewise Plutarch's Πλατωνικὰ ζητήματα or *Platonic Questions,* while only one book in length, consists of ten questions. The pseudo-Plutarchean Περὶ τῶν ἀρεσκόντων φιλοσόφοις φυσικῆς ἐπιτομῆς is also organized according to lemmata,

---

[22] τετέλεσται δὲ ταῦτα καὶ παραδέδοται ἀνθρώποις πρὸ τῆς Κελεοῦ καὶ Τριπτολέμου καὶ Δήμητρος καὶ Κόρης καὶ Διονύσου ἐν Ἐλευσῖνι τελετῆς, ἐν Φλειοῦντι τῆς Ἀττικῆς· πρὸ γὰρ τῶν Ἐλευσινίων μυστηρίων ἐστὶν ἐν τῇ Φλειοῦντι ‹τὰ τῆς› λεγομένης Μεγάλης ὄργια. ἔστι δὲ παστὰς ἐν αὐτῇ, ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς παστάδος ἐγγέραπται μέχρι σήμερον ἡ πάντων τῶν εἰρημένων λόγων ἰδέα. πολλὰ μὲν οὖν ἐστι τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς παστάδος ἐκείνης ἐγγεγραμμένα, περὶ ὧν καὶ Πλούταρχος ποιεῖται λόγους ἐν ταῖς πρὸς Ἐμπεδοκλέα δέκα βίβλοις· ἔστι δὲ ‹ἐν› τοῖς πλείοσι καὶ πρεσβύτης τις ἐγγεγραμμένος πολιός, πτερωτός, ἐντεταμένην ἔχων τὴν αἰσχύνην, γυναῖκα ἀποφεύγουσαν διώκων κυνοειδῆ. ἐπιγέγραπται δὲ ἐπὶ τοῦ πρεσβύτου· Φάος ῥυέτης, ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς γυναικός· † περεη † Φικόλα (Hippolytus, *Ref.* 5.20.6-7).

[23] D. L. 8.54-56, 67-70.

[24] The ninth and final book contains fifteen questions rather than the usual ten, for which Plutarch apologizes (736C): ὁ δ' ἀριθμὸς ἂν ὑπερβάλλῃ τὴν συνήθη δεκάδα τῶν ζητημάτων, οὐ θαυμαστέον· ἔδει γὰρ πάντα ταῖς Μούσαις ἀποδοῦναι τὰ τῶν Μουσῶν καὶ μηδὲν ἀφελεῖν ὥσπερ ἀφ' ἱερῶν, πλείονα καὶ καλλίονα τούτων ὀφείλοντας αὐταῖς.

though it does not show any concern regarding the number of lemmata in any given book.[25] Organization according to lemmata is well suited to Plutarch's writing style as it provides a unifying structure for eclectic and wide-ranging discussions. While the single fragment from Εἰς Ἐμπεδοκλέα is scant evidence for anything it does suggest that the work was wide ranging in its discussions. A lemmata structure seems most probable for so large a work, though without better knowledge of the work's contents it is far from certain.

The most obvious place to begin with what may have been contained in Plutarch's Εἰς Ἐμπεδοκλέα is with the quotations and references that are to be found in Plutarch's extant works. As discussed in the previous chapter Plutarch's *Moralia* preserve more than seventy quotations and references from Empedocles, more than any other ancient source.[26] The nature of those quotations may reveal something about the focus of the Εἰς Ἐμπεδοκλέα. When one compares the quotations found in the Pseudo-Plutarchean Περὶ τῶν ἀρεσκόντων φιλοσόφοις φυσικῆς ἐπιτομῆς[27] to those found in Plutarch's *Moralia* one cannot help but be struck by the differences in their content. Not surprisingly the quotations found in Περὶ τῶν ἀρεσκόντων φιλοσόφοις φυσικῆς ἐπιτομῆς deal exclusively with Empedocles' physical tenets. What is surprising is that the quotations preserved by Plutarch pay scant attention to these physical tenets. Indeed, except in cases where Plutarch is responding to the use of Empedocles' work by other philosophical schools (*Mor.* 400B, 420D, 949C-D, etc.), it is fair to say that he treats

[25] For pseudo-Plutarch's treatment of the lemmata found in his source, see Mansfeld and Runia (1997) 182-194.
[26] See chapter 3, pages 48-50.
[27] See note10 above.

Empedocles more as a literary source, like Homer, Aeschylus or Euripides, than as a philosophical source like Plato, though he at times explicitly refers to Empedocles as a philosopher (515C). That is to say, he often quotes a single line or two from Empedocles to support the point that he or one of his speakers is making. In these cases there is no suggestion of the quotation's original context or meaning, and often it is quoted alongside quotations from other literary sources (*Mor.* 95A, 98D, 418C, 433B, etc.). The longest quotation (607C-D), which is followed by commentary, deals with *daimones* and the nature of the soul, and could be categorized as religious.[28]

In trying to categorize Plutarch's quotations from Empedocles it becomes clear that the quotations are eclectic in their nature and have no single focus. Indeed they seem to prove Whittaker's point that quotations preserved in ancient works reflect the personality and preferences of the author doing the quoting.[29] Attempting to reconstruct Empedocles' work from the quotations preserved by Plutarch produces a jumbled and unclear picture that quite possibly bears little resemblance to Empedocles' work. On the other hand examining the quotations as evidence for Plutarch's interests and the sort of works that he wrote would produce a fairly accurate picture of this ancient author who was interested in religion, philosophy, literature and eclectic learned knowledge.[30] This leads me to speculate that what made the Εἰς Ἐμπεδοκλέα a cohesive whole was not its contents but rather its structure. It seems most probable that the contents of the work were as eclectic and wide-ranging as the contexts in which Empedoclean quotations are found

[28] For Plutarch's interest in religion and *daimones*, see Vernière (1977) 249-267; Brenk (1977) 49-64, 85-183; (1986) 2117-2135; (1987) 250-349.
[29] Whittaker (1987) 95.
[30] Hershbell (1971) 180 has suggested four general categories for Plutarch's quotations from and comments on Empedocles. These are: (1) literary and non-philosophical; (2) physical and "scientific"; (3) polemical; and (4) "religious" and prescriptive.

in the *Moralia*. Indeed, individual lemmata undoubtedly varied in their focus according to what caught Plutarch's fancy, be it a point of religious interest, philosophical interest, or arcane knowledge, or a little of all of those things. And so we see again that Plutarch's interest in Empedocles tells us more about Plutarch than about the work of Empedocles. Plutarch's primary value as a witness to Empedocles lies in the quotations that he preserves.

However, detailed examination of just a few of Plutarch's Empedoclean quotations in the previous chapter revealed that Plutarch is not a reliable witness to the work of Empedocles. Where other sources have preserved Empedoclean quotations with which Plutarch's can be compared, we see that Plutarch's quotations are almost never entirely accurate. The alterations range from the substitution of a single word (1103F) to the reversal or omission of entire lines (618B; 927F; 607C-D). Plutarch's quotations from Empedocles are generally limited to a line (93B, 685F, 360C, etc.) or two (17E, 98D, 663A, etc.). Occasionally, however, he preserves longer quotations of up to five lines in length (607C-D). As we saw in the previous chapter, at times the same quotation may be used in different contexts but preserving a common error.[31] The size and nature of these quotations fits with my earlier conjecture that Plutarch's Εἰς Ἐμπεδοκλέα was organized according to lemmata. Certainly all of the quotations found in Plutarch's extant works could be categorized as short passages or phrases. Nevertheless, none of the Empedoclean quotations found in Plutarch's extant works have clearly been made second-hand, with the possible exception of DK 76.[32] As is the case of the Περὶ τῶν

[31] See chapter 3, pages 52-55.
[32] For discussion of Plutarch's citation of DK 76, see chapter 3, pages 52-57.

ἀρεσκόντων φιλοσόφοις φυσικῆς ἐπιτομῆς, while Plutarch may have had the Εἰς Ἐμπεδοκλέα in his library it appears to have left little trace in his extant writings. The most that can be suggested about the contents of the Εἰς Ἐμπεδοκλέα based on Plutarch's Empedoclean quotations is that it was likely to have been eclectic in content.

Hippolytus flourished at the beginning of the third century A.D. and is among the fathers of the early Christian church. While it is as a Church Father that he is usually of interest, he has not been neglected by those interested in early Greek philosophy because of the numerous quotations contained in his works.[33] Most recently Osborne has examined him as a source for Empedocles and Heraclitus.[34] My immediate interest is not in the quotations of Empedocles *per se* but rather in what those quotations might tell us about the contents of Plutarch's Εἰς Ἐμπεδοκλέα. The references to Empedocles that have often been linked to Plutarch in the past are 5.20.6 and the abundance of references in book 7. However, these are not the only references to Empedocles in Hippolytus' *Refutatio*,[35] and I do not believe they are the only passages relevant to Plutarch's Εἰς Ἐμπεδοκλέα. As we have seen, the first reference in book 5 is of obvious value as it gives us reason to believe that Hippolytus had first-hand knowledge of Plutarch's Εἰς Ἐμπεδοκλέα. Hippolytus rarely seems to refer to works that he clearly had read, given that large plagiarized passages from them appear in his own writings.[36] Thus the mention of the Εἰς Ἐμπεδοκλέα by author, title, and number of books is far more significant in

---

[33] Among those who have discussed Hippolytus as a source for early Greek philosophy are Diels (1898b) 125-130; Bidez (1896) 190-207, 298-309; Guthrie (1965) 144-145 and 259-261.
[34] Osborne (1987b).
[35] For a discussion of the other main passages in the *Refutatio* dealing with Empedocles and their possible sources, see Osborne (1987b) 87-131.
[36] For a chart of Hippolytus' apparent sources —most of whom he never names— see Marcovich (1986) 18-31.

Hippolytus than it might be in other ancient authors, such as Diogenes Laertius who frequently referred to works that he had not read.[37] The references in book 7 are of similar interest because of the abundance of quotations and the context which surrounds them. As noted earlier, some of the quotations in book 7 overlap with quotations found in the extant works of Plutarch, for which reason Plutarch's Εἰς Ἐμπεδοκλέα has been mooted as a possible source.

In *Refutatio* 7.29-31 Hippolytus is concerned with refuting the heresy of Marcion.[38] While it is possible that Hippolytus' account of Empedocles' philosophy was derived from first-hand knowledge of Empedocles, this is unlikely. The reasons for this are twofold. First, the link between Marcion's heresy and Empedocles' philosophy is tenuous at best. It appears that the driving force behind the comparison was not an association made from familiarity with the work of Empedocles but rather a desire to defend the orthodoxy and the Church from the Gnostic heresy of Marcion.[39] Hippolytus apparently thought that the Gnostic schools of thought could be best discredited by painting them "as mere plagiarists of Greek philosophers."[40] This is the technique that he uses throughout his *Refutatio*.[41] The second reason for suspecting that Hippolytus is not quoting first-hand from Empedocles is related to the first. In his desire to paint some Gnostic sects as plagiarists of Greek philosophy Hippolytus himself plagiarized.[42]

---

[37] On Diogenes Laertius and his sources, see Mejer (1978) 7-16.
[38] For the pairing of Empedocles and Marcion, see Osborne (1987b) 98-100. For reasons why Hippolytus may have made the association between Empedocles and Marcion, and for Gnostic exegeses, see Marcovich (1986) 37-38.
[39] Marcovich (1986) 40-1 suggests that Hippolytus' principal objective in this work was "to refute the contemporary Trinitarian modalists Cleomenes, Sabellius and, above all, Callistus."
[40] Marcovich (1986) 36.
[41] On the structure of the *Ref.*, see Marcovich (1986) 32-41.
[42] It is possible that there is little first-hand material in Hippolytus' work and that his contribution has been to arrange material at second-hand into parallel lives so as to expose heresies. See Marcovich (1986) 48-49.

Marcovich has said that "Hippolytus' passion for plagiarizing his sources is a blessing for us, since we can be reasonably sure that he is, as a rule, faithfully copying his sources."[43] In his *Refutatio* he copied entire chapters verbatim from Sextus Empiricus, in addition to copying extensively from Flavius Josephus and Irenaeus —though he does give Irenaeus minor credit at 6.42.1 and 6.55.2.[44] If it is possible to identify extensive plagiarized passages from extant works there is good reason to suspect that many more passages in the *Refutatio* are plagiarized from works now lost. While it is impossible to prove that Plutarch's Εἰς Ἐμπεδοκλέα should be on the list of works that were plagiarized, given the reference to the work at 5.20.6 and Hippolytus' extensive use of Empedocles in book 7, the likelihood seems strong.

Without a copy of the Εἰς Ἐμπεδοκλέα it is impossible to determine to what extent Hippolytus used it as his source for his Empedoclean material, if at all. Nevertheless, the evidence favours the possibility that Hippolytus' material is second-hand, whether or not the intermediate source is the Εἰς Ἐμπεδοκλέα. And the limited evidence for Hippolytus' source leans towards the Εἰς Ἐμπεδοκλέα. Given Hippolytus' penchant for citing large passages verbatim it is plausible that not only the quotations of Empedocles were taken from the Εἰς Ἐμπεδοκλέα but also the surrounding commentary. Marcovich has suggested that Hippolytus' source for Empedocles in his refutation of Marcion 7.29.8-12 and the comparison of Pythagoras' cosmogony to that of

---

[43] Marcovich (1986) 50.

[44] Marcovich ([1986] 36) refers to Hippolytus' apparent research and encyclopaedic education as a "paper-tiger" which demonstrably derives not from his own erudition but his "unscrupulous and reckless" plagiarizing. That the only author that Hippolytus gives any credit to is Irenaeus is itself noteworthy as Hippolytus was a pupil of Irenaeus; see Roberts and Donaldson (1978) 4. This provides an obvious explanation as to why Hippolytus would plagiarize from numerous sources but only acknowledge one of those sources. The practice of citing one's supervisor is a timeless feature of scholarship, see note 3 above.

Empedocles at 6.25.1-4, which appear to be the same passage drawn from the same work, was an anonymous Gnostic writer.[45] Other classical scholars, on the other hand, have long been suspicious that the Εἰς Ἐμπεδοκλέα was Hippolytus' source of information about Empedocles.[46] However, in Hippolytus' refutation of Marcion at *Refutatio* 7.291-26, which is the most extended passage dealing specifically with Empedocles in the work, there is little evidence that can be used to make a strong argument for Plutarch being his source. That is not the case, however, with the context in which 6.25.1-4 appears. The Empedoclean quotation DK 16 is here cited in a context that seems to heavily reflect Plutarch's interests. Plato's *Timaeus* is associated with Pythagoras (6.21.1-22.2); Pythagoras' system of numbers is discussed (6.23.1-5) as is his duality of substances and his categories (6.24.1-7); Pythagoras' cosmogony is compared to that of Empedocles (6.25.1-4); a list of Pythagorean expressions are given (6.27.1-5); and Pythagoras' astronomic system is also discussed (6.28.1-4). With the exception of the comparison of Pythagoras' cosmogony to that of Empedocles and the list of Pythagorean expressions, all of the above topics are discussed in Plutarch's Περὶ τῆς ἐν Τιμαίῳ ψυχογονίας. The introduction to this work makes it clear that this is not the only time or place where Plutarch has discussed these topics.[47] That is not to say that Plutarch is not interested in the other topics. While nowhere in his extant works does Plutarch compare Pythagoras' cosmogony with that of Empedocles, he does provide a list of Pythagorean

---

[45] See Marcovich (1986) 23, 25, 37.
[46] See Diels (1898b) 399; O'Brien (1969) 32-33, 210 n. 3; Bollack (1965-69) vol. 3.1, 154; Osborne (1987b) 92-94.
[47] Ἔπει τὰ πολλάκις εἰρημένα καὶ γεγραμμένα σποράδην ἐν ἑτέροις ἕτερα τὴν Πλάτωνος ἐξηγουμένοις δόξαν ἣν εἶχεν ὑπὲρ ψυχῆς, ὡς ὑπενοοῦμεν ἡμεῖς, οἴεσθε δεῖν εἰς ἕν συναχθῆναι καὶ τυχεῖν ἰδίας ἀναγραφῆς τὸν λόγον τοῦτον (*Mor.*1012B).

expressions at *Mor.* 12D-F, though only two overlap with the list in Hippolytus.[48] Another brief list of Pythagorean expressions is found at 727C in Plutarch's Συμποσιακῶν προβλημάτων though none overlap with the list provided by Hippolytus.[49] Pythagorean expressions are discussed again at *Mor.* 281A and one of the two expressions mentioned overlaps with the list in Hippolytus.[50] The same expression also appears at *Mor.* 12 E and 354E and in Plutarch's *Life of Numa* 14.3.[51] Again at *Mor.* 290E and 727C Plutarch discusses an expression found in Hippolytus' list.[52] Other overlapping expressions are discussed at *Mor.* 354E, 290E, and 453E.[53] Plutarch cites expressions found in Hippolytus' list twelve times in six works (*Mor.* 281A, 12E, 354E, *Numa* 14.3, fr. 93, *Mor.* 290E, 727C, fr. 93, 354E, 290E, 453E, and 12F). Diogenes Laertius cites overlapping references seven times, all in his *Life of Pythagoras* (8.17, 8.17 and 18, 8.17 and 18, 8.17 and 34). The number of references to Pythagorean expressions leaves little doubt that Plutarch was profoundly interested in them.

Plutarch himself tells us that in his youth he was infatuated with mathematics

---

[48] "κυάμους μὴ ἔσθιε"· ἀρχὴν πόλεως μὴ ἀποδέχου κυάμοις γὰρ ἐκληροῦντο τὰς ἀρχὰς κατ' ἐκεῖνον τὸν χρόνον (*Refutatio* 6.27.5). "Κυάμων ἀπέχεσθαι"· ὅτι οὐ δεῖ πολιτεύεσθαι· κυαμευταὶ γὰρ ἦσαν ἔμπροσθεν αἱ ψηφοφορίαι δι' ὧν πέρας ἐπετίθεσαν ταῖς ἀρχαῖς (*Mor.* 12F).

[49] While Plutarch twice quotes (*Mor.* 727C and 728B) a Pythagorean expression which refers to bedclothes it is a different expression than the one Hippolytus quotes about bedclothes.

[50] οἱ Πυθαγορικοὶ μικρὰ μεγάλων ἐποιοῦντο σύμβολα κωλύοντες "ἐπὶ χοίνικος καθῆσθαι" καὶ "πῦρ μαχαίρᾳ μὴ σκαλεύειν" (*Mor.* 281A). "Πῦρ μαχαίρῃ μὶ σκάλευε" (*Ref.* 6.27.3).

[51] The expression also appears in a scholion to Hes. *Op.* 744-5. The author is not mentioned but Wyttenbach and Westerwick have attributed the fragment to Plutarch's commentary on the *Works and Days* because of the interest in Pythagorean expressions. See Sandbach (1969) 199.

[52] "Πῦρ σιδήρῳ μὴ σκαλεύειν " (*Mor.* 12E); "μηδὲ πῦρ μαχαίρᾳ σκαλεύειν ἐν οἰκίᾳ" (*Mor.* 354E); "μαχαίρᾳ πῦρ μὴ σκαλεύειν"(*Numa* 14.3). See also note 50 above.

[53] "σάρον μὴ ὑπέρβαινε" (*Ref.* 6.27.4). "μηδὲ σάρον ὑπερβαίνειν" (*Mor.* 290E); "μηδὲ σάρον ὑπερβαίνειν" (*Mor.* 727C).

(ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ τηνικαῦτα προσεκείμην τοῖς μαθήμασιν ἐμπαθῶς 387F).[54] His interest in mathematics can be seen in many of his extant works, the contents of which at times overlap with the material found in Hippolytus. At *Mor.* 388A-E, after acknowledging his infatuation with mathematics, Plutarch discusses the classification of numbers and the Pythagorean association of numbers with gender. Similar material is discussed at *Refutatio* 6.23.2-3. Two of Plutarch's ten Πλατωνικὰ ζητήματα (questions 3 and 5) discuss numbers and the divisible nature of the world. These show interest in the topics discussed in *Refutatio* 6.24.1-7. In the Πλατωνικὰ ζητήματα, however, Plutarch is discussing the systems of Plato rather than Pythagoras, though Plato's theories were profoundly influenced by Pythagoras.[55] Plutarch's interests can be seen to overlap clearly with the material in *Refuatio* 6.23.1-24.7 in his Περὶ τῆς ἐν Τιμαίῳ ψυχογονίας.[56] Again Plutarch's principal interest is in Platonic theories, but the material in *Mor.*1017D –1030C shows a definite interest in the sort of material found in *Refuatio* 6.23.1-24.7. The reference to Pythagoras' teacher Zaratas at *Ref.* 6.23.2 even shares similar language with another reference to Zaratas at Περὶ τῆς ἐν Τιμαίῳ ψυχογονίας 1012E.[57]

---

[54] Ziegler (1951) 942, suggested that as Plutarch aged he became "mehr und mehr einer mystischen Religiosität zuneigend." While there can be no argument that Plutarch's role as a Delphic priest became a central part of his later life, his own words suggest that he had a burning interest in mystery cults in his youth which was tempered with age. Hardie (1992) 4781 notes that the influence of Pythagoreanism on Plutarch is pervasive and that in Plutarch's time Platonism and Neopythagoreanism often coincided. On the influence of Neopythagoreanism on Plutarch's teacher Ammonius, see Whittaker (1969) 185-192. For Plutarch's interest in Pythagoreanism and philosophical mysticism, especially in his youth, see Brenk (1986) 2118; (1987) 256-257; (1997) 57-79.

[55] For a general overview of Pythagoreanism in Plato, see Burkert (1972) 83-96.

[56] For an outline and summary of the contents of Περὶ τῆς ἐν Τιμαίῳ ψυχογονίας, see Hershbell (1987) 234-247.

[57] καὶ ⟨γὰρ⟩ Ζαράτας ὁ Πυθαγόρου διδάσκαλος ἐκάλει τὸ μὲν ἓν πατέρα, τὰ δὲ δύο μητέρα (*Ref.* 6.23.2). καὶ Ζαράτας ὁ Πυθαγόρου διδάσκαλος ταύτην μὲν ἐκάλει τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ μητέρα τὸ δὲ ἓν πατέρα (*Mor.* 1012E). Zaratas is another form of the name Zoroaster. In book 1 (1.2.1-3.3) of his *Ref.* Hippolytus presents Zaratas as the teacher of Pythagoras, and Pythagoras, in turn, as the teacher of Empedocles.

However, it is not difficult to believe that someone as interested in Plato's theories as Plutarch was would make a study of the Pythagorean theories from which they were derived or by which they had been inspired.[58] It is striking that Hippolytus introduces this section (*Ref.* 6. 21.1-22.1) by explicitly associating Pythagorean and Platonic theory, with specific mention of the *Timaeus*.

> Ἔστι μὲν οὖν ἡ Οὐαλεντίνου αἵρεσις Πυθαγορικὴν ἔχουσα καὶ Πλατωνικὴν τὴν ὑπόθεσιν. καὶ γὰρ ὁ Πλάτων ὅλως ἐν τῷ Τιμαίῳ τὸν Πυθαγόραν ἀπεμάξατο τοιγαροῦν καὶ ὁ Τίμαιος αὐτός ἐστιν αὐτῷ Πυθαγόρειος ξένος. διὸ δοκεῖ ὀλίγα τῆς Πυθαγορείου καὶ Πλατωνικῆς ὑπομνησθέντας ὑποθέσεως ἄρξασθαι καὶ Οὐαλεντίνου λέγειν.

In the discussion that follows, however, there is no discussion of Plato or the *Timaeus*. It would appear that Hippolytus has here borrowed his information from a text that discussed the Pythagorean elements in the *Timaeus*, but has omitted any of the discussion of Plato and the *Timaeus*.[59] While it is possible that Hippolytus' source for this material was an anonymous Gnostic writer, Plutarch seems a far more probable source given the interests displayed.

As mentioned above *Refutatio* 6.25.1-4 and 7.29.8-12 appear to use the same source passage in two different contexts. I will provide the Empedoclean quotation and the lines immediately surrounding it, as there the parallels are most striking. Here is *Refutatio* 6.25.1-2:

> οὕτω φησὶ καὶ τὸν κόσμον ἀριθμητικῷ τινι καὶ μουσικῷ δεσμῷ δεδεμένον ἐπιτάσει καὶ ἀνέσει, καὶ προσθήκῃ καὶ ἀφαιρέσει ἀεὶ καὶ διὰ παντὸς ἀδιάφθορρν φυλαχθῆναι. τοιγαροῦν καὶ περὶ τῆς

[58] On the role of Neopythagoreanism in Middle Platonism, see Whittaker (1987) 17-123.
[59] It is worth noting that in his extant works Plutarch makes reference to the *Timaeus* more frequently than any other Platonic dialogue; see Helmbold and O'Neil (1959) 62-63.

διαμονῆς τοῦ κόσμου ἀποφαίνονται τοιοῦτόν τινα τρόπον οἱ Πυθαγορικοί.

ἦ γὰρ καὶ πάρος ἦν, καί ‹γ'› ἔσ‹σε›ται, οὐδέ ποτ', οἵω,
τούτων ἀμφοτέρων κεν‹ε›ώσεται ἄσπετος αἰών.

τίνων δὲ τούτων; τοῦ νείκους καὶ τῆς φιλίας. ἀπεργάζεται δὲ αὐτοῖς ἡ φιλία ἄφθαρτον ‹καὶ› ἀίδιον τὸν κόσμον, ὡς ὑπονοοῦσιν — ἔστι γὰρ ἡ οὐσία καὶ ὁ κόσμος ἕν,τὸ δὲ νεῖκος διασπᾷ καὶ πολλὰ πειρᾶται καταδιαιροῦν τὸν κόσμον ποιεῖν.

Here is *Refutatio* 7.29.10:

περὶ ὧν ὁ Ἐμπεδοκλῆς ‹φησιν› ὅτι ἐστὶν ἀθάνατα ‹τὰ› δύο καὶ ἀγέντα καὶ ἀρχὴν τοῦ γενέσθαι μηδέποτε εἰληφότα· ἀλλὰ ‹δὴ› λέγει τοιοῦτόν τινα τρόπον·

ἦ γὰρ καὶ πάρος ἦν, καί ‹γ'› ἔσ‹σε›ται, οὐδέ ποτ', οἵω,
τούτων ἀμφοτέρων κεν‹ε›ώσεται ἄσπετος αἰών.

τίνων ‹δὲ› τούτων; τοῦ νείκους καὶ τῆς φιλίας· οὐ γὰρ ἤρξα‹ν›το γενέσθαι, ἀλλὰ προῆσαν καὶ ἔσονται ἀεί, διὰ τὴν ἀγεννησίαν φθορὰν ὑπομεῖναι μὴ δυνάμενα.

If these passages are derived from the same source, and they clearly appear to be, how do the contexts in which they appear relate to each other? And if their source is a work by Plutarch, specifically the Εἰς Ἐμπεδοκλέα, how do they relate to the fragment from the Εἰς Ἐμπεδοκλέα preserved by Hippolytus at *Refutatio* 5.20.6? At first one section appears to be an outline of Pythagorean beliefs and the other an outline of Empedocles' tenets, yet both passages are concerned with the soul and the generation of the world. Such themes make it clear how these passages could be discussed in the same context as Plato's *Timaeus*, as these are the themes discussed in Περὶ τῆς ἐν Τιμαίῳ ψυχογονίας. How these passages would have fit together in their original is unclear. *Refutatio* 6.25.1-4 and 7.29.8-12 appear to have been drawn from the same source. At 6.25.1 the quotation is attributed to the Pythgoreans, but at 7.29.10 it is attributed specifically to Empedocles. Despite the fact that Empedocles is not named the context

surrounding the quotation at 6.25.1 is very Empedoclean in its nature. The repeated use of νεῖκος (5 times), φιλία (4 times), and κόσμος (9 times) in a twenty-one line passage is markedly Empedoclean.[60] It is possible that Hippolytus has turned a discussion of Empedocles' cosmogony and, perhaps, its relation to Pythagorean cosmogony into a straightforward discussion of Pythagorean cosmogony. Certainly it is possible that these sections preserved in separate books of Hippolytus were once part of a larger whole in a work upon which Hipploytus drew.

At 5.20.6 Hippolytus writes:

> τετέλεσται δὲ ταῦτα καὶ παραδέδοται ἀνθρώποις πρὸ τῆς Κελεοῦ καὶ Τριπτολέμου καὶ Δήμητρος καὶ Κόρης καὶ Διονύσου ἐν Ἐλευσῖνι τελετῆς, ἐν Φλειοῦντι τῆς Ἀττικῆς· πρὸ γὰρ τῶν Ἐλευσινίων μυστηρίων ἐστὶν ἐν τῇ Φλειοῦντι τὰ τῆς λεγομένης Μεγάλης ὄργια. ἔστι δὲ παστὰς ἐν αὐτῇ, ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς παστάδος ἐγγέγραπται μέχρι σήμερον ἡ τὰ τῶν πάντων τῶν εἰρημένων λόγων ἰδέα. πολλὰ μὲν οὖν ἐστι τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς παστάδος ἐκείνης ἐγγεγραμμένα περὶ ὧν καὶ Πλούταρχος ποιεῖται λόγους ἐν ταῖς πρὸς Ἐμπεδοκλέα δέκα βίβλοις ἔστι δὲ ‹ἐν› τοῖς πλείοσι‹ν ἄλλοις› καὶ πρεσβύτης τις ἐγγεγραμμένος πολιός, πτερωτός, ἐντεταμένην ἔχων τὴν αἰσχύνην, γυναῖκα ἀποφεύγουσαν διώκων κυνοειδῆ. ἐπιγέγραπται δὲ ἐπὶ τοῦ πρεσβύτου· Φάος ῥυέτης, ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς γυναικὸς· †περεη† Φικόλα.

Here Hippolytus seems to be saying that in the Εἰς Ἐμπεδοκλέα Plutarch discussed a representation of the ritual words from a mystery religion in Phlius. How might these discussions relate to the passages on Pythagoras and Empedocles? Certainly there is nothing controversial in saying that both Pythagoras and Empedocles were closely associated with religious mysticism and

[60] For a detailed discussion of Empedocles' cosmic cycle driven by *Strife* and *Love*, see O'Brien (1969).

initiatory cults. It is possible to see how the rites of mystery religions might be discussed in the same work as Pythagoras and Empedocles, though likely in different sections of that work. It remains unclear, however, why Empedocles' poem would be the central figure in the work, as is implied by the title Εἰς Ἐμπεδοκλέα.[61] However that may be, on the basis of the limited information provided by these three passages from the *Refutatio* a picture begins to emerge of the Εἰς Ἐμπεδοκλέα as a work devoted at least in part to discussing theological matters such as the generation of the cosmos, the nature and fate of the soul, and mystery religions, which presumably addressed the nature and fate of the soul. It would appear that Pythagoras, Plato, and Empedocles figured largely in these discussions, as perhaps did mystery religions. Without a copy of the Εἰς Ἐμπεδοκλέα it is impossible to say how much material Hippolytus borrowed from Plutarch, though it is possible that there is far more material in the *Refutatio* from the Εἰς Ἐμπεδοκλέα than has been suspected.

4.2 Summary

As will have become clear from the above discussion, there is very little that can be said with certainty about the Εἰς Ἐμπεδοκλέα. A work in ten books existed in

[61] According to Alcidamas (*apud* D. L. 8.56) and Timaeus (*FGrHist* 566F14 = D. L. 8.54) Empedocles was Pythagoras' student. While this could be the unifying link, Plutarch never mentions this tradition in his extant works. On Pythagoras' historical background, see Burkert (1972) 109-120. Kahn (1960) 28-35 has suggested that Empedocles broke the Pythagorean vow of secrecy and published the ἱερὸς λόγος, or secrect doctrine of Pythagoras, in his Καθαρμοί. While this would provide a certain link between Pythagoras and Empedocles it is only speculation. Perhaps more significant is the 404-line speech in book 15 of Ovid's *Met.* which is put into the mouth of Pythagoras despite clearly being Empedoclean in nature; see Hardie (1995) 204-214. Ovid provides evidence for Empedocles and Pythagoras being closely associated, though the implications of that association for Plutarch's Εἰς Ἐμπεδοκλέα are unclear.

antiquity entitled Εἰς Ἐμπεδοκλέα which was ascribed to Plutarch. Plutarch himself in his extant works provides little insight into what may have been contained in this work. While Plutarch quotes Empedocles frequently these quotations are generally only a line or two in length. Plutarch's Empedoclean quotations show no unifying theme, and they show little interest in Empedocles' physical tenets or his biography, and they tell us little about Empedocles' work. What Plutarch's Empedoclean quotations and the fragments of his works in multiple books suggest is that the work was wide-ranging and moved from topic to topic. Hippolytus provides us with the only explicit information about the contents of the Εἰς Ἐμπεδοκλέα: Plutarch discussed the words inscribed in a portico in Phlius which were spoken during religious rituals, as well as the paintings illustrating the words. There is more material in the *Refutatio* which may derive from the Εἰς Ἐμπεδοκλέα, but exactly what material and what its original context may have been is uncertain. What little evidence survives provides no explanation for why the work was named after Empedocles. If we had more of Empedocles' work or of the Εἰς Ἐμπεδοκλέα it might be possible to gain a better understanding of the nature of the Εἰς Ἐμπεδοκλέα. It is relatively certain, however, that the Εἰς Ἐμπεδοκλέα was lost within a hundred years of its composition. The only reference that we have to it, aside from its inclusion in the *Lamprias Catalogue,* is the single reference at Hippolytus 5.20.6. Its relatively swift disappearance is not particularly surprising. One would have to be very interested in Empedocles to pay to have a ten-book commentary copied. Indeed, Plutarch is the only author that we know of who was writing in the mid-first to early-second centuries A.D. and wrote a work in multiple books on Empedocles. Most writers of this period who make mention of Empedocles do so in reference to his supposed fiery

death in Mount Etna, a topic Plutarch never mentions in the *Moralia*. Like everything else about the Εἰς Ἐμπεδοκλέα it is unclear why the work appears to have been lost so quickly. One suspects, however, on the evidence of the fragments that survive from Plutarch's other works in multiple books, that if any manuscripts of Empedocles' work had come down to us intact they might very well have provided us with a great number of fragments of the Εἰς Ἐμπεδοκλέα preserved as scholia. Alas for both Empedoclean and Plutarchean scholars that is not the case.

Chapter Five

Summary and Conclusions

The purpose of this study has been two-fold: (1) to assess Plutarch's value as a witness to Empedocles' work; and (2) to discuss whether it is possible to recreate Empedocles' Εἰς Ἐμπεδοκλέα. Here I will address each of these topics in turn.

Plutarch has long been regarded as a valuable witness to Empedocles' work. The standard opinion has been that Plutarch "is generally reliable in reproducing his quotations from Empedocles."[1] This thesis, however, has raised some serious questions as to how valuable a witness Plutarch is for Empedocles. Comparison between Plutarch's quotations of Plato and his Empedoclean quotations showed a vast difference in how the quotations were treated. When Plutarch cites the works of Plato he takes great care to be loyal to Plato's philosophy. When Plutarch is using Plato's exact words or words that closely resemble Plato's he is very careful to be faithful to Plato's philosophical meaning, at least as he understands it.[2] When Plutarch strays from using Plato's philosophy as it was presented in Plato's dialogues, he also avoids using words that closely resemble Plato's words and prefers to paraphrase. Plutarch also provides sufficient information in the context surrounding the quotation for the reader to identify the quotation's original context and thus its original meaning.[3] Whether the quotation is long (*Tht.* 151c5-d3) or short (*Lg.* 731e11 and *Phdr.* 246d6-8), Plutarch strives to be loyal to Plato's original meaning. Plato's words may be altered so as to fit more smoothly into Plutarch's context, but any changes are not substantial. No lines have been omitted nor have words been

---

[1] Hershbell (1971) 165.
[2] See chapter 2, pages 25-31.
[3] See chapter 2, pages 33-35.

substituted so as to change the meaning of any given line. Plutarch is loyal to Plato's philosophy and the care taken in his quotations of Plato clearly demonstrates that loyalty.

Plutarch's philosophical loyalties appear not to extend to Empedocles. Plutarch feels free to change the meaning of Empedocles' lines (*Mor.* 1103 and DK 25).[4] One suspects that the point of the alteration is for the reader to recognize that Plutarch has altered the line, and thus to recognize Plutarch's literary cleverness. However, Plutarch's willingness to alter the text of Empedocles goes far beyond changing a single word. Plutarch also at times omits entire lines from his Empedoclean quotations (*Mor.* 607C), but provides no indication of having altered the text in any way.[5] Indeed, wherever we have a source with which we can cross-reference Plutarch's Empedoclean quotations discrepancies appear, and more often than not it appears to be Plutarch who is not being entirely faithful to Empedocles' original words. That is not to suggest, however, that Plutarch is sloppy in his citation of Empedocles. Works such as Πρὸς Κωλώτην ὑπὲρ τῶν ἄλλων φιλοσόφων (1107D-1127F) suggest Plutarch can be exact in his citations of Empedocles when it suits his purpose. So rather than assuming carelessness on Plutarch's part, we should first ask whether there are any apparent reasons for why he would alter the quotations. As discussed in chapter two, it would appear that lines are omitted so as to limit the size of passages being cited. Plutarch preserves the gist of the passage quoted (DK 76 and DK 115) and the line or lines central to the point he is making, but he feels free to omit lines he deems to be superfluous to his purpose. It is not that Plutarch is attempting to misrepresent Empedocles' work. Rather, Plutarch is not as

[4] See chapter 3, pages 66-68.
[5] See chapter 3, pages 57-64.

concerned about representing Empedocles' work accurately in the way that he is deeply concerned about representing Plato's philosophy accurately.

When Plutarch's treatment of Plato is compared with his treatment of Empedocles it becomes apparent that rather than treating Empedocles as a philosophical source Plutarch is treating him as he treats other literary sources. As so often is the case with Plutarch's literary quotation, Empedocles' work is often cited in contexts which seem to have nothing to do with the original context of the quotation. Empedoclean quotations are trotted out alongside quotations from Homer and Euripides and provide evidence for the broad range of ancient works that Plutarch was familiar with. Often, however, these quotations provide little in the way of evidence concerning the nature of Empedocles' work, aside from preserving the quotation itself.

How Plutarch is using these Empedoclean quotations must be kept in mind when attempting to use them to reconstruct Empedocles' work. While Plutarch appears to be an extremely valuable source for Empedocles, he is not as valuable a witness as one might hope. As this study has shown, Plutarch often alters his Empedoclean quotations. These alterations should not be considered the result of forgetfulness or carelessness. They are clearly a result of Plutarch's habits of quotation. It is clear that Plutarch cared a great deal about making his works conform to certain numerical guidelines. We saw that in Πλατωνικὰ ζητήματα and Συμποσιακὰ προβλήματα Plutarch showed a tendency to group separate questions within a single work into sets of ten. When the number of questions exceeds that number Plutarch apologizes (736C), though the number of questions is still a multiple of five — fifteen. He shows a similar preoccupation with the number of lines in any quotation within a given work. While the maximum number of

lines allowed may vary slightly from work to work, it is generally consistent within any given work. Where Plutarch has clearly omitted lines in an Empedoclean quotation we should assume that he has done so for his own literary purposes. Unless we have evidence from an alternate source, we should not assume that a quotation of two lines or more necessarily reflects the lines as they were written by Empedocles. It is distinctly possible that lines have been omitted, and the remaining lines may not be in their original order. Even single lines or partial lines are susceptible to major alterations. The danger for those trying to reconstruct Empedocles' work from them lies in the fact that without a text to compare these quotations to we are unlikely to recognize alterations. Indeed, because Plutarch was intimately familiar with Empedocles' work he was able to use Empedoclean quotations in subtly nuanced ways. Because of the absence of a complete copy of Empedocles' work it is difficult to perceive subtle nuances in Plutarch's habits of quotation in regard to Empedocles. Plutarch is a valuable witness to the work of Empedocles, but his Empedoclean quotations should never be taken at face value, as there may be far more (and sometimes less) to them than meets the eye.

Plutarch's Empedoclean quotations provide little assistance in our attempt to reconstruct the Εἰς Ἐμπεδοκλέα. The *Lamprias Catalogue* and the reference at *Refutatio* 5.20.6 leave little doubt that such a work in ten books existed in antiquity and was ascribed to Plutarch. Hippolytus at *Refutatio* 5.20.6 provides us with our only certain information about the contents: Plutarch discussed the words inscribed and the paintings on a portico in Phlius which dealt with mystery religions. There are other passages in the *Refutatio* which give reason to suspect that they may have been derived from Plutarch's work. *Refutatio* 7.29.1-30.6 has long been suspected of deriving from the Εἰς

Ἐμπεδοκλέα. The reason for this suspicion has simply been that Hippolytus refers to the work at 5.20.6 and the passage in book 7 deals with Empedocles. There is, however, stronger evidence than that. *Refutatio* 6.25.1-4 and 7.29.8-12 appear to have been derived from the same source. Indeed, in some places their wording is identical. The frequent use of Empedoclean terms, in a passage on Pythagoras, points to an Empedoclean source for 6.25.1-4.[6] While the passage in book 7 and its surrounding context provide little evidence that Plutarch was its original author, the passage in book 6 and its surrounding context provide numerous reasons to sugest that Plutarch was its original author. The discussion —which is implied at *Refutatio* 6.21.1-22.2—of Plato's *Timaeus* and its relationship to Pythagorean number theories and cosmogony, as well as Pythagorean expressions clearly overlaps with Plutarch's interests as seen in the Περὶ τῆς ἐν Τιμαίῳ ψυχογονίας. This material, which provides numerous reasons to suspect Plutarch as being its source, taken with the Empedoclean passages in book 7 (which based on their shared passage, appear to have been derived from the same source) and the reference to the Εἰς Ἐμπεδοκλέα at 5.20.6 suggests that there is good reason to believe that material from the Εἰς Ἐμπεδοκλέα remains lurking in the *Refutatio*. What can be pointed to as being Plutarchean is, however, very sketchy and leaves the vast part of the contents of the work's ten books unaccounted for. Nor does it point to a reason why Empedocles' work would be the central focus of the work, as the title suggests. The certainty that such a work existed and the evidence that suggests that Plutarch was indeed its author means that while we may not be able to take Plutarch's Empedoclean quotations at face value,

[6] See chapter 4, pages 92-94.

we also cannot diminish Plutarch's standing as an important witness to the work of Empedocles. Plutarch was far more familiar with the work than we are ever likely to be.

Bibliography

Algra, Horstand and Runia = Algra, K. A., P. W. van der Horst and D. T. Runia, eds. *Polyhistor: Studies in the History and Historiography of Ancient Philosophy.* Leiden: 1996.

Barnes (1982) = Barnes, J. *The Presocratic Philosophers.* Revised Edition. London:1982.

Barnes (1988) = Barnes, J. "The Presocratics in context." *Phronesis* 33 (1988) 327-344.

Barnes and Griffin = Barnes, J. and M. Griffin, eds. *Philsophia Togata II: Plato and Aristotle at Rome.* Oxford: 1996.

Bastianini and Sedley = Bastianini, G. and D. Sedley. *Commentarium in Platonis "Theaetetum"*, in: *Corpus dei papiri filosofici greci e latini. Testo e lessico nei papiri di cultura greca e latina*, Parte III: *Commentari*. Firenze: 1995.

Bercovitch = Bercovitch, S. "Empedocles in the English Renaissance." *Studies in Philology* 65 (1968) 67-80.

Betz = Betz, H. D., ed. *Plutarch's Theological Writings and Early Christian Literature.* Leiden: 1975.

Bidez = Bidez, J. "Observations sur quelques fragments d'Empédocle et de Parménide." *AGP* 9 (1896) 190-197.

Bing = Bing, P. "The Voices of Those Who Live in the Sea: Empedocles and Callimachus." *ZPE* 41 (1981) 33-36.

Bollack = Bollack, J. *Empédocle*, 4 vols. Paris: 1965-69.

Braund and Wilkins = Braund, D. and J. Wilkins, eds. *Athenaeus and His World. Reading Greek Culture in the Roman Empire.* Exeter: 2000.

Brenk (1977) = Brenk, F. E. *In Mist Apparelled. Religious Themes in Plutarch's Moralia and Lives.* Leiden: 1977.

Brenk (1986) = Brenk, F. E. "In the Light of the Moon: Demonology in the Early Imperial Period." *ANRW* 16.3 (1986) 2068-2145.

Brenk (1987) = Brenk, F. E. "The Religious Spirit of Plutarch." *ANRW* 36.1 (1987) 248-349.

Burkert = Burkert, W. *Lore and Science in Ancient Pythagoreanism.* Cambridge, Mass.: 1972.

Cherniss (1957) = Cherniss, H. *Plutarch's Moralia.* XIII. 999c -1032 f. With English translation by H. Ch. LCL. Cambridge, Mass.: 1957.

Cherniss (1964) = Cherniss, H. *Aristotle's Criticism of Presocratic Philosophy.* Baltimore: 1964.

Chitwood = Chitwood, A. "The Death of Empedocles." *AJP* 107 (1986) 175-191.

Denniston = Denniston, J. D. *The Greek Particles.* Oxford: 1954.

Diels (1898a) = Diels, H. "Uber die Gedichte des Empedokles." *Sitzungsberichte der Kgl. Pr. Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin* (1898) 396-415.

Diels (1898b) = Diels, H. "Symbola Empedoclea." in *Mélanges Henri Weil, recueil de mémoires concernant l'histoire et la littérature grecques dédié à H. Weil.* Paris: 1898.

Diels (1965) = Diels, H. *Doxographi Graeci.* 4th edition. Berlin: 1965.

Diels and Kranz = Diels, H. and W. Kranz. *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker* 6th ed. Berlin: 1951.

Dillon (1977) = Dillon, J. *The Middle Platonists. 80 B.C. to A.D. 220.* Ithaca: 1977.
Dillon (1989) = Dillon, J. "Tampering with the Timaeus." *AJPh* 111 (1989) 50-72.
Dodds = Dodds, E. R. *Plato. Gorgias. A Revised Text with Introduction and Commentary.* Oxford:1959.
Dorandi = Dorandi, T. "Sillyboi." *Scrittura e Civilta* 8 (1984) 185-199.
Duke et al. = Duke, E. A., W. S. M. Nicoll, D. B. Robinson, J. Strachan and W. F. Hicken, eds. *Platonis Opera: Tetralogias* I-II. Oxford: 1995.
Edelstein and Kidd = Edelstein, L. and I. G. Kidd, eds. *Posidonus. The Fragements.* Volume I. Cambridge: 1972.
England = E. B. England. *The Laws of Plato.* Vol. 1. London:1921.
Fairbanks = Fairbanks, A. "On Plutarch's Quotations from the Early Greek Philosophers." *TAPA* 28 (1897) 75-87.
Flacelière and Irigoin = Flacelière, R. and J. Irigoin. *Plutarque. Oeuvres Morales*, Vol 1. Paris: 1987.
Gamble = Gamble, H. Y. *Books and Readers in the Early Church.* New Haven: 1995.
Gottschalk = Gottschalk, H. B. *Heraclides of Pontus.* Oxford: 1980.
Greene = Greene, W. C. ed. *Scholia Platonica.* Haverford, Pa:1938.
Guthrie = Guthrie, W. K. C. *History of Greek Philosophy.* Cambridge: 1965.
Hardie (1992) = Hardie, P. "Plutarch and the Interpretation of Myth." *ANRW* 33.6 (1992) 4743-4787.
Hardie (1995) = Hardie, P. "The Speech of Pythagoras in Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 15: Empedoclean *Epos*." *CQ* 45 (1995) 204-214.
Helmbold and O'Neil = Helmbold, W. C. & E. N. O'Neil. *Plutarch's Quotations.* Baltimore: 1959.
Hershbell (1971) = Hershbell, J. P. "Plutarch as a Source for Empedocles Re-examined." *AJP* 92 (1971) 156-184.
Hershbell (1973) = Hershbell, J. P. "Hippolytus' *Elenchus* as Source for Empedocles Re-examined." *Phronesis* 18 (1973) 97-114, 187-203.
Hershbell (1987) = Hershbell, J. P. "Plutarch's 'De Animae Procreatione in Timaeo'." *ANRW* (1987) 234-247.
Holford-Strevens = Holford-Strevens, L. *Aulus Gellius.* Chapel Hill: 1988.
Inwood (1999) = Inwood, B. Letter. *TLS*, 9 July 1999.
Inwood (2000) = Inwood, B. Review of A. Martin, O Primavesi: *L'Empédocle de Strasbourg(P. Strasb. gr. Inv. 1665-1666). Introduction, édition et commentaire.* New York:1998. *CR* 50 (2000) 5-7.
Inwood (2001) = Inwood, B. *The Poem of Empedocles.* 2nd ed. A Text and Translation with an Introduction by B. I., Phoenix Presocratics, 3. Toronto: 2001.
Jacob = Jacob, C. "Athenaeus the Librarian." 85-110 in D. Braund & J. Wilkins, eds. *Athenaeus and His World. Reading Greek Culture in the Roman Empire.* Exeter: 2000.
Jaeger = Jaeger, W. *The Theology of the Early Greek Philosophers.* Oxford: 1947.
Jones (1971) = Jones, C. P. *Plutarch and Rome.* Oxford: 1971.
Jones (1996) = Jones, C. P. "Towards a Chronology of Plutarch's Works." *JRS* 56 (1996) 61-74.
Joyal = Joyal, M. "A Lost Plutarchean Philosophical Work." *Philologus* 137 (1993) 92-103.

Platonism. Brussels: 1998.
Osborne (1987a) = Osborne, C. "Empedocles Recycled." *CQ* 37 (1987) 24-50.
Osborne (1987b) = Osborne, C. *Rethinking Early Greek Philosophy: Hippolytus of Rome and the Presocratics*. Ithaca: 1987.
Osborne (2000) = Osborne, C. Rummaging in the Recycling Bins of Upper Eygpt." *OSAP* 18 (2000) 329-356.
Pendrick = Pendrick, G. J. *Antiphon the Sophist: The Fragments*. Cambridge: 2002.
Roberts and Donaldson = Roberts, Rev. A. and J. Donaldson. Revised by A. C. Coxe. *The Anti-Nicene Fathers*. Volume 5. Grand Rapids: 1978.
Runia = Runia, David T. "Platonic Citations in Philo of Alexandria." 261-291 in *Studies in Plato and the Platonic Tradition. Essays Presented to John Whittaker*. M. Joyal, ed. Aldershot:1997.
Russell = Russell, D. A. *Plutarch*. London: 1973.
Rusten = Rusten, J. S. "Ovid, Empedocles and the Minotaur." *AJP* 103 (1982) 332-333.
Sedley (1989) = Sedley, D. "The Proems of Empedocles and Lucretius," *GRBS* 30 (1989) 269-296.
Sedley (1998) = Sedley, D. *Lucretius and the Transformation of Greek Wisdom*. Cambridge: 1998.
Sider = Sider, D. "Empedocles' Persika." *Ancient Philosophy* 2 (1982) 76-78.
Solmsen = Solmsen, F. "Empedocles' Hymn to Apollo." *Phronesis* 25 (1980) 219-227.
Swain = Swain, S. "Plutarch, Plato, Athens and Rome." 165-187 in *Philosophia Togata* II. J. Barnes and M. Griffin, eds. Oxford: 1997.
Turner = Turner, E. G. *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World*. London: 1987.
Van der Ben = Van der Ben, N. *The Proem of Empedocles' Peri Physios. Towards a New Edition of All the Fragments*. Amsterdam: 1975.
West = West, M. *Early Greek Philosophy and the Orient*. Oxford:1971.
Vernière = Vernière, Y. *Symboles and Mythes dans la Pensée de Plutarque*. Paris: 1977.
Whittaker (1969) = Whittaker, J. "Ammonius on the Delphic E." *CQ* 19 (1969) 185-192.
Whittaker (1987) = Whittaker, J. "Platonic Philosophy in the Early Centuries of the Empire." *ANRW* 36.1 (1987) 81-123.
Whittaker (1989) = Whittaker, J. "The Value of the Indirect Tradition in the Establishment of Greek Philosophical Texts or the Art of Misquotation." 63-95 in *Editing Greek and Latin Texts*. New York: 1989.
Wright = Wright, M. R. *Empedocles. The Extant Fragments*. Edited, with an Introduction, Commentary, and Concordance, by M. R. W. New Haven: 1995.
Ziegler = Ziegler, K. 'Plutarchos)', *RE* Bd. 21.1, 636-962. Stuttgrat: 1951.
Zuntz (1971) = Zuntz, G. *Persephone. Three Essays on Religion and Thought in Magna Graecia*. Oxford: 1971.